



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Stakeholder Report Back: Verbatim Report

December 14, 2020

Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments presented here include all feedback, suggestions, comments and messages that were collected online and face-to-face through the engagement described in the Phase 2 [What we Heard Report](#). This document is over 4600 pages. We do not recommend printing the whole document. Please be cautious if you choose to print a portion of the document as each section is extremely long as well. All input has been reviewed and provided to the Project Team to be considered in decision making for the project.

Please note:

- These comments are verbatim. That is they are exactly as received. As a result, some of the comments may be offensive, inaccurate, or distasteful.
- Comments have not been edited for spelling, formatting or correctness.

You will see [removed] or [personal information removed] in some rows. This is for:

- personally identifying information,
- easily removable profanity,
- or where the whole comment clearly does not meet the [City's Respectful Workplace Policy](#) or [Online Tool Moderation Practice](#).

Verbatim comments are divided as follows:

- [Public](#)
 - [Wildlife](#)
 - [Dogs](#)
 - [Tribunal](#)
 - [Bite and Run](#)
 - [Livestock](#)
 - [Pet limit](#)
 - [Other](#)
- [Internal](#)
 - [Cats](#)
 - [Wildlife](#)
 - [Dogs](#)
 - [Pigeons](#)
 - [Dog Early Warning System](#)
 - [Fine amounts](#)
 - [Tribunal](#)
 - [Bite and Run](#)
 - [Livestock](#)
 - [Fees](#) (Livestock as Emotional Support Animal and low-income)
 - [Pet limit](#)
 - [Vendors](#)
 - [Other](#)
- [Targeted](#)
 - [Cats](#)
 - [Wildlife](#)
 - [Dogs](#)
 - [Pigeons](#)



- [Dog Early Warning System](#)
- [Fine amounts](#)
- [Tribunal](#)
- [Bite and Run](#)
- [Livestock](#)
- [Fees](#) (Livestock as Emotional Support Animal and low-income)
- [Pet limit](#)
- [Vendors](#)
- [Other](#)

Public

Wildlife

Participants were asked if they would support a bylaw that prohibits feeding and/or teasing wildlife on private property. Responses below are in response to the question 'what, if any, exceptions would you suggest?'.

- If the animal is in distress and needs to be coaxed with food
- Bird feeders etc
- Prohibit teasing not feeding. I feed the deer and moose in the winter especially calving time. They have safe haven, food and shelter on our property.
- Scaring them off
- Feeding rabbits in your yard during winter, for example, should be up to the homeowner, but teasing or harming any animal should not be allowed anywhere, even on personal property
- Put the animal down to sleep and move the animal to it's original environment.. no need to kill at all
- birds - bird feeders, flowers for bees
- None
- Don't need a bylaw for that
- Hummingbird feeders
- fines of some sorts....gotta hit the person where it hurts and it's the pocket book...
- I think that feeding and "teasing" are 2 very different things and should be separated. Providing food or water to animals for hmmm is far different than what teasing implies.
- Education for first offence, fines and being barred from parks for further offences.
- I believe feeding birds is positive... keeps in the city. Squirrels etc are a pain, and eat gardens, do damage.
- bird feeders
- Birds, bunnies
- Bird feeders
- Any harm to any animal should have a penalty, we need to stop punishing animals for the error of humans
- I would like to see the City start to do something about all the magpies, crows and rabbits that have multiplied substantially over the years.



- Bird feeders
- It would have to be very defined and not broad
- Certain farms where kids can milk goats, feed horses etc. Teasing/taunting should be prohibited 100%
- Birds
- That we spend this much time caring about our children and licensing all day homes so children can't get murdered, dog and cats have more rights than children
- None
- Bird feeders, birdbaths, and other types of specific feeders and food
- this should be to dangerous animals. ex bear cougar lynx wolf coyote etc
- Pest control
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- none
- Animal needing assistance
- No exceptions.
- Bird seed should still be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- If it's your property then you can do as you want. Stop controlling people like they are slave.
- NA
- I think bird feeders should be exempt
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Teasing should never be allowed. Bylaw should be considered for those killing and moving birds and mammals. Feeding birds and squirrels allowed unless specific issue (bear attractant).
- Only if person is causing harm to wildlife on said property.
- Feed birds as long as pests, such as vermin, that are attracted to the bird food, are adequately dealt with and kept in check.
- One bird seed feeder of a certain Size and height off the ground
- Professionals/experts allow for this in order to safely deter the animal off the property
- Exception for feeding wildlife which needs support to survive with appropriate food
- Signage made available to land owners if necessary
- Approaching and getting help for an injured animal
- Fine
- Bird feeders
- Feeding sparrow and small birds
- veggies for rabbits, harmless activities.
- No exeptions
- None



- Ban trapping wild life too.
- fines for those proven to have done so
- Bird feeders, flowers for bees
- Bird feeders. squirrel feeders
- Appropriate feeders such as bird feeders, etc. where people are not hand feeding the animals.
- I think it's okay to feed certain wild life like birds or squirrels
- An animal in distress
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- If a Humane trap is being set on private property to trap and relocate a feral animal.
- None
- Distressed animals in the process of getting help
- Educate public on negative impacts
- Food given to animals aligns with things that won't hurt their systems. (Birdseed, vegetables/fruits, etc)
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Exemption for birds
- Feeding should be exempt for birds and other species that are not determined to be nuisance
- Trying to help a lost animal in order to contact their owners.
- People rescuing wildlife to bring to shelters/reserves or to protect while waiting for fish and wildlife to respond
- Feeding birds, especially song birds and hummingbirds
- Photography within reason
- Bird feeders
- A fine
- Allow people to feed songbirds in their yards especially during the winter months as their food source is scarce then.
- Define feeding and teasing. Does this include putting out bird feeders? Many birds would not survive the winter without the bird feeders.
- Deter wildlife considered pests
- Bird feeders and putting out food to try to encourage missing pets to return home.
- None
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Birds, rabbits, raccoons
- If it looked starving I should feed it
- Feeding Injured animals (ex. Attempting to trap animal for wildlife assistance)
- Bird feeders
- Moderate engagement with wildlife and feeding if feeling safe
- I don't have a problem with bird feeders but feeding squirrels is not okay.



- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders/houses, bee house/apiary, etc
- Bird feeders, native vegetation that supports local wildlife without making them dependent
- Birds feeding should be exempt
- Birds/poultry
- Bird feeders and bird houses
- Feeding wildlife to catch them to treat injury or illness through the proper means, such as vet care or relocation, should be acceptable.
- I am not against feeding wildlife, if being fed properly, but am totally against teasing any animal.
- It's private property people are still going to do it so just leave it alone.
- n/a
- Definitely I don't agree with hurting/teasing animals, but I don't see the harm in leaving food put for birds, squirrels, etc... perhaps limitations on how many feeding devices? And fines for any wildlife abuse
- Birds and squirrels or non-Apex animals
- Squirrels
- Feeding wild birds
- Fines
- Inform but don't try to enforce. What harm is having bird feeders/baths or bee friendly gardens?
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- NO FEEDING OF WILDLIFE SHOULD BE OCCURRING - including all birds and small rodents
- if animal is not dangerous to humans (i.e. bird, squirrel, etc).
- Bird feeders
- Feeding deer. Some people love to see them and if it's grain it isn't harming them
- No tolerance for teasing animals
- Teasing should be fined.
- Bird feeders
- Predators and deer. Question is formulated as all wildlife; feeding birds is fine.
- I think feeding bird food in the winter should be allowed
- None
- Rodent or Pigeons
- N/a
- Bird feeders in winter should be exempt from such a prohibition.
- Birds
- None



- Ticket
- If people are feeding the animals it should be ok
- Bird houses
- Will this include bird feeders? Bee, ladybug and butterfly feeders? Feeding and supporting those wild animals benefits everyone. Humane trapping (with food enticements) to relocate problem animals.
- Bird feeders, people attempting to provide backyard ecosystems/safe havens for wildlife, etc
- Helping injured or sick animals
- Teasing isn't ok at anytime but you say feeding wildlife well aren't birds wildlife
- Birds, squirrels, rabbits should not be included. People feed birds all the time. Be careful on what animals are include in fines.
- I'm only against as in a fenced backyard itshard to stop my dog from chasing squirrels/birds.
- Wildlife with young babies that need shelter and a safe place that provides their basic needs.
- none
- Bird feeders
- are bird feeders helpful for wild birds?
- Bird feeders for native birds in Alberta
- Bird feeders
- If the animal is sick or injured, you should be considered to assist it in any way possible until a wildlife officer or animal rehabilitation employee takes them in.
- None
- Exceptions for pests such as magpies, crows, insects, bugs, rodents etc.
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels (via backyard feeders)
- [removed]
- Set up Cameras in areas where Wild life could roam to monitor. Fine people for harrassment, wild life need to be respected.
- None, that behaviour isn't acceptable anywhere
- I would hate to see people not to be able to feed the birds, but I don't agree with feeding squires, deer etc
- Bird feeders, feeding or helping sick or injured animals
- Maybe have permits for people who know what to feed and not to feed birds on private property
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- Seagulls, squirrels, gophers, similar small harmless animals
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- None.
- Bird feeders
- If an animal is suffering and needing food to lure for rehabilitation. To feed wild birds in feeders etc.



- Bird feed/squirrels should be exempt
- Bird/ Squirrel non-invasive feeders and baths
- No teasing, possible feeding on private property
- Sick/neglected animals
- No exceptions
- Hurt/sick wildlife until proper measures can be taken to remove and rehabilitate.
- Bird feeders
- Animals not able to be received by rehab centres at the moment.
- Bird feeders
- None
- Huge fines
- None
- Bird feeders
- Teasing no, feeding should be allowed.
- Bird feeders mimicing a natural diet
- N/A
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- This would need to be within reason and I don't believe that in certain circumstances... ie: squirrels getting into human food or food outside on your deck that could be left with no intention of feeding them
- Birds in winter
- Double the fines for feeding birds.
- Still allowed to feed squirrels and birds
- Bird and bee feeders in yards
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels etc
- Allow feeding on private property.
- Birds/bird feeder
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds/squirrels
- Perhaps feeding animals in distress
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders should be okay. Just no feeding of more nuisance animals like racoons, skunks etc
- Bird feeders



- No ill intent should be placed on wild animals but bird feeders and the like shouldn't be banned
- Stationary bird feeders with no human interaction.
- Feeding birds
- People with a birdfeeder or giving nuts to a squirrel
- 200
- Bees and birds
- Conservation efforts on private property, bird feeders on private property
- Feeding birds seeds from bird feeders seems a reasonable exception.
- Exempt bird feeders
- bird feeders
- none
- You should be able to leave bird seed and the like out
- Bird feeders
- Birds/squirrels
- Neglected animals should be fed.
- Just a note, pitbulls are being singled out because they have a stronger bite pressure? Yikes, I thought Calgary was WAY more evolved than this. Disappointing.
- Bird feeders
- Squirrels and birds would need to be an exception
- Birds
- Education on how to report wildlife, trap them and release where more appropriate for them to survive
- n/a
- I would expect there are minimal times a wildlife is on private property being fed or teased. Fine people for feeding ducks and geese bread at the parks/lakes or
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders or salt licks
- Bird feeders
- Stop building in their environment that they had before !!!!
- None. This would hopefully stop people from engaging with wild animals and getting injured
- Not sure
- Feeding if the animal appears in distress.
- Birds
- Magpies
- If homeowners can produce papers proving the animal belongs to them.
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Teasing should not be allowed but feeding birds species appropriate food is fine
- None



- Bird feeders
- Bird seed / bird feeders
- Not so much exceptions, but focus on prohibiting feeding/teasing wildlife that could become a danger or develop habituation to humans that could have adverse impacts. (i.e. bears, deer)
- Actions by people trying to get the wildlife off private property such as yelling, using a broom, etc
- Dementia in seniors
- Not on private property
- If you cant come and get the animal off the property - you cant except to tell me what to do with the animal on my property. A deer died in my backyard that wondered off the path and because it was 'my property' as said by both fish and wildlife and 311
- None
- Birdfeeders
- Rabbits and young people the occasional carrot left shouldn't be criminal
- even if cats and dogs are stray or wild of feral they should be fed however individuals should proceed with caution and limit touching.
- Cruelty/ harm to wildlife
- Backyard birdfeeders should be exempt. These provide a good source of energy, especially to migrating birds on the way through.
- Birds and feeders
- Support animals or limited number chickens for eggs(4)
- None.
- Bird feeders/baths and bat boxes (houses) should be allowed
- None
- In the best interest for the animals health
- Exception would be if a young animal is found and needs food/water until rescue services can pick it up.
- Bird feeders and other things intended for the well-being of animals
- None
- Bird seed to feed birds, etc
- Birds
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders would become complicated
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- If in obvious need of food
- Injured animal
- Animal is injured or in need of help. Home owners should be able to provide food. Such as an injured deer.
- Feeding birds/squirrels
- Exceptions on birds and non varmint wildlife.



- Education and then fines
- Education and or a fine
- Not sure
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Rural type property within city limits
- Feeding an animal that's recovering from an illness or injury.
- Bird feeders, urban bee nests
- Allow feeding on private property but have a bylaw for harassing wildlife on private property. But allow gardeners from protecting their crops
- Outside of crowded inner city neighbourhoods (ie/ someone's private acreage). In our area one neighbour feeding smaller critters is attracting larger critters from the nearby river and green space/park
- No exceptions. Strict and large fines for feeding wildlife anywherr
- None. Keep wildlife wild.
- Bird feeders
- Wild birds are commonly fed. Other wild animals shouldn't be fed as they can become too comfortable with humans.
- Birds
- Animal is injured or if your trying to trap and regime.
- This is ridiculous! Now you want a law against feeding squirrels and birds in your own yard?
- Bird feeders
- Feeding of animals that are not dangerous should be allowed. E.g birds, squirrels, rabbits etc.
- Feeding no as this can be done not on purpose. Teasing Animals shouldn't be allowed
- Bird feeders exception
- Bird feeders and the like. Help indirectly to not cause nuisance.
- Birdfeeders
- Teasing should not be permitted. Feeding birds, humming birds etc should be allowed.
- Bird feeders should still be allowed, but only if they aren't attracting deer or other large wildlife.
- Bird feeders exempt
- Bird feeders
- I assume bird feeders or other related items that are typically in a backyard would be an exception.
- Bird feeders, flowers for bees/bugs, squirrels will steal food so what can ya do.
- Feeding birds.
- song birds
- Fines
- Exempt the feeding of birds
- Let the kids and old people feed the birds. If it's a bear the human is feeding or if anyone is teasing or being viscious to any animal there should be consequences
- Birds



- Fruit bearing trees being an exception. As you are not purposely feeding them. However. Pups add a clause that fruit to be cleaned fromThe ground by end of growing season?
- Wild life centres
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Bird feeders on residential lots
- Injured animal
- Ask wildlife experts.
- N/A
- Hummingbirds
- injured wildlife that you are trying to capture and bring to safety
- Bird feeders.
- Birds
- Animals that require human intervention to survive, shooing away animals from private property ,
- The feeding of native bird species does not have a negative impact
- Bird seed
- Malnourished, skinny, starving animals
- bird feeders should not be illegal
- Birds, squirrels. We did destroy their habitat to build houses, we probably owe it to them to feed them now.
- Education campaign
- None
- Deterring wildlife (not teasing, but language could complicate this)
- Unless the food is poisoned
- Bird feeders
- People will say bird feeders but those turn into squirrel feeders
- Etter public education...nature is nature leave it alone.
- Feeding baby animals in need of nourishment ie. Bunnies
- In the instance of predatory animals I.e coyotes there should be no tolerance
- Heavy fines
- Bird feeders.
- Fines potential jail sentence if involving dangerous animals.
- I guess we'll just start fining anyone with a bird feeder now
- The animal is injured and won't make it by its self.
- Chickens or ducks
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- None
- But not to feeding extra bird feeders. Teasing disrupting yes!



- Bird feeders should be an exception, especially through the winter.
- If the animal in question is damaging the livelihood of livestock or the root income of a resident than I would suggest contacting local conservation specialist to address the issue.
- Protecting property and scaring animals away from your home
- Silly idea you would have to define "teasing"
- Birds
- Bird and/or squirrel feeders
- Just don't feed them anything toxic
- None
- Wild birds if fed from a feeder with appropriate wild bird feed, kept a certain distance away from people/houses so it is not associated with humans
- No exception
- Unintentionally eg kids leave food out
- Bird feeders should be ok
- Bird feeders
- N/a
- If people want wildlife, then move to a farm outside the city.
- Feeding of birds using approved bird seed
- Bird feeders
- Shooting Magpies and Crows that are disturbing the peace with a pellet gun needs to be encouraged!
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- Make it expensive!
- Bird squirrel feeders
- none. Don't willfully feed the wildlife.
- Bird houses
- Saving a wounded animal or abandoned infant while waiting for wildlife to step in (feeding). No exceptions for teasing.
- Bird feeders
- If it's a coyote about to attack someone's dog
- None
- None
- Bird feeders in yards
- Higher fine
- Feeding song birds should be made an exception.
- No exceptions. Feeding wildlife on private property endangers everyone
- Birds
- Leave wild life alone.



- Songbirds can be fed, not pigeons
 - Bird feeders, bubble bee homes and feeders, bat houses etc
 - None
 - Birdfeeders
 - Birds
 - Except peanuts for chipmunks and squirrels, and bird feeders.
 - Provided this does not prohibit bird feeders. I do not support restricting bird feeders.
 - Feeding birds and squirrels in feeders
-
- Huge fine
 - Humane trapping may require feeding
 - Elected city officials.
 - birds
 - Avian exception for feeding
 - Bird/ Squirrel feeders on private property, Acreages
 - None.
 - Bird feeders
 - Bird/squirrel feeders exempt from bylaw
 - If an animal is injured, and in need of help.
 - Too expensive to enforce
 - The animal is in danger, being neglected
 - Birds and squirrels
 - If the animal was in distressed and required water until authorities arrived.
 - You should be able to feed birds at bird feeders
 - Any animal that seems to be hurt or injured that possibly needs food and water to live
 - Bird feeders?
 - The exceptions would be birds and squirrels as they consume the same food.
 - Stop feeding squirrels
 - Trapping pests
 - Feeding squirrels and birds
 - No exceptions
 - Caring for a hurt animal while waiting for City help.
 - Bird feeders
 - None
 - Birdfeeders
 - Bird feeders are fine
 - Injured wildlife



- An animal in distress
- Bird feeders
- Birds, rabbits, any species that do not pose a danger to humans
- Bird feeders
- Fine the people who are reckless with feeding animals with food that can harm them.
- Bird feeders on trees on private property.
- None.
- Education
- Birds. Bird feeders help birds survive winter.
- Wildlife that seems abandoned by parents or injured
- Hanging bird feeders
- Depends on the specific wording of a bylaw. Birds are wildlife and are fed from a bird feeder and by proxy squirrels. What animals could you be fined for feeding and would this hinder the use of bird feeders?
- Bumble bee feeders
- Birds and squirrels.
- None
- that teasing wildlife on private property be prohibited as teasing would be cruel
- Bird feeders could be acceptable
- No teasing/harassing/handling any wildlife anywhere. Bird feeders ok.
- None!
- Bird feeders, bee and other pollinator supporting activities.
- Bird/ squirrel feeders.
- Bird feeders
- No teasing but feeding perhaps is okay
- Small critters such as birds should be exempt from this.
- Bird feeders
- In distress
- None. Private property is private and only the owners of the property should dictate this.
- Bird feeders/houses, bee feeders, bat houses
- Fines
- Birds
- Bird feeders and water baths
- Feeding the birds should be ok. I am more concerned about large animals
- No exceptions
- Seeing how harassment of wildlife is illegal under fish and wild life on both public and private land why would the city be trying to take care of this? After more tax dollars?
- I'm guilty of feeding squirrels
- Trapping for injured



- Birds/squirrels I think should be exempt
 - It's peoples property
 - Less bylaws
 - Distressed animals in need of care/rehabilitation
 - No feeding wildlife on private property (ie. Squirrels, ducks, pigeons, etc)
 - None.
 - It's not a problem unless it's causing a problem to wildlife or surrounding neighbours
 - Feeding on instruction of wildlife officer
 - Anything with cruelty to animals
 - I feed birds, would that be considered feeding wildlife? I'm all for not harassing wildlife but I worry how that bylaw would be interpreted.
 - Bird feeders
 - Just help these animals out. We need to come together to help
 - None. I work for national parks and know the dangers of habituating wildlife.
 - Birds and animals in need
 - Bird feeders
 - Are you proposing to stop having bird feeders? Thats ridiculous.
 - bird feeders
 - Feeding as a means of emergency care for an animal.
 - None
 - None
 - None
 - If the wildlife is starving or hurt and fish and wildlife can't or won't intervene.
 - Feeding animals on your own land as long as you arent using it at bait
 - Bird feeders should be allowed
 - NONE
 - Proper bird feeders.
 - Trapping pests
 - If they appear injured or sick
 - Passive bird, squirrel etc feeders.
 - Nothing wrong with feeding the birds and squirrels, but definitely not wildlife or animals considered pests.
 - Bird feeders/Squirrel feeders
 - If the pet is visibly being starved
-
- Birds
 - If the animal is classified as a nuisance or is being a nuisance this would make an excellent exception.



- Birdfeeders, if no other wildlife is affected.
- You're over reaching bylaws into a communist state of affairs
- Teasing can be misconstrued when one is trying to evict feral animals from private property. How would you effectively distinguish between them if there is an incident based on "eye witness" testimony?
- Certain species of birds
- Protecting from bears and other animals threatening your family
- Leaving bird food and squirrel food out. Not teasing or harassing of any kind is acceptable. I've seen parents let their kids chase geese at princes island park and I go up and tell them to knock it off
- Small local. I say anything bigger than a bird (deer etc) should not be fed. Teasing is a no go completely!
- Exempt Bird feeders and chasing wildlife off your property.
- 0
- Leave the wild life be they were here first
- Bird/squirrel feeders put out by homeowners should be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- If the homeowner complains then fine someone.
- Feeding birds is wild life . Be carefull what you do with this
- Humming bird feeders, bee gardens.
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- None. No reason to on private property
- Birds
- Birds

- Birds, squirrels
- birds
- I don't think something be wrong with taking in a freezing cat or dog and or feeding them. Not sure what 'Wildlife' entails
- Fine
- Birds/squirrel
- Wildlife should be left alone. Having a bird feeder would be an exception.
- Above ground feeders, bird baths
- Bird feeders should be allowed, I wouldn't even mind squirrels
- Exceptions surrounding feral domesticated animals communities
- I think there should be some education explaining how to act with wild animals on private property
- Abusive behaviour toward wildlife on private property should be prohibited
- Using food for humane trapping/relocation



- Bird feeders in yards. But restaurants leaving garbage cans open for birds should be fined
- bird seed, veggie gardens
- The statement is too vague - as bird feeders would be prohibited - more likely specify the "game" "aggressive" animals eg deer, coyotes, foxes etc...
- None, let wildlife be "wild"
- Helping harmed animals
- Exceptions for bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be excluded. Wildlife eating from yards/gardens should not be a prohibited offense.
- I think encouraging dangerous wildlife (bobcats, lynx, coyotes) should be prohibited. Feeding nuts and seeds to birds and squirrels shouldn't be regulated. Teasing and/or harming any wildlife should not be allowed.
- Humane and live traps for rehabilitation and relocations
- Birds, other than pigeons. [removed]
- Obviously I do not think people should feed a bear or a cougar however sometimes I throw some carrots or veggies out for the rabbits in my yard
- Birds
- exceptions for urban birds (crows, magpies, sparrows etc)
- Exceptions for feeding birds, rehab people
- Fine
- Only to trap an animal and surrender to the proper authority
- None
- If the animal is deemed in distress.
- N/A
- bird and squirrel feeders
- Allow bird feeders
- A sick animal
- None
- Birds
- None, I don't support elected officials imposing on my private life
- Bird feeders shouldn't count as feeding an animal
- Rescuing injured animals and feeding while in your care.
- No
- Awareness campaign of the problems and dangers of feeding/teasing wildlife on private property
- if they are injured and/or they need help, food could be provided to help catch them/sustain them until they can get medical attention.
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- Wounded animal



- Bird feeders
- There should be an exception for things like bird feeders
- Birdfeeders. I also think there should be more penalties for people who are cruel to and harm animals.
- Bird feeders on private property. Heavy fines for people feeding "urban" predators causing habitation
- Bird feeders with appropriate wild bird seed
- Bird feeders
- Reasonable amount of bird feeders and/bird bath
- No exceptions for teasing. Feeding birds on one's property is not equatable to feeding bears, deer etc
- none
- Prohibit teasing yes
- No fines if the wild animal is in a back yard
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders should be exempt
- None
- Bird feeders
- Stop ticketing the residents of Calgary for nothing
- Bird feeders should be exempt.
- If the animal is injured and someone takes it upon themselves to care for it while it recovers...
Example.. Bird with a broken wing. Feeding and teasing disrupts the nature of the little wildlife we are still lucky to see in this city
- Feeding birds should be ok
- Feeding birds
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- Cruelty
- this includes preventing the city from harassing coyotes in Nose Hill park - leave them alone
- Exceptions for feeding birds
- Bird feeders. or planting things in a garden to encourage wildlife like rabbits etc to visit your property
- bird feeders should be allowed.
- To rabbits, as some may be pets and hard to identify as wildlife
- Birds, squirrels, rabbits
- Birds perhaps
- Unless they're getting into garbage or eating plants
- If the animals are threatening
- Heavy fines, arrest
- Birds should be allowed to be fed
- Exceptions for feeding birds and squirrels in a backyard feeder.



- Trying to trap injured
- I think bird feeders are okay.
- Birds, bird feeders are nice
- If the animal is starving, weak, or injured
- Bird feeders
- Feed wild birds
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Feed wildlife As long as its not coyotes or fox etc.
- birds, small animals (like squirrels), deer.
- Bird feeders. But that seems obvious.
- Birds
- Bird feeders, providing they are 'squirrel proof' even though I am terrified of birds
- none
- Bird feeders and even squirrel feeders should be exempt.
- Feeding okay (bird feeders), teasing NOT okay
- If an animal is injured and needs food/water
- Bird/bee feeders.
- If the animal is a baby/ juvenile who is lost or away from its mother
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Non birds of prey
- Birds
- Please DO NOT single out bully breed dogs, I can't believe the city of calgary is actually considering this, what a joke - increase fines for irresponsible pet owners, don't bully bully breeds, how awful.
- Birdfeeder
- Birdfeeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- Bird seed
- Dear are exempt
- None
- Except rabbits, birds, squirrels? Basically to include a by-law prohibiting raccoons, skunks, coyotes etc. etc.
- Since it's a city, feeding is one thing, like birds squirrels. Any teasing or unethical removal/ behaviour towards any animal should be heavily fined.
- Feeding or teasing excludes the use of a proper feeder such as a bird feeder
- Wildlife that feeds on berries on trees/shrubs/hedges of their own free will.
- No exceptions. We shouldn't encourage wildlife to depend on humans.
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeder (nuts, etc.)



- Let cats roam
 - Exception for birds
 - Animal is injured or baby/juvenile
 - Deers feed off bird feeders and this should be allowed
 - None
 - Injured or sick wildlife being taken to get help
 - Bird feeders
 - Bird Feeders should be allowed and squirrel feeders
 - bird/squirrel feeders permitted
 - Bird feeders should be ok, unless they attract animal such as bears.
 - None. Private property is private!!!!
 - Non aggressive animals
 - Any chained up animal that will not be surrendered should be feed
 - Take funds from the CPS and create a wildlife program in the city with experts who can safely and humanely recover the animal and relocate it or have it medically assessed.
 - None
 - Birds
 - Exceptions for birds, squirrels even bees
 - There are bird feeders and the birds love it. I would only suggest not feeding larger wildlife like deer.
 - It is my property, and I pay outrageous taxes so if I want to feed wild rabbits in my back yard, it is my right to do to.
 - Bird feeders
 - If the animals are friendly and recognizes the people on private properties, i dont see why they would need to be disturbed or harmed.
 - No exceptions
 - None! They are wild animals! People should be fined!
 - bird feeders, Squirrels also eat from bird feeders
 - Injured animals
 - Old ladies feeding squirrels. Seriously. I
 - Squirrels and birds
 - Bird feeders
 - Unless licensed wildlife
-
- Why is anyone feeding wildlife on private property. Not allowed period.
 - Exempt bird feeders.
 - Pests, animals that are destroying property, or harassing people or pets on property
 - Trapping wildlife for medical attention



- I'm not sure if you mean things like bird feeders? I think bird feeders should be allowed but not things like feeding deer.... and definitely not teasing any animal
- Educate people on toll of feeding wild animals
- Bird feeders etc
- Obviously people should be free to put out bird feeders for seed and nut eating birds.
- Exception for bird feeders
- None
- feeding stations should be allowed.
- Trapping wildlife for medical attention
- I would say yes, but the bylaw would have to be very clear on what constitutes feeding wildlife and define wild life clearly. For example, if the city bans feeding wildlife on private property would that include bird feeders and bird baths?
- No exceptions
- Coyote sensitization-warding off coyotes
- I do not agree with teasing wildlife. Will birds be put under this umbrella as well as they are in fact wildlife?
- Squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Injured or in need of medical care
- Birds
- I'm not educated enough in this circumstance. Yes I would support prohibition of feeding and/or teasing wildlife on private property, but if it's a sick animal and I had to house it until wildlife rescue comes for pick up, then I would want to feed it.
- If an animal is injured I suppose it would require some exception
- Bird feeders
- If the animal was in danger (incapacitated, emaciated, lost its parent)
- Birds, squirrels.
- Obviously I'm against teasing any animal. But feeding them should not be addressed in the same sentence.
- Bird feeder
- Birds and squirrels
- Torture or pain inflicted for the purpose of entertainment
- Fines
- Fines
- Capturing injured wildlife
- How would you classify a bird feeder as?
- Song bird feeders
- Birds are especially vulnerable. Some wildlife should be fed and increase the atmosphere of public areas.



- Bird feeders on private property allowed
- None
- Birdfeeders
- Birdfeeders and bird baths
- starving cat/dog
- native birds only; not the invasive species
- Bird seed for wild birds
- When an animal is in distress and your trying to bait them in to help
- Fine for harassing or endangering wildlife. Including allowing your pets to harass or kill wildlife
- Except animals identified as problem or pest.
- bird feeders, especially in winter
- Injured animals after a rehab/spca has been contacted (feeding), teasing/chasing off allowed if they are damaging property
- bird feeders or bird baths
- Birdfeeders or beehives
- Injured or sick wildlife in need of help
- Define wildlife first. Definitely not coyotes, deer, or squirrels. Definitely not birds.
- Destroying private property
- Birds
- Gardner's can grow what they want and if animals happen to eat it so be it . Don't fine people for growing things animals might want to snack on
- None
- If they are injured and with the city's recommendations; they can feed under certain circumstances
- Birds and squirrels
- People like to put out bird feeders, those shouldn't be a problem
- Feeding birds
- Birds, squirrels.
- Providing food and shelter to an injured animal until the appropriate agencies (Fish & Wildlife for example) show up to take over.
- I am opposed to teasing, but if someone want to set out a bird feeder in the winter, good on them!
- Wild Birds,Squirrels. Rephrase:"don't leave food accessible to animals" skunks&bears feed on stupidity
- More specifics. Birds are wildlife. What about an injured animal. Teasing - yes, I support a bylaw. Feeding... there should be exceptions.
- Feeding birds etc
- Feeding birds from bird feeders should be allowed
- No exceptions
- Bird food
- Bird seed/nut mixes for feeders



- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Feeding and teasing should be separated....
- No exceptions!!
- Birds
- Birds
- Injured or hurt animals
- Feeding birds seed.
- I have no problems with feral cats.
- Service animals
- Seeds for birds in a feeder, nuts for squirrels in your yard.
- if animal is injured and will be taken to a vet
- Bird feeders, hummingbird feeders, bird baths
- Squirrels and birds. Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Exceptions would be for feeding of birds/squirrels
- Feeding squirrels, birds & rabbits ? Is this feeding wildlife? Of course no teasing of wildlife, but what does this actually entail ?
- Squirrels and birds.
- birds
- Feeding feral colonies should be fine
- Feeding of small animals like rabbits, ducks etc. No teasing of animals.
- None whatsoever
- Birds/bird feeders; animals that have gotten access to bird feeders. Bat's and bat houses.
- A clear definition of the word tease is required. Residents and or hired help should still be able to trap and remove wildlife found on private property for the purposes of relocating.
- N/A
- None, this is unacceptable at all times.
- if animal injured, on okay from Fish and Wildlife or Rescue Operation in regards with water or feeding until they can take control of issue.
- If the animal looks neglected, and or malnourished.
- Bird feeders should still be allowed. Perhaps duck feeding and feeding birds at parks if it's not harmful to do so.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Feeding should be allowed if animal requires it as per wildlife rehab facility
- None
- BIRD FEEDERS ALLOWED
- Feeding birds
- Ensure feeding squirrels and birds (including ducks) is not prohibited.



- Birds and squirrels
- None
- Bird Feeders
- Hummingbird feeders
- Birds
- People should be allowed to feed wild birds.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders.
- Birds
- If an injured animal wandered onto private property
- Bird feeders must be 'rodent' proof
- Bird feeders
- People who have bird and squirrel feeders and birdbaths.
- Birds! All types of birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders!
- Feeding birds
- if an animal is injured and requires help
- Exceptions for the feeding of birds via bird-feeders; exceptions for private citizens involved in citizen science, wildlife rehab, or endangered species monitoring/reintroduction efforts.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding Injured or babies should be allowed
- Bird seed for birds and peanuts for squirrels?
- Teasing yes feeding no
- My answer is yes as long as you would you still be allowed to have bird feeders that attract birds and sometimes small wildlife?
- Backyards
- That license be free for low income
- Animal rescue situations where property owners need to care for wildlife temporarily before taking them to wildlife services
- Bird feeders
- coaxing to be able to rescue. aka keep animal in area until bylaw arrives
- I would support a bylaw that prohibits feeding large and potentially dangerous wildlife (ex. Bears, Bobcats, deer, coyotes, etc). But I would hate to see fines for feeding birds, squirrels and other small animals
- None
- Bird feeders as an exception
- Bird feeders, live traps
- Feeding emaciated or injured animals until can be taken to wildlife rehab.

- Make sure that you INCLUDE NO feeding of squirrels-- they are pests!!!
- None.
- If the feeding results in over attraction of animals that causes property damage in the neighbourhood or risks the health of persons.
- Birds, bats, rabbits. How do you draw a line between a garden patch with rabbits to animal feed?
- Feeding birds
- Only human based teasing. Chasing by dogs on private property should be an exception.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Fines for anyone teasing any animal domestic or wild
- Birds such as hummingbirds
- Dehydrated or dying animal
- Birds and squirrels
- Exceptions such as bird/squirrel feeders
- Small children
- Unless its obvious the animals are being neglected would be the only exception for anyone to try and feed them
- Birds bats.
- Bird feeders
- birds and herbivores (Squirrels, rabbits). More concerned about skunks, bobcats, etc becoming comfortable with humans.
- Bird feeders
- Prohibit Feed, Teasing is too vague, What is consider teasing ? Having a plastic owl to keep birds away. Would you be able to remove skunks etc.
- No exceptions. Wildlife encounters can bring disastrous encounters and encourage more wildlife to the city like coyotes and bobcats.
- Feeding birds should be allowed, but not with table scraps.
- Exempt birds as many people have bird feeders
- Birds
- Exception for outdoor gardens which grow fruit/veggies as the intention isn't to feed animals but it does happen.
- None. City residents do not have the knowledge or experience to approach any wildlife. It contradicts any concerns for the environment to not penalize those who interfere with wildlife.
- Feeding animal(s) in distress (could be caused by many reasons) should be exempt.
- Bird Feeder
- The question has too very different issues. Feeding and teasing. Teasing isn't good any time.
- None. Do not feed wildlife
- Bylaw for teasing should be enforced only
- Bird & squirrel feeders



- An animal that looks malnourished on private property
- Well maintained bird feeders
- Bird feeders, helping a stray cat or dog
- Survival needs / medical distress
- Teasing is not okay, however I think birdseed or bunny food (plant based) Should be exempt from this
- Bird feeders
- None. Zero-tolerance to feeding wild animals. It is always the animal that pays the ultimate price for human stupidity.
- My pet, squirrel in my yard I feed
- Bird feeders
- If the animal looks emancipated, it can be fed but the finder should also report to the city of it is in immediate distress.
- Actually giving out hefty fines instead of warnings.
- Bird feeder
- Shooting away shouldn't be teasing
- Fines
- Squirrels and birds
- Education and warnings.
- Birds should be an exception to the bylaw as people enjoy sitting and watching them and for the elderly this may be the only type of recreation they get.
- If hurt awaiting assistance
- Fines or criminal charges depending on the severity
- Accidental animal escapes.
- None
- No expectations. People need to be respectful to wildlife. We have taken so much of their territory and people need to respect that!
- Feeding ducks
- If it is an abandoned/orphaned baby animal
- If the person has been directed by a rescue agency to provide food until an animal can be picked up
- Ducks in water
- Exceptions for birds/birdfeeders. I do realize that more than birds eat from these, but those critters eat gardens and garbage too, and let's not legislate those anymore than we have too.
- Can feed not tease
- Bird feeders
- Rescuing an injured animal
- Continual and flagrant feeding
- none



- Feeding birds (teasing any wildlife is unacceptable!)
- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- Stop feeding wildlife.
- None
- Obviously if the person is harming wildlife this should be addressed. However, it would be a waste of resources to have POs out looking for citizens “teasing” a squirrel...
- if caught on camera or in person a fine should be giving to such person for teasing any animal wild or domestic.
- A fed animal is a dead animal. Stronger fines and follow through !!
- Birds, squirrels.
- Bird feeders if set up and used responsibly.
- Injured or malnourished animals
- Feeding birds- as long as it is an appropriate diet
- Private property is private. You have no say unless you pay a tax to private land owners for the privilege of putting regulations on them.
- Bird feeders are ok
- Birds
- Feeding birds is not the same as feeding deer or bears. Any legislation or disincentives should be focused around the scale of the wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Birdfeeders
- Perhaps an injured animal might need water
- none
- Self-protection that may be misconstrued by onlookers.
- None. Wild animals should be left as they are.
- Birds (non endangered).
- Bird feeders
- Exceptions on bird feeding
- Small birds
- Feeding birds is pretty harmless and plenty of people have bird feeders in their yards.
- Ideally wildlife officials should relocate the animals.
- Feeding an animal to keep it in place while help arrives to relocate it.
- Birds, squirrels..
- Feeding birds is ok.
- Bird feeder would be an exception
- Teasing yes, feeding no
- Birds
- squirrels, birds



- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird Feeders
- Birds
- Feeding would be okay for Instances where an injured or abandoned young animal is found/rescued etc.
- Only if animal was injured and someone was coming to rescue it
- Feeding animals that need help
- Permitted to feed , prohibited to tease.
- Bird feeders should be exempted from this
- Bird feeders
- Well since city employees were out at nosehill park shooting coyotes with pumps I dont know what to say about this. Also i don't know how you define tease. Clarity needed.
- Home gardens, bird feeders
- Bird feeders to be exceptions
- Bird feeders
- Outside city limits
- Water and feeding birds in the winter.
- Only feed wild birds with bird feeders
- Suggestions for exemptions: bird feeders, deer and rabbits feeding on gardens, fruit trees (apples) when accessible to them.
- squirrels, birds
- The use of food to try and get wildlife to leave the property.
- Teasing/hurting should be banded. If you want feed wildlife in your yard, that is your choice. For example bird feeders.
- Feeding on private property shouldn't be an issue. Teasing on the other hand, I could support a bylaw.
- Birds. Bees.
- No exceptions. As the question says wild life which means they are not domesticated.
- Bird feeders
- No feeding nuisance wildlife (ie. Squirrels)
- is feeding squirrels off limits then?
- I'd suggesting putting money into policing a bylaw you can actually enforce.
- Wild bird feeders and bird baths should be allowed.
- Birds. Bird feeders can provide enjoyment for the disabled, the elderly, and those who can't get out much.
- Not sure what you mean by teasing but private property is private property.



- If the animal is injured and requires food or water.
- Hares, squirrels, mice, and other animals enter people's yards all the time. I don't think it is fair to punish cats and dogs on their own property.
- Feeding birds (this seems obvious, but you never know)
- Bird feeders would be an exception
- birds
- Allow bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions
- Feeding is ok
- None
- Only if allowed by owner
- Allow feeding but not teasing
- I don't believe in teasing animals, but if one showed up on my property needing food or water, I want to give it them. Compassion.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds is ok
- I'm against teasing, but is feeding birds ok?
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders, private gardens
- I support it so long as there are reasonable exemptions for bird feeders. I would like to see a bylaw that doesn't penalize people for having deer in their yard, unless they are actively attracting deer to the area.
- We should be able to feed birds
- People have bird feeders.
- Bird feeding in the winter
- Bird and squirrel feeders are exception
- Stricter Penalties
- None
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Injured animals should be an exception. A size limit seems reasonable as well, feeding a wild bunny is different from feeding bears.
- Song birds
- No exceptions!
- Major fines
- Encouraging large nuisance animals such as coyotes or bears, It is OK for people to feed squirrels and hares



- feeding wildlife only encourages them to stay and puts them at risk
- Bird feeders, bat houses
- Not fining those who grow fruit or vegetables in their yard and have wild life go in to eat it
- birds
- All wildlife feeding should be prohibited with the exception of birds. If there is proof then they should be fined
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions, wild life needs to remain wild
- Birds
- Bird feeders should still be aloud
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders and leaving snacks for squirrels
- Educating people on the risks without fines seems more effective
- Garden and or tree waste, such as fallen apples.
- Rabbits
- Feeding birds and ducks at a park or by the river should be fine..harassing them is not
- Dont feed bears, coyotes, wolves, moose, deer, crows, magpies.
- NA
- Bird feeders
- If the animals are threatening pets and or people that live there.
- Trapping nuisance animals like.skunks et.
- Birds/bird feeders
- Feeding the wild birds should be allowed
- How would you ever police this? People don't feed animals bc they are being heartless they are doing it from a place of compassion.
- Birds
- Those need to be separated as options as one is positive and one is negative.
- More enforcement on current laws before you add more niche ones
- If you saw cruelty or blatant meanness to any animal
- Salt licks
- Injured animal.
- none
- None wildlife should fend for themselves to keep with what nature intended.
- Bird feeders, fish ponds, yards with native/natural growth also provides food
- Birds
- Birds ie. Bird feeders
- Birds (especially in those parks where they have come to expect it)
- In the event that wildlife is posing a threat, then it would be acceptable to lure it away with food, chase it off etc.



- N/A
- None
- Na
- No exceptions.
- A minimum fine of \$500
- feeding/water for injured wildlife, until proper help arrives.
- Wildlife that is injured and needs human intervention until rescue arrives
- Birds
- None
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- None
- Not sure if they would be included, but please exclude birds,
- Some division of urban wildlife between beneficial and nuisance would be nice.
- Bird feeders
- Except teasing - that should be considered abuse.
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders should be exempt
- Acerages within city limits
- It's so hard people feed birds and squirrels if yes for some what birds - seems like a headache.
- If "wildlife" was a pet owned by person with appropriate permits. If rehabilitating animal with guidance from rehab organization.
- Should be receiving a fine
- None
- bird houses
- Define wildlife. Because although I agree you shouldn't feed a deer in your backyard, I 100% will feed a stray cat that won't let me close enough to take it to a vet.
- Feeding birds should actually fall under this category as it attracts cats, skunks, bears etc However, limited feeding of birds should be allowed.
- Is this a problem?
- Birds
- Birds and squirrels
- Bird Feeders
- If the animal is wounded or starving (part of rehabilitation)
- Teasing or abuse should have a bylaw but feeding the birds or squirrels does not need to be policed.
- Feeding birds etc
- No exceptions!! All wildlife MUST be left alone.
- If the animal was in need of fluids etc. before help arrives.
- Bird feeders



- With consent of owners for feeding but no teasing
- Feeding birds appropriate bird feeds
- Injured / Distressed wildlife while waiting for authorities
- small bird feeders and water baths in back yards
- If the animal is causing damage
- Obviously okay to feed birds and squirrels on property. More so No towards bears.
- Same bylaw as in City Parks.
- Feeding squirrels and birds on your own property to me is not a problem. I do think there should be a bylaw against other people feeding and especially teasing wildlife on someone else's property.
- Assist of catching injured animals
- That feral rabbits be dealt with the same way as feral cats as they can be very destructive to public and private property
- Except wild birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- they were hurt.
- small bird feeders, as long as the city does not see the animals becoming dependant on the human food source.
- Feeding for the well being of the animal is ok but teasing/abuse should not be tolerated.
- birds
- Pest traps
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- If said wildlife is injured and in need of food I think an exception should be made
- You should be able to feed wildlife in your own property within reason. Birds, bunnies, etc. Wildlife that doesn't have the ability to harm humans or other animals. And what is "tease"?
- None
- Birds should be an exception. Urban sprawl has ruined bird habitats and private owners can help do more to try and bring more species back.
- None...I thought it was bad to feed wildlife anywhere
- Feeding birds
- No feeding wildlife!
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Feeding is fine but teasing wild animals is not. The two do not go hand in hand and should not be included together in the same question.
- people should be allowed to feed birds from bird feeders
- Bird feeders ok
- Bird feeders



- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- I like feeding birds and squirrels.
- Bird feeders allowed between Nov and Apr
- This question should be actually two: I do not support teasing wildlife. Also, what's the definition of wildlife? Does this include feeding birds? Squirrels?
- With exception, ex. No bread for birds, but seeds are okay.
- None
- None
- When an animal is injured or orphaned and the person needs time to find a resolution.
- Year round wildlife, places that encourage interacting with wildlife
- I would recommend education proper signage in and around the areas of concern with fines that will deter.
- I can see this getting out of hand with neighbours complaining of people feeding the birds & squirrels
- Feeding wild birds using proper food and feeders
- Trying to remove unwanted pests, birdfeeders etc
- Bread to the ducks and geese
- Birds
- Use of bird feeders and bird baths should be permitted.
- Things like bird feeders?
- None.
- Squirrels & Birds have a hard life-putting our food and water for them is the humane thing to do
- Clarify teasing.
- Only exceptions are bears and coyotes. Birds and other small animals are often fed through bird feeders and I think It is ridiculous to remove those or charge people for having them.
- None
- Feeding squirrels, birds, bunnies, etc. Should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- If a stray cat or dog roams into your yard wearing no id
- Feeding of birds on private property
- Except wild bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- NONE
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- What if wildlife feeds itself. What do you consider teasing? If my dogs chase something on my property that's not something I can control.
- Bird feeding is fine
- None
- Birds
- Sick or injured



- Feeding is one thing but violence or abuse and teasing is another
- Natural food sources such as crabapple trees, bird feeders should be exempt.
- Bird seed feeders
- Protection of family, and domesticated pets.
- Birds except scavengers like crows or hawk
- I have no problem with winter feeding of birds on private property but squirrels, skunks, etc. should not be fed.
- None.
- This is too vague, and in many cases wild birds benefit from winter bird feeders.
- Bird feeders and bird baths.
- If the pet can be proven as a legitimate pet. (e.g, squirrel raised from baby)
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders, etc. Should be exempt.
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- If a wild animal is dying and could be saved by feeding
- Bird feeders
- Harming the animal
- Feeding birds
- Water for dehydration
- Bird feeders
- birds, small animals like squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Nuisance Animals
- Feeding for trapping skunks
- Feeding Birds should be exception. A bylaw only works if it is enforced.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds in the winter months
- None
- None I can think of, but definitely look hard into this
- Squirrel and bird exemption
- An injured animal
- Birds
- A huge fine. Nothing under \$500.00 they it will be a huge deterrent.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds and squirrels on private property should be exempt.
- If you guys want to do this stop selling bird feeders and wild bird food first.
- Bird feeders would be exempt



- Squirrels and small animals I think are fine, leave deers and bears alone!
- Bird feeders
- Exception for Birds & squirrels
- More bureaucracy no value if it's already prohibited
- Hands free bird feeders
- Fines.
- Bird feeders,
- Bird feeders.
- Pest control
- Bears
- Exempt bird feeders
- Birds
- Birds, squirrel feeding attracts mice and other rodents.
- Squirrels, birds
- Unless for health and safety
- A 1 warning before punishment would be best
- None
- Wild birds and squirrels could be exempt
- Feeding is complex because it's nice to have a bird feeder, but I do worry about those odd individual humans who go too far and I think there absolutely should be a fine for the teasing.
- None.
- No exceptions, if you're trying to tease or personally feed the animal then it create a potential threat or danger to others or the animal. If you leave carrots or seed and leave it alone then it minimizes the contact
- Bird feeding should be fine. It gives pleasure to many people who are shut or seniors.
- bird feeders, squirrels
- Feeding bird and fishes
- None
- Birds on private property-allowed
- If the animals is clearly in pain or distress and needs help
- None
- Bird feeders
- Pests such as coyotes skunks etc
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- What about bird feeders?
- None
- Bird feeding
- Feeding birds should be exempt
- Bird feeders with the correct feed. No peanuts!



- Unless it's being trapped to be moved for it's own safety, wildlife should NOT be fed. Period.
- Bird feeders, encouraging wildlife to avoid residential properties
- Birds! I love having a bird feeder - although I would understand if it all had to be banned
- Birds
- feeding birds and squirrels
- Wounded animals that they are feeding to help survive before they can get to a rescue.
- On any property, city parks, anywhere.
- Feeding birds
- Fines for torture or abuse of domestic AND wildlife.
- none
- No feeding of wildlife especially the invasive (black, grey, cinnamon speices) squirrels.
- There are many tolerable methods of this including bird feeders and squirrel feeders. Also what about city edges with gardens that naturally attract deer etc? Nope. Not in favor.
- Except feeding large/aggressive animals ie bears, moose during mating season, etc.
- More focus on animal abuse
- Exceptions for bird feeders. Bird feeders should still be allowed. An exception for feeding/rescuing wildlife that has been abandoned or injured, but must be taken to a vet.
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Birds
- Educate public on how to reach wildlife rescue if wildlife appear to be injured or distressed
- Not including bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Teasing wildlife is fine. However feeding wild birds is helpful to support the species
- None, private property is not your concern!!!
- In the exception that we can purchase the proper food for specifically for wildlife.
- I think it should be illegal for people to trap skunks or other wildlife. They live here too & should be left alone!
- Enforcement. I currently see no enforcement of this in City Parks.
- An exception for bird feeders
- Bird feeders?
- none.
- Education programs to inform people of proper practices with wildlife.
- Birds, Squirrels
- Birds if it is done with proper materials (not bread, rice or oats)
- If the animal is wounded
- Reduced squirrel, rabbit, and skunk populations. Fines for leaving garbage accessible to wildlife.
- Birds, squirrels
- I like to have bird feeders out for the local birds. We shouldn't tease but it is nice to help support the birds that live in my neighborhood



- Better support from the city on wildlife issues
- none
- None
- I would support a bylaw against any cruelty or cruel killing
- none
- Birdfeeders
- Not on residential lots
- Birdfeeding should be allowed
- Squirrels and birds
- Enforcement
- Birds, squirrels
- teasing should not be permitted ever. people should still be able to have bird and squirrel feeders on their own property, provided it doesn't result in nuisance
- Severe drought where animals need help obtaining food or water, or in severe cold.
- Except in the case of trapping for relocation. Does not apply to wildlife eating intentional gardens.
- Wildlife posing an imminent danger to the public - bears, bobcats, cougars, coyotes.
- Bird feeders or squirrel feeders should be exempt from fines
- Bird feeders
- Bringing dangerous animals close by feeding or coyotes
- Birds and squirrels
- Birds
- Bird feeders? Hello
- Bird feeders
- Where an animal is injured or starving and cannot immediately be turned over to a wildlife care facility
- wild bird feeders, orphaned or wild animals that are injured in the time between discovery and surrender to proper authorities
- You are never supposed to feed wildlife. But the city has to better support removal of wildlife breeding or living on private property.
- Excluding bird feeders/humming bird
- Except birds. Except situation when help is needed for the wildlife is keep it alive.
- NONE. You are not doing wildlife any favours by feeding it. JUSTLEAVE IT ALONE.
- None
- In the case of a struggling animal in crises...care can be given until professionals can arrive (water/comfort -shelter)
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding injured wildlife in order to capture and bring to vet or rehab
- Properly cleaned and maintained bird feeders in the winter



- None
- Birds and small native species
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- none
- No feeding. Deer, elk, moose, bears, cougars, bobcats, lynx...allow for bird feeding
- Bird feeders could stay
- it depends what constitutes "feeding"
- Bird feeders and bird baths
- Would this make bird feeders illegal? Come on guys.
- Bird and squirrel feeders are important during cold months
- Neighbours feed rabbits and birds.
- Teasing should not be allowed but feeding is okay.
- bird feeders should be allowed
- Define wildlife - does that include birds?
- Fines
- Bird feeders
- Fines if they are caught doing it
- Hunting
- Bird feeders
- Nuisance wildlife with instruction and support from wildlife officials to protect livestock and families.
- Just need to carefully define "feeding" and "teasing". Can I feed song birds still? I hope so. Must be allowed to feed songbirds on my property. But people should not feed peanuts to squirrels or feed ducks etc.
- Birds?
- With exception to bird feeders, people need to should not be feeding wildlife. Teasing any animal, wild or domestic, private property or not, should not be allowed. It causes unnecessary stress to the animal.
- Birds
- Teasing/harassment only
- Working to remove pests (skunks, pigeons, etc) from your property
- No exceptions, other than hefty fines for those who do it anyway.
- Should be able to feed birds and squirrels.
- If there is an injury, and you care for the animal until wildlife officers are able to arrive
- Bird feeders
- birds I guess
- Feeding of birds
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Birds



- If the animal is harmed then something should be done.
- None - a fed animal becomes a dead animal. Save the animals!
- How would you enforce this - logistically ridiculous - lets hire another 100 city staff to keep up with these ideas. Have you heard there's a pandemic and people are without employment?
- bird feeders
- If that animal is injured or harassing your own animals/children/etc.
- bird feeders ok
- None.
- Unsure
- Rehabilitation centres
- Acreages, or fruit/garden access - the term hand-feeding should be used instead of the situation where wildlife is eating food off our properties (trees/berry bushes etc)
- An exception for feeding native birds with an appropriate nutritional feed, particularly during winter months
- how do you manage squirrels eating birdseed for example? will people have to stop feeding birds?
- Injured wildlife/wildlife in distress that would otherwise perish on private property.
- birds. it can still be legal to have bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- birdfeeders or small animal feeders
- Birds and small creatures
- Birds and squirrels should be exempt...squirrels are going to eat from bird feeders anyway.
- So if wildlife comes onto my property without my consent, eats my bulbs, flowers and digs up my garden. What are you going to do, fine me or the wildlife?
- No feeding of mammals, everything else is fair game.
- Birds
- bird feeders
- Birdfeeders, dogs protecting their own yard
- I hope birds are exempt
- Prosecute individuals for "teasing wildlife" on private property under existing animal abuse laws/bylaws.
- baby birds in nest where mother dies
- Birdfeeders
- None
- Bird feeders. However home owners need to keep the area clean
- Bird feeders
- Wild birds
- Bird feeders.



- Need a better definition as to what "teasing" would encompass, the same for feeding.g
- If an animal is starving or hurt . Then help it and feed it .
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- Same fines for public spaces
- Bird feeders.
- Private outfitting companies baiting for hunting
- Several things come to mind. Water left out should be fine, and obviously unintentional feeding.
- Bird feeders
- Would be nearly impossible to enforce, waste of time.
- Bird feeders would've an exception (NOT squirrel feeders)
- None. It's illegal
- Any feeding done from proper feeders (like bird feeders, bee boxes, etc.)
- No exceptions! I see parents allowing their children to chase, throw rocks, etc at wild animals especially the wild hares, it's inexcusable.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Squirrel proof bird feeders
- private zoos/animal sanctuaries, or where the owner of private lands grants permission - such as petting zoo?
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders be exempt. Law shall apply to mammals only.
- None
- None
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding is ok if animal is unable to fend fir itself and wildlife organizations have been contacted to rescue
- Unless working with wildlife conservation on rehab
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be allowed. Teasing should not be allowed.
- When animal is being coaxed with the intent to hurt it
- Bird and squirrel feeders or setting out water bowls for wildlife.
- Bird feeders. Fruit trees, bushes etc. Not like Canmore
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions. They are wild and do not need more encouragement to come into the city.
- none
- Proper bird feeders are okay
- Backyard bird seed



- Increased fine for not picking up pet feces
- Bird feeders
- Hummingbirds. Also there might be some seed birds that need the help in Spring etc after migration.
- None
- 2 or 3 bird feeders of reasonable size per property.
- Wild bird feeders/waterers should be permitted. Slight hazing of wildlife on private property in order to get them safely off property should be permitted - ie. if wildlife makes a den/nest in a yard with dogs, haze them off for their safety.
- Would bird feeders be exempt?
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Perhaps one could give water to an animal found hurt, and they are waiting for someone to come a take care of the animal
- Birds and the use of bird feeders
- In parks only
- No, I hate watching dogs chase bunnies or deer! Fine them
- No exceptions, just please add do not feed wildlife on City boulevards and back lanes, and do not throw food in people's yards to feed wildlife. Please add restaurants/fast food outlets garbage bins in back lanes/near buildings should have lids on .
- bird feeders
- pollinators, and small birds (e.g. finches, etc)
- How are you going to find the animal (culprit) and fine them? Or do you expect people to call 311 and say that wildlife entered their yard and ate the produce growing on their property and ask the city to please mail them a fine for it?
- Malnourished animals may be fed but not teased
- Its private property, HELLO mind your business!
- Bird feeders and such that are deemed appropriate by wildlife experts
- No exceptions
- If the animal is in danger or needs help
- bird/nut feeders and bird baths should still be okay.
- Bird feeders
- Teasing/feeding is far too subjective. Having a dog trained to chase say geese or deer off farm land could theoretically be 'teasing' when people are simply trying to protect their property. Needs to be better defined.
- None
- Bird feeders
- None
- Squirrels and birds.
- Bird Feeders?



- none. Also the bylaw prohibiting licenced cats on properties as cats reduce rodents, should be gone. The owner should decide what their licensed cats do.
- Citizens currently feed feral cats through TNR programs. Making sanctions against this would have a huge impact on feral cats across the city.
- just teasing wildlife on private property. Feeding birds should not be illegal.
- Is this really a problem and how would you make appropriate exceptions for some bird feeding?
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and similar.
- None
- Bird seed/ bird feeders, feeding injured animals to lure/ trap them to get them to a wildlife center/ vet for treatment.
- Bird feeders.
- A safe way to remove the wildlife from private property
- Bird feeders
- I have rabbits and deer that come through my yard, so I leave out apples and carrots for them. I don't see an issue with feeding them to keep them healthy, but teasing or harming, most definitely there should be a law to protect them.
- Feeding birds
- Should cover private animals as well. For example, people should not be allowed to tease a private owned animal on your property nor feed it.
- rodents and nuisance pests
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- It will be yet another unenforceable bylaw.
- Allow for bird feeders, but maybe set a limit to number
- Mandatory awareness training.
- Feeding birds on seeds is OK
- Bird food
- Bird feeders
- Teasing wildlife is not acceptable, feeding wildlife is.
- Birds & squirrels
- Children under a certain age; they may not know better, and the parents should be given a warning only
- Bird feeders should be allowed. Many birds rely on them in the winter months.
- What about birds?
- A review of the circumstances that have created some wildlife 'problems' ie. ring road expansion, we have seen a significant number of wildlife DISPLACED and looking for habitat. Very sad. If they visit my birdfeeders or birdbath i shouldn be penalized.
- feeding domesticated animals that are found on your private property for gaining their trust so you can ensure their safety and well being



- exception to permit live trapping of stray or nuisance animals.
- Just for large animals. Feeding squirrels birds ok
- Helping an injured animal if possible or calling the appropriate animal control officer.
- None
- I think it's OK to feed the birds or squirrels, etc. if it's on your private property. Never OK to tease wildlife anywhere.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Protection of all animals.
- Injured animals can be fed
- Exempt birds
- bird feeders exempt
- depends on the definition you are using if I'd consider any exceptions
- Hummingbirds
- Wildlife is too generic....does that include my bird bath/feeder in my yard?
- There should be a bylaw against feeding wildlife. Teasing depends on the definition - there should not be a bylaw in trying to scare away wildlife for the purposes of pest control.
- No teasing... bird feeders are proven to help endangered songbirds
- Injured or infant wild life
- Birdfeeders!!
- NONE
- You are trying to capture it to live with you.
- Yes to teasing and harassing wildlife on private property
- Feeding is okay, harassing or teasing is not.
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- n/a
- bird seed should be allowed during normal seasons
- The only thing I'm concerned about is birds. Are birds considered wildlife? I think bird feeders should be permitted.
- no exceptions - simpler that way
- Life preservation until wildlife services can arrive
- I would exempt feeding birds, squirrels and chipmunks
- Birds
- As a bird watcher with a bird feeder in my yard, I do not support a bylaw prohibiting this on my property.
- Bird feeders, bylaw against hand feeding
- Birds.
- none.



- bird feeding over the winter
- There should never be an issue with feeding birds/squirrels on private property. Many birds are more likely to survive harsh winters entirely thanks to people.
- None!
- I answered no because I don't know if that includes birds.
- Birdfeeders in yards
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Responsible bird feeding
- None
- Feeding
- No Exceptions.
- None
- exemption for trapping of nuisance wildlife
- Bylaw enforcement of the rules and large fines for rule breakers
- none
- Bird feeder
- None
- Define the word teasing. For example, if you chase a hare off your property, is that teasing It?
- None
- Bird feeders or Squirrel feeders
- Maybe don't try to say feeding birds and squirrels is an infraction. This question seems intentionally vague.
- None
- Bird feeders, water, and accidental example compost/garbage etc
- Bird feeders, baths and houses.
- I think the language would need to be very clear regarding things like bird feeders, mouse traps/baits (if properly housed to limit access by either other wildlife, counter-insect measures (like wasp spray or ant traps), and delimitation (out vs indoors)
- bird feeders
- Exception to typical bird feeders on private propety
- Allow the feeding - no to teasing. Prohibiting feeding wildlife on your property just becomes a big snitch problem and pits neighbours against each other - WE DO NOT NEED THIS!! The neighborhood goes downhill very quickly when everyone is snitching.
- Bird feeding should be banned. Artificial feeding of birds creates dependency on human provided food. Bird feeding supports an unnatural bird population that the natural ecosystem can't support. When a person who feeds birds moves or cant afford bird see



- Feeding on private property is fine but should be limited to small wildlife and provided it's not a nuisance to neighbours/community. Teasing should be prohibited on public and private property.
- Allow discouraging birds from nesting
- birdfeeders, as long as stocked all year long
- Birds - lots of people like to feed birds.
- There's a big difference between feeding & teasing! Why are these grouped together?
- Squirrels bird feeders and hares
- Bird feeders and the like
- Bird feeders should be exempt.
- Bird feeding should be allowed. Feeding animals such as coyotes should not be allowed
- If it was causing harm/abuse
- Birds / bird houses to bring nature into private yards
- Bird feeders
- What do you mean by 'teasing'? I don't want to be limited if I choose to feed squirrels, birds etc. Also, I can't control if a skunk etc choses to dring the water in the bird bath.
- Squirrel proof bird feeders
- there should be a prohibiting from people teasing the animals but feeding a animal if it looks starving should be okay
- Still permit the use of birdfeeders
- birds
- Education initially.
- Birdfeeders
- Birdfeeders, etc should be allowed.
- Don't spend any money on any program like this
- This would mean people couldn't have a bird feeder in their own yard, which is ridiculous. This is not needed.
- Bird feeders bee boxes chickens (if these become allowed)
- No exceptions
- Birdfeeders should be allowed still, same actions to get rid of pest animals
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels, insects,
- Bird feeders. I think it should be enforced for people feeding bob cats, skunks, rabbits, etc. but I would still like to see bird feeders allowed.
- Birds
- None.
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders should be exempt
- Bird feeding
- None.



- Harmless birds should be allowed to be fed
- No exceptions.
- Feeding bunnies or cats
- Exception for wildlife that requires medical care, has been abandoned or orphaned, and/or requires assistance to survive.
- Goldfish ponds.
- If wild.. let it be
- Bird feeders
- Feeding and teasing are two separate issues. No teasing, ever. Feeding can entice injured or displaced wildlife to humans so they can be caught and assisted back to health or proper environments.
- I think you should be able to feed
- bird, squirrel and rabbit feeders should be exempt
- If the animal is helped by a feeder by all means set it up as long as it's not to exploit it for a close encounter. It's kind of a grey area. People enjoy birdhouses.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds
- I don't think teasing an animal should be allowed but feeding stray cats etc should be ok.
- N/A
- If an animal looks to be starving or sick.
- Songbirds
- Nothing wrong with stray cats as long as they are spade/nurtured
- Bird feeders
- Injured animals or those in distress
- Feeding birds in a park
- Backyard bird/squirrel feeders should be exempt
- Hurt/distressed animals
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding or nurturing that is integral to a species survivability and approved by wildlife associations.
- Feeding wild songbirds via a securely hung feeder.
- Someone should be able to feed an animal they are caring for, injured, abandoned, until proper agency can assist, if at all.
- Removing nuisance wildlife from private property
- Bird feeders
- Feeding of birds
- Feeding birds with feeders, etc. should be allowed



- Unless its malicious and hurtful to the animals
- Bird feeders
- If you found an injured animal and you were caring for it until it could get to the proper agency to help. Bird seed, should be allowed.
- None
- Birds
- I would support a bylaw that prohibits teasing wildlife on private property.
- Birds and squirrels
- Teasing yes, feeding no
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders , squirrel feeders , should exemptions.
- None, its not acceptable anywhere at anytime
- Let people feed the birds
- Stay out of my property
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds, bees, butterflies,and squirrels
- Squirrels
- Bird feeders, salt licks and things of that nature.
- Pests that are causing damage. I do not think abuse is appropriate, but some sort of deterrent may be necessary
- None
- Never tease. But you should be able to leave a carrot out.
- Bird feeders are fine
- Birds and small ground animals such as squirrels should be exempt.
- if trying to remove wildlife off property
- None
- M
- Bird feeders.
- Feeding is fine teasing is not
- Feeding certain animals (birds, squirrels, etc.) proper food
- Ducks.
- Birds
- If there is proof that an animal is being harmed or a resident creating a environment of harm for them or their family. Then an investigation with bylaw should be addressed.
- Ducks, birds and squirrels (seeds etc)
- The owners of said property should be excluded but held responsible if any injuries or destruction happens afterward.
- If the animal is injured allow feeding in order to catch it to get it assistance
- Birds, but with proper education about what and when.



- Allow feeding small birds, squirrels etc
- I Jared or orphaned wild life while waiting for authorities to assist
- Bird feeders
- Feeding and caring for an injured animal.
- Look after city property and property owners will look after what happens on theirs!
- First time offenders - provide education
- If they aren't being looked after and need food.
- Birds squirrels feeding not teasing
- Someone who has proper training and experience with wild animals
- Responsible feeding to support the population (ie. Hummingbirds)
- Feeding birds should be allowed
- NONE
- Bird feeders, secondary munchers. We back into fish creek. We put out peanuts when the blue jays migrate. The squirrels get them as well. That's a secondary muncher to me. Also the deer come eat the seed on the ground left over from the birds.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds
- Injured animal seeking shelter on property
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- birds
- It is never okay to tease wildlife - that is animal cruelty. Feeding shouldn't be allowed as they come to rely on the food and not fend for themselves
- I believe that fines should be given to those who tease or feed wildlife, however I think that wildlife should be defined, for example can we feed birds with bird feeders, or feed squirrels .
- Birds
- Bigger animals should be left alone. Smaller animals are fine.
- Farms, acreages and sanctuaries that care for injured animals should be exempt.
- If there is an animal in need, make it mandatory to call the appropriate services.
- Bird feeders
- Only with permission of land owners
- Give warnings for those not realizing they are causing harm (e.g. feeding ducks bread)
- It is not necessary to feed wildlife at all. They are wild animals, that should be respected as wild.
- None. Don't feed wildlife!
- Against teasing. Should be able to feed birds.
- Feeding of Birds, squirrels, rabbits
- I suppose bird feeders would be my exception. But the jerks feeding squirrels peanuts in our community need to be stopped.
- Wild life that is posing a risk or nuisance to the household.



- Exceptions if the animal is in obvious distress or in need of help, provided a wildlife rescue foundation or organization is called.
- Humming birds
- Don't feed or interfere with wild anywhere. They are not your pets.
- Birds
- N/A
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels
- Leave the animals alone; there are bigger issues
- Sick or injured animals
- N/A
- Birdhouses, deer salt
- Squirrel feeders
- None
- I support a bylaw that prohibits physically harming wildlife on property. Keeping in mind, however that some wildlife are 'pests'.
- Teasing should be prohibited. Feeding should be up to the property owner.
- caring for established strays/ abandoned pets while waiting for them to be aided by animal services
- None, wildlife should not be fed
- Feeding yes, teasing no
- No exceptions
- Teasing and feeding are two very different Things, we have bird feeders but we don't tease the birds...
- Kids who don't understand, where education is a better approach
- Feeding bird seed to birds
- Putting feeding and teasing together is sneaky. Teasing is one thing but you really want to ban mybirdfeeder? Good luck with enforcement, by the way.
- Na
- Bird feeders
- It is part of the don't feed wildlife culture
- No exceptions
- None. But it is important to write the bylaw so that it does not take into account situations of unwanted wildlife on private property.
- bird feeders should be ok
- With the exception of hanging bird feeders on private property.
- Squirrels, song birds, chipmunks etc
- None
- I would agree with a bylaw that prohibits teasing, not feeding



- Depends on the animal, if it's one that will become a nuisance (bobcats, coyotes, etc) then it should apply. I'm not worried about rabbits though
- I would support restrictions for larger animals such as bears. Feeding squirrels, birds and bunnies is harmless. We are destroying their habitat
- Cruelty
- Anything that puts an animal in distress should be prohibited
- None
- Private property is that, private. Plublic land use zones i would agree with though.
- If the animal was injured and they were nursing it back to health.
- Birds
- Bird feeders and similar feeders should be exempt from a prohibition.
- None
- Bird feeders, bee hotels, bird baths and houses
- None
- Except animals that are dangerous to life of people (ex. Bears or cougars)
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird & Squirrel feeders
- I'm not sure what 'teasing' means. Can't suggest exceptions if I don't know what 'teasing' encapsulates.
- bird feeders
- Let the animals be
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- Feeding
- Squirrels and bees
- Fine
- bird feeding should be treated differently than say, baiting deer or coyotes
- Fines, community service, mandatory volunteer with SPCA or zoo
- Feeding of birds, rabbits, etc.....we have a bird feeder out in winter and do get wildlife eating from it.....I don't believe we should be penalized if rabbits or deer eat from the bird feeder.
- Not if we cannot have bird feeders. These are important to humansandbirds/squirrels alike
- None
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- None
- More education about the effects of feeding wildlife rather than a law.
- Life saving measures exemption - a property owner should be exempt from fines associated with feeding/and or intervening with wildlife in the circumstance that the animal's survival is at risk.



- I believe you should not tease wild life on private property but I also believe people should be able to feed birds and squirrels.
- For testing for sure. But feeding of Birds.. not a problem un my eyes
- Feeding is acceptable as long as it is not for hunting purposes
- N/a
- Bird feeders
- 1
- Increase education in be able to determine if an animal needs your help, or if you are negatively impacting their livelihood.
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Birds
- If the animal was hurt and needed care/food, or if it's you g and the mother was missing/dead. But no one should tease a wild animal
- Birds
- Hurt animals
- If an animal is injured.
- Feeding birds
- Bees birds and butterflies.
- when it is large animals that can cause harm to smaller pets and humans. moose, bears, cougars, coyotes, bobcats(lynx), and even deer.
- Feedig birds
- If the person is nursing an animal back to health and/or after the animal is healed and refuses to go back to wildlife
- Leave private property alone.
- Bird feeders
- Planting native flowers and seeds in backyard/front yards, this allows wild life to feed naturally without creating a direct human dependency in the process.
- None
- birdfeeders should be exempt
- Increased education and a simple to access URL. Respect ownership previews and rights. Dissuading wild life from nesting in private areas is a prime example of why there should be no enforcement.
- Supply a bird seed chute only filled enough to keep on the set budget for the public to feed birds safely and properly.
- Teasing should be prohibited but there are cases that may require feeding
- If they were being lead onto property to be harmed, trapped or attacked is the only viable reason you should ever trespass on someone's property
- Bird feeders ok



- Exception given for feeding birds. I think it would be wise to work in association with local wildlife experts to gauge which animals would not have negative effects on local environment if enticed with food, minding domestic and wild animal safety too
- Put up more signs
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Definately no teasing of wildlife on private property
- None
- Feeding or otherwise helping an injured wild animal
- Things like caring for abandoned ducklings until they can safely released or placed in a sanctuary
- Birds and squirrels can be fed on private property.
- Bird feeders & similar
- Not sure for this one, something with reason as they are a creature to. Whats the punishment for teasing or over eating as a person you get a punishment or you need self control. So something with a reasonable consequence in my opinion would be just.
- Heavy fines
- Bird feeders, unintentional feeding (gardens)
- Birds and squirrels
- No feeding wildlife on private or public property. Exceptions for wildlife rescue and rehabilitation.
- Bird feeders
- If it is an injured animal and they are trying to help the animal.
- Bird feeders (maybe limit the number per home)
- Feeding to trap and relocate
- Starving/unhealthy looking dogs are cats, they should be allowed to be fed.
- Putting out food such as fruits and vegetables.
- Ducks
- Bird feeders
- Its private property. The city should keep its nose out of it.
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders. Traps for nuisance pests. Poison for rodents are all part of private property management. What the heck is “teasing wildlife”???
- None
- Bird food
- It's a dumb behavior to feed wildlife, but the City doesn't own private property and doesn't own wildlife so needs to stay in its lane.
- Birds/bunnies
- I suggest limiting bylaws dictating how people behave on their own properties. There are enough rules. Educate and make respect for animals the norm. Stop forcing things on people.
- No exceptions for wildlife



- None. Wildlife should remain wild.
- Birds, cats
- None
- Songbirds
- Not pests to keep off property, such as rabbits, magpies
- Feeding squirrels, feeding birds and feeding ducks is good!
- Bird feeders
- Not all wildlife should be included in this law. The fines should be for those feeding predators or dangerous wild animals.
- This needs consideration in various contexts.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Birds and Squirrels
- Possibly bird or small animals that are displaced by human presence
- Hurt animals in need of care, until help comes.
- Birds
- Wild birds. Especially in the winter months
- Only teasing should be prohibited.
- No feeding wildlife, the bylaws have to be very well publicized! City also needs a program to get rid of coyotes and rabbits.
- Birds
- Bird feeders should be acceptable
- If feeding was necessary to save the animals life
- Unless the animal is in duress and requires assistance
- None
- Bird feeding is essential especially in winter
- Bird feeders should be exceptions
- Controlled Bird Feeds
- Bird feeding
- Peanuts and seed for squirrels and birds
- Birds
- What would “teasing” be? Would we be able to shoo them out of our yard? Would we be fined if our dog barked at a magpie?
- Bird feeding should be fine on private property. No form of teasing wildlife should be permitted.
- Be more specific about what is meant by “teasing”. People shouldn’t be allowed to harm animals on their property but if they want them off the grass etc. They should be allowed to scare them away.
- A ground animal that will affect my dog's way of life on our property.



- Does that mean I can't feed birds, what a farce! No one should be teasing wildlife on public or private property, yes to that "captain obvious!"
- A fine
- Bird feeders
- bird and squirrel feeders would be fine
- The animal was in medical distress or in need of medical assistance.
- The answer isn't yes nor no.. to feed is general .. they may eat what's on the property, but tease is abuse ... no teasing / abuse attitude on private property
- If it was to protect the animal
- Bird feeders
- This law should apply to large animals like moose, bears, cougars, wolves and coyotes etc
- birds and squirrels should be allowed to be fed as well as stray cats and dogs.
- starving or injured wildlife
- This already exists in the wildlife acts. Who is writing this nonsense?
- None
- Bird feeders?
- Bird seed, bird feeders
- Birds
- None.
- Exceptions for bird feeders for single family homes/townhouses
- Bird feeders
- Instead of spending money on enforcement, spend money on education campaigns. Explain the consequences of feeding wildlife. Provide education in schools, when they are back to normal.
- Birdfeeders, squirrel feeders, leaving food out for strays, etc should be allowed.
- Injured animals, water should always be ok
- Bird feeders
- If it's winter and the environment is making it impossible for them to survive
- Feeding acceptable. Teasing not
- No exceptions. Wildlife should not be fed.
- Bird feeders using proper bird food
- Bird feeders
- Go [remove] yourself [remove]
- Bird feeders
- Any properties not doing so to hunt the animals but content to leave them roaming the premises
- I don't know enough about why on earth anyone would, but no. Generally not. Leave wild animals alone ! Don't teach them to look for food from humans!
- None
- Feeding is fine, but teasing is not.
- Teasing wildlife should be prohibited, but not feeding.



- I believe wildlife needs to be protected but people should be allowed to have bird feeders and such to keep a healthy ecosystem!
- Bird feeders
- Injured Animals, Animals flees "natural disastrous", Large fires, flooding
- Helping a wounded animal
- NA
- I believe that this could be harmful to people who - for example; see a wild animal on their property. They want to move it but are scared of being fined. They might end up using harmful methods to remove an animal to avoid getting a ticket.
- No exceptions , people shouldn't be teasing or feeding the wildlife
- Feeding birds and squirrels on your own property should definitely be allowed.
- An animal in dire need of help. Although, of course, one exception leads to an unprecedented amount of excuses and dismissed cases.
- None
- Feeding birds, planting wildlife attracting vegetation. As per question one, I feel that fines should be increased for those who let unfixed cats roam freely and the normal fine for fixed cats.
- when creating Bylaws it is important to consider whether or not they can be implemented or enforced. This does not seem like an enforceable rule. The amount of surveillance this would require is not proportionate to the issue.
- Many city bound birds (ie. pigeons) do not have access to proper nutrition. This causes the birds to have "wet" stool and when they poop that stool makes a mess of whatever it lands on. The option to feed these birds proper food should be allowed.
- Squirrels and birds.
- If the person is not intentionally feeding them (i.e garden veggies, flowers on property that animal likes)
- Birds
- Animal cruelty
- None
- No violence.
- They are found dying.
- Bird & squirrel feeders
- Feeding birds
- Rehabilitation efforts. All effort should be made to bring Wildlife to an appropriate facility but there are limited spaces for animals.
- No exceptions
- Fine
- It should depend on the size of property and/or land
- None that involve direct interaction. Wildlife by definition has to be wild. Bird feeders could be the only case with a leg to stand on as they are passive in nature with no direct interaction.



- Animal in need or harm.
- Bird feeders should still be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- If there is a known food shortage and/or drought
- Unless a condo Corp has existing bylaws eg, pigeons
- If this were to pass, an exception for birds and squirrels should be strongly encouraged.
- Injured animals
- Birds, squirrels, rabbits
- Possibly in the event that the wildlife in question is in distress and requires assistance.
- Bird feeders should be permitted and teasing of wildlife anywhere should never be permitted.
- Bird feeders
- Charge owners and not the breed. Bully breeds are not the issue, owners are. Do not discriminate against bully breeds
- Well, bird feeders and squirrel feeders should be allowed!
- Bird feeders
- Any interaction with wildlife that is cruel or harmful to the animal. Any interaction with wildlife that leads to dependence.
- None
- bird feeder
- Bird feeders
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be allowed
- If the animal was injured and couldn't be removed in a safe and timely manner. BEST interest of the animal needs to be considered
- I don't think that bird feeders should be prohibited
- Feeding stations for birds
- I think it should be okay to put out birdseed, and leave out seed for squirrels in the garden if they take it on their own!
- Feeding birds should be exempt
- Rescues, or citizens aiding an injured animal if bylaw has been called and nothing has been done.
- Danger to animal
- I don't think feeding birds etc. is an issue. My issue is more with teasing wildlife, but I'm not sure that it is a big problem within the city.
- Exemptions around pests or trying to allow deter then from your property
- This is a stupid question nobody should be supporting teasing animals anywhere. But if you want to feed birds on your property seems fine.
- Prevent teasing.
- Bird feeders
- Injured animals
- Permission from owner



- The bylaws should be the same regardless if it is a city park or personal property. There needs to be an education component. Residents need to understand the impact feeding wild life in a residential setting has on the neighborhood.
- Fines should be imposed for intentionally inflicting harm upon wildlife, but feeding wildlife on private property should be at the discretion of the property owner
- If the animal is injured
- Except if this animal is relying on the person for food
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders.
- Your question is really unclear. Are you saying people can't have bird houses?
- Nurturing wounded animals. Bird Feeders.
- Feeding bees, birds, squirrels.... etc. More information about how to support wildlife in ways that are helpful vs harmful rather than just an overall ban
- Exception: Birds
- An injured animal
- Feeding monkeys bananas
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird or squirrel feeders on private properties should be exempt.
- Quit wasting tax payer money on this dumb [remove] and fix the [remove] roads
- Danger to public.
- No exceptions
- On your private property, you should be allowed to feed wild animals, depending on what the animal is.
- Should have notice on their front step
- Birds feeders ok
- Teasing should be prohibited everywhere ! Feeding via bird feeders, or helping feral animals in need should not be illegal
- I would expect that whom ever is teasing or feeding wild life and or house hold animals to get a fine.
- Bird feeder. Only human to wildlife directly should be prohibited
- Animals chasing wildlife in parks, owners should have to do a training course with any trainer or choice
- Injured animals
- Feeding only natural or approved items
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- This question is way too broad to be answered with yes or no
- Bird Feeders



- If it's sick or injured, in distress
- Feeding/supporting injured wildlife, provided they have already contacted professionals
- Rescuing abandoned babies and aiding them in rehabilitation or the transportation towards appropriate rehabilitation
- Squirrels and birds
- Bird or squirrel feeders. No exceptions for teasing
- Bird waterers
- Animals that seem under-fed or malnourished.
- None
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions. Signs in Fish Creek asking folks to not hand-feed chickadees. Just because it's fun, doesn't make it right.
- No exceptions. Signs in Fish Creek asking folks to not hand-feed chickadees. Just because it's fun, doesn't make it right.
- None.
- Birds, hares
- Fines and charges similar to any that are applicable in parks and other regions.
- none
- Abandoned baby animals that need food/water
- Bird feeders etc
- People should be fined and perhaps charged if they abuse wildlife on private property. I assume this would fall under teasing but it will probably be written in too much of a grey area. The bylaws need to be very specific about this.
- I don't see feeding as an issue. I feed the birds and squirrels in my yard
- Feeding a animal until it can be rehomed
- Birdseed is fine
- People trying to get animals off their property when the city refuses to help (ie. skunk)
- cut staff by 20% use the money for an education process.
- If private property owners feed or tease wildlife they are solely responsible what happens next and should pay costs for removal or for destroying.
- Allow feeding if it's apparent that the wildlife is in danger of starvation
- A fourth answer that doesn't allow provincial power to govern animals. You asked for opinions but don't give an option to disagree. Question 3 is despicable.
- Small herbivores ex. Rabbits
- Bird feeders, water sources, accidental feeding (e.g. rabbits eating your garden)
- Birds...bird feeders and bird houses
- Small wildlife such as birds and squirrels.
- When animals are injured and may benefit from care.
- Bird feeders



- Bird feeders
- A way to charge someone for it based on a video. Community and enforcement working together to enforce it.
- bird feeders
- Feeding birds, bees, and deer in areas where deer roam such as along the river. Also providing water. This should be allowed.
- Food intended to lure pests into traps
- Bird feeders with proper food exempted
- Bird feeder; for trapping
- Birds can be fed feeders
- Deer, bunnies
- Bird feeders
- No teasing/abusing wildlife. Feeding on private property does not seem dangerous unless drawing large and potentially dangerous predators near the general public
- If an animal looks to be starving and they have spoken to the correct people first
- None
- Don't mess with people private property and let them do what they want on it maybe?
- If that private property borders a Calgary public park.
- None
- Do not prohibit feeding, but prohibit teasing
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions. Only wildlife authority to command rescue or emergent actions as an exception in an animal is in danger/distress/starvation etc.
- No exceptions
- No to prohibiting feeding, yes to prohibiting treating
- None
- If it's a lost baby
- Bird feeders??
- Putting approved seeds out for birds in backyard feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders that are squirrel safe
- Rodents such as squirrels
- Sick or injured animals
- Not too sure , but I agree with supporting a bylaw
- Stop worrying about others. Stop spending tax money on stupid ideas.
- Ethical harvest of feral rabbits and pigeon for food
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- If it's a lost baby



- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders are acceptable, however drawing other wildlife into the city by feeding should be restricted and teasing animals on private property should be restricted in all cases.
- Bird feeders on private property
- Bird feeders should be allowed in the winter months to support struggling populations
- They are obviously starving, lacking nutrition and need food! If you can tell they are weak, sick and hungry then feeding should be allowed anywhere
- Harassing rabbits should be an exception
- Don't feed the protestors
- Teasing — exceptionally high fines, plus community time.
- Bird feeders
- Squirrel proof bird feeders
- None
- bird feeders
- None
- Not too sure
- No exceptions, feeding wildlife prevents them from being able to gather food themselves and takes away their survival instincts. As soon as the owners of the private property stop, the wildlife could die off.
- Bird feeders, bee houses, pollinator gardens
- If it's to prevent harming animals then yes
- Bird, squirrel feeders
- Injured animals or natural disaster. No other exceptions.
- Smaller animals such as birds, squirrels, etc
- Bird seed feeders
- feeding wild birds
- Magpies excluded
- None
- Bird feeders
- none, leave animals alone
- Bird feeders.
- Bird feeders, bee hives
- Bird feeding
- Providing water sources, or feeding birds during winter
- Birds, deer salts etc.
- Obviously distressed animals
- Birds, non invasive and non predatory wildlife
- Bird and squirrel feeders



- Backyard bird feeders and the species that frequent bird feeders, gardens designed to help native wildlife. Prohibit feeding of deer.
- A hurt animal that someone will pickup to rehabilitate
- Wild bird feeders in front and back yards - these are very important for our local birds!
- There needs to be clear info on where to take wounded birds etc who end up on private property for this to work
- Shoo-ing rabbits and Rodents out of gardens
- accidental feeding
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders are ok
- Birds
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Allow bird feeders and backyard feeders, especially in winter
- NO exemption for bird feeders.
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Make sure that the wildlife that is being fed is not destroyed by the City- example- squirrels. many people feed them - they can become a nuisance but they are lovely to watch, so they should not be destroyed or re-located
- Feeding wildlife babies that have been abandoned by their mothers.
- None
- Just expand the bylaw to "within City Limits". Why make it complicated???
- Personal bird feeders to still be accepted.
- Allow a not harmful way of removing the wildlife
- N/A
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders should be allowed on private property
- Birds & squirrels
- Kids, they should be allowed to feed birds bread crumbs. But teenegers and kids old enough to understand should be fined for teasing and fooling with wildlife.
- Exception for bird/squirrel feeders.
- Trapping and killing pests such as rodents such as mice and those other things that are wrecking everyone's lawns.
- Leaving bird feed out for birds and people who leave food/water out for stray cats/dogs
- bird feeders and plants that attract insects.
- Feeding animals proper food. Hummingbird feeders putting out seeds for squirrels ect.
- \$5000 fine
- What about feeding birds and squirrels for example. Is there any harm in this?
- No fine for helping injured animals
- birds, squirrels, rabbits



- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- None
- Responsible feeding measures, ie honey bee house, wild bird feeder etc.
- I feel that people would be allowed to feed the wildlife (within reason)
- I suggest that no teasing be allowed. However, feeding should be their choice
- Feeding birds, squirrels & chipmunks should be allowed
- Non-native species and bird feeders.
- Bird feeders as an exception
- Abandoned young (fawns, etc) and injured animals
- Bird feeds and other things of that nature
- Birds, injured animals (at direction of authorities)
- None
- None
- Feeding birds, animals in distress waiting for city bylaw or animal rescue to pick them up, stray pets
- Feeding wounded animals
- No exceptions
- Birds (as long as proper feed is being used)
- Helping an injured animal before a bylaw/conservation officer can arrive. All life saving measures.
- Enforce fines, as well as establish a campaign to show the public the negative effects of feeding wildlife.
- Feeding animals that are starving or hungry looking shouldn't necessarily be a crime - compassion?
- Birds and small animals such as squirrels.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeding should be allowed
- Fines, charges
- **NO BREED DISCRIMINATION!!!** If calgary did this we'd be taking a step back not a step forward in the right direction. **RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP. NOT BREED DISCRIMINATION.**
- Emergency distress until resources get there to remove animal
- It is unreasonable to expect animals to ignore wild life in their backyard.
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions encouraging contact will only end badly
- None
- None
- None
- None
- Help rescuing or feeding an animal in danger
- Bird feeders and caring for injured/trapped or orphaned wildlife while waiting for wildlife rescue groups/Fish and Wildlife/the city to help the wildlife in question



- no exceptions.
- Birdfeeders
- Birdhouses
- Warnings and fines
- Fines, more signs
- Bird feeders, rabbit feeders, etc.
- Pests control and would require a clear definition on teasing. What about injured? What about safely taking pictures?
- Birds / squirrels
- I assume this would not apply to bird feeders? It should still be lawful to have a birdhouse/feeder on your property.
- People should be able to have bird feeders and things of that nature on their own property.
- Only allow feeding
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird's and herbivorous
- You should be allowed to feed wildlife on your property. "Teasing" animals should not ever be allowed
- bird feeders and rabbit
- None
- Feeding animals appropriate food (birdseed for birds, veggies for hares etc.)
- None
- Bird feeders
- The animal looks like it is starving or needs food to be lured in to help bring it into the vet or rehabilitation Center. Even trained professionals use food to help lure an animal in.
- Squirrel/bird feeders on private property
- Does this include bird feeders??
- Squirrels
- If children are doing unknowingly
- Provide regulations and increase fines for releasing house bunnies into areas (industrial area off MacLeod SW)
- Feeding birds / squirrels
- hurt/wounded animal.
- Bird Feeders
- bird feeders
- no exceptions
- With the exception if the animal is sick or injured and need immediate care such as access to food and fresh water.
- Birds



- Leave wildlife alone. It's different for bird feeders obviously but don't touch and feed and harass the animals
- Bird feeders
- Unless the animal is in danger need of food and water
- N/A
- Education - stop using any excuse to fine people more money. If a repeat offender, deal with that issue individual to the owner. Calgarians are struggling financially and the city do nothing but increase fines!!!
- Bird feeders/squirrel feeders. Not sure if those count as wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders should be ok as long as they don't create a nuisance or attract rodents etc.
- Bird feeders
- If it is a stray pet that is clearly starving that should not be any laws against feeding them
- Teasing yes, feeding no.
- In terms of wildlife rescue situations, this has to be an exception. Also, bird feeders should be exempt from any prohibition
- To distract the animals in order for someone else, say a child, to get away safely.
- Bird feeders
- It's my choice to feed the birds and squirrels.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be permitted and there shouldn't be fines for inadvertent feeding of wild animals, ie if they get in your garden.
- You cant BAIT the animals in (deer and such)
- have more questions about this before I can answer. Does this include not allowing bird feeders/
- No feeding predators.
- None, leave them alone
- None, wildlife should be left alone.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- none
- Don't restrict pitbulls
- Education about the damage it does to wildlife.
- Feeding bees
- None
- birds
- Birds
- Abandoned baby animal, injured animal



- Controlled areas
- NONE
- If the animal is eating from a tree- owner not feeding the wildlife on purpose
- Birds, squirrels, deer, rabbits (small to medium herbivores)
- None
- Teasing should never be allowed until property is being damaged, or corp destroyed. Animal abuse is animal abuse
- Bird feeders I wouldn't have a problem with. (which then also leads to Squirrels as they often get into birdfeeders.)
- Birdfeeders.
- None. When animals loose their fear of people, they usually loose their life.
- Select non scavenger birds (as in magpies and ravens)
- It should only apply to people trespassing on private property
- Bird feeders
- University research projects, as well as wild animal feeders containing food that is healthy for such animals (no feeding animals human food/scraps/leftovers but allowing bird feed or squirrel feed mixes)
- Feeding birds and squirrels is OK on private property.
- If a person is harmed by wildlife because they are seeking a photo with the animal or not exercising common sense. The animal is not punished for any harm done to the person or children. If a child is harmed then parents should be fined.
- let skunks be.numerous near my house
- Bird feeders
- Animal is hurt and waiting to be picked up by a wildlife fondation
- Except bird feeders
- Feeding to trap animal
- Feeding wild animals by hand is a no-no, but if they wanna take a snack from my garden, there shouldn't be penalties
- No restrictions for feeding birds
- Teasing is totally different then feeding. I have squirrels. I leave out nuts for them in the fall. That is totally different then teasing. Anyone found teasing wildlife should face prohibitive fines of over \$1000
- Baiting for trapping nuisance animals.
- An injured animal
- Injured animals needing assistance, birds
- ability to feed injured wildlife until the appropriate authority can drop by to trap / pick it up
- Saving hurt/injured wildlife or taking them somewhere to be euthanized
- Bird feeders



- Animals that roam into pet owners yards will definitely cause the animal to become distressed and possibly chase the wild animal, there should be no fine for this. If people are intentionally luring animals into their yard
- If an animal is in clear need of sustenance, I believe it is okay to give the animal some water and raw meat.
- If the population of wild animals becomes endangering to people and small animals
- Feral cats
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders need to be allowed
- A bird feeder
- Birds, attractant for hunting when seasonally appropriate
- No exceptions.
- Fines
- Fined
- I'm not sure, but my concern is it would not be enforced. Who would report it? An officer can't get there right away. But it seems cruel not to prohibit it.
- Teasing wildlife should result in fines, feeding wild animals should not. We should be able to call bylaw and have wild animals moved to safer locations on outskirts of city.
- Bird Feeders in Trees
- None
- Exceptions include animals that are endangered or the like.
- None
- Feral cats/dogs should be fed
- Bird feeders
- none
- N/a
- Birdfeeders (that often also feed squirrels) shouldn't be an issue.
- Animals in need. I.E. physical injury, abandoned babies, etc.
- No feeding squirrels
- Feeding Birds
- None. Wildlife should NOT be fed (then they become reliant on humans) and they will attract invasive wildlife (squirrels in yards digging up yards to bury their peanuts)
- Bird feeders
- Ridiculous, leave current bylaws in place. Why do we need changes? This allows bylaw officers the opportunity to ticket people for bird feeders. We would also require more bylaw officers to support these policies. This is the LAST place city should spend
- Feeding birds and animals in your private yard
- Unless it was harming the animal or a person was putting themselves in danger that could result in the animal being put down



- No exceptions.
- Bird feeders
- has contacted wildlife rehabilitation and has been advised to offer animal help if injured/sick/unable to get to shelter
- Feeding an injured animal
- Feeding wildlife with the intent to peacefully capture the animal and have it safely rehomed away from the city
- Should be none. All wildlife should be left alone. Do not feed or tease.
- Exceptions for people trapping and harming wildlife or any animal. Charge those who kill squirrels.
- Birds
- Feeding squirrels and birds
- Absolutely none! No wildlife should be harassed or fed. Read the Wildlife Act
- Bird feeders. Seems obvious but native and honey bees and other insects.
- small bird feeders and bird houses should be exempt
- Fine
- birdfeeders and mineral blocks
- Exception to bird feeders & animals in distress
- Except with intent to aid an injured animal/or an animal who is unable to feed themselves (i.e. bird hits window, you try to help it prior to taking it to a wildlife rehab centre)
- Bird feeders
- backyard bird feeders
- Bird and squirrel feeders.
- None. The fine should also be for anyone harrassing wildlife trying to get close to take pictures.
- Coaxing malnourished or ill-looking animals for attempt at capture and care
- Fines
- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders
- Feeding and encouraging wildlife to linger should not allowed. Add some provision to support people to deal with wildlife effectively by calling 311.
- Saving an animal
- If the animal seems malnourished or in serious need of help
- If an animal is extremely lethargic/dehydrated, water may be left out while waiting for Fish & Wildlife to respond.
- No exceptions
- None
- Bird feeders
- This is a vague question. Would my mother in law get fined for having a bird feeder.
- Feeding songbirds with seed should be allowed as long as deer are not consistently attracted to the site. (raptor feeding/baiting should not be allowed)



- Leave people alone
- None, look with your eyes
- Bird feeders for wild bird populations
- For care purposes helping a struggling animal that would not survive without support.
- Taking care of a hurt animal temporarily.
- None. Everyone just needs to mind their own business.
- Bird, chipmunk feeding
- Bears
- Bird feeders should still be acceptable
- bird feeders should be an exception to this
- Squirrels
- If a animal was injured
- Not sure.
- None
- Birds and squirrels
- If there is an injured animal on your property, to be able to care for it until further assistance arrives.
- There should be fines for teasing wildlife and for feeding potentially dangerous animals (EG. coyotes)
- N/A
- Animals that rely on human intervention such as pigeons, urban ducks, etc.
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Some people like bird feeders or fountains because they want to attract certain birds. If you want to look at prohibiting something consider open firepits in yards as it lowers air quality to all the surrounding neighbours.
- I think deer lick blocks are a great idea. Always have. There is also elderly people who like to put hay out for the wildlife. I see no harm in it. They don't feed the wildlife by hand. It's only feeding wildlife by hand that I see a major issue with.
- You can't tell people what they can and cant do on their own property don't fine people for teach people the right and wrong thing instead of punishing people for not knowing
- Bird feeding
- Wildlife is broad... We talking coyotes or birds here? Bears or squirrels?
- If the animal was found in distress on private property and the owners provided care while waiting for appropriate assistance to help in the situation.
- If the animal was injured or newly born and abandoned, individuals should be allowed to help in some way without breaking the bylaw.
- If the wildlife is in distress and needs immediate medical attention, it should be okay to provide food or physical touch to the animal in order to help its current situation.
- forgiveness for perpetrators under 8yrs, or against birds (birdfeeders)
- Feeding bees sugar water, bird feeders, etc.



- People make an activity of grabbing bird seed and feeding them in the parks. I would like for people to still do that responsibly. Maybe if they were feeding them irresponsibly then a fine can apply
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders/baths and ecological research.
- Birds and squirrels
- Education program to encourage bystanders to not support.
- What about petting zoos with tame wildlife used for educational purposes, often feeding the animals is an engagement tool. Wildlife sanctuaries located on private property may also need the ability to rehabilitat and feed wildlife.
- Only in the case of injured animals where you're trying to lure them in to help them or take to the SPCA.
- it should be made for both private and public property, they are wild animals for a reassign and should be left alone
- Sanctuaries
- Except bird feeders, or orphaned/injured animals.
- I think obviously bird and squirrel feeders with seed in them should not apply.
- Birds/ squirrels, would be the only exception that I could see being reasonable. So many birds are dependant on the feeders that citizens provide and discontinuing that could be detrimental. Wildlife, I think of deer, bears, racoons, rabbits.
- Na
- If an animal is hurt
- Fines if caught with proof especially repeat offenders
- None
- giving the animal nutritious food and not touching or scaring it should be OK.
- No
- need to consider bird-feeders, and the recent David Suzuki "butterfly lane"
- squirrels and birds,
- The question is too broad. What does it mean to tease wildlife? What about feeding birds?
- Bird feeders, houses and baths- helps the birds a lot, considering our climate! Also if there were an injured animal that ended up in your yard, and after calling for help, you still had to wait for a long time for the City- water, shelter?
- I would support this if it was for teasing. Not for feeding. That would eliminate birdfeeders which is a ridiculous idea.
- There is an injured animal or abandoned baby that is waiting on F/W to come
- SCREW GOVERNMENTS
- If a person is willing to work with the city to rehabilitate the animal from human dependency. Also ensuring such activities as feeding birds or squirrels are not prohibited.
- Bird feeders
- have a warning option for first offence or education option



- Academic research, Government studies and programs
- depends what type of wildlife. for example i think bird feeders are ok
- Bird feeders should be exempt.
- Provided private property owner actions are not deemed in humane
- None come to mind
- Magpies
- Allow bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders, humming bird feeders, bee feeders, water dishes for animals
- Teasing, harassing, injuring or killing wildlife needs to be treated more seriously! Animal cruelty is rampant and there aren't enough deterrents.
- Feeding birds
- Dangerous wild animals that are stalking families and or family pets/ livestock
- Deterring wildlife from coming onto private property
- Bird feeders that use appropriate food options and that are well maintained.
- Injured animals waiting to be taken by someone for reconvert and release.
- need to define wildlife, ie. deer eating plants from private yards, bird feeding should be allowed
- Excluding bird feeders. They are harmless
- None.
- Birds, small animals, and insects that would pose no threat to people or themselves if they become too used to humans
- Bird feeders
- Lowering taxes and firing Neshi!
- Bird/squirrel feeder should be exempt
- I would support no teasing/harming wildlife, but I think birdfeeders are fine.
- Pest resistant bird feeders.
- small birds like sparrows
- Teasing should be prohibited. Feeding urban wildlife should not be prohibited (magpies, squirrels, etc.)
- Fine
- Feeding ducks.
- Allow the feeding of feral cats, but not wildlife
- When waiting for bi-law to come get an injured animal from property. Or taking animal to safety
- Small animals such as birds
- Bird feeders etc
- If the animal is suffering/in need/showing signs of hunger
- I feel like helping squirrels or birds during the wintertime is ok
- Scientific purposes
- Birds



- bird feeders
- None
- Injured wildlife that need care or bird feeders
- If an animal is injured and cannot feed itself while it is trying to rest or recuperate, for example, birds who have hit a window or injured rabbits, etc.
- feeding of squirrels is common in the city fining people who do this would be a nightmare to enforce so why make the rule.
- Rescue
- none
- None.
- NA
- None
- Orphaned or injured wildlife
- Not an exception but a comment.. My neighbor feeds magpies and crows daily, I have called bylaw many times and they can't stop her. Please make a bylaw to stop this. It is horrible to be around and is also bad for the birds. Thanks
- Feeding wild birds is acceptable
- None. Feeding wildlife increased their interactions with people and may support unnatural balances in wildlife populations. Squirrels included!
- Bird Feeders
- Wildlife is provincial and there is already legislation in place - there are no exceptions.
- If the animal is injured/starving and is fed/given water to save its life.
- These are 2 separate issues. Teasing should never be allowed. Putting out bird feeders in the cold of winter should be allowed.
- Maybe access to water during very hot days..
- Bird feeders
- There is no way this can be enforced. There are already not enough staff to monitor and attend all issues. Justice system also sucks.
- Feeding of birds on private property must be excluded
- Those legally hunting
- People should not be allowed to kill squirrels or pigeons.
- None
- None. More suggestions on calling animal control when an animal has entered private property
- Bird feeders
- Only feeding of wild birds in the winter.
- none
- None
- Should be able to feed birds



- In the case of a sick or injured animal, people should be allowed to provide help and care, with the support of animal aid officers or vets; using the proper tools and resources of course.
- Bird feeders
- rodents and birds. I don't want a scenario where people are fined for mice eating bird food left in feeders, or for feeding squirrels. The only proper way to do this is to exempt certain genus or species.
- Small bird feeders
- Feral cats should be put down not spayed or neutered.
- Petting farms and zoos
- Providing life-saving care to a sick or injured animal prior to the arrival of animal / wildlife services.
- being able to use bird feeders to feed birds.
- No teasing
- Birds
- None
- Bird feeders
- Planting trees, shrubs and plants that provide food for wildlife (birds, insects).
- Cruelty to animal/wildlife
- Feeding on some circumstances is ok but never teasing!
- Hanging bird feeders should still be allowed they give seniors a lot of joy.
- Exception with Bird/humming bird houses/feeders
- Bird feeders should be permitted.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- None
- A young wild animal will not survive on its own, it can be fed.
- none
- Age 16 and over only
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- In B.C. a bear was recently killed due to it being lured into a yard where food was left as bait for it. I truly believe in huge fines and jail time for this behaviour.
- Injured wildlife that require care, never teasing animals.
- Cats
- Things like bird feeders are ok
- Allowing stations to be put up with digestible and safe snacks such as seeds and nuts for the birds and ducks.
- People can do what they want on their own property unless you miraculously have your fingers in their pot stay out
- No exceptions. Wildlife is wildlife, doesn't matter if it's a mouse or a bear.
- Fine the individual who is feeding/teasing the wildlife and not the owner of the private property unless they are the ones doing so.



- If they are a nuisance (digging in garden / yard)
- Drastic increases in fines related to persons who break the law under this bylaw.
- You should never feed wild animals
- Just encourage people not to feed wildlife
- composting in garden areas/beds
- Confirmed abandoned babies
- Birds squirrels
- Animals breaking into garbage cans, bins, gardens, etc. Only intentional feeding, it's CRIMINAL to fine on a mistake like that.
- Only against feeding. Teasing is too arbitrary a term to enforce
- Feeding birds and squirrels using appropriate food and feeders
- None
- -35 below zero in the winter for a prolonged time
- Hanging bird feeders
- We need the animals around !! Charge the people who hurt animals. Levie huge fines to pay for the needs of animals!!
- Obviously feeding birds, squirrels etc should be ok
- Teasing yes, feeding no.
- none
- Helping Injured animals
- If an animal is in need or unable to survive in the wild.
- The Calgary Zoo
- You do realize the bird feeders feed Wildlife so you're trying to outlaw bird feeders grow up
- Sick/starving animals. Have wildlife rescues called to take in and care for them so they can be released
- Birds and squirrels proper food only.
- None
- Those who run sanctuary's on their personal property
- birds. many of us have bird feeders
- None
- None - leave people to do what they want on their own property
- Birds
- If a wild animal is injured or incapacitated in any way feeding should be allowed. The two qualifications (teasing and feeding) do not represent the same thing
- Feeding birds
- If the animal is sick/injured and needs help
- Feeding under proper education. Absolutely NO teasing.
- Birds, animals that aren't dangerous don't matter. Some feed people feed bobcats off of their porch and that's a problem



- Bird feeders as these are non interactive
- bird feeders in winter
- Birds
- Bird feeders ok
- Wild bird feeders
- No to teasing, harming, scaring anything cruel. Wildlife should always be protected regardless what property they have ventured on to.
- None
- non leave others to be free to do as they wish.
- Feeding geese and ducks should be exempt as well as bird feeders
- If someone is helping nurse them back to health
- If proven that actions cause injury to animals or surrounding environments
- none
- Bird Feeders
- Birdfeeders ok
- What consists of wildlife, birds? Squirrels? This question is too vague.
- birds
- Ducks
- None
- Bird feeders/baths
- Feeding them on private property.
- Feeding, especially automated feeding (bird feeders, squirrel feeders) should be permissible.
- birds and squirrels, given they are being fed safely. or a stray that is clearly hungry
- Bird feeders
- Not really an exception, but if the wildlife is injured - providing guidelines around what to do and a number to call.
- Teasing animals should be prohibited, while feeding should not. Feeding and Teasing should be viewed as mutually exclusive topics and never lumped together under the same bylaw, so as not to enter a legal debate about where the distinction lays.
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders in private yards.
- The animal is clearly hurt or in distress/starving
- If the wildlife on private property was being malnourished and you were coming to save the animals with water and food and report it
- None leave wild animals alone
- NA
- Give them a fine. It is not fair that they tease wildlife and feed them, then they come back for more and end up getting put down in the end.
- Definitely put in place a bylaw for a teasing wildlife. Deal with feeding wildlife through education. (Your question joined two different concepts so impossible to answer for each concept.)



- If the animal is wounded or in need of assistance (stuck in a fence etc)
- This question is not very clear. Does it apply to any animal? Birds? Does that mean no bird feeders allowed? People should be smart enough not to feed wildlife, nobody wants skunks or goats on their property. Not everything should be enforced by fines.
- Hopefully this doesn't include birds and the squirrels who get into the bird feeders
- Feeding domesticated animals or animals who may be injured and need help
- Bird baths, bird feeders
- Prohibit antagonistic behaviour, not feeding
- Bird feeders
- Sick/injured wildlife, if they cannot be brought to the proper wildlife care facility in a reasonable amount of time
- Bird Feeders.
- Bird feeders should be ok
- Squirrels and birds are fine to feed.
- if you do a pitbull ban, i'll move bro take my tax money elsewhere
- Abandoned wildlife that would not survive on their own
- Bird seed
- If it is on private property that's allows getting close and or feeding wildlife i.e paying for animal food then no fine should be administered
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird feeders. Squirrel feeders in private yards
- In the case of wildlife injury
- Large fines!
- Teasing wildlife is not ok in any regards so a fine would be strongly advised, the same fine should be for feeding wildlife unless the circumstances suggests that the animal would not survive without help
- None
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Leave them alone and live your best life instead
- Feeding birds in the forest
- Bird feeders
- An animal on obvious distress (eg. Starving, thin, malnourished, etc.)
- If the animal is injured and needs assistance.
- Feeding wild birds with proper seed and feeders
- None
- Ducks
- Private property if for the person that owns it, mind ya business.



- Bird feeding
- Birdfeeders
- Fines
- Feeding birds, bats, bees
- Bird feeders.
- Birds need our help
- Orphaned or injured wildlife that needs to be temporarily cared for until it can be transported to the proper rehabilitation facility.
- Bird feeders with appropriate bird seed fit for bird consumption
- Birds or insects that bring life to the communities and their atmosphere. I would refrain from feeding deer, squirrels, rabbits, etc.; animals considered to be pests.
- If wildlife is provoking or attacking a person or family pet on family property
- Emotional support animals but these animals should not be those that classify as livestock.
- None
- First time offenders
- you can feed on private property, but not tease or harass
- Bird feeders should be exempt. Not sure what you mean by "teasing" but that should not be allowed.
- Homeless or sick
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird feed with appropriate containers should be exempt
- Feeding injured wildlife while waiting for animal control.
- If an animal on your property is starving/injured one should be able to help it until proper help arrives.
- Bird feeders
- Perhaps feeding of birds
- Should only apply to mammals (rodents, skunks, deer, coyotes, etc.) birds should be exempt
- For the purpose of hunting or trapping
- Private property is private property. I do not support additional bylaws.
- Feeding waterfowl (but signs could be put up to tell people what is safe to feed them). Feeding the ducks/geese teaches kids a lot about compassion and fosters a love of nature.
- Feeding the birds
- Bird seed
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- This cannot include things such as bird feeders, feeding squirrels, rabbits, etc. I am only for the not teasing a wild animal, not against feeding
- None
- bird feeders!



- Bird feeders
- signage, a 'lifeguard on duty' educating and protecting high traffic park areas
- FerAI cats
- None. If someone is foolish enough to feed or tease wildlife on their property, then the consequences are their own to face.
- If there is harm to the animal from feeding or teasing a fine could be given, with officer discretion
- Feeding birds, squirrels. Teasing of all animals should be illegal
- Still be able to feed squirrels and birds
- Feeding birds in a park? Not sure if that's currently allowed.
- Feeding of birds that are not bird of prey should be exempt
- Bird feeders, salt licks, things that are not in direct contact with the animals
- Birdfeeders
- Are we talking about squirrels, birds etc, Then I don't support this.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Petiole should be able to feed birds at home. Proper food
- Birds! Feeding birds is amazing. And housing wild bees.
- Birds
- Fines
- Bird feeders, watering trays/pools for birds etc
- Bird feeders, or where the animal presents a real and immediate threat to the safety of occupants
- None
- Birds & Squirrels. The harmless wildlife
- I like the idea, but there's no way that would be enforceable, it's not even enforced currently just in parks.
- Bird feeders
- in case infant/baby wildlife are in danger, those who choose to help these animals should not be fine (assuming the wild animal is released back into the wild once ready)
- None
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds should still be allowed.
- A fine for those caught
- Allow feeding birds
- none whatsoever
- Hunting is an exception
- Farm or acreages should be allowed to feed wildlife. The wildlife is gonna show up anyways to eat so no reason for the occupants of that land to be ticketed when it's not their fault
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeding



- Bird feeders, bat houses, bee enclosures and feeding outdoor cats should be allowed.
- None
- Conservation efforts (zoos, provincial programs, etc)
- While I don't agree with feeding wildlife in most situations as it can be detrimental to wildlife and people, things like bird feeders can be very beneficial and should be allowed on private property.
- There should be charges.
- Birdhouses
- Certain exemptions like squirrels, birds, etc
- Prey animals, such as birds, small critters, deer, etc.
- If it's not your pet don't feed it or touch it
- Many people feed the birds
- Bird Feeders (Humming Bird Feeders?, Sunflower Seeds?)
- Birds and other small non harmful animals
- Bird feeders. Limit to birds not squirrels.
- Salt licks should be allowed.
- should be case by case basis
- Animal feeders I don't agree with hand feeding
- None, what happens on MY property happens. You can't infringe upon my rights on my PRIVATE property.
- communication/teach, understanding whats and whys are more effective than bylaws, bylaws just tell people you can't not you shouldn't and why. bylaws have an importance but don't just expect bylaws to be the answer.
- Bird feeders, bat houses and beehives
- No. Don't feed or tease wildlife, that's awful.
- Feeding wild birds appropriate seeds
- The animal is in distress but the home owner can not intervene till a wildlife officer is made aware and is given appropriate instruction on how to care for the injured wildlife or officer be willing to take animal to hospital for treatment etc
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- none
- Any animal in dire circumstances in need of urgent care
- Bird Feeders
- I think it is fine to have bird feeders but wild animals such as skunks, raccoons, bears there should be a fine
- Safety of residents and there pets
- If the animal is orphaned, injured etc.



- I would support a bylaw that prohibits teasing, and would suggest education - let people know -the general rule for feeding of any wild animal is: do not feed when it might cause harm.
- If the wildlife is hurt + requires immediate assistance before fish & wildlife can respond.
- Feeding an animal that appears to be malnourished or in distress
- A hurt animal needing help
- Less harmful animals- ex. birds, but should only be bird seed. No bread.
- If the animal is injured and they can't fend for themselves.
- Luring violent animals
- Bird Feeders still be allowed.
- If the wildlife is in trouble, being able to feed and water until rescue arrives should be allowed (with minimal interaction)
- Education on wildlife & why that's wrong to tease/feed
- Bird feeders
- None
- If the animal is injured and needs help and they feeds it before bringing it to a vet or calling for help
- Animals who require assistance after animal control has been called but before they arrive.
- Squirrels, bird feeders
- none
- None. They should be left alone.
- A fine for feeding wildlife that may pose a threat to themselves/humans. Bears/cougars etc. But feeding birds or chipmunks etc shouldn't be an issue.
- I would disagree with trying to scare off wild animals on private property
- Birds.
- Private property is private property! Wildlife officers should be contacted if the animal is a nuisance.
- None
- birds
- No exceptions.
- Bird accessories (feeders, baths)
- You should not feed wildlife in general.
- Exempt bird feeders
- None at all
- Possible hurt wildlife
- Birds
- Birds and squirrels
- TNR program for the feral rabbits in the City to help control their population
- I would support teasing wildlife being punishable by-laws. However, feeding wildlife such as birds or squirrels adds to the outdoor life in the big city.
- animal/wildlife rescue facilities
- Bird feeders, except maybe in wildlife corridors



- Feeding wild birds appropriate feed
- Be more specific! Of course no one should harm wildlife, anywhere! What do you consider wildlife? Can we no longer feeds birds or squirrels? Are you asking about skunks or rabbits or deer? The City no longer comes out on animal nuisance calls, why?
- If it is dangerous
- Stay off private property, stop making bylaws you are ruining Calgary.
- None. Don't feed the bears. Or Jason Kenney. Stay off my lawn, UCP.
- It would be hard to enforce what happens on private property, but perhaps ACOs regularly visiting areas/private properties (even if owned) for observational surveys of wildlife and regular contact with residents re: behaviour toward wildlife
- I hope the bylaw would specify what wildlife can't be fed, because I think feeding small birds is ok. But purposely feeding a Bobcat is not. You should also be specific about what feeding is. Because a garden that the deer or rabbits get into, is that feed
- Allow bird feeders
- Only exception for a certified wildlife rehab centre or vet clinic
- Explanation needed to what constitutes feeding - deer enter my yard and raid my bird feeder is that feeding??
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions. Animals should not be abused. If there is an issue with an animal there should be programs in place with responsible and trained animal specialists that can contain the animal without harm done.
- An injured animal that needed water while waiting for animal services
- Bird feeders are okay
- Bird feeders are fine.
- An animal in need of help
- Vegetables that can be grown in Calgary and are safe for animal consumption
- Birds
- None
- Nut feeders for birds and squirrels.
- If nuisance on neighbors
- Feeding: many animals have come to depend on the food source and would likely perish if it was cut off suddenly. Make a feeding exception for stray cats and dogs, as well as feeding any injured wildlife to sustain them after calling for help.
- What is definition of wildlife? Squirrels, birds, snakes? Need more clarity.
- Private property is not city property
- Prevent animal cruelty towards wild animals on private property.
- What about migratory birds?
- Complaint enforcement
- Bird feeders



- Exception is if its not harming the animal.
- Bird feeders etc are ok
- For injured animals in the interim (before intervention from wildlife officials)
- Small song birds and bird feeders.
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Feed them appropriate food
- Bird feeders and the like should be exempted.
- Leave birds out the law
- If they are starving and have nothing around like winter time.
- Bird feeders should be acceptable.
- If the animal is endangered and appears to be malnourished, dehydrated, or otherwise injured.
- Stray cats that need a home should be fed
- None
- Fines that actually deter the behaviour
- pests should be exempt such as voles, mice, or other animals that could damage property.
- Lifesaving feeding while waiting for rescue orgs
- Less about feeding and more about teasing. Ie. Feeding birds.
- If an animal is wounded, lost, sick, young, unable to feed itself, not fit to take care of itself, etc
- Limit it to small animals only for the safety of the larger wild animals that may attempt to venture into the city.
- No teasing or harrassment. I don't want my neighbors getting in trouble for feeding the birds
- Feeding with rescue in mind.
- No exceptions, why creates complications and loop holes
- Removal of pesky animals from properties, ie skunks, porcupines, mice etc.
- Feeding non-wild animals such as strays
- Feeding birds should be ok
- Feeding bird via feeders, loose seed in the backyard should be ommitted.
- Proper Bird feeders
- birdfeeders should not be prohibited.
- bird feeders
- Birds in the winter
- Just get rid of the teasing wildlife. Simply because if you are feeding the birds which we all know at certains times of the year is important deer and other wildlife creates will show up. Dont take this away from our seinors who enjoy watching out the wi
- What do you count as wild life? I have a squirrel feeder and several bird feeders. That being said teasing of any kind is horrible and feeding a bear or a coyote would not be a good idea
- To sustain life while help arrives (for eg. providing water)



- Feeding birds on private property should be allowed.
- bird feeders
- This is a ridiculously loaded question. Do I get a fine for a deer eating in my garden, rabbits raiding my grass in my yard, bird feeders that a squirrel steals from. Seriously this is not a fair question and your questions are one sided
- One bird feeder per household, and must be purchased in retail store and placed minimum 6 feet above ground
- Would this apply to bird feeders too?
- Wild birdfeeders
- Exception of bird feeding.
- Individuals trying to care for injured wildlife, given authorities have been notified
- Bird feeders
- Private property is just that.....private!!!!
- Stop feeding humans.
- While I don't support teasing ANY animal - wild or otherwise, what about feeding birds via birdfeeders?
- If wildlife is naturally grazing on shrubbery/trees/grass on property, or if the animal is in distress and in need of food/water
- It's private property. Leave it alone
- ...does this mean, in our own back yards? Would this mean no feeding of birds, or squirrels, or skunks, or deer wandering through? If so, no I would not support this.
- Do bird feeders count? Because if so that is crazy and unenforceable
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders in the city should be ok.
- Unless they are helping the animal
- That question is terrible, feeding and teasing are two completely different things and can not be looped together.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- birds
- Feeding should not be prohibited, what about bird feeders and seeds / nuts for squirrels?
- If an animal is being hurt
- birdfeeders
- Residential (ie chasing animal off your own property should be fine, not torturing, luring, trapping, keeping etc
- Put in proper feeding stations. Provide corn and other healthy grains in a bubblegum type machine that people can pay a dollar to feed the birds and then monitor the feeding that way. Make a bylaw that you cannot feed outside of these machines
- If the wildlife animal is clearly hurt or injured



- Birds and squirrels
- Pests damaging farm land or gardens
- Deer in gardens uninvited or chasing out of gardens
- Allowed If approved by owner of property
- We do need a bylaw against pedestrians teasing/tormenting dogs in their yards on a weekly, daily basis. Many incidents occur because of this.
- Bird feeders
- Squirrels and birds
- Providing life saving assistance to animals while waiting for waiting for Wildlife to come
- Exceptions for animal species that are non-invasive, non-dangerous, or considered to be domesticated species (cats)
- Bird feeders allowed
- Treat all animals with dignity! Regardless of private property. If you are teasing animals that is completely unacceptable.
- Bird feeders should be allowed still
- "nuisance" or "vicious dogs" should not include dog breed
- Rehabilitation for an injured animal
- Bird feeders with appropriate food for small birds like the sparrows.
- None
- Feeding or controlling populations of urban birds, squirrels, etc. whether they are pests or not.
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders, bird baths
- Better education to those in the parks doing this
- Rescue, only if the animal is in danger
- A definitive answer on wild life. Would this be a ban on bird feeders, squirrel feeders, bat homes etc.
- Have a park where specific feeding is allowed, on the outskirts of the city to keep animals out of the main populated area, but where animal lovers can go to feed wildlife if they do choose, such as birds, rabbits and deer.
- bird feeders, bird baths, wounded wildlife
- none
- No exceptions
- bird feeders, provided that the proper seed is provided
- bird feeders
- Teasing is awful and should be addressed legally due to intent, feeding should be addressed educationally because of good intent.
- If an animal is clearly hurt or starving you could feed it but call the city for help
- No exception, no feeding or teasing wildlife anywhere
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeding, etc.
- feeding birds and squirrels would be OK especially Birds. Bee houses should be encouraged.



- Aside from bird/hummingbirds feeders etc.
- Bird feeder exemption
- None leave wild animals alone
- Dependent on animal. Bird feeding seems to be okay but deers and such I would suggest avoiding as in case they don't get the food one day they could be more harmful if they're used to the easy treatment of receiving food.
- Situations where there is a clear need of a rescue effort should be exempt from the bylaw
- starving/trapped wildlife (which should then be taken care of by appropriate authorities to rescue and rehabilitate)
- If the law is implemented, exceptions should be made for bird feeders.
- I think wildlife needs to be defined. I don't see harm in people feeding the squirrels or birds that come on their property. But obviously it should be a bylaw not to tease any animals.
- Bird seed, berry bushes, etc.
- Bird houses
- If an animal is hurt or abandoned
- Bird feeders could be an exception.
- None
- Water only
- Mistreatment or harassment of wildlife on private property should be fined.
- Birds and shoo-ing away animals that could be in danger of being my dogs snack
- Bird feeders
- To be clear about feeding can be difficult. Does it mean that you can't feed the birds anymore? Or plant fruit trees or flower/plant?
- Unless if they're pests. Squirrels are pests that can be shot with BB guns. Same with magpies or rodents.
- Bird feeders
- Except that it if feeding wildlife would lure it out of your property.
- people should be allowed to feed birds, squirrels, and rabbits if they like. No animals should be harangued or teased.
- None, exceptions are why these animals become too friendly and end up with death penalties.
- The animal may be sick or injured and require help before fish and wildlife would come.
- Fine residents for feeding rabbits or unsightly property that attracts critters.
- cannot think of a reasonable exception
- Feeding of birds in yard should be allowed
- Feeding wildlife, such as birds, on private property should be allowed.
- Licenced to feed wildlife on private property with checks to ensure no problems or abuse is taking place
- no harm in feeding birds, squirrels etc. But not ok to feed/bait predators or large game
- I explained it but your website sucks, I had to reload for captcha and it lost my answer



- Automatic feeders such as bird or squirrel feeders
- Skunks
- Bird feeders
- N/A
- That, with respect to the well being of wildlife, the same or similar laws apply regardless of property boundaries.
- Bird feeders should be an exception
- Birds, squirrels
- Hard to stop squirrels from getting into bird feeders. I would expect this type of scenario to be an exception
- Feeding is not the same as teasing. Would support a bylaw against teasing.
- Only if it is done by animal services for trapping and relocating. The public should leave wildlife alone.
- Exceptions in the defense of people or property. Birdfeeders, backyard bee keeping.
- Fines
- Emphasis on larger wildlife. Minimal on squirrels etc
- None
- If the animal is hurt, in need of help
- None
- A young child with it's family. The parents are there to teach and discipline in that situation. Not the city.
- None
- Feeding a feral cat, for example, to tame or adopt it
- Owners are outside and give permission
- Feeding birds
- Small bird feeders
- Injured/infant animals that can't get support quickly.
- Injured animals on property
- I support no teasing and feeding of larger wildlife but I am not against bird feeders or hummingbird feeders.
- i don't think feeding and teasing should be the same category at all.
- Birds
- except for city or provincial employees, let civil servants have some perks.
- Bird feeders and waterers
- An exception would be if someone is nursing a harmed or injured animal back to good health, with full intentions of release.
- Wildlife rescue missions for visibly distressed animals on private property
- Pest control (skunks etc)
- This MUST apply to teasing of ANY animal, wild or domestic



- Feeding birds is ok
- We must be able to protect our property and our own livelihood before an animal livelihood is considered
- If the animal is injured and you are trying to help or assist it
- No feeding or teasing bears, moose, coyotes or any animal that endangers human safety.
- Bird feeders and water fountains for animals should be allowed
- Feeding birds or squirrels
- Injured animal where wildlife officers have been informed
- there are some places that you can get some seeds, like at bowness park there was a dispenser for feeding ducks or fish.
- None
- Whats considered wildlife? Definition needs to be clear. Skunks, mice, coyotes, squirrels, gophers?
- if it was feeding big game animals (bear, moose) then yes.
- None
- Known aggressive wildlife: bears, cougars etc.
- Birdfeeders
- As long as this doesn't include birds I support it
- Permission of the owner
- bird feeders, squirrels getting into bird feeders, that sort of thing.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Anything not harmful to wildlife. I.e. things like bird feeders
- Nursing injured animal back to life, such as bird or bunny
- Bird feeders should be allowed and explicitly stated that they are allowed.
- Feeding birds and squirrels as an exception. However not permitted in areas where bears may frequent or at times when bears are roaming. Zero exceptions for harassing wildlife.
- I assume this doesn't apply to bird feeders
- Education is required and then enforcement
- If the animal is in danger and needs immediate rescuing
- Non violent wildlife, like birds squirrels etc.
- If the bylaw only prevented feeding coyotes and bears i would support it.
- Bird feeders are okay, but if someone is hurting the local wildlife they should be fined
- Wild bird feeders and food especially designed for them
- Birds/ducks For feeding (bird feeders)
- [removed]
- Feeding and teasing are two very different actions. These should not be lumped together.
- Bird feeders, humming bird feeders, nits to squirrels
- A process to determine whether the behaviour of the property owner comes from a place of care for/fostering of wildlife species that may be in distress/endangered



- A fine for feeding any wildlife
- Feeding injured animals
- No exceptions
- Teasing yes ban it. Feeding birds? No
- Fine everyone who feeds squirrels peanuts!
- Birds
- Hurt or baby animals
- Bird feeders, deer feeders
- birdhouses and birdfeeders
- I want to feed carrots to bunnies in the park.
- None-
- Birdseed
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels
- NO exceptions - don't feed the wildlife and definitely don't TEASE them! What a silly question. This is a no brainer.
- Birds can be fed
- Pests (ie gophers)
- Bird feeders
- Depending on situation
- Bird feeders
- More education on the effects it has
- The same as public property
- Feeding birds- so much natural habitat is gone so it helps them. Maybe not hand feeding
- Bird feeders; cases of injured animals needing immediate assistance while waiting for authorities to arrive
- None
- Bird feeders
- Animal injured or needs aid
- Only if the animal is as dangerous as a cougar or bear do I really find this a concern
- Birds are wildlife. Does this mean people would not be able to feed birds with bird feeders? Surely, people would be allowed to feed birds with bird feeders in the winter time.
- If wildlife is injured and a person is using food to capture the animal to assess injuries and gain the necessary care the animal requires.
- No exceptions.
- None
- Allow bird feeders



- Are we talking about feeding nuts to squirrels or what? What wildlife is being fed or teased on private property? And what is considered teasing? I think you people need to relax or be more clear with what you're talking about.
- Private property should remain private
- Native Song Birds.
- I think bird feeders are okay
- None
- Bird feeders
- None
- None. People should leave the animals alone. Wildlife aren't pets and this is their home too
- No harming or teasing of any wildlife on private property
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeder
- It should still be okay to have small bird feeders.
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird feeders should be exempt.
- Birdfeeders
- This is a very vague question. Are you going to prohibit people from having bird feeders in their yards? If the animal is being lured onto private property to hurt or trap it, that needs to be elaborated on.
- No attempt to domesticate the animal or hunt it
- Veterinary clinics or wildlife rehabilitation facilities that need to be able to feed them
- None
- Teasing should be defined as someone caught loitering or repeatedly returning.
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- I dont know what the solution is but I think for every person and animals safety this needs to happen.
- No exceptions. Well meaning individuals feed birds throughout the year but that invites rodent infestation
- How can this bylaw be enforced
- Animals found to be injured or in an abandoned state that could be saved and rehabilitated with care.
- i think feeding to an extent is ok - i dont agree you should be teasing the wildlife but however if someone is respecting it i dont feel they should be fined for that.
- Coyotes
- Harassment should not be tolerated but I see no issue with having a bird feeder.
- Bird feeder exception/bat house exception
- Stray domestic animals
- No exceptions! As soon as you do, leaves Grey area.
- Only within city limits, does not pertain to acreges or farms



- Stop the ban of specific dog breeds as dog behaviour is based on an owners actions of raising the dog
- Fines
- Baiting coyotes, out of the city limits, to get rid of.
- bird feeders
- Teasing bylaw not feeding
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders, salt blocks
- activities aimed at chasing wildlife off your property
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Birds
- None
- If a person is feeding an injured animal and waiting for conservation, or if temporarily feeding a pregnant or nursing animal.
- Fines
- Bird feeders
- N/A
- Standard bird feeders, suet , and hummingbird feeders etc
- none
- tigers
- None
- Bird feeders
- None
- Birds
- Birdfeeders
- birds no teasing food okay
- feeding squirrels
- No exceptions, no one should be feeding wild life.
- Teasing shouldn't be allowed but feeding birds should be fine!
- Teasing yes, feeding no.
- Does this mean bird feeders?
- Small animals (ex. bird feeders, squirrels, etc.)
- Assist landowners with removal of pest-like wildlife.
- None. I think wildlife should be left alone. If there's an animal in need and needs to be reacued, that's different. You should help them or call wildlife authorities to help them. But I think the wildlife should be left alone
- Birds, who need feeding for migration should be exempt.



- Wildlife eating plants growing on private property
- Does this include bird feeders? What is considered "wildlife"? I don't agree with feeding foxes/larger wildlife but small birds are ok.
- Injured animals/rehab
- I would expect prompt removal by qualified professional if wildfire is on private property and poses a risk
- Teasing or inflicting physical damage on wildlife should be banned, but banning feeding birds on private property is government overreach.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding wildlife should always be allowed on private property!
- None
- Depends on how you define wildlife. Does that include having a bird feeder, for instance?
- Animals in need or injured.
- If the wildlife is causing immediate damage to the personal property or harming the individual or pets.
- If neighbours are feeding squirrels or other animals there should be fines
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird seed, hummingbird sugar etc.
- Why/how would you enforce that? Would having a bird feeder on your property constitute feeding wildlife? Don't be stupid...
- Bird feeders ok
- Allow Bird feeders, humming bird feeders
- Self defence, or defence of personal property.
- Bird feeders, Squirrels eating bird feed
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- If it is a wildlife sanctuary on private property
- Feeding birds/squirrels should be allowed.
- An exemption in the designation of wildlife to avoid domestic pet species
- Bird feeders
- Injured animals or animals in need of help.
- Bird feeders
- I would support this for teasing or for certain species (ie. not birds)
- Birds
- Only if someone was tempting animals to take advantage of them in some way.
- Birds and squirrels eating from bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- I mean, bird feeding is common and I don't think that counts as illegal



- Trap them and then have them adopted or taken to rescue agency
- Feeding should not be permissible, but if teasing is to remove wildlife from private property that could pose a risk to domestic pets, children, home/landscape structure, that is fair.
- Injured wildlife found on property that wildlife rehab has been contacted and told to try to feed
- Bird feeders in winter
- You need to be actually looking into each case separately, this shouldn't be a easy ticket to hand out. And injured wildlife should not count of person is feeding to take into a sanctuary. There are exceptions to the feeding part
- None
- Prey type animals. Birds especially, hummingbird feeders, bird houses and bird feed. No exceptions if the food being fed to them could harm them
- Bird feeders
- when animals are starving, harsh winters (allowing appropriate food to be put out for deer, bird feeders, etc) okay,
- Bird feeder with appropriate bird food
- Accidental garbage
- Small wild birds i.e. not crows or magpies so at a small feeder that defeats larger birds
- Bylaw for teasing wildlife for sure. This is not right at anytime. Bylaw for feeding should be specific. Predator type animals should never be fed. It develops dependant behaviour than is dangerous for all involved.
- Attempts to shoo away animals
- Allowing fixed hanging bird feeders
- Using food to trap nuisance animals.
- Feeding birds, especially during winter
- None
- Birds
- Bird feeder
- bird seed
- Private property is just that. Private.
- Bird feeders
- Except for Bird Feeders
- N/A
- Birds, squirrels, rabbits, urban animals basically
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and the like
- Feeding birds
- A person should have a fine as well for feeding wild animals! This endangers both the person and the animal and encourages the animal to come back repeatedly.
- None



- If the animals are being abused or put in danger
- Bird feeders
- Feeling an injured animals while waiting for animal control.
- None
- Removal of pest like animals such as mice or skunks
- Bird feed
- Bird feeding is ok
- Birds and squirrels
- Feeding wildlife on private property should not be a crime, teasing should be a crime
- Better education
- Birds
- The animals were here first. Set up feeders for them so they are not so eager to get into the inner city as much
- Birds
- Birds, squirrels, chipmunks, and similar.
- Ducks, geese, pigeons, birds, squirrels
- None
- Define “teasing”? Also, some wildlife (like voles) that reside on private property can ruin lawns and I should be within my rights to eliminate that problem without waiting for the city to come and deal with it.
- Bird feeders. Planting flowers to feed bees.
- Fines
- No teasing but ok to feed wildlife
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Fines for people that do it
- cruelty
- Birds
- Birds feeder
- None
- A person with a lack of education about why you dont feed wildlife
- Large wildlife. If you prohibit feeding birds you will receive feedback about normal people feeding squirrels. More trouble than it’s worth.
- Birds
- This is a irrelevant question/bylaw request
- Bird feeders
- Teasing seems a little too interpretive. Stronger wording on do no harm.
- No teasing wildlife on private property.
- Feeding a distressed or injured animal to help it survive
- If the animal is in need



- Stray cats/dogs, birds
- If an animal was clearly malnourished
- If they seem used to humanity
- none
- Birds, squirrels, chipmunks etc.
- Rabbits and birds
- the Geese can be an exception, because they don't leave anyone alone. Ducks too, as people like to feed them. But, signage should be posted for what exactly you can feed them, as bread is bad for them.
- Sign from owner permitting
- Heavy fines for violators
- Birds, food allowed in feeders
- Ducks
- If the wildlife is injured and you are trying to catch it to help it/get it to a wildlife rescue.
- NA
- If the animal is clearly suffering/in need of food. Would also need "feeding" defined - is an animal eating from a plant on my property considered feeding?
- Bird feeders
- Birds and smaller animals like squirrels. But avoiding larger animals like deer, bears, moose etc...
- Bird food
- If it's a raccoon or possum or skunk
- Farmland
- Fines for feeding wildlife. Just don't do it!
- People who have to kill wildlife to protect live stock
- Ducks
- Education as a first step
- Bird houses that have seed
- Birdfeeders should be allowed
- Injured animals that are being tended to
- Bird seed
- The animal is being coaxed away from danger
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Officer discretion - i.e someone feeds a neglected animal
- reasonable and responsible number of bird feeders, and bird, bat and bee houses per property
- Bird feeders
- Stay off private property
- Private properties should be allowed to feed acceptable food to deer and moose and birds like hay and bird feed



- Birds, Birds are wildlife does this mean no more feeding the birds?
- None. Wildlife should not be fed ever.
- Bird feeders
- Make exceptions for the feeding of birds. Having birds active around your home in the warmer months is a positive and can have a positive mental impact on residents.
- Feeding birds; harsh penalties for feeding coyotes
- Bumblebees would be an exception
- Luring of Injured animals
- Fines
- Bird feeders
- Birds are wildlife so bird feeders are illegal? This bylaw is senseless.
- None
- Wild bird feeders - bird seed etc
- Bird Feeders
- Trapping vermin. Eg possum, skunks
- Ducks
- Farms, petting zoos (feeding exception). No teasing exceptions
- Animals whose presence does not endanger man or animal, for example; birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Feral cats
- ferral domestic animals, chipmunks, birds, squirrels, bunnies
- Zoo
- Birds and squirrels
- Fine
- Bird feeders allowed on public property
- feeding animals should be permitted but teasing animals should have laws against these are 2 totally different things
- No undue stress should be placed onto the wild animal.
- Separating feeding from teasing, prohibiting teasing everywhere and providing a definition.
- Feeding and teasing are very different things. Make a better question.
- Feeding for the purpose of trapping/capturing an injured or otherwise at-risk animal for the sole purpose of transporting it to Calgary Wildlife
- If it is for the wellbeing of the animal to receive food, if it appears hungry or thirsty.
- Bird feeders?
- Birds
- Bird feeders that limit contact between humans and animals.



- Feeding- sometimes citizens nurse injured or emaciated animals back to health. Understanding helpful interventions vs non.
- If the person can justify that it was for the animals safety or wellbeing
- None
- No exceptions.
- Unless the animal is malnourished and required immediate sustenance.
- Feeding a desperate and starving animal shouldn't be bad. But teasing or tormenting it is awful.
- Birds feeders
- Bird feeders/squirrel feeders, etc should still be allowed
- Bird Feeders
- Define feeding, like would leaving out a bird bell or feeder cause a fine?
- Carnivorous or predatory animals like wolves and bears should not be encouraged to approach people.
- Exempt feeding birds and squirrels
- Birds
- Teasing should be banned feeding birds and such should be allowed.
- Fines for feeding bears, coyotes, cougars, deer, elk
- Make the fine high enough to be meaningful
- none
- none
- People should be allowed to feed the birds, bees, and butterflies.
- If the wildlife is a bear or coyote in which would be dangerous. But birds and ducks are no worry
- If the animal really needs food or help. God bless you all . God bless you all.
- Bird feeders
- Exceptions would be feeding to care for a hurt animal that can be set free after.
- none. animals habituate and can not discern between private and public land.
- If it was to keep wildlife in one area so that they would not get harmed until somebody can come pick them up
- None. Wildlife should not be fed
- A lot of people enjoy having bird feeders and baths on their property to attract the birds and I think we should continue to have the freedom to do that.
- Hummingbird feeders
- None. This very question is insane. Enforcement would be impossible. Neighbors would turn on each other.
- Bird feeders
- Fines if someone is abusing wildlife on their property or otherwise.
- Where harm comes to the animal, be it physical harm, or food intentionally designed to harm the animal.
- If wildlife is threatening a person or pet.



- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding wild birds obviously
- Exceptions should include bird-feeders designed specifically for birds. While squirrels/chipmunks etc. do feed off these too, they do not pose a large threat to wildlife or humans and increase human engagement in nature.
- Bird feeders
- unless advice by owner.
- Bird feeders
- If it is their wildlife
- I have no problem with people choosing to feed wild animals on their property. I do take issue with those teasing animals.
- Please be more specific when referencing "wildlife". Would strays be included? If so I think people should be allowed to feed stray animals on their own property.
- Feeding birds from bird feeders, baiting for hunting, stuff like that.
- Education offered so people are aware of the dangers of teasing/feeding wildlife
- None
- Education on human behaviour towards wildlife
- I think it should depend on what your feeding. I could see someone feeding some birds and getting in trouble - not as big of a problem in my opinion. I think it would also be dependent on how much of an impact it is having on others near the property
- Bird feeders three per household lot.
- Wild cats should be left alone. They keep mouse population down and can live a happy life on their own.
- Birds ducks and geese
- Birds ducks and geese
- Bird feeders
- Starving animals
- If the animal on private property looks to be suffering from malnutrition and starving.
- Birds
- Bird feeders, bee feeders
- Bird feeders
- Drop at least 20 bylaws . There are too many as it is
- N/A
- animals in need exs. injured etc
- Caring for injured wildlife on your property before appropriate personnel come get the animal.
- Crisis such as fire or flood
- Neighbor has a lot of bird feeders which attract squirrels and then also traps the squirrels ... Should be illegal



- If the animal seems to be hurt
- birds - providing bird feeders. Also it shouldn't be considered feeding if the animal enters the private property and eats gardens, trees and lawns
- Bird feeders
- Allow back yardbird feeders
- For small wildlife (such as rabbits)
- None
- Birds
- Animals needing medical attention
- Bird feeders
- None, we need to respect wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Certain non-pest (pigeons, magpies, etc.) birds
- If there's Starving wildlife
- Allow feeders for birds and butterflies etc
- Feeding birds, squirrels and rabbits should be allowed.
- A bird feeder is completely fine in my opinion.
- Bird feeders would be alright if they're maintained and high enough/out of the way so that deer, etc. couldn't get them.
- Feeding Birds
- None
- Having a bird feeder
- Developmentally challenged people. Squirrel/bird feeders
- Injured or abandoned wildlife
- Unfair treatment of animals should be obeyed on or off private property but feeding would animals within private property should be allowed provided the food is safe and appropriate, including encouraging natural foraging behaviors
- Bears and coyotes
- None
- feeding and teasing are completely different things
- Bird feeders, come on...
- Fines for people who tease these animals
- Bird feeders and watering holes.
- Bird seed is okay. Peanuts for squirrels.
- None
- Stop making stupid rules and dont discriminate against breeds of dogs.
- Deer
- Bird feeders
- Feeding of injured or orphaned wildlife prior to taking it to a proper wildlife rescue facility



- Feeding is ok but no teasing
- Feeding and teasing shouldn't be categorized together. 2 different kinds of people.
- Herbivores
- A pond on private property with ducks
- Bird feeders
- Animals that are hurt and can't survive without care.
- Differentiate feeding Vs teasing
- Birds, squirrels
- If one is hurt for example baby deer needs help
- Bird feeders
- Squirrels rabbits and birds
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- None
- Feeding or taking care of rehabilitated wildlife
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- Omit Crows & Song Birds
- What types of wild life are we talking about? There's nothing wrong with feeding squirrels, birds, stray cats etc on ones private property
- Birds and squirrels
- If the animal is injured and requires human intervention for survival
- Fines, jail time for repeat /severe offenses
- Animals which are injured or were previously injured, creating a degree of dependance on people for aid.
- If it is to get back to safety from a hungry animal
- Bird feeders
- I am against teasing of any kind of animal. We have encroached on their homes, we need to learn how to live in harmony.
- Feeding birds in winter
- Seeds to birds and squirrels
- If the animal was hurt/in critical condition and needed the help.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds with bird feeders especially in the winter should be allowed. Sometimes other animals such as rabbits will eat off the ground what is spilled. This should not be in a bylaw prohibiting feeding.
- None we Shiism t mess with wildlife unless they are threatening our safety
- None
- Fine



- Small urban animal feeders, like for birds or squirrels should be allowed.
- Injured wildlife that the person is going to call for help for
- Bird feeders
- Backyard Bird and squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Feeding birds
- Feeding in dire circumstances is OK.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding of birds, squirrels, etc
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders perhaps
- If the animal was in danger and the feeding/teasing would help protect the animal and prevent it from being harmed.
- Bird feeders
- None. Wild animals belong in the wild hunting their own food.
- bird feeders
- Nuts for squirrels should be ok
- Cannot think of any
- Birds, ducks etc.
- In the case of an injured wild animal, using food as a lure should be allowed. The first option should be to call a professional to handle the situation, but if the situation is serious and the individual feels capable, they should be allowed to use food.
- Birds
- If you are trying to get it off private property
- The animal is in danger and should be rehabilitated (for feeding reasons)
- Bird feeders
- Nuisance animals should be removed
- Obviously the provision of bird feeders and bird "baths." Also the provision of water or food in the case of emergency while awaiting animal services.
- An injured animal can be fed and taken care of
- Bird Feeders
- The animal is injured and needs help.
- Bird houses with bird feed
- Birds
- Bird feeders. Duh.



- An animal that is wounded or unable to survive on its own
- Bird feeders
- If the animal was in distress and someone was caring for it until appropriate authorities arrived
- Bird feeders
- Winter bird feeders.
- Geese ducks etc
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- None
- Birdfeeders should still be allowed.
- Injured/orphaned animals
- Nothing. Leave wildlife alone. They shouldn't be fed to encourage them to stay around.
- Wild birds
- Accidental feeding of animals from gardens or pet food
- Birds
- N/a
- Where the city has provided direct approval of that wildlife to be on and kept on private property
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed/exempt
- helping an injured animal
- Bird feeders allowed
- I think people with acreages should be exempt. For example ranchers and farmers leaving oats for mama deers and babies during the winter.
- Bird feeders
- Allowable wildlife is ok, eg chickens
- Bird feeders
- birdhouses/feeders
- Bird feeders for birds (and obviously squirrels, since good luck stopping them using the bird feeders).
- Teasing should definitely be prohibited but I think bird feeding should be okay. It is so important for the well-being of seniors and shut-ins 'cause it gives them some nature to watch..
- Bird feeders. Teasing skunks (just kidding!)
- Feeding birds
- For the first question, people shouldn't be fined for roaming cats if they are already spayed or neutered what harm are they doing by being semi free animals.
- Fines if you do. We should not be encouraging wildlife to come back if they do find themselves on our property
- Fines
- Bird feeders



- Bird feeders
- Abandoned young/new borns
- Stray dogs and cats
- Birds should be exempt
- fines, feeding wildlife causes a dependence on humans and usually leads to the animal being hurt or killed
- Bird feeders
- Regular feeding of habituated animals on private land.
- None
- Birds
- None
- Bird feeders..
- No exceptions
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- Wild bird feeders/non physical engagement feeders. Larger animals (dangerous/provoke them to be killed because they are coming into properties) should be fined.
- No harassment or "teasing" of wildlife anywhere
- For the purpose of trapping or hunting
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Proper feeders like bird feeders, but feeders, etc
- Lost pet who's owner has been contacted and been made aware
- Skunks the city needs to support citizens with this issue
- Exception to bird feeders unless it has negative impact on wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- An injured or ill animal in need of food/care
- injured animals that need to be lured closer in order to get them the assistance/car that they need
- It's not fair for the wildlife who eventually are the ones that have to be put down
- None
- Private wildlife rehab centres.
- Human interaction free feeding devices i.e. Bird Feeders
- if the animal is in distress and needs food or water
- N/A
- Vegetables from the garden
- Elderly people - when they have limited mobility to chase after a pet
- Bird feeders
- No teasing but putting out bird seed is nice
- None
- Bird feeders.



- Bird feeders
- Bird seed
- Providing birdseed
- bird feeders
- None
- Bird, and squirrel feeders
- Injured animals
- Birds (except pigeons - no feeding pigeons), rabbits
- Salt blocks / salt licks should be allowed, birdseed, rain water
- Bird, squirrel feeders/water
- Injured wildlife requiring food and/or water before a wildlife rescue can take them.
- bird feeders
- Wildlife Rehab Programs
- reasonable discouragement of wildlife to prevent wildlife from settling on private property.
- Somebody defending themselves from an unprovoked attack from an animal.
- Feeding birds
- If someone has already tried to get a hold of animal services on a dying or wounded animal who needs attention and the property owner has had no reception to getting help.
- Feeding for the purpose of trapping and relocating wildlife that have become problematic
- None
- Allowing the safe removal of wildlife or exploring private options for deterring wildlife from homes.
- Bird feeders, honey bee keeping
- Wild animals need to remain wild and feeding them on private property will humanize them.
- Bird feeders, and hummingbird feeders
- Appropriate dietary requirements of reliant animals like geese (not bread)
- Bird feeders/bird baths
- Birds and maybe squirrels.
- People should not be allowed to attract wildlife by putting food for them.
- Feeding isn't a problem. Animals anywhere should not be teased, touched or abused and fines should be in place for this behavior for both wildlife and other animals.
- Bird feeders
- Separate teasing and feeding.
- Birds
- I think bird feeders are ok, and sometimes animals get into food (skunks and raccoons are notorious). But people need to know how to deal with animals live in harmony or learn better ways to dissuade the animals.
- None
- No breed specific bans.
- Birdfeeders



- Exception for birds
- Feeding birds and starving rabbits in winter
- If it is in the animal's best interest.
- Birds
- I would not include small mammals and birds under the prohibition.
- I would exempt birds, squirrels and rabbits from this bylaw. Though if feeding were to be seperated from teasing, i think all teasing should be prohibited, just feeding of those 3 would be ok
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should not be included in the bylaw as they do not typically involve direct contact with the animals
- None. Keep wildlife wild!
- To get the wildlife coached out of a house, shed, garage or car.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, and similar things
- Birdfeeder
- Ill or wounded animals
- Birds. People should be able to have bird feeders or feed ducks particularly on their own property
- Bird feeders in backyards
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- None
- Birds, I think it is important to exempt out bird seed on the ground or in bird feeders.
- Injured wild animal needing medical attention
- Bird feeders, chipmunks, squirrels.
- Birds/Squirrels
- No exceptions. Wildlife are wild. Keep feeding them, they'll keep coming back, endangering themselves and others. If an animal is in distress than you watch them and call it in
- No teasing or hurting but i think bird feeders, water, carrots for rabbits, oats for deer that visit in the winter is Absolutely acceptable. Our wildlife is everything and sometimes food is scarce.
- Don't tease the animals
- Bird feeders
- Bird-feeders
- none
- None
- none
- Bird feeders, and to bait traps to relocate stray/feral animals
- Offer bird seed for kids to feed the ducks, while having information about the different birds there. Feeding squirrels, not such a bad thing. NO HUNTING on private property, unless the landowner allows but does not feed them, thus trapping them.
- Wildlife sanctuaries and bird feeders



- An animal being starved
- Bird feeders, and needing to feed animals in order to catch them for a wildlife facility
- Bird feeders
- No bird feeders cause problems too
- Consider different rules in areas with more wildlife such as communities near Fish Creek & Nose Hill park. Also, I don't think it should be considered "feeding" wildlife if the wildlife is dining on my wife's flowers in the front garden.
- None!
- Bird feeders etc.
- feeding wild birds and keeping bird houses be exempt
- Abandoned baby animals that need to be fed/cared for before passing them to the required authorities
- birds squirrels
- Except when trying to contain an injured animal in need of medical assistance.
- Feeding birds
- If it is a private property where they are in charge of rehabbing wildlife.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- If the person is trying to catch an injured animal to help the animal
- Bird feeders exemption
- None. Wildlife should be left alone.
- Bird feeders
- Birds, rabbits, squirrels, racoons
- Squirrels, birds etc.
- If they are hungry some one has to feed them
- If an animal is injured or abandoned, people should be allowed to save them and rehabilitate them.
- Birds and squirrels should be exempt.
- Bird feeders exempt
- None
- Evidence of neglect of an animal by the owner. Feeding only
- Attempting to help an animal in distress should be exempt from the feeding restriction, provided that the person doing the feeding is in contact with the appropriate wildlife rescue service for guidance and support
- Animals needing food to support further assistance for the animals welfare
- Just because you can afford a power house breed doesn't mean you should own one
- Bird feeders
- Teasing and feeding are really quite far apart? Who comes up with these questions? If you want to feed it, great, no harm should be done. Now, would this include such things as birdfeeders? The question is ridiculous.
- Feeding animals is fine, teasing or harassing wildlife is not



- None, if it is illegal in the park it be the same in your yard
- Equivalent fines.
- Bird feeders or squirrle feeders
- None
- Birds
- An exception for feeding if it appears to be a stray pet and you are trying to get it to safety
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Injured animals until proper support can arrive (ex. Giving them water)
- Killing of stray Kangaroos, Dingos, and Wildebeasts.
- Birds & squirrels
- Bird seed in bird houses
- none
- birds
- No exceptions
- Feeding needs to be carefully worded. For example, bird and squirrel feeders are different than hand feeding coyotes
- None
- Birds, Bees
- none
- Bird feeders are ok, but not from your hand
- Bird feeders or approved methods to deter nuisance wildlife
- Feeding feral cats.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and houses are ok
- None
- None
- Bird feeders
- The feeding of homeless dogs and cats.
- Feeding birds, squirrels
- Song birds
- None
- Bird feeders and fountains
- If the animals looked unhealthy, malnourished, etc. Feeding out of good intentions, would be allowed.
- that the family can adopt that pet, otherwise, it is wild and should be treated as so.
- Maybe a more advertised number of someone to call to remove immediately if there's an issue in a humane way



- Birdfeeders
- Feeding birds.
- Community organizations supporting wildlife. Ex: feeding feral bunnies
- People should still be aloud to feed birds
- None at all
- Bird feeders should be acceptable. Not feeding deer etc.
- If you want to feed wildlife it mush be in a feeder
- Squirrels
- Birds and bird feeders
- Wild birds maybe? Hummingbirds, chickadees, etc.
- Makes no sense why youd allow people to feed wildlife. When people have fed bears the bears get shot ? Pretty unfair and inhumane in my opinion.
- An exception would be small birds and such
- None
- None
- Animal rehabilitation
- Na
- Injured or recovering animals can be fed
- Squirrels
- If an animal is on your property and being a threat or causing damage you should have the right to chase it off.
- Birds
- Various bird feeders
- None
- Feeding birds
- Rabbits, as they are sometimes hard to distinguish between lost pets and feral
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and the like should be allowed
- None
- Feeding wild birds and squirrels
- Wildlife rescue on private property
- Birds/birdhouses/bird feeders, bat houses, anything to do with bees
- Unless feeding is being done in a life/death situation (e.g. giving water), feeding wildlife should be prohibited to discourage human dependency on food sources.
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders and baths
- Capture.
- Hunting for survival not for game.



- Birds should be able to be fed. Squirrels are unavoidable if you're feeding birds.
- Feeding if it is food that is safe for the animals. I think bread has been shown to be bad but other countries recommend rice.
- A petting zoo
- None
- Bird feeders in winter
- Squirrels, birds
- None
- To the discretion of the property owner
- Bird feeders should be ok, although they do provide a lovely buffet for mice and voles.
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds, Domestic Chickens
- If the animal is harmed
- If the "teasing" of wildlife is due to aggression on the part of the animal or trying to move the animal off your property.
- People should be allowed to feed animals if they appear to be starving and in need of help.
- I think baiting and killing pests should still be ok. Such as mice, magpies, gophers etc.
- Bird feeders would probably be okay still
- DO NOT PUNISH PITT BULL OWNERS!! DISCRIMINATION!!
- If wildlife seems to be near death due to starvation
- Bird feeders
- If an animal is in distress, be able to offer help until bylaw officers arrive
- Strong fines
- Same as the bylaw for city parks. Keep ot standard for feeding wildlife everywhere.
- Bird feeder
- You can have bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- None. Call bylaw if in your yard
- If an animal is handicapped due to an injury an has been human fed
- Sick or injured animals that need help or rescue
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders on people's lawns
- Feeding birds.
- \$100 fines to start and increase with repeat offenders
- Bird feeders should still be allowed



- Bird feeders
- None, bad behaviour requires consequences, regardless of where it happens.
- None
- There are no exceptions. There's no reason to be feeding or taunting wildlife. If you see wildlife, either let it be or let the proper rescues/sanctuaries/animal care facilities handle it.
- Animals in clear distress. I.e; provide only water or sugar water until animal control arrive.
- Bird feeders
- If the animal was injured and needed food for survival
- None
- Fines for violations
- Teasing should never be allowed, but feeding birds is okay.
- Feeding birds appropriate foods, ex bird seed, not bread
- Allowing bird feeders?
- None
- birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- Education
- Bird feeders ofcourse should be okay.
- Birds should be exempt
- Birdfeeders
- Bird houses
- Fines
- Bird feeders. I think they should be cool with everyone.
- None
- Hefty fines
- Birds & squirrels
- Birds, Squirrels
- feeding wild birds in winter months
- None
- None
- Birdseed
- If injured wildlife is found, to allow feeding / water while calling appropriate authorities to get animals to emergency care / shelter / rehab, if they can be responsibly released to the wild after
- Bird feeders/baths, anything that supports bee survival, activities determined to be helpful or unharmed to wildlife and the ecosystem
- Bird feeders, bat houses
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders maybe
- Zoos, etc



- Visibly starving animal
- None
- Bird feeders
- If wild life is injured and waiting for bylaw, you can provide food and water.
- The bylaw should be focused on the fines for teasing wildlife. Feeding birds and small animals such as squirrels shouldn't be penalized.
- NOT IN THIS PART BUT... NO TO BSL!!!
- properties on the outskirts of the city
- Feeding birds and squirrels are ok
- None
- Wild birds, squirrels, and rabbits for one. Also during cold winters feeding deer isn't a bad idea eitherne!
- Squirrels
- If the animal is injured and needs human intervention
- Mail delivery people who give pets treats.
- No exceptions....
- Feeding wild birds
- Songbirds, obviously.
- birds
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- Rehabilitation of animals found on property
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders!
- Feeding the birds
- the only behaviours that should be targetted are those that have a negative impact on the animal, eg. teasing, abuse, etc. Feeding an animal on private property that doesn't endanger the animal should not be considered an offense.
- Feeding non dangerous animals (such as crows) the proper type of food ie. Bird feeders.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders etc
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Home bird feeders.
- Possibly birdfeeders (though these can attract and effectively feed other wildlife as well....so I'm not sure about this)
- feeding if done by professionals
- Feeding birds.
- None



- feeding allowed if the animal was in distress or immediate danger
- Bird feeders permitted.
- Natural bird foods for domestic birds in bird feeders in the winter.
- An animal in distress
- Bird feeders
- In need animals ie) cubs with lost parents, injured animals etc
- Bird
- When capturing injured wildlife for transport to an accredited wildlife rehabilitation facility.
- Fines for feeding or not having wild life
- Bird feeder exception
- None. If there is a wild animal on your property that is an issue then they should call animal services or something similar to deal with the situation.
- None. Wild animals deserve the same respect on public and private property.
- It should mainly be focused on reducing the teasing and abuse of animals.
- Bird feeders
- Split the bylaw in two. Feeding is ok. Teasing is prohibited.
- None... let's keep it simple
- Feeding of wild birds should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- Perhaps a injured animal that requires nutrition but can't get that for themselves (obviously official need to be contacted as well in order to actively rehabilitate the animal)
- None
- Salt licks for deer and bird feeders with seed
- Obviously, we can feed the birds ...
- None
- Would not include birds and other animals that would not be harmed or cause a nuisance to others
- Birds.
- No exceptions- even bird feeders negatively affect areas.
- Exceptions for animals such as birds, squirrels.
- Let animals be and charge neglecting owners or antagonist neighbours!
- Be realistic. Many people feed birds
- Signage and education
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Those supporting wildlife recovery efforts
- I would say wild birds should be exception as they rarely become a nuisance when being fed. Or if feeding stops for some reason.
- None
- Birds or any animal that human feeding does not cause harm to the normal life of the animal



- Bird feeders
- If we ban feeding birds there needs to be serious education about why it actually harms them, otherwise people will definitely break that one and feel it is cruel because they don't understand.
- Allow chickens
- Injured animals - I think feeding a recovering animal before releasing it should be ok. But teasing and luring should never be allowed
- Bird feeders
- Injured wildlife who cannot move freely and/or are waiting to be helped by Animal Services/wildlife specialists
- Just, no.
- none
- Birds and Squirrels should be exempt
- Helping Feral Domestic Rabbits (as well as more support for rescue)
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders, and water left out for the animals
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- When there is immediate danger to a family member or pet.
- None
- Birds
- If the wild animal is found in a situation (like malnutrition or dehydrated) and requires assistance
- A child doing it
- Squirrels and birds should be exempt. Old people and kids like bird feeders etc.
- None
- Feeding squirrels and birds (bird feeders)
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders/baths/houses
- changing the bylaw to state no feeding or teasing of wildlife. period. regardless of location.
- Ensure the wording won't prevent people from chasing said wildlife off the property
- None
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders, assistance of injured animals.
- Bird Feeders/Birds
- Small birds being fed in a feeder that can't be used by geese or large mammals.
- Feeding birds in clean well maintained feeders
- What about Bird feeders? Need to account for this. Also need to make exception for nuisance wildlife on property.
- Petting zoo



- If the animal was endanger or needed something for survival until the proper resources were contacted
- Allow feeding, prohibit teasing.
- Bird feeder, bird baths, bee houses. Prohibit feeding/teasing large mammals - coyotes, bobcats, fox, etc.
- Small scale or minimally impacting things like bird feeders, or if people want to feed small wildlife like squirrels or chipmunks, so long as it doesn't attract things like deer, skunks, or larger predators
- Birds and squirrels
- Deterrence of pests, such as magpies
- None, leave wildlife alone always.
- Injured animals
- Not sure
- Birds and the placement of bird feeders
- Taking measures to help get rid of skunks, birds that attack, etc
- Birds
- Teasing is absolutely unacceptable. However I feel it is okay to leave out birdseed, etc. in your own backyard without harm
- Bird feeders
- A friend or someone helping or being harmless to the animal, themselves, and the property. No loitering.
- Feeding birds should be allowed
- Take away private land ownership from people who are not keeping to best practices in regard to wildlife/strays
- Bird feeders provided there aren't cats living on the property
- Except cats/birds . However people should stop feeding squirrels.
- Birds
- Clearly injured wild animals
- If the animal will die without food and property owner chooses to care for it
- Bird feeders
- Feeding of birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders should still be ok
- None
- Bird feeders.
- Bird feeders
- Teasing any wildlife is horrible and should be fined. But I think birdfeeders are okay.
- Bird feeders should be an exception. Leaving poisoned or otherwise tampered good for wildlife should have extra penalties.
- Possibly bird feeders
- None



- None
- Bird feeders
- Duck ponds or approves locations
- Warning first
- Sustainable and healthy food provision like a bird feeder with nuts/seeds.
- Birds
- Birds/squirrels
- Frequent visitors
- if they are attempting to trap/catch the animal (feeding is a way of building trust and making it easier to trap)
- Birds and squirrels
- Feeding tnr feral cat colonies
- Bird feeders
- None
- Wasp nests
- Exception would be birds.
- Wounded animals, baby animals.
- Nuisance birds causing destruction of property, mice
- I think bird feeding should be an exception
- No exceptions!! Call animal services if you think the animal is in need of food.
- Bird feeders
- gophers damaging property
- Wild birds
- Bird feeders
- None. Just don't do it.
- None
- N/a
- If the animal is injured
- None
- Bird feeders or if an animal is obviously starving before calling to get the animal the care it requires
- Bird feeders should be permitted as well as watering spots for neighbouring dogs on walks, etc
- Injured animal, in that case contact proper animal care services.
- But I think then there also needs to be more support for people when wildlife is on their property (like skunks etc).
- Bird feeding could be allowed
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders in the urban centre should be allowed, but for developments beside wildlife corridors there should be no feeding at all to ensure other wildlife is not habituated.



- Injured animals
- If an animal was in need of help
- Exceptions to birds /squirrels -seeds allowed
- Sick and injured and waiting for fish and wild life
- Saving animals in need is permitted
- Rodents
- If the person feeding the animal is under the age of 12 or has mental health issues that makes it difficult for them to understand the consequences of feeding/teasing wildlife
- Accidental feeding ie wildlife raiding bird feeders should be an exception but willfull feeding of wildlife should be discouraged. Harassment/ teasing should have no exceptions.
- None
- Let the old folks keep their bird feeders
- Exceptions to put out bird/squirrel feeders. Allowance of shoo-ing for animals behaving as pests (ex: rabbits eating plants)
- None
- You can do things to deter wildlife from wanting to be on your property.
- Just deer tbh like no feeding deer I mean
- No teasing. No feeding larger mammals
- Bird feeders
- A fine
- No exceptions, if anything make the fines larger on private property.
- I think feeding animals on private property is okay. There are lots of bird feeders and people that help stray animals before they can be captured. I believe that teasing is an issue.
- Birds
- I think bird feeding is ok but no reading whatsoever
- Feeding birds, squirrels, strays, (small animals) PROPER food when they are on private property. For example, bird feeders (with proper seed), nuts left on your lawn for squirrels, feeding an injured animal or animal in need of nourishment, etc.
- Bird feeders and similar items for small animals
- Ducks/birds
- Wild birds and bird feeders
- Trying to care for injured animal who is on your property.
- Allow feeding birds & bird/squirrel feeders
- M/a
- Feeding only: Feral cats for the purposes of trap and release, injured animals for the purpose of trap - rehab - release
- Bird feeders
- Self defense, preventing damage to property
- Only Owner of property can give permission



- Bird feeders
- Caring for an injured or orphaned animal while waiting for wildlife officials to take the animal into safety
- Exceptions for bird feeders and similar things.
- Bait for Trapping Problem animals
- Backyard birdfeeders
- Birds can be fed via birdfeeders.
- Only on commercial private land should this be enforced. Not reasonable or ethical to do at peoples homes.
- Feeding an injured animal until the proper authorities/rescues can get involved.
- None
- Birds and stuff like that are probably fine, cause they won't cause potentially dangerous situations
- Ducks
- Only if/as instructed by bylaw, f&w, etc.
- Pests on properly (skunks)
- Bird feeders
- If the person in question was trying to remove the animal from the property in such a way
- winter bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Rabbits
- feeding birds
- There should be a bylaw against testing, but not necessarily feeding
- Bird feeders in winter
- None
- Feeding wildlife on your property may be appropriate if it is the proper food/diet for the animal and if is not causing pests/dangerous animals to frequently visit these areas
- Fines.
- Follow Federal wildlife regulations prohibiting the harassment of wildlife.
- none
- None
- Feeding areas allowed
- No exceptions, wildlife are starting to draw closer into communities and there needs to be a penalty for ignorance and potential harm to wildlife
- Birds and squirrels
- there needs to be harm if we are to call foul though - the rules need to specific and not generic
- Bird feeders
- Those intentionally clearly drawing in wildlife should be charged on private property
- Traditional bird feeders as long as the food is of nutritional value.



- Bird feeding
- Leave wild life alone. If a wild animal is in distress or Injured people should contact fish and wild life instead of potentially causing more harm to the animal by trying to feed them or take care of them
- None
- Bird feeders
- On a person's property.
- None
- Birds
- Fine
- None do not feed the wildlife
- Feeding birds
- Birds - seeds only
- None.
- Farms and acreages
- Depends what wildlife.
- Banned from parks for 7 days
- Unsure at this time. Perhaps ducks, geese and rabbits; however, that can be problematic too.
- Fines or an animal education service.
- Feeding to save their life
- Abandoned baby animals
- Make sure things like bird feeder and etc are not included
- If an animal is straving and you can tell feed it.
- In more outskirts neighborhoods, have more rules around bird feeders, as they do attract other wildlife as well, including deer, bears etc. Where it has been proven that those wildlife do go into those particular areas.
- Feeding wildlife should be issued a warning followed by a fine of continued
- Bird feeders
- If the animal is hurt or requires medical attention
- Small birds and squirrels
- Bird feeding
- Leaving appropriate food out, such as apples for the deer
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders of reasonable size
- Bird Feeders
- I would say bird feeders and squirrel feeders should still be allowed.
- Feeding small animals squirrels on your own property such as squirrels/birds/ect
- Bird feeders
- None
- Large fine maybe jail



- Bird Feeders
- Injured animals, while waiting for a wildlife officer to come to
- STILL ALLOW BIRD FEEDERS
- None
- Teasing and feeding, in part, could be up to the owner's discretion. If they allow a certain 'type' then so be it
- Exempt typical domestic animals like cats and dogs
- Birds
- birds
- Prevent feeding of wildlife in general.
- When the animal looks sickly. Feed and contact wildlife support or animal control
- Bird feeding
- Hurt animals
- Bird feeders
- I would make an exception to any homes that are in the country and outside the city limits.
- Feeding the ducks was something I always did as I was younger and despite my ignorance on ducks dietary needs I feel it would be nice to continue.
- none in writing-exceptions can be made in the moment using logic if warranted.
- With the exception of birds
- Animals in distress should be able to be fed
- Actually enforcing it, Fines etc
- None
- Deterring wild animals for your yard
- Birdfeeders etc
- Bird feeders should still be allowed.
- Extreme weather conditions, drought, other unpredicted environmental conditions like oil spills, etc what would prevent from natural feeding
- Bird feeders need to be allowed
- Signs stating specific wildlife
- Birds, strays, bees
- bird seed
- nuisance pests
- Bird/squirrel feeders. Birdbaths. Flowers for bumblebees.
- No exceptions. Wildlife should not be allowed to depend on humans for food.
- Sick and injured that the vets won't help.
- Bird feeders
- None



- Feeding is fine as long as it's animal grade and teasing should never be allowed anywhere. On private property many home owners have deer that return yearly that they feed and no harm is done to anyone.
- birds
- Birds & bees. Putting out bird feeders & pollinator water stations shouldn't be against bylaws.
- Wild Birds
- Bird feeders or feeding of wild animals on your property.
- Birds
- Feeding birds
- Maybe in times of extreme weather (blizzards, droughts) where the animals could not survive without help.
- Bird feeders
- Pests. Allow trapping/killing (skunks)
- Birdseed and suet for songbirds only. No peanuts for squirrels, too many allergies and nuisance of digging squirrels in garden beds.
- Feeding birds proper food and educating those feeding them the wrong food
- birds should be exempt
- Feeding to lure wildlife only if it is a danger to the occupants of the property (occupants being people and animals)
- Injuries or abandonment
- Education to business and home owners that wild life don't follow our rules and need to be better respected. Limits shooting and ends rce relocation for dangerous animals (bears, cougars, lynx) and fine people for feeding or unnecessary interaction.
- Feeding should still be allowed. Don't ban bird feeders.
- Feeding without human contact for threatened species that are in danger
- Bird baths, bird seed
- Animals near death
- Mentally challenged individuals
- A sick or injured animal
- None
- Excluding those ACTUALLY helping injured wildlife, unlike out wildlife and ramp officers who just shoot them.
- Bird feeder or if an animal eats straight from a fruit tree
- Na
- bird feeders - neighbours ground feed which attracts mice and we are over run with rodents in our yard and house because of the ground feeding
- Bird feeders should be an exception
- Seagulls and Canadian geese being chased out of parking lots
- wild bird feeders



- In the case where the animal is in a health emergency situation and then require proper experienced people be called in to assist
- Bird feeders fitted with squirrel protection
- If the animals was desperate and in need of emergency food/fluids.
- None
- Bird feeder
- Feeding birds
- Properly cleaned bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders and garden plants that attract wildlife
- Scaring away wild life from property
- Bird seed
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders etc
- I think bird feeders should still be allowed because a lot of birds are dependent on help from humans, seeing as we keep destroying more of their habitat for development
- The animal is injured/ orphaned and needs assistance.
- bird seed feeders
- None
- Exception would be feeding birds - both on private property and in City Parks.
- In extreme heat providing water to wild life
- Feeding birds sunflower seeds during winter season when food is scarce.
- Birds
- Trying to lure the animal with food to take it to a vet if medical aid is needed
- Bird feeders?
- Birdfeeders
- Luring out pests example, skunk away from property
- Peanuts for squirrels, bird seed for bird feeders. Any feeding of larger wildlife should be considered based on the potential for harmful interaction. Example: coyote, wolf, bobcat and lynx populations can be more harmful to children and pets.
- Important that there is a distinction for semi-domesticated scavengers who benefit greatly from being fed by humans.
- If the wild animal is aggressive when NOT provoked?
- Petting zoos
- Should only apply to large mammals. Birds and squirrels and whatever are fine.
- If the animal was in mortal distress (starving, injured), and not a predator like coyotes, bobcats, bears etc, I don't believe someone should have punishment for feeding an animal they believed would die otherwise



- Abandoned young
- Fines for those caught
- Sick animals that require assistance/waiting for assistance from city to transfer?
- Orphans, and rehabilitating wildlife. Rescues are almost always full and sometimes need the guided help
- Bird feeders properly set up to prevent squirrels
- The erlton bunnies can be fed
- Birds, squirrels, etc.
- Small children
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Injured or ill wildlife
- Birds
- Jail time or fines for teasing or feeding wildlife
- Authorized individuals/companies available to humanely trap and euthanize pest animals at the request of the private land owner subject to existing wildlife legislation.
- If animal is injured and experts suggest doing so to save an animal but must work to not acclimate the animal to humans.
- As beautiful as song birds are, feeding them attracts pests like magpies and squirrels. No exceptions.
- I would support a bylaw prohibiting teasing but not one prohibiting feeding. Individuals should be able to put out bird feeders as they please, especially in the winter when food types for specific species are limited in urban areas.
- None.
- Cats and dogs
- Birds - Squirrels
- I wonder if this includes bird feeders... that would be an exception I'd suggest.
- Small animals like birds, squirrels etc.
- None
- Bait for the purposes of humanely trapping/killing rodents.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- I believe bird feeders as well as basic wildlife rehabilitation, like putting a bit of food out for an injured squirrel, shouldn't be forbidden. However, actions that can be seen as damaging to the animal, like teasing, should be prohibited.
- Chasing wildlife off your property
- Teasing needs to be more defined and specific
- To support rehabilitation of an injured animal



- Animals should be able to feed naturally, of course birds and small animals should still be allowed feeders as well.
- If it is a sanctuary for animals, they should be fed
- Squirrels are allowed to be fed peanuts
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders
- Injured animals with vet instructions
- None
- No exceptions. It's poor for the ecosystem
- Trying to get wildlife off your property to protect yards or pets.
- Injured, but only if they have been interested by bylaw to get involved
- Bird feeders
- An obviously injured animal while waiting to fish and wildlife
- Strays, feral and semi-feral cats and dogs are not wildlife!
- Bird feeders
- No other exceptions, I all ready thought it was a bylaw
- Don't ban bully breeds. They deserve as much freedom as any other breed.
- One would hope bird feeding/feeders would be exempt
- Birds
- in case of injury of the animal requiring intervention
- bird feeders
- What about birdfeeders?
- I think there should be a bylaw RE: teasing, but not feeding
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- This should be applicable mostly to large wildlife such as bears.
- Farms
- Birdfeeders, hummingbird feeders, etc.
- Injured Animal
- Not allowed to feed any wild animals including non native species of birds/pests
- Birds + squirrels
- Lure away from property
- None
- When geese attack.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders?
- bird feeders
- People should still be able to feed the birds.
- Bird feeders,



- If it is injured
- Petting zoo
- Bird feeders
- Feeding
- None
- Birds
- Allow feeding of wild birds
- Except in the case the animal is destroying property. Digging holes, tearing up plants, etc. Although... don't feed the animals to avoid this.
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- Not only on private property!
- Na
- No contact bylaw for large animals such as deer.
- None, wildlife needs to be left alone so as to avoid problematic interactions.
- Birds
- Squirrels
- None
- I don't have a problem with feeding wildlife on private property, but I certainly think teasing falls under animal cruelty.
- Birdseed
- Magpies
- Bird Feeders. (Less of a nuisance than other wildlife)
- Feeding birds and squirrels on your own property..
- Bird feeders/baths and squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Trying to trap a nuisance animal for relocation.
- Specific locations that permit this
- None
- Allowing a property owner to 'shoo' away wildlife off their property. Exempt would be creatures that natural dwell there, such as squirrels, rabbits, birds, etc.
- Bird seed.
- Injured animal
- Allowed to feed birds
- Birds are considered wildlife. What about bird feeders being exempt ?
- However on acreages and farms just out of city I think it would be okay.
- If it happens to be in self defence
- None, it should not be done to wild animals.



- If a person is a licensed wildlife rehab we, that's ok. If not, they should leave it alone & call a rehabber.
- Feeding birds
- Accidental feeding. Deer eating out of bird feeders and the like
- Feeding birds in winter should not be prohibited. Teasing any wildlife should be illegal.
- Allow feeding.
- bird feeders and flowers that attract bees and butterflies
- Feeding birds/squirrels exempt. Focus on prohibiting feeding wildlife to any wildlife where encouraging their presence would pose increased risk to public such as deer being a danger to drivers
- Deers
- Deer eating your grass or bird feeder seeds or squirrel nuts should be excluded.. If food is not given directly to wildlife it should not be considered feeding.
- Allow bird feeders
- Injured or potentially abandoned baby animals
- Bird feeders
- Exceptions for feeding animals e.g., bird feeders
- Feeding birds with bird feeders should be allowed
- Feeding should be allowed if an animal is hurt and someone was given directions by a wildlife centre
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- An injured/abandoned baby animal
- Feeding avian species
- If wounded hurt or simply lost , common sense situations
- feeding wild birds and small animals that frequent bird feeders
- None the harrassment if wildlife is a violation of the provincial Wildlife Act. Regardless who's land it's on
- None
- Bird feeders only. We had a neighbor who would feed squirrels and in turn the neighbours squirrels ruined my flowers every year.
- Birdfeeders, etc
- Bird seeds. The teasing part but maybe not the feeding part
- No teasing but allow feeding (eg. Birds)
- Wild bird feeders should be permitted between November and March each year (when our cold winters can make food scarce). Feeders should be removed in off season.
- Should apply to not teasing pets as well
- None
- Bird or squirrel feeders



- Bird feeders. Also what does teasing mean? there should be a bylaw stopping kids from being a nuisance and terrorizing our pets. If there is wildlife on our property causing damage or posing a threat to our pets\home\family, we should be able to protect
- Humane consideration would need to be made regarding how to deal with animals that have become accustomed to being fed.
- I would make an inclusion for people in neighborhoods feeding squirrels and other rodents
- n/a
- My exceptions to prohibiting feeding and teasing would be feeding cats and dogs. And of course birds/squirrels with bird feeders.
- If the dog/cat has a collar and looks like they are lost they should be allowed to feed the animal to get them to come to them. ONLY if they are lost
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- If people are trying to help a wild animal due to certain circumstances such as the animal needing rescue
- Bird seed for birds
- Wildlife on roofs, making nests and destroying property
- Injured or baby animals
- bird feeders
- Birds/rabbits/squirrels
- Birds, squirrels etc. cause they like to eat from bird feeders.
- Prohibit feeding of wildlife with the exception of birds and peacefully/harmlessly deterring wildlife from private property (ex deterring deer from eating your garden)
- No exceptions
- Feeders are okay, the teasing is not
- Domesticated wild ducks
- exceptions for people taking care of feral cat colonies, and for standalone feeders the meet certain criteria and are holding appropriate food. Maybe a blanket exception for bird seed?
- If wild animal life depends in feeding by persons, e.g. Weak or injured animals
- Specialists or animals that live exclusively on property and cannot leave
- Abandoned baby
- Don't worry about birds/squirrels unless neighbors object
- Feeding birds in the winter months
- Birds Bees
- Any birdfeeders/contraption should be legal
- Bird feeders
- Injured wildlife while waiting for conservation officers
- Bird feeders
- If trying to lead animal off property for safety purposes.
- Bird feeders



- None
- if the animal is hurt and needs food while waiting for wildlife officials to remove it, people should be allowed to feed it an appropriate food.
- Squirrels and birds - many have feeders out to attract them and I feel these should be allowed
- If there is an injured animal that can not get immediate help by wildlife conservationists
- None
- With the exception of bird feeders
- Depends on the animal its it's a deer or bear then I would say avoid them if possible...feeding bears is dangerous for the person and often results in a bear being put down.
- Bird feeders, salt or mineral licks
- If they are fostering wildlife through some sort of rescue?
- Sick and or mean animal
- Starving or injured animals that need some assistance.
- Bird Feeders
- If squirrels are getting to bird feeders then it would be unfair to punish the homeowner
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders should be an exception.
- If the person can prove that feeding the animal is not causing adverse effects - like attracting large predatory animals vs stray cats
- Except feeding birds and squirrels
- Rural property exception, To respect hunters rights.
- Proper feed should be exempt as it is expensive to care for animals. And if keeping the wildlife Healthy is a goal they want to pay for then good on them.
- Bird feeders
- When wildlife eat garden produce/floria the owner should not be fined.
- Is the city suggesting no feeding of birds or squirrels on private property. If yes, I oppose this. I do not see an issue with feeding the birds or squirrels.
- Bird feeders, taking in/feeding stray cats and dogs and other animals that need help.
- Bird feeders ok if the food inside feeder is within normal diet of animal
- Bird feeders
- None
- That should be left to the experts.
- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding wildlife is fine as long as you are no causing harm to the animals
- Birds
- Squirrels, bird feeders okay
- None, people need to leave the wildlife alone.
- Bird feeders allowed.



- Birds
- none
- Feeding wild animals appropriate food on acreages located in city limits for observation reasons.
- None
- None
- N/A
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeding
- If the feeding somehow increases the safety of any humans. i.e. Lure away the wildlife
- Unless it was used to LEGALLY trap a wild animal to relocate it to the proper area.
- pollinators, eg humming birds
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- So many of our condo members feed wildlife like squirrels birds and gophers
- I think there should be better rules implemented and clearer guide lines, I do not think a goose should be chased after but I do think it is appropriate to feed them.
- Bird and humming bird exceptions
- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- Feeding squirrels and birds on property where you are the home owner. The rabbits being fed at the cemetery in my opinion is outrageous and totally contributing to the coyote problem!
- using food as a lure to assist an animal in distress
- Except in cases where the animal is being rehabilitated.
- Feeding birds
- Injured animals, abandoned babies
- I would recommend up to the pet owner/property owner if charges are to be laid
- Birdfeeders
- I think teasing should be prohibited on private property, though feeding may be more lenient/ not fully prohibited (eg. Bird feeders/ houses)
- Feeding if the animal looks to be in danger of some kind (ie. abandoned fawn, no mother in sight)
- Birds
- N/a
- None
- Cameras
- None
- Fines
- Scraps for birds
- Pest control (mice)
- Birds
- Having bird feeders on private property.



- Birds
- Feeding birds, squirrels.
- None
- Birds
- I'm not against feeding but teasing or abuse.
- None, once you start feeding wildlife you take the wild out of their lives, and no one should tease any animal wild or otherwise.
- Hummingbird feeders in safe locations without cats
- Birds/bird feeders
- Nothing breed specific for dogs
- Wild birds would be the only exception as we have a variety of birds the do not migrate and our winters at time do get cold and sometime thereis not enough food for them
- Feeding injured/sick animals
- Injured animals
- Feeding birds
- None
- Feed the animal if it's only to save it from harm while animal control gets to the scene
- Feeding squirrels is fine
- Birds and bird feeders.
- bird and squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Obviously bird feeders and large water troughs should be exempt.
- Birdfeeders. Essentially, I support a prohibition on teasing, not one on feeding.
- Bird feeders.
- If the animal looks neglected (for feeding on private property)
- Bird feeders
- This refers to larger wildlife, like Coyotes and deer. Birdfeeders are nice.
- Rescuuing ir rehabbing animals found on property. Taking care of absndoned newborn wild animals.
- i would draw the line at small animals such as squirrels and smaller...but discourage feeding wild rabbits and larger
- Bird feeders are ok.
- Bird feeders. Bird baths.
- Squierells and birds in personal property.
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Feeding an animal who is hungry/has no food water
- If the animal was in need of care or assistance or needed to be lured for its safety
- Stray dog or cat



- Bird feeders
- None
- If the wildlife is injured or starved When person find it then till proper support (humane society/ below agents) comes person could feed wildlife to keep them alive
- Stray Cats/Dogs
- Birds
- None. Bird feeders should be banned. They create a dependance scenario for wildlife, and in addition cause a proliferation of invasive, non-native plant species from germinated seeds.
- fines for anyone caught feeding wildlife.
- Starving
- Bird feeding
- Feeding birds (sunflower seed mix or native seed mix only)
- N.A
- Except birds
- Bird baths, bee nest-boxes, bat/bird boxes,
- If it was necessary to help the animal for whatever reason
- Bird seed
- Visibly hurt or sick animals
- Birds and bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels.
- I would advise to be lenient with children and teenagers and educate rather than punish
- Probably song birds.
- Bird feeders set up to only be accessible for birds
- if the animal leaves in better or the same condition it was in before
- None
- Bird feeders are great!
- Bird feeders
- The city need to take responsibility I how much wildlife is in the city. Perhaps culling or relocation for safety
- Any animal in clear distress that needs water or food before help comes.
- Fines
- I would make certified wildlife rehabilitators exempt from this bylaw.
- The only possible suggestion is if you are nursing a sick or injured animal and your working under the guidance of Fish and wildlife or a vet
- No suggestions if humans are bugging wildlife when we are the ones invading their space then humans should be fined.
- bird & bat feeders
- If an animal appears injured and needs rescuing.
- Teasing only ..



- Feeding squirrels ect in yard
- Why should their be an exception to teasing anything?
- Na
- Bird seed feeders
- Birds
- It's never alright to tease/harass animals. That should be heavily fined.
- None
- I do not think individuals should be fined for leaving out carrot peelings etc on their own property for rabbits. It keeps them from eating city funded flower beds and community gardens.
- n/a
- Bird feeders
- Birds, small animals such as gophers or rabbits (to feed, not tease) as these will not become dangerous to humans if they get used to human contact I
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- If your feeding appropriate foods that are not bad for the health of the animals. Ex. Ducks and bread. Its bad for them.
- Better response in removing wildlife from property when reported to prevent any contact.
- Bird feeders
- If the animal looks malnourished
- Warning for first time offence
- Fine
- Teasing and feeding are 2 different things. Personally I don't want wildlife in my yard but for some with bird feeders etc maybe that could be the exception
- Bird feeders
- Still allow bird feeders and squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels
- Feeding birds, squirrels and the like I think it pretty harmless
- We should be able to feed birds appropriate feed.
- None
- I would suggest the city not plan anything to deter wildlife in the urban areas at all unless absolutely necessary. I would support bylaws for any and all people, whether on public or private property, be fined for feeding/trapping/killing/etc. wildlife
- If they are injured, or without parents/caregivers. Then itâ€™s morally appropriate to feed wild life.
- Sick animals, babies without mothers, abandoned animals.
- Birds should be allowed to be fed
- Feeding various bird species appropriate kinds of food



- Na
- No exceptions.
- Bird feeders
- We should still be allowed to feed birds (bird feeders) on private property.
- Putting out water
- Harsh winters
- None
- Bird feeders should definitely still be allowed
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Birds that can fly to bird feeders.
- I dont think feeding wildlife is a big problem. Teasing the wildlife with food can definatly be a potential problem an animal could get angry and attack.
- Where proper wildfowl feed is dispensed for a fee to feed ducks/ geese, say at Prince's Island
- no exceptions
- N/A
- Injured animals or baby animals alone
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels, chipmunks
- Bird feeders and bird baths
- Unless advised otherwise by Parks and Wildlife or the City of Calgary... whoever oversees this.
- Birdseed should be allowed
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders
- Rehabilitation in the event the wildlife centres are full
- Animals on private property that have been injured and require food and water before wildlife services is able to arrive. Also bird feeders aren't an issue in my opinion.
- Bird feeders should be allowed. But feeding wild mammals should be not be allowed
- None
- If a private property is being used as a registered rehabilitation site then feeding Should be ok, teasing however should never be allowed.
- Squirrels and birds
- If an animal is found injured, immediately trying to help may be reasonable. Otherwise people should keep their hands off entirely.
- Bylaws prohibiting feeding animals opens the door for charges on people caring for abandoned animals/stray animals if the animal is located on private property. This should be an exception.
- Squirrels, birds - small animals that are all over the place anyway and harmless.



- Feeding birds
- None...guillotine for anyone caught messing with wildlife
- Feeding birds/ducks, squirrels/chipmunks
- Bird feeders/squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Exception would be bird feeders
- Bird feeders, local flora which may entice fauna to come for a snack, I.e. Indigenous berry plants etc., home based gardens
- bird feeders, hummingbird feeders
- Bird Houses
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Large animals such as deer and moose that stray into yard should not be harassed. But pigeons, magpies, mice, squirrels shouldn't results in fines.
- Bird feeders
- None. Even wild animals and pests should be treated humanely.
- Similar fines as seen in City Parks
- Exceptions would be to help an animal in danger
- Bird feeders should be exempt if filled with bird seed.
- None because feeding wildlife will keep them coming back into the city for food.
- Birds
- Feeding dogs or cats safe foods
- Song bird feeders, pollinator bees
- Squirrel and bird feeders
- bird feeders
- possibly feeding wildlife that are injured and needing help
- Rabbits why can't we feed rabbits they harm no one and baby birds
- Feeding birds and squirrels is ok, but teasing any animal should be prohibited.
- Bird Feeders should still be allowed
- Injured/sick animals, feeding birds bird seeds,
- proper feeding guidelines for birds
- bird feeders
- If an animal is in distress and is in need of food and/or water for survival purposes. Otherwise no exceptions.
- Bird feeders
- BSL is unacceptable and not a solution. A disgusting proposal by the city.
- Saving an animal
- I hope bird feeders would not be included
- I would prohibit teasing. Many seniors and housebound people enjoy watching their bird feeders, and most use proper bird feed, so I see no harm in allowing proper feeding by the property owner



- Bird feeders wouldn't be a problem
- None
- I would suggest an expensive fine
- Bird feeders exempt and providing water during the hotter summer days
- feeding or caring for an injured animal on property
- None
- Birdfeeders should be ok
- Aiding an injured animal until appropriate authority can come.
- I don't think bird feeders or any feeder that gives the animal the option to feed or not and is responsibly maintained and stocked with appropriate feed.
- Bait for Humane trapping for landowners or wildlife rescue.
- Fines starting at \$125 and will go up \$100 every other time the commit offense
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders okay, accidental feeding (i.e. crabapple trees attract coyotes) okay too
- Bird feeders are ok
- Bird feeders
- Bird Feeders
- No exceptions.
- Wild birds
- Continue feeding wild birds
- Birds, squirrels. This should only apply to large and uncommon animals. Ex. Deer, skunks, etc.
- Bird feeders
- An animal that is obviously malnourished, perhaps.
- None
- None
- Bird feeding acceptable with no physical handling by humans.
- If a baby was stranded or the animal was injured.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, as long as they are being kept clean so that spilled seed doesn't attract other animals
- Bird feeders
- Wounded animals (ie. water or small amounts of food given to an animal in clear distress)
- Leaving food out for your own pet
- Bird seed feeders
- Except songbirds
- bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- Feeding an animal in distress or helping an animal should be exempt
- Bird feeders
- Feeding chocolate cake to grizzly bears



- none
- If the animal is injured or emaciated, and they're waiting for a rescue to recover it
- Devices that support biodiversity such as specialized bird feeders, bat boxes etc
- Bird, squirrel, chipmunk, and other small animal feeders should be acceptable
- I do not take issue with feeding provided the food is not harmful to the animal. However, animals should never be tested.
- If the animal is injured and requires care (Feeding) until an officer can arrive.
- Squirrel/bird feeders should be allowed but any direct contact with wildlife should be prohibited. Also, there should be no bowls of food left out to attract wildlife.
- Pigeons/ song bird
- None
- Bird feeders/any appropriate means of supporting wildlife.
- none
- When and if wildlife are on private property that can not be transferred to a rehabilitation center or relocated, and rely on food.
- Birds and bird feeders. Only hand to mouth feeding should be banned or fined.
- Wild birds/ vulnerable species
- Birds, animals that appear to be in distress
- Unless animal is injured and needs care and wild birds
- Birds, squirrels.
- Injured wildlife
- Injured animals
- proper bird feeders on your own property
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- If the animal is being kept as a pet
- Birds
- Bird seed
- None
- Bird feeders etc
- Animals in distress
- If they are trying to remove wildlife from the property because its a danger to children / parents etc.
- None.
- No exceptions
- Allow residents to euthanize feral rabbits on property or have trapping system similar to cats.
- Allowance for the ability to non-violently run off wildlife that is damaging property (EG. Shoo rabbits and deer that are eating plants).
- None
- Only in the case of wildlife rehabilitation.



- Breed specific legislation is wrong and uneducated
- If it looks to be a starving house kept animal that escaped. One should be allowed to catch by means of coaxing with food so one can take them to a vet hospital or the proper place for a lost pet.
- Acreage land clear definition between outdoor feeding of domestic animals vs wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Injuries the animals may have, or abandoned babies
- None
- When doing so ensures persons safety
- Bird feeders
- Must be specific about what animals are being considered as wildlife. A squirrel and a deer can't be treated the same
- Bird feeders should be allowed in private yards.
- If an animal requires assistance while waiting for medical/removal help (like skunks trapped in a window well)
- Birds, squirrels or When an animal needs to be rescued
- None.
- Exceptions for birds (birdfeeders, etc)
- Obviously harmless and helpful feeding of wildlife, such as having bird feeders. I don't see an issue with feeding any non-predatory, non-destructive wild animals.
- Dogs and cats
- To draw out and capture
- if it is a domestic breed (ie. dog or cat). if its truly a wild animal (ie. hare, coyote, skunk, etc.) there should be charges
- Bird feeders
- Certain Birds
- within the city of calgary i don't see many reason for exception with wild animals, i fear that people with more exocit pets like raccoons or certain dog species though may be mistaken for certain wild animals.
- Racoons, mice, rats
- None
- Bird feeders should be exempt.
- Song birds, squirrels
- More clarification on teasing, if someone is feeding wildlife on their property and it is not harming the animal I do t see an issue.
- none - the rabbits in this area are outnumbering the a-holes who feed them.
- Stray cat dogs
- Exceptions should be made for birdfeeding, particularly in the winter months (including squirrels and other wildlife who may access feeders). There should also be safe harbour conditions for improved wildlife habitat.



- No exceptions-wildlife are not pets and to remain wild should not be fed and watered to encourage them to return every day and should be fined.
- The only except should be if there is injured wildlife on your property and you have been instructed to feed it by professionals.
- Bird feeders.
- Bird feeders or squirrel feeders would be totally fine
- Birds feeders where squirrels may be active.
- Feeding birds at a pond
- None
- There should be an exception of someone is providing care to an injured or sick wild animal.
- Dependant on size of property/distance from city center
- Teasing and killing and any kind of abuse should be punishable by law. Feeding is fine for smaller animals in my opinion as long as food is safe for the animal.
- Feeding birds on private property
- A phone number to call with concerns
- Birds
- Herbivores (ie birds and small mammals like squirrels) be exempt.
- I think bird feeders should still be allowed
- Feeding a bird or a squirrel, silly crap like that deserves no fine, use logic and common sense.
- Bird (bird feeders, etc)
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders and things like that.
- I would support a bylaw against teasing, but not feeding.
- Bird feeders
- Anyone who's participating in a TNR program.
- When wildlife was injured or in dangerous medical situation and you need to feed them to bring to vets.
- people should be able to feed the birds.
- Feeding shouldn't be a issue as long as it is okay for the animal to eat. But no animals should have to put up with teasing.
- Unless their being trapped and moved for their own safety, people should not feed wildlife
- Bird feeders, bird baths, allowing animals to eat from garden
- Wildlife would have to be very specifically defined, as squirrels and birds can also fall into that category
- If feeding feral cat to try and rescue
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- None, people shouldn't even be feeding birds--it causes all kinds of problems and mess



- Only baiting to capture and releasing out of city limits. Fish and wildlife authorities must be involved
- Trying to scare it out of yard
- Birds
- No exceptions- any wildlife should be left alone. We built on their homes, can't expect them to stay away from ours.
- Where a report has been made about an injured animal and awaiting for a rescue sanctuary to pick up allow it to be feed until then
- Bird feeders obviously
- Raised bird feeders
- Large fines for households feeding wild life on private land.
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Helping an animal that is in danger, even if it may cause distress to the animal during the rescue.
- Garbage diving wildlife
- Birds
- Bird and squirrel food that is properly meant for them
- Bird feeders and other non human interaction feeding should be okay
- Feeding birds and squirrels with appropriate feeders should be allowed.
- I think helping an injured animal get appropriate care, (as in a wildlife vet or someone experienced with it). Leaving birdseed seems fine.
- Birdhouses (birdseed), possibly squirrels
- Bird/squirrel feeders are okay
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Areas specifically designed for wildlife feeding. Eg. duck feeding ponds
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- fines for offenses
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders
- None
- Unless it's a rehab program no one should be feeding wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- birdfeeders
- Elevated/ tree hung bird feeders
- Warning first time. 2 offence fine 10000 because if endangers animals lives. They get habituated. to
- None
- None
- None
- Wintertime feeding if necessary
- Bird feeders



- If an animal is injured, in need of care, the person is able and officials are unable to come out to help. I believe there was an example of an injured deer in Okotoks a while back.
- Posted signs remind people to not feed wild animals because they get dependant on humans.
- if animal has been injured
- Except bird feeders
- Injured wildlife
- None! We have jerk neighbours who feed the squirrels, then they destroy our yard and leave peanut shells
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Feeding songbirds and bees (i.e. bee water fountain, not bee keeping)
- Feeding birds, squirrels, bunnies does not seem a big problem but feeding bobcats, coyotes, cougars etc could be a huge danger to domestic animals and humans. Teasing of any animals should be prohibited.
- Still allow bird feeders.
- The only exception I would support is the feeding of wild birds although if this causes problems with bears coming to bird feeders then it would have stop.
- Dogs
- Feeding birds
- The animal is injured or abandoned
- Wild bird feeders
- Permission from land owners, animal is in danger
- Bird feeders should be an exception.
- Birds
- Bird feeders , squirrel feeders
- Birds and rodents
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders etc with appropriate feed should be allowed.
- If it's on private property, the owners of the property should be able to set their own guidelines and choose to follow the bylaw or not.
- A monetary fine
- When it comes to minors, parents / guardians need to be held accountable.
- Bird feeders if using appropriate food
- Bird feeders, humane trapping for purposes of relocation or rehabilitation, planting if native species that create habitat (i.e., safe harbour clause which doesn't inadvertently disincentivize people from making habitat improvements.
- Large fines and Bans or jail time for repeat offences
- NO exceptions. People should NOT be feeding and/or teasing wildlife.
- If the animal is being malnourished.
- Give warnings before ticketing.
- Bird feeders



- Exceptions to feeding birds on private property.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and water dishes during heat waves
- Except if you are trying to find appropriate refuge for an animal to then take them to the right place
- Birds
- exception birds/birdfeeders
- Birdseed or nectar in hanging feeders
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders
- None
- No exception
- exceptions should be made for bird feeders on private property
- bird feeders unless it attracts wildlife into the yard e.g. bears
- I would allow feeding on private property
- Bird feeders. No squirrel or rabbit feeding!
- Animal gets accidentally off leash and chases wildlife (one off offense). The owner is accountable, acknowledges the errors and is proactively taking steps to mitigate it happening again.
- Wild birds
- Birdfeeding on private property
- Bird feeders
- Some people in our community have placed birdfeeders outside of their own back yards in community green spaces and we now have a wide array of small birds that visit these feeders. It is nice to see but should stop if harmful to the birds and animals.
- Temporarily feeding injured animal rehabilitation prior to transfer of care
- Bird feeders, proper bins to feed animals like hay maybe
- None
- Birds
- Animals that are clearly in distress (no teasing of course), as well as small birds feeding from birdhouses.
- Bird feeders.
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Birds
- I think things like bird feeders, or helping an injured animal on your property are okay. But it shouldn't be okay to try and attract larger animals (bears etc.) by means of food to the local or surrounding area.
- Hefty fines similar to animal endangerment
- The only exception I could see to this is if the wildlife was injured in some way. Even then, no food, only water in that case.
- No suggestions. Be adults and be respectful of the city's natural wildlife



- birds
- Birds, squirrels
- If they were to feed in an emergency not as an ongoing thing. Teasing never.
- A fine
- Bird feeders
- Injured/abandoned animals in order to bring them into a rehabilitation centre
- Bird feeders
- Feeding in live traps meant to relocate pest wildlife
- Private rehabilitation of injured animals such as birds or young animals that are abandoned or motherless
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Stray cats
- None
- Birds and bird feeders
- Emergencies ex: Fires, flooding where leaving out food and water may be beneficial to affected wildlife
- n/a
- Injured wildlife awaiting transport to a wildlife rehab
- Bird feeders.
- Bird feeders
- birds
- Only if they are doing it to rescue a wounded animal.
- Wildlife rehabilitation or population management
- Bird feeders and bee flowers should be fine
- Bird feeders
- Feeding ducks bread for example is fine. But letting kids chase animals around parks or throwing things at wild animals is not okay and there should be fines for that!
- Bird feeders or feed for small animals such as squirrels. The only concern is with people getting predators used to human contact and needing to be put down for safety.
- Exception for injured/starved animals that require immediate feeding.
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- None
- If an animal is truly in need and you can tell (somehow) you may feed or give it water. Slippery slope though.
- Bird feeders
- Regulated sanctuaries/rescues
- Ducks if they are being fed proper bird seeds. Birds etc.
- None



- When animal is in danger and needs protection until bylaw arrives,
- Birds and squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Assisting the animal
- Feeding song birds
- Bird feeders
- Rescue attempts
- Bird feeders and bird houses should be allowed. Use of attractants for pest control (i.e. cheese on mouse traps) should also be allowed provided non-targeted animals can't access it.
- Bird feeders
- Feed safer foods to waterfowl (peas instead of bread, etc)
- Bird feeders
- Bylaw against feeding only. I don't think teasing is a real issue.
- If babies are found abandoned
- If you find an animal suffering and needing food/water, as long as it is under the advisement and awareness of animal control or similar organization.
- Having bird feeders on private property should be allowed
- Fine
- None
- Birds
- If they are injured or need any assistance
- None
- I would say teasing is not allowed but feeding is assuming its birds, squirrels etc.
- The Bylaw should be specific that it means intentional placing of food to entice or encourage wildlife onto the property. Otherwise, people will complain as soon as they see wildlife in on anyone's property.
- Pests such as: coyotes, magpies, gophers should be allowed to be trapped or scared away.
- Any interference with wildlife should be done ONLY by fish and wildlife experts
- Fines
- None for teasing. If a wild animal is injured on private property caring for it until Fish and Wildlife become involved.
- More public awareness such as signage, media sources
- Bird feeding ok
- Bird feeders
- Ypu would really have to define what entails teasing and what cou td as wildlife. Are bird feeders included in this? What about gardens thatd wildlife get in to is that considered eeding?
- If the animal looks in distress and the person is trying to help it.
- No exceptions. Wild life belongs to all citizens and thus should be protected with no personal exceptions. We are and should be responsible to care for it.



- Birds feeders and the like
- Injured or distressed wildlife can be fed until wildlife authorities show up.
- Birds
- Animals that need to be sheltered or given water/food due to injuries or inclement weather (extreme heat or cold).
- Hunting
- Fees for rehabilitation of the animal
- Song birds
- Fines if caught
- Not to raise property taxes.
- allow one bird feeder (eg. seeds for songbirds) per home
- Fine for doing so.
- Bird seeds, bird feeders
- Petting zoos
- Emergent rehabilitation
- None
- None
- None
- Registration as a wildlife caretaker could exempt serious wildlife lovers from bird feeding laws
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Birds, squirrels.
- Exceptions for wildlife organizations that are trained to work with wild animals.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding for the purpose of reducing harm (such as starvation or scavenging)
- The catching an animal for animal control
- Malnourished pets who do not fit criteria for mistreatment
- Hunters they have licenses
- N/A
- If feeding is taking place because an animal is injured or unable to find their own food.
- Approved bird feeders, perhaps other efforts to increase songbird numbers
- None
- Wild birds should be allowed to be fed as long as it is appropriate bird feed that will not have negative impacts on their health
- None
- None
- Bird feeders
- Injured or very young animals
- except feeding birds
- Bird feeders



- If the action has no harm to the animal or to humans it shouldn't matter, like hiding peanuts in the ground for squirrels
- Bird feeders should still be allowed on private property
- Animal owners and victims need to be held 50/50 not 100/0 responsibility. If you provoke and animal you had it coming. You are no longer a victim.
- None.
- None. Need more public awareness on the dangers of feeding wildlife.
- None
- Birds. As in, bird feeders should be an exception.
- Abandoned or animals in distress needing care
- It might be possible to educate people that feeding wild birds e.g. ducks and geese should be done with some thought as to what is fed. Maybe Inglewood Bird Sanctuary could partner.
- Issuing issue warnings at first offenders
- Birds. Feeding mammals, especially large ones should not be allowed.
- Bird feeding
- None... Makes it too grey
- Unless injured and Fish and Wildlife had already been notified and had given instructions to feed/water until they arrived.
- Exception to bird feeders
- feeding of wild birds (bird feeders etc)
- Bird feeders, feeding squirrels
- birds
- Birds
- Scavenger animals (crows, magpies)
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Is the animal is obviously starving
- None
- Bird feeders
- Petting Zoos
- I think we should look at educating people. It also depends what is deemed as wildlife. No animal should be teased in private or public but feeding birds or rabbits should not be a problem.
- bird feeders
- Maybe sick or injured wildlife
- Exemptions for responsible small bird feeders
- Squirrels
- If chasing them (without unnecessary stress and any harm) away if they are causing damage to property.
- Hunting related. That has its own regulations.
- Bird feeders and etc should still be allowed.



- Birds and animals that encourage healthy growth of life on property
- Fine/Charge
- None
- Feeding areas, where people can purchase seeds for .25 cents
- an animal in distress (ie: youngsters)
- Bird feeders be allowed
- N/a
- Squirrels and birds are ok
- Rabbits and birds are the exception for feeding
- In the case of animal rescue (i.e. bird hits window, needs aid until recovered)
- Birdfeeders
- No exceptions but education campaigns are also important to consider as many offenders are or are with vulnerable populations such as kids. Education and fines in popular parks and downtown Riverwalk area where many families come to feed geese/wildlife.
- Bird feeders, bird houses, bat houses, bee hives,
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Make it the same! They're wild life! They don't know the difference between provide our city property!
- N/A
- abandoned or endangered animals while waiting for proper care to be dispatched
- feeding birds is fine, as long as the seed/suet is in a squirrel and rodent-resistant feeder
- No exceptions to teasing wildlife thats cruel
- Inadvertent feeding. Say a deer eats out of your bird feeder.
- Bird feeders
- Allow people to feed birds. Ensure that teasing wildlife does not exclude removing pests.
- None
- feeding songbirds should be permitted. Known community member feeds all wildlife with nuts, bread and seeds. What started as one pigeon has grown to a flock of 12, squirrels, skunks, magpies and animals wreak havoc on our gardens.
- The teasing of animals is usually done by unsupervised children. Actually fining the parents and charging both children and parents, forcing community service in shelters. Teach them compassion now before they develop more antisocial behaviors!
- Pigeons are not wildlife and should not be treated as such. They are feral animals descended from abandoned domestic stock. The city should invest in sustainable solutions to pigeons that does not include banning the feeding of them.
- None
- Feeding birds



- Bird feeders
- Please define teasing in this context. As far as exceptions, please consider which wildlife is most impacted by humans providing them food. Wildlife that can be most negatively affected should be protected under the bylaw.
- allow for bird feeders and flower gardens for insects
- Hunting, ex luring deer on private property
- Plant life on property cannot be stopped from being eaten every time.
- Feeding birds, squirrels etc
- Feeding wild birds should be an exception
- If the animal in question is in distress, and with guidance from wildlife experts, people on private property provide appropriate food and water until wildlife orgs can physically remove the animal
- Birds
- Licensed rehabbers
- Endangered or rare species who need assist feeding. As well as if the city provides assist feeding to the local wildlife that needs it.
- Wildlife in need of First Aid/emergency help where feeding was necessary to save its life; no exceptions for teasing
- The animal is injured/in desperation
- Species appropriate diets provided in low contact ways (ex a bird feeder)
- Survival feeding of animals be permitted.
- Bird feeders
- None
- If the animal is causing damages to the house.
- Large fines.
- I think feeding then proper food is okay
- bird feeders, bee hives
- None
- None
- No exceptions
- Even though humans want to feed wildlife they don't know the cause or effect that will bring towards Wildlife. We should explain and educate individuals that feeding Wildlife can make them sick.
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- None.
- Violence towards people or pets
- Injured animals
- Song Birds
- bird feeders seem like a reasonable thing to allow.
- None
- None



- Squirrels and birds
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Heavy fine.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird Feeders. No exceptions to "teasing"
- Bird feeders in your yard should be allowed.
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders, bird baths, wild animal salt licks (where permitted)
- Hummingbird/bird feeders are fine, I support the use of them. Just not hand feeding other wild life which could enable dependency or create a pest problem.
- Bird feeders
- Higher fines
- I dont believe in teasing any animal
- Bird and Squirrel feeders / birdbaths
- Bird Feeders
- Make sure that the Builder/Realtor will inform new buyers about the wildlife existence in the area specially coyotes.
- Remote feeding stations for highly mobile animals that are in our yards anyway -- bird, squirrel feeders, etc.
- Fine individuals that are doing so.
- I once had to feed feral kitten while waiting for city/humane society to come with a trap. So the only exception, I feel, should be to care for wildlife in need under direction of a care/rescue society
- None, wildlife is wildlife.
- Fines for people caught violating the law.
- Animals such as Rabbit.
- Birds, squirrels
- Feeding bird things that are good for them
- magpies
- Feeding should be okay, especially if they look hungry or sick. And absolutely watering. Just no teasing.
- Places of residence. Bird feeders, hummingbird feeders.
- Bird feeders my indoor cats like to watch them
- No exceptions, it makes wildlife used to humans and unable to function without them
- Feeding wild birds should be allowed, wild or domestic animals that enter a yard should be allowed to be chased by resident animals
- None
- None all wildlife should be left alone and not harassed
- Birds obviously



- feed if starving or hungry
- Lost pets who are hungry/ noticeable weak
- Birds
- None
- Only for rehabilitation purposes
- Scaring away wild animals that pose a threat in suburban green spaces. Definition of "tease" needs to be clearly defined to exclude these activities from being illegal as these animals often pose a threat.
- Since I cannot find a space to write this, I will write it here. I find it absolutely repulsive that we are including pit bulls as their own special category to be punished differently. I have a number of friends with pit bulls, and they are amazing dogs.
- Squirrels
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- Educate the public on the hazards and detriment doing this causes animals, which includes habitation and eventually destruction of said nuisance animals
- Specify what kind a food can be given, example bird food versus bread
- Problem rodents, birds
- Feeding and/or caring for injured wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Best to leave them alone
- Ban and fine the people who deserve it not the responsible pet owners/wildlife engagers
- Feeding birds.
- Wildlife unable to feed themselves
- Bird feeder
- No exceptions
- Feeding to catch to take to animal control.
- Fines only apply if wildlife become a threat/nuisance
- Bird feeders, bat boxes
- Education programs, fines for those feeding and teasing wildlife.
- If the animal is stuck in a trap
- Birds...would be hard to stop feeding of wild birds that's happen
- Any animal, not just wildlife
- None
- Giving squirrels nuts and seeds
- Exception for birds/bird feeders, humming birds, bees
- If someone is trying to rescue an injured animal.
- None



- People who leave seed out for deer in the winter, in certain areas, that don't interact with them, but provide them with something that helps with the sustainability shouldnt be fined.
- None
- feeding squirrels
- N/A
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- None
- Places where professional are treating wildlife for injury/abandonment/rehab. No exceptions for teasing.
- Waiting for bylaw officer to arrive, feeding for securing the animal
- n/a
- Bird feeder, hummingbird feeders
- What kind of wildlife are you including in this bylaw? Birds and squirrels should be exempt.
- Bird feeders at least 3 feet off the ground as they can be extremely beneficial.
- Filling up bird feeders in your yard and in public places such as weasel head park.
- Exceptions when pests need to be lured out from a hiding spot (ie skunks)
- None
- None, if you torment an animal and mistreat an animal, you should be completely fined and not allowed around or to own another animal
- Birds, bird feeders.
- Bird feeder or items meant for feeding animals
- Endangered animals, returning native species
- Bird feeders with grains and seeds (or, in the case of hummingbirds, sugar water) mimicking natural food available in the area
- Birds
- Cats/dogs
- None, leave wildlife alone
- No exceptions
- Squirrels,
- birds
- Birds
- If the animal is putting someone's life in danger
- Bird feeder is ok
- Fines
- None. Wildlife should be left as unhindered as possible.
- If the person is feeding seeds or frozen peas
- Bird feeders
- Birds



- Birdfeeders
- songbirds, squirrels
- Winter bird feeders
- Bird feeders on residential property
- None
- NA
- Warning first, then a 200 dollar fine
- If there is intent to help a starving/neglected animal
- injured animals/bird & squirrel feeders
- Bird Feeders
- Older people that I know love to see n even talk to birds. N yes they do feed them
- if the animal is sick or injured and you're waiting for the city to pick it up.
- none
- Excepting
- Feeding the birds
- What do you suggest re: compost bins?
- Feeding of an injured or orphaned animal
- Bird/squirrel feeders in resident yards
- N/a
- No teasing wildlife
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders.
- Gardens
- Baiting a pest animal
- Feeding birds via bird feeder should be okay but feeding birds human food in a park shouldn't be allowed
- Huge fines for those disobeying
- Teasing is wrong, but there should be no bylaw for feeding.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- If the animal clearly needs assistance. Are bird feeders going to be targeted as well?
- Bird feeders
- Allowing feeding but not teasing
- Bird baths and feeders should be exempt.
- Does that include bird feeders? You would need to specify which species that people are prohibited from feeding.
- If the animal was harmed (no fault of people helping) and nothing was open to help, so needed to feed until next day.



- There should be no exceptions. Wildlife should be left alone, they were here first and we should not be disturbing them nor their habitats.
- feeding injured animals
- only water
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Birdfeeders
- None, People shouldn't be feeding wild animals
- Let people feed the birds and squirrels like they have always done and if a stray is on their property and they want to take care of it let them, let them build the trust of the animal so they can either adopt or take them to a vet to get treated and reho
- Bird feeders
- Feral cats and dogs, otherwise no animals should be fed
- Bird feeders, slug pots (with food appropriate for animals)
- feeding birds
- Small species of birds via bird feeders would be exempt. Don't feed anything else.
- Any hurt wildlife can be interacted with in order to bring them to the appropriate services.
- Ensure people whose gardens get raided by animals do not get targeted.
- But not birds, should be allowed to still feed wild birds.
- If the animal is injured.
- Unless it is not done purposeful such as a carrot for a snowman nose, bird feeders should be exempt as winter can be hard for birds to find food.
- A monetary fine to any person shown to be harnessing wildlife that disrupts their natural instincts
- Emaciated wild animals that aren't at high risk due to becoming accustomed to humans feeding them.
- No feeding of wildlife, no exceptions
- Trying to catch a wounded animal that's wild and luring with food
- Caring for an injured animal
- More awareness about who can be called in regards to wild animals on private property (especially if they're hurt)
- Actual tickets given out for people doing it
- Birdseed during winter months in squirrel resistant feeders
- None.
- You should be able to feed wild birds with bird feeders on private property
- Fines
- Bird feeders, non close contact feeders
- Birds, birdseed seems fine
- Birdfeeders
- Hunting with bait
- Animals that require rescuing



- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Perhaps specific areas, parks or ponds, where feeding birds approved bird feed items is allowed
- Provide the public with a small list of exceptions based on expert knowledge. If it looks wounded provide water and call this number, if it looks malnourished, provide this item as a nutritional provision
- Bird feeders for song birds
- Exception to be feeding wild birds
- Bird feeders
- This means feeding by hand, right? I can still have bird and squirrel feeders in my yard?
- Birdfeeders and other safe foods for wildlife
- Birds in winter
- If they are hurt/sick
- Birds and squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeder would be an exception, I think
- \$1000 fine for first offence, jail time for consecutive
- Feeding should be okay on private property.
- Bird feeders
- Relocate the animals instead of killing them.
- If the animal was injured and/or in critical condition
- bird feeders, home gardens
- Feeding of ducks at ponds, streams, creeks, rivers and lakes.
- Squirrels and birds
- This should include NO exceptions, not even hunting for sport
- Bird feeders
- Orphaned animals that need attention
- Birdfeeders
- Apply the same fines and convictions that would be issued in provincial parks, if teasing the animal results in injury or death to the animal than the person responsible should no longer be allowed around animals or to own
- Excluding hunting purposes
- You need to examine what wild life you would consider housepets. What happens in the event that an animal is abandoned on private property by their parents? Do you have external rehab workers on standby who comes and gets the animal?
- Rescued injured wildlife
- Birds in winter. Birds are often prey of feral cats
- none
- Bird feeders!
- Fines



- none
- None
- None
- Bird feeders, things of that nature
- None.
- Bird seed
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed, as long as they do not attract other wildlife/pests
- none
- Squirrel and bird feeders
- Feeding song birds and otherwise appropriately.
- rescuing hurt or sick animals
- Rescue
- Bird feeders, squirrels
- Animal Rescue, rehabilitation, caring for dependent orphans
- Feeding of birds
- Bird feeders, bat houses.
- Injured animals if they cannot take them to animal rehabilitation center at that specific time, as well as bird feeders
- Honestly feeding and teasing should be two different categories. Teasing or harrasing animals of any kind is wrong and its obvious the law should protect them
- None.
- Squirrels, birds
- If wildlife is feeding on feed left out for domestic animals own by the owner of the private land. Feeding of birds.
- Of course can feed birds and squirrels right
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be exempt and people not penalized if other animals who wander on to property (deer, bobcats,)eat from them.
- Allow feeding of birds
- Personal property
- Bird feeders shouldn't be an issue
- Providing support to wildlife in distress
- Bird feeders in backyards
- Bird feeders.
- Rescues who are feeding wildlife to help.
- Birdfeeders (squirrel-proof)
- Injured animals
- Animals that are injured or in distress



- bird/squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders in the winter
- If the animal in question needs to be rescued or relocated. Needs to be captured due to injury, etc...
- An animal in distress
- Feeding birds and inadvertently feeding squirrels while feeding birds
- no teasing the animal, if an animal needs food then feed them
- birdfeeders
- Bird feeders with appropriate bird seed for local species
- If an animal is injured and needs care
- Bird feeders in yards
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders allowed
- Bird feeders, and the subsequent animals that visit them (squirrels)
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- One of my favorite memories as a kid is feeding the ducks. Its sad to think kids can't do that. Is there some way that can happen?
- Shouldnt be aloud to feed large game birds and squirrels should be fine
- If the animal is hurt and they need to rescue/trap, then using food to trap is ok
- None
- Bird feeders, sunflowers or other plants
- Housebroken animals that seem lost like a cat or dog should be allowed to be fed.
- n/a
- N/A
- Signage for allowed areas if applicable
- If wildlife is injured, before calling Fish and Wildlife
- birds and squirrels
- Injured wildlife
- none. this is not helpful to the animals at all as they become too dependent on humans
- None
- No fines please. Fines are how you [removed] peoples lives.
- Animal is hurt and needs assistance
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Leaving nuts out for squirrels or seeds for birds
- Bird feeders with proper local bird seed
- Birds, squirrels
- If the animal has apparent malnourishment, or if it is a young animal that has lost its parent
- none. Fine people who feed, litter any food that may attract wildlife



- Squirrels and birds
- Feeding birds is still allowed
- We should be allowed to have bird feeders and squirrel feeders with approved food. A lot of these animals stick around in the winter and can struggle to find food. Also water fountains and ponds should be allowed they help provide these animals with water.
- In the event the animal is harmed or unable to eat by themselves (a baby), an exception should be made to making care for the animal a priority.
- Fines for wildlife harassment and criminal charges for abuse
- Bird feeders and small animal feeders
- Bird feeders should have tighter restrictions since they can be such a good engagement tool, however, they are often not cleaned properly and/or are filled with poor quality or unnatural foods
- Those who rescue animals in need and treat them before bringing them to a vet
- Trying to rescue if injured
- none
- Bird feeders
- If a wild animal becomes a problem, steps should be allowed to be taken to humanely deter the behavior
- Safe/healthy feeding, no teasing
- No exceptions, people should not interfere with wildlife. If there is an issue they should call the appropriate city department, period.
- Note that an animal in danger is not teasing. Not to put anyone in danger, but stay with the animal until someone arrives.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders to feed birds and only birds
- Nothing.
- Parking infractions for people pulling over to take photos
- Bird feeders and water for animals to drink
- Owner permits it
- None, harassment of wildlife should not be bound by bylaws
- None, bringing swaths of rodents to your yards for a birdfeeder is exacerbating a rodent issue. Squirrels, rabbits, gophers, skunks, moles, mice, are all MUCH more prevalent with the reduced grass cutting, need to adjust Bylaw accordingly.
- Bird/squirrel feeders, planting specific plants with the intention to draw in wildlife
- If the animal is hurt and needs help a little food and water before fish and wildlife show up
- Non you should not ever for any reason be feeding or teasing wild life we are invading their space feeding and teasing them can result in the animal being destroyed that is unacceptable the penalty should be on the person or persons not the animal
- As long as it excludes bird feeders and their like.
- Be able to continue feeding wild birds and squirrels on personal property



- Rabbits
- I think tis okay to feed wild life such as birds and squirrels.
- Bird feeders as an exception
- If a wild animal appears injured/hurt/starving, individuals should be able to approach and feed until help arrives.
- None.
- Exception to bird feeders
- If there is wildlife already being fed by owners of private property, they might have trouble finding adequate food. Also bird feeders and stuff like that should be legal still
- Bird feeders
- Shouldn't feed or tease wildlife
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be allowed
- Bird feeders, caring for injured/abandoned wildlife that is unable to be taken to a facility
- Exempt if its an attempt to help a hurt animal to get further treatment for it.
- Feeding privately owned animals
- Leaving fruit veggies out on the lawn for wild animals should be considered acceptable. Trying to let it hand feed wildlife should not be okay
- If the animal is injured and or babies were abandoned.
- bird feeders should be exempt as long as they are not attracting bears
- None
- Bird feeders
- None? They're WILDLIFE we have done enough [removed] damage already haven't we?
- If the bear wants to snack on you he should be allowed without being killed
- Yard bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Squirrels, birds
- Bird feeders
- People who are rehabilitating injured wildlife.
- If animal appears to be in significant distress; providing water should be allowed at all times
- Limit to teasing. Feeding birds etc should be allowed.
- No teasing allowed, but bird feeders should be allowed
- If the animal needs care due to injury/orphaned
- Birds are ok. No large mammals
- Bird feeders
- I would expect that there be enough staff in the communities that typically get more wild life on private properties to enforce this bylaw.
- If a wild animal is injured and needs to be fed/taken care of while waiting for wild animal rescue/rehab services to arrive.
- Exceptions for squirrel proof bird feeders.



- Bird feeders
- Injured wildlife such as birds, squirrels, etc. On properties next to rural areas this could be extended to deer.
- A starving animal or one in need of medical assistance
- Unless animal is injured and people are helping
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Fines
- Wild birds should be exempt. Clear guidelines need to be in place, because squirrels also frequent bird feeders. Feeding birds means feeding squirrels.
- None
- Na
- Feeding birds should be permitted
- Bird feeders
- Feeding tired/injured bees sugar water, temporarily caring for an injured animal while waiting for professional help
- None
- Bird feeders and baths should be permitted.
- Injured animals or animals that need help
- More signage stating not to feed wildlife.
- Birdfeeders should also be limited in backyards. They attract mice, stoats, and skunks. My dog was sprayed by a skunk attracted by a neighbor's overflowing bird feeder. One bird feeder is fine, not 5.
- exceptions for things like bird feeders
- Bird feeders & bird baths, stray cats
- Injured animals
- Birds are fine.
- Removing pests from garden (ie. voles)
- Wildlife doesn't know why property is public or private. It should be the responsibility of owner to inform proper authority and take the correct steps. Instead of engaging themselves!
- Bird feeders
- Dependent on what is categorised as wildlife. Birds / squirrels etc survive harsh winter on being fed with birdfeeders. Same with many other wild animals.
- Feeding due to injury until a wildlife officer can assist with the situation.
- Birds and squirrels.
- None
- same fines should apply. the behavior is not responsible for the well being of the animal.
- N/A
- Birds.
- Within city limits. If someone on an acreage wants to feed the deer, sounds like their problem



- Bird feeders on private property
- bird feeders
- You shouldn't feed any wild life except birds
- Bird feeders would be the one exception I can think of.
- Not sure
- Bird / squirrel feeders that minimize human interaction
- When the animal is in need of vet care but they are not open until the next day.
- Bird feeders, etc
- Still allow bird feeders on private property
- Feeding actual animal food like seeds for birds
- I think that the bylaw should prevent teasing of wildlife. One should be allowed to feed wildlife (within reason) on private property
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels
- Injured wildlife needing immediate nourishment
- Bird feeders
- Do not put bans and restrictions on breeds like pitbulls, there are many responsible loving owners that dont deserve their animals being singled out when they've done nothing to show aggression. Honestly never had pitbulls be aggressive towards me.
- fines
- Birds/bird feeders
- Bird feeders or similar things
- Feeding and teasing are separate issues and should not be the same law. Would this law prohibit feeding birds seeds?
- Song birds, humming birds, bees
- Bird feeders, or other like objects that have limited capacity for small animals.
- Injured wild animals should be able to be fed and cared for
- Rescue attempts
- Injured animals
- Rescue of abandoned baby animal as long as a proper organization has been contacted to get proper care long term
- Bird feeders
- I think imposing larger fines would be appropriate. The city should also pass a bylaw that makes it a fineable offence to share these interactions on social media and create a task force that monitor social media with geolocation in the city to charge
- If the animal is in obvious distress and needs help even then should call bylaw or other animal program to help the animal
- The only exception is that it's A animal park for that reason and it states you can feed the animals.



- Feeding birds in hanging feeders should still be allowed.
- Rescue situations
- Squirrels, birds (from feeders)
- Birds, acreages
- Bird feeders
- Children feeding birds
- birds and squirrels ok
- None
- removal of wild animals - eg skunks
- Bird feeders and feeding squirrels or chipmunks. Feeding deer, bobcats, or large animals should be a fine
- Bird feeders
- The question is ridiculous. Feeding and teasing should be two separate questions. There is no reason not to leave bird seed, etc out to help especially in the winter and that is a whole different thing than teasing
- Moving them to a safe area
- Injured animals that need to be transported
- Bird feeders in yards.
- None
- None
- Bird feeders , non human contact feeders etc.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- If a wild animal come onto my property, and eats fruit from my tree; or leaves from my bush, that should be allowed.
- Only if the wildlife is injured and the individual is attempting to trap the animal to take to a clinic.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds appropriate food, ie. ducks and bread crumbs
- If they're injured, or need support from humans
- Bird feeders being an exception. Mole traps for squirrels should not be allowed
- Wild bird feeders are ok
- Fines or community service
- Fines for leaving food out for wildlife (not bird seed of course). But I've known one lady to leave out steaks and whole pizzas for the bobcat in the neighborhood...
- Bird feeders, bird baths, helping an injured animal or animal in labour on private property.
- Bird feeders.
- Rabbits
- bird feeders and other feeders (peanut feeders for squirrels), making water available
- An exception for the intent of trapping or catching for the safety of the animal or animals on the property



- Hummingbird feeders. Otherwise, stop feeding wildlife on your property.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and things like that.
- No exceptions!! If you feed or tease you have now signed a kill warrant on these wild animals and that is not fair to the animal. People who do this should be fined and a large fine. Over \$500 for first offence
- But be careful that this excludes bird feeders.
- None, proper authorities should be contacted if an animal is being neglected.
- Bird feeders
- Exclude avian wildlife
- Injured and about to die without it. Otherwise even if injured bylaw should be called to deal with it.
- To catch injured wildlife to take it to the wildlife centre
- FEEDING IT TO SAVE IT'S LIFE
- Squirrels and birds
- bird feeders, water bowls in heat waves
- If the animal is injured and you are waiting for professional help to arrive.
- If the animal is injured and in need of help
- Feeding, small animals squirrels ducks ect..
- Bird feeders
- Teasing must be clearly defined
- Feeding birds, squirrels and rabbits shouldn't be prohibited
- If the animal is in distress and requires formal interventions
- Apply it to large animals only, exclude birds, rabbits etc. Exceptions for gardens.
- none, get the [removed] people to stop parking in the middle of the highway to take pics of cows
- None
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Providing water during fire relief
- Bird Feeders Etc.
- Wild birds should be exempt, people feeding birds seed or nectar.
- If someone works in the industry with wild animals they should be except from feeding wildlife as they may be taking care of them as it's something that pertains to their work
- Removing pest animals like skunks
- Bird feeders
- Bird/squirrel feeders in yard, feeding ducks on a pond
- If the animal was really unhealthy and needs human intervention to get help.
- Birds, rabbits, squirrels.
- property owners should not be allowed to ACTIVELY put food out to attract wildlife other than birds. If a large wild animal does enter property and feed on garden plants or fruit trees or bee hives then the owner would be exempt.



- Injured animals can be cared for while awaiting for their retrieval
- No exceptions.
- Stray or animals in need of food
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be exempt as feeding.
- Birds or injured small animals (ie. squirrels/chipmunks).
- Aviary (birds)
- Song birds and back yard bird feeders.
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Birds
- Starving or injured animals needing support until proper authorities can arrive.
- Bird feeders are allowed as always
- Nature cans
- Feeding and teasing should not be listed together. Teasing or any other type of abuse on private or public property should include fines and/or jail time dependent on severity.
- No exceptions. This should be heavily enforced.
- Fine
- None
- None
- Bird feeders/baths should be allowed
- Squirrels.
- None.
- No exceptions, it's a disservice to the animals as they will most likely get killed
- Birdseed
- Bird Feeders
- Birds, squirrels, feral cats
- squirrel bird feeders especially in the winter.
- Bird feeders
- I think this would be difficult to enforce
- Birds, Squirrels
- Bird feeders (seed and nectar)
- Trying to deter wildlife if pet is in danger.
- Feeding birds seed
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders in backyards with approved diet mixes
- Rabbits
- Good will or self protection
- None.



- If a wildlife was found wounded or in need of help before it can be picked up by a wildlife Rehabilitation facility
- Feeding would be ok if animals are fed away from people and a more natural source of food, such as plants specifically grown for the animals
- na
- None. Let nature handle wildlife unless humans cause danger to wildlife.
- bird feeders
- Fruit trees on lawns
- Places that have healthy food dispensers for ducks!
- Bird feeders should be excluded
- Bird feeders remain acceptable
- Unless the animal is in danger or hurt
- Injured animal may need assistance
- Bird feeders
- Properly maintained bird feeders on private property
- Bird feeder etc
- Restricting putting food out that is appropriate for other yard guests (seed for birds even if it draws other pests)
- Bird feeders
- Acerages or farm life should be ok as they are away from neighborhoods
- If the animal is in distress
- it depends on the type of animals that are coming onto the private property or whether they are nuisance animals
- Fines against any animal cruelty
- Squirrels and birds
- None, we need bigger fines for this!
- Off leash dog parks managed by licensed operators who could charge a fee
- Bird and squirrel feeders, no fines for wildlife eating garden/shrubbery
- Bird feeders should be ok.
- If the animal is injured or at risk of death
- Teasing or provoking should be prohibited. Feeding may be a life saving measure until relocation could be facilitated.
- Birds
- If they are threatening or harming your family
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- None
- An injured or obviously starved animal



- I think feed and/or teasing are completely separate. I think you should be able to feed wildlife if they are in distress or injured until a wildlife rehab picks them up.
- Birds
- Bird feeding
- Bird feeders seem to be relatively harmless for individual use on private property.
- Bird feeders in the colder months when they have less natural sources of food.
- If it is for rehabilitation reasons and our registered at a vet
- Bird feeders/bird seed
- Feeding birds as long as there is not an excessive amount of seed being used.
- Clear definitions of 'wildlife'
- None
- I think small wildlife such as birds and squirrels are fine to feed, many enjoy attracting these animals to their property, however, it should be illegal to feed larger animals that could pose a threat ie) coyotes, bobcats, etc.
- Park bans for people caught
- None. Leave wildlife alone.
- Clarification on what is feeding wildlife is needed.
- Squirrels eating peanuts/bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird Feeders
- Feeding songbirds
- In the even of sick animals in order to catch them
- aggressive animals, damaging property, recurring events.
- If the animal or bird is injured and temporary support is required until it can be rescued.
- NA
- Feeding birds/having bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Suggested exceptions would be certain private property such Wildlife Sanctuaries where the owner of the property is caring for the diets of the wildlife. Feeding the wildlife on private property should be left to the discretion of the owner.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and houses should be permitted
- Bird feeders and setting out water for wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders. I love watching hummingbirds at my feeders.
- Birds and Squirrels
- Any
- Bird Feeders



- Bird feeders. Maybe putting out nuts for squirrels.
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders, and in instances where safety was concerned (of person or animal)
- Out side of bird / squirrel feeders- None, it should only ever be by explicit exceptions never by genericity
- Helping the animal in or on your property
- First a warning, then a 50\$ fine if someone is caught only teasing wildlife!
- If it is on your own property... is what it is, can't police it all.
- Caring for injured animals while the proper rescue is called an en route
- Feeding of wild birds
- Define wildlife
- Bird feeders are fine but teasing or feeding of other species should be controlled
- Injured wildlife
- Starving animals
- No exceptions
- Injured wildlife, prior to being taken to a wildlife centre
- Bird feeders or other automated devices.
- if you do not own the animal just dont feed it.
- In the case of an injured animal being taken care of until some form of wildlife services arrive.
- If feeding is used as a method of trapping
- Bird feeders
- None
- Injured animals
- Birds/bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels, rabbits
- A sick or injured animal being rehabilitated
- Bird seeders
- Birdfeeders
- Birdfeeders
- feeding birds should still be allowed
- None
- If they were in need or those who involved themselves thought it was in their best interest to do so.
- Birds, squirrels
- People should be fined if they are teasing animals.
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- None
- Squirrels and birds
- Injured or malnourished wildlife
- Bird/squirrel feeders should still be allowed



- bird feeders and bird houses
- Feeding ducks/geese at public parks (ie birdseed), and having bird/squirrel feeders on your private property
- Bird feeders
- This needs to be two separate issues.
- Exempt bird feeders.
- If the wildlife is endangering human life.
- Bird feeders
- Birds and birdseed should still be allowed
- None
- Bird feeders, bird baths, gardens
- No exceptions for wildlife.
- Fines
- Bird feeders
- Fines That would increase with multiple offences and well as possible jail time
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Bird feeders and bird baths
- City letters in mail for suspected offenders. Tickets issues based on surveillance camera evidence.
- Small animals such as squirrels
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders, apple trees and plants or bushes that are permanently planted on a person's property
- Birds
- Fines
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds and Birdfeeders
- Feeding birds
- Trying to get the animal to safety
- Squirrel proof bird feeders. People feeding bunnies and other small mammals is a safety issue with birds of prey and coyotes
- At least bird feeders of all kinds.
- Fines
- Feeding birds and such at a park is often times harmless
- Huge fines
- I'm not opposed to feeding birds with the use of actual bird feeders. But feeding or teasing feral cats and dogs should be punishable.
- Zoos



- Bird feeders that are determined appropriate for wild birds. Perhaps people need to go through an application or permit process that ensures they are feeding wild birds appropriately/responsibly.
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- None. Zero tolerance.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- N/A
- Sick or orphaned animals that need care.
- Bird feeders
- still allow feeding birds
- Bird feeders should be ok
- Injured wildlife that requires human support For the sake of their health
- I think feeding them are ok but no teasing or abuse. It is 2 different topics in 1 question
- Squirrels and birds
- More education
- Injured or baby animals needing care until wildlife officials come help
- None
- Feeding if the animal is in distress until wildlife officials can arrive
- Bird feeders would be ok. Squirrel feeders would be ok. If deer eat from a bird feeder that would be ok
- No exceptions. I feel this rule should include pets on private property.
- If the wildlife are starving and need the food.
- Unless used as a method to safely relocate or encourage an animal to leave an area.
- Birds
- Fines in place
- Bird feeders, though stipulations requiring feeders to be situated in a manner limiting access to other wildlife (i.e., coyotes) should be implemented to avoid dependency on anthropogenic food sources.
- Guidelines around what is considered wildlife - ie bird feeders would be acceptable
- None.
- Feeding while waiting for rescue/animal services; feeding to trap for veterinary reasons
- A very large fine. Start with \$2000.
- Bird feeders
- Injured animals - if you had an injured, wild animal on your property that you were trying to care for before authorities arrived, you should not be penalized for watering or feeding it. Define what you consider "wild". i.e. Is a bird feeder OK?
- Rehabilitation would be an exception I would consider when proper circumstances are provided
- Birds
- Bird feeders



- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Personally owned animals
- That pit bulls are left alone.
- Bird/squirrel feeders should remain legal
- Deer
- Unintentional - ex. Apple tree in front yard providing food to wildlife
- zero tolerance
- Animals in need: wounded birds, stressed wildlife needing water, etc.
- People should be able to chase away unwanted wildlife off their property
- Yes to teasing. I think this question needs more explanation because I have bird feeders out, does that mean I would get fined since I'm feeding wildlife. Maybe more description on what animals can be fed & what?
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Injured or abandoned animals.
- The feeding of birds
- If it was to assist with catching a wild animal to release them safely then it would be okay
- Allow Water if animal distressed
- None. It is 110% NOT ok to lure tease or feed QNY animal that is not your own or wild
- No exceptions
- If the animal clearly needing water- I think it's okay to provide water. How about bird house and bird bath?
- Homes that are fostering wild animals for rehabilitation.
- This would be tough to implement without increased monitoring at City parks (increase in costs)
- Exclude bird feeders
- No space given to comment on breed specific yet overly inclusive language, which is inappropriate and discredited. Focus on owners. All dogs can be dangerous and there are worse than pits waiting for popularity should pits be banned.
- Backyard bird feeders
- An animal stuck or injured from a trap who needs assistance
- Literally none. People should be calling wildlife rescue for any wildlife on property that appears in duress, not trying to "help"
- If the animal is sick and needs caring for
- None. Wildlife is WILD. Leave it be. The only exception would be a hefty fine for violators.
- Bird/squirrel feeders, water baths, etc
- Outside of city limits
- birds, squirrels excluded



- If the owner of the private property is a veterinarian, wildlife control expert or similar person, then they should be allowed to make a decision based on health and need of the animal in question.
- I would not be too stringent on the no feeding.
- Does this exclude feeding wild song birds?
- bird feeders, nuts for squirrels and small animals should be allowed
- Still allow bird feeders, but squirrel feeders should be discouraged.
- Feeding of birds/ducks or geese at ponds should be ok.
- Discourage sale of squirrel feed
- Birds
- na
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders for non-water birds
- Bird feeders
- Rescuing orphaned or injured babies
- First time offender let off with warning, 2nd time + offender ticket.
- Fines
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Sub-contract or hire enough personnel to enforce.
- Teasing or hurting should get serve fines. Feeding if appears to need it is fine
- Bird
- bird feeders
- Educating first - the impact this will have on wildlife. If after educating there is repeat offenders, a fine should be incurred.
- Birds
- Bird feeders hung at least 6 feet high
- Feeding birds, squirrels
- If animal is hurt, call 311 to inform and give the animal water or food upon direction.
- the wild life is hurt or in danger
- Rodents
- Bird feeders should still be okay within reason
- Bird feeders, and habits made to sustain diversity
- Birds, squirrels.
- Hunting with license
- Birds. Get real.
- The animal is hurt
- We can still feed birds



- birds - not sure if this would affect bird feeders, I think it would be nice for those to stay but I don't agree with feeding/teasing other types of wildlife inside the city (deer, moose, etc) as it creates too much habitation and puts the animals at risk
- Birds as in bird feeders.
- If it's a lost dog or cat or a injured animal
- You or your pets should not be allowed to tease or harass wildlife. I feed the squirrels
- Food for Birds
- bird feeders and baths to support local bird populations depleted by human activity/cats
- Attempts to get troublesome animals out of private property (i.e. skunks, magpies, etc)
- Squirrels and birds.
- Leave the wild life alone and let them do their jobs being animals.
- Birds as those can be considered wildlife
- Birds
- People should not feed or terrorize wildlife- only exception is mange or rabies wildlife on farm property should be taken care of.
- Feeding/helping injured wildlife
- A lost dog running in neighborhood, feed in order to catch him
- Bird feeding. And food used to trap nuisance wildlife.
- N/A
- Water access. Being able to sting from a yard.
- Bird feeders
- Fines for feeding wildlife. Fines and penalties for teasing or harming wildlife. Squirrels should be included here; I am tired of the squirrels being fed and depositing their fed items into my yard, especially peanuts for allergy reasons.
- N/A
- Small rodents such as squirrels, chipmunks, etc.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeder allowed
- None. Don't feed wildlife . They're supposed to be wild.
- None
- None. It's a wild animal. Feeding any wildlife harms them.
- Permits for exceptions
- Don't even think about BSL
- Bird feeders in backyards
- Birds, squirrels
- Exempt birds
- Bird feeders
- Deer
- Mail out with utilities/taxes to educate. Bylaw demand for landlords to notify each tenant of such.



- Bird feeders
- An obviously domesticated animal
- Fines
- Nuisance pests that are damaging property
- Hope this doesn't include things like bird feeders.
- Birds
- Fines
- If the food is being used to trap said wildlife in effort to stop nuisances caused by the wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding - to trap and relocate
- Bird feeders
- None leave the wildlife alone
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- I'm assuming you can still feed wild birds in the winter?
- Bird feeders, nuts for squirrels, etc.
- No exceptions, people need to leave wildlife alone
- Heavy fines
- Bird feeders squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- None
- Clear outlining of exceptions for birdfeeding and squirrel feeding, and an exception for providing potable water year round.
- Ways to scare the wildlife away should not be considered "teasing"
- None.
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- No exception!
- If the private property is acting as a safe place for the wildlife.
- Birds
- no exceptions
- Bird feeders/baths should be fine.
- Birds
- None wildlife should not be fed or harassed
- None
- Bird feeders



- Cats. Just because their original families abandoned them doesn't mean everyone else has to too
- Birds should be exempt
- Bird seed, squirrel seed
- It's a wild animal, They should not be fed by humans.
- Bird or squirrel feeders. Traps for other nuisances
- Wildlife should ALWAYS be left alone.
- Exclude bird feeders
- Injured animals
- Predators shouldn't be fed: bears, etc
- You should still be able to feed birds.
- If this includes bird feeders, I think that is a bit overboard
- No exceptions!
- Bird feeders
- I would be ok with store small store bought bird feeders but some of my neighbours are leaving our trays of birdseed and butts and the number of squirrels, pigeons, magpies, skunks etc is getting ridiculous
- Bird feeders
- You can't control Birds/Squirrels/rabbits from getting into bird feeders.
- I only support the teasing on private property. I feel that the feeding on private property should only apply if it's something dangerous.
- Bird feeders
- teasing should be prohibited but not feeding (i.e. bird-feeders or bat-feeders)
- Fine
- Acreages
- Bigger fines and jail
- None
- Fines if caught
- Perhaps Geese.
- None
- None
- Animals that are found injured or abandoned infant animals which require care.
- If the wildlife is injured
- Feral cats/homeless dogs
- Bird feeders
- Hurt or abandoned animals that need care
- Could be difficult to manage if food is left out on a property accidentally ie. Kids leave a snack and something finds it
- Only if it is done by animal services for trapping and relocating. The public should leave wildlife alone.



- None. No birds, no squirrels, no rabbits, no wild animals. If you want wild animals move out of the city.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders being accessed by wildlife
- Bird feeders, and anything to help bees
- If a wild animal was in distress
- None
- Wildlife birds/ bird feeders, as they are helpful for birds that stay in the winter
- There's no reason to tease any wildlife
- Bird Feeders.
- If the animal is hurt you can help it until the Conservation officer arrives.
- none
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- NONE. Wildlife should be left to be wild, whether it is on public or private property.
- Injured animals / providing water to hot animals
- I think if the people are educated about the subject and know what to feed wildlife on their property they can do it sparingly
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders, bird baths etc.
- It should be allowed for Calgarians to feed birds.
- None.
- Feeding wildlife on private property is at times ok, such as feeding birds and squirrels etc, but teasing is never ok
- BIRD FEEDERS ARE FINE. FEEDING/WATERING AN ANIMAL IN DISTRESS SHOULD BE DONE.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding only when necessary for the animals survival and when safe to do so.
- Fines should be the same as feeding or teasing animals in city parks.
- Ducks
- Rabbits and Birds.
- Children learning about the animals
- I agree with prohibiting teasing of wildlife, but better define the term wildlife. Would that exclude birds/squirrels eating from bird feeders on private property.
- Cause it will bring wildlife into the city
- no exceptions
- allow feeding of birds
- Babies that have been left by the mother
- I feed the wild birds with bird feeders



- None
- Not birds obviously lol bird feeders have to remain
- Allow bird feeders
- Farms acreages
- An exception for bird feeders on private property
- Injured or sick wildlife
- None
- caring for an injured animal until support can be arranged.
- I don't think that thNone. Even in the case of feeding sick/injured wildlife, it is their responsibility to seek help from places like CWRS instead of trying to care for the animal itself and potentially do more harm.
- Sometimes it is unintentional (food left out or gardens)
- If the person believes a wildlife animal is in distress and needs water or some sort of food until wildlife officers arrive.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders etc.
- Fine
- Bird feeders should be ok
- I will always feed the birds!
- Private bird feeders
- Feeding injured wildlife
- birds feeders
- Animals in need of care, should be cared for properly. Teasing is unacceptable
- If you're feeding them food that is appropriate to their species/diet that should not be prohibited
- In instances where food source is limited and or when appropriate food can be placed out such as bird feeders
- I think private residents should be able to have bird feeders on their property.
- Bird feeders and similar type things
- Birds
- Bird Feeders
- Feeding with bird/squirrel feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Rehabilitation/ injured animals
- Bird feeders.
- I for the bylaw against teasing. If the property owner is feeding them good proper food I would be ok with that.
- Abandoned wildlife babies, people can feed abandoned wildlife while they wait for bylaw services or other services.
- Bird feeders



- Injured wildlife
- Bird feeders would be acceptable still
- None. Don't feed wild animals! Period. Including birds..
- Harassing animals is a big no, feeding animals should be allowed on private property (bird feeders etc)
- Bird feeders should remain allowed.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Birds
- If the animal is injured and requires attention, then you can feed it.
- Bird feed
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- None
- Winter Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders
- Small animals that don't do damage like birds, no rabbits or deer.
- Should be illegal public or private
- Bird feeders
- Allowable to have bird feeders set up for wildlife
- If the animal is ill and I'm need of help. The property owner is trying to help them and keep them alive.
- Injured wildlife in need of care at the direction of wildlife rehabilitation groups
- Injured animal
- Non
- Fines/jail time for those caught teasing or torturing wildlife. If the torturer is a minor the parent or guardian is to be held responsible
- Bird feeders, assisting sick/injured animals
- Pest removal
- Bird feeders.
- Abandoned babies or injured wildlife - can be cared for until wildlife authorities arrive. Train and empower wildlife officers to send animals to sanctuaries it Rehab centres for release back into the wild or relocation. STOP KILLING/EUTHANIZING animals
- Bird feeders should be an exception as should water sources.
- None
- Small wild life like squirrels, birds and rabbits
- Birds
- Obviously bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels



- Exceptions for the feeding of birds.
- Bird seed
- none
- Birds
- Only if animal found injured and unable to feed itself
- none
- Caring for an injured animal or bird while waiting for wildlife rehabilitator to come pick it up.
- Bird feeders
- None. Wildlife should be left alone both on public and private property
- Feeding birds, squirrels, and rabbits should be ok.
- No animals should be teased
- Feeding wild birds (eg seed feeder in tree), or leaving nuts out for squirrels
- bird feeders are acceptable
- Feeding Birds
- Should still allow bird feed, and possibly allow people to still leave carrots and veggies out for rabbits in the winter.
- You should still be able to feed or help an animal who is injured/orphaned etc.
- None
- Bird feeders, bee feeders should be exempt
- None.
- bird feeders and squirrels
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- birdfeeders
- Investigations need to be made when wildlife frequent private property and appropriate measures be made to either limit contact with wildlife or a way to prevent wildlife from coming in the first place.
- Only feed birds or squirrels on private property
- Injured or sick wild animals
- Don't allow people to harm or harass wildlife regardless where they are n
- bird feders?
- Significant fines for all offenses - not just this, but all bylaw violations. \$100-\$300 fines are not disincentiving behavior.
- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders on private property
- Simple feeders like bird feeders
- What wildlife does this include? There are numerous bird feeders that attract squirrels, Magpies and crows, which are pests.
- Chasing wildlife off property
- Birds, squirrels



- Bird feeders etc
- If the animal seems to be in distress and trying to help capture it to bring to help
- Can we still feed birds from a bird feeder?
- Birds - having bird feeders
- all guidelines should be followed equally.
- Before implementing a bylaw perhaps make sure there is clear signage regarding it being prohibited using language that suggests as much instead of "Don't feed the ducks"
- Birdfeeders
- There should be no exceptions on feeding or teasing wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Scaring wildlife away from property should be okay
- Feeding ducks birdseed
- bird feeders
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- None! People should leave wildlife alone!
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Leaving food out for birds and animals. There
- Feeding birds bird seed
- Bird feeders
- Smaller prey animals like birds and rabbits I think should be okay to feed
- If the animal is starving
- Bird seed for birds
- Fines
- If wildlife is a danger to children or pets people can defend fawns them.
- I'm not opposed to people feeding wild rabbits or even the little prairie chicken as long as they don't hurt them.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Okay to feed birds birdseed
- Gardens, if wildlife got into a personal garden of course, no fine should be handed out
- Birds
- Teasing wildlife is an issue
- Bird feeders
- No unnecessary fines.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Animals that are getting into a garden on private property; residents should be not required to fence in and cover gardens to stop rabbits, deers, etc. from eating the food



- Bird feeders/ feeding bunnies
- I would exempt bird feeders. Also, my cats chase mice and rabbits that enter our yard, would this be considered teasing wildlife?
- backyard birdseed feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Birds, sandal animals such as squirrels, or gophers etc gophers
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Birds
- Birdfeeders
- Dependant on the wildlife. Feed birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Allow winter feeding
- These are two different issues: I think people should be able to put out bird feeders on their own property but "teasing" should never be tolerated
- None
- An animal that was injured or in need of food to survive
- Consideration should be taken that scaring or deterring animals is not teasing, and exception should be taken regarding feeding birds
- Bird feeders are okay
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Feeding squirrels as they often eat out of bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds should be ok.
- Bird Houses
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Allowing appropriate foods to be fed to commonly fed animals, such as the geese at the river walk, and having a info section on the Calgary by law page to enforce education.
- Nothing for teasing or feeding You should be able to trap wild animals on your property and dispose of them
- Bird feeders and small animal feeders. Restrict feeding to non-predatory and large animals like deer etc
- Fines if found feeding wildlife, including squirrels!
- If a person is trying to capture a wild animal to take to rehabilitation.
- Bird feeders
- Farms and rural property



- Teasing wildlife for sure.
- Bird feeders are often important food sources for local bird species and should be exempt from the no feeding wildlife bylaw. Recommendations on high quality bird feeds should be provided to the public.
- Injured animals/animals cared for until help arrives if transport is not an immediate option
- Feeding is fine, teasing or causing harm no!
- There should be an exception if It's an animal in distress
- Feeding corvids
- Feeding Birds on private property, bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Feeding of the animal is injured and being captured to bring to a vet/rescue
- Bird feeders, garbage or food left out
- Bird feed
- bird feeding
- Birds!!!
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels feral cats
- Birds
- Bird seed
- N/A
- Homeless cats and dogs should be the exception, until the humane society can come and pick them up.
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- hummingbird feeders/ bird feeders
- Except bird feeders for birds
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird or squirrel feeders okay. No hand feeding.
- bird feeders unless you're in an area with is more prone to bears
- None
- exclude bird feeders.
- Birdfeeders
- If wildlife is in distress and severally needs food or water
- none
- Dogs running at birds, rabbits, small mammals/rodents that cannot be reasonably avoided by the owners
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders



- If the animal appears to be in distress, and requires attention by bylaw or authorities.
- Birdfeeders should be allowed.
- Birds
- Teasing yes. Bird feeders and the like absolutely not
- Ducks.
- An animal that was injured by humans should be fed (without contact) until it recovers.
- Leaving feeders for birds
- If animal is in distress
- Feeding birds.
- None
- None
- Wildlife actively being kept as pets should be exempt. Eg. Pet squirrels, sparrows, mice, rabbits, etc.
- Birds
- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders / water fountains could be exempt
- The higher fines for feeding squirrels Peanuts would really be appreciated
- No exceptions
- Feeding birds is fine. Teasing needs to be addressed in city parks.
- Fines. this money can go back into education about not doing this
- None
- The City should have a mechanism or support process to help private property owners remove or move nuisance wildlife.
- Feeding animals on property in winter time.
- I think people should continue to be allowed bird feeders
- Bird seed
- Rescued wildlife ophans
- No exceptions. Do NOT feed or tease wildlife in any situation or circumstance.
- Luring animal off property
- fines
- No exceptions. Bird feeders create a problem with pests. A single bird feeder in a back yard causes lest birds that can impact a large area.
- Bird feeders
- None.
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Is trapping/releasing teasing? I don't feel that it is. If relocation makes sense, I'm for it.
- No exceptions
- Feeding during winter months acceptable due to lack of habitats and therefore food sources.
- The same as if it were public land
- Individuals trying to rehab injured or abandoned wildlife



- Rescue mission for an injured wildlife
- Hummingbirds and other migratory birds
- If the animal is sick or injured in order to lure to be trapped and taken to a wildlife facility.
- Prohibit teasing on private land, not feeding.
- Bird feeders
- Fines for harming or teasing wildlife, but warning for feeding wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Feeding to be okay if it is an animal that is not dangerous (ex. raccoon, squirrel, etc.)
- Bird feeders especially for nuthatches and chickadees
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be allowed
- wild life pets
- Huge fine for feeding wildlife.
- If the animal is failing to thrive like has a broken or sprained leg, or wing and it needs a little help.
- Birds and squirrels
- Bird Feeders
- Unintentional feeding ie it got into the garbage bin or dog food
- None. Don't feed the animals
- Bird feeders
- If there is an animal in need and you're waiting for fish and wildlife
- Bird feeders with actual bird seed
- In order to coax an animal away from a dangerous situation.
- Birds obviously
- Bird feeders
- The exceptions ring birds and squirrels
- feeding birds from a bird feeder.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Exceptions to birdfeeders
- Respect and protection of wildlife
- Bird feeder
- bird feeders are OK, home owners should be allowed to trap pests (voles, mice etc.)
- Feeding yes, but people should be able to scare/convince the animals to get off of their personal property as rabbits and deer are terrible for destroying gardens.
- Well what about bird feeders? It doesnt make sense. However large wildlife such as deer can cause injury and can be aggressive. So maybe just for large wildlife.
- Feeding Birds and accidental feeding (ie squirrel eats bird seed intended for birds)
- A Fine
- Birds& ducks



- Sanctuaries or education centers should allow feeding
- N/a
- Leaving out water for animals in the heat, feeding birds (bird houses), rehabilitating animal that was injured
- Attempts to domesticate (I.e someone trying to lure in a stray dog or cat to rescue)
- If the animal is dehydrated/injured and requires help
- Allow the use of bird feeders, particularly in winter.
- None
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Birds and squirrels
- Injured or animal in distress would be an exception
- Squirrels birds
- Birds and squirrels
- Feeding to trap and relocate
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders/feeding birds
- A fine
- Birds
- Care for sick/injured wildlife
- Emaciation
- Animals in distress & bird feeders
- Strongly agree for teasing! I think feeding squirrels, birds is fine
- Bird feeders
- None
- Unsure
- rabbits
- Bird feeders
- None
- Injured animal that is on your property but only in situation where proper authorities are delayed
- None
- Birds,squirrels, feeding during winter
- Bird feed
- None
- Sanctuaries etc should be excluded.
- Birds, bunnies, squirrels



- Smaller animals ie squirrels
- Killing mice.
- If someone was trying to "rescue" injured/abandoned wildlife
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- only if trying to make it leave
- None, people feed wildlife things that are bad for the animals
- License cats so if found they can be brought into animal services and fines can be handed out.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders still allowed
- Backyard bird feeders should still be allowed
- No animals should be hurt that's all I can say
- Birds eating from bird feeders
- Except birds. Bird feeders should be acceptable
- Bird feeders on private property
- none
- None. Please enforce this to stop animals such as skunks from building homes at houses b/c they are fed.
- Hopefully bird feeders don't count.
- No exceptions
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeding and squirrel feeding
- Teasing and feeding wildlife contributes to habituation and abnormal wildlife behaviour, I don't see exceptions that would be necessary to this bylaw at this timet
- Indoor/outdoor neighbourhood pets
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Mothers and babies. Injured animals.
- If the animal is a pest and the owner of the property is attempting to trap the animal.
- Abandoned or injured wildlife that are being cared for in the interim of waiting for a rescue or further action.
- If the animal is trapped or in distress and you are waiting for wildlife officials to come and get them
- Birds, injured or in distress animals
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Rescue workers only
- None



- Birds and deer
- Feeding ducks
- Providing water for dehydrated animals before calling the professionals
- Birds, squirrels, etc..
- The small birds like sparrows, chickadees, etc. Small bird feeders.
- Bird feeding
- Birds - not pigeons
- Bird feeders on property.
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders are ok
- Bird feeders.
- Helping a hurt animal
- Birdseed and peanuts for birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders okay
- bird feeders
- None
- Feeding wildlife if in some form of rehabilitation
- I think people should be given the opportunity to shoo animals off property or not penalized for helping an animal in need while a conservation officer arrives.
- Bird feeding
- Bird feeders / bird seed
- I mean feeding birds should be allowed
- None
- Birds. Injured animals
- Fines
- birdfeeders
- Ducks
- none
- starving animals or animals in distress.
- Birds
- Bird feeders only
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Feeding only if the animal seems to be in distress, or needs help
- Birds, squirrels
- Squirrels
- Hummingbirds and other small birds ok to feed.
- bird feeders, humane bird seed, other humane and low impact ways of interacting with wildlife
- No exceptions



- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, wildlife eating gardens
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders should not be included
- There's no excuse for teasing, but Animal is injured they may be helping it so there must be some exceptions for feeding
- Feeding and teasing wildlife are two different things. I think teasing should have a buy law. But feeding them doesn't seem terrible. And i doubt its a negative act when someone does.
- An exception would be an animal who is in medical distress or malnourished could be fed.
- Bird feeder
- Fines
- Im sorry I'm distracted by the next question and wondering why on earth you're being so judge mental to a breed, because it's strong is the reason I'm seeing please educate yourself or visit and spend time with a pit bull absolutely blown away.
- None. Wildlife doesn't get bothered
- Bird feeders
- Chipmunks
- Rehabilitation and legitimate rescue facilities
- Private property that is used for rehabilitation of wildlife, and only where the feeding is necessary for their enrichment or survival.
- Bird feeders
- None
- Programsto support at risk species with species appropriate feeders (no hand feeding no teasing)
- Bird feeders
- An animal that is unwell or suffering from malnutrition.
- Allows bird feeders on private property
- A animal in need of rescuing such as an orphaned animal who's parent hasnt returned for days.
- unintentional feeding of wildlife through things like gardens planted with alberta wildflowers and other native plant life. (Mr rabbit likes petunias)
- Bird feeding
- Bird feeders/baths aren't the problem so should probably be an exclusion
- Bird feeders
- birds
- None
- Still allow birdfeeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- None



- bird feeders should be allowed, but you dont police it in parks how will you do so in private residences.
- If the animal was causing damage to the property or the owner of the lands animals I think they should be allowed to deter them in any way reasonable
- Bird feeders.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Animals in distress that may need to be fed with direction from Fish and Wildlife or a vet if found on property.
- Feeding birds and squirrels is ok
- Rehabilitation of wild life.
- No exceptions...
- If the animal is visibly hurt and the intent is to care for the animal until it can either be released or animal control/conservation officers can be contacted.
- Gardens that attract animals, making it clear that it is intentional feeding
- Birds
- None
- Birds (bird feeders)
- Smaller song bird being feed by bird feeders help those during the winter months however should be reminded it's a year round commitment
- Bird feeders or nuts for squirrels
- Bird Feeders
- If the animal is injured and needs help
- wild birds should be excluded and squirrels
- If the animal is in danger, or needing medical attention
- Birds
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- None
- Injured wildlife being fed to save their lives
- Birds/squirrels
- Allowing bird feeders, nuisance animals that the city will not remove ie; skunks, raccoons, etc.
- Feeding birds
- Birds, squirrels.
- Birds
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders/ baths
- Squirrels & bird feeders



- if an animal were injured & were trying to get it to a vet.
- Fine people feeding wildlife
- Standard bird feeders
- Wild bird feeders.
- A fine
- Chickens
- None.
- Animal gets into garbage can, or you are rescuing it and awaiting animal wildlife rescue
- Birds or other small woodland animals
- Birdfeeders and squirrel feeders should be exceptions.
- Licensed rehabilitation centres
- I would exempt bird feeders on private property
- Feeding birds.
- Bird feeders
- Helping feed and injured animal
- Birds
- Thats your job not mine
- Bird feeders
- If you have a bowl of food outside for your dog you shouldn't be held accountable if wildlife eats it.
- I would want to make sure teasing still allowed citizens to deal with pesky wildlife (ie. skunks or rabbits) in their property.
- Trap and release
- Bird feeders and gardens that allow natural grazing
- None
- Fine
- None
- Allow feeding for birds up to a defined size of animal (eg allow feeding of animals up to say 5 pounds to allow for squirrels but bars feeding cats, or cayotes)
- Birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Except if an animal, is injured and you're trying to help it
- Bird feeders, injured animals while waiting for a rescue to respond.
- You should be allowed to shoo wild animals off your property.
- None
- Birds and squirrels (through feeders)
- Birds
- Bird feeders unless is determined that these are detrimental to wild bird populations?
- Bird feeders



- Exceptions for feeding of birds, squirrels and feral cats.
- Bird feeders
- Fine
- Birds,
- Birds and rodents
- Bird feeders
- Leaving food out for squirrels/birds/other animals to take freely
- None
- Bird feeders for small wildlife
- Bird feeders in the winter
- Feeding wild birds (ie birdseed)
- Birds
- Wildlife that is found injured
- Wildlife that do not pose a risk to humans such as birds, skunks, rabbits, etc
- Bird feeders.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- No feeding. Coyotes should be allowed to be teased or hazed
- Bird feeders
- If signs allow it because it's safe I feel that's okay but generally it should be a no unless it's known to be safe to feed
- Birds
- Birds, and by proxy squirrels
- Huge fines for those who disobey.
- I do like feeding the birds and squirrels I would hope this is ok to do all the time.
- None
- Birds/ ranch/ acreages
- None
- None
- None
- None
- Water bowls/sources should be allowed
- Helping baby animals feed until wildlife services can come and take over
- Impose fines
- Bird feeders
- If the teasing was in fact- hazing in order to dissuade the animal from settling on private property.
- None
- None
- Squirrels
- If the animal appears to be starving



- none
- Birds would be an exception
- Bird/squirrel feeders should be allowed. I also think that helping out wildlife with food like hay during harsh winters is acceptable as well.
- Bird feeders
- None
- When trying to rescue, feeding may be necessary in order to retrieve the animal
- Birdfeeders
- Birds for bird watchers is okay. But fines for people feeding bobcats. We have a number of people in my area feeding them meat.
- Sick or injured animals
- Backyard bird feeding
- Coyotes should be scared away from yards.
- Animals in need of help/ medical intervention
- Allow bird feeders on private property
- Bird feeders
- None
- Chasing / scaring coyotes away because they are dangerous to small animals.
- No building shelters or feeding rabbit specifically. We have a huge problem with wild domestic rabbits in this city. Bird and squirrel feeders are ok.
- Birds feeders should still be permitted
- The Only Exception would be feeding the animal to gain the ability to trap it and relocated.
- If the animal was in any harm or danger
- Fine
- An injured or starving animal, fed with well intention and whatever research they could come up with short notice
- No exceptions unless it was okayed by the property owner in advance
- If the weather is hot as it is today leaving water for wild life should be acceptable
- Feeders that don't require direct human contact such as bird and squirrel feeders.
- Hmmm perhaps if the food is healthy for the animal. Like bread is bad for ducks so no but lettuce? Is good right so if they're being good to the animals sure
- Bird feeders, injured wildlife to be taken to rescue
- Wounded animals
- Birds
- Bird feeders/ removal of pests
- Birds
- Exceptions should be made for wild bird feeding. Many people, especially seniors, love watching all the different varieties of birds visiting their feeders.
- Bird/ squirrels feeders, sonic sound pest control



- No feeding pigeons. Very common in the northeast and they create a hazard
- Fine huge and jail anyone feeding wildlife.
- None
- Birds
- Warning and web training to complete and sign. Second time fine
- If a person rescued an injured wild animal and it was starving, they should be allowed to feed it before transporting or releasing it to fish and wildlife officers.
- I put out bread/seed/peanuts for the local birds on my deck.
- None
- Children who didn't know better...
- If the animal is in distress, needs medical attention or food. If the animal is actively causing damage to the property people should be able to at least scare it off.
- Feeding animals on private property that are believed to be endangered/not getting nourishment.
- Allow people to still keep bird, and squirrel feeders as long as they are kept up and are tidy.
- When there is a fire and you need to put out water and food for fleeing animals.
- The purpose of this law should be to prevent abuse and not restrict enjoyment of wildlife. Feeding birds and squirrels so they'll come enjoy your yard should not be a crime. But if you do it for I'll intent then yes.
- Birds, squirrels
- Agricultural & Farm Animals
- Water dishes and bird feeders
- I think feeding should be ok but teasing should not.
- Allowing bird feeders as long as reasonable steps taken to prevent pest wildlife from eating from bird feeders.
- Suggest it is fine to "shoo" or discourage wildlife from remaining on private property
- Unless it is posted that you can 1. Feed wildlife or any animal on that property and 2. WHAT type of food that is allowed to be fed and what happens to the animal if it is the wrong food
- Birds and other small animals as long as there is no ill intent.
- Bird feeders
- Teasing wildlife should be unacceptable
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds in the winter should be OK
- None
- None. As an employee of a 24 hour animal hospital, we are seeing too many wildlife come in contact human error
- Fines
- None
- Bird feeders should be allowed year round
- Feeding Birds and squirrels. (properly)



- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders.
- Birds should be exempt from being fed
- bird feeders and whatnot.
- No exceptions including squirrels and birds
- Caring for injured or sick wildlife
- Bird feeders
- I don't know enough about this to think of any exceptions, I would also like to know why this bylaw doesn't already include private property.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding of local wildlife like birds and squirrels is fine but teasing Of any animal should not be legal
- Bird feeders
- Sick or injured animal and animal control cannot come immediately
- Protection of animal rights.
- Birdhouses and feeders for local birds given they are placed in a manner that wouldn't attract other wildlife
- If you found an injured animal on your property and needed to give it water, etc, while waiting for bylaw.
- Bird seed
- Gophers & other pests not to be considered wildlife.
- None
- none
- Honestly I would rather see an education campaign than seeing the bylaw enforced.
- It's peoples own risk if they want to feed them and put themselves in danger but just have them know they can die, wildlife will kill them with absolutely no hesitation
- None
- If you could see something that would indicate pet ownership and were trying to catch the pet with the intent to find the owner.
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders, etc.
- No teasing whatsoever. But if the animal is injured or in need of help, there should be an exception.
- Bird feeders, etc
- Except in cases of actual need (abandonment, injury) which would lead to the animal being rehabilitated
- Birds
- Birds
- Birds and bird feeders
- Feeding birds on private property
- Birdfeeders



- Injured animals or abandoned young ones
- No exceptions
- feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding animals (especially bees, humming birds, and fragile or endangered animals) should be allowed, teasing should not.
- Neglected pets/strays
- Let them eat
- Feeding the ducks is ok.
- If a wild animal is on private property the property owner should be allowed to safely attempt to shoo the animal off his/her property, particularly if wild life isnt going to be able to get there in a timely manner.
- Teasing and harming the animals should be stricter, education explaining not to feed should be implemented education
- bylaw against feeding wildlife except birds. prevent attracting wildlife. educate people
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Feed birds and rabbits as we currently do and lots of animals come to us that wouldn't be able to find food
- Would say yes to both of it excluded bird feeders
- Don't bully our breeds
- Teasing or feeding might not be right - but private property is private.
- Bird feeders; squirrel feeders
- Make the outcome of dealing with wildlife clear. You wanna play with a bear ? Then you're gonna get eaten. You want to pick up a small critter ? Congrats you got rabies. Etc
- Nests/babies
- Birdfeeders
- Feeding birds should be allowed
- Private property is a vast category and would be incredibly difficult to enforce.
- How would you enforce this program? Don't dump money into something that can't be enforced.
- The issue with is that the city is getting so big that we're pushing wildlife to its limit. So it comes in the city for food. I don't accept any sort of teasing towards wildlife. We need to learn to co-exist with all wildlife.
- Define wildlife better. No bird feeders that accidentally feed squirrels or the rabbits below when it falls?
- None
- Bird feeders and deterrents to nuisance species should be allowed
- I support feeding wildlife in the city.



- None
- Feeding
- Its private property, if the animals are friendly and the people are cautious, it's not our problem.
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- Birds and other common small wild animals that are part of the urban environment should not be included for sure. Teasing should be prohibited.
- Leave the animals alone They are animals, they don't deserve to be tortured or put down for their breed leave them be
- Bird / squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders, bee feeders/fountains, pest removal.
- none
- If someone was being cruel to any animals then they should be fined.
- Allow bird feeders and seeds
- Bird feeders, salt lick
- Lots feed birds. I feel this is acceptable.
- Leave private property alone. It's exactly that. Private property
- We should be allowed to feed deer in rural areas.
- with bad intent
- No suggestions. Don't try to put bylaws in place for people's own properties.
- More garbage pickups to reduce overflowing bins
- Feeding of large animals or game animals. Bird seed should be fine same if someone grow so lettuce for the rabbits to eat instead of the rest of their garden
- Harmful interactions
- If the actions are putting the wild animal at serious risk
- Birds
- Teasing shouldn't be allowed.
- Would bird feeders apply to this? It seems too extreme to try to tell people they aren't allowed to put bird feeders out.
- Provide educational programs rather than focus on punitive rapping of your residents.
- It really depends on the wildlife. I wouldn't feed a coyote, but I wouldn't ban bird feeders.
- Stop encroaching on people's private lives and property. This proposal to do so is reprehensible
- If the animal is sick or hurt
- Squirrels, birds strays
- Continue to discourage but doesn't need to be enforced
- Luring animals for means of trapping or harmful activities
- Bird feeders and nests are very helpful to the community. Birds help with the insects.
- Not sure what the bylaws are around animal cruelty but this should be illegal anywhere
- Birdfeeders high enough that they're not for deer
- It's ok to feed



- Feeding animals on private property should be allowed.
- Feeding no, teasing yes.
- If you're in an area around the river or any bodies of water, and there's wildlife like geese or ducks and want to feed them bread or seeds, you should be able to without endangering said species.
- Torture or harmful ways are punishable
- The city should be dealing gophers and skunks
- Bigotry!!!
- Putting out a bird feeder is no going to be against a bylaw? Hell no!
- Private property is PRIVATE
- Is this relating also to bird feeders?
- Exceptions should be for bird feeders
- there is not enough information to say yes. is feeding songbirds permitted? or is feeding deer? need more specifics.
- Bears
- Teasing yes but feeding no
- Because the money collected won't be used properly
- All sorts of bird feeders
- We don't need more bylaws.
- Bird feeders and trapping pest animals like mice and gophers
- If it endangers others or a community
- Don't. You will invite controversy, and birdwatchers will be just as angry as those who want to deter squirrels and the like from their property
- Bird, squirrel feeders should be exempt
- Birds
- Feeding wildlife on private property
- I would support a bylaw that prohibits injuring or harmful behaviour towards wildlife on private property.
- Squirrels and birds (no teasing though!)
- Prohibit teasing not feeding
- If a person is knowingly torturing wildlife there should be fines, unsocial behaviour that can escalate
- Squirrels and birds (no teasing though!)
- Hurt animals that need help may need food or water until the right people are contacted to help them
- I would support a bylaw against teasing only. However if property owners wish so, for example, feed birds, I do not think this should be prohibited. People want to care for nature. Educate them on how best to do so instead of making more rules
- Feeding is fine, teasing or harassment is not.
- Feeding Bears should not be allowed.
- Birds, jackrabbits in winter
- Wildlife is a VERY broad category that includes birds and squirrels



- Animal and Abuse is completely different than feeding wild animals. What is wrong with giving a squirrel some nuts and enjoying their company in your backyard? The city should take ownership of controlling pests and nuisance animals.
- educate people , handing out tickets is stupid ,another stupid City bylaw bylaw , JUST EDUCATE
- Teasing should absolutely not be okay on any property but it is also private property. Keep it that way.
- Feeding birds and squirrels seems to be fairly common and enjoyable for some people. Teasing animals should not be allowed though.
- Private property is private.
- Predatory wildlife only such as bobcats, bears, etc.
- Feeding birds
- Teasing is unfair and we should protect animals against it, but we love to feed the birds and ducks that come by our house
- Feeding, to a degree... for example bird feeder
- While I think there should be a law against teasing wildlife or hurting them on your property. I don't believe offering a safe space for them to find food should be against the law
- unless the animal is clearly in distress, people should not feed the animals
- In the case that no bylaw is put into place prohibiting the feeding of wildlife on private property I would suggest legislation be looked into that would instead prevent the poisoning of wildlife on private property as this can put roaming pets at risk.
- Bird feeders & bird baths should be exempt if this bylaw goes into effect. The city should also have a skunk removal program in place.
- My concern is birds and bird feeders, prohibiting feeding the wild on private property would prevent that from happening.
- Would this mean families could not have bird feeders? I would have to see more clarity on what this bylaw means.
- Leave it the way it is as I don't believe feeding birds are an issues. As long as no one is feeding bears or coyotes etc. I don't see the point in regulating and creating a Bi laws against this
- If feeding wildlife on private property is at all endangering the wild animal, or causing it to become habituated to human contact, then that should not be legal
- Bird feeders
- More education around not feeding animals and making them dependant on you/not engaging with animals that can harm you would be most effective
- Birds, squirrels, raccoons, skunks, deer, bobcat etc and any other animal.
- Unless baiting animals
- If people are feed an animal with appropriate food if they're hungry
- I think every situation is different. Ppl feed squirrels and birds! I understand bears and cougars but wildlife differs, u cant put a general price tag for all. I



- If the animal has potential to harm community members and someone is luring it into the community by feeding it that should be illegal
- If it was injured or a baby
- Bird feeders
- You'll never be able to enforce it, can't even enforce masks on trains.
- Don't do this, too many people jump to conclusions. You're going to get all kinds of false allegations and misunderstandings, far more than legitimate, it will just cost the city money, and detract for more important issues.
- Feeding is fine. Until it becomes a nuisance then the animals should be left unhearmed. Teasing should never occur and should be fined regardless of place of contact due to the inhumane nature of the act made by the aggressor (human/person(s) teasing)
- Bird feeders; accidental (pests in garbage)
- Teasing should not be allowed, but feeding would include bird feeders etc which are totally fine.
- Would this bylaw prohibit bird feeders? If yes, then I would not support it.
- A bylaw, if enacted, should separate feeding and teasing by defining the danger to the person and the community. I'm not hurting anyone with my bird feeder, but someone who feeds large animals such as coyote, foxes, bobcat or bears is dangerous
- Harder to in force while on private property
- Teasing sure, but what is a bird feeder? And how would that be different or enforced?
- feeding potentially dangerous wildlife such as coyotes
- Song birds, hummingbirds.. where do you draw the line on this?
- Birdfeeders
- Squirrels and birds
- What about bird feeders? Bird Baths?
- depends on the animal. a stray cat, yes feed it. a bear, no
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels
- Depends on type of wildlife and situation. Obviously feeding predators is not allowed.
- Feeding of deer/birds should be OK, feeding of squirrels/mice/skunks/coyotes should be discouraged.
- Birdfeeders
- For the use of hunting
- Maybe more education?
- Teasing... but feeding is something most people do, bird feeders, squirrel and bat feeders are not harmful.
- Leave it be
- If animals are being drawn into the private property for the purpose of harrassing them then proportionate punishment should be carried out.



- If u don't want people feeding larger animals, you'll end up stopping people from feeding small ones like birds & squirrels.
- My answer would be yes, if not for bird feeders. Feeding raccoons, deer, foxes, etc should not be allowed, even on private property, but birds should be ok
- Birds
- I have a bird feeder, which I turn attracts other animals scavenging for food. Education and awareness is needed, NOT banning.
- Bird feeders. Squirrel feeders
- A bylaw for not feeding certain wildlife may be appropriate but birds and squirrels should be an exception, I enjoy putting out food for the birds. A bylaw for teasing would be good, no animal deserves to be treated poorly by humans.
- Birds - what is the problem with bird feeders
- None
- Birds and squirrels
- Large Animals(Coyotes, Bears, Deer)
- People should be aloud to feed animals such as birds and squirrels.
- Don't bother with more unenforceable over-reaching bylaws.
- If the animals need food then we need to feed em
- Birds at the bird feeders, deer on country property being given salt blocks
- What does this encompasses? Bird house? Bird feeder? Bee house? Bat house?
- Wildlife including birds or squirrels also is difficult
- Predatory animals
- Teasing anytime, anywhere, should not be tolerated. However there are times wildlife need a hand.
- Bird / squirrel feeders should be ok
- Private property is none of your business
- Feeding is not the same as teasing.
- This bylaw would complicate the existence of sanctuaries and could be used against individuals who rescue injured wildlife found on their property. Likewise, it impacts individuals who leave food for birds or squirrels, or who have lost pets.
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Wording is too ambiguous. Clarification is needed.
- Bird feeders
- feeding animals in need on private property is fine, teasing them is not
- None
- Putting out feeders for wild birds and small animals in winter, especially, is an important support for these animals
- How would you determine deliberate feeding of wildlife vs animal preference? Would you police bird feeders and natural pond sanctuaries.
- Stop policing !



- If they are directly hurting animal. Any physical violence should be fined.
- If wildlife enters private property, land owners should have the right to scare them away - animal should be enforced by bylaw.
- Feeding birds and squirrels on private property.
- Bird feeders
- Only behaviors that qualify as animal abuse should be punishable.
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- N/A
- Feeding birds such as songbirds and ducks
- Unless the animal becomes aggressive then it is not completely necessary
- None, the government can stay out of our private property.
- None
- Birds
- bird feeders - I don't agree with feeding other wildlife.
- I can agree to a bylaw for teasing ANY animal.
- I like to put nuts at the bottom of my tree outside my bow for the squirrels to come grab when they need.
- People feed birds in their yards and they are wildlife. I think wildlife is too big of a broad category. It needs to be more specific, like deer, coyotes etc. if this is something to be considered.
- Stop invading their habitat !
- Baiting traps should still be prosecuted on private land
- Bird feeders, common garden plants that wildlife take on their own.
- bird feeders
- Not many wild animals on private property. If there are, they are munching on your garden anyway.
- feeding wild life is fine however teasing wild life should not be acceptable no matter what premise they are on
- Its a persons property.. as long as they are not harming or putting anyone in harms way should not be a big deal.
- Teasing/harrasing-yes, feeding (birds)- no
- Many people feed them as a way to see them. Kinda like bird feeders and bird watching.
- Feeding birds in winter & providing water should be allowed
- I'm not going to feed them directly, but where is the fine line from where I fed them to they helped themselves to my garden and I was just there watching them.
- Birdfeeders
- People feed birds all the time from bird feeders. Why would you want to make that illegal? Also, why are you putting tease and feed in the same sentence.
- None private property is nobody's business but the owner!



- bird baths, bird feeding, habitat enhancements (e.g. apple trees, pollinator habitat, etc.) should be excluded. This should have been two separate questions (teasing vs. feeding). Luring predators should not be allowed.
- Feeding the birds is totally fine... They would still be considered wildlife
- Teasing should be against the law but not feeding
- Bird feeders
- This is a contradictory statement. There is a great difference between feeding and teasing wildlife. I would like to be about to but our bird feeders and feed the occasional deer on my property, but I do not want anyone to harm wildlife.
- 3 warnings before issuing ticket
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Not sure if this would include people putting out bird feeders, but that's why I voted no because I think people should be allowed bird feeders
- Endangered wildlife, non-pests
- maybe ,, conditions ,, two questions in one ,, feed maybe ,, if wild life are free then they should be protected at a provincial level .
- Backyard bird feeders should never be outlawed. I would suggest teasing be clarified.
- I enjoy having a bird feeder in my yard, it keeps them out of people's overflowing garbages.
- Nothing leave private property alone
- Feeding/teasing should not be in the same questions, birds are wild so a bird feeder could potentially be prohibited?
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Feeding birds, squirrels etc.
- None
- None
- Feeding of injured wildlife on private property
- Bird and bees are okay to feed, maybe not deer and other larger beasts
- This is a ridiculous suggestion, this would technically make having a bird feeder against a bylaw...
- I believe feeding is fine but teasing or harming animals should obviously be illegal
- Don't combine feeding and teasing. Feeding okay for birds, etc. Teasing not okay
- Feeding and teasing are not the same thing. Teasing should never be allowed but not feeding wildlife on private property means no bird feeders? That wouldn't make sense to me.
- Putting out avian bird seed is different than feeding ducks sandwiches and take out at a calgary park. A bylaw like this requires specificity. This is far too generic.
- There should be strict fines even imprisonments for anyone teasing domestic or wildlife.
- Birds, rabbits. Squirrels



- Investing in education to teach the public why it's bad to feed wildlife would be much more effective than just adding fines with no explanation.
- No teasing of any animal on private properties. I would allow feeding of birds only.
- The exception is baiting. Purposely putting food out to attract the wild animals
- Birds, squirrels, rabbits should be allowed to be fed on private property
- You should be able to feed birds etc.
- Wildlife are part of our urban ecosystem, let us feed the ones we like.
- Focus on more important issues in this city
- Bird feeders
- Causing physical harm to wildlife should not be permitted. Humane traps could be defined and allowed. No feeding should be allowed.
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Wildlife causing a nuisance, property damage and/or endangering residents (including pets)
- People should be allowed to feed animals. We are the ones destroying the home they have. So we should be responsible for making sure they are properly fed.
- private property is just that. private property. as long as someone is not abusing an animal, you should butt out!
- Bears, cougars, coyotes....but squirrels and birds - no.
- I'm okay with feeding wildlife..I would like more information on what is considered teasing
- No bylaw. Then I can't feed the wild birds! You shouldn't be teasing any animal whether on public or private property. No one should be feeding any wild animal no matter on public or private land.
- As long as people aren't intentionally harming the animals, leaving some food or water out is fine
- No to teasing animals yes to feeding them
- Truly wild animals
- As it's written for private property that is too open ended. For example: what about birdfeeders?
- Bird feeders
- These are not the same thing and you should give more details.
- PRIVATE MEANS PRIVATE! Leave people alone!
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Should be able to feed birds/squirrels on your own property
- Just let the strays be strays?
- Feeding and teasing are 2 totally separate issues. Separate this into 2 questions. It's like your asking "do you like apple bananas?"
- Depending on the wildlife, I think birds should be friend, unlike deers it's better to no feed em so they won't get used to humans and encourage them to stay away for human population
- Luring of the animals
- Prohibit on golf courses, otherwise private property is private.
- Feeding birds (native, non-invasive species)
- It's private property which means [removed] off



- well obviously teasing wildlife, and especially big cats/ bears
- Too vague - birds are wild.
- The bylaw is too generic. Needs a revisit to
- Lost animals need our help if starving.
- N/A
- You can't control a wild animal. They will eat what they see
- BSL does not work
- Feeding should be allowed but not teasing
- Impossible to stop squirrels from driving dogs nuts. I welcome my dog protecting my garden from these intruders. Stop people feeding/encouraging squirrels, bunnies, and other pests. Worst my dog does is chase them off property. No injuries ever. It's natu
- None. Private property is private
- None.
- Does this kill a couple rabbits per year? Why is the City spending so much money engaging on this garbage?
- I don't see feeding being a problem but teasing isn't necessary .
- Not allowing bird houses - get real.
- Not your property, not your issue, mind your own business
- The feeding of wildlife with items such as suet or seed feeders should be exempt, but teasing wilflife should be outlawed
- Wild bird seed, trapping and release of nusience animals on property (eg: rabbits, squirrels)
- if it is private property, its their choice.
- If a human is tormenting an animal, Bylaw should be able to step in to protect the animal, though there are no legal grounds to be on private property.
- Bird feeders
- Dangerous animals like bears, cougars or coyotes
- Question 1. An option for no to both.
- Birds
- Unless the wildlife is being physically harmed or endangered.
- I think if it's a bird feeder then that's fine. Nothing to big or gaudy.
- Exception for birds
- People have a right to feed animals in their back yard and some can't help it if they have a garden or fruit tree
- proper education of the dangers and risks of engaging with wildlife
- Just be mindful of wildlife's situation - roaming vs abandoned are two very different scenarios.
- Large predatory animals (e.g. bears, mountain lions)
- when some one can tell you what to do on private property, it is no longer private. Private means stay off my land or there are consequences.
- Teasing yes there should be a bylaw. But things like bird feeders and such should be ok



- I think it is just fine to feed wildlife such as wild birds, squirrels, etc. on private property.
- Birds, squirrels, monkeys
- Feeding small creatures like birds and squirrels should be okay, while feeding large animals like deer and predators should not
- Non
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Private property
- Private property is private property.
- If what the human is doing is harmful to the animal, then that should not be allowed.
- Mind your own business
- Bird feeders, bird baths, squirrels
- This would restrict the feeding of birds which seems ridiculous
- What the heck are you even talking about??
- Just a comment that it would seem that would be a bylaw that would be impossible to enforce.
- Why introduce bylaws that are difficult to validate breaches and even more difficult to enforce?
- Private property is just that, private
- Needs to be far more specific before I can agree
- If anyone is harming the animal in their actions
- Bird boxes?
- None. All is fine as it is.
- Illegal to kill squirrels. Or harm wildlife .
- Private property - what does the City not understand? Tax payers should not be footing the bill for this. Bylaw doesn't handle it now- just go to Bowness park or any park people are feeding geese daily.
- Feeding is different than teasing or being mean to wildlife!
- Bird feeders
- Teasing & excessive feeding ie. bait traps
- I would suggest educational campaigns for this issue
- none
- I think about bird/squirrel feeders. Would they count as wildlife? A bylaw about deer/bobcats/etc I would support.
- If feeding of wildlife becomes problematic, wildlife officers should be dispatched to provide education on the risks associated to the offending party(s).
- Animal cruelty should not be allowed.
- Teasing should be the exception. Caring for wildlife with the intent for release should be ok
- No teasing but feeding is fine.
- On your private property a citizen has the right to do as they wish at their own risk. We are adults and don't need such babysitting



- Animals should not be teased but some animals if they are in danger or hurt should be allowed to be fed at the persons own risk
- Figure out the wording of the bylaw; technically bird and squirrels are wild animal and I would not support banning those.
- Birds are fine and squirrels. Everything else prohibited.
- Small dogs and off leash dogs are the problem. Pit bulls are the most behaved and this is [removed]
- Slippery slope regarding feeding wild animals on private property. Depending on who and how it's interpreted, critters stealing from a garden could be seen as feeding them as well as anyone with a bird feeder. Slippery slope.
- I agree with a bylaw about teasing wildlife on private property.
- None-Fine people who feed or tease them period!
- Anyone who abuses any animal, wild or pet should be dealt with like any other abusive situation. Feeding an animal with the intent to help it should be acceptable always.
- Depends on the wildlife. Backyard bird seed should be ok, feeding bobcats? Not so much.
- Charges being pressed for anyone teasing or harming animals, wild or domesticated.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Let people feed the birds
- If the animal was being poisoned
- The exception of fear- seeing an animal in my yard while holding a steak would prompt me to drop it and run- but I wouldn't intentionally be feeding the wildlife
- None
- Fines for teasing is great. However, people enjoy feeding birds and squirrels, this implementation would be abused by authorities
- One should not be allowed to be cruel to any animal You should be able to feed whatever you want on YOUR OWN PRIVATE PROPERTY!!!!!!!
- If this isn't covered- depending on the definition of teasing. Abuse or elimination of wildlife like squirrels or raccoons .
- Animal abuse shouldn't be allowed anywhere. I think there should be all the concern if there is a report of animal cruelty. But if a deer wanders onto your yard then you technically have a right to shoo it off if you don't want it there.
- Fine people teasing animals. But feeding squirrels and birds should be allowed if feeders are installed to prevent bears from accessing them.
- N/A
- stop with the bylaws, fix the old ones that no longer suit calgarians. comment box for section three . the singling out of one type of dog is appalling. The owness is always on the owner not the breed. There are plenty of other breeds with higher bite pr
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- [removed] off you busy body [removed]. Cut the [removed] budget and deal with the drug crime
- Birds



- Use your own discretion
- Harmful food/food that will make animal sick
- Teasing animals yes, that's stupid
- Should be public. Should be able to feed but not tease or harm
- Surely you would not stop feeding birds in my yard?? This question is far to vague and too far reaching. Needs clarification and limitations on its reach.
- Teasing wildlife is never acceptable, whether on or off of private property. I want to feed wildlife both on and off of private property if possible, especially in the extreme cold. I do not mean leaving meat out, for example. I mean feeding birds bird
- Bird feeders allowed
- Teasing. Feeding and teasing are two very different issues and need to be separated . I feed birds. Are they wildlife? I don't tease them.
- Birdfeeders, people should be allowed to feed non-mammals in general. Except for mosquitoes. You should probably make it illegal to feed mosquitos so that, as a prank, I can citizens arrest friends who get bitten by them.
- bird feeders
- bird feeders
- This should be two questions. Feeding is a no for me and teasing if you mean being mean then yes but I would report anyone who miss treats an animal
- I feed birds, really like their songs - I have a family of finches that have made this their home for the past 10 years. Am very careful no seed falls on the ground. The sound of birds singing makes my block very different from others in the area.
- Bird feeding
- None
- Private property is exactly that: PRIVATE
- Feeding birds should be an exception. People should be allowed to feed birds.
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Steep Fines
- Very hard bylaw to enforce. How are you going to stop people from feeding squirrels or having a bird feeder out in winter?
- Laws for animal cruelty only.
- My neighbourhood's small bird and squirrel population is heavily reliant on us for food in the winter. Please don't make these animals starve--they are wildlife as well.
- No need for laws against bird feeders. This is out of control.
- Teasing and abuse no feed and educational programs on how to respect wildlife yes
- Educating people is gonna be better for our society than fining them for stuff they're doing on their property
- Mind your business
- Penalties for teasing/feeding potentially dangerous wildlife (i.e. Coyotes, bobcats, bears, cougars)



- Leave wildlife alone
- Bird seed or taking care of feral cat colonies.
- Feeders for wildlife within city limits can make sense, as the animals have adapted to their city environment. Enticing and teasing are a different thing. A more specific bylaw to that would be better.
- Bird feeders
- Trap the wildlife and relocate, people need to learn to live with wildlife
- feeding wildlife on private property.
- Folks should be able to trap and kill skunks, coyotes, and other wildlife on private property if they need to. Also, owners should be able to feed wildlife such as birds, rabbits, or squirrels if they want to.
- Feral Pidgeons should not be included
- Leave them alone, its private property for a reason
- Signage on farms that are accepting of this
- Na
- Feeding (birds) is fine. Teasing should not be allowed. As well peanuts should not be allowed for feeding squirrels!
- They need help finding food in the winter in Alberta, people should be allowed to help them if it's on their own property
- The feeding wildlife...I dont see how you can put feeding and teasing and animal in the same sentence they are not the same thing at all. I personally have feeders out for animals , make that two questions
- How could you stop people feeding birds
- If it's a predator.
- I think it's okay to feed them, like bird feeders and food for squirrels and such. To tease an animal, in the sense of being cruel or harmful should definitely be against the law, no matter where an animal is.
- Depends on what teasing refers to, obviously abuse of an animal should never be tolerated. But feeding should be allowed.
- Feeding is possibly ok if safe to do so, not teasing
- Bird feeders. Pumpkins from halloween. Both of these are a big source of food for city wildlife.
- Wild birds who eat at bird feeders.
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- I think feeding is ok. Teasing isn't
- Focus on real issues in the city. This is an absolute waste of tax payer dollars and I am ashamed to call you my city councilors.
- None.
- All abuse of animals, either domestic or wildlife, should face penalty



- N/a
- Putting out birdseed or other feed for birds.
- teasing wildlife should be
- None this is a ridiculous bylaw that would be unenforceable. This City needs to reduce bylaws not add more
- If the teasing leads to or could lead to abuse.
- Don't tease the wildlife, it'll come full circle. But food is often scarce during the cold months, as long as they are fed outside housing areas, they shouldn't come any further in.
- Dangerous animals such as a bear
- Bird feeders
- Only If the animal posed a danger to the residents
- Poisoning animals with food on private/public property
- Education and awareness campaigns, see if this works first.
- Does that mean you could not feed birds or squirrels? Teasing is definitely a no-no anywhere.
- Birds, pollinators
- Large/ dangerous wildlife
- Birds, squirrels
- Would support in the case of feeding large wildlife
- In cases of clear animal abuse by doing so
- Feeding birds should be allowed
- Causing Harm to the animal prohibited
- Birds, squirrels
- Feeding and "teasing" seem like two separate things to me. I feed my child. I don't tease my child.
- Allow people to feed ducks things like frozen peas or things that are good for them instead of bread
- Teasing is bad yes but feed can definitely be good thing due the building in this city pushing wildlife out of their homes
- People should still be allowed to feed the birds
- feeding wildlife... what about bird feeders and giving squirrels food ex? This is wildlife but should not be banned
- That makes no sense you be making it illegal to feed birds. Kinda insane.
- if someone was torturing wildlife on private property I would want it stopped but not sure that requires new bylaws
- There isn't enough people breaking this law to create a law. Put our tax money to better use!
- I believe bird feeders should be allowed.
- For the intent to hurt the wildlife
- Unenforceable unless cops can just waltz on to your property.
- Teasing and feeding are very different, its like comparing apples to asparagus! Folks should be free to feed whomever they choose - its none of your business that folks have compassion for living creatures.



- they're fine they aren't hurting anyone
- People should NOT be able to feed wildlife on their property aside from birds and squirrels.
- Too many young children and people will be punished for things like feeding the birds , we've got enough random laws.
- None, wildlife should be left alone unless severely injured and needs assistance
- n/a
- forbid bird feeder? Really?
- Why feed and tease are in the same sentence - like throwing bread crumbs for a duck is the same thing as "teasing" an animal. Regardless - if someone is trying to harm an animal I assume there are bylaws for that; else use education.
- I don't understand the use of the word "teasing". I think feeding nuisance should be prohibited. If teasing could mean discouraging wildlife on private property, then I think that should be allowed.
- No teasing/ harming
- How is this going to be enforced?
- If a person is under the age of 18
- Cruelty penalties
- Signs
- rodents or birds with bird baths and feeders
- Feeding no, teasing yes, on private property
- predators (coyotes, bobcats, etc.)
- None
- stop using pets to generate revenue
- I would be okay with feeding wild animals on private property. However, teasing any animal is cruel and abusive so I would NOT support teasing.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding and teasing are different
- Like bird seed in your yard? Why is that a problem? Or like peanuts for the squirrel? Get bent.
- Feeding proper food that is healthy for the animals should be allowed
- Bird Feeders, Bee Friendly Plants etc.
- Let people do what they want on their own property.
- My land, my Choice
- Lawful Hunting needs to be considered on private property as well as species specific control. Animals that can harm or damage nearby properties or threaten the safety of humans needs to be considered
- There are immediately obvious exceptions - birdfeeders. Would baiting a live trap be considered feeding? I would support a bylaw against teasing/harassing wildlife, but a blanket ban on feeding seems ill-advised.
- The Questions so far do not allow neutral or leave the bylaws alone answers. The current enforcement personal already seemed stretched to perform their duties.



- Birds are wildlife, we feed birds in the winter. Putting feeding and teasing wild is two completely different things and putting them in the same question is misleading. Teasing animals is not acceptable in any context, private property or not.
- We feed the birds and squirrels in our area to keep them away from spits where the cats in our area roam and to keep them away from our plants!
- Remove the mask bylaw. Politicians shouldn't be the ones making that call.
- This type of bylaw would cause an increase in neighbour to neighbour conflict and stretch bylaw officials thin with floods of calls. Not practical not really enforceable.
- I personally don't care about feeding animals, but I have a HUGE issue with any form of teasing or animal abuse - which should be punishable for sure.
- You can't put feeding/teasing into the same category. Also this needs to be more specific. What types of animals are you talking about? Are you talking about birds, because you should be able to feed birds appropriate bird food.
- No teasing only.
- I'm not sure what is wrong with feeding wildlife. Teasing I get.
- None let people live
- Private property is private
- Bird feeders for birds and squirrels should be fine.
- Private property, no body else's business.
- Birds and bird feeders
- None
- Allowing people to respectfully engage with wildlife to learn about them and how to coexist and still respect their space.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, feeding squirrels
- If there is harm done to the animal on private property, the owner is to be charged
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Feeding birds and rabbits is fine
- Can feed animals the appropriate food.
- teasing i agree should not be allowed but bird feeders etc should be allowed
- Not on public property.
- Teasing, capturing and containing any wild animal should be prohibited as well as feeding larger potentially dangerous animals ie coyotes
- Bird feeding
- I think it is reasonable for people to feed and house feral animals with the intent of contacting a spay/neuter team or getting the animal to a shelter.
- Feeding poison or bating to harm or kill an animal
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Birds - to make a law against something like a bird feeder is intrusive



- Is there not a provincial law about feeding wildlife?
- Birdfeeders need exemption.
- I think we should allow homeowners to do as they please on their own private property without infringing on their rights. We should come up with a bylaw though that if the neighbors or property owners are creating a nuisance by luring, teasing, or feeding
- That's a very vague question and not easy to answer.
- Teasing is bad.
- Although I think that Animals shouldn't be abused or fed/teased. I feel this infringes on my rights on my private property.
- Don't be dumb. Parks need wildlife.
- Feeding birds
- Birds are wildlife... would bird feeders be illegal? Gardens attract rabbits... are gardens illegal?
- Bird feeders or nuisance traps for animals who are taunting pets.
- Children's actions
- Bird seed, nuts for squirrels?
- I think enforcement on private property is going to be a huge challenge - is this a major concern? If so I would recommend educating the public on the specific concerns
- Poison
- Let people do what they want on land they own
- Large Bears / Dangerous wildlife should be fined for feeding on purpose.
- If it's your own land, there should be no restrictions in feeding wildlife
- We have a feral cat we look after through The Meow Foundation. Skunks, ravens, etc will eat the cat food we put out for the cats. Too challenging to control.
- Wildlife yes it's dangerous to feed but birds squirrels and rabbits should be exempted from this. It is doing them more good than harm
- None
- Birds are wild life as well so we should stop putting bird food out? I would redefine it to large wildlife.
- Education over enforcement.
- Birds, squirrels, gophers, etc small creatures
- Bird feeders
- None this is provincial jurisdiction let them address it
- A bylaws against teasing wildlife. Not feeding
- Bird feeders
- I suggest there be signs or some sort of education explaining what foods can be fed to wildlife and what foods may be harmful. Therefore not harming the wildlife yet they are able to get a easy source of food. However teasing should have a bylaw prohibit
- Bird feeders
- Not sure if yes or no is better answer. Education should be priority.
- Contact the owner of the land and ask their opinion



- Just let people be.
- In areas where wildlife are present (mostly ducks and geese) install machines that allow ppl to feed them food that's good for them.
- None
- I think teasing an animal should be illegal anywhere, but feeding animals on your own property is ludicrous, what about bird feeders?
- It's difficult to enforce. Many people have bird feeders- other wild life will eat the seed. This is such a difficult area. Here in Tuscany people were feeding and chasing moose. I called bylaw and others. No one followed up.
- stop trying to regulate everything
- Let people do what they want its their property
- It's a private property there should be no jurisdiction
- Bird feeders, hummingbird feeders, vegetable gardens, and fountains could all be accused as "feeding" by vexatious neighbours and would tax the overseeing body. Common lawn decor and hobby gardening items should be obviously excluded.
- Teasing or harming
- Private property is private property. If someone wants to feed deer In their yard, as long as there is no poaching, then it would only promote wildlife safe areas
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- You should be allowed to feed the birds. If squirrels get into my feeder, despite me trying not to, I refuse to pay a fine or stop feeding the birds.
- RESIGN [removed]
- Anything that physically harm the animal should be a crime. Other than that, I fear over- regulating engagement with wildlife. Educate but don't create more laws.
- could you try focusing on actual important issues. I hope you're all voted out
- bird feeders
- You cannot control everything
- Birds, bees, ect. Let the animals live here toi
- If the intent of the interaction was malicious to the animal (poison, injury)
- I don't like how this question is worded - if a hare comes in my yard and eats my flowers am I "feeding" it? What about bird feeders?
- Bird feeders and water should be acceptable.
- Bylaw against teasing..not feeding
- Bird feeders
- injuries to animal (wildlife)
- Bird feeders, butterfly feeders, insect houses, bee hives,
- Abuse
- Bird feeding



- If one is implemented, I know numerous people who enjoy setting up squirrel feeders, squirrels should be an exception
- Does this include bird feeders? I put no because of that.
- None. Let people feed the squirrels and birds
- Teasing yes, but feeding on private property I wouldn't support being fined
- Yes to teasing, though we would need objectivity there. If an animal is hurt or needs help by way of water/food the city should not be able to tell you you cannot do this on your own private property.
- Less govt new laws. Mind your own [removed] business.
- Bird feeders
- It should be the property owners decision as to what they do on their property.
- Birds, deer and small mammals.
- n/a
- Feeding and teasing should be treated as separate issues
- To question 1, disagree. Don't do either. Stop worrying about cats...there are bigger issues you idiots could look at.....
- Do not put all wildlife in one category with the same restrictions. Different animals (i.e., birds/squirrels) should be handled differently from others.
- You should be allowed to fed birds they are not dangerous !!
- Vetted list of animals who are to not be fed from private property. Large animals like Cougars or Coyotes should not be enticed to come to a property, where as squirrels and birds are welcome.
- what to do about the deer that come into a yard to eat the bird seed in bird feeders
- You can't control what happens on private property
- I have bird feeders and what I do on my property is my business. Teasing wildlife should never be allowed anywhere.
- bird feeders as well as options to discourage and/or remove wildlife from yards.
- mind your own business, stop bullying and harrasing tax payers
- Leave people alone
- Ducks geese
- Force OWNERS to EAT any animals over the number of 2!!!
- Better educate people about the dangers of feeding wildlife
- Teasing wildlife should be prohibited, but there is nothing wrong with bird feeders
- Animal is clearly deprived
- Feeding birds on your property should be allowed
- Feeding wildlife by placing fresh water on your property should be okay
- Bird Feeders.
- Nobody should tease wildlife, but adding a bylaw is pointless as there would be no enforcement on private property. Current bylaws around off leash areas for example are not enforced (I've NEVER seen a bylaw officer on Nose Hill where I walk almost daily
- It's private property



- Stop interfering with private property
- People love squirrel and bird feeders.
- Deer licks , bird feeders , owl statues all good.
- Any sort of abuse
- Bird feeders/houses.
- I would support not teasing but feeding birds There is a big difference between feeding and teasing, they shouldn't be put in the same question. Someone who feeds birds could be boosting biodiversity, someone who teases could be harming it.
- Wildlife is provincial jurisdiction
- You have NO right to tell people what they can and cannot do on their property. Remember your place.
- I wouldn't ever support just feeding the wildlife since these are the same animals that something is bound to happen to them because they are tamed to humans. A bylaw against feeding could hurt the odd case where feeding might be necessary for survival.
- Fix the [removed] off lease problems first
- Hard to police and hard line to draw. Bird feeders attract lots of animals besides birds to private property, too ambiguous to draw a line.
- More distinction needed on the term wildlife. Feeding birds & squirrels is okay but nothing larger & teasing of wildlife is never okay.
- Birds and squirrels
- I think this needs to actually be enforced to begin with in public. Spend an hour in Prince's island park and actually start ticketing people to leave the geese alone. Why add more to this bylaw but why if it's not even enforced to begin with??
- Teasing and acts of cruelty regardless of on private property or not
- Bird feeders
- Rabbits and birds - they need help in winter
- I think the focus on this needs to be education
- what about bird feeders? to vague - you need to be more specific
- Obvious littering and garbage in yards.
- I feel bird feeders, fountains and nectar feeders are acceptable.
- Prohibit cruelty to any animal. Regardless of location
- By law against teasing, not feeding
- Squirrels! Our family loves seeing them and they are almost part of the family.
- Squirrels and bird feeders
- I live near Fish Creek and wildlife comes into my year (deer, skunk etc) to eat bird seed. I can't control that and I don't want to stop feeding the birds.
- Education
- Leave people on their personal property alone.
- Wild birds and squirrels



- A sick animal needing assistance
- Meat or bone feeding. Birdfeed only. Large animals.
- The problem with this is that what is your definition of feeding wildlife. Would Bird seed or hummingbird feeders be deemed feeding wildlife
- Teasing is unacceptable, but if the food isn't harmful, why not set out some feeders?
- Bird feeder, squirrel feeders
- Don't harass wildlife or feed dangerous animals
- None. This is [removed] stupid. And [removed], you're a [removed] [removed]
- animal control as part of their duties to relocate wildlife is rabbits & skunks etc key word private property! i do not need or want any more city control on what i do or cannot do on MY property
- Birdfeeders.
- Birds, small animals
- Farms
- Wildlife would need to be carefully defined. For instance, a bird feeder should not be prohibited.
- Feeding birds, squirrels etc should be ok. I can u see stand not feeding wild rabbits, they bring coyotes and bobcats etc.
- Stop. You are over reaching.
- Bird seed, peanuts for birds
- I think feeding wildlife should be allowed .. its not like anyone follows that bylaw anyway i see hundred of people feeding the geese in my area
- teasing/harassing wildlife should be prohibited. Feeding is fine.
- The exception would be if the feeding of wildlife posed a threat to public safety.
- Wild bird feeders. Teasing wildlife isn't acceptable but enforcement I see as an issue.
- I want to be able to continue feeding wild birds/squirrels
- I would support a initiative that promotes education about Calgary's various backyard wildlife and community efforts to safely cohabit our urban spaces with local wildlife. Bylaws are not the answer.
- Does this include bird feeders??
- Bird seeds
- harassment or endangering a wild animal
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- You do not want disturb nesting/baby animals, so it should be known to just Leave wild animals alone
- Bird feeders should be allowed in parts of the city without bears
- My no answer is related to bird feeders. Otherwise it would have been a yes.
- Birds
- Prohibit teasing not not feeding
- Birds
- Birds, squirrels, feral cats
- Birds



- Causing harm to wildlife on private property should be fineable, if not already so
- None
- We encroach on their land
- Only if they are feeding dangerous animals. Such as predators.
- Feeding birds
- Pets
- None
- Feeding should be fine. Birds and chipmunks etc. But teasing is out of the question.
- None
- Deer eating hay bales or other unintentional ways wildlife may be fed
- Teasing should be prohibited on private property but not feeding (bird feeders are ok)
- Bird feeders, man made creature enclosures (bees,bugs etc.)
- If the animal is injured or hungry, let it be
- People should be allowed bird feeders, but shouldn't be allowed to feed rodents, coyotes, bears, etc. You need a two part bylaw if you do, so there can be a distinguished difference.
- Feeding ok (thinking birds) but teasing no
- What someone does on their private property is their own business. Not the city's
- Unless it's a business where people can go to. If its a home, I don't agree with controlling what people do in their own home. It's against freedom and most people are responsible.
- There should only be a bylaw against teasing wild animals on private property. Feeding should only be punished if it is done with the intent to poison and harm an animal.
- Over population of a certain bread of bird
- Feeding, are bird feeders going to be banned?
- Majority of animals are fine, if people want to feed feral cats/ dogs then let them. There's no harm in that. My only exception would be regarding bears, and we're doing that with our black and green bins.
- Giving food/water to an injured animal
- People need to be allowed to feed birds, squirrels, feral cats that DO keep rodent population down.
- A mother and babies. An injured animal.
- I would not permit teasing well the animals on property. You cannot help feed the deer from your garden if they come into the backyard
- None
- Only if the wildlife animal is dangerous
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- People feed birds and squirrels is fine. The reason wildlife is an issue is because we took over thier territory and have a harder time finding food
- None
- Feeding birds and animals like squirrels should be fine.
- Bird feeders



- People feeding skunks or animals that pose a danger like coyotes or bears
- Bird feeders
- Just let people be stop policing every aspect of their lives.
- This is a bad idea. Drop it and leave private property alone!
- None, fish and wildlife should enforce wildlife issues not the city
- I think teasing is never ok but when it comes to feeding wildlife I believe it depends on what because a lot of people have bird feeders or sometimes for squirrels
- Bird feeders.
- Stop this tyrannical garbage
- Mistreating wildlife.
- Bird feeders in the winter
- Private property should remain private and the city should mind their own.
- Birds, small wildlife
- Why is it that you think you can control and monitor every human response and interaction? Bylaws are a joke and help absolutely no one, never mind the law
- I feel that teasing wildlife should not be allowed on private property but the feeding of wildlife is too vague. Would this include bird feeders? Does wildlife cover feral animals (bunnies)? Etc.
- No, because this would prohibit bird feeders
- Not a sufficient problem that needs a solution. Existing animal cruelty laws are adequate
- This law is not a bad idea, but ensure that bird feeders are permitted.
- None
- Do not put teasing and feeding together. Squirrels and birds should be classed differently than rabbits and larger animals.
- Birds, small harmless wildlife
- Too vague. What about bird feeders?
- People should be allowed to hang bird feeders. Teasing wildlife should be dealt with differently than feeding.
- Feeding squirrels should be an exception
- Animals like raccoons come back to easy to find food places. Open a feeding program for them and a relocation program to the areas you feed them in.
- I am against teasing, but no feeding is too vague (you can safely feed wild birds, but do not feed bears or larger wild animals)
- There are millions of people engaged in healthy feeding of birds in this city. Allow that to continue. Teasing is not so good... but you will never stop it.
- Birds
- None, we have bigger problems.
- None
- Don't pass
- Let people feed wildlife.



- If they were enticing to do harm to the animal
- Fines for cruelty but you shouldn't get in trouble for putting out some bird seed kind of thing.
- No exceptions. The city currently has too many bylaws.
- Birds/squirrel
- Would support no teasing, but I am ok with feeding birds, squirrels etc
- Private property is private. The city should mind its own business and concentrate on public and city property.
- They cannot harm the animal in anyway
- Animal cruelty should be more effectively enforced against wildlife on private property before using resources in this way.
- N/a
- Not to ban breed specific dogs you [removed]!
- Stop making more laws. Educate. Invest in signs and education programs.
- Feeding birds should be allowed.
- People own birdfeeders and like using this to watch birds.
- Birds
- I feed the birds and I believe its a good thing
- None [removed] off leave people alone you greedy [removed]
- Reasonable bird feeders ect are fine.... teasing/harming them is not ok
- I would yes to the poor behavior. However feeding birdseed to birds I see no issue
- No feeding squirrels
- Birds are the only exception
- Shooing off property
- Allow backyard bird feeders
- If the animal is stuck or in a dangerous place and someone is trying to coax it out of that spot
- When excessive wildlife has a negative impact on surrounding properties within a neighborhood.
- Birds
- None
- Proper seed in bird feeders for local birds.
- If the animal is skeeny/ in need of food
- none atm
- Feeding of birds
- Bird seed
- You are planning on banning bird feeders? Lord help this over regulated world.
- Never teasing, but feeding allowed in emergencies, to be best interest of the animals.
- Feeding Birds
- Bird feeding
- feeding no teasing yes 100%
- Bird feeders



- Bird Feed
- Teasing or possibly harming one is one thing, putting out bird seed and water fountains is another.
- There is a difference between feeding and teasing. I have no issue with feeding but they should not be teased.
- None
- bird feeders
- Trees and vegetation in yards be exempt
- If the person feeding/teasing is associated with the person who owns the private property
- Feeding for purpose of rescue
- I think bird food and food for squirrels is fine but other animals should be left alone
- Except for veterinarians and wildlife rehabbers.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, salt licks
- None
- Those who are trapping and spat/neuter neighborhood feral cats. Allowances should be made to have access to water for any animals.
- A fine if caught doing so.
- organic food (carrots. clean lettuce, etc.) proven to be healthy for the animals (deer, rabbit, etc.)
- Change your signs!!! Of u feed the wildlife we will have to kill the animal. People need to know why or they automatically do the opposite!!
- Education campaigns as to how this is detrimental to wildlife and how it endangers both people and wildlife.
- No
- Abandoned animal that needs help.
- Private property is private!!!
- City allows feeding in desperate situational
- Hummingbird feeders/birdseed feeders
- None
- none
- If the animal is injured.
- If it is a domesticated animal (ie. Cat or dog) or clearly starving/malnourished
- Bird feeders & small wildlife feeders okay
- None - if it's Wildlife it needs to be protected, feeding and teasing hurts wild animals
- Bird feeders
- What do you mean by teasing??? No one should feed wild animals. Quit with the fines. Educate. Duh.
- If animal is hurt or malnutrition it is ok to feed
- Injured animals
- None



- Wild birds
- Harming wild life should be prohibited.
- If the wildlife is being rehabilitated
- Bird feeders
- birds, bats, bees.
- Safety
- Bird feeders should always be allowed
- Don't feed wildlife, ever, regardless of property
- Fines for people feeding and teasing wildlife. Feeding birds should be exempt, with the exception of birds of prey. More education around the effects of feeding and teasing wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Dining property owners if they are leaving wildlife attractants out and also engaging in a plant removal program like Banff and Canmore so property owners can have berry and fruit trees that attract animals at no cost to them by the city.
- Feeding birds should still be allowed. Also if a wild animal is trapped in a persons yard for an extended amount of time they should be allowed to feed and give the animal water if they feel safe to do so.
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders, etc
- Bird feeders, feeding community cats that have been TNR or are in the process of being TNR
- An animal in distress should be helped, contact wildlife the animal rehab centre to defer to their recommendation.
- Young/injured wildlife
- Providing water for dehydration. Feeding squirrels or chipmunks
- No teasing, feeding is OK
- Abandon infant wildlife
- Squirrels and birds
- None
- Poisoned/bait food for invasive species or pests
- throw the human in jail. fine the human. put his /her photo on the front page of the papers/ social media.
- Birds, and rodents
- BREEDS. DONT. MEAN. AGGRESSIVE. If you mean "nuisance dog" as in any of the breeds you listed you're dumb. If nuisance dog means a dog with an aggressive history then I vote that the owners recieve a higher fine.
- Bird feeders
- except bird feeders that squirrels can't access



- Add something about feeding animals for health reasons. Example: someone finds and injured animal and is trying to help it until they can get it to a professional. Or are genuinely worried for their safety.
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions
- None
- Taking care of injured/orphaned animals.
- Bird feeders
- Responsible feeding for aiding in removal of a nuisance animal
- Bird feeders
- Feeding unintentionally
- We are eliminating habitats. They have to adapt. There are cases where they need to be fed.
- Except animals that potentially can become at risk to be euthanized (bears, bobcats...)
- Training with wild animals
- Birds
- Feeding stray cats in order to get close to them so you can rehabilitate/trap them and bring them in for rehabilitation
- Birds
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- None. No one should tease or feed wild animals. It's not good for the ecosystem.
- Bird feeders, feeding an emaciated or injured animal
- Bird
- Bird feeder
- None
- it should be legal to feed wild live only with food they should eat, no junk food. But teasing wildlife should be illegal everywhere.
- Fines
- Not for feeding wildlife no
- A family of animals is starving to death
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Feeding feral (not wild) rabbits
- Birdfeeders will need an explicit exemption to avoid any ambiguity
- Rehabilitation and rescue
- Feeding wild birds and bunnies should be allowed. No one should tease wildlife
- Suggestion for question 1. Release programs are ridiculous. Those cats shouldn't be outdoors, as it puts pressure on wild bird populations and is also unsafe for the cats. I'd prefer to see a spay/neuter and re-home program.
- Feeding any animal in a respectful manner. Only teasing should be banned.



- None.
- Bird feeders
- None
- The animal is clearly in dire need of food and mad sure the food was appropriate for that species of animal
- Nine
- Communal spaces like fields should have signs mentioning wildlife safety.
- Birds, squirrels
- Is this really a problem?
- Humming bird feeders
- No teasing
- If a wildlife animal was harming my pet, I would want to have the ability to stop it without penalization.
- Many people have bird feeders with healthy feed and bird baths for wild birds (and sometimes squirrels), and these should remain legal. I support a bylaw that prohibits teasing.
- Feeding if injured
- Bird feeders
- backyard bird-feeders
- When it attracts vermin
- N/A
- If the animal is injured or requires medical attention.
- I don't think bird feeders are a nuisance, and should continue to be. I am concerned about people attracting and feeding animals that could be problematic, such as deer, coyote and lynx/bobcats
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Not sure
- squirrels, chipmunks, deer, calm animals
- Bird feeding
- N/a
- I would say people could engage with and feed animals, but not tease or harm them
- Leaving feeders out for birds
- injured wildlife
- None.
- No exceptions.
- A small fine / and some information on the repercussions of feeding wildlife
- None
- Prohibit teasing in all circumstances
- Voting no because I don't see the harm in feeding birds
- Bird feeders, squirrels feeders etc.



- Bird feeders
- Bird/ squirrel
- Bird feeders
- Exceptions for birds
- Wild hares, domesticated rabbits, ducks, geese. I support prohibiting teasing but not feeding.
- Definitely no teasing. I do however support bird feeders.
- Feeding birds,squirrels etc should be allowed, deer & carnivore feeding no.
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders should be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Fines
- When wild animals venture onto property and find food, without any aid/luring from people.
- Appropriate bird feeders
- Dangerous wild animals ie bears
- Bird feeders
- Would like to see this handled appropriate to the circumstance. A family with young children feeding ducks can be educated and warned about the dangers while a person deliberately hurting, teasing, chasing or trapping a bird or animal to get steep fines
- none
- Exemption for non pest/predator species
- Feeding of injured animals
- be allowed to annoy nuisance animals so they leave property. Skunks etc
- Teasing, feeding for entrapment absolutely no. But people putting water or bird seed out, no.
- If an animal is in distress we should be able to help. If that means feeding then I want to be able to without persecution
- Mayor Nenshi could not be fed regardless of his location.
- Rescue animals/animals in visible distress
- None
- Birds
- Feeding and teasing feel like 2 different things. One is potentially life saving and the other is torment. Very case specific.
- Feeding an appropriate food in order to supplement animals through the winter eg. Bird food for birds, hay for the deer
- Feeding of birds,bees and squirrels
- Exception bird feeders
- Any non carnivore animals; bunnies, frogs, rabbits, deer. But make sure you collect the food each night/after feeding the omnivores.



- Feeding on private property is ok. Teasing on private property is NOT ok. Should be considered abuse when teasing and a fine should occur.
- Birds feeders should be exempt, no teasing of any creatures should be tolerated.
- No exceptions. Feeding wild life anywhere in the city boundaries is an invitation for animals to stay.
- There is not enough information and warning that people should not be feeding wildlife in City Parks. People clear don't care about the rules and the well being of wildlife. an increase in fines and more monitoring needs to be done for City Parks.
- Bird feeding
- Squirrels, birds, rabbits, other small prey animals
- Animals in danger who need to be moved off property
- Feeding still allowed. ie) birdfeeders
- Birds, squirrels, deer and rabbits and other animals eating garden vegetables or garden foods of their own accord on private property
- Yes the feeding of wildlife should be allowed on private property
- When an animal is causing issues on the property
- Exceptions: bird feeders
- trying to coax animal off of property
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeding
- It is covered by provincial legislation. Why do we need the city involved?
- Having animals eat from your garden is not teasing.
- Bird feeders
- Absolutely none
- Birds
- what is teasing? stupid!
- I think I should be able to have bird feeders and put peanuts out for squirrels...
- Squirrels, birds, bees
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be exempt
- Birds
- Ducks
- Gophers, magpies, rodents etc
- Bird feeders
- song birds (bird feeders)
- This would effectively ban bird feeders. It's ridiculous.
- If the owner is able to be at the scene and speak on behalf that they know the individuals and the animal is safe then they shouldn't be fined, otherwise for the safety of pets in yards this should be a bylaw
- no exceptions



- What about bird feeders? I dont agree with children, pets etc chasing birds.
- Bird feeders
- Lower taxes quot wasting money on this bull
- None wild is wild
- Please clearly state what feeding wild animals means. IE putting out bird seed for the birds.
- Allow feeding birds
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- Teasing would need a very clear definition
- None, wild life should never be teased or fed. It creates dependency and eventually will be detrimental to the animal.
- None
- N/a
- No exceptions
- Exemptions of birds?
- Consent of the property owner. A flexible criteria that allows for case-by-case basis examination of the incident upon appeal.
- None
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Get a life
- Only allow bird feeders.
- Injured animals, I don't believe teasing of any animals is okay. If someone is feeding an injured animal until proper medical help can be obtained that's fine.
- Not sure
- An animal that was clearly injured and needed care and attention until animal services or fish and wildlife could arrive to assist.
- For feeding, if it was injured that would be ok. But to teach wildlife that it is ok to approach humans could be dangerous for the public in public spaces.
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- A bylaw shouldn't be required. That's common sense.
- if feeding would save an animal in trouble
- No exceptions.
- Bird feeders should continue to be allowed
- Quit trying to determine what people do on their property.
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders allowed
- Sick/injured rescue animals
- None
- None.



- Approved list of foods that you can feed on private property
- Only allow feeding of wildlife in designated areas where wildlife isn't close to any important structures or public sites. Teasing should not be tolerated.
- NONE
- Bird feeding seems harmless but I'm no expert
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and all squirrels or other invasive destructive species
- All
- wild animals living the city have already forgotten how to live in the wild..... This environment is unnatural to them. Feeding them will not make the problem worse.
- Too vague, and it would never be enforced. Don't introduce bylaws where there are no resources available for enforcement.
- If wildlife is injured, providing water or needs until help arrives or required and to calm animal if needed
- None
- A in city bow hunt
- No exceptions!
- If an animal is starving and fed I think the fine should be lessened but the person should be educated and possibly fined depending on duration of feeding, especially if they failed to reach out to wildlife.
- Only if animal is injured and short term to sustain until help can come.
- Feeding birds inform birdfeeders in your yard should not be prohibited
- Bird feeders, etc.
- Bird feeders
- Require fences were available
- None
- bird and squirrel feeders
- I'd support a bylaw that prohibits teasing, but not one that prohibits feeding
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels
- Attempts to scare wildlife away from property, without physical harm.
- Does leaving a few nuts for a squirrel fall under this? We have many more important issues in the city, such as delveopers cutting down mature trees, that deserve more resources.
- Wildlife rehabilitation
- An injured animal which one is caring for until Animal control can arrive.
- Unless a permitted rescue or rehabilitation entity
- Bird feeders
- help moving the wild animal off property in a humane way
- Bird and squirrel feeding (and by extension deer feeding) from front lawns/bird feeders...



- Ducks, but city provide seed purchase at common feeding areas
- bird feeders
- I like bird feeders but don't want to see "annoyance" wildlife harmed (magpies, squirrels, etc)
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be an exception
- Feeding an animal in distress to save it before turning it over to the appropriate rehabilitation authorities.
- Bird feeders should be ok
- None. PRIVATE property. Not for you to decide
- Exceptions being feeding birds
- If the animal is hurt.
- Bird feeders in winter
- Bird feeders
- none. Sending enforcement officers to look into private property for people feeding squirrels (or other wildlife) is too intrusive.
- Fine.
- Small song birds
- Small birds, birdfeeders, and bat houses
- Animals in distress
- If the wildlife was emaciated and needed assistance re: food. No exceptions for teasing.
- Bird feeders/baths/houses don't need to be regulated.
- Acreage size, Forest/wildland proximity
- Feeding hungry animals appropriate food
- None
- Squirrel and birds
- If a deer wanders into your garden at night, should you call bylaw to chase it away or just let it wander off on it's own?
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be allowed
- Birds
- Squirrels/bird feeders
- I expect people to respect animals, they where here first after all we moved into their space and they are the ones losing their homes to new builds, I'm an animal lover and i will always be one so I think everyone should respect animals and have boundrie
- Except those who feed ducks on their property
- None
- Bird feeders
- Feeding ducks
- People who are rehabbing wildlife for release
- Care for injured animals prior to taking to a vet or wildlife rescue.



- City owned private property only
- None,
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding squirrels and birds.
- Petting zoos
- Squirrels
- Feeding wildlife at private sanctuaries
- Birds
- a fine of some sort
- Must NOT be done as baiting for hunting
- nursing injured wildlife to health
- None
- Injured animal that a rehab or rescue won't take
- Teasing Or taunting wildlife should be banned and fines given to enforce it, but often wildlife aren't intentionally fed, being drawn in by garden contents, bird seed etc. These should boot constitute a violation.
- Don't want food gardens and fruit trees disallowed like I've heard has been done in places like Canmore to prevent wildlife from encroaching into the city and feeding.
- Birdseed should be allowed, same with humming bird feeders as the harm they cause is minimal compared to the joy. Only authorized food. No bread etc
- Just no teasing, thats cruel.
- None
- feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Would allow feeding birds on private property
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird feeders on private property. Providing these sources for nourishment increases survivorship of birds during harsh winters.
- Bird feeders.
- For large dangerous animals only I feel
- Bird feeders and feeding wild birds
- None
- What is your definition of wildlife. Some can say chickens, pot bellied pigs are and so on. You need to include more precise wording otherwise someone could fight the bylaw
- A bag of garbage being forgotten about and left out on the deck and birdfeeders must be excluded.
- None



- no restrictions. Parents should be fined if their children harrass wildlife. I see this all the time and could lead to kids getting hurt and wild life suffering the consequences of negligent parents
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- So squirrels, aviary animals, and other animals would result in fines??
- None
- Except if the animal is injured and the person has contacted an appropriate organization for assistance
- I would suggest that bird feeders are ok but Our neighbours lay out hay for rabbits in the winter and we often get as many as six coyotes in our front yard because of it.
- Feeding any large, wild animal that is equal in size to or larger than a deer
- Exception would be bird feeders
- Prohibit teasing wildlife, do no prohibit feeding wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Outside of city limits!
- Feeding birds
- An exception if an injured animal was on private property and required assistance.
- No specific exceptions however a clear definition of teasing need to be outlined.
- None
- Specific safe foods for ducks and water fowl
- None
- raising orphaned babies
- Unsure
- Bird feeders
- Split that up. No issue with feeding squirrels but trading is another issue
- Birds
- Bird feeding devices, that are only made for feeding birds.
- If the animal appears to be starving
- Wild Bird feeders should be allowed
- Responsible feeding only
- If the 'teasing' was done to lure wildlife off of personal property for the safety of the wildlife
- Jail time. Or we should tease them in the same manner!
- its private property
- Feeding is okay if appropriate food is left out and not being hand fed. Has provided a safe spot for mother to birth her deer in the back yard and leave them while she goes out for food or whatever during the day.
- You're going to have to be very specific regarding this, what exactly do you mean by wildlife? Does that mean you will no longer be allowed to put up bird or squirrel feeders on your own property? This needs to be clarified.



- Would this include water, bird, butterfly, and the like feeders? I support bylaws that prohibit the teasing or feeding of wildlife for the purpose of harming.
- Birdfeeders
- Wildlife getting into poorly contained garbage/waste should be addressed
- birds, squirrels
- You don't own there property. Stop being money hungry americans
- Migratory birds
- Bird feeders should still be allowed.
- Animals have free roam. They were here before us. No exceptions.
- To help a stray or lost animal
- In order to capture them safely it should be ok but done by professionals.
- You should be allowed to feed the birds
- The animal is obviously being starved/abused
- Birds
- Feeding birds from a bird feeder is ok
- Feeding wildlife their appropriate food types is fine.
- Bird feeders
- For an owner to press charges it could be an expensive/complicated process but the crime itself is just as bad as feeding animals in parks. Owners need city support if this situation arises.
- Bird feeders
- Would a deer eating I your garden be a fine? Stupid
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed on private property
- The only exception, would be planting trees on your property that will provide food for the wildlife to acquire naturally, ONLY if your property is outside city limits.
- The only possible exception I can think of is if a wild animal on private property is injured and cannot feed itself... But even that case, I'd rather see it reported to Animal Control so they can deal with the situation, just to be safe (for the animal)
- Wild life is just that. They can look after themselves.
- There is no exceptions for teasing a wild animal. That can result in the animal retaliating. And do not feed wildlife unless it is seeds or healthy foods for them if you want to leave some food for them. Bread is not a good food for ducks or geese
- Injured wildlife
- Wildlife rehabilitation
- Bird feeders maintained in a responsible manner
- Does this mean birdfeeders would be illegal?
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders are fine, I just don't want people feeding/attracting coyotes and other dangerous animals
- Bird feeders/houses. Priority would be teasing.



- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders
- Where is the line? Is it okay to still have bird feeders, etc?
- None
- birds, squirrels,
- Birdseed
- None
- Injured animals- where they need help to survive
- Using feeders for typically fed animals such as squirrels and birds. Many of these would die; there are not enough natural sources of food - they are pseudo domesticated.
- Bird feeders
- None
- Dangerous wildlife like bears, deer, moose etc.
- The government should find another way to incentivize people to behave differently. More fines is proven to not be effective and I do not support more laws.
- Bird feeders
- Separate out feeding and teasing. Teasing is often abusive and should be outlawed. Feeding birds/squirrels/deer is not abusive and should be permitted. Within reason.
- No teasing anywhere, but responsible feeding (e.g., bird feeders) should be allowed on private property. I don't think feeding animals like coyotes or bears should be allowed though, to avoid habituation.
- Except bird feeders
- Injured
- Feeding birds on your property
- If the property owner allows it.
- Birds
- Exception bird feeding. ban squirrel feeders.
- I do think that however under right circumstances people should be able to help an animal until a fish and wildlife service can show up.
- feeding and teasing are very different things, this needs to be two separate questions. Teasing should absolutely be against the bylaw as it is harassment of a living creature. Feeding on private property is entirely up to the individual.
- People should be able to try and remove deer of their property they are a nuisance
- Injured wildlife needing care
- Attempting to lure in an injured animal using food so you can take it to get help
- Teasing is the problem. Coexisting should be OK.
- Prohibit teasing, but discourage feeding. Bird feeders and such are fine except during winter months.
- Feeding birds should still be allowed



- Baby animals that have lost their mother
- Considerations for type of property, is its an acreage, farm, or residential area. Residential area and people are feeding deere to get pictures, fine them.
- Bird feeders should be exempt. Maybe squirrel feeders too, if those are a thing. Otherwise I would not support this bylaw.
- If the animal was hurt or malnutrition
- Teasing any animal wild or domestic should be unlawful
- feeding with intent to do no harm.
- Feeding injured wildlife to keep them around until services can come to collect the animal
- Luring an injured animal to get it medical help
- However you have to be careful when citizens are caring for wildlife that would It survive. Eg a simple putting out of a bowl of water should It suddenly be considered criminal. You also need to separate feeding/ caring for wildlife versus teasing, abusin
- Wild bird feedersp
- Injured wildlife given food, water and protection until fish &wildlife can aide.
- No
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds
- Feeding wildlife if healthy and safe.
- People put out bird feeders? Does this make feeding birds illegal. What about other animals that eat from this same feeders.
- Injured or sick wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Patrols in the are or video surveillance
- An animal cruelty bylaw regardless of where it happens
- None
- Teasing animals wild or not is abuse and should be treated as such. Feeding can make animals reliant but any law passed must be considerate to the circumstances eg. Bird feeders should be ok, feeding ferals to rescue ok etc.
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Please differentiate between types of wildlife Eg: Don't feed bears, yes you can feed squirrels. No teasing of any wildlife should ever be allowed
- Fakk off with all the fines
- depends on the situation
- beekeeping
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders & water bowls. I have a water bowl on my deck and the number of birds, squirrels, and other animals that come in day/night to drink is incredible. As development increases within our city, wildlife water sources are decreasing.



- None.
- Feeding wild birds.
- birds
- Teasing, yes. Also, if its a [removed] bear, don't feed it
- Bird feeders
- N/a
- No exception wild life should not be encouraged tt return to the city for It's for food it endangers people
- looking after nestlings
- Bird feeders
- If the animal is injured and they are helping it
- None, wildlife should not be fed, that is how it becomes domesticated and sometimes put down.
- Bird feeders in the winter time.
- Neighbours being bothered
- No exceptions.
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Rescue of wounded or abandoned(young) wildlife
- Bird feeders
- If there was wildlife that was injured or needed water before someone could get there to help.
- If the animal is injured or looks malnourished. It should be ok to feed them.
- There should be no exceptions. Why should it be ok to feed/tease wildlife only on private property? The same rules should apply to private and public property.
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeds
- Animal in distress
- Trap and release wild animals out of city limits
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- Birdfeeders
- Emergencies like fires, floods etc
- No teasing but feeding should be ok
- Bird feeders
- winter feeding of resident birds
- Wild Birds obviously
- Bird feeders, composting (can't control what will feed on it), etc.
- None
- bird feeders
- Birds should be exempt
- If it's a stray pet, feeding them would be necessary to rescue
- Bird feeders



- No exceptions, wildlife should be left alone regardless of what property they are on
- Squirrels are amazing leave them out of the by law
- An injured animal that needs help, food/water, etc. until a wildlife officer can attend.
- People would no longer be allowed to feed birds? And fined if a squirrel raids the bird feeder? What if a skunk is eating mice/bugs on private property? I think some more thought should go into this. And more space to type feedback...
- This is too vague of a question. If it's to the length of you can't have a bird feeder because you're feeding the wildlife, then we need to reevaluate
- Bird feeders on property as exception
- First offenders.
- Birds
- Teasing wild animals should not be allowed.
- feeding potentially dangerous animals such as bears, coyotes, etc
- Birds from bird feeders
- Feeding is ok, teasing is NOT!
- If the action is deemed detrimental to the wildlife
- Lots of people feed deer over the winter in their yards backing onto green spaces, the deer will eat bird feeders in that place. I think feeding deer is fine
- Endangered species
- Birds and squirrels are wildlife that people feed, and it is not uncommon for deer to eat the seed etc left for birds. Slippery slope. Feeding coyotes is a different story, and a big no.
- permit bird feeders
- dehydration, starvation or neglect (example, bare bones) or mother with her young, or use food/water just to calm animal until proper authorities arrive
- None
- None
- Birdfeeders and similar devices should be exceptions
- Feeding birds ok (bird feeders)
- Baiting for hunting purposes
- Having bird feeders for wild birds
- Feeding wild birds with wild bird seed, squirrels with peanuts.
- Birds
- Feeding birds and squirrels in private yards
- You need to elaborate on what you define as feed. Birds are "wildlife" and they feed on the berries of our trees on our property. While it might seem obvious, the wording you choose needs to be very specific on your wording.
- Bird feeders need to be approved on the bylaw.
- Feeding birds, chipmunks, squirrels, etc. is an educational experience
- None.



- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Fines to those harassing/teasing/feeding wild life
- I'm against teasing, but if it's a terrible winter, and the squirrels and birds are starving, why not have a feeder.
- bird feeders and baths should be acceptable
- Sick or injured animals may need a little extra help to get them back on their feet
- Feeding Birds and squirrels
- Birds
- Documented proof required. Warning/Education on first offence.
- None
- Maybe birds?
- Birds
- Fruit trees or other plant food sources should not be considered to be "feeding".
- Animal injury/safety concern
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Birds
- None
- People should still be allowed bird and squirrel feeders on their properties.
- Birds feeders, squirrel feeders.
- For hunting purposes
- Not really an exception, but it should be emphasized that anyone who sees an animal that is injured or sick contact Fish and Wildlife or another organization that can provide help and/or rehabilitation to the animal.
- Bird feeders.
- None
- Only for mammals not birds
- Private property should remain "private"
- Seriously? Who wrote this? Teasing animals AND feeding animals are two completely different things. One is cruel (teasing) one can be life-saving (feeding-depending on the circumstance and animal). This is ridiculous to put in same category. Rewrite.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding injured animals that would die otherwise
- Feeding a hurt or starving animal until it can be trapped and taken to a rehab center.
- Injured animals looking for compassion and help
- It's private property, owners rights.
- bird feeders, water
- I disagree because this could extend to birds and squirrels who, oftentimes, rely on the food they receive from homes in the winter.
- Wildlife that is hurt and the city refuses to help the. (I.e. magpies or hares)



- Allow some feeding.
- If the wildlife is owned and abused or neglected
- Giving food or water to Injured animals
- Bird feeders
- birdfeeders, hummingbird feeders, feeding to trap and relocate
- Education
- I'm against teasing wildlife (if I understand what is meant by teasing correctly), I also feel strongly that if feeding is done, it is done properly with food that animals are ok to eat.
- NONE.
- Mice and other pests can be fed for traps
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be ok
- Bird feeders
- I think feeding ducks is not that bad
- Birds (bird feeders), squirrels
- Education on dangers of habituation, fines
- Bird feeders, though I'm not sure about the ecological impact of birdfeeders and would suggest following the council of environmental scientists.
- Specific bird breeds (not nuisance birds like magpies, crows, etc.)
- Proper bird and squirrel feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Wildlife should not be bothered, even on private property.
- Guidance to what is appropriate behaviour in feeding birds etc. many people are unaware that their feeding of wildlife attracts unwanted wildlife or encourages an influx of animal that may be detrimental. Such as squirrels.
- Bird feeders should be allowed, even potentially squirrel feeders.
- Bird feeders
- Tell people to leave the wildlife alone
- Birds/squirrels
- Teasing is one thing, but feeding the squirrels and birds is perfectly fine. What a STUPID bylaw.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Nursing animals back that have found their way to your property. For example ducks. From experience I can say that ducklings taken to wild life rehab centers around the city basically tell you they'll be food for the birds of prey.
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Domestic rabbits that have bred with wild rabbits to produce hybrids should be exempt. These hybrid rabbits have little to no survival skills and animal lovers that look after them and provide food for them are really their only chance at survival
- If animal is starved



- Sick or problem animals
- Cruelty is obviously never to be tolerated.
- Heavy fines and bans for second offences
- private property is private, if people wanna feed bird/squirrel or whatever animal gets there, thats their choice, anything else is a constitutional assault to our rights
- Birds
- Work with the homeowner. Feeding/teasing is a general term. Does this apply to having bird feeders on your property where some food may be spilled. Having mice/voles/rabbits eat your garden? The City needs to clarify what this bylaw acutally entails
- If the animal is starving or in distress
- Bird feeders
- Abandoned babies, injured wildlife
- Bird feeders
- It's acreage (5 acres or more)
- Birds
- Birds
- Unless it's an injured animal and you're acting on the advice of trained and educated individuals.
- If an animal is injured, requires water, looking malnourished, needing help, etc.
- Wild birds
- Feeding is fine as long as animal is safe and not causing issues with with the public
- Fish should still be fed.
- Bylaw against teasing but not feeding.
- no exception for wildlife, they become dependent on this and then are often left for dead.
- Depends on whether you're trying to bait an animal into your property for the purposes of doing either. If wildlife is on my property I should have some leeway to shoo them away.
- birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- NO exceptions!
- injured animals in need of care
- Kids feeding ducks etc
- Make an exception for closed bird feeders.
- Animal is Injured in Which case qualified people can interact with the animal
- Bears
- Exceptions to wildlife sanctuary, birdfeeders etc
- Birds in the winter
- Bird feeders or similarly "proper" methods of feeding wildlife
- Birdfeeders
- stop trying to act like god
- It's private property- but out.



- I feel like bird feeders are harmless but I don't have any expertise in this area
- Wildlife/cattle should be respected.
- Feeding birds and deer
- if i want to feed squirrels and rabbits on my property i should be allowed to put out food for them. just no teasing wildlife
- None
- too draconian
- Feeding birds be exempt
- Seriously, how much wildlife actually comes into our private properties? This seems silly
- none
- None what so ever
- I think a bird feeder on private property is fine.
- Bird feeders?
- Birds.
- Teasing should be prohibited/ regulated based on definition of "teasing"; feeding is acceptable within reason, again maybe more specific definitions and regulations.
- Proper signage and awareness
- Bird feeders are ok
- [removed]
- If animal was injured/ emaciated & in need of immediate assistance.
- bird feeders
- Shouldnt be fined for protected wildlife that might need assistance on property (ie: cannot take measures to remove)
- bird feeders, bee hives
- Unless the animal is in danger
- Feeding birds seed
- Malnourished and ailing animals awaiting fish and wildlife
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- None all wild animals should be left alone.
- Birds and squirrels
- Leave them alone and make sure there is no trash.
- trapping, baiting, drugging wildlife for pleasure or profit
- Bird feeders
- None
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed. Of course there should be punishments for teasing
- none.
- None.



- bird feeders
- hummingbird feeders
- Birds should be the exception
- Birds
- How will it be enforced, half the bylaws aren't or they can't be bothered!
- There was no space to talk about point 3 so I'm going to do it here. Banning dogs based on their look is the most backward and insane thing to do. Pit bulls are one of the most friendly, sweet, loving, and caring breeds I've ever come across.
- None
- People should have the option to drive nuisance wildlife off their property. Squirrels and magpies, in particular, harass leashed pets and other wildlife -- trying to frighten them away should not count as teasing.
- Providing appropriate care for an injured animal
- Where ownership of an animal which could be regarded as w
- That's just dumb. Private Property is private
- Abuse of the animals
- birds squirrels
- Feeding allowed, but govern the types of food used
- More education to help us understand why it is not ok to feed animals. Community engagement such as at Prince's Island where we can learn about what is and is not ok when we interact or share space with the ducks and geese.
- feeding birds
- If you saved a bird or baby animal that was injured and you were giving it water
- Bird feeders because of loss of habitat for song birds.
- None
- Should be bylaw for harming wildlife.
- Allow feeding of birds, squirrels, and other small animals
- I want to be able to feed wild birds the wild bird feed and my squirrel sunflower seeds
- Fines
- Cruelty to wildlife anywhere should be prohibited
- Pests
- Bird feeders
- Bird/ squirrel feeders in yards
- educate the public on healthy feeding practices (which encourage wildlife to return)
- Small birds
- Catch and release shucks, coyotes, aggressive squirrels.
- Bird/squirrel feeders.
- Bird feeders
- bird/squirrel feeders



- If an animal is starving
- If the animal is causing a nuisance or is acting in a dangerous manor on your property
- no exceptions
- Feeding is fine, teasing is not.
- None
- Fines
- Not breed specific
- Trying to tame a wild cat
- None
- Exceptions should be made if the person is trying to catch the animal in order to get it help, for example if it is injured. Also, if there is a dedicated feeding area for feral cats involved in TNR programs. Birdfeeders in the winter to help birds.
- Bird feeders
- within the city - yes. except for bird feeders and by extension, squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Exception for bird feeders / proper bird feeding (appropriate throwable foods such as vegetables, fruit and seeds).
- This survey is bias and doesn't provide all options
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- None. There is zero excuse
- Feeding if there is an Injury, safety if near but road. Teasing is WRONG.
- Bird and squirrel feeding is allowed
- As long as the animals are not being lured to be harmed, then it should be fine
- Ducks/geese where food is provided
- Injured or in need animal
- The care and medical attention of injured wild animals.
- Exceptions should be made for feeding birds.
- Designated birds (ex geese) at certain parks
- If an animal seems like a lost pet, an exception for somebody who is trying to bring that pet in to find its family.
- Technically, feeding birds (e.g. Bluejays) would not be permitted in the bylaw even though it is encouraged to help protect the species. This provision can be confusing. Ensure you understand the problem you are trying to resolve with the bylaw.
- Feeding if animal is held on property due to being injured.
- Bird Feeders/Baths
- You can feed birds,squirrels, etc. you cannot torment wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, bee water
- Feeding only so they dont keep coming back



- injured animals inbetween calling for wildlife services
- Feeding a visibly injured animal for the purpose of gaining trust and trying to get it help through a wildlife rescue organization.
- Feeding birds
- Exemption for your own private property, such as bird and squirrel feeders. Let people do what they want on their own property
- None!
- Birds
- I can't have bird feeders now
- Bird feeders
- This questions depends on the definition of teasing. Homeowners should be allowed to use approved methods to deal with nuisance wildlife.
- Attempts to discourage wildlife from damaging property could be falsely interpreted as "teasing"
- None
- Bird feeders.
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be allowed but teasing and harming them should not be allowed.
- Birdfeeders
- Small birds and only in winder, when food is scarce
- Would this include bird feeders? What about giving a squirrel peanuts? I think you need to call out the intention and be more specific.
- Anything that might be considered a scavenger and could roam into your yard. If a deer wanders into my garden and eats a head of lettuce will I get a ticket? If a raccoon wanders into my back yard and eats a fish out of my pond?
- No exceptions!
- Having signage out about the wildlife found in city parks
- Leaving seed for wild birds should still be allowed. I don't agree with intentionally feeding squirrels/rodents, etc.
- Bird feeders/houses
- Responsible feeding- monitored by a sanctuary such as Inglewood bird sanctuary.
- The animal is injured
- No feeding of potentially dangerous wildlife or wildlife that may cause harm to people and pets
- Birdfeeders should be exempt (and obviously "pollinator gardens" if anyone is silly enough to think it would fall under this bylaw)
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- No shooting any wildlife should be added !!! Heavy fines for this.
- Squirrels and birds
- None
- letting them be



- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders would be allowed
- If appropriate feeders are available.
- Bird feeders
- None.
- Birds, deer
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird/squirrel feeders are fine.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Still allow Bird feeds
- birdfeeders or small animal feeders
- Needs a better definition of wildlife. Birds and squirrels are fine in private residences. But not larger animals.
- Birds/squirrel feeders would be ridiculous to fine!
- Luring them to do harm. Including coyotes.
- Bird feeders
- maybe don't feed squirrels and ducks, but bird feeders/bird baths should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- If someone owns their land it is of no business of the City to invoke rules of livestock on privately owned land. Stay in your jurisdiction.
- Only outlaw feeding
- none
- Private Property, is private property!
- What about nuisance animals? Skunks? Feeding birds? So no bird feeders?
- Animals are injured, provide food until can be taken to proper authorities
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions - unless there are extenuating circumstances.
- Bird feeders
- None, human should be fined for feeding or teasing the wildlife, it only puts the wildlife in danger and no humans ever pay the price.
- Birds such as pigeons
- Bird feeders
- I think people should still be able to feed birds and squirrels
- Other than large mammals not native to urban areas - ie. bears, bobcats, wolves, coyotes, etc.
- Bird feeders
- Cant get mad about feeding birds in feeders
- Ducks
- Ensure fish and wildlife is available to remove and help any sick or injured wildlife



- Exempt bird feeders
- If the animal looks sick or malnourished
- Farms? There are probably a couple of good ones.
- Birds
- Bird feeders and squirrels
- No exceptions - no bylaw needed
- Feeding bird seeds
- Bird feeders should be permitted
- Bird feeders
- The only exception I would say is if you grow plants that tend to attract wildlife to eat them. Eg milkweed attracts monarch butterflies, or foliage that deer might eat. Its somewhat of a passive way of feeding animals but anything more is too much.
- Abusing animals only should be fined
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, water baths
- Things like bird feeders as some species likely rely on these sources of food. However, no wildlife should be teased, even on private property.
- Feeding birds to be ok
- Bird boxes and squirrel feeding is okay, any any animal that would get tracked down and euthanized due to feeding it should be protected by this bylaw.
- Bird feeding in winter
- None
- no exceptions, people should get a hefty fine
- Bird feeders where acceptable
- A warning and information kit to explain why this is a problem.
- Bird feeders.
- Feeding small birds (bird seed from feeders)
- It would depend on the animal, an injured bird for example would someone get fined for nursing at back to health? Feeding a city coyote is completely different
- Unless the animal is found harmed and needs water or attention
- If the animal is harmed there should be a consequence
- Well maintained bird and squirrel feeders or the equivalent.
- It's more for younger people treat it as a crime
- Depending on the private property and the property owner. If there is a way to protect wildlife while working with property owners that would be the most beneficial.
- No teasing but feeding should be ok
- Bird feeding
- leave pitbuls, a breed you are punishing based off looks. out of this.
- None, it's my property I can do whatever I want



- rescue groups who are there to help wild/feral animals that need to be spayed/neutered and could potentially find a home.
- Concerned that this limits bird feeders which I don't agree with.
- Wild birds
- Exceptions given to bird and squirrel feeders
- No teasing, but feeding allowed
- Bird feeders
- None, however this shouldn't impact intervening in situations where an animal is injured/requires assistance.
- Exception of bird feeders
- create info booklet for private property owners regarding feeding/teasing wildlife
- bird feeders
- Putting up coin feeders with safe and acceptable food for the animals.
- Bird feeders and bird baths should be allowed. A Bylaw applicable to private property should be very specific as to what actions are defined as "teasing" and what types of wildlife are more detrimentally impacted by feeding by humans
- I think feeding squirrels and birds is fine but anything larger should probably be left alone
- Many people have bird feeders or squirrel feeders on their properties and there is no problem with that
- None
- Bird feeders and things like that seem fine to me. More to keep animals from coming into the city.
- No fine for feeding, but fine for teasing. Type of animal should also be considered. Example, bears, cougars should not be allowed to feed. But sure feed deer.
- The way this is worded it would include things like bird feeders.
- gardens that are being raided by wildlife (don't see this as feeding them)
- Teasing or feeding food that is harmful to the species.
- birds
- None
- Feeding/Luring for trapping wildlife for rehabilitation purposes
- Bird feeders
- Helping the wildlife? I feel like an expert can better answer this
- If people want to feed a bird that visits their property let them.
- Feral domesticated animals (cats, dogs) are fully exempt as they are not wildlife and may be rehabilitated.
- Slippery slope here...are you going to fine people with bird feeders?
- Birdfeeders, squirrel feeders
- Birdfeeders for wild birds who may rely on them to feed through the winter



- Dependent on the well-being of the animal. A nut for a squirrel or bread for a pigeon may be harmless, but leaving food for predators like foxes, or in rare cases a bear, can be extremely dangerous for both the animal and the offending person.
- Helping animals in need is they are injured or they aren't able to care for themselves because of age etc
- bird feeders
- If an animal is completely starving and emancipated find help or feed it
- Teasing there should be a bylaw however not feeding appropriate food.
- Hay for deer in winter
- Birds
- none
- n/a
- Nuisance animals
- If animals are injured and people fed them to keep help them
- Allow bird feeders.
- Unless the animals are in distress. Other than that leave them be and be charged. We are Imposing on the animals natural habitat.
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be allowed
- Leave birds out of it and deer feeders. Obviously can't feed bears ect.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders/squirrel feeders
- Are we going to get nit-picky, as in a bird-feeder is prohibited? Or is it just protect the wildlife from traps and death?
- 9
- No back yard breeding, no back yard dog rescues
- no exceptions
- Small birds (excluding pigeons).
- receptacles or means to feed wildlife that don't require direct engagement with wildlife (e.g. bird feeders)
- None
- Bird feeders
- I would allow bird feeders
- no exceptions
- Feeding birds
- Injured animals
- Children could be an exception. Maybe a class instead of fine about the dangers of feeding and teasing wildlife
- Rehabilitation of orphaned animals
- None



- I think bird feeders and the like are well meaning and not intended as nuisance. But if someone is leaving a bunch of food on their lawn for wildlife like deer, raccoons or skunks to get into then that should be fineable.
- That a property owner could request fines levied against an animal found to have been chasing/pestering wildlife on their property.
- The city needs to cull hares that are destroying our gardens.
- None. Don't feed wildlife.
- If the animal is injured and needs some food before help or recovery occurs
- Bird feeders
- I think people can feed whatever wildlife they want on their own property. Bird feeders, salt licks, etc.
- Nil
- it is PRIVATE property...
- Birdfeeders?
- None
- If filmed event of abuse to animals then a fine certainly. Hearsay is challengeable, video isn't.
- None. No feeding wildlife unless they're sacrificing themselves.
- Prohibiting teasing yes but not feeding
- Harsher penalties for interfering with wildlife
- Allowing feeding an injured animal until Wildlife officer can collect the animal to take for rehabilitation or disposal
- Not sure what the use case of this law would be but the city should not have more control over private property owners. I might support such a law if I knew the specific use case / incident that it was trying to prevent. If people have bird feeders thts k
- Birds exempt
- Birds
- Birds and squirrels should be exempt.
- Bird feeders on public property should still be allowed
- I think feeding on private property should not result in a fine. Mistreatment and abuse should result in a fine and possible arrest.
- make sure there are common sense exceptions
- Pests
- Basic common sense
- Birds etc.
- No feeding rabbits/Bunnies
- Birds
- Does this man no feeding the birds etc?
- Feeding birds
- None
- If it directly causes harm yo animal.



- Fines
- Feeding animals on private property, depending the animal.
- Prohibit teasing, but I for one enjoy watching squirrels dig into the nuts and seeds I put out for them.
- Unless the animal is starving to death or injured
- Birds
- Allow bird feeders
- Wild life should be respected from a distance. The more we interact with wildlife the more they become "friendly" with human population and because of human error they end up being destroyed because they are not afraid to come into populated areas.
- The animal is unable to care for itself or if they truly feel the animal has been abandoned by its mother.
- The city should start minding their own business when it comes to private property unless complaints are being made or lives are in danger
- Feeding wild song birds be permitted
- Bird feeders
- Injured animals
- BEARS OF COURSE SHOULD NOT BE FED IN THE CITY AT ALL - PEOPLE MOSTLY ONLY FEED THE SMALL WILDLIFE SO THEY CAN ENJOY THEM - RABBITS, SQUIRRELS, BIRDS ETC WHICH I HAVE NO OBJECTIONS TO - TO SOME PEOPLE THIS IS THEIR ONLY ENJOYMENT
- I would recommend to include that it is not wrong to leave small offerings of safe food (like bird seed) for small non-threatening creatures but to restrict any encouragement of predators being in residential areas
- Birds and squirrels should be the only exemption to feeding wildlife on private property.
- What do you mean by "teasing". This is an ambiguous statement. Bottom line, we should do nothing to encourage wildlife to seek out human interaction.
- Birds and small animals like squirrels
- Birds, rabbits, squirrels
- Property owners not responsible for the natural feeding of wildlife on their property i.e., deer eating from trees and bushes on property. Owners/tenants would be in violation if they put out food for wildlife.
- Let kids feed the ducks. Let me keep my bird feeders,
- None. Attracting wildlife can create dangers for other residents.
- Considering pit bulls a problem dog because of their potential for injury is pure ignorance.
- Private property should remain privately managed and overseen.
- babies that need help
- None
- Bird feeders and baths Acceptable.
- Bird feeders



- If an animal is in need and the person has contacted a wildlife rehab centre and been advised to act.
- Exception to squirrels
- None
- No exceptions
- No exceptions.
- Feeding of birds or animals in distress
- Bird feeders and hummingbird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- bird feeding
- If there is a licensed facility within the city limits, and they take in wildlife to rehabilitate, then the rule would not apply.
- Ban bird feeders from April through October ,
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders, rabbit feeders
- Bird feeders for small song birds
- none
- Rehabilitation of wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Allow bird feeders
- None
- bird-feeders
- None
- Feeding Birds
- Exceptions bird feeders
- Ok with feeding if an animal is injured but not ok to harm or domesticate wild animals
- bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders, feeding appropriate seeds
- Bird feeders and humming bird feeders allowed :)
- People who feed birds using feeders, food left out for homeless animals. Nuts for squirrels.
- song birds
- Feeding should be allowed but not teasing or hurting of animals in any way. Kids parents should be fined if they treat animals poorly.
- Leave animals alone on private property and those that do not wish to be provoked.
- Bird feeders
- If something is starving and not leaving...feed it



- Too broad in general - birds are wild life, what constitutes 'teasing', what if I leave food out for one purpose and wildlife eats it?
- Bird feeders
- Feeding of Birds
- Bird feeders should be okay.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- If people are feeding them, big deal. No one should be teasing animals. Don't micro manage this to death
- Birds
- Does shoo'ing pest animals off your property count as teasing?
- Hares, birds, squirrels
- Injured wildlife that is waiting to be picked up by a wildlife rehabilitation facility
- Bird seed
- Bird and squirrel feeders in winter
- Bird feeders should be an exceptio
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Birdfeeders
- If a wildlife is injured and needs tending to immediately before calling wildlife officers
- Birds and squirrels
- NA
- Don't feed other citizens pets as the pet may not return home.
- Bird Feeders
- Prohibit teasing on private property but feeding needs to be allowed. Unless this doesn't involve feeding of birds. We should be able to feed birds especially in our harsh winters.
- Bird seed
- Young babies abandoned that are in need of assistance in order to survive.
- If wildlife is found injured on personal property, efforts to help may include food and water
- I don't believe there should be any exceptions.
- 'Wildlife' is a pretty broad term. Does it include strays, birds, squirrels, deer, etc? I am wholly against feeding but definitely against teasing.
- Birds to be excluded
- Bylaw against teasing but not feeding.
- Starving wildlife
- bird/bee feeders,
- Bird feeders
- Private Property or not teasing of any kind should be punishable. I am on the fence with bird feeders... Provided they are appropriate goods and not attractants to other wildlife i.e. bears
- Would this include bird and squirrel feeders.



- None
- Bird feeders at private residences and feeding feral or stray cats and dogs in need of food.
- Allow humane trapping on private property and increase funding for fish and game to assist in these manners
- An animal suffering & in need, while the home owners wait for city officials/animal control.
- When wildlife gets into a yard and into garbage/gardens on their own
- emergency situations for feeding.. drought or fires
- Feral cats to me don't count as wildlife.
- The animal is starving and in need of help
- A fine for endangering wildlife
- Small birds
- Animal in distress
- Min-fomedicated wildlife.
- None! Call game and wildlife
- Fines
- High fines
- Teasing/harming is unacceptable, but feeding birds contributes to nature appreciation
- I buy bird seed. Quit controlling everything!!
- No
- Birds and squirrels
- Injured animals / birds
- A fine
- maybe only on specific types of wildlife that would be pests or could harm others if they get used to people feeding them.
- wild birds being fed appropriate seeds and roughage in a way that does not interfere with their natural activities or behaviors.
- Trapping wildlife for monetary gain should be prohibited.
- N/a
- If the wildlife was wounded or struggling to survive someone may want to give it some food before rescuers can get there to help.
- Feeding coyotes
- Not sure. Don't know enough to suggest
- I'm worried this would include bird feeders or feeding squirrels. Not sure what the definition of teasing is so I cannot just blindly say yes.
- This is unnecessary, and the previous question is a push poll and my answer is neither (bad survey writing by the way, shame on you)).
- Birds and squirrels
- Birds and squirrels ok
- Definition of teasing



- If wildlife naturally takes up residence on a property and cannot be safely relocated, there should be no fines to property owners
- can feed ducks- good luck enforcing a bylaw on private property
- To have tougher laws against cruelty to animals.
- Feeding birds
- Hardline rule, don't feed wildlife!
- None and please include the feral rabbit population which are overrunning some neighbourhoods.
- It would depend on what kind of wildlife is being fed- birds? Racoons? To put a blanket no feeding wildlife is to large a restriction
- It is ridiculous to not allow homeowners to feed seeds and suet and hummingbird nectar to birds in order to help them survive... would be better to prohibit homeowners from leaving garbage cans and compost heaps in unlocked or unsecured area, since the
- Harassing wildlife in any matter should be illegal
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- No one would be allowed birdfeeders, if this was true, and I saved a bee last week that was exhausted by feeding it sugar water. These should not be punishable. Yes feeding bears and coyotes, not good having seeds in my yard should be ok.
- bird feeders
- Injured wildlife that is being taken care of temporarily until wildlife rescue takes over
- Instead of saying all wildlife, break it down to being specific. Birds are wildlife and many enjoy feeding them.
- Feeding small birds with feeders, providing bird houses, caring for an injured wild animal.
- All for laws against teasing but I still want my bird feeder, maybe even squirrel feeder.
- Bird feeders (seed feeders / suet feeders / hummingbird feeders should be exempt
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders.
- feeding birds in winter, and hummingbirds in summer
- Bird feeders of all kinds.
- Private property
- If the wild animal is a pest or a danger to those on the property it may be an exception to allow feeding the animal if the intent is to trap and relocate the animal
- Amendment that ensures "inadvertent" feeding, is squirrels getting into bird feeder.
- Bird feeders / squirrel feeders
- We don't need the government sticking their nose in our business on our property only exception to this should be if someone is harming a animal
- Both, no feeding as it gives a new dependency to wildlife and attracts more. And teasing is needed because it can stress an animal unnecessarily and trigger them
- Birds



- Support feeding animals from a distance where no human contact is encouraged (ie. the property owner putting bird feeders in trees, or the property owner leaving vegetables on their lawn for rabbits). Under no circumstances should there be teasing/baiting
- Fines if caught feeding wild animals
- Bird feeders
- An option for a trained professional to come to relocate a wild animal rather than having an animal left on a private property and becoming a nuisance.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding interim only if life dependant until Wildlife Control can retrieve the animal.
- If it was in fact to help the animal.
- I believe in not teasing but you would want to feed wildlife if you had a bird feeder.
- If someone were to find an injured animal that needed help, or an abandoned baby, for example, they should be allowed to help it (including feeding, providing water, etc.) until they are able to get it to an appropriate organization.
- You can feed wildlife on private property as long as you get the okay from the owners of the animal.
- Do not let people feed wildlife. If they do, it should be fined.
- except feeding on your own private property.
- Hummingbird/bee feeders
- If the animal is in danger or tied of abandoned / left to starve etc
- Birds
- No poisoning or feeding them to draw them in to hunt
- Stray cats and dogs, injured wildlife (rehabilitation purposes)
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders are Ok - songbirds, etc.
- When wildlife isn't expected on a property a warning should be advised for new information is now available
- Torture of animals
- An animal is struggling / injured and needs the help
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be allowed
- birds
- Wild animals are wild for a reason, leave them alone!
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, if there's a drought or something- I don't know.
- Unless the wildlife is injured and the person involved has been granted approval to feed the animal by the Alberta Institute for Wildlife Conservation.
- Batting problem animals for trapping



- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Injured animals
- bird seed feeders and hummingbird feeders should still be allowed.
- Sick or Injured care until proper services can pick up the animal
- Feeding non prey animals being ok
- Allowing the feeding of smaller animals such as birds, squirrels, ducks
- Bird feeders
- None
- None
- None
- I can't believe this is even a consideration. What about seed type bird feeders?
- If an animal was starving and the residents took the animal to emergency.
- Wildlife in distress might need to be fed and/or captured to help.
- Helping an injured animal
- Same as in City Parks
- Only fine when the actions of a individual are harmful towards the wildlife
- Feeding birds with a proper feeder
- Feeding song birds.
- If permission was asked to the owner
- Fine the people doing so because if the wild animal harms the human, they pay the price, not the human. We already inhabit the animal so territory and then blame them when humans put them in danger.
- In extreme winters maybe a designated area outside city limits for feeding stations that will keep wildlife out, but help keep them happy and healthy during extreme weather
- Fines
- Nuisance wildlife, such as magpies.
- Bird feeders
- Squirrel land hummingbird feeders, temporary care and transport of injured wildlife to rescue org.
- I would suggest an exception for bird and squirrel feeders. Those are beneficial for wildlife.
- Exceptions of trying to get them off property.
- N/a
- Bird feeding
- Birds exempt
- If someone is feeding stray animals who come to their property that is okay.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders, bee feeders
- please expand?



- Fines
- Bird feeders
- Birds can be considered wildlife... that would be an exception
- Bird feeders
- does this include bird feeders, and or hummingbird feeders??? Too broad ... what about farmers that leave out hay in their fields on a bad winter for wildlife - not thought out well at all
- No feeding skunks
- Bird feeders should still be aloud as well as pest removal
- There should be exceptions for feeding injured wildlife who may have found a safe haven on private property temporarily.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Animals accessing bird feeders etc - no penalty
- More traps for squirrels and magpies. Allow residents to trap, release or dispose of them.
- If the wildlife is harassing the private property owners example ravens and crows attacking people and domestic animals in their own back yard.
- Birds
- Injured wildlife being cared for until transfer to facility is possible
- Unless it's playing around with animal
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- Na
- Non-violently stopping it from eating plants or nesting.
- Just let the animals be
- Bird feeders should absolutely be allowed. They are a critical point of engagement with the natural world for many people and a significant source of mental well-being for house bound people
- Starving animals while waiting for wildlife protection services
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions
- If animal presents a direct danger to wellbeing of the people of Calgary
- Nursing an injured animal back to health.
- Appropriate feeding should be allowed (such as salt licks, wild bird feed)
- Unsure
- There is nothing wrong with feeding birds. But I would support no teasing.
- Bird feeders be exempt. If wildlife other than birds are feeding from the feeders, clearly this is out of the property owners control and should be exempted. Providing food and water to injured wildlife found on private property should also be exempt.
- EDUCATION. Educate people on what is acceptable to feed them and what isn't.
- Injured and trying to rehabilitate or waiting for help to rehabilitate



- animals in distress that require intervention and must wait for rescue or wildlife officers to arrive on scene
- Bird feeders, etc
- bird feed
- N/A
- Na
- How about create programs within the school and teach kids respect and what the consequences are when you tease an animal. Whether it's wild or domestic. An animal is still an animal.
- Bird feeders should be exempt.
- Feeding birds
- Injured or abandoned young animals, I don't think there's any harm in trying to help them without removing them from their home.
- Educate people on what to do should they have wildlife on their private property
- More of a problem with teasing wildlife, don't see a problem with things like bird feeders and nuts for squirrels and the like.
- Education of those enforcing, not all contact (with a coyote for example) is wanted- they can and do stalk and run off repeatedly which could look to the untrained eye like "teasing".
- Bird feeders
- Exception being if they're a wildlife rehabilitation home
- None
- Educating the public against feeding squirrels and pigeons with pamphlets, etc to help teach and understand the problems this causes.
- Ducks pigeons
- Injured wildlife with support of organizations such as Calgary Wildlife Rehab
- The problem is dog owners, not the animals. Forcing certain breeds to be limited or wear a muzzle doesn't make sense to me, because they were taught that behaviour so must of them are good dogs and docile.
- Well if your feeding the ducks it's ok but not feeding them bad food
- None
- birds
- I would agree with a bylaw that prohibits teasing wildlife. I think bird feeders are totally okay. I also think that with feeding you get into dangerous territory about people having gardens and fruit bushes/trees and eating/crumbs in their own backyard.
- If the animal looks in distress and animal control has been notified - give the distress animal food/water until support arrives.
- Private land, is PRIVATE land
- If they are being fed the correct food.
- Birds



- Would this mean that people can't have bird feeders in their yards? Because that seems ridiculous and difficult to police.
- Items like bird feeders should be exempt
- If it's on private property due to encouragement of food, property owner gets fine
- Self defence
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders
- Fines and potential charges for repeat offenders
- None! It's ridiculous how bad it is with people feeding wild birds etc.
- Bird feeders
- Allow bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- None
- Stray domesticated animals
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders would be a reasonable exception
- If the animal was injured and needed food or water before help arrived.
- Keep the city out of people's business on their property
- Mice
- Feeding injured animals
- no suggestions
- I cannot think of any exceptions that should be allowed.
- Birds
- NO exceptions , we should not make wildlife dependant on food from us .
- bird/squirrel feeders
- None
- None leave wildlife alone
- Rescue groups that are trying to assist the wildlife should be exempt
- That's people don't get fined for filming or taking photos of the injustice some of these animals face especially farm animals
- Ducks, birds
- No exceptions.
- bird feeders
- Making them leave.
- None, unless there is an animal in need
- Animal abuse
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and baths
- Rescuing an animal (injured, young, lost)



- Don't be stupid.
- Birds
- none
- Caring for injured wildlife
- Bird feeders & bird baths are exempt
- If a home is nursing wildlife back to health after injury
- It should depend on the wildlife. I say birds are fine, but feeding coyotes would be something else.
- So if someone is feeding a bobcat than yes a fine would be good but if someone if feeding a bird or a squire nope... The problem with a bylaw like this is it will end up with some neighbor bitching about a bird feeder and getting a stupid fine
- Injured or orphaned young until rehabilitation is available
- Nursing an Injured animal or abandoned baby until fish and game or someone showed up to take it
- This is unnecessary and would result in unwarranted tickets for people feeding animals (be that birds, squirrels, or any other animal that splits crowds)
- None
- Bird feeders should remain.
- no exceptions
- None. Sometimes you'll find an injured animal that needs help. As for teasing, you could have a fine or charges if people are attempting to abuse the animal in question. Also, what do you define as "teasing" ?
- Don't over regulate things. I think most people use common sense. Animals should never be harmed or teased. As for feeding animals what about bird feeders.
- If the animal is a carnivore (bear or wolf etc.) then you can take action.
- Birdfeeders
- Birds
- Birds
- Feeding birds
- If reported to bylaw, a flat fee would be charged. Make it high - say \$100 to dissuade further fractions.
- If wildlife is injured on private property
- bird feeders
- Should be allowed to feed strays on your property
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Hanging bird feeders
- No exceptions
- feeding vegetables to deer, other safe foods to other animals, bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Do not permit the abuse of any animal private or public property. If you have an average and you feed bears you are risking life and limb if the human AND the bear!



- Bird feeders
- Absolutely none Wildlife is Wildlife
- Hummingbird feeders, bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders, and similar devices
- None.. also increase fines for bear attractants such as garbage out to early
- Birds
- Bird feeders etc
- Bird seed in bird feeders should be accepted.
- If they are feeding out of your garden naturally
- Bird seed, for birds
- If animals look like they are starving
- Wild animals showing too much comfort with people should be trapped and moved out of the city
- Birds chipmunks and squirrels should be aloud as well as geese or any ducks.
- Fines. It increases wildlife in the communities and small animals or children become more at risk
- There are thousands of bylaws for home owners, leave home owners alone. If you buy a property it's your property!
- Feeding birds bird seed
- Feeding birds which will include squirrels. Never feed predators ie, Cougars, lynx, skunks
- Would this include bird feeders? Although not a fan of them, many birds have been accustomed to feeders to help them thru our winters.
- Birdfeeders and birdbaths
- Unless in distress or endangered
- No exceptions for feeding unless you are a registered rehab and no exceptions at all for teasing.
- if a deer or such comes in and eats out of your bird feeder
- Birds
- Bird feeders and helping sick/injured animals.
- Allow to feed just no teasing
- Bird feeders
- Nuisance wildlife.
- None
- Bird feeders squirrel feeders
- If there is a food shortage for a specific animal
- Birdfeeders
- Would this count for birds and squirrels?
- depends on what you count as feeding.
- Small birds
- Feeding of birds in the back yard would be acceptable



- But how will you monitor and enforce that? relying on neighbours snitching doesn't seem like the best way
- Bird feeders or approved methods to deter nuisance wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Let people be free to make their own decisions.
- Do not feed animals that can be dangerous to public health.
- Specifically teasing should be restricted.
- None
- Small birds and squirrels
- Abandoned young; injured wildlife
- Birds and squirrels should be allowed to be fed
- Feeding bird?
- N/a
- None
- Exemption for responsible feeding of orphaned or injured wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- N/a
- No exceptions
- Helping injured wildlife
- If the property owner has a posted visible sign allowing animal interactions
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Injured animals
- Teasing
- No consequence for first infraction
- If an animal is clearly malnourished and in need of help
- Feeding birds should be an exception
- Bird feeders and fruit trees
- Feeding birds/squirrels is not a problem - teasing wildlife sounds awful! No teasing anywhere, private or public!
- Feeding birds and any wildlife that are starving such as during a bad winter.
- Birds
- Feeding birds (squirrels)
- Bird feeders are ok.
- Animals that come to feed on gardens is hard to control and bird feeders
- Rehoming or rescue...if the animal is injured or seperated too young, old...humane circumstances
- No teasing or mistreating. Farmers back home would feed wildlife when the snow got so deep they couldn't eat. If farmers didn't do this the deer, elk and moose would starve.
- If the animal is injured; water may be provided until animal welfare arrives to arrange transport



- Prohibiting what people are allowed to do on their own private property is just one step closer to a communist society... Don't do it
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- None
- If an animal was hurt and/or orphaned, and somebody cared for it until the proper authorities arrived to assess the animal.
- I understand not feeling/teasing actually wild animals (I.E. deers, bears, ect)on private property but not if that animal is a domesticated breed.. a feral cat still deserves to eat
- Birds
- None - this prohibits natural animal feeding and they become dependent on humans.
- Bird feeders, animal in need
- birds, squirrels, chipmunks
- bird feeders
- Ducks
- Abandoned young
- Bird, squirrel and rabbit feeders
- Bird feeders for seed/suet
- No exceptions. Some may have allergies that people don't know about.
- A dog will naturally chase an animal from its property, it is doing its job as a protector, a dog chasing wildlife on their own property should not be subject to penalty.
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- .
- Birds
- Wounded or injured animals. Young abandoned animals.
- Feeding sick or injured animals
- Nuisance Wildlife
- Caring for an injured animal while waiting for help.
- removing nuisance wildlife
- I feed the birds. I guess I'm teasing the magpies who desperately try to cling to the feeder. BTW, my answer to #1 is none of the above.
- Injured animals not able to care for themselves
- None
- Rescues should be allowed
- None
- None
- Bird feeders
- No animals, domestic or wild, should be teased on any property. And no one other than the owners or owner approved individuals, should feed domestic animals



- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- Injured wildlife. Wildlife you are trying to capture for either transport to veterinary facility or rehabilitation centre.
- Bird feeders
- Bird/ squirrel feeders
- For feeding if it is in the case to lure animal for rehabilitation/relocation
- Physical harm
- No exceptions. It would be no different than how Hawaii protects their wildlife. It's just apart of the culture there to not feed or go near wildlife
- None
- There should be no exceptions to feeding/teasing wildlife. We have to learn to share their environment, and requiring them to be as 'wild' as they can be in an urban environment is part of that co-existence.
- Injured animal.
- Animals that are ill, injured or showing signs of starvation or dehydration
- No to prohibiting feeding on private property
- None
- when engaged in the initial act of rescuing Wildlife
- Registered rescues and rehab centers
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, feral cat feeders, any feeder made to help wildlife that doesn't involve feeding by hand. Also rules for helping injured animals based on educating the public
- Orphaned wildlife awaiting pickup from rehab facility.
- The government already has their hands deep enough in our personal lives
- None, nobody takes this seriously.
- Bird feeders
- That means people won't be able to feed the birds with bird feeders or hummingbirds with sugar water. So be very clear about what you are actually putting forth and the wording
- N/A
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Squirrels, birds,
- Caring for injured animals
- Education of the public
- Education, feeding birds from a bird feeder ok, feeding from hand not ok
- No exceptions. Wildlife should be protected and respected so they and we are safe.
- Exceptions would be bird feeders
- Birds/ducks/rabbits



- Bird feeders ok
- Birds
- Bird feeders, live trapping of nuisance animals
- Bird feeders
- Hurting wildlife
- Bird feeders should be the only exception and should be hung high enough not to allow other animals to feed
- Bird feeders
- bad winters when food is limited
- Bird feeders, they rely on them in winter.
- Feeding wildlife places the wildlife in danger of becoming habituated to humans. Bears, coyotes, deer, moose, etc relying on humans for food is a dangerous consequence for both animals and people. Bird/squirrels feeders may be considered an exception.
- Bird feeders
- If wildlife is in need of help and there are no sources to help it currently available. There are many who feed squirrels, chipmunks etc and I do not believe it should be an offense to do so.
- Ensure feed is acceptable for wildlife (e.g. no bread) being fed and wildlife cannot be fed by hand
- Exemptions for feeding injured wildlife in need of care
- Caring for an injured wildlife by feeding if necessary for life
- Putting out bird seed or nuts for squirrels is harmless. Teasing or luring animals onto private property is not ok
- Exceptions should be made for humane removal of wildlife from private property by pest control staff or by wildlife rehabilitation staff.
- I do not agree with feeding wildlife but the city can step off, people can do what they want on their property
- Animals needing to be fed that clearly need support
- Feeding needs to be narrowed down to specific creatures, such as bears, coyotes, etc. Small animals such as squirrels or birds should be exempt.
- Bird feeders and other appropriate healthy food for local wildlife
- Designated bird feeders, nectar feeders, bee hotels, and other similar structures meant to provide habitat or proper feeding to wildlife.
- Bats, birds, dragon flies, frogs all for healthy mosquito habitat control
- Injured wildlife
- If they are trying to get wildlife to come to them to get help, I.e injured or pregnant
- Bird feeders, water troughs
- If they are feeding them to then hunt them there should be a fine
- injured wildlife on private property that may require assistance
- Orphaned babies
- None



- Trapping pests on property (ie: ground squirrels, gophers)
- Fine people who feed bears , or shoot them just like you guys shoot bears for eating food
- Children exempt, provide education
- Attempts to remove wildlife from the property if they are in danger or causingg damage
- Birds, hummingbird feeders
- Na
- None
- Birds & Squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders, salt licks, anything that is not intended to abuse the animals
- Bird feeders
- People need to stop being dumb.
- None, don't feed animals unless you plan on doing it for life.
- I think there's a huge difference between feeding the wild birds luring wild horses onto your property in order to capture and sell.
- Wild life needs to eat also ...and if your gonna make dogs wear a muzzle due to breed you need to recheck dogs in general as pits are one of the most loving dogs ever ..
- The property owner allows it
- A fine for feeding geese and ducks. Destroying or cutting down bird nests. Making hunting certain species such as bears and moose prohibited.
- Not sure
- I would support not teasing wildlife but not a bylaw against feeding especially if they are in need of care
- Bird feeders
- The animal is in danger/a inhumain situation
- Birds
- This doesn't make sense. Are people not going to be allowed to have bird feeders anymore?? Just stop.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding if it is too keep an orphaned animal until appropriate agency is contacted.
- Any injured wildlife
- Birds squirrels
- Exception for some sort of business that is already into care of exotic or domestic animals
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeding
- When required to maintain life.
- Ducks,geese
- Bird feeders



- [removed]
- pigeons in parks
- Don't discriminate against bully breeds. Sanction the owners of dogs. Not the dogs.
- Except bird feeders
- If an animal looks destitute and needs food asap.
- Good Samaritan's feeding stray dogs and feral cats
- Bird Feeders
- People couldn't feed birds? Squirrels? Feeding seems to support wildlife. Cruelty should follow under cruelty laws.
- Bird feeders
- Except for small animals that are not harmful to humans.
- Bird feeders that are high up so other animals can't get at them
- The animal is ill and needs help and no professionals are able to help
- Bird feeders are perfectly acceptable
- Better wildlife protection
- Squirrels & birds.
- Bird & Honey bee feeders
- this bylaw seems to want to stop a bird feeder? Many senior citizens get a lot of enjoyment from their bird feeders and bird baths.
- That birds feeders should be allowed, but other than that, no exceptions.
- Ducks, rabbits.
- Including bird feeder, educate kids, elderly and immigrants about the importance to keep wildlife wild.
- Exception for things like Bird feeders
- None
- Rare/endangered species or injured animals
- Trying to help/protect them
- Just no teasing
- No to teasing. Feeding is fine.
- None - it's disgusting to treat any living thing this way. Anyone doing so should be punished.
- Bird feeders
- Folks trying to get animals to leave their property in a reasonable manner.
- Bird feeders and squirrel food are completely harmless, or feeding ducks (properly not just bread) is also harmless as stopping these suddenly could hurt populations if they do regularly come back for feeding and it's no longer legal
- None, people should not feed or tease wildlife regardless of public or private property.
- None
- Bird feeders, bird houses, temporary care for animals while wildlife rehabilitators are on they way to pick up



- Private property is private. Wildlife education could be promoted more.
- Birds, squirrels, small animals that may rely on feeders
- Same as in public property
- Unless its wild birds, no feeding should happen and teasing is a bid no. Its stressful for the animal and can lead to dangerous side effects.
- Birds, squirrels and regular backyard visitors as well as allowed when trying to catch and help an injured animal.
- Feeding birds should be allowed.
- Feeding birds
- People trying to help injured or abandoned animals.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Attending to a wounded animal
- i do not agree with teasing wildlife, but I don't see an issue with feeding them, I throw carrots for the rabbits on my property, and i will continue to do so in the winter
- Birdfeeders
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders on private property
- Bylaw or fines against killing or torching animals
- Teasing, yes. Feeding, no. If the feeding is not excessive and promotes natural behaviors for the animals in question.
- No exceptions to feeding wildlife
- Bird, bee and squirrel feeding
- Large private properties
- Apex predators. Feeding birds or squirrels is one thing; leaving steak for a bobcat/cougar/bear is another.
- Fine
- Birds and squirrels
- None
- Fine if this rule is not followed
- Rural like property
- Bird feeders, bat houses or bee houses
- Unless the city is willing to deal with nuisance animals this would be impossible yo.x
- Bird feeders
- Don't know what teasing is in this case, but feeding where it creates a nuisance to neighbours .
- Injured/rehabilitation
- Responsible care - we have fed wild animals for years.....as a large city, we have caused the nuisance of wild animals by moving in on their territory. I feel we should at least try to relocate them instead. We have a Wildlife rescue centre.



- Seasonal bird feeders
- Responsible bird feeders
- 'Teasing' needs to be defined. Do you mean abuse, hurt or harm in any way? What about mouse traps/ poison, wasp or ant nest killer sprays etc? What about bird feeders?
- I don't like any regulation on feeding.
- if the animal is in distress
- Hurt or injured animals
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and bat boxes should be allowed
- Bird feeders and attracting polinators, traps with food, gardens that accidentally feed...
- Birds
- Bird feeders. Bat houses.
- Birds
- Any animal abuse: all animals must be protected
- There is no excuse to tease any animal
- Bird feeders
- Rescue/refuge
- Teasing should never happen, feeding should be discouraged with education regarding why
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Feeding birds and trading wildlife are two completely different things but the question is far too vague for a simple yes or no answer.
- Providing aid to injured animal
- Birds
- None. Applies to ALL animals including birds & squirrels (rats with tails).
- Except residential bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds and by extension squirrels. "Feeding" nuisance bugs for the sake of trapping/killing them for gardening purposes.
- Bird feeders
- Teasing & feeding shouldn't be lumped together, they should be addressed separately. In general, bird feeders should be an overall exception.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding wid birds.
- Bird feeders with bird seed, these are important to hummingbird survival in the winter. Or bird baths with sugar water
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Typical loaded question feeding and teasing have nothing to do with each other. Feeding birds prohibition -you must be jokingo



- A very LARGE fine/jail time
- Feeding of birds exempt
- Birds
- none
- Single, small bird feeder
- Shooting or killing wildlife on private property
- None we should not be feeding wildlife - unless they are eating planted fruits/gardens on their own
- Injured animals
- Feeding squirrels should be allowed. Other animals should not. Feeding fox, coyote, deer poses risks to them and us.
- None
- Birds
- If the animal looked undernourished
- If it is private property - it is private
- If it is a matter of safety. I.e. luring an animal with food to keep the animal away from vulnerable people.
- Orphaned or injured animals that need treatment.
- Birds.
- None, chasing, feeding or teasing wildlife should be included
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Birds. NOT squirrels
- Backyard bird , squirrel feeders not be put in the feeding part if the by law
- Feeding and teasing are two different issues. Many wildlife species need winter feeding to survive. Teasing is never okay.
- Bird feeders must be exempt
- I believe feeding wildlife is not a problem its just helping them, but teasing is the major concern weather its on private/public property.
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Birds
- I wouldn't support feeding carnivores.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Children
- None



- I'm all for feeding birds but I don't like the sound of 'teasing' one bit.
- Teasing wildlife, gross, euthanize the offender. Bird feeders, I don't have a problem with that, feeding stray animals sure but call tnr program and alert them to the situation
- No exceptions.
- Pests such as skunks should be exempt
- If an animal is found in distress and requires water/food until help arrives
- Above ground bird feeders, no lower than 4ft above the ground.
- None
- Injured or sick animals that require care
- Bird feeders, humming bird feeders are allowed to remain.
- Feeding birds would be difficult to enforce, should be exempt. Not sure if this is part of the current phrasing or not.
- Birds, squirrels, bunnies
- None. Habituation is terrible for the animal and humans. No exceptions
- I'd say bird feeders should be allowed
- People still need to be able to feed birds
- Its not specifically
- Depends on what type of wildlife because lots of people create food supplies and homes for birds and bees. But feeding wild rabbits, deer, moose, coyotes, skunks for example should not be done at least within city limits because it creates more problems.
- birds
- Uncontrolled animals
- Bird feeders
- Explain what is meant by "teasing wildlife"
- None
- bird feeding
- I don't think any wildlife animals should be fed other than bird feeders with bird seed
- None
- Maybe some bird feeders
- Unsure of what is meant by "teasing. I would hope that no recourse would be made if residents were protecting their family, pets, property, etc, and at times it may be necessary to lure wildlife away instead of taking more drastic measures of harm or kill
- Fine for teasing, feeding potential allowed depending on circumstance (animal is injured, etc). 311 should first be called for guidance.
- None. Wild animals are perfectly capable of surviving without our help and frankly, will survive much better without it.
- Bird seed, squirrel feeders
- No feeding animals considered pests such as rabbits and squirrels
- No leaving food or anything appealing out in yards for wildlife to eat



- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders on private property
- An injured bird
- Birdfeeders on private property
- No exceptions, it harms wildlife
- Bird feeding
- Believe teasing wildlife should always be against the bylaws. Feeding wildlife outside of the likes of coyotes should be ok
- No exceptions.
- Luring an animal with food for rescue
- Birds and squirrels
- Willfully feeding animals that are causing damage to adjacent properties.
- Luring them to remove to safety.
- Allow feeding of wild birds. Allow owners to humanely scare nuisance wildlife away
- Black squirrels, which are an invasive species, could be lured, trapped and euthanized.
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be excluded
- Legislate against wild birds... if you can.
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Private property is private. None of your business Calgary. PFO!!!
- no
- I see nothing wrong with a bird or Squirrel feeder.
- I'm not against feeding certain wildlife during difficult times (deer and especially during the winter). If the city would provide feeding/salt block places away from residential areas it might help keep the deer and other populations away as well.
- Bird feeders
- Squirrel feeding bird feeders etc
- Responsible people feed animals appropriately on their property. It's the jerks that put razor blades in hotdogs Rast you need to worry aboy.
- Im on the fence with this I believe that large wildlife species (wolf, coyote, deer etc) can become reliant on human provided food and can pose danger to human and animal alike therefore better education is needed. Small wildlife doesnt pose a threat
- I'd like to see education about how feeding ducks and geese bread leads to their starvation posted in Prince's Island and Bowness Park.
- I feel teasing is not ok, but feeding birds, squirrels and other misc critters isn't harmful overall, considering they naturally eat plenty of typical garden foods anyways.



- Bird feeders are okay
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Bird feeders would be an exception
- Only exception would be if wildlife were in trouble then interacting to help save their life would be acceptable.
- Allowed to feed ducks as this is a special moment for everyone
- If I want to put bird feed out in my yard I should be able to. The city should have no right to take mine away
- Wildlife eating gardens or any other not purposeful feeding, bird feeders.
- Nothing, stay out people back yards
- none
- Feeding large or predatory wildlife should be banned. Squirrels and birds not.
- None
- Birds
- Private property is none of the city's business
- Bird feeders.
- None
- Na
- None
- squirrel and bird feeders
- Bird feeding
- None
- The person feeding the wildlife was instructed to do so by a wildlife officer/veterinarian
- Bird feeders
- Teasing should be delt with but feeding birds should not be restricted
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions
- Please do not use this kind of on-random design. It is not representative and will be heavily biased toward those with a vested personal interest.
- Birds should be exempt.
- Bird feeders and animals that are not deliberately fed but gain access to a property and eat plants etc.
- No exceptions.
- Bird feeder should be allowed.
- Birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- People are idiots, if they feed wildlife privately and it causes problems, make the idiots pay to have now ruined wild animal transported and cared for on a wildlife preserve!!!
- Birds with bird seed



- Backyard bird feeders, using food bait to humanely trap animals.
- Allowing wild bird feeding in winter
- teasing - ABSOLUTELY! What is private property? I know of Calgary Parks where deer live, and people bring oats and such during the winter. THAT - I am in agreement with. Same for the bunnies that live in some areas.
- Bird feeders/animal feeders where the human does not interact with the animal.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- None
- Birdfeeders.
- Water
- Birdfeeders should be excepted from the rule.
- None
- Animal abuse
- bird feeders
- Any dog can bite. It is the owner of these dogs that are responsible for bad behaviour. Quit being breed specific. It's like gun laws, guns & responsible gun owners are not th problem.
- None they are wildlife!
- Would this include bird feeders?
- bird feeders
- Don't feed them because they may have allergies but if there's no owner and there homeless then of course try to help them and feed them. Do not hurt them doing so.
- Depends on how 'teasing' is defined. Would be opposed to prohibiting bird feeders but support blatant use of food attractants other than for birds.
- Cold winter and hot summer make food and water available
- Feeding birds
- Feeding wild birds on private property
- Capturing injured wildlife to transport them to a rehabilitation or veterinary facility
- Birds
- None. Wildlife is wildlife.
- Exclude feeding birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Birds with proper feeder
- Birds.
- Feeding is fine but teasing is much different
- Deterring animals acting as pests
- Wounded animals that need protection
- If they need help



- Feeding birds (hummingbirds, finches, etc.) should be allowed unless the location is not bird friendly and attracting more birds would be bad. Maybe better education of impact of feeding different wildlife would be a better start (before bylaws)..
- None - it's private property
- None
- An injured animal -that may need emergent care-what animals are considered...squirrels.rabbits,birds-or larger animals deer, bobcats, moose,? bears
- Steep fines for people who feed wildlife in their property. It creates dependence.
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- how would home gardens, fruit trees, bird seed, etc be considered? would all these be illegal if they attract animals?
- I don't think any animal should be teased.
- birds
- 100%. Punishable by mandatory fines and jail time for repeat offenses. Feeding wild birds is good, but other wildlife is not.
- Any wildlife within city limits private property or not, should be respected and left alone. Should the animal/animals become a nuisance, Fish and Wildlife should be called to asses the situation.
- None. Nobody should be allowed to put out peanuts for squirrels, that endangers peoples with peanut allergies because the squirrels carry the nuts everywhere. Birdseed attracts deer and mice so should also NOT be exempt.
- Would like to feed birds.
- skunks!
- Bird feeders
- birds
- I don't think it should be done PERIOD. That would mean I couldn't have a bird feeder in my yard. Birds are wild animals and my property is considered privately owned. Why would I agree to this?
- I should be able to feed birds (or squirrels) in my backyard feeder (hummingbird also)
- Possibly if they were trying o get the animal off the property
- Small birds
- None. People should also be encouraged to report this. It would also be great if the public was educated in places like princes island park for example, just how dangerous bread is to feathered animals.
- Birds during the winter months
- This needs better wording. I'm against wildlife harassment. But feeding wildlife needs an exemption for bird feeders.
- None
- Bird feeders an exception
- Bird feeders



- Bird feeders
- This needs better wording. I'm against wildlife harassment. But feeding wildlife needs an exemption for bird feeders.
- Unless nursing back to health; in which Wildlife officers should be informed and monitor
- In some situations, feeding poison, or contraceptives.
- None.
- None. No wildlife should be fed.
- BirDs
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding okay, except deer. Teasing is not okay.
- Feeding birds is okay; teasing wild animals is not okay.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Anything that is harassment I could support, but feeding must be animal specific. Bird feeders or bat houses that are humane should be acceptable.
- Birdfeeders
- None
- Squirrels
- Bird feeders and seed are eaten by deer, rabbits, birds, and many other animals would you charge someone this that the answer should be no. Teasing should be fined.
- Bird feeders.
- Bird feeding
- Feeding of birds, or bird feeders.
- I am not against bird feeders, but there should be no contact with the wildlife
- Birdfeeders would be OK
- no exceptions
- Birds (bird feeder)
- Fines for feeding wildlife
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders, small animal feeders
- Bird feeders
- If you plan to take the animal to a sanctuary because it is injured
- If animal is sick or injured, care should not be withheld especially if not severe enough to go to a wildlife rehab.
- Allow birds to be fed on private property with bird seed etc...
- If someone is nursing an animal back to health
- Feeding squirrels and birds from feeders.
- Bird feeders



- none
- I actually want to answer question 1. A feral cat problem has a much simpler solution than fines or spray/neutering. Kill them. They are a nuisance and a threat to wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and bird houses
- Feeding animals increases a range of risks which include dependence for food. Animals attacking humans
- No exceptions
- Too broadly a question. By saying wildlife does that mean no feeding of birds on your property? How about squirrel feeders? Clarify this better.
- officer discretion should suffice. If a 92 year old Lady is feeding squirrels, oh well.
- Allow an animal to be fed or given water prior to taking it to a rescue organization. Allow bird feeders.
- education
- So no bird feeders?
- Bird feeders
- Feeders for bees and birds.
- feeding on private property is usually unintentional in my experience. However "teasing" harassing or in any way causing harm should be prohibited.
- Feeding rabbits
- Orphaned, or injured animals
- It depends on the property type. Zoos, sanctuaries should be able to feed animals. Civilians should not. There's a big difference between feeding some fish with provided food at a park vs feed the neighborhood stray cats, dogs and skunks like I've seen.
- None
- Bird feeders
- None
- Certain foods not to feed.
- None
- Bird feeders and baths, nuts for squirrels
- bird feeders
- Bears
- Bird feeders! And vegetable/flower gardens "feed" and attract wild animals like birds, squirrels etc. also my students do bird feeding experiments in their yards, and it's the only place left they can do things like that.
- Hurt animals.
- Ducks
- None



- If the animal is bothering your garden or families ability to use the yard. And even then I would just prefer having a number to call to have the animal removed and not need to “tease” it
- Bird Feeders
- Birds
- Birds and squirrels
- Bird and squirrels are exempt
- if its a bird feeder
- I would just add that of you own a bird feeder you must have a source of or supply the birds with fresh water
- Bird feeders
- If animal is in distress
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- if the animal is in danger
- None
- Birds
- Habituated animals should be discouraged
- If an individual, their family pets or livestock are in danger. Do what you need to protect them.
- An exception would be if a residential owner's feeding of wildlife was damaging surrounding homes and gardens ie. squirrels getting into attics, deer damaging yards.
- Same rules that apply on public property
- if you see something report it to wildlife people
- Bird feeders, nuts for squirrels
- Trying to nurse back a wounded animal to health
- None
- None!
- bird feeders, bird baths, squirrel feeding
- Feeding birds should be allowed. Definition of teasing should include malicious intent.
- bird feeders
- Wild birds
- Bird feeders should not be included.
- No exceptions
- Winter bird feeders
- bird feeding
- Exception for feral cats, if you’re trying to capture
- Feeding songbirds should be allowed.
- Feeding an injured animal
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds



- Bird feeders
- Reporting, investigation, fines and court.
- Deers coming to your yard to eat fruit from trees
- No exceptions for wildlife
- Not sure
- Bird feeders.
- Leave as per current bylaws and apply it to city parks. I agree with no teasing on private property but some times the deer are so skinny in winter they need the extra food
- None, feeding/teasing wildlife in any situation leads to disatrous consequences.
- Protecting nests
- If it was shown that there was a deliberate attempt to domesticate or harm wildlife on private property.
- Injured or animal in distress.
- Exception is for scaring nuisance wildlife off property. (ie. Squacking Magpies or similar animals harassing other animals or birds.
- An approved list of foods people are allowed to feed certain wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Birds (feeding)
- If they are hurting farmlands
- nuisance wildlife may need to be chased off
- I would agree with prohibiting feeding wild life in City but not outside of or on rural properties.
- With the exception of bird feeders
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION!!
- Not exceptions. Wildlife should be leaving a long
- Rescue of any kind
- Birds
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird-feeder might be acceptable.
- Allow the feeding of an injured animal in order to coax it into being caught for care purposes
- A starving animal that could be saved and rehabilitated and set free again.
- Na
- Remove bicycles running thru parks snd ruining undergrowth and wildlife homes.
- if you were trying to help get wildlife to safety and needed to encourage them by feeding them
- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders
- Allow bird feeders?
- Assigned restricted area
- What about bird feeders



- Teasing wildlife is never okay, but feeding urban wildlife is not necessarily problematic. Bird feeders, for example, should be allowed.
- Bird feeders on private property should still be permitted.
- Bird feeders
- If the animal is in distress and fish and wildlife are unable to tend to the animal, putting out food for it until f&w can pick it up should be allowed at the recommendation of fish and wildlife.
- Feeding wildlife like birds in winter ok, teasing should be prohibited in all circumstances, nuisance wildlife in private property humanely addressed
- Hummingbirds and songbirds.
- Permit holders or shelter type situations
- Birds and squirrels
- None. People should leave wildlife alone, period.
- Allow for rescue of injured:orphaned wildlife temporarily with purpose of getting them to a licensed rehabilitation facility
- Ok to feed. Not okay to tease
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders
- Feeding is fine, teasing not.
- Bird feeders need to be exempt.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders in yards or healthy and safe snacks for wild animals. We need to share our space and help wild animals even with food sometimes as we have encroached on their living areas.
- Rescue attempt, or for medical purposes
- An injured animal
- None
- Bird feeders
- Start with enforcing the wildlife no feeding in parks where wildlife live... I constantly see people feeding wild life... educating people on deers are not Bambi and that wildlife would not be relying on humans if they were not being fed
- feeding birds
- Feeding birds
- Feeding wildlife such as birds and squirrels is fine. Feeding larger wildlife and teasing any wildlife is not okay.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders on private property is ok.
- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeder



- Bird feeders
- Birds
- If an animal is fighting for its life due to starvation or thirst, I support any and all efforts to care and save them.
- I definitely don't think people should be teasing or harassing wildlife regardless of where they are, but I don't think bird feeders or giving peanuts to the squirrels is a bad thing. Bird feeders are a good way to engage children in respecting wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Feeding visibly injured wildlife until they can get help
- Private property is just that, stop over reaching
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- hummingbird feeders, suspended bird feeders
- N/a
- Nothing
- I would like to be able shoot deer that come on to my property
- Birds
- Fixed location Wild bird feeders should be allowed.
- Animals who need help get the helpThey need!!!
- If the wildlife is found to be injured and you need to take care of it for a few hours before proper help arrives.
- Bird feeders
- Permission signs
- Bird feeders
- I support hazing of wildlife on private property for: skunks, raccoons, coyotes, cougars, bears
- Allowed to safely chase wildlife off private property.
- None
- Bird feeders. Squirrel feeders
- If the animal(s) are obviously in distress due to malnutrition.
- Bird feeders, but property owner must feed birds year round.
- None
- Indifferent
- Bird feeders on private property
- Bird feeders
- birds
- Feeding of birds (other than birds of prey) and squirrels should be allowed
- Wildlife that are deemed to be problem animals. We should not have punishment for property owners who are humanely dealing with problem animals such as squirrel or raccoon traps that involve food. That is not "feeding" and the bylaw should recognize that



- Stop feeding squirrels!
- None
- Bird feeders. Bee friendly gardens.
- Feeding wildlife includes birds I assume. Teasing should be enforceable everywhere.
- None
- If a non dangerous wild animal is hanging around your property and is hungry I would think it's ok to help them it
- Hummingbird feeders
- Exception should be made for the use of bird feeders.
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders need to be exempt
- An exception being wildlife that is injured or needs assistance to be fed. Consult with a professional before doing so.
- maybe if it is visibly injured and needs to be trapped
- Feeding/teasing large wildlife should be banned on private property. However, feeding like chipmunks/squirrels and birds should be allowed as long as it doesn't cause nuisances for neighbors. For example, if feeding attracts flocks of birds etc.
- None
- Rescue facilities
- truly orphaned or injured animal
- Orphaned baby animals who would otherwise not survive
- Feeding geese at small ponds perhaps
- No exception
- allow bird feeders
- Bird Feeders
- no penalties for birds or squirrels being feed
- Feeding birds
- none - feeding wildlife causes nothing but issues.
- Bird feeders
- Fines given for people harassing wildlife
- More education as to the harmful effects that feeding and teasing have. Don't have bylaw officers out handing out tickets, hand out information.
- Birds? With an awareness of once you start feeding birds, you can't stop, as they come to depend on the food source
- Birds
- Birds
- Gardens not left out for animal consumption



- I like to have bird feeders in my yard and I feel that feeding birds is a perfectly reasonable thing to do. I think this question is very poorly worded what is wildlife if it means birds then I think I should continue to be allowed a bird feeder.
- except birds
- bird feeders
- Assisting an injured or suffering animal.
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- This is a stupid rule
- Clearly injured wolf life that you are trying to keep around for animal control or veterinary care professionals to come help
- Seed And appropriate food for songbirds, hummingbirds, etc
- Feeding birds or squirrels
- if the animals are strays and are in my yard and look hungry I will feed them
- Feeding birds
- Squirrels, rabbits, birds
- Bird feeders that are squirrel proof
- Physical abuse
- Squirrels, birds
- No
- Feeding migrating birds.
- this is what the city spends money on
- Feeders for birds should be excluded in this.
- If animals are causing property damage
- feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, even if they feed squirrels.
- Inside Private dwellings. ("Teasing" should be removed. Too unclear to enforce.)
- No exceptions
- Except birds and bird feeders, except feeding as a way to lure and capture wildlife in order to attain healthcare for it,
- Squirrels, birds
- If an animal is injured / needing rehabilitation. If an animal would likely die without help
- Birds
- Bird feeders or anything that is used to promote a healthy environment for wild life.
- Birdfeeders
- None... this should be a very stiff fine
- Birds are wildlife and if people want to put birdfeeders that should be allowed.
- No prohibition. But keep abuse completely intolerable



- Bird feeders; plants and/or feeders that promote a healthy local eco-system; etc.
- Birdfeeders
- teasing or injuring wildlife should be prohibited, exceptions to prohibition on feeding would be birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders/bowls
- Birds
- None
- Lots of petting zoos, you get to feed the animals.
- No exceptions
- If an animal is clearly injured and in need of care and found in ones backyard, for example.
- 100
- Not include bird feeders
- Investigation/education of property owners. Relocation of the animal. Potential fines
- If owner is okay with feeding.
- A fine for people teasing wildlife.
- if it was passed, things such as bird feeders should be exempt.
- Helping an injured animal
- Allow birdfeeders
- N/a
- Allow for various forms of bird feeders including hummingbirds
- Obviously bird feeding should be allowed.
- Birds, squirrels (since both eat out of bird feeders)
- None
- Shouldn't include bird feeders
- Birds
- Any animal cruelty should of course be penalized whether on public or private property
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Small wild animals
- Squirrels
- Hand feeding birds
- bird feeders
- I think some feeding is ok but it's not ok to tease ever.
- It Hass to be within reason. Feeding birds with birdfeeders should be included in that by law. So you need to review this very carefully. I would make it more targeted towards feeding animals that can become a nuisance, like raccoons. Coyotes. Etc.
- Already covered under provincial law



- None, our toddler is anaphylactic to peanuts and we are constantly finding peanuts in our enclosed backyard left by squirrels that neighbours are feeding. Our child isn't safe playing in our own yard as a result of this practice.
- You should never tease an animal.
- Ensure "wildlife" does not include stray or feral cats/dogs that people may be trying to get/keep safe
- Bird feeders with proper bird seed
- Bird feeders, bird houses, bee & butterfly feeders
- A fine and a course in wildlife patterns. Education is key for change
- farm land has alot of wild life and they can get into food no problem. Maybe explore the option of someone is caught feeding wildlife to issue a warning, of continue then a fine
- Bird feeders/suet and saltlicks (passive feeding)
- None
- Fines. Any sort of prevention measure that has been found to be effective elsewhere.
- If you have a pond on your property that has other pets that need to be fed. Wildlife will help themselves to food intended for pets
- squirrel feeders - peanuts
- Exception would be wild animal cruelty
- Provide education when the bylaw is introduced so people actually understand it
- Bird feeders on personal property.
- Perhaps you could have a report hotline/educational videos through social media platforms outlining the negative side effects of feeding wildlife.
- None
- I think bird feeders should be allowed.
- This is already covered by provincial laws. The city does not need to create a bylaw for it. Ask the SG instead to allow city Peace Officers to enforce the appropriate sections of existing legislation.
- Birds
- Putting out birdseed
- Feeding birds
- A person's property is their domain.
- Animal in clear distress: dehydrated(give water), or emancipated(food)
- Bird feeders
- none
- Distraction for safety
- Bird feed
- If to assist animal or to increase quality of its life
- Birds and squirrels
- Wild life that is ruining homes and properties.
- bird can be feed with seed or a natural food to them.
- No exceptions.



- Feeding injured, non threatening animals
- Actual enforcement
- Allow bird feeders and suet feeders
- Bird feeders
- Private land is private. You can make suggestions.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding squirrels, birds should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- What if there was an injured animal or malnourished? Is there going to be exceptions for this in this case?
- A baby animal that has been abandoned or mother is dead
- Bird Feeders
- Bird seed feeders
- Unless it was baby and was taken by humans don't feed it
- Stop over burdening citizens with your bogus cash grabs through bylaws that you invent overnight
- Landowner - pest issues
- none
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- I think bird feeders should be an exception.
- let kids give bread to birds
- Seeds and the like left in bird feeders or something similar
- children feeding fish or ducks, geese
- We have a neighbour who feeds a family of skunks in our cul de sac. Several dogs in the area have been sprayed in their backyards and in the front yards. Needless to say the neighbourhood is not overjoyed with feeding wild skunks!!!
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- feeding and teasing are different concepts. Leaving harmless food for an animal in rural private property is fine but feeding an animal in an urban center can be problematic. more specifics are required.
- It would have to be proven that there was intentional feeding or teasing done on the part of the home owners before a fine or penalty could be levied against homeowner.
- Feeding birds
- HUGE MASSIVE FINES, NAMES MADE PUBLIC
- -
- If anyone was in danger ie deer in backyard with children would be able to chase it off but preference to going inside and calling the city.
- Bird feeders. Spring, Orphans on occasion.
- Magpies are rats with wings



- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders as long as they are out of reach of deer.
- None
- Urban bird feeders
- I am against "teasing" or baiting wildlife anywhere. Are you suggesting there be no bird feeders as this encourages birds in need of food and water, which brings hares, skunks, feral cats, etc. Simply giving a helping hand to wildlife should be encouraged
- Ducks
- No teasing of animals anywhere should be allowed but feeding on private property should be OK, assuming it's done nicely and within reason
- no penalties for perennial vegetation i.e. apple trees. High fines for wildlife abuse or teasing
- Birds
- Maybe for dangerous animals like bears.
- Water on extremely hot days from a safe distance
- Enforce how?
- Children don't always understand what teasing is, especially with Geese. Maybe some way to make it educational?
- Feeding of proper food should be okay.
- Same as in city parks
- Birds, and squirrel feeders hung in trees
- None
- Feeding and helping of strays
- Feeding wildlife on private property
- Birdseed feeders and hummingbird feeders
- If the animal is injured or in need of help
- Birds
- Only allowing conservationists to bait with food for relocation or tagging purposes.
- Bird feeders and bird baths, squirrel feeders
- Aggressive wildlife moose ect
- Bylaw should only apply to humans. A dog or cat may "tease" a squirrel in the owners backyard.
- Feed birds, squirrels etc in backyards. Disallow front yards. My neighbour leaves horrendous amounts of food on their front yards and the street is always a mess.
- With an exception for bird feeders on private property
- In the instance of an injured animal giving it food and care until proper professionals can be contacted you take it to a vet or a an animal shelter whatever is most appropriate.
- Feeding birds, including corvids
- Fines for those who feed wildlife
- Bird feeders, urban bee farms or other ways to increase the presence of "good"/non-dangerous or nuisance wildlife in the city should still be allowed



- trying to get a skunk out from under the deck shouldn't be considered teasing.
- these are two different questions. also answers may reasonably differ as between, say, birds [feed them if you like] and mammals [prohibit feeding them]. Also relevant might be whether species is endangered or secure.
- Birds
- Squirrels are a pest
- wild birds
- No exceptions
- Second offence fines only
- Water dishes, specially heated water dishes during winter
- a bird feeder,
- No exceptions
- I would allow feeding an injured animal until animal control could arrive.
- Bird feederd
- Injured or sick animals
- with exception of bird feeders
- This is unenforceable.
- No one should be teasing wildlife period.
- If an animal is injured or sick, and in need of assistance
- If a wild animal is hurt naturally and someone finds the animal and cares for it so it can be released into the "wild" again.
- Define "teasing", do you mean harassment which I would support. For feeding, does this include bird feeders? I would not support a by-law if that prohibits feeding in this manner, however would support a by-law that prohibits harassment..
- Birds
- Birds
- Feeding birds should be okay and bunnies and some small animals while making sure its enclosed where Skunks, Bears and any big and dangerous animal is not in reach of food.
- Birds, squirrels, rabbits,
- Feeding wildlife in obvious medical distress
- Using food to distract rabbits from your garden
- Wildlife is harming property
- Attempting to protect people from large animals
- What property owners do on their own property is their business. Also, if wildlife enters my yard, my dog WILL "tease it" because it is his domain and he is curious, why should I get a fine for this? What about bird feeders or squirrel feeders?
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- In favor or bylaw that prohibits harassment, but feeding via bird feeders is important to the bird population especially in the winter months



- Bird/squirrel/insect feeders should be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders, squirrel food, etc
- No exceptions - Fining should be high and rigid as it means death to wildlife once fed or provoked by humans.
- None
- Let people do what they want on their property.
- Squirrels, birds, rabbits exempt
- Bird feeders are ok
- none
- In the event you, your family or pets are in danger of harm from wildlife.
- Folks often feed birds and sometimes squirrels but anything beyond that could be potentially dangerous by inviting predator animals into the community which could make our domesticated animals (dogs, cats, rabbits, etc.) food for predators.
- Unintentional - 1st offense warnings
- Ducks and birds
- Rural properties should have more wiggle room to shoo away wildlife
- Feeding yes, teasing no
- None, it's private property, mind your own public prop.
- Injured animals
- If an animal is in distress and the city refuses to help them, we should be allowed to rehabilitate them in a safe way or offer aid
- Bird feeders or baths that do not attract squirrels such as hummingbird feeders
- Feeding birds shouldn't be included. I'm more focused on the teasing aspect here.
- Bird feeders
- If owner was alright with it, but other than that the animals shouldn't be messed with and if it is the stranger trespassing or messing with animal the owner shouldn't be responsible for any problems because it's common sense to not mess with animals
- People who attract animals to their private property will need to deal with consequences on their own.
- Bird feeders
- Exceptions (unless specifically teasing) to small animals I. E. Bird feeders, squirrel feeders, and in more rural areas deer feeders
- None
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- Many people, especially seniors enjoy feeding the birds/ducks in many city parks. Perhaps certain areas can be designated as safe feeding zones. (Near ponds etc.) With rules posted and or safe avian seed provided.



- If the wildlife is eating garden the homeowner can shoo them away.
- Feeding Wild Birds; Bird Feeders
- Leave it the same. No bylaw needed.
- If urgent situation requires
- NA
- N/A
- If someone isn't caring for their pet then someone should be allowed to feed and water it
- Having a bird feeder
- Birds
- Does this include people who do not cleanup things like apple trees
- Bird feeders
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be acceptable. Feeding/teasing large wildlife (deer, moose, foxes, coyotes, bears, etc.) should be prohibited.
- Bird feeders, shooing off nuisance animals (e.g., magpies picking on people or pets).
- Song birds
- If you have been considered a foster parent for an abandoned baby animal
- Feeding no, Teasing Yes
- Bird feeders would hopefully be an exception.
- If an animal is trapped or endangered and needs food that shouldn't be punished.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Providing water for injured or abandoned wildlife while emergency services r responding
- Explain and educate the negative results of feeding wild animals
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Crops planted for deer or other animals specifically as a part of agriculture groups
- Wounded baby with no sign of mother
- Aggression
- not on your own private property
- Fine people who do and don't kill the wildlife
- If it is part of a program such as bird sanctuary, recovery and release, etc.
- Would be feeders count as feeding wildlife on private property? This should be exempt.
- Bird feeders obviously
- Bird feeding. It has far to many benefits to both birds and humans to stop it.
- Bird and squirrel feeders in yard
- Bird feed
- Feeding and teasing are seperate issues. Teasing and harassing is worse.
- Only to stop the feeding of black and grey squirrels, and raccoons, bird feeders should be allowed.
- None



- Bird feeders
- Feeding wildlife for the purpose of removal of problem animals (ie baiting traps, putting out poisoned food for rodents)
- None. Its a wild animal
- Squirrels and birds
- Re: q1) I'd support greater education on the consequences of roaming cats
- bird feeders, unless there is research that indicates this is not safe for the wildlife
- Farming or a hurt or injured animal
- Teasing
- Bird feeders should be exempt.
- Deer, birds, squirrels,
- Caring for injured pets, providing food/care (if possible to do it safely) until Animal Control can arrive
- Abandoned/injured animals should be allowed to be fed
- None
- Winter Bird feeders, spring/summer hummingbird feeders
- Bird Feeders and other "normal" private property feeders and attractors to yards
- Acreages
- I don't think bird feeders or bee houses/waterers are a problem??
- If the person believed that the animal was actually a lost domestic pet rabbit, dog, cat or any other kind of pet.
- I don't agree with teasing wildlife but see nothing wrong with feeding birds, squirrels ect
- Bird feeders, squirrels etc are fine. You don't want to feed or attract carnivorous wildlife. Larger wildlife like deer etc also should not be encouraged to be around people.
- Bylaw for just teasing or harming wildlife on private properties
- Birds
- Birdfeeders/birdbaths.
- This should be on all property not only private.
- Harming wildlife
- Feeding devices such as bird feeders are allowed
- None
- Squirrels
- Squirrel and/or bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels etc
- feed if you like just don't tease
- Feeding ducks - have programs with food available for sale at parks
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Increase signage to educate people on engaging / feeding Canada Geese populations
- feeding birds



- Bird Feeders
- As long as it exempts bird feeders
- none
- The vague language used in the question renders it unanswerable - would the bylaws prohibit bird feeders? What is the definition of “teasing”?
- Birds & squirrels
- Rehabbers trying to help an injured animal
- No exceptions if a person is teasing a dog and it gets aggressive, the person should be 100% in the wrong.
- This is far too broad and seems like a money grab.
- Birds
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- To mean this says I’m not allowed to have a bird feeder which sounds oppressive and excessive. If people are hurting animals ok their property obviously that’s illegal.
- An animal in distress
- Bird feeding
- I have no problem feeding hungry animals. It should be against the law to tease/harm/eat any animals. I see neighbours running after rabbits especially so they can either eat them or hurt them to get them off their grass.
- Enough with the unenforceable bylaws.
- None
- Need to define what feeding is. Deer come into neighbourhoods to eat trees like cedars and owners are not willingly feeding them. Nothing wrong with this
- Birds
- Certain birds and small animals like squirrels could be an exception (eg. it is common to have a bird feeder)
- People that tease animals should be fined
- None
- I have always had bird and squirrel feeders so I feel like that would make me eligible for fines.
- Gopher/ Richardson ground squirrel, rodents (would include wild rabbits), insects
- N/A
- Allow for the feeding of birds, and pollinators as well as the ability to have birdhouses and batboxes
- Squirrels, birds.
- Bird feeders
- Petting zoos and such farms and sanctuaries
- Bird feeders, as long as they are raised off the ground and do not act as an attractant for animals
- If it is the owner of the property feeding the wildlife. No exceptions for teasing.
- Less bilaws, more education.
- Food in bird or squirrel feeders would be exempt but no hand feeding



- If someone was intentionally harming or killing wildlife on their property then yes something needs to be done.
- The bylaw should be for anywhere in the city of Calgary boundaries, not specific to parks
- It is an animal, they become reliant on the food a human gives them. Maybe Snacks hidden to let them find the food on their own
- Feeding deer, squirrels and birds should be taken into consideration.
- None we should leave wild life alone
- Don't let people shoot bunnies.
- None
- Injured animals until appropriate persons can deal with circumstances.
- If an animal is in need of care/food. Obviously try to get it to rescue/vet immediately, but sometimes it takes time for rescue etc.
- Birds and squirrels
- Injured or sick animals
- Do not ban pitbulls
- If an animal is found injured and a person wishes to feed it as they wait for bylaw
- None
- None
- None. If there is proper signage there should be no excuse.
- I think bird feeders/squirrel feeders should be exempt
- It's their property if they want to they have a right
- Many people feed birds, bees, and butterflies, and this behaviour is often encouraged. I don't understand discriminating against feeding some animals and not others unless it is a safety issue (e.g. bears).
- Bird feeders
- Animals that pose no danger or annoyance
- Fined
- Feeding birds and rabbits on private property. Feed ducks, geese in public places if fed appropriate food.
- Bird feeders
- Only bird feeders.
- Smaller animals. Squirrels, birds, etc.
- Wild life belongs. We are pushing into the areas and expect them to move back
- Birds
- Teasing abusing yes
- Luring of wildlife to do harm
- none
- Bird feeders
- Birds (ie. bird feeder)



- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Prohibit feeding, not teasing. Need a way to get it off your property in certain cases
- None. Feeding wildlife is unsafe and unhealthy for the animal.
- Bird feeders and keeping squirrels out of them .
- Injured or abandoned animals who need to be cared for before going to a sanctuary.
- What you mean by teasing is not clear. I have no problem with bird feeders and similar.
- If the pet owner is aware and agrees to the feeding.
- If the animal is starving or in danger
- None. Feeding wildlife on your property brings them into a more urban area which is dangerous for the animal and the people living around the property.
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird feeder
- None
- Including birds and squirrels? Is this targeted to deer Bobcats?
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Teasing
- Bird feeders to feed wild birds
- Feeding birds/squirrels via a feeder
- None
- If the animal is in distress and needs food for some reason
- Feeding is okay, teasing is not and that should be a separate topic.
- Injured animals needing fish and wildlife/ vet to come to the property. Supply of water permitted.
- Bird feeders high enough to not allow other animals to feed from them
- Birds
- Birds are fine to feed
- It's okay to feed birds & squirrels.
- None
- None
- Hefty fine, education courses on why NOT to feed wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Unless an individual owners feeding attracts aggressive or excessively destructive wildlife, that pose a risk of harm to other individuals or pets.
- Feeding squirrels, birds, small animals that live in the surrounding area.
- Bird feeders
- Make teasing prohibited, but feeding of "wildlife" is vague (ie would a bird feeder be prohibited in a person's own yard?)
- Squirrels, Bird feeders
- Hurt or injured animals if directed



- This survey is very poorly written you are not providing enough opportunity for individuals to answer appropriately Q1 I believe cats should roam free and the current bylaw is a joke, putting feeding and teasing together is messy
- I would support a community service measure that makes violators volunteer as shelters rather than a fine. Educate don't putatively punish.
- N/A
- N/a
- Only if the animal seems domesticated and lost.
- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders
- Injured wild animals should be helped by knowledgeable humans
- Song birds
- Call to have the animal taken
- Birds
- No feeding wildlife at all. Fines for doing so, similar to what we see in national and provincial parks
- Bird feeders and water and food out for wild animals in the case of fires or floods etc that disrupt their natural feeding areas
- Chasing rabbits or squirrels off property
- do not allow teasing of animals
- Feeding small animals such as birds or squirrels should not be prohibited. Only feeding large animals (deer, coyotes) should be prohibited.
- Birds, y'all shouldn't make it illegal to feed birds from a park bench
- If the animal is injured or needing help
- Injured animals that need help
- I think feeding can be find provided it's meant for them such as birds squirrels bees ... etc
- Injured animals
- None
- Injured or sick animal
- Bird feeders, bird baths, feeding deer
- feeding is okay, teasing is cruel
- If animal is in a health crisis require contact appropriate assistance
- Bird feeders for small birds which are primarily seed feeders, or hummingbirds.
- Feeding birds and squirrels on private property should be allowed.
- Birds
- If the person was approached by wildlife and does not do any unnecessary harm.
- Birds and squirrels or whatever people normally feed in their backyards
- Birds
- What wild life are you talking about? I like to feed birds and sometimes the squirrels help themselves. Which I don't mind.



- A fine
- Bird feeders and squirrels nuts
- None
- Bird feeders, butterfly feeders
- Residents chucking food that's about to go bad, but not engaging with wildlife
- Birds
- Can have bowls of food and observe but no hand feeding
- None
- Baiting for hunting
- Wildlife reserves, vet clinics, or if an individual is caring for wildlife (eg: nursing a bird back to health)
- anti "Teasing" or anti abuse laws I would support, but I take no issue with feeding wildlife on private property
- If the animal is in danger of starving and a wildlife expert was called
- Bird feeders
- Injured or abandoned wildlife (like mother dead or leaving it)
- Wildlife sanctuaries should be able to feed and handle wildlife.
- hurt or starved animals
- Bird feeders
- Birds. No idea what 'teasing wildlife' is though
- None, its Private property, a clue in the title.
- I would support prohibiting teasing etc of any animal, including wildlife. Feeding them isn't an issue unless they are attracting dangerous animals like coyotes etc. Then there should be an avenue to stop the behavior.
- Feeding. No one should be allowed to tease or instigate any (wild)life. Though I see no issue with feeding deer or rabbits; We all share this habitat.
- It's cats cop on they don't stay in one property [removed] muppets
- Feeding squirrels and birds
- None
- Birds
- Abusing wildlife. I don't see the problem with feeding. People can do what they like on their own private land.
- Bird seed
- Bird feeders
- Teasing and feeding need to be separated. Teasing is not good on any property. Feeding on the other hand, is ok at times; bird feeders for example.
- Be reasonable
- There are no exceptions to feeding wildlife, by doing so you're putting the animal(s) and civilians in danger.
- Feeding birds, bees, and squirrels should be allowed!



- None
- Wild birds through bird feeders
- Obviously wildlife should be left alone for the most part, but things like bird feeders and rabbit gardens, etc. I do not see a problem with.
- Feeding is fine for some (e.g., birds, squirrels), teasing and being mean to wildlife is unacceptable
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird seed/feed for bird feeders.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Injured animals
- If animal is injured lost or a baby
- Pest control/deterrence.
- Leaving food out for the animals is fine and trying to get them to feed from your hand is okay for smaller animals but for larger ones they should just have food left out and not someone trying to feed it to them example. Bears, deers ect.
- If they were in city limits then yes
- Birds
- Birds
- Birds
- Feeding birds and squirrels.
- Bird feeders
- Designate some wild life as acceptable to feed (eg birds/squirrels))
- Is it really a problem that my grandma goes to the park to feed chick-a-dees? Leave grandma alone.
- Allow feeding of birds on private property
- Accidental- animals get into food that is left out.
- birds
- feeding injured animals
- Perhaps a size limit on wild life that can be fed (e.g. birds/squirrel feeders are acceptable but larger animals like deer should not be intentionally fed)
- Any native, endangered, or non threatening species should be fine. Only ban feeding species that hurt the community, be it through being invasive or potentially dangerous for the safety
- A hunting license
- Birds
- If the animal is injured or abandoned
- Unless someone is causing physical harm to an animal
- Bird feeders
- If someone was caring for a lame animal while waiting to get professional help.
- -
- Bird feeders



- Feeding some birds that need it in winter
- Maybe injured animals could be an exception just until wild life rescue could come to the property
- None
- Bird feeders.
- Educate
- None
- Bird feeders (seeds)
- Feeding is one thing; teasing? or otherwise "looking for trouble" with wildlife (and domesticated life) should be dealt with quickly and expensively to the perpetrators!
- When an animal is facing starvation and they have no owner
- Bird feeders are fine.
- Feeding is ok but teasing is a no no.
- none
- I believe feeding wild birds and other harmless animals should be exempt from the bylaws because it doesn't result in harm to the wildlife or humans.
- Malicious intent.
- More support from the city to deal with the wildlife on private property
- Bird feeders
- If animals are stealing food and humans are trying to shoo them away.
- Only allow feeding in some cases, never allow teasing
- Only feed injured animal until animal control arrived on scene to take over
- Protected/endangered species
- Where do you draw the line? Technically a bird feeder, or a bat house could be considered feeding/tempting wildlife.
- bird feeding should be allowed
- With the exception of feeding birds in private property
- Bird feeders possibly
- kids feeding ducks and squirrels etc
- Exception to feed injured/sick animals with intention of release or contacting a wildlife rehab/rescue.
- Bird feeders
- None... there are significant rodent issues when bird feeders or poorly tended to gardens exist
- Feeding birds from a bird feeder should be allowed
- If the wildlife is injured/young (without a parent)
- Feeding birds is allowed
- Bird feeders are fine if using appropriate food.
- None
- Hefty fine when evidence is produced. Thousands of dollars.
- None
- Bird feeders



- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders for birds which have adapted to metropolitan food sources (seeds, sugar water and such).
- Mouse traps with food
- Deer, ducks, rabbits and other foraging animals
- Bird feeders and such, when the animal is in distress/starving
- Bird feeders, rabbit fruit scraps especially in -30°
- Dangerous animals
- Let people feed the birds
- N/A
- Depending on the situation and The health that the animal is in. if the animal seems to be in distress, then yes until help arrives. Otherwise, only when the owner gives you permission to feed their animals should you feed them.
- Bird feeding
- Feeding common and in habitat wildlife. Ie. Elderly feeding birds in a park or a child throwing bread off the dock to introduced trout in auburn Bay
- I would have an exception for bird feeders or squirrel feeders in peoples yards.
- Birds
- none
- Kids by accident
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- If the animal was suffering and required food to heal
- Trap them
- Certain flora and fauna benefit from feeders. This questions isn't laid out well
- Teasing or abuse of any animal in any situation should be prohibited but let people do what they will do if they are not hurting anyone or any animal. In regards to question one, offer free neuter/spray to new owners or else we will run into a shortage.
- Pit Bulls are no different than other breeds it's down to the owners, banning them from offleashes & muzzeling them is totally unfair
- Birds. Do NOT feed the squirrels!!!
- Unless animal is in need of intervention to have best chance at life, such youngsters without parents or injured.
- None
- If a person wanted to catch a feral bunny, on private property, and make it a pet.
- No contact feeders
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be allowed
- if owner allows it
- Teasing should always be prohibited



- Bird feeders, trapping squirrels and pigeons for food
- Birdfeeders
- Birds (for feeding).
- No exceptions - do not feed any wild animal.
- Three Strike Policy
- Bird feeders
- None!
- Wildlife consuming food on property while the owner is not engaging (ex. Eating out of the garbage or food accidentally left out)
- Birds
- None.
- Private property used by groups. If country clubs, private schools
- Nothing
- Birds in winter
- Birds
- If it is posing danger to public
- If the species is clearly not indigent to the city, or it has strayed from rural in to urban areas by mistake and is danger or distress, and needs food or water
- Know that allowing people to feed animals gets them killed eventually
- Bird feeders
- Feeding okay, teasing not okay
- Birds
- Large fines
- None
- Feeding wildlife in times of natural disasters. eg. wildlife displaced by forest fires.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- humane measures to deter crows and magpies
- Humane trapping and releasing. Some individuals view this as cruel but if done properly it is effective
- None
- Video proof of infraction used as evidence to issue fine.
- none
- Birds
- Never exceptions to teasing wildlife! I will toss out a carrot for the hares on the occasion.
- A young animal that lost its mother
- Should a member of the public rescue an injured/orphaned wildlife and has made the effort to contact the appropriate agency and there is a delay in availability of resources including transportation to the appropriate rehabilitation facility.



- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- If there is an animal in distress on private property, that needs to be captured to contact owner etc
- Birds
- Poisonings
- Birds
- It's fine the way it is
- Time is better spent on other animal issues such as aggressive dogs.
- Bird feeders
- Trying to aid injured animals or humanely trap to rerelease elsewhere (such as skunks)
- If animals eat your vegetation on property, this shouldn't be considered feeding them.
- None
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LANGUAGE!!!
- Bird feeders
- None
- None. Private property is private property. Let kids have their bird feeders.
- Birdfeeders
- Animals should be protected from interference no matter where they are.
- None!
- Zero tolerance
- None.
- Fire the mayor.
- Bird Feeders
- Feral cats
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Animal cruelty in teasing
- Water provided during hot weather
- Natural lawns allowed to feed wildlife - non active feeding , more an environment for wildlife to hen feeding...
- So no more bird feeders? Seems ridiculous. What about fruits that wild animals eat out of residential gardens? Who defines what is "teasing"? I can see this being ripe for abuse.
- Bird feeders as long as they are not used as lures
- There should be a way to deal with someone who is causing material harm to a wild animal vs ppl who put up backyard bird feeders
- None
- too hard to enforce, don't even consider this
- Depends on the wildlife. I dont think people should be feeding skunks or large predator wildlife, or deer. Birds, squirrels, rabbits, small wildlife that poses no health risks are okay.



- Teasing wildlife should not be prohibited
- None
- Enforcement
- Bird feeders allowed on private properties.
- Depending on situation. I don't see harm in feeding a bird
- Bird feeder
- Feeding geese with proper food.
- Birds
- Education on how feeding impacts wildlife
- Bird feeding
- At the point of animal abuse
- Private property the city should not be able to apply bylaws.
- some bird feeders
- None
- Assuming that home bird feeders would be exempt
- It's private. None of your business
- None
- Hunting, bird watching
- Birds should be ok to feed
- To what extent? Is bylaw going to be charging people with bird/squirrel feeders?
- Bird feeders
- None - we have people that feed rabbits and squirrels and it's wrong!!!! They were wild animals.
- Feeding and teasing are 2 completely different things. This question should be split up.
- None
- birds
- You should be able to put out a bird feeder to feed birds
- n/a
- Bird feeders
- I am not clear on the implication, but answered no as providing hummingbird feeders in my backyard is technically feeding wildlife and would be caught by this broad question.
- No exceptions. I've seen adults encouraging children to chase geese in Princes' Island Park. This isn't acceptable. I expect the same thing happens on private property.
- No exceptions.
- None, but ensure bird feeders are adequately covered and how far it would be considered feeding wildlife at that point.
- Should involve supporting Humane Society or other groups
- squirrels, birds
- temp. feeding exceptions, if the animal is injured
- Feeding squirrels



- feeding obviously malnourished animals until animal control personnel can take over
- Malnutrition
- None
- Having a bird feeder with seed specifically purchased for birds seems like a strange thing to prohibit.
- Bird feeders should be an exception as they are very beneficial for native urban bird populations (if properly maintained!)
- None
- Fine for feeding wildlife, they become a nuisance
- Mind your own damn business
- Birds should be fed. Not squirrels or any other wild life.
- N/A
- Bird feeders within city limits to help our urban bird population
- Wasp and mosquito management
- Excepting actions taken if wildlife were posing a real threat to safety, and also excepting actions taken by those under the age of 16 - in such cases both the children and the parents or guardians should be informed and warned.
- Do not know
- If the animals are being hurt on private property then action should be taken
- Bird feeders
- Feed of all wildlife should be exempt
- None
- None. If anyone is caught engaging with wildlife, they need to be fined 2,000\$.
- There should not be any exceptions as you change the natural way wildlife feeds for themselves ... feeding them makes them a possible danger to humans. The bylaw should be applicable anywhere where the City controls.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Depends on the animal if it isn't invasive species or not.
- If dangerous animals are being fed, I would not support that
- Birds - various species, squirrels, smaller animals (gophers, rabbits).
- Squirrels, rodents and birds
- Wild birds
- Dangerous animals (ex. bears, large cats).
- None
- Birds/birdseed
- If someone has a bird feeder or something that is helping wildlife survive there wouldn't be issues, essentially I don't want teasing of wildlife or hurting of wildlife feeding them appropriately shouldn't be fined if that makes sense
- If the animal is starving and needs food.



- It's their private property. Leave them alone. Provide more media for wildlife education.
- None. Incursions on private property rights should not be the purview of municipalities.
- Bird feeders
- Rabbits are a nuisance and should be allowed to be harassed to make them leave
- Teasing wildlife is/should not be in the same bylaw as feeding wildlife. They are on opposite ends of a spectrum.
- None
- If the animal is obviously in need of food or water / in medical distress
- a better definition of what is considered wildlife, or what size of wildlife
- Harassing or abuse yes. Feeding should be dealt with on a case by case basis with varying levels of penalty from none (feeding squirrels birds etc) to harsh (feeding bears and losing their fear of humans in the process making them a public danger)
- In favour of a bylaw that prevents harrassment of wildlife on private property. Otherwise does feeding include bird feeders? Too vague, clarify.
- If you're caring or coaxing an animal to get help (i.e trying to get a cat to come so you can bring it to the vet to get it checked for a microchip)
- Are birds wildlife?
- Define wildlife are song birds included in this etc.
- Feeding deer in severe winter conditions should be excluded.
- Allow bird feeders
- Regular visitors such as birds and squirrels can be exempt, however, living near Fish Creek Park with bobcat sightings, I would like to see bylaws for anyone trying to lure that kind of animal with feeding it (same for coyotes and bears).
- Feeding small wildlife like birds and squirrels does not bother me, however feeding other wildlife that could cause harm to humans (wolves/coyotes) or themselves by becoming desensitized to humans.
- I would exclude bird feeders and suet feeders as I do not think they have any negative effect on wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Exceptions include bird feeders and the animals they attract, gardens being an attractant to wildlife, small animal feeding such as free roaming cats or community cats
- Education
- With exceptions retaining to birds, squirrels and Jack rabbits.
- Hurting wildlife
- Injured animals
- This question is too vague.
- This should be a separate bylaw between teasing and feeding. Feeding should be limited to birds and small rodents such as squirrels. Teasing should be for all.
- Too broad, flowers/plants/veggies in garden feed wildlife, humming bird feeders illegal?
- None. It's private property



- there shouldn't be any exceptions
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- none
- I have a bird feeder so does that mean I'd have to get rid of it? How does one tease wildlife?
- None!
- Give a ticket to people who feed animals human food, allow people to have access to animal food
- Give a ticket to people who feed animals human food, allow people to have access to animal food
- Private animal rescue places should be able to feed their wild animals
- Bird watchers attract birds with feeders. Teasing wildlife is a whole different ball game and I don't support this
- Fines
- Water
- Songbirds
- Birdfeeders
- Non- aggressive animals on private property (i.e. birds) should be allowed, but animals that could pose a significant danger (i.e. deer, bear, wild cats) should be prohibited
- Leaving bird seed out should be fine in your yard
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Large animals, bears, moose, deer
- Birds can be fed
- Signs, and possibly tickets or fines
- No Excections
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders should be ok
- I support harrassing or feeding say coyotes but I don't support banning bird feeders for example
- Birds & squirrels
- Those related to animals well-being. Eg food to help trap an injured animal for assistance
- They should be able to harass the wild life. There are people who take pleasure of seeing these animals and being able to feed them can bring joy to those who are not able to have pets, such as seniors.
- Clear definition of what feeding, which animails are targetted for feeding and what "teasing" is defined as.
- That if wildlife enter your property you can do what is necessary to scare them off
- None
- None, human interaction with wildlife never ends well for the wildlife.
- Squirrels digging up gardens
- Ducks and birds
- An injured animal; until help arrived or animal is transported to Vet or SPCA.
- Bird feeders for winter



- Throwing 'teasing' in with feeding is a very interesting way to get your bylaw passed. Many have bird feeders and like feeding birds - this would be banned; however you are likely tricking these people into supporting your bylaw.
- I don't think that people should be feeding wild animals that live within City of Calgary limits. This makes the wild animals a nuisance for all the residents of Calgary. Wild animals are able to find their own source of food without human intervention.
- Farm properties
- Sanctuary and programs, prohibit in residential
- Feeding Birds
- Where an animal is abandoned or in distress and the response of Fish and Wildlife or rescue center is delayed
- Bird feeding
- No
- #NAME?
- You can not control human interactions with wildlife on private property - this is a breach of individual freedoms. HOWEVER, increasing awareness of the irreparable harm of these negative interactions to wildlife is a must - individuals MUST be aware!
- Feeding Wild Birds
- None
- penalties need to be large to discourage people
- Bird and insect related
- Birds and squirrels in peoples yards
- Similar fines to coincide with city fine structure
- Difficult to answer with feed and tease lumped together.
- Bird feeders
- Burden feeders
- If the animal is in distress
- None
- Fines
- Poison for pests
- Wildlife should be left alone, whether on public or private lands. Fines should be issued to residents, tourists, or permanent residents in Calgary if they are found feeding wildlife.
- People should be allowed to feed birds and squirrels on their property, but not teasing!
- Bird Feeders
- Encouraging dangerous wildlife to enter public places
- Song birds and other small birds
- Feeding birds, squirrels appropriate food that won't harm them.
- Putting out food for things like birds and squirrels should be fine.
- Bird feeders



- Birds
- Fine
- Ban all pit bulls in the city of Calgary
- If the wildlife is contained/caged on private property (the animal is not choosing to be there), then the property owner should be charged for feeding/teasing wild animal
- Bird feeders
- Animal cruelty laws ready exist. I would support nothing further
- No teasing. Deer ok to feed. Not bear or predators
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Only applies to large animals, and pest species (gulls/pidgeons)
- Birds.
- Birdfeeding
- I feel bird feeders are not an issue!
- If an animal requires to be trapped to relocate it then it may be necessary to provide treats to encourage the animal to catch it safely
- Bird feeders
- discouraging wild animals displaying aggressive behaviour on private property.
- Bird feeders.
- More laws are not always more helpful
- Teasing sure, feeding squirrels,birds and such should be allowed. Giving a person a fine for having a bird feeder is asinine.
- this is a leading question implying we should answer "yes" to this question... do you want feedback or simply confirmation of a decision you've already made?
- Farms
- None
- Members of the public feeding an injured animal in order to bring them to a relevant rescue operation.
- Having food spots for wildlife since humans are driving them out of their habitat
- Exception for bird feeders and water for animals
- Feeding birds/squirrels should still be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- Teasing and feeding should be separate. Some people have bird feeders, hummingbird feeders, etc and these should be excluded. They provide food sources for wild birds during the winter months.
- No squirrels or Canadian Geese feeding
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Animals that you intend to take in and keep (ie stray cat). This is how we adopted our cat.
- Birds



- Birds
- Feeding birds, squirrels, etc.
- Bird feeders
- Only forbid feeding bears on private property
- Using food to entice a hurt animal in order to take it to an appropriate veterinary clinic
- If the wildlife was called in but unable to be picked up immediately feeding and giving it water would be justified.
- I think teasing is a different matter than feeding wildlife. Teasing seems much more malicious in nature, and should thus be more stringently penalized.
- If someone is having a negative impact on an animal (teasing?) that should be pursued as heavily as possible as anyone hurting animals is a public safety threat
- 50\$ fine for feeding.
- None
- None
- Ive always fed the rabbits, quails, birds and whatever else happens in my yard...one way of reducing waste.....no dogs wild or domestic, deer unless they help themselves
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Unless it is absolutely in the best interest of the animal but that is a fine line
- No exceptions
- None
- Injured or animals needing help, getting them to safety and contacting local wildlife professionals
- Small wild birds - not including seagulls and pigeons
- Bird feeders
- Traps for pests
- None
- Birds
- STOP being FASCIST leave wild life alone
- Birdfeeders
- None that I can think of in short notice
- Bird feeders
- Animals (rabbits,voles) that are destroying property should be able to be chased away
- Birds
- There are too many people who are feeling nuisance wildlife such as dumping down meat for coyotes / and feeding pigeons to excess. Obviously exceptions such as putting out a small amount of feed for birds / bunnies in the winter.
- Feeding birds
- birds especially in winter in winter



- Some small birds not birds of prey or waterfowl
- None!
- Exclude birds
- Birds
- If another danger is imminent to the animal & human life.
- Bird/squirrel feeders, etc
- Peoples private property is theirs, this is an overreach.
- Jack rabbits
- Feeding birds squirrels, etc
- Bird feeders
- Feeding small non threatening animals / leaving food
- Birds
- None
- Prohibit teasing, but not feeding birds on private property.
- Feeding birds, squirrels and other small critters with feeders
- None
- bird feeders
- None
- “Cruel” conduct should be prosecuted
- Rehabilitation
- bird feeders
- Feeding on private property encourages wildlife to roam into neighborhoods and away for their natural environment,
- Birds
- If the wildlife is causing issues to gardens flowerbeds personal property on private property.
- Bird feeders
- Discourage wildlife visitors - scarring them away
- bird feeders
- None
- Let people do what they want
- Birds - feeding, no teasing!
- feeding birds
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- Bird feeders.
- if the animal is domesticated and the individual has permission from the property owner.
- It's never necessary. Leave it to a wild life rehab place.
- None
- None



- None
- I see no problem with feeding wild animals on your own property. We all have bird feeders, etc.
- Non contact feeders and water
- Feeding in winter only. Assuming wildlife has trouble feeding itself due to damaged habitat in cities.
- Feeding birds
- None
- Providing water on private property for wildlife, especially in the warmer months where fresh water for all creatures is a necessity. Feeding of feral cats in order to trap them.
- Bird feeders
- Birds and the odd squirrel should be exempted
- N.A
- Injured animals
- The exception I would suggest is if there was an animal that showed up that was starving and hurt that needed to be tended to until the animal control officers were called to help.
- Bird and squirrel feeders, ponds
- None
- We should not be feeding wild animals human food and should work to keep human interaction to a minimum. However I support actions towards dangerous wildlife animals if they are causing issues with pet and land owners
- Birds, squirrel
- The exceptions are when the wildlife eats on its own available fruit or grass from your yard, or food from your green bins. Also, bird feeders, insect feeders should be an exception.
- Unless it's feeding any type of rabbits.
- Injured wildlife.
- Okay to feed definately not okay to tease.
- herbivores, and anything under 15 pounds. No teasing
- Birds
- Song-bird feeder ONLY
- Bird feeders
- Injured wildlife
- bird feeders
- Birds
- I would expect it is enforced.
- None
- bird feeders, helping sick or injured animals
- Domesticated rabbits that have been released into parks should be caught and adopted to responsible owners. Currently their feed by random people in our neighborhood (walden)
- Allow bird feeders



- It is okay to feed and help the animal if it is injured and going to be turned over to animal rescue authorities.
- birds, squirrels, insects
- Fines
- Bird feeders ok
- I would continue to allow bird feeders but ensure correct education around this. Teasing in unacceptable
- If the wildlife is injured and the person feeding in attempting to help rehabilitate (not keep)
- None
- Feeding/helping injured or sick animals and bird feeders
- Absolutely no exception
- bird and squirrel feeders
- If the animal is suffering or ill.
- Fines should be enforced for repeat offenders
- You should have separated into 2 questions. No teasing, for sure. Feeding depends. Clearly define wildlife. Bird feeders depend on if properly used.
- No feeding or teasing of wildlife in the City Parks or surrounds. Severe fines (\$500 plus) if caught doing so.
- If the animal is injured or if it's an animal that's in need of rescue
- Fishing or bating for fish
- Birds, squirrels and harmless animals could be fed
- Feeding of animals on private property should be at the owners discretion however teasing of animals should be unacceptable and punishable
- None. Feeding wildlife is dangerous for both residents and wildlife. Intentions are misguided and ignorant.
- None
- Absolutely no exceptions.
- Bird feeders
- Birds.
- Injured/sick animals
- N/A
- Squirrels/Birds
- Accidental / foraging
- Let land owners do there own thing
- Birds
- Birds, squirrels and allowing wildlife to eat from apple trees and other fruit bearing bushes or trees
- Only if teasing them is harmful to the animals well being
- no exceptions
- bird feeders

- Feeding of birds should be allowed but type of bird seed allowed should be limited to types found naturally in the city.
- Feeding birds in your own yard should be allowed.
- Rescue
- Private property
- None
- birds and squirrels
- No teasing or hurting animals
- Teasing and poisoning wildlife should be fined .. some ppl have bird feeders and that should be allowed
- Bird feeders (stationary)
- Let people have their bird feeders. Why would you even suggest this? It is their private property. Stop interfering in land owners' lives.
- Private property owners could call the City to have pest wildlife removed
- Birds, squirrels
- birds and hare
- Feeding is ok but teasing is not!
- none
- Exempt a feeding bylaw for birds, chipmunks, squirrels, rabbits
- Starving, stranded/abandoned animals and bylaw has been called.
- squirrels that feed from bird feeders uninvited and bird feeders for birds
- Make homeowners able to scare/deter wild animals from their property.
- Bird feeders
- Squirrels/birds feeding
- Emaciated
- Allowing bird feeders etc that support wildlife and sustaining our environment
- I'm assuming bird feeders would be exempt?
- Are specific kinds of bird feeders allowed? I am not sure. I assume bird feeders are OK if they are only up in the spring?
- None
- The allowance of bird feeders and other items of that nature where food is provided year round and not hand fed to animals/wildlife
- If wildlife were injured and could be safely captured and taken for treatment, this should be exempt
- prohibit behaviour when damage to neighbor property results or is likely.
- none
- Ok to feed birds and squirrels
- Feeding birds
- None



- Bird feeders, or small animals, feeding only. People should not be feeding large animals such as deer, coyotes or otherwise, because it encourages them to be in the city
- Feeding birds proper bird seed
- Maybe for bigger pieces of land. All that is in my back yard are birds and squirrels who I feed with a bird feeder.
- Attempting to safely encourage wildlife to leave your property should be allowed, and things like bird feeders should be exempt as well. Teasing wildlife should be the main concern here.
- N/A
- N/a
- birds
- Bird feeders
- Small wildlife such as birds and squirrels.
- ban pitbull as pets
- Bird feeders
- If intentionally done they should receive fines
- birds, squirrels,
- Injured and awaiting professional assistance.
- Trying to encourage dangerous animals being lured into residential areas should be prohibited but a blanket law stopping people from having squirrel picnic tables on their fence is a waste of city money.
- Birds
- none
- Feeding birds and squirrels should still be allowed
- Clearly starved or injured animals
- I personally think it's okay to feed birds and squirrels in your own backyard.
- birds
- Birds, bee keeping
- What kind of a question is this putting feeding and teasing wildlife in the same question like this? It's not ok to "tease" wildlife but yes it's ok to have a bird feeder in your front lawn.
- Birds (bird feeders, for example) and other such wildlife. If all feeding or teasing is banned, that would potentially impact feeders , bird baths, etc.
- No teasing or attempting to harm animal
- Birds, wouldn't still be ok to put food out for birds?
- Bird feeders
- If there is an injured animal and the individuals knows how to care for it
- There shouldn't be any bylaw regarding wild life on their private property.
- Pigeons, birds, squirrels and so forth. No need to ban bird feeders or giving nuts to squirrels. Teasing, 100% should be fined!
- Birds and small rodents (eg: squirrel)



- None
- Feeding birds
- bird feeders
- First warning potentially offering education first
- Birdfeeders
- Teasing should be allowed, but feeding animals like birds, squirrels, and rabbits should be allowed
- If the wildlife is in immediate danger
- Bird feeders
- Rabbits,squirrels,birds
- Can not harm or try to tame even on private property.
- discretion by bylaw officers, theirs a diffrence between feeding and teasing. Feeding should be allowed however, teasing should be enforced with penalties !!
- The only exception, should allow property owners to feed Wild Birds such as Crows, Magpies, Bluejays, Finches. etc. Predatory Wildlife, hawks, Eagles, Etc. should not be encouraged..
- Horses
- City funding for removal of invasive animals such as magpies and squirrels so humans don't need to inhumanely trap them
- exceptions should be if there is an attempt to provide supportive care - i.e.) injured animal or lost baby (needs to be fed to survive)
- This "engagement" sucks. You don't care what we have to say anyway, so why bother? You've already made up your minds that you want more rules and more power.
- None of it is private property
- Feeding in an attempt to "adopt"
- exceptions for bird feeders, leaving food out for stray pets like cats and dogs, and feeding injured wildlife to coax them into the care of someone offering rehabilitation or rescue status to an animal that would not flourish in the wild without
- Bird feeders
- Food lure for humane capture and release when needed
- Bird feeders are ok
- Bird feeders
- Birds , squirrels,
- Feeding Squirrels, rabbits, birds
- None
- No exceptions wildlife should never be fed by humans
- Stupid question to include two opposite considerations with only allowing an either "Yes" or "No"! Even a child would NOT group these two together. To clarify my answer, NO bylaw to feeding... YES to Teasing!! What idiot wrote this question??
- Feeding should be allowed. I love to watch the birds and squirrels at my feeders. Any sort of teasing should be prohibited



- Based on two options provided, no. Define teasing, do you mean harassment? I would support if you mean harassment. For feeding, does this include bird feeders? In favour of bird feeders and a bylaw prohibiting harassment.
- Birds
- None
- I don't understand how this is even enforceable.
- none
- This is a ridiculous question! Do we put bird feeders out? Yes. Do we out put peanuts out? Yes. So what does feeding and teasing mean. Laying out a big piece of meat for a bear? Of course people shouldn't be and also teasing should not be in the Same ques
- Birds should be allowed to be fed during winter months
- No exceptions
- None
- Bird seed feeders/sugar water for bees etc
- Private farms that bring people in to feed animals. Similarly to a zoo.
- none
- birdfeeders, perhaps with design types that restrict ability of other wildlife to get at them
- Bird feeders
- None
- None
- Squirrels and Rabbits
- bird feeders
- In the case that the animal needs rehabilitation or it is in the best interest of the animal's continued survival as a wild animal.
- Bird feeders
- This is not an issue
- Bird feeders
- Exceptions would be for bird feeders and things like that, as well as large properties where wildlife wouldn't be an issue to neighbours.
- Exception of bird feeders
- Animals in danger
- Bird feeders
- If the animal is injured
- None, Wildlife is a gift and we should give them the space they need admiring them from a distance and respecting there boundries they are not here for our entertainment
- Bridfeeders
- none



- no concerns with feeding because many of us enjoy leaving peanuts for the squirrels, some carrots for the rabbits in the community etc. But for anyone who thinks they can tease or torment any wildlife even crows, magpies anything they should be fined
- Nuance would have to be made for wildlife professionals and/or rescue situations (I.e. finding an injured animal on your property)
- Wild birds. Let them have bird feeders
- Songbirds, bees, threatened species
- Allowing bird feeders which would allow citizens to feed wild songbirds and corvids, also providing care under the guidance of a wildlife rehabilitation facility (ex. Soft release locations)
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- Please define teasing. Reasonable measures to deal with nuisance animals that destroy property or are a risk to public safety because they harbor diseases for instance (e.g. trapping and relocation, safe use of rodenticides, use of chemical deterrents).
- Birds feeders (that squirrels can't get to) and water dishes or bird baths should be allowed.
- I would support a bylaw that prohibits the feeding of potentially aggressive and harmful wildlife. People should be allowed to keep their bird feeders up, but if a coyote walks into your property, that's a different story.
- If the animal is in distress and require immediate help.
- Fines
- Bird feeders
- Rescue situations - eg. trying to lure an injured animal so that it can be picked up by wildlife rehabbers
- None
- Prohibit teasing animals only
- Only when Owner of property has sign of approval
- the question is 2 pronged, I object to teasing but not to feeding
- The property owner should have input as it is their property
- Bird feeders
- It's not a problem, could be a comfort to people. If you have garden, leave your dog food out and wildlife eat some, are you feeding them. Putting out wild bird feed should not be a problem. If people are capturing animals, this is hunting w/o licence.
- If wildlife was killing live stock/pets on private property certain exceptions could be made
- Bird feeders are allowed
- I would support a bylaw that prohibits teasing wildlife on private property, but fining people for bird feeders? Seriously? The definition is far too broad.
- Shouldn't this be more a question of prohibition of cruelty / teasing of wild animals? If feeding is prohibited, then folks who like to have a bird feeder for example would be prohibited from that. Prohibition of cruelty would be more pointed.



- Stop feeding squirrels
- I can't think of any reason why someone should be feeding a wild animal on private property (other than zoos or rescue societies or similar groups) within the city limits
- Birds
- bird feeders
- Coyotes and/or Skunks
- Private property! Unless your paying my property tax, you don't get to dictate how i live on MY property!
- Children under 16 feeding animals. Teasing remains
- Not sure if birds are included in 'wildlife', but they should be exempt from not being able to feed them. This is particularly well enjoyed By seniors, so that should be allowed.
- A full day session educating them why
- Bird feeders of all sorts.
- Being able to scare off Canadian Geese to prevent nesting in high traffic areas
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- No exceptions. Keep wildlife wild.
- It should be prohibited including Fines
- Agreed for non-domesticated wildlife, I.e., coyotes, deer, etc. Do not agree for rabbits, cats, birds (and squirrels by default).
- teasing or abusing should be prohibited
- No exceptions
- Birds
- Blrds
- Bird feeders
- feeding birds
- No, only because how would you enforce this
- Humming birds and such
- Bird feeding, as long as they aren't feeding them bread.
- Provide bird food at select spots
- Fines for opening leaving feed for wildlife
- If a young animal is abandoned or in distress, taking care of it/keeping it safe until a professional can help.
- bird feeders
- I love to feed my birds. I would support no teasing, but my birds mean alot to me, and I love to feed them. I also have a birdhouse that attaches to my window, and had the pleasure of watching four baby birds be raised for a couple weeks!
- Bird feeders , someone putting out cat food to feed a stray, with the intention to rescue the animal (which may attract wildlife)



- Leave all the issues alone. It's clear that all you're doing is trying to create new revenue streams through new and silly bylaws.
- Bird feeders
- Food in a live trap should be permitted so the animal can be trapped and relocated
- Personal outdoor animals, bird feeders/baths
- The city is purposing I can't leave nuts or bird seed out for squirrels or birds. City Council has lost its mind
- Bird feeders
- Backyard bird feeders
- birds exempt and an application process with review for large animal feeding to ensure animal safety from roads and people. More allowances in winter months
- Bumble bees
- Feeding birds and other welcome animals to ensure a healthy ecosystem.
- Teasing wildlife on private and public property should get fined.
- Bird feeders on personal property so long as the feed is an approved seed
- Injured animals
- Feeding orphaned or injured wildlife.
- None
- Unless an owner intentionally brings/entices wildlife onto their property.
- Birds
- If you were to feed/hydrate wounded wildlife while waiting for city assistance
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Unless it's a rescue animal and is being cared for and nurtured before being released back into the wild.
- Bird/squirrel feeders.
- An exception where the animal's life is in danger without intervention.
- Bird feeders, water bowls in a drought
- Except birds.
- Bird feeders. Bat refuges on houses.
- Stop looking for ridiculous ways to fine people to make money!!!
- Squires, rabbits, birds
- N/a
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- First offense as a warning with information as to the harm to wildlife. Second offense, fine and mandatory volunteering at animal rescue.
- Harassing is against provincial law, isn't it? Also what do you mean by feeding - prohibition on bird feeders?



- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds is fine
- Posting healthy options to feed some animals and anything else illegal
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- No exceptions
- It's hard to enforce this on private property
- Bird feeders
- Fine
- Things like bird feeders should be allowed.
- Bird feeder would be an exception
- None - wildlife shouldn't be fed or teased. Accidental (ex: coyote eating bone left out for dog) would have to be forgiven, if not regularly repeated).
- Supported licensed rescue organizations and their volunteers
- People should not be allowed to harm wildlife on their property, with the exception of pest control.
- None
- Ducks
- Bird feeders should be left alone.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding reasonable amounts of appropriate food is okay (setting out bird seed or peanuts for squirrels). Teasing/harming wildlife not okay on private property.
- Looks in need of help
- Birds from elevated feeders
- Wild bird food.
- Bird feeder only
- Allow feeding, prohibit teasing wildlife on private property.
- Farmers are entitled to appropriate, ethical pest removal
- Feeding fish at the Devonian Gardens
- None
- No exceptions; people can own property but NOT wild animals that roam across it.
- Feeding birds/squirrels keeps a great number of seniors/elderly engaged and happy.
- Squirrel and bird feeders are fine
- Bird feeders, and manmade homes for birds, bees, bats, etc.
- Bird feeders & pollinator attractants
- No exceptions otherwise it will be difficult to enforce
- An animal needing immediate care ie. in distress, dehydrated, etc
- birds on your property
- Feeding okay, teasing not
- Birds



- None
- Well it would have to be specific. While teasing wildlife is definitely not okay anywhere would that mean we can not leave bird seed out? Clearly we don't want people feeding bears but birds should be okay I'm not sure about other animals such as squirrel
- Birds in winter.
- Injured animals.
- Feeding of squirrels, chipmunks or birds
- song birds but not pidgens,crows or magpies
- None
- Kids feeding should only be a warning. Teasing should be a heavy fine regardless
- If the animal is suspected of neglect or irresponsible ownership, the individual(s) should have the right to provide sustenance to animal in need. Teasing and taunting should result in a fine and report to bylaw for documenting purposes.
- No
- This will be very hard to inforce
- bird feeders and Injured animals, but only if no agencies will take them.
- birds
- You would make bird feeders against the law? No thanks!
- Why should there be exceptions? The wildlife don't benefit from any exceptions. If we are talking about children feeding wildlife - fine the parents!
- Birds
- no exception
- Bird feeding in spring , fall and wintersould be allowed with no penalties.
- Bird feeders? Unless there is research that these would be harmful to wildlife.
- helping an animal that is in trouble
- A sick or injured or abandoned animal
- None
- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- None. If a danger, in danger or injured, then the wildlife should be removed from the site by the proper authorities equipped to do so and to ensure the wellbeing of the wildlife.
- NO fines for feeding! People just don't know. Teasing or harming should be fined
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Birds
- Giving bird the appropriate feed in parks etc.
- I disagree that feeding certain wildlife would be problematic, as is often done with geese and ducks around the city. However teasing wildlife or harming them in any way should have a bylaw in place.
- None.



- Ensure people are feeding appropriate foods to the wildlife. ie: not just putting out bread. Birdseed & nuts for birds and squirrels is ok.
- Nursing a hurt animal back to health
- City support of home owners following bylaw by providing resources to deal with them otherwise (e.g. the cost of exterminators or other falls on the homeowner)
- Feeding prey animals
- Bird feeders
- I think bird feeders are fine... not okay with hand feeding animals.
- Offering injured wildlife food they normally consume before bringing them to a rehab centre.
- Allow for bird feeders
- N/A
- If wildlife babies are found neglected then can feed until a proper home is found
- No exceptions. People need to be educated when they also go to the mountains.
- If the animal looks to be very skinny, starved and unhealthy
- Supporting the community by having some come assist with capturing the wildlife and removing it from private property. Also if the Bylaw is violated then fines should be implemented
- Bird feeders
- If the animal is in need of care and must be fed
- Cruelty
- Weddings or large gatherings
- Technically this would mean no bird feeding. Leave private property alone with the exception of harming animals
- Yes to teasing...absolutely. Allow bird feeding
- Private land owners need the freedom to deal with their own wildlife issues within the existing laws.
- Bird feeders
- Animal sanctuaries/educational programs that offer "feed the fish" seminars etc
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders are probably okay but need to have anti-squirrel device so they don't become squirrel feeders.
- Bird feeders
- none
- squirrels. birds
- Give fines
- If it's injured and a call has already been placed to rescue or fish and wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeding should be allowed
- Does this include bird feeders?
- Birds
- Wild birds



- Birds okay, mammals, not okay
- Birds
- Except birds
- Larger wildlife e.g. deer, bears etc.
- Birds
- Feeding a wounded animal. Teasing is never okay.
- Birds, squirrels
- None. We should not be engaging in feeding wildlife.
- Winter feeding allowed
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeding still okay
- If the animal looks like it's being starved and clearly had an owner or lives with people. Until proper authorities can help with the situation.
- birds
- Birds on private property
- bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels should be exempt
- Feeding Birds from bird feeders
- Feeding the birds
- I would accept that the City of Calgary is going to overstep on this issue and unjustifiably infringe on the rights of private owners for no valid reason.
- I would support a fine for trading any wildlife, whether on private property or not. But I wouldn't support fines for feeding wildlife on private property
- none
- Birds
- Feeding is very vague. Bird feeders should not be prohibited. Teasing/harassment are what the bylaw should prevent.
- Bird feeders
- Caring for injured while awaiting animal services
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders, bird baths, or offering water or salt licks without human contact.
- None
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders with species-appropriate feed
- Fines
- Birds
- You guys need to get a clue
- Slippery slope. Definition punish teasing/malicious feeding but what if someone is just say feeding birds?



- If an animal looks like they are starving FEED IT!!
- Public property only
- Having a bird feeder on private property
- I don't think it's okay for bi law to just go onto someone's property with out asking.
- Injured
- Hummingbird feeders as they don't attract rodents
- I would want to be able to trap a wild animal if it is a danger to my pets.
- Feeding wild animals during extreme cold, ie. temps beliw -20 C
- Small amounts of bird seed or a limited number of Bird feeders.
- Squirrels and birds
- Certain scenerios such as starvation due to harsh winter or drought where the animals will die without being fed. In no case is it acceptable to harass or tease wildlife
- Some animals, especially those that may have suffered injury, can benefit from feeding. I am 100% against teasing but information on when it is appropriate and what to offer as food to wild animals that need a bot of help could be very helpful to some.
- Bird feeders during winter
- None, no bird feeders either, they make birds reliant on humans
- limited number of bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- Birds.
- can birds still be fed from feeders, should people not be able to feed wild animals on their property?
- No interacting with wildlife and feeding, also signs that educate people that feeding wildlife becomes a danger for wildlife
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding is fine, no teasing
- If you find abandoned wildlife feed only until Wildlife support can get to them.
- I think it should target the teasing of wildlife. Feeding birds and the opportunistic squirrels should be an exception
- If the animals are malnourished they should be fed and the owner of the property should be fined
- Feeding birds
- Birds
- Birdfeeders
- Yes is the proper response to above but my concern relates to enforcement. It is challenging for current bylaws and police officers to deal with existing bylaws, and most responses result from 311 complaints. Education/awareness is more effective.
- Bird feeders
- None.



- Exceptions would be feeding birds
- Injury cases.
- Bird feeders
- Do not be passing any bylaws that is discriminatory to any breed any bylaws past must go for all breeds
- Hummingbird feeders, other bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Ducks and birds.
- Squirrels and birds
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Wild birds
- Permit allowing such if deemed necessary by wildlife experts
- Wild animals are being kept in so-called private properties like houses, hotels, places of business, worship, and whatever other “fronts” people have. Wild animals are only kept only for entertainment, companionship and whatever “good” excuse people have.
- No pigeon birds
- birds
- Exceptions for bird seed
- Bird feeders
- Baiting for hunting shouldn't be allowed.
- none
- none
- Unless The animal needs assistance
- None
- Bird feeders, or humming bird feeders. No fines if say a deer were to come and eat from a bird feeder as it wasn't put up with the intent of the deer using it. Only the bird life.
- Animals the seem or are on the brink of death by starvation
- Injured or sickly animals that would benefit from human intervention (feed if starving/water if hot/tired/dehydrated; using food to lure/catch and release if trapped in home/yard; using food to trap in an effort to bring to a vet/rescue)
- None for teasing, but birdfeeders should be allowed.
- Feeding in order to encourage the vacating of private property
- Feeding squirrels, birds, rabbits
- None.
- Does this include wild birds, squirrels? If so, I do not support this.
- Bird feeders and bird baths with appropriate bird safe food and water.
- Bird feeders
- birds



- The bylaw needs to exclude birdfeeders if you must do so. We keep the partridges fed in the winter and they roost safely in our back yard.
- any dogs that bark excessively must either be muzzled or returned inside their homes. regardless of wether it's on their property.
- Exceptions for bird feeders and perhaps squirrel/chipmunk feeders
- None
- Prohibit teasing, lots of people have bird and squirrel feeders no reason not to feed them, going to need to be way more specific that just prohibit all feeding.
- Bird feeders
- Birds at feeders
- If the animal was being nursed to health due to injury or otherwise.
- Petting zoos? Duh
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds and squirrels from feeder
- Would feeding of birds be exempted? Bird food must not be sold as mixed seeds. Mixed seed feed encourages mice infestations. Then you need more feral cats and skunks to manage the mice.M
- Bird feeders, etc of safe food
- Bird feeders
- An animal that has lost its mother and at high risk of dying otherwise.
- Are you going to ban bird feeders? That seems cruel.
- None
- If the animal is hurt and being tended to/cared for by people on private property until fish and wildlife or proper care can be given
- No exceptions, no animal should be subject to feeding/poisoning or teasing/torturing in any environment.
- In times of distress/need on the animal's part.
- If wildlife is hurt or starving, we should be allowed to help them.
- That question is too general and would make bird feeders illegal. Hell, it would make a butterfly garden illegal.
- Feeding birds
- Teasing sounds horrible, but I would like clarification on how far this goes, would there be fines for bird feeders, or just for feeding rabbits? This needs more exploration.
- Be more clear. Sounds like you want to take away bird feeders (wild animals eating on private property after all). Also don't lump teasing and feeding together. Teasing is malicious thus needs to be in some sort of legislation about cruelty
- If it's a matter of rehabilitation, i.e feeding for a short period of time with full intentions to relocate to a wildlife rehabilitation center
- Bird feeders,



- This is ridiculous. Do you mean "No Bird Houses or Bird Feeders"? Does this apply to having gardens that attract bees?
- Proximity to city centre
- If the animal is hurt or injured and needs nutrients
- Wild animals found on private property, that are not welcome, should be reported not dealt with personally.
- Helping injured or sick wildlife before they can be helped by Fish and Wildlife etc.
- Squirrel and bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird and other wildlife feeders
- Feeding birds would be acceptable
- Make fines stiffer for incidents on private property
- This is too far reaching. I have a bird feeder on my property. Also, what constitutes "feeding"? I grow carrots and other veggies and that can attract rabbits and such. Could a nosy neighbour call bylaw on me? Would i be asked to create a fence?
- Bird feeders
- There is a natural order most people understand. They won't feed wild animals excessively. Unless they are radical animal rights activists.
- Not feeding but a bylaw against teasing for sure.
- If the animal was in serious/obvious need of help (ex: malnourished, abused)
- Small birds feeders NOT for crows/magpies
- Fine
- Feeding birds
- Bread to ducks
- If the person is experienced who owns the land and is helping to rescue or the animal can no longer be in the wild due to injury or another unforeseen circumstance.
- Exceptions for bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Only prevent the prevent the feeding of invasive species
- bird feeders
- Birdfeeders, squirrelfeeders, etc.
- The squirrel population is increasing in areas close to Fish Creek. There must be citizens dropping in area and as a result people are feeding them as if they're pets. Wild animals should not be fed but left to hunt on their own. At least this would help
- Birds
- Voluntary compliance
- Bird feeders



- It must be witnessed, and the witness who reports it cannot hide his / her identity behind the cover of Protection Of Privacy. In other words, an anonymous tip must be substantiated before any action, even so much as recording a case file note, is taken.
- Bird feeders should remain allowed. I'm more concerned with intentionally attracting dangerous wildlife or putting wildlife in danger by hand feeding or feeding an improper diet.
- Feeding an animal that was clearly in need or injured and the person had done research to ensure it was safe and healthy for the animal
- Wildlife eating from gardens in peoples backyard
- Feeding and teasing are not comparable and should not have been included on the same question.
- Bird feeders, and injured or abandoned wildlife
- feeding ducks should be an exception
- Hummingbird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- keep them wild and leave them alone.
- Birds
- Feeding injured or helpless wildlife is fine
- Exception for injured animal
- Where wildlife is dangerous to people or causes distraction to property
- If feeding of wild life is permitted the people feeding them are responsible to maintain feeding through out winter months
- Abandoned babies or injured animals waiting for wildlife rescuers
- None
- If you are approached by an animal in the wild and use food as a source to redirect the animals attention if your safety is threatened
- Birds, involuntarily feeding (ie. Garbage, compost, garden, etc.)
- Birds/squirrels. The teasing piece is what bothers me not so much the feeding if it's not causing problems for neighbors.
- Birdfeeders ok
- Clearly abandoned or endangered young animals?
- Depends on the animal... I'm not against people feeding birds for example.
- squirrels, birds unless these are not wildlife
- I think that noone should tease wildlife wherever they are located, but bird feeding definitely should be allowed.
- Bird feeders.
- I wouldn't.
- Unclear on "feeding wildlife". What sort of wildlife? Do bird feeders count?
- Retreats and rescues, animals that have become so desensitized to the humans
- Birdfeeders



- The challenge will be differentiating intent, as there will be businesses that may have material considered potential food exposed but not for the intent of feeding. Exceptions for songbirds.
- I think it depends on the weather. In winters with harsh temperatures and lots of snow it is difficult for animals such as deer to find food.
- It might acceptable if the wildlife is posing a threat or is being a nuisance.
- Wild bird feed and squirrel feed
- Nobody should ever tease animal; bird feeders on private property are fine
- If the animal is posing a danger or is itself being a pest, for example damaging property, leaving waste. These must occur at least 3 times for the “being a pest” label to occur.
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders.
- Animals coming to bird feeders
- Warning first before a fine.
- I have cats roaming in my area and there is no control by the city.
- Feeding orphaned babies until they are able to be rescued
- Crows
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- You need to be specific on wildlife. Does this include not being able to feed the birds, bird seed?
- Having the city come trap and release outside city limits
- Indigenous rights to the land, for hunting and gathering purposes.
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- I would support for safety concerns such as when it comes to predatory animals. If people want to feed birds or maybe deer they should. If people want to discourage them away they should.
- Would support a bylaw saying no teasing as humane. But feeding should be up to the person on private property.
- Bird feeders be allowed that protect from animals getting in to them.
- This bylaw is ridiculous. You're a bunch of hypocritical priveledged pricks. Dogs aren't aggressive it's the humans that are. This has been proven in actual research. Sorry where's your research? Right you did none because you're blind and incompetent.
- none, calgarians can't be trusted. duhhh i'm a CoNsErVaTiVe freedom!!!
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders on private property/residences.
- Private property people can do as they please
- Rabbits
- Feeding birds, small animals.
- None
- None



- Small birds and small Herbivores.
- Feral cats, dogs that need capture to spay neuter, foster.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- None
- Farmlands where feeding is unintentional and the animals eating off are considered pests
- Unless explicitly communicated that feeding/teasing is allowed by the owner of the private property. Also, if the wildlife appears to be in a hazardous situation which merits feeding/teasing.
- [removed]i make freinds with bears!!!!!!
- bird feeders
- Bird/squirrel feeders I feel are fine
- A stray dog or cat
- Structures like bird and squirrel feeders should still be allowed!
- Bird feeding
- Farms, petting zoos
- Feeding birds should be allowed
- bird seed or water, any food that is nutritional to the wild animals or is because of a critical situation that has been reported
- Feeding bird, as feeding birds should be okay
- Bird Feeders
- if the wildlife was being tormented/harmed
- Stricter fines and enforcement, its awful seeing what people do to wild animals and how the animals then learn these behaviors and can find themselves being laid to rest because of it.
- N/a
- If you feed them or bug them they become more into humans when they should be left alone
- Birds, squirrels
- None
- None
- Trapping to remove from property
- NONE
- Bird feeding
- feeding and teasing wildlife are two seperate things and require two seperate sets of inquiry
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders, hummingbird feeders
- Exceptions to birds and small mammals in the winter
- That's private property city nor govt should have any say.
- I would still like to be able to offer bird feeders to attract wild birds to my area
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Small mammals like squirrels



- None
- Make a mandatory call to the city to report the sightings.
- Fines
- Teasing and hurting wild animals - but feeding them especially in the winter: birds, rabbits, squirrels is fine.
- Just that description of teasing/feeding be clear versus for example trapping problem animals - squirrels in homes, raccoons...
- In cases of natural disaster or extreme distress, assisting animals is reasonable. Bird feeders are also reasonable. Unintentionally feeding, such as animals entering your garden, should also be excluded.
- If someone wants to feed the animal, they can do what they want. If they are going to tease/abuse the animal that is not ok.
- Accidental feeding, perhaps garbage or something else left out accidentally (first time only).
- Small rodents, ie birds, squirrels
- Allow bird feeders
- No exceptions keep wildlife wild!
- Feeding birds should be allowed
- Bird and squirrel feeders are okay
- Bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels etc
- None
- Would bird feeders be prohibited? I don't agree with that. // For Question 1, I would support fines for intact cats found off property, but not for those that are spayed/neutered.
- Birds
- i would support no teasing or abuse of wildlife. responsible feeding i am ok with
- teasing wildlife or any negative behaviour... responsible feeding of wildlife i am ok here
- Bird feeders on private property
- Bird feeders should still be allowed on private property
- Personal Bird feeders
- None
- let people feed them.
- Teasing, violence/killing or harrassing wildlife.
- Wildlife should not feel comfortable being fed by people for safety reasons as well as the animals safety
- If an animal turns up in an immaciated state, feeding it sould not be a "crime"
- Is feeding/teasing on private property really a problem in this city?
- Any adaptations that are part of the natural ecosystem should be allowed. Ex: flowers that attract birds.



- The feeding of wildlife should be prohibited anywhere including private property if that property is in a residential area. Property owners should have to report wildlife to Alberta Fish & Wildlife.
- Warning/fine system
- An animal that is being rescued or being supported until rescue, with an accredited organization.
- I believe that there should be obvious intent to tease or feed the wildlife. If a person's dog chases a bunny but the owner makes every attempt to stop the dog and prevent it in the future or a kid leaving food outside.
- Bird feeders s/b permitted
- birdfeeding should not be included in any bylaw prohibiting wildlife feeding.
- This should be 2 questions- Feeding and Teasing are 2 different subjects. Feeding wildlife is fine- bird seed/ squirrel nuts etc However teasing- or anything that causes emotional and/or physical abuse to animal should be banned
- What of bird feeders that squirrels raid? Does that mean no more bird feeders?
- If some one is poaching or luring for extermination
- I would suggest an exception if the resident(s) were feeding or offering water to an animal that they had notified the City about, such as in the case of an injured or orphaned wild animal (i.e. temporary measures while waiting for City to arrive)
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Birds and squirrels.
- Injured wildlife that may need some feeding to be rescued and taken to a wildlife conservation center.
- N/A
- Birds and small wildlife should be excepted.
- No animal abuse obviously
- If the animal is injured and or starving
- Bird feeders/squirrel feeders
- Passive birdfeeders.
- Birds, squirrels
- Feeding an animal that appears malnourished in good faith (suitable food for that animal), while also contacting bylaw/humane society to address concern
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- No contact Bird, and squirrel feeders
- exclusions for bird feeders
- providing water for wild animals as well as appropriate bird food etc is OK
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Put up more signs
- Exempt from bylaw if permission from property owner



- Depends on the context. Feeding in some cases like bird feeders aren't a bad thing. Animals should not be harassed though.
- Exception for putting out bird or small mammal feeders/baths
- Birdfeeders
- Bird seed and bird baths
- No exceptions
- Injured wildlife that needs help
- Bird feeders
- Rural properties should remain exempt, such as a deer on a farm. In the city, it's not a good idea for people to feed wild animals, or tease them .
- Bird feeders s/b allowed
- Injured wildlife
- Bird feeders.
- Bird feeders
- If it's a small squirrel or something that is not dangerous
- Bird feeder
- Rescuing or helping injured wildlife on private property
- Where wildlife are already being fed on private property they may depend on these resources and suddenly stopping feeding to comply with new regulations could be detrimental to animal welfare
- Bird feeders
- You need to specify which types of wildlife or it will get silly. is my birdfeeder off limits? What about the squirrels who are secondary guests to my feeders? A blanket ban is nonsensical
- Feeding rabbits. If you want poop in your yard, go nuts.
- Feeding wildlife on private property welcomes more animals that could be an issue to pets, more noise from wildlife, and more wildlife looking to collect on private property.
- birds
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders are okay and people should have to pick up apples quickly before they attract wild life
Using fish as fertilizer is not okay
- No exceptions so it doesn't get confusing
- Bird feeders in peoples yards
- exception to people assisting wildlife rescues
- Bird feeders
- None! My neighbors feed squirrels and birds and my yard and roof is infested!
- Bird feeders
- Animals can only be feed if they are injured, and can not do so for themselves



- if an animal is being mistreat by property owners (example starved) than someone trying to give food the animal could be ok
- Feeding an injured animal
- Injured, at risk, or abandoned
- Bird feeders should be ok
- birds
- Would this include not being allowed to feed birds? I fully support feeding birds even if other animals partake in the food.
- Birds, rabbits, squirrels
- None
- Wildlife on there own, eating the shrubs / plants / gardens on property. As well, any type of bird feeder.
- bird feeders! it would be terrible to ban bird feeders for song birds
- Abandoned infant wildlife. Should be reported to appropriate authorities first.
- Feeding birds
- Injured wildlife in your property that is being transferred to a wildlife center or veterinary clinic can be fed if needed.
- N/A
- More education! Stop fining people for being stupid and teach them why it's wrong.
- Teasing is a very subjective word.
- Trash digging animals and starving animals
- Feral Cats & Dogs
- None
- If the animal is injured or in danger.
- For the city to stop trying to discriminating against certain breeds and infringing on rights.
- Birds, squirrels and such small animals
- Feeders
- Teasing any animal is wrong. I see nothing wrong with feeding animals on the property. Such as bird seed for birds/ peanuts for squirrels.
- If it is private property than I see no issue. The exception would be if the wildlife was being harmed by said "teasing" or if neighbours/public property was being damaged as a deer for example kept coming back for food and started to graze on lawns.
- Birds
- Over regulation at its finest. No harm no foul. If you don't feed them they will eat your garbage anyways.
- Birdfeeders should be exempt. Songbirds are becoming scarce and we need to help them survive
- Feeding birds
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders in back yards should be allowed



- N/A
- None, private property is private property. You don't get to infringe or enforce on that.
- Wild life question is kinda a catch 22, squirrels and birds would seemingly be ok to set feeders for, but deer, fox etc, should be left alone. However on private property, I'm indifferent- private property a person should have rights on what they can do.
- Dangerous animals ie Bears
- Let people live their lives. It has worked fine so far. My
- Private property land magnitude. If private property is house + couple parcels size and naturalized land, wildlife is typically so educate vs prohibit; but I'd prohibit typical city home resident property due to safety
- Fines
- An injured animal on your property
- Birdfeeders
- No exceptions
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders etc.
- You have no way to enforce it.
- Ummm you can't really stop people from feeding birds, so I hope you are making an exception to that...
- If there's a recurrent problem - skunk nest, coyote puppies etc- and animals need to be relocated for safety of all.
- There should be no muzzle requirements for any breed that hasn't been involved in an incident. A sweeping ban like this is like like trying to jail someone for a crime they might commit. Sheer stupidity.
- Bird feeders
- double the fines at minimum
- Depends on the situation - wildlife can become a nuisance, what would constitute teasing?
- Bird feeders (as long as they are hung in a way that other wildlife cannot access them)
- Squirrels
- none
- Wildlife is too broad a term. Rules should focus on discouraging dangerous conditions -- e.g. coyote dens on private property.
- N/a
- Bird feeders ok
- Bird feeders should be an exceptions because our wild birds in Calgary are so used to human provided food, that I worry about what would happen if it were to disappear.
- Birdfeeders, mouse traps
- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders should be allowed



- squirrels
- Animal in distress could be fed if possible?
- protect animals
- If the animal was hurt , a baby with no mother malnourished. If they animal needed immediate help
- Dealing with the skunk
- Cats and dogs that are hungry.
- Bird Feeders should be exceptions
- Young naive kids
- None
- If a wild animal is injured and needs to be captured for treatment.
- Birds
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Nil
- Park rangers more often around highly trafficked known wildlife spots
- None
- None
- Allow people to give squirrels peanuts in shells on private property.
- bird seed
- Bird feeders should be exempt or if a deer or something eats something from someone's garden
- People can provide water, the chain reaction of feeding wildlife is too long for exceptions
- Bird feeders
- if the owner gave us their full permission
- No teasing but feed is fine. Many acreages have deer that often look for hay in the winter and join horses or other outdoor animals. Not fair to fine for feeding these animals.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Injured wildlife
- Where do you draw the line? Is a bird feeder wrong? Is a hummingbird feeder wrong? If I plant milkweed to feed butterflies will I be arrested? where is the line?ed to feed the mo
- Bird feeders / relocation of wildlife
- Squirrels, birds
- birds and squirrels
- There should public service announcements on how to interact with wildlife appropriate and safely when they are on private property.
- Allow feeding feral cats
- Feeding birds and squirrels on your property
- Private property owner ought to be able to non lethally ward away dangerous animals such as coyotes with spray etc.



- If neighbours of the residents report the actions of those feeding/teasing as a nuisance
- Don't do it. pit bulls are only "agressive" because people make them. ban bad people not good dogs
- No feeding animal or harming them which feeding them can do and there should be a fine
- No exceptions animals should never be teased
- In-yard deterrents that are humane.
- Bird feeders on private property to feed wild birds
- There is a huge difference between feeding and teasing. I can't believe these have been grouped together.
- Feeding birds from hanging feeders.
- Bird feeders
- None. Trying to scare them off should be as much interaction we have with them.
- None that's a great choice
- None
- Bird feeders
- That we can feed birds and squirrel's
- Birds and injured animals
- None
- N/A
- Nuisance animals, chasing off rabbits eating garden
- Treatment of injured animals.
- No teasing
- Bird feeders allowed
- None - wildlife are an important aspect of maintaining a health ecosystem, and should be respected and allowed space.
- The animal is in need of help and you have been legally instructed by a professional to do so
- Yard birdfeeders
- Injured animals or orphaned young.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds or squirrels.
- teasing most definitely but feeding needs to be more defined --
- Small bird feeders could be exempt
- Injured wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- I'm not sure that this is City domain. Any rules not covered by Provincial regulations should be implemented by them if required. Lobby them to restrict interfering with wildlife.
- bird feeders
- Feeding birds
- It's private property people should be aloud to feed animals if they want



- Photographing and/ or helping/ feeding injured or disadvantaged wildlife
- Rabbits, squirrels etc
- Fire Nenshi
- Bird feeders
- birds
- Feeders for birds and the like shouldn't be outlawed
- Feeding must be intentional. (eg. a garden being raided by rabbits doesn't count). Bird Feeders, Beehives.
- None
- Feeding appropriate wildlife and perhaps educating on proper ways to feed le birds, squirrels
- Heavy Fines
- Teasing wildlife should not be permitted but feeding birds for instance? Not feeding wildlife is too broad, you need to be more clear as to your intentions on that.
- Food that is actually acceptable for wildlife to eat. Natural foods.
- Education
- Bird feeders and other means that support small natural wildlife
- Assisting a wild animal when injured
- No teasing, feeding is allowed after contact with an animal rescue or sanctuary if animal appears abandoned my parent and seems of an age where they wouldn't survive on their own
- Birds
- I encourage bird feeders or even peanuts left out for the squirrels. I oppose hand-feeding wildlife and desensitization to humans.
- All wildlife is different. Some are ok to feed.
- Dying or injured wildlife that is not a natural predator of domesticated animals
- birdfeeders, feeding starving rabbits/hares
- Birds
- If that private property belongs to a group or organization that specifically supports wildlife and therefore is feeding them for the purposes of supporting them vs causing inadvertent harm.
- Bird feeders?
- Prohibit teasing but not feeding on private property.
- Birds. I feed the birds in my yard. It is especially valuable to have food available to birds during the winter, but food at all times should be allowed. Private property should be kept at just that-private. The city is trying to control far too much now.
- Bird feeders must be permitted.
- Birds
- Birdfeeders
- Birdfeeders on private property
- Yet, how do you enforce it? And to what extend...like someone feeding squirrels versus someone trapping and drowning squirrels?



- If it is not for hunting purposes and farmers leave straw or grain out for deer
- When an animal is injured or needs help
- Birds
- Bird feeders and bees.
- If the animal was clearly injured and they were trying to feed it to capture it and bring it to a rehabilitation facilities.
- Should be able to remove annoyances like skunks, excessive squirrels, etc
- I think that bylaw would get complicated because lots of people have squirrel or bird feeders, and it's been like that for so long I think it would actually be detrimental to remove that food source.
- Backyard bird feeders
- Feeding the birds should still be allowed
- Bird feeders
- none
- Feeding animal on your property should be legal.
- Bird feeders for sure
- none
- Birds
- Feeding proper food to the animal, not junk food or bread for birds. No aggressive or harmful actions
- Does this mean no bird feeders? This seems ridiculous.
- none
- Birdfeeder
- Squirrels and birds
- Protected wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Proper clean feeding should be allowed like bird feeders. Dirty garbage style should not. I do not know what you mean by teasing.
- Okay to feed not tease
- None. People shouldnt be allowed to torment or hurt animals.
- Why lump them together? Obviously teasing is wrong, but are you trying to make bird feeders illegal too?
- Bird feeders
- A bylaw would then have to include birds and bees. Squirrelly.
- N/A
- Not feeding wild life on property.
- Bird feeders
- None
- Wild Birds, native species that are being harmed because of the cities last planning process and over concreting of our city



- Feeding the birds
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- No exceptions
- Injured animals
- Plaid bird feeders around the park areas that people can buy to feed the ducks.
- Would this include birds? Squirrels? Rabbits?
- none
- No foul play towards an animal.
- For survival purposes
- The city can not enforce the bylaws them do have so why make more?
- Feeding Wildlife with the purpose of baiting
- bird feeders should not be prohibited
- Animal seemed to be injured and needed assist/food to regain strength
- Be allowed to feed birds
- A proper review system to prevent unintended fines and punishment.
- Clear instances of wildlife rehabilitation (feeding/caring for wildlife)
- Birds
- I would support bylaws concerning teasing or abusing wildlife. However, I don't see the harm in putting carrot tops out for the neighbourhood bunnies.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- If an animal is hurt and cannot feed itself
- Bird feeders silly!
- birds
- feeding birds would be permitted
- Feeding the (what looks like pet) Bunnies in the erlton area
- Bird/squirrel feeders and water fountains
- No teasing or abuse ever. If injured contact proper authorities. People abusing should be fined & convicted for jail time.
- If the animal is visibly hurt or a struggling newborn
- None. Animals should eat their natural food and be left alone.
- Bird feeders should not be included in the prohibition.
- No exception wildlife should be left alone
- If it's a young person the penalty could be volunteering at soca or humane.
- Pest on farm land
- Feed intended for livestock that wildlife has access too. Example: Laying out hay for cattle to feed on in winter, but deer, elk, moose, etc. also access it as there's no way to keep them away. Farmer's should not be fined if the feed is for livestock.



- None.
- Ex: feeding a rabbit is fine but trying to feed a cougar is not
- Birds!
- No exceptions, wildlife fed by people get comfortable and then they get put down because we started the issue.
- Keep an open mind
- Parameters should be set in place to define each act more clearly
- No exceptions
- Ok to feed an Injured wildlife until help arrives. Like a Fish and wildlife official.
- Bird feeders/baths
- you should be allowed to feed birds on private property, tormenting or teasing birds should have huge fines like \$3000 due to how hard it is to catch people in the act. all mammals, reptiles, and amphibians you should not be allowed to feed, or torment
- None
- Birdfeeders, bird baths and other water availability for wildlife, squirrel feeders and extra produce put out
- No exceptions. If it is prohibited in parks, then it should be prohibited on private property.
- Teasing is wrong and dangerous and mean. But I don't want to intrude on anyone's private property. Neighbors tend to use laws to go after their neighbors. Also would this impact wild bird feeders?
- Include penalties for teasing harassing pets on private property.
- If animal not licensed and found roaming should be considered "wildlife", like house cats roaming around.
- No teasing, but feeding birds is acceptable
- small Bird feeders
- Bird seed feeders
- N/A
- Bird feeders.
- bird feeders in your yard okay
- Wild birds & bees
- if the wildlife is starving or in need of care!!!
- Bird feeder
- Bird feeders in backyards
- Yes
- Wild life such as birds and squirrels.
- Injured animals
- bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird Feeders
- A hurt animal in need of care
- Feeding injured animals



- Please don't feed animals that could become pests and infringe on a neighbors property.
- Still allow bird feeders on private property.
- Birds, squirrels eat any food possible so pretty hard to include them
- Helping hurt or injured animals - feeding them until they can be transported to the correct facility for rehabilitation etc.
- Feed has to be with no harm to the animal. With space between feeding place and wild animal.
- Bird feeders still allowed
- Humans should not engage with Wildlife.
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- Exorbitant fines
- NONE.
- None
- Bird feeders , suet for birds
- Birds need the feeders more often than not.
- birds
- bird feeders
- None
- Nothing wrong with feeding but teasing is not okay
- Winter bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- On private property, bird feeders should be allowed including hummingbirds.
- Bird feeders. Bee feeders.
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions.
- Birds and squirrels. Animals common to the city.
- If the animal was injured.
- Feeding of birds should still be allowed
- Bird feeders and squirrels
- Winter bird feeding. Bee keeping for pollination and honey.
- I like bird feeders, but teasing wildlife is wrong.
- Animals do not have a voice and it's our responsibility to care for them and a bylaw would assist with disrespectful behavior towards wildlife and feeding them what is not part of their natural habitat.
- This is a ridiculous question since the answer should always be yes.
- I would defer to wildlife experts for any exceptions. My understanding is exceptions lead to difficulties for the animals in other situations.
- birds
- Moose or Bears! Call for help!!!



- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- None
- lots of signage letting people know this is against the law and why and the negative impacts it has on animals in the wild.a fine amount if caught
- Bird feeders
- Its PRIVATE PROPERTY. Mind your own business is what I suggest.
- Perhaps allowing feeding stations (e.g., duck food for a quarter)
- Chasing away magpies and crows.
- Wild birds/birdfeeders
- Backyard bird feeders.
- Too difficult to police this
- Using food to lure animal off property
- Don't feel as strongly about feeding as I do teasing/cruelty
- Songbirds
- Birds and squirrels
- Include bees
- Bird feeders
- Baiting pest animals, ie skunks.
- Birds, I wouldn't want to give up my bird feeder
- If the animal was injured and local Wildlife centers were closed until Monday. Then the people should be allowed to feed and house the animal until Wildlife could come and get the creature.
- Birds...bird feeders
- Bylaw that prohibits teasing
- Bird feeders, bee hives, etc., should be exempt.
- Birds
- If deemed necessary for personal protection
- Bird feeders and water sources.
- None
- Bird feeders or the like
- Non e
- Call wildlife protection or SPCA to come and get the animal or wildlife safely
- If the animal has been fed for a long period of time already and would suffer (added to land information of sold)
- Birds and squirrels
- Birds
- Photos within a certain distance
- None



- In the event of injured animal, food used to lure animal to capture and help should be allowed.
- None
- Bird feeders and similar devices.
- If the animal is a baby and seems neglected
- Bird feeders should be ok
- So this means I can no longer put out bird feeders? That is crazy
- The City may need to consider programs to manage populations of some animals like squirrels.
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders
- if a person was disabled
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, Squirrel/Chipmunk feeder
- There should be a fine up to jail time for hurting or bothering wildlife.
- Why would you include feed and teasing together? Someone feeding squirrels or birds should not be subjected to laws prohibiting it.
- Birds
- Teasing or harassing of an animal on private property is prohibited.
- If animal needs/is starving, person trying to do good deed for animal in need
- None
- Animals eating from bird feeders etc- not preventable
- Birds
- Injured animals.
- 250\$ fine & A trespassing charge
- Small feeders for songbirds, hummingbirds, etc.
- Birdfeeders
- Bears, cougars, and other harmful animals
- Birds
- Birds and other non predator urban species
- Bird/squirrel feeders and baths.
- bird feeders should be exempt
- a fine
- Any injured wildlife or wildlife that appears to have been abandoned
- Bird feeders
- Feeding and teasing are two different things. It's unfair to categorize them together.
- Squirrel-proof bird feeders only
- None
- Bird feeders and bird baths
- Bird feeders allowed



- I am concerned that a bylaw against feeding wildlife could be interpreted to include having birdseed for birds or sweetened water for hummingbirds. Would it not be possible to handle animal cruelty concerns on private property without additional bylaws?
- Bird feeders
- N/A
- its wildlife we shouldn't feed them. They belong to the nature and if we start feeding them they will not continue with a wild life.
- Bird feeders
- Exception for animal that used to be pets but have been released such as the bunnies in some parts of downtown Calgary.
- What would teasing be?? My 3 year old chasing a duck? Teasing should be defined and explained
- Age of person feeding and/or teasing
- Bird feeders should be considered as an exception to wildlife feeding bylaws on private property.
- Fines for harming "unwanted" wildlife (ie. BB guns, inhumane traps, poisoning)
- Maybe have duck feeders or bird feeders around parks so that the people can toss out seeds for the ducks without causing them to be sick or have litter around
- Bird feeders
- Major wildlife like deer, elk, moose, bears, coyotes, foxes, lynx, wolves should have bylaw associated with it. Common pest-like animals such as squirrels, crows, magpies, mice, song birds should not.
- Would suggest same rules as in City Parks.
- Birds are already dependent on us feeding them- they have already changed to suit our needs and our feeding them- if we stop feeding them what will they do?
- None whatsoever.
- Bird feeders
- Rehabilitation of a hurt or abandoned wild animal.
- If animal injured and you are taking it home to rehabilitate (or rehabilitation centre)
- Ppl either accidentally or deliberately attract wildlife into our communities by leaving out pet dishes, or putting out feeders. This attracts wildlife that gets into neighbours' roofs, damages property. I don't see exceptions for eliminating feeding wild
- Depends on what kind of animal and the age of the offender.
- Bird feeders
- I'd give a fine for teasing not feeding
- Bird feeders should not be subject to the bylaw
- You are not going to stop people from feeding wildlife on their property. Money should be put into billboards and tv ads explaining the problems the wildlife encounter when people feed them.
- Birds are okay and squirrels but not rabbits. Holy do they multiply. Also people should have to pick up their fruit that drops on ground from their trees. It attracts skunks.
- None



- Feeding the birds in a bird feeder etc seems fine.
- Birds and squirrels
- injured or sick animals
- if it's on private property and the residents are feeding the wildlife and aren't bothered by them coming and going let them feed them
- Feeding birds
- Scaring off predators
- A child feeding or someone thinking they are helping. Would need education before a fine.
- From my view, it might actually be a good thing to stop feeding wildlife but I just don't know how the City could feasibility and realistically stop and ask Calgarians to get rid of all their bird feeders and bird houses, squirrel feeders, etc.
- Bird feeders
- Does this include birds?
- Birds and squirrels should be allowed to be fed with feeders
- Are we allowed to feed birds and squirrels?
- Birds
- Bait in humane traps
- Fines
- Birds, I feel like many would not survive without feeding birds through the winter months.
- I don't think feeding welcomed wildlife on private property is a crime in anyway -- so I certainly don't support that. But teasing or harassing wildlife routinely should have some consequences.
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- If the animal is in distress and the food is being used to calm or extract the animal from its current location
- There are no exceptions. Wildlife is just that... wild. We need to leave it alone.
- None
- Don't discriminate against a breed of dog, as a deaf person with a pit bull as a service dog I refuse to enter your city limits due to your stupid pit bull laws
- Feeding may be done with good intentions for injured wildlife, those people should not be penalized, just educated
- Chasing nuisance wildlife off individual's property should be allowed, i.e skunks, rabbits, magpies, etc. as this is not teasing. Bird feeders, bird paths and birdhouses should continue to be allowed.
- Birds, squirrels
- Birds. education needed as why feeding is not beneficial to the animal and how it will attract other animals
- Black squirrels, non-native birds.
- If the owner of the property is willing to take any and all responsibilities if that wild animal makes their property their new home.
- bird feeders on private property



- Can you explain what's the harm of feeding the wild birds?
- If an animal is stuck or injured and needs luring out in order to get help
- None! Wildlife need to be wild!
- Allow property owners
- Bird feeders
- Birds and small animals
- Birds
- Bird feeders to be allowed
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders
- Animal seems injured, hurt, abandoned (baby), etc. (needs help in specific situation)
- only exception should be feeding some birds in the winter
- People have bird feeders and feed squirrels etc. No law needed here.
- None
- the separation of feeding and teasing. I feel as though teasing has a lot of negative connotations and I would want to hear your strict definition of its context before proceeding
- Injured animals before help can get there
- Exceptions regarding research that has the proper backing and permission
- none
- Further education is needed for public.
- It should not have to be spelled out to not feed or tease wildlife, common sense?????
- None
- Bird seed
- No exceptions, we live by fish creek, should be prohibited already.
- None
- Bird feed would be allowed
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding small birds.
- more bylaw officers handing out tickets in 'high offense' areas in an effort to spread the word and get people to stop
- If an animal was awaiting collection by wildlife rehabilitation organization
- Warning for first feeding offence. Teasing offences no exceptions
- Feeding only appropriate if someone is trying to coax an injured animal to get it help
- leave it alone
- Bird feeders with proper feed should be acceptable
- Stop trying to take over all personal freedoms! Question 2 is ridiculous! We are not in a fascist regime
- Fines
- All animals should be treated with respect.



- Wildlife should not be touched, played with, or teased anywhere. Unless they appear to be trapped or tangled in garbage or other unknown object
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeders should be allowed.
- No exceptions, but very clear definitions around what constitutes "teasing" (pref. say "harassment"). Discretion for 1st time child offenders.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Deer, Elk, etc who join in on feeding of hay to livestock. Offering lifesaving food to injured or young wildlife.
- Unsure. I would follow the recommendations of wildlife experts.
- None
- None
- None
- I wouldn't limit feeding
- When caring for injured wildlife
- Feeding approved healthy food
- Bird feeders
- Birds/squirrels/bees
- I'd the rabbits &/or the deer are eating my garden they will hearses off and quickly. They are both eating and I could be perceived as teasing them.
- STOP fining for cats! They SHOULD be allowed outside!! It's RIDICULOUS!! They've been roaming outside in neighborhoods for 100's of years! Now we have to keep them locked inside, meowing incessantly to get outside to chase a MOUSE!
- bird feeders
- Where do birdfeeders stand in this? They do attract other animals (usually squirrels) but is this bylaw more about coyotes, deer, etc?
- Feeding is fine. Harassment and teasing is not.
- Injured animals that require help
- No teasing, feeding on your own property is our choice, not yours
- A hurt or distressed animal
- Public education
- Unless an injured wildlife end up on private property and the owners are caring or holding for wildlife rescue
- None. Animals are put down because of irresponsible people
- Zoo or private animal rescue
- None
- Orphaned or injured wildlife that cannot be brought into a vet hospital or wildlife rescue on short notice
- if its private property, that should be up to them. not the city



- Bird feeders should not be included in this bylaw. Harassment and teasing of wildlife is what should be addressed with the bylaw.
- Bird feeders
- Fines, more education as to why its bad for wildlife. Some people are unaware of the dangers foe the animals.
- Small bird feeders
- Geese.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding chickadees are fine. Nobody should ever be teasing wildlife. What the hell? We need to teach respect to animals
- none
- No ban on feeding wildlife on private property within city limits
- Bird feeders in private yards
- You should be able to feed wildlife on private property ie your home but teasing and baiting should not be allowed.
- Feeding sick or wounded animals
- I support prohibiting teasing animals, but think feeding ducks would be okay
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Providing bird seed should be acceptable.
- Bird and squirrel feeders, should still be aloud, it's more this big wildlife (cougars, deer, moose,) that need to have more security from public feeding
- Would this include bird feeders?
- Bird feeders
- Fines
- Birds
- If a person found a wild animal that was injured or orphaned, then at least temporarily they could care for the animal
- Bird feeders
- Birds are the only exception. All other wildlife should remain undisturbed.
- Trained or educated individuals helping an animal in distress
- Let people feed and trap to help the homeless pet population
- Bird feeders
- Exception of feeding on private property.
- Non-wild animals, such as strays
- If it's a pet animal and friendly
- I don't support "spying" but it should be made known not to feed the wildlife
- bird feeders, water baths
- PROTECT ANIMALS
- 1



- Birds
- Bird feeders
- If you have hay outside & an animal eats it. You shouldn't be fined for that. Innocent feeding is common. Obviously throwing a steak to a bear would be bad.
- Call pros for help
- None
- I would limit the law to just teasing wildlife on private property, as people may have bird feeders or may feed vegetable scraps to rodents which I consider to be harmless.
- None
- Birds
- Rabbits, skunks, squirrels, small animals
- No exceptions. Including birds.. birds bring mice that bring disease, infestation and other things. Don't need to feed wildlife.. there's a reason they're wild.
- Birds
- None
- Feeding birds and squirrels ok. Teasing NOT OK
- Putting out bird seed and other critters like rabbits and squirrels help themselves, that cannot be stopped. But enticing a deer, for example, with food should be a bylaw.
- If they need water & NEED food (malnourished animals in worse case)
- Birds
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- No teasing or bugging the animals, but you should be allowed to feed them and give them water. They are just trying to survive.
- No more by laws we have too many already
- Feeding is fine, such as bird feeders, teasing is not.
- bird feeders
- Smaller Birds, chipmunks and squirrels
- With permission of the homeowner in regards to feeding. No exceptions to teasing, owners included.
- Bird feeders
- If an animal is put down as a result, prison time for the offender.
- If this poses a danger to those in the area (ie. if the wildlife is a dangerous or invasive species - bears, cougars, mice, etc).
- None
- Bird feeder
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Rescue
- Bird feeders should be allowed



- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- If one has squirrels/birds in their yard it's their business to feed them. Teasing wildlife is wrong. This question should have had 3rd question.
- Educate people on the issues with feeding wildlife and enforce fines
- Don't hurt animals
- Birds, squirrels
- If an animal was a lost pet and was being fed to try and gain trust so owners could be located
- A injured animal or baby animal that needs food
- Bird feeders
- Rehabilitation of injured animals
- Feeding wild Birds with appropriate food
- no exceptions
- Birds and squirrels
- bird feeders sounds like it would be included in this thought process, so hence my vote of NO.
- Dehydration
- None
- None. Surprised this does not already exist.
- Fines for feeding bears regardless of where
- Perhaps leaving out seeds for birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Birds (bird feeder)
- Bird seed
- Really !!! WTF
- If the wildlife was hurt and the animal needed food/water on private property it should be okay to be provided as long as the animals best intents are looked after and wildlife specialists are called to move the animal appropriately.
- N/A
- Privet property by definition , leave it to property owners to make that determination." their house their rules"
- None
- None
- Feeding is fine (aka birds and such). Teasing is never okay.
- No exceptions.
- Watching an injured animal until services can help.
- Exemption should be if the animal found food on your property ie. Getting into a garbage bin, or finding berries growing in your garden
- For instance feeding deer the apples from your tree would be acceptable; unless it was a trap to kill the animal.



- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- None
- No exceptions to teasing animals
- People should still be able to feed birds, squirrels if they so wish
- Squirrels, Chipmunks, Birds etc.
- Birds
- Feeding and care of an orphaned or injured animal
- Feeding squirrels & birds
- Fines
- Animals that are found in danger of death. In cases of emergencies when wildlife rehabilitation centres aren't open
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Pests are free game
- No exceptions. Feeding/teasing wild life is not acceptable
- Birds...they're wild yes, but they've been fed for literally generations, this I don't see the harm in
- Attracting nuisance animals like coyotes or bears would be an issue, but feeding birds, squirrels, etc doesn't matter to me.
- Bird feeders
- Don't know enough about impact to wildlife and communities
- If the food someone provides is actually good for the animal.
- if there was an ecological disaster that required providing food and water to be under the supervision of fish & wildlife, and conservation officers
- Let's allow feeders for birds/squirrels.
- feeding during lean times
- bird feeders
- Bird feeding
- none, decisions made on private property should be that of the owner without penalization in regards to wildlife
- Food for squirrels,
- Birds
- Bird feeders that don't allow squirrels to feed from them
- disallow any teasing of wildlife anywhere. Allow bird feeders.
- birdfeeders..
- None
- Proper feeding techniques and animal respect
- Wild bird feeders
- People should know better
- Bird feeders in winter. Bait for rodent traps like mice.
- Rescue



- None
- Bird feeders
- None teasing animals is cruel
- None
- Birds
- Qualified lay and professional people helping wildlife who need rehabilitation or to be permanently cared for by humans
- Cougars/other predators
- Wildlife parks for feeding.
- Birds
- except bird feeders
- Bird feeders are okay.
- Cruelty
- Birds
- for the purpose of luring animals with malice intent or harm
- Animal sanctuary
- If the act is done by the owner of the property to wildlife that is on said owner's private property.
- Feed small animals okay, teasing never for any
- What is Definition of “teasing”? (E.g. How to shoo them away?) Help relocating “problem” wildlife.
- Bird feeders for small birds. But somehow keep pigeons away.
- If it's private property it will be very difficult to monitor and manage. Perhaps the appropriate warnings and education for those within city limits that attract wildlife. Funnily enough, we live in a city where the wildlife feel comfortable - strange.
- Privately owned facilities like petting zoos
- Pest extermination - mag pies
- None
- Bird/Squirrel feeders. Don't feed squirrels at the park, but have a feeder in the yard.
- Re-releasing the animals to a different location therefore they are out of the way and adding a tracker chip to those animals in case they come back
- Rabbit and Bird Feeders
- bird feeders should be allowed
- N/A
- If it is observed the animal is in distress and assistance to get the wildlife to the proper care is needed.
- None
- Orphaned or injured animal situations
- Better education. Fine if caught.
- None
- Bird feeders



- Bird feeders / feeding endangered animals to help the population
- Cheese are a major problem. We need a system to cull them in residential areas. W
- Bird feeder
- You should be allowed to feed harmless animals such as birds, by maybe bylaw should be allowed to intervene if youre feeding something dangerous or a possible nuisance, like skunks or coyotes.
- None
- Birdfeeders
- If a wildlife officer has been contacted and has instructed a person to care for or feed a sick or injured animal until a wildlife officer arrives to collect that animal.
- Bird feeders
- If the private property allows it with provided feed for the animals
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- People should be allowed to feed birds, squirrels and other small animals on their own property.
- If animals have lived on the property for a number of years (for example, a bird feeder who has a nest in a tree near the house)
- If a dog is not being properly fed someone should not be fined for feeding it.
- None.
- Luring or baiting wildlife onto private property (except bird feeders)
- If wildlife needs to be trapped, it may have to be necessary to bait them with feed.
- There needs to be reasonable allowance for rescue and rehabilitation efforts of injured, orphaned or other wildlife in need of intervention.
- Is this for all wildlife or certain ones. That are considered pests or dangerous? Exceptions for song birds, hummingbirds. Putting out a bird feeder shouldn't apply to this. Teasing wildlife should not be allowed regardless of public or private.
- Fines
- If you are found leaving food out, to entice aggressive wildlife, such as coyotes you should be fined minimum \$2500. Rabbits, birds ect... should be exempt
- Still allow bird and squirrel feeders
- [removed]
- Helping an animal in need.
- Mice and other potential property damaging animals
- Education.. I don't think bylaws will be listened too.. also how to enforce this
- Birds need all the help they can get with all the cats killing them
- squirrls, rabbits, birds
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Bird Feeders, Chasing pests (magpies/squirrels/rabbits) from land
- No feeding bears or wolves, but if you have ducks or rabbits on your property, I dont see an issue.



- Bird feeders
- Feeding rabbits should be included
- None.
- if the animal was in immediate danger or distress
- Based on two options provided, we would have to say no. Define teasing, do you mean harassment, which we would support. For feeding, does this include bird feeders? We would not be in favour of a bylaw that prohibits feeding in this manner.
- None
- birds feeders
- No exceptions.
- Designed animal feeders
- Feeding injured wildlife
- none
- Zoos or petting zoos
- Squirrels, bird feeders, etc
- Exempt Bird/Squirrel feeders
- An animal who is incapacitated
- No feeding or disturbing wildlife on public property.
- Feeding the ducks in the park
- Birds
- Unless the animal is injured and looking for help.
- Leaving food for animals outside, on an acreage for example
- Duck feeding
- Obviously bird feeders.
- Birds
- If a wild animal has become a nuisance and refuses to leave.
- Injury
- None. Don't be an asshole to animals
- None
- If an animal is injured one should be able to feed it if it cannot be brought to the correct help centre immediately.
- Bird feeders
- Animal rescue groups, feeding animals for their safety as they're starving
- If the animal was injured and needed help in any way.
- Exceptions would be birds and squirrels, small animals who people like to watch.
- None - leave wildlife alone
- Would small bird feeders be against this bylaw?
- If the wildlife is injured and cannot fend for itself
- Feeding safe foods for the appropriate animal



- Definitely a fine for teasing but case by case for feeding wildlife.
- Crows, magpies
- Birds
- Bird feeders with appropriate food
- If an animal was hurt and needed help
- If animals that are typically in residential areas are exempt: birds, squirrels, hares, and even ducks- same breeding pair pops by my yard for a few weeks every year
- Malnutrition of a baby animal?
- None
- It is unfair to abide such regulation on private property...
- Bird feeders
- Being approached by an animal like a duck
- In the case of animal rescue or rehabilitation, feeding of wildlife on private property should be permitted.
- Birds
- If someone leaves out oats or something on their lawn for wildlife they should be allowed to feed wildlife but no teasing
- Bird feeders, bird baths, and nuts for squirrels.
- None.
- feeding a wild animal that is injured and waiting for intervention from official resources.
- Bird or squirrel feeders
- Feeding birds/squirrels/bees etc would be acceptable
- If owner and or property is threatened.
- Keep bylaws off private property, I really don't think it is the city's place!
- No teasing wildlife
- No exceptions, don't feed wildlife even if they are in your property.
- Bird feeders filled with appropriate bird seed to support wild birds
- No exceptions, there needs to be a higher penalty for interacting with wildlife, especially larger game such as moose
- Feeding could be considered having flowers that deer enjoy eating. This idea is just dumb.
- Animals in need of medical care may need feeding on private property to build trust to catch it safely.
- birds and squirrels
- None, this should not be happening.
- Bird feeders
- Education, earning, fine
- I think feeding in the winter for people who border a large open area, like Fish Creek Park is ok, especially in harsh winters.
- Birds not pigeons
- Birds



- Bird feeders on private property should be exempt.
- A child feeding a bunny/deer carrots. Especially at Christmas time when it's a fun holiday experience to wake up to eaten carrots.
- None
- Bird feeders on private property
- Bird feeders
- Fruit trees obviously
- keeping "neighbourhood pets" in mind. just teasing should not be allowed.
- Birds
- None
- Feeding of wild birds should be allowed as the care/feeding of injured animals which might come onto private properties.
- Squirrels and bird feeders
- birds
- Feed stations (vending machine/coin machine) where profits go back to supporting wildlife
- UCP supporters
- I think its ok to have bird feeders.
- Designated areas with a food dispenser (for money and controlled by the City). This will ensure proper food is fed to wildlife.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, bee hotels, animal-friendly plants
- feeding birds is ok...teasing /tormenting wildlife not ok
- None
- Leave bully breeds alone
- I think feeding birds is ok.
- None
- Local birds, other rodents such as squirrels or chipmunks
- Only large wildlife , not including squirrels, birds, etc
- None
- Your private property, your rights...
- Wild Bird feeding . Especially in winter Feeding is not the same as teasing and should not be categorized together I would never support teasing any where
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- N/A
- Wildlife owned privately, such as ducks that live on someone's property.
- songbird feeding
- no exceptions
- Don't bother wildlife or other peoples animals



- Design regulations should be separate from teasing.
- Case by case basis. If the food isn't harmful and the "wildlife" comes to you for it why does it matter
- Bylaw on public property only, not private property
- birdfeeders
- None
- No exceptions.
- Should be allowed to feed birds (bird feeders in yards acceptable)
- Na
- Pertains to 1). Cats are animals that naturally stray if let outside your home. Therefore, Cats should be spay & NOT let outside unless Spay & leashed. This would rectify many issues.
- Bird feeders
- How is teasing and feeding even remotely similar. And the purpose of owning private property is so it is just that!!....PRIVATE!!!
- Feeding birds (bird feeders)
- Feeding birds
- Song birds
- Birds
- Specific wildlife. E.g feeding birds shouldnt be an issue, feeding a deer or larger animal could be an issue (leading to more animal vehicle related incidents)
- if it was a visibly ill or starving animal
- None
- In case of emergency (wildfire for example) food and water for wildlife would be allowed.
- Feeding birds is fine, but not skunks, coyotes, ie: mammals.
- Bird feeders should be the exemption
- That people would still be allowed to feed birds etc.
- However I've seen people leave stuff out for ravits that doesn't really concern me as long as your not teasing them
- Except birds/cats/dogs
- Feeding a dog/cat that appears abandoned/neglected
- All property
- a privately owned petting zoo
- Sanctuaries and wildlife rescue
- Maybe providing water only
- Starving and winter with no contact
- Large fines
- No animal feeders of any kind on property.
- Well maintained bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels...
- Your going to outlaw bird feeders?



- Fines
- Bird feeders should be okay.
- Feeding ducks and other wild birds
- Any wild animal caught near houses needs to be captured, not killed, and released far away from people. You can use bear dogs to chase the animal away in Hope's it will be too scared to come back.
- None, leave nature be
- Narrow down specifics. Feeding squirrels vs squirrels stealing bird feed
- Injured animal would require food/medical
- If the animal is hurt
- NA
- Government should stay off private property, we do not need you to police our properties.
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Ensure wild bird feeders are exempt
- Jail time
- Luring mammals
- None, unless feeding birdseed, and not bread
- If they were helping the animal
- Birds, they can have difficult time in winter add to that predation of roaming domestic cats. Birds are in decline globally helping them is to our benefit as they assist in polination/seed spreading/rodent control/ and refuse clean up(Magpies/crows)
- Bird feeders for wild birds
- No exceptions.
- Birds squirrels rabbits ect should be exempt
- Rabbits., squirrels, birds with responsible feed
- None.
- bird feeders
- dogs
- None
- None
- Generally this is good, but I think bird feeding is a hobby enjoyed by many on private property, as well as planting bee/butterfly friendly plants should be allowed, so I said No.
- Bird feeders should be allowed on private property
- Bird feeders and squirrel feeding etc.
- Exclude birdfeeders
- None
- Bird feeders
- Respect people's freedom.



- Birds
- Do not remove any sort of trees etc that wild life seem to love. It is natural and we are on THEIR territory
- Birds and water fowl.
- birds, bunnies, squirrels, bees
- birds in yard
- None
- Sick or wounded animals should be able to be cared for
- If you own the yard and property, and do not share a dwelling
- None
- Would this bylaw include birds? Im not sure feeding bjrds should be apart of the bylaw unless it is attracting other problematic wildlife
- Not that worried about bird feeding. Attracting other wildlife or rodents is obviously bad
- if a wild animal has lost it's mother at a young age and is unable to provide for it's self.
- Opossums and Raccoons
- Bird feeders, safe-squirrel food feeders, etc.
- Birds and squirrels
- Birds need the extra food supplements, especially in winter
- None
- Inadvertant feeding such as bird feeders.
- None
- Fine people who feed or tease wildlife .
- if the animal is injured, an individual may be able to give the animal water or other essentials as they wait for 311.
- Unsure. People can only do damage by too much interaction with the wildlife.
- Cruelty
- Special permissions can be granted
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- This question is unfair, why lump feeding and teasing in with the same question? They are two separate subjects. I would support a bylaw that prohibits teasing. Define feeding of wildlife, if by that you also include bird feeders, then my answer is no.
- Bird feeders
- no exceptions
- Maybe if the animal is injured
- bird feeders
- None
- Wildlife sanctuaries and vets should be exempt



- Seriously Injured or endangered wildlife. Luring away for safety of the general public.
- bird feeders
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- It should be fine for people to put bird feeders on private property.
- none
- Please define both terms; leave feeding out of this bylaw. What about bird feeders?
- None, they are not your animals you don't know their needs so don't [removed] touch, tease or feed! I don't go into strangers yards to torment or feed their animals, same rules should apply for private property.
- Bird feeders
- The City should not be hazing coyotes on City property either.
- No exceptions, wild animals should not be fed or harassed regardless of being on private or city property
- Only intervene if a human and/or pet is being attacked
- There needs to be clarification regarding what constitutes feeding. Does this include bird feeders?
- fine and not owing any animals for a period of time
- Bird feeders
- Birds should be exempt
- If teasing could be on the boundary of abuse. Then there should be a bylaw
- Allow bird feeders
- Bird feeders etc
- Two warnings then a fine.
- If it is private property it is non of the city's concern period!! Mind your own business!
- Bird feeders should be an exception
- Does growing fruit or veggies count as teasing wildlife...?
- None - they are wild and should not be treated as someone's pet
- Exceptions for bird feeders (though they should be emptied/cleaned in spring to reduce risk of bears)
- Does this include birds? I think feeding birds is okay but in bird feeders up high only
- Teasing as in abuse of any animal
- Feeding birds is important, especially in winter.
- places of business - Zoo's, etc
- Normal bird feeders, hummingbird feeders, etc.
- Bird feeders
- I guess I don't support a bylaw unless it's really specific. People should be able to easily feed birds, squirrels, etc.
- Birds
- n/a
- n/a



- Every other house has a bird feeder or hummingbird feeder
- None
- A situation where a rescue is necessary and an expert is not available to assist.
- Bird feeders that inadvertently attract / feed other species should be exempted.
- None
- None
- birds
- Birds
- bird feeders, etc.
- If wildlife was aggressive, owner could use measures to deter wildlife.
- Increasing fines per occurrence
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds through a bird feeder
- Nothing - we have enough bylaws
- Birds and squirrel feeders
- Feeding if obvious starvation. No exceptions for teasing
- Feeding birds should be allowed. Squirrels tend to get fed as a byproduct of this. That's ok too.
- Bird feeders should be an exception
- Re Feeding: If the animal is in distress and a wildlife official is not on scene in a timely manner
- None, really.
- The feeding of small birds
- Uninclude acreages which happen to fall within city bounds
- Off city limits properties like acreages
- Genuine, caring people. The ones that do their research and feed geese or ducks things they're able to eat. Educate people.
- Wild birds
- Birds
- none
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- None
- None
- No exceptions. Feeding any wildlife is unsafe and irresponsible.
- Bears
- Hurt or abandoned baby animals
- Feeding if an animal is on private property
- Animal cruelty should be prohibited even on private property
- Having feeders with the correct food would be fine. So animals rely on those feeders
- It's private property when it comes to wild animals that's Alberta's jurisdiction not the city of Calgary



- the ability to continue to feed birds (seed) especially in the winter months. Feeding critters such as squirrels and leaving dog food outside encourages coyotes, bobcats etc.
- none.... respect a person's right to personal property. Illegal behaviours shall be addressed by law enforcement. Creating new laws and legislatio causes more financial strain on the economy. Perhaps focus on a positive approach at teach people responsiby
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders on personal property
- feeding birds and squirrels should be excempt
- Feeding birds and squirrels should be okay.
- None
- Magpies be exempt from the teasing
- None
- Stiffer Penalties are Absolutely Necessary for Feeding/Teasing Wildlife on any Property!!!!
- Ask wildlife management experts
- None
- If there is a problem animal (ie skunk, raccoon or porcupine) who has taken up residence on your property, you may need to lure them with food in order to relocate them.
- Feeding Lions is ok
- Kids feeding birds, squirrels, etc
- Birds
- BRID FEEDERS
- fines,large
- Bird appropriate feeders and feed
- Birds are "wildlife" and so are squirrels,birds who would not make it through the winter without the birdfeeders. larger animals, like deer, fox, coyote and bobcats - no feeding on private property
- If someone wants to feed squirrels, they should be allowed to. It should be bigger animals that we address concerns with (deer, coyotes, skunks, etc.)
- Birds
- Bird feeders and like activities
- What would be the definition of teasing? Many times people feed wild life in need. It does not make them tame but it can save their life. No one intentionally feeds or pets bears but they will still come onto people's property looking for food.
- Exclude birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird / Squirrel feeders
- Would need to exempt bird feeders
- We need a careful definition of feeding - clear intent to tease or feed should be required. E.g. We don't want to prohibit people from having a vegetable garden.
- birdfeeders,



- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- Birds
- None
- It would be okay to feed Injured wildlife
- Bird feeders to be excluded
- Animals right to open water. Includes allowed drinking from bird bath, ponds or pools. There shouldn't be a fine for water feature and animals have a right to hydrate wherever they are.
- No exceptions.
- Bird feeders to be exempt
- harming any wildlife should be dealt with. Feeding wildlife should be acceptable as long as there's no harm to the animals. Education about local animals should be available in community centers..
- orphaned wildlife requiring intervention
- Feeding birds, etc in the winter shouldn't be fined. Teasing or any kind of abusive behavior should be punished.
- wildlife is injured and needs help
- Animals that have been injured and are in need of help.
- Bird feeders should be allowed in peoples yards
- confirmed cases of parental abandonment (food, care)
- People should be fined if caught feeding wildlife or teasing them.
- I would exempt squirrel proof bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Rural properties or if there is proof it was to rehabilitate / rescue an animal
- Birds
- Try to capture strays to bring to shelters
- NIL
- Giving water during heat warnings should be allowed
- Birds
- Squirrel safe Bird feeders
- Feeding be ok if animal is medically in need of food ie starving or not in good health due to lack if nutrition, etc.
- Feeding and "teasing" animals are two entirely separate issues. Would The City seriously considering banning bird feeders? How ridiculous. As for harassing animals, current laws should be better enforced by Bylaw Enforcement.
- Animals that my have strayed from den or nest, that by feeding them mite increase there survival...
- Backyard bird feeders
- Except birds And squirrels, doesn't the current provincial wildlife legislation prohibit feeding wild animals?
- Bird feeders, nuts for squirrels, etc. Don't feed bears and cougars but the little critters are fine.



- Birds
- How is feeding a squirrel a peanut or two considered teasing??
- If they are in disparate need of attention and assistance regarding their health and well being
- No exceptions required. Let people interact with wild animals in whatever way they please.
- Birds
- none
- Pitbull should be treated the same as any other dog.
- Using bird feeders to attract certain birds to your yard
- Animals causing damage to house structure
- Bird feeders, bird houses, bird baths
- Birds
- Education on the damaging effects to animals and humans by engaging with wild life especially regarding photos opportunity and food
- Bylaw should be for large animals like deer, coyotes, cougars. Feeding birds, squirrels, rabbits should be OK.
- [removed] The law doesn't apply to me. I'll feed what I want to feed.
- MUZZLE ALL DOGS IN PUBLIC DON'T DISCRIMINATE
- If the wildlife was in danger, if the wildlife is suffering from a wound
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Unless domestic strays
- More signage when not in off leash area at Nose Hill Park. Daily (14 st - Calgary Winter Club entrance) and I encounter at minimum 3 dogs which are off leash in the on leash area. I have witnessed many dogs chasing deer and not recalling for the owner.
- Bird feeders, leaving nuts out for squirrels etc
- Maybe for large animals, but is this necessary for birds?
- Bird feeders
- If the animal was hurt and needed medical attention, so feeding it may help ?
- None
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- None
- Education on why you shouldn't feed wildlife and why is required.
- Bird feeders should be permissible.
- bird/squirrel feeders should be permitted
- Squirrels & birds
- Shouldn't be allowed for commercial purposes
- If the animal is starving
- Bird feeders
- None



- Well first off that question is pretty deceiving are we talking about feed squirrels or birds in a bird feeder, or are we talking about feeding the bears. Feeding dangerous animals is stupid but im not gonna back this if its all wildlife.
- None
- Bird feeders should be ok. Many birds would not survive winter without feeders now that humans have taken so much of their natural food sources
- If safety is an issue
- i personally think that if you have candy coin dispensers with the proper wildlife food (for the ducks lets say) and everyone had to pay \$1 to get food it would benefit both parties!
- So, no bird feeders then.
- Squirrels and birds
- Birds
- Bird Feeders
- Birds.
- In case of an injured animal while waiting for assistance from an appropriate rescue or rehabilitation organization.
- Should be able to leave bird seed out
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders in trees
- None, wildlife should be free to roam without humans interfering.
- Never appropriate to feed or tease wildlife. If a wild animal is injured, leave it alone or call Wildlife authorities.
- Feeding birds
- birds
- None.
- Feeding Birds
- some people feed birds, squirrels etc.
- Bird feeders.
- birdfeeding
- Bird feeders should be allowed but teasing wildlife should be fined
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Private property is private property. No exceptions.
- Clear signage posted to discourage feeding / teasing.
- Allow feeding of birds/squirrels provided you have feeders that are inaccessible to others animals such as deer, and bears.
- Coyotes, bears -
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders any large wild animals should not be fed by humans unless they are being rehabilitated. The City of Calgary should use their brains. This shouldn't even be a question on your survey



- No exceptions
- Bird feeders/baths on private property.
- Animals in medical distress
- birds
- Fine for \$1000 straight!
- If it is in your property
- Scaring away potential predators.
- None
- Bird feeders
- it depends on the animal
- Species appropriate/healthy bird feeders. I also don't know how the above bylaw would be enforced - people shouldn't be penalized for growing tomatoes and the squirrels eating them. This bylaw should focus on the health of the animal and human safety
- Cats should not be included in "wildlife"
- No exceptions for Animal Cruelty in any form!
- Existing drought or famine
- Birds (feeding)
- Exceptions for bird feeders
- Squirrels, birds
- Teasing - no exceptions. Feeding - exceptions with squirrels/birds/ducks in public parks.
- none
- N/A
- Relocating wildlife where it is possible
- birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Approval of the owners of said property
- Bird feeders and other feeding where humans are not in direct contact with the animal should be allowed.
- Canada Geese... Long time overdue for action and culling of these nuisance fowl.
- Depending on the cuteness of the rabbit.
- Bird seed
- N/a
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, if properly maintained
- Na
- ducks& geese in the rivers could be fed; squirrels& birds, from feeders and rabbits could be left carrots in the winter.
- Wildlife should be left alone unless they need medical help
- Wildbird food feeding ok



- Birdfeeder
- If you own said animal on your private property and they are not wild
- Bird feeders with carefully selected bird feeds to support native bird populations
- Feeding isn't the issue.. its teasing. That's cruel.
- Accept bird feeders
- bird feeders
- This is too broad of a question. What about bird feeders, or gardens, etc. Also, private property is just that, private property.
- None.
- No exceptions and make the fine sting. If the fine isn't high enough, people won't care.
- Bird feeders
- Birds and squirrels that use bird feeders
- If the animal is feeding on a garden or berries intended for decorative or human use.
- No exceptions. There should be a wildlife phone line they can call for assistance.
- You should be able to feed birds on private property
- None
- none
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be exempt.
- Wildlife causing damage to personal property should be allowed to be humanely escorted off the property.
- Provide support to an animal in obvious distress until an animal control officer arrives
- No one should feed or approach wildlife no matter what property. Unless its song birds and bird seed.
- Feeding and teasing wildlife should be separate bylaws since the reasoning behind each and the results for the animals are different.
- Feeding rabbits and squirrels along with birds should be allowed.
- Efforts to encourage the wildlife to leave the private property.
- None
- The case of an injured or young animal just needing a little minor help
- Only if it is done by animal services for trapping and relocating. The public should leave wildlife alone.
- If the animal was severely starving/emancipated or animal control and associated parties were notified but no action was taken.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- I worry that feeding birds would be included in this bylaw.
- Only if it is done by animal services for trapping and relocating. The public should leave wildlife alone.
- Canadian geese, overpopulated and everywhere



- Winter bird feeders is they are doing harm to the animals.
- Be reasonable with limitations. Example; bird and squirrel feeders should still be allowed
- None
- No teasing
- If an animal is injured and requires human assistance
- Exception for providing food for live-trapping/releasing of pest animals. i.e. skunks, etc.
- Feeding should be okay
- Birds/squirrels an exception.
- None
- Feeding birds
- If the animals was injured and needed care
- If the animal is in distress or injured and requires support to survive until official arrive.
- Squirrels
- none- it should be clear black and white.
- Feeding an injured/malnourished/abandoned baby animal.
- Only if it is done by animal services for trapping and relocating. The public should leave wildlife alone.
- This feeding wildlife covers a huge spectrum. This could reflect anything between a bird feeder to leaving food out for the deer. I think there needs to be more clarity on what is considered "wildlife" and "feeding"
- Exceptions would be bird & squirrel feeders and bird baths.
- You guys have lost your mind with the bylaws [removed]. How about a law against animal cruelty
- Saving life
- none
- Any situation where a pet or human is dangerous and the occurrence is in response to helping someone
- Feeding should be ok, but not teasing or tormenting wildlife
- Bird Feeders
- Feeding birds in your backyard and similar activities
- Owner has full right to press charges in terms of harassment and or assault
- Ponds that provide approved food for feeding fish, etc
- If they're feeding on food that's found in trees or bushes at the property there is no harm, but if they are actively feeding it this is an issue
- Not applicable
- Make this first offence carry a hefty fine \$1000, and so on with jail time after 3rd offence
- Non, people need to leave those animals alone, if anything, they should be contacting the owner of said property
- None
- Bird Feeders



- Impose a fine
- Bird feeders (not by hand) should be fine,
- Bird Feeders to be encouraged with correct feed only, feeding of other animals with correct feed in winter only.
- Small birds, squirrels
- Feeding birds with bird feeders.
- Birds and squirrels
- For animals like bunnies, where they are so prominent, an approved list of foods to feed them would be nice so that if people do feel the need to feed them, if the rabbit lives on their property for ex-pat please, they know how to not cause harm to bunny
- Hurt animals awaiting pickup by city or wildlife employees
- none
- Bird feeders. Prohibiting bird feeders would be ridiculous, but I'd like to see people better educated about feeding squirrels and rabbits, and attracting skunks.
- not if this would include things like bird feeders
- Birds are wildlife and many people feed them at feeders. Having said that, feeding animals such as deer, coyotes, skunks etc, should be disallowed.
- mistreatment of wildlife fine for anywhere
- Bird feeding and squirrels
- No exceptions feeding
- bird feeders
- None
- Putting bird seed in feeders should be ok, but any other feeding should be banned
- Bird feeders
- pitbulls should be prohibited OR perspective owner's should have an IQ test
- Would this include bird feeders?
- Bird feeders
- Feeding wild birds with the proper seeds, etc.
- People can feed birds and squirrels on their own property
- I would support a bylaw against teasing wildlife but not feeding
- Private property is precisely that PRIVATE! If someone wants to feed birds and squirrels, that is their prerogative! If you want to go after wildlife, cull the infestation of skunks in this city! No one wants them around and they invade private property!
- Increase education and ads informing public about the dangers about doing so.
- no exceptions
- fines
- birds
- Birdfeeders
- Birdfeeders



- teasing seems different then feeding. Someone may be feeding bunnies in the park...this is not good for bunnies but the person is not intending to do harm
- Bird feeders should be acceptable some regulations
- birds, squirrels
- Bird feeders
- None
- Birds
- Feeding and teasing are 2 different activities and should not be grouped together.
- We need education on why we need to leave wild animals alone and what to do if you find one on your property
- Bird feeders
- Domestic animals
- Birds should be exempted (Bird feeders)
- None
- Animal is in distress/starving.
- Injured wildlife for purposes of saving and re-releasing it
- Sick or injured animals
- No exceptions, Unless the animal is hurt.
- Bird feeders or under the advisement of a wildlife rehab centre or conservation officer
- Physical attacks on wildlife should be prohibited. Cats should not be outside without a leash due to killing wildlife on a large scale.
- an animal in distress
- no exceptions
- Gophers, there's not much you can do about them.
- Bunny's and birds
- Ok 2 feed not ok 2 tease. Answer to #1) offer free spay/neuter 2 1st x owners.
- None
- Bird feeders.
- how could "teasing" be defined such that it was enforceable in court - this seems unenforceable
- Exceptions for what, the question is not clear.
- Disturbing household pet
- For farmers, alot of the time they despise of dead livestock out in the corner of the Feild. I think as long as no other livestock are around, this should be aloud.
- No injuring of wild animals
- Bird feeders
- huge difference between feeding and teasing. The bylaw should only be for teasing or feeding an animal when it has been publicly discouraged and will be detrimental to the animals welfare
- Bird feeders
- Fines. Larger fines for teasing than feeding.



- Ok to feed but a bylaw against teasing excellent.
- Birds
- None.
- If it is on my property I should be able to feed the animals City already has too many controls on us!
- water fowl, birds
- None. Too many pet owners let their cats roam without control. Our backyards is their bathroom.
- Birds, squirrels, stray cats. How would you draw the line, if a deer walks through your yard and eats your tulips is that considered feeding a wild animal. Of your cat got out and you're worried and you leave out food and a raccoon eats some?
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds in winter
- birds / birdfeeders and by extension, squirrels
- None
- bird feeding with approved substances (ie, not peanuts or other large items but suet, and less irritating items for gardeners that squirrels like to bury in people's gardens).
- If property owner calls 311 and gets specific instructions to feed from bylaw/city officers.
- Bird feeders.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- I don't notice an issue in the city and see no need for change.
- Birds
- You don't do anything when people call bout roaming cats, why would you have man power for this!
- Private property.
- Animal that has been injured and being rehabilitated
- Define "Feed", for example bird feeders, I would support a bylaw that prohibits harassment of wildlife on private property
- Any wild animals should not be feed
- Its my yard therefore my property, if I don't want a rabbit in my yard I should be allowed to scare it away.
- Educate
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- No teasing or allowing dogs to chase wildlife.
- bird feeder
- Rescues and fosters
- Common sense, first offence a warning for people who aren't aware
- Fines



- Feeding vs teasing are two completely different behaviours and they should be dealt with as two separate questions..
- vermin
- Aggressive wild life
- Rescue efforts, special circumstances (ie conditions where normal food not available)
- Each situation should be handled on an individual basis; so if a warning should be given for ignorance to the bylaw it can be, and tougher bylaws and fines for repeat or uncaring individuals if necessary.
- If the animal is injured
- Feeding and giving assistance to an injured animal until authorities arrive
- Appropriate bird feeders
- Bird feeders/bird baths are fine but in general wildlife should not be feed.
- Feeding birds
- Allow bird feeders
- None. Private Property is just that... private. The owner should be taking precautions to prevent wildlife from entering their property in the first place.
- that the city quit trying to govern everything and leave it alone until a complaint comes in
- Bird feeders
- Bird Feeders be exempt, if found to be "Yes"
- Bird feeder should be exceptions, provided they are well maintained and appropriate
- The city doesn't own wildlife. Private property is private. Leave private citizens alone.
- Any Wildlife
- non
- Bird baths are acceptable.
- feeding wild birds only
- None.
- None
- Get rid of the rabbits! Supply more traps and make it illegal to feed them, raise them and release them.
- Allow to feed birds
- Bird, Squirrel and Rabbit feeders. Only Larger game should be considered for prohibition of feeding/teasing.
- Bird feeders
- How to enforce this would be a huge issue.
- feeding squirrels through the use of bird feeders is going to be hard to avoid
- Injury
- Bird feeding and rabbit feeding on private property.
- Wildlife should be kept to parks. first time you feed them they are back in your yard



- If wildlife are damaging private property .Eating bark off trees, damaging property to build a nest etc. The home owner should be allowed to chase off the wildlife.
- Zoos and other regulated exhibits.(i.e. petting zoo) (for Feeding not teasing)
- Bird food for bird
- Bird feeders
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders as an exception, but not feeding deer, coyotes etc...
- Bird feeders,
- You can't stop wild animals from eating people's gardens, so it's stupid to fine them for feeding them.
- No feeding wildlife on outlying communities
- none
- Larger fines
- None!
- Most people wouldn't tease. Just feed until they become a nuisance
- None
- bird feeders
- Its private property let them decide on their own. Would hate to see how a cop would handle a call like this.
- Wild birds
- No exceptions
- none
- Allow a mechanism for neighbours to complain and warnings then action to be taken, but not a blanket ban.
- If you prohibited feeding wildlife it opens the room to fine someone for a bird feeder or the like.
- Salt kicks for deer that stuff
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders
- cats should not be let out at night, and if cats are caught a fine is enforced to the owner.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Defense of inhabitants
- Feeding birds
- No Exceptions
- The city actually uphold these penalties. I find Calgary sets these bylaws and doesn't enforce them.
- Birds and squirrels exempt.
- Song birds
- bird feeders should be allowed



- Feeding should be allowed, depending on what is being fed.
- Bird Feeders
- Birds
- [removed]
- If the wildlife is a pest, or the feeding increases their population beyond a reasonable amount.
- Bird feeders are fine and using food to help catch an injured animal so it can get the care it deserves.
- Bird feeders
- Responsible feeding is not an issue, target irresponsible wildlife interactions.
- Injured animals that need care until Alberta Institute for Wildlife Conservation can retrieve them.
- Feeding and teasing are separate things
- Bird feeders
- Bird/pollinator feeders, frog/fish ponds, etc
- Feeding should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders, bat boxes and bee hotels should be permitted.
- private property is private
- Birds
- Private property is just that. There would need to be strong clarity if this is approved. are we talking feeding the birds, squirrels, or drawing in coyotes? Don't waste time fining people who have birdfeeders on their private property
- It looks starved and needs food/water
- Bird feeders
- I lived in Inglewood and numerous skunks were kept in the area due to being very well fed by members of the community. It was a detriment to others; but, may have protected breeding skunks. So, considering both sides.
- I guess to a degree this is important but what about injured and homeless animals?
- no exceptions
- Poaching on private property.
- None. Feeding squirrels and pigeons must be illegal. Any feeding that attracts pests and vermin should be prohibited.
- Bird feeders
- Does the city remove wildlife like skunks and raccoons? Because if they don't they shouldn't make a bylaw that would prevent homeowners from removing them or discouraging their presence.
- Birds
- Birdfeeders should be allowed
- Injured or sick animals
- Bird feeders should be allowed



- Rescue organizations
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Birds
- None
- Teasing yes.. feeding depends on the animal.
- None
- Obviously no teasing or hurting wildlife but use of such things as bird feeders increases bird survival rates by as much as 50 percent. Prohibiting feeders will increase overwintering death rate on birds such as chickadees.
- Feeding birds should be ok
- Starving or injured animal wandered on someone's property and is given food or water
- Bird feeders for wild birds
- None
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be an exception. Injured wildlife should be allowed to be fed.
- all should be applied
- It is important to educate and discourage people from doing so
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Excludes domestic animals
- Only if they hurt or looking for help. People need to be able to help other animals if we feel they want your help.
- Require signage and some sort of enforcement by private property owners
- Less government is better
- Birds
- Stray domestic animals
- None come to mind
- Colibri birds
- It would be good to depend because it'd also be really difficult not to feed say, a stray feral cat if you saw it was starving.
- None
- Education first
- bird feeders.
- Teasing and/or abuse of any kind should not be accentuated anywhere. Feeding would be hard to show intent for on private property and then I think should be considered separately.
- None
- Bird feeders & birdbaths



- Birds ok
- Bird/Squirrel Feeders
- Only feed if it is a baby animal alone and in distress
- Bird feeders
- You should be able to feed the birds
- If an animal is deprived of food and in need
- If unknowingly (would require a documented warning and cease and desist). Birdfeeders (seed and suet only allowed).
- Birds are considered wildlife, and I will always feed them, and we need to encourage them to stay around to keep bugs in check
- Small birds, squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Can feed if injured or orphaned.
- hungry animals
- Birds
- Feeding birds (bird feeders)
- Birds feeds
- In a attempt to rescue a animal in harms way.
- None
- Birdfeeders and birdbaths
- Wounded animals waiting for transport or help
- They were on private property where the owners decided to feed them
- Sick animal/bird. Or baby that has been abandoned.
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Please allow bird feeders. I would not be against feeding other herbivores/omnivores (e.g a stray cat). (Could specify a distance from property lines, for bird feeders, etc?)I am against teasing of all animals (whether on public or private property).
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- There should be no exceptions, wild life should be left alone and respected. We're literally having to ask about making a bylaw to protect wildlife. It shouldn't even be a question. They get teased, they attack and then it's the animals fault? Wrong
- Feeding of birds, an animal injured and in need of care while waiting for assistance
- Injured bird
- I have a bird feeder and would like to continue using it. Jim Gainer
- Feeding birds should be exempt
- Bird feeders, salt licks in winter
- Small, non- aggressive animals are okay. For example, having bird feeders.
- Wild bird feeding



- Feeding birds should be exempt.
- Rescue/rehab situations, where individuals are attempting to rehabilitate wild birds or small wild animals at home
- Hungry/starving, or hurt animals that need assistance
- birds, and squirrels
- Bird feeders/baths allowed, hazing of wildlife to get them off property for their, your animals or your safety.
- Define teasing and define feeding. If one has a crabapple tree that attracts wildlife is that considered verboten?
- If providing rehab temporarily
- Leaving food out that could attract larger predators
- None
- Bird feeders
- I would strongly suggest that we still be allowed to feed wild birds with feeders on our own property
- Coverage for pet insurance
- Too broad! I agree with no teasing but what about feeding birds? During the lockdown many people have found relief and happiness in observing birds at the feeders. Calgary winters are harsh. We need bird feeders!
- None
- Bird feeders should be permitted.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Animals in need of water or shelter.
- Imminent threat to life or livelihood
- If the animal looks like it's starving then it should be fed bottom line, it's not their fault that they are where they are they go off instinct. Making it illegal to feed cats or strays of any sort is outrageous.
- Petting allowed, just not tormenting the animals.
- No exceptions.
- Feeding birds
- None
- Bird feeding
- none
- None
- Special trained ninja squirrels
- Birds
- If the animal was aggressive.
- Change your signs. Say if you feed wildlife we will have to kill the animal. Make it clear for people that don't understand why you can't feed wildlife
- Birdfeeders and define wildlife better



- bird feeders
- Birds and bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- We need to protect all wildlife and that means investing on education. You can't just say "no" and then people can't even feed birds. We have taken their homes away from them, we're responsible for their livelihood now.
- More education for people. Social media, newspaper, etc. It starts with educating people on what not to do.
- Birds
- Only when the wild animal is rescued and needs to be restored back to health while waiting for authorities to take over
- At the owner's permission you could feed them
- Animals that have sustained an injury impacting their ability to feed themselves without assistance or the animal has lost its parent that would normally have been responsible for ensuring it is nourished until it's able to take care of themselves.
- Winter, when it's very cold, we should be allowed to feed the birds to help them make it thru the winter.
- There should be no bylaw involvement of any kind on private property
- Feeding birds, squirrels, rabbits, and other small animals on private property
- Helping an animal to survive (abandoned baby, injured, etc)
- fine
- Hummingbird feeders
- Feeding and teasing are not the same thing. This should be 2 different bylaws with much harsher penalties for teasing.
- I agree with not tolerating teasing as that is completely unacceptable. However, I think bird feeders and baths are ok.
- birds
- It should be permitted to feed wild birds. Squirrels can manage on their own.
- We only feed the birds, the dam squirrels help themselves.
- Feeding a feral animal
- Birds
- Bird feeders? Hungry deer and rabbits?
- Only teasing sometimes people are helping an animal in distress
- This is every person's right to feed birds and wildlife. Besides it helps the wildlife, why would kindness be seen as a crime? Besides there are much more important things to concentrate on, like graffiti, need more patrols, vandalism and dangerous dogs
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions, people should never feed wildlife, it only leads to problems



- If anything happens, the feeder should pay for the costs. (e.g. wildlife attacks as result of feeding or wildlife needs to be killed due to being too domesticated)
- none
- Injured animals that someone is trying to trap for transport to a rescue group
- Feeding: If animal is being caught for relocation purposes. Teasing: No excuses for this behaviour.
- birds
- Feeding birds from a bird feeder or squirrels from a squirrel feeder.
- Feeding being okay
- There to be a 411 type 24hr number to call for fish & wild life to come detain animal and release back to the wild as the animal is probably crazy and disorientated.
- Birds and small mammals.
- Feeding birds would be okay.
- Bird feeders should be allowed on private property.
- Yes if it was specific to what is wildlife. For example, people feed wild birds all the time. There needs to be specific to the species that feeding is harmful to.
- Starving animals
- Birds - feeding birds is absolutely necessary for the survival of resident, wintering and migratory birds as we have destroyed much of the habitats that they would normally access.
- feeding birds is perfectly fine. Also I didn't answer Q1 as it doesn't have the option I would choose. I don't believe additional investment is needed - coyotes take care of feral cats...
- Nothing. Why can't you feed the birds??
- Birds and squirrels
- Birds
- Bird Feeding-it is very important aspect of an individual for mental and spiritual well being.
- I definitely would NOT support such a ridiculous bylaw, if it involves feeding the birds in one's own yard! Predatory coyotes or wolves should not be encouraged in any way, but birding is a hobby for many Calgarians. Unenforceable bylaw & silly.
- We need clarification of the word "teasing". And does feeding include having bird and squirrel feeders? If so, you are going to upset a lot of homeowners who derive great joy from watching the birds and squirrels who visit our feeders!
- feeding birds & squirrels especially in winter as long as it does not present a hazard by attracting coyotes & other predators
- Feeding birds
- trapping! feeding to set up a trap to trap animals
- The city should include plants in their program that would contribute to the well-being of migrating birds, ie plant sunflowers, grass and flower seed plots that entice passers-by.
- birds rabbits squirrels
- If you find the animal hurt and helpless feeding should be acceptable until authorities are able to deal with the matter.



- Bird feeders
- backyard bird feeders
- Don't mind people feeding, do you really expect people to get rid of bird feeders? But I'm OK with a law about harassing animals
- If the animal is clearly in distress, I wouldn't be opposed to feeding it while waiting for animal control to provide assistance.
- I don't understand "teasing", but I will feed the birds or squirrels.
- Bird feeders should be exempt from this bylaw.
- Na
- Waterguns to chase away Magpies are OK - but only if there is no intent to injure them!
- Bird feeders?
- Unless the animal was starving in someones backyard
- You should be able to feed birds
- none
- Separate the bylaws for feeding and teasing. Make allowance for bird and squirrel (etc.) feeders.
- birds, squirrels, chipmunks
- Bird Feeders
- feeding birds if done responsibly (e.g. feeders, quality food)
- Exclude bird feeders on private property from bylaw prohibition
- No exceptions
- Feeding birds and squirrels yes. No feeding of other wildlife. No teasing any animals
- Bird feeding is not a problem
- Safely securing an injured friend of nature until bylaw is on site
- Responsible feeding of wild birds on private property should be allowed
- Squirrel/ bird feeders
- songbirds
- None
- Birds
- I want to continue feeding birds and insects via bird feeders. In times of great stress (fire, drought, etc), we should help. m against teasing or tormenting wildlife in any form. Combining these two questions makes it difficult to answer accurately.
- Allow feeding of birds as always but no teasing of any animal.
- This question is not clear if that includes bird feeders.I agree deer and other large wildlife should not be fed but like my bird feeder.
- Bird feeders
- Only if it is done by animal services for trapping and relocating. The public should leave wildlife alone.
- wild birds/backyard bird feeders



- No exceptions. Keep the bylaw simple and easy to understand - no feeding of any wildlife, including birds.
- Fines up to up to \$200 for changing animal behaviour and affecting their present and adjacent communities.
- It would be IMPOSSIBLE to enforce this. Besides, you probably have bigger fish to fry such as removing garbage that is spilling over from full cans which DO attract wildlife.
- none
- None
- Bird feeders allowed
- Birds and squirrels
- birdfeeders
- Exceptions would include bird feeders and individuals trying to help injured or young/orphaned wildlife
- Let us feed the birds in our own backyards!
- Bird feeding, providing flowers for pollinators
- Bird feeders
- Do nothing
- None
- Absolutely no feeding wildlife on your property.
- Bird feeders
- I don't believe this is a problem
- Bird feeders.
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Teasing wildlife should be banned. The bird population is already declining with the lights left on the downtown buildings disorienting their flights. We should continue to support the birds that are not able to migrate or miss migration by feeding.
- None
- None
- At risk species + predators that could become conditioned to the human interaction
- exceptions for feeding of wild birds in backyards which is very important to support the population of wild birds in Canada which is in decline and permit the enjoyment of watching these birds in an urban setting.
- Feeding of birds
- Bird feeders should still be allowed.
- Bird feeders that use bird feed that is safe for wildlife
- I think you should be able to feed wild birds/ and therefore if you accidentally feed other animals it should not be against the law. Teasing should be against the law but not shooing problem animals or birds out of your yard or away from you or your pet.



- I'm not sure about teasing wildlife, but many people feed birds on private property, and in winter months can be vital to our year round species of birds (Chickadees, House Finch, Juncos, Hummingbirds, etc.).
- Birds
- to save a life until one could resolve the situation
- There shouldn't be any restrictions on people feeding birds on their own property.
- If wildlife is endangering a human and one had to distract the animal by feeding
- Help if they're injured
- Bird feeders
- Birds ...need help with food and water all year long
- Need leeway to eradicate pests off private property such as rodents
- no animal cruelty
- Bigger fines for owners
- Birds
- None.
- Ok to feed, if feeding their natural diet only.
- I would definitely be in favour of laws prohibiting teasing of wildlife anywhere. However, I am not in favour of banning the feeding of birds . Besides which, why have more bylaws if you don't have staff to enforce them?
- Prohibit teasing but not feeding when it's being done as part of animal rescue efforts
- Birds, squirrels
- Would this cause the elimination of bird feeders and bird baths?
- Prohibiting bird feeding seems an over response
- Bird feeders, planting native species food sources should actually be encouraged
- Wild birds
- Bird and Squirrel feeders that give so many home owners pleasure
- Allow bird feeders in backyards
- None
- no exception for teasing
- Fines
- none
- Feeding birds, squirrels and chipmunks should be OK
- The question is too vague. I wouldn't support prohibiting backyard bird feeders & I'm not sure the question provides exceptions for short term emerg wildlife rehab situations . Also if there was a ban of bird feeders, it would need to gradual/1yr.
- Don't poison wildlife but it's absolutely ridiculous to ask people to stop feeding birds. Define wildlife.
- Feeding on private property should be allowed. For birds, deer, rabbits, etc.
- Feeding is okay, but teasing / harassing wildlife is not okay.
- None



- Bird feeders
- Most small passerine birds should be exempt from this bylaw if it comes to pass - such birds are an enjoyment to watch and bring cheerful song to the property.
- The question is unclear. Birds should be allowed to be fed on private property. However, feeding of raccoons and other pests should not be allowed.
- I want to feed wild birds seed and suet on my property
- Bird feeders
- Songbirds
- Feeding and teasing are two different things. I support feeding birds & squirrels. Not other wildlife. Do not support teasing any animal anywhere
- Birdseed
- Birdfeeders
- no exceptions
- Education
- Enforce the existing bylaw before widening its scope.
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders/songbird
- Bird feeders providing proper/healthy food should be allowed
- you be allowed to feed on own property
- Injured or abandoned animal
- Bird & Squirrel feeder should still be allowed.
- What else are you taking away from us!!!! So now we can't have bird feeders....how stupid is this now. Birds, squirrels etc... bring beauty and nature to homes.. why is this EVEN up for discussion. Maybe look at watering your CALGARY trees and parks....
- None what people do on their property is their business.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- None
- Does this include bird feeders. If so I would exempt them
- none
- Fine those who are teasing and harming wildlife. Those who are feeding may be permitted as long as it doesn't create dependency by the wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Do not ban backyard bird feeders. I contribute data to the oldest (<100 yrs) citizen science database in North America on migratory birds. Particularly endangered song birds that nest in the Calgary region and visit backyard feeders.
- obviously injured



- Feeding birds
- Injured animals
- Does this mean the City of Calgary doesn't want homeowners to put bird feeders up in their own backyards? This specific question is far too vague and needs clarification as to exactly what our city councillors are trying to prohibit us from doing!
- If it were nutritional feed meant for said species on private property.
- It would make having a bird feeder illegal. Need I say more?
- bird feeders
- I love bird watching! I discovered this hobby last spring at a time in my life where I was suffering from depression and health issues. I cannot express the peace I found with just putting up bird feeders and attracting the birds to my yard.
- Birds
- Bird feeding MUST BE totally excluded from any bylaw prohibiting feeding wildlife.
- How do you propose to deal with bird feeders? The question is far too vague and needs to be clarified as to what the definition of wildlife is specifically in this question. I cannot simply answer yes or no based on the questions vagueness.
- Bird and squirrel feeding. I would support bylaws against teasing on private property.
- This question is much too vague. What is included in this bylaw? Bird feeder in private property? Question needs to be much clearer.
- Bird feeders should no be banned. They bring enjoyment to many backyard bird enthusiasts, and are beneficial to the birds
- Bird feeders on private property
- Should be ok to feed things like rabbits and birds.
- feeding birds - (please! they bring so much joy to our family during the winter months.)
- Leave bird feeders alone
- None
- Except for feeding birds using bird feeders
- I love feeling the birds in winter and summer. Your question is too vague.
- If the animal is injured, or needs help(maybe starving,noticeably), then an exempt should be made. Teasing and feeding the wildlife is unfair from humans to animals and the ecosystem.
- No Exceptions.....Fed Wildlife is Dead Wildlife.....ask a Bear.....
- Make a distinction between feeding bears/wild birds in parks vs. being able to have a bird feeder in my backyard. I do not support the feeding of animals outside of someone's property but I do not see an issue with my having a bird feeder in my backyard.
- fines for people who feed wildlife
- Those citizens that get enjoyment from feeding the birds that fly into their own private property.
- bird feeders/bat feeders/bee and butterfly feeders
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Bird feeders in private property for wild birds.



- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Please allow us to continue feeding the songbirds!
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Feeding is okay, teasing should never be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- This is very vague. Feeding birds is not teasing them. It provides enjoyment. This is two separate questions because anyone with some conscience is not going to tease wildlife found on their property. Please rephrase this
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, hummingbird feeders
- A change of this nature could make placing bird feeders on your property prohibited. There are many studies (ex. Wilcoxon et al., 2015; Murray et al. 2016) showing limited to no causal connection between feeding and adverse conditions in bird populations.
- This should not cover wild birds using feeders
- Bird feeders
- Please allow citizens to feed birds.
- I think bird feeders and fountains need to be permitted in Calgary yards
- Allow bird feeders.
- bird feeders
- I would support a bylaw that prohibits teasing wildlife on private property
- We have a small bird feeder. It sustains neighborhood and migrating species. We provide fresh clean water. Watching these birds is a highlight for us, and decreases insect pests in the trees and yard. I do not want any regulation of my property.
- Squirrel feeding
- How far would such a law extend? No bird feeders? No animal friendly plants? If I plant clover and a deer wanders into my yard, illegal or no? What about insects, flowers that specifically attract bees or support butterflies? Far too vague.
- bird feeders if kept out of reach of other animals
- What does "wildlife" mean? I want to continue feeding wild birds at our back yard feeder during the winter months. Please clarify.
- children feeding geese, ducks
- Exceptions for small wildlife i.e. bird/squirrel feeders, but absolutely no 'teasing' or trapping of wildlife on private property.
- Bird feeders should be allowed. I don't think the birds would survive a Calgary winter without help.
- If the animal is injured or can't take care of itself



- I have been providing sunflower seeds from bird feeders in our backyard. I have also been providing the birds with a water source year round (using a electric de-icer).
- Birdfeeders
- Teasing, yes. Feeding predators, yes. Rabbits, birds, and squirrels - we should be allowed to feed Them, especially on our own property.
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Governmental control of civilian behavior on private property is egregious and we should not entertain so much as the thought of it. There is no suggestion here. If a crappy human owns land they'll probably do crappy things on it, but that's their choice.
- Feeding wild birds.
- Teasing wildlife is not acceptable. However I fully support bird feeders and potential feeding of wildlife that may result from that
- Birds
- None - fines should be significant and enforcement should be active and not merely responsive to complaints
- Not including bird feeders
- Bird feeders, water dishes
- I would support all recommendations made by Alberta Institute of Wildlife Rehab & Calgary Wildlife Rehab Society; they are the experts in this field.
- No teasing but bird feeders allowed
- Having bird feeders is okay.
- An exception could be given to caring for an animal if it is suffering or appears to be starving, but only for a short period of time until a private rescue or City run facility can capture and pick up the animal.
- Bird feeders, perhaps with capacity limits per property.
- I don't feel feeding wildlife, such as birds, on private property should be banned or considered teasing wildlife. Building a bird feeder and watching the wildlife from our bay window was one of the positives my Son and I enjoyed during Covid.
- I still want to be able to feed the birds
- Bird feeders should be exempt in my opinion
- None because you don't define wildlife. For example birds are wildlife and birds use my property to feed
- Birds. Feeding birds should be allowed
- Bird feeders on private properties should be excepted
- Birds, Chipmunks, Squirrels
- Feeding bird with bird feed and bird providing bird houses
- When attempting rescue of injured animal
- feeding be allowed, not teasing or harrassing
- Birds



- feeding birds
- I don't agree with teasing any wildlife but I do want to continue feeding birds
- None
- We enjoy watching the birds nest in our birdhouses and feeding at our feeders. The bobcat occasionally walking through our yard.the odd squirrel runs along our back fence . Nature is apart of our community. Don't take everything away from us !
- how do you define "teasing". The popularity of birding, as evidenced by the website "Alberta Birds" has exploded and brings a great deal of pleasure, esp to seniors and shut-ins. I would object to feeding back yard birds being included in any such bylaw.
- Bird feeders and the feeding of wild birds on private property.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders and waters allowed
- Winter feeding the birds!!!!
- Deer, moose, birds, porcupines. Mostly do not feed animals such as bears & coyotes.
- birds! The birds in my neighbourhood rely on my feeder in the winter and they greatly contribute to the enjoyment of my community (seniors, children etc) birding opportunities
- question 2 is for 2 items so one answer is not appropriate.... I agree with no teasing anywhere. Feeding only for bird feeders/water but please educate Calgarians on healthy feeding for birds and squirrels...eg. not all peanuts or crackers or bread etc.
- Birds and bird feeders
- I believe that bird feeders and bird baths should be permitted on private property.
- Bird feeders
- What do you mean by tease?
- None.
- Bird feeders during migration season and winter months
- If current laws were actually enforced, no warnings just fines, then no changes would be necessary. Word would be passed along quickly with fines so more people would be aware.
- bird feeders
- None
- Feeding and teasing are 2 very different behaviors. I would support a bylaw that prohibits teasing wildlife but I would not support a bylaw that prohibits feeding of wildlife if that prevents me from giving seed + water to birds during our bitter winters
- If the animal is clearly in distress, as well water being left out should be encouraged.
- Wild birds: chickadees, sparrows, robins, nuthatches, etc.
- No suggestions
- I absolutely do not support any teasing of wildlife on private property or anywhere. However, I want to still be able to feed the wild birds that visit my back yard as well as the occasional squirrel.



- Prohibit teasing, but not feeding, particularly when it comes to wild birds. While the squirrel pop. Needs to be reduced (not our small naturalized ones), it is impossible to prohibit feeding them wherever bird feeders are present.
- song birds and hummingbirds
- There is a big difference between teasing and feeding. Teasing should not be allowed- ever. Feeding however as long as the property is not attracting more wildlife and interfering with neighbours should not be an issue- like bird feeders etc.
- Feeding birds or squirrels
- No byelaws affecting bird feeders.
- None. feeding birds leads to mice coming into your yard, and then your neighbours yard and then potentially their house.
- I would not support this bylaw if it means I cannot have wild bird feeders in my own backyard.
- bird feeders on private property
- We should be able to continue to have birdfeeders on our private property
- This question is so braod that I ahd to answer no. It obvvilusly makes no sense to feed a bear on privatge property, but it equally makes no sense to prohibit bird feeders (I currently have a bird feeder and wish to continue to feed th birds)
- What does this mean? Are you considering the end to backyard birding?? This is far too vague.
- I would allow bird feeders in backyards
- If the animal looks to be starving or in need of some food assistant then you may feed the animal an appropriate food choice.
- We enjoy watching the birds at our bird feeders, by ourselves and with our grandchildren. We also have enjoyed watching deer in our garden even though they eat annuals from our pots, especially petunias and pansies, and perennials such as hostas etc.
- None
- Bird feeders should be permitted
- bird seeds
- I would allow feeding on my own private property. This is very vague & needs clarification.
- Feeding birds responsibly with appropriate feed and clean feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed on private property. Helps many birds through the winter. The squirrels at times benefit as well. Also, I have heard of people sheltering deer near parks who have chosen a yard as the place to give birth.
- First of all, define what is meant by teasing
- feedign of birdsa nd waterign of small animals
- If there's an animal who is in need of food should get some but not if it's private property.
- Allow homeowners to put bird feeders up in their own backyards.
- bird feeding
- I want to ensure that there are no restrictions against bird feeders or bird baths.
- Please leave us our bird feeders! I would support a ban on feeding predatory animals with four legs.



- Bird feeders should continue to be allowed. This is important to support a number of species in winter.
- I obtain great joy feeding the birds in my backyard. I also have a squirrel feeder I. Order to keep the squirrels out of the bird feeders. Teasing should be eliminated. Feeding of birds and squirrels approved.
- Exceptions to feeding birds by way of bird feeders on personal property to be exempt.
- Attracting wild birds with feeders. Bird feeders are crucial to migratory birds. And where there are bird feeders there will be squirrels.
- Continue to allow bird feeders (if birds are included in "wildlife")
- Birds not to be included in "wildlife ". We love our feathered friends
- Feeding of wild birds should not be prohibited
- Bird feeders
- None feeding wildlife makes them stay in the area becoming a nuisance after then endanger them as well. People need to let nature take its course butt out of animals lives and stop interfering with their natural practices.
- We like to keep a bird feeder in the winter for the birds as there is limited food available. We do not supply food in the summer as there is plenty available. I would like a further definition of what teasing of wildlife means.
- Feeding birds.
- We are concerned this could impact the bird feeders in our yard. Local birds need to find enough food to survive winter. Migratory birds need energy to travel north and south. Please do not limit the feeding of birds.
- None. Wildlife should not interact with or be fed by humans.
- Feeding of wild birds, bees etc. No teasing
- Birdfeeders are essential for the overwintering species of birds.
- Bird feeding (strongly).
- unless it doesn't apply to birds, rabbits and squirrels, which are common garden visitors
- birds
- Bird feeders must be allowed on private property
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders of all sorts should remain permissible
- Bird feeders and baths are fine
- bird feeders
- I'm not sure what is meant by "teasing" but a landowner should be able to remove wildlife from their property and/or encourage them to leave.
- Feeding wildlife and teasing wildlife are two very different behaviours. We should be able to feed birds on our own property. We should never be allowed to tease wildlife. Separate the two things and I will support a bylaw that prohibits teasing wildlif
- Do not include feeding birds



- Bird feeders and water should be available all year for birds
- It should not apply to birds. Having bird feeders does not have the same implication than feeding larger animals. Birds are already vulnerable with some populations declining and I feel that feeding them helps to protect them.
- I am definitely not in favour of preventing people from feeding birds in their own property. This does no harm to the wild birds and is a wonderful educational opportunity for the entire family. I believe people who feed coyotes should be charged.
- The question is too vague and open to interpretation - We have bird feeders out during the winter and it's necessary to the survival of the local bird population. These should be excluded from the by-law.
- Teasing should be included but we feed the birds in the winter, which we enjoy
- Bird feeders
- As currently stated this could be interpreted to include the provision of food for wild birds. This important activity needs to be clearly excluded from the proposed bylaw.
- wild bird feeding, fallen apples, coyotes eating stray cats and dogs, etc.
- Backyard bird feeders should NOT be prohibited.
- One should be allowed to feed birds appropriate bird feed from feeders
- Allowing Backyard Bird Feeders
- Exempt bird baths and feeders
- Feeding ok for birds, squirrels, even deer. Not okay for predators/big animals that would then be at risk because of contact with human contact. No teasing.
- The exception to this law should be bird feeders on private property. Without bird feeders, the numbers of birds in the city may decline drastically and this would likely cause other problems to arise!
- None
- Birdfeeders using seeds and hummingbird feeders
- Really? Does this include feeding birds? Please realize how much pleasure older folks get from sitting and watching the birds feed in the summer and for that matter all year. Please differentiate birds from things like squirrels and bobcats.
- What does feeding or teasing mean? Feeding the birds in a backyard is not a problem. Running a dog fighting ring is.
- Birds. And this may need to be qualified to exclude geese, ducks, birds of prey.
- Feed is ok. tease should Get a fine
- No to question #1. Why is every option this tern worse, with no option for, stay the same
- I answered no to the question because it is vague and ambiguous. For example: will I be fined for feeding the birds? The city has not been proactive in controlling the invasive squirrel population, what if they get into my bird feeder?
- People should be allowed to set up bird feeders on their property to feed wild birds.
- Bird feeders are ok. Separate feeding from teasing in your documentation & define these terms.



- Birds - ppl. Must feed the birds responsibly. Use proper food/seed.
- Feeding Bird's in the winter in my back yard should not be prohibited
- helping injured wildlife
- Bird feeding!
- I am not in favour of feeding non native squirrels yet I am in favour of bird feeders
- None
- This proposed bylaw must be dropped or reworded or it would prevent individuals putting up bird and squirrel feeders. Such feeders are a benefit to many migratory and non-migratory birds and provide a source of enjoyment and education to homeowners.
- I would suggest that the exceptions are if the animals are stray pets that look like they need food/water. There should be no feeding of wildlife of any sort.
- Bird Feeders & Fountains
- Bird feeders
- Needs better wording and detail. Harassment, not teasing. And what about bird feeders? They should be supported.
- Birds
- We always have bird feeders in our garden. Prohibiting feeding birds would be unacceptable to us.
- Supplemental Wild Bird Feeding be exempt
- Bird feeders are ok.
- Do not prohibit FEEDING birds! Of course I would prohibit TEASING birds or any wildlife. It is 2 different issues!!!!
- Wild birds
- I would expect feeding birds with feeders to be acceptable.
- I enjoy setting bird feeder and watching birds coming to my property. Great educational opportunity not my young ones too.
- Feeding birds in appropriate bird feeders
- I have bird feeders and I also feed the rabbits on cold winter days. Nothing wrong with feeding some wildlife so this needs to be addressed carefully.
- Animals in need.
- To the extent that it doesn't negatively impact neighbors' ability to enjoy their own property, a resident should be able to maintain bird feeders / bird baths (understanding this may also incidentally feed squirrels, etc.)
- there is nothing wrong with feeding bids at a feeder
- birdfeeders
- I do not support limiting bird feeders, bird baths, fountains that birds use to get water. We have 2 feeders in our yard. They are designed and placed so they do not allow squirrels to use them. I do support not feeding bobcats, coyotes, rabbits, etc.
- Feeding songbirds is a lot different than teasing deer. This question should be made more specific.



- What is wrong with feeding birds on private property? If that is what your suggested bylaw is I think it should be thrown out before it even gets started.
- I think passive bird feeders should be exempted
- Question is vague so I hop you aren't preventing people from having bird feeders in their yard
- Prohibiting bird feeders would be absurd
- This question is far to vague to determine what the city is trying to prohibit. I support people putting out bird feeders but am unsure what you mean by 'teasing Wildlife'.
- Birds
- bird feeders on private property to provide for local and migrating species of all sorts
- Does "wildlife" include birds. I don't think backyard birdfeeders should be prohibited on private property
- Birdfeeders on private property should be allowed.
- Bird feeders.
- no teasing
- wild birds should not be included or, preferably, should be specifically excluded.
- If an animal that is in need (malnourished, abused or injured) is spotted on private property, an outside party should be able to step in and help.
- Continue to allow bird feeders on property.
- If an animal is injured or starving and a wildlife rehabilitation agency has suggested feeding it as an interim solution
- Needs to be clarified. Could people have bird feeders in their back yards?
- I think some feeding is ok—like birds and squirrels—teasing no.
- Exceptions for bird feeders
- If birds are considered wildlife then bird feeders should be an exception.
- Bird feeders
- I would suggest harsher penalties for people who walk their dogs off leash in non off leash areas or not secured on the owners property with a leash or behind a fence.
- Bird feeders
- Bird/squirrel feeders should still be permitted
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Teasing is out but non-lethal attempts to remove invading wildlife is OK.
- feeding the birds
- Bird feeder, bath, and house. And bee house.
- No animal cruelty anywhere.
- No exceptions
- Deliberate harming of animals that are not causing harm or nuisance to residents or property
- Exceptions are bird seed feeders.
- Exterminators or homeowners trying to catch pests should be exempt.
- Bird feeders



- Bird feeding should still be allowed
- Prohibit feeding large wildlife. Leave bird feeding alone
- bird feeders
- Allow feeding at petting zoos
- Clearer explanation on that bylaw... I do not agree with teasing wildlife however you would have to take away all the bird feeders in Calgary.
- Chipmunks, hummingbirds
- Except for tourist areas such as Eau Claire.
- The rules and regulations must have the health and care of the animal first
- Accidental feeding, animals entering property to eat food that is growing, definitely no teasing
- An acceptable exception would be on a case-by-case basis having authorised persons care for wildlife if injured or sick. This exception could apply retroactively if persons involved could not gain authorisation before needing to help the animal.
- The teasing and abuse of wildlife on private property having severe fines
- Injured animal
- Only feeding certain animals, but no teasing/abuse of wildlife
- Bird feeders, trapping vermin
- If wildlife were being abused or neglected, anyone should be able to help them.
- bird feeders
- In colder months, some animals need a little help. Feeding them helps with this
- Animal health/welfare status ex) if it's clearly hurt and is awaiting RCMP or park ranger pick up and assessment. If it's trapped, in say a hole or cage or den. If it is caught in a fence, or wire and is in distress, it should be called in
- None, no exceptions
- threatened and endangered species
- Taking an injured or sick animal to the animal hospital.
- Bird feeders!
- Birds and animals that feed at bird feeders unintentionally
- Its better to know the animals friends to people
- Unless the animal was starving in someones backyard
- Residential bird feeders should be permitted.
- Less government
- Feeding of wildlife in non-harmful way (scattering of natural food away from living spaces/high traffic areas for birds or small animals as an example)
- No exceptions
- Ensure that the law does not create hardships for wildlife
- Wild birds
- Unless it's a starving Orphaned animals who are being forced out of their homes by humans overly populating the planet



- Would apply to introduced rodents such as grey squirrels but not birds.
- Bird feeders for song birds to be allowed.
- This bylaw should be separate from the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw so as not to confuse matters.
- Bird feeders
- Cohabitation not Habituation! So do not feed or bait or attract deer, coyotes, foxes. Wild birds are the exception!
- Bird feed.
- Birdseed in winter so long as wildlife experts agree it is appropriate
- injured animals needing immediate care such as water.
- Hurt animals
- If there was a bad winter and the farmer or land owner has some dead animals from his herd, leaving the dead carcass for the animals to eat at end of hibernation
- Wild birds
- There should be a bylaw against teasing but not feeding on private property
- I would want an exception for bird feeders, but I find animal baiting loathsome , in general.
- Birds
- Dangerous animals
- you need to define "wildlife" if it includes birds and squirrels then i think you have a problem with your potential bylaw. I also think enforcement of this bylaw would be very onerous and I would hope the city has better things to do
- Bird feeding in winter
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Chickens
- if the feeding of wildlife brings potential danger to the private property e.g. feeding bobcats
- Bird feeders with bird seed
- If they are being fed by the property owner it is fine
- Absolutely NOT to include Bird feeders, as this assists migrating populations that pass through our city.
- No teasing but your allowed to set it feed for wildlife
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Temporary care until transported to wildlife rehab center
- If animal is hurt and human intervention is needed
- Feeding coyotes
- Allow the feeding of birds, unless the property is located close to a "wild" area and has experienced visits by bears, raccoons or other non-target animals.
- Abandoned youth
- Bird, bee and squirrel feeders.
- Bird feeders, and bee keepers should be exempt.



- None
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be exempt. This question is very vague and not clearly defined.
- Bird feeders on private property are ok
- Do not include prohibiting feeding birds in bird feeders. They need this in winter. I wouldn't prohibit feeding wildlife on private property as how would you define this?
- Regular animal respect/abuse laws should apply
- Are bird feeders included in thisif so bird feeders and baths should be exempt
- Bulb flowers such as tulips should not be included. Peanuts for blue jays, meal worms for robins, bird baths and feeders to attract wild birds should not be included.
- Bird feeding should be OK
- An injured animal that needs help. Then it should be a person right to choose to do so
- Depends on type of feeding/ teasing....technically putting out a bird feeder can be classified in this topic
- If the animal is in need of help but the zoo should focus more on conservation of animals rather than displaying them for money.
- Feeders with grain for birds and other critters.
- If animal is injured
- Allowed in specified areas
- Birds, squirrels
- How would the city be able to afford the enforcement of such a bylaw?
- Bird feeders
- Birds / bird feeders
- None
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders
- Rehabilitation of wild animals
- Birds
- Birdfeeders
- Feed the birds!
- Bird feeders still be allowed. Feeding animals with severe malnutrition should be dealt with on a case by case basis. Better education as to what a "pest" animal is under the bylaw and what home owners can do about them.
- an exception, in my opinion, would be bird feeders.
- bird feeders
- home licensed bird ownership - such as ducks.
- Birdfeeders
- Feeding during extreme weather conditions.
- No exceptions. Feeding wildlife is dangerous and careless, and ultimately can lead to the euthanizing of the wildlife.



- Injured animals
- Birds/squirrels
- Bird feeding
- To be clear, private property owners should be allowed to feed migratory songbirds, migratory birds, resident songbirds and woodpeckers. Crows and magpies should not be fed.
- Do not link feeding and teasing. It should be ok to feed wildlife (birds etc. on your own private property if you choose). And realistically, how could this be enforced? More important by laws regarding security/ safety should be a priority
- When trying to lure an injured or orphaned animal with the intention of transporting it to a rescue facility.
- This bylaw must pertain to wild bears, deer and cougars etc. Citizens should be allowed to feed birds and squirrels on their property.
- Feeding - ie. bird feeders
- Unless they're luring bears [removed]
- If the wildlife is injured and can't fend for itself.
- Birds, squirrels exemption. No teasing exemptions. Hasing exemptions.
- It would be hard to limit bird feeding, but larger animals should be prohibited. And teasing/harassment should def be enforced.
- If an animal is starving in the immediate. Something appropriate like water and meat.
- None
- Skunks, coyotes, wolves, cougars and bears .
- I think it's ok to have birdfeeders and to feed the birds bird seed on your property. But I do not think it's ok to feed birds in a public park..
- Forest fire then leaving water would be best
- Feed birds, squirrels ok. More education needed.
- does that include birds and squirrels?
- No exceptions.
- The wording of this proposed bylaw is unclear. I do NOT want this to apply to backyard bird feeding. I need the birds to come to yard for my garden and for my personal enjoyment of birds. If this bylaw is intended to change that then I am against it.
- Birds
- This question is far too vague! Backyard bird feeding is very important in people's lives
- Seasonal bird feed/feed for deer
- Dangerous wild animals like bears, cougars, bobcats, coyotes... and wildlife that are not a nuisance or detrimental to the wildlife.
- Bird feeders. Complete prohibition on leaving pet food or meat products out that would attract predators (coyotes, bob cats, skunks, etc.)
- None
- Bird feeders



- Bird feeders, putting nuts out for squirrels
- Bird feeding be allowed
- We should be able to feed all animals.
- Birds
- back yard birds and bird feeders
- Feeding injured animals should be allowed
- Harming of the wildlife
- Bird feeders should not be included in this bylaw.
- Bird feeders
- Petting zoo birdfeeders do you increase tourism when quarantine ends.
- If hens/other livestock is allowed on private property, wildlife should be able to access private property.
- No exceptions
- Birds and Squirrels are acceptable, but larger carnivores such as coyotes should be prohibited to feed/tease. Many people get great positive mental health benefits from feeding the birds and squirrels.
- Starvations
- None
- That you should not feed any feral animals
- Birdfeeders
- This is stupid
- Wild bird feeders
- Under direction of a wildlife officer
- Prohibit teasing, feed birds squirrels & rabbits
- feeding birds during winter.
- Hurt animals and birds
- Malnourished animals should be allowed to be fed
- any teasing should be unlawful
- This is a non-issue. Spend money on fixing the god-awful infrastructure in this city so people can live in affordable places and get to work in under 2.r
- Birds
- Feeding birds and squirrels and such should still be allowed. I don't think it would be good to support feeding large or dangerous animals as that could cause problems for people with small children or pets. Teasing is probably not a good idea.
- None people [removed] should leave animals alone
- Bird feeders!!!
- none
- Having a bird feeder or squirrel feeder shouldn't be an issue.
- feeding birds



- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- BIRDS
- Birds
- Exceptions allowing for things like feeding songbirds with appropriate food need to be included.
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- I love watching birds at my bird feeders. I also have bird houses and a bat box and these are important to me.
- Fines , hefty
- allow the feeding of stray cats and dogs
- Animals eating from trees on the property, without being enticed
- Allow bird feeding
- Ensure that there is no punishment leveled to anybody who does so out of genuine good will (such as attempting to lure an animal they presume injured or in distress, before calling the appropriate wildlife authorities)
- Fines for animal abuse
- Feeding Stray pets
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- I do not know what your use of the word “teasing” with regard to feeding wildlife.
- Bird feeders exempt. Squirrels raid bird feeders so also exempt.
- Feeding birds
- Let people feed them
- Feeding birds and providing housing for nesting birds.
- Bird feeders, and salt licks in rural areas
- Responsible bird feeders. We bird watch as family.
- Allow feeding of wild birds
- Bird feeders on private property
- No need to feed wildlife. Nature will take care of her own.
- I agree with this but I think it would be incredibly hard to enforce and therefore not financially worth the effort
- Feed Birds ducks squirrels
- Helping suck or injured
- wild bird feeders
- none
- education with radio, tv or inserts with electrical bill
- Birdfeeders would be the only exception that comes to mind
- against teasing only
- Rescuing injured wildlife
- Birdfeeders



- None
- Too many rules! Stop bubble wrapping society!
- If said wildlife is in danger i.e. sick, injured, dying
- Feeding.
- Injured wildlife, however, they need to be taken to the wildlife rescue
- None, the animals were here first.
- Sick or injured wildlife until animal control can take over the care
- Feeding birds
- Please do not criminalize bird feeders.
- Protecting property
- Bird feeders.
- birdfeeders, birdbaths
- small, wild birds using bird feeders
- Planting native plants that attract birds, mammals and insects should still be allowed.
- Avoid having any regulation
- squirrels, birds,
- Rabbits, Birds; these animals aren't considered a danger.
- Bird feeders, seed bars, suet, etc., bird baths, peanuts for squirrels and if a deer wants to lean over the fence to eat an apple off a tree or the ground, fine by me.
- I think of wildlife as the big creatures with teeth. I can see no problem feeding birds unless one lives in areas likely to entice the wildlife to one's property.
- Teasing shouldn't not be allowed. Feeding as long as proper are listed on signs.
- Using "Feeding and/or teasing wildlife" together doesn't make any sense. People who feed birds, for instance, would likely never hurt a bird. Use harassing instead of teasing and separate the two. Allow bird feeding, but discourage feeding wild animals.
- would this eliminate bird feeders? by planting certain flowers people unintentionally feed rabbits, deer, etc . Teasing and feeding are two seperate items and should have been addressed as such.
- None
- smaller birds
- Feeding birds in colder months.
- Majority of bird feeders are on private property feeders andd prohibiting bird feeders, the birs lose and the dedicated people that enjoy loc
- I don't understand 'teasing'. I do think any unfair treatment of wildlife should be punished. However, i think banning feeding wildlife is a touch far. What about bird feeders or children trying to feed squirrels.
- Birdfeeders should be allowed.
- Feeding would be acceptable but there should definitely be a bylaw on teasing widelife, that is unacceptable. Or will there be acceptions to being able to feed birds and squirrels? This question is not written very cleary to be able to answer.



- Bird feeders
- bird feeders should be exempt on private property
- If they were hurt or hurting something else.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders for song birds. ("Feeding" & "teasing" don't belong in same question.)
- Injured animals who need help/food while awaiting wildlife services
- bird feeders are still acceptable. Just want to decrease opportunities for people to bring potentially harmful wildlife into the urban areas
- birds
- bird feeders
- I would suggest exception if providing food for abandoned babies or providing food during scarcity like harsh winters. Obviously the food would have to be animal specific and appropriate to breed.
- None
- larger mammals -- ie larger than rabbits and squirrels
- I feed wild birds suet in winter & find it very annoying to have "feeding wildlife" lumped in with teasing.
- Exceptions: birds and squirrels and if it was obvious the food came from a garbage can.
- None.... the rabbits already ravage the flowers and shrubs. we need to cull the rabbit population in this city.
- Birds
- We want to continue to Feed the Birds and that often includes other small rodents ie; squirrels
- bird feeders
- I feel that to feed small animals ie rabbits or birds would be acceptable if they are on private property. If they wonder on to private property then they are in need of our care.
- your intentions sound reasonable BUT what about feeding squirrels, pigeons, song birds? is there any room for common sense in what Nanny is planning? (albeit with the best of intentions, no doubt..)
- I think education is a far better way to help Calgary, which will hopefully always have wildlife in it, know what is best to allow wildlife and people to both be safe.
- Bird feeders
- Large dangerous animals
- EXCEPTION: Wild bird feeders & bird baths in backyards. The benefits to neighbourhood far exceed potential negatives. Specific limits to this perhaps could be made where PROVEN RELATED harm results, e.g. attraction of racoons, skunks etc.
- None
- if you need to feed a hurt animal at life risk while waiting for the proper authorities to arrive
- Allow feeding of birds using bird feeders. Discourage feeding of pigeons.
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be allowed
- Bird and squirrel feeders



- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Feeding animals that are injured or appear severely malnourished
- Bird seed or water feeders. responsibly feeding that doesn't attract other wildlife
- Maybe feeding if you can tell the animal is in distress
- Education on the problems caused by feeding wildlife
- Allow bird feeders; Allow trapping of nuisance wild life by owner or contractor e.g. racoons, skunks, squirrels, cats etc. Otherwise I would
- fines for any teasing or feeding wildlife to be implemented
- No exceptions for the teasing/ feeding.. Animals pay for Humans stupidity, START MAKING THE HUMANS PAY WITH SUBSTANTIAL FINES, NO EXCEPTIONS
- Yes AND No. These are 2 separate questions! Yes to prohibiting TEASING wildlife. "NOT NECESSARILY" to not feeding, as sometimes wildlife needs our help to survive. Birds are wildlife too! Feeding larger animals though increases risks for domestic animals.
- Animals such as birds, squirrels, deer etc.... that have found ways to live with/along side us should be exempt from any such bylaws.
- Putting out bird side for small birds should be exempt, as well as small squirrel feeders.
- Bird feeders
- If an animal is injured and needs water or food!
- Birds and Squirrels
- Define feeding and teasing. Can I feed birds? Can I trap and destroy pests like squirrels?
- Feeding a sick or injured animal
- The feeding of birds on private property should be allowed.
- Feeding birds, as long as your food containers are kept clean,
- dangerous animals, eg. bears, cougars, should never be fed
- Bird feeders are a good thing
- Bird feeders still be allowed
- I feed the birds and thereby squirrels. Who is going to enforce such bylaws? We don't see current bylaws enforced eg: speeding in playground zones
- Trying to assist injured animals
- No Exceptions.
- Engaging with the animal if it is wounded and to get it medical attention aka to a profession. That's what I see as an exception
- Birds, squirrels, etc
- That is an extremely vague question. Properly maintained backyard bird feeders are technically feeding wildlife. I fully support those as a means of connecting people with nature and trying to give resources back to the wildlife whose habitat is now paved
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders



- The question itself is completely absurd. There is a HUGE difference between feeding wildlife such as birds and teasing wildlife to cause it distress. FIX THE QUESTION. THIS IS GROSS INCOMPETENCE!
- I don't see the harm in feeding the birds especially when it's really cold
- Non
- Bird feeders and the like
- none
- Feeding birds, or taking in injured wildlife to bring to a shelter
- Birdfeeders
- Feeding birds
- Animals with malnutrition or wound(s).
- If they are harassing the animal or hurting it then it should be a problem.
- There should be some exception to property owners who enjoy feeding Birds and Squirrels on their property.
- Bird feeders.
- I would have an exception for injured or orphaned wildlife if wildlife management is unable to assist within 12 hours.
- No wild animal should be teased or fed, with the exception of birds, many who rely on the bird feeders people have in their yards. And offering assistance to any animal in distress is always the right thing to do.
- Feeding bears, foxes, raccoons
- Bird feeders
- If the animal is causing harm to pets, people, etc
- None
- none
- Birdfeeders and bee hotels
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- If bird feeding counts then leave that alone.
- Huge fines should be levied against anyone caught doing this. Unfortunately the city doesn't have enough bylaw officers to enforce.
- Birds and squirrels
- None it's simply unacceptable!!
- None
- Teasing or torturing animals should be illegal and have more consequences. Feeding I think is ok. Like bird feeders and hands free feeding. Shouldn't try to tame wild animals
- Does this mean residents can't have bird feeders?
- none
- Injured or abandon animals
- Bird feeders are fine



- Animals such as bears of course there should be a bylaw but for squirrel and the like no.
- Feeding &teasing are on opposite ends of the spectrum. Teasing of wildlife should NOT be permitted ever. But I feed small birds & don't see the harm. However there should be something in place to prevent enticing of large animals on private property
- Any intent to ban bird feeders & bird baths will be almost ubniversally ignored.
- Feeding birds in a private, fenced back yard should be allowed, especially during the migratory seasons. Teasing of any wildlife should result in heavy penalties.
- Do not let people feed wild animals in pubic areas but do let people feed wild animals on private property if allowed by owner
- If the animal is malnourished and without a collar
- There is currently a bylaw in place against roaming cats. We have about 15 on our street alone and nothing is done about it by Bylaw. How would an additional bylaw like the feeding of wildlife be "policed" if not even a roaming cat bylaw is enforced?
- If the wildlife are being kept in the proprty
- Birds
- birds often require assistance in winter.
- none
- Unless the wildlife is injured and you have no where to take it (too far/life threatening and needs immediate assistance) it would be okay to feed wildlife for their rehabilitation or getting better.
- Feeding of birds on private property should be acceptable.
- Everyone knows not to go on private property
- bird feeders! However, the problem is people feeding squirrels, and they like bird feeders too. I know that in some communities bird feeders attract the deer as well.
- The animal is malnourished and needs human help
- feeding birds and squirrels allowed , other wildlife such as deer, hares, coyotes, racoons not
- If it is an animal that could be considered a pet
- Huge fines as most humanize animals are euthanized - birds are the exception, feed the little sky rats all you want!
- injured animals that can't get food
- Birdfeeders and birdbaths should be allowed
- allowing bird feeders
- Feeding of wild birds with seed feeders.
- Stricter fines
- feeding birds ok. teasing/harassing any animal not ok
- Bird feeders, rescue cases, make it a warning first
- Feeding animals who are injured/starving
- All, private property is private property and what people do on their private property is their business and theirs alone.
- Birds



- If the animal is injured and or you raised it
- Stray cats
- Include a list with risk to human species only
- Video or photographic proof of malnourished animal before feeding it
- If an animal is hurt, or starving.
- not sure
- I would accept the people who help wildlife back to health. I would allow people to feed wildlife, but teasing should be off limits. Teasing a wild life animal hurts, and angers the animal. Where as when feeding wild life humans are able to connect with t
- If it was a stray domestic animal (ie. Dog or cat) to help rescue/help the animal
- They are told not to feed by the owner
- Only feeding squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Birds are except
- Ability to feed wild birds.
- If the animal was obviously starving
- Exceptions for feral cats
- Injured or dying animals that can't fend for themselves
- Bird feeders!!
- Deer grazing, bird feeders, etc. Noninvasive
- If the animal is in need of medical care for feeding. No exception for teasing.
- Animals in clear need of assistance such as as starvation wounds or being trapped/caught on something.
- Bird feeders, hanging or unattended with no other enticements.
- Birds
- If they are not being taken care of probably
- Trying to catch the animal for its own safety or the safety of others
- Many residents gain great enjoyment from feeding birds and squirrels in their own yards. I would certainly not use the words "feeding" and "teasing" in the same statement. Those of us who are wild life lovers would never dream of teasing these creatures
- Fines for those caught
- Bird feeders as they really support the local bird populations, especially migrating birds
- Private property is just that. City should have absolutely no power on private property.
- N/a
- It would lessen wild life attacks against people
- Feeding ad teasing should be separate. Feeding is not teasing. I don't support teasing wildlife. Bird feeds on private land, it's private land that is supportable
- Feeding birds
- If the animal is injured.



- Would support for anti-teasing/abuse on private property, but feeding and extermination should be allowed for pest wildlife
- Baiting humane/have-a-heart traps for nuisance animals
- Fines
- Bird feeders
- No exceptions
- Feeding native birds
- None. Too many people feeding squirrels and rabbits.
- I would support not teasing any type of animals on private property. For feeding animals I think there should be an exception for bird feeders.
- Fine if caught provoking wildlife on private property
- Bird feeders
- Teasing is cruel and a form of abuse that should be a bylaw. I don't think it's right to control what people do on private property unless it is endangering or abusing animals/people
- Pretty vague question. Bird feeders??? What about Apple or fruit bearing trees?..
- bird feeders
- I agree we should not feed wildlife but what is in place to help them or relocate them?
- Bird feeders on private properties that home owners put out themselves shouldn't be included unless they are in areas that can attract bears
- bears
- None
- Feeding on private property ok- teasing/harming NEVER ok
- Bird feeders
- Yes to above with the exception of wild birds.
- Removing wildlife safely from the city back to the wild
- Allow feeding of wild birds on private property.
- Possible exempt bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be excepted. I am concerned about people who feed coyotes, racoons and other predatory animals
- no exceptions
- Feeding birds and squirrels. However if that attracts other wildlife such as deer, moose (etc), bears or coyotes, then that specific situation should be reviewed on its own merits..
- If the "wild" creature is a domestic breed
- Such a bylaw is unenforceable and it is important to feed and provide water for wild birds.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders for songbirds should be allowed
- What defines "wildlife"? Are birds included?
- Feeding birds
- Ducks feeding.



- bird feeders
- no for feeding, yes for teasing.
- Pets
- I want nothing that will contribute to higher taxes. Period.
- Bird feeders
- Touching or abusing wildlife
- Birds, insects
- Sick or injured wildlife in need of assistance
- Bird feeders for small birds
- Feeding wildlife should be okay, but teasing no.
- birds, they need food in the winter to survive in Calgary
- Bird feeders
- If its private property they should not be told they cannot feed the wildlife there.
- If the animal appears to be injured or if you still aren't touching the animal
- None
- Bird baths and bird feeders
- exceptions should be feeding birds and squirrels that depend on a good food source for their survival
- Teasing fines. But many feed squirrels
- What is meant by teasing exactly? Harassment should be prohibited
- Too vague a question please explain what this all includes.
- I don't think that feeding is an issue so long as it's not harming the animal or causing problems with neighbors.
- Let people live
- If the animal appeared to be starving
- People must be allowed to have fruit trees/bushes & bird feeders in their FENCED backyard.
- Bird feeders
- This question is not specific enough as to what bylaws would be introduced
- No bylaw supporting this.
- The person is working with a legitimate study of local wildlife.
- A farm should be able to feed wildlife on their property but no one else
- none
- None
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, bird baths
- Injured or orphaned animals.
- Same rules should apply on private property
- Nothing
- if the animal can't get its own food because of an injury and it's eng fed what it needs to be



- Bird feeders
- You should be love to see the animals so no Teasing
- If the animal's life would otherwise be in danger (starving or injured)
- If an animal is injured/dependent on someone to feed it
- Yes if it is food for that animal
- Feeding birds has to be exempt!!!
- None
- Bird feeders with proper food.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Where the “teasing” might constitute abuse, or the animal is being confined/ability to voluntarily escape is impeded in any way.
- Allow common small bird/ song bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- If the wildlife is affecting a neighbour because of the persons feeding or teasing.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Enforcement and hefty fines
- Ducks and other birds
- Bird feeders
- There are cruelty laws already in place. A bylaw against feeding wildlife would seem to need to be ridiculously complex to allow for bird feeders, for example, while, what making it illegal that mice or squirrels will eat from it, or deer, or bears.
- small animals like birds, squirrels etc should be able to access private feeders
- Specifically, it should be OK to feed wild birds, but NOT animals such as coyotes, bears, rabbits, etc.
- If animal is injured and requires help- private property owners sh like be able to feed/help that animal.
- No teasing or anything but feeding birds and such should be ok
- feeding and teasing are independent issues. bird feeders should be expept.
- Bird feeders
- Exception for bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding common urban wild animals like birds and squirrels, local rabbits and hares is fine. Feeding large, non-urban animals is not.
- None
- I don't fully understand the context. I would remain in favor of bird feeders/bird baths on one's own property.
- If they are damaging property or life threat



- Temporary feeding permitted while a wildlife rescue/rehabilitation group is attempting to locate/capture wildlife
- Fines
- An Animal in distress.
- Neutral
- If the animals was hurt / injured or near death and food and water could save its life.
- birds, squirrels
- Animals in distress
- Bird feeders
- none
- Birds and squirrels
- Obviously if permission is granted by the owner of the private property to feed the animals. No exceptions to teasing.
- BIRDS
- backyard bird feeding though I understand this could be a problem in certain areas of the city where bears might roam and yard unfenced.
- Bird Feeders
- Birdfeeders stocked with appropriate birdseed (no human interaction)
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders on private property should be allowed and be exempt from this bylaw.
- birds, hares
- Suggest to have support from the city with regards to safely removing wildlife that happen to enter private property.
- Bird baths and feeders on private property
- Would not support anything that prohibits putting bird feeders in my own yard
- I especially support a bylaw against teasing wildlife, but I'm not sure about the specifics on feeding wildlife. Does that include bird and squirrel feeders?
- Bird feeders
- Unknown
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Feeding birds through bird feeders should be allowed.
- Allow feeding of hurt animals.
- Bylaw only for large animals (deer) but not for small (squirrels, bunnies, etc.)
- Depends on the animal, they need to survive on their own
- Birds
- A fine
- Bird feeders
- I'd prohibit teasing but allow feeding of birds and squirrels
- bird feeder b) if an animal is in distress & needs help



- If the animal is hurt or starving
- This is very vague. I support not teasing any animal wild or not anywhere. I agree to not feeding larger wildlife such as deer. Feeding birds should be allowed, yet then that's also feeding squirrels, which we are ok, not everyone is though.
- It's not the same feeding/teasing wildlife in a park and help birds during winter in your yard.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- What do you mean by Teasing Wildlife??? Do you mean bait food for them to come out of their hiding??
- Obviously keep things humane. But if people want to feed birds or deal with a pest on their own property, they should be able to.
- None
- Birds
- Bird/squirrel feeders, shooing animals off your property, wildlife helping itself to garden plants
- Birds
- bird feeders should not be regulated
- Allow property owners the option to choose whether or not they allow such things on their property.
- birdfeeders
- Allow the feeding of wild birds at feeders in private yards.
- No violence to animals. Feeding appropriate foods (native) are alright, but no entrapment for hunting, torture, harassment, or killing of wildlife. Calgary already has encroached on a lot of animal habitats, something that allows animals to thrive
- feeding the bunnies is fine
- Birds and squirrels need to eat
- I would NOT support a bylaw that outlaws feeding of wild birds on my property. I do support not feeding other wild animals, such as deer and coyotes. Teasing of any animal should be prohibited every where. The bylaw proposed is too general.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- I would make it specific to wildlife that has potential to harm people and that would result in the animal being put down if it was caught, so more focused on wild cats, coyotes, foxes, that sort of animal, maybe deer and moose, but not birds
- Birds
- Birds
- There should be no fines for a first offence. Just educate the individual the first time. Fines start with second offence.
- Additional fines for teasing- not slaps on the wrist. Impose higher fines so this actually stops the behaviour
- Feeding birds is essential to maintaining the local biomass



- Feeding and teasing are two totally different things.
- Feeding birds, placing Salk licks OK- but no teasing
- Wild bird feeders if designed in such a way to not attract other wildlife like coyotes and squirrels
- Exclude feeding small birds.
- Allow bird feeders
- Teasing I would say only if you're in danger or at risk to get animal off of property. Feeding is fine as long as done in a safe manner!
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- None
- bird feeders
- Hanging bird feeders
- [removed]
- I agree Wild life like coyotes, bobcats, deer etc should not be lured to private property. As a bird lover I would not like to see my bird feeder banned from my property. The birds do not cause any problems in our neighbourhood.
- Birds and bird feeders
- Bird feeders are appropriate to have on private property.
- Stop blaming the animal and look at the idiots you allow to keep them. They are the problem not the animal.
- I sais no, this is not a good idea prohibiting, however I only think feeding wild birds is appropriate. Other animals should not be fed intentionally.
- No exceptions
- teasing only
- Feeding bids, rabbits,.....we all know what animals to feed and the ones not to....no need to micro manage....use good judgement for the relentless morons..
- Bird feeders should be exempt. Birds do not have an issue with being a threat to citizens.
- Feeding of wild birds
- Squirrels, birds
- feeding of coyotes and bobcats
- The City should be culling the magpies - they are constantly teasing and threatening our pets
- No animal should be teased. Re feeding - exempt wild birds, squirrels, bees and other pollinators
- feeding squirrels / birds
- not including bird feeders/squirrel feeders.
- Bird feeders should be permitted.
- Backyard bird feeders should be allowed.
- exceptions: bird feeders



- Teasing should not prevent owners from removing pests or potentially harmful animals from their private property. I.e) mice, voles, squirrels - woodpecker deterrents like shiny paper, motion sensor lights or sprinklers...
- No exceptions
- Birds
- Bird feeders I would think should or could be exempt
- Feeding and teasing are completely different. Separate the question.
- Teasing or feeding animals that are dangerous (e.g., coyotes)
- Bylaw for abusing wildlife, killing wildlife, entrapment on property for illegal hunting. Actually, more than anything, do something about people that deliberately place out poison for wildlife and pets.
- Birds, with proper food placement spas not to encourage rodents
- No exceptions
- NONE
- Wildlife should not be teased anywhere. Feeding squirrels, birds etc. is up to the owner of the Private Property. The City should not interfere.
- Wild Bird feeders should be an exception, particularly using 'no mess seed' , people can be educated on feeding responsibilities if needed, MOST IMPORTANTLY these wild birds are a natural calming and very healthy avocating addition to people of all ages.
- Provide details on what is acceptable, e.g. if one is planting vegetation that is a native species to this region/biome, that would not alter the feeding habits of local wildlife. Should specifically ban feeding of food that's not native to this area!
- besides bird, squirrels and smaller creatures
- Teasing
- We should be able to feed birds
- Bird feeders and hummingbird feeders would have to be the exception - then I would support it
- If the animals in question are owned by the owner
- birdfeeders
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders allowed
- birds, maybe injured/rescued animals or animals nesting on your property.
- If I chose to feed birds, rabbits, and the odd pheasant or owl on my private property, that is no business of the City. You're grossly overstepping your boundaries. This isn't Russia.
- Bird feeders are essential to civic life. Humans connect with nature by providing essential food to birds. We learn from birds how to live in our habitat.
- Bird feeders
- Excludes Bird feeders
- Back yard bird feeders. I am responsible and keep them out of reach of deer and other animals such as skunks.



- I would say "Yes" to the above only if the bylaw EXCLUDED birds. I love my back yard feeders. For me, watching the birds is like watching fish in a fish tank - helps to de-stress and promotes a sense of tranquility.
- Bird feeders
- Teasing or stressing wildlife on private property which includes abuse and cruelty.
- racoons, bears, ect
- Birds
- Allowing bird/squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- I want to continue to feed the birds, in my yard, and enjoy them. They eat the seeds, drink the water and eat the flying insects.
- Prohibit teasing
- Bird feeders.
- It is the property owner's responsibility to 'live with' or 'remove' most wildlife from their property, BIRDS, racoons, skunks, porcupines, bobcats, deer, rabbits therefore the city should not be legislating how property owners do this.
- animals that cause destruction unfortunately have to get kicked off the property (hopefully this does not constitute "teasing"?)
- Proper hunting
- does such a question cover bird feeders , i assume not
- Whatever is best for the animals... Birds come to mind... But I don't know if birdfeeders are helpful or a hinderance to wildlife
- Feeders are ok
- Birds
- Feeding animals such as birds and squirrels should be allowed provided the situation does not create a public health risk, such as attracting vermin or causing problem with neighbours.
- Birdfeeders, unless neighbours report a nuisance
- This should not prevent people from using bird feeders or nest boxes.
- My concern is that bird and squirrel feeders would be prohibited in private yards. If those are prohibited in this bylaw I would not support it.
- I want to continue feeding birds and squirrels.
- For clarity, does the definition of 'wildlife' include wild birds of any sort? I'm assuming it would not. And would assume having bird feeders on private property would not be regulated. There is great enjoyment is being able to feed wildbirds.
- trapping of nuisance animals (raccoons, skunks, squirrels)
- Bird feeders
- Deterrents aimed to shoing wild animals off private property.



- Bird and squirrel feeding is an exception and is often part of citizen science projects such as <https://feederwatch.org/>
- feeding birds and squirrels should be allowed, teasing/harassing never allowed
- permit feeding of birds on private property
- Bird feeding must be allowed.
- Redomestication of feral pigeons, accidental feeding, self defense.
- Birds
- Yes to banning teasing of all wildlife...but the feeding part is vague...you don't get to decide whether or not I feed birds or squirrels that's half the reason I enjoy my backyard. You wanna van feeding rabbits, deer, coyotes, lynx etc fine.
- You are ridiculous to even suggest that feeding animals and teasing them are even remotely the same. Banning backyard bird feeders is complete rubbish and a complete joke that you are instead considering backyard livestock!
- Certain animals such as animals, injured animals one must assist until help can come
- Bird feeders
- n/a
- If a wild animal is young and has seemingly been abandoned and is clearly unable to feed itself but is still very wild, I think feeding would be appropriate in the case that the person can guarantee long-term food support, feeding should be allowed.
- A trap and release program should also be implemented especially where wild animals are found, this way both the residents and the animal benefit
- Animals in need of help (hurt, abandoned young, ect)
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Not sure what "teasing" wildlife means, but if a homeowner chooses to feed wild rabbits (hares), or put bird feeders on their property, I don't see the harm and wouldn't support a bylaw against those or fining those homeowners.
- Bird feeders
- Teasing should be penalized, but feeding under dire weather conditions should be allowed.
- Use existing provincial fish and wildlife act and regulations
- bird feeders
- Teasing wild life on one's personal property is unacceptable but feeding them should be allowed. HOwever, I do understand that if bird feeders are placed inappropriately they may be easier prey for roaming cats.
- Safe birdfeeders
- Raccoons and predators, leave the other wildlife out of it
- The ability to scare them off if threatening self or others
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds



- None.
- It is not clear what is meant by feeding and/or teasing wildlife. I would hope that feeding birds is not included in that restriction.
- I'm unsure what teasing means in this context. I do think that feeding birds is okay. I think this could be re-visited if we start to have incursions of bears looking for food. Having a deer eat my crab apples doesn't seem like a big nuisance.
- This question is too vague. Feeding birds and bats and frogs is fine, but feeding bears or deer is not. Teasing is never acceptable.
- What would be considered "Wildlife"? People feed birds and squirrels on their properties, deer and moose are seen in backyards and communities. I would say fines for people teasing wildlife or people trying to take pictures when it is dangerous.
- bird feeders - these should be allowed on private property
- none
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- None
- Bird feeders and bird baths
- I feel very strongly private property wild bird feeding should be permitted. It is a wonderful past time for many including seniors with limited mobility. Feeding and teasing should be separated.
- Against teasing, but for feeding. Two completely different things!
- Wild bird feeders.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- The bylaw as written would ban bird feeders in peoples yard. Not good.
- the use of bird feeders on private property is a must.
- Bird feeders should be allowed on private property
- Expect not to hurt the animals
- I don't feel there should be any exceptions, even squirrels. Overloaded garbage carts are an issue as well as crows and magpies, I saw a coyote one morning, pick thru looking for food and leave a mess.
- I am definitely against feeding wildlife on public or private property which might be harmful to residents (e.g. rodents, carnivores). However exceptions should be made for bird feeders (including berry bushes) and bird baths which attract songbirds. Th
- No exceptions
- Planting shrubs, trees and gardens is enough to attract wildlife, makes no sense to have fines for that unless they are purposefully baiting them for some nefarious ulterior reason.
- none
- None
- Help them find a new home



- Important to communicate this very effectively so that everyone is aware. People like to feed birds, deer etc.
- None. Keep wild animals wild.
- Hurting, starving, neglecting and or teasing wildlife on private property must be prohibited. Feeding wildlife on private property is part of an owners prerogative. After all Administration – The City should avoid overregulating - right?
- If it's injured, at least giving it water till Fish & Wildlife arrives to take care of it
- None but also say no poisoning or killing or relocating squirrels
- Ducks, swans, geese... birds in general, PROVIDING it's something harmless like bread
- I assume "feeding and/or teasing wildlife" means wild animals roaming into domestic locations (deer, coyotes etc.). I do not support the prevention of feeding birds via seed/suet etc. feeders, or Hummingbird liquid feeders etc.
- If bird feeders were allowed.
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Birds
- Feeding birds on private property to be allowed
- Backyard bird feeders
- Bird feeders and bird baths, bird houses
- Bird feeders MUST be allowed on private property. I cannot imagine wasting tax payers hard earned money to hire people to enforce the rule of no feeding birds on people's private property. What a waste of city time and resources.
- Your last question is extremely misleading and idiotic. I fully support feeding birds/squirrels on private or public property. Teasing wildlife of any kind is wrong and is a moral issue. Having a new law regarding teasing would be completely useless.
- Birds
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Perhaps exceptions for birds and squirrels
- Gofers , squirrels, chipmunk.
- Anything that attracts skunks to residential areas is not needed!
- If the wildlife is in danger from death due to lack of food/nutrients
- Bird feeders and clean, well kept bird baths and humming bird feeders.
- The feeding of small birds in an enclosed garden area.
- Bird feeders
- None. No teasing no feeding. Sure baby deer are cute, but feeding them only encourages them in and on private residences. It's not just the deer it's all the vermin and more aggressive creatures they bring. I'mTalking nice to wolves.
- the feeding or leaving of foods out for wildlife other than birds
- Teasing is inappropriate, I don't understand why the question reflects teasing and feeding as 1'question where they are 2 separate issues. I amAllForFeeding birds, and notForTeasing animals



- Scaring away birds
- does this bylaw include feeding birds? I want to be able to attract birds to my yard. they have to be omitted from the bylaw.
- I don't think anyone should be teasing wildlife but if you consider birds wildlife are you going to ban backyard feeders? This bylaw also seems difficult to enforce without gross infringement of people's privacy and more time than the city should have
- feeding songbirds
- Birds as exception only
- Someone caring for wildlife in a capacity of releasing in the future or if the wildlife is unable to return to the wilds.
- It is your private property. I suggest the City mind its own business.
- Feeding or helping wounded or distressed animals or their offspring.
- Yes to teasing animals but no to feeding with exceptions obviously. No one should be feeding anything other than birds and squirrels in my opinion.
- Feeding no / Teasing yes it's harassment and unacceptable!
- No exceptions
- None
- Many people have bird feeders. This is a possible exception
- government should not regulate what I do on my property
- A threat to livestock
- Cant think of any.
- Feeding birds
- Feeding birds.
- Bird feeders, bird baths, etc should be exempt from a ban on feeding wildlife
- Nothing. Private property is private property.
- I would not support the teasing of any animal, however bird/squirrel feeders etc I do not have any problems with.
- Bylaw should be enforced only if the feeding and teasing is malicious and meant to endanger the wildlife
- We are encroaching on more and more wildlife and i feel there shouldn't be an issue feeding birds, squirrels, even deer.
- Feeding birds and growing plants/vegetables/fruits commonly eaten by wildlife must be exceptions.
- None
- This question is vague. We feed and water wild birds in our yard , year round. This in turn attracts squirrels and rabbits. You need to be more specific in your survey. I would agree that intentionally feeding coyotes, bobcats, skunks, or deer is not good
- birdfeeders; blossoming plants that attract bees
- Less money to the city art program, more money for wildlife conservation
- Bird feeding should be ok



- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds
- bird feeders on private property should still be permitted
- Should fall under animal cruelty/endangerment
- I do support a bylaw against teasing wildlife of even privately owned animals, but I think people should be able to put up birdfeeders in their own yards.
- Wild Birds
- Bird Feeders.
- Keep bird feeders
- We need more information, at this point having a bird feeder would be prohibited.
- bears and coyotes
- I suggest we don't isolate or expense any pets once so ever in my preference.
- There should be exceptions for people that garden, put out bird feeders, etc.
- bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders should be exempt from prohibited feeding
- None.
- The intent of this change is not clear. Does this apply to use of bird feeders? What does "teasing" mean?
- Feeding wildlife to restore health and with advice of experts (SPCA, wildlife officer) only
- None
- Harassment and abuse if any wildlife should be fined and prohibited
- Bird feeders or other feeders for animals who depend on our goodwill to survive the harsh winters as we build and encroach on their territory depleting their normal resources
- If there is an injured animal, an infant animal, or something whose life is in danger, they should be able to have access to food and water on private property until they are healthy enough, or until they can be taken to a clinic.
- Putting out food for wildlife but not directly interacting with it should be allowed, such as putting out old bread for birds.
- Birds.rabbits.
- Wild birds
- Are birds also related in this suggested bylaw? Watching birds at bird feeders is one of the most enjoyable activity for senior and people unable to leave their residence.
- Pitbulls shouldn't be banned in Calgary they are like all other dogs naturally good I know some people might say they are inheritaly bad I first thought that too until I saw Pitbulls in their true light and like all other dogs they are loving and loyal
- Feeding birds
- Feeding birds, squirrels, etc
- An exception should be made for wild bird feeders. I have been feeding and providing water to wild birds in my yard for several decades. It is supportive of wild birds and not harmful.



- let people still have bird feeders
- squirrels, birds
- bird feeders and water baths
- Bird feeders
- Backyard bird feeding is a great pleasure of mine. I would not be happy if the city passed a bylaw. That would restrict my ability to do so.
- Feeding birds on private property should be allowed. In winter birds need extra food and water for survival. This is supported by Bird's Calgary. We do not have an issue with bears coming into our yards for the food.
- The wording you've give is too broad in scope. So I can't have a bird feeder in my back yard or feed the squirrels? I think you'd have to define better just what is wild life and what if any are the exceptions.
- you have got to be kidding, can't feed birds. I am sure there is better use of tax dollars
- Many city dwellers get great enjoyment from bird-feeders, and also from occasional squirrel feeders. These things also teach children that we have to share the world with wild creatures.
- Kids must be educated, so if it is a first time offence and no danger was caused, then education would be better than a fine
- Birds
- What constitutes "teasing"? Shoeing them away? Are you thinking of banning bird feeders? Needs more information.
- First of all, you have not defined 'wildlife' as some people may consider a feral or stray cat a wild animal or the birds mat a feeder. Therefore, please define 'wildlife'.
- This is a poorly worded question. Bird feeders must not be banned. Birds are running out of natural habitat and food sources.
- bird feeders
- Exceptions to feeding wildlife could include backyard/songbirds. These birds frequent feeders, bird baths and bird houses in backyards around the City. They provide hours of enjoyment to many Residents. It is wonderful to be able to enjoy nature.
- Birds and squirrels should be fine.
- Bird feeders in private property should not be prohibited
- Anyone should be allowed to put up and fill bird feeders without restriction or penalty.
- I think common sense should be applied. If you are feeding birds, squirrels or the like, it shouldn't be a problem. however if you are feeding bobcats, foxes, etc, there should be some guidelines.
- Animal abuse only, feeding brids and squirrels should not be a bylaw FFS
- Do not include disallowing feeding birds but provide Information in the appropriate feed for them as I see a mess of bread and things that are not healthy & attract unwanted birds. I love seeing birds at my feeders.. so don't paint everyone with the same
- Birds rely on feeders all year long.
- Backyard birdfeeders should be exempt



- Bird feeders
- bird feeders should be allowed, NEVER teasing of wildlife - totally different questions should not be combined into one!
- bird feeders are important. I don't think people will be intentionally feeding dangerous animals such as coyotes on their properties.
- Does feeding include birds? If so than bird feeders must be exempted.
- During extreme weather conditions feeding should be permitted.
- Bird feeders, insect feeders or traps, bat feeders
- This is a very vague amendment and would include such things as bird feeders. I love having birds in my yard and love encouraging them by providing bird feeders. Otherwise I have no idea what other wildlife you would anticipate. Coyotes, deer,
- I would allow bird feeders but also allow inspectors to be able to respond to the complaints of neighbours and make reasonable operational judgments.
- This proposed bylaw is too vague. While I support a ban on feeding mammals this bylaw would need to make an exception for bird feeders.
- I am a birder, and derive great pleasure from feeding wild birds throughout the year. I also provide a year round bird bath where birds can drink water through the winter, and bird houses where they might nest in the spring. Exempt wild birds.
- Citizens should be allowed to feed birds on their own property. This is particularly important for those who gain pleasure and better mental health by feeding, watering and watching birds in their yard. This also helps the province by reporting bird seen
- How would you enforce such a bylaw? It would be better to educate with signage.
- feeding birds on private property
- Wildlife is such a broad term. I would like to continue feeding birds in my yard in the winter. They require the extra food especially when its really cold. As a senior I enjoy watching & photographing them when its not easy to go out in winter.
- Bird feeders
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Feeders that are set up (ie. Bird or squirrel feeders) where people aren't in direct contact with wildlife
- all bird feeders and bird baths on private property
- Bird feeders
- That bylaw is too hard to enforce, and what about people feeding birds and squirrels. If there is data to suggest there is a horrifically large problem with this then lets do it but I suspect not.
- Allow bird feeders in yards.
- Bird feeders, roaming wildlife like deer eating shrubs/etc
- I have a bird feeder and a bird bath. If these items are included then I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS.
- Bird feeders
- its private property. stay off.
- none



- bird feeders
- Animal cruelty
- This bylaw may prevent bird feeding. Come on you guys
- Feeding birds and squirrels
- The statement need to include context so the property owner has protection in some scenarios or certain circumstances
- It is not our decision to spay or neuter someone. We need more By-law officers And shelters that are funded by the city So we can properly adress these issues and not just put some bandaid solution on it. No one and I mean no one should be allowed to feed
- Feeding of raccoon's should be banned as they can take a foothold in a city quickly
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders and birdbaths should be an exception from any by-law
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, shoing wildlife off property (ex: deer, coyotes, squirrels)
- I don't think feeding birds/bird feeders should be included as part of a bylaw.
- Home owners should be excused from feeding deer, birds and squirrels.
- I don't think people should have to stop using their bird/squirrel feeders
- No exceptions
- Birds
- One should be able to feed birds, squirrels, feral cats etc. Teasing wildlife should be prohibited.
- A person with experience in proplery handles animals when injured
- there is a sign saying ok ex: horses
- Feeding yes teasing no
- Backyard bird feeding of wild birds
- Feeding/Helping an animal who is suffering
- Bird feeders
- keep bird feeders
- Make a provision to allow for falconry or fashion pigeon keeping, an allow backyard chickens.
- Bird feeders
- Having birdfeeders in urban areas to feed blue jays or chickadees is pretty innocuous. Attracting any type of mammal either intentionally or accidentally needs to be controlled. While mice and voles enjoy birdseed I don't feel they are our concern here.
- we do not need more regulations and bylaws. CUT THE RED TAPE.
- An injured animal
- Birdfeeders!!!
- I support the feeding of birds Only hon private property.
- Definition of "Teasing" and "wildlife" is to vague for interpretation. Exceptions is "bird". Would backyard feeders be included. Would "accidental" spillage of bird food be considered feeding "other" wildlife?



- Birds
- This is a very broad question. Many people feed birds during the winter - and inadvertently squirrels. Does City Council really believe they should legislate against people feeding birds in their backyards ? I definitely do not support such a bylaw.
- Except birdfeeders
- Bird feeders on private property should definitely be excepted. They are a great source of enjoyment and education for all ages.
- Bird feeders should be exempt from the bylaw.
- Bird / squirrel feeders
- I believe that bird feeders with appropriate wildlife-friendly content should continue to be allowed.
- Feeding birds in your yard in bird feeders should be exempt from this bylaw.
- I would support the bylaw if it excluded feeding non raptor birds
- Birds
- Bird Feeders
- Consider how many types of bird feeders there are. Consider how many bird feeders already exist on private property.
- Prohibit teasing on private property. Allow feeding of birds from feeders.
- Bird feeders
- There should NOT be any restrictions on feeding birds.
- not feeding wild animals I agree with but I want to be able to feed the birds, having feeders on my property
- Bird feeders and bird baths should be allowed
- Bird feeders on private property should be allowed. It helps many of our feathered friends during the winter months.
- Allow bird feeders on private property.
- Birds, squirrels
- I would support this bylaw only if exceptions were made for feeding wild birds on private property!
- If this get approved I would hope that you would exclude those of us who have bird feeders and bird baths on their property
- Allow bird feeders on private property
- Omit bird feeders on private property or feeding of squirrels etc. We need to help our wildlife critters, not abandon them as we encroach into their habitats every year.
- Bird feeders allowed
- Let us feed the birds, they are mostly migratory and as we encroach upon their space/land let us give them what they need before they move on. Sparrows are of the few that stay year long.
- None
- You need to give your head a shake - do you have any idea how many people feed the birds especially during the winter?



- Too vague and general. e.g. it would prohibit bird feeders. Be more specific. Squirrel mazes are OK. Feeding deer or other feral animals is not. Teasing or harming all wildlife should be prohibited.
- Make government smaller, stay out of my life.
- bird feeders
- A home owner should be able to continue to feed wild birds on their own property.
- Wild bird seed and feeders should be exempt
- feeding birds health seeds and fat in the winter but only if considered beneficial by bird experts
- Feeding birds is good for migratory birds as well as the Joy and well being of many citizens, including those suffering from depression, illness, isolation and the elderly. Feeders in gardens are a great way to introduce the really young to nature.
- Feeding Birds
- Bird Feeders
- Bears, wolves, coyotes ,cougars, lynx, bobcats, skunks, porcupines, crows, magpies, snakes
- I don't want to see the City prohibiting the use of bird feeders in Calgary. Our feathered friends are a joy to watch, and they need assistance and support just as much as other forms of wildlife that roam throughout our neighborhoods.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding of wild birds with appropriate bird feeders must be exempt!
- It is difficult to put feeding and teasing into one bylaw, they are not the same. There are some reasonable reasons to feed some wildlife and also some damaging ways.
- bird feeding
- Backyard Bird Feeders should be exempted.
- Small bird feeding with approved feeders
- Birds! Our winters are hard on some bird populations. They need support because of the increase in house sparrows. We also take great pleasure in watching the birds at the feeders. Really the city should not be micromanaging this.
- Squirrels
- Pest removal
- Bird feeders. Feeding birds saves the lives of birds, especially over winters and when they are feeding their young. It also provides pleasure to people watching the birds from their windows.
- Trapping or killing a wild animal on private property should be banned
- the person who has a feeder for birds on their property for the sole purpose of biodiversity.
- Bird feeders.
- Birds
- Bird feeders / bird baths, non-harmful motion activated deterrents such as lights or sprinklers to deter deer, bait/traps for mice, moles, gophers, etc. It is a VERY POORLY worded question and the bylaw MUST be carefully worded against unintended conseq



- I think bird feeders are a benefit to the birds, and also provide enjoyment and purpose to people who watch them. However, I don't think people should tease wildlife on their private property or anywhere else!
- Bird feeders should not be included
- I like to feed the birds. It's not harassment to own a bird feeder. And why would you lumped together feeding/teasing the wildlife? That's just sheer stupidity.
- Wild Birds
- Bird feeders should be an exception
- There should be no restriction on feeding birds on one's own property. And the question is flawed because it addresses two separate subjects - teasing (abhorrent to most people) and feeding (an entirely different thing). It's not a simple yes or no
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders year round
- None, it inhibits wild animals being resilient when feeding themselves
- Teasing wildlife is not acceptable. We have lots of "domestic bunnies" in the neighbourhood now and people are feeding them - I don't support this. I do support feeding the birds using bird feeders in the backyard however.
- birds
- Feeding wildlife (eg bird feeders) on private property should not be restricted.
- Unless it is your own property
- Exception for birdfeeders, bird baths, and wording that continues to allow backyard gardening. Something to delineate between unintentional and intentional feeding of larger birds/hares/deer/etc
- Birds and bird feeders should be exempt.
- Backyard bird feeders should be allowed and exempt from the bylaw.
- Bird feeders on private property should be allowed to feed these birds especially during winter months when they need the food.
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders are a great way to keep mosquitoes out of your yard and provide enjoyment
- If you are including birds and squirrels I definitely do not agree with it. The winters are so tough here, we should be able to feed the likes of them.
- We planted trees, etc to attract wild birds as well as supplying heated bird baths year round. I think that bird feeders, etc. should be exempted
- I would never support a bylaw which prohibits feeding birds and squirrels in one's yard.
- Feeding birds on private property shall be allowed.
- Not sure what is meant by wildlife? If you mean birds I would not support any bylaw that prohibits me from feeding the birds. If you mean feeding chickens I am totally against having chickens in the backyard of city dwellings. Question s/b clearer



- I am completely opposed to a bylaw prohibiting feeding of wildlife on private property as this would prohibit responsible wildlife support, such as birdfeeders. To avoid mistreatment perhaps use the word "mistreatment" instead of "teasing".
- I think that people should be able to feed birds in their own yard!
- feeding and teasing are two different things. how would this apply to backyard bird feeders?
- We still want our bird feeders & bird watering pedestals.
- bird feeders in winter
- I would support no teasing but a blanket no feeding would be something I would be vehemently opposed to if it were intended to include bird feeders.
- ALLOW TO FEED BIRDS. ALLOW TO HAVE A GARDEN THAT MAY FEED WILD RABBITS AND OTHERS. ALLOW TO PLANT FLOWERS THAT FEED BEES!
- Having bird feeders and watering stations on private property should be an exception. It is not teasing animals and provides some animals with a stable food source.
- birds and yes to above question for teasing
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders on your own property should be allowed
- Backyard bird feeders should be exempt from such a bylaw
- Feeding wild birds in winter!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Bird feeders
- Exceptions need to allow for feeding of birds on your own property
- We should be able to feed wild birds
- I would not support this as its a very opened ended question you have asked, are birds considered wildlife in your questions?
- Exclude in-yard bird feeders, nest boxes and nesting material, and bird baths. Also excluding Mason Bee nesting boxes.
- Teasing should never be allowed, feeding of wild birds should be allowed as they are not terrestrial and are not at risk of being harmed by people or vehicles.
- Wild Bird Feeders | Bird Baths need to exempt!!!!
- Exempt Birds - feeders for hummingbirds. People need to stop feeding squirrels!
- Question is unclear. What wildlife are you including? Are birds considered wildlife? Squirrels? Please be specific
- Bird feeders/baths should be permitted
- Feeding birds should still be permitted.
- Exclude feeding of birds
- Birds, obviously for feeding them
- Bird feeders are an obvious exemption.
- Bird baths and feeders should be exempt



- I think it is responsible to feed bird with birds feeder and provide fresh water for them especially in the cold winter months. I do not think you should be allowed to provide food for mammals such as racoons, cougars and coyotes or deer.
- I put out feeders for wild birds, this causes no harm to any animal. we should be allowed to do this.
- Backyard bird feeders should be an exception. I will never be in favour of a by-law that prohibits me from having a bird feeder in my own yard!
- predator animal restrictions only. EXAMPLE: don't lure bobcats to your yard to control the squirrel population.
- If the animal is hurt and needs care then feeding may be appropriate, or if the resident decides the animal is okay by them.
- I am unsure what feeding on private property means? I currently have bird feeders and bird baths that are utilized by many birds, on a daily basis. I enjoy bird watching and sharing with other bird watchers the variety of birds that come to my yar
- Surely you are not referring to bird houses and bird feeders? Please be specific. NO.....do not ban bird houses or bird feeders.
- There will be a big problem if people are not allowed to feed birds on their own property. There is no harm in it, and it will not be accepted by the citizens of Calgary. I do agree that squirrels should not be fed - they are rodents.
- wild bird feeders in private back yards. These add to property enjoyment
- Il would like to know what this defines. Is a bird feeder included in this definition? I would want to see the details and not a broad statement that can be interpreted in many different ways.
- This question is extremely vague and takes into account two separate types of acts. Would this mean not being allowed to feed wild birds on private property? This would be ridiculous and detrimental to many of our bird species.
- None
- No bird feeders? It's private property, get off!
- Injured, maimed or abandoned animals in distress
- What do you do if a skunk takes up residence under your front step? Does that include feeding of wild birds at backyard bird feeders? What about shoing away deer that are chewing up your flower or vegetable gardens?
- PLEASE - MAKE AN EXCEPTION FOR MY BIRDFEEDER IN MY OWN YARD!!!!
- Because bird feeders and bird baths or water features are a part of many backyard habitats and pleasant pastime for many to watch and enjoy. A separate bylaw on harassing or teasing wildlife would be acceptable.
- Feeding domestic stray animals
- Any teasing wildlife should be prohibited regardless of where it might take place. Please do not prohibit bird feeders in private yards. We get tremendous pleasure from watching the birds/squirrels that come to our yard to grab a snack.
- This will be an increased expenditure for the city to now have to deal with incidents on private property within the city limits



- None and I think the people feeding the birds in Princess Island park and elsewhere need to stop. They may not realize the negative impact this has on the birds physically and also in disrupting migration patterns.
- In general I support this. BUT, it should have an explicit exception for bird feeding.
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- Pls address bird feeders/baths. On private property and in condos.
- Teasing should NEVER be allowed
- Allow feeding of birds. Having this activity in my back yard brings me delight and joy, especially in this time of shelter in place and Covid-19 restrictions.
- Exception to 'no' answer, 'teasing' wildlife is unacceptable
- Feeding birds
- Birds
- An instance where a wounded animal ends up on private property may be an exception to feeding. Provided you are knowledgeable about what to feed the animal and wildlife services should be notified immediately.
- Define wildlife and tease. For example, deer entering a yard to eat out of a home vegetable garden, or birds and squirrels eating out of feeders.
- The above should be a two part question. Feeding wildlife, eg: birds, should NOT be prohibited, but OF COURSE, TEASING should be prohibited (and with fines) at ALL times, anywhere!
- back yard bird feeders
- What wildlife is encompassed by this bylaw. For example bird feeders on private property need to be addressed in this bylaw. Do bird feeders have a damaging effect, either positively or negatively, on the population of birds? The changes are too vague
- I don't want bird feeders on private property to be prohibited.
- wild bird feeders
- Feeding or teasing a Bobcat - no exceptions. Feeding birds is acceptable. Obviously, the more vague this is, the more trouble you will have. Will Bylaw enforcement arrive if a neighbour complains that I have a bird feeder in my backyard?
- I would prohibit teasing of all wildlife, and prohibit feeding of all wildlife with the exception of birds.
- Squirrels
- Birds, especially in winter.
- Not sure what "teasing wildlife" means. However, I fully support feeding birds on private property, as we have destroyed so much of their natural habitat and food opportunities.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders on own property
- Bird feeders in winter and water bowls/baths all year long.
- However - bird feeders and baths should be excluded from this.



- I say I am not in support because you don't seem to even recognize the vast difference between feeding (e.g. a bird feeder) and teasing of wildlife. As a similar question: "Would you support a law against eating and/or murder?"
- Bird feeders Must be excluded.
- This is not something to spend taxpayer money on.
- I think it should apply to teasing. Feeding may happen for valid reasons (caring for an abandon or injured animal).
- Prohibit the intentional feeding of carnivores within city limits.
- This should NOT include feeding wild birds using bird feeders in back yards
- Question is not clear. Owners of property in question should be allowed to feed wildlife, or if one has permission from landlord.
- Sounds too general this particular bylaw. What about bird feeders, hummingbird feeders, etc. These animals do rely on feeders to survive. I would not support a law that banned bird feeders.
- bird feeders as feeding wild birds with proper seeds does not endanger the health of other wildlife and the general population
- Wild bird feeding and squirrel feeding on a private property should be exempted.
- Mistreatment of wildlife in city parks should be prohibited as well as private property.
- Let me feed a bird on my property.
- Birds should be allowed to feed birds on own property
- Bird feeders
- If there is a hurt animal that needs food and assistance
- No exceptions...wait until raccoons arrive in greater numbers...yuck!
- Private property birdfeeders should remain.
- its my property, I can feed the birds if I choose as it is a hobby, and provides birds with nesting places, water and essential food in cold months. You people are ridiculous.
- You should be able to have a birdfeeder in your backyard or private property.
- Bird feeders help to bring nature into our yards and create a healthy and entertaining environment.
- Feeding of birds via hanging bird feeders
- How would you suggest monitoring this? The tax payer is over burdened as it is.
- Yes as long as one can still put out bird feeders to feed the birds, bird. house, baths.
- No enticing of larger creatures which could harm humans or pets. Birds should be allowed to visit our yards. Supplementing their diet with approved food and studying then supports citizen science and conservation projects , helping at risk species survive
- Allow commercially made bird feeders. Don't allow feeding squirrels.
- Definitely allow bird feeders, but don't allow feeding squirrels. They are becoming a serious problem
- Birds, small rodents, and 'harmless' animals should be exempt. That's it. A deer in the rut can seriously harm someone if that's what it wants to do.



- If this means banning bird feeders on private property, it will be yet another ludicrous solution to an unstated problem. NO to banning bird feeders on private property. Guess the next step would mean chopping down my mountain ash to avoid attracting bird
- Wildlife is important to the eco system, let the predators balance nature.
- Backyard bird feeders and bird baths.
- putting up bird feeders and feeding the birds should absolutely not be included in this by-law. Birds are not pests and need to be fed to survive the harsh climate in Calgary. Birds are also a source of enjoyment for housebound persons, especially senior
- If the bird feeder or bird house is determined to be detrimental to the safety of the species then the facility should be taken down. It needs to be taken down
- Feeding Wild Birds
- The feeding of wild birds on private property.
- Birds and bird feeding apparatus MUST be considered an exception. The language as read is too vague, the wildlife prohibited must be specified.
- Bird feeders are a benefit to our yards and neighborhoods. They attract birds that eat insects. Birds eat berries and tree fruits that likely will not be harvested. The birds are a source of entertainment and enjoyment that helps keep us in touch with nature
- This is not an exception I just want to be able to feed the birds in the winter and when weather is inclement.
- Feeding wild birds from bird feeders. Also what about berries and seeds from hedges and plants growing in yard do these count. The same thing applies for squirrels. I can think of all types of things that might be construed as feeding.
- Exception would be baiting wildlife for trap and release.
- People should still be allowed to put up bird feeders.
- Bird feeders do not constitute "teasing" of wild birds.
- Bird feeders
- Bird Feeders on Private Property should NOT be included in any bylaw that prohibits feeding of wildlife.
- Bird and squirrel feeders should be allowed. Providing water for birds should be allowed.
- Wild bird feeders and bird baths
- Birds
- Does this include does this including putting up bird feeders in my own backyard? It is unclear.
- Bird feeders should be excluded from any bylaw that restricts feeding wildlife. Feeding squirrels should be prohibited as they cause destruction to gardens, trees and people's property.
- Leave the wildlife alone, call and see what can be done to relocate the animal safely
- Wild bird feeders
- Bird feeders on personal property should be allowed. Obviously teasing animals (not sure what this means) should not be allowed
- Providing feeders for the wild birds on your private property should be exempt.



- If I can not feed birds in my backyard, I will be force to move somewhere else where I do not have an idiot council and unthinking city administration. What a poorly vague question, was it thought up by a two year old.
- Because the way this is worded it would include bird feeders! And because of habitat loss, destruction (e.g. the Weaselhead by the new roadway through it!) and invasion of wild spaces by people - many birds survive our winters because of backyard feeders!
- Bird feeders are a great source of enjoyment and help the birds get through the winter.
- Teasing wildlife is a no no. Bird feeds and bird baths in private yards are completely acceptable.
- Teasing would have to be clearing define in this situation for me to make an informed comment. For an example; people hanging squirrel proof bird feeders is not intended as teasing but might be seen as that by others or chasing a swarm of grackles away.
- Teasing animals, yes but not feeding birds, especially in winter.
- Do not feed bobcats, lynx or raccoons on your private property. Absolutely fine to feed birds excluding magpies, crows and chicken hawks (Cooper's Hawks)! No teasing allowed for any wildlife.
- bird feeders
- bird, squirrels
- Let's use common sense. Education and engagement. Teaching people whose culture does not include pets to respond responsibly to pets and their owner. Also, let's PLEASE start to enforce already in places laws regarding wildlife. BIRD FEEDERS are not.
- backyard birdfeeders should be allowed. We have deer and rabbits that regularly raid our vegetable patch. would this be considered feeding and/or teasing? How would bylaw handle this?
- Bird feeders.
- Please don't prohibit bird feeders in private homes. These birds give me so much enjoyment & peace.
- bird feeders and bird baths
- Wild bird feeders on private property should be exempt. The question above is leading and poorly written!
- I would like to ensure that those who love birds in our city are allowed to continue to feed and assist with their survival in our own yards. Squirrels in our yards can be a nuisance, but special feeders to deter them can be used.
- The wording of this proposal is rather vague. It is also not clear that this would apply to someone with a bird feeder in their yard, which I fully support. If a deer jumps into your yard, don't feed it, but to prohibit the feeding of birds is absurd.
- First - what is the definition of teasing. Does wildlife include wild birds, or squirrels that happen to take peanuts from a bird feeder? Are bird feeders exempt.? This needs to be more well thought out.
- Feeding birds on private property.
- Allow bird feeders on private property.
- Bird feeders and watching the activity are a joy of life. I don't know what teasing entails.
- Birdfeeders. My bird feeder attracts birds. And stray cats. I would like to keep my birdfeeder.



- what is your definition of teasing. feeders in your yard are not teasing. The birds rely on the feeders during the 8 months of winter and during migration and nesting seasons. if a person is encouraging wildlife to inflict harm that's another matter.
- bird feeders
- Absolutely none. Make it easier ? Supply more bird enticing trees and flowers. Stop letting building developers rip up ponds and fields that have thousands of yellow headed and red winged black birds, hundreds of sparrows and Cowbirds and other species.
- Continue to allow responsible birders to feed birds, bird specific food to help them get through the winter
- Continue to allow backyard bird feeders.
- Bird/butterfly feeders
- NO PIT BULLS!
- Birds, squirrels, hares
- I would support a penalty for anyone caught teasing/tormenting wildlife .. on either public OR private property.
- feeding wild birds must be excepted.
- I want to be able to feed birds on my property in the winter but I would never support a bylaw teasing birds or wildlife on private property. The wording is very ambiguous.
- backyard bird feeders approved
- I don't consider providing a bird feeder and bird bath "teasing". I don't want people teasing animals but I do think it's valuable for birds with declining populations to have access to food and water given the current climate situation we are facing.
- PLEASE CLARIFY THIS QUESTION?! This is far too vague. I agree that coyotes, bobcats, skunks and large mammals like that should not be fed or encouraged to habituate in built up areas. However, if this includes squirrels and birds?? NO Please clarify
- Bird feeders on private property
- Bird feeders should NOT be prohibited.
- Unless it is causing a problem, people should be allowed to enjoy bird watching and feeding birds on their own property. As a retired senior, this gives me a great deal of pleasure.
- So does this apply to people that have bird feeders and nesting boxes (bird houses) on their property? Teasing wildlife, can you be more specific. I'm assuming it's an issue.
- I get great pleasure in feeding the birds and squirrels. They know and trust me. Living near North Glenmore Park and the Weaslehead we see lots of other animals but I don't intentionally feed them.
- There is no harm in feeding birds. They do not become dependent on human provided food sources as most are either migratory or opportunistic feeders. I love seeing birds in my yards!!!
- Deer comes onto private to eat crab apples, berries etc and bird feeders. These situations should be exempted.
- The city council should spend its time [and our tax money] on more important issues such as de-racilizing city departments, police and fire services and the council itself.



- Please do not include wild birds in this broad 'wildlife' category. Otherwise this reads like bird feeders would not be allowed.
- Feeding birds should be acceptable. Teasing or torturing animals of all kinds should be banned not just wildlife.
- This is poorly worded and way too broad in scope. As an example, if passed, it would become illegal to have a bird feeder in one own yard.
- leave bird feeders alone. love our birds
- Clearly define what you mean by "teasing".
- This is a very vague wording. I think it will negatively affect businesses as well as lifestyle if a ban on feeding birds in private property is introduced.
- Bird feeding cannot be prohibited.
- I do not know what teasing refers to but I do feed birds and enjoy watching them come to the feeder.
- Feeding wild birds and squirrels at backyard feeders
- I would support this bylaw if the wording was ...prohibits feeding and or teasing of wildlife but allows bird feeders on private property.
- Bird feeders in personal yards
- NONE. I am TOTALLY AGAINST PROHIBITING TO FEED WILDLIFE! Especially with COVID-19 keeping us at homes, the birds we attract with food are a source of delight and we treasure their visits. Yes to the TEASING Wildlife, but you would need to be specific.
- None
- I really hope that people will be allowed to feed birds and squirrels and put out bird baths, especially in winter
- Define "wildlife". Feeding/teasing of mammals should not be allowed (deer, skunks, coyotes etc.). But feeding of birds on private property MUST be allowed.
- all bird feeders exempt
- Bird feeders.
- Bird feeders and bird baths.
- I am unclear as to how this bylaw would effect bird feeders. I completely support bird feeders and would no support a bylaw that prohibits this.
- Feeding and teasing should not be in the same question. They are totally different concepts. Obviously bird feeders are OK and should not be based. If you are going to write bylaws, do it properly and with some thought.
- This question's wording is bad. This could prohibit bird feeders. You're thinking of harmful things - are you suggesting feeding birds is harmful !??. Go visit the Wild Bird Store or other similar facilities and talk with their staff.
- birds/ small mammals
- Wildlife: if you mean birds, squirrels, etc. then it should NOT BE PROHIBITED to feed or tease on private property. However, if you mean bears, cougars, coyotes, etc., I would support a by-law that PROHIBITS the feeding or teasing on private property.



- Bird feeders and feeding of birds
- Not clear based on the question, would this involve bird feeders, bird baths, houses, etc. This needs to be made clear in the proposal going forward. If it indeed intends to rank bird feeding as teasing, you are misinformed.
- bird feeders should be allowed as in most areas of the city they do not attract big wildlife as they do in Banff. Also in winter bird feeders are needed by local bird populations.
- No feeding of squirrels.
- Does this include bird feeding?
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders
- Providing food for birds by installing and stocking bird feeders on private property should be excluded from the prohibition.
- Allow bird feeders (all types such as suet, seed, nuts, nectar, etc.)
- Too vague. Bird feeders esp in the winter, are an important source of food for wintering song birds.
- Wild bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be allowed on private property. This provides a supplement source of energy for birds and it is extremely helpful for them during migration and winter. This is also a great way to encourage people to experience and care about nature
- Wild birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders in backyards should be exempt.
- Owning a bird feeder in your own yard should NOT be prohibited
- Bird feeders on private property
- Backyard wild bird feeding
- the exception would be putting out Bird feed in one's trees or yard. During winter months its tough on our feathered friends to find food & water. This is not considered "baiting/teasing"
- Bird feeders etc.
- I would support a bylaw that prohibits teasing wildlife on private property. However, prohibiting feeding wildlife would mean all property owners would be disallowed from feeding birds, which is going too far.
- Bird feeders can still be used in backyards
- do not include birds. you need to define wildlife, and what you mean by tease.
- Bird feeders, etc
- Birds
- Bird feeders should not be included
- Birds, bunnies
- exempt back yard wild bird feeders
- How do you enforce such a bylaw? But if you had such a bylaw then exempt birds and rabbits.
- Private backyard feeders should be allowed



- This needs more thought. Feeding birds should be allowed. Teasing or putting into distress any wildlife on private property should be defined and prohibited with appropriately high fines. This should include chasing wildlife with skidoos.
- I believe there has to be a distinction between feeding and teasing. Two very different behaviours. In addition, as stated, it may prohibit feeding birds in the backyard. Needs a lot more definition before it can be properly assessed.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- Bird feeding certainly should be allowed. It seems that there is sufficient legislation already in place to address situations where animals are being maltreated
- As a bird lover, I really enjoy bird feeders and bird baths on my property. I believe that the word teasing should be changed to intentionally harming. What one person considers teasing, another may see as harming.
- You SHOULD definitely be able to attract & feed birds in your garden. It is so wonderful having Blue Jays, Nuthatches, Chickadees, American Goldfinch etc come into our garden, because we feed them.
- We pay a ton of money in taxes if we choose to have a bird feeder or bird bath in our yards that is our private property!
- Bird feeding should be exempt and the bylaw should be more specific in this regard. Technically bees are feeding on private property and could be considered wildlife. Too broad of a bylaw.
- Bird feeders
- Large animals (Bear, Cougar, Deer) or endangered species
- We have bird and squirrel feeder on our property. I believe this adds to attracting urban wildlife to our community which enhances our environment. Bird populations are on the decline, why would we not want to help them grow.
- I don't want animals being teased, but I worry about the implications of vague wording. Private bird feeders should be exempt.
- Ok as long as wild birds are excluded from the term wildlife. We love watching the small birds feeding on our squirrel proof feeders.
- Exclude wild bird feeders. My bird feeder brings enormous joy to my life and is a common accepted practice. It does not harm the birds and in fact provides them with nutrition on the worst days of winter. I would not want this to end.
- Birds and bird feeders.
- Feeding birds and squirrels help them survive hard times. It should NOT be prohibited!
- teasing wildlife should not be allowed but difficult to have on same bylaw
- feeding of birds
- I think people should be allowed to feed birds on their private property by putting up bird feeders for them. Birds could never survive in Calgary's winters without the aid of people putting out food for them.
- It's PRIVATE property in my opinion this is non of the city's business. Feeding birds actually helps to sustain local bird life in urban areas.



- Many Calgarians enjoy feeding wild birds and squirrels. This provides additional nutrients when natural conditions limit their access to food, and is not harmful. People who provide supplements to birds and squirrels are typically wildlife advocates.
- I feel that there should be an exception for feeding wild birds. I don't know exactly what is meant by "teasing" but I don't think teasing in the common use of the word is acceptable.
- Birdfeeders
- Birds and birdfeeders should be left out of the bylaw
- Bird feeders
- Teasing & harming wildlife should be strongly enforced! Assisting wildlife should not be prohibited. In these times of urban sprawl all wildlife is being stressed to the maximum. Small gestures to assist in their survival are both necessary & responsible.
- Wild Birds, and maybe squirrels
- Birds of Calgary need a little support just as some humans do.
- a bird seed feeder and bird bath should be allowed. Bird watching is NOT harmful to the animal and is indeed beneficial in the dry weather of the summer where no water is available and in the cold winter months where food is scarce.
- Allow Bird feeders
- People have been feeding birds for years - leave that privilege on my property alone
- Birds
- Birds....I'd still want to feed the birds.
- What is wrong with feeding the birds in my back yard - nothing as far as I am concerned. Why on earth would you even suggest such a bylaw.
- Allow bird feeders
- None
- Feeding squirrels and birds is fine. Putting out meat for coyotes is a problem
- I worry very much about the local businesses that sell bird feeders etc. I also know how much joy bird feeding bring older Calgarians. Many businesses are already struggling. If you prohibit bird feeding, prepare to buy those businesses out.
- the above question is very vague to me; as a homeowner I have had a bird feeder on my property for as long as I have lived at my current residence (since 1996). I love feeding the birds and watching them. It also attracts squirrels but I can live with that
- Feeding wild birds on my private property has no impact on anyone else around me - especially during the winter months when food and water are harder to come by.
- Allow feeding of birds.
- This question is very vague, so impossible to answer with a Yes or No. You'd have to frame the bylaw very carefully - surely you would not intend this to impact people having bird feeders in their back yards?
- Bird feeding on private property should be allowed.



- These two items don't belong in the same question. Feeding songbirds in your backyard should not be conflated with teasing or feeding cougars, coyotes, deer, etc. Not a very clear / helpful question.
- Bird and Squirrel Feeders
- It is very important that we continue to allow bird feeders on private property. I and many of my friends get tremendous joy from seeing the birds in our yards. I have mobility challenges and can no longer go out birdwatching. Seeing the many birds attrac
- There needs to be clarity around feeding , does this include bird feeders? Teasing any animal anywhere should be strictly prohibited!
- Allow bird feeders on private property
- Feeding birds responsibly with consideration for your neighbours wishes on your own property with bird feeders should not be prohibited. Bird feeders in common spaces should be allowed too if no one has an objection and cleaning and maintenance are done.
- Bird feeders on your own property
- Bird feeders MUST be allowed and not included in any prohibitions suggested in 2 above
- You need to be specific on this. Are you saying bird feeders aren't allowed? Or just 'don't feed the bears'?
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Bird feeders and bird baths should be allowed.
- This bylaw could potentially exempt bird feeders which are an important source of food for resident and migrating birds. I would be vehemently against the restriction of bird feeders in private yards as this would aversely affect bird populations.
- Bird feeders will still be allowed.
- Bird feeders should not be included in this. I think a bylaw like this should be more for dangerous wildlife and deer/elk/moose, etc. Having bird feeders should be exempt.
- Bird Feeders
- I am hoping this does not include not feeding birds and squirrels. This is a big part of my mental health to be able to watch the birds and squirrels in my yard. It helps me get through the day.
- Birds should be exempt
- use of birdfeeders on private property,
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Backyard bird feeding exemption
- More education in public parks on not feeding wildlife
- bird feeders and bird baths should be exempt.
- Bird feeders should still be allowed, and this must be made clear.
- Feeding wild birds would be an exception to a feeding bylaw. I feel that feeding and attracting birds to backyards has many benefits to the birds as week as to the mental health of our citizens.
- feeding and teasing are two VERY different verbs and deeds. I do support bird feeders. I think it may be wise to place signs at ponds informing the young public what to feed ducks etc.
- bird feeders/houses should be okay on private property



- Birds. Need to allow bird feeders
- -
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- I dont know why anyone would feed wildlife
- Birds
- No exceptions
- If it endangers the animal
- Feeding of wildlife such and birds and squirrels should be allowed.
- Birds (feeding)
- Feeding birds or squirrels
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- bird feeders
- no exceptions
- Feeding of birds and other beneficial pets should be permitted
- Designated feeders such as bird feeders. Zero tolerance for hand feeding and using food for direct animal human interactions.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Enhance development of movement corridors for wildlife within the city and make it a criminal to poison or harm them.al within
- Bird feeders should be an exception as well as feeders for pollinators.
- Feeding geese or other birds.
- Birds
- How can you possibly enforce this at all?
- None. No more feeding squirrels - this has got to stop!
- feeding birds should be permitted
- Migratory birds might be okay, but please please make it prohibited to feed pigeons!!!
- Coyotes should be shot in the city if they cause problems
- Yes, still have to allow for the Bird feeders.
- There should not be extra laws against specific breads, as it owner related. If anything regulate those that are allowed certain animals. Require a licensed for you're allowed to own a animal. Much like you must have a license before driving a car.
- The question trading. Totally against it. People that do. Should be charged. As for feeding. We keep depleting where they lived and what they know. So I would feed them. Take back into the woods that remain. But I would help assist any animal are struggl.
- anti teasing



- Intent is important. Feeding a bunny lettuce or birds bread would be fine, but luring wild animals or feeding pets that are not your own unacceptable.
- Feeding birds in a birdhouse, not accessible to cats
- feeding birds should be exempt for sure
- Injured/disabled animals
- parks could offer treats to purchase to give to ducks at a pond.
- Wild animals were here before we encroached on their feeding lands so feel feeding them should not be considered a crime
- Birds on private property
- I believe these are two very different things. I don't support teasing or being cruel to animals on public or private property. Harassing animals is wrong. However I don't think that people should be discouraged from having a backyard feeder that look for
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Birds... With cold weather, birds need the extra food from feeders.
- There should be more education/information available on why wild animals should not be teased or fed. If animals like coyotes are fed they will move closer to city limits and be a hazard to small animals or children.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Physical and intentional harm to wildlife
- None
- None
- Natural environment has been damaged, and/or the animal is injured.
- bird feeders
- We legally sell bird feeders in the city and those feeders are often used by squirrels etc and you can't stop them from eating in the feeders. Or eating fruit off of trees.
- Having a bird feeder in the winter months
- Birds, squirrel
- If wildlife animal is in distress, one should be able to feed it.
- Bird feeders
- The amount of neighbour cats is getting out of hand, have approached cat owners think the laws do not apply to them. Have been waiting for a cat trap since spring of 2019 which in the past has been a waste time as once the cats are returned they back out
- Feeding only to entice a wild animal in to a live trap.
- Bird feeders and non-nuisance animals
- none
- Bird feeders
- This should be two questions as they are completely different from each other...



- Does this include birds? The bylaw should be narrowed to say what wildlife is included.
- Bird feeders (Seeds and nectar)
- No cruelty /taunting/teasing is ever appropriate in any circumstance on any property. As long as bird feeders are not shown to be detrimental to birds or squirrels and are used responsibly, its OK. Also in rescue or other emergent situations it may be ok
- Wild song birds perhaps. No deer or coyote or raccoon. Etc.
- Birds
- Bird feeders for birds.
- Birds
- Squirrels, etc.
- non - wildlife need to be left alone. If they are dangerous or are becoming a nuisances, then they should be reported to City of Calgary Bylaws
- Birds
- If it is to rescue the animal or encourage it to leave the property
- If you have a garden you may be feeding wildlife inadvertently. Also feeding birds I think would be an exception.
- Birds should be exempt
- None
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- If you're going to lump them in together, it's a hard no; but I do think you should be able to feed animals on your own property
- Maybe a bylaw against feed Skunks , Coyotes and nuisance animals.
- Feeding should not be fined, teasing should.
- The animal is in bad condition in need of food and further care.
- Bird feeders containing seed, peanuts, tree nuts.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- none
- Feeding an injured animal in order to keep it well enough for rescue/rehabilitation to a natural environment
- Orphand or injured animals (with the contact of an animal rehab to help)
- bird feeders.
- possibly an exception for birdfeeders, if birdfeeders are not problematic.
- Bird feeders
- Migratory Bird feeding
- Bird feeders
- Birdhouses
- It is difficult to prevent wildlife from eating fruits/vegetables found in the garden/yard.



- Feeding of rabbits and squirrels should be allowed (keeps from wrecking gardens and none invasive)
- maybe birdfeeders are okay
- Feeding wildlife appropriate food should be accepted.
- Most individuals do not understand the basic needs of wildlife, allowing us to feed them could do more harm... however, if providing water is safe than I think this would be acceptable as some wildlife may be dehydrated.
- None
- Birdfeeders
- Allow for feeding of birds with bird feeders. There should be no tolerance for teasing or tormenting wild animals
- The city is unable to enforce city bylaws in the city and relies on citizens to snitch on each other.
- Wild birds
- birds and small animals ok, feeding of large predatory animals no
- Feeding ducks
- Injured animal where someone tries to feed it for sustenance and unable to do so itself.
- Enticement to trap for the purpose of assisting the welfare of the wildlife in question.
- No exceptions....I am frustrated by the amount of crows and magpies around due to bird feeders in the area.
- Feeding birds and squirrels is a beautiful experience, I would not like to see a law stopping that. If a neighbour sees a teasing or trapping sort of behaviour, then that could be an offense. Harming wildlife should never be allowed.
- First need better understanding of which feeding is harmful and why. Birdfeeders? Peanuts for squirrels? What are the issues? Teasing should be banned!
- If its injured or gave birth and has babies in your yard. You don't touch but you help out
- None
- **FEEDING BIRDS ON PRIVATE PROPERTY SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN BYLAW.** Teasing and feeding are completely different activities and should not be lumped together. Cannot stop wildlife entering property of own free will to eat plants / berries / fruit
- If a cat is clearly injured or starving for food
- Bird feeders
- Birds or animals that forage naturally in yards (fruit trees, pinecones, etc)
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders.
- Feeding birds (ie: bird feeders are fine). No one should be feeding deer, bears, geese, etc. No one should be teasing ANY animal.
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Bird feeders



- Teasing OK, but can we still have a bird feeder? Why combine these 2 items that are clearly different.
- Birds
- Bird feeders ... squirrel feeders aloud
- Feeding birds & squirrels appropriate (healthy) food should be allowed.
- Feeding the birds birdseed or
- Bird feeders
- when trying to safely trap and relocate nuisance wildlife
- Only feed & water if the animal is injured on your property until bylaw can attend.
- Feeding birds and squirrels (or those type of animals in yards with their food)
- None
- bird feeders/baths
- Birds on private property
- Bird feeders
- Why on earth would you combine TEASING and FEEDING in the same question given separate sentiment? With a 70% decrease in birds since '70s , how could anyone be against a backyard feeder especially when only 5% dependence and helps with birth weights, etc.
- No animal cruelty
- None, if people want to feed them on their own property so long as it doesn't pose a health concern for the animal it's up to the property owner.
- If you have formal bird or animal feeders or water sources you clearly want them on your property.
- If a persons life was in danger and that was the only way to deter the animal.
- Birds, rabbits, deer
- Bird feeders, bird baths, etc. Nothing that prohibits wildlife from doing what they do best, but enforcing respect towards them.
- The law already provides for this.
- No exceptions . If animal is starving notify Wildlife Officer .
- Let them be
- None
- Hurt or injured animals
- Bird feeders
- Nonr
- none
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- None.
- Songbirds
- You can't put fwed and teasw in the same question. Feed birds for sure, they are wildlife. Feed coyotes, no. No wildlife should be teased, ever!



- feeding birds
- Birdfeeders and birdbaths
- Except birds
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Birds feeders
- None
- yet another bylaw by the city which further stretches by law officers and is not enforced to th degree it's effective!!
- Birdfeeders ok. Design bylaw to focus on large game (deer, bears, moose etc)
- Feeding of birds. Trapping of nuisance animals.
- Birds
- Nuisance by non-native species.
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Are birds, squirrels considered wildlife?
- Stop with the rules
- Hunting Purposes
- Birds on private property
- People are just not Aware of what is best for our wildlife. I believe they mean well but they need to be educated. Some people really enjoy feeding Wildlife so give them guidelines As to how they can feed wildlife what they are supposed to feed them.
- to entice a wild animal to stay so wildlife officers can take the animal away
- I feel feeding is fine, what is your definition of "teasing" that part is unclear.
- Feeing birds on private property is OK
- Don't know if putting out birdseed applies, but
- Species that are not a nuisance. Should be based on legitimate complaints, for specific species, I.e. skunks, coyotes, magpies.
- None
- Squirrels, birds
- Exception would be bird feeders.
- If it's in the animals best interest.
- Feeding wild birds
- None
- approved bird feeders
- Bees would be an obvious exception
- Do no harm- leave wildlife alone unless they are being a nysance on private property .
- none
- Squirrels



- bird feeders
- Squirrels, rabbits, birds
- none
- Fallen fruit from trees in the property
- Large mammals should be left alone (deer etc), but let people scare away the small stuff. Some people like feeding squirrels, that's fine
- Birds and squirrels should be exempt
- birds, squirrels
- Feeding wild birds should be allowed
- Feeding those in distress and not including providing water
- Bird house is allowed. But no seeds
- No exceptions
- Bird Feeders
- None
- Bird feeders can be vital for survival, especially in harsh weather - need to ensure bird feeding at feeders can continue.
- None
- in a city hosted event with educators guidance
- Birds with a feeder. Or same for squirrel and a nut dispenser. No interaction (or minimal) the with humans. Mimicking hunter/gather instinct
- birdfeeders can bring in deer and mice, but can help wild birds, so at least some published guidelines so people are aware of best practices
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders, hummingbird feeders
- Feeding squirrels and birds
- none
- Birds
- Pigeons and small birds
- Piss off and leave people alone
- Bird feed
- Birds
- Birds on private property
- wild birds can be fed raw seeds and water that are appropriate
- Calgary keeps getting bigger, where can the animals find food and a place to rest if they are constantly being shooed away.
- It would become too difficult for rehab volunteers to care for animals if this was a bylaw.
- Fines
- Squirrels steal bird food, what can you do? Nothing. I'm feeding the squirrels but not on purpose. It's on my own property so it should be fine



- Bird feeders (small size)
- Mentally disabled people
- None
- Bird feeders should be exempted.
- No bylaw because no way to really enforce so then really makes bylaws seem useless. Who does this, younger people... who couldn't be charged anyway.
- Birdfeeders should still be allowed on private property.
- Bird feeders in warm months
- Bird feeders/houses, bat roosts, exempt. This would take more thought.
- Allow bird feeders in private homes
- Birds survival depend on being feed. Contact Cornell University to get the facts on why it is important to feed birds.
- Feeding or teasing would encourage animals to return for more food. Best to keep them off the property.
- NONE
- Birds feeders, but must control the feeder, be inside the yard and not enticing deer or coyotes.
- None
- Teasing yes but there's nothing wrong with feeding wildlife on private property.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds for enjoyment
- Birds and squirrels
- You shouldn't own "WILDLIFE" kinda defers ther purpose of being wild if their on private property
- none
- Children
- On property fruit trees
- The fact that anyone would choose to tease an animal or feed it without understanding or knowing its nutritional needs or conditions should go without saying. Animals should never be teased, hurt, abused or neglected.
- Feeding yes, no teasing
- There needs to be an option to have wildlife removed from private property to a safe location.
- Fines
- None
- The government should not be able to stop people from feeding birds/squirrels. Citizens should never be able to taser or harm animals anytime.
- I support not teasing wildlife on private property, but I would not include feeding in the same bylaw. Feeding birds, for example, is not harmful and contributes to enjoyment of outdoor spaces for individuals on their private property.
- bird feeders should be allowed, it is unclear if this is what is meant by this question.



- First of all no one is “teasing” birds by supplying seed and water on our own property. We are NOT harming birds. We are enjoying the back yard feeders and request that the city focus on important issues and not wasting our taxpayers funding on nonsense.
- Bird feeders
- no exceptions
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- bird feeders in yards (seed)
- Except squirrels and skunks
- no exceptions
- Bird feeders on private property.
- Allow bird feeders
- Likely would support bylaw against teasing/harming wildlife on privatw property
- Canada geese leave a mess and dogs help control them. Hummingbirds and others in the spring and summer.
- NA
- None
- ok to poison wildlife (mice etc)
- No exceptions
- Feeding birds in a private backyard
- None...private property is private
- Wildlife that are considered pests could be exempt
- None
- Regular bird, squirrel feeders
- none
- Feeding wild birds should be exempted
- Bird feeders.
- Birds
- Fines for people encouraging it! My neighbor threw carrots all over my garden and my neighbors so the loose rabbits wouldn't eat his. We have footage of him doing it and can't do a thing about it!!
- It sounds like you want to ban bird feeders. That's a bit much.
- Bird feeders
- this is very vague. Would it include people who like to feed birds and/or squirrels? Lots of people like to feed the birds or squirrels and I think they should be able to.
- birds and squirrels
- Feeding birds
- if someone finds an animal in distress and they feed it in order for its survival
- Bird feeders



- If ain't broke don't fix it. Things are fine the way they are.
- Unless the stranded wild animals are in distress and need water for example or need feeding before emergency crew arrives.
- None.
- No exceptions. It's best to leave all wildlife alone.
- Exception for birds and squirrels
- Basing some of your plans on "vicious dogs" then putting "pit bulls" is absolutely outrageous. There have been more attacks by chihuahuas than pit bulls. Quit being mentally retarded and basing things off of how the OWNER trains and cares for the dog.
- none
- Bird feeders
- Bird seed
- None wild animals are just that wild can be predictable
- none
- Birdfeeders could be excluded. Some focus should be placed on fines for people that release pet rabbits that become feral.
- None
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- A legitimate wildlife sanctuary or rehab.
- feeding/teasing of predatory animals (i.e. Coyotes)
- Bird feed
- None
- none at all
- A fine for feeding animals
- Bird feeders!
- Bird feeders
- Song birds need all the help they can get.
- Shouldn't be feeding carnivorous animals
- Leave feral animals alone; as nature intended, wild animals will prey on them.
- Birds should be excluded.
- N/A
- this should be common sense/public awareness. We don't need a bylaw. People feed wild birds in winter -not a bad thing.
- its wildlife, I have rabbits, linx, skunks, the occasional deer, every bird traveling through, are we as a city trying to enclose the city off ?
- Trapping and relocating.
- Bird feeding should be allowed.
- Injured animal



- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Birds, but do not allow feeding meat products to birds
- Birdfeeders
- bird feeders
- Encourage not feeding on private property with information on what negative effects food has on the wildlife. Creating this bylaw would be difficult to enforce, as it is more likely the wildlife will steal for themselves than be fed.
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Birds
- Ok to feed birds and squirrels
- Capture and release or if necessary, destroy.
- Bird seed
- bird feeders, bird boxes and bat boxes
- Seasonal bird feeders like Canmore has Would be acceptable.
- None
- Song birds
- no exceptions
- None
- No feeding of mammals.
- Birds
- Birds- acceptable to have bird feeders
- Go do something usefull and create a bylaw that makes sense and is enforcable. This sounds like a lawyer make work program...
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Birds, squirrels
- Birds
- impossible to enforce - birdfeeders are important to many residents enjoyment of their property
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Self defence against a home pet
- None, as feeding or teasing wildlife on private property can cause damage to their wellbeing and natural instincts
- None
- None, wildlife has survived for centuries without human intervention, this should remain like it.
- Bird feeders
- I don't quite understand what teasing wildlife means. If there's a bylaw, will a neighbour report to bylaw for someone pretending to give a rabbit a carrot? Will we use time and money for a bylaw officer to visit the house and ask if a rabbit was teased?



- None
- Helping injured wildlife.
- Feeding of birds should be allowed
- The dog owner should be responsible to keep their dogs "off" of private property!!!
- Bird feeders
- If caught they gotta pay to move the animal to a sanctuary
- Bird feeders
- Allow bird/squirrel feeders
- I would suggest reasonable exceptions for bird feeders and similar devices.
- None
- a 24 hour number to call if wildlife is on property injured or cannot get out or not safe to let them out
- Bird feeders and fruit trees provided they causing problem animals
- birdfeeders
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- DONT DISCRIMINATED AGAINST DOGS THEN DONT DO IT TO US
- Teasing wildlife should never be allowed.
- None
- Birds
- If providing sustenance and water to an animal in distress is necessary for its survival before the arrival of wildlife specialists
- Type of wildlife must be specified. Deer, rabbits, squirrels, coyotes, birds etc. cannot all be treated the same.
- NONE
- Caring for an injured animal until Wildlife officers are able to take the animal away.
- None
- Feeding birds
- Allow back yard hens
- none
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders
- K
- Birdfeeders
- Pet interactions with wildlife is hard to control (e.g., try stopping our greyhound from scaring the hares)
- Steep fines if caught 1 (fine), 2 (steep fine), 3 (steepest fine)
- Feeding or providing care to abandoned infant animals should be an exception.
- I assume this does not include unintentional feeding from fruit trees, gardens, etc. on private property?



- First time warning to provide benefit of doubt (I didn't know until way later in life that bread is bad for ducks, for example), fines after that
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- none
- bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- na
- Absolutely none. Interfering with wildlife should be illegal and dealt with accordingly. It would be helpful to publicize a contact number to enable an appropriate response for people encountering wildlife on their property.
- Birds, squirrel should be able to be fed
- Birds
- Feeding should be acceptable (birds) however no teasing
- Bears
- Small song birds
- Bird feeders etc.
- None
- If damage or danger is anticipated or actual.
- None
- Exceptions for Registered Wildlife Rehabilitations and Rescues
- None
- none
- Teasing?
- Bird feeders
- I would exclude feeding birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Bird Feeders
- None
- Bird feeders as an exception
- Bird feeders
- None
- birds
- If animal is not harmed, a warning first
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds
- no exceptions, if caught then fines should be issued
- No Exceptions
- Bird feeders



- Birds (bird feeders)
- Shoot those who feed them.
- bird feeders
- Exceptions include bird feeders
- Hurt, injured
- Exceptions for any and all rescue/conservation efforts.
- Enforcement
- Bird seed
- birds and squirrels
- Feeding Squirrels, chipmunks and birds
- birds, squirrels
- Bird feeders
- None
- Allow bird feeders
- Teasing is far different than feeding wild birds. This should be two different questions. Also, feeding deer, coyotes etc. is different than feeding with birdseed. Teasing and animal is cruel.
- If it is causing danger to the general population
- Bird Feeders
- If the animal is in need of medical or starving
- Private ownership of said animals
- N/A
- Birds
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Bird feeders kept above 7-8 ft, to keep deer from reaching for them
- Bird feeders
- Feeding wildlife should be the choice of the property owner. However, teasing wildlife on or off private property is not acceptable as person(s) or wildlife, of both, could be injured. We, as people don't like being teased; neither does wildlife.
- Offer a contact method to address wildlife on private property, especially if someone feels the need to feed a frail animal. Or the same for consistently irritating wildlife.
- Veggie scraps for neighbors chickens
- I would support no teasing. I think putting food out for birds and other small mammals that share our neighbourhoods is acceptable and should not be prohibited.
- Approved bird feeder ingredients?
- If the wildlife is injured, or too young to survive alone in the wild & is receiving care.
- Feeding an injured animal if a wildlife officer is not available
- Outdoor feeders for the winter urban wildlife need help to get through the winters
- Birds Squirrels Porcupines



- Feeding certain wildlife is fine such as birds, squirrels, rabbits but doing so brings bobcats and coyotes that try to eat family pets. No to teasing any animal domestic or wild.
- Bird feeders in properties where there is no direct interaction with the animals should be allowed.
- Injured animal
- Feeding an animal in order to keep it near before fish and wildlife could get out
- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- Would such a bylaw prohibit people from feeding birds?
- fine the owners of the feral pet rabbits that are releasing them into the wild, our neighbourhood has over a hundred of these type of rabbits. We actually know which house they came from and now we have a massive problem.
- I would support fines and legal charges for teasing or harassing wildlife
- None
- bird feeders
- Where stated exceptions by a sign apply, I think there is little hard in feeding small wildlife like birds.
- Bird feeders on private property
- Bird feeders are okay. Teasing animals is not.
- Bird feeders.
- I can't see how a bylaw like this could be enforced. Sounds like more big government to me.
- Bears
- Increasing fines for each event that occurs.
- Bird feeders
- none
- None
- Feeding small birds.
- None
- None
- Bird feeders, hummingbird feeders
- This is a broad topic. Feeding of birds using a feeder is fine. Baiting bears or other wildlife for hunting is not. Feeding is different from teasing. It's not clear what is meant by teasing wildlife and what you hope to prevent.
- None, wildlife should not be feed/harassed.
- If someone found and raised a wild bird that has been abandoned by mother, that is now returning to that person to get fed.
- If the wildlife was hurt or hasn't moved in days, and then call the city to remove the wildlife safely.
- Birds
- Bird feeders.
- Squirrels, birds, rabbits, deer just say no to bears.
- Birds and deer
- To distract wildlife from causing harm to pets, property, humans.



- Need more info
- No teasing what so ever but feeding starving animals seems to be the humane thing
- Injured animals being rehabilitated.
- Teasing wildlife is prohibited but feeding ok -
- None
- Bird feeders seem to be a reasonable exception.
- None
- Stay off my private property.
- A agree with the sentiment on most animals, but what about bird feeders. The city needs stop trying to expand its jurisdiction and NANNY STATE attitude. This belongs to PROVINCIAL Animal Control.
- Birdfeeders in winter
- People should not be allowed to be cruel to wildlife
- A hurting animals until someone safe can come pick him up to give better care
- Feeding wounded animals that cannot help themselves.
- This type of bylaw is unlikely to be enforced, so why bother?
- Injured animals or abandoned babies
- None
- None
- Exceptions I would make are purposefully baiting dangerous wildlife into communities. For example, if they know a coyote is around, purposefully feeding them because you want them to harass neighbours. Squirrels, birds, even raccoons don't really count.
- Feeding might be necessary if animal is in distress. (ie middle of -30 winter). Teasing is always wrong.
- Drastically reduce wages of city council instead of increase taxes and fines.
- No exceptions
- Bird feeders, peanuts for squirrels.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- How do bird feeders fit into this? Are they harmful to wild birds? Should they be restricted?
- Feeding of wild birds - this differs from attracting wildlife from natural food sources. Feeding of squirrels- same point
- starving cat or dog that seems feral
- Feeding and teasing are two different issues. I feed birds and enjoy seeing and hearing them. Sometimes squirrels eat the food. I don't personally mind. A small price to pay, and their antics are fun to watch. On the other hand, I don't want coyotes
- Birds
- If attempting to rescue an orphaned or injured animal.
- Bird feeders



- If this includes feeding wild birds in our back yards I strongly object
- Birds should still be allowed to have bird feed in feeders designed for them
- None
- birds
- Shooing animals off property
- Birds, squirrels
- Songbirds
- Education on how to handle wildlife in your yard
- Bird feeding
- bird feeders?
- Don't know what is meant by teasing. Feeding wildlife should be prohibited because animals that lose their natural fear of humans become a nuisance to everyone. I'm afraid that if I chased away a nuisance squirrel or bird I could be charged with teasing.
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- Possibly small bird feeders
- Wildlife animals must be respected and assisted when necessary
- none
- A bird feeder, bird watching and identification is a common pastime for many seniors and is served as education for youngsters
- Injured animals may need feeding to trap them for safe transport.
- Feeding wildlife to prevent starvation or malnutrition
- Most people do not have coyotes on their property. Bird feeders are essential for helping birds especially in winter. This is not teasing wildlife.
- no exceptions, people shouldn't feed wild life what humans consume and that is the problem. If they were feeding them grains and organics, but they don't seem to know the difference
- Supplying bird feeders on private property - feel this is important for supporting bird life, especially in winter
- Bird feeders, bee keeping would be exempt
- Cruel treatment.
- Education Programs/ More offices in the City Parks
- Bird Feeders
- Birds are OK. Other wildlife should not be fed.
- Education, warnings, fines
- bird feeders
- feeding such as a bird feeder
- BIRD feeders
- Birdfeeders during appropriate seasons.
- Bird feeders
- no teasing; no harming; food and water are fine



- Feeding birds should not be regulated. Feeding carnivores and scavengers should be forbidden.
- If the animal is hurt or in distress and Fish & Wildlife can't get to them quickly
- Feeding would have to be clarified - is this passive or active feeding? Bird feeders seem an obvious exception, and it would also have to exclude "feeding" in the sense growing plants, vegetables, and fruit which wildlife feed on.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Wild birds are also considered to be wildlife and I for one feel limiting the feeding of backyard birds, which means so much to so many in Calgary, especially during the isolation of Covid19, should not be prohibited.
- humming birds
- There has to be some reason ability here. I know many people who have bird feeders. I don't see a problem feeding birds or other small wildlife. Given that it is appropriate food.
- None!
- Define the wildlife species that the bylaw should prohibit feeding and/or teasing on private property. For example, provide bird feeder within private property to feed birds (wildlife) should not be prohibited.
- none
- Bird Feeding. Animal Feeding under extreme circumstances. e.g. severe winter weather causing starvation or wildlife
- I would like to be able to feed birds on my property. It is a joy for me and many people and benefits of keeping Calgarians connected to wildlife far outweigh any issues
- You can not bylaw my behaviour on my land
- Farms
- Maybe feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- No teasing no being disrespectful to any wildlife
- refuge/rehab
- Make a large enough fine for people not to partake in this.
- Provide education and food for animals.
- Birds
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Birds
- Get rid of the stupid cat by law I'm sick of having mice ruin my neighborhood
- None
- Birds during the months of January to March
- Bird feeders in yards are fine
- Responsible bird feeders; butterfly and bees gardens
- If the homeowner is trying to relocate the animal and others come to help with their permission.
- If it's distressed, thirsty. Needs help



- Bird feeders
- Feeding an injured animal, with rehabilitation as the end goal
- bird feeders should be exempt
- none
- Birdfeeders
- Injured animals or pests like mice
- Except when an animal is injured, until you are able to get help for it.
- If it was a desperate situation
- Jeep bird feeders
- Bird/squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders/houses
- Feeding birds is fine. Teasing any animal is not
- Wildlife who's life is in immediate danger and food or teasing is required to assist the animal
- No we should not be allowed to hurt animals
- Feeding bears or other predators. No teasing animals.
- Birds, but not pigeons
- Should allow bird and squirrel feeding.
- Feeding rescued injured wildlife
- Feeding wildlife is only going to lead to more imprinted wildlife which will only create larger long term difficulties with safety for both wildlife and people. With the exception of squirrels and birds.
- Feeding birds
- Birds and squirrels getting bird bells and nuts.
- No exceptions.
- Behaviour that is demonstrably harmful to the wild animal should be prohibited on private property.
- No teasing but should be allowed to have bird feeders.
- My answer is no because I don't understand if this applies to bird feeders My neighbour has feeders and it brings her joy. But I'm not keen on feeding, say, deer
- I'm curious how this would affect bird feeders - a lot of people in my neighborhood put out bird feeders to attract birds as a source of entertainment. This seems harmless and I don't think should be prohibited on private property.
- Bird feeders
- no animal should be teased or harassed but anyone on or off private property
- I absolutely support a bylaw that prohibits teasing wildlife. However I do enjoy feeding birds and squirrels on my property during the winter. In addition to my enjoyment it assists in their survival during our harsh winters.
- Nothing, the birds work for the bourgeoisie. They need to be fed.
- I feel that having a bird feeder and such on your property should be allowed. I do believe if any animal cruelty is happening on private or public land it not be allowed. No teasing or harassing animals fall under animal cruelty



- If there is a private animal rescue centre on the property
- No exceptions wild animals should be left alone
- Sanctuaries
- That the Bylaw defines "wildlife"
- Exception of birds and bird feeders
- Birdfeeders beekeeping
- Many people feed the wild birds with feeders in their yards especially in winter which I find okay. What you mean by teasing wildlife? if you mean harassing I would support a bylaw that states that you can not harass wildlife on private property.
- A hurt animal
- Bird feeders
- I think people should be able to feed small animals, such as bunnies and birds.
- Exceptions for feeding of wild birds and small mammals such as squirrels.
- birds, squirrels, roaming cats... I would support certain dangerous animals being in a bylaw, not all though.
- Visibly starving or emaciated
- If you are trying to coax the wildlife away from your property
- Bird seed, bird feeders
- Birds, squirrels, etc. - There's a difference in potential danger between feeding a crow and feeding a bear.
- Food for the squirrels and birds that visit or live on your property.
- Assisting wild animals in distress by feeding, and or caring for until professional support is provided. City must be notified as soon as it is obvious the animal is in distress.
- Not sure of definition of "teasing" I support bird feeding and do not consider bird feeders as teasing
- Allow for feeding at petting zoos, outdoor learning centers, etc
- Only if feeding is done by a City of Calgary professional for the benefit of the animal and is monitored.
- Bird feeders, and where deer, squirrels, rabbits, etc browse on your lawn and other plantings (this happens in our yard pretty much everyday, including several mule deer that wander the neighbourhood eating from our vegetables, flowers, trees & shrubs)
- Please do something about these damn Pit Bulls!
- Bird feeders/baths, discouraging magpies and crows
- Bird feeders or approved methods to deter nuisance wildlife
- Feeding wildlife that may otherwise die for a temporary period until the animal can be managed by wildlife services.
- This is a poorly worded question. More definition would be helpful. This should not include bird feeders especially in the winter months.
- fines when caught teasing animals
- Birds



- Nuisance wildlife is a problem. In many cases, what someone deems "teasing" is very well creating an aversion, which reduces human/wildlife interaction (which is a good thing).
- Surely you do not mean that this would apply to feeding the birds from bird feeders on private property? This needs to be clarified - that bird feeders would be permitted.
- Birds feeding should be allowed
- There shouldn't be any exceptions, however, there will need to be education on what is defined as wildlife. People may push back on squirrels etc.
- Private property is under the owners responsibility
- Informal pets such as loyal wild avians or any situations that stopping would cause harm to the private premise.
- Bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- I wouldn't be supportive if it means people couldn't feed squirrels, birds, feral cats, etc.
- None
- Bird feeders acceptable.
- Accommodate wildlife with providing water to drink
- allowing bird feeders; removal of problem wildlife in a humane way (e.g., live traps); support for removal of non-native species (e.g., grey squirrels)
- Birds
- Feeding birds should be permitted.
- Bird Feeders
- Bird feeders and similar items
- Birds
- Not sure what kind of exceptions would be reasonable.
- Steep financial penalties
- Large Predators
- Helping wildlife in distress until they can be taken to a rescue, or possibly feeding birds and squirrels if that doesn't harm them in any way
- You have to consider that wildlife includes animals such as birds and squirrels. It does not make sense to have a bylaw stating you can't feed those animals, or any herbivore that is not a disturbance to adjacent neighbours. Bears are exempt from the no.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- feeding wild birds
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds using various kinds of bird feeders and birdbaths on private property.
- If the wildlife seems to be in danger, hurt or injured, then individual can feed wildlife until further help arrives



- This could be taken to far, exceptions would be too numerous, best not to have the law to begin with
- None
- Feeding birds should be allowed
- Bird-feeders; abandoned, injured or animals-in-need
- Birds (can feed them)
- Feeding birds and squirrels should remain allowed. Any animal that does not pose a threat can be fed. No teasing ever.
- If someone finds an animal in distress, they should call a wildlife officer, but if none are available fast enough, they should be able to at least feed an animal if it is safe. Teasing ..absolutely no acceptable
- I think better education as to why not feed wildlife is the problem. We need to educate people more that these wildlife animals can fend on their own unless they are in distress in which case people also need to know the right organizations to call.
- Bird feeders
- None
- Bird feeders.
- Feeding should be fine on private property, but not teasing (I assume this means teasing with food but not giving it to the animals, which sounds rather cruel).
- Except for birds
- Birds- Bird feeders over the winter of seeds and such.
- This question is poorly written and should separate out the two issues. Teasing wildlife is unacceptable, the feeding of wildlife on private property is a more nuanced issue and my stance would depend on the purpose and intended effect.
- No exceptions
- No exceptions. All wildlife needs protection and don't know property lines or borders. Wildlife should be especially protected on so-called private property as individuals might believe they can do whatever they want including torture and killing.
- A big fine!
- Bird/bee feeding.
- None
- Both Squirrel and bird populations have increased tenfold since our neighbor has set up massive feeders for both. This is a huge nuisance for us, as they destroy our garden and planters. Bird feeders would be fine, but in very limited numbers.
- Bird feeders
- If the wild animal is injured or otherwise in need of nourishment until the appropriate wildlife rehabilitators arrive.
- Feeding birds



- If you make this a bylaw, the only method of enforcing this is to have neighbours telling on each other. This is a terrible idea
- I think it should be targeted towards larger animals like deer and bears and exclude squirrels and birds.
- Bird feeders and providing water in summer
- bird feeders, bee friendly gardens,
- Birds
- Feeding of birds.
- The question is too vague. Please provide specifics re what constitutes feeding or teasing. Does hanging a bird feeder in your yard fit into this category? Then absolutely NOT!
- No exceptions, all wildlife should be respected and endangered that includes no teasing and no feeding.
- Let farms or self sustaining places be the exception as encouraging the wildlife to their area could be beneficial for the growth of sustainable products.
- Hurt/Injured wildlife as an exception for feeding wildlife
- None. Animals should be left alone if they are wild.
- Feeding birds should be allowed
- Bird feeders should be allowed, but people should maintain them properly and keep the area clean
- Abusing an animal on private property.
- Birds, squirrels
- Bird feeders. No peanuts. Do not feed the squirrels.
- Feeding birds
- Squirrels
- Bird feeders? But - communicate clearly that if you start feeding birds in the winter, that you have to continue that food source until spring.
- if the animal is obviously hungry
- Injured animals could be fed
- If wildlife is being fed to distract them in an emergency situation where the wildlife may harm someone... for example, throwing a steak behind a bear to try to distract it instead of attacking a person.
- None
- Injured animals
- I have bird feeders
- Proper bird feeders and bird baths.
- Teasing and or animal abuse bylaws should be enforced strongly.
- Bird feeders accessible by wildlife
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeding
- if the animal requires immediate attention (food, water)



- Depends on the class of animal. A squirrel or bird, that doesn't matter. If you're going out of your way to feed a bear, moose, deer or any uncommon animal, then you can create a problem of the animal expecting food or seeing you as a food source
- Limit the number of bird feeders a home owner can have (the feeders draw deer, squirrels, mice, etc that cause damage to neighbor yards and homes)
- Unless a human life or pet's life is in danger.
- Wild bird feeding should be allowed in backyards.
- Birds
- How would you possibly enforce this?
- Bird feeders/baths.
- feeding birds
- I am concerned about the feasibility of enforcing this.
- bird feeders
- leave well enough alone
- Bird Feeders
- Where an animal is hurt or in need of assistance, sometimes food is needed
- no exceptions for feeding wildlife
- Birds, squirrels, bunnies
- None
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Warning off measures for creatures in the garden? Sometimes I shout at squirrels to encourage them to get out of my carrots
- Certain perceived pests will need special consideration -- magpies and geese come to mind.
- bird feeders
- Bird Feeders
- none
- Bird Feeders, Bees and wildlife choosing to eat garden fruit and veg.
- Is this actually a big problem?
- Animal abuse vs animal support are two different topics. Feeding isn't great, but teasing and harassing is terrible. Also, how are you going to enforce that? How are you going to enforce children teasing and feeding animals?
- Except birds
- Are you suggesting that everyone take down all their bird feeders? Yes I support a bylaw to prevent teasing wild animals.
- Bird feeders.
- If the owner is present and gives consent to feed the animal if it is their own.
- Animal cruelty
- Someone is trying to help that wildlife have a better life



- I would suggest the city focuses on more important issues that surround Covid and maybe a little less focus on finding ways to apply more taxes and fees to the people of the city that already have enough on their plate.
- In the case of smaller community animals such as bird feeders for birds and the odd veggie on the lawn for the many rabbit families in our community. .
- Unless it is hurt/in distress.
- Bird feeders if squirrel proof
- No exceptions.
- Birds, squirrels,rabbits.
- Unless trying to feed to lour to being to rescues i think no one should feed strays.
- None. Wildlife will still thrive without our interference!
- Small bird feeders
- No exceptions. If there is a concern about health or well being of the animal(s) the City should be contacted. Exceptions will simply allow too much leeway for individuals to make their own decisions regardless of the spirit of the laws.
- Bird feeding encourages nature & wildlife appreciation, so allow as always. But feeding of mammals is an issue.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeding is needed
- If the wildlife wandered onto the property and the owners were trying to get them away.
- Bird feeders
- Exception for feeding birds on private property (bird feeders, etc.), and for unintentional feeding (e.g. squirrels eating bird seed put out for birds).
- birds
- You should have a separate category for feeding and teasing. Feeding is ok. Teasing is not. Your question is loaded.
- birdfeeders
- Bird feeding should be allowed.
- teasing "pest animals" such as magpies should be allowed with this rule
- Wild bird populations
- Birds
- Bird feeders?
- If wildlife is injured or being responsibly rehabilitated (eg under vet care)
- none
- Feeding birds.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeding exception on private property
- None. If there is an animal on private property that is indanger/distress a professional should be called to handle it.



- Squirrels
- Fines
- Hurt/Injured wildlife as an exception for feeding wildlife
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders for wild birds
- Birdfeeders
- This might be a good idea but many others it will be unenforceable. Does it include birds?
- None
- What defines 'teasing'? What defines 'feeding'?
- feeding of birds should be allowed on private property
- Defining feeding or teasing is crucial. If my dog is chewing on a bone and wildlife gets in and grabs it while he is getting a drink of water, is that feeding wildlife in a way you'd want to justify to a jury?
- If an animal has been hurt and needs feeding as a life saving measurement. Also, the SPCA or the AB Fish and Game should be notified of the animals' needs.s.
- Bird & squirrel feeding should be OK - helps overwintering.
- Providing water receptacle for overheated animals
- Well maintained and well placed bird feeders
- Pest control
- Bird/squirrel feeders that are raised off the ground.
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders.
- education for property owners
- Exception would be to charge someone if they are torturing any animal.
- Bird feeders
- Birds - perhaps.
- Birds who eat bird seed from bird feeder, and other animals who may eat the seed
- Bird feeding!
- None
- Bird feeders
- Penalties for teasing as this is sbuse of an animal. I don't care about them being fed. This should be two separate points.
- No bylaw against feeding
- backyard bird feeder should be exempted
- No exception for teasing
- Education and then fine
- Rehabilitation of injured wildlife
- With owners permission

- Get Wildlife to come in and trap and remove any dangerous animals back into their natural habitat.a
- Bird feeding
 - we should prohibit teasing wildlife. 2. I am not against putting food out for birds and encouraging pollinators. Providing bird baths etc.
- If the animal is actively attacking when unprovoked.
- Wildlife appropriate bird feeders
- Animal cruelty or trapping any of the animals.
- Winter time feeding of birds
- owner's permission is given to feed on their own private property
- Bird feeders should be an exemption
- I feed the squirrels peanuts and I have a bird feeder which I would want to see exempted
- Bird feeders should be acceptable. No teasing of wildlife is appropriate.
- Allow bird feeders
- Feeding the chickadees actual bird seed.
- First a warning as to why behaviour is not appropriate. Then fine.
- Your presumed definitions of wildlife and teasing are unclear. Having bird feeders in private yards should continue to be permitted. Feeding of wild mammals on private property should not be permitted.
- Fines for activities which distress songbird existence also to make sure timing of green space maintenance does not disrupt ground nesting song birds . As long as feeding birds is not interpreted as feeding wildlife.
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- Abusing wildlife
- Bird feeders, natural plant vegetation (ie berries/fruit from plants), or things of similar nature
- Bird feeders are ok
- Feed only during extreme situations
- Hurt or wounded animals
- Feeding wild birds in residential yards is a popular activity that does not contribute to negative attributes this bylaw intends to curtail. Additionally, provincial and federal wildlife act use the term 'harass' or 'disturb' instead of tease.
- Its difficult to tell people what to do on their own property. If this occurs, it should be a teaching moment by Animal Services, rather than imposition of a fine.
- Bird feeders should be permitted on private property.
- Stay focused on economic matters.
- Feeding birds must be an exception from this bylaw - not only is it beneficial for the birds but it brings enjoyment to many Calgarians who are housebound during the winter.
- There is an animal/wildlife in distress.



- Feeding exceptions for injured animals where water, etc., may give them strength and comfort until the experts arrive, feeding abandoned babies or those that appear abandoned, pregnant wildlife that may have come to what they perceive is a safe place.
- The law is too hard to enforce and would likely impact bird feeders - best to leave it alone.
- bird feeders/baths and water stations should be exempt
- Bird feeders
- It could be cool to see something in fish creek, if it was monitored by wild life personnel.
- Feed birds and squirrels but not other wildlife
- I support the feeding and providing of water to wild birds in gardens and private property
- Having bird feeders
- Birdfeeders.
- I'm saying no because how do you determine this.? I have a bird feeder am I feeding wildlife? Rabbit eats the carrots from my garden. Coyote eats the food I left for my dog, etc.
- Birds and squirrels should be exempt
- Bird feeder
- Certain species of wildlife shouldn't be teased, nor fed for reasons of safety. So there should be specifics to the bylaw, regarding species.
- Nursing or taking care of injured/abandoned wildlife.
- Bird Feeders
- There should be no exception because this encourages wildlife remaining in residential areas. This can potentially endanger said wildlife.
- People will feed injured or sick animals, regardless of a bylaw. Specify more, in detail
- Bird feeders should be allowed
- \$200
- If feeding is done to help an injured animal or one that can't live on it's own. They should never be teased however.
- this question should not combine both feeding and teasing. Feeding birds is TOTALLY acceptable and beneficial in our private property. Teasing should have a definition. If it means baiting animals such as coyotes to come into your yard, not acceptable.
- none
- None. Are you trying to ban bird feeders and bee keeping? Is this really a problem? Seriously!
- None
- Sick or injured animal
- None
- exceptions for allowing bird feeders, and exceptions for feeding if it involves responsibly attempting to assist wounded animals/animals in distress until official assistance can arrive (i.e. taking circumstances into account case by case)
- Case by case basis.
- Bird feeders and baths



- education is always a better answer!
- No Exceptions
- birds
- Birds
- Bird feeders, squirrel feeders...
- Bird feeders
- If wildlife comes on property and eats your plants without you intentionally trying to feed them.
- Want to feed birds
- Rescue wildlife
- none, they are wild therefore self sufficient
- Why not be allowed to feed birds?
- Bird feeders
- Higher by law enforcement presence. steeper fines so word of mouth gets around.
- Birds, rabbits, coyote's
- Bird feeders should be acceptable. Feeding birds encourages the survival of local bird populations, especially birds migrating. People should not be barred from feeding birds in their own backyards.
- Squirrel and birds
- Birds and squirrels
- Bird houses are okay but bird feeders are not.
- Personal pets
- 0 Exceptions
- If you have vegetation growing on your property, then a person shouldn't be held responsible. But if you're clearly leaving food out for wildlife than you should receive a fine.
- pest management
- Birdfeeders
- None
- None. This is a growing problem and needs to be addressed with full force.
- You need to clarify bird feeding. Lots of people have bird feeders. There will probably be a huge outcry if this is banned. How would any bylaw be enforced?
- Would this proposed bylaw include bird feeders? Definitely would need to be explicitly clear
- Substitute something better for teasing. What do you mean?
- Excessive /large scale feeding etc.
- Providing temp care to an injured animal.food,water
- enforceable?
- We should be able to shoo them out of our yards.
- None
- Heavier fines for abuse of animals/poisoning
- Bird feeders



- Small animals like birds and squirrels. List examples of animals that this would indeed apply to like: skunks, badgers, porcupines, coyotes, deer, moose, bear etc
- None, we should not be feeding any wildlife. Who knows what their proper wildlife diet is and how we can be harming them by feeding and discouraging them to learn to hunt for their food.
- Don't fine bird feeders and hummingbird feeders! Also incentivize native plant pollinator gardens
- None
- This seems like it would be too hard to enforce.
- I would expect bird feeders to be exempt. Wondering how to incorporate an 'injured animal' exemption as well.
- Bird feeders
- I can support feeding but teasing is cruel.
- Bird feeders should be exempt.
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Would need to be intentional feeding and exclude fruit tree/garden produce being grown.
- Bird feeders and/or bird baths.
- Put funding towards educating people, not punishing them. Teach people about healthy relationships and interactions with nature and wildlife, and what & how much food is appropriate to share with what animals (birds, squirrels, etc)
- None. Feeding domesticates wildlife and then they become a problem. Teasing only agitates them and makes the situation dangerous. Do nothing . . . or call fish and wild life.
- Bird feeders
- None
- If someone is going to be a caretaker of wildlife
- none
- Feeding the birds should not be included. If a deer or moose happens to end up in my yard and starts munching on flowers, etc. this shouldn't be under the bylaw. Enticing animals into your yard is a different story. Teasing is a big no!!
- Enticing perhaps in terms of a rescue attempt to an injured animal on the property. Any action required to ensure the welfare of the wildlife on the property.
- Luring a sick animal in order to get it help
- No exceptions. Keep the bylaw as clear as possible to avoid misinterpretation. We do not want wildlife to become dependant on us for food.
- I think in the case of very young children, then the parents should be held accountable under the bylaw.
- N/A
- Feeding of birds and squirrels. Please define 'teasing'.
- ducks
- Bird feeders should be exempt.



- I think the exception should be if there is an injured animal on private property, it should not be prohibited to offer water to comfort while waiting to get it to the proper authorities.
- Education surrounding feeding ducks/geese - it is often well intentioned but many people do not realize the harm
- None
- The question, above, should have been two separate questions. Feeding wildlife on private property - yes. Teasing wildlife on private property - no.
- Citizens should be allowed to feed birds & squirrels
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- An animal looks like it's in distress or malnourishes
- None
- bird feeders
- Injured animals/birds
- Have people clean up apples and other attractants for skunks and problem wildlife
- None
- Birds and squirrel feeders on private property.
- Bird feeders
- Should be able to chase a skunk off the property
- If animal is injured and they are awaiting assistance from control
- temporary feeding of an injured or orphaned animal until such time as fish and wildlife or parks personnel could come retrieve the animal
- Things like bird houses and squirrel feeders with the vagueness of this wording would be covered by this bylaw, and a lot of folks quite enjoy seeing them in their backyard.
- birds
- Creating parks or wildlife areas so it minimizes the amount they would need to come into private property.
- City should have no jurisdiction on Private property
- Birds
- it's not good to regulate private properties because then you have to potentially enforce such laws.
- If the animal is hurt or if the person is hurt, then it is on the property owner to assume all liabilities.
- in the case of a lame or orphaned animal where the proper authorities have been contacted.
- bird feeders.
- Birds
- Unless the continual visit of said wild life causes distraction to other property. Or if the natural noises become a nuisance.
- Birds, squirrels and the like- feeding, not teasing
- if the land was designated as agriculture use
- No feeding squirrels



- Bird feeders
- We should be able to feed birds- teasing them is not okay
- Except birds
- Wild bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Above-ground birdfeeders
- none. This would mean you'd have to get rid of all the bird feeders in the city and there is more than enough by laws in the city for the Prevention cruelty two animals weather domestic or Wild. Wow this is ill-conceived.
- No animal wild or not deserves to be teased or taunted by anyone. I think fines should be giving out to people who Tante Or tease Any type of animal whether it is wildlife or somebody's pet or a stray
- Please define feeding of wildlife, this is very broad.
- Only acceptable for animal sanctuaries and areas of wildlife preservation
- Birds and squirrels
- No exceptions, but I'd like to see this bylaw actually enforced. People are constantly feeding birds on Prince's Island Park
- If the animal looks like dying.
- A fine
- hot line for trapping and removal from residential property
- None
- Feeding ducks (maybe the city could install coin feeders of appropriate duck food) and have signs up to only feed them food from the feeders
- Feeding a wildlife in trouble
- Exception should be made to passive feeders such as bird feeder stands. But hand/bowl feeding designed to entice larger nuisance animals should be prohibited.
- My property my rules.
- An animal who looks like it's starving or is sick.
- Why would you make it illegal it is not currently an issue.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Restrict bylaws to city properties not private dwellings or businesses
- None
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds, etc are one thing but teasing, being cruel, should be prohibited and high fines.
- noneo
- Squirrel proof bird feeders
- Bird feeders would be okay
- Bird feeders, bird baths, and bird and bat houses should be exempt.
- Please allow Kids to chase geese because it's fun as a kid and geese are jerks.



- Potentially bird feeding at the ponds. Outside of that chasing and pestering the animals should be fined
- None, unless the wildlife is presenting an immediate danger.
- Bird feeders
- Backyard chickens
- None
- Bird feeders with proper seed
- Bird feeders okay, and feeding stray animals
- Private property should be exempt from bylaws with the following exemptions: No feeding of wild animals. All people, on either public or private property should not be allowed to be cruel or negligent to any type (domesticated or wild) of animal.
- No exceptions! People who abuse animals also abuse human beings.
- Also don't have bird feeders that attract damaging nuisance crows , magpies, woodpeckers , etc. that damage property and affect one's sleep!!!
- Bird feeder limit
- Bird feeders
- Feeding appropriate food to wild birds
- More awareness and education.
- Only in cases of blatant inappropriate behaviour.
- Feeding birds should be okay
- Backyard bird feeders
- Birdfeeders
- Feeding birds
- to permit the extermination of squirrels , pigeons and magpies.
- Bird feeders and bird baths
- I enjoy my bird feeders in my yard. Would be heart breaking to have a bylaw to remove them.
- If the animal is not able to feed itself and without intervention would sustain injury or illness.
- Wild birds can be fed
- Depends on the type of wildlife
- e] Is there a person who has exceptional experience with physiognomy of dogs. IE: a CKC dog judge?The CKC has a Canadian Good Neighbour Test for dogs. You should encourage all dog owners to have their dog take 7 pass this test.
- Bird feeders ok, but no food on the ground
- Rural homes
- You should be able to feed birds and squirrels food that is safe. I'm opposed to harming animals only.
- Feeding birds and hares should be allowed
- Bird feeders
- no exceptions.



- Animal abuse
- We should still be able to feed birds.
- I think the better move its to create awareness around why feeding wildlife anywhere is not good.
- Feeding wild birds should be allowed, and encouraged considering their populations have been decreasing. Decreasing populations are another reason to more closely monitor wandering cats.
- None.
- Birds, if there were a bylaw against feeding wildlife.
- It should be up to the individual and their responsibility unless it impacts on neighbours.
- If the animal is hurt and in need of care
- Exception of birds
- Feeding birds in private property should be allowed. However, putting food out for deer, coyotes and raccoons should NOT be allowed.
- Allow bird feeders
- Squirrel resistant bird feeders and fruit trees that attract deer and other wildlife.
- Birds
- Bird feeders (seed feeders, hummingbird feeders, etc.)
- none
- Define feeding. If animal is just eating a plant, is that feeding? Teasing wild animals should never be allowed.
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders allowed
- Of course, no teasing. I agree with prohibiting feeding wild animals eg deer, coyotes, similar. BUT definitely no prohibitions against feeding wild birds.
- No exceptions
- No
- feeding birds and squirrels keep me sane.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds.
- Bird feeders
- Also ban trapping of rabbits and squirrels
- Bird feeders should be allowed. The birds help control insects.
- An animal is a threat or a Nuisance
- Birds, squirrels and rabbits
- Bird feeders
- Feeding wild birds is good.
- Bird feeders should be exempt.
- Squirrels & birds should be an exception
- Question 1 needs "Neither" as an option.
- Bird feeders provide entertainment fir home owners.



- How would you enforce such a bylaw? It would be useless. Education about whatever you are trying to accomplish is the only answer
- Bird feeders
- Birds
- Allow feeding ducks
- Bird feeders
- Finch and other native bird feeders. (to buffer songbird population suffering from roaming cats)..
- If feeding birds from bird feeders in my yard is an issue, and I'd be at risk of a fine. That's ridiculous
- Introduce specifics to animal categories: Some wildlife pose greater threat when acclimated to humans than others.
- fines and education
- Birds and squirrels
- Lindsay park bunnies
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Injury or rescue situations, bird feeders
- Private property should remain private and not the jurisdiction of bylaw enforcement
- Birds
- Bird feeders should be allowed on private property
- Wild birds/squirrels should be able to be fed
- Putting out peanuts for the squirrels I'm okay with. What does teasing refer to???
- None
- This question should be made into two questions.
- Leaving out water should be exempt as pet owners walking dogs often take advantage of their neighbors generosity during hot weather.
- People can have bird feeders
- Feeding wild birds is a wonderful past time especially with coved, working from home etc. It is nice to watch the birds. Not sure what "teasing" refers to but that should be a separate question. "Teasing" sounds cruel.
- if you're going to ban that, it wouldn't make sense to allow chickens on peoples properties. They are bait for predators and create smells as well.
- Bird feeders
- Songbirds in the wintertime. I know birdfeeders often provide many people with a sense of purpose and act as a source of therapy
- Allow bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds bird feed
- Feeding no (e.g birds), teasing yes
- Bird feeders



- Proper bird feeders with the right seed for squirrels and birds
- What about people that like to feed the birds and the squirrels? (And keep their yard clean.)
- during very harsh winters when animals are struggling to find food. Increase fines and penalties for cruelty to animals
- Intention should be considered. Did you intend to feed them or just accidentally leave food in your yard?
- If the animals take food from you, like if they grab it from someone.
- Birds
- Injured wildlife that requires aid until help arrives
- Injured animals
- Bird feeders
- Deer eating the apples that fall from my tree
- No exceptions
- If feeding only to lure an injured animal to somewhere safe and then transferred to vet
- Natural diet supplementation in times of meagre resources
- feeding wild birds should NOT be prohibited by this bylaw
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- Allow people to scare wildlife from being on their properties
- wild birds
- none
- If the animal is hurt or in need of assistance. A Conservation officer should be called immediately
- Not sure what defines wildlife, I support this if feral cats are not deemed to fall under definition.
- Birds
- None
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Assisting an injured animal with food or water while awaiting the arrival of a by law officer
- No exceptions, bird feeders bring in mice
- None
- Should be able to feed birds/squirrels [inadvertently]
- Helping injured animals or sheltering them while they recover.
- Feeding birds in the winter time is acceptable.
- Bylaw that protects wildlife from life threatening injury and also behaviors that cause anxiety to wildlife
- Abandoned baby wildlife
- Wild life should not be tormented no matter where they are, but safe and healthy feeding of wild birds and squirrels via feeders should not be restricted on private property
- Bird feeders
- Unless permission is given



- Bird feeders should be exempt. Bat houses as well.
- Feeding birds.
- Standard bird feeders are acceptable
- shooing away animals on your property
- None
- Lots of people have bird feeders or humming bird feeders in their back yards, these shouldn't be illegal.
- None
- Wild bird feeders.
- Bird feeders
- None
- Birds/feeder
- Birds
- An animal that needs help
- None
- Bird food in species appropriate feeders
- What is going to be defined as "teasing"? As long as private landowners are not maiming or torturing, I don't approve of money towards this.
- None
- Birds
- If nurturing a baby until rescue arrives
- Birds
- Bird feeders should still be acceptable
- None
- Birdfeeders
- Let them be fed but anyone who teases or entices an animal should be charged
- There are already provincial bylaws regarding this why does Calgary need one....What about putting out bird feeders???????
- Live wild life alone or they die no exceptions.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds
- Birds
- None
- bird feeders
- If there are warning signs placed about specific species
- Bird feeders with appropriate food.
- Question is too broad. Teasing animals, absolutely should not be allowed. Feeding is complicated. Birds and insects are fine to feed. Feeding meat to attract bob cats etc. feeding rabbits is also ok, even though they attract bob cats etc.



- Exceptions should be bird and squirrel feeders.... it is more of a problem if people are baiting predators, which I don't think people do
- Bird feeders should still be allowed, especially through the winter
- None, your property your decision
- Bird or other similar feeders
- Feeding birds or squirrels would be allowed; teasing / harassment still prohibited
- Feeding birds/squirrels. Teasing and harassment is always prohibited.
- bird seed for small birds but not crows
- Allow feeding not teasing
- Feeders/bathing stations are good. Teasing is unacceptable.
- Wild bird feeders
- Bird feeders, Bat houses, flying birds?
- wild bird feeders
- types of wildlife ex birds and squirrels as they get feed in many yards
- Bird feeders, bird houses, bee boxes; such a 'can of worms'; will this apply to mice on your property, ants, slugs, do we really need a bylaw about this? Where do you draw the line?
- Bird feeders
- If the feeding is the result of an injury that the animal has sustained
- Feeding: Bird/hummingbird feeders. Teasing: Placing detergents or making noise (non violent, eg clapping talking using cruder rudder) to deter nuisance wildlife from property eg skunks/porcupine
- Helping an animal in immediate danger/critical condition.
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- feeding birds (seeds/humming bird feeders) should be allowed. However, feeding squirrels should be banned. They are a nuisances and the invasive ones should be eradicated. Feeding any type of wildlife other than birds should be fined heavily.
- Teasing is wrong but Bird feeders should be allowed.
- Feeding wild birds
- get SPCA Calgary to have some weekend, lower adoption fees. Cochrane SPCA successfully run this trick
- Bird feed and fruit be accepted in your own yard
- Fines in place
- Maybe a recommendation by a vet, with a statement along the lines of, "while we can't mandate what you do with wild animals on private property, we hope you will take their well-being into consideration."
- Birds and squirrels
- Bird feeders
- None
- Magpies eating my garbage
- none



- Bird feeders, bee feeders, etc...
- Rabbits in the winter
- Wild bird feeders should be allowed.
- Ducks, small birds
- bird feeders..? unsure what "teasing" refers to.
- An injured animal when immediate removal is not available
- Animal is emancipated/ in distress
- Bird feeders
- I feel like birdfeeders and squirrel feeders should be allowed but nothing hand fed.
- I don't think it should be enforceable, possibly unless the animal is being clearly harmed.
- people should no better than to feed wild animals on their property, however would this include bird feeders??? Seems a little draconian.
- None
- Does this pertain to birds and squirrels? Would this mean no bird feeders? If this is about baiting wildlife with food, then yes, I approve of a bylaw that prohibits this. We each must be responsible for discouraging wildlife to hang around.
- Mostly I am concerned with what the relevant research says.
- N/A
- Take out the ban on pitbulls! Education comes from the family it's raised, not the breed. People should be banned then just because how they look. Oh yeah still happening in this century
- Bird feeders should still be allowed
- Bird feeders
- Clarification of "teasing"
- Bird Feeders
- Birds
- Bird seed
- Feeding birds and squirrels is fine, you shouldn't pester or tease them though.
- Fines
- Feeding the Ducks/birds
- Feeders for birds, ect.
- Wildlife that is not causing harm to property or people be left alone. Any potentially harmful wildlife be relocated
- No exceptions, no excuses.
- If the wild animal is injured and waiting to be picked up by animal control
- pesty rodents
- Bird feeders, bees (flowers).
- Seed/suet bird feeders should continue to be allowed. Deliberately feeding meat to any wildlife, including raptors, should not be allowed. Teasing wildlife should never be allowed anywhere. Backyard composting should be allowed, despite raids by wildlife.



- Squirrels and birds
- Bird feeder
- birds--feeding wild bird seed
- none
- Feeding wildlife on private property should be allowed (assuming it is not poisoning the wildlife) however teasing wildlife on private property should be prohibited.
- Feeding on private property o.k.
- None, There are times when animals need help from humans. We have built on their lands
- Bird feeders
- We should not have any exceptions.
- Bird feeders, although needs to be education and/or restrictions potentially. Such as not in open yards, yards backing onto green spaces etc OR birdfeeders not accessible to other animals.
- fines
- Self-defence
- In case of injured animals in an attempt to rescue for health concerns
- Bird and squirrel feeders
- Bird feeders
- If an animal was found injured and in need of aid on private property.
- Exception to feeding would be wild birds and food used as a lure by businesses that trap and relocate wildlife
- Feeding birds
- None
- None. Ppl will begin to abuse animals on private property.
- Gardens not intended for animals
- none MYOB
- The feeding is fine However teasing should not be aloud
- If it's not your property teasing or feeding animals should be fined.
- Bird feeders
- Birds, ie bird feeders should be exempt.
- Bees, birds, etc.- when beneficial to species survival
- Teasing needs to be further defined. There should be a bylaw to prevent harrasment of wildlife on private property.
- Skunks must be controlled by the city.
- Birds
- Bird feeders
- birds would be considered wildlife and feeders often brings squirrels. Gardens also bring rabbits which might be considered feeding but unintentionally.



- I wouldn't agree with a fine, but better awareness strategies of why people shouldn't do this would be better. Parks Canada has done great work with their awareness campaigns "fed bear is a dead bear"...
- If the wildlife is in danger or is dangerous then humane capture and safe release that may involve bait should be allowed.
- skunks, rodents and magpies be exempt
- The feeding aspect is what concerns me, as much of the wildlife tends to eat flowers, shrubs. clover etc. I would be concerned that the next thing I know I would not be permitted to plant a garden. I fully support a bylaw that prohibits the teasing.
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- The animal is injured or in a situation where it can't survive on its own and needs human intervention
- wintering birds, bees and necessary pollinators
- Wildlife should never be teased or harmed. We do feed the birds however!
- None
- Baby animals found without a mother, or injured animals
- Trapping of feral creatures using food as a lure
- Simply notify it to wildlife
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders should be exempt.
- Bird feeders
- We should always be allowed to feed birds.
- Bird feeders and similar approaches.
- Feeding birds
- Bird feeders
- bird feeders acceptable
- If the animal is in distress or hungry, we should be allowed to help them.
- Suggest exception for bird feeders.
- Bird feeders are okay
- I don't think those are the same. Feeding birds some seed or a feral cat isn't the same as teasing an animal. I support feeding but not teasing. Large animals such as bears would be an exception to the feeding.
- Wildlife shouldnt be on my private property. If they are, I should be able to deal with/deter them as I see fit.
- Putting "feeding and/or teasing" in one question is misleading. Feeding often is done out of kindness or positivity, teasing implies negative treatment of animals. I support bylaws against negative treatment of animals no matter where they reside
- Feeding of birds (eg. hanging a bird feeder) should be acceptable.



- Bird feeders and bird baths permitted
- none, respect private property
- Bird feeders
- Bird Feeders should be allowed.
- In cases where an animal is sick or injured and unable to feed itself or forage for food, and is sheltering on a private property while recovering
- None. Drives me nuts when neighbors feed the squirrels.
- bird feeders except
- Skunks have to be controlled by the City.
- Birdfeeders
- Bird feeders - too hard to enforce.
- fines
- Animals that are deemed pets. birds or squirrels
- Birds
- None
- Birds
- Orphaned baby animals or injured animals might be fed only until wildlife officers can collect them.
- Birds and squirrels
- If it is an orphaned animal
- Unless the animal is sick or need help
- The provincial wildlife act already has this covered I would not use the word tease. Disturbed is better
- Bird feeders
- Feeding/playing with wildlife being kept as pets (rabbits, squirrels, etc)
- Adding to the body of legislation implies that said legislation will be able to be enforced - how will this be done without violating privacy and property rights? 'Teasing wildlife' is pretty vague, but don't current animal cruelty statues cover this?
- None
- Bird feeders
- A wild life rescue would be an exception
- If the feeding is done as a means of deterring the animal away
- None at this time.
- If an animal is in distress and in need of immediate food/water
- none
- Bird feeders are ok but should be limited to 2 per home because some neighbours do not want 100 birds pooping on their property.
- Bird feeders
- Educate the public on the types of wildlife
- Bird feeders



- None.
- Feeding injured animals
- bird feeders should be exempt, unless they are attracting predators such as bears
- Birds and squirrels
- Welfare standards to apply to all animals - including wild life we live along side
- Bird feeders
- If a squirrel is digging in my flower pots and killing my plants and making a mess I should have the right to chase him away or even spray him with a hose to deter his visits.
- Should be no reason for us to interfere with feeding. Only time should be done is where in attempt to relocated a animal.
- none
- If the animal is injured or hurt and you need to help them
- Bird feeders
- Owning "wildlife " on private property such as deer and elk.
- If the owner of the property supports it ie: bird feeders
- Feeding - allowed if you are talking about birds and squirrels. Teasing - never allowed
- Bird feeders should be allowed.
- None
- No exceptions
- Bird and Squirrel feeders should be allowed.
- I'm not sure what that would mean as I'm not aware of any issues (besides feeding birds).
- People generally love wildlife and likely one cannot stop people from feeding deer rabbits etc. Most people arent stupid enough to feed bear coyotes cougars etc.
- Feeding birds an approved seed / seed mix / suet should be allowed both on public and private property.
- Education of the effects of feeding wildlife
- Bird feeders, bat boxes, bee boxes
- Animals in Danger or needing assistance
- Bird feeders
- To help it
- Birds. When we have long winters they sometimes depend on the help from people's feeders.
- Feeding birds, having loose seed on the ground (from bird feeders)
- In case of injury
- I would suggest an exception on birdfeeders
- Humane trapping and remote release.
- No
- If an animal is hurt or in need of medical attention, you should be able to take it into their care and feed it until until relocated at a medical/rehabilitation center.
- That this is something up the discretion of the property holder that has a bylaw behind it.



- No exceptions
- Okay if property is secluded
- Birds
- Trying to shoo a wildlife off your property shouldnt be considered teasing
- away from other property
- none
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds
- Within city limits or how dangerous the animal being fed can potentially be
- Provide access to wildlife sanctuaries or companies who can remove pest woldlife
- fines
- Birds.
- If someone has ducks or chickens they should be able to feed them on their property pending it does violate any zoning issues or bylaws
- Bird feeders
- I would have an exception for the rabbits in Earlton as long as they were being fed things they would normally eat (i.e. not cookies, chips, bread, etc.).
- Birdfeeders
- N/A
- Many people have bird feeders and it has gone on for as long as I can remember. I don't think we need to stop it.
- Can feed birds or squirrels.
- The establishment of Bird Feeders as a means of feeding as well as feeding of small localized creatures should be exceptions to the bylaw. To be clear this would make feeding of small wildlife such as rabbits, birds and things of that sort.
- If the feeding is unintentional (animals finding food in garbage, etc)
- Birds, of course.
- A stray animal is trying to be rescued
- Injured animals
- Trap and removal from private property should be excluded
- Feeding orphaned animals
- Bird feeders
- Birds and bird feeders
- Generic feeding of birds
- Feeding birds?
- Feeding or otherwise trying to help injured wildlife on your own property should be ok. It's better than having injured animals run over to death like the police do in Lethbridge.
- No teasing should apply to all animals, but feeding wild birds and squirrels, obviously should NOT be prohibited! We should still be able to feed Birds and Squirrels on private property.



- Unintentional feeding of animals. If you feed your animal out side or you have livestock and an animal comes through and eats, considering that there is no nuisance wildlife in the area you would be aware of (city notification/ animal sign postings)
- None.
- Bird seed.
- Physically causing harm to any animal.
- Birds bird seed everyone has bird feeders. Wild animals should not be fed. Once they are dependent on humans and no longer have to hunt they become a nuisance to humans and end up being killed.
- Birds, squirrels
- My elderly neighbours live to feed the squirrels. While it drives me bonkers, because the squirrels hide their food in my flower garden, I wouldn't want to end this bit of joy for my neighbours.
- Bird feeders ok but NO cat food!
- DO NOT RESTRICT PIT BULLS THEY ARE FAMILY TOO
- If the animals best interest is being held
- No one should be allowed to tease animals and if they feed them they should be a part of a program that is to support wildlife that is in danger therefore helping them as a program, many people think feeding animals bread is a great idea, when it is not.
- None
- Standing fruit trees, open yards.
- Birds ,Squirrels
- This is already a law under the wildlife act! STOP WASTING MONEY!!!
- Homeowner calls for the cities help.
- All animals should be allowed to eat
- Rabbits / birds entering back yard themselves and feed naturally on grass or fruits and they are not touches or captured or touched.
- No exceptions
- Feeding of wild birds and squirrels should be allowed. Teasing of any animals should be prohibited.
- Bird Feeders
- Bird houses should still be allowed
- Unsure if this includes feeding peanuts, seeds to birds and chipmunks. I have no problem with this.
- Bird seed in bird feeders that are only accessible by birds (not deer, bears, raccoons, squirrels, chipmunks, etc.).
- Birds using Bird Feeders, or any other wildlife who may eat the seeds.
- None
- that we are allowed to feed birds, but not other animals ie., deer, coyotes, foxes, etc
- No exceptions.
- I think that bird feeders woudl have to be exempt however, it should include just throwing grains on the ground.



- Bird feeders, as long as they are cleaned appropriately
- Birdfeeders? Disuade people from setting up birdfeeders on public property, such as parks.
- None! Nobody should get to tease wildlife WTF
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- The exception would be if the resident or homeowner is simply chasing a nuisance animal off their property, or if they have a permit to capture.
- None
- Feeding on private property seems less problematic than teasing.
- None
- Bird feeders
- There are birds who depend on bird feeders why would we take that away?!
- If the animal was injured and unable to fend for itself
- Birds
- I think someone leaving feed out for deers is fine. Anything else no.
- Birds, squirrels and critters of similar nature
- No tolerance for 'baiting' wildlife.
- Bird feeders.....
- Bird feeders
- Private means private
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders
- None
- None
- None nuisance animals such as oriental birds
- Definitely agree to the teasing, but think there should be more specifics on feeding, such as no predators, but things like birds are okay.
- If the person contacts wildlife control and it is a baby animal, maybe it needs some nourishment, only if this can be done safely
- You shouldn't be able to control what people do on private property
- Anything done to specifically protect life or property.
- Feeding birds
- wild bird feeders should be an exception
- Don't want strangers harassing my dogs from outside the fence
- If baby animal was abandoned and you had to feed it before animal control arrived.
- Education of citizens so they know how to treat wild animals
- I think we have to consider what animals....what if you're feeding birds compared to deer or bears?
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be exempt.



- None
- Back yard bird feeders are ok
- Absolutely no feeding wildlife on private property.
- N/A
- I think don't TEASE DOGS ON PRIVATE property is a law that should be passed. In my neighbourhood, there are kids who tease my dog thru my fence and
- Protecting property eg scaring off a bear
- bird feeders
- birds
- Exceptions for herbivores. Feeding coyotes seems obviously bad but a deer? Not so much
- Bird feeders
- Bird feeders, set in specific locations, to promote feeding birds and not other wildlife should be allowed
- The only exception MIGHT be if it is an endangered species; provide a clause that would allow a change to this by-law if urgent
- Only for people who don't live/own/work on the property
- Feeding birds birdseed should be an exception.
- registered pets
- Birdfeeders and the like should be made an exception
- none
- does this include bird feeders?
- None
- a situation of trying to feed an injured animal to be able to get close enough to them to get the animal and take them to a wildlife hospital.
- Stay out of my yard
- birds as long as appropriate supply is not causing skunk increase
- Hurt/abused animals
- No exceptions within city limits
- If the person in question has a license of some sort that allows them to feed wildlife, safely. Teasing or harassing wildlife should have a huge fine to discourage people from getting too close to wildlife.
- Birds (ie birdfeeders) and small animals like squirrels. Only apply it to big animals like deer, coyote, wolf, bear, etc.
- Two different issues requiring two answers. Many people feed birds. However, I would be against all other feeding of wild animals. I do not support harassment of wildlife. Owners should have means of scaring off Nuisance animals such as skunks, deer.
- No hunting nor teasing, but we should be allowed to feed rabbits, squirrels, and birds
- Rural property
- We have a bird feeder and I hope that we would be allowed to continue doing that.
- Allowing feeding wildlife that are hurt and not for eating purposes.



- Bird feeders
- bird feeders
- Helping a sick animal
- If an injured wild animal happens to be on private property i think owners at the instructions of appropriate personnel could do what was necessary until animal is removed if they felt safe doing so.
- Hanging a bird feeder on private property is much different than teasing wild life, please fix the question.
- I feed the wild rabbits carrots in my complex, many people do as well, I could stop if needed. We shouldn't be feeding wildlife at all.
- None
- Private property is private. Leave it as is.
- None. No exceptions for squirrels especially!!!
- small bird feeders
- If you are using food as a way to coax the animal off your property or if the animal is injured or abandoned and you are taking care of it until a city employee or the proper person arrives
- I guess bird feeders are okay and if wild life comes into their backyard as they have fruit or veggie bushes that is okay, but not the act of coarsing the animal onto your property.
- Using food as bait to trap feral rabbits
- Bird feeders
- I'm not opposed to bird feeders, bird baths but am definitely opposed to teasing any animal
- 1 educate new comers that animals have feelings and that letting their children throw rocks, at birds, squirrels, cats, dogs or any animal must be stopped.
- Bird feeders, feeding feral animals
- Fines
- Bird feeders, bird bath, define treasing
- none
- The city can leave out food for said wildlife.
- exempt birds from bylaw
- Bird feeders
- Feeding birds should be okay still.
- Possibly bird feeders. I don't know how heavily native birds currently rely on this food source.
- Bird feeders
- a hurt animal
- Bird feeders
- Squirrels, Birds (bird feeder, and the squirrels end up eating some too and maybe other wildlife eats the dropped seeds too)
- None: the squirrels in my area are crazy over populated
- Orphaned wild animals



- The teasing of all wildlife, that is cruel. However the feeding of birds and squirrels should be allowed as long as it's appropriate food in proper feeders, lots of people enjoy a bird feeder in their yard
- Birds
- Birds, squirrels and critters of the sort
- Animal is obviously emaciated
- None
- We often have coyotes and bob cats in the area. Making it unpleasant for them in the yard by making it unpleasant is a way to discourage them from staying. Things like banging pots could be considered teasing.
- Endangered species.
- Yes to larger animals but no to birds.
- bird feeders
- Bird feeders should be exempt
- The ability to feed birds from bird feeders should still be allowed.
- Birds, bird feeders
- abuse without a doubt protect animals ... but lost of things can be classified as feeding leaving apples on trees -- etc

Dogs

These are comments from participants who selected 'other' to the following question. 'A list of measures that other municipalities have taken to reduce the frequency and severity of dog bites is listed below. Which, if any, of these measures you would support in Calgary?'

- You should be ashamed of yourselves for targeting pitbulls like this and even suggesting all pitbulls would need to wear a muzzle in public. Absolutely disgusting. A muzzle does nothing but confuse a well behaved dog and create more tension. German shepherds and Rottweilers are not listed here. Stop feeding BSL against pitbulls, it's a toxic culture that does not understand the living nature of the breed that's been spoiled by bad owners and dog fighting..
- Any dog causing serious bites to citizens (level 4 or level 5 bites) , should be euthanized after end of Rabies hold. These aggressive dogs are very dangerous for our community.
- The owner is responsible for their pets. DO NOT specify breeds. Pitbulls only want to please their owners. Bad behavior is not breed specific. This would limit breeds. In the past we condemned Dobermans, Rottweilers, German Shepherds, Akidas. I have an Italian Mastiff Cane Corso and a German Shepherd/Healer cross. The Cane Corso is a big gentle baby. My cross is the guard dog but is also a sweetie. It is how they are raised and trained. d
- It's not the breed or the dog, it's the owner. The owner of a nuisance dog should be heavily fined and forced to take their dog(s) to obedience classes. Should the dog(s) remain with "nuisance" status after proper training, the dog(s) should be removed from the owner's care, with a stipulation that the owner would not be allowed to own a dog for a specified period of time (ie: 2 years)



- I believe that certain breeds who require lots of training (example pit bulls - undergo severe investigation before putting in a home) most cases there are issues with this breed or really any breed when a home owner either trains or doesn't take care of the pet/animal (I know many families with pitbulls and they are the nicest, more sincere dogs I have ever met) I have also met bad people who trained their dogs to act the way the dogs (drug dealers etc) make sure these breeds go to loving homes and they are loving dogs. They're same as humans.. kids grow up in good home then they will grow up to be respectful kids. Don't blame the breed
- Pit bulls aren't the problem. Bad owners are the problem. Connect the fines and disciplinary actions to the owner less the dog.
- Don't bully my breed. Breed Specific legislation is atrocious and racist.
- I really can't stand dogs of any kind on my property/grass...their excrements does nothing but wreck the grass...they can go sniff somewhere else...the owners need to be accountable for this and control their dog on a leash to remain off other's properties...clean up the dog's mess, I just don't want dogs on my grass...period!!
- Why are you limiting it to the breed. the owners. Educate people rather than punish the breed.
- None of these are acceptable, you can't just pick on one "breed"
- Fines for owners that don't train the dog be it big or small
- I STRONGLY believe pitbulls should be banned in Calgary and Alberta. How many little kids and adults need to get mauled severely or to their death before we decide this breed is unsafe for the average homeowner. I also believe more and more people are getting them, almost to prove they aren't dangerous. The public are not properly informed about this breed. Ban!!!
- There should NEVER BE ANY BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATIONS EVER!
- Again we shouldn't be penalizing breeds especially when little dogs are just as bad. No dog should be discriminated against for colour or size either. Dog training should be mandatory for dogs who have strong personalities, and stronger interviews should be conducted as well. Fines should be given to any owner who fails their dog, whether a dog bit happens or for poor living conditions or for reckless barking when the dog is usually in distress. We should not be penalizing a breed, and should be making i
- Do some research because pitbulls are not stronger then other similarly sized dogs. That is a myth. Breed specific legislation has been proven not to work.
- After a dog is considered a dangerous/nuisance. Mandatory training. If the problem is not resolved by training remove the dog from the home and restrict the owners from having another. Most bad dogs are made by bad owners.
- Mandatory training and licensing to own certain breeds. Owners must prove they can train the dog and the dog listens to them. Have had dogs my whole life and love them but certain breeds are a weapon, like a gun, they should need to be licensed and trained.
- Leave pit bull breeds alone and consider making training more available for such types of dogs.
- Children and adults are attacked far too frequently. There is truly zero deterrence and if an owner does run away, there's no real to identify them. I'm terrified for my child, there is an on leash park



right next to a major playground that is used as an off leash park, why can't it be fenced in? Why can't all of our playgrounds be fenced in like in Europe? Get rid of pit bulls.

- I'm extremely disappointed in the breed specific language. No breed is better or worse. I've been bit by more shitzu's than any of your 'terrier types'
- Pitbulls aren't the problem. It's the owner.
- additional insurance for dogs that have bitten in the past (not specific to breed)
- Obedience training for owners of nuisance dogs
- Please remove the description of the dogs breed.
- There should not be breed specific legislation that targets Pitbulls. Although there is a potential for a stronger bite there is not increase risk. German shepherds and other like dogs are just as capable of causing such a bite. No breed should be punished because they look a certain way.
- Do not treat pit bulls differently than any other breed! ANY dog showing aggressive behaviour should have to undergo obedience training and be on leash.
- Ban pit bulls, period. There are 2 in my building in the beltline and there has already been one fight resulting in injuries to both dogs and one human. Nothing was ever done about it.
- Don't discriminate against a breed, breed does not define if a dog will be a nuisance. Training does.
- Fine people who complain constantly about no issues they claim to be issues
- "Pit bulls" should NOT be treated any differently than any other breed! All dogs have the ability to bite. A German Shepard or husky will do just as much damage in a bite incident.
- I do not agree with any of the above. This is alienating and discriminatory to a specific breed. any dog with a large jaw has the same bite force. Small dogs bite and attack more than large breeds due to improper training. If you discriminate human skin color you're labeled and penalized for it. How is this any different ?
- dont bully pitbulls
- Muzzling causes major issues with dogs. I am fully against breed specific rules. Also costing people more money to own a certain breed only causes hardship for that owner. Act based on behaviour not breed. If requiring training, ensure affordable option available.
- I personally have had more issues with breeds like chihuahuas, shitzus, labordoodles than i have "pit bulls". A dog deemed a "nuisance" should be based on incidents occurred, not breed. My selections above apply to any dog that is deemed a nuisance, not just "pit bull" breeds. Give all dogs a fair chance, just because they're one specific breed does not mean they are bad dogs.
- I would support banning a dog that bites from off leash parks, but it's strange to lump biting dogs with nuisance runaways and barking dogs
- Nuisance dogs are a product of their owner regardless of breed. Set a common standard and enforce it across the board no matter how big or small or menacing or pretty the breed
- Breed specific laws don't work. Any dog can cause harm relative to size only not breed.
- Leave the pit bulls around, it's the type of people who adopt them that you should really be watching, not the dogs.
- Proper breeding licenses for pit bull type dogs with a limit of how many times a female can be bred. Yearly recertification for the breeders



- Pit bulls must be banned all together. They are dangerous dogs and they have no place in the city.
- limit of animals for owners who are involved in nuisance cases/dangerous behaviour until proof of Obedience training for current pets
- Pit bulls do not have a higher bite force than the average German shepherd, Dutch shepherd, Rottweiler, or Doberman. This is a bullshit bylaw and should be dog dependant not breed dependant. Higher fines for poor ownership and training. Make it mandatory for owners and dogs to go through training programs (small breed dogs included as they tend to have worse and more unpredictable temperaments than big dog breeds do)
- The current bylaw has not failed Calgary. People and enforcement has. We don't have a breed problem and do not need to discriminate against pit bulls. We need better enforcement of the current bylaw.
- All breeds have the potential to harm. Bylaw should not use verbiage that singles out one "breed".
- Pitbulls should not be discriminated as German Shepard's and other dogs have stronger bites
- Training and assessment for owners of pitbulls
- if youre admitting pitbulls are not involved in more issues, there is literally no need for breed specific guidelines or bylaws.
- I believe singling out Pitbull breeds is simply racist or uneducated. the focus should be on owners and their responsibilities as a DOG owner.
- Proper training recommendations and if a dog is an issue take a look at the owner and do background research see if they are properly fit for the dog and if it rehome the dog where it can be trained and worked with then take your proper precautions. Dont take it to where it will be a problem and use a leash. Common sense.
- If dog is known to be aggressive then they should be muzzled. and always on leash.
- Requirement of training courses completed for large breed/bully breed dogs, owners of "fight dogs" require extra vetting to be able to purchase these dogs
- SHAME ON YOU City of Calgary! It is incredibly disappointing to see the suggestion of breed specific language being added to a bylaw that was once world-renowned for its success. Only breed-neutral, evidence-based legislation will have any chance to address dog-related problems in the community. You're not even asking for a postal code or any other measure to verify that you are actually a resident of Calgary in order to complete this survey. With the survey being accessible to anyone, what is stopping spammers and pro-BSL lobbyists from skewing the results? Responsible owners of large breed dogs deserve so much better than this type of non-sense!
- Aggression is not breed specific and German Shepard and Rottweilers have a stronger bite than a pit bull. This is outrageous
- Breed specific laws do not address the issues. It's the other end of the leash that too often requires the muzzle. Please don't go 20 years backward and introduce BSL.
- All dog breeds that are a nuisance, have noise complaints or have caused harm should be included in this. It isn't right to only have pitbulls on the list
- Pitbulls should not be singled out...this doesn't make any sense as a bylaw. It is the owners responsibility to train all dog types and breeds



- Calgary should not have any breed specific legislation
- I strongly do not agree with BSL laws. I am strongly offended with the language surrounding 'pit bulls' as there are MANY varieties of other dogs that are deemed more aggressive in nature. I feel like the city of Calgary needs to do their research surrounding dog bite/aggressive breeds. I was once proud to live here for the inclusion of dogs as we are a progressive dog community... or so I thought. Shame on you.
- Owner training not just dog training! A lot of issues in dog parks are the owners not dealing with known issues or not paying attention to their dogs. I don't like breed specific wording. Many people don't actually know dog breeds and it creates an unfair and untrue stigma against the type of dog.
- Pitbulls have not done anything. Any mis behaving dogs should
- Breed specific by laws are wrong
- Do NOT make breed specific breed specific bylawsylaws. Just donr
- How about the city of Calgary worry about the owners and not the dogs. I'd rather have a pit bull covered neighborhood with 5 per house hold then an arrogant person owning a dog and training them to fight. Don't blame any breed for issues when each dog is born caring and loving. It's the owner whom raises the animal. Same as people of their raised like [removed] their gonna be a [removed] person.
- Dogs should not be euthanized
- Any dog can be dangerous, it depends on the owner and how the dog is raised. Pitbull are the most sweetest dogs and don't deserve to me discriminated. Little god like chihuahua are more aggressive and bite more then pit bulls.
- Punish the owners for bad behaviour not the animal
- Please provide training for the owners and public about ALL dogs as lack of training for dogs is an outcome of a dogs behaviour.
- Higher fines for races that are statistically more likely to do certain crimes. Since we're profiling dogs we may as we'll profile people aswell!
- I do not agree with any BSL for our city.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Poorly trained DOGS are. Stop targeting breeds and target poor ownership.
- Training should be obtained by any dog owner if the dog has no prior training. There should not be any discrimination based on the dog breed. Any responsible dog owner understands that individual dog require individual approach, as well as responsible dog ownership and appropriate training. This does not depend on a dog's breed. Any dog can be trained and cared for appropriately.
- It's not about the dog. It is about the owner. Yes training a dog that is high energy is good. but owners who take in dogs that are more likely to be aggressive should have to go through training so we KNOW these people can properly handle these animals. In the right hands these dogs are not vicious. What about small dogs that are aggressive? why don't they have to be muzzled or trained?
- I strongly disapprove of the emphasis on Pitbulls, even with the explanation provided. This question ceetes a strong bias and fear to those not familiar with dog breeds and cannot provide objectional data.



- There are no bad dogs, just bad owners. It's ridiculous that you are so obsessed with pit bulls, instead of trying to punish bad dog owners.
- Why are all these questions specific to the pit bull breed when others have the same opportunity to harm? I acknowledge the strong bite comment however the way this is written automatically creates a bias and insinuates they are the only dogs likely to behave in this manner. Also, is there's scientific evidence the bite is stronger than other dogs of similar size? If so can that be at least referenced here?
- None of the above - especially not in support of your "pitbull" designations, considering that it's stated above they don't bite any more than other dog breeds. This just serves to vilify and demonize an entire dog type.
- It shouldn't be breed specific, it is mainly how an animal is raised by their owner not the breed.
- Don't target pit bulls because they look scary. Target the owners that abuse their dogs and Don't take time to socialize and love Their animals
- Since there was no comment space allowed for this question, I am extremely disappointed for the City of Calgary to even consider Breed Specific Legislation. The city should be focusing more on responsible dog ownership (of all breeds) as opposed to BSL which has absolutely no evidence of decreasing the number or severity of dog bites.
- Who's the Karen who came up with this attack on pitbulls?
- Absolutely NO SUPPORT for breed specific legislation.
- German shepherds have a stronger bite force then a Pitbull. They are more aggressive then Pitbulls. I would like to see this changed, and Pitbulls removes from the list.
- Stop singling out pit bulls. This is complete [removed]
- this is [removed], every pitbull I've ever met has been a sweet dog. I know breeders. Get the police harnessed and leashed and fined for breaking human rights codes.
- How about training of the owners on proper responsibility of owning a pet and what they need to do. As well labeling one specific breed of animal as dangerous is no different than saying one specific group of individuals is dangerous. Each dog is different and should not be categorized as dangerous because a few incidents happen.
- Remove the breed discrimination. Any dog that bites should have to stay on the owners property for a bit. Not just pitbulls or "bull breeds".
- No higher fines or limitations based off a specific breed. Ridiculous assumption.
- Please don't discriminate towards these animals, I think this is the worst idea for a bylaw and I don't even own a dog of the breed listed.
- I DO NOT AGREE WITH BSL!!
- [removed] pitbulls are not bad breed. Ban all poodles and small dogs they are the real [removed].
- Every bite even from a small animal needs to be reported to an online source. All dogs of breed and stature should be put under restrictions. No breed specific ruling should exist.
- Breed specific laws are prejudice and do not reduce dog bites. Any breed of dog can bite and cause damage. APBT doesnt even have the strongest bite strength, making this uninformed bylaw would be shameful and ridiculous.



- Pit bulls should not be targeted. Many breeds of dogs are dangerous and to specify pit bulls is incorrect
- Breed of dog shouldn't make a difference for anything. All breeds should be treated equally. Many breeds of dogs not listed have much stronger bites than pitbulls. Many breeds are much more powerful in every aspect of their being, compared to pitbulls. City needs to re examine the science before making biased laws and rules
- Nothing leave pitbulls alone
- As someone who owns a staffy, she is not at all a nuisance breed. There is no such thing as a nuisance breed and a city supporting breed specific discrimination is disgusting. My dog is better behaved and less aggressive and less of a nuisance than a yappy chihuahua, shizhu etc. Give your head a shake Calgary. IF there is a nuisance dog or a dangerous dog, then by all means increase fines, make thorough training mandatory but it in no way involves specific breeds!!
- No breed specific bylaws
- Rottweilers are worse then pitbulls
- Please stop singling out pitbull and bully type breeds of dogs. Dogs behave based on owner's and it should not matter if it is a 5lb dog or 100lb dog causing the nuisance. "Stories of bullies' super-strong jaws might make great horror film fodder, but science doesn't support them. Research conducted by Dr. I. Lehr Brisbin at the University of Georgia shows that bully breeds don't show any mechanical or morphological differences in jaw structure when compared to other dogs -- nor do their jaws come equipped with locking capabilities. To explore the question of jaw strength, a 2005 National Geographic study measured force of bite for several creatures as pounds of bite pressure. On average, dogs exhibited about 320 pounds of pressure, while humans came in at 120 pounds and great white sharks at 600. The study also included a simulated bite sleeve test with a German shepherd, a Rottweiler and an American pit bull terrier. The pit bull actually registered the least amount pressure among the group, despite rumors that bully breeds can clamp down with an alarming 1600 pounds of force." Animal Planet.
- Nuisance dogs or pit bulls should just treat as other dogs, they are no different than other breed that harm people too.
- Pit bull dogs should NOT be singled out. There are no bad dog breeds, there are bad owners. Pit bulls are more likely to be euthanized because of the stigma around them. Innocent dogs and good dogs shouldn't be blamed for bad owners in the past. There are many different breeds of dogs that have a stronger bite and are more aggressive. Where are the scientific proven facts against these certain types of dogs. They shouldn't be singled out if they have responsible owners.
- Are you guys serious? Pit bulls? Chihuahuas are more aggressive than the average pitbull. Maybe you should be focusing more on tracking down the people that steal them from peoples yards and use them for fighting. This is despicable. Shame on you.
- Stop with the "pit bull" foolishness. The problem dogs often come from problem owners. Pit bulls are certainly not stronger or more difficult to control than any other dog equal or greater in size. You are falling for the Media hype, get your facts straight. Do an accurate and unbiased tally of complaints based on actual dog breeds and facts.



- Any breed discrimination is disgusting and I am ashamed to live in a city considering upholding these antiquated and uneducated standards. Any animal can bite and many breeds do the same amount of damage.
- Breed specific is archaic and not necessary. Also there should be a difference between nuisance dogs and potentially dangerous dogs. Aggressive would be a better term. You shouldn't lump a noise violation or roaming kind calm dog in as nuisance needing more insurance or muzzle. A high risk dog that is aggressive definitely should be. This should not be breed specific, Rottweiler, German shepherds etc are also dangerous.
- fewer off leash areas. Off leash areas should ALL be fenced. The city should put more signs up at playgrounds indicating that dogs are not allowed.
- This entire question cannot be answered due to the predetermination of a specific breed type being assumed as a problem.
- Pit bulls are STILL caring, amazing animals. It's the owners fault for training them badly, and it's also peoples fault for being nuisances to pit bulls! If a pit bull is attacked, don't allow any repercussions on the dog itself. If a dog owner is not capable of training a pit bull, they should not have any animals in general. If a dog bites someone, it is very much so the owners or the person who was bit faults. Leave the poor dogs alone. If any animal is trained wrongly or whatnot, take the dog and give it to someone who can properly retrain and help those dogs live their best lives. If a dog is taken away from an owner, DONT PUT IT DOWN. Thats not fair to the dogs, they don't know what is right or wrong if they aren't trained properly. Ensure the owners of said dogs are not allowed to have any sort of animal in their possession ever again. Leave pit bulls ALONE.
- All kinds improvements can and should be made, but please do not introduce any breed specific legislation. It is generally not based on good science, it has not been effective in other jurisdiction, and causes far more harm than it prevents.
- Pitbulls bite is not harder or stronger than dogs of similar size. The used definition of pitbull in this survey is also inaccurate. To require additional insurance based off of breed is ridiculous. That's the equivalent of saying everyone named Joe and Sam need to pay more for their cars because they're names Joe and Sam. All dogs should go through obedience training regardless of breed.
- ITS NOT THE DOG, ITS THE HUMAN
- Stop my [removed] neighbour from being an utter [removed] about my dog just because I wouldn't [removed] her.
- Create accountability for owners. Please cite your sources about bites! Your breed specific legislation is disgusting and I don't support this! Punish and hold terrible owners instead of assuming a breed is bad.
- If a dog is declared a nuisance because of barking, I do not agree to muzzle them. They are usually barking because they are under stress (being left alone (in the house or outside for too long), being teased, etc. Putting a muzzle on them is only going to stress them more
- Do not target or ban pit bulls or dogs that resemble pit bull like characteristics. As a dog groomer, the breed has nothing to do with how they behave. Their owners and training have the most impact.



- I would love for the city of Calgary to define what exactly a "pit bull" is? BSL leads to a whole other rabbit hole of issue - and it's unfair to discriminate against one specific breed when it should be all dogs under the same microscope period.
- Why is it the dog is being mad the issue? A 'bad' dog is mainly the result of an irresponsible owner. Taking any attack by any animal out of context minimizes the impact such an owner has on the conduct of the animal. Making training mandatory may be a step but this should also be subsidized so as not to exclude any one.
- Pitbull is not a breed, I'm actually very disappointed with this!
- Targeting Pitbulls is unnecessary and wrong. German Shepherdd and other breeds have stringer bite forces and aggression is NOT a breed specific trait.
- Nothing, I don't think being breed specific is fair. Consider most of the incidents at dog parks are started by untrained dogs and bad owners.
- It has been proven in other jurisdictions That breed specific legislation doesn't work, and shouldn't be supported. Nuisance is nuisance weather the dog is large or small. Only wording that treats all breeds equally should be supported.
- By leaving it open to "appearance" of a pitbull type dog, innocent dogs will be unfairly restricted. Muzzling a dog at an off leash park makes it insecure and a target for other dogs. If someone has a reactive or nuisance dog, they should not be off leash, but we SHOULD NOT make bully breeds or visible bully looking dogs the target of our own ignorance and un justified fear. I have been bit by so many chihuahua size dogs or collie types in my life, but never a pittie. Put more effort into regulating dog breeding, dog fighting, backyard breeders, animal cruelty, and neglectful homes. NO to targetting bullies and pitties. YES to ending cruelty and ending backyard, warehouse, imported mass breeding from facilities.
- A pit bull is no different than a German Shepard or a little Yorkie. Its about how you train your dog. I have only encountered 1 pittie mix that was horrible, but you can tell the owners do nothing with the poor thing. Calling out pitbulls is rude, its the owners that should be charged and dealt with ie, dog taken away after so many offenses. Again, I have had more issues with boxers, little yappy mutts and german Shepards than I have with a pit bull. Fine the owners not punish the dog over and over.
- All dogs must the treated equally. Nuisance dogs is very vague what does it include all. Barking is a irritant and classifying it as a nuisance is a issue. As excessive barking is a problem where as barking once in a while can be "classified" as a nuisance is unfair.
- I do not support breed specific bilaws
- who came up with the attached breeds to pitbull, who came up with pitbull being problematic, staffordshire bull terriers are classed as a nanny dog . Also here is the top hardest biters, you will find a few ahead of said bad pitbulls. Kangal – 743 PSI. Cane Corso – 700 PSI. Dogue de Bordeaux – 556 PSI. American Bulldog – 305 PSI. Doberman – 245 PSI. German Shepherd Dog – 238 PSI. American Pitbull – 235 PSI. There is actually no bad dog, just bad owners, introduce a class training for all owners
- No breed of dog is anymore capable of biting then another. Stop breed discrimination, and start targeting irresponsible owners instead.



- how about the owners need training instead of the poor animal. Not the dogs fault if the owner is Irresponsible. Kinda like how angry people have to take anger management
- This is insanely discriminatory. Pit bulls are neither the strongest nor most aggressive dogs. This is unreal.
- I don't support breed specific laws or language
- All dogs no matter the breed can be aggressive! I have personally been bitten chased or had more run ins with aggressive behaviours from smaller terrier breeds, Yorkeies chihuahua's ect... I have had nothing but good experiences with all bully breeds these dogs should not need to wear a muzzle in public as it causes a bigger stereotype which is unnecessary
- I don't think that labelling pitbull type dogs is necessary. Should be applicable to any types.
- You've already admitted that the bully breeds are not involved in more incidents than other breeds. Focus on the individual animals and their owners not the breed or appearance of the dog. This is a discriminatory proposal.
- Limit the number of dogs owned by someone with a prior nuisance dog. It isn't the dog's fault but the owners
- These are horrible suggestions I don't have a pit bull but frankly it's offensive
- No breed specific rules
- There should not be pit bull specific laws. I will not entertain questions about breed specific offences.
- Breed discrimination should not be tolerated here in Calgary and owners should all be held with the same responsibility regardless of the dogs breed.
- Higher fines for any dog involved in bylaw offences
- Owners are required to take city approved education on responsible pet ownership.
- While pit bull type dogs are capable of doing more damage than smaller dogs, there are still many larger dogs capable of similar harm. I strongly believe that targeting behaviours and irresponsible owners is a much more effective plan than targeting dogs that resemble a "pit bull" category.
- Obedience training required for ALL dogs.
- I am absolutely appalled that the City of Calgary is thinking of BSL! "Pitbulls" are the most nurturing breed out there. I moved from Ontario when they implemented BSL. We are better than that. I think any owner who has an aggressive dog, regardless of the breed should be required to take training. Notice I say owner. I firmly believe all pet owners should be educated on the animal and breed they own. I have a fear aggressive "Pitbull" mix. Why is she fear aggressive? Because humans are the worst breed. She was abused and used for breeding, then thrown out. That said I am a conscious owner who does not take her to dog parks, she is always on leash, I have a caution badge on her leash, and wear a yellow ribbon tied to her leash to clearly identify her and warn the public. She has a muzzle which I take with me in case we come to a crowd area, which I avoid for HER safety. What you really need is more education on how to approach dogs, and how bully breeds are not aggressive breeds. They also are not the only dogs who have a "strong" bite. German Shepherds are equivalent ... and are used by the police, brought to schools by police for education purposes, etc. Sorry as you can tell I have strong feeling on BSL. It's racism. Flat out. People fear things they do not understand, so rather than punish innocent animals, let's educate humans. Clearly the fact



that this is being surveyed means education is clearly required. Fyi, if BSL laws go in place in Calgary, I will be moving again, and know I am not alone in this thought.

- Pitbulls should NOT be singled out. Bad owners should be singled out. The poorest owner behaviour I have experienced is in owners of small dogs, who do not monitor their dog's behaviour, socialize them properly, or engage in any training simply because they are small. I was bit by one at a dog park and the owner made excuses and laughed it off.
- Pro active follow up to ensure owners have access to proper containment, vetting and training for nuisance or potentially dangerous dogs
- Owners have to be somehow certified or deemed inept enough to own "nuisance" or pitbull breeds. as not all dogs are bad, some are due to owners, previous owners and abuse.
- The notion that a bull terrier bite is stronger than other breeds has long been debunked. <http://www.animalplanet.com/pets/3-bully-breeds-have-a-stronger-bite-than-any-other-dog/>
- No Breed Specific Legislation. Deal with the bad owners. Focus on problems in dog parks.
- Owner required to take training on how to handle the dog
- All dogs (any breed) and their caregivers should be required to pass basic obedience class. Public need to pass tests to drive a car, seems reasonable to also pass to care for a dog properly.
- huge fines for not cleaning up after dogs
- IT'S NOT THE DOG THAT IS THE PROBLEM, IT'S HOW THE OWNER TREATS THE DOG AND TRAINS THE DOG! IT'S NEVER THE DOG'S FAULT, ALWAYS THE OWNER WHO SHOULD BE PENALIZED NOT THE DOG
- This is stupidly specified towards pit bulls. There is NO evidence that supports your claim that "a pit bulls strength allows for a stronger bite". Absolutely FALSE.
- Treat all dogs as a case by case basis and not on their breed
- Small aggressive breeds (chihuahuas, Jack Russel terriers, shih Tzu, Maltese, etc) be considered on this survey instead of pitbulls as they actually have higher instances of bites, particularly in regards to children.
- Fines and additional insurance required for negligent owners. Or proof of having taken a basic handling/obedience course with dog upon seeking registration.
- You cant discriminate against ONE dog breed. There are all types of dogs that have "more strength" as you put it.
- It's not the pitbull it's the owner. The owner should be fined if they are not trained proper
- Making bylaws based upon the available facts. Pitbull are no more dangerous than any other breed if trained properly. This all bylaws should apply to all breeds and should not be breed specific
- Nuisance declaration how? By breed? No way. Like, NO WAY! A declaration based on investigated complaints with a way to appeal the decision... that makes sense.
- Any large dog has enough strength to inflict a serious bite. Completely unfair to tailor the by laws a target a certain breed or breeds!!!!
- HOW DARE YOU DISCRIMINATE AGAINST A BREED YOU DEEM A NUISANCE.



- Pit bulls aren't the issue, their owners are! My cousin owns 2 and they wouldn't hurt a fly, I know a pug more vicious then they are! Stop punishing a breed that can be sweet when loved, nurtured and trained properly
- My issue with this is that the City should be looking at WHO is the owner of the dog and WHO is the dog surrounded by. A fair amount of people that own dogs are NOT GREAT OWNERS. They do not properly take care of the animal and the animal acts in response. A dog is like a child they view from the environment they are surrounded by, it would be completely stupid and foolish to ignore this fact. If someone can't take care of an animal they should not be allowed to own a animal and should have a BAN on them to prevent them from buying more animals till they are committed. Dog owners neglecting and failing to provide basic necessities for a living creature should be BANNED and the dog should be taken immediately with hopes that a more deserving family/individual will take in the dog before its too late of age. Its a responsibility so make the punishments and warnings big enough that people understand it isn't just for fun and games. PS targetting pitbulls in this is also not fair, most of the pitbull cases came with poor ownership. Stop bad ownership = less offences.
- None
- Is this a Joke? What about german sheppards bite strengths? This is pathetic you guys should be ashamed to even suggest this.
- This portion of the bylaw is based off of a ridiculous pre-conceived notion that pit-bulls and cross breeds of them are inheritly aggressive. From a quick google reference there are multiple "aggressive breeds" of dogs. You can see multiple videos on social media of "vicious" dogs who have been mistreated or neglected by owners. Pit bulls should not be labelled as aggressive. Its the same as naming everyone in Forest Lawn poor or lower class. You can't label a breed of dog based on a poor ownership and poor training. I've been bitten by a Sheepdog in the past but I don't want to muzzle all dogs. My friends German Shepherd got attacked just a few days ago by a Rottweiler cross. This doesn't make me want to muzzle all dogs that I've seen be aggressive. I would of hoped that the city officials I voted for were better than falling into the fear portrayed by the media.
- You only specified pit bulls because of their perceived bite strength when in fact German shepherds bite is stronger. Do your research. That is here say. Breed MUST be excluded when looking at this.
- Do not make any by-laws breed specific. The strongest recorded bite in albert a was a CPS K9 German shepherd. Make obedience training/education part of licensing and mandatory if there are independents of aggression or nuisance behavior.
- Nothing. All of those are terrible
- Increased investment into location services for reported dog bites where owners have no been identified
- If you can't discriminate people then you can't with dogs. Pitbull are some of the sweetest dogs out there. Aggression in ANY breed falls back on the owner. With improper training. NOT THE DOG.
- This is bullying against pitbulls as a breed. It has everything to do with irresponsible owners. Not the dogs. They have better temperaments than small dogs. My dog is bitten regularly by little dogs at off leash dog parks. Do they get size specific fines or legislation? No. Their bite still hurts and their owner's attitudes are sometimes worse than their dogs.



- pit bulls should be declassified as they are not more dangerous than other dogs. Obedience training should only be supported if it is 100% force free and fear free and doesn't include use of any aversives.
- There should be no breed specific language here. This information is not true, and there is no scientific proof that there is. please remove breed specific language. You are making the problem worse by using such language. We need to be breed neutral! I know of more "aggressive" dogs that were 8lbs than of your "pit bulls". Calgary use to be a world leader in animal control legislation in the early 2000s lets get back to that please.
- No change is needed as they are NOT a dangerous breed (pitbulls)
- Don't you dare pick on pit bulls. Our responsible pet ownership bylaw is JUST FINE. You are basically being racist to a BREED OF DOG. There are PLENTY of dogs with strength. This bylaw NEEDS TO STAY NEUTRAL in terms of breed. Sure. Strengthen the dogs deemed a nuisance. But leave "dog race" out of this. Unbelievable that the pit bull part is added in here. It's 2020 for crying out loud. Pull your heads out of the sky.
- All of these are complete jokes. If you don't want to get bit by a dog, don't bother them. Learn the warning signs they give (because they always give them) and don't attack pit bulls for being pit bulls. I am so disgusted in Calgary for even bringing this idea up. Do your own research about pit bulls before trying to spread fear and paranoia about a LOVING kind of dog that is known for being friendly. Shame on Calgary. I have lost respect for this city just by the idea. Do what is right and don't shame a dog just for existing.
- I think the fact that section 3 is targeting pit bull-type dogs is absolutely ridiculous. It is scientific fact that German Sheppards have a stronger bite than pit bulls, and yet pit bulls are singled out for the following reason "the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." Really disappointed that the city would use our tax payer money to come up with such breed specific legislation tactics.
- Stricter requirements on the owners to support their ability to properly care and understand the dog rather than punishing the dog
- This is disgusting. Shame on the City of Calgary. Such a waste of taxpayer time and money.
- Leave pit pulls alone, they are great dogs. Y'all just mean.
- I don't think pit bulls should be singled out.
- Ban breeds doesn't solve the issue. The issue is bad owners there is proof it hasn't worked in other areas why even consider breed specific here. How about fines for people walking dogs off leash in off leash areas. The amount of times I've stopped a dog fight or broken up one in my neighborhood of various breeds is crazy all because a dog is offleash in area it shouldn't be.
- I think it's unfair to focus specifically on pitbulls your investigation should be based on data and not urban lore
- Higher fines for any pet owner with a dog off leash.
- Pit bulls are muscular dogs yes, but Rottweilers actually have a stronger bite than a pit bull. To categorise or single out a dog based on breed or because the way a dog looks is ridiculous. All dogs can be dangerous. There needs to be education programs for owners so they understand the breed



they have and can give the animal the proper training and socialisation it needs. Most bites associated with pit bulls are incorrectly labeled that way. Most people can't even pick a pit bull out of a line up of dogs that look similar. Instead of focusing so much on controlling specific breeds the focus should be spent more on education on those breeds. You want to muzzle something, muzzle a chihuahua.

- I find the focus on "pitbulls" and other pitbull like dogs, despite all of the overwhelming expert and scientific evidence to the contrary to be extremely regressive, unscientific and, frankly, to be incredibly offensive. I've personally seen too many cases of dogs of non-"pitbull type" breeds chasing, biting/attacking, or otherwise causing injury/distress to humans or other animals go unenforced by bylaw. It would be better for public safety if the City would focus on enforcing their own bylaws consistently and truly objectively, rather than (as would be the case in many of the above suggestions) unfairly punish and target responsible pet owners and well behaved dogs strictly based on appearance, in order to satisfy an uneducated but loud minority.
- I wouldn't bring specific species into play. Leave it alone
- I am so disappointed that the City of Calgary is singling out bully breeds in this survey. I have been so proud of our current bylaws that target responsible pet ownership and not singling out certain breeds. A bullies bite is no stronger than other large breeds. You might want to do better research. Irresponsible owners should be fined based on the dogs behavior versus breed. I hope that common sense is used in the developing of our bylaw changes and that certain breeds are not singled out. Fines and consequences need to be in place for vicious dogs based on their actions not based on breed. DO NOT create Breed Specific bylaws.
- Identifying these dogs as nuisance is irresistible, Husky and Poodles bite far more people annually. These laws are punishing the dog, not the owners.
- If there are no increases in pit bull incidents why is it even being mentioned? Time to break the stigma!
- I'm not sure I understand the term "nuisance dogs". What dictates a "nuisance dog"?
- Please don't single out pit bulls. Any large dog can have a strong bite.
- I am strongly against breed specific rules.
- Send owners for training. Dogs are not the problem, their owners behaviours are. Remove the dogs from the owner but provide them with positive reinforcement training. Ban the owners from having other dogs.
- Pit Bulls are not the problem- it's the owners. And that applies to EVERY & ANY breed
- I can see limiting pets to an extent- like no more than 10 adult dogs in a household to prevent extreme cases but I do NOT support someone specifying that a person can only have one pitbull. To me, that is unforgivable. Then people should be told they can only have one child in a household. That is how ridiculous this is. I am EXTREMELY against breed specific legislation. It is not based on facts. It should be specified to certain behaviours presented by ANY dog no matter what the breed. I want the word pitbull taken out of this completely. It is not backed by research and is supporting stereotypes and stigmatization of the breed. Which is ethically and morally wrong. I would suggest



education being provided to the citizens of Calgary regarding dog behaviour and a statement being released that this was an inappropriate suggestion.

- There are many dangerous dog breeds, and singling out pitbulls doesn't help the bad rap they already have.
- dogs declared a nuisance for biting a person the owners should be required to enroll their dog in obedience training and the owners should attend educational training. Dog behavior is ALWAYS the responsibility of the owner not the dog.
- Make proper training of dogs mandatory for ALL dogs regardless of size. Stop breed specific discrimination. Ban/fine use of extended leashes they are dangerous. Leashes should not be allowed to be more than 6ft long. Any person more than 6ft from their dog does not have control over their dog.
- Nothing
- this should apply to all breeds, not just pit bull type dogs. Just because their bite is documented to be more harmful does not mean that the particular dog is looking for someone/something to bite. I work in the veterinary industry and do place judgements on certain breeds because certainly those stereotypes exist, but it does not mean a chihuahua or dacschund gets to go around biting and being a "nuisance" yet a larger breed dog gets punished for a minor offence. Education is the best prevention. Educating current and future pet owners is our best defence in the prevention of these cases. In addition, responsible dog owners do not want to have their pet get into any altercation with another dog or human and naturally would not put themselves at risk. I walk my dog on a leash (non-retractable) at all times, and do not go to dog parks.
- Not the breed!! The owners!!
- *There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household
- *Positive* (not old fashioned Caesar Milan style) training for nuisance dogs and owners should be required.
- Shame on you calgary Super disappointed in breed specific Language. I have 2 pitbulls and they are better behaved and better trained than most dogs at the dog park or in public.
- If dogs and their owners are required to obtain obedience training because they have been deemed a nuisance (based on aggressive behaviour, not barking/at large), there should be some financial aid in this. I'm not saying it should be free, but there should be some help. I think that would set more people up for success.
- Not all Pitbulls or pitbull mix dogs are bad. You can't stereotype a dog. I say if the dog has a history that's one thing, but my pitbull mix is the most kind and gentle soul and I would never ever muzzle him in public. They shouldn't be restricted on where they can go in the city or anything like that. It's in a way cruel to muzzle a well behaved dog because of its appearance.
- Leave put bulls out of it. Treat case by case owner by owner . This is just disappointing.
- please DO NOT support any kind of BSL (Breed specific legislation)!!! Putbulls are NOT the problem, even if they are potentially considered larger and stronger than other dogs. The onus for care and protection from incidents lies with the OWNER not the BREED.



- The fact that this antiquated idea of 'pit bulls' being more more dangerous bis even being raised here is so frustrating. I do not know why government, at all levels, is so against research! Talk to people who know the facts and propose bylaws based on that. This BSL even being mentioned is an embarrassment to the city of Calgary.
- This is an absolutely ridiculous claim
- pitbulls are NOT the problem
- Ban of pitbulls in the city
- 2 strike rule for vicious dogs biting needing to be apprehended and or euthanized at a cost to the owner.
- None! Any dog could bite! Why are you targeting pit bulls?! More needs to be done when someone trespasses and startles a dog. Pit bulls are loving dogs. It's not the dogs it's the owners that are the problem and the lack of training people give their dogs.
- NO BREED DISCRIMINATION LAWS! They don't do anything but punish good dog because they have [removed] owners.
- Hold small dog owners accountable
- There should be evidence provided by both parties to varify claims. Eliminate here-say. I was once a victim of a nuisance human calling bylaw on my dog out of spite. I was ticketed because this person lied.
- Increase education for dog owners, regulate dog trainers in this city so that people who train with methods proven to have aggressive side effects can not operate. Many issues would be resolved if people had to apply for a licence to own a dog that involves mandatory education on non-confrontational training methods. Shock collars, prong collars and choke chains are the reason behind many causes of aggression towards people - there should be fines for people who use these "tools" on dogs because it is a public safety issue to create a ticking time bomb in a dog who's being shocked or choked into compliance.
- I do not support breed specific legislation. Its the humans that are the problem not the dog!!!
- I find this highly tone deaf to be singling out Pit Bulls
- Anything that hold the owner accountable for not properly training their dog, its the owners fault the dog is not properly trained not the dogs
- Mandatory Training for dog owners who cannot control their pet. This is usually the reason the dog becomes a nuisance.
- How can you define this? I've met more nuisance Chihuahua's in my life and large breed. And breed has nothing to do with whether a dog is prone to be a nuisance or not. Additionally PITBULLS ARE DOGS - no different strength or severity of bite than any other dogs. GET SOME EDUCATION!!!!
- Owner's have the ability to surrender a dog, at no cost, if they are declared as exhibiting dangerous behavior
- Breed specific legislation or rules are equivalent to the racial profiling people! A specific race is more statistically likely to be charged with a specific crime, so would we start putting laws and rules in place to punish all members of that race?! The thought of doing so should be abhorrent in our



society, yet the city of calgary is considering applying this same logic to dog breeds? [removed] Calgary?! Focus on the human owners not the breed. Think, don't react.

- Please do not enact BSL. It's rooted in racism and classism, and will not solve any real problems. Rotties, dobermans, german shepherds: we demonize one breed after the other instead of providing affordable education on dog training. When you ban a breed you punish innocent dogs and pet owners, and marginalized communities just move on to a new favourite breed.
- As a pit bull owner, I think it is unfair to single this breed out. If there is an issue with a certain pit bull it should be on the owner. We have spent many hours learning our dogs behaviour and can anticipate his reactions. We (owners) have both had infectious bites from smaller dogs who's owners take them to dog parks and don't pay attention to what they are doing. However because they are small dogs the owners feel like there is no issue. Perhaps having dog parks with fenced areas for large dogs would be helpful instead of only allowing small breeds. It's the small dog owners who are careless. Yes Pitbulls have strong bites but they are also very communicative dogs who respond to other dog cues. If there were bylaws that addressed the "Pitbull" breeds only that is completely unfair. "Bad" dogs are the result of bad owners, how about a bylaw that holds owners responsible.
- Pit bulls are not dangerous dogs, this law would be terrible! Dogs that bite should be treated equally no matter the breed!
- Pit bulls cannot be off-leash on the public streets
- Stop specifying pitbulls as if they are a separate problem
- Confiscate vicious dogs and put in shelters
- Laning a type of dog isnt going to solve any issues...punish bad owners not bad dogs. I am a dog professional and I have been bitten by more shih tzu and chihuahuas than anything....bad owners need to be responsible.
- Ensure and highly fine the small dogs that chase and bite where the owners take no responsibility, and city won't enforce fines
- Eliminate differentiation based on breed.
- Owners who do not train or are able to handle their dog should be restricted from owning another dog for a period of time.
- Pitbulls rank #3 for strength of bite. In no way should anything regarding a pitbull be passed. A golden retriever attacks more then a pitbull as well.
- This has absolutely nothing to do with "pit bulls" and everything to do with the owner. I have 2 Cane Corsos and a Boerboel, and they have never bitten a person or another dog. They have however been bitten by Golden Retrievers, black labs, Shitzus, chihuahuas, etc. Not once have they ever bitten back. You should maybe look a little harder at the percentage of dog bites by breed and rethink your questions.
- leave the pitbulls around. Stop excluding and singleing out breeds.
- Obedience training for all dogs. Dog discrimination is not the way to go, have everyone do it just like public education, a driving license, hunting license and so on.
- Put bulls are NOT the problem. If you have mandatory licensing to own a pet, you should have mandatory training to own one as well.



- All of the above is beyond ridiculous. We are not Toronto. I don't really care for pit bulls but the blatant hate for the breed or similar breeds is shameful
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. You state that it's because of the potential strength behind their bite, yet there are many other dogs with higher bite force that aren't included. I believe singling out pit bulls is ridiculous.
- No breed specific bylaws rather bylaws geared towards poor pet behaviours that are perpetuated or not rectified due to poor pet ownership.
- I don't agree with breed specific bylaws. We should be aiming for bylaws to target poor ownership and potentially make it mandatory for dogs to take meaningful obedience training regardless of breed.
- Replace the word nuisance with dangerous. Have vicious dogs or dogs with bad history's declared dangerous no matter the breed. Nuisance can be the tiny yappy toy poodle which really isn't all that dangerous. Obedience training for dog owners with dangerous dogs.
- Please don't discriminate by breed. There are some amazing bully breed owners and some real jerks who own other breeds.
- None of the above those sound stupid
- This is a (removed)t question. The breed isn't the problem, the [removed] owners of out of control dogs are.
- As a veterinarian, pit bull type dogs are not the issue. I have had more aggressive, ready to bite my face (and hold on) chihuahuas than PBT dogs. Strength should not matter. Training from a young age is key for ANY dog, the same goes for PBTs, so legislation should be towards aggressive dogs in general, not specific breeds.
- Stop discriminating specific breed, instead focus on general dogs behavior. Chihuahuas and miniature pinchers bite more often. Make bylaws that stop PEOPLE from abusing and cruel behaviors towards dogs and make sure those work.
- Pitbulls having a stronger bite is a myth, in fact it has been proven that a German shepherd has a stronger bite than a pitbull. Making any breed discriminating law goes against basic science. Forcing a dog to stay home who has been labelled a "nuisance" due to noise and other minor offences will only make the situation worse, as you have just removed their outlet for their energy (going on walks, parks, etc) The best thing the city can do is education on positive reinforcement training and counter conditioning, and banning force based training techniques that are scientifically proven to cause more harm.
- Obedience training for ALL breeds, not just pit bulls
- " pitbull" breeds should not be singled out! ALL nuisances dogs should be in same category regardless of breed. Owners responsible for their dog and the training. Bad dogs = bad owners
- To ensure that there are enough staff to enforce the rules
- No breed specific legislation ever! Anyone who is pushing it is an idiot that does not understand animals at all and if an animal is an issue it is the fault of the owner not the animal. Many people are too stupid to teach a dog not to bark and that is the easiest thing to teach any breed of dog! So if a dog barks at everything it is also likely trained nothing!



- [Removed] with any breed specific bylaws. THEY DO NOT WORK.
- Do not agree with any of these measures based on breed alone!
- All dogs that have attacked another dog or has bitten someone should be included in the Pit bull category - sounds discriminatory towards pit bulls. Also, obedience training should be required for all dogs in a dog park but too difficult to enforce.
- Required training for the owner of the dog. Dogs, regardless of breed are not bred to be a nuisance.... Dogs who exhibit this behavior do so by lack of training and/or discipline by the owner. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners.
- We/bylaw should never judge a dog based on it's appearance/breed.
- Stop profiling this breed
- I do not believe we should discriminate based on breed.
- This is frankly ludicrous. You acknowledge that pit bulls bite no more frequently than other breeds. In fact, research shows it is significantly less frequent than breeds like labs and retrievers. These are all extremely loaded questions. You're stirring up fear in the ignorant masses, invalidating the very reason for this survey. As a pit bull owner, I can tell you there are fabulous dogs. Kind, gentle, and loyal. Please do your research before stirring this kind of shit up. Bites and nuisance cases should be judged case by case, not by profiling the breed.
- Dogs with a history of aggressive behaviour must undergo training w out h an experienced behaviour modification trainer or behaviourist
- Regulate dog trainers and behaviourists so all trainers need credentials. Pit bulls are not a dangerous breed, all depends on the OWNERS.
- Provide subsidized training. I'm shocked Pit Bulls are being targeted in Calgary, this is a gross assumption of a breed that has a bad rap because of poor owners. The same could happen for ANY breed (husky's, for example). Do better.
- German Shepard's and Rottweilers have stronger bites than a pit bulls and have the potential to do just as much damage as any other. Breed specific legislation is not necessary or effective
- Pit bulls as a breed are not the issue. This ban or order does not work in other cities or provinces and is being reversed. Small breeds, shepherds, retrievers and chows are the highest seen dog fight/bite dogs in Canada not pit bulls. I would not support any bylaws that are breed specific and would sell my home and leave Calgary if the city implemented it as it does not work and punishes those who are good dog owners.
- Remove all pit bull wording in this section; it is not appropriate to have it here. Other breeds like German Shepards and Rottweilers have very similar bite strengths yet these breeds aren't included in this section.
- Dogs that are a nuisance should not be allowed at off leash parks AT ALL
- Please adjust this line of questioning to NOT BE AGAINST PITBULLS OR THE OTHER BULL BREEDS YOU HAVE SPECIFIED. Especially the Staffordshire Bull Terrier who you have ZERO data on about bites!! You need to have this ONLY be about ALL DOGS, because ALL DOGS can be a nuisance and ALL DOGS have the propensity to bite! It's been scientifically proven that a pitbulls bite is NOT the most powerful bite— yet you are only singling PITBULLS out. Mastiffs, Huskies,



German Shepard's, Cane Corsos, Doberman Pinscher's and Rottweilers ALL have a more powerful bite and are dangers to other dogs. STOP INSTILLING FEAR IN OTHERS ABOUT BULL BREEDS! You're moments away from a breed ban, and it's disgusting to single one breed out when others have been documented as being far more aggressive. Please reword this survey to include ALL DOGS! Stop singling out Bull Breeds! And Stop including Staffordshire Bull Terriers in the mix with PITBULLS. As a responsible owner of a Staffordshire Bull Terrier— who has NEVER bitten anything or caused a "nuisance" to others, it makes me angry that you include staffys in with what you depict vicious dogs to be... if you have ever seen one or been around one for 2 seconds you would never lump them in together. Period. Do your research and stop fear mongering. We are not Ontario. Breed fear and breed bans are in humane, they ruin families and they cause unnecessary trauma. I will NOT take part in a survey that promotes breed fear without cause, and will stand with others against you who feel the same.

- There are no bad dog breeds, only bad owners. Singling out "bully breeds" is unfair, and leads to animal abuse in the long term.
- This shouldn't be breed specific. Any nuisance dog should be dealt with the same way.
- BSL is absolute garbage! Shame on you for thinking penalizing a whole breed. We do not tolerate bigotry or racism in this city why do you believe it is appropriate to extend these values to canine companions and four legged family members. Next you'll ask for extra insurance for dogs larger than 50lbs or any male dogs. This is absolute garbage and narrow minded.
- The term "pitbull" or any such breed listed above should not be singled out. It is a proven fact that other dogs including German Sheppard's, Doberman breeds, and Chow Chow breeds have the same biting force as "pit bulls". Putting this type of negative impact of bully breed owners will create an overall negative view on how Calgary is seen. It shows poor judgement and creates a fear based mentality.
- It should be noted that it is not usually a specific breed of dog that becomes a nuisance or harmful but the way in which they were trained. More training for OWNERS and their pets should be regulated and more easily accessible.
- I absolutely do not support pit bulls being singled out and denied access to off leash dog parks. In my experience, aggressive dogs come in all shapes and sizes. I work in several Calgary Emergency Departments, and I have seen more dog bites from German Shepards, Labrador Retrievers and small breed dogs. Denying access to owners of pit bulls and pit bull type breeds is atrocious. Obedience classes should be mandatory for all dogs not just the breeds you deem necessary.
- the real issue here is not the DOG. It has never been the dog. You should be focusing more on the ownership and owner of the dog. Often dogs who are a nuisance is because they're just not being properly watched and trained by their OWNER! As a city we should focus less on the typing of 'problem' dogs and more on the owners responsibility to that dog.
- breed specific language is [removed] its not the breed its the owners
- It is very disappointing that the city of Calgary would target a specific breed this way. "Pitbulls" are no more or less likely to engage in nuisance behaviors than any other dog. It is NOT the breed's fault. It is the owners lack of care that leads to an aggressive dog, not the dog breed itself. You



should be ashamed of yourselves even bringing this to the table. No dog is born aggressive and aggression is not based on breed. Using the excuse of their strength is unfair and I've encountered more aggressive dogs in my time that aren't "pitbulls" than ones that do fall under this category. Please do some serious research and watch some Cesar Milan before taking this further.

- I think the bylaws we have currently are enough. Penalizing dogs for being of a certain breed or owners for having a certain breed is ridiculous and is equivalent to racism..
- Obedience course and dog ownership license program
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household
- Punish the owners not the dogs, its not the dogs fault it is the owners.
- STOP BREED BULLY THATS DISGUSTING BEHAVIOUR BY CITY OFFICIALS
- Do not single out pitbulls
- Breed specific is irrelevant. Only 1 nuisance dog per house hold
- Breed specific laws don't do anything. Owners should be given resources for training and education in regards to behaviour of ALL dogs.
- Pitbulls are a social media darling for targeting. Pit bull is not a specific breed nor any under this category are more prone to hurting people than other breeds. It is fully on a dog owner if their dog exhibits ongoing dangerous behaviours and is not the fault of breed.
- None, I cannot believe in this day and age that BSL is even on the table:(I also think that the owners should attend classes on to how to look after their dog if there is any incidents.
- Stop with the Breed Specific agenda and propose a bylaw for every breed of canine!
- Cane Corrsor should be included in this list. Also any pet considered a nuisance should have to wear a tag to let other pet owners know that the other pet is a potential danger.
- All dogs regardless of breed should do obedience training!
- No changes
- I feel we need to look more at small aggressive dogs - my dog is regularly lunged at by shitzus, cockpits, daschunds, and chihuahuas. The sweetest dogs we meet are those listed above.
- All dogs biting or not trained should have the same rules. At off leashes it's been German Shepard's attacking or bullying my dog, min pin biting my kid and a shitzu, recently a chocolate lab at large attacked my dog on leash over and over and I couldnt stop the attack. Those dogs and mainly those owners should be held accountable. No breed specific. That's lack of education thinking its breed specific
- Obedience training for ALL dogs
- Owners with a criminal history cannot own pitbulls
- Stop worrying about pitbulls and do something about the chihuahuas! I've been bitten/ attacked more by small dogs than any "pitbull" or nuisance dogs. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners, why must you perpetuate this stereotype of pitbulls being bad dogs??
- Regulations on dog trainers to reduce occurrence of behaviour suppressing techniques (eg. Punishment)
- Higher fines & more enforcement for people not stopping their dogs from fighting at off leash parks.



- The information about pitbul bites is a myth . No extra legislation around them is necessary . Its not supported by science and is a biased sterotype. Chihuahas ans other small dogs are more aggressive.
- Pit bulls should not be discriminated against. There are many breeds that have potential for a more severe injury or bite. The stereotype around pit bulls does more harm than good, empowering other dog breed owners to neglect training and feel superior.
- It is a step backwards to introduce bylaws targeting specific breeds or breed look-alikes. Each animal is an independently thinking and behaving animal and biased treatment should not be considered to breeds as a whole, rather on a case by case basis with specific dogs.
- It is not the dogs fault, none of these should be put in place. It is the owner who is responsible, dogs get punished for terrible owners. Ban the owners from having a dog that is not trained.
- No bans should be put on a breed it is the owner's responsibility to train the dog. Put a ban on people who have priors of animal negligence and abuse not the breed of the dog
- It is incredibly inappropriate to classify pitbulls as an issue. They are innocent animals. I work in veterinary medicine, and it has been proven that they are not stronger biters. Do some research.
- I have seen more bites from other dogs mostly small than I have ever seen from a big dog pit bulls are not the problem any dog can bite its [remove] owners and lack of training services for all breeds
- Notice that I answered yes to nuisance dogs and no to all pit bull specific
- I've been bit by a lot of dogs and none have been pitbulls
- I'm frustrated to read that Pitbulls are the dogs of question. Even tho they may have stronger bite strength, it's not more than mastiffs, Rottweilers or even German Shepard's . You're pinning these dogs with more severe punishments than other breeds and that's ridiculous.
- Stop picking on certain dog breeds, if pit bulls are not the main cause of bites then why are you picking on them? This is a silly trend that needs to stop. Plus these other breeds listed are not pit bulls. Please treat every case individually as it should be. You need to look at how the owner responds to what is going on to determine further actions th me to be taken against any individual dog. Plus how would you regulate all the mixed breeds? Just because you say it looks like a bit bull doesn't mean it is! It's a very silly idea and would cause a lot of anxiety to responsible pet owners. Please do not implement such a dog breed specific law.
- This attack on pitbulls is garbage. Fine the crap out of the owner for misbehavior, don't penalize the dog or good pitbull owners. Stay away from fear and cancel culture.
- Stop discriminating against pit bulls. It's pathetic and not fair to generalize by looks or assumptions.
- pitbulls are not the problem! They're the least probability to bite with the right owner . Pit bulls are the most caring dogs I have owned or come into contact with .. the real problem is [remove] owners on untrained dogs . The fact that pit bulls are singled out in this is disgusting
- Could reward owners that pay for obedience training for nuisance dogs / pit bulls. le - reduce city registration fees by \$5 when you submit proof of obedience training completion.
- Its 2020, why are we making laws about dog breeds? It's the owners. As a dog owner, ALL dog owners need to be healed accountable REGARDLESS of breed. And for god sake, get stricter on your "off leash" by law on residential streets, because it's out of control out here.



- None of the above. You are unfairly targeting pit bulls
- No breed specific legislation. This is racism. They are not more dangerous than any other type of dog.
- Obedience training required for all dogs if you're willing to include specific breeds. There are no nuisance dogs, just nuisance owners. Don't punish the breed.
- Let's hold rescues accountable, rarely will a well bred dog ever cause a nuisance as mentioned above as their owners have dedicated their life to include them in their family's. Rescues although don't always ensure that. There is no temperament testing done on the pups they put up for sale or "adoption" as they like to call it. They create situations for puppy's to be put in family's that cannot handle the unpredictable temperament of a mutt. They post about their dogs saying their "pitbull" mix for adoption and people apply to adopt these dogs thinking that they can handle a pitbull. It's very likely that they can handle a pitbull, the problem is they can't handle a pitbull mix cause they can't prepare for the possible temperament of the dog as the true breed is unknown. So let's ensure rescues do as much as reputable breeders do in insuring they dogs are places with appropriate family's.
- THIS IS A COMPLETE VIOLATION OF MY RIGHTS TO OWN BULL BREEDS WITH NO BACKLASH FROM IFIOTS LIKE THE PERSON OR PEOPLE WHO HAVE DECIDED THAT THIS NEW LAW FOR OUR DOGS IS GOING FO BE ENFORCED. ILL FIGHT THIS ALL THE SAY TO COURT
- Only one nuisance dog per household
- DOg this dog that. Its never the dogs fault, its the irresponsible dog owners. Stop putting the blame on pit bulls, that's [removed]. Fine the people, they are the problem.
- No BSL - I believe these rules should apply to dog breeds. It's not dependent on the dog but rather the owners diligence!
- I think the bias towards the "bully" breeds is reprehensible, I deal with several dogs a day during work, and I have for many years. Breed specific legislation does not work.
- I am disappointed that you have included misinformation in this survey. It has been proven over and over again that pit bulls type dogs do not bite any harder than similar sized dogs. I own a large breed dog and he could bite just as hard or harder than a pit bull just due to his size.
- Temporary or Permanent bans on ownership for problem owners (multiple offences or more than one dog). Pit bulls aren't the problem, it's the newbie owners thinking they know how to handle a stubborn breed or careless, negligent and egotistical owners that cause problems. Would also like to see more enforcement on small dogs with aggression issues.
- Offer a discount for training at the humane society. Ensure these people get proper training for their dogs
- Pit bulls and similar breeds are being singled out. Smaller dogs like Jack Russells and Chihuahuas have a significantly higher bite ratio. My large breed dog (not a pit bull breed or terrier breed) has been bitten and attacked over a dozen times by these smaller breeds but because of my dog's size, it was never taken seriously. The same small dogs that attacked my own dogs, attacked BOTH of



my kids. The problem is not the big dogs, the problem is the dog owners of the smaller breeds that do NOT train their dogs appropriately.

- Fine people who antagonize other people's dog such as approaching and trying to pet dogs without permission. Dogs should not get into trouble when humans cause problems for them such as a human touching an unfamiliar reactive dog and thus leading the dog to nip/bite out of self defense.
- DO NOT STEREOTYPE PIT-BULLS. There should not be any specific rules or bylaws for pit-bulls, only for people who are not responsible dog owners.
- Case by case basis, if a dog is bad over and over again, then it wears a muzzle. You cannot lump a breed all together.
- DO NOT FOCUS ON PIT BULLS SO MUCH
- Mandatory training for both dog and owner of ANY breed of a declared nuisance dog.
- Look at ALL dog breeds not just bully breeds, please do more research instead of feeding off fears of a breed brought on by misinformation
- None as pitbulls shouldn't even be a issue or brought into this conversation. A non breed specific law should be in place or remain in place pitbulls is not even a breed. And they don't cause a threat. Chihuahuas attack more. Labs attack more Dalmatians attack more Jack Russells attack more. Stop creating fear. And spreading false facts to implement a bylaw.
- DONT BREED SHAME.
- Not all pit bull are nuisances
- Dog safety education at all dog parks or online education required when registering a dog. Ei , body language, how to prevent bites, how to interrupt a dog fight.
- Owners need to be held accountable, bully breeds should be more controlled so irresponsible owners cannot easily obtain a dog. There should be NO discrimination against pit bulls. Responsibility falls 100% on the owner
- Allow the animal to live at home with the owner until after the hearing. This is far too traumatic for an animal!
- Not fair to single any breed. All these will do is make sure the wrong people get those dogs and don't register them with the city.
- Pit bulls are not a problem. People who own dangerous dogs are the problem, no matter what breed it is. Dangerous dogs are people-made NOT born that way. Breed specific legislation has been shown not to work.
- Please do not single out one dog breed
- I believe all dog breeds should be held at the same levels. Not make specific rules for a specific breed. Owners should be facing more accountability than the animals as training is everything. If you even had a doubt in your mind that your dog could bite or harm another individual or animal, there is proper precautions to take and if not followed, the owner should pay for those actions. All breeds should be treated the same.
- strongly oppose breed specific legislation
- I feel the description of nuisance dogs given does not justify any of the recommendations here. I also feel that "pit bulls" do not require the separate treatment.



- Breed specific is so dumb and perpetuates fear of pit bull type dogs. Please stop it.
- Why are pit bulls being targeted? I've been attacked by a labradoodle and never had an issue with a pitbull. A breed shouldn't be targeted, bad dog owners should be targeted.
- Responsible pet ownership
- No more than one nuisance dog per household. I do not support breed-specific legislation. It is ineffective.
- Educate yourselves before trying to implement [removed] discriminatory protocols. This is not what I want my tax dollars spent on.
- I don't support any of these measures as you clearly have it out for Pitbulls, attacking a breed does nothing I have been bit by multiple dogs in Calgary biking and never once was it anything that looked like a Pitbull. Give your head a shake
- Provide resources or financial help to owners of nuisance dogs of any breed for obedience or training classes
- Higher fines for dog park offenders who let their dogs bite other dogs at the park. Sue Higgins is horrible for this
- How about obedience training required for ALL breeds.
- No breed judgement on specific breeds such as pit bulls. Please.
- repeat offenders (owners) should be subject demerits and only reduced over time and with formal education/courses
- Pitbulls or any breed should not be treated differently! No breed-specific legislation!!!
- Do not specify 'Pitbulls' for any reason. There are plenty of breeds that have a stronger bite. This should NOT be addressed or even an option. BSL is unfair.
- You clearly state that pit bull breeds don't have more bites than other breeds. Let's not penalize them because of an unfounded fear. How is that different than racial bias against different human races. I have rehabilitated many problem dogs, rarely pit bull breeds, and the biggest problem was other people trying to say that their dog was friendly and it was okay for their dog to run up to my difficult dog. That's far more irresponsible, in my opinion.
- Please remove breed specific legislation. It's dog racism
- It's not just a pit bull. It's poor socialization by owners. If dogs received proper training there would be no issue. Small dogs cause issues too
- STOP singling our specific breeds. I'm tired of this crap. Do you know what I see at dog parks? Breeds that are NOT pit bull type dogs getting into it with other dogs while their owners stand around talking and not controlling their animals. I'm sick of a specific breed being singled out. Just stop.
- Breed specific legislation is ridiculous. It amounts to racism amongst animals. Deal with problem dogs an owners, not blanket statements about breeds.
- If any of these rules are placed, pit-bull breeds SHOULD NOT be singled out and be the only breed included.
- Don't engage in breed specific legislation because it doesn't work. By placing this in the bylaw you will be encouraging people's irrational fear of pit bulls which will increase false reports. This harms



the dogs and owners. By perpetuating a stereotype your system will become overwhelmed. BSL doesn't work.

- Equal fines across the board regardless of breed.
- I don't think that pit pulls should be classified as a stronger dog than other dogs. Any dog can cause harm or damage to a person or other dog regardless of whether they are a pit bull type dog or not. Pit bulls should not be bullied. The owner of the dog should be held responsible for dog. Maybe a better back ground check or something to further determine if a person is mentally or even capable of owning a dog.
- I am very strongly opposed to any bylaw that involves breed discrimination as this is biased and prejudiced. Only breed-neutral, evidence-based legislation should be allowed as this is what will actually be effective for supporting the community.
- I don't support any of these. They are outrageous suggestions.
- Someone needs to take out these piece entirely. You guys have seen what ostracizing one breed does. Get informed.
- Nothing wrong with pittbulls, its the owners not the breed.
- stop singling out pitbulls because they are attractive to bad pet owners
- No BSL. Punish owners not dogs
- Breed specific legislation is absolutely ridiculous especially when the government says it classifies pit bulls as "any dog with the appearance of a pit bull breed".
- train the owners as well how to deal with a pitbull breed/aggressive breeds, often times its the owners that create aggression and problems with their dogs, its not the dogs fault, but how they are trained and handled. Cesar Millon type workshop.
- My daughter experienced a bite to her face requiring stitches from a dig off leash in a playground. We wanted the owner to undergo training with their dog as they clearly were not aware of their dog's anxiety around children. We were deterred from this happening as we were told we needed to go through the court where my young daughter would heed to testify. This was not something I wanted to put her through and would have appreciated mandatory training imposed by the bylaw officer as the bite was uncontested.
- I am not in agreement with any breed specific bylaws . Any breed can have issues and these need to be proactively managed with training.ed specific
- This is all ridiculous. It's bsl and it's wrong!!!
- Increasing fines for repeat nuisance dogs of any breed.
- None of these are acceptable, at all!
- not singling out pitbulls as a breed because thats just eugenics with dogs this time
- I believe all dogs need training not just pit bulls. I believe any breed (regardless of their genes) should be given a chance rather than being banned from certain areas. If dangerous behaviour is exhibited then steps should be taken to be declared a nuisance. Any breed can be declared a nuisance .



- Not sure if breed specific legislation is doable. Who will determine if a dog looks like a pit bull. Second offenses should be treated seriously. If the owner is trying to solve nuisance /nippy dog behavior it would be great if the city could help the owner find training or other resources
- All of these measures should apply to ALL dogs, not breed specific dogs. I have personally been more severely harmed by a chihuahua than any large dog I have ever encountered.
- Targeting one breed does not work and is not reasonable to all RESPONSIBLE owners of those breeds. It is the owners, regardless of breed, that do not train and socialize their animals.
- All dogs not just pit bulls
- Owners must go through training too so people leave pitties alone. Bad owners not bad dogs.
- Dogs that are declared a nuisance should receive mandatory but free or discounted training. Many owners can not afford private classes for difficult dogs.
- Wow... none of these. We don't have a serious issue and this is definitely trending in the wrong direction. [removed] would be VERY DISAPPOINTED
- Stop generalizing a breed. Do it based on specific situations and include other breeds.
- Number 2 is the only good option. The rest is a joke. Dogs are dogs and Pitbull are the one of the sweatest breeds. It's not the breed in question it's the demographic of people that are more likely to own strong breeds. How about saying people with a criminal record involving drugs and or violence can't own an strong breeds such as German Shephard, rotweilers, Doberman, and pit bulls
- Something must be done about a dog owner who lets their god bark all day (from 5am in my case) to past 11pm. I'm a dog owner and an animal lover. But the process to do anything about it is long and expensive (including court) I should be able to log times of barking days involved etc.... and put in a noise complaint.
- Higher fines for bad owners. It's never the animals fault
- There are no bad dogs, only bad pet owners
- absolutely against BSL and pit bull discrimination
- Nuisance dogs should have nothing to do with specific breeds. A nuisance dog should be based on each specific dogs behaviour not by the breed
- I 100% do not agree with breed-specific bylawas. Shepherds, Dobermans, and frankly, even chihuahas are all biters, and often small breed dogs are more dangerous, because their owners don't consider small teeth dangerous.
- ban pit bulls. they have no place in an urban environment
- I'd like to see holding owners accountable for ANY dog that is aggressive or fear based aggression because of lack of knowledge by the owner
- Hate how you are singling out breeds . It's owners that are the problem . I think all dog owners should take a test when getting a dog license.
- I never seen a pit Bull aggressive but mix other dogs like Labradoodle yes on many occasions
- How about stop being so biased against "pit bulls". How SICKENING!!!!
- I have 2 small dogs (Maltese x) but I work as a dog trainer and I also work at a vet clinic. Have you actually researched any studies that show a pit bull having more bite strength? Because they don't. Doodles are what we find at the clinic that bite and cause damage.



- Pit bulls are not the only breed with enough “strength” to injure someone. Any large dog could and often does do as much damage as a pit bull. Stop spreading the false narrative that pit bulls are more dangerous because they are strong or look intimidating to some. A badly trained dog is a badly trained dog. No matter the breed.
- We must regulate rescues. Please see <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/ej-rescue-1.5630648>
- ALL RULES SHOULD APPLY TO ALL BREEDS REGARDLESS OF SIZE! DESPICABLE AND HIGHLY IGNORANT TO SUGGEST OTHERWISE! A BITE IS A BITE!
- why are you listing pitbulls when there is much more K-Nines with dangerous bites such as German shepherds etc..
- This is breed discrimination. Pitbull like dogs are not the problem. Negligent owners are. If the dog can be retrained and removed, make it so Negligent owners cannot get dogs!
- Pit bulls should not be discriminated against at all. A dog should be assessed by it’s behavior and history.
- If obedience training is required it should be through the Alberta force free alliance- the training world is not regulated and there should be standards held. If using the wrong trainer a dog can get worse instead of better
- Do NOT bully bully breeds, city of calgary is much better than that! How sad! German shepherds or huskies can do just as much if not more damage than a bully, give your heads a shake city of calgary.
- I do not support breed specific bylaws
- You cannot discriminate against "bully" breeds. Research shows that dogs that bite the most are in fact chihuahuas. If you want to discriminate against "bully" breeds then you better include muzzling, banning, requiring additional insurance, and more for chihuahuas. This law needs to be scientifically backed.
- Dangerous dog designation and licensing for dogs with a Lv 4 or higher bite, or forward moving aggression, unprovoked attack, or redirect bites at Level 3 or higher.
- Treat all breeds equally! It’s the owners, not the dogs that are the potential issue!!!
- Harsher fines for dogs on the loose. Example my neighbours dog gets loose everyday and runs all over our property which rules up our dogs and destroys my property
- There should not be more than one nuisance dog allowed in a residence. I do NOT agree with labeling a pit bull as a nuisance dog because of the breed and would not support additional rules just for them
- I would support ANYTHING BUT BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION. These proposed amendments are awful, pit bulls might be strong but so are other dog breeds! If pit bulls HAVE to be muzzled, then all dogs should have to be muzzled.
- Pit bulls and bully breeds are not at fault. It is owner negligence and lack of responsible pet ownership that causes these issues. Don’t blame the breed, blame the owner
- This seems biased towards pitbull breeds. Make obedience training free for for "nuisance" dogs, and stricter guidelines (or rehoming) for abusive owners who refuse to properly train their dogs.



- Fine or punish the owners of dogs that are violent.
- Pit bulls aren't the problem. Any dog can be a bite risk if not trained properly.
- Ban pitbulls all together. They do bite more than any other breed. They've killed more humans than any other breed
- Higher fines for any dog, not just PITBULLS involved in bylaw offences. These options are sounding far too much like BSL and its wrong. Any dog can be aggressive, any dog can be a nuisance. Owners need to held accountable. Dogs are not inherently bad, bad owners, unfortunately end up with poorly behaved dogs.
- [personal information removed] I do NOT AGREE with legislation questions such as this one. The stigma and fear around this breed is emphasized by questions and surveys spreading misinformation. This is making already fearful people fear the breed even more. Do your research before posting things like this. Don't bully a specific breed of animal. We have been avid dog park regulars for 5 years and never had an issue but witness plenty with "regular breeds". End the stigma of bully breeds. Legislation like this is part of the problem. A pitbull will always be more feared than a black lab because of statements such as this one regarding "severe bites". Where are the German Shepard and Rottweilers and mastiffs listed here? They're all large dogs with a large mouth resulting in a more severe bite. #dontbullymybreed
- no pitfalls like in ontario
- Breeds cannot be classed in this way, it's the same idea as racism. Dogs are subjects of their environment and upbringing.
- There is no reason to put any extra means onto a certain breed, when it is usually problems with poor owners. It is a complete disgrace that this city's council would even consider banning or restricting pit bulls like Toronto. [removed]
- FOCUS ON THE HUMAN NOT THE DOG. Human's should be penalized NOT the dog. Stronger dog training techniques/companies should be used.
- The only thing that would help is stronger screening for animal adoptions. It is the owner who trains the dog to be violent, not the dog itself. And a nuisance dog is no danger so leave them alone. Some dogs are fearful and so they bark or they're learning to be comfortable around people after being beaten their whole lives. Don't go after the people who are trying to help these animals, go after the ones who abuse and mistreat animals.
- In every occasion where a dog is determined to be a nuisance animal, the owner must submit to mandatory dog handling training otherwise the dog may be seized, or if the dog is already been seized they must complete the training in order to get the pet back.
- fine and force educate the owner, and force owner to take the animal through behavioral, obedience training.
- It is a really bad idea to have restrictions based on breed. Restrictions should be based on demonstrated behaviour.
- Regarding nuisance, what number constitutes multiple minor offences
- Dump breed specific phrases entirely. I currently hate this city and council. If i could sell my condo I'd be long gone.



- Pitbulls are not an issue, there should be no dog breed specific bylaws!
- I do not think any breeds should be singled out as it is not the breed but how a dog is raised and trained. Dogs that are aggressive and bite need training and should not be off lease. If owners don't comply, dogs should be seized and need training.
- None of the above. It is not the dog it's the training and owner. Do not take away the right from other pitbull owners to walk their dog anywhere. They are NOT aggressive.
- none of the above
- Why on earth are you being breed specific? I have met more aggressive chihuahuas than pit bulls. It is never about the breed it is about the owner.
- Pit Bulls aren't the problem - stupid people are why not educate them more why does a helpless dog suffer for the stupidity of its owner
- Don't breed discriminate! Have you never actually looked at the stats?
- STOP CLASSIFYING PITBULLS AS STRONGER THAN OTHER DOGS! There is no science behind this.
- It's ridiculous to identify a breed and this would cause issues with people making their own decisions as to what they decide is a pitbull. I can't believe the city will be so ignorant as to even consider this
- Pit bulls should not have any extra bylaws compared to other breeds.
- Calgary should not be looking at breed specific legislation. BSL has not proven effective and only enhances prejudices against a breed.
- their all stupid , need more examples , pit bull and pit bull type dogs should not be the target of this bylaw , the owners should be
- Don't be one of those communities that has hate against a type of breed for no reason. Each dog is different and it depends on how they are treated. Start fining the owners and taking more actions in coming down on poor owners.
- Having a dog declared as a nuisance is too broad of a spectrum. If they are to be banned from off leash there needs to be a more narrow classification as a dog that has been classified as a nuisance due to noise complaints will not always be an aggressive dog. There also needs to be a classification for a dog that is a frequent antagonist in situations but is the dog that gets hurt. I have seen multiple times in dog parks of dogs I know finally snapping at a persistently antagonistic dog that will not leave them alone.
- Pit bulls and similar dogs are proven time and time again to not be problem dogs. If you want to crack down on bites of any breed, instead of punishing dogs fine the owners for not training them properly. But bylaw offenses are broad, this should only be for severe bites not just any offense.
- None of these
- The bsl questions are disgusting and ignorant coming from the City of Calgary in 2020. Has this year not taught us anything about discrimination?! I am utterly appalled.
- Stop targeting pitbulls
- Do not focus on breed. Breed focus is unfair and overlooks the fact that other breeds are similarly dangerous or moreso. Focus on breed is outdated, misleading.



- WOW!!!!!! Appalling and a clear lack of education. I have been bit by little dogs, my dog has been bite buy other little dogs NONE to have been a pitbull. Pitbulls have been some on the nicest friendliest dogs I have met and these comments scare people and then they react and then the dogs react. Very very disappointed with the city of calgary. MAYBE educate and stop pointing fingers
- PITBULLS ARE NOT AT FAULT FOR POOR OWNERSHIP. Small dogs are way more noisy/aggressive than a generalized "pitbull" breed. Golden retrievers are more likely to bite than a pitbull, because pitbulls are many breeds grouped into one that makes their numbers look large. A pitbulls "power" isn't a good enough reason to singlebthem out. What about Rottweilers? German Shepherds? This is discriminatory against a gentle and kind breed that used to be considered nanny dogs. Shame on the City of Calgary for even considering this.
- All dogs should be treated the same no matter the breed. Also what happens to people who don't require insurance cause there listed under someone else who owns the property they shouldn't have to pay more. I think high fines, mandatory 12week training from places like SPCA not the useless list they provide at the city animal services.
- Breed does not equate aggression or nuisance, bully type dogs should not be a consideration in these new bylaws. I am against any BSL
- Owners should have to prove they took the dog to obedience classes, dog should be tested through Humane Society or dog trainer to ensure dog no longer presents a risk. Owners who have dog seized shouldn't be able to own a strong breed for a period of time.
- Stop this garbage saying pitbulls or "aggressive" type breeds need to be extra muzzled. It's a silly fear tactic and Calgary is better than this
- Work with the owner/handler to increase their knowledge of dog behaviour and reactivity via reputable trainers, classes, online resources to help SOLVE the problem, not just to penalized the dog. The singling out of pitbulls from my city is very disappointing. BSL has never been a proven solution in other cities, and doesn't focus on actually solving the problem of aggressive dogs, which comes in all shapes sizes and breeds. A focus on keeping rescues and breeders reputable by regulating the industry is what our city should be looking at. Most aggressive dogs comes from breeders who are not reputable or ethical, lots of times backyard breeders, who are not health or temperament testing their dogs. Breeding aggressive dogs is what should be grounds for hefty fines. Breeding for looks and not health or mental stability is what should be penalized. Rescues should be held to similar standards and should never be "no kill" or in other words "willing to adopt out even the most aggressive dogs". Behavioural euthenasia is the reality of poor genetics and lack of socialization in some cases, and both irresponsible breeders and rescues should be held liable if they are knowingly selling or adopting out aggressive dogs, or puppies who's parents are known to have behaviour problems that are serious bite risks. Penalizing all dogs that fit a certain "look" is ridiculous and would make me feel ashamed of my community.
- Fines should increase with each and every offence no matter any time passed between offences.
- Pit Bulls are big dogs yes. But I have more run ins with small dogs that want to bite and there are no protections for myself and my large dogs against them as they can't do physical damage. I believe any dog who has the potential to bite regardless of size should be required to be muzzled in public,



go through proper training in order to show they are no longer a nuisance and can be a model citizen without a muzzle. However obedience training must be required intermittently (3-4 6-week obedience sessions a year from a accredited behaviorist trainer the city chooses) for the remainder of the dogs life regardless if it's a proven model citizen.

- None. This is an owner issue, not a breed issue
- You can't simply deny dogs being in certain environments. Many dogs while they can exhibit tendencies of their aggressive ancestors, they have been bred and chosen to be family pets, guard dogs etc. People should not be fined for owning and having a dog. IF it attacks someone or something, then it can get into trouble but not before. I know it's a dog-world, but it's dog-equivalent to being racist or prejudice. Let the dog and the owner define what kind of behaviour and if it breaks rules then fine the human, and if it's done major damage then the owner gets in trouble
- Any bylaw that singles out pitbull type dogs is unfair and will be challenged. Many larger dogs can have a powerful bite, and many smaller dogs can inflict serious injury.
- Offleash areas in middle of main paths = I can't avoid offleash area (i.e. nosehill). I now avoid nosehill.
- Nuisance definition was too unclear, cannot answer these questions
- Extra fines for puppy mills and pet stores selling dangerous dogs
- Place a ban on specific (more aggressive) dog breeds
- Continuing barking needs to be addressed by a fine
- Breed specific legislation is not appropriate in any circumstance. Signed, an ER veterinarian who sees dog bite injuries almost every day. Also a Shih Tzu owner.
- Trying to sneak in breed specific legislation by creating a biased association between "pit bulls" and nuisance dogs is unacceptable. Shame on you.
- In my experience I have not had issues with pitbulls but rather other breed owners not following leashing requirements or small dogs with aggressive behavior
- ANY dog can bite. Picking on certain breeds is not the answer. I have worked with dogs for 20 years now and I have had more bites from small breed dogs than any other. NO WAY do i want to see bsl in calgary! What someone decides is a "nuisance" may not be a nuisance to someone else. I think kids are a nuisance...can they be muzzled??!!
- I do not agree with anything specifically singling out pit bulls.
- BSL should NOT happen in Calgary. I do NOT support BSL
- Ban pit breeds
- None of the above.
- How about stop politicizing a breed. It is the owners Pomeranians and small dogs are out of control. How about fining owners who can't control their dogs and stop playing a political game.
- Clearer definitions of nuisance. The same potential penalties should be directly related to specific types of incidents. I.e, a dog with barking complaints and no issues with violence or aggression should not be subject to the same potential measures as an aggressive or violent dog (muzzled in public, not allowed at off leash parks, etc).



- There is absolutely no evidence to prove that pit bulls cause more severe damage than any other large dog. As a veterinarian, I am appalled that this is even an option. There should be absolutely no discrimination based on breed. Bad owners have bad dogs. It is not breed specific in any way, shape, or form. That being said, any breed that has bitten a pet or human should be subjected to training by a professional. If that is unable to be provided by an owner than apprehension from the owner, rehabilitation by apprehending party, and readoption would be recommended.
- Adequate fence requirement for pitbull owners!
- Banning a specific breed of dog from doing anything is ridiculous. A chihuahua is more likely to bite someone than a pit bull.
- Stop assuming pit bulls are dangerous dogs. I am more scared of a chihuahua than a pit bull.
- There should be no requirement for animals such as pitbulls as this is a misconception of the breed. Owners or civilian should be fine for mistreating or harming these animals. The animal did NOT come as nuisance, it is an animal. Please educate people on this! These animals are not born mean!!!
- I disagree with automatically labeling pitbulls as a nuisance animal.
- Fines for nuisance owners
- NONE BSL is stupid!!!!
- Dog training required for all dogs. Don't single out pitbulls. It's bad owners not bad dogs
- Get rid of breed specific legislation . Hold the owners accountable and rather than obedience training for the dog the owner and the dog needs to go through force free training.
- Ban pitbulls entirely
- Obedience should be from approved trainers using science based- not aversive- methods
- None of the above. If nuisance means a dog with a bite behaviour then some of the suggestions are OK but if nuisance means a barking dog or an escape artist then these are very extreme measures.
- There appears to be a strong focus on the bully breeds here (pitbull type). There really shouldn't be any discrimination as to breeds; any dog regardless of size can bite, bark, cause issues etc. It is up to an owner in the end to provide the appropriate training and mental stimulation to their pet(s). Maybe starting with pet owners, as opposed to jumping straight to a particular offending dog breed may be the way to go. Implementing BSL has proven time and time again not to be effective. You speak of their strength and bite power....the larger a dog is the higher the bite force is going to be. Perhaps some more research needs to be done on this, as bite forces with breeds have been done before, and large mastiff (molosser) breeds came in on the high end of this. Im rather disappointed to see the City of Calgary even considering these options. Having worked in the animal field (spca, Animal control, dog training, etc) a good portion of my life, a lot of these canine bylaws really make no sense. More responsibility needs to be put on owners. At the end of the day a dog is an animal with instincts.
- Humans are the problem. Mandate training and behaviour training for owners of nuisance dogs. All dogs should require training. More bylaw officers in off leash parks and a test of recall if all dogs. Where are the extra rules for those who don't observe on leash areas that then cause issue with reactivity.



- Additional insurance required after any dog bites!
- I Have ONLY ever been attacked/aggressively bitten by a chihuahua. If AN animal has had reactive behaviour with a negative reaction then have the owner and animal required to take a course through the SPCA and have the owner trained how to handle the Animal. THERE ARE NO BAD BREEDS JUST BAD OWNERS!
- people should have to get training and they should be familiar with pit bulls before they can own a pit bull. It's not the dog's fault, it's always the owners
- Condition checks for households with more than 10 animals
- Stick with the current bylaw and take it on a dog to dog basis. Breed should not be a factor ever!
- I disagree with all pit bull related stereotyping
- Ban pit bulls. Kill any that bite. They are bred for biting and have no place as "pets"
- Fines should be for bad pet owners and if an owner repeatedly has aggressive pets they should have a ban. I am all for nuisance dog owners being penalized however those of us that are responsible should not have to pay the price.
- I think all dogs over 20kgs should have mandatory obedience training. It isn't usually the dog that is the problem it is an inexperienced owner
- When licensing your animal it should be mandatory to enroll and pass with certified animal behavior training code. This should be done with all dogs! Even the extra small ones! The city needs to set the standard on who can teach these programs. Set everyone up for success not failure. If you do not complete the program you have up to a certain date before a fine is issued. Then continue on until taking the person's animal away and putting the person on a no pet watch list. If people can not afford animal behavior training they are not responsible pet owners. As for the problems with dogs biting now, hire park people to enforce proper behavior in both humans and dogs. Not in a voluntary way. Real job, not a fake one.
- I do not support this. Treat all dogs the same.
- Please educate yourselves around bully breeds. This information perpetuates stereotypes that are inaccurate and dangerous. I have had more negative interactions with smaller breeds (shitzus and chihuahuas, etc) than ever with bully breeds. Go to the experts in the field not citizens with little to no dog experience or knowledge.
- Stop discriminating against "pitbulls" or any breed for that matter. You're furthering an incorrect stigma and it's embarrassing (for you)
- Owner review to determine if they are able to provide adequately for a pit bull. Sometimes the owner is the problem, not the animal.
- If a dog does an act of violence toward a person then they should be put down
- Pitbulls are amazing and lovable dogs. Just like every other dog. Dogs are only aggressive because of poor ownership and being bad people.
- Lots of picking on pitbulls here.
- Nuisance dogs must wear identifying ID/collar to alert others when they are in public.
- It's not proven that BSL actually helps prevent dog bites. You should be ashamed that you are even asking these breed specific questions. Shame on you.



- current bylaws need to be in forced, dogs off leash in leashed zones.
- Pot bulls are no different then any other breed of dog and should be treated no differently. As a dog attack Survivor I will personally say that any untrained abused dog is dangerous.
- None of the above, I don't think that pit bulls or other larger breeds should be discriminated against.
- Removal of dogs living in abuse, whether being exposed to elements or other.
- None of the above owners build the behaviour and it just so happens people purchase "pit bull breeds. There are plenty of good owners with great dogs that are being drug down but An irresponsible group.
- Afrer two incidences of biting or nuisance dog not allowed at off leash park. dog must be muzzled when out in public.
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION. NUISANCE IS NOY DEFINED WELL ENOUGH
- No repercussions for pit bulls, look into the irresponsible small breed owners. Those dogs are the least trained and most aggressive.
- If training is required it will be important for the city to govern appropriate, science based, reward based certified trainers as there are a lot of people out there offering services as trainers with no education or formal training.
- Please stop advocating against "pit bull" type dogs.
- The owners of the dogs that have been deemed a nuisance should have to undergo dog training courses and be fined accordingly.
- Lay off the pit bulls! But general nuisance dogs, of ANY BREED (the meanest dog I ever met was a shitzhu!) should be considered.
- First off, remove the term pit bull from this amendment. Rottweilers, mastiffs, german sheperds, doberman pincers, chow chows, they are all dangerous. / Dogs declared a nuisance that have been to obedience training get reassessed. Being declared a nuisance should not be a life sentence. / Owners with more than one dog that has been declared a nuisance need to undergo proper pet ownership/responsibility training. / There should be unannounced followup to owners who have been banned from owning animals for the full duration of their ban.
- Do not be breed specific
- Please do not make this about pit bulls. Any dog can be a nuisance, and we do not need to go backwards with BSL language
- City should provide behaviour and training assistance with animals adopted from a shelter or the city.
- Bigger charges against anyone who teases, abuses, pets a dog who ISN'T theirs and gets bit etc. Also, not having breed specific rules. Blame the owner. Not the dog.
- Much, much higher fines for having dogs off leash. Fines that exist on a sliding rate so heavier dogs that are more likely to cause harm are fined more for being off leash. Much better enforcement of off leash rules in parks and streets (every part of the city has a problem with dogs off leash).
- These selections are based on Bias and have no place in this survey.. introducing any type of Breed Specific Legislation, by the City of Calgary is reprehensible. Education of dog owners and the public



at large, especially with children on how to act responsibly around all animals would have a far better outcome.

- Proper ownership responsibility training .
- I find it highly offensive that you seem to be picking on the "Pit Bull". We were targeted by a neighbor who encouraged our dog to bark by standing by our front fence. Then attacked me by saying our dogs were always barking. (let me start by saying that I put the dogs out ran up 5 steps to the bathroom and by the time I was on my way downstairs not even 2 mins my dog barked once and this neighbor was bashing on my siding of my house. He was standing there the whole time. We got a notice and I called and never heard from the officer.
- Pit bulls not to be brought in through rescues
- I have had no issues with pit bulls in the past. I believe that dogs are taught behaviours by their owners. I feel if the owner has not raised the animal properly the responsibility of a dog biting or acting aggressive should fall on the owners.
- First this should be provided in plain language not legal for all citizens to understand and not mixing all animals and spetic breeds in the same question. Also all breeds should be held accountable not just a certain breed. Bites on the city have not gone up enough to proke an act like this.
- This is complete nonsense. They have proven time again how their PPSI bit is no different that a GSD or Retriever. So get those facts straight first before you decide to be breedest! Absurd
- Please do not be dog racist. It's a bad look. Every dog can be aggressive or considered a nuisance- don't make it breed specific!
- There is not data to support the discrimination of 'pitbull' type dogs
- No breed specific laws. It causes the crazy people to go out and hurt them
- I don't want to ban a breed ever. And I fully believe that we shouldn't punish everyone preemptively. Insurance and fines for dangerous dogs make sense but only after they've proven to be an issue. Lots of pit bulls are just big clumsy angels. But any dog with a history of attacking should have to go to rehabilitation training at the owners expense, and if they can't afford it maybe it needs to be surrendered to a rehab facility and adopted after training. I think the dog deserves a chance because some people do not properly approach dogs and it's not fair to expect the dog to not react when scared.
- Stop picking on pit bulls
- Stop discrimination against pit bulls (or dogs that look like them). Nuisance dogs could come from any breed.
- City of Calgary, already has amazing bylaws in place for dog owners. What I would like to see them enforced. For example I see daily dogs off leash in areas that are suppose to be dogs on leash zones.
- stop with the pitbull racism. ANY dogs that bites should be trained.
- Balanced training for nuisance dogs, not "force-free positive"
- Preventative obedience for all dogs as part of the licensing process. **NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION PLEASE!** It sends the wrong message to people who own other breeds that their dog is not dangerous.



- Any dog can be deemed a “nuisance”, I believe education can help these dogs and their owners. I support increased fines and seizures if owners do not comply with education requests. There are some very good dog behaviouralists in Calgary that can assist in the education. There are no bad dogs, just naive and bad owners
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION
- Any legislation designed to address problem dogs must be breed-neutral. Breed is not the determinant of a problem dog--the owner is.
- ABSOLUTELY NOT- this is DISGUSTING FOR A CITY TO PROHIBIT A DOG DUE TO THEIR UPBRINGING OR PAST.
- Dogs that have attacked or bitten another dog should be banned from off leash dog parks.
- This is insane! You are suggesting dogs that bark are equal to dogs that are attacking people with lethal force? Also, I don't like the singling out of Pitbulls. While I totally appreciate the concern of their strength and it has concerned me a few times when I have seen some dogs at off leash parks that look like they're not friendly, most pit bulls and staffers that I have met regularly walking my dog off leash are very nice. What I think needs to be enforced is people who take former racing greyhounds to off leash parks. Mine was attacked by one when he was only 8 months and it was terrifying. Right at my feet! Then the owner continued to walk the dog without a leash towards the exit of the fenced park and it went after two other dogs separately. Be much more specific about nuisance and call out each problem - don't group them. Furthermore, most dogs bark. Almost all will bark when another dog in the neighborhood starts barking. It should only be declared a nuisance when the owner leaves the dog home day after day in the yard to bark without being brought in or any attempt to try to get the dog to change the behaviour. Also, dogs that often attack other dogs - if there is a need for vet care the owner should be fined, forced to pay for the vet care, pay an increased kennel fee, not be allowed to take it off leash, the dog muzzled and put in reactive training. If the dog doesn't hurt the other dog but either chase it, knocks it down or terrorizes it - it should be muzzled, require training and be not allowed off-leash as well as fined. If a dog is reactive on leash, and another person or their dog approaches despite the reactive dog owners warnings; there should be no case - they were warned. If this can't be proven, it should go to arbitration if there was an injury to the non reactive dog as to whether the owner should pay for it. The dog should still be made to take training. If an animal kills - it may be required to be euthanized. A trial should be held to investigate the circumstances. Was it defending its owner or property for example. Incidents involving dogs should be handled by animal control - not police - unless there is an injury to people. Also, what does this even mean? “minimize impact to others and follow the rules” - I be very clear!
- Blame the breeder, not the dog. Pitbulls are not dogs that should be discriminated against, bylaws that apply to them should apply to any and all other dog breeds within the City of Calgary
- "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." This is completely false and who's ever put forth these certifiably false claims on a government website should be let go. All I can say is, this had better be changed because it's 2020 and bigoted government won't be tolerated.



- STOP BLAMING THE BREED!!!!
- There should be no bias to "pit bulls" as a breed. Many large breeds can be dangerous if not trained/handled or approached properly. Dogs should not be euthanized immediately after an incident. Training and assessment by a qualified professional trainer should be mandatory beforehand.
- Higher fines to owners of any aggressive dog
- In order to have any dog, the owner must go through city approved training. Breed does not matter.
- I would not support any of this. This just puts a huge burden on dog owners and allows greater mistreatment of these animals as these could be exploited by cruel neighbours and the like.
- Fine owners for their lack of control over their animal
- Owners required to do training if dog is deemed a nuisance.
- These are all crazy
- This breed specific targeting is so wrong. Like it says pitbull types don't bite more than other breeds. How about we punish owners whose dogs are not trained properly no matter what the breed. Specifically targeting a dog by the shape of its head creates fear that the dog is mean. That is the worst message to send.
- Owners should be held accountable for their dogs, increased fines, euthanize the dogs and criminal charges, especially for owners that flee
- Don't pick on pit bulls! A few bad owners should damn a breed
- All dogs should have training
- possible criminalization of repeat offender owners - pet ban and enforcement for owners who have serial nuisance pets.
- Please stop with the shaming of pitbulls, do some research and see how many more little dogs bite. These questions in regards to pitbulls is backwards thinking and wrong Shane on you for spreading fear and hate when no reason too.
- It is shocking that you are targeting pit bulls. I have never met an aggressive pitbull. Dogs should not be judged in their breed. Fine the owners if they are irresponsible or don't properly train their dog but you should NOT target pit bulls.
- Fines for all city staff members who propose bylaws that are not backed by science, like BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION.
- No No No!!!!!!!
- Pit bulls are not the problem. It's their owners training them bad behaviours. Any dog can bite. This is insane of this city to focus on this. How about not letting just anyone get a dog....make them pass a test. For once, do the right thing.
- Stop blaming pit bulls. ANY dog can be a nuisance, and a Doberman, Rottweiler, etc all have strong jaws and a bite from them is just as bad as one from an aggressive golden retriever. Stop punishing the breed, punish the owners.
- To be honest, I am involved in Animal Rescue as well as dog training. It is often the dogs owners that are the problem, not necessarily the dog. That being said, I am very cautious around of Pit Bulls because of their power. One of my dogs is extremely fearful, and is elderly. She is now starting to



lose her sight. I have encountered numerous dogs in our neighborhood that are loose on the owners yard. They have come charging and barking at us, and it invokes a reactive behavior in her. (Not her fault) it is super frustrating, and I should not have to muzzle my dog in order to walk her on public streets. I never take her to dog parks etc, so I find it hard to penalize Pit bulls specifically

- Stop focusing on the breed of the dog. The behaviour is what is important
- Stop breed specific legislation and see that small dogs are problems too.
- This section is very ignorant. If you declare pit bulls, you must also declare German Shepard's, labs and other large MORE aggressive dogs. "It is important to note pit bulls are NOT involved in more bite incidents than other breeds.." then act like it, pathetic. Also, for your information my "pit bull" has been attacked by large dogs on multiple occasions and never retaliated. Do better. Make these rules for all large breeds instead of directly attacking pit bulls. Make it even and fair.
- Better people owning dogs in general and stricter laws for people hoping to save a dog. It's not the dog, it's the owner!
- Requiring public to report bites. Also I do not believe in breed specific regulations and in one of the options above they were condensed into one option. Nuisance dogs-onlybone per household regardless of breed. Also assessment by expert behaviorist to establish what is a nuisance dog.
- Pit bulls or breeds in this section should not be treated any differently than any other breed. MANY breeds have significant strength, and even smaller, "weaker" breeds can cause severe damage when they bite.
- It is honestly very disheartening seeing a breed bias here. Why did that have to be included? Why can't it be left at nuisance dogs.
- Stop discriminating against a breed. Fine the owners of ALL dogs who are a nuisance. Jesus. <eyeroll>
- More affordable training for dogs so people can more easily afford training for ANY dog
- I think it's absolutely disgusting how this is targeting pitbull's we're not all pit bulls are the problem there is just as many large dogs they can do just as much damage that have done just as much damage and I don't think it's fair that if you owned Pitbulls you will be targeted and discriminated against
- None of the above, take the breed out of this and ask it again.
- I do not agree that all of yhe breeds listed above should be considered a nuisance. Stafford Terriers are not aggressive, or at least none that i have encountered.
- Shouldn't judge just one breed and make it harder for people to own pitbull. Make owners responsible. Not the dog.
- How about we focus more on the "nuisance" and a little less on the "pitbull". Quite frankly I'm appalled that the City is using the terminology above and supporting BSL. Nuisance dogs are a problem, the breed of such dog is not. Bad pet owners need to be held responsible for their animals. Period. Fines. Apprehensions. Nuisance titles given to them. Quite simply, if the name/term "pitbull" automatically deems a dog a "nuisance" then no thank you.
- Please review and present peer-reviewed research on the strength of bite from pitbulls versus other large dogs. Resources and laws need to be allocated based on facts not fear.



- Most often it's an issue with the owner not being knowledgeable. More training for the owners of nuisance dogs.
- This entire thing is based on BAD SCIENCE... the scientific facts around pitbulls or bully breeds that you as a city are using is absolutely wrong in EVERY REGARD..
- What year do we live in that we still think the BREED is the problem? It's the owner! Come on!
- I vehemently oppose breed-specific legislation, so any stronger measures for "nuisance" dogs should not in any way target or single out a dog by breed, but by temperament.
- DO NOT BREED LEGISLATE PITBULLS. That is absolutely LUDICROUS. ONLY provide repercussions for dogs who actually prove to provide a problem. PITBULLS ARE NOT BAD- it is the equivalent to saying that muslims are more dangerous than Caucasian people because they're more prone to being terrorists. GET REAL.
- Leave the [removed] pit bulls alone.
- There are many dogs that have a strong bite. Calgary was once considered one of the best cities for fair and equitable pet ownership laws. BSL is a step backwards.
- Absolutely no mention of breed on the bylaw. That would be a massive step backwards. Calgary has been at the forefront as an example to the world how BSL doesn't work.
- Breed discrimination will not help in assisting the city control dogs. Sheppard bites can and have been just as bad as Pitbulls. Punish bad owners not "scary" breeds. This is a publicity stunt.
- There needs to be a concrete way to prove a dog is a nuisance. The current system is incredibly flawed and encourages dog owners to not register their dogs. There needs to be proof it was said dog, and if an owner has proof it was not their dog that needs to be respected and accepted (it currently is not, based on personal experience). .
- Ban pit bulls , it's the only breed that in my 60+ years lifetime that has consistently attacked humans and is the only breed that consistently kills humans
- I STRONGLY oppose breed specific by-laws. It's a step in the WRONG direction.
- I hear more about smaller breed dog bites. Stop trying to bully the breed. It's the owner not the breed.
- Ban pit bull type dogs
- leave pit bulls alone! They do not deserve to be penalized for negative ideals people have of them.
- Ban the deed, not the breed!! If someone wants to own a pitbul they need to be monitored to ensure the dog is not being raised violently. Don't blame the dog!
- Please leave pit bulls alone. Do not breed discriminate. This approach has not worked anywhere ever
- I believe more than bully breed bites can i flick pains, so educate owners
- Mandatory spay/neuter of nuisance dogs
- Pit bulls are not vicious by nature. To single them out is absurd. Nuisance dogs are dogs with recent or repeat incidents, be it a German Shepherd or a chihuahua.
- I don't believe it's the nerds fault. Comes down to responsible ownership no matter the breed.
- Breed specific legislation will not decrease the frequency and severity of dog bites, and will only result in dogs not being adopted from shelters and increased abandonment.



- I do not support a bylaw that is breed-specific. Please reach out to responsible bully breed groups for more information. Focus on owner education and cracking down on irresponsible breeders to keep bully breeds out of the hands of problem owners.
- There should be NO laws that are pit bull or pit bull “type” specific.
- Fines for nuisance must be looked into closely. Others will abuse this just to report neighbours were no such strong evidence it is recurring.
- How about including other large dogs such as German shepherds, husky, Akita, they have strong jaws too
- Chows and German Shepherds, in my experience, cause more problems in off-leash parks
- this cannot be breed specific. needs to be dog specific.
- Other dogs attack not just the ‘bully’ pitbull breeds stop putting all the blame on that specific breed
- More signage about keeping dogs on leash in problem areas (Flames Community Arena field is not off leash, but has dozens of daily visitors next to a children’s playground)
- Shut down rescues that release a nuisance dog especially when new owner doesn’t have the facilities to keep the animal. IE six foot fence. All nuisance dogs that are aggressive must be muzzled even in yard if not properly contained.
- This is discriminatory and breed specific. The focus should be on owners exclusively, including potential license requirements for anyone owning a dog exceeding 20lb and that they should be of age to be liable for pets actions.
- None.
- A Kangal has the strongest bite of 743 PSI. Chow Chows are notoriously aggressive but not a bully breed. I think this is fear mongering and I do not agree with any level of breed specific legislation within the City of Calgary. This only makes people not register their pets and lie about the breed they own because the discrimination based on little facts. Look at places like Winnipeg Ontario and other areas this type of legislation has failed the community. Hold all pet owners equally responsible.
- Ban pit bulls
- I feel the language should be aimed at the owner or caregiver of pit bulls, not the pit bulls themselves. I think the owners deserve higher fines, obedience training etc. I don’t think it’s breed specific to pit bull type dogs.
- It is rude to single pit bulls out there are many aggressive dogs that aren’t that breed. It is not the breed but how the dog is raised !!!!
- No pitbull bylaw (and any other breed deemed unsafe)
- Wheather pit - dobbie - GS - or any dog - before taking dog away - 1) i feel as a dog owner it is important that owner and dog be mandated to get 8 week training session in obedience !! This shows that owner has more control !very important !!
- None of the above!!!! Singling out pit bulls is ridiculous! There are plenty of other breeds more viscous then any pitbull bully breed dog I have ever met! Proposing any of the above is just ignorant!
- Stop legislating a breed!!!



- You should NOT be discriminating against the dog breed - according to many scientists, dachshunds are naturally the most aggressive dog. Are we going to be dining those dogs?
- Leave pitbulls alone, they are amazing animals, and are always targeted, u say there bite is more severe.....but they don't bite the most, so why isn't the breed specified that bites the most and only "pitbull" is described, bsl doesn't work and its time to leave this breed alone!
- Stop assuming all "pit bull" breed dogs are the problem. Increase the punishment and fines for owners that do not train their animals.
- [removed] with the pit bull hate, [removed]. It's the owner, not the dog.
- it is the humans that need the obedience training on how to train and look after their animals. It is bad humans not bad dogs of any breed.
- Leave pit bulls alone! No extra regulations are required for them.
- Owners that have had a nuisance dog that have been fined are not allowed to have another similar dog for 10 yearsbreed dog
- Issues occur when a negligent or bad handler is involved . The bite of a Pitt bull is no different than a shepherd, lab, Doberman or Akita. Smaller dogs bites can be severe as well. All dogs should be judged equally as every circumstance is different.
- BSL does not work. Do some research
- Nothing against pit bulls. All dogs should be treated the same way no matter what breed.
- BSL does not work. If you are going to impose restrictions, limit to ALL nuisance dogs, regardless of breed. There is too much ambiguity with BSL as well, and not enough SMEs.
- Is anyone even look at this from the perspective of the dog? People are [removed] idiots when it comes to dog behaviour - understanding, reading and reacting - even people that have owned dogs all their lives. As a kid the dogs that worried me were the little ones.
- Any dog that bites an adult or child should be euthanized unless there are exceptional circumstances.
- Better signage clearly stating that the majority of places / parks in Calgary are ON LEASH AT ALL TIMES places, versus assuming the public knows this. We live near path and pond system and dogs are always off leash and in the water, destroying the ecosystem and putting bio waste into water.
- None of the above. These biased opinions toward specific breeds of dog are unfounded.
- No to BSL
- It's nonsense to Focus on pit bulls just as a breed - animals are a reflection of their owners behaviour and treatment. I know many people with nuisance dogs who bite and are threatening and none of them are pit bulls.
- Replace pit bulls with "small aggressive dogs" because those are the ones doing the biting. Your reasoning for listing pitbull is their potential for bites. You as a human being have the same amount of potential to be a serial killer, but I don't see anyone preemptively punishing you for that.
- No BSL! That's going backwards
- Any breed, not specifically pit bulls, should be required to complete required specifications if there have been known offenses. Pit bulls should not be isolated for their breed.



- This classification of an animal by breed, not temperament is DISGUSTING, and you can be sure that if you proceed with this classification, the community of responsible owners will rise up!
- Deeper research into accusations of nuisance dogs. Proof required to label dogs a nuisance. Not breed biased.
- Required obedience training. Pay a monthly fee until your dog can demonstrate basic obedience. Sit, stay, down, come and heel.
- Stop coming after specific breeds! Anyone with any education knows these issues are owner issues NOT a breed. Hold ALL dog owners accountable!!!
- I do not support any BSL
- If you are think about required obedience train make it mandatory for all dogs
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Other municipalities have tried to persecute pitbulls for their bites and ignore the fact that more dogs of other breeds bite more and cause more damage and they've realized it's not pit bulls causing the issue and have taken these rules away due to banning/declaring one breed a nuisance has not been proven to reduce the number of bites. PIT BULLS ARE NOT THE ISSUE.
- BREED BANS ARE ABSOLUTE TRASH!!!! I own two spayed/neutered bullies who are trained and socialized and the friendliest sweetest dogs ever. My responsible ownership should NOT be punished by a breed ban. Punish the bad owners with fines. Huge ones. To support the animal support systems we have in place.
- Why is this even a thing? Why just pit bull / bully breeds!!?? Not acceptable!
- None
- Pit bulls were nanny dogs back in the 80s and 90s. Each decade a different breed gets mislabeled. It is the owner not the dog! Nor allowing pitbull breeds into offleash areas or mandatory muzzles is not ok. Aggressive dogs any breed sure but just to judge on breed I disagree with.
- I feel the breed should not be punished for poor leadership displayed by owners. It is the owners responsibility to keep their dog and others safe. Make sure people understand the breed and are capable of managing the dog
- I agree if a dog bites someone, the owner should be fined. However, I do not believe in blaming the dog. If the dog is required to be removed then it deserves a chance at dog training, and a new owner found. Dogs reflect their owners behaviour.
- Keep breed specific wording and action OUT of the bylaw
- No breed specific legislation!!!
- Pit bull who are voluntarily enrolled in training by their owners would not have to carry special insurance as long as they have not been a nuisance.
- PITBULLS DESERVE ALL THE SAME RIGHTS AS OTHER BREEDS
- strongly disagree with any and all "dog breed" by-laws, in my personal experience nurture over nature almost every time. Also every dog and dog owner must be given the opportunity to correct behaviour say in a course or other training venue. In almost no cases should a dog be euthanized, only extreme extreme cases, owners of "nuisance" dogs should be required to go courses before taking a dog etc etc



- Criminal prosecution of pit bull owners whose pit bull maims with a six month jail term. Civil negligence should be considered insufficient given owner's inherent knowledge of risk of ownership.
- As a pitbull/bully owner of two I think this is outrageous!! A pitbull being treated different is another form of racism and discrimination! These are wonderful animals and ALL DOGS CAN BE VICIOUS! Not just bully's! They have no reason to be treated different! How about you look at the small dogs who bite! I had a ankle biter literally bite my son in the face! Pitbull have 0 reason to be treated different or have a ban! Everyone wants to jump at pitbull or large breeds which is insane!!! City of Calgary you honestly make me sick of how you're addressing pitbulls and I can promise I am a woman who has 0 issue raising a roar about things when it comes to pitbulls! I wish the government treated sex offenders or child molesters like you do pitbulls! Shame on you! Spend a moment with a pitbull and you'll see they are the most amazing animals! Any dog can be vicious and normally the owner is doing cruel things so maybe instead of banning pitbulls from things look at the owners and use your all mighty power to remove that poor animal and get it true love! I have 2 bully's and 4 children and my kids can do anything to those dogs with no issue, they care for my kids like their puppies!!!
- There should be nothing stating anything to do with breed specific legislation. ABSOLUTELY NOTHING. Breed specific legislation does not work. Nothing in legislation should include a specific type of dog. The fact that quotations are even used in this survey proves that. Obedience training should be "force free" as negative reinforcement is a recipe for further problems.
- I think if a dog bites someone it should be the owner that gets fined. And or must take obedience course. Cause who know if the owners have trained their dog to be like that.
- Higher fines for all dogs, not specifically pit bulls.
- Owner training should be mandatory for nuisance dogs and really for ANY breed owner. I do not agree with pigeon holding the breeds you have included in your list. A small yorkie can do a huge amount of damage to child. I believe the key is the owners not necessarily the animals
- I don't think any of these should apply, again it's not the breed it's the owner and I think singling out a single breed is in humane and quite frankly ridiculous. Focus on stricter and more severe laws for animal abuse and a more vigorous investigation process for such claims including "fear based" training programs.
- Stop with the pit bull or any other species identifying stuff. Any dog can inflict damage if it bites. Even the smallest chihuahua... Which is a very aggressive breed.
- Under no circumstances would I ever support breed specific bylaws. My Pyrenees has been bitten more times by small dogs than pitbulls.
- Training for the owners nuisance dogs
- BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS IS LIKE DOG RACISM. how about deeper fines for ANY owner of a dog that has more than one offense. With mandatory muzzles when leaving their property
- Pit bulls aren't more dangerous. They should be allowed offleash
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Nuisance dogs are should the whole breed suffer.
- Absolutely do not support any breed specific rules.



- Stop focusing on specific breeds. Any breed can have problematic individuals. Higher fines for repeat offenders, take away off leash privileges, seize or restrict do to yard, etc for problem dogs.
- Pit bulls... how about chows? Bullmastives? Burmese mountain dogs? Don't breed discriminate. If damaged caused is the issue then make regulations size related not breed.
- All dogs should have obedience training, low income people should have help
- Having pit pulls included in this is a distraction from the real issue of irresponsible dog owners. Get rid of the pit bull questions.
- All pitbull and like dogs should be BANNED.
- No need for breed specific legislation. You use their strength to target put bulls, but make zero reference to any other breed that is stronger than a pitbull or can exert more bite force.
- Give me a break. It's like the village idiots are running this city.
- Pit bulls should not be singled out as bully breeds. The dog is not the problem but the owner is. Shameful that pit bulls are lazily lumped into a category because of irresponsible dog ownership.
- STOP TARGETING JUST ONE BREED.
- I would like to see dog owners and handlers that Do Not obey the Bylaws bear responsibility as well.
- This should not be breed specific. It should focus on the owners that feel they are above the laws and do not keep their uncontrolled dogs on lease. Whatever breed they are.
- Obedience training required for all dogs. Known aggressive dogs should not be allowed in off leash areas (or be muzzled) but I do not agree with singling out pit bulls as this could discourage people giving much needed homes to pit bulls and most are not bite risks. Instead focus on behaviour risks of individual dogs and encouraging or enforcing training.
- Obedience classes must be required for ALL dogs.
- So from what I am reading, the option is that noisy dogs should be muzzled? Bites are very different than a noisy dog
- No breed specific regulations. Fines for owners who don't control their dogs all of equal consequence.
- Will never support Anything that goes after one type of dog is wrong, and should not be allowed.
- Breed specific legislation does not reduce nuisance complaints or dog bite incidences.
- Criminal charges fir the owner as it is NEVER the animals fault it is ALWAYS the irresponsible owner who is at fault
- Higher fines for German Shepard's involved in bylaw offences. They have stronger bites than pit bulls. As well as Doberman pinchers. These laws should be based on available data and that data shows pit bulls DO NOT have the strongest bites.
- It is not okay to classify pitbulls in the same sentence as nuisance dogs.
- A law that bans owners of an aggressive/dangerous dog (if it has bitten) from owning dogs in the future, as clearly they do not train and control their animals..
- Having "pitbulls" being specially addressed is asburd. It's about the owner, not the dog. How about anywhere that is not an animal shelter be shut down, ie. Petland, etc. There are already too many animals in this world that need homes. Educate pet owners and the public properly. Stop spreading propaganda about breeds. That is archaic.



- Do not ban pit bulls! Breed-specific legislation doesn't work. All dogs bite
- Don't target pitbulls
- I don't support any of this discriminatory [removed]
- These recommendations for bully breed dogs are ridiculous. Please do not do this to our city. And no, I do not own a bully breed dog. Also, the description of a "nuisance" dog is laughable. Are the people writing these suggestions/bylaws familiar with dogs at ALL???
- Incentive programs for those who put their dog in training classes (certified trainers) and reduced fines for nuisance dogs when the owners seek out training
- Higher fines for ANY dog off leash unless in designated areas
- Do not single out ONE breed. There is a white "fluffy" small dog that attacks large dogs. The owner screams and complains about large dogs. Fluffy is NEVER on leash. Fluffy is the nuisance dog AND the entitled owner.... teach the owners.
- Not targeting Pit bulls
- The inclusion of pit bulls as a nuisance breed is deplorable. There is ample evidence to support the fact that pit bulls have great temperaments overall and are no more dangerous than any other breed. The options provided in this question are not based in fact and can only be viewed as an unethical and uneducated attack on a misunderstood breed of dog.
- "Pit bulls" are not even a breed, get your act together!
- Mandatory obedience training for large dogs, mandatory online responsible pet ownership training
- There should not be measures set ONLY for pit bulls.
- It is the owner and not the breed of dog that is an issue. All pet owners need to teach and train their dogs whether they are 5 lbs or 150 lbs
- Owner of dog needs to get a license to own one of these types. The dogs aren't the problem. It's the owner and lack of knowledge on their end. Bad dog owners are the problem, not bad dogs.
- None of these Calgary has never and should never support breed specific legislation. Calgary was always opposed to BSL and should continue to be
- What is the definition of "exhibiting dangerous behavior" and "nuisance" and who assess or assigns the moniker? The above seems specific in breed type and general in definition. Clarify your definitions and then people can give their opinions on your options. I don't believe pit-bull type dogs are all assumed to be dangerous. Perhaps the OWNER should take the 'How to be a Good Owner' class instead of the dog being vilified.
- Pit bulls aren't the problem.
- I do not agree to singling out pitbulls in particular. You're grouping all pitbull owners and that is super unfair. Besides there are other breeds that have a deadly bite along with pitbulls. Might as well add German shepherds, huskies, Rottweilers, dobermans, and so many other breeds.
- Enforce current bylaws in non offleash areas.
- There are more destructive breeds than pit bulls and I feel it is unfair to target specific breeds. Husky's and Ikeda's are more likely to bite. Bully breeds are unjustly targeted. Any dog that is antagonized can bite.



- Please do not name dog breeds!!! This just adds to the negative stigma. All dogs and owners have the ability to be inappropriate.
- Do not single out pitfalls, the dogs are not the problem, its the owners. Pitfalls are no more dangerous than any other dog and you singling them out like this is only going to harm responsible pet owners and fosters.
- If a there is a second instance of a dog being a nuisance there should be an automatic fine. If it bites, the fine should triple.
- NO DOG OWNER SHOULD HAVE TO PAY MORE FOR THEIR DOG JUST BECAUSE OF THE BREED OR THEY WAY THEY LOOK!! BAD OWNERS ARE THE PROBLEM NOT THE DOG
- It is not just pitbulls. It is the owners. Give them a huge fine. Also some small dogs are scarier than a pitbull. Dont distinguis from any breed. They bite someone or attack another dog. Seize them and fine the owners. I dont know if the dogs should ever be returned obviously the owner wasnt responsible enough. No second chances.
- All dogs regardless of breed are the responsibility of the owner. Owners should be penalized if their dogs cause other people and animals harm. I'd like to see some public education to prevent dog bites from happening.
- Please do not make laws specific to pit bulls. There is no benefit to breed specific legalization.
- Nuisance applies to many dogs of various breeds! Large breed are no stronger than bull breeds and unless it's a blanket rule to muzzle all large breeds like Rottweiler, cane corso, Mastiff, husky, Akita this is unfair to responsible owners who have trained and have never had an issue. More feet on the ground needed to enforce all the off leash dogs in on leash areas and people not scooping their poop. Focus on offenders and dogs that are picked up at large or breach bylaw rules and deemed specifically a nuisance. Not the breed but the individual dog!!
- Small dogs bite people more then pit bulls... you look so ignorant singling out these breeds.
- Choosing to backslide into breed specific Language in your bylaws is ridiculous. Calgary has long been held as the gold standard of animal bylaws in large part because of their fair and unbiased approach to bully type dogs. Going back from this is a huge step backwards. And for the record, do the research on Pitbulls and bite forces; they are NOT the strongest bite force dogs.
- Breed specific legislation is a lazy attempt and creating sensationalized news. Make legislation based on facts not media talking points. Disapointed the city wastes time discussing pitbulls at all!
- Fine the owner of ANY BREED! Not just "pit bulls"! Stop the narrow-minded biased opinion against "pit bulls"
- Owners should be held responsible for nuisance claims rather than punishing the pets
- The proposed breed specific legislation would apply directly to us, since we have had two "pit bull type" dogs living in our household for the last ten years (without any incidents). We are very concerned with several aspects of breed specific legislation (BSL) in general and these proposals in particular. The breed specific restrictions that were implemented in other jurisdictions (amongst them Edmonton and the province of Ontario) were not successful to curb unwanted dog bites, and also not successful to reduce the overall severity of dog bites. Such legislation would also unfairly target us dog owners who are complying with the bylaw and have licensed our dogs with the correct breed.



The proposed legislation also leaves completely open how and by who a dog's breed would be assessed, which could potentially lead to lengthy disputes. It also makes no statement regarding the "grandfathering" of dogs like ours that have lived in the community for prolonged periods of time. If any breed specific legislation were to be implemented, we would prefer a system where dogs could demonstrate that they are not dangerous (e.g. by a behavioral assessment) and live in the community normally.

- City of Calgary STOP USING PITBULL AS A BLANKET TERM FOR ALL OF THESE BREEDS. In addition the lumping in of the Staffordshire Bull Terrier with these breed is asinine. Our breed standard states "totally reliable, affectionate to all people, with an affinity for children". Does that sound like the standard of a dangerous dog to you? Smarten up, and stop calling my breed a pitbull.
- I don't like your wording here, because as much as you think we're brain dead, we know what you mean by "nuisance dogs". I do believe ANY dog that has been in trouble before should be dealt with differently. HOWEVER, we all know you guys are targeting pit bulls. Which, I dunno, fine problematic owners? If an idiot who buys a pitt bull trains it to be aggressive and you put the dog down, they will buy another dog and teach it to behave similarly. Punish the gross and incompetent owners. Fine them, maybe ban them from owning animals. You punish these people and all of a sudden you got a lot less issues with dogs and you could probably fine them a lot to make a bunch of money for, you know, a snow removal budget or something. I don't own a dog of any kind, but this is like killing a cat because it's black. [removed]
- Pit bulls are not the reason! It should be the owners who get penalized! I have been bitten by multiple small dogs unprovoked and the owners do not care. My dogs; current and past who have been pit bulls been attacked by other breeds and did nothing but the other owners do not take responsibility for their dogs because the breed that I had! It is unfair to single out a breed because the media chose to install fear in people's lives. It happened with other breeds in the past and should not continue! It is like singling our people because of the "stereotypes" which is wrong! Do not blame the breed because of other people's mistakes! No more back yard breeding and people need to be educated and trained on how to care for dogs because any dog can bite unprovoked but it should not be isolating a breed for no reason. That is shameful, embarrassing and disgusting.
- Two problems that bother me with bteed identiity is that people will mis-identify and hode that their dogs are pit-bulls and there are many people that take good care of their staffordshire terriers so they should not automatically be treated like bad dogs. I support massive fines and rules for dogs that are aggressive towards people even without a major bite occurring.
- insurance should be required for all dogs, then let the insurers decide what are high cost or low cost insurance dogs
- only one or two dogs per person while in park.
- "Pit bull" dogs are not the problem. I've NEVER had an issue with these breeds and I am an offleash ambassador as well as a vet assistant. Little dogs are way more often a nusience, loud, vicious, badly trained and more likely to attack. If you're worried about "pit bull strength" you should also worry about Bernese, St Bernards, Rottweilers, and wolfhounds. That excuse is a cop out. BSL has never been proven effective, anywhere, in its entire history.



- Stop the breed specific garbage.
- Using Breed Specific bylaws has been proven ineffective as a bite prevention mechanism in nearly all jurisdictions. STOP using language that perpetuates myths that pitbull-type dogs are more dangerous than other types. This is untrue.
- It is usually the owner at fault and not a specific breed. Staffordshire bullterriers are NOT pitbulls. They are known as the nanny dog, please educate.
- IT IS NOT PITBULLS THAT ARE THE PROBLEM ITS OWNERS THAT ARE THE PROBLEM
- Don't blame the animal, blame the bad Owner.
- Ban dangerous breeds
- I don't think pitbulls should have any extra laws it's not the dog it's the owners how about the owners needing to prove they can handle the dog not the dogs problem! I have a pitbull service dog fully certified with the government he's getting the short end of the stick because of stupid owners! He's the friendliest dog but now he can't go enjoy off leash parks or be a dog just because of his breed that isn't fair!
- Let's not go down the pit bull path - there is no evidence it works - instead focusing on "nuisance" dogs. Many dogs may look "pit" like but contain none of the listed breeds - then is it subjective rather than objective
- We are NOT a breed specific legislation city!! Please look at the responses to BSL in other areas. It does not help. Washington state recently passed a law banning municipalities from having BSL. This committee is going backwards on this issue. BSL does not work!!!
- Higher fines, obedience training, bans from dog parks (or other restrictions) should be required for dogs that have had a complaint of nuisance and/or aggressive behavior or if Calgary Community Standards representative observes it. Patrolling of city parks for these behaviors is encouraged.
- Several dog breeds are big and strong, signaling out one doesn't keep communities safer. You should have consulted veterinarians before mentioning any specific breed of dog, and this survey doesn't even ask me for a postal code, very disappointed my tax dollars are going to ask a lay person's uneducated opinion, go with science!
- Not singling out pitbull breeds, any dog breed can bite.
- Absolutely no breed specific bylaws.
- How about just aim it at nuisance dogs and not "pitbulls". Shepherds are more prone to aggressive behavior, should that not be specify if youre going this route?
- Rehoming nuisance dogs on first offence, termination on second offence.
- Avoid all breed specific legislation. First was dobermans and Shepard's and now pitties. Bad owners have bad dogs of all breeds.
- You should not focus on pitbulls as any large breed dog can do the exact same amount of damage. This is disgusting you're suggesting BSL.
- Bylaw should not discriminate against dog breed
- Nine of these are good options. A dog gets a noise complaint so it can't go to an off-leash park?? What's one got to do with the other. And can we please stop targeting "pit bull like breeds? Chihuahua's need the obedience training I've certainly been bitten more often by them.



- None of the above, its not a "breed" issue. Don't be foolish.
- Certified education program for owners of all pets made mandatory
- Absolutely disgusted to see Breed Specific Legislation being floated here. Shame on you.
- I do not support any legislation that singles out a specific breed or appearance of dog to be subject to different rules. There is an abundance of research out there that confirms BSL does not work. Calgarys model has been referred to all over the world as what responsible pet legislation should look like. We should not be changing from that to something that has been proven not to work. Ontario is looking at repealing their BSL because it doesn't work.
- Each person will have a subjective opinion of nuisance or dangerous behaviour. Will never support BSL, every dog is capable of biting and all should be treated equally despite the breed of dog. We need MUCH better control of off leash dogs being purposely walked off leash in on leash areas.
- Credentials for obedience trainers. there seems to be an awful lot of trainers operating in the city of Calgary using methods that science and experience have determined to be detrimental to the human/dog bond and often lead to an escalation of problem behaviours, especially in the case of aggression and other fear based behaviours. Pitbulls are not the problem. Their owners thinking they have a power breed that needs to be dominated in order to be under control is. If needed I can send a mountain of literature to back up the evidence that behaviourists the world over currently use in their practice to assure they are using the most modern methods to assist dogs in overcoming issues.
- I've been bitten by small dogs eleven times! Go after the individual dog, not a certain breed!
- Any breed can be found a nuisance so these should be applied to all animals.
- Rules should NOT be breed specific
- A nuisance dog is a nuisance dog. Shouldn't need to specify pit bull. I personally believe that all dog owners should be required to attend training with their animal regardless of size and/or breed.
- I would support a pitbull ban.
- I DO NOT support any breed specific bylaws.
- Breed specific legislation has proven to be ineffective and misguided in many other cities. I do not in any way agree with breed specific bylaws..
- charging owner with assault for repeated aggressive acts comitted by their dog. There are people who don't care about the danger their aggressive dog poses to the public. The only thing that gets their attention is to treat the attack as though the owner themselves had committed it
- Pittbulls arent the problem, owners tend to be more of the issue. People having unleashed dogs at the leash dog parks, not controlling their dogs..If a dog is trained to view everyone as a threat guess what happens when that backyard guard dog gets out? 24/7 tethering should be banned, and aggressive dogs should be required to be spayed/neutered.
- Stop picking on pit bulls or dogs of a specific breed...any dog can be a nuisance or attack without proper training or handling. The City if Calgary doe not need to be indicating a specific breed and this is wrong!
- Just ban pit bull ownership completely



- BSL has not worked in other cities. What has happened to Calgary? We once were a city whose animal control bylaws were lauded throughout North America
- BSL punishes innocent dogs based on 'looks' and not actions. Calgary has always been about responsible ownership but this will create misinformation misinterpretation resulting in innocent dogs suffering. Only breed-neutral, evidence-based legislation will have any chance to address dog-related problems in the community.
- Very disheartening that you're including breed-specific legislation, which is not supported by the literature regarding effective animal control bylaws.
- It's disgusting that you are making it seem that bullies are the problems. This is not ok and should really think about this one!
- This is so breedist. Essentially racism.
- Give a free year of licencing for all dogs that have completed obedience training, another year for a microchip. I have met some lovely staffies, amstaffs, pit bull terrier and am pitties. I have personally been bitten by a chinese crested that took a hunk of skin through my jeans. Give me a pit any day!
- I am offended by the way you single out pit bulls. There should not be specific rules for one type of dog
- Any sort of suggestion that pit bulls should some how be treated any differently than any other breed shoes a lack of understanding and close mindedness by the author. This is beyond ridiculous
- It's nice how one breed is discriminated against so fervently and used as a example in so many instances when I believe it's not warranted why not use a chihuahua as an example for breed legislation those "ankle biters" little dogs have nipped at my "pibull" than any other breed the city should be ashamed to demonize such beautiful dogs
- Fines for owners that let their dogs run off leash in a residential neighborhood
- BSL is not a good thing. I think you should be focusing on responsible pet guardianship and increased obedience training for all dogs. The off-leash parks in this city are a joke, too many untrained dogs running around while there people are visiting with friends. Retractable leashes shouldn't be allowed either, I think you should have to have a special license if you are going to use one of those.
- I am not sure that your definition of a nuisance dog would push me towards these restrictions, nor the type of dog. I would support these ventures if a dog has been sited for exhibiting dangerous behavior. A dog who can escape from its yard or possibly barks a bit too much and annoys the neighbors is not a good enough reason for me.
- fines for any dog involved in bylaw offences. any breed dog should have obedience training. If there is a potential for any breed dog to be out of control they should be muzzled. No single breed should be held to a higher standard
- Please do not separate out a breed. This has been proven not to work.
- if nuisance were defined solely as biting I'd be more in favour of some of these steps, but a dog that barks when left outside home alone for hours shouldn't need to be muzzled or banned from an off-leash park. The problem should be addressed with the owners. Dog's should be removed from



owners who repeatedly allow their dog to escape their yard, who are off-leash in on-leash areas, or who otherwise disturb members of the public in public areas

- Behaviour follow up reports would be useful
- Why just Pit Bulls. A Bull Mastiff attacked my dog and they have a locked jaw. They can be just as dangerous. How does someone get declared a nuisance? It has to be defined
- I would like to see more enforcement of "dogs must be under control" in off-leash parks. Just because a dog doesn't actively try to run away from the owner doesn't mean it is under control.
- Targeting pit bull breeds is a sign of total bias and miseducation.
- Owner education, that is all
- Please dismiss any and all options that are breed specific. It does not matter the breed of the dog when it comes to being a nuisance. Very disappointing that Calgary seems to be taking a step backwards with their thinking of some of these bylaws.
- Pit bulls do not have a stronger bite than most dogs. The average dog bite comes in at 230-250 psi, a pitbull bite is 235 psi. Fines and regulations should not be breed related.
- If you are going to add "pit bulls" you must define also add all the other strong breeds such as Akita, Chesapeake Bay Retrievers, Catahoula Leopard Dog, Doberman Pinscher, Rottweiler, Boerboel, Cane Corso, Pressa Canario. Plus, if you discriminate against dogs with pit bull in them, you are killing thousands of rescue dogs, as they may be 1/10th pit bull. Please do not have any breed ban or discrimination. Control the behaviours. Bad pet owners can ruin any breed of dog, including some that are even stronger than pit bulls.
- Stop going after bully breeds. Breed specific laws are ridiculous. Breed specific discrimination should not be tolerated. Owners are responsible for the actions of their animals (unless they are the victim) and themselves. Breed discrimination is absolutely archaic. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Put more resources into being able to educate people about different breeds and requirements.
- Follow what you have been doing don't label a breed.
- You must keep this breed neutral, several breeds have greater bite force and breed is not a factor in dog bite incidence
- Dangerous dog bylaws can be effective but breed specific bylaws have been shown to be expensive and ineffective. It is important to target legislation at dogs that have a history of dangerous behaviour not a wildly ambiguous law that targets dogs based on their looks and perceived breed.
- There should NOT be 'pit bull' specific laws of any sort. I do not own one but they are just another kind of dog.
- All dogs (no matter breed) should have mandatory obedience
- obedience training required for all dogs, not just pit bulls. Also, I don't understand why more insurance would be needed for a nuisance dog, as defined above.
- None of the above. It's truly disturbing (disgusting actually) that the city would even consider labeling pit bulls and pit bull like breeds. This is not acceptable in any way.
- Nothing pit bull specific, it's ridiculous to target one "breed" rather than the behaviours and poor ownership that can happen with any breed



- Take "pitbull" out of all of your selections. This is discrimination against a breed that is very difficult/impossible to identify. Don't even go there.
- Fines for owners who have dogs or children that initiated the incident. Little dogs and children are notorious for running towards, jumping at, biting and other instigating behaviors towards larger dogs. Most large dogs ignore it until they need it to stop - this is usually when a bite happens. More accountability must occur for the ENTIRE situation. Not simply punish the big dog and their owner. I would also argue that small yappy dogs should be considered nuisance dogs since they bite and are aggressive just as often as "pit bull" like type dogs, or any other large dog. **ALL SIZED OWNERS SHOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS OF THEIR DOGS.** Please stop targeting one breed, or one set of owner types (large dog owners). I own both - my yorkie was always the instigator against my rottweiler (10 lb vs 140 lb). Too many people simply blame the big dog - when the child or the small dog should have been stopped long ago from carrying on its provoking and annoying behaviour.
- The owners of nuisance dogs need low or no cost access to qualified, positive reinforcement-based trainers. It is shameful that breed specific legislation against pit bulls is even being considered - please follow the science on this subject and not uneducated public opinion. As well, forcing owners to get insurance for nuisance dogs (which includes 'barking') is ridiculous and only serves to add financial barriers to pet owners
- Don't bully my breed! My Bully has been charged at by "non-friendly" purse breeds (shitzu's, Chihuahua, etc) that have been in Off Leash Parks while remaining on a leash. Leash reactivity is the main issue that causes dog fights and issues.
- Fines and/or potential jail time for owners who do not remain on the scene of a dog attack
- If you include pit bulls please include the following: German Shepherds, any mastiff, all labs any medium to large dog. It would be more appropriate to do it by weight. How do you single out a pit bull and not a mastiff that weighs 150 lbs? I think if you have been
- Don't apply additional measures based on the breed. The measures should be the same for all breeds.
- Obedience training for ALL dogs, not just specific breeds or nuisance dogs.
- No breed bans
- It's not just pit bulls or "anything" that looks like!! I have seen more small dogs bite, than pit bulls! It shouldn't matter the breed, these rules should be for ANY breed. I think more needs to be done about small dog starting things, or being off leash and running up to big dogs. Many breeds bite and can be unsafe, you shouldn't centre out one breed. Send out a survey, asking what size dogs cause most issues, and what size dogs cause most issues, whether on street or dog park. You will see where the issues lay'
- I am 61 years old. I have never in my entire life ever met a mean or aggressive "pit bull". Though I have met over 100 mean and aggressive small breeds! Stop berating "pit bulls" and go after any dog that bites!
- Pit bulls are not the issue. As far as I know husky (huskyx) are just as risky as far as injury and death. Please do not single out pitbulls. We want safe socialized dogs. Whether it is a small breed or



large nuisance, out of control dogs should see the higher licensing, fines and insurance. Maybe then they will take pet ownership seriously.

- all dogs over a certain weight (certified annually by a qualified professional) should require to be muzzled in public regardless of breed. Its wrong to single out a dog by its breed. All dogs will bit a person but the big dogs can cause the problems. This should be applied to so called support animals.
- I strongly disagree with singling out pit bulls. The added strength is an old wives tale. I have more issues with labs and golden retrievers than bully breeds.
- Dogs with a pitbull look should have nothing to do with this. Treat each dog and owner individually. BSL doesn't work and only perpetuates the stigma.
- None of the above. The above restrictions are a form of prejudice. The breed is NOT the problem. Educating the public about dogs/kid behavior in dog parks/adult behavior in dog parks would be an excellent starting point.
- Most of the time it is the owner's fault, lack of training with the owner, not the specific dog.
- No breed specific legislation.
- Aggressive dogs should be euthanized. If someone is hurt no 2nd chance.
- Associate nuisance dogs with their owners.. aka if you have one trouble dog, all your dogs are flagged as potential trouble dogs.
- I strongly object to this whole line of suggestions Never owned a pit bull or Staffie but this is simply unacceptable to a 80 year old dog owner who has never had a dog picked up by the pound and has always had my dogs licensed. I object to this whole line of questions
- NOTHING!
- Pitbull breed should be banned within city limits. Enforcement should include jail time.
- More emphasis should be put on the owners of these dogs (there are no bad dogs, only bad owners!) Require owner to pay hefty fines that help fund rehabilitation programs for the dogs.
- I do not agree with breed-specific by-laws. Dogs should never be blamed for their behavior. The behaviors they exhibit are purely a reflection of their owners.
- Keep a recors of the owners and increase fines deny liscing within the municipality for repeat offenders. Action should be focused on the owner not the animal
- Pit bulls are not the issue, you really need to re word and re think this section
- Ban dangerous breeds from Calgary.
- “ the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull’s strength allows the potential for a more severe bite.” This is a fallacy and I STRONGLY OPPOSE BYLAWS BASED ON MYTHS! Bully breeds do NOT have any stronger bite power (psi) than ANY other breed!
- Item 2 - only orders acceptable would be to ensure dog stays on owners property for extent of investigation. No other orders would be acceptable.
- Please use science here. Obedience training is important for 'nuisance' dogs, but not all obedience training is equal. Punishment based training has been shown to increase aggression in dogs. Please make people get science based/humane training. It works and it's safer. Also I assume a dog isn't declared a nuisance for escaping its yard once or twice... that wouldn't be fair to the dog or owner.



- Get your disgusting BSL away from my dog.
- Nuisance dogs are nowhere near same worry that biting dogs are so don't understand why you want heavier control. That was not what was shared in meetings I attended. And BSL is not what the engagement groups wanted either so stop pushing your desires on the public please/. No need for BSL. Any dog can be a threat.
- This is totally unacceptable the problem does not exist with the breed it exists with the person who owned it. I have owned several large breed dogs in this category and they have amazing temperaments. The problem is training is needed of the owners
- Fully on board with restrictions based on nuisance behaviour, but absolutely against those restrictions being breed based. There is insufficient data to demonstrate that pit bull type dogs are any worse behaved or more dangerous than other breeds. I would also support similar rules applying to all dogs owned by a household that has had nuisance dogs, so that the bad owner who has a nuisance dog already is discouraged from getting additional dogs and turning them into nuisances.
- Pit bulls and other like breeds MUST be outlawed. They are a danger and threat to all including their owners
- I am disappointed in breed-specific legislation. It's based on public pandering, not science
- I feel like for any responsible dog owner to use an off leash park they should be required to go to obedience classes.
- Ban the breeding of pit bulls. There's no place for a dog breed with aggression as a breed trait and that much strength in modern society and it's unfair to them to be a breed often sought out by irresponsible dog owners (and thus neglected and abused). Owned and adoptable pit bulls and responsible owners shouldn't suffer for it as not all are aggressive, but they should be illegal to breed. Also, a lot of these questions are too open ended, if my dog growls and barks at someone entering my property, does that give the city the right to take her away? What exactly is a nuisance and what option of redemption do they have (ie. if they were barking all day and owners were trying to find a solution, does this mean they can't go to dog parks? What purpose does this serve and can the owner go to dog parks after a set amount of time since nuisance report? A bored dog is just going to bark more).
- Pit bulls banned from ownership or adoption in the City of Calgary
- Dog parks Are accidents waiting to happen, we not make people leash dogs here. A person should Be able recall their dogs 100% of the time to be off leash. There are so many bad pet owners going to nose hill.
- The term "nuisance" as defined in a sketchy way makes many options, for ex. if a dog barks for 1-2 minutes it could be then a nuisance for anybody who does not like dogs and call the Bylaw for any personal grievances., plus the influx of drug addicts with erratic/psychotic behaviour provokes barking. Keep dangerous dog definition as attacking people or other dogs ! .
- Incident specific bylaws, not breed based bylaws. specific
- Pitbulls are not the problem, owners are. breed specific legislation does nothing to curtail bites, just look at other jurisdictions with the same rules. they are actually reversing them.



- Causing pitbulls to be muzzled across the board is cruel to the animals. They are super sweet dogs naturally and shouldn't be subject to that unless their owners have trained them to be bad.
- There are more breeds (EX: Chihuahua, Pekingese, Yorkies, Dachshund, Jack Russell's, Cocker Spaniel's) that bite people the most often. Yet you don't hear that on the media! Stop vilifying "pit bull's", 99% of them are well behaved, unlike small dogs that are mean and vicious to everyone 60-70% if the time!
- You're very much pigeonholing people/breeds. Many people own dogs that have reactivity issues. Basing the bylaw based on breed or without clearer definitions/terms is way off base. Perhaps the city should open up buildings and help reduce the cost of training classes. This would pay off 10 fold as we all know a well trained dog is typically a happy dog. Happy dogs, don't seek their own entertainment. If we can educate owners and make training accessible to more people. We should see a decline in AC calls.
- Small dogs should get the same discrimination as pit bulls. They are out of control, barking, nuisance, they aggravate all other Dogs in off leash parks and Owners do Nothing. as they lunge and bark at bigger dogs. Who in turn are the "bad dogs" For defending themselves. If pit bull training is Mandatory all dog training should be mandatory .
- It doesn't make any sense to bar all nuisance dogs (ie a frequent barker) from dog parks. It doesn't make sense to ban an entire set of breeds. Ban dogs who have bitten. Require muzzles for dogs who have bitten.
- Reach out to breeders ckc and trainers such as myself (harmoniousstate.ca) we can help implement better programs. As a breeder of am staffs I can tell you how wrong your information is about the breed.
- NO BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS. Come on grow up and leave the hard work done by Bill alone.
- How dare you single out pit bull like dogs? any dog that is bigger than a rat has the potential to inflict damage when they bite.
- Additional authority to euthanize problem dogs.
- Obedience training required for all large or potentially aggressive dog breeds.
- Discriminating by breed is tantamount to racism, the fact that this is even being considered makes me ashamed of this city, I have been attacked by 5 dogs on separate occasions, 1 Pomeranian cross, 2 shih tzu mixes, 1 Dachshund and 1 german shepard mix, yet I have had more interaction with pit bull mixes and have never been shown aggression.
- These are ridiculous. Breed specific legislation has been shown not to work in multiple other cities, and singling out one breed, rather than a specific behavior is ignorant. Focus on training and limiting exposure to problem animals. If a lot of these came into effect you would have to specify what "nuisance" means. Based on the definition for these questions, it is a wide scope of issues. Muzzling dogs that have been at large more than once doesn't make sense.
- Graduated license scheme where owners of specified breeds need to demonstrate an understanding of the breeds specific needs. This is no different than needing a different license for different vehicles. Public education campaign aimed at non-dog owners. They can be a significant factor in inducing negative behaviour. It is far too easy for many people to forget that different



communities view dogs role and status differently and they may not understand the conventions here leading to confusion and possibly conflict. The dog is a product of its environment.

- Higher licensing fees for pit bulls and nuisance dogs.
- Singling out certain breeds just makes those potential owners find the next best dog for them. It's the owners that's usually the problem, not just the dog's fault.
- Avoid all breed specific legislation please.
- Why are you singling out pit bulls?
- Tracking ownership of "nuisance dogs" and put restrictions in place to prevent owners that have a history of incidents from owning powerful breeds.
- This should also focus on the Owner's behaviors, they should complete significant training if one offense.
- Cannot select these without knowing how a dog is declared a nuisance. What are the criteria?
- I fully support the way Calgary has handled BSL, and refusing to make it a part of our culture. The stereotypes against them are just that, and as a city where we promote inclusivity, I think this is a very important decision to foster belonging. Bully breed owners are discriminated against enough, we don't need it from the City we call home as well.
- I firmly believe there are no bad dogs, just bad owners. Seizure of problem dogs would be acceptable if they are given a second change in foster care and not destroyed.
- Pit bulls are not more of an issue than other dogs. Any bylaws should not be breed basis.
- If pitbulls require obedience training, ALL DOGS should required obedience training. There should not be any breed-specific bylaws for animals. Aggressive dog behaviour is a result of its owners and are not indicated by breed. I know more people who have been attacked by golden retrievers than pitbulls. I can't believe this is even up for discussion. Very disappointed in the city.
- If a dog is loose and bites a person it should be caught and destroyed within 24 hours. Owner should be fined in accordance with severity of bite.
- EVERY large dog can cause serious injury stop singling out specific breeds!
- Ban on those breeds altogether
- I would support banned them altogether.
- No breed-specific legislation - owners of all breeds of dogs need to be more responsible with their animals, including leashing, obedience training, etc.
- I highly appose singling out out pit bulls in any city bylaw
- Responsible ownership certification for owners of "nuisance" dogs - putting the emphasis on educating the owner, rather than fixing the dog. Behavioural issues are often a result of neglect on the owner's part - they've neglected to socialize or train the animal, or they've not treated them well (lack of exercise, time, attention).
- We're against any BSL. Stop targeting breeds and focus on education. For example You need Education on the pitbull terrier breed. And remove all other breeds from this discussion.
- Enable 311 report when dog owners don't have their dog on leash in leash zone such as play grounds and parks.



- Easier reporting process for persistent and uncontrolled barking dogs where owners do not control their dogs. Fines for repeated offences that can be verified by video reports.
- it's so much more about proper training. both 'nuisance at & dogs that wouldn't be considered as that. all dog & pet owners are 100% responsible for their pets. always.
- Please do not practice such blatant ignorance regarding "pit bulls" as it comes across as uneducated, stereotypical and biased
- No dogs should be off leash except on private property. Off leash parks are not a good idea.
- I don't support singling out pit bulls for bylaw purposes.
- Breed specific laws are ignorant and dangerous. You've phrased on of the questions here to equate put bulls with nuisance animals, which is pointing to your intent to label pitbulls are nuisance animals, which violates evidence and the Spirit of this survey
- It is clear that the City is looking to be selective towards 1 type of looking dog. I can not see these addressing true concerns of Dog bites. This is forcing on breed nothing more.
- Disheartening that you are being breed specific and would prefer that nuisance is referred to ANY BREED/TYPE since BSL has been proven inefficient in many states/provinces. I feel nuisance should be reviewed as a case to case basis... and required dog/owner training would be mandatory if fined/offender etc. Options to surrender their animal to a rescue of their choice vs humane society.
- I like the idea of muzzles, though I worry it could turn some folks into the 'pit police' thinking they can identify and confront park users they think for this description. I think that education is key. I don't favour solutions that favour those with money to counter bad behaviour. Perhaps owners with pits and nuisance animals would have to attend and pass a city run (free) obedience course (showing appropriate control of their animal) to be exempt from any higher insurance need or to receive a special 'pit' license (the city is aware of the animal and content it was able to complete the needed training so the handler and animal are able to demonstrate their knowledge in navigating problem situations. I don't want the city to judge the animals by themselves as many can be great and it's poor handlers that often result in poor animal behaviour. I don't favour outright breed bans but education and precautions seem reasonable.
- Pit bull ban
- Ban pit bulls. Also ban people who think it's cool to have one. Alternatively allow citizens to use public facilities while carrying defensive weapons. Which is riskier - pit bulls with unknown tendencies under the control of careless or aggressive owners or weapons in the hands of licensed citizens?
- I found it difficult to answer these questions when "nuisance" doesn't must mean a vicious or prone to biting, but rather includes roaming and loud dogs. I don't think a dog that barks loudly or roams should be muzzled but if it's vicious and/or bites, then yes. Same goes for the additional insurance - yes if they are vicious or a biter, but not if prone to bark a lot or roam. I would also add that I don't think Pit Bulls should have special restrictions but the threshold should be lower i.e. if a Pit Bull bites once, they must wear a muzzle, if a non-Pit Bull bites once, maybe they get another chance before being considered a "nuisance" just from a safety perspective.



- BAN PITBULLS COMPLETELY IN THE CITY OF CALGARY AND OUTLYING AREAS UNLESS THE DOG ATTENDS A STANDARD BEHAVIORAL TEST AND PASSES
- pitbulls are not the problem, please do some research, it is poor ownership. there are several dogs ahead of pitbull types that bite more people per capita.
- Calgary Community Standards should have the authority to seize a dog that has exhibited dangerous behaviour but also dogs that are responsible for more than 2 interim orders or nuisance infractions. Upon a 3rd incident, people can only stop the seizure if they complete a thorough obedience class within 60 days. If a 4th incident occurs, then the dog is seized and the owner cannot get a license for another dog.
- Mandatory spay neuter. There are some lovely ones. The breed however needs to disappear.
- The breed is not the problem, the irresponsible owners are.
- Don't implement breed specific legislation, especially since you clearly state these breeds are not more likely to be a nuisance. Breed specific legislation is not evidence-based policy.
- DO not penalize the DOG and the breed! Change the dialoge to address the bad owners! My dog had been 'confronted' by many other breeds of dog in the off leash but never a pit bull! There needs to be free classes for all dog owners to learn dog behavior and better communication/understanding of dog behavior. Of the 20 years I been attending off leash, incidents always happen when the owner is not watching their dogs behavior. There are no bad dogs, just poor dog owners!
- Great ideas. I support all of them! Watched a golden retriever killed at Edworthy dog park last year by a pitbull. The guy took off with his pitbull as people tried to save the retriever.
- Including "pit bulls" in this questioning makes no sense. All dogs have a bit risk, labeling a specific breed makes no sense. We don't have breed specific legislation in calgary.
- I do not agree with any of these. It is very unfair to just assume the pit bull breads should have more rules than any other dog breed. If anything it should be the owner who needs to be watched or looked over because that is where the dog learns its behavior. It breaks my heart to see these accusations.
- I do not support measures that affect pitbulls or dogs that appear to be pitbulls (having seen other municipalities incorrectly identify non-bully breeds on appearance alone). I do support measures that discourage people from seeking bully breeds for violent uses/ aggression.
- I would not single out one breed. IMO It's the owners that need to be held accountable. How about educating the public about dog ownership before buying/licencing a pooch.
- I don't think its fair to single out a breed. Whatever measures that are put in place should be to encourage responsible ownership and training. Not on punishing the dog or responsible owners
- I strongly support all of these steps to reduce serious attacks by pitbulls. My family has 2 pitbull attacks n kids in front of our home with a month of each other. The first child required reconstructive surgery. Thank you for addressing this issue.
- All programs must be cost-effectively enforceable; No regulatory burden shall be put in place if it can't be cost-effectively enforced; prioritize cost-efficiency;



- The pit bulls in my neighbourhood are quite well behaved, and to put a bylaw on ONE breed when others like the Dogo Argentino are permitted is crazy. Shouldn't single out legislation for one breed. Studies show small dogs are the most likely to bite.
- This is the dumbest thing I've read. You want to separate people from their pets? You want the power to seize pets for NO reason?? If any of these pass I will work tirelessly to replace this city council with smarter people !
- While I do not feel it is fair to single out pit-bulls. I do support limiting the number of nuisance dogs per-household
- I strongly disagree with targetting pitbulls and pitbull owners
- More patrol and stricter enforcement of pets off leash in non off leash areas.
- Deal with dogs case by case. Don't judge a dog by their breed. It's about ownership not the dogs breed.
- bsl unfairly targets responsible pet owners. The reality is all dogs can pose a huge bite risk. The current by law needs to be enforced more. The city has fallen short in this area.
- It is ridiculous to punish and single out a single dog breed. I understand the intent in protecting people from the most dangerous bites, but the punishments should be on the owner and NOT the dog in any way.
- Do not target bull breeds - you're wasting taxpayers money by going after these dogs
- None of the above. These options are ridiculous
- If pitbulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other breeds why are they SPECIFICALLY being targeted for rules while other breeds are not?
- Owner training for nuisance dogs. I would not support any breed specific legislation, however.
- Please educate yourselves to see that this is not the way to go. I cannot believe that Calgary is so ignorant that they might try to enact breed specific legislation.
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household.
- You people are mental. This is idiocy
- Making a Breed specific legislation does not fix the problem. The problem is irresponsible pet owners. Bully breed dogs should not be condemned because of how they look.if you want changes start at the root which is pet owners that do not understand how to control a dog (this means ANY breed). A lot of problems are small dogs that can get away with anything just because they don't cause as much damage when in fact they instigate situations that they can not win. Make resources more affordable and easier for dog owners(large and small) to access. There is no reason to single out a dog because of how it looks, stop the stigma. Before pitbulls it was german shepherds, and before that another breed. .
- I don't think it is fair to discriminate the bully breeds. IF new bylaws are passed not allowing bully breeds in certain places , 1 per household , muzzling them. The City of Calgary is the problem. More dogs will end up in shelters / homeless. They deserve to live a normal life just like any other breed. Dogs that have known behavioural issues should have to go to obedience training .
- The problem behind nuisance dogs is the owner not the breed.



- Pitbulls aren't a problem, poor owners and those with a lack of knowledge or experience with this dogs are the problem. I own a pitbull terrier cross and hes been bite by countless purse dogs all while hes never attacked anyone and hes a gentle soul. Shame on the city of calgary for accusing animals like pitbulls to be vicious or dangerous. You seem to lack an understanding of canines and which ones are a nuisances. You base their aggression and level of dabger based on their size? So i assume all males who are taller than 5 ft should be considered dangerous aswell? Shame on you and your narrow closed minded outlook on this totic of breed selected legislation. My pitbull will always remain with me and i assure you that not one person will be placing their hands on his head so help me god! So its safe to assume that the statistics that showcase how small dogs are lore vicious will be included in this survey?
- Pitbull and pitbull type breeds should NOT be singled out - if any dog is demonstrating agressive behaviour or has bitten someone, the owner of the animal should be required to take some kind of training to be able to work with and train their animal properly
- I have noticed a larger number of dogs in Legacy and are not well controlled, I.e. barking and lunging at youngsters. When young mothers with strollers are fearful to walk in the park I think dogs should not be allowed near young children and have a walking park for themselves.
- All of these suggestions are ludicrous. Punish the owners, not the dogs. The fact that the city is considering breed shaming is disgusting and the city should be ashamed of itself. Impose harsh penalties on owners that don't take care of their dogs, but it is absolutely stupid to lump all dogs together in the same category because of their looks.
- Owners should be responsible for their pet training. The definition of 'declared' seems a bit loose and arbitrary. You're targeting a breed instead of reckless behaviour of the owner.
- This bylaw needs to be scraped. It's not the dogs that are the problems it's the owner
- Rottweilers and German Shepherds have been scientifically proven to Have a stronger bite force than a pitbull. Chow Chow, doberman pinscher, dalmatian, Rottweiler, Jack Russell terrier and German Shepherds have all scientifically been proven to be more aggressive than Pitbulls. I think Calgary needs to re-think the breed they are attacking and look at the owner instead.
- It's not the dogs it's the owners, how many times do you need to hear that before it clicks.
- NONE!!!
- Don't discriminate against a specific breed! This city is better than that!!
- BSL is wrong
- NOTHING!!!!!!!! It is 99.999% the owner, NOT "bully" breeds. Get over this discrimination.
- Confiscation of nuisance/threatening dogs from irresponsible owners and bans on those owners owning further animals set at a lower threshold. Punish the owner, not the dog (Unprovoked aggression should never be tolerated)
- People with a history of violence, criminal activity, owning aggressive animals or known for nuisance should be banned from owning any dog breed
- I feel the targeting of pit bulls due to their breed is a form of dog racism. It should be on the onus of the owner to be training their dog properly. We should be targeting behaviour, not breed.



- I would support treating each dog with the same rules and regulations AND NOT SINGLING OUT certain breeds.
- Please no discrimination against bully breeds! I work in the animal industry and the worst dog fight I've been involved with was instigated by a golden retriever.
- This is absolutely ridiculous ! As you've stated pit bulls are NOT involved in more bitter incidents than other breeds !! What that means is that it is NOT the breed, it is the owners. Animals should NOT be punished for human error or laps in judgement. Good animals and responsible dog owners should NOT be punished because there are a few bad seeds !! Honestly, as a non 'pit' or 'bull' breed owner myself, it's disgusting to think that some people would actually think any of these suggested options are a good idea at all.
- I am shocked that a progressive City like Calgary is reverting to this truly closed minded way of thinking. [removed] Therefore there should not be biased laws based on breed.
- I think it's disgusting that you would single out one breed as causing the problems when you actually stated that they don't have a higher rate of bites. The problem lies with the owners. If they can't control their dog, whether it be on leash, or if it gets out of the yard, or whatever the situation is, then deal with the owners. If a dog bites, then deal with that individual situation. Have you seen images of the damage a Husky can do??? How about a Golden Retriever? Like the one that tried to attack me and went into a rage. I can't believe in this day and age there are still people around that are so stupid to think that these ridiculous laws will protect people. Do you actually think the people that keep dangerous dogs are going to follow these bylaws? The local drug dealer who trains his dogs to bite or be aggressive is not going to muzzle the dog when he's walking down the street.
- Pit bulls are not the problem , bad owners are , huskies are more likely to attack . Chihuahua may not have a huge bite but they are more aggressive . If passed I would sell my house and move from Calgary in a heartbeat ! I don't even own a pit bull currently because of work but have in the past . City of Calgary give your head a shake !!
- None of the above
- Stop demonizing one or two dog types. Make all dog owners responsible and hold small dog owners to the same standard you put them all to
- None of the above - these are blanket questions with no scenarios. This survey is towards pit bulls and I don't agree with any of this.
- Pitbull types of dogs are not the problem. How about every human has to learn to be a proper and responsible pet owner? How about all dogs should require obedience training before being allowed in off leash dog parks in general I wouldn't specify it any breed of dog, I specify that to everyone of them. And dogs have to be neutered and spade to go to outdoor public dog parks. No ands or ifs.
- This is breed specific legislation and I do not support any of the above
- Start holding owners accountable for nuisance dogs! Owner of vicious dogs who have failed to correct issue after dog has been deemed vicious should have dog removed from home and taken to a humane society to be rehabilitated, well owner should be banned from owning dogs.
- These rules are completely ridiculous. Punish the owner not the dog.
- Apply to all dog breeds, smaller dogs bites more then "bully" dogs



- Pit Bulls are not inherently aggressive. There should not be Legislation against them.
- Nothing breed specific. A nuisance dog is a nuisance dog. Breed shouldn't matter. Responsible ownership of all animals is what matters.
- Nuisance must be more clearly defined in order to accurately answer questions.
- Owners being held responsible, responsible pet owners classes for person's with nuisance dogs. Who cares about the breed, its all about the owners
- BSL doesn't work. Literal science to back this up. Shame on you Calgary.
- Do NOT breed discriminate.
- All dogs should have obedience training. Owners should be responsible for their dogs behavior. Why single out pit bulls. Why not add German Shepards, labs (lots bite and they are strong too), Rottweiler's, etc, ect, etc.
- New dog owners need to do a basic responsible dog owners course before they get their dog licensed.
- Nothing, your picking on a breed when there are others ie. shepherds with just as strong bites... not ok with any additional bylaws for pitbulls.
- Owners be educated on dog behavior, pitbull or poodle
- Guard dog type working breeds such as German Shepherds and Rottweilers should also be considered for these bylaws due to their jaw strength, and not just "pit bull" type breeds.
- no breed soecific legislation works. It is the owner, not the breed. Pit pulls are not the dogs that attack the most. Why are you targeting them you jerks!
- Full investigation launched into the owners treatment of nuisance dogs and if evidence of abuse or neglect found, dog is apprehended, rehabilitated and rehomed and owner is charged criminally and banned from owning animals for life.
- Do not make owners muzzle their dogs. That is terrible.
- Stop blaming pit bulls when it is irresponsible pet owners. Pit bulls are not the problem.
- People who own little dogs and believe they are not the problem should be held more accountable than people who own "pitbulls". My "Pitbull" is far more well behaved than a lot of "grandma" dogs aka the little shits that bark at a [removed] butterfly or a leaf. How dare whoever came up with this idea to ostracized "pitbulls" and have it come to this point. They clearly have never owned one or been around one before. Shame on them.
- It is terrible that you're considering taking this action against specific dog breeds. I am so disappointed.
- How about fine the [removed] owner. Make them take an education course
- Dog training required for any new dog owner
- Stop singling out pit bulls, they are beautiful dogs (once called the nanny breed because of how good they are with kids). Maybe we need to jail the owners and rehome the dogs!
- Higher fines for people who don't train ANY dog properly leading to bites or other nuisance behaviour.
- Training for owners of nuisance dogs
- Pit bulls are wonderful dogs. Dogs should be individually assessed.



- I cannot believe I am having to say this but this feels very discriminatory towards the staffy/pitbull breeds. You should be focusing on dogs as a whole and not separating out breeds. A dog is a dog. Yes, a staffy is larger than a jack russell making it stronger. But is it really different from a german shephard or a mastif? Please research the bite facts of dogs and the different breeds before stating "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." Not because it's a pitbull..
- Training to advanced level with proven testing of owners for nuisance dogs is more important than insurance. But insurance must include renters not just home owners. A nuisance dog is any breed and is an untrained owner - must prove ability to handle animal to remove nuisance declaration.
- Fine and punish owners of dogs that have actually committed an offense.
- Invest in training for dogs and owners found to be a nuisance. The problem is not the dog it is often the owner and shame on the City of Calgary for singling out "block headed" dogs
- This Bsl is bs If your going to pick breeds by likelihood of nuisance, biting , barking etc Chihuahuas, jack russel , shitzus And the number 1 is lab retrievers This poor breed has been maligned because of few bad owners They test 10% higher than average in all areas of positive demeanor 25 yrs of rescue this infuriates me
- It's appalling that pit bulls are being identified like this.
- Pit bulls are not a dangerous breed. It's the owners that make a dog, putting these laws against what you consider to be a "dangerous" dog would lead to unnecessary euthanizing of perfectly fine dogs. Untrained and uneducated owners are the problem not pit bulls.
- There is no evidence to support breed specific legislation. As a veterinarian who treats many pit bulls, I am strongly against any breed or pit bull specific legislation.
- Any specific breed is not to blame! Chihuahuas are involved in more dog attacks in North America than any other breed! The owner is to blame , not the dog! Any law that targets a specific breed is no better than a law that targets a specific race and have no place in modern society!
- STOP blaming the appearance of a dog. Put more responsibility on the owner. I believe there should be a standard obedience training for ALL dog owners and to not single out a certain breed or behaviour that a dog is exhibiting. The owner should have temporary custody and training should be completed within 3 months after acquiring a pet. Baseline skills need to happen for both the owner and pet. After the temporary custody, the owner needs to license the dog. Failing to license the dog should be a maximum fine.
- Dogs should be on leash 100% of time when on side walks or back alleys
- Ban Flexi leashes. They are dangerous and ineffective, they lead to more fights and human injuries.
- I don't understand why Pit bulls are the only breed put as the most dangerous dogs, I had a dog that bite me and he was a small dog, I think it is the owners responsibility, do not single out one breed.
- No fines stupid bylaw plan
- Don't discriminate a specific dog breed. Crack down on the owner of _any_ dog breed allowing or encouraging dangerous behaviour, whether it is a pit bull or some blood thirsty demon worshipping chihuahua



- Segmenting a dog based on a breed isn't right unless there are other qualifying criteria. As stated "pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents". If the breed does not cause more bite incidents than others there has to be another criteria other than the way the dog looks.
- Obedience training required for ALL dog owners.
- Just want to say its kind of BS that you are singling out Pit Bulls and Pit Bull like breeds. I have a Boxer and she is the nicest dog in the world! She lets kids do whatever they want to her and has NEVER shown aggression to people or other animals! I shouldn't have to mussle her when the worst thing she's going to do is lick you!! I believe fines for bad dogs of all breeds are acceptable. But don't single out a breed without knowing the dogs demener. Its like racism.. but towards dogs! Come on City of Calgary!!! We are better then this!!
- There needs to be owner accountability. It's not the dogs fault, it's the owners fault for not training them. Make sure that owners are aware of the individual needs of dogs and are prepared to take care of them properly. The owners need to be held accountable, not the dogs who look to the owners for guidance.
- Change pit bull to any dog. I have never felt threatened by a pitbull, but been bit by small dogs, chased by breeds considered family breeds (was crossing the street)
- Dogs considered a nuisance must be kept on-leash at off-leash park.
- All dogs should require obedience classes. All people should be taught how to be around animals. Singling out Pit bulls is not a solution. Who gets to decide which dogs are dangerous or a nuisance? It is sometimes the fault of the way the animal is approached and not the pet owner's fault.
- Being a dog owner all of these are discriminatory towards a breed of dog that are some of the kindest (and no I don't own a bully breed). There are small dogs cause more issues that any big dogs.
- All dogs that are "nuisances" should have penalties NOT just "pit bulls"
- No to breed discrimination. A dog's behaviour is based on the training and treatment of the dog. Owner is responsible for it; not it's breed. Do not single out pit bulls. I know people who own pit bulls and they are the sweetest pups. Sometimes smaller breeds are meaner than pit bulls.
- Pit bulls have become the most mis understood breed ! Any breed with lack of good leadership can act out and all breeds need to be treated equally
- Fines should be given based on the owners training of any dog. SHOULD NOT be breed specific. Suggesting pitbull breeds should not be in off leash areas is outrageous. Simply, aggressive dogs (ANY BREED) should be dealt with through training and owner responsibility.
- Please educate yourselves, as this survey is offensive in today's day and age. Pitbulls are not "nuisance" dogs. ANY dog can be nippy and it is dependent on many factors not just breed.
- None of the above Racism is not cool any more
- Target bad owners not the animal. It starts with the owner. Bad owner equals bad behavior.
- Higher fines for all dogs and their owners involved in bylaw offenses
- Behavioural programs for the owner of nuisance dogs. The dogs behaviour is learned from the owner. If they are treated poorly, they will act poorly. The owner should be given resources for how to properly treat a dog.



- Breed neutral language is important. Behaviour Trump's breed.
- Obedience Training and Grooming required for dogs OF ALL DOG BREEDS.
- Hold the owners responsible; not the dog. It's all based on how the animal is trained
- I would kindly ask you to do your due diligence on how powerful a "pit bull" bite is versus a Dalmatian and any other dog. Your information is incorrect.
- Cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a house hold no matter the breed.
- As a pitbull owner I am extremely dissatisfied to see pitbulls targeted in this question and proposal. Unless you have evidence to justify a different rate or severity of attacks by breed you are discriminating needlessly. Further, by adding more restrictions one encourages less socializing of animals and thus encourages more anti-social behaviour from them so setting breed specific rules will further enforce stereotypes. Again, severely disappointed to be seeing such discrimination.
- training for owners. Obviously people don't understand their dogs or know how to train them. Everyone goes right for the dogs first, it's the owners fault not the dogs. Pit ills are by nature actually a very gentle breed. Stop blaming them, start blaming the owners.
- To single out pit bulls and bully breeds is completely and utterly wrong. My bully got bit by a Bernese Mountain Dog for no good reason, and he cried and ran to me instead of fighting back. Should we now consider all Bernese mountain dogs dangerous? The onus should be on the dogs owners, NOT the breeds. I've seen chihuahuas more aggressive than any bully I've encountered.
- Little dogs can be more aggressive than pit bulls. I don't support any additional fines, training, muzzling or anything that singles out a specific breed. I would however support that ALL dogs registered within the city of Calgary be required to take obedience training. If required, the price should be subsidized or come at a more affordable rate (\$25/class and under).
- This is a bogus bylaw, any dog can bite and hurt someone. All large breed dogs have a strong bite force that doesn't diminish the aggressive nature of some small breed dogs. Responsible pet ownership is just that, the responsibility of the owner to raise a trained and proper behavioral characteristics. Punish bad owners not the dogs
- The Bylaws suggested for pit-bull and pit-bull-like breeds are extremely biased, and if its specifically in regards to the potential damage they may create it would only be fair to push for the same legislation on all large dog breeds of the like. Its just another breed being victimized from a long list. German Shepard's saw it in the 1990's and the Rottweilers and Doberman breeds got the brunt of it over the previous 2 decades. The problem involves bad owners, who need to be charged, not the dog type. Look into more charges/arrests/etc. For those abusing their animals, and mistreating them. That's where the problem behaviora generate from.
- Higher Fines for the owners that Have nuisance dogs. They are the ones that can't control them & shouldn't own them.
- None of the above. Making separate rules for pitbull type breeds is ridiculous
- This bylaw should be breed neutral. Not the breed but the uneducated owners and walkers are the real problems. I don't have pit bulls but if I could have a second dog, it would be a pit bull.



- I do not support any breed specific legislation. Being a pitbull or any other breed does not make a dog a nuisance animal. This language is highly concerning. No animal should be singled out based on their appearance and compared or lumped in with nuisance animals. No.
- it is disappointing that a specific breed is mentioned and i do not support this type of verbiage. Dogs that require training and restraint should be mentioned. Owners should be held accountable for their animals behaviour.
- Owners are the problem, not the breed. Don't punish breeds for a few owners. Have enforcement actually engage in parks and popular areas and deliver judgment based on real time evidence, not breed myths. I've had my finger torn open by pomeranians and watched bully breeds exhibit extraordinary nurturing and empathetic behavior. These dogs are victims. Their owners are the criminals. This is abhorrent and cruel and unfair, this is one of the only provinces where bullies can have good homes and not have to face the anxiety of muzzles, mistrust, and feeling the stress of their owners because of their physical characteristics. Many dogs will end up euthanized because our rescues won't be able to take them all. Focus on crime handling of fighting rings, gangs, and gambling, and you'll see the abuse that makes dogs violent lower too. Good grief, Calgary.
- No more than one nuisance dog in the home - not type/breed specific
- Make obedience training a requirement for all dogs. The owners are the issue not the dog breed.
- Breed specific legislation should NOT be considered for Calgary
- The inclusion of Pit Bulls is not necessary. Some of the possibilities listed here punish all dogs of that breed when the problem is the owners not handling their dogs appropriately.
- This is wrong just because a dog is a certain breed it should not be penalized. I know lots of beautiful bull dogs. This is very disappointing.
- All of these breed specific regulations are ridiculous.
- No dog is biologically equipped with a unique jaw structure, locking mechanism or "style" that would differentiate them from other breeds of dogs. No scientific research exists to substantiate the myth that pitbull dogs bite differently or more severely. A study of a simulated bite sleeve test with a German Shepherd, Rottweiler, and American Pitbull Terrier showed that the pitbull bite registered the least amount of pressure among the group. As a responsible pitbull mix owner, I beg you to please do your research on the matter before imposing egregious bylaws of the sort on a specific breed when the majority or the concerns are based on false information and myths. I fully agree on sanctions being placed on irresponsible pet owners that do not take appropriate measures to reduce risk and properly train their animals but this cannot be determined by breed. There are many breeds with double and triple the bite PSI of a pitbull that are also greater in size and force in general. If sanctions of the sort are put on pit bulls they should also apply to all breeds with equal or higher bite psi. The pitbull ranks 19th out of 23 in dog bite PSI and Cane Corso's are 3rd out of 23 on the list at 700 PSI. That is 3x the PSI of a pitbull. For another reference, the pit bulls PSI is 5 PSI more than a labrador which has a bite PSI of 230. Statistics show that pit bulls have one of the weakest bite force of all breeds. The top 5 in dog to human bites rated by frequency and severity is 1. Labrador's 2. German Shepherd 3. chihuahua 4. australian cattle dog and lastly in 5th place is the pitbull. These ranks also confirm that in the majority of cases, the dogs are provoked, are not spayed or neutered,



and often times chained animals. Pitbulls also have a very high temperament passing rate at 86.7% which is higher than Chihuahuas, border collies, and beagles. Multiple peer reviewed studies have found that breed specific legislature does not improve public safety. The American Veterinary Medical Association did an in-depth study of dog bites in 2014 of the last 40 years in 10 countries including the USA, UK, and Australia and concluded that there has been no evidence that breed specific bans or regulations reduced the rate or severity of bite injuries. I feel strongly that the bylaws being presented in this amendment need to be further reviewed and examined as it is based on breed prejudice.

- Training for owners. People always go right to the dog, the owner needs to be trained, since they are not properly training the dog. It's never the dogs fault, stop blaming them and start looking at the owners.
- Training for the stupid people who don't know how to read or communicate with their dogs!!!
- More control on nuisance dogs not by breed, my dog has been attacked at the park and event time it's been a lap dog. Also I believe that if you get a dog through the SPCA you should be required to take training classes(bad owners are the issue not the dogs!!!!)
- The City of Calgary should start investing in programs that actually help the prevent irresponsible pet ownership. This bylaw is stating that is OK for the government to pass discriminating bylaw on certain group based the action of individual. The racism and discrimination is created when certain group is prosecuted solely by the action of some badly behaved individual. Calgary is a place of inclusion and diversity rather a place of discrimination and racism. (For additional useful information the term dog bread was first created within the 19th century.)
- Calgary prides itself on being a great and affordable city to live in. This is outrageous absurd! Pitbulls are not dangers to society. [removed] There are no bad dog breeds only bad owners.
- Very against breed specific or breed type legislation. After a dog is declared a nuisance, there must also be a way to rescind that decision by the owner providing proof of improvement.
- Opposed to breed specific legislation
- I don't support any of these options. Treat pit bulls the same as every other breed.
- Please ban all pit bulls. Most owners do not have the capability to train these dogs. I have witnessed pit bulls off leash on kids play grounds. Pit bulls attract a certain demographic of people of which most are inconsiderate about safety of others. Untrained pit bulls are dangerous to Calgarians and the city can't police owners diligence in training these pets.
- This is horrific. Breed specific legislation misses the point of how important pet owner responsibility is. It is not fair to punish a breed due to your preconceived notions. I believe in humans that is called racism.
- None of the above
- Just do what your doing. No need to be dog racists
- Breed specific fines and restrictions is inappropriate and the wrong direction to take.
- Anyone who owns a pitbull or nuisance dog or that wants to own one needs to get a special license or permit to be allowed to have such an animal, to get this license or permit they need to pay for training to know how to properly raise and treat these dogs (with kindness) and a written test so the



people training them can know what kind of person they are and if they should be accepted to own a pitbull or nuisance dog.

- There needs to an expiry of a nuisance designation after some period of time or after appropriate training.
- I do not believe any of the above are fair. I feel the owner has more influence on a dogs behaviour that the breed of the dog itself
- Special assessment required for people who wishes own a pit bull (or nuisance dog) or prove that they will be a responsible owner along with requirement to chip and register the dog
- Leave the pitties alone. GO AFTER THE IRRESPONSIBLE OWNERS
- Training for owners of dogs that are not appropriately trained. Two strike program for owners. Find suitable alternative homes for dogs with owners that do not invest the time required to properly train and maintain dogs.
- All dogs should be able to demonstrate basic obedience within a year of being registered with the city.
- How about you don't single out a certain breed and keep it as if your dog is a problem or an [removed] you have to take it to obedience class
- None of these make sense, stupid honestly
- All dogs, no matter what their breed are, should be muzzled (nose tie) when way from owner's if they have showed nuisance dog syndrome..
- This is completely bias towards one type of dog bread. I want to see factual statistics or study that actually confirm it's this breed. The person who came up with this should be ashamed.
- Stop picking on pit bulls. Muzzle and fine the owners. Don't punish a breed. I've been bitten by dogs, and they're all small
- Stop breed discrimination and punish bad dog owners instead. Dogs that have nuisance behaviours (all types, not just breed specific))must undergo mandatory training.
- Mandatory dog training classes for nuisance dogs and for owners who continually have problems. Fines against those persons who instigate inappropriate interaction with a dog.
- Dogs that have not been neutered or spayed are not allowed to be at off leash parks. Many owners come to the off leash dog park when dog is in heat which causes male dogs to loose their minds over the female dog causing fights. Unneutered males give off a smell similar to a female in heat that is a challenge to the neutered male dogs which is challenging them. This causes dogs to fight, it is a pecking order. People are unaware of dog behaviours when the are not neutered or spayed.
- stop focusing on pit bulls. My worst problems came from small terriers! Also I believe all dogs should be muzzled if some dogs are muzzled
- Any pit bull ban is garbage. There are only problem dogs because of bad owners. All dogs treated the same.
- If a dog is dangerous it should be based on that dogs actions and not what breed it is. [removed] Therefore there should not be biased laws based on breed [DUPLICATE]
- Obedience training required for all dog-owners (not specific to pit bull or nuisance dogs). Breed-specific legislation (including outright bans, as well as required usage of leashes or muzzles in



public) has been consistently shown to have no statistically significant effect on preventing or reducing dog bite injuries (Nilson et al., 2018; Creedon & Súilleabháin, 2017; Collier, 2006; Barnhard, 2018). If the rationale for regulating pit bull-type dogs is based on the fact that their "strength allows the potential for a more severe bite" (as stated above), such legislation is not supported in the peer-reviewed literature. Furthermore, the claim that the strength of pit bull-type dogs allows the potential for a more severe bite is neither justified nor supported when examining the scientific evidence. Much of the research on dog bite force has been criticized for using unreliable and indirect methods to measure bite force, such that highly variable results can be observed even when replicating identical methods (Ellis et al., 2008; Kim et al, 2018). For those studies that do consistently measure bite force, evidence points to the size of an animal and the shape of its jaw as being the most reliable predictors of bite force, rather than breed (Ellis et al., 2009). Kangals, Doberman Pinschers, and English Mastiffs have the largest cephalic indexes and widest jaws among domestic dog breeds, and have all been shown to have higher bite forces than pit bulls when measured by pounds per square inch (Max Sparwasser, 2019). Without context, evidence, and relevant expertise, it is at worst outrightly false and at best questionable to claim on a public platform without citing any sources that a pit bull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite. Likewise, within the pit bull-type breeds listed in this survey, it should be acknowledged that there is enormous variability in size, strength, and breed characteristics. Staffordshire bull terriers, for instance, generally weigh less than 40 lbs, while American pit bull terriers can weigh upwards of 90 lbs. It is unclear why such breeds should be grouped together into the category of "pit bull," if the rationale is based on a "pit bull's" strength. The strength of an English Staffordshire bull terrier is comparable to that of many other non-pit bull-type dogs. If breed-specific legislation were to pass in Calgary, I would ask for (a) reliable, recent evidence that such legislation works; and (b) a better justification for specifically targeting an extremely broad group of dog breeds under the "pit bull" category. Since neither were provided within this survey and I have not been able to find them in my own research, I cannot support breed-specific legislation.

- The breed does not matter, but when dogs are involved in multiple "offences" I think the care and conditions of the animal needs to be looked into. Aggressive and nuisance dogs are a result of improper socialization during the puppy stage and improper care/training. IT IS NOT THE DOGS FAULT- it is the owners who need to be looked into and perhaps they are not fit to properly care for their dog and the dog needs to be removed from their care.
- None of the above, the majority of these opinions would only worsen public perception of pit bulls and pit bull type dogs creating a more dangerous environment for essentially harmless dogs
- Punish the bad owners not the dogs
- Any dogs that have been declared a nuisance need to have completed some obedience and safety training sessions and have a trainer sign off that they are safe to be without a muzzle.
- I think it is unfair to single out a particular breed. I agree to proposals for nuisance dogs of all breeds. I disagree with all proposals aimed at pitbulls specifically
- Stop focusing solely on pit bulls and other large breed dogs. Small dogs bite just as often but aren't reported as much since the injuries are typically less severe



- All potential dog owners MUST be vetted.
- The problem is irresponsible owners. We should not be punishing the dogs when the owners are at fault. I think behavioural training for dogs and owners would be great.
- I would be more worried about my little boston terrier than I am about a pitbull. What about when dobermans were the nuisance dog. Or rottweilers? Did you know pit bulls were originally called nurse dogs? They were bred to look after children. It isnt the dog. It is the owner!!! Stop putting a breed in a category where it doenst belong. Little dogs are far more vicious and prone to poor behavior. Have you just sat at a dog park and watched?
- Stop judging pit bulls. Any dog can be dangerous
- None.
- There should be absolutely NO separate designation for Pitbull breeds. There should only be a nuisance category. It's about dog ownership and training NOT breed. If you going to single out a breed all other large breed and strong breed of dogs must be included (ie. Doberman's, Rottweiler, Great Dane etc.
- Fines to dog owner of an vicious dog. Do not make this breed specific. Dog racism is not ok either
- Include German Shepard in the dangerous dog category. I lived in Cranston and the most aggressive and dangerous dogs were German Shepard, they would aggressively rush the fence toward me as a walker/runner on the community pathways. I was yelled at by an German Shepard owner to go another direction when he was walking his dog because he was afraid it would attack me (I found out he was a Calgary police officer in the canine unit so this needs to includes dogs 'owned' by the Calgary Police. I grew up in rural Canada, loose German Shepard were shot on sight(unwritten but understood rule as they will kill livestock and attack children unprovoked).
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household
- Consider owner training/licensing to ensure that people are willing to train/take their dog to training. This is not a breed specific problem, it's an irresponsible dog owner problem.
- I do not have a dog, but the fact you have not declared German Shepherds or Rottweilers in this and only segregated Pit Bulls is not fair. Isn't there a reason why police use German Shepherds as police dogs? And I'd be more afraid of a Rottweiler than a pit bull. I have never had a problem with pit bulls, but a German shepherd who her owner has called "Jackle and Hyde" had her whole mouth around my French bulldog 4 years ago. She was off leash on a sidewalk. I'd call her more of a nuisance than any pit bull.
- Have you considered how you would handle situations in which people are purposely antagonizing a dog which then creates a situation where the dog obtains a nuisance designation? People must also be accountable and dogs cannot be expected to tolerate harassing behaviours from individuals. That's simply unreasonable and beyond the control and scope of even the best dog owner.
- HEAVILY FINE THE OWNERS OF THESE BREEDS! It's not the dog's fault!
- Do not single out a breed. Problem dogs are caused by bad owners not by breed.
- Investigate reason that lead to incident. Public awarness needs to be raies over proper etiquett around dogs. Way to many people aproach stranger dogs that leads to possible reaction by the dog by no fault of the animal.



- Calgary Community Standards has the authority to issue mandatory training courses for dogs declared a nuisance. However there should NOT be any breed discrimination of dogs.
- The focus needs to be on owners. Not on dogs. Larger fines for owners who's dogs bite someone or another dog. There are many other dogs that have a bite strength of equal or greater.
- Remove the breed specific measures. Anything implemented should be for every breed.
- Literally take your whole pit bull bylaw and make it, not even necessarily nuisance dogs, because that can be a very broad term, but any dog that has been aggressive towards a being.
- Cannot be more than one nuisance dog per household. Punish the offence, not the breed.
- This is ridiculous. You cannot tar an entire breed based on the few. Absolutely ridiculous. We should be banning BSL not encouraging it. Shame on you City of Calgary.
- More ownership on the pet owners and less on the dogs. Biting is NOT a breed specific problem it means the owner does not know how to train a dog. Stop punishing dogs for their bad owners.
- Owners with multiple nuisance statements may forfeit offleash/in-city public roam areas until proof of injury liability is gained.
- Obedience training should be mandatory for ALL dogs. Not one or the other.
- Mandatory obedience training for second offence of "nuisance dogs"
- There are NO bad dogs. Period. There are bad owners. The fault needs to fall upon the owners NOT the dog. If the owners are neglectful in not caring for their dog and training the dog properly the owner is the one that needs the bylaws against them. The owner needs to take classes. The owner should not be allowed to have the dog. IT IS NEVER THE DOGS FAULT. It is the owner.
- You should never discriminate against a single breed. If our idiot mayor thinks that pitbulls are dangerous, he will confirm my opinion of him being an idiot. It is not the breed but the owner. So wake the [removed] up Calgary. Toronto banned pitbulls and dog bites did not go down
- All of these options only pertaining to pit bulls and similar breeds are absolutely ridiculous and shameful. Aggression is a learned behavior and is not inherent. Preemptively requiring all of these things for these specific breeds is ignorant of the case by case reality of dog aggression.
- My father had a purebred wolf, I was raised around him. Not once had he ever bit me, harmed me in any way. To classify an animal as dangerous means to deem the environment it is in as hostile. Once you do this you can begin to figure out the triggers for its aggressive behaviour. You cannot base your evidence purely off the look of it. You need to know how it has been treated, was it beat, harmed. Was it left outside to suffer elements, was it neglected and never taught human interaction. Animals cannot think or provide for themselves on the level that humans do for them, so why is it justified to blame the animal for the neglectful actions of their owners?
- Stop ragging on pitbulls they are lovely dogs when they have good owners who care about them. Try looking at the bad owners who have these dogs as they are the problem.
- Do not bring in Breed Specific laws they don't work Don't be lazy and hold the owner accountable is not the dogs fault the owner is the human adult
- You can NOT pick on PIT breeds . There are OTHER BREEDS as well. It's not the breed of dog . It' the owners that are to blame ! Then dogs get blame for barking. When they are doing there job.



Because I have SCREAMING KIDS that parents don't look after their kids . Let them run free and bug dogs.

- I think all dogs including pit bulls are innocent until proven guilty and should be dealt with at time of incident.
- I hope you understand that with proper training, any dog breed can be a GREAT dog. It's the owners of the dog that perhaps need special training.
- Leave pitbulls alone as you single out a single breed. The bite can be bad for dobermans so why not
- Please do NOT make this breed specific. This is a classic political knee jerk reaction. Some of city council are way smarter than this. The mayor excluded. Don't be quebec. Yes, that was left in all lowercase for a reason.
- Change obedience training to proper socialization or positive behaviour. Obedience training sounds like the question was written by a person who has never seen a dog. This question is so very badly written
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household
- Don't single out bully breeds based on myths
- Courses for all dog owners developed to teach responsible ownership for any nuisance pet.
- Fines should be give to owners of dogs considered a nuisance, not specific breeds. It's completely unfair and damaging to make one set breed out to be more dangerous when small dogs are proven to be frequent voters and nuisances.
- All breeds should be treated equally as a bylaw
- No dog should be held to higher standards due to their breed. Instead ANY dog that exhibits behaviour that has harmed humans or other animals should have restrictions. Another thing that should be looked into is the previous training and handling of the said dog.
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog per household (pit bulls are fine!)
- This is [removed], dogs are innocent punish the owners
- It is not the breed of the dogs fault it is owners who don't take the time to train and raise their dogs right you are blaming a huge issue on one breed of dog so penalize the bad owners but don't penalize a breed of dog when according to most rescue training facilities pitbulls are the least likely breed to bite. They are just very strong so when not raised properly can cause harm if they attack but so can any other big dog.
- None of these. Dogs need to be walked and cared for, recommend services that have affordable dog training.
- Why after many studies have been done would the city be suggesting breed specific legislation? It equates to racism as there is no scientific evidence supporting that it works on any level
- Owners are the problem not the type of dog. Depends how they are trained not breed.
- There should be increasing fines for repeat offenders. Each offence increases the fines. They should not be breed specific
- stop bullying the breed!



- Stop training dogs and blaming dogs please. The owner requires training. Bad, uneducated or uninvolved dog owners are the problem - people are the problem. Fines and punishments for the dog will not benefit the unfit owner.
- Don't objectify and bully a specific breed.
- Owner screening and education. All the above blame the animal when it is the owner that is abusing the animal in some way. Please increase punishment for animal abuse/neglect/ etc. It's not the dog's fault. Especially pit bulls, very racist if you point them out specifically.
- Hold all animal owners and breeds to the same accountability as I have been bitten by 3 German Shepherds, 1 Rottweiler and 3 Chihuahuas. All pet owners should be held to the same standard. Stop breed discrimination as it is a form of racism to breeds and there is no proof to bans on breed preventing bites anywhere ever.
- Bully breeds should not be treated any different than any other breed. Just because a few have shown bad behaviour they are now judged that happens in every type of dog breed.
- Mandatory dog owner classes for owners of nuisance dogs. The problem begins and responsibility lies with the dog owner.
- [Removed] you and your pit bull discrimination.
- It is absolutely ridiculous how people think pit bulls are more dangerous or have a "stronger bite" than other dogs. Use common sense. No dog breed is more aggressive than any other. That's like saying "white people are more aggressive than brown people by nature". Pull your head out of your [removed] and grow up. I can train a pit bull to be more loving than a golden retriever or a golden retriever to be more aggressive than a pit bull. The breed DOES NOT MATTER. How about implementing a screening process for people buying dogs instead of blaming the dogs when they're "too aggressive"?
- Obedience training for ALL breeds of dogs. I do NOT support breed specific legislation and am utterly disgusted that this is even mentioned as a possibility. It is all about the owner, training and being responsible.
- Not all blame belongs to the dog or owners. All Pitbulls are wonderful living sentient beings that do not deserve to be profiled in any negative way. If owners are discovered to be bad, abusive and neglectful they deserve jail time and rehabilitation for the animals that were abused.
- Additional guidelines/regulations needed to define "nuisance dog", "dangerous behaviour". Also need to define terms of release of said "nuisance dogs". Breed bias has been proven misleading at best, as ALL dogs are capable of incidents. I have never been bitten by a "bully breed", but have had 1 child hospitalized after a Jack Russell terrier almost took his eye in a facial mauling (dog and owner never fined or reprimanded despite complaints and trying to have something done), and that is a child who only knew pitbulls at that time. Also coached a child who was mauled by a black lab and is unrecognizable when you compare early childhood photos.
- Do not make breed specific legislation. As a zoologist, pitbulls do not bite more strongly than other breeds. A German shepherd has a stronger bite force than a pitbull. They also do not have locking jaws. To implement any restrictions for pitbulls or any other breed would be fear mongering, cruel, and not fact based. Shame on the city for even suggesting this.



- Nuisance dogs are a terrible problem. It is not a matter of one particular breed. I have dealt with several nuisance dogs in recent years, most of them small breeds (terriers, beagles). Small breeds also bite! The problem is nuisance dogs and irresponsible owners and the problem must stop!
- Every dog owner is required to complete dog trainer fundamentals prior to being approved to adopt or purchase a dog. In order to have a dog you need this and dog a liscence. Proactive approach!
- Accidents happen with all breeds
- BSL have proven to not work. It is unfair to all the good dogs out there to be lumped into the same group as a couple bad apples. My previous dog was a bully type and was a registered therapy dog and went to hospitals to visit people
- I am against BSL. There should be stricter punishment enforced for pet owners based on specific events and not applied to All pet owners who own a certain breed of dog
- Ive been attacked and had barking issues with more small dogs them any large dogs. Everything has a potential to be dangerous including humans. Should we designate a status on people who display all these signs as well. What about vehicles?
- All dogs should be required in ownership to be trained. Pittbulls shoukd not be listed as a dangerous more at risk dog over any other. Get on the owners and fine them \$5000 if their dog is aggressive.
- I am against BSL. There should be stricter punishment enforced for pet owners based on specific events and not applied to All pet owners who own a certain breed of dog
- Stop trying breed specific legislation. The statistics do not back it. It is based on ignorance and misinformation. Stop pandering to uneducated and ignorant people.
- Its completely inappropriate to punish a breed in broad legislation, dog behavior falls largely on the training and responsibility of owners. This legislation would punish owners who have responsibly trained and cared for their dogs that fall into the category of "pitbull"
- Don't let dirtbags own dogs.
- Do not target pitbulls
- Punish the owner not the dog!!!
- You cannot base a by law on a specific dog breed. Owners are responsible for their pets behaviour, perhaps if a dog is considered a 'nuisance', the owner is required to complete behavioural training or face fines; this cannot be based on the breed!
- Obedience training required for all large dogs, as the dog itself is not the problem, but how they are trained (or lack thereof). As the city has stated "pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog", the dog itself is not the problem and should not be stereotyped.
- When getting a Dog, requirement for certified lessons on obidence for all dog owners to license
- [removed] off. The rules that apply to pitbulls are the dumbest thing I have ever heard. F the right off.
- "pitbull terrier" is no more of a breed than, say "retriever" Please provide the scientific evidence used to make the statement, "a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite". Also, whilst "Obedience training required for dogs that are declared a nuisance" is an option, the option surely should be "training required for owner's whose dogs are declared a nuisance". Re fines in particular question 9A, in other situations eg driving, there is scant evidence that fines alone change



behaviour. Fines coupled with education, training etc would seem a far better justification for increasing licence fees and fines.

- It's not the breed it's the owners, should be mandatory courses to teach people how to be responsible pet owners.
- It is irresponsible and inappropriate to have breed specific rules - that reinforce inaccurate stereotypes. Shame on you.
- No breed specific rules, all owner/dogs must go for training, socialization
- Clarify what constitutes "nuisance"; e.g. complaints about barking when on private property? Or actual harm caused by the dog?
- unfair to classify a pitbull as a dangerous breed as other dogs such as a german shepherd or mastiff could also cause severe injury. This is stereotyping the dog. As a society we are working on not stereotyping people so why do it to our beloved pets. Also, it is the person who owns the dog and the environment the dog is raised and trained in that develop the aggressive behaviour so more behaviour based training for larger dogs is needed.
- The city should be dealing with dogs on a case by case basis. The more secluded pit bulls are. The more "nuisance" dogs there are. Dogs require training in order to do what they're supposed to. How is anyone supposed to train their dog if they can only keep them in the backyard their whole life? Focus on the bad owners instead of a specific breed of dog.
- I do not agree with breed legislation it should apply to all dogs and not be breed specific
- The owners of nuisance or "dangerous breeds" must complete a responsible pet ownership course as well as learning how to deal with and properly care for these dogs. This should be done prior to being issued a dog license.
- You can take all of these and stick em where the sun don't shine, these are all ridiculous. Cash grab at its finest if you ask me
- Why specify Pit Bulls, dog breeds aren't the issue, owners are. Bad owners make good dogs bad. There's no "bad" dog breed
- Absolutely none of the above. The measures you are taking against DOGS is disgusting. It's the OWNER not the dog.
- There should be specific to a dog, there should be owners who are held accountable and more done towards the owners when these incidents happen any dog can be aggressive it's the owner who trains the animal to do such. One could fight primary instincts but animals have proven to show care and compassion and seek help when in need, owners make their dogs aggressive and keeping these "rules" in place won't make it better people will just find better ways to hide it and that will only give pittys a worse rep then they already have.
- Pit bulls are not a problem nor other bully type breeds! Get your facts right. Most aggressive dogs are small dogs all determined to be "fine" but yet they spark more reaction and instigate more than the dogs you're referring too. Is a nice little shitszu a nuisance? It certainly can be! To generalize dogs is to generalize us humans .. are all ethnicities ok? Certainly we have some "bad eggs" in every grow up but we're not all bad! Really it's people who need training not the dogs. The dog's don't choose to honing fight rings... people put them there. It's frustrating to think that Calgary is not



open minded enough to see the big picture on this. Dogs are inherently good, it's people who change them

- Something needs to be done about the nippy, yappy, tiny dogs not just big breeds.
- There should be NO specific law for any breed of dog. Many types of dogs are as strong or stronger than "pitbulls".
- Mandatory obedience training for all breeds of dog. Little dogs are just as likely to bite/be a nuisance, if not more likely.
- Poodles bite more people than "pit bulls" Let's ban poodles.
- Mandatory training for OWNERS. It's not the dogs fault. It is a product of its environment.
- Additional measures should not be breed specific or specific to nuisance.
- I do not support breed specific regulations
- Breed specific legislation does not work, also a "pit bull's" bite is no more stronger than any other dog that size.
- These measures should not target pitbulls. It is the owner, not the dog, who causes these issues. German Shepherds are just as capable of a strong bite and this qualifier is already pre-disposing people against pitbulls.
- I would not support any of these measures.
- it's not the breed that needs to be taken into consideration but the owners treatment of said animal. Often aggression is a sign of abuse otherwise any breed can be harmless or fatal.
- Do not continue the meanness towards the breed, but enforce laws harshly on those terrible abusers who get pitbulls to be abusive. They are the ones giving the animals a bad rap and need harsher punishments.
- You cannot put all dogs under the umbrella of one breed. A "Pitbull" dog should not have to be treated different from other breeds. This is a disappointing request and should not put in motion in our city. It is inhumane.
- Rules against particular breeds of dogs are absurd.
- Licences required to own potentially dangerous breeds
- The fact that you specifically select pit bulls is pathetic!! I am a pitty mix owner and he is the best most gentile dog ever he is very well behaved and plays with my step son and can be totally trusted. Putting the blame on a specific bread is basically dog racism. Owners teach their dogs how to act and allow or promote aggressive action. To say all animals of a breed are aggressive is a sad position for a city to have. If you want to do anything stop owners who have a history of owning a neusance dog of any breed to no longer be allowed to own a dog. Don't punish all dogs
- No breed specific restrictions.
- This is Stupid, Pit bulls have a bad rap because of bad owners, changes the laws to be about owners rather than the dog. Nuisance animals should be defined by the previous life. We dont say a people of a certain color have to live life in Jail as soon as they're born. Why are we doing this to dogs? Also I've had more chiwawas and small dogs attack my dogs because the small dogs are behaved and off-leash in On-leash walk-ways.



- How about do more to the dog owner rather than ban a breed. Other dogs have just as strong of a bite as a pit bull. It is not right that you discriminate against one breed when , there are numerous other breeds that can do just as much damage you just don't hear about them. Because people that don't like certain breeds will always pin it on a bulky type, when in some cases it wasn't a bully breed at all. It is poor pet ownership not a dog breed problem.
- Dont worry about the type of dog but the person training whatever breed to be a "nuisance"
- A discounted or free obedience course for people with gaurd breed type dogs who sign up voluntaly, prevention is the key here not a breed bylaw. Stop the bites before they happen. Help make courses affordable.
- Owners who have offences should not be allowed to own a dog.
- BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION IS [removed]. Small dogs like chihuahua's are much more aggressive. Specifically, im my experince as a dog owner, most bites happen when one dog is on leash while the other is off-leash. This is because dogs are in a flight or fight mode, and if they cant run away they will almost always fight. We need to better patrol for off-leash dogs in leashed areas, and vice versa. There cannot be on-leash dogs at off leash parks. I dont know who the hell wrote this "survey" but it is clearly biased from a perspective of fearing pitbulls. This is not a just and factual way to measure responses as you are already feeding the answer to the responder.
- Obedience training and a leash required in public when a dog bites
- I think it is incredibly unfair that you are singling our one breed of dog for special treatment. It is obvious that whoever set up the survey is not well educated on the behaviour of dogs. I suggest they go to one of the well respected training schools such as clever canines to get educated on the matter. There are is such thing as bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Nothing specific to these breeds. The breeds are not the issue it's the people who own them. Have harsher penalties for owners (ban them from owning animals after investigation) and give dogs to rescue to be retrained and rehomed. Pit bulls are not the issue it is people and low bar of entry to own a dog.
- Endorcing breed specific legislations is absolutely ridiculous. Pitbulls are the same as any other dog in regards to their behavior, and like any other dog are well behaved or poorly behaved based on the owners training. If anything ANY BREED OF DOG should be ceased from irresponsible owners and fostered or rehomed to responsible owners. Pitbulls and or any other dog should not have to suffer a lack of rights or freedoms because of other people being uneducated or irresponsible. Any dog of any breed can exhibit aggressive behaviors if provoked in the wrong way. Education should be provided to people around best behaviors to exhibit as a human around dogs. Muzzling, banning, or restricting a dog based on breed instead of behavior of an individual dog is ridiculous.
- Calgary should not be bringing in breed specific legislation. The focus should be on dogs who have shown a propensity for aggression.
- All of these bylaws are way off. Pit bulls are not nuisance dogs. I think any dog that has an irresponsible owner should be fined. What are the fines for dogs off leash in non off leash areas? Nothing seems to be done about that.



- Pit bulls are not necessarily any stronger than other large dogs. The mastiff breeds in particular are capable of far more damage. Targeting owners with stiffer penalties & restrictions is more effective. If anything, categorizing dogs by size is more effective.
- Ontario has proved banning bully breeds did not help AND Canadian literature actually suggests husky, mix breed, and sled dogs cause the biggest issues.
- Mandatory Obedience training could work but it needs to be more acceptable. Lots of people can't afford it. It's tough cause most people don't sweat and that obedience training is mostly training the owners, not the dogs. There is lots of terrible owners out there that just get there dog training and expect them to just change. It's 90% the owners and 10% the dog most the time, some extreme exceptions. Lastly, stop targeting pit bulls, it has been disproven many times that they do not have stronger bites than many others dogs. Whoever put this together obviously doesn't know what they are talking about and needs to put more effort in to this than just basing it off of size and looks.
- Authorities are failing to make the link between the types of owners who desire fighting breed dogs and the problem of serious dog bites. I can state categorically, that the worst types of people i have worked with in blue collar environments, especially drug dealers and low level criminal types, all either had a fighting breed dog or wanted to get one. These are the LAST people in our community who should own a potentially vicious animal, and yet they are the MOST likely to possess one. These animals are a menace to public safety and should be banned in Calgary. How many more children need to have their faces reconstructed before you people figure this out?
- Bylaws shouldn't be written to preclude ownership or restrictions of only certain breeds. Nuisance dogs can come in all shapes and sizes. What criteria determines a nuisance dog? Risks of subjective complaints that may not be justified.
- This is stupid, no such thing as an aggressive breed it's bad owners. Almost all pit bulls are really kind. This reinforces a outdated stereotype that has been proven wrong.
- Do this for all that's bite or that are vicious not just pitbull type dogs, punish the the deed not one specific breed
- It's not the breed, when will people realize that? Before it was the German Shepherd and before that it was the doberman...come on
- None of the above
- Discontinue trying to push breed specific legislation. Listen to veterinarians and scientists that show IT DOES NOT WORK. There are many other dogs that have a stronger bite than a "pit bull". Also, dogs that have the appearance of a "pit bull" can be a boxer lab mix. There is no SCIENCE behind these ridiculous statements. Refer to the CVMA (Canadian Veterinary Medical Association) for their statements on BSL. In 2020 for this to still be something that any city to consider is offensive. Learn from experts. Politicians should not be making these decisions without EVIDENCE and from professionals that know what they're talking about. Shame on the city of Calgary for even considering such a disgusting by-law.
- Leave pit bulls be. This is an ignorant judgement. Of all the dogs we meet while walking or at the park, it is certainly not pit bulls who are cause for concern. Singling out specific breeds will not solve any issues, will create black market/illegal breeding putting animals at a greater risk



- Training or some sort of intervention should be available after 2 or more complaints. A one time nuisance is not enough information to go off of for the dog in question.
- Obedience training required for all dog owners (and dogs by proxy)
- Charge owners and not the breed. Bully breeds are not the issue, owners are. Do not discriminate against bully breeds
- I don't think breeds of dogs should be punished for an owner's poor behaviour. When people are taking on a pitbull as a pet, or a traumatized dog, they absolutely should be accountable for its well-being. Ensuring they will provide a good home and attention/training needed should be the main priority!
- This is absolutely outrageous. Pit bulls are one of a kind, I have one of my own and smaller dogs are much more vicious and aggressive than any pit bull I've EVER MET. Do not leave one breed out in the loop having their freedom taken away from them when other dogs even with a "smaller bite" can just roam freely !!!!!!!
- No breed specific legislation. I'm a Vet Tech and professional dog trainer. I have never had an incident in the clinic with a Pit bull or pit bull type nor have I had a single aggression related behavioural problem with a pit bull or pit bull type as a training client
- I do not agree with any of the above statements. I feel it infringes on the rights of the dog owner/trainer. A dog that becomes a "nuisance" is never at fault, it is the person caring for them that allows this behaviour to occur without proper training. If these measures are put into place, it opens the door for restrictions to be placed on all dog owners, regardless of breed due to the vague wording of dogs that "appear" like pitbulls. These measures should not be put into consideration.
- You should fine and or charge the owner. We/they are responsible for their pet
- Mandatory dog behavior and training courses for all nuisance dog owners. Please designate this for all nuisance animals, not breed or breed type specific. Please do NOT single out breeds or types, please focus on responsible dog ownership.
- no breed specific legislation is needed.
- None of the above. Singling out a specific breed is outrageous!!!
- Ban pit bulls completely
- Pit bull breeds are no more dangerous than any other. Perhaps owner training for any dog involved in an incident, and not breed specific.
- THIS SHOULD BE BY INDIVIDUAL DOGS. The force of a bite from any big dog/wolf dog even small dogs is dangerous. The only reason pitbulls are being targeted is because of the stigmas.
- Pitbulls are not inherently dangerous dogs. If restrictions are being placed to increase the safety of people the restrictions should be placed on all breeds of dog regardless of appearance. I see no issue with increasing precautions for the safety of the public but the idea of only putting these restrictions on a specific breed does not serve the purpose of keeping people safe, only to decrease the quality of life for specific dogs.
- Research shows pit bulls aren't more aggressive than any other dog breed. Banning pit bulls or making it mandatory for them to wear muzzles is not going to solve anything. Pit bulls are some of the sweetest breeds out there.



- There should be no bias against the type of dog. An owner should simply be fined if their dog is involved in an incident and if a dog is involved in an incident then training can be mandatory with requirement for proof, and as well that dogs annual fees may increase. This puts the owners on the owner to be responsible and make responsible choices for their dog- regardless of breed. I think it would be nice to see people receive discounted annual fees for submitting proof of obedience training certificate.
- “There cannot be more than one pit bull or nuisance dog in a household” This is irresponsible and disrespectful language. This should be two separate questions. By making it one you are implying that a pitbull is a nuisance dog. Please change that.
- None, this exercise is a ridiculous use of tax payer money
- Define what nuisance means
- Dogs should not be targeted for their breed. All dogs should be treated equally and be judged based on their behaviour not breed.
- Bully breeds should not be singled out.
- Apply fines to negligent owners. You are putting all the blame on the DOG. Dogs are just a reflection of their owners, good or bad.
- Having more restricting laws just because a breed is capable of doing more damage seems unjustifiable. I have Australian Shepherd and an Australian cattle dog cross with a collie, these dogs are just as capable of damaging humans as they gave extremely powerful jaws. There are more dogs than just pit bulls or bully breeds capable of damaging another person or animal. This all seems based upon fear of pitbulls. Some dogs are naturally aggressive as heelers can be or husky, etc. But accidents that happen are more so the owners fault as you know your animal and should never put them in situations where they may attack other animals or people. If you know your dog nips at others or is very aggressive then that is your responsibility as a pet owner to not only protect your animal from others but also others from your animals especially if they show signs of aggression towards other breeds or people.
- It’s not the breed. It’s the owner. Perhaps assessing owners, pets home life and training should be evaluated. All dogs bite. But it’s the owners responsibility to train them otherwise, provide a loving and safe home and curb those inhibitions.
- This isn’t breed specific regarding Dog fights. It would be a major devastation to pit bull owners that our city wants them muzzled. I find most pit bulls I’ve met are some of the sweetest dogs. It’s not breed specific training needed.
- If the nuisance is being at large, how will not being allowed at off leash park help?
- It’s offensive to do anything breed specific
- Instead of fines and muzzles for dogs. What about training for owners! There are no bad dogs just bad owners. Let’s not put muzzles on dogs because owners are bad.
- Pit bulls is a very unscientific approach to classification. Add a number of other breeds with a known safety history. Pitbull would create a [removed] storm for the courts to try and interpret, and wouldn't be effective. Make it breed specific.
- **PITBULLS ARE NOT INHERENTLY DANGEROUS. THIS IS STUPID.**



- Stop being racist! Pit bull lives matter
- Dogs are taught to be aggressive by bad owners. Don't blame the breed. Not all pit bulls are bad dogs. If we blamed every pit bull for the actions of a few that would be like saying all middle easterners are terrorists, and we all know what the [removed] is
- BSL for pit bulls (breeds specified), breeding regulations, import restrictions, and better enforcement.
- All of these suggestions are ridiculous. Pit bulls should not be the only dog breeds to be considered dangerous.
- Fine the owners. Pets acts as how they are raised/thought by owners
- It is ducking pathetic you include pit bulls because they are stronger NOT because they are involved with more human injuries or aggressive behaviour. The [removed] [removed] that even brought this up probably owns an ugly [removed] shitzu and she needs to be fired for even mentioning this.
- Make the owner go to obedience training because 99.9% of the time it's not the dog or the breed its untrained and irresponsible owners
- Should not affect specific breeds as a whole. If I dog bites, fine the owner, put the dog on a list. Require them to go to obedience training, insurance, muzzle. Should not penalize specific breeds. Penalize the owner.
- The fact that you are looking at singling out pitbulls is appalling. Do more research and please learn that singling out dogs of any breed can be aggressive and/or bite. This is ridiculous.
- Intact male dogs not allowed at off leash parks unless under the age one years. Soo many issues are caused by intact male dogs. The smell automatically sets off other dogs.
- Focus on nuisance dogs and training for all pet owners, please stop considering breed specific legislation.
- All dogs should adhere to the same rules regardless of breed OR APPEARANCE
- Nothing. It's the owner's fault for not training the dog properly - not the dog.
- Dogs that have a significant bite history should be muzzled in public and have high fines.
- Please stop discriminating against pitbulls. Every single pit bull I have met have more love in them than aggression.
- Dogs should be judged on their behavior not on their breeding. I'm more scared of chihuahuas and the only dog I ever got bit by was a malamute. I still dont think this dog should be muzzled
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household.
- Why pitbulls? What about German Shepards? Mastifs? Dobermans? Rottweilers? There's lots of dogs who could do a lot of damage by biting someone. Maybe any dog someone could theoretically be scared of should be muzzled at all times and not allowed to leave private property? I'm 100% in support for increased measures against aggressive dogs but needing liability insurance for owning a pitbull is one of the stupidest things I've ever heard in my life. I don't understand what group of Calgarians are being represented these anti-pitbull suggestions. My suggestion is to punish bad owners, throughly investigate and handle reports of aggressive dogs and most importantly crack down on irresponsible breeders. Things like "designer xl/xxl pitbull breeders" (of which there are in Alberta) are creating mutant, inbred dogs. In my opinion, that's where the pitbull problem stems from.



- This by-law should not be breed specific. We should not target pitbulls. Calgary is better than this, after 10 years of living in this great city. This by-law has blame considering moving.
- Owners held responsible for the behaviour of the dog, regardless of breed. There is an abundance of supporting evidence that animal behaviour is a result of training (or lack thereof) and the behaviour of the owner. There is nothing to support that a pit bull is stronger than a mastiff or a Great Dane or any other large breed that was bred for sport or hunting. To declare a breed as a problem when the owner has the ability to create a well adjusted, happy, loving dog based on their raising of the dog, is prejudicial. Owners must be held accountable for the way they raise & manage their chosen pet. Every behaviour can be retrained or worked through with proper handling. This mention of a breed specific regulation shows ignorance and lack of proper research by the city of Calgary and is shameful and embarrassing. Just posting this plants the seed of doubt and promotes fear mongering. This prejudicial breed reference should be removed immediately.
- IF THIS BREED SPECIFIC [removed] GETS PASSED IN CALGARY IM [removed] MOVING AWAY!! DO NOT MAKE THESE MEASURES PITBULL FOCUSED!!!!
- Pitbulls are super friendly and do not need the same segregation as racists give to other humans
- Horrible bylaw to have in place. Do not pass this bylaw. I will be exceptionally disappointed and will refrain from voting for any city council member who is in favour for this.
- I do not support this [removed] bylaw against Pitbulls or the bull terrier breeds; it is not the breed it is the owners who should be punished. Since when do we Calgarians discriminate against one specific breed of animal; shame on you City of Calgary for even suggesting this non-sense.
- None of the above, by declaring the other answers, you are placing unnecessary blame on a breed of dog, that you admit to not being in the outliers for dog attacks. There is also a great deal of misinformation in the statement of this survey about dog bite strength for particular breeds. Pitbulls have significantly lower bite strength than more common breeds like German shepherds, dobermans, and various other large breeds.
- Hold the owner responsible for their pet, both financially and criminally.
- Fine awful pet owners. There are no bad dogs.
- Pitbulls are wonderful dogs. Its about the owner. The owner should be fined for them exhibiting behaviors unacceptable and it shouldn't apply to them in specific. This is discrimination of the breed. The dog shouldn't be held responsible. The owner should be fined and required to attend proper obedience with the animal to obtain an alpha dominant figure. DOGS SHOULD NOT BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE. Any dog can bite. I've seen chihuahuas more aggressive.
- No breed specific laws!
- Proof of dog training by certified dog trainers and/or order for same if a dog is declared a problem. I am a dog owner and any dog can be a problem dog not just pit bulls or bully breeds
- Obedience training required for ALL dogs in a dog park. Targeting one breed is ignorant and feeds into a dangerous stereotype. It also assumes that other dogs, like Golden Retrievers, are automatically not dangerous; in reality, a dog's behaviour is determined in large part by the training the dog - and its owner - receives. Look at the owner, not the dog.



- There's no such thing as a bad dog, just a bad owner. Before becoming a dog owner you should have to be screened so the city is confident you'll be a suitable dog owner. Any dog can be a Nuisance if they're owner is one as well, any good dog owner knows that. In instances where "Nuisance Dogs" have an incident, maybe the owner should be investigated.
- Leave owners to their own disputes. These are family members to most. This legislation is being created by a loud minority who wish to have the government control more of our freedom. It's not welcome, it's despicable and you should be ashamed for proposing this.
- Aggression should be punished and the definition of nuisance in your survey is terrible
- I do not agree with any of these suggestions. I had 2 American Bull Dogs, part of the bully breed for 11.5 years and not once were they reported for bad behaviour, or vicious attacks, bites, or aggressiveness. I was, and now I am a new owner of a blue nose pit bull and I believe it is on the responsible dog owner to train and have their dog in a position to succeed, rather than fail. People who believe that Rottweilers, German Shepard's, or even Labs are any different than a pit bull are clearly out with a motive and should understand that any dog bite can be deadly. Calgary is known as a progressive community, and this is a regressive mind set as far as I am concerned. Don't blame the dog for poor human ownership.
- Pit type dogs ARE NOT the issue, any dog can be aggressive regardless of the breed or size. Responsible ownership is imperative. A particular breed should NOT be mandated to be muzzled BUT a particular dog that has been identified BECAUSE OF AN INCIDENT NOT BECAUSE IT IS A PARTICULAR BREED, can then be mandated. Education for owners, people(dog) training classes. A muzzled dog should not be in an off leash park.
- Any and all measures must apply to ALL dogs not just those you are classifying as pit bulls. It is not the breed, it's the owner's fault for not training the breed. There are far more incidences with smaller dogs being a nuisance or danger to children. You cannot classify breeds as nuisance dogs. It needs to be case by case basis.
- None of the above!!!! Pitbulls and bullies are not the problem and punishing them for nothing is not humane! Take your garbage BSL elsewhere
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. If they prove to be "nuisance" dogs, then they can just fall under that category. Calling them out is unfair, as all the pitbulls I've known in my life are incredibly well behaved dogs.
- Higher fines for all dogs involved in bylaw offences. Not just nuisance breeds. Just ridiculous to point out certain breeds.
- Pit bulls are not the issue and it's pretty comedic that the city of Calgary thinks that they are. It's the owners fault if an animal is irresponsible; it does not matter what the breed is. Also, pit bulls pose minimal threats compared to the hundreds of wild animals roaming around the city, including coyotes and bobcats. Also has anyone ever considered that rotweilers, Germans shepherds, and Doberman's are equally and strong as pit bulls? Probably not, but might be worthwhile looking into.
- No law should specifically attack a single breed. This city is disgusting



- It is straight wrong to classify pitfalls in the same category of nuisance dogs that would be the same as classifying a human based on their skin colour as a nuisance please reconsider before you think about segregating a breed ,it's an owners responsibility to raise their dogs you can't blame a breed.
- Pit bulls are not an aggressive breed in nature. It is how the dog is brought up and the owners trainer/aggression use towards them. For the city to deem pitbulls "aggressive because of their stronger bite" is unrealistic and biased. I do not agree that pitbulls or any dog under the breed/appearance of a pitbull, should be punished for behaviour that they likely don't have. Dogs are not born to be aggressive, just like humans aren't. It's a taught and learnt behaviour. If a pitbull is aggressive from learnt behaviour, then some of the bylaws surrounding "nuisance dogs" should be implied towards that ONE pitbull, but same should go for any other breed of dog that is also showing aggression. Not just one particular breed.
- No breed specific bylaw! Can't have laws for specific Race people so why do it for pets
- Stop lobbying against certain breeds. Higher fines should be to the owners of aggressive dogs regardless of breed as well as being banned from off leash dog parks.
- Owner should be fined. If they are not able to properly train their dog, it should more be the dog who is punished.
- How outrageously uneducated of you to apply this to certain breeds. Start holding poor ownership accountable.
- Pit bull behavior is based on the training of the owner. There are many pit bulls in calgary that are well trained as their owners have put in the time and effort. Blaming pit bulls and blaming a breed for a human led problem is not okay. There are plenty of badly trained humans at dog parts who should not be allowed to have poorly trained dogs in a variety of different breeds. I am upset that the city would even consider this as i have many pit bulls in my life who are the most loving and caring dogs. It is humans who are the problem NOT the breed
- ban all PIT Bulls
- Why would it be breed specific when it is specifically noted that "pit bulls" are not apt to a higher incident rate?
- If a dog injures someone I think the owner should help pay for the injured person.
- This is absolutely ridiculous to label a single breed a nuisance. You guys should be ashamed.
- This is absolutely ridiculous. That is singling out one breed of dogs when there are many other bully breed dogs out there! Let alone little dogs are more of a nuisance they are noisy and bark at everything. Removing a dog from someone's home when they own one or more pitbulls is completely inhumane . Pitbulls need rescuing and love just like any other dog. Pit bulls are not the problem UNTRAINED DOGS ARE THE PROBLEM
- Don't punish my well behaved dog because of the actions of the very few. My mutt (which you declar is a 'pit bull' based on looks) stopped a break in. She is a hero and deserves to play fetch.
- obedience training required for all dogs. Any dog declared a nuisance to be muzzled in off leash parks.
- Its a dog and dont think to much about it. A dog is a dog no matter the breed
- Please do not add breed specific language. It is equivalent to human racism applied to dogs.



- all of these solutions are focussed on the dog. We know that breed specific legislation does NOT decrease the number of bites. As calgary has been a leader in breed-neutral legislation, why not put into bylaw interventions that work. I.e, stiff animal cruelty laws, decrease backyard breeding. have new owners of ANY AND ALL DOGS be required to take force-free positive reinforcement training when they register their dog iwth the city (and have a program of reimbursement for those who cannot afford). all of the solutions above are band-aid solutions that do not get to the root fo the issue- people train dogs, and it is our responsibility to train them in a positive method. we need to shift responsibility to the owner not the animal. your proposed recommendations above will simply have reinforce backyard breeding, have people NOT register their dogs with the city, and create unfair fear around 'pitbulls' (which is a broad term with no scientific basis).
- Mandatory training course and licensing for all dog owners similar to the PAL firearm with current owners grandfathered in.
- Nuisance is a BEHAVIOR not a breed. This is a blatant form of discrimination and ignorance
- Dogs who bite and injure a human or attack and seriously injure or kill another dog should be euthanized.
- There are no bad dogs, just bad owners. Banning or punishing a dog breed is not the answer. Punish bad dog owners, not dog breeds!
- I do not like the breed specific questions. Let the title go to the animals that have shown repeated behaviours, regardless of breed. The pit bulls I have met in my life have been loving, gentle dogs. It is the owners responsibility to train and socialize dogs, punish them, not the breed.
- Stop discriminating against dog breads, just shows how uneducated the people in charge here are.
- all dogs should be held to the same standards, bight from and American Bulldog or a German Shepherd has more bite force than an American Pitbull. This comes down to the trainer/owner of the dog, not the dog.
- Owners letting dogs defecate and urinate on private property should be charged
- None because German shepherds and Rottweilers have just as much potential
- They SHOULD NOT!!! Ban ANY SORT OF DOG. There problem dogs because of there owns! It's no fault of there own! I own a Doberman and my girl friend owns a PITBULL and there both the sweetest thing. Think banning dogs has being racist! Think about it
- None of the above. They're not a problem.
- Pit bulls must be spayed/neutered & not allowed to reproduce in Alberta, prior to banning them altogether.
- Pit bulls ARE NOT an issue. All dogs can and do bite. The media and public only share portions of information. If you are going to try ban pit bulls then you best add chihuahua, poodles, shitzus, German sheps and huskyies to the list as well
- Breed specific legislation should not be considered for Calgary. Penalizing an entire breed for the misbehavior of a few (which is the result of poor treatment/training by humans) is archaic and unfair.
- Zero tolerance for aggressive dogs.
- Increase fines per bylaw offence. Ex 1st offence is X dollars, but 2nd offence is X dollars plus, increasing more for repeat offenders



- Make it illegal for people who raise aggressive dogs to obtain any kind of dog ever again. Focusing on “pit-bull” type dogs is retarded, too many dog breeds with similar or greater strength. Germany has a classification system for dog breeds and it’s extremely flawed. Focus should be put on irresponsible dog owners!
- Should not be breed specific at all.
- enforcing breed specific laws are EXTREMELY expensive and do not work. There's evidence on this, it is costly to train bylaw officers to recognize a breed due to their appearance. Calgary's dangerous dog bylaw already works, do not change it to a less effective method based on fear based decision making.
- I do not support Breed specific legislation of any kind
- un-neutered male dogs should not be allowed in off leash parks. The definition of pitbull is too vague and many people "call" every vicious dog a pitbull when infact many are completely different breeds. Many small dog owners let their dogs 'get away' with bad behaviour and these dogs can be just as much a nuisance as any so called pitbull. My experience of pibulls has been that they are wonderful, friendly dogs when in the right family situation. Don't forget that there have been attacks from well trained police dogs in Calgary and I don't see you banning German shepherds. ds
- NONE.... you have no idea what dogs are like. Its how you raise a dog. A pit bull is NO different then a lab. DO YOUR RESEARCH !!!!!
- Breed discrimination is unnecessary and pointless. A dog's behavior is 100% relative to it's owner and how it was raised.
- [removed]
- Fines and required obedience training should be done based on the individual cases not by breed or dogs declared a nuisance.
- No breed specific rules.
- euthanisation upon 2nd offence
- Sterilization of animals deemed a nuisance or danger
- Higher fines for any dog, nuisance status or not, that is off leash in on leash areas. Fines for any dog, friendly or not, provoking others when an owners asks for the offending dog to be removed from their space. Fines for dog walkers who have large groups of dogs not under control. Higher fines for dogs at large. Mandatory obedience classes for any new dog owners or adopter as well as a course in dog behaviour and body language. Please do not turn to BSL it is proven ineffective and really we need to be focusing on better behaviour from all dogs and more responsibility on the owner.
- small dogs should be treated the same as other dogs. Only time I ever had dogs bite me they were small and un trained.
- No breed specific laws.
- Dogs that have been repeat offenders should be fined appropriately. Dogs that have not been offenders should not be punished before they have done anything. That is the same thing as guilty until proven innocent. Not cool Calgary.
- What if the “pit bull” identifies as another breed? Serious question



- A dog is a product of its environment. Punish the irresponsible people not the breed. This is ridiculous.
- Obedience training should be required for all dog breeds. Just because pit bulls are stronger than other more aggressive breeds doesn't mean they should be singled out. All dogs should have proper training regardless.
- A single breed of dog should not be singled out. Small dogs can do just as serious of damage and are often dismissed as minor. A bite from any dog is no less traumatic.
- It's not the breed it's the owner. I'll literally move out of this city if my sweet boy who is an American Staffordshire terrier x bull mastiff just likes to cuddle dogs. It takes a responsible and confident owner. Off leash parks are ALL wild with dogs biting people myself included and need better bylaw monitoring (checking for tags too).
- Giving my head a shake to this.... how about freezing wages of politicians
- None. To single out a specific breed, let alone one that is gentle and kind is extremely irresponsible on the governments behalf.
- Pitbull type dogs are not a problem. Owners of "nuisance" dogs or dogs with behavior problems should be given the opportunity to correct the behaviour through guided training from a professional dog trainer.
- Fines for owners of small dogs who leave their dogs's poop in the street or trails "because it's small and doesn't matter". I've watched people with small dogs leave it so many times. Also, any size dog who bites (including chihuahuas and Yorkies or other small breeds should be held to the same fines and dangerous/nuisance designations if they are exhibiting or attack other dogs.
- bad owners who have a breed they cannot handle should be fined. all breeds have a capability to be declared a nuisance. bad owners need reprimand. not their dogs. we need to be watching and screening people who own these breeds
- People who own nuisance dogs should go to obedience school.
- I don't think it is fair to single out pit bulls or any dog breed, isn't this issue more about bad dog owners than bad dogs. Dog owners should not take their dogs if they are known to bite to the off leash park without a muzzle or maybe at all. Some badly behaved dogs are rescues and need a chance to socialize with other dogs and a muzzle may be enough to allow this safely.
- To single out a breed or breed type is putting many of these dogs on death row. What has not been noted is the fact that dogs act they way they do because of the owner. If there is no proper discipline. They will act out just like a child.
- Pit bulls are kinder than any breed I've met. I personally have one now. They should be treated the same as every and all breeds.
- Owners should be fined for any bites that are as a result of improper or lack of obedience training for all dog breeds, not just pit bulls. The owners should be held accountable without demonizing specific dog breeds
- Ignoring the breed any dog not properly trained by the owner should incur a fine.
- How is a dog declared a nuisance? Also absolutely no breed specific legislation in Calgary



- Please keep a dangerous dogs map with photos and addresses (like the City of Minneapolis) to help keep the public safe and informed. Medical literature is absolutely consistent on pit bulls causing a plurality or majority of severe injuries and deaths: review it and rethink the logic behind "breed-neutral" laws: the medical literature is abundant and clear. If Calgary chooses to remain "breed-neutral" in the face of mounting public health evidence, the City should at least maintain a dangerous dogs list with photos to help keep the public safe and informed. Publishing clear images of dogs deemed dangerous will enable independent research and put to rest the never-ending "breed misidentification" arguments by showing us what our dangerous dogs problem really looks like. MSP's dangerous dogs list is over half pits. DO NOT allow pit bulls, or any dangerous/nuisance dog, to go back home for "rehab" as true aggression is extremely hard or impossible to rehabilitate and these dogs simply reoffend.
- Training for owners that have a dog declared a nuisance
- Breed specific legislation is not required. It's biased to do so.
- Investigation on the dogs home and the way the dogs are being treated. Are they scared. Do they get abused
- Most of the measures listed are pointless as breed specific behaviour is a farce and no actual scientific research supports these claims. It is about common sense training and understanding general dog behaviour. Training should be essential for all dogs going to offleash parks and there are many other breeds that can cause severe damage if they bite (not just "pit bull" type dogs)
- Should be muzzling the owners who do not train their dogs. Leave the pit bulls alone!
- Encourage Pitbull owners to get training provided by community groups.
- Place larger fines on the owner. Leave the breed of the animal out of the picture. A dog is no more at fault for its actions than a child if the dog owner or parents don't raise and train them properly.
- Are you kidding me with this discriminating against a specific dog breed stuff? You need to do more research if you think specific dog breeds should have specific bylaws. The problem is owners, not specific breeds.
- Any breed can be aggressive if not properly trained, it's absolutely ridiculous to single out pit bulls. Every dog owner should be required to go through some form of obedience training. Even if it's just a basic level
- I think any dog with a bite history should be required to be muzzled while in public. I am sorry but a 'pitbull' strength DOES NOT make it's bite any worse. Small dogs, large dogs, any dog bite can cause disease. I can think of multiple dogs with a stronger bite (husky, german shephard, boxer, malamute, etc.). SHAME ON YOU CALGARY for even considering this. 100% disappointing and disgusted that in the year 2020 we are still even considering that this would solve a problem. Look at studies were they have enacted BSL legislation - MAKES NO DIFFERENCE FOR BITE RATES!!!! I am appalled, disgusted, and saddened by this survey.
- All of this is [removed]. I hope you do not add any of this to your bylaws!!
- This is an abomination of a survey biased towards one breed.



- Fines for dogs should not be labeled to certain breeds. I have been bite by a dog before and so have a few people I know, and guess what?! Not one of them were of the breeds you have mentioned. Bad dogs = bad owners.
- Breed specific laws are just as bad as human racism. Don't.
- PIT BULLS -OR ANY SPECIFIC BREED SHOULD NOT BE SINGLED OUT. ALL DOGS CAN BITE AND ALL DOGS THAT DO ARE THE RESULT OF A BAD OWNER THERE ARE STATISTICALLY MORE BITES BY LABRADORS AND GERMAN SHEPHERDS. THIS IS A REQUEST BY A SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED.
- Destruction required for all nuisance animals.
- THERE SHOULD BE NO DIFFERENT TREATMENT FOR ANY OF THE ABOVE DOGS!!!
- Owner's should be held responsible for their animals actions, not the animal. Bylaw enforcement for leashes and proper yard containment should be focused on, not individual dog breeds. It is extremely archaic to think that these breeds are different than other dogs. I have been bit by big dogs and little dogs but never once by a pitbull. The dogs that bit have terrible owners who are borderline abusive. It is so evident that behavioural issues stem from the owner and not the breed. Fine terrible humans and ban them from owning animals...don't harass well behaved dogs because there are irresponsible people in this city. These types of bylaws punish the wrong group.
- Owner safety training for pit bull dogs and nuisance dogs
- Breed specific guidelines are proven to be ineffective and spread dangerous stereotypes.
- I detest that you call out Pit Bulls directly in this - many other breeds have equally powerful jaws and your lack of what seems to be an attack on this specific breed and not talking about the owners - is disgraceful. Your wording is a trap to skew the answers from this and really makes this entire thing invalid.
- Please do NOT have a bylaw against a specific breed of dog. It is ALWAYS the owner who should be held responsible , not the dog. I have known a couple of vicious standard poodles in my time and you're not listing those. It's a slippery slope to over regulation and we don't need that.
- Hold specific owners responsible for their dogs not an entire breed. This is discriminatory and if you did this to people it would be called racism. Good owners and dogs should not be punished because of how they look but by actions. There are many dog bites a year by all breeds. Police specifically use German shepherds for ease of training and attack power so should there be specific laws against those as well.
- There are many breeds associated with violent and erratic behavior, including German Shepherds, Chow Chows, Huskies, Rottweilers as well as smaller breeds, which may not be as physically strong, but are equally dangerous especially to children. I do not agree with singling out "Pit-bulls" for this bylaw.
- There should be no rule discriminating against only bit bulls
- First off we need to be reminded that there are no bad dogs but bad dog owners. Second it seems to me that communities would be better served with education rather than fear mongering. Pitbulls and Rottweilers by nature aren't violent! The people that own them make them that way. I would suggest that rather than animals further suffer humans be made to pay the price. Animals should be removed



for rehabilitation and owners be prevented from ever owning animals again and be put on a municipal and provincial watch list, much like sex offenders.

- I disagree with any form of breed specific legislation.
- Rather than target a specific breed, I think more education on dog behaviour and management of dog behaviour is important. Maybe obedience (positive reinforcement) classes should be a requirement of dog ownership.
- Look at the big picture. Small happy dogs that instigate issues with larger dogs and when the dog gives them quick no harm snap to back off, it's the instigator that is the nuisance
- Exponential fines for owner who fail to comply with proper dog training and care. And for the love of god do not discriminate Pitbull breeds that's such BS.
- I checked one point. That should only happen if dog attacked for no reason. On the other hand is a stranger (including) a child was aggressive towards the dog and it gave a warning in the form of a nip or bite then it's the person's fault. If dog is protecting home during a crime it's the criminal's fault. Leave dog alone.
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. ALL dog bites should have to be reported, including by all small dogs. It should be against the law to not report it. Hyper focus on pit bull type dogs has put fear into people.
- I am vehemently opposed to any breed-specific legislation.
- reassessment of 'nuisance dogs'. As a runner I've had zero issues with bully breeds (they're giant lapdogs) and far more with Shepherds and labs (makes me sad - I love labs).
- Honestly, do your research! Breed has nothing to do with this, especially Bully breeds. They (like any other dog) reflect their owners and their training. [removed] Treat the real problem: their owners! If someone has had multiple nuisances against them, ban them from owning dogs! Don't blame the dog or breed.
- None. These are unfounded and unwarranted fear-based suggestions. If the city is going to start profiling dogs according to the breed, there will be respect lost for the reasonable decision making capabilities of city bylaw. Where is the fact based research attached to these claims, other municipalities enforcing these bylaws is not valid reasons for implementation, that is essentially hoping on the bandwagon. There are a lot of things that have increased potential for harm similarly to the power of a dog bite, are we going to start labeling everything that is "potentially more dangerous" a nuisance and single them out? This is fear based and not fact based, do your research breed specific bylaws are not more effective in preventing aggressive/harmful dog behaviour.
- DOGS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM, OWNERS ARE. How can you say that a pit bull is any stronger than another large terrier? Make Obedience training less expensive for all people. Better trained dogs (not just pitbulls) are good for the community.
- As a dog owner myself, I have had more negative interactions with intact male dogs than any pitbulls ever. Intact dogs should require additional insurance, as well as obedience training, so that owners truly understand the implications of keeping their dogs intact and what that means for interactions with other dogs.
- I would look at making Breeders responsible for selling dogs to people who should not have them.



- Breed based bylaw is a horrible idea and is completely unnecessary.
- Stop [removed] targeting pitbulls. Nuisance dogs makes sense but discrimination does not. This is absolutely ridiculous to even be proposed. Get your head out of your [removed]
- PITBULLS OR ANY BREED FOR THAT MATTER DO NOT DESERVE ANY OF THIS
- How about you make rules surrounding aggressive small dogs instead
- Better education for dog owners. Better screening when owners adopt/shop for 'nuisance' dogs or pit bulls.
- These are ridiculous.
- There should be no breed specific rules, the owner should be at fault and not the animal
- Dogs behaviour is directly a result of the owner. So owners should be required to take a course on dog behaviour.
- [removed] THIS. I do not own a pit bull, and I find every comment on here hilarious. IT IS NOT THE [removed] DOG. IT IS THE [removed] OWNER. MAYBE THE OWNERS SHOULD HAVE TO TAKE CLASSES BEFORE THEIR ALLOWED TO OWN A DOG. A DOG PERIOD. STOP BREED DISCRIMINATION.
- THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH PIT BULLS! ALL DOGS SHOULD UNDERGO OBEDIENCE TRAINING. STOP DEMONIZING PIT BULLS!
- Any laws that apply to dogs should apply to all dogs not to a specific breed or breeds.
- Unfair to target a specific breed... do not believe in that at all
- Pit bulls and nuisance dogs should not be on retractable or very long leashes, and should only be handled by those in full control of the dog (i.e. no friends or family members that cannot control the dog).
- I don't think this should be applied to one single breed. Any dog has the capability to be aggressive if not trained and raised properly. There should be an increase in awareness for owners not repercussions for a dog that might not have been taught any better.
- Both my daughters have had and have now the Pit Bull type dogs...these are beautiful animals, they love love people, they love playing ball and snuggling up on the couch/bed. These are Beautiful Gorgeous animals and to lump them into this BSL Catagory is so ridiculous its unfair... then you should have to do this with ever single breed, there is more dog bites from other breed dogs, one being the Labrador Retrievers. My one daughter had an amazing beautiful relaxed very low key became a service dog visiting people in nursing homes, hospitals etc. She had to go through specific training and she passed with flying colors. There's bad apples in every breed, if an animal is abused, starved, left outdoors all the time, is on a chain, has no shelter against the elements there's a chance that dog might bite because of fear and or protecting itself, this is with all breeds. NO NO NO I'M AGAINST BSL
- Ban of pitbulls entirely. If caught with a pitbull, dog is taken away and owner cannot be allowed to own another animal ever again, even a cat or fish as punishment.
- Nothing if theses dogs are not the problem make it for every type of dog all dogs can be trained to kill



- Obedience training for all dogs in off leash areas. If obedience training expected for bull dogs I due to severe bites I would say obedience training for all dogs over 10lbs.
- I'm very disappointed in the breed specific language in this survey I've had worse bites from those little dogs who think they have something to prove I've seen small dogs biting and nipping at bigger dogs who are trying hard to be patient and/ or move away. And the owners just stand there laughing saying things like oh he thinks he's a big dog Yeah well when the big dog gets mad who do you think they will blame ? There are no bad breeds just bad training/owners. No one breed should be singled out.
- Targeting pit bulls is absolute nonsense. In the words of former director of animal services for the City of Calgary, [removed]; "I don't support breed bans because they don't work." "We have to get to the root of the problem, and that is that people must maintain control of their animals."
- Why not make a bylaw where all dogs are required to take obedience? BSL will not change dog ownership, the dogs are not the issues its the humans that own them,
- A description of "nuisance" dogs that are not pit bull specific; I've had more issues with nuisance behaviours from dogs like shih tzu's or chihuahuas or german shepherd dogs or labrador than I ever have had with pit bull dogs. I'd rather nuisance dogs be defined as dogs that are unnecessarily loud, stranger or dog aggressive, or actual behaviours that are problems, rather than the breed of a dog being specified.
- NONE
- This is [removed]
- Train and fine the owners equally of any breed. Its not the breeds fault its the person who owns them. Remember in the 80s how it was shepherds?
- Pit bull does not equal nuisance, therefore a number of pit bulls in a home should not be umbrellaed under one option. I own 3. They are well trained, socialized and we're chosen for disposition. I avoid off leash parks due to prejudice. Even more so, I avoid off leash parks because small dog owners are NOTORIOUS for not training their dogs, nor do they treat them like dogs. Small dogs constantly display aggressive, pre mount, dominant and claiming behaviours whilst the owners look on and laugh and call them cute. Small dogs are instigators - period. I understand my pits are larger and stronger, but instigation should also be considered. Small dog owners are often undereducated in dog behaviour, the little dog ruling the house. I see this all too often and choose the company I allow my dogs to keep. I am a very responsible dog owner. I have taken steps to ensure my dogs are advocates for the breed. Me and my dogs should not be punished because I prefer a "type". An option that should be considered is that EVERY dog owner in the city have to take a dog behaviour course.
- None of the above. Definitely no breed specific rules. The biggest nuisances are chewawaws.
- STOP categorizing Pitbulls. Make these bylaws for ALL aggressive dogs. Punish the owners not the breed!! This is absolutely appalling.
- None breed specific laws that require basic obedience training for all dogs! Require a license to have a dog to help ensure people of are of sound mind and intent to protect animals and avoid unnecessary euthanization from poor training habits.



- Pit bulls and other pit bull related breeds are not the problem. Poor public education about dog safety, and irresponsible owners are the problem. If any dog (any breed) is involved in an incident, it is the owner who should be to blame and rehabilitated, not the dog.
- Obedience training for all dogs? Wheres that option? Come on guys.
- I have had more bad experiences with non-bully breeds than I have with bull breeds. Calgary should be more forward thinking. The dog's breed is not to blame, it is the owners and training available. Spay and neuter options available for all dogs that are registered with the city to limit the amount of backyard breeding. Have owners who wish to breed fill out a registration form for breeding and limiting the number of litters bred.
- It's not the dogs that are the problem it's the people that own them they have the lack of education. A dog only does what it's taught. So I said owner teaches dog you "get him" or "watch him" then of course he/she is going to show aggression. A dog has the right to defend its home, but at the end of it... ITS ON THE OWNER. They are the ones who have made pit bulls and any bully/Terrie breeds dangerous. The dog didn't chose to be mean and aggressive....the owners made it be. The sooner we understand that... Then the sooner we can correct people. We euthanized a dog because it bites someone.... But we set free sexual offenders who are likely to offend again... And they get multiple tries at life... Where is the euthanize penalty for them?
- More clarity regarding the definition of "nuisance" is required - why would they ever need to be muzzled or kept from off-leash parks if they have only been involved in "minor" offenses? Dogs with a history of bites, however, should absolutely be required to have a muzzle.
- Pitbull and pitbull type breed dogs should absolutely not be victimized by by laws. ALL dogs have potential to be dangerous, and thus, all dogs should be under the same restrictions or bylaws. It is archaic and of bad taste to be proposing these types of bylaws where other provinces are tabling to have them removed. Please don't penalize this breed without statistics and evidence that has more than a possible correlation, but not causation. Many statistics do not account for otherwise extenuating factors. It is more ideal to have bylaws for responsible dog ownership, in general.
- I do not believe they should be muzzled. It is not the dogs fault, the dog only goes off of the owner (how it's trained) even a rescue dog can turn into the most loving animal. It just depends on how it's trained. Not just pit bulls have a hard bite, there are plenty of them that do.
- There shouldn't be special bylaws or fines based on the breed of dog.
- This is ridiculous! Pit bulls aren't involved in more bite incidents...which are? I feel like we've gone back 30 years. First it was the domermans, then the german shepherds now it's the poor pitties. And just because a dog has a square jaw and short hair doesn't make it a nuisance. Spend my tax money on something USEFUL!
- If data shows that pit bulls do not pose a threat then categorizing them a nuisance because of a stereotype seems unnecessary.
- stop call dogs (pitballs) a nuisance dog. They are extremely loving animals and this is ridiculous to have any of these options even as options. If a dog bites, it's up to the owner to fix the problem because clearly they didn't train it or trained it to be disrespectful. Fine the owner of the dog bites, do not blame the dog. This is stupid to be even proposed.



- No regulation of pitbull breeds, only instances where a dog (of any breed) bites or physically harms humans or other dogs
- It's disgusting that the city of Calgary is discriminating against certain dog breeds. Especially at a moment in time when "discrimination" is a world wide issue.
- I believe this should be a case by case decision and get rid of the term 'pitbull' some labs look like pitbulls.
- Are pit bulls automatically considered a "nuisance" dog even without previous offences? I feel any breed should be subject to stricter rules IF they are known biters etc. But I do not feel it right in away to put pit bulls into its own category!
- Above "measures" regarding pitbull breed is ignorant and is infuriating to myself, and i'm sure many others. Increased insurance? Muzzles? Required dog training? That is ethically wrong. People should have the freedom to decide what breed of dog they want to have in their life. This limits that choice in so many unnecessary ways. Please stop with the discrimination of pitbulls - so wrong.
- This is a ridiculous bylaw, a waste of time and resources. The dogs are not the problem it is the training or lack of from negligent owner. Penalize the people not the animal.
- I do not agree with BSL, it's similar to racism, it's how the dogs are brought up
- mandatory dog training for all owners, regardless of breed. Being the guardian of a living being is a privilege, not a right.
- All pitbull type dogs to be banned.
- Not ever dog is the same even if it's the same breed. The actions taken should be specific to what that pitbull has done, not making it a problem for everyone who has a pitbull in their house
- There could be an opportunity here to make some sort of dog/puppy training mandatory before being able to register your pet with the City. I believe all owners should invest in training their dog to some extent.
- Just ban them all
- NO BREED SPECIFIC PENALTIES - PERIOD
- Using specific breeds is disgusting city of Calgary. NO BREED IS BAD!!!! It's the owners that should be dealt with. I'm disgusted at the specific breed topic. More bites happen from aggressive small dogs
- Change pitbull to Pomeranian. Legitimately though. Super racist to target one dog Breed. How uncanadian. Who knew council was so racist against dog breeds.
- Ban on pit bull ownership in Calgary.
- A dog park for just pit bulls or dogs declared nuisance so theres no fines or muzzels involved, and instead of taking dog away or putting dog if dog shows examples of violence or bites then they van go to obedience training. Not all pitbull dogs are violent and a nuisance.
- None of this. They are a very kind, loving breed. You said it yourselves, they are not dangerous dogs so stop labeling them as monsters. There are many other breeds that are far more aggressive yet you target pit bulls because they look scary. Scrap this weak attempt at a power trip. Maybe extra training at the most but everything else is laughably absurd.



- Consideration given to aggressive small-breed dogs, as they are antagonistic and often the aggressor towards larger animals. If there is a confrontation between animals resulting in injury, the antagonistic smaller breed dog should also be declared a nuisance animal.
- Put a muzzle on the damn chihuahuas. A dog is only as aggressive as its owner makes it. So if there's an aggressive dog, blame the owner for abuse, not the dog. Pitbulls have such a bad rep when in reality they used to be used to help nanny children.
- DO NOT even think about putting in place a breed specific law.
- There is evidence Breed Selective Legislation does not work. The statement you included about bite severity and pitbulls is misinformed and provides bias to your survey to mis-educate the public. It is not supported by scientific fact and is irresponsible misinformation, I would expect better from my City Council. If actually interested in tackling irresponsible owners and aggressive dogs do so under breed neutral terms. ALL dogs have the means to be aggressive and there are breeds larger than pit bulls that can produce a severe bite. Other municipalities that introduced BSL in fact had an INCREASE in aggressive dog attacks as their legislation did nothing to address actual offenders but instead criminalized the innocent.
- I do not support any of these measures, and find it ridiculous that the City of Calgary would discriminate on dog breed. Breed does not determine behaviour.
- Pit bulls are not the problem poor and in educated dog owners are the problem it is not the dogs fault, it is a direct reflection of ownership and how the dog has been raised, dogs need to be socialized properly and grow up in a loving environment, do not punish good, educated dog owners simply because there are bad ones that's the equivalent of telling people that can't go into corner stores because some people rob them. I know so many well behaved and loving pittys, WAAYYYYY more than bad.
- Don't restrict pitbulls. No logic involved. It's bad owners, not bad dogs. Punish the owners, not the pups.
- Absolutely none of these are remotely okay! None are warranted, needed or wanted!
- No rules should be breed specific, only from shown behaviour in the dog.
- None of the above!! Pit bulls are not dangerous. Humans are.
- Obedience training required for ALL pet owners, similar to driver's licensing. The more training, the less the fees are. Retraining every 5 or 10 years or so for the privilege to own a pet, plus reward-based training with each new pet. Once those documents can be produced, then other vendors such as pet stores and veterinarians can process yearly visas for pets and owners that have passed this prerequisite training. If you go ahead with the "nuisance" measures, an in-person investigation must verify that the dog is a nuisance. There is too much stigma around breeds that they could be falsely accused.
- Owners must be reviewed, not just animals!! If an animal is a "nuisance", owners must be required to dog school and graduate with a certificate, and/or complete dog training with said dog in question
- Easier to report owner of dogs who allow or refuse to leash their dogs in public spaces
- I DO NOT support breed specific legislation or bylaws against pitbulls. There are no bad dogs that need to be muzzled. There are only bad people who poorly train animals. People who are against



pit bulls are generally misinformed and have never owned or raised one. Pitbulls properly raised are gentle and kindgs that need to be muzzled. There are only bad people who poorly train their animals. People who discriminate

- Owners must complete training before registering a pit bull breed. It is not the breeds fault but rather poor owners not knowing how to properly train them. Punish the owners and not the dogs
- I believe that the fear mongering you are doing here in regards to pit bull breeds is disgusting. The fact that you villanize the entire breed group based on zero factors about the individual dogs is a gross oversight and I am incredibly disappointed. It is one thing to have specific restrictions for dogs of a specific size, but the think about setting up harsh measures like this based on breed is an absolute joke. So disappointing to see.
- Please stop singling out pitbulls. Dog owners are responsible for socializing their dogs, regardless of breed.
- Any bylaws put in place should NOT be breed specific. Rather, they should place responsibility on the owner to properly train and control their dog. Dogs "declared a nuisance" should be given the opportunity to somehow prove otherwise after some amount of time.
- Don't make bread specific bylaws. They are fear based and punish animals not irresponsible pet owners!! They aren't right and Calgary is better than this.
- Mandatory spay/neuter for all Pit bulls
- Punish the PEOPLE who inadequetly trained their dog, do NOT punish the dog. Most of the options above are cruel. Don't single out pitbulls. If you did any research, you would know pitbull bits are not stronger than any other dog bite of the same size. All dogs should requie proper training.
- owners should be required to do mandatory training with dogs before it is taken home.
- Dogs with a bite history not being allowed in parks. Most animals at large need more exercise.
- Pit bull definition is ridiculous. I don't support breed specific legislation.
- None.
- Nothing. The fact that the city is targeting "pit bull type" breeds is despicable. I'm ashamed to be from a city that thinks this is acceptable. It's been proven that these dogs are not more aggressive and shows that the City of Calgary has not done due diligence in researching the legislation they are putting forward. This is a stain on the city, and if approved will be a looming shadow on the city.
- Don't pick on one breed. Rottweilers and dobermans are more terrifying then a pit bull
- None of the above
- How about looking at the people that are cross breeding these nuisance breeds you think of? You are looking at this the wrong way. You need to crack down on the people that own the dogs. Anyone that wants to adopt or buy from a kennel should require background check. Training properly should be mandatory. Crack down on the breeders out there and look into dog fighting rings ! There's your solution to the problem. These breeds you speak of are actually amazing, loyal, gentle and affectionate when they are treated and trained properly. I should know, I owned one for 12 years and I had a baby and he was an amazing dog. It's called Responsible Dog Ownership !
- I support NONE of these measures
- None



- there shouldn't be a law towards a type of dog it should be the way an owner trains these dogs.
- It is not the dogs at fault, it is the owners. Pit Bull breeds are kind and loving, it is the owners that can be the problem. No dogs should ever be held at fault but the people should be. The dogs just need love and proper training.
- Do not pass any of these.
- This proposal is a joke and if anything borderline racist towards a specific breed of dog
- I don't support breed banning, but the owner must be held accountable and I don't feel that is happening as strictly as it should. If you have a dog like that, the owner is negligent if s/he does not properly train the dog. Training should be a requirement of owning such a breed. If a dog bites or attacks, the owner's status should be monitored, and if the dog is seized, and the owner prohibited from getting another one.
- there should be no Breed Specific Laws
- If a dog has attacked or bitten another dog or person ... it should be declared nuisance
- Calgary is being flooded with pitbulls by all these US rescue firms from the 1,000+ cities where they have been or are being banned. I suggest we follow banning them as well. Aren't we all getting sick and tired of reading these weekly stories in the news of unprovoked pitbull attacks?
- Hard no on any breed specific legislation
- First off Pitbull, or dogs in general are not the main issue. Yes their are a ton of bad dogs out there because their are a ton of bad owners with no education not properly dealing with their dogs. I would suggest more bylaw activity at the dog parks, consequences for owners who do not control their dogs, and owners not paying attention, on phone or etc, and not cleaning up after their dogs. Their are far to many people who watch their dogs poop and don't even pick it up.
- City of Calgary Bylaw Officers need to do their job and respond to 311 calls. I reported the drug dealer neighbour's [personal information removed] at-large pit bull that almost bit my [personal information removed] father over my fence (it was caught on video) FIVE times (all five times were also caught on video) - and Bylaw didn't respond ONCE. Not even a phone call. They just closed the SR request weeks later without responding. The dog was usually chained on a deck but the yard has NO gates. They also bred the dog with another pit bull on the deck with no gates. Police responded once because of the drug activity and the pit bull were out at the same time on one occasion but there was NO response from Animal Services to 311 calls.
- Bylaw put in place to prevent backyard breeding of any breed.
- Rather than being breed specific, a reduction in license fees could be applied for dogs that have certificate in obedience training. As part of that training, the trainer would have to also provide the bylaws to the owner.
- Dogs and or pit bulls are not the problem. Humans are the problem. Humans need training. One dog breed is no different than the other. A dog requires love and support and pit bulls are no different. Bad owners are the real issue and require training. The stigmatizing bs that surrounds pit bulls as a breed of bad dogs all transpires from uneducated idiots. Do research and learn these dogs are no different than any other.



- no such thing as a bad dog. Obedience school must require owner training as well, don't just send the dog off to be trained by someone who knows how to handle the dog. Perhaps dog owners should get a licence before getting any dog to ensure they can handle it.
- Can dogs that bark all day/night in someone's backyard be considered a nuisance?
- Pit bulls are fine doggos, its the owners who should be further investigated for cruelty, i know pitbulls who have come from abused homes and have been fostered to become loving house hold members
- Targeting and Implementing breed-discriminatory bylaw is unacceptable and opens a door for the city to target any working breed (Dobermans, German Shepherds, Rottweilers) as examples. Nuisance dogs come in every breed, shape and size, so targeting the bully breeds without stating the percentage of bite/nuisance incidents that have happened in the city over the last 12 years is irresponsible on the part of the City's Bylaw Department.
- Any dog lusted as a nuisance and it's owner should be required to go through training to deal with the behaviour and said dog should never be off leash.
- I understand the association that pit bulls have because of their strength but I have had more issues with smaller breeds in offleash parks because their owners dont seem to think they need the same level of control as a larger breed. My dog has never been attacked by a pit bull breed but has many times by smaller breeds, I think this important to note.
- Training for the owner - NOT the dog. It is people who fail to understand animal care and training.
- Pitbulls are not the problem. It starts with the dog owner and that applies to all dogs period. I find more small does bite then the large dogs.
- All dogs should have obedience training. This needs to be a requirement for ANY dog using off leash parks. I don't feel that breed specific bylaws are warranted.
- Dogs declared a nuisance cannot be in off-leash parks or need to be on a leash, but can be re-assessed following appropriate training. Dogs with a history of bites should require liability insurance.
- None, these are all very bias and do not consider the owner in charge of the dog.
- Owners of animals considered "nuisance" pets should be required to have in person visits from a qualified dog trainer. It's usually the human's inability to handle a certain breed of dog. Dogs are not the problem, irresponsible owners are.
- STOP BEING RACIST TOWARDS PITBULLS! Fine, charge or remove the owners right to own animals if the can not properly train and control their pets. Its not the dogs fault!!!
- No breed specific legislation! Treat cases on a case by case basis. Stop punishing responsible owners and good animals because of bad ones.
- education focused program to increase compliance vs punishment first with no support for correction of the issue
- Pit bulls are not the problem. The owners are.
- I don't believe breed-specific bans or penalties are truly beneficial. Any dog can be a nuisance if it isn't properly trained or has been abused, and any dog can be a good dog if well trained. We need to encourage better pet ownership practices and awareness of the responsibilities.



- I am strongly opposed to expanding Calgary Community Standards authorities and any measures implemented against a specific breed are discriminatory and should not be accepted in our society.
- PIT BULLS ARE NOT A PROBLEM BREED; fines should be determined by responsibility of pet owners, not the dog breed
- No bylaw should be breed specific.
- Any animal can attack and cause harm. Pit bulls are friendly dogs unless trained otherwise. Muzzles should be based on any aggressive animal, NOT all pit bulls.
- "Nuisance" dogs should include obviously aggressive SMALL dogs, not just specific breeds that some people think are a problem, I have been bitten by more small dogs than big dogs....
- I do not support BSL! It is extremely racist and if we've learned anything lately is that racism will not be tolerated! BSL does NOT work! There are many breeds that could cause the same amount of damage as a pitbull. Maybe a higher fine to be put in place if a bite or aggressive situation happens?
- The trouble dogs are due to the horrible owners - not the dogs.
- Dogs declared a nuisance must go through obedience classes before being allowed into off leash parks
- No bylaws should be subject to breed. "Pit bulls", while very strong, are one of many breeds that can exert substantial bite-force (Dobermans, Rottweilers, Cane Corsos, Irish Wolfhounds, Akitas, etc.)
- DON'T INTRODUCE BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS ALL ISSUES SHOULD BE LOOKED AT ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS !!!
- There should be no laws against any breed i.e: Pitbull . What a joke
- I don't support any of these that say that the dog cannot visit parks and such. I do not support having to muzzle a dog to go out.
- The by laws should be applicable to all dogs and breeds of dogs over a certain height and weight. DONT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST PITBULLS!!!!
- rehab for aggressive dogs and training for the owner if any incidents occur. Stop blaming pit bulls! They are great dogs. This just builds people's fear in dogs.
- it is not the breed , it is the training of the animal and the OWNER that needs training. I do not support the idea of picking on certain breeds. The dog is only responsible for how it is trained and the environment around it.
- People with more than two dogs in a house hold (a pack) should be on a leash at dog parks. Three or more dogs is a pack and gang up on other dogs.
- there needs to be a better understanding and definition of what a nuisance dog is, and there needs to be a good check on ignorance among bylaw and general public.
- DON'T INTRODUCE BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS ALL ISSUES SHOULD BE LOOKED AT ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS !!!
- Owners of off leash dogs on the side walk need to be charged and not warned.
- Do not single out one particular breed! My golden retriever was attacked by a chihuahua!
- SCREEN THE PEOPLE NOT DOGS.
- Need to fine backyard breeders breeding bully breeds without proper temperament and health testing. Make a mandatory spay-neutered for bully breeds.



- All of these are complete [removed]. Educated yourself [removed]. STOP DISCRIMINATING AGAINST BREED!!!! Not all pitbull type dogs are dangerous just like not all labs are dangerous!! I will never mussel my dog in public. Ever.
- Doesn't matter what breed or size of dog, if they have bitten or caused harm to a dog or human multiple times, training must take place
- Stop targeting Pit Bulls. It is not the breed, but the owner. I have seen way more smaller breeds being aggressive and snapping at people.
- Track number of complaints lodged against a dog owner including - but not limited to - off-leash dog running off property and attacking dog on leash and on public property (EG. sidewalk). Not all nuisance dogs are large. Often the small ones attack the big ones and eventually the bigger dog will nip at them to drive them off (generally without injury). People need to train and keep their dogs under control regardless of its size.
- All pet owners should be required to go through training before owning a pet.
- Bylaws should not attack certain dog breeds, only applying to across all dog breeds equally.
- Teach people how to raise their dogs better. Its the dog or the breed its the person who raises it. We don't blame kids go how they act why would we blame dogs. Quit putting blame on the animals and look at the real problem which is people
- No special enforcement.. fine repeat offenders.
- Keep [removed] philisophy to place responsibility on the humans and not the dogs. This is dog racism and this is 2020 when racism is trying to make a change. Dont revert back to something he created that worked so good.
- I AM AGAINST BREED SPECIFIC LAWS !!!!
- Do not implement breed specific legislation. It's judging a book by its cover and that is exactly what we teach kids not to do. I expect the city of Calgary to be a role model. My dog was bit by a doodle; breed means nothing. It's the owner.
- None, this is a terrible idea
- Pitbulls are a kind and loving breed. The fact that it is rumored that they are aggressive is a pure joke. Please ensure these implementations are representative of all breeds. Simply put, smaller dogs are more aggressive, but as they have a lower impact aggressive behavior their actions are dismissed. I am appalled at the idea of all the suggestions above.
- The fact that the city is bullying specific breeds is ridiculous. Teach your dog not to be an [removed]. Owners need to be held responsible. A dog is a animal by nature, it does not matter how much training you have, if a animal is provoked it's provoked. (I do not see huskies on this list? They are just as wild and aggressive as any other animal.)
- Pit bulls are not the nuisance people seem to believe, the owners are the issue, not the breed!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Better monitoring and enforcement of dogs off-leash in on-leash areas.
- Can you add something about if the owner poses a threat to the animal or others in a dog bite situation.
- Punish the owner, not the breed/pet. Even golden retrievers can be vicious if taught to be that way.



- singling out a type of breed with eliminate any support from me. Additional training, higher fines, etc. for ANY breed of nuisance dog is the route to go.
- Dog owners who are not responsible enough to care for and train their Pit bull or any other dog properly should be fined.
- Your bias against Pitbulls is both frustrating AND unscientific. You clearly acknowledged that Pitbulls do not bite more often than other breeds. So if you use the "bite strength" excuse to target specific breeds, PLEASE follow published scientific evidence regarding dog breeds and jaw strength (e.g. here: https://dogs.lovetoknow.com/wiki/Which_Dog_Breed_Has_the_Strongest_Jaw) and objectively target all breeds above a certain strength, like German Shepherds and English Bulldogs. Or better yet: do not target any BREED, but individual nuisance dogs.
- breed specific bylaws are a terrible idea. Deal with problem animals case by case.
- its not the dog its the person who raises it... like your kids should be muzzled at the mall for running around screaming. but eh [removed] you
- Breed has nothing to do with behavior. It is the ownership
- owner education, a dangerous dog is different than a nuisance that makes noise or at large and non-aggressive - maybe a different category - I would support a separate dangerous dog designation that can't then be in off-leash parks
- A requirement that owners must get their dogs trained regardless of the breed. Exceptions would be for those who actively work with dogs ie veterinarians and the like
- NONE OF THESE! Pit bulls aren't the problem, bad owners are!
- Any dog if not trained, loved, or treated properly can develop behavioural problems. Owners need to be educated on proper care, and discipline
- If the ANY breed shows SEVERAL offensives then it should require training or be muzzled if cannot train. (By several I mean the 3 rule)
- I worry about the implication that higher fees as punishment to the OWNER might have on the dog. An owner who chooses not to pay a fine might consider harsher alternatives like ... dumping their dog, beating or even killing it in order to punish the DOG and avoid future fines.
- If an owner has a large amount of charges they should not be to own a dog.
- Higher fines for people with any dogs that bite. Eg: Chihuahua's, pomeranians, shitzu type dogs. I think public officials that spread false information such as "pitbulls bite more or harder" should be fined and removed from whichever position they are working until properly trained.
- Pit bulls shouldn't be excluded out. It's nuisance dogs in general. There should be no breed specifics listed. People freak out without even knowing pitbulls personally. I'm tired of them getting singled out.
- Pit bulls have a less powerful bite than German shepherds and other breeds given that is your reasoning for singling out the pitbull or pitbull type breed then should this law apply it would therefore have to apply to all breeds that have as powerful a bite or more so.
- Pit Bulls as described above are not the problem it's the owner that has trained the dog or lack of training that generally causes the problem. Offer subsidized training to those who need more help to train their dogs.



- It's not a pit bull problem it's bad owners. Not fair to single out one breed.
- I think we shouldn't just keep it to one specific breed, i have been bitten by smaller dogs on more than one occasion. I have also had other breed dogs attack my American bulldog, and my dog wouldn't even defend itself. I believe the owners of the animals should be held accountable on a case by case basis.
- Instead of fining people for nuisance dogs, offer programs to rehabilitate and train the animal with the owner. Refusal to enter such training should result in seizure, training and adoption of the animal. Putting a price on bad behavior will not stop its frequency.
- Would be in favor of banning the breeding of pit-breeds, and for requiring a special license to own a pitbull in the city.
- the only acceptable change would be to increase fines on irresponsible pet owners. Perhaps even issuing bans on people so that they cannot own a pet. The argument that pitbull type dogs are more dangerous because their bite has the "potential" to do more damage is irrelevant. A human on human assault charge is the same whether they use a 9mm pistol or a 50 caliber rifle. [removed]
- I think instead of specifically isolating and targeting animals you clearly view as a nuisance, find a way to make obedience training mandatory for all dogs.
- Ban pit bulls
- I don't think we should be breed type specific (Bully breeds) a bite is a bite regardless if it comes from a small animal or large one.It should be one rule for all not just some.
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog per house.
- The city is out of their [removed] minds with this survey. It's the owners fault NOT THE BREED. The owner should be responsible for proper obedience training. How dare you Calgary, single out Pitbulls. Let's just go ahead and raise insurance for specific racial backgrounds for people now too hmmm? [removed] ridiculous
- None of these make sense. Why would a dog declared a nuisance for being "at large" be required to be muzzled in public? Raising the fines will only negatively impact the dog and lead to cases of neglect/abuse.
- Equal laws for all breeds and assessment of dog owner to see if they are good care givers.
- I am more scared of Chihuahuas than a pit bull.
- Euthanization of pit bulls or nuisance dogs involved in serious offences (e.g. serious injury or death of child).
- LEAVE THEM ALONE. It's the owners not the dog. All breeds are different and you can't discriminate against animals
- Require obedience training for pitt bulls but otherwise, leave them alone. Focus on nuisance dogs in general.
- You guys are disgusting and cruel for even suggesting the earlier options. Pitt bulls are the friendliest dogs - and this is coming from someone who doesn't like dogs.
- Please don't target Pitbulls they are sweet dogs who don't deserve it



- A Pitbull is NOT a vicious animal and the fact this bylaw may go in affect is [removed]. Pit bulls are sweet animals and there should be no laws against them being alive and being happy where they should be, in parks, walks, anywhere.
- am offended that you are singling out pit bulls when I have had more troubles with owners of small dogs quit trying to single out one breed. develop a bylaw for all dogs and apply it equitably to all dogs. have seen too many people complain of german shepherds at the off leash park when it is actually the complainants dogs that are not under control.
- None of these measures are founded based on valid/proven studies or science. All dogs have equal chance of being aggressive and it is entirely based on training. Singling out "pit bull" breeds and dogs that "appear" to look like an aggressive breed is COMPLETELY absurd and unfounded. This is a play on the stigma behind "aggressive" breeds and nothing more. To follow through with any bylaws like this would be disgusting and absolutely ridiculous.
- It's not the breed it's the owner.
- Increased fines and enforcement for off leash dogs in leashed areas. More bylaw presence (more jobs, yay)
- Bylaws should apply to dogs that are nuisances. Not all pit bulls or bully breeds are bad dogs. More small dog breeds have been known to be aggressive
- Don't do discrimination on pitt bull... stop!! All big dogs are the same.
- Nothing!! The type of dog does not matter. [removed] you Calgary for even thinking this is an issue.
- You are focusing on one type of dog. In my experience "pit bulls" have never been a problem. It comes down to the owners responsibility. By singling out 1 type of dog, you are perpetuating a stereotype and the perception these dogs are to be feared.
- Pit bulls are not problematic you ignorant [removed]
- I would not support any of these options I firm believe any dog is a nuisance it's the owner who is at fault for poorly training ANY dog
- Owners with nuisance dogs require proof they have sought and taken training with their pet to stem the bad behaviour/habits they and their pet have.
- Additional enforcement or fines for dog owners who do not keep their dogs on a leash on community sidewalks or allow the dogs to relieve themselves on neighbors property/flower-beds.
- Creation of bylaws that are limited to specific breeds should not be implemented. It only encourages the public to be afraid and discriminatory against certain breeds. Any dog is capable of becoming a "nuisance" and I strongly believe that mandatory dog training for ALL dog owners is a more fair and effective bylaw.
- Discriminating against pitbulls is so wrong. Shame on you Calgary and shame on the people who thought of introducing this as a bylaw. Never been so ashamed of this city in my life. BSL does not work and does far more harm than good. Pit bulls are not aggressive by nature it is all in the upbringing and socialization which is the responsibility of the owner. I have a cane corso and she is the sweetest dog ever but with this bylaw her and other dogs will be unfairly grouped for absolutely no reason. Educate people on how to socialize dogs. Make screening people before they get any breed mandatory. I have met far more small dogs that are aggressive than bully breeds. I've



personally been attacked by both yorkies and pomeranians and them along with dachunds have more bites and are more likely to bite. Educate yourselves please because this is the most ignorant thing I have ever seen. Seriously shame on you.

- Do not single out pit bulls. Any dog has the potential to be dangerous or a nuisance
- apply this to any dog no matter what breed or size. In the past I was almost attacked while walking in my community two poodles. The owner could barely control them. On the other hand, I have encountered pitbulls that were as gentle and kind as can be. I am not a dog owner but have a lot of friends with various dogs. Also making sure people know how to handle their dog. I see many people with big dogs and small dogs who don't know how to handle/control them. I am living in a highrise where dogs are allowed and have seen a lot.
- Don't target Pit Bulls. All dogs can be bad.
- None of the above - leave these animals alone
- All dogs should require training for both dogs and their owners. This is not specific to pit bulls or similar breeds
- Provide programs for all registered dogs to receive obedience training. Seize unregistered dogs and those who have not gone through obedience training
- Owner should be held responsible not the animal, fines for owner
- STOP MAKING BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION ITS EMBARRASSING
- Why would Pitbulls breeds be singled out here? Why would the city perpetuate this stereotype so more irresponsible owners acquire these breeds because they are considered the bad boys in the dog world??? This is exactly the problem underlying the Pitbull issue, in the 80s it was the Doberman and the German Shepherd, now it's the Pitbull. Please educate the public and don't perpetuate this stereotype!!!!
- Mandatory training for new and existing dog owners, with biannual refresher training
- Pit bulls should absolutely NOT be targeted separately. If you want to place legislation for dog bites so do it for all dogs. A responsible pet owner of a pit bull is the same as a responsible pet owner of a chihuahua.
- Do not allow pit bulls in Calgary. Do not allow dogs to be brought in from other countries.
- It is very disappointing the city would discriminate based on breed. There are several dogs that have significantly stronger bite force (mastiff, bulldog) and many that are just as powerful including German Shepard, Dobermans) that are also common breeds.
- No, no, no. "while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's [sic] strength allows the potential for a more severe bite" This is plain wrong. It's based on urban legend and decades of sensationalistic reporting, not science. First, there's no good way to measure bite potential in dogs. You cannot put a device in their mouth and direct them to bite as hard as they can. There have been some studies using dry skull measurements, by using electrical stimulation in anesthetized dogs, and by using calculations based on muscles and anatomy. None have given a satisfactory answer to the question, and the results vary from study to study. In one very interesting Canadian study, 40 skulls were sorted by size (small, medium and large) and by shape: brachycephalic (flat-faced), mesocephalic (medium



proportions) and dolichocephalic (elongated). It was determined that bite force was strongly correlated with the overall size of dog. For medium and large dogs, the shorter skull shape was associated with a somewhat stronger bite, perhaps because longer skulls have less leverage. This difference was not seen in small dogs. So what does this mean in laymen's terms? Breeds that fall under "pit bull" restrictions: the American Staffordshire Terrier, Staffordshire Bull Terrier and American Pit Bull Terrier, are all medium sized dogs classified as brachycephalic type. That means that they may have a slightly stronger bite than a similarly sized breed with a long nose. But there's no reason to presume their bite would differ from other brachycephalic breeds of the same size, e.g, the Chinese Shar-Pei, Chow Chow, or Boxer. This also means that as a medium-sized dog, their bite strength would pale in consideration to breeds that are larger. There are dozens of breeds that are larger in size and, according to this study, would have the potential to do more damage with a bite. Once again, science tells us that assessing an individual dog's behaviour and looking at proven risk factors for dog aggression is the key to protecting community safety. Neither breed nor anomalous bite strength, are among these factors. Point E, above, is especially grievous; it provides no substantive or objective way of determining a dog's breed. It simply has to "look like" or exhibit characteristics? This boils down to the biases and subjective determinations of bylaw officers and WILL be challenged in court. Breed-specific legislation has NO place in Calgary.

- Leave the pit bulls alone you [removed]
- If they are muzzled then they can be in off leash parks
- It has nothing to do with the breed of the dog.
- There should not be anything breed specific. Please do not limit this to pitbulls. This is absolutely insane.
- I would not support any of these measures.
- Its not the dogs, its the owners. Owners should be given training in how to handle these types of dogs. Some people should not be allowed to own any type of dog if they are mentally unstable, or not very bright.
- Ban of Pit Bulls within multi-unit dwellings were other residents have not choice but interact or run-into this breed (condos, apartments, townhouses)
- Leave pit bulls alone
- No breed specific legislation relating to pit bulls or any other breed. As pit bulls are (as stated above IN YOUR OWN SURVEY) no more likely to bite than any other breed, I do not support legislating them any differently than other dogs.
- Any dog, not just. Higher fines for owners that think it is ok to be off leash in an on leash. IE. Confederation Park. Even if they think there dog is under control. This threatens dogs that are on leash. This has Ben an issue for over 10 years. All they get is warnings. I have witnessed so many dog attacks and they are not just Pit Bulls. Higher fines for disobeying the rules.
- There should be laws enforced to stop back yard breeder of any type of dog. People who wish to get large breed dog should be required to take educational courses on owning a dog, training, laws. A Pit bull type dogs quality of life should not be ruined because people are under educated, (these are special dogs who should only be in the care of the right people) Also the media should be fined for



creating fear against 'pitbull' type dog breeds. The public and catholic school system should as be educating children about approaching dogs, and how to treat animals.

- It is not the breed it is the owner. I have seen other breed attack as well. People need to be responsible for the actions of their dogs no matter what breed.
- It's really nonsensical that so much attention is being put on Pitbull needs when they are no more likely to bite or attack than any other breed. Please use your brains and think about breeds which have proven to bite and attack people regularly like German shepherds. Don't just be dog racist just because a dog is strong, go with factors not blind great mongering, it makes the whole city look stupid.
- I don't think it should be breed specific laws. There are plenty of dogs whom aren't pit bulls that are way more vicious. Any dog, and any breed that exhibits aggressive behaviour of any kind should be muzzled.
- There cannot be more than one or nuisance dog in a household
- It is a myth that pitbulls have a "stronger" bite than other dogs. I expected more research from the city of Calgary. I believe the owner should be held accountable and not the breed. Being prejudice against a particular breed seems like an archaic way of thinking and causes issues to go underground
- A few bad apples don't spoil the whole bunch. Please deal with dog issues on a case by case basis and don't discriminate pit bull breeds and definitely dismiss the idea of a muzzle at parks.
- Fine the owners of the owners of any breed of dog that is showing signs of aggression. It's not the dogs fault... chihuahuas, German Shepard's bite more people than a pit bull, there is just a discrimination towards pit bulls that need to stop
- Breed specific legislation is disgusting and unhelpful. None of these options are reasonable in any capacity.
- Your prejudice against pit bulls is insulting
- They should not be specific pit bull legislation
- Owners of dogs (any dogs) that have had offenses (i.e biting, attacking) should be held more responsible as an owner. Many people with dogs (does not matter which breed) who have had instances of biting, attacking, etc should be held more accountable for how their dog is trained. 2-3 offenses of biting, attacking should be fined at a higher rate and 3+ cases required to take dog obedience classes and receive a certificate that their dog has changed/improved greatly. There have been many people who laugh it off when their dog jumps and growls and tries to bite someone walking by (even if it's on their own property) and your walking on the sidewalk not near the fence. I have had dogs try to jump the fence to attack when just walking by.
- I think small dogs are far more aggressive and a nuisance (yappy) than pitbull dogs. I would rather see something done about that.
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION, that is very disappointing to see.
- Increased fines and enforcement for off leash dogs in leashed areas.
- So disgusting you guys discriminate against bully breeds. The little chihuahuas are the nuisance dogs. Disgusted



- I do not believe anything needs to be done.
- Owners must be screened for dog's training and treatment at home
- This is a joke right? I have been grooming dogs for 10 years and never met an aggressive "pit bull type". In fact I would trust them over many other breeds. Please give your head a shake city of Calgary!!
- All dogs should be muzzled.
- Additional tracking / restrictions to OWNERS of nuisance dogs. Obviously if they do not have the ability to properly train, they should not own other dogs in the future.
- I feel like the criteria given to explain nuisance animals is way too vague. If an animal has shown violent tendencies WITHOUT provocation on numerous occasions then I feel like they could be classified as a nuisance animal. But too often larger dogs are blamed for incidents that are not their fault, but that of smaller dogs, children or other owners not knowing dog behavior and warning signs. I believe employing an animal behaviourist as those involved in rescues around the city would be the proper way to address whether an animal is a nuisance or not. Based on an evaluation, not just a specific he said she said incident.
- If your dog is a nuisance (pit bull or not) you shouldn't be alien to take it to an off leash area unless you've taken obedience training with your dog and it's been passed by the person running the class
- Mandatory training for owners of dogs that are declared a nuisance
- Pitbulls are not the problem it's the people who own them for the wrong reasons, it's like comparing the son or daughter of a drug addict to their parents they have done nothing wrong
- None. It's the owners. Not the dog. Don't make me get rid of one of my fur babies because someone else can't control theirs. It is not fair to me
- Higher fines for people allowing their dogs to be off leash in all designated "on leash" areas
- Pit bulls are not the problem... untrained dogs in general are. Whoever came up with this notion needs to be looked at as a viable candidate for their position because clearly they are missing vital information on how dog breeds differ.
- It's unfair for the city to specifically target any type of pitbulls. There are many other dogs that are nuisance dogs. Many other large breed dogs severely bite. This poll is one sided and not accurate
- It's not the [removed] breed, leave our pit bulls alone. If I want to have 4 pit bulls in my house I damn well will have 4 pit bulls. Don't single out a breed, there's no such thing as a bad dog just a bad owner.
- None, pit bulls are not a problem it's how their owners train them.
- The main problem is the owner, not the dog!! Stop attacking innocent animals. Make training for stupid people. They're a huge problem!!
- Owners who have multiple nuisance dogs must be sent for training.
- Pitbulls are no more dangerous than any other breed
- Treat all dogs the same. Provide training for all breeds and hold pet owners responsible for the dog.
- I have known many pitbulls several of whom are rescues none of them have any issues and if they did have issues once removed from a negative environment the issue quickly dissipates, Banning and restricting pitbulls creates an environment of hostility towards them which will lead to more



incidence because dogs can sense what people are putting off also restricting them socializing in dog parks means the few times they do see other dogs it may potentially be worse because they have less experience being social!! Also other dogs are going to suffer for this I have spent a lot of time walking a black lab crossed with a boxer the sweetest little girl in the world however her head is square and her fur is short and we have had a lot of negative reactions to a very friendly dog luckily she does not feed into the energy and has never had an incident, but it's heartbreaking to watch her approach people with love and have them shun her and be visibly disgusted she comes back with her ears down sad.. I have been bit by four dogs in my life one large one who I did not meet the owner I was a child I was running down the street it came out of its yard it was big and furry and black and bit me and then ran back into its yard that dog did not draw blood, and three small ones 10 20 and 30 lb respectively each one of those dogs drew blood none of these bites were ever reported. I am not alone in this so your bite statistics are severely skewed.

- STOP BSL
- Leave Pit Bulls out of it. Go after the owners. Dogs do as they are trained. We shouldn't be going after one specific breed. That's like dog racism because they are stronger they have the potential.
- Obedience training or behavioural investigation into the owner as they are the ones who taught the dog to act that way.
- Creating bylaws based on breed is a poorly informed choice. As a professional in the veterinary field it is my opinion that the behavior of a dog has nothing to do with breed and everything to do with training and owner compliance. I would recommend enforcing and educating the public on "leash code", where different colour leashes are used to indicate others about the temperament of your pet (for example, yellow usually indicates a dog that does not do well with others). There is little to no scientific backing that a bully breed would inflict a bite worse than that of a dog of another similarly sized breed. By educating the public on leash code, proper dog park etiquette and encouraging proper training of all breeds, we can mitigate the risk of dog bites and other dog related incidents.
- This is discriminatory against pit bull breeds. I do not support this.
- I think all of these ideas are idiotic. Terrible idea.
- The dog is not at fault for any of these scenarios and it is the owner who should be prosecuted for their training strategies.
- None of the above. I do not support any of the listed measures
- Don't punish a breed punish the nuisance dogs
- The way a dog responds and acts is entirely on the owner. There are a lot more breeds than just pitbulls.
- NONE OF THE ABOVE
- These bylaws should apply to all dogs who display aggressive or nuisance behaviour. Breed should not be part of this survey.
- There should be no bylaws passed specifically for pitbulls, this is an outdated and inaccurate belief with no merit. It is embarrassing that the city of Calgary is even considering this.
- I would like more information on "dangerous behaviour" and how it's determined. I think it would be better to refer to it as negligence on the part of the owner rather than the behaviour of the animal.



Please reconsider breed specific legislation. It has nothing to do with the breed and everything to do with the owner.

- why specify pit bulls? there are many more large breeds that could be as strong and cause a severe bite. this question reinforces the fear mongering that is not based on actual frequency of pit bull bites vs other breeds. regulate the owner and the nuisance dogs, not breed. or if you MUST identify breeds pick the top 10 that cause severe bites and insist on extra training, not just one . I am very disappointed in how this question is phrased
- Please do I put breed specific bands or fees just because of breed. It should be for dogs who have caused problems in the past
- Obedience training required for all dog breeds small and large.
- Breed specific legislation has been proven to be ineffective. Punishing owners for the breed of dog they own, despite the dog having caused no problems doesn't do anything to resolve dog attacks.
- None of these should be enforced. Pit bulls and similar breeds should not be punished for simply being born. It is the owner's fault for conditioning a pit to be aggressive or violent. Stronger training is a possible solution but would be difficult to mandate and ensure.
- This is racism towards pitties. How can you be so cruel?
- None of these should be enforced. Pit bulls and similar breeds should not be punished for simply being born. It is the owner's fault for conditioning a pit to be aggressive or violent. Stronger training is a possible solution but would be difficult to mandate and ensure.
- If pit bulls have to be muzzled, so should all breeds. It's the owner not the dog. Make owners punishable. Not dogs.
- It is never the dogs fault. It is the owners and the world should know this by now!!!
- A fenced in yard that is in good repair and sufficiently high enough to adequately contain dogs exhibiting dangerous behaviour. Also, obedience training should be mandated for all breeds that have a higher degree of or propensity for dangerous behaviour. A clear definition of dangerous behaviour is required and should not discriminate against any one specific breed, but all-inclusive of dogs exhibiting dangerous behaviour. Also, the City should consider that all dogs can be antagonized to exhibit nuisance behaviour when its yard back onto City parks as the general public, including dog owners, can be quite inconsiderate of private property by allowing their children to throw things into a yard at a fenced in dog or allow their dogs to run off-leash/on-leash immediately behind the fenced yard.
- This is so beyond wrong to go after a certain breed. It's the owners not the breed. Start going after the people who abuse these dogs because of their breed! I don't own a pitbull and probably never will because I don't want to have to pay more money to own one or not be allowed in certain areas with my dog.
- This is absolute garbage. My dog has been injured twice by other dogs. Once a German Shepard and another time a Jack russel. My rotti cross dog has never even defended herself. You can't judge dogs based on breed. It's individual just like bad people
- Because "pit bull type dogs" are not involved in more incidents it makes zero logical sense to punish them for peoples unjustified opinions on the breed.



- Remove all "pit bull" specific and targeted language and policies.
- This should not be breed specific! There are many dogs involved in bites etc, and picking on one breed simply because of their bite strength is not right. That's like damning a person before you even know them. Dogs should not be euthanized, they should be removed from the BAD OWNER and given a second chance to show their true colors, with an owner who will love, care for, and train properly. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Legislation targeting 'pit bulls' is the same discrimination as racism. I've been bit by a husky and a chow chow, never by a pit bull. A dogs breed does not determine its behavior. There are gentle, affectionate pit bulls, and vicious, violent golden retrievers. All dogs are products of their upbringing, not their breed. This seems so basic common sense
- BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION IS DISCRIMINATION!!!!
- Muzzled up to a year in public places. Once dog behaviour specialist has confirmed dog has been rehabilitated then it can be muzzle free
- BREED SPECIFIC BANNING IS NOT OK. WE WILL NOT STAND FOR IT AS A COMMUNITY. DOG BITES ARE PUT ON THE OWNER NOT THE DOG!!!! WE ARE BETTER THAN THIS AND THE CITIZENS OF CALGARY WILL FIGHT FOR THIS FOOLISHNESS TO END. STOP WASTING OUR TAXES!!!!
- Should not be breed specific, outline should be subject to all breeds. False information above about "pitbull" bite strength. They are much lower on the list of bite strength compared to other breeds. Also plenty of info in Ontario showing its the owners not breed. Please remove false, misleading information when engaging with the public.
- Not all dogs who have been involved in noise complaints or being at large are harmful at all. These measures are useless. Make these measures for the dogs that actually have a history of causing harm, or that do bite. Pitbull breeds specifically should not be penalized for other dogs behaviors!!! If they bite and are aggressive then yes, something needs to happen but not ALL pitbulls are aggressive!!!!
- Annual checks (or registration renewal) to ensure insurance is current and obedience training has been completed. Until insurance obtained and obedience training completed, not allowed to leave property. Could require a refundable bond in interim.
- Target the irrepressible and lazy pet owners who don't properly train their dogs instead of targeting the breed. The breed is not the issue. Lazy and irresponsible pet owners are.
- Owners with insufficient knowledge on large breed dogs should be encouraged to attend obedience. Passes to better understand their dog. Large breeds such as pit bulls are being wrongly labeled due to the uneducated owners.
- Don't discriminate against dog breeds, such as pit bulls, when making your legislations
- Dog owners get in trouble for not teaching them properly. It's not the dogs fault!
- If this apply to 1 breed why not all .Why not try and find a solution that doesn't have to be as drastic as this . When puppies are licences there should be an automatic obedience course for all dogs. My dogs have both been bite by smaller or non pit bull breeds and it's not fair to say that these dogs are the most dangerous when in realtiy it's all up to the responsibility of the owners. If a dog has had a



few instances for showing aggression regardless of breed I think they should be put on an aggressive dog list. This should include all breeds not just pit bulls

- Owner training with their pets to correct nuisance behaviour.
- I do not support this specific breed legislation whatsoever
- How about no pit bull breeds at all? They have a jaw like they do for a reason, they are not safe dogs and as someone with small children who does not know how to read dog behaviour I hate when I see one approaching.
- Dog owner training and certification to safely and effectively lead their pitbull or any other breed of a large size. The breed is not an issue. The issue is when people don't know how to communicate with and understand their dogs. There needs to be more accountability on the owners knowledge and stop blaming the dogs.
- Targeting «pit bulls » is not a solution... the owner is the source of the problem, not the dog. Having race specific bylaws will only increase people's fear for that type of dog.
- Dogs that are deemed a nuisance after having committed an offence, depending on the severity, should have to take their dog (breed unspecified) to a rehabilitation / retraining program so that the behaviour can be changed for the betterment of the dog. The cost would be at the expense of the owner. If the owner refuses to retrain/rehabilitate the dog in question through a training/socialization program, then they would face either additional fines, or the potential of having their dog taken by the city and given to a rescue agency, so that other, non-ignorant owners could help rehabilitate the dog upon adoption.
- These things should apply to all dogs not just Pitbulls.
- When adopting a dog (particularly a pitbull in this instance), training should be mandatory upon adoption. Although I do not believe in discriminating against a breed, not everyone is equipped to handle a dog with this power or stigma. Adoption agencies should be held accountable to whom they adopt their dogs out to. Pitbulls and powerful dogs of all breeds are not responsible here, their owners are.
- I do not agree with this being breed specific. I have been attacked more by small dogs than I have ever been by Pitties. If changes are going to be made, it should be to rules for ALL breeds.
- NA
- Non of these, this is completely discriminatory towards a breed of dogs and is WRONG!
- More enforcement on leash bylaw. In the last yr when walking my dog we have been attacked by multiple dogs that are off leash in areas that are not designated for dogs to be off leash. At times it has overwhelmed me I can't even go outside in my neighbourhood (Ogden area) with the fear of a off leash dog running on there property and attacking my dog or when I walk and people there dog without a leash and also have a fear of taking my son to the park where others have been using as an off leash parks for dogs when it is not a dog park.
- A nuisance dog must be a dog that has had issues in the past, (ie. noise complaints, aggressiveness) one dog breed should not be singled out, each dog should be on a case by case bases



- I would like a full on ban on the above listed breeds. I fear for my children walking alone to the bus stop as we live near several dog friendly spaces.
- Blame should be put on the owner, not the dog. This “nuisance behaviour” is a product of nurture rather than nature. If a person knows they have a nuisance dog of ANY breed, it is their responsibility to work on training and control.
- Some form of screening before owners even get dogs/pets (regardless of the breed), would solve a lot of problems. Most dog issues are caused by the owner. Limiting the activity of a 'nuisance' dog, one that is noisy or escaping the yard, will only escalate the issue. Those dogs require more activity and stimulation, and attention, in most cases.
- Nuisance dogs that repeat offend after graduating obedience training should be banned from offleash parks. Also, should be made to wear/use a large and/or bright dog licence to visually identify the animal.
- Multiple occurrences should not be allowed. Owners of dogs barking after 10pm and before 8am should receive only 3 warnings and then be fined or mandatory training classes. Dogs known to be biters should always be muzzled when not on owners property. One time offence should mean destruction of dog. More enforcement is needed for dog walkers not using leashes and not picking up poop. Escalating fines should be given based on dog's tattooed id.
- It should be the owner getting punished and not the dog. Pit Bulls aren't the problem it's poor ownership of the dog that is. Singling out one specific type of breed is shallow and unacceptable.
- All dogs should be treated the same . And it has been proven smaller dogs are more of a problem than bully breeds.
- Nuisance dogs are to include the small unmannered ones biting the other dogs and provoking them.
- Your survey is garbage and narrow minded. I can give three dozen dog breeds with more power than a simple 40-60 lb bully breed dog. You complete incompetence does align with most of the City of Calgary Management though, so at least you stupidity level is consistent.
- Mandatory training for owners of aggressive breeds. Dogs who are nuisances should be euthanized.
- Perhaps more focus could be put on educating the public about how pitbull breeds are NOT inherently more dangerous and we can stop using this bias against specific dog breeds!
- None of the above.
- All dogs no matter the breed should have the same penalties for bites or aggression
- Do not discriminate based on dog breed ie pitbulls and pit bull type dogs.
- Mandatory spay/neuter for pitbulls or nuisance dogs. Ideally, people should not bring fighting-breed dogs (pit bulls) to dog parks, but if that is to be allowed, the dog should be muzzled.
- Pit Bulls should not have any separate treatment than other breeds.
- Not all pit bulls are bad. Why are you blaming one breed. What is wrong with you?! I know many dogs that don't like other dogs and they aren't pitbulls!
- Absolutely not. None of these should apply
- Behavioural training for dogs involved in dog bites, this could also include a victim dog as often times a victim dog trigger a reaction because of lack of training or possessive behaviour to their owner



- THERE ARE NO BAD DOGS. THERE ARE BAD OWNERS AND PITBULLS ARE NOT A NUISANCE!
- Don't be ridiculous. You can not unilaterally say a breed is bad or dangerous. That is archaic and foolishly dangerous thinking. More chihuahuas bite people than any large breed. Education across the board is far more helpful than arbitrarily blaming an entire breed. . Calgary is better than this.
- I think there should also be some sort of measure or consequence in place for repeat "complainers." Sometimes when there is a feud between neighbours because of other matters, they will go after the pets because it is easy and a sensitive subject. There should be a record kept for these complaints and perhaps an investigation/proof required if there are repeat reports about specific animals, just to be sure.
- None of the above, you people are just pissing people off trying to change things in the middle of a global pandemic. What type of dogs that are allowed in parks doesn't matter right now, focus on what does do your damn jobs for once.
- a note to add in that specifying pit bulls is outdated and ridiculous.
- Obedience training for all breeds. Big and small. small dogs are scrappy and more vicious than most of the larger breeds. But because they are small they're often not reported or looked over as being a threat.
- Higher fines for owners of ANY breed of nuisance dogs. Pit bulls are not bad dogs and are some of the most living dogs out there. Owners need to take responsibility for their pets, no matter what breed. Chihuahuas can be much more vicious than pit bulls.
- Only dogs that have bitten once or more should have to have a muzzle in public.
- This should be based on a dogs temperament not no the breed. You have an aggressive dog you muzzle it. If your dog has aggressive and proven to be then there should be actions taken. Don't blame a breed for bad owners. This is stupid.
- Quit picking on Pit Bulls, small dogs can be worse I have met some.
- A dog is a dog. The breed may entail some behaviours however that does not warrant any reasoning to muzzle a dog because of their breed. If a dog is biting and harassing other dogs and people then yes, a muzzle or intense training would make sense. Pit bulls are good. All dogs are good
- Hold the owners responsible when dogs exhibit dangerous behaviour and/or are a nuisance. All these options put the onus on the dog whereas the dog behaviour is inherent to how it's trained/raised.
- I think it is extremely prejudice to use only pitbulls. They are not bad dogs. If I, a human, hit a man on the street, he will hit back. If my dog is attacked by a dog, she will fight back. [removed] you guys.
- I somewhat disagree with targeting pit bulls. I live next door to one, and it is the most well trained dog I have ever met. I know that his owner had extensive training with his dog though. I'd be supportive to require owners of pit bulls to show proof of obedience training from a recognized program
- Bite severity shouldn't be the only determining factor, small Dogs can bite all the time and be a nuisance. Ban bad owners with a history of mistreatment of animals, or a history of documented



nuisance animals. Have a database that doesn't allow bad owners from having pets. Being a pet owner is a privilege and needs to be treated as such.

- Ban pitbulls. They were bred to kill.
- No pitbull breeding in Calgary
- This is a truly awful and stupid action. This is racial profiling of a dog breed. It is the owner not the dog that is the issue. Shame on you all for even considering such cruelty to any breed of animal especially pit bulls.
- There can not be more than 1 nuisance dog in a household.
- Do not focus on one type of dog. If a dog is behaving badly it's usually the fault of the owners. I have friends with Pitbulls and they're the sweetest, most loving dogs I've ever met. Stats show that Pitbulls are not involved in more biting incidents, so why implement a blanket policy against them? It makes absolutely no sense. Target the owners of nuisance dogs
- Obedience training for all dogs and owners
- STOP GOING AFTER BREEDS AND START GOING AFTER PEOPLE!!!!!!!!!!!! THERE NEEDS TO BE A TEST INVOLVED BEFORE EVEN THE ADOPTION OF CERTAIN BREEDS WITH REGULAR CHECK UPS!!! AND THE OWNERS NEED TO BE THE ONES GETTING PUNISHED NOT THE FLIPPING DOGS!
- It needs to be known that a "pit bull ban" IS not an effective way of keeping people or pets safe. Shepherds, boxers, bull dogs etc ALL have bite forces similar to pit bulls. It's stated that there are no higher recorded issues of pit bull bites compared to others so why even bring this up. Any dog no matter the size of there is an issue owners need to be held responsible and if there's an issue mandatory classes are way more important.
- Focus on owners, not breeds. It is the owner who trains and either discourages or encourages dog behavior, not the breed.
- Stop using the term Pit bull it is not a breed. Trying to bring in a BSL bylaw under the guise of updating an old bylaw is shady as hell. Don't do it !
- Fines for spreading misinformation about certain breeds of dog ie: pitbulls being more aggressive and having a "higher bite strength" which is completely untrue a German Shepherd has a higher bite strength than a pitbull.
- This is outrageous! The city needs to look at the research behind this! Why single out a breed based on how it looks. Who ever came up with this should be ashamed. There are far more "aggressive" breeds that are issues than dogs that look like a pitbull.
- Training that includes full participation by the owner should be mandated to ensure the owner learns as much as the dog. Breeds should not be singled out in regulations.
- Owners need to take a training course
- Mandatory training for dog owners. Dogs are not the problem — bad and/or uneducated dog owners are the problem.
- It is not a breed standard. Banning a breed is just wrong! You people need to not be biased to a breed. Dogs are friends. Stop buying into the media



- Pit bulls should not be singled out as a breed when other dog breeds such as German shepherds have a long history of also proving they are capable of severe biting. Singling out a breed only further promotes a stereotype on the animal that makes it more likely to be put down and left at shelters. All breeds should be allowed as long as the owner is able to care properly for the animal. Large dogs will always have a harsher bite because they are bigger, not just pit bulls.
- This is discrimination against specific breeds and as a homeowner who fosters abused pitbulls. I do not agree with any of the above.
- Should a nuisance dog cause damages to property or dog of another, the owner should be legally required to cover those fees.
- I am shocked that the city is considering taking measures against pit bulls. These are some of the loveliest dogs. These dogs are not more harmful by nature. This is essentially unfounded discrimination. If a dog is poorly behaved, this should reflect on the owner, not on the dog.
- This is ridiculous> it is the owner's job to train the animal. My bully is the sweetest and known for it and she has been attacked by every other breed but below bullies. Punish bad dog owners not a breed it's ridiculous
- fees on nuisance dogs. do not discriminate against specific breeds, or generalizations of that breed. address the problem, not misinformed public opinion.
- Punish bad owners with troublesome dogs!!! Don't just go after one breed, that's shameful and terrible!!!!
- Pitbulls are the sweetest dogs around. Focus on the smaller dogs who actually bite. Jaw strength doesn't matter if the dog won't bite.
- None
- It's not just a breed like pit bull that is the problem, it's the owner. I also see a lack of mandatory education for owners of nuisance dogs in addition to fines.
- I absolutely do not support breed specific legislation in any form - there is not evidence to support this as an effective safety measure.
- No BSL!
- As a veterinarian I support additional training; consultation with a veterinary professional should occur when a dog is declared a nuisance. There should be concrete definitions of "nuisance" and a timeline through which a dog can be deemed no longer a nuisance through appropriate training and actions.
- Specifying pit bulls is so ridiculous because it is not a breed specific problem. More dog bites and troubled behaviour comes from small dogs such as chihuahuas or Jack Russell terriers. I am appalled by the city of Calgary using pit bulls as a scape goat. This is embarrassing and disgusting. All you and this survey does is add to the stigma of a breed that once used to be used as a nanny support for children. If you're going to mandate breed specific laws and fines, you have to ask your city WHAT OTHER BREEDS ARE PROBLEMATIC. Instead of choosing for them and not letting other people's concerns about other breeds be heard. This is so wrong on many levels and I am ashamed to even have this be a survey the city thought would be worth while. Do better.



- Training for owners is more important .. train a dog all you want it's the owner that is the problem!! Tim for the world to realize it's the owner not the dog that is the problem .. perhaps a required obedience training with all dog license would be a better approach then to be BSL Plus your wording of "Delcared a Nuisance" would prefer your definition before answering those questions so I reserve to answer those at a later date when it's explained.
- It's not the breed it's the people! This idea of yours makes ZERO sense
- no "pit bull" specific legislation!!
- People must take a behavior training course with their dog if it has any incident. Breed specific fines and need for insurance based on breed is disgusting.
- How about obedience training for any dog big or small? Behaviour starts with the owner not the dog. Failure to train and socialize and dog be it a chihuahua or a Great Dane can And will result in aggression. Maybe don't form opinions on specific breeds and then include false facts. Unless you see a dog being aggressive or have proof otherwise, no dog should be forced to be muzzled in public. That is biased and based on fear
- All owners of ALL dog should be required to go through training with their dog. Not breed specific. There are no bad dogs there are bad owners. Any dog involded in any offence should be dealt with accordly. Education for the owner. No dog should be off leash unless the owner has control of said dog and they are polite dogs to people and other dogs.
- I think putt calling out pitbulls only is not right. I have been bitten by dashounds , Pomeranians and so forth. Just because a pitbull is bigger yes it's bit will be more superior. But doesn't mean a lab, golden retriever, Huskys, granted Danes, cocker spaniels or any other breed for that matter can't cause harm.
- Look at each dog on an individual basis and have charges, etc on that individual basis.
- If dog continually misbehaves, remove dog and ban owner from owning any other dog.
- Why is this just pitbulls? This is discriminatory against a perfectly safe breed. It is not the breed it is owners who are the problem. Chihuahuas bit more people than any pit bull breed does, should there not be increased fines for them and insurance requirements for them? Pitbulls are some of the gentlest breeds you can own.
- If a dog, regardless of breed or size, attacks unprovoked, the city has authority to seize. Very important, however, to ensure it was unprovoked.
- Inthink it to be verry detrimental to single out a specific breed of any animal. The claims that pitbulls have a stronger bite then most other dogs is simply inaccurate. And thus the premis these proposed actions are based off of is misleading and false.
- Animal control officers have to take courses in dog behavior
- I think all of this is absolutely absurd. I own a Cane Corso who is trained excellently, very friendly. BUT he will protect his property and family. We need to be educating people on how to approach all dogs, and ensuring that training for ALL breeds is done. I got bit by a husky when I was younger I don't see these measures being taken with that breed? My corso and I got attacked by a chow that was out of its yard, what about them? When I was a kid time being bit was my fault because I wasn't taught how to approach a dog properly and I didn't ask the owners I just ran up to the dog. MY



FAULT. The chow was protecting its property and just got out of the fence, it happens. You guys would never racially profile a person why are you doing it to a dog?! There's no such thing as bad dogs, just bad owners. This makes me extremely angry, and I think the city needs to reevaluate how exactly then want to deal with this presumed "problem". This is an absolute joke. I have a Cane Corso, so I guess he falls under the similar characteristic portion, absolutely stupid. You said yourself that there isn't more attacks. Unbelievable

- Penalizing an entire breed of dog is absolutely backwards thinking. INCREDIBLY disappointing to see this from a City I would consider a forward-thinking organization. Absolutely ridiculous.
- None of the above. We should not discriminate against specific breeds.
- Shepherd, great daines have just as much bite force. No breed should be judged as a whole or unable to enjoy walks/ parks. Any dog with a history of violent attacks should be trained or muzzled for there safety and others safety. Fines should be the same across the board as small dogs with bad training usually instigate the fights and should be held responsible too.
- Stronger bylaws to counteract animal abuse. A lot of times pit bulls are aggressive due to the owner treating them and training them to be aggressive. Instead of banning or placing laws in for the dog, let's place laws in so that people no longer mistreat them.
- I want to know where the city of Calgary got their stats to single out pit bulls. Small dogs may not do as much damage but they can be very aggressive on or off leash. Muzzles can actually increase a dogs anxiety and an exercised dog is a happy dog.
- Mandatory training for ALL dogs, not just a specific breed!!!! STOP DISCRIMINATING AGAINST THE BREEDS!!! Don't allow people that are abusive to animals, have them. Don't let people who have trained or neglected dogs in the past, have them again! Do better, dont punish an animal because of what it looks like. Muzzles can be terrifying for dogs that have never worn them before. A scared dog can become aggressive.
- Must be opportunity for rehabilitation and a process to be delisted as a nuisance if improved.
- Pit bulls are not the problem
- Bully breeds are not the problem. Owners need to be educated and breeders need to be more vigilant as to who receives their charges.
- If the city does force training then the city should pay.
- Singling out bully breeds is unbelievably narrow minded. Punish owners of dogs showing ACTUAL dangerous behavior, not specific breeds with bad press and unfounded fear. The only dog I've ever owned who bit someone was a Shih Tzu!!!
- DONT BULLY MY BREED. My "dangerous" American staffordshire has been set on at the offleah by MULTIPLE "safe" breeds, and she cowers in fear. SHE IS NOT THE PROBLEM!
- ANY dog that is aggressive should have fines, not breed specific. I've seen poodles and other small breed dogs that are more vicious then a pit bull. If you want a dog then dog training should be mandatory and be offered by qualified instructors that are licensed by the city and it must be on the animals license
- This breed specific legislation is a crock, everyone at city hall know its. GROW UP.



- The definition of nuisance in this point is not appropriate. noise, at large and vicious behavior should not be lumped together and no breed should be labeled. It's been proven time and time again (location by location) breed specific bylaws are archaic and cause more harm than good, they don't offer protection but create another division in communities, creating fear and contempt. Every animal is unique in its own right and should not be depicted otherwise or treated differently especially without cause. When it comes to offenses and fines or training enforced it should all be based on the facts of each occurrence (with exception if the same offence is continually repeated) then look for options/opportunities that would really help resolve or prevent re-occurrence not just a financial hit. It's time we work together to make things better, re-engage a culture of respect (live and let live), more rules make for more animosity, if it's one thing we've learned as Calgarians it's when we ban together to help we make change and foster respect.
- Dogs without proper training should not be allowed at dog parks.
- How about we stop directing this at pit bull or bully breeds?!? Pull your heads out of your [removed] - chihuahuas bite more people per year than bully breeds combined do! What's next, segregation for people on the colour of their skin?
- This should not be specific to only "pitbulls" - all dogs have the potential to be dangerous. Please consider a smart responsible bylaw that protects everyone and all animals. Pitbulls are not the only dogs that can cause damage and the City of Calgary should be the leader in setting a safe pet ownership bylaw that other cities can learn from. Simply targeting one breed will not increase safety for anyone.
- Owner training. All dogs are potential bite dogs. Picking on one breed over another is equivalent to racism in humans. It becomes a slippery slope to more controls and more laws that do nothing in the end. Spend time training off-leash supervisors to monitor actual parks of concern. Then watch an episode of the little rascals, and see what was the dog of choice for children. Pit bulls were always kids dogs, as they were the most gentle, loyal, and safest of all breeds for being around children. Go after the owners who raise them to attack. They are the culprits.
- Any Dog that attacks another dog, animal, or human being should be put down.
- Every case should be looked at individually, a blanket solution is not the answer.
- All dogs should be treated equal. Just as we are all humans, they are all dogs. If there is any of the above legislation put in place, it should be for every breed (i.e. retrievers, labs, chihuahua, big, small, etc.). The above seems extreme and the responsibility falls onto the owner, more programs to ensure that pets are in a safe home and give the attention ALL breeds need.
- Licensing program for pet ownership. Something like the learners test. Alternatively, all pets must undergo obedience training within X months of purchase. Enforcement of nuisance dog rules must ensure they cannot be abused by the reporter
- How about not targeting Pitbulls and invest in a spay/neuter programs for feral dogs as well. All of these above are [removed] bylaws
- Ban pitbull type dogs. These dogs are responsible for more fatal attacks and maulings than any other breed. There is no need or justification for ownership of this breed. Children and the elderly are at particular risk. There is no place in our society for these powerful and unpredictable dogs.



- This should not be breed specific and is an absolute joke. If a dog has issues it doesn't matter what breed it is. I'm disgusted that this is even being considered.
- Non of the above
- Provide educational brochure/talk to those who have nuisance dogs. Provide solutions for them.
- ALL dogs must require obedience training! You are more likely to get bit my a chihuahua then a pit!! Don't discriminate the breed, discriminate the owner!
- NO BREED SPECIFYING. but if you are, maybe the owners should be EDUCATED on these breeds to UNDERSTAND their temperament. Don't you dare think this kind of crap will work. Pay more for having a specific breed, even if they're absolutely amazing and cause no problems? Get your tax and insurance money elsewhere.
- Quit singling out pit bulls... a ton of dogs could do the same damage
- There should be more education for pet owners, there are a lot of breeds that are more dangerous than bully breeds, as well as people calling in to bylaw due to a dog being aggressive or barking - what is the cause of this. I have had numerous cases where children and teens are tormenting and teasing my dogs though a fence which causes them to bark
- None of the above
- Don't discriminate against pit bulls. ANY DOG that is aggressive or a "nuisance" should be flagged not just pit bulls. You people realize it's the owners fault not the animals for not being trained properly! Making a bylaw against pit bulls would be so wrong.
- This stigma about pitbulls needs to stop. You are more likely to be bit by a chihuahua. I don't own a pitbull but ive encountered hundreds. And they are the sweetest
- Overall there needs to be much higher enforcement of by-laws in Calgary parks. Dogs off leash in on leash sections parks for example. By having stricter enforcements of those by-laws you can take a proactive approach and wouldn't have so many dogs declared a nuisance in the first place.
- I don't support singling out one breed. Perhaps humans need to take extra courses on behaviour, animal manager and funding the right dog for your needs
- First of all, your survey questions unfairly singles out pit bull type dogs. I have experienced more aggressive behaviour from great Danes, German Shepard's and chihuahuas.
- I would never support ANY breed specific legislation, and the city should be deeply ashamed of itself for even considering that an option. What a horrible idea.
- Obedience training required for all dog breeds
- Stop targeting pitbulls, if a dog is exhibiting bad behavior blame the owner not the dog!
- consequences (if possible sharp fines or beyond fines) for OWNERS who are noted 'toughening' dogs up or ruining them.
- Nothing
- Any bylaw should NOT BE BREED SPECIFIC! [removed] It's not the breed it's the owner!
- breed specific legislation is a joke and the person that needs to be targeted is the owner - 100%!
- You should do nothing to "Pitbulls" or their owners specifically you should treat every dog and owner the same until there is a specific reason To treat that specific dog and owner. This should never be generalized or breed specific but handled by situation.



- Focus on owners not on breeds.
- A city wide ban on Pitbulls. Extremely dangerous breed that can cause tremendous harm when it attacks.
- Do not punish one breed for existing...other breeds can do just as much damage as pitbulls. It's the owner not the breed. Pitbulls are the absolute sweetest. There's aggressive dogs in every breed.
- Educate yourselves! Pit bulls are NOT a problem! Humans are! Go after the irresponsible owners, for all animals. No one is going to admit to a nuisance pet & raise their insurance, how would you enforce that? Irresponsible owners in my area lie through their teeth when reported to bylaw.
- "nuisance" is described as a dog who has been at large or makes noise... why would they need a muzzle? Do you know what a muzzle is for? Why couldn't a dog at large be allowed at an off-leash dog park, do you know what an off-leash dog park is? I seriously question who wrote this and their qualifications.... Seize a dog exhibiting "dangerous behavior", who gets to decide this, some people are just purely scared of dogs no matter how friendly. Stop wasting tax payer money and time with this nonsense.
- NONE OF THESE THINGS SHOULD BE BREED SPECIFIC - it should be for all pets if something this ridiculous is being put into place.
- I have never met a pitbull or a rottweiler that has been anything other than a giant marshmallow. I agree with the logic of the bite being more severe, but I think we can discriminate against a whole breed because of a couple of bad apples. All the dog bites I have received at the dog park have been from the smallest dogs. While the severity of bites isn't as bad from a small breed, the frequency is. I think we need to put attention on the offenders and not on a breed. Innocent until proven guilty.
- Owners of nuisance dogs should be required to do training and or community service such as picking up poop in a dog park. The owner is generally the problem not the dog
- Referral to a trainer at the Calgary Humane Society for nuisance dogs and check that they attended a consultation.
- to make any of these laws breed-specific is absurd. don't do that.
- All dog owners required to have training with their dogs
- I am very disappointed with the city of Calgary and this survey's breed specific bias against pitbulls, you should be ashamed of yourselves, this survey is a witch hunt and worded in such a way that uneducated individuals manipulated by media bias will certainly suggest action against "pitbulls" shame on you shame on city council
- Obedience training required for ALL dogs who engage at off-leash/dog parks and weigh over 45 lbs, REGARDLESS OF BREED. (Not exclusive to nuisance dogs/pit bulls. This should include any medium-large dog and potentially small dogs)
- This is not a breed issue!
- This sort of bylaw has been implemented in other parts of the world unsuccessfully. Most are now retracting these laws. As any dog, if the owner does not take responsibility for its pet, it can turn violent or distressed. Singling out a breed like "pit bulls" is irresponsible and shows a complete lack of knowledge other than what's been brought forward by inflamed news articles and fear mongering special interest groups. Banning any breed is not a proper solution, but identifying and punishing



irresponsible and malicious owners would yield a better result for the common goal of reducing any incidents. If the city of Calgary made dog registration a requirement from all pet stores and breeders, all dogs and breeds would be captured with bylaws enforcement. If a bad owner is flagged in the system, then action against that owner can be appropriately auctioned. The options suggested above only generates more fear mongering and punishes good pets and owners and shows a complete lack of trust and understanding for them. Some of the available option are simply irresponsible to have been even made an option. I'd like to challenge the decision makers to actually follow up with actual owners of these type of dogs and not simply listen to the few historicals voicing their opinion. Please do not place this bylaw in effect. Its simply going to waste tax payers money as well as create negative emotions towards dogs and owners that have this amazing breed of dogs.

- Why are you singling out this breed? People clearly have no idea that it is not the breed that is dangerous, it is the people who own them. They are sweet and loving dogs but hey don't worry about the idiots that buy them for fighting and train them to be mean.... Start putting your efforts into that area. ALL dogs can bite regardless of the breed; so singling out one is ridiculous. It would be like singling out a certain race of people
- I just want to say that I think pitbulls should not be singled out in any legislation. Pitbulls are not more likely to attack or cause injury than any other type of dog of their size, so there is no reason to single them out. Dogs that are aggressive should be muzzled and not let into off-leash parks if they are still aggressive and nervous around other dogs. The breed of the dog is irrelevant if these types of precautions are taken. Pitbulls are not more dangerous than any other type of dog. Every breed of dog can be dangerous. Putting in legislation only against pitbulls is misleading to people who don't know better and creates more fear and will not solve any problems.
- If an owner of a non-pitbull is involved in bylaw offences fined and required to take a dog training courses. Targeting bully-breeds is not the issue. We all know this. It's owners not making the best decision for their dogs, providing proper training, knowing what their strengths are and then purchasing a pooch that they can't handle. So if this stupid bylaw that targets bully breeds goes through I expect that when a person with a non-bully breed dog bites etc. that they are punished harsher than a bully breed. Because if we are saying bully-breeds 'typically' show this behavior then there is no excuse for a non-bully breed to bite under any circumstance. It's dog racism and you know it.
- Better education on what pitbull means, it isn't a specific dog. It is an umbrella of breeds of dog, so adjust you definition as this includes British and American Bulldogs as well as others. Better education to remove the stigma the is associated with the term "pitbulls". Stress the importance of proper training whether it be facilitated by a course or public teachers like Creaser Milan. No dog is a nuisance, it's the owner not putting time in to train an animal properly, we as a society vet the adoption process very heavily. So putting emphasis on proper training is a key part of making our parks safer.
- I do not think it is right to impose breed specific legislation but I agree with measures taken against nuisance dogs.



- There should be an exam for pet ownership!
- Investing in optional pet training (NOT breed specific) accessible to all dog owners
- Training for owners with "nuisance" dogs. Dogs like this are more like to have irresponsible owners. The owner along with the dog would benefit from more training
- None, only one that should be held accountable for anything is the owner, not the dogs fault. Dont discriminate!!!!
- go-getter a single breed is not the answer. I did not select any of the answers pertaining to nuisance dogs cuz what is your idea of one the breed as a whole cuz you say it is or a proven to be case by case.. if it is case by case I agree with nuisance laws mentioned above.
- This is BS!!! This is an owner problem not the dog. Remove the dog from the owner Rehabilitate the dog and find a good home form the dog. Calgary should have a no kill shelter to
- I believe it is very wrong to single out a specific type of dog even though their bite has more power compared to another breed. They are the most loving dogs and I believe there should be more education on how owners can train their dogs properly. I am a pitbull owner myself always have been and never once had a problem with biting/ being a nuisance..? I believe it should be fair for all breed of dog. I have been severely bitten by a lab before but I don't see them on here...
- Breeds should not be discriminated against. Bully breeds are sweet and used to be known as NANNYS left to babysit children. This is wrongful breed discrimination.
- increased monitoring for off-leash dog walking. Often it's a pain to be in my community when many people dont have their dog on a leash.
- fines for the owner for poor training of the pet. Bad ownership leads to bad behaviour in dogs.
- Very disappointed to see BSL language. Dog not breed. Its discriminatory.
- There should be nothing breed specific! Pit bulls dont bite more so why have rules just for them? Dogs that are ACTUALLY a nuisance should have better care taken but there should not be one breed singled out. Every dog is different just like people. [removed] It's not fair! Dogs need to be dealt with on a case by case basis. Not breed specific. [removed]
- There was no section allowing me to type a response to the breed specific issue which I believe is an oversight. It specifically says here that pitbulls and associated breeds are NOT involved in more bites than usual, so why would you need to punish the dogs and their owners on the point of fact that they exist. How is the number of pitbulls in one household relevant to the behaviour they would exhibit. Moreover, if you want to increase bad behaviour in dogs, not letting them expend their energy at a dog park is a sure fire way to do so. Moreover, is the bite of a pit bull that much more severe than that of a German Shepard or Grey Hound?
- Dogs are not the route of the problem, the owner is. Pet owners who have neglected, disrespected or encouraged bad behaviour in their pet should be punished, not the animal. As a pet owner, you are responsible for your pet. A dog acts as it was trained, there is no inherent "bad" or "dangerous" dog. A small dog is far more likely to bite then a larger one.
- Responsibility must be put on owners of bigger or certain breeds, require them to take training and education with their pet



- Increased registration for nuisance dogs. Please don't judge dogs based on their breed rather base it on their behaviour
- Obedience training for pitbull owners.
- The wording is very dangerous on this with the "dogs that appear like pitbulls" and even so pitbulls are not the problem. Owners are, police owners.
- It's not the pit bull it's the owner!!!
- Unless you add every single breed of dog to this section, you're entirely biased.
- How about charges to the owners, dogs attack because of uneducated owners. We should be looking at the owners not the dogs
- Don't single out Pits. Those are some of the sweetest dogs I have ever met. Yes they have a hard bite, but why muzzle an animal who is friendly and gentle go muzzle one who has bit someone
- Breed specific bylaws don't address the issue of bad owners. Make owners take classes if their dog is involved in any sort of altercation.
- Make sure the humans that own pitbulls know how to handle them, it's never a dog problem it's a human problem
- Pit bulls are not a problem dog. They are nursing dogs. To single them out is unfair. A German Shepard, Rottweiler our boxer can be the same size if not bigger than a pit bull and can cause the same injuries. And obedience training should also fall to the owners, not just the animal.
- None of these this is the worst bylaw I've ever heard of in the history of mankind.
- This is awful!!! I cannot believe we are back to discriminating against this specific breed. Shame on you. Muzzling a pitbill and not allowing off leash because they are a pit bull. What is going on here? This cannot be real!!!
- None. It's the owners not the dog, there are no problems with these breeds unless people make them a problem. Stop applying racism and fear to animals, it's a [removed] joke. Dogs are not the problem. Do not discriminate against them.
- Breed bans do not work. Don't let fear and ignorance set policy.
- The fact that Calgary is even considering breed-specific legislation, clearly directed toward pit bulls, is appalling. Please do not consider making any generalized measures directed at one specific breed, especially when you state that pit bulls do not actually have higher incidents of bites than other breeds. This is discrimination, and I do not support any of the above measures directed specifically at pit bulls. I do believe that additional training should be required for any owner/dog that is involved in a bite/attack bylaw offence. I do not believe that is necessary for all nuisance dogs (noise complaints/at large) necessarily.
- Pit Bulls are not the problem; irresponsible owners are the problem. You should be ashamed of yourselves for suggesting that a beautiful breed of dog, that I have worked with for years and have never seen one do anything other than lick you to death and want to cuddle !!) is singled out like this!! If you spent a second doing research on breeds they are totally the opposite of this ridiculous misconception!!! Shame on you!!!
- Fire everyone at City Hall trying to pass breed specific bylaws



- What you are outlining is Breed Specific Legislation. I AM COMPLETELY AGAINST THIS!!!!!! I feel our current by-law orders are MORE than sufficient.
- Mandatory completion and certification of at least one obedience course for ALL dog owners. Owner required to make efforts to rehabilitate dangerous dog. Seizure of dog after repeat incidents if owner cannot prove rehabilitation efforts have been made.
- Appearance specific legislation based on fear and mis-information should be laughably naive. Stop pandering to the un-informed
- Have the owners accountable for their animals.
- None, leave as is.
- I think we need to stop punishment to dogs for being dogs and I think there needs to be more education for owners on how to deal with their dogs. Like mandatory obedience classes for all dog owners.
- Any dog be it pitbull or a yorkie needs to be trained and handled the same way
- I think whoever put this in motion should not be working for the city I live in, thanks for a stupid motion!
- The dogs are not the issue - the owners are the issue. Fine the owners of animals that are nuisance or dangerous, but do NOT include any breed specific rules. It is not the breed. It is the human who owns it. I find it offensive that Calgary would look into rulings that target a breed of animal, rather than recognizing the role of the owner.
- Clause (e) is troubling as it is based solely on appearance and has no basis in behavior, breed etc. Further, there is a large number of breeds with considerable bite strength that are not included. This entire proposal is troubling. The vagueness leaves it highly open to subjectivity.
- There should NOT be different rules for pit bulls!!!! Many other breeds have equal levels of risk/incident and they are not targeted. We wonder why the public fears these dogs and stereotypes against them...this is why. I also am offended that the media only tends to focus on animal attacks that involve pit bulls. All breeds should be treated with the same cautionary measures!!!!
- Horrible you specific pitbull. As a dog owner, my poor encounters are NEVER with pit bulls. Stop being like the rest of the world and single them out. Shameful..
- How about require PEOPLE to partake in courses or education around owning and training a dog. Pit bulls, and other dogs that may bite, are NOT the issue. Poor owners are the issue. This is an absolutely ABSURD direction from this city. I am so disappointed to call myself Calgarian right now.
- Have no breed specific by-laws, they are ignorant and do nothing to educate people on dog ownership. They do the opposite of educate by playing in to common misconceptions, such as; pitbulls have lock jaw, pitbulls are default human aggressive, pitbulls have some kind of super natural strength where a bite from them would be so much more severe than a bite from any other 80-100lb dog. Which these are simply not true. Please do not pass a by-law based on ignorance and fear, we have enough of that nowadays.
- I do not support Breed Specific Legislation. Your * notes that pitbull type dogs are not involved in more bite incidents, and you provide a factually inaccurate statement about bite strength (german



shepherds, rottweilers, many mastiffs, cane corsos, and more all have stronger bite strength than pitbulls)

- It's not the breed of dog, it's the owner.
- I would prefer if the city wasn't discriminatory towards pit bull breeds. They are the biggest babies who are actually very sweet.
- Pitbulls are pretty calm dogs. Any dogs become aggressive if it trained to be like that. Not a raze problem is an owners problem
- No breed specific legislation. Other breeds other than pit bulls can be aggressive and exhibit poor behaviour it is about breeding and upbringing nothing to do with species. Very archaic thinking and quite in the realm of racism.... they are dogs just as much as another breed is a dog.
- This is ridiculous- it comes down to the owner and not the breed of dog.
- Ban pit bulls
- Fines and regulations should be targeted towards owners practicing unsafe handling of all dog breeds. Placing untrained dogs in uncontrolled situations is the problem. Enforcing on and off leash zones, fining those not complying, and enforcing proper training certifications with focus on owner training in conjunction with pet training.
- Implementing any laws around pitbulls specifically is ludacris, it needs to be applicable to ALL breeds!
- There is no evidence that pitbulls need to be treated as outlined above. These regulations will only lead to more problems. The nonprofit National Canine Research Council said pit bulls' reputation for being stronger and more vicious than other kinds of dogs is untrue, and that there's media bias against the dogs. Fans of pit bulls are quick to assert that a dog's propensity for attack depends in large part on its owner and how it is raised, and there's considerable evidence that owners of pit bulls and other high-risk dogs are themselves high-risk people. A 2006 study from the Journal of Interpersonal Violence revealed that owners of vicious dogs were significantly more likely to have criminal convictions for aggressive crimes, drugs, alcohol, domestic violence, crimes involving children and firearms. Last two statements from the internet.
- Dogs declared a nuisance should only be muzzled in public off leash, if they are on a leash, the owner should have control of the dog.
- Fines and jail time for owners that are NOT responsible dog owners. Punish the deed NOT the breed
- BSL legislation has not been shown to reduce the number of bites, and other dogs have stronger jaw strength than "pit bull types" which, particularly when it includes "any dog that looks like a pit bull" is far too vague of a description. Muzzling etc. for dogs that have been found at large or barking seems like a strange jump as well. Perhaps as part of the licensing process owners are required to undergo responsible pet ownership training? Why not put some onus back on the owners rather than the animals.
- Dogs (regardless of their breed) should not be condemned for poor ownership! My friend adopted a dog that was considered a "Problem" and with love and care and classes she is the most loving dog ever! It is the owner, not the dog!



- Biting should not be on par with noise complaints against a dog
- Pit bulls should be the focus of changes. What about a mandatory course or training for people with dogs who bite. Or a voluntary course offered for people with nervous dogs because they are more likely to bite. Especially nervous small dogs.
- Owners of problem dogs should be fined first. Followed by training of the human and dog, upon success no pending charges.
- I believe that pit bulls and the other breeds similar should be treated as the same as ALL other dogs just because of the reputation they have does not determine that all dogs are the same. It all depends on how the owner brings up the dog and I can tell you that the name of a pit pull has been looked down upon for so long which is not acceptable because all other dogs are capable of doing the same thing. There should be no excessive rules for pitbulls
- I do not support any of these stupid ideas. There is no evidence that pit bulls are inherently dangerous. My neighbours Dalmatian is more aggressive than any pit bull I've met.
- Pit bull type dogs have no stronger a bite than any other breed of dog. Enacting breed specific legislation does not work, and does not take into account each individual dog's temperament. Pit bulls continuously score higher than several other dog breeds on temperament tests.
- BSL DOES NOT WORK STOP SUPPORTING BSL
- You should not be including breed specific wording in this bylaw, specifically when you state that pitbulls aren't involved in more dog bites. It should be directly related to any breed of dog (for example with your last suggestion - "higher fines for any dog involved in bylaw offences").
- A dog breed cannot be high risk, it is the owner who raises the dog. It not specific to pitbulls. I own a staffy and he does not even bark when someone is at the door. Don't be stupid, all dogs should be treated the same and the owners should be held accountable when their dog (ANY breed) causes an issue in a public setting. This is the stupidest question I've ever read.
- this is [removed] up, "dangerous breeds" don't exist, dangerous owners do. Be better than this
- Pitbull specific bylaws are completely UNFAIR! All breeds are capable of harm and should be treated as such. Any Nuisance dog is a problem, and the owners should have to take steps to correct it such as mandatory obedience classes or face giving up the animal!
- Don't group one breed type and call it a nuisense breed. That looks very uneducated as a German shepherd dog has a stronger bite than 'pitbulls'.
- Please don't single out any breeds, any can be a nuisance with bad owners.
- Leave pit bulls out of this equation! They are not a problem, some of the owners are.
<https://www.vrcpitbull.com/pit-bull-facts/>
- Seriously? Going after pitbulls? You obviously dont know anything. My pitbull goes to the dog park and gets bit by the small dogs there and he does nothing. Little dogs are the mean ones. Pitbulls are not.
- Pitbulls are gentle dogs that only become aggressive because of lack of care, however German Sheppard's and other dogs are even higher on the list of aggression and deadly attacks but there is no discrimination against them. Pitbulls and other dogs are not the problem, people are the problem, have stricter guidelines for pet owners instead of targeting the animal, animals shouldn't be punished



for the mistakes of their owner. Invest in rehabilitation programs for aggressive dogs, they CAN be retrained.

- This thing against pitbulls is so archaic. The only dog I've ever felt threatened by is a golden retriever. Special restrictions and fines against a specific breed is about as stupid as making males pay higher car insurance before they reach the age of 25 because of the "potential" harm they could do to the vehicle. If you want to reduce pitbull attacks perpetrated by aggressive training methods given by big muscly bros, then find a way to fix toxic masculinity in western culture. That's your real problem.
- It's not just pitbulls that bite. Other breeds do also, and pitbulls should not be discriminated against
- you should not be singling out dogs of certain breeds. Each breed must be held accountable in the same ways. Your model is the best in North America and you have the lowest dog bites in the continent. Don't change your exceptional model.
- It is not dogs thought sometimes sometimes it's the owner I can't go against pitbulls I can go against the owner
- Back ground checks done on all pitbull owners and obedience testing on all pitbulls.
- No Breed Specific Laws - instead, education for owners and extreme requirements for training for any nuisance animals. Consider requiring training for EVERY dog. Every local mailman I have spoken to says the only times they have been bitten was by a SMALL dog like a chihuahua!
- I support none of these
- This is ridiculous! Not all bully breed dogs are the same. I have an adopted staffie/black lab and she has stranger danger and is always on a leash and we have done extensive training with her. If she sees another dog she absolutely loses her cool...if bylaw were driving by and had the ability to take her because sure was then deemed a nuisance that would be absurd. We always keep her as far from other dogs as possible and use all of our training but she still looks like shes lost her marbles and its because she was never socialized and has no idea how to interact with dogs or...how to be a dog!! Each animal is so individually different. You cant group them all under one bylaw because of their breed.I think you need to look at bites on a case by case basis and see how the dog is being treated....fine the dogs owners dont penalize the dog for its stupid owners decisions
- The issue is not breed specific. Please do not target pit bulls but rather the irresponsible owners that mistreat animals
- It's not fair to classify dogs as dangerous based on their breed. It should be based on action, i.e. dogs who have exhibited violent behaviours.
- Less focus on pit bull breeds and worry about people that don't know how to care for a dog in general.. Stop focusing on one breed of dog. People not being competent in training their dog are the biggest problem.
- LEAVE PIT BULLS TYPE BREEDS ALONE STOP ACTING LIKE ITS THE BREED ITS NOT!!!!
- Charge owners who train their dogs to be vicious and aggressive. Dogs are fought vicious tendencies by owners and it is not a dogs fault. Stop classifying pit bulls as vicious animals. They are not.



- Not focusing on primarily pit bulls - smaller dogs are more likely to be aggressive than larger breeds. The law shouldn't penalize innocent dogs - if the dog is a nuisance, then the law can manage that.
- Stop picking on breeds, the owners are the ones responsible for bad pet ownership. The owners should be forced to attend a training if they have an incident, the animal should never be harmed
- You can not be selective with dogs. All dogs will bite when provoked singling dogs out is not going to work to
- Dogs that can kill children, adults and other dogs should not be allowed in the city. We have many laws parallel to this level of safety.
- No breed specific legislation, bylaws should apply to all breeds
- I do not support Breed specific legislation in any way shape or form
- None. Get your heads out of your... In my life I have been bitten by a jack russel, a chihuahua, a poodle and another small mutt of a dog. While a bite from a larger breed of dog (not specifically pit-bull types) can be more serious... I believe them to be less frequent. The incidents involving larger dogs get reported more often when they happen. The incidents involving smaller dogs are more easily shrugged off and dont get reported, even though they still require the same or similar medical attention as a bite from a larger dog, ei. tetanus shot, a couple stitches, cleaning. The issue is not the dog... the issue is the dog owners, and the owners of small dogs often don't take their stewardship of their animal as seriously as those that own larger dogs, regardless of the breed. Breed speciic legislation is rubbish. Deal with problem dogs as they need to be dealt with, and where the root of the problem lies... the owners.
- None.
- Fix the owner. Make mandatory training for the owners available when they have a dog who bits more than once. For any dog owner. Even the tiny ones. Chihuahua's are the most vicious dogs
- Don't discriminate over pitbulls. It's the owner that creates a nuisance dog. Stop being discriminatory, this isn't Ontario.
- Breed specific ordinances hurt families and dogs that are nice as well a nuisances. Plus, many larger dogs have similar bite strength, therefore it would not make sense to change the bylaws to be breed specific. Dogs that have known instances of dog or human aggression should not be allowed in off leash parks, and it should be the owners responsibility to make sure they are secured.
- BLAME THE OWNER, NOT THE BREED!!! I have a pitbull who protects our four year old daughter, has never and would never hurt a soul. She doesn't deserve to be punished for other dog's behavior. Thats prejudice!
- I agree with having the authority to seize a dog when exhibiting dangerous behavior - but only because it's the OWNERS who are responsible for that dogs behavior. There should be a high fine for owners who do not care to train their dogs. NOT just Pit Bulls. Pit Bulls are the most loving animals and to muzzle pit bulls in public just because of the way they look is ridiculous. Fine the owners and take their dogs away and give them to someone who will train them like almost all pit owners do. Shame.
- It is unfair to judge a pitbull simply because it is a pittu. Extremely unfair, they are lovely creatures & aggression stems from improper ownership, & mistreatment.



- Pit bulls are not more dangerous than any other dog. Calgary City Council should be ashamed of this garbage proposal.
- As someone who directly works with animals, I have seen other dogs' bites so far worse damage than a pit bull's. I highly disagree with breed-specific discriminative legislation
- None. Stop thinking pitbulls are bad dogs. What about yappy little dogs that are aggressive. You do not mention them in this? They are the problem. Not this "pit-bull" as this states. Even your comment "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." is a joke. Stop blaming the breeds. There should be fines for owners who let their little dogs do this behaviour
- STOP GOING AFTER PITNULLS!!!!
- Breed specific legislations are wrong. As indicated by the city "pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds". Why is this breed being singled out. It is the owners responsibility, and it is unfair if a good dog owner and their good dog are being punished based on what they look like. This is the same principle for racism, which is also wrong. DO NOT MAKE BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATIONS. I am proud to live in Calgary, and if this were to become a bylaw in Calgary, I would be moving away from this city as this is so against my beliefs, not only as a dog (all breed) lover but also as a human being.
- Instead of fining owners, they should be given the opportunity to sign up and follow through with training for them and their dog. Support education rather than punishments that don't really help the owner or dog become better in the community. Any dog that does not have proper training has the ability to be a problem, not any one specific breed. Breed specific legislations don't stop all dogs bad behaviour. Education and training is what will make the difference.
- This is not ok to pick one breed and give higher fines or make them pay more money on top of bills/ insurance/ taxes and other necessities. Yes i agree if a dog bites a human there should be consequences and depending on the situation and severity, then assess the situation and deal with cases individually, go from there on making rules for that specific case on whether or not it needs to be muzzled/ fined/ banned from parks or whatever needs to be done. Dog/ cats/ horses/ ferrets. They all get into fights, THEY ARE ANIMALS! If a dog has repeated reports of aggression, that's when rules should be put into place and maybe an investigation on the owner and his methods of training or abuse. Pitbulls as you call them are the most loving and dedicated animals to their owners, think about that, if they know they are going to please their human, they will do whatever they ask of them. Most people who maybe have one of those aggressive dogs towards other dogs, take the precautions and don't socialize their dog with others without someSort of protection. The ones who don't, yes there should be consequences but one time offenders, look at the situation and whether that other dog was actually the problem and provoked it, again this is not ok to even suggest breed specific rules
- Consequences should be for the owner, not the dog. Why are we going backwards? A bad owner could have a small dog be more aggressive than a pit bull with a good owner. Put the blame on the right person, not the dog that was trained.



- Ban German Shepard's. The pre-requisite you have installed is a joke. pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite. That's like banning big truck because they have more potential to run over pedestrians. Someone's competence should be reassessed
- Mandatory training class for all dog owners, teaching appropriate training techniques and how to minimize dog bites. Could be offered online and must be completed to get your license for the first time
- Perhaps have a few designated off leash or (on leash parks) where these dogs are permitted so they are still provided with an opportunity for exercise.
- Bylaws should be based on behaviour not breed.
- Absolutely do NOT support breed specific bylaws!!
- The direct attack on pitbulls is disgusting; the lack of true research is embarrassing; the blame is always on the owner, and not the breed, and the fact that you allude to Pitbulls being a problem is appalling.
- Pit bull breeds are not and should not be automatically categorized as nuisance dogs. An 8-week old "pit bull" puppy should not be held to the same standard as a dog who has injured or killed something/someone. Shame on you City of Calgary for discriminating against this breed and the responsible owners in this city who have properly trained and cared for their pets. I have lost so much respect.
- No pitbull specific actions are needed in the city. If in your article you are stating that their biting rate is no higher than any other breed, then they do not need specific laws against them. They are wonderful animals. The bylaw should be against ANY breed that is aggressive or injures a human. The fact the city would do this to a breed is disgusting.
- None of the above. The legislation should be breed neutral. The breed isn't the issue. Pit bulls are a gentle dog. Research dog bites and aggression in dogs. Pit bulls are not at the top of the list.
- The issue lies with the owner and their training, therefore I believe the owner themselves should be charged for any severe dog behaviours. Implementing a 3 strike system (i.e. if the dog has attacked multiple times with no correction in behaviour), the dog should be removed from the care of the owner permanently so they have a chance at reformation with a new owner who can follow an appropriate approach in regards to training. You wouldn't put all the blame on a child who acts out, you'd blame the parent. So why shouldn't the same model be applied to dog owners?
- Pitbulls and bully breeds should not be considered a nuisance. All dogs have the ability to be wonderful or a threat I believe it should be that all dog breeds can be declared nuisance animals if there is evidence and it is the owners responsibility to muzzle or avoid dog parks if their animal is a threat. **DONT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST BULLY BREEDS**
- Owners should be screened as they tend to be the actual problem. Mandatory training and screening prior to owning this breed of dog (police checks).
- Nuisance - referring to dogs that have history of biting or attacking , fines should be higher as well as being off leash
- Disgusting that you would put any breed specific legislation into place.
- None don't make anything breed specific, it's the owner NOT the breed of the dog



- owner training and qualifications/background checks should be met to own a dog that could be hard to handle
- None. It's not a bully breed, it's bully owners that create the dangerous dogs.
- Policing of "pit bull dogs" is proven to be a waste of time. dogs that bite aren't the problems, owners that don't properly teach their dogs to bite are, and many dogs that bite are not pit bulls.
- No breed specific legislation.
- These aren't reasonable, instead if the city should add programs free of charge for pitbulls and bulldogs
- Owners should be criminally charged, if their dog hurts another dog. they are members of families. front end training for all dogs and owners, no bad dogs just bad people: no bad children just bad parents..... why do humans get to own other living creatures.....create the world we want....
- At yearly registration, ALL dog owners are provided with either 1 Responsible Pet safety ownership class OR a Red/Yellow/Green lead which dictates friendliness of the dog. Dogs may only change designation after a sign-off from a recognized trainer.
- END BSL. BSL IS A JOKE
- Its the owners faulty not the breed
- More due diligence and care needs to be used - I.e. WHY did the bite happen? Was the dog teased, provoked, attacked...
- Very disappointed in the City for even attempting such an unfair, disgusting idea. If bully breeds need obedience training, then so should ALL breeds. I've seen more aggressive Pomeranians and chihuahuas than I have pit bulls.
- This is wrong
- The dogs arent the issue, the owners are the issue. Police your people better.
- The fact that pit bulls are being singles out because they are stronger then other breeds is a joke . As mentioned above, this nuisance issue is less common in pitfalls, and therefore should be enough reason to not single them out alone. That's lime saying if I became a bodybuilder, I would need too go workout at home because I intimidate people st the gym despite being less likely to do anything harmful then the neighbourhood convicted killer
- How about you take off all the options that target pitbulls specifically since there is no scientific basis to target this group how about we do some research before we conduct such a study Calgary- honestly, come on. Since your entire team is lacking the fundamental knowledge regarding pitbulls here's some results of research that completely debunks the BSL you are trying to enforce.
<https://www.avma.org/resources/pet-owners/why-breed-specific-legislation-not-answer>
<http://www.animalplanet.com/pets/3-bully-breeds-have-a-stronger-bite-than-any-other-dog/>
- Breed selective legislation has been proven many times over to not be successful. It is the OWNER that is the problem, NOT the breed. It is the very exact same thing as unfairly targeting a specific race that is more likely to commit a crime, when it is more complex than that.
- No breed specific rules are supported - same rules apply to every dog based on their individual history and behaviour.



- None of these rules make any sense. There's no way to monitor dogs that actually contain pit bull, with so many mutts for adoption.
- I do not support ANY of these initiatives. Not one of them does anything to address the questionable humans raising these innocent souls. Go back to the drawing board. Your proposals are divisive, damaging and useless!
- Ban pit bulls and other vicious breeds.
- I will not support ANY breed-specific legislation.
- None of these are fine at all. Pit Bulls have been proven to be kinder and more caring dogs.
- Also a ruling that if a dog is to be surrendered, it goes to a breed specific or specialized group for re-training. Not just the city pound. No breed specific laws. Its about the training, not the breed.
- End BSL
- Stop blaming the breed of dog and start blaming the humans. Pit bulls are kind loving dogs it is the humans that are to blame. If the human does not train them properly force them too, if the human teaches the dog bad behaviour fine the human. Take the dog and put it in a rehabilitation program to teach it to be better, do not hurt the animal but when it is the humans fault
- A nuisance animal should have 3 offenses or complaints at least before being declared a nuisance.
- None, this bylaw against a specific breed of dos is ridiculous. Chihuahuas, Yorkshire terriers, Maltese, shitzus, etc. bite more people than pit bulls, they just don't go to a hospital for it so its not on record. What I would support is if a dog has aggressive behaviour on their record, large or small breed, they have a warning on their harness that is visible to others around and that they be muzzled. I have been nipped at on my ankles more than once by a little dog at a dog park. Owners do nothing because their "harmless". Incorrect.
- Stop specifying pit bulls, they are good dogs. Crack down on individuals exploiting these dogs instead.
- If anything, I've had issues with smaller dogs and never a pit bull. This is fear mongering
- Obedience training is required for ALL dogs, not specifically pit bulls.
- NO TO BSL
- Do not single out breeds, instead single out bad dog owners. If someone has shown that they are irresponsible pet owners then consider not allowing those people to have pets.
- Ban pitbulls.
- Creating ANY legislation specific to a dog breed is completely ridiculous. I am so extremely disappointed in this. This is feeding into stereotypes and puts zero true accountability in owners of all pets to properly train and control their dogs.
- This bltant disrespect for pit bulls and bull breeds disgusts me. There is no reason for them to have any restrictions placed on them.
- Only dogs that are proven nuisances deserve any of these treatments. do not blame the breed for an owners lack of training.
- Any dog should have these restrictions. Many other breeds cause cause equal damage, why single out one breed. If you want to fine or restrict violent dogs do so, dont restrict one breed.



- Higher fines and punishments for ALL dog owners found not being responsible. Bylaws should NOT be for a specific breed EVER. Yes I understand "pitbulls" can have a more damaging bite, but it's the owner not the breed. As a side note 'pitbull' is a term for a fighting dog. NOT a breed. More education and training and less on fear reactions.
- it is horrible to target pitbulls specifically, all dog owners should be held accountable for their actions regardless of breed
- This is a disgusting push backwards to a society that is willing to discriminate by breed & appearance. Shame on you all.
- don't get breed specific.
- [removed] dog owners should have their dogs taken and rehomed, bad behaviour comes from neglectful owners who should be put on a list not allowed to have dogs.
- BSL does not work. Education of owners is necessary.
- Breed specific legislation is a poor decision. The media blows these attacks out of proportion. Smaller dogs are typically more vicious. Pitbulls make the news.
- All dogs should have training. Not just a specific breed
- There is no bad dog it's the owner that's bad!! The dog is not a nuisance and certainly not breed specific!! This is an outrage!! The owners need to be fined and put to sleep the dog is always innocent!! Most dog bites are provoked! Teach kids in school at young ages do not provoke or tease any animal! To properly ask if they can pet and see dog! Owners should have to go through courses on how to be proper pet owners
- Fines and stricter rules on more aggressive dogs regardless of breed...
- Attention Project Team: Please refer to article attached (one of many in existence) that states the "fact" of breeds coming under the "pit bull" umbrella having stronger jaws, and therefore causing more severe bites, is FALSE. It has been disproven many times, among other supposed attributes pinned on these breeds (aggressive aggression, etc.). The article cites its sources, which may be a place to start your research. <http://www.animalplanet.com/pets/3-bully-breeds-have-a-stronger-bite-than-any-other-dog/>
- Fines for dog that defecate on an owner's lawn!
- Fine for owner negligence
- I don't think you should ban a specific breed. It is stated above that pitbulls do not bite more than other dogs, and there are dogs with a higher bite force than a pitbull.
- This is disgusting and ignorant. Clearly someone in city hall is uneducated about dogs. Give your head a shake.
- I have NEVER encountered a pitbull that wasn't an absolute angel. I have, however, encountered numerous small breeds which don't stop barking, have little to no obedience training, AND one has bitten and drawn blood from my partner at the dog park. We are at the dog park every day and only the small breeds (shitzus, maltese, etc.) have been aggressive to my dogs and caused problems. Every pitbull has been friendly. DO NOT penalize pitbulls for being muscular. They are not the problem.
- Pit Bulls who bite non-owners should be put down.



- This is discrimination
- Obedience training for all dogs not just ones “deemed a nuisance” pit bulls have been proven to be some of the friendliest most caring dogs while other smaller breeds have been shown to exhibit more aggressive behaviours.
- Pit Bulls are not the problem here. I was bit by a tiny dog when I was younger and it was definitely not a typical 'scary' nuisance type breed, just a yappy little thing. Don't paint all dogs of a certain breed (or breed characteristics) with the same paintbrush.
- Pit bull breed dogs ARE NOT THE PROBLEM. If one breed of dog must wear a muzzle, then all dog breeds must wear muzzles. If one dog breed must attend training, then all dog breeds must attend training.
- It has to do with the OWNER and how dogs are treated and trained. This breed specific [removed] needs to stop. I have owned 2 pit bull terriers in my life and they were absolute angels it all has to do with how they are raised and trained.
- Take further action for the nuisance dog owners. If they have one offence, they must be held accountable. The poor dog does not know any better. Small dogs can also cause a lot of damage compared to a pitbull.
- The only issue is dogs that bit. Not a specific breed or a dog that has escaped its home "been at large" all of these options are discriminatory and absolute [removed]. Do better Calgary and dont discriminate dog breeds!!!
- Better screening of owners when they are obtaining "pitbulls" or animals know to have aggression. Have more information available about animal to those who are rescuing them. Making animal training more accessible.
- Any breed specific regulations are unfair and unwarranted.
- Irish wolfhounds also have the bite strength of a pit bull. Why are they not singled out? Breed discrimination is unfair. If it's about bite strength, all dog breeds with strong bite strength should be singled out. All dogs with poorer temperament should be singled out too (Akitas, Shiba Inus, Chow Chows, etc.) this is ridiculous.
- Maybe try offering a discount for proper dog training to people who register ANY breed/size dogs.
- None of the above
- Important to consider- some dogs can't physically be muzzled such as bulldogs and pugs.
- Its wrong to single out pitbulls here. No mention of German Shepard (similar circumstance).
- If you want to control a breed like the pitbull specifically, rather than banning them outright, or, more worryingly, placing sanctions on them which may exacerbate aggressive behaviour. You should consider requiring a special license for ownership. This could easily be attained through completion of a short class or test and an assessment of you by a behavioral team. Systems that already exist for all reputable rescues and the city's bylaw services.
- Owners of 'nuisance' dogs should be looked into if more than one incident happens with that dog. Dogs are not bad, people are. There could have been a lack of training, or the dog could have been trained to bite. Fines and consequences should be placed on a person, NOT a dog



- BSL is absolutely outrageous and should not be considered. Nuisance dogs can be of ANY breed and should be treated the same. ANY dog bite can be dangerous, breed is irrelevant and should not impact quality of life for pitbulls that are good tempered, kind and loving.
- If I dog has severe nuisance issues eg) many attacks on people other dogs, then they should have to be muzzled in dog parks.
- Do not believe in breed-specific rules. Do fully support very large fines for owners found to be negligent, especially if they have a nuisance dog.
- Owners not dog breed should be targeted. I have been attacked by more small dogs and nothing is done. Large dog owners mostly take more care. Any dog that bites should be dealt with Any well behaved dog should be allowed to follow the same Rules as any breed
- Dogs whom are abused or neglected should be taken to a shelter and adopted out into a new home. People who know how to rehabilitate animals properly.
- Singling out pit bulls and other similiar breeds is absolute [removed]. Any dog the same size as one or bigger has the potential to create more harm in a bite. Use your [removed] heads and you can expand the list of "nuisance" breeds or you can pull your heads out and strike this part from the bylaw. If ANY dog wanted to it could inflict a "severe" bite.
- How can you call out an animal for bad behaviour when it's all about the training of the animal. I've known more dangerous beagles and golden retrievers than I do pitbulls. This act is a disgrace and makes me embarrassed to be Canadian to read it. Educate and provide proper behavioural training for all dogs. Pitbull lives matter.
- Chihuahuas who are aggressive should not be allowed in public these dogs are often not trained due to their size and need to be pursued due to there aggressive behaviour
- Bad owners breed bad dogs. Blaming certain breeds for the fact that bad humans are buying them specifically to turn them into bad dogs solves nothing. If we ban pit bulls these people will just pick other breeds to torment and make into nuisance breeds, and there are many dogs with much stronger jaws and powerful bite capacity than pit bulls anyway. The cycle needs to stop, and the only way to do that is to start really cracking down on these bad owners. Much more severe penalties should be in place for owners found responsible for encouraging nuisance dog behaviour. Once an owner is found to be encouraging or fostering nuisance behaviour in dogs (any breed) they should be put in a database that flags them so it is much harder for them to get anymore dogs, and random checks to their homes and businesses so if they are found in possession of any dogs there is a much higher fine or jail time issued to stop these people from destroying more dogs. Protect the dogs as they are the victims here, and the real monsters are the terrible people who treat them terribly for so long that the effects can't be reversed. Dog breed bans don't work, hold the people responsible accountable and make it severe enough to stick, that will work.
- Higher fines for people that allow their dogs to run off leash in pulbic parks and spaces. I have had to restrain my own high prey drive dogs (not pit bulls) many times because people with small, untrained dogs will approach them aggressively when off lead. I support fines and repercussions for all careless and inconsiderate pet owners, breed is irrelevant. To single out "pit bulls" is unfair.



- If a dog bites, NO MATTER THE BREED The owner(s) and person bitten should be investigated for accountability of the accident. Owner negligence leads to ill behaved animals, and the negligence of others who instigate/taunt/threaten and/or scare an animal who may have behavioural/trust issues due to abuse/neglect from past owners or circumstances. People should inherently know better, not the dog.
- There should be no additional anything for specific dogs as stated there is no one breed that causes one more bite than another
- none of these bylaws should be breed specific
- all of these options are invasive and stupid. Lots of people have problematic children yet they aren't taken away. Rethink these rules you are trying to enforce. It has everything to do with the OWNER not THE DOG. PEOPLE NEED TO BE TRAINED NOT DOGS.
- Some of the best dogs I know are pitbulls. How is it not obvious that people are the problem. Not a specific breed. People need to be punished, not dogs. Please use your heads. Crucifying a breed is ridiculous and it just breeds fear. This ENRAGES me and I dont even own one of these breeds. Good, healthy people raise good healthy dogs. These options are a bandaid to a deeper problem. Have some sort of guidelines to who can own a dog instead of punishing dogs. Dogs need protection from people, not the other way arounds.
- Obedience training required for all dog owners.
- A dog that is aggressive, has bit, etc should have precautions to help keep them and everyone safe. Like a basket muzzle etc.
- Pit bulls should be regulated more than any other breed. Instead the city should offer obedience training at a low cost for pit bulls
- i think that nuisance and repeat dogs should have consequences but i see that the whole breed of pit bull is being targeted here where every one i have met and been around is the sweetest thing ever! i think a lot comes down to the owner and i dont see any punishment for owners on here. they should also be put through training if they cannot properly train their dogs. if they have a dog that is more likely to act out then they should be able to adjust to the life of their dog and not have to punish a whole breed of dog.
- Deciding to take action against a "breed" of dog is a terrible move. ANY breed of dog has the ability to be aggressive and act as a nuisance. It comes down to the training by the owner, not the dog. Perhaps making a mandate for some behaviour class when a dog is adopted/bought/licensed- within x amount of days/month they need to be enrolled in a city approved program and have proof of attendance afterwards. Again. Dont ban the dog. Educate the owner. I've been bitten and harrassed more by small breed dogs such as shitzus and chihuahuas since they "cant dont harm because they are so small".
- I dont think it should be so breed specific. A lab could be more aggressive than the average pitbull. If your dog is aggressive and has behavioural problems you should take the proper measures
- Don't single out "pit bulls"
- It is very immature to assume all dogs of the same breed are the same in their actions, that's the equivalence of assuming all of the same race is the same. Dog behaviours are brought on on how



they were raised and treated by their owner. As for adoption from a rescue place, that should be looked at as a grace save, as who adopts then has saved their lives from any negative energy. Rescue dogs take time to recover from trauma.

- BSL is absolute garbage. Consider the frequency of bites from other breeds. ANY DOG BITE CAN BE DANGEROUS
- This is an absolute joke. The dogs should not be treated as a dangerous animal.
- The owners care and training for the dog should be evaluated
- Please do not demonize pit bulls!
- Not breed specific legislation. It does not work.
- Stop bullying bully breeds!!!! They are the sweetest dogs out there and the city can NOT be prejudice just because Karen doesnt like bully breeds. Charge higher fees for those [removed] rat dogs (Chihuahuas) instead. They have attacked my 75pound dog many times and nobody bats an eye.
- Dangerous dogs yes, minor offences as listed above no, and in no means target the bully breeds, this is based on fear and not fact.
- none of the above. Can't believe in this day and age you would even single out certain breeds. Your wording of any dog with similar looks to a pit-bull, that is [removed]. Any [removed] with authority could tell a lab or a boxer look like a pitbull. Ban BSL.
- Owner training for having dogs considered a nuisance. There should never be breed specific laws or bylaws, it always comes back to the owner.
- There is no reason to restrict any pit bull breed. If anything must be done, fine the owner of any type of breed for severe bites or acts of aggression. The problem is with the owner not training their dog properly. It's not the dogs fault.
- Any dog can be dangerous or a nuisance. Please don't discriminate based on breed and keep any bylaws to a case my case basis
- They are many dogs that look like a pit bull that have no pit bull breed in their blood. If a dog is dangerous it should be based on that dogs actions and not what breed it is. [removed] Therefore there should not be biased laws based on breed. [DUPLICATE]
- Having veterinarians report dogs they feel could be a danger to the public...but it needs to be anonymous to the owner
- no vicious dogs at all in public spaces
- Additional training/education for the OWNERS of dogs declared a nuisance regarding appropriate and respectful dog ownership. As a veterinarian, I do not agree with breed-specific legislation. All dogs are capable of biting another animal or human and there are several breeds capable of causing severe damage.
- BSL does NOT work
- Breed Specific Legislation is stupid and has been shown to not work. Pitbulls can bite hard but so can a German Shepherd. Suggesting to implement BSL is absolutely ridiculous.
- All dog owners should be required to take training on dog ownership.



- I think if ANY dog bites or is aggressive. The owner should receive a fine and a warning. And then it be required the dog gets professional training. There is no bad dog just bad owners. I think this would be a much more respectful solution than banning them or muzzle them. Muzzles are not nice. They can actually cause more aggression. I think a fine and warning and dog training would be the best and just have it enforced that they HAVE to get training.
- No more than one NUISANCE DOG per household. (Why was this the only one not separated out between nuisance and pit bull)
- Higher fines for PEOPLE and possible jail time for PEOPLE who do not train their dog (no matter what breed). This has NOTHING to do with breed and EVERYTHING to do with people being irresponsible.
- Why are you attacking one breed? Ive been around pitbulls my entire life and have never experienced aggression. Dogs can be aggressive no matter what breed. It all depends on their backgrounds. You're being extremely unfair and it makes me ashamed to live here.
- Ban all breeds of pitbull
- Mandatory animal behavior classes for owners of dogs declared as nuisance. The owners need educating more than the dogs do.
- Im sorry, but are you kidding me?? "Pitbulls" are not the problem. This is disgusting that you would even propose this.
- Calgary USED to be progressive when it came to not targeting specific breeds. But these new rules sound regressive. Plus if someone attacks me and my dog protects me, these new proposed rules sound like you can take my dog and euthanize it and or make my normally friendly dog wear a muzzle - despite me being attacked.
- I don't understand why the pit bull breed is being singled out simply because of bite force. It is discriminatory as they are one of the most loving breeds. A bite is a bite, whether it comes from a Chihuahua, pom pom, pit bull, Rottweiler or shitzu. Nuisance dogs are ones that bite. Period. Damage due to the bite should not be taken into consideration.
- How about providing training? The problem is the owner, not the dog.
- Caution around "bull breeds" for example english and French Bulldogs should be exempt based on temperament and statistics that they are in the top 10 household pets. They are "bull breeds" but should have an exception. Proof should be provided at time of license for the exception (ie AKC or CKC registered pure bred English/french)
- Dont really agree with definition of nuisance (i.e. it makes noise?). Should punish the irresponsible owner, not the dog. Do not agree with breed specific laws. Put limitations on the type of obedience training. Ensure training is based on positive reinforcement
- Please do not be breed specific. Nuisance dogs are nuisance dogs. Don't create a polarizing conversation.
- Seriously?? You are seriously suggesting and looking into discriminatory breed based bylaws? Pit bulls aren't a dangerous breed! Stupid owners are dangerous... if Pitbulls pose a higher risk due to the strength of their bite, why have you also not suggested Rottweilers, Doberman's, German Shepard's, Mastiffs. The list goes on. Again, don't be stupid.



- Breed specific legislation unfairly discriminates against good dogs and good owners. Prefer to see enforcement against dog fighting, animal cruelty and chaining dogs outdoors which leads to dangerous animals.
- Punishment for the OWNER not the dog that didn't learn any better. Calgary has way to many horrible pet owners and yet we look at ways to limit a dog . It's pathetic . Further action must be taken on humans that don't know how to properly care for a dog.... no matter what the breed is. Any dog I'd raised in a poor aggressive environment has the potential to seriously harm or cause trauma to another individual ... not just pit bulls .
- don't think this should be breed specific.
- None of the above. stop trying to expand government interference in our lives
- In addition to Obedience training for the nuisance dog, the owner must go under review and receive training on how to teach their dog before the dog is allowed in public again. The behaviour of an animal usually falls under the failings of its owner, not with the animal.
- Stop vilifying pit bulls. Be smarter. Be better.
- My husband and dog were attacked and nothing was done, no fine, dog is still in the house barking like mad and if he ever escaped again will likely kill as the only reason my dog isn't dead is my husband is very strong. Seize and destroy dogs that try to kill other dogs or people.
- Quit picking on pitbulls
- Honestly a full on ban of pitbulls would be better. They have killed 4x as many and mauled 12x as many as Rottweilers who are in 2nd place. In 2018 they killed roughly 14,850 of the 17,250 dogs killed by other dogs. That's 86% of deaths at the fault of 4 breeds and their mixes. These 4 kill and maul more than all other breeds combined. How do people justify this? How do people call them "nanny dogs"?
- They are more dogs that harm people than pitbull. For example labs, German shepherd and chihuahuas are more likely to bite. It's the responsibility of the dog owners not the dogs fault. The owners should be held accountable not the pet.
- Required obedience training isn't the answer for nuisance dogs or pitbulls when it is the owner that largely determines behaviour. If they are not committed to training, obedience classes won't make a difference.
- **DO NOT BREED STEREOTYPE. BY DISCRIMINATING AGAINST PITBULL TYPE BREEDS YOU ARE GOING TO MAKE IT HARDER FOR THEM TO BE ADOPTED FROM SHELTERS AND INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF PITBULLS SURRENDERED TO RESCUES DUE TO THE INCREASED COSTS. A DOG SHOULD NOT BE PUNISHED BEFORE IT HAS DONE SOMETHING WRONG. MOST PITBULL OWNERS I SEE AT THE VET CLINIC ARE RESPONSIBLE AND MOST PITBULLS I SEE ARE NOT AGGRESSIVE.**
- Many small dogs are more aggressive and problematic compared to these breeds. I have a pit bull mix from a rescue and I volunteer in a rescue home. These breeds are some of the most friendly loving dogs I have ever dealt with. To have certain breeds banned from parks is ridiculous. There are so many dogs that can be aggressive or a nuisance. We go to get unknown dog parks to avoid over crowding and poor behavior mostly from dog owners. This idea is terrible and punished far too



many innocent dogs and owners. There is a ridiculously small number of problems from these breeds. I have seen labs, retrievers, Yorkies and ever breed be aggressive. Very unfair to consider this

- This seems to be targeting pitbull, what about smaller dogs that even if their bites are not as dangerous as pit bull, still shows aggressive behavior toward human and other dogs. Small dog owner should be fine like bigger dogs owner
- "Pit bull" breeds are not more vicious than other dogs. Do not restrict the breed!
- Stop hating on a breed of dog!!!! It's bad owners not a bad breed.
- My room mate has a Pitbull and he's absolutely well-behaved. There have been no issues with him and there should not be consequences for the type of dog, just the individual dog.
- Ban pit bull or pit bull cross ownership
- If you are bringing in a nuisance dog bylaw, it should apply to ALL dogs, not breed specific
- It has been proven time and time again that breed specific legislation does NOT make an impact on the number or severity of dog related injuries. STOP bullying the breeds, there are no dogs born bad there are only bad OWNERS. I have been an animal control officer and cruelty investigation officer for ten years, there is absolutely no science to back up these claims against pitbulls or bully breeds.
- BSL does not work. Having lived in Ontario during the ban, and working in the animal care industry, the ban encouraged more back yard breeding and underground trafficking. If you want to do something, EDUCATE the city, it is irresponsible owners, NOT THE BREED! When I lived in Calgary, my Pitbull, was attacked by a smaller and off leash Labrador. Unprovoked, yet who would actually be blamed? BSL is discrimination! It does NOT work!
- higher fines for dogs of any breed that are aggressive. Most aggressive dogs i've encountered are not specified in this. I don't own a pitbull but the ones ive met have been so nice. Don't make laws to punish everyone based on individual bad owners.
- Breeds have nothing to do with how a dog will behave. How you train a dog does. Singling out pit bulls and their owners is NOT FAIR. my St. Bernard is just as strong if not stronger and she's the biggest suck. Does her size/breed deem her dangerous? The city of Calgary is ridiculous
- Responsible dog ownership is more important than a breed of dog. People who abuse and mistreat their dogs are the problem. Proper love training and attention makes a good dog no matter the breed.
- Owner of biting dog held legally responsible.
- Training for owners of nuisance dogs.
- NONE. It is NOT the dogs fault it is the OWNERS fault for poor training. Do not blame the breed for the owners transgression.
- Singling out pitbulls is a disgrace. Being breed specific is small minded and ignorant. The city should be ashamed of themselves for even entertaining singling out breeds.
- Do not include pit bulls in this at all. There are many other more dangerous breeds. Instead of penalizing the dog, penalize the irresponsible owner
- None



- Pit bulls should not be singled out. That is ludicrous. I agree dogs that are aggressive or have attacked need to be monitored and removed from bad owners. But it is all in the owner. What a sad day for Calgary to join this disgusting discrimination towards pit bulls. Shame on you.
- Basic obedience training should be required for ALL dogs of all sizes.
- Dogs should NOT be discriminated against because of their breed. It is fair to have restrictions in place after a serious incident. However putting forth this discrimination and fear is the same as RACISM
- NO BSL, it's garbage and so many cities are moving away from it as it does not work. More engagement with pet owners to promote responsible ownership is required.
- None of these - they are all discriminating against a type of dog that can be loving. These behaviours normally come out of bad ownership, not "bad dog breeds"
- I don't agree with Breed specific legislation and the way these options are worded gives unknowledgeable people an idea that Pitbulls are bad or abnormally aggressive. I am not impressed with this
- I am more troubled by nuisance dogs and the lack of training their owners have provided it vs specifically highlighting one dog breed. Also lots of people don't pay for licenses especially cats. The other bothersome thing as both a dog and cat owner is cats at large coming into my yard and people who don't clean up after their dogs in public spaces- really disgusting
- There are more than just pit bulls that bite. I believe ANY dog has good in them. If something happens they should be given the chance to redeem just like criminals. We wouldn't kill a person who killed someone so why kill an animal.. teach them right and they will do good.
- "Nuisance" dogs are described as annoying in the example, but the questions imply they are dangerous.
- Educational training for people who don't know how to handle their dog properly! You must realize that it's not the animal's fault that they're deemed a nuisance - people who don't know how to train or look after them are at fault! Do not discriminate against a breed! Educate the owners!!!!
- You can [removed] right off with your breed specific rules. Pit bulls should not be targetted because they're "stronger". Have you seen a German Shepard bite? Why do the police use them? They're strong as hell yet they aren't targeted. Don't be like Montreal. You will be sorry.
- If dogs are involved in multiple bites drawing blood a muzzle could be required. Owners are responsible & if trained with dog this would reduce incidents.
- I understand that "pit bulls" have the strength to inflict damage, but so do German Shepard's, Labs, any dog.
- The owner should be accountable. I have met many dogs within these breeds that are sweet and well-behaved.
- Owner tracking - fines to the owner when they are involved in multiple offenses, including prohibited from owning future pets.
- Poor dog behaviour leads to fines for the owner. Any dog can be good or bad, it's all on the owner
- I think obedience training should be required by all Dogs. I don't believe in punishing a breed, but irresponsible dog ownership



- I don't agree with using any "pit bull" type reference. Yes, they might be stronger, but training and care is what matters. I've had more issues with huskies, and Labrador type dogs than I ever had with a pit bull type dog. Chihuahuas are dangerous for the reason they are tiny and people don't think they need training. Leaving a dog loose is an owner responsibility not a dogs fault.
- I do not own a pit bull dog, but this seems like a very pigeon hole discrimination towards a specific breed of dog... If (any) dog is vicious, be it a teacup sized dog or a 200 lbs dog.
- do not single out pit bulls. Responsible dog ownership of all breeds is the goal
- The breed isn't the problem, the owner is the problem. Charge the owner if their dog is involved in an altercation. Small dogs are usually the one that cause scraps with big dogs because owners don't think to train their little dog. It's all in the owner and not the breed!!!!
- There's something I don't understand about dogs. If, by law, our domestic pets are our property, and thereby products that we buy and sell, how come product recalls do not apply when several of the product sold pose a very evident risk to human health and safety? If people were purchasing an object brought into the home that maims and kills them as some dogs do, that would not be tolerated at all. Not all of the defective product sold need to malfunction either before there is a recall. If the product then cannot be adjusted to standards, there would be a ban.
- Mandatory training for any owner of a pit bull do to not train it to be vicious. Punish the owner not the dog
- Absolutely absurd that pitbulls should require different treatment than any other dog.
- pitbulls aren't a bad dogs. I used to have 2 amazing dogs. Its not the dog that's the issue its owners who aren't responsible and don't take the time to care for dogs. I go to dog parks lots and there are St Bernard's and chawwas that are surprisingly worse dogs. This feels like a ban on pitbulls which is a joke. They don't even bark like other dogs.
- None of the above. There shouldn't be breed specific bylaws. To put extra insurance or to have muzzles for pit bull owners isn't fair to them. If any dog is causing harm, that's when measures should be taken. I think obedience training should be provided to owners if their pet has acted up or caused harm. Bylaws shouldn't be put in place based on the idea that pit bulls are nuisance dogs.
- Don't target a breed. All dogs should require obedience training not just nuisance dogs.
- Any changes must be based on actual dog behavior, not just how it looks and public opinion. Need to focus on small aggressive dogs.
- Higher fines for a specific look or breed of dog is abhorrent. Why don't you start taxing based on skin color while you are at it. The fact that you targeted pitbulls and neglected to mention one of the higher bite forces recorded came from a Kangal breed dog is showing how truly biased you must be. You never mentioned higher fines for Mastiff breed dogs, which have a higher Bite Force (PSI) of 556 versus the pitbulls 235 PSI bite force. We see you, if you are prepared to take on this battle. Be prepared for a battle. No one will take you coming for pitbulls sitting down. Look at how much controversy the cities banning pitbulls in Ontario and Quebec had. You want that for Calgary. Yikes.
- This behaviour is not born into a dog it's taught. And it's horrific to think our animals could be treated as unfairly as certain minorities in this country are as well.



- I have NEVER met a pit bull that was aggressive towards my dog. Breed-specific legislation is a DISGRACE. The breed of the dog has no weight on their behaviour. I will be complaining to the city thoroughly and OFTEN if pit bulls are unfairly discriminated against. It's truly a shame that Calgary is even considering it. I spend a lot of time in off-leash parks, and it is never the pit bulls that harass my dog. If the specific dog is declared a nuisance, fine. But DO NOT put forth breed specific legislation. It's just wrong.
- If ANY breed has bitten anyone, they should have to be muzzled or have extra pro actions taken at off leash dog parks. This does not apply to only "pit bull" breeds.
- Stop going after the bully type breeds. There are so many other breeds (including small dogs) that are ill behaved and can cause just as much damage
- How about you just stop with the pit bull stereo types. It's the human. Not the animal. Stop criminalizing the animals.
- How about the city NOT discriminate against a specific breed of dog. Your reason for listing the Pitbull specifically is flawed because many other breeds of given the chance can also cause substantial damage to someone. It's shameful that the City of Calgary is also spreading misleading information about a grossly misunderstood breed. As old an adage as it is: it's not the dog it's the owner.
- Stop placing the blame on Pitbulls. The owner is completely 100% at fault
- Why just pit bulls - should be all dangerous breeds
- Pitt bulls are not dangerous dogs. Stop picking on them.
- Kill all pit bulls. Why own murder hounds?
- It's ridiculous to apply this as breed specific. Any untrained dog can bite.
- Stop discriminating against types! This is [removed]
- Support to help. Training reduces cost
- I am against breed specific legislation
- Training courses for owners wanting to purchase bully breeds. They need to be aware of the potential issues their poor training can result in. The dogs are not the issues, it is 100% the owners.
- Complete ban on having pit bulls within city boundaries
- I generally agree with the nuisance dog stance but specifically identifying pit bulls is unacceptable. I fully respect that they have a strong bite but they aren't any more aggressive than a German Shepherd, Rottweiler or even a Great Pyrenees. It comes down to the handler and ensuring they are trained properly. I fully support nuisance dogs to be enrolled in dog obedience classes at owner's expense. Saying that, there should be a 2 strike policy..often the first time it happens is because the dog is shocked or scared or has been put in a situation it's not used to and it is up to the parent to understand and prevent it for a 2nd time.
- Stop targeting pit bulls!!! They are a very kind breed, crack down on bad breeding and dog fights instead!!
- Stop signaling out pit bulls! This can happen to ANY dog because of their OWNER! Instead of pit bull this and that maybe you should focus on the owners with bad history with dogs?



- Obedience training for any dog in off-leash areas. While this would be difficult to enforce, I would like to see something where there are significantly higher fines for untrained dogs involved in bylaw offences or bites/attacks on other dogs than an obedience trained dog. I see enforcement as a dog bites or is off leash there are two levels of fines and if the owner can provide proof of obedience training, a substantially lower fine.
- I absolutely DO NOT support any breed biased bylaw!
- Pit bulls and breeds of this type be banned in the City of Calgary
- The owners should be mandated to go through a test to ensure they are not abusing the nuisance dog. Dogs only exhibit nuisance or aggression when they are being hurt by their owner. This should include interviewing neighbors and other household members.
 - it is very harmful to single out a specific breed if the justification is that they may cause more harm due to their strength. This is a problem because 1) there are many breeds that are considered strong (e.g. German Shepard's, boxers, American bulldog, cane corso, etc.) and could easily cause the same or greater damage than a "pitbull-like" breed dog, and 2) it excuses owners of these breeds or any breed from having to properly train their dogs such that they are not reactive or aggressive towards other dogs, which is how serious bite incidents often happen. Also, if such a ban were to be put in place it is unfair to place these restrictions on people who already own these dogs. I agree that some dogs should not be able to attend off leash dog parks but, again, putting restrictions on certain types of dogs releases owners of other dog types from being responsible owners. I understand that these options came from discussions with stakeholders, however there is a level of stigma associated breeds that is almost entirely perpetuated by those who do not or have never owned a pitbull breed dog, and thus have a subconscious bias against a type of dog that is not innately more aggressive than any other dog and that is comparable in strength to a number of other dog breeds. Creating legislature that further singles out this breed only serves to perpetuate stereotypes that have been largely manufactured by misinformation and the media. Of course, owning a strong dog comes with increased responsibility, but this responsibility and face consequences if their dog behaves aggressively towards others, but this responsibility should lie with all owners of strong dogs (and any dog for that matter).
- Higher fines for aggressive, biting dogs in general. Ban any dog from off leash public parks that has a history of aggression/attacks to other dogs.
- No breed specific laws
- Why call out Pit bulls, just call out if a dog is deemed aggressive or a nuisance then.....
- LEAVE THE PITBULLS ALONE! SHEPARDS HAVE STRENGTH TO CAUSE DAMAGE AND SO DO CHAWAWAS
- This is insane.... if we are going off the basis of a strong jaw than German shep should be included and many other breeds. Accountability comes to the owner, they need to be viewed. What is the training and living environment for the dog. Especially highly intelligent breeds with various strengths.



- BSL against pit bulls is unfounded, misleading and wrong. Dog bites and behavior are the sole responsibility of the owner!
- Focus more on owners who do not properly train their dogs. Breeds are not the issue, owners are
- Dogs labelled on a harness whether they've been declared nuisance, to give others a heads up.
- This bylaw should NOT target certain breeds. It's how the dog is brought up.
- Dogs that have a bite record and that are "nuisances" should be put into an aggression targeted obedience school with specific guidelines the owner must follow or lose their dog
- Don't be racist and don't hate on a breed that can't stand up for itself. There is no such thing as a bad dog only a bad owner. Just because one cop killed someone does not mean all cops are bad. And hey guess what cops have a higher ability to kill people because they are given guns and have access to private records...
- Ban the bad Dog owners from owning these dogs! There are no Bad dogs only bad owners! Bad dog owners give these breeds a bad reputation because they make these dogs act out because they were not raised properly! Banning the breed doesn't make sense. It the people that are stupid, can't fix stupid! So ban them from owning ANY animals!
- I don't think that the city should discriminate against a whole classification of dog breeds because of a stigma and bias against them.
- Ban bad owners, not specific breeds of animals.
- No BSL, it is disgusting and discriminatory that this is even being considered.
- So you are punishing a dog breed for their history of the owners not training them properly. This should not only be limited to pitbulls but to all dog the are aggressive or loud including small dogs.
- As someone who has been around and loves "pit bulls" they're an incredible dog! It's never the breed, its training and most occasionally abuse from owners. I've been bitten more times by chihuahuas and other small dogs. Laws should never be breed specific!
- Training for the owners. Especially if they are under 25 on how to own a pet and trading it properly.
- Are you really trying to put breed specific laws in place? Maybe look at the owner and get the owners trained. The dog is only as good as the owner.
- If any law changes, it should be for ALL dogs not "specific" based on a look for a dog!
- Pit bulls are some of the sweetest dogs there are. This is discriminatory, and I do not support it. If a Pitbull is aggressive, it's the owners fault, and a investigation should be done because
- Absolutely no breed specific laws.
- Obedience training required for ALL dogs. Stop this breed specific bs
- Dogs that have exhibited bite behaviour or are deemed unsafe should be mandatorily enrolled in training classes, this type of behaviour is the result of improper training on behalf of the owner. Training will benefit both the owner and the dog. Note: Please do not trap a "nuisance" animal in a small area as these animals often suffer from lack of exercise or boredom and will only serve to aggravate the issue. Finally breed specific legislation for any muzzle or limitation is ludicrous, such steps should be implemented on animals with a history of biting or aggressive behaviour regardless of breed, and reviewed on a case by case basis. Forcing such legislation on specific breeds only serves to increase fear of them, while not solving the greater issue of people owning dogs without



knowing how to train them. Again, further training is needed for the owner of any dog that exhibits dangerous behaviour; untrained owners are the biggest cause of problem animals.

- Are you guys [removed] serious? [removed] get off your high horse. Dogs aren't the problem, owners are. Now the government is going to tell us what dogs can do what? A pit bull can't go to public places because of its strength and possibility to bite? How are we even having this conversation. Ridiculous.
- None of the above , owners are more of the issue then breeds
- I think the rules should be the same regardless of breed. A pit bull is not the problem. The problem lies where the owner didnt get proper training. Dogs are taught bad behaviour. I have a pitty mix and shes fantastic and loving!
- Leave the pitbulls alone.
- This is complete [removed]. Huskies, golden retrievers, labs and MANY more breeds have all attacked humans and in some cases even kill babies/children. Why are these bylaws not for ALL big dogs that have the ability to be "viscous" when in the wrong ownership. The media barely ever shines light on those attacked by other breeds!
- Its not a breed issue its a owner issue and there should be some sort of training for owners involved in multiple offences
- No breed-specific rules.
- Breed-specific legislation benefits absolutely nobody; if a dog is showing signs of any type of aggression, REGARDLESS OF BREED, they should absolutely be declared a nuisance/danger and have limitations put in place. Many other breeds (i.e. german shepherds, rottweilers, great danes, etc) have jaws just as big and strong as "pitbulls", often with even more propensity to show aggression. A dog's temperament absolutely cannot be decided on breed alone.
- you can't declare one breed of dog illegal or create special "rules" for them. this is absolutely ridiculous and cruel.
- Consideration of criminal charges to owners of nuisance dogs involved in attacks against people especially children
- Ban pit bulls and other dangerous breeds.
- IT IS NOT THE BREEDS FAULT! ITS THE [removed] OWNERS FAULT AND HOW THEY ARE TRAINED AND RAISE. EDUCATE YOURSELF BEFORE YOU BAND A [removed] ANIMAL SPECIES AND BAND THE GOD DAMN SICK ANIMAL ABUSERS... MY PITBULL IS MY BABY, IM MORE WORRIED ABOUT A [removed] CHIHUAHUA BITING ME THAN A [removed] PITBULL. [removed] disgusting how it's 2020 and the human race still get get over the fact that it is people that are [removed] not these poor animals who just want to be loved. Go [removed] yourselves :) putting a bad image on Canada. [removed] disgusting.
- Higher fines for dogs involved in incidents that cause bodily harm. Even if its a teacup terrier. I am more scared of improperly trained small dogs then I am pitbulls
- I disagree with having just pitbull breeds. It is owner not the dog breed
- Increase fines and penalties for dog bites (INCLUDING small dogs!)
- I would not support any of these.



- Make pit bulls illegal to own within city limits, and include rottweilers in the ban as well.
- None of the above. The pet owner is responsible for their pet and the government should have no say.
- Ban put bulls
- Breed classifications. Classification A, B and C. Low risk, small breeds would be classified as an A and so on and so forth. Dogs would be classified a base classification based on the physical attributes/breed, the specific animals history and its potential for injury. If an owner chooses to spay or neuter, they could benefit by being dropped a classification. If an animal causes issues, their classification could get worse. Etc etc etc
- Obedience training required for ALL dogs
- This is a n absolute [removed] question. As an owner of a "bully breed" you are simply subjecting the public to their fears. It is the owner, not the dog that should be held responsible for any behavior. If you [removed] in city hall would take your heads out of your [removed] and figure that out it would be appreciated.
- The only problem with any 'nuisance dog', being large or small, Pitt bull or chihuahua or Labrador or Maltese... is 100% the the responsibility of the human owner. Just like all children infant/toddlers/adolescents can be raised and trained to be overall good, so can every pet dog, cat or any other animal be trained with the proper focus and disciplines with the right and responsible and consistent focus.
- i just don't understand why is there only one breed specific it should be for ANY BREED they all are capable of biting and being a NUSANCE and DANGEROUS . And i would love to know WHO CAME UP WITH "A PITBULL'S STRENGTH ALLOWS THE POTENTIAL FOR A MORE SEVERE BITE ????? THIS IS SUCH A RIDICULOUS STATEMENT WHERE ARE YOUR NUMBERS ????? CAUSE THE NUMBER 1 DOG WITH THE MOST BITE POUNDS PER SQUARE INCH(PSI). is a Kangal which has 743 psi the next is Dobermanpinscher which is 600 psi the next is an English mastiff 556 psi The german Shepherd is 238 psi then 8 from the top is the Amercian pitbull is 235 psi you really need to educate yourself before you start singling out ONE TYPE OF DOG...
- No difference in how "Pit Bulls" are treated because they have no difference in bite strength as this is a myth and the city of Calgary does not support discrimination on race or breeds.
- There should be a certain limit of pitbulls in a park in order to prevent bites. For example : One bit bull per dog park .
- I do not support any new rule against pitbulls.. the race does not matter, the owner does.
- This insurance part is ridiculous. No insurance company wants to buy a claim. Get out of here with that. They won't insure an aggressive dog. And pit bulls are not nuisance dogs. I hate all of this. Yes their bite is harder when on the off chance it happens but, I have been bothered and bitten more often than not by purse dogs. Take your Bischon cross and get.
- Do not discriminate dog breeds!!! BSL is unacceptable!!!
- Pit bulls are not an issue. [removed] owners are. Pit bull specific legislation is equivalent to licensing a person on steroids. Fine bad owners and take their animals away if necessary. Just like you would kids from bad neglectful parents.



- Breed specific legislation has no evidence of working and unfairly targets dogs who are not violent. Punish the owners not the breed. Chihuahuas have more bites than any other breed so why not target them?
- PITBULLS ARE NOT BAD DOGS!! They are proven to not be any more aggressive than any other breed and their strength varies from animal to animal and many other breeds are just as strong. I worked at an animal day care and kennel and I was hurt more by dogs with an abusive past and labs more than other dogs. Instead of the stuff above we should invest more money into shelters and humane society for staff, care, food and providing a better life for all animals. This article is outrageous. Pit bulls are some of the sweetest dogs ever. The only reason they can be more aggressive is because their strength and are used in things such as fight rings and to withstand abuse. Just like humans they can share inter-generational trauma and causes issues with the dogs. Not to mention a lot of the times the attack is the victim's fault
- Background checks for people with previous charges or complaints of abusive behaviour when choosing to purchase an animal
- Ban pit bulls
- Owners of nuisance dogs go through evaluations before being able to own dogs in the future, or keep their current pet(s).
- If you are going to do this then this should be applied to EVERY dog! I've never been attacked never mind bite by a large dog rather than I have scars from a Shih Tzu ... It is truly based on owner to owner and if an accident happens then foresee action just as you should any dog, otherwise leave it alone.
- leave them alone
- Stop discriminating against pit breeds. It's the Owners not the dogs!!!!
- Apples be nice if there was training or certification required by a person in order to own a pit bull, because problems arise when the OWNER is a dumb [removed].
- You cannot just single out one breed. Should we make people that go to the gym and are stronger pay higher fines or insurance? Just because their strength is more.
- Pitbulls and similar breeds do have a strong bite, evidence suggests this is related to the shape of a dog's skull rather than the breed. To suggest that only pit bull type breeds have a strong bite is inaccurate and ignorant. Please read: Ellis, J. L., Thomason, J., Kebreab, E., Zubair, K., & France, J. (2009). Cranial dimensions and forces of biting in the domestic dog. *Journal of anatomy*, 214(3), 362–373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7580.2008.01042.x> (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2673787/>) and "Bite Forces and Their Measurements in Dogs and Cats" (<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fvets.2018.00076/full>)
- Higher penalties for dogs off leash in on leash areas
- Absolutely no animal should be scrutinized for its type/breed. Owners should be responsible and held accountable, not the animals. This is purely prejudice and completely unreasonable.
- treat all dogs the same you psychos
- This is all crap! Pit bulls are great dogs, there are just bad owners



- I owned a small terrier that had a much worse bite than any large breed!! We can not and should not put bad dogs under a breed specific legislation. That's is archaic!
- Subsidized dog training for low income people, focus on education and rehabilitation instead of punishment
- Train the owners of nuisance dogs, it's the owner, not the dog.
- I just want to make a point of saying that these measures should not be dependent on breed. Only on behaviour.
- I have never met one Pitbull that is aggressive. Everything listed is ridiculous and cruel and discriminatory.
- Why are these suggestions so biased against pit bulls?? You do know chihuahuas bite more than any other breeds right? Breeds aren't the problem- people are the problem. These measures were quite offensive (and I'm not a pit bull owner).
- Pitbulls are not to be put into the same categories as 'nuisances". As a pitbull owner, he is the sweetest dog in the world and wouldn't hurt a fly. The breed of a dog does not determine how vicious it is. Disgusting and unbelievable that the city of Calgary is attempting to rally against pitbulls. If this bylaw is passed, action will be taken against it.
- LEAVE PITTYS ALONE! They are big baby's dumb [removed]
- I agreed to one and two but would like a clear definition of dangerous behaviour that is the same for all dogs
- Quite targeting pitbulls and other bully breeds. There are many other breeds that can potentially hurt someone. Bullies are blamed whether it was their fault or not.
- Discriminating against pitbulls shows the lack of knowledge on the dog breed. This is ridiculous and needs to stop as it will severely hurt rescue organizations.
- Higher fines for dogs involved in biting incident.
- prevent shelters from 1)mislabeled pit bull type dogs as another breed 2) masking aggressive behavior in a pit bull type dog or a nuisance dog with deceptive language to unwitting adopters 3) get pit bull type dogs disqualified from ESA and as service animals
- The definition and usage of the word nuisance in questions seems wrong, why would a dog declared a nuisance for noise be required to have a muzzle?
- None y'all [removed]
- No breed specific legislation! Impose legislation on dogs that have a history/likelihood of biting (not just for dogs that get out of the yard a lot or bark. Those aren't indications for biting behaviour).
- Well most dog owners would agree that the breed is not what's causes it to be aggressive but the way they are treated. Pitbulls should not be accountable for other dogs actions because of the owners mistakes. Most owners are not capable of handling some breeds which causes them to neglect them, which leads to violence. Again pitbulls should not be taken away from owners or to banned because of the mistake owners make!
- Blame the owner if a dog shows aggression. Any breed from a teacup yorkie to a pitbull can show aggression. Dogs are like children, and if they are not trained poorly the owner should be fined each time an incident happens if their dog acts out. Abusing the dog because of the owner is beyond



cruel. I can train my little yorkie to bite and attack people as well if I wanted, it all depends on the owner. Dogs are the most loving breed. Please stop targeting them.

- Just because smaller and 'toy' dogs don't have the jaw power that larger dogs have doesn't mean they can't severely damage a child - especially since they are closer to child's face. Any dog that bites a person or another animal should be considered a nuisance or a danger. No dog breeds or "looks like" should ever be banned. Owners of all animals need to be responsible! Note also that circumstances need to be taken into account when determining if a dog actually is vicious. ie have people in the neighbourhood been taunting or teasing a dog; was the dog injured, hurting, or protecting pups; etc
- Nothing. This is a ridiculous and very poorly informed. Please look up statistics from other cities who are implemented breed bans and harsh bi-laws. Does not work and perpetuates a false stereotype. Do not let Calgary fall to such ignorance
- "Pitbulls" and all other Bully breeds are not the problem. BAD OWNERS are the problem. Uneducated owners, are the problem. It is COMPLETELY ignorant, ludicrous, and out right unfair to ban or even single out one breed. Years ago they were singling out Dobermans, then Shepherds, then Rotties, now it is "pitties". Stop blaming the dog and look into the actual problem. The people. If a dog is having behavioral issues maybe, JUST MAYBE you folk should consider looking into their living situation and how well the owners are equipt to handle such breeds. I have a American Bully Staff mix and not one person in the time i have had her has had a single bad thing to say about her. What makes her different from all the others? Nothing, other than the fact she was raised right, and by people who could actually handle her breed. STOP SINGLING OUT BREEDS. OF ANY KIND
- Why not Obedience Training required for Owners wanting to own dog breeds that are considered to have a pre-disposition towards being a problem.
- Many dogs in need may be more likely to have issues with noise and have minor offenses. Pitbulls have a harder time being adopted. Adding these bylaws would make these dogs suffer even more. They already need more help than other breeds as it stands. These bylaws would make the issue worse
- If it is STATED that pitbulls are not more commonly found to be in incidents of dog bites than DONT SINGLE THEM OUT!!! ALL dog owners should train their dogs, not understanding dog behavior is why incidents happen. Just because you don't have a 'dangerous' breed doesn't mean your dog is smart enough to socialize and unerstand social cues from other dogs to [removed] off. Bringing in a breed specific legislation is stupid and causes more problems
- Pitbulls are not the issue its the owners
- There should be nothing different for a certain type of bread. Every dog is different. If a dog has bite someone or a bother dog then that owner should be responsible for getting proper training and the city can give them a five if they don't show proof of training.
- Please do not enact ANY sort of breed-specific legislation. Countless studies have shown how incorrect these assumptions are, and how dangerous these assumptions can be to the dogs, which are the ones who need protection the most



- It is absolutely despicable to publicly state that pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other breeds, and then go on to attempt to penalise them purely for their breed. Dog behaviour is almost always a consequence of owner ship not if they are a pit bull or not. Why are you not singling out German Shepards? After all they have a 238PSI (pound per square inch) average bite. A standard pitbull only has a 235PSI. Making them the 6th strongest in terms of bite. Where are the other 5 on your list?? So you don't care about the PSI of bites, you just care about the breed. Pathetic.
- Do not discriminate against one dog breed just because they have a stronger jaw, it is not the breed it is the owner!
- Stop it with the breed specific bylaws. Any ruling applied to pit bulls should be applied to ALL dogs
- I have had no issues with "pitbulls". I've had lots of issues with more friendly breeds. This is utterly stupid. Focus on the real issues please.
- A pit bull gets its strong bite from the bulldog part of its ancestry, so if by extension you are implying that any mastiff, bulldog, St. Bernard, Newfoundland etc are also considered "of the type" then this is discrimination. The only thing the pit bull inherited from the bulldog was mass and strength. Terriers are some of the most aggressive breeds being bred to literally shred rabbits in their burrow. The aggressive tendency comes from the smaller and much more common part of their ancestry. Do some actual research into dog breeds before jumping on the hype wagon of banning certain types of dogs for no reasons. I think you'll find that German shepherds and golden retrievers statistically vote the most people. A dogs bit is it's last line of defence sometimes the person is in the wrong and it would do you good to consider that.
- Stop assuming pit bulls are the problem!!!!!! There are countless other breeds that are of WAY higher concern and the problem is the OWNER not the dog.
- No Breed Specific Legislation. As well education and investigation into why dog acted the way it did. Do not punish a dog for human error or abuse, parents need to control their children and not let the abuse dogs.
- Please don't discriminate against particular breeds of dogs. Each instance of dog issue should be handled on a case by case basis. We should always give the benefit of the doubt to both the dog and owner. Also calm down!
- I do not agree with any
- Other: You're focusing on the animal, not the human that owns it. You should have fines and penalties placed on the individual. You're just demonizing a breed of animal and not having the owns take responsibility for their own action or inaction.
- Other: YOU'RE A GOOF [removed]
- Other: Your rules are [removed] stupid
- Other: Your missing additional, training for those with any dog of any breed, to have additional k9 behavioural training. Breed Specific is racism.
- Other: You shouldn't put restrictions based on breed. Small dog bites never get reported because they are small but just as likely to attack. If you are going to put obedience obligations it should be for all dog owners.



- Other: You should stop discriminating against pit bulls and make it just about nuisance dogs who have bit/attacked someone. If they were human, would you do the same because of their color?
- Other: You should not be discriminating against the breed. Most dogs are not born mean just like people are not born to see skin color it is taught by their owner slash parents. People should be responsible for their dogs actions. A breed should not be punished for the idiocy of a owner.
- Other: You need to get off or breeds, any dog can make a severe bite. Stop groups 10 different breeds as bully. Put responsibility on the owner don't blame the breed it's 2020 give your head a shake. Can we have the same laws for little/small dogs, of course not they bite people and s ok cus they didnt do much damage. A bite is a bite regardless of breed. Wake up city your a joke
- Other: you must include Rottweilers and German Shepherds in this as their bite strength is more than a pitbull's.
- Other: You know what its not just Pitbulls that are bad dogs !!! This is ridiculous
- Other: You have NO right to tell citizens what they can and cannot own. I support NONE of these. Stop overreaching your power. You are supposed to just be a budgeting organisation. Try doing that for once.
- Other: You have absolutely no right to discriminate against dog breeds. What the [removed] kind of a question is this? Any dog can do lasting damage with a bite. If a dog is not well trained, that is when intervention may be allowed. Otherwise, the kind of breed a person owns is none of your business.
- Other: You guys are ridiculous.....who comes with these idea????
- Other: You guys are [removed] [removed] for going after pitbull.
- Other: You don't have the authority to mandate any of this.
- Other: You define nuisance as a dog who has been at large or noisy. This is no reason to say nuisance dogs need to be muzzled in public and in dog parks or not allowed plus additional insurance needed ? I think you need to re word these questions. You mean aggressive dog with history, not random nuisance dog
- Other: You currently have enough laws to cover all instances. Please just enforce the current laws.
- Other: You clearly stated that they are not involved in more dog bites... perhaps you should look at punishing neglectful and abusive pet owners instead of the animals.
- Other: You can't just call out one breed of dog. Just because its a bully breed doesn't mean it's violent. Smaller dogs are statistically more violent so why not put laws on them? Oh wait, because "bull" isn't in their breed name. I know more calm and well mannered pitbulls than small dogs.
- Other: YOU CANT DO THIS TO ONLY ONE BREED!!! German shepherds have a stronger bite than pit bulls. Every single pitbull I have ever met are the sweetest dog. There's should not be a law regarding ONE breed. If your dog is aggressive it should be muzzled no matter the breed. If a pitbull is not aggressive I do not believe they need to be muzzled.
- Other: YOU CANT ASSUME A PIT BULL IS DANGEROUS. THEYRE NOT DANGEROUS AND YOU HAVE NO RIGHT TO DO ANYTHING IN RELATION TO ANIMAL CRUELTY
- Other: You cannot single out one breed. This either applies to all dogs or to none. Breed specific bans are wrong



- Other: You cannot simply blanket all pitbulls as bad dogs. Banning them or forcing them to wear muzzles is terrible and an bad idea. Instead I would invest in more programs for reactive dogs. We have a Collie/Sheltie who is reactive (and not on your list above) and I would NEVER take her to the dog park for that reason. So if someone with a reactive dog - NOT just pitbulls or the ones listed above, it is on the owner to ensure they are being respectful of their dogs boundaries and there 100% needs to be repercussion for actions that dogs take. I know a ton of very friendly dogs who fall into your categorization and if you pass laws that those breeds are banned or have to muzzle it will further perpetuate the stigma around these dogs. The change needs to stem from rescues (humane society, AARCS, etc.) and breeders that there needs to be BETTER training and resources. I did training with my reactive dog at the humane society and it was brutal. We learned nothing and she was still super bad. Until i went private and paid about \$400 dollars, I finally understood where her fears were coming from and learned to RESPECT HER. Yes, it would be way easier to take her to the park to let her get rid of her energy, but she is not okay there. So we do leashed/private activities. I think if you mandated required training through the RCMP for ALL breeds, especially from those who adopt, you would see a huge decrease. As well, how would you even track if a banned dog was at the park? Unless you're planning on setting up a check in system, this is going to be impossible. But it would be great if you did have an attendant at all parks and had to check your dog in with their city bylaw number.
- Other: You can't have one rule applying to one specific breed. That's not fair. One rule must apply to all breeds and all dogs. The breed of a dog regardless of the bite strength shouldn't be singled out. Little dogs can be more of a nuisance than pit bulls any day.
- Other: You can't ban pit bulls, it is not the animals fault that they are experienced to trauma. What happens when you enforce this law? All these pit bulls and bully breeds will be euthanized
- Other: You can not determine "nuisance" dogs only nuisance owners. Labelling a dog gives more power to those who choose not to take responsibility and raise dogs that are not trained. Furthermore most dog bites result when the dog has been provoked. There needs to be a different solution that holds the owner accountable and more investigation as why the dog bit to begin with. - was it being harrassed?
- Other: You can not be racist towards any race of dog. To attack pit bulls is wrong and is backwards of making any progress. These questions are wrong these animals are important to people. Imagine saying you can't take your kid to the park because of the race ignorant and shame on you Calgary
- Other: you can not increase tax or ban a breed at a dog park.
- Other: You are way off base pit bull / bully breeds dogs are getting a bad name perhaps if someone has a dog of this breed the HUMAN should receive additional education and follow up with the human . You're blaming the dog where no blame should be placed . DO BETTER!
- Other: You are very wrong to pick certain types of dogs. It's not breed or looks that is the problem. It's irresponsible humans
- Other: You are stupi to just do this on pitbull.its idiot owner
- Other: You are singling out one kind of dog. German shepard, rottis and a few others have very stong bit. This shouldnt be against a particular dog it should refect on the owner. Any dog can attack



if the owner trains them. I dont think it is far to single out the dog. The dog does what the trainer tells them to. Dogs usually obey the trainer. I think the owners should not just be fined but go to jail. Everyone blames the dog not the owner, that discussed me including By law. Maybe these dogs should be trained by police to work in K9 before being euthanized. I dont agree on animals being euthanized. every dog deserves another chance. While the dog waits for court proceedings maybe someone can train the dog properly, the right way. to show the court that they can be trained to be a good dog. Pit Bulls are amazing dogs if trained right. That is the owners responsibility not the dogs.

- Other: You are promoting Breed Specific legislation with NO substantial proof that the specific breeds noted are problem dogs. NOT COOL. NOT EDUCATED. Breed-specific legislation should not be permitted. Nuisance animals can be ANY breed.
- Other: YOU ARE BULLYING A BREED. IT IS NOT THE DOG IT IS THE OWNERS, QUIT WITH THE STEREOTYPE AGAINST THESE DOGS! I have met more aggressive chihuahuas than I have pitbulls. STOP!
- Other: You all need to be voted out... This is disgusting.
- Other: Why on gods green earth are you people narrowing it down to 1 breed? Come on! Give your head a shake! Shame on you. This has become ridiculous!! Small breed dogs attack too! Its [removed] owners who breed them to fight. Get educated! My god!
- Other: Why not suggest all these for all big dog breeds. This is NOT fair for any of these.
- Other: Why is this only for pitbulls this is ridiculous!!! it should not be listed as breed specific at all this is stupid !!! If you are implementing higher fines . Special insurance or restrictions make it for any dog owner who has had a dog exhibit signs of aggression or so called nuisance d breed of dog that has been involved with
- Other: Why is this only about Pitbulls? A dog behaves how it is trained. There should be more responsibility on owners instead of blaming and singling out a breed of dog.
- Other: Why is this being relegated to just pitbulls? We don't need a bully breed legislation. If a dog is aggressive, it should be upon the owner to fix the issue. I've been bitten by more Wheaten Terriers than any other breed. Please rethink a breed specific legislation.
- Other: Why is the pitbull being singled out? Little dogs bite and attack as well. ANY dog displaying dangerous behavior should be assessed and the owner fined accordingly or training classes mandatory.
- Other: Why is it necessary to have them pay more cats are allowed to roam around but a person has to pay more to have a pitbull in there house that's ridiculous
- Other: Why do we need to limit a certain breed? All dogs...just like all humans should be treated fairly and equally.
- Other: Why are you targeting a specific breed of dog?! Experience has been that its not the dog, its the owner who hasn't or isn't responsible enough to properly train the dog, that's not the dogs fault. I've owned a Rottweiler and would again. Not an aggressive bone in her body. I'm disappointed this is how you think this needs to be handled. This will result in many dogs either not being rescued or euthanized for no other reason that they are a pit bull.
- Other: Why are you being breed specific? I was attacked by more small dogs than anything growing up. So disappointing for our city.



- Other: Why are we specifying pitbull when statistically chows, Rottweilers and German shepherds are more aggressive and have stronger bites
- Other: Why are the dogs getting punished for these behaviours when it's the owner that does not know how to treat the dog. Why not focus on the owner getting proper dog training. The pitbull is getting branded as a dangerous dog; I know several pitbulls and they are as docile and even tempered as any other breed.
- Other: Why are pitbulls being targeted here? We have issues with an aggressive lab/collie mix so punishing one breed makes no sense.
- Other: Why do you "label" dogs. It's not the dog, it's the OWNER!!!! They should be declared a nuisance. I have had a dobie, a german shephard, a rottie and a pitbull. None of them ever hurt anyone or anything. But a god [removed] freaking little dog bit my dobie to the tune of 10 stitches and a \$150 vet bill!!!!!! STOP WITH THE DISCRIMINATION!!!!!!
- Other: While I agree that dogs that have a history of aggressive behavior should be muzzled. I've been bitten by a small breed dog on numerous different occasions unlike a pit bull type dog that I have never had an issue with. People with small dogs tend to leave the dog untrained, leading to WAY more barking and biting. Breed specific muzzling makes no sense when people owning a pitbull breed usually ensure training because of the stigma behind owning them.
- Other: When a dog (any breed) attacks someone or another animal, the dog and owner must go through an extensive training course to help train the dog and owner. Euthanasia or removal of said dog should be the LAST resort.
- Other: What a joke. Pitbull type dogs are not any more a threat than a German Shepherd, or any small breed dog (who are significantly more aggressive) . Any dog owner should be taking their dog to obedience regardless of breed. This is essentially racism towards Pit Bulls. [removed] owners make [removed] dogs. How bout some education
- Other: We shouldnt target just one breed cause it ability to bite stronger or the size. Its not the breed its the person behind it. Smaller dogs are alot more aggressive then pitbulls why arent they listed its cause everyonr thinks its the pitbulls that are bad you always see them making the news and i dont think thats fair just cause were judging the dog based on media. Horrible idea
- Other: We aren't supposed to discriminate based on skin tone for humans why is it okay to do so by dog breed? Some of the nicest dogs I know are pit bulls and some of the meanest don't have a single trace of pit bull. Grow up!
- Other: Vet the people buying the dogs better, its not the pitbull that's the issue, it's the Owners ineptness that is.
- Other: unfortunately you have taken a beautiful BREED of dog and tainted the breed with singling it out as a bad breed ,just awesome I've never been bitten or attacked by any of these wonderful breeds that you people yes YOU people singled out in this question SHAME on you, I have been attacked by little SHITZU many times that are off leash in public, but believe its not the dog its the uneducated owners its the pathedic owners
- Other: Understand that attacks happen with pit bulls in the vast minority, not make harsh rules for one of the least violent (yet powerful) dogs.



- Other: Treat pit bulls the same as every other dog!
- Other: Treat every dog the same don't single out pitbull type breeds
- Other: Treat all dogs the same and look into the reason why they bit!
- Other: Treat all dogs equal
- Other: Training the owner/human
- Other: Training should be for the owners. More often than not it is other dogs like labradors that have caused a hazard for our dog. We are witnesses to several dogs running around off-leash at Haultain Park and never once has a Bylaw Officer been down to check this out despite my complaints to 311. Any breed of dog is a nuisance or acts badly if it is not trained properly or the owner is not responsible or intelligent enough to control that dog. I think a person should have to go through training to get a dog licence. Bad vehicle training begets bad car drivers and there are plenty of those in the city.
- Other: Training required for the dog AND the owner. The owner is responsible for how the dog turns out and if they're not properly educated on how to train their dog properly then their dog is more likely to be a nuisance.
- Other: Training for nuisance dog owners... owners are the problem not the dog.
- Other: Train the owner to be a better owner then. They are the problem not the dogs.
- Other: Train the humans before restricting breeds. Its not the dog that is at fault its the humans.
- Other: To treat all dogs (INCLUDING PITBULLS) with respect.
- Other: To classify pit bulls as more dangerous because of their breed is absolutely disgusting. Shame on you for this. If a dog becomes an issue REGARDLESS OF BREED then there must be consequences. But it is RIDICULOUS to say all pit bulls are bad.
- Other: This whole thing is terrible. Pit bulls are not dangerous and shouldn't be treated so badly. Any of these bylaws are absolute [removed].
- Other: This type of talk feeds into the stigma and fear that people have against bully breeds. Every single dog breed, when put into the wrong hands or when trained inappropriately, can do major harm to others. It is ignorant to believe that bully breeds are the only breeds should be punished when any other animal is capable of harm. Additionally, some bully breeds have a shorter snout. If you were to implement a bylaw requiring muzzles for these breeds, suffering and harm can be done to these dogs as they already have breathing restrictions. A bylaw such as this, could lead to many harmful or even fatal complications. Please recognize the discrimination towards bully breeds that this potential bylaw has. We need to be making steps forwards, not backwards. Alternatively, ALL dogs should only be in the hands of responsible, committed owners.
- Other: This specific targeting of so called pit bulls helps no one and alienates lawful dog owners who care and love these breeds. If anything is to be done it should be pre- screening of potential owners. It is not the breed that is dangerous it is the humans who abuse these animals. German Shepard's are used as police dogs for a reason.
- Other: This shouldn't be targeted towards pitbulls. There's more to attacks than the breed of an animal.



- Other: This should not be imposed period. Shame on the city of Calgary at even thinking about imposing bylaws on bully breeds.
- Other: This should not be breed specific, its the ownership not the dog that affects its behaviour
- Other: THIS SHOULD NOT BE BREED SPECIFIC!!
- Other: This should NOT be breed specific! Many other dog breeds are just as likely if not MORE to bite or attack.
- Other: This should not be naming specific dog breeds at all!
- Other: This should not be a thing. This is uninformed discrimination that the city should not be proceeding with.
- Other: This should not be a municipal government, or any government, responsibility. These matters should be examined civilly by a court should a case be brought to court.
- Other: This should be for owners REGARDLESS of breed.
- Other: This should be a dog by dog basis. It makes no sense to muzzle or punish a whole series of breeds, golden retrievers bite more people than any other dog are you thinking of implementing these against them too? This needs to be dog by dog basis.
- Other: This section needs to be revised. I'm a staffy owner and this is not the case in terms of bite strength. Pound for pound a chihuahua and a dachshund have more bite power. I'm sick of breed specific scrutiny. A pit bull is a mix of various breeds and a blanket term for a square or blocky headed strong dog. I don't like to be discriminated against because of my dog's breed and appearance.
- Other: This section is entirely ridiculous.
- Other: This question is disgusting. Drop the BSL [removed].
- Other: This needs to be 2 separate questions...one about nuisance animals and one about pit bulls. If there are dogs that have multiple bites or multiple being at large then that is what I would consider a nuisance and make them pay higher fines and make them complete courses to become better owners and train their dogs. As for pit bulls I have never believed in breedism (like racism but against dog breeds). I have met so many pit bulls being in the vet industry that are amazing pets. The dog on Little Rascals was a pit bull. When things go wrong it goes wrong with the people....NOT the dogs.
- Other: This must be a joke you just seem any dog that looks like a pit bull a threat. Give me a break smaller dogs are most likely to bite people . This should be all dog breeds or none
- Other: This law is utterly stupid ! The dog is not the problem the owner is. Muzzling every dog doesn't solve the problem
- Other: This is whack. It's not the breed it's the owner.
- Other: This is unbelievable, you cannot declare Pitbulls a nuisance, they are wonderful dogs and let's not do what Ontario did and punish all owners because of a few. I will definitely not support this.
- Other: This is the stupidest thing I have ever read. "Pit bulls" are not the problem and labeling a variety of breeds nuisance just because of the way they look is ridiculous. Shame on you
- Other: THIS IS THE DUMBEST THING EVER!! Calgary you are becoming ridiculous.



- Other: This is targeting a breed. It's not the dog that is the problem with these issues it is the owner. If the dog is properly trained this should not be an issue. Sad to see the target being placed on a specific breed of dog.
- Other: This is simply not necessary! Pitties are some of the friendliest Dogs!!
- Other: This is rubbish. You can't seriously think that a small dog can not do serious damage with a bit right?
- Other: This is ridiculous and will lead to discriminatory adoptions resulting in poorer care and higher euthanasia rates of pitbulls. Cut it out.
- Other: This is ridiculous. Whoever thought of this bylaw is a moron. Thank you #freethepitty
- Other: This is ridiculous. Dogs that are aggressive should not go to dog parks but this is NOT specific to pit bulls or pitbull breeds.
- Other: This is ridiculous.
- Other: This is ridiculous, this is false information, if you want to use the excuse that pitbulls have the strongest jaw I expect Rottweilers German shepherds Dobermans and mastiffs to be included. Wow
- Other: This is ridiculous, pitbulls or any dog for that matter can be aggressive based on the owner. This is biased!
- Other: This is ridiculous, I do not support breed discrimination
- Other: This is ridiculous, discriminating against an entire breed of dog? If Pitbulls aren't involved in more biting accidents why introduce this law?
- Other: This is ridiculous! Pit bulls and the breeds listed above are not the issue. All dogs have the ability to be destructive and cause harm. Don't punish the dogs, punish all bad dog owners. Being breed specific is taking a step backwards. It would be extremely disappointing to see Calgary do this. How about other dogs with high prey drive that are equally destructive? If any of these are implemented, you are setting these dogs and owners up for failure because they don't have equal opportunity for training.
- Other: This is ridiculous! Its not the breed that is a problem..its the human who owns any breed with poor training. Don't single out specific breeds. Please do your research. This is very inappropriate
- Other: This is ridiculous! As mentioned BY YOU...there are no more incidents by pit bulls than other breeds. It's a fact that other breed are more aggressive. Should we ban labs??? Fine owners of aggressive dogs and stop making it about breed! Moronic.
- Other: This is ridiculous to only restrict pitbulls there are plenty of other large breeds that can do the same damage
- Other: This is ridiculous this is even being brought up.
- Other: This is repulsive on every level imaginable. Should we hold council to a higher standard and punish them more severely? I don't own one of these animals, but I find it repugnant that you'd treat a certain breed of dog differently. If this was a group of people... well you get the picture. Its all in how the dogs are raised & trained.
- Other: This is profiling !! Terrible bigotry and prejudice against an innocent animal. Owners should be accountable



- Other: This is not ok, its not the breed (pit bull is not a breed by the way) its then owners and training of any breed. All breeds can be dangerous not just one specific breed.
- Other: This is not fair to specify ONE breed. So I choose none of the above.
- Other: This is not an issue with breed. The city needs punish owners for any misbehaving dogs more firmly. Not just breed. BREED IS NOT THE ISSUE.
- Other: This is not a matter of breed! Any breed can be a "nuisance" or bite. This is unacceptable to even consider!
- Other: This is not a pitbull problem but a people problem. DOGS should all be listed as just that. Every dog can bite. No breed is more prone then an other! People need to be held accountable for there dogs action. If a small dog bites or a golden retriever or a bully breed they should be held to the same standard. There should be higher fines for any nuisance dog. This would include aggressive dogs at dog parks, unleded dogs in leash areas and any other bylaw related offences. I DO NOT agree to singling out a breed because the breed is not the problem the people are. Better training results in better dogs. If anything we should have more private dogs parks(city operated, would be revenue in city pocket) to insure dogs with bite history or aggression issues would not cause problems to people who have worked in training there dogs to be a good citizen..
- [removed]This is disgusting that this is even a topic. If anything goes into place about limited or forcing people to pay insurance for having one will result in riots and protests. This is absolutely disturbing.
- Other: This is horribly arbitrary and chihuahuas are more aggressive
- Other: This is highly prejudicial towards a certain breed of dog. Because I know you aren't going to consider small breeds as nuisances.
- Other: This is disgusting. A dog is a dog. The owner is the responsible party, not the pit bull.
- Other: This is disgusting. Quit wasting my taxpayer dollars on this legislation. Punish the problem owners, not the breed. Do you know that chihuahuas are on the top 10 most aggressive dog list?
- Other: This is disgusting! Wake up!! It's not the dog it is the owner! We will never love or visit Calgary again if you put this law into effect. THE CITY SHOULD BE ASHAMED!
- Other: This is disgusting stop blaming the dogs and blame the owners instead
- Other: This is discriminatory towards a specific breed. Not ok.
- Other: This is discrimination and should not be implemented solely to pertain to certain breeds
- Other: This is cruel punishment for animals that are deemed more potential for a dangerous bite by uneducated, bandwagon individuals. To specify a law against pit ills nearly invoked a Charter violation (which has precedent cases in being used to protect animals). Shame on you, your beliefs and this proposal for putting this forward. A better solution would be a mandatory mussel for animals that consistently show aggressive behaviour towards other people or animals in public areas. This is a bandwagon effort to rally support in a legal fashion for animals that do not get a say in how they are raised or taught.
- Other: This is crazy you are trying to discriminate against a dog breed
- Other: This is [removed]!! Why single out pit bulls?!! Why not the little mutt dog that is face level to a child that bites kids!?! Why not the crazy poodle/poodle coders?? Those are just as bad, if not



worst! I do understand must people that get a Pitbull or Staffy, have no idea how to handle them & it goes bad for the dog, don't blame the dog! Blame the owner. It's how they are raised!!!

- Other: This is completely unnecessary. All dogs have the capability to bite. Pitbulls should not be stereotyped this way. They are loving dogs like any other breed.
- Other: This is completely offensive that you are targeting pitbulls like this! I do not even have a pitbull but I have friends with them and they are not problem dogs at all, they are loving sweet dogs. You're suggesting they all be muzzled and have mandatory training which costs lots of money EVEN IF THEY DONT NEED IT WTF IS WRONG WITH YOU?!
- Other: This is called Responsible Owners, make them responsible for nurturing kind & well behaved dogs of ALL breeds!
- Other: This is [removed]. Pit bulls are amazing dogs they don't deserve any of this.
- Other: This is [removed]. I know so many pit bulls that are nicer then little rat dogs
- Other: This is [removed]! Do you know how stupid you sound?!
- Other: This is breed discrimination. There is no need for the type of dog to be punished. The owner of said dog is the problem, therefore they should be punished. Pit bulls are not an aggressive breed.
- Other: this is breed discrimination! there is MULTIPLE studies against this. NO elected official in any other city has gone without severe scrutiny over this and will cost votes
- Other: This is blatant and unethical discrimination of dog breed. While I understand the premise of a strength of bite argument the reality is the small dogs/other dog breeds are involved in just as many incidents. Make bylaws that apply to ALL dogs or no dogs - breed discrimination is hideously outdated and short sighted.
- Other: This is animal cruelty no
- Other: This is an absolutely disgusting attempt to target dogs based on appearances and not temperament, poor ownership and abuse. I am disgusted that this is even being considered and the thought of this type of legislation should be abolished immediately
- Other: This is an absolute disgrace that you would even be targeting pit bulls it's not the breed but the OWNERS FAULT
- Other: This is all too ridiculous.
- Other: This is all ignorant and completely uneducated. Pit bulls, in fact, do not have a stronger bite force when compared to other breeds such as German shepherds. In testing it has been shown that they have a lower bite force than average. On top of that they also have a higher temperament passing score than the average (86% vs the average of 83%). The problem with aggressive Pit Bulls is largely a product of neglectful owners and breeders who raise them to be aggressive. Perhaps, instead of blaming the breed we hold the owners accountable. Implement a screening process for the owners of nuisance breeds and all breeds in general. Make obedience classes mandatory for puppies of all breeds to ensure proper socialization and reduce chances of aggressive behavior. Increase fines and punishments for those charged with neglect or abuse. Educate potential owners so they understand the amount of work that goes into caring for a new dog /puppy. Holding dog owners more accountable for the behavior and care of their dog will ultimately help reduce amount



of dog attacks in general on top of reducing the number of strays and surrenders and reducing work of rescues, animal services and bylaw officers.

- Other: This is absolutely the most insane thing I have heard of. I would love the city to provide stats on dog attacks and the correlation it has with pit bull or pit bull looking dogs. This is discrimination at its finest and is the most unfounded potential Bylaw I have heard of. Why not ban dogs with a history of biting or aggression ? Why is it singled to a breed?
- Other: This is absolutely ridiculous. You should be shamed for being so prejudice.
- Other: This is absolutely ridiculous. You know when it really comes down to it this is being racist against pit bulls.. I have owned 2 Rottweilers (a [removed] of a lot more aggressive than pit bulls) and they were lap dogs. So [removed] this, this is [removed] and shouldn't even be a thing. Go look at owners into getting dogs, not the poor pups themselves because they have done nothing wrong. [Removed] you Calgary. [Removed] you [removed].
- Other: This is absolutely ridiculous. Pit bulls themselves are not the problem. It's the people who raise them. Owners are in control of training their dogs so that they are raised appropriately. Pit bulls should not be biased against and forced into muzzles and extra fines and stuff just because of their breed. Pit bulls are sweet creatures that have gotten a very bad rap. There should be screening for owners and training for pit bulls. But not extra fines and forced muzzles. People will take advantage of these rules and just go crying wolf anytime a dog poops wrong or something. People are ridiculous and will abuse it
- Other: This is absolutely disgusting to read ! I love this city and to read this as an owner & having to fear that my dogs might have to be muzzled for no reason, is heartbreaking. I will definitely be moving if this is put into place, clearly the city knows nothing about pit bulls, what about Rottweilers or cane Corsos or German shepherds? German shepherds are trained to attack humans as well ?? Why not list them.
- Other: This is absolutely appalling to read. Pit bulls are not the problem, irresponsible pet owners are. Maybe people should be screened and have background checks before they're allowed to even own an animal. I have seen by far more vicious chihuahuas than any other dog. Maybe they should be muzzled and put down. Whoever even suggested this needs to do some research on pit bulls and you'll have a better understanding of how amazing of dogs they are. Get with the times, we are not discriminating against dog breeds anymore we need to look at human behaviour instead.
- Other: This is absolutely absurd. This ideology that pit bulls are more dangerous than other dogs is founded upon with no statistical proof!
- Other: This is absolute garbage Calgary !! If I felt my pitbull x needed a muzzle in public , I surely would . And can make that decision on my own !! Why should I traumatize my rescue dog even more than he has already endured in his first 2 years of life . Leave it up to the owner to decide if it needs muzzling in public . Do not pass this law !!!! And furthermore , the breed isn't the problem . Let's just make every dog have to wear a muzzle in public then !! Chihuahua, lab , pug . All of the above . Absolute garbage you are even considering this . Bologne City of Calgary ! Shame on you !!
- Other: This is absolute [removed], there's dogs with just as/ more powerful bites than pit bulls. Don't single out dogs, this is absolutely absurd



- Other: This is a ridiculous idea , it's unfair to the breed and the breed owners . There's people who have well TRAINED pit bulls . How about instead of muzzling the pit bulls you muzzle the owners . Also if you actually understood dog behaviour you would know that all dogs can't talk right..? They have to nip , bark or give certain body language to tell other dogs to STOP ..
- Other: This is a ridiculous bylaw if I ever saw one the fact that you are putting a bias on specific breeds is disgusting my dog was protected from doodles and German Shepards by pit bulls its disgusting that you would think of even putting a bylaw like this in the city its truly distur
- Other: This is a ridiculous question and is based on a fear of a breed that is not based in actual fact. Even in your question it is noted that they aren't involved in more incidents that other breeds and their bite strength is comprable to other large dog breeds.
- Other: This is a joke. Pit bulls have a history of being affectionate and LOVING dogs. If you're issuing any fines/taking any animal from a home you better be providing a rehab option/training option and you better be exploring the history of the dog. Most pitbulls have a history of being mistreated. How shameful to even consider this. I've been bit by more little dogs then anything.
- Other: This entire question is a complete bias and unacceptable. There are many other larger and stronger breeds than a pit bull and the city is allowing one breed to be unfairly represented in this question. Your beginning statement says there is no evidence of more bites from pit bulls and yet you are unfairly targeting this breed in this questionnaire. Shame on you.
- Other: These choices are much too vague and open to an individual interpretation. You are trying to pass what amounts to Breed Specific Legislation in Calgary. Calgary dog bylaws use to be used as a model for other jurisdictions. Now they are wanting to bring in draconian bylaws which are PROVEN not to be effective.
- Other: This BSL direction is disgusting. I cannot even honestly answer these questions with the discrimination in the questions
- Other: This attitude drives me crazy. The directives here have the wrong focus. It is not the animal that requires training it is the handler. Any dog can be a nuisance if the owner does not properly take responsibility. Small dogs are the worst. they aren't taught anything. If they are mishaving the owner picks it up instead of actually training it. I do not go to off leash parks because other owners do not control their dogs. It's not the dog's fault. People and children are not taught how to interact with a strange dog. Are there problem dogs yes but it is not breed specific. when I was a child I took away a dog's bone, he bit me. I never told my mom about it because I knew I was the one in the wrong.
- Other: This all seems like very old fashioned 20-year old thought. BSL is not the way. My dog was attacked by a German Shepherd mix rescue dog and a Golden Retriever. It's not the breed, it's the specific dog and lack of training and control by the dog's handler.
- Other: They are just like any other dog. They deserve to be treated just like any other. It's all on how the dog is raised. This is unfair and rude for the dog and should not be acceptable
- Other: These suggestions that are pit bull specific are disgusting. Do you not pride yourselves on living in a progressive city? Shame on you, discrimination is reprehensible in ALL of its forms. Why



not regulate the German Shepherd or the Golden Retriever, two breeds consistently in the top for dog bites? Way to take a step backward Calgary. Bravo.

- Other: These suggestions are out of line and only give credibility to unproven theories about aggressive breeds. Also if a dog becomes a nuisance due to noise then it should be dealt with via the existing noise restrictions... not through labeling the dog as potentially dangerous.
- Other: These suggestions are [removed] and no necessary.
- Other: These suggestions are [removed] there is no scientific evidence that proves pitbulls are more vicious than other dogs the issue is with how they're being treated by their owners
- Other: These rules are ridiculous ideas, and without specifying what makes a nuisance dog I cannot even consider supporting any of these ideas. But pit bulls and other bully breeds are not the problem
- Other: These rules are [removed] just like the city its self
- Other: These options are ridiculous. Its not about the dog or the breed, it is the owner. If an owner raises their dog to be a nuisance, the owner should be punished. The breed should not be punished.
- Other: These notes about pit bulls are factual incorrect and incredibly ignorant. Any dog has the ability to cause severe damage with a bite regardless of size. It is the owner's responsibility. All of these notes show a lack of initiative to make owners responsible for training their pets and being informed dog owners
- Other: These items listed above are archaic and misguided. Dogs are products of their owners behaviour. Without competent and capable owners any dog can be dangerous and declared a nuisance. Instead of blaming the dog for their behaviour, focus on the owner. The owner should be held accountable for their dogs behaviour of/when an incident occurs. Blaming the dog is the easy way out and I think it is sheer laziness that is driving the City of Calgary to consider this course of action. Extremely disappointed. I thought you were better than this YYC.
- Other: These dogs are not the problem ! Its the owners ! If you want the violence to stop , stop allowing just anyone to own or buy a Bully bread. Train the PEOPLE who own these dogs . Criminalizing this breed due the negligence of the owner is not fair to one of the kindest and loving breed of dogs out there !
- Other: These bylaws should not be considered for only nuisance breeds but for all dogs. And really the ownness of the problem needs to be on proper care by the owner. Invest in training programs for all dogs, and owners. Require specific training to own a pit bull or nuisance dog in Calgary. But don't unfairly punish all dogs, because of a few cases of owner negligence and ignorance
- Other: These breeds should not be required to wear a muzzle!
- Other: These breeds are not necessarily the problem, but their owners! Any dog can be a nuisance
- Other: These are ridiculous and should not be in effect. Pit bulls are sweet, gentle animals. If the animal lashes out it is due to the owner NOT THE DOG.
- Other: These are all ridiculous. Pit bulls aren't the problem, they're just a breed of dog. As with any dog, behavioural problems are caused by the owners, or lack of knowledge from the owners part. Please stop penalizing dogs or certain breeds for the incompetence of humans. Please look within your own "human" community before passing the blame.



- Other: These are all [removed], this is pretty much being racist to the out bull breed. That breed itself is not violent it's the way certain owners have trained them. So the rest of the good should not have to pay extra just because some Joe blow trained their pit bull breed to be violent or a nuisance.
- Other: These all seem unnecessary?
- Other: These bully breeds are not the problem. Any animal isn't born to be aggressive; it is all on how the OWNER trains them and its the owner that should be held accountable not the dogs!
- Other: There shouldn't be any such thing
- Other: There should not be any breed specific legislation, it unfairly targets dogs when owners are the issue.
- Other: There should be no specific actions related to Pit Bulls they are the same as other dogs and should be treated as such.
- Other: There should be no regulations on this specific dog breed.
- Other: There should be no laws against pit bulls.
- Other: There should be no fines unless it is for ALL dog breeds. Limiting fines to just "pit bulls" is ridiculous and uneducated.
- Other: There should be NO discrimination against bully breeds... why not German Shepard then, why not Rottweilers, Doberman etc. this is EXTREMELY unfair and unjust. We have always had multiple pitbulls, with and around children NEVER any incidents at home, public, parks whatsoever. This is absolutely disgusting to discriminate against such good dogs.
- Other: There should be no bylaw specific to pit bulls. It is an irresponsible owner that is the problem. Any breed of dog can cause problems. Make all new bylaws apply to all different breeds of dogs. Do not discriminate against one specific breed. There are many responsible pit bull owners. A lot of pit bulls are good natured and have wonderful owners so I don't think they should have any bylaw specific to their breed.
- Other: There should be NO breed specific regulations. Behaviour of dog depends on responsibility of owner, and it is unfair to assume a dog will be violent based on the breed. Regulations should be made based on the specific dogs actions and not the breed in general.
- Other: There should be no breed specific legislation. This is discriminatory action and is unacceptable to even consider.
- Other: There should be no breed specific legislation. It negatively affects responsible owners, and is not effective.
- Other: There should be no Breed Specific Legislation. I am vehemently against this
- Other: There should be no breed specific fine, it's all the owner's responsibility and how they train the dog. Make obedience training for all owners. Fines for negligence on training pets.
- Other: There should be NO Breed specific bylaws. This is unacceptable the wording implies that there is a problem with the pit bull breed. The argument that they are stronger is false in comparison to Great Danes, st Bernards, Irish Wolfhounds, newfoundlanders etc. is frankly wrong. I don't support any measure that targets a dog based on breed alone. Shame on you! This starts with a backstory premise that the breed is the problem. False!



- Other: There should be no blanket bylaw based on a breed. This should be fines against the owner for not having control of their dog only. And banning a specific breed is disgusting.
- Other: There should be no action against particular breeds.
- Other: There should be more owner education and less breed discriminations. Other breeds can cause just as much harm, if a dog of any breed is showing signs of aggression it should be on leash at all times in public places.
- Other: There should be absolutely no BSL against pit bulls or bully breeds. This is absolutely ridiculous.
- Other: There is nothing wrong with Pitbulls its how the owner train the dog. Blame the owner not this specific breed. When I was going for a walk I just about got bitten by a little barking Mutt and the owner didn't say anything.
- Other: There is nothing wrong with Pit Bulls if under the care of a responsible owner. No additional actions towards those breeds should be applied. Penalize the owners, not the animals.
- Other: THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH DOGS. JUST HUMANS.
- Other: There is nothing inherently more dangerous about a pitbull than any other big dog. Specifying laws and rules against pitbulls and pitbull owners is wrong. This bylaw should say AGGRESSIVE DOG because that's what kind of animal you need to be preventing access to public parks. Don't breed discriminate!
- Other: THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN AGGRESSIVE BREED. DONT BULLY MY BREED.
- Other: There is no such thing as a bad dog, just bad owners! And please explain to me how is this different than racism? Other than the fact that its a different species, this bylaw would be prejudice towards pit bulls simply because they have stronger jaws than other dogs? The ONLY thing I'd recommend is looking into PEOPLE more diligently if they want to adopt a pit bull as there are horrible people out there who choose pit bulls and make them fighter dogs and take advantage of their strong jaws ... but that is NOT the dogs fault so why should they have to pay the price? Its the people we should be concerned about.
- Other: There is no reason to single out a dog. Owners are to blame for they're behavior. More people are bit by small dogs than pitbulls. It's not fair to muzzle a breed on a dog that has NEVER had to wear one.
- Other: There is no evidence that breed-specific laws make communities safer.
- Other: There is NO CORRELATION BETWEEN BULLY BREEDS AND INFLUX OF DOG BITES! Do not in force breed restrictions on pit bulls. Little dogs bite more and aren't reported.
- Other: There are no such thing as bad dogs!!! Just irresponsible and uneducated owners!! To single out a certain breed is ridiculous and incredibly insensitive!!!! Shame on you! Any dog can have mean trained in to them! In the same sense, ANY dog can be trained to be good!
- Other: There are many other types of dogs with far more powerful bites than pitbulls - German Shepards - ALMOST all mastiffs - Not to mention high content WOLF dogs. The language is offensive and racist. If anything you make owners for ALL dogs be more responsible. There are no bad dogs just bad owners!



- Other: There are many other breeds of dogs that have the potential for a more severe bite. This survey is just perpetuating the negative perception of the breeds you listed. The by law should apply to all dog owners of nuisance dogs (of ANY breed). Dog owners should be reprimanded for taking poor care in ensuring their dog is obedient.
- Other: There are many breeds that can be classified dangerous. I do not think that this breed should be called out for being aggressive and stereotyped because this has nothing to do with the dog. Its the person that owns the dogs. You cannot blame a breed for being failed by man.
- Other: Their should be NO bylaws against pitbulls as they is LITERALLY not evidence they are more of a bite hazard then any other dog! This is absolute garbage!!! Regardless all dog should be treated with the same approach
- Other: The problem is not The BREED. It is the HUMAN. Train the HUMAN.
- Other: The pitbull does not have the hardest bite or "lock jaw" some people say. They are normal dogs like others , the reason they are mean is how they are raised. So how about checking the owners if they are abusing the dog or if the dog was abused previously. Small dogs are the most aggressive, the bigger the dog the gentler. Do not single out a specific breed. We have bigger things to worry about like sex trafficking & rapists getting away with their crime. Do something to make Calgary safer, the dogs are the least concern.
- Other: The owners are the problem not the breed. You should not discriminate against breed who were in-fact nanny dogs. Any dog has a strong bite that does not justify extra bylaws against certain breeds.
- Other: The owner of the dog needs to be the one who is targeted not specific breeds. Its always on the owner to train the dog. Dogs just do what they are taught to do. The breeds should not be scrutinized as little dogs bite way more often just don't do as much harm.
- Other: THE OWNER OF THE ANIMAL SHOULD DO TRAINING! THE DOGS ARE RAISED AND BROUGHT UP BY HUMAN BEINGS WHO HAVE CONTROL OF PUTCOMES. BAD OWNERS EQUAL BAD DOGS.
- Other: the law is RETARDED
- Other: The language is too vague. Additionally all dogs can inflict bites. Discrimination against pit bulls is silly. Its dog owners that need to be fined and educated.
- Other: The information provided is false, Pitbulls do not have the strongest bite, bite strength is not necesarrily breed specific. A simple google search would show this. I am disapointed that the people in charge of animal welfare are uninformed about the animals they are prosicuting.
- Other: The fact the pitbulls or bully breeds have a bad rep, and this is the answer if you do look into it make it harder to get pets I personally have been bitten by more smaller dog breeds then larger breeds, the temperaments of each dog comes down to the owners, good bully breeds owners should not be punished for those who raise aggressive dogs, that's like saying that if you find one drug dealer in a neighbourhood everyone in that neighbourhood is a drug dealer
- Other: The fact that you are clearly uneducated in the strength of a bite as both German shepherds and Rottweilers have a stronger bite force than pit bulls means this absurd breed specific abuse is highly unacceptable by our elected city officials.



- Other: The fact that this is mostly about pit bulls is discriminating, as there are many small breed dogs that cause the same issues and nuisance level, yet are not mentioned above unlike how they have mentioned pit bulls multiple time
- Other: The fact that this is a question is beyond me. This is an owner problem, not a breed problem. Having a pet is a privilege not a right. Dogs and cat should be sprayed and neuter, and fines should be issued if they are not. There should be screening before anyone gets a dog, just like they do at the humane society. Pitbulls are highly intelligent and energetic dogs, just like border collies, German Shepard, sheepdogs. People that don't take care of their dogs don't deserve them.
- Other: The fact that pit bulls aren't involved at a high incident then any other breed of dog therefore it is wrong to single them out in bylaws. Also nuisance dogs needs to be defined better.
- Other: the designation of pitbulls as especially dangerous and the negative ways pitbulls are regulated is unjustified illogical unfair and abusive. any dog can inflict serious damage under some circumstances. pitbulls are not more aggressive than other dogs. they are often abused and mistreated to make them angry by a certain type of dog owner. it is those abusive ignorant owners that should be severely dealt with, not the mistreated dogs.
- Other: The definition of "nuisance" is so vague. Some people are scared of dogs and call bylaw on dogs that aren't posing a threat. There is way too much room for bias and dogs that look "dangerous" (like pitbulls) to be negatively impacted by bias and fear. All of these recommendations . Especially for pit bulls that have no history of bad behaviour.
- Other: The city should pay to have dogs Embark DNA tested for result if ypure going to pull this [removed]. BSL is stupid, there are FAR more nery herding breeds that have a higher bite chance than most Bully bred mutts. An American Pit Bull terrier is a rare breed, and I bet you don't even have any in all of Calgary. Just uneducated people who think they know whats best.
- Other: The city should have no right to restrict innocent dogs
- Other: The city needs to focus on educating owners rather than targeting specific breeds of dogs. All dogs can be reactive, it is up to each owner to know their dog and be responsible for its behaviour.
- Other: The Bully Ban idea is extremely wrong and inconsiderate towards those that have them as companions. Very wrong to suggest that their breed is aggressive.
- Other: The breeds are not the issue owners are for all sizes/breeds of dogs. If you are to make a bylaw it should be a owner must take a proper dog ownership class so they can train said animal to not be aggressive ive been snapped at and shown more aggressive natural from small dogs then large ones.
- Other: The breed is not the issue it should be the owner held accountable, when licensing an animal the owner should require a criminal check and breeder/seller information should be required so that the city can begin to look into bylaws to regulate breeders and sellers who are not following laws or potentially stealing as well. Once again this issue is not breed related but more so owner related if any dog is involved in bylaw offences the owner should then enrol themselves and their dog in obedience and training classes, however it should not be breed specific
- Other: The breed has nothing to do with the behavior. Its all in the owner the fact that you are doing anything to dog is ridiculous and no I don't own a pit bull.



- Other: The breed of the dog isn't the problem. It's the owner and how they are trained
- Other: The breed of the dog has no place in this survey. You need to reassess this policy. If there is an issue with improperly trained dogs look to the owner not the breed.
- Other: The blatant targeting of pit bull and larger type dogs is discriminatory. Animal behavior is a proven reflection of training.
- Other: The assumption that Pit Bulls "nuisance dogs" is a dangerous generalization and if ANY of the above is actually accepted as a bylaw it should apply to ALL dogs (but this shouldn't be a bylaw): strength is subjective. Equality should be shown across the board, right? - If that seems ridiculous, maybe consider that the measures listed above are bias. Until we're fining every human being for harming any animal (and don't forget to fine those who profit from the rape and murder of farm animals!!!), how is it that "nuisance dogs" are at the forefront of the city's concerns?
- Other: The above is absolutely ludicrous. Breeds are not the problem. Owners are the problem. If you're concerned about dog bites, make it mandatory for dog owners and their dogs to go through training. Singling out a breed is not productive. If a specific dog (any breed) is the aggressor in any physical harm there should be consequences but no more and no less depending on the breed.
- Other: That you don't discriminate a breed of dog. There are many other Nuisance dogs. Chihuahuas have an always will be worse with their attitude
- Other: That is bigotry!!! It is the owner's responsibility. There should be stricter rules on owners and breeders. Their lives matter.
- Other: Targeting the bad owners not blaming the dog breed based on previous history
- Other: Target specific owners, not breeds! Muzzling a dog at an off leash park due to nuisance title is stupid if its nuisance caused by excessive barking. All dogs need to be treated fair- just as you wouldn't judge a human don't be assuming its a vicious dog because of its breed. More repeat offences by all means higher fines but not simply because of the breed.
- Other: Take your questions and shove them up [removed] [removed].
- Other: Take the pit bull out of all of these recommendations and have this apply to every dog. No breed specific legislation. As a groomer I've been bitten numerous times and not one has been by a bully breed.
- Other: Take the [removed] out of your [removed] and Put them into [removed] of people who actually believe pit bulls dogs and owners should be [removed]
- Other: Support NONE of these. This is ridiculous as BSL has been proved ineffective.
- Other: Strictly basing this off of pit bulls is disgusting, it is all owner based. People showing signs of being a poor dog owner should be muzzled and not allowed in off leash parks as they are a nuisance just like you're claiming an innocent dog. [removed]
- Other: Stop trying to punish owners of specific breeds. Council is consistently overstepping its role and needs to back off.
- Other: STOP TRYING TO BULLY BREEDS, ITS THE OWNERS LACK OF RESPONSIBILITY, NOT THE BREED, DO SOME RESEARCH, IF THESE WERE PEOPLE THIS WOULD BE A RACIAL ISSUE, THE OWNER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR HOW A DOG ACTS IN PUBLIC, NOT THE DOG OR THE BREED! WHAT KIND OF CASH GRABBING, CIVIL RIGHT STEALING LOAD OF DOG



[removed]. I DONT PAY MY TAXES FOR MY POLITICAL LEADERS TO SQUABBLE OVER AN ISSUE THEY VERY CLEARLY DO NOT CARE TO UNDERSTAND, THIS IS A DISGRACE, THIS IS UNLAWFUL, THIS IS EMBARRASSING THAT THE CITY I CALL HOME CAN EVEN CONSIDER SUCH A DISCRIMINATORY BILL. YOU SHOULD BE ASHAMED OF YOURSELVES.

- Other: Stop targeting pitbulls you fools, there is nothing wrong with the breed itself, but the owners. Any dog will be aggressive if it has an aggressive owner. Just like humans. You have a [removed] parent, you are more likely to end up [removed] yourself. Open your damn eyes.
- Other: Stop targeting one breed. There's no bad ogs, only bad owners. Alot of the time it's fear related aggression, because owners believe abusing an animal into submission is okay. The most issues with dogs ive had are the size of rats, chihuahuas and [removed]. Not bigger breeds, and it's pathetic that the City or anyone for that matter cannot understand that concept.
- Other: Stop targeting breeds and focus on owners
- Other: stop specifying pitbulls as aggressive dogs. take a look at the owners and not the dogs. its so wrong to single pitbulls out, and it really isnt fair. will fight for them every single day until i die.
- Other: Stop specifying on a breed. All or nothing. We don't discriminate people on breed, why do we for dogs? We don't convict people before a crime has happened, don't change it for dogs.
- Other: Stop singleing out pitpulls! As you said they don't cause any more damage than other dogs this is rediculous.
- Other: Stop saying pit bulls are dangerous animals. They can be trained like any other breed. Shame.
- Other: Stop punishing the dog for irresponsible owners. I've seen more little dogs bite people then pit-bull breeds
- Other: Stop picking on pit bulls. There are no bad dogs, there are bad owners.
- Other: STOP PICKING ON A SINGLE "BREED" Anyone who does this has no understanding of dogs.
- Other: stop making stupid laws that only line the pockets of the politicians who implement them and make no actual change in society.
- Other: Stop judging just the pitbulls , its not just that breed,
- Other: Stop it! BSL is nonsense and I'm so disappointed our city would even consider this. I say NO NO NO to BSL of any form in Calgary.
- Other: Stop insisting pitbulls are the issue, and fine the owners. It has been proven time and again that pitbulls are not any sort of problem simply because of their breed, and that any problems come from negligent owners. Your insistence on weaving dog related pseudoscience into this survey, to the detriment of all dogs, is proof you have no idea how to filter public outrage, and educate yourselves on the issue at hand.
- Other: Stop identifying breeds of dogs as high risk it is the owners responsibility to ensure their dogs are trained fine the owners And rehabilitate the dogs
- Other: STOP HATING ON PITBULLS!!!! Regulations should be put in place for dog OWNERS not dog breeds.
- Other: Stop grouping all bully breeds together as "pitbulls" it's not even a real breed



- Other: Stop going after pit bull breeds. It is a [removed] cop out made by uninformed people. Maybe look at any dog that is a risk. If you can't do that, leave it how it is and worry about figuring out how to fix the rest of this broken city.
- Other: Stop discriminating against pit bulls! Just stop letting people adopt or purchase dogs with criminal records!! Its the owners that make a pit bull breed look bad! STOP discriminating against a poor animal who just wants love !!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Other: Stop discriminating against dogs! There should be no legislation based on breed! If you are responsible dog owner it doesn't matter what type of dog you own.
- Other: STOP DISCRIMINATING AGAINST CERTAIN BREEDS. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH. THATS ABSOLUTE BULLSHIT. THERE ARE NO BAD DOGS, ONLY BAD OWNERS. I frequent dog parks, and have NEVER had a problem with a pit bull, I however, have had my dog attacked by those tiny white shitzu things, and labs, ITS BAD OWNERS
- Other: Stop discriminating against certain breeds
- Other: Stop demonizing certain breeds of dogs. It's the owners fault
- Other: Stop demonizing a breed for their owners mistakes
- Other: Stop bullying a breed that was known as the nanny dog. Its not the dog, its the owner, stop blaming the wrong end of the leash. If you require breed specific training you best be paying for it.
- Other: Stop BSL. Maybe start fining the owners. Make them take responsibility for their pet !!!
- Other: Stop breed shaming. This is [removed] ridiculous.
- Other: Stop breed shaming. Its people who raise bad dogs. If you are serious about breed shaming, make people who are trying to save these dangerous dogs prove that they are knowledgeable and capable of owning a dog. I've been bitten by two dogs before, one was a golden retriever & the other a black lab. Never once a pit bull. My dad has his thumb bitten off by a different golden retriever. So please take into consideration that people raise aggressive dogs, not vice versa. You cannot define a dog by its breed. Shameful.
- Other: STOP BREED DISCRIMINATION
- Other: Stop blaming pit bulls for having bad owners.
- Other: Stop blaming pit bulls for having bad owners
- Other: Stop being [removed] about Pitbulls! Do not ban this animal. It is the owners responsibility to train the dog properly not the dogs fault
- Other: steep fines for irresponsible dog owners. German Shepard and many large breed dogs have the ability to do just as much damage. Its the irresponsible owners fault not the animal. ow
- Other: Start subsidizing humane society's, prevention is key. Punishment does not help.
- Other: Start looking into who owns a dog ie pitbull and make them take courses on how to properly train and handle a dog!! Look into their history for abuse! Do not let bad people have dogs!! Its not the dogs fault. It's the owners, dogs aren't bad they are taught to be bad!! Do more screenings when it comes to people adopting or buying dogs!! Make people accountable. It's not the breed, it's the owners. Start making the real monsters pay the price. Not an animal that's sole purpose in life is to love you unconditionally



- Other: Specific breed should not be singled out. Over the years different breeds have been issues and the owners were not singled out. This survey is if it appears to be a pit that is not the way to assess a dog. A dog's behavior no matter what breed it the concern. If you are demanding training you need to specific, aggressive trainers do not train. If we are concerned about of leash behaviours what about dogs that charge up to everyone creating chaos? This is not written by dog smart people it is written in fear and a lack of knowledge.
- Other: Specific breed banning or regulations is absurd. It is the OWNER that needs proper training and education.
- Other: Speaking as a vet tech, bully breed dogs don't need to be discriminated against as they are often very sweet and gentle dogs. Any legislation that would put restrictions on this specific breed is unfair and would result in a lot of perfectly great animals not having a loving home as they deserve to.
- Other: So sad as a society we would consider breed specific nonsense. It should be a dangerous dog nothing to do with the dogs breed. Bullies are by far the most loving loyal dogs
- Other: So much for this being a free country. You should put a muzzle on the morons that came up with this [removed].
- Other: So if we make a crazy bylaw like this for animals should we do the same for whatever race in humans is deemed more dangerous!!!! You people are unbelievable!!! This coming from a non pit bull owner
- Other: Smaller dogs can also we nuisanced.We cannot generalize even though there is no sufficient evidenc. Don't punish bully breeds because some owners fail to train their dogs adequately! This is discriminating against dogs merely because they appear more intimidating with no indication they are actual threats
- Other: Singling out 'pit bulls' is wrong. It's about the owner, not the dog. And the same could be said for german sheppards, rotties, boxers, etc. In my experience, I've been bit more times by a small dog than a medium or large breed dog. Essentially, the issue comes down to the owners and the dog shouldn't be punished for that.
- Other: Singling out pit bull breeds is discriminatory, more focus to negligence of ownership then the breed of dog.
- Other: Singling out "pitbulls" or bully breed dogs is ridiculous! We know BSL does not work, so why try to enforce such a ridiculous bylaw!!!! I own the most sweetest, gentlest, kindest, most loved and loving "pitbull" type dog. She is amazing!!!! This is racism! Just throw this in the garbage!
- Other: Similar to obtaining a gun license. If you adopt a dog that has the potential to be, "a nuisance," then owners should be required to take an aptitude/liscense test. From there forward they sign a document stating should an incident occur, fines and/or jail time (animal abuse) should the animal attack. Depending on circumstance. It is not the nature of the animal, but those who adopt.
- Other: Shouldn't be breed specific.
- Other: Shouldn't single out the pitbull breed ! Its the owner not the dog !
- Other: Should not be targetting specific breeds. Rotties have just as strong jaws. Any dog can be a possible risk. It is all dependent on the dog owner.more worried about little dogs that go on the



defense faster than the larger breeds. Need to be looking at the owners. Not all people should be allowed to have dogs. Lack of knowledge on how to properly train, or getting breeds that are not suited for city live. Example border collies are meant for cattle work not city life. Can result in behavior issues if dog is not in doing what they are meant tonne doing.

- Other: Should be on a case by case basis and not dependent on the breed. The owner should always be accountable for the dog even if the dog displays bad behaviour.
- Other: Shame on the City of Calgary for inciting breed specific bylaws. Pitbulls are very kind companions. You should assess smaller dogs and their aggression levels and have higher fines for small dogs.
- Other: SERIOUSLY??? wow. Did you know that GERMAN SHEPHERDS HAVE STRONGER BITES THAN THE PITBULL BECAUSE THEY ARE BRED FOR IT (POLICE DOGS) Guys you are better than this. This is [removed] ridiculous. Please do not put anything through since you guys are the most uneducated pieces of [removed] I have seen in a long time. WOW just [removed] WOW. I am ashamed to [removed] live in calgary.
- Other: Same measures for politicians who create these archaic rules
- Other: Rottwilers, Mastiff's, St. Bernard's, Irish Wolfhounds are all very strong dogs. So why is it only pitfalls on your list. Seems less like actually trying to help people & more of a witchhunt against pitties.
- Other: Rottweilers have the toughest bite at 328 pounds of force, then German Shepherds at 238 pounds of force, finally Pitbulls at 235 pounds of force. Pit bulls jaws DO NOT lock, by comparing their skulls to other dogs you see they are similar and they do not have the mechanisms to lock their jaws. This legislation against pit bulls is absurd and only further pushes myths and negative stereotypes. Please educate yourselves.
- Other: Responsibility of owners to train animals properly as there is no specific breed engaged in violent behaviour when trained and treated properly.
- Other: Required training for a dog that has bit someone. Making sure the bite isn't the humans fault first before taking drastic measures.
- Other: Require specific training for the owner of these dogs rather than blame the dog. RESPONSIBLE owners should not have to suffer because of the handful of irresponsible owners
- Other: REQUIRE OWNERS TO GO THROUGH TRAINING IF AND WHEN A PROBLEM OCCURS. THERES DOGS WITH A MORE SEVERE BITE THAN BULLY BREEDS BELIEVE IT OR NOT.
- Other: Removing biased options in this survey which infer that pit bulls are nuisance animals and dangerous. This is discriminatory against the breed, while they do possess significant strength they are no stronger than other large breeds such as Rottweilers. I would propose and ownership ban of nuisance dog owners who have repeat nuisance animals. Including increased insurance, increased licence fees, required muzzles etc. This survey is nothing short of pandering to the current and frankly ridiculous bias against the breed.
- Other: Remove Pit bulls from this exception if they are not causing more bites as noted above. Why single them out because they have more strength? Or include every single breed of dog over 50lbs.



- Other: REMOVE pit bull from the problem or nuisance dog language. It is discriminatory. ALL breeds of dogs can be nuisance dogs.
- Other: Quite frankly, i feel like this whole thing is [removed]. It has nothing to do with the breed but the poor ownership. You guys are using it as an excuse that it has to do with their strength? Funny because I know multiple people with pit bulls & multiple people with other larger breed dogs and needless to say, all the other dogs have been stronger. I've been in pulling classes with my Husky and pit bulls are not the strongest. You need to stop caring so much about what the media says and learn your facts.
- Other: Put the onus on the owner REGARDLESS of the breed!!!!!!
- Other: Put bulls are not a violent breed. Saying that they are stronger is uneducated. German Shepards have a stronger bite. Golden retrievers are more likely to bite. This is fear mongering.
- Other: Punish the owner, not a specific breed. Pitbull lives matter too!
- Other: Punish the OWNER not the dog. It's never the dogs fault.
- Other: Punish individual dog and owners
- Other: Provide training for dogs labeled a nuisance. Don't discriminate against specific breeds. Lots of dogs are strong, that doesn't speak to their character. Offer training classes if you actually want to address the problem (with all aggressive dogs) instead of punishing owners and pets who haven't done anything.
- Other: Provide opportunities for low cost quality dog behaviour training for dog owners.
- Other: Provide funding to have all dogs trained. I have been attacked more and seen more attacks and barking come from small dogs!
- Other: Proper pet ownership and training courses for OWNERS who dont train their dogs to avoid nuisance behaviours.
- Other: Please stop penalizing the breed when you should be penalizing the untrained owners.
- Other: Please stop discriminating against pitbulls. I reject every change based solely on breed.
- Other: please stop criminalizing one dog breed! I oppose and will vote against any municiple official found supporting criminalization of any dog breed.
- Other: Please remember YOU are supposed to be the informed professional. Never loose site of that. Public opinions are... interesting, but many people responding are the fools that require our municipality to need rules about pets. Stop debasing the intellect of your organization by even talking in a National Enquirer scope about a topic you should be vastly better educated in.
- Other: Please refrain from breed-specific laws. Also distinguish between dogs declared a nuisance and dogs who have attacked people and create muzzle and insurance bylaws accordingly. Doesn't make sense for a dog who barks a lot to require a muzzle.
- Other: Please do not target certain dogs based on out dated info and myths. All dog breeds should be held to the same standard. Absolutely ridiculous
- Other: Please DO NOT single out pit bull types. Any dog can be dangerous and feeding into the pit bull myths will not help anyone. Lumping any dog that sort of looks like a pit bull type breed into a "dangerous animal" category is discriminatory and has been proven to have horrible consequences when trying to enforce. I have been a proud supporter of Calgary's logical approach to dangerous



dog bylaws as they treated all dogs the same. I am not a pit bull owner but I can not support any breed specific legislation! Please remove any breed specific wording from your proposal! A vicious dogs owners should be held accountable for their dogs behavior regardless of the breed.

- Other: Please DO NOT judge a dog by it's breed. I do not support breed specific legislation
- Other: Place greater emphasis on responsible ownership of dogs, including training, understanding dog body language, treating the dog well, knowing what this specific dog can or cannot do, etc.
- Other: Pitbulls were once used as nanny dogs protectors. There's no reason to ban them. Its not the dogs fault when people train them and abuse them to be vicious that's on certain people and inbreeding.
- Other: Pitbulls should not have any others laws then other breeds
- Other: Pitbulls should NOT have any of this on them. Calgary is better than to single out a single breed. This is ridiculous. My dog has been attacked three times at the dog park. NEVER by a pitbull. I agree with none of those.
- Other: Pitbulls should not be the only dog in this list of we're talking about causing serious damage. Any dog breed can cause this if they are not trained. Please do your research and stop attacking the breed.
- Other: Pitbulls should be allowed to be treated like a normal dog. Chihuahuas should be muzzled and have higher fines as they are a nuisance dog
- Other: pitbulls aren't nuisance breeds :) why isn't a chihuahua on there then? they bite
- Other: pitbulls aren't dangerous. maybe you should be looking into terrible owners instead.
- Other: Pitbulls are very friendly dogs. The problem is owners. Don't punish dogs because people don't know how to properly train. Have a more extensive background check to adopt or rescue ALL dogs!
- Other: Pitbulls are not the problem. Higher fines for people with animals! Obedience classes for anyone with a dog not breed specific. This is the most disgusting survey. The dogs are not the problem their owners are the problem!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Other: PITBULLS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM! It's the people who can't be bothered to train or prepare for living with a dog. I've been attacked more times then I can count by small happy dogs and I don't see you wanting to muzzle them! This is complete bs
- Other: PITBULLS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM
- Other: Pitbulls are not the issue. Owners are. Grow up Calgary. Pitbulls are some of the most loving dogs. Your viewpoints on Pitbulls is [removed].
- Other: PITBULLS ARE NOT DANGEROUS, ITS THE OWNERS. THIS IS RIDICULOUS. ITS 2020 GUYS.
- Other: Pitbulls are no more dangerous then any other dog!!! This whole thing is dumb!
- Other: Pitbulls are fine. It's the owners who are at fault most of the time. Perhaps a common sense and aggression test for the people who wish to own pitbulls. Or maybe if someone owns a pair of Oakley sunglasses, they aren't allowed to own a pitbulls since that combination never ends well.
- Other: Pitbulls are DOGS- A breed of dog- that is NOT THE PROBLEM. The owners are the problem!



- Other: Pitbulls are amazing dogs. it is up to how the owner trains them. these measures singles out pitbulls and doesn't address the issue of having the proper owner.
- Other: Pitbulls and other larger dogs should not be discriminated against due to their breeds, its a bad owner not a bad dog.
- Other: PITBULLS AND LARGE DOGS ARE HARDLY EVER THE PROBLEM ITS THE TINY LITTLE DOGS THAT ARE THE PROBLEM MOST OF THE TIME OR BAD OWNERS!!! Do not blame breeds for bad owners
- Other: Pitbulls / pitbull breeds are not the problem. The owners are the problem. Ban bad owners. I don't care if you have to assess someone's criminal history to do it. Bad people make bad dogs. Stop being a breed bully! I've been bit by more small dogs; terriers, chihuahua, poodle, etc than any large breed in my life. Disclaimer, I've never, NEVER, been bit by a large breed or a pitbull.
- Other: Pitbull breeds have absolutely nothing to do with anything of the listed above. The owner itself should be taken into account. There are TONS of aggressive dogs out there that are not of the pitbull breed and can produce a bite just as severe. It is ridiculous to seclude this to one specific breed.
- Other: Pit bulls should require NO SPECIAL LAWS, a dogs nature is in its training not in its breed. Your setting a dangerous precedent with even suggesting this.
- Other: Pit bulls Should not be specifically targeted or punished more harshly than other breeds. Any dog has the potential to bite regardless of size or breed.
- Other: Pit bulls should not be singled out. This is based on poor ownership vs the breed of dog. Do not enhance the fines specifically because of their breed over their behaviour and their owners lack of responsibility
- Other: Pit bulls should not be singled out. They may have a stronger bite but all pit bulls I know have been the most gentle babies. All they want is love and attention.
- Other: Pit Bulls should not be singled out for this bylaw as ALL breeds have the potential to be aggressive and cause harm. This is discrimination to pitbull breeds and this is unreasonable as this breed - if you know them - is a loving, affectionate and family dog. It is ignorant to think that only pit bulls are being pegged for this. Again - ALL breeds of dogs obedience is based on their training not their breed. German Shepards can be aggressive. Heelers can be aggressive. Bull dogs can be aggressive. Ridge backs can be aggressive. Mastiffs can be aggressive. Collies can be aggressive. Chihuahuas can be aggressive. ANY DOG has the potential to be aggressive. There should not be restrictions. IF you feel the need to create safety precautions implement training options not banning and increasing costs or implementing discriminatory actions. This is beyond ignorance towards dogs. Learn and look beyond speculations and stereotypes.
- Other: Pit Bulls should not be singled out at all since many other breeds are responsible for dog bites as well!
- Other: Pit bulls should not be single out at all. Its small minded to believe pitbulls are the strongest and most powerful. Its be proven scientifically that they are, as well as maintaining a more calm demeanor than 90% of other breeds. If you believe that all humans should be treated fairly. You'd believe that all animal breed and dog breeds should as well.



- Other: Pit bulls have the 19th hardest bite in dog species. There's ZERO reason to pick on that breed.
- Other: Pit bulls have been discriminated against as a stronger or worse breed for years. This is ridiculous. Any dog can be bad or bite or be aggressive if its not trained properly. Invest in programs that help owners with abused pets get professional training that is affordable. Discrimination against one breed is so outdated and its very clear that there has been little to no research that has been done on the breed prior to having this legislation brought up.
- Other: Pit bulls do not even Rank in to 5 for dogs with the strongest bites an do not deserve to be fined based on the stigma people have about them as you have even specified they do not report more biting incidents
- Other: Pit bulls aren't the problem. Ignorant people who don't control their dogs are.
- Other: Pit bulls aren't the problem and being bylaw you should already know this. It would be discriminatory to assume such a bylaw.
- Other: Pit bulls aren't the problem. Breed specific bans don't work. In Ontario they banned pit bulls and now there are more attack by other breeds. Its the owners. Whether they are bad owners or just aren't prepare for the needs of the breed. Don't ban the breed!!!
- Other: Pit bulls are some of the friendliest dogs you meet at dog parks etc. Small dog seem to nip more than large dogs but get away with it bc of their size. Not fair to blame and charge more for Pit Bulls when in fact any breed can bit etc it all comes down to the owner and how they raise the dog. Why not say all breeds before adopting or buying from a breeder must have the buyer attend education classes. Because the problem is not the breed but the owners.
- Other: Pit bulls are not vicious. The most vicious dogs I have found are smaller dogs like chihuahuas. Fine bad dog owners, not "bad" breeds.
- Other: Pit bulls are not the problem. They are not problematic and the fact that these questions are even on here is the absolutely unacceptable. Putting a breed or similar looking to a breed just creates fear and is not just to owners or dogs. It is not okay to single out breeds and even worse to single out dogs that look similar. I have a Belgian malinois. She looks similar to a german shepherd. But she is not a German shepherd. The majority of people mistake her for one which is fine normally. But it wouldn't be fine if these questions were being asked about a German shepherd. I'm very disappointed in the city for even posing these questions.
- Other: Pit bulls are not the problem. People are. Plenty of other working dogs can bite harder and are more aggressive if trained poorly. ANY type of pit bull ban would be a terrible idea. The idea that they have more potential to do damage than other dogs is comple nonsense.
- Other: Pit bulls are not the problem. People are. Make it mandatory for people to take an obedience class prior to issuing a dog licence.
- Other: Pit Bulls are not the problem BSL does not work.It has been proven in municipalities over and over.Education is key not restrictions on breeds based on appearance.
- Other: Pit bulls are NOT the problem
- Other: Pit bulls are not the problem



- Other: Pit bulls are not the issue. The issue is the owners of these animals are not training breed specific. Stop putting the blame on pits and bully breeds!!!
- Other: Pit bulls are not the issue, they are loving dogs like any other dog breed. Humans are almost always the issue...
- Other: Pit bull's are not problems, bad owners are. Owners should go through proper screening before being allowed to own this breed or any.
- Other: pit bulls are not dangerous in any sense. Its the owners that create a poor behaved or nuisance dog.
- Other: Pit bulls are not a nuisance. Make sure pet store and shelters investigate the person who buys it. This is discrimination towards animals. The owner is the problem. Not the dog. Make your research and stop accusing dogs.
- Other: Pit bulls are not a nuisance. I have been attacked by more small dogs than big dogs.
- Other: Pit bulls are no more dangerous than other breeds. This is disgusting and I Calgary should be ashamed.
- Other: PIT BULLS ARE GREAT DOGS YOU [removed] [removed]
- Other: Pit bulls are great dogs
- Other: Pit bulls are a lovely breed of dog. The problem is irresponsible owners regardless of the type of breed. Pitbull should not be targeted for breed specific penalties. There are no bad dogs just bad owners.
- Other: Pit bulls and pit bull type dogs are not nuisances
- Other: Pit bull breeds are not the problem! It's all in how you train them, I've only ever had small dogs attack my dog, pit bull breeds should not be singled out.
- Other: Pit bull are not the problem, education and law I of training maybe but not specific to single out a breed. I feel that all dog owners should be responsible to prove obedience training when registering their dog and be charged a penalty if unable too.
- Other: Pet owners should avoid off leash/dog areas if they know their dog is not good with other people or dogs.
- Other: Pet owners of nuisance dogs should be fined and assessed on their pet ownership abilities.
- Other: Pet owners are the issue not breed specific
- Other: People attack people, animals attack animals and animals attack bad people. If an animal attacks look at the home situation before discriminating against dog breeds, its 2020 don't move backwards move forward and be more considerate to situations and investigate better.
- Other: Paid lessons or classes for dogs declared a nuisance
- Other: Owners should pay higher fines for lack of control over their dogs, regardless of breed, whether their dog attacked or even killed another dog or is demonstrating aggressive behaviour in public (off leash areas included). Dogs that fit this description should be muzzled for everyone's safety.
- Other: Owners should have to be trained to be good dog owners it is not always the dogs fault .All breeds of dogs have the potential to be a nuisance especially if they have bad owners



- Other: Owners of dogs who have exhibited problem behavior should have to take obedience classes.
- Other: Owners of dogs who become nuisances should have to go through training. Pit bull DO NOT need to be banned
- Other: Owners need training. All dogs should be leashed except on private property or in the wild.
- Other: Owners need to be held responsible for how they treat and train an animal! It is not the responsibility of the animal or the breed! I've seen small dogs that cause just as much damage but people think they're so cute they don't complain! Anything beyond a first offender should have an animal removed. Not a breed specific ban or extra fee. This is ridiculous!
- Other: Owners make bad dogs! Hold the owners accountable!!!
- Other: Owners are the problem not the dog
- Other: Our dog has only ever been attacked by non-pitbull style dogs (westhighland terrier, Jack Russel terrier & German Shepherd) this whole section is offensive and racist that pitbulls are singled out.
- Other: Only owners capable of training a loving a dog should own one regardless of breed... enough with the singling out certain breeds, it's the owners fault not the dog
- Other: Only Neutered/spayed dogs at dog parks.
- Other: Only dogs who have actually attacked should be put through obedience classes and the owner should be looked at and if issues continue the dog should be adopted out. Not based on breed as it is due to training and not breed.
- Other: Offer owners access to resources for training when they register their dog. It shouldn't be breed specific, we have come across dogs at the off leash park that were not pitbulls but aggressive. Toys may not be permitted at off leash? Many dogs may be toy aggressive, not a specific breed. Also offering a preferred trainer (city partners with organization) as I've heard PetSmart is not as good of a training facility as (Kayenna).
- Other: Offer dog training services at a reduced fee and penalize the OWNER NOT THE DOG. Owners are the problem not dogs.
- Other: Off leash parks should be banned until everyone trains their dog to be polite with other dogs, otherwise there sre way too many unnecessary incidents in those parks
- Other: Obedience training should be required for ALL dog owners within 2 years of obtaining the dog.
- Other: Obedience training required for dogs declared a nuisance after several offenses.
- Other: Obedience training required for ALL DOGS. All dogs can have problems, but the owners should be required to be trained in responsible dog ownership.
- Other: Obedience training required for all dogs in the city. Small dogs can be highly aggressive and provoke other dogs or trigger a prey drive in other dogs when the panic and run. I am the most afraid of dogs who have inattentive owners. Dogs under 20 lbs may not be suitable for off leash parks.
- Other: Obedience training only mandated if the dog has a previous history of nuisance of violence.



- Other: Obedience training for dog bites. THOUGH all dog bite cases should be reviewed for 'at fault' (dog vs. human, ex. Owner said please don't touch and stranger did it anyway, not knowing dog was defensive/in pain/scared/etc.).
- Other: Obedience training for all dogs, not just Pitbulls
- Other: Obedience training for ALL dogs in the city. Small dogs are not a suitable fit for off leash dog parks. I am most concerned of any dog with an inattentive owner. Breed is not the issue, owners are.
- Other: Obedience training for aggressive dog, including little ankle biters (ie..Chihuahua)
- Other: NOTHING. THIS IS A [removed] RESPONSE TO NOTHING. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING WRONG WITH THESE DOGS. IT SHOULD BE ANY DOG THAT BITES NOT BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION. IF YOU WANT TO MENTION THESE DOGS, THEN ALL DOG BREEDS SHOULD BE MENTIONED. This bylaw is BS and you all need to really give your head a shake to think that only this dog breed is a problem! You obviously didn't talk to any experts. How about the dog that used to be a lion killer (not a pitbull btw) The boxer looks like one, are they exempt because they aren't the list? Oh how about the fact that this phase didn't actually consult anyone and it's biased? Did you know that a Shepard actually is stronger?
- Other: Nothing. Mind your business
- Other: NOTHING. I am a pit bull owner and my dog is a teddy bear and big part of my household! He is loving and caring. Don't not single out my dogs breed it makes no sense!!!
- Other: Nothing. All dogs should be allowed to be dogs
- Other: nothing, I've been attacked by small dogs over large breed. This is blatant hatred towards pit bulls.
- Other: Nothing, it's not a breed specific thing, bites happen!
- Other: NOTHING! Leave BSL out of this! Stop meddling in people's families. The only nuisance problem I see is the make work projects city counsel is coming up with! What's next?! Shepards or reserve rescue dogs? Where does it stop?!? This is SICKENING.
- Other: Nothing should EVER be breed specific. None of the above suggestions are acceptable. Owners of animals who bite (including little dogs!!!!) should have to go through training on how to understand dogs behaviour - nothing should come down on the animal.
- Other: nothing have breed specific laws is discrimination!!! There is no such thing as a bad dog just bad owners!
- Other: Nothing for breed specific legislation. Pitbulls are not the problem.
- Other: Nothing extra for pit bulls because their ability to cause greater damage is a perpetuated myth. Shame on you.
- Other: Nothing done to any pit bull breeds or dogs of similar stature, discrimination against one breed should not be allowed
- Other: Nothing , are you going to create a bylaw for when parents kids misbehave ? Start fining the parents and sending the children to obedience training
- Other: NOTHING !! People need to give it up with the pit bulls being the only problem.
- Other: NOTHING



- Other: Not fair to target specific breeds.
- Other: Not all Pitbulls are problem dogs. Stop being biased assholes.
- Other: Not all people should be allowed to have dogs and stricter adoption criteria should be put in place.
- Other: Not a ban on pitbulls or breeds associated at all ! If you look they score the highest on temperament and were bred to be many dogs and to protect your children ! Not once has my dog ever lashed out ! But has been bitten by chihuahuas, beagles , cocker spaniels . Time after time sometimes drawing blood ! But because my pit bull is hefty he doesn't feel pain ? And if he were to ever strike back in self defence he would be put down ! Does that seem right ??? Look at the stats !! Its not a bad dog its a bad owner ! And you are effectively killing thousands of innocent dogs and family members !
- Other: None. This is assuming a breed is vicious because of media. Take a look before you ban these animals, they are the kindest.
- Other: None. These are foolish suggestions, several unfairly affect urban or low income Calgarians, and BSL IS WRONG!!!! STOP SUGGESTING IT
- Other: None. Pit bull are not the problem.
- Other: None. No breed specific legislation should be issued in Calgary. It forces people to make assumptions about dogs and owners.
- Other: None. It's not the dog it's the owner, some Pitbull's I have interacted with are wonderful and sweet
- Other: None. I work in the vet industry. If your reasoning is that a pit bull type dog can bare harder you're actually severely uneducated. If you look into dog breeds and what the use of the breeds are you can find an abundant amount of breeds with greater bite force than any pit bull type dog. These dogs were not bred for their bite power.
- Other: None. Having a breed specific bylaw is extremely outdated.
- Other: NONE. do not discriminate against pit bulls. They are some of the best behaved dogs.
- Other: None, this is absolute ludicrous.
- Other: None, they're all ridiculous
- Other: None, stop stereotyping pit bulls as aggressive breeds
- Other: None, penalizing the dog or its owners is only going to lead to more bad behavior
- Other: None, completely unfair
- Other: NONE!!! This is absurd
- Other: None! This is very discriminatory.
- Other: None! This is complete and utter [removed]. Golden retrievers are more prone to biting humans. Any dog can be dangerous! And as far as I'm concerned, German Shepards have a stronger jaw than a pitbull you should all be ashamed of yourselves! My staffy is way more loyal and friendly than any other dog I've ever met.
- Other: NONE! Pitbulls should not be stereotyped. Look up the real definition of what a pitbull is! They are nanny dogs; NOT ATTACKING dogs!!! The dog isn't the issue it's terrible owners!! Quit punishing the breed and start ticketing the [removed] owners!! Lots of us out here with outstanding,



well behaved pitbulls that thrive on using dog parks. Making our breed be muzzled while attending is dangerous for them in the event another dog were to attack them. They have no chance at a defence wearing a muzzle !!!!!

- Other: None! Breed specific Laws are ridiculous Chihuahuas bite more than pitbulls! Pitbull score in the top ten best temperament!
- Other: NONE! A bylaw based on breed is backwards thinking by the city of calgary. There are bad owners not bad breeds. I am extremely disappointed by this question and line of thinking.
- Other: None!
- Other: None [removed]
- Other: None this is stupid just like who ever had this [removed] idea
- Other: None the these options are fair
- Other: none PITBULLS ARE NOT DANGEROUS, NEITHER OTHER DOGS THAT HAVE SIMILARITIES
- Other: None of this... there dogs punish the owners not the dogs
- Other: None of this. Pets are not a "nuisance"..
- Other: None of this!
- Other: None of this should be breed specific , it's discrimination!
- Other: None of these. This is more scare tactics and fear mongering. I have a pittie. My friends have them. They are no more dangerous than a Lab (which I also have). I'm saying this for the ones I'm the back - ITS NOT THE DOG BREED, BUT THE OWNER. No owner should be penalized up front for the sort of companion animal they get. Bad owners will create a bad dog, regardless of breed.
- Other: None of these. Putting aside that it's cruel, it would be incredible difficult to near impossible to enforce. Creating way more work for Government staff and it'll allow people to use and abuse these new rules. Does anyone need to give Karens any more ammunition?
- Other: None of these. Breed specific bylaws are absurd considering you stated yourselves that they are not involved in more bites.
- Other: None of these. All of these options are absurd. I don't agree with any of these. Pit bulls ARE NOT NUISANCES!!!!
- Other: NONE OF THESE. absolutely ridiculous that pitbulls are being accused of being bad animals. Any animal can be vicious!
- Other: None of these.
- Other: None of these, pit bulls should no be singled out as nuisance dogs.
- Other: None of these, it's the owners not the dogs
- Other: None of these!!!
- Other: None of these! These options are absolutely ridiculous. The breed of the dog is not the issue.



- Other: None of these there's zero evidence that pit bulls are worse dogs than any other dogs this is completely stupid and unacceptable. Since when did we become a communist city [removed] [removed]
- Other: None of these suggestions are helpful, as they reproduce notions of violence against a certain breed, reproduce a neoliberal ideologies surrounding pet ownership and dogs, and the ideas are very micro oriented. Suggest things that would incentivize all dog owners to go through training, to have anyone that is apply to adopt a dog to have mandatory training. - ALL dogs and ALL owners should be considered within the policy.
- Other: None of these should be passed. Pit bulls are not the problem. Its the owner, not the breed.
- Other: None of these should be implemented as its not humane to classify a few certain breeds as dangerous and make the dogs and their owners suffer.
- Other: None of these should apply. The "pitbull" breed shouldn't be singled out because of their strength... If a pitbull bites it's because it was provoked. It's like saying that guy with the big muscles should be charged a bigger fine for defending himself. It's ridiculous!!
- Other: None of these should apply. Leave the bylaw as is. There is no bad dogs, just bad owners. Pitbulls are loving & sweet dogs and there should never be a bylaw put against specific breeds. This is wrong.
- Other: None of these seem appropriate. I haven't seen behaviour from Pitbulls or any breed that would necessitate increasing our regulations.
- Other: None of these options. The city doesn't need to medal in everyday life of the citizens that elected them.
- Other: None of these options because "pitbull" means nothing and "pitbull" doesn't determine if a dog is aggressive. Some of the most aggressive dogs I've come across are small dogs (chihuahua for example), size of the dog makes no difference if they aren't trained properly to begin with. The nicest dogs I've been around in my life have been the larger "pitbull" types
- Other: None of these bylaws are solutions. How about training the owners on how to raise a good dog pitbull or any other breed, all breeds can be a nuisance.
- Other: None of these because they're not a threat to anyone, dogs should be aloud to be dogs in whatever park, only time they bite is when defending their property or their owners. These laws are stupid and heartless.
- Other: None of these - any dog can have behaviour problems
- Other: None of these
- Other: None of the following. Weiner dogs are one of the most aggressive breeds out there. Behaviour is based on training. This is a waste of tax payers money.
- Other: None of the above... the breed doesnt define the dogs actions, a dog is taught to be aggressive.
- Other: None of the above. This is breed specific and totally inhumane and unfair
- Other: None of the above. This is baseless, discriminatory, and completely unnecessary.
- Other: None of the above. These issues are not breed specific, but owner specific. Why should good pitbull owners be penalized for terrible owners. There are many breeds who bite, not just pitbulls.



- Other: None of the above. There is no science that suggests those measures are effective. It is outrageous to exert such control over people's choice in pets.
- Other: None of the above. Stay out of our lives.
- Other: None of the above. Quit overreaching, someone's dog is not YOUR responsibility. Quit demonizing pit bulls.
- Other: None of the above. It's up to the owners for proper training, no need for any city intervening, especially singling out pitbulls.
- Other: None of the above. Its not the dogs fault for its behaviour, its the owner. Stop discrimination against pit bulls
- Other: None of the above. Its about the owner. Not the dog.
- Other: None of the above. I think that if a person has a dangerous dog no matter the breed they should have specific measures. I do not agree with it strictly only being pitbulls. Maybe re word it to be for every dog breed and not banning pitbulls
- Other: None of the above. Dog by dog bases. More dangerous dogs include: German shepherds, Tibetan Mastiffs, Huskies, Alaskan Malamutes, and more. These are all bigger, with more strength. Do dog by dog
- Other: None of the above. BSL is unfair and based solely on biased, unfactual information.
- Other: None of the above. Pit bulls have a bad rap and I think the owners should require dog handling lessons.
- Other: None of the above.
- Other: None of the above, this is increasing the stigma that pit bulls are worse than other dogs and I find it extremely upsetting.
- Other: None of the above, the problem is the owners not the dogs
- Other: NONE OF THE ABOVE, Pitbulls are nicer and sweeter then chihuahuas
- Other: NONE OF THE ABOVE, LOVE PITBULLS
- Other: None of the above, breed banning is absurd.
- Other: None of the above! This is not acceptable Tomm in my opinion to label any breed like this!
- Other: None of the above! Targeting certain dogs does more to spread misinformation than it does to fix a nuisance. As well, increasing fines or anything to do With increased money, instantly targets low income individuals.
- Other: NONE OF THE ABOVE! I do not agree with stereotyping all pit bulls as nuisance dogs. Simply not true and unfair
- Other: None of the above! A dog's behavior is solely dependent on its owner.
- Other: None of the above!



- Other: none of the above you racist bulllys
- Other: None of the above this is discrimination for dogs
- Other: None of the above the dog breed has nothing to do with this. It is 100% involved in the owner of the dog not training the pup correctly
- Other: None of the above regarding pit bulls make any sense. A pit bull breed isn't any more dangerous than other breeds. The danger falls on the owner raising the dogs. Any breed can be aggressive. It's WRONG to discriminate against a breed. I do agree that dogs that have a history of biting should not be allowed in off-leash areas. But not breed specific. Any breed that has a history of biting should have high fines imposed and higher fees. But it should be a case by case basis. There are so many peaceful pitbulls who these bylaws would not apply to. Grouping them all together in the same category is wrong and shameful. And I don't even own a pitbull and never have.
- Other: None of the above - this is unfair breed targeting that has worked in NO major city. Statistics show that there is a higher bite frequency in smaller dogs. We need to destigmatize bully breeds.
- Other: None of the above
- Other: NONE ITS NOT THE DOGS ITS THE OWNERS
- Other: None don't punish pitbulls for something they haven't even done yet. Its not fair to ban them from dog parks. Its the owner not the breed
- Other: None breed specific guidelines are unfair to both dogs and owners. If dogs are declared a nuisance owners should have to take a dog safety or training course
- Other: NONE because this is incorrect. Pitbulls do not have a stronger bite than the general dog population. In fact, German Sheppards and Rottweilers are just two examples of dogs with much higher bite strength (measured in psi). Avoid ANY breed specific legislation and make legislation specific to behaviours of a individual dog basis. PLEASE don't reintroduce harmful BSL and stereotypes for an umbrella term of pit bull. You shouldn't pay more insurance, be legislated more, etc because your animal is a Pitbull (incorrectly labelled majority of the time). Any dog from any Breed should have restrictions placed on them if they have been deemed a risk or danger.
- Other: None - these options are unfair to the animals and doesn't account for the dogs actual behaviour. It is stereotypical of particular breads.
- Other: none



- Other: None
- Other: None
- Other: none
- Other: Non of these are required against a pitbull!! It should be looked at how the dog owner is treating the dog and if they specifically are fit for being s dog owner!!
- Other: Non of the above. Unfair. If you make any of these laws you must do for all dogs not specific breeds as any dog can harm Anyone or another dog
- Other: Non of the above. Pitbull breeds aren't as viscous as other breeds. Should be aloud to discriminate against breed
- Other: Non of the above
- Other: Non at all no no breed specific legislation!!!
- Other: Noise complaints and being at large are not on the same level as biting and enforcing laws such as muzzles or banning from places for noise complaints are ridiculous. Punish aggression, bites, dog fights etc in ALL breeds that have done this, there are lots of reasons especially after the pandemic that dogs will be struggling with their owners going back to work that should not be phrased the same as biting and damage. Breed specific laws are not the answer
- Other: No. Stop blaming the breed. Blame the owner
- Other: No unnecessary restrictions on dogs based solely on breeds.
- Other: No person or animal should be discriminated against based on breed, race or other inherent trait. Each individual should be judged on a case by case basis.
- Other: No other measures. Stop stigmatizing and punishing one breed because of the stereotypes and misinformation that you have filled your head with.
- Other: No new laws are necessary
- Other: No need for any of this
- Other: No law. Completely screwed up! ALL DAYS CAN BE AGGRESSIVE.
- Other: No dog should be segregated or penalized for its breed. Owners are and must be responsible for their dogs. It is just in fair to single out a breed or type breed.
- Other: No dog discrimination, either all breeds or none
- Other: No dog breed should be singled out
- Other: No discrimination towards a certain breed.
- Other: No changes. Any changes should be applicable to any dog that bites a person. Not just breed specific.
- Other: No changes, leave as is.
- Other: No change. Treat pit bulls equally.
- Other: No BSL shepards have just as strong a bite force the breed is not the problem the owner is.
- Other: No BSL at all.
- Other: No bsl
- Other: No BSL



- Other: No breed specific regulations whatsoever! I coordinate a dog shelter specializing in pit bulls but we take in all dogs. It is an issue with owners not the dogs, do not punish these amazing animals.
- Other: No breed specific regulation. The stats do not support the idea that bully breed bite more than other breeds.
- Other: no breed specific legislation.
- Other: NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION, this is absurd.
- Other: No breed specific legislation, problem dogs need to be assessed and an appropriate plan for owner and dog including follow up. Could be training, band from vertian public areas, fines for ignoring citations.
- Other: NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION! It's RACIST!!!!
- Other: NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION!
- Other: No breed specific legislation- no evidence to support breed specific legislation prevents any amount of bites/ incidences- forcing citizens to either potentially euthanize healthy animals, move elsewhere or abandon animals
- Other: NO breed specific legislation as it is not based on any facts or science. Require tests for the competence of the dogs owners when getting a license. Like are they capable and willing to properly train their dogs.
- Other: NO BREED SPECIFIC LAWS
- Other: No breed specific laws
- Other: no breed should be treated differently. looking into multiple sources pitbulls are less likely than many other breeds to injure people and other pets.
- Other: No breed should be singled out. In any circumstance! Complaints and incidents should be dealt with on a case by case basis. And handled accordingly based on evidence and history of animal and owner. The majority of large breed owners are verg responsible. Dont let the actions of the few dictate the freedom and future of the majority.
- Other: No breed should be singled out due to HUMAN negligence!! In most cases it's not the pet that need the training it the owner!!!
- Other: No breed shaming against pitbulls or breed that even look like them. It's wrong.
- Other: No bread specific descriminon its nonsense. Pitbulls are amazing kind and loving dogs.
- Other: No band on Pitbulls!! Humans are the problem not pitfalls
- Other: No breed specific laws need to be placed , that is unfair to all owners that take care of their pets , we are one of the only places that doesnt have it yet and pitbulls thrive in this city because of not having said law in effect , you cant put all of one breed into a category wjen chihuahuas are more aggressive than a big baby of a pitbull
- Other: New measures to deal with nuisance dogs are not necessary. Additionally, singling out pit bull type dogs will do absolutely nothing to help and will only place additional burdens on law abiding citizens.
- Other: My large Labrador gets attacked by French bulldogs and chihuahuas, it pitbulls. Do something about the actual problem breeds, pitbulls aren't the problem.



- Other: My "pitbull" was attacked by other dogs at a City dog park. To say that pitbulls are the issue shows a lack of education and research. I've been bitten, attacked, charged and made bleed only by small breeds (Chihuahuas, Pomeranian, Corgis.)
- Other: Muzzling anyone who supports a bylaw like this
- Other: More training for the owners. All of these suggest it's the dogs fault. It is NEVER the dogs fault....it is always the ignorant owner.
- Other: More training available/background checks on people with owning "pitbulls"
- Other: More human regulation on who's allowed to own all kinds of animals. All dogs are good dogs and it's not the dogs that need to be trained, it's the humans. When a dog acts out its because the owner is unfit. Create a system that provides dogs with better homes, not a system that singles out and discriminates against one of the most loving breeds in the dog kingdom. Thank you.
- Other: Mind your own [removed] business
- Other: Mind your own business and stay out of people lives. You are acting like fascists
- Other: mind your business?
- Other: Maybe stop signalling out a specific breed and do better Calgary! Its not the breed or the dog its bad owners. Totally discussing that this is even a question! Yeah
- Other: Maybe don't discriminate just because of pitbull has a strong jaw there are plenty of dogs that can do damage more than that a responsible pet owner would know to carry a bite stick. Why penalize an owner with higher insurance etc just because of the breed they have maybe higher fines and penalties for any dog owner that allows their dog to become a nuisance why penalize somebody for the breed of dog that they have how about we penalize the owners that allow their dog to become nuisances
- Other: Mandatory training for owners of nuisance dogs.
- Other: Mandatory training for all dog owners. Its not a dogs fault their owner is an idiot.
- Other: Make sure the owners are good, the dogs are shaped by their owners. Maybe a background check or vetting procedure to license a pitbull.
- Other: Make dog owners accountable. There is no such thing as dangerous dog types. There is such thing as bad dog owners.
- Other: LOVE ALL BREEDS OF DOGS. DONT HATE ON PITBULLS!
- Other: Look at the owners before looking at the dog to be a nuisance. Like child abuse, dogs that are not trained properly, or abused can cause behaviour issues.
- Other: Little [removed] chahuahuas shouldn't be allowed anywhere. Pit bulls are not your problem. You guys disgust me
- Other: Little dogs bite too! Stop focusing on pitbulls. I don't know why everybody focuses on pitbulls it's because they look mean okay what about Dobermans or German Shepherds or Rottweilers. Stop focussing on pitbulls. My pitbull is the sweetest thing in the world and would never ever hurt anything
- Other: Little dogs are far more sggresive than pit bulls I do not support this at all. I do not have a pit bull
- Other: Licence to own a dog, if the individuals animal attacks, revoke their license since they're not fit to raise a dog



- Other: Let the dogs be dogs and leave them alone.
- Other: Legislation based on dog breed is unacceptable. Better public knowledge about dog safety and how to properly approach animals should be a top priority.
- Other: Leave things the way they are and stop making pitbulls or breeds mixed with pitbulls look like horrid wild animals!
- Other: Leave these dogs alone. You're perpetuating a terrible stereotype and it is absolutely disgusting to see this from the city. Shame on you.
- Other: Leave the Pitbull breeds alone! They are kind and gentle and any dog has the ability to be a danger to others or their pets. There shouldn't be laws against certain breeds. A badly trained dog is a badly behaved dog no matter the breed.
- Other: Leave the pitbulls alone. I worked for years in the Vet industry and never had an issue with these dogs. This is not a breed problem.
- Other: Leave the pitbulls alone and shame on you for targeting them. Responsible pet owners raise their dogs to reflect themselves. You stated that there are not more bites within the pitbull breeds, so why? [removed] So is targeting pitbulls in this situation. Shame on you and shame on this city. I wish I could be proud to live here.
- Other: Leave the pitbull, German shepherd and other "highly aggressive" dogs alone. It is how you train a dog. It's kind of how you train a kid. If a kid is being mean should we take the child away from its family and put the child down? No. So why are we doing that to dogs. I'm sorry but dogs are people's children. Let the owners of "aggressive" dog breeds ALONE! ffs
- Other: Leave the pit bulls alone.
- Other: Leave the pit bulls alone it is the owner not the breed.
- Other: Leave the dogs alone, no dog no matter the breed is not inherently bad or aggressive its poor ownership that results in a dog having poor behaviours fine the people not the dog.
- Other: Leave the [removed] bully breeds alone. It's not the dog, it's the owner.
- Other: LEAVE THE BREEDS ALONE! I've been horrifically attacked by chihuahuas and golden retrievers. I have never been hurt or even worried being around any pit bull breed. It is completely absurd to put laws toward certain dogs because the media has demonized them. Pit bulls were originally bred as NANNY DOGS because of their nature towards children.
- Other: LEAVE PITBULLS ALONE. You even say here that pitbulls are not involved in more bite incidents.... then WHY are you being specific about their breed? This didn't go well in Ontario, and this will not go well here! Enforce people having to train their dogs properly, don't punish dogs for their situation! This is awful.
- Other: Leave pitbulls alone, they used to be nanny dogs that would watch children. They're the sweetest breed ever, chihuahuas are the biting yappy unbehaved dogs you need to worry about.
- Other: Leave pitbulls alone, not the breeds fault that the owner raised them that way just like any dog
- Other: Leave Pitbulls alone!!! If your going to be racist to a specific breed, then lets include, rotties, german Shepards, bull mastiffs. Cane corso!! This is unreal that the city is even considering bully



laws!!!! I will never mussle my pitbull and if I want to own 2, I will!!!! Stop forcing others fears down the teoats of every day people!!!

- Other: Leave pitbulls alone
- Other: leave pitbull alone and muzzle chichuchua who bite more people than any other dog. I would also suggest you looked the power of the bite of German shepherds, border collie, Rottweiler, Akita and cane Corso just to name a few. Or you could atleast provide people with scientific article proving whatever was said here about strength of pitbull bite
- Other: Leave pit bulls alone. It has everything to do with the owner and not the breed.
- Other: Leave pit bulls alone. Its horrible people that make bad dogs. Invest into education and training for people to learn how to own dogs.
- Other: Leave pit bulls alone!
- Other: Leave pit bulls alone ! There is no science to back up banning pit bull breeds in any way shape or form!
- Other: Leave my dog alone. You idiots couldn't organize a circle [removed] in a round house. The city of Calgary is useless when it comes to just about everything (except for blowing tax payer money). My chihuahua would be more likely to bite you than my bully breed mutt. Don't punish a breed because some owners are terrible people.
- Other: Leave bylaws as is.
- Other: Leave breed specific legislation out. All breeds are capable of hurting people and other animals. When it happens, work with the owner to determine whether obedience training would resolve the situation if possible or fine the owner for not training their dog in certain circumstances.
- Other: Law unneeded. Labs attack more people then pits
- Other: just because they are animals does not mean you can't be racist. This is wrong. I have never been bitten or attacked by a big dog let alone a pit bull. Stop the stereotype.
- Other: Judge the individual, not the breed. Also, fault the owner, not the animal. Fines should be incremental with the option to relinquish the animal to a no-kill shelter at no cost.
- Other: It's very subjective, and pit bulls aren't more dangerous. I have one
- Other: It's the owners fault not the breed. Stop being prejudice. Stop entertaining stupid people to keep them quiet
- Other: It's the owner. Never the dog.
- Other: It's the owner, not the dog. Stop this harassment of pit bulls and their owners. Treat all animals on a case by case.
- Other: its the owner not the dog
- Other: It's ridiculous you single out pit bulls and then try to "note" that joy all pitbulls are dangerous. I've known a few dogs to bite people, none of which was a pit bull. It was a lab, a retriever, a chihuahua, a healer, none were my dogs. This question is infuriating.
- Other: It's not the dog, it's the owner. Owners should need to train their dogs and themselves.
- Other: ITS NOT THE BREED LEAVE PIT BULLS ALONE
- Other: It's definitely NOT THE BREEED! ITS UP TO THE OWNERS. PITBULLS ARE AMAZING DOGS



- Other: Its [removed] to target certain dog breeds when the owners are the problem. Enough of this [removed]
- Other: Its actually not true that pit bulls and pit bull type dogs have a stronger bite compared to other dogs, for example German Shepards and Rottweilers actually have a bite pressure higher than a pit bulls. These questions aren't accurate because of false information within them, and I will not support breed specific legislation since it usually results in more of the targeted breed being put down than necessary.
- Other: It's very disappointing to see this breed being bullied with these questions. Enforce training and classes rather than taking someone's beloved animal away. I do NOT support any of these options.
- Other: Its unfair to target pitbulls.
- Other: It's not the breed it's the [removed] owners, this is dog racist as little dogs bite people way more
- Other: It's the owner... not the breed that makes a dog aggressive
- Other: It's phenomenal that the City is considering BSL based on all the research and professional opinion set against it. In Ontario where BSL exists the professional communities (ie the Ontario Vet Assoc) refuses to support such crude Bylaw. I think ANY dog that bites should be punished along with significant consequences for the owners of said dog - regardless of its breed and certainly not because of it. As the owner of a very friendly Staffordshire Bill Terrier this breaks my heart and makes me sick that the City is segregating this breed as dangerous while even pointing out itself that they are not responsible for more bites than any other breed.
- Other: It's not the [removed] dog it's the owner
- Other: it's not the dog it's the owner. they don't hurt anyone unless the owner trains them this way.
- Other: It's not the breed of the dog that is the problem it's the owners. This is very dangerous literature which can cause unwarranted backlash on the breed
- Other: It's not the animal or breed it's the owner. I believe if you own a pit bull or any other dog like that you shouldn't have to be fined for the dog because other people are scared of it or limiting the amount of pit bulls someone can have in a house. That's being racist to this dogs breed... why don't you open up and look at actual angry mean dogs like a Dalmatian. STOP LABELING PITBULLS.
- Other: It's not just Pitties, Don't discriminate against the breed. All Mandatory for training doesn't matter what kind of dog. The smaller dogs are the cause of all your issues. Figure that out first.
- Other: It's not a dog problem, it's an owner problem. Irresponsible owners need to be punished, not the animals. I have many friends with the breeds listed, and none of them are even remotely a problem. Small dogs are more inclined to be aggressive than big dogs.
- Other: It's disgraceful pit bulls are still treated this way by Calgary city council
- Other: It should not be dog breed specific. If whatever breed your dog is, and its aggressive. They shouldn't be at the dog park. That includes Huskies, labs, little dogs, etc.
- Other: It is the pet owners responsibility to participate in training classes. They are many qualify trainers in this city.



- Other: It is outrageous that you would even consider half of the garbage in here. Pit bulls are amazing dogs and should not be discriminated against because of their potential for a more severe bite. That's insane. That's like if your dad murdered someone, and now you go to jail because you have more potential to murder. Give your head a shake people, the issue is the owners not training their dogs properly, education on how a pit bull needs to be trained is the only way to help the situation. This could be a mandatory pamphlet at the time of purchase. Steeper cones will do nothing to deter this activity.
- Other: It is outrageous that you are considering any of the above for ONLY pit bull types when you already clearly state that they are no more of a threat than any other dog! You should be ashamed of yourselves.
- Other: It is not the breed that is the problem it is the owner
- Other: It is not a breed specific issue. Smaller breed dogs are easily as aggressive or a nuisance as any large breed, pitbulls are NOT the problem. Irresponsible dog owners are the problem. We need fines or penalties for the owners of ANY breed that is causing issues. The city should be ashamed to state pitbull or bully breeds specifically in this survey. Your adding to the stigma instead of addressing the bigger problem as a whole.
- Other: It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite, what a load of made up rubbish, so pit bull aren't the problem but you are going to make up a reason to make them the problem. I am a dog owner and have met a lot of pit bulls both on the street and in the dog park, they are wonderful dogs. If a dog is vicious the owner needs the muzzle not the dog and it has nothing to do with the breed. I am not liking you questions so refuse to answer any other them. Wake up and look at the real issues in the city, stop copying out of date bylaws from other provinces, dogs are the least of your problem.
- Other: It is disgusting that the city of calgary is considering breed specific rules. What about all the little dogs that charge fences and harass people walking. Go after them!
- Other: It is difficult to respond to this without knowing exactly what is meant by "nuisance". For example, is a dog who regularly barks when someone comes to the door considered to be a nuisance if a neighbour complains? Please be more specific if you want to get a meaningful response.
- Other: It is absurd to say these rules only apply to pit bull breeds. Majority of pit bulls are the friendliest dogs I have ever met. Rather than being breed specific, it should be behaviour specific. I have seen many more aggressive chihuahuas than pit bulls, yet they're not regulated. At the end of the day, it's the owner who needs to be responsible, not the breed of dog that needs to be regulated.
- Other: It is absolutely wrong and unfair to single out any breed of dog.
- Other: It is absolutely unfair! You cannot single out Pit bulls!!
- Other: It is absolutely disgusting that you are specifically naming Pit bulls. All dogs can bite and attack. Owners are the problem, not the dogs. Can not fully answer as this looks like a witch hunt against pit bulls sorry.



- Other: It is absolutely appalling that you are even considering breed specific laws and discrimination. The other issue I have with all of these fines is my dog was bit a year or so ago and the city collected fines to keep for themselves but none of that is allotted to the victim to cover vet bills.
- Other: It is absolutely appalling that the city believes a dog breed can be so standardized and generalized to be violent; the real issue with violent dogs is the humans that own them. No dog is born violent, it is a lack of care and proper training which makes them violent or a nuisance as you call it. As a veterinary worker, I have seen far more chihuahuas cause injury than any bully breed. Will you ban Irish wolfhounds or Great Danes from being in public, due to the size and sheer power of their jaws? No. I genuinely hope the city gets some actual professionals who have appropriate knowledge on the subject before making these decisions.
- Other: It has nothing to do with the breed just the way its raised. Stop targeting specific breeds.
- Other: Is that a cash grab?! [removed] leave Pit Bulls and bully type dog alone. This isn't [Removed] Nazi Germany!
- Other: Investigation of the owner and why dog is behaving this way.
- Other: Invest in OWNER training before adoption to ensure proper care and training for the dog in the future. Good owners have good dogs... bad owners create vicious dogs. No matter the breed. There are other BIGGER dogs who can cause a lot more harm than pit bulls and using this already stigmatized breed in this example is a very poor and disgusting choice.
- Other: Instead of having any kind of BSL in place you could curb the actual problems by having large fines for backyard breeders and prohibit / regulate online sales of dogs.
- Other: If you are making breed specific legislation this will just amount to more people getting ticketed rather than actual awareness.
- Other: If you are including these "bully breeds" you should also consider the smaller dogs which bit and attack more people then these "bully breeds". People need to be in control of their animals. That being said, how is it fair that if I am walking my dog who is on a leash gets approached by a dog who is off leash and snips and my dog but my dog has a bigger and more powerful jaw then the little one gets penalized because they are a "bully Breed"? All these restrictions and so called by-laws should be in place for ALL BREEDS OF DOGS NOT JUST BULLY BREEDS.
- Other: If you are going to punish 1 specific breed you should be punishing all breeds the same when this behaviour is displayed.
- Other: If the dog is provoked, the person who agitated the dog into a bite should be fined. Ridiculous that the onus is 100% on the dog based on experiences I've had.
- Other: if a dog was to bite or harm a human (any dog not just Pit Bulls) the owner should be fined for not having control of the animal, and have to take mandatory obedience training with the owner and dog, multiple offenders should get higher fines and potential jail time
- Other: If a dog is truly dangerous then there should be laws in place to protect people. By no means should there be any separate laws based on their breed. [removed] Which of course is unacceptable.
- Other: If a dog is deemed a nuisance then the city needs to look at the owner. There is no such thing as a bad dog, only bad dog owners. Pitbulls are not and should not be an exception to that.



- Other: If a dog is dangerous or a nuisance, the owner should have to go through training. No putting the dog down and stop singling out pit bulls. I've seen way more aggressive Chihuahuas than pit bulls.
- Other: I wouldn't consider a dog to be a nuisance if they were barking/noisey? So you can't have a dog that is loud and barks at an offleash park? How about education for people on approaching dogs appropriately and asking to pet rather than kids running up to your dog when you say no and are trying to leave. It's a two way street I don't believe bully breeds should be alienated because they're strong, I've never met an aggressive bully breed
- Other: I wouldn't support the city of calgary for anything regarding BSL.
- Other: I would support none of those. Pit bulls do not have a stronger bite, this is false. German Shepards are actually the most dangerous dog.
- Other: I would support NONE of these things. Owners are the problem, not the breed. It is absolutely wrong to limit pit bulls when you've already acknowledged they are not involved in more bites. Little dogs (chihuahuas) bite ALL the time but no one is banning them.
- Other: I would support NONE of these measures. I have known many Pit Bulls and none have been aggressive . I have been bitten by a Chihuahua and required stiches -- so let's ban them! Or how about German Shepherds ...they are very mean and have ripped people apart.
- Other: I would support none of these measures.
- Other: I would advise that animal bylaw help dog owners when they need it. Example, my neighbors and their kid constantly taunt and harass my dogs, fake bark at them, spray them with water guns, poke them with sticks, throw rocks, even putting hands through my fence. I have advised them to stay away from my animals but they do not care. They will eventually get bit because my dogs are scared and pissed off. Bylaw should be able to fine these people so my dogs don't have to die for their stupidity.
- Other: I will not support the unfairness of this because you have a problem with pitbulls. Any dog can be dangerous it's not about the breed, its about the dumb as [removed] owners who raise them to be viscous. Stop discriminating against pitbulls.
- Other: I will not support any of these. Pit bulls are wonderful and can be aggressive if raised by an aggressive owner. PERIOD.
- Other: I totally disagree with your breed discrimination here. My dog has been chased onto the road (no fence at off leash park??That is ridiculous) by a st. Bernard, a black lab has attacked multiple dogs in the park, a Samoyed type dog has attacked other dogs in the same park. To the point that I will no longer go into that park due to "non pit bull breeds" please reword the question. Any dog bite can be harmful, and there are MULTIPLE breeds that have strong jaws that can do substantial damage
- Other: I think you shouldn't be saying pitbulls it should be ALL breeds of dogs! How dare you just assume only that breed.
- Other: I think this should not be breed specific



- Other: I think the dogs need to be evaluated by a behaviour specialist before being labeled a nuisance dog. Most times the larger dog is defending themselves from more aggressive smaller dogs.
- Other: I think the definition of nuisance needs to be revisited. Just because a dog is loud or a neighbour complains that a dog is barking doesn't mean that the dog is a potential threat. It would be more beneficial for the city to provide free training classes where individuals who require additional help can seek out the resources required to help them train their pets. Often times the animals in our homes are rescues and require additional attention and coaching. There should be no breed specific bylaws.
- Other: I think singling out pitbulls is horrible. This is the owners responsibility. I am a pitbull owner and i cannot imagine how our dog would feel muzzled when she is not aggressive at all. this is a horrible move and so heart breaking
- Other: I think signaling out Pit bulls is horrible. My dog has been attacked twice by labs. The breed has nothing to do with this. It is 100% the owners responsibility and all breeds have the same chance of attacking. All the pitbulls I have come across are the nicest and best trained dogs. As a born and raised Calgarian, I find this very offensive.
- Other: I think setting restrictions on these dogs specifically is cruel. More often than not, a dogs behaviour is a direct result of their owner.
- Other: I think requirement on a specific breed is outrageous. Although a pit bull has a different jaw structure does not mean its damage is going to be more or less severe then any other large dog breed. I think it is asinine to have specific requirements for the pit bull breed. I know because I have an a bit innocent with the city and that dog was NOT a pit bull breed at all.
- Other: I think it's reprehensible to treat breeds of dogs differently. Also I don't support seizing of dogs that exhibit dangerous behavior as this is subjective. Also I don't support the classification of a "nuisance" dog as this is also extremely subjective.
- Other: I think it's [removed] to push such a ruling on one specific breed of dog. Rottweilers are just as bad and so are Chihuahua
- Other: I think it is irresponsible of the city to single out any breed and it will promote hate between people and pet owners. There is absolutely no reason to single out pit bulls. It is upsetting that this would even be a consideration. Please note that I do not own and never have owned a pit bull but have been in close contact with many. If I'm not an owner and this is how I feel. I am extremely disappointed to see this.
- Other: I think all these options are bad. If a pitbull attacks s9mebody or another dog then maybe a fine or maybe training but just to slap so many restrictions is not fair for good pitbull owners like myself. I can walk offleash. Dmy dog doesnt bark at other dogs or chase bunnys or anything. I dont think i should be penalized fpr being a good owner and maybe we could do some sort of liscencing bepre being able to be a putbull onwer or soemthing.
- Other: I support none of these. Targeting a breed specific dog is ridiculous.
- Other: I support none of the above
- Other: I just want to let you know chihuahuas are just as dangerous as pitbulls.



- Other: I have walked by many pitbull breeds. They are gentle. I have a german shepherd husky cross who has been nearly attacked by chihuahahs, or shi tzus. Yes, its the training, a gentle kind hand. But ive been bitten by small dogs and their ignorant owners who think aw cute but their dog is growling and snarling. If mine did that, oh boy.
- Other: I have a pit bull terrier mix and she is the most gentle fighter who had NEVER exhibited nuisance behavior or even tried to bite. I am completely offended by these choices. Not one talks about finding irresponsible dog owners who don't have proper control of their dogs and who constantly put their dogs off leash in on leash areas. I have seen small dogs showing aggressive behaviors toward my put bull and she doesn't react. This survey is a joke!
- Other: I have 4 dogs and my pitbull is the least likely to bite, he is submissive and gentle, any dog can bite! Pitbulls are NOT the issue.
- Other: I find this notion absolutely disgusting. It has been proven that BSI does NOT work. We have a staffordshire terrier that is the kindest most gentle dog. I have however been attacked and lunged at by many Pomeranian and chihuahuas. They are extremely violent and bad tempered. STOP HATING on pitbulls types and heighten the fines and jail time for backyard breeding, animals abuses and have better screening for people that are adopting or buying ANY animal let alone an animal they intend to abuse. . You should be ashamed of yourselves.
- Other: I find that the discrimination against peoples is absurd. Individuals should educate themselves before jumping to the conclusion that pitbulls are considered dangerous, this is untrue and we must do better than to just point fingers at a certain breed. There are many other breeds that are just as powerful which are Dobermans known to be aggressive towards humans, Huskies known to be aggressive to humans Rottweiler, even the smallest dog for instance Chihuahua they play a big personality by the small little size that they are. We should be fair with all breeds [removed], we must implicate the same law for animals and owners should be responsible of their pets. Owners should train their pets to not be aggressive take them to training classes there's many of them out there, have proper insurance for their pet, have their pet vaccinated and to be a responsible owner by not letting your pet out of sight
- Other: I feel this survey is discriminates against a specific dog breeds, and is a clear violation of the Alberta/Canada bill of rights to private property ownership! Maybe we should have humans who go to the gym on a regular basis wear a muzzle as well.
- Other: I feel that none of the above apply. Stop trying to criminalize innocent animals. Do we get to put muzzles on loud children who are nuisances too then?
- Other: I don't understand why it's just pit bulls or pit bull terriers are only on this huskies are the worst they like to attack other dogs same with Chihuahuas there are biting risk
- Other: I don't think any of these should be done for "nuisance" dogs. I would support some of these measures for dogs that are involved in attacks / bites on other animals or people. That being said I am very strongly opposed to any sort of Breed Specific Legislation. Deal with problem owners, not breeds. The fact that BSL is even being proposed is ridiculous and ignorant. I will be contacting my City Councillor to express my anger that this is even being entertained by the City. Pit Bulls can be



the most loyal, loving, gentle pets a person can own and should not be singled out or punished by some irresponsible owners.

- Other: I don't think any breed should be automatically labeled a nuisance.
- Other: I don't think a breed is a problem! These guidelines should be applied to all dogs! Usually it's not even the animal that's the problem, it's the owner. So they need to be a responsible owner and take the appropriate measures to maintain their own safety, the safety of the dog, and the General Public. To pinpoint one particular breed is absolutely ridiculous and discriminatory. Dogs are just dogs, they're just following our lead.
- Other: I don't believe pitbulls need to be singled out. And I think it's prejudiced of you to do so. I have NEVER had a bad experience with a pit bull, however I've been bitten by a Shetland collie and had issues with a neighbourhood poodle!
- Other: I don't believe in any of these. Not all pit bulls are aggressive. It's the owners.
- Other: I don't believe all "bull" should be lumped together. I have a French bulldog and he is the nicest, calmest dog you would want to meet.
- Other: I don't approve of picking on a specific breed. There are no bad dogs, rather bad owners.
- Other: I don't agree with this at all! I've met more mean Chihuahuas than I have Pitbulls. In fact, I've been bitten by several Chihuahuas, never a Pitbull type dog.
- Other: I don't agree with any of those!!
- Other: I don't agree that categorizing pitbulls as a dangerous dog is appropriate. Please review expert advice on pitbull behavior before categorizing all pitbulls as nuisance dogs. A dog of any breed can produce a severe bite. Pitbulls have been miscategorized by the press as vicious dogs when in fact, if you review the evidence, they are less vicious than your average Labrador. Please do your due diligence before categorizing a specific breed as vicious. This is an unfair bylaw proposal and if you must, I still think some of these rules make sure it is against all breeds...Chihuahuas are involved in more biting incidents than pitbull breeds.
- Other: I don't agree.
- Other: I don't understand why you think this is a Pitbull problem - owners need to be responsible for their pets. Education is key. Maybe more programs to be offered and training... and not having irresponsible people owning dogs.
- Other: I don't think pit bulls should be discriminated against as other breeds can be just as bad and even worse. Why is there no mention of other breeds on this list of choices?
- Other: I don't think a pit bull is a problem and there should be no discussion on specific breeds, the real problem isn't the breed, it's the owner.
- Other: I don't think a dog breed in particular can be considered a nuisance. There are no such things as bad dogs, only bad people who do bad things to animals, as a result of changing their behaviour because of fear or other such responses. I also believe that we cannot categorize a particular breed of dog, much the same way that we do not do this with humans based on the colour of their skin.
- Other: I don't support any pit bull or terrier restrictions AT ALL.
- Other: I don't support any of these. This isn't okay.
- Other: I don't support any



- Other: I don't believe these dogs should have to suffer any rules. It's quite ridiculous actually. Poor animals being victimized by the city of Calgary. You should be ashamed of yourself. If a dog hurts someone the OWNER should be fined for teaching them to be that way.
- Other: I don't believe it is fair to single out specific breeds and strongly disagree with the above statements. (I do not own a pit bull)
- Other: I don't believe in discrimination towards a specific breed. So I don't feel any of these should be applicable to only pitbull. Going to make a bylaw do it for all or none.
- Other: I don't agree with any of this.
- Other: I don't agree with the above. Its very subjective and leaves a lot of room for interpretation and possible misinterpretation.
- Other: I do not support this you are painting all dogs with one brush based off of hypothetical situations. You are creating a biased opinion of all of this breed which are not the problem. Its going to start with pit bulls and then move on to other pit bull type animals. Cash grab straight up your not trying to protect people. If you were trying to protect people you would look at the dogs that are actually biting people and regulate them on a case by case basis. I do not support this at all and I know it will lead to other breeds that do not deserve this label as well being labelled as such. Throw this out and quit wasting our time and tax dollars. There are more pressing concerns within this city that this time money and effort could be spent on.
- Other: I DO NOT support the use of the term 'pit bull' type breed. I've seen more vicious behavior from retrievers, husky's and terriers then from any other breeds. To single out one breed is irresponsible and paints a negative picture of a large section of dogs. .
- Other: I do not support labelling a specific breed. Any dog can be a nuisance. It should be on the owner and if there is something warranted, then take the steps to ensure the animal is a controlled environment with the proper training and guidance.
- Other: I do not support BSL
- Other: I do not support breed-specific legislation.
- Other: I do not support breed specific legislation. Have bylaws that apply to all breeds, do not discriminate,
- Other: I do not support breed specific legislation in Calgary.
- Other: I do not support breed specific legislation
- Other: I do not support breed specific enforcement. If a specific dog has displayed behavior which is deemed dangerous, this would warrant different treatment for the specific dog not entire breed.
- Other: I do not support bread specific bylaws. They owners are the problem not the breed.
- Other: I do not support any proposals that are targeted at breed specific dogs as they have been proven not to work in other cities. It is the owners that are the problem, not the dogs.
- Other: I do not support any of these. This is an awful generalization of a group of dogs who do not deserve it.
- Other: I do not support any of these. I own a loving pitbull and I have seen way more varying dog breeds who aggressive and should not be allowed anywhere.



- Other: I do not support ANY of these. Smaller dogs bite more and cause more of a nuisance anywhere you go/live.
- Other: I do not support any of these.
- Other: I do not support any of these with pitbulls singled out
- Other: I DO NOT SUPPORT any of these potential laws. Its not the pit bulls fault it's the owners. There are lots of people in the city with THE MOST WELL BEHAVED PITBULLS YOU'LL MEET
- Other: I do not support any of these options.
- Other: I do not support any of these measures. By generalizing the behaviors of dogs that look a certain way, innocent dogs and pet owners suffer. BSL can lead to the euthanasia of innocent dogs that fit a certain "look," and to responsible pet owners being forced to move or give up dogs that have never bitten or threatened to bite. Furthermore, dogs that are considered to be of a "dangerous breed" may already be serving the community in positions such as police work, military operations, rescue purposes, and as service animals. Contrary to being a liability, these animals are assets to society; however they, too, suffer due to misinformation and breed-based stereotypes. Breed bans do not address the social issue of irresponsible pet ownership. Dogs are more likely to become aggressive when they are unsupervised, unneutered, and not socially conditioned to live closely with people or other dogs. Banning a specific breed can give a community a false sense of security, and deemphasize to owners of other breeds the importance of appropriate socialization and training, which is a critical part of responsible pet ownership. In enacting breed-specific legislation, cities and states will spend money trying to enforce ineffective bans and restrictions rather than implementing proven solutions, such as licensing and leash laws, and responding proactively to owners of any dog that poses a risk to the community.
- Other: I do not support any of these measures. Breed Specific Legislation is wrong.
- Other: I do not support any of these measures in particular breed specific legislation that discriminates against pit bulls
- Other: I do not support any of these measures for pitbull breeds. All dogs are individuals and should be treated as such. This does not promote inclusivity at all.
- Other: I DO NOT SUPPORT ANY OF THESE MEASURES AT ALL. Because it is not the fault of the pitbull, it is actually the fault of the owner that raises the pitbull. Because I have a pitbull and my pitbull has never done anything wrong to anyone because I raised my baby with love. So instead of blaming the dog, blame the owner!
- Other: I do not support any of these changes. A certain breed should not determine the severity of there aggression . Any dog can hurt another or be dangerous if not trained properly . This has to be the most insane thing ever. I disagree with all the above and will be ensuring I do everything in my power that this By-law will not pass
- Other: I do not support any of these bylaws. Especially the ones that segregate pitbulls from the rest of dogs
- Other: I do not support any of these
- Other: I do not support any kind of breed specific legislation
- Other: I do not support any breed specific measures



- Other: I do not support any breed specific legislation. Period. It doesn't work, most regions that have previously implemented BSL are now repealing it.
- Other: I do not support any breed specific legislation
- Other: I do not support any breed specific laws, rather treat each incident as needed. There are no bad dogs! There are bad owners.
- Other: I do not support any breed specific bylaws. I think this is extremely discriminatory. My dog has been attacked twice by off leash dogs and neither were pit bulls. I think pit bulls have been unfairly targeted. Owners should be responsible for their dogs. Aggression is not breed specific. Very disappointed with these targeted questions.
- Other: I DO NOT support a ban on Pitbulls!! They may have a strong jaw but they are less likely to bite than a chihuahua or other small dog breeds. Owners with dogs that have bitten a human or other dog should be held accountable and the dog should undergo training. DO NOT ban a breed based on human error!! Its not the dogs fault and is not fair to ban a specific breed!!
- Other: I do not see the issue in the current bylaws
- Other: I do not believe that any sort of breed should have different bylaws, as it is how the owner raises the animal.
- Other: I do not believe in restricting certain breeds ie. Pit Bulls from being in parks or forcing them to wear muzzles in specific areas. There is no reason to punish the animal when it comes down to how they are trained and how their home life is. It is ALWAYS the responsibility of the owner to care for the animal and if there is any aggression then the fault needs to be blamed strictly on them. I have never met a pit bull that wasn't the sweetest creature ever. Solely because their owners know how to properly take care of them. If there is ever an overly aggressive dog, or it bites someone then we need to sieze the animal and fine the owner as well as prohibit them from being able to own another dog either for a few years or permanently unless they are able to show that they can better care for a dog. It is never the dogs fault period.
- Other: I do not believe any regulations should be placed on any breed specifically.
- Other: I do not approve of any of the disgusting "laws" you are trying to impose. This is racism against a dog breed, shame on you. Give your head a shake City of Calgary, I cannot believe I even have to write this.
- Other: I do not approve of all the above. This is basically being dog racist. mind blowing. I DO NOT APPROVE
- Other: I do not agree with this breed discrimination, ive got a 7 year old blue nose who is the sweetest and most lovable old girl ever. Not every pit bull is an issue, just the owners. So if there is an issue with the dog, you should look at the owners
- Other: I do not agree with the breed specific items listed. It should be just dogs. If ANY dog shows aggressive behaviour it should be first be required to go to obedience training. But this should not be based on breed.
- Other: I do not agree with any of the above.
- Other: I do not agree with any of the "breed specific language" in any of section 3.



- Other: I do not agree that targeting a specific breed or group of breeds of dogs that "look" a certain way (ie "Pit Bulls") is an appropriate way to structure measures to control problem dog behaviours. This to me sounds like a uneducated approach to a problem not well understood. I would rather the City consult experts in this field such as canine behaviour consultants or vetrinarian behaviourists, animal shelter/humane society experts exposed to these situatoins on a regular basis.
- Other: I disagree with those suggestions
- Other: I DISAGREE with the above absurd regulations and am disgusted the sly way trying to slide this in.<https://montrealgazette.com/news/local-news/how-calgary-reduced-dog-attacks-without-banning-pit-bulls> : there are articles from around the country and globe stating otherwise
- Other: I disagree with all of these. Pit bulls are beautiful dogs and should not be picked out of a group to have all these bylaws. Maybe you should have better laws when allowing people to have dogs. ITS NOT THE ANIMAL, ITS THE OWNER RAISING IT.
- Other: I cannot believe you're thinking about putting in a breed specific bylaw, that is absolutely appauling and disgusting. There is no science behind any Pitbull having a stronger bite. Calgary bylaw should be ashamed by even bringing this up. Absolutely disgraceful.
- Other: I cannot believe that you are asking these questions based on the hype over pitbull type dogs. No dog should be discriminated against based on the way they look. I find this entire section offensive!
- Other: I can't believe that we're targeting a breed of dog. In 2020 we've worked hard to push for equality for all people and yet we're still targeting animals based on their breeds? All that should matter is how well an animal behaves, not their breed. I have a bully breed who is the most loving and caring animal. I know multiple bully breeds who are loving and caring and great with other dogs and small children. There is no justification to target an animal because of their breed. Penalize poor training and bad homes that turn any dog into a nuisance. Don't target a breed before the dog has done anything bad. I completely disagree with this.
- Other: I can't believe Im reading this. To me this is exact same as racism and sexism. I am shocked to see that a city I love so much would discriminate a loving family pet based on what they look like. Shame on you City of Calgary.
- Other: I am more scared of a chihuahua taking a chunk out of my knee than a slobbering pit bull. The breed is not the problem the owners are. This is entirely unnecessary. If you wish to muzzle one dog, you damn well better include all breeds under it.
- Other: I am going to fight you every step of the way on this. My dog has never shown to be mean in any way so I will not get insurance due to breed and I will never muzzle him. This is all [removed] and I'm going to rally as many people to protest any of this that I can. Let me finish with a huge [removed] you!!!!
- Other: I am disgusted with the city for the discrimination against pitbulls.
- Other: I am an owner of a pit bull I am very upset with the fact that the city is discriminating against pit bulls . Unless your dogs raised to be an attack dog your bully is highly unlikely to ever show any sign of aggression . You guys should be muzzled ,



- Other: I am against any breed specific bylaws. A dog should only be declared a "nuisance" based on a previous incident!
- Other: I am a ridiculous advocate for animal rights and I believe breed-ism classifications are a dangerous and steep slope.
- Other: I agree with your statements regarding nuisance dogs; however, Pit Bulls should NOT be singled out - a nuisance dog can be any breed!
- Other: <https://globalnews.ca/news/2527882/torontos-pit-bulls-are-almost-gone-so-why-are-there-more-dog-bites-than-ever/>
- Other: How dare you single out specific breeds! There are no problem dogs only problem owners! Obedience training for the owners and permanent bans for people who cannot care for the animals. Side note: I'm a cat person!
- Other: How can you pin things on a breed when it has to do with the dog. Small dogs sometimes are more dangerous..
- Other: How about you stop breed discrimination and start applying your [removed] laws and suggestions to every other breed that attacks people and dogs frequently. This is absurd and you are all disgusting for suggesting these laws. 31 years I have lived here and over my dead body will I muzzle my dog for you inept morons.
- Other: How about you skip BSL. it's a joke and inhumane to single out pit bulls but will allow other aggressive breeds. SHAME ON YOU FOR GOING BACK 20 years. Punish the owners NOT the dog.
- Other: How about you muzzle the [removed] owner who can train a dog instead of having breed specific bylaws. Pitbulls are some of the best dogs, and only have a bad name because of [removed] owners. Any dog has the potential to injure someone severely. Give your head a shake City of Calgary.
- Other: how about you don't single out pit bulls as the breed isn't the issue. the dog owner is the issue. calgary you're absolutely & utterly ridiculous.
- Other: How about we don't single out the breed. It's not the dog it's a bad owner. By picking on specific breeds you further perpetuate the stigma, thus making it very difficult for these dogs to get adopted when they need it.
- Other: How about stop being racist to breeds, if you do this you will loose a lot of Calgarians and you're economy will suffer even more.
- Other: How about educate the owner I love pit bulls and honestly it's not the dog that's mean it's the owner that makes them mean stop trying to make pit bulls have a bad name it's the owner fault not the dogs
- Other: Hold the owners of aggressive dogs accountable rather than punishing the animals. There should be harsher punishment for owners mistreating their dogs or training them to be aggressive, some of them should never be allowed to own an animal.
- Other: HOLD BAD OWNERS ACCOUNTABLE NOT THE BREED!!!!
- Other: Hiw about obedience training for dogs that have shown dangerous behaviour (eg. Bites) and give owners training on how to be a responsible pet owner. It's not always the dogs fault for their



behaviour. Pet owners should share that burden with their pets. I think it's wrong to declare a dog a nuisance for being loud or "being at large" dogs make noise...so do humans. Also unbelievable that pitbulls are singled out as these terrible dogs who attack and act crazy and singling them out .. not allowing them to be at off leash parks? Muzzling them? Make owners know their dog and give them training dont just punish responsible pet owners for other people's ignorance.. this is NOT the way to go about this. Dont punish good dogs and responsible pet owners...cant have more than 1 "pitbull" per household. How does that make any sense .. DONT PUNISH RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERS FOR OTHER PEOPLES IGNORANCE AND DISREGARD FOR THE SAFETY OF OTHERS. Give people the ability to learn responsible pet ownership and guidance and training for pet and pet owner... and if after all fails then stricter measures can be taken place. Every case is different and has different circumstances.. dont put everyone and everything in 1 category.

- Other: Higher fines for the owners involved with raising a DOG (regardless of breed) for becoming a nuisance. Having programs for people that cannot attend to the proper care and needs of their pet.
- Other: Higher fines for any person that intentionally trains their dog to be as opposed nuisance. This is shameful what the city is proposing.
- Other: Higher fines for any dogs involved in bylaw offences. Don't discriminate against breeds of dogs.
- Other: Help dog owners that have REACTIVE dogs find training to help both dog and owner
- Other: Having breed specific guidelines is simple put, a terrible idea and further feeds into the stigma against pit bull breeds. In my life, I've met many pit bulls and NONE of them have been aggressive. Please take this off this survey, there is NO REASON to discriminate against a breed simply because some people THINK they are aggressive. I also think it's disgusting to even suggest that pit bulls should be banned from public places or required to be muzzled.
- Other: Govern the humans owning any breed dog that is aggressive. IT is time to STOP blaming dogs. Blame the humans. DO NOT ENGAGE IN BSL. There is nothing wrong with the breed of pit bull. It is the problem of an owner. Heavy fines for the owners of any dog, and believe me little dogs will bite as much as a large dog! Use some intelligence and sanity!
- Other: Go [removed] your self
- Other: Go after the irresponsible owners not the dogs. If any dog is a aggressive with a history of problems. Seek help through animal rescues and fine the owners for the vet/ rehabilitation costs.
- Other: go after owners instead of breeds. Its the people that are the problem, not the [removed] breed!
- Other: Get the [removed] out of here with your BSL [removed].
- Other: German shepards have more powerful bite force than bully breeds. Should include them in the ban if thats the route you take.
- Other: [Removed] this. None of these breeds are bad! Its [removed] owners grow up.
- Other: [Removed] the [removed] right off and deal with the drug crime
- Other: [Removed] right off
- Other: [Removed] off, it's not the Dog bread that's an issue you stunned [Removed]. It's the [removed] owner thats an issue. Leave the doggos alone, you [removed].



- Other: [Removed] off with this bully breed [removed] any dog can be a nuisance and bite and more commonly than not it's not your bully breeds you condescending senile [removed]
- Other: [Removed] off with the pitbull discrimination. Maybe focus on getting our joke of a [removed] out of office, he's more of a nuisance and threat than any pitbull.
- Other: [Removed] off with the breed specific laws idiots
- Other: [Removed] off and stop stereotyping a breed you close minded [removed]. I've owned pitbulls my entire life and none of them have ever shown aggression a breed should not be punished. They're the same as any other dog. But have the potential to hurt someone in the wrong hands. Just like any other dog. It's because pitbulls attract the wrong type of dog owners to a specific breed because they look cool and abuse and improperly train them.... has nothing to do with the breed. This issue will not be resolved by banning them or enforcing bylaws. All you idiots will be doing will make another powerful breed fall into the wrong hands of low life people who desire a "tough looking dog" you guys should be ashamed of yourself for considering such a stupid bi law. You're the same people who probably stereotype people based on the color of your skin. City of calgary I think you guys need to educate yourselves. Being ignorant towards a breed is pathetic. Disgusted with this petition.
- Other: Free community-based education for dog owners and community members to experience dogs and learn to interact safely.
- Other: For the city to understand that the dog is a reflection of the owner, not the breed. It's absolutely sickening the city of Calgary would even suggest any of the above options. The people making these decisions should be owners of large dogs, as they actually have an understanding that pitbulls are amazing dogs, along with all other dogs. Absolutely disgusted.
- Other: For the city of calgary to not classify vicious dogs as just pitbulls. STOP claiming that the breed is the most dangerous. The owners should be held accountable for the characteristics of ANY dog.
- Other: Focus on the ownership and not the dog. I'd muzzle small yappy dogs before pitbulls, as they typically insight fights and problems with large dogs. Deal with ownership, not the breed specific biased drivel.
- Other: Focus on the owners not the breed of dog
- Other: Focus on real issues in the city. This is an absolute waste of tax payer dollars and I am ashamed to call you my city councilors.
- Other: Firstly, I do not agree with singling out one dog pit bull. There are many breeds that are of more danger and any dog that endangers any animal or human should be dealt with accordingly whether it be fined or extra training at the owners offence. I do not and will continue to disagree with singling out a breed when ever dog can be deemed aggressive. The issue is bad owners as well and they should be dealt with accordingly.
- Other: First of all this applies to each every dog that is not raised in a calm manner pit bull lives matter
- Other: Fines for owners, over breed legislation. It is training, not natural behavior, that causes dog bites



- Other: Fines for owners that aren't able to properly train a dog.
- Other: Fines for delinquent bad dog owners and a rehoming program for innocent animals owned by uneducated humans
- Other: Fine the owner. Make it necessary for them to attend a reactive dog trainer class. If not rehome dog. It isn't the dogs fault but the owners
- Other: Fine the owner for bites or nuisance complaints for Any dog breed
- Other: Fine the city for trying to punish good pitbull owners.
- Other: Find bigger issues in city!!!!
- Other: Fair laws for all dogs. Strongly disagree with stereotyping.
- Other: Everything about this question is pure and utter [removed]. Your bias is showing. You all need to be fired.
- Other: Even reading briefly into research on this matter quickly reveals that pit bulls and similar breeds are not inherently violent, only strong. It is owner upbringing that influences the nature of these dogs. I am firmly opposed to any bylaw put in place that would influence ownership over these dogs, with the exception of them being acquired and trained for the specific purpose of dogfighting. Run of the mill ownership of these dogs should not be any more or less regulated than any other breed.
- Other: enough with going after pit bulls. i've meet more small dogs that bite and draw blood than big dogs and pit bulls.
- Other: Education. Pitbulls aren't the problem. Uneducated are
- Other: Education programs for pet owners, the general public and children about how to respectfully engage with dogs, how to approach dogs, the signs for when a dog is uncomfortable and a bite might be possible. Programs can be tailored and delivered at daycares, in school settings, community centres, commercials (like learning how to use our blue bins), mandatory training for new pet owners, etc. The solution starts with education and respect. Not punishment and breed selection.
- Other: Education is key, BSL must stop, I've been attacked by people and they aren't euthanized or banned from Calgary. What about children who go out and hurt pets in back yards? They aren't banned from the city, taken from their families and destroyed. Point is, education is key, they're so many advocates for responsible ownership, why not do more with rescues and trainers to ensure the best possible outcome for the families that pay city taxes who ARE responsible dog owners?
- Other: Education is best. Its not the dog its the people. I find it absolutely ridiculous as a chihuahua can be just as violent and a nuisance as the reference made about Pit bulls
- Other: Education around pit bulls. Don't punish people for owning them and being responsible.
- Other: Education and awareness for all dogs
- Other: Educate yourself in the breed. Small dogs are a thousand times more aggressive and cause more bites/ attacks then large/medium dogs very year. It's all in the way a dog is trained. Please educate yourself before putting out a survey that is fear driven towards a breed. And yes I do agree that every city owner should put any dog they own in obedience school, not so much for the dog, but for the handler.



- Other: Don't. I support none. Do not make pit bull specific bylaws. Stop.
- Other: Don't target pit bulls. Target owners that don't properly train their dogs.
- Other: Don't single out a specific breed of dog. All animals are capable of attacks
- Other: Don't punish the pitbulls for the lack of training from the owners!!! Lumping pitbulls into a negative idea is not acceptable! The only thing i would see as FAIR would be to to have higher fines! AGAIN don't punish the breed/dog for the owners lack of care & training!!
- Other: Don't punish dogs for [removed] owners. My "bully breeds" is frankly better trained then most why isn't she allowed to interact with other dogs???
- Other: Don't be racist, fascists. BSL does not fix the problem, pitbull breeds are no more dangerous than any other breed. Owners of all dogs should be mandated to do training to prevent problems. So stuff your ban. This will also take all of my business from the city. I've moved over 3600km from this nonsense once.
- Other: Don't be breed specific. It is ridiculous to put in bylaws against one breed of dog when it is well known that before pitbulls it was rotweilers that were the "bad dog type".
- Other: Don't treat nuisance dogs any differently than other breeds. It's not a bad dog, it's a bad owner.
- Other: Don't think anything of these are necessary unless it applies to ALL dog breeds. It's unfair to apply to just one breed and using pit bulls.
- Other: Don't target pit bulls. Target their owners to enforce training.
- Other: Don't single out pitbull as a breed
- Other: Don't implement any of these for bully or nuisance breeds. It's not right to ban these dogs.
- Other: Don't do this.
- Other: Don't discriminate dogs because of the breed. Discriminate the owner for their training
- Other: Don't bully the breed. This is such disgusting behaviour, give your head a shake
- Other: Don't ban the breed ban the owners.
- Other: Don't agree with any of the above statements
- Other: Dogs who are considered dangerous must be muzzled in public and can be seized. There should not be regulation regarding traits that can be considered bulldog like.
- Other: Dogs that are harmful to others should have training why do you guys have pit bull. That is disgusting clearly you people don't own dogs.
- Other: Dogs shouldn't be punished for poor ownership and HUMAN error.
- Other: Dogs should not be treated like this no matter there breed. I have met the sweetest pit bull dogs and the most aggressive small house dogs (dash hounds, chihuahua).
- Other: Dogs should not be punished for their actions. It is entirely the owners responsibility. Do not punish specific breeds based on their strength. If both parties (owner and other) is careful no one will be harmed.
- Other: Dogs should not be penalized because of their breed. The dogs that I come across on the daily, its the small dogs that lunge and try to go after my big dog. But because they're small, people think "oh they won't do anything". This is not true. My big dog loves everyone and wants to make friends with people and when a dog a fraction of his size takes him down and growls and nips him,



THIS is not okay. Not once have I ever had issues with big dogs in my entire life of owning big dogs. Its the uncontrolled small dogs. I think that if there is a call made about someone's dog being vicious, that dog should need training or a muzzle when outside in public spaces. But not because of their breed, only because of previous behavior.

- Other: Dogs should not be labelled based on their breed or appearance, all of the above suggestions are poorly thought out and punish people based on the breed of a dog as you clearly state that is not shown to be any more dangerous than any other dog breed.
- Other: dogs involved in multiple offenses should be required to take obedience classes. Dogs with behavioral issues is reflective of the OWNER not the dog. There are "bad" owners not "bad" dogs.
- Other: Dogs (of ANY breed) with a bite history should be muzzled in public and leashed at all times
- Other: Dogs (not just pit bulls) that bite are required to see a dog behaviour specialist to help prevent the same thing in the future.
- Other: Do not target pitbulls. How can you be so cruel? Mine are my support dogs. How could you seize dogs that are family. My potties have done nothing wrong!
- Other: DO NOT SUPPORT ANY OF THOSE. Such [removed]. Don't call out the pit bulls when they're literally the sweetest dog. It's the OWNER not the dog. How dare you.
- Other: DO NOT SUPPORT ANY OF THESE
- Other: Do not specify pitbulls as nuisance animals! Golden retrievers and inbred purse dogs are statistically much more violent. Pitbulls have only been a problem with bad owners. Bad owners should be addressed, not the innocent dogs!!
- Other: Do not specify any animal breeds! Leave the animals alone. Perhaps consider fines for people, that antagonize any animal. The city is looking regulate problems that just don't exist.
- Other: Do not put bylaws in place against pit bulls. I do not support this. It infuriates me that you specify the pit bull breed here and shame on you.
- Other: Do not put any laws into affect that target breeds
- Other: DO NOT PUNISH THE BREED!!!! PUNISH THE OWNER!!!!
- Other: Do not make this breed specific. Statistically, golden retrievers cause more dog bites than any other breed.
- Other: do not like this question one bit it is the owner not the dog. If a person is a proper owner then they would let people know to stay away from their dog. Sometimes people go up to people and touch their dogs without permission and that ia how most people get bit.
- Other: DO NOT legislate breed specific. What a stupid idea. Do it based on Dog behaviour.
- Other: Do not label a dogs temperament based on their breed
- Other: Do not judge dogs by their breed, that's like judging humans by their skin colour- just stupid.
- Other: Do not introduce breed-specific legislation. You do not have your facts right. "The jaws of a pit bull function the exact same way as all other dogs' jaws, and no dog breed has ever been found to possess a locking mechanism. Pit bulls also don't have more bite pressure than any other dog breed. Dr. Brady Barr of National Geographic found that the domestic canines have an average bite of 320 pounds of force, and as part of his study, he tested the bites of three popular dog breeds: a German shepherd, a Rottweiler and an American pit bull. The Rottweiler had the toughest bite with



328 pounds of force, the German shepherd came in second with 238 pounds of force, and the pit bull bit with 235 pounds of force the lowest of the group."

- Other: Do not include breed specific legislation. The issue is the owner. If you are talking dog strength, you should also include dog breeds larger than terriers. Just because an animal has the potential to be dangerous due to "pitbull's strength" doesn't mean it should be held against them and penalized for it.
- Other: Do not engage in breed-specific targeting in legislation. Crack down on small dogs that are more aggressive.
- Other: Do not define a dog by their appearance
- Other: Do not breed discriminate, any animal threatened would bite hard and it's shameful to think city of Calgary would follow in that mindset. It's on owners to train their animals properly so the fines should be Regarding poor training/handling not because it's a pit bull. Offer supportive training programs for all dogs as little dogs if not trained properly can also be considered a nuisance. Help support owners to have happy well trained animals as opposed to penalizing them for owning a large breed dog. I know numerous people with pit bulls that are the sweetest dogs because they were trained properly and not abused. Steeper fines or create a list of people prohibited from owning with previous histories of abuse towards animals would be beneficial for all.
- Other: do not agree with the singling out of pit bulls. Many other dogs ESPECIALLY little dog bite and are a nuisance. The language here is no appropriate. This should be ALL DOGS regardless of breed.
- Other: Do more research on Pitbulls PLEASE!! And stop breed shaming!!
- Other: Do more research before you decide to point the finger at one specific breed. A "pitbull" isn't even a breed, the fact that you want to target dogs based on looks alone is [removed] outrageous.. When will you realize it's the OWNER not the DOG. Unbelievable.
- Other: Discrimination against certain dog breeds should not be allowed under any circumstances. Owners should be responsible for their dogs behaviour and be the ones punished, ie. no forced muzzles.
- Other: Disagree with all of the above
- Other: Definition of nuisance is too vague or broad to fairly assess penalties. My dog barking a few times in backyard might lead to nuisance label. City is overreaching.
- Other: Deal with each dog on a case by case basis. As it's not just pitbulls that bite or are a nuisance
- Other: Current regulations are sufficient, there is no need to introduce discriminatory breed specific legislation as there is no evidence that it is effective.
- Other: Current regulation is sufficient
- Other: Continued enforcement with current rules.
- Other: Considering pitbull type arent the problem. No regulation that are biased against a specific breed pitbull or any other is completely terrible and absolutely appalling on the city of Calgarys part.
- Other: Classifying breeds this way is awful it's about the owner. Dalmatians can be just as "aggressive" as pitbulls are made out to be. Just more education stop trying to get money from us and for generalizing pitbulls as nuisances. So wrong. Should we do that to humans?



- Other: City sponsored dog training facilities. Breed is not the problem, the owners are.
- Other: City sponsored dog training classes as a preventive measure. Who ever came up with these proposed bylaws needs to educate themselves, its horrendous that you are targeting one specific breed of dog. Responsible dog owners and there pets should not be targeted due to the few that are irresponsible. I in no way whatsoever support the proposed breed specific bylaws outlined.
- Other: Charge the humans responsible for not training their dog, as well as offer more training programs so people know how to properly approach new dogs.
- Other: Can't ban a breed. Get your facts straight. This is non sense and people are un-educated all around. Please ban chihuahuas. Please ban min pins. Sharpeis. Akitas (one of the most dangerous) get out of here. Quebec and montreal tried this once. Look where that led. How about we ban and euthanize horrible people in this damn world and those that don't deserve to be loved and cared for by the breed.
- Other: Can you make the wording say dogs and not a specific breed? My owning of certain mixed breed, who is extremely well trained, shouldn't subject me to higher fines than my neighbours annoying golden retriever who snaps at everything it walks by. Why are you singling out on type of dog when it could be any dog? BSL fixes nothing.
- Other: Calgary is not a city that supports breed specific legislation.
- Other: Bylaw gos and investigates if the dog is being treated right if not has the right to take the dog
- Other: Bylaw could invest in training for nuisance dogs. Pitbull type dogs are not all bad. Many of them have sweet personalities, but appears they can be in the hands of poor owners resulting in negative behavior.
- Other: Bullying a certain breed is a disgrace I have owned pitbull type breeds my whole life and have never had any issues it's not the breed it's the owner.
- Other: Bully breeds include small dogs, like minpin, chihuahua and dash hounds. Big doesn't mean bad!!
- Other: Bully breeds are sweet hearts. This is ridiculous.
- Other: Bully breeds are not the problem.
- Other: BULLY BREED BANS DO NOT WORK, ARE UNSCIENTIFIC, AND ARE FRANKLY EMBARRASSING. The city of Calgary should be ashamed of themselves for perpetuating these lies and poor-science regarding these animals. Absolutely do not support this in any way shape or form.
- Other: BSL is outdated and proven not to work. This is discrimination with no basis in fact.
- Other: BSL is ineffective and targets dogs rather than bad owners. It is shameful that this city is even considering something like this.
- Other: BSL is complete bologna, don;t give! Places like Ontario have proven that BSL DOES NOT WORK and they have already introduced a bill to have it removed. Don't take steps backwards ! Leave the Bully Breeds alone and focus on DOGS that do bite regardless of breed. BSL is racism towards breeds and not right. If that's the case let's find out what colour of people cause the most problems and muzzle them, or would that be racist to judge all by the actions of some. I've never been more disappointed in Calgary then I am reading the nonsense.



- Other: BSL does not work. So many communities are repealing and reversing BSL. At most, offer additional training and resources. Any dog is capable of biting, not just the breeds mentioned above. Do not give in to pro-BSL lobbyists.
- Other: BSL does not work. All dogs behave based on the training of their owner, not because they are born and bred vicious or aggressive dogs. Ridiculous.
- Other: Breed-specific legislation is discriminatory. You've also provided incorrect information about pit-bull type dogs. They do not have increased bite severity. This is a well dispelled myth. The fact that you've shared this information in this survey reduces the integrity of the results significantly.
- Other: Breed-specific legislation does NOT reduce the incidence or severity of dog bites, it penalizes responsible pet owners and kills innocent dogs. A community approach to responsible pet ownership, one that focuses on the behavior of the dog and the owner, is the best way to protect public safety and promote animal welfare.
- Other: Breed-specific legislation does not reduce the incidence or severity of dog bites, it penalizes responsible pet owners and kills innocent dogs. A community approach to responsible pet ownership, one that focuses on the behavior of the dog and the owner, is the best way to protect public safety and promote animal welfare.
- Other: Breed-specific legislation does not reduce the incidence or severity of dog bites, it penalizes responsible pet owners and kills innocent dogs. A community approach to responsible pet ownership, one that focuses on the behavior of the dog and the owner, is the best way to protect public safety and promote animal welfare.
- Other: Breeds have nothing to do with it - owners are the problem
- Other: Breeds are not the issue, the owners decisions on training are. If my bull dog breed is properly trained out in public they SHOULD NOT HAVE TO ABIDE BY WEARING MUZZLES. I spend ample amounts of money and time into training my bull terrier. We are responsible owners yet we should not have to be paying more in insurances and fees. We do our part because we know the breed. You should not be imposing fees and penalties to those who are responsible. These laws will increase the risk of abandonment of a breed and more euthanizations. This discussion is pathetic and quite honestly absurd. I have been attacked ore times from [removed] small dogs than big large dogs. Have they ever recieved fines or war rent for opening up discussion for large fees/penalties? NO! If you are going to open up discussion for large fees and penalties for owners then it should be for ALL DOGS NOT JUST ONE BREED. You think my next door neighbour with the [removed] chihuahua who bit me worries about training her rat. I think the discussion opened up should be about RESPONSIBLE DOG OWNERSHIP not breed ownership. Get your [removed] together Calgary, this is racism on dogs.
- Other: Breed Specific measures should not be included in the new bylaw specifically Pitbull related. All dogs should be held to the same standards. Responsible Calgary dog owners especially those who own these breeds already will be subjected to being punished and targeted over a dog breed that has been allowed in Calgary for more than 12 years.
- Other: Breed Specific Legislation would negate most of the animal rescues around Calgary. This is unacceptable.



- Other: Breed specific legislation is not the answer. Concentrate on responsible ownership. Fines and bans on owners who are derelict in their duties as a pet owner.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is not needed here. ANY dog can be a nuisance not just one type of dog.
- Other: Breed Specific Legislation is just animal racism. Seek criminal charges for the owners of ANY animal involved in an assault.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is ineffective and wrong. Please desist.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is dangerous on so many levels. Ensuring owners have the right resources and training to be responsible pet owners is the best call.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is a terrible idea.
- Other: Breed specific legislation does not work. "Pitbulls" are not bad. Require ALL dog owners to train dogs and control them. German shepherds are dangerous, Shar pei, Chihuahua
- Other: Breed specific legislation DOES NOT WORK and is highly problematic in furthering stigmatization of the breed. Problematic dog behaviour is owner specific and should not be generalized.
- Other: Breed specific legislation does not work and does not make sense. A breed does not determine a dog's personality. It's up to the owner to properly socialize and train their pets.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is scientifically proven not to work. Stop trying this ridiculous nonsense.
- Other: Breed Specific Laws are beyond discriminatory to not only the dogs but their owners. Pit Bulls also rank very low on the scale for most breeds likely to bite. This is something you politicians can simply google. If you pass this [removed] law you will face lawsuits. I can promise you that.
- Other: Breed specific labeling is racism and should be abolished!!!
- Other: Breed specific bylaws were shown to not be required/supported in previous public engagement. There should not be breed specific legislation.
- Other: Breed specific bylaws have no place in this. The problem is not the breed it is the owner....and the owner on both sides of incidents. Spend time educating dog owners on how to train their pets. This question and any reference to "pit bull" or pit bull type dogs only creates more bias against these breeds.
- Other: Breed specific by-laws are ridiculous. This is a terrible question, shame on you city of Calgary.
- Other: Breed specific bylaws are not appropriate. Any dog can be a nuisance or violent.
- Other: Breed specific bylaws are [removed]. It's the owners not the breed
- Other: Breed specific bylaws and legislation don't work. Huge waste of taxpayer money. Many places have banned this because of that fact. It does not reduce bites or incidents. If anything it entices criminals to seek out these types of dogs for status. Also, it feels a bit racist to me. What's next? Rotwillers? German Shepherd? Mastiff? I do not support this at all.
- Other: Breed specific bans don't work so this is a terrible bylaw
- Other: Breed should NOT be a factor. If a dog, any dog, regardless of breed, bites someone or something, then the City has the right to order them to be muzzled in public. You should never force



it just over a breed. After 8years of going to the dog park every single day, and playing with Pitbulls, the only dog that has bitten has been a leash reactive 8month old Jack Russell.

- Other: Breed bias should not be part of dog law. Many other breeds are equally powerful and strong. You are punishing people who are breed ambassadors, and will affect the lives and enrichment and socialization of otherwise safe and happy pets.
- Other: BLM does not work. Any dog is able and will bite it does not matter the breed.
- Other: Better training for the owners of the dogs. I find its not the dog that is the issue it is the owner. If there is a way to allow dog owners better training on handling dogs. Also there are situations where the owner of the dog bites a stranger, maybe the dog was protecting its owner. We should have a leash coding system to let people know not to pet strangers dogs.
- Other: Best not to get the City involved in this. Too difficult and hasn't worked elsewhere. Best to address case-by-case as a standard nuisance claim.
- Other: Being breed specific is ridiculous it's almost never the dogs fault. The owners should be held responsible not the dog.. and signalling out pit bulls but not the little dogs that actually bite and attack people just because pit bulls are bigger is ridiculous
- Other: Behavioural* training required for dogs declared a nuisance. Obedience training (sit, stay, etc) isn't going to stop a dog from barking their head off all day
- Other: Behaviour training should be given to owners.
- Other: Basic obedience training should be required for ALL dogs over the age of 3 months, regardless of breed.
- Other: Bans should not be breed specific. That is saying all dogs of one breed are the same, and in this case- aggressive. There are other dog breeds such as Rottweilers that are found to bite harder than Pitbull breeds. This is infuriating that Calgary is even considering breed laws. There should be fines for OWNERS whose pets are aggressive, bite, etc.
- Other: BANNING PITBULLS DOES NOT WORK. there are so many good pitbulls out there this doesnt work! Sure higher fines maybe for repeat offenders. That's it! e. Ple
- Other: Banning and restrictions of specific breeds will help, Pit Bulls are family breeds, this is not based in any science and it's honestly disappointing to see that it's even being considered.
- Other: BANNING A SPECIFIC BREED IS NOT GOING TO CHANGE ANYTHING.
- Other: Banning a certain breed is ridiculous, any large dog is capable of biting, if you're choosing to do this all large breeds should have to go through this. Muzzling a good friendly dog makes them look vicious, there's no bad *vicious* dog, it depends on how a owner raises the dog. If raised properly there should be no problem. Maybe enforce some training classes before being aloud to own a large breed. But making Pitbull a banned or restricted is absolutely horrid and I'd personally be moving right away if this happened.
- Other: Ban retractable leashes, this is a disaster waiting to happen. Small dog owners allow their dogs to freely roam around at large distances. These little untrained dogs then go and attack larger dogs, but get away with it due to their sizes. I don't think banning Pitbulls would solve the problem. There should be equal punishments for all dog owners, despite the breed or size. In that case, everyone should have to go through obedience training, regardless of the dog's breed and size.



- Other: Ban pit bulls altogether.
- Other: Bad owners should be held countable not the breed of dog
- Other: At no point should anyone be penalized for their breed of animal. It is the owners responsibility to make sure there animals are trained appropriately. There are so many little dogs that are vicious and bite strangers and yet they do not have these types of restrictions placed on them.
- Other: As someone who does not own a bully breed but has dealt with many different breeds of dogs over several years, this is a bias and restrictive legislation. Stop with the fear mongering of the pit bull breeds. This is uncalled for and uncouth. The issue is not the breed but the lack of training due to poor ownership. At the most, anyone who wishes to own any dog breed should be required to take a responsible owners course before owning a dog within city limits. The comment about a pit bulls strength possibly causing more severe damage is erroneous information, as a bully breed tends to bite and hold, where as a Shepard for example bites and tears away . The city should consult with canine behavioural specialists and experts who do not work for the city before they ask the uneducated public for their opinions. The general public's knowledge on such an item comes from sensationalize media, which is also uneducated and miss leading.
- Other: As some one who owns a Pitbul type dog I would prefer to see our dogs breed not discriminated against simply because they fit the physical characteristics. We have never had an issue at on off leash park or walking with any sort of bully breed out there . We CONSTANTLY have trouble with small to medium breeds attacking our dog, and luckily enough ours is trained not to react to them. I think instead of punishing a whole breed you should be focusing on the dogs that are showing these types of aggressive reactions.
- Other: As a veterinarian and a pitbull (which isn't a breed) owner, I am highly disgusted at this questionnaire from the City of Calgary. Every dog is a bite risk. Every dog has the potential to cause damage. Pitbull type dogs do not have locking jaws or superior strength compared to dogs of their own size. Cities used to say the same thing about Rottweilers, Dobermans, German shepherds, etc. I have seen more dog fights between golden retrievers than I have pitbulls. You are continuing a dangerous stereotype that leads to more abuse and neglect to these dogs.
- Other: As a pit bull owner and a lover of the breed this law is disgusting and discriminatory. My beautiful 80lb pitbull could never hurt a fly and is terrified of the air conditioner. I've met hundreds of worse breeds that aren't even listed.
- Other: Are you serious.... I support none of these. You literally state there is NO more bites happening from Pit Bulls, yet you are targeting that breed.....[removed].
- Other: Apply the same rules for all dogs. Don't single out breeds, any dog can be a problem.
- Other: Anything specific to pit bulls is insane. Breed specific bans are the most ignorant thing. It comes down to a dogs owner. Not the dog. As a pit bull mix owner I would be less likely to be supportive of anything in calgary if the city puts this into place.
- Other: Any owner that gets a dog must complete obedience training with each dog. Regardless of breed.



- Other: ANY dog that falls under nuisance or breaks bylaws, the OWNER must face fines and training. It is not dogs fault for being raised that way. Stop blaming the dog or dog breed and start looking at the owner
- Other: any dog owner who has a dog that shows antisocial tendencies she be held accountable, not the dog. The owner is the one who puts the dog in a position where thier behavior puts others at risk.
- Other: Any dog of a large size has the ability to severily injur, discrimnation agasint one breed is absurd and outrageous.
- Other: ANY dog not just Pitbulls that cause problems need to recommended extra training. FYI German Shepards have stronger bites that Pitbulls.
- Other: Any dog has the ability to be aggressive. Punish the deed and not the breed. I think it is disgusting that the city is even entertaining this idea of going after pitbulls or pitbull type dogs. That is not fair and discriminatory. As a tax payer I am angry with this and feel as though the city should be ashamed of themselves for entertaining this rediculousness.
- Other: ANY dog declared a nuisance or dangerous should not be allowed off leash in a public area. All dogs can be dangerous due to improper ownership/training, NOT just pit bulls.
- Other: any dog can bite not just pit bull try looking at facts
- Other: Any dog can be violent , dont single out pit bulls. Let them be!
- Other: Any dog can be nuisance, most little dogs such as a Chihuahua or shitsu can cause damage to a larger breed dog ! Pit bulls are not a problem and never will be it all comes down to being a responsible pet owner nothing to do with any type of breed of dog ! Every dog can bite just like any human can fight or kill . NOTHING TO DO WITH DOG BREEDS . Very unacceptable for the city of Calgary to single out one dog breed . ABSOLUTE BULL !!!! [removed] DONT DISCRIMINATE CERTAIN DOG BREEDS. It's the owners responsibility to be in control and know there dogs behaviour.
- Other: Any bylaw in place that is specifically against one breed is insane. Its not the dogs fault it's the owners. I find all the above completely unacceptable
- Other: Any BSL is unjust. Deal with the specific problem dogs. Do not put all types in one group.
- Other: Any breed of dog, when out into the hands of an irresponsible and inappropriate owner, can be trained to be aggressive. How about instead of targeting one type of breed, background checks must be administered for ALL dog owners. Dogs are not the problem. People are the problem. And bylaws discriminating against certain breeds is what creates fear and stigma.
- Other: Any breed can be raised and trained to be the sweetest animal you'd meet, invest in cheaper and more effective TRAINING. So the animals and owners can be well educated on how to properly take care of their dog. Care about preventative measures, don't limit an animals freedom because of their physical characteristics
- Other: Anti-Pit Bull laws are quite frankly absurd, and the idea that the city would try to rip apart a happy, well behaved dog from it's family by making it financially impractical to impossible for its owners to continue to own it, simply based on breed is disappointing to me as a citizen. I am not a Pit Bull owner, but I don't have to be to see that the "solution" the city proposes disproportionately



targets the poor, as well as a dog breed who's only crime is to be an easy target for loud vocal minorities that need to protest something to feel self important. There is no science to back up banning Pit Bulls and not other large more aggressive dogs breeds. We trust our politicians to be leaders who make choices for the common good, not sycophants who cater to the lowest common denominator. This entire approach to this "problem" is misguided and regrettable

- Other: animals. This in addition to the fact that the inaccuracy of dog bite data and the difficulty in identifying dog breeds. What a waste of my tax dollars. City should be focusing on bigger issues at hand while we are in the midst of a pandemic and economic downturn.
- Other: Allow pit bulls to be treated the same as other dogs and not play into a hateful stigmatism
- Other: All targeted breed specific bylaws should be tossed in the trash
- Other: All questions should be applied to the human owner of the breed
- Other: All pit bulls are not vicious.. it should be owner training.. any dog can bite and be vicious. We have a German Shepard in our neighborhood I do not trust and has tried to attack more than once
- Other: All of this breed specific legislation is absolute nonsense. This kind of ignorance doesn't belong in 2020 - you would think Calgary knows better as a self touting progressive city but here we are. Absolutely disgusting.
- Other: All of these suggestions are appalling to me. Pet owners are responsible for making sure their dog isn't put in a situation of discomfort. This can happen with any breed if the owner isn't being responsible. As a professional in the pet industry, I am deeply disappointed and saddened by the breed discrimination in this survey. Pit bulls are lovely animals, and suggesting that they are more prone to accidents/ causing more harm than other breeds is absolutely revolting. A dog is as good as their owner, that is it. I have been bitten by dogs on multiple occasions, but never by a pit bull, and rarely have I seen one in a fight. This survey should be holding owners accountable for their actions, not the dog.
- Other: ALL OF THESE ARE STUPID! PIT BULLS ARE NOT ANY MORE DANGEROUS THAN ANY OTHER DOG
- Other: All of these are ridiculous, it is not the breed it is the owner. If Calgary implements any of these breed specific consequences they should be absolutely ashamed. I will gratefully move away.
- Other: All of these are awful
- Other: All of these actually [removed], pit bull breeds are not vicious.
- Other: all of the above, but please remember that BREED has little to do with BEHAVIOR. If needed, please check that pet owners aren't abusing the animal first, then follow up with the pet.
- Other: All of the above options are wrong. Breed specific legislature is WRONG. Deal with each animal on a case to case basis, not according to their breed.
- Other: All dogs should be treated the same ! Rottwillers have a strong bite.
- Other: All dogs should be trained. All fines should be equal for all breeds. Pit bulls are like any other breed and singling out breeds is unfair in society as we are currently experiencing these problems via race.
- Other: All dogs should be properly trained if they are going to be in the public regardless of breed. labelling a dog because of it's breed is descrimination and shouldn't be tolerated.



- Other: All dogs regardless of breed should have the above measures applied if they are a danger.
- Other: All dogs have the potential to bite and harm others, Pitbulls are not the only breed that have this potential and I do not believe they should be the only breed considered. I strongly disagree with the actions listed above and believe the owner should be punished and not the dog.
- Other: All dog owners should be required to take animal handling courses to help educate everyone on dog behaviour. Small dogs bite more often and create a situation where larger dogs react, and usually badly. Any dog that bites should be seized and evaluated. Just because a dog looks scary does not mean it will bite. Everyone needs the proper education and guidance for responsible pet ownership.
- Other: All Dog owners should attend seminars to fully understand the signs that are being given by dogs. The majority of bites occur when we dont listen to our dog telling us they are uncomfortable in some way. This is their last resort. Schools should implement programs to teach children how to behave around dogs. People are the problem, not dogs
- Other: All dog breeds should be treated the same if their actions are the same.
- Other: All dog breed specific regulations have been thoroughly proven not to work
- Other: Aggressive dogs are formed because of abuse from HUMANS
- Other: Against all of the above
- Other: Address the breeds that are most common for bites. I've worked with dogs for years and have encountered more aggressive shepherds than I have pit bull.
- Other: Absolutely nothing. There are dogs with more strength behind their bites, but pit bulls got called out???? Ridiculous. My pittie would never bore anyone, and doesn't need any additional insurance. Check on Karen's 5lb little chihuahua who bites ankles, and leave my little angel out of this.
- Other: ABSOLUTELY NOT. We just moved from Ontario specifically because of this madness. NO BREED LEGISLATION.
- Other: Absolutely not. It's not the breed. Do not punish the dogs for doing nothing besides being a certain breed. This is not right.
- Other: Absolutely none of the above, any dog can attack and do a lot of damage just as any bully breed can, pit bulls are the nicest dogs I've ever met and have NEVER seen an aggressive one and I own one myself who is best friends with my 2.5 year old son!
- Other: Absolutely none of the above listed measures should be enforceable by the City or by City By-laws
- Other: Absolutely NO legislation specific to pitbulls should exist. Zero. Such rules and policies are based on myth and misinformation.
- Other: Absolutely NO breed specific laws discriminating against pit bull and pit bull like breeds.
- Other: Pit Bull breeds are not always more aggressive, most have a bad reputation because of bad owners. Dogs should be muzzled in public ONLY if they have had a biting offence. All dogs bite, it is one of the few ways they have to communicate that they need space. Biting or nipping is not always aggression. Please do more research on dogs in general before making bylaws



- Other: Bully breed is such a stupid term. It's not the dog, it's the owner. If you get rid of bully breeds those idiots raising them will just turn other dogs into bully breeds. Don't punish the animals because their owners are idiots. If the owner needs for their dog to wear a muzzle, then they can put them on their dog. But saying all pit bulls need to wear them is ridiculous. Did you know pit bulls used to be used as nannies. THEY BABYSAT SMALL CHILDREN. Handle a dog bite as it needs to be handled but don't pin it on specific breeds. Dogs are animals and have animal instinct, its up to us to realize what they are comfortable with and help them through. We as human beings did domesticate dogs after all. It's our fault they're in our homes and it should be our responsibility to make sure they aren't aggressive. But it's not their fault.
- Other: a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite is not an accurate statement as many larger breeds have the same if not more strength and have the capability to inflict far more severe bites and injuries. If the city is so pressed on this breed perhaps requiring a criminal check on people licensing the breed would insure that these dogs end up in criminal environments. And as for declaring a dog a nuisance the situation should be investigated as neighbours with children or neighbours taunt and provoke dogs as well
- Other: a specific bread of dog it not the problem it is the owner. I have seen a 5 pound dog be more aggressive than any pitbull I have ever encountered. Fine the owner regardless for bread! this is discrimination and honestly bull shit
- Other: A huge [removed] [removed] to the city of Calgary for even suggesting this - Pit bulls and the most well behaved dogs I've encountered once they've been trained by the owner. [removed] [remved]
- Other: A German shepherd king corson English bull dog and a bull mastiff and rottweiler all have high psi bite force then a pitbull out of 23 dog breed the pitbull comes in 19th place. And as for stopping dogs from barking you might as well take out your own voice box so you cant make a noise or your kids.
- Other: A full investigation required first, and this must include all dogs, not just bully type dogs. No bad dogs, just [removed] owners.
- Other: A dog shouldnt be charged for its breed as much as a person shouldnt be charged for their color. This makes me disgusted with Calgary.
- Other: A dog should not be held accountable for the way it was raised. It's human error b
- Other: A bylaw that makes it necessary to properly train any dog. Regardless of breed!! All dogs can be dangerous if not trained well! As a child I personally was attacked by a tea cup poodle and had to have stitches and reconstructive surgery to my face.
- Other: A better spca that actually does proper investigations into the situations of pets!
- Other: 20 years ago it was German Shepards, it's not the breed it's the owner. I've owned a few Pitt bills in my day they are no more threat then other dogs
- Other: .
- Other: *ALL* dog breeds should be treated the same. Pit bulls are no more dangerous than any other breed. Any breed can be a dangerous dog given bad owners - and to be clear the problem is the *OWNERS*.



- Other: #dontbullymybreed!! It's not the breed it's the owner
- Other: "Pitbulls" are not the problem bad owners are!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! More small dogs attack people and other animals than pitbulls do
- Other: "Pit-bull" type dogs should not be singled out! Lots of breeds have the potential for severe bites. We need to start educating people better about dog training, dog behaviour and responsible ownership. Muzzles, leashes and obedience training are all good ideas for ANY dog that is a potential bite risk but how can you enforce a bylaw for it?? And a dog that barks in the yard is completely different from a dog that is at large and/or a potential bite risk. Lumping barking noise into the nuisance category is ridiculous for the purpose of this survey as it seems you're really only trying to address severe bites, and introduce breed specific legislation which I do not agree with at all. MORE EDUCATION!
- Other: "Pit bulls" should not be specifically targeted in regards to these bylaws. Doing such can impose unrealistic perceptions of the public towards them. Rendering them vulnerable without justified cause. They should be treated as any other dog.
- Other: *It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite. You're words exactly! So why are singling them out??
- Other: A better clarification on what is considered a nuisance dog
- Other: A complete removal of species specialized bylaws. Scapegoating. We all need someone to blame, but
- Other: A reward for well behaved pit bulls and their owners for all the stereotypes and stress they have to go through, trying to prove that they are a product of their environment.
- Other: It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite. You do realize that a pit bull is not in the top 10 for bite strength? If this is your argument then we should muzzle Dobermans, German Shepards, English Bulldogs, Mastiffs, Rottweilers, and Cane Corsos. So this isn't really why. It's because you believe that pit bulls are more likely to bite. Also, who decides what looks like a pit bull. Any dog with a bigger head? This is ridiculous on so many levels.
- Other: Pitbulls cannot bite any harder than other dogs of their size. This is a myth and has been disproven by SCIENCE. Your survey is supporting BSL which again, has been proven to be ineffective everywhere that it has been implemented. Do not waste our tax dollars like this.
- Other: Absolutely disgusted to see that the City is looking to single out Pitbulls! Shame on you!!!
- Other: Absolutely none of this is right. I can't believe the City is actually discriminating against dogs based on breed
- Other: Absolutely ridiculous to try to enforce breed restrictions as they have proven to be biased and unfounded
- Other: Adding additional legislation for pit bulls is unjust for those who facilitate appropriate training for their pets. I do not think they should be singled out.



- Other: After a dog bites/attacks is the ONLY time that punishment should be given. Any of the muzzling/not allowing dogs into off-leash parks creates a stigma against these breeds which is unfair.
- Other: ALL AND ANY aggressive dogs, no matter what breed to attend behavioral training. No laws bias to pit bull 'looking' dogs.
- Other: All dog have power not just pitbulls
- Other: All dogs and owners should be mandated to go through training
- Other: All dogs should be treated the same, pit bulls are the most caring unless they're owner teaches them to be bad if anything chihuahuas and other small dogs act worse & bite etc but I don't see anyone putting barriers up for them. Ridiculous.
- Other: All dogs who have bitten must be treated equally, no matter the breed. A dog bite is a dog bite, owners must have control over their pets
- Other: All fines should be treated fairly not with bias
- Other: Anti-Pit Bull laws are quite frankly absurd, and the idea that the city would try to rip apart a happy, well behaved dog from it's family by making it financially impractical to impossible for its owners to continue to own it, simply based on breed is disappointing to me as a citizen. I am not a Pit Bull owner, but I don't have to be to see that the "solution" the city proposes disproportionately targets the poor, as well as a dog breed who's only crime is to be an easy target for loud vocal minorities that need to protest something to feel self important. There is no science to back up banning Pit Bulls and not other large more aggressive dogs breeds. We trust our politicians to be leaders who choices for the common good, not sycophants who cater to the lowest common denominator. This entire approach to this "problem" is misguided and regrettable.
- Other: Any breed can be a nuisance, if it exhibits had behaviour. No specific breed should get its freedom taken. If it is a "nuisance" then consider obedience training if you'd like to take your dog off leash or without a muzzle.
- Other: ANY breed dog that causes harm or illustrates aggressive behaviors should be mandated to take training classes and be on leash at all times if this is not complied with then a mandatory surrender.
- Other: ANY dog breed should be given a higher fine, if that animal has behaved aggressively. Not all Pitbull type dogs are bad. Any dog can bite. Any dog poorly trained can cause damage. All dogs are good, until put in the wrong hands. Blame the owner, not the dog.
- Other: ANY dog breed with a PROVEN/DOCUMENTED history of aggression, or nuisance behaviour, their OWNER should be mandated to take an obedience class with a trainer shown to help reduce aggressive behaviour in dogs. This is not SPECIFIC to PITBULL TYPE BREEDS.
- Other: Any dog could act this way. People need to pay more attention to the environment of their home. Just like people get therapy, dogs can change too!!!!
- Other: ANY dog that bites should be subject to the same laws as a pit bull.
- Other: Any laws that single out pit bulls specifically is CRUEL and disgusting. These animals cannot help which breed they are, and these laws will result in more of these breeds left alone in shelters. Sad and disappointing as a Calgaryian animal lover.



- Other: As a pit bull owner ..these laws are incredibly offensive and ignorant. Yes, if someone has an aggressive pet no matter the breed they should take greater precautions but not all pitbull owners should be punished
- Other: Assess to see if dog has been mistreated and reacts negatively because of that, before rushing to euthanizing. Making sure that the owners are teaching children to treat a dog properly and not abuse it, thus which sometimes leads to a dog bite, self defense on behalf of the dog. Attempt to help the dog mentally first.
- Other: Banning breeds is ineffective. It is the OWNERS that are the problem. Ban people from owning pets if their animals are involved in more than one serious incident. Require them as owners to take responsible pet ownership classes, as well as pet obedience training
- Other: Banning nuisance owners for failing to control their animal
- Other: Behavioral issues should be looked at on an individual basis, not creating bylaws for specific breeds. Many pit bulls and pit bull crosses are likely to be victims of abuse and mistreatment, and creating a bylaw requiring all pit bulls to be muzzled in public will likely prevent many owners from taking their dogs out in safe ways to socialize with other dogs, creating more hostile and antisocial animals. Preventing pit bulls from accessing off-leash parks will have the same negative effect. I believe if the goal of the City of Calgary is to reduce the number of dog bites/attacks and "nuisance dogs" that should be done so on a case-by-case basis, regardless of the breed of dog. Implementing additional insurance or training costs would likely prevent people from being willing to adopt pit bulls from shelters and not do anything to solve the problem. Additional resources and support should be provided to those looking to adopt these specific breeds so they are aware of the additional risks and procedures of owning certain breeds. Research has shown pit bulls are the most likely breed of dog to be euthanized, and placing extra restrictions on the ability to adopt and care for these animals will lead directly to an increase in these statistics. Education will go a lot further in trying to solve the problem than implementing bylaws directly targeting more vulnerable breeds and owners.
- Other: Being breed specific and having surveys such as this creates more issue than not. It is an issue w the owner and as mentioned in the above, pit bulls are not involved in more bite instances. Making those that own pit bulls pay more for example is targeting and not looking at the issue as a whole. It's not the breed, it's those who own and that could be said for any owner or any breed.
- Other: Both owner and dog should be required to be evaluated to find out Why said dog is having problems and lashing out. The dog should be vetted and then directed from there to to classes, again for Both owner and dog. ALL dogs, that are proven to be a nuisance, not just bully breeds.
- Other: Breed discrimination does not work
- Other: Breed discrimination is not ok especially since you are well aware that pitbulls or pitbull like dogs are not involved in more incidents. If more severe bites are the issue there are plenty of large breed dogs with more severe bites than small breeds. Bred discrimination is as unfounded as racism.
- Other: Breed has NOTHING to do with the above, Pitbull types are not more dangerous and studies have proven that. Singling out Pitbull types is RACIST and Discrimination and would be disgusting of Calgary to implement this. It's 2020 time to start acting like it.



- Other: Breed rasism is rediculous! I have not met an aggressive pit bull type dog ever, but I have met aggressive Shepard type and others. So putting pit bull types in a group of their own is not right.
- Other: Breed should not be a factor in this.
- Other: Breed specific bans are completely ridiculous. Its the owner, not the dog
- Other: Breed specific bylaws are cruel. It perpetuates a stereotype when the issue is the owners. Punish the people for being the problem not an entire breed. Punishments should be higher for abuse/neglect/cruelty cases. Pitbulls, or any other "vicious" breed, are not the problem.
- Other: Breed specific bylaws are NOT helpful. All dogs require the proper training. It is not helpful to punish dogs who have never done anything wrong. Target the nuisance dogs, regardless of the breed
- Other: Breed specific bylaws are wrong.
- Other: Breed specific is stupid. All breeds have the ability to be vicious. If any dog attacks a human that did not do anything to deserve it should be put into training, if training does not solve the dogs aggression it should be humanely euthanized no matter what breed.
- Other: Breed specific legislation disproportionately punishes responsible dog owners and preemptively penalizes dogs because of how they look. It is not factually based on their actual training or dispositions.
- Other: Breed specific legislation does not decrease the amount of bites or attacks. The bite force of a pitbull is the same as a labrador retriever. It is irresponsible owners that cause dog bites and attacks. If there are regulations around pitbull type breeds then these irresponsible owners will buy other types of dogs. Please do not discriminate against bully breeds. They are inteligent and high energy dogs that deserve space in off leash parks just as much as any other dog.
- Other: Breed specific legislation has been proven time and time again to be ineffective at reducing both the number and severity of bites. It's so disappointing that my city - a city whose Animal Services was once a model used by other cities around North America is even considering this legislation. Shame on you.
- Other: Breed specific legislation has been proven to NOT work. Montreal for example. Research has proven German shepherds & rotties have stronger bite strength. Pitts were once used as nanny dogs. For example 70s it was the German shepherds; 80s Doberman Pincher 90s Rottweilers. The last 10+ years it's the terrier breeds. In all honesty, I'm more terrified of my neighbours small dog. As they are irresponsible pet owners as they can get away with not training their dog. Therefore more bad behaviour because they are cute
- Other: Breed specific legislation has not proven effective in Ontario. There has been no drop in the amount of bites since the law has been enacted. It is also not true that a "pit bull's" bite is any stronger than a German Shepard, Rottweiler or any larger breed. The dogs behavior is completely based on it's training and environment.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is absurd and should NOT be implemented.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is completely inappropriate and I do not support this is anyway. All dogs should be treated on an individual basis. I have never been bitten by pitbulls or any other large breed dog; I have however been bitten by 6 Chihuahuas. Owners make dog behaviour not breeds.



- Other: Breed-related laws are garbage. Chihuahuas are neurotic and bite more than bully breeds.
- Other: Breeds do not have anything to do with behaviour. It is the about the people. How can the city of Calgary be so naive. This is 2020 for goodness sakes. Don't we know better?
- Other: BSL - which means discriminating against a specific breed has proven unsuccessful in preventing dog bites, etc. And in most cases punishes responsible owners. All animals, regardless of breed, should be treated equally. Any breed if trained poorly or mistreated can cause concern and possibly injure someone. Also: a lot of the responses here can come from those who have preconceived or uneducated beliefs about the breed. They're wonderful dogs.
- Other: BSL (Breed specific legislation does not work. Responsible ownership education and training does. BSL has been proven to increase kill rates in shelters because the communities in which they are impacted force people to not choose great and loving dogs just because of their status. And many dogs that exhibit "bully looks" often are not part of any bully breeds and vice versa. There are many Hound dog mixes that look part bully breeds" when they are not. This BSL only encourages less education and responsibility on part of the owner, and only divides the community. I hope the City of Calgary administration puts the tax dollars to good use and actually researches into BSL and how many cities that once had this legislation have now pulled it back due to 1. Public outrage , 2. Not seeing lower numbers of aggressive dog instances because all dogs are capable of this in the wrong owners hands, 3. It indirectly increases kill rates for bully breeds in rescuers and shelters due to people's want to adopt animals that require special legislation to follow.
- Other: BSL does not solve any problems.
- Other: BSL does not work. There are dog bites of all breeds (especially small!) that go unrecorded daily! This is a horrible decision by the city to even consider.
- Other: BSL is not effective in reducing dog bites and is harmful. Obedience training for ALL nuisance dogs (regardless of size) is a much more applicable and safe practice.
- Other: By singling out pit bulls in this questionnaire, of course people are going to say yes to those things. If you didn't single out a type of dog perhaps this questionnaire wouldn't be biased. Please void all your responses and redo it without bias. What about aggressive labs, or aggressive chihuahuas. Or the shih tzu that attacked my shepherd? This is not a time to encourage bias and single out specific breeds.
- Other: Bylaws that single out certain breeds is ridiculous. If, and only if a dog bites or has an incident should fines and measures be put in place to penalize the owner.
- Other: Calgary contracts animal related issues to a competent person who has the relevant experience and skill to deal with the situation.
- Other: Calgary should not in any way shape or form be associated with breed shaming (pitbulls). Instead of passing ridiculous laws let's focus on educating those who are not familiar with the breed and ensuring that any dog owner regardless of the breed is a responsible one. Pitbulls are amazing, sweet and loving pets and deserve a chance just like any other dog. Any dog can initiate a fight, however with proper training and a smart owner many incidents can be avoided.
- Other: Chihuahuas and pomeranians must be muzzled in public



- Other: Chihuahuas are more of a nuisance and aggressive breed why not put restrictions on them too?
- Other: City needs dog owners to be held more responsible for there pets, You can't discriminate against breads. Pit bulls are one of the nicest breads out there and when raised properly are no different then any other dog.
- Other: Disagree with definition of nuisance dogs
- Other: Do not agree with any of the above.
- Other: Do not ban pit bulls from anything. Its a ridiculous idea.
- Other: Do not enact any BSL. It has been proven to be ineffective.
- Other: Do not introduce breed specific legislation
- Other: Do not lump all pitbull type breeds as bad. They are only as bad as the person training or not training them. Don't lump all breeds into bad behavior, especially when they can be so loving and friendly.
- Other: Do not punish dog based on the bread but also please regard the owner compartment and address the matter to the owner and not the bread. Owner should be responsible for their dog - please check what montreal is now doing
- Other: Do not put a label on pit bull breeds put a ban on dangerous owners
- Other: Do not single out breeds
- Other: do not target a specific breed of dog. It is the smaller dogs like Chihuahuas and dachshunds that bite more often
- Other: Do the same thing you would do if a poodle bit you instead of being biased towards a single breed.
- Other: Dog by dog case. Pitbull does NOT equal aggressive. The owner is the issue, not the specific breed. I've had FAR more encounters with aggressive small breed dogs than with pitties due to lack to training by their owner in my opinion. The breed is not the problem. And I find it quite disturbing that this conversation is still happening.
- Other: Dog owner education for owners of dogs declared a nuisance/involved in incidents.
- Other: Dogs involved in more than one vicious offence in the last year must be muzzled in public, including off-leash parks until obedience training is completed and trainer signs off that dog is no longer high risk.
- Other: dogs on leash cannot be in off leash parks, all dogs are required to take some form of obedience training
- Other: Dogs previously involved in serious violent bites must be obedience trained and remain on private property or leashed with a muzzle until training is completed.
- Other: Don't discriminate against a dog breed. Hold the owners accountable. This is as bad as racism.
- Other: Don't discriminate against any particular breed. Dog bites occur in more smaller breeds and retriever/lab types. Pitbulls may have a stronger bite, but a V6 engine is more powerful than a four cylinder. Both have the potential to kill but do we treat each driver differently or make one pay more insurance?



- Other: Don't just accuse pitbulls of being the problem. The fact that you guys put the breed as an example is pathetic and discriminatory against specific breeds and their owners.... coming from someone who doesn't own a pit bull.
- Other: Don't be against any specific breed
- Other: don't discriminate by breed. all pet owners have same responsibility regardless of breed.
- Other: Drop the breed specific rules because we all know that's not going to work, focus on repeat offenders, fine the owner, put the dogs through obedience training and monitor their behavior.
- Other: Education for all owners; I see small teacup dogs with more aggressive behavior as a standard and small dogs, though bite with less force, are biting people and instigating/agitating medium and large breed dogs
- Other: Education for new owners of ANY dog. All dogs have teeth and the ability to bite, not just specific dogs you decide need to be mandated. An educational course that let's people know what all bylaws pertain to dogs within the city, responsibilities that the owners will take on, and resources where they can find unbiased information about different dog breeds and their genetic predisposition would be useful. Requiring that anyone applying for a dog through a store (few and far between now), rescue organization or breeder have completed such a course would maybe reduce the number of incidents overall around the city.
- Other: End Breed Specific Legislation
- Other: Ensure that ALL dogs are on leash when off of private property. There appears to be ZERO enforcement. If there's no enforcement then the law is useless
- Other: Fine bad pet owners that don't train their dogs properly! Just because I dog was bred to be strong there shouldn't be a ban on them now. I owned a pit bull and a chihuahua and my little one was WAY more vicious than my pit bull. My pit bull was also attacked by a husky and walked away with way more injuries than the husky....the husky was in heat and attacked my dog while my dog was on a leash! Owners should be punished not dogs that are unable to learn anything other than what they're taught
- Other: Fine owners when dog involved in offense
- Other: Fine the owner if a dog bites, it has absolutely nothing to do with the breed of dog this is disgusting. The little chihuahuas and small dogs that have never been trained bark and bite constantly and are considerably more of a nuisance than any pitbull. Dogs are not bad, the owners who do not train them are but you cannot require training for a pitbull and not for a German Shepherd (police dog - they don't have the potential for a severe bite?) or a husky. This is disgusting.
- Other: Fine the owners more who do not train or restrain the dog. Have a fine for owners who do not have proper signage on their property or fence to keep dog in the yard.
- Other: Fines and punishment towards OWNERS who DO NOT properly train their dog!!!! Please do not make this a dog issue, it is a PEOPLE issue!
- Other: Fines for an inadequate amount of exercise for specific breeds. (Huskies, German Shepherds, pitbulls, blue heelers, cattle dogs, collies, labradors & golden retrievers) inadequate exercise can be a contributing factor to bites, behavioural issues and injuries.



- Other: Fines for negligent pet owners. It's not the dogs fault that they are a specific breed. Breed specific legislation is bogus. If a dog, OF ANY BREED, has an instance of nuisance the pet owner must be held responsible.
- Other: Fines for owners but also requiring them to provide better training (mandatory). Put problematic owners on a banned ownership list. Don't punish the dogs, punish bad owners and trainers.
- Other: Fines for owners who are not being responsible with their animal (ie. Following posted signage or breaking by-laws). Free classes for owners to take to help teach good animal behaviours and resources if they have trouble with their pet (ie barking). No laws should exist based on an animals breed, all laws should be based on the actions of the owner.
- Other: Fines for owners who drop their dog off at parks and leave them unattended (eg: leave the park, go sit in their car, etc)
- Other: Fines to owners who can't control their animal. Required training for the OWNER to learn how to handle said nuisance dog.
- Other: Funded education programs for owners of pitfalls. Don't bully this breed!!!!!! its people who are bad not these sweet baby's.
- Other: Further screening for pit bull owners before purchasing a pitbul
- 1
- Other: Get the [removed] outta here with BSL [removed], it doesn't fix [removed] but only causes more non registered animals in your city. These dogs are great animals if trained correctly , just like small dogs or cats. They all have a thing called a stupid owners. Never mind punishing the dogs, punish the owner and maybe even focus on more severe topics like pedophiles and rapists..
- Other: HANDLER training for those who want to own "high risk" breeds. The dogs aren't the issue, it's the owners!
- Other: Have a mandatory basic dog training for all owners and have it be easily offered / accessed by the city
- Other: Have a warning system for nuisance offenders - after 3 warnings, an interim order will be issued. There needs to be a clear definition of nuisance activities.
- Other: Having been attacked by several dogs (none of which are pit bulls) more needs to be done to provide victims with easy recourse and ensure safety going forward. FOR ALL PETS.
- Other: Higher fine for dogs who are being aggressive towards dogs and people NO MATTER WHAT THE BREED!
- Other: How about every person who decides to get s dog needs to get training done. Its not the dog that is dangerous, its the lack of training and the owner being uneducated. Pitbulls are no more dangerous than any other breed of dog and majority of them have great temperaments and are super sweet. Train owners how to properly care and train their animals and there would be less problems and it shouldn't be targetted to one breed only.
- Other: How about fines for pet owners that engage in terrible aggression training or who are negligent in their care and treatment of their pets. Nuisance dogs are like that because of their owners, there are no bad breeds. "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more



bite incidents than other dog breeds". This statement looks like an admittance of bias to me.

Legislation should never be based on something as vague as "potential". I don't see big strong people being condemned for their potential to cause harm. Breed specific legislation is illogical.

- Other: How about instead of blaming the dog you blame the owner. Pit bulls and other bully breeds are not aggressive. The only time a dog is aggressive is when the OWNER!!! Does not train their dog. Start putting the blame on the people responsible.
- Other: How about make any pet owner have to take obedience classes. Dogs need training. It's not fair to punish them when it's the human that can't be controlled.
- Other: HOW ABOUT NOT TARGETING BREEDS, BUT THE OWNERS FOR NOT TRAINING PROPERLY
- Other: How about you waste your time on something way more pressing.
- Other: How can you dictate which dog is a nuisance, How can you dictate which animals is dangerous. There's no bad animal, just bad owners. Animals shouldn't be classified based on the city's perception of past beliefs. Pit Bulls are very sweet and a dog that has a barking problem shouldn't be declared unable to attend an off-leash park. Who wrote these questions
- Other: I agree with none
- Other: I agree with the concept of having aggressive dogs, put in obedience training with the owner. However, I will be taking matters further due to the fact that throughout this entire section you are directly attacking one breed. Especially as a pet owner this should have never been presented in this matter. The content is understandable for aggressive dogs; however you are classifying and entire breed as aggressive. Therefore, I believe if you expect one dog breed to be muzzled, then technically they all should be this includes Chihuahuas.
- Other: I am sorry but you are being pitbull racists. I have been bitten by a pit bull it hurts yep caused pain, yes I have also been bitten by a Maltese shitsu cross and it was worse it got infected. Stop with the Pit bull racism. There are worse dogs than pit bulls get off the band wagon.
- Other: I am very disappointed in the targeted surgery towards pitbulls and likewise breeds. The dog is a reflection of the owner and not the dog for the most part. I am far more fearful of the smaller chihuahua like breeds than a pitbull and I have seen far more fights occur between dogs when it is smaller breeds. Please consider removing pitbull from this survey
- Other: I believe a law should be passed to BAN BACKYARD BREEDING, & only registered, responsible breeders can run this sort of business. With this said, there should then be regulations for these breeders & contracts between buyer & seller that buyer will invest in professional dog training. This will limit the amount of surrenders, poorly trained dogs, stray & homeless dogs, & will provide a healthier lifestyle for the owner & pet.
- Other: I believe higher fines for owners, and higher charges for owners whose animals have become aggressive or displayed dangerous behaviour. It's our choice as humans to own such an animal therefore we should be liable for their actions. No particular breed or species should be exempt or over qualified for said fines/charges
- Other: I believe the owners themselves should also be looked at, not just the dogs



- Other: I can't believe that pit bulls are being singled out again. The legislation does nothing and it has been proven over and over again. Why are we going backwards?? Its NOT the breed. It IS the owners. 100%ven over and over again.
- Other: I disagree with the specific guidelines only towards Pit bulls. It should be the same for each dog and no extra insurance.
- Other: I do not agree that pit bull breeds should be signalled out. As someone who used to work in veterinary medicine for 10 years, I saw next to none pit bulls involved in dog attacks. More often it is the small dogs that are allowed to bark and run and attack anything and everyone that are the problem. As people think because they are small they can't hurt anything or anyone. At the end of the day it all comes down to dog owners being responsible. By responsible I mean taking the time to understand dog behaviour and ensure their dog is trained properly even if that means getting extra training when necessary. Pit bulls aren't the problem, owners are and owners of all breeds not just pit bulls. As an owner of a pit bull whom has taken the responsibility to ensure that my dog is well trained and always under my control. My dog is always seen as a good dog in my community. All our neighbours constantly comment how well behaved the dog is and sweet, strangers do too. Sometimes strangers don't recognize the breed and ask what it is and are shocked when we say a pit bull. Their reaction is typically No!, but he's so nice. So although I understand that their bite can be more severe owners need to be held responsible not the breed. Because other dogs can also cause severe damage due to bites.
- Other: I do not agree to breed specific legislation/laws
- Other: I do not approve of labelling pitbulls differently than other dogs. From experience volunteering with dogs, there is no evidence that pit bulls have more strength than other breeds. I have encountered many other breeds that are stronger than pit bulls.
- Other: I do not believe that specifying pitbulls in legislation is going to help decrease these situations. While it was previously stated that pitbulls do have more bite force, the majority number of dogs that cause bite wounds are breeds other than pitbulls. I think nuisance dogs need to be reviewed with an open mind on which breed is involved, and focus more on what we can do for each individual animal involved over a blanket description of said breed.
- Other: I do not condone targeting a specific breed based on physical traits.
- Other: I do not like this breed specific discrimination. Pitbulls are being labelled negatively. I don't want to have a city that bans a breed of dog. It's not the dog. It's the owner.
- Other: I do not support any typw of breed specific legislation, punish bad owners, all dogs are inherently good, including pitbulls
- Other: I do not support breed specific bylaws, singling out pit bulls is unfair and not proven to be effective in other cities.
- Other: I do NOT support breed specific legislation!
- Other: I do not support breed specific legislation. As a certified dog trainer I work with dogs of all sizes and breeds. Breed has nothing to do with severity of bite as it is all in the training and socialization of dogs. Because of their bad rap pitbulls are often not allowed in puppy classes, or quickly discriminated against for normal dog behaviors which leads to not having the opportunity to



get the same socialization to learn things like bit inhibition. Breed specific legislation will further hurt this and will cause more problems not less.

- Other: I don't feel a pit bull breed needs to be mentioned at all. My boxer/pitbull mix has been attacked by small dogs more than 10 times out in public.
- Other: I don't see these specific dogs as a problem
- Other: I don't believe it is appropriate to single out pitbull owners. Any dog can be trained to be aggressive. The owners need to take the responsibility instead of the dog.
- Other: I strongly believe the statement about pitbulls having a stronger bite is incorrect due to the fact that many larger dogs such as great Danes or rottweilers can do more damage. I do believe any dog should have any of these rules in place though I do believe that people with previous offending dogs should take proper action to train their dogs better and possibly muzzle out in public for others safety no matter the breed.
- Other: I strongly disagree with breed specific legislation since it has been shown to be ineffective.
- Other: I think all owners should have to obey by the same laws
- Other: I think it is problematic that pitbulls "due to their strength and power" are being put in such a shameful light whereas equally as large and powerful breeds ie. German Shepherds, St. Bernards, Great Danes, Bullmastifs, Wolfhounds, and Labrador Retrievers are not being named specifically. Change the language and stop targeting breeds that already have stigma associated.
- Other: I think only training should be required for dogs of nuisance because it's not the dog that's the problems. It's the owners.
- Other: I think this is rather disgustingly discriminatory actually. I have 3 pitbulls and they are the most loving dogs we've ever had. This would not be fair at all, any of these. Special insurance, muzzling my animals, not allowing them to have the same freedoms etc. If you enforce any of those above discriminatory actions, we will be moving out of this city very very quickly. Shame on you.
- Other: I think you are targeting pit bulls. My pit bull is more liveable than my lab was. I think you should be going after the owners that turn dogs vicious
- Other: I would like to make this VERY clear. I 100% DO NOT support breed discrimination. Pit-bulls are some of the sweetest creatures I have ever met. They do not deserve to be treated any differently based on their size or breed. I have been attacked and my dogs have been attacked by much smaller dogs. This is not okay and I am very disappointed that my city is even considering putting these laws in place. I believe there should be stricter laws in place on who can own dogs in our city. Reduce animal endangerment and make sure these dogs are being trained properly and not mistreated. That is what causes aggression. Animals should be treated as an individual and not defined by breed.
- Other: I would not support any measures specifically targeting pit bull-type animals, and moreover I am quite disappointed that this form doesn't allow for commentary on the matter. This form has itself acknowledged that pit bull-type dogs are no more likely to bite than any other breed. I do not support any limits put on the pit-bull breed merely because they have a more dangerous, but not more likely, bite. Do we limit what bodybuilders can do because they have a higher potential for harm if they were to attack? Any of the above proposals involving pit bull breeds would have multiple effects.



Firstly, it would add further stigma to the breed, which would actually have very negative downstream effects. Further stigmatization means that those who are not knowledgeable about dogs start to act differently around pit bull-types which increases the potential for danger, not decreases. On this point, wearing a muzzle, while decreasing the ability of a dog to bite, makes them more aggressive because they fear they will themselves be attacked. This can severely impact the psychology of an animal and lead to an overall increase in aggression in a dog who previously was not a risk. Additionally, these proposals put an unfair financial burden on the owners of these animals. This will lead to animals not being properly registered and known to the city and, potentially, being abandoned to shelters or the street. This is especially true for the proposal that there can only be one pit bull type per household. What of households who already own more than one? These are beloved animals, and many families have more than one because they integrate so well into the family unit. I sincerely hope these unnecessarily punitive and wholly ineffective proposals are not approved.

- Other: I would support nothin singling out "pit bulls" as an aggressive or dangerous breed; it's discriminatory and completely unnecessary.
- Other: I'm ashamed of this proposal . How dare you awful human beings. Terrible people . Shame on you.
- Other: I'd like "nuisance" in terms of animals to be better defined as currently anything that annoys anyone at any time of day can create a complaint even if animals are simply displaying normal behavior for the circumstance. If someone happens to be annoyed by music, kids, yard work, group gatherings, etc. there are clear definitions about levels of noise, times of day, etc. that prevent unreasonable complaint about activities on one's own private property.
- Other: If a dog is aggressive then it should be dealt with on a case by case basis. Not lumped into a group and there had better be DNA testing paid for by the city before you deem a dog to be aggressive because you think it looks like a pitbull.
- Other: if a pitbul has not done anything and was raised right, why should owners have to pay more money when there pitbuls are already good.
- Other: If you actually do some research you'll find that pit bulls are not aggressive by nature, are terrific with children, and are incredibly loyal. Not to mention the fact that there are many other breeds that pose a greater threat, regarding size, weight, aggression, and bite force. Even the German shepherd has a higher bite force and the police use and praise them (Pitbull 235psi and German Shepherd 238psi)
- Other: If you believe any animal is a nuisance animal that is not wild, then you need to look at the owner not the animal.
- Other: Implement fines for nuisance dog owners - dog owners that neglect their dogs needs or abuse them, or otherwise treat them unfairly.
- Other: In general, what bothers me the most is seeing (any dog breed) walking freely without a leash next to his/her owner. Some people are not serious regarding this point



- Other: In regards to singling out one breed, I think we need to take into consideration the individuals who are wanting a strong breed like a pitbull. Labelling a breed as aggressive does not help any situation, there should be support for owners instead.
- Other: increased bylaws for pit bulls is ridiculous and unnecessary. All dogs, small or large, need to be trained by the owner. The pit bull discrimination is sad. I've seen more smaller dogs creating issues at dog parks and biting children than large breed dogs and pit bulls. STOP TARGETING BULLY BREEDS. ALL dogs have the potential to be dangerous and bite. Not just pit bulls. Make dog training affordable and accessible. Teaching children how to properly interact with dogs.
- Other: Instead of picking on breeds just make obedience training mandatory for all dogs. It's absolutely wrong to try and create specific laws against specific breeds of dogs. Stop picking on Pitbulls
- Other: Instead of Pitbulls or missions dogs these tules should apply to all dogs. For example all owners should be required to train their dog for Saftey no matter the breed.
- Other: Introducing BSL against pitbulls is ridiculous. Dogs react in accordance to how they were raised/trained. Just because someone has a pitbull doesn't mean that dog is more aggressive than a chihuahua just because of the breed.
- Other: Invest in city sanctioned obedience training and education for pet owners. Breed doesn't matter, just as race doesn't, focus on the problem (people) rather than the product (the animal and their behaviour).
- Other: It is absolutely appalling that "pit bulls" are being singled out in such a way. I also don't believe it is right to fine owners for a barking dog. Dogs bark, it is in their nature.
- Other: It is incredibly unjust to blame a breed. That is ridiculous.
- Other: It is offensive and misinformed to specifically target pit bull breeds in this survey. The city of Calgary has a responsibility to provide and present fair, unbiased and non-leading information, questionnaires and surveys to the residents of Calgary. Singling out pit bull breeds is preposterous. I visit dog parks across the city daily and have seen numerous aggressive dogs (None of them 'pit-bulls'), most of them with inattentive and negligent owners. Punish the owners, not the breed. Please consider changing the wording of this survey, it reeks of misinformation and outdated assumptions about specific breeds.
- Other: It is the owners responsibility it is not the animals fault. Responsible pet owners do jot let their animals attack people or other animals!
- Other: It is the responsibility of owners to ensure that their dog is trained and responds to recall and other commands prior to entering off leash areas and areas where a dog has uncontrolled interactions with the public.
- Other: It should not matter if it is a pit bull or not any dog can be viscous, we can't take the right away from one breed and not others. If the dog is dangerous OF ANY BREED the owner is responsible for keeping people and other animals safe from the dog!
- Other: Its not the pit bulls fault that they have a terrible owner
- Other: Its proven by other municipalities that breed specific bylaws do not reduce the number of dog bites. pit bull type dogs are not more harmful as pets if handled by a responsible owner. The city



need more education on dog handling, body language, and dog communication. Our mayor once said we would never have BSL in Calgary. Its unfair to the many, many good dogs that have a bully breed in them to have these unjust and biased regulations. Focus on education, not condemnation.

- Other: It's [removed] that Pitbulls and or Pitbull type breeds are being singled out in this occasion, when there many other types of dogs that are more aggressive, attack or bite other dogs/people/kids. IF you train your pitbull properly then there are NO issues with them. If you watch to see how they react to certain situations you can learn from it and then TEACH your dogs what not to do. They are good loyal, caring and cuddly dogs. If you don't train your dog properly then any dog will become aggressive and have a higher chance of attacking some one and/or another dog. Its very unfair that any type of pitbull gets singled out. ANY dog that i have ever seen attack or get aggressive and snarl/snap is smaller dog breeds.
- Other: It's not the dog breed it's the owner, there should be no breed specific laws. If a dog exhibits bad behaviour once they should go to obedience class, of the dog does it again then decide if it need more training or not potentially surrender to an animal shelter and rehome the dog.
- Other: It's not the pitbulls it's the owners. I am disappointed in the city of Calgary for bring uneducated enough to think it's the dogs fault and not the owners lack of ability to train an animal
- Other: It's the owner not the breed.
- Other: It's the owner not the dog! I've seen far more aggressive dogs than pitbulls! Pitbulls with the right owner are quite docile compared to a non pitbull where the owner treats the dog as a child and unable to control the dog on the leash. Where these dogs are pulling owners and actively trying to get to people/dogs to attack!! It's the owner, not the breed!
- Other: It's the owners, not the dog!!! Stop hating on pit bulls!!!! I grew up with pit bulls and they would never harm anyone! They are just big lap dogs
- Other: Just going to put it out there that this seems very much like a precursor to the city trying to implement a breed ban. This will not work. An emphasis is required on proper training, not blaming certain breeds. It is enormously unfair for a few poorly trained dogs of a particular breed to result in an outright ban for the breed itself.
- Other: Leave breed specifics out of this debate!
- Other: LEAVE OUR PIT BULLS ALONE! The city of Calgary is discriminating against pit bulls, when we should be training PEOPLE to take better care of their animals and give them the care they need. Punish the owner NOT THE DOG
- Other: Leave pit bulls and bully breeds alone. I have never had an issue with one, but I can't tell you how many times I've had problems with small dogs.
- Other: Leave Pitbulls alone. Time and time again it's been proved that bad owners are the problem. Not the dog
- Other: Look everyone should take a class to get a dog to know the rules and not be a [removed] when out in public. To know that a dog on leash when encountering a dog off leash is not going to end nice. Dogs have manors and humans has self entitled egos. Humans need training. Then there would be less dog drama issues. I've never had a problem with a pit but a blue heeler attacked my



pwd. My dog was on leash and had his ear on my calf sitting. If my hubby was not there I would have had a dead dog as he had to pry its mouth open and hubby was bit multiple times.

- Other: make animal ownership way harder like more registrations so you cannot surrender it either
- Other: Making it about only pitbulls is the equivalent of saying only certain types of people are addicts. If you're going to implement bylaws, make it about all dog breeds. Dachshunds bite more; certain owners are negligent. Make it about all dogs or none at all. There's too much fear mongering against pitbulls; they were once nanny dogs and are some of the sweetest and loyal. I don't own a pitbull but have had one before and met several others. Any dog can be a nuisance and can any owner. I'm disgusted to see that the pitbull breed is being singled out as the only nuisance pet.
- Other: Mandatory owner training for ANY dog REGARDLESS of size involved in incident, for BOTH or ALL parties involved in incident. Victim dogs and owners played a roll as well and the majority of people don't know what to do in a dog conflict situation and that can be just as dangerous as an out of control dog.
- Other: Mandatory spaying/neutering. No intact dogs over 6 months of age allowed off-leash
- Other: Mandatory training sessions for ANY dog and owner with multiple offenses.
- Other: Mind your own damn buisness and hold the owners accountable if anything
- Other: More proper education by formal trainers before people are allowed to own dogs as breed has nothing to do with being a nuisance and more information needs to be put out there by reliable sources like Justice For Bullies
- Other: More resources for training dogs and informing the public on dog breeds and proper training of pets. It's the owner not the dog. Please do not put any breed specific legislation, this stigmatizes the breed. Which isnt fair.
- Other: My friend has a pitbull who is a rescue and she is the sweetest damn dog ever! Singling out pittis is a shame! And so very wrong the owners are responsible more than the dog it self
- Other: My roommates dog is a Pitbull type breed and has never bit anyone or attacked any dog. However she has been attacked by poodles, labradoodles, and labs. I think unfair that majority of your options apply to pitbulls. Have you ever spent time with a labradoodle? Those things are crazy. All rules to apply to all dogs, not just a certain breed. All dogs should be required to have training, not just pitbulls
- Other: No breed restrictions are logical... As a Calgary dog owner of 5+ years I have never had an issue with a pitbull
- Other: No breed specific bylaws!
- Other: NO breed specific bylaws! Small dogs pose more aggression and violence than pit bull breeds.
- Other: No breed specific language. Rules for dogs with bad behavior are fine, but you can not attack a dog breed. When stated above they are not any mkrw aggressive then another dog.
- Other: NO BREED SPECIFIC LAWS OR BYLAWS ESPECIALLY TOWARDS PITBULLS
- Other: No breed specific laws.
- Other: No breed specific legislation. There are no problem breeds only problem owners



- Other: No breed specific legislation. Science does not back this and seeing this in Calgary is highly disappointing. Requiring pitbulls to be muzzled reduces their ability to be trained and socialized properly which will create both more problems and more fear. Quebec just decided not to put their breed specific legislation in place. This is a step backwards for Calgary.
- Other: No BSL. Statistic would show responsible BREEDING can reduce genetically unruly dogs. No BSL please. We will not be able to travel and spend money in your city.
- Other: No specific laws should be put in place against pitbulls.
- Other: Noise complaints should not deem a dog a nuisance for the sake of being muzzled in public, or kept on property. Only if a dog bites another dog more than once should the dogs possibly be put on restriction.
- Other: Non breed specific bylaw for dogs that have been aggressive requiring them to overgo reactive training
- Other: None of the above should be breed specific, its not the dog! Itâthe owners! As a bully breed owner I believe it is setting every dog up for success! Its proper training and socialization that allows any breed to act and be acceptable!
- Other: None of the above this is NOT the DOGS fault this is the owners.
- Other: None, the breed is not the problem
- Other: NONE. "Nuisance dogs" only exist because of poor ownership. All these bylaws penalize ownership based on the simple fact of having that bread of animal.
- Other: Not all pitbulls are dangerous. Pitbulls can be loving and loyal companions, and it is disappointing if you believe that all pitbulls are dangerous. If a dog causes an issue to another person, it may be due to past abuse. These dogs need to be supported and not discouraged. City of Calgary can require obedience training for dogs that cause issues to others. However seizing them should NOT be an option.
- Other: Not grouping together nuisance as noise or biting etc. The solution(s) for noise are so different from what owners ought to be doing to address biting.
- Other: Not immediately ordering to muzzle them, not knowing the dogs history.
- Other: Not in favor of any of these many pit bulls are actually very good dogs it is the ownership that is questionable. Have owners take pit bull ownership courses to make the owner responsible for their dogs behaviour. I have yet to meet a bad pit bull only bad pit bull ownership. A kid 16 or 17 years of age is not responsible enough to own one.
- Other: nuisance dog can not include a barking dog (all dogs bark)
- Other: Nuisance dogs who have been involved in biting incidents must always remain on a leash in public, and must be muzzled at the dog park if off leash.
- Other: Nuisance is too broad- friendly dogs that bark or are intelligent escape artists would be subjected to the same penalties as a biting dog. A vicious/dangerous dog category is required to justify all of these measures. I would only support them if they were specific to a dog who has harmed another animal or human. I own a dog that is a friendly border collie mix with zero nuisance behaviours, I have lived in Calgary since I was 5 and now have a family and four children. This



survey is yet another (in a string) of the municipal government's lack of respect for the citizens in Calgary that makes me want to MOVE! Its disgusting.

- Other: Obedience classes for DOG owners. Teaching them about different breeds and how to train ALL dogs properly.
- Other: Obedience training for ALL breeds of dogs required. It is NOT the dog's fault if they bite, this is a reaction based on fear, NOT aggression. If a dog bites someone that is because the PERSON has ignored warning signs from a dog and not respected their space. Dogs are not dangerous. People who do not properly train or handle their dogs are dangerous. When getting a dog it should be required that the person and the dog attend training in order to understand dog's boundaries. This is not breed specific. All breeds can come from traumatic backgrounds in which they react negatively to certain stimuli. It is the owner's responsibility to keep their dog safe as well as others. It is completely unreasonable to make this a "pit bull type" bylaw. There is too much grey area for this and a LOT of "pit bull type" dogs are great dogs. Do some research and stop this ridiculous narrative.
- Other: Obedience training for ALL dog NOT JUST PITT BULLS
- Other: Obedience training should be required for ALL dogs. There is NO SUCH THING as a bad dog or a bad breed, JUST BAD OWNERS. Owners MUST be held accountable for training and raising their dogs properly, from pit bulls to chihuahuas.
- Other: offer affordable or assistance program for obedience training to any and all dogs who need it, it would change a lot for owners as classes are usually another expense and are not cheap. Pitbulls should NOT be singled out
- Other: Offer free classes and literature, promoting education over punishment for responsible/safe dog ownership.
- Other: Other breeds that exhibit dangerous behavior should be muzzled in public. Not just pitbulls. This should apply to all breeds.
- Other: Owner education. All dogs can be properly trained if the time and effort is put in.
- Other: Owners put through mandatory obedience class with pet per incident class. Being animal owners for my whole life, any animal will react badly if not influenced correctly.
- Other: Owners should be fined for not handling their dog properly. Higher fines for ANY dog that irritates and causes problems in off leash parks.
- Other: Owners should be required to neuter/spay their dogs for all breeds (with an exception for breeders), to help prevent aggressive behaviour. Pet owners should also be required to read the bylaw and understand their responsibilities - too often in my neighbourhood, owners of various dog breeds will let their dogs run off leash in their front yards, on leash parks, and alleys, even though it's against the bylaw. Breed specific restrictions are ineffective - owners should be held accountable for how they care for their dogs, i.e.; neuter/spay them, keep them on leash, exercise them, train and socialize them.
- Other: Owners should have to take a course. The dogs aren't the problem, people having pets who shouldn't is the problem.



- Other: People who are not capable of owning a dog (of any breed) should be fined for not taking proper care of their animals, which includes training (something all dog owners should have to do).
- Other: People who own animals that are problematic should be required to attend training with the pet. Do not ban the breed
- Other: PIT BILL SHOULD BE REHOMED IF OWNER IS UNFIT TO TRAIN OR TAKE CARE OF IT. NOT CONDEMNING THEM FOR THEIR BREED.
- Other: Pit bull owners must be seriously vetted! It's PEOPLE who are the problem, not the breed.
- Other: Pit bulls are absolutely not the problem, bad ownership is, DO NOT punish a dog for a bad owner. How about you require owners to take classes on how to train their dog and I mean this for ALL dog breeds, tiny dogs are often much more aggressive because people think they can handle it and when they bite it's not as bad. If somebody has a dog showing aggressiveness then the owner needs to do better.
- Other: Pit bulls are no more or less dangerous than other breeds. Also technically pit bull is not a breed. The suggestion of a breed ban is spitting on Bill Bruce. The system he set in Calgary had become an example for the world they call it "the Calgary model". Please do not ban any dog breeds. My Staffordshire bull terrier is a sweetheart and she loves people and kids. She would never hurt anyone. I feel insulted that people would think less of me or my dog because of her breed. She is my best friend and she loves me as much as I love her
- Other: Pit bulls are NOT nuisance dogs! How ridiculous to classify a whole breed. Get your biased opinions out of your lawmaking process. Education on the true loving nature of pit bulls is obviously needed!
- Other: Pit bulls are not bad or mean dogs!
- Other: Pit bulls are not the issue. Bad owners are.
- Other: Pit bulls are not the problem and they are not naturally aggressive dogs. Any dog can be aggressive if they are trained to be. This is ridiculous that Pitbull breeds are the ones being singled out. Bad behaviour is taught by bad owners and this bylaw is absolutely garbage.
- Other: Pit bulls are not to blame for the way their owners train them. Any dog that causes an issue should have the same rules applied. The breed is irrelevant.
- Other: Pit bulls aren't a bad breed. Owners training their dogs to attack is the issue. You are looking in the wrong direction and will have a huge push back from pit bull and other bad breed dog owners.
- Other: Pit bulls or bully breeds are not the problem. Bad owners are! All dogs should receive training. If a dog bites they are provoked or untrained. THE DOG IS NOT THE PROBLEM PIT BULLS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM OWNERS NEED TO BE HELD RESPONSIBLE NOT THE DOG.
- Other: Pit Bulls should not be singled out in this. Do some research. A German Sheppard has a stronger bite. This is ridiculous that this is still being talked about. I would be more willing to support some of these if it was [removed] not directed toward one single breed. A breed that in my experience is more loving and kind and gentle than a Yorkie or most small dogs.
- Other: Pit bulls should not be singled out. Dogs should not have to be muzzled unless they have attacked a person/other dog and injured them.
- Other: pitbull behaviour is promoted by its owners, not all pit bulls are aggressive!



- Other: PITBULL'S ARE HARMLESS. I/m more scared of a tiny yapping Chihuahua then a pitbull
- Other: Pitbulls are NOT a nuisance breed! Training courses and neuter/spay should be mandatory regardless, but there are MUCH MORE DANGEROUS breeds of dog than a nanny breed of dog. This goes to show that the people suggesting these bylaws are of little intelligence.
- Other: Pitbulls are not inherently dangerous animals
- Other: Pitbulls are not the issue. They are not a bad breed and they absolutely should not be singled out. If you're going to enforce these measures please do not increase the stigma that these breeds face. My husbands family has three pitbulls and they are more friendly/well behaved than my goldendoodle.
- Other: Pitbulls are not the problem, its the owners. Instill fines for homeowners that don't properly train their dogs
- Other: Pitbull's are NOT the problem.
- Other: Pitbulls aren't dangerous, don't exclude other breeds. A dogs temperament is based on their owner.
- Other: Pitbulls aren't the problem. Little [removed] rat dogs are. Larger fines for people who walk their dogs on extendable leashes and don't control their animals
- Other: Pitbulls should not be singled out. They are great dogs just like any others.
- Other: Pitbulls should not be targeted, they are a wonderful breed. Adequate behavior training should be required for all dogs & dog owners.
- Other: Pitbulls should not have any additional threats made against them or the owners as you say above there are not as many bites from pit bulls as there are from other dogs
- Other: Please do not proceed with breed specific legislation
- Other: PLEASE DO NOT SINGLE OUT PITBULLS. THE PROBLEM IN ALL DOGS BECOMES WHEN THEY ARE NOT TRAINED. PEOPLE NEED TO BE TRAINED ON HOW TO TRAIN THEIR DOGS. PLEASE PUT A FOCUS ON TRAINING. SIMPLY BANNING DOGS FROM PARKS OR OUTDOOR AREAS OR MUZZELING THEM DOES NOT SOLVE THE PROBLEM. TRAINING SOLVES THE PROBLEM
- Other: Please don not become like these other ridiculous places that ban/discriminate again a specific breed. I do not own a pitbull and think these bylawsbannings a ridiculous. The city is pushing all this love ! [removed]
- Other: Please stop discriminating against bully breeds! Your own survey admits they are less likely to bite than other breeds. These types of questions and proposed bylaw just reinforce the FALSE narrative that these dogs, as a whole, are a problem
- Other: Promoting responsible ownership regardless of the breed. More control on backyard breeders. Mandatory puppy classes for all dogs.
- Other: Punish / fine individual owners. Not a breed.
- Other: Punish the human for not training their dog. Don;t punish the animal
- Other: Put more responsibility on the dog(s) owners, breed has nothing to do with bad behaviour or dog bites



- Other: Putt bulls should not be targeted in your legislation. There is no increase in dog bites from them over others and I think this is an antiquated argument. Calgary can do better than this.
- Other: racist against pits and breeds such as pits. Demanding obedience training could make dogs worse with the wrong trainer. You are clearly not educated in dogs and your council is a disgrace. Should not matter on breed since all dogs can be a nuisance not just pitbulls. Leave the bylaw the way it is without that dumb racist ban. stop making your city hate you NO TO BSL!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Other: Raise the fine for the owner. It's the owners fault the dog has become a nuisance and/or dangerous. The fines should not be targeted to the type of dog, but to the owners of the dogs.
- Other: Regarding the asterisked information, if the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull/s strength allows the potential for a more severe bite, why are Rottweilers and German Shepherds not also listed in the Bylaws? Rottweilers have the toughest bite with 328 pounds of force, the German shepherd came in second with 238 pounds of force, and the pit bull bit with 235 pounds of force the lowest of the group
- Other: Responsible pet owners, foster homes not applicable. Irresponsible pet owners need training to own pets.
- Other: Same rules should apply to all breeds of dogs. It is up to the owner to ensure they train there pets appropriately not the dogs fault.
- Other: Scientifically pit bulls do not have a harder bite and are not a more aggressive breed when compared to others. I would support this if more research and scientific evidence was backing this up.
- Other: Should not specify breed at all. A golden retriever is just as likely to be just as strong and aggressive as a pit bull. There should be regulation on the education of owners and dog behaviour rather than setting fines for dogs with behavioural issues.
- Other: Single breeds or breed types should not be singled out. The owner is usually the problem as dogs only know what they are taught. Bad owners should have their dogs removed for the safety and well-being of the animal. They should be fined and restricted from further pet licensing in the future
- Other: Singling out ONE BREED is WRONG.
- Other: small dogs bite more than pitbulls. ban chihuahuas and other breeds that are KNOWN to be more aggrieved than a pitbull. banning pitbulls is dumb, short sighted, and easily the dumbest thing this government has proposed in my 36 years in this city. don't be dumb.
- Other: So sad you're building fear and using pit bulls in this engagement.
- Other: Sorry I have seen more people bitten by little dogs than big dogs, 99% of the time if a big dog bites a little dog it is because the little dog owner allows it to run at the big dog and/or bite the big dog and the bigger dog defends it self but because it is bigger it is somehow it's fault? no. Also jaw strength doesn't matter to a child who is traumatized, has severe facial damage or scars. I don't own a pitbull but I have friends who have a rescue and he is the kindest dog I know singling them out isn't ok.



- Other: Sounds like you've made your mind up about pit bull type dogs.. how about applying those exacting standards to all breeds and maybe factoring in irresponsible owners rather than taking the approach of swatting a fly with a mallet?
- Other: Stop blaming the breed of dog for the issues that are clearly from uncaring owners. Screening of potential animal owners, or anyone that would misuse/not properly train any animal are the real problem. Potentially looking at licensing people to have an animal would be more effective than blaming the breed of dog.
- Other: Stop bullying a single breed!!!!!! Leave pit bull breeds alone!
- Other: Stop discriminating against pit bulls as Chihuahuas are just as bad. Nuisance for constant barking and neglected animals need to be addressed
- Other: Stop discriminating or using language that indicates bias towards certain breeds. ANY breed of dog has the potential to be dangerous. I should know, my worst encounter was with a shitzu, that lunged at my face and managed to inflict damage to the tune of major scars and more than a dozen stitches. The problem is never the breed it is always the owner. Even the best intentions on the part of the owner are useless when there is t an understanding about the nature of dogs all breeds. How about mandatory education for the owners. Creating a community that supports prevention by working cooperatively with shelters and rescue groups to subsidize training and education. Create a system where completion of the training would allow for a reduction of the licensing fees as an incentive. Educate the public better on the purpose of licensing making it a program that citizens see as cooperative instead of punitive. Subsidize and incentivize spaying and neutering and support legislation and enforcement at all levels to prevent puppy mills/BYB from working without regulation or enforcemen mass breeding and inbreeding just exacerbate the problems dogs, and the owners who don't hVe the skill or resources to deal with it.
- Other: Stop discrimination based on breed
- Other: Stop profiling "Pitbulls", and start implementing stricter punishments to the owners. Its not the dogs fault, its the owners fault.
- Other: Stop separating pit bull type breeds & bully breeds from every other dog. Chihuahuas are a bugger nuisance than Pit bulls and are never considered a problem. Give your head a shake, this revision is not going to go well for this city if you go through with legislation like this.
- Other: STOP SINGLING OUT PIT BULLS It's not even a real thing.
- Other: Stop targeting Pit bulls!!! Responsible owners train and look after their dog(s). The breed is not the problem - irresponsible people are the problem. Fine irresponsible owners and ban them from owning pets - stop making it difficult to own a bully mix. My bully mix had less of a prey drive and was not an alpha like my purebread Rhodesian Ridgebacks.
- Other: Stop using bully breeds as a scapegoat for bad owners with poorly trained dogs.
- Other: STOP with the pit bull discrimination. This breed is incredibly intelligent. Punish the owners for not training and controlling, not the dog!!! You wouldn't ban trucks because enough people couldn't drive them properly. Makes NO logical sense to introduce restrictions on ANY single breed. Chihuahuas are more violent. Do the actual research.



- Other: Targeting pit bull breeds is ridiculous. I've been bitten by more small dogs- why aren't they classified as nuisances?
- Other: Targeting pit bulls is classism at its finest.
- Other: The dog breed shouldn't matter, it's the owner's fault if their dog isn't properly trained, there should be a high fine if their dog is in a fight or causes injury. The dog breeds aren't the problem and singling out a breed like pitbull just adds to the stigma and fear around them.
- Other: The fact that you are bullying one breed disgusts me maybe you should take the time to actually do some research the city of Calgary is pathetic
- Other: There is no reason to specifically target pit bulls - that is discrimination!
- Other: The large breed dogs are not the issue. It is the untrained little dogs that get into the face of large breed dogs. I've seen it hundreds of times, if not more. I am the responsible owner of 2 large breed dogs, and I tend to stay away from them, because I have dealt with my dog administering a bite because a little dog, whose owner was 500 meters away had zero control over their dog. It ran up to my one dog, who was leashed, and hit at her face, resulting in my dog defending itself. If anything, start a traffic light color system. Red means I like my distance, I may bite, I may be aggressive, I don't like dogs or humans, etc...) Yellow means cautionary (I may bite, I am shy, I'm in training, I am old and arthritic, etc...) and Green means I am friendly and approachable. I think if you use the traffic light color system, you will see a lot of owners being much more responsible, and keep their untrained dogs away from potentially aggressive or arthritic dogs
- Other: The level of breed selectivity in this survey is absolutely appalling. As someone who has worked extensively around both people and animals (used to work at an emergency veterinary clinic for 5+ years, and currently have a Masters in Occupational Therapy), it is absurd that Pit Bulls are being targeted. I am disgusted that the City is even proposing such options of singling out the umbrella of "bully" breeds. This will not promote responsible pet ownership, and will end up penalizing responsible owners of dogs that happen to fall within that category. I have seen a larger number of nuisance dogs of other breeds, as opposed to 'pit bulls' during my 5+ years working in the emergency veterinary medicine field. I can only hope that the City strongly re-evaluates how they are approaching responsible pet ownership.
- Other: The owners should be banned not breeds of dogs one of the sweetest dogs I know are pit bulls. Bad owners make bad dogs
- Other: The problem isn't the breed, it's the owners, don't target specific breeds. Target behaviour.
- Other: the reality is that these dogs are no more dangerous than any other. They're not predisposed to attacking and this question shows your ignorance. Any dog can be vicious if they're trained that way. Even German shepherds focus on the owners not the breed.
- Other: THERE ARE NO BAD BREEDS ONLY BAD OWNERS. As well as a pit bull does NOT have a "stronger" or more severe bite than any other breed, more research is obviously needed by the committee that put this proposal together. Very unfortunate if this happens to go through.
- Other: There are other dog breeds who have stronger bite than pitbull breeds so please educate yourselves



- Other: There is little to no scientific evidence demonstrating a causal relationship between pitbulls and pitbull-like dogs and increased aggression or aggressive tendencies. The imposition of such a targeted bylaw appears predicated solely on longstanding and unfounded myths about these breeds of dogs. Such bylaws, rather than reduce harm, leads to additional cruelty and abuse to these dogs breeds. The City of Calgary should not be associated with condoning such beliefs, whether implicitly or otherwise.
- Other: THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PITBULLS ARE A ANY MORE DANGEROUS THAN OTHER BREEDS. In fact, the ASPCA has a statement that opposes breed-specific bans and legislation (<https://www.asPCA.org/about-us/asPCA-policy-and-position-statements/position-statement-pit-bulls>). If a ban of this nature were to go into place in Calgary, I would challenge with a lawsuit to protect my dog.
- Other: There is no reason to apply any sort of ban towards a breed that is in NO WAY more aggressive than others.
- Other: There is no such thing as a bad dog only bad owners. I've been bitten by chihuahuas a lot more than pit bulls
- Other: There needs to be no distinction between dog breeds. Almost exclusively smaller breeds are more likely to bite than larger breeds. Pit Bulls in particular are rather living did and do not need to be distinguished from other breeds in any way.
- Other: There should be limitations on the breed, if the dog has issues that it should be put in training. The problem is, is that alot of trainers charge way too much. There should be affordable classes
- Other: There should be mandatory training for all dogs. The majority of dog owners lack basic knowledge to understand dog behaviours, causing their dogs to create problems for others. In parts of Europe training is mandatory for a lot of purebred dogs. I don't see why we shouldn't ensure people proactively take the steps to train dogs before problems arise.
- Other: There should be more public education on not allowing children to run up to random dogs. The responsibility should be place on both parties. Not just the dog owner. I dont even own a pit bull and I think this is ridiculous
- Other: There should be no breed limitations.
- Other: There should be no changes with regards to "pit bulls". They are the same as any other bread and it is this issue with the owner improperly training the dog or not letting other be aware that their dog is not friendly. Requiring a dog to be muzzled can increase the fear/agresion response of the dog making the problem worse in the long run. The voluntary dog early warning system is a much better option than those suggested above.
- Other: There should be no distinction between breeds. Dog problems are always the responsibility of people around them. In public, I have been accosted by far more small breed dogs than large ones and that is also a nuisance based on the definition provided. There should be a difference between nuisance and dangerous with resultant treatment of each issue being different.
- Other: There should be no dog breeds considered a 'nuisance'
- Other: There should be no fees or restrictions on any pit bull breeds. It is owners that produce nuisance dogs, and not a result of the breed.



- Other: There should be no off leash pets except for in dog parks, it's not fair to dogs who are considered a nuisance to be attacked by dogs that are off leash. This should be highly considered please. Also for dogs that are considered a nuisance, the owner should be looked at, maybe they are abusing their animals. Animals usually present what behaviour is presented to them.
- Other: There should be no pit bull related laws as the stigma on them isnt based on any credible facts
- Other: There should be no restrictions because of a specific breed! If the dog (no matter what breed) is violent and the owners aren't training correctly then action should be taken, but breed should have NO factor.
- Other: There should be nothing put against any type of breed. If a dog of any breed is declared dangerous, fine should be applied to that dog only.
- Other: There should be training for the owners on how to properly train their dog.
- Other: There should NEVER be any BREED SPECIFIC restrictions or rules. Penalize irresponsible dog owners regardless of breed.
- Other: There should no limitations for the dogs. But more so the owners. Dogs act how owners teach them (just like kids). Please don't punish the dogs for human error
- Other: There should not be any breed specific rules.
- Other: There should not be pitbull specific bylaws
- Other: These are awful awful hurtful ideas. These poor dogs and their owners. A specifically good idea would be to leave these dogs and their people alone.
- Other: These measures are unacceptable and should not be implemented.
- Other: This interim must be applied to ALL dog breeds, not just pit bulls. Pet owners need to take responsibility for their animals, however targeting one breed (or one that 'looks' like a specific breed) does not solve the problem.
- Other: This is a stupid bylaw trying to be enforced you can;t judge a whole breed on a couple bad dog owner. All the bully breed dogs I have been around have been nothing but well mannered and properly trained
- Other: This is absolutely disgusting, you should be ashamed of yourselves.
- Other: This is absolutely ridiculous and proven to not work...ANYWHERE. Quit wasting my tax dollars on your stupid projects. You're a joke!
- Other: This is absolutely ridiculous. Pit bulls should be treated the exact same as any other dog breed and owners should be held to the same level of accountability specific to the incident NOT THE BREED
- Other: This is absurd. It is stated that pit bulls do not have more cases of bites so they should not be treated as such. If any laws are being implemented on a pit bulls it should be any dog over a certain weight. You would never ask to muzzle every golden retriever. Very disappointing.
- Other: This is ridiculous. Sad to see this in our beautiful city.
- Other: This is ridiculous. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.



- Other: This problem is not breed specific but owner specific -- give much higher fines for people that can not control their dogs!!! It is all about the owner not the breed of dog! I do not support any breed specific banning, etc....
- Other: This seem abit bias against pitbulls and pitbull type dogs, they are not bad pets it's about the owner who need to train them a bit more, pitbull bite force ain't that high compared to mastiff, if a dog is deemed aggressive by owner or by law that said owner should take responsibility for his/her dog, taken the opportunity to get the dog trained, if the dog is aggressive around other dogs do not bring them to dog parks along with if there's another dog walking down the same sidewalk they can move to the side and block there dogs view and let the other people pass or walk across the street to the other side walk.
- Other: This should not be breed specific, it is unjust. If you put a bylaw in place it must affect all breeds not just one.
- Other: This should not be for a specific breed (aka pit bulls) if a dog in general is aggressive it should be all be handled the same.
- Other: To restrict a dog from socializing will not allow them to learn the necessary social skills. Whose ever idea this was your thought process pathetic. The fact you got a job in the city concerns me for the future of our city.
- Other: To single out bully breed dogs is unfounded as you have stated above. Please remove bully breed dogs and make it across the board for all nuisance animal or animals that have been charged for bad behaviour. To punish dogs like mine without provocation will incite those owners and only makes the situation worse!
- Other: Training for dog owners would be great. If people had to apply for permit before acquiring a pet dog and they'd get screened would that help reduce number of people who are not suitable pet owners?
- Other: Training for the owner - it is not the dogs fault if the owner has not taken appropriate steps to train the dog. Poor dog behavior = poor owner behavior.
- Other: Umm check your data. Pit Bulls bite psi is 235.... a dane is 238.... why are you supporting breed discrimination
- Other: Under no circumstances should owners and animals be penalized for their existence. There is no evidence that pitbulls are more dangerous than other dogs. This lies in 5he manner the owner has trained them. DO NOT implement any form of extra regulation simply based on breed
- Other: Use dog behavioural assessment for problematic dogs regardless of breed. Do not introduce breed specific legislation, current city parks and dog walking areas are tolerant and respectful of all dogs
- Other: What an idiotic approach. BSL based on zero evidence, it's a stigma created by the media and pushed by the ignorant. You cannot single out an animal because of how it looks. It's a different breed every decade, it's irresponsible owners who don't change!
- Other: When a dog is declared a nuisance the owner should be required to get training BUT it should be free of charge or by donation to any of the bully rescue groups or SPCA. The bully rescues frequently have behaviour specialists to assist in training of adoptable dogs.



- Other: Why are picking on the pit bulls. It's usually the owner fault with lack of training and such. Or even lack of ppl who just approach dogs If a dog does bite. Evaluate the situation did a random person just walk up to say dog and approached it weird or did the dog come running at person and attack. Investigate the situation and talk to both parties. Do not take the dog away from owner as this causes more stress on the animal. Have them stay at home can not leave , have a trainer come and work with ppl and dog
- Other: Why are you only including pit bull type dogs that is egregious. Its narrow minded and its breed shaming when the real problem is unregulated breeding and purchasing.
- Other: Why does a pitbull have to be named. It is the responsibility of the dog owner. Dumbest thing I have heard to pick on the terrier breed.
- Other: Why pit bulls? I have been bitten by one German Shepard and one Rottweiler. Why is the focus on pitbulls yet no mention about the owner have the proper training to be able to have a dog. This is absurd
- Other: You all are [removed] dog racist, try and take my 2 pitbull like dogs from me, someone's gonna get hurt worse then what my dogs could ever do to you
- Other: You guys have to be kidding on the BSL [removed]. Get with the times and grow a brain, pittys are not the problem
- Other: You guys need to get your head out of your [removed], pit bulls are not the problem, how they are raised is the problem. I've known all dogs that cause more damage than any of the pitbulls I know
- Other: You just said that pit bulls or pit bull breads aren't involved in more violent incidences so why would we take measures for the potential that they could bite. Any dog can bite. There are many other breads that are larger and/or stronger so then they should also have the same safety measures. This is a very bias survey. Unacceptable
- Other: You must recognize the difference between a Pit Bull Terrier and an English Bull Terrier. They are not the same dog. The bylaw needs to be expanded to ANY breed of dog that exhibits aggressive behavior towards people while in public (ie off leash dog parks). The bylaw should not be breed specific, but should be centered on the behavior of the involved dog.
- Other: You're missing many breeds that should be on the list, and pitbull is not one of them.
- Other: You've explained why the pit bull breed is singled out. But I still do not think there is a reason to focus on them as a dangerous breed as I have encountered many breeds of unfriendly dogs.
- Other: You're discriminating against pitbulls... Calgary, you can do better. If you want to actually support the pet owners, maybe having a subsidy for training, for every dog. Punishing the dog for not being trained correctly isn't the dogs problem, why isn't there more support for the owner?
- Other: A course for humans to go through to make sure they are capable of being a responsible dog owner, before they are allowed to own a pit bull breed
- Other: A dog that barks, causing a neighbour to complain, or is frequently running loose does not need to be muzzled. Often times the best solution is to provide better education. Maybe consider increasing fines if you cannot keep your dog from getting loose, or having someone go to the



residence and give advice on how to contain the dog. Work with the public instead of just penalizing them. It will make Calgary safer and a more pleasant place to live for dog owners.

- Other: A test to pass basic obedience for all powerful/working dogs
- Other: Admitting that pit bulls don't bite more often and then suggesting that they be banned/overregulated is unscientific, biased, and frankly a tyrannical form of discrimination against many peaceful dogs. I will not comply
- Other: ALL bully breeds. Too many rampant German shepherds and rottys too. The pittys seem less to me than the German sheps. Don't discriminate on breed use the science of all three bites
- Other: All dogs of any breed should be on a leash when in public areas. If dogs are brought to an off leash then owners should be aware that they risk altercations happening between their dog and other peoples dogs.
- Other: All dogs should be trained, and all crappy owners should be fined. Stop blaming the dogs. BSL is basically racism and it's stupid. Come into 2020 and stop having these stupid conversations. Profile the owners and youll see who is actually a bad owner by listening and looking at them.
- Other: All dogs should be treated as the same for punishment and fines
- Other: All dogs should complete mandatory training like a license , it will reduce problems for all breeds
- Other: All dogs should have to go through basic obedience full stop I don't agree though with breed specific laws, the owners are the ones who should be accountable, people need to start researching the breed before they obtain any dog they should educate themselves in that breeds needs
- Other: All dogs should require obedience training. Pit bulls get a bad rap, but my border collie comes off as more aggressive than the pit bull sweetheart down the street. Our pup has received lots of training, but she's fearful of many things and she barks when she sees them, and it looks like aggression. Please don't ban pit bulls, I would agree that owners should require obedience training, but so should all owners.
- Other: All dogs, regardless of size or breed, need to be treated equally. I am against BSL when the majority of bites come from insecure small dogs. I don't care that their bites may be less severe. People brush it off as they are cute or small. The minute ANY medium to large breed exhibits the sms behaviors they are immediate deemed a nuisance. Be fair to everyone. Ban retractable leashes. Any pet owner has ZERO control of their animal while on a retractable leash.
- Other: Any breed of dog (not just pit bull breeds) that display aggressive behavior should be treated the same when it comes to controlling them. Even labradoodles can be aggressive and a dogs natural defense is to protect themselves and their owner in what ever way they know when they are threatened.
- Other: ANY DOG adopted from any shelter, pet store, or privately and is therefore registered, must attended obedience training with listed owner for 1 month. Upon completion of the month long course, the owner will receive a certificate stating their dog has successfully pass this course. This certificate must be listed with registration. If owner (and dog) fail the course and do not receive certificate, they must retake the course. The owner has three attempts at successful completion. If not successful they must surrender the dog. Again this is for any dog.



- Other: Any dog who is involved in an unprovoked incident must complete obedience training to a satisfactory end point by the instructor
- Other: ANY OWNER of dog labeled as a nuisance dog (no matter it's breed) must complete a city appointed training 8-10 week consecutively
- Other: any sort of breed specific fines or bylaws are RIDICULOUS
- Other: Anybody with ANY breed of dog that has been in a dog incident causing harm has to go through obedience training
- Other: As a dog owner of a non pitbull type breed, and as someone who doesn't personally care for pitfalls etc. I do still feel the singling out of a particular dog breed is overall a bad decision. Problem dogs in general are the result of problem people, some of the sweetest friendliest dogs ive met are pitbulls, the key is the owner. Personally I would sooner see a ban on problem dog owners with repeat problems. Its not the pitbulls fault, wouldn't matter if it was a pitbull, a chihuahua or a golden retriever, its the owner.
- Other: As an ER nurse some of the worst bites I have seen have been from small terriers - I am conserved that Calgary is looking at Pitbulls specifically . I feel the problem of problem owners needs to be addressed - lets keep the focus on them and not Pitbulls
- Other: As I cannot make a long statement at the bottom of this survey, I do not believe singling out one type of dog breed and limiting access to a particular breed is unfair. Any dog can attack and any dog can be declared a nuisance. I believe by limiting particular dogs it limits exercise and activity ability, as well as limits the defenses of the particular breed. All dogs should be treated fairly. I know many pitbull dog owners, where in fact other dog breeds have attack the pitbull, how does the pitbull if muzzled then protect itself. IT CAN'T, plain and simple. If any dog is muzzled it lessons the ability to defend themselves. No animal should be put in that type of situation, period. It is up to the owner to make sure for all dogs there is proper obedience on their own property and off the property in public areas. Therefore the consequences should be to the owner. Repeat owner and dog offenders, should be put on probation, hight fines. Dogs with aggressive behaviour has reasons behind it.
- Other: Avoid breed specific legislation that is watered down like this ... Has been proven time and time again all over the world that it does not work.
- Other: Breed discrimination is ridiculous. There are alot of other breeds that have incredible strength similar to pitbulls, yet they are not included here. DO BETTER.
- Other: Breed specific answers are foul and disgusting and quite frankly, you should be ashamed of this survey. The answers are coerced and you are inferring that all pit bull like-dogs are equivalent to what you've described as nuisance dogs. From a purely statistical standpoint, these answered should be nullified as the answers given are one sided.¹
- Other: Breed specific bylaws are unjust - any dog can have behaviour issues, especially those with a background of trauma. Most "aggressive" behaviours are actually a fear based or protection based reaction. An emphasis on training and working with the right trainer for your dogs needs should be placed with all dogs that suffer from behaviour issues. The City of Calgary should provide resources to help dog owners connect with the correct dog trainer



- Other: Breed specific legislation is discriminatory, lazy and ignorant. There is no evidence that bully breeds have a stronger bite or are anymore aggressive than other breeds (<https://www.pitbullinfo.org/dog-bite-scientific-studies.html>). Likewise, breed specific legislation has been proven ineffective. Finally to require a dog to be muzzled and excluded them from off leash parks on the basis of looking like a pitbull, when bully breeds are regularly misidentified in the first place is deplorable. In Canada we do not pass judgement on what people might do on the basis of their appearance, but rather on the basis of their actions, our animals deserve the same protection. The behavior of a dog is based on its training not its breed. I am embarrassed Calgary would even consider something this ignorant
- Other: Breed specific legislation is disgusting. Imagine treating humans the same way, targeting and penalizing a group for their potential strength, rather than individual behaviour. Most dogs have potential to do harm. Do not put a target on "pitbulls" and do not punish good dogs and good owners with prejudice and lazy blanket legislation.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is unwarranted. I do not support any BSL. Folks who have an inherent bias against the breed should not outweigh the research that BSL does not work and is not warranted. (I do not own a "pit bull".)
- Other: Breed specific legislation only causes problems. It doesn't fix them. Re asses your logic here, you are sorely misinformed.
- Other: Breed specific legislature is an absolute farce. Punish dog owners as a group and stop targeting a vague group of dogs.
- Other: Breed specific regulation is utterly ludicrous. I am shocked this is even being entertained. I am all for regulating "nuisance" dogs, as they have exhibited poor behaviour. However, when determining which dog is a "nuisance" a full investigation must be done, especially for dog vs. dog violence as more often than not, the scarier looking dog is deemed the nuisance, not the one enticing the violence (small dogs with poor owners).
- Other: Breed specific regulations is disgusting. Shame on you City of Calgary.
- Other: Breed specific restrictions have been proven not to be effective. Focus on education for pet owners.
- Other: Breed, no matter bite strength is not the problem. The OWNER and training of the animal is the problem.
- Other: Breeds should not be singled out, I have seen more aggressive Rottweiler and German shepherd show aggression to both dogs and people. You should not single out pit bulls as they are a great breed and to do so shows how uneducated and arrogant this survey is
- Other: BSL has been proven ineffective time and again, the fact the city even wants to explore this is abhorrent
- Other: BSL is not the answer! Pit bull dogs are not more likley than any other breed to bite or cause a nuisance. Owners should be educated and dogs not punished
- Other: City of Calgary can inspect the homes of nuisance dogs to ensure they are being cared for properly.



- Other: Consequences for owners with off leash dogs in protected areas or parks that explicitly say dogs must be on leash.
- Other: Corrective actions by owners could reduce future restrictions (ie obedience training, personal mitigations (muzzles, etc.)
- Other: Create subsidized programs to make training dogs that misbehave more accessible, that way the occurrence of an incident will decrease. More people will be inclined to train their dog if it is affordable.
- Other: Dangerous dogs required to wear a muzzle off property (NOT nuisance dogs); higher fines for all dogs off leash in non-designated areas
- Other: Designating specific breed of dogs is a completely outdated and unproven way of thinking. Every dog has the potential to hurt someone/ another dog. All these rules should apply to all dogs. Period.
- Other: Do not follow the path of other ignorant jurisdictions that enacted breed specific legislation. There is ZERO proof of any of the "bad breeds" named biting more people or other animals nor being a noise issue.
- Other: DO NOT KEEP STIGMATIZING PITBULLS. THIS IS RIDICULOUS. ALL DOGS SHOULD BE ON A PER CASE BASIS. PERIOD.
- Other: Do not start with breed specific laws. They are highly unscientific and pander to ignorance.
- Other: Do not support breed specific fines. If anything, fine chihuahua owners. Those things are the most aggressive breed I have ever seen.
- Other: Do not support breed specific legislation. All owners need to be in control of their animal regardless of breed.
- Other: DOG ATTACKS ARE NOT BREED SPECIFIC. Check the owners.
- Other: Dog breeds should not be singled out. Ridiculous bias and not scientifically based.
- Other: Dog specific regulations are ridiculous. Don't label one breed
- Other: Dogs considered a nuisance for noise related reasons wouldn't need to be muscled etc, in fact it would probably make it worse. For instance my dog has separation anxiety but he is the sweetest kindest dog that my friends actually use for socialization with their puppies. If he was ever declared a nuisance because of being vocal when left alone. He is not harming anyone or any animal and should not be treated as if he was an aggressive dog.
- Other: Dogs have their own set of nature vs nurture, I don't think discriminating against a breed is the way to go. I truly think we need responsible owners to train and be responsible for their dogs. Some breeds could be predisposed to
- Other: Dogs that are a problem are usually because of bad owners. There are many nice pit bull type dogs that are trained well. If a number of complaints come in fine the owner only if an investigation takes place as I have seen neighbours being vindictive.
- Other: Dogs that have previously exhibited unjustified dangerous behaviour should be prohibited from being off-leash in dog parks until successfully completing an obedience course
- Other: Don't segregate pit bulls because of how they look. It has been proven false that a pit bull bite is the strongest out of any dog breed. Any dog has the possibility to be vicious.



- Other: Don't single out pit bulls. All dogs can risk biting, you need to hold the owner accountable and increase pet owner education.
- Other: Don't blame the breed just because pitbulls are no different than other breeds! I have seen more aggressive golden retrievers than I have pitbulls. Many of my friends and family have pitbulls and a few have service dogs that are pitbulls! Blame the owner not the breed
- Other: don't narrow this to pitbulls. Or such breeds. If a dog is aggressive its aggressive no matter size or bite and if it's well trained its just another good doggie. Authority to seize violent dogs is good but don't pick out "dangerous" animals and discriminate. I find chihuahuas more aggressive than any pitbull I've met.
- Other: Don't pull the breed specific [removed]. It is down to bad dog owners/previous trauma suffered (especially children) teasing why dogs generally misbehave, and it is NOT just one breed!
- Other: Educate people instead of perpetuating unnecessary fear about Pit Bulls. Statistically, Chihuahuas have a higher bite rate. People need to learn about dog body language (though, they shouldn't have a dog if these signs cannot be recognized). People need to know when a dog is in distress or appearing dominant/potentially aggressive. This is not breed specific. Dogs are dogs and any one can bite when instigated.
- Other: Education for all pet owners (not just pit bulls) who have dogs exhibiting problematic behaviour.
- Other: EVERY dog needs to be put in obedience / training course, if the household HAS ZERO TIME to help improve the dogs well being for socialization etc. THEN MAYBE that household should not own a dog in the first place.
- Other: Every dog should have obedience training. In extreme situations where a dog has attacked and severely injured or killed an animal or person the dog should be seized.
- Other: Finding out the root cause to why a dog is exhibiting such behavior is important. Dogs have a flight or fight instinct like every animal. A dog may be aggressive because of fear or trauma.
- Other: Fines for people walking dogs off leash aggressive or not. They run up to people with reactive dogs and it provokes them
- Other: Fines to unfit owners (as that's where the problem stems, not with specific breeds) rehoming/rescuing of animals if the household cannot provide proper care/attention.
- Other: Focus on the owner not the dog (e.g. training required for the dog AND owner after being declared a nuisance); "nuisance" status needs to be reversible if dog is no longer a danger; breed of dog is significantly less indicative of behaviour than lack of proper training/irresponsible owner - pit bulls should in no way be singled out.
- Other: For the first option, I worry what the exhibiting dangerous behaviour is and if it can be interpreted differently by each employee.
- Other: Free breed awareness classes for people adopting pitbulls. Educate people before there are issues!!
- Other: Get your head out of your[removed]s on the pitbull issue.
- Other: Harsher fines holding dog owners accountable for their dogs actions not based on breed but based on bite. Dog bites are not specific to a breed and all dog owners should be held accountable



- Other: High fines for ANY dog off leash in non off leash zones! Haven't seen anyone in my area being held responsible for not following that bylaw. All non pit bull
- Other: Higher fines and limitations on dogs that exhibit dangerous behavior. Noise is not a good definition; dogs that showed aggression are. You can have a dog that barks a lot because it's bored. In the dog park it'll be a model citizen. This list seems lacking in up to date knowledge about dog behavior. Maybe bring in certified professionals from the field who are up to date on modern dog training and handling to phrase the options.
- Other: Higher fines for multiple offences FOR ALL DOG BREEDS.
- Other: Higher fines for people that use pitbulls as a fighting dog or abusing them
- Other: Higher fines only if the dog has caused a severe problem. No matter what breed dog is.
- Other: Hold all pet owners accountable regardless of breed. Any unfit animal owners should be held accountable for their actions. If an animal regardless of breed isn't taught and socialized properly has a chance to bite. Small dogs can do as much if not more damage then large breed.
- Other: Hold individual dog owners responsible for their pets instead of generalizing all dogs of a specific breed.
- Other: how can you justify picking one breed of dog and classifying them as dangerous. Every dog can be dangerous depending on how their owners act.
- Other: How dare you put a separate category for pit bulls under the premise that they COULD be dangerous. This is [removed] discrimination and we will not stand for it. You should be ashamed and maybe be responsible and not spread fear and hate on a survey about community safety.
- Other:
<https://www.google.com/amp/s/api.nationalgeographic.com/distribution/public/amp/news/2016/07/pit-bull-ban-aggressive-dog-breed-bronwen-dickey> pitbulls are not a dangerous breed.
- Other: I adamantly oppose breed specific bylaws and legislation. However, there are many people who should not have dogs especially power breeds. I would like the city to focus more on problem owners vs the dogs
- Other: I am against breed specific legislation
- Other: I am completely against breed specific legislation! Owners should be punished not the breed!
- Other: I am extremely disappointed by the city adding any kind of breed specific legislature. Any responsible, educated dog owner knows the issue is not the breed. Calgary has long been a gold standard to other Canadian cities because of their fair and just animal bylaws. Don't ruin your reputation know. If singling our pit bulls why not also include any large dog breed? In the 80s German Shepherds would be on your nuisance list and in the 90s Rottweilers. These proposals are not ok. I dont even own a dog and I am out raged.
- Other: I am shocked that you would put a label on "pitbulls" in this way and even allow the suggestion that any dog that looks like a "pitbull" can't enter an off leash park or must wear a muzzle. Please educate yourselves before putting out this damaging message to the general public.
- Other: I am strongly against automatically deeming a dog dangerous and therefore treating it with separate rules, based only on its breed or perceived breed.
- Other: I am STRONGLY AGAINST BSL



- Other: I am unequivocally opposed to BSL (breed specific legislation). Being a "pitbull" or looking like one has no scientific link to viciousness. Please do not go down this stupid path. And do not ask citizens that are not dog behaviourists to support laws based on hysteria.
- Other: I believe all dogs have the potential to be a nuisance or bite people. NOT JUST PITBULLS!!!!!!!
- Other: I believe animals have rights just like humans and you cannot arbitrarily assign a certain breed different standards.
- Other: I believe no dog should be banned from parks (on or off leash). This is detrimental to the quality of life a dog. Also proposing breed specific legislation is a slippery slope that I think will be a very bad decision that will result in public outcry. There's so many examples of cities where this has failed.
- Other: I believe that there should be every right to put extra fees of out of control dogs but you should never label it to one dog even if they are the stronger breed. It should never have one breeds name in the by law because that is what makes people scared of those breeds even if they are the sweetest most gentle breed.
- Other: I do not support any breed specific by-law legislation
- Other: I do not support any breed specific legislation as there are countless large breeds that can cause severe damage if they bite; any single breed should not be single out, as it is unfair to pets and their owners.
- Other: I do not support any measures that discriminate against breeds in such ways. The specified criteria regarding pit bulls has been proven false many times and such measures lead to further misconceptions and unwarranted fear mongering on the part of the dogs.
- Other: I do not support breed specific legislation.
- Other: I do not support breed specific regulations at all and would leave calgary should it introduce any such ineffective regulations. I am a dog training professional with my KPA-CTP certification
- Other: I dont agree with half of these, pit bulls or any bully breed dog SHOULD have the right to use off leash parks freely, AND WITHOUT muzzles. Ownership responsibility comes into play here. I see many pit pulls at the park and not one has ever made me or my dog nervous or caused harm I do see other breeds of dogs at the park with muzzles, like Shepards or even poodles. This is ridiculous and once again I don't agree with any of these proposed.
- Other: I don't believe breed discrimination is the right approach you are looking at punishment for good dogs that are trained to be around other people and dogs. However if they have been a problem animal in the past rules should be put in place for those owners not just because of their breed.
- Other: I don't own a pitbull, but I think breed specific fines is not helpful. There are not nuisance dogs, there are irresponsible owners. If a dog has been found to be a nuisance by barking or roaming freely, that is an owner problem and should be labelled as a nuisance owner resulting in escalating fines to that specific person.
- Other: I don't think it is right to single out a specific breed. Pit bulls are the sweetest most well tempered animals I have ever met in my life. A bad dog comes from a bad owner that doesn't



bother to train and teach when needed. I think it should be based on each dog specifically if a dog has a history of being a nuisance or of biting extra precautions do need to be taken. But it is completely not okay to say that one breed is worse than the rest.

- Other: I don't think we should have breed specific bylaws
- Other: I don't agree with any extra rules around pit bulls. Its like saying men are stronger, so if they assault someone, they should get more of a punishment than everyone else. Why doesn't bylaw invest in mandatory training programs for nuisance animals? Also, fining people has always been about collecting budget money. An increase in fines at this time, when taxes are so high and people aren't working isn't ok. If you write a ticket to someone, it may mean they can feed their animal in the subsequent month.
- Other: I don't believe that dogs should be punished just for being a certain breed or exhibiting a behavior that is NOT their fault. If Calgary implements any kind of breed discrimination I will move! I dont own a pit bull but inscimation is wrong!! And it's never the dogs fault.
- Other: I don't like the focus on pit bulls per se. While they may pose as a higher threat, other larger breeds may pose as big a risk. If a poodle got out and was running amuck, is wildly different than a Great Dane for example. If there are bylaws about breeds it should be broader and more focused on training rather than penalizing.
- Other: I don't think breed specific laws get to the root of the problem. If you want dog training, make it mandatory for all pet owners to put their pets through recognized training.
- Other: I have been bit hard by a Chihuahua but never a pit bull type breed. Maybe add that breed to your list and take pit bulls off
- Other: I just want to mention that I personally think that putting these restrictions around certain breeds only causes bias towards breeds, and not accountability for teaching your dog properly. I also know breed bans are a huge deterrent for living in certainty places, and I would not consider staying somewhere were pit bulls were banned. Alberta has some great pit bull rescue programs, this just forces more dogs into those spaces, and less into loving homes.
- Other: I strongly believe that pit bulls should not be singled out. Most incidences of nuisance behaviour are a result of owner negligence not breed.
- Other: I think it is completely inappropriate to restrict animal ownership right or force actions that affect the dogs quality of life (ex. Not going to offleash parks) based on anything other than physically aggressive behaviour. I disagree with the term nuisance being applied to loud dogs or dogs that are not displaying physically aggressive behaviour.
- Other: I think it should be on the owner eg if over years an OWNER. Had had aggressive dogs that have shown aggressive behaviour they should receive higher fines. I think it should be all owner based and not breed based:
- Other: I think owners perhaps should be required to take training if their dog has/is causing a problem. I'm being serious. Owners perhaps need to learn how to be more responsible with their particular pet, no matter what kind of pet. Perhaps partner w/Humane Society for this. Although different subject, please make animal abandonment/abuse/neglect an extremely high fine or criminal charge.



- Other: I think signaling out a specific breed of dog is awful. If the dog (any breed) is deemed dangerous then there should be a fine or required training.
- Other: I think that Muzzles aren't the answer as it can lead to more issues at the off-leash dog park (for a multitude of reasons). I do think that additional training should be mandatory for potentially dangerous dogs that are purchased/adopted (or alternatively proof that the person has owned a well-balanced dog of that type currently or previously, with no issues). I.e. If person A wishes to purchase/adopt a Presa Canario, they must either take training classes or have proof they have owned one before. I think this applies to dogs with multiple offences as well, they should be made to take obedience training with a certificate from the trainer showing the dog is ready or if more training is required. In basically any situation it is NOT the dog's fault, it's the owner's fault when something happens and it's usually from a lack of leadership on the owners behalf.
- Other: I think this is completely unfair to say that it is mainly pit bulls being the problem. It is the owners fault. NOT THE DOGS. Make those who own a dog that has behavioural issues go into training. Should not be the dogs fault and be punished or killed because they are under the care of non responsible owners.
- Other: I think this is disgusting to single out pit bulls, it's owner issues.
- Other: I think training for owners is important. I'm tired of small dogs attacking and being aggressive pushing my bigger dog to react. How is that ok ? Look at the owners and how they train. Not just a wide brush stroke of breeds
- Other: I think using the term pitbull is not necessary. Any dog such as a Rottweiler or Dobermans can also have harmful and server bites. Pit bulls were actually used as nanny dogs before they were deemed fighting dogs for their scary looks. Disappointed in Calgary for specifying a certain breed.
- Other: I think you're putting too much punishment on an animal when this should all be referred to the owner. Just because a certain type of dog CAN produce a string bite, doesn't mean it will. I've been attacked by smaller dogs way more than pitbulls
- Other: I took pride that I lived in a city that had no breed specific legislation and I really hope I can continue to promote the city of Calgary. However, I cannot take pride in this city nor would I want to continue living in a city that is okay discriminating against pitbull type dogs. I own 3 pitbulls that have never been in any incidents and happily go to the dog park every chance they can get. I can't fathom not being able to bring them to the dog park or forcing a muzzle on their face because of ignorant citizens who do not understand dogs at all. I SOLD my condo because I was being verbally harassed, threatened, complaints falsified towards me about my dogs AND made to pay fines for things my dogs didn't do SIMPLY because they are pitbulls. The fact that the city is even bringing this topic back to the forefront which is NOT backed by any scientific research is completely ridiculous. The survey in itself reinforces the harassment that my dogs and I face all of the time. I thought the city stood behind the idea that discrimination is a horrible and archaic idea and yet here we stand with the city considering limiting the freedom of pitbulls and their owners by discriminating against them. Even after having acknowledged that they are not more likely to be involved in biting incidents. Absolutely pathetic! For the record, my aggressive pitbulls have been attacked by a nuisance cat in the neighborhood and a Great Dane at the dog park. In both incidents, my dogs did



not even try to fight back and the owners of the animals received no repercussions for their animal's behaviors. So maybe it's time we start looking at owners instead of punishing pitbull type dogs.

- Other: I want it to apply to all dogs. Not just pit bulls. Yes they are stronger but because people are lazy with less aggressive breed I have been bite by many safe dogs. Never seen it in pit bull owners cus they know they gotta have them trained. When I have seen a pit bull attack its been because the other dog instigated it.
- Other: I want to agree with a lot of the nuisance statements, but you did not define it. You left it open ended so you could mold it to the way that would work for what you wanted. Dogs who are violent towards other dogs or people should be muzzled in public. I think that would be a better way to word these questions. Have a pitbull vs have a pitbull in public
- Other: I would just like to point out the obvious fact that all large dogs have the ability to leave a more serious bite. Seriously, don't jump on the bandwagon of hating on Pitbulls. It is sickening. Of you're going to put these ridiculous rules into place as a money grab then do it for all dogs over a certain size. At least that would have some logic behind it. I see tiny women walking three giant dogs of different breeds and that seems more like a safety issue. Put in weight restrictions on walking dogs so people can keep them under control when needed.
- Other: I would support a much larger number of these if bylaw officers had more discretion (e.g. only dogs declared a nuisance for bites are required to muzzle in parks).
- Other: I would support the need for training nuisance dogs, but because you haven't specified what kind of training and by whom, I can't support this. There are too many awful trainers out there and a lot of inferior and/or abusive methods still in practice.
- Other: I'm against any type of breed-specific laws. It should based on prior history of the dog, not because it belongs to a specific breed.
- Other: I'm not saying pitbulls don't have the potential to be nuisance dogs, I believe that all dogs should be required to undergo some sort of obedience training should they be involved in some sort of incidence.
- Other: I've never had an issue with large dogs to me it's small dogs like chihuahuas that I've had near bits from that where not Provoked. All dogs should have obedience training.
- Other: If a dog is a nuisance for biting why does mean they cant be off leash
- Other: If a dog is declared a nuisance because of barking, being at large, or something minor it shouldn't have to wear a muzzle or be restricted from dog parks. There needs to be more detail if restricting. If that dog has a bite history or is aggressive towards dogs at parks, then ABSOLUTELY! I DO NOT agree with any breed restrictions.
- Other: If a dog is problematic, regardless of breed, then measures should should be implemented to either train the people on how to handle this dog or to retrain the dog. If a dog is not problematic, they should not be targetted. Pit bulls should not be targetted specifically, aggressive dogs and problematic people should be.
- Other: If the dog has the right owner it doesn't matter the breed. But holding owners accountable is where there can be more done!



- Other: In most cases it is it owners fault, or lack of involvement which leads to aggressive behaviour in dogs. There should be NO breed stereotyping- dogs that exhibit aggressive behaviour should be recommended to take training classes, BUT unless these classes are free of charge nothing can be forced. The city should put in place training sessions for nuisance dogs covered by the city
- Other: In regards to dogs declared a nuisance not being allowed in off leash parks, I believe this should be up for re-evaluation after training has occurred. On another note by no means should a dog ever be seized from the owners of its declared a nuisance. This is traumatic for the owner and the dog alike, leading to more aggression.
- Other: In regards to your post i think its disgusting that you have the audacity to even post options that are breed specific. Speaking from someone who has been bitten by dogs a few times i will list those breeds for you. Those breeds include a pomeranian, dashshund, and border collie. By all means if a specific animal not breed is deemed a nuisance that specific dog shall fall under a specific category but not be labeled by its breed. My current dog is a 3 year old stafforshire bull terrier that has never once barked at a passing dog, has never once bitten anyone, has never once fought with another dog at a dog park nor has he ever barked when i come home from work. I think to label a breed based on previous provinces is sickening and i think that all dogs have the ability to hurt someone not just listed breeds you have above. I think you really need to re word your documentation cause you will face increased issues in the future with rallies and support groups that will fight this against counsel before you could spin your head
- Other: Increase fines for irresponsible owners
- Other: Instead of assuming that ALL pit bulls and nuisance dogs are the problem, maybe realize that the owners are who train, and as a result, dictate how the dogs reacts in situations. Offer the proper training and resources to owners instead of making them restrict a member of their families. Would you muzzle your mouthy child in public? At the same time, give your police officers and animal handlers better training and resources so they don't just hurt/kill an animal just because they don't know how to handle them. SMH... City of Calgary being stupid again....
- Other: It is 2020, if the city of Calgary still doesn't realize that Pitbulls are not the issue and any breed is likely to bite if antagonize.
- Other: It is disappointing to see that pit bull bread is being targeted within this survey. We all know that the dog behaviour is taught. This should be about the owner and not the breed. Bread profile does not have a place within a survey.
- Other: It is discriminatory to only assume Pitbull need to be in the bylaw. It should only be based on nuisance dog. Everyone knows it's bad owners that make bad dogs, why outcast one breed when German Shepards and Rottweiler have the same capacity to cause damage?
- Other: It is EXTREMELY closed minded of the city to generalize a breed. It completely depends on the owner. Should any fine be dealt- let it be on the handler regardless of breed.
- Other: It is not the dogs fault. Pit-bulls are great if trained properly. It is up to the owner to train them right.
- Other: It's not the breeds its the owners. Programs to screen pet owners



- Other: Its not the dog, its the owner. Mandate proper training. The pit bulls I have met have all been kind and loving.
- Other: It's unfair to target dog breeds. It would be more logical and fair to target problem owners and those involved in dog fighting. This type of fear pandering will only lead to more dogs being surrendered, overcrowded shelters, and euthanized dogs. Don't side with the wrong side of history please.
- Other: It's more often than not the owner that needs training. Dogs are a reflection of the owner. provide training for the owner NOT just blaming the animal.
- Other: Its more on the owner for the behavior of the dog and not the breed. The fact that you look only at the breed of dog is absurd, as small dogs can be more of a terror then big dogs, it all depends on OWNERSHIP!
- Other: It's not the breed, it's irresponsible owners... small dogs are just as aggressive. If a small dog picks a fight, my dog gets blamed for defending itself simply because it's bigger and stronger. I've been bitten by three dogs before, all small breeds, not bully breeds. The owners should have to take responsible ownership classes.
- Other: It's not the dog it's the human. Train owners people and you'll have loving kind dogs.
- Other: Its not the dogs its the owners. Make it a must for anyone with any dog big or small, whatever to take obedience classes. This isn't a "pitbull" problem. Education is key. I truly don't understand why these things aren't in place already. Again my point is its not the dog its the owner. These options make me shake my head. So you might ban dog breads that need to run and excersise from the only places they can legally go other then their yardMAKES ABDALUTLY NO SENSE. fines should be higher across the board not just to one bread or " a dog that looks like one of them" just rediculas. Mandatory training and education and higher fines. That's it thats all. The rest is just noise.
- Other: Its wrong to single out pit bulls. More often than not its the smaller breeds causing issues. You should not be singling them out, but more so working on any dog that is considered problematic, not breed specific.
- Other: I've been nipped at by poodles & jack Russell terriers.
- Other: just a comment. It specifically states that a nuisance dog may be one that is noisy or at large, etc. Yet the next question asks if nuisance dogs should be muzzled. A muzzled dog can still bark and run at large. This feels misleading.
- Other: Leave Breed based legislation out of this.
- Other: Leave pit bulls alone, the only time pit bulls are a problem, is when the owner hasn't trained them properly
- Other: Leave Pitbulls alone please, and thank you. Your description of nuisance (ie barking / being at large) doesn't seem to cause harm to dogs so why restrict from dog parks for example?
- Other: Legislation against owners who are not minding their dog at an off leash park. Also, take out any breed specific language. I was once bitten by a wiener dog, but nothing happened because it is a small dog. My dog is a mix, but would fall under BSL and what you call a pit bull, even though she



is also a lab and many other breeds. Why are these breeds targets? Rottweiler, Doberman, German Shepard, Mastiff, all breeds that also have the jaw strength to do just as much damage.

- Other: Licence the HUMAN as responsible enough to have a dog. Most often these incidences are due to negligence or poor treatment. Poorly trained animals are also the responsibility of the HUMAN being.
- Other: Make all dog owners have certification of proper handling of their animal class/certification with that animal. Provide resources to public how to prevent this behavior. Any dog can be a good or bad dog. It is all how the owner is
- Other: Make obedience training more available/affordable, it should NOT be breed specific, only if the dog itself has displayed a need for it like exhibiting dangerous behaviour.
- Other: Mandatory dog behaviour education for owners of nuisance dogs
- Other: Mandatory obedience training for all dogs regardless of breed.
- Other: Maybe having a subsidy plan with companies like Clever Canines or Dog Ma that train on dog behaviour not just obedience! Not everyone can afford their programs and they are very helpful in understanding reactive dogs (excitement reactivity and aggressive reactivity)
- Other: Muzzle if the dog is aggressive and bites at people
- Other: My opinion has always been there a no bad dogs, just bad owners. I have met many pit bulls over the years that have been great dogs.
- Other: No additional bylaws. Current pet bylaws are adequate
- Other: No breed bias/breed specific policies. Dogs are not the issue. Its no different than racism at the end of the day.
- Other: No breed specific action shall be considered. Any dog regardless of breed is capable of inflicting significant damage if not trained and controlled properly. You can make statistics prove any point you wish. This is not scientific. All factors that contribute to the behavior of a dangerous dog must be considered.
- Other: No breed specific approach as its usually tied to owner behaviors vs dogs (Myself and my dog have only been attacked by small/medium breeds, never Bullies). Training for owners of dogs with history, working with other municipalities/provinces for chronic pet abusers.
- Other: No breed specific bylaws
- Other: NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION! BLAME THE OWNER NOT THE BREED! COMMON SENSE! DO WE HAVE RACE OR GENDER SPECIFIC LAWS FOR STRONGER HUMANS?? GET WITH THE TIMES!
- Other: No breed specific legislation. Any dog can be great or be a problem. People should have a background check before being allowed to own animals. Owners sold twitter training if they have a nuisance dog - it is the humans who are the issue in that case.
- Other: No breed specific restrictions.
- Other: NO BSL
- Other: No discrimination against breed specifically.
- Other: noise complaints should not be a complaint and reason for higher fines or giving up/ putting down dog, etc.



- Other: Not all dogs like to be approached with a fast approaching stranger, screaming child, or yappy dog. Just as some humans don't like to be approached by strangers, receive hugs and kisses from strangers, and even having screaming children around them. There are other breeds that have bigger bites without the stigma of what the pit bull breed has. It all comes down to the owners of all breeds. I've been bitten by a Rottweiler, German Shepard on one side of the spectrum and also small daschunds. We need to focus on pet owners, registrations/chips. Making sure that unethical breeders are fined heavily, as they are bringing in breeds of dogs without the best of temperaments. There are pit bull breeders out there who actually care about their dogs and make sure owners are screened and if the match is not good they take the dogs back to find them the right homes. By places breed specific bans you are causing unnecessary higher costs and limited access to resources/parks for those pet owners where their dogs have absolutely no history. How is this any different from judging a person by the color of their skin? With any dog its always the pet owners responsibilities. We need to protect those pets who can't speak for themselves and are not being trained properly. Being purchased just to look cool, and neglected when they aren't needed. Depending on the size of the victim a small dog can still do a lot of harm to an infant and small animal. So size of the bully bite should not be the only focus for this bylaw. Pet owners need to be responsible, so that they think before purchasing or adopting if they are capable of the time and attention needed to raise these pets.
- Other: NOT discriminating against a specific breed because it COULD POTENTIALLY cause more harm with bites. Pitbull breeds CONSISTENTLY score better than most "family pets" (golden retrievers, labs, German shepherds, border collies) on temperament test. You make an assumption of an animal based off its look is the same as judging another human based off of their looks. Tests the accused dog's behavior or make mandatory training with a dog boarding service rather than euthanising a dog because it looks intimidating.
- Other: Not in favour of the extra measures for minor offences. Would be in favour if it as for aggressive dogs
- Other: nuisance dog should NOT be BREED SPECIFIC! it should be ANY dog. If a dog engages in negative behavior that results in a bite the owner should be responsible to have to take the offending dog to obedience training.
- Other: Nuisance dogs are UNTRAINED dogs. Mandatory 4 week training course when people register their first dog with the city. Take pit bulls off of this survey, its disgusting and you should be ashamed of yourselves for even adding this on here.
- Other: nuisance is too broad a category to for me to agree to mandatory insurance, higher fines, muzzles, etc. A dog declared a nuisance for barking isn't an increased risk for biting. I would support these things for dogs with multiple complaints for aggression behaviours.
- Other: Obedience training required for all dog breeds. In public parks. Subject to fine.
- Other: Obedience training for all dog owners regardless of breeds. Small dogs instigate fights and are aggressive.
- Other: Obedience training for ALL dogs regardless of breed.
- Other: Obedience training for ALL dogs, nuisance or not.



- Other: Obedience training for ALL OWNERS who own dog(s), not just pitbull breeds or nuisance. Your first year of registering your animal with the City should come with a discount code to an affiliated reward based dog training facility. or if you can show proof you've taken your animal to obedience training, you should get a discount on your yearly fee.
- Other: Obedience training for any dog mostly the small ones, pitbulls are only aggressive and dangerous breeds when they are raised that way
- Other: Obedience training for any type of dog that shows violent behaviour.
- Other: Obedience training for EVERY DOG
- Other: Obedience training required for ALL dog owners. Some of the nastiest and most aggressive dogs (who can frequently instigate conflicts) are small dogs whose behaviours are mishandled leading to altercations with bigger dogs. There should be significant difference between nuisance dogs bc of noise and nuisance dogs with a history of at-large or chase threat offences. Put Bull should not be a qualifier at all as there is no research that BSL works and instead increases fear, judgement and misinformation, while doing nothing to teach the public about how to properly and safely interact with dogs.
- Other: Obedience training required for any and all dogs, aggression be it fear based or otherwise is not breed specific and the public must understand that.
- Other: Often, smaller dogs are overlooked as violent because their bite potential is less. We have had far more issues with small dogs attacking our larger dog, including biting. I don't think it's fair if my larger dog defends itself that it is claimed to be violent. She has not defended herself yet against these attacks, as she is very mild mannered. That said small dog bites can still draw blood and traumatize children. We need to hold small dog owners responsible for training.
- Other: OWNERS are to be given a designation of a 'nuisance' when their dog that has been involved in multiple minor offences. OWNERS have to go through obedience training and proper care of these animals before they are returned after an incident. similar to demerit points on a licence. A coloured bandana is to be worn on the arm of the OWNER who is deemed a nuisance as a warning to other animal owners until a training course for the OWNER has been successfully completed, minimum 90% pass required. Not wearing an issued bandana will result in immediate fines and loss of possession of animal until fine is paid and obedience course has been completed again.
- Other: Owners fined for not being able to control dogs in off leash - just visit ranchlands off leash park. It's unbelievable!
- Other: Owners of nuisance dogs should be required to have training and a license.
- Other: Owners of pitbulls should be more accountable for the training and care of the animal. It's not a breed problem it is a people problem.
- Other: Owners should be held accountable if their dog hurts someone, if they are determined to have provoke an attack they shouldn't be allowed to own any dogs ever.
- Other: Owners should be help responsible for their dogs regardless of breed, if an animal bites or causes a nuisance the own should be responsible for taking training courses on how to better manage their dog. A dog can not know any better if the owner doesn't take the time to reach them better.



- Other: Owners who are obviously ignoring and/or incapable of handling their dog should be required to go for training to learn how to handle their dog.
- Other: Penalties should not be breed specific. Pit bulls should not be singled out. There are a lot of aggressive dogs that aren't pit bulls.
- Other: People caught with their dogs off leash outside of an off leash park get stiff fines. My 2 dogs and I have been attacked 5 time in the Elgin area within a 3 month period and now my dogs are reactive when they see other dogs. I have also caught kids teasing my dogs outside my fence and had other dog owners stand at my fence with their dogs teasing my dogs. So when a dog is deemed a nuisance there is usually a darn good reason for why the dogs bark or are reactive.
- Other: People must train their dogs properly - including small dogs who should be muzzled if they growl or bite.
- Other: Pit bull ban
- Other: Pit bulls and pit bull types should not be separated under these requirements. All dogs including little ones must adhere to the same behavior standards while in public and off leash areas. I find more little dogs with poor behavior than large ones.
- Other: Pit Bulls are fantastic dogs and specifically calling them out like this is awful. I am really disappointed in the city for doing this on the survey. Nuisance dogs are an issue. Pit bulls are not.
- Other: Pit bulls are great dogs and the fact that you are even considering this is disgusting. Do more research.
- Other: Pit bulls are wonderful animals. It's the owners that need to be taken care of. I have never met a bad pit bull. [removed]
- Other: Pit bulls aren't a danger, [removed]
- Other: Pit bulls do not offer more of a threat than other dog breeds, and there are many myths associated with them. I implore city council to discuss pit bulls with actual veterinary professionals, and come to non biased decision regarding their well being. Calgary needs facts about pitbulls, not myths and fear mongering.
- Other: Pit bulls should not be demonized! It is not the breed, but rather the ownership! Any breed of dog, small or large, has the strength to bite a human being hard if they are given the opportunity & trained in constant fear of their owner. People who are afraid of dogs are also part of the problem! They should either remove themselves from the situation or find a way for them to not place themselves in a situation in which they would interact with a dog - often they do not & purposely interact thinking they have the right to harass & tease a dog that they fear simply because it must be on a leash - this kind of behaviour ALSO leads to dog bites! Where are fines for people harassing & teasing dogs that lead them engaging in inappropriate behaviours!?
- Other: Pit bulls should not be singled out. If ANY animal has proven to be aggressive then they should have fines brought onto them. There are MANY large breeds that can cause damage from bites. ITS NOT THE DOG ITS THE OWNER
- Other: Pit bulls should not be treated differently than other breeds! It's the owner who cultivates the personality of the dog, don't blame a breed!



- Other: Pitbulls are amazing dogs, and shouldn't be focused on specifically. Do research and look at where pitbulls score. If they're mandatory to be muzzled, I'm not doing it. My dog is gentle and kind.
- Other: Pitbulls are like other dogs. Obedience training is a good start.
- Other: Pitbulls are not the issue, if people have nuisance dogs then it is the owner's responsibility to get training regardless of breed.
- Other: PITBULLS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM
- Other: Pitbulls are not the problem. [removed] owners are. Please give your heads a shake. Pitbulls are big baby's.
- Other: Pitbulls aren't a problem, Chihuahuas are more volatile than a pitbull.
- Other: Please consider removing any specific questions about pit bulls. They are beautiful dogs who are gentle-natured when not trained by HUMANS to be aggressive. My golden doodle is more aggressive than any pit bull I have ever met and our doodle is a family dog who is trusted around a 2-year-old daily. Any owner found guilty of neglect or animal abuse needs stricter fines, there is no need to punish a beautiful breed of dog.
- Other: Please do not implement breed-specific legislation. This is really harmful as many of our shelters are filled with pit bulls.
- Other: Please don't single out a breed. Please. There should be a limit for dogs per household. Ricky View County, Foothills County allow 3 dogs per household and don't need to pay for license but must be registered.
- Other: Please remember, it is generally poor training/a bad owner that causes unfortunate circumstances. Dogs may be domesticated, but they are an animal. People forget that and can treat them as human.
- Other: Positive obedience classes that all adults working with the dog must take, bearing in mind some dogs are rescues and now have good owners. Blame bad owners, not the breed.
- Other: Positive reinforcement-based training required for all dog owners, including basics of understanding dog body language.
- Other: Programs for dog owners who don't know how to properly handle their animals.
- Other: Properly socializing and training your dog is a critical part of responsible dog ownership, regardless of the breed or size of dog. All dogs have the potential to bite and cause serious harm to humans and other animals. If the intent of the bylaw is truly to reduce frequency and severity of dog bites, a bigger emphasis should be put on training and enforcement; there should not be breed-specific legislation in place in Calgary.
- Other: Punish behaviour not the breed
- Other: Punish the owner not the breed.
- Other: Quit focusing on pit bulls. All dogs can and do bite. I also don't like there is no standard to declare a nuisance dog. So any questions about them are a waste of space. A muzzle is good enough for a nuisance dog. Demanding higher insurance coverage is beyond the city's authority. Seizing a dog exhibiting dangerous behaviour in their own yard would be ridiculous (abuse of power). So NO to seizing. Stop focusing on specific breeds. Obedience training is not for dogs, it's



for their owners. Some owners shouldn't have dogs. A yappy chihuahua dog is a nuisance dog by your definition, this is inane.

- Other: Quit profiling dogs based on how they look!!
- Other: Quit punishing the dog for the owners behaviour. Pit bulls are not the problem, their owners are. Maybe the owner should be the one to be punished not the animal. And why don't you have any other breed on here? Does the city not understand it's the owner not the animal. Educate yourselves
- Other: Realizing pit bulls aren't a dangerous breed and that it's the owner who trains it to be dangerous not the breed itself.
- Other: Regardless of the breed, owners need to be held responsible for their dogs actions. It is NOT the dogs that are the problem. If an owner knows their dog doesn't recall and will bully other dogs off leash, don't take them to off leash. Off leash parks shouldn't allow dogs to be on leash as this is a place for dogs to socialize and will always try to go up and say hi. If an owner has a dog off leash at a clearly stated on leash area and do not recall the dog when others are approaching, they should be fined.
- Other: Re-homing a nuisance dog, usually poor trading leads to accidents. Just needs a new home
- Other: Remove noise from the criteria. Some dogs that will be declared noise nuisance have problems that CANNOT be solved by obedience training. Requiring insurance for a dog that barks a lot is not reasonable and is ripe for abuse by busybodies or neighbours with axes to grind. Additionally the reason given for singling out pitbulls is dishonest. The average bite force of a pitbull is below that of german shepards, Mastiffs, Rottweilers, and american bulldogs. If you acknowledge there is not a higher incident rate there is no reason to single them out over other breeds.
- Other: Remove the "pitbull" term from the bylaws. All dogs can be dangerous
- Other: Require proof of training with dog registration. Breed specific bans do NOTHING- there are no bad dogs, just bad owners. If every owner is forced to train their dog, bites will decrease. Additionally, NONE of these measures address the human half of the interaction. Many dog bites happen because the human has no idea how to properly interact with a dog- what is being done to educate them?
- Other: Require supplemental education for owners licensing a "nuisance dog"
- Other: Required training for all dog owners. Only using industry-leading certified dog trainers that hold a DCBC or CPDT designation!
- Other: Required training for any breed of dog displaying dangerous behaviour punishable by fines if owners don't comply
- Other: Requiring all pit bulls to be muzzled is unacceptable. This should be a case by case basis as the majority of the Pitbull breeds listed above are very sweet gentle dogs. My Pitbull would not hurt a fly and to require her to wear a muzzle is completely inappropriate.
- Other: See how the owner is taking care of the dog. If a dog is aggressive then it's usually the owners fault
- Other: See if it's an owner issues, there are times when it's the owner's lack of responsibility that results in bites.



- Other: Should differentiate between nuisance and aggressive (biting, chasing). NO breed specific legislation!!! No "pitbull-ish appearance" legislation!
- Other: Small breed (yappy) dogs that antagonize other dogs should have harsher fines/punishments. Breedism isn't just as terrible as racism!
- Other: Small dogs (toy poodles, Chihuahuas, etc) that are aggressive/barking/exhibiting confrontational behaviors towards larger dogs and humans can also be deemed nuisance. Size of animal displaying Aggressiveness and severity of bite does not excuse poor animal behavior.
- Other: some points should be more specific: nuisance is too general e.g. a muzzle is useless for an excessive barker and would not be relevant in public; obedience training should be required for nuisance dogs but it depends on what the issue is as not all are training related e.g. a dog at large is not necessarily a training issue and is more likely an irresponsible owner; do we have a point for animal removal due to negligent or irresponsible ownership?
- Other: Stop basing this on pitbull breeds. Any dog can be aggressive, ITS BAD OWNERSHIP AND TRAINING NOT THE DOG.
- Other: Stop breed specific discrimination and legislation!! Tiny dogs, or "cute" dogs like goldens and labs, if poorly trained, are just as likely to become a nuisance dog. Pit bulls are not the problem, breed discrimination making people scared of them is the problem.
- Other: Stop discriminating against pit bulls.
- Other: Stop [removed] targeting pitbulls. They are not the problem, the owner that does not properly train the pit bull is the problem
- Other: Stop getting mad at the dog who has no choice but to listen or get beat by its owner. Punish a dogs behaviour based on how it was trained at home. If the dog lives in an abusive home. Dogs don't want to be mean or abusive. Its for their own taught and self learnt mechanisms to get them the way a dog is. You give a pit bull shame for biting someone when it feels scared. But don't give 2 shots about a small chihuahua doing the same. Why? Because obedience
- Other: STOP MAKING IT BREED SPECIFIC. Dogs should be trained regardless of breed or declaration as nuisance.
- Other: Stop singling out breeds!!
- Other: Stop targeting bully breeds - this is an outdated behavior, and similar to being racist.
- Other: Take action against irresponsible pet owners, not against breeds of pets.
- Other: take pit bulls out of the equation. Any size animal can inflict damage.
- Other: Take the dog from the bad home and rehome it to one that will train and take care of it properly.
- Other: Targeting pitbulls is very short sighted. There are many strong breeds living in our city. BSL accomplishes nothing. Education for owners is far more effective. Vindictive reporting is also an issue among neighbors that don't get along.
- Other: That any dog despite the breed, should be allowed in off leash areas unless previous bites or nuisances have occurred.
- Other: The amount of bias towards the city's definition of a pit bull is absolutely unfair these dogs were once known as nanny dogs as because of their kind nature. There is no such thing as a



dangerous at birth do just horrible owners who do horrible things to these animals. I have been to the park with my pit bull who I rescued from a dog fight ring is the most kind soft hearted dog ever and I have seen her chased down and bit by dogs such a chihuahuas but because of their smaller size they are deemed not a threat? I believe the amount of biased to the pit bull breeds needs to be re evaluated and looked at as an overall aggressive dog rather than focusing in on a specific breed

- Other: The amount of lights received at dog parks or even myself who lives in a community with small dogs have been primarily from Chihuahua and terrier pitbulls if a nuisance it is because the owners and the owners need training. The dog is declared a nuisance if and when it is involved in an incident or reflects an aggravated position to another dog. Any breed of dog can become a nuisance specifying one breed over the other will just determine people from getting that breed which happens to be a very social breed. Owner training is required or should be required. Are too many good people and good owners out there to bundle breeds together as listed above.
- Other: The city council and anyone else involved in this, are unbelievably inept and probably have never owned a dog in their lives. Do not target pit bulls because the media leaves you to believe they are bully dogs. [removed]
- Other: The city should have a right to intervene with serious incidents or if there have been multiple calls about a certain household or animal. The fact that these breeds are being singled out are ridiculous, I've seen more aggression shown by poodles and chihuahuas than any pit bull type dog
- Other: The current definition of a nuisance dog doesn't mean that a dog displays dangerous behavior and may just mean multiple noise violations. I suggest creating a different category for dogs that display dangerous behaviour and then applying restrictions (muzzled in public, etc.) to dogs that fall in that category.
- Other: The dogs are not the issue, the owners are. Stop blaming the breeds and focus on bylaws that focus on owners. All first time dog owners regardless of breed must go through training on proper care/responsibility training.
- Other: The fact that pitbulls are mentioned so many times here is disturbing. Multiple studies show breed specific legislation is not effective - pitbulls pose no greater risk than any other dog. Anyone that has been around a well trained, or merely not a pitbull with a bad owner knows how sweet, happy and friendly they are. Maybe the city needs to put whomever decided on the above points through training classes involving only pitbulls, and educate them on this breed. This stigma and stereotyping is disgusting, and shortsighted as usual by the city. Unqualified people should not be put in charge of making any kind of legislative decision. Increase fines for bad owners - mandate dog training classes for bad owners. Regardless of breed, it is an OWNER problem. A human problem - dogs are a product of their owners. This is something so easy a child can grasp it - so why cant the city?
- Other: The fact that you have pit bulls distinguished from every other type of dog is absolutely ridiculous. Their power may be similar or SLIGHTLY more than some other breeds (ie: Rhodesian ridgeback), however they are singled out. If a dog barks on its property, according to your definition above, it is considered a nuisance. Why on earth would it be not allowed at a dog park? I'd love to see the correlation explained.



- Other: The fines need to be for irresponsible owners. Just because a dog's breed is a pit bull or dog that looks alike DOES NOT mean it is dangerous. Any breed of dog can be aggressive and 9/10 it is smaller breed dogs. Before you pass any laws on this please get your facts correct.
- Other: The majority of issues that I see arise from owners who do not observe leash laws. Enforcement of leash laws could help reduce instances of bites and nuisance. The fact that pit bull laws are even being considered is disgusting. They have proved ineffective in other jurisdictions and unjustifiably discriminate against a dog on breed or look. The city of Calgary should be ashamed for even considering following the mistakes of other cities.
- Other: The only thing you guys should be doing is signing better for dog parks - reduce the amount of on-leash in off-leash and vice versa, that's where the problems arise.
- Other: The owners of nuisance dogs must attend animal behaviour classes to learn what THEY are doing to create a nuisance environment for their dog.
- Other: The pit bull discrimination is appalling. You should be ashamed of the policy supporting the confinement and removal of innocent animals
- Other: The targeting of pit bulls here is quite unfair
- Other: The term nuisance should be separated into 2 separate categories. An aggressive dog is not the same as a dog that barks a lot. I would support some of these measures for dogs that are involved in biting incidents, but not for dogs that simply bark a lot. Dogs who bark a lot should be allowed to be in public spaces.
- Other: There are many other breeds that have a strong jaw. You simply cannot ban one breed or make owners pay more just because they are classified as a nuisance by the city. Why not make it a bylaw to have all breeds require obedience training? Yeah, it doesn't really matter if a small dog bites, but a kid will still remember it their whole life regardless of size or breed. If people want to have dogs, doesn't matter the breed or size, they should be responsible for them and have them trained properly if they want to take them out in public spaces shared by families and other dogs. What a world it would be if every dog was trained and friendly, regardless of breed or size. Most of the time it's the owners fault that a pitbull is aggressive, not the dog itself. They are a very smart breed and should be respected and not classified as a nuisance just because their jaws are stronger than other dogs.
- Other: There are no such thing as bad dogs (esp specific breeds? That's retard talk) just bad owners
- Other: There should be a difference in this survey between nuisance dogs and dogs that have bitten people/other dogs. Those are vastly different scenarios and require different responses. In addition, breed specific questions are a terrible idea. It's not the breed or the dog, it's the owner.
- Other: There should be greater screening for those people wanting to adopt dogs with higher needs. I find many owners are not prepared to appropriately be aware of aggressive behaviour or appropriately monitor/train their pets. It is not a breed problem, but rather an issue with underprepared dog owners.
- Other: There should be no singling out of one specific breed. Either require obedience training for all breeds or none. A good first step would be to require a pass of at least a basic obedience course for all dogs.



- Other: THESE RULES ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT BE BREED SPECIFIC!
- Other: These should be for all dogs that are considered a "nuisance" not only "pitbulls" because not all "pitbulls" are a "nuisance" so that would not be fair to call out these breeds when all dogs can have this issue. This is about training not about a certain breed!
- Other: These should not be solely to one breed they should be more in the general species of a dog I own a boxer and everyone thinks they're a pitbull
- Other: This cannot be focused on a breed specific legislation.
- Other: This city seems to be picking on pit bulls - all dogs can be nuisance and any biting of other people not just severe should be addressed. Attacked by one dog in my life that ripped my thumb apart not a pittie it was a poodle! Little dogs are meaner because they are not trained and treated like babies.
- Other: This discrimination against Pitt bulls and dogs within the pitbull family is unfounded. There is a lot of room for retaliation from neighbour or persons who can just say a pit bull caused a disturbance even if it is untrue. There should be absolutely no breed discrimination in the making of Calgary bylaws. The fines should be applied to owners who clearly have not trained their dog to be suitable for utilizing public spaces. I often find that Pitt bull owners ensure their dog is well trained because of the discrimination against the breed. There are many other large and extra large dog breeds that sustain more damage in their attacks than a Pitt bull does during there's. Examples include: St. Bernards, Rottweilers, Doberman Pinchers, Great Danes, German Shepards, and Dalmatians. A number of small breed dogs have are known to have a higher bite percentage. Chihuahuas for example. Please make your bylaws discrimination free in the future.
- Other: This is a cash grab at most, all large breeds have the ability to bite harder, you can't just come up with more things for the people to get mad about in this city, when it comes to pets. There's so much backlash at montreal for their pitbull laws, maybe Calgary bylaw shouldn't be so naive and stereotypical towards those breeds.
- Other: This is a ridiculous section. All of the scientific evidence points to breed specific legislation being completely ineffective. Please Calgary do not go down this fool hardy route. Pit bulls are no different than any other dog.
- Other: This is completely unfair to target pit bulls when you SPECIFICALLY say pit bulls do not bite more then other dogs. This is outrageous and unfair to those dogs.
- Other: This is ridiculous to specifically call out pit bulls. Do NOT include breed specific legislation.
- Other: This question is saying all pitbulls are nuisances this is a stupid question any dog can be dangerous. So if I get attacked by a laberdoodle that's okay it won't make the news, but if it's a pitbull uh oh what is the city going to do! Re word your answers dogs are the problem not just whatever you classify as a pitbull.
- Other: This survey is biased towards certain breeds of dogs (those falling into the category of "pit bull") and many citizens of the public are uneducated about this subject and have a biased themselves towards pit bulls for no good reason. All this survey is doing is allowing those people to continue to believe that pit bulls are more dangerous dogs. There are many other breeds that could be argued to be more dangerous than pit bull breeds. A lot of the time, the problem is with the



owner, and not the dog. Maybe if more dog bites and incidents are happening in Calgary, the city should look at how to make the owners more responsible when choosing to have a pet rather than punishing people for owning certain breeds..

- Other: Training for a human to own this type of dog. Ex how to take care of them, Maybe no backyard breeding.
- Other: Training for owners of dogs declared a nuisance.
- Other: Training required for s dog that has become a nuisance. Train the owner not the dog
- Other: Treat all dogs the same, Not just pitbulls
- Other: Treating pitbulls differently than other breeds is not ok. Issues should be handled in court, not by the city.
- Other: We are not supposed to be going back in time. BSL is the dog equivalent of being a racist. I've got two pitbull type dogs one is a manageable dog and he doesn't like other dogs. So I do not put him in any situations where something would happen. It doesn't matter what type of dog someone has if it acts out. My dog goes to training twice a week and doesn't have the opportunity. Having breed specific law in place isn't going to make people stop getting them or change anything it means people who do get them just won't license them with the city
- Other: We cannot discriminate based on assumption or fear, bylaws need to respond to an wctua0 behaviour or incident, such as a bite, not just the fear of possibility. All animals have the potential to be dangerous under the wrong circumstances
- Other: We SHOULD NOT be implementing breed specific by laws as most behaviors are a result of poor ownership training and knowledge
- Other: When one is exhibiting violent behaviour, consider the circumstances before the breed.
- Other: While I am aware that a pit bull bite has the potential to be more severe, I do not support making breed specific bylaws. All bylaws should apply to all animals regardless of their breed. Pit bulls and pit bull type dog breeds are not bad, it is usually the owner that is a problem if the dog is an issue. Pit bull and pit bulls type dogs are the bad dog of the moment. The city should not discriminate against the owners of these dogs based on a few rotten apples.
- Other: why are you falling into stereotypes around specific breeds? All dogs can be dangerous if not taken care of properly. This is ridiculous.
- Other: Why just pitbulls there are so many other breeds that need this as well it should be a law that if you own a DOG of any kind you are not to abuse them or teach them to be aggressive! It is not a dogs fault what they are taught just like children grow up government!
- Other: Why not look at the owner and the situation that the dog is in and not just the type of dog. i.e. (Pitbull) Come one Calgary when are we going to stop with these false breed predigest? It is the owners fault 99% of the time not the dog or type of dog. Maybe the bylaw should be against the wrong people owning and breeding any type of animal? Would you not let a child play at a park or have more than one allowed in their family due to skin colour? That is exactly how Pitbulls are being treated with these proposed bylaws.



- Other: Why not teach people proper responses to dogs. Screaming and yelling near a dog and running definitely doesn't help if a dog wants to interact with them. It's not always the dog creating problems. People are just as bad.
- Other: would prefer to see a proactive approach to pet care. Most responsible "owners" would happily take additional training if a pup has an incident. And I've been nipped at more by small dogs, while generally not painful, I would consider them a nuisance. And when owners don't have small dogs under control, they cause dangerous situations with reactive dogs of any size.
- Other: You are racists against pit bulls! Hope you making special dog parks that are for pit bulls only!
- Other: You can't discriminate against dogs. That's like being racist .
- Other: You specifically say that peoples don't exhibit more bites of the other breeds. But then you specifically target pitbull's in the questions here. Pimples are naturally very sweet dogs and of course in the wrong hands they are going to be aggressive. But the fact that you're thinking of making pitbulls not allowed to go on an off leash area/ muzzled all the Time is disgusting.
- Other: - having separate dog park areas fenced off for small and big dogs also penalties for dogs that hurt other dogs at dog parks (as owners should know their dog and not bring a dangerous dog to a dog park)
- Other: A dog bite is a dog bite. It doesn't matter what the breed is. The owner is to blame
- Other: A general comment that I do not support bylaws or fines that target specific breeds (eg. pit bulls). Breed biases should have no place in bylaws when it can result in perfectly behaved dogs being punished or restricted just because of how they look.
- Other: A) Breed specific legislation (BSL) DOES NOT WORK. It is the equivalent of racism and unless Calgary Police Service is ready to implement the same bylaw against white males because they're more likely to be serial killers, this should not even be a consideration. I am disgusted that it is. B) There is a very big difference between nuisance and injury-causing. A dog who barks a bit should not require extra insurance. Maybe a bite history warrants extra insurance. That said, have you ever actually tried to obtain insurance as a dog owner? Good luck! So you are creating a potential barrier to pet ownership and may even be setting up a situation where people have no option but to break the law because they can't actually get services.
- Other: Pit bulls should not be penalized more so then any other dog, they should have not have their own check column in this survey.
- Other: ABSOLUTELY NO BREED SPECIFIC RESTRICTIONS! OWNER RESTRICTIONS AND EDUCATION BUT DO NOT SPECIFY BY BREED, SIZE OR PERCEIVED APPEARANCE.
- Other: Absolutely NO PITBULL BAN or singling out Pitbulls
- Other: additional insurance for all pet owners with the option to reduce the premiums through demonstrating responsible pet ownership such as qualifying a dog through the Canine Good Citizen program. Engage businesses in further rewarding responsible pet owners with more access (in transit, public buildings, stores that don't sell food, restaurants) - look at Germany for an example.
- Other: Aggressive dogs should not be allowed at off leash parks
- Other: Aggressive dogs should not be allowed at off leash parks



- Other: All breeds are required to have obedience training and proof of that when you purchase a dog. Not just pit bulls. Bad owners not bad dogs.
- Other: ALL dogs have the ability to injure others. I do NOT support breed specific legislation of any kind. Owners of nuisance dogs, no matter their breed or size should be mandated to attend training classes for a certain number of hours
- Other: All dogs should be treated equally they are no different then people
- Other: All owners should be equally held accountable for their dog's actions regardless of breed.
- Other: Any dog can create damage, this is pathetic just going after a specific breed.
- Other: Any dog has the potential to have a lot of power and have a sever bite, Pit bulls are not a problem or nuisance dog. ITS A BAD OWNER THAT MAKES A BAD DOG! Stop putting labels on just one breed!
- Other: Are we going to start forcing large men to stay home because they are stronger. The hate towards pit bulls just because they are stronger is disgusting and wrong.
- Other: Are we seriously having this tired BSL conversation based on outdated and uninformed fear of dogs with blocky heads? Disappointing and misses the heart of the issue, which is deadbeat dog owners and mismanagement/non-management of problem behaviours. How about discounted licensing with proof of an obedience class in the licensing period? How about a secondary/elevated license for off leash areas that requires (among other things) proof of obedience class? This would actually help improve the safety of the community and create an incentive for owners to actually put some effort in with their dogs and be good neighbours, which I'm assuming is the intent of this misguided "pitbull type dog" nonsense. Your pitbull description is inaccurate (no such breed as a "pit bull terrier," only a APBT) as is your information on bites (bite force of German Shepherds, Rottweilers and other large breeds are higher than APBTs and Staffies, and the locking jaw thing is well known BS). Lazy, shortsighted and based on nothing but fear. Yes, 'pit bull types' attract a greater number of loser owners, but so do many other large breeds that typically scare people.
- Other: Bad pet owners are usually the issue here so I'd like to see something in place that looks out for animals by ensuring their owners are educated on responsible pet ownership with the animal rehomed if their owner fails to take proper care of them.
- Other: Basing any bylaw or enforcement on a particular breed is ridiculous. Many breeds can cause severe injuries and many breeds have bite strength similar or greater than that of a pit breed. The statement regarding pitbull bite strength is incorrect and misleading. It is even prefaced by saying they are not involved in more bite incidents. Why even put the options regarding pitbull breeds? German shepards have a stronger bite strength - are there going to be special rules for them too? What about mixed breeds? Either a dog is aggressive/nuisance or it is not. Breed is irrelevant and it is unproductive and irresponsible to even suggest that one particular breed requires different rules.
- Other: Being as specific to pitbulls as this is, is only adding to the wrong stereotype.. disgusting. It should be dogs in general there are plenty other breeds that have a stronger bite then pitbulls FYI. Not the dogs fault they have awful owners
- Other: Breed should not be a factor, but requiring training of nuisance dogs of any breed is a good idea.



- Other: Breed specific bylaws are biased, and do not stop dog related attacks from occurring, other large breed, and even small breed dogs are just as likely to have aggressive characteristics. Bad irresponsible owners are to blame, not the breed of dog
- Other: Breed specific by-laws are never the answer
- Other: Breed specific bylaws are not right. It should be dog specific. It is not the breed it is the way they are raised. You shouldn't punish a dog or an owner that has not been a problem based only on the breed.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is a hate crime. It is exactly the same as saying that one race is a "nuisance." I am appalled by city Council even considering this. Also, "pit bulls" are no more likely to do serious damage than any other breed. In fact, they are prone to over-reporting of bites, if anything. I've worked in animal care (vet, shelter, and biologist) for 20 years and BSL DOES NOT WORK. Dogs with a bite history are one thing, and I support (within reason) some changes to that bylaw, but breed should never be brought into it. Your animal services officers are already too guilty of bias (like the woman who told me "the only good chow is a dead chow") when she arrived at my vet clinic to pick up a very friendly stray chow. That is dangerous behaviour, but that woman wasn't mandated to wear a muzzle (though she should have been!).
- Other: Breed specific legislation is both awful and ineffective. Calgary needs to be better than that.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is unfair. Good dog owners are punished for bad dog owner behaviour. Shame on you for even considering this... I expected better from the City of Calgary.
- Other: Breed Specific Legislation has been proven ineffective and to have negative effects on public opinion.
- Other: Breed specific never worked nowhere just thinking about it is regressive and goes against science. The mayor of Montreal lost his election a couple of years ago just because he wanted to implement such a bylaw. I would rethink this guys.
- Other: Breed-specific legislation is uninformed and ineffective. "Pit bulls" may have stronger jaws but they are not more likely to bite nor are they a dangerous breed. Do you penalize owners of small dogs like Pomeranians that often exhibit aggression as part of their personality to establish dominance and assert themselves? No. Their jaws are small, but they can easily rip faces of children and cause major damage to faces and the body. Stop pursuing BSL. It is ridiculous and ignorant. Look to lump all dogs together and then assess based on each individual dog which needs tighter restrictions, fees and owner guidance. Stop punishing pit bulls for the messes we have made and our ill-informed views.
- Other: BSL is garbage please don't do this
- Other: BSL laws do not work. Many areas are abolishing them. The current program Calgary has is sufficient
- Other: Bull breeds aren't bad, it's 100% on the owner to train their dog. ANY breed can be a danger and or nuisance.
- Other: Calgary has long been looked to as having the gold standard, why have discussion to go to a more archaic legislation focused on pitbulls? Pitbull type dogs do not have stronger bite force and are no more a risk than any large breed dog.



- Other: Calgary shouldn't be getting involved with pit bull problems ever
- Other: City to provide obedience training for pitfalls or nuisance dogs at no or low cost to owners to remove financial barriers to training.
- Other: Create a new definition for dogs exhibiting dangerous behaviours. This should not be breed specific and should not include nuisance behaviours such as noise, found roaming, etc.
- Other: Deal with the dog owner through access to certified dog trainers to address behavioral issues.
- Other: Do NOT bring in breed specific legislation, it is not effective.
- Other: Do not make limitations specifically against pit bulls. This is wrong
- Other: Do not penalize the breed, pit bulls and their mixes are intelligent animals and raised properly are very good pets, there are many other breeds that are problematic, not just pit bulls.
- Other: Do NOT Support Breed Specific Legislation. The problem is NOT the dog/breed. The problem is the OWNER who cannot train or handle the animal. Punish the OWNER. Not the BREED. -signed a veterinary professional-
- Other: Do not target breeds of dogs, lets not be like Quebec. Fine the homeowner for neglect, no training for the dog and overall not fit to be an owner. It is never the dogs fault, simply the owners. Punish the owners or make them take training for dogs and you will see things to decline. With that, STOP euthanizing dogs due to a bit. Again neglect and poor training from the owner. They have no voice. We don't euthanize a person for punching someone.
- Other: Do NOT target by breed. I am so disappointed that this is an option. All breeds have the same ability to bite and all breeds should be held to the same standard. DO NOT discriminate against pit bulls or any other breed.
- Other: DO NOT TARGET PIT BULLS! WE KNOW THAT DOESNT WORK. I don't like that Nuisance is so broadly defined yet the restrictions suggested imply they are dangerous. If nuisance includes getting loose from their owner or noise there is no reason they would need to wear a muzzle or not got to off-leash parks. It should say dogs with a bite history or deemed dangerous. Dog owners who constantly let their dogs loose should be fined more, this is not the fault of the dog.
- Other: Dog breed does not dictate behavior, it is discrimination, just as it is to pick out one race, to say a breed is worse than another. As for nuisance it better be iron clad that the dog was not provoked. Many dogs are tormented by ppl as they go by their fence to make them bark to the point that as soon as someone goes near it, they will bark.
- Other: Dog owners that take obedience classes pay a lower licence fee
- Other: Don't be stupid; stop blaming the breed. As far as I'm concerned, every citizen should have to take obedience classes. [Removed] didn't believe in blaming the breed. Maybe [removed] should go through all the obedience classes and see what they offer, and see what's effective. Most treat training facilities don't even deal with what you call nuisance dogs anyways or use stupid contraptions or ideas that don't work. I think there should be a law that you can't publish the breed of the dog, only state the colour and size (small medium and large). You have to think where the stigma is coming from to begin with; it comes from social panic caused by the media instead of looking at actual facts.



- Other: Don't single out pit bulls
- Other: Don't type cast a certain breed. If a dog is poorly trained that is because of the owner.
- Other: Don't engage in breed specific legislation
- Other: Don't pick on pitbulls. Pick on [removed] pet owners.
- Other: DON'T SINGLE OUT PITBULLS!!!! Shame on you.
- Other: Educate yourself on the breed and get your head out of your[removed].
- Other: Education for owners on the breed, responsible ownership, educate the public, this is almost always the fault of the owner not the dog, stop letting one incident ruin the breed, all dogs bite, stop singling this breed out....all dogs, not just pitbulls
- Other: Education program for the public/pit bull owners on how to treat their dog properly cause that's the real issue
- Other: Fines for people who instigate or provoke and animal.
- Other: For the first checkbox, what is considered dangerous behaviour? I support seizing a dog if it is biting or being aggressive without provocation towards people or other animals. If being a nuisance is defined as "noisy" how does a muzzle and extra insurance help? E.g., a dog barks because it is bored and home alone so the neighbours complain, but the dog is not a bite risk or a risk in an off leash park. The definition of a pit bull is ridiculous - many dogs of mixed breeds can look like a "pit bull" but aren't, and none of these dogs are more dangerous. Many dogs (e.g., German shepherds, rottweilers) have very strong bites, not just pit bulls, but you're not targeting them. One thing missing from here is increased reporting - encourage increased reporting of aggression, almost bites, and actual bites, especially biting other animals (make it mandatory for veterinarians). I would like to see increased fines for repeated "nuisance" or bylaw offences and encouraged or mandatory education. In terms of part 9 below, I would support that some fines stay the same for the first offence, then fines increase for multiple offences.
- Other: Force the owners to to to training
- Other: Free education course (a one day workshop) for dog owners to learn about dog behaviour and responsible ownership. This could also be in the form of a info booth set up at busy times at a popular offleash park. Education is key, not discrimination against bully breeds. Any dog can become aggressive or be a nuisance without proper training.
- Other: Free education or support for owners that have any breed of dog that is exhibiting inappropriate behaviours and allow a non punitive approach as the primary interaction. Sometimes the owners just need help to deal with certain behaviours.
- Other: Go to school, I hope whoever came up with this didn't, but if they didn't I'd like to know where to avoid sending my kids
- Other: Higher fines for dog owners of ALL breeds of dogs who cause a nuisance to other dogs, including provoking leashed dogs.
- Other: Higher fines for owners who have not socialized their pet to be around other pets. It's never the animal's fault, but the owner's.



- Other: Higher fines for people who train dogs to be aggressive or to fight. It's all about the owners choices and not the dogs. Therefore, pit bulls do not need to be singled out. For example, I've never been hurt by a pit bull but I have been bitten by numerous other breeds.
- Other: Higher registration fees for pit bulls
- Other: Holding owners accountable in obedience training is the only way to make a serious impact in dog attacks and misbehaviours. By specifically mentioning pit bulls you negate the responsibility of owners to understand and train their breeds accordingly. If you are targeting pit bulls with strength as your reasoning you should be issuing this towards all large dog breeds. Please reconsider your motions towards pit bulls. Thank you.
- Other: How about finding the owners for ALL BREEDS who act irresponsibly and more presence from the city in dog parks? I've seen plenty of a-hole dogs that aren't pitbulls. It's the owners. Not the dogs. Not everyone should be able to own a dog. This is a ridiculous rule you are putting in place.
- Other: How about training and fines for inept dog owners - the breed is fine, its the morons that do not have the skills or brains to properly train these dogs. Also huge fines for the ones that train their large/strong dogs to be aggressive. Do not blame the dogs for irresponsible dog owners
- Other: How about using real research, such as researching the actual jaw strength of various breeds and seeing that "pit bulls" are actually only slightly above average
- Other: I am absolutely AGAINST ANY breed specific legislation. It is a waste of time and resources. The above criteria could be for ANY large breed dogs (a "pitbull" is a medium breed) there is no evidence that this line of distorted thinking has actually helped any communities rather it promotes bigots, discrimination and allows for mistreatment and abuse of said breeds. It is a waste of time and money that should be spent on keeping Owners accountable for their dogs. Owners should be held responsible for their dogs behavior NO Matter the breed! I am disgusted our city is even considering this! Let's work together to keep our citizens safe using educated bylaws. [Name removed]
- Other: I believe dog owners are unfairly penalized. Cats roam free without licenses, causing noise, feces, and property distruction. The responsibility for problem cats is put on to neighbours. Deal with the cat issue before focusing on dogs.
- Other: I believe this is targetting pit bull-type breeds and is unjust. I was bitten in my vet's office by a mixed-breed dog, definitely with no pit bull in her genetics, because the owner's partner did not listen to the owner's instuctions regarding another dog in their care. I have a small dog, and have not had any issues when meeting pit bull terriers / staffordshire terrier type dogs, nor have I been threatened by them. We need to target dog owners in general, not specific breeds. We're focussing on the wrong end of the leash here.
- Other: I do not agree with this breed specific legislation. Pitbulls are not the only dogs that bite and frankly I thought the City of Calgary was better educated and informed upon dog attacks and bites and the reasons behind why they happen. It's not a breed problem it's the owners fault.
- Other: I do not believe it is fair to put pitbulls in their own category. They are the sweetest most sucky dogs I have owned. It can not be just put on the breed. Ive had weiner dogs come up and bite myself and my pitty. My pitbull didn't react. Same with labs I have had 3 different dogs either bite or so aggressive behavior towards my dogs and myself. I believe it should be the owner that gets the



bad name not the dog. They only know what we teach they depend on us and for the dog to get the punishment is unfair the owner should be punished and taught the correct ways of owning an animal whether its a weiner dog or pitbull.

- Other: I DO NOT SUPPORT BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION
- Other: I do not support this breed-specific restriction. Restrictions should be applied to any breed.
- Other: I don't believe this should be breed specific it's not fair to responsible owners that take the time to train there dogs.
- Other: I don't think any bylaws should be breed specific.
- Other: I don't believe in breed-specific legislation and it has been shown multiple times to be ineffective. Many dogs that are non-pitbulls can be aggressive (in the 90's, German shepherds were the "dangerous" dog) and not often than not, I find small dogs are more likely to bite than large dogs. Every pitbull and pitbull-type dog I have met has been incredibly friendly and sweet, and I believe it's generally poor ownership if one is aggressive
- Other: I own two mixed breeds with pit bull characteristics, would they be grandfathered in if bylaws change? Or would my dogs be apprehended like Ontario and killed?
- Other: I think as example I had a friend get attacked by an aggressive dog, and the city asked for the dog to be removed from the area and the family would be fined 25 dollars everyday it was in the property. And for the record it was an American Eskimo dog. the bully Breed is by far the best breed, and they are the most caring. any dog could attack it's the owner not the dog.
- Other: I think it's sad to see that the City is trying to ban a breed when 99% of the time training and poor owners are to blame with nuisance animals.
- Other: I think the definition of nuisance needs to be updated. biting is much different that noise. They are two separate things.
- Other: I think this is a matter of the owner, not the dog. My shih-tzu shows more aggression than my Rottweiler ever has. Owners should be held accountable no matter the breed. If declared a nuisance, it should be mandatory to have the owner take the dog through training. Don't blame a dog for how lazy an owner can be, enforce the owners to take better care in training if the dog (any breed) becomes a nuisance.
- Other: I will not support any measures that are biased against specific breeds or physical characteristics of an animal since these measures cannot accurately predict a dogs behaviour.
- Other: I work with dogs and HIGHLY disagree with any type of BSL - dogs like German Shepherds have a HIGHER bite strength and are not being punished by punitive legislation. There is NOTHING to support that bully breeds are more aggressive or have stronger bite strength than other dogs of similar size. I implore that you do not enact BSL in yyc - it is so detrimental to to dog community and adds unnecessary fear to a breed that has been unfairly STEREOTYPED. I've had more negative experiences and more bites from LABS - I've never had a bully breed bite me. This breed discriminatory legislation is actively hurtful to so many dogs and responsible owners in this city.
- Other: I would like educate to be published about the glamorized picture painted about the harm pitbulls do. Many other dogs do the same amount of damage. I would like the city of Calgary to stop



group multiple breeds under the umbrella term pitbull. People need to be educated, these bylaws would only punish responsible dog owners and now decrease numbers of nuisances with dogs

- Other: I would not count loud/barking dogs as a nuisance requiring additional measures, I would like these to be explicit to aggressive dogs, not ones that bark or get out of the house
- Other: If a dog has multiple offences, the city should have the right to request training for the dog and that the dog stay on private property and/or be muzzled in public until the training is completed.
- 1
- Other: If harm is caused by a pit bull or nuisance dog, the owner should be banned from owning dogs in future. Since all bad dog behaviour stems from bad owner behaviour.
- Other: If you [removed] want to introduce breed specific prohibitions, then just say so and stop hiding behind passive aggressive surveys questions that are written to result in only the results you want.
- Other: In the majority of cases the issue is not the dog but the owner not understanding dog behaviour and their needs. I would like to see the city come out with a responsible dog owner manual that explains dog behaviour, medical advice including basics on grooming, etc. Many problem dogs are perfectly fine once they have proper training and guidance from their owners. Also, there working with dogs for years, there are numerous breeds I'm more wary off than pit bulls.
- Other: Increased fines for people who do not train their dogs. Dogs with behaviour problems are not breed specific they are owner specific. Dogs should not be punished or singled out just because they have bad owners.
- Other: Instead of focusing on pitbulls, which as you said aren't statistically proven to be more aggressive, you should focus on responsible ownership in general. I believe some sort of obedience/ownership training, for example, should be a requirement for all dog ownership.
- Other: It is really disturbing that the City of Calgary is targeting pitbulls and "(e) a dog that has an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar to those of dogs referred to in any of clauses (a) to (d); (pit-bull. What a subjective measurement. All pets should be held to the same standards. Specifically targeting pitbulls is fear mongering. Second, what is the definition of nuisance? If a dog is known for barking (due to fear, separation anxiety, etc. why does it need to be muzzled or even not allowed at dog parks? I support not allowing known aggressive dogs in these places, and requiring muzzles until they have passed temperament testing, but not barking dogs. This definition is much too broad.
- Other: It seems ridiculous to assume pit bulls are inherently worse than other dogs when we all (including you, [names removed]) know that it is people who teach their dogs to be aggressive. You should be focusing on educating people who adopt ANY kind of dogs to be responsible owners.
- Other: Its not the pit bulls fault its aggressive where is the reprimanding for the owner why isn't there an option to fine them
- Other: It's not the breed. Make training mandatory.
- Other: It's the owners, not the dogs fault. If the dog is being abused by the owner it will act aggressively.



- Other: Just a comment that increasing insurance and fines for nuisance dogs, keeping in mind that when people first acquire a dog they don't think it'll be a nuisance, might increase the number of abandoned dogs due to owners not being able to afford insurance and fines. Or it'll just increase the number of unregistered dogs. Make dog training services easily accessible and affordable. Take a compassionate approach.
- Other: Keep breed specific legislation out of our city.
- Other: Leave breeds out of it. Poorly behaved dogs come from ALL breeds (note deadly attacks by huskies) it is a problem with the owners. OWNERS need training regardless of dog breed. Regarding roaming cats, fines for INTACT cats makes sense but altered cats shouldn't be a source of fines.
- Other: Leave pit bulls and their owners alone. Your statement regarding pit bulls not biting more but are stronger therefor need more restraints is very flawed. Check your logic
- Other: Make it mandatory for the OWNERS to partake in some sort of program that deems them fit to own and seek help/remedy training of nuisance dog. It's always the owners not the dogs themselves.
- Other: Mandatory obedience classes for new dog owners. STOP ALLOWING STORES LIKE TOO DOG TO SELL ANIMALS & STOP BACKYARD BREEDERS!
- Other: Minimum Obedience/behavioural training for all dog owners not just pit bull owners. Even some online course. No euthanasia for the dogs. Its not thr dogs fault if it wasnt trained properly. Increase funding for shelters to provide spaces and training and promoting adopt dont shop
- Other: More accountability And documentation to dog fights at off leash parks.
- Other: More specific language. I dont care if a dog is barking non stop at an off leash park (nuisance) but I do care if a dog is dangerous. Our dog has been attacked once and we've seen another dog be attacked and neither time was the result of a pit bull. All first time dog owners should be required to take mandatory training which breeders and adoption orgs should require.
- Other: No breed should be singled out. All potential dog owners should be required to complete a certain number of training classes before they can register their dog, NO MATTER WHAT SIZE OR BREED. All potential dog owners should also be put through a screening process, regardless of how many dogs they have owned in the past, before they can even start looking for a dog.
- Other: No breed specific legislation.
- Other: No breed specific legistlation against pitbulls!!!
- Other: No BSL, it doesn't work. A golden retriever can do just as much damage as a pit bull if they bite.
- Other: No bylaw should be breed specific!!
- Other: No discrimination against pit bulls as many other breeds such as German Shepards have even more dangerous bites
- Other: No restrictions by breed, but rather behavior only. Major violations should have more severe outcomes, minor ones are just that, minor. Major issues should have major consequences.
- Other: no singling out pit bulls, any and all dogs . Opens up other questions then: should female dogs, male dogs, puppies, senior dogs? Should there be less of a concern when the dog is elderly?



- Other: Nothing specific to breed. Any dog can be a nuisance not fair for one to be deemed so because of breed
- Other: Nothing to do with a specific breed. If a dog has aggressive behaviour then they should be on leash and possibly with a muzzle.
- Other: Nuisance dogs and pitbulls are not the same. There should not be breed specific laws
- Other: Obedience and rehabilitation training for any dog exhibiting dangerous behaviour or has bitten another animal or person
- Other: Obedience training ONLY if provided at low to no cost.
- Other: Obedience training required for ALL dogs who have complaints against them (including noise complaints)
- Other: Obedience training required for all licensed dogs (course paid for in initial licensing fee). Separating true nuisance behaviours from aggression and dangerous behaviours (a friendly dog barking hello from its yard should not be treated the same as a dog that has a history of aggression). There should be a very clearly stated law AGAINST breed-specific bans, particularly ones that include "looks like" - these have been proven stupid and ineffective for improving public safety in many areas around the world, and need to be taken out of consideration.
- Other: ONLY dogs that are considered to be dangerous or a nuisance should have ANY of these applied to them. It is outrageous to bring forward a breed specific legislation against one specific type of dog based on their strength. I was bit in the face as a child by a COCKER SPANIEL and no one ever complains about them. It's disgusting to bring these types of laws and rules against one type of dog within Calgary. I am appalled that this is even a conversation. ONLY dogs that are considered dangerous should have any specific restrictions placed upon them.
- Other: Only dogs with aggressive nuisance complaints should be considered and then all of the above for nuisance dogs should apply
- Other: Owner screening for specific dog breeds or large dogs (German Shepard, Doberman, rottweiler, pitbull etc)
- Other: Owners of first time offender nuisance dogs or first time minor bite must attend behaviour training with the offending dog. Must provide city with proof.
- Other: Owners of nuisance dogs have to take a responsible dog ownership course and show to city officials they are making appropriate changes in their home to help solve the issue.
- Other: Owners requiring training when having any type of bully breed
- Other: Owners should be assessed as well, certain people should not be allowed to own a dog if they cannot accept the responsibility or have a dog for the wrong reasons
- Other: Owners should solely be responsible and fined heavily and should not be allowed to own any pets in the future. The bylaw should not be dog breed specific. The dog should not be punished or put down, it should be the owner's accountability and responsibility to train and keep their dog under control.
- Other: Owners who don't comply with rehabilitation and training of their dog can have their right to pet ownership revoked



- Other: People owning a pitbull or similar dog should get a kind of licence that says they are able to care for such a dog. The dog is not the problem, the problem(s) come(s) from a human who doesn't know how to deal with such a dog.
- Other: Pit bull bans are based on feelings and not fact. Be better than this.
- Other: Pit bulls are not a breed. If your going to consider making LEGAL LAWS around animals then consult with a specialist such as a veterinarian and get your statistics before posting a PUBLIC survey.
- Other: PIT BULLS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM ALL DOGS ARE THE PROBLEM BREED DOES NOT MATTER THAT IS BREED DISCRIMINATION.
- Other: PIT BULLS ARENT THE PROBLEM. BAD OWNERS ARE. IT IS ALSO A PROVEN FACT THAT MANY LARGE BREED DOGS HAVE AS STRONG OF A BITE FORCE AS PITBULLS. SO WHAT ABOUT THEM. SMALL DOGS ARE PROVEN TO BE MORE LIKELY TO SHOW AGGRESSION TOWARDS BOTH PEOPLE AND ANIMALS. IF A MAN KILLS SOMEONE YOU WOULDNT CALL ALL MEN KILLERS. SO IF A DOG BITES SOMEONE YOU WOULDNT CALL ALL DOGS AGGRESSIVE.
- Other: Pit bulls should be treated like all other dogs. Since they are kind and much nicer than small dogs
- Other: PIT BULLS SHOULD NOT BE SINGLED OUT!!!!!!! It's bad owners that are the problem, not the breed.
- Other: Pit bulls should not be stereotyped. It's the owners that need to take responsibility and train their dog.
- Other: Pit bulls shouldn't be such a main focus - any dog can be labeled as a "nuisance"
- Other: PITBULLS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM. WHAT IS WRONG WITH YOU CALGARY. I AM ASHAMED THAT THIS IS EVEN AN IDEA. CONTROL THE BAD DOG OWNERS. NOT THE DOGS
- Other: Pitbull's should not be singled out due to the HUGE lack of proof showing they are a high bite risk than any other breed. On that note, the proposed above regarding Pitbull's IF enforced, expect an increase of abandoned dogs of this breed due to high cost ESPECIALLY in times like these.
- Other: Pitbulls should NOT have anything to do with this matter. The bite force of a pitbull is less than a German shepherd. Are you going to force all German shepherds to be muzzled in public, not allow them at off leash dog parks, not allow more than one per household, require insurance, etc? That is absolutely embarrassing to even be a thought.
- Other: Pitbulls to be removed as nuisance dogs. This is discrimination against a breed
- Other: Please do not place laws on Pit bulls specifically.
- Other: Please do your research. Like the top of this survey mentions, statistically Pitbull breeds do not cause the most bites. Take a look at how well it worked for Montreal in 2017. Focus your efforts on general nuisance dogs and not specifically one breed.
- Other: Please don't go breed specific. There are bites of varying severity from ALL types of dogs.
- Other: Please don't implement breed-specific bylaws. The bylaws should apply to all owners/pets equally regardless of their dog breed.
- Other: Please just better educate owners/people with regards to the dangers of dogs.



- Other: Please never ban Pit Bulls!!!
- Other: Prohibited ownership of ANY animals should there be a serious incident more than once or non compliance to obedience training
- Other: Public education on how to properly interact with and approach animals AND public education campaign on what it means to be a responsible dog owner.
- Other: putting extra restrictions on "pitbulls" is absolutely terrible and should not even be considered
- Other: Remove breed specification and just focus on the behavioural issue. By adding breed you are suggesting that this breed specifically is a problem. If a non dog owner takes this survey they are more likely to choose areas where you have specified breed just simply because you suggested it.
- Other: Remove pitbull from all of those and generalize it as DOGS IN GENERAL. You ignorant humans.
- Other: Require all dogs, not just "Pitbulls" or "Nuisance Dogs", to require obedience training.
- Other: Shock collars on small dogs, they bark too much and are far too aggressive. I'd suggest putting a muzzle on the owners as well.
- Other: since the city is focussing of pit bulls and pit bulls type, is the city willing to pay for DNA testing on those dogs? Is the city honest enough to accept the DNA results? Aggressive animals, any and all breeds, is the fault of the HUMAN. I don't see any training, that the owner of an aggressive dog is REQUIRED to act. We all know that is an animal is aggressive, that is because the HUMAN is at fault, NOT the dog. You need to understand, comprehend this. But the blame where it belongs...on the HUMAN. Also, get rid of all the off leash parks! That is a problem. Ignorant owners who knows their dogs is aggressive to other animals, go to off leash parks and let them loose to attack other dogs. What are you doing about that?
- Other: Small aggressive dogs that nip/bite/provoke big dogs should be kept out of dog parks. Most aggressive pit bulls/large dogs are only aggressive AFTER a poorly trained small dog (yorkie type) have provoked the attack.
- Other: Small dogs are much more aggressive than larger breeds. There should be restrictions and penalties on small dogs as they tend to initiate more acts of violence and aggression. They are often treated more as a toy than a pet.
- Other: Special licensing for breeding pit bulls where applications are more strict, training for humans and the dogs. People breeding without a license heavily fined. Dogs being seized but NOT put down, these dogs are loving animals but in the wrong hands any dog can be dangerous
- Other: Specifying pit bulls would be unfair to owners of well behaved pit bulls. All bylaws should refer to nuisance dogs only
- Other: Stop picking on pitbulls. Stop wasting my tax money and fix this city. Time for an entirely new city council
- Other: Stop targeting pitbulls and target the terrible owners
- Other: Stop targeting specific breeds when you acknowledge there's no higher frequency of them biting
- Other: Stricter laws on the breeding and ownership of dogs. Breeds arent the issue, people are. Proper training and/or a liscence to own a dog should be required. People should have to take some



kind of Healthcare and training program for high risk dogs. But, let's not kid ourselves, the dogs are not the problem.

- Other: Targeting pit bull-like dogs for the "potential to bite harder" is like targeting ethnic groups for the potential to be involved in crime. Maybe treat the greater issue at hand rather than sweep these dogs under the rug as having to be taxed just for being alive. Prevent terrible people from owning and abusing dogs, don't blame the dogs for simply existing. It's like a form of racism for dogs.
- Other: Targeting pitbulls and their that look like them (ie bully breeds) is racist. It is 2020 - aren't we beyond this!!
- Other: Terrible to single out pit bulls, any breed has the potential to be a nuisance, these should be approached based on the individual not the breed.
- Other: The bias you guys are expressing towards pit-bull type dogs is ridiculous. I do not own one, but responsible pet ownership should be breed-agnostic and enforced equally across all dog owners (even those annoying purse rats)
- Other: The breed of dog is irrelevant. It is the owner that is the problem.
- Other: The circumstances of each case must be determined, and the owner should be held accountable. Bites can be triggered for a variety of reasons, people need to learn responsible pet ownership. I am quite disappointed that Calgary would even consider putting laws in that are breed specific.
- Other: The city should implement lighter annual fees for ANY dog that attends obedience training. Once a dog has been in an altercation, the dog and owners attending the dog during the altercation should be required to attend mandatory obedience training. You need to amend your definition of nuisance; muzzling a dog who is barking or at large will not change those behaviours.
- Other: The dogs are not the issue, the people are. Instead of targeting the animal why not target the irresponsible ownership? Make obedience training necessary for ALL owners. Put more time and money into illegal breeding which is where many irresponsible owners find dogs.
- Other: The fact that the city is even contemplating BSL is sad. We are a city that was once looked upon as a leader in animal welfare and animal care and control. Look what happened in Quebec, the time, money and effort involved with putting in BSL to only have major push back and reversing their decision later. It would be terrible PR for the city to put this in place. As an organization that deals with dog on a regular basis you have to know that any large breed dog is capable of the same damage a pitbull type is. Individual dogs with a history of bites I'm all for restrictions, but not just because they are pitbulls.
- Other: The owner should be at fault the dog no matter the bees should be given a shot at being rehabilitated before deciding to euthanize
- Other: There are a lot of dogs that have a worse bite than a pitbull. Look at German Shepards and other dog breeds! The government has no right to impose bias laws that punish owners of pitbulls. You can not condemn a breed cause of prejudice. Your bylaws should be for all dogs plain and simple. Muzzle every dog or none. I will stand behind a law that has animals put down if they are involved in an incident but why punish an innocent pit bull that is my two year olds best friend. My pitbull is the friendliest dog I have ever owned.



- Other: There has to be something said about the owner, most of the time it is not the dogs fault it is the owner he has to be accountable for his or her pet. I do not own a pit bull but I have seen many pit bull dogs that are better behaved then other dogs.
- Other: There is no evidence that breed specific legislation works
- Other: There should be no breed-specific bylaws
- Other: There should NOT be breed restrictions on pit bulls.
- Other: These descriptions are far to subjective as stated.
- Other: This is the dumbest section, EVER. Since when (PLEASE SHOW ME) Evidence that PITBULLS or BULLY BREEDS are in fact more dangerous than other breeds? Its the OWNERS. my PITBULL has been bitten by small dogs and a german shepherd. Everyone i always speak to at the dog park says "are people scared of your dog?" I say yes! they reply with " thats such a shame they're the nicest dogs. I will literally move my business and my self to a different province if this by law goes through. Holy [removed] we have gone back in time.
- Other: this separating out of pitbulls is ridiculous and is taking the City backwards rather than focusing on the issue at hand. It is offensive and this whole survey has just lost all credibility. Your proposed engagement really just means you've already decided to push this through and are using the fact that you aren't having in person engagement to get it approved. When other provinces and cities are looking at reversing this type of breeder specific legislation calgary proposes to bring it in. Ridiculous. This should not be supported.
- Other: This should also include small dog bites when reported as they are MUCH more frequent. Fines should also be higher for people with dogs off leash in on leash areas.
- Other: This should never be towards one singular breed. Ever. I've seen more Huskies & German Sheppard's more aggressive than put bulls. This is the 21st century! It's always the owners responsibility to insure their pet is well trained.
- Other: This shouldn;t be 2 different questions. Pitbulls are DOGS just like any other dog. This survey is uneducated and disgusting
- Other: This shouldn't be specified to a specific breed. There are so many misbehaved dogs of all breeds. No breed specific regulations. It's not the dogs fault for having bad owners. All dog owners should be taught how to train their dogs properly before even being allowed to own one. Breed specific regulations are ridiculous.
- Other: Train people on proper dog handling making dog training classes mandatory. Perhaps lower dog licences when owners complete a dog training course. Raise fees for those who don't. Reward system works better than punishment.
- Other: Training for owners as they are the ones that create the behaviors
- Other: Training should be mandatory when anyone adopts a dog regardless of breed. The city could invest in a training program or support one already in place
- Other: Under NO circumstances should dog breed discrimination be included in this bylaw. Dog behaviour is a product of human interaction, therefore all dogs should be given a point policy such as demerits on a license to allow for owners to be given the time to correct a behaviour issue without the fear they will have to target their dog as a danger by using muzzles etc



- Other: Untrained and unsocialized dogs of all sizes and breeds are prone to biting incidents and becoming labeled a nuisance. Dog training should be mandatory for all dogs in order to prevent these incidents from happening in the first place.
- Other: We need to stop perpetuating unnecessary fear around Pit Bulls. I get what you're trying to do, but statistically, Chihuahuas have a higher bite rate. Instead, we should simply be educating people on dog body language and signs to look for for a distressed or dominating dog. If people cannot read their body language, they shouldn't have a dog.
- Other: What is determined or defined to be a nuisance?
- Other: What you're trying to do with pit bulls is utter horse [removed]! Its racism, but for dogs
- Other: When thinking of a dog declared a nuisance it should only be for dogs that have attacked other pets or person with two or more offences. You cannot "judge" a dog by its breed and or look. You also cannot judge by a first offence bylaw officers do not know the circumstance of what made the dog attack, the dog could have been scared or felt threaten wouldn't you defend yourself? An animal is just the same... The decision of declaring a dog a nuisance should also come from a panel and not one single person.
- Other: Where is the option where the dog racists educate themselves and turn their minds to negligent owners and NOT to demonizing a breed/select characteristics?
- Other: Why are pitbulls being singled out?
- Other: Why does this target Pit bulls ? I've had issues with many dogs , NOT ONCE WAS IT A PITBULL
- Other: Wtf is with y'all's [removed] policies against pitbulls. Look at the stars ya [removed]
- Other: Y'all dog racist.
- Other: You BETTER focus on SMALL NUISANCE BREEDS OR YOU ARE PREJUDICE!
- Other: You cannot have BSL. That is essentially racism on dogs and is a completely disgusting proposition.
- Other: You cant make a specific breed a nuisance. If a dog has bad behavior its the owners fault. They need to be taught properly. Its the owners fault not the breed..
- Other: You can't single out one breed like this. How many people are actually bitten by these dogs? The fact that this is a discussion proves how dumb city counsel is.
- Other: You guys seriously need to stop unnecessarily targetting pit bulls, seriously. That is so archaic. It's like putting rules against a certain human race because they have the capacity to do more damage than others. Absolutely ridiculous. It is always, ALWAYS, the human that causes negative behaviour in a dog REGARDLESS of breed. Stop this pedantic pandering of "pit bulls BAD rah rah rah". You sound like uneducated children.
- Other: "pit bull" dogs should not be automatically held to the same standard as a "nuisance" dog simply because they are born. I am disgusted to see the city of Calgary partaking in discrimination.
- Other: 1. The person who is bit/owner of the dog that was bit to be reviewed if other incidents have occurred/if they approached the nuisance dog without asking permission to pet or if said dog was good with other dogs. It can sometimes be the fault of people who were improperly taught to deal with stranger dogs. 2. Nuisance dogs should fall into different categories. Based on those



categories, these dog should have to wear a tag of a bright and noticeable colour in public so that others can tell if the dog falls into a certain category without approaching closely.

- Other: A bite is a bite it should not be on the breed
- Other: A dog that bites (and its owner) should have to PASS mandatory obedience training with certified trainers at the Calgary Humane Society. If the animal fails the obedience training, Calgary Community Standards should have the authority to seize it and determine an appropriate course of action, which may be euthanasia.
- Other: A program of reduced licensing fees if owners can demonstrate their dogs participated in obedience training and refresher courses at a period of every 3-5 years. If trainer notes dog does not play well with others, regardless of size/breed then they would not be allowed at off leash areas but not charged additional fees for ownership. This would increase incentive for training, as well as educate owners on how their dog interacts or does not interact well with others.
- Other: Nuisance dog OWNERS should be taught how to properly train a dog
- Other: Absolutely stop breed specific bylaws. They do NOT work and they are completely ridiculous and frankly whomever brought this forward should be ashamed of stupid this idea even was to bring forward for consideration.
- Other: Accountability to owners of nuisance dogs to include canine behaviour education and education on what the consequences could be for a nuisance dog.
- Other: Aggressive canines is NOT breed specific. ALL dogs can be aggressive and/or bite. Breed specific laws do NOT work as it does not matter the breed.
- Other: All dogs require obedience training. Dogs with a history of violent behavior must be muzzled in public.
- Other: Also remember that small dogs can also be a nuisance and can get large dogs aggressive with there behavior. I'm sorry a small dog barking and growling causes all dogs to feel amped up.
- Other: Any breed can be a nuisance, the rules should apply to all breeds that exhibit the above behaviour
- Other: Any breed of dog that has a any type of aggressive behaviour should be treated the same from the smallest like a chihuahua to the largest like a great dane
- Other: Any bylaw should not be linked to the breed of dog but the dog owners so they are made accountable
- Other: Any dog can be a problem dog. The only way to fix that is through training. So nuisance dogs should have yo go to some kind of training with owner and pass.
- Other: Any form of BSL is counterproductive. The logic used to suggest BSL is non-sensical. Pit bull type dogs may be able to produce more severe bites but this is due to their size not breed. By your logic, any dog over 40lbs should be considered for BSL due to the potential to produce more serious bites. BSL is outdated, ineffective and unfair. It only creates disparities with communities who own these dogs and allows for the further victimization of an already vulnerable population of dog. Please only use science based evidence to create your policies.
- Other: Ban animals and ALL become vegetarians...



- Other: Breed is not the issue when it comes to any dog attack or bite. We need stop playing the he said she said thing. Unless the dog is is papered the dog is not a pitbull and need to stop putting blame on dogs with similar characteristics
- Other: Breed should have no part in consideration of if it is a nuisance or not. A chihuahua who bites or is aggressive to everyone all the time is more an issue than a pitbull type dog who bites once under extreme circumstances
- Other: Breed specific legislation (BSL) has been time and time again proven useless. As a dog trainer, it is not one or two specific breeds that bite. More often than not, small dogs are the more common biters. Don't blame the dog, blame the handler. The people training the dog are 100% accountable for how the dog turns out. Biting is not based on breed. Implementing BSL would be one of the most ridiculous things the city could do.
- Other: breed specific legislation does not work. I am disappointed that it is even on the table for Calgary. Look at Quebec. Breed specific legislation puts dogs and owners in danger unnecessarily.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is unwarranted discrimination. You state in your poll that they are not more likely than any other dog to be an issue, yet you single out a specific breed. [removed]
- Other: Breed Specific Legislation is widely accepted to be a wrong practice. This should be completely scrapped. Any breed is capable of biting and aggressive behaviour and just as people are considered to be innocent until proven guilty, dogs should be the same. Any dog that actually harms a human should be put through all of these, but its ignorant to believe that only pitbulls are capable of this behaviour. Please don't make the city of Calgary look as ignorant as this policy is by putting forth breed specific legislation.
- Other: Breed specific stipulations is outdated and proven to be unnecessary as the dangerous breed has changed numerous times throughout history; from bloodhounds in the 19th century, to Dobermans, Rottweilers, German Shepherds, pit bulls and the list goes on. For a comparison the bite force of a pit bull is 238 psi which is identical to a shepherd and far less than a Rottweiler. Any dangerous dog act or similar bylaws should be based on a dogs behaviour not it's breed.
- Other: BSL does not work. I would suggest you do some actual research on municipalities that have put it in place.
- Other: BSL doesn't work! Any breed can be a nuisance, singling our Bully breeds is ridiculous. It's about how you train an animal, not the breed.
- Other: BSL is ignorant. Huskies and German shepherds have been known to cause more damage than pits.
- Other: Case by case review rather than specific breeds being singled out
- Other: Certificate of training completion to own a aggressive breed or nuisance dog. Similar to owning a fire arm. Training requirements min 30 hours with professional program. Start cracking down on people selling dogs on Kijiji or other market places.
- Other: charges against the person aggravating the dog and causing it to react.
- Other: Colour coding tags or ribbon ect. for collars or leashes. Different colours for different temperaments, shy/timid/fearful, excited- but friendly, not good with other animals, and for dogs who are good with everything. Just as a rough example. Targeting pitbulls in general is unfair. Mastiffs



have greater power in their Jaws. Trying to dictate how many "pitbulls" someone can own is there business. I have owned 4 together from babies until they passed of old age, and they were properly socialized and trained. I never had one incident. Though, I think it should be harder for people to obtain dogs regardless of breed. Filling out applications especially for any game bred, "aggressive breed" or high energy working dogs. Such as but not limited to: Belgian Malinois, German Shepherd, Presa Canario, Cane Corso, Rottweiler, Great Pyrenees ect. So many people get dogs with out knowing what they are getting into and so many backyard breeders will sell to whomever. The dog then suffers because the human doesn't have the adequate skill or time to train or give them the "work", exercise or mental stimulation they need to keep them mentally and physically satisfied.

- Other: Dangerous behaviour must be clearly defined. What one individual considers dangerous dog behaviour can easily differ from a different individual's opinion.
- Other: Define 'nuisance dogs' as any canine who has bitten a human (due to owner negligence)
- Other: Do not agree with breed specific legislation against pit bulls. There should be fines against people for not properly training their dogs and all dogs should be required to pass an obedience exam or the owner will be subject to fines. There are many little dogs that have attacked other dogs in off leash dog parks. Additionally- other breeds can do just as much damage and do (please research too dogs for attacks: German shepherds, etc). The dogs are not the issues- it is people who do not train their animals and have no business owning a dog that they don't train (this includes small dogs like chihuahuas). Breed specific is exactly like racial prejudice in our society- targeting a specific group with no right or evidence to support your claims.
- Other: Do NOT ban pit bulls or increase any fine or fees for owning a pit bull. Pit bulls do NOT have more biting power. This is a MYTH. Look into ACTUAL REAL FACTS before introducing anything. As someone who works with dogs day in and day out I can confirm that "pit bulls" are no more prone to biting or aggressive behaviour than any other dog. If you want to put restrictions on dog put it on the toy or tiny breeds. I have gotten bit and ripped apart from more tiny dogs than larger dogs. Any dog can be aggressive. Don't condemn a breed just because they look scary. If you impose these restrictions more and more sweet innocent dogs that look like pit bulls will be euthanized over other breeds because of this. You will be killing off innocent dogs before they even have a chance to live if you impose these restrictions.
- Other: Do not punish an animal based on their breed, punishments for nuisance animals are solely the responsibility of the owners.
- Other: Do not single out a breed or type. Focus on ownership responsibility and training.
- Other: Do not single out pit bulls and bully breeds, this is harmful and damaging to the breed. Other dogs are also nuisances and the language and singling out of a breed is very dispicable and the city of Calgary should be doing better. The owners are the problem. Have better resources for owners. Also ensure proper adherence to bylaws such as owners having their dogs off leash in non off leash areas, I know that this is a huge issue as a dog will run up to a dog with fear issues (who is leashed) and they will cause the problem but it will always be the bully breed that is marked as the problem



- Other: Do not start with that breed-specific legislation stuff please. It's garbage and it doesn't make a difference.
- Other: Dog behaviour course for all nuisance dogs and high bite.
- Other: Dogs are dogs. I know peaceful pitbulls and violent pitbulls. I know violent pugs and peaceful pugs. We shouldn't single out pitbulls because of their breed. It's all about the training.
- Other: Dogs declared a nuisance must label or muzzle their dog in public as a warning to others
- Other: Dogs declared a nuisance to be leashed at all times.
- Other: Dogs involved in a reported bite incident (human or other animals) that resulted in severe injury must wear a muzzle or be required to stay on leash (no flexi leads or long lines - standard 6ft leash only). And can only be walked or taken off a person's personal property by someone 18 years of age or older.
- Other: Dogs should not be punished for poor ownership, pit bulls are capable of being very caring animals, it is not right to ban any kind of dog from a park, it's not good for their health or social skills and will only make the issue worse. We wouldn't ban a human from a store because they are strong, so why would we do the same with dogs.
- Other: Dogs shouldn't be penalized for the breed only for their actions just as humans.
- Other: Dogs who are a nuisance regardless of the breed
- Other: Don't define pit bulls as nuisance dogs unless they demonstrate behaviour that would define them as such. This term should be dependent on behaviour, not breed.
- Other: Don't discriminate against one single dog breed. There are plenty of strong dogs. It's about the owner and how it has trained the dog. Take this pit bull [removed] out of the equation
- Other: Don't go down the same road as Ontario. First of all your Def'n of pit bull is ridiculous. A dog is not an APBT because it may have short hair, a whip tail & a blocky head. Calgary was the envy of the World for its Responsible Ownership Bylaw. Why are you doing this? Why are you even consulting the Public on this? Who has gotten to you? I thought Calgary was smarter than this. Consult with ? Where on earth did you get the idea that the dogs lumped under that insane Def'n have a stronger bite resulting in more damage? Geezus talk to some Experts not the Public.
- Other: Don't just target pit bulls. I have had horrible encounters with huskys and German Shepherds. Mandatory obedience school for all dog owners would be appreciated.
- Other: Don't ban pitbulls, you guys are clearly uneducated [removed] if you think that is ok,, [removed] Lets put muzzles on great danes to then, those dogs look scarier then pitbulls. [removed] pitbulls have been proven to be one of the sweetest most child friendly breeds, and this backwards [removed] way of thinking needs to end.
- Other: Don't discriminate based on appearances. As you state above that pitbulls are involved in no more bite cases yet dogs with proven strong bite forces and bred specially for human defense are not? This is no different than racism
- Other: don't single out any breed. Problems are with owners. Punish owners of any breed when a dog attacks. Do not penalize or punish responsible dog owners simply for owning a pit bull
- Other: Don't target pitbulls. Target bad owners.
- Other: Fine if a nuisance dog is found to be in an off-leash park.



- Other: Fines for the owner bringing a aggressive dog to the dog park
- Other: Give that it specifically states above that Pitbulls are not reported to have any increased incidence of bite rates or aggression, by singling out this group of dogs you are perpetuating fear surrounding the breed along with punishing the numerous well behaved animals of this category and responsible owners.
- Other: Have specific rules for pit bulls or any dog resembling a pit bull is absurd. There are no dangerous breeds there are dangerous dogs. Painting all bully breeds as potential attackers is so unfair. Any dog can bite. While bully breed have strong jaw strength that is a ridiculous reason to call them out. Poodles, labs, huskies, shepherds, boxes can all cause the same damage. This is so unfair to the dogs.
- Other: High fines for not being in control of your dog.
- Other: Higher fines for subsequent offences. Owner prove they are capable of taking proper care of animal.
- Other: Higher fines to owners who do not properly contain their pets. Put more funding towards educating pet owners on responsible ownership and on obedience training.
- Other: Hold nuisance dog owners responsible! Fine them. Don't let them own dogs again. Training of ALL dogs! The dogs are only in these instances because of owners!!!
- Other: How about stricter punishment for the owner not the animal and shame on this for trying to single out pit bulls ! The Rottweiler had the toughest bite with 328 pounds of force, the German shepherd came in second with 238 pounds of force, and the pit bull bit with 235 pounds of force the lowest of the group. Why dont you have rottweiler listed or German shepherd they have stronger bite force and are more temperamental
- Other: I am a veterinarian and have found no evidence that BSL has ever shown a reduction in dog attacks. To combat the problem of dog bites higher fines or even criminal charges for the owners of dogs who are involved in cases of unprovoked violent acts.
- Other: I am disappointed in the city of Calgary and their approach to this project. Pit bulls are not the issue. Bad owners are. Targeting one breed now opens the door for more breeds later. You prevent a bad owner from getting a pit bull and instead they get a German or a rotti and now you have the same issue. A big, untrained dog. All owners should have to take puppy classes and then adult dog classes when the dog is 2 years old (if behaviours issues are starting to show). Why isn't there a demerit process in place for bad owners. Why are we punishing an animal that doesn't know any better instead of educating people or preventing bad owners from getting dogs they can't control. If an owner has had too many incidents then they should be prohibited from getting more dogs. Similar to the adding a breathalyzer to a drunk drivers truck. I know over 20 different pit bull type dogs that I feel safer being around than a large number of small and medium breeds. Fine I understand the damage a pit bull can do. I have also been bitten 15 times by small to medium dogs where nothing was done about it. Limiting the number of pit bulls in a house hold isn't going to prevent what you are trying to prevent. It just means good owners are unable to help this breed and will still allow poor owners to get one. Why should I be punished because I can control two of them but my neighbour gets one and they can't control it. For the record I don't currently have a bully breed dog. But I have



spent my life around them. I have watched the damage banning the breed has done to families and the breed. Be better Calgary. Invest in education, training (of both the animals and people) and represent the city I know us to be. Don't punish an animal because there are some bad apple owners.

- Other: I believe you have to be careful with your definition of nuisance ... a small barking dog is not necessarily in the same class as a biting dog...
- Other: I did not select many of the nuisance options as I feel that the mentioned behaviours (being at large, noise) do not necessarily indicate aggressive behaviour. I do think that a dog with a history of aggressive behaviour towards other dogs should be banned from off leash parks. I also think unneutered male dogs over a year old should not be allowed in off leash parks.
- Other: I disagree that pitbulls are on this list of questions. Any breed can be dangerous, it's the owner NOT the dog at fault!
- Other: I DO NOT agree with any of the above being breed specific. [removed] dog owners and their nuisance dogs should be the main focus not one specific breed.
- Other: I do not support BSL in any way, there are no studies that show it is effective. Any breed can be a nuisance. I support larger fines, criminal charges against the owner, and the owner being banned from owning any animals.
- Other: I do not support segregating pitbulls from other dogs. From my experience, they are typically nicer than other dogs and my dog isn't afraid of pitbulls, as she is of other large breeds.
- Other: I do not understand why the word Pitbull is used in the above. A nuisance dog is a nuisance dog. This type of language, whether perpetuated by the media or you (our city) further perpetuates the misconceptions around the terrier breeds. And further leads people who abuse those types of dogs and put them into positions where they become a danger to the public to attain them because of this bad-ass stereotype. I am truly appalled that the city would stoop to the level of perpetuating this sentiment in this survey!!!!
- Other: I don't agree breed should influence regulations and fines. Every dog has the ability to bite or attack. It's how they are raised and treated.
- Other: I find it absolutely ridiculous that the city wants to penalize "Pit Bulls", due to the biased stance that the city is taking against this "breed." To note: "Pit Bull" is not a breed, it is a generalization of the appearance of the dog. I find it exceedingly concerning that by the city's definition of "Pit Bull", this would mean that at the discretion of a bylaw officer my dog could possibly be seized due to their physical disposition, and I completely disagree with this outlook. As long as my animals are well trained, cared for and that I am in control of them at all times, it should not be the city's concern how many "Pit Bulls" live in my household. My dogs also do not have a history of aggression nor have they ever bitten anyone, it is unfair to penalize my adult dogs, who were not trained as puppies to wear muzzles, to be forced to wear them in public or be excluded from dog parks or off-leash areas. As for carrying liability coverage or pay a higher registration fee for my "Pit Bull", absolutely absurd. I already pay my property taxes each year, ensure my dog is registered correctly. Again, my dogs have shown no signs of aggression or gotten out of the yard, why should we be penalized for the city's ignorant bias?



- Other: I find it highly irresponsible to post information regarding dog bites without citing sources as such.
- Other: I have a pit bull and she has been attacked by a golden retriever and a Catahoula. My pit bull didn't even fight back. The others weren't fixed and my pit bull is. You should make spaying or neutering your animal a bylaw and it would solve a lot of problems. Also you should really stop singling out pit bulls, ever one I have ever met has been a sweetheart.
- Other: I have a pitbull, a shitzu and a Bassett Hound. The shitzu is the mean one. The pitbull is the sweetest girl you've ever known. Rottweilers, Cane Corso, and most mastiffs Husky all have a harder bite than a pitbull.
- Other: I have been bitten and had worse reactions and interactions with shitty little dogs (chuaau, shitszu and the like) and their owners than any other large breed or pit bull.
- Other: I have worked in a clinic and have treated hundreds of pit bulls. The only dog that has ever bitten me was a toy Pomeranian. Stop focusing on pit bulls. Bad breeding and bad owners are the problems with ALL dogs !! Maybe you should think about mandating licensing for breeders of all dogs. Yes I know that would be impossible to police due to manpower etc.
- Other: I only think that obedience training should be necessary to ensure that the pit bull will not be taught to be aggressive by their owner. I have witnessed large dogs trained to be aggressive as puppies because it is cute who then terrorize the neighbourhood when they get older and are no longer under the control of their owners. These dogs then never get exercise or appropriate outlets for their energy.
- Other: I own a pitbull AND a retriever, and my retriever has aggression issues, not my pitbull. We cannot discriminate against breeds, but this must be geared towards behaviour of the animal. If a dog is labelled a nuisance for barking or escaping, but is friendly, a muzzle will do nothing to change this. I encourage the law makers to review reasons dogs are muzzled and what TYPES of muzzles are for what kinds of issues. The standard Baskerville muzzle you find in the pet stores I the city WILL NOT protect against a bite. Please consult an animal behaviour specialist about this issue.
- Other: I personally would not want the responsibility of a pitbull, that said it is the owner inability to be a owner not the dog or breed. Training over punishment. Refuse training, punishment next..
- Other: I really hate that "pit-bulls" are being targeted here! I think owner education is key when getting ANY type of dog. I have a pit bull and she is the sweetest. One walks she is well trained and never parks or lunges at other dogs. But we have had other dogs (small breeds usually) who will bark and lunge and she will not react because we've trained her well. Last week we had a bulldog who got loose from their owner run up to both our dogs and our dogs did not react. I put the blame on the owners and not the breed. I think people need to be educated and go through a test to see whether they are appropriate to even have a dog in the first place. Pit bulls are NOT the issue!
- Other: I think by highlighting bully breeds in this survey is wrong and you are promoting breed prejudices when animal behavior is linked to the human owning them, by pointing out they could potentially be harmful you are promoting the wrong type of person to want to adopt them. People who want aggressive dogs or who are ignorant in training will get nuisance dog regardless of breed.
- Other: I think if you want tonhave a nuisance dog you should require a special license and training.



- Other: I think it becomes more about the owner and less about the dog, If an owner is deemed to repeat nuisance instance they should have to pay a city fee for the right to keep the dog and then the dog must go x amount of time without and instance of nuisance. Basically a dog bond
- Other: I think it is unfair to lump all pit bulls under one category. Any dog can cause damage if they are a problematic dog. Nuisance dogs in general should be kept in check. But I would be extremely disappointed in my city if they create bylaws specific for pitbulls
- Other: I think it should apply for all dogs not just a specific breed. It is typically the way the dog is being treated at home or but the person who got bit. Pit bulls are not that aggressive
- Other: I think it's disgusting to highlight dogs who have a specific appearance over others. Bad ownership and training is responsible for nuisance dogs and breed or appearance has been shown to have no effect on temperament. Responsible owners are crucial regardless of dog breed and the city should focus on encouraging that.
- Other: I think it's important that you don't single out any specific breeds. To have a dog declared a nuisance it should have one or more minor offences. No breed is inherently bad, it's irresponsible dog ownership.
- Other: I think painting all dogs within a breed as being a nuisance is very much like casting judgement on an entire group of individuals. Some animals most certainly are an issue, yet others within the same breed are extremely loving and not a nuisance. Personally I believe that if we as a society cast judgement on a group of animals and assume they are all the same, that it is very much the same thing our ancestors have done in the past with skin colour and religions and personally believe this to be a very low level way of thinking. If an animal becomes an issue I believe rules should be imposed on that owner and animal but not on an entire segment of dog owners. Growing up my grandparents had a bull terrier that was an incredible dog. Never did it bite other dogs, nor humans. It was super loving, even though it wasn't the smartest of dogs. To say that dog was a nuisance would be ridiculous, yet this is proposing that
- Other: I will not support discrimination of any breed. We do support sexism, racism or bigotry in people and I believe this should be the same in animals. I am appalled that the city of calgary would even consider such a thing.
- Other: I would be terribly disappointed in the entire city of Calgary if you brought any BSL (Breed Specific Legislation) into this city. It sickens me to even have to read about it.
- Other: I would just like to state, that in 10 years, there have been MORE bites from small aggressive breeds, and other larger breeds than there are pitbulls. DO YOUR HOMEWORK. Do you realize how many children will poke at a dog they know nothing of, and WILL NOT BE STOPPED? There is more to many "aggressive breed" dogs. I tend to get snarly when people poke me in the eyes or tug my ears too. How about TRAINING THE OWNERS, before they get a dog.
- Other: I would like to see much more respect demanded for owners of big dogs when around little dogs
- Other: I would request that breed specific legislation be avoided as it is not supported by many veterinarian groups and it lacked sufficient evidence of efficacy. Specific to this survey, I also have



concerns that pitbulls in particular are unfairly identified; many dogs have stronger bites and yet these are not included even though this is the reason given for pitbulls being included.

- Other: I'm disgusted that our progressive thinking city council is even considering breed specific legislation. Pit bulls have been terribly villainized due to the actions of a few poorly trained examples. Much like Dobermans, Rotweillers, and German Shepards from the second half of the 1900s. Breed specific legislation accomplishes nothing aside from killing innocent pets and traumatizing families.
- Other: If a dog is friendly but cannot be recalled by owner it should not be allowed off leash. Many dog fights are started by dogs with no manners and aren't under owner control.
- Other: If a dog is determined a nuisance and is on leash and bites another dog that is off leash there should be no charges and a fine for the dog off leash.
- Other: If City Seizes dogs they should be placed in foster homes to give them the chance to be properly socialized and loved. Obedience classes for dogs need to be better advertised, and more accessible financially as there are low income families who would benefit from the companionship and love of a pet, but can not afford thorough training. (Or cannot travel to participate in large classes)
- Other: if dog bite causes death, euthenization
- Other: Increase or developer legislation to help bylaw officers enforce and enact on rescuing animals from dangerous situations, ie abusive and/or irresponsible pet owners. It's been proved that enacting bylaws or legislation on certain breeds DOES NOT help, in fact it only results in more problems. The fact that this is even being considered is appalling. Please focus on helping animals and educating owners, not criminalizing certain breeds because of a very small percentage of ignorant and reprehensible individuals.
- Other: Increased screening and monitoring of owners with problematic dogs.
- Other: Instead of targeting a breed of dogs: ie pitbulls. It would be better to educate those who are getting a dog. People create problematic dogs, dogs are not problematic on their own. We dictated their behaviours to be bad. This is horrible that city counsel would even consider these for one breed type and you should all be ashamed of yourself. This is like calling out a problematic group of kids and then generalizing them all under the same category. Instead of informing/informing or educating those in need you're punishing them. Put a big umbrella over dogs in general and fine accordingly.
- Other: Is it possible to create a bylaw prohibiting intentional breeding of pitbulls?
- Other: It is appalling that pitbull types are being singled out. They are some of the friendliest dogs we meet at parks. Stop breed discrimination and start teaching people that training affects your dogs behavior MORE than breed. We have way more issues with misbehaving retriever, labs and small dogs who instigate by snapping and barking aggressively at larger dogs
- Other: It is discriminatory to only specify pitbulls. In my experience, other dog breeds (EG: chihuahua, shitzu, pinchers, rottweillers, dobermans, etc) are just as if not more dangerous - more often than not. This is highly uneducated/un-informed to state that only pitbulls should be muzzled and considered a risk.



- Other: It is important that owners take responsibility for their dog regardless of breed. There are many breeds that have significant bite strength when not trained to reduce bite strength. I do not support breed specific law.
- Other: It is the owners of the nuisance dog that should be dealt with, not the entire breed itself. Pit bulls should not to be singled out
- Other: It should not be breed specific!
- Other: It should not be breed specific. It is the owner and Their training practices that is the problem so I think it's better for the owner to be encouraged(whether with fines or otherwise) to go to training/be trained themselves on how to raise bully breeds. Bully breeds are extremely loving and gentle creatures it is the owners who make them not so.
- Other: It's the owner that creates nuisance dogs, not the breed. It should be encouraged for people to call and let the city know there are these kind of dogs around. And for the city to actually do something about it.
- Other: ITS NOT THE DOG, IT'S THE OWNER! There should be fines, required training, seizure of animals, ban on owning animals. Don't punish a dog just because of its breed...
- Other: Leave breeds out of classification for bad animals.
- Other: leave the breed alone. If ur going to make laws make sure its for ALL breeds. This is like being racist bcuz u are singleing out a certain race. This is how u avoid problems by including ALL dog types. All breeds have ability to bite. Theyre DOGS!!
- Other: Legally ban pit bull breeds in the City of Calgary
- Other: Lots of dogs regardless of the breed can be very much of a nuisance. Why aren't small breed dogs like; Chihuahuas, Minature Doberman Pinchers, and mix breeds of these two breeds. Sorry, I've been attacked more by small breeds than large breed dogs. I will start calling in these homes that have these small breeds. I'm in contact with at least 10 different dogs on my delivery route (Canada Post) daily.
- Other: Love the option for additional training for dog owners. Far to easy to purchase an animal without knowing how to properly look after it. To own an animals should be registered / microchipped and a training certificate held.
- Other: Make these rules applicable to all breeds
- Other: Making anything for mandatory for a specific breed is extremely ineffective. ANY dog breed can be dangerous without training.
- Other: mandatory BALANCED training for owners of dogs deemed a nuisance
- Other: Mandatory behavioural training for nuisance dogs before anything else
- Other: Mandatory OWNER/HUMAN training for any person that wishes to own a bully-breed. The problem is the human... not the dog. Dogs feed off our energy.
- Other: Mandatory positive reinforcement training for owners or dogs declared to be a nuisance
- Other: Much, much higher fines for owners, as any and all situations regarding these questions pretains to poor ownership and training, not specific breeds.
- Other: Need to make sure that nuisance dogs aren't created out of breed bias as well



- Other: NO BREED SPECIFIC BY-LAWS. They are totally crap and alienate amazing dogs and amazing dog owners
- Other: NO BREED SPECIFIC LAWS!!!! Only have repercussions for dogs/owners who have specific history with aggression.
- Other: No Breed Specific Legislation whatsoever. All breeds should be treated the same.
- Other: No breed specific legislation, people specific legislation is what is needed. Stronger legislation for people who mistreat/hoard animals and participate in dog fighting.
- Other: NO breed-specific legislation at all.
- Other: No BSL!! (Breed specific legislation) boo City of Calgary!
- Other: No BSL. any dog can be dangerous or a nuisance. I think all dogs should have to have obedience training
- Other: No laws specifically about pit bulls! Lots of non-pit bull dogs cause big problems too.
- Other: No laws targeting a breed, just target behaviour and owner education
- Other: Noise and roaming are not vicious behaviours and have nothing to do with the dog being a problem in off-leash parks. The breed of a dog does not determine it's aggressive behaviour but prior events do.
- Other: None of these seem like actual solutions. obedience training would be good for the dog yes, however it's not only the dog that needs to be trained. That said, "nuisance" dogs are more often than not the result of negligent owners or owners that don't care. There is also a trend that needs attention where people become emotional and overly sensitive to normal canine behaviour. Some dogs play more "aggressively" than others and some dogs are more vocal when they play. Neither of these are absolute indicators of nuisance or dangerous dogs, yet there seems to be a growing # of people who I would say that it does. People that don't understand basic canine behaviour are also part of the problem. Somehow the pendulum of logic needs to be controlled.
- Other: Not all nuisance dogs are pitbulls, and not all pitbulls are nuisance dogs! My golden retriever has been injured by a pitbull locking it's jaw on her neck, and that bothers me less than the city of Calgary putting such harsh rules against a specific breed
- Other: Not attacking pitbull owners should be one. My am staff terrier has been attacked numerous times and not once did bylaw charge or go after the other parties even with license plate, address and phone number information of the offenders.
- Other: Nuisance dog(s) and violent/bite risk dog(s) should be different categories with different penalties/fines. A bite risk NEEDS to include ALL dogs/breeds, not just "bully/bull" breeds. (Smaller dogs, often off-leash and not well trained, are quite often the aggressor/instigator)
- Other: Nuisance dogs must be muzzled in off-leash parks (or perhaps in public) ONLY IF previous offenses were for biting. (Noise complaints might make a dog a "nuisance," but don't warrant a muzzle.)
- Other: Nuisance should be bites or aggressive behaviours only and not based on noise complaints. Muzzling dogs that bark but have never been aggressive is not fair
- Other: Obedience training for all dog owners no exception also high fines for those who dont comply to that .also i think there should be a law that you must have a back round check because there is



only bad humans in the world not bad animals and you should be able to provide for you animals make a decent income to be able to support your animals.

- Other: Obedience training required for ALL DOGS. Its the owners, not the dogs.
- Other: of the many dogs in my neighbourhood who show aggression, not a single one is a pit bull...this survey is ridiculous.
- Other: Only Dogs that have multiple bite offences should be muzzled in public as muzzles can interfere with breathing and should only be used as needed. The pitbull stuff is fear mongering against a breed and unless the actual recorded instances of bites changes I see no reason to target them. Dogs that bite do so out of fear, retaliation, or poor training. There is also a difference between a warning snap or bite that doesn't draw blood and one that actually causes a wound. Animals and their owners should be judged on their actions, not their possible actions.
- Other: Only dogs who have a history of aggression should be required to be muzzled or avoid dog parks. By the definition above, dogs who have had noise complaints etc are also considered a nuisance, but likely these dogs are noisy because they are being left in a backyard all day and actually would benefit from the exercise.
- Other: Owners of nuisance breeds MUST prove appropriate training so not only the dog is assessed but the owner also and results submitted to licensing board. There are really no bad dogs but a lot of bad owners so my idea would definitely help. We should also have on file nuisance owners.
- Other: Owners should be investigated as to how they are looking after and training the dogs. Maybe specialized training requirements.. I know very nice dogs who are a dangerous breed and that's due to the owners properly training and looking after them.
- Other: Owners should be need to be educated for specific "trouble breed" dogs. I would be that would help with Nuisance dogs. The fines, education, obedience etc should be looked at a case by case basis. Not generalizing the entire breed.
- Other: People should not be penalized specifically for owning a pit bull this is an unfair dog bias. Any dog can bite multiple times, a chihuahua is more likely to bite than most pit bulls. Don't bully the breed as a city.
- Other: Personally I own two pit bull type dogs who have been bit on several different occasions at the dog parks, it wasn't a similar breed biting them but generally small to medium size mix breed dog who attacked them from behind when unprovoked. During these occasions my dogs didn't even think to retaliate or do anything wrong, because they have been trained and are well mannered dogs. The owners of these dogs that attack and bite my dogs don't do anything but turn and walk away without even apologizing, I feel as though more education and training owners would be a better way to work towards your goals on dealing with severe bites and problem dog behaviours as oppose to lumping my dogs into a BSL.
- Other: Pit bulls (or dogs that look like pit bulls) should not be singled out. Owners tend to be the issue with dogs; more wallet-friendly training would be a better way to deal with responsible owners & their dogs. Small breed dogs tend to be more aggressive than larger breed dogs, the difference is that small breeds don't tend to break skin or cause large amounts of damage. Singling out larger breeds only fuels fear in the general public, which is unwarranted. The majority of news on large



breed dogs 80-90% of the time says the dog is a pit bull, Rottweiler, or shepherd breed and NEVER corrects this when the dog turns out to be anything else. General public is fearful of dogs based on media outlets & singling out pit bulls only enhances that fear. Education & training opportunities are far more effective than fear.

- Other: Pit bulls are not the problem, bad owners are! There are far more aggressive behaviors exhibited by other breeds.
- Other: Pit bulls are NOT the problem, many smaller dogs are behaviourally more aggressive than a pitbull. Any bully breed that turns aggressive is due to the OWNER training the dog to be bad, Pitbulls were bred as NANNY DOGS due to them being patient, calm, and gentle. PITBULLS aren't the problem, BAD OWNERS ARE.
- Other: Pit bulls aren't the problem. This should not be specific to pit bulls. Any dog can be a nuisance if the owner isn't treating the dog properly. Change your survey.
- Other: Pit Bulls do not have a stronger bite. You realize that dogs over 150 pounds exist and are way more of a threat than any pit bull you'll ever meet.
- Other: Pit bulls vs any other breed, malamutes, huskies, Shepards, they all can bite with force to injure. Focus on the owners responsibility to train any breed of dog.
- Other: pitbulls are not the problem. Any dog can be a nuisance. The owners are the problem. Stop blaming the breed.
- Other: PITBULLS DO NOT HAVE LOCKING JAWS. Pure fiction!!!
- Other: Pitbulls have a lower bite force than other dog breeds, such as German shepherds. Informing the public on dog behaviour instead of punishing a creatures existence should be the goal. Look at the grey areas that many of the "problem" dog breed breeders are doing to ensure healthy and happy dogs are being provided, instead of reinforcing the idea that a breed is inherently aggressive. Australian cattle dogs have more instinct to bite in them than a "pitbull" does. Teach people what a reactive dog is, not to react to dogs.
- Other: Pitbulls have a similar bite force to other big breed dogs and shouldn't be singled out.
- Other: please do not breed specify. If a particular dog is an issue, blame that dog (and owner), not the breed.
- Other: Please do not consider Breed Specific Legislation. It doesn't work and is bad legislation
- Other: Please do not discriminate against any particular breed of dog. Fine owners for not being responsible pet owner. Punish the bad owners not the good pet owners.
- Other: Please do not make enforce BSL. As a shelter worker pit bulls are already held to such higher standards because of the reputation and the media. In reality, this helps dogs of other breeds with behaviours problems because they aren't a pit bull well in reality any dog can be a nuisance. Please do not make it breed specific but please make all dog owners be more responsible because pit bulls are the problem in Calgary it's crappy owners who have never been forced to train their dogs.
- Other: please do NOT make this a breed ban! BAD owners not the dog!
- Other: Please don't just single out certain breeds of dogs. It is important that all owners are responsible for the animals regardless of breed. While obedience training is a useful tool it can be expensive and some people can train their dogs effectively without it. The suggestions you are putting



forth are clearly being used as a deterrent for people to not get "nuisance breeds" which is unfair for both the dogs and owners.

- Other: Please do not single out Pit Bulls. Owners are the primary cause of violent or hostile dogs. Not breed. Refrain from using breed specific language in bylaws.
- Other: provide more accessible and cost effective training options for owners of dogs that may be a nuisance. Rehabilitation is possible.
- Other: Punishing dogs based on their appearance or breed, disregarding their behaviour is ridiculous. Bad dog owners should be punished regardless of the breed. Gentle, well-trained dogs should not be punished if a bylaw officer declares them to have "substantially similar" appearances to a version type of dog. Any large breed can be trained by a bad owner to be aggressive.
- Other: Reactive measures need to be taken against all dogs, not breed specific. Especially around noise as there are no ramifications as of now.
- Other: Remove dogs from owners who have more than 1 violation. Aggressive behavior is learned behavior. Change the owner and save the dog!
- Other: Remove pitbull from all wording. Especially the line about look like a pit bull, [removed] which is ridiculous as all dogs can bite, smaller dogs bite more often.
- Other: Required obedience training for owners of nuisance dogs, NOT breed specific. Pet ownership restrictions for persons who have greater than 2 serious nuisance offences, regardless of breed. Let's hold people accountable, not punish the breeds.
- Other: Restrictions on breeding pit bulls to limit breeding to those that would not breed for aggressive traits. Enforcement of ban on dog fighting to discourage irresponsible ownership. Special license requiring inspection of home environment make sure owner does not use dog as guard or train aggressive tendency. Owner education paid for by owner required as part of license.
- Other: Singling out pit bull breeds is not the answer. We don't impose restrictions on humans for their race and by how they look and we shouldn't do it to dogs either. Just because a dog has the ability to do something doesn't mean they will.
- Other: So disappointed in the CoC for this attack on pitbulls. Shame on you.
- Other: Stop bullying pit bulls there good dogs..its the owners
- Other: Stop proposing breed specific legislation and start proposing stronger authority and consequences for all pet owners, regardless of the breed or species of animal. All dogs can bite. Some can bite hard. Some can kill. Most never do. Higher fines and more appropriate penalties for animals involved in such incidents.
- Other: Stronger punishment on owners of trouble dogs
- Other: Subsidies for training programs provided to all pit bull owners.
- Other: Targeting a specific breed is no different than being racist , there are good dogs and nuisance dogs leave it at that and stop trying to penalize responsible dog owners for a stigma
- Other: Targeting pit bulls is systemically wrong. All dogs have the potential to bite or be a nuisance. It's on the owner of the dog to take the steps necessary but to target one specific breed or look of a dog is a terrible stance to take. In doing this you show no knowledge of dogs. Pit bulls have not got a stronger bite and to say so shows you have done no research. Animal planet conducted a scientific



study in 2005 to disprove this. Other breeds have a much stronger bite force. Also this same line of thinking was done on Dobermans, Rottweilers and German Shepards over the years. It's time to stop blaming breeds and start blaming bad owners.

- Other: the bigger dogs are not as much of a problem as the smaller dogs. for this reason pit bulls should not be singled out. a couple of years ago it was dobermans, b4 that it was german sheppards. for that fact alone NO ONE breed should be singled out
- Other: The definition of nuisance and "pitbull" is complete [removed]
- Other: The fact you have identified one specific class of dogs due to their breed is ridiculous. German shepards and mastifs have a stronger bite than out bulls. No mention of that though.
- Other: The OWNER is the single most influential source for any dog. Breed specifications are ridiculous! Pit bulls/terriers DO NOT have the strongest bites among dogs. Fine, but more importantly EDUCATE the owner. MANDATORY training for the owner with the "nuisance" dog.
- Other: The problem is always the owner. Any dog will bite. I have never once been bitten or threatened by any pit bull type animal. Proper training is all that matters. LIST OWNERS AS NUISANCES AND RESTRICT THEIR OWNERSHIP WITHOUT TRAINING. This is not the dogs fault. Personally I have been bitten by numerous small dogs. Poorly trained lap dogs with no repercussions for bad behaviour. Have you ever met a street dog abroad? Big surprise, they're the sweetest things. Not once has a street dog ever threatened me. Shit and abusive owners are the problem.
- Other: The term nuisance is too broad to adequately answer some of these questions. If a dog has been cited for a noise infraction they are classed as nuisance. That same dog could be allowed in an offleash park. But if the nuisance behaviour was aggression towards other dogs than they should not be allowed in an offleash park unless they are muzzled (it is an important step to rehabilitation that they can interact with other dogs in a safe controlled manner)
- Other: There can not be more than one pitbull or nuisance dog.... are you kidding me? Separate that question. It looks like someone putting this survey together wants to spark controversy over pitbulls
- Other: There is no need to single out a breed. Fines should be given to any dog that is aggressive and owners who do not train and treat their animals properly
- Other: There is other breeds with higher bite strengths, I'm not sure why this would choose to single out pitbulls. I've been bit a few times but never by a pitbull despite being around them frequently.
- Other: there should NOT be breed specific rules/laws. any and all rules/laws should pertain to all dog breeds.
- Other: There shouldn't be any breed specific legislation for pitbulls. This should apply to all dogs exhibiting aggressive behaviour.
- Other: This is a horrible idea - pitbull is not a breed, and many dogs who look like pitbulls are not - most dog bites are not by pitbulls. I would appreciate stronger enforcement for off leash dogs in on leash areas, and muzzles for preciously dangerous dogs, but absolutely not a breed specific bylaw. Many other places have tried this before and it does not work.
- Other: THIS IS A OWNER PROBLEM NOT A BREED SPECIFIC ISSUE!



- Other: This is a tough area to address. Ultimately who decides what is classified as "dangerous behavior"? For one dog running and "chasing" could be simple play while to another it is threatening. There must be proper guidance by professionals to make these decisions without personal biases. I feel any breed specific legislation has been proved unhelpful and detrimental to these targeted breeds. It is simply unfair, unwarranted and discriminatory toward the breed and stereotype of the citizen who owns that breed. Should the dog, regardless of breed, prove dangerous or uncontrollable there should be action taken. It should be judged on a case by case basis and while working with the owners or local rescue groups to re-home the animal to a safer and more rehabilitative environment.
- Other: This is absolutely outrageous that Pitbulls are listed here as "more dangerous". I have owned pitbulls almost my entire life and they are the most loving, kind dogs I have ever had. It would be a severe injustice to name these dogs as more dangerous and put bans on them.
- Other: This is so disappointing, discouraging, and disgusting, to even see the Pitbill word on this survey... other dogs are way more aggressive, like small dogs!! Pitbills have been mistreated. We should advocate for them, not label them! Unfortunately, the bad owners make it hard for the good ones. Bad owners should have these potential new laws, implemented towards them!
- Other: This really just seems like racism against certain dog breeds. Why punish a group of dogs because of a stereotype. Also if a few other breeds are going to be categorized alongside pit bull terriers because of alleged bite force, the methodology used to select the other breeds should be outlined. To make it unbiased, measure the bite forces of different dog breeds and then choose breeds based on the results
- Other: This shouldn't just be about pit bulls, there should be an education program for all owners of dogs
- Other: Training for owners who have nuisance or problem dogs who bite
- Other: Treat all dogs as dogs. There are no bad dogs just bad owners.
- Other: Very clear guidelines of nuisance behaviour versus dangerous behaviour need to be clear.
- Other: When you limit the number of unparented, [removed] children people can have, you can tell us what breed of dogs to own
- Other: Why are Pitbull breeds named because they are stronger but Rottweilers, German shepherds, press Canarios, American bulldogs, and cane corsos are all stronger breeds of dog and have stronger bite force?
- Other: Why the pit bull hate??
- Other: You are carrying the moth that pit bull are more aggressive then other dogs. It's not the breed , it's the owners of any nuisance dogs. Your focus on pit bull is miss guided. And owner of a dog involved in a incident should be taking dog training and pass dog control exam regardless of breed
- Other: You invalidate your argument bringing up BSL. These two conversations do not belong together.
- Other: You should not punish the breed because of poor pet ownership. Charge the learners of nuisance dogs, fine but you cannot paint all bully breeds with the same brush. Some of us train and



care for and ensure our dogs are never a threat, why should that dog be punished because of others?!

- Other: "nuisance" must be broken down into more specifics, for example a dog with noise complaints needs different measures than a dog who has bitten. Under general "nuisance" bylaws, this would mean that a dog who barks in it's backyard would have to wear a muzzle at the off-leash park? Doesn't make sense.
- Other: 1. Unneutered or unspayed dogs are a bigger risk than any particular breed; if a person insists on not altering their dog it should be interpreted as wanting to breed their dog, they should have to obtain a Business License when the dog is six months old, whether or not they use that license. PLEASE STOP BACKYARD BREEDERS - at least, require inspections of households with intact animals over 6 months of age. 2. There needs to be a way for a dog to pass a test to be declassified from 'nuisance' to 'nice pet.'
- Other: 1. Dogs declared a nuisance can't be off leash at an off leash park but can still go and use the park. 2. There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household (not exclusionary to pit bulls)
- Other: A nuisance dog that barks on its own property no being allowed at off leash parks is considerably different that a biting dog not being allowed. I would like to see some Discretion here
- Other: Absolutely absurd that municipalities are still targeting the pit bulls instead of bad owners. Stop it! I don't even own a dog, but I can see how wrong that is.
- Other: Absolutely no breed specific legislation. A dog should only be declared a nuisance based on their INDIVIDUAL behaviour and not based off any stereotypes of their breed or appearance
- Other: All dogs regardless of their breed should require obedience training to be registered in the city of Calgary.
- Other: All dogs should be treated the same REGARDLESS of BREED.
- Other: ALL dogs should have required obedience. We have seen in other citys that breed specific laws don't work.
- Other: All large breed dogs can create a serious injury. Breed specific laws are not fair to owners who put the time and effort into having a well behaved dog.
- Other: Although often of more concern, I'm not sure it's fair to label pit bulls all the same. I would prefer to see case by case and have them made a nuisance dog if there is an issue. Some are sweethearts!
- Other: Any dog that can pose a threat due to size , strength and to poor animal ownership should be included such as Rottweilers, German Shepards, Dobermans should be listed. They can do as much damage as a pit bull and in some situations more aggressive.
- Other: ANY dog that is a nuisance should have higher fees. It shouldn't be subject to just one breed of dog (ie pit bulls)
- Other: Any dog that is consider a nuisance or aggressive should not be allowed off leash and should have the owner fined and gave them take their dog to an obedience trainer to try and break them of aggressive behaviour but if it can't then they should be muzzled and leash at all times. Pit bulls



should not be singled out as all dogs can be aggressive and typically that is associated with the way the owner has raised them.

- Other: As a proud Pitbull owner it's not the dog it's the owner make fines and penalty's for nuisance dogs not breed restrictions thier not all bad.
- Other: Banning or placing fines on pit bulls is ignorant. Statistically chihuahuas and daushounds are the most aggressive dogs. I find this so offensive. Pit bulls are not the problem. It's the people who don't train their dogs. My dog was bit by a golden retriever, are you going to ban those? No. I don't think so.
- Other: Barking should not be grounds for any of this.
- Other: Breed specific by laws are basically another form of racism. Targeting a specific breed is narrow minded and wrong. Dog owners should be held accountable for their dog's actions. There is no mention of Rottweilers, mastiffs, or Great Danes all of which are as powerful as Pitt bulls.
- Other: Breed specific laws are not well thought out ever. Make the owners responsible.. not bad laws on dogs
- Other: Breed specific legislation does not work. This is proven in multiple communities that have enacted it and saw no change in dog bite/attack statistics and have even retracted their breed specific legislation. The onus needs to be on the owners of any dog, regardless of breed, who is a nuisance, not innocent families and dogs who are essentially discriminated against because of their breed. There also needs to be more support in rehabilitation and proper training of nuisance dogs (e.g. free or lower cost obedience training for people whose dogs have been deemed a nuisance).
- Other: breed specific legislation is a bad idea, it does not work and only results in more of these dogs in shelters
- Other: Breed specific legislation is missing the entire point. Focus on training and consequences for problem dogs rather than a breed itself. It's the owners, not the dogs.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is NOT okay. Punishment should be reserved for dogs that have exhibited poor behaviour and not pre-emptively based on breed. This is a step backwards for Calgary:(
- Other: Breed specific legislation is not the solution, punish the deed not the breed.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is shameful and ineffective. Who is the authority to declare a dog a pit bull? Look up the reliability of phenotyic estimates, sources of dogs in the city, and relaiability of DNA tests. Embarassing that this is being presented as an option to discuss. Provide sources indicating these breeds or even SUSPECTED based on PHENOTYPE have potential for more severe bites. Explain why other powerful dogs bred to bite (heelers, malinois) or be suspicious of strangers (guardian breeds such as cane corsos, rottweilers, dobermans) are not also listed?
- Other: Breed specific legislation is wrong!!!!
- Other: breed specific legislation is wrong. Period. Realize that its not the breed, its the owner and the way the dog is raised. Disappointing to see the pit bull garbage on this survey. Any dog can bite, including Chihuahuas, which actually have higher statistics of bites than bully breeds.



- Other: Breed-specific legislation is ineffective and discriminatory and should NOT be included. Owners should be held responsible for the actions of their pets and if necessary, mandatory training requirements imposed.
- Other: BSL is a form of prejudice and should not exist. Any breed of dog can bite, it always depends on the owner, training, treatment and discipline of the dog. BSL are being removed from all regions of North America so let not move backwards.
- Other: BSL should absolutely not be created. Nuisance dogs should be dealt with, pit bull breeds should not be discriminated against.
- Other: By law officers should ensure fenced area in home or other measures listed above will apply.
- Other: cannot be breed specific. eliminate unfair pit bull bylaws to be broader to any breed. people pay less attention when focus is on one breed only as a risk.
- Other: Dangerous dog legislation NOT breed specific legislation, dog bites are not breed related (many dogs have a stronger bit force than pit-bull)
- Other: Designating a 'breed of dog' (pitbulls are not usually a breed as it refers to a loose classification of dog type) does not address the issue of dangerous animals. Many jurisdictions have had to roll back such regressive policies. +
- Other: Didn't see comment section. Just want to suggest that nuisance be clarified if any of the above go forward. I don't think a dog being noisy on multiple minor offences would justify being declared a nuisance (definition above) such that it would then be prohibited from an off leash or required to wear a muzzle. I think that would be excessive for that type of nuisance.
- Other: DO NOT enact breed-specific legislation. Use education and prevention tactics.
- Other: Do not punish bully type breeds for existing because of a bias that is scientifically proven untrue bias
- Other: Do not specify any breed in the bylaws as any and all dogs have the ability to become a nuisance or cause harm
- Other: DO NOT START BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION! If you're basing it on bite strength, eleven breeds have stronger bites than piggies. Also, people's ability to recognize a pitbull is ridiculous. I had a Thai ridge back/lab cross at one point and people thought he was a pit. Base fines on behaviour not breed!
- Other: Do not wrongfully go after one breed. Consider what happened in Montreal. Focus only on dogs that exhibit problem behaviours.
- Other: Dog training required for all dogs registered in Calgary.
- Other: Dogs declared aggressive cannot be in off leash parks
- Other: Dogs should not be penalized because of breed
- Other: Dogs who exhibit aggressive behaviour should be treated accordingly, rather than punishing a dog and owner for a dog looking a particular way. It's important to note that if we are penalizing "pitbull" owners for their strength, should we not also be penalizing Great Danes, Rottweilers, German Shepherds, Mastiffs, large Golden Retrievers, and any large mutt from a shelter? The logic is highly flawed and fear based. Please choose bylaws based in logic, reason, and science rather than fear.



- Other: Don't discriminate breeds. Many small breed dogs can be vicious but aren't as heavily regulated. If a dog is showing poor behaviour, the owner needs to step up, no matter the breed. Have mandatory classes in order for them to keep the dog.
- Other: Don't breed shame! Look at little dogs that bite too of your considering breeds that bite.
- Other: Dont specify only one breed, its ignorant. There are many large stronge breeds.
- Other: Eliminate breed specific by-laws, base nuisance on individual dogs not by breed
- Other: Encourage owners to train their dogs and work on passing the Canadian good canine citizen test. If you actually look at overall bites, there are far more from small dogs than big. Big dogs just have more power. Pet owners have to research their breed and properly train ANY dog to prevent bites. Also I would really like the be a tree brought back to schools. It is a teaching tool taught by animal professionals to teach children how to avoid bites
- Other: Enforce and fine people for dogs off leash in on leash areas especially not pit bulls. People should be able to enjoy walking there dogs on leash without so called friendly dogs running off leash right up to them
- Other: Enforcement should not be breed specific. Behaviour issues should be addressed on a case by case not by penalizing specific breeds, or by default responsible owners.
- Other: EVERY dog should have training before they are allowed in off leash parks
- Other: Fines and bylaws surrounding the number and severity of offences the owner(s) of these dogs commit as they are the ones who are responsible for their dog's behaviour, regardless of it's size/breed
- Other: Fines for people who have their dogs off leash in an area not designated off leash, if they are not trained with recall
- Other: Fire the person who added the pit bull to this. Any large dog can cause the same damage ie German Shepherd
- Other: Government to help fund the mandatory training so that someone wanting to put in the work to save their dog can afford to do so as dog training is very expensive
- Other: Higher fines for ANY dog involved in multiple bylaw offences!
- Other: Higher fines for dogs at large with zero chances if owner is clearly not looking for their animal.
- Other: Higher fines for nuisance dogs who have had previous bylaw offences. Do no like the breed specific language, any breed can be a nuisance and this is often the owners fault. Include in obedience training for nuisance dogs that owners require canine education also.
- Other: How about we as a society stop targeting one specific breed of dog, and instead target the type of owner who has dogs that are biting? We care about stereotyping people, but you guys are fine to stereotype an entire breed of dog and give it an entirely different set of rules. Quite frankly I've never been more ashamed of my own city council. Absolutely disgusting.
- Other: How the [removed] is this a serious question. Bully breeds are no more or less dangerous, or prone to biting, than other breeds. The fact that some have decided they are the flavour du jour to hate is exactly like Shepherd hate in the 90s, and doberman hate in the 2000s. Grow the [removed], Calgary. Also, why the [removed] is this a public survey with no postal code requirement? You're just going to get spammed with anti-pitbull psychopaths.



- Other: <https://youtu.be/N996jvCYNks>
- Other: I completely and fundamentally disagree with your breed specific legislation. You stated pit bulls do not have a higher bite rate yet singled them out. Why? Shame on you! Chows, German Shepherds, Rottis ... so many breeds have capacity for severe bites. Yet, per the predictable usual - you demonize this breed. It's 2020, how about the irresponsible humans are addressed versus breeds. Very disappointing Calgary. You used to lead the way. Shameful
- Other: I do not believe that it should be breed specific.
- Other: I do not believe we should discriminate based on breed.
- Other: I do Not support breed specific legislation BSL ... I have met some viscous little dogs
- Other: I do not support the BSL
- Other: I don't believe you should categorize Pitbulls as a good any dog can be aggressive
- Other: I don't think targeting pit bulls is an appropriate response to irresponsible pet owners. If you are going to get a dog that is known to have a locking bite or is stronger or more difficult to train/control, it should be the pet owners responsibility to invest in obedience and training, and understand what that animal's triggers might be. Targeting one specific breed is not okay.
- Other: I don't support a separate set of laws, standards or requirements for certain breeds or cross-breeds of dogs. All dogs and their owners should be treated equally, until that dog exhibits nuisance behavior.
- Other: I feel as though ALL dogs should take obedience training.
- Other: I find it reprehensible that you would illogically single out one breed instead of applying it to all nuisance dogs.
- Other: I find this highly offensive not all pit pulls are the problem most are not trained properly is the problem I am a dog groom I've owned a pitty and plan to again
- Other: I just want it noted that I am highly offended that specific breeds (ie the bully breeds) are even mentioned in this surveys. There are other large breeds that can also be damaging, and I have obtained more bites by small breed dogs. The breed is not the issue. Responsible pet ownership is the issue!
- Other: I know of more bites caused by a chihuahua than a pit bull. It's not a dogs fault, it's the human who cannot handle the dog they are getting a fault. BSLs DO NOT DETER BAD DOGS! Instead they punish the good ones. people are responsible for bad dog behaviours more than any breed. A dog is a dog and punishing a breed or a breed look a like is BS. Shame on you.
- Other: I oppose breed specific by-laws.
- Other: I oppose the singling out of a particular breed. It's owners who are responsible for the dog. Banning a breed of dog is racist.
- Other: I strongly agree that Pitbulls dog breed likes that should not be in a separate box or law then nuisance dogs. They should all just be under one umbrella.
- Other: I think fine should be increase with each offence. I also think there needs to be fines or bigger fines for those found teasing, tormenting animals (especially if it lead to a bite). Parks patrolled and tickets handed out to those not in control of their animal.



- Other: I think it would be wise to maybe have a publicly subsidized program to teach basic obedience to dog owners. Maybe also consider giving dogs that went through certified obedience training a discount on their annual fee, like the way fixed dogs get a discount
- Other: I think it's insanely stupid for you to single out pit bulls. There are many dogs much bigger and just as strong as pitties. It's comes down to responsible ownership of any animal. In fact studies have shown pit bulls score VERY WELL on temperament test. Give your head a shake
- Other: I think it's ridiculous that you are grouping pit bulls as their own group. Guess what kind of dog tried to bite my dog at an off leash area.... NOT A PITBULL. Discriminating against a dog breed is ridiculous. Requesting that a perfectly friendly/playful dog to be muzzled or restricted from interacting with other dogs in an off leash area is absolutely crazy.
- Other: I think stating pitbulls as options is bias. Sd said they do not have higher bite rates, and most animal attacks we see are from smaller breeds
- Other: I understand that pit bulls can cause sever damage but so can police dogs and they at german shepherds. Huskies can also kill and maim people. I think the city needs to focus on nuisance dogs and higher fines and measures.
- Other: I work in vet med and pit bulls are NOT aggressive by nature, and putting them into their own category is completely ignorant.
- Other: I'm quite frankly disturbed by this breed specific approach. It's not the right way to go.
- Other: Increased fines for people who dont control their dogs. Dont be idiots and put fines on a specific breed because of ignorance. If you require muzzles for all pit bull breeds, all that will happen is nobody follows it and then it will cause conflict between people.
- Other: Informational classes for the owner if their dog is considered a nuisance, all dogs act out if they are not trained properly, regardless of breed.
- Other: Instead of punishing dogs that exhibit "pit bull" characteristics we should be provide more insentive for ALL dog owners to follow responsible pet ownership. While the strength of a "pit bull" like dog could make a situation "more severe" we should not ignore the fact that ANY breed has the potential to cause a severe incident. We should focus on, fund, and support education and training for owners and even NON-owners on general dog behaviors, what causes certain behaviors, and how to identify and handle certain behaviors.
- Other: Investigations on the the owners of dogs involved in any serious bites/fights
- Other: It is not pitbulls that are the problem. It is irresponsible owners who don't train their dogs properly. Don't blame the dog breed. Blame the owner.
- Other: It is wildly unfair to single out pitbulls here.
- Other: It's more often than not the case of bad pet owners rather than bad pets. Dogs seemed nuisance should be required to go to training as much as the pet owner should be required to take a class as well.
- Other: [removed] you're targeting pit bulls? IGNORANT
- Other: Leave breed specific out of this. They are bad dogs its people who don't know how to train their dogs. Any dog can bite and 9 times of 10 small untrained dogs bite.
- Other: Leave specific breeds out of it, singling out Pit Bulls is arbitrary



- Other: Legislation that removes dogs from problem owners instead of blaming the breed.
- Other: Make the laws apply to ALL dogs and concentrate on holding the owners responsible.
- Other: Making sure proper training and rehabilitation services are able to be provided for dogs who become a nuisance
- Other: Mandatory obedience training within the first year of ownership for ALL licensed dogs.
- Other: Mandatory training for the owners of "nuisance" dogs.
- Other: Many municipalities and countries have actually reversed breed specific legislation as it does not address bad dog behaviour or bad owners and has been proven to be ineffective in reducing dog bite issues. I'm curious as to why BSL is being suggested at this time, it's incredibly ineffective and an antiquated idea. Emphasis should be put on dining bad owners and making obedience classes accessible to all dog owners
- Other: Mastiffs, rottweilers and german shepherds can all have stronger jaws than "pit bulls" but yet "pit bull" breeds are potentially going to be singled out and potentially require additional insurance, muzzles, obedience training, or banned from off leash parks.
- Other: More should be done against owners who have dogs that bite/attack. Also, targeting a breed is not ok. Chihuahuas are awful dogs that attack. Dalmatian have one of the worst bites. More legitimate research needs to be done. In order to obtain a license for a dog proof of obedience training needs to be show (enrolment and completion). Higher fines for repeat offenders.
- Other: No bad dogs, just bad owners
- Other: No breed specific legislation, require retraining for nuisance dogs
- Other: NO BSL - all dogs should be obedience trained, all owners should show proof of training.
- Other: No BSL!! Gangstas will just pick a different breed.
- Other: No need for breed specific legislation. BSL has never been shown to reduce dog bites in a community. Please check <https://justice-for-bullies.myshopify.com/pages/does-bsl-work> for all the info. Thank you! #endbsl
- Other: Non-pitbull dog bites can also be very severe. I suggest that if breed specific language is included in a bylaw, please consider the following breeds: Poodles, Labradors, and Golden Retrievers.
- Other: Nuisance dogs, should be specifically routed to small breeds. Chihuahua, Pomeranian, bichon, all the small dogs that tend to rush other dogs, bark, and cause large dogs to act defensively. "Pitbulls" are not the problem. When a little dog starts a fight, and a dog retaliated in defense. It is never the small dogs fault. Stop punishing the wrong breeds.
- Other: Obedience or other dog training for any and all dog owners. Maybe reduced licensing fees for those who do.
- Other: Obedience training is key in dealing with nuisance dogs, more for the owner to be educated about how to handle the problem(s).
- Other: Obedience training required for all dog breeds, or maybe above a certain weight class. Pit bulls are not the only bad dogs out there thanks to irresponsible owners.
- Other: Obedience training required for ALL dogs



- Other: Obedience training required for owners of nuisance dogs. Stop singling out pit bull breeds. I don't own one and never have but the ones I've had a chance to know we're the most beautiful and easiest going dogs I've ever met (including my own dogs). The problem dogs at off leash parks are almost never bully breeds, shepherds are far worse when forced to single out a breed.
- Other: Obedience training should be required for all dogs. the little ones are the worst offenders. It's the owner that a problem not the breed.
- Other: Often it's not the dog, but the owner that's the real problem. Can you ban people from owning pets that are a nuisance? Even for a year? This includes people that have cats that stray constantly because they refuse to follow the bylaws!
- Other: Owner training certification required upon nuisance/offence complaints/cases; restricting the owner from adopting/purchasing additional pets in nuisance/offence cases.
- Other: Owners of dogs deemed a "nuisance" should be required to have training in the responsibility of animal ownership and animal behaviour.
- Other: Owners of nuisance dogs must be with pets when in public and warn people coming in close contact that they are a nuisance/provide warning
- Other: Owners should pay for property training for nuisance dogs
- Other: Owners with "nuisance" dogs and have been declared as such should have to attend classes for their dogs and them self's
- Other: Pit bull is an ill-defined breed classification. Also, no dog breed should be preemptively punished.
- Other: Pit bulls and other such breeds should not be singled out! I have met/been chased down the street by/ been bitten by many small breeds who are far more aggressive. Dog owners should be held responsible regardless of breed! However many small dog owners believe that because the dog is small they do not have to bother with obedience training.
- Other: PIT BULLS ARE NOT DANGEROUS!!! They have an unfair stigma against them because they're so HEAVILY over-reported on in media. If you look at any study from any veterinary or animal behavioral group they're NOT DANGEROUS!!!
- Other: Pit bulls are not the issue, it is the owners
- Other: Pit bulls are NOT the problem. The owners are the problem. ALL DOGS need to be properly trained, it is NOT breed specific.
- Other: Pit bulls aren't the problem, the owners are! Fine the owners for not properly training their dog and getting the help it needs so it doesn't have bad behaviour. It's not the dog who has the bad behaviour it's the owner who does it. The owner is the problem!!!! The dog should not be taken away or anything. It should be taken away from that owner to a better home that will train it properly. It can be any breed, this survey is stupid to base it off of pit bulls. Owners should not be bringing their dog to dog parks if they know they are violent, they should be getting help for that dog and if they don't they should get fined. I should be allowed to take my pit bull to a dog park to play and have fun without People judging me and scared of it. It's not the dog it's the owner. Yes pit bulls are strong dogs but they aren't the problem or the reason for anything.



- Other: Pit bulls should not be singled out as dangerous dogs. Plenty of other breeds are mean and bite more often. Action should be taken against owners of nuisance dogs.
- Other: Pit bulls should NOT be singled out. All dogs have the potential to inflict serious injury. And for the first point: Would ammendment that they have the ability to seize if the dog has multiple offenses
- Other: Pit bulls shouldn't be singled out here. BSL is discrimination
- Other: pitbull specific designations are unnecessary. Fueling public fear should not be the object of bylaws. Poor owners can create a nuisance dog from any breed.
- Other: Pitbulls are not the problem owners are the problem . Small dogs have much sharper teeth and cause much more damage. And I owned a Chihuahua.
- Other: Pitbulls are no the problem. Bad owners are.. good owners should not suffer because other people are shitty owners... punish the people not the dog... people who dont properly train the dogs should have stiff fines and get dog taken away.. after the third time the dog is removed they no longer have the right to own a dog.. the three strikes should go for all animal abusers.. dogs are no the problem people are, period!!
- Other: Pitbulls are not dangerous. Bad owners are the danger here and not the animal. Please do not subject specific breeds to uneducated discrimination.
- Other: Pitbulls have less bite force than german Shepard and Rottweilers, as per Google. Specific breed rules is not going to solve issues. Problem dogs require attention as well as the owner. All dogs or no dogs. Breed specific bans are unfair and unfounded.
- Other: Please do not enact BSL. Calgary has been an example of how well it can work as responsible pet ownership bylaws without discriminating based on breeds.
- Other: PLEASE do not implement BSL!!!! It had been proven time and again that it does not work!!! Reprimand the individual dogs and owners, but please do not base these decisions on the breed!!!
- Other: Please leave breed specific laws out and focus on ALL problem animals regardless of breed
- Other: Please look at singling our other breeds that have a higher bit strength psi such as Rottweilers and German Sheppards. Your use of pitbulls in this form is disgusting! Do your research!
- Other: Please look that all dogs have poor behaviour due to being in the wrong hands. I've had my dog provoked more from husky a lab and a labradoodle and never once by a Pitbull. Don't stereo type dog breeds but please hold owners accountable.
- Other: Please remove BSL from your vocabulary. A physical trait cannot determine a proclivity for 'nuisance' behaviour anymore than your foreheard determines your proclivity for shoplifting. Language reflecting larger dogs and bite ratios should be based off weight/size/termperment assessments. Calgary, you disappoint. You have been a voice of reason to the world regarding BSL, and its absolutely disgusting that you are backsliding. It is unacceptable. Absolutely shameful.
- Other: Problem is half the time it's not the pit bull itself. We've come across many vicious small breeds, labs, springers to name a few. All of which are more territorial and require stricter training. Constant barking and I'll care from owners (our neighbour is on with his German shepherd cross) and doesn't care either. Bylaws have no effect or action despite constant contact. It's too much work



or hassle for them and the city. Staffys are NOT to blame, owners of smaller other breeds and ill managed dog owners are.

- Other: Proof of obedience class completion within one year of receiving pet license
- Other: Punish the owners NOT the dogs. Breed specific bylaws are such a step back in thinking especially for our communities.
- Other: Punishing owners based on breed is the worst idea I've heard proposes. The owner and how the dog is trained contributes to the animals behavior. Pit bulls were originally known as the "nanny dog" because they were known to protect and love children.
- Other: Required assessment by a certified dog behavior consultant for all dog bites no matter how severe.
- Other: Second offenses should elevate to seizure, but a first offense should look at training opportunities and remove the dog from off-leash areas. Biting is a lack of training on behalf of the owner most often.
- Other: small dogs are more aggressive
- Other: Stop being so discriminatory against pit bulls. it's not the dog that's the problem it's the owner. period.
- Other: Stop hating on pit bulls. Plenty of breeds are a nuisance because they have a shitty owner.
- Other: Stop lumping "Pit Bulls" in as bad dogs. I have owned multiple breeds of dogs, and my Chihuahuas and my Golden Retrievers are more unpredictable than my Pit Bulls. Maybe give incentives to people who own stronger breeds to take them to affordable or partially subsidized obedience classes so they can learn how to correct the behaviors.
- Other: Stop pretending pit bull is an actual definition. It's not. Breed specific legislation is gross.
- Other: Stop singling out pit bulls. Bad owners, not bad breeds.
- Other: Stop singling out the pit bull breed. I was attacked and bit by a Staffordshire dogs and it was the owner that was the problem not the breed....
- Other: Sure lets single out pitbulls while my neighbors aggressive german shepard barks and tries to lunge at my pitbull and I everytime we walk by them. This is racist.
- Other: Targeting a particular breed is atrocious. Large dogs give more severe bites than small dogs. Shall we restrict the size of dog permitted in the city? This is sarcasm obviously don't restrict the size of dog permitted
- Other: The fact that you're still discriminating against a line of breeds that are proven to have a better test results in the field of aggression than a golden retriever, yet they are not specified, is appalling. Until a dog is declared a nuisance, REGARDLESS OF BREED, there should NOT be any penalties or restrictions on breeds. They were bred as nanny dogs, they DO NOT have locking jaws, and their temperament tests are better than most breeds. This is ridiculous.
- Other: The mandatory training should be for all dog owners.
- Other: the pitbull addition and list of breeds is extremely disappointing, not supported by the data on reducing bites, and irresponsible owners will still be irresponsible- it punishes those doing due diligence to ensure their bully breed dog is not a nuisance.. breed specific legislation does not solve nuisance behaviours. Mastiffs, Cana corsos, german Shepard, saint Bernard's, pyerenese are all a



few of large dog breeds that can cause serious damage when they bite- so does a 90lb labrador retriever (compare it to a 35lb Staffordshire bull terrier), therefore the statement about 'pitbulls being listed due to their bite strength' is not accurate, as many more breeds should be part of this list if bite strength is a factor. lastly a 'pit bull terrier' is not a breed of dog, but rather a group of breeds and mutts based on physical characteristics, and is difficult to navigate and again, does not address the root cause of nuisance behaviours. I'm disappointed by how ill informed this is. German Shepards had a bad rap, then dobermans, now pitbulls. please focus on responsible pet ownership irregardless of breed of dog.

- Other: The poor behaviour of many dogs is poor ownership. The owners of rescues and large dogs should be required to have their dog attend and pass a legitimate obedience training course with the owner involved.
- Other: The smaller little happy breeds are worse than pitbulls. Pitbulls are more loveable than a Chihuahua. Chihuahuas and people's pressy little spoiled dogs that don't listen are the real problem.
- Other: There are no bad Pit Bulls only bad owners. And that goes for all dogs. All dogs should have a liability insurance if they are declared a nuisance. And the reason the dog bit someone should be investigated. And if the person who was bit is found guilty they should to pay a fine for harassing a dog.
- Other: There cannot be more than one pet in a nuisance dog in one household
- Other: THERE IS NO BAD BREED! STOP IT WITH THIS BS! PITBULLS ARE WONDERFUL DOGS YOU JERKS!
- Other: There should be more intensive training given to all nuisance dogs, regardless of breed. If there is proper training, the bond between the dog and owner is enhanced and the dog will want to do what is asked of it. Training should involve the owner as quite often and uneducated owner is the source of difficulty for the dog.
- Other: These should be in place for all dogs that meet the requirements not just certain breeds. Smaller dog breeds are vicious as well
- Other: This appears very discriminatory - it's very difficult to make an informed decision in the absence of underlying data/statistics on alleged bites/attacks/nuisances. I would especially like to see citation on the statement above that reads *It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull strength allows the potential for a more severe bite.
- Other: This is absolutely ridiculous to focus on pit bulls. Small dog breeds and golden retrievers have a higher rate of biting and attacking people.
- Other: This is absolutely ridiculous you're trying to target bully breeds. Remember the hero from a couple weeks ago that saved his sister from the dog bite? Yeah that was a German Shepherd Mix dog...not a bully breed of any sort. German Shepherd's have a stronger bite and are more dangerous than a bully. STOP with the profiling.
- Other: This is an INCREDIBLY leading question playing into an extreme bias. You clearly state that "Pitbulls" are not involved in more bite incidences, yet you also clearly single out the breed (conveniently after you've already played in to the bias!) You note a "nuisance" dog is a dog at large,



noise (no refermfe of bite incidents) ... Then specifically link Pitbull and biting incidents. So.. A golden retriever that bites is just a fluffy nuisance, but a "Pitbull" that has never shown any aggression is automatically a danger to society?! "Appearance and similiar characteristics".. That's a slippery slope. A dog with a large square head - Pitbull! A dog with a short, shiny single coat - Pitbull! A dog that bites and has four legs - must be a Pitbull BSL does not work. There is much data and evidence that supports this. I've experienced more aggressive behaviour from chihuahua's, dalmations and poodles than I care to count...I've had zero incidences with any "bully" and breed. Any breed can have irresponsible owners. Your singling out of a specific breed, and playing into people's (uneducated) bias is just as irresponsible.

- Other: This is not a breed specific problem and targeting pitbulls is NOT the correct course of action. Dogs that hurt, or kill other dogs should be immediately put down and the owners should be fined. I have found boxers to be more aggressive than pit bulls.
- Other: This is NOT A PITBULL OR AN BREED PROBLEM! This has everything to do with the handler. Unfortunately, tougher looking dogs attract some of the wrong kinds of people. All pit bulls I've encountered had responsible owners and were the best dogs ever, and have been attacked 3 times (2/3 by German shepherds). I cannot day this enough, it isn't about pit bulls, or it shouldn't be. It should be about handlers/dog owners being responsible and understanding the needs of the breeds, temperament etc and training these dogs properly and providing proper care, exercise etc.
- Other: This isn't a pitbull issue. I had my face town open by a cocker spaniel when I was young.
- Other: This should not be pitbull it should be any dog that has not been trained probably because of bad owners the owner should be responsible
- Other: Training course for new owners of pitbulls
- Other: Training for all humans before getting access to the dog and their dogs to respect the breed.
- Other: Training for owners with nuisance dogs. It is not always the dog at fault. Often times it is the owner that is the problem.
- Other: Training need to be given to the owners. Its bad owners that make bad dogs...NOT the breed!
- Other: vicious dogs are because of the owner, so it shouldn't matter what breed the dog is
- Other: We should have higher fines for any specific type but we should double the fine after every third offence.
- Other: When a dog attacks someone else's dog make it easier for the victim to get their vet bills paid. My dog was attacked and the owner of the other dog got a fine but the city was no help to me in getting the money for my vet bill. Why should the city make money from my dogs injuries? Also, we have been going to off leash parks in Calgary for years. While we do not own a pitbull, every one we meet at an off leash is very nice and friendly. Out of all the untrained aggressive dogs that have caused problems at the park, none have been pitbulls. Usually the nuance dogs are small Yorkshire terrier sized dogs. These small dogs are usually very badly behaved and in trained. They are not seen as aggressive because of there size, it they bite a normal sized dog and it protects itself and fights back, they smaller dog could be killed. There should a law stating there will not be any repercussions to the larger dog if this happens.



- Other: Why are you picking on pit bulls. Pick on people who don't properly train their animals. You guys are feeding into the fear of these animals. Deal with the owner, any animal has the bite instinct
- Other: Would prefer not to have Pit Bulls specifically mentioned, however, make it easier to tell if there is a nuisance dog in a residence. Maybe signage?
- Other: You are ridiculous to scape goat pitbulls and bully breeds.
- Other: You can't single out a breed. Its about how the dog is trained. That is totally unfair.
- Other: Your term, nuisance dog is not clearly specified. (eg. being at large, noise, etc.), leaves a lot to an imagination. For accurate servery results accurate information must be spelled out. A dog barking is an annoyance to the neighbouring people, it is not a danger. If you want input regarding any attributes they should be clearly listed. Had you stated in the opening brief you were targeting biting dogs then my answers to the questions would be significantly different.
- Other: ZERO breed specific laws, as pitbulls are unfairly typecast as aggressive
- Other: "Pit bulls" do not have stronger bites than other large dogs. Please don't perpetuate this myth
- Other: 1) allow nuisance dogs to go through training and be removed from nuisance dog list. 2) DO NOT ENFORCE BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION AGAINST PIT BULLS.
- Other: A well trained pitbull is no more dangerous than a badly trained dog of any breed. That you specify pitbulls here frustrates me as I have had problems with more non-pitbull breeds over the years than I ever have with a pitbull. I agree a badly trained pitbull can be a danger, but so can a badly trained labrador. Apply the rules to all dogs and dog owners, not just pitbulls.
- Other: Any dog of any breed should have the same bylaws applied. As a professional trainer I have been bitten by more small breeds as they often do not get trained at all and will bite strangers who approach.
- Other: Any law that specifically targets one breed (in this case Pit Bulls) is unsubstantiated by actual animal behaviour and serves to do significantly more damage than it could ever hope to negate. I've been bit severely by 3 dogs in my life and not a single one was or even resembled a pit bull. Any law hoping to reduce dog bites cannot target the phenotype or genotype of an animal, as genetic makeup alone does not determine any animal's (including humans) behaviour. Humans who own nuisance dogs and who are found to be accidentally or deliberately negligent in training proper behaviour need to be fined and punished, including being banned from owning dogs. You want to prevent dog bites? Prevent bad and negligent humans from owning dogs.
- Other: Applying for a license to own a pit bull and proof of obedience on both the dog and the human needs a passing grade!
- Other: As an owner of a Pit Bull, I think it is absolutely asinine that you have singled out the Pit Bull breed. Shame on you and how ignorant of you all in charge of this survey. Breed specific verbiage needs to be removed to properly represent this city.
- Other: As someone who dog has been bitten by a German shepherd while also experiencing very kind loving ones, singling out one breed (even though the proposed bylaw is singling out an appearance) is not effective. Various breeds can have strong bites and even smaller breeds can do damage to children. The problem is with nuisance dogs, not breeds in particular. I support enforcing regulation of nuisance dogs.



- Other: Ban pit bulls
- Other: Breed specific laws are not effective. They unfairly pick out one specific breed while ignoring all others with similar bite strength. Studies have shown time and again that poor dog ownership is to blame for dog attacks, not dog breed, and that any large dog is capable of inflicting serious or even lethal damage in an attack. Stricter enforcement against owners is needed, not against dog breeds.
- Other: breed specific legislation is a terrible idea!!!! It does not work and targets lovely dogs and responsible owners unfairly This city has literally thousands of pitties that cause absolutely zero issues. Deal with problem dogs not based on breed.
- Other: Breed specific legislation is complete crap and has been proven many times over to not be effective. Do some research and stop targeting specific breeds. The problem is irresponsible owners who don't properly train and socialize their animals, and owners who don't respect other dogs and their owners. It's never the dogs fault, its almost always the fault of someone who says "oh my dog is friendly, its ok!" as they rush up to an on-leash dog that may be reactive, putting the reactive dog and owner into a dangerous situation because the "friendly" dog and its owner are actually really rude and disrespectful.
- Other: Breed Specific Legislation is equivalent to racism in animals.
- Other: Breed specific legislation never works, this must be implemented based off of track record offences and behaviour, the owners should be held accountable more so than the animals
- Other: Breeds are not the issue. Owners are
- Other: BSL is out dated, please do not use this language, it is a waste of everyone's time. It unfairly targets pet responsible pet owners. The reality is all dogs can pose a huge bite risk. The current legislation needs to be enforced more.
- Other: BSL solves nothing. Singling out one breed is ludicrous to me and I would 100% NOT be in support of this. Any dog that bites or is a nuisance should be penalized. Not a specific breed. Come on City of Calgary, we are better than that.
- Other: Bylaw officers have the authority to make owners of nuisance dogs fix and/or maintain a fully enclosed yard.
- Other: Cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household. Do not define pit balls in this option
- Other: chihuahuas are more aggressive than pit bulls, pit bulls are targeted because of their reputation with those that abuse them. People need to educate themselves on their specific breed, its the owner that makes a dog. Ive had rotties in my life for years and with proper training they are great. I've only ever seen aggression from small breeds and have been bitten by chihuahuas in the past. Enough of targeting the breeds people THINK are aggressive, go after the people who can't be bothered to train their dogs, regardless of the breed
- Other: Chihuahuas bite more people than any other breed. German Sheppard, Rottweilers, and Bull dogs also have very strong and dangerous bites. Do not breed shame. Control nuisance and dangerous dogs.
- Other: Chihuahuas can be a nuisance too.



- Other: Clear wording of definitions of nuisance dogs, and include how other breeds can be nuisances as well.
- Other: Consider tiers for the level of nuisance that a dog poses. I.E, just barking and being annoying vs being a danger to others
- Other: Do not be breed specific. Don't licence dogs... Licence owners.
- Other: Do not consider a pit bull ban. A Shepard can cause JUST as much damage and this is a slippery and nasty slope.
- Other: Do not discriminate against bully breeds. I have two very loving pit bulls who have never bit or hurt anyone. Why should I have to pay more or have insurance when my dogs are not aggressive. These fines and insurances should only be in place if the dog is vicious or a nuisance.
- Other: Do not discriminate against pit bulls. It's not the breed but the owner.
- Other: Do not single out a certain breed. ALL DOGS have the potential to bite. Dog bites regardless of breed are terrifying and scary.
- Other: Do not single out one breed. It is the training and owners that influence the behaviour, not the dog itself. Fine people that have dogs that are not properly trained and do not single out one type of dog due to a stigma.
- Other: doesn't matter the breed of the dog, it's all on the owner. I am very displeased that the city is signaling out one specific dog breed that doesn't even have a high record of bites. Pitbulls are giant babies unless raised by a monster. As with any dog who is raised by a monster. I think the city should be cracking down more on animal abuse rather than putting restrictions on certain dog breeds. If a dog is not aggressive or has never bit anyone then it doesn't deserve to be musled. Your city is signaling out pitbulls and I think that is just absurd. I'd like to know if the person who came up with the idea of signaling out a specific breed does not like pitbulls because these questions are just ridiculous and shame on whoever thought this was okay
- Other: Dog breed doesn't matter. If a dog makes a habit of being aggressive or a trouble maker, regardless of breed, both it and it's owner should require further training and if that household has had multiple "nuisance" animals, maybe that household shouldn't have pets.
- Other: Dogs behave badly because of how they are trained. I think it is disgusting that the city of Calgary is choosing to single out pit bulls. It should be mandatory that if you get a dog that they have to take mandatory behaviour training for both the animal and the owner. Also its not always the dogs fault. Some people choose to pet an animal without permission. If someone came up and touched me without permission it wouldn't be acceptable. So why is it acceptable for animals? Then let's say this animal came out of an abusive home and fought back. I don't think they should be put down or punished because someone wasn't being respectful.
- Other: Dogs declared a nuisance should not be in off leash parks but I don't agree that they should be muzzled when on leash
- Other: Dogs removed from families after offences or several reports from neighbours (i.e. being treated badly/exhibiting aggressive behaviour). Take it from the family.
- Other: Don't discriminate based on breed it makes zero sense



- Other: Don't judge a dog by its breed. Judge it by how it was raised and what kind of person the owner is. Every pitbull I've ever met was sweet and gentle.
- Other: Don't single out Pitbull breeds. It is unnecessary
- Other: DONT BULLY MY BREED. Why would you single out the pit bull breed when German Shepards have a stronger bite force? Perhaps you need to add additional options for all other breeds with stronger bite force. This is absolutely ridiculous. Any nuisance dog is dangerous, Rottweiler, German Shepard, pit bull.
- Other: Dont focus on specific breeds. Focus on bad owners.
- Other: Don't get into Breed Specific Legislation. Bylaws/ gives should be based on a specific animal's behavior/ actions.
- Other: don't tease/provoke any dog
- Other: Education for dog owners. I don't like the pit bull wording as I believe it's ultimately the owners who are uneducated. I don't think that it's fair to target a specific breed.
- Other: Evaluation by 2 or more CPDT-KAs who focus in behaviour consultation to help put together a plan. Nuisance dogs should never be present in dog parks or face removal from the home. PLEASE DO NOT include breed-specific legislation; we know that it does not help. Focus on the dogs that are actually causing problems.
- Other: Fine irresponsible owners. Fine owners of untrained dogs.
- Other: Fines for those that are letting dogs walk off-leash in any area that is not specifically designated to be off leash
- Other: [removed] with the discrimination against pit bulls. My dog (not a pit bull, for the record) is most often attacked by dogs under 20 lbs.
- Other: Having breed specific policies is a joke and shows how uneducated this pole is, very disappointing
- Other: Hold bad dog owners responsible, regardless of breed, and stop making "pitbulls" out to be the bad guys. Thanks.
- Other: Hold people - IE pet owners - responsible for their pets regardless of breed, don't restrict the breeds.
- Other: Holy [removed] this is dumb. Take PITBULL out of the equation. Not the breed. Its the owner you closed minded [removed]
- Other: How about not being breed specific..its [removed] that pitbulls are listed here. Ive seen more chihuahuas rip kids faces apart than a pitbull
- Other: How about obedience training for all dog owners period. As a responsible pitbull owner I muzzle my dog to protect dogs that approach my leashed animal when their owners lose control of their unleashed animals.s
- Other: How about we deal with the dogs that actually bite.
- Other: I am shocked and appalled at the scapegoating of bullybreeds, please don't let Calgary turn into Ontario!! Banning this specific breed is so unfair, it's the owners that need to be accountable, don't blame the dog. There are so many wonderful bullydogs out there!!



- Other: I believe instead of mandating the nuisance dog stays home for a period of time, owners have to put their dog through training courses to help the issue. Not lock the animal up.
- Other: I believe training is key. Maybe an application process to own higher risk animals..fines dont prevent but training can
- Other: I disagree with specifically identifying pit bulls in these suggested changes various breeds can be a nuisance that require measures and I don't like that pit bulls are high lighted especially the statement "a dog that has an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar to those of dogs referred to in any of clauses" I think that any of the measure should not be breed related pit bull or other
- Other: I do not agree with breed specific bylaws (pit bulls)
- Other: I do not agree with breed specific bylaws. However, in terms of nuisance dogs - when the problem relates to public safety I would argue that these dogs should be kept on leash. However, if the nuisance was related to public disturbance (i.e. noise) muzzles and leashes in off-leash parks should not be required.
- Other: I do not agree with the pit bull designation meaning they should have any bias just because of breed
- Other: I do not believe in breed specific bans or infractions. I think all judgments should be based solely on the behaviour exhibited by the animal not withstanding what breed it is a Chihuahua can do just as much damage as a pit pull if provoked. [removed] DO BETTER CALGARY!!!!!!
- Other: I do not support breed specific bylaws.
- Other: I do not support breed specific legislation. Target, educate, and fine IRRESPONSIBLE OWNERS.
- Other: I do not support breed specific legislation. There are plenty of other breeds with just as much capabikity to injure
- Other: I do not support breed-specific by laws.
- Other: I don't believe that breeds should be pigeonholed. All dogs who exhibit aggressive behaviours regardless of breed should be assessed for safety concerns.
- Other: I don't think any dog declared a nuisance should have repercussions. I do not think pitbulls should be singled out. I also think that any dog who is involved in a situation that results in a bite from the dog should be looked at on an individual basis and the circumstances should be looked at. (eg) the dog was startled or cornered etc.
- Other: I don't think that any dog should be judged by its breed and it's owner should also have some responsibility and fined or not allowed to own other dogs if they have had a lot of offences with nuisances. It is the persons fault for allowing dogs with aggressive tendencies to be around people and other dogs and should be punished as much as the dog!
- Other: I dont believe it's necessary to specifically target pit bulls. If that is the case, then you should have demonstrate graphs/charts and data trends and analysis to prove why you need to be targeting pit bulls. If the purpose of this engagement is to find opportunities for improvement, targeting pit bulls in the same category as nuisance dogs has already made the assumption and biased the



stakeholders to this belief which is wrong. Stakeholder engagement should not put opinions and biases on the citizens.

- Other: I don't believe one breed should be singled out. There are more than just Pitbull type dogs that can do a lot of damage from a bite. Owners should take responsibility for the actions of their dogs
- Other: I don't believe pitbulls should be the target. I am sorry to say a lot of people who are not an expert on the matter would be judgemental and will be against pitbulls. Because that is what they heard from someone without looking into fact. I am actually disappointed that the city has decided to put them in this conversation! But that being said we should not jump to conclusions and decide the fate of the dog on the way they look. In fact we should have a separate division who can be an animal behaviour expert, and decide if the problem is with the animal or the owner!
- Other: I don't think pit bulls should be a targeted breed but these laws should go for ALL dogs. Including smaller dogs as they are often more aggressive than large dogs. Discriminating against a specific breed is not only unreasonable but is a step back in treating dogs with nuisance behaviour
- Other: I STRONGLY disagree with labeling any specific breed. There are "bad dogs" in any breed or mix. And many mixed breed dogs can have a pit bull type of appearance, but have absolutely no bully breed in them at all. Breed specific legislation opens a can of worms in which no one wins. In addition, the breeds listed are true breeds of dog recognized by the Canadian Kennel Club. What most people think of as a "pit bull" is not a registerable breed.
- Other: I think it is disgusting to have pitbulls separately. They may have more chance of doing damage but they're less likely to attack. I have NEVER been a rude pit bull but I've met very aggressive chihuahuas and shih tzu.
- Other: I think the breed specific legislation is an incredibly ignorant choice. German shepherds, mastiffs, and multiple other breeds have equal bite strength and can do equivalent damages as "pitbulls". This is a decision based on fear based media not facts.
- Other: I VEHEMENTLY opposed breed-specific legislation.
- Other: I would not support any type of breed specific bylaws; thus wording is inappropriate and should be left to nuisance dogs only. The issue is not related to breed but to irresponsible owners. Full stop. Disappointing to see this biased wording on a city survey.
- Other: If a dog (any breed) is declared a nuisance, the owner should be forced to undergo, and pass, a training session with the dog (at the owner expense) before being allowed to take the dog home again. If an owner opts not to take the training, the dog should be confiscated, rehabilitated and found a new home and the owner should be barred from having another dog until they can complete the training. Any owner of a dog who is destroyed should be barred from getting another dog for a period of 5 years and require training before getting the new dog.
- Other: If any breed is considered aggressive or a nuisance, they should be required to have obedience training. Stop putting a Pitbull as a foot. There is plenty of responsible ckc registered breeders of dogs such as American staffordshire terriers throughout calgary. Another bylaw you should consider putting in place is unless you are a registered breeder through a purebred dog registry, you should not be allowed to reproduce dogs. And should have to prove your dog is altered



by the time they are a year to maintain a city licence and reduce fines. This would prevent so many dogs running the streets, ending up in shelters, overproduction of dogs and lesser backyard breeders or puppy mills.

- Other: If you are going to specifically have PitBulls as a specific breed in any legislation - you must consider German Shepards, Bullmastiff, Rottweiler, Chows, Dalmations and a few other breeds. If you don't include other breeds and continue to stereotype pitbulls - I can tell you it won't make things easy to implement anything. http://www.forallanimals.org/pit-bull-terriers-breed-discriminatory-legislation-faqs/?gclid=CjwKCAjwm_P5BRAhEiwAwRzSO2PvZrtONGtfBTK1b2T3d4ecExKA4ofowvFOYv8Hel4SJDJ0Gw_6VRoCTt0QAvD_BwE
- Other: If you discriminate against pit bull owners purely based on a stronger bite you are doing a disservice to the animal and the owners who are properly training and caring for their dogs. The witch hunt against pit bulls and their owners is ridiculous. Anyone who is mistreating or abusing any breed of dog should face the possibility of jail time. It IS NOT the dog who is vicious it is the lack of human awareness and care for an animal that causes a dog to behave aggressively. A dog should not have to suffer for it's owners faults. I honestly find it problematic you're questioning involves singling out pit bulls.
- Other: If you're considering "pitbulls" having to wear muzzles, then you need to have Chihuahua's wear them too. I've had more encounters with vicious small breeds than any of the dogs you consider "pitbulls".
- Other: Increased response with respect to patrol requests in problem areas where off leash dogs are a constant nuisance
- Other: It would be going back in time if you implemented breed specific legislation. If anything people need to be trained on how to deal with pitbull types, not the dogs. I think that others have the right to call bylaw if they see an aggressive dog, and if deemed required by law, mandatory obedience classes should be offered, focused on training the person AND the dog. If owner is unwilling then they should be flagged and have to pay higher pet liscensing/ insurance/ rental fee with any dog owned by them until owner completes the class and is deemed by class trainer to be competent in dealing with reactive dogs. Putting more time and effort in educating people will be much more effective in the long term than breed specific legislation. I would also be supportive of raising fines for dog tickets if this was put in place.
- Other: I've been bit by a few dogs, none of them were pits.
- Other: I've been bitten more by little dogs like terriers and shitzu's and they've shown insanely aggressive behaviour when I even approach their owners to talk to them. They lunge and bark and show their teeth. Bigger dogs are not always the problem here!
- Other: Just because it's a pit bull doesn't mean it needs to be labeled. ALL DOGS can be a nuisance. ALL dog owners need to be held responsible for a nuisance dog either it being a chihuahua or a pit bull
- Other: Larger fines for [removed] pet owners who refuse to train



- Other: Leave Pit Bulls alone. "There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household"--your survey option is biased by including both in this one but separating it for others, so I am voting for "no more than one nuisance animal per house".
- Other: Leave pit bulls out of this discussion. Many other dogs are more aggressive and have the same amount of biting force. Do your homework. If a shitzu never has any training and attacks my larger dog, its not the matter that the small dog cant do harm, its a matter of training your animals. Obedience training for all dogs is a better recourse.
- Other: Leave pit bulls out of this. Stop the discrimination against dogs. Discriminate against bad owners.
- Other: leave the Bullies alone... go after there idiot owners!
- Other: Make training courses mandatory for offending dogs/owners
- Other: Mandatory obedience training and education on canine behaviour for all new dog owners, regardless of whether this is their first dog or subsequent dogs within the household. Not enough people have the knowledge or skill set to help their dogs and themselves to avoid becoming a "nuisance" in the first place or combat pre-existing behavioural issues with their pets.
- Other: Mandatory training for nuisance dogs. PS really hate the idea of regulations being breed specific. This is discriminatory and puts animals at risk.
- Other: Mandatory Training for the Owner with Follow ups in order to keep license. The biggest issue is more often then not the dog owner and having a dog they can not control. For that matter the owner should have to have a license from the city to show they have been trained in the care and control of these types of dogs. No Training No license.
- Other: Maybe making the owner of a pitbull specific, city approved one on one trading from an credited dog trainer. They can only legally own, and license a pitbull if they're certified through them.
- Other: Most of the time, it's the dogs Environment/owner that is causing the dog to be like this - whether it's an uneducated owner, not knowing how to train a dog, or whether the dog is being abused/neglected. The dog should be taken taken away on second offence, as the owner is not taking responsibility for the actions of their dog. The dog should be placed in foster until a suitable, responsible owner can be found. Also, an in-depth report needs to be done, as most kids mistreat dogs as well, and no dog should be reprimanded for defending itself against unruly kids. And if thats the case, the kids should be taken from their parents. Kids that abuse animals, have been proven to move on to people and other animals as they age. They need to be punished as well.
- Other: Most of those proposals are reasonable, if they are applied to ALL breeds.
- Other: Most often it is the owner that is the problem. Pit bulls can be scary with the severity of a bite however owners must take responsibility. Most dogs can be rehabilitated.
- Other: my dog and myself have been bitten several times by small dogs and not once by a large breed. This should be noted as a though small dogs do not typically inflict sever bites they are overlooked. If a small dog bites my large breed and it escalates it is the large breed owners fault? Better ownership determines a dogs disposition! I think all dog owners need to be held at a higher standard. Any dog, any age, any breed who displays poor behaviour should be held to the same level of consequence.



- Other: NO BREED DISCRIMINATION. Bylaw affects all breeds and sizes of dogs, or none. I am a certified dog trainer specializing in aggression, and I have worked with and bit by more Chihuahuas and Shih Tzus than any other dog.
- Other: No breed specific bylaws are needed, punish the owners of nuisance dogs of ALL breeds.
- Other: no breed specific bylaws!!!
- Other: No breed specific bylaws. My neighbour's cockapoo is more of a danger than another neighbour's pit bull. It should be based strictly on behaviour.
- Other: NO breed specific legislation
- Other: NO Breed specific legislation. Period.
- Other: No breed specific punishments please, many large dogs have just as much power as breeds like pit bulls do however large breeds are generally much better trained than small dogs. Breed specific punishment is unfair treatment and dogs should be assessed on an individual basis, not a breed basis.
- Other: No breed specific, it should be about the actual behaviour of the dog.
- Other: No BSL in Calgary please.
- Other: NO discrimination against one breed, if an animal has done a crime than it should be treated equally on that crime not its breed or look of a specific breed
- Other: No law should be breed specific. Pitbulls aren't the problem. Owners are the problem. Fine nuisance owners. Ban nuisance owners from owning dogs. Dont punish responsible owner that take care of their dogs and train them well. All kinds of dogs are a nuisance but it's not a breed. Stats show Huskies and mixed breed dogs of all kinds are problems when they have problem owners. [Removed] with your breed specific [Removed].
- Other: no punishment for pit bull owners unless the dog is deemed dangerous. There is no reason to think all pit bulls are dangerous or all need to be muzzled
- Other: NOT ALL PITBULLS ARE BAD!!!
- Other: Not breed specific!! My Rottweiler has been attacked by small breeds but she is trained not to react. Strict rules for owners can be required and education and awareness campaigns would help.
- Other: Not more than one nuisance dog in a household but NOT the reference to put bulls
- Other: NOTHING SHOULD BE BREED SPECIFIC YOU UNEDUCATED INDIVIDUALS. it's not the breed that ruins a dog it's the owners, I've had vicious chihuahuas that are worse than any big dogs. Do your reearxh
- Other: Nuisance and Neglectful owners, regardless of the Breed.
- Other: Nuisance dogs are not allowed off leash and small annoying dogs should be banned from parks
- Other: Obedience education for owners of nuisance dogs.
- Other: Obedience training for all dogs. Aggressive small dogs are a large problem at dog parks
- Other: Obedience training should be offered to low income per owners through the city of Calgary fair entry program.



- Other: Obedience training should be required for ALL dogs registered in the city, regardless of breed. It's irresponsible pet owners that are the issue, not the dog breed
- Other: Opportunity for owners to do training classes if they decline then having the authority to seize the dog, also having authority to seize a dog if after owner stopped attending classes the dog is still a nuisance; a owner has the opportunity for their dog be be undeclared a nuisance after attending obedience classes and proving the behaviour has been corrected. Would agree with muzzled in off leash parks if that only included violent behaviour, requiring a dog to wear a muzzle when in an off leash park when they simply run away a lot or bark a lot I disagree with;
- Other: Owner education needs to be a requirement especially when owning a powerful breed or a dog with behavioural problems. Many people own dogs with no knowledge of their purpose, strength or behaviours. Starting here would be a lot more effective then blaming the dog for being placed in unsuccessful situations by inexperienced people.
- Other: Owner must be fined if they don't pick up dog droppings
- Other: Owner specific legislation not breed specific legislation. If a person wants to own any dog in particular any large breed dog they should have to show proof of training classes upon licensing and the dog may be seized if the training has not been completed. Abolish off leash parks, too many owners do not have proper control over their dogs and serious injuries occur between dogs and people because of this. No more than 2 dogs per household unless the person is a breeder, a rescue or a foster home for rescues. All dogs required to wear a muzzle in public as well as no retractable leashes and length should be no longer than 6 feet.
- Other: Owner training as well should be made clear the animal is a possible nuisance animal if not trained properly and it's the owners responsibility not the dogs fault.
- Other: Owners of nuisance dogs cannot get their animal back until the owner and dog have passed a training course
- Other: Owners of nuisance dogs need to access education and training for themselves (e.g., dog body language; how to properly secure their home/yard to ensure an animal can't escape; how to train their dog using humane methods to bark less; and on general dog behaviour topics). I think that you would also need to consider your definition of "obedience training;" obedience training generally refers to loose leash walking, sit, stay, and other basic cues/commands. However, some dogs need more intensive work on behaviour modification in order to change their emotional response to stimuli, and address issues that stem from fear, aggression, and fear-related aggression. Also, it needs to be noted that under certain conditions, any dog can bite. Often, humans lack the knowledge of dog body language, how to appropriately socialize puppies, etc., and this ignorance is what leads to dogs with behaviour issues. Overall: I do NOT agree with breed specific legislation at all. I prefer an education approach, and for treating dogs as individuals rather than outlawing a particular breed.
- Other: Owners required to surrender dog to a rescue foundation when dog is declared a nuisance and offends again
- Other: ownership limits placed on humans with multiple nuisance animals. Exceptions for people that rehome or foster animals.



- Other: pit bulls and similar dogs should not be targeted. Its the owners that are bad, not the dogs. Ive been bitten by more small dogs than large dogs. Targeting dogs that look like pit bulls is like targeting someone with a different skin color!
- Other: Pit Bulls are not any more of a risk than a german shepherd or even a collie. Nuisance animals and pit bulls should not be lumped together.
- Other: Pit bulls are not the problem, it's dog owners who don't do the bare minimum to train or socialize their dogs that are the issue. Strict enforcement of required training for aggressive dogs (something like completion of a reactive dog training course) would be most beneficial. If a dog has bitten, they should have a blanket ban on off leash areas. All dogs, small or large, not just pit bulls. I have met some of the nicest and sweetest pit bulls, but some of the most annoying and aggressive labradoodles, and it all comes down to training, understanding dog behaviour, and removing dogs from situations that develop. Please talk to some behaviorist and trainers at the Calgary Humane Society about this.
- Other: Pit bulls are not the problem, people are. People who own dogs of any breed should/must enroll, partake and graduate from some form of recognized training program. STOP DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PIT BULLS AND BREEDS IN GENERAL!
- Other: Pit bulls have a bite strength on par with other dogs of their size and weaker than bigger dogs. A dog should not be fined or muzzled unless the actual dog has issues. BSL is a mess
- Other: Pit bulls should not require additional fines, training, or penalties.
- Other: Pit bulls type breeds are not the problem. Irresponsible owners are the problem. Bsl is not the answer. Ownership review is what needs to be invested in.
- Other: Pitbulls and other bully breeds should NOT be targeted.
- Other: Pitbulls are not inherently vicious. My dog has been attacked by many breeds and not a single one is a bully breed. Any dog regardless of breed should be monitored if aggressive.
- Other: PITBULLS ARE NOT NUISANCES
- Other: Pitbulls are NOT the issue- they are not an aggressive breed- it is all in how the owner has raised them. Its bad dog owners not the breed. I have been bit by a golden retreat before because it was raised by bad dog owners.
- Other: Pitbulls have nothing to do with issues with dogs in this city...owners are lazy and no one is fining these terrible owners to allow their dogs to be untrained.
- Other: Pitbulls should not be singled out as a breed. More bites, often more serious as well happen with OTHER breeds. Pitbulls are normally quote well tempered and very sweet. I agree 100% any dog that does wrong should be looked into and trained better. Its the owners responsibility to train and handle their pets. But to say there is more of a threat or more of a chance of damage because of the pitbull breed (any specific breed really) is just wrong
- Other: Pitbulls shouldn't be singled out because of their bite strength. Many dogs are capable of dealing damage regardless if they are pitbull or not. ie) rottweiler, German Shepard's, etc.
- Other: Pitbulls, large breeds or any dogs with strong bites should NOT be automatically noted a nuisance. There are no nuisance dogs but nuisance owners. I would suggest required education to



be provided from a breeder and/or adoption agency regarding a large/strong breed characteristics to any or all new owners.

- Other: Please do NOT change the rules/fines based on breed.
- Other: Please do not single out breeds. Any type of dog can be dangerous and can cause damage. Why limit rules to a breed when you can define any dog as a nuisance and take action on a case by case basis? Additionally people who own dogs and train them to be aggressive should be banned from owning any dog. A German Shepard can easily be as bad as any bully. It comes down to the owners.
- Other: Please don't make this about a breed - it's about responsible ownership.
- Other: Please no breed specific (pit bull) regulations. I work as a veterinary technician, and I frequently see more "nuisance" dogs that are far from a "pit bull" breed. Put more emphasis on the owner's responsibility to train the dog properly.
- Other: Proper leash equipment for pit bulls and nuisance dogs (ex. A strong leash or leash that goes around owners hips and a harness)
- Other: Public education on animal related etiquette, ie. asking the owner before approaching an animal, by approaching unattended or stray animals, how to read animal body language and signs of fear or aggression in animals
- Other: Punish bad owners, not a breed.
- Other: Punishments for aggressive or untrained dogs should be purely the owner's fault and not based on breed or size, this stigmatizes pit bulls and makes people unnecessarily afraid of them, when an untrained dog is ALWAYS the owners fault and has no bearing on breed.
- Other: Putting extra requirements on pit bull owners is ridiculous. I have a mutt with some pit or boxer in him and I am careful to train, leash and avoid high arousal situations with my dog. Most owners of this breed know that even if their dog doesn't do anything wrong they will be blamed because of public perception. We are responsible. It is important to say the only time I've been bitten (and I volunteer at the Humane society, was by a little dog being walked with several other dogs and the person did not move off the walkway so her dogs were comfortable. She was the idiot- not the dog.
- Other: Regulation should be directed to all dogs - not breed specific dogs. Training for ALL nuisance dogs or muzzles for ALL nuisance dogs is an evidence based approach, which is key with pet ownership. People misuse muzzles and such; if the dog is proven to be a danger training for owners and pet should then be mandatory.
- Other: Remove discrimination for pit bulls
- Other: Remove your draconian thoughts and bylaws created specifically towards Pit Bulls. The laws should NOT be breed specific. I think ALL dogs should be required to go through obedience training when a new dog gets licensed. I have been bit by many dogs that were smaller, and I have never been bit by a pit bull. ALL dogs have the potential to bite if not properly trained. DO NOT MAKE THIS A BREED SPECIFIC BY LAW
- Other: Required dog training for owners with nuisance dogs
- Other: Researchers have shown time and again the breed specific legislation and the singling out of bully breeds is not effective in preventing canine related attacks. Chihuahuas bite and attack more



commonly than pit bulls. Remove considerations for Breed specific legislation. Change references from nuisance dogs to dangerous dogs.

- Other: Restrictions on owners ability to own pets after incidents that show they do not train or socialize their dogs well enough.
- Other: Seriously [removed] whoever made this survey. We get it, you hate pitbulls. I've seen [removed] chihuahuas more dangerous than a Pitbull. Go [removed] yourselves Calgary Bylaw. You should be [removed] ashamed of yourselves. Maybe you are the ones that need a [removed] muzzle.
- Other: Should not predetermine that pit bulls are bad.
- Other: Should not target pit pulls itself it the owners! Target had owners that do not know how to control dog. Any bad dog is result of a bad owner. Don't target one breed.
- Other: Shouldn't matter the breed, if a dog is considered a nuisance there should be more responsibility for that owner to correct the dogs behavior. Being bit by any breed would be considered traumatic.
- Other: Singling out one breed is disgusting. Any animal can be aggressive if taught.
- Other: Singling out pitbulls is absolute stupidity!
- Other: Specific breed of dog should not be mentioned!
- Other: Specifying a certain breed has been scientifically debunked over and over. The breed is not the problem. What would be more beneficial is potential owners having to prove their competence in animal care, and responsibility. Depending on knowledge you display, this will identify which breeds you are capable of owning. Pitties/rottis/mastiffs/huskys/various giant breeds are not dogs for beginner pet owners. Some people would qualify for a pet rock, some a small mixed breed. Only after demonstrating a significant amount of experience/knowledge and responsibly, would a person be approved to own certain breeds. Any dog can be dangerous in the wrong hands. Just like any dog can be an asset to society and the community in the right hands. How do we insure each dog ends up in the right hands?
- Other: STOP BULLYING THE BREED, BULLY THE BAD OWNERS
- Other: Stop classifying only "pitbull" like breeds like this. Many other breeds can leave just as much or more damage.
- Other: Stop discriminating against Pit Bulls. They are literally the sweetest dogs. They have no more jaw strength than any other dog of the same size, such as Rottweilers, bull dogs, German Shepards, etc. Stop the hate against Pit Bulls.
- Other: Stop picking on pit bulls. They are an amazing breed. We need to teach responsible pet ownership and obedience. This is disturbing and sad to me.
- Other: Stop pointing the finger at pitbulls. All dogs have the same chance to become a nuisance then a pitbull does. It's the stupid owners that have no idea how to treat them right and train them properly...
- Other: Stop repeat offender owners from owning/training dogs to be dangerous/weapons unless specifically licensed (trainers of guard/police dogs). No breed specific rules as a designated breed will just be replaced with another just as pits replaced Rotties and rotties replaced Dobies etc.



- Other: Stop singling pit bulls. The dogs I've come into contact with that have been aggressive have never been pit bulls. That is shameful.
- Other: Stop with breed specific attacks. All dogs can be dangerous not just bully type. Make the fines on nuisance dogs bigger for the owners.
- Other: Stop with the breed specific branding.
- Other: Targeted against the breed & not the owner is pure ignorance. It is NOT THE BREED. IT IS THE OWNER!
- Other: Targeting a specific breed is inappropriate. Hold all dogs and owners accountable to the same standards. Large or small breed they should all be trained and behave properly to be in public areas for everyone's safety.
- Other: The fact that pitbulls are being segregated from the rest is ludicrous. As an animal professional, I have seen more harm done from miniature breeds and doodles than any "pitbull" I've encountered.
- Other: The fact you are targeting one specific breed means you have lacked proper education in dogs. These bylaws should account for ALL breeds.
- Other: The focus on pitbulls is disturbing. The focus should be on the owners who don't train dogs to not be aggressive.
- Other: the owner needs training, not the dog.
- Other: The pitbull law has been proven faulty in other jurisdictions so why are we repeating old errors? BC has implemented a good canine citizen certificate program we should review if we go down this path.
- Other: The whole pit bull focus is based on the idea that these dogs can cause more damage with a bite. This training ignores the fact that damage can be "bad enough" from many dog breeds. If the issue is severity of bite, then make the penalty relate to severity of bite. Singling out an (ill defined) breed will be hard to enforce, unnecessarily complicates enforcement and serves no real purpose. If these dogs but as frequently as any other breed (as noted in the description) then there is no justification to try and single them out
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household period. This should not be breed specific
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household, Very disappointed this wasn't already an option.....
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household.
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household.
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household. Leave the breed specifics out of it.
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household. Once a dog is declared a nuisance it must be neutered (if not already)
- Other: There should be no mention of specific breeds (ex. Pit-bull). Just call them Nuisance dogs. My dogs were attacked by the same dog and it wasn't a pit bull. It was a German Shepard mix. Every pit bull I have come across, they were all very well behaved.



- Other: There should not be anything specific to a dog breed, only prior behaviour.
- Other: These need to be amended for all dogs, and the singling out of pit bull/terrier breeds is[removed].t. Myself and my dog have been harassed by more chihuahuas than pit bull/terrier breeds.
- Other: This is disgusting, to single out pit bulls. I can't even believe this made it on to an official City page. How shameful. It's got nothing to do with the breed.
- Other: This needs to be dog specific not breed specific. If an owner cannot control their dog they need to be ordered to take part in obedience training with certified trainers or give up the dog. IT IS NOT THE BREEDS Fault it is the owners
- Other: This should be for all dogs, not specifically Pit Bulls It's often not the dog that is the source of the problem, it's the owner.
- Other: This should never EVER be breed specific. Other breeds can be a nuisance, and a lot of pit bulls and other breeds listed here are wonderful dogs. The owners of nuisance dogs should be punished, not the dogs.
- Other: This should NOT be breed specific. It should be based on a per dog basis and if a dog is declared a nuisance dog the owners should be required to go through training and a history of their dogs they have previously had should be taken into account. Nuisance dogs are reacting for a reason. It is typically due to owners who aren't providing the animal with what it requires.
- Other: to single out pit-bull breeds isn't the right way to go about it. i know plenty of pit bull owners that have raised and trained their dogs properly. focus on the owners rather than the dog breed
- Other: Training humans to treat dogs with love and respect. More affordable training programs. Affordable spat/neuter programs
- Other: Training mandatory for any dog deemed a nuisance
- Other: We need a system to track repetitive dog owner offenders. It's not the dogs fault they haven't been trained, it's the owner. They need mandatory training after their first dog related incident and mandatory follow up training
- Other: While muzzling may keep a dog from biting humans or other animals, it also prevent muzzled dog from defending itself from other animals.
- Other: Why are you specifically calling out pit bulls City of Calgary? That is really disappointing.
- Other: Why in the world make this breed (or type since pit bull isn't a breed) when you can achieve better standards and results by targeting problem dogs regardless of breed. A german shephard, mastiff, dane, Rottweiler, large mutt , ect are all strong dogs and can cuase just as much damage. Malinoise, Akitas, ans huskeys are responsible for more deaths accross Canada over the last 10 years than anything mislabeled "pitbull"
- Other: Would like more clarity on nuisance. Agree that while a nuisance dog who bites should not be allowed in an off leash park, I think a nuisance dog who barks a lot should be allowed to go to the park but the owner should need to do training with the dog
- Other: You cannot target breed specifically.
- Other: You have successfully lead a Canada with your proactive bylaws without mentioning breed and remaining breed neutral. As a born and raised calgarian if any breed specific language is



passed, I will not spend any dollars in Calgary any more. My dog is a reflection of me, not his assumed breed. Under this new bylaw, my dog would be classified as a pit bull based on his looks even though by Canada federal law, he is a mixed breed of unknown origin. Do not do this. EVER

- Other: All breed specific legislation should be thrown out and only apply to dogs with documented dangerous behaviour. Breed specific legislation and by laws perpetuate harmful action towards these breeds.
- Other: All dogs must have obedience training, whether or not they are declared a nuisance. We should not include any breed specific legislation.
- Other: All dogs should be muzzled in public
- Other: All dogs should require obedience training regardless of breed.
- Other: All dogs under 14 lbs must be on leash and under an owners direct control at all times including at off leash parks. These dogs are often the instigators of issues with other dogs
- Other: all this depends on the situation around "nuisance" offense. If someone was teasing my dog, I dont think it would be fair that the dog is blamed for biting if it was provoked.
- Other: An owner should be deemed unfit to own pit bulls or bully breeds if their dog is involved in a bite that was unprovoked.
- Other: Any dog can be aggressive and a nuisance. Picking specific breeds is ignorance and shows lack of education in our government
- Other: Any dog that is deemed a nuisance can be seized by Calgary Community standards without obtaining a court order and owners must pay for any training, vet bills or food costs associated with the seizure
- Other: Any dog with a history of aggression should not be allowed in off leash parks and should be muzzled when in public, however, pit bulls should not be targeted as a result of their DNA. I work at the Calgary humane society and I have met more aggressive small breed dogs and labs or shepherds than I have pit bulls.
- Other: Any form of BSL is archaic and does not work. This is equivalent to racism - you're passing judgment on an entire breed for a couple bad dogs that ARE the product of bad owners. Shame on you City of Calgary and shame on any politician who supports this, you are a joke and just show how uneducated and ignorant you are.
- Other: As a professional trainer who deals with the worst cases in the city we need to encourage people to start educating their dog BEFORE there are problems. Possibly discounts for licences if your dog attends classes with a CERTIFIED trainer. Believe me many uncertified "treat free" trainers contribute to these issues more than they fix them.
- Other: Blame the owners, not the breed!!!!!!
- Other: Breed based targeting is often misinformed. Labrador retrievers bite more people than pit bulls and are capable of causing the same amount of damage. They usually aren't included in these types of bylaws because they are considered cute family dogs while breeds like german shepherds, pit bulls, and the like have the public persona of being dangerous dogs.
- Other: Breed specific banning doesn't work, and under your previous chief officer,[name removed], the idea of breed specific banning wasn't the target. Our current responsible pet ownership keeps



the onus on the owners, and that is where it should be. Owners should be required to take classes with their dog so that they can help curb their dog's behaviour. I have a MUCH bigger problem with stupid little dogs whose owners think they are "so cute" when exhibiting nuisance behaviour like barking, snapping, biting clothes, biting at my dog's ankles and legs. Educate and then punish the owners for having dogs that are uncontrollable - don't punish the dogs.

- Other: Breed specific laws are not effective. A focus on nuisance dogs, and problem owners. Punishment should be fines or seizing of pets, not euthanasia.
- Other: Breed specific laws are outrageous to enforce. Owners must be held accountable for the behaviour of their dog, whether it a labrador or pitbull.
- Other: Breed specific legislation does not work, and has been proven ineffective in other cities. Focus on the nuisance dogs and not the breed.
- Other: Breed specific not right. A lot of breeds will be aggressive if not socialized or trained properly. Owners need to be responsible for their pets.
- Other: can you stop with the breed specific legislation bullshit? If you look at statistics and actual research establishing "pit bull" (which is not a breed or even an established type) kills dogs. Don't be the new ignorant in Canada.
- Other: Cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household
- Other: Cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household (not breed-specific)
- Other: Cap of any time of dog, especially in apartment buildings, cap of animals per square footage of dwelling
- Other: Do not create breed specific legislation as it does not address the problem of "behavior issue dogs" and instead blankets a breed. Many large breeds have the potential to be a nuisance. My cavalier has been harassed at the dog park by Huskies and GSDs but never a pitbull so in my history I would want those breeds to have insurance/ be muzzled but in reality it has way more to do with problem individuals who fail to train their animals and as such the legislation should be directed at individual cases rather than breeds.
- Other: Do not discriminate against any breed. It is not the dog or the breed. It's the owner.
- Other: DO NOT go after breed! This is a horrible way to discriminate and has proven ineffective in other municipalities. Be better Calgary. A nuisance dog is a nuisance dog regardless of breed. Your just going to create more problems by targeting breed!
- Other: Do NOT introduce breed-specific legislation. "...because a pitbulls strength allows the potential for a more severe bite," is a harmful myth and you know it!
- Other: Do not just attack one breed. There cannot be more than one nuisance animal in the house.
- Other: Do not make any by-laws 'breed specific'. A nuisance dog is a nuisance dog, regardless of what breed it is.
- Other: do not single out pitbulls - there is no reason for this
- Other: Do NOT target pit bulls as a widespread "nuisance" or "problem" dogs. It is the OWNER, not the dog.



- Other: DO NOT TARGET PITBULLS or any other specific breed. Rather pressure to the full extent of the City's available resources to teach dog owners or fine the shit out of them! As you know not all dog owners are good dog owners. We need to protect the dogs from these morons!
- Other: Do not target specific breeds. The problem is not the dog, but the training imparted by the owner. Bad dogs are BECAUSE of bad owners.
- Other: Dog bites require immediate removal and tested for disease eg rabies
- Other: Dogs can have nuisance declaration removed after City approved remedial training and a period of time after training with no further incidents.
- Other: Dogs declared a nuisance should have to undergo behaviour training and testing to no longer be declared a nuisance.
- Other: Dogs that are considered a nuisance due to at large do not need to be muzzled etc at a dog park. Only those with aggression issues.... Perhaps those should not be allowed at a dog park at all.
- Other: Dogs that have had to have police/by law officer engagement should not be allowed at the dog park period. I stopped taking my dog due to the severe aggression issues displayed at sue higgins and beddington trail off leash park from other dogs.
- Other: Don't preemptively punish breeds punish bad dogs
- Other: Don't punish pit bulls specifically. Educate yourselves.
- Other: DONT SINGLE A DOG OUT JUST BECAUSE OF BREED!!
- Other: Drop the Breed Specific Legislation. It doesn't work and is based off sensationalism, ignorance and straight up lies.
- Other: Due to the evidence that pitbulls are no more likely to bite than other breeds, singling out pitbulls and all dogs that bear resemblance is unacceptable. All dog owners should endeavor to train their dog and ensure proper supervision. Forcing all pitbull-type breeds to be muzzled at dog parks or be banned from dog parks would only cause more issues due to lack of socialization options. Please reconsider this.
- Other: either name all high-risk breeds (Shepards, Huskies, Rottweilers etc) or don't. Just picking on Pitbulls doesn't make sense.
- Other: Enforce current requirements
- Other: Ensure dog behavior is not the cause of bad ownership. Perhaps courses for the owners mandatory
- Other: Escalation of fines for repeat offenders. Assessment of living conditions & responsible ownership regarding a dog declared a nuisance
- Other: Euthanize option to be considered only after vet check, home living check, reactivity training, and fines. If dog and owner shows no improvement or continued aggression then it may be considered.
- Other: Fine the owners or temporary bans on owning animals for repeat offenders.
- Other: Fines for any dog bite. Small dogs are the worst offenders, but rarely reported. People should be informed that this is a law.
- Other: for a pitbull that has attacked other dogs, they should be forced to take obedience training, and this should be followed up on, ie proof of payment



- Other: I am appalled that the City of Calgary is putting out such a biased and prejudiced survey. We should immediately withdraw and rethink/rewrite this survey in an unbiased and non prejudiced way. Have we not learned from the mistakes made in Quebec and other provinces and states? There are other breeds that also have very strong bits, Pit Bulls have a bite force of 235 pounds which is only 71% of that of the Rottweilers. Let's not be biased to breeds, lets focus on owners who do not properly train and socialize their pets
- Other: I am concerned that if dogs declared a nuisance are not allowed in off-leash parks, we will see an increase in the number of people using other public spaces as off-leash or more dogs roaming.
- Other: I am firmly against BSL, it is proven ineffective in areas where it is implemented. I believe much like driving, all owners need to obtain a license in order to obtain a pet after passing a class and proving knowledgable. Could be different classes of license for different breeds. Many people own GSDs and Retrievers which are terribly out of control.
- Other: I am supportive of nearly anything that is not breed-specific legislation. I am a veterinarian and I have met very few aggressive/reactive pit bulls in relation to other dog breeds (German shepherds, poodles, etc.). Please let's not become the states.
- Other: I believe it is the responsibility for all dog owners to train and manage their dogs. Any large/powerful dog can be mistreated, neglected, mismanaged which leads to bites. Breed specific legislation has been proven to not work.
- Other: I believe that removing responsible dog ownership and adding in Breed Specific Legislation is going backwards. Targeting 'pitbulls' is basing this on visual identification and unfair to those that are responsible owners that train, spay and neuter, and license and vaccinate as per current regulations. Keeping it as a viscous dog law, regardless of breed, is sufficient. Penalize those that have not bothered to train or take responsibility for their animals actions, but increase penalties to include jail time for multiple offenses as well as paying damages to victims.
- Other: I do not approve the breed specifics. This is poor research on your part as there are numerous other breeds with great tensile strength and aggression traits.
- Other: I do not believe signaling out pits in the answer. Poor owners result in poor dogs. Period. Breed has nothing to do with it.
- Other: I DO NOT believe that Pit bulls should be singled out. There are many smaller dogs that bite. For the record I do not own a pit bull.
- Other: I do not support any breed specific bylaws
- Other: I do not support breed specific legislation. It should be based on owner and pet previous behaviour and compliance.
- Other: I do not support breed specifics rules. There are many dogs that are dangerous.
- Other: I don't think we should be targeting specific breeds. I do agree however that we should be doing something about nuisance dogs
- Other: I don't support support breed bans but like the idea of all dog owners being encouraged to get some obedience training on their dog. Maybe there could be credits for such related to license fees?



- Other: I don't understand the call out of "pit bulls".....I realize they can cause more damage in case of bites, but the ratio of problem pits to non-problem pits in my eyes doesn't warrant a full attack on the breed as a whole.
- Other: I feel as though breed specific rules should not be made, especially if, as stated above, they do not have more bite incidents per year.
- Other: I feel breed specific measures are wrong. It is more about owner education. Most angry dogs I have encountered are due to the owners being unaware of warning signs and proper introductions. Most cases it is the owner, not the dog. No matter what breed it is!!!!
- Other: I feel that huskies have been a big problem as well and should be included
- Other: I find it appalling that the City or Calgary is looking into BSL. Pinpointing pitbull and spreading misinformation regarding this breed is awful. There are many other breeds that can produce aggressive bites and many others that tend to be more aggressive than pit bulls. I highly encourage the City of Calgary to reconsider including this kind of discrimination in their bylaws review. We are suppose to be leaders for the rest of Canada regarding bylaws and lack of BSL. This is a drastic step in the wrong direction.
- Other: I personally have never had only 1 incident with a "pit-bull", which was in my care as a foster from an abusive situation. None of the other 8+ "pit-bulls" that I have fostered or cared from have done harm. As a dog Walker and kennel tech I have been bitten by chihuahuas, dashounds, lambs, dalmatians, ridgebacks, spaniels and many others on repeat occasions. I feel that all Calgarians should not have a say, but rather dog owners of registered licensed dogs should be voting and this platform should be advertised at local dog parks for more info. Any nuisance animal, regardless of breed should be taken, held and tested for compliance and handled accordingly, regardless of breed. A neighbor of mine has a repeat offender who has been fined 3 times for dog bites, and never stops barking, almost LITERALLY, and her dog remains in her custody despite. Now she also has a mastiff pup that will be raised and untrained with the same lack of discipline. These current and proposed laws are punishing dogs and not the terrible and irresponsible OWNERS!
- Other: I think it's absolutely despicable that municipalities are still targeting and profiling based on breed. I've seen many other breeds that aren't typical for attacking to bite people. Hold the owners accountable not the breed or anyone else who may have a Pitbull. Any dog with the right training and discipline can be a perfect pup. Dogs only know what is taught to them - shame on you Calgary.
- Other: I understand that the pit bull breed has a bad reputation and receives a lot of media attention because of their appearance. This particular breed of animal was bred to be a nanny dog, to protect and look after children. Many if not most are still trained to be the caring, family dog. If you are considering muzzling a particular breed then your focus should be on all breeds.
- Other: I used to foster rescue dogs and train them to be adoptable. It's not the breed of dog that's the problem, it's the owners who will not properly train the dog that are. I believe ALL dogs should be leashed and muzzled while out in public. They are animals. Tiny poodles and chiuauas are much more aggressive than put bulls. Fine the bad owners and track the bad owners better.
- Other: If you are going to include specific breeds, whoever created this should look into the strength of bites of MANY other breeds, not just pit bulls. This is high uneducated and simply and



assumption. There are many other breeds that might pose higher risks. Please do more research. This should be about breeds, rather irresponsible owners.

- Other: Increase licensing fees for dogs that do not receive any training, regardless of breed.
- Other: It is proven and documented that Rottweilers and German Shepards have stronger bites than pit bulls. It is unfair and unjust to claim that pit bulls cause more severe bites due to nothing more than a stigma around the breed of pit bulls.
- Other: It is unfair to single out pit bulls specifically or any dogs that look like a pit bull. I have a rescue that looks part pit bull but we have no idea if she is.. She has anxiety and wearing a muzzle would destroy any and all of the training we have been providing her with. If you are going to go this route, then the bylaw should state that any dog over a certain size needs training with their owners present.. As it's generally the owners that are the issue, not the dog.
- Other: it's dangerous to make this breed specific. As someone who frequents dog parks (daily) huskeys and small dogs are far more aggressive than any pitbull I have encountered in this setting
- Other: It's dog racism... Replace pit bull with 'ethnic person'
- Other: It's incredibly offensive that you're singling out pit bulls. It is the owner's fault if they are not trained properly. Pit bulls are naturally sweet and loving dogs and it's irresponsible owners who don't train them or take care of them that results in ANY dog biting or being aggressive. Shame on you for creating this incredibly biased and inappropriate questionnaire.
- Other: It's not the breed of dog that is the problem, it's the owners. Do not institute BSL, it's unfair to the animal and promotes an unfair stigma.
- Other: it's the owner and not the breed, my wife and I were harassed by a chocolate lab to the point where we almost kicked him and the owner told us to "[removed]". Sorry for the profanity but it's all he would say as we asked him to control his dog.
- Other: Laws should be applied equally and NOT targeted at a specific breed. I know several owners of these kinds of animals and (if not raised in abusive conditions) can be as sweet tempered as any other dog. Breed-specific fears are due to ignorance and misinformation - aggressive behaviour may happen in ANY breed.
- Other: Leave breed specific legislation out of this, there is no science to back this up
- Other: LEAVE THE PITBULLS ALONE! TARGET BAD OWNERS REGARDLESS OF BREED. There are some vicious chihuahuas and poodles out there.
- Other: Licensing should include short training course on liabilities and responsibilities of pet ownership
- Other: Make sure it's the owners who poorly train their animals and not innocent animals being punished
- Other: Make sure that there is a higher fine for owners that does not put their dog in training. It is the owner's fault, not the breed. Have a "teeth" and be tough about the law itself. Big penalties will repel people from owning a pet.
- Other: Mandatory Force Free training for all dogs licensed in the city of Calgary.
- Other: Mandatory training for owners with nuisance dogs. It's clear that it's not necessarily an issue with breed and there are plenty of friendly dogs out there of all breeds but for whatever reason



people use/train these dogs for security which is not appropriate. A public dog should not be trained to be aggressive. People also don't know how to stop a dogs aggression towards people and feel their dog has the right to act aggressively if it feel uncomfortable. Designing a program to establish the owners intentions and to council them would be helpful. To add to your bandana question below I truly feel that is going down the wrong path where you are giving owners justification to continue to raise aggressive dogs. Perhaps the city gives them out stringently to rescue dogs who are unreachable through training.

- Other: Mandatory training for the dog and owner(s) where the breed is considered dangerous or a nuisance.
- Other: Maybe its not so much the DOG, but the OWNER. People should be allowed to own pit bulls and breeds similar, but idiots who don't know how to train a dog are mostly the problem. Fining idiots for being idiots is the best, and make it worthwhile. I like the insurance ideas as well.
- Other: More effort in fines regarding constant barking in backyards
- Other: More restrictions for owners who have ongoing nuisance issues. For example if someone has a dog that is deemed a nuisance removed from their home there should be limits placed on their ability to own a dog. Blame the owners not the dogs.
- Other: More surveillance at offleash too often the owners of nuosance dovs dont give a [removed] and flee we need better ways to identify them and make them accountable.
- Other: Much higher penalties for ALL animal offenses.
- Other: my opinion is that pit bulls can be tame and non-aggressive so I do not agree that all pit bulls be subject to increased diligence; all nuisance / dangerous breeds should be mandated
- Other: no breed discrimination - treat dog incidents on a case by case basis not based on breed. Focus on educating the owner and if they are unwilling to do not punish the dog, punish the owner and remove the dog.
- Other: No breed specific bylaws please. Penalize negligent owners, not the dog breeds.
- Other: No breed specific legislation. Lets get to the root of the problem and deal with owners that don't properly train their smaller breed dogs because I can just pick them up haha! No. A shitzou can still severely bite a child. I'm tired of small dogs being rampant nuisances - barking non stop, aggressive behaviour, but their owners get off scot free just because they can pick them up and walk away. I go through more training for my medium sized dog than they do their tiny terrors.
- Other: NO BSL
- Other: NO BSL!! Don't punish responsible dog owners! I have owned numerous pitbulls, not a single one that was aggressive. There are thousands of people that are responsible dog owners and thousands of pitbulls that cause no harm whatsoever. This breed is one of the most kind and loving breeds out there. You only hear about the negative, not positive. BSL IS NOT THE ANSWER!!!
- Other: no more than 1 nuisance dog in a household, but not including pitbulls into this category
- Other: Non breed specific or type specific legislation all dogs that bite should be treated equally regardless of size, breed or bite strength
- Other: Not all pit bulls are bad just bad owners
- Other: Nuisance yes. Pitbulls no additional bylaw



- Other: obedience training required for all dogs
- Other: Obedience training required for ALL dogs
- Other: Obedience training required for ALL dogs; muzzle required for all dogs in all public areas
- Other: Obedience training should be required for ALL dogs, large and small, before owners can get a city license. Stop discriminating against breeds, small dogs are often MUCH worse than large or "pit bulls".
- Other: often owners are the bigger issue - can be reason for poor dog behaviour - everyone with any dog should have to have training/assessment
- Other: One nuisance dog per household
- Other: Owner dog obedience training and informational outlets for owners that have a dog declared a nuisance.
- Other: Pit bulls are not deserving of any of this. This is ridiculous wording and I'm appalled these questions are even on here.
- Other: Pit bulls are not inherently dangerous! Small dogs like chihuahuas are much more angry and may cause a nuisance from incessant barking.
- Other: Pit bulls are NOT the problem - their people are - ban them
- Other: Pit bulls are not the problem. Neglectful owners are the problem. Improper socialization of dogs is where the issue lies, not the kind of breed they are. I've had tiny Maltese, King Charles spaniels and shit zus lunge after my Labrador when he is walking by them on his leash. It's not the breed, it's the owners!
- Other: Pit bulls aren't the problem. The bad owners are the problem! Don't ban a breed because of human ignorance. Focus on educating the general population and implement higher fines for owners who cannot control their animals.
- Other: Pit bulls as a breed are not more of a problem than other dog breeds. It should be dogs specific (for nuisance dogs) and have nothing to do with the breed. Especially since the owner is usually the problem not the dog.
- Other: Pit bulls may have the strength to bite more severely but that shouldn't lead to restrictions most pit bulls and owners are responsible and don't deserve this. Nuisance and problematic dogs are a result of poor ownership not breed
- Other: Pit Bulls should be treated as any other breed. The smaller breeds in my experience are nuisance animals they just don't leave the same marks. This should be looked at from the perspective of incidents, not damage done.
- Other: Pit bulls should not be segregated into their own section. There are numerous dogs that have significant strength behind their bites. Rehabilitation of all owners and pets should be required regardless of what offense level has been documented.
- Other: pit bulls should not be singled out within the bylaw, nuisance dogs is just fine and offers full protection to all dogs in that category
- Other: Pit bulls should not be singled out. That is so in fair. A golden retriever can do just as much damage



- Other: Pit bulls themselves should not be held to different laws and standards than any other breed. All dogs, regardless of size, can be dangerous if improperly trained. Any dog that has a history of dangerous behaviors should have extra restrictions and requirements.
- Other: Pitbulls are not the issue its the bad dog owners. Also what about people or children that enter the dogs back yard or fenced yard and they get bit? That is the dog doing its job then. In public yes a different story
- Other: Pitbulls are not the issue, bad owners are."*It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." - this is false information that needs to be removed. Please do your research unbiased before writing it into a public query.
- Other: PITBULLS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM. THE PEOPLE RAISING THEM ARE. SERIOUSLY. GET SMART.
- Other: Pitbulls are sweet, the owners are the bad one's
- Other: Please (please) remember -- it's not the dog, it's the owner. Owners are failing. Your focus MUST be owner responsibility.
- Other: Please avoid breed specific bylaws. Typically, the issue with nuisance dogs the owner/training.
- Other: Please do not introduce breed specific legislation. There are many dogs that can do as much damage as pit bulls with bites and there is no evidence that targeting specific breeds reduces incidence of dog bites.
- Other: Please do not introduce breed-specific legislation of any kind. You have acknowledged that statistically pit bulls are no more likely to bite than other breeds. By adding breed specific conditions, you are stigmatizing a breed that is already vulnerable to abuse, neglect, and exploitation. Make the legislation apply to ALL dogs; I have seen way more instances of aggressive small breed dogs in parks than I've ever seen of pit bull or large breed. Just keep it to "nuisance" animals that have actually had documented negative behaviors, not a blanket that stigmatizes dogs that have done nothing wrong.
- Other: PLEASE do NOT lump all "pitbulls" as aggressive. They aren't. No breed specific laws.
- Other: Please make this bylaw dog specific not pit bull specific
- Other: Please stop singling out pitbulls.. there are other breeds with bites just as strong.
- Other: Procedures to seize nuisance dogs and not return to owners if they have had multiple offences.
- Other: Pit bulls are not the issue - the issue is the owner. No breed should be singled out in any bylaw. "Nuisance" should apply rather than a specific breed.
- Other: Remove specific breed from survey, and add obedience training for access to city off leash parks.
- Other: Required education for dog owners, use the media to present
- Other: Rottweilers and German Shepherds along with a variety of other breeds should be featured not just pit bull breeds. They should not be singled out at all and doing so is completely irresponsible



and sending out the wrong message. I've had more bites from small dogs who have zero control and yes, their bites are less severe but they are more of a nuisance in my opinion.

- Other: separate pit bulls from nuisance on the household limit question, and stop targeting pitbulls - the university of Georgia proved Bullies do NOT have stronger or locking jaws!
- Other: Seriously? Breed legislation? in 2020? Calgary is better than this. Come on.
- Other: Should be dog specific not breed specific. It is the owner's responsibility.
- Other: Singling out breed specific dogs is unfair. Owners should be held accountable for a lack of training rather than breed specific bylaws
- Other: Singling out one breed for extreme measures only reduces attacks by those kinds of dogs, if u say pitbulls don't bite more than any other dog why single them out. This seems like very suspect wording for pitbull owners
- Other: Singling out pit bull type breeds for these measures is discriminatory. Irresponsible owners are the problem.
- Other: Singling out pit bulls is ridiculous that's breed discrimination no different than discrimination against a person and do your homework there is many breeds of dogs that have a stronger bite than pit bulls for etc Rottweilers bull mastiffs and a few more the dog is not the problem it's the owners stop making dogs pay for bad owners especially pit bull breeds
- Other: Smaller/less aggressive dogs held to the same level of accountability as that of a pit bull if determined a nuisance.
- Other: Specifying nuisance dogs is much better than pit bulls, many large dogs can bite hard. People probably take more of a risk by getting into a taxi cab in this city than by petting a dog.
- Other: Stop blaming the breeds and start looking at the people owning them. No dog or cat breed is inherently dangerous until they're handled improperly, abused or ignored. Punish the people that cause the animal to be aggressive. Pit bulls especially are naturally one of the sweetest and most gentle breeds out there. The owner is at fault for any pets behaviors.
- Other: Stop discriminating against pit bulls. I used to rent in a house where they let the upstairs neighbour's dog howl for hours in a day and it was a poodle terrier. Please make the bylaw apply to all breeds otherwise it is discriminating and not at all fair.
- Other: Stop including pit bulls in this specifically. I was bit by a 12lb aggressive lasapso - pit bulls are not aggressive
- Other: Stop singling out specific breeds. It's not the dogs, it's their owners. Dogs do what their owners train or condition them to do.
- Other: Stop targeting "pit bulls" and start targeting nuisance OWNERS
- Other: STOP targeting pit bulls
- Other: Stop targeting Pit Bulls and any dog that looks like one!!! It's owners and NOT the breed that are to blame. Labradors have a stronger bite per sq inch than a Pit Bull. German Shepherds, Bull Mastiff, Doberman have all gone through the same targeting as Pit Bulls are under now. You are ignorant to target this breed.
- Other: Targeting any specific breed is idiotic and has been proven NOT to work. The breed has nothing to do with this, and you cannot predict future offences based on a dog's breed.



- Other: The fact you are targeting one breed in your survey speaks volumes to how one sided this is. Deal with neuncance dogs and onwers, not a breed!!!
- Other: There are many dog breeds that have much stronger bite force than the Pitt bull; a mastiff would do more damage, however people can't tell the difference between a mastiff and a pitbull, so they will often name a pitbull as the culprit, while it is often another breed altogether. Invest in a better system to help educate and regulate who is allowed to own any type of dog. I have seen aggressive collies, labradors, etc. Irresponsible owners are the issue here.
- Other: There are many large breeds, such as German shepherds, whose strength is undermined in this specific questionnaire. Singling out one breed of large dog is both ignorant and irrelevant to the issue at hand, which is that any large breed is capable of serve bites and being of a larger risk to causing injury when provoked.
- Other: There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Shame on the city for specifying breeds.
- Other: There cannot be more than one dog declared a nuisance in a household
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household (remove the pit bull portion from that option) - Breed Specific (or looks like a breed as defined in this case) does not address the problem, being nuisance dogs, not all pit bulls are nuisances and yet they are penalized for looks
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household.
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household.
- Other: There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household. People should be able to have more than one pitbull if they are responsible and training their dogs well.
- Other: There needs to be measures put into place for German Shepherds, I work with dogs and 100% of the German Shepherds I have worked with (I work with at least one German Shepherd a day) have issues with aggression and being unpredictable. They are unsafe around people. They are also always the dog breed that consistently attacks my staff. Most pit bulls I work with are safe lovely dogs, I've never worked with a safe German Shepherd and I have worked with over a thousand - they are guard dogs and do not make safe pets/ not safe for communities
- Other: There should also be additional training for owners of nuisance dogs
- Other: There should be absolutely no breed specific rules or bans.
- Other: These breed specific questions are complete BS
- Other: These should not discriminate against a breed. This an owners responsibility not the dogs!!
- Other: This *should not* be about a specific breed, but rather about nuisance dogs. Dogs that have exhibited dangerous behaviour (an owner related problem) should be dealt with appropriately through bylaws, training, and fines. If the behaviour persists, the dog should be removed from the owners care for its own safety and well being.
- Other: This is breed bullying pitbulls.
- Other: This should NOT be specific to pit bulls. There are MANY problem breeds at off leash parks that are not a bully breed. Is should be a bylaw for nuisance dogs period.
- Other: Tighter regulations on pit bull breeders. Regulations should be designed with the goal of reducing aggression and behavioural issues in the dogs. I would also support special licensing for pit bull owners.



- Other: Time exemption should apply for those who have rescued a dog to allow proper time for training
- Other: Understanding the bite strength of a pitbull is significant - they should not all automatically be tarred with the same brush - essentially this is a form of racism = breedism. Owners need to be held accountable for their dogs, including small dogs like a chihuahua, poodle etc... and the owner needs to be punished not only with a fine but community service and/or jail time. All dogs have the potential for good it is crappy owners who do not take the time to train and raise their dog properly. A specific breed should not be singled out. If more people would get to know a pitbull their bias would most likely change. Pitbulls that are raised and treated right are actually very loving, obedient and smart as hell. For the most part their instinct when you put your hand in their mouth is to spit it out. Do t get me wrong - I wouldn't do this with a dog I don't know, and that would be any breed, I've been bitten by poodles dachshund and German shepherds.
- Other: We have a dog that would likely fall under category e above. We, like the majority of other responsible dog owners, go to great lengths to make sure we do not put either of our dogs (the other is a Boxer) in a situation where they could end up in a difficult situation merely because of their appearance. We do not take our dogs to off leash parks simply because we feel our dogs would be held responsible for any trouble that may arise because of how they look. This is despite the fact that we know full well that our dogs are not trouble makers. Existing by-laws are in place to ensure that there are designated off-leash areas and any area not so designated has very clear signs that dogs need to be on a leash. These existing by-laws need to be properly enforced. We see too many people when we are out walking our dogs in our community, who do not respect the on-leash areas. If they want to take their dog off-leash, they should go to a designated park for that purpose. Anyone found in non-compliance should be fined. Also, pitbull type dogs should not be singled out in legislation. Any dog, regardless of size or type, can inflict serious injury/harm to a person and/or another animal. The problems fall to owners not being responsible enough to make sure they take the appropriate care of their animal - and care means to make sure they do not put their animals in a situation where they could come to harm. The problems lie with irresponsible owners not with the dogs themselves. Please do not penalize an entire breed type and the majority of responsible owners who provide stable loving homes for these dogs to ensure they are well adjusted members of society.
- Other: what is the definition of nuisance? a nuisance dog can be anything from the smallest chihuahua to a lab to a wolfhound, don't make the laws breed specific.
- Other: Why are we discriminating against the out bull breed? Plenty of bad owners and bad dogs that are not pit bulls. Many reactive rescue dogs are shepherd or husky. Stock to the definition of nuisance rather than pit bull.
- Other: Additional training for the owners of pitbull and nuisance dogs. Registration of owners of pitbulls planning to breed. Remember - on error, train the dog, punish the owner.
- Other: All dogs bite and all large breeds have the potential to do serious injury. Breed specific legislation unfairly attributes all dangerous bites to a specific breed, continues to promote the stigma



attached to certain breeds and does not hold other dog owners accountable for the responsibility of properly socializing, training, and caring for their large breed dog.

- Other: All dogs must be muzzled when on leash or in an off leash park. All owners of cats must be fined if their cat is found wandering outside and being a nuisance.
- Other: All dogs, no matter the breed, tea cup breeds to any Giant Breeds, need basic obedience training. Have every owner prove training within one year of the dogs first license from certified locations. Eg! Clever Caine, Bow Dogs.
- Other: a lot of these are difficult and time consuming to enforce.
- Other: Dogs repeatedly and known to attack other dogs or animals should be required to wear a muzzle when out in public or in off leash parks
- Other: Fine the owner, stop punishing the dog.
- Other: Fines to repeat offending dog owners. One dog is one problem should fixed through personal training a second dog registered to the same owner should be deemed at fault and charged
- Other: Have only certain dog parks be bully friendly so they d'n't have to be muzzled in all dog parks
- Other: I do not support breed specific legislation, but rather dog /owner specific (such as nuisance dog, not a nuisance breed bylaw). The issue isn't breed of dog, but poor training, behavioural issues, etc. which can be found in any breed of dog.
- Other: I don't believe Pit Bulls should be singled out. The owner is responsible to train and maintain safety. Because of the inherited traits in this breed of dogs, adopters should be required to undergo professional training to ensure they know how to mitigate the risks involved with the breed.
- Other: I have seen more dogs that are NOT pit bulls or any that look like pit bulls cause more harm to others and dogs. I myself have had an issue where a very aggressive dog was put into a dog park (it was dark out) and then the owner went and sat back in their vehicle. That dog then proceeded to attack myself and my little puppy. I was able to hold my dog over my head, although he did get a small abrasion and I took the blunt of it. It took FOUR people to pull this dog off of me and when I went to look for the opener there was no one in any of the cars. It doesn't matter what type of dog it is; if it is brought up poorly, not trained and is allowed or praised for being aggressive, it will cause harm. I've had a Great Dane attack my one rescue who is still traumatized and I've had a tiny shitzu attack my smaller dog. Its so unfair to the animal to punish them just for their stature or looks. It's all about training and I believe training should be mandatory for every animal
- Other: I think it should mandatory for all dogs to attend obedience training with their owners. All breeds.
- Other: I think the same restrictions to Pit Bulls should apply to german shepherds. I have had way more scary encounters with german shepherds than pit bulls.
- Other: If seized, the process must be more transparent. It feels like an invasion of privacy to have a furry family member taken away when you're trying to do the right thing by being open to talk with bylaw and the bite victim. When being cooperative, dog owners should not have their pets taken. Assessments on dogs with cooperative pet owners should happen out of the home and not in a high stress environment like the pound. Those who resist to participate should have their dogs removed from the home.



- Other: In force dog bylaws. Dog walkers with 5 or more do not pick up their shit
- Other: Licensing for dog ownership; including classifications for pit bulls and other powerful dog with high reactivity. Educate the owners on how pit bulls require different care standards from labradors
- Other: Mandatory training for the OWNER of pit bulls or nuisance dogs.
- Other: Minor offences such as a dog at large or nuisances should not remain on record for more than 3 years if no other offences occur during that time
- Other: No more than one nuisance dog in a household.
- Other: No problem type dog should be allowed in public.
- Other: Obedience training for all dogs. I think the best strategy is preventative.
- Other: Ownership ban if a dog continues to show violent/ aggressive behavior after other options have been exhausted or owner has history of it (more than one aggressive dog or multiple nuisance dogs)
- Other: People owning Pitbull type dogs should require home checks and have to have mandatory training for them.
- Other: Pit bulls should not be singled out... there are good and bad dogs (because of owners).
- Other: seizing a dog with dangerous behaviour should depend on the circumstances and should not be only pit bulls, it should be any breed. German Shepards, Mastiffs, etc can be just as bad. eg: one dog bite due to being provoked should not be seized
- Other: The owners are the issue, NOT the dog. A bad owner is going to have a bad dog whether it is a pit bull or a chihuahua. There needs to be more deterrents and repercussions in place for bad owners or owners who get a dog as a "status symbol" with no understanding of the breed.
- Other: There should be a bylaw for the number of dogs, cats, etc. that you can own in city limits per household.
- Other: This bylaw should not specify breeds. There should be no breed specific language because statistically, small dogs are often more of a nuisance than a larger breed. So breed specific language discriminates against breeds that could possibly be very accommodating.
- Other: Working in the veterinary industry I don't feel that breed specific legislation is warranted, although I understand the reasoning. I actually see very little pit bull attacks that are brought on by the pit bull. Generally these instances are instigated by a smaller, nuisance dog that has had very little to no training by the owners because they either do not believe in it or there dog is too cute for rules and boundaries. I myself own a very passive labrador and I can't tell you the number of times she has been approached by nuisance dogs off leash that are not controlled and if she was not a calm labrador she would definitely lash out. My other concern with breed legislation is that I also live with a reactive dog and we always have him on a leash /under control as we know his tendencies. I have had many dog owners allow their dog to come up to mine who's is on a leash, and despite me saying my dog is not good with other dogs can you please call your dog. More people than not, state oh but my dog is. And then if my dog bites yours it's my fault and those owners, despite being warned cry bloody murder and call my dog aggressive. There needs to be some serious small dog education and teach people how to read the signs that a dog is going to bite. Working in vet med I have been bit by way more small dogs than large and to be frank never by a pit bull, German



shepherds yes. And the one thing is that the large breed dogs will generally give you a sign they are going to bit, but I find majority of small dogs don't or people just don't know how to remove a dog from an aggressive situation

- Other: Ability to report nuisance dogs without providing name, at least making it so that the receiving party doesn't know who filed the nuisance dog report.
- Other: All nuisance dogs!!! Any breed!!!!
- Other: As you will see I'm not from Calgary, I do applauded you and support this . F rom what I see here you are not judging a breed or the owner of breed only asking we make sound judgements for ourselves, family and fellow man . Myself cannot express my sorrow in watching a fellow community member, work comrade & all round beautiful Lady taken down in our community by what looked like pit bulls .The dogs where not seized and now cannot be found , This person attacked has a long standing with AHS and has absolutely devoted her life to the saving of lives.The terrifying thing she is living with the very sad outcome of the attack. she is very grateful it not a child that was walking down a the street in the middle of the day to be viciously attacked by two dogs the outcome would have been a grave one Iâ€™m sure . Maybe only a handful of any breed will act out in this manner and if they do even once I believe there is a need for alarm. As an AHS employee we are fighting a invisible foe please help us, walking down a street should not be to much to ask.
- Other: For dogs requiring obedience training, the city of calgary should have a list of approved dog training facilities that provide reward based training only or training that is proven through evidence to be effective. More than one nuisance dog should be allowed in one household where the household is someone capable of handing the dogs and is actively working on rehabilitating the dogs (for example as foster dogs).
- Other: I would love to see repeat offenders - THE OWNERS - be required to take a class in animal training and safety and also have them prohibited from owning those breeds.
- Other: If you own a specific breed, you should undergo training and application processes to ensure you can manage that breed. All animals and breeds are different
- Other: immediate destruction of any dog who bites a person - no psychological testing period; also bigger fines for people owning pit bulls/dogs that bite
- Other: It must be mandatory for owners of pit bulls and dogs declared as a nuisance to attend training with their animal, to learn how to properly train and engage with their dog. Also, pit bulls who have been involved in moderate to severe offences must be seized.
- Other: Jail time for people who abuse dogs.
- Other: Limit the number or total weight of dogs on a property (based on size of lot.)
- Other: Mandatory training for all dogs.
- Other: Most dogs that are declared dangerous are due to irresponsible owners. OWNERS of dogs declared a nuisance must prove that THEY have completed/passed strict training; and if not, they shall be prohibited from owning that dog.



- Other: All dogs who display aggression should be treated the same. While pit bulls are more severe un trained, in supervised dogs can attack. My 100lbs lab has been attacked by a 60 lbs retriever. Irresponsible pet owners are more the problem then the breed.
- Other: Ban the breeds from being allowed within City limits
- Other: For damn sakes, ban Pit Bulls and its mixes in order to keep the city safe.
- Other: I truly believe, that owners of nuisance and dangerous dogs need to be trained and closely monitored. These dogs are not bad, their owners are often neglectful and/or encourage and train these poor dogs to behave in unacceptable ways.
- Other: Increased fines and enforcement of dogs off leash in non off leash areas.
- Other: Limit the number of dogs a single dog walker can walk at one time!!
- Other: Pit Bulls should not be allowed !!!!
- Other: Special license as well as mandatory bandana is issued to dogs/owners with dogs who are a nuisance and/or have aggressed. Owners must pass an online training/test and attend training with their dog. Only the trained owner can have the dog in public. City has the option to require permanent ban on off leash parks or muzzles etc. The owner has a separate license they must carry with them when out with their dog. They are the only person permitted to have the dog in public for at least one year. The training for pit bulls only... must be included with their licensing.
- Other: There should be pit bull only areas where they can roam and play freely unmuzzled. If obedience training is passed, I would support pit bulls not being muzzled.
- Other: These were tough questions...as an owner of two dogs and being a dog walker myself, I don't believe all pit bulls are aggressive, but if they aren't trained can do severe harm. I don't blame the breed/dog, but I do blame the owner. I think it is too hard to enforce training, therefore unfortunately, I think some of the suggestions are needed to keep humans and dogs safe.
- Other: Unable to own a nuisance dog if you have a criminal record.
- Other: Ban Pitt bulls
- Other: Dogs must be controlled by owners at all times including off leash parks. If you cannot control your dog it should be on a leash.
- Other: Dogs that bite should be puy down
- Other: For these dogs, licensing should require owners to be properly trained (obedience, etc.).
- Other: Higher financial penalties/criminal charges for dog bites/attacks and for offlease dogs in unauthorized areas
- Other: Mandatory spay/neuter for pit bull-type dogs, with penalties for bred litters. These dogs are massively and indiscriminately bred. I would support exceptions for responsible breeders but imagine this would be hard to define in law.
- Other: No pit bulls in Calgary
- Other: Nuisance dog should not be allowed in public parks at all. Licensing should restrict the number of total dogs allowed in neighborhoods. There should be a long wait list to get a license for dogs downtown for instance. Dog licenses should be more expensive and dangerous breed dogs should be limited and expensive. Having an unlicensed animal should result in it being seized.
- Other: Off leash dog parks managed by licensed operators who could charge a fee



- Other: outlaw dangerous animals
- Other: Police and animal control should have opportunity and obligation to shoot a dog on site of a dog attack involving a human, minimal paperwork for the officer should be required.
- Other: Specific special licenses to have a pit bull as a pet. Germany has this and they have had very few violent attacks as a result.
- Other: There is a simple solution to the dangerous dog problem without implementing BSL. Every pit bull advocate tells us to punish the deed, not the breed, so that is what needs to be done. If any dog, no matter the breed, breaks out of it's house ,car, or yard to attack and kill a neighbor's pet, that dog is automatically put down. No second or third chance and it won't be passing those genes on. The owner of the offending dog would also be held responsible for paying all of the bills relating to the attack. If any dog purposely attacks a person and inflicts level 4 or 5 bites , that dog is automatically put down. Once again, no second or third chance to attack. The other dog owner would also be held responsible for all of the doctor bills This will also stop that dog from passing on those aggressive, often deadly traits. Before you know it the shelters will be empty of dangerous dogs, no matter the breed. Here's the bite levels to compare .
- Other: What is the definition of nuisance
- Other: Also to please crack down on all the dogs that bark continually all day .I have called bylaw many times because the dogs next door bark 24/7 and bylaw has done nothing .why do I have to live with that?
- Other: Ban pit bull breeding in Alberta
- Other: Ban powerful animals from city limits. Owners can rarely be trusted to have complete control of them.
- Other: Classification of dog based on size/breed that would require owners to obtain permit / training in order to own a "dangerous" type of dog. Often owners are equally responsible
- Other: Outlaw and BAN the breeding of pit-bulls and known dangerous breeds (i.e. the only ones that kill/seriously maim people including their owners).
- Other: Pit bulls can kill you. Ban them from the City.
- Other: Providing a small dog park that is enclosed would make us feel much safer about bringing our small dog to socialize.
- Other: Training classes for potential owners of these specific dog breeds. No passing mark, no dog ownership.
- Other: why is it always pitbulls involved in altercations?
- Other: An them all together.. seen too many injuries
- Other: Ban
- Other: Ban on pit bulls
- Other: Ban on pitbull type dogs
- Other: Ban on those species breeds.
- Other: Ban pit bulls
- Other: Ban pit bulls and "bully breeds" altogether.
- Other: Ban pit bulls and dangerous dogs



- Other: Ban pit bulls and other vicious dogs like cane corsos
- Other: Ban pit bulls.
- Other: Ban pit bulls.
- Other: Ban pitbulls
- Other: Ban pitbulls and other dangerous breeds.
- Other: Ban pitbulls, take away all dogs who bite people.
- Other: Band pitbulls from Calgary, cities, provincial influence to do so.
- Other: Banning of pit bull and nuisance dogs.
- Other: Breed-specific legislation which deems owning a pit-bull illegal
- Other: Complete and total ban of pitbulls.
- Other: Dog bites and offenses towards children and minors should be treated as such, one and done.
- Other: Dog license and registration should be substantially higher I mbreeds like pit bulls for example \$1000 for each pit bull.
- Other: Dog parks should not be allowed next to private homes
- Other: Dogs who commit vicious bite ie requiring stitches should be put down no questions asked
- Other: Enact an outright ban on pitbulls. It is not worth the risk. Ignore the pit-nutters. There is no such thing as a "nanny" dog. Pitbulls KILL!!! Please don't let any more innocent lives be taken by these monsters. PLease.
- Other: Enforcement of off-leash / on-leash areas!! Dogs are NOT supposed to be on pathways without a leash, yet I often have encounters with dogs not under control on the pathways.
- Other: Euthanize all pit bull breeds and their owners.
- Other: Excellent thoughts. I agree that it's "more about the trainer than the dog", but we need to look statistically at the dogs, and the types of trainers who choose to have these dogs. It really goes hand-in-hand.
- Other: Fines for dogs off leash and off property in any neighborhood.
- Other: Having had experiences with an untrained (or the owner just did not care, the dog was "playing" biting at me apparently) pit bull/mixed breed pitbull in rotary park (inner city near a child water park and playground) i strongly feel that all pit bull and nuisance dogs should be restricted to on-leash areas, specifically away from small dog parks and anywhere children may be (parks, waterparks, schools, etc.)
- Other: High fines for pitbulls and nuisance dogs even on their owner's property, if they show aggression to passersby.
- Other: Higher fines to owners that purposely let their leashes be as long as they want and allow their dogs to dig holes in people's lawns and come right up to people gardening in their own garden and bark at the people. Canyon Meadows being so close to Fish Creek is full of these nuisance dogs where it is the dog owners fault, they are allowing the dogs to be bad. One dog owner looked me in the eye and said it didn't matter that her large dog was digging holes in my lawn. The neighbours garage gets peed on all the time by dogs that are on leashes while the dog owner allows it. There should be much higher fines to some dog owners.



- Other: How about "Public identification of owners and dogs involved in bylaw offences"
- Other: I am a dog lover but as stated in the question phrase, pit bulls are extremely strong and capable of killing or maiming and have killed and maimed humans and animals in many instances. I don't dislike pit bulls, but anyone in ownership of that strength and potential for damage must be equipped to manage it
- Other: I have had so many close calls with aggressive dogs in Calgary parks this year because of negligent owners. None of these parks have been off leash and yet the dogs are not on leash. There needs to be harsher punishment for negligent owners. It was not me they chase, but my children who are young and more vulnerable. Humans should not have to fear going for a walk in their neighbourhood park. When did we start giving dogs more rights than people?
- Other: I would like to see a ban on pit bulls and other similar dogs. They are capable of killing a human or other dogs, so I don't understand why we allow them on our streets and in our parks.
- Other: I would support a ban on pitbull, owning, breeding or selling.
- Other: Increase and focused monitoring of city parks and pathways... like the police use bikes to monitor communities bylaw officers should be out and about much more often than they are now. You cannot even get through to 311 to reach a bylaw officer. None of this will work if you cannot properly enforce the bylaws.
- Other: it's the owner's fault, not the breed or the dog. Mandatory training for above mentioned breeds, no training no dog. if you let your dog off leash it has to come to you 100 time out of 100 !!! this is for all dogs. PROBLEM IS PEOPLE!!
- Other: Just wanted to point out that your disclaimer regarding pitbulls not biting more often is FALSE. Please present accurate data. Pitbulls are responsible for the majority of dog-related injuries and deaths. I would fully support a ban, or extreme legislation against them. I am a bite victim myself and could have died.
- Other: License bloody bicycles they are as annoying and dangerous as dogs and police time is Spent on lost bicycles
- Other: Make the owner at least civilly, if not criminally, liable for any attack.
- Other: Mandatory liability insurance for all pit bulls
- Other: Mandatory spay/neuter program for all pitbulls
- Other: Minimum of \$1,000,000 liability insurance for ownership of any blood sport dogs. Rescind once bite gets a pass, these types of dogs, one bite can be a life altering disfigurement if not death.
- Other: More fines for people walking dogs off-leash in areas where dogs are specified to be on-leash.
- Other: No pit bulls or nuisance dogs in fields near playgrounds. Not every field has no dog signs in these areas.
- Other: No pitbulls allowed in city or near children
- Other: Outright ban on the breed.
- Other: Owners of aggressive animals should be held to the one bite law. If their animal bites someone, it should be seized and put down.



- Other: Owners should go through competency tests
- Other: People who own dogs that can cause such damage as injury and death should have to have a special license showing they have had training on controlling such an animal
- Other: Pit bull breeds banned
- Other: Pit bulls and AS Terriers should be banned.
- Other: Pit bulls and nuisance dogs must be spayed or neutered
- Other: Pit bulls should be banned altogether.
- Other: Pit Bulls should be banned in the City of Calgary or at a minimum muzzled when in public. These dogs have very dangerous bites and you cannot predict the responsibility of the owners in their training.
- Other: Pit bulls should be banned inside the city limits.
- Other: Pit bulls should be banned. They are raised and bred as aggressive fight dogs that people have for home security. They are trained to attack. They should be banned.
- Other: pitbull 'type' breeds should be banned. Also, Cane Corso, Dogo Argentino and other pit-fighting dogs should be banned.
- Other: Pitbulls are a danger to the general public.
- Other: Pitbulls should not be allowed on any form of public transportation
- Other: Pitfalls and other declared dangerous breeds should be banned from Calgary.
- Other: Please include dogs registered as "American Bully" in the pitbull laws!
- Other: Restrictions on who can own a pit bull/aggressive dog breed.
- Other: small dogs I personally find are more of a nuisance. I've been attacked by small dogs. My golden retriever has been attacked by smaller breeds. My personal opinion is that the fines for pit bulls should be the same as for small breed dogs. They need muzzles too. If a large breed attacks a smaller breed because the smaller breed is teasing, biting it, the owner must take responsibility. Just because a dog is small doesn't mean it's a sweetheart. I've come across more small dog breeds that are more vicious than a pitbull. This needs to stop. Fines need to be just as healthy as for large breeds.
- Other: Strongly discourage pit bull ownership by allowing more humane euthanasia for abandoned pit bulls. Also, do not let pit bulls be bred by backyard breeders. Anyone selling a pit-bull should be fined.
- Other: There should be an outright ban on dogs that are considered aggressive or dangerous breeds. That includes dogs that are too physically large or strong that the owner cannot properly control them.
- Other: This should also apply to small yappy vicious dogs.
- Other: Time to get with the program - that "all dogs bite" mantra from a few years back was just comical. I'm not concerned about being bitten by the neighbor's ball-of-fuzz or lab - I am concerned about these pit-bull type dogs, etc. My beagle was attacked once by a dog like this. Bylaw did nothing. The owners lied through their teeth. Then I found out my dog was the second dog it attacked! If I see it, I'll kill it, and save another dog. But here we are still debating this. Sigh...
- Other: Van pit bulls and any other aggressive dog breed



- Other: Would prefer a total ban on pit bull type breeds
- Other: Yards must be fully fenced higher than 4 m high for pit bull or nuisance dogs.
- There is no evidence supporting the claims and this discriminatory survey towards pit bulls.
- DONT BULLY MY BREED - THIS IS RACIST AND SEGREGATING BREEDS - WHATS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THIS AND SEGREGATION LAWS FROM THE EARLY 1900's
- Obedience training should be required for all dogs
- Based on definition provided of nuisance, it's ridiculous to request owners have insurance or they're muzzled at a dog park. A dog deemed dangerous however, absolutely should be muzzled regardless of breed when out in public
- This should not be breed specific. Responsible pet ownership applies to ALL pet owners.
- Just to clarify, my response is regarding individual dogs that have been declared a nuisance. Certain breeds should not be targeted.
- If a dog is involved in a by-law offence where the dog potentially poses a risk to others. The owner should be required to take the dog to obedience training and the owners needs to be an active participant in the dog's training. Dogs often becomes nuisance or aggressive dogs due to poor ownership, not because there is something wrong with the dog itself.
- pit bull typing of dogs is unhelpful - many dogs that are not pit bulls can have just as damaging a bite
- Facilitate responsible ownership, not promote breed specific legislation.
- Absolutely do not discriminate against a breed of dog. There are numerous pieces of literature stating that "pit bulls" are not the problem and their "biting force" is no different than MANY other breeds.
- Deal with nuisance dogs and not the BREED!
- Please provide stronger enforcement of the leashing of dogs off the owner's property. And mandatory training for both owner and dogs. This is to create a much safer situation for the dog. I see too many off leash dogs roaming with their owners without any controls and running into the street. The owner often seems to have no clue whatsoever about leash laws or about their dog about to be struck by a car.
- Specifically attacking Pitbulls and similar dogs is not ok, these dogs are no worse behaved by nature than any other. I completely disagree with the bias that these types of dogs are by their nature less wellbehaved than any other.
- Do not focus on one breed, rather behaviour driven.
- I do not support any breed specific bullying.
- This bylaw is bullshit. [removed] you. Just because of how they look? Really?
- Pit bulls should be banned from the city
- Owners need to be responsible. These dogs aren't dangerous!
- There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Pit bulls are sweethearts, I'm not a dog owner but have met many sweet pit bulls. You should be focusing on annual adoption check ins on owners, not restrictions as listed here.
- Say no to BSL. Base punishments on proven behaviour, not looks or uneducated opinions.



- I do not support ANY bylaw that specifies a certain breed should be restricted, or cost the owner extra in terms of fines or insurance when the dog hasn't actually done anything wrong. Especially when the rule is going to read "a dog that has an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar to those of dogs." Who decides what's substantially similar? That's very subjective and the person making the decision may be unfairly biased.
- Any Dog(s) found guilty of provoking an attack while either on or off leash are subject to fines and / or seizure
- None it's the owner not the dog.
- Please stop targeting Pitbulls and specific breeds as being an alleged nuisance. Pitbulls are not dangerous dogs. Stupid owners that do not provide their dogs (REGARDLESS OF THE BREED) with the proper training should be punished. I agree with targeting ALL dogs that can or are a danger to public safety but to have that limited to a specific breed is as good as racism. All Pitbulls are not dangerous, in fact, most are not. If their owners are not caring for them properly, that is the PERSON'S fault, not the helpless dog.
- Dogs that are aggressive (even poodles) are not allowed at off leash areas ever. Or must be muzzled.
- I do not support a bylaw specific to pit bulls. They are very loving dogs. There are no bad dogs only bad owners that do not take the time to properly train their pet or provide early socialization. To pick on pit bulls specifically is a knee jerk reaction from politicians looking to score votes from the uneducated general public.
- Discriminating against a dog breed is no different than discriminating against people. You're more likely to be bit by a chihuahua. Ban nuisance dogs and dogs that are repeat offenders. Not all pit by bulls are bad and not all bad dogs are pit bulls.
- More fines for bad pet owners. BSL is not the answer ANY breed or dog can be vicious and aggressive. It's the result of owners who don't care about training their dogs properly or treating them correctly. Fine them Ban them. More education for all owners and fines will create better owners
- Nuisance animals are not limited to breed, punishment should be metered properly to all offending animals based on the severity of the offence.
- The behaviour of the dog is largely the responsibility/training of the owner. Being discriminatory towards pit bulls is unfair and although pit bulls have the potential to cause more damage, their breed is majorly misunderstood and if a dog is aggressive, that's on the owner. Also, I think if a dog is declared a nuisance, they should go through rehabilitation before being allowed back into off leash areas.
- This bylaw is absolutely ridiculous. You already point out that pitbulls do not have a higher frequency of bite incidents. There is absolutely no reason to treat them differently.
- Pit bulls should NOT be targeted - German Shepard's have a bite just as strong and dangerous, if that is the rational and they should also be included as well as Rottweilers which has a stronger bite force as well.
- Breed specific laws are insane. It's owners that are problems. Not specific breeds. Duh.



- Needs more accountability on the owner. Dogs learn from their owners. If the owner does not exercise or train their dogs it makes bad dogs. If they have a nuisance dog they need training and investigation on whether they are fit to own a dog.
- Leave pit bulls alone and only take the animal away because of the owner of it is attacking, not the animal's fault for the lack of owner's stupidity and lack of training.
- Stop the ban on "pit-bulls". If this was a human would you ban an entire religion, race, ethnicity, gender, identity? This is a form of racism!
- None whatsoever
- No breed specific legislation! It's not the breed it's the owner!
- The city should make sure that owners are the ones responsible and not mistreating the dogs.
- I do not believe that dog bites or behavior are a large issue that requires any of these suggested measures.
- Removing the stigma around the term "Pitbull". Regardless of breed, responsible pet ownership means looking past breeds and administering proper training to all breeds.
- There should be NO breed specific bylaws. All breeds have the capacity to bite/attack. I have been bitten twice and both times it was small breeds. The last time was by a chihuahua and it was severe.
- There should not be any discrimination or prejudice on the breed. Target the owner.
- BSL does not work. Any large dog is capable of doing the same harm as a bully breed/ bully mix. General education has proven to be more effective
- Owners should be required to spend enough time providing an enriching environment for their pet. Don't blame the pit bulls themselves.
- There is no scientific evidence to support these statements. It would be a mistake to make an animal pay the price of something they've never done.
- Bigger fines and punishment for people who abuse and mistreat animals. Maybe if we had actual penalties for animal abuse and severe punishment for dog fighting etc. It would decrease the amount of bad people who strive to own pit bulls that learn to be aggressive. Maybe a rebate for owners taking their problem dogs for training (it's so expensive which is why most don't). More public education around pets and dogs. Ex. SO many people leave their well behaved dogs off leash. Educate that this is not ok and fine those who do. Makes it extremely hard and stressful when walking a leashed reactive dog. Those people don't think they're the problem, but their dogs running up to leashed dogs cause a lot of issues. Also, education for the public surrounding animals. Ex. Kids/parents should know how not to interact with dogs they see. I've had lots of kids come running at my two 100 pound dogs while out walking. They get anxious but Luckily I have pretty good dogs. This behaviour from kids is NOT ok. I've also seen parents shove a baby in dogs face that they didn't know who was tied up outside. An older dog that easily could have panicked and snapped. In my opinion that would be the fault of those parents, not the dog, but we all know who would face the punishment. I know a dog that was put down for biting a kid that climbed a fence into someone's yard.... it was awful what happened, but that dog was protecting his two girls on a property that someone entered. Kids and adults need more education to prevent these things. I had a meter reader walk into my backyard while my two barking growling dogs were there. He ignored them and



proceeded in. Luckily they didn't bite, but in my opinion, he was wrong to take that chance. There's a lot bigger issues than pit bulls. Focus on shitty people who own pets they shouldn't and animal mistreatment. Not pit bulls.

- Higher fines for owners that have history of several nuisance dogs over the years. Lots of issues arise from being unaware of body language and or irresponsible pet ownership- like the people that just take their dogs to the off leash park to throw a ball until the dog is exhausted rather than trying to mentally AND physical engage them.
- You mentioned that pit bull type dogs are not listed to have more bites than other dogs and while I understand the "potential to possibly do more damage" it's not fair to lump all "bully" breeds as nuisances and penalize them all. There are not bad dogs, but bad owners. The owners should be punished harder, not the poor animals. The animals have no control over how they are raised or trained. A responsible owner invest time and energy into training any type of dog. [removed]
- No breed specific legislation - heavily fine owners of any breed that has NOT properly trained their pet!
- This shouldnt be subject to only pitbulls. I was in a dog park yesterday and saw two dogs fight hard. One was wounded and neither of which were a pitbull. Any pitbull ive met has always been amazing and gentle.
- Pitbulls should not be prejudiced against
- Stop using Pitbull as an example. As your note said, there is no data suggesting they are worse than any other dogs. You should make it mandatory for all dogs to be trained.
- there cannot be more than one nuscense dog per household. Owners should be put through a permit before allowing to own an animal
- I HIGHLY disagree with the term "nuisance" can we fine children for being a "nuisance" as well? Also individualizing the breed "Pitbull" it's like being racist let's only make rules for the "Caucasians". Also just like humans dogs are not born aggressive/harmful/destructive it's how they are raised - there should be a class that people must take to own a dog to ensure proper up bringing - also to have a child
- No specifying pitbulls, a dog's genetic predispositions are not reason enough to single them out. Size or power does not determine aggression. Dogs that actually have offended and not gotten training to resolve the issue are valid.
- Lower levels of bias against pitbull breeds
- Impose a hefty permit cost for dog owners who want own a pit bull to disincentivize owning one in the first place.
- All dog breeds should be treated in the same regard. If they are repeat offenders of attacks or bites they should not be allowed off-leash in dog parks. The voluntary colour bandana program should be used to identify dogs who should not be approached rather than muzzle that may cause for panic. Dog owners with animals who are repeat offenders should be held accountable by taking a responsible pet owner course to own another animal.
- Stop calling out Pit Bulls - they are just a dog and they are not more dangerous than other dogs unless they have been trained to be more dangerous or they have been abused



- None of the above.
- There should not be a specific Law for pitbull breeds. We all know that any breed of dog can be a nuisance or bite
- This is stupid. You're singling out breeds. Smaller dogs are actually more aggressive. Perhaps you should rethink this. I'd suggest that you keep breeds out of it, and focus on actual laws that keep people safer. Not this. It's akin to Trudeau's gun control. Doesn't work to keep people safe by punishing law abiding people.
- Why are pit bulls being targeted? They score lower on the aggression scale than a golden retriever... the owner is at fault for bad behaviour not the dog. Higher fines and punishments for owners
- Removal of dog from unfit owner
- Please stop discriminating against pit bulls - they are some of the sweetest dogs, deal with problem animals/ owners don't discriminate based on breed. It is disgusting that options above are that all pit bulls must be muzzled in public or that all pit bulls can't go to an off leash park. The attitudes towards these dogs (the majority of whom are the sweetest, affectionate cuddlers you could hope to have) is appalling!!!. There is no reason for a well behaved pit bull with responsible owners to have to wear a muzzle - that is traumatizing to the animal and the owner!!
- Obedience training should be less yearly dues per dog, teen forcing the training for ALL dogs.
- I do not agree with breed specific bylaws
- I am 100% against breed bands.
- Fine to owners who are careless with their dogs. Punishing Pitbull type dogs is not the answer. A German Shepard can bite just as aggressively. This should never be breed specific in any guideline/fine/restriction/insurance is absurd. Focus on people who disregard public safety and have animals removed from those situations.
- The fact that you think putting restrictions on one breed is appropriate, think again. I know multiple people who have been attacked by German Shepard's. It's not the dog it's the OWNER. Increase the fines are all dogs that are a nuisance
- Fines and restrictions should not be placed per breed, more restrictions and registration processes should be in order to keep OWNERS accountable for poor training and control habits of their pets.
- Dog breeds are not indicative of dog behavior. The owner plays a much larger part in dog behavior.
- Do nothing leave pit bulls alone
- No dog should be muzzled because of the breed. This is Ridiculous and the city council should be ashamed of them self's.
- In order to be deemed a "pit bull" owners must do a dog DNA test and submit it. If the dog has no "pit bull" but still looks like one they shouldn't have any rules or regulations put on them. DNA test must be an Embark not wisdom panel as wisdom panel provides false results. All dogs must have some training done to visit a dog park period.
- Breed based legislation is unfair and absolutely ridiculous. Get a [removed] clue.
- Let me clear that pit bulls are not the problem it's it responsible dog owners. If a dog has been reported MORE than one time for aggressive behavior (there was a physical issue) then that dog should not be allowed off leash at anytime.



- Human training for potential pit bull owners
- None, it's a dog owner problem not a breed problem . How many people out there have little happy jerk dogs like poodles and shitzus that are rude and aggressive
- Nuisance dogs should not be allowed to be walked or at off leash parks in Calgary
- Your definition of nuisance doesn't include any aggressive behaviours. These measures may be suitable if applied to dogs with history of signs of aggression. Regulating dogs that are loose might help but how does regulating dogs that bark help? Do not implement any breed specific requirements. Training should only be positive reinforcement, as punishment makes these behaviours worse
- Breed is not the issue owners are.
- You state above that the reason for the pitbull specific bans is because their bites are more likely to cause severe damage. I suggest doing a little research and you will see German Shepards have a slightly stronger bite force than pitbulls. Will German Shepards also be included in these bans? Please do actual bare minimum research before putting bans and restrictions into place.
- Training for owners of potentially dangerous dogs.
- I don't believe in targeting any breed. Target owners.
- As a pit bull and general dog owner it is our responsibility to ensure we train our dogs properly and take responsibility for their behaviour. This should fall on the owner of the dog regardless of the breed. If the owner does not then they should face jail time as they have made it unsafe for the public.
- It's disappointing to see that we are singling out a specific breed, I would rather see a bylaw in place that dealt with each OWNER on a case by case basis instead of instituting such a blanket statement over one breed of dog.
- Owners of repeat offender dogs, of any breed since literally any dog can fit the definition provided, should be required to attend owner training and face increased licensing fees.
- Pitfalls should not be named here, but nuisance (with a clear definition) dogs. I am most worried about my family being bit by a smaller dog as they tend to be more anxious and strung.
- none. let them be free
- All dogs be treated equally if they're a nuisance. It's not fair to target box headed dogs because of a preconceived notion targeting large breed dogs.
- All dogs treated equally, more responsibility, taking the animals away from poorly behaving owners.
- I think in a situation where a "bully breed" is out in public and known to be easily irritated. They should be on lead and have a certain colour of collar/harness indicating their behaviour
- Daschounds and other small breeds are more likely to bite, don't be mean to pitbulls. They were known as nanny dogs at one point.
- None of the above, all of these are terrible and discriminatory
- No specific dog breed should be singled out. Every dog has the potential to be a nuisance, no specific breed. Also nuisance should be clearly defined, as of now it is very open ended.
- eliminate off leash parks unless they are fenced areas and people pay for a time to just take their dogs into it.



- None- this discriminate against the dogs of responsible owners rather than the bad owners
- None of the above as pit bulls are not the problem
- none of the above
- I do not support targeted enforcement or discrimination against specific dog breeds.
- I would support implementing a program wherein all dog owners are encouraged to have their pets undergo basic obedience training, but to specify pitbulls as specific problem breeds is frankly ignorant, perpetuates something that is misinformation (that pitbulls have a stronger bite, they don't) and causes me to doubt the qualifications of the team behind this.
- Breed specific rules are arbitrarily unfair. Owners play a critical role in establishing the temperament of their dogs. It is not breed specific. This is about the owners not the dogs.
- How about you start charging the pet owners, not banning a single dog breed from being able to enjoy life. This whole idea is pathetic, wake up and realise that it's not the dogs that are the problem.
- It is unfair to discriminate against certain dog breeds. It is absolutely no different than discriminating against people's skin colour. Visible minorities are statistically more likely to commit violent crime, but do we ban them from parks or anything like that? Of course not. Because visible minorities are not naturally more violent than others, violent crime is correlated to how people are raised. The exact same logic applies to animals, none are born bad, it depends on their owners. So the proper course of action is focusing on irresponsible/abusive owners. And do not have higher fines for any specific breed in particular, all fines should be equal between breeds, with multiple-incident offenders having increased fines and direction towards training programs if found to be troublesome. Punishment happens after the crime, not before. It would be unfair to force owners to pay for training/insurance just because their dog is a specific breed and hasn't done anything wrong.
- How about you actually deal with off leash dogs in not designated areas. All owners need to be responsible for their pet and in control of them at all times. Not just bully breeds
- Specific breeds should not be treated differently. It's the owner that has to be fined and held accountable
- I am strongly against ANY OF THE ABOVE. Which will punish responsible pet owners and innocent animals. THIS IS WRONG.
- Quit picking on Pitbulls! They're loyal loving & kind . It's the crappy owners making them into problem dogs
- Breed specific legislation is something I DO NOT support (I (or my friends or family) do not have any pit bull breed dogs)
- First, this screams of BSL, which has its roots in racism. Second, if people can't afford their pets, the pets will be abandoned. Let's educate people about being good responsible owners
- Harsher penalties for those who mistreat animals and bans for those who do not provide adequate care for animals. A city registry of owners who have been found to mistreat animals
- What in the actual [removed] is wrong with this city
- None
- THERE SHOULD NOT BE ANY BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION.
- Mandatory Subsidized handling training for owners of nuisance dogs



- Problem is not a breed! People who own dogs are the problem. Stiffer penalties for irresponsible dog owners would help, up to prohibiting dog ownership of any breed. German Shepard or Rotties can be equally dangerous.
- Obedience training for all dogs reported for any incidents related to harm of other people, pets or property. AND assement of ownership and care of the pets under review. THE PROBLEM IS NOT THE DOG OR BREED, THE PROBLEM IS THE OWNER. A DOG SHOULD NOT BE MISTREATED, EUTHANIZED OR NEGLECTED FOR LACK OF OWNERSHIP. THE OWNER IS 100% RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PET AND THERFORE NEEDS TO TAKE ACTION TO PREVENT INCIDENTS. THE MORE THE CITY AND OTHER INSITUTIONS PLACE BLAME ON BREEDS AND TYPES OF DOGS THE MORE THESE BREEDS ARE HARMED AND THE STIGMA IS ENFORCED. PET OWNERSHIP NEEDS TO BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY AND MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE TO PREVENT OR RESTRICT OWNERSHIP WHEN THE OWNER HAS NO PLANS OR MEANS TO CARE FOR ANIMALS. APPLICATIONS OF ALL TYPES OF PETS SHOULD BE INPLEMENTED SO OWNERS ARE AWARE OF THE NEEDS OF EACH PET. PREVENTION OVER INTERVENTION
- Pit bulls are NOT to be singled out. My AmStaff was attacked by an English Bulldog; he didn't even defend himself! He ended up with stitches in 3 bites and a hole in his head, but he never bit back. He has been trained by a responsible pet owner and is more docile than most small dogs! Singling out Pitbulls is a ridiculous step backwards! Single out nuisance dogs who have bitten and injured others. Not by breed, but by behaviour.
- BSL does not work!!! Please don't go backwards. bsl unfairly targets pet responsible pet owners.. The current bylaw needs to be enforced more, its not pitbulls that are the problem, its the [removed] owners.
- If one breed is required to do so All breed MUST be required to do so as well. Your basically being a racist towards pit bulls.
- No mandatory muzzles for pitbulls or any other dog bread. It is the OWNERS responsibility to properly train and care for their pet. If the owner decides to muzzle their dog that's their business. The city, state, government cannot mandate which breeds are deemed a nuisance.
- Chihuahuas should be addressed as nuisance dogs: I have been bitten multiple times as well as both of my dogs. Friends and family have also been bitten on the street and at dog parks. There should also be higher fines for off leash dogs that are in an area that is not off leash.
- Do not target a specific breed. Any large dog has strength. Limit to actual nusiance dogs.
- All dogs require training including small breeds. Pit bulls are not more dangerous
- There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Shame on your for intending to bully a dog breed.
- Dogs declared a "nuisance" for behaviour such as noise or roaming at large should not be punished. There behaviours are preventable by the OWNER. As such, the owner should be "punished". Keeping "nuisance dogs" and "pit bull type" dogs restricted from exercise (e.g., off leash parks) will cause a larger problem within those specific animals due to lack of exercise. Furthermore, I DO NOT support bread specific bans or laws. We should be looking towards fining humans who do not care for or train animals, no matter the breed.



- Provide actions and consequences for the dog owners not the dogs. NO pitbull specific policies as these are discriminatory and not evidence based. Make the consequences of any incidents mandatory training as this is the only positive and productive intervention that can happen. Seizing a dog or limiting it to inside a household will only increase anxiety and cause more issues, therefore being counterproductive. Disallow weight limitations for condo buildings, it is always the small dogs that bark and are a nuisance not the large ones.
- I would obly recommend if the dog is known for aggression to be muzzled away from home just because its a bully breed does not mean its aggressive i do not own a bully but it all comes down to training working g in the pet field ive seen way worst behaved dogs i the shop some of the best behaved and friendliest dogs I've me over the past 20 years have been "pit bulls"
- None of the above how about better pet ownership responsibility and direction..... any dog can be violent not just this breed and I of MANY and not one has ever had an issue and all have responsible owners and are over 10 years old so these suggestions are Ludacris
- I'm a veterinarian. We don't need to ban Pitt bulls, we need to increase education and training for people. Make stronger legislation for dog breeding, require training with fear free science based training. No dominance or fear based training. Legislate dog trainers, legislate breeders. Humans are responsible for the mental welfare of their animals.
- None
- It is wrong to single out 'pit bull' breeds
- LEAVE THE DOGS ALONE FFS!
- I do not recommend or prefer any of the above options!! While I do not own any block headed or pitbull type dogs, I am 100% against any addition pertaining to Breed Specific Legislation.
- Training required for OWNERS of pit bull type dogs. The dogs are fine. It's the owners.
- Why don't we have obedience training required for all dogs and dog owners
- Owners need to be liable not dogs. Dogs act the way they do because of their owners not breed.
- it is the owner, not the dog who requires training in obedience, following rules and responsibility. Any breed of dog can be a nuisance, train the owner, fine the owner and your problems with dogs will almost disappear. do not allow your children to charge the dog any dog). Stop fear mongering, dogs are not the problem people are. what ? since your at home with nothing to do but look for problems that you can complain about, get out and get a job. Use your brains for more than whining about a problem that does not exist!
- I have been bitten by poodles with owners who are irresponsible.. I have never had an issue with a pitbull or rottie. OWNERS are the problems not the dogs. I think manadatory training should be required for pet owners period. Little dogs are the biggest aggressors in my opinion and the people who own them and don't train them should be fined when they bite.
- German Sheppard's more dangerous
- None of the above. These options only address the wrong end of the leash. Judge the dog, not the breed
- [removed] I have been bitten 3 times in my life. Guess what! All 3 times, was from a small, pocket sized dog.[removed] Disgusting. All of you.



- No increase in fines. Leave specific breeds out of this.
- All dogs are equal. It's bad owners that create these behaviour in dogs. Treat all dogs equal in fines and lables
- Owners must be strong enough/large enough to hold their dog back if it tries to pull the leash, my dog was attacked on leash because the woman walking her dog wasn't strong enough and the dog pulled her to the ground to charge after my dog
- More regulation needs to be in place for dog owners as a whole. Not for a specific breed . Any behavioural problems start with the owner. If there are so many issues with pit bulls then I suggest more regulation on WHO can own them. Do not Punish everyone for select peoples mistakes and bad behaviour.
- I would like all of these dogs banned from the city of calgary
- Don't target pitbulls. why are you targeting Pitbulls?? Laws should be case by case. Don't discriminate against a breed for no reason. I
- I do NOT believe we have the right to target Pitbulls. These animals are not born vicious they are trained to be. We should instead be clamping down on the owners. Refuse them the right to an animal in future
- Pit bulls are nice dogs. It's the breeder, like any dog.
- Nuisance requires a very clear definition, which should only include biting and only when not provoked by the behaviour of another animal or human
- Any medium to large dog has the capability to cause harm. Yes the "pitbull" has a more strong physique, although any dog is a product of their human counter part. I think the human should be responsible, know their dog and actually be fined if their dog is deemed a nuisance.
- None of the above
- I don't think this should be breed specific, should be any dog that bites or considered a nuisance
- All people over 6' have to wear handcuffs in public because they are bigger and could cause more damage than average size people
- None of the above
- Any dog that is aggressive should be facing these consequences such as having to go to training. NOT just because they are pitbulls.
- Make breeding pit bulls illegal. Mainly the people who get them do NOT KNOW HOW TO TRAIN THEM. They end up in the shelters and causing problems. It's not the dogs, it's the people who breed them for the cash and hand them off to anybody. Or put stricter rules on adopting/buying one.
- We need better training programs. The fault is in the owner and lack of training, not the animal.
- Owner assessment and training prior to owning a dog (any breed) to reduce negative impact/influence on the dog.
- This is ridiculous, pit bulls are not more dangerous than any other large breed. If you are going to muzzle them, there are other breeds with stronger bites than pit bulls and the Whole concept of this is absolutely RIDICULOUS
- Actual consequences for crappy owners. Require all people adopting or purchasing a dog to go through ownership standards testing, if necessary do a home visit. Anyone can buy any dog and



treat it like garbage and that is how “nuisance” dogs even occur. No dog is inherently bad, owners make them that way.

- I strongly object to the singling out of Pit Bulls. Simply designating dangerous dogs not nuisance dogs as requiring a muzzle.
- Not all bully breeds are dangerous. It is all in how you train/raise them. They should not be categorized separately like this. ANY dog breed can be aggressive.
- Every specie of dog should have these laws not just pitbulls.
- None of these. This is awful and discriminatory to dogs. Congrats on being absolutely dense and not looking at science.
- Breed specific programs especially when targeting out bulls is discriminatory and if we were speaking about humans would definitely be racist.
- I have a Pitbull and she’s extremely well behaved and trained, I think they should stop being pursued the way they are and bad dog owners should have there dogs removed from them.
- I would support the city of calgary if they stopped trying to mess with every day people and their animals
- an all out ban on pit bulls - Their owners are just as bad as the breed is! As an emergency physician i have seen multiple attacks by pit bulls. I have never seen one from a golden retriever or lab by comparison.
- Dogs that have a history of aggressive behaviour should face higher fines. The bylaws should not be focused on pit bulls who aren’t known for biting but are “stronger” there are much larger breeds with much more strength.
- Breed does not determine temperament. Dogs should not be punished because of irresponsible owners.
- I do not support breed specific laws/bylaws, owners of any nuisance dogs (even the little dogs!) should be educated on and go through mandatory training with their dog. Pitbull owners are usually one of the most responsible dog owners I have met.
- It isn’t the dog it’s the owner! Give the owner obedience and training and Spey and neutering!
- ANYTHING other than breed-specific bylaws.
- No dog should be permitted off leash. Higher fines for dogs offleash in areas where it is not legal. Mandatory canine behavioural courses in order for an person to obtain a dog (which must then be microchipped, spayed/neutered and the owner registered) as they do in other countries. Have different Class levels for different breeds, in the same way as driver's licenses, where more "dangerous" breeds require a higher class (just like a person needs a higher class of license to drive semi-trucks). Also ALL dogs should be required to complete obedience. Offleash parks should have an admittance test which requires the owner to demonstrate a recall with the dog at a distance of 500 meters or more and we examined with dog aggression. A small fee for these tests would be used to offset the cost of hiring a dog behaviorist for this. The person would then get an access card that allows them to enter offleash parks in the province. Make the fee low tho and yearly, so that people are less likely to try taking their dog offleash in other, illegal places. Hold the HUMAN responsible NOT the breed.



- Leave pit bulls alone, are you kidding me with this ridiculous bylaw. Treat all breeds equal and start looking at the owners and the animals living arrangements!
- Higher fines for nuisance dogs at large. Also fines for dogs who are brought to vet clinics and then picked up by the city (right now if they come to the city/humane society as a stray brought to a vet clinic, the owner is not fined, which means that there are lots of repeat offender stray dogs whose owners face no fines for picking up their pets, so have no incentive to correct this)
- I strongly disagree with any form of breed specific legislation as it is not backed up by science or anecdotal evidence and is just fear mongering
- Leave pitbulls out of this. All dogs have the ability to be aggressive especially small breeds- I have been bitten by small dogs
- I only agree with the above checked if the word "NUISANCE" is changed to "Dangerous".
- Dogs that are a bite risk (severe or not) required to be muzzled in public and banned from off leash parks. Not lumping together bites with barking and being at large, which are largely based on owner behavior and not indicative of risk. Likewise not based on breed which is not a risk factor in any published study.
- Should not be limited to pit bulls. ANY dog exhibiting aggressive behaviour, or capable of killing or maiming a small child needs to be on leash and muzzled in any public location. If more than one dog is being walked, all dogs must be on leash (for control). \$10,000 fine for owners who fail to properly control their large dogs in public.
- The problem is not the dog, not the breed, the problem is always the human. Poor breeding/training results in poor temperaments. Targeting a breed/breed type is ridiculous. Discriminating how an "incident" involving a dog is handled based on its breed is exactly that: discrimination. The same rules should apply to all breeds. The level of enforcement should be based on the offense not the breed. Does it make sense to euthanize a pit bull that bit a human, yet let the border collie -that ALSO bit a human- go unscathed?
- mandatory obedience training when ANY dog is purchased or adopted. That way all dogs are trained and will be well behaved which will decrease or possibly eliminate incidents.
- Owners are responsible for all dog behaviour. Owners to pay for animal behaviour assessment by Humane Society animal behaviourists and an assembly of their own skills as a dog owner
- I would not support any of this
- The [removed] is the worst person and should [be fired immediately. [removed] and leave people alone. Less restrictions on people create more positive people.
- Do not allow discrimination and punishment for innocent dogs. Breed specific legislation and bylaws are wrong. Pitbulls are gentle family members. The hate and discrimination has to stop.
- Dogs of any kind are subject to nuisance bylaws. If and when a dog exhibits dangerous behaviours that are confirmed, then they are subject to the increased restrictions above. There is no relation between nuisance animals and breeds
- There is zero need to single out pit bulls, nuisance dogs should be singled out not a certain breed
- Clarify that bullmastiff, cane corso, danes, etc are not pit bull type dogs. No restrictions on responsible ownership.



- The City's job is not to decide which breed is 'good' it is to protect the public. A bad dog/cat/child/person has legislation to deal with it. Do not be racist/breedist. A jerk is a jerk.
- Pit bulls are not dangerous, in any breed. This is a useless law that will protect no one, maybe try banning chihuahuas, as they actually are a naturally aggressive breed.
- How about instead of going after the bully breed you go after the owner. If the pitbull is a problem likely it's due to the owner not being responsible. I have owned two Pitbulls and made sure they were obedience trained. And actually the training was more for me than the dog. I am a responsible dog owner and it's not fair to my dog who is socialized and trained to Be grouped in with irresponsible owners.
- Don't pick on pit bulls them selves. But owners need to be educated.
- You cannot base pitbulls on appearance. Any square faced dog can look like a bully breed. Purebred labradors can appear as pitbulls to different people. 'Pitbull' being classified as a face shape or appearance is unlawful and unethical.
- specifying pit bulls are dangerous is deeply offensive and doesn't point to the real problem, ensuring owners provide proper care to dogs
- There should be no breed specific legislation. It should all apply to all breeds of dogs. BSL is ignorant and shows Calgary does not do their research before creating bylaws.
- You should not have pit bull and nuisance dog in the same statement as they are not the same. You are making a mistake by discriminating a against one particular breed or type of dog. You do not define dangerous behaviour. I hope you are not suggesting dangerous behaviour is the same as nuisance behaviour.
- It's the owners who train the dogs who should be fined, don't hurt the dog if the owner is terrible at training.
- Pit bulls aren't the problem, it's the owners of any dog breed
- Obedience training required for new dog owners that includes information about dog behaviour
- Leave them alone!
- I believe charge the owner of the animal, it's not the dogs fault when they are trained incorrectly or abused to the point where they have to defend them selves. We should focus on charging the human owner not treat the dog as a criminal when it's the human training them to be that way.
- The idea that there needs to be fines based on breed, whether they have been in any violent altercation with other animals is completely ridiculous. Breed has nothing to do with a dogs temperament, it is solely the owner having a lack of control, which should be then fined. I would that no one would support this idea of breed discrimination because I'm disappointed that this was even included in an official survey.
- Penalize irresponsible owners, not the dogs themselves!!!
- Not having breed specific by laws and focusing on the behavior not the breed. As a staffy owner aka the "nanny dog" I am so ashamed to be seeing these suggestions in a city I was born and raised in.
- Higher fines for owners who fail to properly train and manage their animals. This is not a breed issue. This is an lack of responsibility on the owners part.



- All of this is wrong. Stop perpetuating the breed as a problem when the owner. None of this is needed.
- I don't agree with any of the above measures. First of all, it lacks scientific basis to assume pit bulls are more aggressive. I have seen more aggressive Chihuahua than any other larger breed. Secondly, the definition of nuisance is very subjective. I don't think it's fair to penalize the dog and the owner based on such a subjective opinion.
- No breed specific laws!!!
- I support absolutely NONE OF THE ABOVE
- Small dogs of many breeds cause more problems than I have personally had with any pit bull or large dog. German Shepherds can be if not more aggressive than pit bulls yet they're not accounted in this list. The very fact that pit bulls and nuisance dogs are lumped in the same category is an absolute shame. Fully support the actions against nuisance dogs, not a complete BREED of dog.
- None. Breed specific legislation has no place in Calgary or anywhere in Alberta.
- None!! Breed specific specifications are outdated and problematic.
- Dog breed specific legislation is archaic and doesn't solve the issue. Encouraging spay and neuter is much more effective in curbing aggression in all breeds. I would have an option to lower fines and even cheaper licences for spay/neutered dogs.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2387261/>
- No breed restrictions. Be adult and treat all breeds the same.. if they violate the municipal code bite, aggression etc. then have a code that allows enforcement.nuisance etc
- Licensing of an animal should come with a course. Exercise could solve many issues, but people don't take pet ownership seriously enough
- Placing restrictions on animal rights will do nothing to solve the problem. Instead, I propose not allowing people who own dogs for the purpose of fighting, training to be aggressive, etc. To not be allowed to own animals
- At most make them wear muzzles. They are a perfectly beautiful friendly breed. Stop feeding the bad narrative. German shepherds hurt more kids than any other breed. If you wanna ban pitbull looking dogs, ban every shepherd dog. This is unjust.
- Training should be a requirement of dog ownership. A minimum level of training should be required prior to registering an animal. In addition, breed specific legislation is not acceptable. More stringent legislation to ensure responsible pet ownership and animal welfare is the correct course.
- Owner education on responsible dog ownership. There's no such thing as a bad dog. It comes down to the humans that train the dogs.
- Question for the city of Calgary, some varieties of the Labrador Breed have square heads and look similar to pit bulls, is it your intention to deem a Service Dog a Dangerous Dog? Because that is what your uneducated suggestions are implying? Would the shortsightedness of some people really open the City of Calgary to a class action lawsuit launched by owners of Service Dogs?
- I think there should be obedience training for ALL owners, but if it can only be done for nuisance dogs I think there should be the opportunity to review the behaviour of the dog and it's owner after



participating in an obedience class. If dogs are dangerous it is because the owner does not know how to control/manage them, and perhaps that owner should not be owning a dog.

- The pet owner should be fined and if multiple occurrences happen mandatory obedience training should be forced upon the owner. This applies to all types of dogs. Aggressive/mean behavior is taught and not specific to one breed.
- Ensure that the obedience training is NOT AVERSIVE. No trainers who use choke, prong or shock collars
- PLEASE DONT INTRODUCE BSL LEGISLATION. YOU PUNISH "GOOD" OWNERS WHILE "BAD" OWNERS CONTINUE TO PRODUCE NUISANCE DOGS. BSL is lazy legislating!! Address the real problem- bad owners!!
- A nuisance dog should be any breed and the rules should apply fairly to any dog that is a nuisance. Pit bulls shouldn't be targeted unless a specific dog/pit bull has been deemed a nuisance based on past behaviours of that dog
- I believe this to be breed specific criticism and do not condone any form of punishment for a pit bull because it is a pit bull. However, a dog, any dog, that is prone to aggression and has in the past been written up by peace officer or other agency, should have higher fines on the next infringement
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household; an owner of a nuisance dog who does not comply with bylaws or court orders cannot possess more animals
- There shouldn't be breed specific fines. Any owner of an animal that is a nuisance should be held responsible for their dogs action. Nuisance shouldn't include vocal dogs within reason, and if an owner does allow their dog to be vocal for an extended period of time or passed the standard noise violation bylaws should be held accountable, but I do not believe the animal should be classified as a nuisance, instead the owner should be fined for neglect.
- Breed specific legislation is discriminatory and predatory on the anatomy of a dog, not their personality. There is lots of evidence that pitbull-type dogs do not produce more bites, and there is false information regarding how powerful their bite is compared to other, especially larger, dogs. Breed specific legislation is a terrible idea and needs to be reconsidered.
- The problem is NOT the dog. The problem is the owners. You need to be training the individuals buying dogs, adopting dogs from shelters, and breeding dogs. People are the problem!! Not the dogs! You can have a small Yorkie that can be just as vicious at a "pit bull" "bully breeds" . Require training for the PEOPLE before they buy/adopt a dog. It's that simple.
- You cannot make a bylaw based on the breed of a dog. All dog breeds can be aggressive and cause significant injury. Husky's for instance have strong pack mentality and can be aggressive in groups.
- This should not be breed specific, an entire breed should not be targeted, especially if they just appear to look like that breed
- Repeat offenders need to be jailed and restricted from having a dog again for however many years.
- There should NOT be breed specific bylaws. Insurance and muzzle for a nuisance dog in public doesnt make sense... when you've defined a nuisance dog to include noise. Just because they bark, doesnt mean they're violent. If muzzles are required, city needs to do their part in educating owners, as there are different types of muzzles for different uses.



- Obedience training required for all dogs and dog breeds.
- Have responsible owners of pets. Bad dogs come from bad humans
- Breed specific bylaws are wholly inappropriate and should not be considered by the city.
- This is stupid. It's not just "pitbulls"
- Terms for nuisance need clearer definition. There is a big difference between a dog that barks when left alone or strangers passing by than a dog that has severely bit/ attacked someone or another animal.
- These options are ridiculous. Yes precautions should be taken if a dog of any breed is aggressive or a nuisance however not all pit bulls are aggressive or a nuisance so to separate doesn't make sense.
- No bylaws or regulations for specific breeds. Im extremely disappointed that my home city is even considering idiotic measures like some of the ones listed above.
- People should be required to train their dogs not to bite, no matter the breed
- How dare you select out a breed like that. The OWNER of the dog makes the dog. The BREED does not. Thos pretty much sounds like somebody saying, "all races BUT white can live here". Pit bulls and the other "nuisance" breed you listed here are less likely to harm or kill anyone. I have one of these "breeds" and to be honest she is scared of the toaster. She will love you to death before she would harm. Unless slapping you in the face with its paw because of being excited to greet me home". This is disgusting and makes me ashamed to be albertan.
- Measure should only be taken or rules set for dogs who are declared a nuisance or show aggressive behaviour. No measure should ever be breed specific
- You need to clarify "nuisance" and "dangerous" behaviour. I'm not sure why non-residents and non-tax payers are able to voice opinions. PLEASE DON'T MAKE THE SAME MISTAKE AS ONTARIO POLITICIANS IN THEIR IGNORANCE. They are now back-peddling.
- The people are the problem not the dogs. Mandatory obedience training for ALL dog owners
- Treat them like normal dogs. It is not the dogs fault but the owners
- None!!! This is disgusting. It is about terrible owners not the dog.
- The owners of the dogs are the concern, not the breed of the dog. My dog and I frequent city pathways and dog parks. Any nuisance dog we have encountered has NOT been a pit bull (as defined by this survey). Any pit bull we have encountered has been gentle, calm, and very well behaved. My dog is a French Bull Dog mix. He can become a nuisance very easily when tired, overwhelmed, or stressed. I learned how to notice the signs and how to address them from obedience classes. Owners who do not know their dog, who put their dog in situations of stress, and who do not know how to control their dog are at fault, regardless of the dog's breed. Please do not punish the dog for the inadequacies of the human.
- In my opinion, singling out pitbulls is a naive approach to city dog bylaws. I do not support any laws or bylaws specifically targeting pitbull or pitbull looking breeds.
- Absolutely against any restrictions based on breed or breed type. Responsibility for well behaved dogs in public places and dog parks especially should be shared, a small dog may not be able to



cause as much damage as a large dog but are not held to the same behaviour expectations and therefore cause or escalate confrontations with other dogs

- I think you discrimination against pit bulls is disgusting. If a dog has behavioural issues then the owner should be retrained
- Please quit blaming the dog!!! Make it one offence and the HUMAN can never own another dog! This is outrageous! It is always the owner.
- It is not pitbulls. Defining a dogs temperament by its breed is like defining a human on it skin colour. It is how they are raised, it is not the dogs fault but the owners.
- I believe that you are singling out a specific breed for no just cause! Not okay with any of the above as I have bully breeds. Very unfair and unjust!!
- Making specific rules just for pitbulls is extremely ignorant and unwarranted, any dog that attacks may have specific limitations but you are a part of the problem if you are giving innocent dogs specific by laws.
- PIT BULLS ARE NOT "STRONGER" THEN OTHER LARGE SIZED BREEDS JUST BECAUSE THEY ARE "PIT BULLS" THE FACT YOU WANT TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST A SPECIFIC BREED IS BS, ITS DISGUSTING! ONLY ONE PIT BULL PER HOUSE? NO! IF A PERSON CANNOT HANDLE AND CARE FOR MORE THAN ONE PITBULL, THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE MORE THAN ONE DOG OF ANY BREED. THIS IS ABSOLUTELY ABSURD TO SINGLE OUT ANY BREED! SOME BAD PEOPLE GET PIT BULLS BECAUSE THEY CAN MAKE THEM "LOOK MEAN" MAYBE REQUIRE BETTER BACKGROUND CHECKS WHEN GETTING A DOG, BETTER RULES WHEN IT COMES TO BREEDING ANY ANIMAL, BUT PIT BULLS ARE NOT THE [removed] PROBLEM.
- Don't enact breed specific bans. Punish people who don't train their pets well and hurt people or other pets, not dogs for being alive.
- I don't think this should be just for pit bulls. Pit bulls are not bad unless they've been raised by bad owners.
- No change. This is filled with assumptions and a pit bull or block head dog is no different from any others scientifically. The issue lays in the way they are raised.
- BREED SPECIFIC LAWS ARE NOT THE ANSWER! FINE THE OWNERS AND BAN PROBLEM OWNERS FROM HAVING PETS
- These are all absolutely ludicrous - STOP TARGETING PITBULLS
- Fine the bad owners. BSL not the answer
- Please don't discriminate against "bully breeds" just because of a POTENTIAL to cause a more severe bite. That's nonsense! Statistically, small dogs bite more. Is that okay because they're small? No. But no one's going to fine those owners, so why should pit-bull owners be singled out? How about fine the owner WHEN an incident happens.
- You cannot be breed specific about dogs being aggressive. Don't pick on the pit bulls. My labs have been bitten in an off leash park by chihuahua's twice. It's a good thing my dogs are well trained or the little dogs would have been dead with one bite!



- I would love to choose some of the other options but i dint believe they will be used fairly. A dog should be muzzled on the OWNERS CHOICE. If they know their dog is dog aggressive it is not their fault but they will put a muzzle on their dog if its needed. It is not fair for a well behaved dog to be muzzled. Muzzles are for saftey purposes but only if the dog is dog aggressive. This is a highly unfair and biased law. Discrimination against a breed of a dog is not ok. First it was dobermans then shepards now pitbulls. Why? That is completely unfair.
- increased fines and such for any dog that is a problem. If you can't keep you dog under control, you should be fined. Also maybe you shouldn't have one. But this signalling out of certain species is bullshit. I know people with pitbulls and/or these so called nuisance dogs and they are the nicest, friendliest dogs.
- Nuisance dog owners should be able to prove training and compliance to lift restrictions. The pit bull bans are poorly developed knee jerk that should not be in effect because of a dogs appearance.
- No different rules for pit bulls! It's not fair to penalize good dogs and their owners.
- Targeting these breeds is unnecessary. It's like being racist but with dogs.
- Ability to ban a person from further ownership if their dog is involved in dangerous behaviour (ie biting)
- As a certified trainer, former animal control officer and person certified in canine communication I do not support breed bans, or breed specific legislation. Penalties should be only for dogs with repeat offences. Many humans are detached from canine behavior, so many complaints are unjustified and in my personal experience a lot of 'bites' reported are often provoked by untrained smaller breeds, but blamed on pitbull type breeds. I'm unsure of why you are considering breed specific bans, however the information floating around that they are a more dangerous breed, or that they have a stronger bite is absolutely a myth. I specialized in fear and aggression throughout my career and I can assure you that dog behavior primarily relies on the consistency and education of the owners. If you are looking to reduce risk of bites there are two solutions, you could put laws in place that make dog training mandatory for ALL dog owners or you could do this only for dogs who have been deemed dangerous on an individual basis and require obedience training.
- Pitbull ban requested. "Incidents" occurring in parks seem to often involve pitbulls in my experience. The experience of surgeons is that pitbulls cause severe injuries.
- Nothing breed-specific. There's no evidence to support this.
- Education on responsible dog ownership that is not breed specific but behavior specific
- The second time a dog is involved in any incidence of aggression, the owner has a mandatory court appearance to address the problem. Third time, euthanize. How will you prevent someone transferring ownership to attempt to hide a nuisance dog? Mandatory chip for all dogs. Nuisance should include a dog 'rushing' at passerbys even from inside the yard.
- Obedience training required for all dogs licensed in the City of Calgary
- This should be based on the incident and not overall breeds. It is about being a responsible owner, not the dogs fault, the fault of poor ownership.



- “Pit bulls” or any specific breed of dog should not be declared a nuisance. Only individual dogs on a case by case basis should be evaluated. Do not shame specific breeds based on misinformation and bad owners.
- I don't support breed-specific legislation. In addition, the definition of "a dog that has an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar to those of dogs referred to in any of clauses" is overbroad and vague. Target irresponsible dog owners, not specific breeds.
- Pit bulls aren't the problem. Owners are. If the dog is a repeat offender it's obviously been treated poorly. I think singling out a breed is ridiculous. If ANY larger breed bites you with the intent to do damage, it's not going to make a difference whether it's a pit bull or not. Let's start being openly racist towards people too, while we're at it.
- Obedience training for all dogs, not just pit bulls
- The penalties and restrictions need to be on an individual dog/owner, not breed specific. Any dog can be a danger or a joy depending on their training and socialization.
- I don't feel a nuisance dog should have to be muzzled in public for being noisy or running away. If they have been involved in potentially harmful behaviour (e.g., serious nipping at a person, unprovoked aggression...), then it would make sense to require a muzzle for those dogs.
- The determination of nuisance must be case by case and not breed based also educating the public
- All dog owners should have basic obedience training.
- Nuisance dogs are nuisance dogs, please do not single out any certain breeds.
- Like many social issues these days, you are punishing the victim (the dog) when you do this. Every decade has had a dog to be afraid of (german shepards, doberman pinschers, pitbulls) please improve education for dog owners, and go after bad owners, not innocent dogs. If a dog cannot function in society it needs help (training, re-homing) not punitive measures
- I think that dogs should be looked at as a whole not just to one breed. It's still not pleasant nor funny when a chihuahua charges you either.
- Muzzling and required training for any dog non-specific to breeds that has a history of aggression to humans or other animals.
- Pitbulls should not be singled out. You run much higher chances of letting other problem dogs and cats slip under the radar if the focus is on one breed. It's important to educate and implicate bylaws for Owners who aren't properly caring for or training their animals to avoid accidents rather than just punishing the dogs after the incidents.
- No breed-specific legislature!!!
- Just fine nuisance dog owners ! You can't be breed specific that is ridiculous
- as your own question states "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." This is not true and incorrect data. Check the statistics for dog bites from smaller breeds....
- Bully breeds are not the problem. It's always always always the owner who cannot handle the dog and some nuisance dogs are chihuahuas.



- Breed specific legislation?!? I believe the people writing this need to educate themselves on proper statistics. It was proven not to work in Toronto. Educating PET GUARDIANS is the answer. "Pit Bulls" (which is a derogatory term) are often mistreated. Statistically a dachshund is more likely to bite.
- do not ever use breed specific language. Punish the bad owners not the dogs. Pit Bulls are no more dangerous or a nuisance than any other breed but they do attract a specific type of owner who needs to be dealt with.
- The rationale for discriminating against "pit bulls" is insufficient. Any dog can be vicious and inflict significant damage. Bylaw should focus on behaviour, not breed.
- What makes a dog a "nuisance"? Also ANY dog can be dangerous. Not just a pit bull.
- pit balls should not be discriminated against
- Why are you singling out pit bulls? That's [removed] any dog can be aggressive.
- You are insane to include the last clause regarding any dog that has the appearance. This is highly subjective. My Newf has a square head and could suddenly be labeled for no good reason. Deal with bad owners !!
- Border Collies, they can bite you multiple times before you realize you have been bitten once
- I am against the specific targeting of pit bulls. You clearly stated that you know they are not involved in more bite cases and yet are still going forward with this. My dog has been attacked twice in a dog back and both times by a husky. Not a pit bull. Also, what do all these rules matter when bylaw is usually nowhere to be found nor do they ever respond in a timely manner.
- I refuse to answer as breeds shouldn't be brought into consideration. "bad" dogs come from bad owners, breed has nothing to do with this
- Train owners. Nothing an owned animal does is on the animal, it is on the owner. Stop euthanizing and punishing the dog. Start punishing the owner and find responsible owners to care for problem animals. DO NOT PUT THEM DOWN!
- have a registry for said breeds and monitor for any infractions on owner/family, but allow normal dog behaviors until such time harsher punishfor THAT SPECIFIC FAMILY
- Y'all are racist against pit bulls. Just sayin
- I disagree with the breed specific bylaw, it should be ANY ANIMAL, not specific. This should say Animal or any dog. Disagree with this entire section. problem dog behaviors are reflective of the owners. Also BSL doesn't work, it's more expensive and difficult to enforce, evidence-based alternatives exist and effective in places around the world.
- Dog owners should be punished not the dogs
- Do not punish a breed, punish the owner. No breed is bad or violent. It is learned and the onus is on the owner
- If someone else dog bites another dog/ another individual they should give their insurance to that individual, it's not the dogs fault it's the owners training which is at fault
- Breed bans are stupid. This whole thing reeks of nanny state.
- Irresponsible dog owners should have to be provided training on to handle their dog if proven to be a nuisance. It is not the breeds fault. It is irresponsible owners. And fines should be issued to



ongoings who provoke dogs who's orders are clearly trying to train and do the right thing. Please stop breed bullying it's 2020. It's owners not breed of dog. Or even the dogs fault.

- we shouldn't be singling out pit bulls. all dogs should be created equal. there are many dog breeds that have strong bites.
- Please don't target pit bulls! Pit bulls can be extremely gentle dogs and caring owners/families shouldn't be punished for their responsibility in looking after this misjudged breed. There are already reduced adoption rates of pit bulls, and a targeted bylaw would create more unreasonable fear.
- "Nuisance dogs" is far too vague for me to check any of these boxes. I also firmly believe that pitbull breeds should not be treated any differently than other breeds.
- Ensure that anyone takin an animal to the vet for any reason, has a city license. If they do not, they get reported and fined. They cannot receive vet treatment without being a registered dog or cat. (Emergency services exception).
- Do not automatically assume that pit bulls and pit bull breeds are nuisances. Dogs who are involved in an incident should also not be considered nuisances, but the owners should definitely be fined and/or charged.
- Potential owners should be screened more carefully before they are able to adopt or take on a dog or any form of pets. There should also be checks on animal owners no different than if the family adopted a child or had a baby there should be checks on how they are cared fur./treated
- It is completely outrageous that the city is choosing to pinpoint one breed of dogs when it is the owners that are the issue. My dog has been attacked at the dog park twice this year NOT by a pitbull but by a husky type dog. Stop stereotyping dogs for no reason!!
- Take the pit bull bylaws out of this survey, it is absolutely ridiculous.
- BSL does not work! Stop classifying all pitbulls into a dangerous category based on how they look
- If you spend any time in dog parks you will know that the breed is not the issue it's the owner. Small dogs can be untrained and dangerous. It's the owner not the breed.
- You should not be discriminating against one specific breed and get to know the facts. A Doberman has a stronger bite then that of a pitbull. In order for a dog to learn how to be a model citizen it needs to be spcialized you take that away and you will be creating an even bigger problem for yourselves.
- Pitbulls need to be banned in Calgary. Obviously current owners would be allowed to keep their dogs in this scenario but no further breeding or adoptions of pitbulls should be permitted. Pitbulls are predominantly owned by two types of people : aggressive or naive individuals. The aggressive people own them for their intimidating manner and the naive population think they can save these dogs despite no provision of appropriate training or common sense. Pitbulls are unpredictable and can do way too much damage. Other provinces banned them a long time ago. It's time Alberta takes the risk serious and keep theses dogs out of the wrong hands.
- None of the above should apply
- This is ridoculous...i work with dogs and have for years and the fact that you guys are using the term "pit-bulls" as the only way to describe agression or bad behaviour is disapointing. Ive had WAY MORE bad encounters with small dogs (chihuahuas, westies, daschunds, yorkies ect) and yet none of these breeds were mentioned... just because a large dog can do more damage doesnt mean



EVERY large dog (bully breed) should have to be punished. Small dogs can cause serious problems and behavioural issues when they attack or demonstrate aggressive behaviours. Im so upset about the word usage the city has chosen.

- I strongly oppose breed specific legislation
- Any dog must be muzzled in public if involved a bite incident!
- I feel all dog owners should be educated on dog behavior and good dog ownership.
- Ban Pit bulls
- Punish the owner not the breed. Obedience training for all dogs. Assessment of the home and the dog should taken away found unsuitable.
- Measures put in place to reduce the frequency and severity of dog bites should NOT be breed specific. Rottweilers, German Shepherds, and Dobermans can also cause significant injuries, for example.
- The suggested approaches above show a lack of knowledge by the council proposing them.
- Pit bull type dogs are NOT more dangerous, I think that people that own dogs that have agression issues should be at fault and you deciding a certain breed is bad is just going to create more problems. I think that if a dog is deemed dangerous and the owner isn't being responsible the dog should be attempted to be rehomed before any action such as euthanization is involved. Breed bans do not solve agression.
- There needs to be education put in place for pitbulls if they are going to be singled out. Putting them down or restricting their life to confinement is not pleasant for anyone. There are misconceptions with the breed and there needs to be a valued effort to creating public awareness. Other breeds such as golden retrievers have attacked ppl at 13% while pitbulls remain at 8%. Please do not restrict or restrain or put "financial" measures in place for owners as that has no impact on the dog directly. In this day and age. "racism" against pitbulls needs to be changed.
- One dog breed should not be punished. As stated above *It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds“ It is not fair to single out a dog breed or dogs that “look” like a certain breed.
- DO NOT, I repeat, DO NOT make any breed specific bylaws. A nuisance dog can be any breed and any nuisance dog who bites or is aggressive should be trained accordingly. We should not discriminate by breed and not ban specific breeds, EVER
- Do not diacriminate against a specific breed
- None that's what dog parks are for
- Ban “pit bulls.” <https://www.aaha.org/publications/newstat/articles/2019-06/new-study-identifies-most-damaging-dog-bites-by-breed/>
- “I don’t support breed bans because they don’t work,” said Bill Bruce, the former director of animal services for the city of Calgary, whose animal-control program is considered among the most effective in North America. “We have to get to the root of the problem, and that is that people must maintain control of their animals.”
- Mandatory training for owners of nuicance dogs or review of pet ownership for nuicance pet owners



- The owners also must be evaluated as they are often the cause of the nuisance dog because of the way the animal is treated. Dogs don't just become a nuisance, it is a learned behaviour! Muzzling is not the answer, any type of dog can be a nuisance and shame on people for singling out the pit bulls! Any type of dog can bite and cause harm/ injury to someone.
- Children should be under the supervision of parents at all times in off-leash dog parks. No dog should be declared a nuisance without the city proving, by way of a behaviouralist consultation, that the dog poses any danger when not provoked. No mandates should be given based on the term "pit bull" nor the incorrect "definition" of "pit bull" given above.
- I highly agree with training dogs. Every owner should be. It is absolutely ridiculous to set apart pitbulls because they have the strength to make a severe bite. There are so many breeds that do. As well as a lot of bites from small breeds that are far more common than from pitbulls. Ignorance shouldn't be spread.
- This should not be held to a specific breed. Just as there are poorly behaved humans, there are poorly behaved dogs. Responsibility must be on owners and educating the public on the importance of quickly dealing with problem dogs and ensuring pets are licensed. Unfortunately all too often breeds are "profiled" and a well behaved dog gets caught up in that. It is bias and unfair. Too many in the public are not educated or aware of how to treat/train animals. Awareness and responsible ownership are what's needed, not targeting.
- Pitbulls should not suffer just because the owner isn't incapable of training a dog . Owners of pitbulls should be REQUIRED to attend special training to own a pitbull
- Do not label dog breeds
- Something that is proved to be effective and non discriminatory. Who will be declaring a dog a nuisance. THIS IS DISCRIMINATION!
- Leave "pit bulls" out of it!
- No breed discrimination
- Any owner of a nuisance dog should have to go through training on how to handle that dog. Really ALL dog owners should have to provide proof that they have gone through training for their dog regardless of the breed.
- This is an attack on a breed and all other "like" breed. No one should support this insane bylaw proposal.
- Pitbulls innocent until guilty like all other breeds
- it's not the dog's its the bad owners give them higher fines
- None of the options listed. They should NOT be singled out
- WHY are pitbulls being singled out? Training should be required for all dog owners. I am very disappointed in city council's approach to pitbulls. I thought Calgary city councilors were smarter than this.
- It is shameful to single out pitbulls or any other breed based on their "strength". Dogs are what their owners make them, so why go after the innocent animals that can't defend themselves. This is a new low for City of Calgary, and the city council will not get any support regarding this matter.



- Aiming so many of these questions at pit bulls because they have the potential to bite is not an excuse. Dogs that are cared for and trained are fine, you don't need a breed ban or these extreme measures. It's not the dog or the dog breed, it's the owners. Limiting owners that take good care of their pit bulls to only 1 of them will only lead to higher rates of the dogs being left in shelters because of the perpetuated stereotype that they're inherently dangerous (that this question does not help whatsoever). Be better. Think better. Look at Ontario and the pit bull breed ban - dog bites are on the rise and there haven't been any new pit bulls allowed for 15 years. It doesn't work, and it won't help get you a better by-law. Any dog owner found to be negligent, encouraging their dog to be violent, or training them to fight, etc. should be the target. The dog can be trained to behave well and should be given a second chance in a loving home.
- These are literally the worst ideas I have ever heard. Please do not go through with this. You're going to have so many people upset with you. We're already planning protests.
- There should be absolutely no additional regulations on pit-bull type dogs. The idea that pit-bulls are the problem is ridiculous, and you should do research before proposing this type of legislation. Pet owners should be held responsible for the actions of their pets equally regardless of breed. The argument that pit-bulls can do more damage is also absurd, the larger the dog the more damage they can do.
- Dogs are a product of their environment, breed does NOT determine aggressive behaviours! Deem children a nuisance and require them to not leave the property or require additional child insurance as children cause more damage than any dog.
- Should not single out one breed, I do not support the law against pitbulls and mixed breeds to have a law against them. Good looking out and watch half the city move
- Fine the owners. They are the problem not the breed.
- Owners must attend obedience training as part of adoption and fostering as ALL dogs follow owners or handlers direction. It is NOT the dog nor its breed. I am 100% against breed discrimination. I am also 100% for both Calgary's police, City of Calgary Authorities and shelters, pounds, etc. to have EVERY employee and volunteer to take dog classes as people in all positions come with their own luggage and bias and every dog suffers as a result of poor or non-existent personnel and authorities who may not even like dogs.
- Rules that are NOT breed specific. Pitbulls are often less naturally aggressive. Let's have responsible owners and training for people to understand. Bites are often provoked (not all the time, but often), the person provoking is let off while the dog is often rehomed or euthanized, how does instigator get off free? Obedience training for all breeds would be a good start.
- training for owners of dogs declared a nuisance
- The responsibility of issues with dogs should be on the owner NOT breed specific.
- There needs to be a limit of the number of Dogs allowed in one residence.
- Bully Breeds need to be included. Not just pit bulls. Any breed of dog can be aggressive.
- The fact that you single out "bull terriers" by name and nature is offensive and unwarranted. I may not be a personal fan of the breed, but I would never single out. Again, this is all about wording and actions. What you have listed here is antagonistic in nature. I am sure that you would never list a



toy poodle, that constantly nips at people as a nuisance due to its size, but they can be just as dangerous. Choose your words VERY carefully and ensure that you elaborate on any details that will be called to task. Such as MOST of this list.

- I think this section of the bylaw is ridiculous. Many pit bull owners have well behaved dogs and you are punishing everyone for the issues with a few. I DO NOT SUPPORT ANY OF THESE CHANGES!
- Proper training for all owners of all breeds of dogs. I don't believe like you said in your question "while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds", there needs to be better training as owners who adopt and take care of animals. It's not the breeds fault. It is however the on the owners to train all breeds properly.
- Do not make breed specific legislation. All breeds of dogs can be dangerous. Please stop this "pit bull" term. And use dog only. You are creating a horrible influence/ culture for the public to fear PitBull/ block head dogs. You are doing a horrible thing. It's 2020, grow up. BSL has been proven not to be effective.
- Behaviour training for dogs (any breed!) found to be a 'nuisance'. This will help get the owners to take responsibility for their dogs actions...as it is not the dogs fault.
- You can't single out 'pit bull' breeds that would be like singling out people based on their colour because of stigmas that are associated with their colour and in this case their breed
- make PEOPLE take a course in proper handling of a dog. It's the owner, not the dog that's the problem.
- Singling out one breed (bsl) is discriminatory if you feel it's necessary to legislate obedience training it should be done for all dogs pit bulls and bully breeds are not unique to disobedience if you are mandating obedience training it needs to be done for all breeds regardless of size ferocity there are many dog owners that have dogs that do not listen and are a nuisance but fly under the radar because they are small or deemed a friendly breed
- Any other dog can bite responsible pit bull owners should not be punished
- "Nuisance" requires firm definition and not left to subjective judgement of a by-law officer. Owners of dogs declared a nuisance must attend dog-ownership/handling class.
- Owner education is key. Breed specific legislation is unnecessary.
- All bylaw should be non breed specific. I have sheltered two pit bulls that are now reactive due to bites from a miniature chow and a Pyrenees ...both were on leash at the time whereas the others were not. I believe that all dogs should be leashed at ALL TIMES unless they are in a designated off leash park.
- Breed specific legislation is not appropriate. A nuisance dog is a nuisance dog....require the owners to commit to training. Pit bulls are not the issue here.
- Breed specific legislation is ineffective.
- Your definition of nuisance is too broad. Barking or roaming should not have any bearing on muzzling in parks etc. If the dog has bitten before then yes. Pit bulls should not be singled out from other breeds.
- nothing breed specific. Regardless if a chihuahua bites or a shepherd bites, a nuisance dog is a nuisance dog. DO NOT pass this on to breeds, breed lookalikes just because of their title. ²



- These are all ridiculous and very biased towards pit bull type breeds. It's the owners that make dogs aggressive.
- No separate treatment based on dog breed
- Don't fine for animals that don't know better fine idiot owners for poor training. Dogs are not inherently bad based on breed. This is the same as profiling which is also unacceptable.
- The whole pitbull thing is [removed] RIDICULOUS. A DOG IS BAD BECAUSE OF OWNERS. NOT BECAUSE OF BREED.
- None of the above! They may have "the strength" as stated but you should be looking at dogs in general! Not singling out specific breeding
- None of the above!
- I would agree that nuisance dogs have higher requirements depending on the definition of nuisance. If a nuisance dog is defined by its breed then no, however if a dog is defined by past experiences then yes.
- Don't you [removed] dare single out one breed over another!!! A nuisance dog is just as likely to be a chihuahua as a "pit bull". Shame on you City of Calgary!!!
- It is horribly wrong for the City of Calgary to condone for breed specific targeting. We're better than this. You should put muzzles on Shitzus. They are extremely nervous and pose a threat.
- Please ban pitbulls! They are bred to attack and they are dangerous!
- Mandatory education for owners of dogs with severe biting offenses
- NOTHING - ALL DOGS ARE EQUAL - PUNISH BAD OWNERS
- Stop being [removed] about pitbull type breeds and do some [removed] research would be a [removed] suggestion you idiots. Ban small happy dogs. Ban labradors and retrievers. Ban chihuahuas. Ban dachshunds. Ban German Shepherds. Etc. Dogs that are ACTUALLY a problem. Which are not pitbulls. If you did any research. Like I suggested.
- Owners should be required to take some kind of course on training their dogs. There are no bad dogs only bad owners
- Calgary has put out a survey of proposed bylaws. They designate basically any breed that has a chunky head or a stalky build be deemed a 'pit bull', and goes on to list multiple bylaws that would penalize owners and pets alike if a dog falls under these physical descriptions. The discrimination and uneducated biases present in these proposals makes my blood boil with sadness, frustration and anger. Their attempted "we aren't making judgment because of how they look, definitely not propagating fear of a breed due to that breed being exploited, abused and subsequently misrepresented in the media in the past" asterisk basically translates to: 'were not saying pit bull type dogs are more likely to bite, we know they're not, they just have a strong jaw which would be damaging if they did bite, so that's why they should be discriminated against'. That's literally the same thing as, "theoretically someone with darker skin would be less easy to see in darkness, so they'd be better at robbing and participating in crime at night. Not that they would do that, it's just easier for them. So they should be required to wear head lamps and hi-vis at night, and be fined if they're out too late. Oh and they just straight up aren't allowed near any homes or businesses that could be robbed." Despicable. I have a pit bull. She is sweet, gentle, intelligent and caring. She is



obsessed with meeting new people and dogs and loves for play time with every person, animal or toy. My wife and I also have a newborn, and I challenge anyone to see my posts of how our pit bull Minnow interacts with my daughter Primrose and tell me her breed is intrinsically aggressive. Any dog has the potential for damage, the potential for aggression. The important variable is love, attention, and training. Not the strength of their jaw. Maybe you still have your doubts about the breed, if so I really would love to chat and tell you more about my experience as an owner, or maybe offer insight into a negative experience you may have had with a bully breed; I love discussion, and before we even looked for a pit bull my wife and I did heaps of extensive research on the breed. I'd love to do my best to answer any questions you may have. Hopefully you agree with me, and hopefully you will help bring awareness to this ongoing issue. Please take this survey and share your thoughts with the City of Calgary. My heart is breaking for the pit owners in Calgary, I cannot fathom the sense of fear and anger they must be feeling while faced with this heartless threat to the happiness and wellbeing of them and their pets. These pets are family members, people's rocks to lean on, paws to hold, eyes that look at them only with love, through life's challenges, a persistent pandemic, maybe mental health, who knows. This cannot stand.

- training should be universal and not discriminatory, if you want to impose higher fines or mandatory training, do it across the board. many breeds are more aggressive and less trainable than pit bulls.
- Higher punishment for animal abusers. There's no difference in animal breeds and blaming a dog for being strong is like blaming a child for being strong. If a strong child hurts another child. We blame the parent- not the child.
- Shame on you for proposing a breed specific ban on bully breeds! This approach has not ever worked in the past in other cities who have implemented this type of bylaw. Stop blaming the dogs for bad ownership. Furthermore, the first question in your questionnaire should have been: do you support a BSL or not and why. Your questionnaire is biased and completely inappropriate for those who do not support this proposal.,
- Pit bulls are the most gentle dogs when they are raised by the right people the stigma on Pitbulls needs to end. The pitbulls you see biting people are trained to attack people
- [removed] dogs are on owners not breeds
- To quote above: " *It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." A pit bull's bite (measured via "Pound-force per Square Inch" or PSI) is weaker than a German Shepherd, a Doberman, a Chow-Chow, and is only slightly stronger than a Labrador. You are making laws and rules based on misinformation and are spreading false facts and fear. Please stop. I am not a pit bull owner, my dog is 150lbs and could probably take out a pit bull if he wanted to - however; with proper training he doesn't, even when attacked. So think twice, any rules and regulations you place against a specific breed is a horrible thing to do. Change the rules for all breeds and enforce good and responsible ownership. i have been bitten more and attacked by small dogs like a chihuahua, a bichon, and a spaniel because the humans seem to think because they are small, they are not able to cause harm. Which is a bigger issue. Please note this is not a satisfactory excuse to discriminate against the pit bull/terrier breed. Dogs OF ANY BREED



declared a nuisance must be muzzled in public, including off-leash parks. Obedience training required for ALL BREEDS/DOGS. ANY BREED OF DOG that is declared a nuisance cannot be in off-leash parks. Higher fines for DOGS OF ANY BREED, involved in bylaw offences.

- None of the above. This is discrimination over outdated ideas. How about a bylaw that ALL dogs require training? How about all or none for every policy mentioned. All dogs wear muzzles in dog parks?
- None
- Obedience training should be required for all dogs and dog owners!
- I will not support and breed specific legislation. It makes absolutely no sense to single out a specific type of dog. Particularly when you consider “e” in your description of a pit bull type. A dog with pit bull characteristics could be anything from a Labrador retriever to a Boston terrier mix. Basically any dog with short hair and a broad muzzle can be labeled as a pit bull! I am a certified professional dog trainer and on the Behaviour team at an animal shelter. I have met a large amount of dogs with behavioral issues that could put them in to the above description of a “nuisance dog” and they have been a complete range of breeds. Long haired, short haired, large and small.
- Training for owners and offer money for that when people can’t afford it.
- It is absolutely disgusting that you all at city council are trying to push this through. Even this questionnaire is extremely rigged. Pitbull type dogs are not the problem. They are no more dangerous than other dogs. Any proper research would not only confirm this but also show that BSL has never lowered dog bites or attacks. I do not agree with this possible motion to pass. I will not ever muzzle my bully dog. Shame on you.
- The breed of dog does not guarantee it’s behaviour nor does it guarantee its tendency for aggression. It is a biased and discriminatory belief. Educating dog owners AND non dog owners on dog approachability and behaviour is what is needed.
- Any dog no matter the breed if shows aggression and involved in offenses should the owner take proper precautions. Doesn’t matter the breed. Not all pitbulls are bad
- Singling out pit bulls is the same as racism. Think about it.
- I cannot believe that this city is actually think of BSL!!! this is outrageous, jerman Shephards, chihuahuas, any dog is raised by a bad owner can be a bad dog!!! Why people keep picking on and blaming pitbulls, these dogs are so mistreated abused, abandoned and made to fight for their lives when all they want is to be loved. I Totally disagree with BSL!!!!
- Please look into small dogs who have a higher bite ratio then pitbulls, this is basically racism just with dogs. Pitbulls don’t bite if trained yet if your tiny yappy little mutt bites me it’s considered cute. I’d rather have small dogs needing to be muzzled in public I’ve been attacked and they scare me. Quit saying pitbulls are bad. I will never support anything that bans pitbulls.
- Absolutely do not single individual breeds out like some of these proposed measures.
- No BSL. Higher fines for any and all dogs involved in bylaw offences.
- Many of these “pit-bull-looking” dogs are not the problem. Traumatized dogs and improper owners are what creates aggressive dogs. Not breed. Specific breeds and owners of these dogs should not be penalized if they are well-behaved dogs.



- Don't put muzzle on dogs that's an [removed_ move how about if someone put a muzzle on you
- Crack down on the people who train them to be mean it is not the dogs fault pit bulls are loving sweet dogs. STOP Discriminating
- Start a bad owner and bad breeder registry and ebeb ban people from owning animals after multiple offenxes.
- Implement a mandatory training class for anyone looking to rescue a dog from some type of shelter. Aggressive behaviour is NOT breed specific. It is due to lack of training and bad ownership, not bad dogs.
- This is a 100% attack on the bully breeds!!!... there are many other "nuisance" dog breeds out there that are far more aggressive. Perhaps the city of Calgary needs to educate themselves on the bully breed and even go met some!
- Seperating out "pit bulls" like this is feeding into stereo-typing of these loving and amazing dogs. Don't let BAD OWNERS ruin it for the people that actually love and care for their pets.
- Why not focus on boosting the economy, rather than discrimination or bias towards a breed of dog. It's the [removed] owners NOT THE BREED! Idiots!
- NONE
- Enforce this with all breeds. Small dogs seem to be the worst and it's put off onto pitbull owners who actively try to work with their dogs. Chihuahuas are actually the devil. Muzzle them too if you insist on implementation of an archaic bylaw.
- No discriminatory treatment for pit bulls and other block headed dogs. Also, a means for pet owners to protect themselves from neighbours/ citizens who file frequent complaints that are libellous or fabricated.
- Obedience trading for any dogs who were bread for fighting and guarding. (Rottweiler, Doberman, Huskies, German Shepard, Great Pyrenees etc). This should not just be towards pit bulls. There is some data that there is actually more attacks by huskies than pit bulls. It should not be about breeds it should be about the capability of the owner. Little dogs can bite too...
- Fines for off leash dogs in non designated off leash areas
- I think it's terrible that you are breed- shaming pit bulls. Some of the most gentle dogs I know are pitties and some of the nastiest are smallest dogs like chihuahuas and poodles. ANY BREED that is a nuisance should be dealt with in an appropriate manner. Shame on you Calgary.
- Higher fines for any dog owners of any type of breed that are involved in bylaw offences
- none of the above, i dont know which of your donors its pushing for this nonsense but it warrants an inquiry
- do not focus on a dog breed. Jack Russell terriers can be just as dangerous as a "pitbull" it is not the breed. It is the dog. 10 years ago Toronto made that decision. Now they are looking at reversing it.
- Why are pit bulls being singled out when other dogs, such as German Shepherds and other dogs can be just as much a bite hazard and a dangerous dog. I think this bylaw regarding pitbulls is outdated and needs to be rethought..



- I have found that small dogs like chihuahuas are much more aggressive than bigger breeds like pitbulls. Putting a muzzle on a dog will further hinder their development and socialization. The problem lies with how individuals train their dogs. Not the breed.
- Owners should be responsible for their dogs. Please do not be breed specific and punish a lot of good dogs and good, responsible dog owners. Many mixed breed dogs can have a pit bull like appearance. Are you going to eliminate all large dogs? History has taught us this not an effective measure and you will in effect be ordering genocide of a particular species. Is this who we've become? KILLERS?
- I would wholeheartedly support a requirement that any and all dogs in the city should receive some basic minimum of obedience/socialization training before they may be allowed off-leash in public or unfenced private areas within the city. Obedience training strengthens communication and the cooperative bond between the pet and owner and calms dog behaviour. A well trained dog is usually happier, calmer, less aggressive, more manageable, and safer. I believe broad support and compliance could be encouraged by discounted or waived licence fees and/or city support for discounted fees for training from obedience schools that might benefit from increased enrolment. Canine obedience training is a net good. For the pet. For the owner. For the community. I DO NOT support breed specific restrictions or the stigmatization of any breed to satisfy a misinformed or fearful perception, however widespread or popular. The City of Calgary animal by-laws have served as a constructive example of science-and-common-sense based balance with specific regard to its policies addressing aggressive dog behaviours as well as its recognition that Pit Bull-type dogs - while powerful - are not more likely to be aggressive than other breeds. Calgary has been recognized and cited as a leader in this regard. Please don't screw that up, now.
- Pit bulls are not a nuisance, the people who train them badly are. Instead, focus on regulating breeders and ensuring that those that purchase the dogs are responsible owners.
- the ability to remove the nuisance status with proof of training and demonstrated obedience test.
- A dogs behaviour is not the dogs fault. It is a reflection of the owner and upbringing. An "aggressive" dog stems from most likely an aggressive owner therefor they should be at fault, not the dog. If a dog reacts the home should be evaluated and controlled and the dog should be given the benefit of the doubt. Wearing a muzzle and being restricted will mean less exercise for a dog, less affection and less interactions which all lead to an un healthy and unsocialized dog. I understand when a dog reacts it's easy to blame the dog but I hop we can give these beautiful dogs a chance and educate owners on dog behaviour. Change all of these questions to "poorly behaved child" and this wouldn't be a survey.
- Pitbulls are no different from any other breed. If someone is bit by one, it's not because of the breed, it's because of the owners irresponsibility from training their dog as a gaurd dog. They are no worse than chihuauas. Ive heard more stories about people and pets being attscked by small dogs more so than pitbulls. People are only afraid of them because the stories they hear or choose to believe about the breed. They are nanny dogs!! They are good dogs. Don't make people give up their fur babies because someone is afraid of their appearance.



- Fund a foster care program for dogs. Identify the owners conflicts — do not put down animals because the owners are lacking structure.
- Pitbulls are not worse than any other power breed and small dogs can do even worse damage such as to nerves and small bones.
- It is unfair and not reasonable to put all “pit bulls” under the same bylaws as nuisance dogs. The breeds in general are not the problem, it’s the owners (lack of training, or inappropriate training) that needs to be addressed. Any dog of any breed can be a nuisance. There are many large breeds that can do the same damage as a “pit bull breed”. Boxers, Rottweilers, shepherds, malamutes, etc. Deal with the owners, not the well trained family pets.
- Fine the owner for irresponsible training of said dog it’s not the dogs fault.
- Dogs should be controlled by owners but no discrimination should be allowed from people who don’t know your dog
- Particular breeds are not the problem. Owners are the problem. There needs to be better owner education/screening. One should need a certification or license to own a pet, much like being able to drive a car.
- Your definition of "pitbull" is extremely vague, and there have been no studies showing their bite strength to be any different or stronger than any other breed. Your 4th definition allows for visual breed discrimination of any dog that could be simply a combination of any number of breeds that end up looking a certain way. I really feel that there should be conditions of dog ownership that require verification of training prior to issuing a license, with higher fees until said education is complete, as opposed to simply targeting dogs for the way they look.
- I do not support breed specific bylaws or higher fines for certain breeds.
- Why are Pit bulls being targeted when there are more aggressive and more uncontrollable dogs out there.
- Anyone who wants to have a "specific breed" considered "Bully-breed" should be mandated to take training through a reputable trainer/behaviourist.
- There are way more well behaved pit bulls at dog parks than small dog breeds because people don’t think they have to train small dogs. All of the bites I have seen have been from small dogs. Also, can you please create a rule that children under the age of 5 are not allowed to run around off leash parks? This is so dangerous and there are a lot of places little kids can play whereas less places for dogs to be off leash.
- Obedience training to be required for all nuisance dogs. If pit bulls are not to be allowed in off leash parks then their own bully breed specific off leash park. Calgary community standard if anything should be able to have the right to issue mandatory evaluation by a CERTIFIED animal behaviourist for dogs exhibiting dangerous behaviours and if deemed so by said behaviourist obedience classes.
- I don't think we should be looking at pitbulls as a whole it's not the dog it's the owner how they are trained. Maybe when people are buying bully breeds we should be making sure they are going to good homes.
- Further training for bylaw officers and how to adequately deal with dogs without creating high stress environment for the animal and owners



- Any dog can be dangerous, deal with Dangerous Dog label rather than BSL too much emphasis being placed on a specific breed. Deal with poor owners that don't train and their dog has become Dangerous no matter what the Breed.
- Small dogs held accountable too. The small breeds are more aggressive, only ever been bitten by a small dog. And the small dogs bark constantly.
- No differentiation in legislation based on dog breed. It's ignorant and just plain asinine.
- This is [removed] sorry my rude language but pit bulls have been criminalized to the point where people think they need separate rules. There is absolutely nothing wrong with this breed.
- NO BYLAWS BASED ON BREED OR APPEARANCE. It is ludicrous and unfair. Breed is not the problem, responsible ownership is!
- NONE! Its a dog, get over your self. The only thing you need is tougher laws, jail time and fines for owners! God created all creatures for a reason who are we to deiced which breed lives and dies! You want kids to learn to accepted all people but hate a certain breed, do you hear how dumb that sounds
- None of these suggestions is fair. Responsible owner ship should be encouraged and supported.
- When the city or agencies within the city adopt out a pitbull, a 'set up for success package' should be provided to owners. This would entail how to positive reinforce pitbulls (all dogs). People with assault criminal backgrounds should not have a pitbull. They need to go into good homes where they're safe and not abused. Pitbulls are targetted by the public for being bad. Pitbulls should not be targetted. I've had more issues with border collies and German Shepard attacking my dog. I've never seen bad behavior by a pitbull at a dog park (we go everyday) and the owners are usually very responsible.
- pitbulls do not have a stronger bite than other dogs, and no breed should be targeted because of its breed.
- Ban these types of dogs and their arrogant owners.
- ban them
- While I understand the reasoning behind "pit bulls", this should include ALL dogs, the little ones too.
- Screening for those who are looking to purchase a pit or nuisance breed. Breeds aren't the problem. It's people who are. This is shameful city of Calgary. An embarrassment that you've bought into the propaganda associated with stereotyping breeds
- This is not the minority report, you can't punish people and their dogs for things that haven't happened yet. And you can't make the punishment more severe because of a breed of dog. Chihuahua's are fairly aggressive, but just because they're too small to cause serious damage doesn't mean the owner should be able to get away with poor training.
- There are just as many problems with tiny dogs being a nuisance as there are large dogs. By discriminating again a breed, you are singling them out and their owners when there are plenty of small dogs who have cause just as much damage,
- If you're going to implement rules like this on pit bulls, please consider chihuahuas and toy poodles as well. This is ignorant.
- Singling our a breed is not fair. More focus on bad or neglectful owners, not the animal or breed itself.



- Mandatory training for OWNERS, requiring a special license or certification to own, that must be periodically updated with testing (commands, recall, socialization, etc.). Restrict the owners; NOT the breed! Allow for "nuisance" dogs to appeal their status after proof of training and improved behaviours where applicable.
- Breed specific legislation is garbage. Do not regulate Pitbull types any differently than other breeds.
- How about ALL dogs in "Nuisance" category. This is called Responsible PET OWNERSHIP bylaw...stop segregating breeds...it's all the owner's responsibility.
- No fines, mandated classes to help the owner and pet improve their life together
- No laws based on breed types.
- That you rethink this approach as pit bulls are no stronger than Shepard's
- All dogs can be a "nuisance" if not trained to behave properly. And not only "pit bulls" are dangerous. STOP discriminating dogs and people. What is wrong with the world. You people are sick!
- I think the clause about dogs resembling the look of pit bulls should be removed. This is NOT fair to the responsible pet owners who specifically chose NOT to have a pitbull.
- Whatever bylaw is passed needs to address all dogs and should not in any way single out a specific breed or specific look
- Specific dog behaviour and breed knowledge training for all bylaw officers, city officials and staff, LEOs, city and non-city representatives, tribunal staff and officers. Proposing this type of new or updated bylaw clearly demonstrates a deep ignorance of canine behaviour and trying to paint certain breeds because of their structure and/or stereotypes reflects PETA and its like misguided and ill intended agenda.
- Would depend on why the dog is declared a nuisance. If declared a nuisance for noise violation does not make sense for this dog to be muzzled in public.
- Rather than punishing the dog, punish the human. Now I understand that is what a fine has the goal of doing. I agree yes if a dog acts out fine the owner responsible but don't only look into a specific breed BSL is wrong and is literally dog racism. A dog's behaviour reflects its owner, rather than making obedience classes mandatory for dogs why not make owners who seem to not be able to control or train their pets attend training courses.
- ALL dogs should be required to take obedience training (stop being racist to dogs)
- There is absolutely no need to have breed specific laws. Pit bulls are abundant in this day and age. They are not bad dogs. I have a pit myself and I will not have my right to own more than one stripped from me! I believe there are broken and very dangerous dogs out there! Of all breeds though! And those dogs should be either trained or unfortunately put down. But quit bullying my breed :(
- More rules on Pit Bulls. They are dangerous, I have been attacked in Dover by a roaming pitbull. One would tear my friendly black lab up in minutes.
- there should be mandatory proper training for ALL dogs. Owners need to know and research before the ability to have a dog.
- Obedience training mandatory for all dogs. Regardless of breed.
- Owners are the problem, I know of 2 labs that are vicious so you shouldn't stereotype!



- There should be absolutely no support for breed-specific legislation, instead EVIDENCE BASED methods should be used.
- NO Pit Bull Only legislation at all. That is unfair to the breed, the owner and the community. This type of legislation has been protested harshly in other countries and will only cause more harm than good. The breed itself is not responsible for uneducated dog owners. As stated Bully breeds are NOT top of the list for dog bites. This kind of attention to the breed is responsible NOT for accurate education but instilling fear where it does not need to be. Making the public afraid of one of the breed that was historically referred to as the Nanny Dog for its amazing protection and companionship of children, is absurd. Mark my words, this will only cause massive protest and negative attention to the city in an already crazy time. Please think again about this and the repercussions. Educating Bully owners should be first and foremost. The owners of poorly behaved bully breeds need help... not the dogs. Any legislation singling them out would be extremely devastating to the owners and negative for the City. Barbi Procinski
- Absolutely ridiculous of Calgary to even consider bylaws such as these for pit bulls in the first place.
- None of these options. Nuisance breeds are nonsense, any breed regardless of size or physical appearance can be dangerous. Labelling dogs with a specific physical appearance is dangerous, prejudicial, and creates a false sense of security.
- Do not be breed biased. The laws should apply to all breeds equally.
- It's not the breed, it's the owner. don't punish a dog who hasn't been properly cared for by the owner.
- I have no other, just wanted a space to say BSL is a terrible idea and I'm embarrassed that we are considering it. Give your head a shake [removed]!
- Case by case basis. As small dogs cause many bites especially with children. No discrimination against pit bulls. Also I think there should be time slots available for nuisance dogs to be in an off leash park like after 8pm or before 8am to avoid contact with children and many other dogs. Definitely should NOT order a bad dog to stay at home as their behaviour would worsen and that is torture.
- Making this about anything that looks like a pit bull is quite literally, stupid. I have been bitten by dogs before, none of them pit bulls. Either make these suggestions for ALL dogs or none.
- ALL DOGS should be held to the standard of if being aggressive or a nuisance should be charged. This isn't a breed issue this is an owner issue.
- This is ridiculous. My sisters dog has the look of one of these dogs but is a full Labrador. Yes I get pit bulls have a stronger bite. But if it were people you'd never be specifying this completely. Deal with the real issue. The owners. Give your heads a shake. Ive had more Small dogs bite me than bigger dogs. Deal with the actual problem.
- No pit bulls in YYC
- [removed]
- I don't support a special treatment of pit bulls. I think we should instead concentrate on things such as protecting animals against cruelty and educating the public on proper dog training, the importance of exercise, etc.
- Nuisance dogs and owners must attend mandatory dog and owner training with a certified trainer.



- When a dog bites, it must be muzzled in public.
- Pitbulls should not be scapegoated. This is very wrong
- Breed specific regulations are ridiculous.
- Higher fines for repeat biting dogs regardless of breed
- We have had more incidents with small breeds such as Chihuahua and Pomeranians than any pit bull or bully breeds! STOP singling out the bully breeds!!!! The bylaws should stay all breeds, and or dog that becomes a nuisance.
- Pitbulls and other dog breeds are not the issue. It is educating both dog and owner how to properly curb this behavior and keep others safe. Legislating against these dogs is ridiculous. I've met many pitties and like breeds, they are some of the kindest and gentlest dogs I've met.
- Calgary has received praise in many articles on how it handled these topics, from seeing that the statistics do not support what Toronto/Ontario has tried to do with bully breeds. There has been no improvement in dog bites/attacks from even completely banning some breeds. There has to be more education and training for both owners and all dog breeds
- ANY dog that bites once should be muzzled period. Pit bulls should not be discriminated against or targeted in this way, absolutely unfair to make these statements based on a dogs appearance. It should be any dog that bites no matter what the breed.
- It should be a case by case basis. It's the owners fault if the dog is not trained no matter what breed it is. Not all pit bulls are mean. Some are scared and friendly and do not need to be muzzled. Dalmatians are the most aggressive breed and same with chihuahuas and corgies.
- All owners should have to go through training before owning ANY dog. Pit bulls or bully breeds are not the problem. Irresponsible dog owners are.
- why are you suddenly picking on pitbulls and xbreeds. Plenty of other breeds are responsible for bites and fights. Please do not pass this bill. It makes no sense at all . Case by case is the best way to go rather than a blanket ban on PITBULLS.
- Dogs are not the problem. Bad owners are.
- I think any breed specific legislature targeting pit bulls is extremely unfair and inappropriate given that you have STATED they're not more involved in biting incidents than other dogs. I am not a pitbull owner but this is extremely problematic thinking and I'm disappointed that such a thing would even be considered.
- Case by case. I do not own a pit myself but many are great dogs and shouldn't be judged by the way they look. Othrr breeds bite as well so case by case things should be judged.
- Not breed specific. People can make any dog mean
- Putting more information out there on how to identify, handle and protect yourself if a dog decides to attack. With all Davis not just specifically one breed..the pitbull bylaws are dog racism 100%
- Required training for misbehaved dogs
- Use the money made through fines to fund educational programs regarding nuisance dogs, such as: pop up info stands for WHY a dog might be a nuisance dog (Ie. Anxiety, past abuse, poor training techniques, etc.) Putting pressure on the owners of "bully breeds" to get rid of, or hide, their bully



breeds is abusive. It will not increase the quality of life for these dogs or owners, and does not guarantee a safe space. Bully breeds are not the problem. The people are the problem. EDUCATE!

- Don't ban and blame a specific breed of dog, pit bulls are not the problem it's bad owners, requiring all pit bulls to wear muzzles off of private property is the stupidest by law ever. Abolish this bylaw and stop blaming a specific breed of dogs.
- I do not support breed specific legislation. I would rather see education and training services offered
- There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Pit bulls are not the issue. Passing a bylaw stating that pitbulls cannot go to the dog park is outrageous and discriminatory.
- Pit bulls as a breed are less dangerous than German Shephard, Husky, Great Dane, and other large size breeds. these bylaws are discriminatory to a species of dog. Poor ownership should be the main outlook for these programs rather than blanketing all owners with insignificant measures.
- You can not discriminate against "pit bull" breeds, it's is unconstitutional, immoral and wrong! Any dog is only as good as it's owner and this is disgusting that it's even suggested!
- ANY dog that has a confirmed history of unprovoked serious attacks/biting should be muzzled in public including off leash parks; NOT all nuisance dogs; NOT all pit bulls. We should not single out any particular breed or those with only minor offences
- Requiring obedience training/muzzles/not allowing in parks based on the owner and not the breed of dog because that's what actually matters.
- Didn't we all just stand up for racism? It's inappropriate to judge someone by how they look. How is it appropriate to judge a dog for how they look? They didn't choose to look that way either. Be racist against these little ones who can't stand up for themselves or hold riots. Calgary is being ridiculous. All the more reason for people not to license their dogs now.
- DO NOT BE BREED SPECIFIC IN YOUR BYLAWS. This is a dangerous precedent and can actually result in legal challenges to your bylaw. Determine the characteristics that qualify as a "nuisance dog" without naming specific breeds.
- Stop judging dogs by there breads.
- Absolutely do not support Breed Specific Legislation. Responsibility is on the owner not the breed. Ie neighbour's shitzu is not trained and aggressive. I would welcome a neighbour with a trained pit bull over an aggressive small breed.
- Only because there is no other place to specify this. I am ADAMANTLY against breed specific restrictions. There are so many loving bully breed dogs that don't deserve this form of breed discrimination. Increase fines for bad/irresponsible owners. Don't punish good dogs and responsible owners for the actions of others. Fines, standards, and punishments should be the same for all breeds. You can do better.
- It is absolutely stupid to single out a specific breed. Pit bulls are not more aggressive than other breeds, and singling them out is only perpetuating the stereotypes of these kinds of dogs. A dog should be looked at for the content of its character, not for specific physicalities - just like people. Do not punish pit bulls for behaviour they have not exhibited.



- There is no scientific based study showing pit bulls are more dangerous. please do not breed discriminate. A dog that has been at large or is declared a nuisance for barking is not prevented by wearing a muzzle, I don't understand your logic.
- I work in a store partnered with a rescue, and have sustained more serious injuries from chihuahuas than "dogs that look like pitbulls". Stop profiling dogs based on how they look. It is not their fault that people in the past made them SEEM like a "dangerous breed". There is NOTHING inherently more dangerous about a dog that you THINK looks more dangerous. Bringing in a "nuisance" dog classification will only encourage people to make false accusations and reports against dogs, or people, that they do not like. This legislation will only deter responsible pet ownership, and will just encourage those few fearful and uneducated individuals to spread their fear and nonsense. Do not do this.
- Pit bulls are excellent dogs. Please stop discriminating against the breed. Its ultimately the owner who requires the training to teach a dog properly. Theres no such thing as a bad dog
- Stop picking on specific breeds!!It is the OWNERS responsibility to train any BREED!! OWNERS need to be legally charged and not allowed to own any animal IF they fail to train animals and care for them!! Not just Pitbull breeds! This really makes me furious as I have been attacked and chased by SMALL dogs!! PLEASE stop blaming breeds as it is the OWNERS responsibility to teach, care, and provide for THEIR dog!! Dogs are NOT born aggressive!! HUMANS are the issue 100%!!!
- This is just stupid
- Any dog can bite! I think the city is barking at the wrong end of the leash!! How about training schools for people before they adopt a dog!! Apply to when they think of having children too!!
- None of these laws are acceptable. Ruling a dog is "vicious" because of the breed is pure crap. These dogs you are listing are literally dubbed "nanny dogs" cause they are so gentle and such happy dogs. The dogs aren't the problem if THAT ONE DOG THAT HAPPENS TO BE A PITBULL bites someone. It's 100% the owners negligence and the owners poor training. Don't ruin my chance of owning good Pitbull because someone else is stupid.
- Stop villainizing pittbulls this is ridiculous...higher fines for off leash dogs in an leash area without discriminating against a certain breed.
- Dont blame the breed blame the owner.
- Nothing, if these types of dogs are not more involved in dog bites than other dogs than there should be no reason to punish those who have a good dog, whether it's a pit bull or not. All dogs should be treated equally, especially if they have not done anything wrong. Everydog has a possibility of biting.
- Enforce measures taken based on offence for all breeds, not just those declared a nuisance. The root of the problem starts with pet owner, not genetics of the dog. I understand the strength of the bite piece, however a blanket approach to an entire breed is unfair. I would be in favor of providing education/supports to educate the public on healthy dog handling and ownership.
- I believe that pit bulls should not be categorized as a "nuisance" pet while chihuahua's, border collies, beagles, and other common household dogs score LOWER on a temperament test. Pit-bulls should not be demonized as they're very loving dogs. Also, regarding muzzles, many pit-bull cross



breeds find comfort for anxiety through licking, a muzzle would prohibit them from releasing their own problems.

- I do not support breed-specific legislation. ALL dogs regardless of breed should be properly trained and handled (by owners and passersby), but they are animals and things can happen in unpredictable situations. It's usually the peoples' fault (handler and/or passersby) for putting the dog in that situation.
- The specification of pit bulls here is completely ludicrous. Bully breeds already have a stigma against them. Why are they being outed here with an asterisk stating that it's not because they bite more compared to other dogs. This is promoting the idea that Pitt bulls and bully types are a danger to society. Theses dogs don't deserve this.
- Dogs are usually a nuisance due to the owner's behaviour and attitude. Training classes are the best answer.
- Treat all dogs evenly if a small dog bites the owner gets a fine, why only punish large breed owners
- a Pitbulls bite is only 235 PSI. There are 7 dogs with stronger bites. The bite has nothing to do with it. Its the owners. Go after the owners, make them responsible with higher fines for ALL dogs that have been involved in attacks on people and other animals. Be more stringent on repeat owners, up to removing pets and not allowing them to have any more. We have to stop assuming breeds are the problem, its all the owners fault 100% of the time. Even small dog owners need to be held responsible. Pleaae don't make this about the bully breed, they are as wonderful as other dogs.
- There should not be a carve out for pitbulls. You say the reason they are listed is because the bit strength is greater, but you also include dogs that look like pitbulls. This reasoning does not make sense then. How will you determine what dogs looks enough like a pitbull to be captured under this section? Too vague and will cause interpretation issues. Also, the owner is the problem, not the type of dog. German Shepards are involved in more bit incidents than pitbulls.
- No breed specific legislation. ANY Dog can bite or be a nuisance. Any large dog can do the same damage as a pitbull and very few dog attacks not including pitbull go unreported. The media sensationalizes pitbulls and often report dog attacks as pitbulls (though many times have been a completely other breed ie husky, German shepherd). Fines for first offence and increasing fines for repeat offending animals regardless of breeds.
- Breed Bans don't work.
- Stop needless discrimination of dog breeds and penalizing responsible dog owners for the behavior of a small minority.
- Don't pick on pit bulls , we've witch hunted Doberman's , German Shepard, wolfhound, every few years we pick a new breed , make it about the individual dog , not the breed , pit bull lives matter , let's not just by the breed
- I think all licensing (any breed) should contain a requiem for obedience classes. It isn't the breed but rather the owner that sets up circumstances leading to issues. The city is being reactive rather than proactive. Any dog can bite and from someone who required medical treatment from a golden retriever bite, it was never the dog but the owners that caused the issue.
- Pretty sure rottis and mastiffs have strong bites too.. why discrimiate against pitbills



- Fines for humans who do not properly care for their dogs, force free training mandatory if, through the humans negligence, a dog is aggressive.
- Breeds are not the problem. Many dogs have bites stronger than pit bulls. Guilty until proven innocent should not be the path. How about you need a permit to own certain breeds. To get a permit you need to show you aren't a [removed] not capable of owning and training a dog.
- Responsible pet owner act. Extra training, and understanding of breeds is in order. Not a bylaw or extra fines needed for what you consider "nuisance" breeds. But better education and training.
- Off leash parks should not be along pathways
- This is asinine. Pit bulls have a bite strength 5psi above labs and BELOW GERMAN SHEPHERDS!!!! These bylaws strictly support breed specific legislation which has been proven time and again that it does not work! The focus needs to be on responsible dog ownership which includes obedience training for ALL BREEDS, ESPECIALLY CHIHUAHUAS AND SMALL DOGS THAT ARE SIGNIFICANTLY MORE PROBLEMATIC THAN PIT BULLS!!!! Infact, pit bulls were bred as "nanny dogs". Thats right, they are bred to protect CHILDREN!. Change your focus. Responsible pet ownership needs to be the priority, not BSL. Give your heads a shake.
- none of the above
- None of the above should be in place.
- All dogs should be required to have obedience training to be licensed
- Rather single out the animal, ie; Pit Bulls, how about replace that with the OWNER and leave the dogs alone. This breed specific legislation in nonsense.e
- I own a pit bull, he is the sweetest, most submissive dog, and I cannot imagine muzzling him in public for no reason other than his genetics. Putting him in a muzzle would give people the impression that he's aggressive when he isn't at all. Requiring certain breeds be muzzled is absolutely outrageous.
- NONE OF THE ABOVE
- There is a big difference between nuisance and aggressive. That needs clarity. A barking dog vs an aggressive dog are not the same.
- Pit bulls are fantastic dogs and should not be treated differently!
- The inclusion of "pit bull" type dogs into this review lacks principle and basis in objective reality. The potential for a more damaging bite exists for any dog above a certain weight, yet no wide sweeping regulation is proposed for large breed dogs. This demonstrates the hypocrisy of the proposed breed specific legislation. It is clearly driven by unprincipled fearmongering, and I expected better of our public officials than to fall prey to this.
- This is ridiculous Calgary. So ashamed to have to fill this out. Treat all the dogs the same, do not bully our breed.
- Pit bulls are some of the nicest dogs I've met. While I understand that pit bulls have the potential for a more severe bite, that would be like telling someone they can only own one sports car because they're of higher risk of being in an accident. The people that own them tend to know these things. Give them a break.
- Any dog can bite. It should have to be declared a nuisance before it gets extra rules.



- How about train the owners to not be so stupid!
- The criticism toward "Pitbull type" dogs is not with pure motives and intentions. If the ultimate goal is limiting animal bites and getting to the root problem of bite attacks, you would be horribly wrong to place a label on multiple bully breeds based on how they look and human interpretation on their strength, rather than actual aggression of each animal involved in bite attacks, which has the same if not greater potential for severe bites to occur due to aggression. Just as humans are given a fair trial in the courtrooms following a small crime or violent crimes, dogs need to be assessed fairly by professionals in dog behaviour, case by case, and given a fair "trial."
- These rules should apply to all other breeds of dogs that meet the same criteria for "dangerous" if a Lab or chihuahua bites someone it should have the same rules. ALSO. If possible, the city should look into making obedience training mandatory when adopting a dog, and having some form of certificate in person while in public, those who cannot provide this, pay the price.
- Don't you dare try and muzzle an entire breed of dog you morons
- Shame on you city of Calgary for being breed racist. All large breed dogs (or as you would say bully breeds) need is a good home and some additional behaviour training.
- Targeting a specific breed is irresponsible. Target in nuisance animals.
- Fines for owners, not the dogs. The dog is a reflection of what it is taught, so if it bites someone its because the owner has not properly trained it. And therefore is unfit to own the dog.
- Any "pit bull" related bylaws such as these suggested are BSL (breed specific legislation) and is basically dog racism. Just because a "pit bull" type dog is strong does NOT make it any more likely to bite and in fact, these breeds are some of the sweetest I've ever encountered. By your logic, any dog over 50 lbs could be considered a high risk for a severe due to their strength when, in fact, most dog bites are caused by smaller dogs that are never considered for such bylaws.
- Do not discriminate against breeds of dogs. It's just silly. It is not the dogs fault, it is the owner's. Responsible owners should not be penalized for the actions of the irresponsible. There are PLENTY of dogs that have the strength of a pitbull. It has nothing to do with strength and everything to do with proper socialization. Innocent pitbull puppies will have a much harder the socializing if subject to discriminatory penalties and laws. This reinforces the issue. In addition, it creates a bad image for what is an amazing breed of dog, and it's relatives.
- Any fines or consequences need be defined by the action or event and the severity of it. Not breed. We are all against racial profiling so why are we doing the same thing here with dog breed. Quit virtue signaling and solve real problems. Your statement says that pit bull type dogs are not involved in higher number of bite incidents so deal with every case on an individual basis. I also find it hard to select any boxes because although I agree with harsher penalties for nuisance dogs, however, you are already trying to declare pitbull "type" dogs as nuisance dogs so no matter what box I select it will still be applied to some irrational preconceived notion that has already been decided.
- In one paragraph you have 'pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents', proceed to write 'A list of measures that other municipalities have taken to reduce the frequency and severity of dog bites', and then follow with statements targeting pit bulls. This is a very biased survey and should NOT be



focusing on a single breed or type of dog. Instead, some of the statements listed should be applied to all dogs. For example, all dogs should be required to have obedience training. All dogs should have high fines for breaking the bi-laws. Instead of pushing an anti-bully agenda, how about Calgary starts taking action against all irresponsible owners? The two biggest issues we have in our neighbourhood is a) off-leash dogs in non-designated areas, and b) dog poop not being picked up! It is not the bully types that are the problem.

- This is ridiculous that we are punishing people who love their dogs as much as they love their own kids. It's not the PITBULL that makes for a bad dog, but rather the owner that isn't spending the appropriate time training them. Trying to create a bylaw for this is outrageous! A small dog can cause severe injury too so this is the most ridiculous bylaw.
- I don't think these rules should apply to pit bulls in particular! There are many other breeds out there that have a stronger bite and are capable of delivering just as much or more damage than a pit bull! Owners definitely need to take full responsibility for their dogs from following rules and not only protecting their dog but other people and animals if their dog exhibits bad and/or dangerous behaviours!
- All dog owners required to attend training/handling/caring for a dog
- Pit bull ban
- I just want to specify while i support being strict with all dogs overall when required, focusing on pitbulls is extremely negative to the breed which by itself should be very calm, but bad ownership is usually to blame.
- Higher fines for offleash dogs of all types in non-offleash areas. Owners of reactive dogs can only do so much but when owners of friendly dogs allow their dogs to wander offleash and up towards the reactive dogs that are on-leash, it can easily send reactive dogs past threshold and into those aggressive behaviors. Do more to reduce the circumstances that lead to these events rather than just blanket punishing entire breeds. The majority of your suggested reforms are archaic and don't seem to be evidence based. They also seem to make no sense. Dogs that are barrier reactive and bark a lot indoors or behind fences can be labeled "nuisance" but that doesn't mean that they are leash reactive so having them in a muzzle on every walk makes no sense. There's a real lack of logic here.
- This is absolute trash. BSL is a joke and is such an outdated concept. I would hope Calgary would be better than this. I work in rescue and have been bitten by many dogs, none of which was ever a pit bull.
- Pit bulls do not pose harm... this is a racism attack on breeds. All dogs have potential to bite is provoked and instilling this law is insane.
- It's not a specific breed that is a problem! I was an owner of a Pit Bull for 14 years and she was a wonderful, kind loving dog so please don't pin point a particular breed. This wouldn't be acceptable for humans and should be the same for animals. Any dog that is exhibiting behavior problems need to be address!. Owners need to be required to address these behavior problems with a certified dog trainer. Most people cannot deal with these behaviors on their own so it should be a mandatory



requirement. If they choose not to then the owner needs to be addressed and action taken for safety of all involved.

- The only time these dogs are vicious is when the owner doesn't train them properly. ANY dog can be vicious. Stop singling out "pitbull like dogs, its utterly incompetent and embarrassing .
- Adding you many restrictions to pitbulls means those dogs don't get as much of a chance at a normal happy life. With training and a proven track record I don't think it's fair to assume they're automatically dangerous.
- After a dog bites and/or is declared a nuisance dog, they (and their environment) should be assessed by a professional dog behaviorist to ensure that the cause isn't because the dog's isn't receiving proper care. This should include adequate physical and mental exercise, nutrition and a non abusive environment.
- Training is so important, animals need to stop being punished on behalf of people who do not have their best interest. Part of the fee when dealing with pet bylaw should go towards affordable training. This could also help boost business within the pet care industry.
- owner must prove they can physically control/restrain their pitbull/nuisance dog; 1 pitbull/nuisance dog per physically able adult in a household
- All dog owners should have a certificate of training if allowed to be in dog parks, or out in public.
- ALL DOGS -regardless of breed or size should be REQUIRED to take Obedience training before being licensed - look at Swiss laws regarding dogs
- Proper education and training is required for disobedient dogs and their owners, which includes All Breeds. To single out one over another, invites discrimination based on anecdotal evidence. Since "Pit Bulls" are not involved in more bites, the reference used of them being able to inflict more severe bites is asinine, and a baseless excuse, which will increase said discrimination. There are more cases of smaller breeds causing issues than larger ones, but we don't see any targeted discrimination towards them, because of a racial bias. This needs to stop!
- To even include pitpulls on as a "strong" bite is discrimination. If you're going to say this include all dogs husky, mastiff, German Shepard, Bernese mountain dog ect. This should be weight based if you're really going to push this outlandish statement. 2. Humans are usually the cause of bad dog behaviour. Whether it's previous abuse not related to the current owner, current neglect, lack of training ect. It all stems from humans. There should be more options about that help educate OR hold humans accountable in multiple ways for their dogs.
- A pet owner with a large breed should be required to obtain training and demonstrate that the dog is not a danger to the public. All large dogs, not just pit bulls, have the ability to seriously injure someone.
- pit bulls should not be treated as more dangerous than other breeds. Judge the dog, not the breed.
- NONE!
- Training for owners. Pitbulls (and pitbull types) aren't the problem; a lack of owner education is.
- Owners who own pit bull or the breed that looks similar know there dogs behaviour and should be allowed to know f there own dog should be muzzled only and only if that dog bites another dog or



human and if that dog does not listen to commands then it should be muzzled. It's not the dog it's the human who owns the dog

- I think that it is completely WRONG to discriminate against pit bulls as their behaviour is completely based on how they are cared for and it is the humans that are the issues and not the dogs.
- this is sick how your targeting the bully breeds, i have a pitbull and have had more issues from bad owners aka bad owner bad dog whike you wanna punish the good owners thats bullshit, wanna limit problem breeds there are no bad dog just bad owners. [removed] this bylaw is [removed], the bully breeds score higher on temper test than labs. target the bad owners not breed [removed]
- should be against aggressive dogs in general not just the bully breed
- None of the above. Looks like the decision is already predetermined from these options. Banning specific breeds is silly and good for nothing other than headlines
- None of the above
- City should mind their own business
- Breed specific legislation is racism for dogs. There are many pitbulls in the city who are friendly dogs. To stereotype entire breeds NOT based on their behaviour as individuals is wrong.
- No more than one 'nuisance' dog but NOT to include non-nuisance pit bulls
- Literally NONE of these garbage and biased ideas pertaining to dogs and their owners. It's not the breed, it's the human behind them. Sincerely; a proud owner of 3 darling Pit Bulls
- Please do not target a specific breed of dog, when looking at comprehensive statistics a specific breed is not more likely to bite or cause more severe injury. By targeting specific breeds it puts blame on the dogs rather than the owner. The above elements I have ticked off will put responsibility on owners of all dogs. Limiting a specific breed from interactions with other animals will only worsen any potential problems
- Why is the city just attacking pitbulls?? What about the small shit zu dogs that i have bitten by several times! Or the viscous German shepherd, or the 2 Labradors that have already bitten 2 kids!? This is not specific to a breed and it is not the breed that is the issue here!! It is the owners! Any dog no matter the breed should be properly trained! And if any dog of any breed is attacking or biting other people then it is not the dog or breeds fault, it is the fault of the owner!! So instead the city of Calgary should be looking at the OWNERS not the dog, and asking if they should be owning an animal or not? The owner should be fined then for ANY breed including shepherds, labs, shit zus and other dogs that are viscous! The owner is the problem not the dog.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Owners are the problem. Do not subject pit bull breeds to any of these if you are not willing to subject other animals to it.
- Stop discriminating on breeds this is just as disgusting as racism
- None of the above
- All the of the above proposed measures related to "pit bulls" are discriminatory against a breed or breed type and do not address the requirement of responsible breed ownership. A dog and it's owner should not be banned from an off-leash dog park because it has a brindle coat (common in multiple bully-breeds) or its ears are set at a certain angle. You are discriminating against the responsible dog owner and their dog based on the animal's looks.



- Absolutely not! If regulations go up they should go up for all dogs, specifically singling out pit bulls is more blockheaded than they are. It's sentencing before the crime.
- Do not single out these rules to pit-bull breeds
- Breed specific legislation is not effective, all dog breeds have the potential to bring harm. Introducing breed specific legislation doesn't target the actual problem of poor animal care by their humans, solve the human issue. Offer innovative and supportive programs for people with dogs who need training.
- Mandatory training/retraining sessions and/or higher fines for dog owners that do not actively engage with / exercise proper control over their dogs (non-responsible pet owners). Ie the Pomeranian owner that thinks their dog is ok to jump on everyone else's because it is small.
- These are very clearly targeting one specific breed with intentionally broad language so other dogs can simply be rolled into this garbage on a whim. Punish the owners who refuse to address their pitbull behavior, including the ones who incentivize this bad behavior. A single offence can be a warning but multiple offenders are subject to investigation by authorities. Penalties for repeated problems include spaying or neutering the owner. Repeated severe infractions subject the owner to euthanasia. Let's tag and muzzle city council instead, they're very clearly a nuisance but they're still allowed to frequent the parks without a leash..
- Fines for animal abuse or neglect because that starts a lot of behaviour problems as well.
- It is absolutely ridiculous to base something like this off breed. It is ENTIRELY the responsibility of the OWNER to train their dog, regardless of breed. To single out pit bulls is absolutely ridiculous.
- This I NOT a breed issue this is a behaviour issue and you should not be singling out pit bull breeds in these bylaws
- Who is deciding what dogs fit in to these "breeds"? Most of these breeds are not actually breeds but rather BBM (bully breed mixes).
- I think pet owners should be fined higher amounts when a dog bites someone or another dog. They should require insurance if they cause injury to a person or other animal. I don't think this should be based off breed but by the actual dogs doing these behaviours.
- None of the above- the generic labelling of a dog as a nuisance-especially for something like 'noise' should not warrant muzzling in public spaces. In addition, the specific suggestion regarding pit bull breeds and their relations is extremely concerning. Not only is it more common for small dogs to be aggressive, but larger dogs than the standard pit bull can cause equal if not more damage during an incident. Each animal should be assessed on a case-by-case basis following an incident with no by-law targeting of any given breeds.
- Why would a dog who barks a lot or a dog that looks a certain way need a muzzle in public? Seems like a complete disconnect between problem and solution
- Pit bulls are not the only dog that has teeth and bites. This should be geared towards all aggressive dogs. Not just 1 breed.
- Leave it alone



- THIS SURVEY IS BIASED. Whoever wrote this needs to seriously reconsider their inherent bias. You state up front that you "want to understand what you would or would not support" yet you only list items asking what we would support. So many items in this list I DO NOT SUPPORT.
- There should be no breed specific legislation considered. If a dog proves to be a nuisance the owner should be penalized as such. If a dog is out of control, it's the owner's fault. I've been bit harder by so many other medium sized dogs, even my tiny shih tzu bites harder than my American Staffordshire Terrier EVER has. On that note, all of those other breeds have also bitten MORE frequently than my AST. Not to mention the dogs that weigh 100lbs+ can bite way harder, and can do more damage just by running into things or jumping up. It's completely up to the owner to control the dog's environment, and the OWNERS should receive 100% of the blame and very very hefty fines for any incidents caused.
- It is disappointing that pitbulls are singled out here. I would rather than dogs with a history of dangerous behaviors be ordered to seek additional training, but not breed specific.
- These bylaws should NOT be breed specific (re: against bully breeds) it is more important to hold owners responsible for training and handling their dogs regardless of the breed. At the dog park my experience has been that bully breed owners tend to be more responsible than other dog owners there.
- Education session for owners on how to manage their nuisance dog & curb behaviours. Provide them with a list of behaviourist/trainers
- Please don't push forward laws regarding pit bulls or bully breeds. Pit bulls are no more a danger than any other breed of dog.
- A specific breed should not be called out, the breed doesn't indicate behaviour
- Any dog, shouldn't discriminate against bully breeds
- NO MORE SINGLING OUT DOG BREEDS THAT ARE NO DIFFERENT THAN A SHEPPARD OR ROTTWEILER. Bigger so they bite harder is [removed].
- Obedience training should be provided by force free trainers
- This is all [removed]. Breed Specific Legislation is wrong. You can't judge a dog on their appearance, and punish owners for having a certain type of dog. My Pitty is sweet and gentle, and we both always act responsibly in public. I agree aggressive and nuisance dogs should have regulations, but that has nothing to do with breed, it's case by case basis, and largely due to poor ownership. It's 2020 time to evolve and not play into the stigma of dog racism. We're better than this
- I don't think that Pit Bulls should be banned from off leash dog parks, unless they have done something that would label them as a threat to other dogs or owners. To label all Pit Bulls as dangerous and ban them from these parks is too extreme. I think it would depend on the dog's behaviour.
- THE OWNERS SHOULD BE HELD RESPONSIBLE THERE PITBULLS AREN'T THE PROBLEM. BAD. OWNERS. ARE!
- We should NOT single out one specific breed, we should fine and register dogs based on ACTUAL behaviour. Singling out one breed is wrong, just like singling out a group of people based on the colour of their skin or physical appearance.



- This is all garbage. PITBULLS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM. I know MANY pit bulls and they are the sweetest animals. Educate yourselves, this is a huge step backwards and you should be shaking your heads.
- Stop making trouble where there is none. City hall over reach is ridiculous. All you guys want is higher fines to bring in more money so you can spend spend spend. You don't actually care about any of this or pet owners
- I do not agree with banning breeds or putting these kind of restrictions on certain breeds. The dam owners need way more education. People don't do the proper research before getting dogs. Not the dogs fault!!
- Fines for back yard breeding and no license, fines for no permits to operate dog rescues in residential areas, fines for administration of medication to dogs with out proper adequate education
- Dog training mandatory for all dogs and owners. This would improve the lives of all residence and pet owners. Make licensing free for dogs/owners that have reached advanced training level (3 sets of classes)
- NONE. BSL is a joke.
- Ban pit pulls and other aggressive breeds in Calgary.
- I am so appalled that the City of Calgary would even consider breed specific legislation. In a time where we protest love and respect for people of all backgrounds, race, gender, sexual orientation and mental health status, that we would discriminate against a certain breed of dog, is absolutely sickening. A "nuisance" dog should be one with a history of aggression in that specific animal. How can you even justify grouping an entire breed into that category? I do not support this at all and am so disappointed at the large step back that Calgary has taken. I am ashamed to be a Calgarian and that my city is even considering this discrimination.
- Stop targeting pitbull and pitbull looking dogs! Get an education!! Make all bylaws the same for ALL breeds!?
- This is a horrifically biased segment, and worse it includes no contrary options whatsoever. This just seems to ask how we should go about punishing pit bulls, or anything that looks like one, and their owners, as unfairly as possible. I find it hard to believe these options came from someone who knows anything about dogs or dog training.
- Don't let the small breads that attack other dogs and children out in public or off leash
- Law should be inclusive to all dogs and owners should have record of previous pet incidents.
- You cannot specify a kind of dog that's wrong as all dogs can be aggressive This is dog discrimination
- I think this should only be case specific as I know a lot of pit bull and bully breed dogs who are the kindest and gentlest animals ever and they not their owners should be punished or charged when they haven't done anything wrong
- ANY Dog that shows aggressive behavior should be demanded to go through training - NOT DOING THINGS LIKE THIS ^^. Aggressive behavior is the fault of the owner! Do better Calgary, Do wayyyyy better.



- I believe regardless of breed there should be more education put forth for animal owners. Not everyone understands the kind of dog their getting so I think focus should shift to those resources. If an owner decides to get a German shepherd, Great Pyrenees or even an Australian cattle dog they need to know their behaviours, just like someone getting a pit bull type of dog. Any of those other breeds without the proper understanding of what they were bred to do can be dangerous. Having worked at an animal shelter I've seen far more aggressive breeds that weren't of the bully variety; it's everybody's responsibility to understand the dog they are getting.
- There needs to be a program set in place to educate people on the stigma of Pitbulls. The majority of people hear pitbull and the first thing that comes to mind is that that it is a mean viscose dog. Even though you said it yourself, "pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds". Also fines should be put into place for people who abuse pitbulls at dog parks based on their own ignorance because they look mean. I have witnessed someone kicking a pitbull in the head at an off leash dog park because they thought it was going to attack their dog even though this "Pitbull" was super friendly and was only walking up to their dog to say hello. The colored bandanna could help this issue.
- Responsible owners and there dogs should not be over regulated just because of breed.
- All dogs can be a problem if not trained by their owner and not just certain breeds. The main focus should be on owners not cleaning up after their dogs. By the way, I am not a dog owner. Just fed up with all the dog crap left everywhere.
- The dogs aren't usually the problem. Yes they are larger and have more power to bite but it all comes down to training. Maybe offering more affordable or mandatory dog training through the licensing program. Also some direction for the public in general of how to approach dogs would be a good idea. Many people assume dogs are fine but don't know the background, so the dog may react as a trauma response.
- Can only be one nuisance dog in household
- The problem with dogs always starts with their owners. Stop trying to regulate breeds and crack down on breeders as well as bad owners.
- Pitbulls and their owners should jot be discriminated against. The biggest problem with dogs is their owners, often times small dogs can be more vicious than larger breeds.
- Please do not single out pit bulls. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Don't punish the dogs. Punish the owners. If the owners of these "nuisance" dogs cannot properly treat them the way they are suppose to be treated, which is provide them with a loving home and train them to be gentle and not aggressive, then the owner should not have them
- This whole form is a hate speech against pitbulls. Perhaps fix the form to reflect the answers I chose more. Seriously?
- I've never personally met a pitbull that was violent or bit anyone. I've seen horrible and I'll equipped owners.worse, owners that promote this behaviour. Dog training must be mandatory and proof required. Of not, the owners should he banned from owning animals. These are animals and the react to the environment they are provided.



- Each dog must be regarded as an individual and assessed on its specific behaviors... This comes straight from our own Calgary Humane Society. Please do not use your personal bias to force pit bull owners to mistreat their dogs. By muzzling and treating Pit bulls differently we are doing nothing to help the animals. Please leave your personal bias out of this and instead look at scientific facts/studies which show that Pit bulls are no worse/different from other dogs.
- What about German Shepard's and other large breeds. Why are pitbull singled out. There are many breeds that can cause damage.
- There should be no breed specific legislation in Calgary. This is racism, breedism. It is shameful this is even being suggested.
- This is limited to breed specific there are more dog bites and attacks by other dogs especially little dogs then pitbulls it is by far unfair to responsible pet owners and discrimination to owners whom are responsible maybe you should use your resources to convict bad pet owners, breeders and abusers instead of responsible owners of all pets.
- Quit singling out pit bull breeds. The times I've been bitten by a dog it's been fluffy Little white dogs Any dog can become a nuisance or a biter. Poor training and poor ownership (people with bad attitudes) are more to blame for bites or attacks than a certain breed of dog.
- I think it is absolutely unjustified to restrict a breed based loosely on looks alone. It is not fair to the owners nor the dogs. I would say that it would be fair to put restrictions on ANY dog that has a bite history. But several breeds should not pay the price for this based on their looks rather than temperament.
- No [removed] laws against pit bulls they don't do anything it's the owners don't punish them
- I do not support singling out PitBulls. I have seen far more aggressive dogs that are not pit bull. If these were humans it would be called racism over a certain culture. My experience with pitbulls has always been positive, not so much with German Shepard's or rot willets. Also I have been bit several times by chiwawas They are nasty little dogs yet not listed. Stop singling out pit bull. For us on the owner and their behaviour.
- Higher fines for owners of dogs off-leash in leashed areas. Too many problems with aggressive behavior with unleashed dogs when they should be on leash.
- Just like step programs for driving under the influence there should be programs in line for people who don't train their dogs and end up biting/injuring a person or another animal... once any incident happens it should be mandatory for Humans to be put through training their animals if not agreed or doesn't finish the program they obviously aren't responsible pet owners and should have their dog taken away.
- I am sick of walking my dog in my neighborhood and having Purposely unleashed dogs run up. There needs to be large fines for this in non off leash areas. Also never once has this been a pit bull breed. All my negative experiences have been with other breeds.
- Breed specific legislation serves to only demonize specific breeds. No special designation should exist only for a breed. It should be case by case not broad sweeping action



- Canine good citizen test for ALL off leash dogs. If you state pit bulls are listed ONLY because of their bite strength, then ALL dogs as strong as them must be lumped into the same category. There are MANY more powerful breeds.
- Pit bulls should be outlawed to own in Calgary
- All dogs should be treated as equal offenders and no one breed should be isolated for offences because they are “stronger” a bite is a bite, a problem dog is a problem dog... period.
- As supportive as society is about race, sexuality, religion you cant base breed as a more aggressive/dangerous animal. This is a myth that a pitbull bite is stronger than "other" breeds. The facts do no support this. I have a pitbull and German pointer and believe me this is not the case.
- Any dog no matter the size, breed or bite power should be considered a nuisance IF they severely harm another human or animal on more than one occasion. There are multiple breeds with a very powerful bite and I do not believe pitbull breeds should be singled out.
- Obedience training required for all dogs, higher fines for any dog involved in bylaw offences
- The city is basically condoning racism amongst dogs with this terminology and ignorance. Watch your wording and stick to laws that relate to behaviour and not to breed or appearance. It's like putting someone on parole because they look intimidating.
- Pit bulls are beautiful animals and don't deserve this at all!
- Mandatory training for ALL dog owners.
- ALL nuisance dogs should be required to undergo further obedience training and care to correct the issue. If there have been multiple bites, only THEN is it fair to look at reducing the privilege of the owner including requiring them to muzzle the animal or pay for further insurance. REMOVE THE PIT BULL SPECIFICATION BECAUSE IT IS ABSOLUTE BULLSHIT CHIHUAHUAS AND POODLES ARE WORSE
- This kind of thinking is very sad to see the city looking at. Money would be better spend on training classes for all dog owners. Please explain why the city is not going after the breeds that are responsible for the higher number of dog bites. Train the owners as the dog is not responsible for it's learned behaviours. Have owner training requirements for all dogs not just one specific breed as that is just being short sighted. Let's step up to responsibility for all dog owners.
- All breeds have the potential to inflict damaging bites requiring medical attention even Chihuahuas. It is the humans who do not know how to handle them, that are the problem. I disagree with ALL of these measures, they are unfair.
- Higher fines for those who are walking their dogs without a leash in an ON leash area no matter how well behaved the dog is. Higher fines for those who leave the scene of a bite incident. Higher fines for animal abusers.
- All measures must also impact the owners of the dogs in question, not just the animal
- absolutely appalled at the use of pitbull. I do not agree with any of these.
- My mother who rescued a “pitbull” from california. The dog had no training and was a “stray” according to the pound. She is a large “pitbull” and the first “pitbull/large breed” dog to ever enter our family bubble. We have chihuahuas in our different households. The “pittie” allowed the chihuahuas to be the pack leaders, she cuddled them and always allowed them to do everything first. The “pittie”



took treats immediately without any training more gentle then any dog we have encountered throughout our life with her front teeth. The pittie instantly took to the kids in the family and we trust her around any all children and dogs. This assumptions that pitbulls are dangerous is OUTRAGEOUS!! im assuming that the city will recieve similar stories or complaints however including hearinf that its the owner not the dog.. AND THAT IS EXACTLY TRUE.. so when it says in your options the pitbull must recieve training .. no! The owner must recieve training!! My mother looked into training and so many of them included dropping the dog off because it was working with the dog and not the human and the dog is fine so she gave up! When i was a teenager living in surrey BC there was a guy (don't remember any of the info or names) who was bragging and showing pictures to a bunch of kids about him living on this acreage in ? Kelowna, kamloops, abbotsford, or mission? My memory isnt great on that.. it was SOOO many pitbulls all tied up by their necks in these circles a certain distance apart and apparently he was hired by some scary people to fees them and take care of them they were used for dog fighting it was so sad and scarg and i was so young and innocent and didnt know bad people and was afraid of "gangs" in bc so i walked away and never reported it (so sad) however THIS is the problem!! People using and training dogs like this to do this!!! Keywords.. using, treating, abusing, and training them!! Is also like to say as a small dog owner since moving to alberta from BC my dog has been attacked multiple times therefore i dont bring them to off leash anymore .. and they were almost ALWAYS attacked by German shepherds!!!! I love all dogs, but i even personally know an amzing german shepherd amazing with people amazing with babies and kids the dog is now 9 and they still have to put a muzzle on him or he will viscosly try to attack any dog and he is a BIG BOY.. so why single out pitt bulls who are amazing dogs!!? How absurd!!

- There is no research that supports pit bulls being dangerous. They are sweet-tempered family dogs, and as ANY large breed, can do damage if they become aggressive. It is RIDICULOUS to single these breeds out and that will only cause a sense of fear that will lead to more incidents. When dogs are required to have a muzzle, they are viewed as dangerous, and people get nervous around them. Dogs sense the nervousness and can become nervous themselves, which sometimes leads to them barking or growling. That would only create more problems. Education and training about responsible dog ownership (such as the importance of exercising and disciplining ANY dog) is a much smarter route to take. I would suggest, if you are you to make a bylaw based on anything, it would be on the dog's weight. Maybe passing a written test about a dog's needs should be required for anyone who would like to own a dog over 50 pounds.
- Muzzle stupid owners!!! Don't blame the breed for your stupidity
- This should not only apply to bully breeds but others as well. It should be the behaviour that the owner is responsible for in ANY BREED
- Breed Specific Legislation is biased, unfair and ineffective. Please handle bite incidents on a case by case basis and do not punish hundreds of innocent animals and responsible owners simply because they have a dog that looks like a pit bull. The facts do not support this type of action and have not proved effective when implemented elsewhere.



- Breed of the dog doesn't determine the character. Pit bull breeds are no more likely to harm someone or be aggressive than any other. BSL leaves "less intimidating" dogs free to do whatever! This has no place in Calgary!
- please please do not become breed specific , it should remain that any dog that deems to have bitten or attacked other dogs or people would be classified as a dangerous dog ,
- If considered a problem animal, education enforcement should be above all else the first and second line of defence - Dog training classes, volunteering at shelter, ect. Financial burden of such on the city
- This question is misleading. First you are talking about a nuisance dog (at large, barking) and then you are talking about a dog that bites. These are separate questions and should not be lumped together. Usually the problem is not with the dog, it is with the owner.
- Education and training for ppl with nuisance dogs, with a mandatory neuter or spay at the expense of owner.
- I do NOT agree with putting stronger penalties on pit bull breeds or ones that could look like pit bulls. A lot of other breeds also have very strong bites and can do damage for their size. NO breed should be singled out. If a dog is a nuisance or owners are negligent with ANY breed, that should be handled individually. BSL's do not solve or help anything.
- Requirements for fencing. I need my daughter to feel secure when walking home from school.
- My dog has been attacked SEVERAL times in off leash parks and just on the street. I want to see more fines for people walking off leash with their dogs in the city. NOT a pit bull specific rule. Every single time my dog has been attacked it has NOT been a bully breed at all. It's a lab or a Shepard.
- Hugggeeeee fines for dog bites; dog bite legislation
- Proof of obedience training and rabies vaccination for ALL dogs will to receive a discount on city dog license
- The prejudice against one breed type is uncalled for. All breeds are at risk of an attack if the owners have not trained their dogs properly. This type of ignorance only feeds into the prejudice more and is harmful to these animals which end up in shelters, abused or abandoned. Please do not discriminate against Bull type dogs. If any bylaws are implemented or changed they need to apply to ALL types of dogs.
- Leave pit bulls alone. They are not the problem the owners are
- Singling out pitbulls or any other breed of dog is ridiculous and not supported by science. I would strongly opposes and breed-specific bylaws. All it does is further demonize dog breeds.
- BSL is [removed] and you can get out of here with that noise.
- As is, we are not a police state. Back off
- These measures should not be breed specific. Some of these measures seem to target bully breeds. I've seen Rottweilers, shepherds and other breeds that were aggressive. Seems odd that "pit bull" is mentioned so much.
- This whole bylaw is shameful and discriminatory. Do not do any of this. Do it for all breeds who have bad owners and are aggressive. Not just "pitty type" breeds



- This SHOULD NOT be breed specific. Any dog could have the force to do harm with its bite. There are multiple other dogs that bite harder than pit bulls that are not listed. These bylaws should be applied to dogs causing problems. One bad apple doesn't make the whole breed bad. You should be ashamed of yourselves for making this breed specific.
- Huge no! All breeds treated the same.
- Training to know and control your pit bull like bread would be a good mandatory option. But a pit bull or similar can not be Label from the beginning as a dangerous breed. That is literally racism for dogs. Myself I have a 100 pound dog which was attacked by a smaller breed causing injuries and a big bill. Pit bulls or similar have power but it is everyone's responsible to have their dog under control. From chihuahua to great dane.
- Bylaw offences should be declared only if a dog is proven to have indulged in dangerous behaviour. Dogs should NOT regardless of breed be presumed dangerous and/or be forced to wear a muzzle or be subjected to differentiated laws from other breeds.
- You're discriminating against a breed that has a rep for being aggressive, but is actually listed as more calm than a golden retriever. This is breed specific discrimination. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners, and by having laws in place for "pitbull" type dogs, you are part of the problem. This also shows that people who are scared of large dogs can file complaints against an owner and his pitbull because he can, because of the breed, and not necessarily an incident. I've been attacked by more small dogs than big dogs. This is ridiculous that you would even consider bull breed legislation. It showcases your ignorance. If you are going to pass any of the above, it better include all breeds, as singling out one specific breed because of how they look, and not what their temperament is, is ridiculous.
- Irresponsible ownership, a lack of stimulation, and ignorance regarding animal behaviour and socialization contribute to dog bites and attacks. Instead of banning breeds, require 1) all dog owners to undergo an ownership programme before getting a dog 2) require greater oversight to rescue organisations and 3) all dogs must pass the Canine Good Companion test. Large dogs may have powerful bites but small dogs get away with a lot of aggressive behaviour too
- No BSL. Fines for owners of ANY breed deemed nuisance.
- Do not introduce breed specific legislation! Bully breeds are not the problem, the humans who train them are! All legislation regarding dogs should apply to ALL dogs and make the PEOPLE responsible for badly trained dogs be held accountable. Good dog parents should NOT have to be punished because they have a specific breed of dog. BSL is disgusting and should never be allowed!
- Pit Bulls are not within the top 5 of any list for attacks on other dogs, humans, CHILDREN. Nor are they top 5 of any list for jaw or bite strength. STOP THE PREJUDICE AGAINST THIS BREED.
- Having breed specific rules is pathetic and fear-mongering. I thought the city of Calgary was better than that.
- Replace the word pitbull with bad owner. This isn't about the dog it's about the people who own and train them.



- Stop dumping on pit bulls. Chihuahuas are more prone to biting and attacking than pitties. Stop blaming the DOG and start prosecuting unfit owners, and ensuring that there are programs in place to rehab any "nuisance" dogs, and give Animal Protection teams the ability to declare owners unfit. There are no bad dogs, there are only BAD OWNERS, and punishing ONE breed is discriminatory. I've never felt threatened by a pit bull, but I've 100% been bitten and threatened by other breeds, usually small ones. Owners who allow their dogs to be off leash in leashed areas need to be penalized more harshly. Just because THEY know their dog is "friendly" doesn't mean that ME and MY dog won't see a strange animal running at us, and react accordingly. If I'M being threatened, or seemingly in harm's way, my dog WILL protect me and react accordingly. That's not on me or my dog, that's on the other owners who have no regard for the shared spaces and lack of awareness of anyone or anything around them. Good pet owners who know their dogs are reactionary will, and do, take precautions to ensure they don't have any negative experiences, including putting a muzzle on their dog if required. STOP SINGLING OUT PIT BULLS, START SINGLING OUT CRAPPY OWNERS!!!!
- Stop signaling out on type of dog if you want to make this by law do it for all. Small dog are more aggressive and have high incident rates than big dogs.
- STOP with the [removed] breed-specific legislation!!! Deal with NUISANCE dogs because of their actions - not INNOCENT dogs because of the way they look!
- Stop blaming the breed! These are amazing dogs...this is racism at it's best. Any dog can bite. Grow up!
- Animals are reflections of the owner. The owner must be the one who needs rehabilitation and questioned. Dogs can be taken from environment and should be placed in proper home of rehabilitation.
- A dog is the owners responsibility and should pay equal fines despite the breed of the dog
- I do not agree with treating pit bulls/ pit bull look alike differently than other breeds when you yourselves have admitted that they do not have a higher incident rate. In addition, I do not condone the proposed changes that lump any dog that "looks like a pit bull" into the same category, as this is far too open to interpretation and abuse. It is inappropriate for the city to base its nuisance dog protocol on anything other than how an individual dog acts.
- Please DO NOT put in legislation specifically targeting pit bulls.
- There should be no breed-specific rules, rather there should be clear definitions of the term "nuisance" with a focus on observable, repetitive behaviours and there should be a requirement for owner-involved training to insure that the owners take responsibility for the behaviours of their pets
- Breed specific bylaws are not appropriate. The behaviour of the dog and, more importantly, the owner should be the focus of any bylaw changes. Penalizing pet owners based on breed, or limiting the activities of certain breeds, does not address the systemic issue of owner training and management of dog behaviour. It is unfair to the breed to be singled out, when other breeds may pose more risks to the public based on the lack of care or control exhibited by the owner.
- It is not valid that a pit bull's strength makes it more dangerous. There are many large breed dogs just as strong, or stronger.



- Breed specific legislation is PROVEN not to be effective.
- I have been a "pitbull type" dog owner for many years I feel your are unfairly labelling a type of dog. Any type of dog can bite and be considered a "nuisance" as a retired dog groomer I can say I have never been bitten by a pitbull but cannot say that of other breeds.
- [removed] Quit wasting my tax dollars on this and maybe fix some potholes instead!
- I think dogs should be given a chance. Broaden what defines them as a 'nuisance'. They aren't all bad apples.
- Ban pitbulls completely. They are a dangerous breed and every argument that says they are not are flawed. They have no right to be kept as pets, they are a danger to other pets and some humans, especially our most precious children.
- All people should be trained to own all kinds of dogs and should be screened before adopting a pet. People are the problem. Not the animals. Start there.
- you Can Not lump dogs that get out and run away to dogs that are deemed dangerous. Thats 2 very different issues. A breed like a Husky could be deemed a nuisance because they are known to escape and run away, but they could be deemed a nuisance and banned from a dog park, when a dog park is the best place to take them. BSL is a joke, and completely uneducated opinions. Tiny dogs can be more aggressive then blockheaded dogs, but people think its "funny". You have to look more in to each individual situation, and not pick on a breed specifically.
- YOU CANNOT DISCRIMINATE A BREED FOR THE FAULT OF POOR OWNERSHIP!!!!!!
- Nothing should be breed specific. A good dog is a good dog and a bad dog is a bad dog regardless of the dogs breed. There should never be segregation towards a specific breed.
- Pit bulls specifically are not the problem. Nuisance dogs are. There should be insurance, mandatory leashing and training for NUISANCE dogs. Not pit bulls specifically.
- Enough of the pit bull discrimination. I will support NO Bylaw based on bread alone.
- Holy [removed] people. Quit making it about pit bull breeds. Any dog can be aggressive and can bite. Small dogs are just as nasty.
- Any dog can be a nuisance dog. To specify all these bylaws are only applicable to pit bulls is absolutely asinine. I know more pit bulls that are trained, loving, and well behaved than ANY other dog breed.
- Outlawing of breed specific laws as they are useless and only create fear of specific breeds
- Any dog can be a nuisance, not just pitbulls! It also depends on who the owner is. There should be obedience training for owners as well.
- I find it interesting that other unpredictable and "strong" dogs such as dobermans are not listed specifically. I would also like to see nuisance dogs such as chihuahuas and other small breeds who are typically untrained, roaming and instigating encounters. Maybe more thought needs to be put into mandatory basic training for all pet owners, and size-specific off leash dog parks.
- Do not discriminate against any dog based on appearance.
- no Breed Specific Legislation, dangerous an nuisance dogs can be any breed, bylaw should apply to all dogs.



- Nothing that is breed specific as all breeds have the potential for being aggressive. Just implement laws in general. Yes a pit bull is strong, but for example a great Pyrenees is substantially larger and could cause way more damage with a harder bite, but they aren't mentioned? Just keep it to a dog thing, no breeds.
- if you're doing to force owners to muzzle their pitbulls then you should also force people to muzzle their mastiffs, German Shepards, Rottweilers, Cane Corsos, just to name a few. All the dogs I just listed have a much stronger bite force than a Pitbull. Please reevaluate your stance to be more in line with scientific facts instead of personal bias.
- To interview both parties if an incident happens. Sometimes little dogs instigate the behaviour and then it's the big dog that gets blamed.
- Breed Specific legislation does not result non fewing incidents or nuisance dogs. More emphasis should be put on owners to go through proper training courses... by reputable organizations that focuses on positive reinforcement training. Breed specific legislation will simply result in owners NOT registering dogs and not following other legislation, such as staying at the scene of an incident to exchange information.. People will still get certain breeds and good owners will be ostracized for registering and unfavourable owners will simply not.
- None of these. The city has no authority to decide what kind of dogs people get. Not ever single pit bull is dangerous.
- Would not masks any law specific to pit bulls as they are very sweet dog's and no more aggressive than any other breed.
- **DO NOT SPECIFY RULES AGAINST SPECIFIC BREEDS**
- How can you possibly single out pit bulls like this?? Research has showed time and time again that it is the owner, not the breed that poses a threat. Pit bulls used to be nanny dogs because they are so gentle!
- I have never been bitten by a Bitbull. I have been bitten by a German Shepard as well as many little dogs. Pitbulls are not the issue, owners are and putting one bread into a category is lazy and wrong.
- In an incident, a dog off leash should be fined regardless of what dog is stronger.
- All dogs can be aggressive not only one large breed ! All large breed should be looked at
- Courses for the owners!
- Problem dogs are the result of problem owners: THE OWNERS should go for training/be punished!!!
- Stricter laws for all dog owners regardless of breed
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog per household. Stop breed bias and focus on irresponsible owners instead.
- Obedience training for humans please. Most of the time, dogs are products of their environment
- All breeds of dogs should be treated the same!! It's incredibly sad and uneducated to be trying to in force "breed specific" bylaws.
- Don't brand a specific breed. Dogs have individual personalities and should be evaluated on a case by case basis.
- None. Discrimination has no place on City operations.



- Item that states “There cannot be more than one nuisance dog or pit bull in a household” should be split into two items, you can’t group the two subjects.
- “Obedience training” and care giving assessment for all DOG OWNERS. It is not the breed that is dangerous, it’s how they are raised, trained, etc. Do not ban “dangerous” dog breeds from off leash areas. This would be devastating to the city of Calgary.
- Pit bulls are lovely dogs. Some have been trained incorrectly but that could be said of ANY dog breed. Don't punish a breed for a few bad owners. There are a lot of good dog owners out there. Don't cave into some silly trend and incorrect information about this breed.
- I really do not appreciate the focus on pitbull type dogs. This is completely subjective and discriminatory.
- Dogs declared a nuisance should be banned from off leash parks.
- Please do not discriminate against pit bulls. My small dog was attacked in a dog park and it was not by a pit bull. My dog was at the vet clinic for weeks having surgery and recovering. The vet bills were well over \$2000. There are many large dog breeds that are capable of causing harm, not just pit bulls. You cannot judge a dog by its breed, only by it's owner.
- I think this should apply to nuisance animals and not be breed specific.
- When I selected the "declared a nuisance" option, I am assuming there is a tiered tribunal process for that. I am absolutely against any reactionary anti-reality idiocy like declaring all pit bulls a nuisance.
- This is absurd!! Its not the dogs that should suffer its the owners! If you aren't being a responsible PET owner then you shouldn't own and or you should be fined/charged with appropriate fines/charges for the situation. Bylaw/police should do an actual and full investigation to anything that has happened regarding PETS.
- no BSL should be contemplated.
- It should be the City’s duty not to spread misinformation and to make policy through fact and not ignorance. Bully breeds are specific breeds; you would not call a Samoyed a Husky. Why would obedience training not be required for all breeds? Why would owner training regarding dog body language and proper etiquette not be required for all owners? I have witnessed countless dogs that are not a bully breed, that are not controlled by their owner, do not heel and are allowed to lunge and growl at others on the path. People who do not walk their dogs on the right side to ensure humans pass each other, not the dogs. People who use retractable leads and let their dog roam ahead which ensures they have no control over their dog. Training should be required for all. Retractable leads should be banned from walks. And bully breeds should not be segregated. Before the City can place policy and educate others, it needs to educate itself.
- I would agree with the obedience training required for “nuisance” dogs as long as that didn’t lead onto meaning “pitbull” breeds
- Pitt bulls are not bad dogs if they are trained and the owner has control. Any dog will bite or maul anything or anybody. Let us choose what kind of dog we want and then make sure the are properly trained. And I would suggest higher consequences for the owner of any animal should be mandated to have training provided by the city so then you can control the owner and dog. Plus smaller off



lease parks for smaller dogs so then they do not need to meet the big dogs. Mine has been bullied and bitten at the park and surprise not a pit bull.

- I do not support anything that singles one breed out as more dangerous than another. While I do not own a pitty breed, how dangerous ANY dog is comes down to irresponsible pet ownership. I've never met a pit bull just wasn't Just as loving and sweet natured as my two Labrador retrievers.
- Absolutely disgusted that the City of Calgary is categorizing dogs based on breed and appearance. ANY and ALL dogs should have the opportunity to live a normal life and if it becomes a "nuisance" then there should be community standards in place but under no circumstance should pit bulls be singled out. Seriously think about the type of standard you will be setting.
- Stop labeling dogs "bad" because how they look. Be no different than labeling a person for how they look!
- A "nuisance" means a designation given to a dog that has been involved in multiple minor offences (eg. being at large, noise, etc.) Is very different then an aggressive dog that bites or attacks other. However your classifying them all together here. So if some one gets a barking complaint for there dog that dog is not longer aloud at an off leash park ? That's ridiculous. A so called "nuisance" dog and an aggressive dog are completely different.
- I don't believe in singling out one bred. I worked as a groomers helper and the little dogs where the worst when it came to biting.
- This is BS. If you know dogs the worst for biting is a Cocker Spaniel. Need to crack down more on dog fights and bad breeders.
- Owner must undergo supervised dog training delivered through an approved professional when a dog has been declared a nuisance.
- Stop picking on the bully breeds. Start with the people not the breed. My pitbull has done nothing but has been attacked by family breeds. It's not the dog it's the owner. Make them responsible. Ban people from owning dogs if they cant take care or properly train their dog
- Responsible pet ownership, this is stupid!
- How disgraceful! Pit Bulls or "bully breeds" should not be subject to this legislation without reason. This is an outrage and this kind of discrimination is not ok. An owner of a dog who is deemed a nuisance, REGARDLESS OF THE BREED, should be held responsible. Do not punish an entire breed. I do not support breed specific legislation. Chihuahuas and smaller breeds show way more aggression than bully breeds, but because of their size this isn't an issue? This is not ok. All dog lives matter and should be allowed the same rights, regardless of their breed.[removed] This is a huge step backwards for Calgary and I am so disappointed.
- Higher fines for repeat nuisance dogs
- Absolutely none of the above, as they are all ridiculous and trying to attack one breeds when ALL breeds can be aggressive and attack.
- none of these are ok this is 100% discrimination.
- Disgusting to even consider a bylaw like this. This is a new form of power hungry. Look at the statistics. Pet owners are to blame for their dogs actions for ANY breed.
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. Focus on individual dogs not one specific type of dog



- What about persons such as myself that are currently in possession of 2 "block headed" dogs, both of which are "bully" breeds, and rescues? What happens to my well behaved, well controlled dogs if my neighbor decides that they are "acting in an aggressive manner"? What about the not bully breeds that are left to bark, unceasingly, for hours at a time but aren't considered a threatening breed because they are smaller than my two bully type dogs? Why not either make off leash areas all leashed or all muzzled instead of making it that a specific type of dog can't be there or defend itself when someone else's less than well behaved, poor recall dog comes at the muzzled dog in an aggressive manner? Not one of the things listed above is considered effective in the control of an "aggressive breed" of dogs, as it used to be Dobermans, and Rottweilers and Shepards, and now it's "bully breeds". Ontario has NOT had less bite incidences since their breed specific legislation went into effect, so at what point does this come across as an owner issue not a dog issue? And I will state as a fact, not a threat, that if someone in an enforcement role set foot on my property to remove my dogs from my possession, it would most assuredly not be the dogs that would be threatening or aggressive, it would be me, and I would face any legal consequences of my decision in a court room with a smile on my face, because I definitely will have thought through every possible outcome of my choices.
- I don't think you should be breed specific at all. I think it should be an across the board rule that if your dog bites there are consequences. The amount of times my dog has been attacked by a smaller dog is wild but because they are small owners are not required to do anything. These owners should have to take their dog to training as well or muzzle their dog. If a small dog bites another dog they are initiating a potentially deadly fight that the bigger dog will always be blamed for and it isn't equitable
- Investigation of nuisance complaints must be thorough and accompanied with paperwork, after which a dog should need a specific marker to identify the designation, a specific collar tag colour, for example. Deeming a dog "nuisance" without just cause, a complaint from a community member based on a dog's appearance or breed, rather than legitimate aggressive or nuisance behaviour is not acceptable. Similarly, dismissing complaints because a dog doesn't fit a certain "profile" must be eliminated - a small dog who bites repeatedly but is allowed to continue the behaviour in public without the owner being forced to adhere to the same bylaws and fines outlined is unacceptable.
- Holding the owner and not the look/breed of dog accountable.
- I think this breed targeting is ridiculous. All breeds having well behaved and nuisance dogs. I believe any breed that has been declared a nuisance (and I'm assuming this means they have been caught doing something - biting or other) should have rules put in place. Saying a whole breed of animal can't go to the park or has to be muzzled is outrageous; it's discrimination.
- NONE! This is absolutely outrageous that bully breeds are STILL being targeted..in this day and age I can't believe Calgary would propose this. It is totally the OWNER of the dog and not the dog itself. Disgusting Calgary
- Pit bulls should not be discriminated even if they pack more strength, it's up to the owner to provide proper training and guidance to all of their pets



- None this is not acceptable and you are targeting a specific breed incorrectly. Basically dog racism!!!!
- Dogs should only be required to wear a muzzle in public or not allowed in dog parks if they are aggressive not just a nuisance
- This is [remo ved]and should not be allowed !!!
- None. Put a muzzle on yourself for suggesting such an absurd idea.
- NONE OF THEM, You don't think covid has some enough damage to the human mental state. And now you want to enforce some bogus law for what ?
- Pitbulls and like dogs aren't the problem, as is pointed out so clearly in bold. So why should they suffer over some power tripping city officials wanting to make a name for themselves. Leave the dogs alone, we can't ban one species or race just because you want to make them the poster-dog for "bad dogs". This is discrimination at it's finest, and in this day and age, discrimination should NOT be tolerated.
- Pit bulls are the problem. Irresponsible dog owners are
- The owners should be searched for their living state of where the dog is from and investigated on how the owners are as ANY DOG can bite a human if they have bad owners.
- Punishment should be for bad owners, not by breed. My shepherds have been instigated against far more often by small dogs that lack training. You're basically saying if a chihuahua starts a fight with a pit bull, the pit bull is at fault because it is bigger and stronger. You are giving power to the bully in that situation. I have literally been chased in residential areas by off leash Shih Tzu dogs biting at my dogs heels. If my dogs defended themselves I'm now the bad guy because I was following the rules and my dogs should have just let themselves get hurt? Long story short, breed bans are dumb. Training for bad owners is better regardless of dog breed or size.
- Leave the dog alone if not doing anything!
- This is ridiculous. I thought Calgary was better than this. Stop the hate against pit bulls.
- It is absolutely ridiculous that pitbull or bully breeds are considered "nuisances" the breed isn't the problem. I believe that and specific dog that is known to be aggressive or has bitten or attacked someone should wear a muzzle in public whether it be a chihuahua or a German Shepherd. Making an entire breed have to wear a muzzle in public or limiting the amount of a breed per household is pathetic when you have absolutely no idea how those dogs act.
- No law/bylaw should ever be breed specific. Any breed of dog is just as likely to be a nuisance as the next. My golden retriever will guard and protect my home, kids and myself just as fiercely if not more than a pit bull or any "blockheaded" dog.
- We as humans do not want to be judged by our looks so why would we do it for dogs!! Don't judge a book by its cover! All dogs are capable of being aggressive and have the potential to bite so when that happens depending on the situation and circumstances do what needs to be done! Why should innocent animals be punished for the behaviour of bad owners!!!'
- Why are you assuming only pitbulls are the problem? Look at the owner of the pitbull not the breed. Get a clue and what a stupid idea to muzzle a pit bull because they are pitbulls. Shame on you!



- Dog license and Microchip should be made mandatory for all the medium and large breed dogs (small dogs like chihuahua etc. bites are not life threatening) instead of bringing breed sepecific legislation.
- The ability to remove the “nuisance status” of a dog by going through mandatory food training programs. A breed of dog should not be automatically targeted just because it is stronger, that is an extremely unfair judgement especially because pit bulls are not correlated to more dog bites.
- DO NOT TAKE BREED, SIZE OF DOG, ETC. INTO CONSIDERATION. A BITE IS A BITE. AGGRESSION IS AGGRESSION - IT DOESNT MATTER IF IT IS A ROTTWEILER OR A CHIHUAHUA, IF A DOG BITES IT IS THE OWNERS WHO DID SOMETHING WRONG AND THEY SHOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE.
- Dogs are just dogs , the problem is and always will be responsible owners regardless of breed . Banning or restricted breeds does not work . Need fair laws that apply to all breeds !
- What did pit bulls do to you? It’s not the breed, it’s the owner. By passing this bylaw you are tearing families apart and hurting innocent dogs just because they’re pit bulls. What about my friend with a senior pit bull cross who has arthritis in his hips? Is he a nuisance? Is he a danger to the public? Get out of here. This is insane. You can’t just assume that pit bulls will bite others. I’ve been attacked by a border collie who bit my leg so hard that fat came out, where’s the bylaws pertaining to them? What kind of backwards society do we live in?
- Pit bulls should not be treated any different than other dogs. German Shepard’s and other large breed dogs are just as “strong” and “dangerous” as pit bulls. There absolutely should not be a larger fine for Pitbull owners or separate insurance. That is extremely unfair. I do think they should be trained though, I think all large dogs should have to be trained. This is extremely unfair and I am very disappointed that Calgary sees pit bulls as such a big threat. Pit bulls are AMAZING dogs 9/10 of the time just like ALL dog breeds. This makes Calgary look very discriminatory.
- The stipulations against pit bull breeds is rather ridiculous. Nuisance dogs can be any breed and stems from bad owners. Don’t punish the breeds.
- None of these are necessary
- Breed-specific legislation is biased and I don’t agree with any restrictions regarding specific breeds ie. Pitbulls
- Mandatory training for ALL dog OWNERS. There are no bad dogs.
- It is not the dog. It is the owner that needs to control the dog. Fine the owner.
- There should be no restrictions on nuisance dogs of behavioural problems aren't present
- Investigation of owners to deem their ability and knowledge to be a responsible pet owner and the ability to remove dogs deemed to be in abusive or neglected environments. The owners are the problem!
- [removed] Clearly they don't know anything legitimate about any dog breed, let alone Pit Bulls (which isn't a breed, by the way. If you did any research, you'd know that.) Maybe start looking at higher fines, muzzling in public, prohibitions to dog parks to ANY DOG BREED that's considered a nuisance INCLUDING small dogs. Have higher fines, possibly jail time, for owners who have pets



that do any sort of damage, whether its property or personal. Maybe if the City actually fined and charged properly, people would start listening.

- I think a dog that has had a history should be kept out of off leash. I DO NOT agree a dogs behaviour Can be based on their breed
- As a certified dog trainer I do not think pit bulls should not be discriminated against. They were originally bred to be nursery dogs to watch over children. Golden retrievers bite more than pit bulls. Breed discrimination has no place in this city!
- pit bull ban
- Pittbulls are not agresive! Please do not categorize the breed. Aggressive dogs are because of the owners and training, they can be any dog. Do not judge the Pittbull breed!
- Clumping pitbulls in with "nuisance" dogs is perpetuating the misunderstanding of the breed, and thus their continued abuse. I thought the city of Calgary was better than this, as quite frankly even the wording of your question and options are suggesting that pitbulls are inherently bad dogs. As you have provided literally no scientific evidence, this question is misleading and takes the blame off of BAD OWNERS who do not train or exercise their dogs.
- Pitbulls should not automatically be deemed a nuisance and be subject to this discrimination. This is an active breed that loves to socialize. They need walks and play time in the park. Owners of any dog deemed a nuisance, regardless of the breed, should be held accountable. I do not support BSL!
- Leave bully breeds alone.
- There should never be breed specific legislation. a toy size dog to a giant size dog can cause the same issues. its all about training and owners having proper control.
- Don't discriminate against the dog.
- Seems pretty biased. If one breed needs to be muzzled why not all.
- Requiring "pit bulls" to be muzzled doesn't help anyone. It has been shown that they don't actually have a stronger bite. They are not more dangerous. I will not be visiting Calgary if this bill passes. A lot of people will not support a city that is discriminatory on dog breeds. It's 2020, we need to stop stereotyping breeds. People want to feel welcome in a city and this does not make Calgary seem like an inclusive and welcoming City.
- Obedience/social training required for all dogs.
- No breed specific legislation. Higher fines and consequences for any repeal offender.
- Don't single out pit bulls, single out the owners who train them to be this way and fine them! Restate the options to say owners who have trained their dogs or lack of caring for their dogs will fine dining and prohibited from off leash parks.
- Dogs that have been in a situation and proven in said situation can be muzzled and/or restricted after it has been proven to be nuisance and not before. Not 1 specific breed
- To single out one breed is absurd. Deal with the owners with ANY dog that shows aggression. All dogs have the ability to cause sever damage with a bite, not just pit bulls.
- None of the above.
- From my experience the dogs that cause the most problems are owners of dogs under 25lbs (No specific breed although Jack Russell terriers have been the worst I've seen by far). They dont train



there dogs at all then there little cute dogs goes out and attacks other dogs. It gets hurt from the bigger dog defending its self. Mandatory human license for dogs, the people need to take dog training classes before they are ever allowed to buy a dog. Second make breeding permits and inspections programs.

- Pit Bulls not to be accepted on City of Calgary Area
- Bully breeds should not be deemed a nuisance unless they have an offence, on a one by one basis, the same as every other breed. These animals are not the problem and shouldn't be punished. Only owners of bully's who are deemed a nuisance should be held responsible. The same as owners of every other breed.
- Nothing of the above should be put in place for pitbulls. You can't single out one breed
- All dog owners should have to follow the same guidelines regardless of the breed of their dog. It is often small dog breeds that cause big problems because their owners think it's ok to allow them off leash even when they display negative behaviour because they are small. If a small dog off leash comes after my large dog who is on a leash, my dog should not be punished for protecting itself just because he can do more damage. Singling out specific breeds is ridiculous.
- This is the owners fault that the dog is this way. There are no "dogs declared a nuisance" unless the owners have done a poor job training. An alternative would be if a dog has acted poorly (due to its owner) then the owner should be responsible for any of the damage and they should be offered training. If they are required to pay for training on their own accord they will most likely give the dog away or make it stray due to not being able to afford it which will only increase the problem.
- Please don't be "that city." Dogs are what you raise them to be, and if you're a crappy pet owner, you'll have a crappy dog, whether it's a chihuahua, a great dane, or anything in between.
- There are no bad dogs just bad owners why us the dog suffering because its owned by an idiot. Imprison the owner after fines.
- Neutral Breed Legislation has a better chance of actually curbing aggression issues. Breed Specific Legislation is based on misleading information and lack of education. There are false statements in this survey about the subject and has no place in our city. Any by law should be breed neutral and apply evenly across all citizens and their pets. Perhaps a reduced licensing fee for those how have taken obedience training with their dog (regardless of breed) through reputable training facilities would curb much of the issues and concerns. Please do not go the breed specific route I looked up other municipalities to see if there is evidence it works and found that the opposite seemed to be true there was no curbing in aggressive dog behaviour. It would be a waste of resources and money. Education and addressing actual offenders is a better route
- Punish the owners not the dogs.
- This is extremely prejudicial towards pit bulls. It's not the breed it's the OWNER!!! Out of all the dogs that have snapped at me none have been the pit bulls I have encountered. These measures would allow Calgary Community Standards to seize pit bulls with impunity. These are totally biased towards one particular breed type. Which is utter BS.
- None. Penalizing a breed is no acceptable. Do the research and realize other breeds actually cause more bodily harm than any others listed here.



- Don't single out one breed. Punish the owners and not the dogs. not
- Do some research! Why is this so bias? Pitbull's are not the only dog with "Strong bites". Why you excluding German Sheppard, Doberman, Rottweiler, Chow Chow, and Labs. All these should have more training, more liability and be muzzles too. This is racist towards one breed type and might looks like a "pitbull" type. Why is this survey open to anyone outside of Calgary to fill out? Shame on you, Calgary!
- Pit bulls should not be deemed nuisance dogs because of their breed. The same rules should apply for all breeds. I am so disappointed and sickened that the city of Calgary is even considering such discrimination.
- The suggestions involving "nuisance" dogs are excellent however I see absolutely no need to be singling our dogs deemed as "Pitbull". Yes they are strong, however there are certainly a large number of large dog breeds that have equally strong capabilities and potential for bit as pitbulls. I don't believe it does the community any good when breeds are singled out. There are bad apples in all breeds. However singling our nuisance/dangerous dogs specifically, regardless of the breed, would make me feel safer in the community.
- Actual enforcement against little dogs that bite. My dogs and daughter have been bitten to the point of blood three times in city parks due to little dogs. A Jack Russell of leash took a chunk out of my leashed Rhodesian's neck. The owner just laughed, as my dog bled. My daughter's thumb got bit blood running down her hand owner of Basset hound just picks up dog and walks away. My daughter bit through her jeans down the street blood down her leg by a wiener dog. My old Shepard cross on a leash gets attacked by two Boston terriers wounds to his ears and side. Once again owner just walks away saying good thing you have a big dog. Bylaw did nothing in any of these cases. In their defense I was too busy dealing with the aftermath of my injured child/dog and going to the doctors/ vet to follow the offender to their home. But when calls went into bylaw I was just almost laughed at because "it's just a little dog" hello the physical scars are still there the mental scars are still there. You need to take small dog attacks seriously and stop ignoring them!!!
- This is not a well worded question. Nuisance or aggressive? Running at large or barking but not causing any injury or threats should not be lumped with dogs that do. No matter the breed they should be treated the same, deal with the behaviour and not the breed.
- If your going to change the by laws for one specific breed doesn't that in a sense sound "racist " the bully breed is an amazing dog and a loyal companion I am more worried about my child being bit by a small breed dog chihuahua or something like that then any large breed
- These fines and restrictions should apply to ALL dogs!!!
- I don't support any of this
- None of the above should include a specific breed. Higher fines for any owner of ANY dog with risky behaviour and mandatory training within a three month period with a temporary ban until dog has been tested for poor temperment and/orrisky behaviour.
- I am not a dog owner but pit bulls are the nicest dog. If they are aggressive there should be high fines for the owner and possible abuse charges because pit bull are not mean dogs unless abused



- Dogs regardless of breed that have a history of biting, should be addressed. Singling out a specific breed will not fix the problem. A “potentially” dangerous breed of dog is not a dangerous dog until it has committed a dangerous act. Fines, legal action and punishment should be based on the incident.
- I do not support breed specific legislation, targeted toward pit bulls, or dogs who have a similar appearance. To me, making the assumption that all pit bulls are dangerous and need to be regulated, is very similar to assuming that all people of colour must be criminals. As you have stated, "pit bulls are not involved in more bit incidents than other dog breeds". It is unfair to responsible pet owners, with lovely animals, to enforce breed specific legislation.
- Place more fines and restrictions upon specific owners of any problem dogs. DO NOT unfairly target a whole breed.
- Nuisance dog label be applicable for all dog breeds, including toy breeds who are more likely to bite/attack than pit bull breeds. Toy breeds aggression is severely overlooked and rarely dealt with due to their small nature.
- Nuisance dogs, YES. Bully Breeds, NO. As a dog park DAILY frequenter, these are not the dogs that are typically the issues. The majority of Bully owners take extra care to maintain proper control and training of their animals BECAUSE of the prejudice that already surrounds them. The dogs that attack my dog on the regular? Poodles, Golden Retriever, small dogs and the worst?? GERMAN SHEPHERD. So your whole BSL is BS frankly
- How about the owner?? It's never the dog it's the [removed] owner that's responsible for allowing or creating a mean dog! If aware then I would take my own precautions to make sure my dog was safe and so were others while I was out. I don't believe any dogs should be off leash regardless of size or breed! Chihuahuas are worse than pit bulls!! Sad you are going after a breed! Kinda like attacking one RACE!!! It's WRONG The owners are responsible for their dog.. just like we assume that about our kids too
- Higher fines for owners who fail to control their dogs, regardless of breed or type of incident. This can include removal of the animal to be trained appropriately.
- Proper training should be required. Many of these other suggestions are draconian.
- ANY dog with aggression or bite history should be a nuisance dog, bully breeds should NOT be grouped into this category. Owners of nuisance dogs should be responsible because it is 100% the owner's fault, not breed specific. I am so ashamed to be Calgarian right now. Do NOT bring in breed specific legislation.
- How about stop blaming the breed and start doing REAL research. You have a 98% chance of being bit by a small dog, then any Pitbull breed. Calgary needs to step up their game and get more knowledgeable because you CANNOT ban one breed based on nothing..
- Start looking at how aggressive and how much a nuisance chihuahuas have become, and also require there to be rules for children at high areas of dogs to not be running up to a strange dog expecting it to like children. Provide training sessions for people who just got their first dog and they want to teach them how to socialize and train properly so there are no aggressive behaviours.



- Quit naming a breed. Is a shepherd/husky/Pomeranian/chihuahua/etc. Bites a person, then a muzzle should be required depending on severity of the case. Blaming a dog breed is as bad as blaming a race. All are capable of the EXACT same thing. FYI a Kangal has the strongest bite force at 743 PSI. An American Pitbull is only 235 PSI. Perhaps better research would have given you the proper information.
- Keep your dog home if it's not good in public. Common sense. Owners should take obedient classes to be aware when a dog is uncomfortable !
- Offer rehabilitation for dogs. Classes are good but need to be implemented at the right time. Banning the breed is a terrible idea though.
- None, because it is not the breed. It is the person. Can we start nuzzling and making certain people and behaviors prohibition in certain places? No? Then stop trying to make 1 breed the point of your issues. Statistically Golden Retrievers attack more children. Smaller dogs, such as chihuahuas, are far more aggressive, but smaller in stature. Stop trying to make breeds the problem. It is humans. If they cannot properly provide training to ANY BREED OF DOG, then they should not be allowed to have the dogs. It is NOT A BREED ISSUE BUT A HUMAN ISSUE. Stop being prejudice against breeds that really are only an issue when the owners are incompetent.
- Nothing. All owners and dogs should have the same guidelines. Stop stereotyping pitbulls as a vicious breed.
- Breed specific legislation is incredibly discriminatory. It stigmatizes dogs that as you have said in this note, do not bite at higher rates than other dogs. I would be extremely disappointed with Calgary if they were to choose to enact breed specific legislation.
- Please note the subjectivity in this assessment: "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." There is no legitimate primary evidence in either animal behavioural science or statistical representation (as you've noted) that support this inherent bias. It is purely opinion and bias that highlights Breed Specific viewpoints, not evidential research. This discussion needs to be fact-based, not unfounded opinion-based. As a public body, highlighting a breed highlights fear and does not, ethically, portray the facts. Please remove references to Pit Bulls as there is no evidence and, therefore, no requirement to identify a specific breed.
- Pit bulls SHOULD be allowed to go to the dog park freely like any other dog and not be discriminated against. What about other breeds that can do large damage like Rottweilers and German shepherds. This is ridiculous and discriminatory.
- no breed specific legislation . It is not supported by evidence and this kind of discrimination is wrong . Any dog can have issues in the hands of the wrong owner. Charge neglectful owners dont discriminate against a breed.
- Specifying a single breed is ignorant.
- Focus less on breed and more on irresponsible owners! It's always the dog with the owners that are 20 feet away that are causing problems regardless of breed



- I do not support breed-specific legislation. It is problematic to treat a dog differently based on appearance and just creates more fear. I fully support further legislation for nuisance dogs though I would like to see categories or some type of grading system for “nuisance” a dog that is anxious and barks often at home is not the same as one that has bitten another dog at a dog park for example.
- I honestly can't even believe the options I just read. The City of Calgary should be ashamed of yourselves! Time for you to have a qualified professional handle animal bylaws rather than a paper pusher with a bias against a specific breed! Funny that you even mention that there is no evidence of this breed causing more bites..something seems fishy here. Any bylaws that change should reflect to ALL breeds! The city of Calgary ignorance is a nuisance to me, let's change that instead.
- No breed should be targeted over another breed. Pitbulls and their relatives are the most cuddly and loving dogs. I've seen more biting and terror dogs in other types of dogs. This is a case by case and it's usually the human behind the dog!
- NONE of these!!!
- Look at what happened in Montreal for this bylaw. And for extra support look into PIJAC Canada (Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council)
- Pit bull/ pit bull like breeds are no more of a problem then other dogs, demonizing them and fining their owners more will not solve the problems you are trying to solve.
- Leave the pit bulls alone. If a dog is a repeat offender then it should have to go, don't target a breed because the bite can be worse but they don't bite more than any other breed of dog
- I am so confused how your site states “ *It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite.” this quote and you are basing this all of off of what exactly? What about German Shepard's, Doberman's, rotties? Why are the “pit bulls” being singled out. What's going to happen to service or therapy dogs that are considered “pit bulls”? This is a Disgusting display of incompetence and ignorance from whoever is proposing this. If you want to create a safer Calgary you need to focus on not the dogs but the humans. Make it mandatory for ALL dogs to go threw training why only one breed? It just doesn't make sense. I am a certified dog trainer and I don't run the classes to teach the dogs I run the classes to train the humans how to train their dogs, they just need guidance. You should be more worried that literally ANYONE can own a dog, have some sort of screening process or something so you can insure the welfare of the dog before they are even purchased. This would greatly reduce the amount of back yard breeders and reducing the amount of strays at the same time. I really hope there is some actual research and someone with more then half a brain like the person who wrote this garbage in charge of what happens.
- These dogs are not a nuisance. They are like any other dog. Irresponsible owners make for untrained dogs
- [removed] This is not a breed problem it is a owner problem
- <https://www.treehugger.com/the-truth-about-pit-bulls-myths-dispelled-4863833>
- Some of these i would agree more with if nuisance was redefined. I don't think that just because neighbors think a dog is noisy that it should be defined as a nuisance.



- What kind of people do you have sitting there specifically targeting pitbull? Mine's 10 years old and as never even barked at the neighbour! grow up as stick to ANY dog declared a nuisance! I've been bit 3 times at the dog park by a chihuahua, once a golden retriever.
- Instead of breed-specific bylaws, why not make the bylaws towards all dogs! I have personally been attacked and/or bitten by smaller dogs (chihuahua, dachshund, shi tzu, pug, Pomeranian, yorkie) more than I have been attacked and/or bitten by any type of pit bull! I have not once been bitten nor attacked by a large dog (eg: pit bull), but many times I've been attacked AND BITTEN by a small dog! So maybe put your bylaws on those smaller, extremely unpredictable little dogs & educate yourself further in regards to pit bulls and you will learn that the breed was known as the nanny breed (great with children) and also learn that all dogs just need full on training in order to be part of society! Instead of blaming the breed: blame the owners and fine the owners for not taking the time to properly train their dog; whether it's a chihuahua or a pit bull!
- It is not the type of dog that is the issue. It is the owner. I was able to train my tiny 3lbs dog to attack. If a dog has offences on behaviour then mandate a fine, additional insurance, enforced training classes
- Pitbulls are NOT the problem!! Deal with [removed] owners! Not a specific breed!!! Consult trainers and other animal enforcements before making stupid laws like this is indicating
- Separating dogs based on their breed is not okay. Promoting good dog ownership for all dog owners of any breed is an alternative to keep the peace and all dogs happy.
- This is [removed] to target one breed. Do your research on this subject. It's not the breed, it's the irresponsible owners, go after them but the law should be the same for ALL breeds. I've been a Rottweiler owner for 20 years, currently owning 3 including an intact male who is the most gentle, respectful dog ever. I'm so sick of this breed legislation created by people who have no clue about the breed in question. You must sleep with a light on to keep the boogy man away too.
- Education is key. Funds put aside for training and educational purposes. I really don't support singling out a dog breed
- The city needs to make blanket bylaws for ALL dogs that bite. There is no reason why a larger dog should face harsher punishment when there are SIGNIFICANTLY more aggressive smaller dogs. I believe that the correct route forward is to move forward with "nuisance" labels that apply to all dogs. A significant amount of dog bites (in other animals) occur in response to a bite, often by an untrained small dog. Please do not fall for the false narrative that people should be more wary of pitbull breeds. All owners should be EQUALLY responsible and equally culpable for their pets.
- Nothing that puts any bully breeds in a different category than other dogs
- Leave pit bulls alone. Have the same rules for all!!
- All dogs being treated equally. The only nuisance breed are humans!!
- Do not isolate one particular breed type - base fines on the actions of the dog.
- Pit bulls should NOT be singled out. It should be generic dog bylaws.
- This CANNOT be limited only to pitbulls.
- They are the best of dogs and so cuddly, they deserve the same animal rights as other types of dogs!



- This is [removed]. Pit bulls are amazing dogs. The sweetest temperament ever. I've had many breeds and pit bulls are THEE best with kids and other animals if socialized this is prejudice and [removed]
- Don't discriminate against one breed of k-9. That's just ignorant.
- Aggressive dogs should not be allowed off leash in the first place.
- additional insurance reqd for nuisance dogs and dogs who have previous incidents of vicious or aggressive behaviour, NOT defined by breed or by appearance. EVERY dog I have been bitten or attacked by in my life time has been non-pitbull/staffordshire bull terrier/etc types (been bitten by a collie, attacked by a black lab, chased by a basset hound and any small dog has vastly more attitude than typical pitties ever will in a lifetime). It is wrong to penalize a group of dogs because of appearance. Poor owners make bad dogs of any breed.
- I think it should be mandatory the nuisance dog owners be required to take training with the dog. Also please note that for my answers, I am including nuisance/pit bulls as one category; if someone wishes to own a dog, they need to be responsible for it's behaviour .
- None of these as it is not a breed issue
- None of the above!
- PLEASE for the love of God stop targeting pit bulls. They are not dangerous. I work with dogs everyday at work and I have never once been bitten by a pit bull or any bully breed. What you need to do is look at the owners, I have been bitten time and time again by small "purse dogs" that are not taught they are a dog. Instead just a fashion statement. People have coyote wolf crosses as pets and you don't think that isn't more of a threat than a domesticated dog? Why don't you target the wild animals people have as pets that are an actual threat to dogs/people vs going after pitbulls. Look into the UK bully ban and see how well that's working out for them. IT IS THE OWNER NOT THE DOG.
- Any breed can be a nuisance dog. Breed Specific Legislation has been proven not to work, next breed will be shepherds, Rottweilers the statistics just continue on. I thought Calgary was one of the cities that advocated for that.
- I absolutely do not support any sort of breed discrimination legislation and do not understand why the city would be singling out "pitbull" breeds.
- Dogs declared a nuisance must be muzzled in off leash parks, but not required while walking on leash.
- Some examples of dogs that have been deemed 'dangerous' in the course of history -German Shepherds, Rottis & doberman's. It's not necessarily the dog breed, it's the owners. Owners are not responsible and do not do their research before acquiring one of these 'stronger' dogs. If anything, it should be mandated that ALL dog owners from Chihuahua's to Mastiff's and beyond should be required to take obedience classes. Let's face it, Chihuahua's are assholes and can be just a vicious, people aren't scared of them because they are small. But believe me they can induce as much emotional trauma as a large dog, as well, they could inflict physical damage. It's not bad breed's it's bad owners. If this bylaw is passed, how does that affect someone who already owns 2 blockhead dogs??? Do they have to give up one of their family members?



- Making laws specific to pit bulls is idiotic and not very thought out. I'm ashamed that this has to be said.
- I think that obedience classes should be required for all "lock jaw" breeds.
- While I understand that pit bulls have strong jaws and lock jaws when they bite I believe all dogs behaviour has more to do with their training and their owner than the breed. I have met several pit bulls that are more friendly and outgoing than shitzus. My rescue dog has been lunged at while walking her on leash by wiener dogs, shitzus, chiuwawas.
- There should be no breed targeting/wording in the bylaws as it has been proven that breed does not affect bite potential. Cases should be reviewed individually based on dogs history.
- Do not pass BSL! It does not work!
- A dog of any breed can be vicious. Penalize the owner not the animal. The owner creates the problem, not the breed. I've owned nothing but "pit bulls" and never had a problem. They are by far the most loving breed of dog. Its the same principle of horrible children. The parents are responsible for their children.
- Breed Specific Legislation is NOT THE ANSWER. Deal with nuisance dogs case by case. Do not punish an entire breed!
- I support breed specific bans
- I strongly believe owners need to be more accountable for dogs period. The breed of the dog doesn't matter I know labs and collies that are very aggressive. Owners need to train their dogs and the city needs to blame Owners not dogs. A discrimination to a pit bull breed is stupid. There are bad owners and bad parents to children but everyone can get a dog.
- STOP BEING BREED RACIST. It's not the dog, it's the owner. Where are you recommending responsible pet ownership classes.
- all dogs can be reactive, lets not group pit bulls into the stigmatized group it already has been
- There is absolutely no evidence to support that pitbull type dogs have higher or even stronger bites than other breeds. Ultimately the focus should be cracking down on backyard breeding and ensuring when pets are adopted out only responsible pet owners can get their hands on them. This could stop a lot of animal abuse and also crappy dog owners who don't take the time to train. I raise service dogs for PADS and I can assure you I fully understand how much work it takes to have a well behaved dog. In order to do this I went through a rigorous screening process that ensures I'm a good home for these pups. Even with all the training not all of them make it. Just like not all pitbull looking dogs are bad. I've encountered so many that are big sweethearts. Historically they were trained to be service dogs as they are very trainable and loyal pups. They had to stop using them due to public perception. Bylaws like this make it so hard for the responsible dog owners who have put in the effort to raise a sweet animal that would have been overlooked by far too many people purely based on myths that are grounded in valid and reliable data. Please reconsider any silly bylaw that participated in BSL, it only does a disservice to our city!
- I do not own a pit bull breed but I find the discrimination disgusting and the thought that the city would force a family that might have 2 of these dogs to relinquish a family member absolutely horrifying!!! I know they are strong but my child had a nasty bite from a small dog and never a large



dog. I have a neighbor with 4 of the so called nuisance dogs and they are all the biggest babies so you know where this law can be stuck!

- All owners of all dogs held accountable for their behaviour
- I don't agree with ANY of these statements, the city has absolutely NO EDUCATION on pit bulls and should do more research on them before you post stupid shit like this. It is the OWNERS FAULT, not the dogs.
- This is 'racism'. If they have no higher number of dog bites you are punishing them for their appearance in which they have no control over.
- It is unreasonable to categorically single out pit bulls and other dogs with similar appearance. If a dog is a nuisance, put the blame on the owner, not the breed. It's incredible that singling out breeds is even being considered. Surely you know better than this in 2020.
- No breed specific laws
- why are we signaling out pit bulls. We need tougher bylaws on the owners who allow there dogs to be aggressive.
- dog exhibiting dangerous behaviour should be taken by CCS and rehabilitated/trained and not given back to the owner. The owner is the cause of the behaviour.
- Leave the pitbulls alone
- I don't believe that singling out one breed is responsible or fair to those breeds and their owners. It is ownership and how they are raised that determines how a dog behaves. I have had small dogs (chihuahuas, terriers) act way more aggressively towards me than large breeds such as pitbulls or German Shepard.
- [removed] Sure, if someone is injured, take the dog from them and enroll it in some obedience rehab. Fine or charge the owner with negligence, but this goes for any breed. Stop targeting our staffing. Dogs don't get to choose their owners and how they are raised but they should have rights too!hey
- Mandated/ controlled education for owners that wish to adopt a statistically aggressive/potentially dangerous breed of dog prior to adoption with continuing education requirements.
- Don't ban or interfere. If someone breaks an existing law then fine and or prosecute
- Provide obedience training for dogs that are an actual threat, not a perceived one. This should be subsidized and the responsibility to pay should not be on the owner. If a reoccurring issue, aggressive dogs should have their homes assessed.
- Nothing further should be done at this time. Any breed can be a problem not just the breeds identified above.
- just ban them so many deaths and I jury by thes dogs.
- Don't bully a breed! There are aggressive dogs of every kind if they're improperly trained.
- There had been more bites from chihuahuas than pitbulls. The thing is that they don't do as much damage so it isn't reported. Also, in my experience, it is the owner being irresponsible and the dog nit being properly trained, not the breed specific. I say if a dog attacks a human, it be euthanized and the human gets jail time plus fined.
- Stop acting like the breeds are the problem and not the owners.



- No breed of dog should be singled out to require a standard of responsible pet ownership. All problem dogs are caused by irresponsible owners, be it lack of training or ignorance to how your dog is responding to a situation. There is a risk of bite with any animal that has teeth and it is completely irresponsible to pretend that all bite incidents are the same shows a clear level of ignorance on the part of the survey developer. While some bites are caused by a lack of training/ socialization many dog bites are because dogs have been put in situations that cause them to feel unsafe and the humans around them lack the education to read the situation. All dog owners should be educated so they can raise happy and healthy dogs. It is absolutely ignorant for the city of Calgary to single out any single breed or type of dog for heavy restrictions especially while admitting pitbulls do not bite often. Maintain the standards of the beautiful city of Calgary, do not invoke breed specific legislation. Education is the only way to combat fear.
- To say you can have only one pitbull is ludicrous.
- Owners of these so-called nuisance animals, should be held accountable and not the dog because of its breed. That's like saying all people of a certain race can't enter a store or public gathering cuz historically groups of them have been more involved in crimes than other races. Pull your head out of your ass, and make this for all breeds not just a specific breed. Small dogs are more likely to bite than big dogs yet when they do bite, owners are not told they have to put their little shit dog down. But a big dog owner will get that. This is sooooo unbelievably stupid. It's the owner not the breed!!!!!!
- Training for owners of dogs that are considered a nuisance. Wellness checks to ensure that nuisance dogs are being properly cared for. It's the owner that makes the dog.
- None of these. This has been proven again and again that it is a myth that these dogs are dangerous. It is discrimination. It is pathetic.
- Create more awareness about not petting strangers' dogs and dog behaviour and etiquette with others' dogs in general. People (owner and/or the one approaching the dog) are more often the problem.
- Do not make it breed specific, make the rules apply to the pets and owners that violate them.
- If you want to put a ban on a type of dog include little rat dogs. They are the ones that bite.
- Dogs considered a nuisance by who? Someone who walks by and doesn't like the look of my pit bulls? If you'd like to be discriminatory I'd start with German Shepherds or Chihuahuas some of the worst dogs I see out and about. Stop focusing on my breed due to poor education. They are some of the most sensitive, loving, happy breeds I know. If this is passed I and so many other pit parent parents will gladly move and boycott your city.
- Pit bulls are not the problem the owner is. Training classes only work if the owner continues to practice at home. These obedience trainings should come with a pass or fail. If failed the owner would need to repeat the course.
- Bad owners are bad owners. Remove the breed specific differentiation.
- Pitbulls are not the problem. I literally live with one he is the sweetest little dog you will ever meet in your life. His biggest threat is he will kiss you to death whereas I have a friend with a little ankle-biter dog and guess what, you can't walk into that house without getting bit. The problem is not the dog it is the owner and how it is trained. They're going to enforce anything it should be stricter guidelines.



for those who want to adopt a pet. Maybe background checks on people who want to own what you guys deem as "dangerous dogs" I can think of a longer list of humans who deserve to be muzzled rather than Pitbull breeds

- Take the pit bull [removed] out of this. You guys flame to be anti radish yet you're willing to single out an entire BREEDS because you think they're stronger. What about German shepherds? They're really strong? What about chihuahuas ? They're known to be aggressive and in your standard a "nuisance". Crack down on bad dog owners. Not the dogs themselves. But singling out a specific breed cuz you're scared of the way they look is EXTREMELY hypocritical
- It is more appropriate to identify animals that are dangerous by their behaviour not by their breed. All animals have the potential to bite and maul. There needs to be enforceable restrictions/conditions placed in the pet owner not the breed of the animal. Be specific, if the human is irresponsible with the care and development of their pet, they may not abide by any by-law put in place. These owners need to be restricted to behavioural modification classes and proof of improved behaviours. This idea of penalizing, stigmatizing, and punishing the animal without cause is barbaric. All animals have the potential to be trained and respected no matter their lineage. ALL aggressive animals should be managed, trained, rehabilitated where appropriate and the same goes for the owners.
- I don't think you can assigned nuisance to a dog simply by appearance. It is discrimination there should be a prior offence
- The owners of nuisance dogs should have to be trained for how to treat their animal or should be given a hefty fine like in the thousands. Its nit the dogs fault its the owners fault they train the dogs to be like that. They should be jailed for the way they treat their animal.
- Fines to the OWNERS with MANDATORY TRAINING for the owner regarding ANY AND ALL BREEDS, its not the animals fault it was improperly trained
- I support NONE of these
- Shame on you for declaring "pit bulls" problematic. Poor ownership is problematic NOT a particular breed. I am not a current dog owner but have owned a dog (West Highland Terrier) in the past. I have zero issues with pit bulls. To be honest they are one of my favourite. When walking city paths I am bc more likely to greeted by an aggressively behaving small breed than I ever am by a pit bull and there are many in my neighborhood. Problematic and nuisance dogs determined by behaviour and not merely by breed should be subject to increased fines etc but NOT simply based on breeds. Those that support breed specific law such as this are poorly educated on the matter. Shame on the city do Calgary for targeting breeds vs behaviours. Other cities with "pit bull" laws have not resolved their nuisance dog issues because it isn't about the breed it is about the OWNER.
- Obedience training required for dog owners if identified as owning a problem dog
- no additional restrictions for "pit bull type" dogs. BSL is not effective.
- not specifica to pitbulls...any dog who bites is apprehended....don't just single out one breed!
- you can't use Pit bulls. As a term. Dogs in general are a reflection of the owners. The owners are the problem. Have them assume responsibility. My bully loves us unconditionally and has never had a mean moment. With that said he would protect us with his life.



- STOP BSL! You're singling out breeds of dogs that you believe are the issue. You're forgetting a number of breeds in your list that have just as strong, if not a stronger bite. Stop singling out specific breeds and hold ALL dog owners to the same standards. This BSL bs is sickening and I'm disgusted you would even bring it to the table. Treat ALL dogs and owners fairly. Hold ALL owners accountable for the same actions and get your head out of your [removed]
- Look at each dog as a case by case. Breed doesn't define how dangerous or how strong they can bite. Neglectful owners should be penalized.
- this should not be breed or appearance specific, it should apply to any dog no matter, suze, shape, color or breed. Owners should be trained as well. It is never the dog, it is based on the owners training or lack there of.
- Breed specific bylaws are discrimination. These issues are owner and training problems.
- Don't single out pitbulls
- There should not be classified as a nuisance dog at all. A nuisance dog can be any breed.
- Don't apply these to specific breeds, apply to all breeds of dogs.
- This is the stupidest thing I have ever heard of. Breed specific legislation is not needed in Calgary and Pit Bull breeds are not the problem.
- These rules should apply to all breeds
- Depending on severity of behaviour/actions the right to euthanize dangerous dogs providing it is a committee decision. All of what I have chosen must apply to ANY breed.
- Fines for bad owners who do not control their dogs in public
- None of these. Dogs don't bite unless provoked - it doesn't matter what breed they are. People should respect dogs and realize that they also have personal space and if you invade that it make them feel in danger then they'll bite. That's your fault, not theirs. They don't understand any better.
- Small dogs require muzzles for biting
- Stop putting a specific breed on items. There are many other types than pit bulls that cause issues and saying this is going to cause a political storm.
- Any dog that displays violence can be rehabilitated in one way or another. Make it easier for support groups to start and continue to operate. Most of these work on a voluntary basis and as such should qualify for government assistance. This would be a cheaper option for the province as a tax break cost nothing and the private organizations assume the costs associated with the rescue.
- Pet owner should be responsible for their pet. Just because I own 2 "pit bull" type dogs that are well behaved doesn't mean that I should pay for the sins of many!
- None. Nuisance dogs are not breed specific.
- ANY dangerous dog should be muzzled while off private property. Let's not punish good dogs of certain breeds but rather restrict the problem dogs, regardless of breed.
- I would love to see more fines for people walking their dogs off leash in on lease areas!
- To ban a breed from a dog park is only going to cause troubles, people will find new places to make off leash!
- if you are going to require extra insurance for one breed you better do it for all or none!
- How about it's not the dog's fault the owner is an [removed]. Don't blame pitbulls



- I highly disagree with all of these
- Dogs declared as dangerous, not nuisance. Do NOT single out 'Pitt bulls'. The reason stated that these type of dogs have a stronger bite has been consistently disproven. German Shepherds and Rottweilers have a stronger bite. All dogs, regardless of breed or 'type' have the potential to be dangerous. Each case needs to be individually judged and not based on a 'type'.
- Breed specific legislation is costly and inefficient. Singling out pit bulls and pit bull type dogs hasn't worked in other jurisdictions. Calgary's pet bylaws have been championed for its success worldwide. Let's not mess that up please. I'm proud of our approach to pet ownership in Calgary.
- I do NOT believe that Calgary should be bringing in any type of BSL. BSL does NOT work and that has been proven. Why, would you allow appearance to be an option?! So will a pug have to be muzzled and the owner only be allowed one? Since they technically are bully breeds. This logic is completely scewed. All of these answers are biased - and blatantly against "pitbulls".
- Higher fines for bad owners who neglect or abuse dogs! There's no such thing as a bad dog just bad people
- Why are you singling out the dogs? ANY dog can be a problem if the OWNERS are irresponsible. Ensure that the owners are properly trained/vetted before purchasing and/or adopting.
- ("pit-bull") *It is pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, AND EVERY DOG THAT HAS A BIG HEAD.... allows the potential for a more severe bite. This is breedism. It won't happen in Calgary i promise.
- More penalties for negligent dog owners
- Other jurisdictions in Canada have been rescinding breed specific language in their animal control bylaws because they are proven not to work. Why is Calgary going backwards rather than forward?
- Breed specific legislation is biased and unfounded. Pit bull breeds are not always aggressive or vicious. Any legislation must apply to all breeds and must address the issues of concern, not target specific breeds.
- The type of nuisance must be stated (ie fought with other dogs) currently the definition, which includes being "at large" is too vague
- There should not be dog specific rules.
- Punish bad owners and not the dog.
- All of these options are stupid. I have had people put their hand through my fence and get bit by my dog, that doesn't make my dog aggressive, it says that the person was stupid and invaded my dog's territory. Or if a dog barks "too much" at home and gets the designation of a nuisance dog, how does wearing a muzzle at the dog park help the dogs anxiety... It only adds to it. Or if that dog is then not allowed in a dog park again how is that dog supposed to learn to be quiet around other people, it won't have the ability to expell its build up energy or be given a chance to just be a dog. I have also never seen a naturally aggressive pit bull... This is including all dogs in the category. First they don't have the strongest bit, there are other dog breeds with stronger bits, and second they are a breed that just wants to please their owners. If a pit bull is aggressive its been trained they way, that person should be prohibited from owning a dog, because they will train any dog to be aggressive. My definition of aggressive is that the dog attacks on command and it's the owner that is



constantly telling the dog to attack, that is an owner problem, not a dog problem and not a pit bull problem. The pit bull will be very easy to untrain in that behaviour once taken from the aggressive owner. Put a muzzle on the owner and prevent them from owning any dogs. A dog very rarely will attack unprovoked, in the dogs mind there is a reason for the need to attack. In the cases where there is clearly no reason (no one provoked it, no medical reason, not a training issue etc.) then yes that is an aggressive dog and in that case the owners are probably going to be understanding of the dog being put down. But if a dog has puppies and she is separated from them she has every right to get back to her puppies in the way she thinks is appropriate. If a child is unsupervised with her and smells like her puppies then she will think that it is that child that has harmed them and will defend her family. This is not an aggressive dog... This is a dog being a good mother and owners not respecting her.

- Zero tolerance (ie mandated destruction) for dogs that bite people.
- If these generalizations were applied to humans, there would be an outcry of upset people. To generalize and discriminate against one breed is a terrible thing to do.
- Discrimination against one breed is wrong!
- why are you targeting pitbulls specifically. you need to change "pitbull" to ALL dogs in general. it's NOT the breed, it's the damn owner which what you should be putting more focus on. the owner. some people just shouldn't be dog owners.
- Any dog that has bitten another dog or person should go to obedience. Second offence should be muzzled. Rules should not be breed specific.
- All dogs at dog parks should be neutered. All pit bulls should be neutered.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Dog ownership should be a privilege. Needs to be mandates in regards to port dog ownership. Maybe all dogs should go through certified obedience training.
- Definition of a nuisance dog needs to be amended. Equating a dog that barks (any small breed) to a dog that bites (any large breed) is inappropriate.
- None of these!!!!!! It's owner issues not the breed and to specifically single out the breed is ridiculous!!!!
- Its not the breed its the owner racism against one breed is ridiculous
- It's not the pitbull that is the issues, 99% of the time it is the owner. Owners should have to go through training and obtain a certificate of responsible pet ownership before being able to acquire a pit bull or other dog deemed a nuisance. A fee of some substance should be paid for this course. Owners who really want a specific type of dog will pay a decent monetary sum to own the breed of dog they want.
- How about HIGHER FINES FOR ALL DOG OWNERS INVOLVED IN OFFENCES. STOP BREED SHAMING CALGARY, RASCISM DOESNT LOOK GREAT ON YOU. LEAVE PITBULLS AND RESPONSIBLE OWNERS ALONE!!!!
- Dogs declared a nuisance should be required to do more training.
- I agree with Breed Neutral Legislation, that pertains to specific incidents not pertaining to one specific breed. Responsible pet ownership above all.



- Small untrained dogs do more biting than any other dog go after bad dogs not breeds, what about sheppards , rotweilers, dobermins,dalmations, the list goes on why single out pitbulls, what an awful shame
- Owners of dogs declared a nuisance, owners of dogs involved in a ticketed incident, and owners of pit bulls and other larger breeds must complete an accredited responsible dog ownership training program. Dog owner licensing.
- How about make these laws for kids? Less who are a nuisance? Leave pet owners alone if you are not going to worry about shitty parenting.
- I strongly disagree with anything that targets a specific breed ie pit bulls and other bully breeds.
- I don't think you should signal out one breed. As small dogs bite too. All dogs should have obedience.
- Why is this being asked for breed specific. Educate yourselves before having such uneducated surveys
- Publish actual bite numbers by breed, require DNA testing of all dogs that bite to ensure accurate statistics.
- It's the owners fault not the dogs fault poor dog owner ship leads to poor dog behaviour
- Are you kidding me BSL???? I'll never spend any money or come to Calgary every again is BSL passes and I will be strongly boycotting anything and everything to do with Calgary. This is insanity. Prejudice. Limit nuisance dogs only, pitbulls are lovely dogs when given proper care and training. I owned a recuse for 12 years and NEVER had any any issues. Please reconsider these draconian measures.....
- How about we deal with issues as they arise, and do not discriminate against ANY dog breeds. The COC should not be involved in BSL as this will cause more issues than good because it will always be one sided, no matter the situation. There will always be bias which involves the pitbull type dog being in the wrong when that simply will not be true or accurate.
- Dog owners required to take a course on how to care for their animal. It is not the breed but the human that causes the problems.
- Why change? Approximately 1000 reported dog bites in Calgary in 1985 and 260 in 2003. Calgary's dangerous dog legislation was implemented in response to the bite problem. The results speak for themselves – a 70% drop in the number of OVERALL dog bites. The measures Calgary has taken have shown results, and set a model and a precedent that should be implemented across Canada. <http://www.dpctz.com/CalgaryModelDefendingDogswebsite.pdf>
- Base fines on dog and owners actions not breed
- You can't go after one dog breed. It is the owners of the dog that breed the bad behaviour. Years ago it was German shepherds that were considered dangerous as they were associated as being aggressive police dogs, then it was rotweilers that were considered dangerous as people were using them as guard dogs. I personally find the smaller dogs to be more the nuisance dogs and at risk of biting. People also need to to take responsibility and not go up and pet someone else's dog without permission.



- Calgary has long held the opinion backed by statistics that higher fines don't work, nor do breed bans. Scientific evidence does not support these changes.
- Any dog that bites a child no matter the breed, size, color, shape, should have the owners fined and behaviour training course completed.
- mandatory training from specified training facilities for all dogs. Lower licensing fees when do this. If don't do mandatory training licensing fees are outrageous.
- Blaming a particular breed when it is stated they do not have a higher occurrence of incident than other breeds is a disgusting suggestion. Pit bulls are not the problem. Pet owners who are irresponsible are the problem. All pets have the potential to be a nuisance.
- It's discriminatory to focus on pit bulls, why not all dogs showing aggressive behaviour? The fact that you are singling out one particular breed is disturbing and borders on racism... what's your next step? Not allowing certain ethnic groups in parks too?
- This is wrong
- pet owners of nuisance animals need to go training on how to be a responsible pet owner.
- Training and education for owners of dogs - of ANY breed - who engaged in problem behaviours. Why are you targeting pit bull breeds when the data shows many other breeds show problem behaviours?
- Higher fees for owners wanting to keep dogs that are not spayed or neutered
- Ridiculous you'd target pit bulls! A bad dog is a bad dog regardless of size! Any rules for problem dogs should apply no matter the size. Target the owners of bad dogs with fines, seizures, mandatory training - regardless of the size of the dog!
- Nothing that singles out the pit bull breed EVER
- BSL has been proven INEFFECTIVE in municipalities across Canada. Focus on the DOG and not the breed.
- Nuisance dogs should be non breed specific!
- Higher fines for small dog owners who's small dog attacks my 'pit bull like' dog and forces me to get stitches for him and pay a vet bill. Don't be closed minded it's 2020, we're past this.
- Obedience training required for ALL dog breeds
- Large dogs (ie with strength to cause harm) should NOT be punished, OWNERS should be punished. Owning a large dog is a bigger responsibility and that needs to be enforced. On top of obedience training being required for a pet license, if there is a severe incident, they should be required to take further training. If more than 1 incident possibly a home visit as well (at cost to owner) to ensure a good environment for the pet. Lots of public education around this will deter people who can't handle the responsibility of owning a large animal.
- This should not be breed or type specific. Any dog fined with an offense of biting or dangerous predatory behavior should be muzzled in public. No limit to number of bully breed dogs in a responsible home. Dogs that learn to play with other dogs are less likely to bite a human.
- This proposed by-law is RIDICULOUS. It's 2020, Council, give your head a shake.
- Pit Bulls are NOT the breed responsible for the most fatalities in Canada. I am STUNNED that Calgary is swaying from its WORLD REKNOWNED BYLAW. Absolutely stunned. This cannot



happen. It is absolutely NOT breed but the training (positive reinforcement) that should be emphasized for all dogs, especially large breeds, not just the breed you are targeting.

- How dare you discriminate against pit bull breeds. [removed] Just because they look different “scary” doesn’t mean they are. They are like every other dog, loveable, caring, playful, loyal etc. All dogs can bite I’d provoke or feel the need to protect themselves or their owners NOT just pit bull breeds! How about enlightening the public, the haters and those that have opinions without facts that pit bulls aren’t the problem, it’s them. The people who try to destroy things they don’t understand or are scared of. Change the stigma on a dog who people love to hate!
- Don't blame the breed of the dog.
- Do not discriminate against “pit bull” this is not ok
- To set specific rules for certain breeds is prejudice and ridiculous. It will not reduce bites or dangerous animals. The focus should be on the owner, not the breed.
- Education for owners. IT IS NOT THE FAULT OF THE DOGS. OWNERS MUST BE EDUCATED TO WORK WITH THEIR DOGS. I am a dog trainer and there are so many other ways to go about this. You will be destroying so many lives. What if you worked with dog trainers like myself to come up with a citizenship program, where all dog owners are required to attend classes and a seminar, for dogs that are labelled problematic, and this doesn’t just include pit bull types, they must reach the second level in the citizenship test in order to get their city license. Each year, there is an assessment by a qualified force free dog trainer and then go on a case by case basis. It must be a force free trainer as any other type will cause MORE behaviour issues and attacks. Please contact me if you require evidence on this. I am also willing to work for free to create this program with you. My advice to you Calgary... is be different, be the city that changes the standards for pit bulls. Yes, there are some bad apples, but that doesn’t just mean pitties. Pitties are actually incredibly cuddly and loving, they just need the right training. Please please be the change in standards. Invest in people, don’t punish. Don’t be like those dog trainers that punish dogs, you do, and you’ll be punishing the people of Calgary, and the relationship will be lost. Please reach out. [personal information removed]
- Anyone who thinks pitbull are more or less likely to bite than say a Chihuahua is a complete and utter idiot. Pit bulls are not a problem dog type. Give fines to the owners of ANY bad dog owners. Don't punish a breed for bad owners.
- My pitbull is SIGNIFICANTLY MORE CALM than any Pomeranian or Chihuahua I’ve ever seen. You’re stupid if you think they should ever be muzzled in public. It’s 2020 and I cannot fathom that this is still an issue. Good dogs come from good owners. The breed is irrelevant. Do some research before implementing these garbage laws.
- nuisance dog should be better defined here. What constitutes a "nuisance"? A dog that someone finds scary based on appearance? A dog that barks? What size dog that barks, because Pomeranians are small but irritating. Not overly dangerous.
- We have a pit bull and she is the nicest dog! Smaller dogs tend to be more aggressive actually but because they are “smaller” they get away with it! We took our pitbull for a walk and a lady with a small dog attached our dog on leash! Go figure! I 100% disagree with targeting bully breeds it is



discrimination! I can see if ANY dog has been in multiple altercation being called a nuisance yes but not ones only based on breed when they have never offended. Not fair!

- BSL has been proven ineffective, bylaw offences should be evaluated equally regardless of breed, owners held responsible, do not punish pets and owners pre-emptively.
- If you are handling a dog that has bitten a human (most likely out of fear) it is likely this dog is suffering from a behaviour disorder. A behavioural disorder has a emotional which is a psychological or behavioural pattern outside of the norm for the species. There is often an emotional component. An obedience class is the last place these animals should be placed. Preventatively, if there is a mandate in place that dogs are required to obedience classes these should be approved positive, science based training classes, otherwise they will do more harm than good.
- It is rascism to bully a specific breed!!
- Re-offense by same owners should limit their ability to get dogs until they prove they have received basic dog training by a city approved trainer. The owner is responsible for handling of the dog.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. People are the problem. This is so disappointing City of Calgary.
- Punish bad owners rather than an entire breed. This is ridiculous
- There should not be breed specific legislation!
- Society is moving away from prejudice and discrimination and singling out one from another. It is astounding that Calgary is considering moving in the opposite direction in regards to pets.
- this is dog racism and any dog if not trained properly is an issue.
- Breed specific regulations are not based on science but rather emotion. Responsible pet ownership irregardless of breed and public education is key to preventing incidents involving dogs bites.
- You should not be judging a dog by its breed or looks. If anything you should be judging the people who have said such breed, to see if they are even capable to looking after said such breed!
- Evaluate the individual that owns these "nuisance" dogs. Most times it's the owner that causes an animal to behave this way. Or owning a dog they cannot handle. Don't blame the breed! I've seen more "nuisances" from little dogs than any large or bully breeds
- Hey [removed] how about you leave this alone. This is no different then saying only a certain race of people commit crimes or only a certain race of people commit terrorist attacks, just cause its an animal the discrimination os no different. Just keep blowing the cities budget on the stupid art you put up around the city that no one likes, you are useless. You just lost my bote at nexy election although you never had it. Look at the owners of the dogs. Maybe make it a bylaw that if you live in Forest Lawn you can't own a breed specific dog cause we all know nothing good comes out of Forest Lawn. Tbis survey is [removed] why not let people comment on ever question you ask, such as using a bandana system so kids know its okay to approach a dog. If a dog bites a kid cause it grabs its tail, that kids parents should be punished for not teaching their dumb kid to grab a dogs tail. Parents need to teach their kids to ask for permission. Just like how kids used to be taught before [removed].
- Stop with the BSL. It has failed in other jurisdictions why even contemplate it now?
- No speacil rules aka "discrimination" for breed specific dogs and their owners including pitbulls and other bully breeds.



- Literally every dog is different. Have measured in place to monitor and provide assistance to owners with previous offending dogs. Don't punish a breed or a look.
- Demonizing pit bull breeds is nonsense. Other large breeds are capable of as severe bites. Owners and the public need more education on the care and behaviour of these animals.
- You cannot discriminate against a dog because it looks a certain way. Way to be racist against animals.
- These questions directly targeting specific breeds (pit bulls) are offensive and naive. The city should be ashamed for putting forward such options!!! I am not even a dog owner but, I live next to a dog park and I have yet to see pit bull or similar looking breed look even remotely dangerous or misbehaving.
- Mandatory training classes for nuisance dogs. If owner can not control dog, rehoming.
- NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Obedience training for ALL dogs, not just pit bulls
- I don't feel you can make rules based on the breed of dog or what they look like? Any dog can bite if they want to, it's not just 1 breed. I don't know how many times this needs to be brought up about dogs and one breed being pinpointed when most of the time it's not that breed who attacks or bites. There are no bad dogs there are bad owners and that's where the problem lies, not in the dog. So the dogs should not be punished because they have horrible owners. Also you don't know what a dogs life have been like, maybe there is a reason they are the way they are, it's just like humans. You put something on your face that limits your movement and ability to drink after being active and see what it's like. I think pin pointing one breed or animals that have "the look" is not fair to the dogs or owners. If your gonna pinpoint aggressive dogs then pinpoint ALL aggressive dogs, not a breed that has a bad reputation because of assholes using them for the wrong reasons. It's 2020 people let's start being better.
- I think that the best way to go is to NOT label breeds or types of dogs. There should be no specific breeds mentioned at all and ALL dogs Will be treated equally. I have owned Staffordshire Bull Terriers all my life and have found that they are the most loving,attentive and trustworthy dogs especially with children. There has been absolutely no incidence in Canada that I know of involving a purebred Staffy Terrier hurting or biting anyone ever. Please re evaluate your proposal and do not use breed specific wording. A Nuisance dog is a nuisance and all dogs should be treated equally.
- Why pit bulls why not Shepard's and Dalmatians or every dog has potential to harm punish the deed not the breed
- Breed specific legislation should not be introduced. I do not support any bylaws specified to a particular breed.
- If pit bulls are being singled out like this then the government of Canada justice system should be muzzled and euthanized and fined for killing innocent people and stealing money from hard working people and calling it justice ! This is so [removed] ridiculous
- This is a joke and shouldn't even be considered.
- Stop picking on pitbulls
- Treat all breeds equally.



- German Shepard's have a stronger bite more pounds per square inch. Amend this to state that breed instead.
- Why the focus on pit bulls? Indigenous people are incarcerated at a higher rate than non indigenous people, should we ban them? All dogs should have training and all dogs can have problematic behaviour.
- I don't believe there should be a law specifically to one type of breed of dog , any dog can be potentially harmful if treated poorly.
- As someone who can has worked in an animal related field for a very long time, I can you tell you I'm 100% honest when I say that I am 10x more afraid of a chihuahua and Chihuahua mowers than I am of pit bulls or any bully breed dog
- This is a ridiculous bylaw. Isolating pit bulls is a fools errand. Montreal tried this and reversed it. Please don't discriminate on pit bulls. I love all dogs. I've only been bitten twice in my life and one was a German Shepherd and the other a mixed breed. Never a pit bull.
- Obedience training Manditory for all dog breeds
- Stop being a bully to a breed. The government has successfully started a race war between humans. Perhaps understanding that its the humans are at fault, not the breed of dog.
- Abstain from breed specific policies
- Just gonna say this pit bull vendetta is not going to go well. It's not the breed! I even say this after personally having to put my pitbull mix down recently for major aggressive behaviour that we worked to fix for two years but in his case he was too traumatized to become trustworthy. There ARE responsible owners with pitbull-like breeds. This is fear mongering to me and down right wrong to charge more fines based on breed type.
- [personal information removed] I teach many dogs to bite for various services but I also teach dogs not to bite. I have tons of insight on this subject and would love the opportunity to come speak to you's and give another perspective. I think there's some things being missed that are important to hear. [personal information removed]
- Don't don't discriminate against pitbulls. If a dog attacks a person or animal. The owner has failed the dog.
- I think this ban is petty and should be labels to all dogs not pinning out pitts like stated they aint number 1 in incident so why pick on them ..
- Any nuisance dog should be sent to obedience class. Many pit bulls are wonderful pets with responsible owners. A push should be made for what responsibilities are for responsible owners and obedience classes should be mandatory for any adopted animal... every decade has a dog breed that is feared ... it's not the dogs ... it's the owners ... educate and make training services available to them
- How about nothing for the pit bulls & something for the small dogs that bite my pitbull.
- Stop blaming the breed!!!! Start holding bad owners accountable. Any breed of dog can be a biter. All of the bylaws targeting Staffordshires and Pitbulls are wrong. ALL dog owners should be held accountable for their animals. ALL breeds are good until BAD PEOPLE get involved. Bad owners should be fined and punished, not the dogs.



- Limit how many people can have, instead of obedience training when getting the dog there should be a screening prior to getting the dog. Also breeders need to be responsible and accountable that the dogs go to suitable homes, and they should be limited to how many they can breed.
- No muzzle.
- The problem isn't the dog it's the owner. The city of Calgary is looking at this wrong. Maybe enforce mandatory training sessions to any animal owners who've had an incident where there's been an injury. Said owner could go through training to properly care for that particular dogs needs. It has nothing to do with a specific breed. Don't limit what good pet owners can do please.
- Owner education, just as teenagers have to do a course to babysit, owners of dogs should also have to pass a pet ownership course. Usually it is not the dog fault if they are a nuisance, but ill prepared/bad owners.
- If a dog is involved (any breed) in a bite they are banned for a year from dog parks and must wear a muzzled when in densely populated areas.
- Fines and or obedience training for all unruly or nuisance dogs with numerous incidents.
- I strongly believe that this should be taken action CASE BY CASE. Calgary, it is sad to see that this is happening to animal "breeds" it is all in the owner and how you RAISE your dog. Seems to me and also to a lot of people, that this is pretty much saying because you are a certain color or race, you have to be punished without committing a crime. THINK people that are alone by themselves, have no kids, only that dog that is with them every single day of their lives now you just decide to make a bylaw for a specific breed? This should NOT happen to any breed i have been bitten by a chihuahua so what? This is absolutely ridiculous and SAAAAAADD to see from my city. DO NOT generalize.
- Targeting pit bulls is wrong. Breed Neutral Laws is what science and common sense suggest. Also this survey has been shared in a hate group that targets pit bulls and their owners. They were encouraged to fill this out in order to manipulate the stakeholders. The medical studies from the USA are not only level 4 in evidence they are faulty junk science. The CDC Along with every veterinarian professional agency on Earth speaks against legislation targeting and discriminating breeds. Extra insurance on owners guarantees that pit bulls will be needlessly surrendered in shelters by owners who can't afford the unjust extra burden. Target the human end of the leash. Not the dog breed. Actual science along with the victims of other dog breeds show that any medium through large sized dog can and has inflicted just as much damage, if not more than pit bulls. Targeting breeds for any discriminatory policies I archaic and unjust.
- None of these
- No discrimination against pit bulls- if you're going to make a bylaw, keep it the same for every dog
- Leave the "pitbulls" alone and leave the rest like you said it..... Just because a "pitbull" has the jaw strength to cause harm, does NOT mean they WILL cause harm. If a pitbull is involved in an incident and earns a nuisance title... then by all means, they should follow the same rules as any other breed. Should a black man have to pay more insurance to walk the streets, or leave their sweaters, purses, hats etc.... at the counter when they shop? That answer is NO! Use some common sense.



This is PATHETIC!! Clearly NO ONE in this “bylaw office” has ever owned or been around a “pitbull” type dog before. It’s always sooo clear because they’re always saying crap like this!

- Background checking owners. 85% of dog owners that have a "nuisance" dog, are the main reason for this "nuisance". Check the owners and force them to take classes. They are the cause of the dog being a "nuisance".
- Don't discriminate against pit bulls or bully breeds. It's not the dogs that cause issue. It's [removed] ownership and neglect.
- that no household have more than one nuisance dog
- If any dog NON BREED SPECIFIC has ANY bite history or the owner had issues with keeping their dog home, that specific owner should be penalized. NOT an entire breed or a dog that may look like a bully breed ex, in Manitoba many German bred Labrador retrievers were sized because they also resembled the large blockhead short coat of a " pitbull" to the uneducated eye. You can't punish a dog for an irresponsible owner.
- How about higher fines for dogs that are not spayed/neutered and banning breeding of all dogs as shelters are often full.
- Just because they look aggressive does not mean they are. This is a ridiculous law. Maybe the yappy little dogs should be muzzled because I am definitely more worried about them biting vs. a bull breed.DO NOT SUPPORT THIS IDEA AT ALL!
- Fines for owner's of the dog that are deemed unfit allow the dog to be put into obedience classes/training for a chance at rehabilitation it is bad owners not bad dogs or bad breeds any dog can be a vicious dog if not trained in a respectful and responsible manner.
- You cannot ban a breed. You cannot label them all as bad and call pitbulls a nuisance. They are not. All types of dogs have the potential to be dangerous. If an dog shows they are dangerous then it should be dealt with case by case
- I do not support any breed specific legislation. It unfairly targets good animals just because of how they look. I have a mix breed dog who to some “looks intimidating”. I have seen many dog owners scoop up their small dogs when they see my dog, even though he has not even approached their dog. It is discrimination pure and simple. It is no different than racism but for dogs. Just as you can't tell if a person is good or bad by the colour of their skin, you can not tell if a dog is well behaved simply by their stature. And yes, even dogs that “look” scary need exercise and socialization, so it is important that they be able to go to dog parks as well. One solution I have seen, that could work well, is to have some area of dog parks that are fenced off and designed for small/timid dogs. This way people who are concerned about their dog interacting with larger or scary dogs, can have a safe place. If they don't want to use it they don't have to.
- Breed specific bylaws are unjust, these should be scrapped immediately. I also can not support the nuisance bylaws as offered as it seems too easy for escalating behaviors between neighborhood residents. I see a great start with it but a dog who barks at home and is declared a nuisance definitely should not be barred from a dog park where they can get away from the stress of being at home. But seriously stop creating breed specific bylaws.



- I agree that there should not be more than 1 nuisance dog in a house hold, however I DISAGREE that should extend to pit bulls without nuisance status. Also a household with a nuisance dog should not be allowed to have other dogs (even if the other dogs dont have nuisance status)
- No breed is worse than another all dog breeds should be treated equally and fairly.
- Please specify how many minor offences and of what nature. Dogs bark, if you have a nasty neighbour that reports you for your dog barking multiple times are you then saying that dog won't be allowed at a dog park? Makes no sense. For dogs with aggressive behaviour such as biting (NOT pit bulls) if it is first offence then mandatory obedience classes, second offence muzzle In public places, third offence confined to private property. Specific steps will identify the dogs the rules should apply to instead of arbitrarily targeting breeds. Small dogs are often more aggressive than larger dogs, bite strength does NOT correlate to behaviour and personality.
- None of these things. No new laws!!
- No new bylaws regarding pitbulls because they are good dogs who love and care for they family. My dogs have safe me at my lowest point and make me feel safe and loved. You can't take that love a way from a pitbull or they family because they are so much more than just a dog they are people world.
- The dog itself is not there is an offence or a bite, fine the owner and have the dog take obedience classes. Do not ban or put down the dog. The dog is not the problem.
- Come up with a better definition of "nuisance". Is it a dog that is aggressive? Or just a dog that has escaped or barked? A dog that has escaped doesn't need to be muzzled, but a dog that bites should be.
- Has responsible pitbull owners , we are so hurt by this survey. It is so BSL faced. All dogs deserve to be treated the exact same. BSL does not work and that has been proven time and time again . Our dog does not deserve this negative profiling the city of Calgary is doing right now. It's the owners responsibility not the dogs. It's not the breed it's how they are raised.
- Rehabilitation for dogs that are not properly trained, socialized, etc and have had minor OR major incounters with agression. *a dog should not be euthanized for an owners lack of ability or willingness to train their pets*
- Pit bulls aren't always the problem. More dog bits happen from small dogs. This is a ridiculous.
- I think the better solution is interviewing all of the candidates who have previously never owned a "Pit bull" type. But also MORE information needs to be made public as to what the city of calgary will think a "pit bull" breed is as there are many dog breeds that are not bully breeds but have similar characteristics.
- Owners of dogs deemed a nuisances should be required to go to dog training classes. Don't blame a dog that's never been trained, owners need to take responsibility.
- There should be NO breed specific laws! Only dogs who have bitten/attacked/charged/etc should be a nuisance. ALL dog owners should be required to complete dog training!
- Zero of this [remove] is okay.



- As someone who has volunteered at an animal shelter, and has extensive experience with dogs, I will NEVER support discrimination against pitbulls (or any other dog breed). Pitbulls are sweet and loving like all other dogs. A dog is only dangerous if it is neglected and/or abused. A dog that receives proper care and exercise will never be a danger to anyone. You would be better off making it a law to muzzle humans who don't take care of their dogs than pit bulls. Truth be told it would be more prudent to have mandatory testing or checks for dog owners to ensure they are properly caring for their pets.
- Make citizens pass a minimal test when they get a license for their pet.
- None as you can't single out a certain breed
- The fact that the city of Calgary needs to single out 'pitbulls' is DISGUSTING, so now we are being 'racist' against dogs on the basis of their looks??? I'm appalled! I have seen small dogs at the dog park come up to my pitbull cross dog and bark and bite his feet, my dog does NOTHING but runs away and nothing is stated in the above 'choices' for small vicious dogs that make my dog's feel bleed and their owners just laugh it off because their dogs are 'little'? I am embarrassed that the city of Calgary feels the need to even ask these questions. Pitbull bites are worse than any other breed? have you ever been bit by a German Sheppard or a Husky or a Lab? Are you kidding me? You should be ashamed of yourselves for even allowing these RIDICULOUS choices to be available. Pitbulls must be muzzled in public because of the way they LOOK? so I can't walk my dog on my street or at the dog park without a muzzle? This is the most ridiculous thing I have ever read in my life!!! I thought Calgary was a great city to live in, but if these RULES come in place, I'm moving my family out, this is disgusting. If I choose to have more than one pitbull like dog, that is my own choice, this isn't a dictatorship that the city will or will not let me have animals in my house that I paid for and pay the damn taxes for!!!! Who thought of these ideas? Where are these pitbulls that are SO out of control in this city that are causing this conversation? I fought against this kind of treatment of these dogs in Montreal, and now it's here???? This [removed] better not pass, myself along with many many of my friends would be embarrassed for this city, especially on how many pitbulls type dogs are around the city and get rescued all the time. Whoever wrote this survey should go and educate themselves on how Pitbulls act and what type of dogs they are. And if you're going to make these RULES for pitbulls, then you better make the same ones for any type of little dog and medium dog and large dog. And there is no way that I would EVER agree to allowing someone to tell me how many 'type' of dogs I can have in my house. Unless you pay my mortgage and property taxes you can [removed] it. I am so angry and disgusted right now. Guess you just want more protests to be happening.
- I would be completely disgraced by Calgary bylaw to see breed-based discrimination laws against pitbulls and pitbull-resembling dogs.
- No breed specific legislation. Please increase fines for bad owners not "scary" breeds.
- Consider all dog bites equally. The psychological trauma of being bitten multiple times by a small breed can be significant. In addition all animal bites regardless of the size of the animal have potential for infection. Any dogs that bite are to have the situation reviewed and if determined to be a 'vicious' animal based on why it attacked.



- This is absolutely disgusting. The City of Calgary should be ashamed of themselves for explicitly targeting a breed of dog. A dog is a dog. Their bite strength is an excuse to push personal bias and propaganda that a single breed of dog or class of dogs who exhibit more muscle definition. Out of all the dogs I have ever interacted with, pit bulls have always been the most well behaved because they are naturally obedient and compassionate dogs. They have extensive sociability training and are command-oriented on strong reinforced leashes and restrained by harnesses because of the propagation of the belief that these dogs are more harmful than any other dog out there. This is disgusting prejudice. Absolutely disgusting. Do better Calgary and city officials. Do your research and look at the history of the breed, look at their natural temperament and what outcomes there are from dogs who have had the appropriate training and a nurturing household.
- It is wrongful to target specific breeds of dogs for behavioral problems. These problems ALWAYS lie within the training of ANY breed of dog weather it be a chihuahua or a Great Pyrenees.
- This is ridiculous to lay such stipulations on a specific breed. I do not support any "pit bull" specific measures.
- BSL legislation is not fair and should not be used. Every dog should be treated equal from Chihuahua to German shephard to pit bull. If dog is repeat offender its the owner that needs education on how to correct dogs behaviour
- Don't discriminate these breed. This is pure ignorance
- Special courses or classes required before being able to own a bully breed, to prove the OWNER is capable of treating the dog in a proper manner. The focus should be on the owners, not on the breeds themselves.
- Breed specific is not the way to go we need to punish bad owners, no breed is worse then any other.
- don't judge bully breeds, all breeds have potential for danger
- Dont take away someone's right to have a good boy or girl as a companion
- You guys are a certain breed just because of their appearance . What's wrong with this city? Why would you even consider this. I'm very upset with even seeing this
- none of these this is horrible discrimination and completely unnecessary
- How about huge fines for owners who neglect and mistreat their pets which is why they become "nuisances" or "vicious". Or restricting said owners from ever owning a pet again.
- I do not support targeting dogs based upon visual identification. Unless the owner has papers from a breeder, you cannot be sure.
- I think the focus should be on education not on specific breed unless a animal has acted specifically dangerous
- I want to note that breed specific laws are disgusting and do nothing to devrease bites etc
- DO NOT pick on one breed! All dogs are capable of behavior issues and being a "nuisance".
- ITS BAD OWNERS. NOT DOGS!!! There is absolutely nothing fair about using the term "pit bull" to describe nuisance dog. A German Shepard or Basset Hound can create the same amount of damage or injury AS ANY OTHER DOG. Absolutely DO NOT put more strain on our society by putting bylaws against ONE TYPE OF DOG. Shame in Calgarians for being so narrowminded.
- Ban pit bulls



- The notion of a "nuisance breed" is absurd, if anything, ALL dogs should require obedience training
- Pitbulls are weapons and if they cause injury, owner should be jailed.
- The "guardians" should be held accountable and the pets allowed a second chance via rehabilitation at the guardians expense. Do you kill humans when they attack other humans?
- Pitbulls, Rottweilers, and Bull Mastiffs are not pets, they are dangerous animals. A rottweiler killed my 14 year old cat on our front lawn a few years ago, and just a couple years ago a Bull Mastiff killed our neighbour's small leashed dog on the bikepath in front of our house while our neighbour's 8 year old daughter watched in horror. These animals are not 'pets', they are monsters and do not belong in any city. We don't allow wolves in the city, why do we allow these creatures?
- BSL is complete garbage, so disappointed in Calgary Bylaw for suggesting this!
- I am an oncology nurse at RGH and have many colleagues with pitbulls. If this law comes to pass in Calgary I won't hesitate to move and take my skills and my well behaved pitbull with me. Im very disappointed that you are making such a great breed of dog a scapegoat for bad people. My dog and I treat each other with great respect. I treat her well and she is obedient. Why are we being punished? Why should she wear a muzzle? Might I suggest a yearly test of both the dog and owner (ALL BREEDS) with a license to be worn by the dog like a city of Calgary tag. If either fails they must take training and retest. That will cut down on the bad owners of ALL BREEDS. Could be a little money maker for the city as well. Especially if you run the training school too because there are going to be a lot of dogs under 10 pounds that need training as well as their owners.
- I do not believe the breed is the problem. I disagree with stigmatizing pit bulls. The owners are the issue. Years ago dobermans were the scary dogs, then rottweilers. Punish the owner not the breed. I will vote against any of my reps that support a breed restriction.
- I am opposed any breed specific legislation. I feel it's wrong to discriminate based on breed instead of behaviour/character
- [removed] no breed soecifuc bullying chihuahuas can be just as bad!
- Less target on supposed "breed specific" issues, if you are to target or single out anything it should be an owner or person in care of the animal. No matter the breed or type of animal in question if it is neglected (be it in many forms from abandonment day in and day out to not given the time to learn, grow and socialize.), abused, or otherwise put upon by a human being it can become both angered and triggered big, small, dog, cat or otherwise. Targeting a specific animal is no different than discrimination against a person think if you were to be judged on your back ground, appearance, race or otherwise would you not immediately shut this down. This should be no different when it comes to the breeds singled out here. Many are loving members of families and households no different than the human beings whom care for them. If this road of discrimination continues toward them it could possibly lead to the worst where these animals are stripped from their families, cast off to horrible lives or put to death leaving heart ache and loss to the people who care for and love them. They are people's emotional and physical support and these are not roads to travel lightly when trying to enact this so called proposed agenda towards these breeds. Consider that and think strongly for a moment what that could do to so many animals and the people close to them who have spent time and effort to raise, train and teach them. And do not single out or bully the breed but



rather take action on poor care and ownership and help to place and have reintegration for the said animals through classes, compassion and proper care.

- This should not be breed specific. The question practically states that all pitbulls are dangerous dogs. This should have nothing to do with a breed. Owners need to take responsibility and properly train their dogs. Pitbulls are not mean, people make them mean.
- We allow convicted criminals to live within our city limits. They are more risk. Don't let these criminals own dogs. No matter the breed. It's the training not the breed.
- Higher fines for owners of nuisance dogs. Many people who own nuisance dogs do not follow the rules and appear again and again with dogs with the same behaviour. Owners banned. Enforcement required.
- All dog owners could have a behavior screen (testing) done yearly by the Calgary Humane Society (at a cost to the pet owners) to prove they are properly socialized and well behaved to participate in public activities.
- This obsession with pit bulls is not relevant
- No pit bulls
- ALL dogs/owners should be required to attend minimal training/testing to confirm owners have control of their dogs and know their responsibilities for them.
- Breed Specific Legislation is archaic and uninformed! Working in the animal rescue community I find more issues with smaller dogs because people treat them like luggage... it's not the animal it's the people. People need to learn proper training..force free, positive reward based training.. we know better!
- Dogs with zero offences shouldn't have to face consequences of the majority group
- Fines for irresponsible dog owners
- A dog bite is a dog bite! Don't discriminate by breed. Calgary has had tremendous success in past without having breed legislation. Let's work on responsible pet ownership and not breed discrimination!
- First time dog owners of a large or nuisance breed should be screened for competence in owning a dog in general!
- Animals are enslaved. It's time to end the cycle of abuse & control humans exhibit.
- Pitbull type dogs do not have stronger jaw strength than other large breeds (Rottweilers, German Shepard's, Irish Wolfhounds etc). Breed specific legislation should not be based of false data and fear mongering.
- Breed specific requirements are not a solution. Education, training and responsible pet ownership is the key. Require certificates for dog training etc.
- This BSL is antiquated, ill informed and not based on any sort of fact. Pitfalls do not have more strength than other dogs and are not more likely to bite. This is disgusting and lowers my opinion of calgary as a whole. Shameful and ignorant. This type of reasoning shows the world racism is alive and well in Calgary.
- Please consider banning pitbulls, I have been chased by one and they are more likely to continue attacking once they start.



- Who/what declares a nuisance dog????? Just because you are afraid doesn't mean they are a BAD DOG. Owners need to be responsible!.
- Large fines for owners who don't control aggressive dogs in public
- Animals that have attacked children non provoked should be euthanized
- Nuisance owners who have owned more than one nuisance dog within the last 10 years should be publicly listed so if they move elsewhere or whatever it is known that they have owned nuisance dogs.
- None of the above
- You should have to have a license to breed dogs , there are so many back yard breeders that have no regard for temperament or health and breeders that purposely breed bad tempered huge dogs to use in dog fighting rings and to guard. Pitbull's are the target of a lot of bad ppl (drug dealers and so forth) crack down on breeders and the rest will get better
- What about German Shepard's, labs, golden retrievers, etc?
- Quit going after a specific breed. Either treat all dogs the same or don't bother. Sorry you had a bad time with pitbulls but they aren't the problem, sub par owners are.
- Human education for canines for dogs considered a nuisance.
- Ban pit bulls in City limits. Period.
- All animals should be included not breed specific.
- If nuisance animal has another strike it should be euthanized at owners expense
- Obedience training for ALL dogs. Not just one specific breed.
- Pitbulls should be ban in Calgary. I have seen people are not taking full responsibility for these kind of breeds. These breeds need behavioural training, but still they are capable of dangerous/fatal attacks. I have experienced it. In few provinces pitbulls are completely banned. Calgary should also consider this decision.
- Should be dealt with on a case by case basis. To paint entire breeds with the same brush is no better than stereotyping people based on race, religion or creed.
- This is ridiculous, it's a The owners responsibility to train an animal the right way, it doesn't matter the breed, many small dogs cause fights bc they are aggressive. It's up to the owner to properly train their pet
- No bad dogs; only bad owner
- Ban pit bulls.
- Higher fine for any breed of dog which causes harm to another dog or human including rehabilitation for the dog.
- none of the above? Pretty biased wisdom Assuming that everyone Agrees with the statement that this is the only set of breeds that are dangerous? Instead of looking at other municipalities, perhaps should've actually consulted canine behaviorists and veterinarians, which I know wasn't completed. Please get your facts straight
- Please consider fines for smaller breeds, most often I find smaller breeds attacking my 65lb mixed breed.



- All bylaw offenses involving dogs of any breed needs to be treated the same. It's not fair to discriminate just because it's a pit bull. That's no different than racism!
- Obedience training required for all dogs.
- Nothing should be done about pitbulls or other "nuisance breeds" there is no such thing as bad dogs just bad owners. Coming from a person who doesn't own a dog I feel heavily this is terribly and truly wrong
- This is terrible. You say it's not about pit bulls but it obviously is. Do more research this is not the way to go.
- I do not support this proposal
- No breed specific bylaws. owners are to blame not breeds.
- I do not support this at all! Why wasn't there more efforts to involve and alert the community sooner or in Phase 1
- Breed specific legislation should never be considered for Calgary: Deal with offending Dogs/Humans regardless of the breed, just as you are now.
- Pit bulls should not be directly affected in any way! They are a dog.... their owner should be held responsible For there dogs actions not the breed of dog itself!!!
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Owners who don't train their dogs are the problem. Don't punish pit bulls for people being unable to train them. I'm sick of this idea that pit bulls are the issue. Maybe the city should provide taxpayer funded training for first time dog owners.
- Nuisance dogs must attend additional training
- Stop bsl. Please do not become a city that ignorantly support breed specific legislation against pit bull breeds. Educate yourselves on the breed.
- Stiff fines for off-leash dogs outside of off-leash parks. Stiff fines for dog noise. I do not understand the coloured bandanas.
- This survey seems to be vectored against pitbull breeds. It is not the breed that is the problem, it is the owner. Shame on the City of Calgary for taking this approach.
- Higher fines and better enforcement for off-leash dogs in non-off-leash areas.
- Nothing! Focusing on pit bulls and other bully breeds is absolutely ludicrous. Why don't you round up and spay/neuter the owners or ALL BREEDS who bite or become a "nuisance." Society as we know it has come to an end if this is the [removed] we are debating.
- Pit Bull dogs are a danger, end of discussion. Being sorry after the fact is not acceptable.
- Every OWNER should be taking classes to learn how to treat animals. All animals reactions are DIRECT results of their owners. (Previous or current)
- Leave the pitbulls (bully breed of any kind) alone. Instead, make sure owners who adopt or purchase these beautiful animals are respectful and responsible enough to educate themselves on proper training and care for their animals. Its not the breed who is at fault it is their owner.
- Any dogs with history of dangerous behavior are not allowed in off leash parks or must be muzzled
- Ban pit bulls. Any dog can bite, but pit bites are severely damaging to humans and other animals.. Owners of pits are trying to compensate for feelings of self-inadequacy.
- I dont think pit-bull type dogs are the issue



- Any dog with a bite infraction be required to wear a muzzle when off the owner's property.
- Higher fines for dogs involved in bite offences, regardless of breed. (You cannot penalize one breed only!)
- Large breeds be licensed at a higher rate.
- Ban pit bull ownership
- Exeterme fines for falsely reporting pet nuisances.
- Owner to be part of obedience training. Education in schools/community for dog bite prevention. Owner's fined only if it can be proven that the dog was not provoked.
- Higher fines for any dog involved in bylaw offences, not just pit bulls.
- Dog owners should not be allowed to tether dogs in front of stores, restaurants, etc as this causes barking.
- Owners of these dogs should have to post signage on their property. I've walked on the sidewalk by small fences and had these type of dogs run at me. Terrifying!
- None of these should apply to only pitbulls, or need to apply to ALL dog owners, as studies have proven that potty breeds are less likely to be engaged in aggressive behaviour than many common house hold dogs - German shepherds, dalmatians, chow-chows, etc. This is only perpetuating myths about bully breeds and shows a lack of research on the part of the City of Calgary
- Dog behaviours are not purely at the fault of the dog, if a dog is vicious it is because their owner enables it. Stop blaming animals for behaviours they were not born with.
- DO NOT JUDGE A PIT BULL. According to an animal behaviour course, small dogs are the ones that are most likely jump to bites while larger dogs will follow the trend on the ladder of aggression. Maybe this ladder of aggression should be made know to the public. It is unfair for dogs to assume what we want, they cannot verbally communicate and the behaviours on the ladder of aggression is what they're showcasing to show that they're frustrated and anxious. Did you know that pit bulls were considered nanny dogs?! Why are you judging the dogs on the base of its breed (I could equate it to judging a person based on their ethnic group).
- There should only be restrictions to ANY kind of pet that has previously attacked or tried to attack someone or another pet. To suggest that all pit bulls or dogs alike should be alienated because of their breed is the same thing as racism.
- Responsible DOG ownership, not breed specific. Do not single out bully breeds.
- Quit picking on pitbulls, it is not the dogs fault it is the owners fault. Any dog will bite when a stupid kid is harrasing it, the parents should be fined as well. There is alot of other breeds that bit NOT just pitbulls.
- Drop the 'pit bulls' it's the owners that need to be held responsible NOT THE DOGS.
- The fact that you are only going on about pit bull shows there's an obvious bias. How about mastiffs they are just as strong as a pit bull. Caine corso, Rotti, German shepherd you even train these dogs to attack on your k9 force. Owners are the problem not the breed
- Why are just pit bulls mentioned, any large dog can leave severe injuries. This is just a stupid ploy to bring in breed specific legislation.
- Should not discriminate against a single breed of dog.



- \$1M bond should be required for a Pit bull ... and jail sentence should be mandatory for owners who do not follow bylaws ..
- Breed-specific bans on pit bulls
- BSL is not effective. Well bred dogs, properly socialization and training, are not more prone for aggression on humans. I show Staffordshire Bull Terriers and I would never attend or spend money in Calgary again if BSL goes through. You hurt all of the ethical breeders and owners with BSL. Any legislation should be dependent on each individual dog. There is no breed 'pitbull', it's a dangerous umbrella term used against any muscular dog. You will lose all of the ethical owners of so called 'pitbull's breeds from ever showing in Calgary again. I hope you enjoy lost revenue potential because of lack of education and pandering to unfounded media fuelled public fear.
- Pit Bulls and dogs of this breed have never been nor shall they ever be singled out as a nuisance animal , the research shows they are no high on the incident reports of bites or aggressive behaviour , please research your facts before you single out this breed
- dogs who have actually attacked people/dogs shouldn't be allowed off leash at the park
- Owners of ALL BREEDS that DO NOT know how to TRAIN their Pets Appropriately ... should NOT be Allowed to Own Pets/ Fur Babies...Period. It's NOT the animal it's The OWNERS ! There are NO bad Pets ONLY bad PET owners Period..
- This is so stupid. If you do this for pit bulls you need to do it for German Shepard's, Rotties, and Dalmatians.
- legislation of pitbull or pitbull like breeds is not a solution, the entire breed bias is based on opinion. Pitbulls and pitbull like breeds bite is less severe than many other large breed dogs (German shepherd etc.). This has been studied quite extensively. Using real science helps.
- Extreme fines for people falsely reporting dogs as nuisance animals
- don't breed specify.
- Targeting specific breeds is completely insane. Breed specific bans are racist and biased. It has been shown that breed specific banning does not work and that the "blame" shifts to another breed. For example, in the 70's dobermans were targeted, 80's german shepherds were targeted, 90's rottweilers were targeted and now pitbull breeds are being targeted. Not to mention that there is no "pit bull breed" and the definition is subjective. On the temperament scale (gentleness) "pitbulls and bully breeds" score better than almost all other breeds other than labrador retrievers. As for the supposed bite strength stated above, a "pitbulls" bite strength is similar to other large breed dogs. If the goal is to muzzle aggressive dogs this needs to include all dog breeds regardless of bite strength as a small child could be seriously injured by a small dog like a Dachshund. not to mention that the most common dog bite is from a Dachshund or a Chihuahua.
- These bylaws targeting pitbulls and pitbull adjacent breeds are ridiculous. They are not inherently bad!! It is unfair to penalize responsible dog owners just because they own a certain kind of dog. If a dog is proven to be a nuisance due to multiple offenses, then I am all for higher fines and forced training. But to force training, limit numbers and ban any dog from a dog park because of ANY breed is wrong. Nature vs nurture guys... it's a proven scientific fact!



- None of these are worth supporting. The dogs not listed on this are 73% more likely to offend. Responsible dog owners are just that. Fines should be given to owners who display clear signs of incompetence & inability of controlling their own animal in a stressful or agitated situation. Dogs of any breed react fearfully, if agitated or not respected. The owner who cannot control the attacking animal causing the problem is who should receive penalty. Not an extremely well behaved misjudged breed of a dog.
- I don't agree with any of this. Pit Bulls are not ALL aggressive. They are painted with a brush. I don't think it's fair to only include larger dogs similar to pit bulls. It is not the dog that is the issue, it is the owner. The owner should have the choice to put a muzzle on their dog or not. They know their dog better than anyone and therefore should be the only one to make that choice. I think that it is a money grab and NOT FAIR to dogs who are big dogs, like Pit Bulls, who are sweet and are gentle. So no, I think it's stupid and a ridiculous bylaw.
- Pitbulls should not be singled out. They are far more loving to humans than many dogs and problem dogs are a result of the failure of the OWNER.
- As someone who works in the animal welfare industry, and involved in cruelty investigations, targeting a specific breed will not be an adequate solution to reducing incidents. However I do acknowledge that irresponsible pet owners tend to lean towards owning bully breeds, so I am in support of required obedience training as it will benefit the breed in the long run. (Well behaved dogs = less stigma). Let's not take a step back by creating BSL. If you want to hold them accountable because they can do more damage, then you need to incorporate ALL large breed dogs.
- No bylaws that affect pit bull breeds. It is about the owners that train the dog not the breed of the dog.
- Should definitely be more on the shoulders of the owners of all dogs to be in control of their animals. If they are not the animals should be re-homed
- It should be illegal to own a pit bull in Calgary city limits
- PIT BULLS ARE NO MORE DANGEROUS THAN ANY OTHER DOG. THIS PROPOSED BYLAW ON "PIT BULLS" IS SHAMEFUL. THE OWNER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DOG'S BEHAVIOUR. THIS IS DISGRACEFUL.
- All large and medium sized dogs should be required to wear a muzzle at off leash parks.
- It is absolutely appalling that many of these options seem to discriminate against a certain breed of dogs. Dogs are as good as the owners and it is unacceptable that you would propose to impose restrictions and fines and expect muzzles on certain type of breed of dog and this absolutely should not be allowed. Pitbulls are the the problem, people and how they treat animals are.
- Higher fines with increased offences
- Many other breeds are much more of a "nuisance" and generalizing bully breed seems ignorant and uneducated.
- Force idiot owners to take classes on proper care and training of dogs!!!! There are NO BAD DOGS!!! Only bad owners!!!! Quit punishing the poor dog and make the owner get educated , quit breed discrimination!!!!!!!



- To isolate rules to discriminate against pitfalls is to fail to recognize that it is the owners not the breeds that should be held responsible
- Specific Breed Legislation is wrong on so many levels. You are condoning judging a book by it's cover. What a horrible horrible example to set especially in this day and age with all the race issues. In reality, this is just a race issue against dogs. When will people realize that it is NOT the dog's fault - it is the dog owner at fault. I am ashamed to know I live in a city that is so small thinking :(WITH REGARD TO NUMBER 8 BELOW - again, it comes down to people/parents being responsible!!! Children SHOULD BE TAUGHT TO ASK IF THEY CAN PET A DOG instead of just rushing over to pet a strange dog. Perhaps you have a better chance of educating people if there were a program IN SCHOOLS complete with visiting dogs - start by teaching the children (it's obvious that parents are not providing the necessary or correct information)
- Dogs should not be defined by their breed. If a dog acts up, NO MATTER THE BREED, then then owner should be held responsible. Pit bulls are not a nuisance animal, they like all animals need to be trained properly.
- All consequences should be case by case, and should not be exclusive to Pit Bulls.
- Ban private ownership pit bulls and all dogs that are bred as attack dogs. What political philosophy justifies the private ownership of a dog that can do this to a child:
<https://beta.cafemom.com/news/211726-pit-bulls-maul-arkansas-toddlers-face>. There are nearly 500 dog breeds in the world. Surely, there is sufficient choice to meet the "rights" of private citizens, without including dangerous dogs.
- Just ban pit bulls
- Breed specific bylaws don't take into account that any dog can turn into a nuisance dog if not raised properly and not kept well.
- IT IS NOT JUST PIT BULLS THIS SHOULD NOT BE ABOUT A SPECIFIC BREED THIS SHOULD BE ABOUT DANGEROUS OR NUISANCE DOGS AS AN INDIVIDUAL NOT AS A WHOLE. EACH DOG AND OWNER ARE DIFFERENT.
- No pit bulls in city limits
- Don't put the onus on the *dogs*. There are no "dangerous breeds" just bad dog owners. Regardless of breed, fines should be issued, dogs re-homed if need be. But the repercussions should reflect the nature of the offence - which is that the dogs are not inherently bad or problematic, but that there are a certain subset of people who take very poor care of those dogs.
- Only if they have bitten before intentionally and they are a bit aggressive they should have a muzzle on in public places. Pit bulls are not the only breed that this rule should be forced on.
- Am opposed to breed specific dog sanctions. Need to define 'nuisance' behaviour.
- It is not helpful to target specific breeds (or appearance of breed) for arbitrary measures such as required muzzels and only serves to increase fear in the general public. It would be more helpful to focus on public education of signals that dogs give as well as working to eliminate backyard breeders. Including study from u of c on dog bites <https://www.ucalgary.ca/news/anatomy-dog-bite-when-where-and-why-dogs-bite>



- My opinion? None of these are needed. Dogs are not a naturally a "nuisance." Bad/careless owners make for dangerous dogs. It IS NOT the dogs breed that causes it's nuisance. To enforce any of this would be INHUMANE. To be frank? Y'all are [removed]
- None of these restrictions make any sense. This is racism for dogs.
- These are all ridiculous. Its not the breed, its the owner and theor negligence
- assist in training. You think how you feel wesring a mask all day long now how does a dog feel wearing a muzzle?? We don't know as they can't tell us.
- Breed specific legislation has no scientific backing. Any laws involving pit bulls are unjust. There are no bad dogs just bad owners.
- I think there should be 3 strikes before a dog is declared a nuisance. Someone complaining about a dog barking shouldn't result in that dog being classified as nuisance. Or if that dog is at large once. If there were a 3 strikes, then obedience training, animal specific community service for the owner, or increased fines / insurance, I'd support that.
- If a dog is aggressive regardless of breed specific they should not be at a dog park
- Ban nuisance dogs from the city limits.
- None. There shouldn't be specific rules for pit bulls and not for other dogs
- Training for any human and dog...humans make bad dogs train them
- No breed specific regulations at all, and many if not all of those options above should apply to every breed of dog that is a nuisance. Any and all breed owners should face higher fines if more than one incident has occurred, all breeds should require insurance if an incident has occurred. I want to be safe from all breeds! I want all dog owners to feel the pressure of requiring safe behaviour of their dogs, all dog owners of every breed should face the same strict fines and insurance requirements to ensure my families safety.
- Shame on you, Calgary for even entering the bred banning conversation. This is ignorant and your question is leading to a path you obviously want to embark upon, which is breed specific bans. Sound questionnaire strategy provides open ended comments for the public to express their concerns, and not be coerced down a path that council has already intended to take. This is disgraceful irresponsible.
- restrictions on dog ownership for people who have a history of nuisance dogs in their household
- I volunteer at the Calgary Humane Society and I have to say that the pit bull breed is one of the sweetest breeds. I've NEVER felt uncomfortable around them. I've been attacked by "family breeds" such as labs. How can you justify discriminating against a breed of dog based on social media propoganda and fear of the unknown? How would you feel if we discriminated against a certain human race because we didn't feel comfortable around them?
- There is nothing wrong with pit bulls. There is a lot wrong with people. If you start these laws on pit bulls, I'd like to see similar laws for the homeless downtown that are a nuisance to me on a daily basis and pose far greater risk to everyone (including themselves). Give you heads a shake and realize that a soccer mum state is awful.



- Breed specific bylaws are completely uncalled for an unfair. Incidents should be reviewed on a case by case basis-PERIOD. ALL dogs have the potential to bite and or be a nuisance, not just one breed.
- There cannot be more than one dog in a household with a nuisance dog. There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household (why didn't you separate nuisance dog from out ull in this question like you did the others?!)
- Stop bothering about pitbulls... most of them are very docile loving dogs its the bad owners that should be fined not the dog!
- Would support banning pit bull breeds
- Ban pit bulls
- Ban pit bulls. There is no reason for people to own these dangerous, unpredictable, fighting dogs. They have no place in a city where we all must live so close together, increasing the risk of mutilating or fatal dog bites.
- Nothing, dogs are dogs and aren't perfect. No one issues fines for the loud, screaming, crying children and babies
- Pitbulls are no more dangerous than any other dog. If forcing anything make it necessary for al
- Not breed specific bylaw, owners training is the issue. Don't ban a breed. Ban an owner.
- Chihuahuas and similar dogs should have rules or limitations on them. Though they are small, they are naturally vicious and rarely trained. Obedience classes at a minimum should be required.
- [removed]
- Nothing should be breed specific. Deal with bad pet owners
- I do not support breed specific language - these types of laws have proven ineffective in other districts and they are discriminatory
- None of the above. Pit bulls are good dogs. Fine the owner - not seize the animal.
- How about creating some bylaws to make the people responsible for "nuisance" dogs accountable. Ultimately it is their responsibility to train their dog(s) and ensure safety when out in public. How about fines for people who are known to abuse their animals, or have complete disregard for the safety of other animals while they are around dogs they are responsible for. My dog was attacked by a pit bull who was known to be aggressive to small dogs. She was off lease and without a muzzle. I have absolutely nothing against pit bulls and I am against any bylaws saying pit bulls shouldn't be allowed in certain places etc but in this case it was the fault of the dogs human. He knew she was aggressive towards small dogs and he chose to walk her off leash in a public park without a muzzle. I'm sure she wasn't a "bad" dog but she almost killed mine. Nothing happened other than my dog spending a week in intensive care and almost dying. Let's put some things in place to hold these types of people accountable instead of putting all the blame on the animals who aren't being cared for properly.
- I do not support breed specific legislation. Dogs need to be evaluated on a case by case basis. How an animal looks is irrelevant.
- If a pit bull or dog that has been reported as being aggressive, owners must take dog to mandatory obedience training. If owner refuses, dog must be surrendered to a dog shelter.



- I disagree with all the above. I personally believe the owner should be fined. The dog acts as the owner has trained them. People really need to open their eyes and quit labelling Pitbulls as monsters. The only reason a dog bites is because they are either 1. Commanded by owner 2. Threatened/scared 3. Attacked 4. Neglected by the owner. As humans we would do the same. I say the owner is 110% responsible for their dog's behaviour and should be fined.
- I do not support breed specific legislation. Dogs need to be evaluated on a case by case basis. How an animal looks is irrelevant.
- I would support mandatory liability insurance for all dogs.
- The dog breed is not the problem. The problem is the owners and how they are trained. Instead look at fining owners who are not caring for their animals rather than punishing everyone with a pit bull even if they are extremely well behaved.
- It's unfortunate that "pit bulls" are so discriminated against. Any dog can bite, jump on you, show aggression. It's all based on the owner. People think it's "cute" when a pomeranian or chihuahua nips acts crazy. Aggression is aggression.
- ANY DOG, not just pitbulls, who appear to be aggressive or a "nuisance" should be included. You cannot insinuate that pitbulls and such are the only aggressive breed. This is misleading and damaging. ANY DOG has the potential to be trained badly by their owner and therefore hurt someone.
- The fact that you're targeting bullie breeds is absolutely appalling and discriminatory. We vehemently oppose it. They should NOT be treated any differently than other dog breeds. Shame on you!!!
- ban pit bulls
- ANY dog can be a nuisance. STOP PROFILING PITBULLS!! DEAL with irresponsible animal owners!! DONT TARGET THE BREED!!!!
- There should be a bylaw against leaving dogs out all night in city back yards. If dogs are out past 10 or 11, loud & barking, fines should be issued. These dogs are being neglected, so although they start out gentle, they're not getting attention & may sadly change their behaviour.
- Nuisance animals should be monitored, but breed specific limitations are not acceptable.
- Generally it's the owners to blame for the mistreatment of all dogs, big or small. They should be the ones to be fined.
- No matter the type of dog, it's about the owner. Higher consequences such as fines or suspensions from the dog park or recreation area should be imposed rather than outright banning/enforcing muzzle rules on a specific dog breed. It's idiotic to believe a breed is the problem and not the fact that many people do not take the proper time and preparation it takes to train a dog.
- This should not be breed specific but case specific.
- Ban pit bull ownership
- Mandatory training classes for humans who own or want to own. And a screening process for owners. The breed is not bad but people can be and then cause dogs to become difficult or dangerous.



- Laws should not be breed specific- all problem dogs involved in an incident should be treated the same!
- Help support owners of these breeds by offering training and support. Don't punish responsible pet owners just because their dog has physical qualities of a "pit bull". "Pit bulls" are NOT A BREED! I've seen more ferocious chihuahuas. Jesus what about other "ferocious" breeds like German shepherds etc? These poor dogs are being stigmatized unfairly when with a responsible owner are no more ferocious than a baby. Target shitty breeders and underground dog fighting rings, not day to day owners that love their dogs and train them correctly.
- I strongly believe this should not be breed specific. I do not own a pit bull, I own a different breed, and I see "nuisance" breeds of all types, NOT specific to pit bulls
- The CKC opposes fear-based breed-specific legislation (BSL) in favour of well-crafted dangerous dog legislation that is reasonable, enforceable and non-discriminatory. We believe that public awareness and education, stronger enforcement of existing bylaws and stiffer penalties for irresponsible owners are more effective at protecting the public.
- Ban all pit bulls in our city
- All dogs that bite must be put down and owners severely fined or jail term
- Much higher fines for any dog involved in an offense, with no warnings or first chances.
- Pitbulls are not the problem. Their owners are. Please do not discriminate on the breed, but penalize owners for poor management.
- There is NO breed known as a Pitbull. This is irresponsible and it makes you look terribly uneducated.
- BSL does not work and penalizes responsible dog Owners and well behaved dogs. Bias against breeds does nothing to prevent dog bites, etc.
- Ban pit bulls
- Fines for dogs pooping and peeing on private property
- Dogs that are simply a nuisance should not require owners being subjected to higher fines, more insurance. Only AGGRESSIVE dogs should be required to take obedience training and NOT limited to pit bulls because there is "potential" for a more severe bite. It isn't fair to discuss potential for things that could happen but rather things that do, and not breed specific. I have seen more aggressive small dog breeds than pit bulls.
- There cannot be more than One NUISANCE dog of any breed in a household (delete pit bull reference) Any breed of dog can be a 'nuisance' dog...and what categorizes a 'nuisance' dog???
- I support a Breed specific pit bull ban.
- For dog bites: people are more important. Apprehend the animal. And then when it is proven (by whatever process) kill the dog.
- Training would *have* to be positive reinforcement. A lot of behavior issues with "nuisance" dogs are due to the owners not training their animals properly.
- No law should have prejudice against pit bulls. Any dog can be aggressive
- DONT REGULATE PEOPLES DOGS BASED ON BREED.
- All dogs. Stop being breed specific



- All dogs must be on leash except on private property or off leash parks. All playgrounds and school yards signed no dogs..
- If you do this to one dog you better do it to all. Disgusting.
- Nothing. Any dog can be aggressive so don't stereotype
- educate human owners of nuisance dogs
- Obedience training required for ALL dog owners
- It should apply to any aggressive poorly trained dogs not just bully breeds
- The breed itself should NOT be a factor! It is up to the owner! All dogs are capable of biting. Education and offering training to the owner to make the dog better is a must.
- Ban dangerous dog breeds that have the potential to inflict serious injuries.
- It's the owners fault. Not the dog, picking one breed is discriminating and wrong on all accounts. Smaller breed dogs are more vicious and more likely to bite you and be loud.
- Nothing that specifies dogs by breed. Just nuisance designations. Stronger ability to forbid people with more than one complaint from owning any animals and fining those people.
- Other dangerous breeds like Rottweilers, mastiffs, and the Argentinian dogs also be included
- Higher fines for any dog, regardless of breed or size, for being aggressive or unfriendly in a dog park. It is ridiculous that this city would want to base laws on a breed rather than the responsibility of the owner. You're trying to base a law off of looks. This is no different than racial profiling which is been proven to NOT work (scientifically backed up). Instead of blaming the breed and forcing people to only own one or now, blame the owner. Make it do rescues and dogs that look like or are pit bulls have proper training from an actual dog behaviouralist. Make it so if someone gets one of these dogs they can only be purchased from reputable breeders or rescues and that they sign a contract to take the proper steps in the training. I know more vicious Pomeranians and chihuahuas than I do dogs with mix breed pit Bullard your basically making it so people don't own this dog and they get put down by rescues and shelters . That is the most irresponsible thing this city could do. Don't be Quebec: be better.
- I don't have a problem with pit bulls per se, it's more the owners that seem to be the problem. There are loads of lovely pit bulls out there with great owners, and both get a bad rap from idiots with strong, easily trainable, defensive dogs.
- Any restrictions selected (muzzling, insurance, obedience training, etc) should be applied to ALL owners/dog breeds, not any one specific breed or profiled group. Calgary's proposal on this matter is a knee-jerk approach that unfairly punishes owners of these larger breeds while disregarding breeds with higher documented attack/bite frequency.
- Stop labeling pitbulls!
- Owners must pass a test for acceptable breed training and dog care standards
- All dogs (particularly the small nippy yapping aggressive ones) should have to have mandatory professional training with owners present
- It isn't the breed, it's how they are trained. Any dog can be vicious and poorly behaved, it's all about training. People who have these breeds generally train their animals much better than people with other breeds.



- I do NOT support any breed being named specifically in future laws and by laws.
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog per household regardless of breed or size.
- worst idea i have ever heard
- These claimed "nuisance" breeds are none that we have encountered any difficulty with in our 14 years as dog owners to our mastiff. In the last three years we have been mostly attending walks at the Sue Higgins dog park where I have watch a Shephard cross bite its female owner, a passerby dog, and that dog's owner. I have seen a Burmese dog attack a small dog (uninstigated); a Jack Russell Terrier jump up and bite a little girl's shorts, tearing a strip right out of them, because that little girl was running passed it with her own dog - the owner of the Jack Russell stated that the child "should not have been moving so quickly in the dog park". I have watched a Boarder Collie nip multiple dogs including the ankle of my own dog and each time the owner claimed it was "instinctive to the breed as it is a 'herding dog' and not something that could be trained out of it". These are only a handful of incidents I have personally seen and none have ever been with what this bylaw is calling nuisance dogs. Fines should be issued to owners of dogs for the faults of their lack of training, handling, managing and/or their dog's actions, not for the breed. Also, if an animal attacks (causing severe injury) the money from the fines billed should go towards the victim for medical fees.
- any aggressive dog should be considered a nuisance as soon as it bites anyone or anything, regardless of breed. Onus should be on the owner not the animal.
- All dog owners should be held responsible for their dogs regardless of the breed. This bylaw has no right to be particularly set to a specific breed. Owners train their dogs and thats where bad behaviour lies, not within breeds.
- Ban Pit Bulls form City of Caalgary.
- Ban pit bulls
- No fines no punishments for any pitbulls it is stupid and based on ignorance.
- All laws should be for all breeds. Absolutely do not agree with any sort of BSL Law
- this is a stupid idea
- Nuisance dogs and at-risk dogs are not the same. I think this needs to be broken down to more details required. A dog that jumps fences because he's a husky doesn't need to be muzzled at a dog park. They need management protocols in place like fencing being reinforced. A dog with a bite history where the dog was (without question) to be 100% at fault needs a muzzle and training involved. I've seen many dogs who have bitten and it has been a fear response when all other signs have been ignored., Yet the dog is still blamed which I find awful. Hire private contractors that are dog trainers that are certified in behavioural work and you will see a much different perspective on this issue.
- there should not be more bylaws for one specific type of dog
- Ban on dangerous breeds - ie pit bulls, Rottweilers, Doberman', etc
- I do not believe that there should be a breed specific bylaw put in place. This is showing discrimination for an owner who has purchased a "bully" breed. Dogs of every breed can be dangerous and a nuisance - it is the owner who is being irresponsible when issues arise.



- it not pitbulls its other dogs i have encountered, if one dog has to be muzzled then all should, they should have training for owners not the breed
- Complete ban for all pit bull type dogs and euthanize all dogs that bite a stranger or smaller strange domestic animal.
- I DO NOT agree with any breed specific by- laws or rules
- Ban the breed entirely
- Higher fines for dogs that pose problems, but avoid breed-specific regulations.
- Please ban all pitbulls in Calgary
- I don't think breed-specific bylaws will help, but encouraging owners to get training -for them and the dog- has the potential to help.
- There cannot be more then one nuisance dog in a household.
- Dog breed specific legislation is not going to solve the problem, some of the sweetest dogs I've met have been pit bulls. Shocked this is even a discussion here.
- Breed specific legislation has no place in Calgary.
- To single out dogs by the look is disgusting. I have an odd mixed breed that has not type of pitbull in his DNA but has the blockhead and would be treated unfairly by your proposal. It instills unnecessary fear in people . How unfair you are being because of your own ignorance to the pittty breeds.
- Breed-specific legislation does nothing except criminalize those breeds. Ultimately it comes down to owner responsibility on how the dog behaves and how well it's trained. Legislate poor dog ownership as poor dog ownership, instead of targeting a breed that just happens to be more in the public consciousness.
- Rottweilers and Shepards have a stronger bite force then pitbulls. Knowing the strong bias against pitbulls there is already i don't understand why a city survey would be aimed against them with such misleading information.
- Regardless of breed, any animal known to be aggressive or a nuisance should have required training.
- Pit bull ban
- I would suggest that the reasoning that pitbulls have greater bite strength be reviewed against the existence of larger dog breeds in general and consider whether such reasoning should apply to German Shepherds, for instance. <https://maxlawsc.com/dog-bite-statistics/#force>
- How would a dog be declared a nuisance? Are you talking about individually identified dogs? Or a breed?
- I think its unfair pitbulls of all are being only one labeled in this total unfair. Theres so many breeds were I am that are not pitbulls but under u labeling there nuisance .stop using pitbill
- Small dogs should be muzzled when out in public not pit bulls or lager/bully/ guard dog breads
- Leave Pitbulls alone. Don't target them as a dangerous breed.
- Dogs known for being aggressive must be under control and if needed muzzled. Aggressive dogs to other dogs must be muzzled at off leash parks. More education and training to help people handle ownership of dogs with aggression issues.



- Ban pit bulls. In general they are harder to stop when they attack and the owners are often irresponsible.
- The rules should apply to all dog breeds equally. Singling out pitbulls or "dogs that look like Pitbulls" does nothing to address the problematic dog OWNERS. Breed specific rules are highly ignorant.
- I disagree with proposed definition of these dogs because other breeds are often confused with Terriers i.e. Mastiff type dogs are nearly always extremely docile and enjoy a peaceful life. I am more concerned with bad owners who fail to socialize their dogs and transmit a negative image because they are the actual problem. I would like to see a crack down on dog thieves who steal and use dogs for fighting. Dog fighting is the base of bad behaviour and human cruelty. This practice must be stopped..
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION!!
- BSL is not the way to go. It's not the breed. It's the owner. Through and through. Say no to BSL!!!
- Punish the owners not the dog. There is no such thing as a bad dog only bad owners. Happy purse dogs cause trouble in off leash areas so keep stereo types out and stick to definable defendable provable wording
- how about training dog owners to properly train their own dogs. Most dog issues are related to mistreatment by the owners.
- How about any dog that bites or is considered a nuisance have the owner and dog be given training on how to better take care of your dog and teach your dog how to act. Not judge a book by its cover
- Breed specific legislation is pointless. Harsher penalties for dogs causing issues is fine, but any breed is capable of causing severe harm.
- Ban pit bull type dogs including bull mastiffs
- I do not feel that obedience training is necessary for "just" pitbulls or nuisance dogs the way you have it worded, obedience training should be a mandatory part of dog ownership
- It's the owners that are at fault for aggressive dogs. I don't agree with just targeting pit bulls. It should be the owners of any dog that needs extra training
- Pitbulls are not the problem, is usually the owners. Du not punish the breed for errors of ppl, many pitties are loving family members, there are no bad dogs, just bad owners that give them a bad reputation. Manage the bad owners
- I am concerned about WHO decides to declare an animal a nuisance animal. Would this be via a true expert?
- No specification for pit bull type dogs as dangerous or nuisance. ANY dog can be dangerous, not just certain breeds
- Dogs that bite and dogs that bark should not be in the same category.
- Designation of a nuisance dog should be able to be evaluated and appealed after dog AND owner attend obedience training.
- Shouldn't matter the breed of animal that attacks. The owner of the dog that is a nuisance should have a tougher punishment. Not the animals!!!
- [removed]



- BSL is a lazy solution.... instead of dealing with actual nuisances you are punishing responsible owners unjustly
- Pit bull ban
- My pitties are not nuisance dogs. How dare you?
- Breed specific legislation is wrong!!!! I have seen more aggression from smaller dogs like shit-shu type than most pit bulls
- None of the above. The American Pitbull Terrier is not anymore ferocious than a Labrador Retriever.
- You need a special license to get a pitbull. Education a course, extra insurance all needed in order to licence.
- [removed]
- No higher fine or extra measures for ONE SPECIFIC BREED. Same rules for all.
- All dog owners should be responsible for behaviour of their dogs. Fines should be imposed for all dog owners that do not take responsibility for their dogs. NOT ALL PITBULLS ARE DANGEROUS ARE A NUISANCE. It is the owners who are not responsible.
- Nuisance dogs not to be allowed off leash or in off leash areas
- Educating pet owners using the license fee so people do not feel buckle dined by the city all dogs require their owners be trained. Dogs 99% of the time are a reflection of their owners abilities. The tribunal would have biases based on lack of education Dog owners with aggressive dogs must to measures to ensure public safetyBanning ownership to those who use dogs under aggressive purposes with documented occupancies need to have those dogs apprehended if the owner has a violent recordedHistory Leave our insurance premiums alone liability is already in place for this reason
- total ban on pit bulls in the city
- All dogs and cats should be chipped and traces by the city
- I think that it is the owners responsibility to be accountable and know the limitations of their pet. Responsible owners should make the decision to prevent incidents from occurring (ie: muzzle on because they know their animals behaviour, not going to high volume dog parks with an aggressive animal, give other pet owners warning about their pet behaviour, etc). If they do not take the appropriate and accountable measures then they should be held accountable financially and pay a higher fine for the offence.
- this proposal is ridiculous, and by it's own admission, undefinable. if subjective "appears similar to put bulls" terminology and it has been established that pitbulls are no more likely to bite than others dogs, then the proposal is unnecessary. Consider instead more tools to address dogs causing serious bites rather than a foolish breed based ban.
- Pet owners who have received a biting offence should not be allowed to own pets
- Breed specific laws don't work. Find ways to engage people in becoming better educated in taking care of their pets, regardless of breed. Maybe a discount on licenses when the owner can show the animal has gone to obedience classes.
- Higher fines for nuisance dogs regardless of breed - small dogs bite all the time but their aggression is not taken as seriously simply because they are smaller.



- Pit bulls are not the problem, horrible owners ARE THE PROBLEM!
- If you're going to label a dog you better put all breeds in and NOT discriminate for pit bulls!!! The fact you're even putting this in here for a suggestion will cause anyone that is ignorant to the breed to select it because of what they've heard. It's disturbing that you guys are also ignorant about them and playing follow the leader from "what other municipalities have done". Use your common sense and as your mom would have said, if they jump of a bridge are you going to as well. Be a leader and do not do that garbage! German shepherds and several other breeds are more likely to bite than a pit bull. DO NOT ruin a breed due to ignorance.
- Pit bulls are a hazard when the owner leave them alone in the backyard and the fence of the backyard is not scurried enough. I do fear for my children safety when they go to play outside and these dogs try to attach from behind the fence.
- Don't discriminate against a specific breed of dog. It's not pit bulls as a breed that are the issue.
- I would support banning the owning of a pit bull. It seems reasonable to me given the severity of the bites.
- Only dogs who have been aggressive historically should be forced to wear muzzles, and not allowed in off leash parks until they go through obedience training. Multiple in a household is not an issue.
- Ban all pit bull type dogs.
- A program for the owner that educates them on how to behave and treat their dog
- Punish the owner not the breed!
- Obedience required for all dogs and a program for school age children regarding safe animal interaction
- None of these
- We should instead leave Pitbulls alone. End the [removed] stigma and then muzzle the muppet that came up with these questions.
- Require the owner of the nuisance dog to take mandatory obedience training at the owners expense.
- Pit bulls should be banned
- Victim Vet assistance for anyone whose dog is attacked by nuance dog. Covered by City, added to license cost of dog that caused injury. Dogs must be micro chipped. Unable to license if outstanding payment to victim
- Ban on pitbulls
- Special separate licensing for the dangerous dog owners like with firearms. Training the dogs does not prevent attacks (I am pitbull ex owner)
- Breed specific legislation is garbage. There should be mandatory owner training and vetting required for anyone who has a nuisance dog.
- I do NOT support breed specific legislation. I do support behavior specific designations with clear and practical consequences.
- I strongly oppose any breed specific by-law, or additional insurance requirements. I've been exposed to thousands of dogs in the course of my 40 year hobby. Of those animals, the problematic ones are those whose owners cannot control them. i.e. the 2 St. Bernards that simultaneously



attacked me walking my dog on leash in Calgary, the Belgian Teruvern that jumped me so hard in a Calgary off leash area that I almost fell over, the small "cute" dogs whose owners allow them to run up to my dogs, on leash, and harass us to the point where I am unable to walk without tripping over them, the mother with the Bernese Mountain Dog in the Calgary off leash park, who was leaping at my dog (in my arms) while she pushed her stroller and tried to cope with her toddlers, the man whose medium size dog was on a flexi lead at Nose Hill Park - he let it wrap itself around my legs as it tried to leap up at the dog I was holding, causing me bruises to my legs because it tightened quickly. It is the owners who have no mandatory training in animal control that cause others issues. I've seen many pitbulls walking nicely with responsible owners. Every Staffordshire that I've examined over the decades is a sweet clown; nothing in the breed's character is potentially problematic. Please do not adopt poorly thought out, high discriminatory by-laws passed in other jurisdictions, in the misguided attempt to protect Calgarians from injury. It is not the breed that is the problem; it is Calgary's lack of mandatory training for an owner to acquire a license. Switzerland requires every owner to complete an 8 week training course, before the owner can acquire a dog license. These courses teach the owners how to respect other owners, how to train their dog, why it is socially required to teach your dog to ignore others. The mentality in North America is that everyone has a "fur baby" that must be allowed to run out of control; otherwise that is cruel. Confusing dogs with children is not helpful; banning children of a specific race would be obviously discriminatory. Why assume that the dog is so? All dogs have the potential to bite; teach the owners how to manage their obligations and hold them accountability when they fail to do so. I've had owners yelling at me when I respectfully say no thank you to their insistence that their dog MUST socialize (be in my dog's face); and that even though my reasons relate to reducing the spread of disease and protecting my dog from harm, the offended owner claims I am depriving my dog of "playtime". These conversations are frustrating and demonstrate ignorance of both animal behaviour and personal responsibility. Calgary off leash parks are the most dangerous places to walk a dog, due to a) lack of owner training; b) attitudes of owner entitlement; and c) lack of enforcement. If by-law officers patrolled parks more frequently; they could observe dogs bothering other people while ignoring owners. Immediate education and action could be taken; instead, owners fail with impunity. A dog must nearly be killed before anyone takes it seriously. When my dogs and I were attacked by the St. Bernards, the by-law officer informed me "its a nice dog". Why? Because in the owner's home, the dog was well behaved. An hour earlier, on the street, 2 broke loose, one jumped on my back and the other tried to grab my 2 kg dog. I ended up at the Dr and my dog at the vet. This is not a pit bull issue; it's an owner issue. I travel all over the world interacting with dogs of every breed; no Staffordshire has ever been an issue. At those events, I've been threatened by a Labrador puppy, an Australian Shepherd tried to bite me, and a Rottweiler went for my thigh. At one time Rotes were the dreaded dog; now its Pitbulls. Please rethink this entire scenario to focus on owner education, owner fines and owner responsibility. I've lived in Calgary 20 years and each time I try to walk in the park, I am on edge - and not from Bully breeds - from owners who cannot control many types of dogs, including neurotic labradoodles with or without their prescribed "anti anxiety" drugs. It's a terrible feeling given the natural beauty Calgarians have strived to preserve by offering parks to citizens.



- It's not the dog it's the owner. Better education is needed for people. Your own information states that Pitbulls are not involved in more incidents than other breeds. This is just playing in to fear mongering, we can't let people cry wolf to dictate policy. Policy should be determined by fact and the facts do not support this.
- Person walking nuisance dogs in public must weigh more than total weight of the dogs, and must hold on to leash at all time.
- I strongly object to any breed specific wording.
- i am more afraid of a chihuahua than a pit bull , they are great dogs and should not be treated differently.
- Do not penalize pitbulls
- All dogs, regardless of the breed should be required to go through obedience training. The number of misbehaved dogs I see in public every day and owners who do not seem to care is staggering. Extremely disappointed that the city of Calgary has decided to single out 'pit bulls' as problem dogs. To say that the reason they are being singled out is because they have more strength I don't see how that is any different than literally ANY breed of dog weighing over 20lbs. A 'harmless' golden retriever could easily do just as much damage as a pit bull could if it wanted to. Falling in line with media propoganda, it used to be a point of pride for me that my city of Calgary didn't support BSL, shameful.
- Owners of a dog which attacks another dog or person should have their animal seized and should be prohibited from owning any dog. This should be regardless of species. Dog attacks are caused by irresponsible people who do not properly train their dogs.
- I'd support complete ban on pitbulls within the City. As for any dogs that declared to be nuisance, City should seize the dog and put it up for adoption to responsible pet owners. If an owner has more than 1 dog declared nuisance, they should be banned from owning dogs in the future.
- Put bulls are amazing dogs!!! I would be going after the [removed] who have the dogs and doing wrong by the breed before you do anything to the dog!!!! I grew up wth the breed and wouldn't ever own a small breed dog who are more known to attack then my pittys
- we need to protect the incapable pitbull owner from being attacked as well
- This is ridiculous. Pit bulls are sweet and loving dogs unless they are abused or owned by people who don't know how to train a dog. To separate them out from other dogs is nonsensical and outdated. They cannot bite harder than a German Shepherd or a Rottweiler. It is unfair to single them out and characterize them all as nuisance dogs that need to be muzzled and can't be off leash. It perpetuates unfair and unsubstantiated stereotypes. If you want to stop "nuisance dogs" maybe look at who owns them, who's breeding them and who they're selling them to. Fine them. Muzzle them. Make them pay higher insurance for irreparably harming the reputation of one breed of dog.
- Pit bull should be banned in Calgary
- Punish the owner, not the dog. Dog training should be required for all new dog owners and offered through the city at a discounted price. Any dog not trained properly is required to be surrendered to an animal shelter.
- Qwnership of Pit bulls should be banned



- Higher insurance and penalties should also be considered for other breeds which people choose due to their aggressive appearance and/or reputation (ex: rottweilers, akitas, wolf-mixes, dobermans, boxers, ect...) or any excessively large dog which could cause major damage to a person (ex: great danes))
- You guys are disgusting if you think perpetuating the idea that pitbulls are the only aggressive breed. It is the OWNER not the BREED. Every pit bull I've met is loving, you should really ban small dogs. They are the ones I constantly see biting other dogs and attacking large breeds. Shame on you Calgary.
- More enforcement at parks and playgrounds. People do not respect keeping dogs out of these areas, never mind keeping them on a leash!
- I do not believe that a dog should be allowed to run around free and bite people. If a dog is biting people, it should be destroyed.
- all breeds and mixes treated equal. no insurance, no muzzle etc unless that dog, no matter what breed, I'd proven dangerous. then a muzzle and insurance
- Strict liability regarding dog bites and unlimited liability for problem dog owners; ownership bans for problem owners
- Restrict/train dogs known to bite - I don't care if it is a harmless wanderer. Educate responsible ownership.
- Targeting Pit Bull or 'bully' breeds is ridiculous and discriminatory. Focus on nuisance dogs specifically, not a breed. ANY breed can be a nuisance dog if they are not trained or controlled.
- You should be ashamed of yourselves. You have zero evidence to back up a claim that these breeds are more of a risk. Pathetic.
- None breed bias is outdated and misguided
- Discrimination shouldn't be an option.
- Ban pit bulls. People's lives are not worth complete freedom of having a dangerous animal for a pet. There are a lot of dogs to choose from, you don't need a pit bull.
- How about obedience training for owners? In many cases, people may own a pet, however, have no idea how to responsibly care for it and keep it safe. Allowing it to run free at home being a prime example. Leaving it outside all day alone while at work is another.
- For obedience training, City of Calgary must provide AFFORDABLE pit bull training.
- This is a [removed] and illogical idea. How stupid can you be to hate on a specific breed of dog. Get your heads out of your [removed]
- I am an animal control officer in a small town in BC. I do not have extensive records for bites, however German Shepard's are by far a higher risk of bites than bully breeds. Perhaps all dogs over 30 pounds must be muzzled in dog parks to reduce the dog on dog attack percentages.
- ban breed specific laws . Hosers
- I DO NOT agree with anything that is stated above that has to do with pit bulls. It is not the breed that is the problem it's bad owners!! I have several friends who have very well behaved, trained and sweet/cuddly pit bulls who are better behaved than most dogs I've come across. We should not



discriminate based on a breed. Do better Calgary, this is absolutely ridiculous that these are even being suggested!!

- Please do not focus on specific dog breeds but rather focus efforts on the ownership and owner responsibilities
- Fine the owner if their pet resorts to biting a person.
- Pit bull Ban
- In no way should there be blanket breed identification. This old school myth has been debunked for years and it's shocking and disappointing that the City of Calgary is entertaining adding a breed to the list that they themselves state: "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." This is completely unacceptable. All references to measures pertaining to any specific breed - pitbulls in particular - should be removed from this survey.
- No breed specific legislation.
- DO NOT SINGLE OUT BREEDS. SUPPORT BYLAWS WITH FACT AND SCIENCE NOT IGNORANCE AND FEAR. have you also considered that not all bites are fault of dog? Some humans are assholes!
- Banning a specific breed of dogs is inappropriate and ridiculous. I have a pit mix and she is the most gentle dog I have ever owned. My German shepherd is much more excitable. Also, I'm pretty sure GSD's have the highest bite strength of any breed so the bit about pit bulls biting harder is likely at least partially false. I've mostly been bit or harassed by smaller breeds. Blame bad owners, not only the bad dogs. I can't believe this is even up for a survey/vote.
- no measures applying to a single breed such as a pit bull. Any dog not trained or abused can be dangerous and bite.
- Owners fined for walking dogs (any breed) with out a leash on outside of a off leash area.
- All dogs should go through some sort of obedience training
- Leave pitbulls alone, whatever bylaw comes out needs to be towards all breeds.
- How about you stop blaming the dog (or breed) and blame the [removed] owners. The pitties and staffy I know are just giant , drooling lapdogs. I don't know how many times you people need to be told it's not the breed. [removed]
- I wouldn't support any of it! Just because a dog is of a certain breed or looks like one, doesn't mean it's a nuisance or dangerous.
- None of these pitbulls are not to blame
- Specify "dangerous" behavior
- Bully dogs should NOT be singled out as bad dogs! Bad dogs are usually the owners fault, not a specific breeds fault.
- A nuisance dog needs to be proven as such; not assumed to be as a result of their breed.
- Ban pit bulls. They were bred to be violent and can explode in violence at any time. They are not safe and can't be safe. Ban them all.
- None of the above



- Pit Bulls must be banned. My wife was attacked and fines were levied however my wife was traumatized. No reason to keep nuisance/violent dogs.
- I do not support targeting a specific breed of a dog as aggressive, I believe any dog can be aggressive it depends on how they are raised. A dog is not born a nuisance.
- There are some good pit bulls and lots of terrible non pit bulls. Would like to see any aggressive dog face penalties and restrictions.
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. In many cases it is the owners fault if this breed is aggressive. It is not appropriate for the city to propagate the stereotype
- Fines for owners of any breed that bite
- Put bill bans have been tried in other jurisdictions and have been successfully challenged in court. If a Pitbull bylaw is enacted, the City will find itself in court and in all likelihood the bylaw will be declared illegal. The City should be focused on nuisance dogs.
- How about we hand out fines for people that discriminate against an entire breed of dog. According to this proposed bylaw it doesn't even matter if the breed is actually a pitbull, but any dog that RESEMBLES a pitbull: a dog that has an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar to those of dogs referred to in any of clauses (a) to (d); ("pit-bull") Dog profiling and discrimination at its worst.
- Breed specific legislation is ineffective and unreasonable.
- No breed specific laws
- Dont discriminate. Hold all pet owners to the same standard.
- there should be none of these as an option
- Nuisance dog euthanized after 3rd aggressive incident.
- Obedience training for "nuisance" dog Owners.
- Training is required for all humans and their dogs. Any dog can be a biter, a barker, or a nuisance. Proper trading for both the human and the animal are essential.
- Only repeat offenders not breed specific
- people should have previous experience owning and taking care of dogs before taking on the care of a pit bull or otherwise rescue dog that has experienced trauma.
- Classification of "nuisance" seems too broad, since noise & at large are not issues that are dangerous to other people. If the dog is showing signs of aggression or has caused physical harm, than some of these measures would be warranted.
- Higher fines have to be handed out to owners, this a a shame that you are blaming one specific breed. A bite is a bite. A pit bull bite is not any worse then all big dog breeds. Why not account for all the small breed dogs that bite as well. It is never the dog, it is the owner. We must speak up for the ones that do not have a voice.
- No breed base bias. I am all for increasing penalties and restrictions on nuisance dogs, just not breed based.
- I would like to see pitbulls banned in the city. You read about them killing other animals or humans quite often, and I have personally come across aggressive pitbulls that make me feel unsafe for myself and my dog.



- Owners who have had nuisance dogs in the past must be held responsible for their new dogs.
- Remove the word pit bull from all of this. Honestly I have no clue how this made it to actually see the public. Outrageous.
- Incentivise good ownership habits, penalize owners rather than the dog.
- Dogs can be loud, but that doesn't mean they're a danger. Aside from that, why are certain types of dogs being discriminated against?! It is important to note that pit bull terriers were used as nanny dogs oftentimes in the past due to their nature. It's all dependent on how the owner trains them
- No muzzle bad training leads to bad dog.
- Ban ownership of pitbulls
- obedience training for the owner
- I do not support breed specific legislation
- Pit bulls are not any more dangerous than other large dogs.
- When a dog is declared a nuisance. The owner needs to get training and/or evaluated by a professional. Less so the dog itself.
- More severe restrictions could be applied to a nuisance dog. There may be circumstance where limited opportunities would prevent the possibility of reoffending. However, most dogs that cause injury to a human or another animal should be put down and the bylaw should be revised to provide owners a clear understanding of the consequences.
- Responsible OWNER training. There are NO BAD DOGS!!! There are BAD OWNERS!!!
- Ban pit bull type dogs entirely.
- Fines and training classes for owners who do not know how to properly care for their dog. Community engagement to educate the community, not slap fines and restrictions on any dog based on looks.
- Guardians of nuisance dogs should be required have education on how to properly (humane) train dogs.
- None of the above. Breed restrictions have proven ineffective and outdated
- Spend the money on finding these dogfighting rings and those owners, put the owners in jail not the dog these pups didn't come out of it mommy's soon wanting to fight they just want love respect and cuddles
- The punishment should walk on negligent owners, not the animal. A license should be issued to the individuals looking to purchase a "nuisance" breed, plain and simple. The dogs are incredibly intelligent, loving and loyal when trained properly. Banning them/muzzling them will only add to the rife.
- Eliminate pit bull ownership from Calgary. This is a dangerous breed that can hurt or maim small children and pets
- I support none of these and do not support breed-specific legislation. Owners should be held accountable as should their INDIVIDUAL dogs, not entire breeds.
- Owners of nuisance dogs should be required to take ownership and training classes.
- In my OPONION and it's just mine. I have seen other breeds be WAY more aggressive then the pitbull breed. Like chihuahuas!!!!



- Dangerous breed banning. If you want to own a dangerous dog, do it on a rural property, not in a city.
- None of these, it's stupid. Maybe look at the people who are going to get a pitbull, it's not the dog that's bad, it's the owner who trains. Use your head
- Mandatory training for the owner on how to properly care and train their dog. Regardless of breed.
- Ban pit-bulls
- No breed specific bylaws all dogs should be classified as the same.
- Higher fines and public muzzles for dogs who have attacked and/or aggressively bitten. (The general term nuisance doesn't work. If a dog is houdini and gets out a lot, muzzling them in public is of no use.)
- Reduce number of dogs a dog walker can have off leash at any given time.
- Pit bull ban
- There seems to be a lack of addressing the skills of the owner. A poorly trained dog with little guidance will likely become a nuisance. Perhaps if someone wants a dog that requires a higher level of training they should be required to be an experienced pet owner. You would give a 16 year old a Ferrari for their first car after getting their licence on a Honda civic test car, why would you let someone who has a history of crime or violence own a dog that can be influenced by that type of behavior. Might seem like a bit of a judgmental idea but you shouldn't punish a dog for learned behavior from their surroundings, its likely they could be retrained easier than a human could be.
- Owners of dogs that have been deemed a nuisance must also attend proper training in how to handle their dogs.
- Promote breed awareness
- Pitbulls should be banned, PERIOD.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong and unethical.
- Terrible ideas. This is what our taxes go towards?
- i dont think the problem is with the dog, it is with the owner, people should not have to pay more or be restricted due to having a specific dog
- Training should be mandatory for all dogs, regardless of breed
- None of the above. A "pitbull" does not even have the strongest bite force out of the dogs out there. Do research and site your sources to prove bsl that you are showing is invalid and not even remotely close to correct.
- It is not the breed, it is the lack of proper training & care. Pit bulls should not be singled out; any dog can be aggressive when humans provoke.
- 1 year re-assesment after mandatory obedience training for all dogs declared a nuisance. no specific breed legislation.
- Aggressive small dog breeds should never be allowed off leash
- None of these. These are all terrible. Pit bulls are not bad dogs—just misunderstood.
- Have the city of calgary pay for obedience training
- Discipline of dog owner for owners of nuisance dogs. Mandatory dog training classes for example (for the person first, then the dog)



- [Name removed] always talks about discrimination maybe he should heed his words and quit judging breeds. Or maybe the citizens should start judging him by the colour of his skin
- Absolutely no breed bias, it's like saying an ar15 is a more dangerous firearm because it looks different! Pit bulls DO NOT pose a higher risk to public safety!
- [removed]
- Any owner that adopts a 'nuisance' or fighting breed should have to take appropriate training for the human as well. Certification program preferred to confirm completion of training.
- No muzzles or bylaws against friendly dogs that are trained well
- Stop singling out certain breeds and their looks. Educate the owners and stop punishing the dog for his look. This is complete nonsense
- I do not support breed specific bans. I do however support a much stronger response to nuisance animals and those exhibiting dangerous behaviour (this can involve small dogs as well...)
- Drop the breed specific rules. In my experience the more aggressive and likely to bite dogs are small breeds that because their bites aren't as powerful get overlooked for biting and being aggressive.
- NO BYLAWS FOR SPECIFIC BREEDS. It's not about the animal, it's about the responsibility of the owner. Make owners responsible for behaviour, not dogs.
- Why has this survey been opened up to anyone, instead of specifically to Calgary tax-payers?
- [removed]
- consider straight-out bans on species determined by knowledgeable professionals to pose greater risk, & mandatory neutering of existing ones.
- Higher fines for all dog owners who break pet bylaws.
- Animals that bite causing the victim to go to emergency should be euthanized.
- I don't support any of these.
- Many people who own these kinds of animals are not going to be told anything. Therefore, there needs to be very stiff fines and some rigidity applied to these owners.
- Please punish the dog, not the breed. There are many large breeds of dogs that are NOT "pit bulls" that are more than capable of inflicting great damage or death to people or animals. I think fines should be MUCH greater for nuisance dogs, especially dogs that bite. First offense dog bites should have a hefty fine, 2nd offense should include jail time for the owner. Hold owners more responsible for their pets' actions.
- I DO NOT support breed specific bylaws
- Breed-specific restrictions that relate more to owners may need to apply. It is seldom that an "IT nerd" or an elderly individual or couple seek to own "pit bull" or related-breed animals. Similar to firearm ownership, more checks into owners should apply, as they are more responsible for animal behaviour than the animals themselves.
- How about you provide assistance and access to training programs for all dogs, instead of discriminating against a breed that is not predisposed to aggressive behaviour? It's the responsibility of the owner to keep their dog and other dogs safe, if the dog is a threat to others, the owner should be held accountable (not the dog).



- whats with the hate on pit bull? huskys are more dangerous - who is the nut job that hates on a breed?
- Define "dangerous behaviour". (Lunging, pulling, jumping, bite, growl) Define what nuisance would require additional insurance (barking? running at large? Licensing?) Contradictory statement. Dogs running at large are not allowed to go to the dog park? Using pitbull is stereotyping, many many MANY breeds can be a nuisance. Shame on you for using pitbull as an example, its the trainers of the dogs not the dogs.
- Nothing.
- People who unable to train their dogs properly should be banned from owning nuisance dogs or any dogs.
- Animal cruelty charges for owners found in repeat violation
- None of the above, these ideas are discriminatory and harmful to dogs.
- Calgary has the authority to require any dog the bites to attend training. There is little to no evidence breed specific legislation works and is not a deterrent but any aggressive or problem (barking, off leash etc) dog must be managed an responsible pet ownership enforced. Stricter barking enforcement us a must.
- Do not support breed specific legislation. Define what is "Dangerous Behaviour". What kind of nuisance would require additional insurance?
- pitbulls should NOT be muzzled when they are kind and sweet animals. We don't muzzle dogs meant for hunting and killing in the wild.
- Chihuahuas should be declared nuisance dogs.
- This is really about the uneducated owner. I'd like to see fines for the human involved and mandatory education. I know many Pitt I'll breed dogs who are amazing and lovely. I don't feel that it's fair to punish these dogs when people's terriers are usually the cause of dog fights in the parks I've been to!!!! I don't think we need breed specific legislation in Calgary
- I have been to many dog parks and never had a problem with pit bulls attacking my smaller dog. Other larger breeds have been mo be re of an issue. It is ridiculous to have Different rules for dogs only because they look a certain way.
- Obedience training required for dogs who are declared a nuisance and cannot return to off leash park until completed.
- The science does not support what you are saying about pitbulls. Your bylaw is based of off stereotypes and doesn't correlate with what the experts are saying. You need to educate yourselves before you discriminate out of misguided fear.
- Special Lincensing to breed them
- Charge the person and maybe require the owner has to attend a training course on how to handle their dog. Stop blaming the dog and blame the owners.
- BREEDS ARE NOT BAD. Any of these rules will result in unfair loving conditions based on breed, these dogs are not more of a danger. I have been attacked several times by small dogs but no one seems to care because they don't "look the part" of a violent dog. Instead, focus on making training accessible to every dog owner, and focus on making sure people with history of animal abuse do not



get their hands on animals. Dogs are not to blame for the actions or inactions of their owners and should not be treated as bad dogs just because of their breed.

- This bylaw is ridiculous no dog that has never bitten or attacked should be muzzled
- NO, to all of the above.
- Train people to properly interact with dogs
- Pit bulls are not an issue. Owners are
- I do not own a pit bull, however feel this breed is being improperly targeted. Many of these suggestions might be better tailored to dogs in general not just a single breed
- No special rules for ANY DOGS.
- NONE.
- Breedism based policies are reductive, unsupported by scientific evidence, and harmful to the public. Animals are individuals, and their behaviour is largely based on environment and training, both of which are controlled by their human owners.
- Why pick on dogs that haven't done anything? Don't pick on pitbulls and crosses of the breed. Responsible ownership and training. Increase registration and fees for dog that have become aggressive. Make it mandatory to attend a training session approved by the city for any owner and dog that attacks or becomes aggressive with other dogs or people.
- The pit bulls aren't the problem, nuisance dogs are!
- The breed of animal does not dictate it's potential for danger. The owners must be held responsible regardless of breed. Targeting specific breeds will only cause delays and arguments when it comes to determine if an animal is of that breed or not.
- Ban pitbulls
- Pit bulls or "nuisance dogs" should be tested behaviourally before being allowed into off leash parks (as should any dog)
- I know many sweet and friendly pit bulls, this is ridiculous to enforce these rules based on breed and not based on the dog itself.
- Please do not ignorantly single out Pitbull breeds, do the research. All dog breeds have the same capacity for aggression if they are mistreated. The humans are the problem not the innocent animal in their care.
- Nuisance dogs must include all breeds, not just breed specific. Could be a shih Tzu or bichon frise.
- If a dog bites a person, the incident should be investigated. If the person was trespassing at the time of biting, the dog should not be reprimanded. Each incident should be investigated individually. It shouldn't matter what the breed of the dog is.
- Owner should be surveyed to see how treating animal after fine also.usually will be angry because of hassle and abuse the poor animal.
- Try fining the owners. Dogs do what they are taught or allowed to do. Fyi, Rottweilers have 100 psi bite than a pitbull.
- How about if ANY DOG (not just pit bulls!!!!!!!!!!) is vicious, there is a mandatory obedience training? Use the same concept as if a teenager committed a minor crime and use some restorative justice instead of negative reinforcement.



- Greater training and/or sanctions for dog owners when their dog bites or is out of control. It isn't the dogs fault, it is the owners
- None of the above
- Enforcement should be based on actual incidents, not breed.
- There needs to be more definition on the term nuisance. Who is determining whether the dog is a nuisance? In the case that a dog (not breed specific) has bitten someone, muzzle requirement in public or off leash areas should be a requirement.
- Pit bulls and nuisance dogs should be allowed in off-leash parks, if they are on a leash
- More support for pit bulls should be offered due to the erroneous treatment they receive.
- Nuisance dogs should also include ones that bark constantly. Rather than emphasis on pit bulls it should punish ALL dogs that bite regardless of breed. Owners should be held accountable and fined and also responsible for all medical/death costs inflicted on victim.
- Laws need to include all breeds big and small and not just focus on a particular breed. It's irresponsible owners that are the problem.
- Stop putting this on pit bulls. Pull your heads out of your [removed]. It is not the dog breed but the owner.
- This is absolutely abhorrent that you would create such a generalization about a breed of dog - It is so discriminatory!! It is inflammatory to label the "pit bulls" as the issue. The issue with aggressive dogs, more often than not, is the owners. Some people own "aggressive looking dogs" for the wrong reasons, but that is not the fault of the dogs. If a badly trained, aggressive, off-leash small dog charges at a leashes "pit bull" and that dog defends itself, would these bylaws not unfairly target the pit bull that was not the instigator?
- I do not understand that Mastiff, Kangal, Great Pyrenees, Labrador retrievers all have Similar or high bite force than Pitbull breeds. Yet these dogs are not on the list. I have been around Pitbull breeders and I was an owner of a Pitbull across Boxer and she was attacked in Regina and in Calgary by dogs that are much bigger and she never retaliated. Maybe the City should educate themselves on the FACT that Pitbulls and other dog breeds are not born aggressive and it is the owner who creates bad behaviour from their dogs. Maybe the fines shouldn't be directed towards Pitbull dog owners but owners that cannot put their dog through the correct training and should be taken away if that person cannot afford appropriate training. Every dog needs training some need more than others but don't be like Quebec and label Pitbulls as dangerous dogs when I have been attacked by other dog breeds more than any Pitbull Stanford shire terriers English or American bully breeds.
- Pit bulls and any breed looking like pit bulls shall be treated the same as any other breed of dog.
- Very concerned with this wording and singling our pit bull breeds
- Obedience training for any registered dog
- Leave the pit bulls alone
- None, it is not reasonable to pick one specific breed and punish them and their owners. These bylaws should NOT be allowed in Calgary.
- I don't agree with any of these. Maybe potential Pit bull owners need to have background checks before being allowed to rescue or purchase a Pit Bull.



- Breed bans have never proven useful. Ban the deed, not the breed! "Bully Type" is as bad as saying "Dark skinned". Most people officers included couldn't correctly identify bully breeds if tested.
- From working in a vet clinic we have to muzzle all chihuahuas and not pit bulls. Pit bulls are not the problem it's the irresponsible owners.
- NOTHING. Any dogs can be aggressive, it's the owners who own them. You should be ashamed of yourself for blaming "pitbulls". Maybe try jail time for the people who abuse animals.....
- While I agree that nuisance dogs can cause trouble (I work in an emergency department and have seen many dog bites), it is not the dog that needs to be punished, especially not a specific BREED of dog. It is the actions of irresponsible dog owners that needs to be addressed. In the case of "nuisance dogs", please enforce proper education and training for dog OWNERS.
- Pitbulls aren't the problem. Look into irresponsible owners. Smaller breeds of dogs are more likely to bite and instigate fights.
- All the things above but for "nuisance" dog owners. Leave the dogs alone.
- Breed specific legislation does not work and it punishes pets who are designated because of their breed not because of any bite or offense.
- How do you define nuisance?!
- STOP TRYING TO ISSUE BLS AGAINST "PITBULLS" - punish them deed not the breed
- Muzzles for irresponsible owners of nuisance dogs. Ie "nuisance people"
- Training for the humans who are owning any kind of dog. BSL is discriminatory and legislation should be based on the owners not the dog.
- You cannot just target one specific breed of dog.
- Do not penalize pit bulls or their owners.
- Every dog has the ability to be mean. The owners should be thoroughly investigated for animal abuse & if it's found, charged criminally.
- NO legislation specific to "pit bulls"
- No discrimination by breed or appearance.
- No need to single out pit bull, a bull dog or Shepard can have just as strong of a bite. Focus on behaviour of all breeds.
- Nothing needs to be changed
- These above restrictions and requirements should only be required if a dog is determined to be vicious.
- Required training and a fine for the owner who failed to train their dog. This could be any breed. It is the owners responsibility to learn about their dog breed and train them accordingly.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong.
- A dog that bites a human to the point of drawing blood should be euthanized.
- Instead of creating targeted legislation that is breed specific why not require all dog owners, regardless of breed, take a responsible pet owner course and prove their attendance to liscencr their dog. It is not about the dog it's about their owner and their ability to train and effectively care for the dog.



- Please reconsider BSL. This is a poor way of dealing with humans that don't deserve to have dogs. Don't punish every single dog of this breed or similar breed. You're being a racist for animals.
- Why are you limiting breeds it's not because of a bad breed it's because of a bad owner and if a lab bites me I would expect the law to protect me the same way. Also mutts come in many shapes and sizes you can't classify things based on the way they look, that's wrong, we are taught not to do that with people because assuming leads to issues. Get past the breed thing and focus on general responsible ownership
- NO breed specific legislation. It's the owner who is the problem not the dog!!!!
- [removed]
- any breeds small breeds are much more prone to biting and should be under any of these bylaws
- More regulations on rescues who try and adopt out pit bull breeds that's have previous issues.
- Specific breeds should NOT be singled out. Nuisance dogs should be well defined as any breed exhibiting aggressive or destructive behaviours without consideration of breed. A biting Yorkie Terrier could be categorized similarly despite the lack of jaw strength. It is the behaviour that is the issue.
- nothing breed specific! wake up!
- Let people live their lives with their choice of dog
- No breed specific litigation, please. The responsibility lies with the dog owner, and only problem dogs/owners should be fined and constricted, not an entire breed of dogs.
- None of the above. These are all ridiculous.
- Pit bulls do not have a stronger bite strength than all other dogs, this is false information
- This is awful. Statistically pit bulls are not involved in more dog bite incidents than any other dogs. Shameful that the city is considering this.
- [removed] Like hello? It's nothing to do with the breed and everything to do with the person. This is also so oppressive, are we moving towards a hostile government take over?
- Literally none of these. No special laws for owning a pit bull is ideal, because pit bulls are not a nuisance or aggressive breed.
- You guys are jerks leave pitties alone
- none of the above I've seen tiny little pomeranians that are worse than any of the dogs listed above. It's not the breed that is bad it's the owner and how the individual dog is raised. You should be looking at harsher punishment for owners not specific animals.
- Stereotyping dogs just shouldn't happen. And pit bulls SHOULD NOT be individually singled out in ANY bylaw. Only dogs after multiple offences should face these consequences
- I do not have faith in what the city would determine to be a nuisanced animal. Need clear parameters. I do not own a pit bull but I think it is old history about how violent pit bulls are. Intelligence has moved beyond this paradigm. Pit bulls are often the most affectionate animals. Intelligence tells us it is the owners that are the problem. Focus on owners not the breed
- All dogs have the ability to bite and cause harm. As a Paramedic I have been to more Animal bites from Golden Retrievers than from Pitbulls. There needs to be more regulation on training. Maybe cheaper or free dog licenses if you attend and graduate from a certified Training program.



- It wouldn't be fair to isolate one breed especially when a lot of rescue foundations don't know and just put down pit bull terrier as default.
- In the 80s it was Dobermans, now barely a peep. Then it was German Shepherds...now it is bully breeds and irresponsible owners of retrievers or small dogs can be total jerks with impunity. Please don't put the focus on bully breeds because it makes owners of terriers or chihuahuas know it doesn't apply to them. Don't give a free pass to people who think because it is not a bully breed, it doesn't matter.
- Owners of dogs that are a nuisance regardless of breed need to be disciplined, it is as much on the owner for poor training and control of their pet as it is the animal that may cause an incident
- Any dog can be aggressive. Why do this for the gentle giants and such. Maybe research these actual breeds rather than listening to such stereotypes smh. If anything provide more protections for the people that get their dogs provoked just because they are pitbulls. And if you wouldn't do it to a beagle, why a pitbull? Because someone said they were bad. It makes no sense. Listen to actual responsible pet owners rather than being blinded by uneducated Karens.
- Pit bulls should NOT be discriminated against. Lots of dogs have strong bite ability and I know many extremely well trained and harmless pit bulls who deserve to be at an off leash.
- Why are there not an option for none of the above. This line of questioning is discriminatory.
- You cannot tell someone which breeds they can or cannot own. Many pet owners are going to have issues with neighbors who are just looking for an excuse to have a dog removed out of spite. Good people are going to get hurt through this endeavour and good dogs are going to be destroyed "Murdered" because a couple people want to be angry over a breed that is less dangerous than a chihuahua!
- Breed specific legislation is inappropriate - I see many more bites and aggressive behaviour in other breeds
- All owners of all breeds should be held responsible, singling out specific dogs is both discriminatory and extremely unfair, any dog that has the potential to be a nuisance is not controlled properly
- Instead of banning dogs because people are scared. Open proper training and resources to help show humans not all dogs are bad or are scary.
- Breed specific laws are ineffective. Any type of dog can be dangerous, it has nothing to do with the breed and everything to do with the individual animal's training and owners.
- It is very wrong that breed specific laws are being proposed, pitbulls are not a danger nor should they be treated as one. Their bites do not cause more damage than another large breed dog and should not have extra laws because of their breed it should be determined by the past behaviour of the dog but by the breed.
- All dogs should need obedience training. Don't just pick on "nuisance dogs" and pit bulls. This is an atrocious survey and hasn't been thought through at all. P
- Don't judge the breed, judge the owner!!!! No dog is born bad, they are taught that behavior from a young age. I would rather see chihuahua's consider a "bully" breed.
- [removed] The reason that dogs are "nuisance" is because people treat them poorly, neglect them and put their own bad intentions on the dogs.



- Pit bulls should not be singled out all breeds have the potential to be a nuisance without proper training
- In this time of increases radical discrimination - why are we discriminating against a breed and those that look like them ? Education and training is all that is needed. This is becoming out of control Pet owners should be responsible for training their pets. - all pets - properly.
- Don't blame a breed, judge each incident on its own
- This line of questions is small minded and harmful to a gentle and friendly breed.
- None of the above
- Define how a dog is determined to be a "nuisance" v. "dangerous". A dog who is constantly barking and receives complaints is extremely different from an aggressive dog who bites. These terms should not be used interchangeably as they are on the questing above. Who determines if the dog is a nuisance vs dangerous? What are their qualifications as a complaint about barking does not require an owner to obtain additional insurance.
- NONE OF THE ABOVE
- I completely disagree with a breed specific rule. It is the human that is responsible for training and caring for the dog.
- Do not single out the bully breed!
- Train the human and the dog will follow. Do not specify breed when small dogs can be horrible biters and barkers.
- Training required or offered at the time of purchase for any animal.
- Stop focusing on a dogs look or breed and focus on individual dogs. If a border collie is aggressive it should need a muzzle. If a Pitbull is not aggressive (which 99% of them are NOT AGGRESSIVE) Then they shouldn't be muzzled! This is uneducated, and ignorant!
- You should not be prioritizing pit bulls as the main culprit for biting and nuisance behavior. There are many very well behaved, and well trained pit bulls. These questions should be related to nuisance behavior of all dog breeds. A chihuahua can be just as much of a problem in a dog park as a pit bull. Your stigma on pit bulls is honestly quite offensive. A dog's behavior is completely based on the owners ability to train their pet. If a pet is acting out or biting, the best measure that could be taken is seizure of the dog from the current owner.
- If nuisance dogs lose off-leash park privileges, perhaps there should be an option to restore those privileges based on ongoing good behaviour.
- I feel any dog that has had a nuisance label should have higher fines but to declare it only one type, ie: pit bull, pit bull type is narrow minded and not addressing the real problem of the owners.
- Nuisance dogs and pit bulls can't be off leash period.
- these should be for all dogs not specific dog breeds. owners need to responsible for their pets
- Is this even an issue here. It has been shown that these dogs are not a nuisance, the rather any dog to be a nuisance. This is usually because of the owner, not the breed. Get your head together Calgary. We're amending bylaws to move forward, not backward.
- Bad dogs have bad owners if the dog has been a nuisance then the owners need training
- Do not target pit bulls. That unfairly goes after responsible pet owners with well trained dogs.



- There shouldn't be so much prejudice against pit bulls simply due to their breed and "strength". Any dog can be a "nuisance" if improperly trained, as pit bulls can be wonderfully gentle. It's all down to the training (ie. responsibility of the owner, not the dog)
- Nothing. They don't deserve to be treated worse than any other dog. German Shepherds and Boston Terriers also have EXTREMELY strong jaws.
- Aggressive dogs or dogs who have bitten or attacked people cannot be off leash anywhere.
- I DO NOT support breed specific legislation. Yes, there are bad pit bulls. There are also bad Chihuahuas. There are very loving gentle pit bulls as well. Fines and especially banning of animal ownership are more effective. More funding for follow up of less serious complaints to avoid more serious situations.
- Because nuisance involves noise. . . le barking i was unable to consider your suggestions in relationship to dangerous or dogs that would bite.
- nothing. bad dogs aren't born, they're raised. therefore, there are no bad dogs. responsible pet owners won't bring an aggressive dog to the park. shame on you.
- It is unfair to pick on one breed or type of dog. All dogs have the propensity to bite if provoked and unless you mandate that all owners need muzzles and /or training then it is unfair.
- Calgary does some research and stops this!
- None of these. I am not a dog owner at this time & do not think these dogs should be policed in this way. These options are biased. I am interested in rehabilitation and proper homing for dogs that may be aggressive or bite. Using "nuisance" to include dogs that have been "at large" or bark is not in the interest of public safety or animal welfare, it is an overpolicing of dog owners and against the best interest of the welfare of these dogs.
- I disagree with singling out pit bulls and suggest you stick to nuisance dogs that can be any breed. Bad pet owners are responsible for bad pets if they don't intervene. Pit bulls have always gotten such a bad reputation however I know several responsible owners and their dogs are well behaved. I think this focus on pit bulls is unfair and needs to be reviewed.
- Wow, really?! BSL language, after many experts have weighed in on how I'll informed BSL is? Deed not breed.
- Please don't single out pit bulls. It is often poor training on the owner if a dog bites/is aggressive. Not the breed! The notion of pit bulls being singled out seems so archaic and not based on any education or research.
- None of the above, BSL solves no problems. It's completely untrue that pit bulls have a strong bite force. Creating these bylaws puts all blame on the breed of the dog and causes negative consequences for those owners who have worked hard to train with their dogs.
- Breed specific legislation is wasteful and dangerous.
- Obedience training for EVERY dog. Stop being prejudice [removed].
- I feel that increasing any fine due to a dog misbehaving will not encourage the owner to seek more training. Animals are misbehaving because THEIR OWNER did not supply adequate training to the pet and therefore set their pet up for failure. Responsible pet ownership should be encouraged including gaining more knowledge about their breed of dog and to correct the dog's behavior, being



able to identify early warning signs of behaviors that will require attention and correction etc.; adequate training must be obtained for the owner and the pet. Any pet can bite, or be a nuisance as described above, no dog breed should ever be singled out because if not trained properly, any pet can be a danger to their surroundings. A pet should probably be removed from the household or household should be forced to obtain training if biting continues because said household appears to not be able to take care of their pet and supply the necessary attention, training and knowledge the pet requires. Owners neglect will cause animals to be dangerous.

- None of the above Don't blame the breed blame the owner
- Dont Discriminate against pit bulls, theyre one of the most LOVING breeds of dogs. Dont say they require special treatment if it's not being mandatory for ALL dogs as well.
- Do not specify a breed off dog! Charge people that taunt a dog or provoke a dog to bit. Not the dog or the dog owner.
- When dogs exhibit negative behavior, it's a reflection of their owners - NOT the breed. When all other options above have been exhausted, seizing the dogs should be the LAST option.
- Non of the above the breed has nothing to do with bits. It is the owner that should be fined. As the dog is just doing what it knows. Any dog can bit.
- There is no substantial research that shows that "pit bulls" (which is not a registered breed but rather a nickname) have any greater jaw/bite strength than that of a German shepherd, etc.
- I absolutely disagree with all of the above mentioned. Pit bulls are no more aggressive than any other breeds.
- Only one that is fair
- Higher fines for smaller aggressive dogs
- Bad dogs come with bad attitude owners that are the problem not the dog, we have a Rhodesian ridgeback in the neighbourhood that traumatizes other dogs its not just pit bulls stop marketing them as a problem.
- Training for owners!! It's not usually the dogs fault if they are aggressive it's the owners
- Pitbull breeds are not a problem. BSL in any way is narrow minded and punishes people/breeds before anything even potentially happens. If ANY dog is a nuisance then they should have to go to obedience training. I have had more aggression from small dogs infinitely more times than a big dog or "pitbull type" dog.
- this is [removed]. i experience more issues with chihuahuas than pitbulls. ALL dogs need to be adequately trained. blaming a dog for, in your own words, "the potential" for a more severe bite is unfair.
- This by law is over the top and punishing good dog owners with these types of breeds because of some bad apples. I think this bylaw is unnecessary and should be dropped.
- There's nothing wrong with pit bulls. Other bigger breeds have strong bites as well. No additional rules for pits, only for specific dogs who have been aggressive in the past.
- The banning of pit bull type breeds will not do anything to prevent animal aggression. Every single animal behaves differently according to how they're raised. As a child, I was severely attacked by a small Australian terrier that was off leash. The size of the dog has nothing to do with whether they



bite or not. If pit bull breeds “deserve” to be muzzled, have to have insurance, and take training lessons, then so does every other dog. If a dog owner can’t have more than one pit bull, then no one should be allowed to have any two of the same dog breed. You cannot hold a dog accountable to an owners irresponsibility.

- You cannot single out one breed/type of dog. It's the owner of a dog that is the problem, not the dog itself.
- None, this a stupid idea and leading questioning to discriminate this breeds.
- Nothing. Leave them alone
- None of the above.
- Owner is the nuisance and requires education about dog management
- It all comes down to training and owner responsibility not about dog breed. Other dogs like German shepherds and rotties are dangerous too when not trained properly
- Obedience and Owner Training!!
- This is ridiculous. If pit bulls aren't involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds this bylaw shouldn't be passed. Please focus your energy on helping pet owners be responsible (ie. Early dog warming system) and not generalizing that all pit bulls and similar breeds are "bad". This issue is more about the owners than it is about the dogs.
- Most of these are totally insulting and inappropriate, my small dog can do as much damage as a “pit bull”. stop demonizing the breed and have some options that hold the owner more responsible.
- Stop discrimination against the dogs and focus on bad owners!!!
- Breed specific by-laws are inappropriate. There are irresponsible animal owners, not irresponsible animals. Breed specific is discriminatory.
- Children, or owners not strong enough to control or restrain large dogs, should not be permitted to walk the large dogs in public if they cannot restrain them.
- Fine the owner, not the pet! It is the human’s fault, not the animal
- None of these, these are authoritarian and prejudiced, especially right after acknowledging pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents.
- NO breed specific bylaws.
- There should be no special rules for certain breeds who have shown no aggression.
- Why a specific breed? Did you know that Golden Retrievers are prone to attacking more-so than any other breed of dog? Or what about small dog breeds; they attack/bite often, just not severe enough to be news worthy. This bylaw is all bs.
- BSL does not work. I worry more about this small dogs loose/roaming than I do the large breeds. Please focus on educating owners for responsible pet ownership
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION
- Stop with the pitbull specific bullying.
- Focus on nuisance dogs not specific breeds
- Irresponsible owners is the problem not the dogs. Dog problems are not breed specific and it is not right to single out a specific breed over another.
- People who deliberately raise dogs to be aggressive should be BANNED form dog ownership.



- Pit bulls should not be singled out
- There is no scientific evidence that pit bull type dogs have stronger jaws. This is a myth. You also specifically state that they don't bite more often than others, so why penalize them?
- Absolutely no mention of breed ANYWHERE. All cases should be handed on a case by case basis based on ONLY the dogs incident/behaviour/history whether its a golden retriever, a cattle dog or a St Bernard. BREED IS NOT RELEVANT.
- There is no evidence that 'pitbulls' are any more dangerous than other breeds. Not to mention that including a generalized type of dog in this survey about nuisance dogs created an automatic bias that automatically skews any results. It doesn't give calgarians the opportunity to voice an opinion about breed specific legislation. I believe in education over legislation.
- Perhaps if obedience training become mandatory for certain dogs you should try to ensure obedience training is up to standards of actually training dogs. Not giving them treats and they'll learn to sit.
- Leave it as nuisance dogs, any dog has the potential to bite, leave "pitbull" breeds out of legislation, German Sheppards, Rottweiler, golden Retrievers, cane corso, mastiffs etc they all have the same potential to buy and injure.
- What about the small dogs? Why pick on pit bull type dogs? BSL doesn't work, it's not the dogs but the OWNERS that need to be trained and punished. This is such a stupid bylaw and I'm ashamed of my great city for even thinking this is ok!!!
- Owners should be fined if a dog regardless of the breed has bitten anyone. The breed should be discriminated against
- None of the above, they are family pets just like any other dog. Its the owners that are at fault, train them.
- Disagree with BSL. No different than profiling a certain group or faction of people by race. Very discriminatory!!
- Any dog can be a nuisance. Breed specific legislation does not work.
- Treat all dogs equally :)
- The onus needs to be placed on the humans who do not train/educate their dogs. There should be more emphasis on evidence based training methods for owners of all dog type. I take umbrage regarding "pit bull's strength leads to more severe bites" that is simply not true. There are many common breeds that have a stronger bite force than "pit bull" types.
- Pit bulls on their own are not nuisance dogs. Owners of any dog should be held liable for the behavior of any dog they own. Every dog owner should have training of some sort especially new dog owners. I don't own a pit bull but do not support discrimination based on the look of a dog but the actions of the dog and owners instead should be held responsible.
- You guys are right off your rockers. All dogs are a liability at the hands of a [removed]. People are a nuisance; not dogs. Maybe instead of trying to extinguish a breed, put better laws in place to protect them, that way they don't become violent. Make it harder to access a "nuisance" breed. Make people register their pets. Don't punish good pet owners for trying to give a dog a good life.



- Mandatory City provided dog education courses similar to AA style meetings often required in alcohol related offenses.
- Why are you treating pitbulls differently? Any breed can exhibit aggressive behavior. Chihuahuas are known to be quite aggressive towards people they don't know. The only difference is their size and their bites might not cause as much damage. Whatever law is passed should not be targeted towards pitbulls only and should apply to all dogs no matter the breed.
- These bylaws should ONLY apply to dogs who have bitten or been unnecessarily aggressive. Breed legislation is unfair and cruel.
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LANGUAGE
- None
- I don't think a breed of the dog is the issue it's the owner. My dog has never had issues with pit bulls at any park. However in general owners should not be letting their dog off leash if they know there is aggression. The fines should be higher for those people not based on a breed.
- None of the above. That is unacceptable
- Crazy y'all literally think one dog breed is a problem. None of the above, leave it how it's been. Idiots.
- [removed]
- None of the above. All dogs created equal and deserve equal treatment.
- Obedience training required for all licensed dogs in a Calgary.
- None of the above
- No one should have to pay heavier fees based on the breed of dog they choose. We need to hold the owners accountable for the actions of their pets. No dog should need to be labeled a nuisance just to please others.
- Ban pitt bulls
- These dogs should not be discriminated against. This is unfair. Do not amend the act if it's sole purpose is to degrade these sweet dogs
- Pitbulls are not the problem. Any dog can be a problem or nuisance this is not breed specific. Little dogs bite more then big ones and that is because those owners do not train their dogs properly, those owners think it's cute cause they are small. That behavior gets those little dogs in trouble and every one blames the big dog. Also your survey is skewed because there is no definition to what you refer to as nuisance plus the validity of the process depends on the judgment portion of this plan. Biased people judging a pitbull leaves those owners and frankly those dear sweet family members out to dry.
- Pit bull breeds shouldn't be targeted.
- These are all awful. Leave pit bulls alone
- Obedience training should be required for all breeds not just pit bulls. A golden retriever can be just as dangerous to bystanders if they don't have a recall, manners, or social cues in every situation.
- Leave Pitbulls alone you are being a bully.
- The owner is the problem - not the breed.



- I don't think we should ban pit bulls just because the owners didn't train it right and didn't treat the pit bull right.
- Make it fair with dog breeds.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong on so many levels. All dogs and owners need to be held responsible regardless of breed and should be held to the same standards. We're not allowed to create different legislations for different breeds of people, why dogs?
- None of these. [removed] for pit bulls.
- Dogs deemed a "nuisance" should have their home life investigated to ensure they are receiving adequate care, training and exercise. If not obedience classes should be recommended to retrain the owner as well as the dog.
- Stop targeting pit type dogs [removed] -- [personal information removed] it's not the dog its the owner That's why the Calgary model it the number one animal control model in North America and why there are so many repeals of BSL Like : Delaware has become the 21st state to outlaw it along with just a few places that have repealed LOL 2020 Cathlamet, WA (repealed January, 2020) Sarcoxie, MO (repealed February, 2020) Prairie Village, KS (repealed February, 2020) 2019 11/5/2019 Kennewick City Washington repeals 40 year ban 11/2019 Sugar Creek, MO (repealed) 11/2019 Maquoketa, IA (repealed) 11/2019 Everett, WA (repealed) 11/2019 Sioux City, IA (repealed) 10/2019 South Point, OH (repealed) 10/2019 University City, MO (repealed) 10/2019 Fenton, LA (repealed) 09/2019 Kosciusko, MS (repealed) 08/2019 Yorkville, WI (repealed) 08/2019 Cudahy, WI (repealed) 07/2019 Enumclaw, WA (repealed) 07/2019 Highland Heights, OH (repealed) 5/30/2019 Wyandotte County KS repealed 30 year ban 5/30/2019 Kansas City KS A decision has been made to repeal a ban that has been in place for 29 years. 5/01/2019 Washington becomes the 22nd state to outlaw BSL 5/2019 Liberty MO 5/2019 Willoughby Hills, Ohio. 04/2019 Cabot, AR (repealed) 04/2019 Ludlow, KY (repealed) 04/2019 Barry, IL (repealed) 03/2019 Gardendale, AL (repealed) 03/2019 Eureka, MO (repealed) 01/2019 Fort Lupton, CO (repealed) 1/2019 Garfield Heights Ohio repealed ban 2018 12/2018 Mentor-on-the-Lake, OH (repealed) 12/2018 Rocky River, Ohio repealed ban 8/2018 Yakima, Wa repealed 30 year ban 8/2017. Chateauguay QC 30 year ban 8/2018. Montreal QC 8/2018 Springfield, Missouri residents voted against ban 7/8/2018 Springfield, Missouri 5/2018 Pratt, Kansas repealed ban 5/2018 Castle Rock, Colorado repealed ban 4/2018 Eudora, Kansas repealed 10 year old ban 4/2018 Beloit, Kansas repealed 4/2018 Marceline, Mo repealed ban 3/2018. Lakewood, Ohio 3/2018 Anamosa, Iowa removes ban 3/2018 Ironton, Mo. removes ban 3/2018 Reynoldsburg, Ohio repeals ban 02/2018 Hastings, MI (repealed) 01/2018 New Albany, OH (repealed) 1/2018 Burden, Kansas lifts ban 1/2018 Libby, Montana 2017 11/2017 Prince George, BC Canada city council voted to stop classifying pit bulls and other bully breeds as "dangerous" and instead focus on the behaviour of individual dogs, as part of new rules around animal ownership in the city. 8/2017 Beaver Dam, Ky. removed ban 7/2017 South Milwaukee, Wisconsin removed ban 6/2017 Delaware Governor John Carney (D) signed House Bill 13, which is intended to protect the rights of responsible Delaware dog owners by prohibiting any dog from being declared "potentially dangerous" or "dangerous" under state law simply based on the dog's breed. The bill would also prohibit municipalities from enacting laws or regulations based on a dog's breed.



5/2017 Tamarac, Fla removed ban 5/2017 The County of Grande Prairie (Canada) removes breed specific references and restricted breeds from Animal Control Bylaw 5/2017 Payette, Idaho removed ban 3/2017 Florissant, Mo removed ban 1/2017 Purdy, Mo. removed ban 11/2017 Mansfield, Ohio 2016 11/2016 Bextly OH no longer bans pit bulls obtain insurance, spay or neuter their pet, register it with the city and prove it passed a behavior test. 2015 1/26/2015 Roeland Park, KS repealed BSL 2014 11/18/2014 - Spring Hill Kansas has repealed their ban on "pit bull dogs." The old law, which was passed in 2008 2/3/2014 Garden City repealed 1/ 14/2014 Canton Township (MI) repeals breed-specific vicious dog ordinance 1/13 2014 Bonner Springs suburb of Kansas ... 2014 Fairway KS

- It is not the dog that is the problem. Owners need to learn how to properly train and take care of their pets. Owners need training. Dogs should not be punished or restricted. Many owners are responsible pet owners, those who are not need training. You should never take prejudice against how an animal looks.
- targeting pitbulls is wrong. Other breeds not specified have a more powerful bite, why are they not included??
- Should punish the owner, not the animal. Is there a reason why this engagement is suddenly anti Pitbull without a reasonable justification? It is almost comical how obtuse this engagement is. None of this was covered in the first engagement.
- This should not be breed specific at all.
- This is ridiculous, it's not the breed it's the dog!! All dogs are different!!
- Small breed with complaints must complete training for behavior and anxiety.
- There doesn't seem to be any real weight behind the idea of singling out "pit-bull" type or looking dogs. German Shepards, large retrievers, etc can all possess the jaw strength to severely bite. If any bylaws were to be introduced, they should not target a single type of dog.
- Stop going after certain breeds! Small dogs instigate a lot of fights and the big dogs or bully breeds get blamed and punished. Don't take dogs from their owners when something happens and treat them like savages. They have families that love them and the city is SAVAGE in how they treat the family!
- pit bulls are not inherently more violent or more dangerous than other dogs, they are just dogs that can be trained to be more violent (as can literally any other dog breed). creating laws against this specific breed is not only unfair to loveable animals that need homes and love as much as any other animals, its completely uneducated and driven by stereotypes and fear. do some actual research on pitbulls and the breeds and dont promote hurtful stereotypes on animals that havent done anything wrong.
- Obedience training required for all inner city dogs. Hold the owners accountable, not breeds.
- Why are you only saying pit bulls when breed has nothing to do with irresponsible dog owners. It's 2020 stop already
- I support none of these prejudice suggestions.
- Obedience training and a large fine for the owner of the offence dog/ owner.



- The so called pitbull breed was not originally what the media portrays them as now. Just cause some people trained their own different doesn't mean all are the same. I have two amstaff rescues and I wouldn't trade them for nothing. I've had many dogs of different breeds through out my life and other than a mastiff/dane/Sheppard cross the amstaff and their counter parts have been the most loyal and loving of them all. They were nanny dogs, they are decorated war dogs. IT'S NOT THE BREED, ITS THE PERSON TRAINING THEM. START TO PUNISH THE HUMANS THAT TRAIN AND GIVE THEM A BAD NAME
- All of these are ridiculous. Breed specific legislation is antiquated and unnecessary.
- NONE
- Pit bulls are one of the nicest breed of dogs out there. They are judged online because of their histories being FORCED in dog fights and are being portrayed as abusive. I trust my pit bull with my baby more than i trust my own sister. Not once has he done any wrong in his life. Don't judge a dog because of their history, NOT ALL DOGS ARE THEIR HISTORY. It's the bad people who have done this to this breed, but i'm just saying not all dogs are their owner. and i'm pretty sure if a dog was considered a nuisance why would the owner take them to a public area with other dogs? Ask yourself that question.
- Pit bulls and staffy type dogs should not be victimized as they are only one of several breeds that have predisposition for aggressive behaviour
- Every case needs to be treated individuals without prejudice
- Do not punish the breed because bad owners gravitate towards certain breeds. Punish the owner for being unable to train and control their dog, not an entire breed of dogs that are just doing what they learn from their owners.
- [removed]
- Nuisance dog owners must go to therapy & change their behaviour patterns that make them need & create an aggressive dog & have dogs taken away from them.
- It is wrong to single out the "pit bull" or variation thereof and declare it aggressive and unsafe.
- None of the above. Animal discrimination is wrong.
- No breed specific rules. The owner of a dog that bites no matter what breed will be fined
- Pit bulls are not the only breed with a jaw strength capable of providing a severe bite. German shepherds and other dogs are just as capable of the same damage.
- Background checks on people with pit bulls. Dogs are not the problem, they are trained to be a problem.
- Breed specific bylaws are proven to not be effective and are incorrect, unfair, and not justified. Don't bully my breed.
- A pit bull band would be appropriate
- A license and review for breeders of these breeds. It's important that they are being properly socialized and trained in a healthy environment from day 1.
- Ban the ownership of pit bull type breeds
- Discounts on dog registration for completion of obedience training
- Colour coded leashes that let people know the temperment of a dog.



- Pitbulls are not the problem, the owners are ultimately the problem. A strong person wouldn't be fined or require insurance because they are stronger than the average person. Dogs shouldn't be banned from parks based on their breed. Larger dogs typically need more space and exercise, limiting the spaces they can run and play would just cause more issues.
- It is wrong to ban specific breeds or out pitfalls specifically. Fines should include all dogs no matter the type and size.
- Owners required to get training as part of any fine issued for a pet problem.
- Do not allow ownership of violent breeds
- Owners of any bully breed dogs, German shepherd, Rottweiler, husky, etc. should be required by law to complete a training course to ensure that they are prepared to properly handle the animal. At least one person per household, or perhaps any adult in the household. So many experts say that is not the breed but rather the way the breed is handled by a person, so fix the people.
- Ban or restriction on owning bully breeds/pit bulls.
- I strongly disagree with these laws against pit bulls. These are definitely strong dogs, however, they are not a fierce dog, unless they are raised that way by their owner. With that said, any dog can be fierce with a terrible owner. There are other dogs which are larger and stronger than pit bulls, which could do just as much damage.
- Mandatory screening of prospective owners who wish to acquire dogs with high bite strength. Prospective owners must show good character and commitment to enforce good behaviour.
- don't ban the breeds. stupidest thing i've ever heard calgary doing, and that is including the blue ring.
- Mandatory human education before owning and being responsible for a living creature. You must prove to the government you have the skills and education to drive a vehicle, to obtain a job, etc. Instead of putting breed specific legislation out there, why not impose mandatory education/licensing required to own a pet to prove the individual is capable of properly caring for an animal.
- Education for owners that are mistreating their dogs as it is the owner, not the dog itself that encourages the attacks.
- Owners of so-called nuisance dogs MUST be given stiff fines. These are not the dogs' fault!!
- Strength of the Pitbull is your reasoning? There are MANY stronger dogs with much stronger bite. This is identical to Racism. If you replaces 'Pitbull' with any nationality, there would be uproar!
- pitbulls are not aggressive. they are easily trained. this is simply spreading fear of a dog breed.
- Ban pit bulls and dogs declared a nuisance altogether
- Dogs should never be judged based on breed. This is outrageous that the city would be even be considering a pit-bull or pit mix designation. Every dog whether it is a family lab or tiny lap dog needs to be considered based on the character of that dog. I've had more issues with aggressive small dog while out in the dog parks. This pit-bull specific attack is in Calgary.
- No Pit bulls allowed in the city.
- Owners have to prove they are not total idiots. Seeing as how people that like those dogs are idiots they won't be able to get a pet
- NO. Just no. Invest in programs to teach dog owners.



- No breed specific legislation
- owners of nuisance dogs who have previously offended are issued more severe fines if an animal is a repeat offender or if another animal causes a disturbance. Furthermore any owner whos total offenses with one or more animals is convicted of 2 or more offenses shall be deemed an.unfit owner and will not be allowed to own any nuisance breeds
- This is absolutely insane.
- Nothing. Breed specific legislation has proved highly ineffective in other areas
- More emphasis NEEDS to be placed on training people. More resources need to be put into shutting down shady or uneducated breeders. You should be required to have a license to breed dogs. People who have never had a dog before should be required to attend training classes that focus on socializing dogs and dealing with situations like dog fights in a calm and reasonable manor. As someone who has had dogs my entire life and understands dog behaviour, there are many many people in this city that should not have dogs. They create more undesirable situations than the dogs do. People need to be trained and educated. If this is focused on, I'm sure dangerous or bad situations would be significantly reduced. First time dog owners should have to go to classes if they are planning on getting a challenging breed. Ever dog that is raised right and with structure can be a good dog.
- Potential jail time or community service of Owners of dogs who seriously injure a human.
- Punish the owner not the animal
- Ban pitbulls. there's hundreds of other dog breeds. There is no reason why anyone needs a pitbull.
- Leave pitbulls and pitbull style dogs alone. Go after ACTUAL problem dogs, like the little ones that yap and bark all day and nip at people.
- I would strongly support a ban on ownership of pit bulls and related dogs. There is no reason to own these dogs anymore than one should own an assault rifle for fun and home defense
- No one breed should be mentioned. All dogs are the way they are due to the owners. Mentioning pitbulls is offensive!!!!
- Be observed by a DVM and opinions on animal welfare based on findings from Veterinarian and the owner collectively.
- Should be all not just put bulls it's the owners fine them accordingly don't lump them all together
- You should all be ashamed of yourselves. There are no studies that prove pitbulls are more dangerous than other breeds. Maybe instead of punishing the dogs you bring awareness to people. Teach your kids to respect dogs, not to run up to them. Dont try and pet or tease dogs with food. If I ran up to someone and tried to hug or pet them, pretty sure they'd react the same way a dog would. [removed] And also, in the studies that have been done pitbulls have less force in their bite than many other breeds. If its not your dog you have no right to touch or pet. Educate YOURSELVES on how to deal with a scared dog that got out because I can guarantee you, that dog would only bite if it feels threatened. [removed]
- None of the above, there is no scientific evidence proving a pitbull is more aggressive or dangerous than any other breed. Get educated.



- Pit bulls should not be singled out as a dangerous breed. Owners of any dog breed should be held equal including small dogs, which have been show to more aggressive then any larger breed
- Your survey is equating "nuisance" dogs with pitbulls which is going to create biased results. Pitbulls are not nuisance dogs and they are not inherently dangerous. Bad owners make dogs dangerous. Most dog bites happen in the home and there is no evidence to support breed specific legislation. Instead more education on responsible dog ownership and teaching children how to approach dogs would be helpful. Any dog can bite if not properly trained/socialized or if they are put in a situation where they have no other option. Its the responsibility of all owners to keep their own dogs safe as well by not allowing them to get into a situation where they have no other option.
- This isn't the dogs fault. It's the irresponsible owners
- No restriction
- Leave pit bulls alone
- Pit-bull dogs of any type are NOT pets. Pit-bulls unfortunately cannot select a responsible owner. In majority of cases they are adopted by very irresponsible owners only interested in sending a message to impose fear to people around them including children; unfortunately this fear sometimes is translated in attacks by the owner or by the pit-bull causing trauma to innocent people including children. I definitely do not feel safe around pit-bulls and their owners.
- Follow Ontario's lead. No large aggressive dogs allowed whatsoever in the province.
- There should NEVER be a breed specific bans. Breeds other then 'Pitbull' types have a higher bite percentages.
- This is ridiculous. A dog that barks must be muzzled? And why the hate on for pit bulls.? What about Rottweilers? Or pinshers?
- Compulsory training for bad dog owners. The UK and other areas have been through this and made the same mistakes. It is widely excepted that bad dog owners are the issue.
- None of the above , this new law is not the solution why only Pitbulls? Its like you are saying we do not want Muslims because of their religion they are all terrorists!! Come one City of Calgary !!
- The City of Calgary must stop trying to prejudice citizens against bully breeds. It is unacceptable. Owners need to be responsible.
- Its the owners who create aggression. Same with EVERY other breed. Mistreat a dog and they get scared and act out. People need to stop blaming breeds for people's problems. You want a dog, be a reasonable, loving pet owner. You get hurt, leave the breed out of it and deal with the owner who is causing or trying to rehabilitate the aggression. Its a People problem not a breed problem.
- This is breed discrimination. It should not matter the breed. Any nuisance dog should be subject to the same riles. There should not be different rules for different breeds.
- Ban all pit bull breeds from our city.
- Enforcement
- If any dog no matter the breed bites or is a danger to others. The city should have the right to seize the animal and do an investigation into the home of the animal. Similar to if a child was taken by cps. The breed of the dog is not the issue it is the owner. Once the investigation is done there should be fines laid out to the owner based on the findings of the investigation. This means looking at what



caused the attack and if there has been issues in the past and look at how the owner treats the dog. I can say from experience that most of the dogs I have had issues with at the dog parks are the ones that aren't socialized. I have seen many pit bull dogs and they are one of the most friendly ones at the park.

- You can not just single out pit bulls , dogs are all equal . You can have another breed of dogs other than pit bulls can be dangerous . Often it is the owners not the dogs ... your focus should be educating public about dog ownership .
- Institute bylaw banning ownership of pit bulls and other dangerous or aggressive breeds.
- higher fines for pit bulls and nuisance dogs involved in bylaw offences whos owner has not put them through obedience training.
- Owners need to be subject to financial penalties is their pet is involved in an attack on either human or animals that causes injury. Fine, jail terms, whatever, there is NO EXCUSE for animals to act in a way that is dangerous to humans, or to other peaceful animals.
- If the dog is a multiple offender with bites/attacks (not noise complaints or 'being at large') then being muzzled in parks and obedience training are fair but for ALL DOGS NOT JUST PITT BULLS ETC
- Complete ban on bit bulls.
- Declare pit bulls illegal within the city, they are not allowed to be owned.
- This needs to be considered from the perspective that if a small dog behaves aggressively and so does a pit bull, this ought to be treated in a similar manner no matter the ability to inflict injury as it has serious ramifications in a dog park setting and how other dogs might react. Obedience training for specifics that have been deemed a nuisance or dangerous are important and different from any breed specific rules.
- You really should look at more science behind pitbulls. To make a biased survey towards one type of dog is pretty sad and you need to do a lot more research. Any dog can bite so not sure wear your for your research from to only say pitbulls do. Either you got to much time on your hands with covid and are bored cause [removed] there are bigger issues out here .
- ideally a complete ban on pit bulls in the city
- Breed neutral, evidence-based legislation only.
- Ban pit bull
- Higher fines for noisy dog
- Ban pit bulls and nuisance animals.
- For the potentially aggressive large breeds, prior to access to dog parks/off leash areas, have pet parent(s) have dogs behaviour assessed accordingly.
- All dogs should have mandatory obedience training and proper socialization.
- Ban pit bull type dog breeds
- Pit bulls do not have a stronger bite. Please do your research.
- Additional insurance required for nuisance dogs. There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household.



- While it is understandable that people love their pets, the cases of attacks by Pit Bulls are higher than other breeds. That's empirical evidence. Period. The City of Calgary needs to step-up and protect its citizens.
- The breed should not matter when it comes to fines or bylaws the owner should be at fault and NOT The dog.
- No breed specific legislation!!
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LANGUAGE!!!
- Hold the owners of the dogs responsible, not the dog. These will not decrease anything. The main and biggest issue is irresponsibly owners getting dogs that they are unable to train and care for properly. All dogs can do what "pit bulls" and BSL is a terrible and widely proven ineffective method!
- NONE
- What are the studies that show pit bulls being worse than any other dog. Why should the fine be worse for one dog vs another
- Dangerous breed ban.
- All dog owner's should attend dog training when they get a dog. Need to reduce the possibilities of dog bites through education and ensure dogs are socialized. All dogs can bite. An owner should not have a dog if it has to be muzzled and/or cannot behave at an off leash park..
- This is a "leading" question. It implies a misinformed and outdated bias by the city of Calgary not based on facts. I am incredibly perturbed by these statements regarding bully breeds. It further reinforces the 'bad boy' stereotype that causes bad segments of our population to want to own and abuse these breeds. It continues the misinformed stereotype. I have had many bully breed dogs in my lifetime and some make ideal canine citizens others do not, but that has been my experience with all kinds of dog breeds from small to big. In any case, if I haven't made myself clear, this survey is none sense and a waste of my tax money, I am appalled by the ridiculous implications.
- You should be ashamed of yourselves for using the breed "Pitbull" it's never, I repeat, never, the dog or breeds it's the humans!! When will this organization figure this out. Couldn't be any dumber, and I will never support any breed specific rules period! You should be embarrassed by the way your trying to exclude a breed
- The fact that you're punishing the dogs and not the owners is disposable. I have had more problems with smaller dogs like chihuahuas than pitbulls. Actually punish bad dog owners instead of the dog breed itself.
- Ban all pit bull & attack breeds.
- [removed] The fact that the city is deflecting responsibility from the animal owner to the breed of dog is short sighted. This is Donald Trump style legislation and it's embarrassing to even believe a city I was once proud of for having a model animal services is aiming to demonize certain breeds based on their looks. This is disgusting and anyone supporting this new plan should be ashamed.
- Rehome nuisance dogs and charge fees to the owner that the animal was removed from
- Pit bulls should NOT be singled out just because of their breed. Any aggressive behaviours is mostly due to poor / irresponsible ownership
- It's the owners not the breed. Penalize the owner !!!!



- If the dog hasn't been trained properly, the owner should be held responsible. Not the dog.
- Fines for owners that fail to control and train their dog
- Ban dangerous breeds and jail time for owners of dangerous breeds who leave the scene. The city should be able to sue owners of dangerous dogs for damages as should the victim
- Treat ALL Breeds the same!!!! You wouldn't discriminate against groups of people..
- Not all pitbulls and similar dogs are dangerous and it does more harm fear mongering and stereotyping them all. Don't blame the dog hold the owner more accountable.
- None of these. It doesn't need to change. You even acknowledged that they are NOT involved in more attacks. This is just straight up discrimination
- City ban on all Pit Bull types.
- By administering BSL you are severely putting certain breeds' lives at risk. Judge not by their breed but by their actions. As you would to any human.
- PLEASE do not allow people to walk pit bulls or dangerous dogs on city sidewalks, close to where there are lots of people, and PLEASE make a bylaw that prevents these dogs from being on transit or in any enclosed space. It is very anxiety-inducing and worrying to see this, and owners need to be mindful of others who choose not to have pets, who are scared of such dogs or who have had traumatic experiences with them. PLEASE consider these measures so that those of us who choose not to have dogs, don't have to be around them without recourse. Thank you so very much!
- Higher fines for dogs involved in serious biting situations.
- Strongly disagree with prejudice towards pit bulls.
- None of these are supported by me
- No dog should be singled out as "nuisances". ALL DOGS CAN ATTACK, ALL DOGS CAN BE TRAINED. LEAVE THE DOG UP TO ITS OWNER.
- Nothing
- The definition of "pit bull" is absolutely ridiculous. Humans train dogs. Fine the human that can't take care of their animal, not the breed.
- I agree that larger dogs by nature can cause more damage than a small dog but do not support breed specific legislation; only legislation aimed at nuisance/aggressive dogs and irresponsible pet owners.
- It has nothing to do with pit bulls. It has everything to do with owners and training. It's asinine for the City to go over a specific breed. I repeat, it has nothing to do with the dog. EVERYTHING to do with the owner and training. If you disagree you don't understand how to train a dog. Research!
- Ownership of these types of dogs in the City should be prohibited.
- Ideally pitbulls should be banned and phased out altogether like they have done in Australia.
- If this was a general bylaw being applied to ALL breeds I would agree with quite a few
- Pitbulls should not be noted separately here, at all, ever. All dogs matter, all dogs are equal. Punish the delinquent owner.
- put down all dogs that attack at first offence
- Why is this question focussed on pit bulls? Any breed of dog can be termed a "nuisance", etc.



- None of the above
- I live across the street from people with drug/alcohol issues. Their pitbull bit someone on June 26, 2020. The owner was charged and refuses to pay the fine for the dangerous dog registration. It's a matter of time before this unsupervised dog gets out and attacks someone. It's a dangerous situation, and sadly, we can't do anything but wait. The owners aren't responsible and I doubt any amount of reasoning is going to change how they treat their animals. There is a second dog in the house, and, it's my understanding that this owner is considering getting another pit bull (puppy). If this happens we'll be calling Animal Services.
- Basic ownership Training requirements for owners of nuisance or pitbull dogs to be completed.
- The benefit of the doubt should be in place for the animals (regardless of breed), but the owners MUST have full responsibility to either prevent issues through training or socialization and failing that, severe fines, legal action, and internment or disposition of the animal
- Any dog or animal confirmed to have attacked and bitten a person to be euthanized
- Dog owner training. There are not bad dogs, there are bad owners!
- Obedience training required for ALL large dogs.
- People are worse than animals, but they do not get punished accordingly. Pitbull type is not the only breed that bites.
- Depends on many circumstances. I don't think it is fair to punish pitbulls for everything, other breeds usually are involved in dog bites not pitties. People should not be able to own large breeds if they have no experience with them.
- Mind you're own business, this law is racist
- Any dogs considered a nuisance must enroll in force-free obedience training
- Obedience training for pit bull owners.
- I disagree that we are calling out pitbulls at all. Tickets should be given and jail time if needed to abusive owners who are raising animals.
- Dogs declared a nuisance cannot be off leash in off leash parks. Adding off leash to the sentence - not banning them from any area. Instead, asking the owner to take proper control.
- It is all in how the owner trains their dog, not because of what type of dog it is. Make this a rule for chihauhaus too if your gonna do this.
- Dog behaviour is not based on the breed pit bulls can be amazing dogs it's upsetting that our city is assuming that pit bulls are all bad and is even considering enforcing rules only for pit bulls. I own a smaller dog and I have zero fear with him around pit bulls the behaviour of a dog is the owners responsibility and that goes for all breeds not just pit bulls.
- Assesment of household in which the dog lives - improper treatment from owners is frequently the cause of nuisance animals.
- Ban on breeding pit bulls. Mandatory spay/neuter and if there is to be a special license, each breeding dog must pass a temperament test where it must show friendly behavior toward small and large dogs.



- Owners seeking to own what the city refers to as 'nuisance dogs' should go through training and an interview to ensure they are properly informed on how to raise and train said dogs. It is not the breed but the owner.
- More accountability for problematic dog owners.
- Obedience training must be successfully completed/passed by both the animal/pet, as well as the trainer who is currently owner of the animal. If the animal is put up for adoption, the new owner(s) are subject to the same bylaw (ie: must also successfully complete training with the dog).
- no breed should be discriminated against and should all be treated equally whether they are big or small
- This is the beginning of whipping out an entire breed of dogs it is disgusting and I will not support a city that is killing animal. Any of these hurt pit bulls if you add insurance to pit bulls they have an even lower chance of being adopted as the price to have them goes up. It will be harder to find a place to live with a pit bull more so than it would be to have another type of dog because the city is discriminating against them. This is pure stupidity and lack of trying to understand the breed. I am assuming none of you that are making this bylaw have ever owned a pit bull because they are the most loving dogs. If you are going to single out a breed include all the big dogs then. Golden retrievers, Great Danes, German Shepard. If you are worried about the bite then these should be included. I will not stay for the discrimination of a breed of dog that has only been wronged by humans.
- BSL doesn't work. This is ridiculous. Not all pit bulls are dangerous. It's a stereotype. Smaller dogs bite more people than pit bulls.
- Loss of privilege to own a dog for repeat offenders (the owners can't take care of their dog properly and there is clear evidence of this, they should not be allowed to own one.
- Pet owners with nuisance animals to provide annual update for 3 years. Nuisance animals be required to be muzzled when outside the home, including owners yard.
- I DO NOT support breed specific legislation. Define further dangerous behaviour. Define bites based off the Ian Dunbar bite scale. Define what nuisance behaviours require additional insurance. This is vague, misguided and ignorant.
- a complete ban on owning a nuisance dog within city boundaries
- Please do not bring in breed specific legislation, I am a veterinary technician and know first hand that "pit bull" breeds are not the problem. It is the owner that is the problem in most cases.
- Dogs that are vicious should have muzzles on. Dogs shouldn't be judged by their breed.
- Punish the owner not the dog. A fine will do little to solve the problem and possible increase it by Lack of socializing etc. Instead of obedience training alone I would couple it with probation for the owner-to make sure the dog is getting proper socializing and trying and exercise ext.
- Take pit bulls off this list!!
- Higher fines for all dogs involved in offences so owners have reverence for bylaws.
- The term nuisance is too broad. Dogs that cause noise complaints should be allowed to go to off leash parks, dogs with a bite history should not be. These need to be more specific. There should be nothing regarding breeds in any bylaw.



- Honestly this question is looking at the wrong issue. It matters not the potential of the animal, but rather the how the animal was raised and treated. All animals regardless of size and bite force are capable of being a deadly weapon or the most loving family member. I wholeheartedly disagree with all of the options and instead propose handler training. animals reflect the actions of their owners, and their owners should be held accountable for their animals.
- Remove any breed specific fines.
- Euthanize immediately after first attack on animal or human. Heavily fine owner for "pit and run" (running away from scene after their pit mauled an animal or person)
- You said it yourselves- "important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds"... let's just focus on the vicious dogs, the dogs with no training and with bad owners. All medium to large size dogs have strength when instincts kick in and they are biting. THERE IS NO FACTUAL SCIENTIFIC PROOF THAT PIT BULLS ARE STRONGER THAN OTHER DOGS.
- Responsible pet ownership education required for owners of dogs that are declared a nuisance.
- Targeting the bully breeds or those that resemble a pit blu it totally archaic and ineffective. The bylaws need to focus on responsible ownership and education. All breeds need to be treated equitably and all owners need to be held to a standard of responsibility for their dogs.
- Your definition of nuisance dogs (etc.) is too encompassing. A dog that bites/attacks or the owner cannot control is different than a barking dog. Calgary by-laws already address barking dogs and wandering dogs. Dog owners with biting dogs or attacking dogs need their own category. Dogs bite for many reasons sometimes not their fault. Ignorant dog owners who have strong breeds because of the owners ego are an issue. Training for the owners, fines when they are at fault and removal is necessary only in extreme cases. Pitbulls are not all dangerous, it could be the genetics of the dog and/or the irresponsible owner. Many pitbulls are absolutely normal with no issues.
- Instead of implementing bylaws and fines that contribute to pet ownership being high-barrier, perhaps being progressive and partnering with Humane organizations to learn about providing resources and accessibility would be better. Stricter bylaws and fines further harm pet owners with a system that is already built on racism, classism and ableism. Obedience training for dogs declared a nuisance should be affordable and accessible. Secondly, introducing breed specific legislation, rules, and bylaws is discriminatory, inhumane, cruel and perpetuates false stigma and myths which will contribute to the increase in euthanasia and a gross loss of life. Just to get ahead of the "lock jaw" myths, Dr. I. Lehr Brisbin at the University of Georgia shows "that bully breeds don't show any mechanical or morphological differences in jaw structure when compared to other dogs -- nor do their jaws come equipped with locking capabilities." The claim that "a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite" perpetuates the stigma of "pitbulls" being dangerous. I have "Pitbull" in air quotes, because this is a rather generalized term for dogs with muscular bodies and blocky heads, who are often, mixed breeds that rarely include the dogs you have outlined above. Fun fact, when a dog is mixed breed, you cannot begin to distinguish visual identification with behavioural traits. But more science on that later. Being concerned about the "severe bite" a pitbull type dog may inflict, begs the question why some other popular breeds did not make the list. Some popular dog



breeds and their PSI are listed below (according to calculations based off an article published in the National Center of Biotechnical Information, National Institute of Health, Journal of Anatomy) Cane Corso: 700 psi Mastiff: 556 psi Dogo Argentino: 500 psi Akita: 400 psi Rottweiler 328 psi Siberian Husky 320 psi American Pitbull Terrier: 235 psi Labrador Retriever: 230 psi (only 5 less than an APBT) This was only a handful of more popular breeds that I knew are purchasable via breeder in Canada, but there is a long list of dogs that have higher bite force over pitbull type breeds. That being said, dog breeds do NOT indicate the likelihood of a bite. In fact, it is more likely the average Calgarian, and Canadian has a mixed breed dog vs a purebred. Viewing a dog as an individual versus their phenotypic traits is important because looks do not equal behaviour. Socialization, training, environmental factors all play a part in how a dog acts. Only about 50 out of around 20,000 genes determine physical appearance of a dog, so 99.75% of a dog's genome can be any mix of dog. Once a dog is less than 100% of a closed gene pool, their genetic variations are distinct from that breed. Science is cool and Calgary, being the progressive city it is, should continue to construct bylaws based on fact and science versus fear based media. The Animal Farm Foundation states that "the national trend is moving steadily away from breed-specific legislation (BSL) and toward breed neutral laws that hold all owners equally accountable for the humane care, custody, and control of their dogs." ASPCA writes "There is no evidence that breed-specific laws make communities safer for people or companion animals. Following a thorough study of human fatalities resulting from dog bites, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) decided to strongly oppose BSL. The CDC cited, among other problems, the inaccuracy of dog bite data and the difficulty in identifying dog breeds (especially true of mixed-breed dogs). Breed-specific laws are also costly and difficult to enforce." Some other prominent organizations that oppose Breed Specific Legislation include: Humane Society International, Best Friends Animal Society, American Veterinary Medical Association, American Kennel Club, American Bar Association, the White House & Obama Administration, British Veterinary Association, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, National Animal Association, National Canine Research Council, United Kennel Club, US Department of Justice, Canadian Veterinary Association as well as many city specific SPCA and Humane Societies such as our very own, Calgary Humane Society. If the above organizations, which include those from science, medical, animal, law and political fields can agree that fear based, panic legislation is not the way to go, we should not be proposing oppressive bylaws into our city.

- [removed]
- Stop targeting pitbulls there are so many studies to show that BSL does not work! Why are you punishing a breed when you should be punishing bad owners. Don't go down this route Calgary, its disgusting and so disappointing
- fines for irresponsible owners REGARDLESS of breed. There is no correlation between bite/aggression incidents and specific breed. BSL does not work. Please educate yourself with FACTS on dog bite/aggression incidents and do not punish specific breeds. You are going backwards. Breed Specific Legislation is a creation of ignorance to facts and sensational reporting. I have been bitten several times by various dogs at the dog parks. The incidents were not reported as they were dealt with in a civilized manner between responsible pet owners. DO NOT punish a breed. Punish irresponsible owners.



- Not more than one nuisance dog per household (but not the same limit on pit bulls)
- Higher fines and enforcement for dogs off leash in required leashed areas
- I do not support any of these. There is an biased trend toward pit bull terriers and this entire section needs to be junked and re-written. I find it astonishing at this day and age that you feel it is ok to specifically call out 1 dog breed.
- More legal consequences for owners who do not have control over their dogs periods. Even if not declared a nuisance. All dogs are dangerous when not obedient and the owner does not have control. Obedience training should be required for every dog in order to get a license.
- Stop targeting a breed. It's the poor training by the owner that needs to be addressed. Instead of fines, mandate they get training.
- Make owner take those courses too.
- Make owner take those courses too.
- It is not the breed, but the owner. All dog owners should be required to do obedience training
- I think there should be a investigation as to the owners if there is a Incident. All pit bulls or pit bull breeds should not be getting a bad rap there r other breed of dogs that also bite .
- I have worked in shelters for years and am appalled that Calgary would turn to breed specific laws. Owners are at fault not the dogs
- If a dog is under review for being a nuisance the dog and owner should have the opportunity to defend themselves. If found to be a nuisance, there must be opportunities for the owner and dog to show they've taken steps to improve behaviour by taking obedience training and pass multiple tests showing their improved behaviour.
- The definition of nuisance (including barking, or being at large) makes some of the proposals non-sensical. Extra insurance for a do that barks or has a habit of escaping their yard doesn't make sense. I think dogs that have been found to have attacked other dogs should be banned from dog parks. Perhaps all dogs should be required to take at minimum a basic obedience class or alternatively all dog breeds that statistically have a higher bite incidence should be required to take basic obedience course within a few months of acquiring the dog. I think it is bad or lazy owners, more than the dog. Also rescues (such as EJ rescue that bring rescue dogs in that have a bite history should have to inform bylaw and that dog should require more intensive training or assessment to insure there is no risk to the public. Dogs with a history of biting should required additional insurance. Rescues should be required to provide fosters and adopters with all medical history and shelter history within 24 hours of receiving the dog, and also to obtain a Calgary vet check within 2 weeks of arriving in the city. Too many problem dogs have been brought up by irresponsible rescues like EJ that simply wipe out the dogs history and give no warning to the owners or fosters of any issues. There are good rescues that do in depth assessment and matching to educated responsible families or require new owners to attend In depth training. I think the problem is that irresponsible owners are attracted to breeds with an aggressive reputation, and those people take no care in properly socializing or monitoring or ensuring the dog is a good fit for the family. Any dog, especially larger dogs, who receive no training or socialization or attention can be dangerous. The focus has to be on making sure that the owners and dogs have a least a basic



understanding of dog behaviour, needs, etc. I have met many well trained, well loved pit bulls, German shepherds, Rottweilers, etc. that are wonderful loving dogs. It's the people who buy a puppy because it's cute with no thought as to whether the breed fits their situation, without any training or knowledge of dog behaviour, and who tire of the dog and leave it alone, tied up without exercise or even a abuse the dog that creates the problem. There has to be a higher bar to get one of these dogs or any dog. It has to be a well thought out decision with a sincere intent to do the best for the dog.

- Let's not limit this to pit bulls, how about ALL dogs. They all bark and have the ability to bite. A Doberman, bull mastiff, a rottweiler all have the same bite strength!
- Ban pit bulls and all dangerous dogs from the city.
- Appropriate training for all in the house household whos involved with the dog
- You should not target specific breeds. It is not the dog but poor ownership that causes these issues. The dog should be removed from the home (if obvious the dog is not well trained) and placed in a non-kill shelter for a chance at a better life.
- I don't support breed specific laws. There's better ways to address dog issues then call out one breed
- There should not be a specific breed that is named by this ban. Chihuahuas are way more vicious than any blockheaded dog I've ever met. Make the laws against Chihuahuas, not pit bulls.
- Dogs with a history of biting should require to be muzzled, and require a qualified behavioural training. Pit bulls are no more of a threat than any other dog. I think people need to be better educated on protecting themselves in dog attack situations, many times their behaviour and reactions can make the situation worse.
- Higher fines for bad owners! The problem is NOT the breed but the humans that are not responsible!
- Restricted ownership for poor handling and training by owners.
- Seriously? Breed specific legislation? It's the owners that are a problem, NOT the dog. Stop with the ignorance.
- Small dogs Owners need to be held accountable too! I have had numerous small dogs lung at my child and large dog and my large dog should not be held accountable for defending their owners
- Options above indicate nuisance dogs, with proper training there are extremely few nuisance animals. Fines should be targeted to owner education, responsible pet ownership training and owner attended pet obedience training.
- This should NOT be breed specific. I am absolutely appalled this is even happening. Punish the owners, not the breed.
- Make the rules the same for all breeds. Small dogs can be more dangerous than big ones sometimes
- All dogs like all people should be treated the same racism is racism
- This list of potential rules strikes me in two ways - 1). Written by individuals who are either laughably misinformed on the breed, or are singling these dogs out for political gain, and 2) Does absolutely nothing to account for owner compatibility. Owners who acquire these dogs for the purposes of intimidation are the problem. They antagonize these dogs and mistreat them, and their behaviour follows suit. Pit bulls were known as "Nanny Dogs" for a reason, prior to individuals fear mongering



their presence for optics. There should be more stress placed on proper ownership, such as background checks and owner interviews. These dogs reflect their owners and lifestyles. I know MANY individuals who own these dogs responsibly... and I can say with absolute guarantee that these are more loving, and better behaved dogs than any small or "less intimidating" dogs. Do not make the mistake of punishing a breed of animal for a handful of criminal owners who care not for their wellbeing or behaviour. If this were the case, owners of most small dogs should be charged for reckless dog behaviour and aggression.

- These breeds could be banned
- Why single out one breed. It's not the dogs fault it all lies with the owner. Every breed has aggressive dogs just like every city has aggressive people. I believe that any breed of animal that is involved in a violent encounter should be fined but not exclusively to just a certain breed.
- Do not target one breed. It's All breeds. Dogs are dogs
- Training for owners of nuisance pets. The problem is with the owner too, not just the dog.
- Please don't be breed specific .it hurts the bulky breeds and is not helpful . there are many "strong " dogs that can bite or becomr aggressive without provocation. BSL doesn't work .
- Reduce the number of off leash parks in Calgary
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Bad ownership is the problem, and any breed can be dangerous.
- I don not think that pit bull type dogs should be singled out in any bylaw! That is unfair and breed profiling is wrong!
- Do not include breed specific legislation
- Microchipped pit bulls
- Better enforcement of barking. Dogs bark incessantly and the owners should be held accountable. It is too hard to get bylaw to address at the moment. Neighbour lets their dog out in the middle of the night, it yaps..
- Stop with BSL. Please. It's an uneducated decision.
- A leash can not exceed 2 meters in length on any dog.
- Complete pit bull ban
- Specific breeds should NOT be penalized. Rather hold all dog owners responsible for poor training.
- All the same rules apply to all dogs. Again too easy to profile a certain breed of dog. Look at 20 to 30 pictures of dogs supplied by a vet. I bet you couldn't pick out the breed your looking to exterminate.
- Breed specific legislation is discriminatory and should not be a topic of discussion for calgary
- None
- Imprisonment for negligent owners that lead to severe injury of another person caused by their dog.
- Owner registry of poor animal owners. Prohibit them from owning pets. Create a list of breeds that have bitten humans an have been reported.
- Dogs that bite should be considered for euthanizm!
- All dogs should be treated equally, as bully breeds are not the dogs that tend to bite as much but any dog that bites should be deemed as a viscous dog and must be muzzled at all times when outside unless the bite was serious than the dog should be put down



- Make it about behaviour, not breed. It's as unreasonable as judging a race or nationality based on the bad behaviour of a few.
- Although small chihuahuas have attacked more dogs than any other breed and it teaches other breeds the aggressive traits. chihuahuas(and other small aggressive dogs must be included) must be included as they are the main perpetrators of aggression. Go to 17th Ave and 17th nw Calgary for evidence. I have personally been bite by a chihuahua.(cesar millan side that chihuahua are the most aggressive dogs as they don't get trained or disciplined properly his words not mine)
- I support animal bylaws that are NOT breed specific. Focud ghe bylaws on nuisance animals, and their ownets, not breeds. You wouldn't do that to people, there are rights laws against such things.
- If a dog causes a serious injury charge the owner as if they did it.
- This should be done dog to dog and not a specific breed . I have a pit bull that has never bitten or attacked another dog or human and should not be punished because of bad owners she is 4 years old and has never had a muzzle I think that is cruel to subject her to that!!! She would get depressed if she couldn't go to daycare or the dog park where again she has never had a problem !!!!
- If a dog is a nuisance or bites, make it mandatory for an owner to work with a veterinary behaviourist and trainer at the veterinarian's choice out of the client's cost
- The question of "There cannot be more than one pit bull or nuisance dog in a household" is a disgusting way of getting disingenuous support for pit bull legislation. Sure, the number of nuisance dogs should be limited, but breed-specific laws are a slap in the face to responsible pet owners everywhere.
- This is a horrible idea. All of the examples are just plain ridiculous.
- Mandatory dog owning licences. Can not own any type of animal without passing ownership test like a driving test.
- Dogs are innocent until proven guilty. Back off law abiding owners and their dogs that haven't hurt anyone.
- Treat pit bulls the same as any other dog. They are trained to be aggressive not bread into it. Yes they can cause more damage when they bite them some other dogs but they should still be treated the same. They are a lovely bread and no more measures should be put in place for just them. If a law, bylaw is made it should before all dogs.
- I do not think Pit bull specific legislation is required nor advisable, only dogs that have been found to be aggressive
- Where is the measures to deal with the person who may have caused the biting. People not teaching their children how to deal with unknown dogs
- I do not support any of these options laid out for a specific breed. This should be outlined for every dog/breed whatever you want to call it. It is disgusting to pin point and single out a breed based on your such identifying 'marks'. Any animal can exhibit what you are calling out on a type that isn't even a breed. Look at it this way a type of chuld exhibits certain behavioral 'issues' you going to single them out and punish them without all the facts?? All dogs should require the owner to do training. 'Bad dogs' only come from 'bad owners' or uneducated owners. You should educate your people more before suggesting this type by 'bylaw'. I strongly disagree with this BSL!



- I do not agree with breed specific laws. An animal's behaviour is dictated by its owner. All attempts to rehabilitate problem behaviour should be pursued before any direct consequences to the animal
- Ban the savage beasts. Anything that can snap my femur with its bite should be prohibited on CofC.
- Ive seen a lot of owners abuse their dogs..not just pit bulls. I feel if an owner crosses the line and someone gets hurt...they should be banned from having a pet
- I would like to see a requirement for a minimum of liability insurance for all dog an cats. Insurance companies are professional at assessing the risks and would set the premiums appropriately.
- Investigation into whether the victim dog had provoked the attack and possible dog training for the victim dog if it was not under the owners control.
- Breed specific legislation is crap. News flash dogs can bite. Every dog.
- Pitbull to be neutered or spayed within a year of ownership.
- Don't blame the dog, blame the owner
- Breed specific legislation is not helpful. Any dog can bite. Owners training and prevention is key.
- Fine OWNERS of ANY BREED for dogs attacks and other aggressive behaviour. This should not be a target approach towards a specific breed, the policy should focus on the owners.
- Unless owned or contracted to a licensed breeder, dogs must be neutered or spayed. Breeders must be licensed.
- Dogs are not the problem. It's problem people. Fine the owner, mussel the owner.
- No pit bulls
- This is a crazy bylaw, dogs are dogs nuisance can mean a dog barks and someone can complain and then the owners have to buy special insurance , I agree if a dog has bitten people or other animals while out in public then training is required for the owner and the dog, but to single out pitbulls because they have a strong bite then you need to include german shepards, chows, rottweilers , great danes, huskies, newfoundlanders, st Bernard etc pretty much every large breed dog. Most dog bites come from small dogs like terriers, Chihuahuas etc but they don't get reported because the dogs are small and do not look intimidating. This idea of the bylaw is ridiculous .the majority of dogs who cause problems at off leash parks are not bully breeds, the are some of the best behaved dogs at the parks because the owners train them , its the smaller dogs who run wild and jump on people and other dogs and cause aggression.
- Your pitbull specific questions are an embarrassment.
- Fines for not cleaning up after dogs in public and neighbourhood properties
- Mandatory spay/neuter for nuisance dogs, we do not need those dogs passing on those traits. And STOP allowing rescues to import pit bulls from the US! These are death row pits, the very worst of the breed that were ordered to be euthanized due to dangerous behaviour and/or bite incidents. Why on earth would we want them here?? It's like US residents should be kept safe from these dogs, but screw the Canadians, they can have these pits with aggressive histories!
- The owners are the problem never the breed of dog
- Breed specific legislation should not be considered. Dogs are dogs and all have the ability to be aggressive. "Pit Bulls" do not have the strongest bite as a "breed". Specifically pin point these types



of dogs is does not silver the problem when there are other breeds that are trained for aggression. It is biased.

- NONE OF THE ABOVE! Fine the human not penalize the dog! I am a responsible pet owner & I am ashamed things come to this crudeness. Little dogs can cause worse damage. It is the human who is not trained well to own ANY breed. I have seen the results of both lg/ sm breeds. My other dog did not fall under any of these categories & yet could have been deemed as those above. By- law officials should be better trained & add a few willing volunteers in each city quadrant.
- Fines for not leashing dogs in community greenspaces and for owners who do not keep dogs close to them while walking and who allow dogs to jump on passerbys
- Ban pit bulls and the other above-listed breeds/types in Calgary city limits
- Rules or bylaws targeted towards pit bulls not being implemented.
- I find the idea of singling out pit bulls abhorrent; I live in a neighbourhood that I'm told has the highest per capita dog ownership in the city (Lake Bonavista). We have a few neighbours with pitbulls, and many neighbours with other types of dogs. I can tell you that I'm far more concerned about the small terriers and chihuahuas biting or attacking me or my dogs (border collies) than any of the pit bulls. I understand the fear of injury that is inherant in a large dog attack, but we should be dealing more aggressively with the owners of any dog that is a nuisance and not singling out just pit bulls. Doing so is simply an ignorant knee jerk reaction to unjustified fears.
- The dog behavior is on the owner. None of these suggestions address the underlying problem. Educated owners
- Pitbulls are not bad dogs, if you are looking at breed legislation (which doesn't work) then look at the actual breeds of dog bites.
- Pit bulls should be banned and nuisance dogs should be put down for repeated concerns.
- Ban pit bulls in city limits
- Ban pit bulls in the city
- I am opposed to any breed specific bylaws. It is the owners that are training dogs to be a nuisance. Some of the most loyal and loving dogs I know are pitbull or part pitbull and they would NOT hurt anyone!!
- Dog's who are trained poorly should have more restrictions, breed specific restrictions are unfair to well trained pit bulls.
- Ban on ownership and breeding of pit bulls. Full stop. Period.
- Education requirement for pit bull / nuisance dog owners. Whether this is a one-hour class or required reading material, I think pit bull owners and nuisance dog owners, should be subject to fine after a first offense (for more serious offenses - skip the 'educate first' component of enforcement.
- Quit trying to enact breed specific laws, you [removed].
- Responsible pet ownership starts with licensing. It ties an owner to their pet and makes holding them accountable for irresponsible ownership. Fines for unlicensed animals should be enforced
- We Do not support breed specific legislation
- Owners with dogs that exhibit problem behaviour, no matter the breed, should he given access to affordable training classes or dog behaviorist consults.



- Quite honestly, this bylaw is a disgrace. There are no bad dogs, merely bad dog owners. Banning or putting restrictions on specific breeds of dogs implies that a) these dogs are by nature more dangerous, an idea which is very easily disproven by science (including the idea of a "more dangerous bite" from pitbulls - this is factually FALSE and discussion with any animal behaviour expert would reveal this. PLEASE update your science); and b) that other dogs are less capable or likely of being aggressive. Fundamentally, it comes down to the owner, not the dog breed. Feel free to pass a bylaw that would increase fines for "nuisance" dogs or require owners to stay at the scene of biting incident, but do NOT reduce it to what is effectively a mini-ban on specific breeds. It is disgraceful and shows a blatant disregard for the science on the matter.
- More insurance seems an unlikely solution/ insurers will not offer more or even any coverage
- Outlaw the breeds like other provinces have. Let's not be stupid.
- I completely oppose any prejudice against any dog breed. I'm absolutely in favour of fines against irresponsible dog owners. Punish the person, not the dog. Pit bulls score better on temperament testing than most other dogs. Just because psychopaths mistreat them for entertainment is not their fault.
- I do not support any of the possibilities above. especially because this is becoming breed specific.
- many city dog control officers cant tell one breed of bull terrier from another never mind the public they need to get some education on the breeds they are trying to control
- I do not support breed specific legislation. Bully breeds are not more or less likely to hurt another animal or person than any other breed. It is sad that the city is proposing such a restrictive and uneducated stance on a breed that has been systematically and constantly ostracized for the way they look. It's 2020, not 1920 and Calgary can do better.
- All dogs should require obedience training of some sort.
- Don't single out pit bulls.
- I personally have had more bad experiences with rescue dogs that are poorly trained therefore unsafe. Some breeds for example are German shepherds or huskies or any mix along those or other large and dangerous breeds. I also do not believe it makes sense for a dog who is considered a nuisance needs to be automatically reprimanded, because what if it was a nuisance just for loud barking?
- I am strongly against singling out pit bulls. The issue is the owner not the dog. And once the dog has misbehaved training would need to be so strict most cannot do it. I witness a Argentinian Dogo and a St . Bernard fight in a dog park, the aggressor was the St . Bernard as the owner smacked it around after the fight stopped.
- Instant seizure of nuisance dogs
- Any dog that exhibits these behaviours. This is unfairly demonizing pit bulls.
- DONT BLAME PITBULLS FINE OWNERS FOR POOR TREATMENT OF PETS
- None of these. None at all. Not even a tiny little bit.
- Pit bulls shouldn't be singled out. This doesn't make Calgary inclusive or diverse. Bad owners should be punished
- Ban all pitbulls



- Do more work charging the owners of the dogs when issues occur. It is almost never the animals fault. It's due to their upbringing. We can't charge animals for owners behaviour. If an owner proves undeemable to posses pets. They should not be allowed to own them. However animals involved in incidents should be given support and the option to move into a new home where they will have correct training and upbringing. It doesn't apply to solely pitbulls
- Unless we are going to be full on racist towards people now, I think we can agree basically being racist to dogs should also stop. Just because they don't have voices of their own doesn't make it okay to single a breed out and say they are the cause of the problem. This questionnaire I find very disturbing. It's a scape goat if anything.
- I think it's unfair to single out the pit bull.
- This is a highly biased question against a type of dog.
- No changes, enforce what we have!
- It is not the dog it is the owner that requires more training.
- singling out pitbulls is racist.
- Enforce off leash in non off leashes areas
- I do not support BSL in any form. Only responsible owner laws.
- Pit bulls should be banned
- Although the pit bull community will band together to fill out many of these survey's I hope the real majority are listened to. I do not see it happening but a full ban on pit bull/crosses would be something I would support
- Pit Pitbulls are being unfairly isolated. There are many breeds that are bred/trained in numerous Protection oriented directions and even if not trained have high protective instincts and high prey levels. Up to the owner of any of these dogs to keep them under control at all times. Heavy fines/euthanization for first offence and forget about the niceties. None of these breeds should be running free in an off leash park unless muzzled.
- Obedience training should be required for all dogs.
- Each case should be looked at individually the little breeds in my area will bark, snap, and nip at me and my small dogs on walk. The big breeds never do; and yes we see lots of pit bulls out in our area
- Obedience training should be a requirement of dog ownership period, regardless of breed; with mandatory attendance by a primary owner.
- Don't single out pit bulls! It's about "nuisance" dogs in general and poor ownership.
- Keep owners accountable for problem animals. If a pet is vicious make the owner attend obedience classes until proven fit. If this fails and the animal is deemed vicious, the owner needs to take responsibility in keeping that animal away from all other animals and people. For both its safety and animals/beings around. Penalizing the pitbull breed isn't going to fix any problems when it comes to poor ownership and direction given by the supposed owner themselves. Be it a chihuahua, pitbull, lab, or miniature poodle. Extra high fines for reoccurring matters and failure to resolve the problematic issues, should see in the animal put to sleep if retrieval and rehabilitation of said pet isn't successful. Don't blame the breed, blame the human.



- I don't agree with breed specific bylaws. If a dog bites off the owners property or in self defence, no matter the breed it must have additional training, and if a threat and has multiple offences muzzled in public. I do not condone euthanizing an animal of any breed.
- No breed specific laws please!!! But I am in favor of these potential rules for nuisance dogs - regardless of breed.
- Must have training classes for ALL DOGS no just pit bulls, have higher fines and/or jail time for animal abusers and mistreatment. Don't restrict how many "pit bull" dogs can be put into a SAFE HOME.
- Leave pit bulls alone.. they are not the problem
- I am strongly opposed to breed specific legislation.
- No breed specific bans. I have had more issues with little dogs than pit bulls. This is disgusting
- The OWNER is the one that does not know anything about their pet, they get it because of the breed, no matter the breed. They ALL should be held accountable for the actions of their pet, no matter whether it is a CAT, or any other type of pet, it is so very, very sad the animal is held RESPONSIBLE for their OWNERS ACTIONS. It is sad that people have to put a tag on ANIAMALS, yet HUMANS as just a dangerous as any animal on this EARTH. Think about that. The animal just follows what the person in control DOES!!!!
- I do not believe that breed specific laws should exist. Pit bull type dogs are only dangerous when they are mistreated by a neglected owner. Any dog has the potential to bite and be dangerous if not properly cared for. The problem needs to be addressed by stopping back yard breeders.
- Keep treating the mentioned dogs the same as other dogs.
- TRAINING FOE THE OWNER - it's not usually the dogs that are a problem it's the owner and how they've either trained or not trained/socialized their dog
- Any law passed should include ALL dogs, no matter the breed or size. Even small dogs can be vicious
- Dogs that bite/attack (humans or other dogs/cats/wildlife) should be euthanized.
- Do not subject one breed aka pit bull style to these rules but hold all dog owners accountable
- Owner training mandatory, and paid for, by nuisance dog owners. Basically it's corrective action with a positive outcome for not training the dog. All dogs declared nuisance, not specific breeds.
- All dog breeds that have history of biting. Not pit bull specific.
- Pitbulls regardless of that may not be statically more prone to problems have a higher incidents of damage when involved in incidents. Therefore they are higher risk to the community. Also immigration of pitbulls should be stopped as this is a indicator of other communities simply shifting the problem to other communities such as Calgary. Wake up Calgary!
- Not only for pit bull breeds, all breeds must be included.
- Deal with problem owners that do not train their dogs not pick on breed specifics
- Dog owner should be jailed for 6 months if dog bite. This will enable dog owner become more responsible.
- As someone who has education and has been working in veterinary medicine for several years, there is no evidence that BSL is successful. I have done research and written papers on BSL in a



non-biased approach, comparing cities who had, had not and were looking into BSL. Every city that had a BSL Act was not successful in preventing bites. The most successful resource is appropriate training for owners, teaching them and understanding that their dog CAN be a weapon. The majority of bites fall on the owner's inability to appropriately train or handle their dog, not the dog randomly attacking where a muzzle could have proven beneficial. Think hard about this, Calgary. BSL is not the solution.

- This is stupid and there shouldn't be a by law on how many pitbulls one can own, or making them wear a muzzle, not allowing them in dog parks and ect. They are animals too and deserve to be treated like every other dog. They are not a nuisance or bad breed.
- Ban pit bulls altogether
- Let's see all the stats as pit bulls are a flavour of the month. Like COVID-19
- Dogs bite as a defence mechanism, instead of judging the dog maybe take a look at how the owner is treating the dog or raising it as that may be the reason why the dog is always in defence mode.
- Absolutely no "pit bull" type specific laws are fair. You're basically feeding into the stigma that they're bad dogs/giving the wrong impression of the breed and it's appalling. Obedience training should be done for all dogs.
- Prohibit ownership of pit bulls, those can escape from home and cause a tragedy for
- Remove nuisance dogs with repeating offences from owners, rehabilitate and rehome/foster in homes that have been deemed appropriate.
- Mandatory pet owner training for nuisance dog owners. Dogs are not to blame, it's poor dog owners and lack of training, education for the owner that is typically the problem.
- BSL should not be enacted, good owners should not be penalized for bad ones
- ban pit bulls
- What's wrong with you guys .. pit bulls aren't the problem it's the owners .. don't be like Quebec
- Dogs with blood drawn bite history be required to wear a properly fitted muzzle in public. Bylaw officers patrolling pathways and public parks to educate owners on leash laws.
- BSL is [removed] and doesn't work and you know it just too lazy to actually hold owners accountable. Lazy and shameful
- enforce current by-laws. dogs are off leash along the bow and elbow river on a regular basis.
- Ban bully breeds. Not allow animal rescue orgs to bring bully breeds into the city. Especially those animals without a record of their history.
- These are dumb and very limited options. Don't discriminate against breeds. If your wanting to make training mandatory than make it mandatory for all dog owners. Parents should also teach their children not to chase or approach strange dogs. Any dog can bite. My 4 year old daughter know to ask before she pets any dog.
- Fine the people that teach there dogs to act that way a pitbull is only aggressive if thought that
- They have tried this in many other city several i have lived in . Get clue a bad owner is a bad owner even itsbits a pot bull or daxon i don't own a pit bull and I think its so ignorant it reminds me of the racist behaviour of the past. f the past
- Ban pit bulls



- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household
- This is ridiculous. There should NOT be breed specific legislation. Banning, muzzling, and seizing bully breeds is not the answer. All dogs have the potential to be dangerous. It comes down to responsible owners - owners need to know how to properly train their dogs; ANY DOG. Harsher penalties for unleashed dogs. I had a small dog off leash approach my LEASHED dog. Running and nipping at my leashed dog. And guess what, I'm sure if something bad happened, my dog would have been blamed. RIDICULOUS!
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household
- The owners are the problem; not the dogs. Higher standards for dogs identified as stronger breeds should be implemented requiring owners attend and pass additional training requirements.
- Don't treat pit bulls any different than any other pet. Punish the owners of all breeds that are "nuisances" due to lack of training. Many breeds are known for aggression and if inadequate training can be dangerous singling one breed out is highly uneducated. Also people need to understand animal safety running up to or scaring any animal (dog, cat, horse, etc) is looking for trouble no different than when a person is scared they defend themselves.
- Obedience training should be required for all dogs, not just dogs that are declared a nuisance and pit bulls
- Stop breed shaming the pit bull cross it's disgraceful
- your questions and targeted attacks on breed are flipping racist... i have been bitten 4 times in my 41 years. not one time by a pit and i have been around them my whole life. German Shepard's and huskies bite way more people than any other dogs and fyi a Rottweiler has a way stronger bite than any pit bull.
- all dogs should have some sort of obedience training
- Fine irresponsible owners and not punish dogs..bad policy
- There are many other large breed dogs that can bite no different than a "pit bull." I think it is awful to make the laws breed specific. All dogs large or small have the potential for bites. Punish the owner not the breed.
- This questionnaire is biased and not descriptive, "Pitbulls cannot be in off-leash parks" but no clause that they can be if on leash (because at that point it is the responsibility of the off leash owner to control their dog, not myself to differ my walking path due to an off leash area with aggressive small dogs as is actually the statistics regarding the common aggressive dogs.
- Only if the dog has had a prior offence then the dog should have proper behavioural training
- I know a dog that has bitten 7 people and only one of those were reported. I think it imperative that all dog bites are reported. Each time this particular dog bites, the owners act as if it is the first time he has ever bit anyone.
- By banning a specific breed you will go nowhere!!! There is no issue with the pitbull there is an issue with the owner!!! Stop banning breeds when we should make the fines harsher for the owner!!!! It is not the dogs fault!!!!!!
- Proper training for pit bull type dog owners
- ban pit bulls



- what is with the leading questions I absolutely am against any law or bylaw breed specific and every case should hold the owners accountable regardless of breed. If the dog is a a problem repeatedly the owner should not be allowed dogs. Proven to not be effective are these bsl laws. Why is there no option to oppose these purposed changes to count the number opposed?
- none of the above... this is targeting breed specific. the nuisance isnt the dogs, but the owners. i have had more issues with little rat dogs like chihuahuas.. way more aggressive. actually bit 2x at dog park by these dogs. they also attacked my dogs. prompting my dogs desire to protect themselves and me.
- Obedience training for all dog owners!
- It's not that pit bulls are bad it's the OWNERS!!! They need to be held accountable make them go through a training course.
- The city of Calgary should have higher fines for any size dog that is claimed a nuisance
- Pitbull breeds and other nuisance dogs must be declared prohibited to be owned by any household in Calgary.
- Fines for people that provoke a dog to become aggressive towards them
- No breed specific bylaws
- PITBULLS ARE NOT DANGEROUS UNLESS TAUGHT TO BE. DO NOT PUNISH THE BREED, PUNISH THE OWNER.
- Stop being breed specific. This is not the dogs fault, the owner is 100% at fault and the dog shouldn't be penalized for this
- I believe that Pit Bulls are great dogs, except when there are bad owners.
- I believe that pit bulls are not the problem but bad owners are. There should be higher fines and punishments toward bad owners. You can't just single out a specific breed. To own a dog you should have to train them or take them to obedience classes. There needs to be better education on this topic. The human race is the problem. Not the animal.
- This should not be about the dog/s. It should be about the owners and how the particular dog/s are raised. Bully breeds are not "dangerous" they are amazing, smart, caring and loving animals. There should be things put in place for the [removed] owners
- Higher fines for corrupt government officials
- Ban pit bulls
- All dogs and dog owners should require obedience and proper care training
- Get a life!!!! Pit bull is not even a recognized breed! Shame on you
- I believe that the city of Calgary should simply enforce the bylaws it already has, as opposed to picking on a specific breed or type of dog. Alternatively, they should simply create bylaws (and enforce them) against bad dog OWNERS.
- Leave them alone
- All dogs no matter the breed MUST be treated equally
- Please don't introduce breed specific legislation. Pitbull is an umbrella term and even for the purpose of this survey is so broadly described it becomes hardly useful. Many breeds beyond those listed above would visibly look like pitbulls. Additionally, lumping pitbull type dogs in with nuisance dogs



obscures the issue that owners whose dogs have displayed problematic tendencies have a higher obligation to prevent other issues. Additionally, clarifying pitbulls as dangerous would obscure the other proposed measures like the colour coded bandana warnings for children.

- Record checks or home visits for potential owners. As someone who has worked with dogs for 17 years it's the person not the breed. Owners need to be responsible for their animals actions. As someone who owns an American Staffordshire Terrier, it is a long term commitment to own a dog. I am responsible for training my dog, taking care of her and ensuring she is properly socialized
- Breed ban on pitbull type dogs.
- None of these. Have your people enforce present bylaws, know of two dogs that have attacked other dogs and people including biting but still allowed in neighborhood
- Nuisance is questionable, neighbours can complain of dog barking, doesn't mean the dog is dangerous. Compulsory obedience training and compulsory muzzle for dogs involved in a dog/human bite would be the best option. Pittbulls can be the sweetest animals when trained properly and should not be discriminated against based on breed. I am not a pitbull owner but have taken care of hundreds of dogs as a dog walker, sitter over the years including pitts, rottweilers and dobermans. Aggressive dogs and their owners should be heavily penalized and/or dog taken away on 2nd major incident.
- More enforcement! Dog are often off leash in my area, near the river and my kids and I have been charged at. I was terrified for my life less than a week ago just getting my mail because a large off leash dog was after me, and the owner saved my life in time.. I can't enforced the by-law. We need a lot more patrols. Rules do nothing if no one enforces them.
- my dogs an American Bully, it was attacked by a dog that wasnt even related to a Bully breed not long ago over a stupid ball. So to generalize the Bully breed as the problem is TOTAL [removed] !! Think you guys need to redo your homework before you categorize a certain breed as being the issue.
- Fines given to dog owners of dogs that have been involved in bites, have had complaints against them for "bad dog behaviour". With eventual seizure of animal to be placed in better home with appropriate training
- Everyone should do obedience training with their dogs. It's ridiculous to say pitbulls or specific breeds are the problem. It's the owners who are the problem.
- I did not select some of these because your definition of 'nuisance is too broad to impose sanctions against' . I would support some of these measures if they were applied specifically to biting dogs. Nuisance dogs can be a dog that barks or bolts from the house - the measures above don't make sense for these dogs. You need to be specific to aggressive behaviours and not poor manners.
- Stop. Just stop. You already can't wrap your heads around how to deal with cruelty to animals, or with bites from other breeds, so stop with this crap fake engagement and witch hunt related to "pit bulls."
- Nuisance dogs cannot be off leash in off-leash areas
- A city wide bad of all "pit-bull" type breeds. Substantial fine for owners found in possession of the dog.



- I think classes should be required for owners obtaining a dog from a rescue. Especially if they have behavioural concerns
- This survey has been hijacked by an America pitbull group called "Justice for bullies". What you are seeing in hundred of comments from people who live in the U.S.
- Why punish the dog when it is the owners mistake? I've been a part of the dog community my whole life, not once have I, or any other breeder, trainer, etc. Felt unsafe or attacked by something in this 'pitbull' category. On the other hand I have had small dogs and even labradors be more aggressive than pitbulls. It is never truly a dogs fault, it is how they were raised by the owner, or in many cases, the previous owner. With regards to 'their size they can have stronger bite' any larger dog, or small dog pushed far enough, has the capacity to bite hard. Do not punish a group based on 'they look dangerous' when every squareheaded dog I've had the pleasure of meeting is an absolute sweetheart. If one specific dog has had issues, sure deal with that one dog and its owner/family but do not collectively punish a group of breeds because of a handful of 'bad apples'. It isnt fair to the good dogs or owners.
- Strict fines for OWNERS who mistreat and/or improperly train their dogs. Dogs are NOT the problem, the owners of these so called "problem dogs" are. No specific breed should be banned or penalized against.
- Maximum of two nuisance offences with \$1000+ fines on each. Then the dog is destroyed. Or, making pit bulls illegal completely.
- Ban Pit bulls
- Dont single out a breed! Its the owners who train any breed to be aggressive!
- Although I really dislike the pit bull breed and their propensity to be aggressive, given my years of learning more about PitBulls I feel the bad behaviour towards All other animals and children and adults falls solely on the owner/handler. There are 'Very few people' that know or understand boundaries and limitations and discipline and the need all mentioned applied to the owners to realize All dogs need all of the above mentioned. Scrutiny should definitely be applied to the owners of these types of strong aggressive breeds whether they're capable of the controls I mentioned, if not met then those people should NEVER OWN A PITBULL, etc.
- There should be a focus on the owner not only the dog.
- I do not support breed specific legislation. Define what is "dangerous behaviour". (Lunging, pulling, jumping, bite, growl) Define what nuisance would require additional insurance (barking? running at large? Licensing?) Contradictory statement. Dogs running at large are not allowed to go to the dog park?
- The city should require dog training for dogs that have biting incidents. Make the owners pay for it. Punish bad owners not bad dogs. Bad dogs are create by bad owners
- Make these changes for ALL dogs. Small dogs often cause larger react. As a small dog owner I know my dog can be antagonistic to larger dogs. But my dog rarely is seen as the problem. I'm very aware of my dog not all dog owners are.
- Why specifically identify pit bulls? How does the city know the strength of a bite of one breed of a dog than another? What about Rottweiler, Mastiffs etc... let's use appropriate judgement on any



nuisance dog and not specifically target one breed over the other. It comes down to responsible pet guardianship

- This breed of dog is no different than an assault rifle, no one needs one therefore in the public interest no one should have one.
- dogs that have a past record of being dangerous need to be restricted but I do not believe that breed specific laws are the right approach. I would suggest criminal charges for owners that have a history of training dogs to be aggressive
- NONE of this. Although a breed can have tendencies, it's on the training of these breeds, and ANY breeds, that can bring out this type of aggressive behaviour. This is WRONG. If it were people, this would be racism. NOT okay to enforce this. HORRIBLE.
- This is not the time for the city to be going after people's dogs based on breed! Absolutely assisining! If a dog bites do something but until then stay out of it
- Breed specific is not appropriate. Problem dogs are the problem. Caused by owners. Not breed. This is just a form or racism in fogs not people.
- For high risk breeds, mandatory dog training and socialization requirements
- Define "dangerous behaviour". Barking, jumping etc are not "dangerous"
- Please stop differentiating between a dog and a "Pitbull", they are both dogs, no more or less likely to be aggressive. If implementing a new bylaw, it must apply to ALL dogs not just some that subjectively look a certain way.
- Please understand that it is not the dog that is violent but it's upbringing that causes them to be that way. Pit bulls were originally bred to be "nanny" dogs and assist with families whereas chihuahuas were bred to hunt. It is not fair to specify one particular breed.
- Remove "pit bulls" and other breed specific language from these statements. You're better than this, Calgary.
- the goverment should pay for an educational program for people to learn about dogs and breeds so they can best care for then and insure that biting is the least likely to happen.
- it's often the owners that are the problems, so obedience training must be taken by the owner/handler with the dog, not some other party
- Any dog not trained shouldn't be allowed in off leash dog parks.
- Pitbulls are not the problem. MORE FREE DOG TRAINING EDUCATION AVAILABLE FOR ALL PET OWNERS. BANNING A BREED DOES NOT STOP THE INCOMPETENCE OF PEOPLE OWNING DOGS AND NOT PROVIDING SOCIALIZATION OR TRAINING. MORE PEOPLE NEED TO BE TRAINED NOT DOGS
- I am NOT in favor of any breed specific legislation. I am in favor of responsible dog ownership.
- Please note: Muzzles are a terrible idea for any dog as they make the dog wearing it more fearful, aggressive, and likely to be attacked by other dogs. Muzzles are never an effective solution other than for short veterinary medicine procedures. Training and conflict avoidance (aka no longer taking your dog-aggressive dog to offleash parks) are much more effective alternatives.
- PIT BULLS ARE NOT MORE DANGEROUS THAN OTHER BREEDS OF DOG.



- Targeting pit bulls is stupid and dangerous. As a veterinarian, I am much more concerned when a chihuahua or other small breed dog with no training or manners, as they are exceptionally aggressive. These bites can cause a significant amount of damage but the aggression of these dogs is not taken seriously as they are small dogs. Any dog has the ability to be dangerous and hazardous to society. It's not breed specific, it's owner stupidity.
- I do not support restrictions on pit bulls - I do however support restrictions on owners who poorly raise or handle any breed of dog. Pets are a privilege not a right and the breed of dog shouldn't be the issue.
- Obedience training required for dogs involved in bites
- This should not single out one breed the pitbulls that I have seen walking in my area are calm and walking nicely with their person. Most dogs are family members and treated as such
- Pit bulls should not be singled out regardless of the strength of the bite, there's no evidence that pit bulls bite more often than any other breed
- I want protection against all dangerously dogs. All breed included. Bully's are not all aggressive.
- Clarifying point - the definition above says a 'nuisance' dog might be a dog that barks too much or gets away from an owner and is 'at large' how would preventing those dogs from going to the off leash or muzzling them in public address those concerns? A dog that has a history of a minor bite would benefit from a muzzle etc. But by your definition the dog might not be aggressive at all and you would then ban them from a park that might allow them to get their energy out and help them be less of a nuisance?
- I hugely object to pitbulls or dogs that look them lumped together. At off leash park there is a golden with a muzzle that the owner constantly lets try to attack dogs. More sanctions should be placed on the owners not the dog. Maybe jail time as fines are nothing
- There should be no breed classification. All dog owners should take responsibility for their own dogs. Statistically wise small bred dogs have bitten more children and adults than other breeds of dogs. There should be more awareness for dog training to all dog owners. It is shameful that the City of Calgary would even suggest such a bylaw against any specific breed.
- Pit bulls or nuisance dogs are trained to be aggressive and a nuisance. The dogs should not be the focus but the owners of the dogs. I think bylaws and laws need to be made for dog breeding and better screening for owning dogs.
- One strike and you're out - Those who have owned a nuisance dog or pitbull that has shown aggressive behavior or been involved in a biting incident should be banned from owning such dogs in the future.
- Don't pass BSL (breed-specific legislation). "Pitbull" isn't a real breed and most dog "identified" as one are pure mutts comprising multiples breeds than feature a wide head + muscular body (boxer, American bulldog, mastiff (various), and even "friendly" breeds like labs or hounds can all contribute to a "bully breed" appearance. My current dog is mostly hound and I've been asked multiple times if she's a "pitbull.") I've known many dog caretakers in my life and only one has even dealt with severe biting. The guilty dog? A golden retriever. I've had dogs throughout my life, including some bully mutts. The only dog that ever bit me? A toy poodle. BSL doesn't prevent dog bites, it only fuels



stereotypes and punishes people with recuses. (Bully breeds are disproportionately represented in places like high-kill and high-intake shelters.) If you're experiencing a disproportionate amount of "bully breed" bites, then the issue isn't the dogs - it's humans who are training dogs for aggressive behavior. You need to address the people problem, not the dogs.

- It's not pit bulls, it's the owners. People that have had dogs that have had nuisance dog charges should not be allowed to licence or own dogs in the city of Calgary.
- Just ban the breed. The dog was bred to kill.
- If there is an incidence with any dog review what caused the attach was the dog being teased or abused. Noise should not make a dog a nuisance, pet owners have no rights when it comes to children teasing there dogs. Dogs bark people need to realize this is
- Obedience training mandetory for ALL dog owners, if ANY dog becomes a nuisance, regardless of breed, the owner must take the needed actions to limit interation with their dog until the problem is solved. ANY dog that causes harm to an individual will be seen as a public liability and the owners will be fined for damage caused and told to gain proper training and insurance or else have their dog seized. ALL breeds are seen as potential dangers and all dog owners are subject to laws
- Ban of pit bulls and those who's breed is associated with pit bulls. This rule and by-law exists in other areas and definitely needs to be done here!
- Don't be breedist. There needs to be more of a conversation created about choosing the right breed for the right household. Pit bulls are a perfectly normal breed, just like any other, but people need to be educated on how to handle them properly, same thing with small breeds like chihuahuas, or large breeds like St. Bernards.
- In most cases, it is the owner, not the dog who is a nuisance!
- All pet owners vetted properly to insure they are getting a pet for the right reasons and have zero priors of training them to be vicious and/or abuse them.
- Any dog can be dangerous not just pit bulls. Educate public on breeds right for them, why dogs might bite & how to avoid it. Many people lack ed. on dog breeds and responsible ownership. Educate the public.
- A dog is a dog. A bite can be just as severe from a small dog. Discrimination against bully breeds is uncalled for.
- New dog owners must undergo training with their dog to understand dog behaviour, bylaws, and how to avoid dangerous scenerios
- The definition of 'nuisance' is too broad to support unconditional support of some of these options. Exhibiting aggressive/biting behaviour is far different than having a roaming nature (being at large) or excessive barking..
- I'm not checking any of the boxes with the term 'pit bulls' in them. I don't even know why you included this - BSL doesn't work. Definitely stick with the 'nuisance' dog language.
- liability of insurance of pet - (all) needs to be a verification at time of licencing and renewal as per car licence.
- This is ridiculous, I had a chunk of my ear bit off by a Pomeranian, bent down to tie my shoe. Punish the deed, NOT the breed!!



- You cannot breed discriminate. That's almost like targeting a race in Calgary. If an individual dog is problematic, that's the problem. And their owner. If a dog's owner is problematic they too should face fines (all future dogs are declare nuisances, banning licensing in city limits, etc.)
- How about required training for people to own dogs. So that the owners know how to train and own dogs (IN GENERAL) properly. Stop targeting breeds when any type of dog can be poorly trained. It's the people, not the dogs.
- More verification and checking prior to anyone being allowed to adopt any pet. The problem was always and will always be the owner, not the dog, stop punishing a consequence of human doing and deal with the real problem of bad dog owners! Also, how about some bylaws against animal cruelty and abuse?
- If you're going to implement measures, it should not be for one breed.
- No more than one pitbull/cross per household.
- it is truly unfair to target pit bulls. Chihuahua was and other small dogs are more violent than a pit bull ! they cannot be trained. Any dog that misbehaves should the owner should be fully responsible and not the dog have more people at the dog parks that can actually handle by law licenses or chart tickets for the people that can't control their dog
- I don't think discrimination by breed (ie. pit bulls) is fair.
- Obedience training is required for all dogs, regardless of breed
- Pit bulls are very dangerous dogs they must be banned. It's very dangerous for the community. Many violent and aggressive attacks are reported to be a pit bull. Many of them aren't loyal dogs to their owners and many incidents was reported that they maul their owners to death.
- All breeds should require obedience training after adoption.
- I would be fine for any of these as long as they DO NOT specify any breed specifically. I don't care that a pit bulls bit may be more severe, a biter is a biter. I've had stitches from a chihuahua bite.
- If we're raising fines,make it universal, or at least target the breeds that are ACTUALLY AGGRESSIVE. Pitbulls and pit bull type dogs are not dangerous and this bylaw won't protect anyone. It will just cause a ton of unnecessary euthanasia
- Insurance is provided by homeowners so how can you enforce additional insurance and being in Insurance I am not aware of such additional coverage.
- There a lot of great dogs that are bully breeds and by doing this you are basically putting a death sentence on all these dogs. My bully mix is a registered therapy dog and goes to hospitals to visit people
- Calgary should be against BSL, it has been proven not to work
- Back off, putbulls are beautiful and only as bad as their owners.
- I am against breed specific legislation. We should hold individual owners responsible based on their dogs actions not a group of people just because they own a certain breed. I've worked with animals for 20 years and bully breeds are some of the best dogs to work with. Please hold individuals responsible for incidents and not a group. BSL has been proven to not work
- Please completely ban pit bull dogs from calgary
- How many people are in fact bitten by dogs overall? I find cats to be a bigger nuisance in this town.



- Focus on nuisance dogs rather than specific breeds such as pit bulls. There is a higher chance of issues occurring or offences when the dog has behavioural issues, not due to their specific breeds. I fear that typecasting pit bulls for this will allow issues to still occur with nuisance dogs of all breeds.
- None. This is a stupid idea.
- The focus should not be on pitbulls but owners who don't train or treat their dogs well. The dog isn't the problem - the owner is. Including not allowing certain people to have pets if they have a history of bad behavior.
- I do not agree with ANY of these measures - it should be up to an owner if their dog should be muzzled - not every dog of a certain breed should be discriminated against or penalized -
- [removed]
- None of these have been proven to be effective in any way. Pit bulls DO NOT have any more strength than other breeds. All of the possible measures hurt responsible owners of this specific breed and has the potential to increase the stray population within the city.
- So basically the city wants to be "racist" towards canine breeds? Any dog can snap without prior notice, why not treat all dogs equally. You've really outdone yourself this time Calgary, have some respect.
- Stop blaming breeds!!!!!!
- Nuisance dogs are a PRODUCT OF BAD OWNERS not breeds. The City needs to EDUCATE this. not perpetuate this idea that certain breeds are bad. Make mandatory for all dog owners to take responsible owner training before issuing pet licences.
- TRAIN ALL DOGS. TREAT ALL DOGS EQUALLY. INVEST IN LEARNING HOW TO INTERACT WITH DOGS FOR CHILDREN. MAKE OBEDIENCE CLASSES MORE ACCESSIBLE. Banning a certain breed is a useless waste of money. Every dog has the potential to bite. Train people how to interact with animals.
- None of the above
- Breed should not be a consideration, any dog big or small can be dangerous, it gives people with other breeds a false sense of reality that their dog could be dangerous as well.
- Ban of Pit Bull breeds in the City of Calgary
- I am VERY disappointed in City of Calgary use of language suggesting breed specific ideals onto under informed community members in regards to bully breed dogs. BSL is not hasn't been mentioned until this survey and it disappointing to see. It is all about owner education and accountability as well as by standers education around any dogs especially in an off leash type dog parks. Taking away a dogs ability to socialize due to appearance is not acceptable and detrimental to the dogs ability to be able socialize appropriately with humans and dogs alike. Bad owners make bad dogs. Being a certainly type of breed doesn't mean it will inherently be a bad dog. So In theory then if we applied this to humans: a man with a tall frame and large muscles has the ability to potentially inflict more severe harm in an incident but does that mean every man that looks like that should have his hands tied behind his back because he may be able to injury more severely than the highly trained less intimidating looking, shorter and less muscular man? ?



- ALL dog breeds (not just pitbull breed and look alike) should be determined on a case by case basis to prevent future harm coming from ANY breed.
- This is ridiculous. And you 'strength' caveat is absurd. What about GERMAN shepherds and Dobermna pincers and Bernese Mountain dogs? These are all very strong dogs. You are trying to justify an absurd biased stance based on ignorance - not fact.
- How about fines and training for bad dog owners instead of always targetting breeds of dogs that people who don't know dogs, never owned dogs find scary. In almost every case of bully breeds biting it is because of the incompetent owners. Maybe have an age limit for ownership of a Pitbull. The mandatory obedience training for the breeds that can be dangerous with bad owners is a good idea. Which for some reason only Pitbulls have been targetted. Why aren't German Shepard's, Rottweilers, Dobermans, king Corsos, Huskies, and many more breeds that attack people and other dogs on that list? I know so many friendly and loving pitbulls. That is because they have responsible and experienced owners. The issue isn't bad dogs, it is bad dog owners! And greedy city officials looking to make money where ever they can.
- You need to regulate breeders. Especially breeders of pitbulls. No more backyard breeders and sales on Kijiji!! The definition of pit bull including "appearance" is way too broad.definitions are problematic. Definition of "nuisance" is unclear. Does it include biting? Biting is very different than biting. Why would you muzzle a dog for barking or being at large?g?
- Educate yourself Calgary. Is a person over 6 feet tall supposed to pay more for a transit pass because they take up more space? That's what rules for dogs based on looks is like. Same rules for all people. Same rules for all dogs. No multi tier system. No discrimination based on look.
EDUCATION IS KEY
- We should be regulating dog owners. A dog is a reflection of the standard of it's owners. A sub par owner equals a sub par dog. We cannot penalize all the people who train their dogs, this includes myself. We have been through sets of obedience training and have had no issues with our large breed dogs. The only suggestion i would support is a bandana colouring for offleash parks for dogs who have been previously fined and tagged as an AGGRESSIVE nuisance. If they are flagged as an aggressive dog, They should not be allowed off-leash at the parks, and must wear a distinctly coloured bandana. What about all the other large or small breed dogs. i.e german shepherds, akita's. No dog should be punished unless they are flagged in the system and it is justified. and it should be case by case scenario for the outcomes.
- Behaviour and history specific, not based on what the dog looks like
- Pit bulls are not a breed. Any dog can be violent and bite regardless of breed or size. We must go after owners not specific types of dogs.
- Leave pitbulls alone. BSL is a rotten joke and is unacceptable in our city.
- breed-neutral laws - This is over the top and you need to talk to more rescues about what you are doing. Owners have the responsibility, but also some dogs came from bad owners and are being rehabilitated, why do you punish them the same for doing the best they can to now be responsible pet owners. it's not all black and white. There are a lot of people out there who don't understand dogs or respect their space and when they force the dog into a bad situation by threatening them or



their owner why does the dog or owner get punished. There needs to be equal protections for the dogs and owners they can be victims too. What about higher fines for those who go out and put hotdogs with poison in the parks? There needs to be more public awareness - like don't ride your bike through an off leash fenced dog park or bring your small children in - the park is for the dogs not you. Yes there should be a standard warning system "voluntary dog early warning system" with colours to indicate to others if a dog needs space etc. this is long overdue but requires public education as well .

- Punish the deed not the breed! NO breed specific legislation please!!!
- Only target animals proven to possibly be aggressive to other animals/humans
- Its been proven that banning breeds does not work. Education and treating every dog no matter the breed equally when they are aggressive should be done. Muzzles for dogs that bite, 3 strike rule, and fines are all important for the dogs that are aggressive. Hate to say it any animal with a mouth can bite and you need to treat them all equally whether its a 10lb chihuahua (I know more people with sutures from these than any other breed) or a 100lb pitbull type
- Pitbulls should NOT be separated into their own category, rather a vicious or nuisance dog is exactly that a "dog" not breed specific. The amount of "dogs" that have lunged/barked violently at my behaved and LEASHED pitbull with NO behavioral correction to them is horrendous.
- I would support an outright ban of certain breeds including pit bulls inside city limits
- This surgery is very bias in its question by singling Pit Bulls. All dogs can bite and injure people or other animals. The key to this is education and strict rules around nuisance dogs . Calgary has always been know for it forward thinking animal services this is a step backwards. It has been proven time and time again breed bans do not work its education that does
- Pit bulls are not the problem so stop singling out a breed or what "looks like" a certain breed. The problem is the dogs owner and I guarantee there are more vicious little dogs.
- Dogs should be declared a nuisance based off of proved behaviour, not breed.
- As a child, I was twice bitten by a nuisance dog -- it roamed the neighbourhood, bit and knocked over a few people -- the city should have the authority to seize dogs like this -- I'm not sure what 'dangerous behaviour' meant in the first statement. I think a dog that bites may need more than confinement to the owner's property (does this protect a delivery person or a visitor?), so I wasn't sure about your statement 2. Statistics about dog attacks show that they are much more dangerous than any other type of dog, and their bites are much more serious -- dogs like pit bulls that have been bred for fighting are a product of their breeding, and are inherently dangerous. One of the reasons I don't own a dog is because I am afraid of encountering large, out of control, dogs on walks.
- Bring more education to pet owners, create more dog obedience classes and hold pet owners responsible for their dog's actions with fines, but do not seize dogs.
- Breed-specific legislation as it does not reduce the incidence or severity of dog bites, penalizes responsible pet owners and kills innocent dogs. A community approach to responsible pet ownership, one that focuses on the behavior of the dog and the owner, is the best way to protect public safety and promote animal welfare



- Only animals which have shown undue aggression should be affected. Any dog, including block head dogs, should NOT be prejudged.
- Ban certain breeds from city limits
- Do not discriminate against pitbulls
- Leave pitbulls alone. They, as animals, are not the problem!
- Pitbulls are not prone to attacks any more than any other breeds. Their jaw strength is not any greater than that of other dogs their size. There are at five to ten breeds with stronger jaws than a "pitbull", yet no mention of harsh regulations for them. The current bylaw system for dealing with problem dogs has been working just fine. This article even admits there is no particular problem with "pitbulls".
- Small dogs that express dominance and bite or nip people need to face same consequences.
- Stick with "dangerous" with clear definition of dangerous behaviour and do NOT make the shape of the dog a factor. Nuisance is too vague; there's a big difference between barking a lot and roaming, and muzzling doesn't help with either. Don't judge animals by appearance, but by the owner's behaviour. The HUMAN is responsible for an animal's behaviour. Not an animal's shape. I don't like the seizure idea, especially when combined with stupid "breed" specific ideas that have been proven time and time again to be unfair, unjust and not supported by science or evidence.
- THESE DOGS ARE JUST LIKE ANY OTHER DOG. EVERY BREED CAN BE AGGRESSIVE. THIS IS NOT FAIR TO SINGLE OUT THESE DOGS.
- I don't understand how in 2020 the city council thinks that the dog is to blame. Pit bulls are the most loving dogs when raised and loved by the right people. Stop blame the bread start blaming the owner. Also by restricting a dog's ability to burn off energy at dog parks by the use of a muzzle and a leash you the propriety of the law are increase its chance of being considered harmful because it can't run and play free. Shame on you Calgary city council for even proposing these laws.
- Do not discriminate against pitbull breed
- Rules should apply to ALL dogs regardless of breed, not senselessly targeting dogs based on physical appearance that no one is qualified enough to positively identify without DNA sampling.
- [removed]
- Obedience training must come from a certified local source, like Clever Canines or Dogma.
- Choosing to own any breed a dog that has a historically significant risk of causing injury/death to other animals and persons, should come with criminal liability should that animal cause harm/injury. Just like firearm ownership, there is inherent risk to public safety that should be managed accordingly.
- Require testing and licencing for pet owners. Stop singling out innocent animals for the sins of humans.
- Discounted obedience training for all dogs declared a nuisance if they have incident AND owner training if a dog has any violence strikes against them.
- Any dog owner found guilty of by law violations must not be permitted to own any dog any more
- I do NOT believe this is a breed issue more than bad owners. Nuisance dogs are created by the human on the end of the leash. They are so many GOOD BULLY BREED DOGS. END BSL



- Don't discriminate by breed. A chihuahua can be vicious with the right owner. This is ridiculous and outrageous. Be better Calgary.
- Pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds we shouldn't be isolating such a loving animal when there are so many other aggressive dogs in the city and their owners have little to no control over them. We shouldn't be labeling all pit bulls bad. Very disappointing.
- There can not be more than 1 nuisance dog in household.
- No measures should be breed specific. It is a handler issue not dog issue. Focus should be on the humans. Disappointed that this is even being asked. This is about optics not about making dog parks better. If it was about improving the city would not be so busy closing parks and label small pieces of grass a dog park that are not even large enough for 2 dogs to pass each other
- I do not believe that pit bulls of any shape or size are a problem, the problem is irresponsible pet owners. Any dog can be aggressive and calling out one breed is ridiculously unfair. Smaller breeds can be just as much of an issue.
- Ban Pit bulls completely.
- Automatically classifying a pitbull as a nuisance dog is complete backward thinking and I'm quite embarrassed to actually have to read through these statements. Educate yourselves on the breed please, and don't send us back 10 years with this type of thinking.
- Fine the owner for being a BAD OWNER!!! There are NO bad dogs or bad breeds!
- if ANY breed (not just pit bulls) are considered a "nuisance" and have proven it multiple times, then a consequence will follow
- Pit bulls are generally some of the nicest dogs out there and exceptionally friendly - a bigger problem is some people taking unneutered dogs to off leash parks.
- Stronger penalties against the owner of any dog that is aggressive to other animals/people
- Training required for owners of nuisance dogs
- I don't think it is fair to punish everyone with 'pit bull' type breeds. As a Staffordshire Bull Terrier owner none of my dogs are aggressive or would harm a human. I think an offense by offense punishment for the owner of the dog allowing the dog to committing any nuisance violation would thwart the behavior not a punishment for every breed type that has never been a problem.
- Need to investigate if a suspected dangerous dog before an event happens.. for instances dog behind a fence is super aggressive and reduces community life in the areas people are scared in case it gets out
- This comes down to education. Dog owners should require certified training and obedience training with their dogs (over 40 lbs, regardless of breed) to ensure proper and responsible ownership of their pet. Individuals who were convicted or prosecuted for animal abuse should be banned from pet ownership as an exception to policy. Anyone who fails obedience course with the dog should be denied ownership of the dog (over 40 lbs) for at least 1-2 years before they can attempt to adopt another large breed dog.
- None of these make any sense I have never had a bad encounter with any dog. All dog owners will do what they need if they have an aggressive dog in order for everyone's safety. We can't take away right of dogs who are doing no harm!!



- No matter the breed of dog, if it bites or harms a human, that dog should have to attend mandatory training for troubled dogs. Not to be put down just because they were provoked and did what was natural. Just as a human lashing out, we don't put down humans for lashing out of anger
- I don't own a bully breed, but placing more regulations on this breed is wrong. Some of the most docile and friendly dogs that I know are bully breeds. I think it is up to the owner to understand the level of difficulty of training that each breed requires. Maybe this step is included in the adoption process. Forcing well-trained, well-mannered dogs that happen to be bully breeds to wear a muzzle is not okay. I fear that this may only increase the public's fear and bad stigmas surrounding these breeds.
- No breed-specific bylaws!
- dogs that bite or have attacked, not allowed off leash
- I disagree with labelling breed specific in any of your future discussions ,
- No fines or authorization against pit bulls should be done unless the owner is the one that is the problem. It's not about pit bulls it's about the owner that raises them.
- I do not support breed specific bylaws. Responsibility is always on the owner.
- All of these options are absurd and demonstrate a lack of knowledge on proper pet ownership. The penalties should be on repeat and irresponsible pet owners not the animal.
- it has nothing to do with the breed its the owner. Jail the owner for all I care, DON'T blame the breed. Its like blaming a child that is neglected or abused and acting out because of it. I have had many "dangerous" breeds and have NEVER had any issues of any kind. Increase the human penalties only
- The "Nuisance" dog penalties (such as "Higher Fines," "Muzzled," and "Cannot be in Off-Leash Parks") SHOULD apply to dogs with a history of biting, but not necessarily barking. These "nuisance" offences should be separated for these questions, because one type of offense doesn't deserve the penalty of the other, i.e. barking vs. biting.
- I strongly resent the racial profiling of stocky dogs. Horrific prejudice
- Breed specific legislation is completely useless. Pitbulls are discriminated against purely because of bad press .. as you state above 'pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds', and they are no stronger, or more capable of damage than any other large breed or mixture. I personally worked in a vets that dealt with dogs seized by the police; pitbull types were the most common, but they were also, by far, the nicest natured dogs seized; in fact I don't remember a single aggressive pitbull.
- Breed specific legislation is completely useless. Pitbulls are discriminated against purely because of bad press .. as you state above 'pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds', and they are no stronger, or more capable of damage than any other large breed or mixture. I personally worked in a vets that dealt with dogs seized by the police; pitbull types were the most common, but they were also, by far, the nicest natured dogs seized; in fact I don't remember a single aggressive pitbull.
- None of these.



- Absolutely none of these should be applicable except the "Obidience training required for dogs that are declared a nuisance
- This is purely discrimination against a breed. Yes a pitbul breed has an etremely strong jaw, but so do many other breeds, ex police dogs, German Shepards. This is absolutely ridiculous. As the owner you are responsible for your animals, how they act and where you take them. Deal with cases as they happen. Muzzlling and banning a breed of dog is NOT going to stop dog attacks! Educating stupid humans on their animals is how we prevent it!
- I am shocked that "nuisance" is even being applied to describe a breed/breeds of dog. Saying that a breed should have these restrictions and potential additional costs of ownership applied to them because of a dogs potential bite force is like saying a sports car should not be allowed on Deerfoot, or that a individual who works out should pay higher liability insurance because they have greater "potential" to injure someone. As any person should know, it is not the breed, but the capability of the owner who raises and trains the dog appropriately. I have been victim of a dog bite and it was from a chihuahua of all breeds. The fact that pit bulls and similar breeds are being singled out is ridiculous. If you want to appropriately enact measures to ensure less bad behaviour in dogs, then single out the specific problem dog/owner, not an entire breed. I have yet to meet a pit bull, Rottweiler, Doberman etc that I felt unsafe around.
- [removed]
- Recourse/punishment for dog owners showing irresponsible dog ownership. I do not agree with identifying a breed as being a nuisance, even if the reason is something like increased strength. There are plenty of large dogs that can rival a pitbull's strength. Dog behaviour is largely a product of their owners. Small dogs can be a nuisance the same as large dogs.
- Dogs aren't the issue. The owners are. There is vicious chihuahua's. When a dog bites, measures should be taken, before this all dogs should be treated equal.
- Do NOT SINGLE OUT ONE BREED! Or any breed that looks like it. It is PROVEN that more often than not its small breed/ non bully type that are almost always aggressive.
- I do not support any breed-specific legislation. The problem is owners, not the breed.
- I think that the city of Calgary should educate themselves and others around the world on why a pit bull is just like any other dog. It's not in their DNA to be aggressive but rather the owner's fault on how they raise their dog. It is absolutely unfair in every way to label a breed of dog as "dangerous and aggressive" when you clearly haven't taken the time to fully educate yourselves on this beautiful breed on dog. If you are really saying that "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." Then why doesn't the city of Calgary invest time and money to train pit bulls as police guard dogs if they are so strong? I suggest you watch the show Pit Bulls and Parolees, which does an amazing job at showing what pit bulls are really like. Please for the love of god do not label this beautiful breed of dog as aggressive or dangerous in any way. Take the time to talk to people in the city that own a pit bull and get to know that dog and you will understand why this breed is so loved and special.



- All dogs should require obedience training, not just one breed or nuisance dogs. Grew up with a Stafford shire bull terrier and I find these requirements horrendous.
- Owners should face more severe consequences, they should be liable for injuries, damages caused by their pet
- obedience training for both dog and owner who have been in a bite or attack incident at owners expense.
- Do not lump pit bulls and dogs declared a nuisance in the same question. If a dog has multiple offenses, I believe they should require different rules but pit bulls have NOTHING to do with it. All these answers are extreme. Should a nuisance dog be muzzled in an off leash? Yes, but not in all public places if they are on control on a leash. This is a terrible survey.
- No breed specific legislation!! Small dogs can be far more aggressive and bite others! Pit bulls are loving family pets. So ridiculous to even entertain these policies. And who declares a dog a nuisance? A disgruntled neighbor? Somebody whose dog instigated an altercation but throws blame? Far more information surrounding this is needed. But absolutely NO to BSL!
- None of these are proven to lower dog attacks. All these do is make people who own these dogs go through so much unnecessary trouble to enjoy their time with their dogs. It is not helpful. Or kind. Or realistic. Not all pit bulls are "nuisance" dogs. Most problems are found in the owner or breeder. If anyone were to be punished for a dogs actions it should be them first. These bylaws only farther the stigma and misinformation of pit bull or "nuisance" dogs. What even qualifies as a nuisance dog? Could a loud and aggressive chihuahua be considered one? They are often far more aggressive than any other dog breed I've seen. Or no? Because the can't cause the damage a pit bull would?
- Total city ban of pit bulls
- Ensure the dogs are dealt with in a fair and safe manner. Fitting the criteria for a "nuisance dog" should have multiple steps and investigation. Not to be taken lightly.
- Leave the pitbulls alone. theyre not all bad.
- These are so stupid it makes me sick. How ignorant to a specific breed. To suggest that a household should be limited to one pit bull per household is disgusting and controlling. Shame on anyone who had a say in these suggestions.
- obedience training/fines for owners of nuisance dogs
- I understand that there are discussions around the required muzzling of pit bulls. Although I do not own a pit bull, I strongly disagree with the targeting of certain breeds because of their damage potential. This could very easily arc over to many other breeds. It is the ultimate responsibility of the owner to take the necessary precautions if they know their animal is a 'nuisance'.
- Bite incidents are a human caused phenomenon not a breed. Calgary should continue to focus on RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP! There are far too many people who have dogs that shouldn't and/or have animals that they are not equipped to deal with the behaviour issues.
- Euthanize them if they bite. They are not 'dogs' they are different.
- None of these things because this is ridiculous. The link between a "pit bull" and a nuisance dog is not even justified by any evidence. Is the city suffering so much they just need to try find little holes



to get more money? Shame on you. You can't judge anyone/any animal based on breed or physical appearance. I feel ashamed living in this city because this is even on the table.

- Certain breeds such as pit bulls should not be permitted in Calgary. Any animal that has bitten or attempted to bite a person or has attacked another dog should be put down. Animals should pose a threat to people.
- Pit bull type dogs should be banned. They are usually always the culprit when somebody is severely injured
- Don't be breed specific, a dog who bites people or other animals must be muzzled in public.
- Training required for the owner. To understand the breed, how the dog reacts in situations, environments and other dogs.
- If a dog is a nuisance dog and owner must do training
- Define what is "dangerous behaviour". (Lunging, pulling, jumping, bite, growl) Define what nuisance would require additional insurance (barking? running at large? Licensing?) Contradictory statement. Dogs running at large are not allowed to go to the dog park?
- Owners of a dog involved in a related offense should be fined and required to take part in a responsible owner training course. Bad owners raise problem dogs. No dog is inherently problematic.
- This is not about a specific breed. This should be about bad dog owners.
- All dog owners should be encouraged to participate in obedience training, when/if obtaining licensing.
- Nowhere have you specified higher fines for owners who purposely train their animals to be mean ie: guard dogs...plus I disagree with you and your stance on pit bulls...many dogs are as strong, or stronger....Rottweilers, German shepherds, Dobermans...etc.
- I am against breed specific legislation in every sense. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Targeting pit bulls is something any responsible dog owner would not support! Breed specific legislation is horrendous and I truly hope the city of Calgary does not make the same mistakes as Montreal. The breed of dog is not the problem (Golden Retrievers are statistically involved in more severe bites with children!) it is the owners who do not train their dogs that are the problem, OR people who mistreat or are not respectful with others' dogs that are the problem.
- Owners must undergo training prior to owning a nuisance breed
- If we know that the dangers behind the breeds lay partially on how they are bred, why wouldn't there be more surveillance on the breeders themselves? To be able to breed a pit bull type dog, you need a license to do so and make it harder to obtain that license. Once the license is obtained, continue to watch the breeder to ensure they are not breeding to create more dangerous dogs, but instead are trying to breed a nice quality dog.
- None of the above. Breed specific laws are redundant. It is the owners and not the breed. These dogs used to be nanny dogs for children. These dogs are being blamed for a few idiots that decided to make them fight.
- I would 100% support an eventual ban on pit bull-related breeds.



- Enforced training for owners whose dogs are declared a nuisance. No specific breeds specified though!!!
- No breed specific legislation! Bully breeds are not inherently harmful and it's wrong to burden their owners with the costs of training. My dog has been attacked at the dog park, but never by a pit bull.
- Take each problem case by case without discrimination in breed specific. Create more specific guidelines Such as disallowing dogs in public based on offence not breed. Also dog owners not able to control their dogs or showing signs of inability to be at off-leash Parks should be fined. There are too many irresponsible pet owners who are out there.
- I am against discrimination of any breed of dog
- Sad that you are targeting a specific breed - disgusted to see this part of your questioning - shame on you.
- Any dog can be trained to bite. The owners have to take responsibility. It isn't the dog fault.
- Do not use breed specific bylaws. This is inappropriate. Target irresponsible owners and breeders. Many 'pit bull' type dogs are lovely while other breeds such as German shepherds and border collies can also be aggressive. Again, placing a 'whole breed' label is inappropriate as it depends on training and their owners .
- Leave pitbulls and their owners alone.
- When a "nuisance dog" becomes a problem, this should be addressed at the owner level and not the dog. The owner should be heavily reprimanded for not being responsible enough to control their dog. The dog should be moved to care by someone who loves it enough to work with it on its behaviours. The owner should not be allowed to have dogs as they are unable to keep up with proper training and other measures. These other measures include giving space at the dog parks, not going to the dog parks if you know your dog is aggressive, etc.
- Breed specific laws are ridiculous! Focus must be nuisance animals.
- Some of the above points that would apply to nuisance dogs may be valid BUT not based on your definition in nuisance. A noisy dog or one that has been found at large does not imply they are dangerous and would need to be muzzled. Obedience training should be required for ALL dogs and dog owners. This would mitigate the need for many of the above options. Particularly there should be courses offered and required on off leash park etiquette for the owners.
- Government funded training classes for dogs and their owner who could benefit but cannot afford
- Pit bull ban in Calgary
- All breeds can be dangerous, no need to single out one. Some labradors have larger block heads.
- Legislation should punish owners on their dogs behavior not on the breed of their dog
- Suggest training for all breeds.
- None
- Higher fines for charges of failing to leash a dog off private property
- Euthanasia. Long ago I was attacked by a dog. I went to court to ensure the dog was removed from the city or euthanized. All dogs that attack humans or pets should be euthanized.
- while I am not a fan of Pit Bulls or bully type breeds, at the end of the day on my opinion it's the owner that makes the dog. Usually 8/10 people who own bully breed dogs are not exactly stand up



citizens in our society. They buy these dogs for their own protection. like any dog, a bully breed socialized and trained properly from a young age and continuously given the opportunity to socialize and be in a positive environment has no reason not to be a loving gentle dog. My argument is some people just shouldn't have dogs whether it be a pit bull, golden retriever or mini poodle.. whatever if you don't have time to properly care for your dog but you have time for illegal acts where you need protection and you choose that from a dog, it's not the dog's fault, it's the City's fault for allowing that loser to be a dog owner.

- I think that all dog breeds if has a record of biting has to go through training and muzzled in public until they can go through the good citizen . Stricter bylaws with all dogs in public areas should be leashes unless there is a designated off leash area.
- Training for people who want to purchase dog that may show aggression based on the study involved dangerous breeds
- Obedience training for ALL dogs regardless of breed. It's not the dog who is a danger, it's the owner and how they have raised the dog
- Severe bites can occur in on leash areas as well. Higher fines for any dog found off-leash in an on-leash area. The average person has to feel safe from dogs while walking city streets.
- Dogs declared nuisance can go off leash only after dog had graduated from obedience training and is no longer reactive
- I would support nuisance dogs not being allowed in offleash parks if the nuisance behaviour is related to charging or biting people or other animals. I f the nuisance behavior is barking, I don't think there should be a restriction. There needs to be more context around these questions. I do NOT support anything breed specific.
- Ban all pit bull type dogs.
- More education for owning this breed and knowing or recognising that this is a working breed and may not be suitable to some people's lifestyle-these breeds need to be exercised and taught how to interact with people and dogs and obviously monitored as you would any pet - if you ban a breed they will definitely become a must have accessory for certain members of society that don't make good life choices!!
- I would prefer an outright ban on pitbulls.
- Breeds other than those listed can be just as dangerous. It is easy to jump on the bandwagon by targeting specific breeds. The emphasis should be on responsible pet ownership. There are owners who do not control their pets and ignore leash requirements. That is the problem, not the pet.
- My wife was bitten by a dog and received a lot of stitches. The dog has chased a lot of people and threatened them. Bylaw has been called. I'm the dog still is around with no muzzle and in off leash. If this doesn't meet the status for "nuisance" then what does? Get some teeth in this bylaw.
- Treat all dogs the same. Penalize bad dog owners, not dog breeds
- Leave dogs alone. Lay off all the city staff that sucks up our tax money dealing with our dogs.
- I do not support any of those! No breed should be isolated from the rest.



- If you were to act as breed as a different race for dogs this is a very racist questionnaire these bylaws should I here to all breeds not just bull terrier breeds a lot of the times it's chihuahuas that attack other dogs.
- There should be a distinction about what kind of nuisance behaviour warrants the above discipline. If a dog is declared a nuisance because it barks, I don't think muzzling in off leash areas is necessary. If a dog is a nuisance for being involved in multiple fights, then muzzling makes sense.
- Owning pitbulls should be banned. It's an aggressive breed.
- Education and punitive measures based case by case instead of knee jerk political seeming moves to sate the publics concern after having been whipped i to a frenzy about 'pit bulls'. Educate about responsible dog ownership and address dogs who prove to be an issue instead of deciding before beginning that you'll scrutinize a selection of dogs without a history of issue. Bully breed owners should not be discriminated against.
- Education required for the owner
- I support a city wide ban of pit bull type dogs. I'm scared to take my dogs to the dog park because of these type of dogs.
- Save the pit bulls. Leave the potential arguments at the door and only enforce fines and/or training based on actions/reported bites with witnesses support on a case by case incident. It's not about the dog breed, it's completely up to the human's direction and guidance to establish a trusting and safe environment for our pups.
- Immediate euthanasia if dog mauls other animals or people
- It's time to hold higher standards of accountability with pet owners. Period.
- Just ban pitbulls. I have seen very many that are extremely good. The issue is the facts show a higher likelihood of attacks and more likely to end up in the hands of owners seeking aggressive dogs.
- Obedience training required for ALL dogs regardless of breed.
- BSL has not worked well in other punishes and responsible rescues who take the time to conduct temperament testing, require mandatory training for adoptable dogs and find suitable owners for the dog's energy and behavioural needs. BSL will also push some problem dogs onto other cities. Some of the focus needs to be on breeders who are causing overpopulation of strong dogs, without vetting owners. Or irresponsible rescues who do not take the time to know the dogs before adopting them out. If the only idea behind BSL for pit bulls exclusively, was the strong bite force, many other breeds would be facing BSL. Mandatory training for all strong dogs would be great if it was a affordable and feasible to implement, however, I'm not sure how easy that would be to regulate.
- severity of their bite“ just shows how uneducated you people are. First of all any medium/ large size dog has the tendency to bite and you cannot isolate ONE BREED because you “think” they bite harder. First of all you singling pot pit-bulls does not make any sense since in the first place pit bulls Do not have the strongest jaws, IF YOU DID YOUR RESEARCH YOU WOULD KNOW THAT! Second, IF YOU CANNOT TAKE THE TIME IN RESEARCHING THE PITBULL/ BULLY BREED you shouldn't be creating any of these bylaws. ANYONE in the city that stands behind this dumb



ideology is a disgusting human being and a [removed]. maybe use your brain this time might give you more knowledge than taking ideas out of your [removed].

- None of the above
- keep the actual bylaw, no ban of breed since it has nothing to do with the look or the breed, it's the behaviour of the dog, don't discriminate, all dogs can bite and if it's a labrador that bite and kill it shouldn't be allowed or excused just because it's not a pitbull, the actual bylaw is a very known and followed bylaw, all cities in canada are adopting the same bylaw and it's working, your goal is a to have responsible pet owners, the more responsible someone is the lowest chances you have to be bite by a dog since they take every precaution to keep everyone and their animal safe
- I'm just going to take this opportunity to ask and suggest that you really consider other options, hopefully submitted by people more qualified than I am to make such suggestions. Many of these options feel more like punishments (with no 'crime', so to speak) than they do helpful/preventative. For instance, requiring people to pay higher insurance for a dog deemed a 'pit bull', even without having had an incident, makes next-to-no sense for me. Again, I don't believe I'm qualified enough to speak on the manner! But I ask that you please, please try to find alternatives. Thank you!
- Nothing. Banning dogs for breed is ignorant and asinine.
- Fines for aggressive animals period, the breed is irrelevant.
- The above applies to individual cases and NOT breed specific dogs
- This is a stupid thing to think of because no dogs are born to be bad! They are TAUGHT bad habits which is greatly directed by a HUMAN OWNER. Please use your common sense and some basic biology knowledge that this law is ridiculous and completely discriminating against pitbulls ALL BECAUSE of a few bad apples. There are many other dogs that can be considered dangerous and yet they are not attacked. Why? BECAUSE THEY ARE WELL TRAINED. Please City of Calgary. Don't be ridiculous and DISCRIMINATE AGAINST PITBULLS. Instead use this knowledge and BAN THE OWNERS FROM EVER OWNING A DOG AGAIN. Thats what you should do instead.
- None of the above.
- Animals should not be discriminated against based on their breed. Any dog can bite, and owners of other breeds should be under more scrutiny instead of it all being directed towards one "type" of dog.
- Please look at small dogs, i.e. Chihuahua for the title of nuisance dogs before going after the highest rated friendly dog, the Pit bull.
- It's the owner not the breed
- Do not descriminate. Bites are behavioral and many times due to lack of training. Such by laws if passed, should be across the board with ALL breeds and owners
- Fine parents of kids that continue to tease dogs disoite being repeatedly asked NOT to.
- Severe fines for people that refuse to vaccinate their dogs and these vaccines should be free or subsidized by the city.
- As an owner of dogs for almost 30 years, I can tell you it is not the breed or type of dog that is the issue. Dogs, much like people, have their own personalities, characteristics and temperments. Dogs, just like people are shaped by experiences and carry trauma. You can have a typical,



friendly, behavior problem free dog who has been attacked by another dog and be left with an anxious and reactive dog. The problem is not the dog but rather owners and people in general. I do NOT support the targeting or singling out of any breed or type of dog. Owners need to realize having a dog takes effort, work, responsibility and time. Too many people think they have control of their dog when they don't. People forget dogs are still animals and have natural instincts. No one can ever have absolute and full control of an animal. Owners need to understand this and take responsibility. Every dog should be leashed out in public. That means no walking an unleashed dog in a neighborhood or an alley. I cannot tell you how many times I have been out walking my dog and been rushed by a dog who is loose in the front yard with the owner gardening, or getting things out of the car while the dog is running free back and forth from the car to the house, or people in a community playground (not off leash) with their dog charging at me on the sidewalk or escaping from backyards and bolting right at me and my dog. There need to be stricter rules and laws around this. It is not ok for people to do what they want while not having a leash or control of their dog to stop them from going after another person or dog. Off leash areas are just as bad for this. Because people stop paying attention, are too busy socializing and not paying attention. It's a disaster waiting to happen. If you are considering leash ing and muzzling for one breed, it should be applicable to all breeds. In my NW neighborhood, there are lots of bully/pitty types...all gentle giants. My issues have bee with other dogs. There should also be some education and information around parents teaching children not to approach or sneak up behind someone with a dog (whether walking or bike riding). The general public needs common sense when someone is going out of their way to avoid them. Be mindful and respectful. Don't yell at them, follow them, call out to the dog, continue to ride your bike in circles around a dog reacting and a person trying to manage them. It's people that are the problem. Owners and the public. There needs to be more training options besides the basics. For the stubborn, challenging, reactive, anxious and tougher behavioral issues. Almost any dog, with the right attention, commitment and responsibility by its owner will thrive. 30 years as a dog owner. I now have had my first reactive and anxious dog. He has taught me so much and I am so much more aware of things I never gave a second thought to before. Going on 10 years with him and I wouldn't change a thing. It's been very challenging and frustrating and disheartening at times. But I have learned to do well by him and for him because that is what he needed. Every dog owner should do the same.

- I've never been more ashamed of this city. This kind of ignorance is truly disgusting. I never wanted to leave Calgary but if this is the sort of pathetic fear mongering we're going to resort to I will be packing up and getting out.
- Higher fines for any dogs involved in bylaw offences. Training/Support for owners of any dog that has severe dog problems. Ex. Reduced cost at a City approved dog training facility.
- mandatory humane dog training for any dog determined to be a nuisance. See KPA CTP trainers or similar. The training must be for owner and dog, not someone else.
- [removed]



- I would only support bylaws that addressed dealing with nuisance or dangerous behaviors on a case by case basis. I do not support any bylaw that specifically targets a specific breed of dog because that deflects from the actual source of the matter.
- Why can I not select more answers? Only the two that show as selected were the the only ones that would select. I wanted to select many others. Is this a means to influence the survey? Maybe this is incompetence.
- Obedience training for all dogs
- I don't think that this should be applied to one specific breed! I've been around many pitbull breeds and have never been hurt, although licked on many occasions. I have sustained injury from other breeds, including Yorkies and Chihuahuas, some requiring medical assistance. It's not the breed that is vicious, any breeds can be aggressive as a result of irresponsible pet owners! Don't discriminate against a breed, it's not to the dogs or to the people who see them as a family member, and I'm hoping that you don't want to break up family!!
- If you are going to put theses in place it should be applied to all dogs.... a pit bull is not the only dog who is able to apply more force to enable a more severe bite. They are the same as any other dog similar to their size...
- Just because a dog is large it should not be muzzled. If not is dangerous it should be. Straight out. You should wear a muzzle for being breed specific. If anything the small dogs are more dangerous! Shame on you.
- Don't breed blame so many other breeds are real problem have all of these designated to all animals not just one breed
- Make the owners of nuisance, and I hate to say it, pitbulls should have to attend mandatory training. Not because pitbulls are especially vicious, it is because they are pretty goofy, can be high strung and need an expert trainer. Doesn't hurt for any dog owners to go through basic training with whatever dog(s) they have. You never know when FeeFee will over react in a strange situation.
- Breed does not determine violence. The options selected here reflect that. Additionally, owners with multiple offences of nuisance or bites should be prohibited for owning pets, clearly it isn't the dog that's the problem.
- none should be applied. I do not consider extra precaution if the breeds are not involved in higher incidents versus other breeds.
- A dig that barks isn't necessarily a nuisance. The dog could be barking to protect the owners property. Nuisance is too general of a term.
- I would never in my life be in favour of breed specific legislation. My 11 year old chihuahua is more of a barker than my neighbours 1 year old pitbull has ever been. It's not the breed, it's the owner and the training that went into it. My dog (11 year old chihuahua) knows all her basic commands and is a great walker, but again is not nearly as "polite" with strangers coming near her people and my neighbours pitbull or my further neighbours German shepherd, even.
- The problem is not the breed of dog the problem is the people that raised the dog in question
- What is the background to this? What are the incidents of dog bites? Has it increased/decreased/remained the same. I do not support "muzzling" or singling out breed specific



finer or requirements. Who gets to declare a dog a nuisance? Is this another crazy goose chase by city hall to frivolously spend our tax dollars?

- This is mainly listing pit bulls, but there's plenty of breeds that can be vicious. Have you ever met a Chihuahua? They may be small but they can be vicious. If the dog has a history of biting and the owners cannot control the dog to keep it from being aggressive towards others then the owner should be fined and supervised to see how they're dealing and handling their animal. **NO DOG SHOULD BE EUTHANIZED BECAUSE OF AN ATTACK!!!** Get the dog checked medically and make sure there's no neurological problems. Also see how the dog does with someone else besides the owner. An animal like a person isn't born vicious or mean. It's sometimes the environment they're raised in.
- Find a way to stop people from demonizing specific dog breeds and if at all possible seize 'nuisance' dogs from those who are incapable of caring for these animals.
- This should not be "pit bull" specific.
- Full enforcement of any dog owner not taking proper care to manage any breed of dog acting aggressively
- There needs to be regulations for if a dog bites they have to get training help. No matter the breed. This should not apply to any dog who is taunted, teased, or threatened.
- None of the above.
- Breed specific legislation is NOT acceptable. It is NOT the dog's fault if there are behavioral issues. It is the OWNER'S responsibility for ANY dog to properly train and care for the dog. As for your example and statement that a "pit-bull" type dog has a strong bite? **WRONG!!!!** There are at least 5 other types of dogs with much stronger bite force. Do some research first before stating false facts. A Rottweiler can bite at almost 300 PSI more than any "pit-bull" just to name one. Punish the owner, NOT the dog. Approx 2% of "dangerous" dogs can not be rehabilitated. BSL is NOT the way to go. Start punishing the owners **LARGE** and give the courts the power to do something about them instead of a slap on the wrist.
- Lower licensing fees for pet owners who take their dogs to obedience training or socialization classes
- Please be cautious to avoid weaponizing bylaws. Some neighbours are unreasonable and will call bylaw over everything or fabricate the truth to get others in trouble.
- Designated off-leash parks for big dogs and ones for small dogs
- So many cities have tried and ended their BSL legislation because it didn't stop dog bites, in Toronto incidents actually went up. Why? Because all dogs are capable of biting and breed was not the root cause of biting. Besides it is very costly and last I checked we are in a recession further crippled by a pandemic. Don't use my tax money so wastefully please.
- All the listed bylaws above are totalitarian in nature and shouldn't be implemented.
- **NONE OF THE ABOVE.** These ideas are completely unfair to responsible owners, with well trained dogs with no behavioral issues. End the stigma rather than encourage it.
- **OBEDIENCE TRAINING FOR ALL DOGS!!!!** Pit bulls are no worse than any other breed.



- A dog's breed should have zero bearing on how the dog is treated. There are far more terrorizing little dogs than there are big dogs. The fact that the City of Calgary wants to implement a bylaw targeting a specific breed is ridiculous.
- The owner needs to go through a training session as well to understand the breed behaviour as well as obedience training.
- I would support bylaws that enforce/punish acts/behaviors of dogs/owners versus specific breeds.
- There is no reason to single out pit bull type dogs; owners of nuisance dogs, regardless of breed, should be penalized & subject to stricter measures that would both promote safety (ie muzzle off property, requirements around further training & passing a test if they want to use off leash etc).
- My concern is for pet owners such as myself that own a pure breed Labrador retriever that is red in color...people on several occasions have confused our loving gentle lab as part pitbull because of her unusual color. What happens to us then when she is reported as a pit bull breed? Do we have to keep showing her papers?
- As the owner of the dog, individuals could be financially liable for harm caused by their dog
- Owners have secure fences to protect public.
- You need to increase fines for humans/owners who are not responsible....has nothing to do with pitbulls....STOP creating stereotypes! The city needs to clamp down on puppy mills, dog breeding for profit and irresponsible owners, this includes all breeds. I live near a park and see way more small dog owners with small dogs chasing kids, other dogs who are on leash +even in designated off leash) who have bitten numerous times. All adoptions should require a responsible course and dog obedience. I see so many people in my neighborhood who shouldn't have dogs, who have no idea on responsible and loving care (I have seen people beating their dog, choking them when walking to get them to stay beside them, kids running and pulling on the dog leash like a windmill)...all of which I confronted them. City needs more enforcement to issue fines. Many people think off leash means free rein. Finally, this includes nose hill.... I see a lot of dogs (big and small) being allowed to actively chase wildlife as a method of "exercise". So instead of focussing on a fictitious breed issue.... focus on the real issue....[removed] owners!
- Having any dog is a responsibility. Anyone who wishes to obtain one should take courses/classes to obtain a license to own. Like a license to drive. Breed should not be a factor.
- Small dogs have vicious bites and should also need to be trained
- Breeding should require credentials and licensure, without which people can be fined for breeding and selling puppies of any kind. Eliminate hobby breeding and backyard breeding and make it a requirement that people who breed and sell dogs are licensed to do so.
- I am a pitbull owner, I find picking one breed is ridiculous there are many other dog breeds that might be aggressive, this should not be based on the dog breed but on the owners of all dogs, my dog goes to the dog park to play with her ball and stick know I will need to put a Muzzle on her, I won't be able to take her, so know there is no exercise for her Please take these points into consideration I don't think these bylaws are fair for their dogs
- There should be NO breed specific legislation period.



- What is considered "dangerous behaviour"? I am very concerned that increased measures would be abused. For example, if a dog has separation anxiety and cries when its owner leaves home, these measures could have that dog declared a nuisance, then seized. Will the dog then be put down? I see these measures being abused by squeaky wheel neighbours against pit bull owners by neighbours that don't like pit bulls.
- Leave the specific dog breeds out of it. Punish owners for repeat offences. Ban owners not breeds. I've experienced more issues with small dogs than large dogs in my years.
- No new bylaws should be passed as pitbulls or bully's are like any other dog and any dog can bite not only bulky breeds, therefore there should be no new bylaws passed and anyone that is dumb enough to pass a bylaw should be muzzled or deemed a nuisance human being
- Signage required on yards that have pitbulls or nuisance dogs indicating there is a dog on the property.
- No municipal measures should be breed specific. All issues should be dealt on an individual case basis and should have nothing to do with breeds. Just because a pit bull has a stronger jaw than another breed does not make them any more of a threat. Behaviour issues should be dealt with in regards to the owner and training, not breed.
- I think that only if a dog has been deemed a nuisance should it or the owner be fined or penalized, otherwise you're punishing for something that hasn't taken place. Innocent until proven otherwise.
- Make people learn dog body language and check in with behavior specialists periodically.
- No breed should be named as all dogs are capable of biting and causing physical and mental injury. All dog owners should pass a test to prove they have knowledge of the care (physical, feeding, health, grooming needs, time to care for and mental stimulation) a dog could require and the commitment they are taking on, the responsibility of said dog is on them. Training is a must for all dogs and humans alike.
- I don't believe one breed should ever be singled. I also think a talkative barking dog is much different a nuisance than an aggressive dog. I don't think dogs that have a lot to say should be denied the pleasure of a free run in the designated parks
- Breed specific legislation is ridiculous. The owners should be responsible for the behaviour of their dog. No matter the breed
- While a large responsibility rests on the owner for being aware of their pet's emotional 1) animals lack language and operate using different filters from humans; 2) animals can, as a result, be what humans term "unpredictable"; 3) humans should not approach or interact with strange animals; 4) even if the owner gives permission for interaction, it is the other party's responsibility to understand that they could still get their hand removed if they pet Fluffy the wrong way; and 5) even the "nicest pet who's always so patient with Baby" can suddenly decide it is Over This Shit. Unfortunately, no amount of policing or bylaws will replace the huge chunk of the human population who are, let's face it, just kinda dumb about this stuff. : (
- Take away ownership rights for owners that have multiple cases where their dog inflicted a bite or attack on a dog or human. All breeds. Punish the owner not the breed.
- None of these. Ever.



- Don't target specific breeds
- Stop discriminating against breeds and then asking what institutionalized racism is
- I don't support a breed specific bylaw.
- I don't agree with any of the following
- As stated above, pit bull breeds are not the only breeds that can potentially bite, chase or get into dog fights. All breeds can do these things. It is the owners responsibility to control their dog, and there should be no specific rules for pit bull breed owners.
- Nuisance dogs require separate categories for barking vs at large type nuisances, if you want to go there at all. Otherwise, could see bylaw struck down in court in short order if vastly different categories of nuisance are lumped together inappropriately
- Fines for off leash dogs in city parks. Plus more officer enforcement.
- BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION IS DISCRIMINATORY, NOT GROUNDED IN DATA OR FACTS AND HAVE PROVEN ENTIRELY INEFFECTIVE IN EVERY JURISDICTION WHERE IT HAS BEEN ENACTED!!!!!!!!!!
- More on how the dog is declared or considered a nuisance needs to be provided
- No pit bull related restrictions. pit bulls are not the problem and do not have a higher bite force it's the owners who are the problem
- If the dog has multiple dangerous behaviour calls, then the dog can be seized by the city.
- All owners should be held to the highest extent of laws pertaining to nuisance dogs
- All of these are discriminatory towards our pitties! Breed specific laws are outdated so why are you going backwards? What about chihuahuas?
- No breed-specific regulations as it has been shown that they are not effective
- This is ridiculous. You're going to suggest people get higher insurance for a dog? Are you seriously ultimately suggesting the demise of an entire species of dog? As some wouldn't be able to afford that. Cause as we know Jason Kenny will just erase any and all caps on insurance and it'll be out of rageous. The solution is properly training the animal, showing it respect and dignity. Treating it as you would a human. Use your brains. Muzzle at a off leash park? What is it a prison? Off leash is meant for all dogs. If you're not comfortable then go elsewhere. The City can create off leash parks for different sized animals. Stop playing with stereotypes of dogs.
- ban the breed
- None.
- Dogs that have been at large, noise violations, are often neighbour issues. This is ridiculous to group these dogs in the same category as aggressive dogs.
- Temporary additional insurance for dogs labeled a nuisance. For a set period of time after completion of mandatory obedience and behavioural classes are completed.
- This sounds discriminatory think of pitbull as people of colour and your opinion will change
- Obedience training for owners so they can recognize they are the issue behind their dog's behaviour, not the dog itself. No dog should be punished because of their owners' bad behaviour.
- Ban the breed from the city altogether



- nothing needs to be in place for bully breeds specifically as this is no different than racism for humans
- There is no such thing as a "nuisance dog". Regardless of breed, any dog may bite. This could be from improper pet ownership or people not respecting the dog's space.
- The city cannot be targeting pit bulls specifically. The onus is on the owner to work with and train their dogs. Any incidents that happen with dogs is the owner's fault and responsibility, not the dog.
- First-time dog owners should have to take dogs to obedience training
- No Pitbull-specific bylaws, just owner punishment
- Penalize the owner and force repeat-offending owners to take proper dog care/raising courses.
- Higher fines and mandatory training courses for the OWNER of any dog, regardless of breed that is deemed a nuisance and any animal that has multiple offenses to be taken away from their owners and placed in rehabilitation programs. Any animal that is deemed dangerous to the public to be barred from public spaces
- How to be a responsible pet owner Training or classes, it's the people who make bad dogs NOT THE BREEDS!
- Dogs that don't have good neighbour certification are more \$\$\$\$
- Breed Specific Legislation is the animal version of racism.
- more rules/responsibilities on the owners. should not be breed specific. ensure information regarding animal behaviour is provided by animal behavioral specialists.
- Leave Pit Bulls alone.
- more investment into programs that help with breed-specific qualities so we can help our loving pets be the best they can be rather than bad owners giving these breeds a bad reputation due to lack of education and training for the animal.
- fines for owners that are inept and don't know how to properly care for pets, especially for those that own a pit bull. it is the owner's fault, not the innocent animal.
- DOGS ARE NOT BORN AGGRESSIVE, TERRIBLE OWNERS MAKE THEM THAT WAY
- Are we going to restrict people from having children? I think we have a much bigger problem besides dogs and targeting pitbulls. Are we going to muzzle children who bite other kids or put cement blocks on people's hands who have been violent in the past?
- Stop vilifying Pit Bulls
- the questions are leading and show little concern for the animal. How about questions regarding fines for people who behave ignorantly by playing ball sports in the middle of off-leash parks, or run through packs of dogs and antagonize them? yes a pitbull's bite is worse, but I have never been bitten by one but I have been bitten on two occasions by poodles. Leave the breed out of it, there are cities now with a huge number of dumped and homeless pitbulls because of these discriminatory rules which create a negative perception, prop up anti-pitbull sentiment and really solve nothing.
- Various: Hold owners responsible for attacks by sentencing them with jail time.
- THIS IS ABSOLUTELY DISGUSTING. THE FACT THE CITY IS THIS IGNORANT. IT IS NOT THE ANIMAL. IT IS THE PEOPLE WHO OWN THEM. SHAME ON CALGARY, AND THE IGNORANT CITY COUNCIL. There should be proper screenings taking place to make sure the owner is capable



of properly caring for an animal. Clearly that's not the case here. People should be punished. Not the dogs.

- Disapprove of any law trying to categorize a breed of dog into a specific behaviour type which results in restrictions.
- Dogs that bite should be put down
- Allow all dog breeds to be judged fairly, and with similar intent.
- ALL dogs not just specific breeds. Fine the chihuahua owners biting people
- Opposing any measures to restrict or punish dogs based solely on their breeds
- These are all terrible options. The fines should go toward irresponsible owners of any dog breeds, not just one specific type of dog due to misinformation and stigma
- Greater liability for the owner as a whole. I've watched small dogs antagonize large dogs but it is always the large dog held accountable. I am personally less concerned with being bit by a large dog and more about being bit by a small dog.
- fines for ANY dogs involved in bylaw offences. The difference is already in damages. If anything higher fines for intact animals over the age of 1 year
- Any nuisance or aggressive dog, regardless of breed, should be treated the same. It is time to make the owners accountable for their dog's bad behaviour rather than just lumping all dogs of a certain "type" together.
- opposing any measures to restrict or punish dogs based solely on their breeds
- I think singling out 'pitbull or similar dogs' is the wrong approach. There are many dogs of many breeds that can be dangerous. Mandatory training for ALL dog owners should be required. With additional training required to anyone with a nuisance dog.
- You state there are not a higher rate of bites by pit bulls, therefore all the suggestions that pit bull owners have more limitations is unreasonable. It should entirely be based on the behaviour presented by each dog, regardless of breed. Some pit bull owners train and have much better behaved dogs than other breeds, where owners don't even bother with training. Needs to be case by case, regardless of breed.
- Make dog training mandatory for every dog one specific breed of dog is not the issue. Make humans do the work to ave a good dog!
- Please don't single out pit bulls. Don't feed the hype.
- Nothing. Do not judge a dog because of appearance. Also, there bites are no more stronger than a German shepherd, Doberman or Rottweiler. Do your research!!
- THIS SHOULD BE FOR SMALL DOGS AS WELL. I Have been bit by several SMALL BREED DOGS and not any blockhead type/Bully breeds. Calgary needs to smarten up... it's not just pit bulls etc. This is only going to spread more hate towards big dogs.
- I oppose to any measures taken to punish or endanger the animal in question
- no breed specific legislation
- I believe those who have well trained dogs should be allowed to have them off leash provided they are well under control (i.e that the owner has the same amount of control on a leash as off a leash). I do not agree with breed specific legislation. Penalize irresponsible owners.



- The fact you're singling out bully breeds is ridiculous; no pit bull ban or muzzle law is necessary. It should include all large breeds if so, not just one dog breed.
- If a dog is declared a nuisance they must attend behavior training by a registered trainer.
- I disagree with these harsher penalties on pit bulls. It is the owners responsibility to train a dog and ensure they are suitable for off leash areas. I also disagree with targeting a certain breed as not all dogs in one breed display such characteristics.
- None you can go re-educate yourself for being like this.
- Higher fines for those not obeying the rules of off-leash parks
- Stop judging a whole breed off of some dogs actions
- Breed specific legislation is very misguided and detrimental to pit bulls. They are often targeted for dog fighting and other illegal crime. The fact that these questions exist is disgusting and not representative of our great city of Calgary.
- I will oppose specific measures that restrict or punish dogs based solely on thier breed. It is not the dog, it is the person handling it.
- Since there's no higher rates of attacks by pitbulls, it is a stupid and pointless exercise requiring their owners to pay more insurance/muzzle them in public etc. It is also important to distinguish between "nuisance" and "dangerous" - a dangerous dog being a dog which has bitten/attacked presents an imminent threat of attack to other dogs, humans or domestic animals/pets or livestock. Owners of dangerous dogs should be prohibited from owning subsequent dogs, if their dangerous dog attacks another person or dog/domestic animal. Owners of nuisance dogs should be obliged to undergo training in dog behaviour, not just obedience training for their dogs. Fundamentally, issues with dog behaviour stems from a lack of understanding on the part of owners, and/or unwillingness to take responsibility for the dog's behaviour. Deal with problem owners and we'll have less problem dogs, dangerous or nuisance.
- There should be no breed specific legislation. Treat all breeds equally, with higher fines for nuisance dogs involved in repeat bylaw offences.
- I don't have an other. Assume I uncheck if the people who get to decide if a dog is a nuisance are the same people that made this survey. Expecting additional insurance is OUTRAGEOUS and could lead to the death of a lot of animals that don't deserve it. For example, a person that rescues troubled dogs and has every understanding of how to control that animal but would then find it hard to rent a home or get insurance because of the increased rates. Absolutely absurd. I can't believe this is a consideration.
- When a dog is declared a "nuisance" or "dangerous", the owners must undergo extensive training on dog behaviours and personalities. City bylaw should never be the ones to determine whether or not a dog is a nuisance or dangerous as they always have their own agenda which is rarely ever true to the real situation. Punish the owners, not the animal.
- All restrictions should not be based on breed- Any issues with a dog is the fault of the owner for insufficient training 90% of the time- any dog seen as a "nusance" should be forced to take training- both owner and dog with a company pre-approved by the City such as Pest2Pet, and once deemed suitably trained can then be permitted back into off leash facilities. Fines should be modified- some



are way to high and do not insensitive to fix the situation when the money the owner pays could be better used for training correctly.

- There is nothing wrong with the current system as a whole. City council go find something better to try and ruin. I know let's debate fluoride again... for the 5 time
- Fines should be to bad owners, and not breed specific.
- Dog owners need education on how to own a healthy, well exercised dog. Too many think the animal is fine cooped up and on poor food. Eventually, the animal gets angry and upset and that leads to uncontrolled or aggressive behavior.
- Dogs are not the problem. Pit bulls are gentle and loving until a bad human has them. Leave the dogs alone. Educate yourselves. There are many breeds which bite more than pit bulls.
- I believe the city has done very poor research on this topic. For example, the bite strength of a German shepherd is significantly worse than a pit bull and yet they are not listed as a dangerous breed. I have two non-bully breed dogs who have been attacked by a lab, a husky, and border collies, but never pit bulls.
- Pit bulls should not be discriminated against. Any dog can bite but it is the OWNER'S responsibility. If a dog has a previous record of violence, should be the only criteria in assigning harsher bylaws. Not breed!
- How about stop singling out pitbulls and bully breeds
- Breed Specific Legislation doesn't work and only punishes responsible dog owners and good dogs. Nobody calls on jack russell terriers or other dog breeds that bite at a higher consistency.
- I do not support breed discrimination, please stop calling out pitbulls if it's not an actual problem. "Nuisance" dog is just fine and covers all dogs that are high risk. Training, and then fines for irresponsible dog owners needs to be the focus here to limit incidents and hold owners accountable. The measures other municipalities have taken are not science based, they are fear based.
- All dog owners should be required to obtain basic obedience and recall training. No matter the size weight or breed
- It's not the pit bulls it's the owners if a person is too neglect to train there dog and is dangerous of course but to make everyone with a pitbull mandatory to wear muzzel is unacceptable and should not be of question learn to focus on real issues not a breed. PERIOD
- It's very disturbing that this bylaw proposal has singled out a large dog breed based on their appearance and bite POTENTIAL. There are many dog breeds with a severe bite potential and non were listed.
- No bylaw on specific breeds - unfair assumption
- Please do not use breed specific legislation. It has shown to be ineffective and discriminatory. Please try your best to not punish the dogs as much as possible. The biggest change needs to come from their guardians to be responsible with training and proper socialization.
- Mandatory training for dog owners
- Pit bulls should NOT be in the same category as nuisance dogs. Unless that particular dog was labeled a nuisance.
- Ban Pitbulls



- This is disappointing, because breed bans and restrictions don't make people safer. [personal information removed]
- Don't discriminate against pitbulls. Any dog can be aggressive if improperly trained. Every single dog should have to go through obedience training or pass a test to get licensed to be off-leash
- [removed]
- I don't believe it's the breed, take a look at the owners.
- Dispicable that breed specific regulations are being considered. ALL large breeds have the potential to cause greater damage if they bite. German Shepard's have stronger bite than pitbull for example. <https://www.mypetneedsthat.com/dog-breeds-with-strongest-bite/>. Do you research or consult with any reputable vet or trainer. Any poorly trained large breed is dangerous. If anything, you should consider the neutering rules instead. An uncut dog at a dog park poses far greater risk than any specific breed. Please do your research.
- Obedience training should be required for all breeds, not just pit bulls
- I disagree with all the above amendments. If anything, the other one I checked off would work , allowing the owner to think of alternatives for their dog, such as enlisting them in training or whatever THEY think is appropriate in improving their dogs behavior.
- Dogs should not be discriminated against based on their breed
- Absolutely none. To target an animal because of its physical characteristics is one step away from doing the same for people.
- It should be for all dogs that are known to bite just not pitbulls. For a fact pitbulls are the most loveable dog my grown children have 2 of them and they are very protective of me as im disabled i feel safe with her because she makes me feel safe when we are out.
- Strongly disagree with the pitbull classification and segregating them as a separate group. Seems to be a lot of judgement and room for interpretation especially after stating they are no more likely to bite than any other type of dog.
- i'm not a dog owner, but in general I do not support breed-specific bans or regulations. I feel like the questions above are loaded against pit bull types and going by the dogs I know that seems very unfair. I think the law should come down heavily on owners who do not train and control their dogs properly, but I've never felt threatened by a large dog - only by small crazy ones with a Napoleon complex.
- Highly reactive/dog aggressive dogs should not be allowed in off-leash parks. If your dog cannot safely be off-lead it should not be in an off-leash park.
- People who have had more than 2 incidences in which their dog has harmed another dog or human should be banned from owning a dog!
- NO breed-specific bylaws; this is not evidence-based and punishes good dog-owners for the behaviour of irresponsible dog-owners based on fear rather than statistics.
- I think there should be more support and inclusion from the city for the bully breed dogs to help take the fear and stigma away. I also think more training and responsible dog owner classes need to be provided at a more reasonable rate. Also have classes for people and children who do not have dog experience. To teach them what do in a bad situation or even how to approach a dog.



- ban pit bulls
- I agree if a dog (any dog) has been deemed a nuisance; there should be associated fines. I do not believe pitbulls should automatically be considered a "nuisance" due to their breed.
- Putting any of those restrictions because a dog barks excessively ("nuisance") is preposterous. Also, there is no evidence that pitbull type or dogs that look like pitbulls are stronger
- It is absolutely ridiculous for you guys to discriminate against breeds. It has nothing to do with the breeds and everything to do with the training and owners. I have met plenty of dangerous small dogs, discrimination is disgusting. I am ashamed of my home city for even thinking this is okay.
- Not come near the dog without permission this goes for any dog.
- None of them. Are you serious?
- STOP using pit bulls as an excuse for bad owner Behavior. Punish the owner not the "breed"
- Don't have him, greater benefit than cost
- Mandatory reporting if someone is directly affected by an at large dog in which the dog has bitten said person or their dog. Law enforcement is to fine the owner and owner and dog will need to go through mandatory training. This training process will need to be fully completed and signed off by trainer. If second offence occurs the dog will be seized and evaluated by law enforcement to see if dog exhibits any signs of not being able to be put back into society. If deemed unable to be safely intergrated back into society dog will be put down. Owner will not be allowed to own a dog for the duration of two years.
- Please be cautious about labeling specific breeds. "Nuisance" dogs can be any breed. The owner's behaviour and treatment of the dog should also be looked at seriously.
- These are all unfair and uneducated and perhaps even bigoted choices. These are animals we have choices to breed and keep in our homes as family members. The dogs are not the issue the dogs will never be the issue.
- The "pit bull" while it does have strong jaws, doesn't have nearly as powerful as a bite as Dobermans, Rottweilers, Kangals, German Shepherds, etc.... They're only used in fights because of their "mean" appearances.
- higher fines and required insurance for ANY animal deemed nuisance or possible danger to public. The dog is a product of the owner, and typically does what the owner has allowed them to do, part of obedience must be training of the owner
- Do NOT take someone's companion away, for anything shy of assault.
- Anyone who wants to own a pet should have to do some kind of socialization or obedience classes. This is prevention strategy... Dogs learn to be aggressive and I blame the owner for that.
- I do not agree with bylaws specifically targeting pit bulls. Dogs are only as aggressive as their owners and training and breeds do not matter in that case.
- The dogs aren't the problem. The bad owners are. You are just as likely to be bit by a chihuahua
- Any action should only be taken AFTER an offence and should not be breed specific. All dogs can cause harm, it is on the Owner of the animal to make sure they are trained to be in public. Dogs are animals and need to be domesticated properly, regardless of breed.



- Ban Huskies and Rottweillers which have a higher bit incident rate in Canada than “pittbull breeds” do. (Pittbull breeds aren’t a real thing by the way..)
- no more than one NUISANCE dog per household.
- PIT BULLS ARE NOT BAD DOGS. THERE ARE NO BAD DOGS ONLY BAD HUMANS. BREED HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH IT STOP TRYING TO MAKE IT SEEM LIKE ALL PIT BULL TYPE DOGS ARE BAD. IT’S THE OWNERS THAT ARE BAD.
- No specific breed of dog should be targeted. It is on the owness of the owner to see their dog trained properly. Certain breeds do have certain specific needs but that is not for the city to police. The city should obviously take action if a dog is behaving in such a manor that makes it a danger to itself or others but the solution should be removing it from its environment rather than absent mindedly blaming its breed and being too lazy to fix the issues of an irresponsible owner. TLDR: Punish [removed] owners not dogs
- Instead of looking at it in a correctional response, why not look at a proactive approach, offer assistance in training for those needing it (all dogs), and don't penalize the dog for something the owner can do better on. (I have ideas)
- Fines for people who complain frivolously
- Council seems to want to make insurance companies richer. How would insurance stop a dog bite. I would need to see how many dog bites are reported in Calgary.
- Do not target pit bulls, it is not the breed. It is the lack 9f training by an owner which happens in every breed of dog. Banning these breeds of dogs are not going to resolve anything. Are you also going to ban breeds like the Akita, various Mastiffs, Boxers, Rottweilers, Dobermans, and German Shepherds? These are all large breeds that have a tremendous bite-force. Trying to ban or put extra legislation on pit bulls is poorly thought out and reflects badly on the city
- NO BREAD SPECIFIC LEGISLATION
- maybe take a bigger approach to all dog ownership you don't put kids in foster homes without vists and insurances maybe making big dog owners more accountable before the dog becomes a nuicensne is a better approach.. ya know instead of a reactionary approach
- Don’t focus on pitbulls! Just individual problem dogs regardless of breed.
- Higher fines for all nuisance dogs, not specific to Bull Terriers
- BSL has been proven to be ineffective. Targeting pitbulls is going to accomplish nothing other than hurting families who take care of their pitbulls properly and properly train them. Just like guns, the bad people who do bad things with pitbulls (ie. dog fighting) will still have them in their homes within Calgary and this will not change the issue of dog attacks.
- If a dog causes severe injury the owner and dog must be made to go to additional training and then have to provide proof of attendance.
- ANY breed that is a nuisance (I am against banning or treating pit bulls as the only aggressive breed. It is the OWNER'S FAULT, not the dog's fault for being vicious.
- This is just pure discrimination against certain breeds. Pit bulls shouldn't be targeted.
- Dogs can be seized if owners are deemed irresponsible or incompetent in training their animal. Animal put into rehabilitation and rehome.



- I do not support specific rules for pitbull types, issues are from owners and not dogs. I believe a committee of knowledgeable individuals should make decisions on things such as interim orders and when determining a dog is a 'nuisance'. Additional measures should be taken to limit individuals' ability to have a pet who have mistreated or shown issues in raising animals in effort to place more onus on the owners and less on the dog/pet. Dog bites can be provoked by humans and this needs to be considered more in determined when dogs are nuisances
- Mandatory dog behavioural education for bylaw officers and councillors
- Laws/fines only against pit bulls are discriminatory when multiple breeds have the strength for a severe bite and the ability to "lock" their jaw. Dangerous dogs are an output of poor training not breed.
- None of these. Any dog has the ability to be considered a nuisance NOT just pitbulls and block head breeds.
- Pit Bulls are not anymore dangerous than other large breed dogs. Their jaws are no more powerful and they are no more aggressive.
- PITBULLS ARE NOT THE DANGEROUS ONES. IT'S THE OWNER AND YOUR DISCRIMINATING
- License required to purchase a pit bull. Any person who wants a pit bull or guard dog breeds need to have gone through a training course to understand the breed and training that would be required prior to obtaining the animal s in the first place.
- Leave pit bulls out of this and deal with the real problem of little dogs like yorkies and chihuahuas.
- Rehabilitation programs for dogs like people, while animals are not considered legal persons, more fault into people needs to be investigated than the breed of animal
- I support stricter fines for ALL DOGS NO MATTER OF BREED OR SIZE. I would also like to see stricter rules regarding spay and neuter. Education for owners as an owner all responsibility should fall on their shoulders. I DO NOT SUPPORT BSL it doesn't work again I would like to see education put in place for ALL DOG OWNERS BIG OR SMALL.
- I don't believe it's just pit bulls that are the problem. It's any DOG who has an owner wholsn't willing to put in the time to train the animal Properly . It's the owner's responsibility to decide if the animals safe in public areas .If more pet owners were responsible this wouldn't be a up for debate. So Why should any dog be banned when the bottom line is irresponsible pet owners . Maybe make some rules where it's harder to have a pet ? I think the petOwners need to wake up, not ban the dogs !
- Train those who have authority at the Calgary Community Standards and bylaw officers and especially police how to work with dogs and how to understand dog behavior and body language. Innocent dogs get killed by police for simply barking and protecting their home with no intention of attack.
- Non breed specific rules are a must. Owner specific rules are preferred. Owner has a three strike rule of any dog they own in a year of incidences.
- This is absolutely ridiculous!!! I have been bitten by two dogs and it was labs both times! Pit bulls are amazing dogs and maybe the owners should be the ones getting muzzled!
- Why pick on pit bulls who aren't in the top ten for biting? Education is needed for the public



- I believe this law should only be enforced on dogs that have been declared a nuisance and not on a specific breed. Many dogs can be the cause of dog bites or attacks and although it states that pitbulls have the most mouth strength they should not be judged by the breed they are. All dogs deserve a chance to prove they are not a nuisance but if they are then the rules put in place would be fair. Would never want to assume an entire breed is a nuisance if they aren't all like that.
- Discriminating against pit bulls is ridiculous. Dog owners usually have knowledge of their dog and their dog's behavior. It should be UP TO THE DOG OWNER if ANY breed of dog requires a muzzle. Imposing these rules is only going to lead to more animals ending up in shelters and euthanized. Bad call.
- The problem starts with owners. REGARDLESS of the breed, all dog owners understand the need to engage with, adequately socialize and train their animal to mitigate risk of bites. How about a program (maybe in conjunction with businesses in the pet industry) which offers free (or nearly free) annual assessments or certifications indicating socialization and behavior of a dog is within certain acceptable parameters (obviously some sort of participation incentive would be needed). Responsible pet owners are in every income bracket, so wanting to be a responsible owner should never be finance-dependant. For those who struggle with their dogs behaviour, they should be offered FREE constructive advice/tips to help with behaviour concerns, so that the owner and dog can work to achieve success. A program which aims to prevent dog behaviour problems might allow the City and dog owners to have positive interactions and establish a cooperative relationship BEFORE anything has a chance to go wrong. As well, a program like this might have the potential to identify those person/pet relationships which are consistently struggling with poor dog behaviour despite efforts to succeed – perhaps allowing an observer to determine if the problem originates with the dog or the owner long before the dog ends up on record as a problem.
- off leash areas should be fenced and away from bike paths and footpaths.
- Restrict breeding of pitbulls. Have more expensive licenses for pit bulls/ bully breeds to deter. Education should be mandatory for nuisance dog's owners,
- Owners of dogs who are repeat offenders need to take obedience training. Apply these rulings to all dogs who are a nuisance and by the by, other large breeds of dogs (german sheppards for example) have an equal, if not stronger bite force than the generic grouping of "pit bulls" as described above so unless you apply these rules to all dog breeds this is pointless. I know way more small dogs that bite and are nuisances than large dog because 99.9%of the time large dog owners know they need to do basic training with their dogs and train them, small dog owners generally dont.
- You can not group block head breeds and only pick on them as nuisance dogs. As someone that works in the veterinary industry, I can speak first hand the bully breeds are some of the best out there. If they have to wear a muzzle, why don't other large dogs have to? German shepherds for instance, or any dog for that matter as they are all capable of biting. This is picking one breed based solely off of looks. It is right in your writing that they are not the ones biting the most. It's simply due to the muscles in their face, that every dog has and every dog, regardless of breed, is capable of using. This bylaw is extremely absurd and in now way will do anything except create a fear around a dog that already has an extremely unfair stigma attached to it.



- Bully breeds can't be singled out
- None of the above
- I do not agree with any of these answers. And this information is incorrect. There are several other breeds with much higher bite pressure psi than pitbulls
- I prefer preventative actions as a priority. An insurance claim would be nice after a dog attack but I'd prefer the attack didn't happen in the first place.
- Life long ban on animal ownership if the animal is not properly cared for. The animal should be reassessed and put into a better well suited home. The animal is never to blame, only the owner. Additionally - smaller dogs are more prone to bite then larger breeds. Chihuahuas bite more frequently then any other dog.
- To stereotype pit bulls is fairly ignorant. I do not own one but have had far far more issues with huskies and shepard breeds. Although, that is a result of the owners not taking responsibility and training their dogs. Dog owners should be held criminally responsible for their dogs actions.
- You're problem is your ignorance and discrimination due to your ignornance. Perhaps look at why these dogs are involved in attacks, are the owners repeat, what type of owners are causing attacks. Training owners and not just of "nuisance dogs" but the one of the anckel biters too. Muzzeling dogs because you think just the big dogs are scary is a really shit philosophy. (Could call Muzzeling Tramatic to the dog)
- Pit bulls should be fined only if and when they are harming anyone or anything
- This is unreasonable and is an revolving dog conversation depending on era.
- Dog training requirements should apply to all dogs. However, instead of operating as a requirement for all dog breeds, outside of pitbulls, dog training should act as a fine reduction mechanisms, whereas if your dog is involved in an incident and you receive a fine, the fine should be more if you have not participated in a dog training course. Required dog training courses for pitbull ownership should be offered through city endorsed business that have the opportunity to earn licensing, and these courses need to be offered on a set sliding scale from the city that reflects income. Breeds should not be inaccessible due to fees for anyone.
- Owners with history of owning nuisance dogs should be required to enroll future dogs in obedience/ training. Education over punishment.
- The first fine should be manditory training through one of the City of Calgary Shelters. Then fines for the 2nd offense.
- Putt bulls aren't the issue and you know that's [removed]. They have a better score on the temperament test then golden retrievers and German Shepard's. Owners make bad dogs don't you pin this on pittys. You are basically being dog racist
- Breed-specific legislation doesn't work, and it doesn't reduce the the frequency or severity of dog bites. I'm strongly opposed to any measures targeting pit bulls specifically
- Training required for proper handling of all animals
- Do a background check on individuals adopting or buying a pitbull. There is no dog that is born aggressive. It's the bad owners that teach dogs to be aggressive. There has been multiple studies that have found that pitbull types breeds are on the lower side of the aggressiveness spectrum.



Individuals that own pitbull breeds need to take the time to train the dog, therefore there should be incentive to take the dog in for training.

- Can dogs be declared a nuisance because of a spiteful neighbour complaining without proof?
- All for responsible pet ownership, but not breed specific legislation.
- Obedience training should be required for ALL dogs and should be a requirement of getting a license.
- Stop targeting pit type dogs you can't identify a dog based on phenotypical characteristics and generalize behaviour -- SCIENCE and FACTS
- This is offensive!!! BSL has NO place on this ballot! All dogs can bite! No matter the size or breed!!!
- Offer dog training information for new dog owners
- Charge the owner more it's not the dogs fault the owner should have a dog if not properly trained
- A fine should suffice most times, make people learn to train their dog properly (obedience) the breed has nothing to do with the dog it has everything to do with how it is trained
- I would support many more of the above measures if "pit bulls" weren't automatically deemed nuisance dogs. If the city is to continue to treat "pit bulls" as inherently dangerous dogs, then the city should also provide strong evidence backed by well conducted research that demonstrates the higher risk "pit bulls" supposedly pose to people or other animals.
- [removed]
- I disagree with BSL. Please do not discriminate against this breed. It is the owner that is responsible not the dog. Besides you are stereotyping. Many pit bulls are gentle and very loving. Also you are discriminating against all flat ,block faced dogs. This is very unfair. Calgary was proud to be one that did nit discriminate before. Don't let dogs and Calgarians by being ignorant. Please educate yourselves and made Calgary proud. Pls do not break our trust in you.
- [removed]
- Any dog showing aggression or "Alpha" characteristics MUST be muzzled when in a public area. As well anyone owning a such do must have a solid and sucure fence towith a sucure gate to contain sugc a dog. The owner must take responsibility for such a dog. Many times the owner is more to blame for bad behavior as the dog. Proper socialization classes as a puppy is imperative. The owner should be required to show proof that this has occurred.
- Singling out pitbulls is atrocious. I was brutally attacked by a German Shepherd and hospitalized for 3 days!
- These are not violent dogs do not discriminate. It's on pet owners not the breed
- Prohibition for owners from owning future animals if repeatedly found to have nuisance animals
- None of these.
- There is no need to be breed specific if you are doing what you need to with nuisance dogs you will catch the problems without creating extras for good dogs and good people.
- Remove pit bulls from being targeted ... this is ridiculous. I had a chihuahua that was more aggressive than any pit bull I've met.
- Any dog that causes harm (not specifically only "pit bulls"), should be required to have further dog training to improve behaviour



- ANY breed of dog that causes harm should be required to be on leash or wear Muzzle if necessary. Not just pitbulls!!!!
- Dogs must be given fair judgement before being declared “nuisance”; for example: inappropriately approaching a dog resulting in a bite is not the fault of the animal.
- At what point do you make the owner responsible? This is pathetic!! Mean and aggressive dogs are TAUGHT to be that way. You people are SAD!!!!.
- Singling out a specific breed of dog just because their bite is considered more harsh is not okay... if anything their should be extra licensing and legislation for breeders and no dogs should be held responsible for the behaviour, only the owners. Obedience training should be required for any dog that has the potential to react violently if not trained properly, it's not the dog, it's how the genetics are. That being said, their should be legislations and laws put in place for how type of dogs are allowed to be bred. If the father is very reactive, it is legally not allowed to be a stud and must be fixed. OF ANY BREED.
- Obedience training required for all dogs (any breed) in the household
- Breed specific legislation should be banned. Higher fines for owners and an actual fine be put in place for aggressive dogs.
- Pitbulls should not be allowed as a breed
- Just because a dog is a "pit bull" it shouldn't automatically be lumped in with nuisance animals. Judge each animal based on its behaviour.
- There should be more reprimands against the owner of a nuisance pet than anything. It's not the dog, it's the owner.
- Ban pit bulls in Calgary.
- Fines for people provoking any dog. Punishing bad owners.
- Back ground checks for ' Nuisance' breeds. It's the dog owner that create the behaviour.
- [removed] BSL does not protect people. Stop using this type of dangerous language when referring to an entire subset of dogs. Absolutely disgusting that the City of Calgary would sink this low when there is zero evidence that this is even an issue in our neighborhoods.
- I do NOT support breed-specificity, such as for pit bulls.
- Breed-specific bans and legislation is not based on scientific evidence and creates an unnecessary stigma towards certain breeds
- I think we can't be breed specific, smaller dogs actually tend to be the aggressors. Pit bulls or other larger breeds when observed tend to ignore until such time as they can't ignore anymore. What we require is not to select a specific breed or visible characteristics but instead to speak to the unacceptable behaviours and offenses. Responsible pet owners should take their dogs to obedience training if the dog is deemed to be aggressive with NO provocation, if an aggressive dog is observed on 2 seperate occasions as being aggressive (insert very specific language to describe aggressive behaviours), that dog, not breed, will need training, etc. Sorry, this is way too general and ambiguous and it's not reasonable to treat all dogs of a certain breed one way at the exclusion of other dogs/breeds.



- The city needs to engage several dog experts before initiating all these breed specific penalties. There are many breeds far more dangerous in body size and temperament than pit bulls. Pittie paranoia has caused a lot of harm around this wonderful breed many incidents are also blamed on them when, in fact, the offending dog was not a pit bull at all. And these incidents always manage to make the front page, whereas if a different breed attacks we never hear a thing about it.
- Proof of training required for licensing of any dog over 1 year of age. That could be obtained by a recognized dog training service or evaluation of home-based training by the Calgary Humane Society, Calgary Animal Services or Calgary Bylaw Services (the evaluating staff to be properly trained).
- Let's look at the humans that have these dogs....
- I do not like bsl, I believe you guys need to implement a law that protects dogs from lazy and negligent owners. It's not just pitbulls that are affected everything to chihuahuas are neglected and have behavioural issues that should be dealt with but aren't because they're small- it's not right.
- BSL has been shown to have NO effect anywhere else. Do not impose this bull on Calgarians. Fines and training for nuisance dogs of ANY breed.
- I honestly think more vetting for adopters needs to happen to reduce the likely-hood for nuisance dogs. No dog breed is inherently violent, nuisance actions are created through fear and abuse. As well, I think it is unfair to be punish good owners for taking in possible neglected dogs even if they are declared a "nuisance", changing years of a abuse takes time. It would be more beneficial to spend resources on these families who adopt previously neglected dogs with full intention to restore them to their best state.
- When city takes dog the owner is responsible for a daily maintenance fee. Obedience training required for owners of all/each dog they own. Each person that will handle the dog must take the training. All dog owners must have in place a mechanism to compensate any victim of physical trauma.
- A better order to give when a dog bites would be that the dog must be on leash at all times and have some sort of indicator on the dog collar saying not to pet/approach. Keeping a dog cooped up will not help the dog. Owners should be punished, not dogs
- Focus should not be on the type of dog but rather the owners. Should a person wish to adopt or purchase a dog, ANY dog, that PERSON must obtain a license to ensure proper ownership and care of their pet. 'Nuisance' Dogs are the fault of the owner not the dog. To restrict the dog even more for exhibiting these behaviors is not the answer. The city, under direction from animal behaviour experts should retain the right to provide or revoke pet ownership licenses.
- some pit bulls are simply not trained properly part of the reason so many other dogs have also had violent attacks and now just the one specific breed, stop perpetuating the stereotypical understand of a pit bull
- Ban all Pit Bulls from Calgary
- STOP blaming the breed, start doing something about the owners.
- Obedience training required for all dogs
- Bylaws should not be breed specific but apply to all breeds



- All dogs or no dogs, not breed specific
- I'm very disappointed to see these highly leading questions regarding one breed/breed type rather than focusing on behavior.
- I do not have a dog, but please stop targeting the Bully breeds. All the bullies I have met are very sweet and passive. I have met more aggressive small breeds, and albeit the bite would not do as much damage, it is still unfair to target one breed. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners.
- Higher fines for repeating offenders
- Many dog owners ignore no dogs in the park signs. Not only let them in the park but some let them run free even in the water spray parks. I would like to see a higher fine for this it puts children and others in risk. I want to go to a dog free park due to children having allergies.
- Applications for dog ownership must be mandatory. (Like you would with a rescue) too many people get a dog not understanding the commitment, time and energy it takes to make them socialized, well-behaved members of the public.
- Pit bulls are not problem dogs. This is crazy to just pick one breed. They don't bite as often as golden retrievers. If you muzzle one breed muzzle them all.
- **MAKE THIS MANDATORY FOR ALL DOG OWNERS ! LETS GET AFTER [removed] DOG OWNERS!**
- No more than one nuisance dog in a household.
- Allowing anymore to have as many and whatever kinda of dog they prefer. if incidents occur the owner should be fined and have to do training
- **NONE OF THE ABOVE.** Pitbulls do not deserve to have this hated and discrimination because of the name "pitbull" it is unfair and unnecessary to pass these bylaws !!!!!
- Heavier fines for ALL dog owners with ANY AGRESSIVE dog.
- no breed specific legislation
- It's not the Type of breed of dog it's the people who raise it you people are crazy trying to charge people more for a breed is insane
- Dogs are not the problem it is owners who do not have the skill sets to own a dog. There should be a required course before a person can own a dog paid for by them.
- Obedience training for ALL dogs regardless of breed if they are declared a nuisance.
- No breed of dog should not be discriminated
- I do not support breed-specific legislation. I would support better bylaw support (presence at off-leash parks perhaps?) because many dogs that are not well socialized are let loose in offleash parks, but they aren't pitbulls. They are small, nervous dogs. Breed-specific discrimination will only hurt animals who need care.
- Pitbulls should not be treated as repeat offenders due to their potential of more forceful bite. All dogs should start with the same record, wether it be a pitbull, Bernese mountain or a chihuahua. If said dog starts to obtain a "nuisance" record they should absolutely have to start implementing obedience training, house arrest after an incident and fines if necessary. To automatically force pitbull and mixed pitbull owners to start muzzling dogs in parks and requiring obedience training when some of these animals haven't even done anything wrong is terrible. If pitbull owners are forced to abide by



these bylaws, I will gladly present the facts about other breeds of dogs, much larger, much more “friendly” as they seem, until they are not in my next petition towards the city’s animal bylaw. There are not bad dogs, just bad owners. For the love of all dogs, give them a chance before penalizing them.

- City of Calgary should have list of the features one dog needs to meet to be considered pit bull or mixt pit bull genes. Not all the Calgarians know the difference between pit bull and Cane Corso or Boxer. City of Calgary should include pamphlets with the notice for pet licence or have it available online as some Calgarians are not accustomed to different type of breeds.
- A lack of bias propaganda against a specific breed of dog. Pit bulls are no more of a threat than any other breed unless poorly trained. How about focus on the owner, NOT the dog?
- Criminal charges for repeat offender owners
- obedience training required for all dogs. Particularly large ones.
- Pitbulls should not be defined as dangerous animals in this bylaw. Any dog can be as dangerous as the human behind them.
- These rules should apply to all dog breeds not just "pitbull and pitbull like dogs"
- How about stick with the bylaws of dangerous dog designation for dogs that are PROVEN to be aggressive rather than an entire breed. Nuisance dogs sound like dogs that are getting out of their fence and wandering, not dogs that are aggressive toward people and dogs. If a dog is deemed dangerous, then they should have rules such as muzzles or no off leash parks. Breed specific legislation does not work and does not change the owners who are not responsible and reliable pet owners. Pit bulls are NOT inherently mean or dangerous. People need to take responsibility for their own dogs behaviour. Socialization and training are key with EVERY dog.
- Restrict people from owning dogs who are repeat offenders or mandatory training for all dogs who have been involved in incidents.
- Engage in legislation that looks at the responsibility of the owners, not the breed of the dog. Fines given out when dogs exhibit dangerous behavior regardless of breed.
- A Pit-bull has a bite force of around 235psi. There are many dogs with a more powerful bit. German Shepherd, Great Dane, Husky, Bull dog and the most powerful of all is a Kangil at 743 Psi.
- banning a breed of dog is not the answer!! Bas owners = bad dog. The owner is responsible for the actions of the dog. Require mandatory training with a specialist to assist in teaching the animal. Its like rehab for the dog and owner.
- People unwilling to properly train their dogs should be banned from owning or keeping animals for a minimum 5years with more than 1 offense/fine
- All dogs that bite or attack should be Fined first time, euthanized second offence. ALL dogs. Not just bully breeds.
- You can't pick one breed over another. All should be muzzled.
- set up for success packages provided by ALL humane societies and adoption agencies when a pitbull is adopted. Thorough behavioral assessments done for ALL dogs who are going through an adoption system (not just pitbulls). This should be the legal standard.



- Obedience training for all dogs, including participation for all adults and children caring for "nuisance dogs"
- I do not agree with breed specific rules. The issue is with owners not the dogs. And the assumption that a dog "looks like" a pit bull by someone that may not have any dog knowledge is unfair.
- All of these suggestions are absolutely disgusting and despicable. There is no such thing as "problem dogs" there's only problem humans. Maybe you should enforce bylaws that prevent incompetent people from owning animals. Period. This is 100% uneducated thinking and ridiculous. This is breed discrimination and is outrageously absurd. I cannot believe this is even being discussed. Give your heads a shake and educate yourselves. There are MANY other dog breeds out there that have way more "behavioural" issues than pitbulls. How about the little tiny yappy dogs that nip at people? Those are more dangerous in my opinion because small children and people think they are friendlier just because they are small, but they are 100 times more likely to bite someone. This bylaw is also helping to enforce the stupidity of people and that just because a dog is small, means they are not dangerous. OUTRAGEOUS. This is sickening.
- A test required for owners with repeat nuisance dogs so they must learn proper care and training. If they fail the test, the dog should be removed from the home. You need a licence to drive a car, perhaps it's needed for responsible pet ownership.
- This is a joke?! If the city wants to bully pit bulls they should also bully chiwawas!
- Why are you considering breed-specific by-laws? The dogs are not the problem, the OWNERS are! After biting infractions OF ANY BREED, then investigation as to cause (people can cause the biting incidents, but yet the dog gets penalized) and retraining May be required.
- Dogs that have been seized must have owners prove that there is enough space for the animal at the owner's residence. There are so many dogs who are kept in homes because everyone wants a dog but cannot provide the necessary space/care. I think if a dog has been seized, the owner must provide proof of a suitable space for the animal just like child welfare does for children placed into homes.
- You have not given enough info on the definition of nuisance. Dogs that bark are safe in public, but dogs that bite are not.
- It is UNFAIR to single out bullies!! More terrier types, are more nuisance than are the bullies type!
- All people who own a dog should take obedience training with dog. All new owners should have to pass a safety exam on basic dog ownership.
- nuisance dogs are determined on a case by case basis and have nothing to do with breed and everything to do with behavior
- All of the above questions are ridiculous. I completely support laws regarding dangerous dogs. However, the breed specific approach has been a failure for public health and causes an undue burden on innocent dogs and families. Singling out a "breed" by appearance is not scientific and inherently problematic. Disappointing for a supposed educated society to put together this biased survey and not follow the science. It is like saying everyone with red hair is more likely to love chocolate. Calgary - you can do better. Look into creating fair rules around dangerous animals - based on behavior not simply appearance.



- Consultation with veterinary behaviourist or QUALIFIED trainer required after second offence
- It should be mandatory for all potential dog owners (not just pit bulls) to be sent to obedience class so they can be taught the skills required to own a dog, regardless of the breed. The owners need to be taught to raise a well-rounded, social, responsible dog. Some dog owners appear to have limited knowledge when it comes to the training skills required. The dogs cannot continue to be blamed when they have not been taught the basic skills necessary to be a responsible member of the community. This is discriminating against the pit bull breed due to their strength. Question 8, traffic light bandanas is discriminating against the breed.
- No Breed Specific Legislation. A breed of dog should not be discriminated against. Calgary's existing responsible pet ownership bylaw is world renowned, enacting any kind of breed specific legislation is moving backwards. Pet owners should be held accountable if their dog does something. Discriminating against one breed of dog does not solve the problem, especially when the breed mentioned is not responsible for more attacks and using the vague wording of "potential of more severe bite", more severe than what? There are other dog breeds with stronger jaws. No dog should suffer a worse quality of life because they are categorized by a breed, this means nothing against the individual dog, and how they were raised.
- It's wrong to single out a certain type or breed of dog. I am familiar with the breeds you listed. The American Staffordshire is a show dog breed. Owners make bad dogs in ANY BREED
- All dogs should have requirement to be obedience trained, not just large nuisance dogs or pit bulls, ALL dogs.
- Training required for ALL dogs. Maybe try not discriminating against breeds there are plenty of other breeds that have the same or more strength than a "pitbull"
- How ridiculous wanting to pan pitbulls. Stupidest thing I've ever heard.
- Breed specific legislation is discriminatory and fueled by ignorance
- It is the owner not the dogs fault. Let's concentrate on higher fines and muzzles for nuisance people who attack people and children
- Dog owners are the responsible party not the dogs
- Owners should be fined and dogs should have to go through obedience courses / rehab courses for the owner and dog. It's not bad or nuisance dogs it's bad owners!!!!
- most nuisance dogs are not pitbulls and should be treated accordingly with the same rules
- Remove pit bull from list as many other breeds are just as strong (or stronger) regarding their bite. Also highly unlikely that a pit bull instigates a fight. I've been bitten many times by a chihuahua, never by a pit-bull.
- Training programs required for all dog owners of nuisance Dogs. People need training and education if they get a new dog or breed specific training.
- No more free bite policies. Once a dog tastes blood it cannot be trained to stop biting again.
- Please ban pit bulls and have higher consequences for owners who have pit bulls off leash in parks, playgrounds, and streets.
- ANY DOGS THAT BITES ANOTHER DOG OR HUMAN SHOULD IMMEDIATELY BE PUT DOWN
- I do not agree with any of these



- [removed]
- The owner is required to take a course on how to be a better pet owner. Not only should the dog receive training but the owner should receive training on top of this
- Leave bully breeds alone
- No specific breed should be singled out. I have been attacked by a chihuahua and a spaniel but never a pit bull. There is a huge difference between a dangerous dog and a barking nuisance dog?
- I do NOT support breed specific restrictions. If a dog proves over multiple offences to be a problem then that specific dog and owner should be treated accordingly
- Singling out Pit Bulls is not the solution, any dog can be a bad dog, it all relies on the training and ownership.
- Parks and Recreation MUST address the issue of dogs in parks that are NOT dog parks. I regularly watch owners allow their dogs to use a park where families are having picnics and children are running and falling on grass that a dog has just used. It makes me want to throw up..
- I adamantly do not support breed specific bylaws
- How about some owner responsibility, it is not the dog that is the problem, it is 99% owner fault, education for owners who get a rescue dog no matter what breed, and fines for owners who train their dogs to be aggressive or they are abusive to their animals. Pit bulls are not the problem, it is the owner
- All of these measures are borderline insane, get your heads out of your [removed]
- Owners who have been involved in attacks should be assessed for home environment of animal (i.e., potential abuse).
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household. (This option was not given as a choice without including breed specific option.)
- These proposed rules about 'Pit Bull Type' dogs are not based on research. Any dog can cause injury, and your proposal saying pit bull type dogs can cause further injury is based on biased opinion, not science. And the arbitrary powers given to bylaw (this is coming from a law enforcement officer - not bylaw) the unilateral ability to take someone's dog based on their opinion of a 'look' of dog is awful and disgusting. This is a blatant abuse of power. And to allow people to only own one? What would you propose they do with the other(s)? Fill up shelters further? This idea is disgusting.
- Ability for Nuisance dogs to rehabilitate and have the nuisance tag removed
- Do not punish dogs who have done nothing wrong. If a dog/owner breaks a bylaw that is when these additional measures should be put in place.
- Your focus should be on "nuisance" dogs, NOT pit bull and pit bull type dogs. Similar legislation in multiple jurisdictions has proven ineffective! There are no more "bad" pitties than any other breed. It has become fashionable for municipalities/provinces to pass these unfair regulations, causing a great deal of concern and anguish for responsible pet owners. Enforcement of such bylaws is costly and ineffective. If anything, owners of "nuisance" dogs should be required to train/retrain their dogs, if they are to be returned to them. I know several veterinarians who are strongly opposed to BSL, and I am too. DON'T PAINT ALL "PIT BULL TYPE" DOGS WITH THE SAME BRUSH!! HUMANS HAVE GIVEN THEM THIS UNJUSTIFIED REPUTATION BY USING THEM FOR



ENTERTAINMENT. It's time to stop blaming these poor dogs and deal with the actual issues of reckless owners.

- No breed specific rules are acceptable. City council should not be wasting time and taxpayer dollars on this.
- Take the breed out of the legislation and focus on dangerous dog of any breed.
- After a dog of any breed bites, they must then be muzzled in public, including off leash parks.
- For animals that are a 'nuisance' it could be due to separation anxiety or past trauma. These should be taken into account when dealing with them. As they are more emotional, they need more care and understanding.
- It seems that nuisance dogs are being conflated with dogs that have bitten or may bite. A dog may run at large a lot and/or may bark a lot but may never bite. Dogs that have bitten a human should maybe be put under the restrictions above, but once that line is crossed, the dog will probably bite a human again. At this point it should be euthanized.
- Breed specific legislation has been proven over and over to be ridiculous and inadequately enforceable. Judge the deed not the breed
- Ban pit bulls and nuisance dogs altogether.
- The dog's owner is responsible for a dog's behaviour. Owners should have training if required and children/ young people should be educated on basic signs to look out for in a dog, such as when they are nervous and when to leave a dog alone.
- Fines and possible criminal charges can be brought against an owner. Pet societies must determine root cause of behaviour and the dog is destroyed as a LAST resort.
- Pit bulls are dogs similar should be treated the same as every other dog breed. Shame on the city for trying to be racist against a specific dog breed.
- Regardless of the dog breed, owners be fined \$1000 for first offence, \$5000 for second offence. It is NOT an issue with the dog. It is an issue with the OWNER!!!
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. Only dogs that have history of offences and have been declared a nuisance.
- These options NEED to be done for ALL dogs, and fines towards the owner not just the animal. Trainers and owners of these Bully Breeds are only aggressive or can become aggressive when not trained properly. I do not believe pit bulls should be isolated any dog can bite or become aggressive.
- Pit bulls should not be declared nuisance dogs! I have seen more small dogs bite children in my local park than any other. Tiny yappy dogs are the problem. Not big loving pitbulls
- Of nuisance is noise I can't agree - people complain about everything. If a dog has bitten / attacked then not allowed in off leash I agree with.
- I think all dog breeds can be a nuisance NOT just PIT BULLS. If you know your dog is being a nuisance then they should be muzzled.
- Focus should be on the owners if offense is committed fine plus mandatory training course for owner
- I am very disturbed and disappointed by you using specifically pitbulls and presenting it forward for the public input. As you state clearly above there is no evidence, fact, or stats supporting pitbulls being higher offenders when it comes to biting. They are simply the media's focus right now, and



this further perpetuates the stigma against this breed. All dogs are dangerous and can bite, with owners who are irresponsible, it doesn't have anything to do with specific breeds. REMOVE this!

- Fines for owners who have dogs off leash in areas requiring a leash
- None of this should be pit bull specific. There should also be mandatory pet/owner training after any offence.
- All dogs should have the same rules, DO NOT condemn one breed or type of dog. I know chihuahua's that are more dangerous than Pit Bulls. It's usually the owner, not the dog that is the problem
- pitbulls are not the problem. Any dog will be aggressive if trained that way.
- You cannot blame an animal for how they are breed or raised. Where is the accountability to the owner.
- I do NOT agree with breed specific by-laws and think that increased fines have a disproportionate affect on the poor.
- I hope you all collectively get your heads out of the "sand"
- Muzzles for pitbulls is ridiculous. Blame the owner not the breed.
- Additional breed specific regulations are not in the best interest of the city and should not be pursued
- BSL legislature is just wrong. My neighbors german shepard is aggressive and a nuisance. My pitbull is well balanced and a calm companion. Its not the breed it is the owner!!!
- None....
- Please do not make your bylaws breed specific. It is akin to racial profiling. Not all bully breeds are a manace. Please make it nuisance specifi to the dog and teach the owners to control their pets
- I do not support any bylaws or enforcement that singles out entire breeds
- ALL dogs. NOT breed specific
- NO BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS. DOG LIVES MATTER
- Quit targeting and discriminating against bully breeds ya meat heads. It's the owners not the breed any dog can bite and do harm to someone.
- All these fines target and label "bully breeds" as if they were born that way. It's [removed]
- Two strike policy for nuisance dogs leading to them being put down.
- Punish the owner NOT the breed
- NOT BREED SPECIFIC. There are many other dogs that are stronger/worse than pit bulls. Fine the owner, don't fine the dog.
- why are you targeting pit bull breeds? Any breed can be dangerous! Maybe the city needs to teach that too the public!
- I support the above for all breeds. I do not believe BSL works and it has been shown in many cases to be a huge waste of time and resources. It makes me sad that our great city is even considering this.
- If you want to implement changes they should be across the board and non-discriminatory. I have been bit by both large and small dogs both drawing blood and neither of them in the 'pit-bull' category. If anything implement changes and follow up on people who are unfit animal owners. This



does not address the problem Pet owners but instead targets a group of animals and likely owners who take responsibility for their pets.

- NO BYLAWS SHOULD BE REFERRED TO THE SPECIFICS OF BREED OF ANIMAL! IF THATS THE CASE WE SHOULD BE AFRAID OF OR FIRE EVERY POLICE OFFICER BECAUSE A FEW WERE CONVICTED OF POLICE BRUTALITY. A STANDARD OF PRECEDENT NEEDS TO BE SET THE SAME FOR PEOPLE AS YOU ARE TRYING WITH EVERYTHING ELSE
- I think that ALL dog owners should have to do obedience training with their newly adopted or purchased dog. Any breed can turn on someone and become a nuisance if not properly trained. The onus is on the human being. It is never the dogs fault!
- Ban all Pitbulls
- Certain breeds should not be treated differently because of the breed it should be behavior based only
- Separating pit bulls in this case is atrocious. Violent dogs should be trained properly and their owners looked at. Type of dog doesn't matter here one bit.
- I am concerned that breed-specific bylaws are being considered. In my experience with my own dog in off-leash parks, I have NEVER had an incident with a pit bull as defined above. Instead, I have had aggressive encounters from poodles, collie-mixes, shepherd-mixes... In other words, it is not a particular breed that is a problem. The problem is owners that are inattentive or completely unaware of the danger their off-leash and out-of-control dog poses. The focus must be on education of an individual dog's behaviour, not a particular breed. [personal information removed]
- Having a pet is responsibility of the owner. If the dog doesn't know how to behave in public areas they can stay at home. Owners shouldn't pay for more insurance only because its a pit bull. Any kind of dog could bite you, people should understand that pitbulls are great dogs and they are not evil the owner is the one how shows how the dog to behave.
- I really don't think it's the pitt bull breed , there are many more breeds with the same strength as a pitt bull . Its the owners responsibility to raise kind dogs, and if a dog is too over protective (its a natural instinct) the dog owner should take ownership of that behavior and take precautions like not going to off leash parks , have the dog wear a muzzle on leash and off leash in public .
- ° Ban "Backyard Breeders" & heavily fine those who breed irresponsibly. ° Bylaw should release annual reports on how many animal welfare complaints were attended to and what was done. °Regularly check on 'nuisance' dogs and their conditions - Accidents happen, but careless ownership should NOT be allowed.
- Ban Pit Bulls - They are not required to boost the ego of their owner. Get a dog that is more amenable to other dogs and to people other than their owners. Do not own a dog that can cause serious injury to people in your own household or to your neighbours or their pets.
- The owners should get proper training and muzzling. The dog is not the problem it is the owners. I DO NOT support the classification of "nuisance dogs". All dog owners should be required to goto training and obedience school. This should be free and provided by the city.
- Pit bulls are the not a problem breed and all of these rules you want to put in place are just wrong. Small dogs cause more problems then pit bulls



- Stricter penalties and restrictions on the owners of these dogs, as well as the breeders of these dogs. The dog is not to blame, rather, the owners for failure to be responsible pet owners.
- All dogs should be required to have completed basic obedience training (however free or reduced price sessions should be provided to low income owners so that there is not a restriction on owning dogs for socioeconomic reasons)
- Instead of going the breed specific route, why not increase the fines if the dog has a bite pressure of more than 200 psi, or require an additional license for dogs that have a bite above that psi
- I take offence to the pit bulls being classed as a nuisance dog. There are other breeds, Germany shepherd, Rottweiler, Chihuahua, Akita and many more. Maybe put more restrictions on the breeders and who they sell their puppies to.
- I believe breed specific legislation is unjust. The responsibility for the dog belongs to the owner.
- I think any incidents have specific details that can't be generalized.
- Pit bulls are loving pets and should not be treated differently. I have known many Australian shepherds who bite than I do pit bulls. I love Australian shepherds as well. Just because a larger child has more ability to hurt the younger ones doesn't mean we should treat them differently. Training for all dogs with issues makes sense. But the fear that people have towards pit bulls is what causes the stress for the poor dog. They are acting on energy we put out.
- Breed restrictions are an awful and often useless endeavor. Please deal with dog owners and not breeds or how a dog look.
- Stop singling out one breed of dog, there are many dogs in this size and strengthen category.
- Not only training for the dog but owners should also be licensed to own a pitbull after they pass mandatory training. Have off leash parks designate hours for nuisance/pitbulls.
- Owners should be required to go to classes to understand how to properly train and manage an animal and understand why they behave the way they do in difference circumstances
- **It is important to note that "Pit Bull" type dogs DO NOT have the strongest bite. There are two other breeds that have a stronger PSI bite than bully breeds. I am at a loss as to why those breeds are not listed here? This is supposed to be about safety is it not? Please do your research, ignorance kills family pets!!! There have been more killings, maulings and attacks by Husky and Husky type dogs in Canada in the last 60 years than any other breed! Yet here we are again, fear mongering. Shame on you Calgary!
- I STRONGLY disagree with the assumptions being made about 'pitbulls' or 'similar looking' dogs (I hope you're not serious). These are awfully primitive concepts. Horses are 'strong' and have far more power to inflict serious damage -- are we going to ban them too? How about a German Shepard, these 100 lbs+ dogs aren't stronger than a 45 lbs. 'Pitbull'? The police use them for exactly that reason, but hey, lets just selectively turn the other cheek and let citizens own as many as they want (with no training required might I add). Talk about flawed logic. It's not the City's place, nor right to determine what type of dog a Calgarian owns.
- Penalizing pit bulls for being strong doesn't seem fair. You stated they aren't involved in more bites than other breeds. You don't penalize a world class boxer or fighter simply because they have the capability of inflicting harm. That's not just.



- None, you just target a specific kind of dogs, it's all dogs or no dogs. And small dogs bite more people than big dogs.
- Take pit bulls and nuisance dog out of the same question, you do well to separate them up until that point, many dogs are mixed and have pit bull in them to say you can't have 2 in the same house is ridiculous
- The term "nuisance dog" is too broad as anything can be considered nuisance by someone. Also, most people would never be able to pick a pit bull or pit bull like breed from a line-up of similar dogs. When people are afraid, all dogs look like pit bulls. Investigating so-called nuisance claims takes too much time as it is when often the claims have no real basis. Breed-specific by-laws have not been successful in any other country or city and have been or are in the process of being repealed. Dog bites also should be thoroughly investigated, i.e. did the bite occur as the dog was trying to protect its litter or owner, was it being teased, etc. In these cases it is the "victim" who was at fault, not the dog or the dog's owner. I certainly would like a dog to protect me and my property should an occasion rise. I used to breed Alaskan Malamutes and told new people that they were fine but not to hug/touch me unless I gave a permission and never had any problems with mine. In fact, had a male of mine severely injured by a Golden Retriever cross that came out of nowhere and attacked in a off-leash park when mine was in the process of being leashed as we were leaving.
- Breed specific rules help no one. Any breed can be a nuisance or a solid citizen. Language in bylaws must reflect that.
- This bylaw is bogus. You can't single out an entire "race" if you even want to call it that. What will be the definition of a "pitbull" type dog. Anything with a big head and sticky legs. Give your head a shake... As an owner of two dogs, having to muzzle them in public and an unfair cruelty that they should have to deal with and why, because there head is a little bigger, or there bodies are a little stockier. So because is the way they look, they are forced out of dog parks? Because of how they look! This is an insane bylaw that needs to be re-evaluated and thrown in the garbage. VERY disappointed in calgary and the lack of sympathy between dog owners and their dogs. A lot of us rely on our let's for comfort in tough times and this bylaw is going to create a lot of heart ache and emotions that could be avoided. GIVE YOUR HEAD A SHAKE CALGARY!
- training to the people with dogs that act out. it is not the dog it's the owner.
- it is the owner not the breed!
- Nuisance dogs must be spayed/neutered.
- please don't mandate by breed or appearance... so many dogs will be abandoned if people need additional insurance etc.
- Stop Backyard Breeders and Gives them a minimum \$1000 dollar fine when caught!
- I fail to see how targeting one specific breed of dog (to which you definitely are) will help. I would say you should make training mandatory for all dog owners instead of singling one breed out.
- [removed]
- Stop with the Pitbull attack. Any dog can be vicious, it's how they are raised and also background of the dog. Have had many in my lifetime and non have ever attacked or bit. Don't ban or outlaw no dog. Heavier fines is all to the owner.



- Don't be discriminate against the breed.
- This is ridiculous. I read through the entire "what we heard report" and not once was pit bull mentioned. Then I read through the verbatim reports and the comments where pit bulls were mentioned were very uneducated and presumptive. You mention bite strength - but if you're going to single out dogs for size or "looks", then what about bull mastiffs? Or rottweilers? The dogs are not the problem. I don't understand why Calgary wants to go backwards on this - BSL has been shown not to work in many other municipalities, and Calgary has been considered the leader in responsible pet ownership. I'm all for giving Community Standards officers additional authority, and I feel like rather than punishing the dog because of how they look, maybe do a better job of controlling the availability of the dogs in the first place. Backyard breeders should be banned, selling of dogs through pet stores should be banned. Anyone wanting to adopt a breed who could potentially have aggression or dangerous tendencies should maybe go through additional screening. I say all of this as the victim of a dog bite, I was attacked by a family dog while playing fetch with a ball, a standard game, and there are none of the breeds listed above in this dog. I required eleven stitches just above my eyelid and came very close to losing an eye. But I don't judge every dog that looks like the one that attacked me, because every dog is different. I'm really disappointed that this is even being discussed by the City of Calgary.
- BSL is [removed], I have owned bully breeds and when properly trained and cared for, as with ANY domesticated pet, are just like any other dog. As for muzzled, they tend to cause fights because the dog in the muzzle can be targeted by other dogs (I've witnessed it firsthand many times). Dog bites, any breed, should be dealt with on a case by case basis and the owners need to be punished, not the animal. Hate breeds hate, and a loving structured home breeds great pet pets regardless of breed or species.
- Nothing should be breed specific. I believe there should be fines for dogs, case by case.
- Quit trying to dog discriminate
- Dogs (not just bully breeds) & owners should be held accountable. If you raise fines for pit bull breeds it should be for all dog breeds if you're that concerned
- I think its unfair your stereotyping pitbull like dogs. All the pitbulls I have come into contact with have been well mannered and well behaved. You don't stereotype people and then tell them that they will not be allowed in Calgary. People need to be educated and be held responsible for their dog. For instance we had a family dog who had an anxiety disorder. She never bit a person but because we new her issue we opted not to take her to dog parks or walks in public because we didnt know how she would react to situations.
- Obedience training for owners specifically. It's not the breed, rather the owner at fault.
- Fines for nuisance humans that own the dogs. Retarded how idiots think it's the dogs fault....breed does not define behaviour. Racist teach racist. Human or animal. Pitt bulls are not the issue. A chihuahua bite can cause just as much nerve damage, as well as a poodle. Get facts straight.
- Please do not consider any breed specific legislation. It has not proved effective elsewhere and causes so many more problems than it attempts to solve. Aggresive dog incidents should be taken



seriously but it can be any breed of dog. Don't punish the innocent to try and fix the aggressors. Deal with these issues on a case basis vs biased legislation based on what a dog looks like.

- These regulations should not be breed specific. The correlation between dog behaviour is linked largely to that of the owner and the importance of training and socialization. If this is not done accordingly any dog can become a nuisance or violent regardless of breed.
- I support none of the measures suggested..
- To single out the breed is wrong, the owner is the one to be charged as they are responsible for training and socializing the dog, the breed you are targeting is wrong all dogs large and small have the same potential to do harm, you should be targeting the individual who is responsible for improper handling of the dog and find a way to enforce it not make the animal pay for human error
- No! Remove this breed specific bylaw! This should not even be considered!
- BSL is useless and drives good citizens out of your city
- should not be limited to pitbull type breeds. owners are responsible for dog. If you want the dog to be responsible for its actions why do people have the term Owner? Maybe the city needs to do more to provide dog placement laws and Sessions in regards to all breeds to make sure dog is suitable for placement like at the SPCA
- Instead dog training, I do believe the real problem is with irresponsible owners, maybe owners should be trained.
- More training for the owners of Pit Bulls. Owners are often the problem given how they interact with their dogs.
- ALL DOGS need to be on a leash in public even small breeds. Smaller breed dogs have been shown to be more aggressive than "pit bulls!"
- Get rid of them
- Mandatory training for all dog breeds
- BSL legislature is proven not to work. Bully breeds are no more vicious than any other breed.
- No prejudice against Pit bulls!
- I do not support any of these
- once a dog receives a fine even barking for any reason then the dog is declared a nuisance
- maybe instead of going after dogs whose only crime is being born a specific breed. go after the irresponsible owners. a dog bites for reasons other than being vicious. fear, defending themselves.
- This should be assessed on a case by case. Pit bulls are not a bad breed! It's disgusting that you are singling them out. Owners of all breeds should be held accountable for their pets behaviour but not specifically pit bulls or bully breeds. Please reconsider and re-evaluate a law that discriminates against an already struggling and misunderstood breed. Calgary is so much more forward thinking than this! We love going to the dog park and we can't imagine it being a place where not everyone is welcomed.
- dog training for all dog owners.
- Harsher fines for owners of dogs involved in bylaw offences. Higher cost of pet licence for owners of pit bulls.



- The fact that Calgary is considering BSL is disgusts me. I am ashamed to live in a city that is considering discrimination against an animal for their owners behaviors. Education and training are the only tools that work and should be the only solutions we are considering. I'm also disappointed there are no options above to cover vicious animals, which should really be our main concern. The options are misleading, as you only name nuisance dogs, not vicious.
- With regards to put bull type dogs, I'd cap it at 2 per household. I don't think 1 is a fair max. Idea is to stop irresponsible owners and dog fight rings, etc., not arbitrarily limit specific breed ownership.
- The word nuisance, before any type of questionnaire should be thoroughly explained. Trying to answer a questionnaire when you have not explained the definition of nuisance is misleading, at best. Any animal that bites or is considered a nuisance must attend extensive obedience and dog and people socialization classes. This must be proven to the courts. Once this has been proven to the courts, fines should be dismissed. If owners of pets do not attend classes with the dogs, seizing the dog should be considered. Any dog owner that does not follow the set out rules about training their dog after a dog bite should be prohibited from owning any other dog.
- You can't blame a specific breed. Its the owners that have not done the research and put in the time to traine a dog. Smaller dogs bite and attack just as much as a big one.
- Please dont discriminate against pitbulls
- Mandatory course in dog handling/training for owners of 'nuisance' dogs. Educate the PEOPLE. It's almost never a dog problem, it's almost always a person problem.
- I feel this is SO WRONG I find it funny how you only ever hear about the pit bull bites. I have heard about 10 dog bites in the last month and not one of them were pit bull related and not one of them were on the news. Why does the media only target one breed [removed]. You are all singling out one breed this isn't fair.
- Required obedience training should be subsidized as necessary, so that it doesn't become a threat to the health/wellness of dogs & owners who can't afford the additional cost.
- Rottweilers have a stronger bite force then any bully breed. Also fines and everything should be based on prior attacks from said dog and unwillingness to help the problem by the owners
- Not all pit bulls are nuisance dogs, some may have the right owner and be trained. However, for those that are, there should be consequences and we need to ensure the owners of these dogs are going to follow though. It's one thing to fine the owner if their dog is a nuisance, but that won't stop the dog from doing it again.
- Potential owners need to go through a screening process with breeders to ensure a good match as well as competence level.
- Behavioral remediation course and possibly a surrender program for extremely aggressive dogs that cannot pass additional training
- Obedience training required for all dogs
- Standardized fines for offences but increased fines for repeat offenders.
- I DO NOT SUPPORT BSL FOR ANY BREED. This is not the answer stricter fines for any dog that bites and owner education for ALL BREEDS no matter of size.



- I think it's absolutely ludicrous that the city would single out one breed of dog like this. Pit bulls are the absolute sweetest dogs. Very disappointed to see this.
- Why are pitbulls being signalled out here? All dog breeds can be dangerous and a nuisance depending on it's training.
- I do not agree with singling out a breed of dog. I know a number of people who have been bitten by smaller untrained dogs than I do pit bulls. You need to focus on owner training requirements not the breed of the dog.
- Why are pit bulls signaled out? That seems discriminatory. Lots of dogs bite.
- No breed-specific legislation. Hold owners accountable for the behaviour of dogs, regardless of breed. If a dog injures a person, charge the owner as though they had injured the person.
- This pit bull bylaw is ridiculous. Over and over breed specific laws have been shown to be non effective and increase fear in people. Anyone who has ever been around a pit bull knows most of them, like most dogs, are loving and sweet. I have more fear of small dogs biting than pit bulls. Do your research.
- I'm very strongly against breed specific laws, often it is not a breed that is the problem it is the specific dog and have seen problem/nuisance dogs of all breeds and sizes.
- Mandatory approved six sided containment for Pit Bulls, approved leashes and collars for Pit Bulls, age appropriate handling for Pit Bulls
- Stronger animal abuse/ neglect penalties
- I believe that proactive enforcement or education is key, otherwise we are reacting to events. I would like to see more monitoring in dog parks or on paths. In 10 years, I've never seen enforcement in Calgary proactively monitoring heavy pet traffic areas.
- Special licensing requirements for owners that has accountability and serious consequences for noncompliance. Perhaps something similar to a gun license??
- This should not be breed specific! What about German Shepard's if you want to talk about proven jaw strength in bites!
- This is ridiculous. Pit bulls or any of the dogs mentioned are not inherently more violent than any other dog. The owner is responsible for the violence of their dog.
- As a dog groomer I have seen misance dogs. None of them have been pit bulls and your choice to single them out disgusts me to say the least. Breed specific legislation is unfair and absolute crap. I used to take my dogs to dog parks, no more, because of irresponsible owners, not dogs. owners are the problem, not dogs.
- I do not support BSL bylaws. They target and single breeds due to their appearance, not the behaviour displaced. Edmonton removed their BSL in 2013. It seems Calgary is moving backward. Truly disappointing
- Dog breed should not be targeted to specific behaviors. Those behaviors happen in all dogs and require owner training. Provide a mandatory training for dogs that are licensed in Calgary.
- Do not think should specify pit bulls as aggressive
- Breed specific laws do not work and just hurt the owners and dogs that follow the rules.



- what the hell? My dogs are not a nuisance. I have 2 pitties actually and I am a responsible owner. I don't even take my pitties to dog parks because people are stupid.
- Any dog that had been in an incident should be labelled a nuisance dog and those owners should be held more responsible and have to take the appropriate actions to correct that dogs behaviour
- Pit bulls are NOT THE PROBLEM. Its the owners. EVERY dog should go to obedience training. Singling out one breed is not the answer. Ensuring owners are educated and well trained IS the answer...Dogs aren't innately bad, bad owners make dogs bad.
- Owners of dogs deemed a nuisance need to be required to complete a training course and provide proof of completing same. Inexpensive training could be provided through the city which could include local, credible trainers in communities across the city. If there is a concentration of nuisance dogs in a certain area, provide more opportunities for inexpensive training and target advertising in that area.
- Owner knowledge and training need to be key! Dogs follow their humans, humans need to understand the behaviours of animals and there should be a certification in dog knowledge and training to own a dog.
- Dogs that have a history of exhibiting dangerous behaviours should be muzzled, but not based on breed, just behaviour. Have been bitten by small dogs, but never big ones.
- Leave the animals alone. It is not their fault, only the irresponsible owners
- Maybe a report line for bites or other concerns.
- BSL has been proven wrong. Stop with the discrimination against pitbull and similar breeds. The "nuisance" dogs are what you should go after no matter the breed. Increase fines for dogs that become a nuisance. Its the owners fault and they should have to pay. Along with fines the owner should have to go to obedience classes and if that doesn't change then take their right to own a dog away.
- owners of nuisance dogs must take dog handling/training course.
- Pit bulls are not a problem. All dogs have problems so focus on ALL dogs that and that they ALL can bite. Do some research and be educated instead of ignorant.
- Pitbulls should be treated as any other breed in Calgary. They are by far one of the sweetest breeds out there and shouldn't be under the spotlight. They rank an 8 on the strength of their bite and even stated above. Do not bite more than any other breed.
- "Pit bulls" are not the problem. What year are we in here? People need to become educated!
- [removed]
- No bans, no muzzles. Fines for terrible dog owners and if dog owners are found to be overtly horrible with bans on them owning dogs again. The dogs are not the problem. The owners are. If a dog bites, and the owner has done nothing to tee es aun the dog, they don't deserve dogs.
- NO BSL, PUNISH OWNERS NOT BREEDS
- targeting a specific set of breeds based on phenotypical characteristics has been proven a failure the world over - Look to Australia [personal information removed]
- THERE ARE NO BAD DOGS ONLY OWNERS! DONT PUNISH THE BREED PUNISH THE HUMANS. LEAVE PITBULLS ALONE.



- both the homeowners and the dogs should be going to obedience training ... and the owners should be expected to show that they are worthy and responsible . higher fines for the owners irresponsibility . the dog is actually a victim in these situations. And on another note maybe bylaw officers should be educated better to distinguish between a nuisance dog and a dog that is a danger to the public. Because people will lie :)
- Pit bulls should not be targeted that is coive been bitten before but never by a pittty. mplete [removed].
- Fine people, discipline people, make pet owners responsible for their dogs actions.
- Any dog involved in a human bite incident to be muzzled in public. More bylaw officers and extending hours in catching owners, both- using non offleash areas ex. Neighbourhoods for cats, or schoolyards with dogs- & walking around with their dogs offleash (as well as higher fines per listed above- this has become a very huge problem in neighbourhoods *especially during non bylaw operation hours and I don't want to waste 911's time).
- Ban irresponsible dog owners form owning, breeding or selling an animal. Big fines if they dont comply.
- Provide training for all dog owners, all breeds. Blame the owners not the dogs. Let those breeds live a life in peace! Leave the bully breeds alone!
- You state yourself that pit bulls are not involved in more bites than any other type of dog, so why makes all the new by laws about them. There are many other dogs that can and do the wax act same damage as a pit bull and they aren't mentioned here at all. This whole plan is absolutely ridiculous.
- No more higher fined this isn't a concentration camp
- The options seem to specifically target pitbull type dogs where as there's no scientific evidence to say that any type of dog breed is the worst behaved. Deciding to pass laws on dogs that fall under a physical look that laymen could construe as pitbull whether it was or not is unfair and risking demonizing a breed that already has un fair reputation. There should be no passing of any breed specific laws as they have been proven to not work and simply damages undeserving dogs and families based on physical descriptions. Breed specific legislation is ghoulish. Pitbulls make great pets and are no worse or better than Goldens, labs and other breeds legislators never seem to pick on. All dogs require training and this law doesn't seem to address the likelihood for any dog to be problematic based on human ignorance and shotty dog ownership.
- Absolutely ridiculous ignorant to target any breed there are many breeds that are more powerful and capable of causing injury or harm to anyone.
- No breed specific policies.
- Don't be breed specific. If a dog is a problem it isn't limited to one breed.
- Dog behaviour is resultant of owner behaviour. For dogs declared a "nuisance," investigation of at-home rituals would be important. Having dog trainers/behaviourists recommend adjustments in owner behaviour would help many cases. Follow up to ensure owners are making necessary changes.
- This is so unfair and makes no sense at all stop bullying my bully



- Why are you singling out a specific breed? Lots of municipalities have implemented breed specific laws in the past and the results are pretty overwhelming in that they do not work. Only evidence based policies please!
- Higher fines for dog attacks where the victim is a minor
- Please stop dog fighting rings and apply fines to owners who are a nuisance and don't properly train and socialize their dogs or deal with the dogs issues
- I am extremely disappointed with the options above. Has anyone involved in this survey actually researched BSL and/or the term "pit bull"? I assumed the city of Calgary would have done some due diligence prior to developing the survey.
- Children shouldn't be taking grown pitbulls for walks without an adult. They are hard to control. We had a bite incident where the child lost control of her dog, and dog bit our aunt.
- There is no reason to limit a "pit bull" any more than any other dog, the dog is not the problem. Shepards are more likely to bite than pit bulls and also have a stronger bite for instance. Do your research, I did. There are many myths out there about pit bulls but really its the owners who are the problem. Some people should not be allowed to own dogs. I say punish the owner of the offending dog, not the dog unless the dog cannot be rehabilitated. Pit bulls are not nasty by nature , only our perception of them is. If you ban them or treat them any different than other breeds you will be wrong in your assumptions.
- Breed specific legislations are horrible. I am ashamed my city is even considering this. It's one thing to enforce these rule son dogs with past aggressive episodes. But breed does not mean the dog will be aggressive.
- Absolutely none of the above
- Leave pitbulls alone.
- I do not support BSL (breed specific legislation).
- If a dog, regardless of breed, has a history of violence their owners should be held accountable and requires to attend training and or be banned from off leash areas where they are not under control of their owners. Rules should not be breed specific. I find small dogs are let away with more because they are small but most the time they are the problem and less likely to be well trained. There needs to be ow through and regular checks of dogs that are determined to be a nuisance
- Give your head a shake, bully breads are not the issue. Irresponsible owners are!
- None you shouldn't label a dog because of their breed
- Not all put bulls are mean!! What about the other breeds? What about the ignorant owners who don't give a [removed]?
- specifically targeting the bred of nuisance dog is incorrect, the owner must be held accountable for their irresponsible actions or lack of training for their dog (of any breed). \$250 fine for a nuisance dog is not a deterrent. \$1,000.00 plus vet/medical costs would be a start. Why do people continue to speed, because the fine for continuing to speed is not significant enough to make them stop. Pit bulls can be a very gentle dog, we continually skirt responsibility and blame the animal. Shouldn't be the case. We are to blame for their behaviours, time to take the blame ourselves.

- These ideas are vague and unfair. You clearly state that pitbulls are not involved in more bite offences than other breeds, but have the power to do so. German Shepherds, Huskies, and Sled Dog mixes are often involved in serious bite incidents. By limiting pitbulls, you simply move bad owners onto other powerful breeds, such as Rottweilers, Cane Corso's, German Shepherds, etc. This ban accomplishes nothing. Requiring higher insurance, and obedience training for nuisance dogs is more than acceptable, unless involved in a serious incident.
- The pet parent is required to go to training. You need to fix the humans, the dogs are good.
- There should not be special regulations for different types of dogs. It is not the government place to infringe on someone right to own a pet based on breed.
- [removed]
- This should NOT be breed specific. We are in 2020 not 1920 ANY breed of dog can cause harm.
- Muzzles for people who think "pit bulls" are bad dogs.
- By "nuisance" I hope you mean nuisance dogs of ALL breeds, not just ones that "look like pitbulls". I also think that the City needs to ensure they are correctly categorizing a dog's breed based on quantifiable evidence (DNA testing) as opposed to what different people think looks like a pitbull breed. Finally, ALL dogs should be required to undergo puppy and obedience classes - there are plenty of obnoxious small dogs who start fights from their poor behaviour, but it's always the bigger and/or "aggressive" dog breeds that get blamed.
- My dog was attacked by a pyrenees that lives across the street. Absolutely nothing was done to the owners of that dog, and I am now having to put my sweet dog down because of this attack. Nothing was done. But you now want to go after pitbulls? So a pyrenees killing my dog would have only garnered your attention if it had been a pitbull?? I'm frankly disgusted with the bylaw office that I pay taxes towards.
- None of the above, have dogs go to specialist training who are certified in REACTIVE DOGS TRAINING.
- Ban pit bulls from Calgary
- I dont feel like pitbulls or their owners should face any harsher punishment than other breeds. I think all dog owners big and small have a responsibility to be able to control their dogs behaviour and make adjustments to what they allow their dog to do big or small depending on their behaviour.
- Quit singling out pit bull breeds ,,,, it's not the breed it the owners ,,, so you'd like to punish this particular breed because why ??? This the the most disgusting bylaw if it goes through ,, why not have all animals muzzled ? But you pick on one breed (there are other dogs that bite or attack but no mention of them it's like saying you can't buy a fast car because it might cause a bad accident because it can go fast ,,,, stop this [removed]
- The fact that the City of Calgary is even contemplating breed specific legislation shows me that this council is behind the times and only trying to distract from real issues. I'm disgusted!!
- They should be left alone their are other breeds who attack a heck of a lot more it's the owners who mistreat their dogs who should be fined and should never be able to own another pet again. It's not the dogs fault how it behaves it's how the owner treats it and trains it



- Tracking of irresponsible animal owners based on calls received by nuisance owners. Owners need to be held accountable for their animals. Nuisance dogs are often the result of negligent owners.
- the problem with pitbulls are the owners, they tend not to be the most responsible or well educated. Not sure what to suggest here but these owners need training never mind the dogs!
- Leave pitbulls alone. They're loving animals
- None of these should pertain directly to 'pit bulls' . All laws should be on a case by case basis by the dogs actions & behavior.
- Please don't use fines to correct behaviour. Positive reinforcement and training programs more likely to work. Be careful of extra tape/fines for "nuisance" dogs. A neighbour can complain repeatedly in order to force the classification and screw over the owner. Easily abused.
- Pit bull breeds should be banned in Calgary
- If there is going to be fines or rules, etc then it should be for all breeds not just pit bulls and those certain breeds. I have never been bit by my Pitbull nor has he ever bit anyone, but I have been bit several times by small dogs that have bit hard enough to draw blood.
- The owner is responsible for the dog. There are no bad dogs, there are bad owners. Statistically, German Shepard's and boarder collies have as many bite victims
- Breed specific legislation is outdated and creates issues in the lack of training and treatment of any dog. All dogs have the potential to be dangerous and tragically hurt persons.
- This bylaw is ridiculous. Dogs should not be classified according to breed. Many other breeds have a propensity for violence and bites. Moreover it is usually an irresponsible ownership issue, rather than breed
- Punish the owner not the breed. Large fines, jail time for bad owners. Do not condemn a breed based on fear.
- singling out Pitbulls is ridiculous, Its obvious that many people do not understand the breed. pitbulls are not born aggressive, they are trained to be that way. A rottweiler has a stronger bite, so why not single them out? Muzzle the bad owner stop blaming the breed. do your research, pitbulls are not the evil monsters that the media makes them out to be, in fact pitbulls are one of the most tolerant dogs, second only to the golden retriever. Stop discriminating and deal with the problem owners and aggressive animals appropriately regardless of breed. Give your head a shake!!
- The dogs are not the problem. The owners are the problems. There should be training or contracts for SOME owners. I don't have a pit but my friend has a cross and she is the sweetest dog ever. They are good responsible dog owners.
- No breed specific bylaws be passed
- Nuisance dogs should be listed as dogs who charge people, create a hostile environment with their behaviour, and/or create excessive noise. Chihuahuas, miniature terriers, and other small breeds come to mind. Also, for information purposes, mastiffs, kengals, and American Bulldogs all have stronger bite forces than pitbull-type breeds. If you're going to say in your information it's due to bite strength, it needs to be accurate and keep all breeds in mind.
- Ban pitbulls.



- It comes down to nurture of the dog not nature. A lab that's not raised/trained properly will be a bigger threat than a properly trained pit bull. The fines/restrictions should be on the owner of problem dogs not owners of a certain breed. And they should be implemented if that dog proves it's a nuisance.
- Owners must take Responsible pet ownership training for nuisance dogs
- Disallowing at this, or any future time, any breed specific legislation. Banning owners of dangerous dogs to own other dogs if the owner is found to be at fault.
- No BSL
- Dogs are not born aggressive or ill behaved. If a dog is most often it is the result of people. Owners should take courses on how to raise a puppy, strangers and kids should not approach other dogs. Don't stereotype different breeds of dogs.
- No it all dog owners are the same. Go after pit bulls or dogs that look similar is stupid. Yes the tougher breeds should be trained. Insurance is a rip off. You can make any dog mean. More education on how to train dogs properly.
- Have bylaw officers patrol off leash areas more frequently. There are plenty of aggressive dogs at off leash areas regularly, and i have yet to see bylaw at a dog park taking proactive steps to reduce aggressive or nuisance behavior.
- obedience training required for all. Smaller dogs are a problem too, but are rarely reported.
- Pit bulls are not inherently more dangerous than any other breed. Bad dog owners make for bad dogs. It is horrible that "pit bull" type breeds are being singled out as a potential issue or may be subject to stricter rules than other dogs. Higher fines should be implemented on owners with a history of aggressive dogs that they cannot control, regardless of breed.
- How about mandatory courses for people who want to have these dogs. It's not the animal it's the owner. Why punish the dogs when they can't control who buys them and their intentions. This is extremely frustrating for those who own "nuisance" breeds but have created a safe place, and train their dog appropriately.
- None of the above. Signaling out a breed is absolute nonsense. If the owner trains a dog to bite, its going to bite, hard. Get rid of this bylaw immediately. And no, I don't own a pitifully.
- ALL dog owners should be required to prove competent ownership.
- Obedience training with voucher for pet adoption. All dog breeds considered.
- All dogs and owners should be required to have obedience training. Dogs aren't the problem. Idiot owners are the problem.
- I would support obedience training for all dogs, but if you're going to solely focus on pitbulls, you're out to lunch. This breed-specific legislation is ineffective, a cash grab, and not addressing the root of the problem. As you've stated, pit bulls aren't disproportionately involved in bites, so if injuries are truly the problem you want to address, go for all dogs.
- BIG difference between noise/barking and dog running at large and dog that has bitten or is being deemed dangerous.
- I think this should include smaller breeds - they are still aggressive, bite and are noisy and should be considered a nuisance



- This is ridiculous, I find smaller dogs to be More dangerous and attack more. Do not blame a breed that's racist.
- I cannot believe that the City of Calgary is considering breed specific legislation - this is abhorrent. What about considering this for Mastiffs, Dobermans, German Shepards, Rottweilers and other large breed dogs. I have seen first hand the damage that a Labrador can do. What about the Chihuahuas that are so unpredictable? I've been bit by one and a Havenese - both drew blood. Or, what about the Boxer that charged at my dogs in an unprovoked attack that sent one of my dogs to the vet? Or Great Danes? They've been known to do some pretty substantial damage. The City REALLY needs to rethink the direction they are taking in this racial motivated attack. Maybe you should look closer at the people - it's not the dogs but the owners. I am incredibly disappointed ... plus, you need to do your research ... pit bulls are not a real breed. In the end, it's all about irresponsible people that think they can and should own an animal ... not fair under any circumstances to the animal. Step back and think about this ... carefully.
- All breeds need same requirements. Possible a certificate program to allow animal in off leash or public area. A dog that gets loose is not a nuisance. Doesn't assume that they are badly behaved or aggressive. Make pet owner successful complete a behaviour program and receive a certificate upon its successful completion to be allowed in parks much like a licence allows a driver on roadways
- pit bulls and the other similar breeds you have listed is a complete disregard for the breed and should not be outlined explicitly as you have suggested. Bites have nothing to do with the breed and everything to do with the owner. With the current world issues going I would think that the City of Calgary would be wanting to adjust archaic views of dog breeds. Please consider removing the breed specific line items in your regulations and bylaws and instead address the true root of the problem which is uneducated and ill-suited dog owners.
- [removed]
- none of the above.
- Do not try to classify one breed or similar looking breeds into a single category. Make it an umbrella that applies to dogs of ALL sizes and every breed. Do not allow for discrimination and breed specific legislation in an attempt to take away a family pet that has possibly aided the pet owner in mental/emotional disability. Doing so will only worsen the emotional disability of the pet owner. There is no breed specifics on emotional support animals according to the fair housing act and under HUD. Legislation that targets a single breed or dogs who "look" like the breed in question have been proven ineffective.
- I don't think a household with a nuisance dog should be allowed to get any ADDITIONAL pets. Should not be any fine differences between breeds or targeting of any specific breed.
- Nothing!!!!!!!!!!!! Owners are the problem!! Breeders are the problem!! Singling out pitbulls is not the solution. Poodles have bad tempers and they aren't singled out!!!
- There is no such thing as a "nuisance" animal breed, there is only nuisance people that refuse to properly train their dogs. Pitbulls have a bite no stronger than any other dog their size. Furthermore,



you explicitly state that they do not cause more bites than other breeds proving that there is absolutely no reason to further police pitbulls (other than your own ignorance of course).

- Aggressive dogs should not be allowed in dog parks unless muzzled. Regardless of breed, I don't care if it's a chihuahua or Great Dane if it's aggressive it should be muzzled.
- Being breed specific is dumb as pit bulls have weaker bites than some other common dogs. All fines and bylaws should be based on infractions. If a dog has bitten multiple people etc then action can be taken. Fine, forcing better training or education or have to give up dog.
- No no pits off leash around small kids/small adults and small dog
- Ban pit bulls. Insurance does not negate the trauma incurred to a child/adult when attacked by this breed
- I do not support breed targeting. This is an issue about irresponsible owners.
- [removed]
- Depending on the minor offence, need to define this. Having a dog that had offences for noise should in no way limit him from an off leash park. The dog needs exercise and is likely one of the problems leading to the poor behaviour.
- Without jail terms for few months, owner of dog never act seriously for leashed walked
- All pet to owners of dogs should be required to attend obedience training.
- None of the above
- I don't agree with any of the choices above.
- No laws should be based on breed.
- Stop looking at the breed and start looking at the owner.
- Full pit bull ban
- No specific breed bans or regulation until they have been determined to be dangerous. Special licensing for pitbull owners requirements to prove they have taken a course before they can purchase a pitbull.
- All dogs no matter the breed should be required to have obedience training.
- Mandatory education for the owner and behaviour classes for the dog mandatory to attend
- I think owners should be forced to take responsible dog owner course.
- This needs to be applied for all dogs.. I have met more spoiled misbehaving small dogs.. I don't believe one dog breed is the problem.. pitbull lives matter.. prejudice is never a solution
- Could you please not discriminate against "Pitbull" type dogs? Not all these dogs are bad. You are being discriminatory, [removed] so why is my Staffordshire bull terrier who has never bitten anyone, loves people and kids and been attacked 3 times by non pitbull breeds being proposed as dangerous? Why should he be forced to be muzzled in public, when a retriever or husky could do just as much damage to a human or dog but they are given the benefit of the Doubt and not have these ridiculous rules being suggested unless they are considered a nuisance? You wouldn't be racist and discriminate against humans, why do this to dogs?
- The second anyone thinks its a good idea to start singling out a breed because of looks and muzzling them or secluding them from dog parks is the second you will see problems escalate. Dogs are dogs no matter the breed its ALL the owner. The #1 cause of dog bites its LACK of socialization.



Dog parks are essential for the proper upbringing of any dog. Dogs need socialization, they need feel safe in any environment. They don't need to be singled out, muzzled and tortured for stuff that is not their fault. They need to be happy and free, they need to be dogs. Shame on you guys for even thinking of this. I will always own bully breeds and I will always be out with them showing folks how good these dogs are and educating those who think otherwise. NOTHING SHOULD BE DONE TO TAKE AWAY FROM GIVING THESE DOGS OR ANY DOGS A GOOD SOLID HAPPY LIFE. We need to educate owners, not punish the breed.

- These are all focused on bully breeds. Any bylaws need to be equal for any breed of dog. Shame on this board to even push this stigma.
- Instead of making fines "nuisance" and pit specific, make it the same for ALL dog owners
- Pitbull type breeds or pitbull looking breeds are not related to one specific breed. Pitbulls are not the only dog breed with the strength to create serious harm from biting as many breeds small to large have the same ability. Therefore it is harsh to associate these bylaws specifically for pitbull related breeds. Other municipalities and provinces have since had some of these pitbull related bylaws overturned due to the outpour of pet owners, animal professionals and non pet owners working to reverse this injustice for these breeds. Majority of dangerous dog behaviour comes from the pet owner and how that pet owner has trained their dog to behave and react in varying situations. If bylaws and adaptations are needed to be changed, dangerous dogs and their owners should receive mandatory behaviour modification classes, and be responsible for helping assist in ensuring the recovery of the other dog and owner that was put in harm's way. Dangerous dog behaviour should not be limited to dog to dog interaction and should also include dog to sole human interaction such as runners being chased down and trying to be bitten while running. Therefore, restricting and placing bans on one type of breed or look of dog is not going to decrease dangerous dog behaviours as owners will shift to other types of breeds and then where will the line be drawn. Insurance should also not be mandatory for pitbull type breeds nor should insurance fees be higher. Pet insurance rates are determined based on the number and amount of related cases submitted for that specific breed based on health and medical reasons. It is unjust to mandate that specific breeds have higher insurance rates than others.
- fines for people that abuse dogs or for owners that allow small dogs to harass larger dogs until the larger dog bites back to defend themselves.
- None, this is literally a disgrace
- I do not support any breed specific bylaws.
- Dogs are only dangerous when trained or taken care of by bad pet owners. Breed does not matter, by doing this you are leaving lots of dogs at shelters who deserve a great home.
- Educate and fine the human don't discriminate a dog because of terrible owners
- I will not support any of these as this is discrimination and breed bullying. These proposed conditions should also be applied to other breeds, such as chihuahuas, which are more vicious than pitbulls.



- All of this should be addressed on a case by case basis as it is the owners responsibility to take care of and manage the dog by understanding its needs no matter what breed. If a small dog bites it should have the same judgments against it and it's owner.
- I do not support breed-specific legislation. You also need to define "dangerous behaviour".
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION
- Obedience training required for ALL dogs (lesser cost fir licensing like with spay / neuter for instance)
- Breed specific legislation has proven to not work. Training is key, bsl an easy and lazy way out.
- Too many Calgary dog owners are using bin off leash parks for off leash --Aka baker park. I have children and myself as well as them have been jumped on and accosted by dogs.
- No to breed specific legislation
- Breed specific legislation is harmful and cruel please don't implement it
- You have singled out pit Bulls based on misinformation. They do not have a stronger bite, and breed specific legislation is ineffective and not based on science.
- This should be for all dogs period!! Take the words Pit Bull out of all these requirements and I'm game!
- This is an absolutely Ignorant statement in regards to pitbulls bite force. There are several other "large" breeds that WELL exceed the bite force of a pitbull. They rank in the middle for bite force at best. Do your research.
- None of the above
- Investigation of owners treatment and training of "nuisance" dogs regardless of breed
- Responsible ownership is training and proper care for any pet - not just breed specific. Responsible ownership.
- There should not be any breed specific bylaws.
- I don't support any of the above. They should not be singled out because of breed
- Nothing. BSL doesn't work and never will. More education for idiot people like the ones proposing this BS
- As a pit bull owner you are signaling my dog as dangerous. I have been bite a few times by small dogs, Will the owners also be required to have the same rules as my highly dangerous 7 year old pit bull that sleeps his days away?
- Obedience training required for every dog registered in Calgary
- None of the above
- All breeds should be treated the same. It's not the breed that's the issue, it's the owner/trainer.
- Total ban of "pit bull" dogs in the City of Calgary
- Owner responcibility for the actions of their animals. Pitbulls can be so lovley, an aggressive dog is a reflection of their (or previous) owner(s). Rescue dogs have the potential to be aggressive, that might not always be their fault, nature and nurture both contribute to an organism's debelopment.



- I believe that none of these should happen as it's not the dog it's the owner and someone like a small child is running towards the dog they should be taught not to run towards dogs they don't know without asking owners need to be trained on how to deal with a dog
- I do not agree with Breed Specific Legislation. I volunteer at a rescue and have had no issues with the pit bulls we rescue. Bad behavior is a result of the negligence / abuse by the owner and not related to the breed of the dog. is
- If this is for 'pit bulls' it should be for all breeds. Chihuahuas are crazier and meaner than pit bulls.
- I encourage the City of Calgary to conduct further research into the pit pull breed. The belief that this breed is more aggressive than others is archaic and has been debunked by myriad studies proving that a) a domestic dog's temperament, propensity for aggression and overall behavior have far more to do with their human ownership and environment than breed and b) pit bull breeds are infact ranked much lower in terms of innate aggression than are many other common breeds. There are no 'bad' breeds, just bad humans. If the City wishes to mitigate undesirable behavior, it would be prudent (not to mention much more humane and cost effective for tax payers) to address the issue of dog ownership and whether or not Calgary citizens are fit for the privilege and responsibility.
- I don't agree with labelling a specific dog breed as nuisance.
- Ban aggressive breeds
- None
- Pit bulls should be able to access dog parks without a muzzle.
- How about chihuahuas those little guys are more vicious than any pitbull i ever met!!! Leave the pitbulls alone!!!
- Higher fines for Chihuahuas and enforced training for dogs of this type.
- A certain type of person has a pit bull. It is glamorized on TV/online for being a fighting/guard dog. Usually unethical people own pit bulls.
- Minimum requirement of obedience training for all dog breeds
- Pitbulls aren't the problem, it's lax/uneducated owners.
- Bad owners, not bad dogs. Charge the source
- I don't think it's fair to declare a dog a nuisance or threat based on breed and subjective reporting by neighbours. There should have to be a clear and defined criteria and evidence for a neighbour to make a complaint to the city. The city does not do a thorough investigation following a complaint, the pet owner is sent a warning without a fair explanation or a chance for the owner to provide their perspective. This allows for unfair bullying from neighbours. Complaints should be investigated thoroughly and fined and dealt with appropriately.
- DOGS are not the issue. Owners are the issue. Having more support for ownership and having programs that train people, how to train dogs is a better idea. They don't have to be mandatory (though they should be, as this would cut down on accidental neglect and abuse) but they could be mandatory for any pitbull owners.
- Nuisance dogs of any breed are the responsibility of the owner. If a dog is declared a nuisance, the owner needs to be required to take responsible pet ownership training.



- dogs considered a nuisance is not limited to bully breeds. All breeds can be a nuisance or dangerous.
- Absolutely none of these. There is no such thing as a “nuisance dog” , only irresponsible owners. No dog should be required a muzzle unless necessary & there should be no rules stating how many dogs you are allowed in a household. These are an absolute joke.
- None of this [removed].. And to point out pit bulls, are you kidding?? Get over yourself! IF a dog(of ANY breed!) is to attack then look at both parties involved and maybe charge the owner direct and not punish the actual dog!! HUMANS CAUSE BAD BEHAVIOUR ON ANIMALS! NO ANIMAL IS BORN TO JUST FULLY ATTACK WITHOUT REASON. AND A DOG BEING BROUGHT INTO THE WORLD AROUND CIVILIZATION THEY ARE MOST DEFINITELY NOT FIRST THOUGHT TO ATTACK THAT IS BROUGHT ON BY BAD OWNERS!!
- Fine the owners for not training their dogs properly, don't take it out on the dog.
- The language used talking about pitbulls is inaccurate and offensive
- Pit bulls are loving dogs. They should not be singled out as you are here! It should be ALL Dogs Or NO Dogs for all rules. Not by breed.
- Ban the ownership of bully breeds.
- Leave pitbulls alone? This is a [removed], played out trope that frankly i'm sick off, ALL dogs have the potential to be trained horribly and bite or be aggressive. My friend was bit by a lab meanwhile every pitbull that i've ever come across is a giant baby who wouldn't hurt a fly. You want to actually make change? Charge the offending owners, charge the stupid child that wasn't taught manners and provoked the animal. They're a animal, who has been domesticated by humans. This is an absolute witch hunt against a breed of dogs not any more 'naturally aggressive' then any other breed. I'm pissed, this is absolute propaganda:
- Specifically targeting "Pit Bulls" as a major problem is not backed by a single statistic or any type of scientific study. If there is an issue then it needs to be demonstrated in the numbers and investigated using proper methodology. In singling out Pit Bulls this bylaw is pandering to people who have no specific knowledge of dogs, dog training, or what causes problematic dog behavior. Specifically targeting Pit Bulls will do nothing to rectify any issue presented here.
- None of the above. You're becoming to invasive. Nothing is wrong with our current bylaws.
- I do not support breed specific legislation.
- No additional fines for a certain breed. Treat all dogs the same as we do the same with races of people.
- this is absolutely disgusting, the fact that you are singling out a breed and tying a behavior to them while trying to say "its not this breed" is etremely hipocritical, also i know multiple people, myself included who have pitbulls why would we need to pay more for insurance, what about german sheaphards or huskys or dobermen, or multiple other big breeds, this is clearly singling out pitbulls and is extremely unfair
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Don't single them out as nuisance dogs. Other dogs bite more often then put bulls. <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/9/6/324/htm>



- Please do research before singling out "pitbulls." There are many other dogs that have higher instances of biting, including German Sheperds and chihuahuas. Also there is no evidence that suggest implementing BSL into a municipality lowers the number of instances of bites.
- Obedience training needs to be done through a positive reinforcement trainer.
- Pitbulls should NOT be discrimated against! They are loving kind animals and are not dangerous unless taught to be by their owners, if they are aggressive please punish the owner not the dog! I DO NOT AGREE WITH ANY OF THESE MEASURES.
- All of the above does not make sense at all! A complete definition of "nuisance dog" must be part of the survey so calgarians know before answering these kind of questions. Putting restrictions or additional requirements of any type on a specific Dog breed, or their Owners, based on that the dog's bite is stronger is nonsense.
- It is really discouraging to see Calgary jump on the "pit bull bandwagon". Anyone who is familiar with this breed knows they are no more dangerous than any other dog. Bad pet owners create bad dogs, period. Doesn't matter what the breed is, if it is mistreated for long enough it is likely to become more aggressive and more likely to bite. I reiterate - this has NOTHING to do with a specific breed!! You need to toughen the laws for dogs that bite people or attack other dogs/cats. This is how you make the city safer, go after bad dog owners of any breed, if their dog become a danger it has to be put down. Period. Regardless of the breed. Go after bad dogs!! If a dog demonstrates vicious behaviour, it gets put down. To single out one breed as being worse than others is ridiculous and it's simply not accurate.
- introduction of wolves into city to deal with problem/ shoebox size dogs and coyotes, mostly coyotes
- pitbulls are NOT the problem. Bad owners are dont discriminate against one breed unless you require one human race to meet all the same requirements
- do not allow these types of dogs
- Pit bulls are not nuisance dogs, I have met smaller dog breeds that are more aggressive.
- I do not in any way support BSL in my province. In any city. For any reason. Your research is miguided and heavy handed towards pitbulls.
- Your idea that pitbulls are inherently trouble-making is ridiculous. There are many nuisance dogs, and most of them are not pitbulls. Basically your legislation, as written, is "if we think a dog looks like a bully breed, it has to be muzzled". That's nuts.
- Ban pit bulls in the city of Calgary
- Fine owners of aggressive dogs, including jail time if they are negligent.
- ALL dogs should require obedience training. City should offer free or subsidized courses.
- NONE You're sick and disturbed if you think pit bulls are the problem. Humans are the problem. Let's have some restrictions on those beasts. Humans need muzzles.
- That dogs of other breeds that are known to bite have to follow the same rules
- Nothing Pit-bull specific. It's a blanket 'solution' (as in it's not a solution) to an individual problem.
- Fines and punishment for owners allowing this behaviour.
- Definition of nuisance seems too board
- How about NOT introducing BSL against Pitbulls?



- Scientifically, pit bulls do not exhibit any more threat to people as any other breed. The 'potential for a more severe bite' has not been proven.
- For any of the measures I support I would only do so if there was real consistent evidence that a dog is exhibiting nuisance behaviours due to its owner not properly caring for/training them. If an incident (especially bites) occurs due to someone approaching the dog without consent from the owner then the blame should NOT be placed on the dog and its owner.
- More education for owners of dogs who have behavioral issues and follow up to ensure the dog is being taken care of properly (this goes for all breeds, no breed should be discriminated against)
- Bad owners are the issue, there is no bad dog. Training for people who don't know how to be good owners or don't know how to train their dogs. Unfortunately people don't often treat dogs fairly, this results in bad dogs (any breed). I think it is crazy you are calling out pit bulls in particular.
- I think it is very dangerous game to start attempting to crack down on brave specific incidents. Owners are the ones to blame, and they should be the ones who face the consequences. Owners should be forced to go in to dog training if they do not have a handle on their pet, regardless of the breed
- Pet ownership restrictions for owners demonstrating irresponsible pet ownership. (No irresponsible breeds, just irresponsible owners)
- Consider banning pitbulls
- I don't think Pitbulls are any different than any other dog. They are very loving dogs and it is disgusting that people are trying to segregate them.
- Limit the number of dog licences available per household in general
- Train the humans to train their animals. Pit bulls are not more likely to bite than any other dog. They are beautiful kind and loving dogs and they should not be prohibited.
- This absurd! You literally state that Pitbull's & Staffy's are statistically NOT the issue... Yet you discriminate Pittbull's & Staffy's based on their strength & because other municipalities are doing this.... Really?... Just because others adhere to these by-laws does NOT make it right!!! I've bred, raised, trained Great Danes, German Shepards, Labs, Retrievers, & now Pitbulls/Staffy's. Guess which ones are least aggressive, ultra loving, & most intelligent? Hence, why many enforcement agencies are training them. Not because of their strength, because of their ability to be trained, intelligence, & tracking abilities. This should say something. Also, I just want to point out, there are many other breeds (le-Dobermann, Rottweiler, Irish Wolfhound, Akita, German Shepard, etc.) capable of inflicting wounds as bad or worse! This is due to their size, strength, agility, etc. HOWEVER, dog breeds are NOT the issue!!! People are the issue!!! They are often not educated, no or minimal training, irresponsible, & lazy. Also, there is a STRONG STIGMA surrounding Bullies & more so Pitbull's & Staffy's because of people!!! They were & are still often abused, provided testosterone altering their aggression, taught to fight, owners cropping their ears/tails when there is no reason other than the mean look associated, spiked collars, choke chains, etc. There should be by-laws directed towards these types of people or they should be sterilized so they cannot breed! Once again, Bullies & Pitbulls/Staffy's are NOT the issue! I feel people that obtain any animal(s) should be thoroughly checked (le-Background, maybe credit, etc.), required (mandatory) training



regulated via the city, & adhere to bylaws/standards/rules/etc. Since 2016, I have only seen 1 officer enforcing the by-laws & I walk my dogs twice a day, everyday in Calgary paths, parks, off-leash parks etc. Perhaps the city should kick themselves in the [removed]!!!... Another problem is, not consistent training, walks, not properly disciplining when constant barking, highly active, destructive, socializing, aggressive (Often scared or abusive history), etc. If people accept to have these troubled animals in their home, it is their responsibility to rectify these matters & it takes LOTS of effort/consistency!!! Animals have emotions & feel things as we do therefore, you have to consistently treat them like a part of the family!!! I was proud to be apart of Calgary because of the fact they did NOT have by-laws associated to Pitbulls & Staffy's like places in Ontario, etc.

- [removed] It is unreasonable and unresearched. Pitbulls do not pose anymore of a threat to society than a German Shepherd, Labrador Retriever, Great Pyrenees or any common family canine. You are following suit in other community's that believe forcing owners to follow ridiculous rules on their own pets. Yes there will be bad dogs but if you cared about the community you would not only place BSL on "pitbulls" (also pitbull is a blanket term for uneducated people) but also German Shepherds which are more aggressive and impulsive than pitbulls and breeds alike. Educate yourselves and your community of Calgary before you pull this propaganda saying they're all man eating beasts. They are not and should you put a BSL in place you will ruin a once wonderful city of Alberta.
- Are you guys literally insane? Pitbulls can be some of the sweetest most loving breeds, going after them so specifically is completely outrageous, dogs behave how they are trained, no breed is a bad breed, only bad owners.
- Would support a total ban on these dogs in city limits - I cannot see a single reason why nuisance dogs need to live in highly populated areas
- If you're planning in passing a bill for "nuisance dogs" it would make more sense to pass it for all dogs. Especially when statistics show that pit bulls aren't worse than any other breed.
- Absolutely none of them. No breed specific legislation.
- I do not condone BSL in any way. Please do your research as well. Pitbulls do NOT have a stronger bite than other breeds. This is false information and not very professional.
- Ban pit bulls
- How about all the people who walk their dogs off leash around the neighbourhoods, parking lots and non off leash parks. I have more problems with those dogs than any "pit bull"
- Why are Pit Bulls mentioned here by breed when you say they have not shown to be more aggressive than others. This is not a fair question and the wording is highly inappropriate
- Pit bulls should not be singled out as a breed. Nuisance or dangerous dogs come in all breeds as a result of poor ownership. Please remove pit bulls and edit this bylaw to reflect dangerous dogs in general. There should also be fines for owners who abuse animals causing dangerous behaviour.
- Pit bulls are not the problem
- Mandatory training for the OWNER on how to handle their dog
- Dogs should be trained to be licensed like in Germany <https://www.thelocal.de/20120321/41463>
- No BSL
- The owners are responsible for the dogs behaviour so I agree with higher fines



- Do NOT target specific breeds.
- Owners require training
- Better investigations behind why the bite first occurred instead of just putting blame on the dog and owner immediately. Putting focus on Pitbull like dogs is discrimination and will make no difference in the amount of severe dog bites that occur. People with aggressive small dogs get away with it because their dog small. Every owner no matter the type of dog should be dealt with equally and given the same level of punishment. Many dog who are adopted end up with bullie like features. If you put through these acts against bullie like dogs, adoption rates will significantly decrease which is the opposite of what the government should be promoting.
- fines to owner for poor training, its never the dogs fault
- The pit bull heavy leanings of this survey are very biased and wrong. They will serve no purpose beyond further harm the overall breed. The city of calgary should be ashamed of its biased, jaded, and undereducated members
- Higher fines for off leash dogs outside of off leash parks.
- Owners of nuisance dogs must undergo training to learn how to properly control and own an animal.
- There are MANY amazing pit bulls out there. Do not punish the breed for the action of some. ANY dog can bite ANY dog can be aggressive and ANY dog can bite. Pit bulls should be allowed the same freedoms as any other dog. It should never be breed specific.
- Why would we punish pit bull and pit bull owners more if they aren't more likely to hurt anyone than any other dog? Rottweilers and German Shepards, Bulldogs, etc also have comparable bite strength but I see no mention. It's a scare campaign not fully based in science. Extra training for any dog with common bite strength over 200 psi if you want to be serious about this, otherwise it's just unfair and PR based targeting.
- More bylaw presence in on-leash parks
- Not breed generalizing. I was bit by a German Shepherd and a Jack Russell.
- Owner training required for prospective pit bull owners, outlining the special care required for the breed.
- Pit bull breeds are not the problem. Owners are. I know more friendly pit bull breeds than "dangerous" ones. Go after chihuahuas they are more likely to bite.
- This is so wrong to say just pitbulls and and blockheaded dogs, my dog has been attacked way more by small dogs than he ever has a pitbull or big dog. Labeling pitbulls as dangerous dogs increases the negative stamina towards them, as well as making them less likely to get adopted, which will cause them to be put down, pitbulls are the sweetest dogs, I am disgusted by this bylaw.
- Fines and jail time for owners whose dogs harm people
- Required obedience training following first instance of biting.
- Please do not discriminate against pit bulls.
- Breed Specific Legislation DOES not work. Leave bully breeds alone and focus on the rules you already have a do not follow. Example, I walk Edworthy everyday. Not once have I seen bylaw. Poop in dog parks. Dogs at large in dangerous situations. The people who are good law abiding



citizens and already follow bylaws do not have the dogs are you're worried about. The people with untrained, vicious dogs don't follow the law.

- Age minimum requirements for ownership as well as size ie must be at least 100lbs heavier than your dog
- Please do not go the Breed-Specific offences route. It is not a fact-based policy position and BSL is being undone around the world. Calgary has been an example in animal care - don't cave to this ridiculous idea.
- Fines for dogs off leash in non designated areas. Also, don't bully my breed. I've seen tons of dogs off leash when they shouldn't be, if there was an altercation with my bully, he would be the one to blame. Also, maybe google bite strength because there are a ton of dogs that have strong bites. Doberman, boxer, German shepherds, rottweiler, Leonberger, mastiffs. Why aren't they included?
- Breed laws are horrible blame the people not the breed. These types of laws are shameful.
- Breed specific legislation is not fair, all dogs have potential to bite and pitbulls are not the problem. Also the above listed definitions of pitbulls seems like you can deem any dog a pitbull based off of looks. This is WRONG
- It is not the dogs fault. It is the owners and people approaching them. Some dogs don't like people or other animals. Generalizing a breed is ridiculous. [removed]
- Let all dogs be dogs. Pit bulls are just as friendly as a golden retriever!
- Pit bulls are being unfairly singled out in this survey, the responsibility for proper training is on the owners and an entire breed should not be shamed or victimized because of poor management by humans
- There are countless studies that show banning a dog based on their physical appearance lacks not only common sense but also goes against what expert organizations have stated on record including the American Bar Association, The Canadian Kennel Club, The American Veterinary Association...the list goes on. You need more education that doesn't target breed but behavior. You also need to put in proper laws for breeding. You have one of the worst XL Bully Breeders in North America in Alberta, and because of poor breeding several of these dogs have killed people. The breeders are a young couple in their early 30's making so much money off these poor animals. Better breeding laws (animals are not objects!), more education, and hire educated animal patrol officers. Also, implement better animal abuse laws. These breeders should be held responsible for the the death of these people.
- Do these powers not already exist (seizing of deemed dogs, restricting deemed dogs' public interactions, increased fines for repeat offences)?? The City of Kelowna (where I was employed as a Dog Control officer for years) has had these since at least the early 2000s and used those authorities regularly and without issue. Dogs caught roaming repeatedly faced a doubled impound fee every single time they were caught - so some dogs cost owners \$2,000 for release after about the 5th time in a 2-year window.
- All these additional restrictions and recommendations targeting "pitbulls" is ridiculous and unnecessary. Anyone that knows anything about dog behaviour and training understands that it is not about the breed. It is about responsible dog ownership. Don't blame the breed. Blame the



owners. If you want to create more safety, put in laws requiring positive reinforcement obedience classes for all dog owners. Don't bully the breed.

- Nothing because if a person cannot handle their dog they shouldn't own it you are dog shaming. shame on you.
- This is ridiculous to target only bully breeds. Do better City of Calgary.
- Pit bulls are no stronger than any large breed of dog (pit bull bite: 235 psi, Great Dane bite: 238 psi; for reference) - I don't believe that the specific breed is the problem in any situation, I believe it's how the owners raise and bring up the dog and how it is TAUGHT to behave. Obviously, smaller dogs would not inflict as much harm/damage of a situation did arise where it becomes aggressive, but singling out pit bulls specifically only stems from the media's portrayal and "popular" belief of what the breed entails.
- Owners should be banned from keeping dogs if they can't control them. I am a dog walker who walks many pitbull breeds without issue. It's the owners who don't train their dogs that are the issue
- definitely no blanket bylaws against specific breeds. All dogs act as they are taught, not according to the type of breed they are. That is discrimination against the dogs and their owners!!
- Breed Specific aspects of the bylaw should not be allowed. The onus of dog behaviour must be held to the same accountability for dogs of all breeds in order to be effective and protect the public from nuisance dogs of all breeds.
- Stop being so discriminatory toward pit bulls. Implement fines for ANY breed that attacks in public, singling out one breed is out of line.
- Ban Pitbulls from every community.
- Ban pit bulls
- No breed specific legislation! Ban the bad owners!
- Do not allow pit bull ownership in the city
- ANY DOG BREED that is involved in an attack, the owners should be fined. Its not the dog breed that's the issue; it is the owners and how they train their animals that is the issue.
- ANY breed of dog exhibiting aggressive behaviour must be enrolled in a behavioral training course within 30 days of offense or said dog shall be reprimanded by authority to withgo a behavioral training course.
- None this is stupid. Punish the owner not the dogs and stop DISCRIMINATING
- Human education on Dog/Cats etc in GENERAL. Not just pit bulls. To many irresponsible owners buying breeds they can't accomodate.
- I don't support any of them. You guys are ignorant and uneducated. Dog breed has nothing to do with behaviour. It bad owners not bad dogs.
- None
- I have been attacked/bitten by small dogs on numerous occasions and told by the City of Calgary employees that it's not a problem. How about better education vs ludicrous laws made by ineffectual half wits.
- Pit bulls should be banned.



- Breed specific bans. Ontario has already done this and it has worked out wonderfully for them. No more severe bite injuries and deaths from pit bulls. Just look at the statistics to see how much of a nuisance pit bulls are.
- Higher fines for Off-Leash dogs not in off-leash area
- Mandatory Training for dogs involved in altercations, more bylaw availability for dog park regulation and reporting
- No one is allowed to own No pitbulls or similar
- The owners should have to undergo a self paid training program.
- breed specific legislation is a joke. if a dog is a nuisance it's the owner who's the problem and likely shouldn't own any dog. legislate against bad owners instead.
- Penalties to people who provoke attacks from dogs to further a stigma on a specific breed.
- ALL dogs should be allowed un-muzzled within a off-leash dog park. The purpose of these dog parks are to provide exercise for dogs that live within the city. No dog should be mandatory to wear a muzzle if no incidents have occurred. If a dog has had one or more incidents then a muzzle may be necessary, but this should be a last resort.
- Ban Pit Bulls and the similar breeds you identified above.
- Better monitoring and fining for any dogs off-leash where they shouldn't be (where I live in Bowness this is a big problem).
- Fines and insurance are all reactive measures. Need for preventative approach. Calgary Community Standards must have proper dog behavior training to be able to recognize and address problem behaviors without escalating the situation and prompting a dog in question to be scared and act out further. Proper training is required to recognize normal dog play from a dangerous behavior. Proper training for pet owners by qualified animal behaviour professionals is required as a preventative measure to ensure all pets are set up for success as members of household.
- By introducing more costs to dog owners through additional insurance or requiring obedience training, you are putting up more barriers for these pit bulls, even those that are not a nuisance, from getting adopted at all. Fines should only be administered after an offense has taken place, not before.
- Owners with multiple complaints/fines are not permitted in off-leash areas, and may be unable to obtain additional dog licenses until they have completed training on how to be a responsible pet owner.
- How about a program offers to train and educate owners but also the public. Someone walking by could go to pet your dog and it could bite or be mistaken to bite! Education is a key component of a healthy people dog relationship!
- Dogs who attack people or pets unprovoked (except if being teased, protecting a home or fenced property) should be euthanized and the owner restricted from acquiring additional dogs without having taken a course).
- Additional training for owners prior to being able to own a breed which typically is referred to as a "nuisance"
- Obedience training required for all dogs



- It is absolutely disgusting that this city would consider banning a certain breed of dog from being owned. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. ABSOLUTELY go ahead with creating fines and restrictions for nuisance dogs. Expect that category to be full of dachshunds, pomeranians, chihuahuas, and every other dog that is actually a dangerous nuisance. Pit bulls and their related breeds and cross-breeds are gorgeous, loving animals that do not cause specific harm just because of the way they look. It is horrendous that anyone on this project that cares about animals would actually consider banning these breeds.
- Treat all dogs equally!!! Punish the owners or those that pushed the animal to become aggressive
- I would support a pitbull ban within city limits
- Ban them all.
- Higher fees for pit bulls does not stop bites.
- Enforcement of existing bylaws in Calgary Parks, especially leash regulations.
- Higher fines for dogs (nuisance or otherwise) off-leash in leash required areas. Also breed specific legislation is ineffective. Very disappointed to see this as a major topic on this survey.
- Dog owners (regardless of breed) should be held to nearly the same level of accountability and liability as firearms owners. If ANY dog attacks another person or animal and causes injury and the victim chooses to press charges, the dog should be seized and potentially destroyed or the owner should face stiff penalties including massive fines and even prohibition from dog ownership. Perhaps "pitbull" owners should have to register their dogs and be required to have special additional licensing to ensure the dogs are trained and required to see a vet at least once per year for health and well-being of the animal.
- Outright ban on Pitbull type dogs in Calgary
- None of these should be implemented. The singling out of pitbulls is unacceptable in this type of survey. There are 7 other breeds that have a strong bite force than pitbulls, yet you never mention those. The bias of the survey and the agenda of the City are blatantly and unacceptably obvious. Shame on you.
- 1st offence of nuisance dog should be mandatory training. 2nd offense should be a fine
- Don't allow pit bulls or dangerous dogs in the city. Small dogs bite too but pit bulls have the ability to kill. They are too dangerous if they get out....which can happen very easily. All it takes is a gate left open...please ban them or make it difficult for people to own.
- Crack down on backyard breeding... Limit who can breed and you will start to eliminate poorly bred dogs with bad temperaments. A registered breeder is more selective of where their dogs are placed. They make sure they go to capable and knowledgeable owners who can handle the breed requirements..
- There are many breeds of dog that have the strength to pose as a potential serious bite risk. The label should not be breed specific, "nuisance" dog or "dogs with previously dangerous behaviour" should be the target here for stronger rules, regulations and limitations.
- Do not blame pitbulls, it has been scientifically proven that they do not have a "locking effect" when biting, they were originally nanny dogs. People bought pitbulls to watch their kids, newborn babies, etc. Dog fight rings, and docking ears to make them look more aggressive is what gives pitbulls bad



reputations. I do not personally own pitbulls at the moment, if I had the chance, I would. Quit blaming the dogs, blame the owners.

- Pit bulls are some of the most wonderful dogs. The owner and individual behaviour of a dog is what should be looked at.
- Proof of Training for owners prior to getting a pit bull but I do not support the other suggestions in the lists
- Pitbull is not a breed. You're doing a survey without giving stats and incorrect info. Inexcusable
- Do not decide that a dog breed is reason to discriminate and deem a dog a nuisance. Put in place better training for owners of dogs who have tendencies to bite (this includes smaller dogs without the features of those listed) and offer free training to children and adults so they do not approach dogs in a way that may cause a fight or flight reaction .
- I would support the ideas listed above if they weren't breed/ nuisance specific. I would support all dog owners, regardless of breed/ nuisance designation: requiring obedience training, being muzzled in public areas (except for off-leash dog parks), higher fines for any dog involved in previous offences
- Any dog can be a bad dog. More responsibility needs to be put on the owner.
- I support taking extra precautions toward dogs that have been proven aggressive or a nuisance, however, I do NOT support instituting any rules based on a dog's breed.
- Pitbull breeds should not be treated any differently than other breeds. If a dog is dangerous, regardless of breed, the dog owner should be penalized. Owners of dangerous dogs need to be trained in dog ownership and if they can't be responsible dog owners, they shouldn't have the ability to own a dog. Further, "nuisance" dog is too general of a term. What is considered a nuisance to one person might be considered normal dog behavior to others. Unless the dog is a danger to people or other dogs, the city shouldn't step in, with the exception of a extreme cases.
- More onus needs to be placed on the owner. Dogs should not suffer at the hands of an abusive owner
- The owner needs training. It is the owner of the animal that trains or does not train the animal the way it reacts/acts. If the animal has not been trained then that is the owners fault not the animal. If the animal is not good with children then that needs to be told to the other people around. The animal responds the way an animal would. It is the owners responsibility.
- The city of Calgary should be very careful with this claiming Pitbulls as a nuisance could involve legal affairs and lawsuits considering the German shepherds and police dogs are more aggressive than a family pitbull little dogs bite more people than big dogs in Canada every year but you're not saying anything about that
- I support stronger measures for pitbull and pitbull types. Unfortunately they are often owned by those who like to exhibit and tough persona and they either found roaming loose due to the owners lack of concern or lack of strong fencing. I have walked by backyards and have seen the fence boards shake as I walk by. This breed type should be required to attend several rounds of speacial breed specific training. I have witnessed 3 grown men try to separate a pitbull and a samoyed. I have also seen a child (pre-teen) walking a pitbull type. There is no way a child has the strength



should an altercation occur. I've also had a co-worker whose dog was severely injured while in the hands of a dog walker who was walking 5 dogs at the same time. Two of the dogs got into a fight (one a pitbull cross). There is no way the dog walker could handle the situation which resulted in my co-worker going through extensive vet bills and stress. A dog walker walking 5 dogs at once there is no way that any of them are under control. I am reluctant to say that "nuisance" dogs should incur tougher measures as the definition above isn't clear enough.

- breeds aren't vicious. how the owner raises the dog is the out come. cancel this bylaw.
- Fully support any measures that hold individuals accountable if they own a dangerous dog.
- Breed-specific legislation is not supported by science and your "facts" above about bite strength are inaccurate and seeking to mislead the public
- Breed banning has not been shown to be effective - multiple studies have been done on this. As a veterinarian I absolutely do not support breed specific legislation. Crack down on backyard breeders and irresponsible pet owners. Do some research before proposing such stupid ideas, there are no studies showing a pit bulls bite is harder than and other large breed.
- Nuisance dogs, or dogs with dangerous behavior, are a result of a lack of dog OWNER training. I strongly believe that the owners of these dogs should be facing the consequence of further training if their dogs are behaving badly, particularly in off leash scenarios.
- Obedience training required for all dogs. Non-pitbull dogs in our community are much more a nuisance (constant barking in backyards).
- Isolating a specific breed is not the answer. The owner needs to be responsible and needs to be fined if there is an incident. Increase the fine amount dramatically. Dogs declared a nuisance? Are they tagged to identify them or is it that the survey is targeting certain breeds.
- More accountability for people buying dogs from backyard breeders, harder for people who don't have access to dog training to get dogs. At the end of the day the owner is to blame not the dog.
- Stop discriminating against pitbulls
- Teach Dog owners what it means to own a dog and fine them
- Stiffer Penalties for Negligent Pet Owners! My black lab was attacked by a tiny Boston terrier! The owner laughed it off, but apologized. My dog now avoids small dogs like the plague!
- Nuisance lacks description. Eg a repeat barking dog, a repeat at large dog, the restriction needs to address/ alleviate the nuisance. Also, in off leash park settings, nuisance dogs should be singled out, not pitbulls. From the perspective of my extensive experience off leash park experience with sensitive colkie- type dogs, you are barking up the wrong tree and punishing the typically very responsible and educated Pittbul and pitbull type owners. Also it is near impossible to identify dog.is off.leash.parjs. nuisance dogs need to carry an easily readable label.
- No additional restrictions
- Dogs need to be leashed in front yard, even if on owner's property. Dogs do not know where their property ends and approach/attack people off the property.
- NOT breed specific, dog specific. Please also put effort into halting backyard breeders and the commercial sale of dogs (i.e. top dog).
- Owners Need to be Vetted to own a Pitbull .. its not the dog .. its the owner that is the problem



- None of these should apply. Dog breeds cannot be aggressive, they are taught to be that way by the owner. This by law is a sham and should be thrown out. The nicest dogs I have owned have been pit bulls, the worst and most aggressive have been chihuahuas.
- The people coming up with these ideas must be out of their minds to even consider these as options, it's shameful
- Dogs declared a nuisance must wear a specific coloured collar so that people know that the dog is undergoing training and not to approach it.
- Fines, follow up, training, etc FOR ALL DOGS declared a nuisance or aggressive, NOT just "pit bulls".
- This is absolutely disgusting. You are singling out breeds because of some [removed] bias y'all white people have. Get a grip and do some actual research on bully breeds. Maybe without listening to Karen about her crying and whining you'll figure out and realize that these breeds are amazing. If you are planning on having these stupid bylaws in place, they should be for every single dog breed there is. The smaller dogs are more vicious and I have been attacked and chased by the devil Pomeranians. This breed specific bylaw proposal is beyond disgusting.
- Breed specific bans
- Large breeds are only a nuisance if they aren't trained properly. Stop blaming animals for the owners mistakes. Statistically small dogs are more likely to be aggressive than large dogs. Pitbulls in particular are one of the most gentle dog breeds. Start holding owners responsible for their lack of discipline, it's not the dogs fault.
- Ban Pit Bulls!
- Do not name specific breeds in any bylaws.
- I think this should apply for all dogs over a certain weight/size
- Training required for any persons owning unsocial dogs. Jail time, records and/or fines for people harming or training dogs to fight. Pit bulls are not the problem the owners are.
- Any dogs, especially small dogs with a history of biting should be subject to the same conditions as large dogs
- These are all horrible
- Pitbulls are not the problem here. There are many dogs (regardless of breed) that can become aggressive due to bad and inadequate (and oftentimes downright cruel) training, lack of structure in the home environment or animal abuse. Instead, responsible dog ownership is key. Perhaps Calgary should invest in a media campaign about how to prevent dog bites/attacks - which includes telling people to socialize their dog, pay attention to its body language, put a muzzle on your dog if you're worried, avoid risky situations with your dog, or keep your dog on leash in public settings. However, making these things offences when not followed through or banning "pitbulls" will ONLY ensure that responsible dog owners are punished for the misdeeds of exceptional incidents. This would be wholly uncivil and unfair.
- THE CURRENT STANDARDS FOR OWNING "PITBULLS" OR "PITBULL TYPE" DOGS IN THE CITY IS WORKING JUST FINE, THERE IS NO REASON TO BE LOOKING AT ANY OF THE



ABOVE! THERE SHOULD NEVER BE BREED SPECIFIC MEASURES LOOKED AT BY THIS CITY AT ALL!!

- I would include bullmastiff in the Pit Bull and nuisance category
- Pit bulls should not be punished. Owners should be the ones getting educated. BSL is an ignorant proposal and negatively impacts humans and the breeds being targeted. Pitbulls are not known for human targeted aggression and anyone who has met one would know that. I think owners should be properly educated on any breed they get but "bully breeds" should not be punished. If anything we should implement more programs that limit and prohibit poor backyard breeding and breeding aggressive dogs and it can be an inherited trait.
- None of the above
- Work with societies like AARCS, Calgary Humane Society, etc., to develop information campaigns to educate children in schools on dog safety. Dog bites would be severely diminished if people understood dog etiquette and body language.
- Pit bulls are not an aggressive breed. If the dog is aggressive the owner should be fined and dog should be taken away! Its not the breed ots how they're trained. The bite is more severe yes but actual facts Chihuahua breeds bite more, just not reported as much because they're minor.
- Supports available for owners of Pitbulls or nuisance breeds to get training when they can't afford it.
- Penalties are required for nuisance dogs, such as those that bark all the time or don't allow neighbours to enjoy they backyards because they start barking
- Obediance for dogs who bite becuae they generally dont bite unless threatened or treated poorly at home
- There should be no separate category for pit bull breeds.
- Do not bully one specific breed! This is outrageous that you have singled out Pitt bulls.
- Breed-specific targeting of dogs should not be taking place - any breed can exhibit undesirable/bad behaviour if not properly trained.
- These items are vague. I support corrective measures levied against a particular dog based on past behavior. I do NOT support legislation pre-condemning any particular breed.
- Why are pit bulls being called out??? They are just as worthy as any other dog. Shame on you calgary.
- These measures need to be based on individual animal/owner behavior, not on breed stereotypes
- Breed-specific rules are not an educated decision. Owners are the issue. Many different breeds exhibit aggressive concerning behaviour and many of the bull breeds listed are great pets.
- All pit bulls should be put down immediately.
- There should be equal punishment/ fine for all dogs that are problems . Not just based off of breed type or looks . Any breed of dog can be good OR bad .
- Have higher fines for all dog bites regardless of severity.. no dog should bite. Punishing only pitbull type dogs would be wrong of the city. Ive been bit by small dogs that drew blood never once by a large breed dog
- No breed specific legislation whatsoever. The breed is never the problem it is owners lack of training that causes any dog to be aggressive and it is a myth and pit bulls having a stronger bite



- Training for owners of any nuisance dog regardless of breed to provide better owner handling and aggression management
- It is despicable that the city of Calgary is making this breed specific. There is no such thing as a bad dog, the problem is bad owners. If you look at the high percentage of "knuckleheads" that owns pit bulls, the problem becomes clear.
- Many dog bites are provoked or preventable, a dog should be allowed to defend itself. Any breed that is capable of or unprovoked attacks on people or other dogs should be restricted. As other municipalities have restricted pit bulls, Calgary has become a haven for them and there are too many here now.
- [removed]
- ALL DOGS SHOULD HAVE TO DO ALL THIS NOT JUST PITBULLS!!!
- The pit bull designation is misleading and should never be used.
- Perhaps, instead of punishing owners and dogs that are seen to be "nuisances" they could be encouraged to take such a pet to a pet training course. I know for a fact dogs will bite (usually when they're provoked). One bite does not make a dog vicious you morons.
- Change the term "nuisance" to not include a specific breed. Define "nuisance" as any animal who exhibits aggressive traits.
- Obedience training for first time owners of large dogs. Also, Pitbulls should not be singled out as looking at the facts, their bite strength is overblown relative to other big dogs (if you're going to discriminate, it should only be classes of dogs based on size). Speak to Vets to base policy, not a handful of outraged citizens using only poor anecdotal information.
- Do not specify pit bulls!
- Do not discriminate against breeds. There are aggressive smaller breeds. The owner needs to appropriately train their dog. Offer reduced behavioural training.
- People should have to register their chihuahua and other small "ankle biting" dogs since they are more aggressive and suffer more from "little man syndrome", more easily spooked, etc
- A short quiz on good dog ownership as part of the dog license program
- None of these. There is no evidence to support that Pit Bulls are more dangerous than any other dogs.
- Obedience training for ALL dogs regardless of breed.
- This is ridiculous and unnecessary. How about ensuring owners are responsible and understand how to own a dog regardless of breed. I see a lot of large dog owners who don't know how to handle a dog and none of these are pitbulls. I own a mixed breed with American staff and he has never caused an issue nor is he "VISCIOUS". It's the humans 9/10 times not the animal. This question is irresponsible. My friend has a miniature pincher who has bitten more children than I care to mention. Shame on you city of Calgary. If you want the answer its online training for dog owners who license their pet regardless of breed. NOT increased fines or having a dog wear a muscle just because of its strength and potential. Are there any dog owners who put these questions together?
- Don't discriminate against breeds! Be better!!!



- It's ridiculous to single out Pitbulls within this survey. It's important to have regulations for dangerous animals or situations where owners are negligent, but making specific rulings based on a specific breed is uneducated, uninformed, and is a disservice to the public. Policy should be based on behaviour not breed.
- Not be breed specific, it also has to do with owners and the way the dogs are trained I have been attack more by small dogs then anything. It is not fair to single out one specific dog breed to do this towards
- The very fact that officials are still trying to push breed specific laws is ridiculous. None of the above should be applied, BSL should be scrapped!
- Pit bulls should be outlawed. They are dangerous and have killed, maimed both people and other dogs. A bite from a pit bull has a completely different intent, apart from the extreme force, of a bite from another dog.
- SMALL DOGS EX CHIHUAHUAS ARE MORE OF A NUISANCE THAN PITBULLS. IF THE DOG IS TRAINED CORRECTLY PITBULLS AND TERRIORS ARE NOT A PROBLEM
- NO BULLY BREED DISCRIMINATION. THEY ARENT THE PROBLEM
- Don't implement breed specific legislation
- Pitbull cross or other pitbull breeds are not the problem. It has always been the owner. I have had dogs my whole life and started training them from day 1. I have never had a violent experience with a pitbull dog. I have had 3 experiences with German Shepherds and a few small dogs at the city parks. My view is owners should have to take a course on pet ownership and understand how to create the proper behaviour in your dog. Grand father those who already own a dog but come the next dog a one time course is needed to own.
- All of the above, but only for dogs with a recorded history of aggression.
- Treat breeds equally and give all a chance. We dont go around making special rules for breeds of people cause that's racism. Same thing here!
- Higher fines as well as tougher laws for all breeds of dogs who are a nuisance but especially German Shepards, boxers, mastiffs, etc.
- Owners should be held responsible for their own dog regardless of breed. Pit bulls are not dangerous. Irresponsible pet owners are.
- Stricter bylaws surrounding obedience training and animal trainer certification to support positive reinforcement training only
- I don't support how this survey singles out pit bulls. It is always how the dog is raised, not the breed that determines behaviour.
- How about in order to own a pittbull or nuisance dog the owner must apply for a license to own the breed. As it's 100% on the owner that these breeds become hostile
- All owners and dogs should be made to take training and obedience lessons
- Focus should be solely on nuisance dogs! Do NOT single out pit bulls to contribute to the uneducated and unfounded reputation of this dog.
- I think the above should apply for all dogs and not just pitbulls.



- Owners of nuisance dogs must go through mandatory training of how to take care of them (not just obedience)
- THERE ARE MUCH WORSE BREEDS OUT THERE THAN A BULLY BREED. THIS IS THE MOST RIDICULOUS THING THAT I HAVE READ.
- There should be a way to have your dog removed from nuisance list through training.
- A premium on pit bull (or Rottweiler) licences to fund education courses, refundable upon attendance.
- Dismiss in literature the misplaced public fear and / or distrust of Pit Bulls and instead focus on breeds that are statistically more likely to inflict a bite injury like Dobermanns or Daschunds. Pit Bulls, when properly trained and cared for, are loving and gentle creatures that care deeply for their family.
- Breed specific bans
- Criminal charges for owners of dogs that injure any person. Too many owners of unstable dogs insist "he's never done anything like this before!" Fine, if you want to take the chance of owning a loaded weapon, there should be very serious consequences if anyone is injured.
- Do not discriminate against "pit bull" type breeds. Trying to argue "strength" as a determining factor is not appropriate when taking into consideration how many large and "strong" dog breeds there are (for example: German Shepherd, Mastiff, Rottweiler... etc).
- Singling out one dog breed is totally wrong it is no different than singling out humans because of their race colour or Creed. It is more likely that a small dog will bite and cause injury. Singling out pitbulls or any of the bully breeds is wrong if you are going to do this you need to do this for all large breed dogs. It is a proven fact that pitbulls have no bigger bite than a German Shepherd or a Rottweiler. If you are going to segregate one breed you need to segregate all. Once again pull your head out of your [removed] this is ridiculous. I work in an industry where I go to people's houses everyday and I have been bitten by little dogs on several occasions and nothing by by law has been done other than a written warning which is a joke. And in one case I even needed stitches and the owner still only got a warning because it was a little dog. If your laws are going to be brought into effect I will take the law into my own hands and when a little dog bites me I will put the thing out of its misery. My American Staffordshire Terrier has never bitten anyone not even another dog. He is 16 years old and these laws are a joke
- Honestly, just ban the ownership of pit bulls if that is possible. Also Rottweilers and Dobermans.
- Targeting a specific breed has no merit. It is noted above that pit bulls are NOT involved in more incidents. Please please engage places like clever canines in this discussion. Dogs that are not allowed to socialize because they are thought to or have exhibited nuisance behaviour only makes the issue worse.
- An aggressive dog is not a reflection of the breed, OR the dog it is a reflection on the owner. This is absolutely ridiculous. Whoever made these proposals is aphonous. Y'all had to use a story from 2014 to justify this. Get over yourselves and stop bullying the pitbull breed! Your moms Chihuahua is more vicious. Sei muto.



- Dogs are usually never a problem, its their environment/owners that have the responsibility to make sure their dog is respectful and not dangerous. I don't think we should penalize dogs on the breed they were born, I feel owners who have a dog that has bitten/shown aggression should be given opportunities to have dog behavior specialists take a look at their dog.
- These measures noted above should be applied consistently to all sizes and breeds of dogs, singling out certain breeds does not solve the problem of irresponsible ownership that is typically the cause of dog bites/attacks.
- Disagree with breed specific legislation. How are you going to determine these breeds? There are studies showing that people are often incorrect in guessing a mixed breed dog's breeds. In most of the guidelines above would I want to see if more EDUCATION and accessibility of services so that people can safely keep their animals and the community is kept safe too. So help teach people to humanely prevent nuisance and or dangerous behaviour. Additionally, by the definition of "nuisance" given above these restrictions don't make sense. A dog barking in their yard is not a predictor of aggressive behaviour so why would you require a muzzle? If the dogs exhibit dangerous behaviour towards humans or other dogs then regardless of breed, I fully support humane muzzles.
- None of the above. You should never judge a dog by its breed. NEVER!!
- I do not think this bylaw should include CKC Registered Am Staff's or Staffordshire Terriers. But unregistered dogs should be included. I think all pit bulls should be muzzled and on lead at all times outside their property and property should be properly fenced to contain said dogs.
- This survey is deeply flawed and an embarrassment to the City of Calgary, especially the section related to Pit Bulls. BY YOUR OWN ADMISSION Pit Bulls are not responsible for a disproportionate volume of incidents yet you somehow think it's okay to single them out. If dog bites from large breeds are a concern you must include ALL large dog breeds. Whoever put this survey together needs to give their head a shake.
- Education must be completed before purchasing or adopting a dog/cat/pet - just like a boating licence, etc.
- PIT BULLS ARE KIND LOVING ANIMALS SHAME ON YOU CALGARY FOR BANNING PIT BULLS
- Breed bans and muzzles for specific breeds do not work and are not the solution. I do not support this move. It has proven costly to taxpayers in other cities and creates a fear mentality.
- More education provided or offered to pets owners. Maybe when they register their animal with the city or if an accident occurs. It's often not the animals fault, it's the humans fault which isn't fair.
- Any breed can be declared a Nuisance
- Dogs that have history of aggression should be muzzled in public parks/off Leash parks
- I do not support any of these rules trying ban or add extra rules to any type of pitbull or bull breeds. I've been approached by other aggressive breeds that were not pitbulls. For example, Rottweiler, chihuahua, German Shepard. I would not blame these dogs for being aggressive. I would put the blame to their owners for not being responsible for raising them properly.
- None of this BSL [removed]
- Any dog that has caused death to another dog should be seized. The 3-strikes rule is ludicrous.



- should not be something enforced by the city, it's an owner's responsibility stricter rules for people NOT pets
- Most of these options above are not clear. What defines a nuisance dog and what defines dangerous behaviour? Is my dog barking at someone passing by my yard dangerous behaviour? Some clear definitions need to be added.
- Support additional measure for dogs who have had multiple major offences. Dogs who are found at large or have noise complaints are not the same as those who are aggressive and they should be in two categories.
- Obedience training for all dogs, small dogs are often worse behaved than these "nuisance" dogs
- When a dog is recognized as being a nuisance there should an evaluation done on the owner to ensure that they are capable of supporting good behaviour in there dog.
- By-law that the OWNER cannot own more dogs if they are involved in a certain number of incidents. Encourage owner training too.
- Training for pet owners is addressing the issue more than the dog itself. Breed specific fines/punishment is not appropriate when it is the owners who do not have control of their pet. Responsibility is ultimately on the pet owner.
- Small dogs are worse
- The owners must face more penalties for any nuisance
- I don't feel any breed should be singled out. Individual dogs, and very often the owners need to be dealt with on a case by case basis. Many "nuisance" dogs are not the problem, it is their owners that create the situations. Not fair to go after any one type of dog as like humans each is individual with their own personality.
- Fine owners who choose to teach a dog, any breed of dog, to be aggressive. Do not punish a living creature who does not have a voice to rally against you themselves. Discrimination is a problem. Bad owners are a problem. Pit bulls and other terriers are not the problem.
- This ordinance is biased and uncalled for.
- STOP BLAMING THE BREED!!!! Science has proven there are many other breeds with a stronger bite force than pitbulls, why arent they even mentioned?
- Mandate Training for pit bull owners on how to properly train and care for their pets, following any incidents.
- None of the above!
- Do not punish pit bulls, this is ABSURD!
- Ban pit bulls, dobermans and other dangerous breeds, similar to Ontario. There's no need to have a vilolent animal, particularly in the city.
- These are all awful
- Ban agressive breeds
- any breed can be a nuisance so declaring an entire breed is bullying and not right
- Breed specific legislation has been shown again and again to not be effective. Please see explanations by the AVMA and the American Kennel Club <https://www.akc.org/expert-advice/news/issue-analysis-breed-specific-legislation/>



- Dogs undergo behavioral testing before being declared a 'nuisance' (at owners expense if necessary)
- Stop discriminating against specific breeds, thats is extremely ignorant.
- I find it interesting that pit bulls are being singled out. I do not own one myself, but do not like this. Any large breed of dog, including golden retrievers can cause more harm when they bite. I have never encountered an aggressive pitbull, and have been visiting dog parks for years
- Any breed untrained can bite. May as well ban every dog then.
- ALL dogs should be required to have obedience training, not just bully breeds. I have personally been bit by ONLY small dogs.
- While I understand the strength of a pit bull, whether it is a nuisance or not has everything to do with whom the animal is being raised by. It's the owner that deserves the fines and requirement to seek training if the animal is involved with any bylaw infractions. I have a neighbour who's small chihuahuas are far more aggressive than any pit bull I've met. These dogs have attacked me and others on several occasions. The owner is not being held responsible for her dogs, yet if they were pit bulls they would be put down. It's not the dog. It's the owner.
- I believe that nuisance dogs should be treated differently and not breed specific. I also believe that it's an owners responsibility to treat their animal properly. It has nothing to do with the pet and everything to do with the owner(s). If an animal is treated poorly they will react to that treatment. There is no such thing as an aggressive dog! There might be a dog that bites, or barks, or jumps. But all those things are from poor training and ownership. It has 100% to do with owners of animals and not the pet itself or the breed. If there was a shitzu in the neighbourhood that was as big as a bully breed it would 100% be labelled as aggressive. Those little guys can go crazy! But because they are 12lbs and not 80-90lbs they are not labelled as aggressive. I really believe we need to stop using the words aggressive when it comes to dogs. They are dogs. They are animals and they have no ability to display any behaviours that have not been taught to them. That includes negative or positive behaviour.
- Breed specific legislation is fear driven and not effective. "Pit bulls" are not inherently dangerous, responsible ownership for ALL dogs should be the focus.
- One offense the dog should be put down.
- I dont think it should be just one type of breed All Dogs big or little. Stop pointing out bulllys. I was attacked as a child by a little dog.
- All dogs must have obedience training and have a training certification
- [removed]
- [removed]
- Obedience training and muzzling should come as a rehabilitation in hopes to retrain a dog of any size that has harmed or is a repeat offended in attempting cause harm to other humans or creatures (that occurred without instigation). It is hard to write a black and white rule about a very large spectrum of issues.
- This is complete discrimination. Unacceptable. If you look a certain way your personality is deemed dangerous? What kind of prejudice is that?



- A bit more reference checking when it comes to new owners looking to acquire a pitbull or any other dogs I.e. rottweilers, dobermans, boxers, or any other dog big or small, ITS NOT THE BREED, ITS THE OWNER!! Stop handing over dogs to any random [removed] that comes off the street with the money thinking that because they have said money that they're entitled to own a dog
- Obedience training should be required for ALL dogs, exemptions for owners with proof of prolonged responsible dog ownership/dog trainers
- Dog owners who cannot take the time to properly care and train for their dogs should be banned from having them. The fact that Calgary is trying to put a BSL is unacceptable. Since when did you think this was okay? Bully breeds are NOT the issue. It's the owners and irresponsible people. Like the ones who even suggested such a stupid idea. I've met smaller dogs with WAAY more behavioural issues than I have meeting bully breeds. Don't pass this, it's absolutely horrendous that you're even considering it as a bylaw. Shame on Calgary counsel for considering this
- If dogs are considered a nuisance, owners should be held responsible and enroll said dogs into appropriate behavior training courses to address specific problems the dog has. The city should also made said training courses more affordable and accessible so owners are educated when owning a dog. Breeds of dogs should not be singled out because any dog raised by an untrained owner and stressful environment will exhibit similar behavioural problems. Not all dogs that act out are aggressive. Some are anxious and reacted because uneducated non-dog owners do not heed the warning of responsible dog owners and behave inappropriately around anxious dogs and then find reactions intimidating and want to report it as a nuisance. Both non dog owners and dog owners need proper education. Fix the people first.
- Everyone knows chihuahuas are most likely to bite, yet we don't see them muzzled morning destroyed. It is irrelevant if a pit bull has a higher probability of doing more damage. There should be NO BSL, only nuisance dogs, ones that bite repetitively should be fined, muzzled etc. Obedience should be mandatory in order to own a dog!
- Behaviour training for owners with strong breeds should be required and for a cheaper cost. Positive reinforcement based training only.
- Ban the purchase of dangerous dog breeds for the safety of the general public which should take priority over dog ownership
- I do not agree or at all support any of these measures, as they are targeted very unfairly to pit bulls. I think this bylaw would be one of the dumbest things calgary could possible do and I would imagine that if this bylaw passed with its discrimination against pit bulls, there would be a lot of anger and backlash from many people.
- It is misleading to include non-pit bulls (e.g. American Staffordshire terriers) within the definition of a "pit bull." Doing so purposely is also negligent. If The City of Calgary wants to label this class of dog, then it should use a more expansive term (such as "bull-type terrier"). Ordinary members of the public are likely unaware of the aesthetic differences that exist between the bull-type terriers, and labelling every such terrier as a "pit bull" will further erode public acceptance of pit bulls.
- None of the above, as this is cruel towards these sweet animals.



- Why are you targeting pitbulls? There are multiple breeds you can get in North America with higher strength bites.
- Not all pitbulls are nuisance dogs and they should NOT be labeled as such, emphasis on rehabilitation (training) at the owner's expense, there should be a way to clear a dog of the "nuisance" label after a period of time w/out incident.
- Higher fines for people who raise pitbulls poorly, stop attacking this poor breed and target ownership instead
- This question is ridiculous, stop trying to implement breed-specific legislation. Pit bulls might be stronger than many other dogs but it speaks volumes that they are the only breed listed here. Do better.
- Breed specific legislation is absolutely ridiculous. Irresponsible ownership is the issue. The pit bulls I have known are the sweetest dog's I've ever met, meanwhile labs, poodles, and shih tzus are the worst in my personal experience. Perhaps seizing and rehoming "nuisance" dogs is the answer as owners are proving they are too lazy to put the work into training their animal, because dogs of all types and sizes need training. Dogs are not bad, yet we make them bear the consequences of bad owners.
- Singling our Pitbulls is disgusting.
- No extra penalty for pitbulls or any forced training to a specific breed because stated in this survey they do not have a higher bite rate and also they do not have the strongest bite force aswell. So to specify against pitbulls specifically is rather pointless. Personal opinions or how pitbulls and other bully breeds have been broadcasted over media for a few bad dogs or poorly written articles with big captions to catch the attention of people for views is not a reason to put restrictions in place. Also this survey does not allow for actual opinion but suggested answers that sometimes are one sided example of question #1 where there is no option on opposition or an option to say nothing is needed.
- Ban pit bulls and similar breeds as was done in Ontario. There is no need to own this type of animal.
- It's the OWNERS not the DOGS.
- Mandatory prison sentence for any pit bull owner whose dog attacks a person.
- NONE. TAKE THIS OUT. THIS IS STUPID. PIT BULLS ARE NOT ANY MORE DANGEROUS DOGS THAN ANY OTHER DOG
- Why single out Pitt Bulls? Why not Dobermans, German Shepherds & Rottweilers that have equal or greater bite force? Or Chow Chows, Dalmatians and Huskies that are proven to be very aggressive breeds? Furthermore, Staffordshire Bull Terriers ("Staffies") are NOT the same as American Staffordshire Terriers or Pitt Bulls. Staffies are not naturally aggressive - they are affectionate dogs and don't deserve the stigma you are trying to attach to them.
- Fines should be given to the owners of ANY dog that bites/attacks/chases - even those little ankle-biter dogs that are quite often not trained
- The owner should be fined and if there is an incident, the owner should be trained as well as the dog. If there is a repeat, the owner should be banned from the breed and a responsible owner found. The breed is not the issue, it is the owner.



- NO! It is the owner, not the breed that is the problem! You want to be bias against certain breeds of dogs; then go after the Llasa Apsos, Jack Russells, Pekinese, Papillons, Chihuahuas, Cockapoos and other small mixed breeds. They are nuisance breeds that bite people all the time and bark to no end! Just don't hear it on the media simply because it is a small dog! Statistically, there are more bites from small breeds than there are for breeds (over 25 kgs). What's next? Are you going to after white, blonde, brown, red, brindle & mixed coloured dogs and only allow black dogs off leash? Give your heads a shake!!!
- Aggressive dogs - owner should have to take courses to learn "proper training/control" of their dog.
- Banning pit bulls.
- Leave pit bulls alone
- Perhaps mandate socialization training for dog owners (puppy socialization) - this is an essential part of helping dogs learn appropriate behaviours when they are young
- None of the above, just because some dogs created a bad rep, not all of them are bad!
- This is very ignorant as pit bulls are amazing/loving animals
- Obedience training requirements are the best options for all dogs. Discriminatory conduct towards pitbulls ignores how all dogs can be aggressive. Pitbulls used to be nanny dogs.
- Ban all pitbulls!!
- I'm using this field to express my express disapproval in singling out Pit Bulls. More extensive HUMAN training is required.
- Stronger consequences for irresponsible ownership of ALL breeds. And why list Pitbulls and not dogs with a stronger bite force? This makes zero sense! Your "important note" fails to mention that Pit bulls do not have the strongest bite force.
- [removed]
- Pit Bulls need to be banned, regardless of what vets say, Pit Bulls have been genetically bred to kill, and when they go into attack mode their genetics moves them to kill, not just defend. Most other dogs when they bite, do not go for the throat. People in general that buy these dogs what them as a threat weapon.
- Off leash parks - maybe they need to be fenced and individuals only enter at their own risk and need to understand that a dog is an animal and to be respected. It is like a human, ask if you can approve and be respectful. Any dog can bite - why are pit bulls being targeted?
- this survey reeks of bias. owners should be fined for dogs that attack. end of story. no muzzles. this gives too much power to the people and leaves too much variance in what constitutes a nuisance dog. Some people will find a puppy a nuisance. Theres no guidelines for what people can tolerate. If someone were to have low tolerance for hyper dogs they will call it a nuisance. I dont trust people to be honest in their opinions
- Fine owner! As a dog is someones full responsibility like a child would be. If someone is willing to own a animal they need to have proper training for ANY breed of dogs, & Take full responsibility for they're own dogs actions. Animals are the work you put into them.
- This should apply to ALL dogs, not just nuisance dogs.
- [removed]



- None of the above. Rottweilers have a stronger bite but they're not listed, so why are pit bulls? It's more about individual DNA and ownership training, NOT A BREED. I've been bit by a chihuahua and required stitches. What's the difference? More often than not, animal "bites" or "attacks" are brought on by humans; ie. the dog being threatened by a human near their property, or experience of a situation such as someone breaking in. If we wouldn't "euthanize" a human for self defense, why would you even CONSIDER doing it to a dog?
- I don't think any 1 breed should be signaled out. Where it's a chihuahua or a pit bull.
- Mandatory training for ALL breeds of dogs with a certified trainer. Mandatory training/screening for all Humans prior to purchasing a dog to ensure that the Human has the appropriate skills and means to take care/support their animal.
- I don't believe this needs to be "pit bull" specific. It needs to be on a per case basis. There are German Shepherds, Shar Pei and Retrievers that are more scary than a pit bull. An untrained, unadjusted dog is still a dog regardless of looks or breeds.
- No need for breed specific legislation
- [removed]
- Do not discriminate against any specific breed.
- Do not separate pitbulls from other breeds of dogs.
- Pit bulls, and other dogs stereotypically deemed "aggressive breeds", are not aggressive at heart. These dogs are not born aggressive, which is why (as mentioned above) pit bulls are not responsible for any more dog bites than any other breed. There are little dogs that bite WAY more than pit bulls, they just don't receive any reprimanding because their bites typically don't cause much harm. If you REALLY want to reduce the incidence of dog bites, education is the way to do it. Require people looking at owning bully breeds to undergo some sort of education process, make sure they know how to socialize their dogs, and ensure they are not wanting to own pit bulls (or other bully breeds) for the wrong reason. Dogs are not aggressive because it is their nature, they become aggressive due to poor and aggressive ownership. Surveys like this additionally only increase the stigma surrounding bully breeds. If you implement a combination of education for bully-breed owners, and active reduction of the stigmatization of these dogs, a noticeable difference will be seen.
- With all due respect pit bulls and dogs in general are not the problem, the owners are. I have provided this feedback in the past dog owners should require to get dog licenses to own a dog, much like a driver's license. Why? Because if a dog is not properly cared for or trained it can kill just like a car can.
- Get rid of this breed specific language. Owners should all be properly vetted by a breeder or rescue organization. There are no bad dogs, there are bad owners. If a dog has re-occurrence of bad behavior then there should be an investigation into the household and if owners found irresponsible, the dog is taken to rescue for evaluation and re-homing. Pitbulls are some of the best dogs I know.
- How about focus on making sure people are educated on being responsible owners. Most of those options make it seem like the pitbull is so dangerous that no one will adopt them since those would



options above make it way more expensive to have one. They are not bad dogs its bad owners that cause the issue. My "pitbull" is the biggest teddy bear in the world and wouldn't hurt a fly.

- Dogs who are seen as dangerous should be taken from their owners and retrained. The owner should then be charged/fined. The dog is only dangerous because the owner did not train them right. It's the owners fault. Not the dogs.
- Dog parks are not for everyone. While we would love for all dogs to get along without a problem, dog fights happen. Pitbull owners need to REPSONSIBLE!!! Organizations need to be able to do criminal record/background checks should be done on home owners, renters, and individuals who want to own this breed. Private dog rescues or people posting on Kikiji need to be held responsible also in sending these dogs to owners who cannot handle the breed. They should have to do home checks and obtain background checks also on the people who want to own these dogs. The media also has a responsibility in spreading the correct information about a dog incident. I can find many examples of the media expressing that a Pitbull caused a bite but when it is other breeds they will not mention the breed. I believe the media causes the hysteria!!!! Everyone thinks there child is perfect no matter what they do...that includes people with small and medium sized dogs. If a fight occurs the only thing that most people will see in a fight is the Pit Bull, no matter who started it or if your Pitbull is just defending themselves. I would suggest trying to keep your pet out of harm's way from other breeds or people trying to make an example of your dog to have their 15 minutes of fame. If you want this breed then do the research on them. I'm talking from experience but drug dealers, gang members love this breed and treat them like shit! They are loyal to a fault and don't realize a good home compared to a bad home. If you are a couch potato then maybe this breed is not for you as they are energetic, highly intelligent and need a great owner, who is responsible, strong minded and can be the Pack Leader!! These breeds need to be worked running, pulling agility, fetching toys etc.
- Mandatory training classes for owners and their dogs, regardless of breed. Special licensing for breeders all other animals must be spayed/neutered within 2 years of animal's birth.
- More measures to defend property owners from neighbours' dogs that exhibit aggressive behavior such as loud and frequent barking that make it impossible to feel comfortable in one's own backyard. Reconsider the criteria for how much barking is too much (i.e. measured in minutes/day presently). Require more stringent measures against mounting behaviour in dogs in off-leash parks.
- Ban pitbulls and/or dangerous dog breeds please. One injury is too much. See link: <https://globalnews.ca/news/7293560/calgary-woman-pit-bull-attack-pet-survey/>
- High fines for owners that cannot control dogs. Ability to put down aggressive dogs. Quit singling out pit bulls, blame the owners and have a proper system in place to fine or jail repeat owners
- Why are other breeds like chiwas not included? They are quite viscous dogs.
- STOP TARGETING PIT BULLS ONLY ! there are other dangerous dogs out there...it is the owners how need to fined and banned not a breed of animal and most certainly not ONLY Pit Bulls ! Make the owners accountable DO NOT make the animal / breed suffer because of ignorance!
- Competent ownership of any dog, its not the dog that is the issue it is the owners,



- none of those, there is no bad dogs, only bad owner. the dog should not be punished, due to their owners.
- nuisance should be applied after one spontaneous altercation
- Any dog breed that bites from a small breed to large! Your bias is showing! Cats you have a by-law you do not enforce, Start there!
- This is absolutely unacceptable! ANY medium to large breed dog has strong jaws. This suggestion of BSL is absolutely disgusting. To think we have come so far when it comes to inclusion and diversity with humans to just label a specific "look" of a dog? Where is your proof? Just because un-educated and misinformed people believe this does not mean it's true! I do not agree with this proposal and consider the wording of this very ignorant and offensive as well! I have spent many years with dogs that "look" this way and they couldn't be more empathetic, sweet and sensitive in nature.
- Training programs offered for a owner/dogs first offence. However, the training must be force free methods, and available for low or no cost.
- I do not support breed specific legislation Define what is "dangerous behaviour". (Lunging, pulling, jumping, bite, growl) Define what nuisance would require additional insurance (barking? running at large? Licensing?) Contradictory statement. Dogs running at large are not allowed to go to the dog park?
- Pitbulls are not the problem here .
- ANY dog that is aggressive should be muzzled. A pitbull should be left alone unless it has shown that its a risk. Smaller dogs are more likely to be nasty.
- More education and more contro taen to stop backyard breeders, nuisance can be just dogs who bark all day so paying a fine to the city won't fix anything however if a owner is irresponsible and doesn't control an aggressive dog then education to that owner should be made mandatory
- Pittbuls should be banned they are way Too dangerous!!
- All of the above.
- They should do dog specific. My sister in law owns a dog considered a pit bull breed but it is the nicest, friendliest dog i have met. If the dog passes a check green bandana. If a dangerous breed RED bandana.
- do not agree with breed specific bylaws or requirements based on breed.
- This is a fantastic example of discrimination. There are other dogs just as aggressive or worse. Hold the owners to a higher standard where training is needed to own said dogs
- It is not just the dog, it is the owner that should be required to be trained. People with little dogs tend to be more of a problem (and some large dogs) in that they allow their dogs to run loose or on a long leash letting them jump up on people and dogs causing the larger dog to be aggressive. Then the owner yells, it's alright he/she is friendly never thinking that your dog might be uncomfortable. People need to understand its is a privilege and responsibility to own a dog. An owner must be vigilant when in public to watch for the kids and adults who have no idea how to approach or not approach a dog. I'm constantly stopping kids running up and trying to touch/hug my dog. Then I take the time to teach them to ask first, wait for my dog to sit and then touch them on the top of the head



all while being yelled at by parents for interfering. Have schools create a program for domestic and wild animal do's and don'ts since so many parents do not have the knowledge. There are so many problems that arise that a good (and I emphasize good) trainer could help alleviate if there was mandatory positive training involved. In answer to Q8 to be safe all responsible dog owners should put a red bandana on which unfortunately would not teach kids the proper way to approach the dog. Q9 fines the same with mandatory training of person and dog cases of bites or attacks should technically be reduced. I can't stress enough that training by an experienced and knowledgeable dog trainer is paramount to success.

- Problem dogs must be put down for public safety. Kids bitten by dogs that draw blood are to be put down.
- Common sense, any breed can be a danger and own breed shouldn't be used as a scape goat.
- ban pit bulls altogether, they are a dangerous weapon and lethal to children
- Think they have to be classified as nuisance first. And not by a by law or a bad neighbor that doesn't like them. And it shouldn't be just pit bulls. Don't forget about all the other dogs either. Shepherds saint Bernards. Even the little ones that bite. Not innocent either. Let's be fair.
- Pit bull breeds, as noted above, are not involved in any more incidents than other breeds and should not be singled out. The owners of any animal that is declared a nuisance should be fined and required, along with their pet, to take obedience training. It is as much about the owner as it is about the animal. Further more, why would you limit the number of pit bull breeds in a household. Limit the number of any breed in household - may max of 4?
- It has been proven that a "breed" is not an issue, it is concerning that the city doesn't understand (or has investigated) the science of it. Stigmatizing one (or several breeds) is not just foolish but causes no benefits. Proper training and good owners is what is required.
- None. Pitbulls are not predetermined to be nuisances or aggressive dogs & it is not fair to label them as such.
- Additional insurance and muzzles penalize well behaved/socialized dogs and owners of those dogs. Maybe dogs found to pose a threat should be assessed by a behaviourist before the above steps are taken and the owner could pay a fee for the assessment.
- NO breed specific legislation please. It is not effective.
- No Breed Specific Legislation. No additional legislation surrounding any breed of dogs other than "owner Training" for individuals who have a dog who has shown strong aggression.
- Ban them completely
- Too many households in our neighbourhood (Canyon Meadows) have two large dogs in their backyards. Whenever someone walks a dog or dogs in the back lanes, the fenced dogs set up a constant loud barking that goes on and on. And there are some irresponsible owners who simply leave their dogs out all day to bark incessantly when the owners aren't home. That should be illegal.
- you absolutely can not discriminate against pitbulls and pitbull owners. There are far worse nuisance dogs. If you make obedience training mandatory for one breed you had better make it mandatory for every single dog owned in the city. Or perhaps you should make people pass a pet ownership test



prior to being allowed to have an animal because the majority of problems with dogs and other pets are because of the owner not the dog

- I was bitten by someone else's pitbull on the street, I sincerely support banning this breed.
- Total ban of "PIT BULL" dogs in Calgary
- Better animal rights that gives them more protection from poor ownership from humans that don't meet their needs... eg. ethering.. leaving outside, guard dogs, dog fights, malnourishment etc.
- It is not the dog's fault. Owners need better training on how to train and care for their pets. People also need more education and to teach their children how to approach dogs.
- More severe penalties for owners with dogs that bite up to and including life time bans from owning dogs. Which should include the small dogs that bite more frequently
- Some sort of education for owner. The owner is usually the problem of the dog's behaviour.
- Bsl is not a solution. Someone's appearance does not determine temperament
- Fines for Nuisance dogs and their owners are required. A breed does not denote behaviour, it's environment and training does. A pitbull is no more aggressive than a golden retriever when raised and trained properly. Unfortunately these breeds are favoured among individuals who want "Guard dogs" and have developed this horrid reputation. Logically this is no different than racist legislation based on preconceived notions that other races are predisposed to some action.
- Big fines for owners of dogs who attack humans or other pets and cause harm.
- Leave it as is. I had pit bulls growing up. It's the owner's fault. Take dog away from. Owner and make owner pay fine for bad parenting
- You are way off base targeting pit bulls. Of the top 23 dog bites in order of bite psi, pit bull is only number 5. Dog Bite psi 1. Kangal 743 psi 2. American Bandogge 735 psi 3. Cane Corso 700 psi 4. Dogge de Bordeaux 556 psi 5. Tosa Inu 556 psi 6. English Mastiff 556 psi 7. Dogo Canario 540 psi 8. Dogo Argentino 500 psi 9. Wolfdog 406 psi 10. Leonberger 399 psi 11. Akita Anu 359-400 psi 12. Rottweiler 328 psi 13. Siberian Husky 320 psi 14. African Wild Dog 317 psi 15. American Bulldog 305 psi 16. Doberman 245 psi 17. German Shepherd 238 psi 18. Great Dane 238 psi 19. American Pitbull 235 psi 20. Labrador Retriever 230 psi 21. Dutch Shepherd 224 psi 22. Chow Chow 220 psi 23. Malinois Dog 195 psi
- I ABSOLUTELY DO NOT agree with any of the statements around pit bulls. This is an appalling question and continues to fan the flames of people believing this breed of dog are scary and bite which is simply NOT TRUE. Pit Bull owners should be able to visit off leash, not have to have separate insurance, not be fined higher etc. All dogs should be treated equally and the owners of nuisance dogs (whatever the breed) should be punished per the bylaw. Honestly this question is awful
- Not punishing the breed. I've been bitten by more small dogs than ever had issues with big dogs. At the dog park we've had to stop more small dogs harassing our dogs than big dogs.
- I do not believe standards should be breed specific
- Ban them.
- Bully breeds are not the issue humans are. If any dogs have anger bred into them it's small dogs, Chihuahua breeds, and other small dogs.



- None of the above. Extreme regulation for no good reason.
- You guys are dicks and dogs shouldn't be punished for their breed, nor should the people who love them. Make the public take a class on how to interact with dogs that don't belong to you instead. Dogs don't just bite for no reason, you know.
- Ban pit bull type dogs altogether. They are simply too dangerous and there will always be irresponsible owners no matter what bylaws are in effect.
- All dogs at off-leash dogs in parks should be required to be neutered.
- This is ridiculous! The issue is not the breed of a dog the issue is a irresponsible owner. I am totally against this!
- No Dog shall be Off-leash in any of the city park of playground and outside of the dog owner property
- Prohibit Pitbull's and other dangerous dogs completely. Destroy them before they destroy a family or young child's life.
- NO BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS
- Any dog can be a "nuisance" it's how that dog was raised and treated
- A dog that barks at passer-bys in its own yard is not a nuisance
- Would there be a process for an animal to transition from nuisance status to non-nuisance?
- I abhor breed specific legislation when the issue at hand is responsible ownership. All dogs have the potential to be aggressive / a nuisance and regulations should therefore be standardized regardless of breed with owners held accountable after an incident occurs, not before.
- Stop picking on pit bulls. Any dog that is a nuisance should be fined. Not by breed
- Please do not treat so called "pitbulls" as particularly problematic. This term has become a sound bite that triggers an emotional response that is not how public policy ought to be created. All dogs need obedience training. All owners need to be responsible for their dog's behaviour. Focus on the person and their responsibilities.
- The City should provide a virtual course to any dog owners getting a dog license teaching them what behaviors are acceptable/unacceptable. Easy to pick on the Pit bull- how many attacks have we have had relative to other powerful and small breeds? Other powerful breeds should be mentioned.
- Owners should have to have taken extra training how to manage these dogs. This needs to be a part of licensing.
- Ban pit bulls and problem dogs, as the owners can be the problem, fines don't stop a dog from attacking or killing.
- Stop demonizing Pitbulls
- Pit bulls are not the issue, it's the owner's responsibility to train the dog correctly. I do not own one but I have never had an issue with friends dogs or at dog parks
- Ban pitbulls near playgrounds.
- All breeds of dogs that are deemed as "potentially dangerous" because of their aggressive nature must be forbidden in the city of Calgary without excuses by the owners. Aggressive dogs are not human beings: they cannot serve "jail time" or be reprimanded or punished in any way. Adoptions of new aggressive dogs must be banned from the city now, while existing aggressive dogs must be



phased out and not replaced without waiting for an accident to happen before extreme measures are taken. The idea of creating "dog courts" is silly, expensive and impractical: courts of law are too busy with human cases before adding "criminal dogs". Crocodile tears by dog owners and by city officials are not accepted after the fact.

- All breeds and crosses should be treated the same. It is about behaviour not breed.
- I take offense to the generalization of pit bulls. Yes they are strong, but they are also extremely smart which makes them victim to people who train them to be vicious. You have generalized that all pit bulls or pit bull type dogs are going to bite someone more often than another breed. Golden Retrievers and Huskys bite more people but we never hear the breed just "dog". There should be an area in the bylaw that reporting on media should include the breed so that people will realize that other dogs attack too. Myself and my pitbull type dog were rushed and almost attacked by 1 golden retriever multiple times because their owners weren't smart enough to put their vicious retriever on a leash. Who would have been blamed for that attack, the retriever who came after us or my sweet and kind pit bull type dog who was protecting me? It seems the minute anyone sees a pit bull there they assume, and unfortunately the human will lie and the dog gets killed for doing what its suppose to do, protect its human from an attacking. Stronger bylaws are needed yea, but it should not reference a specific breed.
- [removed]
- increased enforcement of all pet related bylaws in public spaces
- Please update this poll to define "dangerous behaviour" so your constituents can provide accurate feedback.
- Outlaw pitbulls altogether
- Nothing, this is absurd.
- Owners are the issue, not the breed of dog. Fines for owners who ignore basic ownership bylaws are where you should be enforcing. Dogs outside in yards in distress, owners not picking up after their dogs. Owners walking dogs off leash in on leash areas. Etc.
- Targeting a breed(s) is not the right way to go. Targeting nuisance dogs deals with the troublesome dogs/owners which is where the problem lies
- No breed specific legislation. The logic for pitbulls being singled out here doesn't even check out. Many other dogs can do very serious damage and do so more frequently than pitbulls.
- Make the owners with ANY "nuisance" dog go to training. It is 95% NOT THE DOG!! It is a result of lack of dog knowledge and training.
- Targeting one breed or type of dog is not the answer, there are many other breeds that can cause issues so targeting nuisance dogs and working with their owners is the right approach
- Stop allowing children under 12 to handle dogs in public unsupervised by an adult.
- Breed specific legislation is not appropriate.
- Spay/neuter existing and a complete ban on new pit bulls and associated genetically similar mixed breeds.



- Training of animals and responsible owners are the key. If a person trains their dog to be aggressive the owner should face hefty fines, Kids need to be taught warning signs that dogs will show and little ones need to be watched. (stay off your phones)
- We need to keep in mind that it is the owners and how they raise it, not the dog breed. Courses tied to raising and training the specific breed will only work if the owner follows what they learn. It's not fair to punish a dog, but the stigma is out there now because of this issue brought to light.
- Pit Bulls and Nuisance dogs cannot be in or around playgrounds or children's facilities without a muzzle.
- Once declared dangerous they should have to go to training. Maybe this way, people will take more responsibility before buying a dog. Not all dogs are bad.
- None, pit bulls are an amazing breed.
- Don't make breed specific bylaws!! Blame bad owners, majority of issues stem from poor breed knowledge/training by the owner not the dog. This is why German Shepherd, Rottweiler, Dobermans and bully breeds have all gotten a bad reputation over the years!
- Please don't implement breed specific measures.
- I don't own a pit bull, and probably never will, but you're delusional if you think it's a dog's fault and not the owner. Bad dogs come in all breeds.
- "Nuisance" dogs are not AT ALL breed specific. My suggestion is to not create such close minded rules about pit bulls.
- Ban Pitbulls they are dangerous my friends own pitbull attacked her and put her in the hospital
- No change. It should not be breed specific. That is unfair and almost like being racist. The most vicious dogs are small breeds in my opinion.
- BSL is a proven failure around the world
- Pitbull's should be illegal to own like in Ontario
- Implementing any form of BSL is a sure fire way to polarize the city [personal information removed] BSL has been proven a failure the world over STOP Look to Toronto not. only have bites increased so has severity BSL is nothing but flawed legislation that placates the stupid and uninformed
- In an Alberta tourist town there is a Shepard breed dog with multiple "offences". The local authorities require the one dog, as this was handled on a case by case basis, to be muzzled when off property and the owners are required to have a "vicious dog" sign with photos visible on their property.
- We should not discriminate by breed all dogs bite not just pitbulls
- Breed specific laws are not effective. Years ago it was German Shepards that were considered nuisance dogs. Breeds don't determine anything, everything is based on how the dog is raised.
- Treat all dogs the same and stop putting pit bulls in a different class. This is absolutely retarded what Calgary is trying to impose!!!
- Calgary should not have breed specific by laws. There are many other types of dogs that also attack.
- I disagree with this.. if the dog is mean, then yes.. however the owner needs to be held responsible.. It is not the breed it is the owner. People need to wake up and do their homework.. before making these bylaws.. As for a dog barking, that is what they do to alert the owners that something is going



on around them.. I would worry more about making the City safe from all the criminals before worrying about a Pit bull dog.. City council really needs to get their heads screwed on..

- None of these; I'm applaud by the city of Calgary for stopping this low.
- I find it ridiculous in the highest regard to single out Pit bulls. I have never in my life seen a pit bull exhibit any more hostility than any other dog in the same situation. I've always only ever seen them be tolerant and more loving than all other breeds. I have never heard of anyone in my personal life being bitten by a pit bull, but have heard of countless other stories of bites from "lap dogs" and dogs considered to be gentler breeds.
- You should have to have a license to have a pitbull.
- Fines for off-leash animals should be significant. Same with for not picking up animal waste. Both pose a hazard to human and other animal health. Off-leash or roaming dogs overwhelming, mauling and harassing owners and on-leash dogs cause stress, dog trauma and injuries so fines should be 1000 dollars or more to encourage people to leash pets.
- Ban pit bulls
- If a dog is wearing a mussel and not allowed in off leash public spaces it will fail to develop proper social skills therefore this is counterintuitive as you are creating a potentially aggressive dog. This goes for all dogs and is not discriminatory to pit bulls. This suggestion is based on a lack of research and education and is harmful to both animals and people alike.
- Let the dogs be.
- Require the city to investigate "nuisance" dog owners since dogs are taught violence, not born violent
- No, to breed specific legislation. Affordable positive reinforcement training.
- If a dog is dangerous it should be based on that dogs actions and not what breed it is. [removed] Therefore there should not be biased laws based on breed. [DUPLICATE]
- Proper investigation on attacks. false accusations on city registered dogs deter owners from registering their pets if they will be incorrectly blamed due to location/proximity alone.
- Less picking on pitbulls. Dog owner are the ones that make nuisance dogs.
- Prohibiting owning pit bulls
- There is no distinction between a pitbull and any other dog, the only difference are their owners punish them not the animal.
- I think there are other breeds that should be considered for this special attention?
- I feel it is playing into the discrimination against pit bulls to specify them when there are definitely other dogs with a higher bite force that are not being pointed out.
- Target bad owners and stop villifying based on breed. I've been bitten numerous times by small dogs, I have NEVER had a pit bull act aggressively towards me.
- stop considering pit bulls to be aggressive animals.
- There are many nuisance dogs. This seems unfairly set against pit bulls even though as stated above they are not proven to bite more. I think the focus needs to be on bad owners and known aggressive dogs rather than breed specific bylaws.
- Stop discriminating dogs by breed, you ignorant bureaucrats.



- More fines and harsher penalties for all owners. What about little dogs that bite? What about higher fines for people who's dogs bite or show aggression... there are no bad dogs. Just bad owners.
- Higher fines for repeat offenders (the owners, not the dogs!), treats for good dogs, including pitbulls.
- We do not support breed specific penalties. We do however support penalties for dogs that have had documented behaviour concerns in the past.
- Registration and behaviour assessment of all pit bulls
- The use of nuisance is misleading and lacking. for being at large, was the dog bothering anyone or being invasive? for noise, that they bark, or whine, or yip. is this only while in public spaces, in residence yard, inside residence? "Exhibits dangerous behaviour" was someone walking passed their yard and they bared teeth, were they in an off leash, was there another dog or action that caused a natural defensive reflex.
- None as there are effective measure already been taken by other parts of the world. I'm sure Calgary can find something better.
- [personal information removed]
- Stricter rules for adoption of dogs as owners are the true source of many dog problems and abuse.
- NONE!!!!!!!!!! BREED DISCRIMINATION IS CRUEL ITS THE OWNERS NOT THE BREEDS
- ITS NOT THE DOG BUT THE OWNER! Owner should be muzzled and jailed!
- I do not support any of the above measures. There are bad owners and people with irrational fear of dogs. Each and every incident and dog should be assessed on its merits regardless of breed. If there is a bite, the owner should be evaluated for competence and fitness to own a dog. There are no bad dogs, only bad/mismatched owners. A fitness test should be a requirement to own a dog.
- Ban pit bulls
- Breed neutral bylaws
- Punish the owner not the breed
- dog owners who are declared unstable, mentaly ill or dangerouse to the public should have dog taken and put in a shelter for adoption to a better pet owner.
- Dog owner training. It's not the dogs fault. It's the owner. Education for owners and obedience training for owners. Low cost if dny
- All dogs nuisance dogs. Its how they are trained.
- Don't discriminate against pit-bull-like dogs! Bylaws to protect citizens are understandable, but breed specific bylaws only creat more fear of a breed that does not deserve to be discriminated against!
- Consider banning pit bulls
- Obedience training should be required for all dogs not breed specific
- I think that the first offence, the owner should recieve a review about their breed of dog, seeing as how ALL dogs can be labeled as a "nuisance" regardless of breed (eg. Pitbull, rotwiler, Chihuahua, chow, bullmastif, boxer, great dane....)
- It's about the dogs environment, not about the breed of dog.
- It is absolutely outrageous to be so specific about the breed of a dog when it has been explicitly proven to be an ineffective way to distinguish a dangerous dog. If the City of Calgary passes breed specific legislation, it is not a city in which I would like to live.



- Responsible ownership. BSL is proven ineffective and very costly to taxpayers.
- Limitations (like muzzles) for nuisance dogs that bite or exhibit dangerous behaviour (but not for dogs that bark, or dogs whose owners don't clean up after them; they aren't dangerous)
- Non of the above. Respectfully i do not believe pit bulls should be treated any differently than other breeds.
- No breed specific laws, deal with the dog causing an issue or problem.
- It's not the dogs who need the training, it's the people. Nuisance dogs are a product of their environment. Case by case. You cannot discriminate against pit bulls. It's the PEOPLE, not the Pitbull. Come on you guys.THINK!
- Review all off leash parks for pedestrians being harrassed by dogs not under control.
- one could make owning a pit bull a lot harder than just getting buying/adopting one. A test or interview could help limit the amount of poor pit bull owners. No BSL
- People who are found to not be treating their dogs correctly or do not train them correctly are given higher fines or jail time. Punish the owners, not the breed.
- Breed neutral bylaws only. No BSL!!
- Any breed, or size of dog, should be held at the same standars when inforcing any bylaw, including nucance, bites etc.
- Ban the breeding of pit bulls. Most of this wording is too ambiguous to say yes or no to. Purebred of the listed breeds should not be allowed in dog parks, but mixes should be permitted (although breeding of pit bull mixes should be outlawed as well). Many people that buy pit bulls want a 'tough' dog, so requiring obedience training would be ideal.
- I have been at off leads several times and have found many well behaved pit bulls. And other breed or mixed breed dogs have been aggressive... (for example huskies and the owner was aware and continued to take the pair of dogs to the off lead. it is not breed specific.
- Breed specific legislation does not solve the problem and is discriminatory.
- How will you make sure owners of nuisance dogs take them to obedience or have extra insurance? The owner often determines the dog's behavior, not the breed of dog. What about dog breeders re number of pit bulls in a household?
- Require special licensing for pit bulls. The licensing requires the owner to produce proof of increased insurance, and requires the owner to attend a series of responsible owner workshops/classes. There are other very dangerous dogs that should be included in this. Akitas certainly should be.
- Maybe people should have to complete training in order to own that breed or prove they can ve a reponsivle pet owner as it not a breed issue it a bad owner issue
- Strongly against any Breed specific legislation or discrimination. The responsibility is and always should be on the pet owners. BSL has been repeatedly proven to be ineffective. Calgary should continue with it's already excellent pet bylaws.
- TRAIN THE OWNERS TO BEHAVE, IT IS NOT OFTEN THE DOG'S FAULT!!!!
- Education on responsible pet ownership. Education on K9 body language. It is the responsibility of the owner not the individual dog to ensure public and their pet are safe.



- Pit bulls are nice animals, their owners are the problem. They need love just as much as any other dog. Cracking down on one specific breed makes no sense. Dogs in general need to be looked after. Pit bulls just happen to be stronger than other breeds that are hereditarily more violent and bite much more frequently but you just don't hear about it as much.
- Training for pet owners to effectively manage their pets
- Calgary needs to actively enforce leash by laws. Every day I see unleashed dogs in areas where they need to be leashed. This is what causes potential issues. Not a specific breed. Get more by law enforcing this. I see ppl everyday walk by my house with their dogs off leash. Pooping, running up to my gate antagonizing my dog.. guess what.. I own a bully breed and I'm responsible. Every breed under the sun I've seen off leash except for bully breeds. Calgary has too many entitled ppl who don't follow simple by laws. Don't enforce BSL. Enforce responsible dog ownership. That begins with leashing your dogs.
- This discrimination towards pit bulls is absolutely uncalled for and unfair. All dog breeds should be treated equal and the responsibility/liability should fall on the owners. Witnessing more bites, aggression and problems from smaller dog breeds is absolutely more of a nuisance than any pit bull type dog that I've met or seen. The City of Calgary should be ashamed of themselves for pushing this.
- Stop targeting Pitbull breeds!!! I have three currently and they are well behaved, socialized, kind and literally just couch potatoes who prefer a cuddle over anything else in the world. I know pit bulls who are dangerous. I know shepherds, huskies, st bernards, and more than any other dog breed, I know humans who are dangerous! Do not single out those that are innocent and have committed no crime Just based on the colour of their fur and look of their face!!!
- BSL has been proven not to be effective - I do NOT support any BSL
- The City of Calgary should not be categorizing dogs in regards to their physical appearance, such as "pitbull" type dogs. Doing so will not prevent "nuisance" dogs or lower the number of bite incidents whether it involves a "pitbull" or not. Any breed/mix of dog has the potential and ability to bite and cause severe damage if it wants. By putting breed restrictions in place against "pitbulls" and responsible dog owners who own these breeds, you are just allowing irresponsible dog owners to continue being irresponsible and not held accountable. BSL is not the answer, but education is!! In order to prevent situations (such as bite incidents, dogs at large, etc.) from happening, we need to educate and provide resources to all dog owners and the general public. Why doesn't the city provide incentives such as when an individual licenses their dog(s), if they can provide a valid training certificate, they get a reduced fee (similar to if your dog is spayed/neutered). If they can't provide that then should be provided with a list of training programs within Calgary and the opportunity to get a fee reduction in the future. Calgary has always been a leader within the dog community and that is something we should strive to continue. We have a countless number of successful and certified dog training programs, dog daycare facilities, walking services, ambassadors etc. Therefore we have the resources and people to help educate and work with the city. BSL is not the solution and it is extremely disappointing that it is even up for debate.



- Discriminating against pitbulls because their bite is stronger is like fining the buff person in a fight higher because he's buff -they're both [removed]. Puppy mills should be illegal, breeding dogs should be illegal.
- This is extreme discrimination. This has happened in the past with other breeds and this is unjust. It's not the dogs fault, rather the owner. However, discriminating against an entire breed is wrong - this happened with people in the past and we know it is wrong. Shame on your for considering this at all.
- Obedience training mandatory for new owners for all types of dogs unless can prove dog behaviour or knowledge of the breed.
- I do not support BSL
- I think pit bulls shouldn't need any of these rules there harmless animals, no need to muzzle as long as there is proper training from the owner the dog should be fine at any public setting.
- Stop BSL please
- Ban Pit Bulls. Protect kids. The blood of every maimed child or adult is on your hands.
- Status quo. If we don't have responsible owners, it doesn't matter what breed they are. Creating sever punishment will just increase the stray dogs that a both a nuisance and/or pit bulls because you are making it impossible to own one without exorbitant costs.
- The definition of a nuisance dog above includes "noise" - this is highly subjective and depends on if the neighbours have a reasonable tolerance for dogs that may bark at times. I don't think suddenly requiring them to be muzzled in public spaces makes sense. If they are known to bite, fine, but the definition is too loose as it stands now. I also do not agree with 'dogs that are substantially similar' to pit-bulls, that sounds like a complicated nightmare to enforce and subjective.
- no BSL.
- Please define "bite". Once I was told that a "scare" or a lunge constitutes a "bite" and I want to be aware of the actual offence. For my own protection and also for that of my dogs in case someone tries to falsely claim an offence. And also for myself in case of a dog getting to up in my face.
- We all deserve the right to feel safe walking our dogs in the park. The city needs to Increase the fines dangerous dog and owners that have their dogs off leash. No one enjoys having a dog run up to you even if they don't attack. There is not enough bylaw patrols to give out fines. Fines are the only way people learn.
- Obedience training for all dogs results in lower cost for licensing during the first year.
- the penalties should be to all breeds, bad owners, not bad dogs
- Bylaws and rules that apply to ALL nuisance dogs. It is not breed specific.
- Training for the owner on how to be a responsible dog owner.
- Pitbulls should be totally banned in Calgary, NO exceptions. Nuisance animals who have a history of biting should be euthanized.
- Don't make breed specific, focus on the dogs behaviour and the owner.
- Massive fines for owner as Pit bulls and NOT dangerous by nature and learn from abuse by humans. Also do massive investigation on who was bitten and if there is a history with this person.



Dogs will growl as a warning to be left alone when being abused then will bite when warning is ignored.

- I agree to nuisance dogs having more restrictions, I do not agree with breed specific restrictions or punishments
- Dogs with a previous complaint about biting, attacking, vicious behaviour, not just noise, etc., should be on a short leash (3 feet), muzzled in public and not allowed in off-leash parks.
- Breed neutral regulations that are evidence based, pitbulls are not the strongest dogs, all large breed dogs can inherently inflict harm due to larger size. This is discriminatory and does not prevent dog bites.
- I think a lot of these measures are superficial and don't really address the problem. #1 - not all pitbulls are dangerous. Some of them are gentle. Why would they need to be muzzled, or why would their owners pay extra insurance? Obedience training should be a must for all dogs (not through bylaws though) - there are some pretty bad other "friendly" breeds that misbehave because their owners did not train them at all. Also I have concerns with singling out one breed. It's pit bulls today, Akitas tomorrow? This worries me as we own two Akitas. While one of them does have aggression towards male dogs, he is a sweetie with humans, children and female dogs. We've learnt to manage him and muzzle him in the presence of male dogs. Because of his dominant behaviour, he has been attacked by other male dogs who were neither pit bulls nor Akitas a number of times (when not starting the fight), and we had to cover vet fees. Our second Akita is friendly with absolutely everyone, zero aggression, and she runs towards everyone, humans and dogs, to give them some kisses. Which goes completely against the stereotype of Akitas. Responsible pet ownership should be enforced with all dog owners regardless of the breed. Also obedience training does not guarantee no future trouble for a dog. Our male Akita was the perfect student "in school" but outside he is still very independent-minded by nature. What should be mandatory is the "canine communication" courses for ALL dog owners. This could prevent a lot of incidents. Finally, there needs to be more responsibility for people falsely accusing dogs and owners of aggression. I had a pretty nasty shouting incident once in my neighbourhood off leash park because my dogs, peacefully playing with each other and her dog, were accused of attacking her. They were nowhere near the woman, and she was just fearful of their size. She threatened to kick them and report to 311, while filming me with her iPhone. This is not acceptable behaviour. Her husband did apologize to us later. Another time my dog got into a fight with another dog (our fault), and the dog owner accused him of biting her. When I asked about the details she didn't give me any, there were no signs of a bite and he had never ever exhibited aggression to humans. It is important that when any accusations are made, they are followed up with specifics and dialog. Only this way we can prevent bad incidents and having nuisance dogs, or having dogs declared as nuisance dogs unnecessarily. Seizing a dog by the City without a thorough investigation is completely unacceptable in my mind. To us our dogs are family. Would you seize someone's child without an investigation?
- I take SEVERE offence to pit bulls being targeted. I have been attacked by minpins, Pomeranians, and other small dogs but NEVER a pit bull or other large dog. It's sickening that they are targeted instead of the little land sharks, as vets call the small dogs



- Individual dogs can be dangerous. The breed of the dog does not pre-determine whether it is dangerous or not. The proposed Bylaw language indicates that "ALL pitbull- looking" dogs and bull breeds are being designated as dangerous. This is ridiculous. Take out all references to pitbull/bullbreeds. There is NO evidence that they, as a breed, they are more dangerous than other breeds.
- Pit Bulls have been shown time and time again to have aggressive tendencies/outbursts that are unpredictable. This is built into their genes. Just like how other dogs have instincts to herd, pitbulls have instincts to kill. They're fine until they're not. Why put the public at risk and people's safety in the hands of negligent dog owners?
- Do not single out any one breed of dog for required training or punishment. Punish the individual animal not a breed
- increased fines & requirements to keep dogs at home if they are found in public places running at large in a pack.
- its not fair to single out pit bulls. Any dog can be a nuisance, its the owners. All dogs should be treated fairly. The rule should be unless your dog is obedient, it should not be off leash. I also feel that pet owners should not gather to talk while they are not paying attention to their dogs. They go to socialize but dont pay attention to what their dogs are doing... ie, being a nuisance, poop with no scoop, but its not fair to single out a breed. The onus should be on the pet owner of all dogs!
- Concentrate on the problem owners and dogs, don't paint all of one breed with the same brush.
- Ban bully breeds
- Education and training for the owners
- Don't have a problem with pit bulls in general. While more people that want a "vicious" dog get them, it's really about the training, they can be good dogs. Punish the behavior, not the breeds.
- The problem is the owner, not the dog. If a person's dog is uncontrollable, the owner is to blame and they should be fined and made to take obedience classes, or never own dogs.
- All dogs required to be off leash when off their property ALL dog owners are required to go through basic obedience training within 1 year of getting ANY dog
- We should not be singling out any breed. We should be administering and controlling the behavior of the owners. If a dog becomes a 'nuisance' it's because the owner has not taken the appropriate action to control that animal's behaviour.
- Its not the pitbulls, its the owner's. There should be restrictions and criteria for people who own those type of dogs. I know a few pitbulls who are lovely dogs.
- I am quite supportive of the specific next steps/escalation of response based on # of offenses for ALL nuisance dogs (regarless of breed, shouldn't only be specific to pitbulls)
- I've always thought of Calgary as an intelligent city that leads by example. Breed specific legislation is not ok. I only support legislation that will address animals that are deemed to be a nuisance. Calgary should uphold itself to a higher community standard.
- It shouldn't be breed specific. If a dog is a nuisance it should be held accountable, no matter what breed.



- Pit bulls are not the problem. I have been bitten almost bitten by small dogs, not at all by pit bulls of any types. The owners are the problem. Dogs are dogs but mostly the problem dogs that attack/bite/chase or due to their owners and the training they receive. Very unfair and unnecessary to put the restrictions on pit bull types of dog. I know pit bulls and mix breeds with bully to be very gentle and loving, never bitten as their owners have trained them well. Would be willing to look at increasing rules for specific dogs if they have bitten. All dogs to be treated equal until they have done wrong, and then fines/results same for any breed
- Public disclosure on nuisance dogs and owners/addresses
- If the dog is a nuisance, it's a nuisance. Breed has nothing to do with it. It's inappropriate to legislate based on appearance. This is akin to racism.
- Muzzling dogs might be a problem for them being able to defend themselves if they are attacked. But, pit bulls need to be banned.
- Any breed that has offended due to aggression should have restrictions, just like humans that offend
- None of the above are reasonable
- Stop targeting individual breeds for legislation when it is purely owner/trainer responsibility.
- Obedience training should be required for any dog, no matter their breed or history of behaviour
- Your questions are not helpful. Obedience training should be required for ALL dogs, regardless of breed. There are too many completely ignorant owners. Pit bulls SHOULD NOT BE SINGLED OUT in this survey.
- Term and definition of a nuisance dog is NOT labelled to one dog breed. ALL dogs and owners should be assessed and not just one specific breed but every one. It is on the owner and not the dog.
- BSL is proven to be ineffective. Any restrictions should be on a case by case basis. Pit bulls are some of the most loving and gentle dogs and putting in BSL restrictions on them is ridiculous. I DO NOT SUPPORT BSL AGAINST PIT BULLS OR ANY OTHER BREED.
- It is never okay to discriminate against any specific breed of dog. A dog bite is a dog bite, all bad dogs are not pitbulls. If a dog misbehaves it is always the owner that should be punished. If the owner is mistreating their animal creating a mean dog, they should be banned from ever owning another dog. Their dog should be rescued and re-trained.
- Invest in public awareness campaign to support nuisance prevention, better dog ownership, as well as educating Calgarians on the fact that dangerous behaviour isn't breed specific. Perhaps this could be a joint campaign with an organization like the Calgary Humane Society?
- Completely ridiculous to single out "pitbulls", whoever came up with this idea has no idea what they are doing and no knowledge of dogs, dog breeds and dog behavior. Ridiculous garbage again from the city of Calgary
- Regulations regarding breeding in an effort to discourage 'backyard breeding'. Obedience training should be required for most, if not all, breeds
- All breeds can be dangerous. Just a dangerous dog bylaw needs to be implemented, not just Bull breed type. We've had much more success with a dangerous dog bylaw.



- I would want to see the mandatory obedience training before higher fines for nuisance dogs (fines should be a last resort whereas obedience training may give an opportunity to actually change the nuisance behaviour)
- Pit bull owners must have training. Pit bulls aren't born bad, their owners MAKE or TEACH them the bad behaviour. Let's train the humans not punish the dog.
- I don't agree with all the extra bylaws for pit bull type dogs. These rules should apply to all dogs as science and professionals have already stated that breed identification is extremely difficult and that pit bulls scored higher in testing to not attack vs other breeds conducted by the CDC
- No breed specific legislation
- Mandatory training classes for all ticketable offenses including nuisance dogs or bites
- There are several issues with the above measures. Pit Bull is not a breed. American Pit Bull Terrier, American Staffordshire Terrier and Staffordshire Bull Terrier are the breeds that make up the umbrella of "Pit Bull". These breeds are not more inherently dangerous than any other breed of dog, nor is their strength higher than any other breed of dog. With your own description of "nuisance" behaviour, I'm not sure why noise or running at large would warrant a dog being muzzled. These issues of nuisance are a direct result of an owner's lack of responsibility, having the dog muzzled does not change that. What does Calgary Community Standards deem as dangerous behaviour?
- Dog should not be judged based off of their breeds. Period. End bs!
- NOT ALL PITBULLS ARE BAD IT IS THE OWNER THAT TEACHES THAT BEHAVIOUR!!! DO NOT PUT IN ANY LAWS ONLY FOR PITBULLS!
- a distinction should be made between vicious vs nuisance dogs... i support vicious dogs not being allowed off leash... but if a dog is "nuisance" due to barking - it does not need a muzzle. I do not support breed specific legislation. People who have nuisance dogs should perhaps be required to go through a training program
- Calgary needs to revamp and enforce the owners who don't leash their dogs. I just moved here and I'm astounded at the amount of ppl who let their dogs walk/run off leash. I'd say 8 out of 10. These dogs run up to my leashed dog and then there is an issue. It's not the breed it's an irresponsible owner issue and Calgary needs to address that not BSL
- Ban Pit Bulls Completely
- Always seize dogs exhibiting dangerous behaviour immediately.
- I am really not understanding why pit bulls are listed separately. Nuisance dogs, absolutely. Breed should not be listed.
- I'm surprised that YYC is being breed specific despite all of the research world wide that clearly shows bites/aggressive behaviour is an owner issue more than breed issue. Aggressive people are drawn to "protective; assertive" breeds & sadly often mistreat them as do the breeders/puppy mills - both from birth or a young age setting these dogs up for failure. Target that. Target training (not just puppy classes). Target buying all animals off of Kijiji - etc. YYC is way behind in attitudes & initiatives in these regards.
- No government action required



- Stop breed specific, don't punish the animals for bad owners, I believe that it's individual case to case that we need to review not the breed.
- Dogs must be seized for bites and severe bites such as bites to face, or requiring stitches must be destroyed, all dogs on second offense must be destroyed e must be destroyed
- Muzzling a dog can put it in danger if it's attacked by other dogs.
- If any bylaw amendments are targeted to nuisance dogs, they need to be tailored to the offences that caused the label to be applied. For example, a noisy dog does not need more insurance. And, a wanderer is unlikely to stay put with obedience training. Don't target nuisance dogs with bylaws just for the deterrent effect.
- No pit bulls at all!
- The way you have defined nuisance (running at large or noise) - why would you muzzle this dog?
- Mandatory obedience / leadership training for owners of nuisance dogs. Often it is not the dog that is the source of the problem, its owners who do not comprehend animal body language and as a result, they do not accurately anticipate and prevent a dog's behavior from becoming a nuisance. Although I have no desire to own an overly-muscular breed within the city limits, I am not afraid of those breeds of dog's I am, however, concerned about the lack of awareness exhibited by many dog owners when they bring their dogs to off-leash parks.
- None of these
- No laws based on breed.. Dog on dog attacks should be investigated for both dogs temperament . Many small dogs are extremely aggressive Unfortunately when they exert that on a larger breed the results usually look like the big dog was the bad dog.
- Put potential dog owners through testing before buying a dog, dogs model owner behaviour
- Why is only one breed being pinpointed especially when you look at bite stats in Canada which pit bulls, which by the way, include a vast number of breeds. I think all dog owners whose dogs are a nuisance should be obligated to do training regardless of breed. Breed specific legislation has never worked. It's time that all dog owners regardless of breed take responsibility.
- Owners of dogs behaving irresponsibly must be penalised, including being required to pay for training (of both owner and dog) up to being forbidden to own dogs.
- Higher fines for any dog owner who is not exhibiting responsible pet ownership, despite the breed of dog.
- I do not agree with BSL. It has been proven that it does not work. Let's hold individuals accountable instead of a group with similar characteristics
- I don't think the problem is with the Pit bull race. It is a problem with the way the dog has been cared for and trained.
- You are totally out of line tageting the dog and not the owner.
- I believe the city should have the right to apply restrictions on dogs that have bitten only. This should not be placed on a dog based upon the breed. Deal with dogs and their owner based solely on any incidents of biting. Having said that, there should be investigation to figure out circumstances on why a dog has biten. This view seem like common sense and doesn't discriminate dogs or owners.



- I have worked for many years with rescue animals. I do not think there is a clear set of rules about pitties. The clear majority I have met, have been very sweet lovely dogs. I have met a much larger number of very aggressive chow chows. That said, pitbulls are a breed that some individuals with certain negative personality traits are drawn to. My dog was attacked by a pit bull that launched itself across the elbow river. The other dog was known to be aggressive, had a muzzle order, had attacked other dogs. Yet, it was unmuzzled and off leash. The dog was owned by an individual who freely admitted to me they had recently gotten out of jail for murder. When I asked them to pay for our vet bills my family was threatened. There are many responsible, level headed owners of pitbulls. Those dogs do not concern me. Any dog owned by a man like I had the displeasure to meet concerns me.
- Not supportive of breed specific bylaws; behaviour of the dog, regardless of breed, and the owner should be the main deciding factor.
- Lots of pitty cross breeds out there!!! Not fair!!! I was half an hour
- Free training to dog owners offered in ALL adoptions of a dog. Humans are the problem, not the animals. We've caused fear, hurt and pain. How would you act if your guardian conditioned you in terrible ways? Mandatory training for owners in first offense. Second offense, community service, fine and a warning that the third offence the animal gets taken away.
- All pit bulls must be bred and purchased from a registered CKC breeder. All other non-registered pit bulls when located must be neutered, spayed or euthanized, depending on each individual case. No exceptions !
- Owners should pay for the vet bills if their dog is responsible for injuries.
- I believe proper training should be considered because it's not the breed it's the training and the owners fault
- NOOOOO breed specific legislation please! these dogs are not the problem. the owners are..
- Refusing ownership of ANY breeds to owners who have broken these laws or needed more than X fines about nuisance dogs
- Breed discrimination is unacceptable (i.e., singling out pit bulls); the same expectations of responsible pet ownership and by-laws should apply equally to ALL breeds and pet owners.
- Just leave the poor dogs alone, Pit Bulls are actually really friendly.
- Stop using the tag pit-bull....this is unfair, wrong and as a life long dog owner - I know labs and wee dogs bit more however is NOT covered in the news nor reported.
- A dog is a dog. If a chihuahua bites it should be dealt with the exact same as if a pit bull bites because the fault for both falls squarely on the owner. A dog should not be branded as anything - good or bad - before it has done anything to anybody. End BSL.
- Obediance training for owners of pit bulls and other dogs declared to be a nuisance. Dogs involved in more than one offence should be euthanized.
- This is an extremely bias survey which is intended to produce a particular outcome. Would you please stop singling out one breed.
- Outright ban; no grandfathering; punitive fines and seizure of all "pit bulls". There is no place for these animals in the city.



- The options above are reactive; YYC needs to be proactive. Educate OWNERS about dog behavior, humane & effective training methods, fulfilling an animal's physical & emotional needs so "nuisance" behaviors are minimized, REQUIRE spay/neuter. REQUIRE licenses to BREED animals!! Prohibit nuisance people from pet ownership, either temporarily or for life. I worry if I select any of the above options, my selection will just be tallied in overall results. I believe in education. I believe pet ownership is a PRIVILEGE, not a RIGHT.
- What's with the attack against 'pit bulls' only. I've had more aggressive behaviour shown from little dogs and retrievers when walking along off-leash pathways in my neighbourhood. So STOP attacking and singling out one breed only for the bylaws above.
- Any dog REGARDLESS of breed that has bitten or cause any type of problem should be held responsible through Bylaw and be fined. And responsible for any damages.
- I do not believe 'pit bulls' should be singled out. They are for the most part a wonderful family dog.
- full enforcement of leash rules in all areas of the City - no warnings! If a dog is off your property and not in a designated off-leash area, the owner should get at least a \$500 fine.
- We have a 'pit bull' that is a big sucky baby. You should be ashamed you are even considering implementing some of these bylaws. I have been bitten by a jack Russell terrier twice, plans on having restrictions against that breed as well?
- I think there should be a difference between dogs that are violent and dogs that are noisy or tend to get out of their yard and roam. To group both together does not make sense. A violent dog should be muzzled in public but not one that barks too much.
- Some certification/evidence of training that must be provided to access off leash parks for all dogs
- Education of Calgarians - this is not a valid response, [removed] this is ignorance and fear driven reactivity you are proposing....please educate people not limit or punish the animals
- Obedience training should be required for all dogs, especially smaller breeds, chihuahuas and such.
- The breed is not the issue. It is the owner. Do not single out a breed based on bias and subjective perspectives
- Please don't have breed specific legislation. Equal rights and responsibilities for all Canadian pet owners is the direction to move in. Inclusivity.
- obedience training should be required for ALL dogs. Dog ownership should require license regardless of breed.
- Need to clarify what is meant by 'multiple offences' (2? 10?). I assume the above rules only apply to dogs (including Pitbulls) who are ACTUALLY deemed a nuisance.
- Ban bit pulls from living in the city.
- More liability needs to be on the owners and not the animal. We also need to look to the public to be smart about dogs and interacting with them. Many children get bit by petting a dog when they have been told not to or they pet a dog without permission. Teasing dogs through fences as well should also be looked at, as this increases chances for a dog to bite.
- I feel just declaring pit bulls as a problem is too narrow. All dogs over a certain size have the chance to seriously injure someone. So that chance should be removed by requiring all dogs over a certain height and weight to be muzzled. Even if the dog is on the owner's yard.



- There is no need to identify specific breeds! I remember when German Shepherds were the problem, then Dobermans, then Rottweillers.... The bylaw should not identify a specific breed!
- A law where pit bulls are to be treated as any other dog.
- Holding owners accountable for dogs behaviour. Have a demerit system. 3 strikes and that individual can no longer own a dog.
- The above measures as they are posed are too vague in some cases to answer affirmatively especially since the term “nuisance” appears to cover a range of behavior, with no explanation as to what the “etc.” refers to. By the City’s own definition, if I understand correctly, a dog cited for the offence of noise (not aggression) could possibly not be allowed in off-leash dog parks and/or be faced with being muzzled in public or at dog parks? I do agree a dog that has demonstrated aggressive tendencies should be leashed regardless of whether in public or off-leash park and regardless of breed. Shouldn’t a muzzle approach be considered on a case-by –case basis, regardless of breed? Should this bylaw be passed, what, if any exceptions would be in place for owners of pit bulls who are visiting friends or relatives in the City of Calgary with a pit bull? Would one expect that a dog who has never in its life been subjected to wearing a muzzle, now have to wear one? Would the City look at offering programs on responsible pet ownership and education for the public? A requirement that pit bulls be muzzled (without any prior relevant aggressive behavior) in public and off-leash dog parks, will only contribute to perpetuating fear and thus, will further unfairly malign these dogs.
- Punishing (or euthanising) the offending dog is NOT a solution. The owners of nuisance or vicious dogs should be held responsible. For example, if a dog owner needs to use a prong collar to control their dog, that dog owner should never have their dog off-leash.
- Do not discriminate by breed my dog has been attacked and I have been attacked by a number of dogs and never a “pit bull” or other bully breed. German Shepard’s have attacked my much smaller dog and drew blood with a huge gash to his head. Other mixed breed large dogs have attacked him and once myself and bit my knee.
- Some pets owners are defiant and want to dictate the rules and the city have been fickle to stand up and take stronger control and protection of citizens.
- I highly disagree with almost all of these options and obedience training should be standard for any dog no matter the breed
- Please do not single out pitbulls, leave it at nuisance dogs.
- There should be clarity around nuisance dog; a dog who barks a lot in their secure yard should not be treated the same as a dog who is regularly roaming at large or threatening other animals
- Irresponsible dog owners should be severely fined and banned from owning any pets for 10 years.
- Pitt bulls are never the problem. Bad humans are the problem.
- Pit bulls are fine as same as any other day. This is BS slander towards this breed
- Its not the breed, its the owner's dangerous behaviour towards any breed that causes exhibiting dangerous behaviour of the dog. Obedience training should be required/law for homeowners and must pass a test before owning certain breeds.



- Aggressive dogs should not be tolerated in any public area. Any offence should be regarded as an extension of the owner's behavior, and the owner should be dealt with to the full extent of the law as though he/she had committed the offence personally.
- I don't think we should discriminate against Pit Bulls in general as all breeds can be aggressive.
- I don't support breed-specific legislation. Need better defining of nuisance behaviour. If nuisance behaviour includes running at large, does that mean that dog can't run in an off-leash park?
- Training and education should be a requirement for the humans.
- More information is required in order for dogs to be declared a nuisance. Who is making this determination? Someone unfamiliar with dog language could perceive a dog as displaying aggressive behavior when it could be playing. And Breed specific legislation doesn't work [personal information removed] Please don't go backwards and let's punish the deed, not the breed. BSL is canine racism and singling out breeds is such a narrow minded approach to a city that touts diversity.
- Obedience training required before issue of any dog license. Training must be updated every 2 years. Cost of such training is to be the responsibility of the person(s) applying for the license.
- No special measures just for pitbulls - that's ridiculous and completely biased. No additional insurance fees either - puts cases in a box too much and does not allow for case by case discretion
- Making laws about different dog breeds is the same as making laws about different races. Each individual animal is different and to just assume a breed is aggressive is wrong.
- Dogs should never ever be off-leash except in clearly designated areas or in enclosed portions of private property where there is no egress. No exceptions, at the cost of significant fines. Dogs that bite should be put down immediately and their owners charged with assault. Having a nuisance dog should result in a fine and the confiscation of the dog. It's time to get serious about this. Stop trying to be nice to dog owners who are not capable of controlling their dogs.
- [removed]it's bad owners the make this breed out to be bad again [removed]
- ANY dog can be a problem if not properly socialized.
- My concern with this question is that a nuisance dog definition was not defined in context. A dog will bark to alert about someone approaching their yard. My mom was accused of having a nuance German Sheppard because he barked at homeless people. The officer was fair and said he was only barking with cause. If we allow any dog to be nuisance, the bylaw suggestion is too far reaching and doesn't allow due process. If a dog is predatory or malicious, then restrictions. I was bitten by my dog as a child but it was my fault. I have also been bit by a dog on a pathway... I blame a bad owner who did not socialize and did not have her on a leash.
- The definition of a nuisance dog should never contain anything breed specific. The only breed of dog that has ever tried to bite me has been a Chihuahua.
- Insights about the Epidemiology of Dog Bites in a Canadian City Using a Dog Aggression Scale and Administrative Data - study by University of Calgary states that "Overall, this finding is supportive of the growing body of research that indicates that breed specific legislation is not a successful approach to dealing with dog aggression issues [45,46]. Dogs in all breed groups are capable of inflicting a bite, and the probability of a high severity bite was not significantly higher in any particular



breed group." Please follow what the studies show. The dogs targeted in this bylaw are ACTUALLY the third LOWEST group for bite severity in this study !!

- All dogs to have obedience training size and breed irrelevant. To pick a breed ie pit bulls is no different than choosing a race and saying they are more likely to be a nuisance!!
- DO NOT bring in BSL
- Please keep the laws breed neutral.
- Pit bulls need/dogs that are deemed nuisance need muzzles in off-leash parks but not necessarily on leash parks
- Case by case no discrimination
- BSL against pit bulls or bully breeds is so wrong! Stop punishing them! Charge the bad owners.
- mandatory spay/neutering of nuisance animals or animals involved in bites. mandatory permanent id on nuisance animals or those involved in bites. Dog owners with dogs involved in severe bites to take mandatory seminar/lecture about reading body in language in dogs. Owners with problem animals are generally the real root of the problem.
- These questions are slanted, negatively towards "pit-bulls". Leave bylaw enforcement to "dogs in general" and do not show bias against a type. Any dog can bite and be dangerous and be a nuisance. Enforce for those behaviours, not based on breed and lack of education on the City's part.
- Dogs declared a nuisance should have follow up with specific certified trainers/behaviourist within 6months of declaration with proof of correcting behaviour before reassessment or any sort. Otherwise resulting in fines.
- Having been around pets all my life, including working in all levels of Calgary Court Services and volunteering at Animal Services, I don't see why you are singling out pit bulls. Cruel, nasty dog owners train any dog to be vicious. There are wonderful pit bulls and biting tiny, overbred, designer dogs. It's the owners who are at fault of dangerous dogs, not the dogs.
- THIS IS SO AWFUL AND UNNECESSARY.
- 'Pitbulls' should be treated as all other dogs. They are NOT a nuisance and should not be treated differently. You've said it above in the writings that these dogs are NOT more Likely to bite.
- Deal with the dog owners on a case by case bases
- Leave as is. This is breed discrimination.
- Any breed can be a nuisance. So requiring pet owners to responsible regardless of breed would be the common sense approach
- Responsible dog ownership and Dog bite prevention classes and new dog owner training
- This bylaw, and any amendments to it, should be directed at problem dogs based on proven behaviour, not based on breed. I find it ironic that I am answering this question, which has a statement regarding the severity of pit bull bites that is not supported by evidence, right beside the picture of 2 boxers that is the photo representing Kristen. You are aware, I am sure, that it was boxers who killed the woman in Montreal a few years ago even though pit bulls were initially blamed.
- Restrictions (muzzles, where dogs can go, etc.) be based on any dogs actions not a blanket rule
- Its the OWNERS that need mandatory training along with their dogs!



- The focus on pit bulls needs to be provided with more real evidence. There are many strong dogs that may have just as much potential for harm. Seems arbitrary and appealing to stereotypes to focus on pits.
- Owners not the breed are the problem. Responsible ownership and their education is key.
- This is tough because if a dog is declared a nuisance something has already gone wrong. I don't support targeting one breed.
- all of these questions are proposing BSL. none of these questions even make any sense. you are asking incredibly leading questions. NO BREED OR the appearance of dog should be discriminated against based on appearance. i am offended even by the wording of this question. this doesn't even allow for engagement. you are answering the questions for the people you are asking to fill it out. if this was truly neutral you would use the word dog not immediately chose (with prejudice) one appearance of dog. the city of calgary should be ashamed of this line of questioning.
- Our kids in the parks need to be safe. Pit bulls are a very dangerous and threat for the kids who want to play in the park with other kids or their parents. Any family should never have to feel terrorized or not being able to enjoy the public park premises due the fear of having their loved one get hurt or not by unexpected wild behaviour of the pets such as pit bull. Also owners of these pets must need to understand that off leash dog areas are assigned for their pet's enjoyment and the kid park areas are for the benefit of kids leisure. Thanks you!
- breed specific bylaws are unfounded and unscientific
- I would suggest mandatory training for the OWNERS of nuisance dogs, and a record kept of nuisance dog owners.
- Do not pin point breeds! It's ridiculous.
- Nothing, the city should stay out of it...
- No BSL, no breed specification is required
- None of the above should happen. The aggressiveness is based off of how the dogs were raised. There should be nothing pointing to any specific dog as the more aggressive dogs are usually smaller breeds.
- No breed specific legislation against any bully breeds
- Owners should have to take training on how to be a better dog care giver to ensure the care of the dog when caught putting their dogs in high risk environments with known behavioural problems.
- This is not a breed problem it's an owner problem.
- The breed does not determine a dog's behaviour. This is ignorant to suggest so. Even small dogs can and are known to be nuisances regardless of breed.
- You have said "nuisance dogs" are dogs that bark and roaming around. This does not tie in with the comments above since it is the OWNERS who should be trained, and not the dogs punished as the owners are not caring for the dog. Dogs who bark are bored or left alone and not inside with their family and not taken on enough walks etc. I suggest that it would be good to make it so that gates have to have locks so the gates cannot be left open for dogs to escape.
- FINE IRRESPONSIBLE PET OWNERS, DONT DEMONIZE BREEDS.
- This is a very unfair question. It is breed specific. ALL DOGS BITE



- Owner specific training
- BSL does NOT help, targeting problem dogs and their owners DO
- None of these options directly speak to the ability of the dog owner to have control over a dog, want to have accepted levels of control over a dog or adhere to any imposed restrictions on owners of nuisance dogs. The use of the terminology "nuisance" dog is preferred over signalling out pitbulls and related breeds. If they are the primary concern then addressing the area of who wants to own one and how it is trained by that owner is more the issue.
- I would like to see the city deal with chronic barking/yapping dogs. Those are just as much a "nuisance behavior"
- I don't think pit bulls should be bred
- no breed specific legislation, and only dogs involved in serious incidents should be declared under any label. Noise, being at large etc are not acceptable reasons to flag a dog.
- These conditions are [removed]. BSL is discriminatory and WRONG. Bad owner, bad dog, ALL BREEDS have capability to be dangerous. This proposal is absolutely disgusting.
- It's not the dogs fault. Require training for humans and pets that cause issues. More involvement in apprehending and revoking mistreated dogs
- Investigation/Surveillance into whether the dogs considered a nuisance have been abused or mistreated/trained to hurt others. Not the dogs fault.
- People training for dogs that are found to be a nuisance or demonstrate dangerous behaviour
- Designate some times for nuisance dogs at off leash parks, like Tuesdays between 4-6 pm. Or designate some off leash parks for nuisance dogs only. Also have the ability to remove the moniker nuisance3dpg after obedience training and a 6 month probationary period
- All of these are blasphemous. as an owner of 2 "pitbulls" I'm highly offended and would move out of city limits if any of these were enforced. neither of my dogs has any aggression or bite history. All dogs have the "potential for severe" attacks you cannot single out 1 type of dog for this.
- Training for ALL dogs after first complaint
- It makes no sense to call out "pit bull" breeds, which is a term you're using incorrectly. Unless a dog has fought in an actual pit, its not a pit bull. I see no mention to an increase in bylaw enforcement or anything either. This seems like a targeted ban at pit bulls with other considerations thrown in to make it seem less obvious.
- i would support a bylaw fining owners for dogs that have been declared a nuisance, based on the animals behavior not because they look a certain way. I consider that the animal equivalent of racism
- Additional community outreach re: training ALL dogs. To register with the city owners must provide proof of obedience/other training classes as with proof of vaccinations.
- Owners of ALL types or breeds of dogs should be held to the SAME standard. Little, big, fluffy or not fluffy can still bite and singling out one breed or "type" of dog DOES NOT FIX THE PROBLEM. Breed Specific Legislation has been proven to not fix or lessen the problem, education and accountability for ALL owners does. There are loads of well trained and properly socialized pitties just like how there are loads of chihuahua who bite and are poorly trained and people laugh it off, if it



isn't funny when a large dog does it then it isn't funny when a little dog does it but BOTH should be held to the same standard. It's on the owners, not the dogs, to teach them how to properly act. When I worked as a dog walker I was bit more times by little dogs and German Shepard's. Not once did any pitbull type dogs in my care ever act aggressively towards me or other animals. Responsible pitbull owners know the prejudice against their dogs and most work accordingly to have their dogs not be a part of the stereotype and have them be well mannered functioning parts of society. [removed]

- Declared a nuisance should to be far more clear for anyone to answer these questions. For example: A Husky might be declared a nuisance because it needs social interaction or longer walks.
- .
- Make the legislation about the PERSON, not the dog. Dogs require a good home and training - regardless of the breed. More Chihuahuas bite than Pitties.
- Absolutely none of these options seem necessary.
- I think pitbull and other vicious dogs should be completely banned here in calgary. Often these owners are young, and /or own these dogs for "status & aggression" rather than a true understanding of dog ownership. And often these owners do not have the emotional capacity to understand (or admit to) the consequences of a vicious dog attack.
- This is about the dog I have had goldens shit tuz and a pit bull type out of all three the smallest one was the most aggressive
- Fines, rehabilitation efforts and punishment should be served on An individual basis. Lumping dogs into catagories such as breeds or even perceived breeds does nothing but promote fear and poor dog ownership. Make the owner take responsibility for the dog and their actions is the only way to fix the problem.
- BSL doesn't work. Please actually enforce our laws around vicious dogs. Vicious dogs come in ALL breeds. No science to prove pit bulls are stronger than other big dogs. All big dogs are "strong". It's 2020- can we please stop discrimination and make our laws based on facts. Every professional association like the SPCA is against BSL. [personal information removed] Other places made their laws based on ours!!!
- Don't bully the damn breed!
- Seizure of any dog that seriously injures (requiring substantial veterinary care) or kills another pet. Time ban on owners whose dog seriously injures or kills another pet. Significant fine \$5000 plus for any dog that seriously injures or kills another dog.
- I do not support any measure which singles out a breed or a collection of breeds. The breed of a dog does not dictate whether it has behaviour problems and numerous studies have shown that breed-specific bylaws and legislation in other municipalities have no bearing on dog behaviour problems. Also the singling out 'pit bull' in this survey is factually wrong and discriminatory - the bite force (strength) of a 'pit bull' is comparable to (or less than) that of many other breeds, including German Shepherd, Rottweiler and Boxer.
- [removed]
- This is ridiculous and you have zero science to prove they bite harder than other dogs



- Here is the latest updated list of all human deaths caused by dogs in Canada since 1983. As of May 19, 2017, there were 42 incidents resulting in 43 deaths. I have chosen not to provide the original spreadsheet. Instead, I have reformatted it into an easy-to-read, web-friendly list. Please read and understand the following few paragraphs before reading the list. Regardless of the fact that I have included breed in the list, it is crucial to understand two things: First, breed identification is ALWAYS suspect. Breed information may be supplied by the owners of the dog, by the victims, by animal control personnel, by police officers, by neighbours, or by members of the media. It is NEVER reliable. Second, even if breed identifications were accurate, the breed is far less important than the circumstances. Here's an example: The majority of these attacks are blamed on "huskies" or "sled dogs". So is any dog up north that has some husky characteristics going to be called a husky? In addition, the term "sled dog" (and "farm dog" in an early incident) is a description of function, not breed, so those dogs could literally be anything that can pull a sled. When you consider that a large number of these incidents occurred in northern communities with little or no animal control, sometimes on First Nations reserves, is it surprising that the dogs involved are northern types of dogs? As you read through these accounts, it should become apparent that breed is not the issue. Circumstance is the key. Children not supervised. Dogs running loose or breaking loose. Dogs chained in areas where wandering children could enter. Dog/child interactions not supervised. These things are what caused the deaths of the children in particular, not what type of dog was involved.

Summaries: # of Attacks 42 # of Victims 43 # of Dogs 130 # of Attacks > 1 dog 2457% # of Attacks > 2 dogs 1536% # of deaths not from bites 12% Victim's Age: 0 – 21 126% 3 – 5 1536% 6 – 12 1023% 13 – 16 00% 17+ 716% Dog Location: Home 1433% Relative 614% Neighbour 819% Loose 1433% Breed of Dog (# Attacks): Husky 10.525% Unknown Mix (northern dogs) 10.124% German Shepherd 4.711% Rottweiler 3.959% Sled Dog 37% AmStaff/Pit Bull 12% Bullmastiff 12% Chow Chow 12% Labrador 12% Malamute 12% Maremma Sheepdog 12% Mixed Breed 12% Unconfirmed 12% Collie 0.51% Jack Russell 0.51% Wolf 0.51% Border Collie 0.251% Breed of Dog (# Dogs): Unknown Mix (northern dogs) 6550% Husky 19.515% Sled Dog 108% German Shepherd 9.57% Rottweiler 9.57% Labrador 54% AmStaff/Pit Bull 22% Malamute 22% Border Collie 11% Bullmastiff 11% Chow Chow 11% Maremma Sheepdog 11% Mixed Breed 11% Unconfirmed 11% Collie 0.51% Jack Russell 0.51% Wolf 0.51%

The conclusions from the details listed are: A secure enclosure for all dogs loose in their yards would have prevented 31 incidents (74%). Supervising young children (too young to be on their own), without knowing there was going to be a dog involved, would have prevented 26 incidents (63%). Supervising a known interaction between a child and a dog would have prevented 10 incidents (24%). Having secure enclosure for all dogs and supervising all children would have prevented 36 incidents (88%). Here is the list updated as of May 19, 2017: Mar 1983. Edmonton AB. 3-year-old boy. 2 Farm dogs. Free roaming dogs attacked boy near his home. Apr 1987. Vernon BC. 5-year-old girl. 1 German Shepherd X. Girl went to play with grandmother's chained dog. Jun 1988. QU. 17-month-old boy. 1 German Shepherd. Wandered over to neighbour's dog. Apr 1990. ON. Newborn girl. 1 Chow Chow. Family dog overturned bassinet. Jul 1993. NWT. 6-year-old girl. 1 Sled dog. Tried to feed bone to tethered dogs. Dec 1993. AB. 11-year-old girl. 5 Sled dogs. Attacked by loose dogs while walking home. Sep 1994. ON. 17-month-old girl. 1 Maremma Sheepdog. Attacked when got between male dog &



female dog in heat. Aug 1995. ON. 22-year-old man. 2 American Staffordshire Terriers. Evidence indicated drunken roommate provoked dogs. Dec 1995. SK. 6-year-old boy. 2 German Shepherds. Attacked while playing in yard by uncle's dogs. 1996. Cross Lake MB. 3-year-old boy. 4 Strays. Killed on Cross Lake Reservation by stray dogs. Sep 1997. SK. 3-year-old boy. 1 Sled dog (Husky/Shep X or Husky/Wolf X). Attacked in junk-filled yard by chained dog, loose puppies also in yard. Nov 1997. ON. 3-year-old boy. 1 Rottweiler. Resident dog broke loose from chain and attacked boy. Mar 1998. Iqaluit NU. 6-year-old girl. 4 Sled dogs. Wandered to dogs staked on sea ice. Apr 29 1998. Stouffville ON. 8-year-old girl. 1 Bullmastiff. Attacked while playing in neighbour's yard. Aug 23 1998. Zacharias Island, Hopedale Labrador NF. 10-year-old boy and 44-year-old woman. 8 Sled dogs (Labrador/Husky X's). Mother & son killed while picking blueberries on island where pack of sled dogs was left for summer. Dec 21 1998. Cross Lake MB. 8-year-old boy. 6 Strays. Second child killed by stray dogs on Cross Lake Reservation. Mar 1999. BC. 3-year-old girl. 1 Husky X. Attacked while playing in neighbour's yard. May 1999. Saint-Charles-de-Mandeville, Lanaudière QU. 2-year-old boy. 1 Husky. Victim tangled up in chain of one of 24 dogs kept in yard – cause of death was single bite to throat. Jul 1999. NWT. 2-year-old boy. 1 Husky X. Attacked while with mother at grandfather's home. Nov 1999. Garden River AB. 6-year-old girl. Pack of dogs (4+). Girl playing with loose puppy, killed by pack of starving dogs (reservation). Jan 27 2002. Woodland Beach ON. 4-year-old girl. 2 Labrador/Rottweiler X. Attacked in field by father's dogs while visiting father's home. Mar 1 2003. Kingston Peninsula NB. 4-year-old boy. 3 Rottweilers. Visiting at home with father, killed in yard where 2 males and 1 female were kept. Oct 13 2003. Nelson House MB. 3-year-old boy. 4 German Shepherd X. Killed by 4 of grandmother's 15 dogs (chained and broke free) – playing with puppy – Cree Reservation. Dec 27 2004. Maple Ridge BC. 3-year-old boy. 1 Border Collie, 3 Rottweilers. Killed by 2 of own dogs (Border Collie & Rottweiler) and 2 visiting Rottweilers while mother slept. May 29 2006. Wellburn ON. 77-year-old man. 1 Jack Russell/Collie X, described by authorities as Pit Bull/Labrador Retriever X. Man "playfully" shoved wife – dog attacked him and bit throat. Jun 15 2006. Sayisi Dene First Nation in Tadoule Lake MB. 3-year-old boy. 2 Husky X. Two loose-running dogs, NOT STRAYS, attacked child. Multiple unsupervised children. Jul 27 2006. Hollow Water First Nation MB. 2-year-old boy. 2 Husky X. Unsupervised child wandered into group of loose and tethered dogs. 2 identified as killers (one loose, one tethered). Tethered dog part of sled team. 17-year old babysitter noticed child was missing one hour later. Uncle found child. Nov 16 2006. North Tallcree First Nation (near Fort Vermilion) AB. 5-year-old boy. 1 Rottweiler, 1 German Shepherd X, 3 Unknown Breeds. Five loose-running dogs. Only two were found (both owned by same owner). Child unsupervised. Neighbours saw attack and tried to stop it. Jan 18 2007. Cumberland House First Nation Reserve SK. 5-year-old boy. 6 Unknown Breeds, both large and small. One report describes dogs as strays, another as owned by a neighbour who let them run loose. Death from bites and hypothermia. Child unsupervised on way to school. Jul 1 2007. Smiths Falls (Montague Township) ON. 17-month-old girl. 1 Rottweiler/German Shepherd X. 10 year old dog at grandparents' house. Family visiting. Child wandered into backyard where dog was chained. Jan 30 2010. Canoe Lake First Nation Reserve SK. 9-year-old boy. 4 Unknown breeds. 9 year old going to visit cousin's house. Found dead. Mar 22 2010. Pangnirtung NU. 4-year-old boy. 3 Huskies. Sled dogs described as huskies broke loose from chains while owner was out of town and attacked



boy, Town coroner discovered dogs tearing body apart while he was driving past. He killed all three dogs. Boy was unsupervised. Jun 7 2010. Saint-Barnabé-Sud (St. Hyacinthe) QU. 3-week-old girl. 2 Huskies. Baby in car seat in kitchen near balcony sliding doors (with dogs), parent(s) on balcony 10 ft away having cigarette. Dogs attacked baby. Third dog in crate with puppies!. Aug 21 2011. Mosquito First Nation SK. 1-year-old girl. 2 Husky X. 1 year old wandered into dogs' yard. Feb 16 2012. Airdrie AB. Newborn boy. 1 Husky. Baby in crib, dog in crate in basement, baby cried, female dog got loose and killed baby (maybe trying to move it). Mar 16 2014. Springfield MB. 7-year-old girl. 2 Malamutes. Circumstances unclear. Visiting family friends. June 14 2014. Puvirnituk QU. 4-year-old-girl. 1 Sled dog (Husky). Child approached neighbour's chained dog. Oct 17 2015. Ross River Dena Council First Nations YK. 22-year-old man. 4 Stray northern dogs (pack). Killed and eaten by pack of dogs while walking. Coroner's conclusion. Jan 30 2016. Tk'emlups First Nation Kamloops BC. 78-year-old woman. 1 Mixed breed (police terminology). Killed in her own backyard by tied up family member's dog. Jun 6 2016. Chesterfield Inlet NU. 4-year-old-girl. 1 Northern dog. Child approached neighbour's chained dog. Jun 8 2016. Montreal QU. 55-year-old woman. 1 Pit Bull (police terminology). Dog broke out of yard and attacked victim in her own backyard. May 13 2017. Little Grand Rapids First Nation MB. 24-year-old woman. 30 Unknown Mix (northern dogs). Found dead at water treatment plant surrounded by 30 dogs. Why are pitbull type dogs being discriminated against in this survey? Education and enforcing current bylaws are what is needed. I do not support BSL for any breed

- nuisance dogs must include small dogs (all dogs) as the only dog I have been bitten by is a small dog but there doesn't seem to be anything done
- Classes on how to properly care for an animal for owners whose dogs are considered a nuisance. It's usually the owners mistreatments of the animal's that cause this.
- None of the above
- all by laws should apply to all breeds ! Not just pitbulls
- That any dog can be free at a dog park no muzzle and they can be unleashed
- Responsibility training for nuisances owners.
- Breed specific legislation is awful. Pitbulls are not the danger, it is bad owners. Invest in education that teaches about the false information and stigmas that are associated with the breed.
- [removed] targeting based on appearance BSL is a proven failure the world over and the Calgary model is heralded as a model other jurisdictions around the world look up to .. Don't implement BSL listen to the actual facts listen the science Ontario has had BSL for 15 years it has not made society safer it has increased in number of attacks and severity even though pit type dogs are all but gone [personal information removed]
- Please do not ban a specific breed of dog for Calgary
- Police the ppl not the dogs. Leave breed specific legislation out [removed]
- City wide ban on all pit bull type breeds
- You haven't provided spaces to cover my other concerns, so I have put them here. 1) The dog early warning system should be mandatory. 2) All fines should be increased dramatically, especially for any injury, at large animals, & failure to remove defecation, 3) All dog owners should be required to



submit a DNA sample to the City for each pet so that injuries from dog bites and feces not picked up can be efficiently prosecuted.

- Policing of off lease parks for dogs not under control. Also a limit of how many dogs per person. Some dog walkers have up to a dozen dogs off lease.
- I DO NOT support BSL. I believe that everyone should support proper education. If you want to own a strong animal then you (or the household if more than one person is at the residence)should be required to take training courses with those animals. The unfortunate reality of dog incidents is that it is 90% of the time human errors in training or handling are the cause but we punish the animals for it. Please reconsider this. There is so much more potential in training and education for a safer city, also dog parks should not be a place for children, while some parents care enough to educate their kids on the proper ways to interact with new dogs, alot of parents don't and it creates a very high risk situation where the child could be hurt very badly and unfortunately it would be blamed on the owner and not the parents.
- The city of Calgary provides training for dog owners who cannot afford it. This would decrease the number of nuisance dogs.
- Calgary Humane Society does not support any form of BSL and opposes labeling any specific breed as inherently aggressive, vicious or dangerous. The Society takes the position that each dog must be regarded as an individual and assessed on its specific behaviours. CHS maintains that rather than BSL, the required deterrents to dog aggression are responsible breeding, responsible homing, responsible and humane training, and responsible pet ownership. Research indicates the breed of dog is not an important indicator of whether a dog might be involved in an aggressive incident, nor of whether the animal will pose a danger to the community. If the CHS does not agree with BSL why is it included in this survey? I STRONGLY support Breed Neutral Bylaw. Education is a must for everyone this should be taught in schools and a program should be available for everyone to partake in
- These laws cannot just be breed specific. I've met some very sweet pit bulls and have been bitten by small dogs with careless owners.
- I don't like when rescue groups bring pit bulls from USA. Dog history is often missing when transfer from shelter to shelter. If someone wants a pitbull can get one from AB. This would control help the numbers. Our Portuguese Water Dog Was on a leash and was bitten by What I think it was a Cane Corso. It was scary since would not let go till owner jumped on top of it and punch it. But still I think if you allow pitbulls in the city they should be exercised otherwise more trouble. So I think okay in dog park as long as not aggressive. We should have more dog parks so not so crowded.
- You shouldn't single out pit bulls. Dogs with poor behaviour are because their owners have not trained them well.
- I'm sorry but I don't understand my dog is not a pit bull but because he has staffordshire terrier mix and may have the appearance this should not label him as a pit bull, he is the sweetest most obedient dog , has taken his classes and I would not feel comfortable having to muzzle him if he is perfectly capable of being a good dog. You need to focus on these back yard breeders that are breeding dogs that are not stable and causing trouble for those that have purchased dogs from



loving reputable breeders , the back yard breeding needs to stop or be regulated mutts are being sold for thousands of dollars , please focus on that. Not our innocent dogs that are loved

- It's not the breed it's the owner
- Picture of Dog and Owner as part of licensing process. Picture submitted by victim can be matched with Dog and Owner. 2. All off leash parks are completely fenced. Dog is removed from Owner if a bite victim chooses
- I don't think there should be a bias towards pit bulls as there are numerous other large dogs that are capable of same extensive injuries, such as german shepards
- Please provide off- leash dog areas for pit bull type breeds.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. The myth of them having stringers bites is exactly that. A myth.
- educate public on how to greet and interact with a strange dog. often it is the owner that unknowingly act so the dog is not acting appropriate.
- Pit bulls are not inherently more aggressive than other dogs, nor do they have more strength than say a German Shepard or Rottweiler. Punishing and discriminating against a breed for what they look like is ridiculous. It hasn't worked in other provinces and it won't work here. Punish the deed not the breed. Calgary is better than that.
- I am against BSL
- I am against BSL
- Dogs should only be deemed a "nuisance" if and when they prove to be so. There are no bad dogs just bad owners! Restrictions should be based off of punishable offences not the specific breed of a dog, that is prejudice and misinformed!
- Please dont single out pitbulls there are no bad dogs, just bad owners!
- give higher fines to ANY breed that is a nuisance. You shouldn't single out pitbulls. Little dogs also attack other dogs
- Please avoid specific breed restrictions. The stated rationale seems to be a cover - if bite strength is the measure then why are other breeds not included?
- Stop with the pitbull, other breeds bite just as hard or worse with bigger teeth, unbelievable you can be so uneducated!
- Make it mandatory in order to get an animal license that you have to attend dog training first. Also, prohibit an owner who has had a history with animals that are declared a nuisance to have another animal.
- Put down dogs that have one occurrence of biting a person. Massive fines for multiple noise complaints or aggressive dog behaviour (eg running up to strangers growling with fur raised or biting). Restrict dog breeds allowed in Calgary. No German Shepard's, pit bulls, aggressive breeds. Allow only one dog per household! (Otherwise there is noise and other disturbance to neighbours)
- Training for the owners of the dogs considered a "nuisance". "Pitbulls" are not all the same. They are not all dangerous! Also, Mandatory leashing for all dogs because any breed of dog can attack.
- Problem dogs are the result of owners not training them properly. The owners need to be trained.
- Owner of a deemed nuisance dog through a bite must take a class on how to properly handle dogs and how to treat dogs of any breed. This will lead to better health of animal.



- There is nothing wrong with pit bulls. It is the owners/ trainers doing and goes for all dogs.
- More strict rules for 'dangerous' dogs (i.e. history of biting or injury to others). Many of the nuisance suggestions would apply to the dangerous dog.
- Breed specific language is [removed]. Remove any reference to pit bulls if you expect an answer to this question.
- Higher fines for ALL owners not obeying animal bylaws. Does not need to be breed specific.
- Focus on training and educational programs for owners.
- Your pitbull laws are stupid and based on untrue information about the dog breed
- All of the above answers depend on what the definition of a nuisance is. I do not consider a dog barking to be a nuisance. I find the neighbors children screaming incessantly more of a nuisance than barking dogs. I feel that pit bulls should not be the only dogs that would require additional insurance, I myself have been bitten by both a collie and a maltese as well as a chihuahua. I know a few people that have been bitten by shepherds as well. As for fines, I think any dog that bites or is involved in a bylaw incident should have a higher fine.
- find one! instance where breed selective enforcement solved more problems than it created. no, no, no. ps.. i am not a pitbull owner and would never own a pitbull
- Dog training for the owners of dogs that are declared a nuisance. Owners are usually the problem.
- Reporting of nuisance animals should always showcase the breed and stop singling out pitbulls. Mandatory reporting should be created for all breeds
- Just want to clarify that the I don't agree with the breed specific segregation. Any animal declared a nuisance should be subject to this, a there shouldn't be a specific option for pit bulls.
- None of the above.
- No Dog specific penalties should be leaved against certain breeds , More fines won't help , but some training and help, proper management of dogs
- BSLs are BOGUS nonsense!!! Training is req'd for bad "OWNERS" of dogs if there are any issues with a dog! HUMANS are the ones needing training, including how to be RESPONSIBLE for dogs' wellbeing! Absolutely NO!!! to all "breed" laws and ignorant, draconian measures that punish the dogs who are the VICTIMS of stupid, uncaring people!!!! Dogs will end up killed off or abandoned by bad owners who don't want to pay to save them! QUIT promoting discrimination!!!
- If you, so help me god, ban a dog breed because of its "potential" to be a threat, you really need to reflect. How in the WORLD is that fair? Do we just arrest people when they're a "potentially dangerous" person? No!! So why do it to a dog?
- Can you specify what is considered dangerous behavior in the context of the first option
- Just enforce or educate people on the bylaws already in place (exs. off-leash dog areas need <6' leashes, no off-leash dogs on the path).
- It is wrong to discriminate against pit bulls, or any particular breed for that matter. It is a myth that pit bulls can "lock their jaws." Also, you discriminate against pitbulls "because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite" when Rottweilers and German Shepards have a more powerful bite than pit bulls! But I don't see them on your list! You shouldn't discriminate against Rottweilers or



German Shepherds either, but at least do some research before trying to muzzle pit bulls or any dogs that have done nothing wrong.

- Please do not include breed specific legislation. It doesn't work! please focus on the responsible pet ownership regardless of breed
- All dogs, regardless of size or breed, that are registered in the city should be required to take Obedience classes. BSL has already been proven ineffective so instead of focusing on discriminating one "type" of dog, let's focus on responsible pet ownership instead
- Ban Pitbulls
- It's unfair to the dog, and the owner, to treat pit bulls the way you'd treat a nuisance dog. Pit bulls can be as aggressive as other dogs, but also just as kind.
- The wording of these questions appears to be heavily biased against dogs having a perceived 'pitbull-type' appearance. Breed-specific legislation simply does not work, and is discriminatory. A focus on education for dog owners would be more effective. You will unfortunately always end up with bad eggs, but education will go a long way.
- This bylaw shouldn't be a thing
- Owners must be responsible of their dog NO MATTER THE BREED!
- No breed specific legislation is needed.
- none of these should happen
- Give dogs that have been proven aggressive training on a case by case basis unrelated to breed
- Pitbulls should be muzzled in Off Leash Parks. But not banned from them.
- I don't think these measures can be used in every instance. Many dog attacks are due to human error, whether that be the owner's error or someone else. Educating children on respect for animals and how to approach a dog is the best way to go.
- None. Stop picking on bully breeds, deal with owners who poorly train dogs.
- all dogs over say 30 lbs and have aggressive behaviors be deemed dangerous, and be required to wear a muzzle, and be under strict care, custody and control of their owner.
- This is pure [removed]. Are you too lazy to do your job so you just google what other places have said??
- All large dogs are strong. No science to prove pit bulls are stronger. Focus on vicious dogs and actually enforce the current laws we have that reduce the number of bites when actually enforced.
- Do not judge all dogs by a particular breed. My neighbour has a small chihuahua type dog that is more aggressive and annoying than many of the pit bulls that I run into in the dog parks and off leash areas. This is ridiculous.
- None. This is dumb. Please let people just have what dog they want. No proof that these dogs do anything and these prohibitions will not decrease dog fights/bites.
- Repeat offenders have their dog taken away.
- Small dogs must be on leash unless in off leash area.
- That all dogs require obedience training not just pits
- Treat nuisance chihuahuas like nuisance pitbulls.



- I believe that the Pitbull breeds are truly beautiful inside and out and treating them as all aggressive and muzzling them would be similar to saying a type of coloured person should be watched more closely. It's the owner's responsibility to make sure they raise their animals as well as their children as responsible and kind beings! Don't blame the dogs, blame the parents (owners)!
- I have seen more issues with smaller dogs than large dogs. If there are more regulations on bully breeds, there needs to be more requirements and expectations on small breeds
- Let the dogs be it's not the dogs that are naturally aggressive how about punish the people than make them aggressive instead of the dog
- Ban pit bulls, dobermans, rottweilers etc or make the licence fees for them quite high so as to discourage people and reduce the numbers of these dangerous dogs.
- How about if the dog has a history of aggression then muzzle it and do not go after Bullie breeds that didn't do any wrong
- don' target one specific breed but improve education and enforcement when public contacts bylaw services regarding a dog that may be a nuisance
- Pit bulls are sweet dogs, please get more educated on the dogs and don't blame them for their owners being horrible.
- Dog specific language should be removed from all choices.
- Owners of nuisance dogs need to be trained in animal management and prove they are responsible pet owners
- Immediate euthanizing of dogs that have bitten people and seriously injured other dogs.
- Dog breeds are not the problem, lazy dog owners and lack of training and discipline
- Smaller dogs should have the same punishment as a pitbull when bites or attacks occur since the dog should be under the owners control no matter what size or strength.
- The city needs to start holding the terrible pet owners more responsible instead of generalizing breeds and punishing the dog
- A city approved dog trainer to determine if newly issued pet license for a dog requires Obedience training for dog
- Obedience training for all dogs
- Obedience Training Required by all dog owners
- I think people who want to own pit bulls or dogs like pit bulls should have to go through a test before getting one, along with having a license to own one.
- None
- None.
- Pit bulls need to be banned in the City of Calgary. Other cities have successfully done this. Why is Calgary waiting? What other statistics do we need?
- Do your research on bite strengths. You are largely misinformed. A lab has very close to the same bite force as a pitbul (in its various breeds) and there are MANY other dogs with stronger bite forces than pit bulls. There are studies done on breeds bite forces and they are posted. The myth of pitbulls having a lock jaw is a myth (so your research on that too). Ask yourself this question...are any dogs born vicious ? If you answer no, than ask yourself how they become viscous? The



answer is humans train them that way. Some intentionally and some through ignorance. If it's humans causing the issue, then if you ban one breed they will train another (and if many have equal bite force they will pick from those breeds and the problem won't go away. If you ban more breeds, they will choose dogs that aren't banned until all dogs are banned. Because you can train a Chuhwawa to be vicious (in fact there are more so unarmed cases of chuhwawa bites than pitbuls in the US). People are the issue, not the breed. So don't ban breeds, ban people who have recorded cases of their dogs biting from having dogs. Makes more sense. And with everything going on in the world with people standing up against racism, sexism, gender equality, etc...do you think it sends the right message to be breed racist? It's wrong and you know it. Do the right thing and Fix the real issue and bam people with recorded bite cases from being allowed to have a dog. Which may mean all dogs are registered (as they should be now) and have a license. Link it to drivers licenses (recorded cases show up on Drivers license for police to see.

- I am disappointed in the city of Calgary for singling out specific breed of dog in the wording of this survey
- Breeds are not the problem. Irresponsible owners are. Deny irresponsible owners pet licenses.
- None of these are okay. Pitbull are genetically well tempered dogs and instead there should be information on proper training resources as well as information on how to correctly and incorrectly approach ANY dog. Cornering the pitbull family like this would move the city backwards rather than forwards.
- Breed-specific legislation (BSL) has no place in our city - research does not support the idea that it reduces risk. In addition, there is insufficient connection between 'nuisance' behaviours and bite instances to merit restrictions on nuisance dogs such as muzzles or bans from off-leash areas (non-violent, non-aggressive behaviours such as noise, or escaping from a yard, are not connected to aggression)
- No BSL. Breed neutral laws.
- Leave the dogs alone this is not going to help you
- It seems that in many cases, it's not the dog's behavior in question, but the OWNER'S behavior. For example, are these dogs placed in good homes with a responsible pet owner? For what I term "attack breeds", I think the OWNER should be screened (police check, home environment, previous dog owner etc.) before allowing any such breed to live with them. ANY dog could become vicious if they are abused in their home environment and/or had a prior history of abuse.
- Bsl does not work, it causes panic in public. Mistreatment of animals who are taken into custody after a suspected incident. Anxiety for the owner who will feel scared to bring their pet out into public.
- Pit and bully breeds are no more dangerous than other dogs. The bite strength of a pit or bully breed is not as dangerous as people believe. They don't "lock" their jaw. They should be treated like any other breed.
- There must be follow up on off leash dogs in on leash areas. I constantly see this happening and it causes distress to people and dogs who are following the rules. It is one thing to make a law but it must be enforced. I have not experienced problems with pit bull like dogs, it is people with dogs they



think are fine that come up and bite my on leash dog and then get upset when my dog reacts by growling. This has happened to my large, scary looking dog by a little off leash white dog that the owner says is not a problem. It is not the dog that is a problem it is the owner! Unfortunately there are a lot of bad pit bull like owners.

- This is absolutely outlandish and incredibly discriminatory and is against our human rights to have rules such as what you are suggesting. This is looking closer and closer to a communist action by even contemplating this idiocy.
- Stop singling out pitbull breeds. Its not the dog its the owner. There are other dog breeds that have a stronger bite that pitbulls such as Rottweilers and German Shepards.
- Don't put the ban on pit bulls and target negligence owners
- None of this should happen
- Heavier laws against bully breeds don't do anything to improve attacks and their probability. Bully breeds are not the problem.
- I would strongly contest any breed specific legislation.
- Please do not enact any breed specific laws, they do not have any effect on improving public safety.
- Education required for dog owners of these types of Dogs
- Ban pit bulls
- No stipulations on Pit bull breeds!!!
- We advocate for sensible responsible pet ownership. Education and socialization of dogs and owners are key to well behaved dogs. Licensing and fines will not suffice as the only method. Breed specific legislation only hurts responsible owners. Irresponsible owners will move onto other large breeds and continue to be an issue to the community. Education and socialization of humans and dogs are key to success. Invest in local training facilities so we all have good access to appropriate training
- I do not think that there should be any discrimination between different breeds of dogs. All breeds of dogs should be assessed the same when it comes to judging if they are a "nuisance" or not. Trying to implement discrimination against pit bull type dogs is unfair and displays unnecessary fear from the city. Whether big or small, all dogs should be treated the same. Perhaps instead of these new proposed ideas that spark uneducated fear, there should be opportunities for dog owners and the public to learn about responsible pet ownership and dog behaviour.
- Educate all dogs owners (of all dog breeds)
- If humans train their dogs why is all the blame being put on the dogs? If you want to do something about nuisance dogs do something about their owners. Also, a class in elementary schools on how to behave and treat animals could help the situation as well. Many people are not taught how to treat animals as they are to treat humans. It is all about all behaviours involved, human (victim/owner) and the dogs.
- None of the above
- No breed specific legislation. Any dog can be vicious in the right circumstances. As the owner of a pedigree white boxer I have been accused of being evil for having a pitbull



- the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite. --- this statement is inherently flawed and has disproven. Golden retrievers have higher bite statistics than a "pit bull". Breed discrimination is as stupid in dogs as racist behaviour in people. Calgary, you're better than this. There is so much more to focus on in the world than singling out dogs that have historically been abused.
- my neighbour has a dog that will not stop barking at other dogs, people, animals, sprinklers, cars, etc...they do not have a full fence around his property and has an aggressive, doesn't listen to owner, pittie. there must be a bylaw saying that properties must be completely closed. and aggressive, or nuisance dogs never left alone in yard. there must be a way to file a complaint and a ticket or warning be issued. they also have a cat that is let out at night and does a lot of digging and popping in our gardens. this is not alright. there must be away to complain without having to trap the cat and bringing him in. There must be away to report the tenant or landlord or homeowner about aggressive behaviours especially when it comes to a pitbull type dog. when someone doesn't feel safe on their own property because a pet owner does not have a fence to contain their pet is very wrong. i have witnessed aggressive behaviour like pacing and following while growling, lungung at kids, and also chasing a man down the alley when it was let off property by mistake and barking non stop and refusal to listen to owner when called back. very scary incident. but was told by 311 until someone comes forward(victim) or the dog actually bites nothing can be done... why is that?
- Dogs that exhibit these behaviours should not be given a second chance. This takes care of item #4.
- Treat all dogs the same and don't target one specific breed
- In any dog incident (nuisance or bite) an independent evaluation of the dogs situation. Is the dog in a mismanagement situation? Where owner or handler is the cause of the incident? Did the owner put the dog in an unsafe situation? Education of people going into off-leash parks. What is basic appropriate human behaviour and basic appropriate dog behaviour.
- NOT ALL PIT BULLS ARE VICIOUS. CHIHUAHUAS ARE MORE VICIOUS THAN PIT BULLS.
- All dogs should be required to have obedience training and a special license stating they passed a test for recall and obedience before being allowed in off leash parks
- there should not be laws in place punishing dogs just because they have the potential to be dangerous
- It's not appropriate to single out pit bulls in these regulations. The city will not be taken as seriously if they do so.
- Every decade seems to have a breed of dog to pick on. This one is broad stroke painting over and beyond breed affecting over a dozen plus any cross breeds. It is subjective to the appearance of the animals and not actual behaviour. It criminalizes everyone who has anything like this in our city regardless of the level of responsible ownership they have already displayed and regardless of the temperament or level of training already invested in these pets. It will lead to owners of these family pets to fear registering licensing, increased abandonment of dogs due cost to owners and open all owners harassment and judgement by neighbours as you have bought into stereotype and fear mongering. This legalizes discrimination on the subjective basis of looks leaving pet owners at



increased risk of harassment and prejudice by neighbours. A small portion of society that are irresponsible and look to own perceived power breeds as status symbols will continue to do so. In the 70's it was dobermans then German Shepards and Rottweilers before bully breeds. Infact the power breeds of choice by this element has already moved on from the bully breeds. Just look at Kijji. The backyard breeders looking for a quick buck are breeding mastiffs, cane corsos and Dogo Argentinos to fulfill that demand. Legislation shpuld focus on breed neutral legislation applicable to all breeds amd owners equally and if reform is needed look at ways to curb back yard breeders, businesses operating as rescues from importing dogs for sale (under guise of adoption). These imported dogs come with unknown or wiped histories. One little such dog adopted out had fear issues, bit his new adopted owners and then a neighbours child The adopters reached out to the Calgary rescue that they got him from to learn this was the fogs 3rd home due biting. The decision was made privately with the owners and rescue business to euthanize the animal. Important to state here not a bully breed dogas ALL dogs have potential to bite when their upbringing has been uneducated and unstable. No to BSL it just does not work.

- Please do not employ breed specific legislation. You state that pit bulls are not involved in more offenses but that their bite is stronger. This is not actually the case. Pit bulls do not have a bite strength that is more than almost other big dogs, for example a German Shepherd Dog. Please please do your research!
- Dogs only need a mussel if they've bitten someone in the past.
- City will stop spreading incorrect info on pit bull breeds
- Better training and understanding if the dogs.
- Pit bulls shouldn't disregarded just because they are a dog
- Breed-specific legislation has been proven ineffective and problematic in multiple jurisdictions where it has been implemented and often subsequently discontinued. I do not support BSL. Please do not go down that ill-advised and dangerous path. The focus must be on responsible pet ownership and consequences for dangerous dogs, not members of certain breeds. I left Montreal when they were implementing this type of breed-specific legislation (which was ultimately unsuccessful) and at the time (2016), Calgary was being held up as a model of successful animal control. Please do not call victim to ignorance and hysterical thinking. Consult with educated dog behaviour professionals as well as the public. [personal information removed]
- I do not support any breed-specific legislation. Pit bulls are big dogs. Big dogs have strong jaws. Any big dog will hurt someone if they bite them. Breed-specific legislation only leads to pit bulls being further maligned. Pit bulls don't deserve this - it will only lead to good people being afraid to adopt pit bulls. It's about how you train a dog, not the type of dog they are.
- Focus on the people who are poor dog owners, breed has nothing to do with it. WHAT a waste of time and money to focus on dog breeds!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Pit bulls should not be reprimanded simply because if there breed. They should be treated the same as any other dog. If a child is teasing a dog that child should be held responsible for getting bite. Not the dog.
- Reducing licensing fees when a dog owner provides proof of obedience training



- Also there should be a look into the owner. If there is issues with this owner in the past possibly ban them from owning pets. Bad behavior is learned and trained. Animals should not be blamed for it.
- The statement you made is not scientifically accurate and is irresponsible. It lends to a blatant bias shown in this survey. I did some research and Calgary has been cited by other municipalities as an example to follow with current bylaws. What is missing is consistency in following through on current laws and education programs. Properly find this, get back to basics. My research also showed breed specific legislation to be costly to engage in and enforce including loss of revenue and cities with this in place have hired task forces to see if their BSL had been effective in improving public safety. It was not. For a city in financial peril and in the midst of a pandemic fear mongering and polarizing citizens in irresponsible. Do not waste our tax dollars in this manner or any manner with my money. You would be instantly criminalizing pet owners, giving license to public harassment to owners with any animal that might look like a "pitty". That is highly subjective by the way. As Inam in complete disagreement with this biased survey I imagine my comments will be omitted from the councillors view. Properly execute on the by-laws we already have. Consider a way to work with AHS and groups to safely report bite incidents. Stop letting foreign gained dogs into our country from agencies posing as rescue organizations. These businesses for profit pulling on heart strings of could be adopters bringing dogs from unknown histories. Stop backyard breeders require permits etc. Discount responsible ownership practices regardless of breed.
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household.
- The owner of the dog must be educated, this behaviour the dog is exhibiting is learned behaviour, I blame the owner for the dog acting out. It is how the human raises the dog in how it behaves. Maybe some classes and education to the human on how to treat and teach their dog in a loving way so they are not aggressive.
- [removed] Pit bulls are less aggressive than a fair amount of other dogs owned in homes. [removed] Even if they are stronger than a lot of other dog breeds. Your not forcing bodybuilders to put constructive gear on to keep them from being so strong in public your not doing anything like that. [removed]
- No breed specific legislation. Seize nuisance/dangerous dogs. Owners are accountable animals aren't.
- None of the above
- Create a campaign to reduce the stigma regarding pit bulls instead of persecuting innocent animals or their owners
- It's the people who teach the pit bulls to be violent, pit bulls are actually really friendly
- None of these. All statistically proven to not lower dog biting rates.
- None because if they do nothing wrong they shouldn't be punished
- Not all pit bulls are dangerous. In fact, most aren't. There's no reason they should face discrimination for some thing they didn't do.
- I support absolutely none of these
- No a dog should not have to be muzzled for being a breed of dog. Blm btw
- None of the above



- Obedience and training should be mandatory for all dog owners. The worst are small dogs with no training. They just aren't big enough to cause harm...
- leave pitbulls alone but look at all breeds and even owners dogs are not to be defined by breed this is just another form of racism or speciesism not ok respect the Dog any dog and it will respect you any dog can be a nuisance dog or aggressive or anything you think a pitbull is, this has nothing to do with the breed it has everything to do with owners of any dog.
- Obedience training should be required for all owners who adopt a new dog for both the dog and the owner.
- Don't let stupid people have dogs. Its the owner not the pet regardless of animal.
- Most people dont even register their dogs with the city and if they have a pit bull more extreme measures will push this stuff underground.
- Owner education for problem dogs. A dog is a product of its environment and its owner.
- Find the root cause of the problem. Better training is required for the dog owner. Raise awareness about proper dog ownership.
- I do not accept BSL.
- Please do not discriminate against the bully breed. You have no facts to suggest they are more aggressive or require more training than any other breed of dog. Consider actually holding irresponsible owners accountable for their dogs- REGARDLESS OF BREED.
- all dogs should have obedience training; also I have seen owners, in winter, simply let a dog out of the car for a poop, then putting the dog back in the car. I also wonder about the number of dogs that can be in the care of dogwalkers. I have noted, 2 in particular, who have 5-7 dogs unleashed and pay no attention to poop.
- Breed specific laws and fines are ridiculous!!
- This should not be breed specific.
- I think it would be important that any requirement for obedience specifies that the training must come from approved trainers. The science has shown that trainers who use adverse methods are likely to exacerbate aggressive behaviour. I also do not support any form of Breed Specific Legislation, it's been proven to be ineffective in other locations that have implemented it, could highly penalized dogs in need of rescue, training and rehoming, and the use of the language "substantially similar to those" is unclear and confusing.
- Training for owners to properly care for dogs that have been declared a nuisance. If you cannot properly care for a dog, you should not be allowed to own one.
- All dogs can bite, do not discriminate based on breed
- Make this for all nuisance dogs. Including the little "harmless" ones like chihuahuas and shitzhus
- Ensure there is a quick way to report offenses/incidents involving pit bulls and nuisance dogs. Ensure those reports get prioritized for quick enforcement actions.
- Do not stigmatize any specific breed ie Pitbulls!
- Nuisance dogs are not the problem. Owners are! They need to educate themselves, be aware of the breed they want. Even a poodle could bite! We need to have a permit for any dog and increase control for illegal markets.



- I oppose the breed-specific legislation suggested in this question; there is no evidence to support the claim that they have a greater bite strength than any other breed
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household
- When a pet exhibits bad behavior, it is always of the owners origin (not understanding species, not providing training, etc). Fines and offenses should be made against the owner and not animal, with mandatory education classes and performance reviews for those who keep dogs or pets that have the potential to be dangerous. Seizing dogs and turning over to a pet shelter (not a kill one) until the owners can prove they can keep a higher maintenance pet is preferable.
- Dangerous dog breed ought to be outlawed altogether
- I think the pitbull argument is ridiculous. There are no bad dogs only bad owners/breeders. There needs to be training for people who want those breeds before the adopt one.
- No to breed specific legislation. How awful pitbulls and bully breeds are singled out as 'problems' Most dog owners of all breeds are respectful, loving, and support the well being of their dogs. They also pay taxes, pay for insurances, and promote community well being. To target and declare a breed dangerous is painting a insane broad stroke. Please handle all bites (small dogs, large dogs, cats too) on a case by case basis. This is the foundation of the justice system (innocent until proven guilty) and it should apply to all of our furry friends and family members. Out of all of the dogs in the city, nearly all have wonderful parents and families who could not afford higher insurances, liability coverage, mussels, registration, proof of classes (even if their animals are trained at home). This proposed legislation will severely limit the freedom and the ability 'pitbull types' to be fairly adopted, treated, or given freedoms that any other animal would in Calgary. I am for responsible ownership, and perhaps dogs that aren't that social should have the owner's place a warning system up or wear a bandanna that says they are reactive or require owner permission before approach. This is NOT to implement blindly across a breed or breed type that 'looks' dangerous. We need a compassionate approach that is easy for everyone to adopt. Your bandanna idea is wonderful and voluntary. Incidents can never be reduced to zero (nor can crime or the propensity for humans to enact violence), but we can stop terrible legislation or perhaps even hire more animal welfare officers that can work with owners, promote education etc. These breeds are wonderful and I know many owners who would not be able to keep their dogs or even adopt new small puppies from rescues if they were pitbull types if this passed. Please take this on a case-by case basis and not with blanket, discriminatory laws. Lots of huge animals are incredibly gentle with all others, and forcing muzzling, no interaction at parks, declaring them violent or dangerous or assuming they will bite will do more harm than good - both in stereotyping the dog and thereby fostering a culture of fear, but also harming the freedom that our family members so rightly deserve. Please do not enforce 'pit bull' restrictions, fines, liability, or insurance increases like you proposed above.
- Ban pit bulls, as defined above, from the city of Calgary.
- I highly object to "pit bull" type dogs being singled out. It is an owner problem, not a dog problem. Mandatory owner education for breeds such as staffies, German Shepards, Rotties, Mastifs, Akitas, so that owners understand what their dogs need.



- Prohibit people from owning dogs if they have had multiple nuisance dogs or dogs that bite. Also, I think that all dog breeds need to be treated similarly. ALL dogs should go through obedience and socialization training if ever leaving an owners property (even if leashed), not just nuisance dogs or pit pulls. In my limited experience, I have seen more bad dog behavior in small dogs at off leash areas.
- Stop isolating bully dog types. Many of these dog owners are very responsible and by implementing specific laws towards this breed, you are lowering their standard of life. Putting muzzles on them mean they cannot defend themselves from other dogs- which usually end up being the issue. Thought Calgary was smarter and more progressive than this.
- Pitbulls should not be singled out.
- Dogs (of any breed) who injure or kill another pet - owners of offending dog are required to fully compensate the victims for any incurred medical costs.
- Pitbulls should never be persecuted for owners negligence
- breed specific owner training
- Owners of nuisance dogs are required to have additional education and limits on number of animals they can own.
- Higher fines for dog owners who do not appropriately leash their dogs, leading to dog bite incidents (ie. smaller dogs that run up to larger defensive dogs and instigate dog bite incidents)
- Minimum requirements for fence height for yards where a pit bull is living.
- This is just wrong. Its not the animal thats the problem its the human that raises it!
- Increase access and funding for responsible dog training courses for all dog owners. Pit bulls should NOT be singled out.
- I would state Pit bulls that already has an dangerous behavior OR an Interim orders are not allowed in off-leash parks and would be needing extra obedience training
- Stop allowing inexperienced people keep larger so called “nuisance” dogs. The owner is the problem, not the dog. I don’t understand why that’s a struggle to understand. A dog isn’t born aggressive it’s either trained to be that way or not trained well enough to know the difference and listen to it’s handler. Stop letting anyone who’s anyone own a dog and put the bylaws on people not dogs. Larger stronger breeds need proper care and training by someone use to the breed and who knows what they are doing. You look at any animal abuse case across this province. In Calgary people leave dogs out in -40 weather, people have duct taped animals mouths and starved them in storage garages. Why is the city not monitoring who is allowed to care for an animal? Before you start blaming “nuisance” animals and putting a muzzle on them, look at nuisance Alberta residents who harm and mistreat them who like the idea of a “big tough dog” but haven’t a clue about the responsibility. Shame on this province if they can’t see that animal abusing evil people are the issue. Start a law that changes people’s behaviour and prevents abuse and mishandling. An animal of whichever breed or creation will respond positively if shown proper care, training and love. I’m not saying there aren’t aggressive animals out there but we all need to realize how our behaviour as humans effects everything.
- Mandatory training for owners whose dog, any breed, is found to be dangerous (bites a person)



- dogs involved in a bit offence (except minor nipping) destroyed
- When you say nuisance dogs, it should be explained further to what you mean exactly. A dog that has bitten previously? Then it makes sense. But just based on the breed, absolutely not.
- I do not support anything based on categorizing a dog based on its appearance and a subjective assessment that a dog looks like and has physical characteristics of a type of dog. In whose assessment? Based on what? This is subjective and arbitrary and has no place in a by-law
- Absolutely nothing. Dogs learn from owner training and control. This should not be a breed specific issue. It would be a very unfair by law to pass on "nuisance dogs", dogs all need control but also some freedom to live a happy life. If an owner is unable to control or train a dog, the dog should not be brought into situations that may cause conflict or issues.
- None. Pitbulls and "pitbull looking" dogs are so stigmatized. There shouldn't be extra fines just because they are a certain breed
- How about NO to breed specific legislation and just look at all dogs evenly. I'm extremely saddened and disappointed Calgary is singling out pitbull and propagating BSL that even other countries have proved is not only incorrect but is discriminatory. Calgary needs to stand up and foster a community of inclusion, where bite cases (disproportionate reporting that often excuses small dog breeds because of size too) are looked at fairly, assessed with the welfare of the animal in mind (not judgements about the breed or instilled incorrect stereotypes and misnomers) to come to a reasonable solutions. If the dog is involved in a serious bite incident or THEN have the dog assessed. Do not blanket all pit bull dogs as violent or push restrictions, costs, insurance jumps, registration increases and liabilities on the rest of the owners. Here's the thing, doing so punishes innocent well behaved and super great pets and their owners. Truth be told they are the bylaw compliant, pay registration and most of them and their dogs have NEVER even had a complaint or issue. I support no BSL or sanctions against pitbulls. I support hiring more bylaw officers, more help for animal shelters, and case by case intervention only. We are better than this Calgary!
- Nuisance needs better definition. Consider dangerous and nuisance definition. Inappropriate to say a dog that barks can't go to off leash
- If you are going to single out any particular breed, single out the pet owners.
- I think we should consider a ban of 'pit bulls'. As other provinces have banned them, have our numbers increased? Also, has anyone looked to determine if there is a correlation to higher numbers of dog fighting rings?
- Don't bully breeds for having a bad owner. Have better screening processes for owners and follow ups on how the animal is cared for. It's not the animals fault the have protective issues if abuse is all they know and have been taught.
- Require assessment, training and insurance for owners who have had dogs cited for dangerous behaviours. Require education for all owners before pet acquisition.
- Fines for owners of nuisance dogs. Pitbulls aren't the problem, the training is the problem. Don't punish responsible owners.
- Owners of nuisance dogs should be required to attend dog handling training
- Pass a test of obedience skills and knowledge BEFORE you can own a dog. Like a driver's licence.



- Obedience training should be required for all dogs. It should be a requirement for getting a license. Park signs for off-leash areas are confusing to many dog owners. It should state on-leash on pathways, not show just a sign with offleash to one side of the pathway (e.g. top of Bowmount Park in the NW). Owners rarely have dogs on-leash on pathways where they are supposed to. I run several times a week. Nuisance dogs should be expanded to cover a threatening behaviour without biting; that would include dogs which chase me, or run at me aggressively, or jump on me uninvited. There needs to be city parks representatives in the city parks in the evenings educating dog owners and giving out fines to people who don't follow the rules. The focus should be on prevention (education on park rules and forcing owners to train dogs) more than identifying one problem breed.
- Warnings then fines for dog owners who do not have their dogs under control at all times
- Have a test for people wanting to own bully breed dogs to access if they would make proper owners
- Any dog owner not following the rules should be fined. This should include being approved by a dog on the extendable leashes. Leashes should be no longer than 1 meter long! I don't like being approached by any dog and owners dines have control when the dog is too far extended on a leash.
- There are many responsible dog owners. I don't believe in labelling a specific breed a nuisance but specifically define the behaviour that is the nuisance.
- Mandatory dog training for any person that gets a new dog
- None of the above
- I cannot stand that Pitbulls are being labeled here, I have friends and family with Pitbulls and they are the most loving and gentle dogs I know. Like any dog it depends on the training and owners, I have seen people bite by more small dogs then Pities. If someone's dog bites whether it is a Poodle, Lab or Pity then fines should be given but do not rule out one single breed as nuisance that is not accurate or fair.
- nothing should be breed related, a nuisance dog is a nuisance dog regardless of breed characteristics.
- Targeting pitbulls makes no sense. German shepherds and Rottweilers have pretty strong bites and were bread for guarding, and aren't included. Mastiffs have very strong bites and were bread as fighters, as do Akitas, Dogos, and even Sharpei.
- you are **WRONG** to single out one dog breed - all dogs are capable of causing injury. Perhaps **ALL** dog owners should be required to take an online education course on pet care before dog tags are issued...
- Obedience training required for all dogs
- There **NEEDS** to be support systems put into place to help low-income and uneducated people learn how to properly care for and train their dogs. If a dog is involved in an incident or becomes a dog who could become a dangerous animal, there should be a rehabilitation program that both the owner and dog must complete together. Fining people will not help solve the problem. Discrimination against specific breeds is the **WORST** approach. The dog is never the problem, it is **ALWAYS** the owner!
- I do not believe that pit bull dogs should be singled out, and the reasoning is unsound, if this were terue police dogs such as german sheppard and other variety of large or high impact biting dogs



should be listed. this is the equivalent in humans to racial profiling and should not be part of animal bylaws. Nuisance animals should undergo some training, nuisance meaning multiple offences not first time offences, not all dogs get along, nor are they meant to be friends and minor incidents can happen, this is the nature of the dog world. When talking animal bites to humans, situation should be assessed if an animal is protecting its owner from a threat, they are not a nuisance. if an animal unprovoked has bitten a human then training classes should be recommended for their correction.

- I'm reticent to separate pit bulls out from other breeds. I would support labeling some dogs as "nuisance dogs" and apply additional requirements (ie bi-annual licensing, additional training, and certificates...)
- This is so uninformed it's appalling. Breed specific rules are wrong and should never be ratified.
- All dog and cat owners should carry annual pet insurance through home owners liability insurance and must be apart of obtaining a pet licence
- Handling training for owners who own the animals.
- An aggressive dog is an aggressive dog it should not just apply to bully breeds.
- It is incorrect that a pitbull's strength is stronger than other dogs to inflict more damage. I am disappointed this survey includes common myths instead of actual facts.
- Due to 1)a pit bull attacking our 1 year old Sheltie severely, in a dog park and the owner responding with profanity and not taking any responsibility, I would vote that pit bulls become illegal to own in Calgary.
- We wish to outline our concerns about the possibility of breed specific legislation (BSL) in our city. As you know, Calgary's Animal Services department has requested public feedback on elements of the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw. We participated in Phase One of this review, and in all the comments we heard and read from the public, including the 93-page summary report, there was no mention of BSL. In the published internal staff engagement report (26 pages) there was only one passing mention of anything vaguely breed-specific. As such, we were surprised to see BSL included on the Phase Two survey - featured quite prominently in fact, with specific questions about muzzling and leashing requirements, higher fines, exclusion from dog parks, mandatory insurance, and household limits. It is difficult not to infer that BSL is being strongly considered by Animal Services and/or City Council, since there were only twelve questions overall. This is a confusing and disappointing development. Calgary was once a leader in animal control [personal information removed] Our city had some of the strongest enforcement, most progressive outreach, highest licensing rates, and lowest bite rates on the continent. All of this was done without targeting breeds. The solution was strong, clear bylaws that promoted owner responsibility and targeted known risk factors for dog aggression. These laws were coupled with enforcement and legislation. This combination worked, just as it continues to work in other jurisdictions that used Calgary's laws as a model. BSL is flawed. Should Calgary choose this approach, here is what we can expect. -- BSL enforcement will rely on visual identification. BSL assumes that two dogs that look alike will always act alike, and that behaviour is correlated with physical characteristics. Studies show that visual breed ID is usually flawed, especially when it comes to mixed breeds and dogs of unknown parentage – which make up a majority of Calgary's dog population. --BSL is an inefficient use of



animal control resources. Instead of investigating behaviours and actual risk factors, our officers will be required to police dogs based on the way they look. Neighbours can call in complaints not because a dog is barking or running loose but because a dog *looks* like a restricted breed. --Bite rates and nuisance concerns will stay the same – or increase. This has happened in the vast majority of BSL jurisdictions. In the last decade in Calgary, an average of 12% reported bites are attributed to “pit bulls”. That may seem concerning, until you note that similar levels are attributed to groups like German Shepherds, Labrador Retrievers, and herding breeds (all subject to the same visual identification concerns of course). Over 60% of all bites are by other/unattributed breeds. A total of 180 breeds have been implicated in bite incidences in Calgary. By targeting only one type of dog for restrictions, you are doing nothing to address the majority of aggression incidences. You are only gaining a temporary, false sense of security. ---You are subscribing to the “pit bull” umbrella definition, which is problematic. Most dogs in our community labelled “pit bulls” are mixed breed dogs and/or dogs of unknown parentage. They range from 30 to 130 pounds, have a variety of body shapes, and come in almost every colour and set of markings. Their personalities vary to the same degree. It is impossible and flies in the face of animal behaviour science to assume they will all behave the same. Calgary Animal Services has claimed that “pit bulls” are responsible for more serious bites, but this cannot be attributed to an umbrella breed label – there is nothing in their genetics or physiology that would explain this. ---Restricted breeds will proliferate in the shelter system. When these dogs are targeted because of their visual appearance, it makes life more difficult for responsible, law-abiding owners. If a dog is caught as a stray, for example, an owner may be afraid to claim him and face harsh penalties and judgement. If the city restricts these dogs, landlords will too, leading to more surrenders. At the same time, the dogs will be less adoptable for all these reasons. ---You will be alienating responsible dog owners and a large segment of the community. While these dogs have been stigmatized in the past, “pit bull” type dogs are increasingly mainstream. They are used in advertising and movies, and as therapy, service, and police dogs. The majority of Canadians don’t support discrimination by appearance when it comes to dogs. In Montreal, Mayor Denis Coderre pushed through a breed ban and months later was voted out in favour of an underdog candidate who made breed-neutral legislation a major part of her platform. -- You will be moving backwards when other communities are moving forwards. Every year, more communities reject breed bans enacted in the 1980s and 1990s in favour of evidence-based, breed-neutral legislation: the exact legislation that Calgary pioneered at one time. ---You would be acting against the recommendation of dozens of reputable organizations. Every professional organization associated with animal welfare, animal behaviour, and animal control takes a position against BSL. So does the SPCA and the Calgary Humane Society, as well as the Centres for Disease Control and the American Bar Association. There are better alternatives. We can look to the successes in Calgary in the early 2000s, and expand and improve upon them. These could include clarification and refinement of existing bylaws, expanded and proactive enforcement, dog bite prevention programs (these are available for free), training and spay/neuter programs, and public education. Calgary is a progressive and diverse city, and our animal legislation should reflect that. Please do not punish responsible dog owners and allow our bylaws to discriminate based on visual appearance.



- None - the dog should not be punished, muzzled, or not allowed in off leash areas - the owner should be the one who takes responsibilities. Higher fines should be given to ALL dog owners, not just pitbull owners or nuisance dogs owners - for an owners inability to be properly educated, and properly train their dog.
- There should not be any legislation specific to a breed. Need more clarification on what considered a "nuisance dog"
- I strongly disagree with the 'pit bull' discrimination. I understand the consequences of their bite might be more damaging but other very popular breeds, such as Golden retrievers, misbehave just as much as 'pit bull-like' dogs, if not more. Dogs are pets, but not toys. And owner should be required to understand this at the time of adoption, besides realizing the time commitment and effort it takes to raise balanced and socially educated dogs.
- End BSL...if pit bulls aren't involved in more incidences then please don't discriminate...any dogs that are declared a nuisance should have consequences for their owners. What you are doing is breed profiling and akin to saying that all people of colour are thieves and should be handcuffed when walking around shops incase they steal...you wouldn't propose that, so why label my 6 year old "pit bull" a danger when he has been attacked by labs, westies and a Dalmatian in 4 separate incidents and never responded?
- BLS only will punish and hurt responsible owners and their families. No not have BSL in Calgary. Enforce breed neutral bylaws and hold individual owners accountable! The answer is not a blanket bylaw that makes things black and white and ostracize people and their pets from our community. I am so sad and worried and dissapointed to see City bylaw even considering this :(
- I think an extremely high fine is warranted if a dog of any kind attacks and kills another animal in an unprovoked attack.
- Maybe have more bylaws about ownership rather than discriminating on a specific breed
- Smaller dogs have caused more injury while working in a vet clinic... This should be applied to ALL breeds.
- Ridiculous to spotlight pit bulls because they're stronger, but have not done anything wrong or acted as a "nuisance", definitely need some changes for dogs that are a problem though
- Looking at data from other municipalities that tried BSL it is costly and ineffective, it gave rise to popularity if other breeds, incidents of actual aggressive dogs was not curbed. They come in ll breeds and damage. Italy experienced this and eventually had 92 breeds of dogs on their banned list by 2009 reduced that ban to 17 breeds. In 2016 they scrapped BSL legislation focusing on addressing the actual issues. The Netherlands gave successfully dealt with their issues through incentives, accessible spay/neuter programs and cost breaks to citizens that participate in responsible ownership.
- The dogs are not the problem, it is the owners. The City should be able to demand training for both the owner and the dog in cases of nuisance designation. Failure to comply should result in removal of the dog.
- nothing but bigotry and hate directed to dogs based on appearance [personal information removed]



- You question is biased closed minded and bigoted targeting a "perceived breed issue" who ever drew this question up is a pit hating moron !! Waiting to protest if you people are stupid enough to add BSL against science and facts ... of its ineffectiveness ... Mess with my dogs see what happens --
- All breed. Should come from official responsible Breeders buying a dog from Back Yard breeder , dogs that are not CKC registered or from other recognized associations (FCI, AKC) are a big part of problem. The responsible breeder will filter buys and will take dog back if the is a problem
- obedience training for the owners knowledge acknowledgement of the dog bylaws, fines for waste, problem dogs, all dogs regardless of their size, it is the licenced owners responsibility to maintain control. An example maybe, in an off leash park where a dog may run up and then jump up onto people. While not serious typically, this is the dog trying to potentially play or assert itself? I am not sure but as a former licenced dog owner people do not know the dog bylaws (dogs on right on paths, no dogs on school ground/sport fields). In my life I know of two people with serious permanent damage due to dog attacks, people need to know and sign off on their liabilities and accountability's as a city of Calgary resident dog or cat owner.
- BSL has been proven not to work. Why don't we hold each individual dog/owner accountable instead of blaming a group
- BAN PIT BULLS: for any future purchases/adoptions, let the ones in homes already live out their lives with all the above precautions/penalties, and remove the rest from the city/shelters. * * * * *
- REQUIRE ULTRASONIC ANTI-BARK DEVICES WITHIN ALL NEIGHBOURHOODS: people get dogs but don't know how to train them, they disturb all their neighbours - please make them put up these harmless yet very effective devices ignorer to own a dog in Calgary
- The above are all sensible measures to address the consequences of dogs declared a "nuisance" - in many cases, isn't the root problem with the owners who keep eg Pitbulls because of their reputation?
- Personally I do not trust pit bulls, although I am told many are loving pets. I am not qualified to answer questions on this breed.
- Obedience training for ALL dogs, not breed specific
- Education programs that help owners understand how to manage their pets. A lot of people at the dog park will say dogs are just being dogs when they are in fact being aggressive.
- Leave pit bull owners alone, there hasn't been an increase in bites, attacks or complaints. So why target them? Your biases need to be checked before pushing such a ridiculous motion.
- DO NOT PASS A BSL!! That in it self is biased and unfair to a specific breed no different than human racism toward people of specific races. If you are going to increase fines or go after dogs that are acting aggressively than do so for ALL dogs. Including the small ones! Teach the owners of legitimate complaints (not ones based on breed because some thinks its bad) about training and how better to control their pet.
- Instead of focusing on pitbull - maybe include more breeds that are also consider dangerous or based on actual numbers, such as bites per breed - this would include labrador and GSD...



- In terms of a dog being declared a nuisance, I think consideration needs to be given to the type of offense.
- Mandatory training classes for ALL DOG OWNERS. Need to be fair now. If one dog has to be muzzled, they all should be.
- Discrimination against a specific breed would be ridiculous. It's never the dog it's the owner. If an owner has a dog who is a nuisance then they should be required to attend behavioural training classes.
- Fines and/or charges should be laid against negligent or irresponsible dog owners, and repeat offences by the same owner should result in a ban in animal ownership.
- Obedience training for the OWNERS of nuisance dogs
- Severe bites need to be dealt with....but enabling breed specific bylaws is a knee jerk reaction. Being involved in obedience training, the only bite I received was from a German Shepard. Cocker Spaniels were also on the top of the list for biting. Blanket bylaws and rules is a mistake.
- These breeds should be dealt within a individual case not all these dogs are bad and it's unfair to specific breed them deal with it on a case to case event
- Do not be breed specific, all dogs should be held at a standard of behaviour. Not just one breed.
- Owners and dogs should be charged for how they act, not how they "could" act. Dogs under 60lbs are 89% more likely to bite. Dogs shouldn't be biting period. ANY dog that bites regardless of the size should be punished or have "strikes". This city is a joke for even trying to make breed specific.
- Instead of breed specific legislation, the definition of nuisance needs to be made clear and it should apply to all dangerous dogs equally, regardless of the breeds and size.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong
- Focus on the owner, not the dog! Focus on pet owners education, not on breed specific regulations, most smaller dog breeds are at much higher risk to be a danger than big ones, and this is because of lack of training. Use licensing fees and fines for free education on dog behaviour, body language, basic training.
- banning pitbulls, similar breeds as described in the introduction and dangerous or nuisance dogs in Canada, Alberta and Calgary.
- Don't discriminate against pit bulls and other bully breeds
- DO NOT support any type of breed ban or breed specific legislation. It can be any dog who create a nuisance.
- Nuisance is fine, but BSL is ridiculous. Take out the pit bull language.
- Bylaw needs to actually do something about aggressive dogs being reported. I report my neighbor and they do nothing. These dogs bark and lunge at people all day long.
- In my preference dogs should be treated nicely and not being isolated or punished.
- Pits do not have the strongest bite of any breed, so confused as to why the focus is on them? Hysteria around a breed exasperates the stress of the public and the dogs themselves, causing more issues. Any nuisance dog should have further training. Any nuisance dog is that way because of an issue, just like humans. This can be taught out in 99% of cases. Owners need to have the responsibility of training and helping their own dogs.



- Its not the pitbull breed, its the owner and this should include all dogs
- In Britain, I've heard that all dogs and their owners have to go for obedience training. I would like to see this in Calgary.
- Other breeds are as strong as pit bulls. German Shepard's and Belgian Malinois for example.
- Pit bulls are not vicious dogs how you raise
- I think that laws to protect people should be under the umbrella of problem dogs not specifically Pit bulls, and there should be fines for people who teach any breed of dog to be aggressive
- I think all dogs are capable of biting and we shouldn't single out one breed of dog. It is not fair.
- I do not support any of the above proposed ideas. This is judgemental and punishing owners for taking dogs who have a bad reputation.
- No profiling based on breed
- These measures do not work as proven in other jurisdictions that enacted similar policies
- By the time there is an offence it's usually too late. I'd like to see puppy classes and obedience classes be mandatory and perhaps prof has to be shown when licensing. That may however increase the number of unlicensed dogs.
- All damages or costs incurred by a victim must be paid by the dog's owner within 30 days of the incident in addition to whatever fines are levied. (Thinking of when a dog (or other pet) is attacked and requires emergency medical intervention by a vet. To a maximum of \$15,000 per incident.
- Again you have not defined 'nuisance' as someone that does not like animals or dogs in this case can call anything or action a nuisance. Also fines and for owners of a dog should be in place. Also dog handling training for owners should be a must if a dog is not of a gentle nature.
- Mandatory training for Pit Bull and nuisance dog owners on obedience and sensitivity training.
- Dog owners must show proof of training to be licenced.
- It is wrong, and unfair to single out "pitbull" breeds based on their looks and perceived jaw strength. Every bite damages. I believe the emphasis should be on obedience training for ALL dogs (including purse puppies). Possibly a higher licencing fee for dogs that do not pass obedience training. It is unfair to single out a breed/type based only on some peoples opinions. Probably people who have never really known a terrier. German Sheperds can do damage. It is about the owner, not the dog breed. I believe the emphasis should be on nuisance dogs and their owners, breed shouldn't matter.
- I am against breed specific legislation and bylaws. It is unfair and prejudiced for city council to impose them
- Obedience training should be incentivized for all breeds. While pit bulls and other large breeds can inflict more damage with a bite it is small breeds that often are aggressive due to a lack of training.
- All dogs registered in Calgary must have proof of obedience training. It's not the breed that's a problem, it's the owners. Very few people understand dog training or do it well.
- Don't judge the dog before it is warranted. Humans are almost ALWAYS responsible for an aggressive dog. Pile the fines on and make the human pay the price. Not the animal.
- Stop fixating on certain breeds. It's the owner not the dog
- Ban pit bulls (and the like) from Calgary.
- Educate people and children on how to handle animals...



- Pit bulls are only [removed] because of their [removed] owners. Train the OWNERS to treat their dogs properly and we won't be having this pit bull "issue".
- I do not support any BSL in Calgary. It have proven time and time again to not be effective. Please review available information on how BSL has not been successful. This is very disappointing that Calgary is even suggesting this.
- Low cost spay/neuter
- If dog, as above, injures animal/people the owner should be fined, dog seized and owner pays restitution for vet fees, etc related to injury
- I don't support BSL, all dogs should be treated equal. Individual incidents should be treated as individual incidents
- I do not support BSL. Each individual dog should be treated as an individual
- Offended by your discriminatory [removed] targeting breed - Pit bull is not a breed you dumb as a 80's pet rock moron stop! BSL is a failure the world over and I for one will protest daily if its imposed
- Training for owners of all dogs that are allowed off leash.
- Pit bulls are also named nanny dogs it really is not in their nature to harm it is the owners that make them aggressive yes they can be big and intimating yet rottweilers have the top bite force then Sheppards you dont here about them to often or what about our firehouse dog the delmation they to are breed with a fighting dog and not very good with kids. But there again its status police have shepherds firefighters have delmations and the drug dealers and bad guys have the pitt bull I guess the point I'm making is that because of the status pit bulls are looked at as mean aggressive killing machines when really there are gentle caring loving loyal dogs that just happen to get a bad rep because of the way they are treated.i would trust the lives of my children and grand children with a pitbull before any other breed I've said it a 1000 times get rid of the owners that are abuseing their dogs/ animals that is how you will solve the issues if you single out one breed for any stipulations you must be prepared to do it for all breeds as they are all animals and have the capacity of being dangerous.i personally disagree with the options you have above as they will not solve the issues just make them worse step in on animal cruelty dont take it out on a dog that was only acting the way the owners wanted.
- ALL DOGS SHOULD BE TREATED THE SAME AND FAIRLY. WHAT GOES FOR ONE, goes for all!
- Current owners of pit bulls can be allowed to keep their current dogs as long as they are muzzled when outsid eof their house.. The ownership, rearing and sale of new pit bulls must be banned. The severity of pit bull bites and attacks greatly outweighs any perceived right of ownership!
- [removed]
- none of these. Pit bulls are usually lovely dogs. I do nto support any kind of anti-pitbull bylaw.
- Concern for definition of "nuisance" are not necessarily dog behaviour (i.e. noise may be neighbour issues). Bites, aggression, damage would seem to be better for the definition
- I would modify one of the statements to read "There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household" (omitting Pit Bull), then I would agree with the statement



- Why the hate on pit bulls there are other breeds that are statistically more dangerous. Fact please not a popularity contest
- Banning the breeding or acquisition of pitbulls would be alright.
- I do not have a dog - "why does everyone always talk about pit bull dogs" I have been introduced to many dogs, pitbulls included and believe me it is not the dog but the owner that is the problem. I am more afraid of some some dogs than the larger ones. Lets be fair in dealing with problem dogs and not picking on one breed.
- Ban Pit bulls within city limits
- Don't constrain where animal insurance comes from, but specify min limits. Is nuisance dog designation lifetime or can it be rescinded, e.g. after obedience training?
- Every dog and owner should go through obedience training.
- All dog owners should by law have an obligation to send their dog (regardless of breed) to obedience training. There should be government regulated trainers and schools. When a dog enters a new home with a new owner both owner and dog should be required to recertify for obedience training. Heavy fines for dogs not certified as obedience trained.
- dogs deemed dangerous must be muzzled in all public areas
- I would make obedience training necessary for every breed of dog registered in the city, if what the city wants to do is actually decrease moderate-severe dog bites
- I disagree with singling out pit bulls
- Breed specific bans and conditions are BIGOTRY plain and simple. Chihuahuas in old age are FAR more vicious than any pit bull I've ever met. And I've met lots of both.
- Nuisance owners or owners who refuse to abide by city bylaws should lose their rights to own animals.
- Remove the word 'multiple' and replace with 'even after a single aggressive behavior'. Some people hurt others with guns - others are arming themselves with dogs.
- I hesitate to endorse some of these, as a "nuisance dog" can, by your definition, just be a dog that barks excessively. Requiring those dogs to be muzzled, have higher insurance, etc., seems excessive. Perhaps there needs to be more nuance allowed in how these terms are applied.
- Dogs defined above as "pit bulls" should not be permitted within the City of Calgary. They should be subject to removal and humanely euthanized.
- Pit Bulls do not need to be held as pets. I support a motion to limit pet ownership and not allow such dogs.
- Not sure I agree with any dog that has an appearance of the above dogs. Unless they show poor behavior they should not be lumped into a dangerous dog list
- Extra training for owners if they do not have a controlled dog
- Owner of offending dog is liable for any and all medical expenses incurred by either the dog or human
- any dog regardless of size or breed should be fined the same if a bite occurs; different designation/fine for 'being at large' and 'off leash' - eg. a dog under control on a pathway currently is designated as 'at large' - should be a leeway to a lower fine of off leash. Yet a dog in an off leash



park that is not under the owners control (too far away from owner, does not recall), while should be technically at large as they are not under control, there seems to be no penalty for these owners.

- Increase knowledge on dogs and their behaviours for all people
- There is big difference between nuisance and dangerous. If nuisance simply means the dog has gotten out of its yard or barks, there should be no restrictions on these dogs although fines for offenses to the owners would be ok. Dangerous incidents (i.e. attacks or bites) need to be evaluated on a case by case basis and perhaps training requirements would be fine, for dogs with multiple incidents of this type of behavior, they should be prohibited from off leash parks (regardless of whether they have a muzzle). I also do not support breed- specific bylaws. Regulate behavior (dogs and owners), not breeds.
- Should be worded and applied to all dogs not selected breeds. Restrictions should only be applied on demonstrated Bad/Nuisance behaviours. All dogs must be licensed as having taken an passed obedience/temperment testing to be allowed in public spaces.
- This should not be just for select breeds of dogs, but all/any dog that hasn't been trained properly.
- BSL isn't the answer. Nuisance/aggressive labelling is the solution.
- Breed specific targeting does not work. Problem / nuisance dogs have problem owners. Bad behaviour in dogs is a result of inadequate or inappropriate training, not because of breed stereotypes. Owners should be fined / penalized, and restrictions on pet ownership for problem owners must be enforced.
- More money for officers for enforcement. Much more important than the useless art and huge city council pensions we pay for.
- It's not the breed, it's the owner. Go after the owner!
- No breed specific legislation
- The bylaw should be able to address specific dogs, rather than specific breeds. Any dog that has bitten another animal or person in a public place should be required to wear a muzzle when in public. Any dog that attacks (without provocation) other dogs or people should not be allowed in off leash parks. Nuisance behaviours should be dealt with according to the behaviour, not a blanket policy.
- Dog owners generally do not abide by requirements to have dogs on a leash and see the entire city as an off-leash area. it has gone way too far especially on the Crescent in the Rosedale area above McHugh Bluff.. Also the diagonal path running from 5th street NW towards downtown through McHugh Bluff is the only real option for anyone walking to work from the Rosedale community. It tends to be slippery in the winter and people are frequently being knocked over by dogs who are mostly friendly but its a hazard. It would be better to require pets to be on a leash on this path especially when there are so many other places people can let their pets off-leash. My kids have both been knocked over and I've seen lots of dangerous situations with bikes and off-leash dogs.
- Nuisance dogs should be defined separately; a roaming dog is far from being threatening and as the noise maker, owners could use help with ideas.
- All of these options are too targeted and neglect ownership responsibility as well as general education. If a nuisance occurs in ANY dog there should be made an effort to educate the owner



and ensure proper training is conducted. It is a product of improper training and irresponsible ownership that can make a "bad" animal. Breed is not a legitimate excuse. Ensuring proper owner education and dog training should always be solution #1, not blind bylaws based on breed.

- Not all pit bulls are bad, eg: samoyed, german shepards, even dachshunds can bite. All breeds of dogs will bite if provoked.
- Mandatory training for owners of pit bulls.
- A dog that had bitten (in a mean way) should be euthanized. A pitbull bit our dogs ear off but the vet said it could have been much worse. That dog was never put down but it should have been because it will bite again except next time it could do much more damage than just taking an ear off another dog.
- Include training in animal behaviour for pit bulls and nuisance dogs. 2. Pit bulls can never be off leash at any time. They should be kept on a leash and under control of owner. I'd rather see that than a muzzle bylaw or a bylaw banning them from off leash parks (I think owners will just take them off leash in areas that are not designated as such causing additional problems). 3. Pit bulls must be on a property with secure fencing. 4. Pit bull and nuisance dog owners are responsible to reimburse for medical and vet costs for any person or animal their dog may injure from the dog bite/attack.
- There should be a special dog training to the owners of a large dogs
- Compulsory training for owners of nuisance dogs.
- Dogs that have attacked people causing severe injury should be put down.
- Severe penalties to owners of offending dogs for bits. 10k and up for severity. Punish the owners, not the dogs
- Higher fines for bad ownership. When you call bylaw about abuse to an animal not a whole lot is done. In reference to the latest attack, the owner was a abuser and clearly did not take care of the dog, said dog attacked and it is blamed then the owner hung his own dog. There needs to be more monitoring on people that should not own animals.
- Dog seized and euthanized if involved in more than one incident involving biting
- I would like to see all dog have muzzles when walking.
- There needs to be an appeals process for non-pit bulls declared "a nuisance". Our pet has passed away now but was reported to have bit someone when in fact it had not. We went to court over this and the judge basically reduced the fine to being off-leash instead of the bite but the records still show we were in court to defend a trumped up lie of a charge.
- Obedience training for ALL DOGS!, if the owner of a dog or multiple knows he she or they are reactive DON'T take them to a dog park and muzzle them when out on a walk to prevent anything that could possibly happen if the pet exhibits reactive behaviour, that way no one is hurt including the dog!
- I am not clear on when a dog would be seized for dangerous behaviour. I thought if a dog does cause harm to others it could be seized. Assessment and training should be required for those dogs who demonstrate aggressive behaviour to harm. As for other dogs who are being a nuisance, it would depend how bad they really are as some people just like to complain. I have received a small nip, wouldn't say bitten, by a dog who was on a leash and from that point on I just kept my



distance and always positioned my hand so the dog never got another chance. Sometimes walking in off leash areas, we all need to do our part.

- The very best case scenario is to not allow ownership in Calgary of any pit bull breeds!!
- Owner engagement must be encouraged. A man walking one dog, drinking coffee and on a cell phone is not being responsible. A woman walking six dogs picking up after them and having them under control is responsible.
- PITY BREEDS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM THE [removed] [removed] OWNERS ARE FINE THEM. MAKE THEM HAVE TO GO THROUGH A PROGRAM LIKE GUN OWNERS. THEY ARE INTERMEDIATE DOGS THEY ARE NOT A PROBLEM THE OWNERSHIP BASE IS. EDUCATE THAT
- Owners of any dog that is not properly trained should be fined and dog should be placed in the care of a trained dog trainer to rehabilitate the dog. This is NOT a breed specific issue, it has to do with the owner and how they train and treat their dogs. Do NOT blame the dog for an irresponsible human.
- TRAIN the humans! The dogs are behaving like dogs. the reason some are more aggressive than others is the fault of lack of proper care and training. NO breed should be singled out as "stronger" There are many "strong" breeds.!
- Fines for people that do not pick up after dogs and properly dispose of feces.
- If "nuisance" dogs have gone through training they should be allowed anywhere other dogs go. I definitely do not support any different laws for pit bulls.
- bit bulls are not the only problem
- Do not discriminate against a breed of dog. Punish irresponsible owners
- Exception for noise as part of the determination of "nuisance" for the sake of the above restrictions.
- Ban German Shepards and Shepard crosses.
- ALL dogs that run and jump up to strangers showing no restraint, and seemingly vicious even if their owners do not think they are, must be on a leash regardless of the location.
- I am disturbed that this document is heavily swayed against pit bulls as a breed. There are numerous breeds that can be aggressive. In the vast majority of cases it is the owner that is the problem. All dogs regardless of size or breed shall require behavioral training if deemed a nuisance. This questionnaire is so disappointing. Not sure what happened to our fair and balanced city of Calgary.
- Monitoring and orders/fines against negligent owners. Don't single out pit bull type dogs that's not appropriate. The term "nuisance" is the right term and would include all problem animals irrespective of breed. Hold the owner more accountable.
- All dogs declared (not just pit bulls as there are pit bulls or dogs that look like pit bulls that are for lack of a better word nice dogs).
- Consider breeder or retailer requirements for training owners prior to purchasing pit bulls, etc. The training should cover the basics of safe handling and breed specific requirements with a test prior to the sale of the dog, or Imported dogs to the City of Calgary. This should also be a licensing requirement in the event that the purchase is made in another province or city.



- “If declared a nuisance” - by what criteria? I do not agree with criteria based on breed alone. My dogs have been attacked numerous times at the dog park and never by the breeds identified here. I am more concerned with dogs who exhibit this behaviour as being identified as nuisances. THEN I would support a lot of these suggestions, but not based solely on breed.
- Mandatory training for dogs AND their owners if their dog is a bite risk either for other dogs or humans. DO NOT separate pit bulls as "dangerous breed", because humans are these that are ultimately dangerous with not properly treating and training their dogs, whatever breed they are.
- Strict guidelines should apply to all large fighting dog breeds, such as Presa Canario, Dogo Argentino. Any of these dogs have a high prey drive, dangerous attack characteristics, heavy musculature, and weigh as much as an adult human. I would also support higher licensing fees and automatic \$10,000 fines for any serious injuries inflicted by one of these dogs, as well as the dog automatically being euthanized.
- Stronger backyard breeding laws are required, and all dog owners should be forced to take obedience classes.
- It is not the breed it is the owner. ANY dog can be aggressive. Even little dogs.
- No differences between penalties for breeds
- If there are costs to dogs attacked by nuisance dogs the owner of that animal should be responsible for payment.
- Bite victims should be 100% compensated by owner expense when they're dog is found guilty of biting another dog at the hands of their disregard ie. Unleashed
- NO BSL! Obedience training could be promoted to ALL dog owners when they are adopting and registering their pets. Proper education for owners is the best way to avoid unwanted aggressive behavior. Perhaps lower-income homes can receive rebates and special offers for approved trainers through the city which will ultimately benefit all communities. Money for this training could also come from dog licencing costs, and owners with dogs which are unlicensed could pay a higher fine to help raise money for these efforts.
- Owners that leave after their dog instigates an incident should be fined.
- If you are going to legislate nuisance dogs then you should be targeting the breeds of dogs who are actually a nuisance like any smaller dog who bites consistently and daily. The dogs who jump on, scratch and bite children unprovoked. Who also bite other dogs. But because of their size it doesn't matter? All dog bites hurt. If Your logic to muzzle or restrict pit bulls is based on their physical strength and size then we should consider men too. They're known to be physically stronger than women. This bylaw is wrong on many levels. I support enforcing harsher penalties for irresponsible owners for all breeds. Don't single one breed out.
- Regardless of breed - dog owners should be charged in the criminal system for their dogs behavior. If a dog (of any breed) attacks a person the owner shall be charged with assault. If a dog (of any breed) attacks a person the owner shall be charged with assault. If a dog (of any breed) attacks a person the owner shall be charged with assault. If a dog (of any breed) kills a person the owner shall be charged with manslaughter. Breed is not important.



- any actions on "nuisance dogs" CAN NOT be restricted to specific breeds. considering 99% of people INCLUDING LAW ENFORCEMENT can't actually properly identify a pitbull, this will not be fairly applied. Also, no specific breed is an issue. Obedience training should be a requirement of ALL dog ownership no matter the breed and inclusive of fluffy little lapdogs and chihuahuas - make it mandatory for licencing. Be careful with the "dog chases or threatens" fine below because a lot of people don't understand dogs and a happy nice dog running toward you can be interpreted as a threat by people who don't like dogs or don't like big dogs. Nobody is scared of my daschund running at them but they will certainly freak out if my boxer mix runs at them even though my boxer mix is too shy of people and won't actually go near the person she is checking out.
- There should not be measures to restrict or punish dogs based only on their breed
- Require prospective owners of all dogs to prove they can care for whatever companion animal they choose. Don't penalize an animal for its irresponsible owner.
- These breeds of dogs are too unpredictable and there exist many cases of responsible owners losing control of their dogs, and in some cases both people and other pets have been injured. At the end of the day, legislation can not control the thoughts and behaviours of a human, let alone a dog. Responsible ownership is a construct that is easy to conjure, but in general, does not materialize much beyond picking up dog poo.
- Banning a breed is not a intelligent decision at all and borders on the line of stupidity. I have seen small dogs inflict major damage to children as they will put their face close to these dogs with little fear. People have to be responsible solely animals are animals and can be unpredictable at times. Even the most experienced people have had issues with animals.
- If a dog is declared a nuisance I am in support of increased fines or restrictions. But I have an issue with breed specific legislation. Countless studies have shown the efficacy of BSL and I'm shocked it's being considered. Vocally and vehemently oppose BSL
- This wording is restrictive as a nuisance animal is the owners fault. I don't believe one single breed should be identified as all dogs have the ability to harm. It should be the mandate of the municipality to create laws that not only protect its citizens but the rights of a dog owner. Nuisance can be defined by your bylaw as receiving infractions for noise which should not impact an individual's home owners insurance. No
- If they bite or attack they should be put down a grizzly bear is a protected animal yet when they attack or fake attack they are put down a pit bull or it's relatives are not endangered put them down
- Pit bulls (and bully-type dogs generally) are not any more dangerous than any other breed. Breed-selective legislation is damaging, discriminatory, and scientifically unsound: all dog breeds must be held to equal standards of bite risk and nuisance behavior.
- Any dog can be a "Problem," Breed/Dog. Both my dogs have been attacked by a dog on a nice Sunday morning walk. The owner stepped up and paid for the 2400 bill. Fortunately both my dogs survived. The dog wasn't a "Pitbull". So please remove this from the process. Any dog can be aggressive, protective. Dog owners in certain situations need to be SMARTER and respectful of the environment.
- Opposing any measures to restrict or punish dogs based solely on their breeds.



- It is barbaric to declare any bylaw posed specifically to pit bulls. It would be an embarrassment to the city to take such a backwards step.
- Focus on owner's responsibilities - avoid targeted dog breed 'witch hunts'. Any poorly trained dog can turn into a 'nuisance'
- If a dog causes injury to another dog, cat or person, the owner MUST be responsible for paying any and all vet fees associated with the incident
- I oppose measures specific to breed, especially those that impact non-nuisance (innocent) dogs
- So frustrating that the city is talking about BSL. When I am out for a walk the most well behaved dogs in my neighborhood are the bully breeds. The owners always have great control of them. Just today I came across 2 dogs in which the owner did not have control and neither was a pitbull type dog. 1st was a woman riding her bike with her doodle running un leashed on the sidewalk running up to other dogs. 2nd was 2 children around the age of 5 walking a yorkie with NO adult present the dog was snarling and growling at me and my dog and broke free of the young child and charged at myself and my dog luckily I had very good control of my dog and the child was able to run and grab the leash. This is NOT OK BEHAVIOUR. If these were bully breeds people would be up in arms. At the end of the day the owner must take full responsibility. I cannot report these interactions as there is no address to attach to the complaint. What I am trying to say is this: all animals need to be under control at all times. I DO NOT SUPPORT BSL. I do support enforcing our current bylaw with possibly increasing fines for all breeds large and small. Bsl is expensive and does not fix anything.
- Obedience training required for ****all**** dogs!!! All dogs (including grandfathered ones) should require obedience training in order to be registered. All dogs need obedience training so that in a dangerous situation, they're more likely to universal commands. There are terrible dog owners out there who don't care of thier dogs hurt people, or thier dogs get hurt. Better trained dogs don't bark all day. Better trained dogs don't bite unless defending themselves. It's not about bully breeds. It's about bad owners.
- I oppose any measures to restrict or punish a dog based on breed
- Would also support a full ban on licensing of new pit bull breeds - there are a hundred+ other breeds and mixed rescue dogs that I'm not sure why people have to be adamant that they have the right to a breed that's caused so many problems in recent decads.
- Fines need to be WAY higher if a dog causes death to another dog. \$350? That's nothing compared to a vet bill. If my dog was killed by another dog and the other owner was given \$350 as a fine, [removed]
- I do not support breed spEcific legislation. Only bad owners.
- Increased access to and support for training and behaviour evaluation of all adopted dogs and additional resources to make obedience school more affordable
- YOU point fingers @ 'pit bull' type breeds (pit bull) is a reference term.... Why are YOU NOT holding the OWNER responsible? Its not the dogs fault of its breed just like its not your fault for your breed! ARE Chihuahuas, Mini French bull dogs/ Pugs, Schnauzer and Shih Tzu ALL being considers for this



- Mandatory dog behaviour seminar/webinar. Understanding dog language and signals is a huge part of reducing bites, dog fights, etc. This is why supervising kids and dogs doesn't work. I would guess 80% of people have no idea what to actually look for in terms of dog signals and behaviour, so that 'supervision' is rendered useless. If people know what to look for when a dog is uncomfortable, near a bite, etc. - then we can minimize the risk of a bite/fight substantially. Alternatively, BSL has proven to be ineffective. First - those that would be identifying an American Pitbull Terrier (this wasn't correctly noted on the survey), or a breed with similar characteristics don't even have the proper experience and education to do so. Many dogs would be incorrectly labeled and penalized because of this. Second - responsible pet ownership should always be the focus, not BSL. For example - If a blonde haired kid beat up another kid at school, does it make sense to ban all blonde haired children because of that act? No. You would default to the parents and professionals to handle the child and situation responsibly and provide support where needed. It's the same thing. Banning or Muzzling a specific breed just isn't effective. [personal information removed] it is really disappointing to live in a city this is even being considered. APT (or breeds 'alike') are NOT the only Breeds with a powerful bite. German Shepherds for example are, and they aren't listed above. Why? To claim this is based on the bite power, is ignorant and insulting.
- Every single point here should strictly be decided in a case to case basis. I'm really disappointed to see that Calgary would take a step back and start discriminating towards "pitbulls". It's not the dog, it's the owner and good owners shouldn't be penalized for no reason. Not to mention passing these laws would lead to so many good dogs being euthanized because less people would adopt them if they were forced to muzzle or not allowed to bring a perfectly well behaved dog to a dog park. Calgary is working so hard to accept all races, all sexual orientations and all people in general for who they are. Why would we do anything different for animals. Let's be what Calgary should be which is accepting and non discriminatory and make our city an amazing, accepting, welcoming place for everyone including all breeds of dogs.
- Against measures imposed upon dogs based specifically on their breeds
- All dogs and owners should do obedience training
- it would be absolutely ridiculous to put any bylaws on pitbull since they are not a breed. they are mix breeds.. plus if they are train properly like any other dog they are the best friend you could have. we dont accept people to be judge by their color or apparent, same should be for dogs..
- no pit bulls, or these types of dogs within city limits
- No extra bylaw. And do a case by case assessment
- I do NOT support breed specific legislation. This line of questions are not fair to responsible pit bull owners (I am not one, but know several)
- I do not support breed specific fears. Please address each situation as an individual issue not one blanket for all (its like saying only one large adult male person per household as they are larger and can cause more damage if they become violent) and its simply wrong. I would support cruelty free behavior training (not obedience) is likely best directed at the dog owners who cause the dog issues to occur via lack of understanding how they are driving unwanted behavior. Education, awareness and skills training are key for the people to be able to help the dog. Please remember the dog has



no control of their life situation and no choice in their owners yet they suffer the consequences / are held responsible.

- Ban vicious breeds!!!
- Dangerous behaviour needs to be better defined.
- Pitbulls as listed above do not have more potential for bite damage. They are a nanny breed initially bred to help watch over children. It's the owner not the dog so stop penalizing the dogs and punish the [removed] people who don't understand how to take care of an animal. Jail time or revoke the ability to own a pet from the owner if a dog attacks.
- DO NOT impose breed specific laws. That is such a backwards way of fixing issues. We should be punishing owners and not the dogs. Some of these breeds are the sweetest pets and you will take away someone's family member. Get to the root of the issue by higher punishments for owners, do not punish innocent animals because of their bad reputation. I am disappointed Calgary is even considering this. Be better!
- We need to ban Pit Bulls period (excluding ones living in the city now). Phase out ownership of them.
- Please do not single out breeds - pit bulls are not bad dogs - yes they have strong jaws, but so do other breeds of dog.
- Fines for nuisance owners, who are unable to manage their dog, no matter what breed. Programs to support training for owners to cope with any dog breed.
- Ban ownership of pit bulls
- Mandatory training after each nuisance offence. Why target pitbull breeds specifically? Especially when you have already stated that they do not have the most amount of bites. Has this approach worked in other cities? How is cracking down on pitbulls going to help prevent the majority of dog bites?
- No breed specific legislation, "pit bulls" have a better temperament than many dogs. If a smaller dog attacks a "pitbull" and a "pitbull" retaliates, the pitbull will be punished. No breed legislation is effective.
- People should have a place to report dangerous dog owners and owners given an opportunity to take them to training ect. To help prevent issues before they happen there should not be restrictions based on breeds. It's silly to rule out one breed VS another. If you're making these rules about pit bulls what about Rottweilers, Mastiffs, Ridgebacks ect they have the same power as bully breeds. Make owners more responsible for training ANY breed.
- Nothing. Close the bylaw enforcement department and fire the entire department.
- I have owned 9 pitbulls, and have no issues. They have been therapy dogs for Military and also with children. I think it's horrible to target a breed of dog; before pitbulls, Doberman's were given a bad name. Prior to that, German Shepherds. In places around the UK, pitbulls are used as police dogs because they are outstanding to train. To consider putting rules towards a particular dog such as a pitbull, is horrible. I've witnessed more problem dogs at dog parks and bites, attacks, from chihuahuas and small dogs as people underestimate them due to size. But they are also nasty and mean if not trained; which people tend not to train a small dog as well as a large because they feel



they can “handle” their small dog due to size. But they cause more issues around kids and dogs than a “pitbull” breed.

- All bylaws should be all inclusive not for just one type of dog as many dogs have different traits not just those you are deeming a problem.
- All dogs/owners must take a training course within 3 months of adoption (for adult dogs/re-adoption) or one year of birth.
- I would support higher licensing fees for all dog breeds to regulate and investigate pitbull breeding. Good breeders have an important role to play in ensuring their dogs are sold to responsible owners. Informal breeding or puppy mills can result in dogs ending up with irresponsible owners, or the dogs themselves may have emotional problems if they were bred in neglectful environments.
- People are the problem, not pets. People who chose to bring aggressive dogs to dog parks will likely continue to do so even if by-laws prohibit it.
- This is so ambiguous. I have gone to a dog park several times where the highest nuisance dogs have been less than 15 lbs. There are several dogs that bark non stop, but we accept this because they are small and so we deem them harmless. There are also several times where I have seen Collies who become aggressive because they are chasing a ball and other dogs want to play as well. Rather than banning breeds, why not consider banning toys? Many dogs become aggressive simply because they are possessive of their toys. Furthermore, I have met many many pit bulls that are absolutely harmless. What is the actual statistic on pit bull/ bully breed attacks vs other dog breeds?
- I take offense that you have only highlighted one breed of Dog. All dogs can bite. German Shepard, Bull Mastiff, Rottweiler, Dalmatian, Doberman Pincer etc etc etc etc .. Please take out " BREED SPECIFICS " I find this as an alarmist and an offensive discrimination against one specific breed of dog.
- Ban pit bulls outright. No pit bulls should be allowed in city limits
- The American Pit Bull Terrier has less PSI than a Labrador or Chow Chow. It is the lack of knowledge from the owner, or plain irresponsibility, that results in any dog being a danger. We need to educate pet owners of simple dog language. How else can we understand what dogs are saying before it turns into barks and lunging?? I do not mind a higher insurance cost for "pit bull" owners as a TEMPORARY solution, for them to help those who have a biased fear of these dogs. This cost will help weed out the evil owners who are not responsible, with any breed.
- I wonder if instead of specifying 'pit bull' it should be dogs of a certain strength/jaw strength that require extra training, insurance, etc.
- I'm in favour of euthanizing any dog that attacks and kills another animal or viciously bites people without provocation.
- Fines for dog owners who do not address barking dog problems.
- Maybe have a bully breed off leash park that keeps them separate from other people that aren't comfortable around bullie breeds
- If pitbulls are not involved in more bites than others this is blatantly ridiculous dog-racism! Train owners! Nuisance dogs being "noisy or at-large" should not require such draconian measures.



- Have an online venue in which those witnessing / providing written or video proof of dangerous or nuisance dog behaviour may allow for bylaw officers to investigate the dog in question.
- Ban Pit Bulls out right.
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household - I disagree with the use of pit bull or nuisance in this questions listed above. Someone should not own more than one nuisance dog regardless of the dog's breed. It would also be beneficial to include in the bylaws that the owner of a nuisance dog is responsible to pay the damages caused by that dog (ie vet bills, property damage etc)
- Breed specific rules are horrible! This goes against EVERYTHING that society is trying to fix right now. Punish the dog and the owner, not the breed. Please stop considering these laws!!
- Mandatory fine of \$10,000 issued to owner(s) or handlers of pitbull that attacks a human. Mandatory fine of \$6,000 to owner(s) of pitbull that attack another dog. Mandatory traceback of pitbull attack to any SPCA or Humane Society or any other shelter that adopts out a pitbull or pitbull type mix dog that attacks another dog or child with mandatory fee of \$5,000 issued to that organization.
- Stronger bylaws that target repeat offenders whether it be roaming, barking, etc. You don't define "nuisance" so I cannot agree with any mentioned propositions regarding "nuisance" dogs. There is NO EVIDENCE that banning or restricting "pitbull" type dogs decreases bites. I would be in favour of mandatory spay-neuter of all dogs that are not a part of a regulated (ie CKC) breeding program.
- FINES FOR ALL DOG BREEDS NOT JUST PITBULLS A LABRADOR IS PRONE TO BITE AS ANY OTHER DOG!!! Disgraceful city of Calgary
- NO BREED-SPECIFIC BANS OR LAWS. STUPID AS [removed]
- Please do better research about your so called "pitbulls" having more strength. A simple google search would do. Perhaps also including someone on your committee who has actual, hands on experience with your so called "pitbulls" would be beneficial.
- Much higher fines for owners that have allowed their pets to be untrained and placing the responsibility on them.
- I do not support a bylaw that included the term BSL. All dogs have the potential to bite and specific breeds should not be singled out because of their strength. Especially when you are only singling out a few. Seems bias. The bylaw should be on a case by case basis, look at the circumstances surrounding the bite. For example was the dog properly trained? Spayed/neutered? Abused? So many factors that lead to a dog bite. Was this the first offence? Researchers have looked into the cause of dog bites and breed is not one of them. Identifying a "pitbull" is subjective and mislabeling mixed breeds will become an issue. Not to mention BSL is incredibly expensive to enforce and our tax payers money is better spent on educating the public around bite prevention. Introducing funding for spay and neuter clinics as most dogs that are intact tend to be a bit more aggressive. [personal information removed] Increase fines but enforce them. BSL in other cities and countries around the world has not worked and are starting to repeal their BSL. Introducing BSL can take away from the actual root of the problem and that is the owner and the owner's responsibility to keep their dog under control at all times. BSL only punishes the responsible owners it does not make irresponsible



owners accountable for their actions. The owners behaviour has a direct impact on their dogs aggressive behaviour. Time and money will be better spent on addressing irresponsible owners, enforcing BREED NEUTRAL BYLAWS, providing educational programs for the public, and responding to actual dog incidents no matter the size or breed of dog. [personal information removed] We need to get to the root of the problem and that is the owners need to be in control of their animal at all times.

- Don't single a breed out. It's like saying ALL policemen are bad, or ALL council members are only in it for themselves. Obedience training should be required for ALL dogs if they utilize Public Off Leash areas. People need to have control of their pets.
- If a dog has caused any harm to an other dog or person it should be put down.
- There is no reason to discriminate against a particular breed. It is the responsibility of the owner to care for and train the dog so it is not a threat to other people.
- How about supporting training for the dog and the owner first at no cost. Education goes a long way. Other measures can be implemented AFTER non-compliance with a mandatory training order..
- Owners of Pit Bulls must have taken a Course on how to handle a Dog .
- You have to treat ALL dogs the same, otherwise it is illegal to stereotype and you open the City to several lawsuits, aside from the fact that, more small dog bites go unreported than any animal bite period. All dogs have the ability to be a nuisance. Their strength has nothing to do with it. We all deal with some asshole neighbor whose shitty little dog won't stop barking ALL DAY. That is a nuisance dog in a neighborhood. Dogs who repeatedly escape, that's a nuisance in a neighborhood. A dog existing, that simply LOOKS like it MIGHT be a nuisance, is no reason to penalize it. All large breed dog owners should be required to know how to handle them, and to some extent, need training. Teach ladies and seniors not to carry their small dogs like a toy as it gives them giant egos that make them think they're the size of a human and, therefore, the alpha/equal. They will bark and bite and growl and snap at anything that is bigger than them and comes too close because they mature thinking they're huge, so everything big scares them. This alone results in more bites a year than all other animals combined. The City is not using facts to create their bylaws, they're using fearmongering. It's the equivalent of jailing a group of people because of the color of their skin or hair or eyes. These dogs don't choose to look big or scary. Do you not remember the dobermans of the 80s on the news, the rottweilers and shepherds of the 90s. The very things you're insinuating about pitbull looking dogs, were once said about multiple other dogs, who are no longer worried or talked about. The only reason that is, is because now, with social media and the "news" more people have access to sensationalized dog attack stories. You never, EVER hear about all the other dog bites. Just "pitbull type" ones. You've fallen victim to those lies. An Akita has the most vicious dog bite and their attacks are almost 100% fatal to humans, but they don't make the list? Chihuahuas and shih tzu's are responsible for more than half of bites on children under 10, but they aren't on the nuisance dog breed list? You are penalizing such a small percentage of the dog world, that it's useless. Media has also said that more people come forward with a pitbull "attack" because of the attention it garners. That is a hate crime. Dogs with a PROVEN aggressive nature or history of violence, should definitely be evaluated. In fact, you could just hire actual dog professionals, maybe



just a couple extra employees, to evaluate and analyze the dogs who are reported or who have a history, rather than terrorizing families and children who have "pitbull looking" members of their family. I would reconsider your choices. They're too judgmental and you will lose even more people of Calgary than the recession has released already.

- BSL- evidence shows it decreases the number of bites requiring hospitalization:
<https://injuryprevention.bmj.com/content/19/3/177>
- I wouldNot support any of these examples
- Pit bulls should not be singled out period. It is not this breed it is known that other breeds can be worse for issues such as biting and harming people. It should be the onus on the owner for ALL breeds. We should never ever single one breed out period to do this is like singling our one culture or one race in humans. The exact same thing. Not fair or just.
- It's discrimination having specific bylaws just for one breed of dog just because they have a strong bite. There are so many other aggressive breeds that also have a strong bite. Calgary shouldn't jump on the hating pit bull band wagon.
- Ban pit-bulls in the city
- Obedience training for ALL animals. And tougher laws for idiot owners, not breed specific.
- Owners of pit-bull like dogs and/or nuisance dogs must take a mandatory (online?) training session; Owners found to be participating in anything close to dog-fighting to be fined a LARGE sum.
- Fines for owners not controlling bad behavior dogs
- Higher fines for dogs not leashed in public parks or sidewalks
- I do not agree with isolating a specific breed for aggression profiling. Aggressive dogs are the result of irresponsible owners, not breed-specific. The fact that the city has narrowed in on a specific breed of dog in relation to aggressive dogs and dog bites is disappointing.
- If a dog hurts another dog it should be the owners responsibility to pay the vet bill.
- Nuisance dogs owners MUSTpay any vet bills generated by injuries to other dogs they attack.
- Full ban on any new pit bull ownership. In addition, add a requirement that any current pit bulls in the city be spayed or neutered. Any unlicensed pit bulls should be seized.
- Nuisance dogs will likely be re-offenders and may turn into vicious dogs since their behaviour was not corrected at a younger age. In my experience owners of nuisance dogs are not skilled and educated enough to prevent future offences. For example all three of our kids, at young age were bitten by the same neighbour dog. Neither the owner nor the dog improved the behaviour. In my opinion a dog that bites at multiple occasions and improvement is not noted should be removed and euthanized to prevent harm especially to children who cannot distinguish a dog that can be dangerous to them.
- More bylaw officers to enforce bylaws. Eg dogs on leash on paved pathways this is a common violation
- They're shouldn't be anything other in place. Every dog is capable of biting it's up to the owners to train them
- Any dog can be dangerous, don't just target a breed



- The owners who train their dogs to be mean should have a higher fine and if the problem persists they should not be allowed to own any more animals. Animals are trained to be mean, it should not be taken out on the animals, its the humans that are the problem in these situations
- Redefine nuisance dog as clearly one exhibiting dangerous behaviour not just noisy or running at large. I dont have a dog but feel that this is too broad. If a dog is Exhibiting dangerous behaviour then fines are larger when bylaws are broken, they should not be allowed at off leash dog parks and must be muzzled when out and about.
- I only support a BREED NEUTRAL BYLAW. There is no evidence that restricting a specific breed will reduce the number of dog bites. Researchers have reported that the factors of a dog bite is not breed related. Identifying a Pit Bull type dog is extremely subjective and will lead to the mislabeling of mixed dogs. BSL is a complete waste of money with no reduction of dog bites to show for it. Mandatory spay/neuter of animals will reduce the aggression factor. The city needs to look at funding low cost spay/neuter clinics, a bylaw that is BREED NEUTRAL and focuses on the behaviour of the owner and the individual dog, graduated fines for any individual dog (not breed) that is deemed dangerous, a bylaw that holds the owner financially responsible for failure to adhere to bylaw, a stronger enforcement for neglect and abuse on an animal, community education, bite reduction education for public. So many options that would be better suited than BSL. [personal information removed] By enforcing bylaws and educating the public that I will support.
- I think the dog should be obedience trained. That is all. The problem is backyard breeders and lack of spaying, neutering. Only licensed people should be able to breed Any animal. All animals should be spayed and neutered as pets. This would help with the unnecessary euthanizing of animals. There should be a fee Included to cover the costs of neutering, Spaying, vaccines etc. I feel if a person willingly pays a fee, they might be more committed to responsibility of owning a pet.
- The City of Calgary is reviewing their responsible pet ownership bylaws. Included in these proposed bylaws is a ton of breed-specific legislature discriminating against pitbull-type dogs. The proposed bylaws include a definition of “pit bull” that names four breeds of pitbull-type dogs and then “a dog that has an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar to those of dogs referred to in any clause a) to d)”. A study (1) concluded using appearance to determine breed was highly unreliable and out of 244 dogs identified as pitbull-type dogs, 62% had less than 50% DNA concentration from pitbull type ancestry. The survey itself states “...while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than any other dog breed, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull’s strength allows the potential for a more severe bite”. This is scientifically inaccurate. There is nothing anatomically advantageous in terms of bite force about a pitbull-type dog’s skull that makes their bite any more forceful than other big dogs. A couple studies (2, 3) concluded that domestic canids biting force was strongly related to size of the dog, body weight, size and shape of the skull, and the presence of mouth related pain. Pitbull-type dogs are reported (4) to have a bite force of 235 PSI, which is 26% lower than the average bite strength of the breeds tested and fully in-line with other dogs of similar sizes and strengths (i.e. German Shepards, 238 PSI). The Canadian Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA, 5) states a number of human, dog, and environment related factors contribute to the risk and severity of dog bite incidents. Lastly, the City of Calgary is proposing that



“additional liability insurance be required for pit bulls, pit bulls cannot be in off-leash parks and must be muzzled in public (including off-leash parks), obedience training is required for pit bulls, there are higher fines for pit bulls involved in bylaw offences, and there cannot be more than one pit bull in a household”. A few studies (6,7) concluded that behaviour (including aggressive behaviour) is influenced by genetics, environment, and experience among other factors due to substantial within-breed behavioural differences. Breed doesn't define behaviour, and no reputable animal welfare organization (CVMA, ASPCA, AVMA, AKC, AVSAB, CDC, NACA, etc) supports dangerous dog legislation that is discriminatory of a specific breed.

- Calling out pitbulls is not a fair statement if the stats show that they are not escalated biters.
- If a dog bites or attacks a person or another animal, there should a very clear ONE STRIKE RULE. An aggressive animal should be put down Immediately, the owner should face a hefty fine. If there is a history of the owner having aggressive animals, then a permanent ban on pet ownship should be enforced.s
- Ban them. They may be able to be trained to be good family pets, but there have been too many incidents where other pets are harmed or killed. It's just not worth it.
- It is absolutely ridiculous to have breed specific bylaws. A bad dog is the result of a bad owner. Also, why are pitbulls being targeted when there are so many other large and powerful dogs that could cause damage? A Kangel has the most powerful bite force of any dog, but it looks nothing like a pitbull. The media is feeding a misconception about pitbulls, and it is completely unacceptable.
- Dangerous behaviour definition needs to be defined. Nuisance dog definition needs to be defined ..cannot be open to opinion of enforcement offer.
- If a dog is involved in an attack, the animal should automatically be destroyed and the owner should see larger fines and possibly jail time for multiple infractions.
- There should be no breed specific legislation, only dogs considered a nusicence after demonstrating certain behaviours.
- Ban them - grandfather in existing pit bulls, but ban the acquisition and ownership of new ones.
- Proven and fact is the Pitbull has a lessor bite strength than other dogs of similar size such a German Shepard,Rotweiler and many other large breeds .all of your above questions suggest a current bias that has been instilled into the public domain by media hype
- Complete ban on pit bulls
- I don't understand why Do you want to bring breed-specific, Pit bulls are not the aggressive breed, I want the owners to be accountable for any breed of dog, small or large, to be responsible.
- pig bulls should be banned in the city.
- Owners of nuisance dogs that cause damage should have to pay for that damage.
- owners of dogs responsible for death or injury of another animal should be help responsible for all vet and related costs of injured party.
- Pit bulls should be banned in Calgary. Too much risk to greater public (especially vulnerable people - kids, elderly, weak)
- Ban all pit bull ownership.



- Penalize the owner of the “bad dog” and let the people with good dogs do as they please. I’ve met some lovely pit bulls!
- It is not the pitbull as a breed that is the problem. Having come from the Maritimes where there are lots of pitbull mixes. The problem in this city seems to be that the owners take their dogs to off leash parks and THINK they can control their dog. Unfortunately they have no idea how and ruin things for other pet owners.
- ban the pit bulls, please. As a dog owner (and I work with dogs as well) I know all the excuses used by the pit bull enthusiasts. Ive also seen the damage these inconsistent breeds can cause. One 'accident' is too many
- Ban then entirely. Doent hurt anyone to not b able to own a angry breed dog. Only people who do own them are the lower class people who wont even follow the above rules.
- A ban on all pitbull breeds within city limits
- Owners of dogs that bite a second time must face much more severe penalties including, lifetime bans on dog ownership, jail time penalties, and at the very least must pay all medical and veterinarian costs. bills
- Targetting Pitulls or similar breeds is silly, as all studies have shown that banning them does not decrease the number of bites and their severity. Would be a waste of taxpayers money to target this breed.
- Ban pit bulls. They do have more severe incidents than other dog breeds and I bet at least 30% when taken as a quantitative measure. If you don't have the statistics look at Edmonton's. Also this would be the most enforceable measure. The rest will only be determined in reactionary enforcement (so is basically useless for preventing anything).
- Often dog behaviour issues are a result of owners' behaviours; dog training needs to be understood to educate the owner as much as (or more than) the dog!
- BSL leads to higher costs to cities and taxpayers. More animal control resources are required to investigate reports of “pit bulls” – policing their visual appearance rather than answering calls about actual risks or behaviour complaints. Disputes about labelling tie up resources and may ultimately end up in court. Discrimination, restrictions, and higher fees may mean that a city may actually see more of these dogs in their sheltering system for a longer amount of time. If a dog is found at large the owner may be less inclined to claim him. It can also be more difficult for owners to find housing or other resources, resulting in more surrendered dogs, and fewer opportunities to adopt them out when the legislation is stacked against them.
- ban pit bulls - period, end of the problem
- Mandatory testing of owners abilities to control and train their dog. Dog should also be checked for signs of abuse amd neglect.
- I support a full ban on pitt bulls and pit bulls like dogs
- CITYWIDE BAN ON ALL PITBULL BREEDS PUNISHABLE BY \$\$\$\$\$FINES SEIZE OFFENDING DOGS AND HUMANELY EUTHANISE THEM IF IT CAN BE PROVEN THE OFFENF+DING DOG HAS HARMED ie BITTEN OR ATTACKED any HUMAN any ANIMALie another dog or cat/pet/or



child NO exceptions NO appeals and the owners get a CRIMINAL RECORD and PAY damages to the "victims" ps. I AM SERIOUS-IT HAS TO STOP>the trauma doesn't "go away."

- [removed] and leave people alone. Also, you're punishing the dogs for [removed] owners. This is simply stupidity at large.
- Restricting breed ownership has not reduced the incidence of dog bites. A survey of reported dog bite rates in 36 Canadian municipalities found no difference between jurisdictions with BSL and those without. Likewise, a 2010 Toronto Humane Society survey found no change in dog bites in Ontario in the years before and after Ontario's BSL. Calgary, however, saw a five-fold reduction over 20 years – from 10 bites per 10,000 people in 1986 to two in 2006. Rather than banning breeds, Calgary uses strong licensing and enforcement plus dog safety public education campaigns. Ontario Calgary The Future Vancouver, Cincinnati and the Netherlands recently repealed their breed specific legislation.
- Breed specific legislation, including Ontario's pit bull ban, is problematic for many reasons The law punishes dogs for their appearance, when aggression can result from many factors, including lack of training and socialization, lack of exercise and mental stimulation, poor breeding, mistreatment, health issues and failure to spay/neuter (which reduces aggression) It deprives owners of due process, with no objective method for establishing whether a mixed breed dog falls under the legislation's vague "pit bull" definition. 1 The ban is unconscionable. As dogs are considered pit bulls unless proven otherwise, the law is open to abuse through false allegations and unfairly penalizes low income individuals, where an accusation can mean the de facto death of their dog. Focussing on breeds gives the public a false sense of security, as individual dogs may be dangerous, regardless of breed; and punishes many dogs that are not dangerous. It is costly to enforce, both for municipalities (through increased sheltering and enforcement costs) and the province (through lengthy, expensive and high profile court cases). Various jurisdictions have found that BSL does not work because it targets specific breeds instead of irresponsible owners. The Centres for Disease Control in the US noted that, not only is it virtually impossible to calculate bite rates for specific breeds, but dogs of any breed can become dangerous if they are raised to be aggressive and individuals who exploit dogs will simply turn to another breed.
- Higher fines for off leash dogs in regular parks/pathways. Too many owners are convinced that their dog is good. Please enforce broadly, my dog has been threatened by multiple 'safe' breeds with carless owners
- It would be nice to just ban the breed altogether. My dog was attacked by 3 different pit bulls in her lifetime. How very sad for a Nova Scotia duck tolling retriever
- Higher fines and sentencing that includes a ban on owning animals if you have not trained your nuisance dog.
- A dog bites, period, it is seized and euthanized. Just like we do with bears, cougars, coyotes, or any other vicious animal.
- I absolutely do NOT support breed specific rules. From everything I've read there is no evidence that there are more issues with pit bull breeds, and there are a number of common breeds that



consistently test higher for bite strength (German Shephard, Doberman, Rottweiler, bull dogs, and many more less common breeds)

- Nuisance dog owners should be made to pay the vet bills for animals their dogs have injured.
- Drastically increase penalties for owners of aggressive dogs of any breed, including jail time.
- Obedience training should be required as part of the city license program
- This is absolutely ridiculous. Twenty years ago, it was Dobermans, then it was German Shepherds, then it was Rottweilers, now it's pit bulls. Pit bulls as a breed ARE NOT DANGEROUS; they are nanny dogs unless brutally trained by vicious owners. Each dog should be judged individually. If you look at statistics for 2019, Labrador Retrievers were responsible for more attacks than pit bulls. IT'S THE DEED, NOT THE BREED.
- No dogs for people in trailer parks. I don't support breed specific legislation but we can all pretend we are good people when we make poor people suffer.
- As a Vet Tech this survey is very lacking in evidence to support special restrictions for "pitbulls" because as you said they are not more aggressive than any other breed of dog. If the city wants to address nuisance dogs they should be requiring behavior training before a dog is adopted or registered and if an incident happens with an animal who has not participated in this training there should be a fine for that. If they have participated in the training, further training should be required before they are labelled as nuisance. There should be different restrictions for dogs who are labelled nuisance because of excessive barking vs aggression.
- A dog that bites is not necessarily a dangerous dog . You must look the circumstances. Was the dog in a dog fight and The human trying to break up fight get bit . That would be the humans fault . Has someone come into the dogs property not invited and got bit ? That would be the humans fault . Dogs are animals. They have territories and boundaries . What's the dog that bit being abused and finally decided they were not going to take another blow to the head . All circumstances not the dogs fault and should not be punished . Now if a dog attacks un provoked and seriously hurts someone then yes they are dangerous and should be put down but an attack is much different then a bite their are lots of levels to biting and it's up to us humans to do the right thing and educate ourselves instead of always trying to push the blame onto the next poor animal victim. All dog breeds have the potential to hurt and bite stats show that toy breeds are more aggressive and dangerous then large breeds but bc they are cute and small they get away with it . I think the city of Calgary needs more education better off leash areas with specific guidelines to owners and separate areas for large and small breeds . The law should be for all dogs and dog owners period .
- Owner is responsible for his or her dog no matter the breed all rules should be applied to all dogs the same as they are to humans
- I recommend you charge the owners. 99% of the time it is the owners mishandling of a canine that brings out the aggression. No particular breed is born aggressive. A mistreated animal presents itself in unfavourable ways as they can't express their pain otherwise. Stiffer requirements for dog ownership and severe maximum fines with community work for animal abuse would help eliminate many of these existing issues.
- Owners of nuisance dogs should be required to pay for damage done by their dogs.



- I'm in favor of requiring muzzles for dogs exhibiting reactive or aggressive behavior. "Nuisance" such as barking or being at large does not warrant that in my opinion.
- I support responsible owner legislation, not breed-specific legislation. Bylaws should hold owners accountable for the behaviour of their dogs. Fines should increase for owners with multiple pet-related offences, and owners with previous citations for dangerous animal behaviour should be required to hold insurance for all pets they own. If only dogs—and not their owners—are tracked for multiple offences, it allows negligent owners to rid themselves of "nuisance" animals, purchase or adopt new animals, and continue the same cycle of negligent or abusive behaviours. Responsible owner legislation motivates pet owners to be accountable for the behaviour of their animals and deters irresponsible pet ownership.
- I do not like that Calgary is exploring breed specific legislation.
- All dogs and owners go through training, no matter the size or breed of dog. Dogs the harm another dog has to pay vet bill
- Why single out Pit bulls? Please do your research, PPSI the Pit Bull is not even in the top 3. What is the City's definition of a Pit Bull? That is the first problem, a Pit Bull is a slang name for a APBT, grouping dogs together because they have a blocky head and short hair is wrong. Breed profiling is wrong. All dogs are individuals, treat them as such. I am all for pet responsibility but not discrimination!.
- There appears to be a lot of focus on the dog rather than the Owners. I'd like to see Owners of nuisance dogs restricted in their ability to have a pet if their nuisance dog has to be apprehended.
- Ban dangerous breeds of dog
- I want owners to be responsible for vet bills/medical costs of the injured party. If they choose to have insurance, good for them. If not, they're on the hook.
- Proof of insurance to be provided to licensing authorities at annual renewal.
- Bylaws should NOT include breed specific language!
- The City should consider applying the pit bull standards to all other bully breeds.
- Pit bulls not be allowed within the city of Calgary.
- PITBULLS SHOULD BE BANNED!!! HOW MANY MORE STORIES DO WE HAVE TO READ ABOUT PITBULLS FATALLY ATTACKING OTHER DOGS OR PEOPLE, OR CAUSING GRIEVOUS INJURIES?!!!
- If your dog bites a person or other dog ONCE (of course bit must be sufficiently severe eg blood draw) It should be put down! Dog ownership is a privileged and a responsibility not a right
- Stop bred specific bans...how about mandatory pet owner training prior to owning an animal
- A nuisance dog is owned by nuisance owner who has no regard for the laws that are already in place. There are ONLY bad owners, The actions of the dog are at the discretion of the owner so owners must be held to a higher standard. For god's sake, people need a licence to catch a fish but anybody can get a dog??! Preposterous!
- ALL BREEDS OF DOGS ARE CAPABLE OF BITING. EACH INCIDENT SHOULD BE HANDLED ON ITS OWN AND NOT JUST TARGETING BULLY BREEDS OR DOGS THAT MAY LOOK LIKE A



BULLY BREEDS. THERE ARE SOME PRETTY VICIOUS SMALL BREED DOGS THAT HAVE COME AFTER MY LARGE BREED CALM DOG

- Obedience training required for all breeds of dogs before they become a nuisance
- Owners of dogs that do bite or are a nuisance should be blacklisted from owning animals.
- Training for Owners who's dogs have been declared a nuisance
- Ban pit bulls
- Due to covid the city is saying it is running at a deficit. Why are you wasting time and money looking at changing a bylaw to something that has already been proven in other cities to not be effective? I feel it is unfair to responsible dog owners and dogs to single out one type of dog based on their looks
- I support a ban on pit bulls, including the other breeds listed above
- QUIT SAYING PITBULLS OR OTHER BIG DOGS WHEN LITTLE DOGS ATTACK MORE.
- Obedience training for all new pet owners.
- Mandatory rehabilitation to prove the dog has been full rehabilitated before being allowed in public again/ around other people or dogs.
- Consider having a higher annual license fee for "nuisance" dogs; seems unfair to penalize only one type of dog (PitBull) when many different breeds can cause issues.
- Owners are the root cause of this issue. I don't understand why the city of Calgary is pointing blame at the dogs, it's not their fault. Owners should be held to account to ensure proper training and treatment of dogs.
- Higher fines for ALL dogs involved in any bylaw offences, not only pit bulls or nuisance dogs.
- There needs to be a small dog only off leash park. For example in the southland off leash park there's ample space to create a separate small dogs only area. I have a small dog who has been attacked several times by large breeds (ie - once by a pitbull, once by a Doberman and once by a shepherd). Small dog owners need a place that it is less likely for severe injuries to their animals should an instance occur.
- This is especially disappointing coming from Calgary, because the city was a leader in animal control and welfare in the early 2000s. [personal information removed] conceptualized a Responsible Ownership Bylaw that combined community outreach and education with enforcement. [removed] dog bites in Calgary decreased by 75% and their bite rate was thought to be the lowest in North America, while their pet licensing rates were the highest. There was no breed-specific language in the bylaw. It was focused on the known risk factors for dog aggression – poor breeding, poor early socialization and care, dogs at large, past behaviour, compromised health status, spay/neuter, etc. Owners were expected to be accountable for their dog's actions, and any concerning behaviour or risk factors were identified early. If the owner did not comply with education and warnings, there were fines and other strong enforcement measures with each offense to prevent the concerning behaviours from escalating. At the same time, the Bylaw recognized that most pet owners were trying to do their best by their dog. The City introduced dog safety education to children and other populations at high risk for dog bites (e.g., postal/delivery workers). There were incentives for licensing your pet and for complying with leash laws. Off-leash areas were expanded and



patrolled by outreach officers. Subsidized training and spay/neuter programs were offered. Costs for the enhanced services were covered by licensing fees, because more people were licensing their pets. [personal information removed] breed is not a risk factor for aggression. Unfortunately, [personal information removed] things have changed. There have been changes in leadership and staffing, budget cuts, and a poor economy. It seems that bite rates have begun to climb again. While the clear solution is to return to the solutions that made Calgary successful 20 years ago – solutions that have been adapted and have worked for countless other communities – it appears that the current leadership is tempted to turn the clock backwards. Phase One of the feedback for the new bylaw changes occurred from February 26 to March 18, 2020. Calgarians were consulted about changes they wished to see. In the 96-page summary document of this process, there is no mention of breed-specific legislation. Phase Two is meant to build upon the feedback from Phase One, and includes an online survey. In this survey, breed-specific language like mandatory muzzling of “pit bull” type dogs, increased insurance for “pit bull” type dogs and a limit of certain breeds per household are proposed. None of these measures are fair or science-based. There is a wealth of information available about breed-specific legislation and why it is problematic – starting with the premise that it is based on visual identification of a dog. Very few of the targeted dogs are purebred, so breed specific legislation asks peace officers to make decisions about a dog’s potential for aggression based on its physical appearance.

- Obedience training and higher fines and insurance s/be required for all dogs that have been involved in bylaw offences. gs that have - not just pit bulls.
- Your definitions of ‘nuisance’ and ‘dangerous behaviour’ are not defined well enough to make an informed choice.
- These bylaws need to be enforced. Not only biting, but attacking, jumping on pedestrians is frightening and frustrating. Also, too many beautiful parks and areas of the city are relegated to off leash areas where dogs are not under control. I am providing these comments here, as I was unaware of any previous consultation. I have also experienced dog owners who have become abusive when asked to keep their pet off of my property and fouling my front lawn. There really needs to be more control.
- You are considering additional action against a mixed breed dog that is being discriminated against. Please weigh all the scientific and current information available. There is a reason that Humane Societies and vets do not support legislation based on any specific type of dog. It isn't factually based, it is discriminatory and has not proven to reduce dog bites
- Owner must be held accountable and/ or fined appropriately in incident
- Higher fines for off leash dogs in leashes areas
- Nuisance dogs are not necessarily dogs that bite, so if a dog is a nuisance because it barks, then not permitting it to be in an off-leash park seems counter-productive!
- For the muzzled if nuisance question, if they are declared a nuisance just because of barking loudly they shouldn't need to wear a muzzle because that makes no sense
- who are these people that set community standards, every dog will bite under the right circumstances, are we going to pass bylaws that people cannot own small dogs because they bark



and nip indiscriminately, this goes back to the grass bylaw, we live in the prairies, if someone has a yard with native grasses

- I had a dog that was labelled and registered with the city of Calgary due to the fact that it had jumped up on a neighbour and when it came down it's too caught her jacket and it tore the jacket. The dog was not vicious. The neighbour claimed the dog attacked her if it had attacked her. She was little in stature and the dog was large. We brought the dog to the SPCA. We brought the dog to be put down and due to a paperwork error a couple days later they called us and have not had the dog put down yet and said this dog was not [personal information removed]. We were able to bring the dog home but being registered with the city of Calgary if it ever did have any type of another incident true or untrue we would be fined and the dog will be put down. Situations are not always black and white, right and wrong vicious and not vicious.
- Only the phrase "nuisance dogs" be used and not any reference to a breed like pit bulls. It is all about the pet owner and their training of the pet. Any breed, properly trained, will not be a nuisance and if the pet is not properly trained, it is not the pet's fault, and the pet should not be the one punished with a muzzle or with euthanasia, it is the owner who should be punished!
- High visibility markings for nuisance dogs must be worn when off home property or unrestrained (eg. off leash on front lawn or courtyards at apartment buildings)
- All pit bull type dogs should be muzzled, short leashed, fixed, chipped, kenneled with a cement floor, roof, no new pit bulls should be allowed in the city, only those currently present with said restrictions in place.
- Mandatory training and licensing for owners of nuisance dogs. Fines / penalties for owners for violations.
- Pit bulls should be banned. It's not the dog, it's negligent owners; but the dogs are a ticking time bomb. They kill. I would like to see a total ban for this reason.
- Owners of dogs that attack and injure/kill other dogs should have to pay the vet bills for the dog victim as a result of the attack.
- Ban pit bull dogs entirely
- Ban pit bulls.
- Training required for people who own pit bulls or "nuisance" dogs -- owners are typically at fault here, not the breed. To add, I've seen far more aggressive small dogs than big dogs -- so maybe all owners need some training...
- Ban these dogs breed for aggression. People need to feel safe being outdoors.
- Singling out one breed of dog (pit bulls) is a short sighted and ignorant position. All dogs require proper training and socialization, no matter if they are 5 lbs or 100 lbs. I have incurred more scratches and bites from small dogs than large dogs, and I have been a dog owner for decades.
- Owner MUST pay vet bill of injured animal.
- Enforcement of on leash areas. More on leash areas.
- Pit bulls are not the problem, the owners who raise problem dogs are. I have been bitten by a small dog. Based on that logic you should ask if all small dogs should be muzzled in public. I suggest making the punishments and restrictions severe for any problem dogs and their owners, not for a



specific breed. Prevent those people from having dogs and ENFORCE that - follow up. Do not let these people have dogs at all and make them truly responsible for what their negligence has caused.

- Do more research. All you are doing is creating more beauracrcy you are cannot enforce.
- Ban on pit bulls in Calgary.
- Pit bulls should be banned from the city period!
- Euthanise after one bite.
- This is not a breed specific issue and should not be handled as such.
- Do NOT discriminate against a specific breed especially pit pull. All dogs have the potential to bit or be considered a nuisance. It is dependant on the owner how dogs react
- no more new pit bull should be allowed as a pet
- He owner of a an attacking dog must pay all vet fees etc caused by their dog, as well as a significant punishment/penalty fee to the victim.
- Banning the the breeding of the same animals for city use, only allowing then outside city limits like farm properties
- Ban all pit bulls and aggressive dogs.
- Ban pitbulls
- Ban pit bulls in Calgary
- Pit bulls and other vicious breeds should be banned. Owners of vicious dogs should be charged with criminal offences when their dogs injure humans.
- Unfortunately breed does come in to play, but I strongly think that the owner must be responsible for proper training of their dogs and held accountable for any actions, unfortunately the dogs are most times the smarter of the two.. My property backs on to a off leash dog walk, amazing to see the owners irresponsibility of their animals, and most are more interested in looking at their phones than what their animal is doing IE: DOG [removed]!!! Can I tell stories!! You need bigger fines and more surveliance of these areas, cameras are everywhere why not off leash dog parks... This city wastes money everywhere... its disgusting!!!
- Higher fines for ANY dog involved in bylaw offences
- Require owners of dangerous breeds to obtain permit just like with weapons
- Euthanization of nuisance dogs.
- Dog owners responsible for all damages caused to other dogs. Ie the associated vet bills
- Any rule should apply to all breeds, but the biggest thing is the owners of any nuisance dog should be required to receive training and have a better knowledge of their breed of dog. To single out one breed is not fair and it comes down to the owners. Part of getting a license should be a mandatory puppy classes / socialization. Once these classes are complete, then issue the license (proof of attending classes). Follow up on those who have not completed the classes and potential fines. As a long time dog owner of various breeds, it is unfair to put a label on a dog breed when it is their owner who, through lack of knowledge, inconsistency in training, or simple neglect is the real issues. Many small breed get away with a lot more than larger breeds but can still do damage especially to a small child



- Owners of nuisance dogs should be prohibited from owning dogs if their current dog bites or does harm to another animal or human. Owners should be held responsible for their dogs actions
- Ban nuisance breeds.
- The owner of a dangerous dog should be made to pay for all the injured dog's vet bills. Why should the owner of the injured dog have to pay monies that they don't have, that was not their fault.
- It's not the dog, a chihuahua bites more humans and are alot more noisy than any other dog. Charge the owners of the dogs. It is the owners that raise the problem dogs. Dogs are loyal to a fault. All they want to do is make their owners happy. Pitbull are known as the nursing dog. Ie. Used to watch over babies and look after the young kids and family's. It's bad owners that get them to be bad.
- Exorbitant punitive fines for repeating offending owners.
- Repeat offending owners of these dogs should have subsequent higher fines leveed to them to the point where they are not allowed to own dogs.
- Ban on dangerous breeds
- Don't support any of the above. It's the owner not the breed.
- Can't be more than 1 nuisance dog in one house. More than 1 pit bull is ok
- Off leash areas are for well trained dogs. Use at own risk.
- Dog OWNERS should have to get licensed to own this type of dog
- Pitbulls should not be allowed in Alberta.
- Pit bulls should no longer be allowed to be imported into the city, issue licences for all current pit bull owners and do not allow any more.
- Total ban on vicious dogs like pitbulls.
- Way higher fines. And responsibility to pay up to a certain amount of vet bills for victims
- [removed]
- I think that dogs should not be discriminated against because of their breed. But on per case basis for dogs declared nuisance.
- I think we should have all owners of pit bulls and or nuisance dogs have a mandatory training process and must fully complete and pay up front. Once they have completed the training and pass the test they should be reimbursed. A portion of it. They as well should be known that they have a dog that can cause harm. This should be a city and province commitment. For the love of these animals. The insurance to cover damage to another's dog or human should solely on the owner that had a dog that was not controlled. No questing here at all. Everyone should feel safe when walking there dogs and the blend of humans and dogs should never be a scary thing. In other parts of Alberta I have heard horror stories and we should set a responsible example how to over come this issue. Safety always first!!
- Any dog owner should be given a warning if there dog is being a nuisance and if a repeated offender they should be fined.
- Offended that pit bulls are singled out. Dogs aren't the problem - owners are.
- Owner of offending dog should be pay the vet bill through court ordered.
- If your animal attacks another, you should be responsible for all vet bills incurred by the owner of the attackee



- [removed] They are GOOD DOGS and do not deserve to be discriminated against. We have been praised for our current practicing laws.
- Dogs must never be off leash in public places.
- I do not feel that these types of animals should be individualized. German Sheppard, rottis have strong bites too. If people actually look at the statistics, there are MORE small dog bites being treated then pitbulls.
- I don't support the calling out of "pit-bull" dogs but feel that nuisance dogs, dangerous dogs, aggressive dogs, and unmanaged dogs suffice and that it be their owners that are held responsible, not the dog breed. I think this sends the wrong message and makes pit-bull owners defensive, which makes us focus more on the political argument than the real issue -- that dangerous and unmanaged dogs are around and that the owners need to be held accountable and rectify the problems.
- any breed of dog with agression towards other dogs must be on leash on and off park
- Breed specific rules don't address actual problems. Any legislation put in place should address ALL dogs not specific breeds or styles
- The owners need to pay vet or doctors bills from injuries
- Higher fines for owners of dogs that are unleashed in leashed areas
- Dogs should be only allowed off-leash in fenced areas, fines should be 10x what they are now for irresponsible dog owner and if a dog attacks another dog the owner should be made pay for damages
- Having dealt with neighbours who are just grumpy and may not like dogs, establishing rules that are put in place by past bylaw offences can be full of false claims. I would support higher fines, etc., only if based on substantiated evidence that the dog/pet is actually a legitimate danger and/or problem and not just subject to discrimination based on breed and fear.
- Pit bulls should be banned in Canada
- Do not specify pit bulls as they are not the only dogs that can be considered nuisance.
- Zero tolerance. One bite = euthanized
- Owners of dogs responsible for harming a human or another animal should be responsible for any medical bills.
- Ban pit bulls in this city before they kill a child
- Not the dog - it's the owners. It's pathetic the city of Calgary is considering Breed Specific Legislation. Owners need to be responsible
- Publicly name the offending owner & address.
- Much, much higher fines for owners of nuisance animals. START the fines at \$3000. Second fine should double, etc. If another dog is killed by a nuisance animal, dog owner should have pet put down and fined \$5000.
- Leash length restrictions for nuisance dogs (ie retractable leashes not allowed)
- All dogs require obedience training. Expect all dog owners to be responsible and dont blame the breed.
- Pitbulls should be banned in Calgary



- Ban pitbulls and prohibit dog owners from owning another pet for 5 years after an attack
- This is a serious issue. A dog that has attacked another dog more than once needs to be dealt with.
- Training for dog owners.
- Special licensing required for ownership of nuisance dogs, requiring yearly renewal to ensure that standards of ownership are upheld.
- It is unrealistic to focus on the dog; focus should be on the owner(s) of dogs and cats. One needs to ask "what has caused the dog to be the way it is". I would trust a "pit bull" type breed more than I would a smaller dog - Chihuahua, Pekenise, Toy Poodle, Yorkie, etc. As for off leash areas, no dog should be off leash unless the owner can say without a doubt that his dog will listen to him 100% of the time.
- All dogs behaviours are a reflexion on the owner. I would, as a dog owner go 25years in Dalhousie, appreciate if the responsibility was put where it belongs - one the owner. There has to be a place somewhere, that teaches pet owners how to manage their dogs specific temperament. It is not dog obedience classes. It is how to understand and control our specific animal. Nuisance dogs need their owner to be trained.
- Any barking dog creating noise after hours full stop. Train them!!
- Very concerned with focus on one breed! Training of some sort perhaps should be mandatory for first time dog owners, no matter where they get their animal from.
- Make a classification for a dog owner who's dog has multiple minor offences. They should be the ones punished for not being responsible dog owners
- I do NOT support any language specific to 'pit bull' related in a Calgary bylaw.
- The Dogs in question are not born aggressive, the owners made them that way by neglect,poor training or abuse. There Are No Bad Dogs Just Bad Owners.
- Mandatory training/obedience training or intervention for nuisance dogs and their owners
- Make it mandatory for ALL dogs to be muzzled when out. All dogs can be dangerous if trained by the wrong owners
- The issue isn't with the dog. The issue is with the owner / guardian of the dog. Training and licensing should be with the human not the dog.
- I would just like to say that I DEEPLY disagree with segregating pitbulls and like breeds
- Ban pit bulls, they are too dangerous in city environments period.
- Pit bulls and related breeds should be prohibited entirely in the city.
- I do not support singling out one type of breed eg: pit bulls. Sanctions should be specific to dangerous dogs of any breed.
- Dogs that have attacked a pet or human should be subject to fines evaluation but a dog of any breed who hasn't attacked any person or pet should not be subject to any special conditions based by breed
- Enforce leash requirements near off leash areas such as near the parking lots at nose hill park. Actually give fines.



- Si many cuties repealed this legislation because it simply does not work and it costs so much money. We din't have money. I want more cuts my tax bill has increased WAY higher in the last 7 years than is acceptable. Stop being wasteful please. .
- Except from fines, depending the breed, the owner should be liable with jail. The fines should be much more than now.
- The concept of banning specific "pit bull" breeds is a stupid idea, and it should not be something that becomes a bylaw in the city of Calgary. There could be lists of hundreds of dog breeds that have a stronger bite and thus pose a stronger threat. Singling out one specific breed is stupid and unnecessary. Ban bad owners, not bad dogs.
- This does not target the issue as aggressive dogs come in all breeds and I find no evidence that bulky breeds have super powers. This will only make owners of targeted pets vilified and reluctant to license or register. This criminalizes people without a crime being committed and dog bites will still happen. Focus in enforcing current by-laws, education, maybe incentive to license including training dicounts and discounts to spay and neuter. More regulation on backyard breeders and impirt of "rescue" dogs from out if country (regardless of breed) for sale here. They operate on emotion of adoption and under assumption of non profit. False advertising.
- Do not punish any specific breed, focus instead on educating dog owners on proper dog behavior and how to train their dog. A lot of people with poorly behaved dogs won't take training courses because it costs money. Invest in free dog training programs for the public, then whichever dogs have multiple offenses, make these free classes mandatory for those owners.
- Not feasible. A quick internet search found many cities who trued BSL removed it because it was costly and did not reduce incidents of dog bites. Breed was not and is not the issue. Please don't waste my tax dollars this way.
- Anyone who owns a dog it doesn't matter the breed should have a basic training, not the dog i am talking about the human. And if the dog is a powerful breed the owner should have an advance course. So the human gets a licence to own a dog
- Banning aggressive breeds such as pitbulls
- Higher fines and financial compensation required for irresponsible owners who do not control their aggressive dogs - not targeting any breed. Owners are the issue. Not the dog!
- All pit bulls, and other breeds known to be vicious must be totally banned with city limits. Period.
- Fines for all dogs off leash in non off leash areas.
- I do not support any restrictions on breeds of dogs. Any dog can be deemed a 'nuisance' and the bylaw should not discriminate against any breed specific dog.
- Outright ban the breed. They were bred to be killer dogs and do not belong in any city. If a ban cannot be done, a \$500 annual licence, plus liability insurance requirement should help get rid of the breed over time.
- Pitbull type dogs should be banned. There is an unfortunate tendency for immature and irresponsible persons to associate with these dogs to seem "cool". There is no place for such dogs in the city.
- I do not agree with breed specific legislation. It is discrimination against dogs [removed]



- Require all dogs to go through training. Dog training is the insurance.
- When the city begins daily news conferences updating the public on dog bite numbers and the mental stress it is causing on society than maybe city council should balance its budget without increased taxes and fines.
- Pit bulls should be outright BANNED in YYC. They were bred to be aggressive.
- More resources provided by the city for dogs that have been abused/mistreated for rehab. Pit bulls can be absolute sweet hearts if treated properly. You need to make sure the owners are responsible versed banning all pit bulls from parks or making their owners get more insurance.
- Nuisance dogs (barking/noise, being at large) is very different from dogs that bite and should not be treated the same. Having restrictions on dogs that have shown aggression is different and should be dealt with on a sliding scale. Your statement that pit bulls pose a greater risk due to their bite strength is misstating the truth. Bite strength generally increases with the size of dog. Some data shows the difference in strength between a pit bull type dog and a lab as 5 lbs (335 vs 330 or 1.5%). Deal with the offender's first - the irresponsible owner and. Then retrain the dog.
- Take an individual approach to unacceptable vs general breed . It's often the humans that don't have the knowledge/skills who should be banned not the breed. There needs to be the opportunity to assess and work with dogs demonstrating unacceptable behavior to determine if they can be unrestricted in public off leash spaces or if conditions need to be put in place. Don't put in a generalist approach to a multi factor issue
- Ban pit bulls.
- Obedience training should be required for all dogs. Build the cost into the adoption/purchase fee. Spay; neuter; train
- Prohibit owners of vicious dogs from having any more.
- I would support breed-neutral legislation and instead, more opportunities for dog training, owner education and non-owner education fo dogs in general. Spotlighting one breed for physical attributes is wrong
- Ensure proper owners, animals are a product of environment. If they are trained and cared for properly they exhibit good characteristics.
- Leave all mention of breed out of it, your statement that they have the potential for a stronger bite is not accurate
- Breed specific legislation does not work (there is no research to substantiate it) and targeting a specific breed is a waste of City resources.
- Financially the cost to implement BSL is high and reports from other municipalities that tried it did not benefit from reduced incidents or severity of bites. Calgary already has been a recognized leader for reducing incidents through existing by-laws and education. Get back to those basics. We don't have dollars to waste on ineffective programs.
- Leave the bylaw as it is now.
- Big dogs/specific types like pitbulls shouldn't be allowed in condos or appartment buildings. Even they are private properties, those have public areas like parks, elevators, halls. This should be mandatory in each building bylaw.



- Discriminating against pitbulls because of their breed is no different than discriminating against a human because of their skin color.
- nuisance dogs must never be off leash (anywhere but home)
- Research does not back up Breed Specific Legislation (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5521144/>), thus introducing "Pit Bull" specific language to by-laws is not helpful. Historical statistics also indicate that "dangerous" breeds are often more related to popularity and perception than reality: <https://montrealgazette.com/news/local-news/how-calgary-reduced-dog-attacks-without-banning-pit-bulls>
<https://globalnews.ca/news/2527882/torontos-pit-bulls-are-almost-gone-so-why-are-there-more-dog-bites-than-ever/> <https://globalnews.ca/news/3556190/what-dog-breed-is-behind-the-most-attacks-in-metro-vancouver-its-not-what-you-think/>
- I really don't like singling out specific breeds. Many dogs can be nuisance and I feel we should be dealing with the owners to address the concerns. Different situations require different levels of compliance. But don't focus on a single breed. Focus on where problems are and how to resolve these.
- Responsible ownership. BSL is proven ineffective and very costly to taxpayers.
- Measures should not just target to certain dog breeds. My neighbour's small beagle/jack russell cross was a nuisance in our block. It was at large and barked constantly during spring and summer and liked to tease our dogs and my other neighbour's dogs. We had to speak with the owners about their dog.
- Dogs that have bitten/ repeatedly shown aggression (to other dogs or people) must be muzzled or banned from off leash parks.
- Terminate dogs that attack humans and their pets. Terminate dogs found off leash. Arrest owners of dogs that attack
- I think there should be an affordable nuisance training program for the under privileged.
- My words can't even express the way this makes me feel as a bully breed owner this is discrimination of the breed I'm a responsible owner they are my kids as for many of us, let's flip the script would this be ok if it was to happen to your children for me it is no different they are my kids !!!!!!! It is not the breed !!!!!!!!
- No pit bulls in Calgary
- What you should be doing is screening pet owners upon registration of their pets. Too many irresponsible pet owners are giving certain breeds (like your outrageous choice of pitbulls at the moment, are we going to include Doberman's and Shepard's as well since that was a thing too decades ago?) be better Calgary.
- Ban pit bulls
- I would like to see more about free roaming cats scratching up our things on our property
- It's not the dog it's the owner
- "Pit bull" breeds should not be segregated out....



- Don't limit this just to pit bulls. I believe if any dog bites someone there needs to be action but not all the way to seizure of the dog right away. Little dogs can bite just as hard and do as much damage as a pit bull
- NO BSL. Calgary is recognized around the world for our current bylaws that focus on Responsible Pet Ownership and Education, not BSL. Many other jurisdictions that have had BSL have not found it to be effective. It is much more effective time to ensure responsible pet ownership and educating the public at large.
- Fines for dogs of ALL breeds not just pit bulls
- Breed Specific Legislation does not deter those individuals from obtaining specific breeds, nor does it prevent them from irresponsible pet ownership that results in aggressive/ volatile/ dangerous behaviour in an animal. If an animal is a concern, promote having a certified animal behaviour specialist make an assessment and train the human - not punish the animal.
- Punish the deed, not the breed! Labeling all pit bulls is canine racism. Is Calgary not capable of moving forward? [personal information removed]
- If the owner isn't being responsible with their animal they should be punished not the animal. Obviously the owner didn't put the time and effort to train properly
- Do not specify breeds, you are stereotyping.
- ALL dogs require obedience training.
- Obedience training for all dogs and dog owners, small dogs cause more problems than large dogs
- treat them like any other dog
- Dogs that have bitten a person or dog cannot be off leash. Higher fines for dogs that are actually dangerous, not nuisance dogs because it is subject to opinion.
- Outright ban on pit-bulls within Calgary.
- Pitbulls should not be targeted. BSL discriminates against pitbulls, while other breeds can also be considered a nuisance. Blame should be placed on owners not dogs.
- Equality for all breeds. The owners should have to go to training if the dog is a nuisance.
- I feel that an owner of this breed or any nuisance animal should be forced to take classes on how to manage these issues. I also believe the lessons should be customized to the problem. A dog is only as good as its owner!!
- Dog behavior is learned from owners- we shouldn't be blanketing a breed as a nuisance. If it's felt these particular breeds are a danger to the public then you need to limit the people causing the problem not the dog. Banning from owning any animal if a behavior or incident is deemed from the negligence of the OWNER is the way to go for this.
- Obedience training should be required for all dog owners. Not only dogs deemed a "nuisance"
- Fines for bad and irresponsible dog owners regardless of breed
- Owners should be held responsible more. If an owner lets an abused dog out and something happens, the owner should be fined and flagged - and perhaps should not own a "nuisance" animal. Not every animal is perfect, and most require 24/7 care/watch. If the owner cannot provide this, the dog should not be punished.



- I don't think that breed specific bylaws or legislation are ever appropriate, it's not the dog or the breed it's the handler or of the dogs experience/trauma that affects their reactions - please see <https://www.endtheban.ca/> for information and research that shows that it is not effective and costly for other areas that have implemented it
- dogs that have bitten people/ other dogs should be required to wear a muzzle at dog parks.
- I do not support BSL... it has proven to not work. Education!!!!
- Required training for the owners. It is their responsibility to be responsible pet owners.
- Stop targeting pit bulls as a breed! Go after bad owners or hoarders and give them \$10,000 fines or something that if they are know. As a bad owner they are sent to jail for breaking limits or not paying fines. Any animal can be trained to be mean. A breed is not inherently bad
- Whatever is decided the same rules should apply to all dogs. Singeling our one breed or type of dog is unacceptable. All dogs can bite and it can be severe.
- I think it's only fair to have owners go through trainer and graduate with the knowledge of how to treat and own a pitbull, considering that all dogs have the same aggression in them, the only difference is the owner of the dog.
- **NO BREED RESTRICTIONS!!! PUNISH THE DEED NOT THE BREED!!**
- I am not in favour of breed specific legislation any breed of dog can bite and leave injuries, I believe it is totally unfair to pick on pit bulls or similar breeds.
- A dog that is declared a nuisance from barking too much is quite different than one that bites often. I don't agree with additional fees, training for dogs that are barking too much but if a dog is showing repeated signs of aggression/biting then yes, a ban from off leash parks make sense until training is completed
- Measures specifically aimed at pit bulls are not supported by the veterinary community. The American veterinary medical association says "while BSL may look good on the surface, it is not a reliable or effective solution for dog bite prevention. The AVMA is opposed to breed-specific legislation." Why would you propose legislation that is not supported by science, you are pandering to uninformed, ignorant people who think they are experts based on internet browsing.
- mandatory training for all dog owners
- Education programs for general public and pet owners. I am very disappointed in the City for proposing Breed Specific Legislation. Breed Specific Legislation is ineffective, discriminatory, and is not backed by behaviour science or animal control best practices.
- In my opinion, I think the owner should be fined for small dogs that continually bark or growl at people walking by on a sidewalk. I see more small breeds go after people than large breeds. I don't think large dogs should be punished because the owners do not know how to train their dog. I believe the City of Calgary is discriminating against different breeds of dogs and that should not be allowed.
- You cannot stereotype "Pitbulls" as vicious! Better to stereotype pitbull owners as 'stupid!' I have seen pitbulls that were better trained and more docile than most chihuahuas! It is all dependent on the owners! 'Vicious' animal owners should be fined at a higher rate should their dog bite, chase, scare, or harm any other person and / or animal! The owners of said animals should be made

aware that if there dog is involved in an incident, penalties can be, and most likely will be more severe than other dogs. But to ban all pitbulls from all owners is WRONG! Why penalize the good because of the bad? Should all cars be banned from the road because a few people drink and drive? NO! Penalize (albeit) severely, those who endanger others through carelessness or stupidity. Put the onus on the owners! Make them responsible for their decisions!

- There should be a please walk your dog curbside bylaw so pets don't urinate and scent on private property.
- leave specific breed right out of it. this question is disgusting
- Total ban on pit bulls!
- Mandatory dog behavioural education for bylaw officers and councillors
- The problem generally is with the owners who do not take responsibility for their dogs , nor do they go to Obedience school.
- Improve funding to Community Standards to increase bylaw officers who respond to pet problems.
 2. Do not allow imported rescue pets - they often have behavioural issues that owners are unaware of or can't deal with
 3. Mandatory training for owners of dogs - do not wait until their pets become a nuisance but prevent it from happening beforehand. Can be tied to pet licensing.
 4. Partner with the industry for education support - for example, a dog/pet can't be sold or adopted unless the owner completes training . Could even have a pet mentoring program where good pet owners can mentor a new pet owner.
 5. Look at strategies for reaching pet owners who come from other provinces where pet ownership laws are different.
 6. We need so much more education on cats and their effect on migratory birds.
 7. Finally, educating non-pet owners about what they can expect from their pet-owning neighbours. It's ok to call bylaw for support and noisy dogs don't have to ruin neighbourhoods and neighbour relationships.
- training should be mandatory for new dogs. too many owners do not know what they should do to raise responsible dogs. "I just want my dog to be a dog" is a terrible method of training.
- Why are pitbulls being targeted? And I don't own a pitbull but know that the owners are the problem not the breed. And some of these options make no sense. An example of "nuisance" includes noise, being at large yet some of the measures include muzzling and limiting attendance at off-leash parks(?). How is that going to help the problem of barking or at large dogs? These measures need to be more specific in order to address the problem. Target known aggressive dogs.
- Reprimand the OWNER.. do NOT punish the animal for being INCORRECTLY trained...
- None
- Just require obedience training to register any dog. If they don't do training then they get fined.
- These dogs should be banned. I see too often kids attacked or adults and their pets. It is unacceptable
- Criminal charges should apply to owners with nuisance dogs. As well as bans on owning future dogs if a person has been fined or charged for aggressive dogs.
- This recent attack in Calgary is a prime example as to why negligent owners need to be accounted for their animals this is unacceptable behaviour this man has been known and been reported to abuse his dogs yet by law Calgary police service did not do anything about it it allowed this poor dog



to be abused and abused and abused and abused therefore turned aggressive harmed another animal because that's all he knew. There has been reports that this negligent owner has hung his dog off of the balcony why because he doesn't want to be caught so that he can go and buy another dog of any breed and train it to do the same thing please Calgary do not discriminate against breeds this is an owner problem humans have failed dogs again stricter fines mandatory neutering and spaying of all animals and bylaw needs to enforce these fines remove animals when there has been abuse reported abuse reported multiple times yet this dog has now suffered and the dog that attacked has suffered This is not a breed problem this is a people problem

- In my opinion, it is the responsibility of the dog owner if there is a problem and I would suspect it is due to lack of training and socialization. Training is primarily for the owner not the dog so they understand dog behaviour and can use consistent commands so the dog knows what is expected. It is about irresponsible owners not specific dog breeds. I also think parents should be teaching children how to approach all dogs not just specific breeds. I don't like the idea of colour bandanas re: reactive dogs off leash. If an owner can't control their dog in off-leash areas, they shouldn't be there. When walking dogs, encourage owners with dogs that begin barking when they see another dog to move way in a different direction or change side of the street to continue their walk.
- The notion that pit bulls are more of a nuisance than any other annoying dog at the dog park is crazy.
- Make them, only wear a warning bandana. Make pit bull owners take training on how to handle dangerous dogs. Carry a license to prove it. Much like a firearms license.
- None.. your breed specific attitude is inappropriate.. these breeds aren't the problem, it's the owners
- Mandatory training with an animal behaviorist for dogs who have behavior issues that could eventually result in harm to the dog (being euthanized) or anyone else.
- Dog training for all breeds mandatory
- It's not the breed that is the problem. It's the owner! All dogs can be dangerous if not properly trained. Also more enforcement of off leash Dogs in on leash areas required (pathways, sidewalks)
- Ban pit bulls
- Stop singling out a specific breed. Small dogs can be far more aggressive And vicious than, for example, a pit bull
- I do not support any breed-specific legislation (i.e. the possibilities shown above including the term "pitbull"). I believe in treating every dog as an individual, and I am a strong supporter of breed-neutral legislation. I would suggest taking out any legislation that includes any specific treatment for animals based on their breed alone. #bslfreecalgary
- You cannot be breed specific like this. Bad dogs are the result of bad owners. The City is not being logical in its thinking on this issue. Yes they are bigger - so are Great Danes, so are Newfies and St. Bernards. You are not dog trainers yet you act as if you know more than a professional. With any nuisance / dangerous dog, it's the owner. Dogs aren't born bad, they are taught to be that way. The owners should be fined, and the dogs taken away from them so they can find a decent home.
- How about training the owners, and using the proper name for the dog instead of pit Bull



- I do not agree with any of these as it's targeting breed specific dogs. I think it the owners responsibility and has nothing to do with the dog breed. What we need are stricter measures for adopting or owning pets that they have no experience on. Education is the key not punishing a specific breed.
- Can't blame the dog. It's the owner and pit bull are not the problem. Been bitten more by little breeds than I have large breeds and pit bull breeds. This is just WRONG
- If you do this for one breed you should do it for all of them. Pitbulls are no more dangerous or aggressive than a chihuahua.
- To be clear, I do not think that a dog should be removed from the home or the owner. I firmly believe if a dog acts out it has to do with the owners behaviours and how the animal was raised. Dogs should also be assessed after incident occurs for its own well being. Perhaps the home they are raised in provokes the behaviour.
- Three researchers from the University of Calgary just published a paper stating that education of the public is one of the most important factors in reducing dog bites ! BSL was not listed as helping reduce dog bites. No to BSL
- This survey does not provide any justificaiton for singling out specific dog breeds and in other Canadian communities these bans have been overturned. Why is this being presented as a viable option? I am further confused by that the question is specific to dangerous dog behaviour, but then goes on to ask about 'nuisance' dogs. A dog that bites humans is not a 'nuisance' it is a danger.
- I do not support any BREED-SPECIFIC measures/rules/regulattions/bylaws (e.g., pit bull or otherwise). Also, please don't lump pit bulls and "nuisance dogs' in the same category for selecting options (i.e., "There cannot be more than one pit bull or nuisance dog in a household")
- Streets and parks must be safe for everyone. Why am I inhibited from and in fear of pitbulls in public areas, should we not all be safe in sharing outdoors.
- Class pit bulls in with nuisance dogs. Escalating fines for nuisance dogs, specifically for repeat offenders.
- ban Pit bulls entirely. Far too much risk and they're way over-represented in severe bite incidents
- I dont think its always pitbulls that are a problem to fo after one breed is not fair ,it is not tye dogs fault on how it was raised or trained so the owner should be held responsible . If a dog is deemed aggressive it should be allowed to show that it can be a good dog and be reformed just like we do with criminals
- ban all variations of this breed
- I think that the questions, instead of focusing on a dog breed or if they are a nuisance, should be more specific. I think the process of assessing how dangerouse and how much of a nuisance any dog is, it could follow a progressive discipline approach similar to what workplaces use. Even a rock is dangerouse in the right person's hands. And any dog can become a nuisance depending on a give individual's perspective and emotions. Perhaps having a scale to rate a dogs level of danger and nuisance to guide decision is what is needed. I don't believe it is fair to focus on breeds. It is the owners responsibility to educate and protect their pets.



- Strongly encourage mandatory obedience training as a method of fining owners and correcting dog behavior.
- Do not single out pit bulls.
- Personally I find it unacceptable to label a "breed" of dog as a nuisance. All dogs should be held to a standard of acceptable behaviour
- High (prohibitive - suggest \$5000) licensing fees for dangerous breeds, and high penalty fees for not licensing animals.
- Declaring a dog dangerous or a nuisance should be based on the history and behaviour of that animal not based on the breed. It isn't right to declare all pit bulls dangerous. I have met so many that are the most loving and gentle dog. I have also met many other breeds whose behaviour has been dangerous. All animal owners should be held accountable for the behaviour of their animals. It just isn't right to punish one breed because of some owners' actions and ignorance.
- Breed specific is not appropriate. It's all nuisance dogs
- public parks where dogs are not permitted, pathways restricted for humans so that people who are afraid of pets could avoid them.
- Laws that nuisance dogs are bot permitted in multi-family dwellings with no caviats.
- Fines Should be levied on dog owners who leave dog bag crap all over the parks including the garbage bins. What's the use of byelaws if they're not enforced? And how can you get catch a dog owner leaving his dog crap all over the parks. Especially during this Covid we are the owners think they're too good to open the garbage can to put the dog crap in. They can use gloves or a doggy bag to open the garbage can. It is disgusting how they leave them on top of the garbage and all around it. Nobody catches them so how is anyone getting fined? I see bags of crap all over city parks and I'm in them a lot walking and riding my bike. They leave them on the pathways and by the garbage bins
- I believe pit bulls and other dangerous dogs must be banned. If this is not possible, then the owners must face severe consequences for the harm their dogs cause.
- na
- I do not agree to or want any kind of breed specific legislation or bylaws. It is unfair and discrimination.
- if a dog is considered a nuisance, perhaps it is more so the owner. need harsher laws for poor ownership
- If a dog has been reported as a problematic dog, no matter what breed, there should be limitations to their allowance at an off leash park as my dog has been attacked a few times. If a dog of any breed has no history or record of attacks, there should be no issue of the dog being at an off leash park. The pet should be identified on their own and not represent the entire breed
- Obedience training required for nuisance dogs and owners of nuisance dogs. Then they can't just pay someone to do the training and not learn themselves.
- banning the importation of nuisance dogs from other countries!! Any dog that bites someone randomly walking down a path should be a nuisance dog. Small dog with a small bite required my mother to have medical treatment for more than a year.



- PITBULLS SHOULD NOT BE SINGLED OUT! THERE ARE NO BAD DOGS, JUST BAD OWNERS. I am a dog owner. I have a miniature dachshund. He is 12 lbs and he is BY FAR more likely to be a nuisance than 99.9% of pitbulls. If you are going to make restrictions, they should be for ALL breeds. I am certain the City would not try to single out specific races of human when implementing legislation, so I would ask that they treat animals the same way. Again, I reiterate that there are NO BAD DOGS, JUST BAD OWNERS.
- Noise complaints should NOT be part of the definition of a nuisance dog, if this is focusing on bites and attacks the two are NOT related. I am only selecting nuisance dogs to wear a muzzle in dog parks if they have a history or near misses or altercations with BITING. NOT NOISE complaints. Warnings should be issued to owners to identify a nuisance dog before the city DEEMS the animal a nuisance. Also, near miss events (attacks) should be flagged on the nuisance dog's file (ie. no bite, but an altercation has occurred). Owner's with multiple incidents to their name should be the ones flagged - they are the irresponsible ones, not the dogs. Can you identify nuisance owners too rather than animals? That's probably a better route to take here.
- More focus on the owner - training required
- Any dog that is a repeat biter should have mandatory muzzle in public. Not just a specific breed!
- Fines and prohibiting people from owning any animal if they are shown not to train their pets to be anything but a pet. Aggressive pets are the result of the owners own actions not theirs.
- I do not support any of these suggestions. Breed specific legislation is not based on fact. The question even states that Pit Bulls are not involved in more biting cases so why are we singling out a breed and raising alarms especially with individuals who have minimal knowledge of animals and will be responding to this survey from a fear perspective as opposed to a fact based perspective.
- Why would pit bulls be separated? If a dog is a bus dance the owner should be penalized. Any dog. This survey is leading.
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household (no matter the breed). And fines/jail time for owners whose dogs have been trained as weapons, that cause injuries. Owners need to be responsible, it's not necessarily the dogs' fault.
- BSL has been proven to not work. Calgary has had the leading role in responsible pet ownership. Lets not move backwards. Start enforcing the current bylaws with increased education and increased fines for those owners that do not abide by the bylaw. NO TO BSL
- Not be more than one Nuisance dog in household. The selection above should not be breed specific!!
- this all is taking into account circumstance and provocation of the animal. It cannot be a nuisance if it was acting in retaliation to provocation or any aggressive behaviour from the human as that is not within the animals capabilities to understand human behaviour if it causes them to feel unsafe.
- Well this sounds like someone who knows nothing about animals is trying to sound smart when what's happening is you're targeting a special breed when the problem more lie in the owner and lack of training and knowledge doing so.
- Look at the owner, not the dog. ALL dogs. Not just pit bulls can bite.



- Looks like other municipalities that tried BSL did not reduce incidents of dog bites (seems any breed is capable of biting) and found the by-laws expensive to implement and enforce. Seems like a waste of money. For a city under economic strain there must be better ways to manage the money and focus on attracting business not creating social divisiveness
- Targeting one dog breed on your form is not ok just as you can't be racist to people you can't to dogs every breed has bad dogs it's the owner's job to raise them properly
- Owners must submit to approved dog handling and training courses
- Breed-specific bans have been shown time and time again not to work. To consider putting in restrictions for pit bulls as a whole, poorly defined group (any dog that 'looks' like a pit bull is not remotely specific enough) rather than individual dogs that have actually been shown to be a nuisance is ridiculous. Some people will always want big, aggressive dogs. Irresponsible owners will move to German Shepherds, rottweilers, doberman pinschers, and other big dogs they will then train to be aggressive, or leave chained up outside and left to escape and cause problems. When those bite numbers go up, will they be banned as well? Why not simply punish poor owners and nuisance dogs instead of going down the road of BSL which has been shown in many jurisdictions not to work? In Toronto, pit bull bites are down since, obviously, dogs that look like pit bulls have been banned. But overall bites are up, the breeds are just different. Calgary led the way in reducing stray and nuisance cats when they implemented cat license requirements. Please do not take a step backwards with this.
- Overall accountability for owners of dogs that are aggressive. This is NOT breed specific.
- *Pitbulls are not necessarily stronger than other bully dogs, but they do have a stronger prey drive that can lead to more severe injuries. Your language might need to be tweaked a little.
- No BSL base the laws on dog behaviour not looks.
- As a pit bull/bulldog owner I am appalled at how these dogs are being profiled specifically. I've seen it with my own eyes and I know first hand it is not my dog that is the issue. I've seen other breeds be sketchy and way more aggressive toward my dog who mostly just walks away and tries to avoid a problem. He is super playful and loving, or else I wouldn't have brought a baby home with him here. I get extremely frustrated with people constantly judging and assuming my dog is bad because he is a pit bull. It is the owner of ANY breed of dog's responsibility to raise and train them right, so that my dog, and so many other innocent pit bulls, can finally stop getting profiled against.
- Target owners, not the breed.
- This is racism against pit bulls or any sort of dog. I have a 90lbs Doberman and the dogs that come after my dog are the little 5-20lbs dogs. And my dog is minding his own business sniffing.
- Literally every option available is in the affirmative for action against pitbulls specifically over and above other breeds. I have owned multiple pitbulls in 3 provinces across Canada and have never once even almost had an issue. This survey is strongly biased AGAINST pitbulls specifically with no checkboxes being provided for opposing views. I expect the city of Calgary to be more objective on the matter. Research top ten aggressive breeds (#9) and pounds per square inch in bite pressure (#7), with huskies and German Shepherd ranking above in both categories, but no survey against those breeds. Be better.



- Ban Pit Bulls outright! How many children must die in North America before this is done? Strange that this is not an option.
- I do not agree with breed specific legislation. Any dog can be dangerous, highlighting one is on par with racism.
- Why talk about introducing BSL when we have been the leader in our bylaws. A better idea is to enforce the current bylaws. Introduce more education to owners and officers. This will be expensive and our taxes should be used in a multiple of other ways. For example increased police to take care of our increased violence. BSL has proven it does not work in other places why ruin the lives of thousands of responsible pet owners for a few negligent owners. There are so many good owners of this breed. Above it is stated that pitbulls do not have the most bite incidents. Which breed does? Will that breed be subjected to BSL as well? Not fair to punish a breed of any size. Start focusing on the owners. Bsl will not stop negligent owners from owing aggressive dogs they will simply find another breed therefore BSL does not work. We also need to focus on back yard breeding of any breed and the unethical rescues that do not run a ethical buisness
- Training for by-law officers to ensure they understand behaviours and that small dogs can cause harm to larger dogs. Also off-leash areas should provide a separate area for small dogs.
- Properly define nuisance, the above definition is so broad as to be useless. Any petty bureaucrat could use that definition to declare any dog a nuisance, truth not withstanding
- These should be dog specific and not breed specific. It's the owners that are responsible and not the breed. There are good points here but they must be used as individuals not breeds. Any dog can be a problem dog.
- You cannot compare BITING to escaping/being at large and barking... that is just plain ridiculous! How about a questionnaire for information when people register their animals... with recommendations on training facilities. None of this is about the dog, it's about the owners and training.
- Owners of Nuisance dogs should need to take a course and be licensed to continue ownership of the problem dog.
- Negative dog behaviour is due to bad ownership.....not the breed of dog
- The focus should be on the people, not the animals. Breed specific language/ rules is not fair to the animal - it is up to the owners to ensure they have properly trained, well behaved dogs. Many small dogs are extremely aggressive as well and get away with it because it is "cute".
- I do not support breed-related restrictions, esp. where the city wants to restrict animals that 'an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar to those of dogs referred to in any of clauses (a) to (d)'. This clause is poorly-worded, non-specific, and not helpful to dog owners.
- None of the above.
- A well thought through education campaign for non-dog owners as well as dog owners. Too few people understand dogs these days. Calgary's diverse population includes many who see dogs purely as guard animals / personnel protection. This is at odds with at least the last 100 years of Canadian culture. Far too many people act in a way that will encourage aggressive behavior even from a docile dog. We stress sensible behavior when encountering wild animals "Be Bear Aware"



etc. The public need to do the same for domestic animals as well. This would demonstrate that the city is actually educated, intelligent and compassionate instead of simply following the politician's syllogism.

- If there is non-compliance on the part of a pet owner, the animal should be seized and put down.No
- The owners should undergo more training with their pet.
- Higher fines for ANY dog involved with a bylaw offence.
- Just because a dog is delcared nuisance, does not mean it bit someone, therefore should be exluded from having to wear a muzzle and not allowed in off-leash park. to off leash park. Nuisance dog = obedience/training class. VICIOUS dog (no matter the breed)= MUZZLE and CLASS
- I'm hesitant to answer questions on nuisance dogs as the wording in the introduction seems to be designating any Pit Bull type as a nuisance dog. Please clarify! There are many breeds that are very powerful.
- DO NOT PICK A BREED OF DOG AND LABEL IT AGGRESSIVE. IT'S THE OWNERS OF ANIMALS THAT ARE THE PROBLEM. DO YOUR RESEARCH!!
- People need training more than their dogs. Dogs behave/react to situations that their owners are not reading. Training/educating owners is a much better way of preventing/reducing incidents.
- Potential criminal charges for negligent owners resulting in attacks/dog bites
- No pit bulls/dangerous dogs should be allowed to be bred.period.
- do not single out breeds. its a training and care issue.
- Obedience training required for all domesticated wolves, public shaming of anyone who thinks "pit bull" is an actual category of dog
- Obedience training required for a dog if they bite
- This is HORRIFIC that these are the only options and that this breed is being singled out. I do not own a pit bull, but have met many that are absolutely lovely. The dog is not the problem, the owner is. When any dog is prompted to be unruly, aggressive or inappropriate, then trouble will happen. But to target one breed is a bad strategy on the City's part.
- Ban Pitbulls and Ban people from owning dogs that are irresponsible.
- If dog has been deemed a nuisance/aggressive the owners should have to attend behavioural classes. If the owners refuse, the dog should be seized.
- If Pitbulls aren't involved in more bit incidents than other dog breeds, then it seems the City of Calgary is trying to fix something that isn't broken. I would support leaving Pitbulls and their owners alone.
- The problem is usually the owner in how they treat and/or are train the dog unacceptably. Seizing dogs would be fine as long as they are not euthanized. Sometimes they just need large private areas to run and let out energy, therefore, perhaps a home area that can accommodate should be approved rather than condos, etc. to home them. Mandatory owner retraining and dog obedience training each time they are in violation and face fines.
- More enforce of the the existing laws.
- I don't think it's fair to penalize dog owners and the dogs when most of the time the bite is caused by people approaching and touching a dog they shouldn't. Make proper animal care something



mandatory to learn in schools. If the average person understands animal body language, the amount of people bitten will drastically decrease. Stop blaming innocent animals for reacting when scared and start teaching our citizens how to act around animals.

- Prohibit pit bulls within Calgary city limits
- Higher roaming required by bylaw officers for off leash
- Dog breeds are not the issue the owners are and should be held responsible for the pets behaviour some pit bulls are very well behaved where some little dogs are very viscous. It is how they are trained no matter what breed the animal is.
- No dog should be allowed to bite/attack a second time. There needs to be a reminder that these are animals and animals are unpredictable. If people want to have pets therefore there should be an expense to ensure that people are safe as well as if they hurt people then the victim is not left with the responsibility for care.
- Government funded programs for “high risk” breeds. Sometimes the problem is that after all the costs of a dog, owners can’t afford training programs. A higher insurance won’t stop biting, only training can do that.
- Why the focus on pit bulls? I see way more unbehaved labradoodles in off leash areas than pitbulls. Perhaps focus on mandatory behaviour training for the owners that can’t control their dogs.
- Stop with this breed specific nonsense! I have owned over twenty dogs over the last 60 years and know you cannot judge a dog by it's breed. Can you judge a person by their race?
- You should not be discriminating against pit bulls. Breed specific bylaws do not work, it is not the animals fault they were not trained properly. How about muzzling stupid individuals and making it a fine able offense to tease and provoke someone’s dog.
- Its not the breeds but the owners fault!
- Problem behaviours need to be clearly defined, with animal behaviour specialists key stakeholders in contributing to this definition. Breed-specific legislation has been scientifically proven to be ineffective, more costly, and punitive to responsible pet owners. Please read through the following resources to understand why any form of breed-specific legislation would be an unequivocally bad idea:<https://www.nationalcanineresearchcouncil.com/public-policy/breed-specific-legislation-faq>
- Please do not put in a breed specific bylaw. Not all pitbull looking dogs are a nuisance dog and should not be treated that way based solely on their appearance.
- No breed specific legislation whatsoever. Unless you want to consider humans as nuisance animals too. The other day, we drove past a roadside zoo with three lions in an area not much larger than our livingroom. There are bans against pit bulls but go ahead and get as many lions as you want!
- I do not support any legislation that targets only one breed of dog or dogs having the appearance of (i.e. "pitbulls") Please focus on measure proven to keep us safe from ALL dogs (incentives to register, spay & neuter, and dog bite prevention education for children)
- All breeds should be included in this
- Dogs must be certified before going to a off leash park and the owners and dog must go through a check/certification to make sure the owners will be good owner for the dogs.



- Make the same rules apply to all dogs... have had more issues with other breeds than the above breeds
- Firstly the owners should be pre screened to own a breed of this kind - muzzling them is not the way to do it. There are MANY well behaved looked after Pitbulls. Punish the ones who commit the offences AFTER not the ones who haven't done anything
- No dog should be declared a nuisance. Owners have the responsibility to take classes and training to make sure their animal is well behaved and handled
- I think you are unfairly targeting certain dog breeds. Although I would not personally own a pit bull I would not want to punish others who are responsible owners or those whose dogs have been well behaved.
- I do not believe in any breed discrimination & do not support any revisions to laws that would include such discrimination
- Breed discrimination is ridiculous. Deal with problem dogs and problem owners appropriately.
- I do not see any owner education here. Things like exercise and stimulation needs of a high energy or intelligent dog as well as body language interpretation and what good dog manners look like is key.
- Ban owners of dogs that have been involved in biting incidents or worse with any breed of dog. The dogs behaviour is only as good as the owners training of the dog no matter the breed.
- There should be much higher fines for off-leash dogs. A dog that is not on a leash is not being controlled. If someone wants to approach a dog that is on a leash, that is their choice to make.
- Higher fines for all dogs involved in bylaw offences.
- No changes to current bylaws
- The breed of the dog is not the issue - there are many pit bulls and other large breed dogs that are loveable and well tempered. Not all large breed dogs are aggressive or bad mannered. It is wrong to lump all dogs from a certain breed, and to punish those that are not the problem. This would be no different than categorizing people based on their size, colour, or birth place. Just because a man is large and "looks" dangerous it doesn't make him any more dangerous than a small woman with an agenda.
- I believe obedience training should especially be required for pit bulls because generally the type of people who own these dogs are NOT responsible or considerate pet owners. The owner needs to understand breed characteristics and is usually the one that requires the training, not necessarily the dog.
- Provide support for dog owners by offering low cost training and individual sessions with licensed trainers and behavioural experts. This idea that isolating dogs away from socialization is going to improve behaviour is unfounded and counter intuitive. This survey is further stigmatizing pit bull and bully breed ownership. Education on responsible dog ownership and providing free/low cost resources for ALL dog owners is the only way to effectively make public spaces safer for dogs and people.
- Special license and Training for wolf content dogs!



- Its usually not the dogs that are the issue but the idiot owners that should never have been allowed to have any dogs period. There should be mandatory retraining to the owners if they own nuisance dogs. All dog owners should have mandatory training in order to own a dog(s) no matter what breed.
 - There is no objective method of establishing lineage of cross bred dogs or dogs which are not registered with a national kennel club. In addition, many municipalities do not have access to qualified persons that could accurately perform breed identification. • Dangerous dogs may exist in every breed and breed cross. • Dangerous temperament and behaviour are products of many factors other than just breed. • This type of ban will result in exclusion of some dangerous dogs, and inclusion of dogs that are not dangerous. • The incidence of dog bites has not been shown to be reduced by restricting the ownership of certain dog breeds
- I do NOT support breed specific legislation Define what is “dangerous behaviour”. (Lunging, pulling, jumping, bite, growl) Define what nuisance would require additional insurance (barking? running at large? Licensing?) Contradictory statement. Dogs running at large are not allowed to go to the dog park?
- Owners of nuisance dogs should be checked like mental checks if they are qualified to own any animals. It's not a pet that is a problem but the owner who is not accountable. There might be requirement to request special training for certain breeds to keep owners accountable and educated.
- No breed specific bylaws. Responsible dog ownership education for all new dog owners. Free basic dog training.
- These are absurd and arbitrary. OWNERS should have to go through training on how to properly care for any and all dogs. It is not a dogs fault it is the owners.
- [removed]
- Dont know why you pick ...I've been bitten by small dogs and border collies and rescue dogs ..never by a pit bull ..focus s/b on nuisance dogs with bad behaviour and ignorant owners
- STOP discrimination against dogs because of their breeds!!!! I've had way worse experiences with aggressive small dogs.
- Depending on the charges that result in a dog being determined a nuisance, I would support the aspects I have checked above. However, if a dog is a nuisance due to noise, I would not support them being prohibited from off leash parks, being muzzled, or the homeowner requiring extra insurance.
- this is too general. You could turn around and declare that pit bull types are a nuisance breed.
- All these suggestions would be great and a gep forward towards sensible solutions. However in regards to the pitbull breed I feel there will still be accidents that could slip through the cracks and happen. And I feel pit bulls should be banned enitirely.
- Screening of pet owners. If trained properly, regardless of breed, a dog will not bite.
- Breed specific targeting is awful! Irresponsible pet owners are the problem, not the breed. Owners of any aggressive dogs, including smaller breeds which are far more aggressive, should be punished!!
- irresponsible breeders of all dogs, but particularly stronger breeds should be fined and closed down.



- Every incident should be looked at on a case by case basis. This is racism and is Disgusting, Appalling and shameful! Council should be ashamed, look at the day and age you are in! The real problem is poor dog owners and training, not specific breed! You have in your wording of your statements above made this the exact same discussion as, [removed] This is not the Calgary that I would like to live in. SHAME ON YOU ALL!!!
- I do not support anything that appears to be heading toward breed specific legislation. Free/very low cost obedience training should be available for ALL breeds.
- Target problem dogs, dogs who have offended. NOT a blanket breed target!
- Owners should be trained. If you have a repeat offender then owners should have to take mandatory training or be faced with a ban on owning a pet. Also, 'nuisance' status should be revoked if the dog receives training.
- Introducing BSL will have a negative effect. Not being able to properly exercise your dogs will create boredom which will create negative behaviour. Placing a muzzle on a dog is unsafe to the dog when worn for more than 20 minutes. Muzzles also have been known to create anxiety and destructive behaviour in dogs. BSL is not the answer here. You have stated above that pitbulls are not involved in more bite incidents, then why are they being singled out? Because of the potential? Makes no sense. Do we ban people of other races due to the statistics that they are more likely to act violently? No we do not. Calgary has been the leader for our current bylaw so why change now? Education for officers and owners is what is needed. Stricter fines for those animals that do bite more emphasis on the owner to have a well behaved animal cats included. At large cats are more of a nuisance than pitbulls. They kill songbirds destroy property with urine and poop. Yet nothing is done to owners who do not contain them. I do not support a city that wants to introduce BSL lets not move backwards lets move forward with education.
- Focus on the bad owners the backyard breeders the rescues that only care about flipping dogs. Focus on higher fines for any animal that bites no matter size or breed. Focus on education. Singling out one specific breed will not work it creates fear. NO TO BSL
- Pitbulls should not be discriminated more than other dog breed
- When asking for specific answers please broaden what is deemed a nuisance animal, two options and an examples and etc do not provide insight into what I would be agreeing to.
- I don't think breed is an issue, I think it's the human and the training. You can't blame an animal for how it was raised, that's on the human. A nuisance dog shouldn't be declared as those at large - stuff happens. To me a nuisance is when they act threatening towards our her dogs or humans. That's when actions need to be taken. Not for barking or getting out of the yard.
- None of the above
- Mandatory competence and pet 101 course required for ownership. (licence)
- There should be a fair way of determining if a dog is a nuisance. Dog owners should have the ability to appeal said decision. If a dog is declared a nuisance, the dog owner should have the ability to redeem the dog through training. Dogs declared a nuisance should only be banned from off-leash parks if their owner refuses to take steps to properly train said dog. Fines to dog owners are more



appropriate then punishing the dog with things like muzzles. Some dog owners may lose the right to own a Pitbull if it is shown that they fail to prevent the dog from becoming a nuisance.

- City wide banning of pit bulls and other aggressive breeds.
- Cannot be more than one nuisance dog per household
- Training classes should be a requirement for anyone who owns a dog. This applies for ALL BREEDS. Vast majority of dog bites, aggression is due to the HUMAN'S lack of responsibility.
- Please go back to the basics and be consistent in the delivery of the existing programs and by laws that have made Calgary a world leader in animal services and responsible ownership.
- Owners should have animals taken from them if the animal is a repeat offender.
- Dogs should be put down immediately and the owner fined at least \$1000 if they bite someone.
- Requiring pitfall and nuisance dog owners to undertake an acceptable level of training, with meaningful sanctions for failure to take the training. Generally, except on rare occasions, problems with pitfalls and nuisance dogs result from an owner not knowing how to handle the dog or owners deliberately trying to engender aggressive traits in their dog.
- If the dog is a nuisance then more precaution is needed, it should not matter the breed, many dogs are dangerous other than pitbulls, to think otherwise would be caused from having a lack of intelligence.
- Pit bulls are not the problem and should never be separated as dangerous any more than the jack Russel who bit my daughter. Owners should have mandatory dog training and be re done every 5years of ownership from a city of Calgary approved trainer. Shorter re training for dogs that are deemed 'problematic' (like a probation officer). Owners are.
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household regardless of breed
- Perhaps "nuisance" or "dangerous" dogs could be required to wear a dog tag (from the city) that is a bright colour, as a way to let people know when a nuisance/dangerous dog is in the area.
- The actions/behaviors of a dog must be what determines if it is a nuisance or dangerous, not its breed, size, age, or appearance, otherwise, that is straight up discrimination, presuming guilt by association, fear based, and unjust. Poor dog behavior is a reflection of the humans who have failed them- whether the breeder/rescue that inappropriately matched the dog to the family or the owner who didn't take the steps to meet the dog's needs and keep it safe. Education is a big piece as is accountability. Responsible pet owners do not set their dogs up to fail.
- Need more advertising re: reminding owners to ONLY let pets OFF leash in their yards or off leash parks not on public sidewalks etc.
- All bylaws involving pit bulls are ignorance and lack education on breeds and species. If anything their should be mandatory background check on people who are buying/ adopting dogs. No bad dogs just bad dog owners.
- I think bad owners should be punished, I find it disgusting that the city is considering discriminating against a breed.
- All dogs can attack and bite. Owners should be fined and potential have ANY dog removed from them if it attacks or bites another person or dog. I know of a pit bull that was the most gentle dog and obedient dog I have ever seen until he lost his battle with cancer. I also know of a Chihuahua that



has bitten kids and adults in the face causing damage, multiple attacks to peoples legs or hands for just being near the dog. But only one of these dogs is listed as dangerous

- no breed specific legislation should be allowed. Pitbull cannot do any more damage then a lab or german shepperd. Those are myths. Laws should be focused on the problem owners not on breeds
- I strongly disagree with Breed specific language, this bylaw improvement should read any dog who has bitten, harmed another animal or person should be subjected to...
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work, stop beating up on bully breeds
- DO NOT TARGET PIT BULLS
- Higher fines for owners who do not pick up after their dogs, including on their own property.
- Mandatory obedience training for ALL dogs, upon completion of obedience training a dog is no longer declared as a nuisance.
- Obedience training is good, but not the thing to prevent aggressive behaviour in canines. See comment regarding the CKKC test Canine Good Neighbour Test.
- Distinguish between dangerous dog and nuisance, address separately. Have users register for offleash access. Maybe a 2 part license?
- Dogs are not the problem, dog owners are. There should be greater fines on the owners.
- Should be put in place for all breeds regardless off size. Also situation must be taken into account. What triggered the attack, were there outside factors like animal being harassed or provoked.
- Either treat all dogs like this or dogs dog, go after huskues as they're much more likely to kill other dogs; stop picking on breeds that you don't like
- This section bothers me. I do not like that pit bulls are listed. I have never been bitten by a pit bull but have by many small breed dogs. It is the owners responsibility to properly train and handle their animal, whatever the breed. It is also the owners responsibility to ensure that if their dog is on the 'not so friendly' side to ensure that precautions are taken no matter the breed.
- The City of Calgary should stop perpetuating the myth that pit bulls are more dangerous than other types of dogs.
- BSL is been proven non-effective , and doesn't reduce dog bites. Every dog owner is responsible for their dog's behaviour and their training. Regardless of the breed , every dog owner should be aware of how to prevent any incidents. BSL is bringing fear , misconceptions, discrimination and Hatred ! Let's live in a world without prejudices
- The bylaw should not be imposed by breed but by the dogs history. There are many dangerous non-bully breeds out there whose owners should be held responsible for their dogs actions.
- I feel that its very unfortunate that Pit Bulls have been given a bad reputation. Like people every dog is different and I don't believe there is such a thing as a bad breed. There are however people who mistreat dog which can lead to bad dog behavior. Any breed of dog can potentially be dangerous and the owner of these dogs should be punished and banned from owning a dog. All dogs every should be required to take obedience training.
- NO BSL in Calgary! This has proven to be ineffective in change to dog bite, or nusiance dogs.
- If an owner cannot train their animal to be obedient, that it is the owners issue and should be dealt with accordingly. Dogs are not born evil, stop creating bylaws and stigmatizing them.



- Punish the owner of a dog as they only act as they are taught
- Training for owners on how to train and maintain dogs declared nuisance.
- Under the pit bull definition, do not agree with item “e” where physical appearance is grounds for restrictions. All dogs regardless of breed with aggressive behaviour should be treated equally.
- All dogs should undergo at least one obedience training to be licensed.
- I DO NOT SUPPORT BSL ALL DOGS ARE EQUAL. Focus on education and stricter fines on a case by case basis. All dogs can become aggressive if in the wrong environment singling out a specific breed is not the answer. Focus on backyard breeders, rescues not caring for the animals and using their business to flip dogs. More programs for education.
- To single out a specific breed of dog is absolutely despicable on the part of the city. A dog regardless of its breed is purely a product of its environment, if not cared for or trained properly, ANY dog can become a "nuisance". Have more in depth bylaws for pet ownership and filter out people who should not be dog owners in the first place.
- MANDATORY obedience dog training. FOR ALL dogs. Why isn't this on here?
- Tighter controls on who is allowed to own them!
- Ban pitbulls in the city limits.
- City develops programs with certified behavioural specialists to support owners of nuisance dogs.
- Mediation and education. I find that these suggested measures are very biased towards pit bulls and very suggestive for folks to opt for one of them, since they're soooo many involving them to choose from and next to few other chooses to explore and ponder. Brutal.
- None of the above
- [removed]
- “Pit bull” ban. These dogs are raised to be vicious. People generally don't get these dogs for their friendly qualities, they want them for their aggressiveness. This cannot be encouraged. These dogs are like assault rifles: they serve one purpose that is unacceptable for the general public to have to experience: violent attacks.
- Stop attacking pitbulls, target the owners of nuisance animals
- STOP BREED SPECIFIC FEAR MONGERING...
- Pit bulls are not the problem. ANY untrained dog is the problem.
- Breed specific legislation is not the way to go. All dogs should have the same rules.
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. Problems should be dealt with on a case by case basis looking at severity, context and circumstance. If owner is willing to be responsible than they should generally be allowed to redeem themselves and the pet through training and rehab.
- Would potentially support more measures if the threshold for “nuisance” was higher or if correlation from nuisance to danger was clearer
- Breed specific legislation is ridiculous. Dangerous dogs should be treated as such, regardless of breed.
- Pitbulls should be banned. I've seen too many attacks. It's nothing personal, it's statistics. These dogs are too aggressive.
- Training on how to safely separate fighting dogs.



- I would prefer a ban on pit bull or similar breeds. I like dogs, my best friend in life was a dog, but pit bulls have no place in modern society.
- obedience training for dogs considered aggressive or a nuisance upon a repeated offence, particularly if a dog or owner had already received a fine and that animal is involved in a second incident then obedience training should be mandatory after a first or second offence.
- Dog owners that choose to own aggressive pit bull type breeds must complete at least two dog obedience classes for each pit bull type dog they purchase.
- Training should be standard to have any dog licensed.
- To have owners decide if their dog should go through a obedience training to prevent them from biting people, and at the same time not being discriminatory to a certain breed of dog. Giving them a choice and not being discriminatory.
- Nuisance dogs should be on leash on off leash parks and muzzled if necessary.
- None of the above
- I hope the nuisance dog designation does not target pitbulls but other breeds, including small dogs, as well. Also maybe educate people who frequent dog parks for walks but do not own a dog as to how to approach or avoid dogs.
- Pitbulls are some of the gentlest of dog breeds. It's always the owners fault(of lack of presence) they are aggressive
- Making it illegal to have a pit bull in Calgary.
- Training for OWNERS on dog obedience, training, and recognizing behaviour. Owners need to be held accountable. Owners need to be responsible for training and manner in ANY DOG BREED
- Obedience training required for all nuisance dogs.
- **BAN ALL PITBULLS FROM ALBERTA (NO EXCEPTIONS)**
- Obedience training for all dogs
- I do not think there is evidence to discriminate against pit bulls. Please stop promoting this. It would be more helpful to focus on "nuisance" dogs and more importantly on the "nuisance" owner as this will engage the group that need special help. Can you show us the evidence that Pit bulls are responsible for the majority of bites and why there should be a specific category for the dogs? Please try and stick to the science and facts rather than jumping on the populist bandwagon.
- Behavior training for owners of dogs that are displaying behavior problems. These problems almost always stem from owners awareness or how an owner treats their pet. Pit bulls are not the problem. All breeds of dogs uninformed and poorly skilled owners will display Behavior problems.
- There should be absolutely no breed specific legislation. Owners should be held accountable on a case by case basis regardless of breed or size of the dog.
- If there is an incident, owner and dog should have to do and prove obedience training. You cannot single out one breed, that's disgusting
- Train owners,
- Breed specific legislation is highly discriminatory and wrongly punishes a breed for the poor training choices of its owner. Small dogs are often far more aggressive and willing to bite. Severe fines are fair, not a breed-discrimination bylaw. This only leads to homeless pets that may have otherwise



done great in the community. Punish based on incidents, not breed. No dog "breedism" is acceptable in a modern bylaw. Don't punish innocent dogs and owner.

- I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS BSL AT ALL. Stray cats and cats allowed to roam on other people's property is more of a nuisance than a specific breed of dog. All pets should be spayed and neutered unless you are a registered breeder. Education is key for all owners this is not a breed issue this is a people issue. Properly trained and exercised animals can be very well behaved. Banning one breed will not solve aggressive dogs. Proper education will
- rescue dogs undergo obedience training
- BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION DOES NOT WORK!!!
- Fines and obedience training should be the same for ALL dogs. No breed should be discriminated against. As a dog trainer I've seen more Labrador Retrievers biting people than pit bulls.
- Escalating fines for repeat offenders (including leash offenses)
- The dog breed does not correlate to its behaviour. Focus on handling nuisance dogs rather than blindly targeting a specific breed. Targeting dogs of a certain breed is unacceptable.
- I don't agree with any of the above. Sounds like the city has made up their mind about bully breeds being "nuisance" I won't accept your preconceived notions. Check your facts, there is no science proving a bully breed has a stronger bite than any other dog breeds. Punish the owners of dogs that allow them to exhibit aggressive behaviour towards other dogs and mitigate through training and socializing with other dogs in a controlled environment. If that doesn't work make the owner surrender the dog to a shelter and help find a better owner.
- Actions should be based on dog behaviour, not breed. To base limitations and penalties simply on breed is discriminatory. All of the dog bites and nuisance dogs I know are not pit bulls.
- Owners of repeat nuisance/problem dogs any breed must complete training programs or forfeit animal ownership for 2 or more years
- A ban like Ontario
- Although "pitbull" type dogs are perceived to be the worst, any large dog (husky, doberman, etc.) can be extremely dangerous. Furthermore, small dogs are often not trained and provoke dog-dog attacks. There should be a mandatory basic training requirement for all dogs.
- You [Removed] at enforcing current bylaws so the only thing you should change is increase bylaw officers
- I don't think it should be breed specific. A dangerous dog is dangerous no matter the breed
- Leave pitbulls alone and do some research on them instead of listening to people's bias
- Stop being inhumane to pit bulls. I have no pets and kids however even I understand that there pit bulls should not be discriminated against. Even the United States in all their failures don't have these bylaws I am ashamed that Calgary is choosing to side on the wrong side of history against man's best friend.
- A vicious dog is a vicious dog, regardless of size. Granted, the damage caused is worse but any dog that bites should be required to have training. Also, the 'pit bull' breed doesn't have the strongest bite force.



- Just a reminder that if you specifically say "nuisance dogs," it covers all breeds, and any dog with a history of aggression would be included. Also, as someone with a B.S. in Animal Sciences from the University of Illinois, I can tell you that pitbulls have less biting power and damage potential than German Shepherd Dogs, Huskies, wolfhound, and other breeds with an elongated snout (like a wolf's mouth).
- There should be no breed specific legislation. Let's instead focus on animal abuse, neglect and dog fighting. Hold owners responsible, not the dog.
- Literally none of these, dont discriminate againt pits
- All of these options are illogical. To help prevent issues, how about providing education and training to new dog owners, afterall a dogs mannerisms reflect the training it is received from its owner. There is no good or bad dog, just how much love, care and training it has received. And certainly, issuing penalties based on breed is just ridiculous. It's 2020. Wake up.
- NO TO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION!!! The german shepard has the highest bite strength. This is biased and had been proven not to lower dangerous dog encounters, and moreover victimizes the dog and their loving families for no reason other than how they look.
- please stop targeting "pit bulls," breed specific legislation is outdated & cruel.
- Breed of the dog should not be a factor to declare it a nuisance or dangerous
- The owner should be trained in handling if dogs a nuisance. Not the dog!! Nor a specific breed I have seen worse out of chihuahua's!!!
- Nothing because pitbulls are just dogs. More bylaws for shitty owners.
- I ABSOLUTELY DO NOT support BSL, restrictions or increased expectations for pit bull owners. I might support restrictions or increased expectations for dogs with multiple offences where there is a higher potential for dangerous behaviour - it would depend on the situation and should be considered case by case.
- I think that the criteria of what 'nuisance' fully entails needs to be much more specific, with many examples. My concern would be that the variance between those in charge of declaring a dog a 'nuisance' would be too large with the current vagueness of criteria.
- If a dog bites the owner should be held liable. Focusing on pitbull's is very narrow minded. I own a pitbull cross rescue. He has never displayed aggressive behavior toward any animal or person ever. He loves to play with other dogs run around in the dog park chasing his ball etc. However he has been bitten by a border collie because my dog was running in the dog park. Where are border collies on your list. This is such a mindless, cruel stereotype of beautiful animals. I'm a Jr. High teacher in Calgary. I would move from this city before I would ever allow my dog to be muzzled or on a leash in a dog park. Airdrie and Cochrane would be my first choice. Less taxes no inhumane treatment of animals. Who would put a muzzle on a dog in the summer when the only way for them to cool off is through their mouths? Wow.
- I think it's absolutely horrible the way you're singling out pit bulls as a violent breed. Shame on you.
- Breed specific legislation is a waste of your time, efforts, and tax dollars.
- Absolutely stay away from breed-specific legislation. Owner education and responsibility will be more effective than any fear-based laws.



- Owners are the problem and folks with nuance dogs need to have support to either rehome their animals and lead a dog free life, or both train their animal and themselves. as such I'd rather see owners get proper training.
- Do not ban pit bulls and other bully breeds, ban BAD OWNERS. NO SUCH THING AS BAD DOGS.
- Re-educate yourselves. Bad owners make bad dogs, singling out a breed with no real stats is not ethical in the slightest. There was a golden retriever that attacked a small dog at sue Higgins last week, are we going to start muzzling all of them? I can't believe you aren't trying to do more for other real issues in this city, specifically domestic violence. Pull your heads out of you [removed] and start doing something worth while.
- My dog was attacked by a chihuahua at a vet!!! Nothing happened and she still has the scar!! It attacked her face! A chihuahua attacked a 65 pound husky and by-laws did nothing!!! Ban those
- Have a bylaw, mandatory for all rescue dogs and owners , comply with certified obedience training course . INCLUDE with all adopted dogs fees obedience training course. Competed. INCLUDE incentives with discounts for merchandise at the animal shelters.
- Harsher punishments for all dog owners who do not take the time to properly train any dog, you can not make this for just a pitbull type dog, that is wrong and unfair!
- High fines for dogs off leash in on leash or bike areas.
- Bylaws should target irresponsible dog owners not specific breeds. It's not the dogs, it's their people...
- I support a ban on pit bulls. I have witnessed a pit bull attack another dog and was shocked to see that 3 large men could not get the pit bull under control. An unleashed pit bull came up to my kids' faces during fireworks and all the owner said was, "Don't worry, he's friendly." I've known two women attacked a total of three times by their own pit bulls.
- Definitely need more by law officers to enforce all pet related matters. Off-leash happens outside of off-leash parks
- Absolutely do not support breed racism, but even more that you define the breed as "any appearance of" ..that is ridiculous!!
- I would like to see large dogs in better control at dog parks. I have a smaller dog and larger dogs have tried to bite her while the owner was on the phone and couldn't care less. It looked to be a teenage pitbull. I think dogs that haven't had obedience training yet (and their owners regardless of whether it's a bit bull or confirmed nuisance dog or not), should not be allowed off leash at off leash parks for the safety of other smaller dogs. I don't care so much about getting bit it attacked (because I'm big enough and strong enough to fend off most dogs), but I do care if my dog gets killed. I'm too scared to take her to off leash parks now and cannot make the most of a faculty that I should have equal rights to because I fear my dog's safety. This had also happened on other instances with non-bull dogs. One was a German Shepard and I'm not sure what the others were.
- Limit the number of dogs to a household to three.
- Criminal background check on individuals looking to adopt a pitbull
- none of these unless your enforcing them upon all calgary dog owner nonbreed specific



- Dogs who are aggressive shouldn't be in off leash parks. Cheaper classes should be available for ANY BREED to help them with whatever they have been through. Dog aren't aggressive for no reason. And background checks for these animals before buying so we know those dogs aren't being abused.
- Owners who are found to cultivate nuisance behavior in any dog breeds fined and their dogs seized for activity related to dog-fighting etc.
- Obedience training should be a standard for all dog owners as well as funding programs for such programs.
- Most of these are ridiculous suggestions that are not based in science. Your own survey states pitbull dogs don't have a higher rate of bites. BSL perpetuates fear mongering of animals instead of addressing the issue of bad ownership.
- Rescue dogs must undergo a safety certification.
- I only support the above IF the insurance is on a scale based on income. And would also question what happens if the owner is not able to pay? Does the dog get taken to the pound? Do we not think perhaps this will worsen the dogs behaviour or otherwise have an impact on it?
- No breed specific laws
- All dog owners should be required to complete obedience training with their dogs as a condition of licensing. The city should put funding towards accessible and affordable dog obedience training.
- Responsibility Training Program for Owners of nuisance dogs
- I don't think any of this should single out pitbulls. I feel that these rules should apply to ALL dogs even the small breeds. Every dog owner should be expected to be responsible regardless of breed.
- no BSL this should apply to all dogs regardless of breed or size
- I do not support any form of BSL. I am more scared of being bit by a Chihuahua. My dogs have been teased by the neighborhood kids so now bark every time someone walks by, but would be potentially restricted from attending an off leash area?
- Targeting pit bulls is absolutely insane to me. Don't make an entire breed suffer over [removed] ownership. Instead just treat all dogs the same and if nuisance behaviour ensues then deal with it the way you would any other dog. I'm disgusted that my own city would target an entire breed.
- Pit bulls should be banned completely as they are in many other places. They can and do KILL people and pets on a regular basis. They kill 66 dogs PER DAY in the U.S. and one person every two weeks! In 2015 they KILLED 24,000 dogs and 13,000 cats. Their jaws cannot be pried open. There are groups across Canada and the U.S. made up of people who have been attacked by Pit Bulls or have had loved ones killed by Pit Bulls. One Pit Bull can cause terrible grief for victims. Six Chihuahuas can hurt no one, so the TYPE of dog is much more important than the number! No one should be allowed to have an animal that is a dangerous weapon.
- Instead of targeting pitbull type dogs, enforce proper training FOR ALL adopted dogs regardless of breed. I am more scared of a chihuahua biting me than a pitbull, but if a chihuahua bites nothing happens and a pitbull would be put down. This is not okay.
- Obedience training required for all dogs. Small dogs can be instigators which can cause another dog to react and get blamed for the incident. Bad behavior is dangerous in any size or breed of dog.



- Stop mixing the word pit bull with nuisance dog. They are not the offenders. Bad owners should be held responsible but do not condemn a breed.
- I do not support breed discrimination. Please leave pitbulls alone, they are wonderful dogs.
- Better ability to report animal abuse and stiffer penalties for abusers
- Lower license fees for owners of any dog that do initial and ongoing training with their dog (proof req'd). Similar to car insurance: better premiums for responsible drivers w/o offenses.
- Breed specific bylaws are not acceptable.
- I am troubled by this survey singling out specific dogs breeds and feel you are coercing dog owners to villify all pit bull type dogs with this questions wording
- I think everybody should have to take their dog in for training no matter what breed it is because it's the owner who makes the dog vicious or not.
- No opinion
- Focus on the deed not the breed all animals have the ability to bite and the owner needs to be responsible no matter the breed. Focus on stricter fines for those who DO bite no matter the breed. Focus on education regarding safety around all dogs
- I would not support anything that singles out pit bulls. I work with a local rescue and have many pit bulls that are sweet in nature and no different from any other breed. Singling the, out would be grossly unfair to a responsible dog owner.
- All rescue dogs must undergo obedience/aggression assessment by qualified individual.d
- Focus on the root of the problem banning or restricting a specific breed is NOT the answer. By doing this you are not stopping neglecting owners from owning an aggressive. Focus should be on education as well as when an animal bites and it is reported it should be on a case by case basis no matter the size or breed of dog. The owners need to be investigated regarding why the dog bit in the first place.
- I wanted to note that the ambiguity of what a nuisance dog could be doesn't allow me to answer these questions appropriately. A dog who barks in their yard is very different from an aggressive dog in public and cannot be lumped into the same category.
- There should be no breed specific rules
- I don't support any of this, the problem is the human not the dog! My pitbull was attacked by a Herman Shepard he ended up at the vet and the German Shepard without a scratch. Why punish the dog? They are like kids, Is the owner the problem.
- Ban pit bulls. As a breed
- obedience training should be a requirement for any dog, not just certain breeds or nuisance dogs.
- I had a lovely and well-mannered American Bulldog picked up and put into Biter Quarantine at the civic pound once because someone mistook her for a pit bull. Training for those who will enforce these regulations is essential! They must be able to determine dog breed, and be able to interpret dog behaviours correctly, not just make assumptions.
- Higher fines and extra insurance for dogs that have actually done something wrong, not based off of breed or being scared.



- I disagree with any Breed specific bylaws. The bylaws should be about making the human a better trainer, not vilifying innocent pit bulls.
- This stereotyping is absurd and antiquated. The dogs that have been most aggressive towards me are chihuahuas, and they never stop barking unlike larger breeds.
- Nothing. I have 2 pit bulls and they're sweethearts. My kids can lay with them do really anything and they won't even so much as nip, or growl. My husky is more likely to bite someone than my pitbulls. There is nothing wrong with the breed at all. They're just an intimidating looking dog because of their size. By that logic any body builders, trained fighters, or overly muscular people should have to walk around with handcuffs and leg restraints just like a prisoner, I almost never see nor hear about any bully breeds biting or attacking it's almost always other breeds this is by far the most ridiculous law this city has ever tried passing
- The owner is responsible for the dog and should attend good citizen classes on being a proper owner as well as taking the dog to training... the dog is only as good as it's owner
- Train or muzzle the owners, if they can't train or handle ANY dog big or small shouldn't have one. If they are going to have a big dog, they need to have training. And don't let people approach the dog unless it is safe.
- nuisance means a dog involved in multiple "MINOR" offences. The owner of the dog should be fined for the offences and owner and dog should have to attend training if offences continue to happen. We do not need new bylaws. The bylaws that we have just need to be enforced. And exhibiting dangerous behaviour and being dangerous are two very different things.
- All dog owners should engage in training
- All breeds of dogs should have the same rules. My elderly mother's buchon used to attack when you entered the house. The dog is now deceased.
- None of the above
- higher licensing fee for pitbulls to discourage those without resources to properly train and care for them from owning one
- Trainers must have a history of being experienced (minimum 10 Years) and demonstrate the ability to identify and modify the root cause of behaviour and to educate the owner.
- I do not believe in breed banning. Certain breeds are sought after by certain types of people. It is these people that need to be banned from owning any dog.
- What is considered a nuisance dog? might change a few of my answers.
- None of these options are reasonable. Pitbulls are inherently good, a nanny breed. Proper education about handling and better efforts from authorities to stop dog abusers who creat mean dogs. Whom by the way with proper care, love and patience can almost always recover.
- In the case of more than one pit bull or nuisance dog in a household, I would like to see it permitted only in the case of the dogs being rehabilitated.
- Legislation should only feature nuisance dogs, breed specific legislation is misinformed
- I so hearty believe the "pitbull" breed everyone keeps talking about shouldn't be singled out and muzzled just because they have the "potential" to cause more injury. A German Shepards should also be muzzled too since they have a higher tendency to nip



- Programs for dog owners to educate and help. Background checks and investigation on living conditions before dog ownership. Obedience training for dogs over a certain weight limit.
- A bite is a bite. Dog breed should not be a reason to isolate. A biting small dog should be treated the same as a big dog
- Mandatory dog training for all dog owners at time of purchase or adoption training by certified dog trainers.
- No breed specific rules. Focus should be on nuisance dogs which can be any breed.
- Remove “pit bulls” from every statement suggested above. Breed is not a factor in this. I have been bitten twice by two separate Labrador Retrievers in my lifetime, while the dogs you are assuming to be “dangerous” have been nothing but loyal and kind to me.
- I just want to make it clear that there is a difference between nuisance dogs and pit bulls. This makes me so angry that BSL is even on the table.
- I would support additional measure only if a dog is involved in unprovoked attacks. To declare a breed of dog as a nuisance as a generalization is totally wrong. You cannot punish the breed for the actions of a single dog.
- Nuisance offences should be totally separated from "aggression" offences, and treated differently. "Nuisance" issues such as barking / noise are totally subjective, and should not in any way be taken as an indication of aggression or danger.
- I do not believe that any single breed should be singled out. It is the dog owners responsibility for the behaviour of a dog. Any dog can be a nuisance and any dog can be a great pet.
- Muzzle the owner not the dog! Pit bulls are NOT THE PROBLEM
- Discrimination of dog breeds is ignorant. Any breed can attack or be considered a nuisance. The regulations should be applied to the BEHAVIOR of the dog NOT the breed. Consulting a dog training expert should be mandatory when brainstorming by laws concerning dogs. Do better [personal name removed]. Discrimination on dog breeds is Discrimination on a race of a child ... the parents/owners are the ones to blame not the colour/breed. I am disgusted this is even being considered.
- I would be embarrassed if Calgary started any breed specific discipline. It is apparent that these ideas came from ignorant planners and I hope they become educated in the fact that it isn't the breed, but how the dog is trained. I have a Golden Retriever and go to the dog park all the time. The pit bulls are the nicest dogs and are usually very well trained. I am appalled at the idea we would penalize a breed rather than an owner. I feel like the planners should be ashamed of themselves for not looking deeper into this.
- No extra measures, for any reason.
- No breed specific rules! This would be discriminatory! Lots of breeds bite and cause harm usually bad owners! Pitbulls like other dogs are gentle and sweet.
- Pitfalls aren't the problem. Owners are the problem.
- The underlying cause of nuisance dogs is that they have been abused. I would like there to be investigations into whether a dog owner has been abusing their dog, if it bites or attacks. I live pit bulls. Also there could be more restrictions on rescue dogs until it is proven they can properly socialize with other pups.



- criminal trial of negligence for pit bull and other dog bites that causes severe injury or death
- Higher fines for nuisance small dogs that bite, charge and instigate aggression toward larger docile dogs and especially docile pitbulls who DO NOT retaliate.
- Obtain proof you know how to deal with potentially difficult behaviour before being allowed to own and license one
- This shouldnt be breed specific! 9 times out of 10 its the owners fault not the dog! Any dog ANY dog/owner that has a past should be dealt with prehaps all dofs should be muzzled on off leash parks.not one pitty or bully has EVER attacked or given chase to my dogs! Its always been little dogs with big complexes or retriever types!
- All dogs should be under the same rules. A pitbull owned by a responsible owner is not dangerous. The only additional thing that should be considered is perhaps obedience training and proof of such training.
- No to all above suggestions- these are serious infringement s of our rights.
- certain level of training required to go into public areas with a dog. If a dog goes unmanaged, whether able to little or a lot of damage, they should be trained to a certain degree and treated as potentially a weapon of sorts without proper training certification.
- BSL does not work and will not work, the fact that it is stated that it is stated “pit bulls strength allows for a more severe bite” shows that there is an agenda and bias, and it is incredibly untrue when you consider the strength potential and size with say a mastiff or a Rottweiler, or the potential of a German Shepherd to cause extreme damage. Having worked in AC I know the potential for all large breeds and suggesting a BSL is ridiculous.
- Have a higher teir of fines for animals that have been put on the nuisance list. For an animal to be out in the nuisance list I believe the owner should be spoken to more then 3 times on a specific issue. Also basing a nuisance animal on what a dog looks like is awful and basing this theory that they could be more dangerous than any other dog is wrong. How a dog behaves is mostly based on the owners and how the animals are trained.
- None of the above the is breed specific! This is WRONG! Please provide the statistics for the amount of bites from the listed above breeds!
- dogs that bite should be put down and owners fined
- Generalizing certain breeds of dogs and punishing owners with additional insurance fees is unacceptable.
- If you have a high risk dog (doesn't matter the breed) you should have to pay accordingly to ensure other peoples safety and the safety of the dog.
- It would be wonderful if in future surveys you could include the City's definitions on certain terms such as "nuisance". I support obedience training being mandatory for dogs who have demonstrated uncontrolled violent tendencies, and the same goes for prohibition from being in off-leash parks. If and only if the dog, of any breed, has established violence, should those be mandated.
- Put owners of nuisance dogs in training on how to handle and train their dog.
- Unneutered male dogs (of any kind) should not be allowed in off leash parks.



- I would like to challenge why the City of Calgary is stereotyping the "Pit Bull" breed. I have owned dogs my entire life and never have I had a negative encounter with a "Pit Bull" or terrier breed. The dog attacks I have personally experienced have come from vast majority of dog breeds non of of them being "Pit Bulls". The archaic notion that these dogs are "dangerous" has been disproven time and time again. I question the City of Calgary's "experts" proposal. The City of Calgary should not be discriminating against a dog breed as it is a band-aid solution that will provide more problems than results. The City needs to start holding pet owners more accountable for their dogs actions. The problem lies with the owner, not the dog breed.
- ANY BREED OF DOG that bites should be ordered to take training
- Basic obedience training required for all dogs. Discrimination of certain breeds should not be acceptable within City of Calgary bylaws.
- I DO NOT agree with any of those rules!
- No breed specific rules
- No breed specific legislation. RACISM AGAINST A DOG.
- The issue with a nuisance dog, pit bull or otherwise, is the owner not the dog. Anyone considering adopting a large dog breed should be vetted for appropriateness, owner should undergo training on how to properly handle a large dog, and the dog should receive obedience training. If the owner cannot pay for training for themselves and the dog, they should be denied the ability to adopt the dog.
- BSL does not work. Owner education is key and I think that is a better way to combat this.
- A bylaw should not be created to generalize a breed of dog. Any dog breed can be a bite causing harm. Dog bites should be reviewed on a case by case basis. You cannot discriminate against a breed of dog. It's not fair to the owner or the animal. Many people try to fight against this pit bull stereotype to help an animal in need. To make an owner pay more money to rehabilitate or care for these animals is outrageous
- leave the pit bull alone for f***s sakes. The owners are clearly the problem.
- If the definition of a nuisance dog is one that barks too much and is running around, it makes no sense at all to require them to be muzzled. Barking is a natural behaviour and is their way of communicating. If a dog has a problem with barking, it should be the owner's responsibility to become more educated and learn what is wrong with the dog. For instance, dogs left outside on their own all day is absolutely terrible. Those people should be fined!! That is neglect! Too many of these options seem to be punishing a dog for an owner's bad behaviour. That is the same case for pit bulls. As you have stated, they are no more likely to bite than any other breed. Putting restrictions on a particular breed has zero efficacy against dangerous attacks. Again, that comes down to responsible ownership. The only reason I agree with obedience training for nuisance dogs is so that the owner is required to have some sort of training and can learn how to be a more responsible dog guardian.
- Repeat nuisance dogs owners should be investigated to make sure there is no abuse or neglect happening to the animal. If it is proved that there is, the best thing for the animal should be considered including whether the dog should be removed and rehomed.



- This should not be breed specific. The people should be held accountable. These dogs are some of the best family dogs a person could have. If with a irresponsible person any dog can be dangerous. Hold people more accountable and not the breed. Some of the rescue pit bulls are the most loving animals on the planet and show it back every day they didn't want to be abused by humans and made to fight.
- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household. **The option above does not allow this selection without implicating pit bulls. 2 non-nuisance pit bulls SHOULD be permitted in a single household.
- Fines/jail time for dog owners who off leash their dog when they know it is aggressive. They just won't pay fines, and continue to train their dog to be vicious (all dogs, not just pittbulls). If jail time is involved, they would less likely put the public at risk. Also ban future ownership of animals if they are repeat offenders. Dogs aren't bad, they're taught to be.
- I do not support any fines or prejudice against "Pitbulls" and "Pitbull type breeds". As an experienced dog owner I have heard of more other types of breeds who are vicious and attack/bite. It is not right to single out pitbulls or pitbull breeds. instead look at education and training for both owner and dog. More times than not, it's the owner who's to blame rather than the dog.
- None of these because if you actually do research, breed specific laws actually do not help and pitbulls do not have extraordinary bite strength as opposed to other breeds
- What is wrong with you? The only one at fault for any issues regarding any animal is the guardian of the animal, there are many large dogs that have vicious bites and if you do not know that then you should not be making these rules and (or) questions, using pitbull as an example is pathetic, and this is coming from someone who does not own a dog. Any dog can be a nuisance, how dare you use stereotyping as a way to allow others to get away with bad behaviour (because depending on your stereotyping others who are not under the law will probably use it to their advantage.). There should be no specific dog under scrutiny when it is the owners who should be held responsible, [removed] So how dare you try to say that "oh this dog has a visious bite so definitely going to have to mark that down"... You are rediculous and should be ashamed. [removed]
- Having owned multiple "pitbull type" dogs in the past all these bylaws for specific breeds are ridiculous, uneducated assumptions that show a huge lack of research, understanding and education on our cities part. Growing up with animals my entire life I have more scaring and reservation from small dogs and cats then I do any pitbull I've ever owned. Holding terrible irresponsable owners more accountable is one thing, but assuming 1 dog type as a whole is the problem is ridiculous.
- Dog owner should be psych evaluated and they should be properly trained on dog obedience and prove that their dog is obedient to their commands after obedience training.
- anything to prevent people from keeping dog off-leash anywhere that is not on-leash...i am sick and tired of people telling me "my dog is friendly" when i don't want close any dog ...friendly or not I don't want to be touched / sniffed by any dog!



- Targeting specific breeds with any of the above measures has been shown to be ineffective at reducing bites. Better owner education for all dogs would be a better investment than targeting specific breeds.
- Fines to be doubled or tripled when an offence has been repeated.
- Owners of dogs declared nuisance dogs and the dog be required to take obedience class or remedial class, including proper methods for training and correcting bad behaviors.
- Obedience training for all dogs and owners.
- Stop disproportionately demonizing a specific breed and deal more harshly with irresponsible, bad pet owners.
- Fines and law cannot discriminate against a particular dog breed. People with their negligence create dogs.
- that all breeds be treated equally, and for Pit Bulls not to be 'the exception'. I've had a Pit bull / Mastiff cross for 8 1/2 years and she is far better behaved than your average poodle, bichon, daschund, or terrier.
- Behaviour specific fines. Cannot be based on breeds
- Dangerous dogs and poor behaviour is a TRAINING issue and is NOT breed specific!!!! Creating breed specific bylaws is well documented to be ineffective.
- I don't believe that any dog that hasn't committed an offence and been given its proper inquiry and day in court should be punished just because of the type of dog it was born to be.
- People should be screened for owning an animal. How you raise your animal is the problem, not what breed they are. This is discrimination against a breed. Your argument is also invalid. There are canines with a higher bite force than the pitbull. For this breed to be specifically mentioned is ridiculous. Not to mention there are larger breeds than this in general that can cause the same amount of damage.
- immediate seizure of dangerous animals, subject to home evaluation prior to return.
- more stringent control of leashed areas. It has become very common to see owners unleashing their dogs where prohibited.
- I do not support any breed specific measures.
- I do not support any measure which singles out a breed or a collection of breeds. The breed of a dog does not dictate whether it has behaviour problems and numerous studies have shown that breed-specific bylaws and legislation in other municipalities have no bearing on dog behaviour problems. Also City's singling out 'pit bull' in this survey is factually wrong and discriminatory - the bite force (strength) of a 'pit bull' is comparable to (or less than) that of many other breeds, including German Shepherd, Rottweiler and Boxer.
- Suggest better education of proper dog etiquette in public spaces, for adults and children. A campaign encouraging people not to approach unknown animals would be helpful, or the right ways to approach when greeting a dog. For example asking permission from the owner before proceeding. Also, all dog owners, especially inexperienced ones should be encouraged to seek basic training for their dogs. If financially responsible enough for a pet, then also for appropriate training. Large dogs and small dogs can both have behavioural issues. Declaring one type of breed



more dangerous than all the rest seems like doggy racism. At the end of the day more could be done to educate owners and public about safe practices for dog ownership, especially in public or mixed use spaces.

- None of the above. This is ridiculous and breed specific laws have been proven false and unfair in repeated studies
- Pit bulls are not the problem, many other breeds are just as bad but do not get the bad wrap. This happened to other breeds in the past and it's bad owners that make bad dogs and that can be in any breed size or shape
- Owners of nuisance dogs should have the book thrown at them, but owners of innocent pit bulls that have never harmed anyone or exhibited dangerous behaviour should not! These provisions will only make these dogs harder to adopt and lead to more euthanasia of innocent dogs.
- Based on my above answers, my thoughts are "Go after the owner not the dog"
- This should be for dangerous dogs not a certain breed
- Smaller breeds have a much higher frequency of biting. Singling out dogs by breed doesn't help anything
- A case on any dog. No discrimination between what breed the dog is. It's a CASE TO CASE basis. Not a pit bull problem.
- Pit bulls are NOT the problem. PEOPLE are the problem. I know little tiny dogs that BITE, it's the OWNER who NEEDS TRAINING!!! OWNERS of ANY BREED of DOG should have to undergo mandatory training BEFORE owning ANY DOG
- just pointing out specific breeds are not the problem, bad owners make bad dogs. If anything maybe requiring dog training as part of ownership could help. Even if it's just a few videos on tips for keeping dogs better behaved
- Obedience training for ALL dogs, regardless of size or bite strength, those are ridiculous measurements to base rules/bylaws on. A dog that bites is a dog that bites! They should all be treated the same, as picking on one breed creates a stereotype and unnecessary fear of that breed. Owners need to be targeted, not breeds
- Why are you specifically using Pit Bulls? any dog can be aggressive towards humans. I own a pitbull and he has never or bit any human. he is the most loving dog ever.
- If this is going to happen it should apply to all dogs!
- It is time to punish the owner of nuisance dogs, not the dogs. If a dog is deemed to be a nuisance, it would be desirable to rehabilitate the dogs and have them rehomed at the expense of the owner of the dog when it became a nuisance.
- Should go for all dogs if this was people we were talking about this would be considered segregation and inclusiveness. Proven fact that pit bulls or bully breed as they have been term score high on temperament test that dachshunds.
- All dogs should be muzzled(cage muzzle) in off leash parks to reduce potential for injury.
- It is wrong to have any form of breed specific legislation. It is unfair and prejudiced
- No breed specific legislation; there are plenty of non-pitbull type dogs that are nuisances or poorly trained/handled by owners



- Mandatory check and maintain fences and dog pens when a nuisance dog is involved and some way to stop the dog from forcing exit through windows and front door..
- Owner training for large dogs (mandatory for dog license renewal) that discusses socializing the dog, training the dog, aggressive/nervous cues, general behavioural stuff. Have a dog behavioural expert visit the dog's residence to meet the dog and assess it's behaviour to recommend training if required.
- OWNERS need as much training as the animal. It is not enough to send a dog off for training without expecting the owner to receive attitude and behavior training as well. This is part of the expense and responsibility of owning a pet.
- I would prefer if this was not a BSL. All of these questions should stand for all dogs not just pitbulls or bully bread dogs. The fact that this is in your survey is disturbing as you are playing into the media hype about pitbulls. It is discrimination and I do not agree with this at all.
- We should not be pointing fingers at a specific breed. It is the owner who makes and tailors the behaviour of a dog. We should mandate, as a responsible dog owner, that upon purchasing/adopting/gifting a dog the owner should register with the dog in obedience classes and provide proper training to the dog, otherwise, the owner will get fined if the certificate of obedience classes is not registered with the City.
- none. all dogs should require obedience training. breed should not matter. punish bad owners, they're the ones who allow dogs to become violent. punishing people for "nuisance" breeds is just ridiculous. I've been bitten by more Chihuahuas or small badly behaved dogs. never once a nuisance breed
- Training programs for problem OWNERS. Bigger fines for owners with dogs (ANY BREED) who exhibit and have previously exhibited problem behaviours. Banning and bigger fines for "backyard breeders." Giving out proper educational materials on dogs, dog training, dog bites and attacks (i.e. golden retrievers and german shepards have more reported incidents than any other breed, including all "pit bull" breeds combined - why are there no surveys on these types of breeds???)
- Any change you make for pit bulls should then also be applied to large breed dogs such as German Shepards, chow-chow, huskies, etc as their bites are just as strong. Only making a change to pitbulls is breedest and will upset a large portion on the community.
- Online training course on dog safety required prior to licensing dogs. Higher fines for unlicensed dogs
- if a dog REGARDLESS of breed has been declared a "nuisance", it would be nice to have some sort of...collar or vest they could wear to let other dog owners know so they keep their distance. Once said dog has done training and can be declared non nuisance then they won't need to wear anything.
- I think if there is an incident then mandatory obedience training should be implemented, this could provide information and guidance on how to properly manage an animal. This could be provided at a discounted rate and could provide some jobs in today's workforce.
- Possibly have a registry for higher risk dogs so people are being more responsible and can be more accountable for misbehavior



- There cannot be more than one nuisance dog in a household;
- Owners of nuisance dogs prohibited from having more than one dog in the household. Owners of nuisance dogs prohibited from breeding dogs.
- i do not believe in BSL... bad owners need bigger penalties. Animal abusers need banned for life, across municipalities and provinces
- All dogs should be given an adequate amount of exercise daily.
- It is not the breed of the dog that I am concerned about; it is the human who is behind the dog. Any dog breed can be trained to be vicious even a chuawawa can be dangerous; so please take out specific breeds and put DOGS IN GENERAL!
- Stop labelling pit bulls, it is an ownership issue not a breed
- none of the above
- There should not be a specific label on a specific breed of a dog, make owners take training, if owners are caught abusing or training a pet for violence - have a severe penalty and do not allow them to own a pet ever again and monitor this
- Stop BSL period! It is the owner, not the dog. Don't be racist against pitbulls purely on their "bite" or look. There are far worse dogs. This is an archaic step backwards.
- get rid of those Bull breeds. They are all [removed], and I know better than most working in the dog industry. Sad, but it is what it is. Can't train out genetics and prey drive.
- DO NOT ENACT ANYTHING AGAINST A SPECIFIC BREED. WE ARE A MULTICULTURAL COUNTRY. WE DON'T CHANGE LAWS BASED ON A CERTAIN SKIN COLOR OR RACE WE SHOULDNT DO THAT TO DOGS. IT SHOULD BE GOING BY INDIVIDUAL DOGS. EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT AND THIS ISNT FAIR TO PITBULLS. 2ND THE PITBULLS IT STRONGER THING IS A LIE YOU ARE FEEDING LIES TO PUSH YOUR NARRATIVE. YOU ARE USING THE MEDIA TO LIE AS WELL THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE. IF THIS GOES TO VOTE YOU CAN BET JUST LIKE AIRDRIE THAT YOU ARE GOING TO BE SCREWED MYSELF AND OTHER "bully breeds" OWNERS WILL MAKE SURE THIS DOES NOT PASS. BSL IS UNACCEPTABLE
- None of the above.
- All dogs required obedience training
- The dogs are not the problem! People are the problem. If there is a problem, the dog should be removed from the home to a loving caring home. Pit Bulls are one of the kindest and loving dogs out there in the right home. No dog should have to be muzzled at all times when outside walking, and should not be excluded from dog parks! It goes to the same saying as guns don't kill people, people kill people.... the gun is just a tool. German Sheppards, Dobermans, rotwillers all have the same potential to do more damage. Again it is the people and not dogs fault.
- Owners of nuisance dogs require training and strong screening guidelines for owners of pitbulls. I am appalled at the nativity around this Brees. Yes their bite is stronger but I have been attacked by multiple small dogs at off leash and never once has a pitbull come at me. At one point I owned two rescues. I don't feel limiting the number of pitbulls per household will make any difference. People like me (responsible pitbull owners) rescue this Brees to help change their reputation. Those who



aren't responsible aren't going to register them so you'll only be hurting the responsible pitbull owners

- Education I'm dog handling for owners. Nearly all bites are the product of ignorance.
- Any dog that attacks and causes harm to a human or another animal should be put down/destroyed. Too many chances are given to aggressive/nuisance/dangerous dogs.
- I do not believe that a breed of dog should be singled out! And to single them out to the point of looking like a pitbull is condemning a dog that has done nothing but be born! I do believe if the dog has done something to deserve action then it shall be felt with. But why charge the dog and it's owners based on a name of a breed that isn't involved in more bite attacks as you have stated here. I owned a pitbull classification dog back in the late 80s and he lived a full and happy life with many children from infancy. He never once bit anyone or caused anything that would be classed as a nuisance breed other than being the dog he was born to be. We can not impose extra cost and fines on the owners and animal if it is innocent and has done nothing wrong!!
- The owner of a dog should be criminally responsible for the behavior of their animal. I.E. if your dog/pitbull attacks and/or kills another person or animal, you should be charged with an equivalent offence as if it were you who attacked/killed someone.
- Punish the owner. If the dog is a nuisance, then they must attend court ordered training until they pass. Just like for humans who have anger issues.
- not just pitbulls. Any dog can exhibit these behaviors. Fines should be issued for all dogs
- NO TO BSL! IT DOESN'T WORK.
- Pitbulls are not inherently a nuisance. Do not treat them as such. Dogs that have committed an offence may require obedience training
- NOTHING BUT DISGUSTING BREEDISM [personal information removed] IN 35 YEARS THERE HAVE BEEN 45 DEATHS ONLY 5 HAVE BEEN ATTRIBUTED TO PIT TYPE DOGS NUMBER ONE KILLER SLED DOGS - BUT YOU CONTINUE TO DEMONIZE THE VARIOUS BREEDS [removed]

Tribunal

The following comments are responses from participants who selected 'I would support a tribunal as long as it followed this condition'.

- The tribunal would have to be made up of dog owners that were not all small dog owners or at least have a few dog owners on it
- Where are fines for dogs in vehicles?
- They knew what they were doing not dogooders. The dog should stay with the owner under house arrest til situation resolved. Retraining is the first action (ie dog fight victims)
- I would support this if this means that the situation is looked at the dog or the owners. If owners treated or trained their dog a certain way and sometimes it's on the owner not the animal. You don't know how the animal is being treated (beaten, neglected) without more investigation into cases



- It is open minded and hears all responses from people involved and wasn't bias towards dog breeds as this whole new change is to a specific dog breed
- Pitbulls are treated the same as other breeds
- the dog owner(s) need to check in all the time with bylaw until a decision is made. Let's not plug up the Courts...
- Pitbulls were not targeted for unfair and biased reasons
- There should be an appeal process available
- Suggest alternative measures than euthanasia
- The tribunal consists of people within the vet or dog behavioural industry. Not just general people or councillors.
- Yes
- That the 'dog' in question is fairly assessed by a CPDT (certified pet dog trainer) before any euthanasia decision is made
- There is no breed specific laws (I.e. pit bulls deemed more dangerous than other breeds)
- STOP EUTHANIZING ANIMALS FOR THE FAILURE OF HUMANS
- Clear ethical guidelines, systems, and processes layed out for them to follow
- That animal experts are included as representatives such as vets, trainers and behaviorists.
- It's an independent party
- Euthanasia only when serious bodily harm or multiple incidents of biting have occurred.
- Review whether the animal poses a threat or not
- completed during a reasonable amount of time
- I support any measure that is as punitive to the animal as possible. Any support should go to the victim. Why does the animal have more rights again. Out the dog down like they did in the old days and stop wasting tax payers money over this.
- Can not mandate euthanize for the dog. Must go to court for that order.
- What is best and safest for the dog is the guideline
- Dog is assessed by a certified veterinary behaviourist
- There is fair non breed biased decisions
- Tribune must consist of at least a subset of experts (veterinarians, animal behaviourists).
- Maximum process time. ie no more then 3 days to decide outcome.
- Fair and impartial
- Not bias on breed of dog
- So long as all are dog owners. I don't believe someone who's never owned a dog couldn't truly relate to what is best for the dog and owner.
- Instead of euthanization, they are taken to a training facility for rehabilitation
- Take into consideration a dog's past. Some previously abused dogs will be quite and with drawn, some will in a sense, act aggressive to protect what wonderful life they've been given. Also view what things the owner has done to care for the dog and the public. Any dog can be aggressive and go overboard. What was the actual if any contributing factor.



- Euthanasia was not on the table. Rehabilitation is key. You don't put down a child with problems, you help them
- Euthanizing as an absolute final option after rehab has been exhausted completely or placements in appropriate settings, i.e., a sanctuary
- Appeal at lower court (QB requires costly legal counsel). Info to be reviewed must include owner, witness, vet, behaviourist info as provided by owner and bite victim).
- Give owners and dogs a second chance, and require owners to put dog through training after first bite to prevent secondary bite. Obviously this is variable, if bite results in death than a second chance isn't ideal.
- Serious injury should be treated differently
- Professional who does the assessment my bet is an agreed upon person by both parties involved
- Funded through pet licensing fees or by owners of nuisance dogs
- A certified professional dog trainer is a member of the tribunal
- Allows owner to continue housing the dog (must remain on home property)
- If the owner is the cause due to lac of control/training, abuse, or neglect that the animal be surrendered and assessed for rehabilitation then placed with a rescue or Humane Society for re-homing
- The people on the tribunal must be impartial, be capable of looking at the situation as a whole, and have both compassion and logic- just as any judge would when looking at a situation. It is all too easy for tribunals to become wildly biased and unreasonable.
- The tribunal selection process is fair and unbiased
- Problem dogs could be seized for A vet check And held for 48hrs. After that time, pets would be released to owners with strict conditions that It remain on their property (no public ventures) until case is processed and closed. Frequent if not daily checks to ensure compliance.
- Unbiased to breeds. Bully breeds get a bad rep and I feel they get reacted unfairly
- euthanization only as a rare and last resort.
- Animal behaviour considerations / motivations are fairly reviewed in addition to other evidence
- Review the dog and give owner restrictions to keep that dog
- That the owner is penalized and prohibited from owning animals in the future
- Involvement of a veterinary team for assessments
- Opt to keep the dog with the owner on their property unless it is unsafe to do so
- The people sitting on a tribunal can not be associated in any way shape or form with supporting breed specific legislation and should be knowledgeable enough about dogs to make an educated, informed and unbiased decision
- Not prejudice toward specific breeds. It is based off behavior and loud does not count as this is a fear tactic. Many rescues experience this issues but are wonderful dogs and are very kind
- Hhhh
- The tribunal would have to prove that they do not have any existing biases, and prove that they are qualified. They can't just be a "concerned citizen".



- As long as they are fair and hear each side
- The tribunal is made up of people who are educated in dog behavior.
- restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal
- As long as there was appeal or additional action that could be taken
- All those condition seem very fair to me.
- It's fair
- Need concrete documents on how to classify and punish situations. Personal bias (ex. Breed bias) should not be allowed.
- Professional animal behaviourist was part of the tribunal and could fairly and accurately assess the dog (ie outside of high stress environments where an accurate assessment could not take place)
- The tribunal does NOT take breed into consideration it has nothing to do with breed and everything to do with how the dog was raised (ei locked in a kennel for over 5 hours little to no walks/workout and little to no contact with other dogs or humans
- Not breed biased
- Corrective actions should be made. For example if a dog escaped the property must be deemed safe for no escape. Discretionary decisions should be made on individual cases. Animals should stay with the owners.
- As long as the dog is kept safe with the owner. Of course if the dog was also involved in previous problematic behaviour, the dog can be muzzled in public. But absolutely not be put in shelter away from the owner, if the owner especially does not support this.
- The tribunal members are extensively educated in behavioural and environmental factors in dog anatomy, psychology and training. It cannot be individuals who do not understand the complexities of dogs
- The appeal process is explained thoroughly.
- Third party non biased expert
- It remained unbiased and was ACTUALLY appropriately assessed. An incident is rarely the animals fault, owners need to be held more accountable and the animal shouldn't have to suffer for it.
- As long as appeal is available and tribunal are diverse and properly educated in dog behavior/qualified.
- This would be tricky to ensure, but a good idea.
- The panel consists of expert dog trainers as the fault is not the dog but the owner. Owners need to be educated and trained as well as the dog.
- There should be no assessment regarding euthanizing. If a dog is displaying violent behaviour then the owner should be looked at as to their treatment of the animal and if they have put in the work to maintain the animal's behaviour. To euthanize a dog for biting when it has learned aggressive behaviour, or when it feels scared or threatened, would mean cats should also be euthanized for scratching or biting. If you think euthanizing a cat is ridiculous, then so is euthanizing a dog.
- All breeds are included not "pitbull specific
- Significant oversight preventing it from becoming a typical power grab, ensuring fair and objective assessments.



- Euthanasia as a last resort. Not a first
- You must work with the family to help rehabilitate the dog.
- Panel members must be veterinarians or professionals - NO members of the public or non-professional representatives.
- Dog causes bodily harm.
- .
- that the dog be able to remain with its family till a decision is made, it is hard to evaluate a dog in such a stressful environment as a cage in a shelter. And that there is no prejudice to the breed of the dog...
- There would need to be a safety in place to avoid bias. Be that folks who have experience owning difficult dogs, veterinarians, techs, etc. I am hesitant to include more monitoring and regulation that already has preconceived notions that dogs can not be 'rehabilitated'.
- The dog stays with the owner during the time wait
- as long it gets the dog home in a timely manner
- As long as there is a well defined appeal process.
- Breed or breed appearance should be irrelevant
- If it does not cost taxpayers to run it
- Review restrictions.
- Cannot use breed specific wording or ideas
- Pets would be vigorously tested and obedience training completed before any choice to euthanize is even considered. Not just for "nuisance" breeds. Every Breed!
- That the tribunal weighs in the evaluation of an accredited animal behaviourist of the dog and situation(s).
- Unbiased, honest and fair assessments and facts. The situation and history is also a consideration.
- A veterinarian as well as a well educated canine behaviourist would need to be permanent members on the tribunal.
- Severe bites= required behavior assessment, and owner loses their dog. (Unless it's obvious self defense or error and not poor ownership- if dog is deemed to be safely rehabilitated with RESPONSIBLE owner.
- Members had sound knowledge of dogs and dog behaviour.
- As veterinarian or veterinary behaviourist was consulted on each individual case.
- Unbiased breed tribunal - equality for all situations despite any sort of breed. Or size. Consider all pet history, stressors etc
- Don't euthanize the dogs. That should not be an option. Allow the dog to be rehabilitated and trained to become better than what their owners have taught them.
- It should not discriminate against pit bulls, as German shepherds or other breeds can do just as much damage.



- Persons who exhibit non biased behaviour towards breeds. At least one behaviouralist there to review and assess the dog and explain to the individuals what behaviour the dog is exhibiting and how this could or could not be improved/resolved.
- legislation acknowledges that pitbulls do not have a more severe bite compared to dogs of similar size.
- There is no conflict of interest, such as the non city representatives that were victims of the bite and or family/friends being involved as a board representative
- Depending how these representatives are selected
- At least one member was well educated in dog behaviour and had experience as a trainer or behaviouralist
- No dog should be euthanized. No person should have the power to euthanize a dog unless owner allows it.
- They cannot penalize a dog based on breed (large or “dangerous” breeds receiving harsher penalties or treatment than a smaller “non dangerous” breed.
- As long as the dog also has a 3rd party advocate, perhaps from a bully rescue who is considering rehabilitation as an option.
- if it was the dogs fault and randomly attacked. I have warned kids and parents not to just approach a dog leash or off leash without asking the owner or how to safely approach. PEOPLE NEED SKILL AND TEACHING. A dog no matter the breed will give warning signs.
- More info
- The tribunal would have to have current veterinary doctors and professional dog trainers in it. They have the most experience and would be best suited to identify the dogs disposition.
- The owner is on board and understanding with everything
- They abide by humane society standards
- There are credible dog trainers involved in the team. I do not trust half the people we have been putting into political or elevated powers.
- stop euthanasia! This should never be an option
- If the people involved were experienced dog persons
- Tribunal made of members who own higher risk dog types.
- Experienced dog people, non biased, no BSL
- Did not order a dog to be euthanized because of one or two bites
- Possible appeals especially on euthanasia
- I would support the tribunal as long as certain breeds would not be penalized or have harsher repercussions just because of their breeds. I do not think pit bull and bully breeds should be recognized as nuisance breeds just because they could have the “potential” to cause a harsher bite. Treat each case uniquely and get rid of the stigma.
- The decision can be appealed
- All tribunal members are experts in animal care that may appropriately assess the animal and consider root cause analysis for why animal behaved the way it did (trainers, vets)



- A thorough investigation
- External behaviour experts are involved in assessment of dog's behaviour and part of tribunal decision making process.
- Does not increase City costs.
- A veterinarian be on the tribunal panel
- Dog put into foster care while waiting, no euthanization.
- Always look at alternatives to euthanasia
- Those on the tribunal must be dog behavioural experts.
- There is no discrimination against certain breeds. Pit bulls may have stronger bites but you have no evidence to show that Pitbulls bite more. This is a good idea if there is no discrimination
- Must be an independent appeal process
- Rehabilitation, not euthanization.
- those appointed are not just representatives that have a issue with certain breeds of dogs, or those appointed have had other types of dogs and understand more about dogs than most people who oppose these "nuisance" breeds.
- Does not target specific breeds & judges stay open minded.
- Be fair and allow representatives
- A dog expert/trainer must be attended
- Euthanasia should be a last resort consideration after all attempts to rehabilitate the caregivers ability to handle dog in safe manner have been exhausted.
- animal is placed in the best situation, depending on the circumstance. If the owner has repeatedly proven irresponsible then the dog should not be placed back with him/her.
- It sounds like a tribunal would be to expedite the dog being found "guilty". Owners are responsible for their dog's behavior and for managing behavior issues, not the dog. Therefore owners should pay the consequences, not the dog.
- No "vicious dogs" would be euthanized without a third party, non government funded behaviour analyst reviewing and agreeing.
- It was separate from animal in-law services to be fair and unbiased.
- A rep from Calgary SPCA on the tribunal
- that no.breeds are singled out as nuisance breeds because they are that breed of dog. It is the owner many times that is the cause of the behavior. Ive seen just as many small breed jerk dogs that have caused problems as pit bulls and related breeds.
- All dogs are treated equally, a severe bite is a severe bite, regardless of the dog being a chihuahua or a pit bull. It is not fair to blame specific dog breeds.
- Assessment of animal, owner, household and situation by positive reinforcement QUALIFIED with credentials trainer
- Don't focus on the breed, focus on the behavior. BSL is biased and unfair.



- The standard of review by QB is reasonableness or correctness with no requirement of deference to Tribunal. Also fixed terms for tribunal members with at least one veterinarian or dog behavioural specialist sitting on every case.
- A appeal process that does not involve the court system. The courts are busy enough.
- Unbiased opinion on dogs breed! Any dog can do significant damage if it wants to! Not to mention more times than not, the victims dog or they themselves provoked the attacking dog to feel threatened and in need to protect them and their owner & we are often to quick to jump up and take the side of the victim
- Reviewed history of the owner to determine if dog acts the way it does because of the owner.
- That the dog is not judged based on its breed, but rather solely on its behavior.
- Review of the case with both owner and victim present
- People who know dogs and have no bias against certain breeds
- Did not base its decision on breed but severity of incident. Breed MUST be excluded
- Specific reasons that would indicate euthanization as the only option.
- Independent adjudicators with strong knowledge of dog behaviour.
- Veterinarians, Animal Rescue, Bylaw officers and dog trainers were an integral part of the tribunal.
- Not bylaw staff on tribunal.
- That they are not allowed to euthanize dogs, but rehabilitate them in foster care and taken away from their irresponsible owner.
- No dogs get euthanized, it is understood that dogs only bite when not trained or when taunted. At worst the dog should be surrendered to a humane society.
- It takes into account the best interest of the dog. Restrictions don't work and can offer cause more aggression due to frustration. Opposed to restrictions there should be mandatory classes the dog and owner must go through and only if there has been issues.
- Participants provided legal assistance when accessing the tribunal.
- Fairness. A look at all of the evidence.
- As long as Breed Specific Legislation (as used in section 3 above) is NOT used. For example, if a pitbull breed dog bites someone, it doesn't mean the dog is vicious or needs to be euthanized. Instead, first confirm what was going on, how was the dog approached by the individual, what was the individual doing at the time, etc.
- Those involved in determining the restrictions and consequences to the dogs are trained dog behaviourists
- So long as the owner didn't have a record of owning vicious animals.
- They accept character statements of said dog from friends and family members who interact with the animal on a regular basis
- It focuses on the behaviour of the owner and mitigation strategies the owner xouls out in place.
- No members had been involved in an animal incident, to reduce any bias towards a specific breed.
- That not every case is gone to euthanize



- The tribunal workers were not dog breed biased. It being more strict towards pit bulls for the same actions having been done by a pug.
- Non biased representatives were used
- Had a fair representation of dog trainers, actively involved in both regular training classes as well as specialized 'problem dog' training
- As long as this tribunal is fair and not used to discard nuisance dogs that have been poorly treated or trained by their owners.
- Restrictions on a dog always be attempted before a choice to euthanize
- Having a dog taken from its home and owner is traumatizing and therefore should be kept at home with owner. This extra trauma can increase aggression. Instead should be connected with a trainer that specializes in reactive dogs for rehabilitation
- Experts in dog behaviour are involved
- The owner goes for behaviour training on how to manage a dog.
- As long as they are processed in a timely fashion that minimizes the dogs time in isolation.
- It can not assess if a dog is to be euthanized without a court ruling.
- Members of the tribunal are educated professionals involved in, but not limited to, members of the veterinary industry (not necessarily solely a veterinarian) , registered breeders, behavior specialists, bylaw officials, etc
- Euthanasia should be always last resort
- Third party assessments mandatory for dogs. Certified trainers using force free methods.
- Qualified dog trainer that can evaluate behavior.
- Perhaps multiple offenders should go to court?
- I think there should be a further review, with perhaps a referral to the court systems, if the decision is made to euthanize. This is a significant decision and should have various experts involved.
- There is no breed ban.
- Dog behavior expert(s) on tribunal
- If training/rehabilitation doesn't work the first time try again, don't just go for euthanasia off the bat.
- It does not go specifically after pitfalls only
- shouldn't cost tax payers.
- Don't euthanize the dog, deal with the owner
- That they take everything into consideration and do not come into cases with a basis for a specific breed
- If the dog was teased, those people be held accountable.
- The owners of the dogs should have a psychologist to examine their well being. All dogs are nice, it's the owners who raise them that turn dogs vicious.
- Some kind of restriction on appeals. Because otherwise all cases will simply be appealed and there's no time savings
- Animal experts, such as board certified veterinary behaviourists, would be consulted on any case where euthanasia is considered.



- People who are properly educated in dog behaviour be included in the panel. People who have taken highly respected and well known certification programs, are fear free based, not “self taught” or took a weekend course and now hangs out a shingle saying they are qualified. Also should include a Board Certified Veterinary Behaviourist (currently only one “in residence” living in Alberta and is based in Cochrane) but others could be involved virtually perhaps.
- I do not support euthanasia as a first option, I feel that it should be an absolute last resort, and would like to see more steps added to rehabilitate defensive animals. I think it's also important to inform people when they register a new pet on basic obedience training, proper socialization for animals with people, other animals, new situations and new environments.
- I'm not sure how I feel about the tribunal being able to assess euthanasia as an option. This could be a very unbiased opinion by the group and could lead to the destruction of more animals than is necessary.
- The dog gets a behaviour assessment or spends time with a trainer who is not biased towards the case
- The members of the tribunal have a reasonable, fact-based, understanding of dog behavior.
- Not being breed specific i.e. a golden retriever kills someone one and lives. Where as a pitbull protects its property by biting someone and the pitbull has to die
- As long as any extreme rulings such as euthanasia are bumped up to court. This tribunal could be an intermediate step to rule out extreme cases for the sake of the owner and dog.
- Retrain the animals when possible
- Does not discriminate against size of bite. A small dog can cause extreme damage by the infections in their mouth. A bite is a bite no matter how large.
- The breed of the dog is not taken into consideration and an equal determination is given across small and large breeds for equal offenses.
- Rehabilitation program, no euthanizing
- The representative has to be bias free of size and breed.
- No breed specificity was aloud when considering a case
- No dog should be euthanized because of irresponsible owners. [removed]
- Canine behaviouralists would need to be consulted to determine if the animal could be rehabilitated and what conditions would need to be met.
- Tribunal consists of specialist in dog behavior and has the power to make conditions of return of the animal to the owners (eg. Corrective behavior instruction/classes) that can be verification sometime after an animal is released back to the owner
- There is a fair and educated group members involved
- All tribunal members must remain impartial to breed.
- That bully breeds aren't unfairly targeted, and that if a dog is out down, so is it's owner.
- They absolutely had to consult a veterinary behaviourist (veterinarian specialized in behaviour) on every case before making any decisions, especially regarding euthanasia, as someone who is not professionally trained in behaviour and behaviour modification is simply unqualified to make these decisions.



- It's not biased in who is on the tribunal.
- Tribunal members have set terms of duration; Tribunal member CVs/bios are easily publicly assessible
- That a member of a known and trusted organization (Calgary Humane Society) be able to participate and/or evaluate the tribunal on an ongoing basis.
- Dog behaviour expert on the Panel and a fair evaluation by a neutral party
- Representatives declared experts in science based dog training and behaviour are part of the tribunal.
- euthanizing a dog should not be an outcome. Alternatives like fines, mandatory training, banning from public parks, etc. should be options.
- Ok
- The dog is not to fully blame. Owners are responsible for their animal, as well as others should always ask to approach and or pet said dog
- The tribunal needs to include trained, accredited dog behaviourists to help assess.
- Be comprised of educated dog owners and veterinarians.
- A veterinary behaviourist and/or dog trainer was a member of the tribunal
- proper representation for the dogs. Not immediate euthanization as a means of finding a result.
- Provided proof that enough research was done regarding the reason behind the attack/bite
- Na
- Don't agree that the tribunal can rule for euthanasia
- At least 25% of the tribunal be dog behavior/obedience trainers.
- Include behaviour specialists in the decision.
- The representatives are a group that lean towards saving the dogs' lives and are more in favour of requiring training and rehabilitation, with a BALANCED dog trainer experienced with aggressive & reactive dogs.
- That it be done by a board of peers who had no prejudices against specific dog breeds, and that if euthanization is ordered that it be done with the dogs family present and as humanely as possible for the dog and it's family. Preferably in the Dog's own home.
- Considering if it is the dog's first offence and the pattern of their past behaviour
- Owners need to be heard and given a chance to correct the problem
- The tribunal members are not labelling dog breeds but instead only review the actions that have occurred to make a judgement call. Unbiased against race.
- So long as "bully breeds" weren't targeted, and humans were punished if they provoked the attack.
- Consultation with a behavioural trainer is provided before thinking of euthanasia.
- The dog in question is not based on its breed
- I support the tribunal as long as the OWNER is also held accountable for the lack of proper training the dog has been given.
- Can not decide on euthanization
- Actually gives you enough time to properly go through the courts.



- does not discriminate on breed
- The City and non-City representatives be very knowledgeable on dog behaviour (dog trainers etc.).
- The cases must be thoroughly investigated as most dog bites are provoked and no animal should be euthanized due to someone else provoking the dog.
- Owners taking anti aggression classes by a professional or SPCA would be taken in to consideration
- No bias involved, especially when it comes to the breed of dog (BSL)
- Punish the owners NOT the dog, it's the owners responsibility to teach there dog behaviour.
- There is no breed bias, all must be treated equally
- The dog stays with the owner but is required to stay on the owners property. Unless it's an abuse situation or abuse is suspected. If the dog leaves the property then the are seized.
- Wherein the breed of the dog does not play a factor and the decisions are based case by case on the specific dog in question.
- The tribunal is not Breed specific, compassion is shown for each canine involved,
- An unbiased tribunal that will asses all bites fairly and not punish a dog harder based on breed
- Breed is not a determining factor in the dogs outcome.
- Members of the tribunal must be unbiased to any and all breeds, not be former victims of dog bites or attacks and must be impartial overall.
- Provides an advocate on the side of the animal at no cost to the owner.
- Decisions aren't backed by a breed bias
- Unbiased panel of experts make up the tribunal, not the neighbourhood watch.
- Non-city representatives are educated and certified in canine behaviour
- That the people making verdicts are legitimately educated in animal behaviours & not just opinionated.
- Dogs should not be euthanized until the owner and dog have gone through extensive training and rehab. An owner who's dog is determined to need euthanasia, should not be allowed to own another dog until certain training requirements have been met.
- There should be dog behaviorists on the panel as well as an experienced trainer. How will you ensure that a member of the panel simply does not like dogs.
- Representatives should look as cases objectively (without biases based on breeds and sizes) and consult scientific evidence to make the best assessment (whether a dog can be trained and re-habilitated)
- But I do not agree with euthanization.
- If tribunal included at least two professional individuals to support the animal. Eg a vet and a dog trainer
- It is staffed by pet owners.
- As stated
- I'm not sure how I feel.
- A dog trainer/ behaviourist should also be included within these tribunals.



- The dog should remain at its home but be ordered to remain inside and only allowed out on a leash for bathroom breaks
- If the tribunal included animal behaviouralist a
- The tribunal had at least one dog trainer/behavioural expert on the tribunal
- Setting forth an immediate way for dogs to be returned to their owners under strict conditions. Kind of like probation. It's a dog, sometimes dogs bite. Their not people. Their dogs. They can rehabilitate quite quickly. Quicker than the ultimate decision of it being put down. Being with it's owner, who is willing to correct the behaviour while court proceedings are going on or tribunal, would be beneficial for the dog and it's recovery.
- The members selected for the tribunal must have backgrounds in animal health and animal behaviour.
- The dog would be returned to the owner until the final court case is concluded.
- Sufficient time and support are provided to owners to facilitate the appeal process before irreversible conditions, like euthanasia, were carried out.
- Fair understanding of the circumstance leading to the issue. You dont kill pedophiles and rapists right away now do you?
- as long as it is not breed specific
- Where the Person is held 100% accountable and to blame, not the dog.
- Having the correct balance of people sit as members is essential. An expert in dog behaviour would be a must. Much like in child welfare cases, because the dog does not have a voice they should be assigned an advocate to speak on their behalf.
- Fair, impartial and MUST include animal behaviour experts or veterinarian.
- They understand dog language and look at the whole picture, animal and people combined, to see what can be done differently.
- The tribunal consists of dog trainers/behaviourists. "Victims" be fined if it is found that they antagonized the dog (going onto private property without permission, touching the dog without permission, hurting the dog first) and thus caused an attack on themselves. Judgement based on the breed of the dog should be thrown out.
- Tribunals were made up of responsible dog owners who have been through dog training.
- The decision made is equally as enforceable as the decision made in a court.
- Don't pick on pit bulls
- Had a wide representation. Including pit bull type responsible owners and trainers on the board
- Unbiased jury
- As euthanasia is not the immediate end result.
- Those involved in the tribunal have extensive training of dog behavior, And therefore it can actually give informed advice/ruling
- As long as the group is not one sided. Or go with their feelings instead of facts. Or are apart of the fear mongering against one specific breed.
- As long as the individuals are experienced and knowledgeable in the subject matter.



- On the condition it is staffed by pet owners
- you have a panel of dog trainers and dog owners with dangerous dog experience evaluate the dog. I have had many dogs that were/are problematic. Not every expert.. knows every dog trait. Dog personality can be hidden by fear ,environment, smells. Ect. Fait of a dog should not be determined by ONE PERSON
- They cannot euthanize an animal without owner consent.
- Regulated ethics and goals , with steps to be followed to increase dogs staying with their owners unless owner neglects to follow recommendations (education, muzzles etc)
- as long as there are animal behaviorists that will assess the animal and work with to see if it can be rehabilitated- some are just not a good fit with certain owners but could be rehi Ed through shelters and their vetting process
- Give options for required training before dog is put back in custody of the owner
- Only those actually familiar with dog behavior are involved in discussions.
- Tribunal should be more than adequate to review dangerous animal cases
- A well educated (including professionals in the dog behavior industry) and balanced range of perspectives represented on the tribunal.
- Every attempt is made at rehibilitaiton prior to euthanasia. No prejudice e against specific breeds (such as pitbulls, boxers, ect).
- There are “pit bull” owners on the tribunal.
- As long as it isn't biased against certain breeds
- the law
- Fairness to all parties involved.
- No euthanizing the animal. Attempt to rehabilitate it first.
- Consider the circumstances of the attack. Was it provoked or not (ex was a child Left unattended with the dog and was tormenting the dog?)
- As long as you can appeal it.
- Independent review by a behavioral specialist of the owner’s choosing, programs to subsidize costs of the owner is low-income, contextual awareness of the owner’s socioeconomic situation, since the declaration of a dog as a nuisance can cause housing instability for poor people. An awareness of how the verdict will affect the owner is key, especially if they’re renters.
- As long as a sufficient amount of time is given between a decision and appeal.
- Dogs are permitted to receive rehabilitation training prior to considering euthanasia
- More information is needed to appropriately answer the question
- The individuals appointed to the tribunal have experience in animal behaviour (such as trainers, vets, etc) and there is no breed bias.
- Only euthanize if truly needed, this should be the LAST option
- As long as it didn’t assume pit bulls are more aggressive than any other dog.
- The condition to not be biased, a German Shepard could bite someone or another dog just as hard as a Pitbull.



- Tribunal made up of experts in dog behaviour and both parties are appropriately represented and supported.
- Evaluation by qualified dog behaviour professional as to rehab ,etc
- As long as the city engages the proper advice from a vet or other pet authority, and does not take guidance for any employee of the city of Calgary who is not qualified to offer such guidance
- it is a clear ruling and both parties agree on the outcome
- Dog is allowed to stay with owner for first time offence and not be automatically placed in a shelter
- did not discriminate against specific breeds
- Did not allow for breed specific bias (BSL)
- At least one member is a veterinarian and another is a certified animal trainer
- Two sides to every situation
- Dogs don't get euthanized due to bad behaviour caused by bad ownership
- Experienced Veterinary professionals are involved in the process
- Further investigation and obedience training should be required before a euthanization is considered.
- Focussed on rehab and incorporating mandatory training for animals that are at fault in incidents
- Support
- Pit bulls are not a problem, aggressive dogs and bad owners are. I support consequences for aggressive dogs/bad owners but not based only on breed
- being sure that pitbulls arent unfairly punished more than other dog breeds.
- If the offending dog was able to stay strictly with the owner on their property during the case. If the opinion of the general public was taken into account. If all sides were taken into account including anything that provoked an attack.
- All animals are viewed equally. Breed should never be a factor.
- There are veterinary and animal behaviour professionals on the board
- Average members of the community should be involved. This shouldnt be city officials and this should be strictly volunteer based.
- To see if it is the dogs fault or not
- Those on the tribunal are experts in dog behaviour.
- depends
- A chance for the owner to speak on their behalf.
- Dogs history, severity of incident, and most importantly the owners demeanor as the owner is most likely a route cause to why their dog acts out
- Don't be discriminatory to one breed of dog.
- Is fair
- there has to be appropriate trainers on the tribunal, ONLY those who use non violent training methods
- Qualified animal behaviourists are consulted
- The breed of the dog was not used in court.



- Using euthanizing as a last resort.
- release said dog back to owner with rules in place until matter is heard. Trauma of this kind would only make the dog worse.
- should have a behaviorist and vet on the tribunal
- That this would not be used as a quickers means to euthanize the dog.
- Rescues or dog rehab experts were involved with the process.
- As long as the dog is euthanized as a last resort
- Allow said dog the change to be put through proper training to be rehabilitated
- The tribunal committee must be made up 30% members representing Calgary Humane Society or other animal welfare organizations (eg AARCS, Alberta Humane, etc)
- Not discriminate based on the breed of the animal
- Do not bully bully breeds
- Euthanasia decisions have secondary review
- There was an appeal process
- There is a certified professional canine consultant or vet behaviorist as part of this tribunal, making objective recommendations about animal outcomes.
- Dog training experts and behavioural experts be paid and part of the tribunal
- Decisions can be appealed to a higher lev
- Owners are allowed to visit the dog. The dog has daily vet check ups to ensure it is not in distress.
- It takes into considerations the behavioural and welfare history of the dog
- Give the owner an opportunity to train and educate themselves and the dog
- as long as part of this tribunal involves someone who works closely with "dangerous dog breeds" and can provide an educated and experienced opinion.
- That the members come from a non discriminatory background towards breeds (i.e someone that has been bitten before) and it should be case by case and not breed specific
- That all other options of rehabilitation has been exhausted.
- In a timely manner ie 10 business days.
- Both parties victim and owner would have to come to an agreement.
- That there be an agreement by both parties as to the members of the tribunal.
- They are fair and unbiased in overseeing these cases. I do NOT want to see breed bias becoming a factor
- Tribunal made up of animal professionals such as Veterinarians and certified/credentialed trainers
- Dogs cannot be euthanized. Education and canine handling training must be required of the owners in order to reclaim their pets.
- Aslong as the noncity representatibes are volunteers that change at every visit. Make the noncity rep's fraud-resistantt
- Tribunal made up of animal experts
- ggg
- No euthanize, its the owner not the dog



- It's not based on breed BSL prejudice. And facts are taken into account of the bite was provoked; in self defence etc.
- Cases were seen within days of the incident. No point in adding another step that takes forever.
- I would support this as long as this includes members who can be advocates for the animal and for promotion of education and rehabilitation for the animal. This could include staff from animal shelters, or dog trainers.
- euthanize orders should only come from the Court of Queens Bench.
- Dogs should not be euthanized they should be rehired. In most cases of attacks they are provoked by people. Do not punish a dog when it should be person punished
- Non lethal remedies
- No Euthanizing, rather evaluate how the owner keeps their pet and maybe see they are the problem and rehome the pet to someone who is willing to help them correct behaviour. Funny how some people do terrible things and we don't have laws here to put them down why should a pet be any different.
- As long as everything is done fairly
- Term limits
- They are professionals in a field that deals with dogs and have knowledge about dog behavior.
- Whomever the representative is to review the roles mentioned about must be educated in dog behaviour and psychology. Many times the dog is reacting like a dog should and it doesn't justify euthanization. Did a child come along and pull on it's tail or smack it in the face or on top of it's head? Were there clear behavioural warning signs that the dog will bite before actually biting (i.e. tucked in tail, growling, etc.)
- That there is follow up within a certain. Time frame
- No BSL, dog breeds are not prejudiced against, the tribunal is made up of a variety of dog specialists like vets, humane society representatives etc.
- Until the tribunal has made its decision, the dog should remain with its owners, but not allowed off the owners property and always restrained while outdoors.
- as long as city and non-city representatives are objective and have no bias.
- Wasn't against certain breeds. Open minded people.
- That there must be a vet , spca bylaw officer,dog trainer on the tribunal
- Yes
- Euthanizing the dog would require court order.
- Only the court can determine if a dog needs to be put down.
- Making an unbiased decision; not based on pitbull breed.
- The dog is not removed from the owner until the final verdict.
- Tribunal composition would have to be completely unbiased with a background and understanding of dog behaviour.
- there are no biases and there is an understanding that if provoked an animal will bite and thats not the animals fault.



- Have at least three different behaviour assessments done by three different assessors from different areas of the Country. Have 7 impartial tribunal members with at least two being veterinary professionals, 1 dog law savvy lawyer, 2 behaviour assessors who have had no contact with the dog. My worry is that by hurrying the process proper and thorough vetting of members will not be done.
- listened to positive reinforcement dog trainers opinions. did not focus on breed but focus on behaviour and what prompted the behaviour.
- Dogs shouldn't be euthanized for an accident that they usually give notice before proceeding with.. we don't even have the death penalty for humans?
- Consultation with all involved as well as animal advocacy organizations or dog trainers who specialize in aggressive behaviour to determine if the dog can be rehabbed.
- Rehabilitation
- Could dog be fostered with dog trainers
- Fair and unbiased opinions
- No BSL. Singling out "pitbull's" is so uneducated it hurts.
- That an animal behaviour trainer was on the tribunal
- A tribunal makes sense to support the speed of a decision.
- If you go the tribunal route, then do it properly, consult the people or culture who are experts in tribunal methodology. [removed] can ruin the potential of a good program like this resolution method
- If the dog is to be euthanized, it must be a second or third offense where the owner of said dog has been clearly notified that the dog need to be kept under control and the repercussions of another incident. Ie: they must know that if their dog is involved in another incident that the dog will be euthanized.
- Dog bites are most often excluded from most common home insurance liability policies , meaning their claim will be denied because companies do not cover dog bites.
- That there are sides that understand the breeds in full and why the dog attacked not just euthanasia because the dog was provoked and defended itself
- enforceable.
- A reasonable balance of private citizens, responsible rescue representatives, bylaw officers and others involved in humane animal contact
- Non-bias against specific breeds
- No euthanization. Proper training.
- proven impartial and unbiased in terms of breed and personal connections
- If animal educated persons were on this council (vets, dog trainers, animal behaviouralist etc...) were on this tribunal it would be effective and fair.
- An expert experienced dog behaviorist gives input. Not a bylaw officer
- Euthanizing an animal is only used as a last resort. The owners should be heavily fined and perhaps a new home found for the animal.
- Dogs should not be euthanized



- The dog's behaviour was not reasonable in the circumstances
- Properly qualified people in assessing dogs ability to be rehabilitated
- The animal should not be placed in shelter
- I think those on the tribunal have to have education in the subject (either vets, those part of the SPCA etc)
- A mandate to spay/neuter ANY dog which has been declared a nuisance, or who has bitten, or exhibited aggressive behavior.
- it's tribunal is dog professionals and not emotional public
- The animal is not euthanized without the recommendation of a veterinarian, and that there is time for an appeal before euthanasia
- the owner claims responsibility and the animal is on leash at all times, failure to comply implies euthanization
- 3 or more vets from different clinics agree
- I do not think the dog should be separated from the owner. Allow the dog to stay in owners home, but restrict from walks and dog parks.
- Don't buy into public opinion about bad breeds. Complainers are the loudest and most incorrect and notl proof behind their stance
- Euthanasia is only the owners decision as the dog is their property and family member.
- If there is an appeal process in place, a tribunal would be fine. if the tribunal used the existing laws to make judgements they would gain credibility.
- As long as everyone involved is credible and knowledgeable in the aspects involved in the case (example being canine behavior, training, etc)
- No breed discrimination
- Have the animal re-homed to a facility that can handle at risk dogs at the owners expense
- All measure to not destroy dogs is the goal.
- Only in cases for severe bites, no other function.
- I would support this decision if animal behavior specialists are present as representatives
- Each dog is vet and temperament checked
- no dog is euthanized ever and owners are assessed for being fit to own a dog
- Tribunal cannot order euthanization of an animal without in-depth input from animal behaviourists AND proof that animal cannot and will not be kept safely by current owner and cannot be rehomed.
- Both parties to tell their side of the story and gain an understanding as to why the dog may have acted as they did. As well as allow for a third party to interact with the dog to understand its normal behaviour as the incident may have been provoked or a one time incident caused by increased stress or another variable.
- As long as at least 50% of the representatives are or have been certified dog trainers
- Yes they should be given a mandatory training if possible first before deciding to euthanize the animal



- Consider strongly the ownership and home the animal comes from. Most "nuisance" dogs are brought up poorly, it is usually not the animals fault.
- All dogs were reported not just bully breeds
- Decisions appealable to Court of Queens Bench
- The breed of dog mentioned or used as a determining factor
- It needs to be reasonable and not a one person emotionally driven decision.
- The owner of the dog is required to cover all costs for the tribunal. NO taxpayer money!
- If the owner disagrees with the tribunal's decision, they can opt to have the dog apprehended and proceed with regular court hearing.
- Must contain an equal number of dog owners and non-dog owners.
- Has an appeal system in place with review by different panel.
- It has a vet, a dog trainer, and an attack victim.
- The dog is not euthanized unless the owner has had the opportunity to process the case through the courts.
- -
- As long as the representatives are knowledgeable in dog behaviour, dog psychology and behaviour modification.
- A fair and unbiased tribunal
- The dog remains with the owner
- Na
- If it actually sped up the process for the well being of the animal. Otherwise sounds like another city paid position that will cost taxpayers
- Rewards-based behaviourists are members of the tribunal.
- The wait period is no longer than 72 hours. Radio collars on the dog if restrictions are put in place.
- Owners of dogs that were found to be dangerous may not own or live with a dog for a specified period of time, such as 10 years
- They were not more lenient than current processes.
- It was fair
- Done
- that the entire incident is looked at carefully as it isn't usually the animal's fault but usually human fault
- This has to many "ifs" to answer. I do not like the idea of Calgary identifying pit bulls as an issue or putting the spotlight on the breed. It is the owner, not the breed.
- The owner has a fair chance at defending the animal as well as the actions that caused the bite be assessed as well.
- as proper assessment are done by the bylaw enforcement that took the dog and the keepers/vet tech
- As long as the whole scenario is addressed and observed. Animals often pay the price for the human error which is not right. As an animal advocate I would want the whole story to be heard.
- It comes down to the dogs behaviour and not the breed



- People of the public, not appointed by prejudice parties
- Euthanizing an animal for nuisance should be a last step for multiple infractions not as a first step
- The tribunal was made up of individuals knowledgeable in animal behaviour (ie. credentialed, vet, behaviourist, etc) and bylaws
- I think a board of people including vets, shelter workers, dog trainers, and civilians would be effective for this.
- Animal remains with the owner
- Immediate control of the dog and frequent checks that dog is being controlled
- No discrimination/bias against pit bulls and NO euthanasia
- As long as they are professionals in animal behaviours.
- It actually reduced length of stay, the process was completely transparent, the basic elements of court that ensure justice remain the same such as sufficient evidence and presumption of innocence until proven guilty, tribunal demonstrate qualifications and ethics such as in depth knowledge of animal behavior, EVIDENCE-based practice, the communities within Calgary, and demonstrate a commitment to being non-discriminatory towards both people and dogs..
- The people on the tribunal are experienced with handling animals such as a veterinarian and/or a dog trainer that specializes in behavioral issues.
- There is a neutral third party representative to ensure a fair hearing.
- There should be appeal processes and multiple chances to prove that the animal is either improving or manageable
- Any tribunals to deal with these issues must be breed-neutral. This is a sound idea but it cannot and must not discriminate based on breed.
- As long as it does not discriminate based on breed
- The tribunal needs to ensure it follows the history of the dog, living conditions and the situation that caused this to arise ie: previous complaints, children teasing it etc
- They would need undergo sufficient training and certain facts about the situation should be void in the information shared, such as dog breed to eliminate biases. Dobermans, pit bulls, bullies, Rottweilers, etc have a underserved negative reputations. You're more likely to be bit by a chihuahua.
- The tribunal MUST be a neutral party. They cannot be biased against any breed or owner, they must undergo training and educational programs to ensure this.
- "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." This is completely false and who'm ever put forth these certifiably false claims on a government website should be let go. All I can say is, this had better be changed because it's 2020 and bigoted government wont be tolerated.
- There is a qualified professional dog trainer among the decision makers to assess the animal's risk of offending again.
- As long as there is discrimination of breeds is minimal.
- Above



- the owner needs to abide by following the direction of the court. not all cases are the same
- As long as the members of the tribunal displayed that they did not have any bias against any dog due to breed.
- For a first offence. If there's already been an attack criminal proceedings should be followed.
- As long as it's fair and takes everything into account
- If a fair agreement cannot come for both parties it should move to provincial court
- Un biased decisions
- in the event of euthanization decision by tribunal - there must be an appeal process which the owner can elect to default to the courts.
- As long as the tribunal is in full understanding as to what really happened and NOT governed by people who have issues with any specific breed or size of the dog. Way too many times a dog is labeled being vicious when, in fact, the person/animal that was bit was at fault and the dog was only protecting itself.
- Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal
- A dog is a dog regardless of breed. Fair non judgmental rulings.
- Dog stays with owner unless severe aggression issues or past history of bites until tribunal is done. Maybe with the stipulation dog cannot leave the residence until tribunal complete, etc
- The dogs also need to be assessed by a Certified force free dog trainer, as well as the owners (to see if the owners actually know how to work with the dog)
- Give the dog back to it's family or you're going to cause it more mental damage than necessary
- No breed specific provisions
- The panel does NOT have a predisposition about particular dog breeds. It is a case by case instance. You need a fair panel and to interview extensively. Otherwise it is an immediate death sentence for dogs who don't stand a chance against bias individuals.
- Made up of people who understand dog behaviour.
- Who would be on the tribunal? I would support if a veterinarian, expert dog trainer, and other experts were on the Tribunal but not if random people with no accreditation.
- The person can still sue the owner in Provincial or QB for damages
- The dog is not put into a shelter until the ruling is made, unless there is a risk to occupants on the property (example kids)
- No dog should be euthanized. Proper training to correct behaviour should be made mandatory.
- It would have to be a fair decision
- Must include the owner, the victim, and at least one dog behavioural professional who is highly regarded in their field. Must be a majority rule.
- That there is a basic understanding that dogs that are teased, threatened or feel their owners are in danger may bite and therefore there is always the possibility that a bite is not the dogs fault. Just because a person is a human does not make them innocent victims.



- Please note that dashaund and chihuahua attacks are SUPER prevalent, but less reported because of tiny dog status..
- Contained an unbiased and certified animal trainer and, ideally, a veterinarian to assess the temperament and behaviour of the dog.
- Bully breeds should be held to the same standard as any other breed.
- The tribunal includes a majority of people who know and understand dog behaviour, specifically dog behaviour or training specialists.
- The tribunal would need to have vets, animal behaviourists, and certified dog trainers. The tribunal would need to be made up of experts in dog behaviour.
- It remains breed neutral.
- As long as it was fair and those reviewing orders and declarations are educated in dog behaviour and review the "big" picture.
- The owner would be able to have fair representation.
- Owners need the chance if it WAS NOT their dog to prove same. Speaking in a situation where it is a dog without an owner (stray or run away) and the dog is gone after the report. The current system of looking up registered dogs in that area that fit the description and getting their photo for identification is incredibly flawed. Calling a dog a nuisance, charging them or ending their lives is a grave decision so there needs to be no doubt on which dog it was.
- Dogs are assessed by professionals
- Again it's the owner's responsibility and the owner needs to be held more responsible than the dog. Dogs must prove they're not dangers, and if they are...the human is ultimately responsible.
- committee made up of both ends of bully breed spectrum
- Follow up with owners
- Dogs apprehended for ANY bite. I realize that pitbull type dogs can cause damage, however ANY dog bite should be treated with the same level of caution and diligence. Little dogs that bite are not cute or harmless.
- Ok
- The dog and owner are properly monitored to ensure compliance, laws that can't be policed are not laws.
- It includes animal behaviour specialists
- Work with an agency such as ARCCS for assessment.
- Unbiased people towards
- Euthanasia being an absolute last resource. Just because a dog bites doesn't mean its not able to be rehabilitated
- This include assessment of the dog by qualified behaviorist. Owner have option to surrender dogs deemed trainable to bodies with knowledge o
- An absolute unbiased panel on the board. People with bias and think specific breeds are dangerous cannot be on the tribunal
- That the tribunals fair to all breeds and follow strict guidelines.



- Balanced tribunal - include knowledgeable animal behaviourist with credentials
- Not breed specific
- the tribunal committee be comprised of dog experts such as vets, certified trainers and certified handlers.
- The members don't show a prejudice against pit bulls
- Only persons who own a pet are able to serve on the tribunal. The chair must be someone with dog behaviour background.
- Hold handler accountable if problem dog.
- Great care is taken to ensure there is a balance in opinions of those on the tribunal, specifically those who are anti pit bull and pro pit bull.
- The general information about the case and their decided restrictions.
- A certified animal behaviourist must speak to the conditions/acts leading up to the bite incidents, the dog's home environment and the owner's interactions with the dog.
- A wide cross section of individuals are represented, not just pet owners or those in the pet industry. Plus, see above, euthanasia should be the default for dogs that severely injure a person.
- Dog had to adhere to the above mentioned and remain a(n) indoor/on property only animal
- No euthanasia without court ruling.
- As long as they were QUALIFIED to make such judgements. By qualified I suggest a board limited to certified trainers, vets and animal behaviour specialists.
- As long as interviews are held and someone with expert dog knowledge is included.
- They not be allowed to make the final decision on euthanizing a dog without appropriate input from experts in the field of dog aggression.
- Is lacking any bias towards a certain outcome and is free from any party that has an invested interest in unjust decisions.
- This should look into the owners history of actions included to reduce the harm presented by the dog.
- Made up of third party people include a range of professions and a mix of pet and non-pet owners. As well a process to appeal any decisions made by the tribunal.
- Using real dog behaviourists people who understand why dogs do what they do and what triggers them
- Determine why the dog is problematic. I.e: is the dog being abused physically etc but owner
- It needs to be made up of educated dog trainers and behaviour consultants. I am a force free dog trainer in the city and I don't want to see dogs futures being determined by people who have little or no experience with fear and reactivity
- You may NOT urbanize any animal without owner consent.
- Extenuating circumstances
- Be fair! Make sure people have no bias
- The last option is euthanasia, and the owner is investigated for their treatment of the dog.
- Anyone on a tribunal had proven expertise to assess an animal



- I would support this as long as there is strict oversight! The tribunal must consist of active animal owners of the same type of animal being tried.
- Owners would need to pay full cost of compliance for tribunal representatives' time in monitoring restrictions . This monitoring process would need to be well defined for adherence.
- If we are willing to Euthanizing a dog for biting someone.. why aren't people who murder or rape get put down? The dog could feel threaten, you have no idea what that dog has been through. Or what that human has done to them.
- That part of the process is OWNER education and training.
- If the end result is euthanasia make sure the dog can not at all be rehabilitated first. I think the tribunal should explore this option before passing it on to a judge
- No breed specific tribunal
- No breed specification and option for approved rehabilitation program
- Judging a dog based on breed is not fair. This shouldn't be allowed to sway a decision either way
- The tribunal has people educated in dog behaviour. Not a bunch of bleeding heart do gooders.
- The tribunal had an individual(s) who either have the ability to access a dog or can understand the assessment of the dog in question
- The review needs to be fast to benefit the victims. Offending animals need to be euthanized immediately.
- Tribunal would need to allow only fact to be introduced. No generalizations based on breed submitted as "evidence". Only the facts of each case and testimony from certified animal behaviourists or trainers
- That each dog is treated equally and not because of its breed.
- As long as the Tribunal follows the 3 points made and action is taken. Furthermore, if a dog is demean Vicious it should be euthanized and never allowed to roam in public again to protect the public.
- The officials making decisions need to have extensive knowledge of canine behaviour.
- That it did not result in a less thorough and fair assessment of the issue
- The qualifications of those reviewing the facts were well educated in dog behavior.
- The people on the tribunal are aware that pit bulls are not inherently vicious and that they do not have stronger bites than other dogs.
- Qualified members of said Tribunal would have actual dog training including rescue groups
- Must have experience being a long time dog owner ex: have had more than two dogs in lifetime
- Dogs not be euthanized, but instead go through proper training.
- Uses a qualified and certified Veterinary Behaviour specialist as reference, not just someone who claims to train dogs
- Included a vet and/or canine behavioral expert
- It was a cut and dry case. Ie something was wrong with the dog and the bite wasn't provoked by unwanted attention



- I would like to ensure evidence is valid. A 6 yrs old walked a Great Pyr past my house. The pyr ran into my yard and attacked my gsd cross. The 6 yrs old intervened and was bit. The animal control appeared to seize my 15 yr old dog. The traumatized child had a father demanding that the dog who bit his child be killed immediately. Upon further investigation, the child admitted to his dog being the biter. Where were my dog's rights in his OWN yard?
- as long as the tribunal had experience and an experienced behaviorist is allowed to examine the animal. It's not always the animal's fault and an absolute liability is not fair to the animal.
- That euthanasia should only be considered in the case of unprovoked, severe, disfiguring bites.
- Look further into assessments before putting a dog down.
- Owner could appeal in the case of a euthanization order
- The people on the tribunal would have experience and knowledge about dog behaviour (for example, trainers with certification).
- Look more towards the owners not the dogs.
- Appellate avenue available
- No euthanizing
- Owner pays for all cost. Nothing for the tax payers
- The veterinary industry is involved in the tribunal as well as a certified dog behaviorist
- The tribunal has the power to fine owners and enforce the fines. In the case of a vicious attack or bite, the dog is euthanized.
- Don't put the dog down just because of its breed
- The dog can remain in the owners care is possible until the process is done. If it is safe enough to do so.
- Support/intervention/training before euthenization of dogs. Some dogs are provoked, and use bites/attacks as last resort. Sometimes it's more of the owner's fault than the dog's.
- People with knowledge only ...
- There is an option to chose at least some of the members of the tribunal similar to a jury and that the members have knowledge of dogs and can be unbiased when it comes to visible representation of breed characteristics.
- More dog owners on the tribunal then non dog owners. People need to have empathy when dealing with these difficult situations
- The people sitting on the tribunal were well respected and knowlagble trainers and behaviorists.
- Change in sitting members on an annual basis and no affiliation or benefits to certain organization such as Calgary Humane society
- The people serving on the tribunal MUST be qualified as animal specialists ie: vets, behaviouralists, trainers. They must have education and experience relating to animals (dogs in particular).
- Review In quick easy manor, fair to owner and pet
- As long as the victim is not a minor in the same household as the owner, that is too much bias and needs to go beyond just them and the tribunal
- It always had member which is a certified dog/animal behaviorist/trainer as one of the member.



- Completely dependent on the tribunal panel
- The owner is punished severely.
- I can't read the whole question.
- There needs to be a unbiased source. An all animal activist individual or group that loves all animals and is not one sided. All areas need to be explored before taking any drastic steps like euthanasia and it needs to be thoroughly done, tested, etc to make sure what happened, why did it happen, could something be done, was the dog provoked, teased, mistreated, etc.
- not heavily based on specific breed. I do not support ANY of the BSL language found in your documents. It should be down to each individual dog, and I would fear that a tribunal would lay heavily into specific breeds with no other consideration.
- Have proper oversight and be staffed fairly
- All tribunal officers are trained in behaviour and more then one person is needed for a decision to euthanise an animal
- The tribunal system included people that are experienced at dealing with dogs, ideally have worked with them in some capacity.
- While euthanasia could be a recommendation, tribunal should not decide this. CoQB should decide.
- Not breed specific
- Trainers of different methods were on the tribunal so the dog gets a fair assessment
- In order to be euthanized it went higher up
- There was absolute proof the dog in question was to blame and it had a history of bad behaviour.
- Check in on the progress of the dog and owners dogs can be trained with the right help
- All non biased persons must be seated on this tribunal. No mention of the dogs breed but instead what has happened with said dog. There are plenty of dog breeds that are very strong ie) all working/ farm breeds, labs, retrievers, poodles, dalmatians, great danes, ect. With all the pointing fingers at "pitbulls" right now it can not be based on a dogs breed to determine if it is dangerous but rather the behavior it has presented. I truly believe this would be the only way to fairly determine whether a dog lives or dies because a human has taught it bad behavior.
- These decisions need to be made by people who actually care about the wellbeing of the animal.
- Had both a vet versed in animal training and a certified trainer (i.e. CBCC, IAABC, CPDT-KA)
- Dogs in question go through a training /test period. Given. That some dogs have problems. Does not mean they must be destroyed.
- Pitbull breeds are not being singled out.
- If the person is proven knowledgeable of animal behavior, then yes, let someone judge in the tribunal process.
- Not biased against certain breeds (i.e. pitbulls)
- Tribunal has no authority to create an order for euthanasia. This must be reviewed & ordered by Criminal Court level judges.
- Community safety is paramount and it contained at least one expert or the advice of an expert.



- Dogs are not euthanized but repurposed for a more fitting role, where they won't be a threat to the public.
- There is no one on the tribunal who dislike pitbulls or pitbull types
- the dog is brought to a behavior specialist for proper review. Not by the court.
- Tribunal members must have appropriate experience and experience in pet management
- The Tribunal must take into account the "Severity" of the offense. Human bites give animals a "Taste" for human blood.
- If the owner doesnt follow steps to educate him/herself on how to correct the issue.
- No seizure of the dog should take place without due process through the tribunal. The tribunal must be a third party and must include one person educated in canine behaviour with a CBCC-KSA, PCBC-A, or ABCDC (iaabc) credential.
- The owner is given the opportunity to defend the dog, or bring supporting evidence for the dog.
- At least 1 member of tribunal should be dog behaviour specialists voted on my community.
- The members of the tribunal are neutral
- This tribunal includes animal professionals who could adequately assess each circumstance
- The animal can be Assessed by the right people to see if it can be rehabilitated.
- long as it still holds the owner responsible and actually is willing to make the tough decisions including euthanizing vicious dogs
- That is openly and honestly looked at all dog breeds as equal and as the full scope of the incident. A small dog can traumatize a child or adult just as badly as a big breed.
- That the dog is completely isolated from other people before the case is decided.
- Not immediately euthanizing a dog until the owner has a chance to present their case and/or say goodbye to their pet, when appropriate.
- Fair rulings
- As long as the members are knowledgeable dog people, like dog show judges, dog sport competitors and trainers, vets, vet techs.
- Highly qualified vets, lawyers, police, psychologists etc on it. Must own a pet
- The owner/victims are able to attend and offer their views. Also having a mixture of people involved that are both pet owners and not pet owners.
- dogs remain on owner's property properly secured until decision is rendered. The opportunity is there for appeal prior to animal being euthenized.
- Experts on the tribunal
- Included a tribunal member who is experienced in dog behaviour/proper assessment of dogs
- Extenuating circumstances
- The owner has the option of requiring it be handled through court.
- The same options as if in court of law
- Appeals are dealt within a set time period.
- As long as the representative actually knows how dogs behave.
- All participants have absolutely zero histroy of breed discrimination.



- Rules would need to be set in place, a strict guideline for selecting people to eliminate the possibility of bias and breed discrimination. Preferably a good reliable source of knowledge regarding dogs.
- Qualified vets or dog behaviour experts only
- It would depend who was on the tribunal. There needs to be people on the tribunal educated in animal behaviour such as vets.
- A veterinarian should always be part of the tribunal
- Maybe for non-death issues. If a dog's life is going to be in jeopardy then it should go through the courts. If it's a minor case, a tribunal sounds appropriate.
- as long as it was composed of knowledgeable people, i.e. vets with a behaviour background, certified science based trainers etc.
- The city and non-city representatives are completely objective and open-minded about ALL breeds of dogs.
- Requirement for breed specific representative, vet (non city, neutral 3rd party), certified animal behavior specialist and trainer (neutral),
- Have non-biased members preferably those in animal medicine who can properly assess animals.
- No euthanasia
- I do not believe that holding dogs in shelters does anything for the situation other than to terrify the dog, keeping them in an unfamiliar place without their owner/family. Think of it if your child was taken from you and placed in this situation. How would they be reacting - certainly not in the manner they would in front of guests in their home. However, this is how and when we judge the dog's behavior - when they are possibly at their worst. Seems unbearably unfair in the animal's defense. If a tribunal could be held such that the dog was allowed to remain, and possibly be assessed WITH the owner, or IN the owner's home you would be able to get such a better understanding whether or not that dog is a danger, or if it was reactive, or if it was provoked.
- As long as rulings are coming from educated individuals that understand animal behaviour such as animal behaviourist, veterinarians, certified positive reinforcement-based dog trainers, etc
- As long as The City of Calgary does not pursue a Breed Specific Law (eg requiring Bully Breeds to be muzzled, more insurance, etc WITHOUT any previous incidents.
- the tribunal would need to be 3(at least) people with specific skills to assess animal behaviour
- People on the tribunal are highly qualified not just in mediation but also in animal behaviour
- It should only apply to first time offenders
- The dogs are not euthanized, unless it's [removed] good reason!! Not just because it's breed specific
- The euthanasia judgement must be moved up the ranks of our court system. One tribunal (with who knows how much dog experience) should not be able to make sweeping death decisions.
- depends upon WHO is on the tribunal....Is it a voted in position? if so Yes.
- Tried to have a neutral non biased panel/members
- Large dog breeders/owners must be part of the panel.
- The tribunal consisted of people who are documented experts in dog behaviour.



- The owner is able to make a written and oral presentation to the tribunal which includes a live demonstration of the dog's temperament and training.
- As long as the decision was unanimous
- As the tribunal were vet behaviourists, or were professionals that understood canine behaviour (at least two professionals)
- Euthanize the dog.
- You have appropriate people on a tribunal and not just [removed]
- Not only subject to pit bulls
- There was a review processes for the efficacy of the tribunal performed on an annual basis.
- It would have to be a fair process for both parties and ultimately the dogs needs are met. Bad dogs come from bad owners, that includes pit bulls! In my profession as a letter carrier, i've been bit several times, all them were by small dogs and a lot of them were no fault on either our parts. You unintentionally scare a dog it will react, it's just common sense.
- The not only looked for the best solution for the victim but also the best solution for the dog (who is also a victim).
- Trained dog behaviorists should be involved in every step of each case.
- No euthanasia
- It would need to involve at least one certified behaviourist
- As long as a veterinarian is present to assess/diagnose before any decisions are made.
- They make their reasons public
- As long as the tribunal is made up of individuals trained in animal behaviour and bylaws. This would be a negative/pointless process if the tribunal is made up of the general public or self professed animal behaviourists
- Chosen representatives provided a cross section of knowledgeable and trained dog professionals appointed by election.
- All measures were taken to rehabilitate the dog with sufficient time before euthanasia is deemed necessary. Additionally, non-city reps must be educated and/or experienced with dog assessments, behaviours, etc. and not random citizens.
- dog owner pays for the tribunal
- As it is placed on the owner and not the dog or breed
- Recommendations to euthanize a dog can be stayed if a licensed dog trainer or shelter is willing to take and rehabilitate the dog.
- Quick review, support to the victim, and immediately euthanize the dog, as it will attack again
- A tribunal could be effective as long as those on the tribunal were certified by a recognized certifying body that requires training in dog-dog social dynamics and dog behaviour and body language.
- There cannot be a bias on pit bull breeds, all dogs can be vicious, it is dependant in the owner and proper training
- Need more information to support or not
- Fair and non-biased



- The tribunal should include people with canine behavioural specific training. The tribunal should allow and consider input from witnesses and behavioural specialists brought by all parties involved.
- As long as no bias towards any pit bull looking dog! Little dogs bite more but are not reported .
- .
- the people making judgments would be force-free experts and trainers
- Dogs need to be evaluated by qualified third parties. Said third party should be a certified fear free trainer with behaviour back ground.
- Led by animal care workers who have experience with traumatized dogs and whether or not they can be rehabilitated
- Dog is not allowed off owner's property
- Tribunal members are not prejudiced and have no history of campaign against particular breeds.
- Volunteer basis
- They have the authority to severely punish negligent dog owners.
- I would support the tribunal if it was made up of knowledgeable people - dog trainers, vets, etc. not bureaucrats.
- no fog should ever be forcibly removed by anyone from its owners.
- It would be dependent on who the representatives were. Are these people trained in dog behavior? Do they have breed specific biases (it seems like that is a problem based on the significant focus on pit bulls above).
- Dogs deep into the history of the person that is bit is looked at closely - eg - was the person tormenting the dog....
- The process is open and transparent. The tribunal needs to be an honest broker and not seen as an easy cash grab. This should not be an excuse for all parties to lawyer-up, a cost cap should be considered.
- If they were given all the facts and history and able to make an educated and unbiased decision not based solely off that one offence.
- No pit bull advocates
- I don't believe dog attacks are totally a problem with the dog - it's the owner's poor training. If a dog is involved in attacks, it should be trained and put up for adoption with a new family.
- Who would serve on the tribunal? I would suggest representatives from the Calgary Humane Society, a veterinarian, and a member of the public.
- The tribunal needs to have experienced dog owners/trainers to effectively understand the nature of the offence and provide corrective action accordingly TO THE OWNERS (not always to the pets). If it's just some stupid city councilor than I object to the tribunal
- No animal should be euthanized. Train the dog and get it out of the home it's in.
- Those determining the fate of the dog must be professionally educated in animal behaviour. i.e. a professional accredited dog trainer
- Supported documentation and testimony of breeders, trainers and people involved in the dog community.



- The dog should not suffer and have severe restrictions due to a bad owner. The dog needs healthy socialisation, care and lots of exercise to curb unhealthy energy and behavior.
- A type of bond payment in order for the owner to get the dog home - and the bond is forfeited if the dog is involved in future incidents of aggression (prior to conclusion of tribunal efforts)
- If the owner elects. This should be an option.
- Non city representatives would NOT be from the Calgary Humane Society. 2. Non city representatives would be CKC licensed judges or CKC registered breeders of Sporting, Working or Terrier breeds.
- It included a dog trainer on the team and veterinarian
- owner pays for the care while awaiting result
- The tribunal is fairly represented and includes people knowledgeable about animals and invested in their best interests.
- Yes
- Any dogs with more than one offense must go to court
- The representatives receive specialized training regarding dog behaviors including what provokes a bite
- Provided there is a professional that has expertise in dog behavior on the tribunal
- As long as there is no breed conditions put in place (ie. ridiculous bias against pitbulls)
- Would like to get input from a licensed Dog trainer
- the dog has gone through a proper assessment and there is clear understanding the dog was in the wrong and not the person whom it bit.
- The people making the rulings are knowledgeable about dog behaviour.
- legally binding but an option can be appealed to a higher court solely at the pet owner's expense.
- The members of the tribunal would have to be carefully vetted. The members could only serve a limited term.
- The right people need to be chosen to be a part of the tribunal
- Unable to declare that an animal should be euthanized.
- Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal Tribunal decisions could be appealed at the Court of Queen's Bench.
- diverse panel.
- Included mandatory rehabilitation training instead of euthanasia
- Punishments are not harsher than what would be suggested in court
- A dog that bites someone once should be euthanized. No second chances.
- Yes
- Somehow follow the dog and owners between cities and Provinces.
- There would need to be a fair panel. One that would include owners of all breeds including a Pit Bull type dog.
- More than one "expert" to assess and determine the dog's demeanor vs one person calling the shots in ending a dog's life based on one type of assessment.... all dogs react differently with being



scared/threatened or abuse/neglect and euthanasia is a easy out for a owner's neglect or abuse and what stops them from doing it again and again?

- Knowledgeable area experts on the tribunal equipped with a wide variety of tools at their disposal (restrictions they could place, remedies they could require (like a particular training program etc). I also think owners should be given the choice between waiting to be seen in court or going before the tribunal (after being informed of the differences of both paths). I really like the idea of a tribunal.
- Reconsideration can be taken if requested, and appeal is taken to an appeal tribunal before having to be taken to court
- Would need to know the criteria for the people in the tribunal and as long as the Court of Queen's Bench is not just a rubber stamper of the tribunal decision.
- Condition: tribunal shall not consider trauma experienced by a dog. It's just a dog, not a human.
- no breed prejudice.
- Just want to say that the owner has to be really looked at. Sometimes the owner is more to blame the the dog.
- More focus on the bad habit of the owner. Restrict the owner from having animals and attempt to rehome and rehad the dog!
- that the tribunal is made up of legal professionals, volunteers and animal care professionals for best possible representation of our communities.
- The tribunal panel includes a dog behaviouralist to determine likelihood of rehab. determine rehab po
- They do not have the authority to prescribe permanent action such as euthanasia
- Repeat offenders must be treated more seriously
- Good expertise on the tribunal and no conflict of interest
- The dog would get to stay with it's family the entire duration. Kept on the property when possible.
- Proper representation from shelter/rescue and dog trainers to assess the true damage to the animal before decisions on putting down the animal.
- As long as the tribunal has the full authority to resolve the issue completely and is not just another step for the dog owner to appeal.
- You've not identified who the tribunal is in this question. Who and what authority is required knowledge before being able to answer this! Police, judge, committee made up of who?
- Animals who are unfit to be in public (i.e. dangerous), are not allowed in public.
- I would support a tribunal as long as it treats all breeds equally and treats aggressive Behavior from all breeds equally. A bite is a bite no matter the size of dog. Discriminating against dog breeds is no different than discriminating against people for what they look like (race).
- ethuanization not being a go-to option, especially for a one time offender
- N/a
- The tribunal tries everything posible prior to ever coming to a decision to euthanize a dog. Or if possible eliminate that option all together.
- Dogs couldn't be put down without a second chance, and the Dog could potentially go home with its owner while it waited



- Dog is allowed to live with their family until the hearing
- There is no bias based on breed and each case is looked at individually and at face value.
- Staff is properly trained in situations.
- All mandates of the legal system and isn't cost prohibitive to any party
- Inclusion of dog behaviour expert in tribunal
- Minimum professional qualifications of panel (Vet/Vet Tech etc)
- To not be guided by breed discrimination. And help the owner to become a responsible dog owner with education and assistance with the dog in question.
- Has Veterinary professionals and licensed animal behaviouralist/ trainers as the non-city representatives
 - The tribunal is made up of owners and/or pet professionals 2) The tribunal operates within the provincial court and it's regulations and legal processes. 3) the tribunal does not cost more than placing an animal in the provincial court system.
- Not breed specific but each situation treated individually
- It would take into account the entire situation. Those who are making the decision must be unbiased in all ways. I think when making these decisions, the breed of the dog should not be released until after the decision has been made.
- as long as they get more than one party doing an assessment on the dog. It needs multiple options before deciding to euthanize. Include not only "behavior expert" but also a person from a dog rescue that interacts with many dog temperaments. As well as let the dog have a couple of week to adjust to its new surroundings in a not stressful environment.
- It be breed [removed]
- Educated and unbiased individuals that is fair to all breeds
- if the owner wants to appeal the euthanazia order of the tribunal, the tribunal must wait for the courts before any action is taken
- Respects me and my dog. He is half staffirshire and I'm tired of always avoiding people because of what he looks like. (At least with vivid I can take a wide path around because he wants to meet everything he sees.)
- The focus of these reviews should be on the owner and how to punish them, not on the dog!! A bad owner will just result in more dogs getting put down, and the dogs don't deserve that fate.
- The owners complacency in training should be considered.
- this is comprised of people that work professionally with dogs. Example; Trainers, Vets,
- It has to be answerable to a higher authority & ensure that the decisions made are subject to regulations. The use of approved animal behaviorist as well.
- There was no implicit or explicit bias against pit bull breeds.
- I believe a trained professional, specifically someone who has extensive knowledge in bully breeds dogs, should be in charge of making unbiased decisions. A dog trainer or vet would know more than a city representative.
- The dogs aren't the issue it's the [removed] people raising them wrong
- No euthanized animals.



- Persons on tribunal are elected not appointed
- The owner has to take a course to understand how to keep their dog safe and others
- There should be a review on the owners behaviour and bad owners should be flagged. Held responsible and prohibited from dog ownership.
- There needs to be protocols to follow and making sure people aren't making biased decisions and are looking out for the welfare of the dog. I witnessed a dog bite where the dog was defending himself from an aggressive attack, But then does the biter get penalized or the aggressor?
- Euthanizing should only be an option if there is no chance that the dog can have a happy life otherwise, and the officer should not have a bias against bully breeds.
- This would need to ensure that it was actually for the good of the animal and not a fast track to euthanasia. Was it the animal's fault or was the owner unequipped to have this animal? Sending an animal to a rescue not a shelter should be a potential outcome as well where the animal would be given the opportunity for proper care and training and love and to be fostered out to someone who could help the animal get ready to be adopted
- A diverse group of educated individuals so dogs have the best shot at rehabilitation and not just euthanasia. It's not really reducing the trauma for the dog if you're just going to kill it anyway.
- I don't know enough about the process to comment on this
- there is rehabilitation and training available for the dog and human before any form of euthanization
- Properly vetted members of the tribunal who are impartial
- It was held by an independent third party, not the city Or SPCA but a rescue group
- Rescues are also given a position on the tribunal
- Tribunal is made up of elected officials with experience in veterinary medicine and/ or dog behaviour.
- As long as it was right away as the dog and owners will be distraught from being apart
- If treated fairly and owner given options to rehome or education provided for owner and dog
- That the tribunal focuses on the owner and not the pet. A pet should not suffer the consequences of bad owners.
- Veterinary and behavioural experts must be part of the of the discussion
- Those on the tribunal would need to be thoroughly vetted to ensure bias is not present and the option to appeal should be available to owners if an unfavorable outcome is determined
- Persons selected should all have experience with dogs, ie. qualified trainers or vets.
- Unbiased tribunal
- They follow the above suggestion of ensuring investigation into the owners treatment of the animal.
- Does not lead to premature euthanizing of animal to clear space
- Explained fully
- If the person was harassing or trying to touch the animal without permission
- No dog should be killed. It's not a dog's nature to hurt people, this is the fault of irresponsible owners.
- There wasn't an unfair bias to particular breeds.



- I think there would need to be at least two animal behaviour specialists. One not appointed by the city to be on the tribunal
- They were a group of individuals well educated in dogs, force free training, and were not boded in any way.
- It is not biased
- All the facts were taken into account from the surrounding environment, the people involved, what happened, past situations with the dog and the other people too.
- If tribunal is similar to a mediation & reviews all details was it attack or defense? Owner response, attitude, payment for damages and continued education/training.
- There is no biase or un biase option about the breed.
- every option must be discussed and able to be tried prior to deciding on euthanasia (euthanasia should never be one of the first choices)
- More emphasis on owners rehabilitation as most dog incidents are due to irresponsible owners
- All options are exhausted before euthanization
- Don't be biased against pit bulls.
- Review statement from owners and victim
- You shouldn't be given dogs a death penalty. Unlike humans they don't understand the difference between right and wrong. They are innocent.
- There are people who are educated on dog behaviour and welfare on the tribunal. There should be NO breed related restrictions or bias.
- The individuals representing the tribunal MUST be animal specialists and NOT members of the general public or politicians!
- Representative from organization like Humane Society be present to educate and prevent bias
- They are educated on the topic to be on the tribunal.
- Neutral 3rd party to engage in assessment of the dog at owners expense
- The tribunal had animal experts on it
- Dogs that bite should be euthanized
- Pet should be allowed to stay with the owner
- The tribunal takes into consideration circumstances of an accident, consists of experts on dog behaviour, and also considered rehabilitation or rehoming a dog.
- Members of the tribunal system should be formed with prerequisites that consist of a variety of dog owners each with different breeds. This could be considered similar to a jury due to the large range of personalities each breed possesses.
- H
- Animal advocates were included in the tribunal
- The persons delegated to be on the Tribunal must not be breed prejudice.
- input from all parties was considered
- These representatives would need to be qualified to make these decisions. This shouldn't be like joining a condo board so you can offer your uninformed opinion.



- No euthanization, that is very inappropriate.
- Allows for owners to submit appeals
- As long as vets are part of the process.
- The dog stays in the home of the owner.
- For first infraction tribunal yes, but after multiple it shouldn't be an option.
- That pit bull breeds are given a fair chance, and that euthanasia is not the go-to and that behaviour training is the first step.
- Follow up with the owner, most often dog attacks happen because of owner abuse
- Any dog apprehended must attend obedience training and there is provision to be able to mandate financial compensation for victims.
- That cases be looked into very thoroughly and possible have a panel of tributes to discuss and create a verdict as opposed to one person's opinion dictating the cases
- Depending on who would be the representative (avoiding bias)
- A professional veterinarian familiar with the breed in question was consulted during the tribunal process
- I like the idea of a tribunal to speed up the process, reduce time separated between the pet and their owner, and be able to conduct a full investigation. However, I believe that euthanization should be an absolute last resort, provided there be serious or permanent bodily harm or the animal is a repeat offender of serious incidents and all other resources or rehabilitation attempts have been expended.
- As long as there isn't breed specific laws
- Dog stays with owner until decision made
- There should be no euthanizations for aggressive dog behaviour. The behaviour is learned, they are not aggressive by nature. It is the owners fault, not the dogs. I would support the tribunal only if it allows for dogs to stay at home rather than being locked somewhere unfamiliar for any amount of time where they would become scared and more aggressive as a result.
- You take everything into consideration. What set the dog off? Dogs have natural instincts to protect themselves, if they were being taunted, then they had every right to attack
- Welfare of the dog must be taken into account.
- The only condition would be that the animal is not euthanized
- It isn't breed specific and more so bite specific. Don't base this on breeds, base this on individual dogs.
- The tribunal would need to be qualified to make judgement calls based on the dog's demeanor, behaviour, history, etc. as well as the owner(s) behaviour, history, etc.
- Those on the tribunal be educated and have experience in the field.
- You didn't mess it up
- The tribunal must be impartial and independent. The first whiff of activism or bias would permanently destroy its credibility.
- Case by case



- That dogs "deemed" to be euthanized wait until the trial is over so they have a chance. Most dog bites ARE NOT the dogs fault. And I would only support if the assessments are done through third party.
- Have an animal behaviour therapist assess the dog!! It is not always the dogs fault.
- Again it's about the owner, the owner needs to be looked at. Stop always blaming the dog, the dog doesn't deserve to suffer because the owner provides poor training.
- Breed bans or limits are ridiculous. Go after bad owners not the dogs!
- Allowed the dog to remain at their home and not a shelter. Making it on a sort of house arrest and only able to walk with a muzzle.
- There are levels of severity, and immediate apprehension and option of euthanasia should not be the first step.
- No discrimination based on breed.
- There is an opportunity to prolong the process in order for good pet owners to collect themselves from this trauma and make an appropriate plan that they can implement and help their case. The death penalty should never be taken lightly. Rehabilitation is almost always possible with well educated and dedicated guardians
- Unbiased and allows for reasonable mitigations/restrictions for the owner keeping the dog and rehabilitation rather than the "easy out" of leaning towards euthanized frequently
- Veterinary and dog behaviourist also agree on results and are involved throughout tribunal process.
- some dogs defend themselves when they are being teased, it needs to be determined if this is the case, if so give the owner a fine but release the dog to him or her and require disciplinary actions, the victim should also understand that they can not tease animals and should also receive a fine if that's the case.
- Owners wishes and circumstances of bite are taken into account
- Tribunal for the irresponsible owners. Mandatory courses for them
- Euthanizations would need to be a last resort and should not be discussed unless this a repeating incident with a dog.
- The powers of the tribunal were similar if not identical to that of the provincial tribunal.
- If there was no bias to dog breed
- The understanding that it's not the breed but the owner. And the owner should be dealt with and the animal regimes not euthanized because of a neglectful pet owner.
- The dog be assessed by dog behaviourist and deemed safe to be re-intergraded back into society....my strong beliefs are all dogs are trainable and any aggressions can be reversed...no dog should have to die because of bad owners...
- This group will only help if it doesn't discriminate against specific breeds.
- Euthanization is a very very last alternative and not breed-biased. Many times it's owners, not dogs.
- Each dog be treated the same. I notice quite often that nuisance dogs (excessive barking, aggression, etc) are quite often smaller dogs. It seems that owners of these smaller dogs don't realize that they also need training. Personally I had 2 very aggressive small dogs that had to go



through behavioural training to address concerning behaviour. I don't believe singling out a breed is fair as there are many other large AND small breeds that can become aggressive.

- The dog has been involved in an Incident causing harm to person or other animal without being provoked
- Members of the tribunal are unbiased towards different dog breeds. Eg. unbiased towards bully breeds
- It's a fair process
- The tribunal must have a dog behaviour expert, preferably multiple, on the panel to more accurately judge the condition of the dog. Furthermore, no police should be on the tribunal panel, because they are more likely to seek extensive punitive measures (this includes all current and/or former police officers, of ANY municipality, of any rank, as well as RCMP, bylaw officers, peace officers, etc.). However, if the City feels a cop is necessary, it must not be a cop that has ever dealt with the dog, which if that means having an open rotating position for police officers to fill in order to make them impartial, so be it.
- All dogs and owners judged on a case by case basis regardless of breed. No bad dogs, Just bad owners.
- As long as it can be appealed
- Animals are not euthanized at all. They are living sentient creatures, not property. Our treatment of them is appalling.
- It be optional to use. The owner would be able to decide which route they would like to take
- The owner must have a say in whether or not the dog will be euthanized. In most cases I agree that attacking dogs need to be euthanized, however in some case there could be other. impacting circumstances.
- Dog must go through training with owner.
- All parties must be allowed to speak, including dog owners.
- The tribunal was clearly unbiased towards so called pitbull/nuisance breeds
- A professional dog behavior specialist is involved and can asses the dog's behavior fairly and unbiased. Full review of the dog's history and reasoning behind a bite. It is not always the animal's fault.
- Certified dog trainers with knowledgr of dog behavior and positive reinforcement training.
- No dog should be euthanized because they bit someone. There is always a reason that a dog will bite. If it feels threatened, scared or hurt.
- The identity of the tribunal is known to the public, it has people considered experts in dog behavior, and the public can have a say in the efficacy of the tribunal and can request change if needed.
- The tribunal must rule fairly, especially is a small breed attacks a larger dog and the larger dog protects itself. The small breed owner is responsible in that situation as they never trained their dog.
- It was not a "head hunt" on any one breed of dog
- The people who are reviewing the case as a tribunal must be knowledgeable and familiar of dog behaviour.



- If the representatives was a known dog trainer based from balanced training practice. Working dog trainer as well as behaviourist.
- Members of the tribunal must represent both pet owners and non-pet owners
- That they are not presiding to one breed.
- That they have the same guidelines and processes as they would in court
- The OWNER needs to be heavily fined if any dog is not on a leash, with the exception of an Off-Leash Park or in the owner's fenced / secure backyard.
- Professional canine behaviourists and any other appropriate professionals being involved to make it in the best interest of the animal victim and all options being explored thoroughly.
- Set percentage of members should be expert on animal behaviour. There are no bad dogs - only lack of training, trained bad behaviour and strangers that don't respect the animals personal space
- Training for both owner and dog
- This applies to ALL dogs no matter the size or breed of the dog. Attempt to train the dog properly.
- Tribunal must be made up of unbiased and impartial individuals. Especially against specific dog breeds.
- Focused on punishing the owner and not the dog. As it is the owners fault if their dog isn't trained properly not the dogs fault.
- It must increase the ability of knowledge and access to skills to manage said animal.
- An un bias verdict is key, I quite like the idea as long as it could be appealed and possibly overruled depending the circumstance.
- The tribunal should be a collective of dog trainers and handlers and not a bunch of useless politicians and people who have no knowledge of dogs
- Proper understanding of animal behaviour
- Elected officials
- Reputable dog professionals are part of the tribunal. We don't want people on the tribunal who don't understand dog behaviour.
- Pit bulls are not singled out as a breed and given harsher orders than other breeds, and representatives are consistently screened to be unbiased of breed.
- Fair look into the reasoning that caused the nuisance.
- No euthanization
- If the tribunal is comprised of unbiased individuals.
- Unbiased committee. I do not support euthanasia, all alternatives should be considered first.
- Restriction for the dog and the owner abide by them.
- Reduce the time of the courts but the panel has to be well informed
- It was a choice of tribunal or wait for courts
- No euthanization
- Review vicious dog declarations and assess if the dog should be euthanized
- Owner experience/attitude toward pet ownership



- All sides of the story are taken into consideration, such as why the attack occurred, background of both victim and dog. For euthanization to be approved, all parties on the tribunal must review all aspects (both stories) and consensus must be reached.
- It is not biased against breeds.
- DO NOT EUTHANIZE ANIMAL. Dogs do not just bite for no reason.
- No euthanizations
- Tribunal must be knowledgeable in dog behavior and take the circumstances of the note into consideration, some people behave inappropriately towards animals and that's not the animals fault
- The owner is who is responsible for the dogs actions. The owner is who the city should be concentrating on, not the breed of dog.
- the option was given to handle it either way by the defendant
- Owners of pit bulls or large dogs should be on the tribunal for balance, but those representatives cannot have any record of nuisance dogs in their care.
- Look at all the factors on first offence before urbanization
- The tribunal will review the case, and only pass judgment on whether the dog can be released to the owner while waiting court. The courts still should review bite cases.
- There are trained professional animal behavioralists on the tribunal
- It is not breed specific. The worst attacks I've been witness to have not included the pitbull breed.
- It was ensured that appropriate animal expert professionals were on the tribunal such as veterinarians and Registered veterinary technologists
- They are actual dog behaviour specialists AND owners can be punished rather than murdering already abused dogs.
- Properly trained and educated people are on the tribunal
- Allows both sides to present their case.
- Leniency to treat pit bulls as any other dog breed.
- Specifically trained judges in dog behavior!
- Decisions must be equally agreed upon and process for reducing bias must be applied.
- Dog has to be muzzled outdoors, not allowed outside unsupervised, until hearing is complete and final decisions made
- Dogs would not be euthanized until the case is processed in court.
- Considers if the owners were at fault for not trained or were aggressive with the dog before assuming the full responsibility was the dog.
- Everyone on the Tribunal has a reasonable understanding of dog behaviour.
- As long as it doesn't cost more to tax payers
- euthanization to be determined only court of Queens bench.
- as long as euthanization is not an option
- A fair trial, not based solely on the breed. What if a smaller dog bites 100 people and a larger dog bites a person put of defense? That has to be considered
- Depends who is on the tribunal and how people on the tribunal are selected



- maximum tribunal tenure of 3 years
- The tribunal was made up of animal care professionals including vets and trainers. The Humane Society should not have power to make decisions unilaterally the way they do now
- That it is fair and all parties are represented.
- Who would be conducting the tribunals?
- owner pays for the tribunal costs
- The dog is safe
- Owners become liable on training their dog and not placed dogs themselves (Bad Owners)
- Not biased based on breed.
- The cases were looked at in an unbiased manner, specifically with regards to misplaced breed specific bias vs. Pit bulls or dogs that cosmetically looked similar to Pit bulls.
- Don't Euthenize - rehabilitate
- These people are screened to be fair to both sides and not have a specific motive against these breeds.
- Tribunal is made of a mix of people, experts etc
- It was made up of animal behaviourists, vets, and trainers.
- Members of tribunal receive training in administrative tribunals. Members of tribunal have appropriate subject matter expertise (animals, etc.)
- The dog should have a chance to be put through a training program instead of euthanize it. If training is unsuccessful and the dog is deemed as dangerous then perhaps it would need to be euthanized.
- A true investigation into the animals lifestyle first, as the cause may be its owners.
- If it's the first incident with the dog and it has not has training or obedience, it must be mandatory for the owner to enroll the dog in these programs. Then a re-evaluation should be done. Dog must be muzzled at all times!!
- Properly Determine if the OWNER is FIT enough to have the animal.
- What did the person do before the dog reacted; what have the owners done to work with the dog?; was the dog teased? So many factors that should be assessed before sentencing the dog!
- more community consultation on this with dog behavioral specialists.
- It greatly reduced time animal has to be in shelter
- I would support a tribunal so long as experts in dog behaviour (e.g., the behaviour department at the Calgary Humane Society) are also involved in these tribunals.
- Follows the same assessment methods and standards as a court would
- on the tribunal. They need people that understand all breeds of dogs.
- Give the owner the chance to work with a trainer when possible to rehabilitate the dog. No dog should be put down without the honest effort to rehabilitate. We extend the courtesy to hardened criminals - why not our pets - they are members of the family.



- Often dogs are unfairly euthanized. Sometimes all they need is dog owner education and dog training, dog behaviourist and veterinary help. It would be great to have a veterinary behaviourist on the tribunal so that dogs are not unfairly euthanized.
- Euthanasia should require secondary approval following current process.
- So long as it actually provides a decision quickly, isn't costly to run, and that if an appeal is sought, to dog would remain in shelter
- There would need to be impartial parties. The decision to euthanize must have a second opinion.
- As long as it is not breed specific
- The tribunal includes an animal behaviorist
- It does not have the authority to order euthanizing
- The dog owner must be willing to take the proper steps to ensure their dog is safe around others. Proper training classes, etc. Euthanization should be the last resort after all other options have been exhausted.
- As there are people on the panel who understand all dogs are capable of aggression, not just pitbulls.
- Those selected were educated on the realities and are not just random members of the public, not even volunteers. MUST have clear education on real issues - humans being the issue, sometimes the dog, definitely not the breed.
- There were rules and regulations in place, as well as the ability to appeal
- They can be declared not a nuisance dog isn't he future
- Proven dog bite fir no reason.
- Allowed the animal to be treated fairly and humanely like it would in a home environment.
- It had representatives on the tribunal that were not bias towards larger dog or "nuisance" breeds!
- I think by default a dog should be left with the owner if the owner is found to be caring and responsible while waiting with restrictions put in place immediately.
- That the first line of defense recommended by a tribunal must be obedience training. Then a visit following obedience training by a trained professional dog handler to determine if dog (and human) are ok to resume at home relationship. Most aggressive dogs are this way because of the treatment they receive at home.
- Who would be these representatives? I would only want to see representatives that are from animal shelters for example. Process would have to be in the most humane way possible.
- Euthanasia should be an absolute last resort
- When it comes to any talk of euthanization - This dog must have offended multiple times, and the cause of the incident should be taken into account; Was the person who was bit doing something the dog didn't like before?
- Specific dog breeds aren't discriminated
- The owner is able to provide a minimum of three strong references which undoubtedly confirm that the dog was either provoked or was acting out of its natural behavior.
- need unbiased people in the tribunal. Bully breeds arent the problem



- If there should be a human victim involved that the victim or someone representing them can petition the court instead of having to go through this process if they felt necessary.
- The panel must be made of qualified veterinarians, minimum 2, qualified and certified dog trainers, minimum 2 with different specialties, 1 animal behaviour specialist, and 2 lawyers, one weighing in for the city the other weighing in for the public, and two city council members, that must remain on the tribunal during their time in office.
- Dog owners are not being punished because their dog is a specific breed.
- Review and assess the OWNERS of the dog. It is not the breed that makes the dog dangerous but rather the training or lack of.
- Had Pitbull experts (from rescues) as well as vets make the decisions not just average people. Have experts.
- That the dogs in custody are treated humanely and fairly, and given a chance despite their breed.
- It would depend on the rules set forth for the tribunal and who would be sitting on it. Not enough information to make a choice.
- I think if the dog has a history of bites, while waiting court the dog could remain home and muzzled when outside and on walks.
- Assessment by a veterinarian with behaviour specialist to determine if this was an isolated incident or if rehabilitation is possible either through surrender or owner compliance.
- Review and assess before euthanization
- To do whatever it takes to rehome whichever before euthanizing
- That there is an animal expert present on the tribunal
- I don't know if I could cause it would probably end up being useless.
- If the dog is a pit bull, it should be euthanized on a first offence. Fighting Breed dogs should be banned in Calgary.
- The tribunal consists of all dog owners some of which own what you deem as "an aggressive breed"
- The tribunal is fair with educated people
- At least some of this time, the person who was bit was at fault (ie. harassing the dog or dog owner), these people should have to be trained in proper dog interaction or fined.
- It is a fair and unbiased process and would not increase costs to dog owners
- So long as everything is reviewed on a case by case basis, without the stigma of certain breeds. The other thing to consider would be to have established clear rules and regulations in regards to the tribunal itself so that owners are prepared and can therefore get through the process quicker.
- Euthanization decisions are not included in their powers. This should only be done by the courts and should have an appeal process.
- It must remain fair and impartial. So many "tribunals" are nothing more than rubber stampers, processing cases based on bias and prejudice.
- Clear set of requirements for representatives that represent the concerns of the community and well-being of the animal.
- .



- This is an issue with the pet owner and not the animal. Working with a animal to adjust the behaviour is the best thing. Not to punish the dog based on poor training from the owner.
- The owner is at fault, not the animal
- Look at the dog itself not the breed of dog it is. Bias cannot be tolerated in humans or dogs.
- All parties have equal opportunity to prove/defend their case and no members of the tribunal have been thoroughly vetted to insure they do not have any sort of dog or Pitbull bias.
- A way to remove bias against certain fog breeds
- Ensure it is the evidence they are basing everything on and not the dog type
- If it makes the process faster that is great. But I don't think taking a dog away from the owner is appropriate. I believe the dog should be able to go home with restrictions from leaving the house until decisions from the tribunal are made.
- Reasonable prices, chance for appeals
- The dog stays at home with the owner and NOT in a shelter.
- All dogs judged equally and breeds not specified. Context of attack is extremely important, as the dog that was attacked, may have instigated the fight.
- IF IT WAS FAIR. DONT BREED SHAME
- People with immense training in all breeds of dogs.
- euthanasia not supported
- Tribunal has knowledgeable people trained in dog behaviours and training
- The breed of dog should not be taken into consideration. Other breeds can be aggressive also. The owner is responsible for making their dog aggressive.
- Da
- Get the full story most dogs will only attack if provoked or they have a bad owner
- Tribunal representatives must not show bias toward specific breeds of dogs or socioeconomic, racial, religious or demographic characteristics of owners.
- Dogs need to be assessed by an trainer outside of government. Owners need to be assessed and some consideration needs to be made if owners have attempted training prior to incidents.
- Appropriate and un-biased participants, with proper knowledge and training were leading tribunals. Owners or interested parties would be allowed to appeal and have new tribunals or excel to higher court.
- As long as vicious dog declarations cannot result in the dog being euthanized. Please provide education/training to the owner and dog instead. All dogs can learn to stop vicious behaviour.
- Unbiased
- It would need to be comprised of dog behavior professionals
- As long as it is believed the dog can be effectively trained or retrained in a way that there is no risk of biting in the future or the bite did not result in death
- Tribunal members must be a mix of dog owners and non-dog owners
- That the tribunal have an animal behaviour scientist, a veterinarian, and psychologist to assess the owners participation, and that the tribunal not have the right to issue death sentences.



- These people are actually have a level of certification in animal behaviour...
- Holds the owner responsible. And do not euthanize the dog. Treat all dogs equally. Do not single out a breed.
- I can not see thd rest of this sentence on my phone. I need further explanation.
- I agree and support that a tribunal system would be ideal to regulate dog restrictions.
- It cannot order a dog to be euthanized, it can order muzzles and corrective training
- Certified vets and dog trainers not politicians making the decision.
- I don't think every "problem dog" should be euthanized. I think they should be rehabilitated not locked in a cage and killed. Euthanasia should be done as a last resort when dogs won't respond to any training (with the right trainer this should never be an option)
- The owner of the dog and the person claiming damage must be allowed to provide evidence of their claims. The fate of the animal cannot be determined by taking the word of the victim in good faith. The victim needs to prove they did not provoke the animal as well.
- That there would be a unannounced check up on the owner of said animal as well to see how they behave. Most animals behave a certain way because of owners not based off of breed.
- As long as it doesn't increase taxes.
- That members of the tribunal must contain animal experts not just citizens
- So long as the decision made is void of the influence of racism against specific dogs. As said above pit bulls are involved in bite cases no more times than any other breed. Maybe there should instead be encouragement/resources/investment/financial aid put into helping owners of larger breed / strong dogs to ensure they are properly trained and cared for so they will not act aggressively.
- That the tribunal would not require an euthanization unless specific attempts at obedience have been attempted or it is agreed upon by all parties to the case.
- If the owner didn't have to be separated from their pet and the pet had to be in a shelter.
- if the decision made by the tribunal was not agreed upon it can be appealed
- Dog should stay in owners care
- People on the tribunal be animal experts like veterinarians, certified dog trainers.
- maybe foster the dog to people who are responsible, it's not the dogs it's the owners responsibility to take a dog and socialize it and train it, so many bad owners, I see it in my neighborhood the dogs are confined, never walked wouldn't any human go mental
- The tribunal is made of people with no pre decided personal agenda and does not have a history of closely knowing anyone who has been attacked by a dog. I also feel that they must NOT show judgement based on breed or size
- Any person on my panel must be a dog owner
- That the tribunal can be appealed if required prior to any final actions being taken (euthanasia)
- The tribunal is unbiased towards breed
- a unbiased group.
- That there is representation from cities with varying bylaws on animals so that decisions made are non-biased.



- It is NOT biased against pit-bull breeds
- No muzzling
- Allows owners a second chance to re train their dog
- That a professional, with the animals best interests at heart, who have worked with “dangerous” dogs has the ability to spend a reasonable amount of time with the animal to do an assessment. Many dog lovers are willing to adopt or foster these animals and provide the training they need. Perhaps a follow up in 6 and 12 months should all be part of the process instead of euthanasia as the option.
- The dog should never be euthanized, euthanize or at least severely punish the owner and put the dog into a home with someone who knows how to train an animal.
- They aren't biased against the dog breed. Bad training, or timid dog issues are not the fault of a pet, it is a human problem.
- Dog behaviour experts included in the panel to better assess why something occurred and work through proper steps to correct the situation: training of the owner,
- You also look at the full situation going on around not just the dog that bit
- The tribunal needs to be made up of experienced people who have worked with dogs on a professional level. Veterinarians and Veterinary Technicians, Groomers, Rescue workers, etc.
- I would want it to be taken into consideration that if the person that was bitten was antagonizing the dog prior to the incident that it is the persons fault and not the dogs...dogs do give off signals to back off and if a person gets bit they deserve it just like when a schoolyard bully finally gets beat up
- Dogs and animals were not taken or euthanized. Deserve a fair investigation just like people
- Euthanizing should not be an option. Dogs have shown they can be rehabilitated.
- Yes
- Proper investigation
- Dogs should never be euthanized, euthanize or at least severely punish the owner and put the dog in a home with someone who knows how to train animals.
- Criteria to be a member of the tribunal must include dog training experience.
- Pit bulls and other supposed “bully” breeds are not egregiously targeted as “nuisance” dogs and steps are taken to prevent biases against them.
- volunteer based and made up of experts on canine behavior
- As long as tribunal has knowledge on dog behaviors and owners are required to go thru proper training by certified trainer.
- tribunal members are elected and have dog behavior backgrounds (spca workers, dog trainers etc)
- Avoids breed specific focus
- All circumstances surrounding the incident are investigated(why the dog did what it did, was it provoked or not)
- Never euthanize!!!! There is ALWAYS a training option if people ARE WILLING TO LOOK
- The dog is kept humanely and treated with respect, owners permitted to visit and walk the dog while waiting the tribunal results.



- If a dog is aggressive and bites there could be many factors in which the dog reacted. Fear, protection, raised to bite. I think the owner should be responsible for the dogs behaviour. If a dog attacks, the owner should be responsible to have a highly experienced dog trainer intervene. Low enforcement should then keep in contact with the trainer and the trainer should approve the dogs behaviour or not. If not the dog should be removed from the home. If the dog improves its behaviour the owner shall keep the dog. If the dog strikes again the dog shall be removed.
- It would need to be fair and whoever was chosen would need to be non biased to all breeds.
- Tribunal could not order animal to be euthanized
- Proper screening to ensure individuals on the tribunal are working in the best interest of the animal. Representatives should be knowledgeable and educated in animals and animal behaviour. It should be mandatory that one member of the tribunal is an owner of a previously declared vicious dog.
- The dog is treated fairly and past history is assessed. Base the conditions off of the dogs history & behaviour not off of what it looks like or what breed it is.
- Fair people presided over it. Not a bunch of Karen's.
- Tribunals held by those that own dogs, or worked with dogs
- Keep your Biases out of the case!
- Na
- It does not discriminate against particular dog breeds
- That euthanasia is not an option.
- This cannot be just random members of the community with social status but those with empathy and who think logically. It's not the animal it's the owner. In order to obtain a dog one should have to go to training.
- Pets should remain with their owners to avoid trauma
- No dog breeds were singled out as higher risk inherently. Tribunals must review cases on an individual and unbiased level.
- There is a lot of people who do not like certain breeds of dogs. Those people should not be allowed to be in this
- They didn't over think and they looked at the whole entire picture regardless of the breed of dog it is!
- The people on the tribunal must not have any breedism as all dogs can be vicious.
- The SPCA should be involved as part of the tribunal process to make sure the animal's best interests are protected.
- each case has a case manager who is being held accountable to the life of somones four legged family member. lets say someone breaks in, and dog bites; thats diffrent than if youre on a walk in the park and your dog attacks. CASE BY CASE. we need to overveiw these cases ith care
- That each case is treated individual by a 3 rd party to make sure the right decision is made.
- That this does not increase the chance of a dog to be euthanized for thd purpose of "speeding up" the due process.
- it would take less tax payer money and actually speed up the process
- No person on the tribual can have any pre-existing biases against any dogs or dog breeds. No dog breed deserves to be singled out because of ignorant people.



- The history of the animal and the owner is reviewed
- Fair and reasonable assessment of the situation without eliminating due process. I would hate to see innocent dogs euthanized because of gaps in the processing system
- It was fair and background information as well as situation information, including witness details are shared.
- Release dog back immediately then proceed if need be. Warnings sent out etc.
- Reassessing of what qualifies a dog as a nuisance and stricter guidelines on how a dog is determined to be euthanized. Dogs do not need to be put down, rehabilitation and accountability on owners part can be effective
- Not judging one specific breed as worse... example. I dont agree with ALL pitbull type dogs are bad. In my opinion that is racist. you would NEVER do that against humans and the kind of nationality we are so why would you do this with dogs? They are family too...
- It does not lead to euthanization. There should be restrictions placed however on allowane in public spaces including fines for not wearing muzzles or being let off leash in publis areas
- They shouldn't have the power to euthanize.
- The tribunal needs to include dog owners, including those with specifically noted breeds.
- Putting dogs down as a last resort investigate the dogs home to see how they are being treated and if they are abused and if the dog acts different away from the own the dog may have to go to a different home if the owner can not care for it properly.
- As long as these tribunals don't become a he said, she said, kind of accusation train that allows dogs to be put down when they shouldn't be
- If decision is euthanasia, there should be a second review by the courts.
- A veterinarian is a member of the tribunal
- The breed should not be judged, it's the owners that are at fault. I believe that all owners that choose to have a dog should be committed to the training and responsibility of owning the animal. It is not fair to the animal to be put in a muzzle because of its breed. Pitbulls have a history of aggression which means any owner that chooses to own a pitbull should be certified by a dog psychologists authorizing that this owner is able to provide this animal the best future
- Sitting members on the tribunal can NOT be a negative dog hater. Also absolutely NO breed specific rules. Dogs, but more important the owners are to be held responsible, NEVER a breed
- Option C that they review restrictions the owner must abide to while the case is processed in court. This will cause less stress for both owner and animal, this situation would already be stressful enough for all parties.
- that no specific breed of dogs are specifically called out. Bad dogs are the result of bad owners.
- The whole circumstances involving the incident are reviewed. (i.e., don't just look at the fact the dog bit someone - look at whether it was being teased or taunted, etc.
- Looks at rehabilitation options and owners impact on dogs, if dog is dangerous and must be euthanized the owner should be barred from owning pets in the future. As Dogs are reflections of the owners, not their breed. Pitbull specific laws will further stigmatized that they are dangerous, when it's literally stated above that they are no more aggressive or violent than other breeds.



- As long as the tribunal consisted of multiple decision makers with clearly different backgrounds and viewpoints, with a goal of reaching an objective decision that is best for all parties involved.
- "Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal" is absurd. The owner does not follow the rules or common sense - that is why their animal is a nuisance. The owner will not comply with any restrictions set by a tribunal. Animals deemed to be a nuisance should be destroyed, PERIOD!
- That the people on the tribunal are highly educated dog people, unbiased, and fair.
- The tribunal committee needs to be impartial and educated in animal behavior
- Euthanasia is ONLY used when there is no other option or a dog has murdered someone. It cannot be a first option or second. Must be last resort.
- no euthanizing any dog, the dog can be properly trained and go to obedience classes
- The Tribune is filled with animal services experts.
- It should be based on an individual case, not a breed of dog
- Getting underlying behaviour base lines from people in the community in which the dogs lives (ex. Neighbors); the decision should not be solely based on what city workers see at the time of incident(s)
- I would like to know that the selection process for the tribunal is diverse and unbiased. Cannot have had negative experiences with dogs.
- has to be fair
- They shouldn't be able to decide if the dog can be euthanized.
- If it based on individual case before them, not breed related in any way.
- No biased judgments towards pit bulls
- Members of the tribunal would be qualified to make those reviews, ie. Vet, animal behaviour expert, etc.
- I do not believe that the dogs should be euthanized ever.
- individuals on the tribunal were well educated, understand dog behavior and psychology, take into account that breed bias/scapegoating is not tolerated and each case is based primarily on the owner and the situation. Cannot be individual with breed biases.
- As long as it was done as a trial to make sure it is fair and works as intended
- Contains a number of dog owners who are involved in rescue.
- This was used equally for all dog breeds, regardless of size. An aggressive shih tzu is just as dangerous as another aggrieved large dog
- They remain indifferent to "bully" type breeds. ie, they don't show discrimination towards them
- As long as the dog isn't forced to be euthanized at the scene. There has to be multiple people to approve.
- They were assessed properly by a formal trainer before going to court
- Pet is interned at residence property while pending hearing
- As long as the representatives are not biased and are 100% neutral when reviewing the case. Biased representatives could result in a unfair decision for either the dog, the owner, or the victim.



- Tribunal must have representation for vets, as well as certified individuals trained in animal behaviour or obedience. Considering the bias of this engagement survey, I would also request that members of the tribunal have first-hand knowledge of working with and training bully breeds
- The owner of the dog is held accountable for the actions of their dog with little punishment to the dog itself
- I would like to mention that whether the dog was provoked or protecting their owner should be taken into account.
- The owner picks if they want to go to court or have a tribunal decision. That might stop the wasting of funds for tribunal process only to have the owners appeal it anyways.
- There is a measurable window of time allowed for a case to sit there, otherwise it gets handed over to provincial court
- Not biased on breeds.
- The persons on the Tribunal have good knowledge of dog behaviour.
- That could be appealed
- The tribunal consists of individuals that hold no sort of bias towards breed
- Dogs shouldn't be euthanized. They should have to go to mandatory training
- That all cases be assessed using the same criteria regardless of breed
- Paid for by the owner
- Experts in animal behaviour were included in the process so that they could help identify if a dog is vicious or aggressive because of the owner (suggesting seizing the dog instead of euthanizing it) or factors outside of the owner's control (not taking dogs from owners who were not at fault)
- The tribunal includes people who are unbiased to pit bulls. This survey already shows a severe bias against them.
- The owner of the dog at fault **MUST** pay for the Tribunal on top of an increased fine. The rest of Calgary doesn't deserve their taxes to go up because people are bad dog owners.
- Dogs should not be euthanized but given the option for behavioural therapy on the owners expense.
- Dogs should not be euthanized but instead put in behavioural therapy on the owners expense.
- Unbiased to breed of offending dog.
- There is a fair appeals process
- There was notice of who was in the tribunal
- There has to be proof of the dog being aggressive without being provoked
- all involved in the fate of X (dog) should have extensive training in canine behaviour or something of the sorts. Dog experts should be the only people assessing the dog.
- The panel would include at least 1 licensed veterinarian, with min 5 years experience and one experienced animal worker ie: dog walker, animal shelter caretaker/volunteer, or trainer with minimum 5 years experience
- With a clear mandate of dog rehabilitation and training



- The owner of the dog is to blame, not the dog. Dog's who are mistreated and abused by bad owners cannot be held responsible for defensive actions, just like people who are defending themselves. All dogs have the right to a life without abuse.
- The dog is given back to the owner if the dog is being kept under safe circumstances until the trial is finalized
- I honestly don't know how you would please people on abiding by the rules when people who are not supposed to own pets due to hoarding or something still secretly own pets.
- Dog stays with owner during processing. Dog should not be held in a shelter at all. (Restrictions could be imposed like dog being muzzled while not secured on owners property).
- As long as every effort is made, prior to euthanization, to rehome the dog to owners that will better manage and correct aggressive behaviour.
- Sections within the enabling statute, with detail, prohibiting prejudice against pitbull and pitbul type of otherwise looking dogs.
- The tribunal be made up of educated animal professionals from a variety of backgrounds to best determine if the dog can be rehabilitated and look at a variety of different methods to allow the best chance for rehabilitation for the dog.
- As long as it is composed of knowledge and educated dog behaviour specialists
- Who would the tribunal be made up of? Depending on who would dictate my answer. Need more information BUT again use my tax money for something else!
- Dogs do not get euthanized.
- As long as there is more effort put into researching the cause of the accident to avoid just ending the dogs life because that affects the family of the dog and not all bites are the dogs fault.
- Do not euthanize an animal unless it is the very last resort!!!! Most animals can be rehabilitated and if our in proper care, they will no longer show aggression. Most aggressive behaviour from any animal comes from the owner!
- A veterinary professional reviewing the case and giving their opinion
- Allow all parties to make an informed decision on the dog an behaviour. If it is once there is no need to euthanize if a proper train practice can be Maintained to reduce likelihood of the attack happening again.
- representatives should be well versed in behaviour and psychology of dogs for educationally based decisions
- There's an appeal process
- Dog kept on own property
- Dogs are sensitive creatures and are not inherently evil or aggressive. Circumstance, fear and owner engagement shape dogs into aggressors. I think owners, not dogs, should be penalized for incidents. Dogs are under the care of their owner. Children aren't penalized when they do something wrong to a stranger- parents are held accountable. Same thing!
- That the dog is assessed by a professional trainer/dog handler who then determines where this dog can live while waiting.
- Legal process - similar to residential tenancies tribunal



- fair and just counsel in trial
- The dog isn't found guilty based solely on being or appearing to belong to a certain breed
- The tribunal includes at least one animal behavior expert and one animal care expert (preferably a DVM, either practicing or non-practicing)
- It contained a variety of dog owners
- It was impartial and not decided on by people who have a dislike for certain breeds.
- The prominent pet owner eg own a pet store or train dogs or what ever but actually understand the animals they are judgeing
- Did what was best for the dog and the family
- Its not just judged on pitbull breeds. I do not agree to the judge meant being placed towards the Billy breed dogs. Education towards the owner would be better
- The do not issue dog euthanized
- Euthanization is the ABSOLUTE last resort. If an owner has a nuisance dog, as is well aware of that, the owner is responsible and should not be putting the dog in a situation where it could react from fear (reasoning behind attacks). This is not the dog's fault, but the dog needs rehabilitation and support from an owner who knows how, and can, provide that support.
- The dog should not be taken from the owner in a traumatic event. As this can cause the dog to rebel further, proper assessment should be done when the dog is NOT stressed and afraid.
- Accoutabililty should always be held on the owner and not the animal
- the city representatives are not involved in the case and are neutral in their opinions until they hear the case.
- I have no faith in City of Calgary. So whatever the outcome, I don't believe it's in the best interest of the public.
- The owners must be deemed responsible and undergo dog training to be able to own another dog.
- There is NOT an option for any dogs to be euthanized
- So long as the people called to a tribunal have no animal biases. It would not be fair to have someone with dog trauma declare to euthanize a dog that could easily be trained just from a past experience. So make sure there is vetting of some kind for the participants in the tribunal.
- Every option is exhausted before euthanizing the dog. Euthanizing should only be used as a last resort.
- Adheres to the facts. Has people who are trained in dog behaviour and have some years doing it. Impartiality. Proper risk assessment of dangerous dogs. Considered feral/unsocializable/other
- People were given proper opportunity for representation
- Many measure would need to be taken to ensure no biases are present on the tribunal
- A tribunal should not be allowed to determine if an animal should be euthanized. This should only be determined by professionals.
- Understanding the punishment might not fit the fit (someone trespassed), or if dog was defending owner



- if the owner handling skills of the dog are looked into and if the victim is questioned of if they did anything to provoke the dog to bite.
- There should a recognized expert on dog behaviour, someone who specifically works in the field of dog behaviour.
- Tribunal members are dog owners
- Provided the dog is assessed with the owner present by a trained professional to determine if the dog is actually a danger or if there were extenuating circumstances.
- Please review the dog ownership aka the Owner. You need to look at them! They are the reason why dogs are vicious, they are trained too and they know no better than to listen to their Master. I do NOT support euthanization ! The Dog deserves another chance at life
- is what is best for the dog. Dogs dont have voices. If they bite something is wrong. Very few dogs cant be rehabilitated.
- Euthanasia of an animal should be a last resort and only for extreme cases, more priority for training or other behavioral modification techniques
- A thorough look into the dogs actual behaviour by an expert in dog behaviour.
- It was shown to be more cost effective (i.e. cheaper) than the current method of housing and waiting.
- That the dog does not suffer because of the owner's fault. The dogs should be given grace and training
- Is not prejudiced due to breed. Does not bring up breed (any breed) as the cause of the incident.
- That this is not used as an excuse to persecute pit bulls, or other breeds. The tribunal must ascertain if the dog itself is the problem or the improper, or lack of, training is at fault.
- non-city representative includes dog behavior expert
- As long as it does not disproportionately affect pit bulls due to bias against their breed
- NO euthanasia; dogs should not have to suffer for the poor training given to them by their owners. Instead, force the owner and dog to undergo dog training to better the pair. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners!
- As long as the representatives have had EXTENSIVE training on the matter.
- It cost taxpayer's less than the alternative.
- Owners of the specific dog breed in question are present on the tribunal. The tribunal is picked like a jury with rotating and new members for each case.
- There are professional animal behaviouralists involved
- tribunal must include animal rights activists and professional dog trainers who can help assess if the issue is the dog or the owner and what the proper steps to rehab are if any.
- As long as members of the tribunal do not belong to any animal rights associations or have expressed pro-animal sentiments in the past as it would cloud their judgement when euthanization may be required.
- The owners property has been investigated
- committee agreed by both parties or at least an impartial group of people not decided by City of Calgary



- Panel must have certified animal behaviour specialists
- As long as the members of the tribunal are experienced, knowledgeable individuals who understand the dynamics of dog behaviour. These individuals should have the necessary qualifications to be able to evaluate each individual case.
- Tribunal members take safety for the community into equal or greater effect as the safety of the dog.
- Dog owner and victim involved in tribunal proceedings to ensure entirety of incident is captured and both sides have a chance to weigh in on tribunal decision
- The dog is not punished or secluded from its owner. It should be kept at its home.
- As long as there is a trial which includes a fair unbiased assessment of the dog for external parties.
- Must have an open mind to the fact sometimes people bring an attack on and frighten or antagonize the animal. It can't be a kangaroo court where the "victim" is automatically believed to be truthful.
- The victim of the attack is also investigated. A lot of attacks are at fault of the person who was bit, and the dog is only protecting themselves. A dog should not be at fault for protecting themselves.
- It does not focus on breed but rather the individual owner, dog and building an j deer standing of what lead to the incident including the behaviour of the victim.
- the tribunal includes a varied panel of individuals educated and experienced in areas relating to the cases
- The onus should be placed on the human not the dog, and euthanasia should not be an option.
- Both parties of the incident must be present at the tribunal
- Nobody on the tribunal has a pre-existing opinion regarding dog breeds.
- Those who are representatives are checked for any biases
- Included unbiased arbitration with a set of protocols based on offence
- An unbiased tribunal - randomly selected for each case. People become jaded over time and lose their ability to empathize
- Making sure the members are not biased against one breed of dog. People that have experience working with dogs etc.
- The people on the tribunal have to be seriously vetted to be impartial and no one should be on it if they are bias towards certain breads (i.e. pitbulls)
- Tribunal representatives would need to include experienced animal behaviour experts.
- Breed of dog does not impact the severity of the fine/ penalty. Rather all cases reviewed omit breed from the discussion. The tribunal has height weight age of dog but no mention of breed
- The dogs best interest
- The dogs went to rehab and didn't get put down.
- It did not have breed specific rules.
- as long as the judges, or people involved in making recommendations are well informed and knowledgeable about dogs and not biased against dogs like most non dog owners and bylaw officers seem to be.
- At least one certified dog trainer and one veterinary professional should be on this tribunal
- Dogs cannot be euthanized for their behavior



- No euthanization of dogs in any way.
- Euthanizing a dog would be completely out of the picture and should not be allowed by any means
- The animal is not euthanized unless it has an underlying condition (rabies, etc.)
- Educated on dog behaviour and handling
- n/a
- Treats all dog breeds equally and put blame on owners not on the animal.
- Tribunal decisions could be appealed at the Court of Queen's Bench. If appealed, the dog must be kept at an Animal Shelter and the owner must pay for the care of the dog while pursuing the appeal process.
- Not breed specific
- They are educated dog professionals that have zero breed bias
- No bias towards "bully" breeds
- Assessment..muzzle in public. All dogs causing death should be euthanized.
- It could guarantee that representatives do not maintain an unfair bias towards specific breeds in their judgement.
- Has experts involved. Not simply city employees. Animal behaviourists and vets.
- Everyone is given the same rights as regular court proceeding
- If there was a relatively easy way for the owner of the dog to make a defence if they feel it's required.
- That the decision to euthanize a dog is the LAST possible option, after extensive training programs for both the dog and owner have been completed as well as possible change in ownership (if the owner is not fit to properly train / take care of said dog). To conclude, the decision to euthanize a poor dog, should be the very very last option, and there must be proof that we have exhausted all other options before we decide to euthanize.
- it didn't have authority to euthanize a pet, and recommendations for euthanasia would be referred back to courts.
- The make up of the tribunal would need to be public ally available and mandated to be people of varying opinions and backgrounds. I worry that it could easily end up being all people biased against animals in general, and overly recommending euthanasia or it could end up being overly composed of people biased against specific types of dogs, ie pit bulls, and result in harsher penalties against those specific types of animals.
- That if blames the owner, not the dog.
- Ensure that people who are educated of dog like behaviour have more say on it then some general public.
- any order to have a dog euthanized MUST go through the court of queens bench.
- We cannot enter into any legislation that is breed-specific. Ever. It's useless, and stupid.
- Representatives include at least one dog behaviouralist as well as a veterinarian. They will have a better understanding of a dogs breed and dispositions to know whether a dog is likely to repeat the offense.



- The dog owner is entitled to their pet and may be allowed to continue caring for them in their home.
- I feel that the members of the tribunal should be transparent and that the Humane Society and licensed animal behaviouralists should also be involved
- Non city members of the tribunal are selected by the City as objective, non biased persons who have an understanding of both animal behavior and impacts to communities. I.e. veterinary medical personnel would be preferable over a person who is an advocate for the pit bull or other known nuisance breeds.
- It proved to be a fair assessment of the dog and not a rush to judgement.
- The dogs were no longer held in a shelter and returned to owners if needed to appeal at Court of Queens Bench
- The dog remains in the owner's home under restrictions while awaiting tribunal decisions rather than in a shelter
- Euthanizing was last resort
- I don't like the idea of euthanization as a method to control dogs deemed vicious - simply because of their BREED. That is an unfair assumption because it's not always a particular breed (ie: pit bulls). Only as a LAST resort - it at all.
- There shouldn't be appeals... the decision of the tribunal should be final
- As long as a professional animal experts reviewed ALL cases. Not uneducated people that do not know anything about animals.
- Tribunal should be composed of a balanced representation of views. Pro and Anti views.
- The owner and the victim should be allowed to give statements of the account.
- The individuals were not biased on type of dog
- The tribunal is only comprised of animal behavior experts, where euthanasia is only acceptable when all other options are exhausted.
- As long as the bench consisted of animal professionals with an unbiased approach
- Non-city representatives must be impartial and not related to any causes or organizations that would make them biased
- appointment of tribunal members appropriate (i.e. unbiased and knowledgeable)
- A mix of dog owners and non dog owners. If one of them had a "nuisance pet" that would be optimal.
- The tribunal must be formed by people with knowledge in regards to animal behavior, including at least one veterinarian who can accurately make an informed decision.
- Require the owner to get obedience training BEFORE the thought of euthanizing. And there should be a number of strikes before euthanizing - it shouldn't be a first choice.
- There is no breed specific regulations. The owners are assessed
- Should not be able to decide if a dog should be euthanized without attempting other options for rehabilitation first
- TRIBUNAL MEMBERS WEREN'T PREJUDICE TO CERTAIN BREEDS
- No decisions based on breed of dog. Rehabilitation should always be an option.



- They aren't biased against certain breeds.
- Not financially wasteful or bureaucratic like Calgary City Council is.
- If proper visitation and care is provided for the animal
- The tribunal rep has experience with dogs.
- tribunal membership has to be fair and equitable.
- That the dog isn't put under too much stress and both sides are heard.
- The victim is given the option to provide an impact statement and it is given strong consideration in the final assessment and the victim is given a vote in decision.
- That it would be a fair and just system that isn't in place just to point fingers at bully breeds. The system must recognize that smaller dogs can be and are more aggressive but people only see the breed not the dog itself.
- Treat all race of dogs equal
- That the tribunal has dog behavioural specialists
- As long as rulings are made based on evidence not the breed
- Euthanasia to be used only as last resort after all rehabilitative options have been exhausted.
- if it was fast and not only used against pitbulls and Pitbull like breeds.. get that idea out of your heads right now and leave our innocent babies alone
- Review past history of dog
- Veterinarians were involved in the tribunal process/decisions
- As long as the tribunal is made up of competent people and objective criteria is established for making conclusions.
- Each party has been verified to be non biased eg, suffering a previous bite themselves, being of a culture that hates dogs etc
- Must not interfere with ability to immerse pursue civil case for damages
- The tribunal included a objective group of people that have experience with pets
- With the guidance and help of certified dog trainers, canine behaviour analysts and vets, there needs to be a proper assessment of the animal before coming to a final decision.
- The dog stays with the owner, under "house arrest" while the case is pending. This further reduces trauma to the animal. (assuming there is proper care and shelter etc being provided. I also **STRONGLY** object to the term "dog attacks" you used in this question (dropdown#1). This presupposes some ill intent. This bias in this questionnaire is becoming more and more apparent as it continues.
- No kill
- Including a vet and a animal behavior expert on the panel
- The dog has to be declared a danger to the general public not just a nuisance
- Dogs are assessed by a professional in a low-stress environment. Statements of witnesses and the actions of the victim (animal or human) leading up to the incident are taken into account. The dog's history is considered, including a statement from any trainer, dog handler or veterinarian familiar with the dog.



- The tribunal should include a dog behavior specialist
- A thorough review of the owner. Its usually the owner to blame for the animal's behaviour. Not all people should own animals.
- Both sides have an even chance.
- Involves people with knowledge on dog behaviour
- Not specific to ONE DOG BREED
- As long as it is any breed
- assessed owners capabilities of training and proper treatment and care of animal. If the owner is deemed inadequate the animal should try to be relocated before euthanasation is considered.
- As long as every single dog that does attack gets sentenced the same way. Whether it's a small dog or big dog. Shouldn't matter.
- There should be more than one person reviewing each incident. The panel should include a veterinarian and someone from the Calgary Humane Society.
- Appeals are possible
- Dog obedience specialist and pit bull experience professionals.
- The tribunal cannot be made up of solely dog lovers and/or pitbull owners.
- Veterinary professionals are included in the tribunal
- A professional dog trainer is also involved in making the decision
- As euthanasia is not an outcome. Dogs should be allowed to rehabilitate from lack of owners training.
- No decisions where the breed plays a part, for example pit bulls. If you label a dog breed as bad or dangerous it puts a label on a creature that may never do anything wrong it's whole life.
- It did not make euthanasia delicious based on breed. (Ie. Just cause its a pitbull doesn't mean it needs to be put down) assess the situation for severity and whether the dog was provoked or if the owner has not trained the dog or will not train the dog to not bite.
- Review and screen the owner for incompetence of training their dog
- Not putting dogs in shelters or euthanizing after an incident. Assess the training the owner has provided and the environment the animal resides in. It's the owner not the breed.
- Do not go after a specific breed of dog however only dogs that have had a history of biting or being violent
- Don't blame owners up front and fines should not make it so owners can't even afford get pet back
- As long as euthanasia was not considered as an immediate action. It would be preferred that the dog was maybe given to a dog trainer/someone capable of dealing with rescue dogs would monitor the dog through different behavioral phases. Only then should the dog be considered to be euthanized.
- Euthanasia is utilized as a LAST resort, and an animal behaviourist is utilized to help assess the danger of the animal. Again I feel like pairing with local rescues here, where euthanasia is already a LAST resort is a step in the right direction.
- It is solely staffed with professional licensed dog behaviourists and dog trainers.



- The owner must keep the dog inside or use a muzzle whenever leaving the house until seemed safe
- Dog allowed to stay with owner during tribunal process
- Members must be experts on dog behaviour
- give the owner and dog proper training
- Members cannot use "Feelings" nor personal experience to make any decisions, facts, evidence, and EDUCATED precedent only. The fact the city is considering banning a dog breed not on evidence or fact. Beyond a weak excuse that "pit bulls bite harder" is already a red flag this will be handled horribly
- If both parties agree to a tribunal
- No breed specific rules are applied. Dog breeds are not a problem owners are.
- Owners investigated to why the animal is a problem!
- Depending on how many offences a dog has against them. First offenders should proceed with Warnings and mandatory training
- Two members of the public and must be dog owners.
- Don't single out ANY breed. Pitbulls don't deserve to be punished due to poor ownership. Dog bites are the direct result of ownership and training. Don't punish the dogs because of their owner not either properly training or acknowledging the temperament of their dogs
- Knowledgeable representatives are appointed
- Professionals in the K-9 World should be on the tribunal not Layman hyped up on Fear
- There is no discrimination against particular breeds of dogs
- All dogs are treated equally, not because they are 'pitbull' like. If a chihuahua attacks & bites, the dog should receive the same treatment.
- The owner is held responsible and that safety measures are taken to make the dog more comfortable.
- The dog should not be euthanized but instead rehabilitated through training WITH THE OWNER so they receive the same amount of training, expectations and observation done by the court.
- Members include professionals of veterinary medicine and animal behavior.
- Their decision CAN be timely challenged in court
- The tribunal had actual experience with animal behavior
- I do not like the idea of euthanasia. If a dog is repeatedly a nuisance and the owner continues to do nothing about it, the dog should be seized and placed for adoption. A dog does not deserve to die because of an owner's refusal to see there is a problem.
- As long as dogs are always referred to for obedience training and euthanization is considered only in the worst cases. No discrimination against pit bulls.
- There are animal advocates who are experts in dog behaviour to determine what the cause of the behaviour was.
- That the reason for attack is thoroughly reviewed.
- You look at if the owner is training the dog properly. It's not always the dog's fault which seems to be a massive missed point so far.



- At least 2 or more tribunal members with extensive dog behavioral training, tribunal made up of min. 8 members, min. 75% agreement in decisions
- non-biased experienced and knowledgeable people must be on the tribunal.
- Had a large ranges of representative of people from the community
- The dogs behaviour would be assessed but also taking into account if it's a neurological condition the dog has or if the dog was poorly trained and can be retrained.
- The tribunal must consist of community members or individuals involved in animal care services. It cannot be made up of a prejudiced group.
- The tribunal must consist of community members or individuals involved in animal care services. It cannot be made up of a prejudiced group.
- I require more detailed information than is provided here
- Consideration must be given to provocation of an attack by inconsiderate humans.
- As long as the process is fair and impartial and all evidence has been reviewed
- The owner has sufficient/fare time and resources to appeal the case after the tribunals decision.
- Consist of qualified individuals, with a mix of dog owners and non dog owners. The affected parties also need to be given the opportunity to speak to tribunal (provide statements/records/explanations/video,etc) before decision is made.
- Both parties present and valid fight from both of the parties in court
- Tribunal members should be qualified for the task, familiar with animal behaviour and training practices for aggressive animals
- If the tribunal deemed that a dog should be euthanized - that case should go before the court for a final decision.
- There should be non-biased professionals able to assess the dog LONG-TERM. In a calm, safe environment for the dog.
- No breed-specific legislation. It's the same discrimination as racism.
- The dog is not forced to be euthanized but to be trained. Or given to an owner that will put in the time and effort to train and socialize it properly.
- The tribunal cannot determine the dog should be euthanized.
- Animal experts are included to prevent BREED SPECIFIC DISCRIMINATION
- It is made up of people with actual knowledge of dogs and breeds, and is utilizing facts and verified statistics to make decisions. It must not have a bias towards any particular breed of dog.
- That the dog not be euthanized.
- The individuals acting in the tribunal must be able to present some credentials of higher education, such as a degree or diploma.
- Appropriate rehabilitation measures are sought-after before euthanasia
- The owner is able to prove that the dog bit another person or being due protecting their owner from harm of another dog or human. And that just because the dog hurt another animal does not mean that it wasn't provoked. Their should be monitoring of daily activity of the dog to see if it normally acts very well around other people and dogs. Also it's important to investigate the owners and not



the dog. Maybe the owner is abusive and/or did not properly train dog. Owner should be held responsible in such cases and the dog should have a chance to prove itself for training and adoption.

- If fault / negligence was found by the owner, the owner should be fined and dog removed from the home. A responsible owner should be allowed to adopt said dog before euthanizing is considered
- Limit the sanctions they are allowed to impose, and maybe only take first time cases
- As long as the first step isn't putting the dog to sleep. Other steps should be taken first like obedience classes and muzzle/off leash regulations.
- Has people on it who are experts in dog psyche and behaviour
- An alternative solution (where possible) to putting dogs down
- The owner having to abide by the rules in place to have the dog.
- Meetings with involved parties to get a detailed history of the dog's previous behaviour. Keeping a detailed list of past issues.
- The owner is also reviewed to determine if further pet care education is needed.
- There were at least 3-5 people in the tribunal and it had decent representation and people who have been given training as to animals and the information needed to make a fair decision.
- People on the tribunal have the appropriate qualifications to make the right decisions.
- This needs to apply to ALL dogs. There are many small breed dogs that have bitten people/dogs on multiple occasions and the repercussions are not equal.
- NEVER single out a 'breed', or develop subjective reasoning based on a breed, as to influence the decision.
- Equal number of dog owners to non-owners on the tribunal board
- There is not a breed specific bias
- Fair representation
- the tribunal was composed of animal doctors and experts only.
- Case by case bias and not breed by breed and hold owners more accountable
- Fair review of the case looking at if the dog is truly at fault or if the person bit provoked the attack
- Should not be appealed
- Not looking at the dog as being in the wrong always, this is still an animal. We need to look at the owners to see if they are fit to train and take care of the dog, see if the dog has any history of abuse in its life and also look at the one that was attacked to make sure that dog was not provoked or teased or the dog was defending its self or its owner or other people for that matter
- Responsibility is put on the owner, and if needed the dog is appropriately rehomed or fostered
- No thanks
- No breed discrimination. All breeds can bite.
- The tribunal must sit for all breeds.
- The dog should stay with their owner but be on house arrest until the decision is made
- Impartial and educated representatives including people that work with animals on a daily basis.



- It is either elected by the public or it is made up of qualified, unbiased professionals who understand animal wellbeing and health care (ie: vets, animal behaviourists)
- Non biased to certain dog breeds ei. A pitbull.
- Members of the tribunal must be responsible Dog owners
- Euthanasia is the last resort after behavioural training and rehabilitation has not worked and owner continues to put other dogs and owners at risk in public areas.
- What would be the make up of a tribunal? Joe bylaw or actual trainers?
- tribunal is not bias. Owners animal records are taken into account - are they providing proper care, do they keep up to date on treatments, meds, etc. have they had incidents in the past, have they had previous pets ? Where did they get their pet from ? If from breeder, was the breeder meeting proper standards, why were they breeding?
- As long the tribunal representatives are unbiased.
- as long as the decision is solely based on the severity of wounds caused by the dog is truly looked into thoroughly
- Money was not put first and cases were looked at with fairness and empathy
- If they decide a dog is to be euthanized, there should still be opportunity to appeal regardless of the staying time in the shelter
- Depending upon the dogs attack, if it's show over aggressive behavior. Then definitely it should be euthanized! People that own these types dogs will never be able to control them!
- The dog actually attacked. Not a nip or a dog that was defending themselves.
- No bias on type of dog
- The answers for this question are unreadable past tribunal in each one. I cannot read the rest of the answer. I would support it only if it reduces stress and trauma for the dog, the owner and the injured person.
- Fair appeal process
- Judge the dog without mentioning the breed of the dog as to not attach any pre conceived notions about the dog, or prejudice.
- The dog doesnt go back to the owner while this is being determined, people with vicious dogs are not responsible enough to follow restrictions.
- As long as they are not biased and hating the breed that was on trial. YOU CAN NOT USE JO BLOW OFF THE STREETS! It would have to be dog behaviorists and trainers. NOT COMMON PEOPLE WITH A HATE ON FOR A BREED!!!!
- Reputable dog trainers, behaviorist and vets are only ones on the panel - people who know dogs, can assess the situations and if needed give effective solutions or options that are then enforced and must be followed through on by owners
- I would support a tribunal as long as it followed this condition
- A minimum of 80% of the tribunal vote is required for a dog to be euthanized
- Those on tribunal needed certain qualifications.
- Any additional costs for tribunal process be put on dog owners



- It is also an option to identify an incompetent owner, where rehabilitation and transfer of ownership/rights are given to an experienced (and willing) dog owner / trainer. If the dog is rehabilitated because the owner is reckless, the dog is very likely not to be aggressive again.
- It must be fair for both parties!
- Tribunal members would have the experience and qualifications to assess dog behaviours, coming from veterinary, animal control/conservation, and dog training backgrounds
- Do not euthanize dogs
- Properly accredited dog behavior specialists and veterinarians. Not a mob of appointed concerned members.
- It depends who sits on the tribunal and how they are elected. Should be animal advocates and behaviour experts
- No euthanizing
- They met certain educational requirements. Such as taking courses on the difference between reactive and aggressive dogs and can non discriminantly assess cases on individual merits.
- Part of a tribunal consists of parties who are a part of animal care in the city (whether Humane society or trainers).
- Offered extensive training as a first rehabilitation option before being euthanized
- Are well educated in dog obedience and obedience methods
- Pet and dog experts formed the tribunal, rather than random people who don't know what they're talking about when it comes to pet ownership.
- It isn't biased toward a specific breed (ie. Pitbulls)
- Dogs should remain with their owners if this ever happens. It's cruel punishment to both the animal and it's human(s) to be separated during a traumatic time.
- There should be certified dog trainers/ dog behaviorists on the tribunal to help come to a fair decision.
- The tribunal is not biased towards breeds and is more focused on the owner and training. I would also like the Tribunal to focus on methods of training and prioritize positive reinforcement techniques and be extremely biased against punishment in training.
- There is diversity in the appointments and candidates are not biased in favour of one side or the other.
- As long as there is no breed discrimination.
- The tribunal should include a veterinary professional (trained veterinarian or animal health technologist) with knowledge of animal health and behaviour.
- That you as a city doesn't use this survey as a way to stigmatize against a breed that is not a problem. While completely overlook the actual problem of poor ownership and irresponsible pet owners. THE DOG IS NOT THE PROBLEM AND BY ADDING TO THE STIGMA YOU ALSO ADD TO THE PROBLEM. Do better.
- I do not believe tribunal should be allowed to assess whether a dog be euthanized or not. Review the owners care, enforce training and therapy for the dog. Do not punish the animal for a human's



mistreatment. Also, multiple individuals (ie. Veterinarians, Dog Trainers, etc.) should assess a dogs mental and physical health and capabilities before considering euthanasia.

- the pet rehabilitation. Prolonging the process is hard on the owner and person injured.
- Right to request a second trial at the provincial level
- Limited euthinization- only under extreme circumstances
- That it looks at the reason the dog attacked and not just the breed of dog. Most dogs will not attack unless they are threatened, those that are threatened should not be punished.
- Case by case basis
- No euthanization for any dog, regardless of breed or attack. Dogs can be trained or restricted, it is completely unfair that a dog be sentenced to death rather than taught how to behave. That being said, a system for compensation after dog attack is a good idea.
- Had dog behaviour experts on the tribunal
- I think euthanasia should be a used only in the utmost extreme of cases.
- There is no bias towards the breed of the dog(s) and the behaviour of the victim is considered (teasing, rough housing, petting without the consent of the owner, etc.)
- Fair and honest representatives from BOTH sides of the 'training' world. IE. only "positive only trainers" don't get to judge on a dog nor do "negative only" trainers. A mixture or a "balanced" trainers panel gets to decide to ensure the dog has a fair hearing from both sides.
- I would support this as long as there were other legal appeal options for owners.
- The decisions were come to by a board of individuals not just one
- There are experts involved in assessing
- They have experience in dig behavior
- There should be one owner off multiple small dogs, one owner of multiple big dogs and a professional dog trainer. Non dog people will not be able to understand the difference good training can make on a "bad" dog.
- We need to focus more on rehabilitation of the dog instead of euthanasia.
- No euthanasia but options of different tiers of training programs.
- Reached out to canine experts to properly asses the dog, & to offer the owner a chance to abide by whichever rules needed to keep the animal without euthanasia occurring.
- Same Due Process for Owner as provided by Provincial Court; an Appeal Option not related to Court; Focus on rehabilitation and collaborative solutions vs. wielding power and euthanasia.
- The people appointed to this tribunal show absolutely no bias based on breed of animal. Breed holds no bearing, inly how they are trained.
- It needs to happen within 48 hours of the incident
- Every case must be looked at fairly/nonprejudicial, on its own merit based on facts, the animals best interest must be taken in to consideration as well. Any person(s) who have personal issues, fears or dislike or prejudice of animals or of specific breeds, color, shape, size should not be permitted or should be excused from participating in a tribunal of this nature.



- There was an actual fair trial for the dog - as most dog attacks are not due to the animal being inherently viscous, but negligence on the owner/surrounding human's part. Therefore the dog may not need to be euthanized, but removed from the owners care and placed within proper care.
- All other options ie dog training, rehabilitation are considered prior to euthanasia.
- The dogs remained in a safe place that would not cause trauma (i.e. foster home, vet, etc.)
- A tribunal is a great idea but only if it consists of experts in the field not various citizens. IE: vets, trainers, physiotherapists for dogs etc
- A reasonable amount of time is given after the tribunal decision for any appeals to be made. During this time the animal is allowed to remain with their owner. This is especially important in cases where euthanasia is decided. Owners should be allowed to be with their pets while trying to appeal this decision and/or spend time with their pet before they are euthanized.
- Have the animal spend a year in obedience training with lots of love and care and PATIENCE
- The representatives must have sufficient training and knowledge of animal behavior and must adequately consider that the dogs problematic behavior is likely a result of inadequate training rather than the dog itself, decrease euthanization practices and instead attribute funds towards free behavior training for dogs.
- It is NOT run or influenced by so-called 'animal rescue' or activist group or person. They are a biased party whose focus is on dog 'rights' and not public safety.
- The tribunal be made up of certified knowledge dog experts/trainers.
- Don't euthanize dogs, funded training and behaviour classes provided after incident
- Considers the dog's history, i.e. was it rescued from a fighting ring, has it been abused, etc. Sometimes it is not the owner's fault for the bite because the dog may be afraid or in the process of overcoming abuse. Dogs experience anxiety and trauma too. Euthanasia should be the absolute last resort.
- pet not allowed off of owners property without muzzle.
- As long as the people involved in the tribunal have never been involved in a traumatic incident. A person previously attacked by a dog may not be able to step back from that and judge the episode fairly and on its own merits.
- Not bias towards breeds
- Have a qualified non biased professional assess the dog
- Don't euthanise the animal, rehabilitate it.
- As long as it fit the actions of pet, owner etc
- Removal of the euthanasia option. Look at other solutions to help resolve any behavioural issues
- Take full consideration of the animals history and be more willing to explore behavioral training before euthanasia.
- So long as the tribunal is run by the people, of the people, and for the people.
- dog muzzled in public and not allowed off leash for that time.
- assess if the dog requires to be rehomed/additional training to be a good citizen...
- A tiered judgement on euthanasia



- so long as bully breeds are not discriminated against because of their breed. The behaviour must be first and foremost taking into the consideration.
- That it cost the city no further money as the city cannot afford an outlay like that. If there were no way to create a tribunal that netted no cost to the city, then I would not support the creation of a tribunal.
- Appropriate qualifications for those on tribunal
- Equal number of pet owners to non pet owners on the tribunal
- The dog was only euthanized if the bite was life threatening
- The RIGHT people are on the tribunal; informed, educated, unbiased representatives.
- Against euthanizing as an option.
- Euthanization as absolutely last resort
- The dog being euthanized is the absolute last resort. The dog should not suffer consequences of poor ownership
- Depends on who is on the board, very little information given how I am supposed to properly answer this question. Who would be on the board, how do they get to be on this board, what are their qualifications... etc thanks for making a biased questions allowing you to do whatever you want...
- No discrimination against pitbulls
- provided the dog and owner are not entirely and fully separated--this could lead to increased stress for the dog.
- Do not assess dog in shelter environment. It is a scary place and you won't see the true personality
- Not be allowed to determine if a dog should be euthanized
- The dog is assessed by a science based trainer/behaviourist.
- euthanization is not required as a punishment for infraction.
- Pit bulls should not be targeted as aggressive animals due to severe bite. there is no scientific evidence proving such statements. Animal would have to be a repeat offender to be labelled as a nuisance.
- Give the dog a chance by obligation the owner to get training lesson by a PROFESSIONAL and let the professional trainer make the decision.
- As long as the tribunal is assembled using a mixture of dog owners and/or professionals and has a fair makeup so that the dogs have a fair chance.
- Clearly defined process, procedures and authority
- BSD is not implemented
- Members of tribunal are proven not to hav breed specific bias
- no dogs are euthanized. owners are given the resources to train out the violent behaviour.
- There is a non-breed bias in the tribunal. They cannot make decisions to euthanise based on the breed of the dog, the potential of the breed of the dog, or anything else unrelated to fact. Any speculation regarding the breed of the dog, especially speculation that includes overlooking the circumstance and previous history of the dog, cannot occur or be allowed on the tribunal. The



tribunal must be impartial and treat all cases equally, regardless of the type, size, or strength of the dog. The tribunal must be selected under great scrutiny to ensure this condition is met.

- Make sure your looking into how the dog has been living - check into the owners! They are the problem.
- Ensure two opinions of the dog are recorded that are not involved or related to the incident. People can be unnecessarily harsh, crude and vindictive. I would like to live in a city that uses unbiased reason and a lot of compassion to effectively evaluate situations.
- On first offenses, we address the environment the dog was raised in, the owners competence of training. And potentially look at putting the dog through rehabilitation as there life should not be shortened because they were adopted by someone incompetent
- Non city representatives are balanced dog trainers and not force free alliance (positive reinforcement only) trainers.
- As long as the people on it were all qualified dog trainers from a variety of philosophical perspectives. In other words not biased one way or the other.
- That the tribunal base decisions on incident and not breed.
- Tribunal needs to be fair and unbiased. There needs to be a representative from the city that is competent to discuss animal behaviors.
- No one displays breed discrimination.
- The tribunal does not decide euthanasia and qualified vets and trainers are on the tribunal
- It was treated as innocent until proven guilty. For example if a pitbull were involved in an attack during a break and enter.
- Tribunal needs appropriate professional on it.
- That it is not bias toward pit bull breeds
- Make sure said tribunal actually includes veterinarians and dog behavioural specialists
- That euthanizing is considered as a last resort. Take the time to understand how or why the attack happened and make a non biased conclusion on how to proceed
- The cases must be handled with the utmost respect and empathy
- It depends on why the dog was apprehended - does "severe" mean hospitalization? Does "severe" mean stitches? It depends on the reason dogs are apprehended.
- Impartial judgement. They should not know of the breed while deciding, just what happened in the incident. Knowing the breed will allow biased results
- Euthanasia was only considered for dogs with health issues/mental issues as confirmed by a vet.
- I completely disagree with the use of euthanasia. No dog should be euthanized. If humans aren't euthanized why would we do that to our animals?
- Fair chosen representation. A multi step threshold for offenders .
- Not to discriminate based on breed.
- Someone who understands dogs is on the board as well.maybe a respected vet or trainer.
- There was a fair investigation in the pet owner to find out why the animals behave the way they did. Most animals are innocent and react to something , for example a child sticking a pencil or an object



up a dog's butt and the dog turns around to snap at them the dog should not be destroyed because the child was not doing what they were supposed to be doing.

- Euthanasia was not the consequence for first offenders. It should only be a last resort.
- Experts on dog behaviour are involved.
- Canine behavioural experts and veterinarians are included in the tribunal decision
- REVIEW THE OWNER NOT THE DOG
- NO euthanasia
- If euthanasia is proposed, owner has the option to request case go through provincial court.
- Have at least one veterinary professional on the board, allow for trials to occur more quickly and for the tribunal to not work as a way to get pit bulls euthanized.
- It does not have any breed specific punitive options; there are no breed specific conditions or consequences.
- Euthanize is the last option. Most animals that have dangerous behaviours are the fault of the humans in their life. Dogs should not be euthanized unless it is for pain measures and illness. Every dog can be rehabilitated, a lot of humans can not be.
- There is more than one person presiding and deciding course of action.
- This must be for all dogs not just pitbulls
- The members are knowledgeable and have some kind of background related to animals. The members of the tribunal are rotated - a pool of members that a board is selected from for a hearing.
- They can not declare a dog be euthanized. Any euthanasia decisions would need to mandatorily proceed to the provincial court.
- That there were people on the tribunal with a healthy respect for the fact that pit bulls, german shepherds, dobermans, etc are not wrongly discriminated against due to their breed.
- takes place within one week of incident
- Do everything possible to help the dog, dog owner and victim so that the dog can stay alive and retrained
- non-biased representatives
- Leave the dog at home under house arrest
- Dogs shouldn't be euthinized because of the wrongdoings of humans. Most (not all) of the time the dog attacks for a reason, meaning they most likely feel unsafe or threatened by the person who ends up getting attacked. There are warning signals and people should know what they are.
- Non-biased opinion of breed. There are no bad dogs only bad owners.
- Euthanasia should be banned for offences. Forcing proper and specialized training for the dogs and the owners is necessity.
- Anything to make the process less traumatic
- Provided myself or a like minded person is on the tribunal
- dogs must be places into rehabilitation programs before considering euthanasia
- Measures in place to ensure fairness



- As long as they give their recommendations when it comes to euthanization and not the final decision. Also would recommend requiring training from the owner for the human and the dog. With recommended dog trainers at the owners expense.
- There need to be representatives from rescues around the city involved. Calgary Humane, AARCS, ARF, etc
- First offence and unique conditions like someone running through a “fenced, off leash, dog park”
- That it could be appealed at the Court of Queen's Bench
- Animals that are apprehended are treated fairly
- The people running the tribunal has the best interest of the dog at heart.
- No breedism. Don't judge a dog based on what breed it is.
- Fair and not targeting breeds. Must have varied “judges”, not just bylaw officers.
- They were in a foster system, with an experienced handler
- That the person reviewing the case is WELL trained, and the case is very well examined, and the dog in question is given a chance to undergo retraining so as to save its life, and potentially adopted out to more responsible owners.
- Vet and train the people on your tribunal so you don't have someone biased against a certain breed or against animals in general for any reason.
- no judgements for specific breed of dog. the tribunal can only work if each dog is looked at on an individual basis and judged based on the issue at hand, not because of their appearance or perceived breed
- It had non biased people who are level headed and don't hate pitbulls
- Euthanasia should never be considered. The owner should be fined and the animal taken away for rehabilitation.
- Pets owners need to be held accountable for the ownership of their pets
- Experts must be part of the tribunal. Such as vets, dog behaviouralists, etc.
- STOP DISCRIMINATING AGAINST PIT BULL TYPE BREEDS
- There must be an professional dog behaviour analyst or someone to that effect in the tribunal at all times.
- Unbiased representatives, similar to a jury system .
- Tribunal members should go through unbiased education on pit bulls, or people with a biased view of pit bulls should not be allowed on the tribunal.
- The SPCA or other animal welfare and qualified people made up some of the panel.
- The owner's perspective and statement were considered and the dog's history was evaluated.
- You send the owner to obedience school. Dogs aren't inherently vicious, they are trained by their surroundings
- More than 1 dog behaviour/trainer are doing separate an assessment.
- The tribubal must review the owners as it's the owners fault if their dog is considered a "vicious dog". If dogs have to be euthanized due to the owners neglect, owners should receive jail time and heavy fines as their behaviour is criminatory.



- No dogs being euthanized without thorough review
- Dogs cannot be seized without warning, or time to appeal. Both sides of a case must be heard equally - there is a lot of misinformation and misunderstanding that can occur when people try to interpret what happened during a dog bite. Facts should not put all of the burden on the dog, or the larger animal in animal on animal circumstances. If euthanasia is the outcome of a tribunal there should be an option to appeal and take the case to the next level.
- The dog, no matter what the breed, isn't put through any emotional stress
- As long as the pet's stay could be subsidized, or paid for by the province. Not everyone can afford to have their animal kept in a shelter until it's able to make it to court. More serious offenses, and repeat offenders should just be euthanized.
- Euthanasia is too extreme to even consider.
- People on the tribunal owned dogs themselves
- The makeup of the tribunal must be dog behaviourist outside of city enforcement, protection dog trainers would be ideal
- Members of the tribunal are well educated in animal bylaw and behaviour and consist of animal professionals capable of making sound and educated decisions, as the potential euthanasia of an animal is not a decision that should be made lightly or by people with little to no experience in animal care.
- Receiving input from neighbours and people (aside from the dog's family) about the dog's typical behaviour.
- Certified dog behaviourists are included on these panels
- Who is paying for this tribunal? if its tax payers, then I do not support it at all. Its a joke
- Does not euthanize the dog. Does not take the dog away from the owner
- Those involved show they are not biased towards or against certain breeds.
- was a well thought put process that takes everything into account, and not a way to quickly euthanize a "problem" dog because thats easier than rehab.
- At least half of tribunal made of pet owners, pet experts consulted
- Would need to be reviewed by a court if they choose that the dog is to be euthanized
- The owner NOT the dog should be the subject of the tribunal.
- Support
- The tribunal does not include People who are anti dog (open minded)
- People on the tribunal would need to be properly qualified.
- No euthanasia unless involving children or death.
- Adjudicators include knowledge experts in the fields of animal behaviour.
- as it would be fair and consider all events that occurred and did a proper investigation.
- Again, not choosing a punishment towards the dog, but holding owners accountable and assessing if it is even a safe environment for the dog to return to.
- I don't believe in euthenization, I believe the dog should be romoved from owner custody and the pet owner is no longer permitted to own an animal for a set number of years. And must complete dog



training classes if they wish to own in the future. For the dog we should have a government funded animal rehabilitation center to try and help the animal.

- Don't let the breed of the dog determine the fate of the dog, and before euthanasia all other routes to help understand why the dog is biting must be used
- Involves only members of effected community.
- Only for minor cases.
- If the tribunal consisted of experienced and educated people who deal with animals
- People that understand behaviour of dogs (sometimes there are reasons dogs bites. Eg. Kids playing inappropriately with them)
- Resolution for the dog asap
- Included a team of animal behavioural experts
- If the owner can prove to keep their dog locked at home during the decision period it would be best for everyone including the animal
- The dog is able to be with its family not kept in a shelter
- the owner was also incarcerated at the time the dog was.
- The dog gets to stay at home with the owner (not leave the property) until a decision is made by the tribunal.
- Made up of partly community members where the dog is located as well as citizens from Calgary.
- I support a tribunal as long as it followed this conditions
- Tribunal includes behavioural experts (expert dog trainers and vets)
- Judge the owner and not the dog
- Was composed of individuals that are not biased against pitbulls.
- Fair
- All dogs are given a warning, that no animal would be destroyed without an attempt at rehabilitation. The tribunal members should have experience owning pets.
- They should not be allowed to decide if a dog is to be euthanized.
- All breeds are considered equal
- True animal experts are on it. Ones without breed specific bias.
- No unauthorized euthanizations. (Without owners permission)
- No Animal should be euthanized for behaviours - there is a reason for the behaviour. You wouldn't euthanize a toddler for biting or a grown man for ending another life.
- The tribunal should consist of people who have knowledge of dogs and their behavior, not just general public. Your previous selection of the pit bull breed is unfair. Any dog will react and the situation has to be on a base by base issue.
- The people in it are educated about dogs and not just biased because the breed is one that is "scary". This way there is no inherit bias against the dog and the case can be reviewed fairly.
- Not to bypass provincial court and have individuals uphold their own opinions when it comes to breed specific laws or decisions. It needs to be objective.



- I don't support the tribunal deciding if a dog should be euthanized. I also don't know the regular process for this decision. Depending on the expertise of the tribunal (veterinarians vs. volunteer citizens vs. experts in dog behaviors) I could get on board with them making the assessment in euthanizing.
- Persons appointed have proven (e.g 3-5 years) experience training, walking, or volunteering with dogs
- Dogs are rehomed and rehabilitated, never euthanized
- euthanization does not occur, animals can be trained and the blame/consequences should be placed on the owners
- Put down crappy dog owners before the dog
- At least three different veterinarians, three different reputable/qualified dog trainers and a reasonable standard set of criteria that must be met 100% for euthanization recommendations
- As long as there is people with a legal background and people with experience on animal behaviors. Family and friends can attend to testify.
- Dog innocence to human guilt
- Rehabilitation of the dog before euthanized
- the tribunal is not a set of people with previous assumptions about dogs and breeds. there should be experienced dog trainers and behaviourists involved in the process.
- qualified people and does not include euthanization. It is a misunderstood and usually scared dog that requires training not death.
- There is representation by a bully breed positive group. Bully breeds suffer from stigma, and there should be representation to ensure they are not receiving harsher sentences.
- That those on the tribunal are not for or against specific dog breeds and that the hearings are fairly represented by those who support certain breeds
- The fines don't increase based on the type of dog but the severity of the incident
- Do NOT euthanize the dog. It has been trained poorly. All dogs deserve the right to have a second chance. It may cost more because of prolonged training, but their life should not be shortened because of someone's sick brain to train them as a mean dog.
- Again depends on situation
- Has broad rights of appeal
- Variety of people on tribunal/non bias etc
- Do not euthanize but assess if the dog should be put in some sort of training or rehabilitation program
- There were experienced and credible dog behaviourists present
- If the attack does not involve the death of another animal or person. Any deaths by dog attack should be processed through the provincial courts.
- First offences only.
- they are unbiased towards certain breeds. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners.



- I would want an annual assessment of its rulings as compared to similar cases ruled in provincial courts in other cities and provinces to ensure the arbitrators have not developed a bias.
- Look into the pet owner. Do not blame the dog first. Many times biting is a taught behaviour.
- A canine behavior specialist is present
- The tribunal sounds like an excellent idea. It would be important that the members are well educated and experienced in animal behaviour and welfare.
- It has people who understand all dog behaviours not bias against pit bulls as this Survey seems to be
- The owners be held accountable should it be found that their actions in any way encouraged the dog behaviour, and the punishments for those actions be severe enough that these people be held fully accountable and the behaviour will cease.
- That they are helping to rehabilitate the dog, not just putting it down
- Fair trial by trained dog behavioural specialists, with mire effort put on training and examination of the dogs environment. Emphasis on being able to remove dogs that are being mistreated, living in unhealthy environments, etc
- If veterinaries and animal behaviouralist were involved in recommendations and providing insight and education to cases. Decisions should be made based on the animals best interests.
- The tribunal should include a veterinary professional
- Could not be appealed at the Court of Queens bench
- The dogs breed is not a determining factor
- That it would not throw out cases in which the dogs were "smaller". A lot of the time smaller dogs instigate the attack, and get hurt because of bigger dogs. In cases with humans, a dog attack is a dog attack and the owner is at fault, regardless of the breed.
- Owner and Dog should be put in a training course before any euthanization talk is happening.
- Why a death penalty for a dog? We dont even have that for humans in Canada. PUNISH THE PERSON NOT THE DOG. Most times dogs bite is because their fear/trauma manifest itself through aggression. If a dogs attacking people, go to the [removed] source of the problem: ITS OWNERS.
- Any assessments or determinations of course of action needs to be conducted by a professional that is familiar with dog behaviors.
- The procedure is against the owner and their history and not the dogs, as far too often fearful and weak citizens place the fault of an attack on a protective dog and not on the inadequate ownership of said dog.
- Fair and done by a variety of pet owners
- The dog should not be in a shelter unless the owner consents to this. Dogs should have the right to a speedy trial
- Case by case
- They should not be assessing euthanasia. Many responsible dog owners can manage a reactive dog if given the chance. Especially in first offence scenarios.
- As long as there was some oversight to ensure they a breed isn't being singled out for euthanization and there was additional oversite for all euthanization cases.



- Dog stays with its family, not allowed in public or around kids or
- All costs born by pet owner
- A tribunal is a qualified veterinarian
- Fair selection of tribunal officials that are unbiased
- Must have balanced representation and not biased against bully breeds.
- It must be made up of people who work at/volunteer at animal rescues as they have a greater understanding of animal behaviour and a love for all animals to remain fair minded.
- representatives from local humane society and animal welfare groups or a zoo person, someone who has the dog's interest
- All members of the tribunal must not be anyone who has been bitten by that breed of dog, as that would lend an unfair bias to the judgement.
- That the OWNER not the dog is what is focused on . Training should be mandated and fines for the owner .
- If the panel had an animal behaviourist on it
- People need to be open minded - and knowledgeable. Not all Pitbulls are bad, and it's disheartening to see here that they are being singled out.
- They are well educated on rehabilitation of dog behaviours and favour rehabilitation and proper training over euthanasia
- Based on dog's actions not breed.
- People on the tribunal have knowledge of dogs.
- Situation specific
- It is fair and just
- Did not allow for euthanasia and that the dog could remain with owners during the time under certain conditions.
- Tribunal members have clearly demonstrated experience with dogs and dog behavior, and keep in mind that the dog's behavior is due to the owners training.
- Providing the owner of the dog is additionally investigate for abuse to that animal that may have contributed to the behaviour
- Option: house arrest if the owner is responsible. Also court or tribunal should both be options.
- Euthanasia is seen as a last resort, not a regular outcome.
- If dog doesn't get euthanized asap
- No Breed specific regulations!
- Caution to classify English and French Bulldogs with "bull breeds"
- Do everything we can not to euthanize the dog.
- There is no possible way for someone to exploit a case based on breed
- Tribunal should not comprise individuals that have bias against specific breeds. Must be impartial.
- If the recommendation is to euthanize, the case should still proceed to court.
- intense training paid by owner with SPCA or affiliate. Dog must be muzzled when walking but can stay in the owners care if requirements are met.



- Remove the euthanization authority, and staff the tribunal with at least half responsible dog owners, animal rights experts, and ban appointing anyone who would profit or benefit from the position
- As long as the dog is given a chance to do better, if that's obedience training that the owner and dog must go through. But these dogs deserve a fighting chance to change, it's not fair too be classified as their breed stereotype and not a chance to prove different.
- Can guarantee non-biased decisions
- Members of the tribunal met a specific standard I.e. worked in a related field, completed training
- No breed specific legislation or prejudices involved in the process. A dog is a dog.
- I'm not sure how a tribunal would reduce times if it's decision can be appealed
- A veterinarian and dog behaviour expert assess the dog
- The dog remains on the owners property in the interim and if appealing
- decision not bias on breed, but on aggressive behavior, no matter what size is the dog
- there is a formal, objective selection process for members and training, there needs to be a balance of expertise on the tribunal and a member of the public who is not necessarily an expert but represents the community
- Exhibited no breed-specific biases
- The tribunal must have at least one expert on dog obedience/training
- The breed of the dog is not disclosed to the tribunal as pit bulls are judged unfairly. All dogs have the same risk of being violent but it is not the fault of the dog, it is completely the fault of the owner.
- There was no-bias judgement/prejudice based on the breed of the dog in question. The case would be looked at from all angles and the tribunal would review WHY the dog in question was biting in the first place.
- The tribunal consist of a group of neutral people representing many areas of life. And include dog owners, dog breeders, and behavior specialists.
- fairness and not having automatic rulings based on breed.
- If assessments are fair. If a dog is being terrorized or it's life is being threatened it also deserves the chance to defend itself
- The breed of the dog is not a factor in their sentencing. In fact the dogs species should never be a factor. The victim should get a voice so should the owner of the dog and the dog should be able to have a character witness outside of the family speak to their general behaviours. The death penalty should only be on the table after the animal in question has been sent to a behavioural specialist and they have deemed the dog unmanageable and or dangerous.
- As a former Animal control officer, I do not feel that a tribunal such as this should be given the authority to enforce such a drastic measures as demanding euthanization. I do not feel any authority should have this right barring a full court proceeding and with extensive research and involvement of professional behaviourist and veterinarians. I do not feel that our enforcement officers have sufficient training to fully assess a significant bite situation and all of the surrounding factors.
- Euthanasia should not be included in any prosecution
- The people on the tribunal would be people who have no bias against any breed of dog and be well informed on dog behaviour



- It consisted of unbiased animal experts, including a vet, a dog behaviorist, and a dog trainer.
- Dogs are not euthanized unless it is a last resort
- Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal.
- The tribunal needs to be non biased and not just blame the animal but asses the owners. The animals should not be euthanized unless they in rare extreme cases have no chance of rehabilitation. They should be removed from bad/neglectful owners, and surrendered to people who are trained in rehabilitating animals before placed in a new home/foster care until a new home is found. Euthanasia should not be a simple choice.
- Dog is kept with owner until a decision is made
- What background would these people have? There must be non-biased people on this tribunal if there was one and certainly not anyone that supports BSL
- As long as the decision to be euthanized can be appealed
- The tribunal members should be REQUIRED to understand that poor behavior by dogs is a result of the human element and act as advocates for the dog since they are victims as well, but are unable to speak for themselves.
- Tribunal should be clearly defined and members should be voted in and not appointed
- No euthinization of animals
- As long as they looked at the complete situation and circumstances and not just the breed of dog involved.
- Eliminate euthanasia! A better understanding of the owner-dog relationship, rehabilitation for the dog if owner is not compliant.
- Tribunal not empowered to assess if a dog should be euthanized.
- Investigate the situation in which the bite occurred! Do not just put the animal at fault! Something would have triggered the animal to bite!
- Fair & appeal process implemented.
- Time frame for this process should be days, not weeks or months. Establish a timeframe and communicate to all citizens of Calgary.
- There is ZERO bias against breeds and that breed specific legislation is NEVER in play
- Faster processing with better overview
- It does not target any breed specifically and focuses on the owner not the dog.
- with experts on the tribunal. Vet, animal and people phycologists and with the authority to do behavior testing on the the dog and interview owners
- That this is not about reducing increased trauma to the dog. Please make the victims, the human ones especially, the priority here.
- They must have the appropriate training and knowledge to be able to determine these things.
- Not biased by presumptions about square-headed breeds. Pit bull is NOT a breed. This survey is biased! The issue is always terrible owners and owners who encourage negative behaviours in their animals. "nuisance" is not "breed" - specific.



- All assessments must be done by a trained dog behaviourist. No dog may be euthanized until this step has been fully completed. And No person on the tribunal may have any prejudices against any dogs or dog breeds
- All dogs are treated fairly. Including aggressive chihuahuas and smaller breeds who do less severe damage. They're just as dangerous.
- The circumstances around the bite MUST be clear and concise. You will not euthanize a pit bull who bit a child that was harassing them or another dog that was doing the same, or any other breed of dog. They cannot speak for themselves, so we have to.
- Choosing to euthanize isn't used as a method to decrease the number of dogs under review when the numbers get large.
- The focus should not be breed specific. If the dog has bitten or caused hem then it was on the owner to take precautions and train their dog.
- The tribunal must include people who are actual experts in the field of animal behavior and rehabilitation and/or the psychology of animal/people relationships (i.e. hold relevant degrees, have done relevant research in the field etc.). Decisions must be evidence based.
- If I keep custody of my dog throughout the process
- Review the declaration and decided based on the assessment of the animal
- The dog should not be euthanized. Owner should be held responsible, not the dog.
- It is not based on breed
- Depends who would make up the tribunal
- It would need to be made up of a mix of unbiased people. Someone who knows the law (police, lawyer, judge), someone familiar with animals and animal behaviour (vet).
- Rehabilitating the responsible parties to be more responsible pet owners.
- No bias towards certain breeds like pit mixes!
- Have a dog trainer/dog behavioural expert on the panel, all owners should be required to train their dog
- If one of the members of the tribunal was a veterinarian or an animal behavioural expert, and the purpose of the tribunal was to educate pet owners as well as enforce fines or other punishment
- That they are independent of the city, nor serving the city's agenda, and they are not breed biased
- Dog breed should not be released. Case should be viewed solely on what happened and not swayed by breed
- It must include educated people about dog behaviours. Vets ect.
- As long as clear criteria is defined and personal opinion is not involved plus specific breeds are not targeted
- The tribunal should not be allow to euthanize. Dogs need to be rehabilitated, not killed.
- As long as you listen to what your people want.
- Everyone in the tribunal was a dog expert/trainer, otherwise we will be losing a lot of good dogs that just aren't a good fit for that specific home!
- Had the dog's best interest



- There is NO breed-specific legislation (the absurd pitbull bylaws) as they do NOT WORK and the City of Calgary has thousands of dogs (large breed) far more dangerous than pitbull types.
- The owner of the dog and the victim would need to be involved in any tribunal process.
- There is a unbiased advocate for the dog.
- Mandatory training until the dog is not a hazard rather than euthanized
- Do not automatically blame the dog. Look further into the reasons behind the bite; may have been abusing the animal which led to self defense
- The dogs would be allowed to return to their home, it certain conditions are met. Providing the previous owner wasn't abusive
- Euthanization is used as a last resort not as a first option
- Right of appeal to the court system
- The people sitting on tribunal have background in dog behavior, and that tribunal is focused more on owner than dog
- Doesn't judge a dog based on the breed, such as being a Pitbull.
- That every effort is made to avoid euthanasia and provide every dog and owner the opportunity to rehabilitate, especially after a first offence. In addition an animal behaviourist should be on the tribunal or at very least consulted in each case.
- Is for every breed of dog
- All breeds matter , no unfair judgement to breed types or looks
- Individuals on the tribunal have adequate background in dog behavioural training . And as this is the only available place to comment, I am also 100% against any breed specific restrictions. This is close minded and fear based, and does not act in an animals best interest.
- it is based solely on the behaviour and the dangerousness of the animal. If the animal can be rehabilitated, then it should be attempted (poss in another home). Its not always the dogs fault, sometimes its poor parenting. WHY did the dog attack should be referenced. Afterall, if someone kept pulling ur ears and picking on you, how long till u get angry and lash out?
- as long as it is fair and not bias towards pitbulls and other dogs of that nature.
- It had a
- have impartial people who have no bias against specific breeds with proper training most dogs dont bite no matter what breed
- N/a
- Proper oversight and wellbeing of the dog are the top priorities.
- the people on the tribunal are dog behavioral specialists
- Consisted of professions and community members with the education and training to make informed non biased decisions based on evidence (both of the issue before the tribunal and best practice based research).
- Educated on dog behaviour and sensitive to all parties
- there are multiple opinions made as not to take a biased decision for a dogs life. The owner gets to defend the situation. That there is NO BREED DISCRIMINATION!!!!!!!



- The tribunal is non-biased towards all breeds
- Non-city representatives must include people with formal education on dog behaviour and the tribunal must consider all factors leading up to the incident.
- The dog should be trained better and given a chance rather than killed.
- D
- There is no dog specified. Chihuahuas are more noisy and aggressive than every single pit bull I know. It's about the individual dog, not the type of dog. Replace the word "pitbull" with "black human" in every one of your questions and see what I mean. It's disgusting.
- Conditions need to be in place
- Must speak to dog's vet to get an understanding of the nature of the animal in question.
- Strict review of circumstances leading to incident.
- Dependent on who is picked to be on the tribunal.
- There was NO BIAS against pitbull terriers
- There must be animal behaviourists both a part of the tribunal, AND either that animal behaviourist or another must assess the dog and give a detailed report to the panel.
- Target the owner not the dog. I am tired of people blaming an animal that is influenced by whom they are with.
- Tribunal would NOT have the authority to euthanize any animal.
- was optional to request it to be tried in a different court.
- Rehabilitation for dogs would be good.
- Aggressive dogs should not be euthanized, it's not their fault they weren't trained properly
- How many times was the offender warned by the attacking dog, what measures were taken, how many times did the "victim" instigate behavior that would make the dog retaliate. Regardless of size.
- Ability to assess if a dog should be euthanized be removed.
- That there be a tribunal free of biased opinions towards certain breeds.
- Breed isn't taken into consideration and the owner is required to work with a professional dog trainer until they are able to properly care for and control the animal.
- No animal should be euthanized for being labeled as a nuisance. Absolutely none.
- The panel of people must be unbiased towards all breeds of dog. Taking into account the physical attributes of a breed is one thing, but going into trials with a predetermined notion of a dog is unacceptable. Cases should be treated equally, and fairly.
- Really listen to the owners and consider ALL factors
- Tribunal should involve dog owners that own similar breeds as they best know those type of dogs.
- As long as the owner is held more responsible than the dog for a lack or bad training.
- A trial and review period to ensure this system is more effective than the current one in place.
- As dog experts including a veterinarian were present on the Tribunal.
- No authority to euthanize
- Included individuals with knowledge in dog behavior



- Representatives are not showing prejudice for breeds; all parties are still heard and alternative options are made possible before euthanasia (other mandates from above like obedience classes)
- No dog should be put down for mistakes made. Make a training and rehabilitation centre for dogs who have committed an offence and the attacking dog owner responsible for all vet bills.
- Yeah makes the most sense
- Non bias
- Breed specific punishments are not involved. All breeds can bite and be a nuisance.
- Decision maker provide written reasons and it's a statutory appeal on the record. Not judicial review. Faster and easier for self reps to navigate (I say this as a lawyer.)
- that the order to euthanize should not be influenced by petitions, pit bull pressure groups, or false narratives made public by the pit bull owner.
- That there is no bias towards pit bulls and other "mean looking" dogs
- The results of the decisions must still be carefully thought out and avoid euthanasia whenever possible
- I would only support a tribunal as long as it followed why the dog bit the person and if the history of the dog is checked.(if the dog has had a traumatic past, anxiety etc.)
- Dog behavior is the consideration not dog breed
- It was based on the dogs actions and not it's breed
- The dogs best interests, and safety of ALL (dog included) is held at the highest priority
- If all reasoning is taken into account
- The other party can be held responsible for irresponsible behaviour as well- approaching the dog without permission, hitting the dog, etc
- It was professionally manned- vets, shelter professionals, etc.
- One member of the tribunal is a veterinarian.
- Breed cannot be factor in these decisions
- They would not have the authority to approve euthanasia
- Not discriminate on a dog based solely off its breed
- No biased towards breeds
- That the tribunal look at both the dog, the dog owner and the person who has reported or was involved in the incident leading to the declaration as in many cases a person may simply want a dog of a specific breed gone and antagonize the dog to illicit a response.
- Owners have an opportunity to take their dog in for training prior to a decision to euthanize is made
- Please do not enact ANY sort of breed-specific legislation. Countless studies have shown how incorrect these assumptions are, and how dangerous these assumptions can be to the dogs, which are the ones who need protection the most
- That a dog be thoroughly reviewed by over two different people before deciding on euthanasia.
- as long as there is no bias against pit bull type dogs. That is RIDICULOUS.
- Be fair to all cases and not see first time offences for some dogs worse due to breed.
- The tribunal does not have the option to euthanize, rather to rehome.



- Cause the least about of stress and trauma to the dog
- education and investigation into why dog acted the way it did. Do not punish a dog for human error or abuse, parents need to control their children and not let them abuse dogs.
- See my notes above
- They do not place restrictions on dog solely because of their breed (BSL)
- Other: "nuisance" dogs are not singled out and treated differently than other dogs.
- Other: \$
- Other: .
- Other: .
- Other: .
- Other: .
- Other: ..
- Other: ?
- Other: 1. There should be a veterinarian and animal behaviourist on the tribunal or consultation with the aforementioned is mandatory 2. The animal should be returned to the owner during the trial if they want but must be kept in a leash or private property if they are not a danger to the owner. 3. Dogs who were provoked should be treated differently than an unprovoked attack eg. Little dog continuously snapped at larger dog or child hitting dog with a stick
- Other: 100% transparency to the public on each step of each case
- Other: 2 dog behaviour/ trainers on the tribunals to review the dogs behaviour.
- Other: 2 licensed dog behavioural trainers be in attendance to assess the nuances of dog behaviours for the attacks.
- Other: 30 hour training with the dog or rehabilitation program as first solution to the situation.
- Other: A "professional" mediates the tribunal (meaning someone with significant animal knowledge or expertise such as a veterinarian, animal trainer, bylaw officer, ect.)
- Other: A behavioral expert is consulted to see if the dogs issues are human influenced and if training will rehabilitate the dog.
- Other: A behaviour assessment is done by a qualified assessor.
- Other: A behaviourist and trainer was included on the panel
- Other: a canine behavioral specialist is involved in assessment
- Other: A canine behaviourist has a chance to assess the dog and make expert recommendations
- Other: A certified animal behaviourist or veterinary sits on the tribunal
- Other: A certified dog behaviorist is present
- Other: A certified dog trainer and Veterinarian are on the board.



- Other: A child is not involved with the biting. This needs to be criminal. Also the people who sit on the board must be trained in all breeds not just pit bulls.
- Other: A clear outline of what would be involved in euthanizing a dog that bit. Including questions upon if the dog was provoked or not. In that case a heavy fine on owner and provoker should be set. As well a clear history of dog could be included
- Other: A complete unbiased in regards to breed of dog. During the tribunal the dog remains home under strict quarantine orders. If in a household with children, dog an primary caregiver of dog must reside either at a separate location (hotel), or dog must be isolated from all other family members. If the dog cannot reside at a different location (hotel), then the additional family members must reside elsewhere (hotel). Separate residence is to be at owner's expense. If the owner has to leave the quarantine location with the dog, it MUST be muzzled and remain on a short leash at all times.
- Other: A consideration is always made for dogs that have never had obedience training, where the owner must get obedience training before euthanization is considered. Except in situations where an attack/bite caused death.
- Other: A diverse group of representatives with no specific dog breed bias
- Other: A diverse team of representatives, with at least 15% having a career in dog handling and training.
- Other: A Dog behaviour specialist is also on the panel, to ensure FAIR decisions on cases of severe dog bites.
- Other: A dog behaviour specialist is included in the review panel
- Other: A dog behaviour specialist is involved in assessing the dog to determine the cause of the incident.
- Other: A dog behavioural specialist be on tribunal.
- Other: a dog will not be euthanized
- Other: A dog's breed should NEVER be a factor in deciding to euthanize
- Other: A educated, experienced dog behaviourist is in attendance. To many dogs will be put down due to inexperience in dog behaviour.
- Other: A Euthanasia order should be reviewed by a judge
- Other: A fair "jury." No prejudiced people on tribunal. Members must like dogs. Must have relevant background either legally or working with animals.
- Other: A fair and diverse group and individuals making up the Tribunal party.
- Other: A fair and just look at the situation surrounding the incident. A dog can't speak so sometimes people ignore or are ignorant to warning signs and get themselves bitten
- Other: A fair and UNBIASED decision is made and more accountability is on owners not dogs
- Other: A fair and unbiased opinion as well as a structured plan for both the owner and the dog to follow in regards to training. With the option for counselling or therapy for the victim of the attack. Let them grow and understand why the situation happened and how to prevent it going forward.
- Other: A fair group of representatives that are neutral and unbiased.
- Other: A fair judgment from people that include experts in animal behaviour.
- Other: A fair trail, don't just pin harsher punishment based on the dog breed



- Other: A fair trial for all types of breeds and assessed the abilities of the owner (ie. did the owner abuse the dog etc.) if the owner abused the dog for example then they are the ones that should have to pay a huge fine or have their dog taken away and put into the care of a more responsible individual. The dog should not suffer for the owners negligence.
- Other: A fair trial, with rehabilitation for the dog and possibly owner.
- Other: a first offense. If multiple offenses, then jail time for owner should be a possibility
- Other: A full history of the dog's behavior is considered.
- Other: A highly regarded dog trainer was involved & made an assessment. This trainer should not have bias towards Calgary run operations (I.e., Calgary Humane Society) to provide a well rounded assessment without bias against the dog or its owners.
- Other: A home visit to see the environment of the dog would be helpful in making a decision about the dog. If the home environment could be a factor in the dig's behavioural problems, then that should be factored into the decision.
- Other: A licensed veterinarian be one of the tribunal members and breed-ism is a non-factor
- Other: A neutral third party is brought in to manage.
- Other: A non breed bias non city owned trainer comes in to review the dog, if the trainer is confident it can be trained and rehabilitated to a new home. If the dog has multiple bite history with the same owner then the owner is the problem. Remove the owner and see if that is the softener to insure a dogs success.. as a city we have the ability to change the treatment of animals so they are set up for success rather than failure. If what was happening before was not working chance how the system runs to better insure the success of the program.
- Other: A process similar to jury selection is put in place to ensure the tribunal is unbiased
- Other: A professional dog trainer also be present at the tribunal. Many dogs can be rehabilitated, many can't. A professional should also be there to assess.
- Other: A professional dog trainer/behaviorist is involved and examines the dog
- Other: A professional trained in dog behaviour is on the tribunal. Having untrained citizens be part of the tribunal is ineffective and likely for a high bias.
- Other: A proper behavioral diagnosis and assessment is completed, along with a background check on the owner. First offences may be excused depending on severity of the situation.
- Other: A qualified trainer or rescue is used to assess the animal to see if rehabilitation is possible prior to euthanasia - an independent third party, not a city employee.
- Other: A representative from city, training facility, rescue organizations, etc! should all be represented in the tribunal
- Other: A representative was a dog expert (I.e trainer)
- Other: a review of the owner and training of the dog. The bully breeds you keep listing are just incredibly faithful to their human companions, if the owner trains them poorly that should 100% be taken into consideration before euthanasia is on the table.
- Other: A review of the ownership and approach the situation for the dogs safety, and harsh punishments towards the OWNERS who are solely responsible for behaviour.
- Other: A second party reviews as well in cases that deem euthanasia as the option



- Other: A strict retaining regiment or a release of the animal to A shelter should be prioritized before the decision to euthanize
- Other: A third-party professional on dog behavior, such as a trainer specializing in stronger breeds such as German Shepherds, bull-dog type breeds, etc should be used to determine the dog's behavior and potential for behavioral modifications of the dog before ever considering euthanasia. Most of the time it is an owner who is unable to unwilling to properly care for and modify their dog's behaviors.
- Other: A thorough, fair and transparent review takes place before euthanasia is used as a last resort (if ever).
- Other: A trained and certified dog expert on the tribunal
- Other: A trainer also looked at the dog - to see if it needs mandatory training to assist in recovery/retraining and if that would help first
- Other: A tribunal can only be used for a first offence only if during the release from a tribunal a animal does bite a person or animal again it will be seized pending a court trial. Also of realeased by tribunal the owner must follow a strict curfew and animal must have specific restrain equipment and muzzle will be a requirement for 6 months
- Other: A tribunal member must be 100% non-biased towards ANY SPECIFIC BREED.
- Other: A tribunal must not be stacked with biased dog lovers. Dogs can be dangerous and debate around their danger is not based on risk but on polarized and emotional arguments. The tribunal should have risk based guidelines and not be free to decide on their on whim or love of cuddly killer dogs
- Other: A tribunal should be populated with people who are, if not experts, at least very knowledgeable about dog behaviour.
- Other: A tribunal should not have the right to decide if someone furry family member should be killed.
- Other: A tribunal that is made up of EXPERTS in dog behavior.
- Other: A true balance of viewpoints & animal expertise on the panel.
- Other: A vet AND a trainer is to decide if the animal should be euthanized.
- Other: A vet and animal behavior specialist should be part of the tribunal. Not just the people involved and the city officials.
- Other: A veterinarian and behavior specialist is on the tribunal
- Other: A veterinarian and dog behaviour expert are part of the tribunal.
- Other: A veterinarian and/or animal behaviourist is on the panel
- Other: A veterinarian gives the advice on wether the dog must be euthanized or not. This is a bunch of [removed]
- Other: A veterinarian With behaviour training must be a member
- Other: A veterinarian, animal behaviour expert, or similar must be used as counsel in each review of a case. Representatives involved in the tribunal must undergo a screening beforehand (to ensure no bias against animals/breeds).
- Other: a veterinarin or someone with professional knowledge of animals should sit at the panel



- Other: Abide by court standards with educated and informed members in the decision making process.
- Other: Ability to abide by certain conditions after less serious bites without euthanization. Trainer input
- Other: Ability to appeal decisions of the tribunal and have the tribunal answerable to the public
- Other: Ability to appeal the decision with the Court of QB.
- Other: Ability to quickly process a fair appeal (different judges/reviewers/tribunal members)
- Other: Absolutely NO breed specific laws discriminating against pit bull and pit bull like breeds.
- Other: Actual dog trainers be involved.
- Other: Actual experts in the field.
- Other: Again, consultation with or have outside experts who and invested in the dogs on the panel. These experts and behavioural specialists should be non-biased and not lining their pockets with corporate cash.
- Other: Again, please stop penalizing/euthanizing the dog. If the dog bites or attacks, it's caused by a lack of training and consideration from the owner. Penalize the owner since they are responsible for the care and training of the dog.
- Other: Agreed
- Other: All animals deserve the chance to be rehabilitated and retrained. Not euthanized.
- Other: All aspects are considered. Sometimes it is not the dogs fault. Humans need to be more accountable as well.
- Other: All avenues are exhausted to rehabilitate said dog. It is not always the dog or breed specific when incidents like this occur. Sometimes it's the human that makes the animal act this way.
- Other: All avenues are gone down, such as condition animal lives in before any decision is made.
- Other: All breeds and not hyper focus on Pit Bulls.
- Other: All breeds are treated equally in it..
- Other: All breeds of dogs are treated the same
- Other: All cases involved severe bites. I don't support tribunal for vicious dog declarations as the definition is subjective. What specific criteria are used to label a dog as vicious?
- Other: All decisions are in the animals best interest
- Other: all decisions should be made available to the public and a separate set of rules and procedures should be available and accessible.
- Other: All details made public
- Other: All dog breeds are thought of the same way! And none are labeled more aggressive because of breed!
- Other: All dog breeds were seen as equal
- Other: All dogs are treated equally and "pitbulls"aren't automatically found guilty while other dogs get more leniency.
- Other: All dogs be treated equally no breed shaming



- Other: All dogs, DESPITE THE BREED, is not euthanized for small bites and attacks that were for personal defenders purposes unless it is a repeat offender. Not all blame should be put on the dog because the dog owner was not training the dog properly.
- Other: All efforts for rehabilitation, rehoming with owners education).
- Other: All evidence including cell phone pings at the time of the illeged time of the incident.. All evidence be reported and shared and not withheld
- Other: All evidence is clear, heard and common sense is applied.
- Other: All information is provided and addressed.
- Other: All involved, owner and victim. Must be present to ensure a fair process. That the animal is not euthanized simply because it bit.
- Other: All members are educated on dog breeds, behavior and hold no bias to any breeds
- Other: All members had extensive knowledge of animal training background as well as an understanding of breed types and behavioural adaptations/ recommendations to training facilities were made before euthanizing the animal occurred.
- Other: All members must be dog owners
- Other: All members of said tribunal are dog owners, and have otherwise not displayed any baseless resentment towards any specific breed
- Other: all members of the tribunal must be screened for bias against specific breeds
- Other: All members of the tribunal must first complete dog behaviour awareness training and submit to annual training refresher courses.
- Other: All of the members of the tribunal had previously had personal experience owning or working closely with what you have defined as nuisance dogs.
- Other: All of this breed specific legislation is absolute nonsense. This kind of ignorance doesn't belong in 2020 - you would think Calgary knows better as a self touting progressive city but here we are. Absolutely disgusting.
- Other: all other avenues are tried before euthanizing, training, rehoming etc.
- Other: All participants must be thoroughly screened in regards to bias against particular breeds or cases that may cause a biased decision. Screening results should be made public.
- Other: All parties be included in the tribunal process. A behaviourist and trainer included in tribunal process a part
- Other: All parties involved must insure non bias to specific dog breeds and have some form of education in relation to dog behaviour
- Other: all parties must be present and the history of the dogs abuse and owners previous pet history if they train animals to be aggressive
- Other: All persons involved should have animal experiences. I am a dog trainer and the way that dogs behave is highly reflective towards how they are raised, or if they are rescued. People making these decisions need to understand how animals behave and why.
- Other: All representatives must be experienced in dog behaviour
- Other: All sides of the story.
- Other: All vicious dogs are euthanized and owners are fined harshly.



- Other: Allow for appeals after training, veterinarian led board
- Other: Allow for character witnesses. Perhaps the dog had a bad reaction one time to an unexpected circumstance, but is otherwise a very friendly and well behaved dog.
- Other: Allow input from the owner as a lot of cases don't give the dog/animal adequate representation.
- Other: Allow obedience trainers in to view the animal in stressful situations. If the animal appears to be vicious and tends to snap quickly, then euthanization. I do not support any BSL as pitbull type dogs are least likely to bite and will resort to any other defence first.
- Other: Allow the dog to remain with the owner under strict supervision and only euthanize if it's a severe case. A lot of dogs protecting their property or their pack are being unjustly put down..
- Other: Allow the dog to stay with owner
- Other: Allowance for this to be taken to provincial court if desired for alternative sentencing.
- Other: Allowed people to take their dog home while they awaited the assessment
- Other: Allowing a professionally trained and capable trainer to work with the vicious dog should be attempted before deciding on euthanization. Training for the owner or re-homing should also be required.
- Other: Allowing an appeal just means that every dog owner that loses will end up at Queen's Bench. I really don't think this is a great idea.
- Other: Allowing owners the right to make changes to animal care prior to looking at euthanization.
- Other: Allowing the dog to be at home with conditions
- Other: Allowing the owners of the dog to also give a heard statement
- Other: Allows for owners to attain behavior training for their dog in order to maintain the dog being a "stand up citizen"
- Other: Also increased provided support to the owners to help train their dogs
- Other: always offer alternatives to euthanization, 99% of the time it's not the dogs fault, killing the animal because it was improperly trained, protecting it's self, or an accident is not a valid decision.
- Other: An acceptance of ALL breeds and no discrimination based on breed.
- Other: An animal behaviour expert and a veterinarian sat on the tribunal
- Other: An animal expert was also included to address any bias towards breeds/type of pets
- Other: An animal specialist is on the board such as a veterinarian or animal behaviour specialist to ensure no biases at the hand of the tribunal board.
- Other: An appeal process is available so that biases can not be formed.
- Other: An appeal process is in place and possible in the case of euthanization orders
- Other: An independent assessment of the dog by someone who is non biased and has working knowledge of the breed involved.
- Other: an investigation into why the dog bit in the first place, perhaps it was being harassed or injured and was protecting itself
- Other: An invitation from a Non biased member



- Other: An owner should be assessed by professionals to determine their role in the dog's behaviour. Multiple professionals showed have their opinion reviewed on the behaviour of a dog if euthanasia is involved. Too many times are dogs not given proper attention from professionals before a court orders a euthanasia which does not allow for a chance at rehabilitation
- Other: An unbiased judgement of the dogs behaviour.tribynal.must be made of FAIR and UNBIASED people.
- Other: An unbiased tribunal court, similar to jury duty.
- Other: Animal and dog behaviour specialists are part of the committee
- Other: Animal Behavioral specialists for dogs are able to be a part of the people doing the reviews
- Other: Animal behaviour specialists are involved such as Calgary humane society staff to ensure the animal has the best and most reasonable chance possible.
- Other: Animal behaviourist, professional trainers etc. As advisors of the tribunal. As well as assesment of owners to determine willingness and capability to do what is necessary to prevent their dog from casing more harm based on evidence.
- Other: Animal can not be ordered euthanized by tribunal
- Other: Animal experts are included on EVERY panel to provide information regarding remediation and further training for both the animal and the owner
- Other: Animal get to stay in it's own home with conditions.
- Other: Animal lovers/experts/owners on tribunal. People without pets should have no say.
- Other: animal services and bylaw work together ass representatives may help ,, ensure owners are liable for knowingly supporting nuisance behavior ,, traning for both owner and pet with proof of improvement ,, penalties issued for repeat offences ,, escalating but no keen on ethanaizing ,, thats a call for animal services or fish and wildlife ,, ,,
- Other: Animal specialists are handling these cases.
- Other: Animal stays of of shelters and with owner during case
- Other: Animals are not euthanized based on hysteria. A behaviourist needs to assist.
- Other: Animals are not euthanized with out rehabilitation first
- Other: animals are not to be euthanized unless deemed by more than 3 un bias parties that the animal is not able to be rehabilitated
- Other: Animals shouldn't be euthanized for things that can be worked on.
- Other: Any and all associated expenses are charged to the dog owner not the taxpayer
- Other: Any appeal must stay a tribunal's sentence of euthanasia until heard in court
- Other: Any decision made to euthanize or sevely impact the pet or it's family, must have the same requirements for proof.
- Other: Any decision to euthanize or separate dog from owner would be required to be confirmed by Court of Queen's Bench
- Other: Any decisions were legally binding and that the non-city reps are subject matter experts in their fields (vets, dog trainers, etc.)
- Other: Any dog that bites any human should immediately be put down.



- Other: any dog that bites should be put down.
- Other: Any pitbull that has bitten a person, regardless of severity, is put down.
- Other: Any sentences given to the dog need to still be subjected to review and consultation. A euthanasia needs to be reviewed. Giving a tribunal the authority to make these decisions is not in the public interest.
- Other: any time spent in a shelter for an animal is trauma for the animal. keep the dog at owners home under supervision.
- Other: Anyone on the tribunal would have to be vetted to ensure they have no bias against certain dog breeds or people. Ultimately, it is never the dogs fault, it's the owners.
- Other: Anyone that was apart of the tribunal system should be unbiased to all dogs breeds. (Not be biased towards the generalizations that one breed of dog is more aggressive than others. And that they should speak to the owner and people who have spent time with the dog to determine whether or not the dog is actually aggressive or if it was provoked or had to resort to violence. And also realize that how a dog behaves is 100% reflective of how the owner has trained or treated the dog, dogs ARENT bad unless they're raised in bad conditions/treated badly and or beaten by the owner.
- Other: Anything that causes less stress to an animal
- Other: Anything that speeds up the process I am ok with, owners are the on responsible for having a misbehaved dog it does not matter the bread it's the owners fault no matter the bread
- Other: Appeal levels prior to Queens bench as the costs associated are not accessible for people with low income
- Other: Appeal of decision. Those on the tribunal are voted on by dog owners to avoid breed specific bias
- Other: Appeal process
- Other: Appeals can be made to Court if owner is not happy with result; and dog should be able to be at home with owner under restrictions, not have to stay in doggy jail till a decision is made. This costs more money and is traumatic for both the owner and the animal.
- Other: Appeals can be made to force a court hearing.
- Other: Appeals process is clearance and swift.
- Other: Appeals should be allowed
- Other: Appeals to be taken prior to any euthanization order
- Other: appropriate experts are involved as required e.g. dog trainer etc.
- Other: Appropriate experts are part of the tribunal process and tribunal judgments are legally binding.
- Other: Appropriate representatives included on the tribunal- for example, dog trainers/experts.
- Other: Appropriate training of members who own a variety of animals of different breeds themselves.
- Other: As each case was assessed to address if the dog was taunted or abused that resulted in attack. If the dog is usually a fun loving nevdr hurt anyone dog and gets pushed to a limit its not comfortable with, any person let alone a dog would retaliate.



- Other: As hard evidence was provided that the animal was at fault rather than the handler and the animal was not teased or provoked prior to genuinely attacking. If it was the fault of the owner the animal should be brought to a shelter to potentially rehome.
- Other: As it took into account both sides.
- Other: As long as a full investigation into what could have caused the dog to bite, as well as if there is a bite history etc.
- Other: As long as a pit bull advocate is a part of your tribunal. As it's obvious you're vilifying pit bulls.
- Other: As long as a tribunal could operate without a breed bias I would support it. Breed specific legislation is stupid and I'll educated, many dogs have bite force higher than that of a pitbull and singling out bully breeds is terrible.
- Other: As long as ALL breeds are treated equally a tribunal seems like a reasonable process.
- Other: As long as all dogs are treated the same regardless of their size or breed.
- Other: As long as all parties involved are able to see the status of the case at all times.
- Other: As long as an expert dog behaviourist is included in the tribunal such as Cindy Peacock.
<http://www.cindypeacock.com/>
- Other: As long as animals are not euthanize based on physical characteristics and or breed such as being labelled as a pitbull
- Other: As long as animals are not euthanized.
- Other: As long as breed is left out of the discussion.
- Other: As long as decisions can be made expeditiously, and moved up to the court system when necessary
- Other: As long as euthanasia is not an option there is never a reason for that. Dogs don't just attack for no reason they are provoked and always give warning signs. Depending on the situation the owner should be reprimanded and maybe the dog needs to be taken away but there are places that deal with rehabilitating dogs so there is never a reason for euthanasia.
- Other: As long as euthanization is off the table.
- Other: As long as it cost less to run than going through the court
- Other: As long as It does not effectively lead to more euthanized dogs
- Other: As long as it doesn't involve euthanizing the animal!!!
- Other: As long as it doesn't require additional tax payer funds but instead reroutes already existing funds
- Other: As long as it follows the same conditions as the current legal process.
- Other: As long as it involves people who are not breed specific
- Other: As long as it is a fair panel
- Other: As long as it is breed neutral ONLY. As soon as breed or type is focused on, it takes all rationality of context and circumstances of the individual dog and dismisses it in favour of emotional opinion which does not help the dog, owner, or court.
- Other: As long as it is conducted by balanced trainers and not based on pure positive opinions.
- Other: As long as it is not a one sided hearing.



- Other: As long as it is not breed specific
- Other: As long as it is not in line with breed specific legislation. The breed is absolutely not the problem.
- Other: As long as it is only made up of dog behavioral experts, veterinarians, and experts in this field. No one else should be providing their opinions on this matter.
- Other: As long as it is strictly breed-neutral, ONLY taking the behaviour (and context of the incident and circumstances of dog) into account.
- Other: as long as it refuses to support breed specific legislation. Punish owners NOT innocent animals. There's no supporting evidence that BSL works, it's purely run by fear and lack of education.
- Other: As long as it was done in a timely, efficient and fair manner.
- Other: As long as it was not biased
- Other: As long as it was not full of snowflakes and had some people on it who are level headed with dog experience and know behaviors and did not get the position because of nepotism
- Other: As long as it wasn't specific to breed, that every dog that bites gets the same treatment
- Other: As long as it's a fair trial for the dog; don't want to risk the idea that all dogs who bite get out down when there's always chance for the person who was bitten to be fault
- Other: As long as it's a first offence...the whole story need to be assessed.
- Other: As long as it's fair to the dog
- Other: As long as it's fair. Not based on breed specification.
- Other: As long as it's main goal would be to keep the dog with the order. Much like children with their families in child welfare cases.
- Other: As long as it's fair for all dog owners and not breed specific.
- Other: As long as it's not targetted towards certain breeds of dogs. Singleling out pitbulls only puts the dog in a bad position and makes it so they'll be in shelters more and for longer periods of time.
- Other: As long as judgments were not overly hasty, and took the dogs history into account. It's not always the dogs fault, not should a dog be euthanized for a one time event if they have had no other violent history
- Other: As long as members of the tribunal were non-breed biased and properly trained to assess dog behaviour
- Other: As long as not breed specific
- Other: As long as owners that have more then two offences or cases where a dog bites gets escalated automatically to queens court bench
- Other: As long as pitbulls or any bully breed won't immediately be euthanized because of their breed.
- Other: As long as proper steps are taken. There should be investigations for every dog offenders not just pitbulls
- Other: As long as said person was a dog handler, trainer, behaviour specialist, etc. Not a dog enthusiast but a professional



- Other: As long as the animal is allowed to stay in its home with its family.
- Other: As long as the animal is not fully responsible for its action as it's the owners fault for neglect.
- Other: As long as the animal is returned to its owner as soon as possible.
- Other: As long as the breed doesn't make a difference in the outcome
- Other: As long as the breed is not under question, but the owner's lack of proper treatment and training, regardless of size.
- Other: As long as the breed of the dog is redacted during the process to avoid undue discrimination and as long as behavioural rehabilitation is an option.
- Other: As long as the decision can be appealed in court
- Other: As long as the decision is made unbiased. In some cases a dog can bite someone because they are assaulting the owner. If a dog bite occurs during an assault that should be declared self defense
- Other: As long as the decision to euthanize is made by a certified, professional dog trainer that uses it as an absolute last resort if the dog is deemed unable to return to society.
- Other: As long as the dog and owner were still treated fairly. There are no black and white cases.
- Other: As long as the dog attack was not lethal.
- Other: As long as the dog could not be euthanized
- Other: As long as the dog is not discriminated against (ie. Just being a pit bull) and the investigation is thorough. Some people lie about a dog's behavior to get rid of a dog that they don't like.
- Other: As long as the dog stays with the family until they make a decision
- Other: As long as the dog was assessed by a dog behavior specialist and the target outcome was to correct behavior and hold the owner accountable vs the dog
- Other: As long as the dog was not provoked by another dog or human
- Other: As long as the dogs are not singled out because of their breed. They need to all be treated fairly and equally.
- Other: As long as the dogs could stay in home to prevent trauma of being away from owners and in a shelter. Also if this leads to fewer euthanized animals this would be a good option as the owners would be able to appeal as well
- Other: as long as the individual whom would act as the judge for the final decision holds an unbiased opinion against breeds of dog and if they can not proceed a case without having one biased opinion they would turn it over to someone else to give both personal and lets involved a fair chance
- Other: As long as the investigation was free of discrimination against certain breeds of dogs.
- Other: As long as the officers assessing the situation are trained to properly review the situation and not be trained to determine the pit bull or nuisance dog as the problem by default
- Other: As long as the owner is punished and not the dog.
- Other: As long as the owner was also being looked at. If lack of training and or neglect etc. Played a part in problem owner should be charged and dog should be given a 2nd chance with the right foster home to see if can change before it suffers by death just because of bad owner.
- Other: As long as the owners are present and able to give input



- Other: As long as the owners can have the chance to get their dog back and train it again.
- Other: As long as the panel are unbiased towards dogs and are selected for their integrity and experience.
- Other: As long as the people on the tribunal are qualified to make the decisions and are not prejudiced.
- Other: As long as the people were open minded and let the owners explain any extenuating circumstances or issues and worked towards getting the dog treatment and help.
- Other: As long as the priority of the tribunal is to keep the animals in the home and work on ensuring the animal is safe (to themselves and others)
- Other: As long as the representatives are knowledgeable in dog behaviour, etc and non-biased.
- Other: As long as the representatives aren't biased based on the breed of the dog and they look at the whole picture. Dog behaviour has everything to do with the owner and how the owner treats the animal, trains the animal, and provides an ethical way of living for the animal. The decision cannot be based on strictly the behaviour of the animal at that particular time, there may have been triggers to cause the behaviour. Many animal owners are not appropriate to own animals and should be reprimanded as such.
- Other: as long as the reps or people on the board are diverse, ppl with and without pets and definitely experts in the cat/dog field
- Other: As long as the rules are applies the same in a faster time manor
- Other: As long as the tribunal consists of appropriate members who are unbiased in their decisions. There should be checks and balances to ensure bias does not come into play in their decisions.
- Other: As long as the tribunal has well knowledgeable non-city pro training individuals. Not all breeds are bad. Bad owners make bad dogs.
- Other: as long as the tribunal included people like veterinarians, trainers, behaviorist, etc. and not just a bunch of random people who may have prejudices against certain breeds.
- Other: As long as the tribunal includes a significant number of dog behavioral specialists, veterinarians, and professionals with reasonable qualifications to asses dog behaviors.
- Other: As long as the tribunal includes several dog owners of large breed dogs.
- Other: As long as the tribunal is composed of subject matter experts that have relevant experience to back this up. It cannot be composed of office workers/no experience people.
- Other: As long as the tribunal is impartial and representative of the differing opinions in the matter at hand
- Other: As long as the tribunal is not biased based on breed of dog (ie pitbulls and other similar breeds)
- Other: As long as the tribunal is not biased to dog breed
- Other: As long as the tribunal looked into allowing for training and studying why the dog has aggressive behaviour first before being considered to be euthanized.
- Other: As long as the tribunal maintains an equal number of individuals that are experienced in handling and rehabilitating dogs.



- Other: As long as the tribunal members are sufficiently qualified in law, statistics, biases, and take a comprehensive examination of the evidence and circumstances. There must be thorough screening of tribunal members for personal biases against particular breeds of dog.
- Other: As long as the tribunal stayed neutral when reviewing the dog and the reason for the incident (ie: don't assume a "pit bull type dog" was at fault automatically because of it's breed. Another breed of dog may have instigated the incident.
- Other: As long as the tribunal was made up of experts in the dog field, eg. trainers, behaviour its. Not people that have no experience with dogs and have preconceived notions of certain breeds
- Other: As long as the tribunal was made up of well versed individuals and people that were knowledgeable about animal behaviors
- Other: As long as the tribunal was not biased towards the breed of dog.
- Other: As long as the tribunal was run and heavily influenced by people involved with taking care of animals, and who care about animals. Focus should be on rehabilitation and finding solutions other than euthanasia.
- Other: As long as the tribunal wasn't biased.
- Other: As long as the victims are involved/included in the process
- Other: As long as there a thorough investigation on the body language of both the human and the dog prior and during the attack. As well as an in depth look at the potential triggers the human may have presented the dog. We expect much more out of dogs than any creature or human.
- Other: As long as there are educated dog behaviour experts involved in the tribunal
- Other: As long as there are multiple dog behavior experts on said panel so no personal feelings about breed come into play. As well as looking at rehabilitation/re hoking the animal and euthanasia being an absolute last option.
- Other: As long as there are NO BIAS to the breed of animal
- Other: As long as there is a city representative well educated on the applicable laws.
- Other: As long as there is a committee or group of people making the decisions rather than one single individual.
- Other: As long as there is an active representative of the community whom can dispute the incident
- Other: As long as there is an appeal process. I.e. owner does not agree so then pet would stay in the shelter until court decides.
- Other: As long as there is no appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench. If there is an appeal then jerks will just use the process to drag out how long they can continue to endanger the public.
- Other: As long as there is no bias on the tribunal
- Other: As long as there is no bias towards bully breads and that more blame is put on to the owner. It is the owners responsibility to raise their dog right not the dogs.
- Other: As long as there is no bias towards specific breeds of dogs over others.
- Other: As long as there is no breed specific branding. Look at the incident not the breed.
- Other: As long as there is no breed specific wording or bias
- Other: As long as there is no pre decision circumstances. Prejudgements are made and this determines outcomes which are not considered neutral and un biased. Absolutely a must for any



decision made. What provisions are being considered to put a non-biased tribunal system of guidelines in place if they move forward with this decision?

- Other: As long as there is photo, video, or physical evidence of an unprovoked attack.
- Other: As long as there is some sort of training and/or the non-city representatives include those who have background with animals
- Other: As long as there was no bias towards certain breeds, every animal breed needs to be treated equally otherwise there is no point.
- Other: As long as there were 2 opinions on euthanizing one of a vet and a professional rehab trainer
- Other: As long as there is a dog community representative & other neighbors are allowed to speak up against 'Karens'. Also that this process should NOT increase the time on the case as mentioned hopefully it stays true to its word.
- Other: As long as these representatives were held to not have any preexisting bias against certain breeds or types of dogs.
- Other: As long as they are not biased based on breed (such as pitbulls being the center of attention of the city!) I say biased, when really it's a race of dog, and therefore racist.
- Other: As long as they are not biased towards specific breeds. They should be knowledgeable about the breeds they deal with and have guidelines they follow.
- Other: As long as they are unbiased toward pitbulls.
- Other: As long as they CAREFULLY assess whether a dog should be euthanized. Dogs have lives just like humans and it is not right to euthanize dogs without carefully assessing the situation. However I agree that the dogs should not remain in shelters for a long time waiting for the court to make a decision.
- Other: As long as they do not have the authority to choose to end the animal's life; only measures that the owner would be required to follow to keep their dog without allowing that dog to harm anyone/thing else
- Other: As long as they have specific, clearly outline guidelines, such as first-time offenders would get the chance to seek out training or behavior specialists for their dog, depending on severity of the incident.
- Other: As long as they were unbiased towards the specific breed
- Other: As long as they're not biased one way or another, they would have to be absolutely neutral. And be able to make decisions appropriately and through evidence.
- Other: As long as this applies to all dogs, including toy dogs that bite!
- Other: As long as those that are on the tribunal are from human society or similar organization and have intensive training in animal behavior
- Other: As long as the tribunal includes people from all sorts of background. Example) one owns pitbull or other dogs people see unfit, dog trainers, wildlife associates.
- Other: As long as the tribunal is well-versed in animal behavior.
- Other: As long as you actually listen.....
- Other: As long as it does not discriminate against certain breeds
- Other: As long as it was a faster system



- Other: as long its based on the severity of the injuries
- Other: As reviews are based on facts and not stereo types and bias'
- Other: As the appeal process is upheld and a new civilian oversight committee or existing committee
- Other: as the dog breed was kept a secret from the tribunal to prevent bias against any breeds.
- Other: As there is no breed bias
- Other: as there was no opportunity for the tribunal to determine if the dog should be euthanized.
- Other: As they do not separate the owner and the dog during the court trial
- Other: As we would a jury I would support a tribunal if they displayed zero bias towards dog breeds. Much unlike this engagement survey.
- Other: Assess the owners history with animals.
- Other: Assessed by a industry leading dog trainer that has extensive background in assessing behaviour for public safety.
- Other: Assessed by how many times this dog has broken an offence.
- Other: Assessing the dog for extra obedience training and evaluating it on behaviour and not breed
- Other: Assessment of the dog must be done by a qualified individual and not some "Won't someone think of the children" person off the street. Assessment must also include context, what led to the event.
- Other: Assumption of innocence of the animal over assumption of guilt. If the dog is to be punished, the burden of proof is on the "aggrieved."
- Other: At least 1 member is a certified dog trainer and NO members are involved in anti pet ownership movement
- Other: At least half of the people on the tribunal are familiar with dog behavior and breed temperaments and training
- Other: At least half of the tribunal is composed of qualified members (bylaw officers, veterinarians, certified dog trainers, etc..)
- Other: At least one member is a vet and one member is an animal shelter staffer or rescue member.
- Other: At least one member is a veterinarian, and one is a licensed dog trainer
- Other: At least one member must be a dog trainer, understand whether a dog exhibits behaviours that would allow it to be rehabilitated
- Other: At least one member of tribunal must be a dog veterinarian or have another valid license that they know about dogs (ie: trainer?)
- Other: At least two assessments are done on dogs declared vicious as to avoid bias
- Other: attempt to get rid of or balance bias. This involves advocates for and against bully breeds that attempt impartial judgement
- Other: Attempts should be made to corrects dogs behaviour and/or have the dog re-homed to a more suitable owner.
- Other: Avoid bias. I worry that a single circuit could become corrupt. There should be representatives from various rescue organizations (not Alberta SPCA or Calgary Humane as they do are infamous for their own problems). There should be certified trainers and people experienced with



rehabilitation. Tests should be fair and humane. For example, the fake hand on a stick is a terrible test of true aggression.

- Other: avoid euthanize and provide training classes first to see if the dog improves, all dogs deserve second chances, it could come down to poor training or inexperienced owners who should get the help they need
- Other: B
- Other: Bad owners are put in jail and dogs go to rehabilitation for a better home.
- Other: Bad ownership leads to a bad dog. If an owner wont train their dog regardless of breed, thats what makes a bad dog. Human owners are just as responsible for the dog bite as the dog its self. All dogs require formal training. All dog owners should by law have to attend obedience training regardless of dog size or breed.
- Other: Balanced tribunal, including breed specialists
- Other: Bbv
- Other: Be fair
- Other: Be judged on the behavior of the dog and not be breed specific.
- Other: Be made fully public. Have follow up to make sure conditions are met moving forward.
- Other: Be made public.
- Other: Be reasonable and look at all angels of the incident with NO prejudice towards the breed of the dog. I'd also recommend having a voice of 4-8 people if the decision is leaning towards Euthanization
- Other: BE SMART ABOUT IT
- Other: Because it should
- Other: before I utting an animal down, the owner has to take the dog through extensive training to try to rehabilitate the dog.
- Other: Behavioral training must be offered to the owner, largely to review the behavior of the owner. If the owner does not comply, they are not fit for ownership of animals hereafter.
- Other: Behaviour of dogs is trained by the owner. There are no bad dogs just bad owners.
- Other: Behaviour specialists to the specific breed are part of the tribunal.
- Other: Behavioural/training experts from industry involved in the tribunal - reps from rescues, trainers, etc
- Other: Behaviouralist and owner have not been able to come to a reasonable conclusion before discussing euthanasia
- Other: Being biased against a certain breed because of something or anything and taking into account the animals past history and the past history of the other animal parties involved
- Other: Being fair and comprised of an expert panel or individuals with understanding of dog behaviour who diligently assess any and all factors leading up too or being the cause of the incident. Strong consideration needs to be considered and all options exhausted prior to ending a dogs/animals life.
- Other: Being fair and unbiased. Not over stepping their powers. Looking at all scenarios. Fir example maybe the dog was provoked.



- Other: best interest for owner and dog
- Other: Best interest for the dog
- Other: better attention to both sides of a story when a bite is concerned. Many times the bite is provoked and the dog is acting defensive. I do not support the euthanasia of animals when the court or tribunal only agrees with the person bit while not considering past actions of the animal itself.
- Other: Better for the dogs
- Other: Binding decisions, as in a judicial atmosphere, that had the same effect as a court decision. The members would also need to be experts in the area of the animal bylaw and responsible ownership.
- Other: Binding results - no loop holes for owners if dogs are deemed high risk/ vicious.
- Other: Blame is on the owner, training, household factors, explicit details on the exact situation. All those reviewing, making decisions and holding ANY power must NOT be afraid of dogs. must have an animal background. Must have someone who trains animals. Must have someone to analyze the owners mental state. If you disallow this, you are allowing systemic racism on a canine front to allow innocent or fixable dogs to be killed.
- Other: Blind breed reviews.
- Other: Board certified behaviourist should be consulted. Breed biases should not be considered.
- Other: Both owner and person who got bit attends as well as have a dog training specialist present.
- Other: Both parties were able to bring witnesses
- Other: Both the owner of the dog and the victim consent to the tribunal instead of the regular court process.
- Other: Both the owner of the dog and the victim must have a voice in the tribunal!
- Other: Breed bias must not be a part of the decision making process (i.e. results of the tribunal should be based on dog/owner behaviour and not how scary the dog is.
- Other: breed discrimination isn't in play
- Other: Breed is not discriminated
- Other: Breed NOT be listed or discussed during tribunal and at least one DVM sit on each tribunal
- Other: Breed of dog must not be a factor, but environment the animal is kept in should be considered.
- Other: Breed of the dog is not included in tribunal to mitigate bias.
- Other: Breed should not play a role in euthanizing the dog. Although it may cause more damage, it you wouldnt put down a small dog it seems unfair to put down a larger one for the same type incident.
- Other: Breed should to be a factor. Pit bulls have the same strength as labs, but labs are not penalized the same way.
- Other: Breed specific labeling was not included in the decision making process
- Other: Breed specification is left out of the conversation
- Other: bsl is a [removed] law , when small dogs are found to be more aggressive than bigger breeds.... if your gunna do that ban all dogs not just one breed because they look scary



- Other: Bsl legislation is not a consideration of any terms. All dog get the same treatment
- Other: Built up of professionals experienced with dogs, and the issues/incidents they'll be a part of
- Other: But the people involved actually had some experience in enforcement
- Other: Can be appealed in a timely manner
- Other: Can it be harsher based on being breed specific, for any type of dog.
- Other: Can not discriminate based on breed
- Other: Cannot be biased against any type of breed. Pitbulls included.
- Other: Cannot be biased based on breed.
- Other: Cannot decide if a dog should be euthanized. Can only decide where the dog stays during the waiting period and what conditions are on the owner during this time
- Other: cannot euthanize. Restrictions only.
- Other: Cannot hand out euthanization sentences - must proceed to provincial court - and all mitigating circumstances must be presented and accounted for.
- Other: Cannot know the animal or owner and has to be an unbiased opinion.
- Other: Cannot make decision to euthanize
- Other: Case by case scenarios and input from dog behaviorists and vets
- Other: Cases be investigated thoroughly and dogs be assessed throughly. Owners are a huge part of why dogs are involved in these types of incidents. Don't punish an animal for the failure of the human. If the dog can be retrained, the owner should be fined and either given the option to train with strict requirements, or dog surrendered and given a chance with another owner/family after being retrained, at the expense of the previous owner.
- Other: Cases must allow appeals.
- Other: Cases where the tribunal believes euthanization is necessary should require mandatory review at the Court of Queens Bench
- Other: Certain breeds are not picked on or singled out
- Other: Certified CPDT-KA dog trainers are included in the process.
- Other: Certified behavioural professionals were involved
- Other: Certified dog behaviourists and those well trained in dog behaviour are involved in the decision making.
- Other: Certified dog trainers are involved in determining the future of the dog. In some cases this may involve determining the family does not have the ability to work with the dog, or the dog is truly in able to rehab, or more training and additional restrictions are needed. The tribunal should be made up of people who understand dog behaviour, and have shown success in retraining in the past.
- Other: CertifiedAnimal behaviorists are involved in the tribunal process with their recomendations holding more "weight" than those without indepth animal behavior and obedience training back ground.
- Other: Checking up on accountability
- Other: Clear process, qualified panelists, written reasons.



- Other: Clear, concise and plain language terms of reference be established for the tribunal members. Member base be equally comprised and include industry advocates. Not funded in any way by political parties. Absolute transparency for every decision made.
- Other: Closely follow existing laws and fines to minimize appeals
- Other: Collect statements from persons knowing the dog
- Other: Community oversight
- Other: Comprised solely of certified veterinary behaviourists as general public, rescue workers, vets etc. do not possess the knowledge to assess for euthanization
- Other: conditions to appeal the tribunal's decision if needed.
- Other: Consider if the dog was provoked. A dog who bites because its owner was attacked or someone was throwing rocks at it deserves a second chance, you can't blame them for self or owner defense.
- Other: Consider past training the dog has had, past medical records
- Other: Consider ways on which to prevent the euthanization. think of other alternatives for the dog first.
- Other: Considering re-homing of nuisance dog to home that can deal with behavioural issues prior to ordering euthanasia.
- Other: Considers the owner to have pet taken back home. Not all dogs are bad dogs and need to sit in shelters.
- Other: Consisted of experts in dog behavior
- Other: consisted of various animal care professionals which needed to make decisions based on majority to prevent misguided decisions.
- Other: Consistent application and interpretation of these rules would be necessary, and there should be a mechanism in place to perform a thorough investigation of the circumstances.
- Other: Consult from the ABVMA
- Other: Consultation with a qualified dog behaviourist with a background in aggressive behaviour and bite risk assessment.
- Other: Consulted with actual accredited experts regarding canine behavior- ie a veterinary behaviorist. Based on questions above the City of Calgary has nonplace assessing these circumstances and has a lot of further research to do to even begin learning who to consult.
- Other: contained a person with a degree in animal psychology
- Other: Cost covered by pet owner
- Other: Could be over ruled
- Other: Could not decide if the animal was to be euthanized
- Other: council members are not biased against certain breeds
- Other: Court is still on option if desired
- Other: Dddd
- Other: Decision makers would have to have extensive experience in animal behaviour



- Other: Decisions are based on the actual history of the animal rather than bias towards or against any specific breed.
- Other: Decisions are based solely on an individual dog without breed considerations.
- Other: Decisions made by many objective people (like a jury).
- Other: Decisions on euthenization should continue to be handled by court
- Other: Decisions should be made based on consistent guidelines
- Other: Decisions were made based off an animals training and behavior and NOT their breed. Punishing a dog because the owner is incompetent is horrible. Measure the dogs temperment individually with dog trainers/behavioralists so an independent and unbiased reflection of the dog's behavior. Any sort of trial or tribunal should also assess the owner's skills and behaviors before it can make a final decision on an animal.
- Other: Deep review of interim orders before euthanasia
- Other: Definition of severe bite needs to be well defined and not open to interpretation
- Other: demonstrate the cost / benefit analysis of creating more bureaucracy
- Other: Depend how the plan to review and assess the dog and situation. As most incidences are a result of uneducated owners not on the breed of the dog
- Other: Depends on who the representatives are that are making the decision.
- Other: Depends who is on the tribunal. Must be pro-dog people not all negative people.
- Other: Determination of the case outcome is ONLY done with a panel of persons highly qualified in canine behaviour. Dogs should not be held responsible for the mistakes of humans.
- Other: Determine & review restrictions placed on dog, which owner would need to abide by to keep the dog
- Other: Determine & review restrictions which the owner would abide by
- Other: Determine and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal
- Other: Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog
- Other: Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal
- Other: Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal, or be placed in a foster home that has dog training experience to work on the behavior
- Other: Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal.
- Other: Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal. No animal should be put to death because humans decide to make bad decisions.
- Other: Did not discriminate against certain dog breeds in order to speed up processing times
- Other: Did not discriminate against pit bulls
- Other: Did not discriminate against specific dog breeds



- Other: Did not euthanize dogs, but rather explored restorative options such as strict policies on wearing a muzzle/leash/etc. For public protection after an incident
- Other: Did not have the right to make euthanization decisions - only to place restrictions on the dog.
- Other: Did not into account the breed of the animal, only how it's being raised and housed.
- Other: Did the dog bite in defence? If so other measures should be taken.
- Other: Did the owner or owners train the animal and act in such a manner that sole blame cannot be placed on the dog for the issue at hand. Irresponsible pet owners should face fines/penalties before the pet does, especially if the owner is the reason for the pets behaviour.
- Other: Didn't euthanize the dog
- Other: didn't take away from actual matters that belong in a court of law.
- Other: Discriminate against dog breed.
- Other: Do no euthanize animal, require the dog owner to put their dog through training to change its behavior. No euthanization necessary unless for EXTREME CASES ONLY
- Other: do not agree with euthanizing dogs or targeting certain breeds.
- Other: Do not allow officers the ability to kill dogs right away. Wow thats asking for officers to abuse it.
- Other: Do not be bias and side with the bylaw officers on all cases like seen in other cities. Each case must be handled differently and not look at the dog as the aggressor in all cases
- Other: Do not decide the euthanize part
- Other: Do not discriminate against certain breeds
- Other: Do NOT discriminate based off breed
- Other: Do not discriminate by dog breed, and make sure members are well educated about dog training/behaviour and are not just concerned citizens
- Other: Do not euthanize the dog. Often people lack the money needed to properly train a dog. The city should be focussed on reducing nuisance dogs by not killing them but giving them what they need to become better. You people need to give these dogs chances and resources to improve. This is ridiculous
- Other: Do not euthanize the poor dog, it is not their fault, it is the owners fault for not properly training the animal.
- Other: Do not have the power to euthanize only court should have that power
- Other: Do not hire, ill informed people to do the job of evaluations, have education available and classes to send the owner and dog for training and behaviour management.
- Other: DO NOT PUT DOWN DOGS BASED ON ONE PERSONS ASSESSMENT and they should be trained in dog training and psychology to understand that a lot of bites are due to poor human training, and dogs with anxiety. Also taking into account the victims actions, if the owner said do not pet my dog and they did anyways, that is not okay and the owner should not be liable. Perhaps do not pet vests optional for people who do not want strangers coming up and petting their dogs.
- Other: Do not represent breed specific biases



- Other: Does not discriminate against Specific breeds. Small breed dogs bite just as often but are taken less seriously. These small breed dogs cause fights in dog parks and cause larger dogs to be blamed
- Other: Does not discriminate based on breed
- Other: Does not discriminate by dog breed.
- Other: Does not go based on breed but temperament of the dog
- Other: Does NOT include breed specific legislation
- Other: Does not increase taxes
- Other: Does not lean towards and breed specific bias. If more pitbull type dogs are being put down we will know that this is caused by a bias and that the system is not working.
- Other: Does not provide the authority to euthanize
- Other: Does not put dogs down unless they've been involved in several incidents. Not just one.
- Other: Does not request euthanasia. Euthanasia orders/requests (unless agreed upon by the owner) should go to Court of Queens Bench
- Other: Does not result in more lax sentencing or the increased likelihood that a dangerous dog will reoffend.
- Other: Does not show bias or prejudice against specific breeds of dog.
- Other: Does not support breed specific bylaws
- Other: Does not support breed specific language. Pit bulls are not the only breeds who bite. In fact, many pit bulls have never harmed a fly.
- Other: Does should NEVER be euthanized
- Other: Doesn't have pre existing bias against pit bulls
- Other: Doesn't increase taxes or pet licence fees
- Other: Doesn't judge by one dogs breed.
- Other: Doesn't euthanise for first offenses or based on breed.
- Other: doesn't take time away from other cases.
- Other: Dog aggression needs to be better assessed in this proposal. Chihuahuas have way higher rates of aggression and these little demons are still allowed in dog parks.
- Other: Dog and owner and trainer work together.
- Other: Dog behavior should be reviewed by a dog behaviour specialist and obedience training should be attempted before euthanasia is required. Euthanasia is last resort, and the owner should also face a consequence such as a fine or a period of time where they can not own a dog.
- Other: Dog behaviour experts currently working in the industry must have representation and their advice should carry more weight than other nonqualified representatives.
- Other: Dog behaviour experts were part of the tribunal panel
- Other: Dog behaviour specialist was called in to work with the owner and dog. Also look at dog psychology and body language and determine if one dog was instigated before attacking. Dogs do not "just attack"
- Other: Dog breed discrimination does not have a role in this rule.



- Other: Dog cannot be declared vicious before an event. If a dog is being considered vicious the tribunal needs to take the situation into consideration. If a dog has been trained to protect the household and someone comes in and threatens then the dog has acted according to his training. When dogs are being punished, the tribunal needs to look at the owners and how/if the owners are training their dog.
- Other: Dog did not need to stay in a shelter
- Other: Dog experts were involved
- Other: Dog experts would be placed on the panel as well as full medical assessment to determine if pain or other medical issues caused the attack
- Other: dog has attacked or injured a PERSON, unprovoked
- Other: Dog has demonstrated repeat biting and owner is not being a responsible pet owner
- Other: Dog hasn't improved
- Other: dog is evaluated by a professional no-force trainer.
- Other: Dog is left in owners possession. Putting animal in shelter lowers chances of rehabilitation
- Other: Dog is NOT Euthanized!! Dog returned to owner! The individual bitten must take a course in how to approach dogs....let see if they pass!!!
- Other: Dog is taken away from owner and is thoroughly assessed and given a second chance. If dangerous behaviour is still present then there may be no choice to euthanize the animal
- Other: Dog is to be muzzled and cant go parks. Obedience training required for owner and dog. If they dont listen remove dog.
- Other: Dog must be given a fair and unbiased chance.
- Other: Dog must be kept at home until decision is made (exception would be a vet visit) Bylaw has authority to make decision to keep the dog at AS if they feel the owner will not or cannot abide with keeping dog at home. Time limit that tribunal must meet and make a decision. ie. 14 days
- Other: Dog must be observed in an unthreatening setting to ensure behaviour is not considered typical. An unbiased and accredited dog trainer should also be a representative in the tribunal
- Other: dog must go to obedience class and not be put down
- Other: Dog must not leave the owners property other than vet and training location
- Other: Dog must stay on owner property and be muzzled on walks.
- Other: dog not allowed in public parks/areas, must be on-leash at all times, must be muzzled
- Other: Dog owner a requirement to be on tribunal
- Other: Dog owner can have input and provide steps they are willing to take when an offense has occurred.
- Other: Dog owners must be on the tribunal
- Other: Dog owners of a similar breed are majority on the board to prevent bias on certain breeds.
- Other: Dog owners of pit bulls
- Other: Dog remains in owner's care under as removal from known space agitated animals.
- Other: Dog remains in owner's care while they wait for court.
- Other: Dog remains in the household of the owner, not in a shelter.



- Other: Dog remains on owners property
- Other: Dog remains with owner.
- Other: Dog shall remain in its home until case is resolved.
- Other: dog should ALWAYS be put back into the care of the owner. taking away a pet will just cause it stress and resources.
- Other: Dog should not be euthanized . Thorough assessment should be completed and required training for owner and dog until improvement is noted
- Other: Dog should remain at home while case is pending but not be allowed in public areas
- Other: Dog should stay in owners care while decision is being made. Dogs are part of your family and if it is determined that the dog is to be euthanized, the family should be allowed to spend that time with their family member.
- Other: Dog should stay with owner unless visible to show aggression
- Other: Dog should stay with the owner but be on house arrest.
- Other: Dog stays in their environment while under review.
- Other: Dog trainers or behaviour specialist is part of tribunal for the unbiased look at the dogs potential for rehabilitation
- Other: Dogs AND OWNERS should be put through obedience training before decision of euthanasia
- Other: Dogs apparent breed is not used to support decision.
- Other: Dogs are able to remain quatantined at home, if it is safe to do so (ie. the victim does not reside in the home), while the process is ongoing.
- Other: Dogs are able to stay with the family during the deciding time, and training/therapy for dog can be done. 2 strikes rule.
- Other: Dogs are assessed based on behavior, not the breed. Also, further dog training as an alternative to euthanization
- Other: Dogs are not auto euthanized unless attack was unprovoked
- Other: dogs are not euthanized
- Other: Dogs are not euthanized - owners are charged.
- Other: Dogs are not euthanized. All dogs are born with love. Humans teach them or neglect to teach them and that's what causes violent dogs. It's not their fault. Instead of euthanasia, mandatory obedience classes should be taken.
- Other: Dogs are not judged by their breed being a pit bull. Should be fairly judged by actual actions and dog behaviour, not breed.
- Other: Dogs are not viscous they are made viscous. There should be a strong strong assessment of a dog before any euthanasia is suggested
- Other: Dogs are rehabilitated and sent to training courses with their owners before euthanasia is considered
- Other: Dogs aren't put down for owners mistakes/ poor training. Dogs should be given to a new owner and taken care of /trained. Dogs aren't dangerous , bad owners are. And pit bulls especially shouldn't be punished, their not vicious dogs at all.



- Other: Dogs awaiting case review should be kept if possible in foster care rather than kennels in order to minimize emotional trauma to the animal. Dogs that seriously attack should be removed from their owner and put up for adoption with obedience/ behavioural school requirements. In these cases the dog should not be held accountable and should not be punished with euthanasia - it is the owner who should be held accountable (why wasn't this dog properly trained, why wasn't it on a leash or in a yard, why was aggressive behaviour encouraged, etc.). If the attack is minor behavioural classes should be required and the person investigated (perhaps while the dog is held in a shelter or foster home).
- Other: Dogs can relearn behaviour; how about training the owner how to handle the dog.
- Other: Dogs could remain at home with conditions placed on them while the process is taking place. Appeals also need to be quick and efficient.
- Other: DOGS DO NOT NEED TO BE EUTHANIZED
- Other: Dogs get a chance for rehabilitation over euthanasia
- Other: Dogs may not be euthanized due to a bite or other act or aggression - we don't have punishments that serious for murders and rapist, so why would we have it for a dog?
- Other: Dogs must be allowed to go through a rehabilitation program to improve behaviour before being considered as a subject for euthanasia.
- Other: Dogs must be contained and appropriately muzzled as needed" prohibited from dog parks and perhaps prohibited from walking during normal hours in which a child may be present
- Other: Dog's owner given the right to speak in defence of the dog with corroborating evidence of dogs demeanor, and situational circumstances to the incident.
- Other: Dogs should be assessed by a trained dog behaviourist
- Other: Dogs should be allowed with owners unless they harmed the owner.
- Other: Dogs should be assessed by a behaviorist. If the owner is unfit to care for the dog or get proper training to help the dog they shouldn't have dogs. Not every dog that bites is aggressive. Owners should be responsible in getting proper training at the first warning. Before the situation is allowed to escalate.
- Other: Dogs should be offered help and assessed by certified dog trainers to determine the threat of the animal and the likelihood of a repeat offence, rather than being assessed by personnel who don't necessarily understand the psychology of the animal.
- Other: Dogs should be revoked if the owner is incompetent not put down.
- Other: Dogs should NEVER be euthanized due to an outlash. Research should be done into the home life of the dog and it should be enrolled immediately into rehabilitation/ training classes. If we were to euthanize every person that made a mistake there would be no one left. It is disgusting that a life could mean that little.
- Other: Dogs should not be euthanized. Any behaviour that has been exhibited is due to human error.
- Other: Dogs should NOT be judged on appearance at all. Dogs should not be judged solely within a strange and threatening environment.
- Other: Dogs should not be put down for biting instead extensive obedience classes should be required. Most of the dogs who bite are afraid- remember there are no bad dogs just bad dog



owners. Also sometimes people are insistent on coming up to dogs even if the owner says no- sometimes the bite is the fault of the person who approaches after being told not to.

- Other: Dogs should NOT be put down for their owners not training or taking proper care of them. That is incredibly unfair to the animal.
- Other: Dogs should not be separated from their owner unless the owner is neglecting their dog
- Other: Dogs should not EVER be euthanized. A dog bite is a result of either a) poor leadership from the owner or b) being antagonized by the victim. Depending on the what the tribunal determines it should either result in a fine to the owner and both them and the dog will report for mandatory obedience training or b) a fine to the victim for disturbing the peace/assault and a mandatory class on how to properly behave around dogs so that they can read language cues.
- Other: Dogs stay in home with owner during review process - May have to abide by staying on property order no taking pet elsewhere
- Other: Dogs that are apprehended should not be returned to the owner as often the owners is the cause of the poor behavior in the dog. The dog should be placed into care of a foster home that is able to dedicate the time to training and correct the dog's behavior.
- Other: Dogs well being as in care is put first
- Other: Dogs were allowed to stay home with owners during this time period and instead of immediately seizing the dog bylaw officers should impose a standard that owners must immediately start training with their pet. The tribunal should have a registered dog trainer to access dogs before making the decision to euthanize a dog.
- Other: Dogs were not euthanized. Only a proven multiple repeat offender dog should be removed from the owner and placed in a no kill shelter for rehabilitation. Use the fees collected for dog licenses and the fines for repeat nuisance offenders to pay for this. Owner must pay a fine, they do not get the dog back after rehab unless they attend training and prove measures have been taken to prevent further instances.
- Other: Dogs will not be subject to euthanasia but will have mandated behavioural training
- Other: Dogs with behavioural issues only if responsible owner consents
- Other: Don't be biased because it is of a pitbull nature
- Other: Don't blame a breed, blame the owner.
- Other: Don't give people who dont know [removed] the power to euthanize someone else's family member. Use common sense and make sure the proper people have says.
- Other: DONT BLAME THE DOGS FOR AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR. It is bad owners that are the problem, not the dogs.
- Other: Don't euthanize or put them in a shelter. Fund fosters and trainers to rehabilitate the dog.
- Other: Dont euthanize the poor animal, i understand it bit someone but its the owners fault for lack or taining and paying attention. I would not allowed that person to own a dog/ animal for a set # of years or not at all.
- Other: Don't just decide to euthanize a dog just because they're a troubled dog. They are part of a family too. Educate yourselves better and help educate other too.



- Other: Don't think a dog should be euthanized, should then be placed with owner with instruction to go to training or something.
- Other: don't use someone who has a problem with a certain breed of dog. This needs to be dealt with fairly, it's the owner, not the dog!
- Other: Due course where the owner should be punished vs. The dog if the incident occurred because of poor ownership (off leash etc)
- Other: Duly qualified commissioners with a well defined organizational structure and appropriate supports with robust appeal rights for those involved.
- Other: Each case is heard with the details of the case without knowing the dog's breed to avoid bias
- Other: Each case is screened on a case-by-case basis, and seen as necessary to be taken to court.
- Other: Each person gets 20 min to defend. If you do a tribunal, crazy people will try to filibuster.
- Other: Each person on the tribunal is vetted so they are not biased against a specific breed.
- Other: Educated individuals making the decisions for the dogs
- Other: Efficiency is important, but also need to be kind to animal and minimize trauma
- Other: Elected
- Other: elected members; stated clear qualifications for members.
- Other: Ensure neutrality of the tribunal by including diverse representation
- Other: Ensure non breed bias. Maybe discuss the matter at hand and keep the breed of the dog blind to the tribunal.
- Other: Ensure proper assessment of the dog by a behaviour specialist and ensure all elements of the circumstances of bites are taken into account. For example, if someone trespasses on property and the dog bites.
- Other: Ensure that a) the dog was not being teased, b) has the dog had any other problems? c) has the dog been abused? d) does the animal by law officer have an issue with the specific dog? e) too many dogs are blamed with there are other extenuating circumstances
- Other: Ensure that the tribunal members are trained to assess adequately the negative behaviors in a dog. For example, understanding the behaviors that can occur under a variety of circumstances, like seizure and detainment. As well, dogs should be assessed independently by a non-city employee that can provide feedback on the dog's behavior, prior to euthanasia. An example would be a behavior rehabilitation specialist like at Cochrane Humane.
- Other: Ensure that they are unbiased and take into account all sides of the story, including if the victim is to blame for the bite. Many times animals are labeled as the problem, but they are just being animals and protecting themselves.
- Other: Ensuring owners get a chance to make it to their appeal before something happens to the dog in question.
- Other: Ensuring the tribunal system is made up of competent experts on it that don't discriminate unfairly against certain breeds (like pitbulls)
- Other: Entirely self funded through fines and levies.



- Other: Equal care needs to be taken to understand the behaviours of the victim (I.e. did the victim antagonize the dog by running up to it without asking permission from the owner? Was the victim teasing or baiting the dog? Was the victim on private property without permission? Etc.)
- Other: Equal or lesser cost to victim and dog owner as current option
- Other: Equal representation of parties in tribunal
- Other: Equal representation of the victim and the dog owner
- Other: Equal to both large and small breed dogs not targeting large breeds
- Other: Euthanasia as a last option. Training and education needs to come before something so final as euthanasia.
- Other: Euthanasia as a last possible resort. Owners must be given the opportunity to provide further, adequate training.
- Other: Euthanasia as an absolute last resort- expansion on training centers funded for both dogs for retraining negative reactions AND law enforcement on how to handle a scared/aggressive dog
- Other: Euthanasia as an absolute last resort/ not an option. Rehabilitation or rehoming as the preferred option
- Other: Euthanasia decisions should be automatically reviewed by a higher court.
- Other: Euthanasia is a last resort sentence for an animal, only used when training has not improved an aggressive dog. A training program should be funded for these animals as it is not fair for people who can't afford extra training to have to kill their pet because of extras they cannot afford.
- Other: Euthanasia is a last resort when investigating and determining a punishment for the dog. It's not the dogs fault, it's the owners fault. Do not punish the dog for the humans problem.
- Other: Euthanasia is an absolute last resort
- Other: Euthanasia is cruel, even for a severe bite. The owners know their pets better than anyone, if the animal was being abused and attacked back, people would still choose euthanasia. Cases are bias in that way.
- Other: Euthanasia is last resort
- Other: Euthanasia is never an option. Work to rehabilitate the dogs! We do not euthanize children when they misbehave or are not taught properly in the beginning.
- Other: Euthanasia is not given to the dog
- Other: Euthanasia is not granted. A fair trial should take place before this is approved.
- Other: Euthanasia is the last option
- Other: Euthanasia is the last resort
- Other: Euthanasia is the last resort after all other resolutions have been attempted
- Other: euthanasia needs to be a LAST resort, more often putting them in a loving CALM environment will help them. I would only think veterinarians and dog behaviorist could be on the tribunal
- Other: Euthanasia of the dog should be the last resort.
- Other: Euthanasia only happens when go through all court process



- Other: Euthanasia should be considered as a last resort, after all other options have been exhausted including mandatory obedience training. Obedience and socialization training should be implemented first before the consideration of euthanasia no matter the breed or severity of the bite.
- Other: Euthanasia should be reserved for only repeat offenders. Something akin to third strike
- Other: Euthanasia should only be considered in the most extreme of situations (if the victim died
- Other: Euthanasia was taken off the list all together. Every dog can be trained in the right home
- Other: Euthanasia would need to go to provincial court
- Other: Euthanasia as a LAST RESORT, no matter the breed, age, or crime the animal has committed.
- Other: Euthanasia as the absolute last option available
- Other: Euthanasia cases must be reviewed by the Court of Queen's Bench
- Other: Euthanasia couldn't be ordered. Or a 3 strikes rule applies prior to an order to euthanize.
- Other: Euthanasia is a last resort. First train, or re-home.
- Other: euthanasia is for very very very very very bites nothing less.
- Other: euthanasia orders must go through court
- Other: Euthanasia requests move to court
- Other: Euthanasia should be an absolute last resort and the decision should not be taken lightly.
- Other: Euthanasia should be the absolute last conversation.
- Other: Euthanasia should never occur for an animal due to one person's complaints. Most dogs do not bite unless abused or provoked. Owners should be mandated to attend training should an bite incident should occur, failure to do so should result in the dog being removed from this owner and rescued by an organization that will train and rehabilitate the dog.
- Other: Euthanasia should not be an option. Rehabilitation should be looked into first.
- Other: Euthanasia should not be considered for a first time offense
- Other: Euthanasia should not be considered. Animals bite when threatened and shouldn't be murdered for defending themselves when scared. Create a rehabilitation/training program.
- Other: Euthanasia shouldn't be brought to the table, but the owner should be held accountable.
- Other: euthanasia was seen as a last resort and if the dog in question has been through the system multiple times
- Other: Euthanasia was the very last possible option, if an option at all.
- Other: Euthanasia as absolute last resort. I'd rather see proactive/preventative measures. Sometimes a dog is better off with the appropriate owner.
- Other: Euthanasia at the VERY LAST RESORT. It's depressing and awful for everyone, not to mention very expensive
- Other: Euthanasia of a dog because of lack of training makes me think you're not really for preventive measures like assessable training, neuter/spay, etc.
- Other: Euthanasia of a dog is not a good idea. The dog should be assessed by a behavioral veterinarian that could determine if the dog is indeed a problem (naturally aggressive etc.) Many behavioral issues come from the owner that doesn't know how to deal with their dog.



- Other: Euthanizing a dog is the absolute last resort.
- Other: Euthanizing a dog should only be considered if proper measures were not taken if the dog is a repeat offender, if the dog has been abused or conditioned to act upon displays of aggression and has not been through retraining or has been through training and relapses. Often dog attack is a fear response or a perception of threat that was left unchecked and allowed to escalate.
- Other: Euthanizing an animal seems unfair when we allow murderers, pedos, and criminals live when committing a crime. Most dog attacks are based out of fear. They don't attack to attack they defend themselves
- Other: Euthanizing an animal was seen as an absolute last resort and would require a higher level of oversight if this verdict was reached.
- Other: Euthanizing and animal should never be an option.
- Other: Euthanizing animals would have to be a last resort.
- Other: Euthanizing as last resort
- Other: Euthanizing is never an option
- Other: euthanizing the dog is taken off the lost of roles, and rather training for both the dog and owner is mandatory
- Other: Euthanizing the dog is the last option. Classes, like behavioural training, will be given to the dog first. If a dog bites, there needs to be context as to why it did, for example: somebody was in its space for too long and it gave warnings but then bit. There is a difference between biting and attacking. If a dog attacks somebody, then take the correct steps to stop that behaviour. The people looking at the case need to look at the owner, dogs can even aggressive because of how they were trained, it's not predisposed.
- Other: Euthanizing would be the very very last resort. Like after other disciplinary actions haven't worked.
- Other: Euthenize owner not dog
- Other: Evaluation by independent animal behaviorists
- Other: Evaluation of the dog should be done by persons who have training and experience in dog behavior. This could include people from the Calgary Humane Society e.g.
- Other: Even a small amount of power corrupts a small mind. My concern is stupid people are 95% of the population... Faster than courts is good. An appeal process or an option to go to court instead of tribunal has to be allowed.
- Other: Even dogs rescued from dog fighting can be rehabilitated. Use humanity and intelligence. Give the dog a chance. Do NOT give the human owner a chance!
- Other: Event(s) leading up to incident MUST be considered. Dogs have the right to defend themselves
- Other: Every aspect of the case should be looked into carefully. Human error and poor ownership play the biggest factors in any dog bite instance. Aside from distemper and rabies. I fear a tribunal may act to euthanize too quickly to get through the day quickly.
- Other: Every attempt to rehabilitate dog was exhausted



- Other: Every case has to be treated as an individual case-cannot be based on a previous case with similar breed for example. If humans are innocent until proven guilty and get light sentences then so should a animal.
- Other: Every dog and situation is different. The dog doesn't bite unless provoked in some matter and it should be investigated.
- Other: Every effort is made to place the dog into obedience/rehab classes before any decision is made.
- Other: Every effort is made to rehabilitate the dog, whether it be additional training, removing the animal from a bad home etc. Before discussing euthanizing the animal.
- Other: Every member of the tribunal must be a professional dog trainer with a minimum 10 years working and speaking at dog training seminars. Average citizens have no business making these decisions.
- Other: Every situation is different. If a dog attacks a human out of self defence. The dog should not be utilized
- Other: Everyone on the tribunal must be dog friendly, no dog haters, it is biased and ultimately end with more dogs being found guilty. Appeals that are made through the Court of Queens Bench be given priority, allowing for less stress on the dogs and there owners.
- Other: Everyone was well educated and no rash decisions were made
- Other: Examined by a veterenarian (ie did the dog bite from a pain response)
- Other: Exceptionally high fines or punishments if the animal is found off site or proof is provided they were off site during mediation.
- Other: Exhaust all options first before euthanasia like training, behavior modification, owner education, follow a proper behavior guide to see if they are deemed safe for public again
- Other: Exhaust all options with the dog, training, re-homing, etc. Dog bites are caused by irresponsible owners setting their pet up to fail. Euthanasia should not be the answer, even extreme cases can be managed by a rescue or responsible pet owner.
- Other: Experienced dog behaviourists on tribunal
- Other: experienced people dealing with dogs behaviour and possibly human behaviour to determine if there's a chance for rehabilitation for the dog.
- Other: Expert dog people not politicians
- Other: Expertise in dog behavior, opportunities for owners to make submissions
- Other: Experts must be involved, owner negligence must be identified.
- Other: Experts such as vets were included. This would be to ensure there isn't unfair discrimination against certain perceived aggressive breeds.
- Other: Experts with animal welfare in mind need to be on any tribunal. I'd also like to see the panel include a veterinarian with considerable experience and some sort of mental health professional like a psychologist as well.
- Other: Explore the entire history of the owner and dog, consider rehabilitation courses for the dog.
- Other: External members of tribunal must not be associated with another cities bylaw or council and must have minimum of 4 years education on animal behavioural studies.



- Other: Fair and animal is assessed to see if another owner can save it and ownership was the problem.
- Other: Fair and equal representation of experts in the tribunal panel
- Other: Fair and equitable treatment based on circumstance and not based on breed
- Other: Fair and gives owners a chance to defend themselves
- Other: Fair and reasonable.
- Other: Fair and unbiased against the dog breed and more attention to the owners actions raising the dog. Which is majority of cases is why the dog is aggressive in the first place.
- Other: Fair and unbiased panel
- Other: Fair and unbiased, involving individuals trained to understand animal behavior, and that the situation is reviewed for 'at fault' (dog vs human).
- Other: Fair due process without prejudice (although this whole segment on pit bulls makes me worry that certainly won't be the case)
- Other: Fair evaluation and the dog's breed isn't used against them.
- Other: Fair treatment of an animal. What if a dog lashed out because a person was not properly trained in mannerisms and scared the dog resulting in unfortunate situations. It's not a black and white situation
- Other: Fair treatment of the dog and place more responsibility to the owner to train it properly it is not the dog's fault.
- Other: Fair trial
- Other: Fair understanding of the reason the dog bit
- Other: Fairness and being reasonable take a huge part
- Other: Fairness and consistency, unbiased
- Other: Fairness towards a dog and harsher penalties towards repeat bad owners.
- Other: Faster systems are good but the people involved need to be knowledgeable. Vets maybe.
- Other: Final decisions on dog's fate must be decided by multiple adjudicators working independently from each other to prevent collusion.
- Other: Find all alternative approaches possible to avoid putting the animal down.
- Other: Find another home for the dog. Do not euthanize.
- Other: finding fair and impartial community members to sit on the tribunal would be very important
- Other: First hand experience from the folks reviewing of the breeds to ensure no unjust bias against the breed - like this entire survey showcases :)
- Other: First-time offenders would never be euthanized and both owner and dog would be required to undergo extensive training.
- Other: Focus more on rehabilitation and training, less on punishment and euthanasia
- Other: Focus on rehabilitation of dogs
- Other: focus on retraining for nonviolent behavior don't put them down
- Other: Focus on the PEOPLE not the animal.



- Other: Focused on dog rehabilitation or strict home- arrest type rules rather than euthanizing the dog.
- Other: Focuses more on the owner and less on the dog
- Other: Follow condition
- Other: followed law and precedent and did not call in petty revenge or one sided justice
- Other: Follows an unbiased and step by step process in decision making, including a NO BSL policy.
- Other: For all sizes dogs...even the little ones
- Other: For first time complaints only, and the dog should not be euthanized. The dog should be retrained or rehabbed.
- Other: For severe dog attacks. The dog would be euthanized at owners expense.
- Other: Foster and training not shelter or pound detention of the animal. Train the dog and fix the problem. Rehab not remove
- Other: Found equal members of the public and animal rights advocates were involved
- Other: Full transparency and ability to challenge decisions made
- Other: Fully supervised and reviewed before decisions are made.
- Other: Fully vetted and qualified to make such decisions
- Other: Fund a training program for dogs with behavioural issues INSTEAD OF euthanization
- Other: Gave the owner chances to rehabilitate their pet before you ppl decide to put them down as the ONLY option!!
- Other: Get a fair judgment of ownership AND Dog behaviour. Sometimes it's not the animal but the owner themselves.
- Other: Get another family (without kids) to foster the dog in the interm. This will show the courts how this dog adapts. Perhaps it just needs some love and attention. If that's the case then take the dog away and have it mussels at all times while out in public. The foster family can have the mussel on the dog while it is in there home until they feel the dog is safe. Don't use up the shelter
- Other: Getting money for the victims vet bills if it's a dog on dog attack.
- Other: Give the dog a chance at rehabilitation with a qualified trainer .
- Other: Good investigation on why dog bit someone
- Other: Had a veterinary board certified behaviourist on the panel for assessment.
- Other: Had compassion for the animal.
- Other: Had the stated goal/priority of keeping as many dogs as possible in the owners home.
- Other: Had true dog behavior professionals from all realms (not having a bias against pit bulls)
- Other: Had very specific authorities for passing judgement, and that the owner's background be checked in conjunction with an aptitude test for the dog; often dogs bite because they are being mistreated and the tribunal should absolutely be investigating ownership as much as temperament of the dog itself.
- Other: Has a set time line for the decision of max two weeks
- Other: Has a specialized professional inputs
- Other: Has dog owners of the community on the tribunal.



- Other: Has experts in fields like animal and human psychology to assess behaviour reasons for animals and acknowledge trauma to people
- Other: Have a background in dog behaviour.
- Other: Have a vet specialized in behaviour or an expert in dog behaviour on the tribunal
- Other: Have an unbiased opinion of dog breeds and seriously took into account what transpired to cause the dog to reach their limit.
- Other: Have appropriate representation of both law and shelter/ animal handling professionals
- Other: Have educated people such as a veterinarian or veterinary technologist as part of the tribunal.
- Other: Have members of a veterinary team be able to assess without judgement of breed and for members to assess only on the case at hand.
- Other: Have only accredited dog behaviourist assess the dog.
- Other: Have the dog assessed by an animal behaviourist
- Other: Have unbiased people
- Other: Have vet and animal behaviorist on panel to advise and make recommendations for alternative solutions
- Other: Have veterinarians and behaviorist weigh in and assess the dog and situation ie was the dog provoked or was the owner negligent
- Other: Having a certified canine behaviourist on the panel
- Other: Having the pet euthanized should be the absolute last option and to try other alternatives first
- Other: Health and rehabilitation of the animals should be a priority, and euthanization should be an absolute last resort.
- Other: Heavy fines to the owners, which can pay for this tribunal.
- Other: History of the dog is assessed, fines levied to the owner and mandatory dog training/ behaviour rehabilitation issued to owner and dog to attend IF this is a first time offence.
- Other: Honorary member of authority looks into it as an investigation.
- Other: How is the tribunal selected, what are there qualifications, will they just be bureaucrats or will they be knowledgeable in the appropriate field.
- Other: Humane treatment of the dog, and looking at the victims role in provoking the dog
- Other: I agree with everything except the pet being euthanized. Why not have a tribunal make the easy decisions and leave the hard decisions to the old process?
- Other: I am not familiar enough with tribunals to say.
- Other: I believe dog experts should make up the tribunal or be consulted on every case
- Other: I believe dogs should be allowed to stay with their owners, creating separation trauma after an incident is not healthy for the dog or the owner. I also would like the Tribunal to look at all evidence openly, I.e did the dog bare its teeth saying to stay away and the person ignore the warning signs. Did the person ask to pet the dog. Etc.
- Other: I believe it's the owners responsibility to properly train a dog. A dog should not be euthanized for a humans irresponsibility.



- Other: I believe that all incidents should be handled individually, as in not labeling the breed of the dog as more dangerous than others. The OWNER is THE RESPONSIBLE person for the dogs behaviour.
- Other: I believe unless an owner doesn't want their dog back, I believe the dog should be assessed in their environment (any animal in a shelter begins to show unnatural signs (ie: aggression/depression). They would also need to do a thorough investigation of the incident. Tribunal representatives should also have some background that would help including some that can make animal based decisions ie: animal specialist, trainers, vets, etc)
- Other: I can't read the answers so this is absolutely useless...how about city council steps down and we get some people in there that aren't completely useless?
- Other: I do not support euthanization or the discrimination against bully breeds. Section 3 is unacceptable.
- Other: I do like the idea of a tribunal, as it could be comprised of people who have a better knowledge of dogs than a judge. However I am curious/concerned as to how this tribunal would be selected and that it would be done fairly.
- Other: I do not agree that a dog should be euthanized. Take a look at the owner and their behaviours rather than the dog
- Other: I do not believe a tribunal should be responsible for determining if a dog should be euthanized. The tribunal should determine the restrictions that are posed on the dog in the interim (ie doggy house arrest) until a court date is available
- Other: I DO NOT SUPPORT ANY FORM OF BREED DISCRIMINATION. DO BETTER.
- Other: I do not support breed-specific decisions of any kind. It is NEVER a breed issue, and always a behavior issue.
- Other: I do not support euthanization.
- Other: I do not support the idea of euthanizing dogs. The owner should be responsible to train them in obedience classes or removed from their care. The dog is almost never at fault whereas the owner is.
- Other: I do not think that tribunals should be able to declare the euthanization of a pet and if that is the determination those cases should go to the court.
- Other: I don't believe pets should be euthanized for behaviour that is the fault of the owners
- Other: I don't think a dog should be euthanized for biting. If off property, muzzle in future. On property, was the animal provoked or not being watched if it was with a child?
- Other: I don't think the dog should be euthanized especially if its a first offence. Owners can be the issue as well. Or situationally, why did the dog bite in the first place/attack.
- Other: I don't think the tribunal should be able to declare a dog to be euthanized, or there should be another step between tribunal and queens bench in the case of a euthanasia decision
- Other: I don't think they should have the authority to order a dog to be euthanized.
- Other: I don't agree with euthanizing dogs that bite, especially when the people have been warned not to approach or to approach slowly. Not fair to owners and animals.
- Other: I don't believe in euthanizing untrained dogs



- Other: I don't fully understand how the current system works and would need more details of how the tribunal system works.
- Other: I don't know
- Other: I don't support euthanizing a dog for a bite. They should be put into an environment that doesn't provoke them.
- Other: I don't support having different laws for different breeds but rather handling each situation on a case by case basis to gather the facts and make a decision.
- Other: I don't think a dog attack is plain and simple. In a high emotional case as these described, I think it's a multifactorial problem.
- Other: I don't think a tribunal should have the authority to order a euthanasia. That power should reside with the court system.
- Other: I don't think it's fair.
- Other: I don't support murder. Sorry.
- Other: I feel as though if the decision is to euthanize the dog should be held until a provincial decision is made (unless the owner supports euthanasia) this will give the owner the opportunity to appeal the decision.
- Other: I feel it would be essential that the tribunal would include a certified professional behaviour consultant when making decisions about animal outcomes.
- Other: I feel like this could make the process move quicker.
- Other: I feel more detail is needed as to the training and education of the members reviewing each file.
- Other: I feel strongly that this must apply to ALL dogs not just pit bulls. It appears as though many of these new restriction suggestions are targeted at pit bulls. Too many times I have seen small dogs at large, not under control nipping at people and other dogs who are on leash/under control.
- Other: I had a dog once that bit one person, during a separation and divorce huge life change in the household..... after that things were ok until the second I took it upon myself to euthanize the dog, he had never ever done it before and was 14 years old..... extenuating circumstances may be involved. And as a responsible dog owner I did what needed to be done at the time. Dogs can be stressed for many reasons and have rescued a few over the years. Dog in question was not a rescue but got him as a pup.
- Other: I have reservations about individuals that could be biased in a case just because it is a pit bull. Also individuals should be open to all sides of the story and not be on their own power trip.
- Other: I hope that the stigma placed on pitbulls won't be reflected in the panel. The tribunal should be screened for biases as much as possible.
- Other: I need more information on how the representatives are picked and a way to ensure that they are not biased towards pitbulls.
- Other: I ONLY support a tribunal process if it is ultimately the absolute best route for the dog, dog owner and victims. Calgarians need to be assured that the city and non-city representatives do not have a bias against pit bulls or any specific dog breed and that a dog's appearance and breed is not the smoking gun for a ruling. I own 2 pit bulls myself and I find the entire bylaw review concerning



dogs to be overwhelmingly bias towards the many countless dog breeds that have been lumped under the term "pit bull" because of how the dog looks. Frankly I feel that some of the options listed (aka. A limit on the number of dogs from the pit bull family in one household and higher fines for pit bull owners) to be an infringement on people personal rights and honestly just down right bias!! I honestly expected non-bias, actual sensible solutions from my city...

- Other: I support a tribunal as long as it is made up of educated and non-biased representatives. One of the members should be an animal professional (trainer, vet, etc)
- Other: I support this idea
- Other: I support tribunal - these things do need to be dealt with expeditiously.
- Other: I think a dog should be given the chance to rehabilitation, no different then the murders, rapists, and other criminals in our system that get out early on good behaviour. And like these programs, it should be funded by the government.
- Other: I think a pet behavior expert should be included to determine if the animals behavior is retrainable and or if it is a result of poor care by the current owner.
- Other: I think animal rescue groups such as Alberta Animal Rescue Crew Society should be included on the tribunal.
- Other: I think if it comes down to euthanization, it should definitely be something decided in provincial court
- Other: I think in order to be able to euthanize the vicious dog, there needs to be a review of the owner to rule out animal abuse, and secondly I feel as if the opinion of a animal caretaker (such as a vet) would be needed in order to make the most logical and informed decision.
- Other: I think it is most important to review the owners responsibility in the attack and show that they will educate themselves on dog behaviour, training, and rehabilitation. Most incidents are preventable and the owner must demonstrate their dedication to training the dog. Owners need to advocate for their dog when it is in an uncomfortable situation so that it doesn't result in an injury. The owner should be on trial not the dog.
- Other: I think it should be up to the owner to decide if the dog should be euthanized, otherwise I believe that there should just be more restrictions in place in order to ensure future safety for the dog and others
- Other: I think that a representative from the shelter/rescue holding the dog should be present in the Tribunal (and potentially a dog trainer or professional dog behavior specialist depending on availability).
- Other: I think the conditions should be fair, to determine whether or not the dog is actually a nuisance or if there was an issue as to why the dog acted out in the first place to be determined and if so, corrected in a fair and proper manner (ie training, etc)
- Other: I think there should be someone with education from the court as a mediator, to help things along. It can't just be random people.
- Other: I think there would be some non-City representatives that would show extreme bias and would throw cases.



- Other: I think you should be asking whoever got bitten and or the owner, what they have been doing to the dog to cause it to bite.
- Other: I very much support a fast-track because shelters can't house animals for long periods and it perpetuates more issues in the future, especially because often dogs are wrongly accused OR are teased/abused/triggered into biting and do not deserve punishment. In the time they sit in a shelter, you are actually creating the conditions required to cause more bites in the future. That said, I am concerned that a tribunal would be similar to the witch hunts of old, where a biased group of uncaring people who do not understand dogs determine the "easiest" fate that limits their liability. The tribunal should be publicly accountable, include veterinarians, rescue organization volunteers who are experienced with rehabilitation, certified trainers experienced with rehabilitation, and dog owners.
- Other: I want more emphasis put on the owner than the dog. I believe dog bites have more to do with the owner than the animal. I think euthanizing an animal should be an absolute last resort and only be used in extreme cases where all other efforts to rehabilitate the animal have failed.
- Other: I worry about bias with this process .. considering previous question. I think if there was a way to ensure tribunal members were unbiased, it could be plausible.
- Other: I worry that these tribunals could focus too much on the breed of the dog and let that play too much of a role in their decision. Dogs should not be judged by their breed.
- Other: I would like the tribunal reps to be people who are not constantly new (ie, a long-term commitment). I'd like Humane Society rep(s) to be on the tribunal. I'd like euthanasia to not be considered lightly. I think people are at fault, not the dogs. Different subject but please make animal abandonment/abuse/neglect a very high fine or criminal charge.
- Other: I would like to dispute any issues within city rather than provincial
- Other: I would not want it to cost regular dog owners more or be too big of a cost to taxpayers.
- Other: I would not want to see any breed bias happening. As any responsible owner/trainer knows it is not the breed but the training or lack that causes problems. I don't think the tribunal should be allowed to euthanize the animals, that should be decided in a more authoritative body. There could be extenuating circumstances.
- Other: I would support
- Other: I would support a tribunal if they are unbiased in all decisions made, no decision should be made based off of breed appearance.
- Other: I would support a tribunal with a member(s) of an animal rescue
- Other: I would support it as long as there is a proper dog behaviouralist on each case and properly educate the people on the case
- Other: I would support the dog being able to remain home with the owner during this time period, with restrictions on going outside
- Other: I would support this as long as it is ensured that the specific situation was assessed and made sure that it is actually the dog at fault not the other person involved.
- Other: I would support this if it was based on a dog's past behaviour rather than it being based on breed



- Other: I'd support if not in contradiction with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Also there needs to be an appeal system in place for both parties.
- Other: If a dog behaves badly consistently, then other options such as rehoming and training should be explored. Euthanasia should not be an option except in the most extreme or egregious cases.
- Other: If a dog goes through the process they need to attend approved training classes/behavioural assessment by a professional.
- Other: If a dog's bite is severe enough to have to place someone in the hospital for reconstructive surgery. The dog should be euthanized if the owner is not willing to go through intense training with the dog and put a muzzle on the dog whenever outside in public.
- Other: If a pit bull mauls (Whether it killed it not) someone or another animal, just freaking out it down! Why does it need any second thoughts?!?
- Other: If a serious offence take it to a judge
- Other: If all dogs are treated equally. No bias because of the appearance of the dog.
- Other: If an animal behaviourist were involved in analyzing evidence.
- Other: If anyone on the tribunal voted in favor of breed specific bans or restrictions, they are immediately in a conflict of interest and not permitted to sit. Major penalties and immediate case dismissal should this not be followed.
- Other: If City and non-City representatives included knowledgeable, highly trained, unbiased professionals (eg. breed specialists, licensed dog trainers, animal rescue representatives)
- Other: If decision is to euthanize, must then be pushed back on provincial court
- Other: If determined the representative is byist on a breed they can no longer attend to cases with said breed or lookalike breed involved. Any dog can attack.
- Other: if dog euthanasia is chosen, that a court make the final rendering.
- Other: If euthanasia considered, a second party must agree
- Other: If euthanasia is the last resort. Training programs before euthanizing
- Other: if euthanasia was determined to be the assessment the tribunal would be officially reviewed
- Other: If euthanization is not a potential outcome. This is inhumane and there are better ways to deal with such situations.
- Other: If even a dangerous dog is safe with their owners or on their property, then it should be implemented that the dog has to be either restricted to their property, or on leash/muzzled/not allowed in off leash dog parks. And if that is not abided to, then heavy fines should be implemented. Euthanizing should NEVER be a forceable action without owner consent.
- Other: If everyone involved in the decision was educated and understands that these breeds aren't more aggressive than others and should be treated as a family member just like any other pet
- Other: If it actually did decrease trauma to the dog, did not support euthanasia for this, and required dog owners to be reviewed to see if they should have a dog, and mandatory dog training and rehabilitation.
- Other: If it determined the dogs were a threat to others or if its been mistreated/poorly trained
- Other: If it expedited cases while still being fair to the owner, dog and victims.
- Other: If it had the same quality of decision making that a court would



- Other: If it included individuals with dog behaviour knowledge to help assess the animal.
- Other: If it is a VERY sever bite (life altering/life threatening condition), it should be handled by the courts
- Other: If it is confirmed that there is no biased to any specific breed and the cases are treated like a trial with background checks similar to a jury.
- Other: If it is for all dog attacks from all breeds and not just Pit bull types
- Other: If it is one time offence/ the dog was in a high stress environment - it should not be blamed to the point of taking away the dog or eurhanization
- Other: If it was a fair trial and taking account of owners actions. Its not the breed of the dog that's an issue its how they get trained.
- Other: If it weren't biased towards any dog breed and looked at the dog and owner as individuals
- Other: If its a minor offense that can be solved relatively simple then yes
- Other: If it's the dogs first offence that appropriate training and education for the owner be enforced. If the dog continues to have offended because the owner has not been compliant or refused to comply initially then the dog should be evaluated to see if re-homing to a RESPONSIBLE dog owner is in the best interest of the dog. Eg. the dog is trainable and would make a good pet as long as the owner or new owner was educated and took the responsibility to train the dog appropriately.
- Other: If its the dogs first time doing it, give the owner restrictions rules but don't euthanize the animal. Theres always factors to why the dog may have reacted.
- Other: if owner is deemed the problem then a behavioral specialist rehabilitates the dog, owner is fined and dog rehomed
- Other: If selrction of members was reasonable eg. Not govt employees
- Other: If the bite wasn't lethal; and not just the dog but the owners also had to be trained.
- Other: If the board consists of professional dog trainers and people who actually work with dogs for a living
- Other: If the city is marking pitbulls as nuisance, I have zero faith in their ability to decide on anything.
- Other: If the decision was euthanasia that a second option be given - because dog bites can be caused by bad dog ownership and it is unfair to punish the dog in most cases
- Other: If the decision was to euthanize, then they would proceed to provincial court
- Other: If the dog cannot be properly trained to not be vicious and bite other, then euthanization may be considered
- Other: If the dog has good reason to be put down then do so. But if it was a one time bite or not even a bad bite, they shouldn't be put down for that either.
- Other: If the dog has multiple vicious declarations
- Other: If the dog is not judged for being a type of breed
- Other: If the dog IS required to be euthanized by the tribunal or is required to have serious action then it must go through the system twice to ensure that it is the only and final option
- Other: if the dog was involved in a vicious attack or aggressive behavior, the dog should have to wear a muzzle when leaving the owners property for any reason.



- Other: If the dog was provoked and then bit the offender there should not be a charge at all to the dog or owner but to the offender who harassed the dog.
- Other: If the dog was provoked or someone was trespassing fault should not be the dogs. It is their job to protect the home
- Other: If the dog(s) involved are well known in the community as constant offenders.
- Other: If the owner feels it's best to have the dog euthanized they are allowed to be present at the euthanasia as that is their pet and they deserve that right. I believe that if the owner feels euthanasia is the appropriate action the holding period of that dog should not have to take place if there are rabies vaccine records provided. It does no good for any party especially the dog.
- Other: If the owner is offered an alternative to euthanization such as mandatory training sessions. **NO DOG SHOULD BE EUTHANIZED WHEN THEIR OWNER IS NOT A RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL PROVIDING THE PROPER TRAINING AND ENVIRONMENT FOR A DOG**
- Other: If the people making the decisions were animal lovers and **DOG OWNERS** so they could make an **EDUCATED DECISION**, not just a bunch of people with a vengeance for pitbulls.
- Other: if the representatives would be certified trainers and behavioral professionals, then maybe
- Other: If the tribunal consists of a vet and animal behaviorist.
- Other: If the tribunal could be guaranteed to be non-biased and included people who are involved in the protection of animals as well as that of the city.
- Other: If the tribunal decides the dog must be euthanized it must be referred to the Provincial court
- Other: If the tribunal had an animal specialist on panel such as a vet.
- Other: If the tribunal included a person not directly owning the dog, but who would be familiar with its typical behaviour.
- Other: If the tribunal was neutral in terms of breed
- Other: If there are trained professionals on the tribunal. Not some random City Employee or some random Calgarian who hates animals or had a traumatic experience as a kid. You need a holistic approach here. People who are understanding and want the best for the animals welfare.
- Other: If there has been a severe bite, I think the dog should still be allowed to go home with the owner while it awaits a decision, under very strict order the dog is to stay on leash/in the home etc.
- Other: if there is severe fines (or other penalization) for either party in breach of the tribunal
- Other: If there was a k9 behaviouralist on board to advise. You **NEED** someone with experience and can properly assess the situation. Not everyone understands k9 behaviour. It's in everyone's best interest to have an expert to weigh in on the matter at hand.
- Other: If there were actually a fair chance for the dog. No speeding things along to put them all down. I don't want the dog to spend unnecessary time in the shelter but this needs to be completely fair
- Other: If they did not have the power to make euthanized orders.
- Other: If they did not take the breed into consideration at all.
- Other: If this is done, there needs to be no biases. For example, bully breed dogs need to be looked at in the same way one would review a golden retriever. It is an owner's responsibility to train the dog, as well as know if their dog has triggers of any kind.



- Other: If you can still fight the decision
- Other: If you do the proper investigation to ensure the dog is actually at fault for the issue
- Other: If you make sure that there are people on the tribunal with dog behavioural experience. People who know and have experience with behaviour issues, challenges and problems so that they are able to make informed recommendations and decisions.
- Other: I'm against putting restrictions on pit bulls. I'm disappointed with Calgary that they are even considering it.
- Other: Impartial and unbiased
- Other: Impartial members
- Other: Impartial participants (animal friendly people who understand situational behaviour and can fully assess the situation while listening to all accounts of incident)
- Other: Impartial third body present
- Other: Impartial to all breeds.
- Other: Impartiality; random citizens if possible
- Other: In my opinion, healthy, happy, well balanced dogs do not act out. A home evaluation needs to take place to find out the conditions this dog is living in. Whiteness need to be questioned if there was an incident that occurred and people who are around the dog daily ie. neighbors also need to be questioned. If the incident took place outside the home, and the home is fit for the dog, than they should be kept at home under strict rules until things are figured out. If it happened at home than the dog should be placed in a safe place until everything is settled.
- Other: In the cases where euthanasia is the verdict opportunities to appeal with an impartial party must be available, history of complainant and dog interaction/defendant history need to be disclosed in court, and owner must be able to say goodbyes/choose own vet if desired for termination.
- Other: In the cases where the owner is found to be in possession of an animal that has generated a severe bite, the owner should be officially recorded in a registry that is available to the public such that residents in proximity to the owner and their animal are aware of the potential risk.
- Other: Include not only legal members but also experts in domestic animal welfare and protection.
- Other: include participation by victims and animal owners
- Other: Include vets on the panel specialized in animal behaviour and assess the owner's role in the bite handing out bans on dog ownership if the owner being a bad owner is directly attributable to the bite
- Other: Included in the non-City representative would have to be ACCREDITED and RESPECTED dog professionals.
- Other: Included individuals educated in dogs and rescue dogs; no people biased on breeds.
- Other: included responsible large dog owners including pitbulls
- Other: included those experienced in dog training and/or rehabilitation OR ranking employees/members of a shelter (like the Humane Society)
- Other: Included veterinary assessments and opinions on rehabilitation first
- Other: Includes an animal behaviour expert not just citizens with no knowledgeable background.
- Other: Includes canine specialists



- Other: Includes dog behaviour experts, does not include representatives with agendas against specific breeds or owners
- Other: Includes dog behaviourist/trainer
- Other: Includes members on the tribunal that are knowledgeable about animal health and animal behavior, and no member shall have a perceived bias for or against a specific species or breed of animal
- Other: Includes members who are considered experts in interpreting dog behaviour and that an effective method is used for capturing the dog's behaviour at the time of the incident like bystander testimony for example.
- Other: Includes people experienced with dog behavior and are not biased towards Pitt Bulls
- Other: Including a professional dog behaviorist
- Other: Including an animal behaviourist, veterinarian, or other person qualified to assess the animal
- Other: Including experts who are open to rehabilitation
- Other: Increase fees to cover
- Other: Independent Veterinary and animal behavior specialists are involved
- Other: Independent assessment of the animal to determine likely hood of recurrence and potentially mitigating factors.
- Other: Independent third parties with public oversight
- Other: Individual cases treated as such, not a blanket bias based on the breed of a dog. More training for the owner, not necessarily the animal.
- Other: Individuals assessing Whether a dog is to be euthanized is sufficiently trained to avoid breed bias
- Other: Individuals on the tribunal are not biased to a particular breed. All breeds are treated equal.
- Other: Individuals on the Tribunal would need to have specific training and testing to ensure bias is not used in their decision-making.
- Other: Individuals should be properly vetted and should not have internal biases towards certain breeds
- Other: Individuals who Have experience in dealing with animals (I.e vet, dog groomers, vet tech, etc). Individuals should not have a previous incident with any sever dog bite (to ensure no bias against specific jobs). Individuals do not pre-judge dogs based on breed and understand behaviour of dog is due to training, not breed.
- Other: Individuals who understand animal behaviours are on the tribunal
- Other: Individuals with animal behavior knowledge are involved
- Other: Input from a veterinarian or similar animal health professional before euthanasia is considered
- Other: Input from vet. Owner etc
- Other: input/assessments were made/ influenced by dog behavioral specialists
- Other: Instead of a shelter; the dog in question is to remain in the owners home. Providing less stress on the owner and animal.



- Other: Instead of euthanasia, do court ordered dog and owner training, as well as proper muzzle training, and have the dogs need to wear muzzled. Keep dogs in their home to reduce trauma with the dog needing to be muzzled when around new people, and no public situations until court matter is resolved
- Other: Interview owners before decision is made. Team up with rescues and dog rehabilitation centres
- Other: Interviews with family and friends in regards to the owner and behavior of the dog.
- Other: Investigating the situation and cause for the bite; if the owner could've done anything to prevent the bite they should be deemed unfit to own breeds like pit bulls, German shepherds, Dobermans, Rottweiler etc.
- Other: Involve professionals, like dog trainers and vets
- Other: Involved actual animal experts such as vets and individuals from the multiple shelters across the city.
- Other: Involved experts, involved both people for and against euthanization
- Other: Involved representation from the Humane Society and a Behavioural Specialist
- Other: Involvement of a competent person with relevant experience and skill to deal with the situation.
- Other: Involving proper dog training while the dog in question is being held until a decision is made. Potential rehab option and rehoming.
- Other: Is actually useful and speeds things up D fairly
- Other: Is fair and with in reason and allows the owner to have a chance to take appropriate action before drastic measures are taken.
- Other: Is not biased about breeds and is a panel of experts.
- Other: Is the owner capable of caring for a dogs need or physical and mental health
- Other: Isn't breed biased. Is a tribunal of dog experts/educators not just random city workers.
- Other: It actually reviews the circumstances of what cause the altercation and allows reasonable time AS WELL AS access to support for appeal. I have many friends with bully breed dogs that are the sweetest dogs. Bully breeds tend to be provoked at the last option (and usually by a much more aggressive smaller breed).
- Other: it allows the owner to realize that this is a problem and that there are repercussions to disorderly activity like biting and attacking.
- Other: It also depends on the behaviour of the pet. The main problem with pet ownership is that they do not train their pets the basic commands.
- Other: It can not consist of people with a bias opinion for certain breeds
- Other: It cannot include any person who has previous issues to any dog.
- Other: It can't be just anyone making these decisions. A trained person needs to be part of this process
- Other: It comprises of at least 1 veterinarian, 1 dog behaviour specialist, and 1 member of the public
- Other: It did not become a shortcut to euthanizing problem dogs or any pitbull type dog deemed problematic



- Other: It did not have increased cost for the dog owner
- Other: It did not hold breed-specific prejudices
- Other: It did not pick on specific breeds
- Other: It did not rush to a decision on the dog and was still a fair assessment
- Other: It didn't allow for euthanasia and that the people involved are non biased towards animals and specific breeds
- Other: It does not define aggression based on breed discrimination and include breed specific legislation. This could further increase discrimination towards renters with pets and destruction of the ability of these breeds to be adopted by humane society and shelters. <https://www.asPCA.org/animal-protection/public-policy/what-breed-specific-legislation>. It is important that obedience training is suggested but not based on breed!
- Other: It does not single out pitbulls
- Other: It does not target specific breeds and push them through to euthanize
- Other: It doesn't assume behaviour based on breed, but instead is concerned with a Behaviour
- Other: It doesn't discriminate against dog breeds and takes into consideration the behaviour of the human injured in the incident
- Other: It doesn't have a full on worded attack on a specific breed ie- pit bulls which can be the most loving pets.
- Other: It doesn't result in a large administrative cost to city tax payers.
- Other: It doesn't automatically decide certain dog breeds are bad or have a prejudice towards certain breeds.
- Other: It dropped the [removed] pitbull bias
- Other: it follows a clear parameter for what justifies euthanasia, bylaw can in fact enforce a home confinement or utilize a tracking device on nuisance or severe bite dogs so they are confined. But not at a shelter. Put accountability on the owner.
- Other: It follows a very personalized very case by case basis. That they look at everything before euthanizing the dog and are thinking of rehabilitation first and what's best for the best and family as well as safety.
- Other: it had actual vets and behavioral experts on the panel. No politicians or Karen's.
- Other: It had both dog owners and non dog owners on the tribunal
- Other: It has qualified people on it - not just a vet, but animal advocates.
- Other: It has to be done for nuisance dogs and not specific breeds. Have we considered mandatory licensing for all dog owners which involves a course on responsible pet ownership (regardless of breed)
- Other: It has to be independent and subject to a middle layer of review, other than the Court of Queen's Bench
- Other: It has to have dog/pit bull lovers on it. People who are not these will not look at the trauma that the owner and dog also suffer.
- Other: It has to have some form of check and balance, comprised of individuals that work in dog related industries such as vet, trainers and breeders



- Other: It identified and lists the events that lead up to the severe bite and is NOT prejudiced by breed only.
- Other: It included a veterinarian among its constituents.
- Other: It included an individual who is very familiar with dog training and behavior.
- Other: it included at minimum one veterinarian, and one dog behavior expert
- Other: It included people who had the wellbeing of the animal in mind. I.e. Veterinarians or dog trainers who could see if it was possible to rehab the dog
- Other: It includes animal experts (behaviorist, vet, etc.)
- Other: It includes experts in dog behaviour and includes due process in determining the environmental contributions that lead to an incident
- Other: It includes folk with dog expertise particularly in rehabilitation of problem dogs
- Other: It includes people that have actually owned pitbulls and have experience with the breed and how they really behave, instead of a tribunal member who's only knowledge of the breed is hearsay they've read in Facebook posts
- Other: It includes properly trained dog trainers who have thorough knowledge of canine behaviour and body language
- Other: It includes veterinary experts.
- Other: It involved actually knowledgeable and capable people, while mitigating bias and denigrating breed specific legislation as this is inherently biased and unscientific.
- Other: It involved behaviour specialists to weigh in on the reasons for the dogs behaviour and a preference was made for retraining or rehoming whenever possible.
- Other: It involves qualified experts in the field
- Other: It is appropriately assessed
- Other: It is balanced and thoughtful
- Other: It is based of people who actually work with dogs, not city council who has owned one maybe two dogs in their life.
- Other: It is based on facts and evidence of a recurring issue with the dog and not a biased public opinion based on the breed and not the individual dog.
- Other: It is cost effective and fair
- Other: It is done fairly and does not breed discriminate. It must not be biased in any way.
- Other: It is effectively and efficiently run and organized with non biased staff with suitable expertise and with suitable expertise on retention
- Other: It is established early on as to whether the owner intentionally trained their dog to be aggressive. If so then I think they should go through the regular process
- Other: It is fair and equal for all cases. There would be no allowance for influencing opinions based on breed
- Other: It is fair and not biased based on the breed of dog
- Other: It is fair, not breed specific. It needs to be based on the amount of incidents, and the steps to prevent. It would be hard to do because people are too biased.



- Other: It is fairly and unbiasedly looked at with an open mind. And the full story of the incident is looked at. Events leading up to event in question and why it may have happened.
- Other: It is free from breed specific prejudices. There is no evidence to support Breed-specific legislation. ANY animal if provoked can be potentially dangerous.
- Other: It is made up dog behavioural specialist.
- Other: It is made up of animal experts ie veterinarians, trainers, phycologist
- Other: It is made up of dog behaviour experts, not politician-types.
- Other: It is not based off of breed specific bylaws aimed at pitbulls. All dogs can be dangerous. Even small breed dogs
- Other: It is not based on breed but on the offence of the animal
- Other: It is not biased to dog breeds, much like this questionnaire. Euthanizing is a last resort. Many dogs just need additional training to work through issues, not be killed for doing dog things. A true investigation as to why the dog did what it did instead of assuming it's just the dog "turning on people." Usually, it's human error and the dog is reacting. So let's give dogs the benefit of the doubt since most people don't train their dogs.
- Other: It is not biased towards ANY breed.
- Other: It is NOT breed specific
- Other: It is not breed specific and euthanasia is a last resort
- Other: it is not breed specific, meaning each incident is assessed and treated equally regardless of breed
- Other: It is not harsher on pitbull breeds
- Other: It is operated by unbiased, reasonable people that promise to use their best judgement. This system would need to be reassessed periodically to ensure no internal corruption has taken place
- Other: It is quick
- Other: It is quick and fair.
- Other: It is run by people who are not biased towards any type of dog breed, and must care about the well being of animals.
- Other: It is substantially quicker than waiting for courts.
- Other: It is taken as seriously as in PC - the individuals making the decision cannot be biased based on a breed of dog
- Other: It is thoroughly looked into
- Other: It is unbiased and does not result in the death of an innocent dog, rather the punishment of the incompetent owner
- Other: It is understood that the dog is a reflection of the owner. The owner should be banned from certain types of breed ownership if their dogs are a continuing issue.
- Other: It just acts as an typical provincial court with adequate representation from people in the field, as well as those in charge of properly reviewing all aspects of the individual animal(s) in question
- Other: It looks and the entire case and is not prejudice of bully breeds.
- Other: It must be put together with experienced pet owners/behavioural specialists.



- Other: It must have experts in dogs and dog behaviour and follow scientific evidence (for example, peer-reviewed articles stating breed-specific legislation is ineffective)
- Other: It must include citizens, representatives from the humane society, and dog trainers
- Other: It needs to be made up of dog behaviourists, veterinarians. No one with a fear of dogs should be allowed to sit on the tribunal..
- Other: It needs to have a veterinarian on the tribunal. End of story
- Other: It pertains to All Dogs equally including small breeds such as chihuahuas which are typically poorly trained by their owners and tend provoke bigger dogs.
- Other: It produces net revenue not net cost.
- Other: It punishes the owners and their behaviour and training of the dog.
- Other: It remained fair to the owners and the dogs (victim and otherwise)
- Other: It seems that this entire survey has been about pitbulls so I would not have confidence that there wouldn't be a bias within the tribunal
- Other: It should be a neutral selected committee or group of people. Include dog trainers, animal workers, behavioural consultants. Ensure that there are no biases toward breed. Give the dog a chance as it is not the fault of the dog.
- Other: It should be comprised of experts in dog behaviour and psychology and not simply made of counsel for local areas.
- Other: It should be done as a case by case
- Other: It should have representatives from Calgary rescues and dog trainers. It should also focus on how to help the owner manage their dog as often these problems stem from ownership.
- Other: it should include individuals such as vets, dog trainers, and rescue professionals.
- Other: It should involve a professional trained in dog behaviour (CPDT-KA designation). The trainer should be a force free, reward based trainer so they know how to properly assess the dog and situation.
- Other: It should not tie up precious time at appeals court. Some other secondary review could take place.
- Other: It should only ever come to this action if a serious incident has occurred, like an unprovoked attack. Underline unprovoked. A dog should never be euthanized unless it is required due to medical reasons and a sign off by a responsible owner. If a dog is attacking unprovoked the owners should be investigated and if found to be unfit the dog should be rehomed.
- Other: It still needs to be a thorough and fair process.
- Other: It took in consideration each dog and their home situation/ the situation in which they became aggressive. If they were protecting their owner or a passerby they should not be penalized for such.
- Other: It took into account if the dog was a rescue from a bad situation. If the dog went to formal or informal training measures. Whether or not it was provoked.
- Other: It uses animal experts to decided. A judge would not know enough about dog behavior to make this sort of decision
- Other: It was ACTUALLY fair and it DID NOT ALLOW euthanization of any aggressive animals



- Other: It was composed of animal behaviourists/ individuals qualified to determine the viability of rehabilitation and training impact
- Other: It was comprised of people who are actually knowledgeable about dogs, their behaviour and their ability to be rehabilitated.
- Other: It was comprised of people with diverse backgrounds (animal lovers and those who advocate for euthanasia frequently)
- Other: It was fair and the decision could be appealed to an unbiased party
- Other: It was fair and unbiased. Involves unanimous vote
- Other: It was fair to the dog.
- Other: It was for extreme conditions a dog would ever be euthanized..
- Other: It was headed by people actually educated in dog training and was kept racially diverse to avoid bias (breed specific legislation has often had racist roots)
- Other: It was led by or partially made up of people who understand dog behaviour and not random politicians or law makers
- Other: It was made of carefully screened individuals to minimize radical thinkers.
- Other: It was made up of dog owners, and had a mandate to not take breed into consideration
- Other: It was made up of public people ie a jury of peers, veterinarians/ shelter careworkers people qualified to determine a dogs dangerous
- Other: It was made up of veterinary professionals
- Other: It was non biased
- Other: It was not breed lead discrimination. Let's not be racist again certain breeds
- Other: It was populated by dog owners who are not biased against pitbulls in any way
- Other: It was reviewed periodically to confirm shorter times in kennel and a low rate of overturned decisions. I'd also like to see independent party to be knowledgeable in dog behaviour and obedience to determine reoffender risk. I'd also like to see a sliding scale of repercussions based on repeat behaviour
- Other: It was stacked with people that rescue all breeds that understand animal behaviors
- Other: It wasn't biased against specific breeds
- Other: It wasn't run by the city of Calgary. I have no trust in them to do an unbiased review
- Other: It would be important that the tribunal members didn't have negative biases towards certain dog breeds (e.i. pit bull breeds) and give harsher outcomes based on that factor
- Other: It would contain vets, dog trainers etc. Most times it is an owner training issue not the dogs fault.
- Other: It would depend whoales up the tribunal. But I don't think they should have to stay in a shelter.
- Other: It would have animal behaviour experts who can best assess the dog's likelihood to be rehabilitated.
- Other: it would HAVE TO include people who are not biased against pit bulls as well as advocates for pit bulls and breeders



- Other: It would have to be an open decision process so that owners and the public know how the decision was made. Owners have a right to know and others could learn from such information.
- Other: It would include veterinarians, people who like dogs, and people who can see past the breed and look at the owner.
- Other: It would need to be made up of the right people. A couple citizens and then a vet and at least 1 certified professional dog trainer
- Other: It would need to be properly regulated, too much bias from vets and others.
- Other: it would not be breed biased and would actually look at the circumstances of the situation
- Other: It's fair and accurate and includes real animal experts, especially vets. Not just bylaw officers or individuals looking to band aid a problem that doesn't actually exist.
- Other: It's fair and not biased to any specific breeds
- Other: It's humane, respects the dog and the owners, isn't discriminating breed specific and reinforce rehabilitation / training first.
- Other: It's main goal is of the dogs safety. These bylaws should reflect the human responsibility for all dogs.
- Other: It's not bias to the breed of dog, and if the victim provoked the dog the dog should not be the one punished.
- Other: Its not expensive for the owner of the dog
- Other: It's not the dogs it's the humans, with a proper handler any dog can live a well happy life!
- Other: It's taken seriously . And the dog does not get euthanized just because of its breed. The severity of the offence should depict that. And if it's a first offence . Should get a warning and they have to take said animal to training . And if it reoffends , then euthanasia is appropriate
- Other: It's the owners that are usually the problem. There should be rehab programs to help dogs who have been taught to be aggressive. Why are you always trying to kill things?
- Other: Its fair
- Other: Its fair
- Other: It's fair and accurate and includes real animal experts, especially vets. Not just bylaw officers or individuals looking to band aid a problem that doesn't actually exist.
- Other: It's not just pitbulls, my pitbull does not have a nasty disposition. It was how he was raised. It's not a breed issue period. A rottweiler has more psi per bite than a pitbull. And little dogs bite more than big dogs.
- Other: its not punishing a specific breed of dog.
- Other: It's not rushed through without all parties getting a to state their 'side'
- Other: It's there a possibility the dog could go back to a foster, the owner, etc during this time?
- Other: I've never had a nuisance dog, but there is a lot of talk against bully breeds which, yes, their bites can be rougher, but its other dog bites that happen more. If there is a different plan for dealing with dog bites, I would hope that they are a little less bias and a little more understanding. Dogs generally don't bite unless something has caused it. They don't have knowledge of death or penalties if they get into a dispute. I would recommend a warning system.
- Other: Jgfcjinnkk



- Other: Keeps dogs stress free.
- Other: Kept off public spaces whilst awaiting decisions
- Other: Killing a dog is never an option and rehabilitation should always be the first line of action. Dogs bite because of [removed] owners.
- Other: Knowledgeable and impartial members of tribunal
- Other: Knowledgeable people be involved in the process (veterinarian, dog trainer, dog behavior expert, animal control personnel and owners.
- Other: I would support
- Other: Legislation isn't breed specific on bans or issues
- Other: Less dogs are euthanized more dogs are put through a rehabilitation program many times dogs are provoked to bite
- Other: Less euthanization. Dogs can be mandated to remain at their residence.
- Other: Limit on time, cost and number of nuisance appeals
- Other: Limits the amount of Euthanizations
- Other: Listen to community members on both sides of the issue, make sure this does not become a tribunal that is tough on others and easy on some. Fair treatment.
- Other: Long as the owner of said dog is accountable for the action or of therefore of the dog in question...
- Other: Long investigation to prove it's the dog and not the human
- Other: look at the owner as well as the dog animal behaviors are typically learned from their owners and how they are treated there are an endless ammount of documentaries on this subject and how a dog can go from being aggressive and near feral to a very loving family dog
- Other: look at the owner, and have proper animal professionals on said panel.
- Other: Look further into animal rehabilitation ex. Animal sanctuary, fostering, or new ownership.
- Other: Look into the history of the dog and be compassionate about it.
- Other: Looks at the owner not the dog
- Other: Made of non biased people who don't pre judge based on breed or appearance.
- Other: Made up of animal behaviour educated individuals
- Other: Make cases based on that case not breeds
- Other: Make euthanization the absolute last resort. Have a good mix of people on the tribunal so it is not skewed one way or the other.
- Other: make sure it has the authority to follow up and follow thru on its findings or judgement
- Other: Make sure it was conducted in a fair way.
- Other: Mandatory conditioning of both dog and owner. Professional training with a trainer qualified - not a pet smart representative. Someone who deals in animal and human psychology.
- Other: Mandatory dog behaviour classes for owners of dog. Followed by training with owner and dog. Euthanization is last resort.
- Other: Mandatory education about animal behaviour/animal training.



- Other: Mandatory training for the owner and the dog, by a licensed dog behaviour specialist and mandatory follow up training
- Other: Mandatory training. There are great programs for aggressive dogs out there. The owners are the issue. Fund the shelters to take on those animals that are surrendered as a result and fund training programs, not a tribunal. Prosecute the owner.
- Other: Many steps taken before the thought to euthanize a dog even is considered. This is not the best solution to many situations! Many bites are avoidable and could be due to improper treatment to the dog by the victim and dog was defining itself.
- Other: Maximum process time within a month
- Other: Mediation between all parties involved and free and full transparency to all parties involved.
- Other: Members chosen for the tribunal would be able to maintain objectivity when judging the case (for example no prior trauma involving dogs; preferably education in dog behaviour/training).
- Other: Members include representatives from rescues such as Aarcs.
- Other: Members like dogs.
- Other: Members must be bias free and shown to be so
- Other: Members MUST have varied experiences in training and keeping animals (i.e. a great variety of breeds) to reduce bias.
- Other: Members of the tribunal are dog savvy and not just taken out of the general public.
- Other: Members of the tribunal are trainers, behaviourists, rescue leaders, or other dog-knowledgeable people.
- Other: Members of the tribunal must be educated in dog behaviour and must not have proven or suspected biases against particular dog breeds, such as pit bulls.
- Other: Members of the tribunal must be vets, vet techs or animal training experts
- Other: Members of the tribunal must go through rigorous no bias training and compassion. And must prove to not be bias against any animal or breed.
- Other: Members of the tribunal must participate in training (face-to-face or online or combo) to learn what their roles entail (e.g., scope of their authority) as well as training about animal behaviour and the potential and/or options for behavioural rehabilitation. There must be an advisor with validated expertise in animal behaviour rehab to work with the tribunal.
- Other: Members of the tribunal were respected members within the field of animal control/training. My issue with tribunals are that they are incentivized to prolong deliberation and delay actionable outcomes in order to get paid their per diem rate for a longer period of time.
- Other: Members of this tribunal had appropriate knowledge around dog behavior issues
- Other: members of tribunal do not have breed biase and have background with animal care
- Other: Members of tribunal should be legitimate trainers (force free background) and/or board certified veterinary behaviourists
- Other: Members were well versed in animal behavior
- Other: Members with vocal opinions against Pitbulls and any other aggressive dogs should not be allowed on the tribunal. We would need a fair and unbiased base in order to cast judgement.



- Other: Members would have to be unbiased towards already discriminated breeds in order to reach a truly impartial decision. Weed members out the same way people are filtered out during jury duty.
- Other: Membership that consists of well respected and educated canine behavioral experts from the community
- Other: Minimal government oversight, representatives from rescue organizations and reputable animal training services as well as a Veterinarian.
- Other: Minor cases are heard without bias
- Other: More due diligence by bylaw officers in investigation. Take statements by all parties and witnesses. Allow pictures by defendants to be presented.
- Other: More focus needs to be placed on the ability and willingness of the owner to create and enact a plan to prevent future problems rather than on actions toward the dog. The dog is only a symptom of the problem - removing a dog and issuing fines does not change owner behavior.
- Other: More than one of the representatives were a trainer that had dealt with these breed specific dogs and had the background to make these decisions. No representatives on the panel voted for a BSL ban, as that would sway their decision without having any real logic and thought to the cases.
- Other: Multi-judge tribunal with unanimous decision for euthanizations.
- Other: Multiple assessments by different parties before euthanasia.
- Other: Multiple expert opinions, it should be very clear who can weigh in, how much knowledge they need to have and that the dog would not be euthanized if they chose to appeal.
- Other: Multiple people review the case, not just one person making the decisions. And if there is no singling out of certain breeds such as pit bulls. It is not right that they are being singled out in general in these new bylaws. Any dog can be aggressive no matter the breed.
- Other: Must attempt rehabilitation and training before even considering euthanasia
- Other: Must be a non breed biased tribunal
- Other: must be able to be appealed to the court of Queen's Bench
- Other: Must be conducted by experts in animal behaviour
- Other: Must be fair
- Other: Must be fair process
- Other: Must be impartial and adhere to the provincial court standards for rulings
- Other: Must be impartial.
- Other: Must be knowledgeable/educated about dogs and unbiased.
- Other: must be non bias persons to breeds of animal
- Other: Must be very qualified people doing these reviews.
- Other: Must be well versed in animal behavior and look at all factors contributing to the incident.
- Other: Must fairly assess where the ultimate responsibility falls on: the dog itself or the owner ? Or any 3rd party before putting down the dog.
- Other: Must happen within 3 business days. Animals should not be separated from owner during this time, it only exasperates the issue.
- Other: Must have a vet and trainer on the committee, all on the tribunal should be pet owners



- Other: must have a Veterinarian and other knowledgeable people on the tribunal; no PETA
- Other: Must have an accountability time frame. Do x by this date or fines /sanction immediately doubles.
- Other: Must have dog owners on the tribunal along with non-dog owners for balance
- Other: Must have multiple past incidents of biting, and must have a change of ownership before euthanasia is considered
- Other: must have some sort of behavioral expert on the tribunal to avoid biases more importantly breed specific biases
- Other: Must have the same burden of proof as a real court.
- Other: must include experts in dog behavior and not biased based on breed
- Other: Must include fellow bully-breed supporters as well as unbiased members.
- Other: Must include non bias people.
- Other: Must include unbiased views of all breeds
- Other: Must include vet, person with official dog training experience, and people on tribunal cannot have breed preferences.
- Other: Must not take longer than it would in court; must meet the condition that all decisions are not final and can be appealed
- Other: must review the owners background and home checks as to if they are a good owner in the first place
- Other: Muzzle if aggressive no off leash parks Ect unless proven to have fixed the issue
- Other: N
- Other: N
- Other: N
- Other: N/
- Other: N/a
- Other: N/A
- Other: N/a
- Other: N/a
- Other: Na
- Other: Need to have a canine behavioural specialist involved, or a vet who specializes in this, especially when euthanasia is involved.
- Other: Need to know of the process
- Other: Need to work with surrounding municipalities to make sure they uphold rulings. Must have teeth to be effective.
- Other: Need tribunal members with balanced views, no breed bias and with dog behaviour/training knowledge & experience.



- Other: Needs to be 100% anonymous and cases must be presented completely fairly
- Other: Needs to be truly neutral - without an anti-dog ownership bias/agenda
- Other: Needs to follow conditions
- Other: Needs to include people who are aware of dog behaviour and can determine what is the best outcome for the animal.
- Other: Needs to show itself not to be bias against pit bulls
- Other: Needs to support all evidence of incident, ex. Dog being teased or inappropriately approached
- Other: Never authorize euthanasia of dogs nor hold any bias toward dogs of specific breeds.
- Other: NEVER KILL A PET. NEVER TAKE A PET FROM OWNER UNLESS THEY ARE MENTALLY/physically UNWELL.
- Other: No additional cost to the Clty. Otherwise use existing courts.
- Other: No animal should be euthanized based on breed.
- Other: No animal should be euthanized for poor behaviour re-training should be ordered
- Other: No authority to euthanize
- Other: No authority to euthanize. That must be done in court.
- Other: No authorizing euthanizations, and ALL factors as to why the attack/bite need to be considered (i.e. was a child taunting the animal? Was it cornered? If so, it was simply defending itself, as we also do)
- Other: No bias
- Other: No bias against certain breeds.
- Other: No bias against pit bulls - NOT BREED SPECIFIC!
- Other: No bias on breed. Only on the dumb owners
- Other: No bias to breed of dog
- Other: no bias towards a specific breed
- Other: No bias towards breed specifics and a fair hearing for the owner
- Other: no bias towards dog breed. No one involved in the decision making jniws any party involved or a mutual friend
- Other: No biased based on breed
- Other: No biased is given to type of dog
- Other: No biased reps
- Other: No biases against certain breeds. Absolutely ridiculous behavior. As is the whole section on Pit bulls of this survey.
- Other: No biases against certain breeds. Dogs are dogs. Great Danes to chihuahuas.
- Other: No biases towards pit bulls
- Other: No breed based decisions. Every dog is evaluated on its specific behaviours and tendencies and it is done so fairly
- Other: No breed bias
- Other: No breed bias



- Other: No breed bias. All breeds can be dangerous without proper training.
- Other: No breed biases - they should not know what breed the dog is. Only the situation that has happened.
- Other: No breed discrimination
- Other: No breed discrimination!! Pitbulls are NOT the problem!
- Other: No breed discrimination. This process needs to be neutral and fair. So many people are sadly blinded by breed. We need to move away from looking at the breed and looking at the owner instead. Did they choose the breed based on looks or reputation instead of what fit with their family? Is the dog a good match for them? Why did the bite happen? What lead up to it? Is the dog physically and mentally sound? Are they receiving enough mental and physical exercise? What is the dog's home life like? What other factors were involved in this bite. Dogs are bred for a purpose and no breed is bad in the right hands so we need to ensure we are focusing on that as well as why a dog but not the breed.
- Other: No breed shaming legislation. Don't blame the dog for their owners negligence of training.
- Other: No breed specific banning of any kind
- Other: No breed specific bias
- Other: No breed specific bias
- Other: no Breed specific bias existed, options of dog trainers, rehabilitation and animal rehoming explored
- Other: no breed specific biases
- Other: No Breed Specific Laws
- Other: NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION PERIOD, there should be a mechanism to make sure that the tribunal is stocked with people who have experience dealing with dogs and never politically loaded.
- Other: No breed specific rules
- Other: No breed specific rules
- Other: No Breed-Specific Judgement.
- Other: No breed-specific prejudice
- Other: No breed-specific rules! It should be on a dog/owner basis.
- Other: No BSL or targeted dogs with blocky heads that fit the description.
- Other: No BSL. Focus on rehabilitating the animal and educating the owner - regardless of breed.
- Other: No chances, euthanize on first incident
- Other: No City of Calgary representatives on the tribunal.
- Other: No conditions
- Other: No decision to be made by anyone other than a judge to euthanize the animal
- Other: No declaration on euthanasia
- Other: No different rules for pit bulls
- Other: No discriminating against breeds - each animal must be looked at individually. If you are biased you cannot be a board member.



- Other: No discrimination against breeds. I.e. a pitbull and a labradoodle should undergo the same scrutiny
- Other: No discrimination against certain breeds. It is more than just pit bulls that are that strong and I do not think it is fair to the animals to judge based on strength. That is like saying we should assume all muscular and very strong humans are dangerous and should be restricted as well.
- Other: No discrimination against dog breeds
- Other: No discrimination against dog breeds
- Other: No discrimination against other breeds and must be treated the exact same way.
- Other: No discrimination against pit bulls and no euthanasia.
- Other: No discrimination against specific breeds.
- Other: No discrimination for pit bull type dogs.
- Other: No dog gets euthanized for biting
- Other: No dog gets harmed or put down
- Other: No dog is euthanized on the first offence and training is offered to help rehabilitate dogs.
- Other: No dog is euthanized
- Other: No dog racism. Every individual case needs to be fully assessed as a individual case not a breed issue. Must be handled with as little stress as possible to figure why the incident happened. Dogs give warning signs long before they would bite and people need to be educated in that.
- Other: No dog should be destroyed, until adequate measures are made to rehabilitate and or to correct said behaviour.
- Other: No dog should be euthanized, but rather rehabilitated.
- Other: No dog will be euthanized unless it has gone through a minimum amount of professional dog trainers who all deem this dog cannot be helped (which is probably less than 1% of the time). Why should a dog have to be euthanized due to a humans lack of training.
- Other: No dogs euthanized!
- Other: No dogs get euthanized, this is not the dogs fault and the owner of the animal is to blame and therefore should be fined.
- Other: No dogs should be euthanized due to their behaviour, I would like to see the city encourage and provide resources for proper obedience training. Many dogs act the way they do as a defence mechanism.
- Other: No dogs should be euthanized for being 'vicious' they should be trained.
- Other: No dogs should be euthanized for biting. It is always the owner of the dogs responsibility and if it is an ongoing issue with a certain owner the dog should be seized and rehomed.
- Other: No euthanizing dogs. Require they and owners go through intense behaviour retraining program.
- Other: No euthanasia
- Other: No euthanasia
- Other: No euthanasia
- Other: No euthanasia



- Other: No euthanasia
- Other: No euthanasia
- Other: No Euthanasia
- Other: NO EUTHANASIA - this is NEVER necessary. All dogs can be retrained and rehabilitated with the right care. Ask ANY shelter worker and they will have a plethora of examples.
- Other: No euthanasia at all. Offer training instead
- Other: No euthanasia for animals, & identifying the cause of the bite from the person making the claim.
- Other: No euthanasia occurs in response to the tribunal.
- Other: No euthanasia of dogs under any circumstances.
- Other: No euthanasia thats awful
- Other: No euthanasia unless involving children or death.
- Other: No euthanasia unless last resort
- Other: No euthanasia unless the animal is suffering
- Other: No euthanasia used. Training measures instead.
- Other: No euthanasia!
- Other: No euthanasia!!
- Other: No euthanasia, any dog can be trained and corrected
- Other: no euthanasia, only rehabilitation
- Other: No euthanasia.
- Other: No euthanasia. Dogs can go through therapy or training to prevent further incident.
- Other: No euthanasia. Extensive training and intervention before considering euthanizing.
- Other: no euthanasia. Re-homing and rehabilitation.
- Other: No euthanasia. The dog can live a full life away from other animals or muzzled in public. It is the owners responsibility. Put the responsibilities on the owner. Large fines, dog ownership restrictions.
- Other: NO EUTHANASING ANY ANIMALS
- Other: no euthanisia
- Other: No euthanising of any dog. Instead require training of some sort.
- Other: No euthanization at all
- Other: No euthanization but more training by someone capable (ie. not the original owner)
- Other: No euthanization orders.
- Other: No euthanization, dogs can be provoked without someone knowing
- Other: No euthanization.
- Other: No euthanized. Period.
- Other: No euthanizing
- Other: No euthanizing an animal without review from court of QB
- Other: No euthanizing animals



- Other: no euthanizing these dogs. I believe it would be best to hand them over to AARCS or similar rescue societies. I strongly believe that animals who are aggressive were not trained properly, nor given love by their owners, and/neglected. And if this is the case then why should the animal have to die? Instead these animals should be given the chance to feel real love in foster homes and adoptive homes.
- Other: No euthanizing. These dogs are unfairly judged and are easily rehabilitated with proper care
- Other: No euthinizations
- Other: No forcing the owner to put a dog down. Dogs can be fixed into behaving well with then right training.
- Other: No increased cost to taxpayers. Owner would pay expenses.
- Other: No kill policies were in place.
- Other: No members show a propensity to breed bias (e.g. pit bulls).
- Other: No more euthanizing dogs- force owners to surrender the dog. Then endure the owner has to go through a training program if they ever want to own a dog again and out the dog through extensive rehabilitation work. This is a human problem not a dog or breed problem
- Other: No non necessary euthanasia
- Other: No one can discriminate based on the breed and their personal opinions.
- Other: No one can tell the owner that a dog needs to be put down.
- Other: No one has the right to determine if a dog should be euthanised. It is not the dogs fault but the owners for not having educated themselves or trained their dog properly in a manner that befits the breed. This is a fear tactic used to create more fear around bully breeds and is unacceptable. Dogs that have proven to be a nuisance/have bitten people other dogs should undergo retraining and rehabilitation and all resources should be used before consider euthenasia. Dogs are parts of people's families.
- Other: No one involved in the incident were allowed on the tribunal.
- Other: No one on the tribunal has been the victim of a severe dog bite/attack
- Other: No person without legitimate training and background in animal behaviour should ever make the decision to euthanize an animal.
- Other: No pit bull bias
- Other: No pitbull-specific legislation is used
- Other: No politician, only a collective of veterinarians and dog behavioralist involved. And Only people who have never been in favor of any bylaw not supported by science (ie bread specific)
- Other: No prejudice is used from the tribunal team.
- Other: no prejudice toward any certain breed
- Other: No profiling pit bull breeds as they are less likely to bite someone than a Chihuahua. Also that civilians like myself who deal with all breeds for many years. Also some consideration on a plan whereby the canine isn't also traumatized. That owners get a chance to care for their dog during the process with guidelines in muzzles, strong harnesses, hours of being able to walk the dog, and location restrictions ie off leash, etc.



- Other: No right to tell an owner to euthanize a dog. The owners should not have to abide to that order.
- Other: No ruling unless there is a dog/cat behavior specialist on the tribunal. Also, proper support needs to be available to the animal.
- Other: No suggestion
- Other: No unfair judgement against breeds!!!!!!
- Other: Nobody in the decision making part of the tribunal can have ill-will towards bully breeds.
- Other: Nobody other than the owner of a dog should have the right to decide if it should be euthanized
- Other: Non bias
- Other: Non bias members
- Other: Non bias to specific dog breeds.
- Other: Non biased based on breed
- Other: Non biased individuals; including those who do not believe in breed specific legislation.
- Other: Non biased judgment of the breed
- Other: Non biased members, a lot of people are scared of the pitbull and pitbull like breeds, and will judge the dog prior to finding any information about it
- Other: Non biased opinions previously on dogs. Used a fair understanding
- Other: Non biased opinions, if in tribunal must have experience with dogs of all breeds.
- Other: Non biased panel with FULL investigations into the situation surrounding the bite, not just deeming the "scary" looking dog as the perpetrator.
- Other: Non biased people in the tribunal. People with fear of certain dog breeds can give biased opinions and ruling.
- Other: Non biased people that are making the choice
- Other: Non City Members. Must have professional experience with canine behaviour and breed dispositions.
- Other: Non city representatives should include experts in the field of dog behavior
- Other: Non city representatives, with equal voting powers as city be SPCA, Behavioralists or Animal advocates(general) to ensure an unbiased decision.
- Other: Non discriminatory against specific breeds
- Other: Non of them are biased on breed
- Other: Non-bias participants
- Other: Non-biased against specific dog breeds (as this seems to be) and involving an animal behaviour specialist
- Other: Non-biased opinions based on dog breeds
- Other: Non-biased, dog educated people should be the only ones to make the decision.
- Other: Non-breed biased
- Other: Non-City representative must be an experienced animal welfare advocate and not a freaking Karen



- Other: non-City representatives are experienced in animal husbandry (vet, vet tech, certified trainer)
- Other: None
- Other: None biased participants thoroughly screened.
- Other: None of the trials are breed specific, only behaviour specific. There must be ample time for an appeal, where the dog accused is kept at home, under severe restrictions.
- Other: Not all blame lands on the dog.
- Other: Not all offenders in dog bite attacks are to blame. Most bites do not happen unprovoked. Often times the victim is the agitator, and cases must be handled with this in mind to prevent the euthanization of innocent dogs.
- Other: Not allowed to put down
- Other: Not allowing anything in section 3.
- Other: Not based on breed of dog but specifically because it's dangerous
- Other: Not based on breed, based on ONLY proof of more than one offence from said dog
- Other: Not based on dogs breed but rather the care the dog is being provided and behaviour of the dog(s)/ people in incident. Dogs can have aggressive behaviour for a variety of reasons and therefore the incident as a whole needs to be looked at.
- Other: Not based on the dogs breed
- Other: Not basing the outcome on the breed or appearance or stereotypes of the dog.
- Other: Not bias on breed
- Other: Not biased against pit bulls and other bully breeds
- Other: Not biased to dog breeds
- Other: Not breed specific
- Other: not breed specific and not euthanasia
- Other: Not breed specific and only animal experts were allowed on the tribunal
- Other: Not determined by breed but by action.
- Other: Not done by breed haters. If one is against pitbulls for example, they might be more likely to deem it to dangerous, whether they are to dangerous or not.
- Other: Not enough information to give informed response
- Other: Not euthanizing dogs specifically due to breed. If the dog is aggressive, chances are it's the owners fault.
- Other: not familiar with a tribunal
- Other: Not impounding the dog. Let the owner take it home to work with the dog. Mandate behaviour training with a breeder
- Other: Not just one representative making the decision. Multiple representatives would need to take on each case to make sure decisions are fair and not corrupted. Many city reps already corrupt and



discriminatory against pit bulls as we can see. The fact this survey was even sent out judging pit bulls is complete [removed].

- Other: Not made of the same people or council each time. To not create biased opinion
- Other: Not making rash decisions about a dog's life for the sake of efficiency.
- Other: Not only a single party is responsible for the decision. Those most educated in the field of animals (I.e veterinarians, trainers) should also be involved in decision.
- Other: Not only pitbulls bite
- Other: Not putting dog down
- Other: Not singling out bigger dogs when smaller dogs attack more people
- Other: Not sure
- Other: Not sure how you would pick the tribunal but it would need to be a mix of dog owners and non-dog owners to ensure its fair.
- Other: Not taking the dog's breed into consideration and only looking at the training and obedience an owner or shelter has provided
- Other: Not targeting specific breeds
- Other: NOT TO BE BIASED AGAINST PITBULLS OR BULLY BREEDS
- Other: Not to have any breed of dog singled out as worse than others. All nuisance dogs tried equal.
- Other: Not using discriminatory breed bans
- Other: NOT. BREED. SPECIFIC.
- Other: Nothing makes any of this [removed] ok this city is becoming a joke
- Other: Obedience training rather than euthanizing first offences. Identify the cause (teasing, etc) before making a decision
- Other: Objectivity is enforced. There can be no bias.
- Other: Offer courses for the dog instead of euthanasia
- Other: Offer the owner to get training for the dog do not put the dog down
- Other: Officers with dog training and/or animal behavioural training could be an option. Clearance from a council of animal specialists (including vets and certified trainers) as to what the next steps should be.
- Other: Ok
- Other: Once again, you need to place more emphasis on the person and not the animal. You should be reviewing if the individual is fit to care for the animal, their living conditions and if any training has been spent on the pet.
- Other: One of the representatives on the tribunal was a certified/licensed professional I.e: veterinarian, dog trainer, veterinary tech
- Other: Only for attacks
- Other: Only if someone is severely injured should the dog be euthanized, they are also innocent until proven guilty and no one should die for being trained to be reactive/aggressive and acting out-training/re-training is necessary



- Other: Only if the animal in question is never put down. It is never the animals fault and the animal should be taken from the owner and the owner should be punished.
- Other: Only if the decision-makers are highly educated in animal behaviour
- Other: Only if the dog viciously attacked a human for absolutely no reason
- Other: only if the representatives do not have predisposed bias against certain dogs
- Other: Only in the most extreme cases does the dog get euthanized. It is usually the owners fault if a dog is vicious - in that case doesn't mean the dog should suffer.
- Other: Only people from the neighbourhood that the pet lived in, instead of in city and non city representatives, have an actual professional diagnose the dog find out why it bit.
- Other: Only the courts can decide to euthanize an animal.
- Other: Only the courts should have authority to order a dog to be euthanized.
- Other: Only trained and proven unbiased representatives were a part of it.
- Other: Only unbiased representatives would be able to serve in these positions. Including people that personally owned breeds such as pitbulls.
- Other: Option 3 above
- Other: Other options should be explored. Not jump straight to euthanasia.
- Other: Other restrictions should be considered before euthanasia, even if the animal is determined to be vicious
- Other: Outside dog behavioural trainer to assess dog and make recommendations.
- Other: Owner and dog must go through proper training.
- Other: Owner and individual involved are present.
- Other: Owner and victim and witness are present
- Other: Owner can still appeal it.
- Other: Owner responsibility
- Other: Owner/others have right to appeal if they can provide reasons why reconsideration may be valid (particularly in euthanize verdicts)
- Other: Owners are able to keep the dog throughout the process and are able to issue a statement Regarding the incident.
- Other: Owners are also evaluated.
- Other: Owners are responsible for their dogs as well as their dogs training and therefore should have to take classes on how to properly raise and train their dog rather than punished animals who have been trained to act the way they do
- Other: Owners can appeal a decision and it's not solely focused on a breed
- Other: Owners given the chance to implement restrictions prior to any further action
- Other: Owners had an option to appeal tribunal decisions if they felt it was unjust.
- Other: Owners have a fair chance to dispute/ defend their animals and case
- Other: Owners receive final say in their family member being put to sleep. it is not someones decision to kill your dog on their own merits
- Other: Owners should be held responsible for their dogs behavior not the dogs.



- Other: Owners should have the choice to pursue the tribunal or wait for court. Tribunals can only recommend euthanasia, this would have to be determined/ruled by the court. Your list doesn't mention hear testimony on behalf of the dog/owner..
- Other: Owners treatment and training methods taken heavily into consideration.
- Other: Owners were able to participate and show if they have been working to address behaviour issues. If the owner has been working with a dog behaviourist that this person is also included in the dogs assessment and tribunal.
- Other: Owners were offered the ability to bring their animal to training before euthanasia. At which point the trainer determines if the animal is safe enough to continue.
- Other: Ownership on the dog owner not based on breed of dog
- Other: P
- Other: Paid for by pet owner. Tax payers shouldn't front the costs.
- Other: Panel including behaviourist/veterinarian
- Other: Panel members are trained animal professionals / behaviour specialists, etc. and are required to assess the dog in person.
- Other: Parties from a program such as the Humane Society are included on the panel
- Other: Peace officers are properly trained to work with "nuisance dogs" and the owner is heard throughout the tribunal. As a pitbull owner, I was once handed a fine by a peace officer because he deemed my dog "vicious". My dog was scared because this peace officer decided to run her down on his bike, instead of waiting for her to come to me. If these peace officer are not regulated and my dog (a part of my family) is euthanized, I will sue for wrongful death. I'm sure many more petowners out there would be willing to put money into a lawyer for outrageous accusations like this from Peace officers.
- Other: penalties on the owner were significant deterrents to prevent bad training and encourage responsible pet ownership - dogs, and pit bulls especially, are never bad inherently they're just taught bad behaviour by bad owners!!
- Other: Pending investigation of why the dog might have been triggered in the first place. Were they put in a bad situation and felt threatened? As long as human error is taken into account. They are still animals no matter what breed.
- Other: People appointed need to have appropriate knowledge of animals
- Other: People educated in dogs are on the tribunal.
- Other: People have the opportunity to appeal
- Other: People involved were experts in animal behaviours, vets, trainers etc.
- Other: People must be given the chance to appeal this process prior to euthanasia. Also we must screen those on the tribunal.
- Other: People on the board had better have real life knowledge of dogs behavior not just a diploma from an online course.
- Other: People on the committee were knowledgeable in dog training/dog trauma and there were many biases represented
- Other: People on the tribunal are educated in dog health and behaviour



- Other: People on the tribunal should have dog behaviour knowledge.
- Other: People selected to make the decision are reviewed and also have no signs of prejudice against certain breeds. Things like people with experience in dog behavior and/or laws regarding these types of incidents.
- Other: people who own dogs of varying variety, vets, animal behavior experts and people who deal with animals at large like SPCAs, shelters and similar should make up the tribunal
- Other: periodic follow-ups to the dog owner (3-6-9 months) to ensure compliance with tribunal findings
- Other: Persons on the tribunal include humans society or SPCA staff, vets, and others familiar with dogs, their care, health and behaviours.
- Other: Persons on the tribunal includes professionals in the canine field (ie. professional dog trainers, representative from the Humane society, representative from AARCS, veterinarians, or the like). Regular citizens do not have the dog behaviour knowledge needed to make decisions about a dog's welfare in this instance.
- Other: Pet owner should be able to represent themselves or retain counsel to represent them and address the tribunal.
- Other: Pet stays with their owner
- Other: Pets should not be euthanized. Special training would be a better, more humane option.
- Other: Pit bulls and bully breeds are not targeted based on breed and given a fair review
- Other: Pit bulls and bully breeds are not to be singled out simply because of their breed
- Other: PIT BULLS ARE LIKE ANY OTHER DOG
- Other: Pit bulls are not unfairly judged more harshly than other dogs as they are generally much sweeter in nature
- Other: Pit bulls shouldn't be discriminated against
- Other: Pitbull appearance dogs ARE NOT necessarily pitbulls and need to be classified differently!!
- Other: Pitbulls are not marginalized as a vicious breed. ALL large breeds are capable of being aggressive. My pitbull has been attacked twice and never strikes back.
- Other: Pitbulls should not be singled out
- Other: Pitbulls shouldn't be singled out, very specific when it is about who owns the animal and the training they put into it. NOT the dog/Breed
- Other: Pitbulls aren't being treated unfairly. Let people have their [removed] dogs and make training cheaper and easier through programs. This is dumb
- Other: Please include dog experts ex) vets, trainers etc
- Other: Please review, why is first case to euthanize?
- Other: Potential tribunal members would need to be screened the same way a jury is screened
- Other: Precedence for seizing or euthanizing a dog as set by the court and not by judgement of tribunal members
- Other: Preference towards avoiding euthanization at all costs. This should be a very rare extreme case ruling.



- Other: Process being followed. Exploring all options including rehoming as I believe issues are a result of bad owners, not bad dogs.
- Other: Professional certified trainers being involved in the assessment process
- Other: Professional dog trainers on tribunal.
- Other: Professionals with dog expertise(handling, training, REHABILITATING) should be regulating and creating laws. No one else.
- Other: Professionals, such as a vet and behaviour specialist, were on the tribunal
- Other: Proper balance to the members of tribunal. Include vets, shelter worker, etc.
- Other: proper evaluation of the representative, proper experience, and proper review of the situation, I find people make a judgement without all the facts and think they are dog specialists and they are not. It would have to be a specifically trainer PANEL of reps not just one
- Other: Proper evidence is collected and decision are made on actual case facts and not assumption. Moreover the time frame is short and fast!
- Other: Proper psychological assessment of the owner, proper assessment from a dog behaviourist
- Other: Proper qualifications held by tribunal members
- Other: Proper training, including some basic veterinary training, for those who determine whether or not the dog should be euthanized.
- Other: Properly educated
- Other: Properly educated persons be on the tribunal
- Other: Properly look at the animal as another life notmkist some stray or evil dog, and help the owner find classes for the dog including obedience training
- Other: Provided fair and just support for the animal and not just assuming guilt, or discriminating by breed.
- Other: Provided outdated breed specific prejudice is not a factor in selecting tribunal representatives.
- Other: Provided there's an opportunity for an opportunity to take the case to provincial court if a party wants to dispute the tribunal outcome.
- Other: Provincial court is the proper method for handing these matters.
- Other: Public has a say in how tribunal members are selected
- Other: Punish people, not pets.
- Other: Punishment fits the crime
- Other: puppy training and following through with training. I believe all puppy's should have mandatory puppy classes.
- Other: Puts the dogs best interest first.
- Other: Putting a animal down should be the last resort
- Other: Putting a dog to sleep as a last resort invitatie the dogs home and how it's being treated
- Other: Putting in place a training program for 'problem' dogs and their owners to allow for reintegration to standard society rather than immediate punishment
- Other: Qualified & capable poeple participate, is financially reasonable
- Other: Qualified and informed representatives for all parties involved.



- Other: Qualified animal behaviour specialist reside on the committee. No arbitrary city councilpersons
- Other: Qualified board members, vets, behavioural specialists.
- Other: Qualified personnel to speak to the matters. Eg. Dog behaviour experts
- Other: Qualified personnel, dog owners and professionals who deal with dogs on the tribunal not just suits
- Other: Qualified staff
- Other: Qualified vets/Dog behaviourists
- Other: Qualified, and diverse panel with differing backgrounds (Ex. Veterinarian, reputable trainers and breeders, breed expert, etc...)
- Other: Quarantine to the owner's home and property until the tribunal concludes.
- Other: Re training or obedience training over euthanasia
- Other: regardless of outcome the owner minimally must complete an online training and test... and attend training sessions with their dog. It shouldn't be called Dog Obedience.... they need to understand it is focused on being a responsible pet owner and learning ways to manage their pet.
- Other: Registered trained professionals from dog trainers, bylaw officers and a veterinarian
- Other: Regulated professional behavioral experts are on the panel. Not a kangaroo court.
- Other: Regulations similar to the provincial process are followed. It is not a single person's decision to deter from bias.
- Other: rehabilitating the offending canine, instead of euthanizing or giving it back to incapable owners
- Other: Rehabilitation instead of being put down. No deaths are necessary.
- Other: Rehabilitation is considered for the animal as an alternative to euthanasia first
- Other: Rehabilitation not death sentence
- Other: Rehabilitation over euthanasia
- Other: rehoming and rehabilitating "vicious" dogs is the alternative to euthanasia.
- Other: Remember that there are many reasons why dogs bite, being vicious isn't the only one. They bite when they feel uncomfortable, stressed, cornered, and so many other reasons. A dog biting once does not mean it is a vicious dog.
- Other: Removal of the euthanasia clause; tribunal must include animal behavioural experts
- Other: Remove euthanasia option
- Other: Report from the dog's veterinarian. Representatives from the community.
- Other: Representation be dog owners and non dog owners but no one with a nuisance dog or someone already hurt by a dog
- Other: representation from professionals in animals
- Other: Representatives are educated on the topic of canine aggression and unbiased to certain breeds
- Other: Representatives are from shelters and rescue foundations, and have animal interests as top priority.



- Other: Representatives include experienced dog trainers/handlers with a proven understanding of behaviours
- Other: Representatives must be fair and understand dog behavior/backgrounds. There must be enough time to appeal if necessary.
- Other: Representatives reviewing the orders need to be dog behaviourists/highly skilled trainers. Dogs should not be assessed in the shelter where the additional stress, trauma and fear they are under can illicit unnatural reactions due to the environment and circumstances.
- Other: Representatives were screened appropriately as to reduce bias.
- Other: Representatives would be experts in training and animal behaviour and the owner would be presented with options to keep the dog alive.
- Other: Restrictions are not breed specific, but rather suit the offences
- Other: Review and asses whether the dog is better cared for at home while waiting for court. Lets look at alternative measures and not euthanization,with no other options.
- Other: Review by the province
- Other: Review orders
- Other: Review the conditions the dog is living in. ie has the dog been conditioned by the OWNER to exhibit vicious behaviour.
- Other: Review the owners ability to properly train a dog, suggest dog training classes
- Other: Review the situation thoroughly and not assume that the dog was in the wrong. There is always two sides to a story and a dog cannot tell us theirs. If a dog is being harassed by a stranger, or someone enters an area that they protect (ie. backyard of a home) it is not fair to assume that the dog is aggressive, but to consider that this is the dog's home, and they are doing their job to protect their family.
- Other: Review vicious dog declarations and assess by a qualified and unbiased trainer if the dog should be euthanized
- Other: Review was done in a jury system
- Other: Reviewed by veterianian and dog behavioural specialist
- Other: Reviews should not be taken lightly.
- Other: Right to appeal judgements.
- Other: Right to speedy appeal
- Other: Safety for the public is at the forefront, and cases are all handled in a timely matter with in Stone rules for certain nuisance behaviours
- Other: said people in tribunal were screen for bias against breeds and dogs in general. tribunal made up of at least 5 people.
- Other: Sane and rational people should be a part of the tribunal.
- Other: Selection process involves community, members have training in non-bias and anti-racism
- Other: Sesiure and Euthanasia decisions would be reviewed by a third party before action was taken.
- Other: Set rules in place that people can also read.



- Other: Setting up a Tribunal seems like a big expense for the City for something that I hope doesn't happen all that often. Why not just make the pet owner post bail for their nuisance animal (dog)?
- Other: Several owners(jury) of the same breed to aide in the character of the dog and breed. They would know better than a bunch of uneducated suits who have never owned an animal.
- Other: should be done on a case by case basis. Not all dogs are a problem and almost goes back to treatment they face at home by their owner
- Other: should consist of animal specialists and pet owners only
- Other: Should it be deemed to be euthanized, then it must go to court first.
- Other: Should not allow them to decide on whether to euthanize
- Other: Since the majority of dog attacks seem to result in euthanizing the animal, I would only support this if a) euthanasia was only considered as an absolute last resort, favouring training and rehabilitation first, and b) all factors of the both incident and the animal's history are taken into account. If an external stressor results in a bite from a dog with otherwise no history, it is totally unfair and inhumane to euthanize that animal.
- Other: sit reinforcement and credible) SPCA etc
- Other: So as the dog involved in the incident is only evaluated based on the actual incident itself; not its breed.
- Other: So long as it was NOT breed specific. Breed specific legislation is the brainchild of ignorant, misinformed, uneducated people. Breed specific legislation is the animal equivalent of racism and should not be tolerated. A dogs behavior is entirely dependent upon their OWNER and NOTHING to do with the breed.
- Other: So long as it's headed by those with either veterinary training, or animal training backgrounds.
- Other: So long as the tribunal had unbiased (towards breeds, situations, socioeconomic status etc) members making judgements on cases.
- Other: so long as there is an unbiased animal advocate on the panel
- Other: So long as they are not going to punish some breeds more than others
- Other: So long as this is geared towards "nuisance" dogs as a whole and not just one breed of dog! (ie. pits!)
- Other: Some type of trainer or class the the owner and or dog has to take in order to keep the dog
- Other: Someone in the tribunal must be a dog handling expert with no breed biases.
- Other: Someone on the panel must be a dog behaviourist
- Other: someone trained to deal with bully breeds and similar dogs is involved in deciding if said dog is overly aggressive
- Other: Someone with proper education in dog behaviour must be present on the tribunal
- Other: Sometimes it's the people's fault on why a dog attacks or bites someone. How would you like it if your ears or tail were getting pulled in every direction? Causing the animals to attack or bite.
- Other: Special consideration must be paid to the owner. The dog is an animal taught a behavior. The owner is at fault not the pet
- Other: Specialists would be better to deal with these cases



- Other: Specific guidelines to assess individual cases. Tribunals should be able to maintain objectivity throughout the process
- Other: statements on behalf of the dog should be allowed from neighbors and or people who have had experiences with said dog. Some dogs aren't great with strangers or men for example but that doesn't mean the dog should be taken away ever.
- Other: Stay at home order for the dog
- Other: Stay breed neutral and punish bad owners
- Other: Still holding every condition that would have been set out by an actual court case.
- Other: STOP blaming the [removed] dogs and blame the owners. The dogs shouldn't be punished but the owner. It is the owners negligence for not training/watching the dog. Also in some cases it is the plaintiff (victim) is responsible for provoking the attack
- Other: Stop discriminating against bully breeds! You said yourself they don't bite more than other dogs yet continue to single them out.
- Other: Stop euthanasia and require retraining or rehoming in severe cases.
- Other: Stop euthanizing dogs for human stupidity. Their behavior is almost always a direct result of either their "owners" training or lack thereof or the victims actions.
- Other: Stop pointing fingers at certain breeds and only focus on dogs being a nuisance
- Other: Stricter fines and sentences for owners. Constant an animal will get punished for the lack of responsibility shown by its owner
- Other: Subject to review by the court of queens bench
- Other: Sufficient evidence of incident and dog to remain on property at all times with family until decision
- Other: Supports Calgary Humane Society and City of Calgary ideals.
- Other: Sure
- Other: Sure
- Other: Take into account if the dog was being attacked or taunted by the victim in question. Even the most well trained dogs have a breaking point if continuously harassed.
- Other: Take into account the entire scene, not just a he said she said case.
- Other: Take into account the history and not the breed of the dog. Breeds aren't the issue the owners that raise the breed is the ISSUE !!
- Other: Take into consideration if the owner of that animal has trained it properly and taken the time to take care of it properly. The behaviour of the animal reflects on the persons actions in training it, NOT the animal itself.
- Other: Take into consideration, owner and previous incidents
- Other: Take the dogs away from people who are training these dogs for bait and dog fighting , make stricter Guidelines to who can own a pit bull and require the owner to take training on their own aswell training for the dog to BENEFIT both partys. DO NOT EUTHANIZE A DOG WITHOUT TAKING THE TIME TO UNDERSTAND THE SITUATION ITS IN! BAN BAD DOG OWNERS NOT THE BREED
- Other: Takes into account the ability of the owner to reform and is not breed targeted



- Other: Takes into consideration the behavior of the person that was bit, maybe they deserved it.
- Other: Th
- Other: That euthanization is the last option even considered after training and more than one violent incident
- Other: That 2 impartial qualified animal behaviourists and veterinarians are to make qualifying decisions on if the animal is a candidate for behavioural rehabilitation
- Other: that all dogs be considered equal regardless of the breed. Appearance does not mean the dog is a nuisance. Say no to animal prejudice. Pit bull matter
- Other: That any decision be able to be appealed in court.
- Other: That any owner involved in this process is allowed to make their fair case on their pet. A bad incident doesn't always mean a bad pet, and there's always 2 sides to every story. Not just the victim, not just the bylaw, but the owners and pets as well.
- Other: That any single breed of dog is not singled out. All the choices are labelling pitbulls specifically and that is not fair to the breed. Sherd's, Huskies, and little "floo-floo" dogs like chihuahuas can be as bad.
- Other: That both parties have been interviewed, and it is known to not be a case of a person provoking an animal (EG: Kids poking, sitting on, rough-housing a dog/cat)
- Other: That bully breed trainers be a large part of this. They understand the breed and they would determine the dogs behaviour and have suggestions
- Other: That City or non-City representatives included very dog-knowledgeable people or took into account the opinion of a dog whisperer or other breed knowledgeable person.
- Other: That dogs are held if deemed to be euthanized until decision is appealed.
- Other: That dogs be given the same rights as people. No discrimination.
- Other: That each dog be given an appropriate amount of training by a trainer experienced and agreed upon by both the city and the dog owner.
- Other: That euthanasia was off the table. And rehabilitation was on the table.
- Other: That euthanization should be the absolute last resort. But, also, that more often than not, it is most likely the owner that is the reason for a vicious or uncontrollable dog. And that education is the best option, but relocation for the dog is a better alternative over euthanization.
- Other: that euthanization would only be considered a last resort, and only for severe harm (e.g. when another pet is killed, or a human sustains severe injury)
- Other: That euthanizing them was a last resort choice and have tried multiple things to appease the problem and all have failed
- Other: That experts with science based techniques/training on dog behaviour are on this tribunal
- Other: That families participate in tribunal mandated training before euthanasia is EVER considered. Additionally, is the home environment explored before anything else? Its the owners fault, not the dog's.
- Other: That if the owner doesn't agree with the tribunal's opinion, they can still go the usual court route, not as an "appeal" in the sense that the court looks for technicalities in the tribunal's decision, but for the court to look at the situation as a "fresh case."



- Other: That if the results of the Tribunal are solid and the harm that the dog inflicted due to the owner lack of care and attention - i.e. not a simple accident and out of character situation - then the owner cannot file to the Bench.
- Other: That if the tribunal came to the conclusion that a dog should be euthanized, this must then automatically proceed to the Court of Queen's Bench. I would not support the tribunal being given the authority to euthanize animals.
- Other: That is sped up the process, but does not change the evaluation of each case - if speeding up means not actually listening to what happened, this is not an improvement.
- Other: That it be based on the incident itself and not on the breed only.
- Other: That it be fair and holistically look at the situation, with termination of the pet being the absolute last resort. Look at solutions such as behavioural training.
- Other: That it be for all dogs and not just Pitbulls
- Other: That it doesn't cost the taxpayer more than the current system. In this economic time please do not waste more precious taxpayer dollars on this,
- Other: That it is a non-biased review, and done in a professional manner
- Other: That it is a panel voted on by the public or by shelters and includes at least two members from independent shelters
- Other: That it isn't discriminatory against breed.
- Other: That it takes the specific circumstances into account.
- Other: That it were fair
- Other: That it would be a non-biased way to ensure the dog could return home (with conditions such as training)
- Other: That it's only on NUISANCE dogs
- Other: That judgement is not prejudiced by breed.
- Other: That members be screened for bias favoring breed-specific legislation, which does not belong in our city.
- Other: That multiple agencies are involved.
- Other: That multiple professional opinions are taken into account and not just one. Animals behave differently around all people and other animals. This too can be said for how people act around others and animals. Multiple professional opinions is a must
- Other: That neighbours and others in the vicinity be contacted as character witnesses for the dog, owner, and victim.
- Other: that no one on the panel has a hate on for bully breeds!
- Other: That only extremely dangerous neglected dogs be put down in the most extreme of circumstances. Issue fines and obedience classes, dog socializing classes, for 1st and 2nd offenses. Give owners time to try and rehabilitate the dog with proper training that the owner should pay for.
- Other: That people on the tribunal had knowledge and experience with dogs/dog training
- Other: That specific breeds of dogs are not discriminated against
- Other: That specific breeds of dogs are NOT discriminated against.



- Other: That the animal go through training to correct all bad behaviour and extensive searching of how the owner brought up the dog and raised it (it's not the dogs fault if the owner abuses the dog. It's a defence, you wouldn't kill a human that was abused for reacting)
- Other: That the decision can be appealed in court, ESPECIALLY euthanasia cases. I believe that the owner should be able to opt to explore any option (with court approval of methods) before the city would be allowed to step in and euthanize the dog (example: training, moving to a different environment out of the city, dog needs to be kept indoors away from other people etc. This would be at owners expense. Dogs are like family to some people and if they are willing to spend the time and money I don't think we should be so quick to euthanize problem dogs. Of course of behaviour continues and dog is still a problem, owner not complying then dog should be considered to be euthanized.
- Other: That the decision was fair not based off of discrimination (breed of dog)
- Other: That the dog And owner are allowed to be together until the case is closed
- Other: That the dog be helped and not put down
- Other: That the dog must be assessed by an animal behaviorist from outside the city's jurisdiction. Someone brought in to asses an animal that is not jaded by the "news" and can fairly and accurately asses the animal.
- Other: That the dog was not provoked to bite. Ie a kid running over the dog with its toy
- Other: That the incidents were caused by kids/teenagers/adults taunting /abusing the animal.
- Other: that the law doesn't go through.
- Other: That the members choosen do not have an pre conceived ideas about certain breeds. The judgement needs to be fairly assessed. Breeds do not make an animal aggressive, small dogs can and sometimes are much more aggressive than a pit bull breed.
- Other: That the members of the tribunal would be from a variety of backgrounds that focus on animal care, training and wellness as well as bylaw or other agencies.
- Other: That the owner process of member selection not be political appointments and that the non-city members be people who have the welfare of animals and their people As a priority, that the tribunal be given ongoing education on both animal behaviour and reactions as well as human behaviour and reaction. AND al members be given equal standing.
- Other: That the owners behaviour is accessed during this time. More often then not dogs poor behaviours are a result of mistreatment or abuse from the owner.
- Other: That the panel consists of equal amounts of members of both sex and minorities and also dog owners.
- Other: That the people involved in the decisions are welcome to the idea of animals or are comfortable with them. People who are not are more negatively going to look at cases
- Other: that the people on the board are true pet lovers, and will listen to the full story and ask the correct question to bring out the honest truth , because the victim will adjust their story or exaggerate the story and possibly miss very important events of the incident and same on owners story , board need strong open minds to make a correct decision , and not have a animal labelled incorrectly
- Other: That the people sitting on the panel are dog knowledgeable people



- Other: That the people who are in charge are educated and unbiased. So far this survey is very bias on pit bulls and vague on what is a nuisance dog.
- Other: That the person doing the reviewing was not biased on either side.
- Other: That the person's conducting the tribunal are educated and unbiased
- Other: That the tribunal include animal behaviour experts and not merely uninformed politicians.
- Other: That the tribunal include professional trainers/behaviourist experiences in working with behaviour issues in dogs
- Other: That the tribunal includes at least 1 veterinarian and 1 dog behaviorist
- Other: That the tribunal is made up of knowledgeable individuals who have no breed bias.
- Other: That the tribunal is not made up of people who don't like dogs. Plus, not having euthanizing as the first option is a dog is considered dangerous. Have an option for the owner to put the dog through training first
- Other: That the tribunal must be within a set period of time. It would not serve its purpose if the time frame was not set and adhered to. Cases could be dealt with in a week but if there was a backlog, it could be much longer. There must be a time frame that can be met.
- Other: That there are individuals from differing backgrounds and knowledge standpoints regarding dogs
- Other: That there be an appeals process for pets declared dangerous and slated for euthanasia
- Other: That there is fair representation and no biased opinion against certain breeds
- Other: That there is follow through to ensure owners are abiding by the decisions put forth.
- Other: That there is no prejudice or bias towards a specific breed
- Other: That there is recourse to appeal
- Other: That there is two or more dog behaviouralist on the tribunal.
- Other: That there was a dog owner option to openly challenge any by law officer, and that the dog owner automatically receives a copy of any paperwork / report(s) submitted by any such by law officer.
- Other: That there would be absolutely no biases towards any dog breed and that a sincere consideration be taken into the habits of the owner and NOT the dog. No matter the breed
- Other: That they do not judge a case by the breed. Any case being heard should have the breed omitted in the reports
- Other: That they don't discriminate against breed but individual dogs.
- Other: That they take into account events leading up to the bite and not just the fact that an animal attacked.
- Other: that they were open minded on all the breeds of dogs and not just after one breed. And understand that they must look at all the facts and what was going on.
- Other: That this isn't just limited to pit bulls. Small dogs are some of the most aggressive breeds out there. There needs to be more education around breeds
- Other: That those on the tribunal are screened for dog breed biases (eg. negative biased opinions on pit bull type breeds, etc).



- Other: That those who are exploring the case are unbiased like jury in a court case.
- Other: That you can Challenge their decision
- Other: That you [removed] off with this inane [removed] and fight drug crime
- Other: That you guys don't just use this role against Pit Bulls, they're as loving as any other dog. ALL dogs bite. Don't just point fingers at the Pitties
- Other: That you look at the owner and make sure they arnt abusing there dog before even considering putting them down it is never the animals fault its is always the owners fault and i think that the animal should get a second chance also i think the dog should not be in that person care anymore and that they be rehabilitate before eeuthanization should be even a thought.
- Other: That's if the dog is determined to be dangerous that further behavioural evaluation be take by a professional.
- Other: That's euthanizing is not an option
- Other: The "City and non-city representatives" go through proper education and are properly vetted to make the decision they need to.
- Other: The animal and owner are checked regularly if not euthanized. If animal needs to be euthanized then that owner should be banned from any new pets until they have taken courses in training puppies and dogs
- Other: The animal can stay with its owner and training is encouraged.
- Other: The animal does not suffer at the hands of the owner. Place the dog into foster care. 99.9% of attacks are provoked and not the dogs fault.
- Other: The animal in question sho3be left inder the owner's supervision (with strict guidelines) whenever possible.
- Other: The animal is overseen by a qualified vet and behaviourist
- Other: The animal should get a chance to be rehabilitated and trained properly.
- Other: The animal stays home with its owner with guidelines
- Other: The animal stays on residence
- Other: The animal stays with the owner, as long as the owner is not a clear and present danger to the animal.
- Other: The animalls properly vetted and an animal behaviourist assesses the dog - the animal could not be euthanized until an appeal is complete
- Other: The best interests of the people involved and the animal. All aspects should be considered before an animal is euthanized.
- Other: The breed of dog be considered irrelevant, and all cases treated based on severity.
- Other: The breed of dog is not allowed to be taken into consideration through the tribunal. The onus must be on the owner, and the blame not placed on the dog.
- Other: the breed of the animal is not included in the report or decision. final say should be decided on the facts of the incident and not be biased by breed. all animals and persons involved will be treated as equals of no specific breed, race, colour or religion. a blind court type of situation.
- Other: The breed of the dog is not important. All dogs are not bred to be mean. Owners are the ones that make dogs act the way they do.



- Other: The breed of the dog wasn't the main focus
- Other: The breed of the dog would not be a factor. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Other: The breed or suspected dog breed should be left out of the hearing. A dog bite is a dog bite, regardless of breed and should all be treated the same whether inflicted by a Shetland Sheepdog or pit bull
- Other: the breed should not affect decision-making
- Other: The bylaw officers are NOT known to the offender. Too many "friends" helping people cheat the bylaws
- Other: The care for the animal needs to be a priority, a stressed or aggravated dog needs to get home where they feel asap.
- Other: The case be handled in a manner, that focuses on the moments leading up to the bite incident. Was the animal teased, harmed or egged on? Did the owner act to stop the event?
- Other: The case be very carefully looked at and considered before declaring a dog to be put down. There is a lot of harsh dog deaths by both cops and for biting. If a dog is protecting someone in danger or just known for barking it should be able to live.
- Other: the chance to fight for an appeal happens before anything is allowed to be done to the dog (euthanize)
- Other: The city and non city representatives consist of people who are actually educated on dogs (Vets, dog behavioral experts, etc.) and are not biased about specific breeds.
- Other: The city and non city representatives should be voted in
- Other: The city and non-city representatives are individuals that have a history of working with dogs, are knowledgeable on the subject of aggressive behaviours in dogs, and will not discriminate against dogs on the basis of the dog's breed.
- Other: The city and non-city representatives need to be vetted somehow, as to not show bias one way or another
- Other: the City and non-City representatives were actually trained in animal behavior and qualified by science based certifying agencies, and have no breed bias
- Other: The city of Calgary cannot euthanize dogs if they are protecting themselves, children in a yard, etc.
- Other: The committee is formed of non-biased personnel, meaning they would not discriminate against a dog simply because of its breed.
- Other: The committee was on a rotation. I would not support the same people to make the decision every time.
- Other: The counsel selected to make decision is screened thoroughly to ensure they do not have malicious intentions or are inclined to sociopathic tendencies
- Other: The court system is too back logged that they cannot process the case in an efficient manner.
- Other: The decision could still be appealed in court
- Other: The decision is always based upon the best interests of the dog
- Other: The decision makers should be vetted heavily to make sure they are making empathetic decisions.
- Other: The decision to euthanise a dog should not fall to a tribunal



- Other: The decision to euthanize must be escalated to the courts.
- Other: The decision was to be made by multiple (at least 5) unbiased experts. Dog training, dog psychology, behavioral ect. That testing should also occur multiple times and including at the dogs home and not in a scary jail-like environment.
- Other: The dog and owner in question should not be subjected to different rules due to breed. Ex. A Caucasian Shepherd looks nothing like a pitbull and can do similar or greater damage.
- Other: The dog and owner remain unseparated, supervised and the dog cannot leave the owner's property, unless there is a requirement for it.
- Other: The dog assessments were completed by a panel of dog behavior experts with accreditations of DVM and CBCC-KA
- Other: The dog being euthanized would be the last resort. Give the owner the opportunity to agree to keep the animal on their property for a certain amount of time. And investigate if the victim edged on the attack first.
- Other: The dog bite is considered a non-defensive violent attack
- Other: The dog breed is not identified.
- Other: The dog by law must remain in the household of the owner. Being locked up in a kennel can be a trigger to certain dogs, especially those who were rescued from a similar situation.
- Other: The dog can remain in the home and the owner is provided with resources to learn how to manage the problem behaviour.
- Other: The dog can stay with owner instead of in the shelter.
- Other: The dog cannot be blamed for the attack, it is the owners fault. The dog itself is innocent and it cannot be euthanized.
- Other: The dog could be in a training course during the system
- Other: The dog could stay at it's own property
- Other: The dog could stay with the owner in the meantime, as long as they were meeting with a force-free dog trainer to help them work on their dog's problems and to better assess the behavior of the dog
- Other: the dog deserves a change 90% is owner error
- Other: The dog does not get out down
- Other: The dog doesn't disappear by the time the decision is handed over. There should be a huge fine if the dog "disappears" before the verdict.
- Other: The dog got to go home with it's owner in the intern
- Other: The dog has killed a person or another animal. Bites or small attacks the dogs should not be euthanized but rehabilitated and potentially be on house arrest or along those lines
- Other: The dog in question would be assessed by 2 licensed behavioural specialists to make a determination. Only those well trained to make assessments should make that decision.
- Other: The dog involved is not euthanized; just regimes if necessary
- Other: the dog is kept in quarantine at home while waiting for a decision by the tribunal.



- Other: The dog is not euthanized until all other options are exhausted (obedience training, muzzle, adoption to an agency that could handle this etc)
- Other: The dog is not euthanized; the city provides extensive training before it is considered
- Other: The dog is not kept in a cage/kennel for long periods of time. Should be released to owner, paying a "like bail" fee. If the dog re-offends, then the "bail" is kept by tribunal/courts and more serious action should be taken. Otherwise, just trust the owner/dog combo to be better in future.
- Other: The dog is not seized and can remain with the owner within their home, private property, and muzzled while off the property
- Other: The dog is not taken to a shelter. Taking a dog out of its comfort zone will make it more anxious, therefore making it more likely to be "aggressive" and more dogs will just be euthanized for having normal anxiety responses
- Other: The dog is now allowed off of private property while this is in court. Also, the yard would have to pass security inspection of the yard.
- Other: The dog is placed in a foster home during the court case
- Other: The dog is released to its owner on bail and with conditions.
- Other: the dog must be "innocent until proven guilty" very rarely do dogs just bite, there is usually a trigger associated with the attack.
- Other: The dog must be given the benefit of the doubt. Owners need to train any and all dogs.
- Other: The dog needs to be assessed for aggression by a professional trainer.
- Other: The dog owner is NOT automatically deemed guilty because of how the dog reacted. Dogs give out plenty of warning signals and it's on people to take responsibility for how they interact with dogs, known or unknown.
- Other: The dog receive a behavioral assessment by a expert in animal behavior.
- Other: The dog remains in home but can't leave property until tribunal system is conducted.
- Other: The dog remains in the owners home with restrictions of remaining on the property
- Other: The dog should be assessed by a trained personnel to see if the dog is aggressive because of the owners negligence rather than a vicious dog
- Other: The dog should be rehomed to an aggressive breed specialists, not put down.
- Other: The dog should have the option to be able to stay home with their owner.
- Other: The dog should not be assessed and immediately declared a risk that needs to be euthanized. Additional home restrictions should be placed on the owners and the dog to prevent future incidents while the decision is made; the dog should not be surrendered to the shelter. The owner should face severe fines if the restrictions are breached.
- Other: The dog should not be assessed for euthanization.
- Other: The dog should not be euthanized! I say the animal being taken away and provided to the appropriate shelter. Or mandatory training in pending removal of pet. The pet's behaviour is a mirror image from its environment holistically. If the owner cannot prove themselves able to care for the pet (mental, physical, social, and emotional needs) then it will be taken away. Just euthanizing a dog doesn't bring the owner who is responsible for their behaviour to really deal with it. Maybe the owner be banned from owning a pet in the future.



- Other: The dog should not be euthanized, the owner should be fined or the animal should be rehomed if they are unable to properly care and train it.
- Other: The dog stays at home
- Other: The dog stays in the owners property until the bearing is done. The dog would not be allowed off the property.
- Other: The dog stays with its owner until a decision has been made.
- Other: The dog stays with its owner until a decision is made
- Other: The dog stays with the owner during the process. The dog is not euthanized. The dog goes for training. The owner is fined and banned from owning dogs.
- Other: The dog undergoes obedience training after an incident prior to being euthanized. Must show improvement; rather than immediate death
- Other: The dog was able to be back in the possession of the owner under strict conditions until the court/decision can be made on what to do. It is not the dogs fault for poor ownership and lack of training and obedience.
- Other: The dog was not kept in the kennel for more than a week
- Other: The dog was not put down and instead trained.
- Other: The dog was placed in rehabilitation and being euthanized is not an option. It is not the dog. The owners are the one responsible for the dogs behavior.
- Other: The dog would be on a house arrest so to speak, the dog may stay with its owner until the court ruling has been completed
- Other: The dog would have to be analyzed by a dog behaviourist to determine the best courses of action for said tribunal.
- Other: The dogs absolute best interests are first, and the humans who have trained or taken care of the dog in such a way that it feels the need to attack are Held responsible, not the innocent pet.
- Other: The dogs are allowed to live in their own home while procedures take place
- Other: The dogs best interest is in the forefront. The people responsible for making this decision should be put through extensive education on animal behaviour before they get to make a decision about euthanizing any animals.
- Other: The DOGS best interest is the priority.
- Other: The dogs breed is not relevant to the decision whether to euthanize.
- Other: The dogs owner is allowed to defend themselves and their animal in a fair trial. Right now it just sounds like a bunch of people saying whats done with the dog without any input from the dogs owner or their representative (lawyer).
- Other: The dog's owner should be able to choose between tribunal and court; also tribunal needs to be fair, transparent, and run by intelligent people with vision and common sense.
- Other: The equivalent of social worker inspections: unannounced surprise checks on owners.
- Other: The euthanization of dogs should be reserved for only the most extreme cases. The decision to euthanize should not be made by a single person.
- Other: The evidence is clear and all measures have been assessed.



- Other: The experience of the representatives
- Other: The focus of the tribunal should be on the owner's behaviour, not the dogs. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Other: The full case is looked into and the City is willing to work with owners for offences eg/ a bit warrants house arrest for the dog. No public parks. No off leash. Muzzled in public. Fines or seizures for failing to comply
- Other: The goal should be rehabilitation and enforced training of the dog and surrender if the owners do not agree.
- Other: The home in which the dogs lives would need to be approved as a safe location in which there is little risk of the dog escaping. No bias in the process based on the breed (or apparent breed) of the dog.
- Other: the human be euthanized as they are the problem. And have laws for them not to be able to own a dog again
- Other: The humane society is involved in the case.
- Other: The idea of inflicting less trauma is amazing. As long as it doesn't result in rushes decisions.
- Other: The immediate response is not to just euthanize the animal. Perhaps additional training requirements could be an alternative. Dogs that bite are usually fear reactive, not aggressive. That can be trained out of them.
- Other: The individual splinted was actually qualified to make these determinations
- Other: The individuals are unbiased
- Other: The individuals on the tribunal for it to be fair MUST be neutral in their opinion of all dogs regardless of breed. If they have a bias against certain breeds or display this trait they must be removed from the tribunal.
- Other: The individuals sitting on the board understand a bias they may have towards certain breeds of dogs. A bias that I'm disgusted to read in this questionnaire against pitbulls.
- Other: The involved members of the tribunal have representation of larger dog breeds, and precautions are taken to ensure that there is absolutely no bias
- Other: The judge be knowledgeable in dog behavior if not having them attend a class on normal dog behavior (prey drive...ect)
- Other: The members are focused on the individual dog and owner not the breed in anyway. The owners are responsible for training their dogs regardless of breed
- Other: The members are required and PROVEN to have no biases against certain breeds
- Other: The members either worked in the animal care field or was vetted to not have any breed bias
- Other: The members have experience with dogs and dog training and will judge based on actions and not breed or appearance
- Other: The members of the panel varied and alternated. The panel was made up from nurses, veterinarian, an bylaw officer and management on a rotating schedule. To keep the panel impartial.
- Other: The members of the tribunal are actually informed and educated about bully breed dogs



- Other: The members of the tribunal are significantly vetted and go through a robust process to ensure no bias/issues
- Other: The members of the tribunal have extensive knowledge and experience with dog training and behavior. This would make it fair to all those involved as a random person off the street would have no knowledge and could easily make the wrong assumptions.
- Other: The members of the tribunal have no history of lobbying against certain breeds (i.e. pit bulls) and that there is some representation from a shelter (e.g. Calgary Humane Society).
- Other: The members of the tribunal must be experienced dog handlers, veterinarians, etc.
- Other: The members of the tribunal were educated on ACTUAL evidence and research RE: risk mitigation
- Other: The members of the tribunal would have to both be qualified and be accountable to some body.
- Other: The members of this tribunal must be unbiased and have no breed specific hatred (especially for dog with a stigma such as pitbulls)
- Other: The members that make up this "Tribunal" were members of respected societies whose knowledge base is directly related to animals. I.e. behavior specialist, vet, dog trainer, etc...
- Other: The non-city council members do not have any breed specific biases.
- Other: The non-city representatives consisted of veterinarians and reputable dog trainers with positive only training methods (aka, no Caesar types)
- Other: The non-city representatives should include animal specialists (ie veterinarians or shelter staff)
- Other: The offending dog should be muzzle trained properly and the owners should be using it when off their property if they think it could be a risk once again
- Other: the only people on the tribunal should be vets, and professional dog trainers. no politicians. no teachers. no lawyers...
- Other: The owner and dog attend mandatory dog training sessions
- Other: The owner can participate in the process and determination of the outcome.
- Other: The owner gets to be involved in the tribunal discussions
- Other: The owner has the chance to work with a trainer to eliminate the bite risk prior to it being euthanized
- Other: The owner has time before to prepare and after decision a right to speak all decisions especially when the decision is to murder the animal
- Other: The owner is punished more than the dog
- Other: The owner MUST attend dog training classes before gaining their dog back or buying another dog
- Other: The owner MUST be consulted first. No stranger knows a dog better than its handler, and taking the life of an animal you've met once because it wasn't the most well behaved dog you've ever met is unethical and murder.
- Other: The owner must be held accountable for the dogs actions. It is the owners fault for teaching a dog to be aggressive. The dog or breed itself is not the issue, it's always the owner. the owner needs



to have restrictions, similar to what a sex offender would have (not allowed to own dogs, can't have other pets etc.) This is not a breed specific issue. I can't stress enough that it's never the dogs fault for biting, it's the way the owner treats the dog.

- Other: The owner needs to be looked at on how they treat their animal
- Other: The owner of the dog got a chance to share on behalf of the dog their character and also what happened and why they believe it happened.
- Other: The owner of the dog must be investigated to determine if animal abuse or neglect was a factor leading up to the attack
- Other: The owner should be allowed access to the dog so that to offer it comfort. Any dog could come off wrong when locked up and surrounded by strangers. My cat would do the same If locked up away from all she ever knew but no one cares because she's a cat.
- Other: the owner should be allowed to demonstrate their dogs training
- Other: The owner should be allowed to give their dog items to calm their dog down (i.e blankets, pillows, dog beds, etc) and retrieve items after tribunal, regardless of outcome.
- Other: the owner should be held more liable than the animal. The tribunal should be looking into the dogs behavior and see where the lack of desirable traits stem from. Such as developing a program to monitor the dog and owner in social situations where other dogs and owners are present to see mannerisms and corrections.
- Other: The owner should be rehabilitated to owning a trained animal instead of the animal being punished for poor ownership
- Other: The owner was not a personal known by anyone on the committee.
- Other: The owner(s) of an animal subject to decision(s) made by a tribunal should have the opportunity to appeal before the court prior to any action(s) being taken to implement said decision.
- Other: The owners are allowed to give a fair statement and it doesn't not always end in the dog being euthanized
- Other: The owners are the ones punished
- Other: The owners must also be fined and looked into and if they have been proven to be bad owners they can no longer own any type of dog/ pet
- Other: The owners statement needs to be taken into consideration. For example, if a dog (let's say a lab) is being chased or harassed by another dog (let's say a shepherd) when the owner of the lab specifically requested the owner of the shepherd to put him on a leash, and the lab got nervous and bit the shepherd after giving multiple signs (hiding behind owner, trying to escape, nervous behavior), then the owner of the shepherd is equally at fault. The owners should then be required to complete a training course, which they have to provide proof of passing. Same goes for if it was a person. A parent needs to be in control of their child/an adult in control of their actions just as much as the owner does the pet.
- Other: The panel contains qualified people to make judgements based on experience and facts, not just people who throw out an opinion.
- Other: The panel was made up of qualified people.
- Other: The parties are not breed biased. However it would be difficult to find these people.



- Other: The parties have an extensive knowledge of dog behaviour and have participated in dog training with their dogs in the past. There are too many people and cultures in the City who are inherently scared of dogs, and I would be considered that their prejudice against dogs would mar their ability to sit on a tribunal.
- Other: The people assessing are trained, knowledgeable and experienced with dog behavior
- Other: The people chosen to be on the tribunal are qualified to review incidences and make decisions.
- Other: The people chosen were not people that hate dogs to begin with.
- Other: The people get into training and there is improvement within the animals home life
- Other: The people handling these cases are well educated in dog behaviour and canine professionals are present.
- Other: The people in the tribunal are from professions that specifically deal with dogs (ie vets, dog-trainers)
- Other: The people in the tribunal were educated in dog behavior and are unbiased against any breed of dog.
- Other: The people involved have some knowlege about the issue.
- Other: The people involved are actually educated in dog behaviors
- Other: The people involved are trained animal specialists such as humane society staff vets etc and not general public
- Other: The people involved in making these decisions do not show a bid against large breed dogs and have dog behavioral training.
- Other: The people involved making the decision has a certification to work with animals. Euthanizing a dog is not to be taken lightly.
- Other: The people making decisions are unbiased and are fair. That they don't make the dogs take the fall of an idiot owner.
- Other: The people on the panel do have bias against specific breeds and are knowledgeable able dogs and dog training or rehabilitation
- Other: The people on the panel were experts and not non-dog owning members of the community
- Other: The people on the tribunal are knowledgeable about dog psychology. When decisions that determine life or death are made Suzy homemakers opinion isn't not nearly as valid as someone who has spent years learning and understanding how the dog mind works.
- Other: the people on the tribunal are properly trained and able to maintain objectivity without singeling out specific breeds.
- Other: The people on the tribunal need to be properly trained experts in animal behavior not vet, not basic trainers, but people who are experienced working with dog behavior.
- Other: The people on the tribunal need to have a good understanding of dog behaviour and not have any bias' against certain animal breeds.
- Other: The people on the tribunal should have a demonstrated attachment to jobs, ie previous involvement in rehabilitation or education programs for dogs.
- Other: The people reviewing should be animal lovers



- Other: The people ruling on the matter remain unbiased and look at the matter from all sides.
- Other: The people selected do not already have a bias against animals
- Other: The people selected to be on this tribunal are well educated in animal behaviours as well as just animals in general in order to ensure that they are able to review every possible route other than euthanization.
- Other: The people selected to oversee the tribunal are relevant and have experience in the matter
- Other: The people that get put on the case can't be discriminate against the breed in the case
- Other: The people who are in control actually know something about dog behavior!
- Other: The person deciding should have dog behaviour psychology accreditation and be proven to be unbiased and experienced with all breeds
- Other: The person has a degree in animal wellbeing and can make judgements unbiased
- Other: the person investigating the issue is not against any dog breed. As soon as someone is put on a case and they have a personal issue with a certain breed then they'll fight to have the dog put down, even if it doesn't deserve it.
- Other: The person making the ultimate decision on the dogs fate is non-biased on breed and knowledgeable about dog behaviour and dog training
- Other: The person who was bitten or attack gets to decide if the dog dies. Human lives trump animal lives.
- Other: The persons did not have any bias on type of dog and had compassion for all involved. Dogs can be a victim as much as those who received the bite. They may have been defending themselves. I think more needs to be considered.
- Other: The persons making the decisions have animal behavioural experience/training.
- Other: The pet owner has to bear some measure of tesponsibility and teceive training to be able to keep the nuisance dog.
- Other: The pet owner should be treated more harshly than the pet
- Other: The process for determining who is on the tribunal is fair and unbiased (eg not full of people who hate dogs).
- Other: The process for electing the City and Non-City representatives be inclusive and diverse, with a focus on trained and educated individuals in this field
- Other: The process should be able to be appealed.
- Other: The proper people on the panel. Dog behaviourists, etc.
- Other: The public elects this panel
- Other: The reason bite occured. Was the bite recipient teasing and egging the dog on? This happens a lot more than people realize.
- Other: The reason for the bit needs to be considered. If someone was hitting or running away or screaming. There are animals there needs to be on the tribunal a professional in animal behaviour so that there is an equal opportunity for human and animal. There cannot be a bias panel.
- Other: the reason for the bite is identified and deemed not necessary
- Other: The reason for the dogs behaviour is examined (was it threatened, does it lack training etc.)



- Other: The representatives all had the same approach. I.e: whether it was a pitbull or a golden retriever, same punishment.
- Other: The representatives are completely impartial and have experience and knowledge of dog behaviour and treatments.
- Other: The representatives are individuals who understand dogs and have had experience with dogs - not someone who is afraid of all dogs.
- Other: The representatives met the dog and spoke to family members or friends outside of the household about the dog as well as the owners.
- Other: The representatives on the tribunal would include people who are animal behavioural experts.
- Other: The representatives were experts in animal behaviour.
- Other: The representatives were not biased against certain breeds and are knowledgeable on animal welfare.
- Other: The responsibility lays on the owner. This is who should pay the price for the pet biting, not the dog!
- Other: The review restrictions include a thorough process to ensure the dog is being treated fairly by the owner and not harmed in any way. Also, prohibit the euthanization of the dog in question.
- Other: The right of appeal at queens bench with dog returned to owner with strict rules until case is heard.
- Other: The safety of the public is the guiding principle
- Other: The same procedure as courts for case presentation and defense
- Other: The selection of the tribunal members is non-biased.
- Other: The selection of the tribunal would be like a jury process where unbiased people would be chosen to make the decision. Either that or have a mix of dog owners vs non-dog owners vs general pet owners.
- Other: The situation is looked at fairly and if it is a first time offence the dog **SHOULD NOT BE EUTHANIZED**. All dogs deserve a fair chance. The person could be at fault in the situation where they get bit.
- Other: The structure of the tribunal would need to be centered around the interest of the animal and not those with conflicting priorities, such as the City of Calgary.
- Other: The tribunal should include members who are dog owners probably a good idea to have a member who has or has had the breeding question as a family member.
- Other: The tribunal be composed of dog owners and non dog owners, including responsible pit-bull type dog owners.
- Other: The tribunal cannot determine euthanization - it should not have this power. Those required to take part in the tribunal should face penalties similar to court charges for failure to attend.
- Other: The tribunal consisted of a city employee and also local rescue agency advocates
- Other: The tribunal consisted of parties from multiple agencies. This must be done to eliminate potential bias.
- Other: The tribunal consists of experienced dog owners (or whatever animal is in question)



- Other: the tribunal consists of impartial people who see able to be both sympathetic to both owner and victim, especially in the case of the dog being provoked into attacking, as commonly happens.
- Other: The tribunal consists of members that are qualified for the position I.e veterinarians, animal behaviour specialists etc.
- Other: The tribunal contained at least a few people with dog breed behavioural and health education/background
- Other: The tribunal could review any cases to ensure if any changes in cases or facts could cause a reversal of decisions made.
- Other: The tribunal decisions be solely based on the current case, instead of past cases or breed specific prejudices
- Other: The tribunal does not have authority to declare a dog to be euthanized, and if euthanasia is the necessary outcome, a thorough court case should be required.
- Other: The tribunal had a balanced and full membership including veterinarians
- Other: The tribunal had both veterinarians and dog behaviorist in the majority
- Other: The tribunal had members consisting of: behavioural trainers, veterinarians and bylaw enforcement officials and rescue workers
- Other: The tribunal had people on both sides, not just anti pit bull
- Other: The tribunal has a fair representation of dog professionals ex. Balanced dog trainer, behaviourists, experience etc
- Other: The tribunal has at least 50% dog owners and 25% own a pitbull or bully breed to avoid incorrect assumptions around the breeds.
- Other: The tribunal has clear guidelines, processes, timelines, deadlines, and members of the tribunal have short term periods, not long, and there is limitations to the number of times someone can serve on the tribunal.
- Other: The tribunal has first hand experience with the dog breed.
- Other: The tribunal has thr power to follow up on their decisions and implement additional restrictions as necessary.
- Other: the tribunal included people trained in accessing the dogs behavior (vets, trainers)
- Other: The tribunal includes dog / animal behaviour experts
- Other: The tribunal includes experienced dog trainer and vets that are not city of Calgary employees and do not have ties to any Council member. Preferably drawn from a pool of people that have the necessary qualifications to insure impartiality.
- Other: The tribunal includes professionals in the animal behaviour and care industry, and who do not stand to receive a political or personal gain from actions taken on this tribunal. IE - no politicians who will use being tough on pit bulls as a platform for election.
- Other: The tribunal is accessible to all (low cost, transportation) and pitbull breeds are not judged unfairly to other breeds.
- Other: The tribunal is compiled of vets, dog trainers, and/or people trained in animal behaviour
- Other: The tribunal is comprised of experts on the subject matter, including animal behaviour professionals.



- Other: The tribunal is made of specialists and veterinarians who understand animals natural habits and instincts
- Other: The tribunal is made up of an unbiased individuals
- Other: The tribunal is made up of animal behaviour professionals
- Other: The tribunal is made up of impartial dog behavior experts for accurate assessment of the individual dog involved.
- Other: The tribunal is made up of open minded professionals within the animal industry and no prejudice is given towards a pit bull type dog
- Other: The tribunal is made up of or consultants a animal trainer and rescue organization prior to issuing a decision.
- Other: The tribunal is made up of qualified and unbiased members
- Other: The tribunal is not biased. Animals when provoked will defend themselves
- Other: The tribunal is operated by experienced dog trainers/owners.
- Other: The tribunal is trained in understanding of dog behavior and can help determine if it is a dog problem or a human problem.
- Other: The tribunal is well educated on dog behavior. Our [removed] don't know anything about animals.
- Other: The tribunal is well-educated in animal behaviour and training
- Other: The tribunal meets the dog and interacts with him/her
- Other: The tribunal members are dog training experts and have an opportunity to assess the owner's ability to handle the dog.
- Other: The tribunal members are educated, informed and have no breed biases
- Other: The tribunal members have received some training in dog behaviour
- Other: The tribunal members most consist of dog owners and non owners to remain unbiased
- Other: The tribunal most only consist of dog owners.
- Other: The tribunal must be composed of experienced dog trainers and rescue organisation representatives who can properly assess the potential for rehabilitation through proper training, and issue orders that could re-home a dog as one of the Tribunal outcomes.
- Other: The tribunal must be comprised of animal behaviour specialists and preference must always be given to retraining or rehoming the animal.
- Other: The tribunal must be made up of a diverse group with chance to change the tribunal members if suspected of bias.
- Other: The tribunal must be made up of dog owners and non-dog owners, similar to a jury picked for court cases.
- Other: The tribunal must be made up of people who are within the dog community. Any breed of dog can bite, but the BSL language used in a question above makes me nervous, so to be a member of a tribunal you must be a dog trainer or work with animals in a non-kill shelter. The tribunal should always work in the interest of the dog. These are living things that have no control over the environment they are put in.



- Other: The tribunal must be overseen by qualified dog experts and veterinarians. Discrimination by breed or dog size must be prevented. As well meaning as tribunals can be in theory, the likelihood for persons to enter into biased judgement based on breed discrimination is very high.
- Other: The tribunal must be properly vetted to not be biased to bully breeds.
- Other: The tribunal must be transparent and members can only sit on the tribunal for a short period of time (for example 4 months or 20 cases whichever comes first. The penalties recommended by the tribunal must be ones that have been proven to a) deter behaviour b) rehabilitate dogs/owners, c) accurately determine when an animal is required to be euthanized with steps of severity that reflect the offender clearly outlined.
- Other: The tribunal MUST consist of dog Behavior specialists! ETHANIZATION is taken off the table as a solution! ALL dogs can be rehabilitated and owners can be trained and educated. Rehoming to a proper home is always an option.
- Other: The tribunal must exercise an appropriate level of fairness and accountability
- Other: The tribunal must have a significant portion of experts on animals.
- Other: The tribunal must have representation from the veterinarian community and reputable breeder of the dog involved.
- Other: the tribunal must include a dog trainer who is a qualified behaviour consultant, the tribunal must also include a veterinarian
- Other: The tribunal must include a recognized animal behaviouralist.
- Other: The tribunal must include members who are dog owners and there should be a mix of owner types (eg. Large breed, small breed)
- Other: The tribunal must not be biased in their decision making. Example believing certain breeds are more likely to attack. As well the owner of said dog must have access to their pet during its time in a shelter.
- Other: The tribunal needs to be comprised of people who actually have animal behavior training and knowledge!!! Not just people in suits making decisions with no experience!!
- Other: The tribunal needs to be educated on dog behaviour, training, rehab etc and not average citizens
- Other: the tribunal needs to be experienced dog handlers and/or owners.
- Other: The tribunal needs to be made of both certified canine behaviouralists & small animal/canine veterinarians that have proven to be unbiased. (i.e. an individual who has publicly spoken out against pit bull breeds calling them all dangerous).
- Other: The tribunal needs to include at least one individual who has a recognized certificate or designation in animal behaviour, for example through a veterinary program or CPDT knowledge AND skills assesses
- Other: The tribunal rules would apply to ALL BREEDS of dogs!!!
- Other: The tribunal shall include a canine advocate
- Other: The tribunal should consist of experts from multiole backgrounds, for example a panel of 3 people could be a bylaw officer, a dog training expert and a doctor. This would round out the panel



so bylaw knows the laws, the training expert can assess the chances of rehabilitation and a doctor to ensure the victims injuries are properly weighted in the decision.

- Other: The tribunal should have a vet or tech, lawyer and lay person present
- Other: The tribunal should have no authority to require euthanasia.
- Other: The tribunal should have non-city members that rotate cases. Non-city members should include trainers and vets who have the knowledge and experience needed to assess the dogs and owners.
- Other: The tribunal should include a veterinarian a animal bylaw officer and an advocate for animals/expert
- Other: The tribunal should ONLY be made up of animal health professionals
- Other: The tribunal should only be used to return dogs to their owners, a full investigation should be required to end a life.full
- Other: The tribunal stays impartial and is not biased based on breed
- Other: The tribunal team absolutely must include dog trainers who have a strong background in and knowledge of behaviour. There are too many "dog trainers" and "behaviour" experts in Calgary who do not have the knowledge to be calling themselves trainers, let alone be making these decisions.
- Other: The tribunal was made up of a fair panel, including experts in dog behaviour and training
- Other: The tribunal was made up of unbiased individuals who are not prejudice against breeds. This s
- Other: the tribunal was made up of veterinary, animal behaviour, and social services experts
- Other: The tribunal was made up of vets and knowledgeable animal advocates, not city employees.
- Other: The tribunal was made up of vets, dog behaviourist, trainers and people with extensive canine knowledge.
- Other: The tribunal would consist of a vet, a dog owner or two, they would be a vote on each situation
- Other: The tribunal would have to be based on dog experts and people trained to properly assess a dog's likelihood of serverly injuring someone again
- Other: The tribunal would have to be made of bipartisan members who do not have a history of labeling certain breeds (i.e bully breeds, German Shepards) as "bad breeds".
- Other: The tribunal would have to be made up of unbiased non dog and dog owners who are appointed. If it operates like condo boards based on self promoted volunteers then no this is not acceptable means to solve these issues.
- Other: The tribunal would have to be made up of unbiased of breed and situation.
- Other: The tribunal would have to have a significant increase in time that a dog is returned to an owner. I also think the tribunal should also consider if a dog would be better off in another situation rather than euthanize. I also think a vet should sit on the tribunal.
- Other: The tribunal would include educated people to make effective decisions based on the dog and owners. Such as veterinarians and/or experienced obedience trainers
- Other: The tribunal would include members that are actively involved in animal rescue.



- Other: The tribunal would need to be comprised of ACTUAL dog owners and those with borderline intelligence and integrity.
- Other: The tribunal would need to be made up of actual dog people who know and can assess the risk factors for dogs. Not some random [removed] pr [removed]
- Other: The tribunal would need to include at least two animal behaviour experts (e.g., people with the Certified Behaviour Consultant - Canine (CBCC) designation, veterinary behaviourist, or a professional in animal behaviour working in a humane society)
- Other: The tribunal would need to include people who have worked with animals in some capacity previously for me to feel comfortable with them making the decision on euthanization
- Other: The tribunal would only make sense if it contained most - if not all, experienced dog owners. Even better if they have experience with different dog breeds among the group. This way, they can objectively look at each scenario with some experience to back up their decisions.
- Other: The tribunal's decision is not binding and final... that the tribunal be subject to a legal review of procedural fairness in each case.
- Other: The tribunals members are trained in animal care in some way (vets, dog trainers, animal behaviour experts). This tribunal would be a waste of money and time if they did not have people who can value the life of an animal and see its whole situation. Just as we would want experts on how WE act and feel deciding for us.
- Other: The use of a tribunal instead of a court of law would need to be approved by both the dog owner and the bite victim prior to it being used.
- Other: The vast majority of staff for a tribunal should be vets or vet techs. They should be the one to assess the dogs. Let the politicians assess the human owners.
- Other: The veterinary medicine community should be included.
- Other: The victim and the accused have all the same rights and responsibilities as they would in provincial court, including a right to appeals.
- Other: The victim can be assured the dog will be put down if they so choose.
- Other: The wait times for court would be no longer than 8 weeks. If you have to wait 6 months to find out if you have to out your dog down, you might as well just let it live.
- Other: The whole comment is not showing up for me - this is an error on mobile
- Other: Their non-bias
- Other: their say
- Other: Ther dog does not get euthanized, unless reviewed by dog behaviorist, vet and dog trainer. Bad behaved dogs are just poorly trained.
- Other: There are a great number of so-called "experts" who are, in fact, rigid and letter-of-the-law in their thinking. For this to work, the tribunal would need to NOT be comprised of such "experts." Critical thinking, reasoning, logic and open-mindedness is paramount. If one is not well versed in canine behaviour, this won't end well. For anyone.
- Other: There are alot of homeless people out there, and the dogs can sense this and is making the dogs react. So many of the homeless are coming up to people in a way that could be considered aggressive because they are desperate to get some money from people.



- Other: There are at least two animal behaviour specialist as representatives.
- Other: There are dog behaviour experts present on the tribunal
- Other: There are members of the tribunal experienced with dogs of all breeds and animal advocacy.
- Other: There are no harsher sentences for different breeds
- Other: There are other dogs far more aggressive than pit bulls. Ever meet a jack russel terrier?
- Other: There are people on the board that can properly assess the situation because they understand animal behaviour. Someone needs to be there that is on the side of the dog since it cant defend itself.
- Other: There are people who are educated and up to date on the latest scientific research and methods of dog behaviour and training and are also experienced in these fields
- Other: There are requirements for veterinarians and dog behaviour experts on the tribunal
- Other: There are responsible dog owners, vets on the tribunal vs political crooks, bylaw services.
- Other: There are strongly defined guidelines for what the tribunal can and can't order to be done.
- Other: There are surprise checking for compliance with restrictions placed on the animal/owner
- Other: There are thorough background checks on everyone involved.
- Other: there are timelines & reasonable procedures put in place with resources provided to owners. NO breed singled out or judged harshly based on looks. tribunal are certified dog behaviourists with EXTENSIVE knowledge.
- Other: There are very little circumstances where the dog has to be put down.
- Other: There has to be a clear way to appeal the results
- Other: There is a dog training expert and a vet represented on the tribunal
- Other: There is a fair chance for the owners to make corrections and that all options are offered to support the owners. It has to be fair to the dogs and owners
- Other: There is a quick and sound way for appeal.
- Other: There is a review for the judgement granted by a judge
- Other: There is a way to fight the decision made after the fact in real court, power corrupts always, if some random unelected official took my dog I would want a way to have a day in court as well. Kind of makes the whole thing useless unless
- Other: There is an evaluation on the owner. A dog isn't aggressive on their own. It's based on their home life and proper training which is the owners fault not the dogs fault
- Other: There is an opportunity to appeal. lol
- Other: There is at least one animal behaviour specialist on the tribunal
- Other: There is biases.
- Other: There is forced training for the owner, moreso than the dog. Dogs arent bad by nature, it comes from poor pet owners.
- Other: There is no ban on pit bulls or the other breeds mentioned above.
- Other: There is no bias against pit bull type dogs. Each dog is different and has the ability to bite and cause serious harm
- Other: There is no bias against specific breed ie. pit bulls!



- Other: There is no bias and there would be an ability to review the outcome
- Other: There is no bias towards ANY breed of dog. Decisions should be made STRICTLY on behaviour.
- Other: There is no breed bias
- Other: There is no breed specific biases
- Other: There is no discrimination towards certain dog breeds as already displayed above.
- Other: There is no other option
- Other: There is no prejudice among breeds.
- Other: There is real proof that the dog didn't bite in self defense because of the victim harming the animal in any way.
- Other: There is still fair consideration given (ie. No shotgun decisions to euthanize)
- Other: There is zero breed bias as a deciding factor
- Other: There isn't some biased, dog hating [removed] wit that's the judge.
- Other: There must be a dog behaviourist on the tribunal
- Other: There must be at least one dog specialist, and one rescue organization member on every tribunal.
- Other: There must my MULTIPLE outlets determining if a dog is safe. Being thrown in a shelter after a high tension situation then tested is asking an animal to fail
- Other: There needs to be an appeal process
- Other: There needs to be more than one person with equal experience making a decision
- Other: There needs to be no bias in this system. Dogs that bite are often because of trauma, or because the person ignored warning signs that the dog was showing. Instead of euthanizing a scared dog, use restorative programs. There are many people that are trained to work with dogs from rough backgrounds. Euthanizing dogs because they reacted like an animal is ridiculous.
- Other: There needs to be significant effort to reduce bias towards "dangerous" dog breeds which are largely unfounded lies. The people on this tribunal should be carefully chosen so that dog breeds like pit bulls or german shepherds are not negatively impacted by biases.w
- Other: There needs to be trained animal behaviourists sitting on that tribunal. More than one preferably as they dont always agree. Laypersons with animal behaviour training are not qualified to make those decisions. Decisions to euthanize should never be made without an independant behavioural assessment. Not a simple tribunal vote
- Other: There should always be the ability to appeal every decision even if it's euthanization
- Other: There should be a dog behaviour specialist on the tribunal.
- Other: There should be a full investigation before ever euthanizing ANY thing. I do not believe in breed specific bans or infractions. I think all judgements should be based solely on the behaviour exhibited by the animal not what breed it is, a Chihuahua can do just as much damage as a pit pull if provoked. Breed specific banning is like saying let's incarcerate all black men because one black man committed a crime. This type of legislation is no better than systematic racism faced by people of colour. DO BETTER CALGARY!!!!!!
- Other: There should be a method of appeal



- Other: There should be absolutely no prejudice regarding dog breed.
- Other: There should be individuals trained in animal behaviour on the tribunal
- Other: There should be someone on the tribunal that has adequate dog behavior experience. Someone with qualifications/credentials that would be competent in assessing these incidents. It should not be comprised of random people with no knowledge of dog behavior.
- Other: There should be zero breed specific legislation
- Other: There was a way to regulate and keep the tribunal in check.
- Other: there was at least one dog behaviour professional on the tribunal.
- Other: There was fair assessment no matter the breed. I've worked in the vet industry for 8 years and have not had one bad incident involving a Pitbull or Pitbull like breed. I would say there are many other breeds out there that are more dangerous.
- Other: There was representation from trained animal behaviorists and vets to provide educated and unbiased direction. Also representatives are consulted from animal welfare and rescue organizations who can provide alternatives to euthanasia such as working dogs, rehoming and training for owner and pet.
- Other: There were a variety of representatives that were not biased against specific breeds of dog.
- Other: There were clear guidelines to which members of the tribunal would have to adhere to. It would need to remain as objective as possible and not target breeds of dogs rather the owners of dogs under tribunal.
- Other: There were dog behavioral experts as part of the tribunal
- Other: There were experts in animal behaviour involved in the decision
- Other: There were impartial dog experts as part of the group.
- Other: There were multiple persons involved in the tribunal and they were possibly voted in rather than government chosen.
- Other: There were people to come in and speak for the owner or against the owner. It's not the dog, it's the training the owner gives it. The owner needs to have training or the dog needs to have the option of being taken away and see if it can be changed
- Other: There were restrictions placed first before euthanized. It's not the dog's fault they were not trained and raised properly, give them a chance to fix their behaviour please.
- Other: There were veterinary and animal behaviour specialists involved throughout the whole process.
- Other: There will be NO breed bias
- Other: there would be a veterinary representative
- Other: There would have to be a commitment to impartial and fair rulings as well as an appeal process
- Other: There would have to be a fair system with professionals who are unbiased.
- Other: There would have to be a stringent selection process on who can be on the tribunal. For example, if the incident involved a pitbull-type breed, people who believe in BSL and other anti-pitbull measures would need to be excluded.
- Other: There would need to be people who are dog smart not politically directed people.



- Other: There would still be an aspect of liability to owners for mismanagement of the animal. The responsibility needs to be placed on the owner.
- Other: there's proof that those on the tribunal are not discriminatory against pitbulls and other large "aggressive" dogs
- Other: These dogs should not be euthanized. They should be given proper training why punish the dog when the owner is the issue?
- Other: These must be determined by non biased people. IE some people just dislike certain breeds, and this could sway their decision
- Other: These positions must be held by qualified dog behavior experts only.
- Other: They actually care about these dogs, and are not prejudiced to dog breeds such as the Pitbull-type. This whole bylaw review is extremely opinionated against an already targeted breed, shame on you Calgary.
- Other: They allow the dog to be mediated before euthanasia is even discussed.
- Other: They are a tribunal of TRAINED professionals who know that a specific breed is not dangerous, and with training and care, ANY dog can be saved.
- Other: They are aware certain breeds of dog are not likely to be more vicious. That is a myth
- Other: They are educated and non bias.
- Other: They are fair and not biased
- Other: They are members who do not have biases toward certain breeds.
- Other: They are non bias, educated people
- Other: They are not bias towards dog breeds and they don't rush through cases.
- Other: They are professionals in dog behaviour
- Other: They are taking in account what happened before and after. With witnesses under oath. TooMany people torment dogs of their neighbours till they react they need to be held accountable too
- Other: They are trained properly
- Other: They are unbiased in breed and every dog bite is released to the public not just bully types
- Other: They cannot be biased against specific breeds owners.
- Other: They cannot make the final decision on euthanizing.
- Other: They cannot rule to not euthanize any dogs. Dogs can be made to go to training school, or muzzled if ABSOLUTELY necessary. However. Euthanasia should not be an outcome.
- Other: They can't decide to euthanize a pet before trying everything else before hand
- Other: They could not make euthanization decisions without the support of two industry professionals (vet, dog trainer CPDTKA or higher) owner to pay for assessment
- Other: They court was canine educated, removing stigmas and bias. Misinformation is harmful, especially when a life is on the line.
- Other: They do not get to make the decision on euthanizing an animal.
- Other: They do not get to make the decision regarding euthanization
- Other: they do not have a bias against Pitbulls



- Other: They do not have a bias of a dog Soley on breed or apperance.
- Other: They do not have complete authority on euthanization - cannot order someone to put down their dog.
- Other: they do not have final say on euthanization
- Other: They do not have the power to euthanize any animal.
- Other: They do not have the power to euthanize dogs. A bad owner should not be a death sentence.
- Other: They dont discriminate against pitbulls or other dog types that have been deemed aggressive
- Other: They dont discriminated against breeds!!
- Other: They don't have the authority to make the final decision on if the dog is euthanized.
- Other: They don't have the power to euthanize an animal until that animal has gone though a behavior course
- Other: They explore rehabilitation options for less severe cases
- Other: They followed a no-kill philosophy and never endorsed euthanization.
- Other: They got all sides of the story not just the victim statement.
- Other: They have a dog behaviour background and show 0 signs of breed bias
- Other: They have a knowledge and understanding of dog behaviour or have a behaviouralist to consult
- Other: They have the same degree of knowledge and fairness when determining case outcomes.
- Other: they include animal behavior specialists and rehabilitation experts.
- Other: They investigate the human victim as much as the dog. As most circumstances that involve dog bites the human victim is at fault and the dog is just doing what is rational for a dog. I.e. victim attacks dogs owner dog bites victim, dog is not at fault.
- Other: They look into the history of the owner and see if any animal abuse is present
- Other: They looked at the owner and how the owner handles the dog. Were they trained to be vicious.
- Other: They make the efforts to make sure the owner is the right fit for this dog
- Other: They must have pets of their own to understand both the dog and the owners situation
- Other: They must take their job seriously and review each case with an understanding that each dog is someone's pet and it is loved. Bully breed or not.
- Other: They need to be completely objective. No connections to the victim.
- Other: They need to be unbiased in the situation. They need to look at the situation with no bias towards a certain breed
- Other: They need to be vetted and non biased agianst certain breeds
- Other: They need to be within the canine professions. Preferably educated within canine behaviour and rehabilitation.
- Other: They need to not have a bias towards pit breeds. If so, these poor babies will be uthanized because of someone's preference. It needs to be judged fairly.
- Other: They remain non biases against breeds.



- Other: They review all facts and do not have a bias based on breed, consider human roles in situation as most times the underlying cause is human related and not the dog's fault, consider non-lethal solutions first
- Other: They should be able to assess if an animal should be euthanized, but they SHOULD NOT be able to enforce the euthanization.
- Other: They should be mandated to keep dog in quarantine until ruling made.
- Other: they should not be able to euthanize a dog without a second opinion from a professional
- Other: They should not have the right to declare euthanization
- Other: They stay completely third party non-biased on ruling. They don't take biases against pit bulls.
- Other: They take the owners and victims' statements and hear both sides. Treat it almost like a court case.
- Other: They treated all breeds evenly.
- Other: They try to rehabilitate dogs first.
- Other: They understand the situation that actually happened with the breed notwithstanding. If a black person robs a store or hurts someone, are they processed differently than a white person?
- Other: They were fair and have been looked into to make sure they don't portray any breed-specific bias option.
- Other: They weren't allowed to be biased against certain breeds, such as pit bulls!
- Other: They will not exhibit/partake in breed bias, i.e. victimize pit bull breeds.
- Other: They would have to seriously consider the impact of the offence not only on the dog but also on the owner. If the offence led to euthanizing this animal instead of utilizing obedience training facilities I think it is completely uncalled for. You can't insist someone with addiction go seek help at a rehabilitation center instead of suggesting they die, so why wouldn't you allow an animal to seek help and change their ways instead as well.
- Other: They would need to be unbiased toward dog breed
- Other: They would need to have dog behaviour credentials or their opinions would be merely subjective
- Other: They would not be able to assess whether or not a dog should be euthanized
- Other: They're completely impartial and do not have any biases against any specific breed.
- Other: They're qualified individuals (e.g. certified trainers)
- Other: This
- Other: This answer cuts off so I honestly don't know what it says at the end...?
- Other: This applies to all nuisance dogs, not just pit bulls. I live in an apt building full of poodles who are very well behaved
- Other: This cannot be breed specific. I am so tired of hearing about pit bulls and similar breeds being labelled!



- Other: This cannot turn into a group of people who are against the breed. This should be made up of people who are well educated in the manner of the animal (like rescue groups). If you have a panel where no one speaks for the dogs that's not a fair trial.
- Other: This could work but could easily be biased by the breed of the dog.
- Other: This is beneficial if said tribunal is qualified, board certified veterinary behaviour. And only cognitive and scientific evidence based behaviour methods implemented. This can be used across the board for all breeds and should never be breed specific. It is also much too vague to base this on pit bull looking dogs, there are so many things wrong with this approach considering one lab breeder has pure labs that look more pit bull like. Basing behaviour on look and bite pressure solely on a breed does nothing to help. So to assume a pit bull breed will or could do severe damage should not be based on guesswork or because some people just simply don't like them. There are so many high drive breeds that kill other pets in the home, I can not tell you how many boarder collies, kelpies and heelers have been put down or rehomed for biting. Or in those cases nipping like they were bred for. Or, to think small dogs do not do as much damage consider the Pomeranian that was surrendered because it caused so much damage to its owner they required over 300 stiches from bite marks all over.
- Other: This is disgusting !! Bsl support. This is what is wrong with the world !
- Other: This is not based on a single person's option and a professional dog behaviorist assesses the dog
- Other: This needs to be clear and specific
- Other: This one
- Other: This process would be completed in a certain period of time and the dog could potentially stay with the owner rather than the shelter.
- Other: This process would need to have some legal clout. I would want to know that the orders would be followed by the owner and the city would have the ability to enforce it. If i were the victim I would also want to know the owner would be responsible for any damages caused by thier animal.
- Other: This seems like a waste of money, put the dog down
- Other: This should be net neutral In terms of employees and budget
- Other: This would apply to dogs of all sizes, not just Pitbulls. And all dog bites would be treated the same regardless of the the strength that one bread can have compared to another.
- Other: This would give the owner and others a method to be heard.
- Other: Those appointed should not have breed bias as this survey somewhat suggests. In order to have an unbiased outcome which is fair.
- Other: Those appointed to make the decision were well educated in dog behaviour and the bite severity scale.
- Other: Those assessing the dogs temperament and disposition must be qualified outside of the city's system to make determinations
- Other: Those making decisions have formal and recognized education in dog behaviour and are not bias based on breed



- Other: Those making the decision regarding whether or not dogs should be euthanized or placing restrictions on owners should have an official background in dog training and behaviour and veterinary professionals should be consulted
- Other: Those on the tribunal are educated in current animal behaviour research
- Other: those on the tribunal are found to be with no conflict of interest
- Other: Those on the tribunal cannot have bias opinions on specific breeds or regulations that they believe should be in place
- Other: Those on the tribunal have extensive experience and qualifications in dog behaviour and assessments
- Other: Those on the tribunal have shown no bias towards/against any particular breed of dog, and have expertise in dog behavior and rehabilitation.
- Other: Those sitting on the tribunal have experience with training and/handling dogs. Demonstrate knowledge regarding canine behaviour.
- Other: Those sitting on the tribunal have some expertise in dog behaviour.
- Other: Those who are on then tribunal are qualified animal behaviouralists and individuals without preexisting bias towards specific breeds
- Other: Those who make up the tribunal have a canine training/ public safety and legal background. Dog trainers must be included.
- Other: Tribunal to be made up of non-biased people and NO Breed specific legislation.
- Other: time.
- Other: Timely and fair justice for owner and victim
- Other: To faster process the cases
- Other: To have the dog stay at home with the owner, not in a shelter.
- Other: To have those included in decisions have experience/knowledge in animal related fares
- Other: To not euthanize if dogs aren't viscous. Do not torture or bug the animal during an obedience test and provide video proof of the obedience test to the owner, lawyer and judge.
- Other: to place responsibility where it belongs, owner must demonstrate mental and physical ability to be the right person for the dog, not just the recognized "owner" of the dog
- Other: To put an animal down should be last resort. Other options such as obedience and muzzles should be explored first.
- Other: To remain unbiased, do not specify the breed of dog.
- Other: Took into consideration vets and trainers opinions
- Other: Trained in understanding dog behaviour
- Other: Training courses
- Other: Training is offered and required for an amount of time before any consideration of euthanasia
- Other: Training rather than euthanized if possible
- Other: Training required for all tribunal members
- Other: Training, training, training and having at least 2 individuals who have experience and credential in dog behaviour experience assessing the dog in calm (non caged) environment.



- Other: Training, training, training. If you just go around euthanizing dogs your going to have a bigger problem on your hands than dog bites.euthanize as a last resort, start a volunteer program, reach out to local dog trainers for assistance etc etc.
- Other: transparency on what cost a tribunal would mean for tax payers
- Other: Treat each dog on it's own behaviour and not on the breed.
- Other: Treated dog fairly and put more responsibility on the owner for training. Don't blame a dog for a bad owner, make the owner better so they can improve the current dog and hopefully any dogs they own in the future.
- Other: Treats all breeds of dogs fair, everybody involved should be required to have experience with animals to avoid people who are just there for the pay cheque, for example requiring volunteer hours at a shelter before a position can be offered.
- Other: Tribunal must be *very* knowledgeable about individual dog breeds, behavior and working knowledge of rehabilitation options.
- Other: Tribunal cannot euthanize a dog. This would have to be recommended and then taken up with the courts.
- Other: Tribunal cannot order euthanization, that would have to go to Court of Queens Bench
- Other: Tribunal consisted of dog trainers, groomers and other licensed dog related professionals.
- Other: Tribunal consists of several dog owners/experts and not only bylaw.
- Other: Tribunal consists of well educated experts with no bias.
- Other: Tribunal council is elected by tax payers
- Other: Tribunal decision could be appealed through the courts.
- Other: Tribunal decision is not final, owner has right to appeal decision
- Other: Tribunal does not have authority to euthanize, only to place restrictions on proven aggressive dogs.
- Other: Tribunal employees are highly educated in canine behavior and control of dominant breeds including Pits, German Shepards, Rotties, Huskies...
- Other: Tribunal has a combination of vets, animal behaviourist, and citizens
- Other: Tribunal has to be dog owners, not people who hate dogs for no reason
- Other: Tribunal includes a minimum number of pet owners
- Other: Tribunal includes vets and behavioral specailist
- Other: Tribunal is impartial and fair.
- Other: Tribunal is made up of dog owners who can demonstrate they have knowledge in training and experience with multiple dogs.
- Other: Tribunal is not mandatory and court option available to dog owner; decision of tribunal can be challenged in court process
- Other: Tribunal is vetted. I want to know how a tribunal is decided upon. Would there be some dog positive advocate as well?
- Other: Tribunal made up of certified animal behavioural professionals only and appeal is possible
- Other: Tribunal made up of vets who can make this determination not a by law officer



- Other: Tribunal member must be qualified animal handlers (ie trainers, animal behaviourists and veterinarians, etc). Perhaps members of the various pet charities in the city (AARCS, Meow Foundation, ARF)
- Other: Tribunal members are as free from bias as possible (including bias against specific breeds like pitbull-types)
- Other: Tribunal members are impartial and show no bias based on dog breed
- Other: Tribunal members are properly educated in animal behaviour, and have experience dealing with animals in the past
- Other: Tribunal members are properly educated in dog behaviour to ensure no bias towards certain breeds
- Other: Tribunal members are qualified to assess the animals risk level (behavioralists, vets, trainers)
- Other: Tribunal members cannot be against a specific breed, they must base decisions on THE FACTS in the individual case
- Other: tribunal members have appropriate qualifications (e.g. veterinarians, animal behaviour experts)
- Other: Tribunal members have education/experience in animal behavior and the appropriate knowledge in order to make fair and well-informed decisions.
- Other: Tribunal members include animal care personnel eg vets, spca etc
- Other: Tribunal members include someone who is familiar with dog behavior such as a trainer, veterinarian. Not just bureaucrats with an agenda.
- Other: Tribunal members must be educated about the risk of recurrence and animal behaviour.
- Other: Tribunal members must be screened prior to being allowed to act on the tribunal for bias against certain breeds of dogs. Failure to do so would be unethical and put far more innocent animals at risk for euthanasia than it would protect other animals and Calgary citizens from nuisance animals.
- Other: Tribunal members must be volunteer only. No pay.
- Other: Tribunal members must include reputable experienced dog trainers
- Other: Tribunal members should be comprised of veterinary experts, as well as dog and non dog owners.
- Other: Tribunal members should be unbiased in their decisions and it should be more restrictions on offending pet owners rather than the animals.
- Other: Tribunal members were people already familiar with appropriate laws. Also, includes a bully breed expert
- Other: Tribunal members would need to include recognized canine behaviour experts (not necessarily veterinarians).
- Other: Tribunal members would require extensive training and have wide knowledge about dogs. Review of tribunal memo or process in which biases could be addressed
- Other: Tribunal monitored so if any concerns with outcomes or a personal on tribunal being biased it can be revisited.
- Other: Tribunal must be have recognized credentials in dog training and rehabilitation



- Other: Tribunal must be unbiased towards specific breeds
- Other: Tribunal must have a full time professional dog behaviourist employed to provide their feedback on each case.
- Other: Tribunal must have simple paperwork, be totally digital, and it must provide written reasons. At least one member of every panel must have formal animal training (vet, vet tech, VMA, behaviourist etc)
- Other: Tribunal must include subject matter expert I.e. animal welfare specialist
- Other: Tribunal needs to be made up of experts in the field
- Other: Tribunal needs to be unbiased and not include members of spca and other animal activist organizations. Should include Calgary or Canadian kennel club members , vetrinarian and othersnel club members
- Other: Tribunal presence by the Humane Society.
- Other: tribunal representatives need expertise and experience or training with dog behaviour and familiarity with bylaw
- Other: Tribunal reps would be Knowledgable dog people: breeders of 20 years, trainers of 20 years, veterinarians of 20 years.
- Other: tribunal reviews should not exceed 10 days to come to a decision
- Other: Tribunal should be efficient and inexpensive - preferably as a means to lead disputes to successful resolution outside of the courts
- Other: Tribunal should have an interaction with the dog before making a decision. They shouldn't make a decision just by the breed of the dog
- Other: Tribunal should not be allowed to decide the animal must be euthanized, if that is their decision, it should be moved into the court system to be approved before the animal is euthanized.
- Other: Tribunal should not have the final decision making power regarding euthanasion.
- Other: Tribunal similar to jury, ask random members of the community for a decision
- Other: Tribunal to be made up of people of varied backgrounds and experience with pets/dogs.
- Other: Tribunal was comprised of a group of non prejudiced people
- Other: Tribunal was made up of staff from rescue/SPCA animal trainers ONLY.
- Other: Tribunal would have include at least one trained dog professional such as a certified dog trainer, dog behaviorist, veterinarian etc.
- Other: Tribunal would have to had people educated in dog behavior, rescue, etc
- Other: Tribunal would include someone specializing in canine behaviour
- Other: Tribunals may only decide that euthenasia is necessary if the dog is unable to go through proper training.
- Other: Tribunals should include non-City representatives that are trained to work with animals (e.g., veterinarians).
- Other: Tribunals should NOT have the authority to issue euthanization orders
- Other: Tribunals should not have the power to euthanize dogs



- Other: Try and alternative training BEFORE KILLING ANIMALS AND RIPPING THEM AWAY FROM THEIR HOMES
- Other: Try every other possibility before even suggesting putting the dog down.
- Other: Unbias especially against certain breeds. The dogs breed SHOULD NOT be a deciding factor. Just because a dog is small does not mean the incident should be treated any differently.
- Other: Unbias towards the breed of dog
- Other: Unbias tribunal, no prejudgement in breeds
- Other: Unbiased
- Other: Unbiased as far as the breed goes. Neglect and poor ownership lead to bites, not breeds.
- Other: Unbiased decision against the dogs breed, find out what led to said events, note if its a first offence etc
- Other: Unbiased dog experts involvement in tribunal
- Other: Unbiased groups- volunteers/members should not be permitted to address cases from their own neighborhood. Members should be non biased to dog breed and should be limited to outside opinion.
- Other: Un-biased judgement toward pittbull breeds
- Other: Unbiased opinions (unbiased on breeds) and only require training or new owners if current owners cannot do the training
- Other: Unbiased opinions first. The breed is never to be mentioned. Again holder dog owners responsible. Even small breed dogs must go through this process!
- Other: Unbiased people on the panel that included behavior specialists. Dogs should be given the chance for obedience training.
- Other: Unbiased people on the tribunal.
- Other: Unbiased people sitting on this tribunal, who have gone through an intense vetting process.
- Other: Unbiased representatives focused on rehabilitation of dogs
- Other: Unbiased to dig brief
- Other: Unbiased tribunal
- Other: Unbiased tribunal. Takes into account all factors of the situation (I.e what caused dogs behaviour) take into account dogs history
- Other: unbiased!!!! And cannot be anti-breed specific!
- Other: unbiased, animal behavior and health experts who can assess the situation effectively, not just put labels on dogs based on a situation that may not have even been the dogs fault. Many times dogs are pushed to their limits by irresponsible people, the dog should not be punished for this.
- Other: unbiased, only recommends death when case is very severe, allows pet to stay with owner until vase heard
- Other: Unbiased/objective attitudes towards breeds and the recognition that some dogs may be able to be trained/rehabilitated



- Other: Unless the dog has had multiple offences prior, the dog should be allowed to stay with the owner with conditions (eg. muzzled when going for walks, no off leash dog parks, dog supervised even if in backyard) UNTIL the court is dealt with.
- Other: Useless bureaucracy.
- Other: Usually there is reason why the dog attack so there should be an investigation into why then attack whether its medical or situational.
- Other: V
- Other: Variety of people on panel, chance to explain, first offense warning
- Other: Verdict includes euthanasia ONLY when the dog has been involved in multiple severe attacks and decision is purely made from proofs
- Other: Verified dog trainers who would sit on the tribunal and see if the OWNER can be trained to handle their dog.
- Other: Very clear rules/regulations and training for tribunal members.
- Other: vetted and certified representatives from all or as many dog sport and dog training facilities involved.
- Other: veterinarians and dog trainers are among the representatives
- Other: Veterinarians to be on the community
- Other: Veterinary and animal behaviour experts included on the tribunal committee
- Other: Veterinary and pet behaviour experts on the tribunal
- Other: veterinary behaviourist evaluation
- Other: Veterinary or vet behavior officials are apart of these discussions
- Other: Veterinary professionals are called to oversee each case
- Other: Vets and dog trainers are on the tribunal
- Other: Vets and trainers are part of the tribunal
- Other: Vicious dog declarations be viewed and assessed in a contextual manner, I.e. the situation. A lot of times the owner can prevent severe bite or nuisance situations by proper training and care.
- Other: Victims who felt the need for criminal charges to be laid would still have the option.
- Other: Visitation and not a shelter
- Other: Was composed of a mix of experts on animal behavior. And the tribunal did not have authority to demand euthanasia
- Other: Was conducted by an independent panel knowledgeable about dog behaviour
- Other: Was fair to both parties and decisions were upheld.
- Other: Was not biased on breed and did what would be best for the well being of said animal
- Other: Was made up including members of the law, veterinary, and animal behaviouralists.
- Other: Was not biased on breed
- Other: Was not biased towards bully breeds
- Other: Was on a case by case basis for punishment/rehabilitation. Involved the pet's veterinarian as an authoritative and professional witness to the dog's past behaviour, owner's care and level of attentiveness. As well as using the vet to suggest alternative corrective measures.



- Other: Was regularly monitored to ensure those serving are not discriminatory against certain breeds.
- Other: Was reviewed VERY thoroughly, as a dog shouldn't get euthanized over a bite.
- Other: Wasn't bias against certain dog breeds (e.g., pit bulls)
- Other: We do not euthanize dogs. There are no bad dogs, only bad dog owners.
- Other: We need to have representatives that are experienced with dog behaviour, and understand that rehabilitation and behaviour training are ideal options.
- Other: We shouldn't punish the dog for the owners fault. This is plain cruelty
- Other: We stop judging a dog on its breed and start looking at the owners
- Other: We would need an animal rights person(s) on this group as well. To avoid prior judgement.
- Other: Weighing fairness in the situation and putting blame on the owners of the animal, not on the animal itself.
- Other: What are the qualifications of people in the tribunal? What measures would be in place to ensure they have all parties' interests in mind and are not biases in one direction?
- Other: What is best for the dog not the owner or person attacked
- Other: what would the make up of the group be? related education, experience, ability to be objective, not make decisions based on personal feelings, need strong mandate for the group
- Other: When child abusers are euthanized before dogs.
- Other: When determining to euthanize an animal, consult with behavioural experts first.
- Other: When owner fails to control the dog and breach the bylaws and dog is involved in attack outside owners premises
- Other: Who appoints the tribunal? Will there be specific investigative procedures exploring options and stories from all parties?
- Other: Who sits the tribunal, and what qualifications do they have? Who decides who is on the tribunal and what qualifications do THEY have?
- Other: Who would sit on the tribunal? How many people would sit on the tribunal? Would they be dog behaviour specialists or simply law enforcement/legal representation? Unless you have several qualified people on the tribunal, it would risk being biased.
- Other: Who you would assign as members of the tribunal. City representatives are NOT animal experts.
- Other: Whoever asses the dog needs to be a team of professional trainers with tons of experience and completely non bias opinions. If the calgary representatives don't like pitbull type dogs, you are setting the dogs and the owners up for failure. Euthanization should be the absolute last resort
- Other: whoever the complaint is is that they be looked into the background to make sure that they're not just doing this because they don't like animals and how many times they've reported animals in the past. Plus I will give the owner and the dog an option to move from the city and also enrol in a behavioural program for the dog.
- Other: Whole and complete view of dog and owners life. Assessing situation and conditions of living, training, exercise etc. Before any conclusions and consequences are made.



- Other: Whomever is deciding if euthanizing is warranted is educated in dog behaviour and veterinary medicine
- Other: Why the dog reacted in such a severe way. Eg: a child hit it multiple times and it snapped. Child is at fault.
- Other: With a veterinarian, trainer, rescue staff, etc. to make sure the process is fair. Dogs should be innocent until proven guilty.
- Other: Worked on rehabilitating bad owners instead of punishing the dog
- Other: Would have dog friendly people on the board. No breed discriminating people.
- Other: Would want to know and understand rules they are adhering to and the boards background knowledge
- Other: [Removed] is with question number three. Pit bulls are no worse than any other dogs and do not need to be singled out. This is [removed].
- Other: X
- Other: Xx
- Other: Yes
- Other: Yes if followed
- Other: Yes the tribunal should be able to place restrictions that the owner must abide by until the case can be processed in court. However I don't think the tribunal should be able to determine if the animal should be euthanized.
- Other: Yes.
- Other: You are looking at the owners fit are to own a dog
- Other: You can not base this by breed. Anyone who shames or singles out pit bulls should be ashamed of themselves.
- Other: You can't decide if it should live or die, only fine, seize, and rehabilitate. Once deemed safely trained it could be adopted.
- Other: You can't euthanize dogs for living. If a dog is violent, and an owner is unable to provide the dog with the proper training to prevent it from being a danger to others, then you can provide a separate solution where the dog is transitioned to someone else's care. If a person is violent, you don't just murder them. They go through rehabilitation to help them. Killing animals should not be your solution to violence. They don't know any better.
- Other: You don't ban pit bulls or put them on the top of your list as they are bread to be nanny dogs!



- Other: You don't place biased people in charge of making decisions.
- Other: You don't go after "bully" breeds only and you take the people and hold them responsible for the dog attacks.
- Other: You have a fair basis of people who aren't biased towards certain breeds. As you guys are being biased towards pit bulls in this survey.
- Other: You have someone on the tribunal that is a dog training experts that are experts in aggression. This is critical as dog behavior is different for every dog and the route of aggression should be analyzed by dog training EXPERTS in aggressive dogs
- Other: You hear both sides of the attack, many times it is people that are fault if they hit a dog or tease it. People do get bit because of their actions. It seems like you have already chosen to hate Pit Bulls I am not so sure a tribunal would be open for discussion if there was a problem that involved a pit bull.
- Other: You need to have a legitimate dog trainer on hand to assess each case as it comes. You can not punish any animal for their owner's actions or inactions.
- Other: You need to understand the situation. Any dog can bite.
- Other: You prosecute the owner more severely than the dog. Dogs are what people make them. Nasty people who are terrible owners have multiple dogs but there's zero repercussions for people. Fines are not enough.
- Other: You provide more training to owners not more consequences
- Other: You remove euthanization as an option.
- Other: You take into account the whole series of events. Sometimes dogs attack other dogs because they got scared not because they're malicious
- Other: You use a non biased certified dog specialist
- Other: Zero euthanizing
- as long as it included individuals with professional knowledge of dogs (ie. Vets, animal protection etc) not just city councilors or members of the general public
- It didn't discriminate a dogs breed. Especially without taking the owners history/behaviour into account
- Increased fines for breach of conditions. Three strikes rule.
- Actual dog behaviourists are apart of the tribunal. Not just comprised of a bunch of Karen's clutching their pearl necklace in horror and making impulsive decisions without considering dog behaviour.
- There should be a veterinarian or other behaviour specialist included in the representatives that are making the decisions
- Didn't discriminate against a specific breed.
- No discrimination based on breed.
- A canine behaviour specialist is a part of the tribunal. And euthanasia is considered a last resort.
- a tribunal should include experts - i.e. veterinarians, animal behavioral specialists, animal protection service experts
- Qualified, educated, independent individuals would be appointed, hired.



- Having an unbiased and nonjudgmental stand point.
- Must be more cost-effective than court
- Dogs should not be euthanized due to the lack of training provided by owner. Dog should be properly trained by a professional before returning to owner.
- These cases need to be closely looked at, dogs can bite simply because they feel threatened, not necessarily because they are not otherwise well behaved. Euthanizing a dog for an isolated incident is wrong
- A decision to euthanize must be reviewed by the court given that the tribunal would essentially have to have court assigned powers wherein it effectively amounts to seizure and destruction of property
- It would have to be people that are actually knowledgeable in dog breeds, temperament and behaviour.
- depending on circumstance, if someone is intruding into my property and my dog is protecting that is ok
- As long as it worked to hold owners accountable rather than punish dogs
- That the dog's safety is paramount, this entire survey reads like you're endangering and harming and blaming pets.
- Tribunal members have varying points of view and decide without bias.
- Civilian members of the tribunal are trained veterinarians and or some other trained animal specialist
- There must be an appeal system. This is too easily corrupted.
- Cases are fairly and without bias reviewed and not targeting a specific breed of dog, rather, looking at situations as a whole and determining if there was some sort of a danger as a result of negligent owners that resulted in poor training of a dog. Breeds should not be deemed a nuisance, rather situations should be determined as potentially dangerous or not.
- obedience training or reform should always be looked at first, initially before an incident happens but if one occurs the owners should be forced to put their pet through more training, rather than fines and a deceased pet
- honesty
- The process was agreed upon by both parties
- They look at the dog owner and the victim. Is dog poorly trained? Easy dog being teased, taunted or abused by victim. Decision must not be because of breed
- As long as it didn't cost more taxpayers money.
- As long as the breed isn't mentioned in the incident reports and only refers to the "animal in question" to achieve impartial and unbiased resolution.
- An animal should not be euthanized for vicious actions, like mentioned before, the dog should go through rehabilitation and training seeing as the dogs behaviours is a result of the owners care, it's largely the owners fault if they are vicious. You don't kill a human for doing something wrong to someone else, you allow them to go through a rehabilitation process, so, if the dogs behaviours is a result of the owners training so why should the dog be punished for the owners negligence?
- Tribunal should not be influenced by the breed. Cases should be adjudicated based on previous behaviour of the animal and it's owner(s).



- as long as the person is proven to not have any bias and has background experience in dog training and/or psychology
- No harm comes to the dog and that worst case scenario the dog/owner are required to attend extensive training in order to prevent reoccurrence
- Decisions are not breed-based, or innocent animals punished for owners' poor behaviour.
- Review of the dog owner - their home and the way they treat their animals
- If the tribunal was made up of independent dog behavior specialists and trainers.
- There will be no breed bias and the circumstances surrounding the bite AS WELL AS what the dog had been exposed to earlier in the day is taken into consideration by the tribunal that is comprised of various individuals that are well versed in canine behavior and psychology
- Dogs are not needlessly being euthanized!!! They need rehabilitation and training after being removed from a household that likely abused and neglected them, Just the same as kids and adults those with behavioural issues or drug/alcohol misuse disorders stems from trauma
- Euthanization is NOT the first option considered when reviewing dogs
- It is handled in a timely manner and the pet owner is allowed to spend time with the pet
- The dog stays with the owner and is required to not leave the premise.
- Have representatives from various sources including animal rescues/shelters on the board so there is an overall big picture thought process
- Look at whether the animal was aggravated to bite by someone.
- As long as the tribunal is not a round about way of putting an end to an animal's life prior to its owner receiving the right to fight for it in court. I would approve of tribunals as a way to reduce wait times only and reduce the trauma to both dog and owner at being separated. The system should not work to punish anyone as punishment does not repair any damage caused and only perpetuates more suffering.
- The representatives are educated in the field of dog behaviour and management
- That they do not automatically assume the pitbull is at fault.
- Euthanasia isn't the primary decision from the courts
- The owners are not allowed to own any more animals and are investigated for animal cruelty
- Provided counsel provided for the animal - similar to a children's guardian in family law proceedings
- as long as they could be appealed
- education is given to member, the public, and owners on balanced management strategies for reactive dogs on the first offense.
- I would support the tribunal if there is follow through.
- Euthanization should not be result of dog that just need more work or poor ownership/upbringing. Assessments should have ZERO to do with breeds and 100% be focused on temperament and environment! Aka- did the dog they bit initially show warning signs that it displayed but were then ignored by the other dog or person which then resulted in a bite!
- Euthenizing cannot be a common resolve. There is no bad dogs, only bad owners...and would they take into account that the bite victim could be sticking fingers through private property fencing or surprise or egg on the dog to bite.



- Have dog educated people on the tribunal. Not people with no clue about dogs, dog sports and ownership.
- the human is punished; the dog kept alive
- Euthanasia shouldn't be an option.
- nuscene dogs not specifically pitbulls and the owners should be held more accountable
- judge all dogs, case by case. No bias to pitbull breeds
- Assessed each animal on a case by case basis. If the dog was provoked into attacking or if it is protecting its home, it should not be euthanized. Case by case assessments are essential without prejudice towards any breed.
- The owner is present and takes responsibility for the behaviour of the dog and how it got to be that way. Remedial work and restrictions on owning future dogs.
- They were fair and unbiased to the dogs breed and take into consideration the history of the animal. Example: first offence, was the incident provoked.
- Dogs who have bitten should not be punished let alone murdered simply because they acted out of instinct. Rather, a rehabilitation system should be put in place and a tribunal should be held decided if the rehabilitated dog should be let back into the possession of the previous owner. I'd rather pay more taxes for you guys to pay for proper rehabilitation than pay less cause you guys are cheap and would rather murder innocent animals.
- Owner has to take dog obedience course
- That there is a review on the owner to determine if their actions created an aggressive dog and punishment for the owner
- As they consider the owner and their training.
- Needs to be professionals- vets and behavioralists only
- that the tribunal was fair and that appeals were easily available
- Orders to euthanize dogs should be off the table as much as possible.
- Unbiased opinions with professional trainer included - NOT JUST VETS AND CITY WORKERS
- Influence from animal behaviour specialists must be considered.
- euthanization is not an option
- Stop killing dogs. Force the owners to hire a dog trainer instead, or donate it to someone who cares.
- No reason
- Dogs are judges on their level of nuisance or aggression. NOT because they are of a particular breed.
- Unbiased panel of 5 or more. Not taking influence from neighbours or families of either the victim side or dog owner side.
- This may speed up the wait times.
- Veterinary medical professional or an animal behaviorist is part of the panel for a decision of the animals status
- As long as the representatives have had animal behaviour training, such as vets or vet techs or animal trainers



- VERY CLEARLY identify if the victim instigated the dog. Citizens of Alberta have a duty to educate themselves on the behaviour of animals just as much as pet owners have a responsibility to train their pets properly. Dogs and pets should not be punished for being instigated to bite, or for protecting their homes/owners.
- It was fair, non-biased and consisted only of animal advocates.
- Adequate proof Must be made before any tribunal can be made. Just because victim says the dog but them but doesn't provide proof there should be tribunal until that proof is made. Photos of the dog is not sufficient in saying the dog but them.
- Dogs are given a fair chance at rehabilitation. And are not separated from the own unless the owner is deemed unfit to own a dog.
- Both sides of the story were known, rather than only victims side.
- Not cost a lot
- Includes dog experts
- Are dog behaviour experts going to be on the tribunal?
- not biased based on breed. Signaling out breeds is not the issue. Pitbull are not a "bad" breed. The owner is the owner
- All members would be certified dog trainers or experienced in canine psychology.
- The tribunal workers have to actually care about animals and understand why animals do the things that they do. Most dog attacks are provoked by humans who are disrespectful of a dogs personal space, boundaries, or by being stupid like running at the dog or causing it stress. People are stupid not dogs.
- Breed is not a factor, just the seriousness of the offence and the owner should have to take their dog to a reactive training class/ program before euthanasia is a consideration.
- The Tribunal included experts in dog behavior
- It did not unfairly target any breed, including "pit bulls"
- I did
- It doesn't vilify certain breeds
- it is optional, owner's choice
- No Euthanizing dogs.
- The tribunal is education on animal reform and are not biased. Euthaniza should always be the last option.
- The decision to euthanize a dog should not be made quickly. Restrictions placed so the animal can get out of the shelter faster is a great idea
- The tribunal consists of dog experts and trainers to determine if the dog can be rehabilitated. As well that the tribunal takes into account what lead up to the incident. The weakest point in this bylaw is people and their actions, that includes the victim and dog owner.
- It is a specialized group of educated individuals who are knowledgeable about dog behaviour and training. For example, people that would know that German Shepherd has a stronger bite strength than PitBulls but for some reason are not mentioned in this survey.
- Tribunal includes knowledgeable professionals in veterinary science and dog behaviour



- It allows all parties to provide information, facts and an opportunity to resolve and properly address the issue before making a definitive decision.
- Owners retain the right to appeal tribunal decisions in provincial court.
- reputable breeder input and /or assesment
- Can show panel is unbiased and pragmatic. Processes are transparent and inclusive.
- with no option for euthanasia.
- have a dog go through training before assessing for euthanization
- Tribunal Members must remain unbiased and have no conflict of interest in the case. Tribunal should not have decisions on whether to euthanize. Taking a life should be reserved for the courts.
- a dog behavior expert was on the panel and no animal should ever lose their life over this
- Rather than euthinization, obedience training as an alternative.
- As long as you actually apprehend and asses any vicious dog. The city did nothing to apprehend or asses the neighbour dog(s) that killed my puppy.
- tribunal to include knowledgeable animal advocate
- The people judging the dog need to actually be professionally trained in dealing with dogs. Ie: vets, trainers, kennel attendants.
- The results penalized the owner and not the dog. The dog has become a nuisance because it has not been properly cared for and trained. If you euthanize thier dog, they will go out and get another and have the same problem. We must focus on the owner not the animal.
- There were veterinarians and animal behaviour specialists on the tribunal
- Dog obedience training and facilities that could work with the owner to improve dog behaviour.
- Select, diverse group of unbiased people on the panel with real experience with animal behavior
- Yeah...let's make people on this panel appropriately educated and experts in the correct fields. This has great potential for abuse and misuse by the wrong people being on the tribunal
- euthanization is NOT an option
- A mix of pitbull owners and other dog owners not regarded under the "pitbull" category.
- Animal advocates (eg. humane society) and dog professionals who have education in animal psychology and training certification involved
- Tribunal made up of professionals within the dog care and law professions only.
- Dogs should never be euthanized, in most cases it's behavior comes from the OWNER, NOT the dog. Behavioral rehabilitation for dogs can do wonders, and being placed with a proper loving family can change a dog's personality. No dog deserves to be euthanized.
- Don't be breed specific with pitbulls; their bits is not stronger than other dogs. More research is needed before any of this gets put in place. Also need to look into how much training the owner has put into the dog.
- Representatives do not support breed-specific legislation to reduce breed bias in euthanization determinations, and the tribunals must occur quickly (within a few days) so the animal is not traumatized.



- Tribunal should not have the power to euthanize, only to recommend to euthanize
- Looking at the owner as usually how a dog acts is due to how the owner is.
- Vicious dog declaration and decision leading to euthanasia should not be an option available to bylaw officers. Removal of the dog from the questionable owner should be a first step followed by attempt to rehome animal with better suited people.
- There can not be any type of bias towards specific dogs. And it should be more of a judgement of the owner not the dog. Bad dogs are raised by bad people.
- The dog gets a second chance with a trainer.
- errs on the side of not euthanizing the dog whenever possible and offers offending owners options for some training and dog handling classes
- The owner has strict restrictions to keep the dog, training be mandatory.
- Option for owner to appeal tribunal decisions to a court system.
- It was made up solely of professionals such as vets and dog trainers. It guaranteed less time in a shelter. Testing on the dog was not done in an unfamiliar/stressful place such as a shelter. Accommodations could be made to house the dog at home where there is the least chance of further incidents if owners agreed (conditions such as muzzling could be included).
- people know the breed they are seeing not just people with no dog experience
- Had members educated in science and animal behaviour
- The costs are borne by the owner of the animal regardless of tribunal outcome.
- veterinarians should be part of the tribunal. Experienced dog owners should be on the panel. Panelists screened for their stance on pit bulls
- The tribunal committee is comprised of responsible dog owners of various breeds especially pit bulls, dog rescue organization representatives and/or dog trainers or vets.
- 5-7 individuals with extensive background in dog breeds, behaviour, training and ownership. Contact the Canadian Kennel Club for their recommended breeders/owners/judges and veterinarians.
- Had a well represented group on the tribunal and must include certified dog trainers/experts
- A certified behaviourist is assessing the dog in question
- fully researched the issue and if the dog is not at fault, the offender (human) receives a hefty fine.
- Exploration to causation of a vicious dog needs to be considered within the tribunal to determine objectively if it is solely a vicious dog or product of a neglectful owner. A tribunal with the capacity to effectively render this decision could provide better overall decisions more efficiently, saving already lengthy court process
- That's it's not just based on the breed. Look into the home owners and training
- that is a case by case situation and not just a broad response. This needs to be taken seriously with the animal's welfare in mind as well. Why did the dog bite? What were the factors? Was it protecting itself?
- The tribunal consisted of educated dog trainers and advocates who can provide educated responses on behaviour and training for the pet owners.
- Favoured mandatory obedience training for first time offences opposed to euthanasia



- That biases for certain dog breeds are noted before hand, and if someone has a negative bias for a specific breed (i.e., pit bulls) they are NOT to take part in the tribunal.
- Had involvement from animal welfare groups such as AARCS
- To not euthanize the animal
- Not just euthanizing any dog. The owner and dog should have to attend a training session or be judged based on ability to train and ability to obey.
- Make sure the panel is made up of big breed dog owners and to keep a level headed mind
- That all information is included, especially when the dog gets provoked by humans
- That a recognized pet behavioral specialist be engaged by one or both sides
- Representatives included animal behavioral specialists and the actions and behaviors of the owner are taken into account
- Participants must be dog owners, and must not discriminate based on breed
- Just as a human has to go through a mental diagnosis, so should a dog but with their human counter part present. To see the trigger or really dig deep with the problem.
- Has to be the same across the board. Pit bull type dogs shouldn't not be unfairly persecuted
- Made up of intelligent unbiased people.
- Determine and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal
- Professional dog trainers and behavioralist be involved
- Non-city officials appointed to the tribunal should be expected to represent a variety of non-aligned interests and groups within the community. It should also be expected that the tribunal consists of a balanced number of City and non-City representatives.
- That they use multiple valid references for cases where a dog would me euthanized. (Ie behaviour specialists)
- Breed specific legislation is not utilized. dd
- Multiple independent members of tribunal
- I don't agree with euthanasia.
- ALL dogs, from small purse dogs to any large breed are treated equally. I have been attacked and charged at more often by smaller dogs (30lbs and less) than any type of larger breed
- Euthanizing was a last resort only (after the dog had tried and failed multiple rehabilitation and training attempts and the owner was determined not to be the cause for aggression).
- There was a representative on the council who had a dog behavior background
- That it is NOT breed specific and there are no biases with breeds
- Do not euthanize dogs who are a first offender regardless of the severity of the bite. They are only doing what they have been taught to do. If more than once, may need to consider harsher consequences especially for the owner who clearly has not trained their dog properly even after it reacted poorly to the situation.



- On the condition that the members aren't biased to the breed of dog but rather understand that all and any dog can and will be reactive without proper training. The responsibility falls on the owner and not the dog.
- Representatives are not against bully breeds. They are open to rehabilitation. Do not jump to euthanasia just because they hate bully breeds
- At least one dog training expert and one veterinarian on the panel.
- At least one dog training expert on the panel and one veterinarian
- There is someone unbiased that understands dog Behaviour etc.
- A dog has an innocence that humans do not. When they do become aggressive and attack, it's most likely a result of poor training/care from the owner. Revoke ownership privileges and have the dog put into a shelter where it can be rehabilitated and trained by professionals. A dog doesn't know it's doing something bad, it's reacting instinctively. They should not have their lives taken away because of something a human has failed to do.
- The tribunal included animal behaviourists/shelter workers who have experience and can make case specific recommendations
- Dogs not be euthanized just because they are pit bulls. All dogs should be viewed in light of behaviour not breed. And full consideration given to whether it's the owner that's the problem. If so, they lose the right to own pets and the pets be rehomed/ retrained, not put down
- The behaviors of the human leading up to the bite were examined to ensure that the dog wasn't giving warning signs of being under stress
- Members should understand dog behaviour, expert opinion should always be presented and considered.
- Training and reformation is an option for the owner and is strongly encouraged, the dog should be offered a chance to be educated to not act as violent.
- The tribunal consists of individuals who have previous knowledge of dog behaviour such as: obedience trainers, veterinarian industry staff, dog groomers, dog trainers, pet resort owners.
- Those people making the decision consisted of a vet behaviorist (with an education and registered), a canine behaviorist and a trainer who uses CURRENT methods (IE not shock collars/punishment/pain) and has worked with rehabilitating dangerous dogs and can thus assess the dog appropriately. Also the foster/spca in charge of the animal after being seized should also be involved.
- A certified Animal Behaviour Consultant is a part of the tribunal
- The people on said tribunal are qualified to assess animal behaviour
- A certified dog trainer/behavioural specialist is on the tribunal
- That it judges the owners training and not simply on the breed of the dog and that whoever is in the tribunal isn't biased against "bully" breeds
- It did not have the power to have a dog euthanized
- As long as there is not bias directed at certain breeds. The tribunal's decision must be based on the behaviour of the animal. No BSL.



- Don't euthanize dogs. You don't kill people, so don't kill dogs. People can abuse and rape small children, and they're not killed. What is more traumatic?
- Members of the tribunal need to be familiar with dog behavior and body language
- A solid, short timeline or time limit, with the potential for dogs placed under house arrest rather than confiscated.
- Transparency around requirements for qualifications of members of tribunal eg) vet or canine behaviour expert, not some random person with no particular qualifications in dog expertise
- A trainer and a veterinarian were involved in assessing the animal in question
- Dogs shouldn't be euthanized for a bite. Killing an animal because of an instinctual reaction is morally reprehensible.
- No euthanizations! There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- They had a basic understanding that the dog is a reflection of a person and offer healthy ways, and using death as a last resort.
- Breed specific legislation regarding pit bulls is unscientific and largely race based/discriminatory.
- I disagree with a tribunal having the authority to euthanize an animal, but it is a good first step to help deal with more minor offences.
- I would want to know more about this tribunal before agreeing to it to ensure a just trial for animal welfare.
- Yes
- There is a 'committee made up of a diverse section of the population'
- the people on the tribunal should not show any biases against bully breeds
- The tribunal is comprised of equal part pet and non-pet owners.
- No euthanization. All can be rehabilitated or rehomed.
- A certified dog trainer and a vet should be a part of the tribunal to ensure knowledgeable opinions can be made regarding any dog that is brought before them.
- non euthanasia
- Breed is not taken into account and the owners have a chance to get their dog properly trained.
- Majority vote that considers the circumstance or the complaint and doesn't automatically put the blame on the animal
- I would like to see the folks on this tribunal be pet owners, or people with knowledge about animal behavior.
- Remove the pit bull bias. Rules should apply to any dog who have a history of issues regardless of breed and the requirements for any animal that can be aggressive. With rehoming then following rehabilitation with trainers. Don't blame the dog blame the owner and rehab the dog
- Tribunal composed of dog behaviour experts
- Hopefully a tribunal would be a speedier solution.
- Have a variety of people on the panel from separate backgrounds including laymen
- there are no blanket cases and you actually review case by case and take into account why the dog bit someone. get the idea out of your head that pitbulls are bad!!!



- Na
- I believe the dog should go to a professional trainer to get the dog back to the proper learning spot, you can train a bad dog to be good but it needs to be done by a professional and not some one who will abuse the dog even more. The dog shouldn't be put down if it's defending him self or his humans life and if they were trained incorrectly by the human owner it should be taken away and properly trained and re homed just like so many people do all around the world. If they can train and aggressive dog to be better then it can be done. NO TO KILLING ANIMALS !!!!!!! Charge the human.
- Euthanasia should be an absolute last resort. If the dog shows signs that it's behaviour is not being actively addressed by the owner there should be a seizure of the animal from the owner, however it should be a system where there is attempts at rehabilitation before anything drastic. So if the tribunals are able to facilitate that without bias based off breed I believe it would be helpful.
- They are blind to the dog breed involved. This would reduce bias in decision making.
- As long as proper training is given to bylaw officers to reduce risk of bias against specific breeds or size of dog, seeming level of income of the owners, or any other biases (including sexism and racism) to try to ensure as fair of a process as possible, with severe repercussions against proven biases that result in unfair treatment of a dog and their owner's, a tribunal could be a better alternative to present processes. However, the choice to euthanize should be a very last resort reserved to dogs deemed untrainable or high risk of attacking with little provocation and only be given after a proper investigation, as many dogs bite in defense of themselves, and to kill a dog for protecting itself against abuse is cruel and unfair to both the animals and the owners.
- Euthanasia should not be an option
- It's fair and the tribunal isn't biased
- V
- The tribunal members were qualified to assess canine behavior. I.e:vets
- Not biased against breed.
- Well constructed policies and procedures were in place to guide the tribunal
- Dogs should not be euthanized. They should be put into a rehab program where they can be trained. THERE ARE NO BAD DOGS, ONLY BAD OWNERS.
- The dog is reviewed by a three unbiased animal behaviorists for assessment prior to any determination.
- Priority is given to the well being of the dog
- Those involved must be highly trained and include animal welfare advocates so that unfair discrimination against certain breeds is not encouraged.
- Again, there should be restrictions placed on the owner, not the animal
- It was not biased towards any breed or size of dog.
- Someone on the tribunal should be educated and knowledgeable in dog behavior and breed information.
- They cannot decide to euthanize an animal.
- Also involved observing visitation between the dog and it's owner(s) in order to take into account the dog's true behaviour.



- Any decision is appealable to a court before punishment is handed out.
- Proper behaviour assessment. Science based education in dog behaviour.
- Dogs are not completely at fault for their behaviour. As a dog owner, the actions (negative or positive) of your dog directly display your efforts in training and controlling your dog. I myself have 6 dogs total, including a pit bull, and have NEVER had a problem with any of them attacking another dog, or a person. They have been trained properly. Animals should NOT suffer for the incompetence of their owner.
- If the members of the tribunal were educated in animal behaviour and it was not used to carry out punishment to animals due to human error, negligence and ignorance.
- That it is in a per dog basis and not breed bias
- I would support the idea as long as everyone has an open mind. All too often the dog is completely blamed, but there are always underlying circumstances. I would want to make sure that everything is looked at before the dog is considered dangerous. Not just have a closed mind.
- That the tribunal be made up of impartial personelle, vets, physicians, groomers, dog trainers. Someone educated to make the decision, not just random people with bias against specific breeds.
- Tribunal members are qualified, bound by ethics, include a variety of backgrounds and professional qualifications, and include members of the public, are subject to reviews, and must disclose conflicts of interest and refrain from participating in tribunal for cases in which they have a conflict of interest
- Vets and those certified to work with animals on tribunal, not just a random city councillor.
- Owner of dog could still go to court to save the dogs life.
- It is being conducted by individuals who understand dog behaviour.
- An investigation is done into the owner for what kind of training the dog has had. If the dog is mistreated. Or any other cases.
- Is not discriminatory towards pit bulls or any dogs that resemble pit bulls or are a variation of pit bulls
- If a dog was rehabilitated compared to euthanized.
- A full review of the dogs history. Look at the big picture not simple a snapshot of occurrence.
- I think a dog that has bitten should be put in a corrective behaviour program
- Fair review of the dog and no euthanasia.
- The dog and the owner's previous history would have to be taken into account.
- That it was binding and to appeal it would see a cost of \$5000 non refundable.
- That the person doing the tribunal is fair and neutral to BREED. And look at all sides of the story, whether the attack was provoked or not and be FAIR to all situations
- Members of local rescue and C Humane Society must be involved
- There would need to be qualified animal behavior specialists on this tribunal along with at least one vet and a psychologist.
- To hear all sides, and euthanized being the last results.
- Obedience training as a requirement within a reasonable timeline and no off leash access until completion of obedience training. OWNER(s) must attend and complete training with dog.
- Veterinarians or educated dog behavior experts need to be involved.



- More information needed on this process and qualifications of tribunal members, but I support the goals of this approach
- Not discriminating against a certain breed....such as bully breeds. Because like humans there are dogs with issues and it has nothing to do with their breed whatsoever!
- not breed specific
- No euthanization on first offence . Only be an option if the problem is constant and persists multiple times and no amount of training works or makes the situation better
- For owners to learn how to control dogs
- The owner and the victim both got to be part of it.
- Includes a truly non biased group of people, and is not lobbyable
- As long as everyone is properly certified
- No breed-specific legislation or discrimination.
- It does not factor breed of dog into the investigation.
- That the animal in question I'm guilty. Not here say on people's behalf.
- That pit bull or other large breed dog owners sat on the tribunal
- assessment of the environment dog was raised in
- If the dog has tried everything else. Rehabilitation, moving to a new home ect then euthanasia would be the next choice.
- Each situation must be considered independently. Even the most calm animal can get defensive if it feels threatened.
- Those on the tribunal would need proven experience in animal behavior and training.
- It does not take into consideration the breed, just the deed
- Does not discriminate based on breed of dog
- Provided trainers opinions and educated behavior experts override the majority when euthanization is in question.
- The tribunal is made up of animal behaviour experts, including veterinarians.
- Breed of dog isn't taken into account, only it's history if any
- As the dog stays on the owners pripery and if it is walk has to be muzzled. No off leash parks, or any dog parks.
- I would like to ensure there is a system in place to avoid, deter, and punish vexatious claimants. Moreover, I believe the burden of proof should be on the claimant, rather than the dog owner/dog. I am concerned with the pattern of frivolous cases we have seen brought before other tribunals in Canada recently, which seem to put the onus of responsibility on the defendant; I support the idea of quicker resolution as long as we do not create a soapbox for entitled, anti animal advocates to harass their neighbours.
- Members have dog knowledge.
- I don't think other people have a right to decide if someone else's pet is euthanized, I think egregious cases should be handled on a case-by-case basis.



- The role of the tribunal is to be clearly laid out in a best attempt to avoid personal bias. All decisions may be appealed. The dog owner must be included in all proceedings. Nothing is done without the full knowledge of the owner. Alternatives may be offered - ie a large dog may be moved outside of the city to a rural area where the behaviour may be resolved due to space. Training can also be an alternative, with the dog and owner reviewed regularly during the courses.
- Careful and un-biased investigation
- The tribunals should not include breed it should include activity how it was raised what obedience classes it has and how the dog is socialize with other dogs
- If there is a cost savings to taxpayers. If it costs too much money to implement, and if all cases end up being appealed at Provincial court, I feel like this is wasted energy.
- Has breed neutral guidelines and representatives, also a representative that is educated in scientific based research on canine behaviour
- Provided clear standards were set for the tribunal to follow-to allow for consistency and transparency
- Only if they were to look at both sides properly. Ie, the dog was provoked
- As long as the final decision has nothing to do with the dog's breed. When a dog attacks it's the owner's fault not the dog's.
- This tribunal can NOT be focused on specific breeds more than others. I've seen vicious chihuahuas bite more people than other dogs.
- It includes professional from vet fields and other animal related fields to allow a proper judgement of the situation.
- The tribunal is not biased against "nuisance dogs."
- People in these positions have proper credentials and don't "just know dogs". Start with someone educated enough to know Breed specific legislation doesn't work.
- they were very disinclined to euthanize any animal unless absolutely no other option is available.
- that no extra new staff would need to be hired,
- The dog being euthanized was not an option unless the owner supported the decision.
- .
- It was fair and unbiased towards specific breeds and was made up of animal health professionals
- City representatives are unbiased and fair and do not discriminate based on breed, but instead make informed decisions based on fact.
- The dogs not euthanized
- Punish the owner, do not put the dog down, find a suitable home for the dog ONLY IF the owner is found unsuitable otherwise leave dog with owner until court case and slap fine or jail time on owner pending severity of the case.
- The people on the tribunal are dog behavioural experts.
- owner is able to prove the animal was provoked that it was only in self defence, certify that the animal does have vaccinations and training. The animal is not guilty until proven otherwise.
- That tribunal is formed by animal behavior specialists, positive reinforcement trainers as opposed to force trainers, veterinarians. Also, that the owners are tasked with the accountability of making sure their dog is safe.



- There there is no bias to breed
- That it applies to all breeds
- Don't lock up the dog use rehabilitation and punish the owner
- Every person on the board must have training in dog care and euthanasia must be be a last course of action and always with an option to appeal the decision
- As long as the appropriate people who sit on the tribunal are voted in and are completely unbiased.
- No more taxes
- If the owner has never provided training to the dog then the dog should go into a foster home where the foster family has tools and knowledge to train the dog
- as long and the dog is indeed labeled properly. the process does not get back logged an posses stress on the dog, owner or victims.
- It does not single out specific breeds ie: pit bulls, a kind and loving breed that has the unfortunate luck to be the victim of vicious untrue rumors. Quite frankly I'm sickened at the thought of this city that has been my home for more than 50 years is even considering being so backward as to think that pit bulls are any way a "nuisance"
- As long as it wasn't breed specific/prejudice and had the dog's best interest at heart. Blain the owner not the animal..
- there is appropriate representation for all parties involved.
- euthanasia is not considered. Obedience training should be required for these dogs. The owner should be fined and/or charged
- That it is fair
- It would be important that the bylaw officers check up on the situation to ensure the decision is being carried out
- Some members came from accredited rescue organizations
- The representatives reviewing the case would have to be impartial (ex: not know anyone involved or have been involved in an attack themselves, etc)
- Dog experts on the tribunal.
- They cannot discriminate against breed specifically. Bite severity should still be taken into consideration though.
- I do not support euthanasia as a possible option at all. The tribunal should not have this option.
- As long as the tribunal was an accurate representation for the community and not biased to specific dog breeds
- I don't believe these things should be influenced by breed type (I've known vicious Chihuahuas and gentle Pit bulls, it's all in the owner and how they're raised!). I would worry about bias towards certain breeds.
- Be impartial to breed
- There is absolutely no breed specific rules or practices that would make it unfair for any one type of dog



- At least one of the tribunal members is a veterinary behaviorist to properly assess the behavior of the dog.
- Euthanasia is not an option, penalties should be awarded to owners, not the animal. Dogs can be trained, but vicious dogs come from bad owners
- That the tribunal focuses on education than punishment
- It should be made up of individuals with a high level of understanding of dog behavior
- That the animal owner has the right to hold animal in their home for a fee instead of being seized assuming no one is at risk in the home and the animal doesn't leave the property.
- Thinking of the possibility of rehoming of a dog in shelter or rescue that is willing to help said dog as the problem is the owner not the dog.
- Members/representatives cannot be biased. They cannot be fearful of any dog breeds, they cannot dislike dogs, they cannot know anyone involved in the incident
- Accountability that goes farther than one or two people, to ensure unfair decisions are not being made based on personal bias.
- Qualified individuals subject to screening, ie vets, animal behavior specialists
- as long as it us a fair assesment and not based on looks of the dog. Include how the dog is raised and wether or not this would have been prevented with better ownership or if the person injured was tourmenting the dog. Look at all the factors
- The tribunal would review and assess and suggest restrictions which would then move forward to provincial court. These situations still need to be dealt with in a professional and proper legal manner.
- A third leave of assessment from a veterinarian
- Appeal process for euthanasia.
- Verified by more than one witness to prevent wrong accusations, have the fog fostered not in a shelter
- Those on the tribunal are certified dog behaviouralists, veterinarians, and not random counselors who don't have any experience with animal behaviour.
- No discrimination based on physical characteristics
- Number 1 and number 3
- Mo euthanization without provincial court order
- I think the representatives should include people who also know animals: trainers, veterinary professionals, animal behaviourist experts etc
- The owner keeps their dog during the trial. Shelters cause stress on dogs.
- It was dealt with WITHOUT bias on the type of dog
- As long as the dog gets a fair case
- It must be made up of professional dog trainers/behaviouralists.
- There needs to be strict screening criteria in place that ensures whoever sits at the head of these decisions is not biased one way or another.
- Treat all dog breeds as equals and do not discriminate based on the pitbull breed



- It's in favor of the dog.
- The breed of the dog is not included. It should be judged on behaviour and owner's behaviour and NOT the dog breed. Dogs should NOT be euthanized under any circumstances unless it is for THEIR health benefit
- It can't be a biased tribunal
- Dog are not euthanized
- members are appropriately educated on statistics and risks around dog breeds - there is undo vilianization of pit bull breeds in our culture
- That the Tribunal (members) are rightly positioned to manage these cases and fully disclosing any bias such as breed and/or people discrimination. Also, the owner must have a voice for the voiceless. And the bylaw officers must also have their own records examined in cases of bias/perceptions/charges that are in line with facts. The members who decide on the fate of a dog;s life should not be a position that is taken lightly nor the sentencing to the owner. All parties must agree to hold honesty and fairness to uphold the life of any animal as they would a human being.
- breed of dog is not used against them
- Proper investigation proving dog is actually violent, and has not been continuously instigated. Aggressive training as first order.
- As long as you don't make judgements based on the breed of the dog. All dogs can be bad and all dogs have the potential to bite. Looking "like a pitbull" is the stupidest thing I've ever heard.
- people forming the tribunal need to know and understand dogs. Not be biased against certain breeds.
- A dog bite out of fear or being surprised must not be considered aggressive behaviour (eg. dog with poor vision surprised by a person's hand)
- As long as the emphasis is on the owner, not the breed of dog.
- It takes the owners actions into account. What did the owner do before and after.
- I has to be fair to both side. Yes the one that gets bitten will scream the loudest, but the dog owners have RIGHTS also that should be listened to. This is NOT trial by social media. That is my fear.
- If the dog is allowed to stay with the owner during the process and if euthanization is warranted the owner can have their own vet donit
- Fair and appropriate representation on the committee
- As long as the process includes a behavioural analysis from a legitimate dog trainer or behaviourist (most animal control workers and shelter employees have little to no education regarding canine behaviour and training)
- the people involved in the tribunal are savy about dogs and dog behaviour.
- 3 week isolation
- Must include persons experienced with dog training/rehabilitation so there is a better chance of a balanced opinion.
- If the tribunal is for ALL dog breeds.
- There is an appeal option



- You do not need to euthanize a dog just because it attacked a human. Just train it to be better. An animal is still an animal. You're basically supporting the death penalty for animals.
- At least one person on the tribunal is a certified animal behaviourist.
- Dogs do not get euthenized, the owners should be responsible.
- As long as qualified individuals from varying animal behavioural backgrounds provide the guidance and have a great amount of influence. Force free behaviouralists mainly.
- Impartial, unbiased tribunal members. If anyone claims a specific breed rather than poor training is responsible for action.
- DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST A DOG FOR BREED AND OR PHYSICAL APPEARANCE
- Dogs are NOT euthanized, period. They should not suffer due to poor training/care from owners.
- No breed prejudice.
- Provided the dog stayed with the owner or a city-approved foster care giver.
- quick and strictly enforced
- There are people on the tribunal that actually are animal experts (e.g. veterinarians)
- So long as the pet can be kept with the owner with limited restrictions to public outings
- Expedited and fair process, knowledgeable review board/person, appealable decisions. Process for review needs to be publicly available and vetted.
- Euthanization should be a last resort. Training should be recommended first
- People on tribunal are impartial and voted in or agreed to by both parties if not a set tribunal.
- The actions of the victim are considered when determine the fate of the dog. For example, was the victim aggressive towards the dog first, did the dog's owner ask for the victim not to approach the dog, was the dog cornered or scared by the victim.
- As long as they were 100% unbiased. Maybe made up of vets etc
- representatives must be non-biased and educated
- A 2 strike rule. The first strike causing mandatory training
- The animal is NOT singled out for its appearance but for the offence
- The tribunal committee is comprised of veterinarians, animal rescue workers, citizens with animal knowledge and common sense and bylaw officers.
- That the breed of the dog never EVER determines their destiny. That ALL dogs, every breed and every size, are treated the same for bad behavior and that more irresponsible pet owners are punished harder and more accordingly.
- The dog must be seen by a certified animal behaviorist who makes a determination on whether the dog should be put down or not.
- The tribunal must have at least one veterinarian or other animal behavior specialist, and one social worker.
- All members of tribunal have been thoroughly screened to have zero breed specific biases
- As long as the people who own the dog could stand up for it and give an honest word for their dog, there's plenty of time's a dog will bite and it's in defence and not it's fault.
- Careful review of tribunal members. Include Peace officers and humane society members



- Tribunal members are not biased for or against any particular breed, a portion of members must have sufficient education or knowledge pertaining to animal welfare and animal behavioural psychology.
- Firstly, a dog should NOT be kept in a shelter as a result of a bite. Nine times out of ten there is a good reason the animal has bitten a human being or another animal. An investigation should be launched into WHY the animal felt the need to protect itself or its owner, be kept in a "house arrest" type situation until investigation is complete. Under no circumstances should an animal be euthanized for protecting itself or its "pack" (owners). If it is determined that the animal may be showing signs of consistent aggression or over protectiveness the owner should be required to work with behaviour specialists until there is improvement. The only case in which a dog potentially should be euthanized in a bite scenario is if the dog has a virus transmittable to humans and even then - evaluated on a case by case basis. For example, the rabies virus presents extreme danger to both animals and humans. In that case, euthanasia may be the best course of action. I would ask that whoever is going to be making these day to day decisions about what happens to these dogs be required to go through extensive dog behavioural training themselves. After all, would it be fair for you to be tried by a judge that did not go to law school and have an exceptional understanding of law? No it wouldn't. These animals deserve that same right and consideration. Lastly I will say that in no way shape or form should there be a breed specific set of laws to govern this. Animal aggression is something that should be addressed on a case by case basis.
- Animals are given a full health check,And behaviour assessmentBy a qualified individual NOT just a humane society employee or bylaw officer
- That ALL dog/cat bites be treated equally. Chi chi's bite a hell of a lot more often than big dogs do, yet they are NOT treated equally.
- The breed of dog should not be taken into account, only the owners actions and actions of the victim at the time of attack.
- Dog must stay at home until tribunal rather than a shelter, perhaps with a tracker to make sure. There must be sufficient evidence of an attack.
- So much nuance in dog attacks
- no forced euthanasia
- If the members are sufficiently knowledgeable about the animal(s) type in question.
- There are also exceptions.
- It is made up of people with actual dog breed and behavioral knowledge
- I don't support euthanizing.
- Dog assessed by a professional trainer and rehabilitation has failed.
- It should have at least one member from the rescue community and one from a dog training facility.
- The tribunal consists of animal advocates and animal specialists such as trainers and veterinarians. I do not support a tribunal that consists of people who have zero experience, knowledge, and training of dogs.



- Full history of the dog was provided and the full impartial report of the incident was investigated - provocation - all circumstances identified and reviewed and was for all animal incident NOT just Pit like dogs
- that the tribunal is form by dog breeders and vet, no city official but people that actually understand the situation
- I would support the tribunal if they include all available evidence of behaviour from said animal. I find some breeds are discriminated against before their case will be heard.
- The background to what triggered the dog is taken into account.
- The tribunal panel Must include a person who specializes in dog behavior and must be allowed to assess the dog and give heavily weighted input.
- I would want to see recognized legal and veterinary expertise representing all interests including those of the plaintiffs, owners, community, and the animal. No decisions would be actionable without ample opportunity for review and appeal.
- That it takes into consideration if training the dog is an option. Get the humane society and their behaviour specialists involved.
- No dog should ever be euthanized. That is inhumane and often aggressive dogs comes from abusive owners, meaning it's the owner we need to target as well not necessarily the dog.
- there must be training for tribunal members and decisions have to be determined by policy not at the whim of members
- The members of said system had no bias on dog breeds and solely made decision on case by case circumstances.
- There are professionals that are experienced with dogs.
- Consider if there were any social laws broken ie trespassing, loitering, harassing of the property. The dogs are likely there for protection.
- Dogs can remain at home. Those on the tribunal are trained and educated in the relevant matters such as dogs and bites and human health. Dogs wont be euthanized
- It took into consideration all of the variables that may have led to the bite
- the dog is looked at as a whole in the situation and "why" would they do this rather than the focus being on what they did
- The Tribunal decisions should be able to be addressed outside of the court system to allow ease of access for all Calgarians. Also the Tribunal should be assessing the owner rather than the dog.
- The tribunal MUST have at least one member educated and experienced in dog behavior and science based training methods, and all other members must have some education of dog body language prior to being able to serve on the tribunal
- It consisted of those qualified in dog behavior, as well as those with experience with pit bull type dogs
- All dogs-not just pitbulls or the like, would have the same process and investigation into the incidents that caused the need for an investigation. The tribunal must be fair and impartial.
- That's breed specifics are not the main reason for the results. That they be based on past offences, the owners behaviour, the dogs behaviour that the dog has been evaluated by a CERTIFIED animal



behaviourist as well as how the owner handles the dog. While a pit bull does have a more damaging bite than a chihuahua (who has a higher bite record) the chihuahua needs to receive the same treatment as the pit bull and be required to take all the same steps as the pitbull.

- That it is made up of mixture of citizen's, veterinarians, trainers, no one with a political bias. People with common sense and the ability to make an informed decision.
- The speed at which the case is processed does not compromise the integrity of the outcome; quality assessments over hastened assessments
- rehabilitation is tried before the animal is destroyed.. also in the case of pitbulls and other terrier types that the tribunal has a panel that has advocates of them breeds
- Any dog can be rehabilitated. Euthanasia is too extreme and an extensive behavioral assessment should be conducted.. The dog could be rehomed with someone who will rehabilitate them or tend to the dogs' needs - none children home, only dog home etc.
- A non-biased organization would be best
- As long as their is objectivity and non biased members present in the tribunal; as long as euthanasia is a last resort (only considered after multiple tribunals or for extreme, severe first time offences).
- As long as this did not discriminate against one breed. This needs to be for all dogs.
- The dog is not discriminated against based in breed
- Consultation/ rehabilitation assessment of dog AND owner performed by a competent professional dog trainer that is experienced with the breed separate from security/enforcement training.
- The dog gets a chance at rehabilitation instead of euthanasia.
- You guys are legit morons
- It is easy and fast, so all parties involved are not put through stress.
- There is no bias based on the breed of the dog. Perhaps the tribunal does not get a picture or description of the dog, just the weight and size.
- Honesty and transparency
- As long as the people in the tribunal do not have any bias against any breed and can look solely on the facts of the case.
- Bylaw officers and tribunal staff (judges, attorneys, clerks, etc.) receive and successfully complete advanced dog training and dog behavioural training to be able to fully assess situations, actions to be taken, and penalties to be given if applicable. There are many reasons for canine behaviours and not all of them are aggression related (dog could be sick, injured, defending themselves, etc.). And breed specific should not be even considered. All decisions and judgements should be based on behaviour, research, circumstances, owner-related behaviours (95% of the time the main ulprit)..
- As long as the tribunal has a representation of proven canine behaviour knowledge and is not breed biased.
- They had rubric to assess each situation with.
- Equal city and non-city reps, and the non-city reps are chosen by the Calgary SPCA
- Work with animal behaviour experts (veterinarians, dog behaviour specialists) to make these decisions
- It is not biased towards differing dog breeds.



- Dogs involved in severe bites should be put down if off leash/unprovoked
- As long as its not used to selectively enforce breed discrimination
- As long a tribunal members did not abuse their power
- The tribunal does not have the authority to decide if euthanasia is needed. The case would have to continue on to court.
- Fairly and not prejudiced against any form of Bulldog (i.e. pitbulls, etc)
- Continuing my comment from section 2. I have encountered many small aggressive dogs both off leash and around town. The owners do nothing to stop these dogs. I'm more nervous around a chihuahua than I am a pit bull. Dogs are never born bad. There is no such thing as a mean dog. It's the owners who train them, or more often, don't train them, that causes a problem. We need to be punishing the owners, not the dog. If a parent gave a loaded gun to a child and told them to shoot someone, the child is not at fault, the parent is. This is the exact same for a dog. If the "pit bull" bill passes the city of calagry will be solely responsible for the death of hundreds of dogs. Calgary claims to be dog friendly but this is the exact opposite. Do more research on the dogs you are wanting to ban. You even said above that pit bulls are not the most common for injuries, yet because of neglect and bias, the city of calgary is wants them on a dead list. Same on you calgary, I thought you were better than this.
- The people acting as the source of final say, are educated and unbiased, just as it would be in a court of law. It would not be a rushed means that is not taken seriously or be biased against the dog and/or dogowner.
- Euthanasia should be off the table for bites.
- The tribunal includes veterinary experts
- Tribunal should not be permitted to make a determination on euthanization.
- The dog can be in the owners care with restrictions, not a shelter.
- As long as the tribunal members are assessed on a regular basis and confirmed to lack prejudice against certain breeds.
- You have animal behaviouralists also consulted, or trainers familiar with the dog/breed.
- appropriate disciplinary action on the owners not just the animal
- That there are certified dog behavioural specialists on the panel at every tribunal case and hearing.
- City and "non city representatives" is a vague, frankly dumbass description. It's misleading the public if you can't be specific in writing this option. Do better city council.
- Investigation on the instance this dog acted aggressively. Both parties should be examined at the time of the offence
- .
- I would like to see a few people involved to ensure the decision is not biased/fair.
- Educated dog trainers or behavioral analyziers are part of this group. Must have experience with dogs and understand dog behavior and relationship with owner behaviour
- The animals' best interest must be considered at all times. An animal is never viscous by fault of its own-it always comes down to bad training on the owner's part. If the owner is not willing to engage



in dog training and education, then the dog should be placed with a family that will care for it and love it properly.

- Unbiased persons conducting it. People not involved in implementation of breed biased bylaws etc
- Pit bulls should stop being targeted as nuisances.
- As long as individuals were non-biased and all peoples of society were well represented
- Tribunal members shall be animal experts (ie vets) not members of the general public or politicians.
- appointments to tribunal were transparent and merit based (qualified). Tribunal was subject to the integrity and ethics office
- They are not biased against pit bull and pit bull like breeds. BSL is no different then racism and, as we all know, you can't judge a human by their race and the same applies for any animal- dog or not.
- Equal representation of tribunal members, including professionals in animal industries, vets, pet trainers
- Breed specific discrimination is not allowed to be included in any decision.
- Is in favour of avoiding euthanasia as often as possible and focuses on restorative justice.
- the members are screened and have not displayed any breed prejudice before sitting in a trial.
- Non binding if euthanasia is recommended: queens bench decides
- Professional breeders or trainers were being consulted.
- I can't see all the words of my voice here to comment properly
- no euthanizing!! Allow there to be steps to take to better train or rehabilitate your dog first.
- Tribunal must contain dog behaviouralists
- There needs to be equal representation. That means involving someone who knows the laws(bylaw), and someone who has or works in rescue and rehabilitation of dogs. An assessment should also be done of dog but also owner and their home.
- be very careful who is chosen for the tribunal.
- So long as the tribunal is representative of dog owners and all Calgaryans (not just old white people).
- A panel of trained, independent behaviour specialists. A panel of 3 or 5 with a consensus before action taken.
- It is for ALL dogs that have bitten not breed specific.
- The owners required to take some sort of pet care course. It's not always the dogs fault. People can be ignorant
- Includes dog owners
- Euthanasia is a last resort and requires more levels of approval
- It is fair and no bias towards the hate of these beautiful dogs
- Members of the tribunal must be professionally qualified in the assessment of dog behaviors and have knowledge of rehabilitation techniques for dogs and training for owners.
- No destruction of the animal
- Non biased staff for the tribunal in order to ensure there is a fair outcome for all involved. Euthanasia should always be a last resort.
- There is nothing in the bylaw that is breed specific (e.g. pitbulls)



- There is licensed veterinary personnel and professional dog trainers included in tribunal.
- Not euthanizing the animal.
- Transparent, open to appeal, and run by dog owners accepting of all breeds
- AN OUTSIDE PARTY JUDGING ON WHETHER OR NOT THE DOG CAN BE TRAINED
- Those on the tribunal have evidence based training with dogs, are a range of experts in the dog field, and are not breed discriminatory
- They can NOT order a dog to be euthanized under ANY circumstance
- Remove their ability to decide if a dog needs to be euthanized. Let them decide if the dog needs training, and make the owner comply with obedience training, then in the instance of failure convene an impartial panel to decide the fate of the dog. Giving the tribunal the capability to decide a dog will be killed would encourage those individuals who dislike certain breeds to be more likely to recommend euthanasia. Do not give them the power to make decisions based on personal preference.
- Fair representation of all the stakeholders. For example if everyone on the tribunal works for the city then that really wouldn't be a fair tribunal would it?
- They don't have the authority to euthanize any pet.
- Euthinizations should ONLY be last resort due to Multiple report IF found legit!!! Also, the defendant should be allowed to have friends used to define owners true character!!
- I would only support a tribunal if it could not declare a dog should be euthanized. I could only impose fines, rehabilitation or re-homing of the dog.
- Adequate and ongoing training is provided for tribunal members. We've seen examples of poorly trained members of the public overseeing refugee claims.
- As long as the tribunal participants were properly educated.
- The owner of the dog in question should have the choice.
- The dog bit someone on their own and not in self defense against themselves or their families.
- I do not support dog declarations. I don't want to see a list of breeds that are an easy check mark to euthanize. Review offences case by case. I'm in support for processing cases in a timely and efficient manner, but I do not want to see outcomes determined by a list of nuisance breeds.
- Should not have anything to do with the breed
- The people chosen can NOT have a breed bias. They need to be able to judge based on individual dog and not base it on a breeds. All breeds are treated the same. No decision meds can be based on a breed only on the actions of the animal and owner.
- It should include a reputable dog trainer / behaviourist
- As long as it could be appealed in court, which is sounds like it would be.
- The tribunal should include people that know dogs/ dog behaviour.
- As long as they have a qualified dog training specialist in the tribunal to assess the dog
- No euthanization. Rehabilitation, training and re-homing if required.
- Animal control officers and of canine behaviour specialist on the board
- The people running the tribunal are actually objective and fair.



- Decision makers must have extensive knowledge and no biases in animal behaviour
- Mandatory obedience training for the dogs rather than euthanasia. Dog behavior is dependent on its owner not the animal
- Actually results in rulings that can be enforced.
- The human guardian of the dog agrees to force free training.
- Would need to include members of public who are also dog owners. Balanced based on dog owners and non dog owners, Gender and race.
- Treated all dogs the same as Shepards, Retrievers, Mastiffs and all other large breeds of dogs can do just as much damage as a pit bull breed. As well as small dogs should be treated the same.
- The dogs are in a POSITIVE environment during the intern. If this is not available at home, a foster situation should be offered.
- Treated all dogs equal no matter the breed.
- the panel is a fair representation that includes PROFESSIONAL DOG BEHAVIOURISTS/PSYCHOLOGISTS AND TRAINERS, not just a bunch of people in suits pretending they know dog behavior.
- No one involved in anti-pit bull legislation, groups etc. was allowed on it.
- So long as it does not simply discriminate by breed, treat all breeds with equality rather than singling out breeds such as pit bulls and similar breeds based on media and such which only display the aggressive actions of these breeds which would have been due to their upbringing. Dogs aren't born aggressive, they are trained to be what you wish of them.
- the owner should be held accountable, the dog should not suffer because the owner did not train the dogs properly
- Your tribunal would need to consist of trained professionals in dog behaviour, so as to be unbiased. Lay people with limited knowledge and understanding of breeds, behaviours and circumstances surrounding bites leaves too much room for an error in judgement and unnecessary and incorrect euthanization of breeds you deem dangerous like pitbull breeds. This is an incorrect bias as there are many factors that contribute to dog bites. Trained professionals in dog behaviour understand this, lay people do not.
- The investigation was thorough. And the OWNER and handling of the dog in the home prior to the incident was investigated thoroughly.
- Tribunal cannot discriminate against specific breeds. They must stay third party non biased
- Being non bias towards large breed dogs.
- The people presiding are in fact pro-dog and do what they can do save lives of pets.
- animal experts are included in the tribunal panel selection
- Petitions and/or testimony must be provided from persons who know the animal to advocate for its fair trial.
- Animal knowledge IE animal by law personal and vets
- It includes members of a local, acknowledged kennel club, with experience in both animal behaviour and training.



- The dog in question remains with the owner with some restrictions until their court session. Also, euthanasia should ONLY be considered after attempts at rehabilitation
- Condition - tribunal to include professional dog behaviorists and trainers who are not biased by breed
- The animal poses an immitate danger to people and other animals
- Subject to review by a neutral third party
- The tribunal would need to consist of people who work with dogs in an official capacity. Dog trainers & behaviorists, shelter workers, Vets, etc. People who understand dogs. The tribunal would also need to have witnesses from the scene. Furthermore owners should be able to bring character witnesses for themselves and their dogs, along with any proof of obedience training. I say this because I have a reactive dog. Sadly it is normal for us to be approached by off-leash dogs in on-leash areas. This send my dog into a blind fury. It is something we have been working on with a licences trainer and we do our best to avoid these situations. If an off-leash dog approaches us and my dog attacks, would we be at any fault? That is why I feel the tribunal should allow witnesses at the scene, and allow for owners to prove that their dog was thrown into a situation they shouldn't have been in because of the other irresponsible owner.
- No breed / size discrimination. Small dogs held equally liable as large ones.
- It's not a bunch of activists agains a particular breed!
- A dog trainer or behaviourist without breed bias is part of the tribunal. Most often the owners are at fault and need education, and the dog is simply communicating in the best way it knows. Often it is the owners that caused/allowed the dogs to build/practice these behaviours, they misunderstand their dogs and need education. When these people cannot prove having taking dog training to either work on the behaviours, to gain education so they work on themselves to ensure a good life for their dogs, these people should not be allowed to be dog owners. Too often dogs are euthanized when it was all due to uneducated people.
- As long as it's members were unbiased towards specific breeds and acknowledge that any wrong doing on the dogs part is the owner's responsibility.
- The dog is NOT returned to irresponsible owners during the tribunal. Also why is the dog's trauma an issue in this rather than the victim of the attack
- I believe the tribunal needs to be made up of an indepant group of people including vets, animal control officers, ect
- Understand that most dog bites are provoked by the human not the dog
- After the dog was assessed by a trainer that specializes in behavioral issues.
- Animal experts (e.g. Vets, professional trainers, behavioural specialists) made up the majority of representatives on the tribunal. There would be nothing worse than having someone who is uneducated in these matters, and potentially biased, determining the fate of a pet and an owner's responsibilities.
- Not discriminating against certain breeds
-
- They would have to follow a schematic to make these decisions it can't be all opinion based.
- the dog is in the owner's custody during the tribunal



- Breed of dog is not in question. The bite, severity of injury, and the frequency of occurrences should be the top things that should be considered. There's no such thing as a bad breed, just bad owners (my cousin's have four pitbulls that are very well behaved, loving, and friendly) also the amount of time the owner is able to spend with their animals should be one of the highest things considered because neglect will lead to a misbehaving dog which could cause problems.
- Tribunal members should be qualified professionals such as Veterinarians, dog trainers and animal behaviour experts. It should apply to cats as well
- Only to be comprised of Professional Trainers, Breeders and Veterinarians, no civilians who like to inject anecdotal occurrences into their opinions. And all decisions must be based on Facts, Scientifically based.
- It includes a diverse non bias group of representatives. Also educated representatives (vets, humane society members, ect)
- does not hold bias to pit bulls or any other breed.
- Non biased tribunal members who have expertise in animal training/treatment.
- Unbiased and proper vetting of tribunal members on a case by case basis
- As long as the dog can stay with the owner during this time if the owner is capable
- No euthanasia. We don't have the death penalty for humans, what makes it any different for animals?
- Tribunal members should be knowledgeable about dog behaviour as well as the law.
- That the review applies to all dogs involved in incidents, not just specific breeds. And is done case by case and not as a blanket issue order.
- Quick hearing times and if the dog can be with it's owners until the hearing. There must also be educated people on the board that have experience with dog breeds and is unbiased towards the dog because if the breed.
- I support this to help alleviate the stress on the dog. I think that most dog bites are the result of a protective nature and that the dog should not be punished for improper human behaviour. As long as it is a fair and impartial tribunal that understands and respects all parties in the incident including the dog.
- that people on board know breeds and know that owners are usually to blame and not racist against breeds like the city is towards bully breeds
- To review and fully understand and process the cause of the incident and release the dog back into the owners hands as long as the situations sees fit. For an accidental attack or an attack where an animal's feels threatened, they should not be taken from their home. If you want to own an animal, then you must take the time to understand and learn their behaviours.
- The members of the tribunal also work for or are part of animal rescues and shelters
- Cost effective
- No dog can be tried on appearance and species alone. All animals must be considered equal before the tribunal.
- That it is a true and fair trial. Perhaps the dogs should be kept on the owners property until the trial rather the in a shelter. The owner to be fined if the dog is seen off the property.t



- Tribunal should be selected without bias
- Critical that tribunal members are neutral with no need biases
- That it includes all dog breeds.
- Was not breed specific
- N/a
- Any dog can be dangerous and it should be proven that said dog is a nuisance before any course of action is taken
- Euthanasia is not an option they can impose.
- Tribunals must be made up of at least one representative from all of the following domains: Dog trainers/behavioral coaches, veterinarians, emergency docs, and pediatricians, bylaw representatives (excluding lawyers). That way if it has to go to court of queen's bench the legal system maintains some level of impartiality as they would be reviewing the facts and findings from the tribunal in an independent fashion. I would happily endorse my tax dollars in that direction, instead of wasting time arguing about the length of grass on the lawns.
- Local kennel club and obedience club members the majority on the tribunal .
- Dog remains in owners possession on property
- A certified dog behaviourist, trainer and vet are involved in the decision making since it is not fair for someone with no experience to make those types of decisions.
- Members of the tribunal include those who have professional background in animal behaviour.
- The cases were adequately investigated and no animals were euthanized too promptly without very good cause
- Who would be considered for the tribunal?
- As long as euthanization is the absolute last option and all others are exhausted first.
- as long as the tribunal had at least one veterinarian and one dog behaviorist expert sitting on it
- As long as there is an appeal process as mentioned above and consider keeping the animal out of the shelter and 'confined' to the owner's property during the case review and appeal.
- Members of the tribunal should not have any breed-specific biases.
- tribunal must be made up of people with formal animal behavior training, veterinarians etc.
- That the people on this tribunal are true animal lovers that understand pet ownership, bonds with pets and that accidents do happen. If they would just put down every dog that has an incident i would be strongly opposed to this.
- Tribunal members are experienced members of the animal husbandry, veterinary, agricultural, or other animal care related professions so they provide educated, non biased opinions.
- If the cost of the tribunal loser is required to pay for all fees necessary to hold the tribunal in the first place. We as tax payers cant be setting up a tribunal for every dispute. If the City responds to a situation that turns out to be a dispute of poor faith, the individual that brought forth the tribunal and lost should have to pay reparations.
- NO BREED BIAS



- As long as it's a fair, balanced and just tribunal that follows the letter of the law and bylaws and enforces justice when necessary.
- It is critical to remember that in all cases of dog-related incidents, it is the PEOPLE who are the problem, rather than the dog. Focus should be redirected to what the owner has done to contribute to the behaviour of the animal and held appropriately accountable. Where animals are found to have been mistreated, including training to be aggressive, the animal should be removed and a lifetime ban of animal ownership needs to be implemented.
- As long as the decision can be appealed and is not final
- The pet was allowed to reside in its residency while a verdict is made. Not in a shelter or kennel causing more undue stress than necessary.
- As long as it focuses on the owners lack of control over their dog and doesn't target specific breeds
- Euthanasia would be determined by dog behaviour specialists only
- It contains a vet, an animal behaviouralist and one other person- all 3 must be 100% in agreement.
- Including animal welfare advocates
- As long as the cases are handled with CARE and not just assuming because some by law officers would straight up try and euthanize a dog because they are prejudice against a breed
- It is filled by impartial people and not used for a witch-hunt by people who don't like dogs.
- They're not biased against "pitbull" breeds it's case by case rather than having a breed bias
- Assessed by dog trainer to determine steps in managing the dog behaviours with force free training and teaching the owner how to effectively and properly train and enforce their animals
- Not specific to a breed. ANY breed of dog can bite. Look at chihuahuas for example.
- It does remove legal responsibility from the owner of the dog in the court of law.
- The officers are actually educated in canine behavior and posturing
- There is an appeal process for judgments provided by the tribunal and effective oversight and transparency into the operations and appointments of the tribunal.
- So long as the tribunal was made up of verifiable/certified dog/dog training experts
- The laws are the same for all dogs and the owners have a permanent record attached to them, for future offences by other pets
- As long as the tribunal system does not allow the dog to be kept in a shelter for a long period of time.
- Fair and unbiased based on breed
- 3rd point
- There be someone who actually knows and understands dogs and dog behaviors, and for dogs who have a first offense the circumstance be reviewed and considered
- It is taken into consideration where the dog should be during the waiting period. at home or at the shelter.
- No euthanizing what so ever. never.



- As long as owner is also held accountable for their role in training/raising the dog (ie: if dog is determined dangerous, owner is no longer allowed to own dogs since they cannot train them properly)
- As long as it is not based on the breed of dog but actual facts of individual case
- If the case is appealed by the owners (in a euthanasia decision) that the dog would continue to be held by animal control services until the appeal date.
- as long as its fair and both sides of the situation is addressed.
- I like the idea as long as the tribunal isn't chosen by the same people trying to regulate specific dog breeds. They need to be animal specialists like veterinarians, vet techs or groomers.
- it didn't single out specific breeds of dogs.
- There needs to be people who work professionally with dogs! Informed decisions only!
- The breed has nothing to do with incident
- The animal gets to stay with their families
- Remain at scene is simple like an accident or collision until supported and directed by law officer etc.
- Harsher and enforceable limitations on dog owners including economic consequences and a public list
- Each dog must be regarded as an individual and assessed on its specific behaviors... This comes straight from our own Calgary Humane Society. Please do not use your personal bias to force pit bull owners to mistreat their dogs. By muzzling and treating Pit bulls differently we are doing nothing to help the animals. Please leave your personal bias out of this and instead look at scientific facts/studies which show that Pit bulls are no worse/different from other dogs.
- 50% of the tribunal are current dog owners
- There should be representatives from pro-dog, dog training and education facilities and/or associations that weigh in on these decisions. It must be mandatory that one of these representatives attends the hearing. Could be from Humane Society, profession dog trainer, etc. Tribunal should offer solutions for the dog owner to keep their pet such as training. Should not immediately resort to euthanization but of course decided on a case by case basis. RTDRS works pretty well and I feel that something like this to deal with dogs seems reasonable.
- That the owner is offered psychological counselling. Owners of problem dogs are quite often the root of the problem. They may not understand the breed of dog they own, they may have poor control over themselves and then by extension, have poor control of their dog. Perhaps people should be licensed, rather than the dog.
- Non biased to dog breeds
- As long as all members are dog owners themselves with no discrimination based on the breed of the dog being reviewed.
- there is a dog advocate, expert opinion present
- Seems fair
- Again focus on owner and their behaviour most dogs when handles properly are good
- If all parties are not against a certain breeds! They have to be open to all breeds of dogs and not be one sided



- That a dog is not euthanized because it has lacked training by its owner. It should get the appropriate training or given to a shelter if the owner is unwilling to change.
- Sufficient screening/background checks to ensure that the members of the tribunal are non-biased and responsible
- as long as there is proper oversight on the proceedings and the verdicts are fair and non bias and is taken by is looked at by a case to case base.
- It was not discriminating dogs based on breeds eg pitbulls
- Tribunal needs to be comprised of experienced dog people (eg. vets, trainers, etc)
- It's not Bias against bully breeds
- Involved many people with high knowledge of dog training and did not enforce euthanasia
- This tribunal should consist of dog behavioral specialists that can determine fair outcomes professionally as opposed to biased opinions based on breed.
- each case was treated equally, fairly and accordingly. Take a decent amount of time to look at each case individually.
- I do not think a dog should be euthanized at the decision of the tribunal, and I would not want to see a decision to euthanize expedited for the sake of efficiency.
- This court should not be allowed to decide life or death for an animal. Instead leave that decision up to the owner and make sure the crime fits the punishment. For example, if someone comes on a property where a dog is being detained and ignores signs of dog on premises, the dog should not be held accountable for defending against an unauthorized intruder. If a dog escapes their property and attacks anyone, not just barks or intimidates them, that should be treated more harshly and have a 2 strike rule.
- The dogs behaviour is reviewed in an appropriate environment not one of high stress setting the dog up for failure, and an accurate history of the dog is taken into consideration ie a dog with no history as a Nuisance, or history of aggression.
- Non biased towards a dogs breed and looks more at the character of the owner
- Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal
- It would have to be truly objective and include way too many valid inputs to be truly efficient. It would need professionals in dog behaviour as well as rehabilitative experts and there are currently not enough unbiased perspectives that could be made into a full-time tribunal when these circumstances arise
- Any and all tribunal members must be declared a fair fit for ALL breeds without bias towards specific breeds.
- That at least one member of the tribunal is from the purebred dog community - either a Canadian Kennel Club licensed judge or temperament evaluator.
- Penalties/corrective action must be applied to owners as well as animals
- As long as the decisions were made without bias towards the breed of dog. All dogs can be vicious or a nuisance. The determination should always be about the severity of the incident not the breed of dog.



- Individuals involved in the tribunals should be checked for possible bias
- Yes
- Transparency into tribunal selection process
- No euthanization!!
- No dog should be euthanized without at least putting them through a rehabilitation program or revoking them to a more responsible owner. Euthanasia should be an absolute last resort. It's the owner, not the dog.
- All dogs are treated the same
- It is fair and unbiased and takes ALL the facts into consideration.
- Representatives are independent on related matters
- There would need to be a certified dog behaviorist / trainer and veterinary on this tribunal; to give background experience in support of understanding what triggered the responses from the dog, (whether they were behavioral or / and medical condition) to make sure that all the facts were dealt with in a professionally expert supported manner
- Tribunal members need to have a clear understanding of dog behaviour and no bias toward specific breeds.
- Dog assessed by 2 trainers having the owner allowed to choose 1 of the trainers. Dog also assessed by 2 different veterinarians. With the choice of one vet by owner. choice by owner
- If these people are properly trained
- The tribunal was not bias towards any person, or breed of animal so a fair judgement can be made depending on each situation. This could be tricky but for faster processing it would be beneficial.
- No opinion
- The animal stays with the owner
- As long as it's a fair straight across the board tribunal that does not discriminate against breeds. [personal information removed] I will tell you right now the most vicious and crazy dogs I see are black/chocolate labs, Shepard's, and shiba inus. You can not be breed-cist when making this decisions.
- prior to euthanization, the animal to be access for rehabilitation and the owner or owners should be penalized (not to own a animal after education courses) and deemed fit for owner.
- All decisions bcan be appealed by the owner and victim in provincial court. And the "experts" are chosen from a diverse population
- Tribunal should have veterinarian and professional
- All attacks be treated equally regardless of breed or size of dog.
- No dog death. It could be the persons fault for the dogs Behavior. Asses the person
- No animal is euthanized if it can go to a responsible sanctuary for animals. The owner is given atleast 60 days after appeal to find one. If the animal is rehabilitated the owner can get it back if they qualify for adoption through the sanctuary, with restrictions. The bylaws apply to all dogs regardless of size and is enforced on all dogs
- Who is on this tribunal, what biases and agendas do they bring?



- Included members from a variety of backgrounds/stances
- Breed was not brought into decisions. They were looking at if the dogs ever been in incidents before. And considering if it was a one time thing or not bc dogs have anxiety too, and people approaching them can make them act out, same as a human that feels threatened.
- A trained dog behaviorist is involved in the assessment and decision making process.
- One tribunal member is a dog obedience expert and determine if it is a nature or nurture issue
- The dog is not put in harms way, can remain with the owner unless the owner poses threat to the animal. Animal to remain on property or not allowed around other animals until process is complete
- If there are restrictions that require the dog to stay at home, unless the bite occurs at home or the victim is a family member
- The owner and his dog have a right to defend their case. If the attack was instigated, or if the dog was attacked by the person who is claiming he was attacked needs to be looked at. Most bull related convictions arent given the opportunity to defend themselves, and end up being euthanized anyways because of bias. You need to make sure all the facts are being looked at.
- Offer support for training at first offence, educate owner in how best to help the pet become a better member of society through training.
- Dogs are taken from bad dog parents and rehabilitated.
- Proper representation of the dog and authority sectors
- Multiple parties of people and rescue societies with actual life experience with multiple dog breeds and actual experience with Bully breeds such as Prairie Pitbull Rescue. Rather than someone who knowingly carries prejudice to any breed.
- The people appointed to the tribunal would need to understand and support proper canine health and wellbeing, and understanding the psychology around potential triggers and situational stressors on dogs. Who would the non-city reps be? What steps would be taken to ensure they have the proper understanding of animals and not just want to put all "bad dogs" down?
- The animal remains in its home
- Different placement, no euthanasia
- Dog owners given the option to skip a tribunal and go straight to court instead.
- Vets and dog behaviour specialists are on the panel
- they have specialized training in dealing with vicious dogs, and strive to rehabilitate the the dog where possible.
- If the representative s included the appropriate people including a vet, dog Trainer/behaviourist with proper credentials like APDT, by bylaw officer
- Those individuals representing the tribunal have the requisite skill/expertise to make an objective recommendation.
- Only if the tribunal actually review all the circumstances of the incident and used the same reasoning regardless of breed of the animal.
- A tribunal can remain unbiased towards dog breeds
- That persons doing these assessments are professional dog behaviouralists and or trainers



- They'd have to have clearly defined outcomes/penalties that were fair across the board otherwise everyone will just go to court anyway
- As long as it speeds up the process to euthanize all pitbulls and dogs that have severely bit other dogs/straggers, then it is acceptable.
- The best interest of the animal is the priority. Why did it misbehave? What was the human error? The humans should be on trial, not the animal.
- The participants are knowledgeable on judicial law regarding animal rights and animal attack, and included members who are Veterinarians, Animal Control officers, and blockhead pet owners, along with those who aren't. It has to be a fair tribunal and not an angry group of villagers with pitchforks.
- Those on the Tribunal are Unbiased. There are a lot of incidents involving biased individuals and Pit Bulls. Just because it is a pit bull doesn't mean it is going to kill everyone.
- It included a bullydog owner with experience handling bully breeds
- An expert in the field must be present and have a vote
- The tribunals decision should be made alongside city representatives as to not fully replace their position.
- Shouldn't cost extra taxpayer money
- I support this as long as the voting are NOT biased against any breed
- people on the tribunal are knowledgeable and unbiased
- Have people who are familiar with animals and not just breed specific legislation supporters
- Had the best interest of the dog included
- That "bully breeds" receive fair judgement and are treated like every other breed of dog
- Review further history of dog's behavior (I.e. is this a recurring behavior?, was the dog provoked wrongfully?), By asking, what caused the dog to act the way they did?
- as you can appeal it in court
- The opportunity to file for an appeal remains in place.
- A mix of viewpoints- not all members can be prejudiced against Pit Bull type breeds
- That the tribunal would be non biased and understand that the dog is/ could be a danger to the community. Ensure that there is a fair process for all attacks and set timelines and dates to ensure the conditions are met by. Ensure that you have all your bases covered to leave no room for error or misunderstanding that would cause the dog to go back into unsafe hands of an owner which has the potential for another bite.
- That it be assured that the tribunal members have no bias against the particular animal
- Ok
- if you're doing to force owners to muzzle their pitbulls then you should also force people to muzzle their mastiffs, German Shepards, Rottweilers, Cane Corsos, just to name a few. All the dogs I just listed have a much stronger bite force than a Pitbull. Please reevaluate your stance to be more in line with scientific facts instead of personal bias.
- Don't euthanize someone else's dog. Tell them to keep it at home, send it to obedience school, pay a fine, whatever. Just don't go around killing dogs for being loud [removed].



- Decision for euthanization to be unanimous in tribunal, recommendations/suggestions be science based, have a certified trainer who specializes in reactive dogs, either on the tribunal or brought in for assessments (ie, Cindy Peacock), and have set standards and rules to follow for every case.
- To interview all parties involved. Sometimes small dogs run up to large ones and bark and snip at them, and the little dog owners assume the behaviour is "cute". Both parties need to have their dogs under control.
- euthanization is rarely only an option. And if the tribunal allows dogs to be trained properly with the right restriction implicated.
- The dog was vicious and not provoked in anyway
- They have extensive training and knowledge about rehabilitation and training of dogs
- The breed/image/description of the dog should not be provided during the case. Stereotypes should not be the basis of a decision. It should not matter the breed of the dog pertaining to the situation.
- No breed specific discrimination- the incident has to be looked at for what actually happened with NO BIAS due to breed of dogs involved
- the owner, as well as victim (or family) are involved. Proof that the dog is in fact not a victim and has bitten in self defence. A fair approach and not just based on breed of dog putting certain breeds into a "bad dog" category before things even start.
- Both parties agree
- regarding restrictions or increased expectations for dogs with multiple offences where there is a higher potential for dangerous behavior should be for all dogs. NOT BREED SPECIFIC!
- Unless the dog is a threat to bite again I would never put the dog down. Have the owner and the dog go thru classes and work with the owner
- Yes
- Rehabilitation was the priority
- Qualified individuals only as representatives; dog/owner rehabilitation attempted before euthanization.
- The people making those decisions included vets and animal rescue group representatives and not include people that have no education, training or hands on experience with numerous dogs of various breeds.
- No euthanizing of dogs, all dog can be rehabilitated it's the owner that would be the issue
- Absolutely no bias against breeds. There are NO bad breeds only irresponsible owners.
- There's an immense amount of prejudice against bully breeds. You need people that love, understand and can handle all dogs.
- There would have to be an assessment done by a educated dog trainer to assess the dogs behaviour
- Yes
- Instead of euthanizing dog send it to a rescue/business specializing in rehab of aggressive dogs
- The tribunal members are dog owners and actively involved in dog training.
- Must be run by canine experts next to law experts. No person on the tribunal shall be any thing other than those 2 mandates.



- Councillors, bylaw officers, judges, city officials that are breed discriminatory are not part of tribunals.
- Zero euthanization unless extreme behaviour. One bite is not enough.
- Willingness to work with the owner and offer support for training and obedience.
- There are not breed biased opinions (ex cannot be against “pit bull” breed)
- There are sufficient appeal periods to allow for further evidence or amendments
- Staffed by people who unlike the people writing this survey know anything about dog training..
- The people on the tribunal must be knowledgeable about animal behaviour, and not enforce stereotypes.
- Unbiased members who are not judging by breed but by owner actions
- As long as a full investigation happens.
- A strong ethical standard is upheld in determining the result of these cases and that they are not taken lightly. Both sides of the incident should be taken into account to ensure that all efforts have been made by the animal owner to re-train their animal before any euthanasia is even considered.
- A board that is completely impartial based on breed/the case, they would have to be trained professionals that understand behaviour, fear and health of animals (veterinarians, veterinary technicians, trainers, etc)
- must include someone from a group that supports animal well being not just the interests of people.
- There must be an assessment by a licensed trainer, that does not work for a pet store. Trainer reserves the right to take dog to boarding for training.
- There should be an effort to ensure there is no breed bias in the tribunal - especially when euthanization is an possible outcome
- The dog was witnessed attacking, and that it applies to ALL breeds, including Golden retrievers...
- I think a bad dog is a reflection of its owner. I think tougher penalties for the owner for attacks. Any dog who is not trained will bite. Any dog with a bad owner will bite even the ownet.
- That is run by people that are knowledgeable about dogs and dog behaviors
- Animal behaviorists and science based trainers should be part of this process including a behavior vet. This way we can look at the dog in question to see how the problem should be solved. Ei put the down down, regime to a more experienced owner, take extra training into account to help the dog.
- A thorough investigation and not an arbitrary determination based on appearance. This should also apply to small dogs displaying aggressive behavior.
- The tribunal should be able to recommend charges against the owner if their behaviour was negligent and charges had not already been laid.
- The tribunal has the authority to throw out a case and return the dog to the home immediately. 2. The tribunal cannot euthanize a dog without allowing the appeal process to run its full course. 3. The composition of the tribunal includes canine professionals in a number suitable to allow a majority in instances where voting is to take place.
- No euthanasia
- Interviewing the owners and victims



- as long as it was fair to all parties and can be appealed if need be.
- the dog remain with the owner on their property.
- So long as the tribunal's interest is what is best for the animal!
- The tribunal was treated in a similar manner to a jury and were able to face the situation in a non-biased manner.
- The same actions for small dogs and large dogs
- The tribunal was made up of people who know something about dogs
- I DO NOT agree with the suggested prejudice against "pitbull" breed dogs. Tribunals should consider each dog on an individual basis and people should not be eligible for membership on a tribunal if there is reason to believe that they are biased for or against particular breeds.
- I think that is fair the longer a dog sits in the shelter scared away from its family the worse it is
- There are educated members from dog communities such as a representative from shelters,experiences member of a rescue group, a veterinarian, dog trainer, etc
- As long as the people picked for the tribunal did not have any biases towards specific dog breeds.
- No one should have the right to decide if my my dog should be euthanized!
- Have employees that are actually knowledgeable about the different dog breeds, not ones who just think pit bulls are evil. (Looking at you Calgary)
- If it included equally the amount of unbiased representatives in the tribunal.
- It needs to be an unbiased tribunal that is not prejudice to specific breeds of dogs.
- As long as the dog is with a responsible owner don't traumatize the dog by putting it in a shelter
- as long as an appeals process is available
- The tribunal includes a CBCC certified trainer who DOES NOT use aversive training. Any credible designation will NOT use any punishment in their training. The tribunal MUST include an expert in dog behavior and NOT someone that claims to be an expert. DOGMA in Calgary had the MOST educated trainers and the owner is internationally recognized for her experience
- That no dog was put down without the owner being able to appeal it at the court of queens bench.
- The dogs are not euthanized, they are meant to go to obedience training, unless absolutely necessary (no hope ever of training the dog out of it, which must be determined by professionals, like several obedience instructors and vets) not as an easy out solution.
- The actions of the supposed victim MUST be taken into consideration. If someone behaves in a way that is against the instructions of the owner OR makes the animal behave in a way that demonstrates it feels threatened; the responsibility for the alleged attack should be with that person. I personally do NOT permit my neighbors children around my dog because they have no social responsibility, personal responsibility or owners9 of their actions. If my dog were put into a position to be judged because of something THEY did, it would be a terrible injustice. Education of owners to know when to allow people to be in their pets lives is key, BUT other people need to clearly understand the owners right to deny access.
- Tribunal is a great idea. Any dog which gives multiple level 4 or single or more level 5 bites to any citizen should be seized and euthanized after the end of rabies hold, these animals are too dangerous to live in a society and can give life altering injuries to citizens specially children. For



other offences level 2,3, provoked single level 4 (non predatory) bite, Killing pet cat, pet dog- Do a bail like system - start legal proceedings but no need to seize the animal, if owner does not pay fine , follow recommendations, multiple offences then seize their animals and adopt them out to responsible owners.

- It is transparent and weighs ALL bites the same, regardless of the breed of the dog.
- Breed neutral arbitration
- As long as dogs aren't apprehended based on their breed.
- They make educated decisions
- There are coaching processes to assist in less killing of animals and more support is provided in affording lessons and training for lower income people or those whom have fallen on hard times. Also exceptions and more support should be available to rescue and foster programs to rehab dogs in t any animal not just punish the animal by killing it for having bad owners . Dogs aren't born bad they lack a good owner. With proper handling skills these owners should be punished by being forbidden animals not killing the animal .
- Best interest of the dog
- Tribunal members were ensured to be unbiased against certain breeds and Euthanasia was only considered as a very last resort
- This does not inhibit the quality of life for an animal dependent on their breed. It is the people and owners who cause animals to be aggressive. Owners should be watched more responsibly rather than the pet itself.
- No breed specific restrictions, make it BEHAVIOR BASED
- The tribunal was non biased
- It includes a member who works with a local animal rescue. And a dog trainer or someone with a full understanding of dog behaviour
- Has to be fair
- No comment
- Has dog behaviour experts on it
- The dog can stay with the owner under certain conditions (not allowed to leave the property) until a decision has been made.
- It has been determined that the dog was not coerced by the victim, whether or not there is a lack of training for either dog or handler
- no euthanized measures taken.
- The tribunal must understand canine behaviour and not be biased towards specific breeds. The tribunal should be composed of vets, trainers, etc., not unqualified city council members.
- Had at least 5 experts in the field (I.e. vet techs, veterinarians, ect).
- a certified behaviorist making the declaration Not some bylaw officer or city official scared of terrified dogs
- It is like jury selection, the people involved MUST be neutral and very case is an individual.
- Focused on dog rehabilitation rather than euthanasia.



- The tribunal was made up of people who have knowledge in dog training or behaviour, holding no bias towards certain breeds of dog
- Not requiring the destruction of dogs based on breed and understanding dog behaviour to determine if the offence was purely due to dog aggression or human error. Dogs show MANY warning signs before resorting to attacking in majority of cases.
- Tribunal membership would include representatives from Prairie Pits and veterinarians who understand what a terrible idea this is . You can not segregate a group of dogs based on their looks or genetics .
- If a dog is declared to be euthanized by a tribunal, the case must then go to court for a legitimate court hearing.
- Members of the tribunal board be involved in animal rescuing or animal care
- Did not exhibit any bias against breed
- Take all things into account (ie. Was a child teasing the dog and being mean to it? What's the history of the dog? Has this happened before? Was it another do? Was the dog doing what it naturally was born to do? Was the dog protecting something? Was the dog hurt? Or is this dog bred for attacking? Mistreated? Abused?
- Ensure their are owners of pit bulls or the other dogs listed in the tribunals. Especially those who know these dogs and know they can be loving dogs. Also a tribunal that focuses on owners who make dogs mean.
- The process includes a behavioural assessment of the animal
- that judgement and facts were looked at and not breed myths
- They used CKC appointed dog experts to have input with all breeds.
- Was made up of individuals who were educated in dog behaviours. Someone who understood dogs and what is best for them.
- I would like to have someone that is more "for the dog". Like how you have the prosecution and the defense. There shouldn't be just an entire tribunal made up of people against pit bulls. TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT FOR THESE STUPID LAWS
- Not breed specific.
- Euthanization should not be an option. I would suggest a rehabilitation program for dogs that appear to be "aggressive" that focus's on teaching the owners about responsible ownership and emphasizes proper training.
- the case was fair and all the evidence was heard.
- Tribunal members have adequate training and education on dog breeds and issues
- The owner should be investigated. A dog learns viscous behaviour. They are taught how to act. Therefore, an owner can train a dog to be non aggressive which has been proven in so many cases with pit bulls.
- It looked at the owners of the dog and the owners lead the dog.
- That euthanasia is taken off the table. Because people are biased towards the animal.
- Said "vicious" dog gets obedient training.



- I suggest that while looking at the investigation you see that it's not the dogs fault he became aggressive. If anything it is the owners fault for not properly training their dog
- A professional dog trainer is involved with the case to determine the dog's behaviour
- They don't have the i sane amount of power animal enforcement officers have
- as long as the person/panel doing the evaluation includes a known dog behaviour training specialist
- Tribunal members be dog owners and knowledgeable in these matters. Tribunal members also be voted upon by public for specific time periods.
- Provided it remains bias free based on dog type and there is an option for appeal if owner feels it was treated incorrectly
- The representatives are highly educated animal experts.
- It was voluntarily, the tribunal consisted of dog owners/breeders of a variety of breeds. This includes pit bulls, shepherds, rot ties, and smaller breeds. No cost to taxpayers.
- They need to be tracked. Follow up at certain intervals: 1 month, 6 month a year.
- Apprehending to a shelter may not be necessary. Consider a 'bail' option as funds could help support a tribunal system
- As long as there is an option for rehabilitation for the dog and not just immediate euthanization
- I think a tribunal would be beneficial for the dogs that have a record of being a nuisance. Hopefully with this system, we can weed out the unresponsble dog owners from the ones that care about their animals.
- There is screening for bias towards "blockheaded" dogs to ensure fairness and not an increase in the "blockheaded" LOOKING dogs being euthanized.
- Just review orders that were handed out at scene. If it is really serious address the issues
- Has at least one dog trainer on it and made up of dog owners
- Those on the tribunal are knowledgable with animal behaviour including vets, animal trainers, registered breeders et cetera.
- Members are fairly selected and have the animal's best interests in mind
- One of the board members is from an animal advocacy center.
- Does NOT discriminate due to BREED
- Pitbulls, and anything mentioned above should not be singled out. It is unfair to the pet as it is an owner's responsibility to train and control their pets.
- If the tribunal adequately assesses the nature of the incident: was the dog unprovoked or was there some stress applied to the dog (children screaming/running, child unsupervised with dog, inappropriate behaviour by person around dog, etc.)
- All views are equally represented
- As long as behavior, training and animal experts were on the panel and it isn't just a bunch of lawyers, cops and general whatevers dealing with the decisions. Leave these decisions to the professionals.
- Tribunal must include majority who are extremely familiar with dog behaviors regardless of breed
- Breeds should not be discriminated against.



- Look at the situation. Why did the dog attack ? Was there a person coming at them aggressively, was there a child tormenting them, was there another dog attacking them and it was in self defence, is the owner a new owner and still learning how to train them, or is the OWNER the one who has trained them to attack. You just can't decide to euthanize an animal on a yes or no decision. Look at the situation, they are a family member.
- If it wasn't just a bunch of pitbull hating people on a board to get rid of our fur babies
- Be unbiased. Dogs attacks Normally happen because they feel threatened, their family is threatened, the are provoked or incompetent owners and lack of traini. Why are we punishing dogs for their owners competencies. If a dog's tale gets pulled, they will nip. That is not considered an attack. Have a better laid out plan as to what is identified as a vicious animal attack. If my hair gets pulled by another adult, I'm probably going to slap the. Why would be treat dogs with such viscosity, as they are only capable of so much.
- No euthanization.
- NA
- There were experienced dog behaviorist specialists on the panel and people involved with rescue/sanctuary options as well.
- I would support a Tribunal that is not mandated by Breed Specific Legislation.
- The tribunal needs to include at least 2 qualified dog behavior specialists.
- As long as it is the best interest of the dog being taken into consideration. Example; being allowed to remain in the home instead of shelter.
- The tribunal cannot have any biased members if one member hates certain dogs based on appearance not situation it could end terribly for the animal
- As long as the decisions are still invested, fair and not rushed through.
- No breed discrimination.
- Tribunal is a panel voted and selected by the public
- There were certified and trained people involved who have an understanding of dog behaviour.
- As long as the owner is provided sufficient time to gather evidence and defend their stance.
- this applies to ALL dogs. To select this policy based on breed is the same as making policy for POC vs. White. [removed]. People shouldn't own animals they cannot train or take care of. Many people have dogs as therapy tools and don't register them. Many of these dogs have been abused and partner well with domestic violence victims. Overall, you ban these dogs from good people you'll have a rise in dog fighting. [removed]
- Euthanasia considered as only a very last option when no training can change dogs aggression
- They must understand that the DOG is not the problem. It is the OWNER that is.
- the owner has the ability to take training
- Minimum knowledge requirement for selected city and non-coty representatives
- There are members from the animal field present (vet, dog trainer, etc). These members could offer some educated insight.
- Why are Pitbull's the only ones listed and it's not the dog perhaps you should look into the owners as well



- The people on the tribunal are not biased against any breed of dog and includes an owner of a pitbull at all times as this can lower the chances of an unfair verdict against a pit bull or pit bull appeared dog.
- Block head dogs are not treated differently solely because of their appearance or breed
- Fair and no breed prejudice
- That those in charge of review understand dog behavior and can judge fairly.
- Allow the dog to stay at its own home and instead of trying to force people to euthanize or otherwise give up their pet, have them seek training instead.
- Dog could not be euthanized without approval of a judge
- Not judge an offense because of the breed of dog
- as long as they consulted a good balanced trainer before making any euthanasia decisions
- Fairness and investigation into why the incident happened. Often the dog is provoked which does not set them up for success in any situation.
- Trained animal behaviourists included in the discussion. I don't want the fate of an animal left in the hands of highly emotionally charged. There are many reasons why attacks happen and it does not necessarily mean they are bad animals. Objective professionals need to analyze and be apart of the process.
- It's not biased on breed
- No breed bias
- As long as the appointed individuals for the Tribunal were well educated in the matters of which they are making decisions on.
- If euthanization is a rare case
- The issue was dealt with in a timely manner and the arbitrator was educated in dog behaviour so both sides were equally considered.
- That it had unbiased representation
- There was a certified dog behavioural specialist on the panel
- Should the decision be the 3rd bullet, the owner is required to take training on how to handle the dog and random follow up visits for a specified amount of time, depending on the case.
- If it's done responsibly
- The city doesn't use it as an expedition of a guilty verdict for the dog
- As long as a vet was involved
- If the people on the tribunal were inclined to helping the dog and owner vs just euthanizing the dog. If we can supposedly "rehabilitate" rapists and pedophiles why can we not train a dog not to bite?
- Using a behavioral therapist (like JC St Louis) in a correct environment for temperament testing. Animals have fight or flight and if you take away the ability for flight by placing a dog in an enclosed room you are left with flight.
- There is no breed discrimination and each dog is treated as an individual case - regardless of breed.
- You would need to have an impartial person - one who doesn't judge based on breed but on the situation. For example, if a kid gets bitten and needs stitches. What as the kid doing? Was he



minding his business or was he tormenting the dog? Again, let's face it, kids can be assholes and parents would rather be friends than parents. Therefore, kids aren't taught how to behave around animals and may think teasing the dog or pulling their ears or tails, is an acceptable form of behaviour. Wouldn't you react, if it was you being tormented? Now, if the situation is someone has their dog offleash and they randomly attack a person, then yes by all means impose restrictions or euthanize them if deemed a high risk.

- As long as specific breeds are not discriminated against. The idea of BSL makes me sad to be a Calgarian.
- Low cost, has an appeal system, actually speedy
- It would be made up an appropriate representation of dog people including people having the breed in question.
- Don't forget training for the human part of that equation
- You are doing bias checks with the individuals processing these cases because if you pass BSL then I doubt the cases against any breed looking like a pitbull would be fair. It's kind of like how if indigenous individuals are suspected of being involved in a crime they are more likely to get charged with less evidence and proof than if a white person committed that same crime. We need to do bias checks before allowing people to process cases against animals and humans
- The dog would be placed in an appropriate home for behaviour training.
- No city representatives. Law enforcement to replace city representation.
- The dog gets a muzzle and gets to stay at home and not in a shelter.
- Tribunal must include at least one expert (ie. vet, animal behaviourist) and one animal rights advocate, in addition to a city/law enforcement rep.
- It follows the same guidelines a ruling handed down from a provincial court.
- The person making the judgement call on the dog has trained/worked with dogs extensively. And someone that isn't breed biased.
- The tribunal should contain or at least consult dog professionals who have experience rehabilitating aggressive dogs to assess whether mandatory training is an option instead of euthanasia
- The people are not biased AGAINST pitbulls or other "aggressive" breeds
- The dog lives at home during the process
- They were educated and had knowledge around the issues.
- the dog is put into protective care and tested to see if it can be rehabilitated...and not given back to the owner.
- Fair, unbiased rulings.
- The dog is not always guilty of being vicious. If provoked situations are taken into consideration I would support this. If the dog is automatically considered guilty I would not.
- The dog must remain with its family. It is not the dog's fault as it is the owner's responsibility to raise and train the dog properly. Owners must attend dog training sessions with their dog to ensure they have control over their dog.
- Vicious dogs should be trained and possibly rehomed, NOT euthanized!!!



- The tribunal was made up of not only city officials but also individuals who work in and around dogs ie. Trainers, breeders, etc so that they are able to properly evaluate and assess the dogs behavior and provide a proper rehabilitation program.
- as long as there is a program we can put these dogs in to give them a second chance and allow them to be loved and cared for while awaiting the process. The owners need to be on trial not the dog
- An investigation took place regarding whether or not the aggression was instinctual or a behaviour trained into the dog.
- Depending on the severity of the attack, a first attack should not result in euthanasia. There are a number of reasons dogs may bite, and if the Victim was antagonizing the dog this may result in an adverse effect. Look again at the pet owner and not so much the pet. IF a pet owner has had multiple animals that are overtly aggressive then more should be done about the pet owner.
- Emphasis on behavior training and diversion from euthanasia.
- e important and should be considered before euthanasia.
- Had various people included such as owners of the "certain breed" or experts of that breed and not just who ever is available
- Dogs are not euthanized. They are removed from the home that made them dangerous. The owners of the dangerous dog are fined and given jail time / probation.
- People on the tribunal must not have any bias on the matter.
- A behavioral expert is included
- The dog owner was able to put forth their case fairly. And for the tribunal to be able to see the dog owner and dog interact together.
- As long as human and child issues got the same "sped up for minimized suffering" consideration!
- Members of tribunal need to be educated on dog behavior
- The parties involved in the biting incident have a say in what happens to the dog and also that people who know the dog can testify to its usual behavior etc. for a final decision.
- must look at every case as an individual dog/owner, and not be predisposed to label certain breeds bad.
- As long as euthanasia is OFF the table
- Behavior assessment done by a veterinary behaviorist
- Dog should not be euthanized but removed from owner and given to someone who would train and socialize the dog.
- Thorough assessment of the dog instead of quick judgement by only the case in court. Please do not euthanize dogs for no reason!
- No breed specific bylawys
- They aren't allowed to decide whether or not a dog should be put down. Rather they can't be in dog parks must be muzzled while out in public, etc.
- There are people on the tribunal who are educated in dogs and behaviour. The cost of the tribunal should be shared by the city and the dog owner.
- Do not euthanize dogs if they bite. Assess the situation and rehabilitate the dog.



- The selection of people include pet owners as well
- As long as they are great pet owners and have compassion for the animals.
- The tribunal was composed of people that understand animal behaviour/conditions, and not JUST general members of the public
- Need to ensure that there is no bias on the tribunal. decisions cannot be subjective.
- a tribunal would need to have an experienced dog trainer on it
- A legal vs just an opinion at the City level
- There is a system in place to ensure that the members of the tribunal do not have a conflict of interest, especially prejudices against certain breeds, and if euthanasia is recommended the final decision is passed to the courts and can be appealed
- They were to work with a highly trained dog trainer to better assess and/or determine the reason behind the dog's behaviour. Such as, poor owner training, medical issues, outside forces (self defence), etc. There needs to be someone advocating for the "vicious" dog, other than the owner.
- Animal trainer and vet be involved and provide full assessments to be considered in any decisions.
- As long as you do do you not discriminate against breed
- no breed bias
- The tribunal has a degree or experience with animal behavior
- Tribunal is operated with expert dog people and vets, the event needs to be fully investigated. No dog should be euthanized if they were protecting their owners, or due to be teased and taunted.
- A fair and unbiased decision not based on breed but on facts and the individual dogs/owner history of behaviour
- Was composed of a panel of vet professionals, dog trainers and behaviourists.
- Give the owner the right and ability to choose to try to have their pet retrained by a professional dog rehabilitator and all parties will have to accept the rehabilitator's assessment as to the dog's reliability to be safe.
- if the finding could be appealed
- There is two people involved, not just the 'opinion' and decision of one individual.
- External reviews and assessment as well as owner reviews and home conditions reviewed
- Their position does not favour a breed and all types are considered the same, including small breeds!
- Representatives had experience with dogs and did not have biases towards breed which could cloud their judgement
- There must be a fair trial even in tribunal.
- Not be biased against a certain breed of dog. All dogs are equal
- i can't read the rest of the question
- The condition is there must be enough dog bites to justify this. Is it justified today? People getting bit all over town?
- Input from a non-biased expert in dog behaviour
- No existing bias in the tribunal members based on untrue stereotypes surrounding breed behavior



- the metric for membership on the tribunal needs to ensure zero bias
- The tribunal members are unbiased and members make up a diverse representation of the city of Calgary
- Euthanasia was not utilized.
- An opportunity for the owner to present a case and evidence in regards to the dogs behavior, an opportunity for restitution for the victim, and consequences that include dog training or other preventative measures over putting the dog down
- Punishing the owner and not the dog
- The animal remains in home or with a rescue group
- There is no prejudice against a specific breed. Any dog can be aggressive if it hasn't had proper training.
- Appeals process at provincial level in cases where euthanasia is a determined result
- The tribunal had dog behaviour experts as sitting members overseeing each case, so as to prevent the euthanasia of provoked animals. This includes animals who are teased, or feel that thier life has been otherwise threatened and are exercising self defense.
- It'd not done by law enforcement. It's done by an organization educated about dogs.
- I would support a tribunal
- As long as the people were not bias against certain breeds and did not forgive first offences too easily.
- Professional dog trainer and certified veterinarian
- Fair chance to offer the dog rehabilitation
- Providing that breed specific language is not applied.
- Euthanizing is a permanent decision and does not belong in a tribunal. Tribunal is an interim...not final decision. Tribunal should only be acting in the welfare of the dog and safety of community.
- The people on the tribunal don't act out of fear and have the appropriate dog-hqndling education to make a sound decision that isn't rash.
- Media attention tends to sway public opinion; media should be advised that although not a trial, any reporting of the tribunal should be the same as such
- That the owner and dog are allowed to both be together at the tribunal so that the owner can demonstrate it the dog is actually aggressive, that these tribunals be held at a dog training facility such as Dog Topia where dog trainers can see the dog in action and if the aggressive behaviour continues during the tribunal with several dog trainers not being able to correct the issue then that can contribute to the outcome of the the case if the dog needs to be euthanized, but if owners and trainers are able to demonstrate and determine what the cause was for the behaviour and correct it, that can also contribute to the case. The tribunal needs to consist of various dog trainers, other dog owners, veterinarians. And the dog owner should be allowed to bring in any people that know the dog and have frequently interacted with the dog. This can include the dog walker, dog trainers, dog daycare staff, roommates, family and friends that have spent time with the dog, pet store staff that know the dog personally etc.
- Maintains or enhances the level of strictness of the current structure.



- Their suggestions are not focused on disciplining specific breeds (ie pit bulls) but rather individual cases
- Fair process & right to appeal
- Not discriminating against one breed. And actually taking into account what provoked them to do such a thing to have the tribunal systems called along. And euthanasia should never be the option. You wouldn't put down a human if they attacked someone. Why a dog?
- Has to be multiple steps including training as an option prior to euthanasia
- Members of the tribunal would have to include responsible owners of the breed and would need to evaluate both owner and dog (ie: dog fight owner)
- tribunal is never given breed information or images, so that there is no discrimination against specific breeds or looks
- As long as the situation is reviewed b\y a knowledgeable person
- Pit bulls are not unfairly classified as nuisances
- As the owner of 2 rescue bully breeds, I would feel discriminated against under the blatant "pitbull" proposals being made. This is all biased propoganda. If "pitbulls" are discriminated against, your city is moving backwards in its way of thinking and lawmaking. Shame on you Calgary! We will start visiting elsewhere and encourage other "pitbull" owners to follow suite. This is very short sighted of your city. Perhaps clean up the real threats in your downtown core- the meth, the fentanyl and the obscene amounts of garage! It's actually disgusting and you should be embarrassed this is where your priorities lie.
- Dog breeds would not sway the decision at all
- Dog should be released to rehab
- It does not cost tax payers extra. Dogs should be kept with owners not away from them while waiting, no matter which system is used.
- Complete public transparency and the release of all names involved including all tribunal staff.
- As long is there is certified animal behaviorist, certified trainers and not just humane society employee employees.
- All members are animal behavior specialists
- The identity of the breed would not be mentioned as it would keep out myths (which should not even be used) and biases.
- Tribunal must be trained in dog behaviour and must assess dogs temperament before issuing fines or euthanasia orders.
- To take into account the dog owner, it's the owner who is responsible not the dogs the dog is doing what it was taught or not taught by the owners
- There is NO bias. The breed of the dog should not be disclosed until the decision has been made. This goes for any and all dog breeds. Not just "pitbull type" dogs.
- any disagreement to the (so called experts that don't know which way to wipe) referred to court automatically.
- Reasonable people have to be on the tribunal. Where would you find them?
- No people who dislike one dog breed



- Unbiased members. Some members must own pitbull type dogs personally
- Restrictions placed on owner need to make sense for the rehabilitation of the dog. The focus should be education and rehabilitation not punishment as it's been proven ineffective in protecting the community.
- Unbiased opinions on dog breeds- no one who discriminated against 'bully breeds'.
- Included a wide range of board members including humane society representatives and behaviour specialists.
- This cannot be based off a dog's breed! It needs to be based off of what happened, surrounding factors and previous history.
- If dog needs to be euthanized it must go to court
- It's not breed or look based and simply based on the severity of attack.
- As long as it is SOLELY on a case by case basis, the owner/victim is allowed to take the case through higher authority if wanted, and it is NOT breed specific.
- The dog should be kept at home with their owner unless the home is neglectful or abusive to the dog.
- Does not call out a certain breed
- All dogs were treated fairly, pit bulls or any dog in that family should not be treated differently
- consisted of reputable dog trainers / behaviour experts
- Does not target "bully" breeds
- Involves both city representatives and UNBIASED citizens
- Did not exhibit a notable anti pit bull bias
- As long as the tribunal has officials on it that are neutral
- Keep the dog at home or with an approved interim guardian where possible to reduce stress on the dog. Approved guardian could be appointed at time of licensing.
- Allow dog owner to come up with solutions and provide references on dog.
- Because I would
- Pit bull does not automatically mean nuisance!
- Tribunal MUST have certified and credentialed dog trainers and/or behaviour consultants
- As long as it didn't discriminate against dog breeds
- due process.. follow the law, and not notice on specific breeds
- It is used for all nuisance dogs, not just "pit bull-type" dogs. Responsible ownership still is the most important element. I have seen vicious injuries sustained from many breeds, including huskies and boxes and chihuahuas.
- Includes a dog behaviorist on the tribunal and an assessment by an independent behaviourist
- Professional dog trainers and behaviourists are consulted. And if the bite is not fatal, a training plan must be followed by the owner at their cost. Minimum 6 months.
- the people making up the tribunal are not judgemental on dogs based on a breed bias, and if they are aware of programs that help deal with extreme aggression that are available other than euthanasia



- As long as it included people who are educated in animal behaviour such as trainers or veterinarians.
- No animal should be euthanized without a chance to be rehabilitated
- If the person assessing the dog for euthanasia is a qualified veterinary professional, ideally a board certified veterinary behaviorist.
- The dogs get to stay with their owners not the shelter
- Faster isn't always better.
- The dog is sent to rehabilitation training with or without the owner. However there has to be consequence to the owner and prevent him from acquiring dogs in the future until proof of capable training has been confirmed.
- The owner should be the one punished, not the dog.
- Undeniable proof
- Tribunals are effective if the members of the tribunal include representatives from CKC sanctioned dog clubs, qualified dog trainers specializing in and understanding dog behaviour (example, Schutzhund, IPO trainers)
- Judge based on individual animal not by breed
- no dog should be euthanized, we need to look into its living situation/owners and try to rehabilitate them and find them that perfect home. We need patient and time with certain cases that you think show aggression that could honestly be fear.
- Unsure at this time
- The persons on the tribunal need to be people who have knowledge and could understand the facets of the dogs behavior, cause and effect etc. Examples would be Veterinarians or Dog Trainers.
- The tribunal has expertise in animal behaviours, are pet owners themselves, and they consider statements from friends and family of the owners as to how the pet behaves at home or in less stressful situations
- The tribunal has at least one animal representative (ie Veterinarian, behaviour specialist etc)
- Individuals with specific animal training such as dog trainers and vets must have space on the board, and euthanization would be avoided as a "solution"
- As long as they really hear and investigate. There is always 2 sides of the story as well as more than one external factor. Is not always black or white
- Has no BSL attributes.
- to euthanize a dog should be a last resort if dog has committed violent acts
- Property is always given to ensure the dog is not euthanized but instead measures taken to retrain the when necessary. As well, that the family or person owning the dog is given an opportunity to visit and care for the dog to lessen the trauma for all those involved including the dogs.
- The tribunal should be comprised of dog owners and the public should be able to challenge their orders.
- That the dog stays with its owner with some rules stating the dog can not leave the property
- It consisted of a fair and balanced group of members and not all pro or anti dog with pre set beliefs
- Science based evidence with witnessing opinions from direct animal behavior specialists.



- The rules were the same for ALL dog breeds. A chihuahua bite is just as important as a pitbull bite
- Required clear witness accounts to identify dogs accused
- Euthanasia shouldn't be determined by the tribunal.
- Neutral people not anti pit bull/ breed
- There are veterinary techs or veterinarians as representatives
- Expert dog behavioral consultants on tribunal.
- assessment of the entire situation of why dog bite occurred in the first place (ex: dog was in distress and scared and so bit person who approached it)
- It is made up of animal behaviourist and veterinarians or veterinary staff who deal with behaviours of dogs all the time
- Euthanasia is the ABSOLUTE LAST RESORT
- The dog will stay with its owners
- As long as it does not bully specific breeds
- Gives the "nuseence" dog a fair trial and doesn't penalize it for defending itself or its owners.
- A well- balanced group of people - with no bias regarding issues to be able to fairly consider each case
- Qualified people on the tribunal, not laypersons
- Only allow Calgary residents to participate
- Muzzled in dog parks, sent to reactive dog training, and help out with the training costs because usually that's the issue on the first place.
- I would support this if there were experienced dog trainers that specialize in these harder breeds on board to give their in site. I'd be happy to help. I'm paid 150-300 an hour for training. I'm willing to volunteer for this
- The victim received justice
- Its done properly by educated personnel.
- The dog is assessed by a trainer known for their work with difficult or aggressive animals before it is returned to its owner... the dog would be happiest in its own home making it safer for people involved ... individual scenarios must be considered
- As long as all of the people involved have training and knowlegde of dogs and their behaviour. It can not be people who are afraid of dogs or certain breeds
- Dog in the case remained in the care of a responsible owner and not traumatized in a shelter
- On the meantime the dog should not be spending time in a shelter, clearly it has trouble and change of environment will only cause it more stress and likely to do it again.
- PROFESSIONAL dog trainers, not random city people
- Had dog behavior and vets on it only.
- That there be a number of infractions prior to any animal being seized.
- Fair trial or dog aloud to stay home on the property
- If the dog that attacked was not protecting there property by a intruder, and or a persons on there property. Children as well adults should learn that a dog will protect there human, so if a child



wonders upon a property and gets bit the adult of that child should be fined not the get euthanized. This sounds harsh but why should the dog be at fault?

- No bias in dog breed. Also, looks at the owners history of dog ownership.
- There is a mix of people ie: people that work with abused animals, shelter owners, pound workers. People that are determined fit animal owners.
- If members of the tribunal were unbiased towards large breed dogs, and one of these members included an individual from an animal rights non profit such as the humane society.
- Includes input from a professional animal behaviorist
- Breed Specific legislation lobbyist, Activist, supporters and sympathizers are not allowed to be part of the tribunal
- I dk
- No breed specifications. Understand that it isn't always the dog who did the biting, fault! Dogs don't just bite because they want to. Psych evaluation on the owner, determine if they are a responsible pet owner who treats the dog properly. These will all help make your end decision. ITS NOT ALWAYS THE DOGS FAULT.
- An animal should never be euthanized if a human pushes them to the point of attacking. It isn't the animals fault they got "bullied" by humans.
- There is no discrimination against specific breeds.
- The dogs are not euthanized.
- Appeal maybe submitted to regular court
- yes
- As long as they don't act like judge jury and executioner with biases.
- NO DOGS SHOULD BE EUTHANIZED
- I would support as long as dogs are not put down because of their breed or without being given a chance to partake in proper training
- The onus is on the owner
- The tribunal must function as an advocate to prevent the euthanasia of the animal. Euthanasia should never be considered as a recommendation. All roads must be taken to prevent the euthanasia of the animal.
- Not when determining if a dog should be euthanized.
- Review of tribunal decisions on a regular (monthly/semi-monthly basis) to assess rates of euthanization
- Dogs are not put down for their first offence.
- Euthanization should be a last resort. Each animal in question should be given the chance to go through re-training first.
- That euthanasia can be stayed at multiple levels
- That no dog is euthanized.
- The dogs must go through intensive rehabilitation, training, and socialization before being euthanized. Euthanization should be the LAST and option.



- Leniency is applied on punishments
- Tribunal should include at least two experts in dog behavioural science
- No euthanasia right away. I think that the dog should first be put into training for help and if something happens again it should maybe be considered
- The dog should not be separated from the owner during the decision time and a dog should have multiple offences against it before being considered for euthanasia.
- Include dog behaviour experts and veterinarians
- Any owner dog who find them self in this situation NEEDS to be held accountable. If a tribunal decides the dog should be put down (i disagree with that) the owner should not be allowed to own another dog. They are responsible for this situation and as a result someone/another pet is injured and a and their dog is loosing their life. They are not responsible pet owner and have no business owning a dog.
- Consists of people with formal education around dog behavior (I.e. veterinarian)
- Testimony on dog's behavior is allowed by dog owners who have interacted with the dog
- The tribunal also reviews the behaviour of the owner and victim, as it is likely a human's fault that the dog has bit them/someone, not the dog.
- The safety of humans be the top consideration. No second chances. Fines to dog owners pay for the tribunal and staff.
- Keeps dog with its owner
- If the person is educated on the situation and knows animals, not some joe blow from the city who hates animals
- They have the authority for any decisions listed above EXCEPT euthanasia of the pet.
- Only if the tribunal board is composed of people knowledgeable of all breeds of dogs.
- The tribunal has people who are all dog friendly, do not believe in breed specific legislation
- Fair and equal information provided by owner as City employees.
- Dog be deemed fit to not re offend by vet and gets training
- Euthanasia should only be considered if it was an unprovoked attack. There needs to be recognition that most dogs require a prolonged incident which antagonizes the dogs. Accountability is paramount. Rather than demonize a breed of dog and fear monger Calgarians, why not place money into appropriate education at school that supports teaching kids how to respect animals' personal space and recognize adverse reactions and cautionary cues. This could also be an elective course or seminar one weekend or available online from the City of Calgary website.
- People on the tribunal are fully educated about dog behaviour and not have a biased opinion against certain breeds. They would need to have extensive proven history with dog behaviour
- There was unbiased representatives
- Owners get their dogs returned in a reasonable amount of time (1_2 days)
- Due process is followed. Witnesses are called. Every party is given a chance to be heard. Dog taunting or abuse be considered if it leads to the bite or can be considered the cause for attack; the abuser to be tried in criminal court. Dogs should be given grace for such acts of self-defense and



judged on a per case basis. Also, previous character of the dog shall be taken into consideration. Good or bad.

- No worse/less punishment based on dogs breed
- does not unfairly judge an animal on its breed
- An option to have the dog trained and possibly have it isolated while in training. Until is been assessed by a professional that the dog may be around others
- Restrictions placed on the owner and treatment of their dogs.
- A dog and it's owner must enroll in training courses - YOU CAN TEACH AN OLD DOG NEW TRICKS. Again, people and their scared, timid or violent energy is what would cause a dog to react. All dogs are good dogs. They just need time.
- As long as this system is not biased against specific dog breeds
- It's not a knee jerk reaction to euthanize the animal
- They would need to have several years experience with dogs and educated about all breed, legislation, and mediation
- If there is an animal behavior professional that determines if an animal is to be euthanized or can be rehabilitated.
- Owner keeps dog
- As a responsible pitbull owner the thought of people who don't know my dog making judgments against her based on the word of a complete stranger terrifies me. Think horrible neighbor. For example I would want the opinions of her vet, daycare staff, friends, family and boarding facility to weigh heavily in any decisions that were made against her for whatever reason. Several times while walking we have encountered off leash or aggressive dogs. If there is ever a fight because she is bitten first I feel that she would be blamed because of her breed and that is not right. Perhaps I will wear a body cam everytime we go for a walk.
- It has to be fair and allow advocates for the animal opportunity to present their case
- Fair consideration from trained and educated professionals whom understand animal psychology and training
- no prejudice on breed
- It wasn't breed biased. And reviewed every case fairly and thoroughly
- It should not be just pit bulls that this applies to.
- As long as euthanasia was not carried out without all the other options considered and tried first.
- The tribunal members be vetted for bias, ie: do they dislike dogs? Do they have bad/traumatic experience with dogs? Etc.
- The welfare of the animals is not affected by bias
- The representatives must be or have been dog owners recently
- Innocent until proven guilty, not the other way around
- Explore the why of the situation? We are so quick to put an animal down... We need to invest in "Certified" Animal behaviorist storm do temperament assessments!
- If the dog was able to stay in the home with the owner without being able to leave the yard until a decision was made



- Truly objective officials made the decisions. No bias, including breed bias.
- More timely than provincial court
- Must have an appeals process and oversight
- That an unbiased decision is made not one that hands a tougher punishment to the breed instead of the actual incident
- Severe and repeat offenders should lose the privilege of owning animals and should be responsible for covering all future costs of rehoming the animal to a suitable and experienced forever home.
- Was fair- took into account the provocation of the dog. The dog bit a child, however child was poking a stick in its eye just before- not the dog's fault
- The tribunal is educated in dog pathology and understands that just because a certain type of dog could have a stronger bite does not mean that that type of dog is inherently bad/mean.
- That it is done fairly with appropriate (non-dog hater) and owners involved
- People on the Tribunal must have support from 5 character references. A max. Term per person.
- It isn't more costly to the current system. If dogs bite, they are dangerous and there should be no leniency. Invest in poverty and hunger for people !!
- Those on the tribunal are educated about dog breeds and behavioural issues. I see a lot of concerning wording around pit bulls in this survey that are a clear misrepresentation of the true nature of pit bulls when they are cared for appropriately. Every dog has the ability to be vicious and dangerous regardless of breed. I'm concerned with Calgary's approach and language around pit bulls as if they are inherently a danger to society. The tribunal would need to be more educated on the subject than those who put together this survey.
- The dog and owner was monitored with fines for probation offences
- It would include dog trainers. Veterinarians are not behaviourists. SPCA workers are also not trainers. Qualified behaviourists to evaluate the dog or to hear of the incident.
- Gets things done
- It includes people from Calgary Humane Society or similar experts in dog behavior.
- every possible step is taken to try and return the dog to the family
- No euthanize
- The reason the bite happened in the first place was carefully assessed.
- There should be an expedited appeal system or the tribunal would not solve the issue
- City and non-city members are dog owners, at least one whom owns a pit bull or other dog thought "dangerous".
- Minor bites/attacks
- As it is unbiased
- Euthanization only for repeat offenders
- I'm leery of the tribunal idea, since it can go to court anyway. But if it had the unintended consequence of more apprehension orders (because maybe the officers are leery of the long separation in 'grey' cases) I would support it
- Have people with educated backgrounds in animals



- the right to appeal
- If the dog is to be euthanized the owner should be too, irradiate the real problem
- if an owner has exhibited a patter of irresponsible dog ownership
- The dog can be at home with its family while awaiting trial with tribunal or court
- As long as detailed unbiased (including breed type) investigation was done before a declaration of being euthanized. Every situation is different and everyone has there own side of the story.
- Matter has to be heard within 1 week
- There is fair consideration of how suitable the owner is to handle and properly train the dog and efforts are made to do so.
- Their decisions are fair and depending on the severity of the circumstance(bite or aggressive behaviour) the owner and dog should be given “rehabilitation”. like a training course to see if anything can be done about their behaviour or restrictions on outdoor activities.
- Decision can be appealed on ANY grounds (i.e., including the ability to appeal the reasons for a decision)
- That owners have the option to request a provincial ruling after tribunal is finished.
- NOT breed specific. Just because a dog is smaller and bites doesn't make it less of a danger or irresponsible ownership than a larger dog.
- The persons sitting on the tribunal have been determined to have an understanding of the bylaws and processes and are unbiased towards specific breeds.
- The final decsion needs to happen in a court as a city appointed tribunal could have a bias one way or another.
- Tribunal must be non biased and include individuals from both sides
- owners responsibility to have proper training for the animal.
- Needs experienced dog people on tribunal. Especially experience with reactive dogs.
- The dogs get proper love, care, and treatment (rehabilitation) while in the shelters instead of being punished. Teach them right from wrong. Neglect is not acceptable.
- Tribunal includes dog behaviourists, dog owners and non dog owners.
- If dog owner appeals tribunal recommendation, dog must be kept in quarantine. Dog immediately back in quarantine if owners do not abide by restrictions.
- Before a dog is euthanized, training programs should be mandatory. (Poor training and inadequate socialization leads to more problems than anything else)
- The members of the tribunal were highly regarded and educated pet care professionals (eg. veterinarians, dog behaviourists/trainers, dog daycare owners, & the like). I do not support regular citizens with no dog education being on the tribunal.
- It issues euthanization declarations following a bite which has caused injury to a human being or other animal.
- Any perg owners so they understand the nature of dogs. son who is part of the tribunal must be deemed unbiased towards any breed of dog. They should be educated on breeds, training, and rehabilitative therapies.



- Professional dog trainers / handlers were part of the tribunal as they are best qualified to assess animal behaviour.
- There are MANY dogs out there with the bite force equal to or greater than a pit bull. I do not own a pitbull but ive owned old english bulldogs for over 30 years. They are block heads ,related to pitbulls BUT couch potatoes. U are continuing the block head dog prejudice. I just sold my house,ive been looking for a rental..the ones that do accept dogs do not accept any" bully "dogs.what im trying to say is do not encompass all blockhead dogs into being dangerous. You will open a can of worms thst will hurt more than just the dogs. Thank u
- The process is respected by the dog owners. The public is notified when and where the attacks have taken place. Fines are high enough that it stops the event from repeatedly happening. Drug dealers own these dogs and have enough money to buy their way out of any fines.
- an experienced dog trainer and a vet that specializes in domestic pets must comprise the main part of the tribunal and need to be given time and access to evaluate the dog in question
- No euthanization for first offence
- People on the tribunal are knowledgeable about dogs
- Don't be speciesist towards pit bulls
- Responsible DOG ownership, not breed specific. Do not single out bully breeds.
- The animal must remain on the owners property an not allowed in public and MUST attend a behaviour classes.
- There was a third party agency involed. Sorry but sometime in politics the individuals agenda means more than truth or fact
- If the proper dog breed is always identified correctly.
- A veterinarian was on the tribunal.
- Everyone involved (City and non-City reps) must be trained in assessing dogs - they can't just be volunteers with no background in dog assessment.
- dogs would be assesed on the circumsatnces of the incident , and provocation if any .
- Dogs should not be euthanized for behavior, and the tribunal should not have the power to decide to euthanize a dog.
- I would be concerned that there is some authority overseeing the "judges".
- there are experts (vets, behavioral analysts, trainers) on the tribunal
- It is people educated and experienced working with animals making the decision
- No Breed Specific Legislation
- Appropriate qualifications for those sitting on the tribunal.
- The people assessing the dogs need to be accredited dog trainers or behaviourists. All dog breeds regardless of size would need to be assessed.
- Please follow
- Dog stays in the original owners care. All supporting facts, videos, pictures & evidence from witnesses is reviewed & no biased judgment be placed on the innocent animals life. Animals behaviour is a direct result of that from the owner. Read that again!



- The members of the tribunal should be highly educated in canine behaviours and training, and the decision to euthanize should be an absolute last resort if determined that obedience training has not been effective at mitigating behaviours. Additionally, there is no conclusive evidence that pit bull type breeds have stronger bite potential than other breeds. Introducing rules against these breeds only contributes to the stigma against these dogs and reduces their chances at being adopted from shelters.
- All cases were being considered equally, regardless of the breed of the dog.
- I believe that all dogs can be trained. I do not support euthanization. IF a dog were to bite someone, they should be put into a training program where they are taught what to do.
- As the owner get an equal chance to defend the dog prior to any euthanization order.
- Tribunal members are well educated in dog behavior and training, and not be prejudiced against any specific breed of dog.
- The dog be muzzled and leashed at all times while out of the owner's yard/fenced in property.
- Multiple animals rights advocate groups, veterinarians and animal behaviour specialist should be on this tribunal.
- The tribunal is comprised of experts on dog behavior.
- It is reviewed by a panel of decision makers and not one person/regardless of their credentials
- As long as pit bull breeds are not singled out. Breed specific bylaws are disgusting.
- The owner of the dog is thoroughly investigated AND an appeal is held PRIOR to any euthanization.
- All options are used and tried before euthanasia
- appeals process and FAIR
- qualifications of the tribunal include dog behaviour experts
- Include vets, experts in animal behaviour and rescue (people that advocate for all dog breeds and do not single any out based on myth and media sensationalization)
- Experts in dog behaviour and training.
- Qualified tribunal members (based on experience working in animal protection act and behaviour)
- Dog behaviour assessment performed by Calgary Humane Society or another HIGHLY TRAINED AND PROVEN ON PAPER QUALIFIED assessor
- Appropriately educated professionals were involved in the reviews and decisions
- Be inclusive of a vet, a representative of several dog sports, a few dog trainers and not only “positive only” ones.
- I would need a lot more information as to who sits on the board.
- All facts are able to be shown and not just the accusing party is right.
- Cases are looked for why a dog attacked. If a kids is picking on the dog and they attack, the dog is protecting itself and shouldn't be put down.
- Both the victim and the owner agreed with the representatives selected to hear their case. Ideally we don't let someone hear a case that is already biased against dogs.
- See both sides of the dog attack and figure out which dog initiated the attack, not just created the most damage.



- Jzjajxnndnx
- The owner has the right to get training before euthanasia is on the table.
- If they're trained professionals who are part of the dog showing, training and breeding communities
- Had unbiased members
- They are educated in animal behaviour and thoroughly analyze impartially (as in they don't judge based on the breed of dog).
- Appropriate qualifications for those sitting on the tribunal (as in experts who actually understand the breed)
- The tribunal members be unbiased and or selected at random.
- Can declare a dog vicious. Cannot declare a dog must be euthanized.
- Do not release the biting dog back to the irresponsible owner, who has already proven that he cannot control his animal. Unfortunately, the dog should be euthanized or it will bite again. The tribunal should grant generous compensation to the innocent victim who was traumatized and injured by the offender.
- The representatives are trained well enough to make informed decisions
- Dogs should stay with owners
- There was a place to appeal decisions made by the tribunal
- Members of the tribunal need appropriate qualifications. But probably better than whom ever put this survey together. Its been proven that size is indicative of jaw strength, which would mean any large breed dog, not just 'pitbulls'.
- The tribunal is comprised of those who are appropriately qualified
- No euthanasia
- Members of the tribunal need appropriate qualifications.
- Breeds are not punished and both sides are properly heard.
- AS LONG AS EUTHANIZATION IS THE ABSOLUTE LAST RESORT.
- subject to independent, non-interested party appeal
- More serious cases should still go to court
- IT MUST be determined by the owner NOT THE BREED!!
- I do not believe a dog should be euthanized if it is deemed "aggressive" or based on the breed that it is. The owners should need to keep the dog on their property or on a leash when walking.
- house arrest for the animal
- Tribunal decisions must be final. All members of the tribunal must be fully trained in the process, decisions and applications for the positions should only consider individuals that have the appropriate occupation or training (such as Veterinarians, Dog trainers, or others with similar experience.
- as long as all sides of the story are looked at , evenly , without bias .
- It is something that should be explored further.
- Certain animal experts should form part of the tribunal (eg. Animal services officers, veterinarians, certified behaviourists)



- dog must not be out of home or fenced yard, pending tribunal
- That trial is not Breed Specific
- Zero tolerance for pit pull bites or attacks. Put down the dog immediately
- it was as cost effective or better than current process.
- Imposes serious penalties. My guess is that a tribunal will treat attacks like parking tickets.
- Increased involvement of owner and affected party (mediation component) if euthanasia is recommended by tribunal.
- That the participants of the tribunal be a mix of non dog owners and dog owners or previous owners of dogs!
- The tribunal is made up of those knowledgeable of various breeds and can be unbiased
- It was fair and blind
- N/a
- Providing the owner with options to train the dog before euthanasia.
- Yes
- so long as it's cheaper and impartial.
- Provided there is representation by knowledgeable authorities (ie humane society, vets, etc.)
- Dogs are given a 3 strike rule before being subjected to such. Accidents can happen, people deserve a chance to correct the problem before their dog's life is ever at risk.
- Dogs released on a bail system, minimum \$500.00. until matter decided.
- I believe vets should be apart of these Decision
- The victim and owner need to be involved in the decision making process and not just told a decision without having any input
- Decisions about Euthanization should be for the court of queens bench to determine not a tribunal in my opinion. However, If a tribunal does make that decision it should be as a recommendation that an owner can appeal at court , and should only be recommended after all other avenues such as: training and restrictions have failed or the owner has failed to abide by those restrictions or failed to provide training sufficient enough to re-assess an animal as safe. Other than Euthanization I think the tribunal is a great idea.
- Fair and non biased towards specific breeds.
- No authority to euthanize.
- If there is any criminal negligence on behalf of the owner it goes into provincial and or federal courts appropriately
- The people involved have the dogs best interests in mind
- If it had the same rate of conviction. My concern would be if it went easier on offenders.
- The dog is not automatically singled out as in fault based on breed. That bylaw officers would have to have solid video evidence of the offence, and that if the assessment for an aggressive or nuisance dog be handled by a professional dog behaviouralist with an actual degree (not someone who is a trainer) and can do a proper assessment. Also, the tribunal should require to have training



on dog behaviour and what makes for bad behavior and scenarios to have an appropriate understanding.

- Put down dog that bite
- It doesn't cost tax payers. Seriously, how many dog bites are there in a year?
- No euthanasia
- The "victim" and owner is investigated for possible reasons due to bad animal behaviour
- safety of the public against any further aggression by the dog
- If the review board is actually educated with facts and not driven by fear.
- A majority of members of the tribunal should be dog owners. No member of the tribunal should be found to have any malice towards dogs of any breed.
- tribunal members must include people with knowledge of animal behaviour and be unbiased.
- Is done in a timely fashion and pet stays with family if that is best and safest option. Being separated from family can cause undue stress in animals making the situation way worse than necessary
- no euthanization to be declared.
- Allow for statements from people affected by the attack
- No BSL
- Personal feelings regarding a certain breed (like pitbulls because that topic is such a huge controversy in the current times) should warrant a certain member to be omitted from consideration. The unfavourable bias against certain people or breeds of dogs will cause a lot of unnecessary suffering and trauma. We need to give these situations a very fair opportunity to get a fair and unbiased set of eyes.
- ,
- That a full investigation at the time was completed and that the animal was not automatically found guilty when perhaps it had been provoked and was defending itself.
- It is binding and appeals are handled by the tribunal body
- Tribunal members must be dog owners.
- Yes
- Are invested in the best interest of the animal
- Unbiased members, all tribunal members should be pet owners.
- That the people involved not have a bias against bully breeds ave a
- Would include a dog behaviorist specializing in dogs exhibiting dangerous behaviors.
- Anyone involved in the tribunal should have a history of working with animals in stressful situations (vets, professional trainers, ect), to be better able to tell the difference between an animal who is actually a problem, and one who was in a stressful situation and lashed out (as animals will do).
- Go into every case unbiased against specific breed of dog and decisions are soely made based on the situation at hand.
- Aslong as there not bias and a animal hater
- Should be composed of individuals trained in dog behaviour
- No breed specific legislation. Problem dogs come from all breeds.



- The dog is returned to the owner without forcing euthanization. Suggest a training program
- Understand the reason for the dog bite, was it unprovoked or was the dog giving warnings signs that the adults did not pay attention to, which is the fault of the owner or other persons not the dog
- Ok as long as the representatives are educated in dog behaviours and have worked extensively with many types of breeds so they're informed and not biased against certain breeds
- I would prefer to have a group who would have enough canine knowledge/experience to assess why the bite happened. All too often small dogs are initiators and owners don't control them causing a larger dog to panic. Children screaming can put the largest breeds into fight or flight mode as well. All factors should be considered in an "event." Again, it's critical for a tribunal to understand the complete picture.
- Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal.
- It is not breed specific and it is case specific, I do believe that the owners need to be looked at in these sort of situations and the dogs need to be given more of a slack. I don't think a dog should be euthanized because they had poor ownership. In fact I think this is barbaric and they should be sent for training and rehabilitation.
- The mandate means of evaluating and need for proof are retained not 3 people with whims
- If the dog is left in the owner possession and the owner has the right to defend it
- Dog owners must go through a training program, including care, feeding and discipline. Most dogs that are "bad" can be directly related to how they have been treated.
- Dependent on individual situations
- Expert consultations with reputable animal behaviourists to determine when a dog is considered a "dangerous" dog on a case by case basis.
- Do not specify or name the breed at the tribunal or Hearing. It creates bias. Small dogs bite just as often as large breeds.
- A canine behavioral expert was part of the panel.
- Little dogs are not trained, Nenshi and his piglets always blame big dogs!!
- Members must be experts in animal behaviour and/or veterinarians
- Non biased representatives
- The owner had a chance to defend or represent the animal
- They should not have the decision surrounding euthanasia.
- as long as the decision is subject to review and appealed with no jeopardy to the dog
- Representatives must be both competent and compassionate, and understand animals and training.
- The tribunal needs to include veterinarians, responsible, certified dog trainers
- It must consist of people who actually understand the bylaws and also have a vested interest in animal welfare. For example, representatives from animal rescues. Not just anyone who may have biases against specific breeds. I want to be clear on this because I'm sick of people advocating for this BSL against any dog that even appears to be a "pit bull" (which is completely arbitrary). People with this agenda should not be allowed to rule in these types of infractions.
- It must be appealable in a court of law and if appealed the decision is stayed during that time



- Not bias against pitbull breed dogs
- it was a tribunal of impartial representatives. No special interest groups, animal shelter employees or animal rights activists. City bureaucrats with no history of bias would be fine
- As long as euthanasia isn't the default. These dogs likely need further training and/or rehoming to caring and responsible owners.
- There are no bias against pit bulls. Ridiculous.
- The tribunal was made up of dog experts, trainers, vets, etc.
- The members had an appropriate selection process
- No prejudice against pit bulls
- It's made up of a mix of experts with knowledge of breeds, handling and owners, such as dog trainers, vets, breeders, dog walkers, kennel personnel
- Each dog and incident was treated separately and on their own merit. Different breeds not having different rules. Targeting pit bulls is ridiculous and ludicrous. The owners should be charged more severely for nuisance dogs the animals should not be.
- If the people on the tribunal were respected dog trainers and could look from an unbiased point of view
- The dog stays in owners care
- keep the dog in nice conditions and provide support/training. Do not euthanize right away, do an assessment first
- There has to be a animal behaviour therapist to help identify if the situation was caused by the animal or the other factors
- Completely without conflict of interests
- Must include a member of the community where the attack occurred.
- If she t shortened the length of time a dog was kept from the owner. Tribunal must consist of experienced and knowledgeable members of the "dog community".
- People are the problem, placing the dog back in that environment is not going to fix anything.
- the tribunal should be made up of an animal enforcement officer, a veterinarian, and an experienced canine trainer or breeder with extensive experience.
- Dog should be assent by a trained animal behavior specialist
- Guaranteed faster decisions, and the dogs should be away from home no longer than 1 week.
- As long as the committee does not hold bias towards dogs of any breed. This may need the support from local or provincial groups that represent pit bulls.
- Dogs that are apprehended for severe bites should be euthanized regardless of the court/tribunal process delays.
- If the dog was provoked in which the animal bit someone I would see what all happened before taking the dog!
- Can be appealed by the owner or victim.
- Considered the reason for the dog attack. Dogs are often only aggressive when provoked or exposed to violent or aggressive behaviour. The conditions the dog experienced prior to the attack



should be reviewed- often times it is the fault of the owner and not the dog itself. If the dog was raised in violent or aggressive conditions the penalty should be placed on the owner and the dog should be given a second chance to correct its behaviour (ie adoption/foster to a new home)

- The owner should not be allowed to own a dog again for their lifetime. They should be wholly responsible for their dogs behaviour.
- They would not have authority to decide if the dog is euthanized
- that when possible, the dog is placed with a volunteer to access their behavior outside of the traumatic environment that a shelter could be for the animal
- The tribunal was made up of veterinarians, dog behavior specialists ie trainers, animal advocates and others who had the best interest of the dog at heart and would not come to the decision to euthanize lightly
- That it was for ALL breeds including the little breeds.
- Decision makers should be screened for bias.
- As long as the life of the animal is valued
- It includes dog experts (trainers/veterinarian staff, etc)
- There would need to be a selection process for the tribunal to ensure that the people selected have no conflict of interest and are not part of interest groups for or against dogs.
- contains neutral representatives, with both dog owners and non-dog owners as representatives (to cancel out any inherent bias someone may have)
- The tribunal must focus on the specific animal(s) involved and not their breed, and the actions of its owner/handler. The tribunal must also be able to review the actions of the victim(s)
- Representatives have experience with animal training and behaviour.
- A tribunal decision needs to have the same standing as a court order. Otherwise every decision would automatically get appealed and go to court anyways.
- Owners must have input and breed must not be a deciding factor
- all members should be dog owners or former dog owners, with some being pit bull owners
- The breed of the dog is not taken into consideration. And the courts can appoint someone without prior bias to decide.
- Review vicious dog declarations and determine whether they are justified declarations. The tribunal should serve to reduce numbers of euthanasia NOT increase.
- I think a repeat offender (dog owner) Should pay very high fines, as well or in lieu must attend a training with their dog to decrease the chance of dog on dog attacks and improve temperament, they should also be required to be neutered or spayed .
- Dogs should not be euthanized. Dog should be placed into training, given a second chance. There are so many variables as to why a dog might bite.
- Recommendation to euthanize can be made by tribunal, but the decision is sent up (court perhaps)
- The owner would have a chance to approach and speak with them.
- Euthanization cannot be declared by tribunal
- If the focus is on owner's responsibilities (or lack of) and not focused on particular breeds



- It reviews the dog behaviour and not it's breed
- As long as it was the same rule for ALL dogs, not just certain breeds. Rules should be the same for everybody.
- Supports to correct the dog or rehome to a trained family.
- consisted of a range of people with varied backgrounds and expertise in the area
- Conditions before euthanasia
- Serious attacks by dogs with previous history of problems.
- it is not the dogs fault lock up owner.
- Saving dog euthanasia as an absolute last resort and not using it as a punishment for dogs and/or owners.
- Dog safety and RE TRAINING or RE HOMING comes FIRST. Euthanasia is NEVER NECESSARY.
- Tribunal members are animal behaviour experts, veterinarians, experienced dog trainers, etc. Decision making process is transparent. Case information, outcomes, rational, and/or proceedings are made public as is appropriate/allowed.
- Members of the tribunal should have dog behaviour expertise
- Leave the judgment of euthanization to official courts
- The dog is innocent until proven guilty, and gets to stay with it's family until the tribunal reaches a verdict.
- The dog would be allowed to remain with owner during process.
- The tribunal would need to have people that specialize in the field of animal welfare and care. Vets, animal behaviour specialists, peace officers, bylaw officers, and people with knowledge about animals rather than people who's background is in politics or city management.
- Took in to actual account the situation and the events that lead up to the accident.
- Specific needs would not be targeted.
- It had consistent terms of reference
- As long as the members are thoroughly vetted and proven to not hold any breed specific bias.
- Kill it
- All things are taken into consideration. I have a big dog who was perfectly fine with other dogs until 3 small dogs attacked him when he was on a leash. He is always on a leash and still people with little dogs still use the retractable leashes and dont pay attention and bite my dog then they look at me like im the irresponsible pet owner
- Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal
- Members of the tribunal included experts in the field and a balance of beliefs
- That it does not deem all pit bulls as dangerous and need to be euthanized. A breed of dog does not make it more dangerous.
- Hhfgg
- the tribunal is heavily involved with dog owner/breed advocacy groups who have a greater understanding of the nuances of dog ownership and not just a way of expanding the judicial system.



- Includes veterinarians and representatives from owners of breeds that face public discrimination
- Mandatory putting down of violent dogs.
- As long as members with dog expertise are on the tribunal. The members need to understand the different breeds. Possible dog trainers.
- Procedures/restrictions are put in place to ensure impartiality
- No breed specific legislation, should be based on a case by case basis.
- At any given time in the process, the pet owner can opt out of this process and go straight to the court of Queens bench
- NONE of the tribunal members have a vested interest or financial payback from the city.
- Emphasis on rehabilitation rather than euthanizing the dog; highly consider the influence of the owners responsibility/attribution to the case.
- They officials remain neutral and understand not one breed is at fault. Maybe it's time to crack down on breakers and animal abuse I steed.
- Dogs do not get out down, but put in a better fit home. I personally would revoke a dog even if they bit someone. Dogs bite for a reason and the issue can ALWAYS be fixed.
- Only for minor injury situations
- The non city reps would need to have dog behaviour knowledge.
- The tribunal system be setup and administered by Alberta Justice and not the City of Calgary.
- Clear and transparent steps with justification
- Only if tribunal is composed of dog behavior specialist
- That each individual on the tribunal have proven knowledge of dog behaviour ie Vet, trainer, etc.
- They are not prejudice towards specific breeds. Ie. Pitbulls.
- There isn't a significant cost Burden that falls on pet owners.
- The tribunal must consist of one: legal representative, one dog trainer and one animal shelter employee.
- Takes a look at the whole picture. WHY did the dog bite? What factors let to the bite? Ex: teasing or taunting which leads to a bite are NOT the dogs fault
- At least one member is a qualified expert in dog behaviour.
- The dog/owner history. If an isolated incident I wouldn't support it.
- As long as subject to appeal and review
- 100% non biased against bully breeds.
- review interim orders
- That dogs are rehabilitated and re-homed, not euthanized, due to improper care and neglect by the owners.
- Dogs be given a proper behaviour assessment and taken away from guardian if need be.
- Non biased individuals are used on the tribunal I.e. special interest organizations. Punishment should lye on owner ban them from owning animals.



- The people on the tribunal need to be unbiased in regards to dog breeds. I know more people who've been bitten by small dogs (chihuahas, pomerians, etc.) than by large dogs, so this needs to be taken into account when selecting the people on the tribunal.
- owners should be required to take ownership and training classes
- 2nd incident euthanasia
- they need to assess each dog fairly and not be biased towards certain breeds.
- All evidence and a true advocot for the dog
- Fair and impartial members with NO BIAS REGARDING DOG BREEDS, SPICIFICALLY "PIT BULL TYPES"
- unbiased hearing
- As long as the representatives in charge of each case have first hand and significant experience in working with dogs and are thoroughly educated and well informed about the nature and psychology of dogs. It would be completely unacceptable and irresponsible for the representatives to have no knowledge of dog nature and behaviour.
- I would be interested in seeing the qualifications for those who would be on the tribunal and their ability to be impartial.
- Allow victim statements and take them into consideration in decision-making.
- It includes certified dog experts versed in ALL breeds
- the tribunal should consist of people who have expertise in dog training and behavior so they can determine if the surroundings the dog was raised in were a determining factor in the incident(s).
- There are "pit bull" owners on the tribunal at all times to cut some of the bias toward the breed.
- It moves quickly
- did not just focus on pit bulls or similar breeds, it must be inclusive.
- Independent consultant brought in to evaluate dog, owner, living conditions and rehab potential.
- The dog is not punished. It is an owners responsibility to raise a dog, just like a child. Fine the owner and leave the dogs alone. It's not their fault, it's the owner's fault.
- Na
- Before euthanization, there is the option to remove the dog from the city, or enact obedience classes (then reassess), and finally make it so the owner is not allowed animals (they are trained to be like that, the dog is not inherently dangerous)
- i would like it if the people chosen for the tribunal are dog owners
- I would support the use of the tribunal, but not with the wording listed for "Dog Attacks". It implies that dogs who bite are only attacking and have not been provoked in any way.
- As long as the people are not bias towards the breed
- It is fast and paid by the owner of the animal
- a logical system instead of emotional reasons
- If upon request of the tribunal in mutual standing the case could be transferred to the courts.
- Might work but people are corrupt so probably not in actual application
- They are not all Karen's



- Dog stays in custody at owners expense.
- reeds are just as vicious as pit bulls. Tragic results can happen with any strong breed.
- Tribunal must be focussed on educating dog owners on proper dog care, dogs are a product of their environment
- That it will be fair and unbiased to the breed involved
- The tribunal is filled with experts on dogs (Calgary Humane Society, local rescue groups, local behavioural specialists, vets, etc)
- Owners should have access to their animal during the wait
- Members must be dog owners
- Needs to have an appeal process
- Educated and experienced dog trainers/rehabilitators are involved in the decision.
- Yes
- Previous or current dog owners with no criminal record
- no euthanization without the dog itself already at risk of death
- Obedience training FIRST, with euthanasia as the very LAST resort
- Tribunal "officers" do not make breed-specific decisions.
- I disagree with breed blaming. I would want assurances that the tribunal is impartial to the dog breeds when making decisions.
- Appropriate expertise and representation on the tribunal
- The presence of animal behaviour experts, the "victims" or advocates, and representation by animal owners (not of the apprehended animal, but as a generally represented group as part of the tribunal).
- The dog & owner have to go to behavioral classes before euthanization is even thought of
- That measures are in place to provide behaviour training and assistance for owners to prevent future incidents
- Actual dog trainers and experienced people on the tribunal
- Needs to be fair.
- That euthanization be removed as a possible response, and that the tribunal does not discriminate based on breed of dog
- As long as membership of the tribunal is transparent and changeable by the public in the event of someone malicious, ignorant or with a personal agenda joining the tribunal
- The requirement that an animal behaviorist (arms length) not with the city is included for impartial advice assesment
- If the owner of the animal is not satisfied with the outcome of the tribunal, quick, efficient appeals can be made with the court. Minimal wait time for appeals.
- As long as the their is fair representation on the tribunal (I.e. ppl not biased against pitbulls.
- members of tribunal would need appropriate qualifications
- If a dog is deemed so dangerous that it must be euthanized and not rehabilitated, the owner should never be allowed to be the primary guardian of a dog ever again.



- ALL persons involved in the tribunal must be certified in k9 behaviour and be completely unbiased towards ANY specific breed of dog.
- That fines and restrictions are on the HUMAN owner
- Proper people sat on tribunal with extensive experience and knowledge about the animals and recommendations made - not just city council delegates who don't really understand whats best for animals and families
- It has to have members of an animal rescue involved.
- it be apprised of non-partial people, vets, and animal behaviorists
- Strict policy on overlooking all details and making sure the owner of the accused dog is educated on what they can do to reduce risk.
- Someone with background working with dogs - groomer, vet, vet tech, etc
- Euthanasia is the last possible option and these include ALL BREEDS including small breeds, as all can be dangerous if put in uncomfortable positions. It's rarely the dogs fault and often the fault of the owner, both need to be examined and re-training, re-homing and rehabilitation should always be thought of before euthanasia
- That the representatives were educated in dog behaviour and training.
- No prejudice against bully breeds
- Explained further
- Has animal (Dog) EXPERTS on the tribunal.
- Only euthanasia when ABSOLUTELY NO OTHER OPTIONS EXIST
- That the tribunal focus on the best interests of the animal, not necessarily the animals guardian.
- Euthanizing a dog should be a last resort option, only after it has been decided that there is no rehabilitation options feasible.
- A dog should not be euthanized unless it had a fatal attack to another dog. Pit bulls should not be tried more aggressively - more often than not it is a bad trainer not a bad dog, they should be removed from the household or put into a training program if it is a non fatal attack
- Includes at least 50% professional dog trainers
- The owners of the dog are the ones to be fined NOT THE ANIMAL! It's an owner's responsibility to train their pet.
- Most often a dogs behavior is directly related to how they are raised and treated in the home. If a tribunal were to be reviewing a case, I would expect they also review the owner and their history very thoroughly. Criminal record checks should be done. The owner needs to be looked at through a microscope. Are they abusive? Does the animal show signs of neglect? The expert opinions of a non-biased veterinarian and animal training expert should be included. Does this animal get appropriate care and exercise? Is the animal in a suitable environment etc. All of these things need to be considered. On the flip side, is the case involving a rescue dog? Are the owners working on "said" behaviors. Can they show proof of this? Perhaps they are trying very hard to help the animal. Perhaps they are just terrible owners that should be banned from owning pets. All angles must be looked at very carefully and with non-biased opinions. Simply throwing a group of people together



and having them decide the fate of an animal and it's owner is a recipe for disaster if not done correctly and fairly.

- Can the tribunal be an elected panel? I would have concerns about bias against bully breeds.
- All members of the tribunal group MUST be dog owners.
- U need experts from a rescue or other that have experience with dig behavior. This can't be a government decision. Use experts
- As long as they were not influenced by antiquated BSL
- All evidence collected and analyzed before a non-biased decision is made.
- It is not breed specific and any dog is prosecuted the same
- Allowed the owners to choose between tribunal or court. Make it an option.
- It included animal behavioural professionals
- Applicable animal experts should be involved in the tribunal (ie. a dog behaviorist)
- The representatives of the tribunal have a thorough understanding of animals and their behaviour
- The decision should not be biased by type of dog.
- Euthanasia can only be recommended at the tribunal level, but must then be passed on to the provincial court for final decision.
- The dog was not euthanized until a court hearing took place.
- There were warnings and owners given opportunities to train their dog, almost like given "community service" and that community service is training or seeking out dog behaviour specialists to hear their options and actively move forward with them and taking the steps necessary. Euthanization should be absolute last option and only if very dangerous or multiple instances with no improvement.
- The appeal process is restricted, to avoid the majority of cases being appealed
- The people making the decision have the experience (is there training, a course, experience they must have) and are not biased to breed.
- Be expeditious and not take forever like most court matters do
- Treat all dogs under the same rules, no matter breed or size.
- Had an appeal process
- Not prejudice against pit bulls or any other breed and looks at the owner instead of dog. There are training programs like dominance training that work wonder for large muscular breeds
- As long as there are guidelines for these tribunals that do not discriminate towards breeds of dogs. The definition of "nuisance" must be based on behaviours exhibited both by the dog and the owners (ie if it's the owner letting the dog run loose, the owner is the nuisance, not the dog)
- There is a way to dispute the tribunal decision and keep it fair.
- If assessment for euthanasia is impartial and an absolute last resort.
- That a dog cannot be euthanized by decision of the tribunal. This would need to go to provincial court
- Don't single out pitbulls
- There is NO bias towards specific breeds
- As long as it had unbiased people, dog and non dog owners and no one with previous dog bias



- All dogs are treated equally independent of their breed.
- as long as it would not support bias to any specific type of dog breed
- No euthanizing.
- As long as it is run by qualified individuals (non biased) and it does not make it impossible to appeal.
- Without euthanization
- As long as innocent dogs are not taken from owners then put down with no warning like has happened in the past to bully breeds
- Unbiased decisions when it comes to dog breed. It should also be emphasized that the victim is analyzed as well. Dog bites can be provoked by disrespectful human behavior including but not limited to uninvited approach, ear/fur pulling, approach by human with an unfamiliar animal etc.
- Assessment by behavioural expert
- Must deal ALL with nuisance dogs, NOT only pitbull breed.
- Court should be used when it is recommended that a dog be euthanized due to behaviour, so the process is more fair and there has been time and due process used before ending a pets life.
- No
- The tribunal is made up of a representative sample of individuals who are competent (adequately qualified and suitably trained) in animal behaviours.
- Tribunal has representation of people with expertise in dog behaviour and rehabilitation
- It would be case specific, where the owner would also be assessed (are they encouraging this dogs behaviour) - all breeds of pit bulls should not be treated as the same 'nuisance' animal. While I understand it is the strength they possess that poses a threat if they were to bite, most dogs behaviour is synonymous with a nature versus nurture approach and I whole heartedly believe the owner and their training habits should be assessed first.
- The tribunal included dog behaviourists/trainers/other people highly trained in dog health and behaviour
- Have dog owners and known vets on the tribunal
- The representatives making this decision need to be a fair mix of individuals and should not only contain peoples who have views that support a blanket approach and paint every dog with the same brush.
- The owners must show that they will train their dog properly. If the owner can not demonstrate that they put in the effort to train their dog, then they should have mandatory training for their dog. Again, it is the owners responsibility to train their dog properly.
- The tribunal is made up of people without a bias to block-headed/"pit bull" type dogs. I don't know how to ensure that neutrality, but this bias the city is attempting to employ is disgusting.
- The dog be assessed by a canine behaviorist
- It would need a strict code of ethics and framework
- There is no way these should take up the time or expense of the courts. Including appeals. Appeals should also go to a tribunal.
- A fair process for the owner and dog.



- No prejudice against bully type dogs.
- Members of the tribunal had a background in animal behaviour
- No Euthanization to be decided by tribunal
- I do not like the idea of a tribunal getting to decide whether a dog is euthanized. I also feel as though a tribunal would immediately have biases against "pit bulls"
- Dog breed has no bearing on punishment, it is randomly selected from the community, both sides are looked at, if the jerk dog at the dog park antagonizes the wrong dog, kinda a life lesson not to be a jerk
- didn't discriminate against breed
- !
- As long as dogs aren't discriminated against because of their breed rather than their behaviour.
- Representatives professionally trained in dog behaviour and had the dogs best interest at heart
- No bias to a particular breed. Each dog treated as an individual.
- That there is still an appeal process available.
- Members of tribunal are qualified to assess; for example Vet.
- A tribunal could be effective in reducing strain on the courts, but the process would need to be carefully considered. How frequently would they sit (scheduled not on demand)? What qualifications should tribunal members possess? Will 'accused' owners have access to representation?
- There is an appeal process.
- That appropriate people are involved and vetted
- Does not involve any euthanasia decisions.
- Would need people knowledgeable about dogs on this tribunal, not just random people.
- Within 24 hours
- Experts in dog behaviour or health (ie vet) included
- There are dog owners on the tribunal panel
- Do not euthanize people's loved ones.
- The tribunal should include someone who runs or works in a dog rescue that's there for the good of the dog and not concerned in public opinion.
- I don't really understand what this means. I only support the idea which puts less stress on the dog so he can come home sooner. I've heard how those dogs are treated under the city when they are taken from their home.
- They should not have the power to kill a dog
- At least half the members of the tribunal are familiar with dog behaviour in various situations (I.e. they are able to distinguish between a dog defending itself and a dog attacking viciously in more nuanced situations)
- This tribunal is not bias towards certain breeds
- Need to know who comprises the third parties. Need dog advocates, bylaw etc, cross sector of representatives



- Stop euthanization of dogs. Dogs are not inherently violent. It is a trained behaviour and Pit Bulls are no more violent than any other dog. Owners are always at fault for this kind of behaviour.
- As long as the owner is made to have the dog properly trained
- As long as there are open minded individuals who are actually educated when it comes to dogs and their behaviors.
- It had a variety of people including owners of certain breeds, people of colour, women and LGBT+.
In addition, the tribunal members must undergo several tests of judgement and values before joining.
- Any animal that is under review for euthinization. Is assessed by a certified and qualified trainer for chance of rehabilitation. Rehabilitation options are available and euthinizing is the last resort. I would also like to see at least 50% of the tribunal members be someone who works with dogs and understand k9 behaviour. Then the undereducated general population is represented, as well as the k9 educated population. All animals need a chance, and breed specific bylaws are unfair and unkind to our society. It's been said here that Pitbulls do not represent the highest number of bites. Let's address the problem as a whole and not target one breed because they can be strong.... well so can a shepherd. The stigma around pitbulls is unfair and biased by those who are uneducated.
- Democratic and fair elections for the tribunal with regular turn over and accountability
- Why is it assumed when a dog bites somebody, that it is the dogs fault. Could a human possibly been trying to harm it? These questions have ridiculous options as possible answers.
- There would need to be a proper selection process for the individuals on the tribunal.
- That the reason they are aggressive is looked over before the dog itself is punished
- Is not using breed specific guidelines/language
- The dog is not mandated to remain in a shelter.
- I would support a tribunal as long as the first instinct was not to euthanize but to attempt any other method of training possible.
- It is done through consultation with a dog behaviour specialist.
- Educated individuals were at the helm of this tribunal Not those that have a cross to burn !
- Do not euthanize the dog because that's murder
- There be a fair representation on the committee.
- I think there needs to be a vet and a behavioral specialist. Much like humans, dogs need to be rehabilitated after these instances because they are also acting out of fear
- Look at the history of the animal and what circumstances led to the offense
- The owner and the dog go through training. It is important to train a human so they can have a healthy household for a dog
- There is sufficient time to appeal any decisions to euthanize a dog.
- Those who are assigned to the tribunal are qualified and unbiased
- That the members of the tribunal are unbiased in regards to breeds, have accurate knowledge of what a reasonable pet owner is, they have accurate knowledge of what a trained dog, regardless of breed, looks like, and are capable of looking at the facts in the case and make an impartial decision
- Really looking into the case and the details of the case before making the decision to euthanize.



- That every single detail of the incident was taken into account
- No specific breeds there are also instances where the dog is overly provoked or someone comes onto the dogs property are the dog is protecting its owners there needs to be a full evaluation of the whole situation and the owners responsibility. Neglectful owners need to be held responsible but there are situations where it's not necessarily the dog or the owner's fault
- Members of the tribunal have dog of similiar breed to offending animals.
- The tribunal is made up of people who are familiar with animal Behavior (eg. veterinarians)
- Dog can be kept at home while tribunal takes place, Non-euthanasia interventions are emphasized
- Members of tribunal are knowledgeable of dog behaviour and psychology, and not individuals who have preconceived negative bias against certain breeds.
- Is fair
- Unbiased. Should have a veterinary professional on the tribunal.
- No bias for dog breed or size. Consider euthanizing to be the very last resort, after multiple offences and no attempt made by the owner to rehabilitate. Or, an alternative to euthanizing could be sending the dog to a rehabilitation center to have proper training (then can be adopted by a different owner)
- People have the option to fight their decision in court
- Animal professional must be involved.
- The owner's ability to raise a non-violent dog is also assessed. Is it nature or nurture?
- The people selected are knowledgeable and impartial.
- Involves 2 parities
- no one against any type of animal (biased) is allowed to serve.
- The tribunal that is hired is an animal expert
- The Tribunal follows advice by an animal behaviour specialist and/or a veterinarian
- The tribunal be made up of unbiased representatives who are properly informed on the nature of these dogs, and the ability of the owners to provide the proper care and rehabilitation, if required.
- V
- Euthanasia needs to be carried out after a behaviour analysis. Not just put them down,
- Recognize that it's not the breed of dog that's inherently dangerous, but the way the dogs are bred and raised that is problematic. Not all pit bulls are aggressive and dangerous, only those that are trained to be are, and not all pit bulls should be punishment for th mistakes of a few awful humans.
- Euthanization should not be a decision determined by a tribunal
- All parties are involved. Fair process where all get to say thoughts. Euthanasia is final option after it has been found that training and other options have been completed.
- It is focused on rehabilitation for the dog and training requirements for the owner. Dogs should not be getting euthanized.
- I disagree that the dog should be seized and put in a shelter.
- It does not discriminate against any specifics size or breed of dog. A dog bite is a dog bite. Doesn't matter if it's a 2 lb chihuahua or an 80 lb Rottweiler.



- As long as the representatives don't have any prejudice against any dog breeds and peoples origins. Everyone, whether people or pets, should be treated equally.
- Tribunal includes at least one animal health/welfare expert.
- The owners should have a chance to say their side of the story
- Specific guidelines were put in place for making decisions on the animals future. Also, the owners part in the attack should be looked at. Are they responsible and do they truly have the dogs best interests in mind
- They could not pass judgment on a dog being euthanized. This extreme measure, if it must be in place, should only be determined by the court. Ideally euthanizing wouldn't be an option unless aggressive behavior was determined to stem from a untreatable medical condition.
- Yes
- vicious dogs should not be euthanized they should be rehabilitated.
- If is able to be fairly represented for each side
- That it addressed the owners behaviour again dogs get aggressive due to the incompetence of the owner in most cases
- Isn't breed specific the officers look at the situation (dogs and owners behaviour)
- Breed is not a factor. This perpetuates current untrue biases AND statistics. This should be a case by case review opposed to a precedent setting one. If one Chihuahua bites someone you wouldn't just set a precedent that all Chihuahuas will bite someone. Same thing for any other breed. Situational factors are also incredibly important, I've seen people at the dog park swing or kick at other peoples dogs because they are angry or scared (not used to larger breeds) and that is unacceptable! Provocation can be a huge factor.
- Do not enable euthanization
- The people on the tribunal are diverse and change often. They should also have people who are dog behavior experts and/or work with animals consistently on the tribunal.
- Knowledgable and fair people on tribunal no bias Situation why bite occurred should be fairly and truthfully accessed. Dog bites for a reason which must be looked at
- That the tribunal consists of past animal control personnel, professional dog handlers — police, government (NOT pet dog trainers)
- It's fair and unbiased
- Dog breed can't be considered. They must look at all the factors to decide.
- if the members of the tribunal are not biased against pit bull type dogs, are pet owners, and are educated on bsl pros and cons.. too many people are ignorant of how pit bulls are and are biased against them due to unfair misrepresentation in the media
- No breed discrimination
- it involved owners of same breed were on tribunal
- Review the actual case, not just scrutinized based on the dog being a pit bull
- Tribunal members are able to be removed from the position if they repeatedly make bad decisions (i.e., if tribunal members are continually too lenient on dogs or owners who proceed to reoffend, then the tribunal member should be deemed ineffective and removed from the position)



- The tribunal contains people who are educated in dog behavior
- The dog does not stay in a shelter. It goes home while everything gets sorted out
- That it's headed by a veterinary, trainer, or otherwise expert organization on dog behavior
- It must be fair and someone knowledgeable but third party so there is no bias towards owner dog or bylaw officers.
- No euthanasia
- Pet experts like vets and dog trainers were on the tribunal
- no clear prejudice
- The tribunal comprises professional and experienced dog behaviourist. Must be impartial. Only place recommendations
- The members of the tribunal were qualified and do not have a history of over euthanizing
- There isn't a bias against breeds
- Pitbulls are not to be judged differently from other dogs.
- Are comprised of veterinary doctors and trainers who have experience with dogs
- The tribunal was ONLY made up of dog trainers, dog rescue coordinators, and other people who directly work with dogs and KNOW what they are talking about. Absolutely no Karen's from Suzy's school just because Karen wants a say.
- educating the pet owners on proper training and socialization of their pets.
- The bully breed wouldn't be discriminated against or any breed
- Individuals qualified to assess the dog and provide education (if required).
- No biases against specific breeds of dog, only on the actions of the dog
- It's following a fair process
- Got the opinion of a professional trainer
- They do not have the authority to issue immediate kill orders.
- Dogs declared a nuisance get a second shot before being euthanized, taken away and put in the hands of a responsible dog trainer/ foster. If they are still aggressive after a time then do what's needed
- If there were more information regarding the treatment of the animal and decision making process.
- There is no breed discrimination among those on the tribunal
- They are aware of the problems in accusing "pit bulls"
- A veterinarian/animal behaviour specialist was part of the tribunal. Too many dog attacks are misunderstood and the larger dog can be blamed easily by people who do not know or understand dog behaviour and warning signs (eg: a dog that growls is not aggressive- it's telling the person/dog it's uncomfortable with the situation they are in, people often think it means the dog is bad and that dog is blamed when it is actually only doing what is normal and natural warning behaviour).
- Not breed biased



- To consult with actual dog behaviour trainers who utilize science based training methods. There need to be educated persons involved who know behaviours of dogs and why they would have happened.
- They take all factors into consideration-was the “victim” provoking the dog? Did the dog feel threatened? Was the dog protecting their owner or someone else? Were there witnesses? Etc.
- This is used for repeat offender dogs. Single incidences are not a clear indicator that an animal is aggressive.
- Absolutely no bias against the dog- this would need to be consistently demonstrated. Avoid euthanasia at all costs. And not using this procedure to rush a process through that might need time.
- That there is adequate support/defence for the dog. All reasonable measures to be taken BEFORE euthanized (such as possible relocation or mandated training for both owner and dog.)
- If it's for all dogs not just pit breeds
- As long as the tribunal includes at least one animal behaviourist that is certified as such.
- They did not discriminate based on breed. (No harsher punishments because it's a pit bull, etc).
- Had a fair judgment of the animal, no biased going into it and representation from ordinary Calgarians.
- The reviewers did not show bias to bullies/pitbulls anymore or less than other breeds. Also, provided the euthanizing dogs isn't handed out like candy.
- A genuine and unbiased opinion towards ALL breeds.
- Representatives must have unbiased opinions on “vicious” dog breeds. ie. owners of said vicious dogs and owners of opposite.
- That the tribunal representatives are professional dog trainers or vets, dog rescue management, or long-time responsible owners of these aforementioned (BSL) breeds of dogs.
- There is always a vet and/or dog trainer included in the tribunal to provide their professional insight. A city of Calgary employee or others who have an opinion, rather than an educated input, have no business being part of a tribunal.
- Determine and review restrictions placed on a dog
- Not to destroy the animal on breed alone
- dogs well being should be considered highly and euthanization should not be an option. Rather owners should be trained and go to obedience classes and if that does not work, dogs should be removed from irresponsible owners and put up for adoption for another chance.
- Must have a spokesperson for the animals a non partisan representative like a rescue -- a credible rescue like CB Rescue foundation
- To be fair and non judgemental
- Representatives need to be impartial, qualified and accountable. Their credentials and decision making should be made public record.
- Review if the other party has fault
- They are all fair towards pit bull type dogs!!
- Not based on breed.



- It is run/governed by appropriately qualified behaviour/animal behaviour experts who are entitled to an opinion on such a subject.
- Euthanasia is not a must
- Engage with animal experts for each case
- A fair panel and not one with placements of people who will decide exactly what the city wants.
- Prejudices about breed is expressly forbidden and focus is on owner, not dog.
- Having a vet be the deciding factor not a random person that doesn't know anything about dogs and behaviours
- if the animal has bitten more than once it should be taken away and euthenised
- Heavy training to ensure these cases aren't simply sent to euthanasia due to the tribunal's laziness or bias against a certain breed.
- If it had an unbiased jury based system
- Euthanasia only as a humane option where *medically* necessary as determined by a veterinarian
- It's an unbiased result for what should be done. Not a decision that's affected by false fear
- No layperson should decide if an animal should be euthanized. A team of 2 vets and 2 animal behaviourists should make the decision.
- Release the dog back to the owners and have it only be allowed on their property
- No prejudice towards certain breeds of dog.
- Assess whether the owner is wholly responsible for the dogs behaviour ie soending long hours alone or on chain with no cance of social interaction. I feel owner should be held more responsible
- The breed of dog is not considered during the tribunal just the actions of the dog.
- As long as dogs aren't targeted by breed and all are given a fair trial I see no issues with this, but keep in mind small dogs can be a nuisance as well.
- Bit specific to dog breed
- The tribunal had people with extensive dog behavior experience/training and were familiar with wगत dogs were bad dogs versus bad owners
- The owners have ample time to appeal while the dog is still not in a shelter
- Anyone sitting on the tribunal should be an unbiased individual, such as not being someone with a previous team am related to a vicious dog, or having a fear of dogs.
- Fair, multi faceted group consisting of vets, pet trainers, dog handlers and proffessionals that see where possible areas could be improved upon helping both owner and dog. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Proof that the Tribunal is truly unbiased.
- the tribunal
- An objective assessment without the automatic assumption of euthanasia
- As long as there are individuals who own "pit bulls" (or as you classify them) and are knowledgeable about dog behaviour are also present to help make a decision
- Members of the tribunal have the necessary qualifications to make these determinations and follow the same standards as the provincial court



- Pit bulls were treated like other dogs because it is insane you guys think pit bulls should be treated differently than any other dog... It's actually infuriatingly sad
- Different staff/stakeholder rotating through in case of bias towards specific breeds or owners
- No dumb asses allowed in it
- Multiple professional dog behaviourist are on the tribunal and people who are not biased by breed
- N/A
- They have experience with dogs
- The appeal process must not be allowed to be used as a tool to delay a ruling. Too many defendants would disrespect the tribunal in favor of an appeal in order to waste provincial resources
- It should be made up of veterinarians and dog trainers who can professionally assess the situation and the animal
- Qualified people sitting on the tribunal
- If the people on the tribunal could also identify if the animal is inhabitable even with a different owner - is it the dog or the owner. Animals shouldn't pay for the sins of the owner.
- obedience training instead of euthanasia 100%
- It was fair
- Decision to euthanize a dog should still go to provincial court
- How about listen to the owner because I guarantee they know why the dog felt they needed to protect themselves. Dogs just dont attack just because.
- The dog remains confined to the owners home awaiting the tribunal as shelters stress dogs and can cause more harm
- The members of the tribunal should have appropriate animal experience (trainers, Humane society employees, etc.)
- Dog should be euthanized if demonstrating aggressive behaviour.
- That well versed/trained persons ie dog trainers, animal behaviourists or others well trained in dog behaviours make up the tribunal
- Charge the owner for not being responsible
- No one is prejudiced against bully breeds
- several in depth investigations and home visits
- As long as they are willing to work and get the dog the right help and not just jump to putting the dog down. Also look at maybe not allowing that owner to own any dog for a certain amount of time.
- Needs to be agreed by offender and victim
- Like a jury, we're not biased to certain breeds, have a dislike of dogs, know the owner etc
- No pre-conceived bias towards certain breeds.
- A canine expert such as a trainer or veterinarian be on the panel
- The tribunal would work with the pet owner in determining the right course of action, depending on the seriousness of the case
- Had a veterinarian familiar to the dog sit on the panel, or have an animal behavioral specialist asses the dog to see if it is retrainable or if it should be taken from the owners and retrained



- Fair decision made and not make a quick, easy decision because it's less effort
- As long as it was fair and not based on erroneous information, like the fallacy that "pit bulls" have a uniquely strong force to their bites.
- They were educated in breed behaviors and the breed was not disclosed as it does not matter.
- They need all the facts and if it's a first time offence the dog shouldn't be put down but the owner fined and or the dog placed in a different home. Training could be provided as well for the dog.
- Experienced dog owners, unbiased to breed, common sense persons who have no conflict of interest, chosen as members of the tribunal.
- Tribunal must include Dog owners
- It's not based slanted biases toward ANY breed.
- I am not educated in legal procedures, but tribunal sounds like a good idea because of increased efficiency. However, this tribunal system should operate through the same procedures used by provincial court.
- Balanced representation including those without breed specific opinions/leanings.
- No euthanization
- No conflict of interest with non city representatives
- The panel includes professionals in the dog industry with no biases. The accused and victim can retain lawyers.
- Not to euthanize dogs
- The Representatives makes decisions not clouded by personal bias
- Depending on severity of attack. If attack is vicious in nature, or life threatening, dog should be euthanized.
- No bias tribunals
- The people involved in the tribunal are trained. Knowledgeable, and experienced with dogs and not just lay people.
- Decisions can be appealed in court
- Has professional animal behaviouralists who have met and assessed the animals
- Both parties have enough time and financial means of financial help to prepare for the tribunal
- I would support this option if the tribunal consists of people experienced in administrative law to reduce bias
- Take into account whether the dog was trained by the owner. If not, the owner should be held responsible. Not the dog.
- That it listen to both sides of the story. Would hate to see dogs euthanized in certain circumstances where they don't deserve it
- As long as it was a system that had representatives that didn't promote discrimination against breeds.
- We need to have people who will genuinely treat each dog differently based solely on there own circumstances and not on biased opinions based on stereotypes. Also small vicious should be treated the same as big dogs



- The representation at the tribunal is chosen through a transparent and equitable process
- The selection of the tribunal consists of a wide variety of personalities and opinions on dogs.
- Required timelines for making a decision so the dog is not kept locked up because of bureaucracy.
- The tribunal panel must be open to an appeal process (no summary executions) and outside review for bias.
- More information on time frame and process needed.
- the concept of appeals to Queen's bench, seems like a lengthy process and would lengthen or at least make the same amount of time to process as current?
- an understanding of dog behaviour and what factors contributed
- **DON'T TARGET BREED SPECIFIC DOGS.** Target shit owners that didn't do their research before adding a dog to their family.
- Any dog that bites a person will have restrictions applied !!! Stop talking about trauma to the dog and consider the victim of the bite.
- breed is not included
- Able to appeal to provincial court
- Done in an efficient manor
- Independent appeals process. Also if they have the power to decide on euthanization one tribunal member must have a veterinary background which would have veto powers over euthanization.
- any vicious animal who has drawn blood should be euthanized
- The owner of the dog is disciplined for being a bad pet owner
- review restrictions to abide to keep animal, depends on the owner.
- I was attacked by a goose, where can I press charges?
- As long as dog has alternative options of waiting in a kennel as this will cause more stress to the dog.
- No dog owners, vets, dog breeders or anyone connected with dogs to sit on the tribunal.
- The owner being responsible to remediate behaviour. The dog is not the problem. Responsible owners ensure good dogs.
- It was followed through accordingly
- Attempt rescue of dog and rehabilitation in a non-traumatic and safe place before considering euthanasia.
- The city tries to rehab the dog before they talk about killing it, you then charge the owner and have them pay for the rehab.
- Tribunal's priority **MUST** be public health and safety. It must not attempt to "balance" the public's right to safety with one individual's supposed "right" to keep their dangerous dog
- Viewing the level of knowledge and training the owner is able to successfully provide to the dog.
- First offense only.
- it should be made up of people who do not discriminate against any specific breed or person
- That the owner has the choice to bring it to court if they do not agree with the decision made.
- Need enforced



- Don't discriminate against pit bulls. A dog's behaviour is a reflection of the training and owner.
- At least 1 Dog trainer and/or specialist who understand dog behaviour should be a required seat on the tribunal. Evaluating the owner's behaviour as much as the dogs.
- Adequate time be given to the owner to prepare. Animals be provided with rehabilitation outside of the owner's control
- Dog should be released to owner as long as owner can abide by conditions and ensure dog does not escape or cause harm.
- Appropriate qualifications for those sitting on tribunal.
- Not being biased by breed
- The tribunal should include professionals such as a veterinarian, veterinary technician, Calgary humane employee, etc.
- Nice having options
- The dog remains in their home and in their yard until the court case unless muzzled and on leash in the care of someone 18 or older.
- As long as it's not a biased group
- Take pit bulls off this survey!
- The tribunal should involve dog behavior experts and a member of the veterinary community along with citizens and bylaw officers.
- As long as the non-city members were educated or experienced animal experts and not general citizens.
- They could be appealed
- Tribunal members must be certified dog trainers or have other specific expertise in assessing the animal's temperament and potential for rehabilitation/training.
- There needs to be trainers and dog behavior experts on the tribunal.
- This tribunal would have to be comprised of professionals AND who can fairly assess the circumstances surrounding the bite. Suggestions: Certified veterinary behaviourist, Certified dog trainers etc. Surrounding conditions of the bite like environmental factors need to be considered. Animals can be placed on quarantine inside the owner's home via agreement with Animal Control Officer vs in a shelter.
- If it was the dog's first bite and the situation causing the bite. Eg. Other dog comes onto property
- As long as the tribunal consisted of trained professionals i.e., vets.
- FACTS are taken into consideration and a balanced view is taken.
- People who are experts (have professional history) in related field and elected by the public.
- Dependent on the membership of the Tribunal representatives. Vets, animal caregivers involved not only City employees.
- That it is fair and equal in its tribunal selection. It needs responsible pet owners of multiple breeds, not government bureaucracy.
- I think the dog should remain in the household until a verdict is determined.



- Owners are held legally responsible for the actions of their dogs, punishments/fines etc. are too light at present.
- A professional veterinarian or dog behaviour expert be included in all tribunals
- as treated that makes it bite .
- The tribunal contains at least two registered dog trainers in that it can be impartial and It can be determined if the home is fit for the animal or if it would benefit from new ownership.
- The owner and dog have the opportunity to demonstrate their training and behaviour in an outdoor setting.
- As long as the tribunal was unbiased
- The tribunal is made up of a combination of community members- general public, vet, animal behaviourist, bylaw ext. Not just represented by a single faction
- People on the tribunal actually have knowledge of dogs (ie: vets, vet techs, dog trainers)
- If People wouldnt narrow in on a breed of animal and hopefully will realize that is not the breed of the dog its the type of it the environment and improper training they have had.
- Has trained animal behaviourists and has evidence the dog can not be rehabilitated.
- thought for rehabilitation must come prior to euthanasia.
- Members of the tribunal have veterinary representatives. Understanding of the behaviour was aggressive due to medical, behavioural or situational reasons will save animals from being euthanized from lack of training.
- Provocation must be taken into consideration. I.e. under no circumstance should kids ever be allowed to run up to a dog, hug a dog, etc. If there is any provocation the dog MUST not be euthanized
- That it was the first offence and the dog didn't have previous complaints of aggressive behaviours.
- The dog is not taken away from its owner and the situation of the dog's actions is scrutinized (eg. was the person antagonizing they animal (provoked or unprovoked)
- must have neutral parties
- They weren't against Pitbulls in any form or influenced by media against Pitbull type dogs
- Opportunities for cases to be questioned and challenged for special cases.
- I would support this, so long as there are NOT ANY political party members present in any shape or form. Animal behaviour specialists, veterinarians, and other professionals engaged in the wellbeing of animals should be, as to limit the use of the outcomes of these trials for personal gain.
- That the dog is not euthanized
- That there is a 1 strike rule for biting.
- Members of the Calgary humane society and behavior veterinarians are active participants on the tribunal. Humans are quick to judge dogs they don't like, or don't want around, but their judgement doesn't mean that dog is bad. The circumstances, human owners, conditions of incidents should all be relevant and considered in a situation of a misconduct. More often than not, it's not the dogs fault and more often than not, it's not a pit bull type, so placing judgement with bias is a very wrong approach to supporting a safe community and creation responsible pet ownership.
- Appeal process



- It included knowledgeable members (ie. senior shelter staff) with knowledge of large dog types. And in particular a balance of members for breeds like pit bulls.
- Dog kept on owners property
- Does not have authority to euthanize
- It doesn't tie up the courts for more serious offences done by people
- The tribunal must consist of individuals who are not predisposed to penalizing specific breeds.
- The tribunal must not have persons and it that have bias towards certain breeds. It should in fact have at least one or two owners of pit bull type breeds involved with it
- no breed specific legislation
- It was bi partisan and no one with an agenda can be on the committee
- It is not biased to bsl and no bsl supporters are allowed to be on a tribunal
- Judged on behaviour, not breed.
- Dogs out all size be considered equally thank you
- Tribunal members should receive training from professionals regarding animal behaviours. This will allow them to focus on specific animal behaviours and not judging by breed.
- Dog stays at owners home, not off property
- Not a pensionable position
- They could not decide if a dog should be euthanized.
- Make sure the the tribunal has at least two veterinarians (including one with additional training in veterinary behaviour and fear free certified)
- Any non city representatives would be well educated in animal behaviour & handling. Eg. trained animal behaviourist, Veterinarian etc. It should not be in the hands of just anyone to determine if a dog should be euthanized. Input should come from a trained animal care/ veterinary professional.
- It is totally unbiased. There is huge prejudice against "bully breeds" and I worry that this would just cause those dogs to be euthanized faster.
- The dog is heavily assessed to see if they are actually aggressive or vicious before euthanizing, or the owner needs to agree to not have the animal out in public again or is heavily fined. I think every situation is very different and needs to be done on a case by case basis
- The breed of dog is exempt from the description to the tribunal to prevent undue bias.
- If the tribunal contains adequate representation from an organization like the Calgary Humane Society.
- As the tribunal was filled with a fair subset of members that are knowledgeable with dogs. Not greasy politicians.
- I think dangerous dogs should be dwalt with quicklu
- The group is made up of dog experts and not just random members of the community
- Seems fair.
- As long as there is no bias regarding the breed of the dog.
- some dogs are bugged by kids or toddlers who just wants to look or touch the dog.....if the dog bites then no it should not be euthanized



- Any decision made by the tribunal must be in full agreement with the victim.
- Legal representation was included, event and character witnesses could be called, and the victim could be questioned by both the tribunal and the accused party's lawyer to ensure due process.
- It needs to be fair for ALL dogs that bite. Not just put bull-breed types.
- I would need to know how the tribunal is chosen and what they're motive for sitting in the tribunal was to ensure fairness to both parties
- Qualified experts on the tribunal who are properly trained
- No breed specific targets. The only dogs that have ever bit me were a collie and great pyrenees
- Dogs should not be euthanized!
- It would be guaranteed as fair and non biased be certain dog breeds
- Must include various groups such as purebred advocates, trainers, I.e. not like a jury stacked with animal rights advocates etc.
- I agree with the tribunal, as long as there is substantial research done on the situation. Yes I agree that there are dogs(non breed specific) that are viscous. But also there are bites caused by lack of education by the public. I myself have had people rush at my dog, just because she's cute, and grab to pet her without asking my permission. This has tramatized my dog to the point where if there are people out and about, she tries to run home. It's become quite difficult to take her for a walk. Other dogs may nip or bite out of fear or self defense. This is needs to be investigated case by case.
- That they have authority to euthanize or impose fines the same as provincial court
- As long as wait time and trauma to the dog are decreased.
- The owner and dog are given a chance to deal with the issue with training and a professional animal behaviorlist is brought to assess the animal and witness statements of the incident are taken into serious consideration of the events that took place.
- As the animal owner has an oppportunity to appeal before euthanization.
- As the animal owner has an oppportunity to appeal before euthanization.
- As the owner has an oppportunity to appeal before animal is euthanized
- NO second chances for any dog that kills another dog or other pet. NO second chance for any dog that causes severe damage. NO second chance for any dog that attacks unprovoked; I'm not talking about a warning nip. I'm talking about a full-out attack launched at a person for no reason whatsoever, where the dog clearly takes it too far. This would include scenarios where the dog may not have made contact due to the person jumping on a car etc, but it was clear that the dog intended to do as much damage as possible and could not be called off or deflected from the intended attack.
- The animal owner has an oppportunity to before being euthanized
- Who it is made up of.
- Wait on euthanization. Train the dog to be gentle,it can be done!
- As long as the representatives making tribunal decisions include a vet and specialist in dog behavior
- I wouldn't want to see the dog suffer for too long, speed up the process
- The non city member needs to be impartial.



- Two or more dog behaviourists be part of the panel, as well as two veterinarians and an expert in the breed of dog being assessed, as well as representatives of no kill rescue shelters or sanctuaries be part of the panel as well.
- As long as the tribunal is staffed by true experts and not those motivated by sentiment ie. so-called dog-rescuers and people inclined towards importing diseased, unsocialized and aggressive breeds to Canada.
- Depending on who exactly would be on tribunal
- Yes
- They do not euthanize nuisance dogs but penalize the owner
- As long as rehabilitation for the dog was offered.
- Have a member with a legal background and be unbiased as to euthanization.
- Members of the public and professional dog trainers are apart of the process
- Fair way to choose the members of the tribunal
- Limited the shelter time to max 30 or have the dog in question fostered with a registered “safe house”.
- Any dog that bites is a problem dog and specific breeds should not be labelled a problem without having shown cause ; it is the owner that raised them. One strike you're out ... even that cute little yapping poodle. perhaps ban more people from having dogs if there is a problem.
- No tribunal
- The people determining the outcome must be qualified, unbiased and dog owners. They should also be mixed genders for rounded perspective.
- Actual animal experts are the majority. Animal attacks are very seldom simple situations and many factors can play into a situation going bad. We need people with knowledge of these factors and experience dealing with them before and after.
- I think reducing wait and shelter time is important for both the victim and the animal. My concern is the breed specific breed legislation. I disagree with that.
- Consultation with certified animal Behaviourists and/or veterinary Behaviourists. Dog guardians need to have access to positive dog training classes.
- Everyone on the tribunal is correctly educated on up-to-date science re: animal behaviour and no one on the tribunal expresses any biases towards specific breeds of dogs.
- The people on the tribunal had extensive knowledge and understanding of ALL breeds and were not biased
- Animal health industry workers. People making decisions need to be knowledgeable
- Did not make a decision based on breed, but rather individual circumstance.
- Choose the member the same way as jury duty random people chosen by chance
- There were consequences if the terms were not met
- As long as it cannot be appealed in court otherwise you are just adding another layer/cost and waste of time
- Those presiding are not prejudiced against certain dog breeds



- At least one member of the tribunal is well-versed in dog behavioural issues and would be able to recommend appropriate rehabilitation/rehoming for animals who attack as a result of human abuse/neglect/
- That it would consider the rehab potential of the animal if it had the right owner
- Those on the tribunal are educated about animals specifically and meet the qualifications
- Licenced dog behaviourist and veterinary were on this tribunal at a minimum. These decisions cannot be made on emotions
- I don't agree that any animal should be taken away from their owner/home unless the animal is being abused/mistreated in the home. I also don't agree with any animal being put down.
- The dog stays in their own home and has to offend more than once.
- How many people would be in this tribunal? Who would be? I think there should be pit bull advocates on the tribunal
- Take the extra time to monitor the animals behaviours and the owners behaviour. Don't jump to conclusions and face the facts fully. If a dog is involved in an incident. Look at ALL factors leading up to it. What if the victim of the bite or attack was disrupting and pushing the animals buttons? They're just like humans. Push them long enough and they can lose their cool
- More information is necessary about what kind of people will staff this tribunal. How are these people going to be chosen? What qualifications would they have in order to ensure humane and objective decisions?
- There should be no bias in its final decision.
- There was no BSL.
- The dogs would be allowed to return to their home, if certain conditions are met. Providing the previous owner wasn't abusive
- Include dog behaviour/trainer experts in decisions. Nuisance dogs are the owners fault/lack of proper training.
- None of the chosen representatives have openly supported or opposed the pit bull issue.
- would stiff fines be in their power?
- I think a tribunal is a good idea as long as half the members are from pro dog organization like the humane society or justice for bullies(a calgary based Facebook group). Also I dont believe you need to prosecute any specific breeds harsher. It should be the owners that should be held responsible.
- the tribunal had high ranking staff member or dog behaviouralist from either AARC's, humane society, or another local animal rescue organization.
- the dogs must each get a file that is updated online to help provide stats on the types of dogs who harm/bite, as well as be able to address a dog who has been to tribunal before. It would also be important to take down owner information to see if a specific owner has a history at tribunal; if so they should not be allowed to adopt/breed/possess any kind of dog
- No euthanizing. More training required and rules followed if deemed a viscous dog. Again not breed specific
- It takes into account what provoked the dog to bite, has experienced trainers to assess the situation, and focusses on rehabilitation or what do you can do to correct the dog rather than euthanizing



- The decisions are binding if all parties agree to process the case through the tribunal. If not binding, then this seems like a costly and ineffective initiative.
- Euthanasia was absolute last resort, and mandatory training was implemented first
- If the tribunal considered opportunities for dog rehabilitation instead of euthanization- dogs who exhibit aggressive/vicious behaviour should be given an opportunity for behavioural improvement. Dogs often do not exhibit positive behaviours in confined/kennel-like environments. Assessments should consider the environment that the dog is in before presuming that they should be euthanized and that there is no hope for them.
- The owner should be VETTED, to ensure they are putting the animal into situations for their own BENEFIT!
- Mostly accredited dog training/veterinary professionals sit on it.
- Not penalizing a specific breed and only using tribunal decisions based on record, charged, dog bites.
- Dogs should stay with their owners, especially if this was a first time case. The dog may have been simply protecting himself or the owner. It would be more confusing and traumatizing for the dog to be kept in an unknown environment and therefore providing inconclusive and unjust analysis of the dogs behaviour. Can you imagine euthanizing an animal based on poor judgement? People need to be responsible, and need to be educated on how to care for their animals. Having them is a privilege. Both of my pitbulls have been attacked several times, by cocker spaniels, chihuahuas, huskies, golden retrievers and labs. Most of these are “family dogs” no? Then explain to me why the city is entertaining the idea of banning, muzzling, additional cost for insurance on dogs that have never attacked or bitten back. I’m the one spending money every month and time daily boosting their confidence back up because they’re scared, cry, and whimper when any dog approaches them now. But here we are focusing on one breed that “has a more damaging bite”. Shame on you Calgary. Your lack of education and ignorance, and support of BSL is absolutely embarrassing!!!!!! I would trust my child with my 2 pits before I put them in any other dogs care. I am disgusted that we are even ENTERTAINING this. SHAME!!!
- To not be bias based on breed and only look at the facts in each individual case leaving the breed of each dog out of it
- Providing that it is fair and UNBIASED not all bully breeds are bad and it’s usually the owner not the dogs fault
- It includes all breeds of dogs
- Paid for by owner of dog declared nuisance.
- There are an equal number of people having both for and against persuasions for such dogs on the tribunal: i.e., it cannot be one-sided.
- Any dog “convicted” of a crime whose owner wishes to appeal at the Court of Queens Bench be released back in the owner’s possession until the official court date and a final verdict reached.
- MUST include veterinarianS or veterinary technologistS on the panel. Must be held within 7 days.
- I would like to see an animal behavioral specialist or a veterinarian on the tribunal for every case to ensure no bias against the dog.



- As long as the dog doesn't get euthanized.
- Treat all dogs equally as one breed should not be subject to special orders
- The tribunal members have a good understanding of dogs and focus on the owner rather than the breed.
- No stereotypes of dog breeds
- The animal can remain with its owner. And since there is no space to add thoughts on the above questions, please stop coming for the pit bulls. Too often these dogs pay for the sins of shitty owners.
- Tribunal should be a pet owner committee so there is no biased opinions against the animal
- There is a knowledgeable team set up who can honestly and unbiased decisions can be made.
- These people must be well trained, so they don't default to putting dogs down unless it's absolutely necessary
- members of the tribunal are qualified
- The owners should face more responsibility in their dogs behavior, less focus on the dog and more focus on the owners. Dogs should still be reviewed, but more focus on the owners and how they have trained and care for their dogs.
- Using animal trainers, separately from city reps and Calgary Humane Society
- Time spent waiting dog should be educated to see how it reacts. Insurance is a joke and should not be forced unless insurance is forced to actually insure not exempt and change policy and yours doesn't count, corporate scam
- All incidents are treated equally and dog breed is not a consideration
- Tribunal should include canine behaviour experts
- .
- Depending on the situation should be either or. Would be excellent on lower level cases to keep the small stuff from the courts
- harsh punishment handed out to owner, potential referral to criminal court for proceedings.
- Animal owner to cover court costs and animals stays in custody of animals control until hearing.
- They are fair and impartial. People have such misconceptions around dogs and dog bites. Euthanasia of an animal should be a last resort. And the animal should be assessed by actual experts and trainer. Not currently bylaw officers who have no training and are biased.
- That the owner would be given opportunities to restrain or retrain the dog in some other manner.
- The process is objective and there are no breed specific restrictions. I do not support singling a particular breed.
- Members of such a tribunal should be very familiar with dogs and their behavior. Since dogs are not the problem, there should be every opportunity for the dog to be rehabilitated before being euthanized.
- The tribunal cannot be more than 3 people, and it should be disbanded if the annual cost exceeds \$100,000



- They take into account situations ; if a dog bites because someone trespassed, the dog should not be euthanized. If a dog bites because it was provoked, they should take that into consideration as well
- as long as it is not breed bias.
- As long as the tribunal had the wellbeing of the dog as a high priority
- Membership was composed of highly trained dog behavioural specialists. The panel must be balanced and all bias removed.
- It was taken into consideration the dog owners ability to train the dog correctly
- Should be optional and based on the situation
- Each case has to be assessed on its merits.
- The owners have a voice
- No euthanizing.
- that if shown that a person was aggressive or taunted a dog to become vicious be held responsible for all costs of having the dog locked up at animal services
- Look at each case objectively and not just assume that a certain breed is more vicious than another
- It is not bias towards specific dog breeds and takes into consideration the individual dog.
- Is fully paid for by dog owners and not taxpayers.
- All dog breeds are treated as equal
- Qualified and knowledgeable people about pet behavior are involved
- The tribunal would be experienced and highly qualified.
- Any tribunal would need to be staffed by neutral third parties with some level of relevant qualification
- Careful and balanced representation on the tribunal. Clear conflict of interest guidelines for tribunal members.
- Yea
- Troubled dogs are not euthanized, instead they are worked with by dog training professionals
- No city staff involved, only animal experts to be panelled
- At least one dog training professional expert present.
- If a dog bites more then once and it must be proven beyond reasonable doubt which dog did the biting.
- determine and review conditions which owner would need to abide by. Better than having a bunch of "think they know it alls" deciding the future of your pet.
- I do not support euthanization. I'm sure there are other options rather than a cruel quick fix that can traumatize an owner for a long time. If we don't euthanize people for their (intensional) cruel attacks, then why do it to a dog who has proven to be more Loyal than the majority of humans.
- The tribunal has people who do not discriminate against breeds, includes trained professionals/specialists in the areas of dog behaviour (I.e trainers) to ensure animals are not judged unjustly with biases (such as what is displayed with the wording and elements of this survey- I.e anti "pitbulls" or other breed specific discrimination)
- A property check is done to the home is the animal as well



- I would want to see specific criteria about who is represented on the panel to ensure a balanced assessment (ie. - not only 'pure positive trainers as these trainers do not produce good outcomes when addressing problem behaviours. I would also want a balanced trainer represented - they get results with problem dogs.
- People unhappy with the decision can still have their day in court or some method of appeal. So many of your boards and commissions are so corrupt, I have a hard time trusting them as a final authority.
- Injury to other living being caused by the dog.
- Euthanasia is a last resort for multiple offenders
- euthanasia must not be a consideration under any standard for other than the quality of life of the dog. dogs deemed vicious in manner that control or retraining is completely inapplicable must be surrendered to a specialized care facility where they cannot hurt others and their own safety and welfare is guaranteed.
- A vet assess the or behaviour assessment on the dog
- Decision would be made without breed bias.
- That the people on the tribunal actually have dog behaviour expertise. Not people who are uneducated about animals or "pit bull" haters.
- Educated and diverse representatives in the tribunal.
- Appropriate qualifications for those sitting on the tribunal.
- It included animal behaviourists, not just community members.
- The non city representative would need to be an educated animal behaviourist
- It does not discriminate against a dog's breed and base harsher punishments on pitbulls or dogs resembling pitbulls. The only premise for quicker handling of cases should be a history of the dog being a nuisance or previous/repeated aggressive behaviour
- Members of the tribunal should be people with a history of working with dogs and they must meet an animal and interact with it before they pass a euthanasia order
- A fair set of peers to be used
- It applies equally to all breeds. Any size dog whether small or large is considered dangerous if inadequately socialized/trained. Targeting the pit bull family of dogs is highly irresponsible.
- Yes as this may speed up resolution
- Case by case
- Appropriate qualifications for those sitting on the tribunal.
- ONLY if truly competent and know leader like people are put in place for this tribunal. Cities often do not recognize dog educators and refer to veterinarians who have no education in behaviour.
- There is no breed specific element to the tribunal process. And those on the panel include dog behaviour specialists and veterinarians.
- if the owner had the choice to choose either to go to court or to use the tribunal
- Euthanasia decision can be appealed



- As long as it is not civilians making these decision. Needs to be someone who knows animal behaviour (ie. vets, dog trainers/behaviouralist, etc)
- There are no biases toward breed of the animal being judged
- The breed of dog is not disclosed to the tribunal. Breed prejudice could play a role in outcomes.
- As long as there are trained professionals (veterinarian, trainers etc)
- The breed of the dog was not mentioned and only the events of the include the so ruling were not biased against on breed over another
- Dog is kept away from people & other dogs
- as long as the information regarding the incident was collected and scrutenized case by case
- there has to be a fully qualified vet at minimum on the tribunal to avoid breed specific phobia. Often a bite is caused by someone mishandling the dog or approaching a dog incorrectly etc. A dog most often bites to protect themselves from harm not just to bite unless the owner treats them poorly.
- Increase tags price for breeders a lot, the back yard breeders should be target here. Real breeders are rare but way to many back yard breeders
- At least some of the members of the tribunal need to be certified animal behavioural specialists ex. Vet behaviourists or dog trainers
- The tribunal isn't based on BSL.
- Stayed bias and neutral like a real court.
- That it isn't a lame duck. It needs to have some sort of power in its decision making. I also feel that the owners charged and convictions need to mean something as well. (Ie...no ownership of a dog like that ever again or inability to volunteer around children or vulnerable people if the attack included one of those types of people).
- If the case was fully reviewed - why did the dog attach is it the dogs fault or is it the injured fault
- Need experts on dogs on the panel. Can't just be citizens.
- Takes victims experience and trauma into account
- That dogs not be euthenized based on breed or breed class, that all cases are looked at without bias opinion and are seen on a case by case basis instead of based on likelihood and severity of attack or media propaganda
- Making sure it consists mostly of professional dog trainers and walkers who can properly assess an animal and it's behavior.
- the tribunal is made up of fair minded and dog experienced people
- Both owner and victim have been investigated. People need to know that you just can not walk up to a dog and tease it...
- There were proper representation and non-biased members.
- Not euthanizing the dog
- Qualified, different
- I cant read the full descriptions of these on my mobile phone
- No euthanization
- A group of people that were not against "pit bulls" or big dogs.



- In the hopes the review all process is faster.
- Was there a situation that provoked the dog
- It is not based on dog breed, instead reviewed on a case to case basis
- As long as there can be an independent review board not in anyway associated with the tribunal system. This way the public is protected from apparent bias.
- A thorough investigation to make sure the dog accused is actually the animal responsible
- As long as it was based on proper fact.
- The dog be given an advocate of its own and all persons on the tribunal MUST hold a degree in animal behaviour(not all dog bites are because the dog is bad. There are stupid humans that CAUSE the dog to bite)
- That any dog that has bitten a person or another animal must automatically, with the owner attend dog behavioural retraining classes before the tribunal merits to give the animal the chance at redemption. If the owner does not comply, the animal should be seized, the wner restricted for owning another dog for five years and the seized animal placed in behavioral training at owners cost and adopted out.
- Open, transparent and tribunal is held accountable for decisions.
- I am genuinely concerned of the possible biases that could come through in a tribunal setting. Especially with this current survey being put out, many individuals see bully breeds as more of a threat and therefore more of them would be put down while a similar situation with a different breed would heed different results. Though appealing the decisions at the Court of Queen's Bench is a possibility, I believe a proper education of breeds for those who are part of the tribunal is incredibly important.
- As the tribunal is composed of extremely knowledgeable dog people. Trainers that truly understand dog behaviour. However, this is problematic as in Canada we don't have any real standards/accreditation for trainers. Any Joe Public can day they are a trainer. So I guess any tribunal would be impossible to put together without outlining some very stringent guidelines for what is required of a tribunal member, which would need to be in place 100% before even exploring the option of having a tribunal.
- Place stronger punishment on the owner rather than the dog. Enforce owner training - they are just going to get another dog.
- The incidents of dogs being euthanized does not increase.
- The animal remained in the care of ts owner until the end of the hearing. Also, rehabilitation programs are offered for the dogs by experienced third party providers and re-home by dog rescue agencies. Many times it's the owner, not the dogs fault.
- All cases resulting in decision of euthanasia would automatically go to court and never be final.
- Make sure you get both sides of the story fairly. People may lie about teasing a dog before getting bit.
- If it is a severe bite not a nip the animal should be put down.
- No euthanasia rullings (but recommendation for it and then ruled at a higher court)



- As long as there is a voice for the dogs on the tribunal that has experience training bully breeds. there is no need for a bunch of Karen's or Dave's on the tribunal that couldn't care less about animals.
- Treats all breed equally and does not bully Pitbull breeds
- Where killing the dog wasn't the go to recommendation.
- Providing trained professionals (dog experts) are involved in the tribunal devious, especially the ones involving possible euthanization of the dog.
- Education is paramount. Regardless of the subject. If we did a better job shutting down BS backyard breeders then there would be less pups that have been abused and needing help both with social situations and health issues.
- There would be a court order that these dogs who are being investigated for vicious attacks remain on their property and not allowed off-leash outside of it. Obedience training should be the outcome of this as court order. Once training is completed they could be re introduced back to the dog community on-leash and then eventually off-leash
- Animals should not be euthanized for not fitting into the human society. There has to be some other solution for dogs deemed not fit for ownership or life in a house.
- It did not unfairly target Pitbulls
- More weight should be given to the humans that are meant to care for, the animal. More consideration should be give to an animal who has not been socialized with people or other animals.
- As long as it's not breed specific. No higher fines for certain breeds. Decisions must case by case not bias on breed.
- Yes
- Base decisions off of behaviour, not breed.
- Pit bulls were treated the same as any other breed
- Must not be swayed by special interest groups (ex: pit bull importers)
- It focused more on prevention for further issues, such as restrictions.
- No dogs should be euthanized, dog owners should be required to have their dog's complete obedience classes, before they can return to public parks.
- There should be a clearly defined appeal process
- Strictly judge an animal by its behavior and take into consideration if the animal was taunted into the violent reaction.
- Consistency in its rulings
- I don't agree with any breed specific legislation. Dogs are a reflection of there owners behavior not the type of breed.
- The members of the tribunal have experience with dog behaviours/ have completed a training that relates to dog behavioural patterns.
- Punish owners, not animals, and breeds should be treated equally (breed-blind decision-making)
- Dogs could stay out of shelters
- They people on the tribunal are elected, not appointed.



- Members of the tribunal must include at least one animal-friendly lawyer. Appeal should be made first to the tribunal, then to Court of Queen's Bench. Appeal to Court is extremely expensive and may be beyond the reach of the average dog owner.
- People from different walks of life need to be on this tribunal to make decisions, like veterinarians, community leaders etc.
- Must have people who love all dog breeds and judges the owner not the dog.
- Every person on the panel is qualified to properly be able to understand behavior and temperament which also includes the bylaw officers who most often than not are NOT qualified in any way to make such assessments or accurately identify breeds of dogs.
- There could not be more than ONE person on the tribunal that didn't own a dog themselves at the time they were a member; euthanization would ONLY be an option if the owner was found incompetent to properly train the dog, muzzle it in public, pay fines incurred by their dog attacking other dogs or humans, or (most importantly) causing the death of another dog or (God forbid) person.
- No euthanasia orders should come from a tribunals
- Tribunal must be made up of individuals with ongoing personal experience with the breed currently under investigation. There must be NO PERMANENT MEMBERS. Any citizen called to sit on the tribunal would be reimbursed for lost wages based on the provincial average income.
- An animal behavior specialist is a necessity on such a panel. No decisions should be made without the consultation of someone with extensive experience in dog training and behavior evaluation.
- As long as they can be appealed. I support it.
- Looks at the same things as a judge would look at and ensuring that there are no pre-existing biases to those on the tribunal.
- I would want more information before fully supporting.
- All dog types receive equal treatment, regardless of size or breed. The dog owner needs to be punished, not just the dog.
- That dog smart none aggressive people are are involved. Calgary Humane society, AARCS not members of any level of govt
- No breed bias
- I like the idea of a more efficient way to process these incidents. Would need more info on the process and how the process would work to fully support.
- Proper documentation and follow up
- That there are dog experts on the tribunal
- The people chosen for the tribunal are not prejudiced against pit bulls
- the dog is not quarantined while the owner is dealt with in court. Its not always the dogs fault that the owner has not taken the time to train them
- euthanization must take place very quickly in drastic cases
- They start with mandatory training camps for those dogs, to rehabilitate the dogs, other then jumping to euthanizing them.
- Don't bring breed into it. This should be based on severity and behaviors alone.



- The tribunal does not have the authority to order a dog euthanized
- Impartial to the breed of the dog
- Owner should be held accountable for dogs behaviour no matter what kind of breed
- Breed specific terminology and prejudice is removed from all bylaw terminology and responsibility is solely focused on ownership.
- There were extreme considerations made for dogs that were prompted to bite through being mistreated by adults OR children, as they are only using their natural means of self protection.
- It didn't single out certain breeds
- A dog should not be put down . There should be restrictions placed for a dog and their owner to protect others.
- absolutely no prejudice against any specific breeds. This is racism of the animal world and is disgusting.
- the individuals making up the tribunal must be 'qualified'. I.e veterinary professionals or certified dog trainers, etc. Not random citizens with a pet peeve or dogooders without any relevant background
- The representatives must have good knowledge of dog behaviour and any decision made by them must be open to an appeal.
- The representatives must have good knowledge of dog behaviour and any decision made by them must be open to an appeal.
- As long as the public has assurance this would be only speeding up the process and not overlooking the process.
- As long as cases are handled in a fair manner, and the owner of the animals are educated, sent for some training with they're animal or separately.
- No preemptive opinions of breedism (just because the dog is a certain breed, that does not give you the right to stereotype the animal
- Wasn't comprised of people who support BSL.
- They do not have the capacity to make decisions regarding euthanization.
- A thorough investigation, including living conditions of the offending dog, any triggers that might have instigated the attack (e.g. kids waving toys, tobogganing, in off-leash parks), and the behaviour/responsibility of the owner of the offending dog
- The tribunal can determine punishment
- If the tribunal chooses euthanization, the case proceeds to court
- No decisions should be based on the dog's breed.
- operate using a set of guidelines that is non discriminatory
- they are medium to large dog owners themselves
- The group selected to serve is not biased and equally represented the victim, dog and owner
- Fair representation on both sides.
- The tribunal must include dog trainers, animal behaviour specialists, and professionals who could fairly assess on case by case basis. It is unfair and unrealistic to set a standard such as a dog bites and is seized then euthanized.



- Should be funded, in whole or in part, by fine for convicted nuisance dog owners.
- All opinions are considered before a decision is made on the fate of dog.
- As long as they can make the same decisions as the courts and have the same options for the outcome. If it's a faster process then it might be best for all involved.
- The dog is not in a shelter longer than required.
- owner must do reactive dog training with their dog.
- Irresponsibility of the owner. Most of the problematic pet behaviours are a direct result of neglect of the owner!
- Appropriate qualifications for those sitting on the tribunal.
- Thoroughly investigate the dogs state as health problems could be the cause. As well there must be witnesses in order to even consider disciplining or euthanizing the animal. Owners and victims are just biased.
- The owner of the dog at fault bears the responsibility for inadequate training or conditions.
- obedience training the owner may try first
- The composition of the tribunal needs to include individuals who are formally trained in dog behaviour. Additionally, representatives from dog rescues should be included to ensure there is a perspective from experienced individuals.
- Rescue organizations are given opportunity to rehabilitate animals set to be euthanized.
- It is funded through additional costs to pit bull licences.
- Has an appropriate method of appeal, allows for counsel to assist people, hears from the owner, ensures there's a presumption of innocence/state burden of proof
- As long as every tribunal actually had both a vet and a dog behavioural specialist not just laypeople. Even people who work in city animal bylaw departments have no expertise in animal behaviourism.
- It truly speeds up process to avoid prolonged trauma and separation
- It includes professionals in dog behaviour (vets & trainers) and those versed in legal procedures & rights.
- LOOK AT THE INCIDENT FOR WHAT IT WAS NOT THE TYPES OF DOGS INVOLVED.
- Determine and review restrictions
- As long as the people selected for the tribunal do not have a negative bias towards dogs.
- The tribunal includes experts in the field of animal behaviour.
- Shortest possible time spent with animal away from its owners
- As long as a qualified dog trainer/behaviour professional is also involved
- The members of the tribunal include certified dog behavioural specialists who can appropriately assess the situation
- Not all dog bites are unjustified, there has to be criteria to exempt dogs who bite for justified reasons from being punished, such as defending themselves or protecting their owner, etc.
- Allow dog to stay with owner but add restrictions until a decision can be made.



- Have dog owners or the committee who own a variety of breeds to attempt to keep the tribunal unbiased towards dogs. Additionally, I don't think you should immediately have to go to a tribunal, if this was a fluke accident or first incident, it should be on a case by case basis.
- Non-city representation should include a number of people who have education to properly handle dogs (vet, vet assistance, groomers). As this would suggest that those people who are educated are perhaps more qualified in handling such dog and that perhaps it is not the dog that would always benefit from programs but the wonder himself who should go through training. By including trained dog experts it would also allow those who frequently spend more time with a variety of breeds to provide non bias and factual based data about breeds and dangerous occurrences.
- If only fair to the situation....
- Dogs should remain with the owner under conditions- I am I net of dogs for 35 years. It is possible
- Follows very strict guidelines prior to any decision is made on any animal .
- It is not biased based on breed
- We should lessen the need to use our courts if possible. The Tribunal should be non-political and be immune to any political interference.
- N/A
- Involved rehabilitation of the animal with proven rehab.
- 2nd offense only for ANY breed
- I do not believe the dogs breed should be mentioned. The size of the dog matters but it's race does not.
- As this process is fair to ALL dog breeds.
- Give the dog back, legally require them to not leave property unless for walks muzzled
- Should their assessment/ruling be euthanized it must first go before the Court of Queens Bench for a secondary review and ruling.
- if the tribunal is comprised of unbiased persons and professionals ie veterinarians
- Takes into account the history of the dog, and the situation as a whole, and not on personal prejudice.
- Euthanization was not an option. Put the demand on the owner to do better with mandatory obedience training (paid out of pocket as fine) for vicious and multiple independent witness supported dog bites.
- Agreed
- Not have the authority to order an animal's destruction that should be limited to a court of law.
- Include a behavioural expert
- No breed-specific wording, bias, or targeting
- The tribunal is educated in dog behavior and rehabilitation options for both dog and owners
- Decision principles are transparent, consistent and equitable
- The tribunal would have a vet and dog experts on the board
- That's you assess the person that the dog attacked! AGAIN! Dogs are animals and if triggered like, humans they tend to protect themselves from any harm.



- no euthanasia
- Is able to render an unbiased judgment on whether or not the dog is in need of euthanization, restrictions, or if it was a case of an accidental bite.
- If you would reconsider euthanasia as an absolute LAST RESULT. A dog shouldn't be judged for their reactions when it is the owners fault for not properly training the dog. The dog should be allowed ample time to be properly trained to redirect their "vicious" behaviour. As they were not taught anything else. It's not their fault they don't know any better.
- As long as the members of the tribunal were not expressly anti pit bull, causing bias in decisions and sentencing dogs that could be fixed by training to death, simply due to prejudice.
- Also addressed owner history, and if there's a potential case of animal abuse in the home.
- That the owner could testify on the animal's behalf
- Issued for all breeds and owners. Eliminate poor complacent and ignorant trainers/or owners
- Thank you
- Veterinary medical professionals and human medicine professionals involved in tribunal, not just law enforcement officers.
- the people are knowledgeable about dog behaviour
- Restrictions and conditions the owner must follow. The majority of incidents with dogs are due to the owners lack of action. If a dog charges at me and my reactive boy while we are out walking and the other owner can't get a hold of their dog, and the dogs begin to fight, whose fault is it? Mine? But mine is leashed and harnessed and also wears a blindfold to help keep him calm. Or the loose dog? Am I at fault if I unhook my dog so he can protect himself from the other dog? And if the other dog gets hurt? Who is responsible then? All questions I've asked myself after every run in with loose dogs in my community. It is the owner. Unless the dog is dangerous and has attacked without provocation, there should be no need to put a dog down. Owners and people need to be more aware and alert and cautious,
- Owners be held accountable for their dogs behaviour and training
- as no more dogs need to be put down or in shelters due to overcrowding
- It doesn't blindly, and baselessly assume bully breeds are guilty. I see this as a problem seeing your previous hate mongering towards bully breeds. As a vet, I can say that there are far more popular family dog breeds that have a higher instance of biting than pit bulls.
- As long as those on this tribunal are those with sound knowledge and experience with dogs and dog behaviour.
- As long as it is to ONLY determine and review restrictions needed for owners to keep animal
- Was made up of people who do not have the obvious biases that this potential bylaw does against specific dog breeds
- tribunal should be comprised of animal experts (veterinarians, trainers, behaviouralists, etc.)
- The only way someone should be able to be a representative is if they are a dog owner
- Reviewers must remain unbiased to ALL breeds
- As long as a certified dog trainer/behaviorist is on the tribunal.



- Ensure reason for attack (for example: being taunted, being attacked/injured, etc) are taken into account
- I think the dog should be with the owner and the owner should then follow recommendations to prevent any incidents from occurring.
- Pets and owners of said pets involved in bite incidents were given fair opportunities for corrective behaviour training and reintegration if deemed safe. This training would involve both behaviour correction training for the animal and animal awareness training for the owner to help avoid situation that may stress the animal and cause aggressive behaviours.
- Was the person bit at fault, or behaving unsafely
- A panel that included a group of non biased individuals similar to the way a criminal court jury is selected. People are to be selected on a case by case basis and should include individuals who own a dog of the same or similar breed. And extensive questionnaires should be administered prior to panel selection
- Evidence that the dog owner has been neglectful and that the owner should be responsible for fines/damages/bills etc. The behavior of a dog is due to lack of owner responsibility to train dogs or obtain proper behavior help for their dogs. The owner needs to be held accountable the dog is only as good as their owner is responsible.
- The process would have to be significantly faster than the current system. I love dogs but if they have bitten someone for no apparent reason, i.e. they pass them in a park and the dog attacks, they should be euthanized ASAP to not prolong the owner's suffering over the loss. The dog may be sick or old, you never know, they are animals and act genetically on instinct.
- Dogs should NEVER be euthanized. Especially if the dog was provoked by another animal or human. All animals and humans react defensively if being harassed or abused. If need be; the dog can be enrolled in an obedience training class
- It wasn't supporting Breed Specific euthanization and had the credibility to make a FAIR judgement
- All members of the tribunal must be vetted for non bias against breeds.
- So long as the "tribunal" had adequate and proper training on dog behaviour, as well as qualifications for overseeing these reports.
- The breed of dog can't be a deciding factor in these cases
- The only people that should be on the tribunal should be veterinarians, people who are licensed dog trainers, trained mediators, trained investigators.
- Do not euthanize dogs without sufficient cause and evidence.
- Not breed specific. Animal and owner can visit, if not remain with owner. Animal is not taken by force and not without a offered "goodbye" from owner and pet can be accompanied with a toy or blanket if taken.
- During the review process the dog should be allowed to live with the other with severe guidelines in place. Ex. Cannot leave the home and/or must be on leash even in their own yard
- Euthanasia should always be the last option after retraining and new dog ownership.
- As long as the tribunals goals are to rehabilitate rather than euthanize.
- Only if the dog attacked without warning, unprovoked. (Has to be proven)



- The tribunal is recognized to be impartial and their judgements are reviewed for any bias (ie - more often they euthanize pitbulls. Or have bias towards other dogs)
- No killing of animals
- Every effort is used to help the animal with euthanization as the last resort
- The tribunal must visit the home and go on a walk (on or off leash) with the owners.
- Those involved in the tribunal are unbiased and experienced
- Tribunal members do not know breed of the dog so decision is based on the facts of the incident as well as any applicable history.
- Dog Must be kept at the owners home at all times till a decision by tribunal is made, photo proof of dog should be made at least once a day at home.
- To become a representative in the tribunal system, all representatives should: undergo training to become familiar with the behavioural patterns of dogs, have professional experience with training dogs, or be a licensed veterinarian.
- Dog behaviorists and animal shelter workers need to be part of the tribunal to offer their expertise
- I believe dogs are not vicious by nature but it is the result of the influence of the owner. Pit bulls attract a certain type of owner due to their reputation of being aggressive. I think people should be prohibited from owning dogs if one of their dogs behaves aggressively. The dog should be retrained and not euthanized.
- Non-biased representatives. Persecute the owner NOT the dog. Breed does not determine whether a dog will become a "nuisance" or not, poor training and ownership does.
- That all requirements are upheld and refusal to adhere to the conditions are taken seriously Safety at all costs especially where children are concerned
- Who ever is deciding these needs to be properly educated and informed (not breed blaming or dog blaming....it's NEVER the dogs fault....it's shitty owners who are irresponsible and often have no idea of how to train a dog).
- Euthanasia isn't the first punishment
- Individuals trained to assess dog behavior conducting the tribunal.
- N/a
- It would have to have an unbiased approach to the type of breed being judged
- It is highly unreasonable to expect the average person to pay for an appeal to QB. Consider alternative administrative review steps first (e.g. review of the decision by alternative or mediation with a dog-loving expert (one who doesn't hate pit bulls) included in the panel, with QB being a final option.
- This should not be used to determine whether a dog should be euthanized.
- Members of the tribunal must be able to deal with each case as a reflection of the dog owner, and any inciting incidents without have a breed specific bias.
- the owner and thier lifestyle were taken into consideration as well.
- No discrimination/bias towards breeds or owners
- It was handled by actual behavior specialists and veterinarians (in cases that may require medication to help the dog mentally or physically), and the dogs were assessed in an area they were



the most comfortable in, as well as reviewing the entire incident and what else in the dog's life would have lead up to the bite happening at all.

- The tribunal would have to consist of individuals with animal behavior expertise. No individual with an agenda against a specific breed should be allowed on the tribunal.
- Dogs not be euthanized but rehabilitated.
- Very short timelines for resolution
- All dogs treated equally.
- As long as tribunal members are educated on responsible pet ownership
- This power should be used wisely by the city. Should not be used in a biased way towards breeds considered "pit bulls" and should be used on a case by case basis!
- Comparable to the jury selection process. Ensure that the tribunal does not lean towards one direction more than the other. Should include veterinarians, vet techs, etc.
- The animal doesn't get euthanized. There are other ways to help the animal improve before killing them.
- Those that sit on the tribunal committee include individuals that understand dog behaviour in addition to those working in government - for example a veterinarian, veterinary technician or behaviouralist.
- Thanks to the UCP government, the Court of Queen's Bench is overloaded and understaffed. The provincial government, at any level, should not have to sort out matters that should be common sense.
- Is not paid for out of tax revenue
- Breed specific is outrageous
- Unbiased judgement, unlike this survey.
- Fast resolution is better for the pet
- I want to know the experience and training of those involved in the tribunal. I wouldn't want non-animal people involved at all. Maybe include a veterinarian.
- As long as you rehabilitate dogs before you even think of putting them down
- I would support the tribunal for serious or repeated dog bites/ attacks. However I do feel the bylaws should not solely be focused on pitbulls and breeds that look similar to pitbulls. I believe the bylaws to be put in place should protect and include all breeds.
- The tribunal members are not biased against any breed of dog
- As long as the tribunal includes dog behaviour specialists
- I'd like to see the entire situation reviewed. For example, if there was a dog bite, is it because someone can onto the property when they weren't supposed to i.e. was the dog protecting the property.
- Frequent turnover to prevent bias
- Right of appeal to court.
- Dogs should remain in owner's homes until decision is reached.
- Members must be chosen for concern for animals and decisions must never be breed specific but based on the particular circumstances.



- Look into the owner they are the problem
- Retrial
- It get solved a lot quicker
- There are veterinary staff majority on the tribunal. The general public does not have breed or behaviour education. As clearly shown above with the bias toward bullie breeds
- No euthanasia
- Ther is a no destroy order in place for all animals nucence or not
- Professional arbitrators or mediators were used.
- The members of the tribunal are educated and experienced in dog ownership, care, and behaviour.
- No breed specific decisions.
- Only if tribunal members are neutral and have no bias.
- As long as the people on the Tribunal are knowledgable
- All attempts to rehabilitate an animal are made, and Euthanasia is not an option.
- An ability to take the verdict to provincial court if desired.
- Assess the behaviour of each individual dog and not sit because it looks like a “pit bull”
- This would need to a quick & fair process that involves dog experts.
- Euthanasia not included whatsoever. No animal should be euthanized for the mistakes of humans! Proper rehabilitation and training should be given
- Contains animal behaviourist personnel
- People who are unbiased based on species of dog
- Qualified individuals to be on it.. Nominated and voted on positions
- There is a clear storyline to the argument. Many bites are the result of human error and not due to the behaviour of the dog. Too many people run up and pet dogs (big and small, alike)
- Unbiased tribunal judges
- The jury should be made of people and not be full of pit bull lovers or dog lovers and people who have had a nuisance dog or a bad past can not be in it.
- Everything humanly possible was done to avoid euthanasia but instead offer rehabilitation of the animal in a safe, knowledgeable and loving environment
- I believe a dog should only be euthanized if it has a history of violence or attacks. Some children and adults could trigger the animal in many ways, dogs have personalities so especially if the animal is anxious or nervous. Sometimes people get in their faces and if they get bit that should not be on the dog.
- it is not slanted towards rushing to judgment of the pet
- ...
- Animal can not be out of the house of the owner while case is investigated
- That the tribunal contained an even split of pet owners and pet owners alike who, athe very minimum have an indeifference towards dogs. It wouldn't be fair to have a bunch of dog hating maniacs on a tribunal to decide a dogs fate.
- Opposing any measures to restrict or punish dogs based solely on their breeds



- Included some individuals who are experienced in the realm of animal behaviours.
- Members of the tribunal must be neutral and should not be allowed on tribunal panel if they exhibit prejudice or bias.
- Considered all options prior to euthanizing including rehoming if the owner is deemed irresponsible and the professional animal behaviourist believes the animal can be trained.
- It is fair and kept that way
- The animal can remain protected by either their owner at their home or a safe space with adequate care (i.e food, exercise, attention)
- the representatives consisted of animal experts (trainers, shelter personnel, etc)
- All clients were represented fairly
- I support an alternative process for dogs who have attacked other animals/pets. Dogs severely attacking a person or attacking a child in any regard should not be granted alternate process.
- that non biased people are selected just like a jury and the dog be assessed by a professional prior to final judgement
- The judgment is fair and not bias based on a specific dog breed, the attention is put on the responsibility and care of the owner based on their relationship and training of their dog
- That it is fair to the dog and that it is not a rushed situation that does not hear all the conditions under which the dog is "misbehaving".
- an effective appeals process
- Tribunal members should be limited to people with substantial training and understanding of dog behaviour (i.e. vets and vet technicians).
- I would support a tribunal as long as there is the opportunity to appeal the decision at the Court of Queen's Bench. The process should be fair, inexpensive and ensure open and transparent processes are in place for all involved. Also want to comment that it is unfair to put all dogs in a nuisance category based on their looks. Staffordshire bull terriers are considered one of the most family friendly dog breeds, are highly intelligent and easy to train. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- There is an even representation of city and non-city representatives. There needs to be an agreed upon vote and it should NOT fall solely to the city to ultimately make the decision on what to do with the animal. The non-city representatives are people that understand dog behaviour (not a random Karen off the streets that hates pitbulls because she doesn't actually know what kind of dog it is but one barked at her one time so she definitely hates them).
- A veterinary behaviourist will play a major role in every tribunal
- **THE OWNERS MUST GO THROUGH TRAINING ON DOG BEHAVIOUR AND PERSONALITIES!!! PUNISH THE OWNER, NOT THE ANIMAL!!**
- That euthanizing a dog not be the easy way out and not used until ALL other options have been tried and tested in each case. Calgary does not have the death penalty, and applying the death penalty to a dog bite is inhumane and extremely cruel if there are other options, which there are in almost all cases. A dog bite is a dog bite regardless of the size, breed, and strength of the dog. Dogs can get



rehabilitated and do all the time. Euthanizing an animal is not an appropriate response, it is a lazy response.

- Third item, review restrictions
- The committee would have to be made up of open minded individuals- trained in the animal business, and not just far left or far right believes that specific breeds would instantly be euthanized without a fair tribunal.
- People are adequately trained to properly evaluate canine Behavior.
- It doesn't discriminate against dog breeds
- IF they specifically look at the way the animal is raised and trained rather than the painting breeds as dangerous. IE focus on the bad training habits over bias on the animal.
- More education for the dog owner.
- Either a volunteer commission or a responsibility taken on by existing city of calgary employees at no cost to taxpayers
- Ensure that dog owners take training to see how THEIR BEHAVIOUR has created a nuisance dog. There are no bad dogs...only owners.
- Was not in support of breed specific regulations. As any breed can be viscous or prone to biting it is ENTIRELY based on how the dog was raised by its OWNERS.
- No unrealistic opinions or stereotypes to be held against pit bulls or nuisance dogs
- Who makes up the tribunal system? It should not be made up by other animal service members or persons that would be partial to one side or the other
- Euthanization orders were not declared at tribunals.
- It is fair.
- Training for the dogs owner should be included in this. It's 9/10 the case of being the owners or previous owners fault anyway for a dogs behavioral issues.
- As long as parties involved have fair say/representation for their cases
- The dog can live at home providing the owners have met necessary fence, gate and leashing guidelines.
- It is composed of a team of professionals educated in animal behaviour and welfare
- any declaration of euthanization by the tribunal is reviewed and approved or dismissed by the court.
- So long as it is treated as a case by case basis and not breed discrimination.
- Tribunal members had sufficient animal welfare and behaviour training.
- Rehabilitation is used primarily, and euthanization is not an option (or a last resort)
- It is paid for by increased dog licence fees
- Euthanization would not be included in their assessment
- Tribunal should include a veterinarian
- Must have members from the field of Vet, Animal abuse worker, etc not randoms
- I would support a tribunal as long as there were animal behaviour experts on the tribunal. A tribunal with bureaucrats only and no animal specialists would be useless. It would be abysmal and



ignorant if the city of Calgary introduced a pit bull ban given it's the owners that produce dangerous dogs not the dogs themselves.

- Pitbulls should not be banned. The tribunal must be efficient, penalties must be adapted case by case and you should have dog experts not city employees or social groups running the tribunal
- The dog and owner must attend mandatory obedience training
- Ensure a full history of the dog was taken.. where did it come from (if he was a rescue he may just need further rehab but NOT euthanasia), is this the first attack hes been a part of? (If so , perhaps have the dog on a city watch list to keep tabs on severe behaviors like bites. I just don't want to tribunal to lead to a very black and what conclusion ...
- That the tribunal chair is trained and knowledgeable about animal behaviour, animal welfare, and that the human factors that contribute to dog bites are taken into account when reviewing cases
- No arbitrary demonizing of particular breeds of dogs. Any vicious bite, whether Golden Retriever, Labradoodle or Bulldog must be treated with the same severity.
- Tribunal members are experts in dog behavior and training
- Tribunal membership would need to be consistent to ensure equal rulings for all cases.
- I think a dog should be given every opportunity to either be re-homed or placed in a training system before euthanasia is an option.
- The decision makers would need to be very knowledgeable in animal behaviour, and have no breed biases
- I would support a tribunal as long as the panel is not made up of known pro BSL supporters
- There was no bias in the tribunal
- No euthanization without owners consent
- Understanding that in most cases dog but because they are scared or protecting their owner.
- It's non bias, fair and considers the ownership treatment of the dog, has the dog's best interest at heart, tries all other methods of treatment before even considering euthanizing the dog
- fast processing of an animal to reduce wait times in shelter
- The tribunal members do not hold bias against specific dog breeds and ultimately their goal is restorative
- If owner was not happy with decision they could still request a court case
- No government persons, animal professionals (vets, techs, trainers) and civilians should make up the tribunal. As well as it should be an option that the owner is looked at more than the animal itself. Opportunity for rescue from unfit owners and training for the animal
- That it happens speedily
- Pit bulls are not bad breeds and shouldn't be treated as such!!!!!!
- As long as the tribunal was made up with diversity of members and include more than one expert (meaning several) on dog behaviours.
- Done in a short, timely manner as to not cause further trauma to the dog
- While the decision is being made the animal should stay with the owner, and not in a shelter.
- If It isn't run by a bunch of uninformed fools



- As long as the incidents are recorded without breed specification. Rather to just use weight. This will help eliminate breed discrimination and bias.
- Only if they assess whether or not the other person was on the dogs property when bit, or if the person who was not was teasing the dog.
- The victim must be the priority, not the dog owner or the dog
- Does not cause an undue financial burden to the parties, ie higher cost than associated with the courts
- all 3 of these conditions must be thoroughly reviewed, to ensure best outcome
- Moving the process along quicker for both dog, owner and victim
- The owner is not separated from their animal.
- Only current dog owners on the tribunal
- It should not be able to circumvent the court. It should not be able to euthanize the dog before the full court process has occurred. It should be able to allow the dog to go home to its owner in a he event that it can stay there safely until the court process is complete.
- The Tribunal would be great however the people on said Tribunal would need to be from Calgary if they are going to judge Calgary cases. Additionally all Tribunal members should be dog owners with a variety of breeds between them to keep rulings fair.
- never declare pit bulls as the major problem, it should be the owners that are held accountable, if they do not properly train the dog it is not the fault of the breed
- Owners of un-trained dogs NEED to undergo training THEMSELVES. Owners of aggressive animals NEED to recognize their faults, not the animals being punished for the owners behaviour.
- the human owning the dog was a largely considered factor. Rarely is the dog the reason for it's acting out. Usually it is the owner being a poor trainer, abusive towards the dog etc. Have the tribunal look at the home situation of the dog, much like you would have a social worker look at the home situation of an unruly child
- You can not take the dog to be euthanized without a real court setting.
- Fair judgement of the case on an individual basis and allowing the dog owner a chance to take their dog through a behavioural course following an attack instead of euthanasia.
- Tribunals must be run or advised by behavioral experts that can evaluate time and cost necessary to retrain animal behavior. A panel with no advisor board would only unnecessarily put dogs to death.
- considered.
- The bylaw should inspect the dogs premises and ask for changes to fencing and gates to help avoid dogs from reoffending. On occasion owners let a small dog off leash in alleys and the dog fence fights until the captive dog gets loose.
- Proper and fair value (\$ for benefit) for citizens b/c it cost \$\$\$ to run. Proper panel - need animal educated professional(s) at minimum, not random citizens with bias
- Members of tribunal are educated or experienced on dogs (e.g. veterinarians, police K9 handlers, SPCA volunteers etc.)
- No euthanasia only further training for the vicious dog. Not leaving them in a shelter as that would mean further trauma for dog and owner



- You shouldn't be seizing people's dogs and holding them in shelters when the situation hasn't been processed. That's awful for no reason. That's guilty before it's even been assessed.
- The people hired to be a part of this tribunal must be certified dog trainers and animal behaviourists.
- Those on the tribunal MUST be as un-biased as possible. And each case must be treated individually, not comparing it to any other cases.
- The members of the tribunal consists of experts
- Tribunal should not have final say. They should be a recommendation only. Final say should be provided by at least 2 animal behavioural specialists.
- As the animal has had the opportunity to be retained or rehabilitated away from their current owners and rehomed if necessary.
- I like the idea of the tribunal but hesitate to go with that because there are various severities of dog bites...if this is the 1st offense and dog felt he was trying to protect itself etc. 2nd offence definitely with tribunal system. What about (though it's harder on system) - dog owner shows compassion and wants to fix this - give a chance. If they knew their dog was violent then they should have known better and taken steps....which perhaps leads to this - owner has to prove he's taken dog to obedience training - buys the muzzle and harness to restrain dog better and a fenced yard at the residence.
- Similar to above, a knowledgeable committee should gather to make more timely decisions rather than hold animals in shelters. Perhaps, depending on cases, a dog could be placed with experienced fosters if needed to be separated from owners while cases are processed in effort to avoid time in shelters.
- An unbiased and fair tribunal that is not discriminatory to any dog breed and is educated about proper dog handling and that poor animal behavior is not a result of the breed.
- If this would be the case for ALL breeds. Not just pitbulls and block head breeds
- Determine and review
- Often there may be civil and/or criminal claims alongside extreme incidents. The 'tribunal' concept would have to be sculpted to ensure a lack of conflict with these more important functions that involve distinct civil rights.
- The tribunal must be made up of a diverse group of adjudicators who must make an unbiased vote separate from each other. The dog attack must also have been severe enough to warrant stitches or other medical care.
- In the case where a dog was ordered to be euthanized, there must be sufficient time given to allow an appeal.
- That every other option be explored rather than ending the animals life
- Doesn't cost the taxpayers more than the current system
- An unbiased decision to be made based on the act not the breed of the dog
- Unbiased group of people, that do not have issues with certain dog breed (e.g. PITBULLS)
- If euthanizing is an option, a very professional opinion be mandatory. Killing a family member is more serious and devastating than many understand and needs to be taken very seriously and only as a last result; meaning training, etc.



- Tribunals should be staffed by individuals who have an understanding of dog behaviour, aggression, and appropriate remedies
- Applies to all breeds equally!
- Their decision is not based on breed. It is total bullshit that pitbulls are considered dangerous from birth. The way a dog is raised/trained makes it vicious, not the genes. When I was a kid this issue was with Dobermans? Which is also false.
- I do believe there are many steps to be taken before choosing to euthanize a dog and I do believe that they can be trained if put in proper care. I think everything on the tribunal is great but they need to take necessary measure before ever even considering euthanizing. I would be much more supportive of the tribunal if euthanasia was not on the table. I think euthanasia should only be an option if a human was attacked and was near death.
- Was unbiased
- Some form of the following: The dog should NOT be left to languish in a shelter without being given every possible chance to be assessed by more than one behaviourist; efforts be made to see (if it can be re)trained to sit, stay, etc., while out of the owners custody. That the dogs home environment and owners at the time of the incident, as well as possibility there may have been a previous unknown potential history of mistreatment be given thoughtful consideration. If the dog is a victim of its circumstance, owner, environment, etc. and has the potential of being rehabilitated to some degree, it be given opportunities to be placed on rescue lists
- That the bite is looked at as self defense first, before assuming that the dog is aggressive. That negligent owners are looked at before placing blame on the dog. That the person who was bit is questioned as to why they were in the space of an anxious/angry dog in the first place.
- No dogs are euthanized
- As long as it does not lengthen the process if someone were to appeal. That would defeat the whole purpose. And the tribunal must be educated and not biased towards certain dog breeds. They must look at alternatives for helping the dog such as training or socializing skills or worse case going to a farm where it can live a different lifestyle that may not stress the dog out and eliminate future issues. It is also important to strongly consider reuniting the dog with its owners.
- Not biased on breed.
- They could not determine euthanization without the support of the court
- Owners were also charged as the guilty party and the animal as the accessory, any breed of dog can be dangerous, however a "pitbull" is indeed stronger, which is why you see these dogs with drug dealers and other people who want to give off a "tough" persona. Animals are just that animals, & to many people do not abide by on leash areas and continue to allow their dogs off leash, so in this instance which happens more often than not, a responsible owner walking her pitbull, who is not dog friendly, (but owner moves out of the way of other dogs, does not stop and talk or allow her dog to run free when other dogs are present happens upon a lady with a mouthy daschound, who is off leash. Pitbull owner attempts to reign her dog in while the other owner does nothing to retrieve her little disturber, said pitbull gets ahold of the dog and injured and kills it, well now a pitbull who just doesn't like animals is facing death because of an irresponsible owner allowing her dog to wander



without a leash. How is that fair or doing anyone any favors? A responsible pet owner would have their dog leashes at all times no matter what unless in an unleashed area. Pitbulls are NOT the demons of the park. There are thousands of dogs who aren't dog friendly and they all get away with bad behavior. Pitbulls deserve a break, owners need to face consequences not the dog. The dog can be rehabilitated the owner is cruel and teaching a pet anything but love is animal abuse.

- Na
- It included a representative from the Canadian Kennel Club.
- Both parties must be investigated. Instead of euthanasia to rehabilitate the animal.
- Circumstance and history of the dogs behaviour be in the forefront.
- At least one veterinarian must be part of the tribunal board along with a canine behaviourist. There should be public engagement regarding to positions on the tribunal board and positions should only be appointed when the position is unfilled.
- The investigation was based on actual truth and not based on breed of dog
- These people have education in animal training and or anatomy and behaviour as it can pertain to circumstances in which dogs behave
- As long as the representatives are people that do stuff with animals and have the animals best interest at heart and are not profit focused or malicious
- Was a loaded board and how would members be chosen for it?
- Tribunals need to be paid positions that are appointed, not elected. Appointees should include professionals with experience in veterinary and/or dog training with multiple referrals. Appointees should also include a licensed AKC breeder of a specific breed, again with multiple referrals. Appointees should not include anyone that demonstrates either in-person or online any clear bias against any specific breed. Appointees need to include dog owners.
- The dog is permitted to live with the owner under strict rules until a decision is made.
- I dont believe the aberahe citizen is capable of prescribing euthanasia as a solution. This would need to be from an animal behavioralist trained in positive reinforcement.
- They cant decide about euthanization.
- Dog training
- No decisions based on breed of dog
- Random panel or experts from all areas of animal behaviour including bully breed advocates, small and large dog advocates, trainers, and animal behaviour specialists
- It works exactly the same as a court appearance.
- Impartial to all breed's
- There is a veterinarian or certified behaviourist on the tribunal to evaluate the dogs behaviour and future bite risk.
- That it reprimands the owner and not the dog. Euthanasia should be a last resort, and behavioural training and removal of the dog from the poor household is a better option. The dog doesn't deserve to die because it has an awful owner.
- Explore the owners to see why the dog is a nuisance
- The tribunal is made up of neutral members.



- The tribunal members are fairly chosen from people knowledgeable about dogs and dog behaviour as opposed to people who only understand dogs based on what they see in the media.
- As long as there is a panel of informed and accredited people.
- So long the owner has the option to keep the dog in their household for the time being, and/or can speak on behalf of their dog to show them what training they have done to change their behaviour(s).
- If the extreme of euthanization is on the table, then upgrade the case to the courts.
- Do not practice prejudice against pitt bulls.
- er doesn't know how to raise an dog
- All people on the Tribunal must remain unbiased in the way that they have no past trauma with the matter that could cloud their judgment.
- Dog is only euthanized if after resources for training/socialization/obedience does not help the situation. Also, a dog should never be euthanized if it was being actively provoked by the bite victim.
- Dogs demed "vicious" would be assessed by a qualified and licensed CPDT or behavioural vet. I do not however support BSL AT ALL
- Owners of all breeds including pit bulls and other so called "agressive" breeds were on said tribunal so the poor dogs that can't speak for themselves have a voice
- Are you seriously asking about a court case for dogs? How about a court case for the criminal property tax increases year after year combined with the criminal fees for bin collection, and water supply? This city is broken and is on the verge of collapse.
- Ensurance of no breed bias in voters and educated responsible voters
- The tribunal must have short deadlines for meeting and making/implementing a decision. The owner is usually the problem, not the dog so sanctions should include owner education or bans from pet ownership.
- That similar to a jury, there would be an at the not to remove biases (especially for particular breeds with stigmas attached EI: large, powerful, bully etc). Tribunal members should also be dog owners
- That the decision made by City or Non City representative is not prejudice to the breed, size of animal, etc...
- Guaranteed meeting within a time period.
- Ensure fair judgement to the animal and it's owner: ie. No benefit of doubt given to the victim except in the most serious cases
- Instead of euthanizing the dog, check how the owner treats them. Most "problem dogs" only cause problems because they're owners are too irresponsible to train their dog properly or give them enough exercise.
- Diverse group of individuals
- Breed shouldn't factor in to the final decision for penalties. If a dog attacked someone, they were not trained and raised properly. The only correlation to "violent breeds" is they have been vilified in the media and society. Any dog owner should be required to show they can handle their dog appropriately and responsibly.



- Use euthanasia as a last resort. Disobedient dogs or violent dogs are usually a product of poor training or uneducated parents. Obedience classes should be offered and education for the parents as well
- The acting members of the tribunal must be dog owners
- Tribunal must include experts from vets to trainers to people well educated in dog behavior and not the idiot down the street who stays at home with nothing better to do then pretend they're Judge Judy.
- There was public engagement over his the tribunal was formed.
- The tribunal should be comprised of certified experts in various fields of animal behaviour, training, and rehabilitation
- That all facts are documented through a ticketing system vs a he said, she said process. That a vet and a reputable shelter representative as well as a behavioural specialist be appointed to sit on the tribunal and that every avenue be looked at to get the animal assistance prior to euthanasia.
- Contained certified dog trainers and behaviouralist. Not general public or group advocates.
- It didn't cause a large amount of tax funding
- The tribunal members must be free of bias and respectful of the pet owners.
- They are dog savvy and fair. Certain criteria should be followed. House arrest for dogs that aren't the most severe cases.
- It is conducted within a few days of offenders and the offending animal is kept by the owner under strict supervision (muzzled, leashed or confined in pen outdoors (leashes no more than 6 feet), repeat offenders within that period of any sort described as nuisance means seizure by Calgary Animal Services until Tribunal Process completed.
- No predisposed bias towards pit bulls in regards to not liking the breed
- There would have to be a PANEL of representatives with pit bull owners on the board, I don't think euthanasia is the best option for any dog if the owner is working toward training! Most animals don't just bite out of no where, typically their actions are instigated by another human where they felt threatened. More training to humans should be done on the proper way to approach dogs. 100% I would need to see some representation of voting in adequate decision makers on this board to ensure adequately fair representation. I also do not support the idea of euthanasia for dogs who may have had a rough past or even made a mistake, if they are deemed a nuisance, should they not be sentenced to mandatory obedience training rather than death? Just as a human with anger management issues would be sentenced to anger management classes.
- I am not sure how this would differ from what would happen in traditional court. I am concerned about any bias members of the tribune would hold for or against dogs, and that this system wouldn't give the victim a way to get compensation. I don't know if the compensation part is a separate thing though. From the wording above I am assuming this is for cases where the owner is at fault and not say, a trespasser being bit, where the trespasser would be at fault.
- Consultation with veterinary specialists
- Those part of the tribunal are tested for biases towards certain breeds and are educated within the realm of animal behaviour.



- Dogs should not spend a long time in the shelter
- that the owners of the dogs are reprimanded in a proper method also
- Includes dog trainers and dog owners
- High level of expertise including experts on dog behaviour and dog trainers who use positive reinforcement.
- Proper follow through with incident report, ensuring that the dog was in fact in the wrong, not having been put in a threatening situation by the victim
- This would not be used to just quickly determine dog's death! Must but be used to take away owner and dog rights to rush to euthanize!!!!
- Reduction of dog stress
- Remained objective and unbiased towards specific breeds. Also, focused on dog owner education and training.
- Dog should be quarantined at home, must be spayed or neutered, if not already. Must be muzzled in public and never off lead. Euthanasia should not be considered unless the dog is a repeat offender, if the owner wants it done
- Unbiased and fair in circumstances, done as a panel
- That accredited veterinarians are involved to provide a medical opinion on the case, and have the background and knowledge to assist in decisions.
- Having members with an unbiased view who are regularly expected to research stats on breed aggression/attacks
- not make an enforceable assessment on euthanization
- Dogs have the opportunity to have proper assessments, obedience training and re homed if the owner isn't a responsible dog owner. It's the owners NOT the dogs !
- As long as does not allow dog to be exposed to public before it is determined if dog is dangerous or needs to be put down.
- As long as there is no criminal intent related to the severe bite (e.g. domestic violence, assault)
- The owner takes course on dog behavior.
- That the dogs do not have to stay in shelter as this causes more stress and trauma
- No bite no euthanasia
- appropriate qualifications for those on the tribunal (vets, animal professionals, etc.)
- Be overseen by animal professionals and not politicians.
- Not judging a dog by its breed but by that single dogs history of issues.
- back ground check on the 'owners' physical examination of the dog in question.
- It was not one sided
- As long as there were no bias' from the people on the panel
- Euthanasia only for fourth strike offenders
- Euthanization is not an option. The owners should be punished as they are directly responsible for the dogs behaviour. Improper training is what leads to these incidents. The dog shouldn't have to die for their mistakes.



- It does not distinguish by breed. Small dogs can be just as viscous as big dogs.
- Members of the tribunal are experienced with dog behavioural issues and rehabilitation
- Members of the tribunal include various dog training & behaviour experts
- It reviews each case equally and doesn't single out pitbulls
- A due process was followed
- Non biased members who review each situation on its own merit. Not compare other same type dogs, each dog is an individual and should be treated as such
- All dogs are equal.
- Rehome the dog if owner is unfit to provide training. Rehome dog if owner has violent criminal record.
- They look into why the dog bit
- Eithanization without owner consent should not be an option until the case has been completed re the dogs culpability
- That a qualified board that has a behaviouralist, a senior Veterinarian that specializes in animal behaviour as well as a qualified obedience trainer. Minimum of 5 experts.
- Breed of dog omitted from tribunal proceedings, review of evidence supported by medical and veterinary specialists.
- I actually do not support the tribunal process too much \$. I think the dog should be barred from leaving the owners private property while waiting for due process. if the dog is found outside of private property during court the dog should automatically be seized and destroyed.
- At least three experienced, QUALIFIED dog behaviour consultants are on the tribunal, including the veterinary behaviourist if possible
- That the breed of the dog in question be specifically mentioned in all paperwork and filings. NO EXCEPTIONS!
- Consistent to ALL dogs complaints, bites and offended.
- If it's fair and speeds up the process
- Human takes responsibility for baiting or teasing dogs
- As an appeal process is in place
- Tribunal members must include 2 qualified/certified behaviourists and a CKC member familiar with the breed when the incidence involves a purebred dog
- At least one qualified canine behaviourist included in the tribunal representatives
- That the individuals serving on the tribunal have extensive knowledge on the animals in questions.
- They must have vets on the tribunal
- A Vicious dog is determined by a qualified dog behaviour therapist or trainer AND veterinarian to rule out any medical condition.
- The tribunal should be trained and educated and not biased to dog breed
- As long as they're non bias towards the breed and
- Dogs should not be euthanized.



- No harm for dog. Dog should be send to behaviorist. Owners should be properly teach how to train dog, what dogs behaviors mean and how to properly support dog in his-her needs.
- Tribunal to be made up of vets and animal experts / animal trainers.
- Euthanasia should not be considered a punishment for nuisance dogs - dogs should be turned over to fosters or appropriate rescues whenever necessary.
- Decision-makers understand learning theory and at a minimum have training in science-based canine ethology.
- Members with AND without dogs are put on the Tribunal.
- Careful vetting of tribunal representatives to ensure no bias.
- There are no breed-specific biases regarding the apprehended dogs
- There are no breed-specific biases against dogs, whether they are apprehended or not
- The costs for a tribunal weren't much greater than the current method (i.e., +/- 10%)
- Dogs must be assessed, at the City's expense, by a qualified and unbiased dog behaviourist.
- In the tribunal must be at least 2 veterinarians
- The members of it are professional / possess skills and knowledge related to topics that would be handled
- A professional dog trainer who has extensive experience in dealing with bully breeds, is brought in to assess the dog and assess the situation. People who don't understand dog behaviour should not be deciding on euthanasia
- The tribunal would need to be impartial and not single out specific dog breeds; individual breeds are not the issue.
- 2 and 3
- That the City and non-City representatives were ONLY animal behavioural experts, such as the trainers at the Humane Soceity, and not average citizens who can be quite biased.
- The tribunal would need to include someone who is active with behavioural training who works with all breeds and is responsible, knowledgeable within the Calgary canine community
- only with the possibility that dogs being assessed are considered for a rehabilitation or training program if possible. The well being of the animal should be strongly considered.
- Applies to all breeds
- if is a fair tribunal, including non judgement or negative mindset of any animal including pitbulls, as they seem to be the issue
- Unless it has some kind of brain condition, I would not suggest euthanizing should be any consideration unless all other training options had been exhausted.
- unbiased professional,
- We should take every precaution before euthanization - dogs can be rehabilitated... bad owners, not so much
- With the exception of euthinazation cases.
- Only able to determine restrictions on a nuisance dog, not able to decide if the dog should be euthanized



- It has diverse representation and is not chaired or governed by a white person
- No animals were euthanized
- The members of the tribunal are adequately trained or are experts in the field of animal behaviour
- That the dog was given a fair trial. Environmental, human, other dogs and the suspect dogs behavior at the time are all factors that need to be considered. Humans treating the dog poorly and/or not responding when the dog gives obvious warnings. If that's the case then the person should be held responsible for inciting and being ignorant.
- Yes
- Qualified person assessing the dog's behaviour
- As long as the tribunal members are not political appointees but people qualities to make these judgements e.g. animal trainers , vets
- It employed only people who are certified dog trainers and/or behaviourists.
- Recommend program to rehabilitate the dog, at owner cost, instead of euthanasia.
- There is an animal behaviour specialist
- The representatives are qualified to make decisions surrounding the animal, and the animal's best interests are kept in mind
- Instances of severe behaviour would result in a mandatory civil or criminal review by a court adjudicator or judge.
- The Tribunal is open to sending a dog to a rehabilitation sanctuary rather than return the dog to the irresponsible owner.
- To identify the owner of the animal and how that animal is being trained at home and the home environment. Dog owners need to be held responsible for how they train their animals and the process that goes into training such animals.
- That if it is decided by the tribunal that a dog was to be euthanized that it was reviewed by the courts
- The members were dog owners themselves
- If a dog bites or kills another dog or human and it was not the humans or the other dogs fault, it should be euthanized.
- A dog who bites isn't always the problem dog in all situations. More due care needs to be given to the dog charged
- N/a
- Those that are carrying out the tribunal would have to be assessed prior to, to determine any kind of dog discrimination or racism. ie) someone who is against pitbulls can not work this job. They have to be of sound character, mind and non-judgmental.
- If the dog receives a medical examination from a veterinarian to determine if the incident occurred due to a medical issue. An assessment of the housing situation for the animal is conducted. i
- It's not bias towards certain dog breeds. I don't want you killing a pitbull just because it's a pitbull.
- Not blaming the breed, holding the owner accountable.
- Alternatives to court for a first step seem reasonable, but I don't know enough about them to suggest conditions.



- Dont be biased against a certain breed. Bad owners make bad dogs of all breeds. My rescue pitbull is ten times better behaved then my neighbors aggressive German Shepard and my other neighbors Malamut. Bad owners make bad dogs. Breed is not the issue. Bad owners are the issue
- The decision is not final unless both parties agree to it. If one party disagrees, it gets escalated to the court system.
- As long a committee members are not slanted to breed specific ideation.
- Clear and transparent processes are put in place for defining and declaring dogs as 'viscous' or 'nuisance'
- Involvement of all relevant authorities AND lawyer representation for the animal. NO ANIMALS ARE TO BE PUT DOWN. NONE. END OF COMENT. THERE IS NO EXCUSE TO KILL A DOMESTICATED ANIMAL.
- Both sides are represented
- other nuisance dogs are all judged the same, regardless of breed
- No dog should ever been euthanized, all dogs can be trained regardless of age or breed and a vicious dog can be recovered. It is on the onus of the owner who should then pay for re-training of a "vicious" dog and should pay for all damages and trauma (including therapy for the victim) for their lack in ability of training a dog.
- The owner faces punishment for not properly training and socializing the animal.
- They did not have the power to authorize euthanization of a dog and they are composed of experts in the field (dog trainers, vets, etc)
- No discrimination based on type of dog. It is important to be aware of fair practices for all dogs.
- As long as eurhanizatuon is truly the last option. The dog should not be punished, the owner should.
- Includes dog behaviour expert with experience in rehabilitation of dogs deemed dangerous/improperly socialized or trained
- The efficacy and impact of the tribunal system is reviewed to ensure that it is meeting the original goals (reduce waiting time and reduce trauma).
- Dogs should have the ability to rehabilitate before being euthanized.
- No dogs are euthanized
- Non bias twds pit bulls
- Breed Specific Legislation has contributed to harmful myths/stereotypes, similarly to our Judicial system this leads to harsher penalties. A tribunal should NOT have access to what "breed" a dog is when determining the severity or conditions of consequence.
- yes they should use a tribunal
- All dog bites are treated equal, including dog maulings from police dogs/retired police dogs.
- There was no bias displayed towards certain breeds (like pit bulls).
- You do not judge based on breeds
- Proper dog training by professional
- Yes



- As long as the dogs were given a fair trial, the dogs were actually processed quicker and with less trauma, and allow owners, the bylaw officers involved, and the victims to input statements.
- No breed/animal bias for people who will be on the tribunal. This can affect their impartiality.
- Every case is looked into separately.
- The tribunal is fair and not bias. Humans are not perfect but training and love might be needed in some cases. Not all.
- More investigation into the OWNER, not the animal. Get your head out of your asses and learn more about the breed you clearly know nothing about!
- That those apart of the tribunal are educated on the irrelevance of differentiating the dangers of a dog by breed. There is no bad dog breed, there are only bad owners. Any dog can be deemed dangerous or a nuance, their breed does do not play a roll in their behaviour.
- ensurance of no tribunal bias against specific breeds
- Non city representatives should include balanced trainers
- I think the dog should be able to stay with the owner with conditions to keep everyone safe.
- Tribunal is made up of dog owners, with preference given to owners of similar breeds to the one involved.
- Costs to be covered by pet owner.
- repeat offenders must be fined and the animal euthanized
- It would depend how members of the tribunal are selected.
- Dogs would only be euthanized under extreme, and rare circumstances. All options must be explored first. If many dogs are deemed to be euthanized, an investigation into the reasoning should be conducted, and the potential for punishment to the reviewer if their decisions are made unethically. Pitbulls should not be targeted due to breed in this or any process, breed holds no bearing, only evident behavior does.
- Owners need to be required to undergo classes to understand dog management and what their behaviour or management brings out in their animals
- Tribunal officials must have expertise in animals and animal behaviours.
- All members must be assessed for any inherited biases
- I am not sure this would work that well I suspect many would still appeal and it would end up in court which causes trauma to the animal and additional costs. I think if the tribunal was made up of independent people who are not affiliated to any groups that target specific breeds and are not directly involved with the animal or animal's family.
- Dogs are a part of the family, and mean the world to so many people. I'm all for expediting the process, but you better be using experts -- not 'bylaw' officers to determine outcomes/next steps. Given what's at stake, the opinion of a vastly undereducated bylaw officer on the topic is/should be of little value.
- It doesn't cost more than apprehending and housing the animal.
- Past behaviour MUST be considered. Most dogs that bite are doing so in defence or there was a sign of aggression that was not dealt with by the owner. The dog should be offered rehabilitation



without their current owner and the owner should face the fines and legal charges against dog bites. The dog does not understand why their act was not ok.

- The dogs should remain on “house arrest” until the case is settled. Removing the dog from its home only increases its trauma fear response which ultimately is setting them up to bite again.
- That you recommend Obedience training before euthanizing the dogs.
- The tribunal must include more than one reputable veterinarians and more than one obedience trainer with training experience with aggressive dogs.
- Reasonable representation for all parties involved- vet, animal behavior experts, breed experts, and support for victims
- Both dog owner and victim have equal voice in tribunal proceedings.
- breed of dog not mentioned to tribunal
- Not being breed specific, or biased towards a specific breed.
- The tribunal should be comprised of certified dog trainers, community standards representatives, and I would suggest someone from the Canine group from Calgary Police. I do not believe the general public should be allowed to be part of the panel.
- No breed specific bias!!! I've been bitten 6 times, and every time it was a small dog
- The members of the tribunal would have to have specific dog behavior training in order to be fair when understanding reactions of dogs
- That the animals are treated fairly and then underlying cause for the attack is determined. It wouldnt be fair to decide a dog has to be euthanized for a typical dog response to something that a person did.
- Many dog professionals are consulted to make sure the dog is indeed dangerous, behaviour is compromised when in shelter or stressed, the owner should be able to explain, put in place training and show he can and will make sure his dog gets help before deciding to euthanise, also if the owner is the problem, considering rescues to take in the dog and train him too. The tribunal should be fair and use dog trainer who are science based to establish if the dog is a threat. More money should be spent on making sure those dogs get the help and training they need. Hold the owner responsible. Take into consideration the environment, his life, treatment, etc.
- tribunal made up of both pet owners and non pet owners
- Look at all factors on why behaviour or bites happened. Aggression? Teasing? Bad ownership? Fear?
- Followed a similar system to the courts where in which the tribunal is a panel of peers, not an elected or volunteer group. These people would be a random sampling of an appropriately aged population.
- As long as Euthanizing the dog was a last and final resort. A three strikes your out rule. The Tribunal would also need to be made up of, Dog Trainers, Vet's, Dog behaviorist,
- Was a fair and consistent process
- That the individuals are vetted and are not found to have a bias against any type of dog, are not victims of a dog bite nor any family member has had an incident.
- These people should know and be knowledgeable in dogs and training and to enforce and support the system



- Can not read the entire drop down sentences—only the first 5 words show
- That the owner is considered. Including whether the owner has taken appropriate steps to help the dog i.e. dog training.
- Members are dog behavior experts and learn toward rehabilitation whenever possible
- Yes
- The people occupying positions on the tribunal have sufficient education and knowledge regarding animal behaviour to assist them in making the most appropriate decision for the animal and the public at large.
- NO discrimination of dog breeds. It is the owner that is responsible not the dog breed. Any breed can be aggressive if not treated or trained properly.
- Disregard breed and perform tolerance test on all and any dogs involved.
- That legal process would follow an unsatisfactory decision for the owner.
- Fine the owner. It's bad owners not bad dogs
- All members of the tribunal take bias training. Anyone who is majorly biased towards breeds (I.e. thinking all pit bulls are dangerous) should NOT be included on the tribunal. See the Harvard internal bias tests.
- Professional dog handlers and or trainers analyze the psychological profile of the dogs.
- You must understand pit bulls in order to discipline them, please take value in that. During the tribunal process the dog is held at home not a shelter and during this time is already subject to obedience training.
- Members of the tribunal should be experts (vets, etc.)
- If it were supported by animal experts, and documentation of that support were provided to the public. I don't feel informed about the issue,
- Be just as strict as court would be.
- Owners are held responsible and go through training with the dog to learn from mistakes
- If it would help speed up the process
- Needs to be decided by city officials or those who do not have bias about violence in dogs
- They consider the owners behaviour more than the breed of dog. Also consider the person bit, did they do something to instigate the incident.
- The issue was dealt with within a reasonable period. 30 days? Less?
- A fair jury to decide the dogs fate would help thin out the shelters
- Discrimination of pitbull like dogs is not used. Little dogs are quite often more vicious and should be tried more often
- Both pet owners and non pet owners were on the tribunal
- it moves the process along quicker. It still provides the best outcome for the dog and those involved.
- They cannot be biased towards one type of dog/cannot have a bad experience with a “nuisance breed”, which would then influence any future decisions regarding these breeds.
- Pit bulls should not be regulated differently from any other dog breeds.
- I support this as long as the animal is not held up in a shelter



- Dogs can not be euthanized until proven a nuisance
- Consulted DVMs professionals to reach a decision (veterinarian doctors)
- That the owner of the dog was questioned about how it's raised, it's environment and if the owner of the reason the dog is aggressive
- Very quickly this could be a one sided dominated conversation and dogs could be judged most harshly than in typical court.
- the people making the decision have a background in dog behavior so that they are judged fairly
- Unbiased towards dog breeds and examining the situation only. Violent animals have nothing to do with breed but with improper training and poor ownership.
- Persons put in this position of authority be non biased regarding pit bulls, Rottweilers, Doberman etc
- The dog and its owner is put through an assessment and training sessions with a credible trainer that specializes in problem dogs.
- So long as they don't discriminate against breeds and they look to retraining before euthanizing.
- Fair , fast and proper inquiry
- Thorough training on dog behaviors and obedience/rehabilitation training options
- Decisions would have to be based on majority vote and the pet owner having the right to know details of decisions
- That it is directed at animal owners not breed types
- The tribunal staff remain unbiased.
- included the priper no biased individuals so that dogs are not needlessly euthanized.
- Breed plays no part in decision making
- The tribunal is not full of bsl supporting lunatics. The tribunal should be filled with professional dog trainers and veterinarians and a few psychologists for the people involved. The dog isn't the problem, the owner is
- Does not have authority to recommend or enforce euthanasia.
- Tribunal cannot order euthanization, and breed of dog cannot be considered. Pit bulls are no more dangerous than Saint Bernard. It based solely on the Dog and owners behavior
- Must have private citizens who are in rescue as part of the tribunal
- Both sides of the incident MUST be reviewed. No bias.
- I like this idea as long as it does not lead to an increase in expedited decisions regarding dog attacks that results in an increased use of euthanasia and/or and increased dismissal of dog attack cases. Basically, I wouldn't want the idea of the tribunal to lead to reckless decisions that result in needless loss of animal life and/or overlooking cases with seriously dangerous dogs being allowed back onto streets. The tribunal should be making the same caliber of decision as the provincial court would but should be expediting the process to reduce the suffering of the dog, its owner, and the victim of the attack.
- that there is at least one person present that can actually discuss dog behaviour - a canine specialist perhaps
- Does not decide if a dog should be euthanized



- Humans are held accountable
- If the tribunal was made up of people with experience working with dogs and is familiar with dog behaviour. Most people misunderstand dogs unless they have extensive experience with them (which is why bites happen in the first place).
- If they were non biased and did what was best for the animals not because of dollars.
- The owner is investigated as well 9.9 times out of 10 a "vicious" dog is that way due to owner neglect and/or abuse. The dog should not suffer because their human used them for wrong doing.
- restrictions placed on a dog for being a nuisance, owner needs to abide by the restrictions for a certain time period ex: 6 months. if dog is deemed a nuisance more than 3 times then more restrictions are put in place, or time frame is extended. A dog that causes serious injury or health should undergo obedience training for a course up to a year or dog has to be surrendered.
- Included at least one expert in dog behavior/training
- There are qualified animal experts at the table.
- Unbiased and animal familiarity
- Yes
- Strong preference should be given to training and intervention over euthanasia. Killing the animal should be an absolute LAST resort.
- As long as the tribunal does not have the authority to euthanize an animal, instead power to enforce require training for pets and owners.
- It had a fair ratio of non pet owners to pet owners. It should include animal behavioural experts and also someone qualified to judge/see the victim's point of view.
- Owners should be able to see their dog during the decision making process
- The tribunal should be made up of people who have a formal background in animal behavior.
- Right to appeal euthanasia.
- That those on the tribunal be made up of professionals in relevant the fields of which they are presiding over, eg. For dog bites they would be veterinarians and dog behavioral specialists etc.
- Tribunal of veterinary behaviourists.
- No Bias against bully breeds and large breeds.
- That the non city representatives include dog behaviourist that can also assess what role human error played in the situation that led to bite.
- Dependent on how this tribunal would be appointed and the level of transparency regarding the selection/voting process and the backgrounds of the potential tribunal members.
- Representatives are educated on animal behavior and recognize that that BSL is not supported by scientific evidence.
- The members of the tribunal did not have a bias towards any dog breed and automatically blame the dog for the event just because they were breed X.
- Depending on the breed and action
- Must be staffed by animal behavioral experts
- Any recommendation for euthanasia must go to the court of queens bench.



- Serious vetting of members of involved. Bias against dogs, or certain breeds cannot exist.
- Dog should never be euthanized. Its the way its the dog was raised. Give it a chance to Rehabilitate.
- As long as courts have final say
- If there would be no breed specific legislation, or biases against pitbull breeds, particularly
- A 2nd level hearing needs to be carried out if the tribunal determined the dog needed to be euthanized.
- Dog would not bw euthanized, but i stead rehabilitated
- Some Common
- All appropriate information/documentation is reviewed appropriately and the owner is given a chance to attend obedience classes and takes all measures to ensure the animal does not re-offend.
- Please also assess the owner's ability to manage their pets - too many people neglect basic training and responsibility.
- Training comes before euthanasia
- No dogs are euthanized. Prefer if dogs are trained and returned to owners.
- It cannot order euthanasia.
- Takes place quickly
- I would accept if the tribunal kept in mind.. most often then not, it is the owner and not the dog that is at fault. The owner should be responsible for getting training on how to handle and care for their dog.
- Unbiased persons are sat in the tribunal, no one person that is know to have or outwardly dislikes ANY specific breed of dog. I believe bias against a specific breed or appearance of any living being is a form of racism and should not be tolerated, no matter the situation or form
- X
- Euthanasia is the LAST resort. It is not an option unless there are and have been several attacks at multiple times and if all other methods (training, etc..) have been tried. I do not support euthanasia as a result of a single attack.
- The owner of the dog is held responsible rather than the dog.
- Must try to rehabilitate the dog first before drastic measures are taken.
- That all parties involved were not biased toward any specific breed
- It was not discriminatory to a specific dog breed. There is no proof that put bulls are more dangerous than any other dog breed.
- ...as long as all nuisance dogs are treated the same, regardless of breed, decisions made based solely on the facts of the incident.
- As long as the dummies who run everything else in this city aren't involved.
- Vets, dog behavioural specialists, dog owners & public safety experts consulted. Judges must have experience handling dogs to understand their behaviour.
- It is analyzed as a case by case scenario and the people involved are not biased or skewed due to the dog breed or other personal biases



- Obedience classes with proof that they were taken. I don't feel pit bulls are appropriate for the City - most owners don't have the physical strength to hold them back when they get agitated.
- That animal behaviourist, board certified veterinarian, social workers, and law enforcement agencies are used to evaluate the dogs behaviour, home environment, where the incident occurred, and the potential for re-offending
- No city employees on the tribunal. Animal behaviourists and vets only that look at what caused the dog to bite.
- Properly selected representatives that do not have a given bias against pitbull breeds.
- Made up of balanced persons that are recognized professionals in dog behaviour with a basis in science and does not include dog bite victims.
- As long as the tribunal is as strict as a the court system would be and it's not a "get out of jail free" card
- It is made up of bylaw officials, dog behaviouralist and vet personnel
- No dogs be euthanized as a result of government or shelter negligence
- The dog's breed should not be part of the process. If a person colour isn't listed in an arrest, a dog's breed should not be either. It causes unneeded and unwanted bias.
- Humanity is used. NO EUTHANASIA! We're a 1st world country! This is sick
- Don't believe the dog should be euthanized. First should be given to foster and attempt made to better the dogs behaviour.
- It needs to be a fair trial. look into why it happened. sometimes the dog is just protecting its family but no one else realizes that.
- The tribunal is made up partly of people with training in dog behaviour.
- Euthanasia should not be on the table until the case is processed and the dog/owner are found guilty.
- was overlooked by third party like spca
- Depends on how members of the tribunal are selected
- Don't act based on the breed. It's never the breeds fault. A domesticated pet isn't born aggressive.
- I like the idea of dogs not waiting to be terminated. They are under stress and that's not okay.
- I would like to see stiffer penalties for owners that have aggressive or nuisance dogs, as it is rarely the dogs fault, versus the owners fault for failing to provide proper training.
- N/a
- Includes judges/lawyers on the tribunal team.
- Half of the tribunal members own large breed dogs
- Don't put down dogs for biting, it's the owners fault. The dogs just need training
- Fair representation for dog owners. Scientific evidence-responsiveness.
- If one of the members owned a "pitbull". No biased opinions!
- This shouldn't be just for pit bulls, other dogs can be harmful fault. It should never be the animals fault, bad owners = bad pets. And pit bulls are no exception.
- You look at the case by case basis and not by the breed.



- the option for the tribunal does NOT include euthanasia
- The officials should be elected and unbiased
- There should be veterinary input on the tribunal.
- Need vet &/or behaviourist on panel. Panel powers must be clearly defined.
- Dog behaviour expert should be involved
- There needs to be a fair and objective assessment performed by a licensed and certified animal behaviorist. Fair and objective is the key.
- It contained people who did not have prejudice towards certain breeds and included people from animal shelters, clinics and training facilities as they understand canine behaviour best.
- Includes members of animal shelters in order to reduce harm to animals
- there is a fair and just process to determine the tribunal and that it is monitored/assessed and reports shared publicly.
- Assessment of the actions of the human leading up to the bite, as humans are the cause of most dog bites, not the dog.
- So long as this tribunal does not become a vigilante in banning or only process those dogs directed in breed specific legislation and allows the pet owners due process with the aim of reuniting the pet and their owner.
- The tribunal could not order euthanasia. Tribunal should contain members who are responsible pet owners this should make up the majority of the tribunal. Tribunal should have members from local rescue societies and dog training facilities.
- A dog behaviour specialist makes the decisions not some random person with limited knowledge and high opinions against breeds
- A dog trainer was allowed to assess the dog and provide feedback around the incident and the likelihood of future dog behavior.
- No euthanization
- Panel of pet owners of various breeds . No major power only to suggest small fines. For a dog to be euthanized there have to be a serious track record of bad behaviour (attacks). Education or transfer of ownership should be priority.
- Pit bulls are not treated differently
- If it is a fair process for everyone. Dog owners as well as people who get hurt by dogs.
- The breed of the dog is not disclosed to allow fair and unbiased assessment.
- They would have to follow a legal mandate, being fair and unbiased. They would also have to be able to impose and enforce fines and conditions.
- Included animal- and in this case dog experts- on the tribunal
- Why the dog bit the victim is taken into account- The victim could have been harassing the dog or owner, and the dog may have been acting in defence.
- Those part of the tribunal have appropriate experience and training to appropriate decisions
- That the tribunal participants are industry professionals such as veterinarians, or certified dog trainers.



- Include non-biased veterinary professionals
- There needs to be an effective appeal system to the courts to address issues of bias or other issues of unfair decision making.
- That this applies to all dog breeds. Remember any dog will bite, and if the owner and the victim are in agreement then the animal should remain with the owner and the animal needs to be supervised when outside and kept away from people it doesn't know
- The dog is able to remain at their respective owners house under house arrest conditions. As well as taking a deeper dive into how the dog was raised, what type of dog owners are they. Ect... as more often than not, it is an owner fault rather than the dogs fault that a bite happened. Unless it's a chihuahua, they are one of the most aggressive dog breeds. Pitbulls are not aggressive by nature, I've never met a truly aggressive pitbull. Unless it was raised by an aggressive and or abusive owner.
- It has to contain people that actually understand dog behavior and not automatically blame the dog. Someone who looks at all contributing factors.
- It included professional dog trainers so the life of a dog is not taken based on opinion.. emotion ..or prejudice
- The tribunal should not be making decisions about euthanizing an animal, such cases should go to court
- Euthanization should always be off the table and rehabilitation should always be sought.
- How would the tribunal be formed? Would they hate bully breeds as much as you? How would it be fair?
- Any assessment must be done by a certified professional dog trainer with proper certification and experience. No assessment shall be done by the City. It must be from an independent party, non-related to the City.
- The dog is offered rehabilitation at owner's expense and never be euthanized
- Blah blah
- Owners are required to take obedience training or be banned from owning dogs before the animal is punished
- Appropriate qualifications for those sitting on the tribunal.
- You aren't biasing the judgements off the breed / size / look of the dog. The tribunal should make decisions without seeing the animal whatsoever.
- Dog is treated fairly, to stay on "bail" condition with owner at home until tribunal is completed
- I would support it as long as it's for all dogs, and not just one breed specifically.
- Owners of nuisance animals are required to be educated on animal care and training
- nn
- Allow the dogs to stay with their owners while waiting for the court appearance
- The dog could remain with the owner, even if it must stay on the owners property
- The tribunal would be made up of citizen experts, ie vets, dog trainers, etc.



- All tribunal decisions should be made with no breed based decision making. All dogs should be judged based on reasoning for any incident and number of incidents. The human beings should be on trial more than any dog.
- The dog should remain in the owner's home or in a trained volunteer's home under specific conditions (muzzle etc)
- That there is no prejudice against certain dogs that portrayed by media.
- Clear process for any breed with input from humane society, trainers, other. Needs to have proper assessment and understanding of the full situation. Not based on judgement.
- Destroying the dog should be a last resort. Would recommend rehousing first.
- Support for appeal
- The tribunal has strict guidelines and act as a support only (no power grabs)
- 100% completely unbiased and vetted people on are on it
- As long as the tribunal is screened and regularly reviewed
- It was unbiased in decisions made
- Only applied to dogs considered nuisances and not to pitbulls without violent offences
- That the dogs don't get put down and they get rehabilitated
- Dog behavioural experts and/or vets as part of the tribunal so the decisions are based on evidence based information and not knee jerk emotional based responses
- Qualified pet experts on the tribunal
- You have people that support the breed in question
- Includes dog specialists only
- As long as they are qualified to assess dogs
- The dog should be put through obedience training first before vicious dogs are euthanized.
- It had one peace officer on the tribunal
- Strict conditions need to be met if decision is to return the pet. People need to understand that if their pet is aggressive they need to invest in correcting their behaviour.
- The options given above are too nebulous. I support the effort to limit an animals trauma and to return them to their homes as quickly as possible however, a tribunal doesn't sound like the efficient solution that is required.
- That the dog could return home and just have to stay there, its not fair for them to be separated from their home and locked up, if anything that would cause more drama for them and encourage more bad behaviour
- the dog owner being allowed to present support such as veterinarians and witnesses who have a history with the animal as well as anyone on their side that might be part of the incident in question.
- That there be members who are also dog owners/pitbull owners
- Obedience course for the dog, warning to owner about consequences relating if obedience courses are not done or the animal becomes a 'nuisance' again. Giving the dog and owner a chance to correct the behaviour.
- That it didn't discriminate against dog breed, and would never end in the animal being put down



- The dog's welfare is foremost, followed by the owner being required to take responsible pet ownership training.
- training has been provided for both the dog and the human. As well as the breed of the dog cannot be a factor in the ruling. A dog bite is a dog bite, regardless of the breed.
- The best interest of the dog is the main reason behind this tribunal.
- The dog OWNER is held accountable. Muzzling, or that idiotic idea of house arrest, or literally killing the animal are used as last resorts and the breed of the dog is not taken into account. Again, all breeds have the potential to be aggressive, it's all in how the owner trains them
- Look into the dogs living situation. Dogs cannot be held responsible for improper training by owners
- The the individuals appointed to these tribunals represent a diverse field of experts. That both animal control officials, veterinarian, and dog rehabilitation professionals are represented among the experts.
- No more bylaws!!
- Appropriately staffed by educated people who are not all terrified of pit bulls.
- Size and type of dog are taken o to account. Pit Bulls (and the like) should be considered a public danger.
- BAD OWNERS. NOT BAD DOGS. So disgusted how this is all against pitbulls. Give your head a shake.
- Much of the results revolve around training and education on dog behaviour and training.
- The civilian volunteers need to have a background of working with dogs so they understand that one particular breed is no more vicious than another. Ex: vets, animal technicians, certified dog trainers etc.
- If it's not breed specific and the owners are held responsible not the dog
- No one can murder anyone else's dog
- Only if the tribunal is make of individuals that understand dog behaviour
- Tribunal decisions should be legally binding and registered against owners within the judicial system.
- Mandatory training with a professional trainer.
- Yes
- It should include all breeds of dogs not just pitbull type dogs
- No euthanization, as this is an owner issue and they should be held responsible.
- There was properly educated people on this tribunal that do not have bias towards certain breeds and who can properly asses and make a decision regarding this situation and those involved.
- All dogs treated as a case by case.
- It is not breed biased
- Properly mediated and advocated on both parties sides
- A higher focus on owner training and punishment. Euthanizing the pet should not be an option before jail time for incidents.



- I like the idea of a tribunal, however I dislike the idea of city officials delegating their responsibilities to non-city personnel. If the city of Calgary officials are willing to forfeit some of their decision making, they should be willing to forfeit some of their salary as well.
- The owner keeps the dogs while waiting for the assess
- Required use of experts in dog behaviour
- Dogs are not to be euthanized and sent to mandatory training. Dogs to remain with the owner during the waiting period, with conditions, unless it is determined the owner is the problem due to abuse of the animal.. Both sides of the story must be heard. I'm sure in some cases dogs are provoked and bite because they feel threatened.
- same governance experience level of people managing tribunall
- tribunal is made up of professionals such as veterinarians, dog trainers and not people inexperienced with dogs.
- As long as the victim was okay with the result
- As long as this can be challenged, discussed and appealed, and they are not given ultimate authority.
- Fair and speedy trial. No unnecessary bureaucracy and red tape.
- Similar to those voting or have say in animal by-laws, I feel a Tribunal Group must consist of only people with actual legitimate dog experience & ALL must have unbiased opinions.
- Apply statistical analysis rather than make stigmatized assumptions
- I would support a tribunal if It was in support of rehabilitating instead of straight to killing the animal. Most times it is han error in training that causes biting or attacks. Not the fault of the dog.
- The people on the tribunal would need to have extensive knowledge of dogs (including behaviors)
- No breed specific legislation
- That all factors of the situation be considered, beyond the dog's purported breed.
- That Pitbulls did not get euthanized. Better yet, penalize the owner. They're responsible for their dog. Dogs live purely off of instinct and what they are taught. A dog deemed vicious should NOT be allowed in dog parks or off leash areas. This needs to fall back on to the owner, not the dog.
- Each case must be investigated on equal terms no matter the animal.
- Review visicious dog declarations and assess if the dog should be euthanized
- At the owner's cost, they can pay for the right to get the dog out of shelter if they abide by certain restrictions (must stay on property; must be on leash outside at all times).
- Euthanizing should only be a very last resort
- it should have animal behaviourists on the panel
- The tribunal needs to be comprised of experts in dog behaviour.
- The members of the tribunal had no predisposition to specific rulings and complete transparency of their background. Also their decisions would need to be completely consistent with those passed by the Court of Queens Bench, just more efficient.
- It actually is more timely than the alternative.



- The tribunal included multiple veterinarians with a special interest in behaviour and veterinarian recommended dog trainers that specialize in fearful animals
- A thorough investigation behind why the bite occurred.
- As long not a single person on the tribunal can be biased against any breed for any reason I.e. right always saying the animal is dangerous and must be killed simply for being a pit bull. Even better if ones a Veterinarian or animal behaviorist, and one has or had a pitbull or other unfairly targeted breed
- As long as the tribunal has members of input from local rescue groups and/or a dog behaviouralist to determine what's best for the dog. Euthanasia should be the LAST option.
- The members of the tribunal are sufficiently versed in the legal aspects of animal control.
- As it was fair and not one side.
- That they understand ALL dogs are capable of biting.
- The tribunal understands that there are not bad dogs, just bad dog owners
- If they can properly train the dog and prove its trained then these rules no longer apply to the dog.
- Owner of dog pays for fees
- Must be able to appeal
- Owner needs to be held accountable, not the dog.
- The animal isn't allowed to leave owners property
- An investigation is done into the cause of a dog bite. Most dogs don't bite unless provoked. Did the victim tease, harass or otherwise abuse the dog to provoke it to bite?
- They are trained and non biases against breed and give punishment based on sitation and owner. I wouldnt want someone who is unknowledged and biases to decide what happens to my animal. Proper training and investigation should happen.
- The dog should get to stay at owners house on conditions that it doesn't leave the property.
- Not be breed biased
- Policy, standards and procedures are pre-established based on the law. Flexibility and compassion are but into system.
- Dog not to be euthanized until a second decision at court.
- It considered past issues, doesn't discriminate based on breed, no kill orders
- Experts in canine behaviour must assess dog and be part of the tribunal.
- Dog should be thoroughly assessed for danger. If rehab is truely out of the question, then euthanasia is the only option. No dead dogs.
- Please ensure that individuals with experience in this area are involved.
- That at least one member of the tribunal be an impartial lawyer with no affiliation to the City, Humane Society, rescue organization, etc.
- The right for an owner to appeal a decision made by the tribunal. At least 50% of the tribunal has training or education in animal care.
- Dogs are not judged on breed type
- Be comprised of at least one general member of the public, a vet, and a trainer.



- Do not put all dogs in the same situation.
- Needs someone with actual legal/judicial system experience heading it (ie - not a civilian City employee)
- The representatives must consist of Non-biased individuals with some having extensive expertise in animal behavior.
- As long as it is done quickly and effeciently.
- as long as those hearing the cases are unbiased
- If a dog has bitten or exhibits bad behaviour only, not breed specific
- as long as all appropriate bylaws are followed - should be overseen by a legal professional to ensure the case is looked at without bias.
- The dogs are NOT euthanized and instead receive obedience training.
- Additional training classes led by pit bull specific trainers
- The tribunal can not be a “fast lane” for euthanizing. Euthanizing should be the last possible option.
- That breed does not play a role in the determination of guilt alone. All dog behaviour should be held to the same standard in order to protect the public from dangerous and nuisance dogs of all breeds.
- Fair, unbiased and fact based
- At least one responsible owner or a “pit bull” on the team.
- If you didn't hire a bunch of Pitbull worshippers.
- As long as the tribunal is comprised of qualified, non bias individuals
- The tribunal includes a dog supporter, perhaps someone from the humane society
- Pitbull not be targeted as a nuisance dog for the sake of their breed.
- If euthanasia was the last resort. Any aggressive dogs should undergo behavioral training and assessment.
- Be actual trained experts and not politicians or otherwise motivated.
- Unbiased opinion. Review the incident on WHY the bite occurred. Often its a human getting in the way of a dog fight or even instigating the bite themselves.
- Happens in a reasonable time frame
- Only people in this tribunal should be people with deep understanding of dog training and obedience. Preferably professionals in the field.
- So long as it is fiscally responsible
- who is on the tribunal and what are the professional requirements of those people. I don't want a drama teacher making decisions on animals (or our Country)...
- Having an independent review and complaints board. All tribunal members being science-based behavioural trainers with previous experience working with high-risk animals.
- Qualified, unbiased animal behavioural experts are on the tribunal.
- The owners of the dog are responsible for payment and take a responsible pet owning class
- That it can be appealed to a higher authority.
- breed was not a factor in the decision making process



- It doesn't mean more dogs are euthanized and that people who understand dogs and dog behaviour are part of the tribunal
- As long as it is staffed with qualified and properly trained individuals in animal behavior
- The individuals sitting on the tribunal would need to be treated like a jury - screened to make sure there are no biases or conflicts of interest that would prevent an individual from making decisions based on prejudice.
- Animals are never euthanized as a result of tribunal decision. Jail time/hefty fines for owners would be fine though.
- If all avenues and reasons why the dog was biting was thoroughly investigated and that putting the dog down wasn't the first decision made.
- No breed specific legislation is allowable. All responsibility is on the owner not the dog or the breed.
- No "breed racism" against dogs. The owner raised the dog; the owner should be the one judged for bad behaviours or insufficient training.
- The costs of the tribunal are borne by dog owners and there is fee recovery against guilty owners.
- The whole situation is looked at and a fair trail is given for the dog and it's not condemned due to breed
- Both representatives from city and non city (to represent client and dog) would be present
- Qualified people need to be on this tribunal. Veterinary professionals or qualified dog behaviouralists
- If the tribunal is created and administered by Alberta Justice
- fair system that is not corrupt like many that exist now / not used to hurt people or animals
- It is the first offence (or alleged offence) for *both* the dog and the owner. Otherwise, the dog should be held until the owner's court case is completed.
- The people who sit on the tribunal have been proven to be fair and invested in the cause.
- Swift carriage of actions with very clear guidelines for dangerous animals
- The tribunal should include dog lovers and spca, etc. This is not a place for bureaucracy.
- Breed was not one of the factors considered when determining the fate of a dog.
- The panel included a vet
- Same rules for all breeds - small and medium dogs included.
- The tribunal representatives should not have the ultimate decision in serious cases that have the possibility to end in euthanasia.
- Representatives (both City and nonCity) should be professionally accredited and certified animal (dog) specialists. Lay people who do not have a background to understand root cause behind animal behaviours should be prohibited from sitting on the tribunal.
- The tribunal is allowed to enact strong deterrents/punishments against owners and their dangerous dogs.
- As long as there are harsh punishments. And that the tribunal members do not give favouritism to dog owners
- A dog is not taking full responsibility of an attack it should be the owner as well
- These situations should be handled quickly for the sake of the animal and everyone involved.



- This should involve a quality person from Humane Society or possibly a dog trainer
- follow a set of questions, how was the dog trained? was it trained? why would the dog attack? Find out the background of the dog? is this normal behavior? how did the owners react? Was the dog protecting a person? etc
- some dogs are enticed, some aren't
- The only determining factor is the actual incident—not breed and not anything else
- stereotyping breeds is a racist type of behaviour that the city will promote shamefully. It is NOT the breed that is the problem, it is the environment that it is raised in. For the city to utter such bigotry is disgusting! shame
- Depends on who is involved on the tribunal - should include peace officers, veterinarian doing intake of dog at shelter
- Tribunal members be informed, impartial and educated
- Training for the dog owner be considered as a requirement before considering euthanizing the animal.
- It includes experts in dog behavior/training with proven unbiased opinion towards certain breeds
- Experts need to assess this. I support your effort to reduce the suffering of these animals.
- Completely non-biased based off breed, and if the recommendation is to euthanize the dog - then it be carried through the provincial court and decided by a judge. Lastly, canine professionals must comprise of the tribunal to make fair and rightful decisions.
- Gives the owner an opportunity to address the issue by registering for training with the dog.
- If the tribunal was made of dog positive individuals with education (ie vets, trainers, etc.)
- That it has no over-reaching power and there is still the option to have council or a representative during the tribunal.
- Tribunal Members are thoroughly screened and approved by Calgary Humane Society
- C
- Option exists for a court hearing.
- No euthanization of dogs; shelters should instead be found to rehome and retrain difficult dogs.
- the person overseeing the case has no preconceived notions of a dog's "attitude" based on its breed - in other words, all dogs are capable of biting.
- Clear ground rules specified; permits the use of experts related to dog training and behaviour.
- There must be a cost recovery element. I also don't like the idea of a tribunal being able to order a dog to be euthanized.
- It depends on who will be part making the Tribunal decisions.
- non city representatives are experts in dog behaviour, SPCA Rep,
- Animal behaviour background, showing no bias towards breeds. More focus on owner and their actions or lack of.
- All parties are heard and considered. Unbiased reviewing committee.
- They do not hold prejudice against breeds. This is an owner issue not the dogs. Training should be mandatory for dogs who haven't been raised right or abused. .



- worked strictly under the by-laws put in place by the city for all adjudications.
- there needs to be responsible dog owners, and/or humane society staff.
- Dogs should not be euthanized for biting or attacking another animal or human. This is absolutely not the fault of the dog. An aggressive or dangerous incident is entirely the fault of the dog owner. Please punish the owner accordingly and NOT the dog. If the dog is taken to a no-kill shelter, I promise you that it will eventually be adopted by a loving individual or family that is able to properly care for the dog and ensure that it receives the proper training and structure in it's environment that it needs. I would strongly support a tribunal if and only if the dog would never be euthanized after an attack or bite incident. Again, I must strongly reiterate that the dog or specific dog breed is not the problem. The problem is the human owner of the dog.
- The representatives would have to interact with the dog.
- Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal ONLY IF THIS WAS THE FIRST COURSE OF ACTION
- The decision(s) made by the tribunal cannot take effect while they are being appealed at the Court of Queen's Bench, and a sufficient period of time should be provided between when the decisions are made and when they take effect to allow for the owner to decide and begin the appeal process.
- made it VERY clear that pit bulls, etc. receive the same fair trial that something "nicer" like a labrador would. humans produce enough racism as it is.
- One of the people should be a Certified Animal Behaviourist and the other members on the board should be unbiased to breeds and understand general dog behaviour
- As long as the representatives were qualified and trained to understand pet behavior and available effective pet training options.
- They don't judge based on the breed of the dog
- The reason that the dog bit the person should be a the center of the tribunal (i.e. was the animal threatened, did the "victim" invade the personal space of the dog or owner, etc)
- It is not biased to specific breeds.
- Unbiased proper trial
- Don't euthanize the dog
- If there is the ability to appeal the decision, then anytime a pet owner does not agree with Tribunal, they will appeal, which will simply drag out the process longer and defeat the whole purpose of having a tribunal to speed things up.
- Fair and not bias against any specific type of breed. The fact that one specific type of breed is singled out in the above question is appalling. Other jurisdictions that have been successful in reducing dog bites have a comprehensive understanding of the issues surrounding dog ownership and do not lay blame at the specific breed. Very disappointing to see this approach taken.
- A Bail Condition on offending Pet Owner, Will insure adherence to condition(s),and enforce the gravity of the matter,failure to comply will place pet into custody of Bylaw officers...
- As long as the breed of the dog is irrelevant, an alternative method to process these cases is acceptable. ANY and EVERY dog-bite, regardless of the breed of dog, that is severe enough to require investigation can and should be handled this way.



- The dog is not subjected to euthanization
- it seems good in theory but if it is a tribunal of people who have a prejudice against pitbulls, that's a problem. euthanizing should only be an option in extreme cases for ANY BREED or a dog that has multiple aggressive offenses. putting a dog down for biting someone trespassing into his yard is ridiculous and unfair. he is protecting his property and doing what he is supposed to do. a tribunal must be fair and just or it shouldn't exist.
- Identification of one off events vs repetitive aggressive behavior and involving a dog behaviorist to individually assess nuisance dogs. Is it the dog or the owner or the environment affecting the dog.
- both sides of the story are clearly heard. I have had people at the off leash park kick my dog because it was bigger than his small dog. My dog was wanting to meet his small dog that was on leash. Most people are the problem.
- Discriminatory practices against certain breeds is not allowed
- If this tribunal did NOT seek to prosecute owners of certain pets unfairly, and if it ensured fair conditions and FACT based evidence to assess every case.
- only if the non city representatives were non biased, if they had a dog attack trauma previously they should not be allowed to vote their opinion as it will be muddled
- No euthanasia
- I do not support euthanization of the dog. Dog should be rehabilitated and sent trained. The issue is the dog owner not the dog!
- As long as this involved in the tribunal are educated on dog psychology and behavior and are competent in what it means to be a safe dog owner
- While a tribunal system sounds more efficient, I would like to better understand the differences between the proposed tribunal system and provincial court and where the decision making power lies.
- Evaluate the owner AS WELL AS the dog. Often times dog bites/attacks are due to poor ownership and training - the dog doesn't know better!
- As long as it was reputable and knowledgeable people in the tribunal
- Dog owners pay for it, always
- That no specific breed is discriminated against just because of how it may look. That a professional behaviourist evaluate the dog and also how owner of the dog handles the dog in any situation. It is the responsibility of the owner to insure they have total control over their dog no matter what and no matter what breed the own or the size of the dog.
- Tribunal would need to be fair and in the best interest of the animal not the owner. The right representatives would need to be on the tribunal, informed, fair advocates for the animal.
- No authority to euthanize
- fairness and impartiality by neutral parties
- The tribunal has animal care/training professionals on it.
- Outlaw these dogs.
- Do not base on breed of animal. Its still rasicm!



- if it isn't biased and the tribunal has members that own dogs and understands the animal. Not people that have 0 experience with dogs and have biased opinions against certain breeds.
- The dog should go to obedient training and then be judged on how far along the dog has come
- No breed discrimination. Period
- Determining whether the dog is at fault as opposed to the human/animal who's bitten.
- No dogs euthanized. Compensatory obedience training with a professional to correct both the dog and the owner's behaviour
- if it was deemed that the dog wasn't fully at fault. Yes they have been not on a leash however there are times when a dog is defending itself
- Cases were reviewed by more than 2 city representatives
- No Euthanization.
- I support this as long as there are truly evenly weighted individuals involved. For example, perhaps include a dog trainer, a vet, dog owners from the public, non dog owners, folks who are a neutral party etc.
- Make sure that the Dog wasn't provoked or attack (by animal or human) and just defending it's self.
- Subject to a timely appeal.
- That it was not breed specific but behavioural
- the panel included experts in pet care, training, and behaviours.
- No euthanizing dogs until they see a professional trainer. Does not get left up to the city to determine.
- Done inside and outside the shelter as dogs can experience high stress in shelters and may not behave as they would if they were more comfortable.
- Multiple sources are used as character references for the animal as displays of aggression can be very circumstantial
- Owners of dogs should be required to attend a training session with the dog and be educated on handling the animal.
- Non-biased individuals should be partake in this tribunal as all dogs that have teeth have the potential to be vicious in the presence of any strangers.
- Tribunal would include a dog-behaviour expert.
- So long as due process is followed
- All non-City people are animal professionals that can share research references that help them make their decisions
- Euthanization is not an option. First offence should label the dog a nuisance causing the dog (any breed) to be muzzled in public. Owner should surrender the dog if a second offence occurs and all realistic options explored for rehoming the dog with new responsible owners
- Have people with experience in dogs (trainers, rescue organization personnel) and justice running it, not exclusively one or the other.
- It must have veterinarians and pro dog people on it - with intimate knowledge of dog behaviours



- Assessment to determine euthanasia should not use breed or any other stereotypes as determining factors. Each case should be carefully reviewed and determine first if behavioral issues can be remedied through training or rehoming the dog to a more responsible owner.
- Reviews need to be completed by a person who is aware of breed biases bias. Investigations need to be directed towards the owners handling of the dog. A relocation if the animal to trained professionals who specialize in rehabilitation of the dog should be an alternative to euthanasia. Corrective measures would need to be put in place for the owner. They should have to meet training requirements and pass a course on dog handling.
- Additional consideration is provided to the clear ability for dogs to rehabilitate, and the owners have additional onus placed on them to ensure that the dogs were not taught to act aggressively. Also that rescues and other volunteer organizations are used to retrain aggressive dogs, and killing them is not the knee jerk reaction. The unnecessary killing of dogs has happened previously and when there are willing parties asking to take the dogs and work with them, this is considered and done.
- It is still required to go to Court of Queen's Bench (not only by appeal)
- That they would not discriminate against breed, but rather look at the objective evidence that lead to the incident, in order to make an appropriate judgment
- cannot make euthanization decisions
- Only if the decision makers are highly knowledgeable in animal behaviour and are unbiased when it comes to breedism
- I think experts in dog bites and behaviour (true experts - behaviourists, veterinary behaviourists etc) need to be consulted on these cases and the tribunal should be educated too. But yes I support fast tracking this as I have first hand seen the conditions these dogs in while waiting for a court trial. It's not good welfare.
- At least one member of the tribunal is a dog behaviour specialist.
- Your survey does not provide enough information to submit an informed answer. Whoever wrote this survey needs education on how to craft an impartial survey.
- People who are not dog owners should not be allowed on the tribunal. I can just imagine some power hungry dog hater being on the tribunal with absolutely zero empathy or understanding.
- To please remember, a dog bites for a reason - human error - it is not the dogs/animals fault!
- Those on the tribunal must be balanced, reasonable and unbiased
- They are able to err on the side of caution and ensure problem owners are not able to find loops holes to use.
- As long as the owner is responsible and adheres
- The representatives in the cases were carefully hand picked/elected to avoid biases/discrimination
- As long as representatives used in the tribunal are non-discriminating against animal breeds.
- Don't euthanize the dog. If the dog is bad, it's because the owners are bad. Rehabilitate. Not murder.
- The tribunal should consist of animal behaviorist sand veterinary medical staff who are more aware of animal behavior. Pit bulls or pit bull types should not be singled out. Small dogs are more likely to bite and cause damage than a pit bull.



- The tribunal recognizes that an owner will say anything to defend/protect their pet.
- There is an unbiased jury
- It was also used to determine owner responsibility (if the dog has bad behaviour do to the household it is in)
- The euthanization of a dog be the absolute last resort. Second last being that new owners with proper training are found.
- No bias would be placed towards pit bull breeds. It would always be a fair tribunal
- any assessment or designation of a dog is done by an independent professional trainer
- if they had an impartial and un biased approach.
- The City of Calgary and those in charge of said tribunal **MUST RECOGNIZE THAT NOT ALL "PITBULLS" ARE BAD!** Do you? Do you recognize that?!
- I would be concerned if the tribunal was not open minded to the owner's input, under appropriate circumstances. Also, there would have to be a mechanism to recuse tribunal member(s) if by chance they knew the pet owner.
- Still reviewed in court after
- The pet and victim get through the process faster
- No euthanasia unless involving children or death.
- Dogs should not be euthanized.
- Biggest concern is bias. Nothing wrong with using a tribunal but how are members chosen to ensure that each case is assessed without bias.
- Non-bias professionals made the decisions
- A large variety of people based on race, gender, age, education, etc., so that their decisions are fair
- No euthanasia unless involving children or death.
- Euthanasia is a last resort i.e. training and rehab are the most common outcomes.
- That the tribunal has the ability to add restrictions/conditions relevant to the case so that public safety is a priority as the process continues.
- Dogs don't need a fair trial, tribunal or other legal process. If they bite a human, they should be put down immediately, and the owner charged criminally.
- Members of tribunal should have experience training dogs of all breeds and extensive knowledge of psychological behavior of dogs
- Appropriate challenge/review process available to any victims or owner.
- An unbiased system that isn't biased to any one breed
- It was treated the same as if it was a court case, with the same penalties
- If it included trainers that are recognized for their work with reactive and/or aggressive dogs or prey behaviour.
- It does not discriminate based on the breed of the dog.
- The tribunal does not have the authority to order that a dog is euthanized, they can only submit their recommendation to the Court of Queens Bench.



- That the guardian of the dog was able to defend the dogs actions. Some dogs will attack if threatened or scared.
- If the animal is a danger to people and the owner isn't taking accountability and the animal can't be rehabilitated then I would support a tribunal
- All factors were met
- There should be NO leniency for a dog that has completed enforced obedience classes and still offends obviously the help available is not helping the dog.
- Reasonable rules put into the family and the dog in question
- No euthanasia unless involving children or death.
- The panel must include someone from the Humane Society, a veterinarian, and a professional trainer.
- Good idea
- Not be breed specific but behaviour specific and take into account behaviorists thoughts on the animal.
- As long as it's an easy process for people to follow and they're not using this to target bully breeds specifically and problematic owners instead.
- The panel is made up of knowledgeable and non biased decision makers. For example, have a veterinarian, behavioural trainer, a member of the city of Calgary bylaw team, and a non-dog owner, all of whom shall be impartial or have no relation to the people involved in said case.
- Vicious dogs are considered one that "bites" more than 3 times
- Someone monitored the dog/owner to ensure that they are abiding by orders and restrictions.
- As long as it is not targeted towards pit bulls as they are some of the most gentle dogs.
- yes
- Clarification on what vicious dog declarations are (do not agree with breed characteristics being apart of this) ~~W~~. Ensuring effective reporting standards are in place for bylaw officers to ensure all the facts are gathered. Euthanasia must be a last resort, all other options must be explored before that option is to be considered (training, change in ownership, rehabilitation program, etc.)
- I agree that cases need to be heard and assessed within a reasonable period of time to minimize the time a dog spends in the shelter. This punishment will likely only make their behaviour worse.
- The dog owner would agree to use the tribunal instead of go to court.
- Tribunal decisions are made on a case by case basis and are not biased based on the breed or appearances of the dog.
- dog is considered innocent until proven guilty for a first offense
- They should not decide if the dog should be euthanized
- As long as there are no "breed specific" wording and it only deals with the exact dogs behaviours and doesn't discriminate due to breed/size.
- severity, number of cases against the dog. Also, if a dog bites someone the actions used up to the incident should be investigated for example, people or kids taunting or chasing dogs and ignoring the dogs signals of telling them they are scared or stressed.



- The dog in question stays with the owner until a decision has been made .
- Yes
- The dog owner has a say in whether the dog should be put down, all other alternative measures (such as keeping the dog at home) must be considered first
- The dog should be kept with its owners, muzzled when out of doors and the owner and dog must obtain obedience training. The dog should be removed from its owner if there is not an attempt to rehabilitate the dog.
- Nothing further
- The non city and city officials are not biased against specific breeds or have a record for advocating for all types of animals/dogs.
- The standard of evidence and rights of the owner/defendant are still respected to the same degree
- Ensure an unbiased process
- diverse animal experts on board
- If the dog stays in a foster home equipped to care for him/her while the tribunal takes place
- Transparency On all relevant information and documentation(s), “without any delays, and or systematic delays”.
- Number three
- Euthanasia should never be the outcome.
- Euthanasia was a very last resort in all cases
- Animal wellbeing specialists (vets) would need to be a part of representatives
- It is made up of a panel of impartial people with knowledge of animal behaviour - vets, canine behaviour specialists not just the SPCA or animal control
- No bias can be present against a dog on the basis of its breed. Only the behaviour and the owner’s (in)ability to control it should be considered
- Get people that love animals and actually know about the breeds like pit bulls, not people that just assume they’re all bad.
- Science based dog behaviorist is included in the panel
- fair and objective review of the case, regardless of dog breed; members of tribunal will NOT have any affiliation to any specific group that caters to any specific dog breed and must not have any animal-related violation or offences
- The best results 4 all
- The tribunal consists of individuals knowledgeable in dog behavior.
- That the tribunal included a dog behavior specialist that is independent of the city, both parties and has any specific aversion to the breed of dog in question.
- They are screened to ensure they aren't biased against pitbulls
- experts in dog behavior and training are included
- Non-city individuals should have a legal and/or background in dog behavior of some kind - trainers, vets, etc.



- As long as rehabilitation or rehoming is a choice because animals should not have to suffer for the choices of the owner
- The persons involved in the tribunal must not be biased to dog breeds and should not believe that some dog breeds are just classified as aggressive/dangerous. A completely impartial tribunal would be required which checks to ensure that it remains that way.
- Every dog should be given a second chance to succeed.
- Includes dog owners of pit breeds
- That the blame lies solely on the humans involved, and not the dog who was raised incorrectly and doesn't know any better.
- That the crown prosecutor had knowledge of the breed and would not want to want to kill the breed. This would also include the Judge who should have some education in regards to the breed and not just their bias.
- People from different areas of expertise who are able to present different opinions and without agenda.
- Those involved with determining the case would be educated on the subject/experts (dog behaviour, rehab)
- If the tribunal has authority to order euthanizing dogs exhibiting dangerous behavior.
- That it address the owner not the animal. Clearly the owner does not know how to take care of their dog.
- The people on this so called tribunal not have any pre determined opinions on any breeds of any kind and actually have compassion for the animal in question and have an open & fair mind & heart
- Must be a dog owner.
- Addendum to above - I would need to know more about the specific differences between the tribunal and court before I could support this idea. A tribunal decision sounds like something people would more easily ignore for the worst of offenders.
- The panel consists of animal experts
- That each case is peer reviewed
- I would like, for the owner, being looked into, as to, do they take good care of their animals? are they being abused?
- Zero tolerance for repeat incidents. By law must remove dog and shelters must euthanize it.
- It would need to be a diverse, knowledgeable group of people within the tribunal
- There were opportunities for pet owner to rehabilitate the pet with professional training.
- Appropriate qualifications for those sitting on the tribunal.
- If the dog bite tore flesh the dog should remain at the holding facility. Or if it had to be forcibly removed from the victim.
- At least one member of the Tribunal must be a licensed DVM
- To include knowledgeable trainers with specific and proven training and knowledge of these types of incidents.



- The owner is permitted to address the tribunal and discuss the orders that were handed out and any mitigating actions that may have led to those orders as well as apprising the tribunal of actions taken to address issues raised by the interim orders.
- The tribunal would have to be staffed by people who actually understand dog behaviour and is up to date on how these dogs are reacting.
- The tribunal must include a trained behaviourist and others familiar with dogs, not joe public.
- Tribunal has authority to mandate owner/ pet training. No authority given to Euthanize.
- As long as the cost isn't currently paid by Alberta, but would now be paid by the city of Calgary
- as long as it was quick
- People that have experience and knowledge of dogs and dog behavior are on the panel.
- Not discriminating against the dogs breed
- Euthanasia is LAST resort. Training classes are encouraged, situation and owner's participation is acknowledged (eg poor treatment of the dog), animals have rights too
- The tribunal should not be allowed to determine euthanasia.
- The tribunal should be transparent in its goals and non discriminatory in its decisions. As mentioned prior any disciplinary action should be taken on the individual dog and owner, rather than the breed as a whole. My concern is the tribunal will become overrun with lobbyists or the like who's goals are clearly to destroy specific breeds.
- There is no breed specific legislation discriminating against 'pit bull' type dogs
- The tribunal would have to include dog experts.
- took into consideration why the dog bit, and the owners own reaction to the bite
- Look at past offences and owner responsibility as the first defence (ie: owner cooperation with dog remediation and avoiding euthanasia/seizure when possible.)
- First offense
- only for non dangerous breeds.
- No euthanization, unless we do the same for humans who are on the sex offenders registration. It is not the dogs fault it bites, it's the humans fault for not training or being irresponsible.
- Tribunal is made up of qualified behavior experts who's decisions are science based.
- The non-City representatives should include at least one person with relevant canine expertise (vet, dog behavior trainer etc)
- The City builds a fund that allow some dog owners to appeal, because QB matters are expensive and low income citizens would be unfairly disadvantaged in this matter.
- All dogs that bite should be put down immediately.
- To be made up of people with ACTUAL dog knowledge. They will need to know the difference between dog that is provoked and the bad owners that have made their dog this way.
- Providing the appeal process remained
- swift and efficient
- An experienced dog trainer was part of the tribunal.



- Prohibit Pitbull's and other dangerous dogs completely. Destroy them before they destroy a family or young child's life.
- If tribunal deems euthanasia, trial should then go to provincial level for final judgement
- I would like a range of different people on the tribunal, and they must all be dog owners. I feel dog owners can be more rational when making decisions
- The dog breed is NOT SPECIFICALLY TARGETED DUE TO BREED. DOG BITES HAPPEN, DO NOT BLAME THE BREED OF THE DOG AND FINE THE OWNER FOR NEGLIGENCE.
- Euthanization couldn't be decided solely by the tribunal
- An appellate process needs to be place to remove bias in the event of a contested ruling.
- Pit bulls are not singled out
- The tribunal needs to be made up of people who understand dogs and dog behaviour.
- Biting dog to be destroyed
- History of the dog being accused to be accounted for. Single incidence does not call for euthanasia as many factors can lead to a dog bite (eg. children pulling on dogs tail).
- animal can be kept with owner in cases where allowed
- They would need specific training and perhaps instruction from a judge or lawyer to exercise their authority
- Impartiality, members of tribunal should be varying ages, political beliefs, ethnicities, etc. Don't just do the 'Berta thing and get a bunch of old, white right-wing dudes that all agree with eachother on everything. No-one with any connection to interest groups.
- That it's not breed specific all bites by all breeds of dogs are treated the same
- tribunal members can be proven not to be biased or politically motivated
- As long as it is fair and not bias toward a type of dog. The situation of the bite or attack should be taken into consideration. Example would be did the pit bull protect itself and its owner from another attacking dog? In that case it would be what the dog does on instinct is to protect and shouldn't be punished.
- Don't destroy the dogs
- As written above.
- Wasn't city biased
- As long as decisions could be appealed.
- The dogs should get to stay with the owners until a decision with the condition that the dog stays on the property and only comes in to contact with the owners and not the general public.
- Tribunal has extensive experience with pets
- As long as the animal is kept indoors with OWNER! Until decisions made. No animal should be put down. We don't do it to sick humans who rape or kill why a animal?
- who would sit on the tribunal? Level of knowledge required to be a part of the tribunal? Do tribunal members themselves own large aggressive animals or demonstrate biases?
- I do not think the dog should be euthanized
- must have citizens on the tribunal those with training experience



- That all legalities are followed
- Depends who is on the committee and what canine expertise they have must have a citizens on the panel that have expertise that are not related to the city or animal control
- Euthanasia of dog should be based on multiple offences and supported by a certified animal behaviourist
- That it be open for review before any act, such as euthinization, be carried out.
- The breed of the dog was not included.
- Euthanasia as a last resort.
- Yes
- Not only based on a certain breed
- there are clear facts about the reason why dog bit someone in the first place.
- Let the dogs be.
- investigate owners. Animal abuse leads to visious animals.
- Rehabilitation programs for first offences
- They could not make the decision to euthanize an animal, if they feel eithanization is required it would need to move to a proper court. An animal's bread should not be disclosed during evaluation.
- I don't think animals should be put to death; in the case, a dog bites really bad a person then they should go to a tribunal and find an efficiency way to solve this. Owners should pay a fine and the hospital or doctor's bill for the
- Tribunal would just based on circumstance and not breed.
- There is more emphasis on the situation in which the attack occurred and never emphasize the breed of the dog
- Must include a Vet on the tribunal and an assessment by a separate Vet,
- assess restrictions on the owner, not the dog
- Stop killing aggressive or nuisance animals
- Harsher penalties for the owners. Like bigger fines. More than a slap on the wrist.
- Only opted for euthanization in very extreme cases
- A dog behaviour specialist meets and interacts with the dog on 2-3 separate dates to assess behaviour, temper, and ability to be trained or reconditioned.
- Dog should not be returned to owner after vicious bite
- Any tribunal member must demonstrate impartiality and lack of bias. Any undisclosed bias or prior involvement should be met with a significant fine not less than \$1000
- It wasn't biased against certain dog breeds
- Ability to appeal.
- The tribunal is run by a panel of veterinarians here in Calgary. Bylaw officers and the pound are not the right people to make these decisions
- Decisions are made on the current incident based on situation and severity, not on breed.
- was fair to both parties & listen to both sides therowly & fines go towards med bills and damages.
- Fitness to own an animal are consider



- Animal behaviourist/trainer and veterinary assessments required before any final outcome decided
- Made up of an open minded animal supportive person.
- as long as there is no preconceived bias against pitbulls and/ or terrier looking dogs. fairness and regular review of the tribunal board members is paramount.
- That I would get to approve the members of the Tribunal or at least be allowed to appeal the Tribunal's decision on the basis that the decision was not made objective and based on pre-determine criteria.
- Associations like the humane society and animal behavior experts are included
- Euthanasiation should be only an option if the dog was involved in multiple incidences or a severe case where human or animal was hospitalized, and I like the restrictions of dog owner needed to abide by.
- Absolutely NO breed specific regulations. All breeds treated the same.
- There is a complete and fair review of the dog in question. Dogs should be given a chance under new ownership and training. All dogs become dangerous because of their environment and previous owners
- Educated open minded dog professionals on the tribunal that follow science and not BSL.
- Professionally qualified positive reinforcement dog trainer with experience with *behaviour dogs* is on tribunal
- That the owner would abide by the restrictions and guidelines determined by the tribunal
- The members must be dog owners of various breeds and have in their repertoire several dog behaviour courses and trainings from a positive reinforcement based (science based) Dog programs such as from the CHS or Impossible Possible (Catherine Harbord)
- No euthanasia as an option
- As long as those representatives standing on the tribunal have an appropriate background in dealing with similar situations and proper knowledge of dog training, and behaviour; relating specifically to reactivity and aggression.
- As long as the dog can be handled by the owner, and there is no medical reason the owner can not handle said dog with either strength or at a mental capacity the owner should (if allowed) be able to keep said dog
- No euthanasia unless situation is VERY clear. Certainly if a dog kills or severely injures a person (not in defence of self, people or home), euthanize immediately rather than leaving in a kennel for months.
- can not support euthanasiation
- There are many aspects of the option of tribunal system missing in order for me to support this option, i.e who are these city and non-city representatives?
- Training / education provided to all tribunal members
- People on the tribunal are educated regarding dog behaviours
- Both parties are equally represented fairly
- The tribunal is made up of industry professional in K9 behaviour, shelter representatives, etc.



- Didn't openly discriminate certain breeds and each animal faces the same assessment and trial.
- The panel be comprised of Unbiased and knowledgeable people from different backgrounds and an appeal process is in place and easily accessible.
- Very limitations for the vicious dogs exposure to people or situations that are at high risk for another incident.
- Non BSL judgements
- Dog has the chance to have more training rather than being euthanized.
- Decision makers would need to be extremely knowledgeable in animal behaviour and have no history of breed biases
- Both parties are given a fair opportunity to discuss what happened. The dog is given back to the owner and kept out of the shelter.
- It treated all offences the same - no special treatment for special circumstances.
- The tribunal decisions are made by people who really know dog breeds. Dogs have been thought to be "aggressive", but in fact are not "aggressive", only scared and unsure of what to do as their owners do NOT train the dog properly. The dog is only as good as their OWNERS train them to be. The responsibility should be on the owners to properly work with and train their dogs. Every breed is different. It's always the way that us humans treat them that make the dogs great or "bad". The dogs should go to trained people to assess whether or not the dog can be worked with properly to have them social in any situation.
- It treats all incidents equally & is not biased against specific breeds. It's the training or lack there of, not the animal.
- Dogs are not put down
- No city council members are allowed to be on the board!
- I do not believe any dog should be euthanized due to behavioural issues, training should be required or rehoming to someone who have provide adequate training - possibly done through a rescue
- Non biased members
- Who picks tribunal?
- The owners have a say in what corrective action they will take the first time. The second put the owner down.
- Each member swears that they agree that Euthanasia is appropriate for dangerous animals.
- Pit bulls should not be singled out for unique treatment under law. However, owners who have abused or trained dogs for aggression should receive harsh penalties and prohibition of ownership rights.
- No euthanization.
- The panel must include people that work with/ have knowledge of animal behaviour
- Euthanasia is the very last thing to suggest. Training, education and helping the dog is priority
- Only if tribunal included people with specialized knowledge e.g veterinarians, pet trainers, and not just "volunteers" or city personnel!!
- All dogs viewed same



- A thrall Owner background check with officer licences background check. 2. Dog to be removed and put through training with a trainer and foster care to evaluate plus rehabilitate , as Canadian law does that to violent offenders, dogs are the same, you kill a person you go to jail and not shot but law officers will shoot dogs with out any trial. 3) Once dog has been reviewed in fostercare plus training and owner back ground check clears then victim should be investigated also (did they tease/harrass dog prior etc.
- As long as the representatives include individuals on all sides of the spectrum
- Not biased due to breed of dog
- As long as there is a fair and judicial process that includes mediation and trauma therapy
- euthanizing a dog should be absolutely the last resort. I hope the tribunals would consider all sides and not automatically take the side of the humans. Decisions should favour management, traning and restrictions over euthanasia.
- Members are elected and change often
- All alternatives be explored before euthanasia is even considered.
- It had dog experts in it to assess what's best for the animal. If an animal is being mistreated and that is the cause of their aggression, an expert can identify that and if the animal can be saved
- I would have to know more information to make an informed decision about this.
- Ability to appeal decision
- I would agree if this tribunal was represented with non biased.
- These a wide verity of People
- The tribunals decisions are reviewed by a judge or other law professional afterwards to ensure that the tribunals are operating in a fair and just manner and that tribunal members are relieved from their positions if they are not fair or just.
- I only agree with the 3rd point. The owner must take obedience classes or not own a dog. A tribunal will just end up costing tax payers more money. People who wish to own a dog should be properly vetted and take classes with a dog in the shelter. Then if they want a dog after that, they are now certified to won one.
- The dog owner is the real problem here and they MUST be held accountable for any/all injuries as a result of their dog biting anyone. Any second offense means the dog is seized and that owner and household loses the privilege of ever owning another dog again.
- I would like the opportunity to be on the tribunal.
- The tribunal needs to have an animal beviorist that can provide some context as to WHY the attack happened from the aimal's perspective.
- As long as you can appeal the decision before your animal is euthanized
- .
- Dog is not to be euthanized before the case is before a judge.
- As above, in agreement
- People on in this tribunal need to be well educated about all dogs.
- They are unbiased towards dog breeds with a reputation of being aggressive



- As long as there is a proper appeals process and breed specific legislation does not hold sway over proceedings.
- That people on the Tribunal are dog owners with no bias to size and breed of the dog
- Don't euthanize
- No euthanasia unless involving children or death.
- The tribunal should include experts in animal health and behaviours (veterinarians, animal health techs, etc...)
- Qualified dog people need to be on the tribunal
- Tribunal includes a balance of perspectives and approaches when it comes to animals in relation to people.
- Training for the owner and the dog is essential. As well as training, all vet bills incurred should be paid to a victim of ill-trained dogs BEFORE the offending dog is returned to the owner.
- A truly unbiased group that is educated in animal behaviour
- That Nuisance charges and bite and instances are investigated for provocation
- The composition of the panel needs to be balanced and include veterinarians, dog trainers, dog owners, doctors, psychologists
- the tribunal must hand out equally harsh sentences to the dog and owner and order the dog to be euthanized immediately. If a tribunal helps the victim then I'd support it. If it helps the vicious dog or irresponsible owner, I would not support it. The owner should receive a criminal record, a red sign on their yard that they have a vicious dog and are a non-responsible pet owner. They should be fined \$3000.
- As long as the decision is NOT based on breed or "predisposition", but actual evidence.
- As long as the owner and victim were both able to fully be involved and were to be able to plead their cases in front of the tribunal.
- The tribunal needs to be objective, it isn't a licence to kill because of personal feelings towards a dog breed or "type" of person who owns the dog. Dogs aren't born bad, they're taught the behaviour.
- The owners should face penalties for their animal's behavior
- As long as dogs aren't euthanized based on breed and behavioral treatment is looked into before deciding.
- no euthanizing!!
- It would depend who the tribunal consisted of...
- Owner must clearly demonstrate that this is first time behaviour and they must report successful completion of city approved obedience training .
- There are time limits to be met to keep the matter moving thru this process or we're back where we started. If euthanization > fast. Again, timeline imposed.
- More than 60% of tribunal members are veterinarians and/or behavioural specialists
- Ultimately, I believe the behaviours of dogs are controlled and taught by the owners. I don't believe any dogs should be euthanized because they weren't properly trained nor treated with human decency. Dogs don't tend to bite (for example) unless being provoked or neglected or mistrusts their owners or abused in some manner. They're already traumatized. They bite as their last resort to



control the situation as they access the situation in their limited dogs' minds. They're like toddlers/preschoolers, but go throw tantrums (or even bite and scratch) when they don't have the vocabulary or properly-taught ways of releasing their "big and scary" emotions, such as anger, frustrations, fear, being overwhelmed. I believe that if I want to include a dog into my family, it is 100% my responsibility to train, educate, and lovingly discipline my fur-animals. They are ultimately still animals, not humans. We just take responsibility in loving and caring for them properly, which includes discipline. A parent does not love his/her child if he/she lets the child do whatever the child wants. That will destroy the child. Same with a dog, no matter the breed.

- The tribunal should have knowledge of dog behaviour, and should force the dog owners to attend dog training courses and euthanizing the animal should be the last option.
- Kept their personal breed bias out of proceedings, eg-same procedures whether the dog is a Golden Retriever or pit bull.
- All dogs are treated fairly and the owners behaviours are reviewed
- Tribunal contained people from the Veterinary Industry
- One of the members of the tribunal must be from an animal rescue as they would have the required experience to assess each situation.
- All parties to the nuisance situation are required too attend canine communication / body language training to ensure the owners learn how to properly train & manage their Doug's, as well as to ensure the victims are not raising an alarm simply from a base of personal fear and not a true nuisance audition.
- That all measures are taken to try to support re-training, based on using independant canine behavioral experts vs just putting a dog down because it exhibits aggressive behavior. There should be steps to try to correct it and understand the animals ability to change. Sometimes unfit environments and owners cause the issues. An indepent review would allow a proper assment vs a death sentence to an animal that doesn't deserve that.
- make sure the people on the Tribunal have owned at least two dogs in there lifetime
- That the dog receives training and that the owner be investigated for being a responsible owner or not.
- Focus on behaviours of the irresponsible owner, more than on the dog.
- The members of said tribunal are not biased against specific dogs breeds and are competent to assess and make such a decision.
- It was made up of animal professionals including employees at the City of Calgary
- The tribunal members would need to be pet owners to understand the distinct nuances of pet ownership.
- dog behaviorists need to be a part of the panel
- The option of appealing the verdict.
- I feel like owners should have a chance to either speak on dogs behalf or submit written statements from vets/trainers to relay previous behaviors or character of said dog. I say this because there are cases in which there are unprecedented circumstances that causes a dog to bite that normally wouldn't. Having said that I think this is a great idea to shorten the time a dog stays in a cage, as



some of these dogs have stayed there for months! There is a case to be made that its cruel leaving a dog in a kennel 24 hours a day , no sunlight, forced cage soiling, decline in mental well-being, very little social interaction, no touch.. ect.

- The committee must have a vet a dog behaviourist an animal trainer at minimum on the committee
No citizen at random who has no experience with animals
- The tribunal can be UNBIASED.
- Decision are enforced
- Would need more information on this. Are representatives trained in animal behavior? How about human behavior? Human and animal psychologists for every case. If you're going to make the effort, do it right.
- Both sides of the story are actually heard and not based on simply stereotypes of breeds of dogs. The city discriminates enough against coloured people, you want to bring dogs in the mix?
- my condition is that the tribunal must have trainers or other people who are familiar with whichever breed is involved.
- A vet or animal behaviourist be present.
- The tribunal included an expert in dog behaviour.
- Owners and pet receive classes
- A tribunal would need ample representation from animal rescue experts and behaviourists i.e., Calgary Humane Society, AARCS and veterinary behaviourist.
- If the victim of the bite was in any way provoking the attack, the dog should NOT be considered a threat
- the tribunal has pro-dog voice - not staff from the city pound
- The members of the tribunal are knowledgeable and unbiased
- As long as the Calgary Humane Society is part of the Tribunal
- It was comprised of mixed group of people EDUCATED on these topics - no politics, fair selection (i.e. they don't get selected because they donated money or know somebody who knows somebody).
- The tribunal would have to consist of totally non bias members that have never been part of campaigns for or against BSL.
- The owner's ability/willingness to make improvement to the animals wellbeing should be considered
- All dogs are equal regardless of breed. Literally any dog can kill, it's not logical to target a specific type when they're all capable of causing harm. This article literally says pitbulls are NOT involved in more bite incidents than other dogs, so why target them specifically? Even if their bite is stronger, a St. Bernard can harm a human just as easily.
- I would want to see neighbours of said dog be interviewed to see if they feel that this dog is a constant threat. I would hate to see a dog euthanized due to an incident with only the victim testifying to the incident.
- Animal behavioural specialist is part of tribunal.
- costs covered by the owner of the dog



- The non city person or persons should be qualified to assess a dogs behavior and understand what may have led to a bite or incident with the dog.
- had multiple representatives with an educated understanding of canine behaviour.
- The tribunal needs to have the power to determine if the dog, or the owner is at fault. If it's the dog then it should be seized, but if it is the owner perhaps the dog could be turned over to the humane society for readoption.
- Tribunal members must be made up of a variety of professionals (legal, councilor, animal behaviour, etc)
- If this is a second bite occurrence the dog should be euthanized.
- Depending on how you are choosing the non city representatives
- Whether there has been a previous problem. The circumstances of the event. If someone has entered a fenced yard without permission from the owner.
- The qualifications for members of the tribunal should be published and should include some legal training (not necessarily a lawyer. Possibly a course in administrative law and animal behaviour
- Tribunal members should have litigation and/or mediation experience. Individuals brought before the tribunal should have access to representation should they want same.
- Tribunal must have even representation from both dog owners and non-owners.
- It be provided as an option and that the members of the tribunal be significantly knowledgeable and educated in the psychology, behaviour and training of dogs, not casual or common citizens.
- As long as it proves to be a swifter course of action. Dogs respond to how they are treated and are more manageable when both dog and humans are trained. Training dog should be a requirement of keeping dog.
- Like in court I think person appearances by pet owners, victims and any witnesses should be part of the decision making.
- Includes an animal behaviour specialist
- The tribunal must have the authority to enforce and ensure decisions are obeyed
- Need more information as to who would be leading those tribunal, judge, city employee, etc.? What training would they receive if not a judge? Process would need to be fair to all parties. Decisions and rational are made public
- doesn't require hiring/increasing the size of the City administration.
- ensure no bias
- My condition is that there is representation from competent, experienced animal rescue groups (i.e., AARCS), not just Animal Services.
- It is not biased on the type of dog. A nasty bite from a toy poodle or a Jack Russell terrier show poor responsible ownership too.,
- No euthanasia
- Obedience training required for dogs and owner again and a trainer assessment on the dog, paid by ower.
- Tribunal must be comprised of those knowledgable and qualified. This should be defined in the bylaw.



- This is my answer.
- Yes
- As long as it follows all City and Provincial laws, and decisions are enforced.
- Diverse panel of members of tribunal. Kind of like a jury
- The decision to euthanize an animal is a final measure after other orders and measures to modify behavior have been exhausted
- If the tribunal is intended to make the system more efficient then I support it. However, if the intent is to somehow be nicer to biting/aggressive/vicious/untrained dogs and the owners that failed to control them, then I oppose them. Let's see some responsibility by dog owners for a change.
- It is unbiased and based on a case by case basis, not on breed.
- It is based on a per incident basis and not biased towards heavier punishments that are breed specific (e.g pitbulls)
- They have no bias towards dog breeds
- Is funded mostly by fines levied
- dog should NEVER be euthanized. We don't euthanize people for assault and battery
- No City member rather an animal organization such as SPCA plus people with a knowledge base re animals or experience interpreting legislation.
- As long as all sides were reviewed and the decisions wouldn't be solely based on the breed of dog, singling out pit bulls is discriminating.
- Nothing breed specific, must be available to access for any breed of animal.
- All parties need input on this process and an appeal process must be in place.
- This be completed with in a short a timespan as possible e.g. within 14 calendar days
- Breed neutral, licensed, educated and trained experts on the tribunal.
- If there was no bias against certain breeds of dogs
- As long as they do not discriminate dogs based only how they look
- The tribunal members must be stakeholders in the community of both human citizens and pet citizens alike. More details would need to be provided on how these members would be selected. Please provide research that's been done on other communities that have this type of tribunal and where it has been set up and used successfully (meaning most parties understand and can accept the resulting decisions, which seem fair and reasonable).
- Fair and no discrimination
- I do not believe dogs should believe dogs should be euthanized no matter the "damage", they should be rehabilitated and rehomed as the owner is most likely the reason for the dogs behavior, the owner should be fully accountable for the dogs actions as they are have taken "ownership" of the dogs wellbeing and anyone/anything it comes in contact with.
- As long as a proper investigation is conducted. A dog that is being antagonized in some way may respond by biting. Extenuating circumstances need to be considered
- Tribunal board needs to INCLUDE with again a specific all around certified trainer/behaviourist (non-biased) or veterinary field.



- That the tribunal was an independent team and not Animal Services.
- The dog remains in the custody of the owner.
- As long as specific breeds aren't being targeted.
- As long as you can appeal the decision before your animal is euthanized
- As long as they not rushing without due diligence in the matter
- No assessing if the dog should be euthanized
- If a dog were ordered to be euthanized the owner would get to spend time with the dog in a safe environment first.
- Dog behavioural experts are involved. Every time.
- Responsible dog ownership
- There would be a balance of professionals who work with reactive or other types of dogs; there is an automatic right of appeal to QB and not just a judicial review process where the standard of review is difficult to deal with; that the ability of the dog to be rehabilitated or other restrictions placed on the dog are undertaken by professionals who deal with these types of dogs, not by bylaw officers.
- The conditions of tribunal would have to be presented before being able to make a sound decision
- Was comprised of trained animal behaviour experts/veterinarians. I room for politics here.
- All dogs regardless of breed are treated equally. It seems rather ironic that we condone racism within humanity however, you are intending to discriminate against a specific breed of dog.
- both dogs and both owners needs have to be considered. again this question is misleading and poorly worded.
- If the dog was able to stay with it's owner while the decisions were being made.
- Fair
- The conditions listed above
- members are unbiased and elected
- euthnization of a dog should only be considered in extreme cases. Educaation/restrictions should be attempted first.
- The tribunal members have not be involve in a similar case or a case involving animals. The ability to properly trains nd maintain the animal is included in all tribunal assessments.
- That no dog is judged by their looks. That there is actual evidence that the dog is a danger no matter the size.
- They keep there prejudices out of the process
- Each member tribunal owns a dog
- for the first offence.
- There is a animal behaviour specialist involved and the doctor(s) who treated the patient who was injured
- People are accountable for the decisions they implement.
- Decisions involving Euthanization should be taken to provincial court before carrying out euthanasia.
- Rehab/training before euthanasia is considered



- Be careful about really biased folks who join tribunals so they can punish dogs
- So long as the representatives are a non-partial cross section of animal behaviour experts.
- Well defined guidelines that will conclude to the verdict. Minimize grey areas for the tribunal to act by.
- They have an understanding and education to make such calls and that their decisions have nothing to do with specific breeds.
- The dogs are being treated fairly.
- 3rd party on rotation for a fair and only get info on case in front of them with no pre existing info on the case
- The animal stays with the owners and owners must immediately begin behavior training for reactivity through the Humane Society, or another accredited dog behaviorist.
- Made up of a diverse group of people
- All parties can agree on conditions
- Due diligence is followed to determine the cause(s) of the vicious behaviour and the relationship between the dog and the owner.
- It must be made up of members of the community
- A tribunal is not breed specific.
- As long as there are members of the tribunal that have a professional designation regarding animal care or behavior.
- as long as they remain thorough
- It is not BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION. Should it be applied to all breeds equally I'd support it.
- The representatives would need training to hold the role to make decisions which are in the best interest of the animal.
- it should not have authority to euthanize.
- The dog should not be euthanized, as dogs that are driven to bite are not properly trained by their owner. Responsibility should be placed on the owner, including fines and mandated training for the owner and animal.
- Dog remained in the home not a shelter
- The choosing of tribunal membership should ensure that individuals are not overly sympathetic to dog owners and dogs.
- Focus on owner responsibility rather than fault of the animal
- Tribunal to take place within 7-10 days of an incident
- Tribunal members would need to be selected in a thoughtful way to avoid biases, and there would have to be oversight on the tribunal and a mechanism for appeals of tribunal decisions.
- that the tribunal does not go in biased to any breed of dog. I appreciate a tribunal would decrease the amount of time a dog is kept in a shelter since that can increase the trauma to an already stressed out animal however I don't think I trust a Tribunal that goes in with an 'agenda'.
- non-City representatives should be animal professionals and fanciers with up-to-date educations and experience with dangerous/nuisance dogs.



- Have people who specialize in dogs or other animals behaviours on the tribunal and also have professional dog trainers also present when making the decisions as they are trained and more qualified than the general public or appointed leaders.
- That cases and the people involved were heard, evidence was given, trained behaviorists could assess the animals. The animals were protected from labels that the public might be al to quick to put on them.
- Who would be on this tribuneral panel? SMEs related to animal behaviour and responsible ownership?
- Both sides of the story need to be heard from all parties involved.
- Don't bully the breed. Small dogs, fluffy dogs, all dogs can attack.
- Dogs should be given a chance before euthanized. Not caged up but worked with. More likely than not it's the owner who is bad and not the dog.
- The assessment is done by a professional
- it includes all dogs that bite
- Ensured that previous relationships of domestic violence and abuse of animal are considered before sentencing or decisions AND history of owner's animal abuse be ruled against owner,not animal.
- Tribunal should include the dog owner
- trained people and clear guidelines
- Severe bites being thorough investigation of all involved and whether there was any instigating by the injured.
- It be the choice of the owner
- must have people who are not bigoted towards breeds based on appearance
- Tribunal must be made up of actual dog behavioural specialists not bureaucrats.
- dogs with multiple offenses were secured at the owners property. le does not leave the property except for leashed, muzzled walks. And if this is not complied with maybe harsher punishments like extra fines or the removal of the dog from the owners custody.
- As long as the dog remains with it's owner, while the case is processed. No need to further scare and potentially harm the dog by having them in an unknown environment.
- The victim supports this system
- All dogs apprehended for severe bites should be taken away from their owners permanently and the tribunal should have the power to determine if the dog can be rehabilitated.
- I would support city officials that were properly trained to handle and assess the specific animals they are dealing with. The unfortunate reality of most dog bites is that it's mostly human error when it comes to training or handling the animal and honestly I feel that if the people deciding the fate of the animals were actually professionals we wouldn't have to euthanize so many dogs and could potentially rehome them rather than unnecessarily killing them.
- The family of the owners testify as well to talk about whether they feel the owner has correctly trained the dog. It cannot just be he said she said if it is an isolated incident...
- Tribunal



- The tribunal members would be assessed and vetted to be non-prejudicial toward specific breeds or heavily leaning to draconian measures when dealing with cases. Members must be fair, creative and genuinely interested in animal welfare as well as community safety.
- The tribunal needs to consist of people knowledgeable in the science of animal behaviour. Education is the key to fair and appropriate decisions.
- Why can't put response Not sure. Probably okay.
- assess and euthanasia
- There is no cost to protest against finding, and every effort should be focused on owner responsibility not destroying dogs
- So long as every effort is made to minimize euthanizing the animal (such as first-time offenses, or for those who frequently adopt older dogs that would otherwise have been euthanized). Also, that information to assist in obedience training be made accessible to any offender.
- Not target specific breeds and determine if the dog is actually vicious by uninvolved party
- On individual basis
- All dogs who have bitten have to wear a muzzle in public spaces and may be removed from owner if the bite victim chooses
- Ensure animal is in safe home.
- If the dog is owned by an irresponsible owner then the dog should be removed from said owner and rehabilitated...if possible.
- Tribunal representatives should be well-informed on a range of solutions to evaluate for each case what is best for the community, dog and owner.
- the dog was not euthanized but instead put in behavioral training
- The tribunal has no relation (personal or professional) to the dog's family, by-law officers, impacted victims, etc. Just like a jury for fair process.
- Eutheanizea of the dog should never be an option, dogs need training and proper ownership which should be the main goal of a tribunal which I would only support if also included representatives from rescue shelters & adoption/foster centres as well as a queens bench representative. We want to make sure there is someone there to speak for the dogs not just the justice department!
- Victim finds outcome of tribunal sufficient and dog owner can be monitored to ensure they're following conditions laid out.
- That there's representation from dog trainers or rescue associations that are unbiased towards different breed of animals. And further, that the panel is unbiased towards animal breeds.
- An appeal would be accessible to anyone and there would never be a rush to euthanization if the review deemed necessary. Adequate time should also be offered to get professional and expert assistance by both parties to help guide the decision.
- Animals generally don't do well in a shelter. Therefore the owner should be required to pay a bail so the dog isn't under a lot of stress. Behaviour training should be mandatory because fining the owner DOES NOT correct a dog's behaviour.
- I don't believe in the euthanizing of animals, they should be properly cared for and watched. They are just dogs, the owners should be held more accountable.



- Support systems offered to both owner and animal before euthanization considered. Support the animal and owner's rehabilitation.
- I would only support this if Calgary chooses to NOT adopt a BSL targeting "pit bull" looking breeds.
- As long as the representatives were selected randomly and decisions were made fairly after reviewing the cases.
- If the tribunal included a trainer that could determine if the dog was a nuisance do to poor upbringing and if able to be rehabilitated or not with new owners
- If euthanasia is recommended, it should go to a higher level court.
- That all dogs are viewed and no biases are placed on "pittbulls".
- If they determine the dog should be euthanized, it will be housed until the appeal is determined and finalized.
- as long as it allowed for a formal/legal appeal process if desired.
- Individuals given authority within the tribunal required a minimum level of dog behaviour education.
- Animal rescue members.
- No breed specific segregation. Regardless if it is a pit bull or not, the same process and analysis should apply.
- Members are not previously biased against "bully breeds"
- If the dog is dangerous enough to be euthanized, the owner should be banned from getting another one for up to 5 yrs . The owner should also have to take a register course on proper dog ownership and training.
- The people on the tribunal have been educated in dog behavior and understand not one breed is more likely to be aggressive. It depends greatly on environmental factors
- I don't think euthanasia is ever necessary. Require obedience training for both pet and owner
- That people involved are actual dog professional capable of assessing the situation, dog and commitment of owner
- Owner gets to keep the dog and does not have to pay out of pocket for any proceedings.
- As long as tribunal is made up of some members that are experts in issues of dog bites and probability of repeat incidents
- tribunal would not be declaring a dog to be euthanized. rather their only other option is to mandate rehabilitation to occur while waiting for a court decision.
- The members of the tribunal are split 50/50 city/non city members and have no previous association with direct animal bylaw enforcement.
- As long as the tribunal is split with 50% with advocates for any dog declared vicious or in trouble ... It must be fair or the dogs will suffer again
- Fundamentally, I do not agree with "vicious" dog definitions or dogs' destruction, since bad owners are nearly always at core fault. Conditions: the reduced time is not unreasonably short, to allow for long-enough and truly expert "assessment." Owners should be allowed to call in other behavioural experts of their own choosing as well (BAD owners wouldn't even bother). "City & non-City representatives" is far too loose a term; true experts MUST be consulted, e.g James Tsai of Arf Arf Bark Bark Rescue Foundation. If owners don't agree to restrictions placed, dogs still shouldn't be



destroyed, but given the chance to be rehabilitated &/or "downtrained" first, using ONLY true experts in same, then either returned to the owner or adopted out. Since even virtually all of Michael Vick's canine victims were successfully rehabilitated, that proves it CAN and SHOULD be done for most dogs!

- A tribunal should not be allowed to determine if any dog should be euthanized.
- If euthanization was off of that list, and instead determined that the dog would do rehabilitation through one of the shelters and then have to re-do obedience training. We don't put down people for biting. Why should we do that for any other part of our family?
- Does not discriminate against Pit Bull type dogs!
- A high level of transparency of how a decision was made and public availability of clear guidelines that outline how these decisions are made.
- They are unaware of the dog breed in order to provide a fair trail
- A specialized team of unbiased representatives that only handle cases of this nature
- Breed-specific legislation is archaic and not supported by data. I find the continued negative references to pit bulls very problematic coming from the City. It indicates a huge discrimination issue. You guys need to evolve.
- If it makes the process shorter and is fair
- As long as there's an appeal process
- Tribunal must consist of 50% dog owners and at least 2 should have professional background (training, veterinary etc)
- That representatives have knowledge and background in animal care and bylaws, such as veterinarians and animal control officers
- The tribunal must be impartial, experienced in dog behavior, and have no breed-specific biases. That is to say, it must be staffed by professionals with training.
- Non biased opinions on the dog and person
- As long as the dog isn't out down
- This applies to all dogs, not just dogs that look like "bully" breeds. Also the owner should be looked into more for the bite than the dog. There are only bad owners, never a bad dog.
- It did not euthanize a dog prior to court. This allows the owner to appeal the tribunal's decision at court.
- No euthanizing the dog
- If people are bias just because they like the breed or dont like it, or if there a big dog that 'could' do damage it should not be uthinised because of it.
- Put to more people who have dogs of different sorts
- Requires that the owner have to get training in how to properly take care of pets, especially dogs.
- Assessment of dog by at least one and preferably more than one certified behaviour specialist.
- Owner keeps dog at home.
- It has at least 7 members



- There was fair representation of people that have a high understanding of dog behavior not a bunch of pit bull haters.
- It is unbiased by the breed or appearance of the dog and owner.
- The tribunal was made up of vets and knowledgeable animal advocates, not city employees. The owners should be the ones to be held responsible. There are no dogs that can't be saved from bad owners.
- Representatives must include an expert that has experience with that animal (the animal's vet, it's trainer, caretaker at its shelter or breeder)
- Instead of euthanizing a vicious dog, put it through behavioral training with a professional.
- Must have qualified behavior specialists and vets to assess and the assessment must be done in the least stressful environment and take any added stresses of assessment into account.
- that the dogs are treated as kindly as if you owned them yourself
- Dog experts/ Vets are on tribunal
- No euthanization
- the victim was provided support to attend or to hire counsel (financial and psychological) and was given the opportunity to decline a tribunal if worried about intimidation or retribution from dog owner.
- The owner or owner's lawyer is also represented
- Extra considerations would need to be taken to ensure any "bully breeds" aren't being unjustly euthanized.
- The tribunal is completely impartial with no implicit bias towards pit bulls or other similar breeds
- the composition of tribunal has a majority of dog trainers and breeders on each tribunal panel.
- As long as the accuser has actual proof of said pet being a nuisance.
- If the representatives were non-biased and educated on both laws and domestic animals, specifically dogs.
- Owners are punished
- The dog was not euthanized based on breed but an interaction with a human
- Assessing a dog to be euthanized can only be done by more than one highly reputable dog trainer.
- There is no bias from the committee with regard to breed specific language
- that vicious dogs that have bitten people or seriously harmed other dogs are euthanized and the cost of the tribunal is at the dog owner's expense
- The dog stays alive no matter what
- Clear and impartial mandate
- As long as it is not used to rush a fair process
- Only for the sake of the victim, couldn't care less about the added 'inconvenience' or money for the dog or their owner
- Non bias toward breed; No breed discrimination.
- If someone is willing to adopt the dog in a set amount of time with training in mind, euthanasia should not be considered.
- It is able to listen to the owner and witnesses in person/video call etc, they have to see/meet the dog



- All tribunal members must be educated in dog behaviour and understand that breed punishment is not the solution
- Considering the owner as the only responsible of any incident, and avoiding punishment on the animal. The Owner must pay for animal rehabilitation and re introduction to social environment.
- Mixed races, mixed genders, mixed non animal owners and animal owners. No
- Don't euthenize people's dogs
- Only true dog EXPERTS, breed neutral TRAINERS/BEHAVIOUR specialists get to make the decisions and the dog welfare is truly maintained during the whole process
- as long as it includes professional opinions of a veterinarian on the team
- People with recorded cases of dog bites are banned from Having a dog
- Animal behaviorist, veterinarian, and psychologist are members.
- The animal has an aggression or bite history and it's not a one time offender in which case there's absolutely no reason for a dog to get put down.
- Have a vet also perform a temperament test to assess the dog's temperament.
- The dog is not euthanized unless it is a persistent offender
- The members of the tribunal are qualified ie Calgary Humane Society etc.
- As part of the tribunal committee a professional dog behaviorist is added. Many people do not understand dog behaviour and my concern is that there could be bias with tribunal members against our canine best friends.
- Not discriminate against different breeds of dogs
- Tribunal decisions would not prejudice in any way an appeal to Court of Queen's Bench. A decision to euthanize would also be out of scope of the tribunal.
- Euthanization should be absolute last resort, AFTER obedience training, assessment of trauma/abuse, and being available for adoption into a proper foster environment (approved for nuisance dogs)
- If there is a a fair chance for the dog such as 1. make sure the jury and judge have dog behaviour knowledge 2. are non biased to all breeds 3. Know the difference between a dogs aggression or the lack of owners knowledge on how to handle the dog or breed. 4 charge the owner more and make them take a animal training course rather then killing the dog 5. Euthanize the dog as very last resort!
- Decision makers must have expert knowledge in animal behaviour, and must remain impartial when it comes to breed
- The tribunal is composed of members who have no biase against breeds
- Everyone involved is educated on the matters at hand and there are guidelines to follow so biased opinions do not alter the situation.
- Absolutely no euthanization. Some human don't get more than probation for assault!
- No bias and transparent...fairness.
- Tribunal should include vets as well as dog trainers who can accurately judge the dogs temperament and owners handling.



- Any dog is immediately euthanized on the second bite, not taken to a shelter.
- A qualified impartial veterinarian, as well as a qualified dog handler/trainer are a part of this tribunal, and have equal/overriding vote on the matters.
- It is neutral and is run by knowledgeable dog people and not fear mongering people
- Steps are taken to ensure that those with an obvious bias are not allowed on the tribunal.
- As long as the people chosen for the tribunal have extensive experience with several breeds of dogs as part of their profession, e.g. dog trainers, dog daycare workers, veterinarians. People who have a fear of dogs should be disqualified.
- The owner needs to demonstrate training in management of dogs. Problem dogs are most often the result of problem owners.
- Fast turnaround!
- It does not single out one breed to be considered as a more severe nuisance than others.
- Don't euthanise the dogs. Instead, train them to have better behaviour.
- The tribunal is experienced in dog behaviours
- Don't euthanize the dogs
- Idk
- long as it reduced total costs rather than adding to them.
- Professional dog behaviorists must be part of the tribunal and the tribunal must take human actions into account e.i. Was a child allowed to torment and abuse the dog, etc.
- Decision to be put down not made by tribunal
- Right to appeal in the courts. No barriers to an appeal
- You need a second opinion on any decisions
- Those on the board are knowledgeable in people and pet behaviour.
- It's not the dog's fault they are aggressive. The dog shouldn't be euthanized. The dog needs training and re-homed.
- That the decision could be appealed before anything happens to your animal.
- The tribunal members must be DOG TRAINERS that are well versed in dog Aggression & possible reasons for
- If it was initiated by one dog and due to the size of the other dog an injury occurred both animal need to be looked at fairly.
- Veterinarian members.
- It needs to have dog experts on it
- Administrators making decisions are thoroughly trained and knowledgeable about the breed.
- Dog trainers/behaviourists are on the tribunal, an unbiased advocate for the dog is appointed, those on the tribunal are knowledgeable about dog behaviour, animal rights and do not support any form of BSL so that fair, impartial decisions can be made, owners take responsibility and fines, penalties, conditions are enforced.



- When it comes to the dog being euthanized, I think there should be complete proof of what the animal did. Not just one person's claim, and if the only evidence is bystander claims, there should be at least 3 bystanders that agree on what happened
- Following all rules and doing what is BEST for the animal.
- Very strict guidelines in front of a multidisciplinary committee.
- It occurs within a 2 business day time frame
- The tribunal has appropriate representation to reflect the community
- They have a biased opinion. Can't be against specific breeds when put on tribunal
- The dog and owner should take obedience classes together to assure the owner takes full responsibility for the dog/owner's actions.
- Dogs should not be euthanized
- If the goal of the tribunal was education and training for the owner and dog.
- Includes all breeds big or small
- There is no unfair bias against specific breeds
- The dog will not be put down
- There needs to be an appeals procedure in place. The tribunal cannot declare that a dog should be euthanized. Euthanasia should be outlawed in place of other solutions that focus on the root cause of the issue (there are no bad dogs, just bad owners)
- If the individuals chosen had experience and knowledge of breeds and looked at each case individually and fairly for all sides involved.
- Obedience training requirement before release, the option for the dog to be returned to the owner with restrictions while the case is going through court. Euthanasia only if absolutely necessary and only an option when an incident has caused either excessive harm to another person/animal or death to another animal directly related to the incident.
- It includes a recognized canine behaviourist.
- It would be comprised of dog behaviour experts and not just appointed city officials on a power trip.
- Panel members are a balanced representation of interests and values
- No tribunal members have a bias against specific dog breeds
- The courts processes.
- The tribunal members have ample knowledge and experience (or training) regarding the issue being discussed.
- They are not biased towards BSL
- So long as it was provided equitably, to all breeds of dogs.
- Non-City reps must be either animal lovers or work in or is a volunteer with an animal rescue organization.
- That if the tribunal decision was appealed by the dog owner, the victim(s) are notified so they could take action to defend their case.
- More control about the owner: the ability to handle dogs!



- Animal care professionals (e.g certified trainers, veterinary professionals etc) are included in the tribunal
- Tribunal members must complete anti-bias/anti-racist training workshop.
- That whole story is taken into account for every case and the tribunal doesn't become a death sentence
- if euthanasia is selected, it should go before a judge to deliver final ruling
- The tribunal is fair to the animal and supports alternative ways of keeping the dog and owner together as a family and working through the behavior problem. This is more effective in the long run and better for the dogs
- Provides consistency and is able to provide best accommodation and compassion for the animal. Many dogs are simply not given a 2nd chance when it is usually the owner who has not done proper training or care.
- The tribunal comes from as many walks of life as possible. Pit bull lovers and all..
- There are people who have knowledge and understanding of dog behaviour (such as from the Calgary Humane Society).
- Did not have the authority to euthanize dogs, only refer to court proceedings if their recommendation is for euthanasia. Also, gave a panel of behaviour experts to assess if a dog could be rehomed after training instead.
- The people on the tribunal can be objective and are not bias to one breed/type of dog over the other. As a young adult I was bitten by a small dog and more recently had my American Eskimo dog was bitten by a small dog; because of that I might not be as objective as I need to be about small dogs.
- Unanimous decisions, if not unanimously approved then deferred to the court
- A professional property credentialed expert is the one who assessing the dog and providing suggested restrictions, outcomes, etc. not just tribunal members.
- .
- There should never be an option to euthanize. It is inhumane
- Non biased opinion judge
- trained professionals representing the interests of the dog were represented on the tribunal
- How about dont add these ideas your making yourself look bad
- Members of the tribunal must have significant experience working with animals and include a balanced representation of citizen interests. Tribunal members should include veterinarians and experienced dog behaviourists.
- Aren't biased to dog specific breeds.
- Gives the dog owner a chance to explain. I have bad neighbors who tease/instigate my dogs through windows & over the fence!!!
- Includes representation from knowledgeable advocacy groups such as Justice for Bullies.
- Proper time to have Dialogue between both parties and a non-partisan third party
- If the dog and owner are cooperating
- A



- As the people were educated about all dogs and were not biased.
- Euthanization should be the decision of a court case.
- As long as the tribunal followed the recommendations of animal behaviourists and experts, using scientific studies to guide their recommendations. The requirement of proof should also be to the same standard as it is in court.
- Dog behavior specialist involved
- As long as all dogs involved in an incident or severe bite only are assessed on a case by case basis
- That the breed of animal involved in the incident does not hold more fault than the owner.
- Should there be an appeal and the dog owner is unsuccessful, the owner should reimburse the city for legal cost.
- As long as there is someone on the tribunal who works with a reputable and ethical animal organisation, such as the Calgary Humane Society.
- The dog isn't punished, it's retrained and perhaps rehomed. It's the owners fault for neglecting training or the animal itself.
- NO Euthanizing, i believe this to be a cruel method of control. we dont do it do humans we shouldnt do it to dogs.
- The tribunal consists of people from a variety of occupations, with no conflicts of interest, and have some experience in animal training or animal behaviour
- Any destroy orders must not be carried out until the owner has had a two week period to decide if they want to appeal. If they decide to appeal, the City should do nothing until an appeal decision is rendered.
- The tribunal needs to practice due diligence
- Determine, and review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal
- Dog owners need to be more accountable. A fine should reflect their income and be proportional. Higher income should receive a higher fine. Any bites are unacceptable and preventable.
- are verified as being unbiased
- Cost of appeal covered by the dog owner regardless of final decision
- Owners cost
- If the dog is to be put down that it needs to be determined if its the dog, or the owner. Most times the problem is the owner, not the dog.
- A dog sympathizer could not be a part of this tribunal (members must be impartial).
- Previous behavior is considered
- We need people who are educated, informed and experienced in animal behaviour on tribunal.
- Provided the tribunal is made up of experienced dog people
- It has fair representation by members that own the same type of dog in question
- the tax payer is not footing the bill
- All breeds of dog should be treated with the same expectations and held to the same regulations.



- I believe that even dogs that have been involved in biting incidents need to be evaluated fairly. The circumstances of the bite and previous behaviour need to be taken into consideration, as well as the owner's responsibility in the matter. In many cases, rehabilitation and rehoming solves all issues. This needs to be considered before euthanasia.
- Tribunals can be appealed at provincial court and/or court of Queen's bench. The right to decide euthanization is not given to the tribunal. The animal is to be evaluated by a professional trainer for its ability to be rehabilitated and suggested recourse as well.
- Aggressive dogs be given the option of adoption by people capable of rehabilitation. Bad dogs are a result of bad owners. A dog shouldn't be killed because it's owners are negligent/abusive. People with a history of bad dogs be banned from owning any breed.
- A nuisance dog and their owner must complete behavioural training during this time to show a dedication to making their relationship healthy.
- That a animal behaviourist was involved to spot underlying issues, or non apparent issues.
- That the dog be evaluated by several independent dog behaviour specialists. That the owner be able to visit the dog during the tribunal process.
- In instances of euthinization verdicts, an appeal process should be in place.
- Tribunal members must be educated, certified in animal bylaws/violence issues, and chosen by the community.
- A specialist dog trainer and vet must be on the panel at all times to assess dog behavior/ circumstances for the bite, as well as overall dog health.
- The owner gets a fair hearing
- I do not believe they should have the power to make the decision to euthanize, however a review of interim orders and restrictions would be a good idea to cut back on processing time.
- The representatives should be experts in dog psychology and behaviour. The stereotype of 'pit bulls' being more dangerous is conditioning too many people. The majority of the misbehaving pet dogs are not pit bulls, in fact, it is dogs of any breed, mixed or not, whose owner misses dog handling education or fails to take the time to train/socialize their pet. Mandatory training or rehabilitation should be the first line of intervention/prevention to be considered. In fact, anyone should be required to enrol at least in a basic obedience training program when taking a puppy or adopting a dog.
- Opportunity to retrain and recover obedience in dogs is offered before such steps as euthanization are taken.
- It did not discriminate against the breed
- Pit bulls should not be the primary reason or the only reason for this.
- If it were comprised of experts. Like Cesar Milan.
- When it comes to euthanizing a dog, that should be left to actual courts, judges, and lawyers. A family's pet might be put to death, a tribunal is not enough.
- As long as the tribune can still enforce punishments / orders similar to a provincial court.
- The tribunal would be fair, no additional expense to the owner or tax payer. Training dogs does not guarantee success and insuring the dog is impossible to enforce. We have a vicious cocker poodle



(not pit bull) that has received 3 years of obedience schooling from a kook using treats for when the dog is barking. It's not the dog's fault but the owners. Hit them where it hurts and stop hiking our taxes.

- As long as they didn't let people off easier than what they would face in provincial court
- Unbiased people on the tribunal.
- The dog could stay with the owner but kept on closer watch during the trial so less traumatized for dog and owner
- The members of the tribunal contains various types of dog owners
- That all parties agree to it.
- That eye witnesses have the opportunity to provide feedback to the tribunal
- That Regular static's be published such as breeds, offences, and verdicts.
- they are not BSL. Not all box breeds are aggressive and not all box breeds will bite. Have a FAIR tribunal. Because right now this legislation sounds like its only going after box breeds.
- Additional obedience, heavy fine for owner instead of declaring all "bull headed" dogs aggressive.
- There was no bias towards what is considered a 'nuisance dog' including size and breed.
- They agree to solution and follow through. If they don't, they lose their dog and it's euthanized.
- As long as the tribunal had someone who specializes in animal (canine) behaviour. All members should be working within their scope- for example vets or animal owners etc.
- euthanasia is automatically under a second review- by a third party vet, or another city's bylaw office, or the court of queen's bench.
- Give them the power to order compensation to the victim so the victim doesn't have to sue
- Includes individuals such as veterinarian and other educated animal personnel ! (trainer / obedience instructors) who can make a unbiased decision !
- How do tribunal members get chosen?
- The dog stays with the owner with particular rules depending on the individual case.
- If they have valid evidence that the dog was not at wrong, then yes. Adults and kids have provoked dogs to do bad things and that is not okay.
- The tribunal adjudicators are trained for their jobs, are impartial and taken from a mix pool of general public and animal behaviour experts
- D
- Severe or permanent injury cases, or cases involving death should follow the current process.
- To punish the owner, not the dog.
- remove dogs that have injured others from Calgary
- no discrimination against breeds
- Not to be breed bias. Pit bulls are not as dangerous as many other breeds. Be educated on the breed. Don't make this breed specific.
- Aim to protect the animal, offer training unless there is disease or medical condition that is the cause of the animal acting aggressively.
- ???



- knowledgeable dog representatives about breeds and behaviours are present
- Allowed for formal charges to be brought against the offending owner.
- Tribunal followed the recommendation of professional dog trainers that have assessed the dog for rehabilitation possibilities.
- Use of a tribunal system must not increase the time required for decisions to be made.
- Proper training of dog should always be considered first, or re-homing/re training dog. Look to owner as the first problem.
- The owner is also “assessed” to deem if they are in fact a responsible/fit pet owner. If the owner is found not to be (Ex. They are found to have been abusive, or have malicious intentions etc), there should be harsh punishment, and a life time ban against that person ever owning an animal again. Rehabilitation (PROPER rehabilitation) for animals included in a situation should also be provided. Animals should not be punished for man kinds behaviour, those animals who have become “vicious” due to years of abuse/mistreatment should be extended the same courtesy as any victim is - we always seem to find it easier to punish the offending animal...euthanize the dog that bit someone, but allow that dog owner to continue owning dogs and when it happens again continue saying “oh it was just a bad dog and needs to be destroyed” or “oh it’s the bread that made them vicious - we should ban and destroy that entire breed”.
- Eliminate the time a dog is in a shelter and ensuring that other methods, such as training for the dog and owner be employed before resorting as a last measure to euthanization. It’s not the dogs’ fault and they should not pay for the owners negligence. And “pit bulls” are not vicious animals, stop segregating them.
- Dogs should not have to be euthanized in any instance. As a dog trainer and technician, there is no reason a dog cannot be relocated. Humans are responsible for dogs, if a dog is misbehaving, this is due to human training. Dogs should not have to die because of lack of education by their humans. Every dog of every breed is at risk for becoming a nuisance if the owner is not educated. Pitbulls only end up in these scenarios because these dogs are easier to purchase for low costs shelters and backyard breeders. Education is the way to go!
- Yes but cannot result in euthanizing
- Take into account whether it is a first incident,
- More information needed in order to say for sure.
- that the appeal would not include the verdict the tribunal came up with so not to influence the appeal
- No profiling based on breed
- Euthanasia is cruel
- If appealed, the dog owner must pay monthly in advance for the dog to be housed with Animal Services (or alternate provider) until the appeal has been withdrawn or fully completed. This cost is non refundable, even if the appeal is successful.
- Only if there are consequences for the owner, not just the dog. It has been noted in many cases that the problem is the owner
- No dog owners or members of the Calgary dog lobby could be on the tribunal. Not even one.
- One non-dog owner.



- As long as both parties agree to it.
- It is a "fair" group of people in the tribunal with a knowledge base of the issues involved
- evaluations were made on behaviour, not breed
- Membership in the tribunal must include certified animal behaviorists.
- Dog gets to see their owner when waiting for trial
- Transparent, with knowledgeable, ideally expert panel members.
- If a dog is involved in a severe bite it needs to be kept indoors and the owners need to do obedience training
- SPCA/AARCS/HUMANE SOCIETY members are present. It cannot be just the useless city council and mayor. Animal advocates MUST be involved
- All parties must agree to a tribunal process, otherwise, go to court.
- There was no discrimination against dogs based on their breed.
- Does not have BSL integrated into it.
- No breed specific legislation
- must have rescue people on the tribunal
- It is balanced and impartial to breeds
- All parties represented
- Did not in anyway include breed specific bylaws and leaned toward rehabilitating both the dog and educating the trainer. Bad dogs get bad for a reason.
- As long as their decisions are fair and binding.
- The tribunal panel must consist of a balanced mix of bylaw and enforcement personnel as well as animal behavior specialists such as dog trainers or veterinary medicine personnel.
- Appeal to courts must be enshrined, especially euthanize decisions. During appeal process, dogs may be placed in a shelter at owner's expense, or some other guaranteed means of restricting dog's roaming.
- Our taxes aren't increased.
- yes
- Tribunal were persons with extensive knowledge & experience with dogs (vets, dog walkers, trainers, groomers, employees/volunteers from animal shelters, foster home conductors, etc.) Min of 5+ years working with dogs
- It was made up of representatives including vets, trainers and qualified animal shelter workers.
- Review viscous dog declarations
- The stated goal should be rehabilitation where possible. Decisions are public record.
- No breed specific bans or conditions. Some dogs are bad because they have idiot owners. It's never the dogs fault... it's their owner.
- As long as breed is not taken into account . Lifetime ban on dog ownership if the owner has been involved in multiple dog bite incidents
- Places equal responsibility on the registered owner as given the dog. Both need detention, training and re-introduction with others.



- Those sitting on the tribunal are knowledgeable about dog behaviours/ training / psychology / and have the best interests of the dog at heart.
- An order of euthanasia should be signed and approved by a judge of the provincial court.
- no euthanization
- Owner needs to provide proof of compliance with any imposed conditions
- Consisting of people who are actual experts in dog behaviour, and are able to accurately assess the incident and its causes.
- It is impartial
- The owners are more of problem than the dogs They need to learn obedience training
- That there is a look into possible teasing / egging on the dog, or someone going on the dogs property without the owners permission . Ensuring that this is not a first time offence and doing a proper investigation into the situation before any decision could be made.
- In the event of a decision to euthanize, the owner can still appeal.
- There was irrefutable evidence to support euthanasia
- Owner(s) held liable for ALL Damages, Medical Bills, Etcetera....
- Tribunal participants have some qualification regarding dog behaviour, not just an interested citizen.
- Actual dog behaviour experts are involved
- Any tribunal must have legislative backing, otherwise problem owners would not be under any real obligation to comply. Reducing trauma to dogs and victims should be a priority.
- Must be dog owners
- I would like to understand how the representatives were picked/assigned to ensure qualifications were accurate to make these decisions
- Remove the ability of the tribunal to decide to kill a dog. it is a huge decision and cannot be taken lightly or too soon. Due process. Who is adequately authorized to decide what dog to kill? Based on what criteria? Size? Defending itself?
- If all cases are carefully examined and euthanasia is a very last resort
- There should be at least one representative on the tribunal with a strong understanding of dog behaviour.
- The tribunal should include animal experts such as a Veterinarians and animal trainer.
- Independent
- Ensure Tribunal members are not biased against any particular breeds.
- It depends on who makes up the tribunal... make it fair - people that understand dogs
- The tribunal members aren't all supporters of breed specific legislation/discriminatory against certain breeds
- The dog is assessed by an independent dog trainer for behaviour
- Non city members should include individuals who are trained to assess animal behaviour and should also include members of animal rescue. An option to re-home the dog rather than euthanize should be considered in all cases - by including such members on the tribunal an assessment could be done on the viability of rehoming.



- Equal part dog owners to non-dog owners.
- It should not be a forum for debate. Have real responses ready for specific actions. It should not take 2 weeks to decide if a dog who attacked a human should be put down unless it was clearly provoked into doing so. Most circumstances needing intervention or investigation by officers do not need an IQ of 150 to determine where the fault lies. This should not be a body used to spend tax dollars and waste time.
- Decisions by the tribunal could be appealed at the Court of Queen's Bench.
- There needs to be a non biased tribunal. Like race if people hate a certain type of dog and it is involved they will not see the facts or help to move to a fair decision instead will condemn the animal based on looks and looks alone.
- People overseeing the process, or involved in the process, must include responsible pets owners.
- Vets and dog behavioural specialists should be required to make up the majority of the tribunal due to their expertise with animals.
- There is a transparent and inexpensive appeal process available to all parties of an incident being heard by a "tribunal."
- Both parties are considered. Each party is informed. IT is understood that each party exhibit understanding of pet ownership and coerced behaviour is absolutely not tolerated
- ALL OPTIONS for the pet must be considered. There are organizations around North America that take dogs like this. There are special pet owners who have advanced handling knowledge. There are rural communities that have farms where they'd be nowhere near other dogs or people. There ARE rehabilitation options. Dogs almost always bite when they're terrified and threatened or trained terribly.
- Emphasis is placed on the behavior of the owner that lead to the dog becoming a 'nuisance' dog. Was the human training the dog to bite, was the human using the dog for dog fighting, did the human look for guidance when aggressive behaviors were noted. Again, the dog is not naturally aggressive, remove dog from owner, place the dog with someone to work with a trained dog trainer to retrain the dog.
- I do not believe a dog should be euthanized for bad behaviour. The onus should be on pet owner too rehabilitate.
- Absolutely NO euthanization unless a human has been killed. Leaving a dog at a shelter is cruelty. Invest in fostering to get professional care and training
- Tribunal includes at least one citizen resident who has extensive knowledge of dog behaviour.
- Dogs are not euthanized just because of a poor owner. Owners should have more responsibility and training expected of them rather than blame the animal
- Both victim and owner must have the opportunity and clear process for appealing decisions made at tribunal
- The dog be allowed to remain with the owner and all circumstances of the incident be fairly reviewed
-
- Included conditions for surrender to a willing rescue in lieu of euthanasia in all cases
- Using outside people on the tribunal...ie vets, obedience trainers.....NOT by law officers!



- Qualified members with knowledge of animals not as opposed to law/bylaw or enforcement backgrounds.
- Must not require an increase in property taxes, but rather budget cuts from other programs.
- Dog remains with owner until sentenced. If the incident happened because of the owner, such as letting the dog off leash, the owner must legally respond for that and not just receive a fine.
- Any dog confirmed to be responsible for a severe bite or injury should be euthanized, no exceptions.
- Keep this limited to trained professionals with the best expertise on animals, not law enforcement.
- The breed of the dog is not the only factor in making a decision.
- The laws are followed.
- I recommend a low threshold for euthanasia in the case of injury to a person.
- That they are not biased against dogs based solely on breed.
- people can not be biased against specific or bully breeds
- It shows no bias Or prejudice to any one breed
- There is an option for both parties to escalate to Court of Queen's Bench. I strongly feel owners should be held criminally responsible (assault) for at fault dog bites.
- Had a minimum of 2 veterinary professionals and 1 certified behaviorist as part of tribunal
- Reducing upset for the animal, it should be temporarily placed in an appropriate foster, vetted foster home.
- Members of the tribunal must include at least 2 veterinarians, people that specialize in training animals, and those that specialize in animal behaviour. This tribunal should NOT be laymen or members without relevant expertise in animal health and behaviour.
- A veterinarian was involved in all decision making
- The tribunal would need to be made up of experience animal people that could work with the owners. Not just enforcement personnel.
- Provided all parties agree to the tribunal process instead of court process
- I would need to know more about the composition of the tribunal
- N/A
- conditional upon the tribunal consisting of fair and impartial participants with thorough education and understanding of dog behaviour
- As above
- list above seems to be rigid. Above has no reason to be any faster/reduce wait time as outlined.
- Well researched and educated members of the field should be an integral part of the process. Vets, animal rights, trainers, dog behavior experts. It is important that we don't ask people who know very little about dogs to make decisions on their lives especially considering this questionnaire specifically targets pitbull breeds.
- Focus on owner responsibility and ensure owner gets trained until they pass certified tests
- It would need to include vets and SPCA or Humane Society representatives
- Tribunal should not have the ability to mandate euthanasia, only recommend. A court order (in addition to tribunal recommendations) should be required to euthanize



- That they ensure that the dog doesn't suffer from fear aggression
- Tribunal members be trained and knowledgeable in dog behaviour
- Dog "bites" and "attacks" are very relative - i.e. a chihuahua vs a pit bull attack are quite different in risk and damage. Therefore there should be allowance for owners of smaller dogs that are deemed less risk to be restricted to the owners property or muzzled while out for a walks
- Appropriate qualifications of those sitting on the tribunal
- cannot put down the dog
- ?
- the reason of the attack.. what trigger the attack.
- They would allow the option for the dog to be rehomed to a rural property in an approved home as opposed to euthanasia. Unless the attack resulted in death of either another let or a human
- The individuals involved in the tribunal had sufficient training on relevant topics (such as on dog behaviour), and were fair
- As long as it can run in tandem with criminal / civil court proceedings to eliminate delays.
- It was ensured that it would be unbiased towards specific breeds and it looked more at the owner than the dog
- If it is not a pitbull, let the owner have the dog until it goes to court
- Pre-screening for breed bias
- As long as it is held to the same standard as the current model.
- The tribunal can recommend a dog be euthanized, but the family/owner of the dog should have the opportunity to defend their animal. In some cases a dog bites/attacks because they were provoked. I would hate to see an otherwise loving animal put down because someone else taunted/teased/or otherwise agitated the dog and got bit.
- professional dog trainer with experience with more aggressive breeds be one person on the tribunal. That there is a variety of socioeconomic representation on the tribunal. All are dog owners
- I would support as long as the tribunal makes ever effort to keep the dog and owner together if that is in the best interest of the dog. thx.
- The dog should have the opportunity to be trained or rehabilitation given by a proper handler or trainer. If that does not work, then additional measures be taken. Many of the incidents are because of the owner; it shouldn't be a punishment to put a dog down after one incident or where they had no training prior.
- Euthanization, is never to be an option. Training should an option with a dog behaviorist.
- If all members are breed neutral, do not support BSL (Breed Specific Legislation) as that would make them biased, and they must all be reputable animal professionals that have years of hands on experience.
- Not all dog attacks happen because the dog is vicious. There are MANY provoked attacks. Before a dog is labeled dangerous or euthanized, it should be evaluated by a vet for illness and by a behaviorist to determine its temperament.
- Any councillors who support breed specific legislation are barred from taking part.
- Animal welfare experts who consider the best interest of the animal must be on the tribunal.



- A statutory right of appeal regarding matters of law, not reasonableness.
- If the tribunal is made up of educated persons regarding dog breeds, behaviour, behaviour remediation, etc and all efforts are exhausted to rehabilitate / re-home the animals
- The Tribunal must include a dog training professional and a veterinarian.
- Decisions should be based on the individual dog's training, behavioural history, and on the competency of the owner. Bias toward specific breeds should not be tolerated.
- Unbiased to dogs and breeds.
- Ensure there are NON BIASED members. Your survey here clearly shows BIAS
- it is fairly reviewed. no basing on type of dog, and how many times its happened and if the owner is responsibly training or neglecting.
- All representatives must be in the dog training/behaviour world. Both force free and other methods. Balanced and unbiased opinions matter strongly here! Dogs who bite can be victims as well, as they are reacting out of fear not aggression
- As long as all parties are heard. Bylaw officers are never at the scene at the time of the event and the dog owner MAY have mitigating circumstances (e.g. the victim may have provoked the situation somehow)
- There is an enforcement and monitoring component that should happen regardless. Someone still needs to go out there and ensure rules and decisions are being adhered to.
- The victim can receive payment for injuries.
- Do not let the tribunal become stacked with dog fanciers who become more lenient than current system
- They cannot order a dog euthanized without a full inquiry.
- A team of several, unbiased individuals, better than your team for this project. Based on my experience working with the Court of Queen's Bench, many animal tickets handed out which included a small breed dog or cat are treated less harshly because they are "small", while most cases of bites involving children are actually breeds such as labs and golden retrievers, but as soon as your so called "pitbull" breed is mentioned, first instinct is for the uneducated to automatically euthanize.
- Euthanizing is an absolute last resort after the dog has the opportunity to go to obedience classes or follow other rules such as having a muzzle in public.
- All "authorities" parties need to be experts in their field, with some sort of educational background on dog behaviour. Not just on the job training!
- Included people with a professional background in training/caring for animals - as they would have the most accurate opinion in the assessment of the animal. Also, people who are unbiased regarding breed of dogs.
- The tribunal needs to operate objectively based on well-defined bylaws. A dispute and or appeals process must be available to dissuade bias and provide remedy when it is felt an unjust ruling has been made.
- Proper representation from both sides. Animal lover and neutral.
- Unbiased and knowledgeable tribunal members including veterinarians.



- Don't be biased against specific dog breeds
- Was a non biased system toward specific breeds of dogs, and treated every dog breed the same.
- It contains people who own and understand large breed dogs.
- If dog has a repeat offense they are taken from the owner
- As long as it was a court decision to euthinise a dog.
- It must take place promptly . Dog bites should NOT be tolerated at all .
- All dogs were treated equally by a team of court staff who actually know something about dogs and dog behaviour.
- I would only support it if it pertains to ALL breeds and does not single out one breed.
- the members of the tribunal included animal behaviour experts not just city officials and thay the members of the tribunal are evaluated by the community annually.
- This would on a case basis. Did a dog that caused damage threatened, defending itself? It would a case by case basis.
- As long the representatives know what they are talking about
- As those on this tribunal were educated in dog behaviour. And did not support BSL.
- A trained dog behaviouralist is present and provides guidance no matter what the breed is.
- A program for rehabilitation for the dog, instead of a fine, owner must pay for rehab. Euthanization must be the last choice! They can live under certain restrictions like the muzzle. They can always be relocated to a forever home if the one it is in is not suitable
- The tribunal needs to be composed of ANIMAL EXPERTS such as veterinarians and dog behaviorist not random people who know nothing about dogs, dog behaviour, etc.
- Yes
- Somebody with veterinary and/or training experience needs to be involved in this tribunal.
- Euthanization as a last resort only after full investigation proves dog is a risk to injure Again
- As long as both parties - esp the victim agrees
- That subsequent random visits are made to the owners home. There are no bad dogs just bad owners.
- Tribunal decisions are regularly reviewed for consistency and whether they have made a difference to the frequency and effects of complaints.
- As long as the the owners ability to control their dog is strongly looked at.
- they consist of intelligent people who can make real decisions on the animals.
- As long as it did everything possible to rehabilitate the dog instead of putting it down
- Not sure how tribunals work but would need to ensure those on the tribunal are chosen in a fair manner.
- Depending on the people determining the decision, that would include a licensed veterinarian and certified k9 trainer.
- Not confirm the euthanasia order
- Euthanasia is considered after other remedial efforts have been taken ie. dog training, muzzle and leashed on walks.



- quick, efficient, no years on doggie death row while careless owners appeal
- It was not discriminative against specific breeds, genocide is not okay in the animal kingdom either.
- A dog bites, period, it is seized and euthanized. Just like we do with bears, cougars, coyotes, or any other vicious animal.
- There needs to be a better definition of a "nuisance" dog. Pit bulls cannot all be lumped into the same category. For example, a 40lb pit does not present the same potential "nuisance" as a 120lb Rottweiler.
 - 120lb Rottweiler
- As interim period pending court case.
- Appeal process provided before action against the dog
- Does not discriminate against breed. Pit bulls are not the problem.
- all breeds are treated the same and not just focused on a specific breed.
- Standards and training are clearly defined and adhered to
- Yes
- As long as it's a major incident that includes death, vicious attack to people, kid's or other animal or including death.
- Using a true educated and qualified dog behaviourist.
- Due consideration be given to the life of the dog. Perhaps with a standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt if euthanasia is being considered.
- As long as there are NOT breed specific laws in place. The dog's master is his owner.
- Ability of person suffering personal or other injury (e.g. injury to animal bitten by dog) to pursue litigation
- The dog went through a test and the results weren't affected by the breed of dog
- Set a time limit for evaluations and appeals
- No bsl. Its racist and wrong. Any who do are the problem not the solution.
- it must expedite the process and not cost too much to set up
- Dogs which cause severe bites should be euthanized.
- They would be the first line of defence to sort which cases need to proceed to a higher level of consequence. The tribunal decisions should not involve euthanization orders. Only trained professionals should weigh in on that decision
- Euthanasia is taken at last resort
- When restrictions or seizure to a rescue takes priority over euthanasia.
- should have a set of criteria out line to follow.
- tribunal includes some pet owners. Owner of dog defendant has input to tribunal's review. If there is advice from vet or doctor it s/be considered.
- Ok
- It involves both victim and owner.
- That the tribunal members were dog poo wner as and had knowledge of dogs with regarded to most breeds.



- Owners should be able to speak their truth.
- The dog remains safe at home
- The representatives must not have any prejudices towards specific breeds, or have supported BSL in the past.
- They should review all interim orders, declarations, and restrictions, but should not be the ones to pass judgement on their behaviour. A professional, such as a veterinarian representative, should be the one to pass judgement. Lastly, the owners should be involved in all discussions regarding the dog's punishments and wellbeing.
- Destroy the animal.
- must include an recognized animal behaviorist as a representative. The animal must be fully evaluated for temperament etc. to get a better understanding of whether an incident was a 'one off' due to specific circumstances or whether there are clear signs that the animal poses a potential future threat to GenPop.
- As long as the owner is involved
- If they assess that a dog should be euthanized, the case should still go up to the court.
- They have the authority to put aggressive dogs down.
- As long as the tribunal is not staffed by biased people, meaning tribunal members should not all be dog lovers.
- Follow up with severe punishment for the owner, whatever that is - a hefty fine, possibly jail time, but no slap on the wrist.
- Breed specific bylaws are not in place and local rescue organizations are involved (outside of the SPCA).
- I would be in agreement with this if certain things are taken into consideration. A different residence for the dog could be an option meaning the dog could be allowed to live on a farm property away from the public instead of being put down. If not possible then allow the owner to be there when the dog has to be put down
- The tribunal must thoroughly consider every ethical option for the future of the dog (training to improve behaviour, giving the dog to another more equipped owner who can actually care for it etc) before euthanasia is considered.
- All costs and fees if maintaining the tribunal must be paid only by owners of problematic breeds and owners at fault
- If it was the 2 or more offence.
- The tribunal needs to consist of at least some designated animal experts (veterinarian, animal/dog trainer, etc. - volunteer basis maybe?). Otherwise, the non-City representatives won't be taken as seriously by the animal owner and possibly victim, which may increase appeals.
- Review mental health of owner. If found erratic and abusive take the dog away.
- Annual review to examine internal biases against those dogs who have a negative public persona (e.g. pit bulls, Am. staffs, etc.) to ensure fair enforcement.
- Those making the decisions are not biased (afraid of pitbulls, mastiffs, etc), have knowledge of training and behavior exhibited by various breeds and consider the owner of a dangerous dog a



large part of the issue. If the dog is euthanized all costs should be placed on the owner with a ban on owning such a breed ever again

- I would support
- As long the date dog owner is able to provide a statement and there are mechanism to help individuals through the process.
- How are the members of the tribunal selected in a way to ensure impartiality, and not stacked with say pitbull enthusiasts who white wash any offence one commits.
- It would help
- Diverse group, including trainers, rescue agencies, behaviourists
- Restrictions that owner needs to abide by the keep the animal
- They can't determine if a dog can be euthanized. Several factors and opinionons should be considered for that
- A dog owner of one of the problem breeds on tribunal
- Had members from the veterinary industry
- Dog training experts part of tribunal.
- consideration should be given if a dog is antagonized or provoked.
- Regular rotation of tribunal members, does not become another venue for delaying action, does not deny the attacked party the right to proceed in a civil action
- Provide education to tribunal to ensure there is a lessened bias when making decisions.
- Monetary costs to be paid by the owners of the dogs. It should not be up to the taxpayers to fund a tribunal for these dog owners.
- Tribunal members must all demonstrate familiarity and experience with the bylaws pertaining to animals
- Dog should be retrained rather than euthanised, in most cases it is the owner at fault not the dog
- Nn
- The dog owner should also be held responsible
- Most owners are aware of their dog's personality and risk factors. They are responsible for ensuring appropriate restraints and avoiding problems. Penalties as in fines and repercussions should be clearly stated and followed.
- I don't think its necessary, if its going to be a big cost to tax payers.
- That the dog is NOT automatically destined to be euthanized without trying something first
- Appropriate training and education for tribunal representatives is provided and kept current.
- Unspecific breed interpretation no terrorizing of pitbulls because they look like they're mean
- Tribunal members should be vetted to ensure they are impartial. Members should also regularity be replaced somewhat like jury duty.
- Victim impact statements are heard and considered
- Members of the tribunal should change frequently; those selected should be reviewed regularly to ensure they remain unbiased (somewhat like jury duty)



- The tribunal has enough power to be able to support the bite victim and penalize the dog/dog owner. The dog has just been apprehended for a severe bite!
- If there has been more than one incident injuring person or another animal
- Harsher penalties should be handed out to owners whose dogs have injured other animals and people.
- The welfare of the human victim is paramount
- Public safety is utmost, a tribunal may be too inclined to protect a dog and its owner rather than the public at large
- All decisions were reviewable at a court
- They are actually willing to euthanize a dog
- Must have a majority of certified animal trainers on the tribunal board..
- if nuisance dog owner is repeat offender then court and no longer allowed to own any animal
- Is as harsh as the court
- Those on the tribunal are educated on breeds and do not discriminate against certain breeds.
- Nuisance dog and their owners have ONE chance. If a problem occurs again, dog is automatically put down and owner charged.
- p a tribunal as long as all dogs are considered equal
- The owner of the problem dog remains on scene until authorities arrive.
- The owner may choose a tribunal or court.
- Professional in the animal institute must be on the tribunal. Vets, animal behaviourist
- automatic appeal if dog deemed aggressive and should be euthanized
- Fair and just evaluation and result, not dependent on breed, but behaviour.
- Any penalties would have to be harsh and binding including jail time for the owner of the nuisance dog
- If there were the option to rehabilitation or other options before euthanizing.
- Yes
- Euthanization shouldn't be an option unless all other options of rehabilitation have been explored and were unsuccessful..
- There is an attempt to recondition the dog and the owner before the euthanasia is preformed
- Tribunal must be overseen by experts in dog ownership and training to ensure that all possible options are used before euthanasia
- That euthanasia wasn't the only option given
- Involved at least one individual qualified to conduct behaviour assessments (such as at cochrane humane society)
- It indeed was a shorter wait period and the representatives had an understanding of dogs/dog behaviour and their priority was to return the dog to its home quickly with the necessary supports to prevent another occurrence.
- A licensed veterinarian & dog trainer where part of the tribunal.



- The tribunal must have at least two independent reputable, certified dog trainers / dog behavioral specialists that can assess the incident properly. These decisions should not be left in the hands of people without the proper knowledge.
- No prejudice towards a certain breed
- Certified dog behaviour expert must be one of the tribunal members and an assessment performed on dog by a certified behaviour expert in more serious cases when a dog is in consideration for being euthanized.
- Required rehabilitation or obedience training for dogs with single/minor offences, to increase the chances that they will be able to remain with owner or be adopted by another responsible owner.
- There must be a reasonable representation of dog owners and non dog owners on the panel
- indifferent
- Vetting the individuals who are on the tribunal would be important so that bias isn't present in decisions.
- Rehoming was prioritized over euthanizing.
- Membership in the tribunal should be restricted to persons with legal and community protection/civil rights expertise and exclude persons who have a vested interest in promoting animals (e.g., members of SPCA, breeder groups, dog advocate groups, shelter operators or supporters, PETA, etc.
- Not specified by Pitbull
- that the dog is evaluated on the basis of its behaviour and not its breed. That rehabilitation be considered.
- Consists of people knowledgeable in the area of animal behavior
- There should be more than one adjudicator on each case, and no prejudice against any certain breed.
- Honesty
- Depending on the people who were making the decision. They would have to be educated in the animal industry ie vet, dog trainers..
- Don't make it breed specific and engage veterinarians in the evaluation of dogs
- That the dog is immediately put to death with no appeal
- The dog can remain in the care of the owner.
- Too much power is put here in a court that won't necessarily take it as seriously (even some human life isn't in court). Tribunal is fine but should not have a say on euthanization. It must be an unbiased risk assessment without a fate suggestion included.
- Quick turnaround
- Must remain unbiased as in the person is not afraid of pitbull or other terrier dogs when deciding.
- They didn't discriminate based on breed.
- Comprised of dog owners knowledgeable about a variety of breeds
- no biases
- What's the difference between options a and c?



- there needs to be a way to appeal the decision for/against
- Unbiased and knowledgeable members of the panel are a must, people who work with animals not politicians or bored middle class house wives
- a fair and unbiased selection of representatives
- Decisions are not based on a pet's physical appearance.
- There would need to be animal behaviorists on the panel. City employees don't have the expertise
- Those involved in deciding the dog's fate be fully educated in dog behaviour and training, and that no BSL bias is involved in decision making.
- Veterinarians and professional dog trainers only
- I support
- *as long as there is no breed specific legislation. Otherwise I do not support a tribunal.
- As long as appeal is available as specified above.
- Before a dog is euthanized, there should be mandatory behavioural training in order to correct the dog's problem behaviours. Most dogs are able to change their behaviour when given the proper care and training. I also believe there should be an investigation into the current or past owners of vicious dogs if applicable, to see if they were given the proper care. Dogs do not become vicious on their own, they are always reacting to a negative environment in which they have been placed.
- Tribunal would include several members (no single person making the decision).
- N/a
- Someone who has a knowledge of animals, such as a shelter/vet clinic volunteer. Also at least one tribunal member should have a satisfactory history of animal ownership and currently own a licensed animal.
- There is factual evidence of the dog's behaviour and there are professionals that understand the animals there to assist in the decision making
- more information about who the City and non-City representatives are - are these people accredited and/or experienced experts?
- I am concerned that quick decisions may be made and dogs may be taken away or euthanized when they should not. I would want to ensure that correct decisions are made in the best interest of everyone.
- If the city is referring to the dog as a particular breed then it must follow through with proving the breed via CKC/AKC registration or DNA prior to labeling in order to remain accurate. A lot of amazing well bred purebred registered dogs are being lumped in with dogs of mixed heritage.
- House arrest and muzzled on walks
- They looked at every viable option before deciding a dog needed to be euthanized
- The representatives be HIGHLY trained in the area to be able to make these kinds of decisions
- Proper investigation needs to occur, lots of things need to be considered while putting a dog's life on the line. Ownerships, past care etc. Keeping a dog locked up after a traumatic incident or a trigger isn't going to display their proper characteristics. They are an animal with instinct, it can take up to 48 hours for them to process and cycle through emotion and fully calm down. They should be kept with their owner during the time of review.



- the dog goes into foster care or special care for its trauma or behavior disorder.
- The tribunal had final say and couldn't be challenged.
- That the members were not prejudiced towards any specific breed or animal.
- Don't hold dogs in a shelter. They just get house bound
- Certified dog behaviorist and a certified force free trainer is part of the tribunal to ensure there is a good understanding of dog behavior
- Vicious dog owners should be banned from having any dogs in future.
- The tribunal members would need to be carefully select or elected.. tribunal details would be advantageous to public knowledge prior to formation.
- it was objective and not biased (e.g breed bias not allowed)
- I believe dog training experts should be involved Pit bulls are not the problem but bad owners that do not properly train their dogs are. One must be an expert On this dynamic to assess a dog and its owner
- Determine the right measure depending on the scenerio
- No euthanasia. Dog should be removed from home and go to a behaviour specialist until ready to rehome to an owner than can handle it.
- They are trained in science based animal behaviour and not pop culture expert knowledge of dogs.
- It included members who do not support breed specific legislation, but rather responsible pet ownership policies.
- Having the power to ban the owner from owning a dog in the city again with the ability to forward that decision to be upheld provincially as well
- A significant portion of tribunal members had the training necessary to meaningfully assess the dog's behaviour relative to the situation and determine how likely another, similar incident will be.
- I would support the tribunal if the dog is not euthanized
- As long as someone who is trained in dog behavior is on the review panel and they are able to assess the dog, it's living conditions and it's handler interactions/training habits and methods before determining if it is something to do with the dog (health/trauma/reactive) or if it's the person's treatment of the dog and the dog is able to be rehabilitated in a new setting
- How do you insure the members are always fair and reasonable?
- If a vicious dog is released back to the owner with restrictions, there needs to be significant oversight to ensure that the owner is following the restrictions and that the dog is not endangering the public.
- There was still the avenue open to move a case through the courts if it was deemed severe enough, for example, if a dog was purposefully used as a weapon against another person or dog.
- if the victim of a dog bite was proven to have tresspassed, harassed, or in anyway agitated the dog the victim will be punished and the dog will not be harmed will have no record.
- Tribunal run by persons with legal background
- That the dog be helped and not Euthanized. It's the owner not the dogs fault.



- There is no biased individuals on the tribunal. They must be impartial individuals who have not campaigned against a pit bulls or other nuisance breeds. Additionally, the type of animal/size/age/weight must all go to tribunal. For example, if an chihuahua had bitten someone I would expect the same steps. They are just as vicious as some other dogs.
- The tribunal does not have the power to authorize a euthanasia of any animal
- Cannot be prejudicial towards a dog breed.
- The tribunal includes experts in the field of dog behaviour such as a board certified veterinarian behaviouralist. This cannot be a decision made by a city staff member uneducated in the field of dog behaviour.
- Both dog owners and both dogs were assessed in the event there is a serious dog fight OR dog bite to a person(s) or a dog(s).
- As the animal (if able to) is returned back to the owner until a decision is made and not in a shelter.
- Fairness.
- the dog remain with the owner but not allowed to leave the property.
- Those on the tribunal be qualified and knowledgeable.
- As long as the tribunal members underwent education on the myths regarding "put bull" type dogs and their bite strength, the actual effectiveness of BSL, and animal behaviour experts were consulted for every case.
- The tribunal would need to have multiple animal behavior specialists involved in each case. These specialists would need to come from diverse training backgrounds, i.e., the city should involve those from both balanced and force free approaches.
- At least 60% of the tribunal are experienced dog owners
- as long as specific breeds are not targeted
- Any dog that causes severe damage should absolutely be euthanized immediately!!!
- The tribunal is representative in terms of diverse genders, education, pet ownership, and culture.
- If it speeds up the process and potentially gets the dog back to the owner quicker it's a good thing.
- Cases could appealed before the animal is euthanized
- That the dog still remains in the shelter while tribunal processes the case. If the tribunal is faster, then the dog is not in the shelter for as long. Or, have the dog start at the shelter, then once terms of release are agreed upon, the dog can then be placed back with the owners. I feel the dog being taken away for at least a short period of time send a message to the owner about the severity of the situation. The other option is to charge the owner for their dogs stay in the shelter.
- If they are dog owners and dog trainers, it's not the dogs fault 90% 9f the time the owner is to blame, ie lack of training and corrections and affection.
- if a dog is not possible to be rehabilitated. Euthanasia should be an absolute last resort because a pet life should not be considered less than a human life.
- Yes
- Yes
- People on the tribunal have experience to deal with these situations.



- Review previous incidents, assess the dog and place restrictions on the dog and owner
- It is upsetting to me that a dog is blamed for behaviour when quite frankly I feel it is due to irresponsible owner behaviour. The owner in this case should have to attend mandatory dog behaviour education and perhaps be banned from owning dogs until they do so.
- No BSL or racism against bully breeds. Attempt at all costs to reach non-euthanasia solutions
- As long as the dog owner pays all costs for the appeal at the Court of Queen's Bench.
- Dogs are not euthanized for something that is their owner's fault. There should be a focus on training and rehabilitation, not on euthanizing dogs. If the owner isn't capable of dealing with training the dog then the dog should be rehomed.
- It happens Quickly
- A dog behaviorist outside of city employment and humane society is on the board
- Owner pays the costs of the tribunal.
- Representation from the Calgary Humane Society must be on the tribunal
- The tribunal would have to be a good representation of the population including people who own a variety of dogs and those who do not own dogs. I also believe the decision should be unanimous and not a "vote".
- Pitbulls are not viewed ANY different than other breeds. German Shepard's are equally as strong and yet are not penalized.
- The tribunal MUST be made up ONLY of professional dog trainers and veterinarians who understand why the dog is in this category of aggressive, and they must be allowed to ascertain the home environment of the dog. Euthanizing a dog should only be a last result wherein the professional determine that the animal cannot be retrained.
- As long as it isn't breed based.
- A dog behaviourist or expert is able to assess the animal and be part of the tribunal. Full investigation all animals/people involved and actions leading up to the incident. People need to also show respect towards the animal and pay attention to said animals body language and overall situation.
- If bylaw officers become efficient and responsible in actually reducing the inherent danger of pitbulls
- The tribunal cannot make the final decision for euthanizing the dog.
- It should also reduce overall cost to the court system
- Look at the underlying reasons for the vicious behavior and consider finding a better home or situation for the dog - ie: Rural location, or with adults if it isn't good with kids, etc.
- It contains experts in dogs, especially vicious ones, so its decisions are unbiased, extremely informed, and reasonable.
- the way it was raised ,tge living conditions of said dog
- Further details on the election of the tribunal system to fairly and equally represent the city, owners, and dogs. And incidents should put focus on dog owner more than the pet to put in place corrective and preventative behavior going forward.
- They do not make their decision based on breed but based on the dogs condition and behaviour.



- Tribunal system cases should NOT be allowed to appeal to another authority (Court of Queen's Bench) as this only prolongs the process.
- The process is started within 1 week of the incident.
- Dogs are kept in their homes with the condition they are not let loose.
- The restrictions would still be enforceable on the owner even if it was outside the court system
- An animal learns what it is trained, people who are unable to care for a dog should be fined heavily and excluded from future pet ownership. Explore if the dog could be retrained or placed in another environment.
- The dogs are not given another chance to bite
- that the owner pay severe and appropriate penalties to a victim when there is an attack.
- restrictions and harsh fines for bad owners. pit bulls thrive with good owners. the bad ones need to be punished, rather than the dogs
- As long as they use witnesses at the incident and the owner can have family members that know the dog more personally
- Appropriate qualification for those sitting on the tribunal
- Dog receives training to try and curb aggressive behaviour
- A non biased decision not based on breed but the death of severity
- how would people be chosen for the tribunal - at least one needs to be a non-pet owner
- The tribunal seats be filled by NON-BIASED, educated individuals (i.e, veterinarians) who do NOT see certain breeds as more harmful than another.
- It still can involve criminal charges of the owner for not abiding by the restrictions placed on the dog. Bad owners should be charged in the justice system not city bylaws.
- Non-bias breed clause. We should treat all animals kindly. If the animal is an aggression repeater, the animal should do obedience training and then a muzzle in public
- No euthanasia. Retraining and forfeiture by the owner.
- Panel members must have a thorough understanding of dogs. They should be dog owners themselves and they should be well versed in dog behaviour.
- Individuals have the right to appeal in a provincial court of law
- How are the members of a Tribunal selected?
- It does not become an equally slow process
- be fair to all breeds
- Owner must take approved course on dog behaviour, handling and training
- In the case of a death or more than one bite reported. Bite incidents can be recorded by bylaw and if there are more than one incident of bites then there should be a course of action taken against the owner.
- As long as the tribunal was made up of qualified professionals (veterinary professionals, certified behaviourists)
- The tribunal representatives would need to be made up of a reasonable selection of the community. For example, the tribunal could not be made up of a group of people who are active against pitbulls,



or bully types of dogs. Judging by the wording of this survey, it sounds like many people who are involved are already firmly against "pitbull" type dogs. "

- Fair non biased opinion
- Veterinarians and/or animal hospital workers with no bias toward any specific breed be on the panel. Actual experience across various breeds versus propaganda and fear mongering.
- As long as the dog was allowed to stay with it's family during the process.
- As long as all non-kill options are carefully explored.
- All members of the tribunal must be existing or recent dog owners
- People on the tribunal must also own dogs. This will avoid those that are anti dog and would not look at the situation as all dogs are bad.
- The representatives were actual animal/dog owners themselves.
- Be careful who is chosen for tribunal. Must be unbiased
- Dog should never be euthanized. It is never the dogs fault. It is always the Owners fault. The dog should be given to shelter / rescue to be rehomed to a family that will take the appropriate steps to train the dog. Under no circumstances should the dog be euthanized. It is not the dogs fault.
- At least one of the members must be a practicing law practitioner
- Fairness for the animal
- Depending on the bias directed towards specific breeds. All dogs big or small have the capacity to attack and cause damage.
- A clearly defined mandate, open and transparent. Defined cost upfront, with the loser paying. This would limit the number of marginal cases brought by the city and limit abuse of the asymmetrical financial and power advantage held by the city.
- No "second" chances for dogs; immediate euthanization...this would save money all around in the long run. People who keep menacing pets, are only on a ego trip.
- The owner needs to abide by restrictions and be required to pass training class with their dog.
- i would support this as long as it does not involve bias against a particular dog breed. review of incident details and follow up actions should only be based on facts, not assumptions of dog breed characteristics.
- costs must be controlled
- only if it will be done faster. If it can't be done faster then there is no point bringing in another Business Unit.
- An animal behaviour specialist is part of it and they are have NO association with the city of Calgary
- No Breed Specific Legislation
- All incidents should be treated equally, regardless of the breed involved.
- Representatives MUST also include a professional in the canine field (dog psychologist, trainer, humane society member, etc...)
- Tribunal members must be animal experts from the field, and not advocates nor counter-advocates to the already listed breed-specific issues
- No dog should ever be euthanized



- Criminal charges for the owner
- All members of the tribunal must own a pet of the same type as the one on trial.
- Wondering how the tribunal would be formed.
- As long as the individual performing the tribunal has expertise in dog aggression
 - dog training implemented and reviewed by independent company: (2) assessment provided based on whether it's the dog or the owner, and if the owner - removing the dog and finding a new home vs. euthanizing.
- If the persons on the tribunal were qualified to accurately assess pet behaviour, temperament and provide alternative supports for the animals and owners.
- As long as the representatives are trained in animal behaviour and can therefore properly assess the incident.
- No dog should be euthanized
- Decision is based on incident and not on breed
- Members are trained, their serving terms are limited and restricted with no ability to serve back to back terms and a limitation of two to three terms in total, they keep up to date with what normal behaviours are for dogs and apply a non-biased approach. They must remain ethical, disclose conflicts of interests and must have different backgrounds to maintain impartiality.
- Same day decisions with no chance for appeal
- Aaaaaa
- The "jury" or whomever is making the decisions, should be comprised fully, or almost fully, of individuals who have dogs/animals or have worked directly with dogs/animals. It's unfair to put someone in charge of a decision regarding an animals life if they have no idea how dogs/animals act and how to interact with them
- Keeping kennel time low as possible
- The dog is not euthanized because its breed is "deemed" vicious. ALL owners of pets dogs, or cats, MUST be responsible for them! You want a pit bull, required classes. You want a jack russell, classes! Some just buy a dog (or cat) because they want to and they don't know what all is entailed with the huge responsibility! Education! Classes! Lessons! And make them afford! Not everyone is rich in this province!
- Decisions would have to be effectively enforced.
- The victim should be the the focus a human being attacked by an animal. Society are allowing animals to kill babies, kids, human beings and we are treating it as if verbal dispute. If the tribunal is not a dog and pony show, that doesn't fails to follow through in upholding strict consequences. If people are cannot afford the expense in having a pet they should not have one in the first place. Movie stars have huge yards and lots of money and so poor people should stop following Hollywood.
- As long as all breeds are tried in the same manner. Focus on the severity of the infraction. Not the breed
- That those on tribunal reflect a cross section of hands on experience & common sense without bias and breed prejudice.



- People with appropriate qualifications should be on the tribunal, including animal behaviour specialists.
- The animal is not deemed guilty or a nuisance based on its breed or appearance. Solely on the facts.
- Tribunal representatives are current experts in this field, have past experience assessing these orders and show NO discrimination to specific breeds of animals under assessment. The panel will be made up of representatives from varying animal backgrounds ex. vet, private animal rescue workers, public shelter care workers, obedience trainers etc.
- No euthanasia for behavioral issues. Order rehabilitation at owner's expense. Dogs should not become victims due to human negligence.
- Veterinarians would need to be involved
- The cost of said tribunal must fall on the owner of the pet being investigated.
- Ensuring that the pet has actually been mistreated to lead to the violent behavior.
- Depending on who sits on the tribunal.
- The dog should remain with the owner until the case is heard and decided by the tribunal. During that time the dog should not be allowed to leave the owners property unless the dog needs medical attention.
- Do not put down dogs unnecessarily. Force owners to get remedial training, and dog stays secured on property and/or enclosed, safe yard.
- If you look at all cases, who caused the attack either the owner, victim or dog. It's not always the dogs fault! It's usually how the owner trained the dog or the victim doesn't know how to treat or be around dogs and sets the dog off!
- As it is fair for all parties involved and the owners are held responsible if necessary
- Tribunal was made up of people proven to be unbiased on the topic of policing certain dog breeds.
- If appropriate people without bias are appointed.
- No dog should be euthanized, when humans commit actions like this they don't go directly onto death row. Why would you even consider doing this to a dog? People are let off on bail if they've hidden a dead body, there's no reason as to why an animal should ever be euthanized.
- It shouldn't cost the taxpayer anything. Costs should be covered by the problem dog owner.
- Tribunal decisions should not be appealed as it would waste Courts' time on minor issues that can be dealt with by the Tribunal.
- The dogs home life/ ability or willingness of owner to train, health of dog and quality of life.
- The tribunal does not decide to euthanize an animal
- I think a tribunal could be effective if it is properly and fairly overseen by people with no bias and educated on the facts of the matter - not based on emotion or hearsay or limited fact.
- The tribunal is comprised of individuals who are specialists in animal welfare and behaviour so that a dog who bit because of the situation it was put in (i.e. being tormented by a child, cornered, in pain, stressed ect) is not euthanized unnecessarily. Sometimes great dogs do things out of fear/protecting its self if pushed to its limits.
- Tribunal members have the education and experience to make such determinations.



- Have the owners assessed if they should be allowed to own dogs in general. Most of the time the dogs are aggressive due to the owners and not the dog itself.
- A protocol to deal with dogs that have been professionally assessed as dangerous or vicious (eg. euthanasia or confinement).
- must be cost effective, reduce wait time significantly, and have knowledgeable members appointed
- The Tribunal reviews the entire case and actually has knowledge on dog behaviour. Dogs first instinct is not to attack, they give plenty of warnings prior and testing a dog in a stressful environment like a shelter is not a good way to indicate their behaviour as it's stressful place.
- Those on the Tribunal are appropriately qualified. I would have to look more into what I would deem as appropriately qualified though.
- Representatives must include professional trainers/behaviorists, and a vet.
- Dogs should not get euthanized instead the owner should be ordered to go through training programs to better control their animal.
- Who would be on the tribunal? What background would they have? Would they be volunteer or paid? If they have an appropriate background in animal training/behaviour or similar, it could be reasonable. If they are random members of the public - no.
- fair and impartial representatives
- Followed the law and bylaw without bias
- *did survey on my phone I couldnt read the answers from the drop down
- I dont understand the difference. I would need more information.
- un biased people on tribunal
- Euthanasia should be a last resort, as the issue is frequently not the breed, but the owner and training.
- They would be fair and unbiased towards people and dog breeds
- not significant extra expense
- It is not breed specific
- There would need to be a mix of vet's and animal behavioural specialists as well as the general public, always including an owner of the same breed of dog, as well as someone whom knows the dog but does not own the dog that is being reviewed.
- Must be as unbiased as court. No preconceived ideas about types of dogs and behaviour.
- No BSL!
- It was fair and just for the animal, not biased towards the humans.
- ff
- The dog is observed for its nuisance behaviors in its home rather than the shelter.
- Euthanasia of the dog is more often than not inappropriate. Dog incident occur most frequently due to inappropriate training and handling allowing the dog to be placed in a dangerous situation. The dogs should be rehabilitated and rehomed where possible, not immediately euthanized.
- As long as the dog is not euthanized due to serious cases rather receive proper training for both owner and dog



- Understanding the qualifications of the individuals on the tribunal and levels of expertise in assessing each case
- Responsible the owner for the dog behaviour and provide rehabilitation to the animal
- No additional public taxes
- If the dog must be euthanized from a decision, the decision should be reviewed by a team that consists of vets, CPDT-KA trainers and behaviouralists. Dog should have to pass a medical examination first to ensure no neurological issues could be present etc.
- The victim must agree to by-passing a formal trial. There also should be multiple animal experts, such as veterinarians, on the panel of representatives.
- Fff
- The tribunal is procedurally fair, the tribunal as an appeals board, and all decisions of the appeal board are reviewable by the Court of Queen's Bench.
- Yes
- It is more efficient and cheaper then the current approach.
- A tribunal would work ONLY if it APPLIES TO ALL BREEDS and NOT singling out breed specific dogs.
- it did not increase wait times
- Actually qualified people. Not just nepotism.
- a chance to give evidence
- As long as it wasn't too soft on nuisance dogs.
- No discrimination of the breed.
- If both sides can be heard out appropriately to determine why the situation escalated in the first place. Not just listening to one side of the story. Likely needing a witness. And/or involving an animal behaviourist in consultation to aid in decision making processes.
- Members of the tribunal exercising decision making authority should have real expertise in dog training, especially as concerns problem dog behaviours such as reactivity. Dog training agencies should also require better certification. There are too many dog trainer operating in Calgary who have no idea how to handle problem dogs, but claim that they do.
- Only within reason, a danger to other dogs or humans only.
- As long as there are guidelines and accountability.
- There should be a maximum time limit on dogs being in a shelter awaiting the Tribunal. If possible, dogs should be kept with owner under "house arrest" type conditions (i.e. muzzled when off property).
- I would support a tribunal to shorten the time frame for all involved but the members of the tribunal must be impartial nonpartisan people with accredited expertise in the fields of veterinary medicine and animal behavior.
- Must not incur costs to general taxpayers.
- Dogs are not euthanized
- Made up of unbiased qualified people with expertise in animal behaviour and rehabilitation



- As long as it is handled fairly and the people involved have the choice to proceed to the courts if they don't like the outcome but at their expense
- I support this idea so long as it does not result in an increase in property taxes.
- They respect the life of the dogs as a full living and the need for the animal over the owners. As it is the owners responsibility to be sure in all time the animal is protect , feel secure, and respect as a full leaving like anyone.
- That a minimum of 2 professional animal professionals (ie. behaviorist, Vet, professional proven reputable trainer) was included as representatives.
- Minimum number of people in the board
- The responsibility level of the owner is determined. Has the owner done their due diligence in training? Has the owner provided an abuse free home with plenty of exercise and mental stimulation for the dog? Has the owner had previous nuisance or aggressive dogs? Was the dog provoked? Was the dog frightened?
- dog owners paid for the cost of the tribunal
- Tribunal members had requisite skill and experience and no preconceived biases towards specific dog breeds
- N/a
- Must be qualified and understand animal behaviour.
- As long as the tribunal will not hold any breed specific biases and make the decision based off the evidence, looking to the owner to see what they have done or not done that could have caused the dog to bite.
- Bully breeds should not be held to a different standard than any other breed.
- Members of the tibunal should be dog experts rather than regular people. Experts in dog behavior, vetrinaians, professional dog trainers. Regular lay people will may rash, emotional and uninformed decisions.
- As listed above. The owner needs to be held far more accountable than they currently are. Yes the dog may be vicious, however they didn't get that way on their own. Determine if rehabilitation is possible for the animal before deciding euthanizing is the only option, substantially fine the owner and if warranted seize the animal from the owner without possiblity of it being returned.
- no breed specific decisions-all dogs can be good or bad.
- Members rotated often or case by case
- As long as it followed the condition that the dog severely bit / attacked someone with no reason.
- One representative is a certified Behavioural Specialist or other animal specialist (ie vet, vet tech)
- The tribunal members are chosen from those with expertise
- More supervision by owner
- at least one animal advocate/behaviorist on panel. rehabilitation is possible. some dogs just need a different environment in which to thrive, not unlike humans.
- Mixed elected and appointed tribunal members with at least one vet and one lawyer
- I don't have enough info to form an opinion



- Na
- You do not force someone to kill their dog. Euthanasia should solely be up to an owner. You don't have the right to murder an animal.
- the owner keeps the dog confined after bylaw officers deem that the owner is a responsible owner and that this owner cares for his/her dog well. If the conditions for the well fare of the dog are met, then the owner can keep the dog at home, take it muzzled for daily walks.
- To make the dog being in the shelter a more better experience for the dog I'd suggest to let the owner spend time with the dog daily to help the dog not feel lost or abandoned, especially if the certain dog has separation anxiety. The owner should know the dog more and the dog should be comfortable with the owner. But that is if the owner feels safe with the dog...I fully agree with the first point. But I think that to let the court have reduced wait time you could have all severe dog bite cases put into one category then divide it into three groups, one being low severity, second being mild severity then third being extreme severity. These different severity cases could go to different courts, and the mild and extreme severity dog cases will have overall less wait time with the low severity's out of the way. The dogs, owner and the victim will have the attention. I agree with the third point as well. It is an excellent point. But just the second one I am weary about. Aren't there humanity rights protecting these animals? Euthanization should only be used when an animal is suffering right? I believe that the vicious dogs should go under extensive care to train them to not hurt people or other dogs, and for walks should be muzzled.
- Who would the members of the tribunal be?
- Members of the tribunal must be unbiased towards the breed and objectively review the incident
- Dogs cannot be euthanized and instead are issued mandatory obedience training and a muzzle until graduation of obedience training
- At least half of the representatives on the tribunal would have direct, related experience with animals and animal behaviour.
- Tribunal members screened for bias, maybe have both dog owner and victim agree and accept tribunal members
- Emphasis on training and not putting dogs down or banning the breeds.
- if is cost effective
- Make sure that the individuals on tribunal are not all siding with BSL Make sure that some are positive reinforcement dog trainers
- The members of the tribunal are educated and experienced in regards to different dog breeds, training, and recognizing behaviour.
- Unbiased towards breed of dog
- NO cost and listens to the victims.
- laws cannot be breed specific, only behavior specific
- There is no previous bias towards any specific breed of animal.
- On a trial basis to monitor advantages and disadvantages of utilizing a tribunal.
- Experts placed on the tribune should be knowledgeable of dogs and/or seek advice from those who know dog behaviors. Non experts should not be making these decisions.



- Did not hold any bias against Any specific dog breeds, and only focused on each individual case independently of the others.
- Why the dog bit occurred.
- At least half of the tribunal members are working in a veterinary field
- I can't read the rest of the sentence on a mobile phone.
- must have all best interests
- That they look into rehabilitation of the dog over euthanasia
- They would absolutely have to be specialized in the nuances of dog cases and understand that nearly all dog behaviour is a direct reflection of their owner's treatment and training. The first response should never to euthanize a dog, but instead to investigate the owner and place punishments on that owner.
- Due process is followed
- If they recommended euthanization that the owner have a chance to go through the court system as a secondary look
- Not guilty until proven guilty, allowed all parties to speak, allow the owner time to prove they have done everything possible to train and control the dog. Be fair to the pet owner.
- That the tribunal be comprised of people not biased against dogs, or dogs of specific breed.
- Not influenced by the proposed breed specific discriminatory measures
- At least 1 dog behaviouralist is on every tribunal
- Found every practicable way to work with the owner to improve behaviour of nuisance dog(s) (i.e. mandated training class(es), rehoming of the dog into the care of a qualified individual, etc.) before even considering having the dog put down. It is my belief that poor ownership creates nuisance dogs; dogs are not at fault for poor behaviour, owners are. Also, during the tribunal, there must be no breed bias.
- There should be no breed bias in the judgment. Obedience training/re-homing of the dog to a experienced trainer/foster homemust be the first course of action, euthanasia should always be a last resort. Poor ownership creates nuisance dogs, dogs are not inherently bad.
- They review evidence, not make decisions based on breed
- Can't read this answer. It cuts off
- The welfare of the animal, taking in its upbringing, must be held in high consideration.
- All facts should be taken into account regarding the bite. Ie, triggers and such. There are nearly always warning signs
- At least one or two veterinarians sit on said tribunal
- The owner is investigated, for example for history of animal abuse and neglect. The breed of the dog should not be a determining factor when deciding if a dog is euthanized. All dogs should be sent for a behaviour assessment by a non biased organization always prior to euthanizing a dog.
- I do not believe they should be able to decide on euthanasia prior to the final sentencing of court.
- The tribunal consists of dog behavior experts, trainer and vets



- They work with certified behavioral trainers and vets before declaring a dog must be euthanized, and allowing the family to have a voice in the matter.
- The members of the tribunal are educated in dog behavior and assessment.
- The owner is held accountable only not the dog. A dog should never be put down because of an owner's stupidity for lack of training, exercise, love or a proper home.
- As stated above, tribunal decisions can be appealed by the Court of the Queen's Bench
- It is NOT a result of BSL.
- Kangaroo court is not sensible. All individuals must be lawyers or judges, people who understand the law. It's people who understand the law or it's just a joke. I mean would you hire a plumber and go tell him to teach physics? No kangaroo courts.
- That at least one of the tribunal be a professional or highly recommended by the community canine behaviour expert..
- Na
- If it's freeing up the provincial courts and costs but not if it's adding another level of bureaucracy to the process.
- A fee is not imposed on an accused to engage the tribunal
- Euthanasia is decided after multiple bite incidents with owners not proving to make any effort to change the behaviour or keep the dog away from other people and dogs.
- Owners and dogs stay together
- as long as dogs of this type are allowed to be free in public places and off leash where all dogs are allowed until an attack happens with that dog. Not all dogs of this breed are aggressive.
- composed of knowledgeable individuals eg veterinarians, behaviour experts, animal services people, and/or citizens as a check. But if owners launch appeals just to be jerks, doesn't that take awhile and dog still suffers?
- I think there must be dog experts on the tribunal and the owner must not be part of it.
- A qualified non force using trainer should be a member of any tribunal panel and have at least the same input as other members, including voting rights. Their vote should be the casting vote if no agreement can be reached
- The dog cannot be euthanized but will be put into the care of a rehabilitation facility to train the dog
- The qualifications of the tribunal are appropriate
- It keeps the interest of the dog's health and safety a top priority.
- Dogs aren't euthanized unless it is it extremely serious case I do not believe that we should have the power to kill a animal when people are blamed and arrested for murder every day and we do not kill them we find every solution first to help those human beings...
- The tribunal was reviewed yearly for performance by the citizens of Calgary and background checked for non-malicious activities. Tribunal members must also be qualified and to have the passion to rehabilitate dogs on a case to case basis.
- The vote is unanimous to pass.
- Euthanasia used as a last resort. Rehabilitation and behavioral classes should be the first option in all cases



- There is a unanimous agreement before euthanization.
- If a dog causes a serious injury to a human the matter should be settled by a court of law.
- Tribunal members are professionals like veterinarians, professional trainers, etc. that can make science-based decisions
- I do not agree with euthanizing the dog. In most cases it is the human influence/how a dog was raised. The dog should first be looked at by a dog trainer to try and properly train the dog before it is simply euthanized.
- People on tribunal will need to have appropriate qualifications for the tribunal
- It was felt with within 30 days.
- No bias towards specific breeds
- The members of the tribunal are well-educated and have some credibility that warrants them being qualified to make a decisions about a dog's life (experienced animal worker or someone having formal animal care training).
- There must be means of appeal as outlined.
- The decisions was made promptly and without bias
- Appeals to courts must be allowed
- Have subject matter experts/trainers be a part of the process to determine suitability of the dog.
- Who would sit on this Tribunal? Who decides the tribunal makeup? This has to be a fair process
- Euthanizing is ALWAYS a last resort. And they people on it aren't absolute cone heads who target pit bulls
- dog is not euthanized and funding for dog obedience training
- The breed of the dog does not influence the tribunal in any way, shape, or form (ex: pitbull, rottweiler)
- Euthanize was a last resort and the animal was giving every opportunity to go to a "rehabilitation" training program for aggressive dogs.
- Movement against euthanizing wherever possible. Including harsher restrictions (homebound, no off leash, muzzle, training and punishment for the owner over the dog)
- That it is fair and equal for all dogs, not just based on their looks or breed. All dogs and responsible dog owners need to be treated fairly.
- There must substantial proof of dog attack and must be unbiased to bully breeds
- Those on the tribunal must be experienced in the area of dog ownership, health, behavior etc. Families and communities must also be consulted.
- The representatives are required to have extensive knowledge on dog behaviour, rehabilitation, training, and obedience. They cannot be breed-biased. They are required to have had 5 years or more experience working with dogs that have behavioural problems. The tribunal should include the dog's well being in all cases processed. The tribunal should work hard to ensure that the dog under investigation will be found another proper and safe home/owner when needed. An order for a dog to be euthanized cannot be used as a way to "speed up the process" of the court case and tribunal decisions have to be based on the well being of the dog and safe rehabilitation.
- Limits time for a dog to be in a shelter



- A fair panel - members such as a certified dog trainer, someone who owns a dog, along with city workers and at least 4 members.
- It is not discriminating certain breeds
- Only unbiased people can be appointed to the tribunal. No history or personal experience with dogs involved in incidents, no possibility of personal gains from outcomes of cases, must have education in dog behaviour so educated decisions can be made, and must always act in kindness and fairness
- Only one chance per household
- The dog wasn't in a kennel for months
- That the tribunals do not become some basis for an anti-bulldog crusade.
- Veterinary and animal behaviour professionals were represented in the tribunal
- There should be at least one dog behaviour specialist in the tribunal.
- The tribunal includes one or more experts in animal behavior/health/psychology and includes a person or people with a very thorough understanding of the bylaws
- Training for the dog and owner
- The tribunal should be based on law not feelings. I believe it would be hard to find people who are not biased one way or the other to do what is right for the dog and community
- Input from local balanced dog trainers and NOT treat based trainers
- It's not used as a vehicle to expedite euthanasia.
- Educated individuals (Veterinarians, animal behaviorists) need to be involved in tribunal process
- to put the animals needs first, understand that they weren't born this way, they were made that way by shitty ownership.
- I would hope that a tribunal would consider hearing from both the victim and the owner in terms of their wishes (and planned remediation on the part of the owner).
- Not all dogs bite because they are aggressive they also bite out of defense or terror or they are protecting their human or animal friend. So the tribunal must take this into consideration as well
- Mediation & restorative justice first
- A tribunal would be okay if there were penalties for the people/smaller dogs that cause the larger dog to defend itself.
- Euthanizing should not be considered
- You can't be quick to judge the dog. If the dog has potential to be trained let the knees have the chance to do that.
- People on tribunal having biased perspectives on breeds would hinder proper growth of system. It would make sense for people elected to tribunal to have background and or training in dog behavior
- As long as the goal was not to euthanize the dog. A fair assessment of the dog is had.
- It merely provides a quicker method of processing legal actions against dogs to keep their time in confinement to a minimum.
- Nonpartisan, must prove to be more effective than provincial court
- Any and all dogs not just "scary looking" breeds
- You have not explained what a tribunal is or what the purpose is



- Dog owner must agree and further restrictions shouldn't be placed on the dog in question while waiting for tribunal to decide.
- If the dog has a history of offences.
- Condition that both dog owner and complainant agree in writing that they WANT the tribunal instead of court, and that they will abide by the decision of the tribunal.
- Strict and limited scope of authority, these tribunals can easily begin to make rulings that are outside of a mandate.
- Was investigating thoroughly by profession of behaviouralists
- includes an expert about dog training and behavior
- As long as there are no breed specific biases
- Orders to destroy a dog can be appealed in court
- It's members are well versed in dog behaviours / training and have some experience in shelters/training/animal animal related profession
- not assume all pit bulls are nuisance dogs, and made rulings based on behaviours, not breeds.
- The dog is evaluated. Sometimes circumstances are not cut and dry. It could be an owner's responsibility/cause. I hate that this breed is targeted as a dangerous breed. It's not always the case.
- Fairly appointed members of the tribunal, members from the community not city officials.
- Each case must be viewed and processed depending on the specific breed behaviour and needs. Only then should TRAINED professionals be in charge of this task
- The owner and household only get a single opportunity. Afterwards penalties should be severe.
- Tribunal members must have experience with dogs and their variety of temperaments. They should know the difference between aggression and fear.
- Punish the crime and the instigator NOT the breed.
- If this was to pass you best make sure you have qualified certified animal trainers or behaviorists running the show and making the recommendations not just some non qualified city worker
- The breed is not the main factor but the owner and their responsibility around training and modifying behaviour be evaluated.
- The people on the panel do not have any bias towards dog breeds
- No euthanization
- As long it provides ample opportunity for the dog owners to make their plea and there are appropriate measures done to deem the dog aggressive, by an experienced behaviourist.
- Before ordering the dog for euthanasia the dog would go through obedience training and removed from the home in case the problem is the owner and not the dog.
- As long as it is making the process quicker to get the animal out of a shelter.
- There is a veterinarian or licensed obedience professional on said tribunal
- There MUST be 1-2 professional animal behaviouralists on such a tribunal were it formed.
- Was represented by non-biased individuals and very carefully looked at on a case by case basis.



- The tribunal should consist of a variety of people (e.g. dog owners, non-dog owners, ppl with kids, etc.)
- has dog behavioral experts on the tribunal - not just regular people who don't understand animal or dog behavior
- NOT decided strictly on breed. Was the person or persons bit tormenting or attacking dog. Was dog attacked the original instigator.
- Euthanasia should only be considered after extensive review of the dog's behaviour and after extensive training and rehabilitation. Most dogs become vicious due to learned behaviour and training from an owner, and there should be an attempt to undo this training before euthanasia is considered.
- None
- you leave your bias against pit bulls at the door. Again, the owners are the problem. Can we spay and neuter the owners instead?
- If animal neglect or abuse is discovered, the animals should be surrendered to a shelter or rehab and the owner should be prosecuted in a regular court and prohibited from owning animals again.
- The person needs to be punished, if the dog is to be killed then that owner should be held accountable for the bite victim and the life of the dog.
- Left putting the dog down as a last resort.
- Someone on the tribunal is an expert or advocate for animals and is able to help determine if with proper intervention the dog will not reoffend
- Look at the stability of the human who owns the dog. Also look at if the human was purposely training the dog to fight, the human should always be held responsible, if the human is showing signs of aggression, if the human cannot listen, if the human can not provide documents showing that this is their dog, they should not have an animal and there should be a system to show that humans who have previously been abusing animals should not own animals. However the dog should be allowed to tear a human apart if the human attacks the dog. Self defense.
- Not to be biased against breed, but take each case as its own
- The animal is not held responsible, but the owner is. They animal should not be euthanized
- I would need more information on the tribunal and also criteria for the people who sit on the tribunal to ensure they are not biased
- The dog and owner should be assessed by a qualified, third party trainer to provide a recommendation to the tribunal as it is often the poor actions of the owner that is responsible for bad behavior by dogs. Recommendations should outline the type of remedial training required for owner and dog.
- More emphasis needs to be placed on the dog owner. Most dogs are not aggressive! Rather they pick up on their owners behaviour. So if the owner is aggressive than will pick up on that as well. Just putting a dog down for aggression does not stop the owner from getting another dog nor teaching it the same behaviour.
- People are dealt with according to what they have permitted their animal to do, NOT based on what breed the dog happens to be.



- Must be completed in 30 days or sooner (not sure what the first choice "Tribunal being efficient" really means - what is efficient for Tribunal could be different than what animal owner perceives is efficient (especially for animals who are impounded at Animal Services for more than one-year during court proceedings). Does "efficient" just mean faster than the courts?
- be objective, and speak to 'bite or victim of complaint', owner, and surrounding neighbours if applicable to get a better all servicing picture.
- Still follows proper legal procedure and ensures charges/Euthanasia sticks
- As long as specific breeds were not targeted with severe consequences. This isn't a breed issue its an owner issue. A small jack Russell can hurt a child as much as a pit bull can hurt someone. Im not a fan of targeting breeds.
- Tribunal members must have a pet themselves.
- The representatives have a background knowledge of dog behaviour
- They are not biased based on breed specifications. And they are animal lovers themselves or else these people won't truly care and will just euthanize with no care.
- Not jumping to conclusions based on breed.
- Dogs get fair representation from people who understand the nature of dogs and can assess whether the incident was truly vicious or self defense of an insecure animal who was forced into a difficult situation.
- It is NOT breed specific or biased.
- It's fair and not bias against a breed
- not based on a breed.
- I would support if the specific animal had numerous strikes against it for similar behavior. I also believed in holding the owner accountable more than the animal itself.
- if the injuries are very very severe or life threatening. no animal should ever be put down for biting someone if they need a few stitches or if there's a small gash.
- Owners should be given options for what happens to the animal, tribunal cannot decide to euthanize the animal without an effort/options being made or given to correct the situation before ending a life.
- Members of tribunal need to be trained dog professionals, eg Vets, trainers, rehab specialists.
- I don't believe in euthanizing a dog, unless you absolutely had to under certain circumstances. But I always believe in rehabilitation and maybe instead if the city offered a dog training program it would do much better.
- The tribunal would need to be qualified to make such decisions in a fair manner with no breed targeting
- The tribunal should be made up by members of the ABVMA, animal behaviourists, and other veterinary professionals.
- I support a tribunal if it mean to effectively speed up the process, with less harm to animal.
- As long as it would include canine behavioral professionals such as individuals associated with the Calgary Humane Society.



- Determine , & review restrictions placed on a dog, which the owner would need to abide by to keep the animal. The person who teases or aggravates the dog and it results in a bite, the person should also be held accountable.
- The interest of the animal is kept first and foremost. The owner is the one that is at fault for not controlling their pet.
- input from a trainer, an animal behaviourist, a dog enclosure specialist. if house and yard are impregnable after changes then dog could stay at home under conditions if owner can be trusted to follow specifications.
- The victims and owner can decide
- No prejudice against a specific breed, for example pit bulls.
- Review the owners care of the dog. Most nuisance dog behavior is an example of bad dog care by the owner.
- No appeal. Whats the point of wasting the efforts of the tribunal. Otherwise, stick with the court system.
- That the dog does not have to be put down. This is like introducing the lethal injection once again to our criminal system
- If the dog was being harassed by the victim, a lesser charge would be placed on the dog, as well as a harassment charge on the victim.
- An educated and trained non-biased individual providing the investigation.
- It was objective to the breed, as in there be no difference in how the case is handled for a chihuahua as it is with a pit Bull. Only implement this if you can guarantee the judging will not be breedist.
- Where the owner has the choice to have their case held before a judge if they prefer
- you would need a veterinarian and dog trainer as part of the tribunal to give a professional opinion, not personal.
- Members of tribunal had experience with dogs (or vets, dog trainers/walkers)
- The tribunal should not be for breed specific as often the problem is the dog owners
- Euthanizing is a extreme last resort; the tribunal should include trainers which can work with the animal to rectify the behavior. There is generally a reason that the dog is acting out this way and it almost always is due to the owner, not the dog.
- The representatives would be required to have experience/ training in legal proceedings and demonstrate impartiality.
- I don't agree with euthanasia until every attempt to get the dog under control has been made. Additional training, muzzles etc are tried first
- Ok
- Tribunal is not a static committee but a changing jury of peers
- g
- Does not discriminate against pitbulls - you've admitted in this survey that this choice isn't evidence-based
- The tribunal is educated on the issue at hand with extensive background in dog research and breeds.



- Good
- Mandatory retraining of the dog and consequence to the owner
- The breed is NEVER discussed to prevent bias.
- Pitbulls should not be singled out based on stereotypes. This is a backwards concept.
- It was efficient and focused on quick resolution so that the dog does not needlessly suffer in isolation
- The owner being able to defend the dog and explain the actions
- There are properly educated people on the tribunal who understand dogs and dog behaviour including BALANCED trainers.
- They practiced the same guidelines when making a decision as the courts
- People are invested as well. As human instigation is usually the issue.
- The dog should not be put down. The owner should be fined and the dog placed in a loving home. I once adopted a dog that was a Doberman, constantly in trouble and running away from his home. Was the best with me, and never had an issue or ran again. Kjnda like some youths that run from abusive situations.....
- The tribunal is diversely selected
- Please stop putting dogs down? Owners should be punished for repeat offense
- It applied to ALL breeds who are involved with overly and unjustified aggression, NOT breed specific. The tribunal would have to be a mix of people who are both for and against big “dangerous” breeds like pit bull and Rottweilers so that the tribunal is FAIR and unbiased. Dogs are not bad, owners are.
- The tribunal has dog experts and/or people who are very knowledgeable of how to deal with a variety of dog issues.
- There needs to be assessments completed on the owners for the behaviour of the animal. Seldom is the animal at fault if they have not been trained properly or put in the correct environment by the owner. The owner needs to be held accountable to change
- Only when it is given to a dog that has made a Offence before
- The people on the tribunal would have to be educated specifically in the treatment and behaviour of dogs, vets for example would be ideal
- Consultation with a person trained in canine behaviour and/or veterinary medicine were a mandatory step in tribunal decisions.
- DEPENDS WHO THE SHAREHOLDERS ARE

Bite and Run

If a dog bites a person or other animal, do you support a rule that requires the dog owner to remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer if necessary?

Responses below include those that responded ‘Yes’ and provided an explanation.



- The owner is always responsible for the dog especially if there is a history and the dog doesn't have vaccines up to date
- It should be part of responsible pet ownership, if the owner has to leave the scene for personal safety or safety of victim so as to prevent more bites. Owner should call 311 and provide their information.
- It's common sense
- If my dogs ever harmed anything it is my responsibility to deal with the consequences. People take off and leave the "victims - owners and pets" to deal with trauma and cost then have to find the aggressor and take them to court. No accountability.
- Previous offences. If the dog has had rabies shot recently. Reduced stress on the animal.
- Absolutely they should and if they don't then big fines ahead. It's the same for hit and runs, should be the same for dogs and owners.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dog's actions
- Yes I do believe that they should remain at scene or give contact information. This will help understand whether the dog has been in a neglected home or not and investigate the owner as well. If people leave there is a reason .. most likely owner hiding
- As a dog owner you should be responsible for your dogs behaviour.
- I'm shocked this isn't already a law like remaining at the scene of an accident. Isn't a bite incident the same. It would eliminate a person needing rabies testing etc.
- the dog should be removed from the situation - if the individual needs to leave though to do that (say a park), then there should be a way to contact that person. sometimes it is less safe to remain.
- Pet owners should always be responsible for their pets.
- Owners must be held responsible for their dogs. If they don't remain at the scene it can be more difficult to track them and their dogs down.
- I agree.
- how else is the officer going to find the offender and investigate properly....
- My pitbull has been attacked by many "non-vicious" breeds and been taken into vet care due to it with no responsibility taken by the other owner
- I feel that this is an important step in ensuring the sharing of personal information that is correct and keeps both parties civil in a heated situation
- They need to be held responsible.
- Same as any accident. Should remain on scene if needed
- People need to be held accountable for their pets! Vet bills are incredibly expensive and depending on the situation the bills should in part be paid by the at fault party
- Every person's account of the incident should be on record while it's fresh in their minds.
- Similar to a fender bender in a vehicle. If the person just leaves then it's like a hit and run. There needs to be exchange of information and sometimes an enforcement officer may need to be present
- Yes because the dog could be sick and the person or other animal may need more medical attention.



- Owner must always be present with the pet when off the owner's property. For Eg: It should not be treated any different than a hit and run case.
- There is ownership for the trainer in how the dog is acting. Severe cases must be recorded to prevent them from happening again. This can only happen if treated as similar to a human violation (aggressive behaviour, assault, etc).
- Owner should always be fully liable for what damages that their own pet dog has done. Similar to car accidents, driver / operator is responsible for the damage or the accident.
- Bad animal behaviour should be the responsibility of the owner. Not the fault of the breed.
- I personally think if a dog bites a person that dog should be taken away. No second chances for biting dogs.
- Dogs that bite should be held accountable
- It is important for information to be exchanged for the safety of both parties if illness arises, complications or questions come from the incident. Is the animal up to date on shots, medical bills, etc.
- Too many dogs get injured at off leashes And the offending pastries just leave. There should be heavy penalties for doing so
- As a pet owner I am responsible for my pets actions. Should be treated the same as a motor vehicle accident in that those involved should be required to stay at the scene.
- If there is any incident where animal attacks a human or another animal information should be shared from both parties. Failure to do so should penalize the owner.
- Dog owners need to be responsible and accountable for the behaviour of their pet. Valid contact information needs to be gathered in case there are medical expenses incurred by the injured party.
- Its only common sense
- A person's dog is an extension of them while in public. If they caused harm to another person or animal, the decent thing to do would be to exchange information and face repercussions if necessary.
- Common sense. Also would depend on severity. Whether or not bite breaks skin.
- No different then a hit and run with vehicle
- Owners are responsible for their pets behaviour. If it is serious enough, the owner should compensate the victim where required.
- It's common sense.
- Accountability.
- They should share contact info.
- Sharing contact information isn't a bad idea but separating the animal and it's target it likely necessary.
- Oh my god. This is embarrassing that in the year 2020, this is not a requirement. Are you allowed to leave if your car hits someone? Or not provide information. You can be more seriously injured by a "pet" than by a 1500kg machine. Come on. Aren't you embarrassed that we even have to ask these questions.
- But this could be difficult depending on the circumstances of the incident.



- That's only common sense.
- Seems reasonable people remain at a scene like any other situation.
- The dog/pet is the responsibility of the owner. Just like at the scene of an accident you are expected to stay and give your information to the other person. The same should be considered with a dog bite/attack
- unless the owner can provide contact information to a witness so that the dog can be removed to ensure no one else is harmed
- to understand if dog has up to date vaccinations to help victim to understand if thus has happened before and the circumstances
- Of course! Just like with any accident, the same rules should apply here.
- It's serious if a dog bites anyone and a responsible owner should stay to deal with the situation.
- It's inexcusable that someone would allow their dog to attack someone or another dog and not submit their info to the victim and police if the victim decides to pursue charges etc.
- There is no where else to put this input, but I believe the language used in the proposed bylaw, specifically targeting one breed (pit bulls) is inflammatory. Many breeds bite, have large jaws, and are capable of causing harm (Shepards, Saint Bernards, etc). Breeds are not the problem, owners are. If anything, there should be bylaws around responsible pet ownership, ie, training classes mandatory for anyone adopting any dog, vs breed discrimination.
- I think it's important to have both sides of the story. Like for instance if the dog was being harassed of course it will bite why is that the dogs fault. Dog owners shouldn't feel like they are always in the wrong as I don't think that is always the case
- I think it's important for a dog owner to take responsibility for their animals actions. An exception to this would be if the animal required immediate medical attention.
- Per incident, if not a small tousele and a vet visits is not needed, then I do not believe they need to share information.
- Yes but all dogs. I'm disgusted at the fact you have zero knowledge about " pit bull " breeds. How dare you start to try and scare people when it comes to these " pit bull " type dogs. Shame on you narrow minded people who take zero time to learn about the breeds you categorize as "pitbull" .
- It is not the animals fault for irresponsible ownership. Owners need to train and teach their pet social etiquette - just like children.
- So the owner is able to be educated by the officer or provided resources that provide education
- I had 1 of my dogs attacked, and my roommate had his viscosly attacked to the point of needing to get something like 20 stitches to close the back of its neck. Both happened at a dog park, both owners left. I had to get the city to call them and deal with them.
- Yes, the only way that they should leave the scene is if there is a medical emergency (e.g. they were injured in the incident as well and need immediate medical attention) or if they are being threatened by the other party in which case they should be required to self-report the incident within 24 hours
- Well yes I would expect anyone who's dog has bit to stay and see of the person is okay. But with u treating to kill peoples pitbulls if they bite I can see why people don't stick around!... leave the "bully" breeds alone..during a pandemic don't you have something better to do with yourself?



- By staying and communicating, everything can be resolved more quickly. It will be important to ensure as little bias as possible while this is all taken into consideration by the Office. Also - what if Bylaw is busy or its after hours? Perhaps require contact information to be shared - like a car accident.
- Helps determine how each dog reacts around each other at the time of the incident.
- Owners should be held responsible for their dogs actions. Pay for vet bills of injured dog, be held accountable and put their own dog through training to prevent another incident
- The owner should be held responsible, not the dog. Therefore they should stay at the scene and give any contact information if the person was hurt.
- Yes, and if they don't they should be charged with fleeing the scene of a crime. As dogs can be used as weapons, we are fully responsible for our own dogs actions. And bigger fines should be enforced.
- A pet owner is responsible for their pet and if an incident occurs the owner is accountable for their pets action
- Its all about accountability, you own a dog, you are responsible. You don't leave a car accident without exchanging information or speaking to police. . .
- They should stay so that the enforcement officer can record info in case of future events or to check if there are any past events, to check for vaccinations, and in case any fines need to be levied.
- This puts ownace on the owner where it belongs. If a dog is violent, regardless the breed, it may point to mistreatment or neglect at home.
- Seems like a good way to hold them responsible and get the information needed for treatment of the victim
- necessary with any accident where someone gets hurt anyways, why not here?
- Yes, except if the situation requires you to remove your dog or seek medical help.
- how else are we able to track nuisance dogs
- Owners need to take more responsibility for their dogs. I've heard of too many incidents where owners have left the scene and left victims with large vet bills.
- There have been many who blames the other when in doubt they always think there animal is in good behavior. Delusional!
- Or they can be charged for leaving the scene of an accident.
- Owner must remain and provide necessary information for follow up
- The owner should be held accountable. Not the dog.
- The dog owners normally disappears after and incident and can not be traced
- The owner of the dog should have to pay all required fees. (Vet fees if attacked another dog, prescription fees if human was sent to doctor)
- The owner must carry full responsibility for the dogs misbehaviour. Including compensations, medical expenses, moral damage, punitive fines.
- The dog owner is ultimately responsible/accountable for the behavior of the dog
- Because that's what the owners needs to do there dog there responsibilities to be there ! Thank
- It's the right thing to do



- It is no different than witnessing an assault or a car accident. You stay and give your statement and accept consequences if necessary.
- I feel that there is an obligation to pay for any medical needs that the other person, animal or thing would need after a bite.
- This I can get behind. PEOPLE need to be responsible when their dog attacks another animal or person.
- The owner is ultimately responsible for the behaviour of their dog. If a dog is found to cause harm to another animal or human it is only the responsible thing to do but provide contact information, take photographic evidence of the aftermath of the altercation and if serious enough (hospitalization is required) then enforcement officers should be brought to mitigate.
- There is always two sides to a story so both owners should be spoken to.
- "Within reason. Maybe the person really has somewhere they need to be. If they take some appropriate steps such as exchanging contact info then I could see, in some circumstances, it being alright for them to leave.
- But it can't be like a hit and run. They can't just leave to avoid responsibility."
- A dog bite is no different than any other accident.
- It is an accident scene and someone has been hurt. Exchanging information and talking to enforcement is vital to ensure shared information between parties and aid if needed is properly rendered.
- Yes so there is no she said he said.
- Yes, too many owners walk away and avoid taking responsibility when their dog has injured another dog or a person.
- Unless the owner needs to remove the dog from the scene for safety reasons
- Unless there is a need for immediate medical attention
- Yes, just like a car accident.
- Yes, people should have responsibility for their dogs. A dog bite is still considered an accident and information should be exchanged.
- Yes only because they should own up. Its not always the dogs fault or the dog might have a legit reason sometimes not.
- People need to take ownership of what happens, it is not fair to expect the victims owner to foot the Vet Bill. People should get reprimanded when they don't stick around and own up to it.
- Or at minimum, the dog owner provides the information to the victim
- like a car accident. the aggressive dogs owner should pay for vet bills in order for the other dog to become healthy again.
- As a pet owner, you are responsible for the animals behaviour
- It's part of being a responsible pet owner
- When you own a dog they are a dependent member of your family. If you minor child attacked someone you would be expect to represent them to the police. You have to represent your dog because your dog cant represent themself.



- The individual who owns the dog is ABSOLUTELY responsible for the dogs' actions, and must be present to claim responsibility. If they do not there should definitely be consequences
- Plain and simple - stay, give your information help out the injured.
- it is the owners responsibility
- It's responsible dog ownership
- Its just like a car accident, they should be charged for leaving the scene
- if a dog is injured the owner should have to share their information
- Yes, however the offending dog needs to be under control. It would be hard to share information with someone if you dog is still continuing it's aggressive behaviour.
- Hhh
- Same as if you are in a non animal accident.
- You should be responsible for your dog. Unlike a car, there are few identifying indicators to identify someone who did not remain at the scene
- The owner needs to be responsible for the actions of his dog and tell the enforcement officer what happened to lead up to the incident.
- It is no different than a car accident. The owner must take responsibility for their dog's actions.
- Unless dog needs medical attention, leaving the scene is like a hit and run. However the dog being on the scene may make things worse
- Good dogs bite too. It's important to have all the information to make an informed decision.
- "The dog owner may need to share vaccination information and sometimes the extent of the injury is not known until later.
- I wasn't sure where to put this, but I vehemently oppose breed specific legislation. Each dog and owner should be treated as individuals."
- It should be treated similarly to a traffic accident.
- Yes this makes the most sense out of everything. IT IS NOT BREED SPECIFIC. It is just simply being a responsible pet owner.
- Any owner of any dog that bites, no matter how minor the injuries might be should give a statement.
- It should be no different than a legal obligation to remain at the scene of an accident. If the opportunity arises for an individuals dog to attack or cause injury to another property (dog or other animal) or person, they are legally and civilly liable to be responsible for said injuries and damages. They should legally be compelled to remain at the scene until it can be properly recorded, all details obtained, and all individuals involved properly identified along with their contact information in case a follow up is required. Similar to an accident report.
- They need to take responsibility
- Yes but I dont think the dog should be put down, the owner be fined for not training properly
- It is important that all parties share pertinent information. Including any issues of both pets/ persons may have.
- Punish the owners and make the owners responsible. Its nor fair to punish the dog when its the owners fault.



- Both parties should be available to speak with an enforcement officer to explain the whole situation
- It's the owner who raised the dog(s). However both parties must be held accountable and if the non offending party leaves no further action should go forth. As some dogs have been rescued and are still working through problems. Dogs whom are off leash in non off leash areas and run up to a leashes dog after being told by the leashed dog owner that they aren't good with other dogs yet and if the non leashes dog gets bit for going at the leashes dog the offending party (doesn't matter the breed) should be given fines weather they stay on scene or not.
- Enforcement officer needs to be there to get all the details to ensure correct accurate documentation
- it is important that the owner stays as its important that both sides of the store are matched up and not hear say
- The owner knows the dog best. Dogs will bite/ attack out of fear/ anxiety/ lack of training. The owner should remain at the scene to be able tell their side/ dogs side of what happened as there are 2 sides to every story.
- The same reason why someone should be held responsible to remain at the scene of an accident.
- Too often irresponsible pet owners flee the scene to escape possible vet or medical bills which is unacceptable.
- I have heard of too many incidents where the owner of a dog who bites another dog or human doesn't even apologize, let alone stay and provide their contact information. They need to be held accountable.
- That's like asking if a person involved in a hit-and-run should stay or go until owner of damaged car is back. Yeah, they should stay and be responsible and take ownership of their poorly trained dog.
- A responsible owner would be present with the dog at all times.
- The owner Should have to stay and provide id
- Yes of course because it's like when you get into an accident. Both parties should be there to explain their sides of the story.
- Too many owners take off and face no consequences.
- This is essential. It is like children or humans. Animals are also the product of their owner and training. An owner must take Full responsibility of their animals and their actions/behaviours- we never want our animals to hurt anyone or an out her animal, but must ensure and take responsibility.
- Same as a car accident. You have a responsibility to address the incident.
- Except when circumstances require leaving...eg. To get first aid, remove dog from situation and secure until officers attend, etc.
- Otherwise there is no accountability. Owners now with problem dogs and not following the rules just swear at you for complaining and walk away
- "Being a responsible pet owner requires accountability for causing damage/injury or being the guardian of a being that does this.
- It also prevents the possible misidentification of an innocent pet and owner."
- The handler or owner is responsible for the animals behavior
- Fined for leaving the scene of a crime



- Yes but only if blood is drawn or obvious damage. Dogs use their mouths to play and communicate and nobody needs dog park Karen calling the authorities everytime another tries to play with hers...
- People should take responsibility for their animals.
- This one could allow for vet information to be exchanged, and for an enforcement officer to collect testimony from multiple parties.
- It is the owner's animal, and therefore their responsibility to ensure the situation is taken care of.
- "Do NOT make someone put
- Down their pet. Provide classes
- For said animal and owner and
- Don't assume it was the dogs fault."
- However, if the dog is in a state that cannot be controlled at the scene contact information should be given verbally and the offending dog should be removed from the situation promptly.
- "Unless of course the situation requires the dog to be tas
- ken away to prevent further injury, then what?"
- The dog owner knows their pet. They can explain behavioural issues and perhaps they warned the other party to keep their distance due to their dog's unease and these warnings were ignored.
- dog owners are or should be responsible for their pet's behavior. Car owners take responsibility for driving, and must stay on scene of Collision, i think a dog biting is similar to that and the owner should stay on scene until situation resolved.
- There are always 3 sides to a story
- Yes, the owner should take responsibility
- Its assault. They should be held accountable.
- Owners should be required to stay at the scene of the incident, provide proof of vaccination and licensing, and communications with officers.
- The majority of responsible owners do. This is punishing a bred and I don't agree with that.
- If the dog bites someone the owner should be held responsible for and medical or vet bills.
- This is reasonable
- I have had my large dog attacked by a smaller dog. They walked away cause they can pick them up and run.
- Absolutely. I feel it is necessary to deal with it as it's your dog.
- Be responsible as you would for any other accident.
- But it depends if the dog is biting out of protection. Is it a biting a predator? If so, NO!
- 100% the owner should remain at the scene of an incident involving their dog biting another dog or a person
- They need to accountable
- its like a car accident.
- How else would you determine what happened, the circumstances around the bite
- Yes unless the other owner or person gives them the okay to leave.
- Owners must be responsible for the actions of their pet.



- I believe that regardless of the breed, if a dog has bitten another animal or person, it is also the person's responsibility to make sure that the person and/or animal is okay. It is important that they stay there and share all information necessary as would be expected in any other incident scenario.
- "If a person is touching a dog without consent then [removed]"
- You know the risk of petting."
- This will help keep the owners responsible for the incident, and extra vet and or health care costs.
- Yes I most definitely agree with the statement because a lot of pet owners of animals that cause severe damage while biting tend to flee the scene or become very confrontational and aren't able to reason with. That being said nothing gets resolved and the owner of the pet attacked has to suffer the consequences of paying the bills if required and dealing with the trauma without ever getting coverage from the persons who's animal is at fault. Those people at fault as well don't get held accountable and most likely the incident will reoccur.
- [removed] PIT BULLS ARE NO MORE LIKELY TO BITE THAN ANY OTHER DOG. [removed]
- It's just respect to the person that was bitten. And to at least make sure they are ok. Just like car accidents.
- Depends on the severity
- If animal is involved with a bite or attack. It should be treated like a vehicle accident. No one leaves the scene until an officer arrives and assess the situation and out come. Small or large dogs need to be treated equally.
- people should be responsible for their dogs
- However, if the dog isn't in a state to remain present with the owner this can be challenging.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to stay.
- Dog breeds with stronger bite strength than American Pit Bull Terriers: Bull Mastiff, German Shepherd, Chow Chow, Cane Corso, Irish Wolfhound, Doberman, Great Dane.
- The owner is responsible even if the dog bit and attacked another dog who wandered onto their property as long as the other dog has no record or signs of aggression.
- Accountability
- So everyone knows the facts about what happened
- It makes sense that a person should have to stay to share info after significant incidents.
- I have many reasons for saying yes, one being to hold the owner accountable for their dog, two to ensure the dog can be rehabilitated if possible without hurting others.
- I have a friend who was attacked by three dogs and the owner just left her lying there, severely injured and unable to get up!
- Its an accident and everyone must take responsibility.
- If a mediator is needed to sort through he said/she said bull [removed].
- Often owners of other animals are left to foot the bill of bites while the owner of the biting dog leaves the scene
- It's important people give contact information for any vet bills. And for officer to hear both sides of story



- My dog was bit by another dog and the owner didn't even seem to care.
- Wehaverules that have people staying on the scene for car, bike, robbery, and all kinds of other incidents. Dog bites should be no different. Be a responsible owner.
- They should be allowed if necessary to put their dog in a safe & contained space such as the car or in the house, but then return right away to the scene of the incident.
- People need to be responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- Dog owners need to be accountable for their dog actions
- They need to give information to find out if the dog has had shots and possibly pay vet bills
- Should also be liable for any expenses that may be occurred
- Taking responsibility for your pets is extremely important.
- Of course if there is an incident the owner should be present and ensure that the other person or dog is alright. Exchange information and check in if appropriate. With that said, there are also lots of instances where people over react over their own cause of defensive behaviour and then blame the dog for defending himself or herself.
- Pet owners must be responsible in the situations they put their animals in, and be held responsible for their animals behaviour. When animals are in public, owners must ensure they are well mannered, socialized, safe and in good health (including all recommended vaccinations).
- It is the equivalent of a hit and run otherwise.
- any medical or vet bills should be the owners responsibility
- Absolutely. Like a hit and run. The bite should be on the dogs record whether minor or not in case it's a pattern. Fleeing should be a crime. I've seen a dog attack another and the owners took off.
- Common curtesy.
- I think it's required to discuss the matter with an officer.
- Like a car crash, it's important to have all the information. But on the other hand what would they do with their dog that instigated the attack?
- This isn't currently required?
- Regardless of if beings an accident or not, it is fair to everyone involved. Incase follow ups need to happen for various reasons (eg. bill about injury, spreading of diseases like rabies, etc)
- The owner is responsible for that dog, so must remain present for next steps.
- It would be best to trace any incidents with dangerous animals - this would better track any future incidents including other dangerous situations or places like vets.
- Both parties should stay to be able to share their stories with an officer and determine who was at fault. It is never the dogs fault, always a persons fault.
- It allows for the scene to be assessed in real time and for proper identification to be shared in a possibly tense situation.
- It's the responsibility of the dog owner to follow through with any incidents your dog may have caused.
- "sharing information is a requirement after other civil issues such as collisions.
- Waiting for enforcement is impractical in many cases however."



- to be able to find.
- That's just common sense. Only an idiot would leave the scene of a crime
- [removed]
- The dog could be acting out of resentment of possible abuse of owners. Aggressive dogs need to be chipped for tracking at owner's expense.
- I think that all parties need to be heard.... for example if the big dog bite a little dog because the little dog was attacking the big dogs legs, etc
- If the bite is sever aand requires veterinary care
- The situation should be assessed from both owners and facts should be considered before making any decisions. Witness testimony could come into play. An owner with a nuisance dog should be held responsible if another dog or human is injured due to negligence.
- Safety for those affected. Know if vaccines are up to date. If animal has history. Accountability for their animals actions.
- Knowing the medical background of the animal would be important but I also feel the context that lead to a dog biting is vital to the outcome of any situation. If this is not part of the case it does not allow for exploration of what lead to the incident.
- If the officer available is 15-20 mins away, yes staying at the scene and understanding what happened will help with handling future cases.
- If it's severe enough. However if it's just a nip (does not puncture the skin) I don't think it is necessary.
- I don't understand why this isn't mandatory now
- For the tribunal of course.
- that owner should be responsible for the vet bills and also should be held responsible for how their dog acted.
- It is a responsibility as a dog owner to ensure you are acting as such. If your dog bites someone or another animal, you as the owner should ensure the damage or injury and offer any assistance possible
- It is the right thing to do
- If a dog bites the owner needs to remain on site unless the owner amd dog are in fear for their wellbeing by staying. However they should be in contact with authorities within a set amount of time.
- A third party would be beneficial in determining if the dog was provoked into an attack or not. As well as ensuring information was collected properly
- If it was an accident have record of it. As a scared person may say one thing when that's not what happened. Ie PEOPLE WHO DONT HAVE DOGS WALKING AT A DOG PARK AND START SCREAMING WHEN A DOG COMES FOR A SNIFF. like come on! You know this happens and the dog gets punished not the stupid act of the humans.
- A dog bite is like an assault. There should be consequences.
- It comes down to taking responsibility for your animal .
- First of all, your dog should never bite anyone. I've owned "aggressive breed" dogs my entire life Rotty's, german shepards, chows, pits. On my third pit bull, and NONE of my dogs have ever bitten



anyone because they have all been socialized properly. However, if your dog does bite someone, you are responsible for its actions and should be required exchange information and be available to make a statement to an officer.

- Its like a vehicle accident. If it occurs you need to stay at the scene.
- any decent dog owner should want to make sure the other party is ok or help. You do not flee the scene of a crime, so why would you now
- Vet bills should be covered by offending party if in public and unprovoked. Everybody should be able to tell their story and I believe everybody who is responsible should be held responsible.
- I agree.
- To allow for follow up - as required depending on the incident and outcome.
- The owner and dog's information should be taken and tracked for repeat offences.
- Vet bills
- Just like with a car accident. Agree.
- An owner should be held legally responsible for their dogs actions. Including being responsible for paying for damage inflicted
- It should be treated as any other incident involving injury or property damage
- People need to be responsible for any consequences from an attack.
- I agree but rather than punishment I think maybe a warning and responsible owners typically would seek treatment or obedience training for their animals.
- Same as with a car accident, you can't just leave!
- It's a matter of taking responsibility
- I think it is absurd that you are targeting a specific breed or a breed that looks like a specific breed. [removed]. You need to be ashamed of yourself for even including this in a survey. Pit bulls are not more likely to harm a human than any other dog. This survey is racism towards dogs
- Similar to a vehicular incident. Sharing of information should be mandatory (should be common sense but that's another discussion)
- Both parties need to be held responsible for their animals and share their views on the incident.
- No different than if you were in a car accident. You remain in on the scene.
- The whole focus so far as I can tell is penalizing the dog but the real issue are the owners
- If another dog bites my dog or my child, the owner should be held liable for all injuries. The dog and owner should be dealt with in a timely manner to prevent further attacks.
- By law officers need to be able to identify the owner as they are the real culprit
- owner must live up to their wrong doings
- Working in the vet industry this would greatly reduce the issues of who should pay for what
- Yes I believe with any incident both parties should remain at the scene if there was an altercation to take statements and exchange information.
- Owners of a dog that has bitten another person or animal should have to stay. Not leave and let the victim have to deal with it. You're required to stay at the scene of other incidents, why should you leave after a dog bite?



- It should be treated like any other accident.
- This shouldn't matter what breed the dog is. If an owners dog is at fault they must take responsibility.
- It's like a traffic accident, but with flesh and blood. Of course that makes sense. Also what makes sense to implement fines for fleeing the scene of the incident.
- If requested, if not being abused by the other party and if safe to do so for both the animal, owner and the individual bitten
- I didn't even know this wasn't a requirement.
- I work at Healthlink and take calls from people who are bit by dogs and the owner leaves. The person doesn't know the dogs health status also it may re offend .
- They can explain everything that happen cuz that is thier dog???
- Taking ownership and responsibility is critical
- A severe bite is serious and any responsible pet owner should be willing to share this information and speak to an officer anyways.
- Dog owners should be held accountable for any vet bills required if the injury needs attention
- For the owner to take responsibility
- Such incidents should be treated in the same manner as car accidents
- If someone owns a vehicle and hits another person with that vehicle they have to stay. It's should be the same for animals.
- Just like if you hit a car, you are required to stay at the scene. I do believe they should be allowed to step away from the scene for safety purposes, however remain close by. Ex. Take the dog down the block.
- If a dog has bitten someone it is the owners responsibility to make sure that person is ok. If that victim doesn't have specific health coverage or know how to handle a bite the responsibility should go to the owner who didn't properly train their dog not an innocent bystander.
- I was bitten by a small dog at a dog park and the owner laughed it off and did not offer any contact info. I wished to file a complaint with bylaw and did not have enough info.
- Personal liability encourages owners to be more responsible
- Dogs shouldn't be allowed to bite other people then the owners are allowed to leave
- Owner needs to be held responsible.
- It's just common sense
- Because regardless of breed, there's lots of incidents where bites happen & owners flee.
- Yes, so both parties can tell their story, would encourage any other witnesses to remain on scene if possible. It's easy to claim that somebodies dog bit them unprovoked with no evidence other than the "victims" word
- It is the right thing to do, just as you would in a vehicle collision or any other incident involving another party.
- People who take on the responsibility of caring for a dog also take on the responsibility to keep their dog safe in all situations. If an incident occurs they should take responsibility to resolve it. Sadly



because euthanasia seems to be a “quick fix” to deal with a dog termed as a “nuisance” I can understand people being hesitant to stay if they fear their dog will be euthanised.

- there needs to be accountability by all parties. and information gathered right at the time of the incident
- no different than remaining on scene of an accident
- If your dog hurts someone it is your responsibility as a pet owner to remain at the scene as your property caused injury to another person
- Everyone should be responsible for their pet.
- Just a note, I'm confused as to why pi
- Any attack should require the owner to stay on scene.
- If any breed of dog bites and draws blood (only without warning), yes, I think contact info should be shared. A dog won't attack unwarranted unless it's had zero training and/or has been mistreated. The owner then is at fault. Not the dog. The owner should be held responsible and get obedience training or surrender the dog.
- Unless the person needs to leave to secure the dog and then return.
- You must stay present to ensure proper handling of the situation.
- If your dog bites another dog or a person then you should take responsibility for that dogs action and stick around to deal with it.
- To be able to gather information and having the owner remain in the area allows the proper people to discuss and learn the underlying reasons for a bite ie. behaviour issue, who's fault, whether the dog was provoked or being protective.
- Regardless of breed, owners need to be responsible for the behaviour of their pets.
- It should be the same requirements as a hit and run: all parties are required to remain on scene.
- They need to be held responsible
- obvi
- If they leave, it is difficult to track them down later.
- responsible pet ownership
- They are responsible for what their dog does
- Yes they should !
- Accidents happen and I understand this, but the animal who gets attacked and hurt- their vet bills should be paid for by the person who's dog attacked. It is good to have an officer present to take down the story of what happened and to note the attacker dog to be possibly added to the nuisance list.
- To provide contact info, however hanging around waiting for bylaw may not be reasonable if the dog is aggressive and needs to be removed from the site of the incident for safety reasons
- too many owners run away when a problem arises
- I support it but I don't see how it is enforceable.
- Ultimately the owner should be responsible for the dog. If they allow the dog off leash and an incident occurs the liability should fall to the owner.



- All details should be recorded to allow assessment.
- This is critical to ensure the owner is aware of the severity of this incident and proper care is taken afterwards such as supporting the victim and training for the biting dog
- The owner must take responsibility for their pet
- It's self-explanatory. A dog bites another dog or person, the owner of the offending dog should be required to be present if police are brought in.
- Yes it's just like a car accident and if you can show your dog is a calm dog hell yeah
- An owner should be responsible for their dog's behaviour in public. If a dog were to attack wildlife, the owner should not have to remain there as there would be no one to exchange information with.
- Dogs that are allowed to run free that don't have reliable control. Which is most at the dog park. Should be liable for vet fees etc. Much like someone that gets your car is responsible for the damage.
- Too many bad dogs attack without repercussions.
- This is key. We need to have instant access to the dog's medical records to ensure rabies shots were given. Rabies has to be treated quickly or it can be fatal. The only exception is if they have to lock the animal up to prevent more injuries.
- Pit bulls must NOT be treated differently than any other breed!!!
- Similar to remaining at the scene of an accident.
- It's the decent human thing to do! Obviously no one wants their dog to bite someone or another animal, and things happen, often times it's an accident. But you should still remain on scene to share the incident and contact information
- Whether it be because the dog was defending himself/herself or the dog just bit them. All parties should remain on scene. Personally, I've had run in with idiots that wanted to pet my dog even though I stated NO multiple times and they get way too close in my and my dogs personal space (which he did not appreciate) and defensively he would bark and show off his fangs. Is it my dogs fault? no its the idiot who doesn't understand the meaning of NO so I would want the enforcement officer to understand that.
- Owners must stay at the scene of the assault
- Many cases of people lying about who they are when involved in dog bite situations
- This seems to be common sense. Just as you would stay at the scene of a car accident
- That owner is responsible for the dog.
- This should also go for little dogs butting big dogs. Even if no damage they need to be controlled more than any pitbull
- Shouldn't this be common sense?
- Providing skin is broken and it is a bad bite. If a child runs up to a pomeranian it might scare them if scared.
- Just like with a car accident, an exchange of information should be required.
- That's responsible pet ownership.
- I feel there is always 2 sides of every story and all sides should be heard.



- If a person who owns an offending dog leaves the scene of an accident, they should be held accountable both criminally and financially
- This should be a given for ANY dog owner with ANY breed
- It's simple, it's about accountability.
- It makes total sense to for both owners of the dogs to have contact with each other and exchange information. This is the same process that is used during car accidents. This should extend to incidents concerning dogs and people.
- I think it important to know that all dogs involved are licensed and have current immunization.
- If the bite is serious - not a 'nip', then yes.
- Any responsible owner would do this without a bylaw.
- It's just the right thing to do.
- it depends on the bite severity. In most bite cases the fault lies with the person bitten or the attack is exaggerated.
- Stop targeting bully breeds. They are not the issue, Responsible pet ownership is
- This is crucial to ensure the animal is properly vaccinated as well as in case the bite causes major medical concerns such as abscesses, torn ligaments/broken bones, any vaccinations the person may require etc
- if a dog severely injures another animal or person, then they should be held accountable and help pay for vet bills if necessary and would legally be responsible to any injuries on a human.
- In the event of a serious incident where it is called in as there should be a statement.
- "Not for animals, unless in the event of obvious and severe injury. Dogs will sometimes bite one another without injury or in the context of play.
- With the exception of instances where someone feels intimidated or unsafe. Either party should be able to leave in this case."
- Yes, if the "victim" requires it. If the victim does not require/ask for this, the owners/dogs can be free to go.
- Obtain emergency medical assistance for injured persons or animals. Required to wait for bylaw to determine apprehension and/or quarantine of animals (rabies, etc) and appropriate law/by law enforcement.
- Then both sides of the story can be heard and it can be dealt with properly.
- If vet appointments need to be made, it's fair that all parties are involved. It shouldn't end in enforcement taking either dog.
- I agree. My own pup was bitten by another dog once and the owner left. My issue wasn't with the dog. My issue was with the owner. The city allows people to simply purchase pets and this particular family literally built a small pen (about 5' x 8') and kept their full grown Siberian Husky in there ALL THE TIME. It was never walked, and the only time it had company was when they were trying to breed it. Well of course the dog got antsy and aggressive. It was never allowed to interact with other dogs or people. I tried calling the Humane Society and they said that due to our city's rules (that an animal only needs food and shelter to be deemed as being cared for) they couldn't do anything. THIS is what the city needs to be changing. You shouldn't be allowed to just lock dogs up and



provide some food and call it a day. That is how dogs become aggressive, and can end up hurting someone. These lax rules are what allow people that don't care about the animals to attain them, and then get other people hurt.

- I think it is common courtesy and shows respect to the victim
- Aggressive or Dangerous dogs that bite (not breed specific as I have no issue with BSL breeds) should have owner take responsibility.
- This allows both parties to have information they feel they need to deal with the situation.
- Having a pet involves responsibility. This is one of those responsibilities.
- Accountability for owners is never a bad thing. If your dog bites you should have to explain the actions.
- It's like a car accident. Need to give details to authorities
- Only if the skin is broken
- Absolutely need to be a responsible owner. Things happen and or get heated both sides need a fair share to explain or take ownership.
- Why shouldn't the owner be there to provide info!!
- it is the responsible and reasonable thing to do.
- duh
- This would hold owners more accountable.
- Actions have consequences. If you own a dog, you are responsible for their behaviour.
- Owner responsible for all behaviours of all animals in their care.
- There are many reasons any type of dog would bite. So yes. Each person should stay. The other person could have been terrorizing the dog or rushed on it. Many dogs have ailments. So treating dogs with respect is a given. Never approach anyone else's dog
- It should be a requirement of responsible dog ownership.
- Trace and penalize nuisance owners
- I believe it would be easier to track a dog's track record. Makes the accountable for their dog's actions.
- I have been bitten by dogs before, quite badly. The animal bit me in error, and if the owner had not stayed, there might have been a discrepancy between the two versions of events. The dogs are rarely at fault, it is usually owners who was don't raise and train their animals correctly.
- Too many incidents where the owner disappeared and not taking responsibility for their dog
- Too many people take off after their dogs attack another. It is not fair to the owner of the attacked dog to not get compensated
- The owners of both attacking dog, and attacked dog should both be required to stay and take ownership for their respective roles in the incident. Often, the dog that was attacked was also engaged in irresponsible ownership/behavior, but wound up the one with worse injuries
- This is a responsibility action. The owner has the responsibility to stick around and face the music as well as assisting with any information required by medical staff involved and animal enforcement officers.



- This helps to ensure that authorities will know what dog caused the bite and the owner can be held responsible.
- Need officers to get identification info
- Same rules as a car incident.
- The information regarding the dogs medical history and it's aggression history needs to be known. It's important to understand if the dog is struggling with anxiety or aggression, versus if the dog was very innocent and was provoked.
- An owner should take responsibility for its dog's behaviour.
- More information about the dog allows to determine if dog should be in public spaces etc.
- We've had our own pet injured on our property, while the other animal was roaming free, due our neighbours being irresponsible, complained to animal bylaw services, investigated, found the neighbours responsible for vet bills. Animal by law services pressed charges against them, went to court several times, no money was received, no charges were laid against the neighbour. At this time I've followed all of your rules to stop my neighbours cat roaming free, no charges have ever been laid against them. So cat owners know that animal bylaw services have no power, so once people of this city know that, they let their cats roam free knowing that the bylaws don't apply to them, which is same, that animal bylaw services are a joke, and everyone who owns a pet knows that especially those with cats, but those of us with a dog gets investigated immediately which is unfair to us. Regardless of what had been reported each should be taken seriously and made to follow the city bylaws for their pets.
- Dog owners need to be accountable for their lack of training for their dog.
- Same as traffic accident
- It's their responsibility to provide contact information and possible health/vaccination information on the dog.
- someone's dog should not be allowed to bite or attack anyone and the owners have no responsibility. Take ownership of yourbdogs behavior
- Obviously yes
- You should have to take responsibility for you dog. To me leaving the scene of a dog bite is the same as a hit and run, and it should be treated as such.
- There are always two sides to a story. I agree that both party's should stay on scene but away from each other and talk with enforcement.
- Only if safe.
- It is the OWNER that is responsible for a dog's behaviour, regardless of the breed. If the owner is not putting in the effort to train their dog, or is abusing them at home which leads to violence, the owner should be held responsible.
- The owner is responsible for the dog and must rectify any wrong doing to the best of their ability.
- I've been an owner of a dog who was attacked and severely harmed by a dog and the owner fled the scene, not long after this incident a community alert was sent out for the same dog as it had bitten an elderly lady. The community was looking for tips on where the dog and owner reside, had the rule



above applied I feel that both incidents could have been prevented as my dog was not the first to be attacked by the same dog.

- Should not need a law for this. People need to own up.
- Should be like an accident.
- How is this any different than hitting someone else car with your car? You are damaging anothers belongings if an incident occurs and it is only the right thing to do to be a responsible owner and provide information.
- Unless both parties agree, I think there should be incident reports of dog bites etc. The trouble I see with this is what constitutes an incident where the owners need to be on scene ie. what is 'serious'
- I think this is essential for identify and recording dangerous incidents.
- Owners should always except responsibility of their dogs. But at the same time all stories should align.
- It is the responsibility of a pet owner to have control of their animal at all times and be responsible for their behaviour
- I believe that if any breed of dog bites someone or something else that the owner is responsible to ensure that person or subject is taken care of medically and/or legally. Same as if your kid bit a person or you hit a person.
- Sure, I'd want to know if the dog has been vaccinated.
- Yes, but only if it's safe. Perhaps they could leave information or immediately call 311 if it's safest to leave.
- Owners need to be held accountable for their dogs actions and keeping proper records ensures thats possible
- Absolutely. This is a serious incident.
- "It is the responsibility of pet owners to train and co trials our animals. This includes their fear based "aggressive" behavior.
- Owners needs to take responsibility of all aspects including bites."
- As long as it was an aggressive bite and not a playful one
- They should always share contact information.
- It would make sense that the owner has a chance to explain their side of the situation
- Always need to get both sides of you leave after an attack no matter the circumstances you look guilty
- If you have to stay for a car accident, you should have to do it for your dog(s) as well.
- The victim or victims owner needs to have access to the offenders vet records for safety
- This ensures all parties take responsibility.
- The dog owner needs to take responsibility for their pet
- Its similar to a car accident. So it should be similar charges if the person leaves. Bite and run!
- As someone who ones a Staffie if it was my dog you'd all be screaming for her to be taken away!! But if it's a small dog nothing happens



- Owners (of vicious dogs especially) whose dogs bite must be held to the same standards as drivers in motor vehicle incidents.
- Yes but at the same time it's probably not safe for the owner to remain there with their dog who may have just bite someone or A dog.
- So many people don't stay, they don't take responsibility, people should be held accountable for their dogs actions
- It's the responsible thing to do
- Accountability & responsible ownership. It doesnt matter the size of the dog or who was supposed to be in charge of said animal
- "If I get into a car crash should I remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with enforcement officer...?"
- The answer is yes! Should not be different for an animal attack."
- Absolutely the information needs to be exchanged or a "failure to remain on scene" should apply with a heavy fine (over\$1000)
- My puppy has been bitten at the dog park and they just run away
- If severe enough to require medical attention for person/ animal bitten. Such as puncture wounds or other damage.
- This is common sense. Those involved in a serious incident should always remain on scene until an understanding is met of details given/taken.
- The responsibility should be similar to hitting a car and causing damage (ie: hit and run)
- A person should be expect to stay at the scene of the altercation, just like you are suppose to stay at the scene of a car accident, etc.
- Any owner of any dog breed should remain on scene if necessary.
- If necessary - if someone is upset or hurt then they will ask for an extra enforcer to be involved to help the situation. This may not work if someone is feeling guilty about making enforcement get involved, but it may lead to better animal control in public places if someone owns a biter or a dog who is not well trained.
- It's your property therefore your responsibility
- liability reasons
- Yes, I believe its the owner that's responsible for their pets behaviour and being able to effectively manage it it so bites don't happen
- There have been many stories of dog owners walking away with their dog to avoid responsibility.
- I believe this would allow for sides to be spoken for on both parties, however I think it is important to recognize that without visible proof of the situation, resolutions may still be difficult to come by.
- A dog that has been involved in an incident needs to be documented and investigated to determine if it is a nuisance. Fines can be a deterrent to stop owners from leaving the area to "protect" their dog and avoid other fines
- They deserve to explain their side of the story. Maybe the dog was being harassed
- Owners of dogs should be responsible for keeping their pets in control. The reason why people run and hide is because previously this was a death sentence for the dog even if the dog was defending



themselves from a person who was abusing them (stranger kicks my dog, my dogs bites stranger, strange files complaint and my dog gets killed)

- The owner should be responsible for the dogs behaviour.
- As a dog owner you are agreeing to be responsible for something that can hurt others, just like when driving a car you should be responsible to stay at the scene of an incident and provide details and input.
- If another person or pet is injured statements should be made by both parties regarding the events before and after the bite. It should be responded to quickly so as many facts surrounding the circumstances of the bite are available for review.
- You can't just let your dog attack someone and walk away
- You have to be responsible for your own dog
- Seems like common decency toward a fellow human.
- Dog owners should be responsible for the actions of their dogs and seek assistance from professional trainers to prevent future incidents.
- This would prevent owners from fleeing the scene and not being held accountable.
- Same as a vehicle accident. People who don't remain at the scene get charged with hit and run don't they?
- Well if any human or animal party involved needed medical care, I don't think it's reasonable to expect them all to be present but I do think it should be mandatory to share contact info (but people can lie so not sure how to police this)
- Owner must accept responsibility for their dog's' behaviour.
- Absolutely!!!! Severe damage can occur from a dog bite or any kind of incident, and the OWNER is responsible for everything that dog does. However, there will be people take advantage and call Law Enforcement if a dog even growls at them (which is a dog's defence mechanism before they bite. Ie. Growling = back away)
- The need to explain thier side of what happened
- Unless they have to rush animals to a vet or a person to the hospital
- it is the owners responsibility to watch their dogs when in public areas or at dog parks. Responsible dog owners learn dog behaviour and understand how to read the cues. Unfortunately a lot of dog owners assume their dogs are fine when they're running off leash, it's been my experience that if a dog is communicating with a untrained dog and they take action it is the defending do that gets blamed. The responsibility should be on the owner to deal with the consequences.
- As lone as the dog does not need immediate veterinarian assistance, the owner should remain on scene.
- I believe an owner must take responsibility for any harm or damage inflicted by an animal in their care. It is unacceptable for such a person to leave a scene without providing information on how they can be contacted in case of lawsuits, medical issues, and simply to keep track of an animal that is demonstrated itself to be vicious.
- Owners need to be responsible for their dogs.



- There are always 2 sides to every story. It is beneficial to hear both and to know the dogs' history. Also too many people mis identify dog breeds.
- Bite definition would need to be very clear as any uncertainty in interpretation will be confrontational, especially when dogs playing or exhibiting communication but not aggression.
- It's no different then a car accident. I dog biting it MOST time's an accident. Therefor information of the owners should be shared, the owner of the bitten dog deserves to have vet bills covered but that the end!
- Yes, the owner should take responsibility and remain on the scene, UNLESS in an off leash area, where they should move to the nearest safe area so they aren't putting other dogs at risk.
- Take responsibility for the dogs actions
- Part Of responsible ownership
- Same as with a vehicle so it makes sense. The only reason someone wouldn't want this it likely because they don't want to be held responsible for it
- Any breed of type of dog owner needs to be responsible!
- It's their dog and they are therefore responsible for its actions. It's the same as hitting somebody with your car and leaving the scene of the crime; it's unacceptable. They need to pay for damages their dog caused to the other dog /person.
- Every pet owner needs to be responsible. Been bitten by a small dog off leash, the owner picked them up, told me I was fine, and ran...needed antibiotics after infection took place. City did nothing as was a small dog
- People need to be held responsible for the behavior of their pet.
- Only if it makes sense if the dog is upset it makes no sense for the owner to have to stay there waiting around the animal should be allowed to go to a safe environment to cool down
- A physical attack from an animal should be handled the same as a car accident. Additionally, the cause of the bite should not immediately fall on the animal. There can be instances where the victim of the bite provoked the attack.
- There responsible for training or lack of
- If you are involved in any kind of incident you should always stay at scene
- As long as the owner has the offending dog under control stay. If the owner has no control leave but must leave contact information for the officer
- It is responsible. People will be terrified that their family pet might be taken away but as responsible dog owners, it is important to learn from mistakes and seek help and guidance. It is also important for the person who was bit to learn how their actions might have called the problem.
- Owners need to take responsibility for the actions of there pets and held accountable to a reasonable degree
- If a dog bites another person or dog, the fault should be on the owner due to lack of training. Dogs aren't born vicious, there is a reason behind it and it most likely has to do with lack of training, trauma or neglect.
- I believe that the dog that bites a person/animal has a right to pay out any hospital/vet bills.



- any dog owner (regardless of it's size or breed) should be held accountable if their animal causes injury to another person
- It is the responsible thing to do
- There should be accountability if a dog bites another person or animal, and it should be taken into account whether the dog has had obedience training, vaccines, etc.
- I'm surprised this isn't already in place. Unless the dog is under duress and at danger of violating again, the owner should absolutely remain present.
- Not always possible as many times the owner is nowhere near the dog when an attack occurs.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for the damage their dog causes. Vet bills should not be left to the victim.
- This would enforce the need for the dog owner to take accountability and be responsible for damages caused by their dog.
- The owner is the problem, not the dog.
- background and history are key to understanding why a dog bites- many dogs are not aggressive per se, but become fear aggressive when scared or feeling threatened. Understanding circumstances (e.g., did the owner warn others nearby not to approach their dog, but someone did anyways? Was their dog responding to another dog being aggression and was trying to defend itself? Did the owner instigate it somehow? Does the owner know their dog is aggressive in certain circumstances, but failed to warn others verbally or by not having their dog wear a noticeable vest/label for others to know not to approach?) are important to making accurate judgment calls on potential dog bite incidents.
- Medical costs and responsibility - if my dog hurt someone or their pet i would feel horrible and would want to help any way i could. Im responsible for that pet and should be held liable. If someone hurt me or my pet id want them to stick around. Medical bills for pets are quite expensive and they should be held responsible financially if their pet hurts another or person.
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets and if someone is harmed, it should be illegal to leave the scene until a bylaw officer investigated. Much like hit and runs are illegal when involved in an auto accident.
- Yes, provided that a large dog or pit bull will not be immediately placed at fault if it was antagonized by another animal or a child ran up to it and approached without asking.
- It's no different than a car accident
- The only way they should be allowed to leave is if their contact info has been shared so they can be held accountable.
- correct identification of any suspected offending entity
- Same rules should apply here as they would a car accident. Leave the scene you should get charged for that. Officers should do thier job to the letter of the law without bias. Ppl leave because they are afraid to loose their dog immediately however that shouldn't be the case unless an unprovoked attack occurs in my opinion.
- It's about taking responsibility and ensuring that there is follow up for the incident
- Common sense, duh!



- Seems the responsible thing to do
- Too many people take off
- That goes with out saying. That is called responsible pet ownership.
- Any incident where harm is cause to another individual or animal should require the accused to remain at the scene. Similar to an impaired driving charge.
- Take responsibility
- But only to the degree that emergency transport to a vet or hospital is not required. Medical attention first. If injury the result of the dog bite, practitioners could notify City Bylaw if the offence. Should leave name and contact info if cannot remain on scene
- It makes sense. Car owners have to stay at the scene of an accident. Dog owners should too. But blame the owners, not the dog. Breeds don't matter.
- it's only fair to the owner of the dog being bit to have a way to report to 311 or get monetary compensation for vet bills.
- It's called responsible ownership.
- Easier to manage.
- Yes, as long as it is safe to do so. If the situation becomes hostile or if it will create more tension, sharing contact details with an officer via phone should suffice.
- It makes sense that the owners should exchange information in case a trip to the vet is required
- "If the situation allows. If the dog
- or persons involved need medical care, they should be allowed to leave and give a statement at the vet / doctor."
- 🙅
- It is the other party and the owners right/responsibility to share each side of the story regardless of what happened.
- It should be against the law for dog owners to leave the scene when their dog bites/attacks
- There needs to be accountability and exchange of details means an impartial party may be able to make that judgement if necessary
- "It's like a hit and run.
- They need to be there to tell their side of the story"
- They need to take responsibility for the situation.
- Unfortunately not all owners take responsibility for the actions of their pet. This should be mandatory as the owner should be held accountable for the actions of the animal. If an animal can not be controlled the owner shouldn't have them in a public setting.
- Owners must be responsible for their animals. They can not flee the scene of an incident
- This should happen.
- It's assault and the owner needs to stick around. Animals are like children and when an animal bites the "adult" needs to be around to be their voice
- how is it fair that if I get bit by someone's dog, or if my dog is attacked by another that I must now deal with everything cause that person was irresponsible?



- The dog assaulted the person or other animal. They need to stay and deal with the consequences.
- this is no different than if they were in an accident with a vehicle.
- This would allow for accountability of the dog owner and aid in determining the next steps.
- the owner with the offending dog should stay, especially if the other has been hurt.
- The owner should take responsibility for their animal.
- I assumed this was a rule already, but yes, I don't see why you shouldn't be held responsible for providing proper training if such an incident occurs
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their pets. It's the same way someone should stay and talk with an officer after a car accident.
- If they are not required to remain at the scene, how else would people be held accountable? Similar to vehicle accidents, those involved remain at the scene for officers to arrive. Otherwise it's a hit and run.
- Like any accident, that parties should be present to provide contact info
- It's common sense.
- It's the owners responsibility. It's mostly the owners fault for a dog that is aggressive, not the dog. There are more cases of Labs and Chihuahua bites than Pit Bull type breeds.
- Yes!
- It is the owners responsibility to take control of their dog and explain a situation. If the owner knows the dog might bite a person or another animal, it's the owners responsibility to control their dog or put on appreciate gear to control their dog (ie., muzzles, harnesses, etc.)
- Same logic as a car accident...the owner is responsible...but it needs to be the person in charge at the time of the incident who needs to stay
- That way the enforcement office gets both sides of the story. Instead If it being one side.
- It comes down to the owner understanding their dog and having to be educated on how to control their dog in the incident setting. If the best way to being their dog out without incident is training or muzzle, they need to be enforced and not up to the owners preference
- I think it should be agreed upon by the people involved in the incident. So if one party wants an enforcement officer then they need to stay. If they can resolve on their own then not necessary.
- Common sense and acting in a responsible fashion.
- the owner is ultimately responsible for their pet's behaviour
- 100% owners should be liable for their dogs.
- People who own a dog that can cause trauma to another dog or person should be liable and the best way to determine who is at fault is the scene of the crime
- That's the responsible thing to do
- This is imoortant
- It is a social responsibility to stay at the scene of an incident where your pet causes someone else harm.
- Only for bites that draw blood. If both parties agree not to call bylaw then they don't have to
- Dog owners of vicious pets should be held accountable for the actions of their pets.



- Should always give contact info for dog bites. If severe but should stay till officer arrives.
- Unless the human or animal is in danger. If the person bitten provoked the attack, they should have to take responsibility as well.
- No different than remaining at the scene of a traffic accident.
- I think owners should stay on the scene, most do not with fear they will lose their dog. There's more to an aggressive dog than just a bite, sometimes that's a one off and a dog isn't actually aggressive.
- I believe it is in the best interest of the victim if information is exchanged in case the damage is worse than originally thought
- It is the responsibility of the dog owner to handle the situation safely. If the dog needs to be removed from the situation then a quick relay of information is necessary for later proper assessment of what happened
- Any owner whose dog bites a person or dog should stay at the scene.
- It is like a hit and run offence. The owner shouldn't leave the scene of a crime.
- The owner should have to stay and exchange information
- Need to exchange info as the same as a vehicle accident
- This seems common sense to stay and help the victim and speak to officers. With the exception of if the dog cannot be controlled and immediately needs to leave the scene for the well-being of others.
- The owner is accountable to pay damages to the victim
- You must be responsible and accountable for your pets.
- I think it should be treated the same as a vehicular accident....contact info is exchanged, ect....
- Often times I have heard the owner of a dog in a bite situation runs away and has no responsibility whatsoever, leaving the victim the vet bill for their animal. The irresponsible dog owner should be held accountable.
- Well of course, vaccine history is extremely important to be able to give or get at this moment.
- It's sad that there has to be a law to ensure this, but it does seem to be necessary given some owner's behaviour
- Should pay for medical bills for animal
- Scene of an assault which could be causing serious bodily harm. Owner of dog is responsible for assault and therefore should be required to remain at scene and report incident to authorities
- The person responsible for the dog has to be responsible for their dog's actions
- Yes, but people should be assured that their case will not immediately result in euthanasia
- Everyone, no matter breed or severity of incident, needs to be held accountable for their dog's actions. If you can't be responsible enough to stick around when your dog is involved in an incident, you are not responsible enough to own a dog.
- Yes because it is necessary for the dog's well-being of the dog bites are serious enough. Medical bills is main reason.
- A responsible owner would stay.
- Similar to any automobile collisions causing injury.
- Either that or call in to report it themselves



- The dog owners must be punished not the dog.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- The owners need to take responsibility
- People lie about their contact information
- If there is no rule requiring the owner to remain at the scene of an incident, then the owner is absolved of responsibility and why should they stay? Also the owner may not want to share contact info and if there is no rule then they will not. The contact information is important because the owner may be liable.
- A parent is responsible for their child's actions. An owner should be responsible for their dog's actions. Dogs should be trained just as children should be trained to behave appropriately. People should not be leaving the scene of a car accident, dog owners should not leave the scene when their dog has bitten another person or animal. Otherwise, the owner could leave the scene, give a false name and phone number and could never be traced. The person or animal injured would be left with vet or medical bills. If a dog is trained properly to behave, then an owner need not be concerned with such incidents.
- The dog's misbehaviour and violent outburst is most likely due to negligence and failure to properly train/look after the dog by the owner.
- You need to have the health information from the dog.
- I work in the veterinary field. I have seen very sever dog fight injuries where the owner has left; and the victim is responsible for an incredibly high bill.
- I've had a dog attack my dog and because we only knew the dogs name nothing ever happened and the dog had proceeded to injury a few others as well
- Ultimately a dog owner is responsible for what their dog does and a dog is considered property. You can look at it similar to a hit and run - if your dog attacks someone and you do not stay on the scene you have caused bodily harm to someone and ran away to avoid consequences.
- Rarely has their been an incident at the Braeside off-leash park where I take my dogs however a dog did attack and bite a dog (not a pitbull - in fact the pitbull dogs at our park are friendly, well socialized and well behaved) and the owner of the aggressive dog took off and left the older lady to deal with her injured dog. I'm sure it will be hard to enforce but helpful if a rule.
- If my dog bites someone and they want law enforcement involved I should be held responsible to be there. My concern is that if my dognis agitated, I would need to get him to a safe space first, so maybe exchange information and follow up later?
- Accountability
- Irresponsible dog owners need to be held accountable and pay for any damages or vet bills of the attacked. Note that I have stated the owner be held accountable not the dog.
- The owner is responsible for the dog and should have to provide assistance and remain on scene in the same way it is required for traffic accidents. There should be penalties for "bite and run", including losing the right to own pets.



- Because it's the only way to assess the situation. Just like in a car accident all drivers have to stay and exchange information if necessary and/or wait for reinforcement, same should be with dog altercations.
- Much like a vehicle accident this should be a regulated incident as the pet owner.
- yes owners should take responsibility for the actions of their pets
- there is liability both civil and liability
- They are responsible for everything related to their pet especially if it causes harm
- Depending on the bite. If it is severe enough that someone needs to be contacted the owners should be responsible and exchange information, take pictures. If it doesn't warrant immediate medical or vet attention than I would leave this up to whoever is involved. Also, keeping a dog at a scene like this could increase its stress and lead to further reactions.
- The owner of the dog that caused infliction onto a person or animal needs to be held accountable especially if there are medical/vet bills that are to be incurred due to the incident.
- Take responsibility and take care of any medical and be forced to take dog training and report back
- Owners are responsible for their dogs of course they should have to stay at the scene of an attack on another person and deal with the consequences.
- Yes, dog owners need to take responsibility for poor training and subsequent behaviour problems.
- People need to take responsibility for their actions
- Just like motor vehicle accidents, an owner should remain on scene. What if they never turn up again?
- If an owner leaves the scene it should be treated as a hit and run vehicle accident would have been treated.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for what their dog has done.
- You meet to stay at the scene for a motor vehicle accident, assault etc. why not a dog bite incident
- "Victims shouldn't feel abandoned and left without information.
- However- if the dog is clearly in distress they shouldn't be waiting in public. Maybe in the car or at home after providing contact details."
- Have heard too many stories of of people or their animals being attacked & the owner of the dog attacking just walking away & facing no consequences. That should not be possible or happening.
- It is important for people to take responsibility for their animals actions. There could be substantial costs incurred by the animal for medical attention.
- They shouldn't leave the scene that's like a hit and run
- yes and there should be a fine for not staying at the scene.
- The owner holds more responsibility than the dog.
- If I end up with vet bills because another dog attacked it, I would expect they take responsibility. Having them stay at the scene would ensure this.
- So the responsible owners can pay for vet bills
- Responsible owners would do this and should do this.
- Sure



- Just the same as if you caused a traffic accident with your vehicle, the owner of a dog has the responsibility to stay and report the incident to a local enforcement officer.
- A dog's actions are often the responsibility of the owner's actions or inactions. Also, if they know they have to take responsibility they may make extra effort to avoid a potential dog issue.
- If a dog bites another dog or person the owner should be held responsible
- Because it's the right thing to do
- This is the responsible thing to do
- Every story has 3 sides
- Information exchange should take place - just like a car accident. But medical attention is likely required so understand that people will leave to tend to their animals.
- Responsible ownership
- Absolutely as with any accident or issue information should be exchanged
- Additionally, a fine if they leave.
- If someone is bitten and there is proof then the situation should be explained by both involved.
- This is purely BSL, you've singled out "pitbulls" for no reason. You should also KNOW YOUR FACTS. It is proven a "pitbull's" bite is no stronger than any other specific breed. Their bite force is 300lbs of pressure which IS LOWER THAN A GERMAN SHEPHERD. When will organizations wake up already. Also, "a dog that has an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar to those of dogs referred to in any of clauses (a) to (d); ("pit-bull")" ARE YOU KIDDING ME. So it just has to have a big head or boxed body like a boxer and it's already dangerous? Sugar coat your words as much as you like this is just wrong.
- I believe that owners should be held responsible for any dog bite or aggressive behaviour caused by their pet. The only exception would be if no visible injuries are present.
- It's essentially not the dog's fault but the owner's lack of discipline
- It is an incident. The owner should take responsibility for their dog.
- Owners whose dogs bite other dogs and cause harm commonly leave the scene to avoid responsibility for the harm caused to the other dog.
- They need to be there to explain if their dog has had vaccinations and rabies shot, they should be present to see who they've affected by their dog's behaviour and be fined accordingly.
- It's the responsible thing to do. There can be Veterinary costs associated in certain situations and the Owner at a min should be held responsible.
- Owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their animal
- People need to be held responsible for their pets.
- Owning a bully breed..I struggle with many other breeds and owners NOT respecting city parks that are NOT off leash and allowing their dogs to charge my mastiff. We have worked hard to be in control but will be blamed. You never hear lab or small dog attacks or charges bull breeds. The city NEEDS to be more responsive protecting those of us who do follow rules and train our dogs. I have yet to see a bylaw officer in my suburban SE neighbourhood. In 20 yrs on Calgary pathways, I have never seen bylaw or bylaw enforcing rules. I am saddened that I have rules for my breed but no one is standing up or following through on the many dogs and owners allowed to behave poorly.



Bandanas will only help if people know what they mean but now you are asking me to advertize my trained "reactive dog". While I will participate, what will the city do for me if a Yorkie charges my mastiff and due to size does harm? How does the city plan to balance the breed scales?? How will they plan to protect on leash areas not being used incorrectly causing harm..because there is not enough signs posted and who cares..except I do when that lab is coming straight at me and my dog. Upping fines is great..who is gonna enforce this. People will not wait for an hour for bylaw to respond.

- This just makes sense
- I support the requirement to share info but if medical attention is needed staying at scene might not be realistic.
- This one should be common sense.
- The officer can see the owner and the animal for himself shortly after the incident AND the person can't just leave and potentially never be contacted if the incident caused injury or damage. The person with the offending animal shouldn't have an easy out by just leaving and not giving personal information.
- As a responsible dog owner, that should be an obvious response.
- That's responsible pet ownership and being a decent human being. It is law to remain at the scene of an accident and I think it's reasonable to expect the same in this instant.
- any animal that bite a human or another Animal their owner should of course stay .
- This holds the owner accountable. More often than not, attacks happen when owners are not careful with this breeds
- Your dog just assaulted another human. Take accountability. It's like getting in an accident and taking off and ultimately the dog learns that behaviour is okay
- If your animal attacks someone or something you should be liable for the damage
- The victim of the attack may need follow up information (ie vaccine status), or financial support for veterinary bills and should be able to be in contact with the dog owner if needed.
- If an enforcement officer is not readily available, police must make themselves available with out undue delay.
- This would promote accountability and provide victims of biting a legal standing to request contact information for follow up.
- The owner needs to be held responsible for the attacks. Animals behave on what they are taught. The owner is directly responsible for this.
- Hold owners accountable hands down
- Once a person leaves the location where a dog bit a person or other animal they could disappear and never be found
- We have to have accountability and recourse
- All sides should be heard.
- Because it's the right thing to do.
- Same as every other incident (ex. Hit and run). Need to stay on scene



- if owner is on hand can get information regarding status of shots to the animal (such as rabies vaccination)
- yes, because Pitbulls are not the only umbrella breed that bite or attack people, [removed].
- It should be treated as a road accident or any other incident. If you hit someone with your car, you wait for proper authorities. Having your dog accidentally injure someone is the same thing.
- most take off and then its hard to locate thw owner for vaccine records
- Common decency would dictate this is an approach behaviour.
- That's good in theory but I can see owners leaving especially if there is no way that the owner can be identified. It happens now so I can't see that changing even with a rule. The only way it could possibly work is that a fine would have to be paid by the owner if that owner was caught.
- Leaving is similar to a hit and run, and very hard to find the dog and owner after
- Well it's basically assault. But I do not agree with deeming certain breeds more dangerous
- Responsible pet ownership needs to be enforced
- Information is critical.
- Any bite should be properly investigated and documented.
- Owners should be held accountable for the training and behaviour of their dogs. Running for an incident is comparable to a hit and run.
- If the dog bit another animal or human out of aggression, or if the accident was severe then yes. However, some dogs give warnings to humans or other animals that are ignored which can lead them to further defenses like bites, in this instance if the bite is not severe than it should not be mandatory. Severe meaning needing medical attention like stitches.
- They shouldn't be scared their dog is going to get euthanized, and I think that needs to be made clear
- I think both parties should stay. I also think that whether the dog that was injured was in compliance with bylaws is important. Eg. If they were off leash and not under control (bothering the other dog) and the owner was unable to contain their dog, then the dog gets bitten, that should also be penalized.
- In case the dog owner tries to run away. There should be a way to safely do this without the dog being more stressed out and causing more incidences.
- It's important to get both sides of the story.
- Owners have to be held responsible. There are not bad dogs only bad owners. Better screening process to breed and own a dog.
- As a dog owner you are responsible for your dog and it's actions, including if they bite a person or an animal. You should need to stay, provide contact information and speak to an enforcement officer if they are able to come within a reasonable time frame (I.e. 30 minutes)
- The people need to be properly identified and so does the animal.
- Just like any other accident, people should stay and take responsibility for their part.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their pet and ensure the injured party has the care they need.



- The dog owner should be held accountable just as they would be if they were the cause of any other kind of injury.
- Dog owner should be held responsible to pay for vet bills and provide contact information to victims.
- Stop penalizing pit bulls and their owners because of their "strong bite" my Staffordshire bull terrier is an absolute wimp. We are responsible dog owners, he's had obedience training and we have pet insurance which includes liability. I'm so [removed] mad at you guys for penalizing this breed. How [removed] dare you, chihuahua's bite more.... penalise their owners, my husband and I already work [removed] hard, pay taxes, worked through covid and now you want us to pay more, just because we own a "pit bull" [removed] off...it's a cash grab. You should be absolutely ashamed of yourself. If ANY dog bites and is deemed as dangerous, you should be penalizing the owner at that point not discriminating against a generic breed. My dog has never been muzzled at all and never needed to be, if he goes to park (assuming you dont ban him first) be he gets attacked by a husky dog (also a big powerful dog) he can't defend himself...then what? It's [removed]...are you gonna ban all white people from the parks now too? How [removed] dare you suggest this.
- It should be treated the same if another person bites someone
- I agree with this as this will allow for easier exchange of information and gathering of information for whatever follows
- If a dog bites anyone or another animal it should be treated as something serious. And should be looked into. Not just for people's safety by must for our animals safety and well being as well. It could also help identify dogs that are not being trained properly. Improper dog ownership can lead to the dog being euthanized because if the pet owners irresponsibility
- Same as a hit and run. You don't leave the scene.
- Simply put you are leaving the scene of an assault on a person. You should have to stay put or exchange contact info.
- Same as a car accident can not bite and run
- The owner of the dog needs to be held responsible. It's about the training from the owner not the dog specifically
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets. Just as you should remain at the scene of an auto accident
- "Each story has 2 sides
- If another dog attacks mine and then my dog defend itself how can you blame my dog"
- "Because we need to hear both sides of each party to determine why the dog would bite in the first place.
- Also, if there is any life threatening injuries that would be at the cost of the party at fault."
- Too many times dogs are off leash and the incident happens without the owner being close enough or denying the incident. Owners need to take responsibility.
- If you can't control your animal and it bites you should take responsibility
- Only if it's a bad attack. In the same breath if they just exchange information it should be good enough.



- ANY dog that bites another animal/person needs to be held accountable through the owner. Regardless of breed/size.
- it called being responsible .
- The resulting vet costs for the injured dog can be significant and the owner of the attacking dog may need to hold some responsibility or be questioned.
- Dog bites that result in puncture wounds should require follow up from a medical perspective, vet bill contributions and Rabies holds (in owners homes requiring vet check in 10days post bite)
- I was bitten by a dog once n when I confronted the owner, he was very rude n didn't care. When I told him that I will call the authority, he said "go ahead " n then drove away. There has to be stricter rules that dog owners have to follow.
- "It depends on the situation
- If the dog was approached by a stranger when it bit, it falls on the person approaching the dog, NOT the animal"
- For identity reasons
- The dog's owner should be held responsible for these kinds incidents
- In theory as long as the animals can be separated and calm - but depending on the situation it may be too hard keeping everyone there with upset animalsy
- But only if it puts no others or the dog at risk or in a stressful position. Owner should be able to take the stressed dog home if necessary as long as contact information is left.
- If this situation did take place, it is the responsibility of the owner to ensure the situation is dealt with properly. Leaving the scene will only cause more questions and no answers. Always good to have both sides of the story and as much information about the animal such as shots and possible infections for everyone's concerns.
- Unless the owner of the dog who had been bitten doesn't want to speak with an officer
- I think there would need to be a level of severity. If there are no injuries I would be be concerned about someone trying to hold me to this rule and it could cause unnecessary lawsuits and be a violation of basic rights.
- Make sure everyone is safe and vet bills are paid
- Should be responsible for vet/doctor bills
- People with dogs that bite should be held accountable and should be responsible for any damages caused.
- Owners should take responsibility for the actions of their animals.
- You cant leave the scene of an accident
- I believe information needs to be exchanged but forcing dogs just in an altercation to remain close is not a good idea.
- Absolutely! Too many times have I heard of dog bites and attacks on other dogs where the owner just vanished and never faced fines or even vet or medical bills resulting from it. It should not just be a rule but law to remain at the scene, share contact information and talk to an officer!
- Yes there should be a law in place that they have to stay and supply Information. Something similar to fleeing a scene should be in place.



- I don't agree with this idea because I am unsure how these people would be chosen for this job. A lot of people are not open or fair minded about animals breeds and animal care. For example, people that would be appointed for this job may be against bully breeds, therefore they would be more strict on bully breeds rather than others if they were to bite someone. All dogs should be given the same treatment when in this situation. We don't discriminate in our legal system based on someone's race or where they are from, dogs should be treated the same.
- Animal/ owner should be held accountable for both pets actions and their own.
- As long as the victim party wants to pursue this route.
- If the bite is severe and/or to a child. The owner should be held responsible. Any bite is a result of a poor owner. However, dogs play and sometimes play rough. I think bite needs to be better defined.
- There are 2 sides to every story, and the consequences to both parties need to be fair.
- I do believe if there is an incident. All parties should remain to report and provide info
- vet bills are very expensive and someone shouldn't have to foot the bill for other people's mistakes.
- This just seems like common sense. You don't leave the scene of an accident involving vehicles. How is this different?
- like a car, as an owner/operator of an animal you are responsible to act in the best interest of the injured party
- The owner should be held responsible for not properly handling and training their dog
- My dog has been bitten by off leash dogs in our community and there is no accountability for owners who are not keeping their dogs under control or in their yards
- Only way to document history and behaviour of the pet and the owner
- It should be treated like a car accident. Fleeing the scene isn't allowed.
- Owners are responsible for the public behaviour of their animals and must be held accountable.
- Too many dog owners just walk away leaving health care costs to the victim
- Many bites big OR small should be addressed. As an owner of a dog, pitbull to be exact, and having my dog attacked at the park and having puncture wounds I wish I was able to call someone to report the incident or request owners info. I would have liked to see some kind of discipline placed on the OWNER, not dog. Like a fine and warning.
- Bites can be severe and should be treated at the dog owners expense. Only for bites, not knock downs (without serious injury) and noise.
- Often, at the dog park for example a dog will attack another and the owner will leave, and ultimately leave the attacked dogs owner with a large vet bill and trauma to deal with, when it should be the attacking dogs owner responsibility.
- Because you're awful if you don't.
- Any decent person would stay unless it's some [removed] who asked for the bite
- If I'm in a car and I get in an accident, I'm required to stay at the scene and file a report. If someone has been irresponsible with their dog and as a result it has attacked another animal or person, the rule should be the same. It's about being responsible for your animal.
- yes
- Responsible owners will do this anyway.



- All information should be reviewed during an incident in order to let all parties reach a satisfactory conclusion efficiently.
- Yes. I think they should remain there and if they don't it would be similar to an offence like a hit and run on a person. Obviously not as extreme but something similar and if they don't stay then a fine or something would be issues.
- If an owner leaves then they should be charged the same as leaving the scene of a car/pedestrian accident.
- It is appropriate for the owner to take accountability for what occurred
- I'd support this if the bite was aggressive. I've seen dogs get impaled by teeth while playing, clearly an accident, but sometimes it happens. No one's fault and a risk of dogs playing.
- Why does this even require an explanation.
- This is responsible and courteous. The other measures are way out of line and restrictive and preemptive. If an incident should occur, yes of course the owner should stay on scene and provide contact information.
- Similar to an accident, full damage isn't known right away.
- Owners should be required to provide their contact information at the scene. Both parties should be required to do so. All things would be as equal as possible if it started out this way.
- Same as hit and run. Can't leave the scene of a crime
- Of course, they shouldn't be able to leave the scene of the crime
- I have been through this having my dog badly bitten resulting in surgery and I do not think it is fair for those nuisance dogs (a pitbull) to be able to get away with whatever they please because owners can't own up to what happened.
- It makes sense and is the right and courteous thing to do to stay at the scene to possibly be held accountable
- Owners should be accountable for their animals behaviour. Owner could have information that is needed for the human or animal.
- There has been situations where the dogs bit a smaller animal and the owners left.
- Dog owners must take responsibility
- Yes, the owner needs to take responsibility of their dog at all times
- Responsible pet ownership means taking full responsibility for incidents. Having a third party to take both sides of the story could help with problem solving - this would also ensure that incidents could be recorded for data use.
- Need to be held responsible
- Seems obvious
- Dog bite injuries can get expensive, the owner of the dog that bites needs to be held accountable.
- Like in a car accident or any other accident, a person involved or at fault is to remain at the scene. This should apply here unless veterinary care for a suffering animal is required and thus the obligation is on the owner to report and the vet to report so the situation can be resolved.
- it's similar to getting into a car accident, information should always be exchanged (of course with the premise that neither party can harass the other). Especially if the person and or dog ends up dying



from the attack, the owner shouldn't be allowed to keep that dog (especially for repeat offences). the dog should go to someone else who knows and understands how to train/control the breed.

- This is basic common sense.
- It should be up to a professional trainer whether a dogs behaviour can be corrected. A lot of these problems are down to owners who need to be explored more than the dog. Mandatory inspection and training would be a better solution.
- Yes that's fair
- Owner identification and dog history can be obtained.
- just like any accident... YOU are responsible. Wait at the scene.
- Yes, the owner should be held responsible for the dog's actions
- owners need to accept responsibility for the actions of their dogs
- Just like a hit and run accident, the owner of the dog who has bitten shows a lack of responsibility by leaving the scene. If they stay and be responsible that should be taken into account at the tribunal. I prefer to only see Euthanasia as a very last resort.
- because like with any other incident, you need to stay behind to give your information and speak with an officer.
- the owner of the offending dog (and the dog) needs to be afforded some protection from retaliation while waiting. Information on what do do in the event of a dog attack (or SERIOUS dog fight), should be provided with licensing info. Or owners can exchange information like a traffic accident.
- "Absolutely.
- Any dog's owner that bites a person or another dog should be held responsible and ensure that vaccination record are made available to the family and to anyone involved. Same as a car accident."
- dog owners need to be accountable when there animal bites. The owner should stay at the scene and if they leave it should be seems as leaving the scene of an accident.
- Not remaining on the scene is completely irresponsible.
- owners are responsible for their pet's actions and need to remain on the scene to take responsibility
- Absolutely! This is common sense no different than a car accident.
- The owner should remain at the scene to explain the dogs side of what happened.
- People need to be responsible for their pets.
- I agree that the owner needs to give information after a bit, however I do not agree with having to wait for an enforcement officer
- If a dog bites another person there should be a significant fine for failing to remain at the scene
- Sure
- I hope fines would apply for those that leave the scene, unless needed to in order to obtain medical attention (human or animal)
- Owner should be responsible for there animals and is not on breed pacific
- The owner should 100% be responsible and pay for any vet bills incurred by the attack. You should never leave then scene without providing your information etc.



- As the owner you are liable for what your dog does just like you would be liable for your 7 year old kid punching another kid in the face
- A lot of people try and run away with their dogs when they bite. They should be held accountable
- Like a car accident. No one wants to have a hit and run. Just as it would seem unethical to let a dog that bites and the owner run off.
- I can't believe this isn't a bylaw?
- Those with a nuisance dog must be held accountable. I own American Bully's, and have never had an incident where my dog was in the wrong. But have had plenty of other dogs stir issues up with my dogs.
- I'm not quite sure what there is to explain? Good pet owners should take responsibility for their pets.
- It is important for animal owners to take responsibility for their pets and their actions, and also to defend themselves against wrongful accusations by other pet owners, regardless of size or breed.
- .
- Responsibility and accountability must be fully enforced as it is an injury regardless of severity.
- Yes. As it is the persons fault as they are responsible for their animals
- Owners has to be responsible for training and bringing their pets out.
- To improve accountability
- dog bites arise in many different scenarios, this will help accountability
- It allows for both sides of the story to be heard. There are often times a dog bites another dog after repeatedly being provoked which is valuable information to know.
- It can be difficult to identify dogs involved in these incidents if the owners leave. Then they may be involved in multiple incidents before being identified.
- Yes... provided there is a way to remove the dangerous dog from the scene. People need to be held accountable if their dog bites or attacks someone or another animal. (Other than hunting dogs killing wild, legal prey)
- absolutely. However, if it is safest to remove the biting dog from the situation to avoid further problems, I think owners should be allowed to trade diver licence info and follow up through home insurance if necessary.
- So someone can be responsible for the incident
- You are responsible for your pets behaviour.
- They need to take responsibility for their dogs actions
- It is the same as fleeing the scene of a crime, in my eyes.
- We need more information about what happened and not just assume if a pit bull was involved it's their fault.
- People need to take responsibility for their animals.
- If you leave the scene of an accident it is breaking a law, why would a dog attack resulting in injury be any different
- If your dog bites, you need to take ownership
- It's like a hit and run...you remain at the scene until it is resolved



- We have to do this for other crimes or accidents . It will also help know if the injured person needs to go get a rabies shot. the only exemption to this would be if they had to get the dog out of the area for the safety of others
- When my dog was bitten the owner of just runaway
- Just like a car accident
- Absolutely. Information should always be shared due to vet bills and any concerns relating to the health of either dog.
- Of course they should! Their dog was responsible for the attack, it's like leaving the scene of an accident...
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their dogs and stay on site to resolve the issue and take measures to prevent another incident.
- Remaining at the scene is the responsible thing to do. however, if someone is willing to exchange info then that is a show of good faith
- Accidents can happen but an owner needs to do the responsible thing and remain onsite so it is dealt with. If their dog is still being aggressive and they need to remove it from the situation they must provide valid contact information.
- I believe the offending dogs owners should be responsible for the fees incurred from the bite, if veterinary care is needed and information on if the affending dog is vaccinated.
- if they do not stay, irresponsible owner. Therefore, untrained dog.
- I believe it should be treated as a car accident-must remain at the scene or it's considered same as hit and run
- I'm not sure why they would leave in the first place...
- Owners should be held responsible if their dog bites a human or another animal.
- OWNERS NEED TO BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE ACTIONS OF THEIR ANIMALS NOT THE DAMN ANIMAL REGARDLESS OF SIZE! THEY ARE THE ONES LACKING RESPONSIBILITY!
- it would assist in fines/charges being made and allow dangerous animals to be documented more easily
- If a dog bites unprovoked there may be costs occurred by owner that should be the responsibility of the dog the issued the bite. Also if it is reoccurring other actions may be needed to be take
- Treat it like a hit and run if they do not remain at the scene. But will an officer show in time?
- Like any accident, the owner should be present to speak to enforcement.
- As a responsible pet owner you should be required to stay at the scene and share contact information in the event that your dog as inflicted damage to another dog or person, I would expect to be contacted to pay for any vet bills relating to the incident. I think it is valid to speak with an enforcement officer to get all sides of what happened - it could be a situation where someone is lying about how the incident happened.
- People must be responsible for the behavior of their dog pets. If their dog creates a problem, the owner must deal with any consequences.



- This is the most responsible thing to do! If the dog owner who bit my dog last year stayed put my situation at the dog park could be resolved better
- Similar to rules requiring you to stay on the scene if you're involved in a car accident.
- They should also be required to pay medical: vet bills.
- It is important to be responsible for your animal. It is also important that accurate information be recorded, and any medical (or vaccination) matters be addressed. I believe more education is needed, however, as many people believe that any bite means euthanasia.
- I didnt know people would leave!?!?
- Responsible dog owners would want to remain at the scene, irresponsible dog owners (who should be prosecuted) would not
- This should be a given! Your pet has injured someone. Same as if you are involved in an accident.
- They need to be held accountable and acknowledge something went wrong.
- My dog was bitten at an off-leash park and the other dog's owner did not provide any contact information (nor seem to care her dog was vicious PS was not a pit breed) so I was not able to follow up with her about vet bill for broken skin wound. My dog has a scar and we are fearful to return to that park.
- Pet owners need to be accountable for there pets actions.
- They should be responsible for any vet or medical bills
- Should stay to not only be accountable but also have an opportunity to tell their side of the story (eg if dog was provoked)
- The owner can provide information on the dog, is it up to date on vaccines, provoked? Owner should be responsible for costs if damages
- The owner must bear the responsibility for consequences.
- In many cases the person and dog leave before necessary information can be gathered.
- I think it is akin to a car accident. Someone was injured, you are responsible as it's your pet. You should remain there.
- Do not bully bully breeds
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets.
- Owners must be held responsible for their dogs behaviour
- "As long as Contact information is exchanged then they can part
- Ways."
- They have an accountability to stay
- A person should always be responsible for their dog.
- Owners need to know that they will consistently be held fully accountable and liable for any harm done by their dogs.
- I believe information needs to be shared in the occurance of a bite. I don't believe enforcement officers are required on all these calls, so as long as the victim is satisfied with receiving the appropriate information, this should be acceptable.



- It's basic owner responsibility. You're required to not leave a scene of an accident, same idea should apply here.
- Be an adult, as a dog owner I would never run away!!
- Too often owners don't stay. This new bylaw might not improve that, but will add an extra penalty onto delinquent owners.
- Owners need to take responsibility of their dog and should have a chance to explain themselves.
- If the dog bites it is more than likely not the dog's fault, it is the owner's fault for not going to training or putting their dog on leash or a muzzle. This is why we need muzzle laws not breed specific legislation that has been proven by endless universities and animal welfare charities to be detrimental to pet welfare
- Abusive owners would likely want to cover their tracks and not be held accountable for animal abuse. I really question the role of an "enforcement officer" however, and would like to see there be stricter animal bylaw services in place for abusive pet ownership.
- Yes and no. If you are endanger and the dog bites somebody then obviously leave. But yes, it is important to hear the whole story, and take appropriate actions.
- Owner should be responsible for any damages to person or pet
- It's just like exchanging information at an accident site
- As a dog owner, I would want to both have accountability for other dog owners being required to stay while the issue is settled, as well as accountability on behalf of other dog owners should my dog bite.
- people get away with their dogs biting people too often!
- A responsible owner, should and would remain, unless one or both dogs/animals required immediate veterinary care, and then i believe the owner(s) should be able to do that and have the enforcement officer meet the parties there.
- So that the owner can explain what happened and not be railroaded because if the breed
- With the exception of unwanted attendance on private property or provocation on private property.
- If the bite draws blood and if the victim (person) or another animals owner requests it.
- There are a lot of dog attacks that the owner leaves with dog and needs to be in contact to deal with the issue
- this is like s hit and run, so many people take off. Owners should be held liable for fleeing. The victim should not be held liable for damages another dog has done.
- my dog has been attacked at off leash and required stitches. owner left so her dog could not be identified, take responsibility, and I did not know if shots were up to date.
- If another dog harms my dog, the other dogs owner should be responsible for vet bills.
- It's common sense
- Collect info re rabies shots, history, analyse event. Eg was the dog being harassed by a child, did the dog attack with no warning.....
- Of course this needs to be a "rule", I'm surprised that this is even a question. It's common decency and people need to take responsibility for their pets' behaviour, including when they bite.
- The dog owner is responsible to control the dog and its actions.



- The responsibility is with the HUMAN not the dog/animal. When taking on the ownership of the dog people need to be educated on the whole spectrum of dog ownership.
- More accountability for bad dog parenting
- Holds people accountable
- It is good to look at both sides of a situation. Sometimes the dog may have been provoked by the person being bitten. For example, a child poking the dog in the eye with a stick, or pulling it's tail extremely hard causing severe pain to the dog. In which case the dog had the right to defend itself. The child's parent should be handed a fine and not the dog owner.
- there are always 2 sides to a story and i believe both sides should be heard in full but a lot of people leave the scene, leaving the other person with questions and often a vet bill
- Responsible pet ownership would be part of this.
- I am shocked that no such rule exists!
- Its the responsible thing to do. Its also accountability.
- they need to be held accountable!
- Without speaking with the owner there is no way to know if a dog has been vaccinated etc. Owners should be responsible for any damage/injury caused by their animals.
- it should be just like if you get into a car accident. You have to exchange information and then decide from there what to do. If damage is severe enough then the choice is made for you, you have to wait for bylaw/police.
- The owner needs to be there to take responsibility for their dog.
- How else can the victim pursue a complaint?
- You must be responsible for your animals behaviour
- The dog should remain at the scene unless required to seek medical treatment.
- They should stay and be held accountable.
- Many times the owner will flee and the opportunity to grab info in the spur of the moment evades the victim. Should be dealt with in the same way as a hit and run offender.
- I think anyone who leaves the scene where their dog has bitten someone needs to stay, render assistance and wait for authorities. If they need to remove the dog from the scene, they should be obliged to provide identification to witnesses.
- Too many people leave the scene leaving the victim no voice
- As an owner you should stay with your pet and provide information.
- I feel like it is important to stay at the scene to make sure proper information is shared to ensure owners are held responsible
- Animals are a liability, very much like a vehicle. You don't hit someone and get to leave the scene of an accident. It's imperative to act responsibly, and take ownership because if not, it makes the DOG look bad.... which is wrong.
- Unless there is an emergency
- Being able to contact someone to help cover veterinary bills after an incident can be beneficial to the injured party



- If your dog bites someone, you need to stay and give info, not just run off and get away with it.
- Staying to share information just seems like common sense. People need to know the dogs health/shots etc
- They need to be held responsible
- simple courtesy, if your dog bites another human being weither it is your fault or theirs it should be reviewed by a third party so that either the owner/dog or person who was bitten can be punished accordingly
- It should be treated the same as a car accident, where owners of vehicles have to stay to explain what happened/trade insurance etc.
- I think responsibility should be taken if a dog is attacking a person or there pet. Make sure party is ok and has been fallowed up with.
- 100% too many run, and owners are left with costly vet bills. And that offending dog is a risk of biting again. This also helps clear up disputes if a dog bit in self defence or to get a dog off it causing it pain. Bystanders knowing you can't leave the scene, like a car accident, would be more willing to stick around to provide witness testimony. A dog bite is NEVER a black and white clear cut case. And a bite does not necessarily mean it's aggressive or at risk to others, depending on the circumstances. Having cameras set up at dog parks that can have footage pulled by request could help mitigate a lot of these issues.
- It's the responsible thing to do if there has been an injury to a person or other animal. That said your pitbull questions are hugely problematic and offensive. You need to restart this survey. I have been proud that Calgary has not gone down the path to breed discrimination like other places and this is very disappointing.
- I believe that part of being a responsible pet owner is taking responsibility for the actions of your animals. By requiring people to take this responsibility, hopefully we can encourage the pet owner to acknowledge the issue, and work with law enforcement and the public to make their community safer.
- This is common sense
- There have been many times another dog has attacked my dog and other dogs in parks and the owners just leave right away with no info given. It should be treated like a car accident. You should have to exchange info.
- If there are medical bills to be paid due to injury than yes. I don't think, the biting pet should be taken away as people are part of the problem
- It may be more dangerous for the owner to remain at the scene with the animal
- Need to know if animal is up-to-date on shots.
- The owner is liable and it is just the right thing to do! It is like a hit and run if they leave
- They need to be held accountable and be offered the required resources to help manage their dog. They need to be monitored to ensure they are being the best owner they can be to their dog so incedents don't happen again.
- That person should be responsible for the action of their dog



- It shows responsibility of the OWNER and how the owner reacts to being under scrutiny and if they should even keep the dog.
- Such a requirement enhances dog owner accountability; increases efficiency for the city and victims; and facilitates the subsequent process.
- Yes is pretty clear.
- It is part of being a responsible dog owner and information should be exchanged if your dog harms someone or another animal.
- Only if it is safe to do so and the dogs can be calmed down.
- Bites should be reported, in order to watch for patterns of bad behaviour
- People must take responsibility for their dogs.
- I think it's like an accident causing significant damage, either incident should require the person to stay and give information.
- They should be held responsible for damages
- It is an owners responsibility to have their dog under control and like with a car accident there should be an expectation that the owner either remain at the scene of provide contact information.
- Some responsibility needs to be had for out of control dogs that bite people and injury other dogs/animals.
- I think whatever is safer for the animal to calm down
- Information needs to be exchanged to resolve vet bills, fault, etc
- Dog owner should be held liable for costs incurred from injury, including loss of work, counselling etc
- That's makes sense.
- I have seen multiple times people either having their dogs get in a fight and run away, or have their dog antagonize another dog, get into a fight and threaten to call bylaw. Having them forced to stay would be a help.
- Accountability is an important part of dog ownership, but both sides need to be accounted for, like a car accident. Authorities should look into the events leading up to the bite, not just that the dog bit.
- This is a good idea but only if the injury is severe, something that breaks skin. It's just too unreasonable. Some people will claim anything as a nuisance.
- Be responsible as well as pay vet bill
- Is this not common sense already? No different than a car accident.
- U investigate animal bite for rabies and many owners flee the scene or refuse to provide the information.
- The owner should have the chance to also explain and be offered advice on training classes
- Drivers of a car must remain on scene and share info. Owners of dogs are responsible for that dog.
- Your dog is your responsibility, if your dog injured another person and or animal, it's your responsibly to ensure it is handled properly. This would be like doing a hit and run with a car if you did not remain on scene.



- I feel like it's the same as a car crash. You should have to stay so someone is held accountable. People run off with no recourse on their actions and once they leave the scene no way to prove what happened
- I have had dogs bite and people don't care what their dogs have done. I have been bite and people think it is okay cuz their dog is small. People need to take ownership for their dogs. So many dogs are surrendered as people cannot afford vet bill after their dogs are attacked. Or why should people have to put up with a dog that bites and the owner get away with it. This escalates attacks if owners allow it to happen over and over due to lack of recourse. enforcement might be hard
- Too many times, the owner of a nuisance dog will brush the incident off - ESPECIALLY if the dog involved is a small breed (Yorkie, Pomeranian, etc). Most times the incident is not reported properly with consequences to the owner. Regardless of the breed, if they bite it's a problem!
- People let their dogs attack others and especially other dogs and are never dealt with. A friend's dog was attacked and the owner specifically said it was the third time, and then she gave a fake number and ran off. My friend almost had to put her dog down and was on the hook for a huge bill. Ridiculous.
- To hold owners accountable.
- Any incident where property is damaged, car accidents, etc. The owner is required to remain on scene, this should include dog incidents
- It is an owner's responsibility.
- The owner must account for the dog's behavior - owning a dog is a responsibility & owners need to be held responsible.
- Yes, to keep a clear record and accountability.
- Leaving the scene is trying to not take responsibility
- Take responsibility for your animal's actions.
- The owner needs to be responsible
- I believe this is important for legal reasons
- ...because it's a good idea ...
- If the dog owner remains, they can be asked to produce vaccination records (within a reasonable amount of time)
- YES!!! Oh my gosh the amount of times they just leave is absurd. If you get into an accident you are not supposed to leave the scene of a crime. This is a crime / do not leave. He said she said is less relevant when someone has an injury but having both witnesses is important
- There is important information required when a dog bites such as vaccine history.
- They should at least exchange information in the event the bite resulted in more damage than expected
- I don't think staying at the scene is imperative but exchange of information should be required so that the owner of the offending dog can pay vet bills and the dog brought to the attention of authorities as a possible problem dog.
- If it is safe to do so they should stay. They may need to get the dog away so they may have to leave.
- If a dog bites someone, the owner is responsible to deal with it, so they should stick around.



- Of course. Owner responsibility.
- Owners should be a part of the process
- Owners need to present to be held accountable
- It's important to create records and document dog bites for everyone's safety
- The person who had the dog attack should remain at scene and if not be charged with fleeing scene of incident
- It has to happen due to the potential for the offending dog to have infectious diseases, or lack of licensing or registration.
- They should also bear the responsibility of any medical attention needed for a person or animal harmed by their pet.
- responsible pet ownership = owner needs to be accountable.
- How else will you find the dog or owner-accountability!!!
- I don't know how you would enforce it however!!
- Many dogs get attacked and are left with the bills when the other party flees
- As the caregivers and owners of our dogs, we are responsible for their behavior. And bites always have an escalation sometimes it's not the owner or dogs sole responsibility.
- "You
- Should not be able to leave the scene if your pet injures someone"
- Many owners of dogs that have bitten another dog leave the scene without exchanging information or accepting responsibility for the dog's behavior
- Too many dog owners leave the scene of a confrontation or bite/attack without even acknowledging it. We need them to be held accountable for their animals actions.
- Remaining at the scene is just about taking responsibility.
- People should not be allowed to run away from their responsibilities. If their dog bites a person or animal they need to make sure that the injured party receives the care that they need, and that they pay any applicable fines.
- It's important to get info on rabies vaccination or not.
- In my opinion an incident involving a dog bite is similar in nature to a car accident. The owner of the offending dog needs to be held accountable for the actions of themselves and their dog. If any medical or vet bills result from the incident there should be a reliable way to ensure proper information is gathered. If an owner is unwilling to accept responsibility for the actions of their dog then they should not be pet owners.
- If you get in a car accident do you leave the scene? Same rules should apply to the dog owner!!
- To exchange information for possible compensation and identification of the animals
- Or leave their contact information. As the owner may have to leave with the dog
- They must show responsibility and pay if there were any damages.
- We are liable for our dogs and sharing our information should be an act of a responsible owner. Accidents happen, but a lot of bites go unreported until they are more serious. Raising the bar in regards to expectations may push owners to step up and act more responsibly.



- Of course...you take responsibility for the actions of your animal. The worst bite I've had came from a cat...no one seems to be bothered by them???
- The owner needs to be accountable for their pet's actions.
- Ultimately, I feel it is the owner's responsibility if an animal is behaving badly. They should be accountable for it's actions.
- The owner of the offending dog should be responsible for any medical or vet bills.
- There are 2 sides to every story. Dog could have been antagonized. The owner and other person should remain o scene.
- Why would they not be required to do that already? An enforcement officer would need that information to see if the dog is licensed, if it's had it'sivshots, etc
- Owners are responsible for their animals behaviour and should be held accountable
- Explanation is required as to why the dog but someone or another animal
- It should be treated like a hit and run. They should not be allowed to leave the scene if their dog injured another dog or person. There needs to be a way of contacting them should the other dog/person requires medical attention and they should be responsible for covering the costs. A note should be left on that dogs file/ license.
- I have heard many stories of people rushing away after their dogs bites. This leave the victim of the in a awful position trying to identify the attacker/owners and often these owners (of aggressive the dogs) will continue to put others in a dangerous situation.
- Absolutely the owner of the dog of any breed should take responsibility as well as the vet bill if required to treat
- Same as a car accident. You should not run from the scene of an accident.
- It is the owner's responsibility of the behaviour of their pet as it would be their child.
- Only exception would be the need to remove the dog for safety reasons (ie return them to fenced area or home).
- Too often victims are left with an injured dog and the bills that go with them, and people need to be held accountable for their dogs behaviour
- It's no different than a car crash.
- I believe that it is the owners responsibility to be sure that the injured party is alright and offer help in anyway possible.
- I'm not sure how you enforce this. Many owners of Hesse nuisance dogs, and bully breed dogs, don't tend to be the most upstanding of citizens - but there should be an economic penalty for this infraction.
- The owner of a dog needs to take responsibility for the action. Many owners run because they don't want anything to happen to their dog. Perhaps a tribunal system would be helpful with this
- If you know that your dogs can be aggressive and that dog does bite, you need to take responsibility for the actions of your dog.
- This should be treated as any other accident and information should be exchanged, as well as enforcement officers if there is an open wound, bleeding, etc.



- While bites sometimes happen accidentally, they should all be reported so it can be determined if there is a problem. I've heard of way too many people with dogs that have bitten at the park on multiple occasions. There should be a X number of strikes and you're banned from the off leash park rule.
- Dog owners should remain at the scene to provide their personal information as well as any medical information pertinent to the animal (rabies, distemper shots, etc.).
- They shouldn't just leave, they need to be reliable for the other dogs medical costs because those can't be upwards of \$1000. Atleast stay until the owner has assessed the dog that has been attacked.
- This can be a huge liability problem and can have huge costs for the victim. It's the same as your child causing damage - it's the owners responsibility.
- I have a comment to the ridiculous number 3 question...there should be NO breed bans, extra rules etc just fine the owners more!!
- Gives the owner a chance to explain thier case so its not one sided and an animal is put down for no good reason.
- The accountability is with the owners. They need to stay and provide contact info
- There are always two sides to story. Ownership of an animal is as that they are responsible for any occurrence(s) that the animal was involved in
- I believe removing the dangerous animal ASAP likely going to be of higher importance, but I'm also concerned that people would use this as an opportunity to never take responsibility.
- Need to be able to assess dog and verify accuser's statement.
- Dog owner of the buyer should be responsible for paying vet bill costs
- The owner needs to be held responsible and accountable for their dog. They need to remain and should also cover vet fees required to the owner of any animal injured.
- To find the truth and get the right info
- The person should remain on scene so information can be exchanged. That being said, they may need to get their dog away from the situation quickly so the dog can be put away safely and calm down, so this needs to be taken into account.
- The owner needs to be available to explain the situation
- It is your responsibility as a pet owner to have respect for others and other pet owners. There should be a fine for them walking away from the incident if it is serious.
- I said yes, surely you can understand that answer
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for the behaviour of their animals.
- It would help those that are responsible dog owners and help to identify possible nuisance dogs that are not necessarily large breeds
- Stop vilifying pitbul type dogs!
- Ive had a dog attack my dog and the owner brushed it off and quickly left me with an injured dog and large vet bill
- Any human aggression the owner should wait. Not all dog fights/scuffles result in major damage so if both parties are sufficiently fine with the situation, enforcement should not be necessary



- Vet bills could be incurred as well as not knowing the vaccination status of the offending dog.
- 100% should be required to remain on scene. It's essentially an accident. If it was a car accident, regardless of injury someone that leaves the scene would be in big trouble.
- My dog has been bitten and the owner just walked away.
- If a dog causes harm it should be dealt with in a timely matter
- Be a good human.
- Dog owners should face Additional charges if the dog owner does not remain at the scene of an incident or provide contact information.
- Too many times I have heard of a dog attacking a person or another dog and the owner leaves.
- People whose dog attacks another dog or person take off and often evade all responsibility for their dog's attack. If the dog attacked another animal, that pet owner has to bear the cost for all veterinary care and this is not fair.
- Absolutely, a dog owner has to be responsible to the people the dog hurts
- They are responsible for their dog, whether it is the dog's fault or not. This way there are more sides to the story than just the victim
- officers should be able to determine if a human is unfit to own the dog and if the attack was provoked. There are no bad dogs, there are bad owners.
- People should be responsible for their animals; in the same way that you are expected to remain on the scene after a vehicle accident (regardless of its severity), the same should be done for an animal altercation. At the very least, contact information should be exchanged.
- I think responsible owners should recognize they are responsible for vet bills. I also think that all owners are responsible for their pets. Small dog owners rarely recognize aggressive behaviour that may result in their dog being NG injured. A more balanced review needs to be considered. Larger dogs aren't always the problem.
- In my eyes, this is the same as a car hitting another car. If there is harm or damage done, both parties have the onus to come to an understanding or an agreement and if that means staying until an officer arrives on scene because one of the parties called for one, then that is what needs to happen.
- I'm amazed this law isn't in effect already
- Every owner should be held accountable for their animals.
- This should be in affect for all animals
- This cannot always be possible but I DO BELIEVE THE ANY DOG OWNER should be responsible for the actions of their dog the same with their child
- Or if a picture of the dog tags are taken and sent to the victim of the attack along with contact info (similar to a minor vehicle accident)
- I didn't realize this was not the law as. Similar to any other incident all parties should stay on the scene till info has been exchanged.
- I think if a dog bites another dog and draws blood then the owner should provide their contact information to the other owner. It'll be hard to establish who is at fault as many dogs are not well



trained and dogs in general will give a warning bite if another dog is acting in a way contrary to pack order.

- To ensure the dog owner and/or the other that was bitten take the correct responsibility for the incident.
- Owners need to be held accountable for damage their pets do.
- Dog bites can happen even with the best behaved pets. If another animal or person is injured, information should absolutely be exchanged.
- Because there could be more damage done to the dog not at fault and vet costs are very high.
- To verify if the animal has their shots up to date
- Too many people flee. People should live up to and accept the responsibilities of pet ownership
- If the dog is repeatedly biting others, the only way to observe repeat offenses is if that person shares their contact details with officers.
- When it's safe to do so.
- Yes, to facilitate tracking of nuisance animals
- They need to be held accountable for their actions
- because the owner or person bitten may have a very biased recollection of the incident, this would allow both sides to be heard.
- The owner of the dog has the right to share their view of what happened. Victims should not have an issue with both sides being documented.
- I say yes so long as the bite causes injury. Sometimes dogs play bite or nip as a warning, and I don't think it should be necessary in those circumstances.
- Yes, these incidents should require the owner to talk to an officer.
- A dog owner should be held responsible for their dog's behavior
- Yes, unless they are in the process of restraint ion the dog to prevent more than damage.
- For dogs to be safely investigated and for the safety of the victims they need to be discoverable, so the owner should remain at the scene such as with a car accident. Recent history of the dog should also be taken at the time of the bite (had they been camping, ill, in a stressfil environment, etc).
- There is no other way for the victim to get the information. If they leave the scene it should be treated the same way as a vehicle hit-and-run.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility and deal with the consequences. There are no bad dogs.
- I had a dog bite my dog at off leash park and when I confronted the owner they ran to their vehicle and left. They were only able to be found and ticketed because someone took down their licence plate.
- With the exception of them being allowed to remove the dog in question and return.
- Too many people just walk away and they should be held responsible for any medical bills for people or the animal injured
- Many stories of problem dogs in a dog park but they owner takes off with the dog = no recourse
- Potential liability and to determine fault.



- Had my dog killed in our backyard by an off leash dog that smashed through our gate. Owner did not stick around but was identified by our neighbor.
- If a dog injured another dog or human then the offending Doha's human should pay medical bills if needed.
- This will help someone receive contact info so they know vaccination of other animal, etc and ability to split vet charges
- Provide history of dog
- Yes I would like the dog owner to take responsibility for said dog.
- Fines for those that don't take responsibility
- Too many reported incidences of people leaving the scene and skirting responsibility. Should be fine for leaving the scene without giving proper contact info (if unable to wait). No point in rules if people can avoid responsibility
- Yes. Just like a car accident they should have to be held accountable.
- Yes. It's the same as if you were in an accident. A lot of dogs have a lot of damage caused by bites of an attacking dog...vet bills can be horrendous!! The owner of the attacking dog should have to pay
- It is important that the pet owner be responsible for the actions of their pets. Also to find out what happened, if the attack was provoked by the person or other animal that was attacked.
- This way there can be accountability and education as well as the opportunity for the victim to get additional information and support if needed.
- My dog has been bitten at an off leash park. It happened so fast and the other owner took their dog and left, we barely got a look at it. That bite cost us \$700 and our dog almost died.
- Any dog owner that has been involved should stay on scene and assess the situation. Including giving information of vaccines up to date and contact information should anything further happen.
- I believe that it should be a bylaw for the dog owners to remain at the scene and exchange information, as I was in this exact situation myself. I was lucky to have people stay and exchange their information, although I know others haven't been able to say the same. Your pet is your responsibility and people take advantage during these times.
- This is important to establish the situation on site. People running away after their dogs bite seems to be an issue.
- Unless the dog attacked needs to go emergency at which point both should go to emergency. The aggressive dog owners should be held responsible to pay for all damages to the injured dog.
- The owner can provide important info regarding the health/vaccine history of their animal
- The owner must take responsibility for their animal. It maybe that the person or dog that was bitten may have to go to emergency for repairs in that case both parties go to emergency waiting for the enforcement officer. The offending dog owner should also be responsible for paying the medical and/or vet bills of the offending dog.
- When you're involved in a car crash, you need to provide your information, why not when your dog injures someone?!
- Problem dogs should be put down



- Dog owner needs to take responsibility for their pet and ensure the victim is okay, and should also be held liable for ongoing injuries, like if a person can't work.
- As the pet owner it is their responsibility
- That way they have the contact info of the person, in case anything else happens or they need to be contacted
- This is akin to committing a crime. You need to stay on scene to talk to the Victim or enforcement officer and provide your information so that the issue can be properly taken care of. If you flee, it should be charged like leaving the scene.
- The dog is your property and part of your family. Stay and take responsibility for it.
- The communication is necessary to resolve a dispute.
- If there are injuries to the other animal or person the owner should be held responsible
- It's the same as a hit and run.
- Any bite that breaks skin should be reported and kept at scene.
- The owner should remain at the scene but only after the animal(s) have been safely secured
- It is important to take ownership of your animal, for any actions.
- If damage has been done yes.
- In my mind it's the same as a car accident you stay at the scene to swap info when involved
- There is always a reason for a dog to bite, often times it is the owners fault for putting their dog in that situation. The dog or animal who has suffered from the bite is also not always following city bylaws or proper dog/owner etiquette
- Unless the person is under the age of 18, children should be allowed to leave to get assistance
- Politeness?
- Owners need to provide info and take financial responsibility for any injuries. Too many leave parks if their dog injured another animal
- If your dog bites someone, that's 99% on the owner (not the dog) due to the training and proper handling of the animal. You better believe they have to stick around and deal with the repercussions should the bite have caused harm to an individual or other animal.
- Yes especially to receive information on up to date rabies vaccines.
- A bite is an assault - a crime. Staying at the scene of any other crime is considered mandatory as it should be in this instance.
- People need to be held responsible for the actions of their animals. There should be very heavy fines for a pet owner that leaves the scene of an incident
- Dog owner needs to be completely responsible, which includes ensuring the victim is looked after and appropriate next steps are taken.
- It's all part of responsible dog ownership. There is also 3 sides to each incident: the side of the bitten do, the side of the dog that bit, and the incident that actually occurred to cause the bite.
- People should be responsible for their dog.
- Too many people leave and the injured are left to deal with it.



- Unless the person or other animal is seriously injured. Most people have a cell phone with them, and could/should provide their contact info to the injured person or owner of the injured animal. Waiting for an enforcement officer to show up is not helpful
- The owner of the attacking dog should be responsible for medical fines and/or trauma fines.
- All owners of a dog who's attacked another tend to leave the scene, leaving the owner of the injured dog with a large vet bill.
- Dog could have rabies
- I think it's common sense they should have to, otherwise how can they possibly be held responsible? I'm shocked this isn't the rule already.
- Yes, but not wait to talk with an enforcement officer. Exchange of verified contact info including license tag # is sufficient.
- Many times I have seen stories on social media where dogs have attacked and owners don't stay around, give false info, etc. This is not ok considering large vet bills or other liabilities may need to be addressed and fines applied
- They shouldn't just run away to avoid getting in trouble or having to pay for the other dogs care
- Just as a driver of a vehicle involved in a collision is required to stay at the scene, so should the owner and or the victim (barring necessity for immediate medical attention) to avoid a "he said/she said" situation
- I can't believe this isn't already in place.
- Same as a car accident, proper information and documents / contact info should be shared .
- How else would the person or the police know if the dog has had all their shots. My sister has had to chase down a person whose dog attacked a couple of dogs and people.
- Vet bills should be reimbursed by attacking dogs owners.
- because otherwise there isn't any accountability being taken or proper actions taken such as if this is a pattern with the animal/owners
- As a responsible pet owner it is your due diligence to do this. It should be common sense.
- I believe that there are good dogs that bite when provoked or teased. I also believe that if an animal bites it can be compared to a car accident you have to stay if you hit another car so why not when your dog bites.
- if similar is expected for a car accident over a certain amount this seems to be an obvious and easy expectation.
- Yes. Same like a car accident, witnesses should be there to claim their side and claim their story.
- This should definitely part of the rules. I've read so many stories where dogs or people have been attacked and the person flees, and the victim is left to pick up the pieces and vet care bills
- If an actual bite has occurred the individual who's dog bit, should be responsible enough to leave info or pay for vet bills
- It gives the owner an opportunity to share their side of the incident
- They need to be responsible for biting another dog/person but in the end it's the owner who should be held responsible not the dog



- So many folks walk off after their dog bites, and there is no way to get a hold of them for vet bills, or to follow up with the safety of having their animal out and about.
- Yes, Like any other accident.
- No different than a car accident
- Similar to a car crash... fines should be implemented
- it only responsible owners that will stay
- your question is poorly worded - "and talk with an enforcement officer if necessary?"...of course it is necessary and how long will it take for an officer to get to the scene?
- Remaining at the scene allows the dog owner to explain their side of the story, especially if the bite was a result of antagonizing from the "victim" or another dog owned by the "victim"
- Take responsibility for your animal and make sure the victim is alright.
- The problem is that people take off; provide false information, etc. If people do not remain at the scene, or provide false information - and are located post-incident - they should be banned from owning any domesticated animal for at least 3-5 years.
- like getting tagged by a car or another driver, it seems like it would be wise to stay at the scene.
- I always support this when feasible and logical. However I can hypothesize times in which flexibility is warranted, such as an outdoor cat comes onto someone's property and is bitten by the dog while unsupervised outside in their yard. Although ideal, I do not think it is reasonable to expect all residents to supervise their dogs in securely fenced yards at all times. Another scenario would be in which both animals are injured and the dog owner cannot remain on the scene to wait for an enforcement officer, and needs to rush their animal to emergency care as soon as possible. In that same vein, getting both animals separated and secured should take precedence over remaining at the scene. Two or more animals - one or more injured - in high states of arousal - should not remain in the same area. Without a second person with each of the owners to take their dogs elsewhere, this is not possible.
- Why wouldn't they have to stay at the scene?!
- I think all animal owners regardless of breed, should stay on scene when their animal attacks another animal.
- I believe every dog owner should exchange info without another if something was to happen.
- Owners should be held accountable for the behaviour of their pet. That being said, one must also acknowledge that dogs are animals and animals can behave unpredictably at times.
- Your dog. Your responsibility
- It helps get all the information at the time it happened and can help bring about other factors like the dog being harassed
- My husky got attacked at a park and as I was assessing the damage the owner speedwalked away. I was left with hundreds of dollars of torn ear emergency after hours vet damage.
- I believe the owner of an animal needs to take responsibility for their animals behavior as it is their responsibility to care for a properly train that animal. They should then be immediately beginning training to help avoid or prevent any further issues.
- The owner of the offending dog should pay for any medical bills



- I believe they may have to leave momentarily to remove the dog but they should remain with the person who was bit to ensure they are cared for and to be responsible for their dog's actions.
- I believe this should be the case if the animal causes harm. Witnesses should also be asked to stay/or give contact information about what they witnessed
- Too often you hear that the owner ran off after the attack, this should be mandatory to stay at the scene as long as it's safe to do so. Minimum should be sharing information and/or required to fill out a report
- The owner of the offending dog should remain on scene so the situation can be settled with both points of view
- It is important to take responsibility for the animal in your care and possession. Like any weapon or firearm, if anything were to happen you'd be responsible if it's in your hands.
- As a responsible pet owner, the dog owner should remain at the scene of the incident and be additionally fined for leaving the scene before the incident is cleared up by both parties.
- Owners are responsible for the conduct of their dogs and being able to account for harm caused by their animals is a reasonable requirement.
- The owner should be fined if he/she leaves the scene after his/her dog bites a person or another animal.
- owners are responsible for their dogs behavior. I doubt it will change behavior of irresponsible owners but having extra penalties for not providing info if they are eventually found seems like a good idea
- Leaving would be like a hit and run
- my dog was attacked by another dog and owner left with the vicious dog and then denied that it was his dog when authorities questioned him.
- Responsibility
- Only for serious incidents. If there are no injuries, exchanging info should be sufficient without having to stay at the scene
- "If a dog attack occurs both owners should have to explain the rationale / situation to a bylaw officer.
- A dog bite on a person is socially considered worse; however, I doubt a person causing a situation where a dog bit because of a human interaction would ever be given a fair shake."
- In many cases if a dog bites when the owner is around typically there were warning signs or a reason. The owner should be able to explain what lead to the incident. As well the owner needs to be held accountable to the victim as a dog is acting on instincts only (unless trained otherwise)
- Similar to a car accident situation - there could be legal liability in the case of a dog bite - so an owner should be mandated to remain at the scene until an enforcement officer can come and assess the situation.
- If the person or other animal is injured, then information should be exchanged and the owner of the animal should be held responsible for any incurred costs such as vet bills for the other animal.
- "As dog owners we are responsible for the actions of our pets and must make sure all legalities are met and help the victim if needed.



- It is always a good idea to remain at the scene of any disturbance or biting to protect the victim, yourself and your pet."
- I have friends whose dogs were attacked causing emergency pet care and the dog owner walked away without even offering to share their name. They should be required to produce their phone, and ID, to share contact info with the dogs owner.
- I think only if the bite is severe enough that it requires obvious medical attention that the owner must remain at the scene of the crime.
- Any dog can be vicious. I am sick and tired of the breed specific targeting of pit bulls. And you cannot declare a dog vicious Just based on 2 second interaction. Dogs cannot speak. They cannot say I'm afraid or I'm hurting or that person hurt me so I'm defending myself. I'm sick to death of hearing how dogs get shot when observed for 2 seconds and it's said they are growling. Dogs also bite for various reasons. I'm sick of hearing all dogs that bite are aggressive. No one ever takes into consideration the reason behind the bite.
- I feel dog bites are like any accidents (eg. Car, etc). It's only fair to remain and ensure both parties are ok and happy before leaving
- This should be required as many attacks to animals have large veterinary bills that the owner of the offending animal should be responsible for.
- If bite causes damage to either human or animal the owner should remain in the scene much like a car accident.
- It makes sense for accountability but without proof it could be just hearsay
- That way the owner of both dogs/all those involved are held accountable for their actions. A dog doesn't bite (typically) without provocation. A full investigation should occur and all parties involved.
- That sounds reasonable
- Owners must take responsibility for their animal
- It's called being a decent human being...
- We expect the same from a car accident. An accident where someone is injured should require accountability and due process.
- I've heard of people's dogs getting attacked and the other party provided false information.
- People should be held accountable for their actions or the actions of their dog.
- I look at it like a car accident. You stay there until authorities arrive.
- It's your dog in your care. It's no different if you own a car in a accident. You stay onsite or fined if you leave
- Dog owners need to be held accountable for their bad behaviour and their dogs actions
- You'd expect them to remains at the scene of a car accident or a shooting so why not this?
- Because that's important in being a responsible pet owner
- Promote responsible dog ownership
- Too many people are demonstrating a lack of accountability. Puncture wounds may not be immediately apparent, infection rates with dog bites are second only to human bites. enforce staying and being a responsible pet owner. In the event of a contracted pet walker/sitter they are still responsible and should be insured for this event or decline the animal as a customer



- The owners need to provide all information to victim and bylaw.
- too many people run away after their dogs bites someone or another animal
- Vet bills need to be paid and if your dog has hurt another dog you should have to pay the vet bills.
- There is a huge difference between two dogs getting into a disagreement and a dog attack. To me a bite or attack causes another animal to go to the hospital in that case yes you should remain at the scene. If both animals have minor wounds Scrapes minor bleeding not needing a vet then the owners should be able to work it out.
- There is no other way of finding the owner
- If the owner is not there how can the bylaw officers get the full story, and background on the dog?
- Of course they should remain. How else would you identify them?
- In case the dog needs stitches for the owner of the other dog to be able to provide help paying or insurance information.
- They need to be accountable and recorded I case of reoccurring bites.
- Details of health of offending animal and to track repeat offenders.
- If you discharged a weapon you would stay. Same thing.
- If your dog bites and hurts someone, you must take responsibility. It's how to be a good dog owner.
- Every owner should remain on scene even if it only to ensure the person that was bitten is ok.
- All too often the irresponsible owner leaves the scene, and their are medical issues that they should be paying for. As well, people send their children to walk dogs, and they have no idea what to do is something should happen
- If your dog bites someone or another animal they need to stay for legal reasons and to help pay the bet bills if there are any
- Yes, owners are responsible for the behaviours of their dogs.
- Yes as long as it is safe to do so (not being intimidated or threatened)
- "This seems obvious. Rabies, proper documentation of incident to establish patterns of behaviour, also will help to find dog fighting rings.
- I would like to comment on bandanna issue. If a dog is reactive in any way regardless of how a human approaches, they should wear a muzzle. The onus should be on the owner to be in control of the dog and remove it from potential triggering situations, or wear a muzzle."
- Yes, both sides of the situation should be heard. Not all bites are the dogs fault, most of the time they're not the dogs fault
- There is no way to track the person down if they don't remain at the scene. You may need the owners information if you require compensation for damages to yourself or your pet
- If a dog bites, the dog owner should share contact information with the other party. If one party contacts an enforcement officer then the officer is engaged. I don't think it is practical to wait until an enforcement officer arrives.
- It makes it easier to hold irresponsible owners accountable for their dogs behavior.
- This person that owns the dog to provide identification and contact information in the event there is a veterinarian bill or other expenses as a result of my dog being harmed



- Yes they need to take responsibility and be there when bylaw officers arrive
- I feel that a responsible animal owner should do this - just like an automobile owner is required to remain at the scene of an accident and share contact information and talk with police if need be.
- Self explanatory. Not to stay would be leaving the scene of crime would it not?
- Your dog is your responsibility.
- Individuals should be required to take responsibility for their pets.
- If necessary the owner should stay and willing give their info
- It is responsible pet ownership.
- I struggle to see this working in reality though. I expect immediately after an incident that the owner would detain the dog somewhere, which would more often require the owner to leave temporarily until authorities arrive and take over possession of the dog. It is more important to me to remove the dog immediately than anything.
- yes or at least provide contact info or ID. Owner should be allowed to leave the scene in order to secure the dog (for safety of all involved) provided they leave ID/contact info or their house/property is in view of the victim/s
- People need to take accountability for what happened. I believe too many dogs are being labelled as pit bull type dogs because their owners run off after a situation.
- Again, people need to be held responsible for their animals. An injured person shouldn't have to be chasing you down to get your address or info.
- Good luck with that. Who's going to enforce that?
- Yes. Obviously the dog needs to be reported to the enforcement officer at the time of the incident. The dog needs to be known to the city and the excuse my dog isn't vicious and has never done this before is not good enough
- Dog owners should be held accountable.
- The owner should be held responsible for dogs behaviour
- Owners need to be responsible pet owners. The owner may need training to help their dog. Depending on the situation, I'm the fault may not fall fully on one dog/owner.
- Unless they give the correct information to the person or owner
- It's the SOLE responsible thing to do.
- Unless the dog was defending an attack on it's owner.
- Same as with any other incident, all parties should remain on site. However, there may be instances where, for the safety of all involved, the animal should be removed from the site. In that case, if there's a trusted individual who can remove the animal from the situation, they should do so. If not, the owner should be able to provide contact information and temporarily leave to ensure the animal is secured.
- Too many bite and runs happen and enough is enough. The owner of the aggressive animal should be ticketed and held fully responsible for medical veterinary care required by the damaged party as a result.
- The tribunal should include a vet, dog owner, bylaw officer as well as other people needed to make the decisions



- Just like a vehicle accident where you have to remain on scene, the same should apply to incidents with animals.
- People need to be held accountable for the actions of their dog. This would also provide a more accurate picture of the dogs involved in bite incidents.
- I think animal ownership is a huge responsibility and the owner should show some compassion and responsibility to what has happened, whether the dog is at fault or not.
- It should be no different than leaving the scene of a collision.
- This way the dog owner cannot give out false info and they can also explain their side of the incident while fresh in their mind. Also, if they are impaired at the time the officer can see it and it may have been part of the reason for the attack.
- Dog owners need to be held accountable for the behaviour of their dogs
- If the owner is there, it should be required they stay as a responsible pet owner. Just like car accidents or other incidents you should have to remain on the scene. This helps to know which dog was involved, and makes the process easier.
- It is long overdue that owners become more accountable for their either wilful blindness to their responsibility for owning a Vicious dog that is a likely a reflection of their lack of concern for our fellow citizens
- There must be an explanation provided by the dog owner as and hopefully witnesses as to the event and if there were extenuating circumstances that threatened or aggravated the animal in question
- My son has been attacked by a dog before (a Chihuahua, it was vicious) and so has my dog. It's important to know the contact info of the person for vet bills or vaccination records.
- Any information pertinent to the incident should be properly documented and the owner of the dog should always remain and be present for the report.
- Due recourse is necessary I'm being a responsible dog owner.
- As a responsibility owner should do.
- Pet owners have responsibility to us all
- The owner of the dogs should always stay at the scene of any bite to ensure information is exchanged
- There is always two side to the story. Was the animal teased or provoke to attack?
- That is responsible pet ownership
- Dogs who were provoked or people who did not comply with owner requests when interacting with dog should not be penalized
- This is the only way a person and his/her pet can be made accountable for the incident and assessed (consequences) as a result of the incident. It is too easy to give a fake name and contact info etc.
- Interviewing the dog's owner will give insight if they are able to handle the dog, why would the dog attack another dog, or person. Hold the person responsible. Not the dog. The dog's behaviour is the symptom of the disease.
- Absolutely. Just like a car accident. The owner of the dog is responsible for the dogs actions.



- My dog has been bitten at dog parks in Calgary and most owners of the dog that bit use deny the incident and walk away. The vet bills are very expensive.
- to follow up if dog and owner are repeat offenders
- Otherwise a person does not know if dog has previous history of same behaviour
- A good dog owner would stay on scene.
- Often you hear of dog owners running away when their dog attacks another dog, and I think this will help curb some of that.
- Dog owners are responsible for their animals. If our dog bites someone we need to be there.
- Definitely bites are serious and can cause trauma. I believe the owners should be punished for not restraining their dog or denying their animal could be a threat.
- It's the responsible thing to do
- Take responsibility for your dog.
- This is to ensure responsibility for each pet owner
- The owner is responsible for the behaviour of their animal through upbringing and day to day control.
- When dog owners are required to be responsible for their dog's behaviour, which could include restrictions on how they move around the city with their pet and/or financial responsibility for vetting bills, they may (hopefully) take their leadership more seriously.
- Owners should not be allowed to avoid responsibility by simply leaving the scene of an incident. This is a public safety issue as the offending animal may need to be tested for disease.
- Common sense of owner to be at the scene for questioning.
- I was bitten by an off leash pit bull on a public street.
- Liability reasons, make sure the dog is up to date on vaccinations and such.
- Owners are responsible for their pets.
- Some dog owners play the victim card during a bite. Let officers determine who is at fault. Way too many times the dog owners flee!
- So they can be held accountable for what the dog did.
- They are responsible for their pet
- there are a number of reasons a dog might bite, and not all are the fault of the dog. For example if provoked or cornered any animal will protect itself.
- Cannot leave scene, like a hit and run.
- the dog owner who bites runs and hides
- Accountability, you are not allowed to run from the scene of an automobile accident.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets. If there is vet costs or medical bills for the bite victim, the owner of the dog needs to be held accountable and pay the medical expenses.
- Too many dog attacks and the owners walking away because they don't want the fine
- Half the time you can't find them again
- I think everyone needs to be held responsible for their dog's actions. Too many times the owner of the aggressive dog leaves the scene without giving info to the victim
- Common sense



- If there is injury to either a human or animal, the owner of the offending dog could be held civilly liable. They need to provide their contact details for victims to follow up.
- A nuisance dog that bites any living person or animal should be put down, this should not even be negotiable.
- Owners should be held accountable for their animals and take responsibility if their dog bites a person or other dog.
- Why should the victim beat the brunt? Dog owners often leave the scene.
- People need to be responsible for their dogs. Many people believe that their small dogs don't cause damage. So they just walk away.
- If they fail to remain they should be charged.
- I've been bowled over and nipped at by other people's dogs but the owner doesn't care. The owners need to be held responsible and learn to better control the dog if it is hurting other humans or animals.
- All dog owners should take responsibility for their dogs
- Same as a hit and run accident. All parties involved should resolve the issue.
- Responsibility should remain with owner. Remaining or providing identification for contact should be required in the circumstance of a bite.
- People need to be accountable for their dog's behaviour. Also might be hard with an escalated dog
- If a dog is involved in a biting incident. Both owners should exchange information, and if that does not happen, police shall get involved.
- That is part of being a Responsible Pet Owner
- You cannot leave the scene of an accident with a vehicle and the same should be applied with animals.
- This is common sense
- Too many people walk away and never own up to poor dog behaviour. This leads to no actionable recourse to the bitten person or dog.
- Won't make any difference even if there is a rule. Some will stay and some won't
- Taking off after an altercation does not help solve the problem. Fines and further pet ownership restrictions ought to be imposed on owners who flee the scene of a severe dog attack (between human or other animal).
- Information should always be giving and an officer called to come assist.
- Only if bylaw was going to be available and not make someone wait for hours on end. Also, bylaw never works holidays. How would you support this without increasing taxes and OT costs?
- It's the best way to make sure the situation is dealt with properly.
- Just like after a car accident, if your dog and therefore you are involved in an altercation where someone is hurt you should both be required to exchange information and report it
- People should be responsible for the actions of their pets
- yes, the responsibility is the owner of the dog in question.
- Known of several incidents where the owner of the biting dog just walked away



- Yes - they should be there to explain what happened. The dog could have been provoked.
- This further shows you are a responsible pet owner and affirms that you are responsible for your or your dogs actions.
- that is responsible pet ownership.
- I believe that the owner should act responsibly and be accountable.
- I thought this was already a rule, or atleastbvommon sense.
- Most complaints with animals are not enforced without household information shared. I believe an owner should always take ownus of their animal.
- "accountability.
- All dog owners should be licensed and registered."
- There are often extenuating circumstances, including provocation, that the enforcement officer should record
- Ppl need to be help responsible.
- It's the descent thing to do if you are a responsible person.
- I no longer go to larger offleash areas as I've heard too many horror stories of irresponsible people fleeing the scene of an altercation with their dog
- Just like in any other incident, the owner needs to take responsibility for their pets actions
- Taking ownership helps the community move forward as a whole.
- I have seen dog owners flee a scene once their dog has bitten someone so dog owners need to be responsible for staying at a scene or should face a criminal offence. Victims can be severely hurt by a dog bite.
- Pet owners are just as accountable for their animals as a car owner is accountable for their vehicle. If damage is done, you take responsibility. Period.
- It would be no different than a car accident as more often than not it is the owner is missing the cues that their dog is showing them. If acted upon early the incident could likely be avoided
- Yes, however dogs being left off leash leading to a dog bite from a dog on leash in on leash areas should not be prosecuted
- Same principle as a "hit and run" accident. Owners must take responsibility for their dog's behaviour and their lack of training.
- So that the owner knows of injuries etc. and what to expect from a lawsuit.
- A responsible pet owner would be forthcoming and accountable
- it is no different than an auto accident. If you or your property have caused harm and damage, you must stay at the scene of the crime to help come to a helpful outcome. (if the dog owner is aware that the dog has harmed someone/some other animal).
- It's a criminal offence, the owner should be held accountable, just like when people have to remain at the scene of a car accident
- I believe a reasonable, responsible dog owner would already do this. This will hopefully prevent owners from leaving the scene of an incident that they should be financially responsible for vet bills etc.



- I think it increases accountability rather than the person and dog running off
- Effectively like a hit and run, owners should be required to stay at the scene of an “accident”. Dog bites are traumatic and can be life threatening, owners need to take responsibility.
- Be a responsible dog owner!
- Yes, with the caveat that if a dog bites someone who has provoked the animal, or has been warned to maintain distance, and does not comply, that they not have to remain on scene.
- The dog has caused an injury and the owner must be held accountable.
- Owner should also be responsible for vet bills
- An assault has occurred causing bodily harm. The owner of the dog should stay on site
- This is common sense.
- Often times the dog and owner responsible for the bite will leave the scene without sharing information.
- Incident reporting and documentation is essential for a fair trial.
- Like any accident responsibility needs to be taken and OWNERS held accountable. I see so many people allow their dogs off leash. They’ve jumped on my child in excitement but my child is to this day scared of dogs. That is the owners fault.
- "There is almost always a reason why a dog bites someone.
- All parties need to stay and say what happened as well as bystanders.
- Dog parents need to be held accountable as dogs are animals and need training!"
- My dog and myself were attacked by the same dog in two different occasions, and the owner was clueless. Said owner didn’t even receive any sort of fine or mandatory rehabilitation for the dog.
- Its good to have enforcement there some people would give false info
- There are many incidents where dog owners who’ve had their dog attacked don’t get the other owners information and are left with no options.
- A person should be responsible for their dog and its behaviour and if it injures a person or dog, they should be held accountable. By providing contact information, this will allow the injured party to have the ability to re-coup any expenses arising from the injury and for animal services to levy any fines that may be applicable. If the parties agree between themselves that nothing further needs to occur, that is their decision but first step should be to have that conversation.
- It would be ideal but I doubt most owners whose dogs actually bite other dogs or people are probably responsible enough to stick around and wait for a bylaw officer.
- Unless the dog or the owner is injured as well. In that case they should call/contact 311 as soon as feasible.
- This makes the owner accountable and responsible for their actions. Should this include the actions that the owner took. In many cases the owner will not get in the middle.
- Owners are
- Like any other accident, owners should remain on scene until the information has been provided
- Owner and victim should remain with the dog. Wrongful accusations of similiar dogs in the area are harmful to the system.



- This need explaining?
- Many owners of dogs who bite run away leaving you with a large vet bill while you help your injured dog. This may not stop that but might change a few people's minds about leaving.
- It's hard to find the owner if they leave. Not sure why this question needs an explanation.
- It's just good dog owner etiquette to ensure everyone or every dog is ok. And transfer information in the case of vet bills etc, if their dog is the guilty party.
- Information should be shared and a report filed. There are two sides to every story and both should be documented.
- They must pay for any damage done. To another dog or person
- Your dog, your responsibility
- In my opinion many dog bites are either the fault of an unwise owner or in some cases the fault of the person who approaches the dog without permission. Punishing a dog who is trying to defend itself or it's owner is not at fault.
- Needs to be responsible
- I view it as adherence to responsible pet ownership both to the animal(s) involved and other parties. The medical costs may be prohibitive and if, like driving a vehicle, an incident occurs you must be held accountable. This is additional motivation to owners to ensure their animals are well trained and socialized. Accidents do occur, of course, and having a third party assist in determining the party at "fault" if necessary, may mitigate additional issues that could arise.
- It is reasonable that it be treated like an accident of any kind
- Accountable is key, most dog aggression are the cause of the owner not the dog itself
- Difficult to enforce.
- The dog is the property of the owner and the owners property has harmed another person so the owner should be required to answer for the incident
- As a dog owner, you have a responsibility to manage your dog and if an incident happens, you should have to explain why you think it happened and what actions you plan on taking to mitigate the risk in the future.
- Vaccination records/ vet bill payments are not possible if the owner leaves the scene. It's also potentially not possible for bylaw to find the owner of an animal that leaves the scene. Owners need to understand they're responsible for the actions of their pets.
- They should be responsible they own the dog or they are taking care of hence they accept responsibility
- They should be doing this anyways!
- It is very important to handle the situation immediately and to ensure that it is managed appropriately.
- Is t that the right thing to do? If I hit another car or pedestrian, I am required to stay on scene
- testing for Rabies is important, also assure dog is not a repeat offender
- just like vehicle accidents, the owner should remain at the scene and take ownership
- Sometimes a dog bites that isnt a aggressive attack and the owner staying to answer questions would be helpful



- Ensures accountability
- Much like we are required to remain at the scene of a traffic accident until a police officer arrives, or else be charged with a hit & run, dog owners must remain at the scene until a bylaw officer arrives if there is an issue with an attack or bite.
- No different than hitting someone with a car. If you are at fault you should cover the cost of damages.
- yes because they should take responsibility but being fined or have the dog be put away or euthanized is NOT ok
- Any departure of the scene other than to find a phone / person with a phone would simply be a dereliction.
- I fully believe the OWNER is to stay as if the dog has bitten it's the OWNERS fault NOT the dog! A dog bites from being raised in a bad environment or abused!!
- As long as the safety of BOTH the animal(s) and any humans is taken into consideration.
- Any dog has the ability to cause harm and all dog owners need to be held accountable for their dog's actions.
- The owner is responsible for their dog.
- If there is physical damage to animal or person they owner should be required to give info so the victim of the bite can report it si there can be follow...eg the health of the animal doing the biting and if it is carrying any kind of disease and the owner of the offender should be responsible for any required veterinary/medical costs.
- It's the same as an accident you should not be allowed to leave the scene were you or your animal has caused harm to another person or dog
- This should be a standard practice anyways.
- It is important to collect information where it happens A.S.A.P.
- I think In all situations the owner needs to take responsibility as they are tasked with training and raising the animal.
- Human error, not the dog is always at fault. Training the dog is always the issue, not the breed, not the dog
- Just responsible pet ownership
- It would be hard to regulate but in order to prosecute they need to remain on scene.
- The owner needs to takes responsibility for what their dog did
- I don't understand how this is not already a law. This would be required in order to understand next steps
- They need to take responsibility for their animal.
- How is this not already a law?? If your dog causes injury you should be legally required to stick around until an enforcement officer attends the scene. Dogs KILL people and it's not usually the first bite that results in the death of an animal or person. This requires action following an incident will save lives.
- Many times when a dog bites the owner will leave with the dog. The owner of these dogs need to be held accountable.



- It responsible ownership and ensures it is addressed properly
- If your dog bites a person or another animal the owner should take responsibility and remain at the scene because that's what being a responsible owner is.
- Treat it the same as if it were vehicle collision.
- If my dog was bit by another dog I would like contact information for possible vet bills and also to monitor repeat offenders
- Only if the dog was at fault
- The owner needs to be responsible and accountable.
- yes! they need to be held accountable, too many times irresponsible owners give false information and run off.
- Sage has been done to person or property (the bitten dog) im surprised this was not already a rule
- If someone is hurt at a car accident scene they are required to remain at the scene. Why should this be any different.
- If you hit someone with a car, you need to remain at the scene or it is a hit-and-run charge. Why should it be any different when you assume the responsibility for a potentially harmful, life altering being such as a dog
- They should be responsible for their dog's behaviour and pay vets bills if required. People need training, not only dogs!
- I think that is fair
- Decent thing to do and they should have to pay medical and related vet costs.
- The story of the incident needs to be heard from both sides, as well as any monetary values taken care of.
- Owners should be responsible for any behavior and injuries caused by their dog
- Just like at any accident scene, the offender needs to stay at the scene to share information. Unless for the safety of those involve the dog needs to be removed. But information should be shared before leaving
- Take accountability
- Of course they should remain at the scene as they are ultimately responsible for what happened.
- A responsible dog owner should not fear losing their pet if an incident happens, they should receive support to asses and correct the behaviour
- The owner is responsible for a dogs behaviour. They are the ones who should be punished not the dog.
- Many times dog attacks go undocumented as the owner of the attacking dog is quick to leave the scene. It should be no different than a car accident.
- This seems like common sense?
- "People need to be help accountable for the damage of their dogs. As someone who's dogs been attacked by the same dog twice and nothing was done to help me and my
- Dog I feel the owners should be held accountable and pay for their poor training"
- It is the responsible thing to do.



- Too many owners walk away after their dog has bitten or attacked other dogs making it hard to follow up by bylaw or civilly if the animal bitten requires extensive vet bill
- Maybe then the annoying owners of those little ankle biting dogs will be held accountable to train their pets.
- People need to be responsible for their pets
- A dog owner should be held to the same standard that a Motorist is held too when involved in a collision. They should also be required to produce Government Identification with a photo just like a motorist does and all contact information for proper follow up investigation by Authorities. If a dog owner/handler leaves the scene they are clearly looking to avoid any liability and Court Appearances should be mandatory.
- Makes sense
- This is just basic human decency and responsibility
- Owners should be accountable for their dog's behaviour. However I support management, not euthanasia as a way of dealing with the issue, and careful assessment of the situation that doesn't result in owners or dogs being unfairly punished if they have not been irresponsible, eg if the dog was being attacked or hurt.
- If there are vet bills traceability is important to both parties if a claim is needed
- Owners need to be responsible for their dogs behaviour and too often they leave and the behaviour gets repeated
- Everyone involved in an incident (e.g., victim, perpetrator, or witness) has the responsibility to assist the city officials in obtaining whatever information is necessary to successfully process the incident.
- But people run away all the time. And sometimes what one person thinks they saw is not what happened. There are some crazy people out there that will accuse your dog of biting when everyone else saw the other dog attacking.
- For all breeds of dogs
- Responsible owners will/do always stay-Irresponsible owners leave or never accept accountability or responsibility for their fault as owners
- It's the civil and responsible way .. common sense
- People are more of a problem than dogs. If the person was to stick around to provide more information, a greater picture could be formed about the dogs learned behaviour and home environment. The owner should face greater consequences and animals should be saved from caustic living conditions.
- They should stay to fill out a report. If a dog injured a person or another animal, information from the offending animals owner can be used in medical treatment options for the injured parties (rabies vaccines and such). They should be there to fill out a report as some incidents are not the fault of the reaction of the dog. Animals are allowed to defend themselves.
- In cases of moderate to severe bites.
- People need to be responsible for their pets
- Yes, how can owner be held accountable if he is not at the scene



- Dog bites (and negligent owners) seem to be on the rise. I think stricter laws are required, and heavier penalties should be imposed.
- To provide information, context, and be held responsible. If your car hurt someone you wouldn't leave the scene, or if your child hit someone you would want to talk to the other parents. The same applies here.
- Too many people leave the scene of an incident without the exchange of information. There is no way to track repeat offenders.
- If bite or incident is severe owner must remain on scene until spoken to an officer.
- They are ultimately responsible for their pet, and should remain on scene to help officials process the scene.
- It's like hitting someone one in the parking lot, you need to stay and share contact information.
- The "officers" that arrive to the scene should not just be police officers, they should be specifically trained to understand animals and the abuse of animals.
- A dog owner is responsible for their dog at all times
- Definitely for a person but for dogs, there needs to be a more descriptive explanation of bite as sometimes dogs inadvertently break skin when playing (ie., my own dogs playing).
- Just like a car crash
- I've heard of many dog owners walking away after an attack and the victim doesn't get resolution.
- Depending on the circumstances, the dog owner of the biting dog should be responsible for vet bills. Similar to an auto accident, both parties should remain at the scene, or in the event that one dog needs to go to the vet, both parties should head there.
- A responsible dog owner should/would remain at the scene and share contact information, just as being a vehicle owner must obey those same rules.
- It's the same when someone hits your car, the person needs to stay at the scene to give their information to bylaw officers.
- Ok once the dog is secured or if it must be taken home, the owner returns to the scene or contacts bylaw to provide his contact information
- I feel my response is self explanatory
- They must be responsible for their pet
- This should be common practice
- To ensure that both sides of the story are taken into account and if necessary be find or ticketed at that point. Assessment of the dog I can also be done at that point
- Its important to be aware if the dog has bitten someone previously. If this is a first offense
- Both sides of each story needs to be heard.
- Dog owners are responsible for the actions of their Dog and should be required to give enforcement officers their information should the victim require more intensive medical attention than initially thought.
- The idea is akin to a traffic accident. Dogs are considered property and if I need to repair my property via the negligence of others then similar accident rules should apply.



- I believe a responsible owner would want to take responsibility for their animal(s) but also to make sure all information is provided.
- so further people/dogs are not harmed
- It's a reasonable request and provides accountability if the biting dog has possible illnesses, is behind on vaccinations, etc.
- There have been too many occasions where pet owners have abrogated their responsibility.
- All parties involved in an incident of dog aggression should remain on the scene to ensure the facts are collected properly. Allowing someone to leave after an incident is akin to letting one party in an automobile collision leave before giving their statement.
- "You are doing nothing but contributing to the already biased view of one specific breed, Rottweilers, Newfoundlanders, German Shepherds, St Bernards, Mastiff are all large strong dogs that can do damage, the reality is its the Chihuahua, Dachshunds and Jack Russells responsible for the majority of bite incidents.
- This questionnaire is a complete joke!"
- They need to stay in order to give the side of why the animal bit. If there was teasing etc involved.
- There are often 2 sides to a story and if the dog is at fault then there should be responsibility. Also if that dog is not at fault it should be dealt with too. Example a small dog attacks a larger dog and gets injured. Who is at fault? Yes
- The owner is at fault for not being able to control the dog.
- Many people do not stay at the scene and it can make it hard for the victim to attain medical care if not from Canada.
- Yes providing it is safe to do so.
- Ensures everyone is protected including the animal owner in the event it was a provoked attack
- An owner should be held accountable for the actions of their pet
- Really? Explain my answer? It's virtually the same as a hit and run otherwise. Of course they need to stay at the scene.
- that would be responsible pet ownership and just the right thing to do.
- Information should be exchanged, similar to if you have a car accident.
- Consider it like a car accident. You exchange info.
- If you dog is involved in an event, all owners should stick around and the incident be handled so all parties are determined to be OK and to determine if further action is required.
- You are responsible for your dog. If your dog bites someone absolutely stick around.
- I'm suprised this is not required now
- People need to be responsible for their pet. You may never see that person again if they don't stick around
- How will you enforce this safely?
- Owners need to take responsibility for all behavior of their pets. That includes when it bites someone.
- It is the responsible thing to do.



- Yes to provide information if either the injured person or animal require hospitalization and to pay vet bills or to be charged
- I think stipulations must be in place for this to work in ensuring the safety and well-being of the animal as well as persons involved. Which would give the person the option to provide a photo of their drivers license or other identification before putting the animal away into their car / backyard / home. Somewhere that eliminates potential for further risk. If they flee the scene without providing a photo of their ID (or directly reporting themselves) it should be treated like a hit and run.
- Only if the owner is at fault
- Your dog, your responsibility.
- It's the responsible thing to do and shows that you're a responsible pet owner. "Stuff" sometimes happens out there.
- This ensures accountability for injury to a person
- Obviously the offending dog's owner should be made to pay veterinary costs to the aggrieved party therefore independent investigation is required.
- There was an incident in our nearby park where an aggressive german shepard nearly killed a small dog. The person in charge of the dog, called it back and disappeared. The owner of the small dog was traumatized. When the owner was finally located, she should have been fined as well as charged. It is absolutely disgusting what irresponsible dog owners are getting away with.
- There needs to be accountability
- This way the dog and owner can be held responsible for their actions
- All parties need to wait to be questioned unless emergency to a pet hospital or hospital is required
- If a dog bites the owner should remain at the scene and cover the cost of the vet bills that the other owner will now have.
- I feel that if your dog hurts another animal or human you are responsible for the after math. Vet/hospital bills and all that comes with an injury
- Just like a vehicle accident. Leaving the scene of an accident should be fined. Also recorded and charged.
- Why is this not a law already?
- To give factual information to the officer.
- Too easy for the owner of a dog to take off after a bite incident, leaving the victim without recourse. A responsible dog owner would also want to be able to provide their side of the story. Unfortunately an irresponsible dog owner involved in a bite incident may be inclined to leave the scene regardless of any law/rule in place, but as with vehicular hit-and-run situations, there would at least be additional punishment options if the person was located later.
- It is ultimately the dog owners responsibility.
- Your dog, your responsibility, period.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions
- Dog owners are responsible for the dogs. They should remain on scene of the incident.



- I think that any dog that causes harm to another needs to have the owner take responsibility. And often there can be a leading cause to this having happened in the first place (another dog being off leash and rushing a dog that is on leash for a reason)
- This is to be within reason. If all parties are fine and everyone can leave then no. But if there is serious injury then yes they should stay.
- Regardless of the breed of dog that bites! Owners should be obligated to stay to report no different than a car accident and take responsibility.
- Too many people are getting away with walking away and facing no consequences. We all know someone who has had an experience like this. Remaining at the scene needs to be enforced.
- Liability reasons if the animal needs medical attention then the guilty party should be contacted and responsible for expenses
- I think the dog should be removed from the situation as soon as possible, but the owner should be responsible in providing information and taking responsibility.
- Responsible pets owners should be held accountable for the behaviours of their animals; not to mention theres always 2 sides to a story and if the owner takes off it's like an unspoken admission of guilt
- To help the injured party
- Part of responsible ownership is taking responsibility for whatever happens while your pet is under your authority & ownership. The only exception would be if it's unsafe to do so and the dog needs to be contained away from the scene.
- People need to be accountable for the dogs actions, but sometimes if an incident occurs the dog needs to be removed from the situation, then leaving name address and contact info is ok
- An owner should be responsible.. just like a car accident
- Of course they should remain at the scene to provide information and talk with enforcement.
- How to you intend to implement that? As if a bylaw will ensure they remain at the scene! I'm shaking my head over this one!
- If harm is caused the offending dogs family should be responsible for medical costs.
- Just like a car accident, these situations can cause trauma and monetary loss, and needs to be processed as such.
- A decision by such a tribunal would potentially have severe outcomes for the dogs, owner and victim. I am not confident in the selection process of "City and non-City representatives" who would make decisions of such importance.
- Owners must be responsible for their pets.
- Like a car accident, there maybe injuries. My concern is that if, like a car accident, there are pre existing injuries or Conditions that maybe undisclosed.
- Yes because there is two sides to a story and also because it is important to keep record of these incidents.
- This information is crucial in being able to follow up for injuries.
- It's required when a person is involved in a traffic accident, and most of the reasons why would also pertain to the above mentioned situation.



- Problem isn't the dog. The owner needs to be held responsible.
- Just like a vehicle accident need to exchange valid contact information and verify ownership etc
- If the victim (person bite or owner of bitten dog) wants to have it dealt with via enforcement officer they absolutely need to abide. Information should be exchanged at the very least.
- Same requirement as leaving the scene of an accident
- It is the owners responsibility. It's like if he were to drive a truck and struck another persons car then took off. 'Hit and run'. It is the owners responsibility to own up to the mistake of their dog.
- Dog owner should remain after Animals have been removed from the scene- leaving animal and owner after incident cause more stress to animals involved
- The dog owner has a responsibility to take ownership of the dogs actions & also take that chance to give his/her side of the event
- I'm shocked this isn't in place now, they have to be able to have a record of where the dog is/who owns it in case it becomes reoccurring
- It's your dog. You are responsible.
- I would have assumed that an owner of a dog that bit someone would remain at the scene until police arrived if necessary. It surprises me to learn that this is not already in place.
- It's just the right thing to do i.e. take responsibility
- They should give information but not stay until enforcement shows up because this could leave the dog in an agitated state and could result in further aggression. Should be required to provide the other person with the animal licenses number and the owners identification.
- It's like any incident. The guilty walk away.
- How will we know who it is if they do not stay. This is part of responsible pet ownership
- Responsible
- All depends on what happened. Unfortunately my dog got attacked by two cairn terriers and the owners were across the field and did not care about what happened and my dog needed further care. People that like make everyone else lose the privilege of handling situations.
- It should be an offense to leave, just like it is an offense for drivers leaving an accident in a hit and run.
- There are far too many pet owners who fled the scene because they are sacred their dog will be taken away, but they need to stay and exchange info and take care of any vet bills related to the incident.
- but how can it be enforced, uncontrolled digs are usually the consequence if irresponsible owners
- "Its like hit and run, dog parks should have at least have cameras in parking lots. Won't mind paying extra. There are people who cannot support them selves and have 2 or 3 dogs on top not even registered with city.
- Have never seen city officials visiting dog parks."
- Like a car accident, information should be exchanged and pictures should be taken as proof.
- Just as with a car accident, the same should apply to pet owners.



- What a stupid question. Of course they should stay. The problem isn't should/shouldn't stay. It's the ones that choose not to stay-what is being done with them if they're caught? Causing them to not leave if it happens again.
- Similar to getting in a car accident, if person or property is injured, the info needs to be exchanged
- It's like being in a car accident - things can turn for the worst, vet costs can be high, the dog or human that were but might require medical attention and need someone to help them.
- It would be the same as leaving after a car accident. A responsible pet owner would stay
- why not?
- Due to the high cost of vet bills it is imperative that those who own dogs that injure other dogs remain accountable.
- Owners need to be held accountable
- If medical attention is required, then a person should stay at the scene and police can determine if anything criminal was done by the owners. Damages done by their property (the dog) can be assessed in civil court. Additionally, allow people to carry protection (pepper spray) from animal attacks inside city limits.
- The owner is 100% responsible for the dog. Don't blame the dog.
- Same as a car accident. Hit and run. Attack and run. Same idea with fines.
- Severe fines are needed for those that leave the scene. Preferably criminal offenses as well.
- It's like a car accident...owner must answer for actions of his animal.
- It is considered a crime to leave the scene of an accident so the same should apply when someone or an animal is attacked by a dog.
- I would support it, but doubt it will have much effect overall. Far too many people whose dogs are involved in an incident stick around. Even with a rule in place, it will still be difficult to find the individual if they were to leave the scene.
- Yes I'd my dog ever bit someone or there dog it's my responsibility to fix that! And pay for bills but sadly not many people think that
- You have to do this if you have an accident of any kind, why wouldn't you if you had a problem with your dog
- Owners are responsible for their dogs. If their dog assaults another person, dog or animal the owner is responsible for their dogs actions and needs to remain at the scene of the assault to deal with the situation to its end.
- If a dog is involved in a serious bite incident, the owner should be required to provide contact information.
- Absolutely, the owner should make the scene safe (contain the dog etc) and then wait. Much like an accident, the owner is responsible for damage and possibly bylaw infractions that need to be addressed. There should be significant penalties if an owner leaves without sharing contact information/talking with enforcement officer
- It is the owners responsibility
- The owner should provide their contact information; however, remaining on scene may not be the best course of action. For the sake of the bitten individual and the safety of all involved, immediately



removing the offending dog from the location to a safe and secure location may be a better course of action. Lingering at the scene to await an enforcement officer while in care and control of the offending dog may cause further stress for the animal(s) and parties involved (and moving the dog to a vehicle to wait is also not ideal).

- Any responsible owner should want to ensure that the right information is provided
- Most owners would just walk away and therefore never be held accountable for their dogs (and their) actions. Owners should also be made to attend training with their dog.
- If a dog bites someone, I absolutely believe that the owner should stick around to give their information
- Your dog your responsibility
- It's common sense not to leave. How would you track down the nuisance dog afterwards?
- It's the same if someone hit a car, it's damage done and needs to be held accountable.
- I say yes because people have had their pets seriously harmed or killed during a dog attack and often left with a very unfortunate event as well as a costly expense for vet bills, treatment, euthenizing their pets etc. Treat it like a "hit and run" if you do not stay on the scene then there should be harsher punishment for fleeing. The owner needs to be held accountable for their pet.
- if the owner leaves and there is no way to contact them it causes many issues, such as not knowing vaccine history.
- It will be easier to process the incidents if the owner stays present
- The dog owner should be present to present his side of the event. Circumstances that led to the event
- It is the owner's responsibility to prevent a bite, so also their responsibility to deal with the consequences.
- It's important to require responsible pet ownership.
- Whether causing injury by car or dog, the individual may have important information to share (rabies status), and is responsible for their pet.
- All too often dog owner flee the scene and costs and damages are left to be borne by the injured party or owner of an injured dog. These can be serious and expensive.
- Take responsibility for your own pet's behaviours.
- The owner must be held accountable, and this is allows that to happen.
- Should be some sort of offense to flee a scene when your animal hurt another persons pet. Those kind of owners need to be held accountable for their pets actions
- As with any incident you are to wait at the scene and exchange information.
- Owners should always take responsibility for their pet's actions, just like how parents have to take responsibility for their children's actions.
- The dogs owner is responsible for their dog and should be in control of them.
- It would be common sense, just like a car accident.
- These things should be taken care of properly. If i dog has bitten another they should be required to exchange information along with any previous biting incidents to determine if that dog should be muzzled when off leash for safety.



- Self explanatory within the question
- The owners need to be held responsible and that can't happen if you don't know who they are or how to contact them.
- They need to take responsibility for their dogs actions and any vet/hospital bills that arise
- Too often people involved in incidents take off and there is no accountability for the damage their dog has caused.
- I think it is necessary to hear both sides of the story, and for a enforcement officer to be able to make a clear decision if the dog is to be labeled a nuisance
- I think if they leave the scene of the offense it should be treat much like a "HIT & RUN". No Excuses.
- Same thing as a hit and run.
- The dogs owner should be responsible for covering the costs associated with the injuries.
- There are 2 sides to every story.
- Often owners don't take it seriously and will just walk away, sometimes not even acknowledging the incident.
- Just like a person must remain at the scene of an accident, a dog owner remaining at the scene to discuss what happened, would assist in determining if the incident is a one off or more of a problem
- Dog bites should be treated the same as any other accident, it should require the owner to stay at the scene, provide contact information and speak with an enforcement officer.
- Ensures owner responsibility
- Too many people leave or run away from the scene.
- Everyone should take responsibility for their animals.
- As the owner and person responsible for the dog, they must remain at the scene. They are in charge and fully responsible.
- I strongly believe that the individual should stay at the scene. With that being said, there needs to be time to let the dog decompress instead of being held in an over stimulating environment for a long period of time. Leave should also be allowed for animals that are injured.
- Too many owners running off with their nuisance dog and not taking accountability
- People need to take responsibility.
- Humans are responsible for and accountable for their pets as master. Therefore contact information/ownership is very important.
- Accountability for behaviour, responsible for vet/doctor bills
- Owners should always take responsibility for their animals
- Follow up information regarding the dog is necessary
- Yes this allows all the right information to be said.
- I suspect that some incidents where the pet owner has left have been exaggerated by the complainant.
- So that they can be contacted with any consequences or follow-up
- There are owners that just disappear after their dog has attacked.



- It is definitely necessary to get the information about the dog's health and vaccination.
- Yes, not only is it the right thing to do but a person is required to stay at the scene of a motor vehicle collision involving an injury. Leaving the scene of a dog bite should be the same as hit and run.
- I think this is a good requirement but due to the way a lot of these people end up in the media I totally get why people leave the scene so to speak.
- "They are responsible for the attack and should pay the vet bills."

- My dog was attacked by a boxer/pitbull almost 3 months ago. That same dog also attacked another dog a month prior to that.
- That dog is still at the house and still acts vicious. So serious action needs to be taken especially when it's not the first attack"
- It is important the owner remain on the scene
- People must be responsible for their animals and the actions of their animals.
- It's the right thing to do
- It's the owner's responsibility as head of their "pack".
- To me it's like someone being involved in a car accident. They must remain at the scene. If a dog bites someone it makes sense that the owner must remain at the scene and exchange contact information, as well as report the incident to police. Dog attacks are being treated far too lightly by the City.
- At dog parks if a dog bites or attacks a dog often people try to take off and leave rather than stay to exchange information and take accountability
- Require accountability regardless of the reason for the incident. Exception for any person or animal that needs immediate medical attention. Substantial fines for leaving the scene or not contacting animal services within a specified time.
- They should be obeying the law and honouring the situation. If the attack warrants the need for hospitalization for either there needs to be a way to work around but information must be exchanged
- The owner needs to be held completely accountable with witnesses and charged if necessary.
- It may be difficult to find the owner of a dog that attacks, so having owners provide contact info can help with enforcement and getting things like vet/medical bills paid.
- All pertinent information is needed in such a case. Both sides need to be heard
- There have been multiple times I have witnessed incidents and the owner of the offending dog runs. This prevents documenting and dealing with issues.
- Photos and statements of dog bites should be documented.
- That is common human decency. If for some reason they cannot remain there they should call and give their information.
- Bla legislation is complete garbage. Owners need to be held accountable for any animal that bites. Ordered muzzled in public is reaction



- Yes, if a person got bitten or another animal was severely injured by the biting. Dogs quarrel sometimes, that doesn't mean every biting amongst dogs needs to be reported.
- I thought this was already a rule? Basically a hit and run if the owner takes off
- Dangerous animals and their owners should not be able to just walk away when an injury has occurred to another person/animal.
- It's your dog no matter what size or breed you should expect to be held accountable for any actions
- It is like a hit and run if they don't. They should remain (and once their dog is under control) they should provide contact information and be held accountable. If they leave the scene it is likely that they are trying to escape responsibility.
- People need to take responsibility for what their dogs does.
- I was bitten (accidentally) by a large Malamute dog in a neighbours yard (I was retrieving my cat from the yard, she had jumped the fence) the dog was tied up...while getting my cat from the dog's jaws it accidentally bit my leg, I would have liked the owner to come out to talk to me about it so I could find out if the dog's rabies shots were up to date...I took my cat in the house, discovered I was bleeding, looked next door and the dog was inside and all was quiet, I knocked and there was no answer but the dog barked from inside...I had to go to the hospital for a shot just to make sure (tetanus) and get information about possible rabies...the owner should have taken responsibility and talked to me.
- Rabies. Prior violations. Making sure victim is cared for. Same as leaving any accident. What is point of extra insurance if they don't have to stay at incident?
- As long as it's not a dangerous situation
- To help the cost of vet bills
- It becomes hard to remember and locate idiot dog owners when everyone is in shock over an attack...even if the attack has been caught on camera and the owner leaves. Rules for biting dogs should be no different than rules for drivers remaining at the scene of an accident.
- It's the same as a hit and run
- My dogs have been attacked before at local offleash dog parks. Ive had both situations where the owner has stayed to provide their information and where the owner has left with their dog without saying anything. I believe both of the owners have an obligation to stay at the scene to exchange information.
- It is the owners responsibility to know their dog. If it bits once unprovoked it will bite again!
- Owner is responsible for the dogs behaviour and must be cooperative or face charges for leaving the scene of the incident.
- We are the responsible parties for our pets! If they act out we are responsible for ensuring that they are ok and that the other party is ok as well.
- every dog owner is responsible. Only the owner can advise and stand up for his/her dog and defend in certain circumstances (provoked, etc). any dog has the right to express discomfort or protect himself. It is the owner's responsibility to have their animal under control and understand the triggers, thereby avoiding bad situations. Accidents happen....be responsible
- Tell their side is the story



- My dog was bitten and the people fled the scene. When I tracked them down, they mentioned that this wasn't the first time their dog had bitten someone. Remaining at the scene might help to identify repeat offenders.
- I think this is great as many dog attacks to other dogs are due to uneducated, uncaring owners who will just go to another park. This way it can be assessed and accounted for especially if high vet bills are a result.
- Same as losing control of a car and having an accident
- People need to stay to be able to provide their side of the story and accept responsibility and provide contact information to share in any medical or veterinary costs incurred.
- Some bites are out of fear and the owner may need support to help the dog move past biting out of fear. Also if they leave or that not considered a bite and run, like a hot and run.
- The owner should take responsibility for their dog
- Responsible pet ownership & taking responsibility for your dog
- Yes, the owner or handler should be required to remain on the scene as long as it is safe for all involved. If the dog is out of control (and they have no leash, etc) it might be safer to exchange information and allow the owner to take the dog home until bylaw can respond.
- essential for assessing any subsequent legal actions or assigning responsibility
- Yes and often there's are vet expenses, plus follow up should be done for both or all dogs involved
- The owner is accountable and like other incidents or accidents should be expected to remain at the scene
- No different than a hit and run. Stay at the accident site.
- the owner needs to be accountable. Too many times the owner leaves without giving correct info
- A Bull Mastiff attacked my dog and didn't stay at the scene.
- People need to be held accountable and owning an animal is a privilege that comes with responsibility
- The owner must be held responsible and be traceable so that action can be taken against owner and dog. Victim cannot be left alone.
- We have previously encountered incidents during which the owners of the dogs ran away after severely injuring our dog.
- The owner should be responsible for the dogs actions if someone is assaulted.
- Leaving the scene of a traffic accident is illegal, why isn't leaving the scene of an accident where your dog causes harm to another dog or person?
- Unless they have to leave to try to catch the animal that bit or the animal that was bitten....or to take an animal to the vet or a person to the hospital.
- Pet owner should be responsible for any veterinary fees, therefore contact information needs to be provided.
- All parties must remain at the scene unless being attended to by medical or veterinary care.
- They are responsible for their dog's behaviour
- You should take responsibility for your pet.



- Similar to a hit and run accident if they leave the scene, and should be handled appropriately.
- The owners should be responsible for their dog
- It is the responsibility of the owner of the pet to deal with all consequences due to the animals behaviour
- Why shouldn't the owner remain on the scene? to provide additional information? They shouldn't be able to flee if their dog is aggressive and untrained.
- just like a motor vehicle accident
- It's part of taking responsibility for your pets actions and behaviour.
- Same as a car accident. My only thought would be if the person walking the dog is a child, they might go home first.
- Because it will help the victim.
- They need to be there until the situation is closed. They need to be responsible for their dog's actions
- Be accountable and responsible for actions.
- If the dog and/ or owner leave the scene they may not be able to be identified. Should be treated the same as a car accident.
- major caveat - If Necessary.
- Like any incident between two people. Everyone must remain on the scene until all information is exchanged and/or police dismiss individuals
- I would be part of being a responsible pet owner for any breed.
- Absolutely. My dog was attacked and left for dead by another dog and the owner took off with the dog and refused to help
- At the end of the day, the dog's behavior is the owner's responsibility and unfortunately it happens this responsibility is not taken. This is also why I am more in favor of hefty fines for the dog owners than euthanizing dogs.
- Their may be circumstances where the owner may lie about their identity in order to hide from the problem so having it mandatory to speak to an enforcement officer will reduce any issues avoiding liability
- If a dog bites another person or dog, it is the owners responsibility to remain at the scene, the same as it is the owners responsibility to provide food, shelter to the animal. The dog accused of the bite should be taken out of the situation, and all parties should be there to tell all sides of the story.
- Takes responsibility for their pet
- Just like a car accident, they should stay. Exceptions, the dog is also injured and they go to the vet or something.
- Why would they leave?
- Yes they should stay and take responsibility
- Owners should have to show a piece of identification, the city dog tag number and ensure the owner of the other pet has a means of looking after their animal, if injured.
- If it is safe to do so.



- Allows a third party to assess and defuses people's emotions at the time.
- An animal's owner should be responsible to cover medical costs for a dog who has been attacked by their dog. Even if the situation doesn't go to bylaw, there should still be accountability and the owner whose dog was not the aggressor should not be responsible for the medical bills.
- any responsible dog owner should stay if it is safe for them to stay. If the others at the scene are hostile and put owner in unsafe situation then this would not apply. Dog owner should have option to go to police station to report.
- A person has to be responsible for their pet.
- How else can we ensure that dog isn't a repeat offender
- I would like to qualify this answer as I was involved in an incident and was ordered out of their sight when I tried to share contact information. In such a case a person should not be penalized.
- In order to properly attend to matters and record the right information they should stay
- Too many people get away with their dogs of any breed seriously injuring people and other animals and are never held accountable. If your dog causes harm their should be consequences. It's all a part of being a responsible owner.
- Too many people are out in public with aggressive dogs off leash - whether it be at a designated off leash park or not. If your dog causes severe damage to another dog or person you should be held financially responsible and be charged if you don't stay at the scene if the incident is serious enough.
- Absolutely important, strongly in support
- If there is an actual injury and health care or vet care is needed sharing info is the responsible thing to do.
- Yes BUT they must be allowed time/space to remove their animal from the incident. A dog on continuous high alert in an over active situation is a bad situation for the dog and people.
- I believe the owner should remain at the scene, but the dog should be take home by someone. The experience can be just as terrifying for them as it was for the other dog/child.
- my dog was attacked by a dog at an offleash park. The owner took off with the dog and I was left to cover full costs as well as the emotional trauma to my dog. Animal control was ultimately unable to trace this person/animal, despite physical description.
- Most definitely. If you hit someone with a vehicle, it is illegal to leave the scene - the same should apply for an owner whose dog bit/attacked another dog or another person. It should be considered a criminal offense for the owner to LEAVE the scene without exchanging information and citizens should be able to call 911 immediately with the description of the owner if they leave. A police report should also be filed in the case of someone encountering a dog owner who leaves the scene of an attack without exchanging information with the person who was attacked/owns the animal which was attacked.
- They should stick around, on the same note if they are leashed and someone comes up to them and it results in an incident it should also be considered that the the other party is at fault and not the dog. IE jaywalking in front of a car.
- i know of many people who are at an offleash and a dog bites them or their dog and they never stay around to see if everyone is ok and share information, it's unacceptable.



- In case it has to go to court or a tribunal the contact info would be needed
- An enforcement officer should know all details related to the incident (from both sides). Sometimes people or dogs can provoke a dog to bite with inappropriate behavior.
- Small or large dog bits are a issue
- If it's not required to stay by law then that's a big loophole
- Pet owners need to be held responsible for the actions of their dog, especially if the actions result in injury to another dog or a person. I'm surprised this already isn't a rule.
- Being a dog owner, it's your job to protect your dog. People leave, because they are afraid dogs will be taken and euthanized. People shouldn't be afraid to do the right thing. Accidents happen, or other loose dogs approach and then one dog gets blamed! If you don't have evidence to prove which one is lying , you SHOULDNT Blame a dog just because of breed.
- If hit and runs are a crime why aren't "bite and runs"
- if the bite is severe and aggressive.
- Precisely how to you expect to enforce this bylaw? Hire another 10,000 bylaw officers?
- Waiting until an enforcement officer arrives would be an impartial observer.
- no matter what happens, they need to own up to their dogs actions. They chose to own their dog. If they are not responsible enough to stand up to what happened, they should not be allowed to own any pet
- Just like a car accident...stay in the scene of a crime!
- just like a car accident, information exchanged helps the process move quicker.
- Yes, or they have 24 hours to contact enforcement. Sometimes if the dogs are injured they need to be removed. Or if they cannot control the dog it's better that they take the dog away than stand there.
- I have seen many incidents where dog attacks another and the owner takes off leaving owner of victimized dog to pay and aggressive dog not registered. This aggressive dog may have already done and fled several times.
- We have to stay at the scene if an accident or human on human assault, the same should be for dog issues
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs
- responsible owners do this already and the WHY of the bite is determined. It is the irresponsible people who take off.
- At a minimum the owner of the offending animal must provide contact information to the victim (or owner of the injured animal) before leaving the scene.
- All owners shod be responsible for their dogs.
- Sharing contact information is essential but dogs/people might need immediate care and won't be able to hang around until an officer gets there.
- Seems reasonable
- My dog was bitten by another dog, the owner was gone before I knew it and I had to pay the vet bill. I also had to back his dog off mine graphing the hind legs



- If my dog were to be bitten, or if I was bitten, I would want something to ensure that I would have a way to contact the person who's dog did the biting, and a way to report who the owner is. I like the idea of it being a rule, just like it is for traffic accidents.
- The owner should remain at the scene and take full responsibility of the incident
- As long as the dog does not have to be transported to a emergency hospital
- This seems like a no brainer
- Pretty obvious
- Just makes sense.
- If you are in a car accident you need to remain at the scene. A dog attack/bite has parallel similarities.
- Dog owners need to be held accountable
- A responsible owner would stay to talk to enforcement
- I have had a dog knock me over and injure me and the dog and person with it ran off
- This is critical.
- Nothing to explain, it's decent pet ownership.
- This should be similar to the requirement that all drivers stay at the scene of an auto accident and take responsibility for their part in the incident. Regardless of responsibility, everyone should provide contact information and speak to an enforcement officer. This means, of course, that enforcement officers should be able to attend an incident in a reasonable time frame.
- The dog should be immediately seized and the owner should be immediately arrested. If he/she refuses to remain at the scene, a warrant should be immediately issued for his/her arrest.
- I witnessed a small dog get attacked by two large saint bernards in my neighbourhood. All were on leash. The owner of the large dogs walked away and the owner of the small dog was in such shock. It wasn't until I asked the owner of the small dog a few moments after if she was okay, if the dog was okay and if she needed help that she realized her dog had been bitten and was bleeding. Dog attacks can be shocking and the injuries from them may not be known until later on. If one of these injuries needed veterinary intervention, I would expect the owner(s) of the dog(s) who attacked to pay for those costs and be fined accordingly. There information would be required to follow up if this was the case.
- this could be hard to control, as what is stopping the person from running away? perhaps a steep fine could be applied if the owner is located after a "bite-and-run" much like a hit and run.
- If the owners stays then perhaps the situation could be resolved quickly. If the animal is not at fault .
- It's like a car accident, if you hit a car you should stay at the scene. Your dog is your responsibility.
- Unless staying involves risk - information should be shared before leaving
- A dog bite is an assault. Owners must remain on the scene and should be heavily penalized for fleeing.
- I agree that owners should remain at the scene of a bite or exchange information (same as with vehicular accidents)
- I've experienced an owner providing incorrect contact information or not wanting to provide any information.



- Actually thought this was the rule already. Owner of dog that bites, injure should be liable for cost. Dog should be in system to track if it bites again
- Dogs are not wild. Owner who cannot control the animal must be punished
- I have been in a situation where my giant breed dog bit another dog and severely injured it. When this happened we immediately called bylaw to document what happened. The owners of the other dog (who was running off leash in the neighborhood) were not in the frame of mind to have a discussion about what happened and did not want to communicate with us. The bylaw officer was incredibly helpful through the process but it would have been nice to be able to discuss things as a group with the officer, for example were the dogs shots up to date, could they be at risk for disease etc.
- Part of responsible dog ownership is working toward a solution to ensure the victim is ok and facing the consequences
- Owners should stay on scene and help with vet costs if their dog is at fault
- Safety in case there are any future incidents
- I think this is important for severe bites. Bites that don't break the skin can be caused accidentally (when breaking up two dogs fighting as an example). Perhaps there should be ample dog behavioural training for bylaw officers so they can also recognize what has happened.
- This is law for motor vehicle accidents and I feel it is important for dogs accidents too. This will aid in reporting and charging the correct people and allow for learning experiences and potential rehabilitation for more improperly trained dogs/dog owners.
- they should at least provide proof of identity
- As the dogs owner, you need to take responsibility for your dog
- Too many people are leaving the scene after their dog has bitten.
- The rule should cover information exchange, as not everybody can wait hours for an enforcement officer.
- Yes, I support that rule.
- A "responsible" dog owner would not hesitate to stick around to provide information. In fact, a responsible pet owner would not let their pets bark incessantly, urinate or defecate on anyone else's property, bite or attack others. So really, the question is, how many "responsible" pet owners are out there? Not many!
- Like a car accident, both parties should have to remain on scene
- It is that person's responsibility to control the dog. Now sometimes a dog could be agitated by that other person in which case either scenario needs to be identified by both parties. Sometimes the dog gets blamed for something that wasn't its fault. People need to be responsible for their pets!
- The owner needs to take responsibility for the actions of their dog.
- It is their responsibility, same as if you hit another person in traffic
- Same as a car accident, you should be required to stay and exchange info. And stay if police/ambulance are coming or else it's defined as fleeing the scene of a crime
- Collect all relevant information from owners
- Yes of course



- Too many irresponsible people take off and are not responsible for injury of other animal/human
- Required for tracing the owner.
- The dog is the owners responsibility, and thus, the owner should remain on the scene.
- I hear so many times of dogs of all breeds (not just Bully type breeds) attacking a dog and the owner takes off. This leaves the owners with the cost of vet bills, if they are lucky enough to not lose their dog from the attack.
- Bylaw would be useless if the owner disappears and there's no info as to who the owner was (necessary info is a fine/penalty is to be charged)
- If an owner flees the scene of an attack it just makes things difficult for everyone.
- Anytime someone or another dog gets bitten people should remain on scene. Even if an accident.
- Yes, too many incidences of people taking aggressive dogs to parks, the dog attacking and the owners leaving without giving victim dog owner their contact info. Sometimes these dogs return to the park again and again despite multiple attacks and there needs to be accountability for this. Situations such as a dog pestering another dog and the adult giving a quick bite or an owner misinterpreting rough play as aggression are a couple concerns with this rule though.
- Owners should be responsible for their dogs, similarly to remaining on scene of a vehicle accident.
- This will ensure proper safety information is received, such as whether the dog is vaccinated etc.
- This is assuming that the owner has the dog under control. Sometimes the owner may need to remove the dog from the situation. But yes, the owner is fully responsible for what their dog does and needs to be able to contacted if needed. It's like a car accident of sorts
- Pretty much like a accident where the driver stays or is charged with hit and run
- The dog owner should be accountable and also be prepared to pay damages if any.
- Leaving the scene should be considered an aggravation of the offence. However could there be unstable/mentally ill or simply vengeful persons who would accuse an innocent owner and dog. There should be a penalty for false accusations for the person who claims false injury.
- If it's safe to do so. Some people become violent and abusive
- Absolutely, it is just like remaining at the scene of a car accident.
- The same as a car accident, the owner should not be allowed to leave the scene
- To facilitate the process and clarify/confirm next steps.
- Myself, people I know and strangers as well as other dogs on the street or dog park have been bitten by aggressive small dogs. The owners pick up their small goblin and immediately leave the area. Anyone without morals will not remain in the area whether there is a bylaw or not!
- If he or she were to flee the scene it should be punished the same way a hit and run is punished
- The owner is responsible for keeping their dog restrained if it is aggressive, therefore is responsible for vet or medical bills arising from their dog attacking another dog or person, and they need to be contacted by bylaw officers for further investigation into their dog's behaviour
- They need to be responsible for their dog and any damage it causes. People leave because there is no law which requires them to stay and they avoid the consequences of the bite
- I think circumstances and dog parenting is a huge factor in dog bites. I think that if it's bad enough that they need an enforcement officer then they should absolutely stay until one arrives.



- They are the person responsible, they need to own up.
- Too often dogs will attack a person or other dog and then the owner flees. This to me is no different than a hit and run, especially in the cases of dog on dog attacks as vet bills are expensive and should not fall onto the owner to the attacked dog to pay.
- As long as the dogs are safely separated owners should exchange information.
- It's simple. It helps the owners of nuisance dogs be held accountable for their dog's behaviour. The owner is responsible for their dog's behaviour and perhaps the dog needs to attend more behaviour classes.
- If it is your dog, it is your responsibility. If you have taken on the commitment to have the animal, you must also assume the consequences of any negative actions by your dog
- This is a stupid question - why wouldn't the dog owner be required to stick around and take responsibility?
- "If a little dog bites my med size dog. Nothing happens because bite is not severe enough. My dog has pinned a Pekingese for biting her face when she was smelling her dog. My dog pinned little dog and owner said her dog deserved it. Now I cannot let my dog near little dogs. She was traumatized by this out of control dangerous dog. My dog is very well trained and she does not approach any dog unless I say it's ok. That little dog changes my dog forever. That is wrong. If little dogs cannot be controlled they should
- Not be allowed in off leash areas. Bigger dogs bigger teeth bigger bites. Little dogs just as dangerous, perhaps not physically but they can change a bigger dog into
- a fearful dog.
- As for pit bulls they can be dangerous depending on breeding. Some are
- Just wrong. You should stop all backyard breeding. Their are adds for pit bulls on kijiji. Real well bred pit bulls are
- Not violent by nature. It's when they are backyard bred that they get messed up. Also isn't
- Know criminals should not be allowed to own a pit bull. These people Are the problem stray with fining people who breed and sell without papers. That is the
- Pit bull problem. Not the breed"
- They should also be assessed by a behavior consultant on how to mitigate further behaviors.
- Dog owners must take responsibility of their dog.
- Accountability to the victim for possible damages to the victim and/or their animal.
- Need to find out why the animal attacked. Was it provoked? Is the animal sick? This way the victim of the bite is protected from harm, as is the animal, so the animal is not "put down" unnecessarily.
- -
- as the owner would be at fault in the first place to let the dog bite/attack another animal or person. they should be dealt with the enforcement officer and get fined or be reprimanded.
- Absolutely. Owners must be held liable for the bad acts of their animals. It is rare that bad behaviour appears out of the blue and owners must be held accountable including, but not limited to, vet bills. I doubt owners would ever stick around but we need all the tools possible to hold these people responsible.



- As long as it is safe for owner and dog to do so
- people are responsible for their dogs
- Not sure if this would solve the issue as problem owners are unlikely to comply.
- People must be held accountable for the actions of their dogs and this may be a way of ensuring the animal in question doesn't do this again.
- This is that same as if a person assaulted another person or damaged their property.
- The owner of the dog that bites should be responsible for any vet bills or other damage caused and should be required to give their contact information.
- Should be no different that any sort of incident
- Depending on the extent of the injury and the cause. People should be held liable some no one gets hurt again.
- Same as if a human injures another human. If they leave, it's like a hit and run.
- People should be held to account and made responsible for any veterinary fees incurred if their dog bites and injures another dog. Unfortunately in this day and age people leaving the scene is the norm, not the exception.
- It's like a hit and run - they are responsible and should face the consequences.
- The owner needs to be responsible. Should be no different than leaving the scene of a car crash.
- Seems like a no brainer to ensure both sides of the story are captured.
- People are irrational and in the absence of a bylaw will be even more apt to flee.
- We need to make owners accountable. Also important to understand both sides of incident.
- People need to be responsible for their pet's behaviour.
- Depends how severe and how injured the victim is
- Owner walked away after I was bitten. I could not effectively report the incident.
- I think it's reasonable for owners and "victims" to be held accountable and supports can be offered to both
- As much as I hope they can remove the dog from the situation, the owner can give false information to the victim to report.
- The owner should always be held responsible. I feel it's rarely a dog "issue" as it is an owner issue in not Responsibly and properly training the dog.
- Owners must take responsibility, follow up on injuries that may have long lasting impact
- Yes. It's important to understand the history and health of the dog in question.
- Dog owners must be held accountable for the negative actions of their dogs.
- Any and every situation has two sides of a story, and the victim isn't always the one who received the bite. For example, someone could have provoked a dog into an unlikely behaviour and/or act, and the enforcement officer should have both sides of a story.
- The owner should stay on site or charged if they leave.
- Be responsible. And understand that just because the dog that caused the injury may not be the dog at fault. For example little dogs going after big dogs.
- Definitely. That is what a responsible owner should do.



- It's no different than at the scene of a car accident. As well to ensure dogs with a bite history are tracked properly.
- Tough to police, unless the victim or victim's owner knows the perpetrator
- I think owners of dogs that have bitten or have a history of bites should be responsible for providing the information necessary to make sure there are measures in place so that it doesn't happen again and so they are held accountable.
- I think both sides of the story are needed to accurately determine what happened
- Only if they can move the animal to a safe distance for all included, animals don't bite for no reason. They need to be in a safe location
- If the owner leaves the scene, it would be as bad as a hit and run accident.
- "There seems to be a correlation between owner behaviour and their dogs behaviour. The owners who are nowhere to be found likely won't make the necessary changes to prevent it.
- And sometimes there's another side to the story and it's important for the owner to be able to explain. Say in the case of an owner telling someone not to approach/touch their dog and the person doesn't listen and gets bit, I feel that is a different situation and the owner shouldn't be charged (I'd almost consider saying you should charge the person being bit as they didn't listen or take proper precautions)"
- The Owner has to ultimately be held responsible for the behavior of their pet.
- If the owner leaves the scene, to me it's the same as a hit and run. There should be law that absolutely requires them to remain at the scene.
- It is important for everyone to be held accountable for their dog.
- I see many cases on the Nextdoor app, and my community Facebook page about aggressive dog owners leaving the scene and ultimately getting away with attack.
- It's no different then attacking a person yourself
- They must be accountable to deter future incidents and to enforce any subsequent consequence/compensation.
- Once the owner of the dog that has been bitten has gotten home could discover that the bite was more severe than first noticed and the owner of the biter should be contacted for cost of vet bills
- Yes, but only if its safe to do so. Once a dog has been in an altercation they need time and space to lower their adrenaline and calm down.
- Too often the owner of the offending dog walks away and is not properly educated on how to prevent such incidents.
- Too many dog owners leave the scene and bystanders or the other party are left to find where the offender goes. If punishments were harsher maybe offenders would stay put until enforcement officer arrives.
- Currently there is no penalty if they leave. There needs to be accountability
- If a dog bites a person or animal it is at the fault of THE OWNER and not the dog. How would the attacked dog/person get vet or other bills paid for if the owner of the dog that attacked the person/dog left. That is irresponsible ownership.
- Self explanatory



- It's just common sense to remain on the scene if your animal hurts someone. Unfortunately a lot of people like to slip away nowadays.
- It's a sign of being a responsible citizen.
- Responsible owners will always stay
- Depending on severity.
- Absolutely they must stay on scene. It's an assault causing injury. The attacking dog's owner needs to pay for vet bills or replacement animal.
- It's an obvious answer.
- I also believe that people need to be better educated. As a person who owns a large dog I have on numerous occasions gone to a park and had a small dog come running up to me behaving aggressively towards myself and my dog. Large dog owners should not automatically be assumed the guilty party.
- More accountability by owner this way
- I think there should be a condition that if any skin is broken, the owner should be required to stay at the scene. If the victim requires medical attention, they should have the contact information for the owner. If no skin is broken, perhaps this isn't necessary.
- Just like a car accident
- I feel this should be mandatory for BOTH small and large breed dog owners. And equally enforced without bias against large dog breeds.
- Be responsible to the injured pet as well as your own. Always helps with both parties giving there side of the incident.
- This makes a lot of sense.
- It's a bit like car accidents - you need to stay at the scene and ensure the incident is reported
- Although accidents happen and animals have their own nature it is the owners responsibility to be the dog autonomous voice
- It's part of responsible dog ownership. If the dog has caused injury, the owner should ensure the person/animal is okay, and pay for any medical care required. Also, there should be a record of the incident, in case that dog becomes a repeat offender.
- Owners should take responsibility for their pet's behaviour.
- Take responsibility for your pets and their training.
- People need to be responsible pet owners and if your animal is so out of your control in a public area then you need to stay at the scene and be responsible for the consequences of your animals actions
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- Again enable 311 app to accept such a report with photo of the owner and dog to stop them from fleeing the scene.
- Owner responsibility
- The dog is the responsibility of the owner.



- Enforcement officers must be available quickly. Police potentially. I am concerned about the dog doing the biting remaining close to the bite-ee
- Dog owners should remain on scene to take responsibility for their dogs actions, to provide relevant information (i.e. vaccination records) and to provide their account of the incident.
- It would ensure that the offending dog was up to date with any vaccinations (like rabies vaccine), it also would allow for people to get the owners insurance information, and the officer can determine whether or not the dog needs to be seized
- My sister was attacked by a dog, and the owner fled. My sister was standing and the dog lunged for her neck, we were concerned that if the victim had been a child, they might not have survived. The owner was never caught.
- It's no different than staying on the scene of a car accident or any type of accident. If your dog caused an injury, you need to remain at the scene until officers arrive.
- "accountability and responsibility continues to be scarce attribute with some pet owners.
- There should also be consequences if the pet owner or responsible person leaves the scene of a pet incident similar to a vehicle hit and run matter"
- Owners need to be held accountable.
- Essentially the same as a vehicle accident. The owner bears responsibility to ensure a proper outcome.
- As far as I'm concerned it's just common sense for a owner to stay at the scene
- Dog owners should be responsible for their dog's actions
- For liability purposes, all parties involved should be present when the enforcement officer arrives just like any other accident for sharing of information, what happened and as a responsibility.
- No different than any other accident or incident.
- Only if a bylaw officer can attend the scene promptly. Otherwise, exchange of info
- This should fall under the same category as a motor vehicle accident, and people who leave without sharing valid details should be fined.
- owners need to take accountability for their dogs
- do i really need to? this feels self explanatory.
- Its akin to a hit and run. If your dog causes an injury you should have to stay around to respond to the officer.
- Owners should absolutely take immediate responsibility for their dogs (as long as the person bitten, or owner of a dog bitten, chooses to call enforcement or asks for information). the one exception should be if they need to leave to immediately remove their dog from the situation for safety purposes.
- I think it's just common courtesy for the dog owner to stick around
- Hold the owner responsible.
- Responsible pet ownership and accountability. The owner needs to explain the dog's behaviour.
- Owners must always be responsible for their animals



- I support the idea of a tribunal, however, each case should still be allowed the opportunity to be fairly assessed in court.
- Dog bite is no different than a car accident. All parties should exchange info and cops should be called too
- Should be the same as a car accident
- Pet owners should hold more accountability
- People must take responsibility for their pets, including small dogs!.. (Pit Bull owner here)
- This provides accountability and may lead to reduction of incidents.
- It makes sense, we stay at the scene of an accident to exchange our info. This is the same idea.
- There is always 2 sides to every story. Plus, if the bylaw office requires information it is best to have both parties present.
- They should pay for damages or injuries their dog caused (vet bills of other dog, etc)
- Similar to a car accident, the offensive party should be held accountable for damages.
- Too many 'incidents' involve one party taking off or giving false information. The Requirement to stay until Enforcement arrives is necessary. There also needs to be greater enforcement officers either on duty, or available 'on-call'
- In most cases the owner of a vicious dog will flee the scene of the crime/attack, adding a bylaw to require them to remain at the scene adds another layer of enforcement.
- If the dog was in the owner's control this would not happen. I do not support any off leash areas. Private fenced property only for off leash
- Dog owners have to be held accountable
- Details of shots and contact info should be provided
- I support it, but this is a traumatic incident for both dogs and owners so I'm not sure about the dog remaining on scene with the owner after an incident. I would think in most cases removing the dog from the scene immediately would be prudent.
- Proceed as you would for a car crash
- If owner walks away no one knows where to contact them after for information
- Owners should be responsible for their pets
- There can be health concerns (need vaccine records) and financial concerns. Need to trace offenders and multiple time offenders. Get dogs and people the correct help.
- If there is injury or damage to property from any event, accident or not, the involved parties should not attempt to hide their identification.
- I believe no matter the breed of the Dog that the owner will need to be responsible in all cases.
- Even minor the responsibility needs to be taken and understood a small bite could get infected and vet care required. As well if the dog is a repeat offender to asses or fine or require dog training to assure the dog's behavior with owner responsibility is taken into consideration.
- It would give a victim some legal way of demanding contact information. I was attacked by a dog that it's owner was unable to control. I had no way to get contact information and hold the owner responsible.



- If it's not required it's almost impossible for the city to intervene and potentially prevent future incidents. The victim also benefits from more knowledge in that they may need to know the health of the attacking animals to receive proper care. I can understand staying at the scene may sometimes be impossible (controlling an animal that just attacked while staying near the target may be unsafe) but it should be treated like a car accident. Responsible parties should at least swap contact information if not want for the authorities. It should also be made clear who to contact and how for swift attendance (the attacked may need prompt medical care and people won't wait unless rapid on-scene attendance is assured).
- The owner of the dog that bit, if found responsible, should be required to pay for any required medical treatment or pay a fine toward the cost of any required medical treatment due to the bite
- Ridiculous question. Why would it be acceptable to leave? Ditto for auto accidents - it's a crime to leave the scene.
- I have seen many times were a dog attacks another dog (for various reasons), and the owner simply grabs the offending dog and runs off. The rule would be nice, but the penalty would need to be high enough.
- As a responsible pet owner I would want to stay and ensure everyone is ok and all information needed it exchanged. If you leave the scene, you could give false information or none at all.
- They should be responsible for any vet bills and/or wait for bylaw officer to determine whether a nuisance animal
- If the person or owner of the animal that was bitten wants the contact info. I don't think it's mandatory if a minor bit happens and the other person/owner says it's okay.
- Absolutely they should stay. The only problem is sometimes the victim needs to leave immediately to seek veterinary care and doesn't have time to wait.
- I am assuming this would only be in cases of a more severe nature. Not a dog acting like it was going to bite, or giving a warning snap at a person.
- Yes, if there is injury. Any time we (or our dogs) cause injury to someone else, we are legally responsible for that. We need to provide the victim with the information they need to pursue the appropriate remedies.
- Pretty well impossible to enforce
- Common sense and decency. The owner either controls the animal or is irresponsible.
- It would be important to have contact information for follow up.
- To me, it's the same as remaining on the scene of a MVA. It's irresponsible for a pet owner to leave the scene, and it suggests they are not equipped to own and care for animals.
- If you own a pet you are responsible for that pet no matter what they do
- I think that responsible pet owners should stick around and provide any details that are necessary, it reminds me of situations such as car accidents where of the party in question leaves/flees its a hit and run
- Question is how do you possibly enforce this ...
- The wording needs some clarification! Minor dog nips/bites commonly happen at the dog park sometimes as a result of playing or when a dog is letting another dog know to either back off and



respect their boundaries. A dog 'attack' is another incident all together. This wording should not be vague.

- makes a lot of sense
- Its like a car accident. Share your info.
- This equates to the same as staying at the scene of an accident. It's about accepting responsibility and dealing with the issue.
- "Unless the owner is willing to accompany you immediately to a vet or human urgent care centre and cover any costs associated with the attack. This was our experience when a neighbour's new rescue dog attacked our dog.
- I think all dogs should be registered on home insurance so that a claim can be made to recover vet costs if the owner does not voluntarily help.
- I'd like the conversation with the enforcement officer to be an and/or proposition. If the owner of the dog in question is obliged to trade contact information and willingly shares contact info and insurance information like at a car accident scene then I think any official followup is at the discretion of the injured party."
- With the caveat that it cannot endanger anyone further. A single owner may not be able to safely control an animal without causing further harm.
- But good luck enforcing that one when such people who are inclined to leave a scene and not take responsibility would still do so regardless.
- While I support this, after an incident it may be necessary for the owner to leave to return the dog home. Is there a way to accomplish both?
- This should be a criminal offence if the owner at fault leaves the scene without handing any personal info to a witness or the victim.
- treat it like a car crash
- I don't feel like this is a yes/no answer. I don't think the owner/dog need to stay on the scene with the victim until bylaw arrives. This is very stressful for pets and people. Perhaps the bylaw states that the person needs to show valid govt ID to the victim so they can be contacted later.
- There are many incidents with aggressive dogs where the owners know and see what happens but choose to run away rather than be accountable for the animal under their direct care. In the case where dog-walkers may be involved, they should share responsibility with the dog owner for which they are providing the service.
- When speaking to bylaw officers after a pitbull attack on a child in front of my home 2 years ago the officer told me that pitbull owners regularly flee the scene after an attack. Bylaw officers even had a name for it, a Pit and Run. I strongly support the new rule.
- It's the responsible thing to do, but some people will likely run away following an incident
- The dog owner must take responsibility for actions taken by their pet
- Like a car accident you should be required to stay the scene.
- I support the mandatory sharing of contact information
- Pet owners should be responsible for their pets.



- If it is serious enough to require an enforcement officer, the owner should explain what happened from their prerogative as well as the person that was involved to avoid hearsay on either parties part.
- There are many, many instances of dog attacks where the owner walks off scott-free never to be seen again, with the victim being left responsible for vet/medical bills.
- This should be law and failure to comply should result in a fine. After the dog is removed or secured, the owner should remain on scene.
- Absolutely. It's called being an accountable and responsible owner. If they depart the scene, hefty fines to the owner and confiscation the dog, should ensue.
- I believe the dog owner should always remain on the scene. Bylaw should always understand why the dog bit and the observe the dog's behavior.
- It's part of responsible pet ownership.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs and need to be in control of their dog no matter their breed.
- regardless of severity, if authorities are to be involved it should be treated as a car accident or "first on the scene" situation where you must stay
- hold irresponsible pet owners accountable. It's not the animals fault!
- It's just like if you were to be in a car accident. You can't leave the scene of an accident. Fines should be issued for dog owners that leave the scene of a bite incident.
- They should share information, but then remove themselves and the dog from the situation.
- Every dog owner should be responsible for that dogs behaviour and should remain at the scene to explain why their dog will not bite, or explain the circumstances that caused the dog to bite, i.e., being teased, etc.
- The owner is the one responsible. They should be the ones facing repercussions. Similar to how a driver is responsible for their vehicle.
- I think that they need to evaluate the owner and hold them accountable for an issue, however if it is due to a circumstance beyond the owners control I think that they should not be punished.
- I think dog owners should take responsibility, it's not the dogs fault it's the owners fault. No bad dogs, just bad training
- No punishment if someone leaves. Dog bites can be scary for everyone and bad decisions can happen.
- The owner of the biter should take responsibility for the incident if it was unprovoked
- Yes but only if the dog is not a danger to those around.
- A person should be able to flee the scene (unless information to get in contact with them was given) because they need to be responsible for their dog's actions.
- Owners must remain accountable for their pets, as animal behaviour is most likely due to the owner's behavior.
- Responsible pet owners provide information such as a vehicle accident. Held responsible.
- "It is the right thing to do
- Should your dog bite someone or Another dog"
- Owner should have proof of training for dog.



- It has been in my experience that the owner is responsible for its dogs behaviour that's not to be said that if not given consideration on circumstances or without a medium should not be consulted
- A dog attacked my dog 2 years ago. My mom tried to get the other dog off my dog and in the process the dog knocked her over and broke her leg. The owner of the dog disappeared from the scene and took no responsibility for the attack.
- The safety of the person and animal(s) involved comes first. An incident with an animal should be treated the same as an incident with an automobile.
- Unless owners work out on thier own
- It should be the responsibility of the owner or the instigator.
- Yes and no. If it's a person, yes. If it's another dog, that's open to interpretation based on the severity
- I believe that if a dog causes injury to an individual or a pet the owner should be required to disclose any and all information needed for a bylaw officer, or the other individual to contact them if and when needed. This will aid in promoting that ANY dog bites or attacks be reported immediately as to ensure details are correct. This will also prevent attacks from smaller breeds flying under the radar as they usually have less of a chance to being reported if nothing (for example, an injury) comes from the attack.
- If any dog hurts another dog, or any person or other animal due to owner negligence they need to be held accountable. These should be dealt with with no prejudice against the dogs breed, age or size but by how the owner cares and controls their dogs
- this would add another perspective, as well as shows responsibility for their dog
- As you would like a car accident.
- Of course. Responsible ownership.
- It is necessary for proper follow up
- The enforcement officer should truly investigate the incident, rather than assuming the dog that bit is the only problem. If the person or other animal was doing something to threaten the dog, that party should be held accountable, not the dog.
- Owners should always be accountable to the behaviour of their pets
- no different than leaving the scene of an accident, the owner should remain at the scene
- However I think it would depend on the situation and if the dog would cause more harm in that situation, loud noises, showing aggression towards other dogs/ animals humans. Then information should be exchanged but the officer could visit their home.
- This is responsible pet ownership, and it also means being a decent human being.
- Need to be responsible for your pet
- Seems to be a reasonable expectation
- Owner must claim responsibility, but have all evidence gathered.
- Depending on the situation, I believe if the owner is in a safe mental and physical state to stay and wait for an enforcement officer then they should wait to give their information. I think a severe incident should be treated the same as any other serve incident (car accident, injury, etc).



- If it happens no matter what type of dog it is, its owner's responsibility to deal with it properly. But all this about banning and special rules for specific dogs is [removed]. Rescue the dogs and give the cruel owners jail time for neglect.
- Any responsible owner should do this - why is it even a question.
- This enables both sides of the story to be heard. Circumstances of bites vary and must be judged as such
- Animals are animals, and people are people. Just as someone who swipes your vehicle on the way out of the parking Lot should stick around to exchange information, since their dog acted up, they should have to explain exactly what happened. THERE ARE ALWAYS TWO SIDES TO THE STORY THOUGH, and people have to realize that animals do have different instincts than we do.
- the owner must take responsibility for their dog's behavior as they would their children. It is important for the enforcement officer to learn the facts involved in the case of dog bites.
- If I had to chase down or track some [removed] that let thier dog attack my cat I would [removed] both of them myself.
- I already did the survey, but didn't have a chance to comment on my experience. My dog (mostly border collie, was a rescue) was attacked by a staf bull terrier and a pit bull while my 11yr old child walked him on our block. The bully dogs ran out of their house when a door was accidentally opened without them secured and came running from behind. Our dog was pinned down, his shoulder was pierced and it took 3 adults to remove the pit bull. We knew the owners, they claimed the dogs were "sweethearts" that never did anything like that before. They also have young children in their house. Our 11yr old was scared to walk our dog for quite a while - he still is. Fact is these breeds are more unpredictable compared to others.
- If an owner is allowed to leave without sharing info it is almost impossible to tell if it is an isolated incident. Also not all dog owners are as up to date on vaccinations as they should be and the other parties involved should be made aware of any risks associated with the incident
- More consequences should be placed on the owner rather than the dog
- Owners should be held accountable. Dog bites can inflict pain to another dog, incur costs to heal them and the offending owner should be liable.
- The owner shouldn't take off, that would be like a hit and run car accident. They do need to control the dog that did the biting do if they had to step away a say like 20 feet or do fine but still wait for the enforcement office to get there.
- The owner should stay and the incident should be reported to determine whether this is a recurring issue with the dog / owner
- If there are vet or human bills post bite, information is needed. Especially when a dog has done this multiple times and owners keep bringing those dogs to areas they shouldn't be at.
- A lot of times people leave the scene and because the owner that has a pitbull they automatically get blamed sometimes it's the small dogs you wouldn't suspect. It's only fair both parties stay until an officer arrives
- This would aid in holding owners accountable for their dog's behaviour and to better diffuse a dog bite situation.



- This seems it should be common sense.
- It should be a fine if you leave the scene of an incident, similar to driving, the outcomes can be just as severe and fatal.
- Dog bites must be treated at par with other accidents, eg road accidents.
- That's what responsible pet owners do, as their guardians we need to take the hit as we have failed them if we put them in a position that they could cause harm to anyone or other animals
- there should be some responsibility taken on part of the owner of the dog that bites. A responsible owner would stay and make sure everything is ok whether it was a one time incident or not.
- Staying is responsible pet ownership
- It's just good manners to stay
- As long as the dog could be controlled, no sense in staying around if the dog shows no sign of calming down after the incident
- As a responsible pet owner, you know most dogs do not bite for no reason. Your side needs to be heard so both sides are heard.
- "Both sides should have the opportunity to tell their side of the story.
- Often dogs bite because they were being antagonized and you never get that to hear that side."
- makes all parties involved accountable
- The owners of dogs who bite and injure people or other animals must be identified. This is to ensure the dog is identified.
- Expensive vet bills is a possibility and trauma for the dog or person. This should go for ALL DOGS.
- I believe it is the responsibility of the owner of the dog that bit to take the responsibility...this goes for ALL dogs, even Chihuahua
- It makes sense!
- Depending on the circumstance. I think information should be exchanged between dog owners no matter what to decide the course of action.
- Responsible dog owner
- Dog owners need to be held accountable for the dog's behavior. Stop euthanizing dogs who have been trained poorly! **HOLD THEIR OWNER ACCOUNTABLE!!!!**
- **ABSOLUTELY.** For any breed of dog. They should be given harsh fines if they don't as well, it's leaving the scene of a crime!
- Seems reasonable just like a car accident to remain at the scene.
- Absolutely, otherwise it's like a hit and run. I'm not sure why this isn't a law already. You have to be responsible for damages your dog inflicts.
- Owners are solely responsible for dog behaviours not the breed of dog, and they should be held accountable. Plus if the dog was being harassed they could say so.
- The owner and dog must be identified properly and held responsible. A dog should not be put down for the attack though.
- A responsible owner would stay



- Only if it is safe to do so , otherwise give contact information to a responsible person or call the police yourself .
- Just like any incident, all parties should remain at the scene so info can be obtained/exchanged
- It is important to determine the well being of the victim as well as the animal. This is because the breed is not the problem, it is it's environment.
- You need to take responsibility for your pet at all times
- They are responsible for their dogs behavior.
- Ultimately dog owners are the responsible party and need to remain at the scene as drivers have to when in a collision.
- It's just like an car accident
- Accountability.
- You need to be able to gauge the severity of the bite or the situation and be able to contact if anything serious happens further like infection
- They only need to remain there for information exchange and then the dog should be taken home or to bylaw so the dog dosen't do it again
- Yes, if a dog bite occurs with enough severity to call police the responsibility of the owner should be to make a statement. At this point in time though, police officers should be taught that the dog is likely not cause of the problem, and the responsibility lies on the owner or a victim who may have not heeded requests by the owner. The police should also be taught to not escalate tension for the dog - they legitimately don't know any better.
- Accountability
- A responsible owner should have no problem staying on the scene if their pet is at fault, unless the pet needs to be removed from the scene for safety reasons
- I think the owner should stay if their dog did hurt someone.
- Yes, this will allow for the possibility that owner of said dog may be held responsible for any damages done to another person or property or other animals.
- In whose mind would it be okay for owner to leave??
- A responsible owner is responsible for their pet and anything it might do
- Same as a traffic accident.
- I think the owner should be taking responsibility for how they train their dog.
- The owner is responsible for the actions of the dog. They need to ensure they share their information.
- I feel like everyone should be able to state their side of the story.
- necessary information is required in order to properly deal with the situation and being able to communicate with the involved people would help the process
- If the bite is severe and the person needs medical attention then the owner should pay for any meds needed if not covered by insurance. If the bite is not severe and does not require medical attention then the owner does not need to stay there.



- The options regarding pit bulls in this survey are saddening and incredibly out of touch. I encourage you to read a bit more regarding the genetic nature of the dog to realize it has nothing to do with the breed and everything to do with the owner. Pit bulls should not be singled out in this survey.
- As a responsible dog owner, if my dog was involved in an altercation, I would remain at the scene until the issue was resolved. I hope other responsible owners would do the same.
- An owner needs to be responsible for their dog at all times.
- All dogs can bite and the owners of those that do should be held to account. BSL places the responsibility at the wrong end of the leash.
- Common sense, if a bite occurs, there should be paperwork shown to prove they've had their shots, to rule out things like rabies etc when treating the bite victim. And the owner should take responsibility. If a dog bites someone who is attacking the owner, that is a whole different scenario and should be treated as such..
- its their pet
- It's still a form of assault so contact information should be required
- It is the owner's responsibility to ensure their dog behaves properly. It is their responsibility to deal with consequences should the dog act out.
- Need accountability
- And if not major fines to be enforced
- Unless the dog is also injured, this seems reasonable
- It's not the dogs fault they were trained, or lack thereof, to react in a certain way. A dog can only be as good as it's owner. Support more educational measures and not breed specific legislation.
- That should be a given for a responsible dog owner
- To keep a record of the incidents to help any future cases against the dog. Take all facts into account (why did the dog bite in the first place?) To assess if the dog is getting proper direction from their owner.
- Was it a nip or a real bite ? Different people interpret different ways. Some dogs inherently nip for herding and social training of other dogs. The real question is how do you enforce the rule, especially if it's a real bite scenario.
- Owners need to be responsible, PITBULLS ARE JUST ANOTHER DOG AND ALL DOGS SHOULD BE TREATED EQUAL. Owners need to be responsible for THEIR dogs actions
- Its respect
- Owners need to be accountable for the actions of their pets.
- they need to take responsibility
- these accidents are often just as harmful and costly as a car accident, if not more emotionally damaging in some cases. should be treated the same way.
- Information should be shared regardless of the severity of the incident and size/breed of dog. I have had dogs attacked by small breeds before and the owners have simply laughed it off and walked away.
- Recently a putbull got out of its yard and attacked my dog while on leash walking on the sidewalk. The pit bull bit my dogs neck and would not let go. The owner couldn't get it off my dog. The owner



ran away with their dog and left me no information. The surgery cost me over \$800. It was traumatizing and they should have had to pay for the damage they inflicted on my dog.

- Owners need to be responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- For the same reasons you should have to stay after a vehicle accident, it should be the same for animal related accidents.
- Pet owners need to be held accu
- Yes if a person is bit, no if a dog is bit.
- could then track incidents and flow up foe owner accountability
- If necessary can be determined by the phone call to bylaw officers
- The owner must take responsibility for their let's behaviour.
- The owner should first be able to calm their animal(s). If that requires leaving and then returning, that should be considered.
- Like a car accident. Take responsibility.
- I'm really disappointed that our city is looking at punishing the dogs for being a specific breed, rather than doling out consequences to irresponsible pet owners. I have met far more aggressive and undisciplined chihuahuas and shitzus than I have pit bulls.
- Taking responsibility for your dogs actions (no matter what the breed or size) is part of being a responsible owner.
- I hope this could lead to responsible dog owners but based on the rest of this survey I worry that this will be used unfairly against certain breeds
- Yes. Owners are responsible for the training and care of their pet, no matter the breed or size.
- The owner should always be responsible.
- Legal liability of the owner
- It's their responsibility
- Pet owner should be held responsible
- This law is absolutely necessary so that the victim is not getting into a confrontation with the owner of aggressive dog after the incident. The other advantage of having this law is it will cause the owner of aggressive dog owner to break the law if they flee the scene after the incident.
- NO EXPLANATION REQUIRED
- Owners need to take responsibility for any incidents
- This should be in place if the person that was bitten requests it
- This would allow for effective follow up for the above enforcement options
- Dog owners should be held accountable for the incident. This includes both dog owners. Each owner should give a statement of the incident. Just like a vehicle accident. This includes all dog breeds small and large regardless of the bite or attack.
- As a pet owner we should be responsible for everything that our animals do.
- It is important as part of responsible dog ownership to remain at the scene of an accident and share contact information and speak with an enforcement officer. If a dog bites another person or animal



because it was provoked and it was in self defence, this should be taken into consideration. The exception to this is if a dog or person is in need of medical/veterinary attention.

- I think it's only fair you take responsibility for your inability to understand your dog or lack of training. If you're a dog owner you need to know their triggers and their behaviours - you're dog can't take responsibility for their reaction. They should never be put into a situation where they can harm others with their reactions.
- It is a dog owners responsibility to ensure their dog is looked after and trained appropriately. Anyone that cannot put in the time to properly train a dog does not deserve to even have a dog. Period. That being said, dog owners need to take responsibility for their dogs inappropriate behaviours (without euthanizing a dog that is not terminally ill).
- There must be a discussion about the severity of the bite and what the next step needs to be. Also, the aggressor should be assessed to determine the likelihood of such an incident to occur again.
- Only for severe cases (when caused an injury for example)
- The dog is like a person's property, like at a car accident
- It is fair to stay on site so that both parties can explain their side of the story
- Should be a chargeable offence if the person responsible for the dog who bit someone/another dog, leaves the scene of the incident
- If a dog bites another dog there could be vet bills for the injured dog which the owner of the guilty dog should pay.
- as a dog owner it is your responsibility. Dogs should be treated with the same care and responsibility as you would your child.
- I think it's in both parties best interests to be able to make statement while they still recollect the details of the incident
- There needs to be an explanation? To be responsible
- It should be like a car accident, reported and reviewed.
- The owner should not flea the scene if their pet injured another person or animal.
- A lot of the time when a dog bites someone the owner leaves the scene with the dog. I think when they do that the owner should go to jail and get a fine.
- Responsible pet ownership
- Not necessary because bylaw officer should be involved but the vet if the dog that got bitten might need additional information from the other dog to help treatment
- If you are a responsible person you would do this anyway.
- if they leave, and someone was mauled or a pet killed, no one will know who to put the responsibility on
- The owner is responsible for their pet and any damages or assault should be the pet owners responsibility. Too many owners leave the scene and it's difficult to track them down. Their dogs may seriously injure the next person and that should be prevented
- There are always two sides to a story. The owner should remain at the scene but enforcement should only be necessary if the incident is severe.



- I'm not sure why anyone would leave... I am not a dog owner, but if I was & my dog attacked, I would be responsible. I would stay with the victim as long as they need.
- A dog owner is responsible for their dog's actions.
- Just as in any other accident, etc. People should remain on scene. Not only to make sure everyone is okay & be responsible with steps moving forward, but also allow everyone to speak their mind in a professional, safe environment with the enforcement officer
- If an incident occurs NO MATTER THE BREED then the owner should take responsibility and law enforcement should consider the situation— off-leash dog attacks a on-leash pittie, pittie is not at fault etc.
- If any dog bites another animal or person the owner should most definitely give any info they have as well as pay for medical bills. Vet bills, pain meds etc.
- It is always important to have both sides of the story
- I would support fees or fines if a dog owner left the scene after an incident with no contact details
- Same as any other offense committed by an individual.
- The owner of the dog is responsible for their behavior and therefore should remain at the scene like a parent would for a child
- Owners must be held responsible for our pets
- I think it is important for owner to take responsibility for their dogs actions. If they do not take responsibility in that moment, then the behavior doesn't get corrected and it will happen again. This will ensure that this owner is in the system and bylaw is aware of a potential nuisance.
- Same as with a vehicle collision, the people involved should be present when enforcement officers arrive.
- And be fined for leaving the scene. See too much of this
- Owners should be made accountable for dogs that cause harm. If not required to remain and share info, they may avoid the consequences of punitive action, perhaps allowing the dog to become a repeat offender and the victim would not see any justice.
- The pet owner needs to take ownership and responsibility
- It's the right thing to do!
- The owner must be held accountable for the actions of their dog.
- Bites are obviously dangerous and can lead to infection. This may or may not be the dogs first time biting, so I think it's a good accountability measure. It may also deter owners who have anxious/anti-social dogs from taking them to at-risk areas (off leash dog parks)
- They need to take responsibility.
- In most cases, dog reactivity is dictated by the owners own irresponsibility to not provide proper training to a reactive dog, that they do not appropriately read their dogs' body language, or put the dog in an environment where they are more likely to be reactive. I believe that in the case of the majority of incidents such as the aforementioned, the fault lies on the owner, and this rule may increase owner accountability.
- Self explanatory
- Dog owner should take responsibility for the dog they own.



- Pet owners need to be held accountable for their animal's behaviour. And record of repeat offenders need to be built/maintained.
- People need to be responsible and accountable for their actions and/or pets. No different than hit and run accidents. Remain at the scene!
- They should stay if there's a witness to confirm the conditions!
- need accountability
- The owner should be strictly liable for their pets behaviour and should remain at the scene. The officer should be able to provide resources to the owner for how to properly act around a dog and how to train the dog.
- Of course. This just makes sense
- This would improve accountability
- This way they couldnt get away, and police wouldnt have to track them down. However, it might not work if the owner doesnt have a means of controlling the dog while they wait.
- People need to be responsible for there pets plain and simple
- People put their hands on other people everyday; usually it is dealt with in a way no one is hurt. I have personally broken up fights outside my building. I am not asking for anyone to be held accountable; however, as an owner of a Rottweiler I think this is incredibly biased.
- The issue is never with the dog. It's with the owner. They need to be held accountable.
- Person can know if dog is up on vaccinations, person should get help if assistance is require. Person should exchange information so charges can be laid if requested. Person should be liable for any medical costs associated with damage done by their pet.
- People should be held responsible for not having control over there dogs. If someone gets bite by a dog then that person should make the call.
- It's their responsibility as they are responsible for their pet
- A responsible pet owner would and they aren't the people you have to be concerned about.
- The owner should be liable to provide information on the dog and a record should be kept of the incident
- The dog owners perspective is also to be considered such as the actions of the person bitten that may have agitated the dog.
- I think this should be required by the dog owner or the person responsible for the dog at the time (ie. Dog walker)
- To obtain fresh evidence from stakeholders—anyway one must remain at scene of a serious incident, i.e. a dog bite.
- I would want to see more specific guidelines around severity, age or ability of the person bit, etc
- Just like at car crashes both parties should stay at the scene
- It's not already a rule??
- They should be able to defend their dog. Most dogs don't attack unprovoked. Usually there's more to the story.



- I was fortunate when my dog was bit that the owners were responsible. They were incredibly apologetic and forthcoming, and they paid for the stitches and other medical attention my dog required. Many people are not this way, and I don't think the owner should have to shoulder the cost. It also should be on record if a dog has aggressive tendencies, and perhaps they should be encouraged to keep these dogs on leash.
- Any incident invoking 2 or more parties should have to stay until the matter is cleared or can be proceeded with and all information exchanged.
- Yes if there is any injuries and fights
- Its a scene of an incident, wait for enforcement officers
- people need to be responsible for their animals
- It's always the responsibility of the owners.
- No different from other accident situations where parties should remain at the scene until authorities arrive
- Yes both parties involved should remain at the scent to give a full report to an officer.
- They should take responsibility, just like a vehicle collision.
- The owner's responsibility to train her/his dog, and keep it well. It is breed neutral, I have seen pit bull as therapy dog and vicious golden retriever.
- My son got bit by a dog and we have no idea if it has rabies or not!
- animal behaviour is a result of training and handling, owners should be held accountable.
- Same law as hit and run
- They are responsible for their dog, including the dogs actions. Train your dog and train yourself on dog behaviour and body language.
- T
- If someone gets hurt, stay there! Ethically and morally its an obligation!!! Officers also need to focus on bias training not only regarding animal breeds but also what they expect the animals.to behave like or what they assume about the situation because of their reaction to someone's gender, race, or attire.
- This should be mandatory - a dog is a property and extension of the owners liability. If you leave the scene of a car accident where person or property is damaged it's a hit and run. The same should apply to dog bites to humans or property (animals)
- The owner is in charge of their animal since they did not train the dog well enough to not bite someone. Dogs are trained to hurt, singling out a certain dog breed is unfair and we should be punishing the irresponsible pet owners for their negligence.
- of course they should remain at the scene, it is like being in a car accident ...
- we must get all sides of what happened. If the person leaves you can't get that.
- Ideally there is most always a reason for a dog to react. It's best to have both sides heard personally. The dog just doesn't bite unless threatened or possibly Scared.
- You are responsible for you pet



- People need to take responsibility for their dogs' actions. That being said, sometimes it is another's actions that cause an issue with a dog. Having someone at the scene (not an officer, but maybe a representative) might provide a clearer picture of the situation.
- The owner of the dog who bites should take responsibility. If they know the dog is aggressive towards other dogs and/or people, then the dog should be muzzled. But if it was an accident, say a person was annoying the dog before the dog bit them, then that person should also take responsibility. Accidents happen.
- It is your responsibility as a pet owner, and it is the right and moral thing to do. I fully agree with this, and failure to do so should be dealt with accordingly.
- Yes! Because it's the owner's fault for poor training of the dog. Stop blaming the dog!
- It is important to hold the owner accountable for their negligence. This could hold the owner accountable for abuse toward the aggressive dog, or lack of training if the officers investigate the situation. It would also help identify any risk of disease or infection.
- I think it is always a good idea to get the full story right away so to not let people leave the scene just like in a car accident.
- An animal is not just a pet, it's the owner's property, so just like in the event of a car accident, the other party is responsible to share information and/or pay for the damage.
- Yes, regardless of the breed, dogs can bite. Go after the owners, not the breeds!
- If your dog bites someone and you leave, that's not like leaving the scene of a crime??!
- It allows for the person injured to receive real contact information.
- It's like an accident - both parties involved should stay at the scene until matters are discussed with an enforcement officer.
- Owner is responsible for pet.
- This is a thing during vehicle incidents, why is it not already happening for dog incidents?
- Yes, unless care of the injured individual or animal requires immediate care. All efforts must be made by both parties to have shared information. The pet owner is responsible for their pet's actions.
- Of course, the dog owner should remain on the scene to share information. They should be responsible for any bills that arise from the bite. Our dog was attacked and the owner took off with his dog, leaving us with an emergency trip to the vet and a \$1,000 vet bill.
- As long as the dog is not taken away from its owner. This will be very stressful for the dog. An investigation should be done, there could be numerous reasons a dog would, it doesn't make the dog aggressive.
- I feel like people will flee the scene if they believe their dog will be taken. There needs to be more forgiveness for dog aggression.
- Absolutely, if a dog bites and someone has an issue with it, then yes, there needs to be a rule that requires the owner to stay at the scene.
- If someone's dog bites a person or another dog, they should give their information and be able to press charges or that person should be held 100% liable for paying for damages done.



- In severe cases. In some areas the cards are stacked against good guardians with poor public knowledge on the breed and people acting out of unsubstantiated fear. Making a mountain of a molehill. However! I do believe in responsible positive reinforcement training and this takes a lot of patience. I would rather see funds going into preventative measures, like educating dog owners on the importance of behavioural training and exercises. This goes for all dogs! Big & small and every colour Inbetween.
- Hold owners accountable for poor dog behavior. Dont generalize and punish an entire breed.
- Pet owners are responsible for the their conduct and that of their pets.
- it seems reasonable and as part of owner accountability that they would do this anyway
- makes sense that the owner gives their side of the story as well
- The owner must be responsible and be able to present their side of the incident.
- Depending on severity, if hospitalization is required then the owner of the dog should remain on scene, if blood is not drawn then there should be no need
- The owner must act responsibly and cooperate with enforcement personnel.
- I feel as a responsible pet owner, the best thing to do in a situation such as the one above would be to remain on the scene.
- I can't believe this isn't a rule already.
- absolutely. the owner shall be responsible for the dog's action like a parent responsible for a child's. This is no different from a car incident or any other incident that requires law enforcement at the scene.
- The owner should take responsibility for any incidents that may occur concerning their pets.
- As like any incidents some information may be very important on what steps to take after like if it has its shots? Is it a neuciense ? Re occurring issue for owner and pet ?
- It's just like a car accident. All parties must remain on scene to provide information
- Its nit the fault if the dog. Its irresponsible pet owners
- I think it's important that if your dog bites a person or another animal, that you take responsibility for it by sharing your contact information if there are any costs. However, sometimes when a dog bites another, it may not have been their intention and could have been the other dogs fault so I think both sides should be taken into consideration.
- Dog owners need to be held accountable for their dog's behaviour as they are responsible for the animal itself.
- Only if it is severe enough and damage is done.
- It is no different than a motor vehicle accident where an injury has occurred. Be accountable.
- If someone dog bites another person there needs to be someone there to explain the situation. Bites often occurs when the victim was being to forward with an animal
- Owners should be responsible for their pets, and dog bite causes can ultimately be traced back to the owner, whether it be lack of training, control, supervision, etc.
- Absolutely also with small dogs not just pit bull type breeds



- Too many owners take off with their vicious dog, leaving victims responsible for all treatment and trauma (physical and emotional) to dogs and humans. Too often it's next to impossible to find the person/animal responsible and hold them accountable.
- First of all no dog should not be loose, without supervision eg: off leash park. Most definitely personal information should be shared..
- Person has to wait for an officer
- The owner of the dog need to take responsibility for it's actions. no matter the breed. Obedience training should be a requirement for owning a dog. Not breed specific
- In the case of a human, yes. In the case of another dog, yes, but in most cases law enforcement should not be needed, just share contact information to pay for the vet bill.
- The owner should be accountable
- Well it's pretty much self explanatory
- It should be treated the same as if at the scene of a MVA.
- How is this not already in place?
- Should stay to deal with investigation
- I believe your pet is your responsibility. Owners should be conscious of their pets ability to interact with people of all ages, dogs of all kinds and in all environments. Accidents do happen, so staying at the scene of an incident and exchanging contact information should be required to record both persons statements and decide if medical attention is necessary.
- You're required by law to remain at the scene of a traffic accident. You should be equally required to remain at the scene of any POTENTIALLY at-fault incident, not just with motor vehicles. This would make sense to apply to ALL pets as well.
- If there is a bite or attack all persons and witnesses should remain at the scene . If my Staffordshire was attacked and defended himself or my life he should not be at blame .
- It's responsible
- People leave before checking the condition of the other dog or person as they know they are in the wrong and it is not the first time their dog has been involved in a situation. They are not a responsible pet owner. People need to be held responsible.
- Vital information about the animal could be shared immediately.
- I support a rule that requires pet owners/the concerned parties to swap contact information for the purpose of creating an online incident report list which would be used to suggest behavioural therapy to 'problem dogs' or otherwise assess ways to help the dog coexist in the world. Euthanization should only be a very last resort, after every other option has been tried and exhausted.
- If your dog attacks someone or something it is your responsibility to make sure they are okay and have the means to contact/know you. It's the equivalent to a human attacking another human.
- Defining what is necessary should be required
- if the other animal needs care this becomes a civil matter
- Housemate bitten multiple times, multiple dogs. Owners never own up to their responsibility. The laws you have are unenforceable, the ones you make will be too, because the owners & dogs walk



away. Not every person in the midst of a traumatic attack whips out a camera to document dogs and owners. Mandatory obedience training at accredited facilities with the first issue of a licence would be a great start, since bad dogs stem from lazy owners who don't know how to control their dogs. In fact, it's probably the way to have the greatest impact on aggressive dog situations. Mandate training from first day of registered ownership, automatic refresher if there's any incident.

- Similar to an automobile collision, it is my personal opinion that by making the decision to own a dog, you assume responsibility for what that dog does. If the dog bites a person or other animal, it should be treated in a similar way to an automobile collision (requiring staying at the scene, exchanging contact information, given statements if necessary, etc.).
- You would be stupid to run away and not share contact information
- Be responsible. If a dog bites, it wasn't trained well. That's on the owner. The one who was bitten should be able to get answers.
- It needs to be put on record so if it happens more than an allotted amount of time you can label the dog a nuisance dog, etc.
- People are responsible for their animals
- Dog owners MUST be held accountable for their dogs- this is crucial in order to maintain safe public spaces for every person and animal
- If the victim would like to call an enforcement officer and take this further.
- While being accountable is important, this allows for the owner to help ease the situation and calm people down before a "witch hunt" can happen. Because the lines between victims and non victims are not black and white in the majority of biting incidents. Many dogs don't bite unprovoked
- If you cause harm to any other person or animal in any other situation (ie. Hitting with car, physical assault) you are required by law to remain at the scene to share contact information. Animal bites should be no exception, this should be treated like a hit and run.
- It is appropriate and a responsible thing to do.
- Not fair, they should stay and pay the damages.
- Safety- taking responsibility for your dog
- The owner needs to remain on the scene to ensure contacts are given.
- I agree and feel this should apply to all breeds
- Just like getting in an accident with a vehicle. I find people may flee the scene cause they are worried their animal may die as consequence.
- As a pet owner they are your responsibility. Just like a car accident you should be required to stay.
- the dog owner is responsible for their animal and should be reviewed.
- Like a car accident, both parties need to remain on the scene. This gives officers the opportunity to understand what occurred from both parties involved.
- Owners should absolutely be held accountable for their pets actions. Irresponsible owners should not have pets.
- It is basic human kindness. Something happens you stay and handle the situation
- once the dog is safely confined. If it is better to remove the dog to get it settled they should report it to bylaw.



- It should be treated the same as annoy other incident, especially if further action may be required
- Both Dog owners need be responsible,
- just like a scene of an accident
- Be a responsible pet owner.
- People need to engage and communicate regardless of who's fault it is as well as take responsibility for their dog's actions.
- Owners need to be held accountable for their dogs behaviour from both parties involved, sometimes the offending dog is not the instigator.
- It's a no-brainer. The person responsible should be held responsible and that is only possible if you know who it is.
- Just as with a car accident, it should be mandatory to exchange pertinent information in the event of a dog bite. If there is a possibility of infection by some sort of virus, ie rabies, the person who was bit and the dog owner should be informed
- It the responsible thing to do
- My husband was bit when riding his bike and the dog owner gave fake information. She left before an officer arrived so we never tracked her down. They should have to stay on the scene.
- Responsible dog owner's would never second guess exchanging information and helping anyway that they can.
- Very much like a car accident. Your property hurt someone else.
- They should take responsibility for their dog's actions and now run away from the consequences.
- Like a hit and run, if enforcement is required stay at the scene
- Accountability of the owner!
- Once contact information that has been proven to be correct (Ie: proof of address via drivers license, cell phone number being called to ensure the persons phone rings)has been provided, all involved persons should be free to leave.
- The same as in a car accident, one does or rather should not hit and run. There needs to be responsibility on all sides in regards to dog bites, it needs to be treated in the same manner
- due to how many people say their animal is okay and it results in an injury shows they do not feel responsible to meet the needs of the animal when out in public or a human comes to their home they should be held responsible and this would be a start by taking responsibility for the animal by having this rule or bylaw enforced
- As long as the dog itself can be removed from the situation to de-escalate the problem.
- Of course the owner should stay at the scene. Leaving the scene of an accident is illegal so this should fall under that.
- I've been bit in the past. The owners stayed, exchanged information and were extremely accountable for their dogs behaviour. I feel everyone should be entitled to that.
- It is the owner's responsibility to train their dog properly. If the dog bites another person or animal, the owner should be punished for it, not the dog.
- Drivers are responsible for the results of their driving. Dog owners, all pet owners, are responsible for the actions of their pets.



- It's better for these types of things to be on record for in the future.
- Important information must be shared about current vaccines and shots the dog has.
- "When a dog bites there are only two reasons how it could have happened.
- Bad owner who did not train their dog.
- The dog was aggravated purposefully, in which case it would not be the dogs fault.
- If necessary, the enforcement officer will be writing a report which goes to the Tribunal. The owner of the dog should stay at the scene to make the officer's report as accurate as possible so animals are not wrongly euthanized."
- More accountability needs to be put on owners, not on specific breeds.
- Owners of problematic Cats/Dogs are increasing. Receiving a heavy fine in the spot that can be decreased after registering the pet in behaviour correction courses, the cost of multiple infraction should make pet training a worthy investment.
- "Everyone deserves an explanation.
- It's illegal to hit a car and drive away, why not your dog attack someone or someone's dog or whatever and you walk away?
- Same situation, different variables"
- Owners of dogs that attack often leave without giving info or proper info, leaving victims without the ability to get recompense for injury.
- Self explanatory
- The owner, not the dog, needs to be held responsible.
- I think it can protect eh "victim", the dog, and the dog owner. Owners of problem dogs will still probably take off though.
- If it becomes a legal matter, witness statements are crucial. No better time to do it than asap.
- To regain control of a frightened animal or child by "leaving" is understandable but information must be exchanged and possible consequential bills (vet or doctor) must be paid by defendant.
- Unless the dog is distressed and the owner is unable to keep it under control
- because they need to be held accountable for the damages and the animal should be taken into custody right away
- If an owner is responsible for the animal they should provide their information if there is an incident.
- My last dog was viciously attacked by another dog while we were walking her (small dog picked up in the jaws of a larger dog and thrown around). The dog owner just sloughed it off and had we known there could be recourse for it we would have sought it. Dogs are taught to be vicious, they are not naturally this way. Bad pet owners are the problem.
- Owner's should be responsible if their animals inflict harm on others.
- Once their dog is under control they should absolutely be there to share their info
- Only if the victim requires
- If not, it's too easy for an owner to disappear.
- It is important that the victim obtain information about the dog and it's vaccinations. It also needs to be known that the dog has bitten and may do so again



- If there are actual bite marks, yes exchange information. Remaining at the scene might be dangerous however as it would be very hard to control your dog after a situation like that. YES TO EXCHANGING INFO ONLY.
- It is the responsible thing to do.
- My dogs have been there. They walk away. And say my dogs fine . Running free as mine are on a leash. They should pay for vet bills if need. I breed belong to CKC . So yes I look after my show dogs. I don't need them to be attacked by a dog that a child can;t control. Been there.
- When possible owner should be present to state facts
- Should be treated like assault. Don't get to leave the scene until it's been addressed.
- Owners must be held responsible for their dogs and making sure they are trained properly.
- All owners should take responsibility for their pets behaviour regardless of breed and should be held accountable
- Its called " Responsible Dog Ownership" take responsibility of what your dog did. Its not always the dogs fault, many incidences its the owners fault and the dog pays for it with its life. Not fair at all! Doesn't matter what breed it is.
- It may be serious and leaving the scene is dangerous to track down the dog who may bite again
- Responsible pet ownership
- I believe its the same as a car crash. And there should be a significant penalty applied for fleeing the scene.
- As long as the other party stays too. And enforcement officer is a horrid term. Whatever happened to Bylaw and Animal services? You sound like an American.
- Its an incidental no different then a car accident. You leave the scene its way worse for the person that left the scene. But make sure its in control first.
- It's every owners responsibility to train and maintain their pet. Regardless of breed or situation, each owner is accountable for someone or another animal sustaining an injury due to a dog bite
- It's the same as a hit and run, they need to stay there
- Need to get information to pay for any care.
- It is responsible for the dog owner to do so. They would be able to explain their perspective of the situation. Bias prior to hearing both sides cannot be allowed.
- Any responsible dog owner would remain there and would offer to make the situation right, but this shouldn't come at the cost of a dog's life. Offer course to educate and aid this in not happening again
- If a dog harms someone else, the owner should be held responsible.
- The person can explain what happened
- Owners should have to remain at the scene no different than a car accident
- In case a vet or doctor visit is required....
- Take responsibility as a citizen
- I think this should be the same as if someone ran into someone else with their car... exchange info at least.



- A dog attacking someone or another animal is very much like a person assault another person, doesn't matter the dog size or bite abilities. Too many small dog owners don't get held to account for their viscous dogs.
- The owner could take off and then the dangerous dog won't be dealt with.
- It is depending on the situation. For instance if a dog bites a person always yes. If a dog bites another dog not always. Because the bite could have been a provoked scenario.
- I think the owner is the equivalent of a driver on the road. My only concern is: what happens to the problem dog during this period?
- This is common decency
- If you hit a car you have to stay at the scene call the cops or at least work it out among your selves should be the exact same process
- No need to hide when it's innocent
- May need contact info for Vet bills and to report the dog.
- I have had my pit bull attacked by a golden retriever at a dog park before and the person took off. Yes dogs fight I understand that I wouldn't have want the dog penalized I would have wanted some help with the \$5000 vet bill I had from his dog attacking mine. But proof not always the pit Bull attacking
- If necessary, yes. A dog bite can be traumatic for all parties.
- So that an unbiased third party can help determine proper next steps.
- Not related to this question: there is no science supporting the claim that pit bulls have a stronger bite than other dogs and you are feeding into ignorance by stating otherwise
- People should be held liable for the actions of their pets
- If a dog bites and causes harm.. Not a nip or mouthing(warning bite) the dogs history and medical information should be made known.
- The owner should not only be there to take responsibility but to tell their side of the story. The bite may not have been the dogs fault but the other person or dog.
- If a dog bites, the owner is responsible, not the dog.
- I think that putting the responsibility on the owner to provide details before the leave the scene but just like a car accident once information and id has been provided they can go. But safe distance may need to play a factor as well. Of the person can show a drivers license or other id for the other person to take a photo of. And if there is a bit or situation sometimes the offending dog waiting for authorities to show up could cause the situation to escalate further depending on location
- The victim in that case is within their rights to obtain contact information and call for an enforcement officer. If they decline then the owner and dog would be free to go.
- Discussed wether attack was provoked or not.
- They are responsible for their pet and therefore need to follow up if an incident occurs
- It depends on the nature of the incident,
- Yes. It should be illegal to leave a scene until information is exchanged, that or advised by an officer on site that they may leave. If an dog owner leaves, they should be fined for such action.
- I do think both owners should make this decision together if an officer needs to be involved or not.



- Definitely if a dog has bitten a person. Perhaps, it should be determined by the guardians of the dogs to decide if it's necessary when a dog has been bitten.
- It's common sense. Just like road accidents.
- If there is no immediate medical attention required they should remain at the scene
- It's important to take responsibility for your pet's behaviour as many people's pets are considered a member of their family. It's must be transparent and clearly communicated what immunizations the attack dog has had as well.
- its part of responsible pet ownership. Same goes for cats
- People must be held accountable and the owner must be seen with the animal. Was the owner having a bad day? Is he/she relaxed? Are they all amped up? Etc etc
- Hearing from all parties involved is important to best understanding the situation that led to the bite.
- It would be extremely immature and irresponsible to leave if your dog bit someone, regardless of the severity of the situation.
- I think if a dog attacks another dog viciously (this term should also be defined with restrictions. One bite is not vicious , tearing flesh and biting neck is.) or bites a Human (also with redirections, if the human is being an idiot and in this dogs space it can be warranted that they would self defend and bite) at a park or any location the owner should give contact information only for the reason the dog may need to be unlisted in classes to help with behavior. Not at all to be reported to police or to be suggested euthanized
- Totally reasonable and I'm shocked it's not already somehow a rule. It's just common decency.
- Its the dog owners responsibility to deal with the incident
- The dog is not the issue. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Blaming the dog (or a specific breed) is lazy and cowardly, and does not actually address the issue of irresponsible people who shouldn't be allowed a house plant owning a dog.
- If you animal bites Someone or Animal and you did not have necessary control of The animal but I reported a Chihuahua that was aggressive and bite me repeatedly and nothing was done. I disagree any animal should be allowed to bit but if you won't up hold in that circumstance you should not have the power to make choices like that as that is someone's family member your talking about having proper people owning Pets not the animals that is the problem
- This should be treated no different then any other accident. Owner must remain on scene until police arrive
- The owner is responsible and needs to be available if there is a problem.
- Everyone shares the same responsibility.
- It's important that the owner is educated and the dog trained if needed. There needs to be consequences for owners when their dog bites.
- Same goes if a person hurts someone, why not their animals?
- You need to take responsibility for your animal
- Should have been in place already honestly



- An animal can be trained as a weapon, any animal, and dogs are no different. We require drivers to stay at accidents, as well as witnesses with no personal involvement, why should an animal attack not hold an owner accountable?
- Seems pretty sensible to punish someone when they run away after they've attacked someone
- I do not think dogs should be restricted. However, I think owners should be fully accountable. Part of that accountability requires cooperation with law enforcement.
- Dog owners need to take accountability for their dogs. Irresponsible owners denying, brushing off, or becoming aggressive themselves about their dogs is a huge problem! The accountability needs to be enforced!
- must be accountable as ultimately it is the owner's fault.
- This is about ensuring accountability, dog owners are responsible for the proper handling of their animals.
- If a dog bites someone yes. If the dog has done no harm then no leave them be
- The owner is responsible for their dog.
- Responsible pet owners shouldn't have an issue with this.
- There should be information shared for medical reasons.
- The key words are "if necessary". A nip that does not cause visible injury should be exempted.
- Yes, depends on the severity of the bite of course and how it was instigated. Sometimes the other person can be at fault so both sides of the story should be heard.
- To ensue a record of the bad behavior in the event of ongoing issues as the consequences may need to be revisited.
- We should know if they have a rabies vaccine up to date especially
- most won't stay, so having a law in place means an extra charge they can receive, which is good.
- This answer depends on the severity, and enforcement officers should be subjective
- Undecided. I think the owner should remain because they are responsible for whatever their dog does, but the dog should probably not stay there if it could lead to further issues
- If ANY breed of animal bites another person, the owner of the animal should remain there to exchange information and give support.
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- Or allow them to provide contact information to be contacted if and when an enforcement officer is available.
- The owner is responsible for their dogs actions
- There are no bad dogs. Just bad training. If that person flees, they should be charged
- You are responsible for your dog's actions, no such thing as a bad dog or breed, just poor owners ANY breed of dog can be aggressive, it's YOUR responsibility to socialize and train them.
- Again, owners are responsible for their dogs behaviour.
- It's important to make sure we know who the owner is.
- No different than any other incident that occurs in life, example a car accident. It is still an incident involving 2 parties



- Your Dog, your responsibility. Ensure the space is safe. Sort of like if you get in a fender bender, you say on the scene safely till the proper authorities arrive or you and the involved parties come to an agreement.
- I think it's important to have both sides of the story. Sometimes dogs only bite because they feel threatened or afraid.
- Owners must always be responsible for their animals
- I can't imagine why they wouldn't stay unless the victim said they could leave
- Clear description of the event is necessary to determine if another such event is likely in the future.
- Pet owners should take responsibility for the actions of their pets. Whether that pet is a chihuahua or a pit bull, the responsibility lies with the owner. Breed specific legislation has no place in a progressive society.
- Yes, you are responsible for the dog just like you're responsible if your car hits another car
- Educating owners as to their responsibility to advocate for their pet is crucial none more so in remembering they are animals who don't speak so do use their mouths in other ways to communicate fear (arising from whatever basis). Currently, we have three dogs, our tiny chihuahua is the only resident with a bite history (not since we moved to Canada). She is frequently approached by people (adults and children alike) who think she's "cute", and we never miss an opportunity to educate them to ALWAYS first ask no matter the dog "looks like", and to respect the response, which in the case of our tiny dog is "No, please don't stroke her." If we are ever in a situation where our dog(s) could be the cause of or involved in a negative event, we talk charge. As we commonly say "We are the humans, they are the animals!"
- The owner is the one that trained the dog, but if the person who got bite provoked the dog, than they deserve to get bit.
- People need to be held responsible for that animal they have allowed to have specific behaviours
- I believe it should be like a motor vehicle crash. Regardless of the type of dog, the owner is responsible for how the dog acts, if the dog bites me and it was unprovoked, the owner should be fined.
- If an owner's dog injures someone or their animal (which is considered property of the person) they should be responsible for any damages (as in medical bills or pain and suffering) their dog imposed on the other animal or person, additionally they should stay at the scene to verify that their dog is up to date on all of its vaccinations so additional medications are not prescribed as preventative measures (such as rabies shots)
- No different than a car accident
- How could this be enforced though?
- the dog is ultimately the owners responsibility as hard as it is sometimes
- If a dog bites a person or another dog then the owner should be required to do the right thing and exchange information
- Our dog was attacked 3 years ago, and the man left immediately with his dog. We've never seen him again, and the cost of her surgery was over \$1000. We're so glad the Vet Staff cared for her so well because she healed and isn't traumatized!



- It's better to exchange information than to not.
 - It's your dog you have a responsibility to take care of what they might do
 - This should be required as a part of responsible pet ownership.
 - "-has the dog been vaccinated for rabies?"
 - -does the dog have a history of attacks, should it have been wearing a muzzle?"
 - It's called taking responsibility for your animal.
 - "Animal attacks are serious and can potentially begin a dangerous trend (depending on the initial incident)
-
- I believe that the person mat leave 'IF' they reauire emergency care for themselves, their pet OR a person who is with them AND they should still have to speak to an enforcement officer."
 - This allows the owner to share there information and side of their story
 - People should be held responsible for their pets actions/ lack of training. Treat similar to a hit and run with vehicles
 - This would be similar to a vehicle incident with waiting for police to fill out reports for fault and insurance purposes
 - "I believe you should be required to share contact information (first last name, address, phone number) but do not support a legal requirement to stay on scene to speak with an enforcement officer. Because after an Incident if the owner can't control the dog then he Must have the right to leave for the safety of the dog and the public.
 - I would support a requirement to speak with an enforcement officer as soon as possible after the dog is under substantial control (example a fenced area or car or home)"
 - The owner should be held accountable for the actions of their dogs actions or questioned for how their dog became so aggressive in the first place.
 - I think this is the best way to hold pet owners responsible for their dogs actions. I think implementing this rule would require what level of bite requires an owner to stay on the scene. An air snap? Contact with skin but no injury? A bite that breaks skin?
 - Dog owners should not be allowed to hide from consequences of their animal biting someone. If there is medical follow up needed, the owner should be responsible for it
 - Encourages accountability and fair treatment for both sides... like you would for an insurance claim
 - The owner must stay to speak with an officer to be held accountable for the dogs behaviour and have it recorded reliably by the enforcement officer to get the full story.
 - The owner needs to take responsibility if it's the dogs fault for biting or be there to defend the dog if it's not the dogs fault (ie: they were being provoked in an off leash park or if they were being hurt)
 - people should be held accountable for their actions, and a discussion about the dogs behaviour is important
 - How are you going to enforce this? Public vigilante? Give the public the right to use force to restrain people?



- Only if necessary (teeth entered the skin on any degree of any being)
- Similar to being involved in a car accident vs. a hit and run.
- Being responsible is part of pet ownership and if your dog bites you should remain and be responsible
- Pet owners should have to take responsibility for their dogs actions just like drivers have to take responsibility for their own actions.
- I have been in this situation and the offender fled.
- There's no bad dogs, only bad owners.
- I think that is just common sense and common courtesy
- Too often small dog owners don't see it as a serious issue when their dogs bite people/other dogs. It would be good for them to know they have just as much responsibility as a large breed dog owner.
- Similar to car accidents. If the bite is serious it may be important to know about vaccination status, etc.
- Same as a vehicle accident where someone is injured. Lots could be on the line.
- They need to take responsibility for their pet's behaviour.
- It is very easy for people on a walk with their dog to flee and not be identified. They should be required to remain at the scene.
- Animal owners should take accountability and advocate for their animals if an incident happens.
- Both sides of the story need to be heard. There's always 2 perceptions and 2 realities. There's always truth in the middle
- My youngest dog, at two months old was attacked by two dogs. The vet bills were considerable, yet the owner of the two dogs ran away with the dogs. If there was a bylaw that required her to stay, at least other owners would be willing to become involved if the law requires it
- The dog owner is responsible for what their dog has done. Seems like a no brainer??
- Only right that they stay
- Supports accurate data
- This would allow for bylaw to be involved and for repeat offender nuisance dogs to be evaluated for training sooner.
- It will help to identify problem dogs
- The same goes for car accident and should be for accidents of this sort. Dog owners are responsible for their pet and any actions they take. Ensuring the other animal/person is okay should be a priority.
- They need to take responsibility for their pet
- If your dog is aggressive the owner needs to be held responsible.
- you're responsible as an owner to do what's right and as a witness to declare no false statements regarding the situation.
- ABSOLUTELY. A bite and run should be as severely punished as a car hit and run. A bite can leave permanent damage just as a car hit and run.
- If medical assistance is required the owner of the aggressive dog might be responsible, also this will allow the city to know if it is a repeat offender



- Yes, they should have to stay at the scene and exchange info in the case that someone or something gets seriously injured
- Common sense. You must be a responsible owner
- The animal may be the one who bit but the owner is responsible for the animals actions.
- That would be a responsibility as a pet owner.
- It is important to understand the history of the dog and what would have caused the behaviour.
- Owners need to be held responsible for their dog's behaviour, this rule could help make people more conscious about training their dog.
- For severe bites, dog owners should remain present.
- This would be important to track nuisance dogs. It should also be required that the owner of the dog pay restitution to any person/animal injured.
- There are no bad dogs their are bad owners if your dog bites the owner is responsible. This will force people to be more accountable for the actions of their dog and likely force owners to be more aware of proper training
- I believe a dog bite is like a car accident, and should be treated with the same level of care. You cannot live the scene of the accident if it is severe and that should be the same for animal attacks
- The more witnesses the better. It's also important to have the owner around to explain their pets behaviours as they probably know them best.
- I support this, but in cases where two dogs fight and both owners agree that there are no injuries an enforcement officer should not be required.
- This is a given. A responsible dog owner should be on scene to help determine who the aggressor was. Even though a pit bull would naturally be thought of as the aggressor, it is often not the case, but it is easy to lay blame. I personally have never encountered an aggressive pit bull breed and I am in contact with hundreds of dogs in clients homes as a contractor. In fact the most aggressive dogs usually are the smaller breeds.
- All responsible owners should remain at scene to discuss the incident, contact info, vet costs if necessary.
- I know too many people who have been attacked or their dogs attacked and there is no accountability. Ps- not by pitbulls or discriminated breeds!
- If your dog bites someone you are responsible in the same was as if you were involved in an at-fault car accident. You don't just drive away
- Yes some one was hurt and all information should be acquired regarding the situation
- While impossible to enforce without risking dangerous escalation by those involved in the incident, a rule against fleeing the scene that is accompanied by a fine may deter the owners from leaving the scene as well as being an additional punitive measure to owners that do not take responsibility for their animal.
- Yes, as these incidents are becoming more common, a well understood process that is to take place afterward (like what happens after car accidents - people share contact info, contact authorities if needed etc.) could benefit everyone.



- If it has caused any harm to any person or animal, it should at least be required to share information such as: Owners name & phone number, rabies vaccine identification, and pictures/descriptions of the incident and what occurred.
- It should be handled no different than a car accident.
- I am confused as to why this question requires an explanation. It is illegal to leave a crime scene - there should be no exception. Especially when the consequences could mean the dog will be euthanized without proper statements and information.
- An incident occurred and the person responsible for the dog should be held accountable.
- The owner or current handler of the attacking animal should always remain on scene until told otherwise by either the victim/victim owner or current handler of the victim, or enforcement officer
- It's about accountability. Everyone makes mistakes and if your dog causes a problem you need to own it
- The dog owner is responsible for all that their dog does. That includes any actions the dog may do. Take responsibility for what your pet does.
- I have 7 dogs on my farm and if one of them bit a person or pet it is my responsibility to come to a conclusion. Excluding the need for emergency veterinary care.
- If it is a severe injury to another dog and the owner wasn't paying attention or respecting other people & their pets they are also at fault. If their pet is to inflict a serious injury or something that may involve stitches or going to a vet, they should be helping cover that cost as vets are expensive. People need to be aware of their surroundings and recognize animal behavior and how to prevent accidents when possible, depending on the situation. They should be relaying both sides of what happened to the officer so they can make the best decision based on the information available.
- I had a dog attack my dog & I called in but no one came out to the scene & I gave the other person's info to the operator who would not give me the information later when I called back & I had to get a lawyer to help me find the owner to get my vet bills paid. If they would have come out while the owner was there I wouldn't have had to do that
- Again, in theory this seems reasonable but not enforceable. Officers are not readily available and ultimately the people that would stay are going to stay regardless of whether or not there is a rule that they could easily avoid.
- It's like hitting another person's car with your own, to leave would be immoral and you need to take responsibility for your actions. The same thought applies here.
- They need to exchange info. I want to know if the dog is up to date with vaccinations. It helps in treating a person who has been bit and another animal.
- If the incident is severe enough that warrants further action the dog owner should be held accountable
- If both parties stay to discuss and explain there would be less confusion and would practice ownership to the action.
- I would be concerned that the dog would cause additional damage, however, they would need to remain on the scene to ensure matter is dealt with (insurance, Obedience training)
- People should be responsible for their animals.



- People aren't allowed to do a hit and run so why should they be allowed to have a dog that bites people without justice being served.
- Unless the owner of said dog is taking the victim to an emergency facility.
- It's the owners responsibility
- Unless the safety of the owner is at stake, the owner of the dog that bit should be available to give information immediately after the incident.
- I think you are responsible to provide risk information to the person that was injured and provide an accurate picture.
- The owner should be responsible for the behaviour of their dog.
- It is important for pet owners to take responsibility for the consequences of their pets actions.
- Show that the dog can be restrained and it was an accident, or whether the dog is just overly aggressive due to other sources.
- As a responsible dog owner, you are responsible for your dog's actions. Just like a vehicle hit and run, owners should never leave the scene without appropriate follow up
- Any dog is the responsibility of the owner and as such the owner needs to remain at the scene until an endorsement officer arrives. The owner may have some feedback on why the bite took place
- Dog bites/attacks/fights should be treated like traffic accidents. Everyone shares information, and there's a protocol to follow.
- As a pet owner it is necessary to have responsibility of your animal.
- Accountability
- so that the owner and dog can be tracked to see if other incidents have happened before
- Enforces pet owners to be held accountable
- I think owners of vicious dogs should be held responsible when their dogs attack as it's their fault rather than the dogs
- It is the owners responsibility of the dog bite
- The owner needs to still be responsible for their animal actions and expenses if a dog bites
- Responsibility.
- To deter the equivalent of hit & run.
- Just like a car accident.
- If it's a severe enough bite, there should be a requirement similar to more severe car accidents where the police must be involved.
- Many owners are repeat offenders and are never brought to justice over what has happened
- Of course. Many terrible dog owners don't take responsibility for there dog and blame it on others. This is very important that they stay at the scene.
- It would be the equivalent of a hit and run in a vehicle incident. They should stay and be penalized if they flee and are caught.
- people who own pit bulls and let them run loose and attack other dogs and people should be subject to jail time.
- This is like a car accident. Must stay at the scene.



- Or call into 311 to get a file number and share that with the other party
- Severity of bite should be specified. Dogs play-fighting can draw blood and that does not mean the dog is injured.
- The cost of vet bills
- To provide any information that would be relevant.
- my dog has been attacked twice and the owner has fled and left me with high vet bills,
- I have read frequent news reports, and have anecdotal support, that Those owning vicious and/or nuisance dogs which attack citizens and/or animals refuse to identify themselves, or leave without consequence. In order for individuals to be held accountable for their and their animals actions, a legal requirement to stay at the scene is an excellent idea.
- Too many entitled people think they're above reprimand. It's also imperative to get the dog owners side of the story.
- Dog bites are VERY circumstantial, and not always the fault of the dog (ie, dog had been taunted, and the person did not listen to the warning signs and sounds)
- This is what a responsible person should do
- It is your dog, that is in your care. It should be no different than an individual who hits another car and is at fault. You must be there because in the event that the bite/attack was severe it should be on the owner to compensate the victim for their dog's actions.
- Easier to obtain information from all parties at the scene of incident. Plus witnesses can be interviewed.
- This is to ensure that the owner is held liable for the injury to the other animal.
- Some dog owners leave right away, leaving the victim without any recourse, especially if their pet or themselves have been injured. Owners should be held responsible for their pet's behaviour. There should be severe consequences for leaving the scene.
- Charge owners and not the breed. Bully breeds are not the issue, owners are. Do not discriminate against bully breeds
- This should be self-evident. If a dog owner does not remain at the scene of an incident (ANY incident) then it is clear that they are an irresponsible owner. Taking responsibility for your dog, and it's behaviour, and accepting any and all consequences for such, is a fundamental requirement of responsible dog ownership (be it a pit bull or a chihuahua.)
- Actually all parties involved should remain, just like in accidents or as a witness to a crime. Very often people get bit because they are not conducting themselves well around the dog. Before the dog is punished for possibly defending itself, if legal recourse is desired by the person who was bit, they should have to go through the same process as the owner.
- Yes, if a dog has been in a biting situation. Both owners of the dog in the incident should both be there
- Yes they should have to stay
- If the dog owner does not remain they are not a responsible owner.



- I've heard numerous accounts of dogs being attacked by dogs that were not under control and the owner of that dog provides false information or leaves. Responsible dog owners would not leave and take responsibility for their dogs actions. However I'm not sure how this could be enforced.
- The owner should be held responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- I support the rule however many owners don't recognize or take responsibility for their dog's aggressive behaviours. It would be difficult to enforce.
- If your dog bites someone you need to be accountable
- It's the right thing to do. If your animal causes harm to another or person, you are responsible for the outcome
- Owner responsibility
- There are usually a lot of circumstances and different sides to explore when a dog bites. Context is needed to ensure that the proper legal avenues are taken. For instance if a large dog, say Rottweiler, is at a park, and is charged by a smaller and more aggressive dog. The Rottweiler bites the smaller dog in defense of itself, or as a reaction to the aggression. Who in that situation is at fault? (Hint: its not the Rottweiler)
- If there were any serious injuries to my dog (caused by another dog), I would expect the owner to pay for any vet fees so I would need their contact information.
- People can get seriously injured from animal bites.
- Owners need to take responsibility, and enforcement officers should also be looking for signs of animal abuse in these situations
- For future follow up of incidences
- It the right thing to do.
- Why does this even need an explanation? You (your pet) has caused injury to another person or animal. You are responsible. This is no different than a car accident.
- It's the owner's responsibility to avoid a situation where their dog bites
- As long as it is safe for everyone involved. Sometimes it is better if the offending dog is removed from the scene asap.
- Generally a dog bite is the fault/responsibility of the owner, NOT the dog; therefore, their contact information should be given to officers for further discussion. Too much onus is currently placed on the animal instead of the owner.
- It is the responsible thing to do, it seems like common sense to me as a dog owner myself. Transparency and follow up should follow a process that includes sharing contact information.
- If the animal has bitten or attacked another dog. If the 'victim' ignored the warning signs from the other dog then they should be charged. Small dogs have a tendency to aggravate big dogs and the owners let them and then press charges against the larger dog/owner because the system allows it.
- A responsible owner will always remain at the scene, and if the incident is not their fault, will have no problem explaining the situation.
- To many ppl are taking off and not taking responsibility
- There has to be a clear definition of bite and clear and reasonable expectations. If a dog makes a biting motion, or nips another dog, but no harm is done, does this count? If another animal or person



is pestering a dog who bites, is the dog and owner at fault? What if there is no visible injury? What if the dog is cornered, or harmed before it bites? What if the owner asks for the person who is pestering the dog, to stop? I think yes, they should have to provide information. I'm not sure staying at the scene is always do-able. You may need to get the offending dog out of the situation. Why is a pit bull, pit bull adjacent, or even a mix that looks similar to a pit bull, treated any different then other dogs. There are may mutts that have no pit bull DNA that look similar. These dogs won't get a chance at adoption with rules like this.

- It is the owners responsibility for their dogs action
- As with any other sort of infraction, an owner of any dog that has been involved in an incident needs to remain at the scene so that immediate investigation is possible.
- In order to hold dog owner's accountable, they cannot remain anonymous and should be reported to the city and local humane society/animal protection agency.
- If they are responsible pet owners they should stay to give the proper information. Ex: are the shots all up to date
- It's the owner's responsibility to properly handle their dog - if it is an unfriendly dog that has a lot of anxiety or antisocial behaviours or bites, the owner needs to ensure that their dog is under control and not put them in a situation where their dog responds with non ideal behaviours. Any incidents that occur should absolutely fall on the owner and they (the owner) need to be held accountable.
- As a long time dog owner I think I understand people who do and do not have dogs for the most part. As well as that dogs by nature are a bit unpredictable. I don't believe most dogs including pitbull's are usually trying to hurt anything, they are exerting dominance. However if a major incident occurs you have to take responsibility.
- Many run from their responsibilities
- If anyone injured needs medical attention it's up to the owner of said dog that caused harm to cover expenses.
- I agree that it is important for people to be held accountable in the event that this happens.
- It could be that the attack was provoked by the person bitten. Both sides of the story should be heard and assessed.
- I think dog bites are due to irresponsible ownership. All parties involved should remain on scene to exchange information and the owners should be given ample resources (access to training resources, be held responsible for vet costs, given resources to surrender the dog to a reputable rescue, etc)
- So the owner can be held responsible
- Owners should be responsible for training their dog and if they let a dog get our of hand ending in injury they should be responsible
- As a pet owner you are responsible for your pet's behavior
- The dog owner has responsibility for these actions which creates a larger priority in proper training,
- If it is a severe bite then I think they should have to stay until someone comes to the scene if the person bitten asks for that



- That is what a responsible dog owner should do. So that the dog in question and the owner in question can have an opportunity to defend themselves.
- Any dog biting incident should definitely include exchanging contact info to deal with any potential related costs from injury etc
- Owner is responsible for the actions of the dog so of course they should stay at the scene of the injury
- Context must be explained and managed when judging the situation.
- If a dog bites a person or animal then the owner should be held accountable; thus it should be at the victim's discretion as to how they should proceed and whether to involve an enforcement officer.
- Required to be a responsible pet owner
- For documentation and record keeping
- It is an incident and this should happen no matter the breed!!!
- It's important for them to stay there so law enforcement can be sure potentially dangerous dogs are identified to help prevent further problems.
- Owners need to be responsible for their animals, and provide vaccination and other information.
- Owners need to be held accountable.
- If your dog bites another person causing bodily harm or extreme injury then you should be held responsible, if you flee the scene there should be some sort of consequences.
- Owners of any breed dog are responsible for the dogs behaviour
- The only exception would be if they are the only one that can get that person or pet to required medical attention.
- Owners are responsible for pets just as parents are responsible for their children
- People need to take ownership of any incident their dog is in, just like their kids.
- When a dog attacks, the owner can feel they can run from the situation. I've seen it happen.
- The dog owner is responsible for their dog and they have a duty to answer and be held accountable for what their dog and/or their own negligence has caused other people.
- If they are at the site of the incident.....should be like hit and run when driving
- Owners are responsible for their pets and their behaviour, no different than auto drivers. They need to do the right thing or be charged with bite and run compared to hit and run.
- owners need to be accountable. Provide proof of vaccinations and proof of identification/ insurance to the officer
- Yes, responsible owners would do that anyway.
- When safe to remain on the scene and if bite/attack was unprovoked
- This would make a record of the dog biting the person or animal, in the case that medical attention would be required.
- I thought it was already required for a person to stay at the scene (whether or not a person actually does). Perhaps there should be an added fine for someone that does not stay at the scene. It is the responsible and honest thing to do.
- This is not even necessary for a bylaw as the criminal code covers this.



- As with any accident whether truly an accident or due to negligence the dog owner should be responsible
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets
- If it cannot be sorted out with the owners than yes
- It's like being in a car accident. If the victim requires medical attention that isn't covered by ahs, then the owner should be on the hook for the bill.
- The attacker dog needs to be held responsible and should remain on site.
- no different than leaving the scene of a car accident
- It should be common courtesy to stay at the scene.
- Pit bull owners are notorious for not registering, vaccinating, and taking responsibility for their attacks. Video after video shows them walking away after their pit bull attacks a dog or human. They are also notorious for claiming the dog doesn't belong to them. Swapping information can lead to determining the dog's owner.
- No explanation needed.
- Makes sense
- Yes I agree, but again, breeds shouldn't be taken into consideration.
- Of course the owner should stay at the scene if safe to do so. If not safe then they should phone authorities asap to report the incident.
- Pet owners responsibility on how animals react/act towards others
- No [removed] it's their fault for not properly training or controlling their pet
- Providing the bite is severe enough to warrant the presence of an enforcement officer.
- Or provide valid contact information if the dog needs to be taken home / away from the scene to calm down?
- Yes, so long as there isn't discriminatory legislation in place targeting pit bulls.
- This will hopefully enforce the owner to take responsibility i.e. if damage is done any and all medical expenses will be covered UNLESS the dog is provoked i.e. by a person antagonizing the dog by poking with sticks, throwing rocks, screaming or shouting at the dog and lastly raising their hand to the dog. **By ALL NATURAL INSTINCTS AN ANIMAL OR PERSON SHOULD ALWAYS BE ALLOWED TO DEFEND THEMSELVES**
- Dependent on severity. Who determines that? How is it defined?
- Like a car accident.
- It's common sense! Your dog has attacked and you need to suffer the consequences because obviously you can't control your dog!
- Unless it poses risk to the owner and other animals, the owner is responsible for the actions of their dog and should remain on site. If they cannot due to safety concerns, they should provide a valid contact
- "If ANY dog (any breed or appearance) bites, they should remain at the scene - ONLY if it is safe to do so. If they feel that themselves or their dog is in harm by others, they should be allowed to leave and contact bylaw to report the incident.



- In my experience the dog that bites is not the offender, they are the defender. Antagonistic dogs that owners have not trained and do not pay attention to will pester and attack other dogs. Normally a dog does not bite another dog without instigation. Even if the dog that bites harms the other dog, it is usually the biting dogs fault. This is the problem with the whole system."
 - This is the case of other serious incidents (e.g. car accident), so it is logical for it to apply here.
 - Yes. This can help work things out between both parties before it escalates. And if the owner is clearly a bad owner, an enforcement officer can help resolve this by encouraging the dog owner to take part in training.
 - I think if a persons dog has bitten the owners should stay until everything is sorted out
 - Yes because it is absolutely irresponsible for the owner to leave in the first place and they may be entitled to fines
 - Health concerns
 - This should be treated just like a vehicle accident to ensure that all parties are ok. If the parties involved exchange contact information they could, as with vehicular incidents, file the report later.
 - For no other reason than to file an incident report if injury is involved. No apprehension of the dog should be considered
 - Same as a auto collision, all parties need to remain on scene. Bite-and-run does nothing to help the victim.
 - As an animal attack is a serious issue, exchanging information is important for the safety of the victim.
 - Way to many people run when there dog bites another person, this would help ensure there dog does not bite again
 - This would reflect the same concept as requiring someone to stay at the scene of an accident until information is exchanged.
 - Owners need to be responsible for their pets.
 - Is is like remaining at the scene of a crime.
 - The animal is your responsibility and you must deal with the consequences of their actions.
 - It needs to be noted and filed to prove that pit bulls are NOT the problem. Lazy owners of disobedient dogs are the problem don't punish the dog punish the owner
 - "Humans need to be held accountable for the actions of their animals. They need bilaws enforced so the bite hopefully does not happen again.
-
- DO NOT MAKE THIS [removed] BREED SPECIFIC. ITS THE SAME AS SAYING A HUMAN WITH A DIFFERENT COLOUR OF SKIN IS MORE DANGEROUS."
 - To explain a situation and like a car accident everyone should remain to complete a report
 - Responsibilities- just like a car accident you cannot leave the scene of an accident
 - People should always stay at the scene of an accident



- It is similar to remaining at the scene of an accident. We know how much vet bills cost. The owner of the offending dog needs to take responsibility.
- It is similar to remaining at the scene of an accident. We know how much vet bills cost. The owner of the offending dog needs to take responsibility.
- All involved should remain at the scene of an incident, similar to if one was involved in a crime, or an accident. This ensures everyone's safety, especially the victims. Also, people are less likely to remember important details when they move from a scene that they have witnessed. This will help prevent people fleeing.
- More efficient as officers don't need to track down owner or person in charge of the dog.
- Like a car accident or any other offence, the responsible and involved parties should remain on the scene and complete appropriate paperwork, including police reports, incident reports and insurance claim reports.
- If the person runs off with their animal they are trying to avoid their responsibility.
- Yes, if ANY dog causes harm to another dog or human, the owner must remain on scene and be held responsible for any medical expenses and/or accept any interim orders given by an enforcement officer and prove completion of those orders.
- The owner of A dog that bites **MUST STAY ON THE SITE OF THE CRIME** (dog biting). Like a car accident- if you hit someone- it is a criminal offence if you take off.
- Yes if the dog bites a person, not necessarily if it bites another animal.
- I think it would be the responsibility of the owner to make sure they could be contacted for follow up. Same as you need to remain on the scene of an accident.
- It just like if you get into an accident you need to be there
- Otherwise it would be leaving the scene of a crime.
- Owners are 100% responsible for their pets.
- This can be helpful yes. The person of dog who is harmed should be responsible for the medical bills. But no harm to the animals.
- The dog owner should be there at the scene of the incident to also tell their side of the story.
- Whomever has custody of the dog day of incident should definitely be expected to stay at the site and release information. Just as you would in a car accident.
- Owners should be kept as or more accountable as their dogs
- Perhaps the dog felt threatened, one needs to know the whole scenario before forming an opinion
- Yes unless it is unsafe meaning the offender is unreasonable
- It's like a hit and run. The owner is responsible for the dog and therefore responsible for providing information so they can be contacted should complications arise as a result of their dog's actions.
- That is responsible pet ownership
- Just like a car accident.
- In case further contact/information is required



- The only time I don't think it would be a good idea is if the dog is still reacting, or if the dog was defending itself and the owner, or any situation where it could compromise the safety of anyone at the scene
- Take responsibility for your animal you trained it
- Owners of dogs that are responsible for causing harm or biting another individual must be held accountable for the consequences.
- It is the responsibility of the dog owner to own what actions the dog takes. If you have a dog that is behaving poorly, the owner should be held responsible for the dogs actions on a case by case bases.
- however, they are not likely to stay so this seems to be a waste of paper.
- The owner must be held responsible for the conduct of their dog.
- Exchanging contact information should be the bare minimum requirement. Allowing someone to remove the dog and themselves from the scene is probably better that forcing them to stay with potentially highly agitated animals and high emotion, but contact information should be required.
- Any dog involved in a serious biting incident has basically committed "assault" - so yeah the owners should stay and give their info to the police...just like if they'd hit someone with their car.
- Owner need to take responsibility for their dogs. And should already be staying if a case is going to be filled
- Proper ownership and responsibility of said owner. Can trace whether rabies needs to be taken into account.
- Likely will need to get that reactive dog away from any further triggering stimulus for everyone's safety so it might require the owner to leave promptly. But in this day and age with cell phones, you could likely easily exchange some key details.
- Just like any other incident ever, the owner must remain at the scene of the incident or else it would be the equivalent to a hit and run.
- It should be considered no different than a hit and run.
- Easier for both parties involved in the dog bite.
- Yes
- The problem is not the dog. It's the owners.
- People need to be held responsible if their dog injures someone.
- Important to treat the incident like a crime so that proper actions can be taken if need be
- If my dog were to attack someone or their pet and the incident was bad enough they wanted to contact authorities, I would want to stay to speak with authorities.
- Failure to remain at the scene should trigger severe consequences for the the owner and treated entirely separate from the actions of the animal. Animals do not understand our system of justice however humans do and should be held to a higher standard.
- I believe that because of the lack of training the owner of the aggressor dog should pay some cost for damages but the dog should not ever be euthanized.
- If a dog bites another person or animal it would make sense for them to stay on scene and speak with an officer to decide how to proceed.



- I think it is important that if a dog bites another dog or a human, that the owner and the person/owner involved stay and wait for law enforcement to come and make a statement. There are many reasons why a dog may choose to bite and sometimes it may not be entirely the owners fault. Therefore, I think it's important that both involved parties and witnesses stay to attest to what occurred and the circumstances surrounding the incident.
- Dog owners regardless of breed need to be responsible. That includes dealing with consequences of an ill tempered or ill trained dog.
- I am in favor of this, as it would reduce (or at least introduce penalties for) instances where the a dogs owner leaves the scene after an incident.
- Prevents false info being given by the dogs owner; accoutability
- Just part of being a responsible pet owner
- We need to know who the dog owner is and be able to track the dog to determine if it is a nuisance dog and apply the required penalties.
- The owner of the dog who attacked should have to take their dog to obedience training. It is always the owner's fault for not training their dog properly. I know very many lovely sweet pitbulls. Because if the way their owner trained them.
- If you get in a car collision, do you just [removed] off? No you sayy and talk and make sure people are okay
- Owner is responsible for all behaviours exhibited by their animal. In case of legal proceedings, information would be needed.
- To me that is a responsible dog owner.
- It's the owner not the dog. Proper training is necessary. A Pomeranian can be equally as bad as a pitbull under immature ownership.
- Yes, but that wouldn't happen, owner gets mad, we had it happen to us, not a good confrontation by the owner
- Incase the dog needs to be taken away
- A person or pet may need medical attention and the offender should exchange contact information so they can cover expenses. An officer should be able to determine if the dog has previously hurt someone
- A history of rabies vaccines needs to confirmed. However sometimes an animal exhibiting extreme violent behavior needs to be removed from an aggravated situation/environment right away to prevent further issues and there should be a way to gauge that type of situation and a way to solve it presented
- identify the legal dog owner
- If there is any damage done by a dog attack, the owner should be held responsible
- If an owner's animal inflicts harm on someone else, the owner should be held responsible.
- The owner needs to be accountable for their dog. A few owners at Southland feel they don't have to be accountable and there are many stories of aggressive dogs hurting little ones. My Bischon was bit by a Ridgeback and the owner told me to leave if I can't handle it. I said if I could get my dog away from your Ridgeback, I would, but I was too scared to.



- If a dog bite a person or animal then yes... Accpuntabilities then need to take place.
- Too many owners leave
- 100% you are responsible for your dog you need to make sure everything is ok and settled before leaving . Its irresponsible to leave the incident
- If you hit someone with your car would you leave? Enough said.
- People need to be made to be responsible for their lack of management.
- As a responsible dog owner you take responsibility for your dogs behavior. If it is a situation that requires bylaw then absolutely yes remain. Please note there are a lot of uneducated dog owners who think a dog growling is biting so there needs to be some definition on what warrants a call to bylaw not just some crazy person who doesn't understand dogs.
- Owner should remain on scene to determine if responsible pet owner, is willing to prevent future incidents, and is willing to take part in behaviour classes.
- yes. It shows accountability. additionally an enforcement officer should be a unbiased view in the conflict.
- An incident is an incident regardless if it's a car crash or a dog bite
- They should stay and take responsibility for their dogs actions and their lack of control over the dog.
- Just the same a a traffic incident, there are two sides to every story that should be heard.
- Its no different than a vehicular accident. Take ownership.
- Dog owners must be held accountable
- A good dog owner should remain on scene
- This is to ensure the owner will take the necessary steps to be properly educated on prevention and training
- Absolutely! It should be dealt with the same as a driver leaving an accident without doing so.
- Yes, but only if it caused severe injury, if it didn't just get over it.
- Not any different than a car accident. You're responsible for your dog and it's actions.
- People should be responsible for their dogs as long as the other person was following leash requirements in the city. If someone has their dog off-leash in an on-leash area and it runs up to an on-leash aggressive dog and gets bit, that should not be the fault of the owner of the aggressive dog.
- Just a good idea.
- Like a car accident
- Severe incidents need to be tracked, but two dogs playing at a park and someone nips at the other, you really gonna call the cops?
- If an owner or walker is their you can get a more accurate account of what happened instead of the bias statement of the person who was bit.
- Owners must take responsibility.
- People are equally if not more liable for actions of their dogs and animals
- I believe they should stay so they can make sure everything is okay. But I understand why they leave. No one wants there dog to be euthanized.



- If someone is hurt the owner still has to account for the incident to either disprove or approve the claim
 - "All dogs . Singling out of pit bulls
 - Is stupid .sre
 - You planning to take equal
 - Action against chihuahuas and poms .. come on.... a"
 - If another person or animal has been assaulted the owner of nuisance dog is responsible for what happens- it should be treated like a traffic incident
 - yes it has happened to me and the people tried to run away after their dog had injured mine
 - "My dog was attacked by a pit bull that the owner could not control! The owner dropped the leash and let the dog charge us and immediately grabbed ahold of my lab's neck.
 - He didn't even know what to do when he finally ran to us .
 - He was a younger kid .
 - Probably 18.. maybe 19..
 - But he was clueless.
 - So yes ! Owners of the animal should remain on the scene !!!
 - This COULD get tricky because if the animal that was attacked needs to get to an emergency hospital ASAP!
-
- I've worked in emergency animal hospital and having the owner stay at the scene would help ensure the victims vet bill
 - Be hopefully covered !"
 - Same as any issue. Depending on the situation and if it's safe to stay.
 - The dog has caused an "accident" and the owner must take responsibility.
 - it then gets the facts of both sides and a chance to pull video if needed
 - Owner should stay to notify bylaw if this is the first incident or if it's a recurring issue.
 - The pet owner should stay and make sure that the person/animal who is bitten has the support they need. This may mean the personal information of the owner so they they can help with payment for treatment if needed, as well as to give police/bylaw the information to track animals who are regularly involved in biting incidences.
 - I think the owner needs to take responsibility for the action of their dog not just take off
 - I had a bad experience twice of dogs biting my dog and the owners fleeing. This should be banned for sure. In both cases I am sure it was not the first time. Time to crack down.
 - You may need information about the dog well after the incident. I believe contact information is necessary in case a victim developed an infection or got ill after being bitten
 - Depends if the bite caused injury, if yes the owner should take responsibility. If it's a minor it should not be turned into a big deal.
 - It equates to a hit and run



- It is the responsibility of the owner for how all dogs behave
- So many people flee. I think there should be an ADDITIONAL fee for pet owners who flee from the scene, rather than stepping up and taking responsibility.
- Dogs biting individuals is often the result of poor dog ownership, not inherently the dog's fault, warnings and tickets would help support efforts to deter inexperienced and unsuitable owners from allowing poor behaviour.
- We as owners are responsible for our pets and if something happens that results in a bite, fleeing the scene is not an option
- This will encourage responsible dog ownership and will give both sides in an argument a chance to explain.
- There have been cases in the past where irresponsible owners flee the scene because they do not want to pay for the victim animal's vet bills. At which point the city should question whether that owner is a fitting pet owner.
- If the owner leaves the scene then how can the dog be tracked. Responsible pet owners should be able to own up to the situation.
- It would be important to know if the other dog had their shots etc.
- [removed]
- Comparable to a hit and run. Your dog should be in your control much like a vehicle.
- Accidents happen and owners should stay to be responsible for their actions.
- An owner is solely responsible for the behaviour of their dog. As such, just as in the event of a car accident (for which the driver is also responsible), dog owners should remain present until both parties have resolved the incident and/or until law enforcement has arrived to assist in the resolution of the incident.
- n/a
- My husband and daughter have both been attacked by dogs and the owners just took their dogs and left. They would not give their information and we had no recourse.
- Owner must take responsibility
- There aren't bad dogs there are however bad dog owners, this would hold bad owners accountable and in result force them to fix the animal's behavioural issues
- I agree as the owner of the dog should pay the vet bill. If the dog that got bit catches a disease from the bite the owner must be found
- I think this is a great idea as long as it is safe for everyone to stay. Good for both parties, especially since most attacks are not unprovoked it would be good for both sides to be heard.
- Dog ownership is a responsibility. Owners are responsible for their dog's behaviour. I think it's perfectly reasonable to require the owner to share contact info and/or speak with an officer.
- Owner should take responsibility
- It allows the owner to explain the incident and gives the issues dog a fair chance.
- Only if it is safe for the animal/owner to remain on the scene.
- For the owner to take full responsibility, they would need to provide and be provided all relevant information, so they should be available to do so.



- That is only fair that the individual stays to provide information. But all reasonings for the dog bite needs to be assessed as well. Just because a dog has bit someone or something doesn't mean they should be automatically punished. If they felt threatened or attacked by another dog then the bite is not necessarily unwarranted. The conditions and causes of the bite need to be thoroughly and fairly assessed.
- If the bitten party thinks it is necessary and requests the dog owner stay to discuss then I believe they should have to.
- Good idea
- Keep the owner accountable
- Yes it is the responsibility of the owner to make sure whatever the dog bit is okay
- You should stay there if the incident is serious enough. If Charlie bites fluffy and fluffy takes a dive then no. Common sense people.
- Owners should accept responsibility for their animal.
- Unless the dog was provoked
- Then the person can get training to work with its dog. More bites are from small dogs but not reported.
- It should be treated as an accident and anyone who leaves should view it as a 'hit and run' type incident
- Your dog is your responsibility, it's like being in a car accident. You don't just drive away. Sometimes dog bites can be fatal.
- Pit bull owners tend to leave the scene with their dogs.
- Owners know their dogs best, therefore should have the right to back their dog up. Same as it works for humans. They have a right to legal counsel, animals should have the right to their human helping them.
- Its the same as a vehicle collision. Stay at the scene, swap information and wait for authorities if necessary. But it Better be the same for any dog bite. City of Calgary is big on diversity and equality right?
- Any dog large breeds are unfairly targeted. I have family members that were permanently disfigured from a shitzu bite
- To ensure shots are up to date, a lot of people walk around without proof of I.D.
- Na
- It should be determined if the owner is fit to own a dog. The dog is not the problem, the owner is.
- This should apply to all dogs and not just pit bulls.leave pitbulls alone!!!! They are a beautiful loyal and loving breed. They shouldn't be considered a threat just because they are strong!
- For liability, medical reasons and to file a complaint. There should be a record.
- Mostly if a dog bites a human. I think it's fair that both parties involved are allowed to voice their side of the story at the time of the incident. I don't believe in a long wait as it could potentially be traumatizing for the individuals involved
- Untrained animals should have the opportunity to be corrected, and the only way that will happen is if the owner sees consequences.



- The owner is responsible for whatever actions their dog have taken.
- If dog owners flee and someone has been hurt by the bite then there is no accountability - it should be an aggravating factor if someone is proven to have fled the scene after their dog but someone/another dog
- It's like a car accident. It's pretty self explain
- It is the owners responsibility to give their contact information if further medical treatment is needed.
- Dog bites, even accidental, can cost a significant amount. Owners of dogs have been known to flee the scene to avoid payment
- What's to explain if a dog bites someone and an injury is incurred contact info should be shared.
- I believe the person should be able to tell their side and if their dog was the aggressor and provoker, be held accountable for fines, vet fees etc. I don't think it's right if a dog attacks another, is injured by that dog and is then able to turn around and claim the dog that defended itself is now dangerous, a nuisance or needs euthanization. (I.e. a Yorkie attacks a lab and lab bites back and hurts Yorkie).
- It is the responsibility of the owner if the dog does anything, because the owner trains and teaches the dog what it can or cannot do, if the dog bites another organism, it is not entirely dogs fault, it is either the owners or the dog responded to a stimulus, dogs do not bite anther beings for game or to hurt for no reason.
- The owner is responsible
- as a first time dog owner, i would not know what to do or where to go. If both parties involved stay, the incident can be viewed from both perspectives and it hold people accountable to each other and everyone else. like a car accident.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their own dogs.
- My dog was attacked and bit at the Sue Higgins dog park years ago by a German Shepard. If my dog had needed stitches I would have liked to have the woman's name so that she could pay for the vet bill. There were many witnesses to the incident and that dog should have had a muzzle on.
- In the case where a set of dogs cause harm to one another both owners should have to speak to an officer and leave information. Harm being the key word. No harm than no issue.
- Not staying in the dog owner equivalent of a hit and run vehicular offence. Owners must take responsibility for their dog's behaviour.
- The reason being is similar to a car accident. If an accident occurs information is swapped and police are called. By running away, it makes the person with or without the dog look all the more guilty.
- Unless dangerous to either animal or human. There are ways to pass on information without staying in a dangerous environment.
- The owner needs to be accountable for their animal's behaviour
- It's important to be a responsible dog owner and take ownership of any events that transpire with them.
- To reduce potential conflicts between owners there should be included in this recommendation a level of injury to the affected animal. This would be to avoid owners taking offence if dogs are play fully engaged and one dominates the other



- Aggressive dog behaviour is almost always linked to owner behaviour. Owners should be held accountable, or at the very least be available to provide information, following a biting incident
- Strict liability should apply here. A reasonable and sound owner should take responsibility of and be held liable for their damage to others. If we can hold a person liable for their car, accidentally rolling and hitting another person, we should hold liable the owners of a dog, that they consciously chose, biting someone. A sound and reasonable person would not choose a dog that is statistically likelier to bite and not train/guard it more heavily. This should be considered negligence. If you can bear to make the choice, you should bear to take the consequences of said choice
- It should be again the law for the owner to leave the scene of an animal bite incident. This would be similar to leaving the scene of a vehicle accident.
- Owner should stay until everything is sorted
- That is a given for responsible dog owners.
- I don't think it's necessary to add any explanation. One should remain at the scene always.
- This places more accountability on the people involved.
- How else are you supposed to deal with the situation if they leave
- It's too easy to just walk away
- While this isn't solely a pit bull problem, Schilder et al. (2019) @ Utrecht University found pit bulls were a whopping 56% of the dogs seized for killing other people's dogs. Fleeing the scene is so common, other pet owners have a name for it: "pit and run" (also "dine and dash"). It's a big problem and making it illegal is a great first step.
- As a responsible pet owner I feel that you would have to stay at the scene and deal with the situation. However if it is unsafe to do so e.g. the other pet owner getting upset and abusive then i would not stay but hand over my contact info.
- Just like a car accident, people should have to stay to report including witnesses
- They should exchange information such as photo id and contact info and if the situation warrants it, remain on site until officials arrive
- If it was required to share contact information I think problem owners could be identified quicker would in time decrease the number of problems
- It makes sense to keep the owners at the scene we're their dog caused damage, much like when a driver has to stay if they hit someone
- My logic for this one is the same that's applied in hit-and-run car accidents - all I want is for people to accept responsibility for accidents (because dog attacks are often just that) and learn the impact of their action/inaction on others. If I had a dog that bit someone or their pet, I think I would want to do my part to make sure it never happened again and that the affected parties were okay.
- Owners are ultimately responsible for their dogs behaviour.
- The dog owner should be responsible for the dog and the damages the dog caused and half to pay for the vet bill or meds for the person. Just like they would have to pay if their child caused damaged or they did in a car accident paying for the vet bill or meds for a person could end up being more than any fine.



- If there is a similar rule for car accidents, it would make sense that the owner should not be allowed to just walk away with no accountability.
- This should be happening in severe dog bites anyways. Definitely depends on the severity. If the victim requires immediate medical attention this rule should be enacted
- So they incident can be explained in detail, as it's not always the owner or the dogs fault.
- It's the responsible thing to do as a dog owner.
- It is a way to determine if the dog owner has been involved in similar incidents before
- its like a hit and run you should definitely have to stay. However if the person who was bitten leaves you should not be required to stay.
- Bites can be very expensive for owners. Owner of the dog which bit should be responsible for vet bills. Requiring information exchanged will help facilitate this.
- Absolutely, especially if an injury occurs because of the bite. I do believe then that the animal should be mandated to be wearing a muzzle in an off leash setting.
- Yes the owner needs to take responsibility if their dog bits someone
- All parties should remain at the scene as all are involved. (Just as you shouldn't leave the scene of a car accident, you shouldn't leave the dog scene)
- A responsible pet owner should be doing this anyways. I think exchanging information is necessary, enforcement officer likely not required in all cases.
- Normally if a dog bites a person or another animal the behaviour is due to previous or current abuse/lack of training. Incident specific action is required not bylaws biased towards pitbulls/large breeds.
- There's always two sides to every story. People aren't always innocent.
- I want penalties for leaving the scene of the incident.
- Same rationale as a car accident. Owners are liable for the actions of their pet, and should be held accountable for providing information to officers when applicable.
- Just like a motor vehicle accident, you shouldn't be able to run away.
- Just like an accident, all persons should remain until an enforcement officer can collect all relevant parties information
- Yes, be a responsible owner for your pets actions & provide your contact info. in case need to address incident.
- The owner of the dog that bites should be held responsible to provide Information.
- All owners should be held entirely responsible and liable for their pets. Penalty should be accurately delivered.
- I believe it is responsible for owners to be accountable for their dogs behavior and actions by remaining at the incident and providing contact information, particularly if harm is caused to another person or animal.
- but rules only work for those who follow rules, and if they are enforced. This is common sense - how do you legislate common sense???
- I feel this is fair. Not doing so would be Similar to leaving the scene of an accident if something occurred.



- If someone's dog bites a person or animal, the people involved in the situation should remain present on the scene to share contact information and share details of the event with enforcement officers. This process will help with insurance claims/medical claims/etc. that might result from the dog bite. The event of a dog bite should be treated much like any other incident that results in damage to someone else's property/person/pet/etc.
- when a dog bites another dog the owner of the dog who bit should be held responsible for any vet costs for injuries, just like with car insurance.
- This better be applied to EVERY breed NOT just the above named!!
- It's like a car accident, if you cause enough damage you need to wait for enforcement.
- It is the owner of the dog that needs the training. The owner is obviously neglectful in their knowledge and training of dogs and needs to talk with the enforcement officer especially if they own a pit bull or a nuisance dog.
- The owner is always responsible for their pets no matter what the situation. In this case it is important for the owner to take ownership for their pets actions and remain on scene to ensure the person or animal is okay and is able to get the help they may require.
- Like any other accident
- Enforcement officers may be able to offer helpful advice to owners who care enough to try to change their dog's behavior
- It doesn't do any good if there is a dog bite and the owner leaves the scene. This makes it more difficult to track down said owner. However, it is also a nuisance if there is a problem dog and it remains at the scene , causing more trouble.
- Its like a car accident, why flee and leave someone injured. That's inhumane and irresponsible. Yes the dog did it, but what provoked the dog? How was the dog raised? Dogs aren't born vicious.
- if you / your dog are at fault you need to be responsible enough to deal with the altercations that come with not training your dog properly. if the was was trained properly it would not bite any human or other dog aggressively
- Yes, assuming they do not need to go to the hospital or veterinarian.
- Similar to a car accident - dog owners just generally leave as quickly as possible. Having been bit before and the owner and dog left saying it was my fault (...) it would be helpful - but likely impossible to enforce.
- The owner should be held accountable but not every dog needs to be put down. Individual circumstances need to be considered in every case.
- Too often I've heard cases where people left the scene after their dog another dog or person. That is not ok. Pepple need to be responsible for their animals, especially when they behave violently
- There needs to be accountability for the dogs actions and repercussions for the owner
- If the owner leaves they are not displaying responsible ownership.
- Contact information should be shared if requested by the victim of a dog bite, or the owner of a dog that was bitten in case any follow up is required for any reason. Refusal should then require the presence of an enforcement officer.



- If a dog bites another dog/person then it is common courtesy to stay. Give info. And if a vet bill is needed for the injured dog the person should at-least have to pay half.
- Contact should be shared unless the dog was touch without the permission of the owner
- If a dog bites another person or animal, I believe it shows integrity and responsibility if the owner provides their information.
- It should be documented appropriately by the authorities.
- May be other circumstances that caused the reaction
- You need to get the owner's information in case there are veterinary bills so that owner can pay for the damages that their dog caused.
- Just like a car accident
- It's just the responsible thing to do.
- It's the owners responsibility to stay
- This rule would help hold people accountable for their animals
- It is your responsibility as a pet owner. Same as driving a car, you have an accident you don't leave the scene. As a pet owner, you stay with the victim until help arrives.
- It just seems to make sense that they would need to remain around
- It only makes sense that the owner take responsibility for their pet.
- Although in principle I do support it, this would be hard for the owner as if your dog bit someone or another dog you would want to get the dog away from others to avoid any further issues.
- A person is responsible for their dog and if that dogs bites/attacks another dog or person, injuring them, that owner should provide information in case medical care is required for the victim.
- What if the bite gets infected. What if this dog is constantly biting. It's a good way to track it
- Strictly for medical reasons.
- because an animal or person is injured and in order for due process to happen, information needs to be exchanged
- I agree only if it was serious.
- EVERY dog bite should have to be reported. If we are going to hyper focus on one specific type of dog, than it needs to be law that ALL bites are reported.
- Same as a car accident.
- To protect both parties.
- We need to hear both sides of the story
- working in a vet clinic, I see many dog attacks and most owners flee the scene without having any repercussions. the owner should stay and discuss with the officer what happened, and either pay for the vet bills or be fined (this should include all breeds)
- How is this any different from fleeing an accident or fleeing the scene of a crime? If a dog bites a person, a crime (assault) has occurred. The owner or guardian should have to be there.
- makes sense for insurance purposes



- In any accident whether it be automobile, pedestrian or animals. The person/vehicle responsible stays at the scene and does not flee, as they were responsible for the situation or at least handling the outcome.
- I will say yes with the caveat that there should be a clear definition of what is a dog bite; dogs often nip at each while playing, so if it is an issue where the owner's dog has caused significant harm to another dog (requiring medical assistance and/or drawing blood), then yes, they should be required to stay. But I could also see this being abused as I've seen some owners get quite emotional (to the point of physical confrontations) over what appeared to be fairly minor incidents in off leash parks where neither dog appears to be harmed, so I can also see this clogging up the system/being abused by some people who are overly protective of their animals. I agree in severe/serious cases, but the wording above seems too broad.
- Responsible pet owners should be willing to speak on behalf of their pet. Both sides need to be recorded while fresh in memory, regardless of breed.
- The dog is never the problem, it is the dog owner.
- As an owner, we have to be accountable for the actions of our pets.
- Owners should take accountability for their dog's behavior. This also gives the owner the opportunity to tell their side of the story, as we all know there are two sides to every story. Especially if it's a dispute.
- Owners need to be responsible for their animals, and both sides of the event should be recorded
- I support the idea of the dog owners remaining at the scene. The only exception to this, is if their dog is in need of medical attention or if they need to remove their dog from the situation to avoid prolonged exposure to an over stimulating environment. They should however exchange details if they are to leave the scene.
- I see it as similar to a vehicle accident. Owners should be required to take responsibility for their pets.
- No different than a traffic accident, especially if there's an injury.
- owners should be accountable for their dogs actions
- Yes the owner should be held accountable for their dog, the dog should not be punished
- Liability. The story would not be one sided.. witnesses to the attack would be great as well
- The owner should be responsible for their pet.
- This is fair as long as the enforcement officer is humane and understanding
- It's responsible pet ownership to follow up on things pets do.
- If a dog bites another dog there could be a very costly vet bill which could turn into a legal problem and therefore an officer should be present in such a tense situation. This is all depending on the severity of the incident.
- Owners should be responsible for their animals the same as their vehicles. The law considers animals property
- The owner should take responsibility but the whole story should be heard. Ex if owner says no to petting animal and person goes ahead then the person is at fault



- Dog bites can be dangerous; dog owners should show cooperation & care for the victim as much as possible
- N/A
- The owner is responsible for their dog. They should have to wait at the scene of the dog bites. Just like you wait at the scene in a car accident.
- This helps with potential rabies cases and help to understand the health of the dog
- If the victim of a dog bite felt they needed to report it than the owner of the dog should have to wait. If it was a minor incident and the 'victims does not have concerns this shouldn't need to be a bigger problem than it is. Also BSL DOES NOT WORK, read statistics
- If the person leaves, there is a likelihood they will not be held accountable.
- THE OWNER IS RESPONSIBLE. NOT THE DOG.
- Same as a car accident.
- It should be the same as an assault charge.
- Absolutely. All parties involved should be present. It should be the owners responsibility to remain at the scene.
- As long as emergency action required then info should be left
- Any dog bite has the potential to be bad. People need to be held responsible for their dogs
- I've talked with many people at dog parks who have had their dogs attacked and the owner of the attacking dog just vanishes, leaving the owner of the victimized dog with a huge vet bill + traumatized dog and no recourse. It's like a hit and run.
- As long as punishment isn't given to the owner (such as confiscating the animal) then this can be a reasonable rule.
- If not owner should show others his license so he can be contacted
- I believe the owner should be given a chance to explain the behaviour of the dog. Many pitbulls belong to people who are aggressive themselves.
- People are responsible for these things. They should stay to find a solution. But i soynot agree that dogs should be punished for it. They dont even understand what is happening.
- Without this type of law, there is very little preventing the dog owner from walking away from the scene - in this case, there would be no repercussions for incidents involving dogs
- That's kind of a no brainer.
- As with MVAs, the owner is responsible for the actions of their animal and as such need to held accountable.
- My dog was attacked by three German shepherds a little over a year ago. The owner of the dogs left without a word to us. My partner knew he lived in the neighborhood and found him, but bylaw couldn't do anything about it. That is completely irresponsible dog ownership and he 100% should have had consequences for fleeing.
- Treat it as a hit and run
- The owner must take responsibility for their dogs actions. They are the ones that took them out in public



- Dogs can transmit diseases and pathogens so if the dog owner remains at the scene to share contact info, everyone involved in the incident can be clear on what vaccines the dog is up to date on and what possible diseases/infections may be transmitted in either direction (from dog doing the biting to the bit person or animal and from the bit person or animal to the dog doing the biting)
- It would be no different from accidentally rear ending someone on an icy road. No one asked for it to happen, but you can't flee the scene before the police get there.
- Just makes sense
- However, if the dog is still at the scene and a risk to other people or animals, the owner should be able to take the necessary actions to secure the dog away from the scene.
- I support the owner having to take ownership
- Ownership responsibility is paramount in dealing with pet incidents and this is a good way to deal with the issue of lack of responsibility.
- All dogs can be trained as a attack dogs. Every owner should have the same standards
- Same responsibilities as car crash or other incident.
- With the exception of if the animals require medical attention -that needs to be handled first
- I agree with having this rule, but I fail to see how it could possibly be enforced. I have seen far too many instances of owners taking off when their dog attacks or simply being so far from the offending dog that it is difficult to ascertain who the owner is. If a dog is attacked, especially severely, it is often all the owner can do to tend to their injured animal and exceedingly difficult to chase down the offender and force them to remain on scene.
- Dog and owner should be traceable and accountable
- I think its important to take accountability for our actions and if a person or animal has been injured they need to stick around or offer to pay for the animals vet bill.
- If a dog has bitten, the owner of the dog needs to be held responsible for it. Owning an animal is a privilege and a responsibility.
- If a dog attacks a person, the owner should not be allowed to collect their dog and leave the scene of an incident without speaking to an Animal control officer (not necessarily a police officer)
- I am a veterinarian. Often times if a dog and or it's owner have injuries obtaining information regarding vaccine status of the attacker is important
- Sometimes its the other person or dog who prevokes.
- Share contact information no matter how serious but if minor do not need to stay at the scene.
- Too much bias
- It would fall under being a responsible owner and individual.
- well its just like a car if u run over someone with ur car then u take off its called a hit and run... a dog bite followed by leaving is just like a hit and run
- Just as you cannot not leave the scene of an accident due to possible injury or damage you should not be permitted to leave the scene of an animal attacking someone without the police assessing the situation IF it can not be handled without a 3rd party mediator.
- People need to take ownership for their lack of control over their animals. Leaving the scene is a way to shirk ownership/responsibility.



- Would improve accountability
- Dog owners just run away and do not take responsibility for their dogs actions. They say that the other dog instigated the attack
- Yes absolutely I support this rule. That way the issue can be resolved quicker, less likely that the owner will leave before anything is resolved.
- Owners should be punished for the neglect to teach there dog proper public behavior.
- It should be considered the same as a car accident, no one intended for it to happen but it still did. There are massive costs and potential heart aches associated with a dog attack to themselves, their kids or their animal be it from vet bills, hospital trips, time away from work etc. The owner of the attacking dog is ultimately responsible for the lack of training they provided their animal that resulted in the event.
- It's important to understand why the dog felt like it needed to defend itself. Hearing both sides of the story is important to take proper steps forward. If a person knowingly or unknowingly provoked the dog, they need to be educated so that the incident doesn't happen again.
- Responsible dog owners would stay and give information anyways, but people who decide to not train their dogs, or seek help or just run away should be punished.
- Dogs can be unpredictable it does not matter what breed they are but owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions
- When a dog bites another animal or person, the owner must stay on the scene and be held responsible.
- There should be more done when a pet is attacked by another's on public or private property. There should be more follow up on the incident as well. Loosing a dog to an attack by another is terrifying, I know someone who lost their small breed dog to an attack of a large breed dog, it happened on the property of the large breed dog owner but there was little follow up. This incident did happen outside of Calgary, but the possibility of the incident happening within city limits can still happen. There was no penalty to the large dog owners at all. I feel like private property should also be included.
- A responsible dog owner should not flee the scene
- Of course I do. Do you leave the scene of an accident? Not unless you don't have insurance or registration or your a criminal. So why shouldn't you stay at the scene of the accident were the attack occurred?
- I have witnessed owners of dogs that have attacked other dogs simply ignore that there was an attack: they made no effort to correct the behaviour, leave, put a muzzle on, or put the dog back on-leash so it wouldn't happen again. They should be held responsible for their dog's actions if they will not make an effort to change the behaviour or avoid potentially dangerous situations, and there should be a record of that behaviour to avoid these situations in the future. To be clear, this should only apply to actual bites, not just aggressive behaviour. There are many responsible dog owners working on curbing that behaviour and do their best to avoid dangerous situations.
- It's the dog owners responsibility.
- It is a situation that is very similar to a car accident. If your pet allegedly bites a person or another animal and you leave the scene before information is exchange how is different from a hit and run?



- Just like any incident you stay and deal with it. You would do the same with a car accident so why not an animal. I do not believe the dog should be euthanized though or sent away to a shelter because it could make the dog act out because it's not at its home or with the people it trusts. It will be scared and defend its self from people it doesn't know just like we do with strangers.
- Unless the dog cannot be safely restrained at the scene or is in need of veterinary assistance.
- no different than exchanging info at a car accident. those involved should wait
- People should be held responsible when their dog bites.
- If the dog bites (enough to hurt the other animal) then information should be exchanged. The biting dog should go to dog classes, not be euthanized or have to be always on a leash / muzzled.
- As in the situation of a car accident, I feel that animal bites should be taking with the same degree of seriousness
- As long as their ability to control their animal will not invite more harm being on the scene
- Their dog, their responsibility to stay and take accountability for their dogs actions.
- If theres damage and the person wants to involve bylaw.
- To make sure the dog has not been involved in other instances of aggression. There should be a record on all aggressive animals.
- For cost purposes, a vet bill can be expensive especially for a dog bite.
- It's part of being a responsible owner. It's the pet owners responsibility to control their dog. It's against the law to leave the scene of an accident, I believe a dog attack should have the same laws
- All sides have to be heard.
- Similar to a vehicle crash such as in a parking lot
- If there are any medical issues that come to the victim it would be important to be able to contact the owner of the offending dog for health history
- In any other instance, you are required to stay at the scene of an accident or injury so this should not be any different
- "yes however immediate care for those injured, including animals, should be first priority.
- Please stop targeting pit bulls. In the past also german shepherds, rottweilers and dobermans have been targeted as dogs with ""potential"" for greater harm. There is a course through Coursera called Dognition that your research staff should look into. Temperament of dogs and their owners (breeding programs) are the potential for fatalities and injuries not breeds."
- Absolutely. The owner of a dog assumes responsibility of the dog's actions and has a duty to sort the situation out properly.
- Violent dogs need to be identified and so the owner needs to take responsibility
- Just like an accident. Things happen. Animals get prevoked. If a bite occurs the owner should be taking responsibility. Information should be traded. Depending on the severity of the bite depends on everything else. Each situation is unique in its own way. Animals are like humans. Mistakes can be made. And yes some animals are just "bad" but in the end it comes down to the owner, not the animal.
- Just as one would stay at the scene of an incident involving humans(fight, crash ect) they should stay for dogs



- Because their dog could have not been the aggressor you need to know the whole story not an assumption
- the owner of the dog would want the same if it happened to them - if their dog or family member was the victim of a bite.
- The dog is the responsibility of the owner, therefore, the owner must stay to talk to enforcement officer.
- Having been involved with incidents where often a large obstacle to getting a resolution is owners fleeing to avoid reprimand it would an additional incentive/ requirement for them to stay or face additional discipline
- depending on the severity of the bite, type of circumstance then yes
- That should be a basic requirement of being a responsible pet owner.
- If your dog bites a person weather it be a pitbull or not, you need to stay until everything is resolved.
- I'm shocked that this isn't already a rule. Far too many people take their dog and run, how is this any different than a hit and run in a vehicle?
- Yes I support this because often owners shrug it off like it's no big deal, whether another dog has been bitten or a person has. However, in the emotional state that occurs when there is a conflict like this is may not be a good idea for both parties to stay in close proximity and sometimes it is best for the dogs to get separated as soon as possible. It would be more effective I think to simply step up patrols in the parks and fine those with their dogs off leash because there is already very little visible enforcement.
- Ensures pet owners take responsibility for the incident,
- I've seen many posts from owners of injured dogs searching for the owner of the biting dog online, feeling helpless. The owner should definitely stay put.
- Just like any accident they should stay to give information and also get the chance to state their side or explain why this may have happened because it may not always be the dogs fault and it would look better for the case of they were there to explain and give all information
- Being a pet owner requires responsibility. If you can't take responsibility for your pet, you shouldn't have one.
- The dog deemed the aggressor not to be decided based on size or breed, instead based on facts of the actual events
- I think that's self explanatory. How can someone be held accountable if they leave the scene of the incident without providing contact information
- The owner knows the dog and was likely witness to tge situation, plus, the dog will likely be calmer if tge owner is with them. If not, we might want to look at the owner for the cause of the problematic behavior
- "If an individual's dog is involved in a confrontation (ie bite incident) in ANY capacity, the individual should be held accountable to remain at the scene, even if their dog did not directly cause harm. Their witness testimony can be crucial for court proceedings and bylaw investigations.



- ALSO:
- I'm not sure where else to put this, but bringing animals on-leash into a designated off-leash park/area should not be permitted. I have seen many ugly encounters because the animal on-leash feels nervous and defensive (as does their owner) intermingling with the peacefully roaming animals. Signage should indicate that if your dog cannot be safely and comfortably off-leash, the off-leash area is not for them, to prevent confrontations, or have a mirrored fine for having an animal on-leash in a designated off-leash area (much like if the scenario were reversed). Thank you."
- Yes and no, people like to cause problems for no reason. And if your dog is aggressive, don't take it out. And honestly, walking my dog, I've experienced people petting my boy without asking, making rude comments, stuff like that.
- If someone's negligence of training and obedience injures my dog; or child or myself then it should be that owner's responsibility to pay for any medical bills or help needed.
- "My sister was attacked walking down the sidewalk .Dog ripped her brand new winter coat to shreds.That dog owner should have been responsible for that wrecked coat. Just said sorry and left.That's not responsible pet ownership,she should have been remunerated for the
- Cost of her new coat.Right!!??!Yes!!!"
- This will keep the dog owner accountable. There are lots of issues of dog attacking other dogs (regardless of breed) where owners leave the scene. Owners of the aggressor dog should have to contribute financially and their dog should be assessed to determine what it needs (muzzled... etc).
- In order to clarify what happened, similar to a car accident.
- The owner is responsible for their pet and should be responsible for what they do
- The owner should have to remain present to minimize resource wasting in an attempt to track them down. Fines if they leave.
- May require to compensate for vet bills
- Imperative to know vaccination status of dog
- Why does this need explaining? People know not leave the scene of a car accident? A responsible pet owner would know to stay at the scene of an incident.
- it's the same as a car accident or any other accident for that matter. Dog bites are an accident or in self defense a majority of the time.
- Any accident traffic or otherwise where there is an injury should require all parties either remain on scene or exchange information.
- Or they are required to give dog license info and contact info
- I think a dog owner should remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information but I do not support an enforcement officer or anyone to have the ability to seize the dog in any instance including this one.
- Again, it is the owner's responsibility to keep their dog and the people around the dog safe. The person is who should be held accountable.
- In any incident, both parties should be present and take responsibility on BOTH sides.
- Owners should be held responsible if they are a poor dog owner 100%. It is not the dog's fault
- Problems should be dealt with quickly



- Only if a dog bites a person. Dogs bite dogs often in defence and cannot be blamed.
- Allows for the ability to have proper contact information to follow up and track reoccurring incidents.
- Because Cause it is the right thing to do
- easier said than done tho as has been shown in the past. A RESPONSIBLE dog owner would stay but not everyone is responsible.
- This is common sense for any dog. Should not be breed specific. Total stupidity if that actually goes through.
- Not sure if enforcement office is police or city. What if both parties agree to not involve enforcement officer's?
- the owner is responsible. these acts of the dog should be documented along with the owners info
- I support remaining on scene to share contact information and discussion if needed
- Only if the dog in question can be secured in a safe place
- False information is given out often by the instigator
- Dogs aren't naturally vicious. They are trained
- Only if it bites a person, dogs sometimes bite other dogs playfully
- An owner should legally be required to provide information and speak to an officer for both the benefit of the victim and themselves. The victim should be able to hold them liable, however for the dog owner it also provides them the ability to defend their side as well. For example if the victim was harassing their dog.
- I think it's common decency
- Dog owner must take responsibility
- It is the owner's responsibility to own up to it. The enforcement officer is there to assess whether the OWNER is a responsible dog owner or not, and seems to genuinely want to rehabilitate their animal. An assessment such as this is much more accurately done in person than over the phone or through emails.
- If you leave a car accident, you're an [removed]. Same applies with animals and humans
- An owner is responsible for their dog. Depending how bad the bite is, the owner should have to be held accountable for their dog.
- A dog attack should be reported and handled appropriately.
- Dog owners should be held responsible for the actions of their dogs.
- Should be standard with any incident. To be able to track behaviours of potentially dangerous animal.
- to confirm all details and just cause
- Easier for authorities to gather all information, when it happens including any witness statements
- Like a car crash there are liabilities to the owner of the biting dog
- .
- Responsible dog owners ought to take responsibility for the dogs in their care.
- Where both pet owners agree that remaining at the scene is not required, they should be able to leave.



- Because owners of offending dogs are often able to avoid accountability by running away before they can be identified.
- Obviously, why isn't this already in place? It's the same as a car crash, the owners need to be present to take responsibility.
- The owner is 100% responsible for the actions of their pets. Just like a car crash, you must remain on scene, a dog bite is the same.
- accurate followup
- Owners should have to stay at the scene of the incident and be held accountable for their dog's bad behaviour.
- The blame should not be put on the dog. It is either the owners doing or the "victims" doing for the dog to bite.
- I think the owner has full responsibility of their dogs actions and need to train them accordingly
- To ensure the correct information is given to the enforcement officer.
- I think that rule should be in place because it would hold the OWNER, not the ANIMAL, accountable. This is an OWNER problem NOT an ANIMAL problem.
- It is an accident. As with motor vehicle accidents or other offences, you must remain at the scene to provide contact info.
- Responsible ownership is a must. Otherwise they need to give up their pets to be raised by someone more capable.
- Humans are responsible for their dog(s). Right of ownership comes with responsibility.
- The same as if you get in car accident. I've seen cases where little dogs were off the lease and out of control around larger dog with lease on.
- Once the dog and owner run away, who knows whether you will find them. These dogs are capable of killing a child & strict bylaws should be put into place
- Both sides of the story should be heard. But if it is unsafe to keep the animal on scene I would support them to leave and return it leave contact info.
- Owners should take responsibility for their pets
- Often when dogs bite, it's because they were provoked and are defending themselves/their owner. Or the owner has trained them to do so. Keeping the owner at the scene allows for clarity into the issue
- It's only common courtesy
- If irresponsible pet owners aren't held accountable for their pets and are allowed to leave the scene after an incident, it allows for irresponsible pet owners to continue to get away with being irresponsible rather than encouraging responsible behaviour
- I had no idea this wasn't already a rule. This feels like common sense.
- The owner should remain present, both sides of the incident should be presented to limit the bias.
- Treat it the same as a hit and run. If damage/injury occurs, the person must stay to face the consequences.
- People should be held responsible for the actions of their pets.
- It is important but sometimes the person who bit was enticing the animal to bite them



- The dog is the owners responsibility therefore. The owner should remain on scene. The bite/agression might be the dogs fault or the other humans fault.
 - No different than fleeing the scene of a motor vehicle accident
 - "Anytime someone is injured, those involved should provide their contact information.
-
- Also - the issue below is not mentioned anywhere so I'm putting comments here Dog owners that allow their pet to pee on other's lawns and gardens should be fined. Dog pee kills the grass/plants and requires time and money to fix - this should be a bylaw."
 - Once again, it is the owner who needs to be held accountable and not the dog.
 - sometimes it is difficult to know how a dog situation happened, or assess blame, which might be a problem. If the owners prefer to leave and not pursue that should be allowed if both dog owners agree. Human bites are a different story.
 - A victim may need to know who to contact regarding veterinary, medical or other bills incurred due to an incident as well as information required regarding the dog's behavioural or medical history in order to properly care for or treat a human or animal victim. In addition, enforcement officers may require both pet and owner information in order to investigate any history of past incidents or to issue any warnings, fines or other potential enforcement requirements, such as behaviour training or additional fees or insurance.
 - If people don't get the info needed from the owner, then the owner and dog might be able to disappear without consequences
 - So they may inform the officer of what occurred without the bias of the "victim".
 - "It's like being involved in a car accident- damage was done, responsibility needs to be taken.
 - **Note: there may be instances where it is safer to remove the dog before a prolonged discussion occurs. In this instance, only information should be shared immediately, the dog removed from the situation (taken home by owner) then the owner's responsibility to follow up in 24h."
 - If its a serious bite then yes but some dogs will fight and nothing comes of it
 - It's no different from a MVC. Details should be swapped.
 - To tell said persons side of the story so it's not just one sided
 - If the owner does not stay, it's akin to a hit and run. And the owner should be held accountable - too many owners don't take their pet's behavior seriously. I experience this frequently in off-leash parks.
 - It makes sense to remain at scene
 - I absolutely agree with this proposal.
 - as long as the animal also does not have to be seen by a vet
 - Just like with car accidents, there is liability and, in some cases, fault. Sharing contact information with both parties and law enforcement helps identify both parties, and speed up court proceedings if necessary
 - If the victim required medical attention, then contact info should be shared



- "I support this in the case of a severe incident or bite, but not in the case of a minor nip. I think there will be issues with enforcement of this type of rule based on the range of situations in which this type of incident arises.
- Also, I think that thorough recording of how the incident took place, what precipitated the incident, and statements from both parties should be mandatory, and that penalties or fines should be given accordingly."
- I was bit by a dog and she ran off with the dog a neighbor told me where the lady lived
- It's just like a car accident.
- While I support measures to deal with an aggressive dog. I am absolutely against stereotyping or branding any specific dog breed with greater restrictions. Pit bulls are not any more dangerous than any other dog and we should not label them so. It's the dog owners fault not the breed that creates aggressive or anxious dog behaviours.
- To explain why an animal bit. Some don't bite for no reason.
- I defiantly agree, no explanation needed this should be common sense.
- They should be able to provide their contact information.
- If you have a dog you need to know how to control it and take care of it. If you can't control it enough to stop it from lashing out, you as the owner need repercussions and education.
- This will allow both sides of the incident to be explained and discussed.
- A victim may not have a cell phone to record the event or to get a picture of the other owner and dog.
- A dog is an owner's responsibility. I am a dog owner. If my dog bite another dog or person I would feel it is my responsibility to give my information and I would have to pay whatever the cost.
- When two people get into an altercation and physical harm is done and police are called this should be no different.
- Owners should be held accountable for dangerous pets. People and pet owners who are victims of these animals should, at minimum, have the right to follow up and enforce bylaws.
- All info should be shared from all parties involved if an injury occurred from a pet.
- I agree
- It's an attack and the owner is a witness and essentially involved as they are responsible for their pet's behaviour (through training) and the handling of their pet (leash, muzzle, etc) that resulted in the attack.
- The same as a motor vehicle accident.
- Just like you can be charged for a hit and run. Info should be exchanged in case of vet bills etc.
- Ideally yes, though it should be understood that people in that situation would be scared.
- It is the responsibility of the dog owner to remain at the scene of an incident involving their dog
- A dog owner is responsible for the actions of their pet and should be held legally liable to provide a statement of what happened, similar to a motor vehicle incident.
- Any incident needs to be recorded and the owner held accountable.



- The owner of the offending dog should have a legal responsibility for injuries and associated medical costs. There should be a bylaw in place that states they must remain at the scene.
- A dog owner is always responsible for their dog. If they don't stay and provide the required information that is negligent.
- I think if a dog or person is bit by a dog and the bite causes serious injury that is the responsibility of the dog owner to stay and make sure that the person/dog who was bit is okay and if not they should share their information and understand that they could be liable for any expenses that come up because of the bite.
- People need to be accountable for their pets actions. People giving out false information and then leaving the scene needs to stop
- It is called being a responsible Pet Owner.
- The dog owner should be accountable to the actions of their dog, they need to provide proof of rabies vaccination, proof of their name and address etc.
- I support accountability and responsible pet ownership. Being able to walk away from a nuisance animal attack is not responsible pet ownership.
- The owner is responsible for the behaviour of the dog and should remain on-scene of an incident.
- This is in response to 3, as there was no where to put a comment about that question. What you are proposing is discrimination and will most definitely ruin your all time record of low dog bites and incidents. Currently Calgary is the poster child for dog owners and cities that maintain low dog involved incidents. The problem is that when you ban pitbulls, dogs are STILL biting... because ALL dogs bite. Banning pitbulls will increase your number of dog bites and incidents because you will shift your focus from ALL dogs to a group of dogs that look the same ... (btw this includes about 20+ breeds based on your description above, so you did a poor job of naming the types of dogs you're actually discriminating against). If you need proof on why this way of thinking is severely flawed, just look at Ontario... an article was just posted stating that since banning pitbulls, the number of dog bites per year has INCREASED. It is shameful to say the least to have to live in a city, province and country that claims to be so diverse yet is considering discriminating against a DOG. Literally the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard. I hope you are VERY cautious in your decision on this matter consider current events such as protesting and rioting due to discrimination. Calgary has a very large group of pitbull type dog owners. Good day.
- A dog that bites another dog or person needs to be recorded so that if multiple incidents occur by the same dog ... and the owner does not take steps to train the dog better, further action can be taken. Including keeping them at home for a duration, mandatory training, leash requirements etc.
- Common sense
- Just as if your vehicle has damaged another person's property.
- If a dog bites someone or something an owner should stay if requested to. Some run for fear of their dog being painted as the bad guy though while some people who get bit or their dog gets bit were the antagonists and also will play the victim card for all they are worth.
- Every crime has two sides to a story. Both are needed to proceed with blame and punishment.



- This could help to ensure all involved parties have been heard fairly, and statement of facts can be made
- Just like a car accident. You need to remain at the scene.
- the owner of the dog should be required by law to act responsibly, be accountable, and take responsibility for the dog and its actions. remaining on the scene would also allow for both sides of the incident to be heard and recorded.
- Like a car accident, contact information should be shared but in a non violent or threatening manner
- I've heard too many stories of pets being attacked and the responsible pet's owner walking off without acknowledging what their pet did.
- What defines "if necessary"? I'm supportive but as written seems to add more mechanisms for enforcement officers to exercise subjectivity and enforcement officers need to have more defined rules to avoid poor decisions
- Responsible pet ownership to me means if your dog is in an incident, you should remain at the scene until authorities can assess.
- People need to be held accountable, not the dogs - it's training not the breed. So lets make sure the owners are responsible for their actions.
- If an owner can not control their pet, (i.e. let it off leash and it attacks another dog, regardless of the breed) the owner should be responsible for its actions.
- A pet owner must take responsibility for their dog's behaviour
- If a bite is severe, it should be required that an owner stay; however, the guidelines need to be clear around bite severity and exceptions should be made (i.e. snapping or nipping) as some dogs may resort to these behaviours if they feel they are in an unsafe situation they cannot escape (i.e. being on a leash while being bothered by a dog who is not being called off by its owners)
- We have such a rule for motor vehicle accidents. It makes sense that the owner would be required to stay and give a statement. However, it should be clear that such a rule would apply only for severe bites, as opposed to nips, snapping, and otherwise harmless normal dog stuff.
- The dog owner should be required to take responsibility.
- Unless having the dog owner at the scene of the incident is only aggravating the situation then only contact information needs to be shared
- Often owners of small dogs don't think it's a big deal, so they leave.
- But I think the dog who bit should be secured and in a safe place after an event like this happens. So maybe just contact information should be shared
- Allows for increased tracking of incidents and accountability on the owners behalf.
- they should act responsibly and give as much helpful information as possible. if their dog bit someone/someone's pet they should be held responsible.
- Just like staying at the scene of a car accident. You need to stay and take responsibility.
- The same as an accident, the adult involved should be responsible for explaining the situation and providing an contact information necessary.
- either remain at the scene or provide valid dog licence (photo of the license) as well as government issued ID of the person responsible at the time of the incident.



- This will save the time and trouble to track down the owner to get more information. I don't believe that the owner should have to stay after providing contact info, as sometimes it would de-escalate the situation if the dog is removed to a calmer place.
- It is the responsibility of the owner thus they should be present.
- They need to own up for their animals actions
- In the event of a serious incident, both parties should remain present at or near the scene until an enforcement officer becomes available. Exceptions may be made if extreme weather warrants either/or party to wait in a nearby home or vehicle.
- Should be more than just for dog bites. Should also apply when a loose dog takes a person out at the knees causing severe injury, for example?
- For insurance purposes.
- Owners should be responsible for their dogs
- There is no other place to put this. People need to be responsible for their actions against dogs, even children. If a child goes and kicks a dog in the head and the dog bites to protect its self, what are the consequences to the human? That should be addressed also.
- This is no different than a car accident if an animal is injured responsibility must be addressed.
- Common courtesy
- Yes, they need to remain at the scene to give appropriate information but only if their dog is secure and is in good health, physically and behaviourally. If the dog is not behaviourally sound, it should be moved to a safe location (either owner's home, enforcement officer's vehicle, vet clinic, etc.) before contact information and discussions take place.
- I believe in the fact that there are no bad dogs, just bad trainers. I would also like the owner to be assessed if they should at all own a dog.
- Yes, they should be there and give info.
- People should be held responsible. Not the dogs.
- This seems obvious.
- **BREED SPECIFIC LANGUAGE IS COUNTERPRODUCTIVE. PLEASE DO NOT LEGISLATE BASED ON SPECIFIC BREEDS OF DOGS. IT BUILDS STIGMA AND PREVENTS PIT B**
- definitely having an enforcement officer available.
- Just like a car fender bender, it should be considered a bite and run if your dog bites another human or dog and the human flees the scene.
- We may need help with vet bills
- I would like to see neighbours act a bit more neighbourly when there is an incident. Most people have insurance and are willing to resolve the issue without immediately calling law enforcement
- To me it feels the same as a hit and run with a car. Damage has been done and humans must take responsibility.
- I honestly thought this was already required.
- Because I want to know information about shots. I do not believe any breeds should be specifically called out or targeted like you are proposing.



- How is this not already a rule?
- I don't believe that there should be a discrimination towards any breed of dog. Any dog can act out, and has nothing to do with their strength, etc. But I do agree that there should be incident review and contact information shared.
- Just like an auto accident! Remain at the scene!
- If the dog draws blood and it is in a vicious manor
- often the owner of the offending animal leaves the scene and the remaining individual is left on scene to assume all costs associated.
- Dog owners are responsible for their pets actions. They should be held accountable, including financially if applicable
- Often the dog is threatened by BAD HUMAN BEHAVIOR. Not bad dog behaviour. Any human who owns a dog should be subject to a 2 hour dog behaviour course to better understand dog behaviour, to avoid their pet feeling threatened and put in bad situations where they could get scared and potentially go on the defence.
- Soo the dog can be seized if necessary and they also pay damages and vet bills
- Further steps may need to be taken to protect the public from that dog in the future. Without remaining at the scene there would be no way to enforce this
- Or provide lisenace and contact information.
- Similar to a car accident.
- Why is this even a question? This is the responsible thing to do and should be required for ANY BREED of dog.
- As far as I am concerned if a dog is involved in a biting situation the owner is at fault and should be educated, possibly legally charges, obey restrictions (muzzles etc recommended) and should identify him/herself and the dog owner's care of the dog should be investigated.
- Just like a car accident, one must ensure everyone is alright, or if they require further assistance such as medical care.
- This should be common sense, but unfortunately most people won't stay.
- n/a
- People run off with their dogs leaving the stressed owner to stay and care for their dog rather than chase down a person with an animal that has proven itself to be a danger.
- N/A
- People should take responsibility for their dogs.
- This is required for traffic accidents over a certain dollar value even though no injuries ocured
- The own should have to account for the incident.
- Dog owners should be held accountable for their pets behavior and restitution should be made for damages done. Owners shouldn't be able to just walk away if their dog has injured another dog or person.
- "Presuming the owner is physically capable (i.e. He/she was not also attacked and injured by one or both dogs trying to break up the ""event"")



- How long does it take for a by law enforcement officer to attend? What is a reasonable amount of time to expect a person to wait? 20 Min... an hour, more?"
- "It is literally only 1% of these ""pit bull"" bred dogs that you guys are putting down. It is never ever the dog. It is always the owner. And the smaller breeds are the only breeds I have ever had an issue with. The little breeds like Chihuahuas and breeds like them. I have dealt with dobermans, ""pitbull"" breeds, rottweilers, all breeds like that and have never ever had an issue with any of them other than the little ones.
- Like I said, I believe these bylaws are not needed. Maybe a few more law implementations like owners need to be screened to make sure they are suitable to own a ""pitbull"" breed, or the owners need to have a training course. But the limit to one is ridiculous, the muzzeling is ridiculous, anything in regards to the dog is ridiculous. As previously stated, it is 99.9% of the time the owners not the breed, not the dog. All dogs can attack. All of them. It all depends on the owner."
- Information on vaccines and previous issues must be resolved
- If a dog you own or are caring for bites another dog or person you should be responsible for medical care.
- same as a car accident - stay at the scene
- It's just like getting in to a car accident
- is that not common courtesy and sense?
- Because it's the right thing to do.
- In my opinion it is NOT the dog who is at fault, but the OWNER. Owners actions dictates how a dog will react, the owner should be held accountable and should provide their contact information.
- My dog was bit my a doodle and we didn't get the information so we were stuck with the vet bill
- Like with a car accident, there are two sides to every incident. It's crucial that contact information can be acquired so that the right decision can be made.
- I believe the owner should take full responsibility for the dog bite. similar to when a person is in an accident after driving a vehicle, the owner of said vehicle must remain at the scene until information has been exchanged. I believe the same concept must apply here as the owner is at fault (not the dog).
- Increased accountability is essential
- It's like a car accident, stay on the scene
- Owners are responsible for the actions of their pets.
- No such thing as bad dogs, only irresponsible owners
- We hired someone to work in our yard and our dog bit him. I personally felt responsible and made amends. The guilt was immense and the responsibility huge. I can not imagine a society where I would have walked away in that scenario. We must all take responsibility for our pets.
- This is no different from the rules regarding minor accidents between cars and cyclists. If the victim (cyclist or person bitten by dog) demands the owner remain and wait for an officer; then they should stay.



- If an aggressive incident takes place the owner needs to be accountable
- Owners should be held accountable for the actions of their pets. It's not okay to drive away from a car accident. It should not be okay to walk away after your pet has injured someone or another animal.
- You need to pass along information to the owners like vaccination history. And if this is a reoccurring situation the dog needs to be put in training or be in a more controlled environment other than dog parks. Also if your dog bites someone else's dog I think you are responsible for the vet bills that follow. That needs to be reinforced by police.
- Why wouldn't they
- people get too defensive of their animals and aren't always willing to stay and fix or help with the situation. they should be forced to stay and help since they couldn't control their animal in the first place
- Seems like common sense and courtesy.
- The other person should stay as well. Sometimes it's not the dog's fault it but someone else.
- I think that they should be made to give contact information however if the dog is being aggressive or needs to be removed from the scenario then it may be safest to allow the owner to take them home. If the dog is stressed it may be more dangerous to leave the dog in the stressful situation
- To hold the owner accountable
- Obviously someone should be required to stay if there is bylaws in play.
- I believe it is responsible pet ownership to remain with the victim and to provide all information applicable. I think dog and cat owners should have to provide, when asked, their pet licence as well. It should be mandatory to carry a wallet sized card with you at all times in the event of an incident. Lots of people insure their animals, this is a great way to ensure the public is actually licensing their pets.
- It's like any accident. If you hit someone with a car, you are required by law to stay.
- It should be treated like a car accident
- They need to ensure they stay to figure out how things are to be dealt appropriately
- if someone wasn't controlling their dog, or if a genuine accident, there still needs to be a check in place and they should stay to make sure the other dog or person is okay.
- This will keep dog owners more accountable. Often I've seen owners play off a bite and walk away so they don't get in trouble. This is unacceptable behaviour as a pet owner, they need to take responsibility for all of their dog's actions whether it is out of character for the dog or not.
- It's no different than the scene of a crime or accident. Dog bites most times are not the fault of the dog. It can be from a dog being anxious in certain situations and as human nature tells us, fight or flight is the decision. There's always two sides to the story and animals don't usually bite (even in the wild) unless they're feeling threatened. For example, Because a human doesn't listen to a dog owner saying "don't approach my dog for this reason _____" - but a person says "it's ok, dogs love me" and a bite happens, why should the dog and owner face a penalty/euthanize because someone didn't listen to an order from the owner.
- Yes because an individual must take accountability for the pet they are responsible for.
- The dog's owner must provide information, the same as a driver has to remain at the scene of an accident



- like an accident report there should be some way for incidents to be reported, but depending on time frames it may not be that easy for someone to remain at a location for a couple of hours.
- The owner should be taking responsibility and remain. If they leave, tracking them down in the future might be difficult.
- Yes but only if it is a severe injury
- Injuries may take time to develop or appear. A person may not think that a bite is serious at the moment when adrenaline is high but it could turn out to be later. If the owners are required to exchange information (like in a motor vehicle accident situation) it provides a standard procedure that people can follow after an incident. In addition, requiring the people to wait for law enforcement can help to ease tensions because the people do not have to talk to each other they can simply both wait for the officer and tell their side of the story.
- It's about responsibility
- we honestly do need your bs
- It should be treated like any other incident and not to leave the area. Causing physical and mental harm to another person should have a minimum of responsibility on behalf of the dog owner.
- It's the responsible thing to do. It's like leaving the scene of a crime. Stay and take responsibility.
- If a severe bite (blood drawn or skin broken or animal severely hurt)
- Dog owners need to be responsible for the actions of their pets, and should an accident happen (and it's often not the offending dog's fault) the owner should be there to either defend their animal or provide whatever assistance (whether financial or otherwise is needed eg vet bill)
- Of course, they need to remain at the scene, it would be no different than a car accident.
- It would be irresponsible otherwise
- Yes, it is the owner's responsibility to
- I have seen many times the owner will take off. It may be hard to enforce but I think it would help people in keeping the owner of the dog at the scene.
- What's there to explain? Yes, the owner should not leave the scene until bylaw or some other method has been used to confirm accurate contact information.
- They are responsible for what their pet does and should be fined. Dog taken by By-lawofficers
- This is the standard in any other form of violent or destructive incident so people should be required to remain by their pet if these instances occur
- If it had bit a animal or person they should talk to a enforcement officer because they should report about the situation and if there were other reasons to why it occurred
- A responsible pet owner would stay on the scene to meet with an enforcement officer, there are 2 sides to every story. The only time this would not be acceptable if the animal or others involved is also injured in the encounter and needs medical attention immediately. Follow up would then be given. I think whether an enforcement officer or not is called in, this may help individuals resolve smaller scenarios better and have less matters in court.
- Definitely. The owner has a responsibility to stay at the scene. Leaving the scene should be a crime ... a severe fine, at least. It happens too often.
- Does this seriously need explanation? People need to take responsibility



- The owner needs to take responsibility for their animals
- It's their responsibility
- However they need to secure the animal first. This might require them to return to the scene rather than "stay" at the scene
- Exception: keeping the animal at the scene poses a bigger risk.
- They should stay at the scene of the crime like any other incident.
- I believe this would allow for a more efficient process.
- Because these owners need to be held accountable.
- It's hard to report a bite if the owner leaves the scene.
- It is the owners responsibility to be accountable for their dogs behavior.
- Obtaining more information could be crucial
- This comes with responsible pet ownership.
- Because it's like tracing if the dog has done it before the proper actions need to be taken
- Dog owners are held liable for the behaviour of their animal and should thus remain at the scene of an incident if a bite or attack occurs.
- Because it's the RIGHT THING TO DO
- Its important for the owner to explain their side and how the dog was trained as opposed to blaming an entire breed for select individuals wrong doings.
- Treat it like a hit and run. It is your property causing damage to another being.
- The owner of an animal that has caused harm, should be fully responsible for the actions of their pet.
- The person with the dog should be held accountable
- Pet owners should be held responsible for harmful behaviours by their dogs. Leaving the scene where your dog has bitten some person or animal is the same as a "hit and run" and should not be tolerated.
- Dog unable to answer to the situation.
- It's similar to car accidents. And incident happened and both, victim and perpetrator should be forced to stay so that no false information can be given about the incident
- If the other person/animal is injured it should be the responsibility of the owner (unless the owner/owners dog is also injured to the point of needing medical attention).
- Both parties should remain at the scene in any altercation. Whether its a dog bite, traffic accident, assault.
- I believe it the same as I would any accident
- I did not realize that it was not yet mandatory for someone to stay at the scene if their dog bites some one. It really should be
- They should have to stay at the scene to help handle every situation in a healthy manner and without extreme emotional/irrational motives to deal with the situation.
- It is illegal to leave the scene of a vehicle accident, I feel this is no different.



- This shouldn't need to be explained.. if you hit a vehicle and drive away its considered a hit and run. Same thing should apply here.
- Determine whether the same owner has been involved in multiple incidents/has, in fact, followed any potential bylaws as to additional training or insurance required for certain dog breeds.
- It should be treated no different than a vehicle accident. The owner of the attacking animal is responsible for the animals behavior and needs to be available to provide any necessary information.
- It should be illegal for a person to leave a scene if their animal harms another animal or person until Officers arrive, documentation provided and or arrangements made for follow up of situation.
- OWNERS RESPONSIBILITY- NOT THE BREED
- Just like a vehicle, you've accepted an animal or machine into your life that has inherent liability and should be responsible for it.
- We can't track nuisance dogs without contact information; injury may have insurance repercussions for the victim. I can't see the justification for somebody's dog to cause injury and then just walk away anonymously.
- This is a must like it should have been a law already. The owner with her/his dog that bit the other needs to be responsible for the other dog/owner's mental/physical health that caused by the trauma. Also financially be responsible! Many irresponsible dog owners are getting away from it!
- Depending on the severity of the bite and what the victim feels is necessary.
- The "If necessary" part of this statement makes little sense. Who judges if it's necessary?
- Just like a car accident the person responsible for the incident should be required to stay
- If a dog attacks someone or their animal, the owner of the dog who attacked (if unprovoked) should be held responsible for any vet fees
- Both parties need to give their sides of the story so miscommunication doesn't happen and an innocent dog gets euthanized
- The owner should remain available at the scene of the incident as they are responsible and liable for their dog.
- However, I think it's also hard to keep a dog in that state at the scene safely.
- owners need to take responsibility
- Responsibility of ownership should dictate this action.
- Its not fair to just leave a scene. Regardless of what happened.
- Just makes sense
- It will Ensure that the dog owner takes responsibility over the accident
- A dog attacking is how the owner trains the dog, they are held responsible for any damage caused by their dog. The dog should not have to be punished for the way it was trained. It should be on the owner to take all responsibility.
- Dog bites should be considered assault and as a crime has been committed the perpetrator should stay at the scene and give the other person their insurance information.
- Both parties can give their statements. Dogs do not attack unprovoked; it's not always the dogs fault.



- any dog owner should take responsibility of their pet after a bite or incident
- The owner of the dog who attacked is responsible for all vet, medical bills and criminal charges if necessary. Just like a car accident!
- Makes the owner accountable for their pet when any injury occurs. Similar to a serious car accident with injuries or death, the perpetrators should not be allowed to flee the scene.
- I agree that the owner of any breed of dog that bites a human or another animal should be responsible and should have to give their info to bylaw officers
- This will require owner's of nuisance dogs to be accountable for the dog's actions and would hopefully compel them to take the bylaws more seriously.
- If the dog owner is there then they should stay.
- It should be mandatory to stay and give information on the dog that attacked
- It's just the same as a car accident. One party is in the wrong and they must remain on scene to exchange information with those who they have harmed.
- You own the dog legally and should remain at the scene of an accident or injury. Just like a vehicle.
- Dog owners should be responsible for damage caused by their dogs. In dog parks and from friends, one hears of cases of dog aggression causing harm and damages, and those owners should stay and be accountable.
- A responsible owner should exchange information.
- IF an accident happened all party involved should exchange information
- If they leave, it becomes more difficult to substantiate which dog and which owner. Having a similar bylaw to leaving the scene of a vehicle accident makes sense.
- The dog is the owner's responsibility and must provide help and support to the injured party so long as the dog can be contained and that person didn't instigate the attack in the first place.
- Similar to remaining at the scene of an automobile accident, the owner needs to take responsibility for their dog.
- I have had an incident where another dog (NOT a pit bull) bit my dog and the owner just walked away. After a long process of communicating with 311, no resolution came. Once again, rather than focusing on creating bylaws for post incidents, I strongly believe a mandatory training classes for dog owners and the dogs (focusing on responsible dog ownership and handling) should be implemented. Educated dog owners who are capable of handling their dogs are less likely to cause a "nuisance" or behave in a way that is dangerous.
- Good owners take responsibility for their actions. The dog misbehaved because they failed to discipline or correct the behavior.
- I refer to question 4. I didn't like any of the options. What about a behavior change program for the dog.
- My dog has been attacked by off leash dogs on multiple occasions and the owners always leave the scene asap.
- A person is responsible for any kind of bodily injury caused by their pet. You wouldn't leave the scene of a car accident. This is no different
- To resolve the situation



- It's the right thing to do
- Yes there should be responsibility if a dog bites, but there are too many factors involved in that behaviour to immediately euthanize the animal or take it away from its home. There should be reparations made, but do not punish the dog. It is the responsibility of both the owner and the victim.
- Just like a traffic accident you have to remain at the scene until police arrive to give a statement
- Last year my dog was attacked and died due to injuries not once was the owner present.. this happened not in Calgary but I can relate and feel the necessity of this
- It's no different than any other accident. We have a responsibility to show care for one another. If harm can be prevented in the future by owner education the opportunity needs to be taken.
- Yes, it should be treated no different than a car accident
- Your pet is your responsibility. If they cause harm to another being, whether person or animal, they should be held accountable
- Absolutely, if it happens with car accidents it should happen in cases like this when injuries or death of another animal occurs.
- They need to take responsibility for potential liability and vet bills.
- Prove rabies vaccinations, insurance reasons, see if dog was previously a nuisance.
- You get in trouble for leaving the scene of an incident, i.e. car accident, why wouldn't a dog attack be any different.
- The dog owner should be there to face the consequences of their dog injuring a person.
- If follow up is needed then you have their contact information. However stop trying to make us have to run because we are scared you're going to euthanize our pets
- Only if it's severe. Some dogs may feel threatened and defend themselves, so this should be considered
- The dog is the owner's responsibility.
- Each case should be specific to the dog and owner that had a role in the incident with consequences and actions taken to correct that specific case, and not penalizing a whole specific breed for the actions of A.) a negligent person not respecting the space of a dog that they are unfamiliar with, without being told to do so, or given permission to by the owner, or B.) having the actions of the specific dog reflect on the owner, as the dogs behavioural traits reflect their owners and whether they are treated with care, or abused
- It depends on the situation.
- This is essential information for medical reasons and to create tracking of aggressive dogs.
- Too often the offending owner is never found.
- It's up to the owner of the dog that bit to cover costs.
- There are too many "bite and run" incidents.
- Dogs should be euthanized whenever they bite.
- Only if said bite was enough to draw blood or serious trauma
- "Not fair to the owner who has to pay for the vet bills when their dog is insured.
- Cost should be put on the owner of the dog who injured the other dog"



- Dog owners are fully responsible for the well being of their dog. Accidents do happen, but ultimately they should be required to stay at the scene and share their information in case further contact is needed.
- The owner of the offending dog yes. However there should be a process that the owner of the injured dog can follow up with law enforcement so they can get their animal the needed treatment. For example they should be able to give their info the 911 operator and be contacted later by the officer that responds. I'm sure there would be plenty of photos to document.
- It makes sense to take responsibility for aggressive pets.
- no different than a vehicle accident. Owners need to take responsibility
- Very good idea. Pelle shouldn't be allowed to run from their liability.
- The only reason a dog owner should be able to leave is if their dog was injured in the incident and requires care. If the rule isn't to remain at the scene, it should be mandatory to leave contact information and self-report within 24 hours.
- At minimum, information should always be shared. An enforcement officer being present would ensure cooperation. However, I believe the cost of resources for this may not be viable
- See it as a motor vehicle collision. Remain at the scene and exchange information. Its the responsible thing to do.
- I do but I do think it will be difficult to enforce
- They should be there to defend their dog. It isn't always the dogs fault..
- If someone is injured they should both parties should be there to talk further
- Dog bites can happen without the owner even being fully aware.
- My dog was bitten/attacked and the lady left and refused to give any information
- Its not always the dog's fault, the owners should be looked at thoroughly as well.
- The owner of the dog that bites the other person/animal should be held liable of any vet/medical bills incurred by the victim
- If there is a dog bite and people are required to stay at the scene, you will see the majority of dog bites are NOT pit bulls. They're not the problem.
- "Of course they should stay, not staying would be as bad as a hit and run.
- Regardless of that, since you failed to denote a comment section above, there should be no difference in the rulings for pitbulls as any other breed. Breed specific legislation opens the door to a multitude of problems, and should not be included in any responsible pet ownership bylaw. And frankly, I am extremely disappointed in the city of Calgary for even suggesting it. Shame on you."
- Common curtesy.
- It is their dog, and their fault if their dog injures another dog or a person.
- As long as everything can be held under control all parties involved should remain at the scene.
- No different than being in a car accident, you are responsible and need to be charged of you leave the scene
- As with any accident, responsible parties need to be accountable and available to recount the situation.



- a incident has occurred and the owner should be present as the party responsible.
- They need to take responsibility- no different that remaining at the scene of an accident
- There are a lot of irresponsible dog owners in Calgary. They don't care if their dogs cause thousands of dollars in vet bills to other people because they have "no reason" to care, so please give them one. Too many people in this city don't seem to have any sort of conscience or moral integrity so the need for a law requiring them to do the right thing and stay at the scene seems long overdue!
- This applies to ALL dogs
- Similar to a automotive collision, when an incident occurs, it is the responsibility of the citizen to own their mistake and provide reasonable means for solutions in the present and future while the incident is resolved. An owner leaving the scene after an incident is equivalent to a hit and run.
- It's important to hear both sides of the story, and I think it's the responsibility of the owner to give their statement so it is properly documented.
- I think it is only proper for the owner to remain at the scene of the incident until an officer arrives, similar to what you would see with a car accident.
- This is something a responsible dog owner should be doing.
- Similar to a hit and run, should stay at the scene of the accident if necessary
- It is our moral responsibility to keep others safe and comfortable when out walking.
- I previously did own a pit bull, and an incident occurred, and I feel like any responsible pet owner should stay at the scene until aid is provided and the victim is on the way to whatever medical care may be needed. If your dog attacks, you are responsible and should do your best to ensure the best result of the situation.
- As long as it goes for every breed of dog and pit bulls aren't discriminated against because of stereotypes.
- It's the right thing to do. More information of both parties may lead to faster response as to why the incident happened.
- Just makes sense.
- its like reporting an accident it makes sense
- Of course they should stay on the scene, I have heard of too many who leave and then are never held responsible.
- Their dog, their responsibility.
- But this depends on severity as well
- This is common sense. If your pet injures someone or something, that's your responsibility.
- Needs no explanation really does it
- The owner should explain his side of the incident.
- But I also think it's important that the owner assess the situation, they cannot stay on scene with an out of control dog that could potentially cause more damage.
- There has been multiple accounts of owners fleeing the scene after an attack of a person or animal because they dont want to get in trouble. Leaving the victims in distress and not knowing what to do or who to contact.



- the owner should be fully responsible upon attack and should be present. for example, a case of hit and run the vehicle operator should be present, if they leave the premises it can be considered an offence.
- I think this is important to have owners show accountability.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- If the owner runs away from the scene of the incident it indicates they are not a responsible dog owner.
- If they leave there should be fines and jail time possibly. They are fleeing a crime.
- The person owning the dog who bit someone or an animal is responsible for all vet bills, medical bills, and should be charged if the victim wishes to.
- Any animal should be held accountable for biting. Not just pit bull breeds like you guys are making it seem they are the only ones that bite. Little dogs are the savages
- Because it is like remaining at the scene of a car accident.
- The dog owner should remain at the scene, just like in a car accident. So that they can make sure the victim or animal victim is okay and gets proper treatment and they are responsible for that treatment. I.e. If a vet visit is required for the attacked animal then the owner of the attacking animal should be responsible for the bill.
- Just like a car crash yes fines and/or tickets should be given then
- It is the owners fault for poorly training the animal and the owner is responsible for the environment the dog lives in, it's not the breed it's the owner. If an animal bites or attacks, yes fine them like a person would for assault but don't take that animal from them.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to take responsibility of the dog. They should be available to help with any incident their dog causes, as well as accept any fines/ bills (medical, vet, etc. from the victim) that would be associated with their dogs actions.
- ABSOLUTELY. If an owner leaves the scene of a dog bite they should be held accountable for that action.
- This is necessary for information on the dog so treatment or assessment can be made accurately
- Owners should remain to give contact information and be made to pay for injuries sustained to other animals.
- It is not the dogs fault how it was trained, it is the owners.
- Information should be collected and stored for repeated behaviour.
- Unless the animal/s in question need to be removed from the scene. Either way contact information should be shared.
- Bites and vet bills can be expensive. Sometimes there should be compensation
- Important to have as much information as possible about the incident.
- An owner must be held responsible for vicious animals
- Yes they should.
- it protects all parties involved if proper care and records are made of any incident.
- Dog owners must accept responsibility for their pet's actions.



- Anyone that's involved in an accident should take care of it
- If a person or animal is bitten the owner of the aggressor should pay for injury and damages
- they should own up for what their dog did and take care of medical bills for the person or animal that was bitten.
- Owners need to be accountable especially if they allow their dog to be off leash in an on leash area which is becoming a huge problem around Calgary
- "Just like any car accident if there is damage or injuries both parties must exchange information or wait for enforcement officer if necessary.
- It's very simple."
- There may be exceptions if it is not safe to do so or they need medical attention
- We cannot single out pit bulls
- What caused the problem? Inbreeding, heat ,abuse?
- To me, it should be mandatory that the owner should stay on the scene, just as in an accident
- In case the other dog need vet treatment
- It's logical responsible ownership
- It would allow for tracking of owners that have multiple offences.
- Just like any road accident - stay at the scene
- Regardless of the breed involved the pet owner must take responsibility and provide information to the enforcement officer so the appropriate investigation/action can take place. The only exception would be if the owner felt their personal safety was at risk from the other dog's owner. I ABSOLUTELY DISAGREE WITH SINGLING OUT A SPECIFIC BREED OR BREED TYPE. RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP IS REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF THE BREED - DEAL WITH INDIVIDUAL SITUATIONS AS THEY ARISE! BANNING PIT BULLS FROM OFF LEASE PARKS AND/OR REQUIRING THEM TO BE MUZZLED WILL DO NOTHING BUT CREATE MORE FEAR OF A DOG THAT DOESN'T BITE MORE OFTEN THAN ANY OTHER BREED.
- A dog owner should share contact information if any incident happens. And if an enforcement officer needs to be involved, there should be levels of how each offence is handled. First time offenders getting warnings, mandatory training and second to third offenders receiving fines, involving a court decision. Dogs can be reactive depending on multiple situations, breed isn't always a factor. It should be focused on training and not the dog. Mandatory training should be given, providing a list of places a dog can receive training and giving a time of 6 months to complete training. Providing certificate of training after could also be necessary.
- Yes they should. Dog attacks can be severe and there is a need for accountability.
- Every pitbull I have every met is the most loving. They are family and better than most humans currently walking around Calgary
- Ultimately the owners should be responsible for their pets actions
- I agree with this as long as there is a safe place for the dog to to while information is given. Not all dog bites are malicious. Many dog bites/incidents are caused by another person or animal scaring or intimidating the dog. I think it makes sense that all owners or persons involved in an altercation should remain on scene to explain all sides of the story.



- The owner is responsible for the dogs actions and should stay there.
- It's like a car accident, have to make sure no one is hurt or any damage.
- .
- It's all about communication. So both sides of the story can be told and so proper steps can take places after to resolve the incident. Dogs should not be seized if the owner remains at the scene of the incident and is co-operating.
- Any dog can bite not just pitbull looking dogs! You should finally get your facts straight!
- Dogs only bite if their owners train them to do so. The owner is at fault for being a bad trainer, or giving the wrong order.
- Only if the bite causes harm. Dogs playing that is misconstrued by an owner as a bite should not be considered an issue.
- Dog owners should take responsibility for the actions of their pets (fines, lawsuits, etc.), especially if they failed to adequately train them.
- The officer should make an informed decline based off owners personality, the dogs defensiveness, as well as the actual circumstances within the situation. Most times the dog is just being defensive of their owner as they feel threatened, they aren't violent they just love too hard.
- I think it will help the individual understand that they are responsible for thier dogs behaviour and to remain and have a discussion would be a very good first step in showing ownership over possible future steps to help train the dog properly
- There needs to be accountability for the dog owner.
- It's not different than a human attacking another human. It's an offense and needs to be followed up with the proper report.
- The owner of the dog needs to take responsibility for the actions of their pet. The pet is a product of its environment and demonstrates solely how the owner is treating the dog
- otherwise it is like a hit and run crash
- This should be a no-brainer
- All owners are responsible for the actions of their pet. If their pet hurts another animal or person they need to be accountable for that action and provide the information required to follow up with them in case of injury or their animal is a repeat offender and must be dealt with accordingly
- The owner needs to take full responsibility for their dog, leaving the scene would allow the dog to potentially cause harm again.
- too many leave and are not held accountable
- Accountability needs to happen and either changing training behaviours for the owner or obedience school for the dog is required.
- These situations are often about the person or animal who was bitten, but very rarely are the situations or behaviours from all parties leading up to the bite investigated. It becomes one sided if only one party is present.
- They should take responsibility and ensure the person/animal that was bitten is okay.
- If it became serious injuries.
- It's the right thing to do.



- "I think punishing one breed just because they usually end up with poor owners is not fair. How about we develop a program screening people to determine if they are right for pet ownership? We are failing these animals. A blanket muzzling law is not the answer.
- Also, what is with this annual licensing money grab. How about I register my animal ONCE and it can be considered mine until further notice. You guys are gouging people in hard times and its not ok."
- There should be follow up to make sure the dog doesn't hurt any one again. Lessons, training for the owner, if the dog continues being a problem, make sure it's the dogs fault and not the owners. If the owner has issues raising dogs that are aggressive they should be penalized, send dog to rescue or rehabilitation. Normally it's the person
- It's important to gather information about the animal's history to properly and safely treat the victim. Eg: up to date on immunizations, history of other attacks or violence, possible exposures the animal has had
- I am a firm believer that dog behaviour is a direct result of the owner and as such owners need to be held accountable. I do not support ANY breed specific legislation.
- Maybe the dog owner can explain if the dog was cohorsed.
- this should be like a car accident. vet bills are expensive and if my dog was injured due to someones negligence in controlling their animal I want them to be accountable.
- Someone needs to be held accountable for their dogs actions. Dogs are never the problem, its the owners
- If a dog bites it is the owners fault. Owner should be held responsible for dogs behaviour
- When it comes to automobile accidents the driver must stay at the incident scene. Likewise the owner is responsible for the dogs behaviour and therefore should stay.
- I believe an owner is responsible for their dog but that sometimes, it is necessary to leave the situation to avoid causing any further stress to the animal. I believe dog owners should be allowed to bring their dog to a suitable distance to calm them, but should remain in sight so that the enforcement officer can talk to them afterwards.
- The owner needs to be held accountable.
- I've been bitten by a Jack Russell terror. Would you even care if a dog bites and they are not a pitbull.
- I believe an owner is responsible for their dog but that sometimes, it is necessary to leave the situation to avoid causing any further stress to the animal. I believe dog owners should be allowed to bring their dog to a suitable distance to calm them, but should remain in sight so that the enforcement officer can talk to them afterwards.
- All about respect and liability
- There are many instances that I know of where nothing is done because owners are not responsible and run away. This way it helps prove who is trying to cooperate and be responsible for their dogs. Dog owners that run off after an incident without being responsible and sharing information to support the victim should be treated the same way as a hit and run
- The dog owners should be held accountable.



- It is important for both parties to have their recollection of events documented.
- If a dog bites a person or other animal, the owner should remain at the scene to exchange information if any serious injuries occur. the dog owner should stay in contact to make sure everything is okay with the person or animal.
- Anytime anyone causes harm to another person or damaged property they are to remain on scene. This should be no different if your dog bites someone. Unless the victim isn't concerned by the incident and doesn't want to have enforce the involved or if the owner is unable to control the dog in that area and ya no choice but to leave.
- As long as they now have the dog in control and the other Person or dog that was injured feels safe.
- If you're involved in an accident, you're expected to stay and own up to your part of the situation. Only makes sense the same goes here
- It should be required the same as it would be in a motor vehicle collision.
- If someone's dog seriously injures a person or other animal, the issue needs to be resolved. Whether it is looking over both animals/persons to ensure no serious injury or exchange info should further discussion or medical attention be required. It should be recommended that the people involved try to resolve things first (in a respectable fashion) before escalating things. Good pet owners do this as usually this is uncommon and something has happened to result in the situation. It is those who flee from the scene who are usually reoccurring culprits. It should also be kept in mind that sometimes the responsibility is with the owner and not because the dog is a bad dog. People put their pets in situations that they aren't ready for or haven't been trained for and the dog may be reacting out of fear or others reasons. We can't forget that when a dog 'says no' it isn't going to be verbally. Nature versus nurture
- And additionally required to pay for any physical damages caused to any persons or animal
- They need to stay at the scene to provide information, just like a car incident.
- The owner should always maintain responsibility of their pet! You have a duty to take accountability for your animals actions.
- For a person, yes no question. For another animal depends on damage.
- If the owner is there, however if the dog is at its home and provoke to bit, than I feel that its the person who provoke the dog should own up to their mistake.
- Accountability
- The owner can defend their animal
- They shouldn't bite and run.
- This might be very hard to enforce but I think dog owners should have to remain or give contact info. They should have to explain their version of why the incident occurred . Sometimes the story is not always what it appears.
- It's the owners fault for not knowing how to control their dog.
- Why should i have to pay for my injuries to myself or my dog if it was caused by a difdent dog. That person should give information and be held accountable, like in a car accident.
- Because if medical assistance is needed it would help to have the information of the person owning animal



- Dogs either have to be untrained or provoked to bite. Assessing the owner on how they care for the dog could show it's aggression meaning you should look into blacklisting people, not dog breeds.
- Similar to car incidents, if the damage is great enough, the person ought to wait for law enforcement to arrive. My only concern is police behaviour with the dog.
- it's the same as any other incident, these injuries can cost thousands so people need to be held responsible
- Owners must be held responsible for their animal harming another person or animal, period.
- Of course, my friend got bit by a dog a few years ago and the owner left the scene
- Common decency.
- Because it's the right thing to do. Especially if the injury to person or dog is serious enough that it requires medical attention.
- Like anyone who causes damage to anyone else's property should .
- Unless the dog is still out of control and needs to go to a safe space
- They need to remain on scene.
- The owner needs to be held accountable.
- Just like any accident, you have a responsibility to report and if you flee from the scene of an incident that should be considered a crime.
- Responsible pet parents would stay. They would care that their animal was aggressive to another dog or to a human. THIS IS NOT A PITBULL ISSUE.. it is the pet parent who is not raising their animal right!!
- Yes, the situation should be investigated. Should be determined who's at fault as it's not always the aggressors fault.
- This makes it easier when it comes to both parties if info was exchanged. Keeps owner's accountable
- Must also consider the danger of having the biting dog remain at the scene with the owner. What does the owner do: control the dog and remove from the dog from the situation, or remain to leave contact info (with dog in hand, potentially not in control). Need to draft this carefully to ensure contact information is left, but that the danger of having the biting dog at the scene (and potentially still out of control) during the time it takes to leave the contact information.
- This is the same as a hit and run car crash in my mind
- Of course. If their dog is aggressive, they should have to pay medical bills and take responsibility for the dogs actions. However I would like to say I'm disgusted that pit bulls and other bull breeds are being targeted specifically for this in the city of Calgary. So many bully breed dogs that I know would never hurt a fly and it comes down to leadership with that animal. If you muzzle all and have breed specific legislation then you are doing all of those dogs a great disservice and I cannot support Calgary if this is not revised. Protests will happen and you can be assured that I will be partaking.
- Owner responsible for their dog. Should be required to admit ownership. Owner should muzzle dog if it has aggressive tendencies. Owner must ensure fencing around their property will not allow their dog to escape & run at large.



- Of course, if somebody's dog bites another person or animal that is the owners responsibility and he/she needs to remain at the scene of incident until resolved.
- The owner should gain control of the dog and then be accountable for the actions of the dog.
- The main cause of dog bites are an owners fault. I believe with a knowledgeable and attentive owner conflict can be prevented and owners are not being held accountable BEFORE conflict arises, therefore dogs are being labeled as aggressive and are euthanized.
- Running away and hiding is not being responsible
- All sides of a story are crucial when people consider euthanizing a pet over what could be a misunderstanding.
- Yes if there is damage (laceration, bleeding, serious harm), or if it was done aggressively and not by accident (excitement etc)
- If the owner was present, they are a witness and need to provide information and possibly a statement.
- I would say they need to share the information with an enforcement officer but potentially if the animal was in a fight it could need medical attention and in that case I would not agree with the owner having to stay after having given contact information to the other party or an officer.
- Similar to a car accident.
- If there is a bite the dog owner or person caring for the offending dog should not be permitted to just leave. It should be dealt with appropriately.
- Yes because that's the same accountability to the offender as a car accident and I would consider this an accident.
- "Any breed can be dangerous.
- If a Chihuahua happens to bite someone, it's should be treated the same as though it were a stringer and larger breed."
- How is this not already a law??? This is not different from a hit and run, in my opinion.
- I think it's responsible and personally better for the person involved to get their story across instead of bystanders with negative opinions that don't serve the dogs best interests because they're biased.
- DOESNT HAVE TO BE A PITBULL STOP BREED DISCRIMINATION, IVE BEEN BIT THE WORST IN MY LIFE MY A [removed] BOSTON TERRIER. ITS THE OWNER NOT THE DOG.
- This is the same procedure as a car accident. The owner would need to ensure a safe distance from the other person involved, and call enforcement officers.
- your dog bit a person, stay same as if you got in a fence bender
- There are always 2 sides to every story. It's is important to know why the dog bit another person or animal from the owner themselves.
- I agree with the above statement due to the plain fact that they may be a witness to what has taken place, additionally by being a responsible owner they need to take responsibility for their dog.
- I don't see how it's any different from a accident with a vehicle. If your pet, regardless of the breed, attacks another animal or person it is your responsibility as the pet owner to follow through.
- The owner is responsible for the animal, so definitely needs to stay put in the place and give the information required.



- To ensure the matter is dealt with
- Both parties need to have answers like if the dog has been vaccinated.
- Yes so appropriate information can be obtained ie: insurance etc.
- It's the same as a car crash, the dog cause an injury, the owner MUST stay and answer for it
- yes the dog/dog owner should have to stay at the scene unless the dog/dog owner sustained injuries in the incident I.e two dogs were fighting both got bit both need medical assistance.
- Yes
- If a dog is attacked by another dog, the liability should fall on the owner of the attacker. They should have to cover any medical expenses involved.
- They should remain if the person bit wants their information and to contact an officer
- If the bite results in a puncture through the skin. Not just for a nip
- To take responsibility for actions
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets. And they can make sure their side of the story is told.
- Common sense IF the "damage is sever enough & both parties agree to the exchange of information.
- This seems like the logical and responsible action of the owner.
- Yes in order to see damage caused and should pay the injured person for the damages and accept responsibility for there dogs behaviour. Many times owners don't pick up after there dog leaving the dogs poop all over the ground. There should be signs put up at parks that are not designed for dogs warning that there is a bylaw against having a dog Running lose in are that is not designed for dogs. See lose dogs countless times at George moss park and there is no enforcement put in place I have encountered Off leash aggressive dogs there and owner will say There dog is friendly. There was also an owner that was to busy on there phone and not watching there off leash pit bull at the kids playground (George moss park) and list his dog because he was not paying attention. In Ogden community countless times dogs have run of private property into public space to attack my dog owner will just stand there and say don't worry my dog is friendly. One time 3 pitbulls came out of a van parked by house it was going into and tried to attack me and my dog when we're walking. Many people don't put leashes on there dog when coming out of a car or in public areas including when walking there dog. There are loose dogs roaming all over Ogden neighbourhood and attacking people I feel unsafe and scared for my son safety and my dogs.
- So both sides of a story are heard
- If the dog bites something it's obviously for a reason, good or bad we need to make sure we have the full story as not to run on hear say or rumours
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets.
- In ANY situation where one person causes damage to another or their "property" (beit caused by themselves, their car, dog, child, or anything else they are responsible for), that person must own up to it and take responsibility for it. Step one, sticking around and exchanging information/speaking to authorities if required.
- Leaving the scene is similar to a hit and run in my opinion.
- The owner needs to accept responsibility.



- That is fair that if an incident would be to occur that the owner must then stay and at least give their information to authorities
- The dog owner should explain what happened, provide reasons for the incident and if applicable, be held responsible for the dog's actions. It is the owner's responsibility to control their dog. It's not the dog's fault.
- Owners are responsible for their pets and should be held accountable.
- An animal is the owners responsibility, so they need to be held accountable for the actions of their pets.
- Any respectable dog owner would stay on scene . As its been done before with small and big breed dogs .
- If the victim needs medical attention, the owner of the animal should cover the charges.
- Sounds like a good way to keep owners accountable.
- It's no different than a hit-and-run or assault. By leaving, you are guilty of fleeing the scene.
- I believe that pet owners should be held responsible if their pet bites a person or another animal
- I feel that if your dog bites a person, it likely should be put down, unless a crime was being committed against your person.
- "Dog owners need to be held responsible for their dogs actions no matter what the breed. I have a dog and have had way more issues eith non bully breeds.
- My dog was attacked by a German Shepard and the owner grabbed his dog and ran away so he could not be held responsible. I think the city needs to monitor dog parks for these dog owners"
- If a victim needed medical attention which could possibly require payment, the owner of the dog should be held accountable for paying for any injuries. It's just important for everyone to have each other's contact information because you don't know what could happen. It's also important to talk to law enforcement if the injury is bad enough.
- Yes, both sides should be heard. And dogs that bite are either not taken care of properly, or the person bit, was being guarded against (guardian breed dog which has been trained properly and only acts during danger)
- Vicious dog owners will often run away with their pet after an attack occurs, this should be a punishable offense as they are fleeing the scene of a crime.
- I believe most dog owners would do this out of good conscience and social responsibility
- Any accident you should stay at the scene and swap info.
- Owners need to take responsibility for the dog (of any breed) that bites. It's not the dog's fault.
- If there's is an injury caused then absolutely contact information should be shared with the promise that vet bills will be covered
- Yes but only if the dog can be safely controlled at the scene. Otherwise contact information and the dogs license# being left.
- If a person leaves after their dog injures a person or another pet, there is no way for them to be held accountable i.e. pay for any medical bills for the person/pet injured.
- Too many times the owner of a dog will try to avoid responsibility of the actions of their animal. They should be held accountable for any incident, minor or major.



- Common sense
- Good luck enforcing it. Many owners run away
- A dog which bites a person (or other animal) has assaulted the person bitten and authorities need to assure the dog has not done it before or will do it again.
- You need to properly understand both sides of a story before making any decisions.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to accept ownership of their dog's behaviour
- Your dog is your responsibility, as is training and ensuring your pet is well behaved and trained
- To defend the pet. Usually humans provoke animals not the other way around!
- nips can happen when people are not paying attention to their dogs kids etc, and some people trigger attacks my running and screaming. Again, education is key.
- If a dog bites another dog or person it is important that the owner stays to share their information with bylaw officers and the victim because it is the owner of the attacking animal that should have to pay the vet/medical bills for the injured person/persons or animal/s and there would be no way of holding them accountable for that.
- The owners need to take responsibility for their animal
- If a bite incident occurs, I do think it is important for the owner to take responsibility. This way they cannot later claim that it was untrue, and potentially give opportunity for more witnesses.
- If the victim feels it is necessary.
- The dog is the responsibility of the owner and that person should remain at the scene until the incident is dealt with in case there is any follow up needed
- Isn't this already a thing???
- Responsible pet ownership includes taking responsibility when your pet has caused a bite
- Regardless of which party was at fault, it is helpful for the owners to know the severity of the bite(s) and the current health conditions of the other dog as there could be transmittable diseases that could emerge after the incident.
- Better than leaving
- dog owners are responsible for their dogs and should take responsibility for their dogs. They should be there to do so.
- dog owners need to take responsibility for all aspects of dog ownership. And if that includes their dog biting somebody else and they need to stay and face the consequences.
- It may add more accountability to dog owners.
- Just like a car accident , you need to exchange information in case one of the animals show sickness to get vet reports
- Take responsibility for your pets behavior!
- Dog owners need to be responsible and accountable for their pet's actions.
- Much like a hit and run offence, owner accountability and liability should be established
- I believe that if someone's animal causes harm they should be held responsible.
- It is the owners responsibility for the actions of their pet.
- It's their responsibility and are accountable for their dog



- An animal attack is assault.
- Yes I think that's responsible pet ownership, however they should make sure the dog is in a safe place away from others. So they may need to walk to their car to secure their dog.
- In case the dog has any viruses that may be passed onto a human
- The incident is fresh in people's mind, better to report it as soon as possible.
- Only fair
- It's common courtesy
- To pay for vet fees
- The dog basically committed a crime to some extent. It is too easy these days to falsify information
- I think this would allow for a better understanding of the situation.
- The dog owner should be held accountable.
- I feel owners of dogs who bite/attack need to stay on scene to help the investigation
- The owner knows the dog and can defend the dog at least. Many of these incidents are caused by ignorant or nervous individuals who have preconceived ideas about animals and it is their behavior that causes these issues. I am completely on the side of the animal and the owner of the animal.
- People with dogs really love to run away and claim attacks never happened because their dog is "sooo nice and would never hurt a fly!!". Even when it's blatantly badly trained and aggressive.
- If damage is done, and an enforcement officer is called then yes.
- I have fenced yard front and back of my house. Dogs are territorial by nature if a person hangs over my fence and teases my dogs they should be responsible for what happens such as getting their fingers bitten.
- People need to be held accountable. But also, share their side of the story. Two sides to every story.
- I feel that all dog owners whose dogs bite should be required to at least provide their info to witnesses or victims on the scene. If they don't then there is a severe fine/penalty kind of like leaving the scene of an accident...
- If a dog injured a person and/or pet, the owner must take responsibility by remaining at the scene
- Why is this not already in place? People need to be held more accountable for their pet's actions.
- Too many bad dog owners run away hoping they will never have to take responsibility for their lack of pet responsibility.
- Too many times people leave the scene. Information for health and safety needs to be exchanged.
- Only the owner can be the dog's advocate.
- This should be mandatory! A dog bite, even the smallest can cause a lot of problems and/or cost a lot of money. Too many people know their dog is an issue and when something happens they run away because they know they are in the wrong. Any person who leaves the scene of a bite/attack should also face stiff fines and penalties
- If the dog owner stays to give their information it shows that they are responsible owners.
- I think that when a dog attacks a person the dog should immediately be impounded pending the results of any investigation.
- The owner should always take responsibility for dog's behaviour.



- They should exchange information obviously if someone got hurt
- Of course, owners must be held accountable in the same way that drivers who cause collisions are.
- If a person takes off after their dog bites someone then the dog can't be tested for rabies. Also the dog could get away with biting several people with no consequences to the owner.
- With the exception of a bite that is blatantly in self defense / defense of owner, where harm to a person / the dog is inevitable and the only way to ensure safety is to flee, it would make sense for the owner to be present to communicate what happened.
- If my dog were to bite someone or another animal that caused damage or needed surgery then as a responsible pet owner I should remain in scene just like in a car accident to make sure the proper info is given to all parties!
- If an incident happens the owner should take responsibility
- All parties must exchange information no matter the injuries incase of unknown injuries that arise later on. Especially for sever injuries that result in surgery.
- Pet ownership and responsibility dictates this is necessary
- What happens when a dog bites depends on circumstances and this becomes he said/she said without any proof.
- This is like a hit and run. You stay at the scene
- These incidents are typically an accident (unless there was malicious intent). Sharing contact information is no different than if it were a car accident. Depending on severity of the incident, I agree an enforcement officer should be involved. Again, same as car accident discretion — we don't always involve the police on scene, but we do so when necessary.
- I definitely think it is necessary but don't think owners should have reason to fear their animal being killed or taken from their possession when these situations occur, and currently that is a big fear for many Calgarians.
- The owner is responsible for their pets actions. If their pet attacks anyone they should be legally obligated to share their information as dog bites in particular are very dangerous and potentially life threatening
- As the owner you are responsible for the animal and should handle the situation completely
- If any dog harms anyone else the owner should be required to provide information incase any follow up is required
- The dog owner should be held responsible. Unless the dog was provoked!
- I agree unless the owner has to pen the dog, but should then return to the scene.
- "If your dog injures a person or pet you must be held accountable. To run away from
- The scene of a crime should be an offence."
- The owner should be fully responsible for dogs behaviour.
- It is important to receive information from the owner, asses if the biting dog was being provoked and ensure that the biting dog is being appropriately looked after.
- The owner should always be held accountable
- If the offender leaves before the situation has been de-escalated and the victim is satisfied, it should be classified as illegal and follow repercussions including fines and potential consequences



- At the end of the day the dog is the owner's responsibility. This would be no different than being required to stay at the scene of a cat crash for example
- Yes- it should be considered some sort of offence to have your animal hurt someone and not be accountable for it
- yes, because it is not always the Bully Breed or large breed dogs at fault. More times than not small dogs exhibit more reactive behaviour, it is just easier to turn a blind eye to due to size. That being said the behaviour is just as dangerous.
- Does the dog have any medical conditions? Is it caught up on its shots? Easier to answer if the owner sticks around
- It's the right thing to do
- Considerable resources are required to track down owners after serious incidents
- I think it's great for the owner to exchange information if needed
- The owner of the dog is responsible for the incident and like a car accident, should stay at the scene of the incident to provide contact information.
- I think that's fair.
- Just like a car accident, they are responsible for damages and need to be there to be held accountable. However, if the biting dog is out of control, they may need to take the dog home and away from the scene, so there needs to be an understanding of mitigating circumstances.
- One hundred percent; just as someone part of a car accident or physical altercation is obligated to remain present.
- Owners must take responsibility of their pets actions
- This is not any different than being liable to any other accident that may occur. As an owner you are responsible for the actions/damages of your pet and should be held accountable.
- Yes. Bites can occur without showing visible damage until later on (ie if the skin is not broken but there is damage to the underlying tissues) and it is important that appropriate contact information is exchanged should this occur.
- accountability and to hear both sides of the stories, often the dogs have been provoked
- Yes because that is responsible pet ownership which is the issue. Not the dog.
- Many times it's our larger breeds of dogs that are provoked by other dogs and people. But as soon as bylaw or police show up there's a bias already. We (owner and dog) are presumed guilty already
- Owners need to be educated that an attack by a pet should be no different than a vehicle accident where all parties must exchange information and wait for or check-in with officers to report the incident. If the parties do not, they can be charged for leaving the incident.
- A potential serious injury from a dog bite is the same as a being involved in a car crash.
- A person should not be allowed to 'flee the scene'. If a dog bites and harms someone or another animal, the situation should be further investigated. The dog owner should be investigated for neglect, abuse, and bad pet-ownership. Both stories must be heard however! Sometimes, animals can feel easily threatened when approached by strangers (both other dogs and other people). For parks, both on leash and off-leash, there should be some consideration and bylaws to protect pets



who are more sensitive. I feel this is a very sensitive topic, and must be treated as such. More must be looked into regarding this section of the bylaw.

- i think this would eliminate some time and resources to find the owners, and if they do not stay at the scene, they get fined.
 - Exchange information and the owner should pay for any vet bills incurred by the offending dog.
 - Owners should be responsible, or be made responsible, for their animals.
 - People need to be accountable and need to be required to educate themselves and teach their dog. The person who owns the dog needs to be accountable and taught better handling strategies for their pet.
 - "It is the owners responsibility to properly handle any situation the dog is in. If their dog causes harm it is their job to follow the proper steps and share information with those effected.
-
- PLEASE stop grouping pit bulls in with this. They are an amazing breed and so so sweet. I know more unruly dogs out there that are not bully breeds. So please stop blaming pit bulls. It's UNFAIR."
 - It only makes sense
 - Just like a car accident it safer to stay and pass on your contact info
 - If someone is bitten they must stay for health insurance reasons. If another animal is bitten it should be established if there is any fault. Who instigated, how much damage was done, do either animals have a history of violence
 - A dogs owner has a responsibility to stay and answer questions along with other witnesses
 - Owners should be held accountable for the behaviour of their dogs.
 - This is a perfect way to know what dogs are aggressive and maybe you could keep a record of it, instead of making breed specific legislation from assumptions of dog behaviour.
 - The enforcement officer needs to hwar from both parties. Including the owner ofthe offending dog regardless of breed.
 - Because who is stay that dog was defending it self. I have a big dog and have smaller dogs attack my dog and I have had to take her to the vet, because of it.
 - Absolutely owners should be held accountable within reason and should have an obligation to report the attack and have consequences if they do not stay and provide information.
 - The owner should be responsible for the incident, and be cooperative in dealing with it afterward.
 - Otherwise it's easy in the chaos for the owner and the dog to walk away and then it might not be possible to identify them or for them to face consequences, increasing the risk of the dog doing it again without training or other intervention.
 - Responsible dog ownership requires taking responsibility for ones dogs actions. If trained properly, a dog won't bite. At the end of the day it is the owner's fault, not the dog's.
 - There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. If the owners are made to explain why they can't control their dog, they might take steps to attend obedience or perhaps surrender the dog to a more responsible person.



- The owner is responsible for the behavior of their dog, and removing the owner may cause additional stress to the dog who is reliant on them.
- There is a degree of responsibility which should be taken into consideration, but also it is necessary for those taking the statement to have the education to understand 1. Dogs who bite aren't necessarily dangerous 2. They may have been provoked (esp. in regards to children in dog parks) 3. Dog parks are breeding grounds for bites (too small, too many dogs, too many people ignoring their dogs) and 4. MOST dog problems should and can be blamed on the owner, not the dog. Further training can save the dog. A reluctant owner can't.
- Same as a car accident.
- Owners need to take responsibility
- Yes they should stay and share information if vet bills need to be covered and to ensure the animal or person is fine
- Dog owners need to be held accountable for the actions of their dog. A dog's behaviour is entirely a result of proper training, socializing, and any other activity that is initiated by the owner. When something (such as a dog attack) results in a situation of a victim (the attacked) where commonly a fee (a vet and/or hospital bill) is associated, information and enforcement is absolutely required.
- If the dog bites then it needs psychological assistance. Therefore the owner of the dog should be obliged to obtain the help that the dog requires.
- One thing that really needs to happen when this occurs is that the entire story needs to be told. Just because a dog bites does not mean it was not provoked. The bylaw officer needs to be impartial until all sides are presented
- I think it is extremely important for the OWNER to be held accountable for their dog's behavior. No matter what breed of dog.
- Responsible ownership means being responsible for every aspect of the dog both good and bad.
- This would be in line with any offenses that involve harm to an individual, such as the expectation for car crashes. It also reinforces individual responsibility for the actions of your pet.
- As long as it is safe to do so
- An owner is responsible for the dog, and therefore the actions of that dog. Just as you don't drive away from an accident, you don't walk away from a dog bite.
- The owner need to take responsibility and do whatever is right. For both parties involved.
- The animals behaviour reflects the training from the owner. They are responsible for any action done by their pet and should be held accountable. Should be a criminal offence to leave the scene after the dog attacked anyone.
- Dog owners have to take responsibility for their pet the same as a driver would do in an accident.
- Owner has to take responsibility for its dog's actions. The dog owner needs to make sure the victim is safe and gets the needed medical help
- A dog I had (a rescue Shih Tzu,) bit someone on a path. It was my responsibility to face the consequences.
- any dog owner should be held accountable. Not just pitbull owners.
- It would promote accountability



- if ANY breed of dogs bites anyone or another pet i believe it should be dealt with by an officer. Not just a certain breed ALL BREEDS
- Dogs are never at fault for their actions, it is always up to the owner to be responsible. this vilification of "bully" breeds is ridiculous. It's time the City of Calgary steps up instead of passing blame to the animal.
- If my dog showed aggressive behavior and bit another dog/person, I would want to be held accountable and be able to represent my case. Proper documentation and measures should be taken so that this incident does not happen again. My sweet, loving pitbull was attacked at a dog park by another "accepted" dog breed. He had to get stitches all over his head and body. The other owner did not remain at the scene - He walked away without remorse, leaving me with a mentally scarred dog and a very large vet bill. As a responsible dog owner myself, I have slowly rehabilitated my dog to be around other animals. However he is no longer allowed to enjoy himself at the dog park, because meeting new dogs gives him incredible anxiety. My dog was scarred by an aggressive Golden Retriever and an irresponsible dog owner bringing an aggressive dog to the dog park. It is NOT the breed - it is how an animal is raised.
- Shocked it isn't a rule already. There needs to be a rule on what constitutes as a bite though. Some people are over dramatic when playfully nipped. There needs to be a solid definition so that Karens (sorry people named Karen) dont start making stuff up about dogs they don't like.
- Stop the madness of banning pit bulls. This is disgusting.
- Yes, as long as the situation is safe for all people and animals or no immediate medical attention is required.
- Accountability is paramount. But it's hard to do with a "Karen".
- Responsible pet owner.
- This is an action of a responsible owner.
- The owner of the offending animal is ultimately responsible and this is the same as leaving the scene of the accident.
- Should be no different than leaving the scene of an accident a fine should be levied if the person fails to remain at the scene
- no explanation needed, my pet hurts someone, i need to step up and deal with what comes
- Owners should be responsible for their dogs behavior as the owners are likely the problem rather than the animal itself.
- Should be like hit and run, an offence in itself.
- I went to a dog park and my dog was attacked by a bigger dog. The owner grabbed her dog and ran out of the dog park and didn't even ask if my dog was fine. It should be mandatory for them to stay and share contact information.
- Absolutely. Otherwise, they should be charged with leaving the scene of a crime.
- I believe the owner should be accountable not the dog
- Increased accountability on the owners part is a primary concern of mine relying less on the dogs actions and more on the owners response to those actions
- If the dog bit someone or another animal for no reason yes, if it was provoked then no.



- Yes maybe after getting the dog to a safe place, the owner can stay and explain the situation.
- If it has caused harm to the person or animal - yes.
- I thought this was already a normal practice.
- Common sense dont be a coward
- Your dog, your responsibility. The same as causing a motor vehicle accident, you don't just take off before exchanging info and talking to police.
- if your dog bites anyone or anything you should be held responsible if it was by fault of the owner, but alot of the time it is the victim that did something to agrivate the dog into biting them
- pet owners need to be held responsible for their pets.
- Unless the bylaw officers are going to be hours, stay and take responsibility for your pets bad behaviour.
- My dog has been bit by another dog at a dog park.
- Like a car accident
- All sides of the story should be heard at the time of the incident
- It's not the dog it's the owner, the dog is not the evil one the owner is. You can't categorize all Pitbulls as dangerous!!!!
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for the public behaviour of their dogs.
- They should already have to. It's the responsible thing to do
- "If the bite is bad sure.
- But if it was an accidental bite or play bite then no."
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs behavior. If a dog is involved in an incident where there has been a bite or attack the owner needs to be there to the matter is dealt with appropriately. Leaving the scene of an attack should be treated as seriously as leaving the scene of an accident. Someone could be seriously hurt.
- Only to ensure that the victims medical and/or vet bills are covered by the owner of the dog that bit. I don't think it needs to be a big thing where they euthanize the dog or take it away. Consider certain terms if this is a reoffend. Such as interim orders, the dog having to stay on its own property for a certain amount of time. This should be for any breed though, not just pit bull breeds.
- With in reason. I agree that contact information should be provided to be able to follow up for both parties however if medical attention is required I do not feel like they should have to remain at the scene to talk with an enforcement officer if contact information has been provided to the other party already and they can be reached at a later time once medical care has been received.
- I also think they should share their information with the victim, since the city does not share this. The victim needs more rights
- Shame on Calgary for using breed specific language. Why not include huskies, shepherds, labs, Rottweilers, Dobermans, retrievers, who are much larger in size than "pitbulls", are responsible for similar bite numbers, and can inflict far more damage due to their size?? This makes no sense, the language for dangerous dogs should be BREED NEUTRAL!
- Its simple respect



- Yes this should be treated no different than a scene of an accident. Dog owners need to be held responsible
- The owner of a dog that has caused a issue should stick around for bylaw to understand and receive consequences. Owners right now never stick around.
- A responsible person should remain at the scene. It's no different than a car accident!
- Having an owner take responsibility for their animal
- Simply take responsibility for your pet. The only exception being if the dog is still actively posing a danger to a person or animal and needs to be removed from the area to maintain safety.
- There are reasons for a dog bite that may be the victims fault. Both sides of the story is good
- I don't believe the bitee should be responsible for vet/ dr bills. Therefore the attackers owner should be held responsible for such bills.
- They are a witness to the incident and should stay in order to relay necessary information to the responding officer. It is their responsibility as a pet owner
- The same as if you were part of a vehicle accident, stay to give your side of the story and exchange contact info should it be needed.
- If there is serious injury there needs to be action made against the dog owner
- Please do not put these extra restrictions on pit bulls. They are incredibly sweet caring dogs by nature. While they do have the potential for causing major damage of an attack were to happen, they are absolutely no more of a risk than other large dog breeds (huskies, golden retrievers, German shepherds, etc) and in fact retrievers account for almost twice the percentage of dog attacks. It is completely unfair to single out this breed and put more restrictions on it when they pose no more danger than any other large dog breed.
- it's the owners responsibility to face the actions of their pet
- Irresponsible dog owners get away with things all the time. Make sure they'll be held accountable.
- "Why are you targeting pit bulls ?!
- It's the owners that are the problem. Start looking at dog bites from chihuahuas... and German shepherds ? If the pit bulls have such strength to make the dog bite worse... why aren't we using them with CPS ? German shepherds aren't dangerous ?"
- Otherwise can be difficult to trace owner and dog
- It's called being a responsible dog owner. No explanation needed
- supports accountability - like car accidents.
- Just as vehicle accidents, the owner should stay and give all information required, only cowarda would leave
- the owner know the dogs temperament and can advocate for the dog and provide additional context for the incident
- It's like a car incident party's must stay as one of them isn't at fault and shouldn't have to pay for undue consequences
- Would be the same for any other accident or incident
- No different, in my opinion, than a traffic/vehicle incident where you are required to stay on scene



- It's the right thing to do if an incident occurs
- It's call responsibility
- OBVIOUSLY the owner needs to stay! They are the ones responsible for the animal.
- That way it's documented
- Once someone leaves, there's a good chance they won't be able to be contacted again.
- I think that any pet owner, regardless of the breed of the dog should stay and the scene.
- It's important to determine what led up to the situation, provide medical care for the injured party if necessary and the presence of the owner simplifies this process. In question 3 above, define exhibiting "dangerous" behaviour. I can't give an opinion on this question without more precise information. I am opposed to breed specific restrictions or conditions.
- If i get into a car accident I have to stay and exchange information or speak to an officer. The same would be common courtesy in the event of a bite.
- Dog breeds are not indicative of behaviour, no matter what this bylaw's suggestions may indicate otherwise. Owner behaviour is the root cause of all dog behavioural issues. Owners, therefore, must be held accountable not only for their dog's behaviour in this instance but in all instances. If a dog bites another person or animal, and one would have to be careful what "biting" looked like since many dogs will "bite" in play, a perfectly natural behaviour that is, again, not breed-specific, then it is imperative that the dog's owner be put under investigation to understand why that dog is acting out like that, for the protection of the rights of that animal that is, quite likely, being neglected in some fashion at home. The first step in that process is the owner in question remaining to speak with an enforcement officer. It also means enforcement officers must be available and deployable with due speed so as not to cause unnecessary delays in the days of other people such as witnesses. Moreover, it is imperative to note that this behaviour is not breed-specific and cannot be breed-specific. Thus, it is highly inappropriate and downright offensive that this council is proposing a bylaw that discriminates against pit-bull breeds, going against established science in veterinary medicine for the sake of public appearances. Owners of "nuisance" dogs should be severely fined and prohibited from owning dogs or other animals, the dogs ought to be rehabilitated (at their former master's expense as enforced by the City) and allowed their legal right to continue living a life of happiness in the care of a more suited owner.
- Owners should be required to stay at the scene anyways
- Dog owners must be held accountable for their dogs behavior. They shouldn't be able to run off after a dog has caused harm to an individual or a pet owners pet. Identification is important to place measures such as a muzzle so the dog cannot harm anyone else.
- Remain on scene unless it would be life-threatening to the owner, or other person/animal (i.e., medical attention is urgently required)
- Before I owned a dog... walking with someone who did... a scuffle broke out, I tried to break it up, I was bit, the other owner could not get away fast enough, I had no medical history of that animal or who they were.
- This is about responsibility and empathy and it's wild that needs to be explained.
- If it's a dog fight and it was an accident you shouldn't have to wait for an officer



- If the damage is severe which requires medical attention then the owner should provide information
- Yes, as getting information on identity etc should be up to law enforcement
- People with aggressive dogs need to be held responsible/accountable. They can wait there with their ball cap, sunglasses and the keys to their F150 and wait for a cop.
- My dog was attacked and the owner stayed and took ownership of the incident.
- Each party involved in the incident should be heard, details should be exchanged in case there's an injury to the dog or an injury to the person, similar to a car accident.
- Our dog has been attacked at a dog park. The owner did not apologize or offer to help with vet bills (stitches were required). The owner left. No information was given. Will never know if this dog attacked other dogs.
- The dog owner should remain on site seeing as they would, presumably, have been paying attention to their dog's behaviour prior to the incident and can help to provide a good idea as to what happened and why.
- My German Shepard was bitten by a smaller dog (collie like). He was injured and required stitches. The owner just walked off leaving me with a big vet bill. I think their dog should have been ticketed and the owner required to pay the vet bill.
- Your dog your responsibility !! All depends on severity
- There are 2 sides to every story, both sides must be heard. The responsible party should provide info as they should assist with vet care.
- The owner should take responsibility for their pet - they need to deal with the consequences
- too often owners evade the enforcement officers by running away and not held accountable for the dog.
- Yes unless the other dog or person needs urgent care
- A responsible owner is going to cooperate with the process and that means taking responsibility. Accidents happen but owning up to them is important. If an owner takes off, they should be fined for that offense in addition to any other offenses.
- It is important for the owner to take responsibility. However, not with the threat of losing their beloved pet.
- Absolutely. Dog owners should take responsibility for the actions of their animal. I have personally experienced a dog attack in which the owner of the offending dog did not stay on scene, and that made it difficult to hold the owner accountable for her animal. Luckily, she lived close- but it was still unfortunate.
- "Just like a
- Car incident, you should exchange information to address the damages and costs in the future"
- As long as enforcement officer take into account that these animals are often teased and annoyed to where they get scared, which is often the reason dogs bite. So the person the dog has bitten should also have to talk to an enforcement officer
- The officer needs to be aware of both sides of the story. If an animal was not provoked and attacked or if just cause was made for the animal to defend itself.



- I think the owner should be able to first bring their dog to a safe place away from the scene. However I think that information should be exchanged, as though it were the scene of a car collision.
- Like a motor vehicle accident, people should be required to stay to speak with police/by-law
- Dog owners must take responsibility for their dog
- I feel like both sides of the incident should be explained before immediately putting blame on the dog.
- its simply the right thing to do!
- Although I have never had any bad incidents with dogs, my mom's friend was out running one day when a large dog attacked her. The owner did apologize but the friend was in such shock that she forgot to get the owners information to report it. She suffered numerous minor injuries
- Depending on severity, it is necessary to exchange information in order to track a potential nuisance animal. Again, circumstances will dictate the severity. If it is an accidental play injury it is a completely different situation than an attack.
- Details must be shared immediately while it has just happened
- People must take responsibility for their pets.
- I do provided the bite is serious. I think it is unnecessary for a little nip of another dog, but I do think that it is important for owners to take accountability for their pets actions
- Dog, should be moved to a safe location
- Dog owners must take responsibility for the actions of their dog and their own actions.
- I think it's absolutely fair for the owner of the dog to stay and give information and speak to the officer. If I was that owner, it would be smart of me to give my side of the story, if I saw that my dog was instigated. Also it just looks bad if you leave the incident.
- The dog is the responsibility of the owner, they may be a witness to the incident and should report what happened. As well, if infection or further injury occurs due to the bite it should be the owner of the biting dog's responsibility to cover the expense.
- Responsible pet owner
- A responsible pet owner does not a 'rule' to stay at the scene.
- Owners are liable of their pets, and should be held responsible legally and financially
- If they leave it should be considered "fleeing the scene of the crime"
- If owners stay and take responsibility, repercussions for the dog and owner can be reduced. And with an officer educated in animal behaviour may be able to see and guide owners and dogs for needed training.
- common courtesy and common sense
- Just like a hit and run with a vehicle, pet owners should not be allowed to have a bite and walk lol
- Accountability is key for new dog owners or dog owners that are emotionally unadjusted. I've seen time and time again angry people with angry dogs because dogs read and feed off energy. This is where compassion could play a part in creating safe spaces for everyone. So if they are angry and their dog is aggressive, maybe they shouldn't be at a dog park until they have completed therapy and dog training courses.



- Would need the owner and dogs info so owner must stick around. Just like at a car accident. Info needs to be shared.
 - Provides context to the bite. If the victim was provoking or endangering the owner. Helps identify if it was a random incident or of the animal was protecting itself or the owner
 - It should be the same mentality as if you get into a car accident.
 - The dog owner is responsible for training the dog. In some circumstances the dog is being teased or taunted and any dog in those situations would bite but if there's no instigation than the owner is at fault.
 - Because people shouldn't always assume it's the dogs fault. Dogs can feel free and maybe the person came up and approached the dog without the owners consent. You can't assume the dog with or will not bite based on its breed. Puppies bite and no one wants to get rid of them. Because we understand they are young and it's not in their control.
 - I personally have being falsely accused of my dog biting a person and if this rule had been in place at the time I believed I would have been immediately vindicated rather than having to go to court
 - This prevents false accusations about dog bites. Enforcement officers need to take into account both sides (handler and potential victim) to ensure that it is not a false accusation. Many dogs bite when they play, especially at off leash parks, and enforcement should be mitigated by handlers first. If necessary involving enforcement officers is acceptable but should not be first choice.
 - It shows courtesy and is ethical to do so. The dog owner has responsibility for their dog and must follow through with whatever support is needed.
 - should be a legal obligation
 - This is only beneficial to contact owner in regards to a need for more training.
 - If its very minor then no, if there's blood everywhere then yes. But also depends on the situation like if the dog was protecting the owner
 - Only if the dog bites a person.
 - its an assault and needs to be dealt with.. running away is like hit and run auto accidents.
 - It depends on the situations. For aggressive dogs yes because it should be made aware and to not hurt another.
 - "Any dog can be aggressive
 - I know many pit bulls that wouldn't hurt a fly
 - And would freak out if they had to wear a muzzle just for being a pit bull
 - I know one who is scared of his leash never mind a muzzle
 - Little dogs can be very aggressive
 - It depends on the owner and how the dog was raised that leads to it being aggressive or not
-
- Please don't issue the pit bulls must wear a muzzle"
 - Like any accident you should be there to make sure everyone is ok and being looked after



- If the dog bites a person, absolutely yes. If the dog bites another dog, it's not as straightforward as it may have been defensive. If serious harm (i.e. significant medical attention) is caused (large dog bites a small dog), the owners should be required to talk to an enforcement officer.
- The owner should be held accountable. The reason for the butting dog is lack of training
- An owner must take responsibility for their pet's behaviour, and similar to a car crash, should be obligated to stay at the scene until law enforcement arrives.
- If there is a bite that occurred you want to make sure the dog that bit the person/ animal is healthy. Also it is important to make sure the bitten individual is okay.
- The owner needs to take responsibility. It is the owners fault not the dogs.
- The owner of biting dog usually take off and leaves the victims to deal with bite
- That makes sense, you couldn't leave the scene of a car accident, you shouldn't leave the scene of an incident.
- just like a car accident. If your property (the dog/car) is responsible in an incident (like an attack/accident) you should be responsible to exchange information and for the damages that were caused.
- If someone were to get in a minor car accident, they would be required to stay put. Would it be the same for a dog bite? I'm not sure how clean or behaved the dog is. I might incur costs as a result of tending to an injury. The dog that bit should be liable, or at least willing to assist in a process that is brought on by their actions (or inaction, anyways.)
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their pets and should remain at the scene of a bite incident to relay information. It makes sense inherently in the spirit of responsible pet ownership
- It is the owners fault for such accident they should be liable and charged for their poor job at raising their animal
- It is the same as a car accident
- It would be necessary to obtain the information if the dog has previously been aggressive or recorded as biting before this incident and proper measures can be taken.
- Make it mandatory that they stay. Too often they leave and you hear of owners with terrible vet bills and no one to take responsibility
- However, I am completely against euthanizing the dog. There are multiple ways to improve behaviour, and they should be used.
- Generally. There may be circumstances that they can't but should at least provide contact information
- If someone has an "accident" in a car and property is damaged they are required to stay. If someone is hurt on your account you should have to stay.
- This is a no brainer, people should be accountable for public safety and the behavior of their beast. Hit and run is a criminal offence, why not bite and run?
- Hit and runs in my car are illegal. Why should I not take responsibility for my dog too?
- The owner should be held accountable.



- This is similar to a hit and run incident. Both parties should remain if there was a serious incident. If it was a minor incident or in the act of play the owners should talk and assess if this justifies bringing in law enforcement.
- "People ought to be responsible for their pets. If someone flees after a serious incident, it is the same as leaving a car accident you caused.
- People should look for a resolution first."
- It is the responsibility of an owner to participate
- This increases dog owner accountability and places blame on negligence in ownership rather than on the dog.
- To understand if this was an isolated incident or a progressive temperament of the dog and their environment/ upbringing
- It just makes sense
- I have witnessed attacks and then been very upset and frustrated when watching the owner of the attacking dog walk away with no repercussions. Also, I was scared to return to the park later, because the owner and vicious dog might still be going there.
- Treat it like a car accident. Someone is at fault some one is hurt both parties stay
- They should be liable for any vet costs incurred to your injured pet.
- Owners are entirely responsible for their pets.
- Exchange of contact as well as vet info
- because most likely the dog inwer does not know what or how to train there animal.
- No different then a car crash your dog hurt someone and there should be repercussions if it was serious! There is a difference between a dog attack biting and causing injusry and a dog that was playing with someone at will and causing an accidental injury though
- Responsible for pets actions, makes sense.
- 100% yes if you leave it's no different then a hit and run
- The owner of an animal that bites a human should be held accountable for the animal's actions. To do so, they need to share their contact information, etc.
- The responsibility should always fall on irresponsible owners.
- I think it's important for a dog owner to explain their side of the story I don't feel that dogs go out of their way to attack someone there's usually something behind it. And I don't believe in destroying them as the only answer retraining and working with a pet owner can go a long way
- Most bites are not malicious in nature, they are caused by someone disregarding the dogs boundaries or not understanding their body language.
- They have to be held responsible
- It makes sense. However if this ridiculous BSL comes in to effect your number of reports won't rise or fall. Because you want to muzzle a dog rarely involved in such things. Would it be taken seriously when the rat terrier attacks a pit bull (this DID happen to my pit bull) and draws blood? Because little dog owners reverse accuse and leave as soon as thier dog has attacked another dog or person.
- Find the truth behind the situation and what the owner is proposing to do to mitigate risks.



- Taking ownership for your animal if good ownership. Like a car accident intentional or an accident all parties need to be known and accountable. Pit bull breeds should be extended the same approach you would any other dog.
- The pit bull ban has me really upset. We owned one for 13 years. He was lovely, never bit anyone, was the kindness and gentlest do I have ever owned. The questions above were completely loaded and unfair. I would like to see the stats that in Calgary pit bull are so much more dangerous that they need this type of attention.
- Owners need to be accountable for their pets.
- If someone's dog attacked me or my dog I would want the person held accountable, not the dog.
- The owner is the one responsible.
- Dog owners are responsible for their pets just like if they were in a car accident and needed to stay to swap insurance. However, enforcement officers MUST be knowledgeable in dogs/dog behaviour and that breed specific dogs DO NOT correlate with aggression.
- All dog owners should demonstrate responsibility for their dogs and the actions/behaviours that occur and if it is helpful, staying at the scene should be required.
- The owner absolutely needs to stay and take responsibility for their dog. Also to ensure that the victim of the bite is tended to and ok!
- People are ultimately responsible for their pet's behavior. They should absolutely be required to remain at the scene of the incident.
- It is the humans fault if a dog bites someone so the owner should be there to be accountable.
- Better understand the situation and the dog
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their pet's actions.
- There also needs to be a way for the owner to remove the issue dog from the situation while they remain at the scene.
- It shouldn't be necessary, but that would require all owners to be responsible and unfortunately not all are
- It is the same as staying at the scene of an accident if you have a crash. Be responsible for the actions of your dog.
- The owners must take full ownership of their animals actions
- Animals, like vehicles, are considered property - and therefore, the owner needs to have full control of, and take responsibility for, them. Yes, I fully support a law requiring owners of offending pets to remain at the scene to process the incident.
- If no harm has been done then no, if injury to dog or human (obvious injury including blood), then bylaw is not required.
- and the owner should be punished not the dog.
- "Only if it is a severe incident and the intent was malicious.
- Dogs play and sometimes bite. It also depends if the dog has been triggered by another dog or human. Humans can be extremely cold hearted with animals and that is not okay."
- If someone receives a bite and the owner/animal leave, there is no way to identify the animal or person and leaves the victim in a difficult situation where you can't always pursue the matter. How



will an animal be declared a nuisance if the owner/animal never stay and information is never collected/recorded?

- If there is clear damage then yes. If it is just a dog scrum at the dog park and neither dog is really neuter then no.
- It needs to be treated like a vehicular accident. The owner receives fines for leaving the scene.
- How is this not already an expectation. A dog owner who leaves the scene of an incident should face a fine....no questions asked.
- I'd like to defend the situation if needed. A lot of people are uneducated and help themselves to meeting your dog without asking
- Absolutely. It is the responsibility of the owner, they have raised and trained the dog and should be aware of their potential aggression. If you are aware your dog is aggressive with other alphas for example, the owner should make the decision not to bring them to an off leash dog park until they have improved. If they choose to not do that and the dog bites, they should be held responsible.
- owner needs to give contact info to other party just like any other accident or injury
- I want to know if the dog is vaccinated or not. Also then maybe the dog can and owner can start a training program so the issue doesn't escalate
- I support this if it applies for EVERY breed of dog. Stop singling out certain breeds.
- Depending on severity. If medical care is needed then, yes
- Like a car crash, both parties should remain at the scene (as long as there is no emergency need - i.e. hospital/ambulance).
- If someone has to stay after a car crash where there has been damage, I don't understand why it shouldn't be the same.
- Be responsible for your animal
- Too many pit-and-runs
- It's the same as hit and run incidents in a vehicle. As an assault, it should be handled in a similar fashion. Again, euthanasia is a major contributing factor to dog owners fleeing the scene. This must be taken off the table as it is cruel and unusual punishment.
- As long as the attack has been controlled and nobody is severely hurt they should stay. If medical attention is required for an animal or person, phone numbers and names should be exchanged before anyone leaves. Staying at the scene allows an officer to get both sides of the story as well as see any evidence first hand. They can also talk to any potential witnesses.
- This ensures that proper care is taken to stop the biting from happening again, and allows important information to be shared (eg does the dog have rabies shot)
- yes, because then the chances of another incident become lower because the person has to deal with the consequences immediately instead of taking off
- There are always 2 sides to the story.
- Should only be for obvious injuries, such as bleeding.
- This would allow for a proper investigation and the possibility of an interim order.
- A dog's behavior is a reflection in part of the owner. The owner is responsible for the dog.



- That just seems like common sense, you hit someone with your car your not supposed to drive off. Your dog bits a person you should have to stay, that could be serious damage too.
- If the dog is at large the owner would not be there...then what??
- Of course the owner should stay if safe to do so. Like a car accident, you should remain at the scene.
- To many people at dog parks walk away from these incidents and/or provide false contact information without an authority figure present. The exception would have to be if the injured person or dog required immediate medical care.
- People are responsible for their pets actions, putting down "nuisance" dogs is a cop-out . It is the owner who is responsible. If their training is so poor they can't take their pet out in public they need to own up to that shortcoming, stay at the scene, accept fines etc.
- You are liable for what your dog has done, just as you are responsible to share information and stay on scene of a car crash, you should have to do the same for any dog biting incident
- Why? This is a very straight forward answer
- Its important that the owner be responsible but there are also situations where a dog was taunted, threatened etc and should not be automatically deemed at fault
- I assumed they did remain at the scene
- This should be a practice already in place.
- This allows an opportunity for all parties involved to share their perspective of the incident.
- Anytime a person or animal is bitten both parties should remain at the scene and a report should be made anyone caught not abiding should receive additional fines
- I feel this will hold people accountable for any pets who have the potential to have multiple offences
- I am of the mind that there are no bad dogs, just bad/challenged owners. So yes, I believe that the owner/walker should stay on scene.
- You can tell someone they need to remain at the scene but that doesn't mean they're going to do it. It is the dog owner who has issues, not the dog.
- It's good to hear both sides of the story as to what happened and they should be required to stay to discuss it with the officer so that the officer can get their contact information
- The person is ultimately responsible! It's like a car accident, of course the driver needs to remain at the scene, so does the dog owner!
- They should be held accountable if their animal bites someone.
- It's like a serious accident, you stay until authorities come.
- It's important to know the circumstances
- As with a car collision, one would hope all parties involved can provide swift information to resolve the issue. Remaining at the scene can help this along. When injuries are involved, its even more important.
- Otherwise it is like a hit and run
- A person needs to be able to provide the "other" side of the story. If they leave, the story will only be one-sided and not fair to either party involved.



- If the dog is not well trained it requires support. If the owner is unable to train and provide for the dogs welfare it should be against a bylaw to leave the scene to allow more penalties to build up so they can get retraining faster
- It is not the dogs fault, it is the owner, they should have accountability for their pets lack of discipline.
- Dogs are not animals and though we may train them to the best of our ability, in off-leash parks with large numbers of dogs and other natural stimulants (balls, frisbees, wild animals), incidents can happen, and they can also vary in severity. Most of the time if an incident occurs between two dogs, the severity is low and the humans should be able to talk it out. I say yes to this question but I don't see it being enacted unless an extreme event occurs. Hard to really say without looking at the data the city of Calgary has on this (if any?) because my opinion comes off anecdotal evidence.
- People should be responsible for their pets but the dog should not be subject to euthanasia because it hit a person or dog
- responsible ownership includes being accountable for your pet, period.
- I just like a hit-and-run you can't leave the scene until all your information has been given out so you can deal with it properly
- its the peoples responsibility to socialize their pets.
- Absolutely - this should be treated like a hit and run vehicular collision. There should be severe consequences for anyone who leaves.
- It should be a criminal act to leave the scene
- Dog health and vaccine status must be addressed so who ever was bitten can proceed with care accordingly.
- Dog owners need to take accountability for their dogs behaviour , regardless of breed , as aggression issues are fully related to training and care of the dog.
- As a dog owner and a good human it is the right thing to do
- Like any incident when there is a clear victim, all parties should remain at the scene.
- If they do not stay at the scene you may not know how to find them later
- Accountability
- Ownership responsibility, it's the right thing to do.
- Owners are responsible for their pets and their actions. They should definitely remain on at the scene.
- Yes, just like a car accident, people should have to be accountable in case of further complications.
- Need to know if the dog's shots are up to date.
- Not likely to happen, but would be helpful to determine why an incident occurred. Some owners are a greater problem than the animal.
- The situation should be heard from both sides in what led to the aggressor from the pet.
- Yes, but if the owner needs to restrain their dog or take them home or to their car to keep the dog and those around safe then that should be done first. Then they can return to the scene if necessary.
- The owner must take responsibility and provide information in case of vet bills etc



- Vet bills can be very expensive, any dog that causes harm to other dogs must be held financially responsible.
- ANY dog that bites needs to be dealt with. The owners causes it so there better be heavy fines and they should be required training and proof they took the dog to training after a bite occurs
- This would allow explanation as to what happened and if the owners' dog who bit the other person or animal is innocent then this should be used as explanation for their behaviour.
- It is the owners responsibility to the victim. Dogs learn behaviours from owners and if a dog it kms vicious it's because of a vicious owner.
- Yes as long as the dog has returned to a calm state and the stimulus inducing the attack has been removed from the site.
- Why should it be any different from a vehicle accident with injuries???????????????????? I didn't realize this rule wasn't on the books.
- owners need to take responsibility for their animals NO MATTER WHAT BREED
- It ensures that the owner is identified and it allows the owner to share their view of the incident (if their dog was being harassed, whether warnings were given to keep away from their dog, etc).
- If a dog bites a person or another dog it's the fault of the owner and the responsibility of them to remain at the scene and support the victim and speak with bylaw. Further, because you have not provided a place for comments regarding pitbulls I think its outrageous to condemn an entire breed of dog by enforcing more rules and muzzles for them compared to other dogs. Its pet owners responsibilities to properly train their animal and keep them on a leash or muzzle if needed. Its not fair to make every pitbull or every dog with some pitbull in it suffer. They should be treated with the exact same rules as other dogs, especially since there is no evidence that they do not cause more bites. At the very most the fine for a bite from a pit bull could be increased because of the severity of the bite.
- People need to be responsible for their pets
- Anything requiring medical attention yes o
- No different then a accident stay until resolved
- If a car was involved in an "incident" the owner must stay onsite until officers arrive. If a dog causes an "incident" the own must also stay. (I'm shocked that's not already a "rule".)
- Vet bills are expensive and the risk of the offender fleeing the scene is high.
- This is not limited to owners of pit bull or similar breeds but includes all dog bite incidents down to Chihuahua.
- Sure, depending on the severity of the incident. Also consider the recent rise of abuse of power and regulations and false reporting of incidents (dog-centric or not) because of, for lack of a better term "Karen-ism." Public thinking they are the judge, jury and executioner, when it comes to by-law enforcement will lead to false accusations, and non-issues turning confrontational. The city doesn't have the resources to properly enforce such ideas and this will lead to bigger issues.
- If someone is seriously injured the dog should be evaluated. If the "bite" left no visible signs of injury then I would consider that minor and both parties can walk away.



- I don't understand why they would be allowed to leave. Obviously, just like in any attack or accident, the person responsible should remain at the scene. And if they don't, there should be fine, just like fleeing the scene at a hit-and-run.
- I do support this because the owner is responsible for the dogs actions. If medical procedures are required for the attackers dog, the attackers owner should be at fault
- I have been involved in aggressive dog behavior in my neighborhood and in dog parks. Both incidents could have been resolved between the owners if they stuck around to talk. Stomping off and complaining to bylaw only increases neighborhood disruption and bad feelings. Dogs are by nature aggressive animals but there are often reasons for behaviors. Fines do not fix behavior by either the animal or their owners.
- See above
- Be responsible for your dog's actions!
- The dog owner can't run away from their problems. Separate them from the victim but the owner should be in contact with law enforcement right away, so they can be stopped and brought for questioning to receive fines and jail time. A vicious dog is always the owner's fault, not the dog's (or dog breed type).
- In case an order needs to be issued or a vet/ medical bill needs to be covered
- It is important to take responsibility for your dogs actions if the bites/injuries are serious enough.
- The owner of any dog that bites should be responsible.
- Owners should be responsible for their dog's behaviour at all times, that includes assuring that if their dog causes a incident they help those that have been harmed and give a fair and honest statement. The exception may be when they need to get away to secure their animal - but there should still be a report and attempt to contact.
- If any animal bites , the owner needs to be made aware of the next steps to guide and train the dog out of this behaviour
- I think every attack should be reported, so we can track dogs who are aggressive and prevent severe attacks against children, other animals and adults.
- Same with a hit and run. Obviously if I hit someone's car I'm going to stick around to give them my insurance information. It would be the same if my dog bit someone - I would wait to give them my information for further discussion about how to move forward.
- If injury occurs
- I believe an owner should take responsibility for a dog bite, but I do NOT believe that the dog is to be taken away, it is NOT the dogs fault for aggression, it is on the owner, therefore why traumatize the dog. Perhaps provide small funding for animal behaviourist to work with owners & aggressive dogs in severe cases.
- This is the same as if you are in a car accident. You need to stay and speak to the officer about the incident.
- If a dog bites a person or another dog it should be required they provide property insurance policy numbers or face fines in excess of \$5,000 and 100% of that sum should go to the victim and not the crown.



- only exception if a person or animal needs medical attention, then information must be left with someone at the scene
- Yes. The dog and incident is the owner's responsibility to handle. Similar to the expected standards in a car collision.
- It's crucial for that person to provide context for the incident and take ownership of the consequences.
- People need to take responsibility of their pets. Stay and provide your information. This should be no different than leaving a scene of an accident
- It would allow for more effective and efficient information gathering. First hand accounts are always best and even then people's memories are always flawed. If people go home, talk to others then they will have altered views of events.
- Contact information for follow up legal concerns regarding medical matters, loss of income, damage to pet, etc.
- Dog bites are dangerous. As a small dog owner I want repercussions for dogs who bite, whether the bite a dog or a human.
- I explained it but your website sucks, I had to reload for captcha and it lost my answer
- Yes or at least provide accurate contact information
- I think all claims made to bylaw must be made immediately and both parties must remain on the scene for an officer to arrive. The individual that was injured needs to tell the other person immediately for minor injuries unless medical attention is required.
- It would be similar to An auto accident.
- Yes if the other party feels the need to have the cops involved then yes. How else would you get your aide of the story across if the cops are going to be involved anyway.
- should the animal need to be tested for disease it is necessary to know where the animal lives
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dog's actions.
- The victim needs to ensure the dog has no medical issues/diseases, and the owner should be held accountable. Similar to a hit and run. Take responsibility.
- Best way to keep track of these things and identify the REAL problem - bad pet owners.
- Taking accountability for your pet is important. People want to know who's dog bit theirs and why so stay at the scene or return after putting your pet at home or something so you can share info and any important things that can explain the situation is important. The officers may need both sides of the story too
- Accountability needs to be taken. Both sides of story need to be given.
- In the case of injury, regardless of the victim or the circumstances, proper measures must be taken to ensure a proper followup. I believe that this is essential to keeping dog-owners and non-dog-owners safe.
- People need to be responsible for their pets
- There would need to be a quick response from an enforcement officer given Calgary's weather! Dog owners are responsible for their dog's/dogs' behaviour and should be available to explain the



situation. Often the other dog involved has instigated the incident and almost compelled the "guilty" dog to react!!! A lot of irresponsible owners out there especially those of smaller dogs!

- If severe injury occurs to the attacked dog in which costs money to treat the owner of the dog that attacked should be responsible for those costs.
- Ultimately it is the owners responsibility to care for their dog & explain the situation.
- Not really a yes/no question as too many variables. People and animal safety and care would take priority over staying at the scene.
- This feels like a common sense action;
- The owner of the dog who bites someone/something should be held responsible for the dogs actions. This may include vet or medical bills if needed. They should be charged if they flee the scene with their animal.
- The owner is responsible to share information with the injured individual
- In some cases it isn't known the severity of a bite until some time later. What may seem like a small bite may in fact have dire consequences. I think sharing basic contact information would suffice in most cases. I have no idea what turn around time is for an enforcement officer to arrive on scene but as an alternative perhaps having those involved submit online reports of what happened to be followed up with an enforcement officer later.
- I believe that the owner should be held accountable in ensuring that the other dog is safe and receives proper medical treatment, and gives information if follow up is necessary.
- Two sides to every story. If the owner was being attacked by the other person and dog protected etc etc
- It's good to see both sides of the story. This way the owner can give their side of the story and see who is to blame for the dogs misbehavior
- My sisters dog was bit twice at the Sue Higgins Off Leash park; vet bill in excess of \$2,000. Neither owner stayed at the park or offered assistance. One was a dog walker with too many dogs.
- It is the owners fault not the dogs
- "As is the case with any incident, both accounts of what happened (victim and aggravator) are needed.
- I would add that there should be language in such a bylaw that allows for a dog owner to sufficiently remove their dog from a high stress situation so it can calm down (ie/ leave an off leash dog park but remain in a vehicle in a parking lot next to the park)"
- Simple. It's the owner's responsibility.
- Should be the same as a traffic collision due to the liability along with leave the scene tickets, etc...
- That just seems like common sense. Like a fender bender car incident.
- Just like any accident, we have to remain at the scene or write a report later. Hopefully the two parties could try to settle things on their own first.
- Yes because there are two sides to every story and it is used in human criminal law, it should be the same for dog bite offences
- how else do they get information of the offender?
- Of course the owner should wait and explain the situation.



- There are so many reasons why a dog could be aggressive. Most of the time it is out of fear for previous abuse. Bylaw should hear the story of the owner and dog to determine if the dog is vicious or has history of abuse.
- The owner should be responsible for their dogs behaviour
- People often disappear as quickly as possible to avoid having to be liable if their dog attacks or bites another animal, however in the case of injury they should get medical attention right away and might not be possible to wait at the scene for an enforcement officer
- This will enhance accountability
- The person should be held responsible for the injuries incurred by their animal onto another. If there are phones, photos should be taken as well.
- only if the attack results in an injury that is needed to be seen by a vet or doctor
- It's too easy for someone to walk away from the scene and not be found again. They should treat it just like any other accident and remain at the scene.
- The dog owner/dog needs to be monitored so that this doesn't happen again, and possibly made to participate in behaviour classes with their pet and given an order to keep their dog muzzled. Also, they need to be able to give evidence and their side of the story. Depending on the incident they should be held responsible for paying the vet bills or hospital bills of the person or other dog injured.
- "Yes just like an accident you need
- To stay at the scene"
- too many dirt bags giving false info.
- Obviously?
- So many incidents of this nature are 'hit and run'. Dog owners and managers eg pro dog walkers, need to take responsibility for the behaviour of their dogs. Leaving the scene should be an offence
- This is 100% necessary. Its the same situation with children hurting other children, car accidents on Calgary roads, or any other form of offence or accident against another vehicle, child, or pet.
- Owners should be held responsible for their animal's behaviour
- If a dog is aggressive or harms another creature, the owner of said dog should be responsible. The way I see it, if you leave the scene of an accident you're fined, so what's the difference here?
- People need to be responsible for their dogs behavior.
- There are two sides to every story and context is critical. Witnesses should remain as well
- Just like an accident with a car
- It's just like with any other situation where someone is hurt. It shows that the owner is holding some responsibility for what happened, not fleeing the scene.
- Assuming there is a place to remove the dog from the situation
- If there is visible injuries yes, if not there shouldn't be enough reason to most likely waste people's time. Common sense
- This is the definition of responsible ownership.



- Allows them to share their side of the story. The exception being if their dog was also bitten or injured and they leave to acquire immediate veterinary assistance, but they call law enforcement within a reasonable timeframe to schedule an appointment to follow up.
- Unless emergency vet or hospital for a person requires them to leave the scene.
- I think this is important for both owners to stay on scene. I own a Staffordshire bull terrier, and because of her breed she easily could be at fault even though the other breed could have exhibited the behaviour.
- This already exists. Whether people honor it or not is another matter. So really??? Calling it a rule now will make that better?
- Taking responsibility is a pet owners duty. May not be the proper spot for this but come on Calgary, it's not a breed issue, it's an owner issue. Don't blame breed specific dogs. My vet said he's been bitten more often and with broken sling by smaller dogs.
- Duh
- Need to know we're to find the animal
- Pet owners should take responsibility if their animal is involved in an incident - whether their animal has bitten another animal/person, or where they or their animal has been bitten.
- leaving the scene of a dog attack should be penalized harshly, even if it wasn't a bad attack. it should be up to both parties whether charges will be pursued
- My dog has been bitten multiple time's and the people never stayed and ran off while I was tending to my wounded dog.
- The owner is liable for their dog and should lawfully be required to remain on the scene and identify themselves
- Same as getting in a car accident and if someone leaves should be treated as a hit and run
- It's common decency.
- Yes with reservations. Sometimes staying on the scene is dangerous for both dog and human, esp when the party that may be at fault is endangered by remaining. In my more than ten years of dog ownership in this City, I have seen vastly more aggressive non-pit bull dogs (golden retrievers, esp) behaving badly with other dogs and their owners tend not to notice or care, but they themselves do get aggressive when their dog does something wrong.
- This is similar to leaving the scene of a vehicle accident. However, there must be consideration of nuance, not automatic condemnation of the biting dog (e.g. aggressively running other dog), or no one will comply.
- hold pet owners accountable for their pets
- They need to explain why dog did it .Maybe not dogs fault but dog being teased or other reasons .there usually a reason .
- Yes they should be required to as the animal can be assessed at that time and the Incident can be properly investigated
- At minimum an exchange of information should be required. But the owner may need to remove the dog from the situation, before waiting around for authorities, if they have been called.



- If the dog owner is not required to remain it would be extremely difficult to track them down later to determine whether there have been previous incidents with the animal and to seek compensation.
- I don't think law enforcement is a requirement for this sort of incident, the person should share contact information. If someone is really hurt you kinda need to go to the hospital or vet
- I have been in a situation similar and I remained on scene and accepted the fine and all preventative measures necessary to avoid another scenario happening. (Dog triggers, past trauma, new dog to the family, pain, etc)
- I think the majority of responsibility comes from the owner, and that applies to all areas that have been discussed; an owner ought to stay if their pet has injured another animal, an owner is responsible for training their dog. Bylaws that support owner responsibility, I support; bylaws that stigmatize a breed, I do not.
- The owner needs to take accountability if their dog is improperly trained
- Once a person is gone it may prove impossible to identify.
- As an owner you need to take responsibility for what just happened. That being said, you should not fear that your pet (family member) will be taken from you. For so many their pets are their family, their children, you wouldn't remove a child because it got into a fight with another kid so why are we treating animals any different?
- The owner needs to be held responsible.
- Hold people accountable and provide relevant history and information in case vet bills arise
- A responsible owner should insure that their dog is safe from a situation that would make the dog bite. ie. keeping other dogs and people away from their dog. In past reports the dog is always shown to be at fault. Staying at the scene will make for a more accurate account of the incident. Example: If at any time a dog runs into another dog and that dog reacts by a bite. Who is at fault? The dog out of control by running in or the dog that reacts? Also people who insist in coming in to pet a dog they do not know and being told repeatedly by the owner to not touch their dog.
- If someone becomes injured it is the responsibility of the dog owner to stay until all is dealt with to avoid misinformation
- It's like a hit and run. Pretty [removed] if you run away because your dog bite someone
- I think it's absolutely crucial a dog owner stays to share their contact information so that going forward actions can be taken and tracked if there is an incident, versus them running off and then they could potentially be a repeat offender.
- My dog has been bit before and the owners took off, I would have liked to talk to them and ask them not to bring their ball aggressive dog to the dog park with a ball
- This is common sense. Only criminals leave the scene if they or someone/something under their responsibility leaves after hurting someone. Is there no rule on this? Really?!?
- This will ensure accountability and responsibility.
- This would only work if the enforcement officer can respond in a timely manner. I also find it critical that the enforcement officer needs to investigate the true cause of the bite. All too often dogs are protecting themselves from a person or animal that has made them feel (I.e. dogs off leash who run at dogs on leash).



- Because it attacked/caused injury. It should be treated the same as a car accident or physical attack by another person.
- Owners need to have accountability.
- "But I understand why this is scary for the owner. Calgary's stance towards dogs is very adversarial compared to other places I've lived in Europe, the States, and B.C. For example, when we first moved to Calgary, we brought our dog downtown for Canada festivities but were told even though he was on-leash and well behaved, we'd have to take him home if we were staying in Olympic Plaza. Meanwhile, people were smoking all around us but that wasn't considered a problem even though, it was a much greater health risk than our dog. The barking by-law also seems exceptionally subjective. We live across from a park and when people take their dogs there ours will often bark, not aggressively but by way of greeting and wanting to play. I've worried multiple times that one of our older neighbors might call by-law even though barking is a completely normal behavior.
- So as dog owners we know the scales are tipped against our dogs."
- In our park, there have been a few incidents on dog biting and owners leaving area or providing wrong data. People should remain in place as the victim is trying to access damage that can't be done in short order or damage is not know for a few days. Plus people need to be responsible for their actions and of their pets.
- I think it is important to keep track of bites, intentional and unintentional. but to also understand the nature of the bite (why, and how). Which could hopefully lead to the owner of the dog who bit to take that dog to obedience training.
- Same as if you hit someone with your car. If your dog bites someone you should have to stay so that the police can assess the situation. It protects both parties.
- People, not the dogs, need to be held responsible. A dog bites from poor training.
- the person/animal that gets injured could have aggravated the dog. It is best to get both sides just like a traffic accident. There are always 2 sides to the story.
- if the dog is biting animals/people the owner should be required to provide contact information as they may need assistance in better training or providing care for their dog to ensure better behavior in the future.
- Unless the incident is minor & the owners come to an amiable resolution (ie exchanging information & willing to cover vet expenses).
- In case of a disagreement between parties best if both parties are available.
- I only said yes because I think if something should happen to the person/animal that was bit then the owner of the dog should be made aware.
- It is the dog owners responsibility to be present if anyone has been in danger/injured by their dog
- I think as a dog owner you have the responsibility to remain at the scene. However, I do believe every situation is unique - if you or dog are in an unsafe location then I believe placing some distance maybe needed. Do not flee but ensure all parties are safe. Things happens tempers can fly and situations can escalate so I think it's not so black and white sometimes
- Essentially sounds like the same as a fender bender. Of course I would want the person to remain at the scene of the crime. As a responsible dog owner, I have been in situation that point to there also



being irresponsible non-owners who can taunt, surprise, or harm animals. There are always two sides to a story.

- The owners need to understand what the impact that their pet had on the other animal
- Same as a vehicle incident. Share information. If you require an officer on scene one can be requested.
- Owner is at fault for not properly training and or socializing dog
- They should be fined for leaving the scene and should be forced to pay the victim dogs vet bills.
- Of course someone needs to stay at the scene and talk with an enforcement officer.
- As a responsible dog owner, it should be required to ensure all involved are unharmed/understand the incident. However, enforcement officers attending these occurrences should have the appropriate training and understanding of dog behaviour in order to correctly mediate the situation.
- Dogs are animals. Situations happen during play time, or adrenalin rushes. But it is the owners responsibility 100% of the time.
- Once the dog is safe and secured yes. Sometimes you need to avoid further issue and secure the situation first
- Accountability
- It is a way for dog owner to take responsibility for pet
- I believe everyone should equally held responsible for their dogs action. I would like this also to apply to the smaller dogs that have the highest bite/attack rate but is not reported because they don't do damage. A bite is the same aggressive behaviour why should one breed be penalized more than another due to its size.
- If they can't stay on scene there should be a way to immediately provide contact info to all parties involved
- If a dog bites another person or animal the owner should already remain at the scene of the incidence and I'm surprised if they don't already have to stay. I feel it's essentially almost the same as leaving the site of an accident, i.e owners should be charged or fined if they leave.
- But sometimes they have to go to calm the situation and get the dog away from the other animal. In which case, provide contact details.
- Accountability needs to be with the owner or handler to
- If an incident happens then both parties need to share their side of the story.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions. If your dog is not normally a reactive dog then you should be worried about staying.
- "As long as both sides are heats openly without prejudice, dogs normally do not bite unless provoked or threatened and there for should not be held accountable if pushed to that point.
- We are too quick to judge the animal and not the person that has been attacked or the person that owns the animal."
- Just like a vehicle accident you stay and exchange what happened. Fines should double if they leave the scene
- If your dog is vicious and bites someone or another animal, you should absolutely be responsible to ensure your contact info is given and should be required to take responsibility.



- For any dog breed that bites in any scenario.
- This should be law. If a person injures someone with their vehicle, they must remain at the scene. The same should be standard for dog bites.
- This is what should already be happening
- It's against the law to flee an accident, so why not the same for a dog incident where the dog bites
- If a dog does bite someone else or another dog, there must be a story. Both the victim and dog/dog owner may be at fault or it was a genuine accident. Hear them out and act appropriately.
- Just like vehicle accident, remain on scene until required
- For sure if they bite another person- even just to provide info on the dogs health/vaccines etc (ie rabies, tho person should get vaccine anyways). Though it may not be the dog owners FAULT it is their responsibility. Ex. What if the dog bite & injured then hand of a man/woman who was a surgeon- there's serious implications for the injured individual.
- "I believe this important so that both parties can tell their story.
- Also it would most likely make it easier for the enforcement officer to do their due diligence for the investigation."
- If you get into a car accident you're required to stay. I say if the person leaves, there should be further charges.
- Owners should be responsible for their dogs.
- Dog Owner must fully participate in taking responsibility for all of pets actions on private and public property
- The owner is responsible for their pet and should answer for it. By leaving the scene and not giving their contact information, they are trying to avoid responsibility for their pet.
- If a person is involved in a traffic accident they must remain at the scene and provide all necessary information to the other parties/ enforcement officer. This should be no different for an animal attack on a person or other animal. If the person leaves with out providing info than it should be deemed a 'hit and run' type of situation with more severe consequences.
- Just like accidents you MUST stay at the scene or at least provide identification to report from home.
- Provide context to the incident
- There needs to be communication so victims of the attack can report the dog and see if there were previous incidents
- there is no excuse for dog attacking outside of playing (not real biting). If this occurs an owner should have to undergo training to learn how to take care of their pet.
- I believe it is important for all parties to remain present to provide testimony to the incident, as well as collect eye-witness testimony. As dog fights occur for many reasons and can be skewed by each party, it is important to get information close to the incident time.
- Except when the dogs are playing with each other as sometimes they place their teeth on one another, this is still play and not an act of aggression.
- Given that the dog can be kept a safe distance from other potential conflicts until the officer arrives. This may not be feasible in large off lease parks with many dogs where a small fenced incident waiting pen may need to be constructed.



- It is the pet owners responsibility
- For liability purposes
- I also feel this should be taken more seriously over severe bites. Some are minor and would not require this action. If a dog severely bites another dog they should help with vet bills etc.
- Owners should be held accountable for their dogs actions.
- Same as a car accident. It is the responsible thing to stay on the scene. If they can return the dog to the home and return very quickly that could be ok too. (So the victim isn't further traumatized by continued presence of dog).
- Thw dog owner is responsible for the training and handling of a dog. Therefore, the entire responsibility of the bite should be on the owner.
- Any responsible pet owner would stay and share information. This law could help enforce this for the pet owners that would leave.
- It can be hard to get id and info later. Especially if trauma is involved
- A responsible dog owner would provide this information regardless.
- It would enable a discussion of how the bite event happened and what the owner can do to prevent recurrences. Sadly, it would also be hard to enforce.
- It should be a responsibility of a responsible pet owner to take ownership of there pet as they would for a child. If damage is done they should have to pay for what there pet has done
- That should be the case in any situation or accident. **PITBULLS ARENT THE PROBLEM OWNERS ARE THE PROBLEM**
- Leaving would only give the impression of guilt and not taking responsibility, owners need to be held accountable for their pets.
- Dog bites / attacks should be assessed, however: this should be with ANY breed. Not just pitbulls. There's no need for hateful prejudice and rhetoric, most pitbulls are typically calmer than other dogs when trained and cared for properly.
- It's ok to ensure people are ok
- Unless if people or animals need to leave to seek medical or veterinary attention, owners should remain to ease follow up
- So many times the owner leaves the scene with the dog and can't be found. It should be made a rule that they remain on scene. If they break this rule, there should be fines and penalties (I.e taking the dog)
- I am shocked this isn't already in place to be honest
- Only if the dogs do not require immediate medical attention.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs actions.
- What do you mean explain? Of course one should share contact info - if your a responsible dog owner one would.
- absolutely, in most cases people run because they know it is their fault.
- Ya obviously. The person should be held accountable.
- Accountability and contact information - same as any other injury accident requires



- Owner needs to accept responsibility for their dog
- The owner of the dog is the one responsible and should both be willing and compelled to make sure the other party is safe before departure.
- The incident should be investigated. There is always two sides to a story. It is not always the dogs fault for reacting the way it did.
- if the bite is severe where it causes medical aid then as a responsible dog owner they should step up and make sure everyone is ok and their dog takes the correct training to avoid that in the future.
- Same as a car accident.
- There has to be context. If a dog bites someone who is attacking an owner or a dog, I see no issue here. If a dog bites a person for no reason this is a problem. Dogs bite each other all the time for many reasons, every situation is unique and should be viewed as such.
- It is similar to hitting a car, I see no reason the dog owner would be able to just leave after their dog causes someone harm
- With a caveat-it may not be safe to do so. Sometimes the priority may be to get the dog away from the situation.
- If a dog bit me and the owner did not remain at the scene, I would make certain that I obtained the information myself.
- It's a dangerous situation. If you get into an accident or hit someone while driving, you are expected to stay at the scene.
- People with dangerous dogs often “disappear” before Information can be obtained! If they leave the scene and are found later, a very, very hefty fine with NO EXCEPTIONS AND NO EXCUSES will be accepted!
- As long as the dogs involved are safe
- I think the owner has full responsibility of their dog and I don't think they should put the dog down, I think they should evaluate the owner to discuss them to be able to have ownership rights on pets.
- But allow them to place themselves and their dog in a safe space away from all others
- This should be a no brainer thing to do in the first place
- A owner is responsible for a dogs behavior and should remain at the scene
- Often people whose dog or person gets bit tell the one sided story. At times the person who reports it is at fault! The other person often leaves to avoid having their dog taken and potentially euthanized (which you obviously want to do). If it was properly investigated and addressed when people remain on scene, then dogs that react appropriately and aren't to blame wouldn't be at risk but people who are at fault would be held accountable.
- The owner needs to ensure that the other parties are okay.
- It is morally right
- So the owner can explain the incident from their point of view
- Injuries or vet, bills could be resolved, the dog that instigated the incident should be held accountable.
- Charges and fines for those pet owners who leave the scene.



- many times it is impossible to find out where the person/dog live after leaving the scene of an incident. This should be no different than an auto accident.
- Dependant on how severe a bite I don't think this is something to enforce and waste tax money on. For example if it should be medically assessed then yes. if it is a minor nip or play bite i do not think contact information is necessary.
- Accountability for your dogs actions
- However if the other person requires medical attention and the owner is taking them for that then no
- or at least be required to provide contact information before leaving
- Only if reasonable. If medical reasons compel the owner of the dog to help the victim there should be some flexibility
- Responsible pet owners would stay, irresponsible do not. Hard to enforce.
- Often times people leave because they're afraid their dog will automatically get put down. I would only support this if the law enforcement officer remained impartial and took both statements without judgement. Perhaps an animal trainer or rescue personnel should be required to go to the scene with the officer.
- So the issue can be addressed and resolved.
- that is just the right thing to do, same thing applies to vehicles incidents, right?
- Like a car accident, if you have nothing to hide, you should stay at the scene. Hand out fines if they don't .
- My old lab was bitten three times. Only one owner paid her vet bill. This should be MANDATORY or lose their dog.
- Having dog owners own up to their dogs behaviour will help change some patterns of behaviour. However, I do not believe this would be enforced very well, as can be seen in the example set forth by cyclists who hit cars.
- There is nowhere in this survey to put this comment, so I'm putting it here: please add a "button" to the 311 app to report nuisance animals... it's not at all obvious how to report this on the app.
- Often problem owners leave and the issue never gets addressed and the person could be the one that is responsible for many incidents
- The owner of the dog should take full responsibility for the actions of their pet. By providing information this will hold the owner accountable for the dog's actions and allow the victim ability to follow with any additional cost.
- We still need to keep responsibility on the owner for any dog related accidents.
- Yes and No, while getting contact information and info about the attack is incredible important, keeping a dangerous dog at the scene might lead to more injury.
- "I think it depends. If the dog owners are respectful and give their information they don't need to stay.
- Our puppy was bit by another dog and the lady was great. She paid for the vet visit that included stitches near the eye.
- But I also get that some owners wouldn't provide their actual correct information."
- Your dog is your responsibility



- just like a car crash - injury done - need to be accountable
- Same as works for vehicle accidents
- a fine should also be placed for failing to remain at the scene of an incident.
- If a dog bites and causes actual injury yes (example, draws blood) however when dogs play they do bite and nip, some owners see this as aggression when it is not. In the case of playing, and no injuries received I do not believe they should have to wait for an enforcement officer.
- The owner of the dog, should always own up to their faults
- Common sense/courtesy
- Yes they should stay and if they can't because their animal was hurt they should be giving someone their phone number to contact.
- For me it depends. If a dog bites a person, then yes. If a dog bites a squirrel or other animal (other than another dog in a public place) then no. If a dog bites another dog and the bitten dog requires veterinary care, then yes.
- Need to take responsibility for their dogs actions. Dogs can be dangerous and people need to take responsibility
- owner to be held accountable
- This is simply common curtesy
- The dog owner must be responsible for the actions of their animal
- "I agree with staying at the scene IF it was serious enough, dogs have a language that most people dont understand and I feel that it gets over looked quite a bit, these things shouldnt be looked at just ""a dog bite"" and the situation should be evaluated more.
- I would like to add since there is no comment box for the bully breed pol I will rant in this box. I think that it is arrogant of the city of Calgary to say that bully breeds ""strength allows the potential for a more severe bite"". WHEN THAT ISNT TRUE. All research doesnt support this, German shepards, Dobermans, Greatdanes have a stronger bite force even Golden retrievers have a similar bite force to the bully breeds. Just because they may look scary doesnt mean they are (even though in my opinion they are the cutest). I would suggest instead of singling out one breed and humiliating them I would start offering more affordable training for people who have dogs that have some sort of behavior issues and offer more education to people buying or adopting for all breeds. I have been bit only by little dogs and the owners just laugh about it because its little THOSE kind of dog owners need to take their dogs to training. Stop initiating fear into people because thats what this is doing instead EDUCATE."
- The behaviour of a dog is ALWAYS the responsibility of an owner. Bad behaviour is not breed specific in dogs the same way It isn't COLOR specific in humans.
- "Any person with integrity would take responsibility and do this anyway.
- What you are not addressing in this survey is that most dog incidents happen because the owners of the dog do now know how to control their dogs and get dogs over their competence level and do not understand dog behaviour. Not all owners pit bull owners should be punished because of the ignorance of a few."



- However, the rule needs to allow for the possibility that the dog owner may need to remove the dog from the scene and secure them to prevent further harm. This would not remove any responsibility from the owner for ensuring they identify themselves and speak with enforcement officers after.
- This would provide the opportunity for both people to provide their story. Some dog bites are human-initiated and not the dog's fault.
- I think if a dog bites someone, it's best for the owner of said dog and the victim to both stay put at the scene if possible! If not possible, exchange contact information. There maybe a reasonable explanation to this attack or it maybe a misunderstanding. Its most likely bad training. Again there's no bad animals, just bad owners. Its not the pets fault.
- Any dog, if it bites anything or anyone should be euthanized immediately.
- It is similar to a car accident. You cause damage to someone else, you stay to face the consequences. Otherwise, it's a bite and run
- The dog is your own responsibility, any damage it may cause is therefore your responsibility to have sorted (much like vehicle collisions).
- **DO NOT EUTHANIZE THE DOG!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!** the Pet's OWNER is solely responsible for their animal's actions. Their ruling should be to put the dog into obedience/reactive/whatever training suits their behavioural issues. There then should be a follow up with a PROFESSIONAL dog trainer to ensure the dog's behavior is improving/if the training needs to continue. All of the above should be paid BY THE OWNER. I've had enough of owners not taking responsibility for their animal's actions. Time to start holding the OWNER accountable and not the dog!!!! FINES. WILL. DO. NOTHING. Training will educate the owner and make the animal a better domestic pet.
- If it is severe enough. There is an obvious difference between play fighting between dogs and a vicious bite. However people are afraid to die to euthanasia which should be removed.
- Any breed of dog can be aggressive and may need further training to prevent these instances
- The owner has to take full responsibility of the dogs damages.
- Dog bites are direct reflection of the owners training and control, so the owner must be held responsible.
- The majority of dog bites occur because the owner of the dog has not treated the animal properly, and the owner must be held responsible for anything their pet does
- But - we've been attacked a few times and in those situations - the victim usually wants to get away from the vicious dog and the irresponsible owner asap so not sure how this would work.
- I believe both parties should be able to share their side of things so there's no miscommunication in regards to what happened
- As a pet owner you are responsible for the actions of your pet. If your dog bites someone or another animal you need to ensure that you have taken appropriate action and follow up.
- If medical care is needed for the animal the dog owner who bit should give contact info in case they need to pay the bill
- They should be there, just like a car accident.
- Like a car accident, makes sense. Difficult though if there is just the owner and the dog, because that means the dog has to stay there too.



- This is a reasonable amendment. It would be helpful to have the phone number of enforcement officers posted at off leash areas.
- Yes, that is the most direct source of information regarding the animals history.
- 100% this needs to be required.
- If the owners dog bites someone he should be held accountable at stay at the scene.
- It's difficult to identify dogs and owners who leave the scene
- Self explanatory. Same reason someone involved in a car accident needs to stay on scene.
- If a car accident requires you to exchange information then a dog bite should too.
- That should be a very obvious thing to do that any responsible pet owner would want to do! Again animal attacks have more to do with a horrible upbringing than anything. Please stop at ways to punish the dog and more ways to take away rights of a [removed] person.
- "If a persons dog bites someone, it's the responsible thing to do to take care of it and have it documented.
- I also believe owners who flee the scenes of bites, or refuse to share information should lose their rights to own a dog due to irresponsible ownership."
- If the bite is serious enough that the victim feels an enforcement officer should be involved I believe they should be required to provide contact information as it could happen again and there should be a history
- Accountability for a pet's and your own actions should be a given.
- Yes, but how will you enforce this?!
- I would consider it like a hit and run. Once information is exchanged the parties can leave. If someone leaves without giving information they can face punishment
- Very much yes. So many owners don't believe a dog's actions are their responsibility. "It was just an accident. He's never like this." A strong message needs to be sent that difficult dogs shouldn't be at dog parks or at large.
- I have heard of many incidents where there has been dog altercations at dog parks and the owners involved do not stay around. If you hit someone else's car you are required to stay at the scene, the same should be applied to if your dog causes an accident
- the owner is liable and should share info just like a car accident.
- A dog owner must take responsibility for the behaviour of their dog
- This is vital to collecting information such as vaccination history, behavioural history and contact information. If your dog routinely bites people/other animals then you are responsible if you are taking the dog out of the home and into the world. The owners need to be held responsible.
- just seems neighbourly
- Responsible dog owners should always be with their dogs.
- Not all dogs will get "along" however if there is a bite involved sometimes the severity of the injuries cannot be determined or there is an overreaction and there may be no injuries.
- When any type of accident happens, a person should remain to be questioned.
- When my husband attacked the owner didn't even apologize.



- My granddaughter was bit by a dog and the owner took off, leaving her traumatized. That was completely irresponsible. By the way, it was NOT a pitbull.
- Too many pitbull owners run away after their dog bites another person or animal. It would be about time for it to be a requirement for them to stay.
- We need to know the truth if it was aggression or if it was just over a toy. Or an intact male being an [removed] to another dog and being to humpy.
- This is just basic respect and responsibility for an owner. This could, in the long run protect a pet and the individual involved - to understand history of dog, ensure shots are up to date....
- It's like a car accident, information should be exchanged in case further complications ensue (e.g. dog is not up to date on rabies vaccine)
- for the dog, it may not have been their fault
- we must share information to ensure the animal did not have any deceases, had all it shots
- If a dog bites someone it is necessary to share your information and make sure the person gets the medical help they need and this isn't a reoccurring problem with the same owner and dog. However what THIS bill is doing is WRONG. You do not have more "bite cases" with pit bulls in Calgary or surrounding areas. Singling out an entire breed for arbitrary reasons is disgusting and wrong. The entire province of Ontario has been trying to repeal the BSL ban that has been forced upon them for years. The only thing this will do is make more people go into hiding with their dogs. Most pit bull owners know their dogs and their responsibility to those dogs and in my personal experiences take their role in the dog community much more seriously than ones that own small dogs. I am actually appalled that is bill is even being put up.
- Yes, but only for severe bites that have caused obvious distress.
- I can't think of a single reason why a dog owner shouldn't have to stay. They are responsible for their dog, no matter how tiny or small the bite issues can arise at a later time, they should be responsible for any vet or other bills incurred due to the bite.
- both parties should remain at the scene, however the full story should also be captured, i have seen a german shepard bite someone when they were being aggressively teased
- It is important as this animal is your responsibility. You are liable for its actions.
- Many take off - they need to be there to accept responsibility and see what their dog has done
- Sometimes there are two sides to each story. Would be good to make sure all events are correctly recorded.
- It only make sense that someone be responsible for the actions of their animal in the same way they have to be responsible for their actions when driving a vehicle.
- It is the responsible thing to do. Just like any other accident.
- If it is not legal to leave the scene then it is more likely that people will stay.
- Unless there is a good reason to leave the scene, for example, to deescalate the situation and calm the dog down. The owner should be required to leave contact info with a witness.
- Owner accountability
- Like a car accident, if there is a bite the owner should share their contact information
- Who could enforce this?



- tracking down a dog owner to recoup costs to your injured dog can be impossible - or to file reports against the attacking dog if you can't find or don't know the owners residence
- A Dog owner MUST be responsible of the pet's actions
- I feel it is necessary as the person who was bitten (or owner of the animal that was bitten) deserves to know that the situation will be handled properly in the case of infection of the bite. It is also a good thing so that enforcement officers can see that pit bulls are not the majority of bites, but all dogs equally as it is not the fault of the dog, but the fault of the owner for lack of proper training.
- It should be required to provide your information should an incident occur as part of being a responsible dog owner
- No different then a traffic accident, they must be held accountable, or at the least, explain their side of the story
- "As a dog bite victim, it would be great to have the animals medical records. To ensure the dog gets proper obedience training. And a possible fine.
- As a pet owner, it is my responsibility to ensure I have a well behaved and socialized animal."
- an investigation must be held, evidence of foul play must be presented.
- Pet owners should be responsible for their pets and if an incident occurs you must stay to make sure everyone is ok and offer help.
- If the dog has harmed another animal or person the owner should be assessed as a good dog owner and get their dog to obedience school. Failure to do so should be taking the dog away and placing it in a shelter or better home
- The owner should be responsible for any medical/vet bills. A friend of mine had a \$6000 vet bill when her service dog was attacked at an off leash park. The owners of the dog took off leaving them on the hook for the bill. (this happened in Edmonton)
- It's the responsible dog owner thing to do
- Itcis called owner responsibility.
- In some cases. It may not be safe for one of said parties to remain there however (dog is still aggressive, retaliation, etc.)
- Owner needs to be responsible
- Just like a hit and run
- It is the equivalent to a hit and run if a dog owner flees the scene following a dog bite/attack
- Have seen too many times where the owner of the dog who has bitten took off immediately.
- Evidence/context is necessary so they should remain at the scene if safe to do so.
- Both parties should remain at the scene and give their account of the incident. Many times it is not the dogs fault!
- To clarify, as a witness, the circumstances that brought on the incident
- The owner of a potentially dangerous animal must be available to be accountable for his/her animal's behaviour.
- responsibility can be determined
- If any type of dog has done physical harm the owner should stay to be accountable



- Many individuals who own these dogs exhibit aggressive behaviours themselves and I would be concerned about situations escalating. I wonder about a requirement that they report the incident and provide their contact information.
- Owners must be held responsible, and a bite-and-run is very easily done.
- But you can't force this to happen.
- This, but also the bitten party should stay except to leave for medical treatment. The biter's owner/guardian should also be given a fair chance to be heard, as it may not be their fault (i.e. when an off-leash dog approaches an on-leash dog in an on-leash area).
- Dog owner's need to be held responsible for their dogs actions ... they must stay to provide information on the dog's vaccinations, provide a full account from both sides of the incident and face repercussions if required.
- The owner has to be held accountable and monitored if they are being responsible dog owners. If they leave a scene they are obviously not responsible.
- "My dog was viciously and repeatedly attacked at an off leash park next to my three small children. The owner could not physically or verbally control her large mastiff. She finally got control and left the park and me trying to comfort my children and find my dog..."
- A bystander followed her to her car and took down her license plate, he said he was going to report her and insure she didn't bring the dog to off leash sites again. My kids recovered from the incident a lot sooner than my dog..."
- It's important to know information about the dog and owner after a bite to ensure the proper care.
- Provided the animal can be kept away from the scene safely I think it should be mandatory that the owner is held accountable and remains at the scene. It is the right thing to do and I would support additional fines if they do not remain at the scene.
- Dog bites are the responsibility of the owner. If a dog bites another person or pet the owner should remain at the scene as well as both parties involved should. As dogs generally do not bite unprovoked an investigation should be conducted into why the dog bit in the first place such as did someone just walk up to this dog to bite it without warning and did not give the owner the chance to advise against going close to their dogs? I have a friendly great pyr and on ever single walk we go on we have at least one person who just goes fully in to pet him without first asking. Instead of penalizing an owner for walking their dog, penalize the instigator of the situation such as the parents of a child who does not have good dog etiquette, this would minimize the amount of child related incidents as well as children will be more unlikely to go up to service animals to pet them this aiding that community as well.
- It allows the victim to be able to seek financial restitution if the offender does not offer it
- I think the owners should be assessed if they are fit to have the animal remain in their custody.
- Only if skin is broken. I.e if a dog bites but does not break the skin
- that's just a given!
- I'm surprised this isn't already a rule!!!
- Any incident should involve sharing of contact information but waiting for an 'officer' is not an acceptable expectations.



- However I am also in full support of investigating the full context of the bite. Was the dog being abused, picked on or teased by a person or another dog.
- If this was actually doable yes! Absolutely but unfortunately the lack of available officers on any given shift is not even close to sufficient to be able to attend incident scenes within a timely manner. Most offenders will leave without providing any information long before an officer is able to arrive on scene.
- Of course however everyone runs because mistakes happen. Doesn't mean the dog is bad. People hurt others all the time by accident they aren't killed for it.. why should An animal
- The person who was bitten should be able to allow the owner to leave, (if the bite was minor.)
- "I think anyone should be charged if any dog bites a person. Unless that person who owns the dog tells whoever not to touch or pet a dog.
- I also want to add.. if you're at an off leash dog park and you're scared of dogs, you shouldn't be there in the first place."
- Should act like a car accident. Info exchange, if a visit to the hospital is needed they should have some info on the dog IE shots.
- Why is this not the law right now?!
- If the person walks away, it looks as though they are the guilty party. It's best to tell enforcement exactly what happened before too much time has passed.
- I compare it to a hit and run. The damage is just as bad if not worse and the owners of the dog bite need to be held accountable.
- Most definitely. If the owner flees, it should be considered a hit and run.
- If necessary is key word. People must take responsibility. Share contact info is the main thing. A safe environment is needed for all parties.
- Owners need to be more accountable. Education is the key.
- owner must remove their pet from the scene and place in safe environment - no good is done when the pet remains and is surrounded by anger, fear and anxiety
- People should take responsibility for their animals
- If necessary
- So then a dog with a history of being anti-social can be identified
- Why would they leave? How do you get the animals history of shots without the owner present? If they leave, they forfeit their rights. If they care about their animal they will take all means necessary to protect them. If this is mandatory, then people will understand this is their only way to prevent automatic euthanasia.
- Dog owners are entrusted to be responsible for their dog's behaviour toward other Calgarians. This is the right thing to do for the dogs and the people. The enforcement officer would need to be quickly available. People cannot be expected to wait for more than 20-30 minutes - especially if someone needs medical attention.
- Yes, if a (bite) is substantial, no different than comparable to a minor fender bender vs a car collision.
- As long as the dog can be placed in control or that contact information can be provided



- The owner is responsible for the dog period!
- Replace "dog" with "car". Replace "bites" with "collides into". And replace "other animal" with "other car", and tell me what you think. Why should dog owners be exempt from being held responsible for their property?
- Ensures the owner accepts the responsibility for the incident
- Although depends on severity some dog owners are over the top when another dog simply plays with theirs
- This just seems like basic courtesy...
- All dog Not just Pitbulls...It's the owners not the dogs
- Is the right thing to do
- Everyone should have the right to explain the situation. Staying at the scene at least shows the person cares.
- Dog bites can be traumatizing and dangerous and if the dog doesn't receive the appropriate training and rehabilitation, it could happen again.
- I think it's a responsible thing for a pet owner to remain at the place of the incident so they can discuss with the person or other owner about what to do. No hit & runs.
- Similar to a car accident it should be necessary for an owner of an animal to provide important information.
- Like a car accident
- not different then a car accident
- All responsible dog owners would, this would penalise irresponsible dog owners
- "As long as this applies to ANY dog that bites regardless of how it looks or its perceived breed.
- Also as long as the owner is REQUIRED to demo state they are fit tow own and care for and nurture a pet and that the owner can prove they are not abusive and neglectful of their animal - because THAT is what creates a nuisance dog, not presumed ""breed.""
- Everyone should be responsible for their animals.
- To an extent absolutely. However you must also look at safety of people and other animals.
- People bring their poorly trained aggressive dogs to the dog park and then flee when their dog causes harm. This enables the victims to have access to names, contact information, and vaccine records of the other party involved.
- Absolutely.
- "Dog owners should absolutely be held accountable for the aggressive and violent behaviour of their animals.
- Stop trying to discriminate against pitbulls. Punish nuisances but leave breed out of it."
- Depending on the severity of the incident. A minor tussle with another dog should not warrant the involvement of law enforcement. If either dog or owner is moderately or severely injured, it would warrant law enforcement.
- It would be a lot harder to assess the danger the dog may or may not pose without the owner present, and it likely would even protect the owner as the police (etc.) would not just be relying on



information from the victim. Also, if your dog bites someone, I don't think it's that inconvenient to have to wait a few minutes.

- Part of being a responsible dog owner regardless of breed
- I believe it is important for owners to take responsibility for their dogs actions. I refuse to go to dog parks anymore because my dogs have been attacked so many times. Owners often say that their dog was just playing rough.
- PEOPLE are the issue. Both parties are likely at fault and BOTH parties are responsible for dealing with the issue.
- People need to be held responsible for animals in their care.
- In the case of biting a human: yes; biting another dog: no. To me it seems there's no point in having punitive measures where dogs bite people if the owners of such dogs are not expected to remain where the infraction occurred to be accountable to enforcement officers.
- It's the same as a car accident, you don't leave the scene
- I think person absolutely and I think if there is another animal or dog then both parties need to remain at the scene. Some dogs bite in self defense.
- This encourages open communication and responsibility for dog owners
- Responsible pet ownership.
- Absolutely - its like being in a car accident (Trauma, injury to victim)
- The owner should be responsible and stay to deal with the situation but the dog should be removed.
- This makes sense. It's like a car accident- you need to share your contact info. My only concern is if the animal is agitated, they may need to leave.
- I would consider this leaving the scene of an accident if you left knowing your dog was involved in an incident
- Nobody should own pit bulls, they kill more people than any other dog.
- Owners should take responsibility
- There are two sides to every story. I think it's important to get all the facts.
- Think of it as a car accident. If there are no injuries the parties can exchange information. If there are injuries, the police are called.
- You are responsible for your pet. If your pet bites someone, you should not only cooperate with authorities but stick around to make sure the victim is safe.
- I am shocked that leaving an incident site without providing this information and meeting with an enforcement officer is not already a violation
- It should be the same as a car accident - both parties need to stay until bylaw arrives to assist or night parties are required to share information including Calgary license information - there should be a large fine for not staying as well
- As a pet owner you are responsible for the actions of your animal at all times.
- Responsible thing to do. The nite may be serious
- I do, but it might be hard if they are trying to remove their animal from the situation to provide any further distress on anyone else



- Any bite should result in exchange of information ie to pay vet bills if minor bite on dog. If bite is really bad then law enforcement should be involved and steps should be taken with that owner.
- I kind of support this but I think it would be unreasonable time wise to wait for an enforcement officer as they are busy. I think similar to an accident, they must provide their information and contact information to the other party involved or face significant fines. This would also help enable remedy through the civil court process as the owner and perpetrator would be positively identified at the time of the incident and would allow enforcement officers to better follow up to confirm dog registration, training, shots/vaccines etc.
- Pet owners need to accept responsibility
- If you are in a car accident you are legally required to stay at the scene. Accidents involving dogs should be no different
- I have several friends who have been bitten and best the owner does is apologize and leave. They have never offered their information. But the City of Calgary has been very lax in their communication of what a dog owner is responsible for.
- This is a good, however, there are many dog owners who claim an incident happens when they have not in a public area.
- I think dog bites should be treated the same way as assault.
- "If the bite
- Is serve enough."
- Too many people allow their vicious dogs to attack other dogs and then immediately leave the scene. They should be liable for the obscene veterinary bills/trauma caused by the incident.
- Seems only fair to take responsibility for your pets actions
- Of course!! The info of the owner should be shared asap, but the dogs also need to be secured.
- Dog owner is a responsibility and owner need to be held accountable for there dogs actions
- if my dog bites someone it is my responsibility to stay there no different then driving a car!
- Be accountable, what was the scenario, was it vocalized that the dog possibly didn't like being touched etc
- Again the responsibility is with the owner. Not the dog.
- Its called a hit and run because you ran and didn't want to be in trouble. If your dog bites you should remain at scene until spoken to by officer. I support sky high fines for individuals running from responsibility.
- Owners need to be held responsible if their dog has a lack of training or if they let that dog off leash and are aware that their dog doesnt not have proper socialization skills and may be a danger to other dogs.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their animals behavior, so stick around and share info, otherwise a dog could be a nuisance several times and there's no record of it.
- Dog bites can do alot of damage and can be quite costly if it bites your animal or yourself! The owner of the dog (unless they where being physically attacked) should be responsible for paying for the personal damage
- Would you leave the scene of an accident?



- Just like any accident.
- Then the officer will see that the owners bad attitude affects the dogs behavior
- I think the issue should be addressed at the scene.
- Ensure owner of dog has responsibility to remain on site in case a solution can't be found between owner and victim.
- Enforcement fails more often than not because bylaw officers cannot or will not follow up with irresponsible dog owners.
- Depending on severity of bite. If there is damage done then yes, otherwise no.
- Having a dog is a privilege, not a right. People's dogs, when in public, have the potential to interfere with people and other dogs. Sometimes violently. If your dog hurts someone, in any way, it's a serious matter, and so the owner must remain on the scene to accept responsibility for what has happened. Owners are 100% responsible for the control and and behavior of their dogs.
- They should stay there to discuss their side of the story, so that contact information can be shared. It's common decency and it's what happens in other accidents such as car accidents, etc, so why not for dog bites
- Like a car accident, information should be shared if needed
- I think it is important to have the household contact information for an animal that has caused an injury
- "It's just like a car
- Accident you need
- To take responsibility for your actions or say if your child was driving you are responsible for that vehicle"
- a dog bite could be caused by a number of factors. The more information the better. All parties should remain on scene
- they need to distance animal, put it in a vehicle etc but be there for an officer to take info down. but this should go for ALL dog breeds
- A dog bite can be related to a hit and run. You legally have to stay after you hit someone with your car. Why don't you have to stay when your dog has bit someone
- The owner is legally responsible for their pet just like a vehicle. If they cause an injury they must rectify the problem.
- Except when they or the animal also require medical attention. Should be allowed to attend a veterinarian.
- If someone's dog bites wether it's malicious or not it's important the owner take responsibility ghat their animal caused the damage and provide contact information
- Should be treated much like the Scene of an accident
- Yes, otherwise the victim may have difficulty finding out who the owner is. I would also support an opligation to provide insurance information as well.
- They are accountable and must remain on scene
- it ought to be the same as a car accident.



- Yes if there is blood drawn or a serious injury
- I believe if anything occurs such as a dog bite, you have to stay and explain what happened because not all bites are aggressive. The officers that respond should be well versed in how to spot the difference between an aggressive dog and a scared dog.
- Owners need to be accountable and responsible for their pets
- It's like any other accident. If someone was hurt, then an officer needs to be involved. You wouldn't hit another car with yours and leave would you?
- Ownership and expenses should be placed on the dog's owner.
- If your dog bites someone then yeah you need to be fined big time. But no reason to kill them. We don't even kill pedophiles.
- The owner should be there to ensure everyone is safe. But should be able to take the dog somewhere else out of the situation
- Like a car accident, one should be required to remain on the scene
- The humans should be held accountable for all dog attacks including covering the hospital bills that come with the injuries. ONLY IF the circumstances were 100% the owner's fault. If it's a break in, trespassing, teasing the dog, invasion of space, at absolutely no fault to the owner, they would be exempt
- Both sides should be heard not all dog bites are not deserved and some are caused by the victim's abuse of the animal
- It's no different than a traffic accident.
- It's important that key information be collected so the dog and owner are known.
- It is essential to at least know vaccination status of an animal that bites another animal/person, as that will determine whether rabies is a concern and whether the animal needs to be quarantined. It would also be beneficial to get everything sorted at the scene (i.e. vet bill payments, hear both sides of the story, etc etc) as opposed to either catching up or being unable to find them later on
- It should be a common courtesy.
- common courtesy
- No explanation needed. This is common human decency.
- It is important to discuss the issue and have responsible conversations in regards to the issue. The pet owners should have the info needed. Dog owners need to be responsible for their dog's reactions and if it bites another need to cover expenses for that injury.
- Treatment for dog bites is costly and traumatic. The owners should be responsible for these costs as well as responsible for and involved in any resulting investigation or legal action.
- It is important for contact information to be exchanged in order for follow up, however, depending on the circumstance the safest option might be for the owner to leave the scene with their dog in order to avoid further conflict/altercation.
- Bites can have serious and life-altering affects on those bitten. This would ensure pet owners understand their responsibility when a dog inflicts damage or bodily harm this also gives a formal process to understand number of nuisance dogs and opportunity to recommend education or alternative measures.



- Same concept as remaining at the scene of an automobile accident. Should be a no-brainer. Dog owners need to stay accountable.
- Again understanding. People now get a bit crazy on both sides
- If this experience was traumatizing and the dog needs to be taken to a safe place, they should be able to offer their information to the victim so then the officer can contact them in a less stressful time
- I was bitten by a dog being walked by someone on a bike. The dog nearly took me down and broke skin. The guy did not stop biking even when I yelled after him. Because he didn't stop I had to get rabies shots along with a tetanus shot. The dog was a lab.
- The person is responsible for their dog. Either stay on scene or report it.
- Information should be exchanged in case vet attention is required. It's common decency and respect to take accountability for your pet's actions.
- They should be held accountable for any resulting vet bills, as well as providing information regarding vaccinations, health concerns, etc
- Yes the owner should take responsibility.
- The dog owner must have assurance that their dog will not be seized at that time and must be allowed to provide witness accounts of what happened.
- To ensure that they remain responsible for their dog's actions
- Dog owners must assume responsibility for their dog's actions
- Be responsible for your dog's actions.
- Yes, but if the bite is caused by a person approaching with our consent or bites another dog not on a lease and the biting dog is they should not be charged
- Some dogs bite because other dogs or people DO NOT listen to their warnings. Both parties should remain to speak with an officer because they BOTH have a side.
- A person should take responsibility for their animal's actions.
- Health reasons need to be taken into consideration.
- I feel like it will force the owner to have accountability!
- If someone's child assaulted somebody with a knife they would be required to, and a mauling from a German Shepherd is potentially as bad.
- That should be an automatic requirement as a responsible pet owner.
- The owner is responsible for the dog. The rules should be similar to a car accident, you can't just leave.
- Accountability is required.
- A dog assault is still an assault, hit and run is a crime.
- It is the right thing to do if they are responsible pet owners
- enforcement officer should be contacted, and the owner should be allowed to explain the incident.
- I think the person should be allowed to leave if a dog or person need urgent medical care or if animals need to be removed from the situation. A way to contact each party must be established before leaving.



- Responsible pet ownership should require the owner to be responsible
- It allows both parties to share their story
- owner needs to explain the incident, and whether it was provoked by the dog or in many cases, the person who was bitten
- Always should stay
- When a dog bites a living being an investigation should be launched. A thorough investigation must include an interview with the owner who was in charge of having control over their dog (or the person who has possession of the dog on the owner's behalf, whom I assume would also be required to stay to provide contact info/discuss the incident with animal control if the dog bit while in their care and under their supervision).
- Owners are the issue, not the animal. Simple and you [removed] who think otherwise should smarten up.
- Only required to remain on scene if the incident has caused visual tissue damage or puncture wounds.
- The owner staying would help the situation be resolved in a rightful manner.
- the owner should remain and be responsible for the actions of the dog
- I think they should be required to stay for the sake of filling out a police report. But the dog owner should always leave with their dog.
- If your dog bites, you are responsible, not the dog.
- Let's get serious here the dogs aren't the issue it's the owners.
- Like any accident you should exchange info
- I myself have been bitten and my dog attacked. In both cases, the owners fled the scene.
- Owners need to be held responsible for their pets.
- This provides more responsibility to dog owners
- A responsible person should (notice I said person, not dog owner... This should be valid in any context)
- It would be helpful in tracking repeat offenders
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets and their actions
- I see too much of a grey area here so it would come down to the severity of the dog bite on the person or the animal. Just like in a traffic accident it isn't always necessary for an officer to be on scene but I like the concept that at request - personal information has the right to be obtained to provide assurance in case anything goes wrong after the fact due to the injuries sustained.
- If the bite requires medical attention then contact information may be needed by the doctor who treats it or the insurance company who may have to pay for it.
- There are too many pit'n runs to avoid fines. A \$500 fine should be issued to anyone who doesn't license their dog like the Richmond, BC Model. They also require pit bull owners to pay a \$300 annual license fee if not speutered and \$50 incentive if speutered. Non-dangerous designated dogs only pay a license fee of \$50 if speutered and \$100 if not. This has been a successful system since 2000 and it keeps the pit bull population more manageable.



- "Hit and runs are illegal so why the hell wouldn't an assault by an animal also have a requirement to way for authorities.
- I feel like I'm being punked here..."
- No comment.
- The person is responsible for the behavior of their pet. They should be held accountable.
- It forces them to take responsibility as they should and encourages them to engage in training or assessment of the dog to help protect the dog from being put into another situation that could set them up for failure at the fault of their owners lack of responsibility
- I think its important to get an account of the incident and make sure the appropriate parties are held accountable.
- Because it might cause damage
- Now if the victim so injured and it is determined that it is the owners fault take it out on the owner not the dog. The dog doesn't know any better
- "This can be seen similar to a hit and run situation.
- the owner of the animal in question should stay at the scene."
- I think it's a good idea because I'd want to have the proper contact information in case of a severe attack to me or my pet.
- Insurance wise and legally wise this is the most responsible act.
- When it comes to the behaviour of a dog, the owner has a large part to play in it. The amount of time spent on training pets is often portrayed in the pets behaviour. Therefore if a dog is to be violent and bite someone the owner should be held accountable.
- Owner should explain but no punishment should be put towards the dog as there are unknown factors such as mood of the dog or how the dog reacts to certain breeds or dogs/animals themselves
- Owners should be held accountable, it is not solely blameable on the dog. People can use words and explain situations, actions, and outcomes.
- Because it is the owners' negligence and they should be held accountable.
- If it is a severe incident, it should not go unpunished.
- Your dog is your responsibility and you should fairly well know how your dog behaves so you must take responsibility even thou am accident or not
- No matter what breed, when a dog bites another you should take ownership of your dog and provide all options available.
- A driver must stay at the scene of a car accident. All responsible pet owners would stay at the scene of a negative dog encounter.
- For tracing for rabies or other information the dog owner should not be allowed to leave.
- Forced accountability
- If an incident does occur owner should have to remain at the scene same as with a motor vehicle accident.



- While dog attacks are almost always preventable, some owners do not take responsibility for their pet in these situations. While most attacks I have witnessed did involve the owner exchanging information with the victim and offering to help, a rule that requires it might encourage those who would rather leave the scene to stay in order to ensure responsibility.
- They are the owner of the dog and should therefore be responsible for said dog. Similarly to a car accident, driver must stay at the scene.
- There would have to be a rule of how long an owner should wait, if no bylaw or police is available to attend the scene, proper contact information should be provided. (Ex. A photo of a driver's license, a text sent to provide a working phone number, etc.)
- There's always two sides to a story and most times the dog is triggered and that's why they attack and the "victims" usually won't explain everything
- Just like any other incidence of accidental damage to someone else's property.
- I believe dog bites can be caused by humans not knowing about dog behavior or knowing signs dogs give before a situation
- Pitbulls should be banned in Calgary
- I feel it is the responsible thing as a pet owner to stay involved and concerned regarding any incident involving your dog.
- All parties should
- Only if it's more than a one-time offender. Or the owner is known to CPS.
- This should be a standard rule. If you have to stop and exchange information for scratching a parked car you should be required to do the same of your dog injured someone.
- I think it's important for the dog owner to be present because there could be more to the story than what the individual who was bitten may say especially in pursuing action when filled with emotions rather than thinking rationally as many things can make dogs react
- The dog owner must be held responsible for their animals.
- Owners (or the person handling the dog) are accountable for the actions of their pets and should bear greater responsibility for the behaviour of their pet; they need to be actively assessing risk and avoiding unsafe situations for their untrained or aggressive dogs.
- No. A yes is self explanatory.
- An enforcement officer would be able to put more details on record and therefore add important information to each case.
- Only if bites person
- To create accountability and prevent future accidents from the same dog
- Responsible pet owners do remain at the scene or call for help.
- Their side of the story is just as important. Their dog may have been provoked or they might be responsible to cover vet bills.
- It should be like a hit and run. People are afraid of getting in trouble and having dogs taken away. If they have to stay this may lessen that issue. It also may help identify the dogs for future offences.
- It is important to know if a owner is going to take the appropriate measures to rehabilitate the dog before engaging it with groups of dogs again.



- Accountability
- Accountability
- Here's an analogy: It's like getting in a car accident. Damage has been done. Information needs to be exchanged and if a dog attacks due to negligence on the owners behalf, then they should be responsible for the vet bills.
- It is not the dogs fault. It is something that the owner is doing and the owner should be taught, fined or have to finish and complete a training course with the dog through a trusted and proper company.
- They should be held responsible and pay the vet bills!
- We do it for automobile accidents. And require them to share their insurance information. When someone gets bit, they need the at fault owner's home insurance info. I say from experience that if you don't get it at the scene, your chances of getting it go to about zero. Realistically, the ones who flee are often uninsured. So yeah, it's very important to get that info ASAP.
- I believe that the owner should be given a warning and possibly a fine if their dog is continually being aggressive. This aggressive behavior reflects how the owner is raising the dog and the dog should at no point be punished for this. However the owner should have to take actions to ensure the dog is not put into a position that it would react with aggression. This may include mandatory training.
- Because it is their dog they should have trained
- An owner is responsible for their animal and needs to take accountability for their actions.
- As long as there is no danger to people or animals
- Statements should be taken by both parties involved
- You must remain at the scene of a car accident or you can receive an addition charge; so you must remain at the scene of that incident or potentially face another fine.
- Are you [removed]? It's an assault by the PERSON, dogs are property.
- "pit and run" is a term common on social media - it refers to a pit bull type dog owner leaving when his dog attacks to avoid liability and financial responsibility as well as put his animal's rights over the welfare and safety of other pets. there should be additional fines for leaving the scene when the owners dog has attacked, just like there is in the case of a vehicular accident.
- Obviously.
- It should only be fair thy the officer gets both side of the story
- If there is a severe incident it is up to the owner to stay and deal with the situation, like like with cars. However, just like with a car, there are 2 sides to every story and each side deserves to be heard and judged appropriately.
- Yes, however in an aggression situation with a solo owner it should be allowed that the dog be safely removed from the area.
- I see it as an accident, you want to ensure that both parties have said their story of the events and should exchange info like one would if in an accident
- Should be the same as staying at the scene of a car accident.
- Well if you dog bites some one there could be 2 reasons. You may have been harassed and your dog wanted to protect you. 2 the dog is being neglected and should be cared for which is why an officer should take information.



- The dog owner should remain so that they can take responsibility .
- but not necessarily the owner. Likely best if the handler or one in charge when incident occurs is the one to remain. Unless handler or dog are hurt or circumstances make staying at the scene dangerous.
- Yes. The person needs to provide information about their dog and vaccines.
- Too many people let their dogs run wild, attack others, and then run away. You are left with expensive bills and not knowing if the other dog had it's shots.
- People need to be accountable for their pet.
- if you hit someone with a vehicle you'd be expected to stay. Why should it be any different
- Because the Owners should be responsible and accountable for their animals behaviour.
- This is similar to a hit and run. Or otherwise the owner must report to a police station to make a report as soon as reasonable.
- It is the owner's responsibility to know and understand their dog. Owners should be held responsible for how their dogs behave, and not the breed of the dog. If someone knows their dog can be dangerous, the owner should take precautions and accountability for their dog. It's not the dog, it's the owner.
- Owners should be held responsible for their pets. Owners who have dogs with behavioural problems are frequently failing in some aspect of pet ownership. They should be held responsible and the dog's general home-welfare would be more likely to be investigated
- Yes to ensure there is no serious injuries
- As a responsible pet owner I would want to ensure the person or animal is OK. I would also want to be able to give my side of the incident if needed. Provide my information in case further information is needed.
- As a pitbull owner it is my responsibility to give my information during such a time and as a paramedic working in the city whenever we are called to a dog bite the owners are never around and we have questions
- an owner should be responsible for their pet
- Owners need to be there to explain from their view point what occurred and take ownership of the incident. Just like an injury accident in a motor vehicle.
- Ownership and honesty.
- Simply appropriate
- "It is much more difficult to track down an owner or dog than it is say compared to a car accident where there is licence plates that are easily visible and easier to track down.
- It's unfair for someone's animal to attack another person or animal and just leave the scene with very little means of locating them again for proper investigation"
- It is necessary for OWNERS to take responsibility as the dog can only do as much as they have been taught. Training should be mandatory for all owners, this is what would actually prevent issues with dogs.
- It is far too easy to run off and deny responsibility and liability.



- Yes, if a dog bites, the owner should not be able to walk away without consequences/an action plan to prevent further attacks.
- Unless the person who was bitten agrees that they can leave.
- As a responsible dog owner you need to take responsibility for the actions of your dog and deal with the incident
- Owner should remain at scene or provide contact information to victim for follow up by medical staff, bylaw, insurance purposes.
- Their dog is their responsibility
- The owner of the dog should remain so they may explain the story without any bias the “victim” may have.
- Humans need to take responsibility for bad dogs
- The owner needs to take responsibility. They should get a ticket that can be reversed if shown proof of training.
- The owner should be responsible for their dog’s behaviour at all times and should be held accountable for the dog’s behaviour.
- The owner should be present to explain the actions leading up to the incident - oftentimes the dog is provoked by the victim, or is not properly handled by its owner.
- Don’t need to explain ... if you don’t stay at the scene it’s just like a hit and run ...
- Yes, absolutely! Just as you are required to remain at the scene of an accident. Vet bills can run thousands of dollars and the offending owner should absolutely be held accountable to the actions of the dog
- It’s your responsibility to stay like any accident.
- The dog owner is responsible, and should be checked to make sure the dog is in good hands. No bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Dogs are bad and bite from being with bad owners. The owners need to be held accountable for their dogs actions
- I have witnessed one particularly dog on many occasions attack other dogs and once another dog owner. Unfortunately this dog i new as a puppy was the sweetest pup. Unfortunately the owners are what destroyed this dog. The owner runs from the dog park each time and blames the victim.
- Have witnesses and both parties present. Dogs don’t bite unless they have reason to.
- How are they supposed to find the attacking dog if they leave without exchanging information?
- Yes because the animal could have done this before or even had a disease.
- We need to be responsible for our dogs. Though if it is a mouse I don't think I'd stick around..
- I don’t understand how this isn’t the case.
- I agree that a bite can be a serious issue. Although, I do NOT support this if this is only applied to pit bull type dogs or enforces the idea that pit bulls are in anyway more dangerous than another breed of dog.
- It’s part of being a responsible and accountable dog owner



- If an owners dog bites a person or animal, it is the owners responsibility to ensure that the proper protocols are followed
- We must all be responsible for the animals in our care, that includes all situations including bite incidents regardless of how they began.
- I've heard of and experienced numerous incidents where the owner just leaves the scene.
- A dog is not sentient and therefore not responsible for its actions, its owner is.
- I think that all information needs to be gathered. Was the dog that bit the instigator or was it provoked
- If I hurt someone and the cops need to be called then I would be expected to stay so why wouldn't you expect the same from a dog owner
- You should be taking ANY vicious dogs away from people who have a history of substance abuse.
- As a responsible owner you should always stay to ensure no one was injured. If no injury then I would agree the owner can leave
- They should stay if possible, but should be able to leave if the dog can't settle down or if the exchange between owner and attacker because violent verbally or physically
- No more pit and runs, owner should be required to remain at the scene of an attack and the dog should be surrendered pending a rabies test.
- The dog owner can then be identified immediately and can therefore be held accountable if need be.
- Most dog bites are a result of poor training and ownership not the animal itself. I believe it should be law for someone to wait if the dog bites not because the animal is the problem but the owner needs to get training for themselves and the animal
- Remain at the scene long enough to exchange contact information
- They are responsible. It's not different from leaving from the scene of a car accident they were involved in.
- "My dog was attacked at an off leash dog park and the owner left immediately- \$1000 in vet bills. The same dog sent another dog to the vet the next day.
- I was attacked by a different dog and the owner refused to provide information and I required an emergency dental apt.
- In both cases, I was unable to hear if the dogs were vaccinated/healthy, or provide follow-up."
- Owner is 100% liable for ANY charges and bills which may incur as a result of their dog's actions.
- I think the owner should remain at the scene so they can explain the situation and as to why the dog may have attacked.
- They need to be held responsible for their dogs actions from poor training. As well as ensuring the victim is properly taken care of.
- It's the responsible thing to do
- Owners need to take responsibility of their dogs - all breeds.
- Depending on the situation it would be good to get both sides of the story
- This dog could be involved in multiple instances and if they attack someone there should be a record kept of such attacks



- If your dog bites somebody, you are responsible and therefore you should stay to talk to enforcement.
- The human is in charge of the training, behaviour and wellbeing if their animal - they should be accountable. Instead of euthanizing a dog that has bitten, how about we solely hold the owner accountable instead of the dog?
- It is important for dog owners to be liable and held accountable if their dog causes injury to another human or animal.
- Any dog who attacks a HUMAN should be held accountable. Dogs can be territorial and this cannot be blamed on the owner and dogs should not be put down because of this. There is a reason they bit said human/animal
- A dog owner needs to be responsible. When a bite happens there are more than one side and the owner needs to defend their animal
- If owners are allowed to leave, then they likely will not take responsibility for their dog's actions
- there needs to be a point of contact for medical purposes. but no immediate action should be enforced. individuals need time to decompress from a traumatic situation.
- He should definitely have to provide contact info but if his dog remains a risk to others he should get it home.
- People need to be held accountable for their awful pets
- The person who owns the dog needs to demonstrate responsibility. If the dog causes Injury to a person or animal the owner must be held accountable and provide their information for follow up much like a car accident.
- The owner should remain at the scene and do all the things mentioned above because there needs to be more accountability on the owners for their pets
- That would be responsible act on behalf of the dog owner unless the dog cannot be controlled. Then the owner should be able to provide info- scannable tag via a smartphone?
- This is a part of responsible dog ownership regardless of breed
- The owner needs to take responsibility for what their dog has done. It needs to be documented and assessed accordingly, as dogs who are biting repeatedly need to be properly handled.
- If a dog bites another dog , the owner of the aggressive dog should be responsible for the costs associated/held responsible depending on the severity of the bite wound.
- Like any other assault, or like a car collision, it would make sense for the owner to remain at the scene to share contact information and talk with an officer if necessary.
- The dog owner needs to be accountable for their dog just like how a parent should be responsible for their kid.
- For record and if there has been another biting incident then they can take disciplinary actions.
- It will allow for more justified and reasonable probable explanation.
- communication between all parties involved should be encouraged
- Of course all the parties Involved should stay at the scene
- Accountability is important.



- It is important to get all sides. I saw an incident where someone had a yappy, growling tiny dog in the big dog area of a dog park; after it went for legs, feet, and other sensitive parts a big dog snapped back. All were upset but it was owners fault not the dogs. Every situation needs assessing from all parties.
- It's responsible to exchange information to make sure the dog has shots and it's health, as well as if the victim has severe or long lasting damages.
- Same idea as a car. If there's no damage then they can leave. If there is enough damage to cost money then yes
- Just for vet bills
- Dogs should be treated similarly to children. Where if someone's child attacks another child the parents need to share contact information.
- Absolutely yes. People need to be accountable for their dogs actions, bites can be traumatic both physically and mentally. Perhaps this would push people to train their dogs better and be more responsible, and keep a closer eye on the needs of their dog and behaviours their dog is exhibiting. If they knew they'd be held to account for their dogs actions, perhaps people would try harder to prevent something bad from happening.
- It would be the responsible thing as a dog owner every story has 2 sides best to make sure everyone is present to make sure details given are correct.
- This creates ownership of the dog's behaviour. However (!!) this rule needs to apply to EVERY single dog breed as little dogs are generally the instigators in incidents but generally are not labeled as an attack because of their small size. A bite is a bite, regardless of the jaw size.
- I and my JR terrier were ambushed and attacked while on a public path by a St Bernard, and I had great difficulties getting the owner to deal with the damage and vet bills her dog caused. There needs to be more tools to hold owners accountable for their pet's behaviour.
- Absolutely, as their dog is their responsibility, and leaving the scene prior to officials' arrival and documentation should be viewed as a hit-and-run and an attempt to avoid liability.
- A dog owner should be included in communication regarding his or her dog causing harm.
- Only if able to get the animal under control. If not able, the dog should be moved so it's not disrupting investigation.
- The owner and animal are often not positively identifiable without this information. Also, the victim may require aid.
- I have had an experience at a dog park where another dog attacked mine and the owner of the dog refused to talk to me or acknowledge the attack.
- requires increased responsibility of dog owners
- It's responsible pet ownership.
- Owning a pet implements responsibility. As one would buy a car with the awareness of vehicle collisions, one is also aware of misbehaving pets - as is evident to be a known hazard given by the existence of this poll.
- My shitzu was attacked by a bull mastive and although they gave me their info once bylaw came there was very little they could do as the person walking the dog was not the owner. They should



also be responsible for vet bills if the attacked dog. I ended up \$6000 in the hole they got a \$250 fine that they didnt pay.

- Common sense. A person with information about the incident should not flee the scene in any case
- An animal attack is no different than a car accident in that, you may not have seen it coming and it was likely not intentional but it is your responsibility to remain at the scene of the incident to both help the victim and provide a statement to law enforcement.
- "In many cases, dog bites occur because the victim approached the dog and intruded the dog's personal space (i.e. a younger child runs up to the dog and gives them a hug, or an adult gets in a dog's face while attempting to pet it. Dog's go off of body language before spoken language and dogs can read that type of body language can be read as intimidating or with intent to harm).
- With that being said, sometimes the victim or victim's parents do not realize that they intimidated or scared the dog, and thus accuse a normally kind and sociable canine as aggressive and dangerous. The owner should be there to speak up for the dog.
- In other cases, a bite can happen because of the owner. Improper training and handling of their canine can lead to loss of control or they simply didn't socialize their dog so it doesn't know how to properly react in social circumstances.
- Very few dogs wake up in the morning and decide that they want to hurt a human. Most dog bites occur because of fear aggression, not true aggression."
- just like your children, you are responsible for your pets. If you pet injures someone they need to be held accountable. No matter what breed.
- I think the owner should stay ONLY IF the bite/incident is severe enough to require medical attention or police.
- Seems like common sense.
- Again I believe owners need to be held accountable in certain situations, I also believe that as an owner you need to be responsible, and deal with what is happening in regards to your dog.
- I'm any incident the person responsible for the dog at the time it happens should remain and be accountable
- Absolutely yes. Their dog is their responsibility and if they bite someone, the owner should stay at the incident as it is the owner to blame.
- That's just common curtesy and responsibility
- "This will hopefully make some pet owners more accountable for their dogs' behavior. I do think it is important to have options for dog training for all income levels as obedience training is often too expensive for most people which I think leads to behavior issues.
- There isn't a comment section for the thinly veiled breed specific legislation the city is trying to pass but this is not the answer. The project team all shows photos of their animals, some ([personal information removed](project manager)) have dogs that could pass as 'pit bull looking' and have restrictions based on them regardless of their pets behavior. BSL is unrealistic, unfair and unkind. It is not something I support in my city AT ALL."



- If the animal that has been bitten is injured, the offending dogs owner should be responsible for the damage, depending on how the altercation came about ie: if a small dog was off leash and charged a large dog on leash and got bit, I don't believe the dog that bit should be at fault.
- Yes but if they are trying to manage a highly agitated animal it may be best if they leave their info but DON'T remain on scene.
- Yes, but no dog bites without a reason, like an accident there should be two witness accounts and a bystander account.
- Dog owners that have a dog bite need to be aware and involved in the process. If only just to work on training or other measures not necessarily to punish or fine.
- In my view, responsible pet ownership should include the requirement to satisfy the exchange of details in the case of an accident/incident - should be similar to that of car accidents.
- The incident needs to be reported so that follow up can be taken. Is training happening? Are there multiple incidents for this dog?
- The owner should stay and talk with an officer. I have seen incidents that a dog was provoked by people and actually pulled and hit and the dog naturally tried to defend itself. People need to be held accountable for their own actions as well.
- E sise this is what an actual responsible dog owner should do. They can wait in their car if they don't feel safe.
- There are liabilities towards one or/all parties involved
- The dog owner should be held accountable for there dog its common sense stay on the Sean to make sure everything is good
- Noting this, if a dog catches a squirrel/ mouse I feel this would be different. Perhaps qualifying the statement with "œanother person or another person's pet."•
- Just like any accident scene, any parties included in the incident should remain at the scene until an enforcement officer arrives.
- People need to be responsible for their pets. They are like children in that they are a reflection of their upbringing and environment.
- They are responsible and need to take accountability as well as provide insurance and contact information.
- They should be held responsible and stay to address the issue.
- They should be held responsible for the incident
- Owners need to be held responsible for damage by their pet.
- Absolutely!
- Both parties and witnesses should be present.
- Yes but only if said animal was not injured in any way themselves.
- There needs to be accountability for the animal.
- we do it with vehicle incidents, it makes sense.
- Absolutely. There is liability and risk involved similar to a car accident.
- "They are otherwise leaving the scene of a crime, and if not



- Present should be fined"
 - As owner they need to be accessible to victim/authorities in event of damages.
 - Owners of ALL dogs types should be required provide personal contact information after this type of incident.
 - Making sure shots are up to date
 - This would ensure dog owners are held accountable and cannot simply walk away from an incident without consequence. It would also ensure public safety as dogs involved in serious incidents could be identified.
 - Same logic as not leaving the scene of a car accident
 - The dogs behaviour is SOLELY the responsibility of the owner, so yes.
 - "This acts the same way as a car accident would. If you do not stay at the scene of the accident, its a hit and run, which has a higher punishment.
-
- Having the offending dog's person there, important information (like vaccination records) can be obtained."
 - The person who's dog started the fight should be responsible for their dog and any medical bills that also come from the dog bite. If my dog ever was to bite someone I'd stay and I'd expect the same from anyone else.
 - It would ensure that the owner is talked to and the situation is properly handled.
 - It's being a responsible citizen to stay at the scene. Also, the owner will have the opportunity to advise their side of the situation. Not every dog bite is solely the dogs fault. What was the reason behind the dogs action? Was the dog threatened, teased, hurt, mounted by another dog? Not every situation is black and white.
 - Same as an assault, or a traffic accident. Owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their animals.
 - I guess it's kinda like a car crash because the result of an attack could have costs and things that need to have contact
 - Context of the situation needs to be found out as to why this behaviour occurred
 - Proper responsibility maintained
 - It would like be leaving the scene of a car accident, use common sense.
 - It is the responsible thing to do to ensure everyone's safety that they remain at the scene
 - The owner is responsible for the dog's behaviour.
 - This seems pretty self-evident
 - A responsible dog owner would do this anyways!
 - The pet owner mist take responsibility.
 - There could be a very valid reason.
 - The dog reflects the owner, owners should be responsible for their dogs actions



- The owner of the dog that was aggressive should also be required to pay the vet bill if they injured another dog- my dog was attacked by another dog and the owner just left and our dog had trauma and Injuries that we had to pay for.
- That is just common courtesy. BUT fear of severe punishment (animal being taken away/euthanized) would cause many people NOT to stay and take ownership of an incident. Example - my doberman was attacked at Sue Higgins by a shepherd mix dog. The wound required stitches. I did get the owners information. Note - my dog was the victim...and it is perhaps a breed that would be deemed the instigator.
- "They need to stay at the scene so contact information can be obtained in case there is personal injury to a person or animal. Too many people are getting away with
- their animal causing injury and they have no repercussions. It isn't right."
- Does this really require an explanation?
- I believe as mentioned there are not bad dogs or breeds, just awful owners. If you didn't train your dog and it bites someone that's on you. You should have to stay and face the consequences. The victim shouldn't have to deal with the consequences. If the owner leaves it should be treated as a hit and run.
- Seems like this should be done already!
- The dog owner is liable for the actions of their animal much the same as I am for damage or perceived damage from my car. The law should be the same-you cant just leave.
- I would think this is necessary for the details of the incident to be fully recorded as well as the owner be offered education opportunities or given ideas for various training for their pet to reduce the likelihood of an incident such as this happening again.
- This seems to be common sense, if there is a need. By law officers would be too busy if this was required for all incidents because most bites tend to involve small dogs and often no harm has come to the victim.
- if it happens and is severe & pretty bad bite then yes but if not & didn't leave any mark or the persons not hurt let it go
- In order to get a full history both parties should give a statement
- Not in regards to this but in regards to "pit bulls" - German shepherds actually have more force in their bites, and there are many dogs that are much more aggressive and dangerous, yet these are demonized and they shouldn't be. All the ones I have met are the sweetest, kindest dogs. It is often the parents/trainers responsibility and fault for a seriously aggressive or mean dog, not the dogs fault. This shouldn't even be an option above, chihuahuas are usually more aggressive and mean.
- I see this as no different from an at fault car crash
- I think you owe it to the victim - whoever that might be; whether another pet or a person - to ensure they're okay, and in the case they're not to exchange information and cover any costs incurred by the incident. Similar to how you would when in a car accident.
- There are so many variables as to why the bites occur and care must be taken to hold an owner responsible. Not necessarily punishing the dog



- because it shows acknowledgment of responsibility
- My late mother was attacked by two dogs whose "walker" lost control (but were well known to the community). An ambulance was required, but the woman went through the usual litany (wasn't her, then was her but wasn't her dogs, then it was her son's dogs and she was doing him a favour, then ultimately she walked them every day but had trouble controlling them). It took three days of nonsense to confirm all this nonsense because the dogs had a history and (of course) the dogs were no longer at the house by the time the animal control officer finally was able to contact her, but the witness couldn't confirm as the dogs were no longer in town (they returned about four months later). AS a dog owner, take responsibility.
- It is likely the owners fault that the dog was not trained properly, so they should face the repercussions, not the dog
- It is important for dogs with behavior issues to receive help and training. I support ASSISTING dogs with behavior issues.
- Most dog bite incidents are due to people not paying attention to behavioural indicators of the dogs. If a person is not paying attention to the dog, Or disregarding the fact that the dog is indicating their discomfort in the situation, that is on the person not the dog.
- The dog is the owner's responsibility and must take responsibility for the dog's actions.
- "Yes -
- This should be required to support further action eg law suit, charges"
- Depends on severity of the bite/incident
- The owner must be in control of their pet. Their owner must communicate. This is exactly like the owner of a car hitting someone. You don't blame the car, do you?
- I believe the owner of the animal should be responsible enough to account for the instance which may have occurred. It would also be beneficial if different points of view were to be presented on the incident, to be on site and have immediate evidence available.
- As long as it is safe to do so for the owners, the dog, and whatever it had bitten.
- Common sense..no.different than leaving a car accident.
- They should provide info for follow up
- As with any incident, I believe both sides should be heard and listened to with equal intent and sympathy.
- As an owner, you are responsible for the actions of your pet and assume all liability associated with that pet.
- would take case load off of judges, but if its appealable its pointless. Anyone who gets a judgment they dont agree with will appeal and use up court time anyway.
- Stay at the scene. It is your dog that caused troubles, be accountable for its actions as you are the responsible dog owner/guardian.
- An animal in your possession has harmed another person or animal. You are responsible for that animals actions.
- Your dog your responsibility just like a dependent.



- I think people should take responsibility for their animals and stay around to find out if there are any injuries.
- Liability
- If it's actually a real bite, not just a squeeze. Some people are dramatic about nothing.
- SMALL BREED dog owners are never held accountable for their dogs actions. Pitbulls don't need to be prosecuted, but breeds such as chihuahuas do.
- If an owner didn't stay and take responsibility that would be horrendous behaviour
- A hit and run in a car is illegal, it is the same principal.
- It is the dog owners responsibility to make sure context is provided and all parties involved are ok. Negligent pet owners would be the ones to flee because they know their dogs bad behaviour is a result of their care and training
- If the dog owner doesn't remain at the scene, what's to prevent it happening again. There needs to be an official record.
- All owners should be responsible for their pets' behaviour and should be held equally liable, regardless of the size of the dog.
- I don't understand. Why would a person not stick around?
- It's the right thing to do
- I believe the owner should stay and talk to officials if their dog bites another person or animal
- Proof of vaccinating may be necessary, and also a history check if its a repeat offense
- This is a no brainer. This is the responsibility of the owner. Doesn't matter circumstances.
- I walk my dog on a leash in my community. This is because I feel it is important that when I am in public I have control of my animal at all times. I have had many dog owners have their dog off leash and their dog comes rushing towards us. My dog sees this as aggressive behaviour and the instinct is to protect her owner and herself. Let me be clear though my dog does not react this way to children. This is not wrong behaviour and neither of us she be penalized for this and I would like to have the opportunity to correctly explain the situation.
- "This is the only way to record multiple
- Incidents"
- Common sense.
- The owner should be responsible and if need asked to take specific dog training with the dog. Do not punish the dog without knowing the owner and the whole context
- Yes, for any clarification needed about the incident and for proper identification and follow up
- Share contact information to cover the cost of vet/ medical bills.
- "No different than a car accident.
- However, humans that taunt dogs through a fence while the dog is on their own property should also face fines."
- If someone damages another persons vehicle they are required to stay at the seen.
- Owners should take legal responsibility for dogs.
- Less investigative resources needed. Statements can be completed more efficiently



- Dog owners should be responsible to those who are harmed by their dogs.
- Owners need to be held accountable for their actions. It may not necessarily be the dog that's the issue, majority of behaviours in dogs corresponds with the owner and the education and training the dog has. The animal cannot be immediately put to blame.
- Pet owners must be accountable for their animals.
- Of course, it's the same as a hit and run if they leave the scene before providing their details. It's an offense in my mind.
- I believe the owners need to take responsibility for their dogs action as it is the owner who trains the dog to be the way they are.
- It is necessary to prevent it from occurring again
- They must or should receive an increased fine (leaving the scene fine)
- Oh f a dog bites someone and any financial problems occur they should be held responsible
- Dog owners need to be held responsible for an aggressive dog. Small or large.
- Yes, so both side can explain the situation. Most dogs bite out of fear so this needs to be considered.
- When owning a dog, the owner should ALWAYS be responsible for the dogs actions. They should stay and wait to talk to a city official, not a police officer (as its one more thing for them to worry about it), more like a 311 employee. The dog should not be held responsible for their action of biting someone when it's the owners job to make them a functioning and healthy dog in Calgary. If you can't train the dog properly, you shouldn't have a dog. Dogs should not be punished by death.
- This seems to be an expected response.
- they should take responsibility for the incident their dog caused
- People are responsible for how their dogs are trained regardless of breed.
- This is a reasonable expectation so long as there is any sort of injury sustained. If it was a non-contact nip in the direction of a person or other animal, then this is too stringent.
- Just like we must remain at the scene of a car accident.
- Although if the dog is upset this may be dangerous. I'm not sure about this one
- Owner should not be able to walk away & get away with their dog injuring a person or other animal.
- the owner should be held accountable for dog bites. It's their fault the dog bit anyone or someone.
- People are responsible for their animals. If they cannot bare the consequences of owning an animal, they should not be in a position of owning one.
- This is good so everyone involved makes a fresh statement
- This shows that they are responsible pet owners
- However getting the offending dog home and secured is very important
- It should be treated like any other accident/incident.
- If anyone including another animal is hurt or injured they should have the contact information and an enforcement office present to assist. The purpose isn't to try to make anyone feel worse, but to assist with the process for both parties and all animals involved
- Holds the party accountable



- All dog attacks should be taken seriously and looked into by enforcement officers, even if it's a family golden retriever or a Chihuahua.
- Obviously yes
- It's a responsibility as a good citizen to follow through with doing the right thing. Be accountable
- It should be like a car accident. Both parties should have to remain.
- owners are responsible for their dogs and should be held accountable when they do something wrong
- Civil responsibility. You don't leave a car accident scene: this should be treated the same way
- Owners are responsible for their dogs behaviour, it is not the dogs fault
- The owner should be held responsible for damages and follow up on care of the injured just like in a car accident
- There are two sides to every story. The enforcement officer needs both sides to determine the correct course of action.
- Responsibility if insurers occurred
- The owner is responsible for their dog and should take responsibility for any incidents and should want to resolve the issues that led to the bite
- The person should remain at the scene if it's safe to do so but definitely give their information as they should be responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- The dog owner needs to take ownership of the attack and it is important that they remain there so proper vaccinations can be verified. Many people provide false information after to avoid any repercussions which makes vaccination verification impossible.
- If necessary, the owner should be able to present their side of the story.
- If an owner cannot train their dog properly they should be held accountable for any wrong doings their dogs create.
- Like any accident, remaining on the scene is a moral responsibility. And to exchange names and contact information if the case needs to go further
- I have witnessed dogs biting people and their owners running away.
- Provides accountability
- Just like a car accident, it's an important issue
- So the own can take responsibility and pay for damages just like if the owner child caused damaged or the own caused damaged in a car accident.
- It would be harder for people to let their dogs get away with things if they had to stick around and explain what happened.
- If vet is required
- It is the owner's responsibility to be accountable for their pets actions.
- owners should be responsible for there animals
- I think its important to have tge info on file just in case it happens again so they have the ability to make more informed decisions
- No different than an accident; additional medical issues, lawsuits, etc could occur.



- If a dog bite it needs to be documented, the frequency of attacks should be taken into account when assessing a dog.
- Responsibility answers require questions. Is the owner behaving responsible
- Be responsible for your pet regardless of breed.
- Yes because some dogs can be a problem but again do not just base it on a breed.
- If the bite is serious, both sides need to be able to come to a civil conclusion on how to proceed.
- There's always 2 sides it's good to get a different perspective of what happened and shows responsibility
- Regular etiquette of a person how is responsible for an accident.
- They need to provide information at the scene.
- The dog owner should remain at the scene the exact same as a driver would need to remain at the scene of an accident. Otherwise it would be the same as a hit and run.
- Making people responsible for the behavior of their dog is integral to the process. People must train, restrain, and manage their dog(s) with the safety of the public in mind. All responsibility should be the owner's.
- The owners. Red to be in control of dogs at all times
- Only in the case of severe injury
- It's the dog owners responsibility
- Need to know dogs history i.e. if the dog has it's shots
- Just like drivers must remain at car crash scenes and exchange information, so should the dog owner in the event of a dog bite. It should be required of the dog owner, within a specific time frame, to provide the victim with his name, address, telephone number, and the name and license tag number of the dog.
- Too many dogs get bitten and the owners take off.
- Any responsible pet owner would do this.
- What if the dog has rabies? I would want to know who bit me or my animal. Also, medical expenses depending on how severe they are should be paid by the offender. Also, the animal should be noted for future or past attacks. Again, the owners are usually at fault for bad training most of the time or not acknowledging that their dog is temperamental and taking their own safety precautions for both their dog and others.
- They need to ensure they take responsibility for any injuries and this also helps better track an animal who becomes aggressive multiple times.
- Should the rare situation arise where significant damage is done, then the owner must take responsibility for their animal. The animal cannot take responsibility as they are, well, an animal.
- It should be the same as leaving the scene of an accident. And just because a dog bites, it doesn't mean it was the dogs fault. Kids tease dogs or sometimes antagonize an animal just to be mean. Then the kid should be punished, not the dog.
- The challenge however would be to prove whether the dog bite was defensive or offensive.
- Absolutely! There are to many times where an animal attack occurs in an off leash park and the offender takes off as soon as possible as to avoid getting in trouble. This way if a license plate is



taken down there is an extra fine for the offender. It will hopefully make them think twice before running away from the scene.

- How else can the dog be traced
- As long as the dog that caused the issue has been safely secured & calmed down. When a dog is attacking another they are viewing something as a threat, removing the dog from the situation will prevent the attack from escalating further. If this can not be done then the owner would have to leave their contact information so the bylaw officer can follow up.
- The dog owner is responsible.
- Pet owners are responsible for the actions of the pet
- Responsibility for ones dogs behavior should be enforced, there have been too many attacks where the owner takes off fast.
- They should be held responsible.
- Similar to a human-to-human incident, owners should be held to the same standard.
- If you dog physically harmed another dog or human it is the owners responsibility to address the issue. There are only irresponsible owners not irresponsible dogs.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for the actions of their dog, and pay any vet bills that their dog inflicted, and the situation would need to be reviewed by a third party to see if training for pet and owner needs to be enforced.
- Get rid of this whole "Target Pitbull type dog" baloney BS. Aggressive dogs are mostly the results of bad owners. Owners that keep the dog locked up and not allowing them to be social at a young age or the results of abuse. Enforce mandatory training for high risk repeat offences and allow the chance for the owners to understand what they must do or To allow trainers to determine if the dog is the actual issue.
- Dogs should always be under the control of the handler, therefore some of not all the responsibility is in the handler of the dog that bit.
- as a pet owner, one should be responsible for their pets actions but if both personal involved remains on site it will give the enforcement officer a full picture and they'll be able to make an unbiased opinion of the incident and not based of the type of dogs that are involved
- It might be easily explained. It's not always the dogs fault if they felt threatened,
- It is common courtesy
- I have had my dogs attacked and my dog has also bitten someone, previous dog I talked about. I would expect the same from any other dog owner.
- Owners must take responsibility for their pets.
- [removed]lost it all. This is dumb. We should ban all white people from Starbucks. Or would that be racist agai st white people. Kind of the same way your [removed] city 8s being racist about a certain breed of dog who have no i put i the way they are raised or treated 9r the way that may have had to fight to survive their whole life. CLgary.... youre a disgrace.
- Should be treated like a hit+run, i.e. a crime to leave the scene of a dog attack (i.e. any injury including bite)
- "They need to take responsibility of



- Any harm the dog May have
- Inflicted upon others."
- The owner needs to be held accountable for any actions leading up to the incident, and any possible follow-ups as well regarding the dog.
- If you get in a fender bender, the right thing to do is stay to exchange information. Or if people get into a bar fight, witnesses and those involved have to give statements.
- I feel like my answer speaks for yourself. Same with other accidents, people need to be responsible for their pets and that includes if they are aggressive or bite.
- Many bites come from ill trained dog owners. They need to be held accountable for the actions of their dog. Further training and requirements should be obtained before that person can own a dog again.
- The owner and the dog needs to be accountable, and record keep on the owner AND the dog. Maybe it's the owners fault. Not the dogs.
- If a dog viciously bite another animal or person then it is up to that dog owner to take responsibility
- As a delivery agent for Canada Post, I'm instructed to call bylaw, police then my supervisor. Get all details of the situation. Some owners have no clue on how their animals react. I'm not scared of dogs, been in my family my whole life. I have more issues with small dogs than large dogs. I've been attacked more than once on my route; owners says my dog is friendly as it's lunging at me after I've asked the owner to put their dog in another room. One of these dogs bit my winter boot one year. These small dogs are worse than any large breed I've come in contact with.
- I think the dog owner should be on scene 100% but I think they should be given the opportunity to remove the dog (if still reactive) from the scene as it could further escalate or introduce prejudice into the situation seeing the dog in a hyperactive state
- Yes, a husky attacked my dog and it's owner screamed and swore at me instead of apologizing and offering to pay vet bills. They should be made to pay the vet bill.
- Some owners (especially of small dogs) don't take biting seriously. They should be required to share info or talk to an enforcement officer. They should have to take their dog's behaviour seriously.
- No waiting for officer. Just required to share information.
- Yes, if it is a serious incident. I've had small dogs nip my ankles and wouldn't want people to overreact in such a case.
- If an animal attacks another person or animal, the owner should be held responsible for that attack. If that means staying on scene AT A MINIMUM, then I support it.
- While I don't support targeting dog breeds or low income households, I also know full well that most (though not all) cases of aggression in dogs is the result of poor training or treatment by the owners. I have heard of cases where one dog serverly injures another and the owner simply flees the scene. I fail to see how this is different from a hit and run, and it should be treated as such.
- For insurance purposes.
- None
- Responsible owners should be doing this already.



- any responsible person would. But i know that you hold your officers back from arresting people. i think that they should be able to arrest people who don't obey the law
- So long as officer attends in a timely fashion.
- Should be the same as a car accident. Remain on scene or be penalized. This dog caused injury.
- As long as both owners have seen what happened and which dog initiated the fight.
- People need to be accountable for the actions of their pets.
- And Owner is responsible for anything there pet does I'm leaving the scene should be treated just like leaving the scene of an accident
- It would make sense. No bad dogs just bad owners.
- If damage/harm is done requiring a vet or a doctor, the individual with the nuisance dog should be liable. Just like a vehicular collision.
- People should be responsible for the care of injured animals/people
- Owners should be responsible for the behavior of their animal
- Accountability
- Bite victims may require medical attention. This could be costly and should be considered a cost of the aggressive/instigating dog's owner.
- The owner can then explain the situation. Giving the situation two sides. What if the dog was scared, threatened, or cornered.
- Contact information should be exchanged.
- This is necessary of responsible pet guardianship. As guardians we need to take accountability for our pets actions and support the process and those who are victims whether it is human or another animal
- Owners must be held to account for their dog's behaviour
- There have been too many occurrences of a attacking dog's owner leaving the scene after their dog attacks a person or another dog.
- For the purpose of being able to follow up on the victim of the bite, and to make sure the dog has been properly monitored thereafter
- Only if said attack was entirely unprovoked. Many people get bitten by dogs because they approach them too fast, and don't ask the owners permission before petting. Another animal may get attacked because their owner didn't allow time to communicate with the other owner or give the dogs time to properly introduce themselves to see if they will behave nicely or not
- It should be treated like any accident. You have to remain on scene for a car accident so why not any other incident.
- If the bite is substantial. If it was nil and likely and accidental hand in a place it shouldn't have been then no. But if it's one that was out of Agression sure.
- If someone has been injured, all parties should remain at scene
- If your dog bites you should be responsible.
- Na
- Of course



- If a dog bites a person or animal, they should remain on the scene and provide a clear explanation as to what happened. However, pit bull discrimination is incredibly antiquated and out of touch. The problem is bad owners, not bad dogs.
- Taking responsibility
- Would like to know dog history and vet records
- Animals are a privilege and owners are accountable for them.
- You should be responsible for your animal and own up to it if an incident happens
- As a responsible dog owner, I would always remain at the scene if this ever occurred. I would expect the same from others.
- It does not matter the breed, if your dog bites someone, you are responsible for it. Dogs do not have any fault, they do what they have been taught to do.
- Every owner should be responsible for their dog. This includes all breeds, not just the said "pit bulls".
- Yes, so the investigation can happen on scene and witnesses can report.
- Punish owners not dogs
- It is important that the owner takes responsibility for their pet and that appropriate steps are taken to ensure the dog is properly cared for and to prevent further incidents by educating the owner.
- Owners must take responsibility, whether it be a bite from a chihuahua or a mastiff, same rules
- You are required to remain at the scene of an accident when driving. It'd be no different here. As a dog owner, you are responsible for your dog's actions, no excuses.
- I'm against putting restrictions on pit bulls. I'm disappointed with Calgary that they are even considering it.
- The owner is the responsible individual for their animal. You don't leave the scene of a car accident, you shouldn't be leaving the scene when the animal you are responsible for injures someone or their animal.
- The owner should be questioned with the other victim or owner of the pet that was bit. They should be assessed for if they feel remorse for their pet, or if the victim did something to instigate the attack. This should be treated just like a car accident.
- If you hit someone with your car you have to stay.
- The more information given as to why this had happened, and what previous history the dog has had, the better. If this dog had never been known to be aggressive (PIT BULL OR OTHERWISE), it is important to note during and after the incident.
- Deplorable. This is disgusting
- Yes
- They should be charged like hit and runs are charged. You cannot flee the scene
- But rather than remain at the scene it may be better for the owner to provide the other party with ID and licensing info so the owner doesn't have to remain at the scene with a dog that has just bitten someone as that could create further conflict for the owner and/or the animal
- Owner accountability.



- Dog owners should remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer if necessary.
- A person should be held responsible for their pets as well as have the option to engage as to their perspectives of events
- The owner KNOWS their dog, if the person approached the dog in an aggressive manner to indicate fear in the dog (the dog would bite) they should be able to explain what happened and not put the future of this dog in the hands of someone who inappropriately approached an unknown dog saying “that dog but me for no reason”
- I have heard anecdotes of too many irresponsible pet owners refusing to share contact information or remaining at the scene to share information with affected parties. There should be consequences to this similar to leaving the scene of an automobile accident.
- It's the exact same as hitting a car with your car. You stay and make sure everyone is ok. Irregardless of your dogs breed.
- Too many people just leave and do not take responsibility for there animals actions
- In my opinion this is similar to a traffic accident causing harm. People remain on scene for them
- This makes sense. It's important to know if the dog is up to date on vaccinations. Also, the person who received the bite should be eligible for compensation.
- An owner is responsible for their pet, however the individual bitten should also be reviewed for what they were doing.
- You should have to explain to an officer what happened, but my no means should the dog be forced to be muzzled, or put down.
- Owners should always take responsibility for their animals behaviour and need to stay
- Too many people are quick to leave the scene when bites occurs to avoid payment of injuries.
- No such thing as bad dogs, only bad owners
- To ensure that people and animals are protected
- I feel that is important
- They are responsible for their animal and the animals actions or the costs associated (vet bills etc)
- Absolutely it is your responsibility as a dog owner if your dog bites, you need to stay on the scene. Too often I have heard of dogs being attacked and the other dogs owners leaving the scene, leaving an injured dog and vets bills. Also, why are these questions targeting pit bulls? My dog was attacked as a puppy by a golden retriever in an off leash dog park I.e The breed of the dog is not the problem, it is the owner. Any aggressive dog with any bite history should not be allowed in public off leash areas. This includes small dogs.
- Of course. An incident such as this should be handled correctly. Both parties should wait for an enforcement officer.
- All dogs can bite, the owner is responsible and needs to be responsible
- For dogs listed as pit Bull like, when there is an attack the owners should also be charged as though they committed the assault.
- Information should be exchanged when an injury occurs involving multiple parties.



- Owners should be responsible for their dog. This does not differ in the way a parent should be responsible for their child. Owners should be kept at the scene and should be required to provide all information.
- They need to be held accountable.
- I'm unsure how enforceable this would be. What response time would we expect from by-law? What about areas of the city where the attack could happen with an off leash dog on an on leash path, eg Fish creek or nose hill. Having seen several encounters where a dog bites another dog and the owner effectively runs away apologizing, how would you enforce this practically?
- That's being a responsible pet owner. And that's for ANY dog. If a little dog bites mine I want them to stay and me me info.
- The dog owner has a responsibility and remaining present to talk with an enforcement officer it the first step in accountability for their pet's actions.
- If it was a bad enough bite that required enforcements attention then all parties should stay to explain what happened.
- Getting details from both parties regarding any incident as soon as it happens & is fresh in everyone's mind is always a good idea because it potentially could mean more accurate information
- This could present dogs from being wrongly accused.
- Contact information should be shared in order to further assess any disputes
- That way there can be proper follow up
- This is similar to a assault on a human, and information should be shared.
- It would protect both parties, as there are always two sides to the story. Unless the other person or animal needs immediate care, or there will be further danger if they stay, there shouldn't be an issue with waiting for a little longer.
- Owners have to be held responsible for ALL issues with their pets.. damage, noise, etc.
- Their dog is their responsibility. They need to be accountable of their dogs actions and control them or face consequences.
- Just like a car accident, people should be held accountable for their actions. If an owners dog bites a person or animal, they should ensure that they are okay, and if needed call for assistance.
- Even accidental, car drivers remain until info is exchanged.
- You're responsible for the actions of your pet. You should have to pay the consequences.
- This isn't already required?!
- responsibility.
- people need to take responsibility of their dogs actions. If a person's dog bites a person or another domesticated animal, the owner needs to remain at the scene to give their information.
- Owners need to be held responsible for their animal's actions, which includes staying at the scene of an incident.
- Sharing contact information
- As long as the owner can keep their dog. People might be afraid if they think the dog will be taken.



- My dog and I were bitten years ago while waiting at a crosswalk- bites required stitches. Owner gave fake name and number and I was out \$1000 for emergency vet.
 - People with so called nuisance animals must take responsibility for their actions.
 - Their dog is their responsibility. In the event of a motor vehicle collision, drivers are expected to exchange information, I see no reason why the same could not be expected of dog owners in the event of an incident.
 - Many vicious dog attacks (I personally have had three incidents) occur during periods of surprise and dismay. Owners most often shuffle the dog away quickly requiring the victim respond to their injuries without having an opportunity to obtain demographic info.
 - The dog owner is responsible for the vet bills that their dog has created. It's like leaving the scene of a crime.
 - The owner has the best interest of the animal at heart and should NEVER be leaving their animal alone in public regardless of any situation. Also if injuries are severe the owner should be present to receive either ticket or summons to training/rehab program.
 - once the attacking dog is gone, so is that negligent owner
 - Information and report is required for court cases if it gets to that point
 - If someone's dog attacks another dog on private property or in public, they should stay until a police report is taken
 - "The owner should stay at the scene because too many times a dog has attacked for no reason and the other person or animal is meant to deal with it alone and too many times the owner of the aggressive dog has gotten away with it without any punishment and they usually don't help their dog to improve it's behavior.
-
- I also don't think we should be putting any kind of negativity towards pitbulls because breed-specific legislation does not reduce the incidence or severity of dog bites, penalizes responsible pet owners and kills innocent dogs. We definitely can't penalize a dog just because it ""looks like a pit bull.""
 - Any good person SHOULD stay at the scene. What the hell?
 - Responsible Owners will want to stay on site to explain the situation & make sure that everyone knows all sides of the story.
 - It's out of courtesy to ensure the victim of either party to receive appropriate justice.
 - It should be like a vehicle collision scene in which people exchange insurance information.
 - it would be easier to get ahold of them when needed instead of sending a letter or getting someone else to deliver it
 - This should be mandatory! Owners of dogs that bite typically take off in most scenarios I have heard about!
 - Dogs owner is also responsible for the dogs behaviour. They should know to take extra precautions if their dog is new to the home or if it has behavioural issues and therefore should be required to take responsibility for any action they allow their dog to take



- The owner needs to take responsibility for their pet!
- It is owner responsibility to respond to their dogs behaviour and should it bite or harm a person or animal, it is their responsibility. It is like a hit and run in a car, the person must remain at the scene
- Both parties should have to stay and explain what happened.
- If a dog bites the dog owners are the only faulty and they need to be responsible. Dogs are animals and how you treat them and behave them they will act.
- Depending on the severity and if the other party was involved. Dogs for protection on private property should be exempt, and small tussles without major incident at the dog park should be exempt.
- Yes, if it is a serious bite, not just a playful nip. If there is an injury to a person or animal then the owner should remain on site to speak with an officer so a clear picture of what caused the incident can be put together.
- ANY Dig owner should remain at the scene if their dog was involved in any type of altercation
- Yes just due to someone being able to take responsibility for the bite and help the next steps in the process go easier if the degree of the bite is bad enough. I have been bitten badly by a dog and having the owner stay and exchange information made the process smoother and more efficient.
- ***Response to: "This would be an alternative to provincial court and would include City and non-City representatives." - It is the legal right of Canadian citizens to have a legal proceeding be governed by a proper legal process and qualified judges. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms protects every individual's right to be treated equally before the law. A tribunal consisting of citizens uneducated in the law will likely not be able to approach the trial without bias or with the proper education to be able to interpret the law.
- This is no different than a car accident. All parties should have a voice
- The owner is the one ultimately responsible, if leashes their shouldn't be any incident. The only issue is the owner might not be able to keep the dog at the dog at the scene if they don't have control of the dog
- The owner should take responsibility as the animal does not have the same brain understanding as humans do
- Because if the dog has done severe damage that will insure that the owner of the animal will pay for any damages that the dog caused
- As owners we are responsible
- I view this to be like a hit and run, but obviously to a lesser degree. If the victim is present and doesn't know the owner of the dog, how does it get reported properly otherwise. A dog biting someone or another animal should not be treated lightly. I support this concept. Bite, or extent of biting, should be clearly defined. For example, puppies nip and while undergoing training may nip or "bite", but I think in most of those cases, it wouldn't qualify as a true bite causing injury.
- Too many pit and runs. Victims are left with huge hospital/vet bills while the vicious dog owner runs like a coward
- It is the owners responsibility to answer for their dogs behaviour.



- Most likely the owner already knows their dog is a bite risk. This forces the owner to take responsibility for their actions.
- It is the same as a car accident or an assault. The person who takes legal responsibility for the incident must remain at the scene.
- They should be responsible and deal with it immediately
- This is to ensure the bite is documented
- If the dog bites someone, the owner should be there to explain the training that dog has had, what could've led to the incident. Past incidents if there have been any.
- Then the officer can secure both accounts, witnesses, etc. Also helps the situation from escalating.
- Look it's common human decency not to let your animal attack another living thing and if it happens the right thing to do is stay at the scene
- It is the responsible thing for the pet owner to do.
- Just like an accidental car crash, both parties should stay to share information as good human commutation.
- I know of several cases where dogs bit other dogs and the owners fled. This could prevent that from happening.
- I saw a person's dog kill another dog at an off leash dog park and they left with their dog and did not stay to give contact info. The other person had no way to confront the person or provide any information to the police when they arrived.
- Too many people with dangerous dogs leave the scene of an attack, leaving the victims unable to pay for care. These dangerous dogs are allowed to go back in to society with no one knowing how dangerous they are.
- owner should remain on the scene.
- It's ultimately the owner's fault for allowing their dog to attack. They must take responsibility and not flee the scene, no different than any other attack. The attacked should also remain so both parties provide info, as it might have been their provocation.
- The dog should undergo behavioral assessment.
- This is not limited to "pitbull" type dogs - it's unfair to classify them as dangerous when some of the smallest dogs are more "bitey" than any pitbull I've ever met
- Owners are ultimately responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- They need to be responsible. HOWEVER the person bit and their witnesses need to do the same. In fact the more witnesses the better.
- Keeps owner accountable and holding responsibility for their dog. Intent would be to help prevent "hit and runs" .
- Any accident should require contact info to be exchanged in case there are costs that should be paid for by the dog's owner or criminal charges if the owner trained the dog to attack.
- If an owner whose dog bites a person or animal leaves the scene, he/she could therefore evade responsibility.
- I think you have to take responsibility if your dog bites and do what you can to help the person that was bitten (medical care etc). I don't think an enforcement officer is necessary though.



- Owners need to take accountability. If their dog bites someone, they should have to exchange their information and should be responsible for any medical or vet bills related to the bite.
- If they're unable to stay at the scene then contact information needs to be exchanged and verified at the scene
- I believe that all dogs who prove to be a hazard to the health of others or other peoples animals they should be held accountable and responsible.
- They could then explain vaccination history, temperment issues etc
- Regardless of breed there are repeat offenders, requiring the owner to stay would help to track that and track dangerous dogs
- They should share contact information and stay at the scene unless an animal is injured to the point of needing immediate medical attention, then they shouldn't need to wait for an enforcement officer.
- To me it's no different than a hit and run
- How is this even a question. If you hit a car, you need to stick around. If your dog is aggressive and an incident happens, stick around.
- Maybe then you guys will see it's not always pitbulls.
- This seems like a no brainer, of course they should have to stay and accept responsibility
- Two sides of the story need to be documented to determine the best consequential outcome for the situation.
- The owner should have to explain why the dog bit someone. It should be the same as a car accident you can not leave the scene til it is reported.
- Only if an enforcement officer can get there in a reasonable amount of time, or if both people exchange information and they've been waiting more than 30 minutes for an enforcement officer, there can be a follow up call later.
- It is important for a dog that is improperly trained to get specific training
- How are you going to enforce anything if the person doesn't remain at the scene.
- The explain possible diseases but not to punish the animal.
- It's owners responsibility
- Their animal, their responsibility.
- More often than not, the owner of the offending animal leaves, and the owner of the injured animal is stuck with vet bills. The offending owner also very rarely faces consequences.
- The dog owner needs to have the opportunity to explain their version of events (especially for dogs that are provoked by others)
- If the dog that was bitten is in need of medical attention, the owner of the dog that attacked should be responsible for medical expenses
- Depends on severity, but a significant dog bite to an animal or person should be treated as a serious incident and owners should accept responsibility for that.
- Within reason - people out walking dogs do not expect their dog to be part of an incident and thus must have non-negotiable constraints on their time (eg child care). I would support a rule that requires a dog owner in this situation to make every reasonable effort to share contact information and speak with an enforcement officer.



- It is a responsibility, just as vehicle ownership requires the driver to remain. They are responsible for the damage their vehicle can incur, just as they should be with a pet.
- Similar to a car accident people should have to stay at the scene
- Or at least provide contact information
- Like a car accident, need to exchange information in case you need to follow up on an injury or damage.
- All owners are completely responsible of their own dogs and if something should happen they must take the responsibility to ensure anyone affected by it is ok.
- If a dog bites someone or another animal they should be required to stay on the scene and take responsibility for their pets actions.
- As long as it's safe to remain at the scene of an incident. There should be a fine for leaving without providing contact information, unless it is truly unsafe.
- The person responsible for the dogs behavior must provide contact information in the event this requires medical or veterinary costs which they should be made to pay to the injured party
- Owners are responsible for their animals. Unless they feel threatened for some reason there is no reason they should leave. If they leave there should be fines involved.
- All dogs owners should be responsible dog owners.
- Any dog owner should have to be accountable for dogs actions regardless of fault/cause of incident
- seems to make perfect sense, much like a hit and run.
- To make sure that other dog has all the vaccines. And cover the veterinary if is necessary.
- I believe it is on the owner for the Animals Behavior. With the owner remaining at the scene this will allow for the enforcement officer to interact with the owner. I think all pet breeding should require a licence, That licence # is then given to the owner. This # should follow the animal for life. When you take your animal to the vet they check the number. When you register your animal with the city they have your number. Something like that so we can control and track all animals and where they come from.
- I think the owner should remain as it is the responsible thing to do. Make sure the victim is alright/gets medical attention and hopefully the officer is trained to offer the owner information on training resources to start the process of correcting the dogs behavior as soon as possible.
- The owner of the dog responsible for the attack should be responsible for providing contact information to enforcement officers. Enforcement officers should also provide additional resources for preventing attacks and training dogs properly.
- I would want them to stick around for info in case of any medical concerns etc.
- Yes to ensure the dog a has had its shots and to take responsibility for the the cost of any medical treatment to the other person/animal
- After a bite this may not be practical with emotions running high
- It should be treated the same way as a car accident. Both parties stay.
- Or at least return ASAP once bringing the dangerous dog somewhere safe.
- But please ban pit bulls before a child is killed in Calgary.
- The owners are supposed to have control over their animals should be treated like an other accident



- The owner is responsible for the animal.
- Maybe the person that got bit was harassing the dog or not listening to the owner about leaving the dog and them alone and was aggravating the dog to the point it bit them.
- That would just be pure common sense. People need to be accountable for themselves and their animals.
- As long as no discrimination is taken place
- I believe that a huge part of addressing the follow up of an incident is the way the owners handle the event and what comes after. This could prevent unnecessary euthanasia and potentially identify more irresponsible owners
- I think this is common sense, the same way you wouldn't leave the scene of an accident
- Owners need to be held liable for their dogs actions. I believe that if a dog is to cause serious pain/mauling/damage to another animal or human that it should be treated just like any human doing the same thing. It's the owners responsibility to know their animal and how it reacts to other members and animals in normal society:
- Tracking purposes same as any accident
- This will prevent the owner from avoiding taking responsibility.
- A similar rule exists for traffic accidents. I see no reason why it should differ in a situation where injuries might occur.
- Yes to determine if it is a repeat offender and dealt with appropriately.
- Same as car crashes, if it's above a certain amount of damage they should stay on site.
- This would hold owners accountable.
- The owner should be held responsible
- Most of the time they flee the "scene" and the owner of the hurt dog left to deal with the consequences, which is not fair
- Contact information should be made available. However sometimes people need to get their dog out of that situation as something may have scared or set them off. For safety I think they should be allowed to leave as long as they gave contact info
- This shouldn't even be a question. Dogs can and have severely injured both individuals and other dogs. It is the pet owners responsibility to stay at the scene and provide the proper information if their dog has caused harm and bit another animal or person.
- They must be responsible for their dog
- "Just like a car accident
- Need both sides of the story
- Can't just be he said she said."
- In response to Q3, it is unfair to single out a single breed of dog for punitive action. Labradors have stronger bites than pit bulls; by this logic they should be the ones proposed to be muzzled and restricted. Preventing a group of dogs from socializing normally can also lead to behavioural issues. I am strongly against any breed specific restrictions. For Q9, I am concerned these fines could become punitive without evidence to support them. I feel a balance needs to be achieved between the rights of pet owners and those accusing their pets of specific actions. I also feel the



circumstances need to be considered prior to implementing a fine. For example, was the animal goaded into biting an individual by the owner, or was the person who was bitten baiting the animal?

- It is important for information to be shared for damages, and medical reasons.
- I think they should need to remain at the scene to provide information on the animal, such as vaccines and contact info
- As stated, my dog was bitten by a pitbull. The owner fled. The owner (and family) lied to Bylaw. What a waste of time. Criminal Code sanctions must be put in place - Bylaw is useless. Sorry...
- if injury is caused (ie blood drawn by bite) owner needs to share contact info to be able to ensure things like up to date shots, and cover any out of pocket expenses like vet bills etc...
- It should be treated with the same severity as a hit and run
- If you are a responsible you you would never consider leaving the scene unless your animal was in medical distress - in which case you would leave complete contact details.
- As a dog owner this should be an expectation in order to ensure everyone's safety.
- Because the owner should be responsible not the dog
- That way they could explain as to why it bit in the first place. There could have been lots of reasons, provoked etc
- As the owner it is your responsibility to uphold your dog's behaviour. If your dog was involved in a incident then you should be available to provide your info and witness statement.
- You would remain on scene (hopefully) if you hurt someone. Your dog is your responsibility.
- The owners should be held accountable.
- Any issues the right thing to do would be to remain at the scene.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs behavior.
- It should be a crime if they leave a scene and a person or pet was badly bitten
- Since the dog is responsibility of the owner. He/ she must care for the person who was bitten
- I seriously cannot believe this is not a law already.!?!?!?
- I think it's only right regardless of the circumstances of the bite, it's still a chargeable offence.
- I thought this was already the law. If a dog bites, the owner needs to take responsibility
- The owners should be responsible to share information regarding vaccines and reasons for the bite.
- This helps to ensure safety of all parties involved. It is also crucial to note that pit bulls are not innately aggressive or dangerous. Any dog has the capability to become dangerous based on the actions of their owner and how they are treated by their owner. Banning a breed of dog based on a dated reputation is unacceptable.
- I have heard of multiple incidences where a dog ha bitten a person (full thickness) and the owner and dog have left and identification has not been possible
- Both sides should be looked at, wether the dog owner is responsible or the person who got bit is responsible for getting bit.
- C
- I would consider the leaving of the accident by a person and their dog the same as a hit and run
- Can't leave the scene of a crime, this is no different.



- Its important to take down information.
- Keeps owner accountable and responsible in their role in their dog's behaviour.
- It can help protect the victim, making sure they know which shots are up to date. Thinking of also the rules of car accidents - this is no less serious
- No
- Dog bites are OFTEN not the fault of the dog. A full account of what happened must be obtained. Responsibility must remain with the human.
- Unless the dog or person needs to go straight to hospital
- Yes. But there is a difference between dogs being dogs and behavior which isn't always interpreted correctly by humans. Also I think the verbiage nuisance is incorrect. An aggressive dog is difference than a Nuisance.
- Bylaw officers take weeks to respond and are indifferent, useless, and bloated parts of the bureaucracy.
- The owner is responsible for good and bad behavior. They should remain on scene.
- Unless their dog is injured they should stay to explain. Sometimes its equal blame but the persons who dog is more injured pleads the victim card. If you have a tiny dog that comes at me off leash. That's should be considered. I've seen it too many times.
- The owners of the animals are required to take responsibility for the incident. In addition, both parties can give their side of the story to the bylaw officer, which is of particular importance if the offending animal was harassed or provoked before the attack happened.
- I think it's important to ensure that owners are held accountable for the actions of their aggressive dogs.
- Experiencing this myself, I find that we can't talk thru options for the situation but rather create a bigger concern for the care of other dogs in the neighbourhood.
- If a dog bites the owner of that dog need to take responsibility. A dog bite is usually the result of poor training and people not reading their dogs cues properly. The owner may need training on how to properly care for their dog & this cannot be accomplished if the flee.
- Please keep in mind if the dog need to be removed to avoid further issues the owner should deal with that as a priority
- just like a car accident, owners must provide Tag numbers and contact information. If the dog is without a tag; or owners leave the scene of the incident; immediate and harsh fines must be enforced, animals apprehended and licenced/chipped/tattooed and all costs pased to the owner and PAID IN FULL before released including a behavioral assessment. If the owners cannot afford the fines then the animal must undergo behavioral assessment before adopted out or euthanized. Costs again to the owners. The city must then issue a no pet order for 10 years against the owners due to lack of responsibility or means to care for an animal. Breach of those conditions would fall under criminal law and be prosecuted with fines and or a reasonable amount of community service/jail time and a criminal record. The only way to protect the public is to hold offenders accountable. This should apply for ANY animal owned that attacks and causes injury to another person.



- Owners should be held liable if the other animal or person gets injured by their pet - as long as no laws were broken (ie. bitten dog was off leash in an on leash area)
- i agree
- Only if it is sever enough that the person requires emergency care
- Because in every dog bite/attack case I've heard of the owner of the dog never stays, why would they as they don't want the dog to get in trouble.
- Your animal is your responsibility. If the animal bites or attacks a person it's your responsibility to do your diligence and take responsibility.
- It shows responsibility and accountability for their part of the incident
- its the correct thing to do, and if the complaining owner files a report its going to be written in their favour, if the accused owner stays on site the truth hopefully be correct on the report ,
- It's called responsibility.
- The owner has to own up to the situation since their dog caused it.
- I think accountability of the owner to make sure the injured party is ok is necessary just the fleeing a hit and run or something like that is punishable this should be too ie. Fine
- Depending on the scenario, the owner should be held responsible. If a loose dog ran up to a leashed dog and the leashed dog bit it, the owner of the unleashed dog should be responsible for all costs.
- I feel that this is no different than if you were involved in a car accident. You are required to remain at the scene.
- To many times owners flee with their pet so as not to get in to trouble.
- Accountability should be a requisite of pet owners.
- If a dog butes a person or another animal it needs to be in record so that if another incident occurs it can be dealt with properly. There have too many cases of dogs severely injuring or killing people in the last 2 years and it needs to be addressed.
- It should be handled like with automotive accidents.
- An owners responsibility of a pet includes making sure they dont hurt other beings it should be treated similarly to an assault.
- as a dog owner the responsibility is on the owner for the dogs behavior and needs to stay on scene of any incident
- You'd stay at the scene of a car accident, wouldn't you?
- I think that if there is a bite personal information should be shared incase the situation gets worse (injured dog dies, person bit needs dogs medical history) etc.
- Owners of dogs that bite are responsible and must be held accountable.
- Just cause
- Person should be liable not the dog. It is a persons responsibility and duty to take care of the dog and surroundings while out in public.
- As a responsible dog owner that should be your top priority if your dog has been involved in a bite situation.



- It is important for owners to take responsibility. If a dog bites another pet, that owner could have serious vet bills that should be covered by the offending dog's owners.
- I think if your dog bites someone it is your responsibility to stay at the scene until everything is dealt with
- The dog & its behavior is your responsibility. You should be there to accept it
- If the injury is serious enough they need to remain. Though im most certain theyll run away.
- If it bites a person seriously you should not take off. Treat it like a traffic incident.
- Yes staying at the scene demonstrates responsibility of pet ownership
- My dogs have been bit at dog parks and the owners don't even bother to apologize let alone stop and see if your dog is okay. It should be like leaving the scene of a car accident.
- A dog owner is responsible for their pet, regardless of the breed of dog. Far more small dogs are aggressive/bite than large dogs, and their owners tend to just go 'aww, they're harmless'. By remaining on sight and answering will mean that a repeated behavior can be tracked and the dog can be dealt with accordingly.
- What??? They don't have to stay now???????
- The owner is responsible and MUST take full responsibility. If the owner does not stay all means to track down the offender should be taken and the dog should be destroyed.
- The owner should remain at the scene. And account should be offered by both sides. It is often the human that is bitten that is the cause. Ignorance blames the dog.
- we are required to take responsibility for other aspects of our life that involve harm (ie motor vehicles) people need to be responsible for the actions of their pets and potential lack of training that results in harmful events
- If there is an injury caused the owner should be required to provide valid contact information and possibly be liable to medical/vet expenses incurred.
- A lot of pit bull owners are irresponsible.
- The translation from the owner, is important and should be required. As, getting the owners side, is very beneficial to their case.
- Better to resolve what's happened and get each other's perspectives and understanding rather than one crazy person freaking out over something probably minor.
- there should still be responsibilities as a dog owner to ensure well being of others.
- Sometimes the owner is the root of the issue, this would be better assessed if they were present at the time
- If they are claiming responsibility and that pet to be a family member, they should be present when an officer needs to speak with them. That way, they can't give false information and run away and never be known. the follow up needs to be immediate.
- Good for understanding what happened. As well, just for their well being! Make sure they're okay.
- Full details of the event should be recorded
- My daughter was bite by a small dog years back at a play ground the people basically called their dog back and left. That was the end of that for them as we went for a tetanus shot and tried to soothe a crying scared child. (It isn't always the pitbulls)



- Just like if someone got in a car accident, if it's serious the owner should stay
- Must be enforced with all dog owners, not just "pit bull" owners
- responsible ownership means being liable for damages. If you do not remain at the scene the victim is unable to obtain this information.
- Easier for vet bills
- Similar to a traffic accident. If the vehicle / animal that you are with and responsible for causes an accident / incident, it should be illegal to "hit and run / bit and run".
- If a dog bite occurs both parties of the incident should remain on scene to provide contact information. This does not mean either of the dogs should be seized, only that contact information should be provided.
- To be able to also provide their side of the story
- Responsible dog owners will do this anyways
- Common sense and responsibility.
- It would be no different if a child hurt someone. You'd want to have their parents info.
- The owner is ultimately responsible for controlling their dog.
- Follow up should be required or information so that the incident can be followed up appropriately if it is unsafe for the dog and owner to stay and wait
- It should be treated like an auto accident. Information needs to be exchanged. Needs to have an officer present. Owner of dog who attacks needs to be accountable.
- Owners need to report incident
- If someone dogs bites someone they should stay and take responsibility
- If someone's dog bites another dog or person the owner needs to take responsibility for that action
- Great idea
- you don't know what shots the dog has or doesn't have and if your dog is breaking the skin of a person you should stay ofcourse!.
- All owners should be held accountable , not the dogs. They only behave how their owners allow them to.
- The dog's behavior is the owner's responsibility. It's the owner's responsibility to ensure the dog has no history of aggression, and no genetic aggression in the parents. The owner is responsible for proper training/socialization/vetting to ensure the safety of their dog, as well as other people/pets. The consequences of failing to do so is entirely the owners fault and they should be held accountable where applicable.
- I think this would support responsible pet ownership.
- Sure. But I don't agree with euthanizing a dog for this. So as long as the officer is fair
- technically is treated as assault, so the owner needs to stay to talk to the officer
- If a dog bites someone very few owners are going to stick around if this is something of a common behavior for their dog, which hurts everyone in that scenario.
- Only if the victim requests they stay, otherwise they victim and dog owner should just exchange contact information.



- Being held responsible for the animal you have is important to responsible pet ownership
- Much like in the event of a car accident this would give all parties opportunity for testimony and perspective on the matter. This will likely result in more accountability as well as a more nuanced understanding of events prior to the incident.
- If a dog bites a person or another animal, the owner should remain. Hopefully law enforcement can implement training sessions for both the dog and owner with a reputable dog trainer to help them.
- Your dog, your responsibility for it's training.
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets
- they do need to stay. It is their responsibility as a pet owner
- Accept your responsibility
- They often take off
- There is no punishment if they leave now
- I'm surprised there isn't such a rule in place yet
- Too many dog owners, especially pit bull owners, give the wrong information and run away with their vicious dogs.
- When dealing with dogs bites, it is important to know who is responsible, and if both dogs are up to date on their vaccines. Even for minor bites, there is still risk of infection and trasmission of diseases from one dog to another and possibly even from dog to human through zoonotic diseases. If both parties are not required to stay at the scene, this could lead to future health problems and could possibly be fatal.
- Dog bites need to be taken seriously, the dog owner needs to share their side of the story as well.
- Even if you think dogs on both sides of an altercation or even a person, issues can arrive medically later on or be worse than you originally thought. Contact info should be exchanged in case this happens. Especially if one party was clearly at fault.
- If that dog is unprovoked biter or repeat biter, or if the bite is clearly serious then there should be enforcement whether that looks like training for dog/ owner, fines, etc.
- If your dog injures a person or dog, you should at lease provide your information and pay half of the vet bill
- Only if injuries occur, other than that information could be exchanged.
- Yes. There are many reasons for a dog to bite. It's important to see accountability on all sides.
- You must be able to identify the owner and the animal
- Yes as is the case when involved in a car accident.
- Just like hit and runs, it's terrible to leave if your pet is involved in an altercation
- This could allow for better enforcement and follow up after an incident.
- If there is cost related to this , the owner needs to take responsibility and help cover those costs according
- Yo make sure everyone is ok



- If there are injuries to the animal that has been bitten the costs may need to be born by the owner of the animal that bit. Without their information a suit could. It be filed and the city could not follow up on any rules out in place
- Accountability! The dog owner must know their dog and only put them in situations they can handle. If your dog bites a person or another animal the owner needs to own up and have consequences. I am a Vet Tech at a Specialty Hospital. So often families are stuck with vet bills trying to save their pet or having to make that difficult decision to have to euthanize them because an irresponsible owner left with their dog in a hurry after it attacked their dog. BTW I have never had one of the aggressor dogs be a pit bull.
- It depends on the situation some own take responsibility and do the right thing. Go to the vet and pay for anything to assist the other owner.
- First, what if the dog has a zoonotic disease? Second I've read stories where someone was bit and the owner just fled the scene. Responsible ownership means taking responsibility for your pet, whether they "escaped" or someone else "let them out".
- It is part of responsible pet ownership to be accountable for the actions of your pet.
- If a dog bites a person or animal, I believe that it makes sense for the owner to remain at the scene if possible as long as it does not endanger them or their dog and to make sure that the person who was bitten is okay, if not directly on the scene, but close by.
- Absolutely! Fine for leaving scene of accident
- In a perfect world that would be lovely but how do you enforce it when people also leave the scene of traffic crashes, assaults etc. It could be another unenforceable by law
- They should remain to explain there side of the story
- Owners should be responsible for the actions of their pets. And being responsible means speaking to the proper authorities if something were to happen. Like a car accident. Don't leave the scene.
- I feel like all dog bites can either be the owners fault or the person it bites fault. As long as bias isn't used by enforcement to issue fines then I support this. For example if a child pet and got bitten by a dog, as a result of their parents not teaching them to approach dogs or pet a dog without asking the owner if it's ok. I believe the owner shouldn't be punish and fined.
- simple, accountability and responsibility.
- Shows they are taking responsibility which is the first step in being a good pet owner
- Too many times I have seen owners struggle to pay for their dog to be seen to sutures wounds, get antibiotics etc from the owner and hearing that the owner of the dog that attacked just shrugged their shoulders and walked away. Owing pets are a responsibility
- Any incident that may have costly implications that can be associated with fault, should require responsibility.
- Any responsible owner would do this!
- Dog owner absolutely needs to share contact information, however, it may not be possible for the owner to stay and await the arrival of an enforcement officer. In some cases, it can take awile for officers to show up.



- Accidents happen sometimes but I also think that if you are a pet owner that you should be responsible and stay at the scene where it happened to explain that your dog really is a good boy and you are working on improving his skills but the accident happens you should always stick up for your animals' innocents and life
- People need to take responsibility and we'd need their information to know who the dog belongs to.
- A responsible owner would do that anyways
- This seems fair to me.
- It's necessary for this so they can be held accountable and so the victim can get comprehension
- If it is a severe enough attack to require an enforcement officer then it is reasonable to expect owners to wait and provide contact information
- Owners need to be responsible. Also they should be able to provide their side of the story. How many dog bites happen because people are acting irresponsibly around a dog. Or teasing them.
- Yes, if an animal is normally well behaved and has no signs of aggression previous to the incident, and was either antagonized or threatened by another person or animal and lashes out, having information exchanged and involvement of law enforcement would be a good idea. This also goes the other way, if your animal is attacked without provocation, and emergency medical care is not immediately required, the exchange of information and law enforcement would be ideal.
- If this is a repeat offending dog the owner probably won't choose to stick around.
- To discuss whether medical treatment, if any, must be paid for and/or to educate the owner about proper behaviours.
- Dog owners should be held accountable for their dog's behaviour.
- Well it would eliminate the "My name is John Smith" and "I don't have my ID on me" when a pitbull mauls a child.
- This is an attack and a crime. Should carry the same charge as leaving the scene of a crime.
- In case of further questioning being required. To give their side of the story
- My dog has been bit and thankfully I got their info and they paid for the vet bill. It's pricey if this doesn't happen.
- Otherwise the victim would be unable to bring civil or tribunal pleadings
- The owner should stay talking to an officer help out the victim in anyway he can be responsible
- They are the ones responsible and need to hold their pet accountable to what happened.
- It's like leaving the scene of an accident.
- Like a car accident the person responsible should not leave the scene.
- Owner should be responsible for dog bite and vet bills
- Information should be exchanged and whoever caused the incident should be legally obligated to pay any costs incurred.
- Owner of "dog attacker" should be responsible for vet bills
- It's the owner's responsibility if their dog attacks someone/something; they should 100% remain at the scene.
- How is this not already a thing??



- The owner and by extension need to be accountable. It could be difficult to find the owner if they leave the scene. This could prevent future bites by taking action early.
- It is a good idea to share contact information so that proper steps can be taken to deal with the situation.
- "Absolutely.
- If there are any damages, injuries or illnesses that occur the owner should be liable."
- Should be treated similar to a vehicle accident
- My dog has been attacked by a pitbull and was nearly fatal, I think it is important To make the owners held accountable for their animal.
- Dog bites are not always the dog's fault, but precautions need to be taken to ensure that the dog, the owner, the victim and the community are safe. Part of that is knowing which dog was involved and to whom the dog belongs.
- If a bite happens, it is the owners responsibility, not the dogs fault.
- I believe this is good as problem dogs and owners should be tracked. If it becomes a habit other steps should be taken. Training, muzzles, etc. If it continues, that person might not be fit to own a dog.
- Its the right thing to do anyways it should be in place already.
- We need to explore whether or not the dog has the potential to be rehabilitated and to also determine what caused the bite (e.g., did the person or other animal actually antagonize the dog?)
- You are responsible for your animal.
- Makes sense. Like a car accident, etc.
- Dog owners should be held liable for their dog's actions.
- Common sense
- Common courtesy among fellow dog owners and community members
- It's likely that the owner needs some education and should stay at the scene of the incident to be given more support and resources
- No one should ever leave a scene
- Bad owners would then face higher fines for not staying around after their badly trained dog has harmed another living creature. Bad owners are the fault not good owners.
- Should be treated similar to a car accident
- It's their responsibility
- Make sure someone gets both sides of story
- Owners need to take responsibility and have their side of the story heard
- They need to take responsibility for their animal and the harm it causes.
- All parties should remain
- It makes sense that an owner should have to stay at the scene to make sure no major harm was done.
- However, how will you enforce this?
- My dog was attacked, it's a bite and run



- It is only right for them to remain at the scene and also be accountable for any vet or medical bills incurred.
- Only if there is damage (medical/vet required) to what the dog bit.
- All information should be supplied to a officer so that they have an idea how the incident came to be
- Dogs can't talk! Seriously, how would you even track the owner down afterwards if they left the scene or person who was bitten without giving any contact information?
- So many times, attacking dogs are whisked away by their owners and are never identified or properly assessed. Staying on scene needs to be a requirement.
- It's important to know both sides of the story. Also to understand where the dog is coming from and the behaviours/energy of the human behind the dog
- Yes, because the dog is their responsibility and they need to be sure that there was no harm done or if there was they need to be help accountable
- Because it's an assault!
- The owner must be held responsible for the actions of their pet (especially if this is reoccurring)
- The owner should be held responsible
- Yes often people leave and the owner is then having to pay out of pocket for the vet expenses.
- The human is more at fault than the dog; the human should have just as severe consequences as the dog, if not more.
- Treat it like a car accident. You own the dog, and if it is your dogs fault you should pay
- Should be the same as a car accident.
- It's the right thing to do? It's like fleeing the scene of a crime?
- If we have an incident involving two cars, both drivers are expected to remain at the scene, exchange information and if damage is over a specified amount, police must attend.
- Responsible owners need to be accountable for their pets. Remaining on the scene is responsible.
- They need to stay and claim responsibility for damages
- If a dog were to cause an incident, it's the owner's responsibility to make sure the victim is okay, and whether or not there needs to be further investigation.
- I think the role of the owner is to be there to take care of the aftermath of the problem that has happened
- To encourage responsible pet ownership. Owners should be accountable for their animal's actions.
- If it safe to do so a pet owner should always remain at the scene for proper assessment
- Need to know if dog has had its vaccinations.
- You are obligated to exchange information at a traffic accident. A dog bite incident should be no different
- My daughters dog was bitten last summer and the woman refused to give her any info. She denied the dog actually bit but the wounds said otherwise
- Because at the end of the day the dog owner should be held responsible for the actions of the dog



- This would only apply if the owner were at the scene to begin with. Taking responsibility and providing another perspective on the incident are vital. There should not be penalties for owners that cannot remain for extenuating circumstances, if they have provided contact information.
- Of course. It may have been aggravated as in human caused or caused by aggression from the dog. A full story is required for this situation just as it is required in human in human court of law.
- It should be the same as when in a car accident, the owner should provide contact details this is very important if veterinary care is needed and to know the vaccination history of the offending animal
- It is the responsibility of the pet owner to stay and give a report, just as if it was a crime or motor vehicle accident
- You don't know if that dog has a history of attacking other dogs or people and whether or not the owner has taken any corrective actions
- Yes just like a car crash but not to blame the dog
- The dog is the owner's responsibility.
- I think you need to have both sides of incident. Offending Dog could be put into vehicle to de-escalate situation but owner remains on scene to tell story
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their dog. If the dog damages property or another person/animal, that owner is responsible to make sure all aspects are taken care of
- Responsible pet ownership means taking responsibility for your dogs behavior, even if it's not normal behavior for the dog. I think pet owners are scared their dog will be punished, but mostly people want to ensure the dog has up to date vaccinations and the victim is okay.
- Because how else can the issue be resolved
- Even if your dog was simply protecting itself, you have a responsibility as that owner to be that dog's voice in what lead up to that action.
- Most owners are able to leave and thus avoid being identified. There should be a fine for leaving a scene of a dog attack/bite.
- It should be mandatory if your dog bites someone/another animal that the dog and owner stay (or leave correct contact info if the dog is being a "nuisance" as described above) to allow the proper steps going forward to take place, whether that's obedience training or restrictions.
- It's the same as a car accident. If there is injury, all parties must remain until the authorities arrive.
- This should have always been the case
- N/a
- How will you make this happen? Do owners just leave. Is the victim supposed to follow them home and risk assault by an aggressive pet owner? There needs to be a "hot line" to report issues with dogs so that police or bylaw officers are dispatched quickly.
- Because in these situations it is critical that Information be shared for safety purposes.
- There is always two sides to a story, and responsible owners should be willing to talk to officers
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs behaviour. It would seem fair that both parties would be able to give a statement to the enforcement officer. This would be best if it was reasonable to wait for an officer.



- incase further action is needed at a later date
- Responsible owners would definitely stay on scene
- Owners should be held accountable for their dogs behavior, the breed is irrelevant while assessing a bite in question
- Its sort of the same idea as a car accident in this way, however that also could cause different issues later on with insurance coverages and prosecutions.
- The owner is liable, and sometimes due to temperaments of animals it is hard to assess the whole situation at that time. Information should be exchanged same as a vehicle accident.
- If vet costs are involved, the owner of the attacker should be responsible
- Punish the owner, not the dog.
- the owner should stay and exchange information, but i don't believe the dog should be taken away immediately or euthanized. Dogs behaviours are trained by humans. The owner should be extensively and adequately evaluated to see if they are fit for the dog, if not, the dog should be trained & re-homed to a family that can handle, understand and care for it. Dogs & certain dog breeds are NOT the issue, humans and inadequate people OWNING dogs for their own pleasure are the issue.
- Part of being a responsible pet owner. People also own cars and aren't allowed to leave the scene of an accident - they shouldn't be allowed to leave the scene of an alive animal incident they're involved in
- If a dog bites to cause severe injury, then yes they should remain on scene.
- It is just like a car accident causing injury. That person is responsible for that dog and needs to remain on scene until the necessary reports are documented.
- Owners are responsible for their pets and pitbulls/dogs shouldnt be villanized
- The dog owner needs to be accountable and should be fined and required to have the dog assessed
- An owner must take greater responsibility in the case of a bite
- It is important for the owner to take accountability of the situation. Even if the owner may not be at fault (for example if someone decides they want to pet your dog without asking). It is important to make sure that the person/animal bitten is okay.
- Dog bites are due to the owners not controlling their animals. It is the owners responsibility and should have to stay on the scene.
- But it's most likely that the person did not give the dogs space and or ran up with out asking to pet the dog
- They should remain at the scene unless there is an injury to them or their animal which requires emergency treatment
- No different than a motor vehicle accident
- Trauma to the dog is the not usually the victims fault
- Dogs don't bite with out being provoked. Instead of punishing a dog for biting a child perhaps take into consideration if the child came up to the dog with out permission from the owner OR if the child was taunting the dog. In instances where a dog bites another dog (which is instinctual for animals during play or conflict) I feel the owners shouldn't have to remain at the scene unless there is



significant damage to one of the animals. In that case the hurt animal should be taken to the animal hospital and the owner of the other dog should stay and speak to an enforcement officer.

- Owners should take responsibility
- I think the owner should be responsible if their pet hurts another. For example, it's like a car accident and the person at fault should be the one fixing it.
- Owners should be held responsible for the actions of their dogs. It is their duty to raise and train them to not harm others.
- A dog owner should be responsible for the behaviour of their animal, much like a vehicle owner is responsible for any damages incurred by their vehicle.
- There are so many variances as to why a dog would bit someone or something. The owner could give a little background info as to why it happened.
- similar to in the event of a car crash, in which you stay at the scene for questioning.
- As a responsible pet owner you are responsible if you dog injures another dog or person
- Owners of dogs involved in an incident need to be held accountable and the issues of the dogs behaviour need to be addressed so it doesnt continue or escalate
- They should remain on scene to ensure they can provide proper proof of current shots etc
- It should be treated like a car accident in that mandatory reporting is required. This would ensure nuisance animals/owners are correctly identified.
- It's just like a car incident the owner should be in control and and injury occurred so there fore the person responsible needs to be available for info
- Absolutely dog owners need to take responsibility
- Common sense.
- Would be no different than if a car accident occurred it's the responsible thing to do
- The owner should take full responsibility for their let's actions.
- Pet owners need to show responsibility for their pets.
- The same as you would if in a car crash. Especially if someone may have been injured.
- If there is damage it is fair to work that out with the dog owner. Or up to debate with the owner if the dog was not at fault.
- It is the owner's fault, not the dogs and if there is a negative consequence, it should fall on the owner
- Yes because a lot of people after getting bit are kind of in shock and don't always thing to get contact info
- I think ultimately the owner is responsible for the actions and training of their dog there for they should be held responsible to any damage their pet may have caused. The only exception being is if the victim then in turn begins to assault the owner and escalate the situation
- More owner accountability
- If the affected party is concerned about it yes. But dogs can have small skirmishes all the time and every small bite shouldn't be reported
- I do not believe this bylaw should be targeted towards pitbulls. I have seen more attacks by other dog breeds such as rottweilers and poodles, never a pitbull. I think the bylaw that should be put in



place is whether or not the person wanting to purchase and have an animal of any kind is fit to have an animal. Fit meaning, financially stable - be able to house, feed, and have the means for any medical emergencies, mentally stable, proper training to train animals, no record of abuse of any kind. This is excluding support dogs/animals which should be funded by the city anyways considering that family or persons that need that support dog/animal most likely already has a tremendous amount of bills to pay, of course being situational. But just like children, the dog/animal behaves according to how it is brought up and the environment that it is in.

- Yes, the owner should stick around. That's just common courtesy.
 - Only if it was indeed, a vicious attack or one of the animals got severely hurt. If it was an accident or in play or in anyway provoked, then no.
 - again i expect it from anyone doesn't matter on breed.
 - If a person leaves the scene before the police arrive they may not able to contact them.
 - Must be handled just like an accident. Must remain at incident.
 - "I feel as tho this is unfair. There are many aggressive dog breeds that your not considering that bite way more frequently then a pitbull.
-
- Like chihuahuas, other smaller breeds. Pomeranians.
-
- I feel like the owners should be more responsible for nuisance dogs. Fines and mandatory dog training course. If its is a repeat offender of biting or aggression move towards euthanization
 - Don't judge the breeds judge the owners."
 - This should already be the rule
 - Owners are responsible for their pets 100%. Owners should be responsible enough to report incidents or remain at any scene necessary.
 - It's no different then a car accident. Dogs bite and fight for number of different reasons. Usually it's due to poor socialization. Also looking at the dog bite pit bulls type dogs are less likely to bite people. It's in the staffordshire bull terrier standard that they need to be good with people particularly children.
 - The owner should be held responsible for any incident as well as the other person/animal involved to assess how it happened and how to prevent any future incidents. Education should be a part of any punishments.
 - Self explanatory
 - Much like when an individual gets into a car accident, certainly
 - Yes. Dog bites are typically often the result of bad ownership/not enough training. The dog owner should have their information taken always so the dog can be effectively rehabilitated and, if necessary, explain the actions of their dog.
 - Absolutely! They need to take responsibility for their pets actions



- Victim may require assistance. May require future care.
- Yes, the owner should be held responsible for their dog, especially if this dog has no had proper training, or is the in process of being trained/rehabilitated
- Accountability
- It should be treated like an accident..... That shows being responsible for your animal
- If a dog should bite or attack anyone or any animal, the owner should be held responsible. Plain and simple. Unless the dog was provoked or hurt by someone or something else. Dogs may need to defend themselves as well
- Remain on scene and/or file report with authorities. Treat bite and run as if hit and run with car.
- Too many times, the owner just stands there, watches their dog bite a person or another dog, and does nothing at all. They don't even try to call it away. My border collie was attacked and bitten by a pitbull and the pitbull's owner just stood there with a stupid look on her face and got annoyed when I asked her to get her dog away from mine.
- owners should take responsibility and be given training classes or something but not euthanized dogs
- The owner has to be accountable.
- The situation needs to be examined. If a kid is chasing a dog with a shovel and the kid gets bit, that's logical and the dog should not be harmed or punished. The kid should be taught appropriate behaviours.
- Each dog owner is responsible for their own pet. A dog's attitude/aggressiveness is a reflection of how the owner raised the dog, a dog should not pay by being put down or anything for being badly raised (similar to a child, you blame the parents not the kid).
- because the victim shouldn't have to pay for damages.
- I've been attacked by dogs and the owner should be held responsible for not taking proper precautions with their own pet in public areas. Owners generally know their own pets and what courses of precautionary actions should be taken.
- I have witnessed dogs attacking other dogs in the park and the owner walked away. It would be better if they were obliged to stay
- The owner needs to be held responsible for the pet at fault. My own dog was attacked twice, once in an off leash area and once walking down the street by a dog that was off leash. Both time the owners ran off.
- Although I think a rule is a good idea, sometimes it might be safer to remove the dog from the situation.
- Your dog your problem. Just like a hit and run
- too many dog bite incidents flee the scene leaving affected with hefty vet bills. Witness reports and stories must be taken. It is not unheard of for a smaller animal to start fights with bigger animals
- You should give your info if you or your animal are involved
- And pay medical bills if needed



- Just like a car accident, the person responsible should take accountability for the incident. It would also give cops a chance to record info about the incident to determine if the dog is dangerous or a nuisance dog.
- Absolutely. It is no different than a vehicular accident. Unless urgent medical treatment is required to address a life-threatening injury, the owner should be legally required to remain at the site of the incident until an enforcement or police officer arrives to record the specifics.
- Treated as a vehicle accident, everything needs to be documented and reported.
- A responsible pet owner should remain at the scene to explain and/or defend their dog's actions...for example, was the bite a result of the dog being teased or threatened.
- People need to take responsibility, not the dog.
- Same as a car accident, they need to stay and accept fine/punishment
- The owner and pet need to be appropriately identified and take responsibility for the incident. Often leaving should be seen as fleeing. A statement needs to be insured for the incident.
- the owner should be a responsible person
- Absolutely! This is already the social expectation for any decent dog owner so it should definitely be formalized in the bylaw to punish those who try to bolt. There should also be fines for leaving a scene of an incident.
- If the injury is severe enough then yes they should stay but minor occurrences should be done on a case by case bases.
- Particularly with increased penalties, there will be an increase in people who try to "pit-and-run," so to speak.
- Na
- accountability for pet owners seems to have no negative effects.
- Of course this should be the case, you should never leave the scene of an incident.
- I do think a person whose dog has bitten another person or animal should be required to remain at the scene, but only if that can be done safely for all parties involved.
- Too many owners are not taking responsibility for their animals actions.
- just like a vehicle accident, the owner should remain at the scene to explain the incident
- There are many reasons why the dog may have bitten a person or other animal. Like any sort of incident, you are responsible for your pet and should remain to provide proper explanation and witness to the incident.
- Its the responsible thing to do.
- Its the responsible thing to do.
- If a person or animal is harmed, powers should exist to compel contact information and contact with enforcement. A reporting framework would help establish documentation if dispute arises later
- If you are supposed to remain at the scene of a vehicular collision or incident where a person or property was hurt/damaged, then the same should apply to incidents involving dogs/animals.
- Dog owners must be responsible for their dog bites
- The owner is more responsible for the bite than the dog is.



- It's completely ignorant and unlawful to segregate Pitbull type breeds. I frequent dog parks often and own a very well socialized friendly dog who has been confronted on multiple occasions by Shar Pei's, shepherd mixes and especially small vicious poodle mix dogs that get away with ANYTHING with zero recourse. This has nothing to do with breeds and everything to do with irresponsible ownership! There should be more bylaw patrolling dog parks like Sue Higgins to enforce fines on aggressive dogs and warn unruly owners not to return.
- It is important track if a dog or owner is involved in multiple incidents.
- If a dog bites, not in all cases but in some, it can be for a lack of a better word justified/provoked. There are two sides to every story and the owner is responsible for that dog whether a provoked bite or an attack.
- They should be held responsible for the incident if it is their fault or if it's not their fault to make sure that everything is ok even if the dog was provoked
- Owner is ultimately responsible for the actions.
- Forensic evidence should be obtained, if possible.
- Should be treated like any other accident/assault
- It is the owners responsibility to take ownership of what happened
- The owner is responsible for their property (pet) and therefore needs to participate in the process. If the dog owner does not stay at the scene then they should be fined and the dog taken into custody.
- It's the responsible thing to do. Animal accidents should be treated the same way as car accidents.
- They should be there to deal with the situation and talk to make sure the situation is cleared
- That seems like a reasonable request for someone involved in any incident as long as the response time to the incident is also reasonable.
- To me that would be no different than a hit and run with a vehicle if you left
- Accountability and responsibility
- They should be available for whether their rabies vaccine is current, possibly to pay the other person's vet bill if necessary and to find out if this has occurred in the past.
- As long as it is safe and/or they have taken the offender home
- Just like a car accident, you must remain at the scene to provide a statement. Same should apply.
- It's the responsibility of all pet owners to stay at the scene to ensure the safety and accountability of all involved
- Yes you stay at the scene of an accident. That's common sense
- "Situations can be taken out of hand by emotions. I think it is important for law enforcement to have the whole story. All dogs deserve to be treated fairly as aggression and being a nuisance is not breed specific.
- I work in the veterinary industry and can say first hand that everyone adores all bully breeds as they are known to be the sweetest. It's 2020, time to advance past one consequence fitting every situation."
- As long as the dog has a place to go
- It's just the right thing to do as it is an incident



- Animals bite for a reason. Any good owner can articulate why their pet felt that biting was necessary
- In my opinion an owner leaving after their dog bites someone and law enforcement is called, if they leave it's just like a criminal fleeing the scene or obstruction. Unless they've got a genuine reason to leave (of great importance) then they should stay.
- I think there needs to be responsibility for the owners.
- It shows the owner taking responsibility.
- You should be responsible if your dog bites and be there in person to deal with the consequences. This will also save time/money by enforcement officers not having to track down the owner and the owner denying it.
- this is extremely important to get all information of the dog bite and information of people involved, also requires the dog owner to take responsibility
- to give info and see both sides of the story.
- Yes because I have had my dog attacked twice by another dog
- As long as the dog is under control and it is safe to do so. If not, the owner must provide contact info.
- They need to pay for vet bills
- Dog owners should not be leaving the scene of an incident if a dog has bitten a person or other animal as injuries might have occurred. The dog owners are ultimately responsible for the behaviour of the dog.
- All owners are responsible for the actions of their animal and any costs or management of their animal. They should stay unless a person or animal needs medical attention
- I believe all involved parties should remain on scene to ensure that a full and comprehensive report of the incident is provided, including the dog owner experience and any relevant circumstance that may have led to the incident .
- Depends on the severity of the bite. Any bite that breaks the skin of animal or person should have to stay until bylaw attends
- If it is a person it is an assault! Charges should be mandatory. They should also give info to victim for health information and so the owner can be sued for the injury.
- If the person's dog attacked first, was off leash, etc. Then they are responsible.
- Only if there is an injury, so the owner can be held liable for medical costs. This answer also applies to question 9, the fine should be the cost of medical treatment and/or property damage.
- It is important to understand why dogs bite, and when. It should be mandatory for bylaw officers to engage in and complete behavioral training as it pertains to dogs. They have a different communication system than do humans and that should be considered when responding to dog behavioral situations.
- Common decency
- Most responsible pet owners would stay making it law will not change this
- You shouldn't hit and run why would you be allowed to bite and run.
- Any kind of conflict should always be resolved. Address the problem, determine what triggered the dog. Seek proper advice as to what to do next.



- Yes as they will be able to provide extensive behavioural background of their dog to enforcement officers and take the opportunity to train/ allow their dog to assess the mistake it has just made. Ensuring the animal it is not okay to act in such ways.
- This is like a hit and run. You should remain at the scene and be accountable.
- Yes. It is an incident that causes damages to another person or persons animal or there could be a process by which they could provide their info via phone reporting in the event that either party feels threatened at the time of the event
- If someone flees the scene after the dog causes bodily harm, it should be considered the same as fleeing the scene of an accident. A responsible owner would be willing to be held accountable for their dog's actions.
- How do you plan on enforcing?
- The owner should be there to convey their side of the story such as why the attack took place and should be held liable for their animals actions
- Witnessing a crime by their own pet, they have a civic duty to stick around to talk to police.
- Your dogs are an extension of you and your ownership. If you damage or hurt someone else's property or themselves, they deserve immediate remediation.
- All part of being responsible. If something happens, stay and deal with it no matter the outcome.
- Accidents do happen. Good dog owner remain
- Common sense. Just like what you guys don't have when it comes to question 3!!!
- it is important to take responsibility for your dogs actions.
- yes they need to take responsibility even if it is an accident.
- As long as the dogs are in control - both parties should give their information and their sides of the story of what happened.
- irresponsible owners need to be held accountable and i believe they should be required to remain at the scene of an attack for the proper course of action to be discussed with an official
- The issue with this is that people who have dogs on the receiving end do not always ask the person to stay or state they are calling bylaw, in this case it would not be reasonable to then say the person whose dog bit broke rules if they did not know. I do think absolutely anyone who is involved in a bite incident should share contact information at the bare minimum in case there are unforeseen vet costs or follow up required.
- Owners need to take responsibility sibility for their dogs. Dogs are dogs, they only do what they have been trained to do.
- Ive had neighbours say a dog bit their child, but they couldn't find the owner as they walked away (leaving the scene) immediately and the victim couldn't inform officers who to speak to. I think that's completely unfair and should be prohibited.
- The owner is responsible for their dog
- I think owners of ill-behaved dogs need to be held accountable for their actions. It can be fines, or mandatory training, and (if necessary) removing the dog from the home if the owner continues to neglect their obligations. The dog could benefit from being in a new home where the owners take the time to properly socialize and train the dog to avoid negative instances.



- But how do you make that owner stay? And let's be honest, you're targeting pit bulls and other large breeds. It's more a case that certain people should not be allowed pets more than the pet is dangerous.
- another person was injured due to another person/dogs actions, they should have to remain on scene and provide what ever is needed.
- I have heard where a dog has attacked another dog or person and the owner leaves without staying. The RPO is about pet ownership responsibility. The owner should be fined heavily for leaving a scene.
- You can't sucker punch someone and run away why would you be able to let your dog do it
- The owner must stay with the victim to ensure they are okay while restraining their dog(s), the owner also has a responsibility to do this as it was their dog(s) who attacked the person
- Yes, it's the scene of an accident. Everyone should share their side of the occurrence.
- it is the responsible thing to do. Any oner who flees the scene should be charged, the same as a person would be charged if they fled the scene of an automobile accident
- Responsible dog ownership means you ate responsible for the dog and therefore you remain at the scene.
- A friend was bitten by a dog and the owner left. She was not seriously hurt but was shocked and didn't know what to do. If they took pictures of the animal/owners hopefully people would be more responsible.
- This protects both parties, as if the individual was provoking the dog it would allow for the owner of the dog to act as a witness
- Same as a car accident, you should have to provide your information.
- Owners have to take responsibility. It is how they raise the dogs that's the issue, not the breed of the dog
- Yes of course, the fact that they are already not required to do so is ludicrous.
- there are times when a normally submissive dog turns protector, either they are cornered or they are protecting their pack, ie, person/child. It is not right to blanket statement an animal as a nuisance if they or their pack were being threatened. I have a loving boxer that would never harm anyone but he might if he ever felt that we were being attacked or if someone was to corner him and he was being tormented. No way for anyone to know if owner leaves the scene
- The problem is often the owner
- It should be the same as if you get into a vehicle accident.
- Additional fines should be given if an owner leaves the scene of an incident with out doing either of these things
- I think any level of dog bite incidents should be treated as seriously as any other public incident (like a car incident). The owner should be required to take responsibility for their dogs, as their dogs actions are a result of their own actions. In addition to sharing contact information, dog registration numbers should also be shared.
- So that obedience training can be offered to the owner of the dog
- If owner does not remain at the scene how else are you going to find them????



- The owner should take responsibility if at fault but should also remain to explain the situation fully so misunderstandings do not occur, for example if the dog was provoked by the person or animal bit the provoking party should be held accountable
- An owner is responsible for the dog. It is only fair that that they are responsible for responding to an incident directly involving their animal. If you have an animal, be accountable for it.
- I've seen people walking their dogs at the offleash park, and parents bring their young children who want to go up and hug the other dogs. This lack of respect from the parents towards their child and another animals personal space can be devastating and NOT the fault of the dog. They give warning signs for a stranger to back off.
- if tour dog bites another person just like a car accident thw victim should be able to get your information to mke sure the issue is properly resolved
- People should be held accountable
- many owners of offending dogs will leave the scene rather than take responsibility for injures to another dog
- people are expected to remain at a scene of a crime or accident they are involved in. same rules, laws and fines should be enforced for this.
- I think that the owner should have to explain to an enforcement officer and there should be a look into the owners training or treatment of the animal. Do not automatically assume it is the animals fault.
- The owner needs to be responsible
- It's important for dogs and owners to be held accountable for bites.
- Dog owners need to be held accountable in these situations.
- People need to be accountable for the actions of their pets.
- Owner should be present
- A dog bite would have to be well defined.
- It would allow for better accountability
- There are too many stories with owners leaving after their dog has bitten someone or another dog. If it's a dog that bite another dog. I think the owner of the aggressor dog should have to pet all vet bills and have to take their dog to behaviour training
- It's common sense
- Yes I do
- If your dog injures someone you should be required to stay so that it can be recorded as part if the animal's history, and so the animal can be tested for possible diseases. You information should also be made available in case a lawsuit should arise.
- My father was bitten by a dog in Calgary and the owner left to "contain the dog" so we never were able to get more info to inform bylaw
- Yes but an attack needs to be better defined. Sometimes a dog just snaps at another dog that is bothering it, and is not harmful.
- Yes a dog owner should be responsible for their pet and remain at the scene.
- Yes, a the dog owner should be present to explain what actually happened.



- It is important that the owner is responsible for their animal. However, if the situation is dangerous the owner should be able to remove the dog.
- The sharing of contact information should be mandatory, although the dog owner should be permitted to leave the scene of the incident to remove the potentially aggressive dog from the situation
- This is the case for every other incident, crime or altercation, so it only makes sense to make it mandatory in this setting as well.
- If the bite is significant
- How else would you find out where the animal lives and it's owner?
- If a person is not required to provide their information, how can they be held accountable when a bite is severe enough to cause damage to another person. If the bite victim waves it off or doesn't want to obtain the person's information, that is the only time when they should not be required to stay.
- It is the owners responsibility to pay for all medical fees or vet fees or loss of wages due to an attack.
- This should primarily be to ensure the well-being and safety of affected parties, and ONLY in severe situations, such as injury. (Dogs fight from time to time, involving officers, and stopping to share information is not always necessary)
- Responsible pet ownership regardless of size or breed
- If a person is injured it is because of the owner not declaring that their dog does not like certain things or because the injured person ignored warning signs. The owner should stay not only because they should make sure the other person is okay but also because they should explain the circumstance.
- They should be required to share contact information in case the attack results in medical bills, they need to be isolated for a rabies observation hold as per MOH, need to be held accountable for dog's behaviour etc.
- Pet bills aren't cheap, so the owner of the victimized pet shouldn't have to pay for an entire vet bill.
- Otherwise it's a bite and run
- Irresponsible dog owners should be required to take responsibility and not allow certain breeds to take the fall for people who should not own dogs.
- The dog owner should be responsible for their dog and needs to be present.
- I've heard of owners ferrying away their pet after it has become aggressive and the victims are often left on the hook for any medical or vet bills. That's not fair
- it is the same as a car accident. Everyone should stay at the scene until enforcement shows up and all sides of the story have their say. Only exception should be if the person or animal needs medical assistance.
- Staying at the scene of an incident is responsible dog ownership and should be mandatory
- Responsible owners will remain at the scene of an incident and provide their contact information. This should be required for everyone.



- It may be challenging to implement as the owner may be struggling with the dog, and the victim may want to get away from them.
- If you hit someone by hitting them with your car, it is illegal to leave the scene. Why wouldn't the same rule apply when your property hurts another.
- It helps find all of the necessary information required. Like a hit and run, but with animals
- It's your pet, you should take responsibility.
- Our golden retriever has been attacked twice by two different pit bulls. The wounds to our dog were so serious that immediate veterinary intervention was required. We couldn't stay and get personal information from the dog owner or wait for Animal Services to appear. When a pit bull attacks - the attack leaves serious wounds.
- My boxer/mastiff was attacked, and the owners just left... I would have liked them to at least take responsibility.
- How else would there be restitution - ie reimbursement for vet bills, ripped clothes etc.
- No bite and runs.
- It's the responsibility of the pet owner to stay at the scene, no different than a car accident. You don't hit and run.
- Too many people are leaving and skirting accountability for injuries.
- People need to be responsible for what they or their pets do.
- Seems reasonable obviously. Like a hit & run. Stay with the vehicles..
- No different than a hit and run
- Owner must be responsible for their dog
- I thought this is already a rule!
- People don't do this already?
- Almost all dog aggression incidents I have heard about involve the owner of the aggressor leaving the scene as soon as possible to avoid persecution. Owners must be held responsible for their aggressive animals and attack incidents
- I feel it is important for owners to be responsible for the actions of their dogs.
- It shouldn't be different then if a car hits someone. Don't be a hit and run or a bite and drive
- Yes as I am confident my dog (Pitbull would not harm another animal !
- I think of it as being the same as a hit and run in a vehicle. It would be irresponsible of the owner to leave the scene of a crime until it has been sorted out
- Should be treated like a hit and run if they don't stay
- There are too many incidents in Calgary where a person or animal has been bitten, and the owner of that dog leaves the scene. They should be charged just like a hit and run.
- It's important that all information is shared so that a harmless dog doesn't get put down because they were provoked by a rude child.
- Dog owners need to be accountable to their animals same as if they were driving a vehicle. Leaving a scene where someone or another animal was attacked or hurt would be the same as fleeing a scene of a vehicular accident/incident.



- As long as the enforcement officer does not jump to conclusions and acts with professionalism, then I'm fine with the owner staying and giving contact info.
- Any type of injury should be dealt with immediately like any other accident leaving or fleeing the scene should have bigger consequences
- Vet costs and the well being of the animal or person is important. I understand why most don't as they are scared their animal (family member) will be taken away from them.
- If the bite was due to aggression and creates an open wound.
- It seems like common courtesy to make sure the person is ok and take responsibility for what has happened. Also gives an opportunity to explain both sides of the story to the bylaw officer.
- How can a person and animal be punished if they are allowed to leave the scene? It should be similar to auto accidents, depending on the degree of offense (human attack vs animal, severity of animal injury) the offender should be required by law to stay at the scene until an officer can take their information.
- I have seen and heard of many dog bites (on other dogs or people) where the owner of the aggressive dog leaves and no one knows who they are, so difficult to enforce unless the victim is able to get and address or licence plate number...so great in theory, but hard to enforce
- Owners should be responsible for their animals. Leaving a victim to deal with the damage and trauma by themselves, and with no way to seek redress for an attack, is not fair or just.
- Reinforces the accountability and responsibility of the owner and sharing in any incurred expenses.
- The owner must wait at safe distance for law enforcement to arrive
- It only makes sense to have the owner present.
- As the victim of 2 such incidents, my emergency vet bills might have been covered if this occurred.
- Should be no different than leaving the scene of an accident
- It makes sense to be able to ensure that things get resolved and that all parties feel heard.
- Owners should be held liable for their pets actions.
- Having the owner there with the dog will show how the dog is with the owner (maybe they dog was being protective of the owner or maybe someone provoked the dog to bite it ei: reaching for them after the dog expressed it didn't want that or someone else's dog went after the dog that bit the other one) dogs are gonna react to people around them like kids do, ei. Shying away from someone they aren't not comfortable with or trusting and having the owner there will also allow the owner to advocate for the dog seeing as dogs can't speak for themselves.
- But only then.
- dogs are animals and should not be blamed for animal behavior. It is the owner that is liable for actions, ie: was the dog not on a leash in public areas. If the owner has violated the rules of responsible dog ownership, then the victim has the right to seek repayment of damages. Therefore contact information should be immediately available.
- dog bites should be treated like car accidents (must remain at the scene of the crime until law enforcement can attend and make a report). Its much harder to find a dog/owner (there are no plates to run, just a visible description)



- If your dog hurts someone, it's your duty to do what you can to remedy the situation. It's the same as a car accident or any other situation like that.
 - This is common sense and courteous.
 - Depends on severity of bite (eg. Mouthy dog "bite" vs. actual bite down)
 - I agree a responsible owner would already do this
 - Would cut down on people hiding the offending dog and/or denying responsibility
 - Should remain on the scene like any other offence
 - Like any accident you should stay to talk it out with the others involved and the proper authorities
 - As someone who was severely attacked and bitten by a nuisance animal that was at large and who had no contact with the negligent owners because they were not responsible owners, I would prefer if they are required to present themselves, share contact information, and take responsibility.
 - unless there is a possibility of the situation escalating. Contact information should be shared.
 - So often I have been at a dog park and many dog (none of them pit bulls) have shown aggressive behavior towards other dogs/ attacked other dogs. Often owners will leash up their dog and continue to walk through the park, letting their dog off leash again.
 - It should be considered part of responsible ownership to take responsibility of the dogs behaviour.
 - same as a car accident, if you have caused injury or damage, you should exchange information.
 - It is the dog guardians' job to take responsibility for poor behaviour including appropriate training.
 - "I said yes because, my dog was attacked at the dog park and the person ran away while I was assessing my dog to see if she was ok.
-
- I wasn't mad at the person or the dog or anyone... but it made me sad because I know if my dog did that I would stay.
-
- My vet bill was 1600 dollars, not that I care. My dog is more important then the money. But it would have been nice if the person stayed..."
 - It will increase owner feelings of responsibility and lead to the fear of higher consequences for incidents, which may reduce the negligence that allows these incidents to happen in the first place
 - The person or animal bitten deserves to have the ability to be aware of the vaccination and possible bite-history of the aggressive dog involved, and to allow for further investigation of the circumstances surrounding the incident.
 - If there are expenses as a result of the bite, the dog owner needs to give his info so that he can be contacted later.
 - Dog owners have to take responsibility for the dogs actions.
 - To explain their side of the story.
 - Similarly to if a child hurt another child, the parents must be accountable for the behaviour of their pet. Fleeing from a scene in which someone/another animal is hurt should be punishable. It is



reasonable to get control of the animal and move away from a target, but if an incident is bad enough to call for law enforcement, it needs to be formally reported.

- The owner must be held accountable
- Just like with an incident, you should have to remain on the scene.
- If a dog bites someone than I feel the owner has an obligation to provide their information as well as be responsible for any damages to the other dog.
- There has to be a degree of responsibility of the owner to the person bit. However, involving law enforcement or those who are not trained in animal handling can lead to unlawful seizure of the animal (either to be unnecessarily euthanized or placed in a shelter until court, causing trauma)
- Just like the scene of an accident, an owner should have to stay
- Dog owners need to exhibit personal responsibility, no different than operating a motor vehicle in an accident.
- Owners should be punished for mishandling there animals
- The owner needs to be accountable in that situation. If the injured party wants to sue, they need to know who to sue, and if enforcement measures are required, the owner should be made to stay to face those consequences.
- A person has a right to defend their dog. Some dogs are aggressive, and in such a case need to have muzzle or be monitored more closely. Its not always the dogs fault though, sometimes kids run up to a strangers dog, step on its tail, scare it , etc and if a dog turns around and bites a kid for any of these reasons then its 100% the child or parents fault.
- The owner needs to b responsible for his animal.
- Dog owners should be held responsible for the action of their children.
- Just like a car accident you must remain at the scene
- Too many owners refuse to take responsibility for a dog that is poorly trained and acts in an aggressive harmful way.
- Owner must be present to report the incident. Just like in a vehicle accident.
- Yes of course
- Any breed that bites someone who be staying on scene yo give information
- Because whatever breed of dog, the owner is responsible for it and should remain on scene.
- I don't believe it is ever the animals fault for acting aggressively. That is the responsibility of the owner. I believe the owner should face the consequences not the animal.
- The owner and animal should stay at the scene so that information and to figure out the proper story on why that situation happened
- Sometimes the owners of the dog who had bitten someone take off, and no one can find out who they are for future contact
- Bullys are not the problem owners that are uneducated are the problem and they should be forced to either take a two week training course at their expense to keep an animal who has bitten.
- The owner should clearly be the one held responsible...
- Yes, including witnesses. It's important to understand the situation the dog was in leading up to the incident. The dog shouldn't be treated as guilty immediately.



- Only makes sense.
- It shouldn't be on the victim to find the perpetrators. They have a responsibility to remain that the scene until the proper authorities arrive.
- I've had my 84lb elkhound pinned to the ground by a loose dog that the owner may or may not have been holding onto. This was not the first incident with this dog or the dog owners. My dog was basically traumatized and they walked off and that dog still goes nuts when he sees my dog
- The owner should be able to explain what happened from their point of view.
- Pet owners have to be responsible for their animals and make sure that everyone is safe including their pets.
- I thought this was already a rule. Or maybe just common courtesy. My only concern is that sometimes people aren't very reasonable based on whether or not they are 'dog' people and can blow things out of proportion which can lead to the dog being put down unnecessarily. Most dogs just need time, patience, and understanding in order to rehabilitate their behavioural issues.
- An owner should take responsibility of their dog.
- Aggressive dog owners should be responsible for their dogs actions. Fines are appropriate in certain cases.
- I believe the owner of the dog who bites the other animal/person should be responsible for any damages cause. Yes, exchange of information should be legally mandatory.
- it should be considered a crime if they leave the scene. Much like any accident.
- This seems like common sense to me! Yes you should remain if your dog attacked someone or another dog!
- Its just like being in a car accident
- Provides third party (enforcement officer) to collect unbiased account of events.
- Or if it is better for the situation, share contact information with valid picture ID and remove animal from the situation.
- The owner is responsible for the dog. The owner must be held accountable for the actions of the dog, regardless of severity. The victim has no way to do so if they cannot contact the owner.
- I believe they should be present to speak with an officer or be made available. It may be safer for them to secure their animal in a vehicle or at home to lower increase stress to the animal and the owner
- Yes, but only if it's safe to do so ie. dog is under control and no chance of the situation escalating.
- A pet owner is responsible for their pet and so they must act as such. This includes staying at the scene of an incident and sharing their contact information.
- The owners are responsible for their dogs
- As a responsible owner they should stay and provide information to authorities.
- To get both parties info & both stories.
- That this isn't a requirement already is insane. If a dog bites someone or an animal, it is now subject to enforcement. The owner has an obligation to not evade that enforcement. Accountability and responsible dog ownership means providing this information to enforcement officers. There can be



an exception for providing contact information to another involved party AND to self-report to 311 within 24 hours.

- Only if the dog and or person don't require medical attention.
- To exchange info and discuss vet bill payment
- So information can be provided
- Sharing of contact information should occur for follow up reporting and vet/medical bill accountability. Of danger is still present, owner and offending dog should wait in a safe location.
- Owners should be responsible for costs incurred Asmara result of their dog bites a dog or person.
- Absolutely, regardless of size this should be enforced.
- The dog owner needs to be accountable and responsible for dog behaviour.
- The bitten person or owner of the bitten dog needs to have Rabies vaccination information and the owner of the biting dog should be held responsible for associated vet costs.
- Because there are always two sides to the story and if it is a law shouldn't the law enforcement deal with it?
- Remaining at the scene is simply the responsible thing to do.
- You have to exchange info after an incident. If you leave the scene it's a fine.
- If an animal inflicts injury, it should be viewed as similar as a car crash. Driver must stay at the scene or be charged with leaving. The same should happen with dog owners.
- Yes it's accountability for what has happened. The owners have created their problem by their abilities with animals.
- Just like staying at the scene after a car accident-the animal is our property and responsibility.
- Yes cuz if some lady with a small dog bites mine but it's no big deal and she leaves and never has a report filled that's wrong ! Or when a small dog constantly nips at a bigger dog until the bigger dog reacts in self defence !
- People need to be held accountable for their dogs actions. Financially and otherwise.
- This should be treated no different than a vehicle accident and leaving the scene should be punishable by law
- I believe this is fair and appropriate due diligence to expect. However in the case that the individual who was bitten begins behaving aggressively and engaging in harassment, this expectation should be waived.
- Dogs that are not under their owners control need to be held accountable.
- They should be allowed to leave if the animals are agitated, but all contact information should be shared before they leave.
- Nuisance is a broad definition for some, lacks by others. If a dog barks a few times in an hour during daytime hours some would consider them a Nuisance. Which is excessive and thus the suggestion of required obedience training or additional insurance is unreasonable.
- No way to assess dog, owner or situation if they leave. Leads to a one sided story
- Obviously yes, an incident has occurred.
- Determine if dog is provoked and it's not it's fault



- As a responsible pet owner information must be disclosed.
- Owners need to be responsible for the actions of their animals
- Owners should have their dogs under control so they can't bite anyone
- Regardless of breed an animal owner should be responsible for poor behavior
- They need to take responsibility for their pets.
- Provide clear picture of situation
- It is the same as a car accident, you should be required to stay and provide aid. I think an exception is required if the dog poses a threat and the owner needs to secure the animal first
- It's important to not be ashamed for something happening, take accountability of your pets actions
- If a dog bites a person or other dog the owners should exchange information and depending on the severity. Also start reviewing the owners as most of them don't even train their dogs which is neglectful for the dogd
- Common sense
- It is the correct thing to do
- its like a car accident the owner should be responsible and give their information to those who were affected as well as law enforcement.
- I agree that they should be accountable.
- Because the dog that attacked quite often the owner runs. And the owner of the injured dog is left with the vet bill.
- If the owner is present at the time of the incident, they have a responsibility of care and to provide their information to officers.
- Treat it like a traffic accident.
- For serious bites only.
- Depends, most people don't understand dog behaviour enough to say who was at fault. If it's at a dog park or other public place probably not necessary but for dogs that are running at large yes.
- It isnt fair to other that if the owner leave once their fog has bit another. It is the owner of the dog that bites to have responsibility in helping the injured dog as it wouldnt be their fault . Especially if the dog tends to be a bit more aggressive to others
- Right thing to do.
- It's the right thing to do
- It would mirror car incidents as an obligation to stay at scene of an accident.
- This ensures that all parties involved can provide their statement as to what happened.
- It's the owners responsibility to control their dog, therefore they should do whatever they can in that situation.
- The owner is responsible for their animal, much like a parent is responsible for the action of their child. If a minor commits a crime, their parents have to be involved. Same same.
- Just like a hit and run
- Dogs can seriously injure to the point it may have pasting effects on a person. The owner should be held accountable



- Everyone should have to ensure full disclosure of information when a bit occurs
- You know very well that the owner will not remain at the scene, I know of 2 incidents that were serious and no owner.
- Much like a vehicle incident, any event that results in damage should require the owner to remain to speak with enforcement.
- It's the right thing to do
- If it is not resolved between the two parties you should have someone come before the two parties can leave. If the two parties involved can part with necessary info and/or understanding if anything needs done in the future no officer needed
- Dogs that are raised properly will not bite. If there is a reason why then that needs to be looked into. Pitbulls are not dangerous it's the owner that makes them a danger due to the raising of the dog. Saying this is a pitbull and that is the issue makes you naive and uneducated to the extreme. I am a pitbull owner and never has my dogs ever shown aggression to any dog or person. Don't think that because of a breed that is an issue always look at the owner, they are the issue 100%.
- It is no difference then if it was a vehicle accident. Fines given for leaving the scene.
- Pertinent information needs to be taken
- If a person is a responsible pet owner, they need to take responsibility for the action of the pet. Remaining at the incident is a minimum requirement. There should be clear examples of what constitutes an incident so there is NO confusion or room for interpretation.
- Same as car accidents, share info before absconding.
- Often there are injuries that require vet assistance. The owner should be held accountable by an officer to provide ID and address for further communication. I have had a horse bit by a dog and had the expensive rabies shot and X-ray on a bone chip because the owner loaded their dog into their car and took off
- This makes owners accountable. Too many stories of dogs biting other people or dogs and the owner runs away. Should be treated like a hit and run in a vehicle.
- A responsible pet owner should never leave without exchanging information. If the person needs medical attention or a vet bill needs paid they should offer assistance and help out as it was their dog. Or it should be disputed who was at fault.
- You have to claim responsibility for your dog's actions if they are severe enough to warrant an officer coming.
- Many bites and repeat offenders and were simply not approached properly the first time.
- It's the right thing to do
- Should be the same responsibility as a car accident
- The owners should be held responsible for their dog's behaviour
- It's the responsibility of a pet owner to ensure that anything their pet does is being handled. Leaving the scene is like leaving the scene of a crime and they should be charged for same.
- People or other animals could have been hurt and may require attention and the owner of the offending dog should have to pay.



- Our dog (is a "pitbull") was attacked and bit at an off leash park by a larger dog (not a "pitbull". She required vet bills and the guilty dog/person vanished.
- It is a way for an owner to take responsibility. I would do it if my dog were to be involved. I do not believe in breed specific bylaws. I believe that an aggressive dog must be handles the exact same way no matter the breed.
- The owner is ultimately responsible for the dog and as such, needs to share their information and accept the consequences.
- How is this not already the case?
- The owner of the dog should be able to explain what caused the bite, if the dog has shown aggressive/defensive behavior in the past, and if yes, if the dog has ever attended some form of professional training in the past.
- Yes the owner should stay but the dog should be able to be picked up and taken home so the dog does not feel threatened and potentially cause more disturbance.
- Owners should be required to own-up to the event and deal with it immediately if a negative event happens with their dog.
- I think owners should take responsibility if their dog was involved in an attack. It also gives them a chance to share their side of the story as well.
- The owner will have to verify the shots that the dog has had, the nature of the incident and if the other person was provoking aggressive behavior, etc.
- They should have to remain at the scene to be held responsible if that's the case
- Just like any other incident, if police are contacted or any emergency services the people involved should stay at the scene to tell their side of the store to the officers who arrive.
- No different than a car accident. Contact info is critical and and enforcement officer taking a report and potentially issuing a temporary order is easier if all parties involved stay
- Only if the victim is wounded.
- This is any dog owners responsibility and should happen regardless. As an owner I am responsible for my dog and it's actions as I am my own. This should be treated similar to a car accident.
- Owners should do the responsible thing and take responsibility for the actions of animals in their care.
- I support this as it is the responsible thing to do
- Because that's common sense.
- Its a crime, don't flee the scene
- I have been bitten by a freaken rat terrier and a dalmatian. How dare you go after pitbulls!
- It should be treated as a car accident as to allow for the authorities to make a judgment on it as fairly as possible
- Both sides of a story should be told. Often times it gets blown out of proportion
- It should be the same as property/vehicle damage. Someone has to pay for the damages and be accountable.
- It is the best way to ensure the pet is safe and the owner knows what has occurred



- Owner needs to be responsible for dogs actions, outside private property
- Treat it like any other accident that may require insurance. Follow up information regarding pet registration is a must.
- A dog bite should be treated seriously and handled just like a traffic accident like a fender bender you have to stay and give insurance details for those so why not a dog bite
- They must be accountable for these actions
- It is a no brainer, if I were to assault someone it is expected I stay at the scene. Same should go for dogs and owners.
- Accept responsibility, the bite or attack could be defending itself, it is not always the dogs fault
- My husband has been bit twice in the last 4 years, once cycling and once walking in our neighborhood. The dog that bit him in our neighborhood left and we luckily found him via social media.
- If you are required to go to a tribunal then your info will be needed.
- There are far too many cases of people not taking responsibility when a dog becomes hurt off leash.
- The dog's behaviour stems from its treatment by the owner.
- They are responsible for their dog. They should stay unless members of the public show violent behaviour towards them.
- Of course, as with any other injury incident
- Should any serious harm be done to a person or another animal by the dog, this rule would help ensure that all cases are tracked and reported
- It makes sense, like the scene of an accident
- There could be expenses that arise from the attack and the owner needs to held accountable for the expenses
- Yes treating bites more seriously would be a good thing in that it identifies specific owners and pets that are dangerous rather than punishing entire breeds.
- The owner of the dog that was the cause of the incident should be held responsible for their dogs actions
- If its necessary they should share information incase a wound becomes infected or the owner continues to not train their dog to not bite the dog may need a more responsible owner.
- yes as long as the owner can prevent a further/worsening attack, if the dogs are already agitated/injured it could result in a much worse situation (sometimes dogs need to be fully removed from the issue to return to a normal state of mind)
- This would help with both sides of the story.
- It shouldn't be any different than a incident or accident involving humans. All parties should remain at the scene and give information for potential vet bills etc..
- My dog was previously attacked by dogs and the owners left in an attempt to avoid the seriousness of the situation. Witnesses were able to assist with identifying the dog owners who took zero responsibility. Dog ownership includes the full responsibility of the dogs actions, including any costs related to an attack on a person or another animal. In our case it was approximately \$1000 in emergency vet bills to stabilize and administer care to our dog - entirely at our expense.



- Pet owners need to be held responsible.
- If the owner leaves, there is no way to completely identify the situation.
- Obviously yes. If a dog is vicious, it's a fault of the owner for providing improper training.
- Poorly trained dogs are the ONLY issue. "Aggressive breeds" are not an issue when properly trained.
- responsibility is on the owner
- If a dog attacks any person or animal it should be recorded on the owners record and include a fine of some sort for not understanding their animals behavior
- Just like driving, a major ticket for failing to stay at the scene of an accident
- Accountability
- if it turns out the human that got bit was teasing the dog or acting violently first - then what? I object vehemently to pit-bulls being singled out!!
- For enforcement or liability, you shouldn't be able to just run away and avoid enforcement
- Accountability
- Absolutely. There are always two sides to a story. The dog may have been tainted by someone, it's space may not have been respected by another dog or human, etc. There are other owner may not have proper control over their animal or a proper understating of how to read a dogs body language.
- I think it is important for the owner to remain at the scene so all correct information can be shared and corroborated by the officer.
- The owner should have the opportunity to express what they saw, rather than only the statement from the victim. These could both be taken a later time if the situation is too emotionally charged at the time of the incident.
- Need to know who owns the dog so appropriate discussions can take place to determine if dog is a continuing threat to others/other dogs
- Yes, it is wrong to leave the scene if their dog bit someone else. My friends dog was bit and ended up with 20 stitches and a large vet bill after a large abscess formed. The owners of the dog who bit their dog didn't pay for anything and they should have been held accountable for the damage and vet bill.
- When you own a dog you're responsible for that animal, you need to own that .
- The owner is responsible and that is a condition agreed upon with you become a dog owner.
- I only support this if the dog bites a person.
- Accountability
- Nuisance dogs must be dealt with immediately
- I think the owner should be responsible for it's dog's actions
- There is nothing to explain. The individuals responsible for an incident are obligated to remain at the scene until it is resolved.
- Yes they should as they need to take ownership instead of leaving.
- Its there dog and they get can give their information about what happened then and there,
- Owners should take responsibility for their animals.



- An animal is an animal, they will act out of instinct and behaviour. How humans react however, is very different. That person should remain on scene and give a very full description of the care and procedures they use with their animals
- I have had my dog attacked and been given fake info.
- People should not leave the scene of any incident involving injury. Especially if people were injured by their property (dog)
- This shouldn't be any different than assault/battery. If the owner of the animal flees the scene of the crime they should face additional charges of fleeing the scene of a crime.
- It should be treated like a car accident - leaving the scene without disclosing information/talking to enforcement officer should result in extra fines for owner
- Dogs are a reflection of the owner and the owner must take responsibility for the dogs actions as if it were its own.
- If the owner has to pay any medical attention for another dog or a person, they have to remain in the scene.
- It is, and always should be, the responsibility of the owner to ensure their dog is well behaved, and socialized.
- Only if the bite draws blood or severe injury; otherwise, inexperienced dog owners could be complaining for dogs playing.
- Must provide the same level of information as required during a car collision.
- The owner needs to be accountable for their pets actions.
- It would only be the responsible thing to do.
- As long as the dog has been controlled.
- Accountability for injury is necessary, victim must be able to receive contact information if injury is severe. And allow both parties to document the incident
- The owner should be held accountable for their dog's actions
- If a dog bites me, I sure hope the owner sticks around and gives me their personal information
- Any bite incident needs to be reported and investigated, however response time to said events needs to be consistent and rapid as an upset or aggressive dog should not remain in a public place for extended periods of time.
- A dog, whichever breed, shows signs before he/she exhibits a negative behaviour. The owner is responsible for recognizing this.
- Yes, unless they share their correct information without supervision involved. How else are they going to be held accountable for the incident if they can just leave the scene.
- The owner of the dog that bit someone or another animal needs to be held accountable for that dog.
- You are responsible for your animals.
- Yes because incidents occur that result in a non-violent dog biting and both sides of stories are required for an efficient and fair reprimand.
- Only to share contact information with other party. Similar to a motor vehicle collision. Report to authorities as necessary, not mandated to wait for them to arrive.



- Enforcement officers shouldn't have to track owners down. If your animal has bitten another animal/person, you need to accept responsibility and stay at the scene, similar to if you've had a car accident.
- "I want to have the owner to remain and have a police report filed if there dog bites another dog.
- This way they cannot run off and if they do they could be fined for violating the bylaw - if the owner leave then a fine to them like a hit and run be given out"
- If my dog or myself require medical attention, I want to know that that person is who they say they are, and that they are there is a legal record of the event and those involved.
- If a person is a responsible dog owner they should remain at the scene
- It's just like a car accident. Both parties should remain at the scene to explain their side to an officer.
- A dog is the owner's responsibility
- This is necessary and should happen.
- Important to get the facts and information from all parties
- Yes if any kind of dog bites an animal or other human the person should stay around and have to pay any vet bill if an animal is involved or any type of disability if a human gets bit
- This is common sense and the fact there needs to be a law says alot about people
- "This Completely depends on the severity of the incident. If the bite is not Severe, e.i. No tissue damage, or anything that requires immediate medical response, the Persons should not be required to remain on seen. A complaint can be made, if the victim so chooses to do so.
- For Severe Bites, e.i. Tissue damage, blood, immediate severe bruising; both parties shall exchange information, and call authorities, if necessary."
- Our dog was attacked and my husband was bitten also. We did not get any contact information from them and they left. This left us with huge vet bills and trauma.
- You need to know the dogs has their up to date shots.
- It should be considered a crime of assault and fleeing the scene otherwise.
- it's an injury so treat it like any other injury report
- I do feel this should be done as my dog has been attacked by a lot of small dog breeds and they never control their dog.
- With the exception of the owner not being able to control their pet, then it would de-escalate the situation to separate.
- And further action to be taken such as obedience training and or a muzzle & leash while at off leash parks
- The owner should be open to covering expenses if the person requires a vaccine or antibiotic prescription.
- I agree if there has been a dog attack that the owner of the dog is responsible for any vet bills etc
- Many times people shrug it off and there also needs to be accountably to the person bit as to their actions leading up to the bite.
- Animal is the owners responsibility, is only right they basically follow the same rules as if there a motor vehicle accident that causes injury.



- I agree because the owner should be held accountable. It's the owner's responsibility to train their dog appropriately. There are no bad breeds, only poorly trained dogs due to bad owners.
- Owners need to be held accountable for their animals behaviour. If they flee the scene, that is not responsible pet ownership. I own a dog who is a huge bite risk and it is my responsibility to keep him safe, keep other animals/people safe, and put him in appropriate situations.
- A bit like car crashes, it makes sense that all parties remain to exchange info, communicate with an enforcement officer if needed and decide whether further steps are required. However, I do not believe that Pitbulls should be specifically targeted, as it does not address behavioural issues and rather gives in to unfair assumptions.
- As a pet owner you are responsible for your pet's conduct at all times.
- it's an accident
- It should be treated like a traffic accident
- You stay for a car accident. Should stay if your dog causes issues as well.
- My dog was bitten by another dog at the park. The owner pretended not to see me trying to address this and rapidly left.
- Any animal that bites, the owner should wait and pay the consequences of the bite.
- Makes sense.
- No explanation required. It's common sense
- I've been bitten by a friends dog and let it slid only to hear later it wasn't that dogs first incident. The owner needs to take responsibility!
- "It, would show that this person is responsible pet owner.
- If they don't stay then larger penalties, should be incurred, again for all type of breeds"
- Depending on the incident that occurred and would sustained; yes - they should stay. No different than a car accident.
- .
- I had a friend whose dog just recently bit someone, and the incident was handled poorly. It seemed my friend was 'off the hook' as bylaw and the vet would not do anything, include euthanize the dog. And now all of a sudden he is being charged.
- This makes sense if the person or animal bitten isn't in serious distress. If they are, an exchange of contact information to be forwarded to the enforcement officer makes better sense.
- It's common sense
- If a pet that you are responsible for is directly involved in the injury of another animal or person(s), you should be required to remain at scene or provide information to assist the animal bylaw officers to properly investigate the incident. Just like collisions under the traffic safety act. This would place more accountability on the owner and help ensure safety measures are more likely to be applied by the owner. (Muzzles, avoiding off leash parks, etc).
- Depending on the severity, financial compensation could be necessary. Having a law enforcement officer involved would also give both parties the ability to provide their side of the story.



- If someone assaulted the other it would be required. The only time someone should leave the scene is if the animal needs medical attention in which a bystander can collect information and be witness to the attack
- It's like anything more information is better.
- "As long as one or all owners want to involve an enforcement officer. If all involved in the incident agree that there is no need to talk with an enforcement officer then they should be able to by-pass this step. My other concern is that if veterinary care is urgently required then the requirement to talk to an enforcement officer at the time of the incident should be waived. If my dog required urgent veterinary care it would be unreasonable to make me wait to provide this care.
- It should still be necessary for contact information to be exchanged."
- It should be the pet owners responsibility for their pet no matter what the case.
- Just as I think the owner should stay, I think the one who was bit should also stay as it is often HUMAN error that leads to this, NOT the dog.
- It should be common curtesy
- i feel as if that a dog were to bite someone else out of no where that the owner must be held accountable because if your dog bites somebody without reasoning of defending itself or the owner it would be the owners fault for raising it to attack. if you raise your dog in the correct way like most people do your dog should not bite other people or other dogs. it is never the dogs fault it is always the owners.
- When a person punches another person, he is required to remains on the scene or he's going to be search. Same for dogs.
- It is the owners responsibility to take accountability for the actions of their dog and defend their dog if the bite was precipitated on the bad behaviour of another person or animal, however if the owner is with dog at the scene they may not be able to de-escalate the situation and more harm could occur.
- You can't just run away...
- If your dog bites someone, it's your responsibility to stay until an officer comes - also it is not always the dog's fault.
- It is the same as staying at the scene of other crimes
- Yes, within a reasonable time frame. (I.e. an officer will arrive within 30 mins). This is an opportunity for the owner and victim to provide on record explanation of the incident.
- You are responsible for your animal. Including its actions
- Again, it's poor animal husbandry not particular breeds that are to blame. Hold people accountable.
- Owner should be forced to take responsibility for the dogs mistake.
- It just is common curtesy to ensure all involved in an incident are ok and if medical attention is required everyone involved can contact each other
- It is the owners responsibility to make sure their dog, and others, are safe.
- ownership of
- A fine similar to "hit and run". If someones dog attacks someone or something, they need to be held responsible



- The owner is ultimately responsible therefore needs to be the accountable person if a situation occurs.
- I do believe that any dog who bites and the owner is in scene should stay until reports have been discussed.
- makes complete sense
- Unless doing so would cause harm or physical injury to another person. Ei: child ran off during incident
- In my experience, dog owners often flee the scene after an incident. This makes it hard to check on vaccinations and seriousness of the incident. They should be required to remain on the scene.
- Quite obvious isn't it. How could a tribunal committee do its job if they can't find out who the offending party is.
- I believe it should be the responsibility of any dog owner who is involved in an incident to stay at the scene and provide any and all information required, ie; license number, vet info regarding vaccinations, any prior incident.
- It is no different than a car accident or something like that
- It is important that the dog bite perpetrator remain and pay for the damages done to the victim.
- The dog's owner should be on hand to provide further information on the dog's medical history (recent vaccinations, for example)
- Provide background and other info
- People are responsible for their animals. If there are vet or medical costs they should be held accountable. If they just take off, it's like a hit and run...
- Some people don't have extreme funds to cover for their vet bills or their own health reasons. For some owners of the dog that was bitten this could be a matter of spending all the money they have or take loans, worst case scenario to put their loved animal to sleep not being able to afford potentially very expensive procedures. The person / owner needs to stay on site just as the owners of the vehicles that get into the accidents.
- People hide vicious dogs and then they bite again. Tracks repeat offenders. Most poorly behaved dogs have poorly behaved owners
- The owner should be responsible for the actions of their dog and stay at the scene and take responsibility for their actions
- I feel like it would help identify where the problematic animals are and help deal with them efficiently
- My pitbulls have been attacked by collie type dogs and the owners ran away afterwards and my dog was severely injured.
- There is always 2 sides to every story, both should be heard.
- Usually dog bite is followed with a big bill at the vet so having an info from an owner would help settling those kind of issues.
- determine if dog is nuisance, rehabbing, rehoming (if owners are obviously incapable of providing the dog with a safe environment [ex: bad dog owners])
- That's like hit and run with an automobile. Owners should be willing and cooperative in taking responsibility for their dogs actions



- As an owner I've done more than my share of ensuring one another are okay after a dog interaction. Dogs are animals and need to be handled and respected as such. We however equally take ownership and must behave responsibly.
 - Need the whole story which includes the dog owners account of what happened.
 - The owner of the dog should remain at the scene. In the event a bite causes more trauma than what is covered under AHS, the owner of the aggressive dog should be required to pay for antibiotics, etc.
 - Too often do people run off, it should be the same as fleeing the scene of an accident. You are responsible for what your dog does while in your care.
 - Pet owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their pets.
 - it may have been the bite victims fault. Dogs do defend themselves.
 - Yes so both parties can have a clear understanding of why the dog lashed out
 - I think it's important for the dog's owner to be present and to see what needs to be done.
 - I think this is vital.
 - Just as with a car accident, this should be mandated.
 - I do believe it is the responsibility of a dog owner to properly train the dog and it's a dog has bitten a person or an avid animal I do feel that the owner is liable for a fine and maybe some retraining for the dog
 - There's always 3 sides to every story, everyone involved should remain at the scene of incident to share details of what happened.
 - It's important to remain at the scene to explain the situation.
 - If your dog has caused harm, you should be held responsible. To leave would be the same as a hit-and-run.
 - "If it is a severe bite from one dog to another or a person has been bit without provoking the dog or trying to break up a fight.
-
- If unsure then just stay. Although, officers reviewing the cases should understand that not all dog owners understand dog behaviour and don't recognize when their bouncy, hyper active dog does not get a get out of jail card anytime there is an interaction with another dog. Owners need to be able to always be aware of other dogs and owners. If your bouncy dog runs up to a leashed dog or one that has given multiple signals it is not interested in playing and you don't correct your dog eventually the dog that doesn't want to play will do the correcting. It is not only the dog that does the correcting at fault. The other owner needs to know when to recall their dog and not just walk with their dog off leash and not pay attention and instead spend the entire walk talking to a friend or other owners and not be aware of where their dog is and what it is doing. A bouncy playful dog does not equal a good dog and a good dog owner.



- I fully support the bandana idea. Education to owners will be required to ensure this is effective. Owners that don't respect the bandana coding and continue to just let their dog interact with any dog even though the bandana clearly gives a visual of the type of dog it is. The owner not caring to respect the colour code should be held accountable if there is an altercation. Also who will regulate the bandana colours, ie who will be responsible to assess the dog to ensure it wears the appropriate colour. As not all dog owners understand dog behaviour or recognize when their dogs behaviour is not a favourable behaviour, thus potentially leading to issues. Lots of education for owners would need to be done around the colour coding."
- Dogs are wild animals and occasionally there can be a situation where one dog attacks another dog for a number of reasons. Although no owner wants this, the vet bills can be quite expensive for the owner of the dog that was attacked. The owner of the attacking dog should offer some sort of compensation for their damage.
- treat dog bites like car accidents. It should be illegal to leave the scene of a bite accident.
- If people could be fined for a "bite & run" and forced by law to pay vet bills, that would keep pet insurance costs down for responsible owners.
- Both parties, and witnesses should stay if bylaw is required. There is more to a story than your dog just bit my dog cases. Often both parties are in the wrong at some point. Fines could potentially be brought into both parties with understanding of situations.
- Much like a car accident
- I was bit by a dog on a path. It was not an off leash area. I was walking alone. The owner did not provide information and left. It was a pit bull crossed. I received a tetanus shot and antibiotics from the hospital and nothing happened to her.
- This is pretty obvious, isn't it? Enforcement needs to know who the dog's owner is... is this the first time for that dog, has it bitten before... what if there are significant vet bills for the bitten dog... also, you would like to be sure that the biter doesn't have rabies.... amongst other reasons...
- Because our pets are our responsibility. If your child hurt someone or something would you walk away?
- Had a friend who had been attacked by a dog and the owner ran away.
- It's the same as remaining at the scene of an accident. The relevant facts can be manipulated if the owner of the offending dog is allowed to leave.
- It is their dog
- A bite should be like a car accident. If there's blood an officer should be present.
- as in any accident involving person to person injury, responsibility is placed on the owner of the pet to take the responsible action to assure the person injured is appropriately cared for and that both sides of the issue are heard out
- Its your dog you need to follow through if they bite.
- Vet bills may result and it's like staying on the scene of a vehicle accident
- Owners must take responsibility
- In what other assault would it be okay for the perpetrator to leave? How is this even a question?
- If bite is severe enough to draw blood. If one party insists on it.



- No different than being involved in an accident
- it is the responsibility of the owner to remain on scene
- The owner is responsible for its animals actions.
- My dog was attacked several times by the same dog when I lived in a condo complex. Bylaw was unable to do anything about it except document the experience. Please update your bylaws to support good pet owners!
- If there is infection the victim should be able to notify the owner. This also seems like the way to track repeat offenders. I also believe that the owner/handler should be assessed as "fit" to handle their dog (i.e., that the owner is invested in training their dog, socializing it appropriately, etc)
- Dog bites can lead to further health complications such as infections in both humans and other animals, as well both parties should be held accountable to their own animal /self as it could have been either side at fault for instigating the dog bite it may not always be the pit bull owners or the pit bulls fault.
- A dog just doesn't bite for no reason. The owner must stay to explain what happened so it isn't a one way story. But that also being said if the incident was unprovoked and the dog bit someone or something its good for the owner to have to stay and get a better background of the owner. Because its not always the dogs fault. It could be the owners fault for poor training.
- Yes, this is part of responsible animal ownership.
- Just like if a driver hits another driver or vehicle or person you must stay and exchange information...
- People need to take accountability and responsibility for their pets actions. If a dog attacks a person, that dog needs to be put down. Coming from a Pitbull owner.
- like any accident or injury, people need to be responsible and accountable. you choose to own a dog, you have to assume the risk and do your part. at minimum, if the dog is agitated, some effort needs to be made to go be your contact info, and then parameters made clear when to stay on scene and when you should leave (ex; your dog is agitated and at risk of another bite or not under control)
- If another dog bites my dog for example, I would expect the owner to come and explain the situation, if they run from the situation with the dog i feel they are not responsible or not willing to be accountable for their animals actions
- I believe the owner much like a traffic accident that way both parties can give their events that happened and the officer can make a determination then.
- Or must share contact info before they leave.
- Too many people who have an animal that is reactive do not take responsibility. Both parties must remain at the scene to give statements like a person against person attack. Whether evoked, or a one time incident or a dog that has had many counts against them. This would be the only way to find that out
- If anything were to happen to myself, my loved ones or my dogs. I'd want all of that persons information for fines, payment of treatments and to be able to know that dog is getting the help it needs.
- Exchange of information is necessary to get vet bills covered for the injured dog.



- If it is safe to do so. Otherwise they need to immediately contact animal services and give their name address and phone number and make arrangements for the animal to be checked out.
- Common decency
- Two sides to every story. Credibility of owners/complainants can be evaluated in person .Important measure for the animals sake.
- Should be held accountable and illegal to leave scene
- I've seen enough owners run away after incidents like these.
- Dogs do not bite out of no where - unless diseased. If happened once, it will happen again. A dog biting another dog or person needs to be addressed by the owner and enforced rather than fleeing.
- The owner should be held accountable for owning a dangerous dog.
- Yes I think they should stay and answer any questions.
- It should be an offense, just like an assault. Parties responsible should be held accountable. Dogs with previous offenses would be treated more harshly.
- The owner is at fault not the dog. Their responsibility
- No responsible owner should ever leave the scene of an attack or bite. Make some distance so there's no further issues, but don't leave.
- Owners need to be held accountable for the actions of their pets and their own inactions
- If an injury or damage of person or property cannot be ignored simply because it was caused by an animal. The owner must take ownership and responsibility or be give a VERY large fine.
- This could be considered assault.
- I think it's fair if it's a TRUE altercation. Meaning broken skin or major issues.
- vet bills cost more than my truck payments. if someone's dog put mine into surgery they can cover the cost.
- The owner is ultimately responsible for the dog so they should be required to remain at the scene, just like with car accidents.
- A small dog bit and didn't let go of my pitbulls next, she remained calm and tried to shake it off, I was about to boot the little dog but the underage child that was walking it grabbed it before I could. First of all no underage child should be walking any dog without a paren, second this is a prime example of how "pitbulls" are not the problem.
- As a responsible owner this should always be done in the unfortunate event of a bite
- No one should ever leave the scene of an incident that you directly or indirectly have caused.
- Only if it is severe
- so they can be made to be responsible - often never see some of these people or dogs again otherwise - like a car accident - need to stay unless it is not possible due to the nature of any injury/need for medical attention
- Common sense and the golden rule of being a good person lead me to my answer
- More often than not, animals bite because of people not respecting their space, being approached without permission, being scared, etc. People should be held accountable whether that be the owner or the individual who has been bitten



- This is fine, but you cannot "ban" dog breeds!! Come on people!!
- As a car accident or other issue, should have to remain at the scene.
- You don't know the severity of a bite until assessed by a vet/doctor. Internal damage doesn't necessarily reflect on the exterior, therefore, providing contact information and a statement to an officer is a necessity!!
- Owners of aggressive dogs usually disappear without giving any info.
- They need to take responsibility
- Same as any other incident.
- Yes, however the situation needs to be permitting. If both dogs end up injured or the owner is also injured or the dog can not be controlled then no, I do not believe someone should have to stay at a scene. That person also has a responsibility to others around them and their dog. I do support that information between the people and dogs involved needs to be exchanged and if it is not exchanged then there should be consequences.
- If their dog bites someone...they are responsible. In Skyview some Dog Owners with high anxiety dogs blame people for their dog trying to attack others meanwhile their dog does not have a muzzle and they are walking their dog on public property.
- Uhhh yea? If your dog bites somebody you better talk to the police/byla/whatever about it
- Any injury is the responsibility of the owner
- Not if the dog is only playing. There could be different perceptions of a "bite." You should also be allowed to get your dog to a safe situation first but you should state your intentions to return. Just be a good samaritan.
- As a responsible dog owner you should own up for your dogs actions
- It's a liability like an accident so yes.
- This should absolutely be a requirement. There should be stiff penalties for dog owners who leave the scene of an incident when the victim wishes to pursue investigation/enforcement.
- Or pass on info for contact. Sometimes leaving is better for all parties to avoid conflict.
- Repeat behaviour, costs the city money. It should cost the owner.
- Their dog is their responsibility
- Even if it was an accident, the dog owner should still remain on scene to answer questions, assist, and provide their information.
- Just like a car accident
- Keeps people accountable for the care and training they are providing their animal so their can be a paper trail if something really bad happens
- Owner should be responsible for their pet and sometimes a pet is not approached correctly.
- If a person leaves the scene of an attack, it should be considered the same as a hit and run incident
- Owner must take full responsibility.
- It's the responsible thing to do



- "At the end of the day , no one wants to be responsible for their pet in hurting another animal or person. It happens and is unfortunate but it would be great to know that they're held accountable and accidents do happen especially when taking ownership of other living creatures.
- On the other hand - banning certain breeds is not necessary and will be ineffective. I know personally if these laws were implemented if one of my dogs were to harm or injure another animal I would be less likely to stay and report it to law enforcement as I'd be scared for my pets safety."
- If a person is bit by a dog the owner stick around to resolve the situation. A dog biting another dog is not a bit deal...however a dog full on attacking another dog is.
- Of course the owner should be responsible.
- In case of accident. Or in need of more training. And a check of rabies or other serious conditions. And check of abuse to animal if that is a reason that the animal is aggressive so judgment can be passed on owners and training can be given to animal so it never occurs again.
- If serious harm is done it's important that the accountable party remain involved and potentially pay for damages.
- Same as a traffic accident
- This is something all responsible pet owners should do anyways - you are responsible for this animal and therefore should step forward when an incident like this occurs
- There's more to one side of a story
- You should be required to share contact information to move forward with the situation.
- Should be considered leaving the scene of assault.
- So the owner can be held accountable for the actions of the dog
- Enforcing the need to stay on scene will help determine the psychology of the owner, as research heavily suggests that deviant behaviour in domesticated animals are a symptom of poor ownership and lack of resources from owners versus dangerous temperament of the domesticated animal in question.
- Well obviously the dog owner needs to take responsibility, if they are there when the dog bites, unless it was the victims fault in the first place, or the person was teasing or hurting the dog.
- Pit bulls and similar breeds of dog should not be regulated any differently than other breed. They are not the only breeds with more potential to dangerous bites based on their size. These breeds and their owners should not be scapegoated as problems due to a stigma that has been created around the breed(s).
- An act of aggression should still be delt with in a civil fashion
- If a dog attacks, it is the owners responsibility to make sure the other person is okay.
- There are many of these incidents like these at the dog park, the owner shy away from the incident and uses excuses like "my dog was just playing rough" and makes excuses to not help pay for the vet/doctor expenses.
- Same way you have to remain at the scene of any accident.



- Of a dog bites then the owner should be responsible.
- Need owners to be responsible.
- I was bitten while riding my bike on the slip road adjacent to Edworthy off leash area and the owner was not nearby. The bite broke the skin and I had to get a tetanus shot. Owners should be in control of their pets at all times.
- It may be the person who antagonizes the dog and the dog should not be penalized for that circumstance.
- Within reason only if it is safe for both dog and owner to remain at the scene.
- Most dogs who bite and misbehaved are more likely trained improperly. It makes more sense for the owner to receive consequences than the dog
- If a dog bites a person or an animal. The owner should be charged. It is not the dogs fault the incident happened. It's the owners for not properly training their dog. The owner should be treated the same way a parent is treated for not taking care of their child.
- An owner is responsible for his/her pet.
- it just makes sense. like a car accident.
- You have to stay at the scene of a motor vehicle accident. Same should be with dog bites.
- Should be given a fine on site
- If the victim of the incident was teasing/bothering the dog to the point of aggression or for the incident to happen, the dog and their owner should not be liable given that the dog was provoked
- As long as no further harm could be done during that time. If safer to remove yourself and animal i believe it should be okay to.
- Simple legal responsibility.
- How is there not a rule for this already????
- When you adopt or purchase a dog you are making a 10-15 year commitment to be responsible for them. You would not leave the scene of your child got into a fight with another person and there were injuries, you stay and make sure everyone is sorted out.
- The owner of the dog (or cat) that bites a person or other animal needs to be held responsible for necessary medical assessment and care, loss of work time / wages, and any required long-term care resulting from the bite. The owner needs to provide full contact information before leaving the scene - but also needs to remove the offending animal and get it safely restrained at home as quickly as possible. Waiting for an enforcement officer in public with an offending animal, or forcing the victim to wait to receive medical assessment / care until an enforcement officer arrives seems detrimental to health and safety.
- Overall less stressful for the dog and owner
- The dog owner should be held responsible for their dog and its behaviour.
- Sounds like the same idea as a car accident.
- If a dog bites a person or another animal it is necessary for both parties to explain the actual event. The owner of the perpetrating dog must be held accountable at the time of the incident. Leaving the scene allows the owner of the offending dog to avoid consequences. I have two small dogs which I pickup and carry when walking past other pet owners with large dogs. Too many pet owners of



large dogs state, "My dog is gentle and harmless." However, it is pet owners that display complacency instead of caution that become shocked when their dog suddenly attacks another dog unaware of what triggered the attack, and quick to justify the event or divert blame.

- If a dog bites a person or severely bites another dog, the owner should have to wait for an enforcement officer, but in small incidents of dog nipping another dog it should be left up to the owners to discuss the situation.
- It should be the responsibility of the of the pet owner who's dog has bitten someone or other animals to shoulder all necessary medical expenses of the victim/victim's pet, thus, exchanging of contact information is a must.
- I feel it is the owners responsibility if their dog is a threat to anyone or thing in anyway. A lot of people don't realize their dog is not friendly to everyone.
- Just like a car accident...they need to be responsible and share their info in case other issues come up.
- Owners must be held responsible
- The owner needs to accountable for their dog
- As long as safe to do so. Sometimes it can get quite tense and situation may escalate between people and dog may have to be removed from environment to ease tension. Info must be exchanges though.
- The owner is the problem, not the dog
- Owners are liable for their dogs behaviour therefore it is their responsibility to acknowledge and be held responsible for their dog's reaction.
- As long as the biting dog can be safely contained during this time. If not, then the enforcement officer could go to the owner's home for further follow up, so the dog is safely contained until things are worked out.
- If they are able to do so without causing additional risk due to the dog or the other inhabitants they should as they are responsible for their dog and their dogs actions.
- You're responsible for your pet and the way it acts. It looks bad on you to leave the scene even if it's not the dogs fault.
- Dog owners who cause harm have an obligation to remain on scene to share information & to talk to enforcement officers if necessary. If the same logic applies to people who drive, who also have a duty of care for pedestrians & other vehicles/bikes on the road, people who own dogs should be obligated to follow similar rules as well. That should be a clear responsibility for people who choose to own pets.
- This is a crime, like an attack. If a person hits another person, they need to explain to the police. The same goes for if a dog attacks a person.
- I think they should be present to speak to the officer what exactly happened
- To many just leave the scene. They need to be held accountable.
- all pet owners should remain at scene of incident
- No different than fleeing a scene of an accident.



- "The owner is responsible for controlling their pet and therefore are at least somewhat liable for their actions. Should be treated the same as hit-and-runs if they leave after a dog bite.
- For dog-on-dog bites, should not be as much of an issue unless it was clearly intending on/succeeded in injuring the other dog."
- Yes, however I have witnessed dogs owners who dogs have 'Fought' (varying degrees of dog behaviours, not always an actual fight) get into physical fights themselves. People get protective over their dog, it's like a loved on. And I do agree exchanging information is needed.
- I think it's important for owners to be responsible during an incident. It needs to be up to the involved parties whether enforcement officers should be included. If necessary, then yes, the owner needs to be present for the consequences.
- too many times the owner of a dog that bites leaves immediately and there is no prosecution.
- This is important in case of additional expenses to the victim. Same as vehicle accidents in my opinion.
- If there's a victim, whether dog, kid, cat etc. Then you stay at the scene of the crime, just like a car accident.
- that rule applies in ever aspect of life ,, leave name and number and submit report pertaining to the incident ,,
- medical attention may be needed for the person/animal, and if bitten rabies is a possibility and should be treated for within the animal. As well, it's dangerous and irresponsible to leave
- If the dog was to bite a person, that is the owners responsibility and should be sharing information for the next step, just as you would a car accident etc.
- They should definitely stay and exchange information if blood is drawn. If not severe, then a report should be made (information exchanged but you do not have to stay until enforcement arrives)
- A person should be responsible for the actions of their pet especially if it causes injury. Similar to vehicle accidents.
- Of course they should be accountable for their animal. If one of my dogs were to bite another dog, I would want to be sure that dog received the proper care, and that I would hopefully be required to get the needed training for my pup and myself by the enforcement officer.
- This is a responsibility of being a dog owner.
- It's like any incident that occurs when injuries are involved, all parties should talk to the authorities
- Getting both sides of the story and accountability are important, same as a car accident.
- My dog was bit by a dog that was with a dog walker. I forced the issue for her to have the dogs owner call me so they could be informed, but if I didn't they would never have known.
- This is assault and since the dog cannot take responsibility for its behaviour, the owner must. The public must be protected from a bite occurring again.
- If a responsible owner has a dog that bites, they will stay. If not, they will flee the scene



- You can hear both sides of the story. I would also like to see this with small dogs. Every bite, big or small, needs to be documented
- Accountability should be required in all aspects. Owning a dog does not make you special or put you above the law.
- Own up
- I feel like regardless of the breed the dog's behavior is owner's responsibility. If dog bites someone, it's not because of the breed, but because of the poor training, and owner should give up his/hers info and take responsibility
- The owner should be responsible for their pet hurting people or other animals. That responsibility should include sharing information and explaining the situation to enforcement officers.
- It's called being a responsible person
- No more runaways
- Because most of the time it's the little dogs that have the problem.
- My dogs have been bitten in off leash areas with owners scuttling off before I can get contact info. It is unlikely that such a rule would change this behaviour but there may be firmer consequences if you can determine who the owner is
- We need to make owners accountable for their animals, people says pets are family then have your family member abide by the laws.
- The dog's owner needs to provide information to victim but shouldn't necessarily have to wait for an officer. Depends on the severity of the attack.
- The person should be held accountable for the attack, it is easier to do this if the owner converses with an enforcement officer. However, if the dog was defending itself and/or owner against a perceived or actual threat the owner and dog should not be charged.
- I believe if the bite is bad enough information should be exchanged and people should be held accountable
- "Within reason. (On leash, separate from other dogs.)
- I believe that not everyone takes accountability for their/their pets actions. I believe there are TWO sides to every story."
- behaving in an accountable way for your animals behavior is something I feel and think that responsible pet owners should have to do.
- The owner should be responsible for how the dog reacted.
- It's responsible ownership
- Responsibility and accountability
- They should be able to explain if the animal was provoked.
- Qualified yes as long as animal in control.
- Dependent on there being an injury. Also, both parties must be able to safely stay in the space and have their animals under control.
- Yes but only if they can calm their dog down enough to stay.



- Because often once the offending animal and its owner leave the scene the victim or victim owner are left to handle things including vet costs. The offending owner isn't held accountable. Should be treated like a hit and run
- People take their dog biting other people and animals not seriously at all
- Owner shares responsibility for assaultive behavior
- My dog who is a bully breed was bit by another dog and they took off. Again, the fact this survey shows bias is totally unacceptable and also creates fear and outcome that are bias and emotionally based.
- That is key to responsible pet ownership.
- It's just like getting in a car accident. You are responsible for what happened.
- if a dog bites then yes
- Owner should take responsibility of their pet
- I think owners need to take accountability for any actions their animal has
- People should take responsibility for their pets.
- It is important to obtain vaccination information from the owner.
- Like a car accident.
- People yes, Dogs no. To many people have their dogs off leash where they shouldn't. If their animal gets hurt in those circumstances with any breed, it should be their responsibility.
- It is the dog owner's responsibility to ensure their dog is safe. The least they can do is share information and talk to the by-law officer.
- Depending on how severe.
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- If your dog injures any living creature the OWNER should be held responsible for poor dog training.
- So all parties involved can report what happened and have their information taken for future reference if needing follow up. In case medical services are needed for citizens and/or animals.
- Vicious Dogs will continue to bite and harm other animals and humans. Best to take information for next steps regarding what to do with the dogs.
- Pet owners take on the responsibility of their pet and their pet's action when they buy/adopt a dog. This should include dealing with the consequences if your dog bites someone or another animal.
- It's common courtesy.
- Much like a car accident people need to stay and exchange information for future vet bills, any charges etc
- Too many people don't take responsibility if their dog is involved in an altercation whether their dog is the aggressor or not.
- Yes, in cases of serious bites. If no injury is felt or visible, this is unnecessary.
- I believe ANY bite will cause physical or psychological damage to the victim and the owner must do their duty in being a responsible owner to stay at the scene and make sure the other person is okay. I believe there should be the same process as when a parked or unattended vehicle is damaged, the



person responsible should stay at the scene or leave a note in that situation, and the same framework of decision should be the same.

- If the dog bites somebody or something the owner should stay at scene
- It is their responsibility for their dog not being trained.
- Dog owners are responsible for pets.
- It's like cars, it makes sense to have the owner there if your dog bites another creature.
- Any dog of any size who bites someone, the owner should stay at the scene.
- It's almost always poor dog ownership that is the issue, not the dog. There are too many repeat cases because the owners do not get properly educated or reprimanded
- "Dog bites are serious and can be traumatic for the victim.
- There needs to be more accountability for dog owners"
- Somebody's dog biting somebody else should be considered a form of assault attributable to the owner, they should have to stay the same way in a car accident you can't flee the scene.
- Same as a car accident. Cooperation with any investigation is required
- Owner is responsible for dog-information should be exchanged but it is unnecessary to stay at the scene when the dog is obviously agitated. Would be best to leave with the dog ASAP.
- Yes
- That would be the respectable act to follow
- Any witness should be required to give a statement
- It's important to have the info of the dog not just for reprimanding but what if the dog has a disease, these things should be known
- If a dog bites regardless of breed the owner should treat it like a car accident and talk about what happened and what caused the dog to attack, a lot of cases the dogs are provoked by other parties that lead up to the attack
- Action should always be taken for these events.
- How else do you enforce this?
- They can't get away with it and leave
- Of course, just like an accident. It is the responsible thing to do
- They have to provide contact details for follow up
- They should be held accountable for the behaviour of their dog
- Of course the owner of the dog should remain after a bite. Ridiculous that this isn't already a bylaw.
- Owners need to be held accountable for their animals & for the injuries they may cause.
- Owners need to be held accountable for their pet's behaviour.
- If an incident occurs, it should be properly documented.
- "Yes it is the same as a car accident.
- If animals are treated as one's property in the eye of the law then the owner is responsible for any damages caused by the aggressive dog."
- Yes, for any dog. Not JUST bully breeds.
- No explanation needed.



- The owner should take responsibility if the dog is at fault. But if the non owner is at fault it should still be explained why
- Common sense... unless of course person or animal is transported to a hospital, in which case leaving information should be considered
- It makes sense. We'd expect the same level of action in the case of a car accident (the sharing of information) to help resolve the issue.
- Both owners should be present to properly assess what caused the incident. My primary concern is related to responsible owners with larger dogs/pit bulls being unfairly blamed for a potential bite situations caused by another irresponsible owners dog acting aggressively. If a leashed pit bull reacts to an aggressive Yorkie that runs up to it off-leash, should the pit bull be at fault?
- This would help track the animal and owner.
- Owners must be responsible for their dogs.
- Humans who own dogs are responsible for the dog's behaviour and for their own negligence and failure to control their animal. Humans need to face much more consistent punishment for being a root cause of poor animal behaviour.
- The owner is the one responsible if their dog bites & should be held accountable.
- Owners need to be held accountable, this should be a given.
- This would make it easier for information sharing amongst everyone involved.
- If the dog can be safely restrained and apprehended while awaiting for an enforcement officer to show up. If it cannot be, it may be best to flow up with contact information or meeting at a different place.
- You shouldn't leave when an animal or person is hurt.
- Too many people flee the scene of the crime leaving the injured without compensation or even knowledge that thr animal has had proper vaccinstitutions.
- The fact this is not already law is ludicrous. This should be a hefty fine that is staggered by your income level.
- The owner of the Attack dog should be required to pay for all the vet fees required by the dog(s) it injured from the attack.
- It would depend upon the severity of the bite against another animal, if blood is drawn then they should have to wait. Attacks on humans should have to wait no matter
- my dog was bit at the dog park and the couple grabbed their dog and left. My wife was alone and didn't know what to do. Now my dog does not like other dogs so we can't go to the dog park anymore
- To show papers that support the dog has had their shots and to do the right thing
- Nothing should ever be harmed and then ignored. It's your responsibility just as it would be when you hit a parked vehicle.
- In the case that the animal bites an individual causing great bodily harm, owner should remain as a safe distance from victim while waiting for officer involvement in a safe and visible location when necessary
- The owner should be held accountable



- How is this not already a bylaw?!
- Again, ensure officer is taking statements from both parties.
- Documentation of incident from all parties involved must be recorded at the time and place of incident. I have had my dog attacked at an off leash park by another dog and the owner fled, with no responsibility nor repercussions.
- Makes sense to take responsibility
- The owner of the animal should be responsible and must stay at the scene
- A dog is just a dog. The owner needs to be accountable.
- Why are you singling out pit bulls if they are not responsible for more bits!!
- That would be a good idea
- Like a collision. Makes sense to me.
- Often times at Vet Clinics the owners say that they have an agreement that the offending party will pay for the vet bill. However 9 times out of 10 the offending party is never heard from, and these owners have no choice but to pay for the injuries received from another dog. I believe having formal police records of this agreement will make it more binding and hold people to their word more effectively. Or at least be able to work out a fair solution.
- Just like a car accident. If there is an accident. Exchange info.
- leads to more responsible pet ownership, and fines for lack of training.
- Owners should be held accountable for a dogs actions and placing them in a situation they could cause harm if they know their dog is aggressive
- Should own up to their animal doing harm. Also should be able to provide records of shots so there is not unnecessary boosters given to the person being bit
- Must give contact info/ show id to victim. Bylaw will follow up. I have no faith bylaw will show up in a reasonable time.
- People need to take responsibility for the costs and trauma their dogs cause.
- If it's a actual bite with significant damage you should have to stay on scene. But not for someone crying wolf if the dog does not have a real wound.
- Dog owners must take full responsibility for the actions of their dogs. If their dog bites another dog or a person, they need to pay the costs for treatment of the bite, and they must share all of their contact information in order to be held accountable.
- Follow up information will always be required.
- Owner of the dog who bit should be responsible to pay for the other dog's vet bill pertaining to the bite.
- The dog owner must take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- The owner should be held accountable
- Be a responsible pet owner
- I think its important both sides can speak. Many times dogs are provoked, or strangers do not heed warnings about dogs that are not good with strangers etc.
- The owner needs to be held responsible



- In case any follow up is required. I think if the owner leaves it is like a hit and run accident.
- People need to take responsibility for when their dog causes damage to anything.
- I think the owner should be held responsible over any medical bills, but no euthanasia whatsoever.
- It's personal responsibility. If my dog causes an altercation, it's only right that I should remain at the scene to both support the accusations and/or defend against the accusations, if need be. If a person should flee the site of an altercation, that person should be heavily fined and automatically found guilty of what they are being accused. Innocent people don't flee.
- Like if you hit and run, why would you leave after injuring someone
- There should be accountability for these actions and fines if the scene is fled.
- As a responsible pet owner it should be their commitment to their beloved pet to explain why the event happened (dog was tormented) if applicable, and concern for the victim.
- Just like a car accident, the owner needs to stay on the scene until arrangements are made, if not they should be fined.
- I believe and have seen dog owners leave after a bite and I believe a fine should be imposed if they leave such as with a hit and run
- Vet and medical costs should be covered. Vaccinations records are needed.
- They are responsible for the actions of their pet and need to discuss all consequences with law enforcement
- "Dog bites can result in expensive vet bills that is unfair for the victim to have to pay.
- Should also have a record of aggressive dogs in case of repeat offenses."
- The dog owner is responsible for controlling and training their animal. An animal doesn't know as well as humans do, and could be acting out for various uncontrollable reasons. Owners who have animals that are aggressive should act and be responsible for the proper care and training as well as any incidents. This ensures the victim is compensated.
- No matter the damage caused at the time, there could be internal damage that goes unnoticed at the time.
- Too often the owner flees because they know they are at fault
- Of course. A dog owner is responsible for the actions of their pet at ALL times.
- Owners need to be accountable for their dog's actions. This can only happen if the investigating officer can contact them. All dog owners should be held to this standard. However, the owner needs to be held accountable, targeting specific breeds is not effective and unfairly penalizes responsible dog owners.
- Look at the owner before you look at the dog.
- Owners need to be held responsible for their dogs behavior.
- My dog has been run at and nearly hurt by a few dogs in my area. I would the owners to have to share their information to pass onto the city like any crime. They may be more careful or train their dogs then.
- This is logical, you would be expected to do the same in the case of a car accident.
- the owner needs to be accountable however if there is no way to secure the dog that is acting out and there is a danger, the situation should be followed up at the residence.



- Taking responsibility is a must if an animal is thought to be aggressive then the owner is the problem
- Everyone should remain at the scene of any accident
- Any responsible dog owner would take responsibility for the actions of their pet. They would also have the opportunity to shed light on the situation from all sides
- I support it but more information is required on how you suggest this would be followed up if the person fled
- Or they could phone 311 from the scene to report the incident and provide contact details that way. Dog bites should be documented and documentation should be tied to both the dog and the owner.
- If your dog caused harm, the owner needs to take FULL responsibility. The dog should NOT be punished, but instead make training mandatory.
- Punitive measures are not the point, however support for both victim and offender are necessary to improve socialization in the future
- Just like any altercation with people or vehicle accident all parties should be available to speak with law enforcement and take responsibility for the action that has occurred.
- It makes logical sense
- People are responsible for the actions of their pets. They should either be there to defend that their pet was provoked into attack or they should take responsibility for the poor training and socialization of the animal.
- Shouldn't leave the location of an incident
- That's the only way to ensure that both sides of the story are shared and that the owner takes responsibility for their dog's behaviour.
- Information should be exchanged but the owner of the animal should get the chance to remove it from the situation as to not aggravate it (take the dog to a car or home quickly) then return.
- It is ethical to ensure that all parties are contacted, involved, and informed with extent of injury and next steps.
- Yes as it's their responsibility. But also in some situations other people's dogs are the blame
- Causing injury to person, and/or property needs to be reviewed. Review and discussion are difficult if there is no bylaw put in place to discourage those who leave without permission/exchange of information.
- If a dog bites an animal or person and draws blood, the owner should be responsible for costs associated to the injury.
- I have had my dogs who are pitbulls bitten by other dogs who are the aggressors, and their owner high tails it out of there and I'm left with an expensive vet bill for my dog and they ran free with no consequence
- Just like a car accident, you were involved where someone was injured and you should be responsible for making sure everything is ok and bylaw officers or police as the case may be, can get the information needed
- Dog owners need to take full legal & financial responsibility if their dog damages another dog or person.



- The owner should be the one at fault, not the animal. If the animal bites or causes harm, it's clearly because that animal was not trained properly and or needs more training.
- Yes. If another persons dog regardless of breed leaves area they should be faced with large fines
- Just like leaving the scene of an accident, pet owners should also be held accountable and stay. Many leave for fear something will happen to their dog.
- Having the owners present is important for obtaining information.
- Yes, they should remain at the scene, as should the person who was bitten (or their parents/guardians). There are two sides to every story and at the bare minimum both parties should have contact information if an incident did occur.
- People need to be responsible and accountable for ANY pet they own
- I think everyone involved should feel supported and cared for - and this would be a way for that to happen.
- Having a dog is like having a child. If someone hurt your child would you let them just walk away without information?
- there are issues with dog owners leaving and the victim getting left behind with a vet bill. however this is an issue with ALL breeds not limited to pit bulls.
- If a dog bites an individual the owner is responsible for that pet
- Only if necessary. It depends on the situation and severity of the bite.
- Owners need to be held responsible for their dog but people also need to be held responsible for their own actions. Yes dogs can be aggressive, but people can also act inappropriately towards dogs. It is important for both parties to remain on scene in order to give statements and if possible have witness's remain on scene to help corroborate the incident.
- As mentioned above, a dog is a reflection of the owner. If the dog bites a human or animal, the owner is responsible.
- because you don't know what the dog might have and to get the proper care by a health professional is best
- The owner is ultimately responsible for vet bills if another animal is injured. Plus its just common courtesy.
- To explain the situation.
- It's like a car accident
- There should be an exchange of information and any witness statements of what happened too.
- I have friends where the dog and owner have run after biting another dog
- To provide information on temperament of the dog and actions leading up to the incident
- Ultimately the dog owner is responsible
- No
- It's the same as getting into a car accident so the owner should stay and exchange information.
- It's like hit and run laws
- The owner needs to be a responsible party and give information such as vaccine history, address, phone # etc.



- A dog bite can be serious and a dog owner should be responsible for their pet
- Too often victims are in shock and the owner is anxious to move on. It becomes a missed opportunity to document an aggressive encounter
- Why does this need explanation? Of course they should stay & exchange info; just like if you were in a car accident.
- Yes, however each party should be able to temporarily leave the immediate area in order to put their dog in their vehicle etc.
- Too much "pit & run" nonsense. If a person is going to have a nuisance dog, they should have all the consequences of their choice.
- Allows the owner to give their side of the story as sometimes a dog may react to negative action against it or its owner resulting in a bite.
- I view this the same as a motor accident. All information should be exchanged and if necessary all parties should wait for law enforcement.
- I've been in an incident like this, and have been bitten on the face by a dog. We exchanged information but I wasn't going to do anything. They called an officer to report our dog. So now I wish I had stayed there and waited for someone. I think it's important for other people to do the same.
- Yes. The dog is the owner's responsibility. Both parties should remain present.
- I think an enforcement officer should be there in order to determine how bad the bite is. Some people will play up injuries, or proceedings in order to get money out of the dog owner.
- It is part of accepting responsibility for an animal that you also accept responsibility for its behaviour.
- Provided their dog is now under control. If two people present leave one person while the other removes their dog. If only one, remove dog to vehicle or house and return to the scene if dog cannot be under control on scene.
- Owners of a dog that has attacked another should be liable for vet bills.
- Dogs are not inherently bad - owners have responsibility in training that dog. Applications should be sent to those who want dogs prone to aggression. If the OWNER does not qualify then they should not be allowed to buy or adopt a dog prone to aggressions.
- Like a vehicle accident, the dog owner should be accountable for the dog bite and any harm or damages it may have caused.
- You can't leave if you hit someone in your car, you shouldn't be able to leave if your dog bites someone.
- Yes, this allows the matter to be dealt with. If however the owner leaves the scene it should be considered a crime. Just like a hit and run.
- This provides protection for a responsible individual or dog owner if they or their dog are attacked by an aggressive dog. The responsibility and financial burden should fall on the irresponsible owner.
- People need to be accountable for their pets. As a responsible owner it should be assumed that you'll stay on-site.
- "I would say that dogs do not actually attack without a reason. It must be either the owner's or the victim's problem or both.



- An enforcement officer can take the words from both sides in this case if the owner also to remain at the scene of an incident - and it will be fair to both the dog and it's owner, and the victim(s)."
- Similar to requirements for vehicular collisions
- So they can explain the situation to authorities so that the "victim" can't twist to story in their favor.
- The dog owner has to take responsibility for the dogs actions and submit relevant information.
- If it's your dog, you should be held accountable for the dogs actions
- This is important information for liability
- "Yes. Absolutely yes!
- If a vet is needed the owner or the dog who caused the injuries needs to pay for All costs the other dog (and their own) requires"
- The owner is responsible for the dogs actions. Need to confirm with the owner if the dog has it's vaccines ie. rabies
- Not all cases of dog bites are the result of a nuisance animal. All parties should remain on scene and all sides should provide a statement, as is the case in any accident or assault case. Dogs may be reacting out of fear or in an attempt to protect their owner from an assault. This should always be taken into account.
- It's a good way to understand the whole situation that led to the bite. You are not basing fines off a one sided story.
- If you hit someone with your car you have to stay on scene. If your dog bites someone same rules should apply.
- Yes because its similar to a car accident and dog owners should be held accountable.
- Most times it is the owner who needs the training. Having the ability to assess how the owner behaves with their dog is important in determining next steps
- A pet is a person's property and responsibility. If that pet injures someone or someone else's pet, they need to be held accountable if it was due to their own negligence.
- Too many people, especially those with attacking pit bulls, tend to leave the scene of an attack to avoid having to pay medical bills (either to a human victim or pet victim) and to avoid having their dog taken away and euthanized. Often, they get away with this.
- Only if injury occurs. Owners should have to exchange information in case medical/vet bills are incurred.
- Treat it like a car crash
- So long as the dog can be placed in a vehicle or separate area. So the dog may not do this again. It could also help access the total story, if the dog was defending itself or other extenuating circumstances.
- This is logical to me not to leave the scene of a crime.
- To share contact information. They should not need to remain at the scene of contact information is shared anything further can be dealt with at another time, as is with "fender bender" incidents
- The owner needs to be held accountable, period.
- Victims should have an opportunity to safely consider their options.



- If it is a scrape or a very minor injury there should be no reason to peruse any further if it is a serious injury the owner needs to be help responsible for that
- Of course they should be required to stay in scene, it reduces the investigation needed to track down the dog and owner.
- All those involved should remain, to ensure due process and safety of all involved.
- My uncle was bitten by 2 dogs and the owner fled the scene with the dogs and he only found out who owned the after he got a bone infection,
- A dog owner should be held responsible if their dog bites another animal or human and should remain at the scene with their animal.
- They should be held accountable
- In personal experience, I have been bitten as a result of something the dogs owner was at fault for, not the dog. Explaining your experience of what occurred may result in finding the owner at risk, not the dog. Most dogs exhibit behavior problems relating to how they are treated. I would like that to be taken into consideration instead of just blaming the breed.
- Always stay on scene to pay bills that your dog has caused
- You never know the kind of damage done to the other individual so It's important the dog owner stays and takes responsibility for their dogs actions
- If you can't be responsible enough to follow through if your dog bites then you are not responsible enough to own a dog.
- Everyone should stay on scene, like for an MVA, until the matter is documented and reported.
- Dog owners should take responsibility for their pets actions.
- This is required, if violated they get charged bwith fleeing the scene. We need to accurately record nuisance dogs
- It's just like a hit and run and should be treated the same. If the owner fleas they should be punished at a higher degree but if they stay, as long as they have placed their dog in a safe space away from people and animals like in a car for example.
- Owners to be responsible for dog's actions and subsequent consequences
- Because obviously.
- Breed isn't an issue I have two large breed labelled dogs and both are registered canine good citizens - focus on responsible ownership please not breed bans
- I think that is just what every responsible owner should do now..
- Responsible pet owners should be doing this. But it's the irresponsible owners who are not following bylaws and general dog protocols.
- Yes 100%. They need to be held accountable and be required for obedience training.
- Hold them accountable and be traceable
- They need to be held responsible for their dogs actions and ensure safety of others by being a responsible dog owner.
- there may be associated costs as a result of an incident - the pet owner may be held liable for some of those costs - his/her information is required for this.



- Same as a car accident, if someone is injured the person responsible should have to stay
- It would give the dog a voice to be heard. A lot of 'bites' and 'dog attacks' are provoked and not treated correctly.
- Dogs are property in the eyes of the law. Up to the owner to maintain safety with their dog. No different than being in an accident and leaving the scene. Dog owner should be responsible for the cost of the dispatch of emergency services, hence the need for a large liability policy and to cover costs for the victims.
- It is important to hold pet owners responsible for their pets and having something in place to protect the public and their animals is something I support.
- There should be no reason to leave. Far too many people leave the scene when their dog bites and the victim of the attack is left with vet bills. People need to take responsibility
- When a dog bite/attack occurs, the owner should be considered as liable as the dog. It is important that owners are also involved in the process of justice so that they do not encourage negative behaviors (jumping, biting) in the future. There aren't any bad dogs-- only bad owners.
- It makes sense, just like if there was a car accident.
- It's no different than a vehicle accident. Bite and run is just as bad as a hit and run
- PUNISH THE BAD OWNER NOT THE DOG
- so both parties involved can explain what happened
- Because it's the right thing to do.
- While I support the concept of this I believe the execution of it would be cumbersome. If a person leaves the scene, what realistic recourse is there? I will say this here because it appears I have nowhere else to offer any other final comments: the problem isn't nuisance or vicious dogs. The problem is the people that own them. Solve the problem of nuisance people having access to and purchasing dogs, regardless of the breed, and you won't have nuisance and vicious dogs. And for god's sake let go of this "pitbulls are scary and dangerous" mantra, it's old, boring, and not the 80's. What's next a rebirth of satanic panic? ALL DOGS have the potential to be scary and dangerous. 9/10 a scary and dangerous dog is scary and dangerous because of a human being. We are the problem. Dogs are not the problem. Let me say this one last time: dogs are not the problem!
- People should be responsible for their pets. The person bit should also be required to stay along with witnesses. Sometimes the person bit is at fault for treating a dog poorly. That is bit the dog's fault if they bite after being hit or teased. Everyone should be accountable
- I think that there are far too many dog walkers and dog sitters that are taking their clients to off-leash parks without knowing about the dog's temperament. In this case I think it should be classified as negligence on the dog walker AND on the owner for not taking appropriate precautions or giving adequate instruction. However, I don't think that this should be limited to breed.
- Our dog was bitten, and the other owner took off leaving me with a \$160 vet bill.
- If my dog were to cause any kind of harm I would hold myself to this standard. Vet bills can be expensive and it should be clear who is going to be covering what.
- This seems logical to me. If you're in a car accident you must remain on scene to exchange your information with the other person and with CPS.



- Yes it is important to get both sides of the story and both perspectives.
- if a hit and run is a crime, instead of talking to the other vehicle owner, then a "bite/attack and run" should follow the same guideline.
- You are responsible for your animal and should be responsible for the repercussions as well
- In case anyone has been hurt the dog owner should be liable and NOT the animal. The animal should have to go to training and taught to not bite or attack. It is the owners fault and not the dogs
- If your dog bites, you are responsible for it
- It is the owners responsibility to train a dog properly. If a dog bites it is the owners fault, if a dog is aggressive it is the owners fault. The owner shall take responsibility of the dogs actions. I believe if owners aren't equipped to train a dog properly they should be stripped of the right to own such an animal
- I think if someone could also be fined for leaving an incident then it would act as a deterrent for leaving the scene.
- This is important as it holds people accountable.
- There needs to be more emphasis placed on the responsibility of the owner. EX: If the dog is known to be reactive and they still bring them to the dog part it is not the dogs fault for it's response. Also there needs to be collateral on whether this has happened before or if it was a one off poor interaction, or even caused by harmful behavior by the individual that was bit.
- If safe to do so. How else would the incident be dealt with? Info needs to be exchanged.
- So everyone has necessarily info.
- Unless it is not safe to do so (e.g. they need to remove their dog from the scene and then return)
- Of course the owner should stay at the scene.
- Both parties need to stay at the scene to ensure accurate information is translated to the enforcement officer.
- Yes, I do. I have read/heard many stories about how the dog's pet parent take the biting dog and run. I also think the city should also talk about little dogs. As quite often little dogs are instigators and they get away with bad behaviour cause they are little. Pet parents should be held responsible even if the bite is small cause it came from a little dog. I live across the street from a pitbull. It is the sweetest dog that I have ever met. I know how some of my neighbours react to that dog just because it is a pitbull. I think we should judge each dog on their own merit and not just because of the breed. The only dogs that have ever bit me were a miniature poodle and a golden retriever.
- This would ensure that the owner and dog are identified so that accountability is ensured, and proper training of the owner and dog can be recommended to prevent future instances.
- If the dog bites a person they should make sure the person is ok, it's human decency.
- Hold the owner accountable. If my kid punched another kid in the face, I'd expect any parent to wait to speak to enforcement and not run away. The owner needs to be enforced to take responsibility and train their dog properly
- it lets the owner and officer communicate properly and allow for a proper solution



- If your dog bites someone then you should have to answer for it. Although I can see it being avoided. I can easily claim someone's dog has bitten me and if that person leaves they are fleeing the scene of a crime.
- Allows for both parties to provide information at the time of the incident
- An incident meaning there was injury or negligence. Dogs attacking is a non-issue in the owners can control their dogs within the situation.
- Only in cases where the other person or dog become injured
- If the dog bites another person or animal, it's the owners responsibility to cooperate in any way possible
- The responsibility should fall on the owner of the dog as well as the person who was bitten because they may have provoked the attack.
- It's important to take responsibility.
- This is an incident that requires investigation and as such statements need to be taken.
- Except in cases where the person needs to remove the animal to reduce the risk of further injury, or in the cases where the person needs to leave to find medical care.
- If a dog has bit someone, it is the responsibility of the owner to stay on scene. Always. Regardless of breed.
- It should be like remaining at the scene of an accident.
- To provide vaccination information etc
- If there is no bylaw that requires this, I think people feel they can just walk away with no consequence.
- It is the part of a responsible pet owner to accept responsibility for actions done. However, if there was no actual damage they should be able to leave.
- It's their obligation to remain onsite and exchange information just as it would for any accident.
- It's responsible for owner whose property (ie dog) causes damage to people or other property.
- This should apply regardless of the size of dog, an owner should be held accountable even if it's a 'cute toy breed' that bit a child. Simply because they don't have the jaw strength doesn't mean they should be any less liable.
- It isn't always obvious why a dog has bit someone. Often a dog is taunted by the person. The whole story needs to be heard.
- This just make sense, kind of like remaining at the scene of an accident. If a dog bites someone or causes injury to another dog they should be responsible financially.
- Owners should take responsibility for their animals behaviour.
- Only upon request of the victim or owner of victim animal
- Both sides of the story are important, but exceptions must be made if the dog needs time to be at home to settle down.
- This just seems logical
- Similar to hit and run. All parties need to remain at the scene to give statements.



- It's a serious event if a dog becomes that unruly. If both parties can mutually work it out that would be a consideration.
- Have heard of several dogs biting people and owners fleeing the scene
- I work at a vet hospital and numerous times clients say that the people just take off and they cant get ahold of their contact info or rabies information.
- Its like a hit and run accident they should be fined or jailed just like in hit and run incidents
- Pet ownership cannot be taken lightly. An owner may not be identified if they leave the scene
- It's important to keep everyone in the same place, but the dog should be farther away from this person, so it doesn't attack again.
- Often people skitter off quickly to avoid penalty. More penalty could be added if a person hasn't got the moral ability to accept responsibly.
- It's respect. Just like a car accident.
- I have had an owner refuse to pay for the damage their dog has done to mine so would like more enforcement to get vet bills paid
- Just like a car accident, need to stay around to exchange and assess damages or health risks.
- A dog bite is the responsibility of the animal who is guilty. They need to stay so they can pay if there are vet or medical bills involved.
- Pitbulls are not the problem. Owners who do not train them are!
- Should be treated like a car ACCIDENT .
- If a dog bites a person or other animal the owner should be accountable for their dog's behavior but also given the right to discuss their version of events and what led to the attack.
- If your dog bites me or my dog , you will pay my vet bill. If this is the first time a dog has bit a person whatever I have free coverage through alberta health but my dog doesn't. So they should pay the vet fee
- They are responsible for their dog and what it does.
- "the owner of any animal regardless of breed or species should be held directly liable for the actions and behaviour of said animal.
- Animals should have the same rights as small children."
- Many people get away without having to pay for the consequences of attacks and this needs to be addressed!
- Only makes sense to stay in scene and report all information about the dog from the pet owner.
- Accidents happen. Taking responsibility for an incident is part of responsible pet ownership. HOWEVER, there are dogs that ignore viable cues from other dogs and in the end are bit. The dog that did the biting may not be at fault. An owner who allows their dog to torment another to the point where the biter has no other method of communication is more culpable if a bite occurs. There are far too many instances where pet owners are responsible for ignoring the escalating signs.
- The owner should be allowed to secure their dog in a safe, nearby location to avoid further conflict. The owner should stay available near the scene to provide any needed information.
- Your dog is under your care, you should take as much responsibility that is reasonable.



- It may be a repeat offender
- A responsible dog owner should welcome resolving the issue and cooperating.
- You don't have aggressive breeds of dogs. You have IRRESPONSIBLE OWNERS who don't know how to train/treat dogs properly. Depending on the situation, owners should be heavily fined. Start a file at the very least and/or investigate a designated "nuisance" dog -- on the owners. Start a file on the pet owners when a complaint is submitted to see trends easily especially if owners will have a history of complaints.
- It should be viewed as an assault.
- Because I feel like if it happens once then it may happen again and it would be better to have past records kept on the owner and dog so they can keep track of it and also assess them in person right after the incident.
- Take responsibility for your dog.
- "The owners body language and the way they are holding the dog needs to be seen. As in remorse.
- If the the dog was on leash and provoked by someone."
- When my dog was bitten, she needed multiple stitches. We have insurance, but that doesn't cover everything. If another dog bites my dog unprovoked, that is on the other person and they should pay for damage of property. Assuming the law that my pets are my property is still valid.
- Yes because they often run away in these situations
- This is only common sense!! If they leave the scene, they should be charged like a hit & run
- Owners need to be accountable for their pets actions and not leave the scene
- This is like driving a car you own and people own dogs so you should have to stay and exchange information
- It's obviously proper pet ownership.
- pets are family members and people need to be held accountable
- Yes, if the other party deems it necessary
- If a dog bites and causes harm to another animal/person, they should share their contact information so that a follow up can be done. I'm not sure they should be required to stay at the scene of an incident, however, as that may make the whole situation worse if the dog is being aggressive and/or out of control. If contact information is shared the owner should take the dog home and away from other animals/people.
- How would the city enforce those items listed in section 3, especially around dog bites
- I believe that this protects both the dog owner, dog and victim. I think it's important to have law enforcement have a verified copy of the facts incase civil lawsuits ensue.
- it's our responsibility as dog owners to own up and be present to protect both other animals and our own. If your dog bites another dog or human, it is your responsibility to be present and not flee the scene.
- Dog bites are caused by bad ownership so it would be a key factor for the owner to remain at the for officials to determine what happened



- That would be ideal but I can't see how a victim would be able to force the offending dog owner to remain at the scene
- This can give you insight to the handling of the dog and then the proper steps can be taken to better the situation.
- Similar to a hit and run.
- I have been through traumatic attacks against my dog. It's a chaotic situation and not knowing what to do adds to the stress. An established process that was communicated to all owners would be very helpful.
- Any dog can be aggressive. Just like any accident involving people they must stay on scene. Also people are legally not supposed to be judged separately for their ethnicity this should be the same for our local animals. Every dog big or small she be treated the same.
- Dog bites to humans or other animals should be treated like car accidents. Exchange of information along with a bylaw or enforcement written report.
- A dog who bites human should be put down. Period. Owning a dog is a privilege not a right
- All animals deserve the same love and care as a human or a CAR
- How about you stop breed discrimination and start applying your [removed] laws and suggestions to every other breed that attacks people and dogs frequently. This is absurd and you are all disgusting for suggesting these laws. 31 years I have lived here and over my dead body will I muzzle my dog for you inept morons. Start fining people whose dogs initiate the attack!
- Absolutely! That's common sense of being a responsible pet owner.
- Owners should be accountable for their animals, regardless of breed.
- Owner must take responsibility for their pet
- I think this should apply to Dogs that come up to people barking and/or showing aggressive behavior.
- I believe taking ownership for your dogs actions is part of being a responsible dog owner.
- It is similar to an accident scene. You need both parties for a full account.
- As with the scene of an accident, all involved parties should be required to remain at the scene.
- it is the responsibility of an owner to train their dog and must be present for anything that may happen.
- Yes, dog owner's are 100% responsible for their dog's behavior. Incidents need to be documented to show if there is a consistent behavior.
- It is important for the person whose dog caused the issue to be there as they are at fault.
- If you get into a collision in your car you must remain at the scene, same should apply for dog bites/similar incidents
- THERE ARE ALWAYS 2 SIDES TO EVERY STORY AND STAYING TO GIVE YOUR PERSPECTIVE IS THE RESPONSIBLE ACTION.
- Dog owners should be responsible for their pets
- Accountability. It depends on the severity of the attack.
- That is part of the responsibility of dog ownership



- I've had to follow people back to their car to get their license number after an incident in the offleash park, most people will just grab their aggressive dog and run to avoid fines or worse.
- It is our responsibility as dog owners to stay at the scene until contact information is exchanged if there was a situation where there was an attack.
- Dog is owners responsibility. Owner should be held accountable.
- Like a accident stay at the scene
- The owner is responsible for their animal and must act as such, including owning up to incidents.
- Or information needs to be shared between both parties
- That is part of the responsibility of owning a dog
- The owner of that dog is responsible for how that dog acts. If the dog is viciously attacking people or other animals I believe the owner needs to be held responsible. I have never known an animal that came from a loving family to ever attack someone.
- Too many owners of dogs that bite do not stick around to take accountability.
- They better be staying to give their information and should pay for any bills etc. If their dog did any damage to another animal or person
- Same as remaining in scene for a vehicular accident
- Yes IF it is safe to do so. The owner may need to get their dog back home or away from the scene to get it under control.
- This should be the same as a car accident. Fleeing the scene should be a punishable act.
- Common courtesy
- People should be responsible for their dogs
- Obviously don't leave if your pet attacks someone.
- Yes... there is a difference between a dog grabbing someone with its teeth if that someone was doing something the dog didn't like vs an actual bite.
- It can be difficult to track down those who are involved. If severe damage or lasting effects are determined AFTER the event, it would be beneficial to be able to talk to the owner of the aggressor dog (in case of infections, rabies, etc.).
- In the event of a dog, the owner should be required to stay and provide details.
- yes if an incident occurs. But alot of the time, careless owners are the main reason for issues, especially while "the aggressor" is in the middle of training in more public settings to be able to get used to have their owner in control all of the time, everything from recall training to simple obedience
- This would give a chance for the full story as a lot of the times a dog is provoked and it is not their fault
- This is no different than getting into a car accident and leaving the scene without giving your information.
- Not unlike a vehicle accident, the dog owner is responsible for their dog and should remain on scene until the incident is reported properly.
- Common responsibility
- This should be practiced already



- N/A
- Every situation is different the owner has the right to state what happened from their point of view. Would your car at the scene of a car accident? NOPE.
- This should include ALL DOGS, even tiny dogs that "can't do that much damage" this is not a breed specific problem.
- Seems like it should follow the same rules of a traffic collision. If an injury has occurred they should remain on the scene. Caveat: the offending animal needs to be removed from the situation.
- The owner is responsible for any damages the dog may cause, and if the person wants to press charges especially if there's severe injuries it is important that the dog owner is required to allow them to do so.
- You have to stay at a car crash for the same reason.
- If injury is caused by an animal it is the owners who needs to take responsibility for their dogs actions. If the person must stay at the scene of the incident there is more hope in that person getting the right guidance to help them and their dog to avoid further incidents.
- To ensure that the dog has had their shots and severity of bite.
- It's like a car accident. Share your info.
- This ensures that if the animal is an issue it is properly identified (not identified based off of what a witness thinks happened which can lead to improper reporting). Ensuring the owner speaks to an enforcement officer can lead to a more pro-active approach to rehabilitation of any aggressive behaviour, and if required proper fines which can be used to support further community-based and non-bias bylaw enforcement.
- How would you know information regarding the assault if the owner left?
- Owners are responsible for their dogs and must act as such.
- If the injury is to the point where law enforcement is required then yes they should remain on scene.
- All too often perpetrators flee the scene, causing so much trauma for the victims. And it is irresponsible.
- To often one owners side of the story is not enough.
- Yes of course, it's important both parties are heard
- Some dogs might be protective of their owner's which could play a factor in why some dog attack other dogs. If a dog attacks a human it might be due to body stance or if they make a sudden movement which will cause the dog to react aggressively.
- that way both sides of story are documented
- It's the responsible pet ownership
- Too often social media is used to track people down.
- That person or animal may require medical attention. This refers back to potentially requiring insurance for breeds with powerful jaws.
- I think it's important, as a pet owner, to take responsibility.
- The owner should have to share information, however medical attention for humans/animals must take priority, and so if the owner, the owners animal, or someone under the care of the owner is injured, they should be able to go receive immediate medical care and report to animal bylaw later



- Owners are responsible for their animal's behaviour. If their animal hurts someone the owner should do everything in their power to rectify the situation, which includes sharing information with the victim(s)
- ..
- Only if it is severe and requested by the effected party. Otherwise minor incidents shouldn't require that much process.
- It's important because if the dogs are dangerous then appropriate steps need to be followed and if these laws to enforce fines and harsher consequences come in to play then we need to be able to id the owners.
- Yes, especially if the other dog or person instigated the dog, didn't listen to the owners instructions to back off and stay away from their dog.
- The dog and owner should remain but targeting one dog breed over others with immensely strong jaws is ridiculous and pathetic. If pit bulls are on the list then German Sheppard and all other large breed dog should be as it's not the dog who is the problem it's the owner for not properly training and socializing the dog. Give your head a shake.
- People need to show responsibility for their pets, health concerns from bites need to be addressed without the owner running away.
- They need to be held accountable
- providing it is safe for the owner/dog to do so (ie: exception if the owner/dog are threatened by the victim or bystanders)
- Owners need to be accountable for the way their animal behaves in public. Should anything occur the owner needs to provide contact information, etc for follow up and fines.
- Beyond the obvious sharing of contact/vaccination information, there needs to be an opportunity to talk to both parties and to educate about typical dog behavior. The owner of a dog that bit someone maybe needs some information about socializing and training the dog; a person who got bit may benefit from follow-up counselling/education to help them be more dog-informed (so they can confidently/successfully interact with dogs in future).
- The dog owner is responsible. This is Kong different to a hit and run.
- To explain what happened.
- I feel it is the responsible thing to do
- This should help bad owners from running off and not being held accountable for how they deal with their pets
- So the owner can be held accountable and take necessary measures to correct
- Information should be given but the owner may need to take the dog away to a quiet place.
- The owner should be held responsible for the actions of their pet.
- My girlfriends mother was attacked with her dog at a park and the man left with the dog right away didn't even care if she was ok. Should be law, that upsets me he left and nothing was done
- the owner of the dog that bites another animal or person should be financially responsible and they should be providing vet records for their dog so that the injured party has all information necessary



for care. By remaining at the scene there is a better chance the incident is reported properly to the city and appropriate follow up measures taken to prevent further incidents.

- I agree that they should stay on scene but if they need to remove the dog from the dangerous situation there should be an allowance for that.
- The owner is responsible for what their dog does as it is likely due to the negligence of the owner (inappropriate supervision, lack of proper training etc.) Similar to the scene of a car accident, the owner should be held responsible for any harm caused.
- There are no bad dogs just bad owners. To be a responsible dog owner you should stay at the scene
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dogs actions however no dog should be euthanized for these actions. They should receive support, training and rehabilitation.
- Share contact info for insurance. Not sure an officer is necessary.
- Just like a car crash, you stay and exchange contact info and call authorities as necessary.
- We should be responsible if we allow our animal into a situation in which it has the chance to bite
- Any person or animal that causes damage or injury should have to stay to share contact information.
- The dog is not to blame. The owner is and should be held responsible.
- It's a common courtesy to make sure the other person is alright
- Too many owners of aggressive dogs do not get held accountable after incidents. It is 100% their responsibility to pay for any damages caused.
- This is much like a vehicle accident. We need to make sure there's contact info and the pet is up to date on vaccinations.
- the need to be charged for not controlling the animal, it is bad owners not bad dogs that is the problem
- The owner is always responsible not the dog. Its all psychology. People need to learn about how to help their dogs and listen to them. Its the persons fault.
- I agree
- Treat it like a hit and run
- People need to be responsible for their animals behaviors and deals with the consequences.
- If a dog bites a person or animal, the dog's owner should be liable for vet/medical bills for the other dog/person.
- Information needs to be exchanged in case the bite becomes infected or requires a hospital trip/hospital bills.
- That's the best way to get a full incident story, collect data and ensure proper measures/training are carried out afterwards
- I think it is your responsibility to take ownership for the actions of your pet. Definitely including when they have harmed another dog or person.
- Not every bite is a result of aggression, many things factor in and having the owner explain the situation could help.
- If this is the dog that did the attacking then absolutely yes.



- Unless an enforcement officer is unavailable. Then they can call or visit the owner at a later time to avoid inconvenient wait times.
- Normal rational human beings would do this
- This rule would be essentially the same as a car accident. People are expected to stay, as they should if their dog is causing physical harm regardless of it being human or another dog.
- yes
- I view it similar to a car accident. Dog behaviour is 90% how they are trained and the rest is how other people interact with that dog. Fleeing an accident is illegal. Same should go for fleeing a scene where your dog as reacted to a person or situation poorly and bit someone.
- This should follow the same logic as if a person assaulted another person.
- If for some reason the person cannot stay at the scene, they would need to provide photo ID to be able to leave and agree to have their photo taken. Any responsible pet owner should be willing to do so.
- If a dog bites someone and the owner leaves the scene, it should be treated the same as a hit-and-run car accident.
- Unless situation is unsafe for person or dog.
- Ultimately it is the owner who should be held accountable for the dog's behaviour. If they knew the dog was aggressive or had the potential to harm they should be the owns that need to answer questions.
- If there is injury that needs to be addressed further, having the dog and owner leave seems similar to a hit and run scenario
- Dog owners are responsible for the dogs actions
- It's good to have a person's information in case what looked like a cosmetic bite turns into something more once looked at.
- Yes, however it must be well understood that dogs have the capability of biting for MANY reasons, majority of which are unrelated to whether or not that dog is a safe pet/animal. Also, if this rule applies to 'dogs', then pet owners with small dogs (chihuahuas, beagles, pugs, etc.), are subject to the same rules as large dog owners. Lastly, this rule should only be used to protect the rights and safety of dogs (including large breeds), NOT to demonize them. I have been a large dog owner my entire life, and I have only ever felt concerned over my dog's safety when it is being aggressively approached by a small dog, as they tend to be more vicious and ill-behaved.
- It's out of respect but gov't is taking way to much control of everyone's lives. What's next?
- This is self explanatory. Any offence they should be there to have their contact info ready.
- I am veterinary office assistant, who'd worked at the Calgary Humane society, so I u understand the issues regarding problem dog owners.
- It holds the owner liable for their animals actions.
- It's either their fault or the other person/owner and either needs to take responsibility for being bad
- I would support this as long as the dogs involved don't need immediate vet assistance (this should be primary)
- It is their dog and their responsibility.



- You are responsible for the dog and the damage it does.
- Need to be able to exchange contact if needed and let affected party know if rabies vaccine up to date
- It's called being a responsible dog owner.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their pets no matter what.
- Absolutely - there are always 2 sides to every story. Dog owner and victim (whether a person or another dog) should all remain at the scene and exchange contact information.
- Yes, I believe that the owner should stay. However there are situations where the dog should not have been pet by a stranger yet, they were still pet anyways
- I think I support this, my concern is around people who harass animals they don't know. An owner is responsible for their pet, but on occasion strangers or kids might approach without consent and provoke a defensive response from an animal. In such a case the owner should not be penalized.
- If serious or needing medical attention or breaks skin then yes the owner should have to report and make a statement
- Too many people jumping to euthanization...this is obviously a deterrent and that concern should be fixed so people are willing to stay instead of punishing people for leaving when they think their pet will be killed
- Just like if your child bites another child. You are responsible
- When a dog bites, it's the people involved (the owner and the victim/victims owner) who are responsible for the incident.
- They should be responsible the owner should be investigated as welk dogs aret born vicious they are made that way mostly
- Running off is not ok but I can understand as some police and bylaw officers go over board in handling the situation. Owners need to know that thir dog won't be treated roughly or shot at.
- depending on the animal for example another pet (not necessary for wild life example coyotes) but if a dog bites another dog information should be exchanged or bites a human
- They should take responsibility for vet or medical bills
- "Contact information should be exchanged in the regards of it being a serious bite, opposed to a dog play fighting in a friendly manner.
- BSL does not work."
- Yes, it is their animal and they should be there to help with the situation.
- If a dog does bite someone or some other animal, the dog's owner should be there to be held accountable.
- At minimum, *both* parties should remain at the scene to exchange contact information and talk with an officer if necessary. I also would want to ensure that, particularly in the case of two dogs where one gets bitten, that the behaviour of *both* animals and their owners are addressed to ensure there weren't extenuating circumstances ie. one dog antagonizing the other until the other snaps and bites back. Many, many small (supposedly non-vicious) breeds dogs are not properly obedience trained and in a lot of cases, it's the antagonizing dog that has the problem behaviour that led to the attack, whether or not they were the ones doing the biting. It's not always the "big bad terriers" that are at



fault, but they certainly take the lion's share of blame in every case. Banning or restricting breeds will do nothing to reduce the number or severity of attacks if the dogs (and their owners) that remain do not have *their* behaviours and attitudes addressed. Moreover, I'm particularly concerned by the inclusion of any "dog that has an appearance and physical characteristics that are substantially similar to those of dogs referred to in any of clauses (a) to (d)". Way too much grey area that will absolutely result in docile and well trained animals being unfairly punished for their looks rather than their behaviour. We can do better than that.

- Owners must take responsibility.
- My boxer/pitbull Cross has been bit 6 times while on leash for a walk in parks and street. The owners simply say sorry and leave. I have spent about \$600 in 3 years for vet bills due to this. All the attackers were small breed dogs.
- It's the same as if you are in a car accident.
- You are responsible for your dog, if it attacks someone or something you are responsible as you did not train your dog properly. It's not the dogs fault any more than the owners.
- As an act of respect and also the person who got bit could need medical assistance. And also the pet owner should be able to explain his or her side of the story.
- Owners need to be held accountable for the behaviour of their animals. They should also be required to cover the cost of vet bills, damage to property etc.
- If they were a witness to the incident they must be there to provide information.
- At present some leave the scene without much worry leaving victim's owner to cover expenses etc. Give steep fine for leaving without ensuring contact info is exchanged.
- Far too many 'bite and runs'. Do the right thing and wait and share info
- Your dog is your responsibility. If your dog harms another creature you need to take responsibility.
- I think it is prudent for proper information to be shared in the same way that we share insurance information in the event of a car accident
- I think that both parties need to make sure they if they can (not a vet emergency).
- You should have contact info
- As long as they can contain the animal.
- It's kind of like if you're in a traffic accident, common sense is that you stay until you have ensured the other party(s) are alright, have your information, etc. It should be the same with animals.
- Dog owners should be responsible for their dogs actions, even if it was an accident
- Yes because you have to remain at a scene if you where in a car accident you should remain at the scene if your dog attacks something and take responsibility for you dogs actions.
- it is important for dog owners to be accountable for their dog's behaviour regardless of breed.
- If a dog bites an animal or human, the owner of the dog most certainly needs to remain at the scene to exchange information. They should be responsible for vet / hospital bills 100%
- Right thing to do.
- No different than fleeing the scene
- Owners must be responsible for their dogs actions.



- I believe this should apply whether it was a person that was attacked, or another animal. It's illegal to flee the scene of a motor vehicle accident. The same should go for animal attacks. And the owners should be responsible for paying any vet bills that the victim ends up with.
- They need to be held accountable for their dogs actions
- How else would you be able to hold the owner responsible
- Yes, as it's important to get a history on the dog (rabies vaccination, etc) for effective medical treatment of victim
- Dogs could be lethal weapons if the owner don't pay attention to their responsibilities (proper license, training, behaviour control etc) If the bits happened the owner should remain at the scene etc like when car accidents was happened
- Its important for everyone involved to share their details to allow insurance and Healthcare issues be addressed immediately.
- Yes I do agree with this if it was complete negligence on the owners part. However, I do strongly hope city of Calgary would be smart enough to not immediately jump to conclusions with a bite. For example, if I was walking my dog in the evening and was attacked by a person and my dog retaliated to protect me resulting in a bite-then that would in my mind NOT be at owners fault. I'd like to think city of Calgary or Calgary community standards would have some common sense with particular situations.
- This should be mandatory for animal and human bites.
- An assault has ocured. The owner or handler of the dog is 100% reponsible for the assault and must be held accountable.
- That way both sides of the story are heard and not just the story from the alleged victim is heard.
- again. it's the owners fault. not the damn dogs. people need to understand this & get it through their heads. there is NO bad dogs.
- Dogs owners need to be accountable for their dog's behaviour that may cause bites/aggressive incidents. Victims need also be held accountable if they have teased a dog that resulted in them being bitten or barked at.
- Treat it like a serious car crash
- You need to take responsibility of your dog and understand your dogs actions as yours.
- this is what responsible dog owners do. If they flee and get caught then u can fine them.
- I would consider that good ownership.
- If your pet damages another human, pet or property it is your responsibility to take accountability for them.
- I think if a dog bites or injures another dog they should be responsible for the bitten dogs vet expenses
- I think it'a important to obtain as much information about the situation that led to the dog bite including the dog's history.
- An dog owner is always responsible for their dog and being aware of it is reactive or not. If a negative interaction occurs a responsible pet owner should always take responsibility for what happened.



- Its like a car accident or someone brawling at the bar. Therw might be further issues that need to be adressed.
 - Owner takes responsibility for pets actions
 - "Like any other incident, it's important to be courteous and take
 - Responsibility. dog bites can be from
 - Big or
 - Little
 - Dogs"
 - If necessary
 - Only if the dog is adequately contained - if not, they should be able to leave
 - If it is safe for the animals and owners to do so
 - They should pay for any vet bills accrued
 - just as any assault or any time someone gets hurt if you are a witness stay to give a statement
 - Each person should be responsible for their pet at any given time
 - I don't think the onus should be on the victim to determine what the next course of action should be.
 - I think it shouldn't be a hard rule, because I can imagine in some scenarios the dog owner needs to get the dog away from the situation in order to prevent further problems. I do think it's a good idea for them to stay and provide information is possible.
 - Na
 - The owner should always stay and talk with anyone necessary if an attack happens, but not allowing pit bulls to have the same rights as other dogs because of an assumption is cruel.
 - Pets can get sick or injured, requiring more finances to fix.
 - If that means all dogs including small dogs. Small dog tend to bite way more but people brush it off cause it doesn't hurt as much as a large dog bite. Rule must be the same for all
 - Of course
 - This is simply responsible human behaviour and required so appropriate legal action can be taken if necessary.
 - Why should the dog owner be allowed to leave the scene? If their dog caused harm of course they should stay
 - "Questions need to be asked - keep in mind that it is not always the dogs fault with parents not parenting their kids and small dog owners thinking it is okay that their dogs are jumping/ being aggressive to bigger dogs
-
- Discriminating towards breeds is absolutely ridiculous and the city should be ashamed for stereotyping one breed over another and who is to determine if a dog "has pit bull characteristics"
 - I've had an off-leash pitbull bite a dog on my backyard. The owner left the scene with no offer of help even though the dog was bleeding from its neck and required vet attention. I had to have someone



find the man owning the dog by searching through the neighbourhood so that it could be reported. Even then the man was only fined and the victim had to pay for the expenses themselves. I'm honestly surprised there has not been a rule put in place like this before. Having to track down an owner with a violent dog after an incident is just more stress put on someone already in a tough situation.

- If an animal harms another the owner needs to provide information in the event the person/animal requires treatment.
- if your dog bites u are responsible and should stay to make sure everyone is ok
- It's harder to identify people/dogs who seriously attack someone. They must remain or be severely fined.
- Just like in an auto accident, the owner must stay and answer questions.
- If it severe yes. Bi Law would be called anyway and this way it can be discovered if the animal is up to date on shots and or if the person or other animal is injured action can be taken right away.
- Yes same rule as a car accident. If there is injuries, no one leaves until situation is accessed.
- Yes they should remain at the scene as a common courtesy. But no dog should have to be put down or put back in a shelter. We should be trying to aim for better training to prevent these incidents. I feel as though all these rules will result in less people even wanting pit bulls which breaks my heart to think about there being even more just left in shelters. All dogs deserve a loving home. and the city of calgary is just plain stupid if they decide to pass this. I will be ashamed to calm myself a Calgarian. No seriously. you should be ashamed for even considering this. And this is coming from someone who's dog was attacked by a neighbours pitbull a few years ago. He had trauma from previous owners and felt threatened by my pup, can't help that. we need to try to teach these dogs that they r okay. but they will never feel that way trapped in a cage in a shelter. :(
- Any violent interactions between animal-human or animal-animal should be handled with care. If the owner of the aggressive animal leaves, this is negligent and would not allow the pattern to be documented.
- As long as the enforcement officer is trained in animal handling and social factors instead of law enforcement
- I have actually been bitten by a dog in the NW, and when it occurred, I did not report it. The owner quickly left the scene with the dog in tow. The dog was a smaller breed but managed to break skin and cause bleeding.
- Because by would you not as a owner of a animal.
- Yes, the owner of every animal is responsible for whatever happens before, during, and after a situation in which said animal displays aggressive behavior.
- They are responsible for their dog, and it's actions. They can provide vet contact and dog history.
- Self explanatory
- Basic dog ownership? Accountability for an animal?
- If a dog bites to defend, it should never be at fault
- It's important to track the owner/animal for issues such as rabies, etc.



- Most dogs are good, but poor training and aggressive owners are the leading cause of these problems. They shouldn't be able to run off to skirt their responsibility.
- This should be common practice, however, even making this a rule does not mean individuals will abide by it.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions
- Pet owners need to be responsible and accountable for the actions of their pet.
- A dog's behaviour stems from their owner, the owner should be held responsible.
- My dog has been a victim of a dog bite and this would have been helpful.
- I like this idea but typically those with dogs who bite or attack a person or another animal will not stay at the scene regardless. Needs to be fines associated with leaving and not providing your information.
- It's just like a car accident. Simple.
- Only fear would be that the dog would be taken away
- For the same reason you remain at the scene of a car accident. It is the right thing to do.
- The owner and their dog need to be kept accountable. This will ensure repeat incidents are tracked and dealt with appropriately
- Too many irresponsible owners will simply walk away from a bite incident, leaving the victim with no way to truly report the incident to any real effect.
- In case of injury that results in medical care or vet bills an information exchange needs to take place.
- You never know if after a bite if an a infection will happen or something plus if this dog it's continuously fighting people, but it's not being reported, then nothing can be done
- It provides the opportunity for the owner to explain their side of the story. Responders should be trained to recognize that the biting dog may be highly distressed in the situation and needs extra space. Do not unnecessarily antagonize the animal when it is already stressed.
- Yes, because if information is not given from both sides of the situation, proper action can not be taken. It also makes it more difficult to keep track of incidents and dogs/owners with repeat offences
- they still need to be held liable
- Yes to ascertain that the dog has had required shots including for rabies.
- It keeps dog owners accountable, in addition to providing a chance to clarify the situation.
- Should t be able to walk away without providing information
- Yes this is the same situation as a car accident.
- Please do not consider pit-bull specific breed ban legislation. This is proven ineffective. Please, many more dogs will die unnecessarily because of this.
- If visible harm is done and there's still visual aggression bylaw report would be necessary in order to prevent future attacks
- The owner is in charge and responsible of the dog. If the dog hasn't received proper training, that is the owners fault.
- If a owner doesn't stay on site there likely are not a good owner anyhow



- You have to be there to advocate for your animal in the case that someone picks on the animal enough to make it retaliate
 - The owner should be able to identify exactly what triggered the attack at that time and why it did
 - So nobody else/or other animal gets bit by the same dog
 - People should be responsible for their dogs, it's like getting into a car accident.
 - Just like a car accident, if injury has occurred an exchange of information is required in order to hold the offender accountable for any costs that may incur.
 - Yes, this is essentially like a car accident. When the offending party leaves the scene, it is hard to hold someone accountable for the damage(s) caused.
 - "Biting a human: Yes, the owner of the attacking dog should stay to provide contact information. The owner should take responsibility for it's animal's actions, as proper training or precautions were not taken to help eliminate the indiscretion however, the situation should be looked into further as to why the dog bit a person in the first place. Was the dog put in a place of uncertainty or uncomfortably and the human chose not to read the dogs body language? That is the person's fault, not the dogs.
-
- As for biting another animal: Dogs are animals at the end of the day and fights are going to happen, but it's up to the person in care, custody and control of the animal to be aware of it's temperament and ensure that it is not put in a position to be aggressive towards another animal."
 - Too many times, a dog and owner flee the scene. The law should require the owner to be present.
 - They should definitely have to exchange information, at the very least so that they can pay for any vet bills that are incurred. Kind of like getting into a car accident - the at-fault person should be financially responsible for the damage.
 - It's called being a responsible person!
 - A responsible dog owner should be present during any and all incidents
 - Any owner of any dog should always take responsibility for their pets actions. It's not the dog but the person raising and training the animals fault. Any breed! Pitbulls should not be treated any different, it's pretty much like being racist towards other people and that's not right! It's how a child is raise just as it's how a pet is raised! Nothing to do with race or breed for any thing they do, accidental or purposely..
 - Why should they be allowed to leave after and assault?
 - If you're dog bites it's your responsibility unless the dog bite in defence. If you or your dog attack my dog they have every right to protect them self just like a human.
 - Yes for sure, it's not always the biter that is really at fault. There may be underlining reasons why the dog bit...maybe the other dog was being a jerk and provoked the other dog
 - Unless they must be taking their own animal or self for medical care. They should however exchange info with the other party.



- Owners can be so irresponsible. If your dog is at fault it's because you haven't trained the dog properly (most likely) they need to pay for vet bills if their dog bit another animal and they should also be charged for neglecting to control their dog.
- No different than a car accident.
- A police report should be made and both parties should be required to remain at the scene. The victim can then choose to go to civil court to pursue charges. The municipal government should have no further involvement.
- I like the idea of having a chance to provide context/background. Maybe a dog is biting due to being provoked; this can be explained to an officer if people remain at the scene.
- It is the dog owner's responsibility to properly train their animal so it does not engage in vicious, potentially life-threatening behaviours with other beings. Therefore, just as one is legally entitled to stay at the scene of the crime if they were involved in a traffic incident, it makes sense that they would legally be held responsible for staying at the scene after their dog bites, or attacks, an animal or human.
- Only makes sense. Owner must take responsibility. Same as hit and run otherwise.
- Including small dog owners
- People should be held responsible for their pets.
- This seems obvious
- No different than a car accident, if they can secure their dog in a safe space it would obviously be preferred
- I believe that if a dog bites a human or another animal the owner should stay on scene because it is the right thing to do and information may be required from the owner.
- That is a huge aspect of being a responsible pet owner. Accidents happen, but it is imperative the dog owner remain on scene after gaining control of their dog.
- Only if the bite resulted in injury required to be seen by a physician or veterinarian
- Yes all bites need to be reported to an enforcement officer and the dog should be quarantined for 10 days. Responsible pet ownership is taking responsibility for your pets actions.
- Owners should be held responsible for their dogs actions.
- It is important to hear opinion from both parties before further actions are taken
- Sure, with the knowing that the consequences does not include the dog being seized or euthanized. Refer to answer above.
- It's just like a car accident
- Just like any accident that happens you need to get both sides of the story so everything adds up
- Owners need to take responsibility for their so called "children", the same way real parents need to.
- ...
- A dog bite should be treated like a car accident where contact info must be exchanged in case further follow up due to injuries is required
- Owners whose dogs were involved in a biting incident should be required to take responsibility and also allowed to share their side of the story.



- I feel walking away would be an omission of guilt. Why wouldn't you stay at the scene to make sure everyone is OK?
- No different then any other incident, ie: car accident. You wait and deal with the situation, leaving the scene is not an acceptable response.
- It's the same to me as if you accidentally hit someone in the head with a rock you've thrown. It may have been an accident, but you're still morally obligated to be there.
- People run away and don't take responsibility.
- If there is a serious bite that causes injury then people should at the very least have to exchange information. If someone needs to take an animal or person for emergency care, they should not have to remain at the scene, but should have to exchange information before leaving.
- Reinforces dog owner responsibility and accountability for the behaviour of their dogs.
- Why would there ever be a reason to not wait and provide your information? To think otherwise is ludicrous.
- As a dog owner of a dog, I firmly believe that all owners are responsible for their dogs no matter what the circumstance. If my dog ever bit anyone, I would give my contact info freely as it is the right thing to do.
- Considering the bite is serious and is something that would need medical attention. It should be treated kind of like a car accident. That is fair!
- Any dog fights should be resolved with a mediator especially in cases of an animal being harmed.
- That would be the way to do it, makes it easier to get things resolved.
- Victim and offender stay on scene.
- "I won't bring my dog to off leash parks anymore for this reason.
- My dogs have been attacked and injured a few times by other owners dogs and they run off after calling their dog while not even being close to their dogs to control them during or prior to the attack."
- BOTH sides must be heard
- While I think it's important the dog be moved to a safe distance where it can be managed by the owner, it's also important that we ensure the dog and owner can receive the support they need to ensure the dog isn't a risk to the community, so yes I support a rule requiring them to stay and provide contact information. I think that follow up to ensure dogs are registered for training with approved, evidence-based dog trainers (ie positive reinforcement) would be valuable for owners and dogs alike.
- If there is any aggression toward another animal or person, all parties involved should need to wait or at minimum exchange information. Often, the dog that has bitten has been harassed by other dogs and is only asserting itself. The circumstances become he said/she said as the biter is often perceived as an aggressive dog.
- Owners must take responsibility for their dog. It's not the breeds fault. It's the owner.
- Absolutely the dog owner should remain at the scene. If a dog bites someone/something it needs to be assessed to prevent it happening again. If the dog owner leaves there is too much room for error in the incident. Both sides also need to tell their side of what happened to the enforcement officer.



When it comes to pitbulls or any bully breed type dog people are very quick to point the finger. Each person involved should be present to explain what happens to the proper action is put in place.

- It's common sense
- Too often owners leave when there is an issue. Contact information and dog license info must be shared for sure. If the victim wants to report it the other must remain on the scene.
- They should be near by but they would need to talk the dog away from the incident before enforcement officers arrive to avoid anymore bites.
- The owner should have to share contact info--it holds them accountable for their dog.
- The offending dog owner must stay while the injured person or animal must seek medical attention.
- If a person can not control their dog, or their dog is inappropriately off leash, and bites a person or animal, the cost of medical care should be on the owner, as well as a fine for off leash offences. It won't happen if the owner leaves the scene immediately to avoid responsibility.
- Just like an accident. You remain at the scene until help/police arrive.
- So many dog owners have gotten away when their animal bites someone/another animal and face issues that can be easily resolved (As someone who got attacked by a dog)
- Any dog can bite and some people don't listen to the owner when approaching a dog. The dog/owner should not be punished on the other persons actions.
- it is about owner responsibility
- Bylaws need to reflect responsible pet ownership, any incident injuring a person or animal involving bylaw officers should include a responsibility to be present until bylaw arrives
- If someone leaves the scene they are showing they are not a responsible pet owner. The City needs to keep track of problem animals, they can't do this if the pet owner leaves the scene.
- To many times people dogs (mainly small dogs) bite someone and the owner leaves and then it is harder to find the owner to hold them accountable for their pet. My only exception would be if they leave their information to go to the vet or dr to attend to wounds and the dr/vet has to report if someone comes in with dog bite wounds.
- N/a
- The dog bit a person it could have been for all sorts of reasons maybe a person pushed the hand in the dogs face after the owner said not too. Thier animal also hurt a person they should be held responsible
- This would help in tracking nuisance/viscous animals and hold owners accountable.
- Generally the owners are big problem not the dogs - if not trained properly - all dogs can be classed as nuisance / more needs to be done to owners not the dog
- I think it's important for dog owners to be accountable for their dogs, if a dog bites another person or other dog (animal) then we need to ensure that dog is accessed properly to avoid future incidences.
- The owner and the victim (and family if under age/incoherent) should both stay present. Both sides are needed to come to a proper decision.
- Both parties should stay at the scene to share contact info. If the injured person or animal needs urgent care one person should stay if possible but at the very least contact information should be shared so the guilty party can be charged accordingly or pay for vet bills etc.



- Its the owners responsibility for their pet. They need to stay and make sure all information is given.
- I agree but an report should be made some times the dog was provoked
- The owner should remain on scene as they are responsible for the animal and it's training.
- You should be responsible for your dog.
- Depending on the servility of the attack done the owner should have to stay at the scene. If done to another dog they should be responsible for the vet bill.
- Owners should be 100% responsible for their dog. Breeds should not be discriminated against. Perhaps behavioral training should be mandatory for those considering owning a dog that can overpower them. not breed specific, but large dogs that are high energy. Owners should face higher fines and consequences if they do not train their dog appropriately. the dog should not suffer as a result of an irresponsible owner.
- It is the right thing to do. If you flee the scene then it'll make you look very bad.
- Poor dog behaviour needs to be accountable by the owners
- An attack of any kind, to me, is assault. It should be seen the same way that we look at car accidents and physical altercations.
- It promotes responsible pet ownership and ensures accountability and ensures follow up
- I view it the same way as a car accident, the owner is responsible for their actions.
- If a person has an animal they know to be "nuisance", or reactive, and that animal attacks another dog (unless the 2nd dog is off-leash in an on-leash area, which is another matter), then the owner of the 1st dog should be at least partially responsible for the vet costs of the 2nd dog (unless, again, the 2nd dog is off-leash in an on-leash area).
- A person should always be in control of their animal, animals are considered property and people are always responsible for their property. If a person allows their animal (by way of negligence or unavoidable circumstance) to harm another living thing, that person needs to take responsibility for that.
- If an owner is deemed at fault and a dog attack was unprovoked the owner of the unprovoked dog should be compensated for vet bills. I however do not support taking the dog from the owner unless they are repeat offenders attacking unprovoked and behavioral rehabilitation has been unsuccessful.
- To later discuss options
- Absolutely people should have to stay and give info. Just like a car accident.
- The owner is responsible for the dogs behavior.
- It is a dog owners responsibility to follow up with anything their pet does. If a person experiences an injury, only a doctor can really say whether it's fine or not. If the injured person believes they require some medical assistance, it should be taken seriously until the end. Due diligence.
- Well as you should. If you dog does damage to another pet or person. You as an owner should be responsible and deal with those consequences
- It is similar to being in a car accident and not leaving the scene. The pet owner needs to be there so that details can be gathered in a timely manner.
- The exception to this would be if the dog/owner requires immediate medical attention (in the case of a dog fight).



- A dog bite is an assault and damages can be sustained to the person or the other dog.
- Just like a car accident exchange info or talk with police or bylaw
- One would be charged for leaving the scene of a car accident, so dog owners should remain.
- AGAIN, IT IS THE OWNERS RESPONSIBILITY NOT THE BREED ITSELF
- If I was bit by a dog I would want to make sure that the dog is healthy to be better prepared if I needed to go to the hospital.
- No matter what the situation the owner is responsible for the dog and should be held liable and considered criminal if they leave without at least giving contact information
- They have to be accountable.
- It depends on the severity of the bite- it should generally be regarded as a non-incident if the skin is unbroken however
- Responsible ownership is mandatory for all animals, should your animal injure another you should attempt to remedy the situation as best possible for the outcome of BOTH animals and owners.
- I do think they should remain on scene
- Both sides of the bite story need to be heard to accurately establish if the animal is actually at fault or was provoked
- Yes, often times the extent of injury may not be immediately obvious.
- I thought that was already a law.
- as an animal owner you are responsible for it. give your side of the story.
- The owner is responsible for the dog's behaviour.
- Explain my answer? This is common sense. Who thinks you should be allowed to leave the scene? Of course they should remain. Who thought of this question? Duh. By rule I assume you mean bylaw?
- Remain at scene same as MVA
- If an incident occurs, it is the responsibility of the owner to stay and take accountability for what happened. Plus it's just the decent human thing to do.
- I can't believe this isn't already a requirement. There needs to be greater accountability for all dog owners, especially those whose dogs injure others. There's a clear reason why we require driver's licences, insurance, and vehicle registration when operating motor vehicles. We need to treat the ownership of dogs and possible injuries in like manner.
- Yes - however there must be some consideration for the owner and their safety, if they feel threatened by the situation or feel the best option for the state of the dog is to put it in a vehicle/house if it is acting up they should be able to leave contact information
- Owners of pets that have caused harm, must take responsibility for their pet's actions.
- A stupid German Shepherd bit my Shar Pei while on a walk when the owner let his dog run across the yard and street. He was unwilling to wait with us and exchange information. Rules like this apply to traffic accidents and will provide accountability to pet owners. All breed owners, not only pitbull
- Being involved in an unprecedented situation like this is stressful on all parties. Get personal/contact info. Keep animals secured and away from the area of the incident. immediately attend to any



injuries (vet or hospital). Keep in contact with others involved and follow up on what steps come next. Communication can only help in times like these.

- To be held accountable
- similar to hit and run. owners need to assume responsibility for animal bites
- Information gathered for both sides are important in assessing how/why the bite happened. Both the victim and the accused should be able to share their information to give a complete picture.
- dog OWNERS must be responsible, y'all need to stop criminalizing 'bad dogs' and start criminalizing bad owners. and [removed] you guys for being breed specific. [removed]
- The dog owner and the victim should both have to explain the situation. The only exception should be if the dog who attacked cannot be kept at the scene in a safe manner (safe for the dog or the victim), the owner must first control or contain the dog before calling bylaw (or the governing body) to explain the situation.
- Many small breed owners whose dog bites strangers or other dogs choose to just walk away as if nothing happens as the bite is typically not severe but they should be held responsible and educated to know that it could be due to their dogs behaviour that causes another dog to bite or be aggressive.
- The reason a dog bites is due to how the owner trains their dog. So it should be their responsibility.
- This is common sense
- If the owner of the dog that was bit would like an enforcement officer to come, then yes. Otherwise no.
- Should be the same as a traffic accident. Depending on the situation you can exchange info at the scene or wait for bylaw
- Basic courtesy but is often ignored. May help if there are repercussions for not doing so.
- This seems common sense - the dog hurt another person, so must share the information to prevent future incidents and pay for any damages (health) caused to the other person or animal.
- They should have to stick around similar to a car accident.
- There are a lot of dogs that have multiple bite incidents, if the owner can run off before it is reported then the misbehaving dog may never be reported and may cause more serious harm or death if its allowed to keep attacking people or other animals.
- Often times dog owners walk away and the victim is holding the bag for all incurred vet bills
- If an owner's dog is aggressive towards a person or other animal, that owner should remain at the scene of the "crime" until a enforcement officer arrives.
- You have a dog, it's your responsibility. Doesn't matter what breed it is.
- I believe owners should take responsibility for the actions of their dog.
- An owner or handler is in care and control of the dog and responsible for their behaviour
- Yes ultimately it is the human who is at fault they should be held accountable . It is the human ego needs direction and education on the type of breed their dog has. If the human is weak the dog has no pack leader and is lost ..
- No dog is at fault, any misconduct occurred by an animal is directly related to the owner. All pet owners should be responsible for their dog wether it is a pit bull or Chihuahua and should be



required to stay at the scene of an incident and provide proper information, just like it is required to do after a car accident.

- Only if the problem dog isn't a continued problem, the owner should have to stay at the scene.
- Responsible pet ownership would be the owner staying and taking responsibility.
- Victims of attack shouldn't have to pay the vet bills for stitches / infected wounds, that should be on the owner of the attacking dog.
- That is what responsible pet owners do.
- If a pet is involved in an incident resulting in bodily harm the owner must be required to follow similar rules to that of a car accident and stay at the scene until information is shared and emergency services are at the scene if required.
- Similar to a car accident you are responsible as the dog's owner and must take accountability
- If they require any further information due to an incident the owner should be liable and provide any required information.
- Yes but only in a situation that is severe and 9-1-1 needed to be called for the injury
- "Absolutely. But please, no breed specific laws. Any breed of dog can end up as a "bad dog" if it's not raised properly.
- I don't own a pit bull breed dog.)"
- It's impossible to track down an owner after an incident since it's often based on witness descriptions. Need something to motivate people to stay if their pet is involved in an incident.
- Owners' need to be held more accountable. If you own a dog that bites someone you should be 100% required to provide info/speak to bylaw - or not be allowed to own dogs.
- The owner is responsible for the animal's behavior.
- If it's their dog the owner must be there like a parent would talk to the principal with their human child. It's their responsibility
- I understand why owners would want to leave as more and more we move to the termination of the animal - an animal they love and have a bond with. If that wasn't the knee-jerk reaction, an owner should stay for the sake of responsibility and care of the others involved. It's traumatizing to both the animals and humans.
- There is no reason why a dog owner shouldn't take responsibility for the incident.
- They absolutely should stick around and be held responsible if this happens
- Yes
- Intentionally leaving the scene of a dog bite/ attack should be treated similarly to a hit and run incident, and owners be subject to fines/ punishment if they intentionally leave the scene.
- BSL is unacceptable and not a solution. A disgusting proposal by the city.
- The dog owner should be liable for any damages or harm caused by the animal. By leaving the scene the owner should be just as liable as fleeing an accident or crime.
- Only the owner can provide information on the dog's history, such as behavior and vaccines.
- For the health and safety of other animals it should be necessary for the owner and the dog to remain at the scene.



- They should be ready to give personal info but not remain at scene. Trying to control a dog once it is worked up to the point of biting is not safe for anyone in the situation.
- If a persons dog hurts another person or animal, it is their responsibility to pay for any medical care required.
- it is simple responsible pet ownership. Much like a car accident
- If any dog breed bites or hurts someone they should be required to stay.
- Just like an auto accident, it's difficult to assess harm at the moment an injury occurs. Dog owners should be responsible for any injury or damages caused by their dog, and therefore they should have to provide their contact information for follow up and resolution
- Only if the bite causes damage IE punctures
- An incident involving an injury needs to be handled accordingly regardless of the cause.
- This is important from a liability perspective and to ensure responsible pet ownership. The owners that don't stay are often the owners that have not trained their dog correctly and are not willing to.
- many times the owner leaves which makes the incident worse. I understand leaving so the dogs can't get into it, but contact information should be exchanged.
- All parties involved should remain at the scene to record proper statements.
- They should be responsible for their dog and explain if there were any other factors as to why the dog could have bitten someone (teasing, feeding, attacking, etc.)
- The owner should be held accountable and must remain present to do so.
- This is along the lines of a car accident - you need to stay long enough to at least share contact information should there need to be follow up on the victim (ie. vet bills). An enforcement officer should also be required to attend the scene to determine who is at fault - for instance a leashed dog biting a dog that ran up to it while unleashed in a designated on-leash area should NOT be penalized, the unleashed dog should receive a fine instead.
- How do you keep the dog on scene if the owner leaves
- I think owners need to be held responsible if their dog bites another animal or person. It can be a very traumatic experience for the person or animal that was bit and the owners should have to come clear and deal with the re precautions.
- Requiring the owner to remain would make them more likely to remain vigilant with keeping their dog out of dangerous situations, and could reduce false reports if both parties were still on scene.
- The animal is your responsibility and likely the bite was caused by your raising or by instigation from another human.
- Punish the owner, not the animal who was taught by the owner. STOP BLAMING ANIMALS FOR STUPID HUMANS
- "It is part of being a responsible pet owner.
- People flee the scene often and that should be considered a fineable offence."
- Owners should always be responsible for their pets part of that responsibility would be staying to exchange information should their dog hurt someone.
- There have been many instances when my family dog has been bitten (NOT BY A PITBULL BREED) and the owner fled the scene. We were stuck with the vet bill as our dog required stitches.



- Owner needs to be accountable for actions of their dog.
- It is a form of assault. Refusing to stay on scene to exchange this information may cause future risk to other animals and people.
- If there is significant damage done
- It should be treated like a car accident. The whole situation should be looked at, just because a dog bites a person/dog it doesn't mean is at fault
- Just the same as with a car accident, I believe people should be held with the same level of accountability
- Responsibility of ownership.
- If the bite is serious to require medical treatment, yes. It could be harder to determine if dogs are play fighting with each other or if there's an off leash park and the owner is distracted/distanced and doesn't see the incident occur. Things like that should be considered when educating the public about the bylaw
- Pit bulls don't deserve to be treated this way
- All too often you hear of stories of mostly pit bull owners running away with their dog after their dog attacks someone or someone else's dog. The victim is then left without any possible way to discuss what happened and charge.
- Only if it is safe to do so, depending how the dog is behaving afterwards
- Too many people leave the scene, either thinking it is not important or don't want to be held liable.
- Dog owners need to be responsible. If their dog is not under control they need to stay if an incident occurs and help the other victim with costs incurred from a bite or attack
- Dogs bite for many reasons not all of them because the dog is vicious. Dogs need their owners to advocate for them. Stay at the scene.
- Take responsibility for your animal(s)
- It's important that when a dog bites, information is provided and verifiable by bylaw
- That seems very reasonable
- Yes so we can be sure the dog has all vaccines
- It's no different if you hit someone with your car. You are responsible for injuries caused by your car and your pet
- Owner is responsible not the animal.
- I thought people would have already been doing that
- Should be no different than a car accident.
- Need to assess damage, trauma, responsibility, and fitness of owner.
- I like the idea but think there should be limitations similar to car accidents where police don't need to be involved unless the damage exceeds \$_____. Maybe if the bite was small or no blood was drawn or both parties agree to go on their way, that should be permitted.
- The dog owner is completely responsible for the dog and should remain at the scene.
- It is important that an owner shows responsibility regarding the incident.



- I believe they should stay as this should be treated like any other type of assault, it should be considered the same as a hit and run if the owner leaves.
- Owners need to take full responsibility for their animal, including paying fines and taking training courses deemed necessary.
- As someone who has a small breed dog attacked by a Pitbull at a dog park, I would appreciate this as a rule. The owner ran away while I was tending to my dog and I would have liked her info.
- It's the same as a car accident it needs to be reported and or handled in case something comes up in the future.
- They need to answer questions and provide health information of their pet.
- As long as there is evidence there was an actual bite
- Good idea
- This way the owner can tell their side of the story with true knowledge of their dog's behavior. Many victims are only victims because they antagonized the dog to the point of it snapping (just like any human). This also gives the officer the opportunity to judge the relationship between human and dog, and ensure the human is not abusing or neglecting the dog. This will also give the officer the ability to judge a dog's training, and order obedience classes to the human (to be followed with a fine or something if they do not follow through). This will help reduce the number of bad dog owners, and as a result, bad dogs. I firmly believe the dog should be given every chance at life and shouldn't be killed cause they have a bad owner.
- owners should be held responsible for their animal. Its not the animals fault its the owners
- Dog attacks should be treated similar to car accident, in which information is required to be given, otherwise it is treated like a hit and run with higher consequences
- If an owner leaves the scene of a bite (that requires a visit from local enforcement, as some bites are very minor and the victim decides not to involve local enforcement) the animal should be seized and the offender be unable to own future animals (should extend to immediate family also or persons living within the same residence).
- It is important to make sure the owner is responsible for not properly training the dog correctly but not all blame should be put on the dog.
- Treat it similar to a car accident. Require both parties to exchange information and if injury is severe wait for an officer, otherwise both parties should be encouraged to take photos for their own records.
- In case this is a repeat offense
- If this has to be explained to you, you shouldn't be in a position of power to decide these things. All parties involved should have to wait and explain their side of things to the by-law officers. No one should be able to abscond from the scene of the incident without incurring some sort of fault or fine.
- Yes to ensure no one or animal has been harmed or needs medical attention
- The owner should share info so they can be liable for the dogs behaviour or the dog should be seized.
- Yes because sometimes certain pieces of information do not get exchanged between the two parties, especially if there has been a traumatic incident. (Ex. Dog city ID #, addresses/ phone numbers etc)



- it should be treated the same as a car accident.
- i think it's important for the owner to be there if they witnessed the incident to explain what happened, and to be there for their animal during this time
- Two sides to every story, important to hear both and to have contact information and identify the owner, dog and "victim"
- Yes if it is safe to do so, it may be the case that the owner needs to leave to remove the dog from the situation. Ideally they would leave contact information for the enforcement office to get a hold of them but it may be safest to move the dog to a building or car to prevent further reactions.
- Both sides of what happened is important to be registered whilst still fresh in everyone's mind and any witnesses statements should be taken. All too often the dog and it's owner are charged when the incident was created by non responsible people, dog owners included. I have many times asked people to please put their dog on a leash in a public park only to be told, oh it's OK he's friendly..... well my dogs don't bite but they also don't like big dogs and if they don't know the dog they could bark if the dog approached them. Or parents let their kids walk up to your dog, my dogs are good with kids but not if they run at them or grab at their fur or pull their tails. There needs to be something in the by-law to address these issues. It's not always the dog or it's owner.
- The accused dogs owners should be able to tell their side. Maybe the dog was provoked or scared.
- Absolutely need to stay! If owner left, that is similar to hit and run and should have same consequences when person of hit and run located.
- I think it is very important for dog owners to be responsible for the actions of their dogs. If their dog caused a bite to a person or other animal they need to at minimum provide contact information and follow up as necessary.
- Owner should be held accountable
- The owner should have some responsibility in damages
- Why would they be allowed to leave?
- "Only if a vet or a dr is required.
- Otherwise people will be calling and making people stay for play bites."
- Rabies prevention
- So that the owner can clarify if the other dog or person intended to harm the bully breed . Just in case the dog was defending itself
- If your dog attacks someone it's your responsibility to stay and figure out a solution.
- Gg
- This is common courtesy currently. Contact information should always be shared in the event of an incident.
- The owner should take responsibility if their dog has bitten another person or animal.
- As a responsible owner you should have control of your of your dog. If an incident were to occur, you should be held accountable - no different than a traffic accident.
- Absolutely, the owner needs to be held accountable and pay for medical treatment and maybe a fine if applicable



- The OWNER is responsible for the pets behaviour and by extension should be held responsible for damage done to other people and animals in the event of an incident
- To give the person a chance to defend what happened.
- I believe it is important for all parties to be involved with providing a statement of the events at the scene from their own perspective
- I think an owner leaving the scene of a dog bite is equivalent to fleeing an accident scene. However, they also must be able to control/restrain their animal.
- Dog bites and attacks can cause a lot of vet bills. Often these bills can be more than a minor car accident
- too often the owners take off, and you can't track them down
- A dog's owner is 100% responsible for what that animal does and, just like a traffic accident, should stay on the scene to deal with the consequences/aftermath.
- N/a
- Leaving a scene where your dog bit someone is no different than a hit and run in a vehicle. Personal injury occurred.
- Absolutely you hear all the time about dog attacks at dog parks and owners just get in there cars and leave fast. The owners of the dogs that are victims are busy assessing there dogs injuries and usually cant follow them to their vehicle to get license plates. If dog owner has to stay at scene it would make them more accountable for their dogs behavior .
- The owner needs to be held responsible. The dog should not be responsible for bad pet ownership.
- Owners need to be accountable for their dog's behaviour. Invariably, it isn't the dog's fault yet they get blamed and often lose their life. Wrong on so many levels.
- Your dog, your responsibility regardless of circumstances
- Puts the responsibility on the owner, especially during a severe incident similar to a guy and run.
- If there is long term injury to the person or other dog thete needs to be contact information. There needs to be discussion around of this is habitual, the dog needs more training the owner needs more education, etc.
- The dog owner is just as responsible if not more so than the dog.
- This is super important in terms of finding out this dogs vaccination status and whether or not this dog has a history of the same. Owners must also be held accountable for the actions of their dogs.
- You hart of many dog owners that have incidents with other at large apressive, non behaving dogs that have attacked or bitten or both and they always seem to flee the situation.
- Both the dog and the person bitten deserve to have all details noted before any decisions are made.
- Of course
- It is the responsible thing to do.
- This seems completely reasonable, no different than remaining at the scene of a car accident.
- Unless the parties involved have come to an agreement (trade vet info, guilty party says they will pay) then you should have to stick around.



- Yes I agree with this because I currently own two bullies and they would never hurt a fly but if a different breed attacked my dogs, which has happened by the way, I'd want the persons info.
- Responsibility of ownership. Maybe the issue for the dog behavior is the [removed] home life. Help the dog.
- Allows for both sides to explain what happened. If the dog was provoked or not etc
- It's important to get all information possible on the events to stop them from happening again
- If this needs explanation there's no hope.
- Not sure if it's even enforceable, but requiring face-to-face accountability with bylaw enforcement is IMO a good idea and might even act as a deterrent
- Yes. I hear of pets being attacked in our neighborhood by certain dogs and then the owner has to pay out of pocket for their dogs medical bills instead of the other party having to do so.
- Unless both parties agree this is not necessary.
- Just like a car accident. It's important both sides are heard, and case by case decisions are made based on circumstances (NOT BREED).
- The dog is ultimately the owner's responsibility and they are the one that needs to answer for any incidents involving their dog.
- Both sides of the story must be heard in every situation.
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- The way this is worded is that you are Singling out pit bull type breeds. These rules should apply to ALL dogs. This is prejudice against the breed because of a few bad eggs. Punish the deed not the breed!
- Obviously people need to be responsible for their pets,
- Surprised this isn't already the case.
- The owner of the dog that has injured another animal should be liable for cost accrued for medical bills
- it's the same as a car accident vs a hit and run
- The dog owner (or custodian) should be available to answer the questions of enforcement officers. The dog is their responsibility, and they should be held accountable for any misbehaviour.
- May need medical information about the dog (re: rabies) or contact info for owners.
- It should be treated in a similar fashion to any other incident causing harm (like a traffic incident).
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their pet.
- My dog was bit twice- one time the other owner covered expenses but the second time, the owner left and I was responsible for 1000 in vet bills
- I've witnessed too many owners leave the scene when their dog bites another dog, and the victim is left responsible for dealing with the vet bills and any fallout from the situation. The owners of the dog who bit should be held accountable instead as they're the perpetrators. Same should go for humans who are bit.
- Owners need to be held accountable for their actions.
- It is a reasonable part of responsible pet ownership.



- As with any assault, witnesses should remain at the scene
- It is ethical to explain the incident from both parties involved. I believe the owner is to blame, not the breed when it comes to dog bite incidents. The training the dog is given from its owner, therefore the dog is not at fault, it may have been over excited or not kept in well living conditions at home with the owner. But it is always good to explain what happened instead of running away.
- It's best to get the full story of what caused the incident. Sometimes it is not fully the dog's fault as a lot of people do not know how to properly interact and treat a dog
- So they could be held accountable.
- It's a difficult one to enforce as my dog was attacked and I wouldn't have waited at the scene. My dog needed to be seen by a vet ASAP.
- Seems reasonable. Much in the same way insurance is required to switch hands in a car accident, information should be exchanged in the event of a dog bite.
- We need to be responsible for the actions of our pets. It's like remaining at the scene of a hit and run or car accident. It would provide a learning opportunity for all involved. But it would also mean that the response times to call of dog bites were about to be responded to in a reasonable amount of time.
- You don't get into a car accident and flee the scene.
- Should be a crime to leave the scene of a dog bite
- It's the same as a car accident. Any decent human would stay on scene of an accident of any kind if authorities are required to attend.
- If the dog is at fault, the owner should be responsible for contact information and should wait for an officer if the case/dog needs to be fined or taken to court.
- Dog owner is responsible for it
- A "viscous" dog is almost always the result of bad/irresponsible ownership and is the responsibility of the owner when a dog attacks or harms somebody/another dog. This will also help reduce the stigma and just put the blame on a breed
- No different than remaining at the scene of a vehicle incident. Treat it as a hit and run and similar consequence.
- Dog guardians should be accountable and responsible for the outcomes of their dog's behaviour.
- Owners need to be available for contact if a serious incident occurs and should be prevented from fleeing a scene.
- It's the right thing to do
- They are responsible for their dog biting. They are the one who raised that dog and failed to teach their dog not to bite.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong and uneducated
- Just like a car accident but this is fully related to injury so of course they should have to remain
- If at least one of the parties wishes to involve the authorities then all involved (incl. witnesses) should remain at the scene. Depending on the situation, when a dog attacks and injures another dog, it should be required for the attacking dog's owner to cover veterinary expenses with some exceptions (such as if the incident was initially provoked by the injured dog).



- Think of it like a car accident; the owner should be legally held accountable, it is their dog (just as if they hit someone else with their car).
- Absolutely yes. And the owner of the dog that bites must be responsible for any related vet expenses.
- While other factors may be at play a owner must remain in control of their animal at all times
- i can't see how ppl would stay though
- Because then you would get both sides of the story
- If your animal has caused harm to another being it should be your responsibility to make sure that the proper information has been shared I.e. car accidents
- Owner can be required to stay on scene provided that neither the animal owner and the person bitten are required to talk with an enforcement officer.
- I've been bit by many small dogs and the owners brush it off as "oh they are just little and your fine" while they just leave, instead of taking responsibility for their [removed] dog.
- ..
- People are responsible for their pets and should be held accountable.
- Too many fakes names or just leaving happens. The dog and it's owner need to stay there, no question
- If a dog attacks another animal or person, contact information should definitely be shared.
- I believe all details should be shared with an enforcement officer so that the individual harmed is treated justly.
- Owners should always be present
- I think it is very important because in many cases they just walk away and thus can't be held liable for the subsequent costs incurred by the injured party.
- I would consider the owner leaving the scene of the incident as equivalent to living the scene of an accident.
- Owner's need to be held responsible for the actions of their pet. This includes the financial side of these incidents (veterinary/ medical costs) as well as ensuring the incidents are recorded.
- That way the person who has been bit can confirm current vaccination status
- Just like a hit and run, an owner of a dog that has bitten should remain at the scene and be accountable for the behavior of the dog.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for the actions of their pet.
- It is important to have all the information about the animals involved, for both/all parties. Should an animal need medical attention.
- Yes, for reasons of liability
- How else is a victim to have a chance at compelling compensation for the costs incurred due to an attack, if the owner is free to leave the scene? An owner could be involved in multiple attacks by his animal with no accountability. Citizens shouldn't be put in the position where they have to choose between following or recording an owner "thereby possibly further risking their safety" and letting the owner walk away, along with their chances for compensation and justice.



- I believe if your dog bites someone you need to stay until help or a police officer arrives
- In order to take financial responsibility
- "otherwise its like a hit and run? u cant cause damage to someone and then just leave the scene, u are liable for any damage or harm
- ur dog causes"
- This is demonstrating responsibility aka responsible pet ownership
- it is similar to leaving the scene of a crime in my mind, my only concern would be people abusing this like they already do when calling the police a lot of the times as a threat.
- The owner is responsible for the dog's behavior and as a result the owner should have to answer for any wrongdoings by the dog
- The dog owner should take responsibility for the incident, as well as provide any additional information to the enforcement officer.
- well this seems obvious, like leaving the scene of a car accident
- Several times the offenders leave. If there is significant damage to the human or animal, it should be treated like a hit and run of the offender leaves. Because it can take bylaw to respond, perhaps exchanging information (like in a car accident) would suffice.
- there needs to be severe penalties if they do not stay. Owners names should also be made public
- But only if the dog that bit can be contained/controlled in a safe manner (on leash with proper control by the owner, in a crate or in a vehicle.) Remaining at the scene should only be done if everyone's safety can be guaranteed.
- Pet owners need to be responsible for their pets, they are the ones who train them so just like car insurance you pay the expenses caused by the incident.
- I support sharing information if there are concerns about the severity of the bite.
- We need to hold the owners of the dogs who bite accountable.
- Because it's the right thing to do! if my dog bit someone, or their pet, I sure as hell wouldn't run off.
- Its the responsible thing to do
- It protects both sides having the pet owner being able to defend their dog if the person who the dog bit was antagonizing the dog.. they should get a ticket
- People still have to take accountability for their pet.
- because it falls on the owner regardless NOT THE BREED. that is some regressive and shameful thoughts to think it would be best to ban a specific breed of dog and honestly quite sickening to think the city i grew up in would consider such a thing.
- Get the owner has a bad dog... get them training, it's not the dogs fault the owner is incompetent
- It is responsible to stay on scene after any accident, a dog bite included. That said, there should be considerations made that allow for the person to remove their dog from a stressful and traumatic situation. For example, if my dog bit a person, I would want to remove her from that situation quickly since there was obviously a trauma/stress/trigger which provoked her to bite. Dogs almost never bite for no reason. I would communicate with the person that I would be right back, I would secure the dog (for instance, in my house or vehicle), then I would return to administer first aid, if necessary,



swap contact info, etc. Removing your dog to safety as long as you return or make arrangements should not be penalized.

- A responsible dog owner would remain at the scene of an incident to talk with an enforcement officer obviously if the dog bit a person or other animal there is a problem with the dog.
- The person whose animal has acted out should be required to provide their information, although If their animal is unable to stay on the scene due to behaviour or injury, the owner should be able to provide contact information and then be able to wait at home or in a safe place for further action.
- Any breed should be held accountable.
- The owner of the animal who bit another dog should also share their contact information with the owner whose animal was bit so that they can compensate for their veterinary fees associated with the dog attack.
- As the owner it is YOUR responsibility to be in control of your dog and you should be liable for any vet or hospital bills that that person or animal gets from your animal.
- The owner should remain at the scene of an incident regardless of what happens. They should not be able to get away without trying to deal with the incident.
- I believe that that should be the ethical thing to do, it's also better this way because then you can provide information about your dog such as if they have had all there vaccinations.
- Same as a car crash, it is just the right thing to do.
- As in most other conflicts (car accident, physical fight, etc), the owner should have to stay on scene to either call the appropriate authorities and/or collect information in case monetary compensation is sought (vet bills, ambulance ride, etc).
- They absolutely have a responsibility as dog owners, to admit fault when/if something happens. I know too many people who have been left with a dead pet, or an astronomical vet bill because of negligence. They should absolutely be expected at a legal level, to stay at the scene.
- Of course. People need to be held responsible for bringing their dog to a dog park that shouldn't be there. When my Staffordshire terrier was bit by a german shepherd, i spoke with the owner.
- Owners should be held responsible, but they should not fear their dog being killed as a result of an accident.
- The owner should be required to provide their contact information
- Owners should absolutely be required to stay at the scene, and share contact information.
- It depends what is best for the situation. If it makes sense for the owner and dog to leave to prevent further issues then they should be able to leave.
- Only if the bite results in substantial injury.
- Sharing information is important. Just as if there was a car accident, you should keep the information of the other individual for your records
- owners should take responsibility for the dog they raised.
- You should do that no matter the incident
- I had an experience with this situation which in retrospect I feel was unfair. I stayed and my dog was given a warning. She was a herding breed and a pup so was deemed aggressive because the other



owner called the authorities. Had I just left I wouldn't have had to rehome my dog. I stayed because I thought the other owner had overblown the situation.

- If your dog has bitten anyone it is your responsibility to stay at the scene and meet the needs of the people affected/involved.
- The dog is their responsibility
- "Vaccine history (rabies) is important to know.
- Exceptions should be allowed however, if the dog/owner needs medical attention."
- The owner or responsible party should be held responsible for any injuries to people or other animals.
- I think it is important that the owner takes responsibility especially if there are vet bills to be paid
- This should be self explanatory, there was an incident, someone or something was hurt, possibly killed you don't just run away.
- I think that's it's very important for dog owners to talk responsibility of there dog no matter what the breed is
- The dog handler is the party responsible for the damage. The same rules should apply for any situation where you're responsibly for bodily harm to someone (ex. If you damage property with a motor vehicle, the operator is responsible and expected to provide contact information). There is also the health safety component in regards to disease (ex rabies vaccination status, etc).
- At the least they should exchange information. We need to enforce obedience training and if it is severe I expect the attacker to pay for vet bills
- It is necessary to document the incident for future resolution and to maintain a record of the dog's behaviour
- It's like a car accident. Also, the attacked individual has no opportunity to perpetuate a fraud by making the attack "appear" worse than it was. Video footage of the resulting attack should be mandatory when possible.
- Same rules as a car accident.
- Part of being a responsible dog owner.
- Pretty self explanatory the same way you're supposed to stay at the scene if you it another car..
- You are responsible for your dog.
- As a dog owner, these are the actions I would take and I would expect other dog owners to do. If your child bit another child you wouldn't just run away.
- There are not enough owners being accountable for their dog's behaviour.
- The owner is responsible for their dog and should provide all information as required. I've had the experience where a lady's dog bite my dog and she took off without giving her information we had vet costs to cover for the damage done.
- As with all accidents no matter what is involved the parties involved should be required to remain at the scene.
- To make sure the person/animal was okay at got the right medical attention
- Yes, as the owner should be able to plead their case if necessary
- its your responsibility to be in control of your animal staying at the scene is the right thing to do



- To confirm the dog has been updated with vaccine and how big the damage was
- To obtain accurate information they should be waiting for an enforcement officer. Otherwise freely showing government issued ID.
- I expect someone in a vehicle accident to stay and provide insurance information. I would also expect someone in a bite situation to do the same. I do respect the owners right to find a way to safely contain their dog while they deal with paperwork, which may mean returning the dog to its home or a vehicle. Having the dog right there while people share information is not a safe situation.
- If a dog were to bite or attack my dogs they should be required to stay on scene. They should be held responsible for any injuries to my dogs, especially those that result in a vet bill.
- The owner of the dog that is responsible for the bite, should be held accountable, similar to that of an assault.
- Yes, unless the dog is really riled up and it may be safer to actually provide the contact information first, secure the dog at home and then have the owner return to the scene of the incident to meet with the enforcement officer.
- I believe that this would allow enforcement officers to more effectively reprimand the owner of the animal. I believe that most negative behavior of animals is due to owner negligence.
- Both sides of every story deserve to be heard and information should be shared the same as in any other accident/incident.
- I am surprised this isn't already a rule as it makes sense for a person to remain at a scene to provide information much like a vehicle incident
- If a dog bites another person or animal, it's the owner and only owners fault for not providing proper training.
- There should be consequences for animal behaviour especially when it results in harm to someone or someone's pet. If there is no repercussions for fleeing, why would anyone stay and risk being charged?
- As the victim of a pit bull attack that cost me \$1000s of dollars in vet Bill's and a diagnosis of PTSD, I support this rule as the owner fled the scene and when caught, refused to pay the vet bills
- Exchange of information is needed as the severity of the bite isn't always known right away (if bite gets infected)
- Should be no need for explanation, this should be just like a traffic accident or similar. I've been bit by a dog in a public park and have also been approached by threatening dogs in public parks (dogs off leash in on-leash areas no less) and I'm tired of irresponsible pet owners.
- Owners have to take responsibility for their pet and what their pet does.
- Yes because it is the owners responsibility for the dog biting and if they know they can be aggressive it is the owner that should face the penalty not the dog
- All owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions. Keeping the owners accountable if their dog attacks/bites should be a priority. No dog owner should be able to get away with their dog attacking a human or other animal.
- Bad pet behaviour is the responsibility of the owner. Period.



- Dog attacks should be treated like any other offence. You can't leave from a car accident, the same should be said for dog fights
- Unless the parties involved come to a mutual agreement, both should stay on scene- same as a MVA
- We have this rule for vehicle accidents, it should be the same if an animal harms someone.
- I believe it is important in order for safety but believe if it makes matters worse they should remove the animal for safety but sign we registering dog with city that if during an animal attack a victim has the right to take a picture of the owner or vehicle if they leave
- Yes, I feel like a lot of irresponsible owners talk down the severity of the situation. If you got in a car accident that resulted in injury/damage to someone else's vehicle, you would be charged for a hit and run. Anything that results in injury should require those who are accountable for the animal to stay on scene.
- This is just common sense
- A dog bite is an assault so it is not ok for the dog owner to take off, especially as there are often huge costs the victim has to undertake in terms of vet bills. The dog owner needs to be held accountable.
- I support it with the caveat that if the owner leaves their contact info in order to leave to contain their animal, they would not face consequences for this action.
- Yes, under any circumstance where person or another dog sustains any harm
- Hear both sides of the story
- Unless unsafe to do so. Both parties should remain on site.
- They should be responsible for damages.
- I fully believe that a dog's behaviour is learned from the owner so the owner is more responsible than the animal for any incidents.
- I support the requirement to share contact information, but not requiring people to wait for an officer. Bylaw has taken hours to respond to complaints in the past
- I think this rule should only apply when the incident results in moderate or significant injury to people and other animals.
- The owners of dogs that have attacked other animals or people need to be held accountable.
- I don't think it's responsible for a person to run off if their animal has bit.
- It is helpful to know the offending dog's vaccine history and it should be determined if this dog is a repeat offender as it may need restrictions such as a mandatory muzzle
- I can't believe this ISN'T already a rule that's in place!!
- Owner must take responsibility of pet.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to deal with the situation and be held accountable
- There are two sides to every story and sometimes dog attacks happen and it's not the owner's fault. Some dogs just don't like each other and sometimes it's dogs that are not properly trained. Owners should also have to be trained to handle their pet.
- Only if safe to do so for owner and animal(s) involved and this gives all information from both sides of incident as it may bring clarity and ease of information regarding the situation



- If the bite is severe and the person or animal needs medical treatment the offending dog owner should pay the bill!!!
 - People should have a way of contacting the person who's dog bit them in case they need to inform them if anything.
 - I think it's reasonable to do so in some cases. In other cases maybe just exchanging information (or even pet licensing information? Assuming that pet licensing could be made more widely known and available (a LOT of Calgarians aren't aware that you need to license pets, or don't have the resources to do so.) Im imagining it somewhat similar to exchanging info after a car accident. In some cases you need to stay but in others you're free to go after exchanging info.
 - Because it's their responsibility and they should be held accountable and talk to police.
 - I've heard too many stories about people getting bitten and the dog owner running away with the dog. Owners need to take responsibility for their dog's behavior
 - people should take responsibility for their pet's actions in the case of attacks at dog parks/etc
 - "The fact that a city is trying to put bans/control measures on a specific breed is repulsive. A pit bulls bite is NOT the most powerful do bc bite. Their bite is NOT on top of the PSI list. There are many other breeds with jaws just as strong but are not mentioned at all. This is no different than racism in humans. Unbelievable how [removed] disgusting pieces of garbage humans are in charge of things they have no knowledge in and don't even do the research to fact check themselves.
-
- You should be embarrassed."
 - The dog owner who attacked should absolutely stay and talk to authorities as they are the owner and responsible for their pet.
 - I think in extreme circumstances, definitely. If it's a minor encounter, there's really no point.
 - I think if owners must remain at scene and if not, can receive a fine, it would be beneficial for the city of Calgary to understand what breeds are causing issues and which individuals shouldn't be allowed to have a dog if they can't probably train them. It is unfair for a dog to bite and there be no repercussions. I also think owners should be fined and dogs be monitored before getting in trouble. Dogs can be behaved well if they have responsible owners.
 - Their dog, their responsibility. It's no different than hitting someone in a car.
 - I believe that it is the owners responsibility
 - Common sense says to exchange information?
 - I also think they should pay for any damages like vet Bill's as well
 - It is important for pet owners to take accountability for their pets actions.
 - Take ownership for both your animals as well as your own actions.
 - Contact information exchanged, with photo ID
 - Depending on the situation
 - People need to be responsible for the behavior of their animals
 - If an officer is necessary, then maybe they should stay.



- The dog is the responsibility of the owner. An owner should be able to control their dog the way they would control a car. If you hit someone with your car you must stay and exchange information.
- It's no different that a vehicle collision or an assault. They should have to stay and speak to authorities.
- Information should be shared between involved parties and City should have tracking information.
- Accountability. The owner knows the dog best.
- The owner is responsible for their dogs actions and must answer for them.
- Can't run from a problem
- You should take responsibility for what has happened. But if the animal needs urgent care and is unsafe it should not be required although information should be shared just as it should be shared with a car accident.
- This is no different than a traffic accident. If you cause someone or something harm you need to be held responsible
- Its your dog, the dog is trained by you. It is not the animals fault it is the owners.
- It is the owners that need to be held liable for their animals actions. Owners should be educated that their animals = their responsibility.
- To hear both sides and for admission of guilt.
- Yes, the owner should be liable the pain and suffering of the victim and there should be documentation for dog bites to track problem dogs.
- As a responsible owner/human being. If your dog was to bite you should do the right thing and stay at the scene.
- I do support the requirement for both parties to remain on scene for the bylaw officer to investigate
- Like a hit and run
- Owners need to be responsible.
- Would make the process easier for the victim and easier to track the offending owner and dog
- Like any accident, the person's involved stay on site.
- That is simply common courtesy
- The owner is responsible for their pet, if there is an attack they need to stay (or provide a way to be contacted if they cannot), so that follow up can happen to ensure another attack does not happen again
- Yes and no, the dog should be removed from the situation to lessen tensions and the possibility of another attack but its the owners responsibility to ensure the victim is okay and to provide their information. If the dog is unable to be removed without the owner then unsure of how one would assist a victim/provide information.
- A vicious bite is an offense and owners need to be held accountable...many vicious dogs can be little ankle biters that instigate the whole attack and then its their owners who run away or cry wolf
- Proper dog ownership
- Self explanatory.



- I think it's the responsible thing to do- it's your pet and it should be in your control- if not it should be muzzled or kept away from public, so yes you should stay and give your info in case further steps are required
- If the bite is serious enough, there should be an officer present and contact information given by both the owner of the dog and the victim
- The owner is responsible for its dogs actions
- Owners should be held personally liable for any and all damages caused by their animal. I believe criminal charges should be filed in many cases.
- Dog owners are legally and financially responsible for their dogs and their dogs behavior, they should be held accountable.
- That would be the right thing to do.
- Sometimes damages and injuries are not immediately visible. Staying to supply contact insures there's a way to reach the owners should a delayed outcome arise.
- I feel that the incident should be discussed with the 2 parties concerned. If the 'culprit' dog owner does not do so, an enforcement officer could be contacted.
- Yes, it is the responsibility of ANY BREED, ANY DOG OWNER to stay and ensure that the accident is covered. Similar to an vehicular accident.
- It's imperative to obtain information about the dog and the owner is the person who would have that info.
- If your dog injured someone you should stay at the scene
- Similar to a vehicle collision. People should remain on scene
- I think its a good idea so that both sides of the story are given at the same time.m
- There is nowhere to comment on the above, but it is ridiculous to treat pitbulls and bully breed dogs as different from other dogs. The majority of the time these dogs are much more loving and better behaved than other dogs. They are sweet natured and so loving. It isn't right to penalize them or people who want to own such special dogs simply on their breed. If a dog is aggressive that is a different story, but that is across breeds and in my experience bully breed dogs are much less likely to be aggressive naturally than other dogs.
- I worked at the humane society for a time, and saw how people's stories could change once they've talked with other people to help shape the story. It's a lot of he said she said, and I think if people had to explain at the time of the incident, things could be more honest.
- Yes, the dog owner should remain at the scene to provide information to the victims and law enforcement.
- If they arrive in a timely manner and can be respectful.
- The dog is his owner's responsibility. Thus he should of course stay on the scene. As you are supposed to do when you are involved in a car accident.
- Be a responsible owner, it's not the breeds it's the lack of responsibility from owners
- The owner will need to provide information on whether or not the dog has had its shots. Makes sense for them to have to stay at the scene.
- If an owner flees the scene they are trying to hide from the incident.



- They should stay to talk about why the incident happened to begin with or explain the situation from both sides.
- Is that not providing a witness statement to an incident??
- So that the owner can be identified in case of repeat offences, and possibly so the dog could be tested for any transmittable diseases.
- Yes, I think the owner should take responsibility. The owner should be required to go to reactive training to support the dog.
- Too many owners run away or the dog has never had veterinarian care
- Yes they definitely should because a lot of dog owners after their animal is engaged in an attack tend to just run away/are difficult to find again. It should be an offense if they escape the scene.
- Don't let the coward get away. Unleeeessss the dog is uncontrollable in which case it should not be in public
- It's like a hit and run if they leave
- You have to stay at the scene of an accident that you're involved in so why wouldn't you be expected to do the same in a situation involving your pet.
- They're responsible for the training and control of their pet, even if well-mannered, dogs are still animals that will sometimes act on nervous energy or an instinct. It's the owner's duty to control that, and their responsibility to care for anyone harmed in the case they lose control.
- The owner should be held responsible for their dogs training , the dog is not necessarily always at fault.
- If a trip to the vet is necessary, then the owner of the aggressive dog should be providing compensation. Accidents do happen when dogs are playing, but pet owners should be able to have a civil discussion to determine what next steps are necessary (not running away).
- Regardless if it was intentional or not, if you're an owner you're responsible for the dogs behavior.
- Any good person would stay and help and also go to vet with victim to hand over their credit card for the vet bills of victim
- If you cannot control your animal and there is an incident, you are responsible for payment of any medical treatments the victim(s) require. Same as if you cannot control your vehicle and get into a car accident...
- Fines should be upheld for dog owners fleeing the scene of an incident
- Seems only fair and the responsible thing to do
- They should remain. Treat it like it is a crime scene/car accident.
- Yes but this would be very difficult to communicate and enforce. This can come down to two different perspectives of the incident between the owners (arguments), and may just end up taking enforcement officer resource time away from other duties.
- Part of responsible ownership is to take responsibility for your dog's poor actions. I do believe that the reason for the bite must be assessed though - even the best dogs will lash out if provoked, hurt or scared.
- Yes, that's the responsible action to take.
- The people/owners of the aggressor should be responsible to pay vet bills of the injured dog.



- Yes, when it is safe to do so. However if the owner is not able disengage the dog from the incident, they should have to give their contact info to victim so the police can speak with them later.
- The dog owner is responsible for the dog and their lack of control/care resulted in the bite.
- Only if there is a somewhat decent amount of blood drawn, and other dog would need to be taken to the vet right away is in somewhat serious condition.
- Seems like common sense. The handler or owner of the dog that bit should be required to cover all vet or therapy costs of the human or animal that was bitten including physical therapy.
- **NO MATTER THE BREED. DO NOT DISCRIMINATE.**
- It's important for owners to be responsible for any incident regarding their pets and the safety of everyone involved in an incident involving their pet.
- Too many owners take off after an attack or situation
- Most dogs don't bite unless provoked. Even if it's a kid/adult sometimes they go to pet animals that don't want to be pet. The animal didn't consent and protected the owner. So the owner should be there to be able to defend
- The owner can provide clarification, aggravating or mitigating factors
- Bites from animals can often come with medical complications, that should be paid for by the guilty party - but not if their dog was acting in self defense. If a chihuahua bit a pitbull, and the pitbull bit the chihuahua back causing serious injury, the pitbull would not be at fault, as it was protecting itself. It needs to be recognized that although they don't do as much damage, small dogs biting people or other dogs need to be treated equally as large dogs or certain breeds behaving the same way. A dog's size does not excuse their owner from training them properly.
- If a dog attacks another dog or person or pet, this should be recorded so that the owner can be mandated to get the dog proper training
- too many times fake info is given or people run away
- You should be responsible for the damage done, vet bills and so on
- The owner should be required to provide contact information to an enforcement officer, however if the animal is in a "high emotional" state and is at risk of biting again the owner should be able to remove their animal from the situation to decrease the risk of another incident.
- Understanding animal behaviour means some dogs are provoked into biting; even by a person. Dog bites are simply not as black and white as the dog decided to bite someone because they are dangerous. While I agree this is true in some cases, it is not true in all cases. If my dog was being cornered or attacked and decided to bite back, I would not blame the dog! If this happened I would expect this to actually be heard and listened to by animal services and would stick around to explain the situation absolutely. ANY breed of dog can bite someone, ANY BREED.
- I believe in being the bigger person. Share both sides of the story
- The owner needs to take responsibility but the animal should not be punished for the owner's incompetence and being irresponsible
- I think that humans should be held accountable for their dogs behaviour. A dogs behaviour is generally directly correlated to the humans behaviour (either the owner or victim). A dog, regardless



of breed, is a product of their environment. And their aggression is in response to an action, be it visible by humans or not. Better owner training is required before a dog should be euthanized

- It's important to take ownership of this kind of behavior.
- you are responsible for your pet and should be held accountable for its actions.
- This is the only way that bylaws and appropriate follow up can be done
- any injury to or by a third party should be required to remain at the scene. (Unless both parties agree that it is unnecessary.)
- Much like a car, you need to stay and exchange information
- The owner of a dog who bites another animal or person should be held accountable and they should have to stay at the site just like a driver who crashes into another person's car.
- A dog bite can cause permanent bodily damage. If the owner is not required by law to remain at the scene of the incident, they have no incentive to do so and it could be difficult to locate them in the future.
- People can't walk away if it's their responsibility
- The OWNER needs to be held accountable for the action of their pet. Both sides of the story should be told.
- Important to document bites and the dogs/owners responsible.
- It's common decency to stay at the scene, share information and pay any required vet bills if a dog bites unprovoked.
- It's like a car accident, don't let your dog bite and run.
- For the protection of the animal or people involved it is essential for that a law is in place to exchange information. This is extremely important in reducing future bites or vicious behaviour as initial incidents will be recorded and documented.
- If one of more parties recommends they owner stay then yes. Especially if vet bills are required.
- Yes, however it is also important to consider they may have to leave the scene and come back in order to get the dog home (or in a secured space) safely and away from the heightened situation.
- I think that is fair. However, some people who are bit by dogs will take advantage of the situation so you have to be careful.
- similar to a car accident, i feel information needs to be exchanged should there be veterinary costs, or possible bylaw infractions
- I support this answer. However, what happens if there is no other person to take the dog home? What happens if the dog who bit the human is a smaller dog?
- As a responsible pet owner it is your job to remain at the scene and take accountability for your pets actions.
- part of being a responsible dog owner and citizen
- Within reasonable wait times. Would also accept a registration of complaint online
- Dog owners should be held accountable or be able to dispute the event - dogs cannot explain their actions. I don't necessarily blame the breed - all breeds can be sweet and aggressive.
- They should remain on scene however we cannot always assume the animal is at fault



- Leaving the scene of a crime is illegal. If your dog bites someone or another dog unprovoked you are responsible.
- Yes; however, only if it is safe to do so. In some instances, the owner has to remove their dog from the scene for safety reasons (e.g., another attack possible/ not under control); however, whenever possible and safe they should stay and connect with enforcement.
- Regardless of which dog is at fault running away never helps. Also laws need to be evaluated for who is responsible when an off leash dog comes up to an on leash dog and causes a fight! This is not the on leash dogs fault!!! There are many laws that need to be examined!! Any type of law that has a specific dog breed is not effective! The humans (owners) are the problem!!!
- Medical bill and concerns can then be discussed and addressed
- Logical that the owner would be required to be accountable and cooperative.
- The owner is and must be fully responsible for the behavior of his or her dogs
- Both sides need a voice and uncovering facts must be the goal of the enforcement officer.
- Provides a way of contact for the people/animals involved.
- Best to track minor incidents in an effort to avoid larger incidents before they happen.
- I don't see how this situation is any different than in the case of a motor vehicle accident where there is an injury. The parties involved are expected to remain at the scene. That should be the case in this situation too.
- Strict fines if an owner leaves the scene.
- Dog owners and bite victims should remain present to provide context of the situation to the enforcement officer.
- I just dont want to see any animal euthanized because of people period
- I;m sick of people not taking responsibility for the behaviours of their nasty dogs; if they don't remain at the incident scene, issue them a massive fine and destroy the animal - you have to be tough or people don't take the rules seriously
- Unfortunately it seems to be the pets that pay the price for irresponsible/negligent owners. Owners should be held accountable for the behavior of their animals
- Owner must held responsible for their animals
- n/a
- Legally, dogs are property/chattel. If a driver hits a car or injures a person, the law states they must stay at the scene of the crime. If an owner is in possession of a dog, it would make sense to apply a similar law where the owner of the animal must stay at the scene. We don't allow hit and runs, and we should not allow bite and runs.
- Regardless of breed if your dog bites, you are responsible
- Ultimately the owner is responsible for their pet. Be it a dog, cat, bird, etc. I feel like the scope of blaming the animal is misguided and we should focus on making sure there are adequate owners teaching the right types of behaviour for their pets.
- You are responsible for your animal. If they cause damage or injury to anything, you need to own up to what happened.
- That's just responsible and respectful for ANY dog that bites.



- A responsible dog owner would do so anyway.
- maintain responsibility for the actions of your animal
- Ensures the owner is held accountable for the actions of the animal.
- It should be like getting into a car accident. You exchange information and wait together until an office is able to come by.
- I think it's important for an enforcement officer to hear both sides of the story to determine if there were other factors involved in the dogs behaviour (ie. another dog or persons approach was inappropriate and your dog reacted)
- The owner of an animal is responsible for what that animal does, period. The owner should have to remain at the scene so all information can be exchanged and a potentially dangerous animal can be dealt with.
- Then the person can stay and explain the situation, or be issued a ticket.
- the owner is responsible for their dogs actions not the dog also the "victim" has a responsibility if the failed to heed owners warning.
- My concern is the offending dog owner will not abide by such a rule
- If someone or another animal is injured, especially to the point of life threatening conditions then both parties must be expected to exchange information and wait for emergency response
- Dog owners should by right make sure everyone is ok and it should be reported. But let's try to make that a law. It won't. People will run
- Yes. One time a dog attacked my dog, and the owner ran off with their dog and didn't speak a word to me. I would like it to be a rule so that doesn't happen to anyone else.
- I do think it's important that the owner be as cooperative as possible.
- Unless they need a minute to remove their animal from the "trouble" or emergency care is needed for a person or animal.
- It's the owner responsible to do so if the animal attacks another animal or person
- The owners are who need to be responsible here. Rottweilers and Doberman's can have the same amount of bite strength as bully breeds so it is the owner that should be responsible
- Dog bites can be due after the animal is provoked and if the owner has asked the other party member to step away/remove the cause and the request went ignored leading to a bite then the owners representation and word should be taken seriously. That way any officer can have both sides of the story immediately and assess from there.
- The owner is the one responsible for the dog. The dog is simply acting within the rights that it was taught by its owner and no breed should be blamed for negligent owners
- When damage is caused to another vehicle it is required - it should definitely be required when the damage is done to a living being.
- All pet owners who cannot contain their animals should be required to obtain training for said animal if given the opportunity to keep their animal after any incident in which an injury occurs has taken place. Legally, the owner should be present to the scene of any injury until dismissed by a bylaw officer. In the event that a fine be written or an injury has occurred, the owner should be responsible for all fees associated with their animals behaviours. If they leave the scene when it is not



appropriate to do so, they should be found guilty of leaving the scene of an accident and be punished with increased fines or legal charges based on the severity of the incident.

- Too often owners of problem dogs simply leave the scene in an attempt to avoid responsibility. These people should be held accountable, just as you are not allowed to leave the scene of a major car accident (ie: hit and run)
- They should have to give their information to both the cop and the victim
- It's not unlike remaining at the scene of a vehicle accident you're involved in.
- People need to be held responsible for their dog's actions.
- Because my dog was bite and the owner took off and cost me over 500 dollars at the vet from the damage
- It allows for the owner to explain their side ex. if someone was harassing their dog
- People need to be held accountable for their actions. They should be held liable for actions of their pets.
- The owner, not the animal is generally responsible for a dog bite and should be there to 1) share their side of the story 2) make it easier to keep track of them
- The victim and the owner of the dog should remain, just as both drivers should remain in a vehicular incident.
- It's an important part of collecting necessary information
- Ultimately the dog owner is responsible. Treat like any other offence. "Leaving the scene"
- I work in a vet hospital. The number of attacks that come in with no information of the offending party is alarming as they literally run away.
- They need to give their statement
- Animal bites don't happen if A. The dog is not intimidated/teased ex parents not watching children/pets irritating the dog and not paying attention to warning signs and B. Proper education/training has been given to the animal and owner and other people ex. Learn warning signs of aggression in dogs, using proper harnesses to identify nervous/friendly dogs
- If a dog bites, their owner is responsible for all injuries. Common sense as the dog cannot pay for injuries incurred.
- If the dog bites a person the owner should be required to take responsibility for it. Should not be legal to "bite and run"
- It makes the most logical sense however how is it enforced? Fine for leaving the scene? How do you contact bylaw in an after hours situation? Could an exchange of contact info and licensing info be exchanged similar to a car accident? Difficult to police.
- You should remain at the scene of any accident or incident you're a part of, with or without dogs involved. That's just common sense.
- Leaving is like leaving the scene of a car accident. Heavy fines and charges should be implemented if the "bite and run" owner is caught.
- If you have to do this when you hit someone with your car why wouldn't it be the same with your dog.
- I think this is important to get both sides of the story
- Common courtesy



- I think this is valuable to hear both sides of what happened. Sometimes dogs are not well trained and are the cause of the incident, but other times I have seen non owners blatantly ignore the request of the owner, and be the actual cause of the incident in the first place.
- if a dog bites some one the dog owner should stay and give info. Kind of like a car accident you still give your info.
- People need to be responsible for their pets.
- In the chaos that surrounds an dog attacking and biting someone, the victim is often not calm enough to get all the information from the owner and often the owner has little interest in staying around to take responsibility.
- This would be smart considering some people can give fake information.
- It's just like getting in a car accident. The owner is responsible whether a vehicle or a dog caused the damage.
- A person who is the victim of a dog bite has a right to make sure the dog has been vaccinated and to request documentation proving such.
- I've heard of alot of dog bites and attacks happening and either the owner is no where to be seen or the owner takes off. The owners of biting and aggressive dogs should be required by law to stay at the scene.
- People are responsible for their dogs. It's unfair to target all dogs and not problem owners. Please crack down on problem owners and explore the possibility of having them no longer allowed dogs if they continue to be a problem.
- Remaining at the scene helps officers understand the full story and hear both accounts of what has occurred. Additionally, this ensures that the right dog and dog owner is held responsible.
- It's called taking responsibility for your dogs action.
- This does not already happen?
- If it's a tiny little bite no.
- This increases accountability on the part of owners but also gives them a chance to explain if the dog was provoked by teasing or something by the victim.
- It should be treated similar to a car accident both parties stay until officers arrive
- If it's a small bite where no blood, severe pain, and or vet visits occur then no you shouldn't have to stay. Although if any of those conditions happen yes absolutely you should be forced to stay and be held accountable for your dogs actions.
- If any dog of any breed bites or attacks anyone, the owner of that dog should be held accountable and responsible for the outcome of incident. Not the dog, if the owner cannot display the ability to properly train their dog, then the dog should be removed from that persons cate.
- Should be held responsible for his dog's attacks.
- The owner should be required to stay at the scene to exchange information in case the bite is severe so the victim has the option to sue in case of large medical or vet bills related to the incident
- I think it's valuable to know who owns/has trained the animal that bit a person, but not to punish the dog.



- The enforcement officer needs to hear both sides and this way if it wasn't the dog's fault then that can be discussed right away
- Only if the incident is severe. Accidents happen and they should be treated as accidents, not crimes. As police are not needed at every fender bender the same should be with all incidents.
- No different then a hit and run, stay and take accountability
- The situation should be explained with all present. Sometimes a dog is spooked from trauma and not normally vicious then all areas should be explored.
- Like a car accident.. even if it was accidental an owner is responsible for the actions of their dog
- I have been attacked by a vicious dog and the owner left promptly. I believe they should have been held accountable
- The dog owner is responsible for the behaviour of the dog. I do not believe being breed specific is called for.
- They need to take full responsibility for the incident
- Victim would need medical attention, the doctor would need the dogs medical records from its veterinarian.
- People need to take responsibility for their pets
- as a dog owner, if a dog attacks the owner should exchange information, and allow an investigation
- Owners need to be held responsible for the actions of their dogs.
- Owner should take responsibility and make sure person is okay.
- This bylaw would help in follow-up after an aggressive incident to ensure the problem dog is being rehabilitated or better contained.
- Irresponsible owners need to be held accountable. Not the dogs.
- It really depends on how bad the bite/attack is
- I feel that this would be a benefit to the owners on both ends of the attack. The person who owns the dog who attacked would have a chance to explain the situation in the event that their dog was antagonized. Otherwise, if the attacker owner wasn't fit to be a good owner ei: had it's dog in dog fighting, etc. this would allow for authorities to take action and ensure this owner was dealt with accordingly.
- Owners need to be held accountable for their animals actions. This rule needs to be especially enforced for small dogs who often antagonize larger breeds. Larger breeds may be more 'dangerous' due to their strength but poorly trained smaller breeds I feel are the main issue.
- It is important for the dog owner to stay on scene and explain what happened in the incident
- People should be given the option to explain what happened and take responsibility for their dog and the situation
- I see it like being involved in a vehicular accident. If you leave the scene, it is considered a hit and Run. They only issue I see is if the dog is aggravated enough to bite it may be best for the dog to be removed form the scene as other people and animals may be put at risk.
- The owner of a dog who has caused harm needs to take responsibility. It goes to show the owner has not properly trained their dog.



- Just as how you are required to stay at the scene of a car accident, the owner must either remain on scene until enforcement arrives, or have someone (the owner if it is a dog walker per say) attend the scene immediately.
- I believe it's in everyone's best interest to have all of the information gathered at once, allowing informed decisions to be made.
- Even if it's not necessary the dogs fault for what has happened, the owner is still the owner and liable for what has happened.
- So the dog and owner can be tracked and if it's a repeat incident they can be dealt with appropriately
- I think it's only fair that if your dog harms a person or another dog, that contact information should be exchanged and the owner be held responsible for the actions of their dog
- This should be treated like hit-and-run. However, if it is to be implemented, there would need to be a commitment for a law enforcement officer to be sent out as soon as a call is received.
- This should already be in place.
- You would have to remain at the scene of a car accident, an animal incident should also require a trade of information - including smaller breeds.
- It's the owner that is responsible. And too often you will see the person left behind exaggerating or out and out lying about the incident.
- If a persons dog bites someone they should have to stay their. Until the person the dog bit or an officer says they can go
- Dogs and or owners with a history of aggression towards people or other dog's should be tracked and restricted as such.
- If a dog bites someone severely enough the owner should be willing to support the victim. But in some cases it makes way more sense for the aggravated dog to leave the scene as well to calm it down.
- So they have a chance to prove whether or not their dog acted out of self defence and to give information
- It should be the same expectations as with a motor vehicle accident.
- People should only be forced to stay if there are bite marks, cause lots of people like to cry wolf. I think that role changes are doing to cause a lot of problems
- it's the same as a hit and run
- My dog was attacked (unprovoked) by a much larger dog that the owner did not have proper control of. The owner tried to run away, refused to give contact info and tried to blame my dog for the attack when we didn't even see it coming.
- I think it's important this way the bylaw officer can advise the owner of that dog the issues at hand
- The pet owner must be responsible for the actions or lack of control of their pet and the damage they may cause.
- This is just common sense and anyone who fails to comply should be charged - I see this scenario the same as a motor vehicle collision and swapping information



- It seems obvious that all parties should remain at the scene of an incident to take responsibility for their dog's actions, provide contact info and speak with an enforcement officer. That is responsible dog ownership.
- Similar to a hit and run. Must stay and take responsibility. If owner/caretaker had to leave they MUST call 311 and leave contact info. Failure to stay at scene, or contact 311 would be a very high fine ie. \$1000.
- The owner needs to be held responsible, I think if there was a dog bite maybe order mandated training class.
- Dog bites can be fatal or seriously injure the other party. A responsible owner should pay for their dogs behavior.
- Common sense would be you remind on scene!
- Owners are just at fault as the dog .. They should know their animal well enough to determine if they are ok with others and humans
- They should take ownership for dogs actions.
- The victim might be intimidated at that moment or not be collected enough to think of all the steps they should take. Also I consider a dog attack similar to a vehicle accident. Damage was caused and leaving the scene is a "hit and run".
- Depends on the situation
- Ownership of a dog is similar to ownership of a car. They should not leave the scene.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to manage their pet. The city should be reviewing these rules under that guideline.
- To many people run away from their responsibility if a dog is seriously injured it should be the owner of the dog who bit the person or dog to cover associated costs
- People should have to stay at the scene of any accident. If people knew that their dog wouldn't be instantly guilty and euthanized, (even if the person or other animal instigated the reaction) they may stick around instead of running.
- Yes - it's important to be able to answer questions about the bite if the person needs to go to the hospital or if the other animal needs to go to the vet.
- Too many people try to leave and I feel the owner should always be held responsible for the bite, and any fees associated to the care of a bite
- Common sense. We are responsible for our dogs, if there is a bite incident, we need to take that responsibility.
- Yes
- Like a car accident. Remain at the scene, exchange info and make your case with whatever witnesses you can. Leaving the scene should have similar consequences as a hit and run. A bite is a guaranteed injury and the owner should be responsible for that incident.
- Any dog bite, the owner should stay and help support both animals involved.
- The same reason why people are supposed to stay at the scene of an accident???
- This is sensible providing the owner was present at the incident. If not, they shouldn't be penalized for something they did not know about, but should deal with their dog being at large.



- it's the right thing to do
- I support if the owner or responsible person is present at the time of the incident. If the dog is running at large unsupervised this is a different issue
- If you hit someone/something with your car you must stay behind to exchange information and talk with an enforcement officer so I believe the same rule should be in place for accidents involving animals. If the animal bites and the owner takes off it is like a hit and run.
- Information from the owner is important to establish if the animal is current with required vaccinations and to determine if the animal is a first time offender and be responsible for costs incurred for the bite.
- Reduce likelihood of distorted facts from witnesses and other 3rd parties.
- To many people get away with dog on dog bites and the owners are stuck with the cost to fix their harmed animals
- It's just the right thing to do. Why do you need an explanation?
- Seems like common sense
- Yes, too often I see complaints on our community facebook page of a dog attack where the dog's owner either blamed the victim or fled the scene. They need to be held accountable for their dog's poor behaviour because it is their responsibility to train their pet.
- Just like in a car accidents happen. If there's an incident you stick around and do what you can to make it right and not run away.
- Depends.
- I believe the owner of the dog responsible for injuring another living being should be held responsible for their dogs actions
- The owner should take FULL responsibility for the actions of their own dog.
- Even if enforcement isn't necessary, this is an opportunity to educate.
- Should the person or animal require further assistance/meds they have contact information.
- Owners must take responsibility for their pets. A misbehaving animal is due, in large part, to the owner's attentiveness (or lack thereof). Owners should be held responsible for their pets' actions.
- Please don't run away from a mistake that was made by the person not properly controlling an animal.
- Yes, must share contact information with the other person or animal owner. But not necessarily in all cases to wait for an enforcement officer - would not be practical for minor incidents.
- This should be part of pet ownership of any animal
- It is better to deal with the situation at hand at the time of the incident than wait, or hope that information can be collected/provided at a later time. That said, if it is an emergency, clearly waiting is not going to be an option in all cases.
- Dog owners are ultimately responsible for their dogs and should always remain at the scene.
- Just like any vehicle accident or pedestrian accident
- Why wouldn't they? It is their dog and they need to be held accountable.
- so they can pay the other owner for vet bills or things like that



- Allows victim to have police officer facilitate some reconciliation given the assault that has occurred and hopefully solve the situation on the spot.
- It's the same as any other accident, you are responsible to make sure the injured are okay
- They must take responsibility for an accident or incidents.
- It's important to hold accountability to the person and animal even if the "attack" is minor.
- Absolutely they should remain and give their information. The dog or dogs should be sieged
- Ownership and liabilities. Must demonstrate accountability and ownership of incident to work out options to resolve
- Owners should be held responsible as they are the ones who was supposed to train the dog to act in an appropriate matter. Hold owners responsible.
- It is important for the owner to be responsible for their dog
- All dog owners should be responsible for the behaviour of their pets. But the approach of the officers need to be trained to be empathetic and understand that some situations are not always black and white. Educational resources need to be on hand, and punishments need to be handed out on a case by case situation. If it's their first offence then have it mandated that they need to go to these behavioural classes (resources handed out). There are some situations where the owner is aware of their dogs anxiety and keeps them controlled and far away. But then other owners lose track of their "friendly" dogs who approach the anxious dog and a dog bite occurs when the owner did everything in their power to keep their distance. Every dog has their space radius around them, and if someone crosses into their space/property are likely to react. Basing judgement on breed and not owners negligence is not the way to handle these situation. Therefore, owners do need to stick around as they would a car accident to state what happened. There will be bias but a trained officer should be able to figure out the truth with witnesses and statements.
- They should stay to provide details and exchange information the same as you would for a car accident.
- Yes, provided the owner is able to control the dog. If having the owner remain at the scene causes the situation to escalate, then it would not be the best approach. The owner she be obligated to provide contact information if they leave the scene.
- They should also have to pay vet bills
- Its no different than a traffic incident
- It's the owners responsibility to train their animal properly, therefore they should take responsibility when something goes wrong.
- It depends of the situation, they should be able to give their information to be contact. However, in most cases this situation will escalate cause more issues and potential having the animal at higher risk.
- The above notes on dogs who may be a "nuisance" is insane and stupid. These kinds of thoughts makes these kinds of dogs more scary, when they are largely big babies.
- No different than an at-fault vehicle accident. You have caused bodily harm and are responsible to own up for it.
- This ensures that any liability and enforcement may is attributed to the dog owner.



- Dog owners should remain at the scene to provide information regarding vaccinations.
- There are 2 sides to every story - the owner should have the right to explain their side and what they witnessed just as well as the victim.
- The owner is responsible for their pet's actions and needs to be held accountable.
- I think it's the right thing to take ownership and try to resolve the incident in the most peaceful way.
- It is the liability and therefore the responsibility of the owner to account for their dog and its wrongdoings.
- It is the dog owners responsibility to manage, control and train their dog. If the dog bites someone, there could be extenuating circumstances that has caused the dog to bite. To make sure that everyone is represented (especially the dog) they owner should step up and stay at the scene of the incident to show proper responsible ownership.
- My dog was bitten and required multiple vet visits yet I was never told what happened to the owner nor any money recovered for costs.
- I believe this is necessary to ensure that all safety measures are put in place to support dog owners and victims.
- I think ALL dog owners should be responsible if they're dog bites. The nature of the bite of it is regarding another animal should be further investigated a dog doesn't bite for no reason especially another animal. Owner should be responsible for vet bills pertaining to the other dogs injuries
- Bad dog owners are bad dog owners
- Dog bites can be traumatizing and dangerous, regardless of breed
- Staying at the scene of a bite incident should be required, leaving the scene should be considered something along the lines of a hit and run situation.
- a responsible owner should hold themselves accountable for there lack of properly training there animal
- If their dog bit another person or another dog, they should definitely remain at the scene and be accountable for their actions.
- They should still remain there but separate from the other dog. Otherwise they will continue to cause issue.
- just the right thing to do
- Leaving the scene of a dog bite incident is like a vehicle hit-and-run.
- It's called responsible pet ownership.
- Too many owners leave the scene and can not be found.
- Of course, otherwise they can possibly do it again.
- Owners should take responsibility but also be able to explain their side of the incident
- All animal attacks are circumstantial. Both party's need to be able to define the parameters of the attack to ensure the proper picture is represented. Dogs are our children and the severity and extent of the situation can be construed if not all parties are able to elaborate on the situation.
- Both sides of the incident (victim and aggressor) need to be present in order to assure there are no false claims due to breed discrimination



- If a dog bites there should be an investigation! Dogs bite out of fear! So what did that person do to provoke the dog! We are humans! Why would we subject our dogs to this type of abuse!
- IF ANY dog, seeing as i've been bit by a chihuahua & needed stitches but have never EVER been but by a pit bull, i would appreciate it greatly if the owner AND dog stayed in scene so that documents can be made stating WHAT KIND OF DOG EXACTLY IT IS, rather than assuming it's a pit bull ;), & record what type of animal is REALLY doing the biting & attacking
- If a person or another animal is attacked and assaulted by the dog, the owners need to be held responsible for the attack. Bad owners have bad dogs. The owner needs to be fined and required to take courses and training for dog ownership and obedience. People are required to know how to handle a vehicle, people need to be required to know how to handle dogs that are dangerous to others if not raised properly.
- Owners should not be allowed to leave the scene of an accident (dog bite) and brush it off. They need to be responsible to help the other dog and/or dog owner in paying for expenses related to injuries.
- The dog owner should be also held responsible
- It's the responsible thing to do. The reason they don't is they are afraid their dog will be euthanized
- It is a part of responsible pet ownership.
- Should be same as a car accident. Share your personal and insurance information at the scene.
- "If you were in a vehicle accident would you leave the scene
- If you were in a vehicle accident would you leave the scene? Common sense"
- I think it's important that all parties involved in an incident discuss what happened with an enforcement officer and not just the dog owner. The enforcement officer should hear both sides to gain full understanding of the incident.
- They need to investigate whether or not the owner is being abusive, neglectful, or encouraging their dog to be aggressive. Pit bulls aren't inherently aggressive, and when they are brought up in a loving and caring environment, they flourish into loving and caring dogs, and wonderful companions. Investigate the owners.
- If you hit someone's car, you have to stay and make a statement. I don't see how that's different when your dog bites someone else. It's like a bite and run.
- People need to be responsible for their dogs and how they are training them.
- PITBULLS AREN'T THE [removed] PROBLEM, BAD OWNERS ARE. LEAVE THE POOR CREATURES ALONE.
- Should be treated no different then flying the scene of a motor vehicle accident.
- Then, we can make sure that it really happened and that the owner is being responsible.
- It is only proper for owner of dog to exchange information
- Yes so there can be follow up and learn why it happened and if obedience training is needed or other factors where involved.
- should be the same as a car accident ... all parties involved should remain at scene unless emergency vet/Dr visit requires
- It is like a hit and run with a vehicle.



- If a dog is biting because of poor ownership these owners should be held accountable.
- To calm the situation down and explain what happened.
- They should have to be involved in the whole process since their dog just bit a person. They shouldn't just get to walk away.
- There are good bully breeds out there if there owners are not there they can't say there statement explaining the incident. Most times bully breeds are provoked by bad behaviour
- Info should be shared between parties immediately. Same requirements as a vehicle collision.
- Depending on the damage the other party might need to be held liable and pay for the damages done
- Dog injuries are incredibly expensive and owners should be held financially accountable for injuries created be their animal
- Owner should be held responsible for the action of their pet.
- Owner should be held accountable and made to pay for damages and vet bills
- Only if the victim believes an Enforcement Officer needs to be contacted.
- Owners need to be held responsible for a poorly trained animal. And should be easily contactable throughout any issues that happen after the incident.
- It is the owners responsibility to ensure the dog is trained well and will therefore not be aggressive, so they must be accountable if an accident occurs.
- To me it can be compared to car accidents. If you hit someone, you have to stay at the scene until a solution is met by usually police. The same should be with animals. If an animal creates a dangerous environment for another animal or human the owner should be responsible for the dogs actions, as a number of things can contribute to the behaviour. Such as; little to no training, home environment, and care from the owner. These should all be considered before making a decision for the animal
- Refer to Criminal Code of Canada definition of assault.
- Dog owners should be responsible for themselves and their dogs behaviour
- The human is responsible for what happened, and they should have to explain it. Not the dog.
- The person who is with the animal at the time of the offense needs to be responsible for that animal. There should be charges if they do not stay on-scene.
- All of this breed specific legislation is absolute nonsense. This kind of ignorance doesn't belong in 2020 - you would think Calgary knows better as a self touting progressive city but here we are. Absolutely disgusting.
- A responsible dog owner should stay on scene and share information.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for the actions of their dog, weather intentional or accidental
- If they leave the scene, it is less likely that there will be enforcement on the owner.
- A dogs behavior (regardless of breed) is largely predicated on training or lack thereof. Enforcing dog owners to stay at the scene holds them accountable as the stewards of their pets and also offers an opportunity for education regarding how to be a better pet owner. Reprimanding and punishing the owner should not be the primary intent.
- Because there may be a very valid reason why this happened and need to have their story heard



- If they do not stay at the scene it's like a hit and run car accident which is you can be charged for. If you are a responsible pet owner you stay at the scene and deal with the issue.
- It would be nice to think this would be the usual event. However, I suspect it will be difficult to enforce as it is often reported that owners of dogs that have bitten leave the scene of the incident. If the owner can be located after the fact, this rule could come into play in terms of actions against the owner of the dog that has bitten.
- Makes sense
- It only makes sense
- That seems very reasonable. Much like how you are to stay at the scene (if medically appropriate) if you are in a motor vehicle accident.
- Owner is responsible for dog behaviour; dog may not have tags
- Responsibility and ownership needs to become the norm. No different than fleeing the scene of an accident or crime.
- If your dog bites a person or other dog, it's on you for being a bad dog carer.
- The owner of the dog that did the biting should get a chance to defend their pet and explain their side of the story before the animal is just carted off on someone else's word.
- A report should be made on scene when these attacks occur. Many owners with dogs that bite have been known to give false information, or flee the scene.
- If the incident is severe enough, the owner should be held accountable
- I support the owner being required to talk to enforcement but I understand there are times when it's best if the owner leaves the area immediately (for safety of all) and then report in.
- It is your responsibility as a decent human being
- As long as the dog is under control, the owner should remain at the scene to be held accountable.
- as with any damage or injury, if the people won't act responsibly on their own. then we should require them to
- This seems as though it should already be a law. No brainer.
- It is the owners responsibility to make sure the situation is dealt with properly if their pet does injure someone. In the case of a dog on dog encounter, and no people are hurt then their should be an exception to this.
- Absolutely! As mentioned before, it is never the dogs fault for biting. Yes, they did the action but it's the OWNER who is responsible for the animal. The owner must be held accountable for the dogs actions and ensure they are ticketed for such actions. If it continues to happen, the owner must have restrictions on owning animals.
- The dog owner needs to take full responsibility of their dogs actions
- A dog bit is serious and further investigation is required. The owner must provide contact information.
- It is important to know all factors in a dog bite situation. Was the dog attacked or harassed, intimidated, pushed to protect itself or owner etc.
- I do NOT support in any way any wrong-headed, unscientific racial profiling of dog breeds. BSL increases dog bite incidents and reduces accountability of owners of any dog deemed to be



dangerous regardless of breed. Furthermore, "pit bull" is not a breed, and cannot be determined by appearance. Also, Staffordshires have not been involved in any incidents anywhere more than a poodle or any other dog. Calgary has been cited as a North American role model in how to be a responsible dog owner WITHOUT BSL. What on earth are you thinking?

- Just like a car accident those involved should remain at the scene
- Information should be given between both parties and then verified. I guess depending on the condition of the dog or person, you might not be able to stay.
- If the dog owner does not remain at the scene, then I consider this to be the same as a perpetrator of a crime trying to escape apprehension.
- This is a no brainer. A dog owner is completely responsible for their pet same as a car driver. You cannot hit and run so you cannot bite and run.
- The issue is NOT the breed, it's the owner. The owner NEEDS to be responsible and take accountability when a bite occurs.
- It's important that owners of dogs who bite, bear the burden of vet or medical expenses incurred. Victims should not have to bear these costs.
- OF COURSE! This isn't mandatory already?!?!?
- If the injury is to a specific degree of severity requiring medical/veterinary attention they should be required to share contact info to the victim.
- Bad dogs are a result of bad dog owners
- The law and basic moral decency requires this for things like hitting a pedestrian, lest it become a hit and run. The same should apply for all injuries.
- Responsibility. Accountability
- "Owners need to be responsible for the damage their pet inflicts.
- They must remain in scene and take the proper actions"
- Pet health care is expensive
- People need to be held accountable. And leaving is just not right.
- Yes, because we should be educating people to the fullest extent possible. Again, it is not the dogs who are at fault.
- The owner should remain on scene to ensure the victim is given accurate information about vaccinations records and about the animal in question. They need to be accountable for the actions of their animal.
- We need to know the medical history of the animals involved. The owner's information to request payment for vet bills.
- Someone shouldn't leave a scene of a crime unless the victim is ok with it
- Purely a common sense bylaw that would keep people accountable
- The owner should be in control of their pets. They need to stand up and accept responsibility, now cowardly run/walk away as if nothing happened.
- I believe everyone is accountable for there animal, if you do not have control of your pet it would be like not having control of your vehicle and leaving the scene of an accident. If your dad attacks someone UNPROVOKED i think its your duty and responsibility to face consequences, however i



don't think it's appropriate to punish someone whose dog is attacked and ends up defending itself or its owner and punishing them.

- This will enhance an owner's responsibility over his/her dog's actions.
 - There are not always known/obvious injuries to human or dog immediately following a bite. The owner should provide contact info and be responsible for any vet/medical bill. Not staying on scene or providing info may leave costly vet/medical bills to the victim.
 - We need to know where offending animals live. Owners need to take responsibility
 - "Yes, you need to hear both sides of the story. Not just the victim. Like I mentioned before did the person run up to the dog, did another dog run up to a dog that was on leash. Which this does cause stress on the dog on leash.
-
- Both parties must stay at the scene"
 - they need to provide medical information and contact information to assure rabbi's shots and health is up to date
 - All dog owners need to be responsible so if your dog does bite, you need to ensure you stay and be accountable for your dog's safety as well as anyone else that may be impacted
 - People need to take responsibility for their pet
 - Both owners need to be at the scene, there are always two sides to every story.
 - Necessary and part of being a responsible pet owner
 - To reduce the chance of repeat offences by the same dog and owner
 - Biting dogs are usually a result of poor ownership. Leaving "the scene" is just another show of that. Bad owners should be held accountable instead of leaving the scene of the incident
 - Any dog owner should take responsibility
 - Dogs can bite for a number of reasons and if it's safe to do so, it is important for both parties to remain on the scene to provide statements
 - It's too easy for pet owners to escape their responsibilities
 - The owner must stay at the scene and take full responsibility of the dog. It is the owner's responsibility to ensure the dog does not bite and it should be the owner punished, not the dog. The owner should attend training classes with the dog to work on ensuring the dog is appropriately trained to be in a social setting.
 - Too often, people don't know the name of the person and dog that bit them (or their pet).
 - The concept of having a new court system set up for the purposes of reviewing and making a verdict does not bode well - considering the language used on pit bulls in particular this sounds like it would be a biased and uphill battle for almost anyone but particularly those owners of a certain breed.
 - Absolutely. Any damage caused by a dog in your ownership or possession at the time of incident is your responsibility and therefore you must atone for its actions.
 - That's part of responsible animal ownership. If your dog hurts someone/an animal they should pay for any related medical attention



- I look at it the same way as car accidents. You are involved, you remain at the scene.
- Then the dog owner is able to indicate if the dog was provoked or give a history of incidents
- Yes they should explain what's going on with the dog and be given a fair chance to speak on it
- So that the officer can understand both parts of the story, as the dog may have been approached by an unwanted visitor. In some cases the dog is not the problem, it was an individual who wanted to approach the dog without permission.
- If there is damage the owner should be responsible for costs incurred (vet bills, medications not covered by health plans, etc.)
- People should have to stay and communicate with authorities after such an incident.
- Multiple stories of dog owners simply leaving the scene when their pet attacks another pet/animal. There should be a requirement for people to stay around
- Yes, but this can be difficult because both dogs will be aroused. There has to be a provision that allowing a cellphone picture of the dogs (with tag number showing) and their owner is enough. Also, please consider that while I am training a highly excitable dog, who is on-leash, and I call out to other owners not to approach, but their dog does approach, either on-leash or off, if my dog bites the fault will be placed with the approaching dog. Please set up a yellow-ribbon rule so that everyone knows not to approach a leashed dog with a yellow ribbon on its lead. I went further in the survey and I see you have anticipated this. You did not give me the option to elaborate on your question about fines, though. All fines should be on a sliding scale - eg. first "at large" \$25, second \$75, third and beyond \$200, with "demerits" expiring after three years with a clean record. This type of sliding scale approach should apply to all, or nearly all fines. It allows for learning to happen!
- It's like an car accident you don't leave the scene even if everyone's okay till until you've contacted to police they have come or you and the other person have exchanged contact information.
- If my car is involved in an accident I'm required to remain at the scene. If I'm involved in an assault I'm required to stay at the scene. If an animal is considered property then how is it any different than your property causing damage in any other case? Why is there a special case for dogs?
- need, to stay and not run away when you know your dog has bitten someone. has happened in past
- Staying to Talk with the officer can help de escalate the situation however
- Too many people get away with having bad dogs by offering to pay vet fees or apologizing so they don't get reported and their dog never gets better
- It seems to be the only way to consistently track such incidents and ensure proper steps are taken to compensate the victim (if applicable) and prevent it from happening again
- Same as any accident, there should be rules if a person leaves the scene.
- If your dog bites another animal you should be required to remain on scene or leave contact information.
- Owners should behave the same way as if they were involved in a car accident.
- Idk what there is to explain I agree with staying at the scene
- accountability is key from the owner and animal involved in the incident.
- I think it is ABSURD that there is even a mention of BSL for pitbulls. Do your research! This has been proven over and over and over again that BSL DOES NOT work. I used to pride myself on



living in a city that was progressive enough to realize that any dog can bite, any dog incident can cause significant physical and emotional harm, and all dogs can be aggressive in the wrong hands. The proposal of BSL in Calgary shows that whomever is running this is ignorant and uneducated. Maybe go get an education in understanding statistics and truly grasp pit bull related incidents. Also, to show your lack of education, pit bulls are NOT more powerful than other dog breeds unless they're specifically trained. They do NOT have a stronger jaw than all other breeds, they do not have lock jaw at all. In fact, the kangal, wolfdog, rottweiler, German shepherd, chow chow, and malinois all have stronger and equally as strong bites as "pitbulls". I am ashamed that my city is even considering this! What a joke!!

- Makes sense, much in the way we stay at the scenes of car accidents. However, the dog owner should be given the chance to make sure their dog is safe even if that means taking them off scene and returning. For both the comfort of the dog and the bite victim.
- Liability issues and vet bills
- It's like a car accident, it happened so just as long as the owner is present so nothing escalates it's fine.
- within reason - if medical attention is required for either animal or person, that needs to be responded to!
- If a dog bites another dog or animal there should be an exchange as that owner should be responsible for vet Bill's unless it happened on owners property and the other animal was not invited on to the property. If it involves a person it should be left to bylaw to get information from both parties
- Again, the owner of the dog is responsible for the behaviour and discipline. Many owners love their dogs, but never discipline or train them, and the dogs unacceptable behaviour is the owners fault, not the dogs.
- Unless the owner cannot remain on scene because the dog needs to be removed from the scene immediately.
- They must be held responsible for the dogs actions.
- Owner of dog that bit, should be held financially responsible for injuries.
- It's like running away from the scene of a crime.
- As the dog owner you are responsible for the actions the dog takes. If there is an incident you should be required to take responsibility. Obviously this is within reason, your dog is acting aggressively and the situation is unsafe for others it is more important that you remove the dog from that situation.
- Important to know about pet medical/vaccine history, possible pet or home owner insurance for a claim. The only reason someone could leave is if the situation doesn't de-escalate (pet or human interactions).
- I think it is fair to investigate bite incidents, so long as no bias exists. I am concerned there would be breed specific bias.
- The owner of a pet needs to be heard as well as being accountable for its actions.



- It's much like a scene of a car accident. You must stay present to answer any questions related to the dogs health like immunizations and to give proper information to an officer in case of someone trying to give false information.
- If someone's dog bit mine I would expect them to provide their contact info to me and pay the vet bill.
- It is necessary for the dogs owner to provide necessary info.
- Oftentimes bites happen when one or more parties to an incident do not remain in control (I.e. not keeping their dog on leash or secured, ignoring signs that a dog is in distress and leaving the situation, people not heeding an owner's warnings, commands, or advice about approaching their animals) and that needs to be accounted for when dogs bite other people or animals
- People should be in control of the pers at all time and if they are not then they should be held personally responsible for any damages that have happened
- I've been bites by a dog (pomeranian off leash) called bylaw and made a report but nothing came of it because I didn't I the address of the owner. The owner is continuing to walk the dog without a leash
- It's too easy for the offending dog's owner / caregiver to take off and leave the wounded person or animal. The dog owner / caregiver should be forced to remain on the scene.
- That's a responsible thing to do.
- There needs to be some follow-up to the incident to prevent its re-occurrence and possibly to either educate the owner or make them get training for the dog.
- A dog bite should be dealt with like a car accident. If the owner leaves the scene before information is shares it should be treated as a "hit and run."
- Owners are accountable for their pets.
- How is this even a question? Information should be exchanged if injury/damage was done
- The owner should be accountable for their actions, same as if you're in a fender bender or accidentally harm another person in any other scenario. Both parties should be able to assess the situation, trade information, and handle the situation amicably.
- Animal control need to have contact information for people whose pets prove a nuisance.
- If there is an incident it is important that both the owner and target as well as the bystanders are consulted. Sometimes the biting dog was provoked and not in the wrong. If the target was harassing or allowing thier dog to instigate without being checked they would be in the wrong. Bites are not cut and dry.
- It is the responsibility of the pet owner who bit the victim to remain at the scene and take responsibility for the actions of their dog.
- If an enforcement officer is available, then yes; but enforcement should only be used when necessary and when the owner isn't complying or following up appropriate steps.
- As long as the dog is under control.
- If it causes severe injury not just a nibble
- Owners must be responsible for the behaviour of their pets, just as parents would be for their children in a similarly dangerous instance



- An owner should be responsible for staying when their animal bites someone/another animal and exchanging information, similar to vehicle accidents
- Yes, except if they need to leave to help their Dog calm down
- To ensure health, vaccinations and licensing information is received by needed parties. For the owner of the animal to be held accountable in the situation. To determine an accurate account of the situation from all parties.
- Makes sense. Just like a car or any other accident causing an injury.
- Like a car accident, holds people responsible if there is lasting damage
- The owner takes full responsibility for it's pet and actions. Pet attacks are a reflection of the owner's training of the animal, and NOT the breed.
- It's the only decent thing to do.
- I've met people with dogs that were attacked and they don't know how to get the person that owns the dog.
- They should remain at the scene so they can get both sides of the story
- There are various reasons a dog will bite, and sometimes it's not the dog who bit who is the instigator. Dog behaviour plays a grand part. All dog owners should be educated in training and dog behaviour to seen the signs prior to a bite. There are always signs, just owners that are not educated. This needs to be discussed with both owners.
- Any time there is a server dog bite no matter the breed of dog (shepherds, retrievers, chihuahuas.) they should remain on scene.
- Responsible dog owners should absolutely stay and share contact info with the victim. The circumstances and severity of the attack should be considered before reaching out to authorities.
- It's an issue that still needs to be dealt with, but I believe properly training the dogs after issues like this would be best. We don't euthanize people with DUIs. We take away their license and send them to classes. The difference between people and dogs is that people can make premeditated, conscious decisions. Dogs react out of emotion, they don't premeditate hurting other people or animals, they are afraid or uncertain.
- Many Dog owners, not just "bully breeds" have dogs capable of biting. It should be required that contact info be exchanged just like auto accidents. Dog vet bills can be insanely huge, not just for immediate care but also for followup.
- They should be responsible for the damages their dog causes to a person or their pets. Running shouldn't be an option, without severe penalties, just like with hit and runs.
- I feel like it should be no different than a car accident someone has been hurt and should remain at the scene until information can be exchanged and statement etc can be obtained from an enforcement officer.
- Yes a responsible owner will take accountability. Keep irresponsible pet owners from having pets, do not discriminate based on breed. Look at the human.
- Dog owners are responsible for dog behaviour
- Na



- I feel not staying there to talk to someone about the situation is like a hit and run if in a car accident and leaving
- the dog OWNER needs to take responsibility for the actions of their pet. It is not the fault of the animal
- An owner should be held responsible for the actions of their pet.
- Both parties should have the choice to deal with the incident by themselves or call an officer if the other person is not cooperating or fleeing
- The animal or person bit need the info so they can ensure that bite are treated properly. But dog breed should have nothing to do with the bite
- a dog's misbehaviour is the fault of the owner, not the dog. It's their responsibility of a dog attacks and they are liable
- The owner should be held accountable for not controlling there dog while outside of their private property and should be made and held accountable to any damage fees and vet bills
- The owner should stay on the scene to hear both sides of the story rather than just the victims.
- If you are a "pitbull" owner and since they always get the blame for everything it's important to show what evidence you have such as, videos, photos, witness, time of the event. Unfortunately, Pitbulls have a bad stigma and we must be a voice for them. Discrimination my stop. We live in a country of freedom and that should be the same with animals. The breed shouldn't have to implicate their future pimpls have a bad stigma and we must be a voice for them. Discrimination must stop. We live in a country of freedom and that should be the same with animals. The breed shouldn't have to implicate their future.
- The person should remain so they can give their side of the story since most of the time when a dog bites, it was provoked (ie when my dog is on a leash and someone has their dog uncontrolled off leash)
- The person with the dog that bit should have to pay full coverage of any wound care, or treatment needed.
- Best to explain both sides immediately as the situation is still fresh.
- Yes as long as the dog no longer poses a further threat to the people present.
- I previously worked at an animal clinic. I experienced far too many cases of dog bites where the owner of the offending dog just doesn't care and receive no consequences for their irresponsible behaviour because they simply walked away after the incident.
- Need both sides of the story. But also need to ensure the dog has been removed from the source that caused them to react the way they did.
- Dog bites can lead to infection and if the owner doesn't have control of their animal they should be held responsible for that.
- I firmly believe dog attacks can be prevented, but if a dog attacks it must be put down and the owner fined and available for legal action. So they take both a financial and emotional blow for not controlling their dog, money is easily replaceable friendship and companionship isn't, they won't re-offend. A tribunal does not force a person to reflect on their actions, they sit trough it and tell the people what they want to hear and re-offend later. If police/animal control simply shoot the dog, and



slap like a \$5000 fine on the owner they are going to suffer to inflicting pain on others, they likely not choose to have an aggressive dog.

- Humans should be held accountable on how their dogs behave.
- Your dog is your family. If your human child bit someone you would be expected to remain at the scene.
- Yes because it's not the dogs fault it's often the owner or the person who got bit for teasing or annoying dog
- It should be no different that having to stay at the scene of an accident.
- No different than staying at the scene of a car accident!
- It is important to share that kind of information in any accident, it should be no different with animal cases.
- Just like an accident
- There are problems with owners fleeing the scene where a dog has attacked. And bylaw officers must be prepared to enforce the requirement to share contact info. My dog experienced an attack that was witnessed by bylaw. The officer fined the offending owner, but refused to let me get their contact info and would not share it with me, citing privacy laws. I had to take my dog to emergency to get examined and I was out of pocket for that expense because of bylaw. I had no way to recover my cost because i was refused my right to obtain contact info on the owner. This is just wrong and is not actually legal ti do that
- Dog ownership requires a level of responsibility, especially regarding safety. If a dog bite is substantial enough to require the presence of an enforcement officer, then the owner has a responsibility to remain on scene. I also believe that both parties (the owner and the complainant) both need to remain on scene (providing it is safe to do so), so that an enforcement officer has the opportunity to hear both sides of the story. I have seen cases in my neighborhood where someone was taunting or mistreating a dog, resulting in a bite, in which case does not warrant a charge against a dog owner.
- Like any accident all parties must communicate and have statements
- People are the ones who train or dont train their dogs. So they are responsible for them
- The information should be collected in a timely manner from the owner.
- Most times a dog bites is because its scared I feel if possible they should be allowed to put their dog inside or give their contact information over the phone to an officer
- I've seen too many people who are not in controls the of their animal walk away
- To avoid going to small claims court against the owner and potentially just exchange liability insurance to handle.
- But only if they have a safe place to put their animal while they wait for enforcement. If the animal is still in a state of anxiety or panic with no safe place to go and people panicking around them, another incident could be likely.
- Its the dog owners responsibility to stay at the scene of any incident involving their dog, doesnt matter breed. Your dog, your responsibility.



- Especially if it's a child the owner of the dog should be held accountable for the dogs actions. The owner is ultimately the one who raised, trained, and encouraged and or all behaviours displayed from their pet.
- I think they should stay. Both sides of the story need to be heard. Other dogs or animals could have provoked the dog or approached the dog that made the dog feel unsafe and that that was it's only option to defend him or her self.
- In my view, it's like staying at the scene when you have a car accident. People should be responsible for their dogs behaviour.
- It's part of being a responsible owner
- Dog baiting results in bites that people will use against the dog. They should be able to explain the situation and look at both sides
- I believe, like any accident or injury incident, all involved should be there to discuss the matter, unless the victim needs to leave the scene for medical attention, whether an animal with their owner or a person or parent with their child.
- It's kind of like a hit and run, you you leave the seen of a accident? No, there for I don't think it's right if you were to leave after a animal attack.
- Should be treated similarly to a car accident. As long as information can be obtained. If the person leaves without info and can be found, additional fines should be placed.
- N
- It's illegal to hit a car and run, so why would it be any different for a dog bite? Owners need to be willing to take responsibility if they're going to have pets.
- I think this should be treated like a car accident for example!
- This is absolutely necessary for people to take responsibility for their animal. By taking off, the offender adds to the trauma of the situation.
- Bites that break skin only.
- The owner needs to be responsible for their pet - this applies to ANY dog breed.
- There must be transparency and accountability on the part of the dog owner to provide their information and they must be held responsible for their pet's actions.
- You are responsible for your dog, plain and simple.
- Important to understand what happened and potential condition on dog
- Any bad owners dog can bite including little dogs. I fi d small breed dogs are worse in temperment and their [removed] owners think its cute when little dixie is biting my pant leg or ankle.
- It is a privilege, not a right to be a pet owner. Part of that privilege is to take responsibility for abhorrent behaviour regardless of how it reflects on you as the pet owner.
- Absolutely. As long as contained and isn't creating more of an issue by staying
- Owner should take responsibility for the dog's behaviour, and should be legally required to do so.Ã
- The owner should be held responsible for the actions of the dog.
- Yes. This rule must apply to all dogs. Little terriers have bitten me before but it's âœœokayâœ• because they're little. That's not right.



- If necessary, if it's severe damage yes. I think there is a witch hunt on certain dogs and they do not get a fair deal. I see other dog constantly biting or harassing dogs and no one does anything, Pitbulls do something and everyone wants to lynch them. Usually these pitbulls are harassed by other dogs and THEN they react and yet it's their fault. I don't own one and probably never would because of how other people act/treat them. I think a bigger concern is was the other dog behaving? Was it unprovoked? Usually it's not. I feel like yes they should stay but I feel like they also won't get a fair trial by anyone.
- if a dog bites some one or another animal regardless of size or breed yes they should stay because small dogs and big alike both have problems with aggression
- Absolutely.
- Many dogs will not bite unless instigated. If it were my dog that bit anyone or another animal I would want the officer to get all the information instead of just that the dog bit someone because there is a high chance the person did something to cause the dog to act out in a way that, in my opinion, would be justified and there person (not the dog) would be at fault.
- If the bite is severe enough that it will require veterinary attention. So, perhaps if the bite breaks the skin and bleeds, the person should stay on the scene to at least speak with the other person/owner.
- This just makes sense so that information can be shared and both sides of the story presented.
- They need to be more responsible.
- Contact information with the person/other dog owner should always be shared like a traffic accident. An enforcement officer isn't always necessary on scene though.
- Dog should be in a safe place away from people. Owner should remain on scene
- Owners and witnesses should share contact information. The dogs owner(who bit) should have a bylaw officer visit the home and also a specialized dog trainer assess the dog before deciding what should be done with the dog. A fine should be given to the owner if it is not the first offence.
- Accountability and responsibility should always be demonstrated by a dog owner. Not to mention that it is the right thing to do.
- It keeps the owners accountable
- If there any other issues arising from the bite, this would be beneficial for all parties
- Anyon en involved in any incident should remain there, obviously move the pet to a safe location where it can be treated fairly, but the owner should stay and assist if it were to happen.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dog. If it bites something or does any damage, the owner and dog should stay to file any report needed
- The dog owner can provide necessary pertinent information about vaccinations and other time sensitive facts to prevent unnecessary trauma for the injured party.
- Dog breeds are not the problem. The owner of the animal needs to be held accountable. Pit bulls are babies the behavior they display is a taught behaviour.
- I believe there is always two sides to what happened during an altercation and should be addressed then and there so there is no confusion or blame where it should not be laid.



- I think it should be treated like a car accident. Hit and runs are not acceptable, however the two parties can figure out what the next steps should be together, including involving an enforcement officer.
- Regardless of breed of a dog bites another dog or human just like car accidents they need to remain at the scene and provide all their information and be held responsible.
- But it does depend on severity. If it breaks skin and draws blood
- But not with each other, they should share their information with the bylaw officers. People can get weird about their dogs.
- It is a responsibility in my mind to remain at the scene just like you would be required to in an automobile accident. For the sake of a victim it is appropriate that this is a requirement as they may not know what questions to ask a dog owner.
- Multiple reasons exist for when a dog bites. Having a clear picture of the incident will help determine the best outcome.
- This would help victims with possible compensation if necessary and force owners to take responsibility
- This should always be a YES.
- The owner should be held accountable for what their dog did. Especially if vet costs are involved.
- Only when biting an adult, unless injury has occurred to the other animal. There are many dogs that are pushy with others and can get nipped as a result causing no injury, just a yelp
- The person is now as responsible for the attack as the dog itself. They must remain on scene until proper authorities have responded and taken all info pertaining to the incident. And seized the dog
- Problem animals are always a result of a problem owner. Fines and punishments should always be directed to the owner, not the animal, regardless of breed
- Owners need to be responsible if a dog bites, same as if there was a car accident
- If ANY KIND OF BREED OF DOG bites yes.it should be a rule anyways for any kind of dogs.
- This is assault and should be dealt with. Why should anyone who owns a dog biting other dogs or people be allowed to leave a scene after committing assault? Owner responsibility needs to happen!
- If the bite is severe on a person or another animal there should be an obligation to share contact information with the injured party.
- You have to stay at the scene of a car crash so it should be the same for this.
- All parties must remain at the scene for the appropriate time, if safe to do so. Otherwise people will just run away and never be seen again.
- I had a dog that was attacked by 2 others, and the owner simply went home, so bylaw said they'd come talk to her but there was nothing they could 'really' do
- Should be fined for fleeing the scene before giving information
- Be responsible. But also depends on the severity.
- "Yes but no one will if the threat of their dog being taken away is there.
- Mandatory training and classes should be enforced."
- Owners need to take and accept responsibility



- If injury is sustained by a dog bite, it should be no different than a car accident. The owner of the aggressor dog exchanges information so that they or their insurance would pay for medical expenses
- To take a note that's all
- Dog owners should remain on the scene to answer any questions that may need to be answered such as vaccination update and etc.
- But exceptions should be in place if the owner of the biter fears for their safety
- The owner of a dog that bites is responsible for its wellbeing as well as the behaviour of that dog (ANY breed). The alternative to this is information supplied by a witness which is in my opinion insufficient to appropriately identify the dog responsible.
- This is a prime example of being a responsible pet owner
- If someone is seriously injured then yes the owner must remain present. However if it is a minor issue then no.
- There needs to be a way to track how many times a dog is a nuisance.
- Both should be present. If the other dog instigated the bit. The dog biting shouldn't be at fault. Also common sense used on behalf of the officer
- It is important to hear both sides of the story
- You need to be responsible for your dog, don't flee the scene of an incident
- They need to be accountable for that. I also think that by having to stay at the scene this allows for there to be documentation of the event from both sides (perhaps the dog was provoked).
- It would identify patterns.
- I think it is the owners responsibility to react when their dog has bitten someone. It is certainly important they remain at the scene. It is similar to a car accident, when you are at fault you must remain at the scene to provide information... why should this not be the same?
- I think the owner should absolutely be required to stay. I actually can't believe that isn't already a thing. It's like a car accident, the owner should have to remain at the scene. It's the owner's responsibility.
- Being a responsible pet owner implies "responsible" and remaining at the scene should be mandatory. Increase fines substantially for an owner who just walks away.
- I feel like if your animal caused enough damage to call the police you should stay, similar to a car accident. If the person who was attacked is okay to leave and just trade info with the owner that's their discretion
- Yes - Only if there is no discrimination towards the dog based on their appearance. I believe an owner should stay on site in order to offer to pay medical expenses, etc. However, I believe many owners are discouraged from staying as they feel their dog may be judged on their appearance.
- I think people should be responsible for their dogs regardless of breed.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for dogs actions
- Dog owners need to be held accountable for their dogs behaviour. Especially if there are injuries
- I do feel all pet owners are responsible for their pet and have a duty to deal with these situations according to a protocol. However, this could perhaps educate the city officials in what statistics of



what breeds are actually involved in bite incidents, which is actually all breeds, of all sizes which you clearly fail to account for.

- Responsibility.
- The owner is responsible for their dogs behaviour but can also provide context to what caused the bite
- Because then it is easier for enforcement officers to track if a dog is a repeat offender. As well then the enforcement officer can request a dogs medical records to ensure they don't have any contagious diseases. Also, if the bite is severe enough to require medical attention the owner of the aggressive dog should be required to pay for any medical fees.
- A dog owner is responsible for harm done by their dog, regardless of breed, and should remain on scene so that the situation can be handled properly and insure that the victim is okay
- Only if it is severe, same as a car accident, if it's minor then require contract exchange and move along.
- if an owners dog bites another individual or animal, they should own up and take responsibility for what their own pet has done. It's only fair.
- Responsible pet ownership starts with the OWNER!
- If the dog is aggressive, it's the owners fault/responsibility. Contact should be exchanged, additional training for the pet and a follow up
- Yes but you need an unbiased and experienced Dog person. They need to be trained and have extensive knowledge on dog training. These breed specific laws are so flawed and bad owners aren't held accountable.
- The OWNER (and NOT the dog) needs to be held accountable for their dogs behavior!!!!
- Unless their animal requires medical attention.
- Dog owners should take responsibility for their dog.
- I think any type of attack should be documented
- The owner responsible must be held responsible. Too many times the owner flees and no action can be taken because their identity is unknown.
- If a bite is serious enough either party wants to call the officers. Absolutely they should wait
- Be accountable. If they don't remain they must provide contact information.
- If the scene is safe to do so
- In my experience, people don't take responsibility for their dog's actions when someone is bit. My partner has been bitten twice now, and both times the dog owners put the blame on my parter, when we was either running or riding a bike.
- An owner is responsible for their animals behaviour and they should ensure they can be contacted after an incident.
- Unless immediate medical help is need for the owner or dog.
- Yes and no because the situation could of been them being attacked and the dog reacted for the owner as protecting and the attacker may try and use it against them and the owner might be frighten or afraid



- If your dog bites either a person or another dog, they should be legally responsible to remain at the scene to ensure the health of the person/dog involved and so that a fair and reasonable investigation be performed.
- I think it is a good idea
- If necessary, the owner should be held accountable and his:her information should be taken for record.
- It's important to get both sides of the story from both parties. I have heard of too many times where a small dog provokes and attacks a bigger dog in a park, and the bigger dog bakes back in defence BUT then the larger dog gets punished. A neutral party should be able to take accounts of the incident and meet both dogs to determine how things should proceed.
- A pet owner is responsible for their pets, therefore if there is an incident involving the pet, the owner should take responsibility for said incident.
- It's just common sense.
- It can get deadly duh
- I think it's important to meet the owner, so you can get a feel for whether the owner isn't training the dog well
- The owner of the dog is responsible for the dog themselves and should make any afflicted by a bite or reporting a bite aware of any relevant medical issues and vaccination status
- It's supports responsible pet ownership and accountability... as long as the dog is secured and under management
- The owner is responsible for the dogs behavior, therefore is responsible for the incident and must be held accountable at the scene
- This is so both parties can discuss the issue with the enforcement officer
- As in a vehicle accident, to stay on scene and provide information
- That is fair to determine past history of dog behaviour.
- Basic common sense; if a dog bites or attacks another person or pet, the owner should be legally mandated to 'do the right thing' and remain at the scene
- A full history of the animal needs to be taken, to rule out potential health concerns and any previous aggression issues.
- The owner of the aggressive dog should cover costs associated with the bite, vet bills, time of work, etc.
- If any dog breeds bites someone the owner of that dog should stay to talk to the officer
- Like a car accident, the owners should be held responsible. regardless of breed.
- I've had my dog attacked many times (20+)at the dog park by other dogs (none of which being a pitbull by the way) and I've only ever had one person take responsibility for their dog and stay and apologize
- It's the same as someone fleeing the scene of an accident. A dog can be a deadly weapon just as a car can.
- Dogs don't always bite out of aggression, sometimes its fear, or due to being provoked and not properly understanding the animals needs, I believe this should be taken into consideration, and



owners on both sides need to take responsibility for not doing what is best for their animals. Small dog owners in particular have a bad habit of not accepting blame when their dogs are aggressive and attack, but should a larger dog respond to their aggression with a bite, both sides need to be heard and understood.

- But only if it is safe to do so, normally after an attack the victims first thought is to get to safety.
- This will ensure a victim in case of especially severe damage knows the owner is being held accountable.
- If a dog is reactionary or aggressive the owner should be responsible monetarily - in order to be held responsible obviously they have to remain at the scene
- Yes, when safe to do so. There are also times when the owner needs to remove the dog for safety or health reasons. For example if there is an issue in an off leash area it may be safest for the owner to remove the dog which may require them leaving the scene. Or the dog may require medical attention. They should be able to share contact info but may need to talk with an enforcement officer offsite.
- No
- Having the rule in place could give some added force to a repeat offender, but in actual fact, this is virtually unenforceable.
- As long as the dog is kept under control.
- I think its always important for information to be shared in an incident. But also I think its important for people ie officers to not be prejudice against pit bull breeds and believe it is 100% their fault as soon as they show up
- Responsibility of the owner
- People should be responsible for there animals and there actions. meaning dealing with the situation as best you can.
- It's needed to stick around and exchange contact information for future vet bills
- just like car insurance, one must share info. I do not agree to put such ridiculous laws in effect regarding pitbulls, however, yes the owners should be absolutely responsible for attacks or bites!
- I think the owner needs to stay at the scene and give their information quickly and then leave the scene to get the dog out of the environment. If an enforcement officer is involved, they should be calling said owner or setting up a meeting at a different time and location. Being in a situation like that would be very stressful, meaning dealing with the situation right then and there wont have any positive effect for either party. Let the stress calm.
- As it isn't necessarily clear about the situation even if the dog in question has offended. Eg. Specifically if the victim's dog was off leash and the offender was on leash and possibly in training.
- The dog owner should definitely remain at the scene of the incident for the safety of the dog, the person/other animal that got bit, and so that communication is clear on what the next steps are for the dog/pet owner.
- I am surprised that this requirement does not already exist. It is the owner's responsibility to attend to the instance where their dog bites another person or animal similar to vehicular accident situations.



- It's important to get details on a possible rabies infected dog AND build history of the dog
- It only makes sense for a person to stay at the scene. To leave or flee the scene when a person or animal has been bit or injured should be a chargeable offense.
- That way the dog can be assessed for shots ie rabies and recorded as part of its nuisance history.
- It makes sense that the person remains on scene to provide information. That way by law can see if there is history with the animal/owner, information can be exchanged for purposes of vet bills etc.
- An owner is responsible for their dog, at the end of the day they should be accountable with their information as such
- If a dog bites, the owner should be able to explain the circumstances (ie, person was hitting my dog, my dog bit back in defence) to ensure it's not a one-sided, victim only story.
- If your dog bites it is on you to be there to deal with the consequences or you can exchange information so that you can be reached at a later time
- Because the situation needs to be fully understood.
- If your dog attacks someone or someone's pet you should be held responsible, your information should be given to the city so they can make sure you are taking the necessary steps to keep the public and their animals safe such as wearing a muzzle and not attending off leash areas. If serious damage is done you should also have to contribute to the vet bill if the person or pet needs medical attention.
- So that all facts from both parties are heard
- The owner should 100% stay, by moral obligation alone. If you impose a rule making pit bull offenses more expensive, owners wont stay. That's why the increased penalties for pitbulls **SHOULD NOT EVEN BE ON THE TABLE.**
- You can't hit someone with your car and flea the scene, it should be the same if your dog bites someone.
- Dog owners should be given resources to help train their dogs to avoid future incidents.
- There needs to be a record of the bite. After a specific amount of bites/severity I believe the animal should be put down for everyone's safety.
- This is a no brainer - **NEEDED.**
- It's just like getting in a car accident. Exchange information with the person or animal owner before leaving the scene.
- Vaccination history for victim of bite
- I dont see why this needs to be explained. Otherwise it's like a hit and run. Or an assault where the person runs away.
- It is never the dogs fault. If the owner can not or will not do proper training or care of dog then the owner is at fault and the owner should be the owner to blame with consequences.
- It's usually the owners fault or the fault of the person or animal who was bit - dogs rarely bite while unprovoked or without warning signs.
- A dog biting a human or other dog should be seen as assault and the offender should be penalized if they leave the area without exchanging information or speaking with law enforcement



- Officers should be able to support the dog owner in the situation and help them find appropriate actions to correct their dogs behavior
- Like a hit and run you should be there to explain and help negotiate the situation. If you run away it's because you did something wrong stay and talk it over maybe it's not because it's a bad dog it is because of a crappy person.
- This is basic good character of a responsible pet owner.
- It should be treated like a car accident and failure to remain is subject to fine or charge
- If it's the animals fault. If the other person or animal provoked it, it should not be the fault of the other.
- Just like a car accident you need to stick around I believe a dog bite should be treated the same
- it is responsible petmanship , pet parenting ..
- For the safety of the victim person or animal, the owner should remain on the scene. They are still responsible for their dogs actions and are thus responsible for correcting the issue
- The owner is responsible for the dogs actions and therefore must be responsible for providing information to police. Dogs are reflective of their training and owners.
- If a dog bites and injures my dog or son, I want that persons info and to be held accountable.
- The owner of the dog should be held accountable.
- These situations should be treated just like a car accident you stay and give your account of the incident, leaving before the police or bylaw arrives is an offence
- It's the same as any other assault crime or accident
- My boyfriend was attacked by a dog in his mom's alley. Guess what? he called the police and they did nothing. Was it because it wasn't a pitbull that no one cared?
- Seems like the same logic for a car accident
- A dog owner should take responsibility for their dogs actions and face consequences.
- Fairly clear that you would want the owner to be questioned quickly after the incident.
- Reduces bylaw time tracking the owner down. If they leave the scene then a fine should be imposed similar to leaving the scene of a car accident
- Owners are responsible for their pets behaviour. This rule should be applied to ALL breeds.
- Should be charges if left, should be considered an offense that they must remain present for
- The owner needs to be held fully responsible if an animal in their care does harm. They should face fines and be banned from owning animals if they cannot put the training that is required for ALL dogs
- I didn't know they were allowed to leave. They aren't actually. They would totally get charged for the bite anyways (negligence) so this new bylaw will change nothing. You guys couldn't have taken 1 law class??? Just get the police/animal control to deal with this, why do you want more money to hire more people, right, you're the city.
- Just like a car accident, people should be required to stay at the scene of a dog bite. I don't know if this is realistic (ie: how long does it take for an enforcement officer to get to a typical incident?)
- There are a lot of breeds that exhibit vicious tendencies and it needs to be recorded



- It is not the dogs issue it's the owners who are responsible so they should stay. It's lack of training and love the dog receive as I have witness many breed considered dangerous that have been nothing but loving and protective.
- Owner is responsible for their dog if it bites someone or another dog they need to make sure everything is alright and leave contact info for future reference
- It should be the same as if it were a car accident
- Cooperation should be considered before euthanasia
- Yes and No - if the animal is also injured, then priority needs to be the wellbeing of the animal, not to wait for law enforcement. The important part is that contact information must be exchanged in a timely fashion - that is the only part that should be legislated.
- It's just like a car accident. They need to stay on the scene
- Pretty obvious that if your dog bites a person or another dog you should remain on scene. Exception would be if people/dogs need medical/veterinary attention.
- Most definitely they need to stay to share information, but if the dog that bit, or the person/dog bitten requires attention, or is too agitated then after information is passed on let them go to get things taken care of.
- They must remain at the scene of an incident to do a report as to why the dog has bitten someone
- The owner of the pet is ultimately responsible
- It should be like when you're in a car collision. Everyone should remain on the scene and be fined if they leave before they are allowed to by authorities.
- The owner of a dog can know something about the dog that is imperative for the human to know. (i.e. Dog medical history)
- This is no different than a hit and run, once you leave the scene there is room for evasion and error in the facts of the incident.
- It should be like a car accident. If something happens, at least exchange contact information to make sure all is safe
- I agree with this because the owner and dog have to be dealt with.
- It holds the owner accountable
- Taking responsibility for actions
- Regardless of cause, remaining at the scene to share contact information is the responsibility of the owner.
- I would consider this to be the same as a traffic infraction. If there is damage to a vehicle you share info. If an injury has been sustained to one animal by another then you should share info. Most respectable dog owners would agree
- The dog and owner should stay a good distance away from the victim, until enforcement arrives. That way there's no mixups with stories, and you get both sides of the story right away.
- I assumed this was a law already
- similar to leaving the scene of an accident
- The owner is ultimately responsible for the dog, therefore should pay for any medical expenses, it should be treated similarly to a car accident



- Most dog bites go unreported especially smaller dogs
 - People need to be made accountable for their pets actions
 - To make sure no further issues happen.
 - As long as the victim is okay with that
 - They need to tell their side of the story. I have seen dogs bite a) they were playing with another dog n the other owner is over reacting b) if the person who got bite was being the troublemaker n the dog was protecting, was getting manhandled by the person n it's not there dog etc.
 - "Yes and no. Depending on the situation.
-
- DONT BAN PITBULLS THERE LIFES MATTER"
 - If the incident is severe enough to warrant bylaw involvement all parties should remain
 - The owner of the dog needs to take responsibility and it is important to have their information for many reasons, but mostly to track the dog for reoffending. In my experience, it isn't always the offending dogs fault, but if the dog is problematic in the future, more needs to be done to keep that dog out of stressful situations.
 - I feel like both parties should be at the scene so there is no discrepancy between stories
 - You do it for cars, why not dog owners?
 - We're all responsible for our dogs if the person bit is calling enforcement that person should stay too
 - If we treat the bite like an accident, it should help to protect animals and people.
 - I feel like it is more the owners responsibility for how the dog acts
 - They are responsible for their dogs behavior therefore they need to explain what happened and give contact info for further investigation if needed.
 - If the problem was solved I see no reason for enforcement officers
 - For all attacks big or little. And if every breed of dog
 - As dogs may or may not have shots done they should remain and have information available, if dog harms people or other pets all Bill's should be paid by the person whose animal attacked.
 - It's your dog, your responsibility.
 - I stay on scene of a car accident to exchange info. Same should be true of animal incidents
 - You would be wrong to leave the scene of an accident
 - Similar to offenses involving people. It is important to be required to stay at the scene, otherwise you will never be able to track down the individual responsible for the incident.
 - Every dog owner is responsible for their dog. I actually don't support any off leash activity in public areas, regardless of dog breed. Responsible dog owners should walk their dogs on a leash.
 - It would be helpful to know if there was something that provoked the dog. Did the other dog antagonize the biter, what caused the bite. Dogs try their best to communicate their voices and sometimes another dog doesn't respect their answer.
 - If the bite was malicious and either human or animal was harmed I believe they should stay there and exchange insurance and contact information.



- The owner needs to be held accountable
- Important to maintain responsibility for your pet if it bites. Also gives opportunity for two owners to discuss issue and resolve peacefully.
- "I do think this is the responsibility of the owner to make sure they stay and give information and statement.
- Not every situation is the same."
- It's important to get identification and the vaccines records for the dog and know what actions will be taken
- Important for all parties to know and explain their case. There are many reasons why dogs bite including being provoked but a victim is likely to exclude that type of information. while talking to enforcement officers.
- Easier to charge if the person is forced to stay at the scene, and if they don't stay, it's another offence (if it's an offence chargeable under the by-laws).
- It's the responsible thing to do. Owners who don't should be fined.
- Its the right thing to do
- An owner is responsible for their dog's actions, it is important they remain at the scene to provide their version of events. However, I also understand that they may need to remove their dog from the situation for its own safety and/or the safety of the others involved. At a minimum they should provide their contact information and return to the scene or arrange for someone to pick-up the dog while they wait.
- Owners should be held accountable for their animals
- My own dog was attacked in our own yard by a neighbours dog through a gap in our fence. Our dogs dogs nose was severely damaged and required emergency surgery. The neighbour didn't stay and when we tried to contact them to get assistance with our \$900 vet bill they ignored us. Having a rule that requires them to stay will ensure people take responsibility for their dogs actions and it will help give support to those who are affected.
- Otherwise you may not get that information
- This is evident
- i believe that dog bites happen for a reason; the dog is trying to defend itself or perceived space. Having the owner at the scene would ensure that the entire story gets told. If training for the owner or dog is required this is a good time to find that out.
- Owner is responsible for their pet. Absolutely they should remain at scene.
- If an attack or incident occurs, a dog owner is responsible to ensure the proper/legal steps are taken.
- Same as a car crash - your dog shouldn't be able to bite someone and then you run away
- These incidents may require investigations.
- "Only if severe injury occurs.
- Small nips are dogs nature. It is also best to inform dog owners to let others know to go and get a doctors check if their dog doesn't have their shots up to date."
- Owners should be responsible for their pets.



- That way we'd know what dog was a regular aggressive. If a dog is consistently biting then the animal can be banned from public parks etc
- I believe the owner needs to stay to share contact information and the pet's latest updated vaccine information as to make sure the bitten is safe from getting sick
- I think this is 100% necessary, it's a traumatic event to be attacked or bit by an animal and having a rule that you need to stay would be very helpful
- An owner is responsible for the actions of their pet. If it is considered a serious incident by the victim, the owner of the offending dog is liable
- My brother was bitten and the owner and dog left the scene so no fines or any discipline were ever imposed
- They should give a report and information showing they are taking responsibility for their pet. However if the animal is in distress and needs to be removed from the situation the owner should have the right to leave and keep everyone safe.
- If I leave the scene of a crime or car accident there are reproductions, this is no different
- All parties should stay until enforcement is there. There are two parts to every story and dog bites are sometimes provoked. This way both parties can share stories and responsibility
- Only if it's a serious incident. However, people's definitions of 'serious' may differ, so specifics may be helpful for people to determine if they need to stay or not.
- I've had a few people whose dog has bit me or my dog and they just run off. It would be nice if there was some way to hold them accountable
- Enforces responsible dog ownership
- Your dog, your responsibility. And maybe people just need a little guidance on what to do with their dogs and where to get behavioural training. (On ALL breeds)
- It would secure the accuracy of the event as well as input from bystanders to confirm such events. Otherwise it becomes difficult to pinpoint cause/penalty.
- This will allow both sides of the story to be heard so a fair assessment can be made.
- It is the best way to determine animals with problem or repeat behaviour
- It's leaving the scene of a so-called accident idea
- I fully support all parties should remain at the scene of a dog bite until authorities arrive.
- It protects that owner of the dog, as much as the victim.
- Real pet owners don't run they face things like this.
- There's always two sides to a story, this way they get to explain their side
- If a crime occurs you don't leave the scene of the crime. This would help hold people accountable and it's always best to get the story right away as opposed to waiting a few days.
- Otherwise it's a hit and run. Same thing.
- Owners should be held responsible
- This rule makes sense and I am surprised that this isn't already in place.
- Contact info necessary for resolution matters
- "Accountability, and vet costs associated with a dog altercation can be costly.



- Being able to have a scenario breakdown/record with enforcement officers/witnesses is important for both parties, and their potential liabilities."
- An owner needs to be responsible for their pet, therefore would need to take responsibility and tell the police what happened.
- If the owner is there, they can explain what happened, so both sides of the story are heard. If someone was antagonizing a dog, and it bit them, the dog should not have to be put down.
- People need to be held accountable for their animals
- I think this is important as a dog owner you are taking responsibility for your dogs actions to ensure whomever it but is okay.
- It should be required for the dog owner to provide accurate contact information and talk with the officer about what happened.
- Dog owners are responsible for their dog's behavior, just like a parent must be present and is responsible for their child's conduct.
- The owner should have to stay at the scene, share contact, and talk to law enforcement because evidence needs to be gathered
- It is the responsible thing to do. The only reason I would say no is if the dog is further aggressing and the situation is becoming worse.
- There's always a reason as to why a dog will bite. A dog would resort to biting as his/her last option.
- Nobody knows their dogs behaviour better than the owner. Having the dog owner on sight is the best way to de-escalate and further reduce an already traumatic situation.
- That's just common courtesy as a dog owner. This would make you a bad dog owner-no different then fleeing any incident
- This will lead to owners taking responsibility over their dogs and not just running off after an incident occurs.
- It is like a car accident. If appropriate training hasn't been taken they need to stay
- I think to hear all sides of the story, verify if dog shows signs of aggression or not and decide an offence from there
- This makes sense. A responsible owner would do this anyways
- The person must remain at the scene and provide correct contact information.
- To ensure all stakeholders are heard at the time of the incident
- Regardless of breed, a responsible dog owner should own up to their animals behaviors. If that animal causes harm, they need to stay and ensure everyone is ok and take the fine as given.
- My service dog has been attacked and the other owner fled
- Common courtesy and For insurance and vet bill purposes
- Owners must be held accountable for poor animal behavior. To ensure this, they must stay at the scene of any incident and provide contact info.
- I believe remaining at the scene would be an act of responsible pet ownership
- The owner is responsible for the dogs behaviour and as such should be required to be held responsible.



- Accountability and responsibility as a pet owner is important for everyone.
 - It's common sense. However it's the same like a car accident. People flee. You can't really enforce this without spending money to have officers are dog parks which is a waste of money and time.
 - There are many reasons that a dog bites, although unfortunate, in some cases it is the fault of the victim or the other dog.
 - "Information should be exchanged for the owner to be liable for damages caused.
-
- If the owner waiting for an officer to arrive puts others in danger they should give their contact information and remove the animal from the scene."
 - They need to say what happened and take responsibility
 - Dog bite offenders who flee the scene set themselves up for repeat offences
 - Unless the environment is unstable. But owner should return in a timely manner once dog has been placed in a secure area...such as home, car, etc. Safety for dog and victim
 - Owners must take responsibility for their animals. Just as law requires you to stay and provide information in a car accident, so too should you need to stay when there is an animal accident.
 - It allows for documentation that the animal was involved in an incident, and allows the owner to be accountable to their dog's actions. Contact info is a good idea to follow up on the incident
 - Absolutely. No matter what "breed" does the biting. It is the Owners responsibility to make sure their dog is trained and under control. If a dog bites and their owner takes off that's ridiculous. It's almost as bad as a hit and run. the dog was out of control, the owner needs to face the Consequences, and should be charged if they leave the scene.
 - If not remain at the scene they need to at least be required to leave contact information
 - I think education for the owner is key...,
 - They should leave their contact information, though they may also need to take the dog away to a separate area, or their home.
 - It's important to have everyone's input
 - You should stay at the scene of any accident or crime until police allow you to leave.
 - All dog owners must take responsibility for their dogs actions
 - The owner of the dog that bit should be held responsible for all vet/medical costs that are incurred by the victims.
 - Responsibility and accountability is an important part of being a pet owner
 - This is what responsible dog owners should be doing anyways.
 - Fleeing to prevent a dog from being put down happens and canleave victims in scary situations when there is insufficient information about the dog and possible vaccines
 - Provided that is it safe to do so, for the owner and dog.
 - Yes, to a point of sharing contact information with the other dog owner. We know enforcement officers in Calgary will take their sweet time to arrive to an incident like this, and I am not sitting in a public park for four hours to abide by some daft ordinance.



- If a dog bites a human or another animal the owner should be held responsible.
- We are seeing an increase in uncontrolled dogs in offleash parks where owners are negligent in attending to their animal and it's behavior including waste management and aggressive behavior. These individuals then leave without exchanging information and some animal owners incur expensive veterinary care after their dog has been attacked.
- A person should naturally take the responsibility for what happens to their pets, just like a driver takes responsibility for what happens with their car or a parent with their kids
- This ensures both sides are heard
- Unless there is a medical emergency get information and get medical treatment
- There are too many repeat offender incidents in my community and there needs to be a bylaw that prevents owners from escaping all scrutiny over their nuisance dog.
- Nothing to explain, this is very obvious.
- Only if it is a severe bite and will physically/medically affect the bitten.
- It is their dog. They should know what happens. And maybe the officers can judge the owner and not the dog.
- just makes sense
- Many people seem to flee if their pet causes an issue, and that's unacceptable
- A nip is one thing, same with a mutual fight. An attack needs to be dealt with and vet bills and emergency care need to be compensated by the guilty party.
- I would support it but it wouldn't be enforced when someone leaves and doesn't share the info.
- Same as a car accident the owner is responsible
- The owner remaining at the scene is necessary in establishing responsibility for the animal involved. The only exception would be that the owner needs to remove the animal for the safety of others in the vicinity (i.e., the animal cannot be calmed down without being removed). That being said, I feel that "nuisance dogs" are an issue of the owner being fully responsible and treating the animal with respect and properly training the dog and not a breed issue.
- If it's necessary, a third party should be involved to sort things out. A mediator if you will to confirm events with both parties.
- Wouldn't this be the same if there was a car accident and if you left it would be a hit and run? Stay at the scene.
- How else does anyone get the information of the dog or the owner
- It's the owners responsibility where it's a big or small dog.
- The incident can be blown out of proportion and if the person attacked is only there then you only hear one side.
- If there is a car crash you are required to stay at the scene and not drive off. It is the same with a animal bite.
- Because it is the owners responsibility of the breed
- if a dog bites someone out of aggression. It has behavioral issues that need attention. Any dog can be aggressive. It's all about the owner



- So both sides of the story can be told.
- All too often an altercation requiring a vet visit will happen at a park but the owner of the attacking dog will leave so there are no consequence and no monetary assistance
- If someone is injured by a pet that is not their own, the owner of the pet should stay. Not only for fairness to the individual injured, but to the pet and owner as well. A lot of the time we hear of a dog bite and assume it was unprovoked however this is not always the case and the potential for a tormenting of the pet and/owner also deserves fair judgement and trial where necessary
- Common sense
- As long as everyone is safe and the dog is not at risk of attacking again the owner needs to remain at the scene.
- You are responsible for your animal and should remain with the person/animal until information is given
- It is just decent
- Makes sense that they stay and pass along appropriate info
- Owners should be accountable for their dogs.
- Just like a car accident with any breed of dog a owner should stay with victim at incident scene to trade information or wait for law enforcement
- As long as the dog owner has control of their dog (the dog isn't at danger to harm someone else)
- Owners should be held responsible if their pet assaults another animal or person.
- The owner should remain in case of liability issues. Once they have left there may be no way to contact them.
- Critical for receiving health/vaccine info on the dog
- The dog owner needs to be held responsible as it's a big part of training NOT breed that makes a dog attack something or someone
- The owner must be held accountable for their dog.
- Owners must take responsibility for their pets and must be obligated to stay at the scene of an incident
- Yes, but the dogs and owners should be separated to prevent escalating events, if the individuals leave than fines should be considered
- Regardless of breed, the owner should be held accountable for their dogs behaviour (from the smallest to the largest sized breeds)
- I think that dog attacks should be treated as human attacks. The owner should remain on scene to provide all contact information- especially if the dog that was attacked needs medical treatment
- Too often owners aren't reliable to stay if their dog bites another
- failing to stay at the scene of a an aggressive dog incident would be similar to a hit and run in a vehicle
- Owners must assume all responsibilities
- Dog owners taking off is like a hit and run to me



- During a tribunal - how would victims be reimbursed for any medical expenses, or being off work etc?
 - makes sense
 - It is always the dog owner's responsibility for their pets. they need to hold accountable.
 - Often, there are extenuating circumstances. Dog "owners" have taken on a huge responsibility when they get a dog. But that does not mean that the general public does not have to be responsible, also, for understanding what will trigger bad behavior. This is a dog loving society.....I always figure, if you can't handle drunks, stay out of the bar. If you or your kids are afraid of dogs, or don't understand the ramifications of your behavior, please stay out of dog parks.
 - I recently watched a video where a lady's dog attacked and killed someone's dog. She just pulled the dog away and left the owner and dying dog. It was horrible to watch. I can't imagine being in a similar situation with my own pet. It should be treated like a hit and run. The owner should hold responsibility for the harm caused.
 - They are accountable for the action of their pet. With cellphones there is no need to leave an accident scene
 - There are way too many people who give incorrect contact information because they don't want to deal with the aftermath of their dog's bad behavior. All dog owners and any witnesses should remain at the scene until an enforcement officer can arrive and take note. All dog owners should also be encouraged to have a Go-Pro type of camera when out in public with their dog, for their dog's safety and their own, regardless of what kind of dog they have.
 - I treat this like a car accident. Stay and give your info or be gined for leaving the scene.
 - Owners should take responsibility, it's not the dogs fault
 - its common sense
 - "Like all the small dogs.
 - Why does a difference in bite pressure matter.
 - A chihuahua that bites a baby can do as much damage as a pitbull that bites a adult.
-
- The action should be the determining factor both the amount of damage.
-
- A bite is a bite and should not be different for a small dog and big dog.
-
- Also to single out pitbulls know full well they are not as likly to bite us beyond wrong"
 - owners have to take responsibility
 - The bitten party must also remain on the scene, similar to motor vehicle incidents involving police to officers



- Regarding any other accident or injury it is expected the perpetrator remain on the scene. As pets are owners responsibility, the owner should remain on the scene whenever an incident occurs with their pet.
- Failing to remain at the scene is an additional offence that the owner of a dog could be charged with, creating - hopefully - a bit more of a deterrent to negligent pet ownership.
- good luck with enforcement
- Pit bulls aren't dangerous. The owners are the real danger. Don't make dumb rules cause people don't know how to be a pet owner
- No matter what breed the dog owner should remain at the scene and cooperate with authorities as a responsible pet owner.
- Unless this is part of play biting with dogs that are just having fun. So, if the bite is to a person - YES, if the bite is to an other animal and is predatory in nature - YES, if it is two dogs playing and being dogs and they get a bit carried away (but not in an aggressive trying to do real harm manner) - NO
- Easy, make people responsible for their animals actions.
- It's the owners responsibility to give information if their dog bites someone
- If such an incident occurs I believe the owner of the dog should be able to explain why it happened.
- As the owner it is their responsibility of their dog bites.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their animals, victim and perpetrator. There are always 3 sides to a story.
- Why should this accident be any different than a car accident? Additional punitive action for those that leave the scene.
- "Of course the offending owner must remain at the scene of an incident, as is required of drivers to remain at the scene of an incident. When someone is at fault, they must be required to remain at the scene so that resources aren't wasted finding them. If they leave, they should be fined for failing to remain at the scene of an incident.
- That being said, enforcement officers need to arrive in a timely manner."
- "This allows for both sides to be heard. The dog should not be seized immediately though.
- There are extenuation circumstances when removing the dog is safer as well."
- The owner needs to take responsibility for the dogs actions. A dog lashing out with a bite is likely not proper training, guidance from owner or ignorance of owner putting dog into a situation where it feels threatened. The individual needs more education and training on dog behavior and should be given these resources at the scene.
- Why wouldn't you stay to address the incident.
- If the bite is violent/severe and an unreasonable reaction (not provoked by a frightening or dangerous situation for the dog) it makes sense to require the ability to follow up with the owner.
- It promotes responsible dog ownership
- The owner is as responsible for the behavior of his/her dog.



- Both the victim and owner should stay in order to hear both sides. Sometimes a dog bites to protect that dog in cases like that should not be punished. Know the full story before accusing, fining, hurting the dog, etc.
- Owners must stay and take responsibility for the actions of their dog(s)
- Yes this will ensure it get reported accurately
- But only if the animal is in control - if not they should leave to ensure public safety- my big dogs s have often been bitten by little dogs at off least- we no longer walk out dogs there because of smaller aggressive dogs-
- The owners need to be held responsible for the actions of their pet.
- The owner is ultimately responsible for not training the behaviour out of the dog.
- Absolutely the owner should take responsibility for their dogs actions. That's what being a responsible owner is!
- If a dog bites another person or animal, the owner should be held responsible and face legalities for the trauma inflicted. They should be required to give all the information and talk to authorities if this does occur. Owners should be held responsible for their animals' actions as they should know how to properly raise and train their animal.
- My dog was bitten at public off leash dog park. The owner then fled the scene with his dog, and my small dachshund had a puncture wound that cost upwards of \$700 for surgery to fix and heal.
- I don't think it matters, honestly- how are you going to force someone to stay put? Unless you physically restrain them, or disable their vehicle, your options are limited if they want to leave (and enforcement takes time to show up). Additionally, these statements often turn into one person's word against another, which is useless.
- Owner needs to stay put.
- Needed to identify the dog and get vaccination records
- If there was an act of aggression it should be addressed.
- Owners should be held accountable and in control of their dog. If a dog bites another animal, their may be hefty vet bills that the offending party should pay, or at least a portion. At the very least, accurate and truthful contact information should be left.
- As there need to be accountability to raising a pet.
- I feel a person should stay on scene until information has been exchanged.
- Dog bites can be extremely severe ans traumatic. The owners of dogs responsible for bites must take that responsibility upon themselves, as dig behaviour is largely the product of owner training and treatment.
- owner should take responsibility of their pets and should ensure their pets have proper training
- If your dog bites someone and it's serious you should stay and figure out what's going on and how serious the bite is.
- It's the responsible thing to do, however there is a fear that their dog will be taken away immediately which likely encourages owners to leave the scene. I do not think that bylaw should remove the animal But gather information for due diligence.



- Owners should be responsible for the behaviour of their pet and should not be able to walk away when harm is done
- Not just pitbull owners like I said. I've seen incidents with little dogs and another with two dogs that were not pitbulls who left the scene. I have never seen a pitbull get away with an accident.
- Of course! Dog bites are the responsibility of the owner.
- Owners are responsible for any and all actions
- Owners responsible.
- Your responsibility as a dog owner
- The person must be accountable for the behavior of their dogs, and all perspectives are best considered immediately after it happens.
- To ensure there is an opportunity to educate owners and provide help managing dog behaviour
- This definitely should be put into effect. Just as a police report would be made by both sides during a traffic accident.
- We need training programs for situations where dogs may get out of hand because their owner isn't taking charge and leading the animal, both human and dog must be trained
- So potentially dangerous animals can be tracked
- It's common decency and could spare the victim from rabies shots as well as taking responsibility for your dog.
- Owners must be held responsible for what happened.
- It is always the owners responsibility to ensure the safety and well-being of their pet and others, so it's important they stay on scene so proper and correct information can be obtained from all parties involved.
- Information shared is necessary for possible medical bills/issues
- If the case is severe, the person in charge of the offending animal should remain at the scene. A minor incident should not allow a person to use this for personal gain
- I had thought this was in place already. It's common decency.
- If its your dog, then you should be liable for what it does
- I believe they must remain to ensure the victim is ok. By the way- pit bull bans are wrong and I think it's a shame you're feeding into this
- The owner(s) of the biting dog (or both dogs if it was two way biting) must provide information for contact for tribunal or vet fees.
- People should to be responsible for vet bills if their animal causes harm! Allowing them to legally walk away prevents any responsibility.
- I think if people are to run away with their pet after it clearly injured or hurt another person or animal should at the very least do this. Just as if it were an car accident you provide information because you are at fault.
- Its similar to a vehicle hit and run in my opinion. If you cause damage, you should be held responsible.



- When the owner of dog that has attacked another person usually leaves the scene so they are not responsible for paying and sometimes give false information.
- An owner must take responsibility for their dogs actions
- Absolutely, this should be treated similar to a car accident. Again, it should not be mandatory in every situation but if a victim requests an enforcement officer's involvement the owner of the offending animal must be required to stay.
- If there are any damages, absolutely. You need to know if the dog in question has its shots, if the owners will cover vet/doctor costs if needed.
- It just makes sense to do this.
- Its their animal they have to take responsibility. Too many people are held unaccountable for their animals.
- The owner of the dog is responsible for the actions of the respective dog and impacts the dogs actions are the owners responsibility. An owner who is not responsible for their pet should be fined and not allowed to own animals.
- A person is responsible for their dog's actions
- It seems reasonable, if my dog ever bit another dog I would provide the dog owner with my information to cover any vet bills necessary
- It is important that all parties remain present to provide as much information as possible about the incident
- A dog attack is just like a car accident. If people got hurt then information needs to be accurately obtained and documented to provide further information about what happened including what happened up to and following the attack.
- Much like any incident with a vehicle, or other property, the owner should stay at the scene of an incident to share information and talk with enforcement as necessary, and those that run away from severe incident should be charged with a "hit and run" type penalty.
- Regardless of who's fault the incident actually was it's the same as a car accident. Contact information needs to be exchanged.
- if your dog harms another animal or human you should be held accountable
- It's like a car accident, you have to remain at the scene there, should be the same for severe dog bites.
- If the bite resulted in significant injury to person or animal, owner should have to legally give their information so a report can be filed. As a veterinary professional, I know of many incidents where bites have occurred and the owner of the dog that attacked will leave immediately (run away) or not share any/the appropriate info or lie about who they are or who the dog is. It makes it very hard for officers, veterinary clinics, and victims to follow up and file a report.
- The owner should then go into training for themselves and the dog
- In order to hold the owner responsible, they should remain at the scene if the victim indicated they wish to involve an enforcement officer
- If a dogs bites, it's the owner's responsibility and their poor training of the animal.



- The dog owner needs to remain on scene and provide proof of rabies shots, and their information as most dog bites are the fault of the owner or the person who got bit, not the dogs.
- Dog owners must be held accountable for their pet's behaviour.
- If you are in a minor car accident you are required to stay and give your information, if your dog harms a person or an animal you should also be required to stay and give your information
- Yes they should remain there. And the police or bylaw officer can then assess the owners!
- It shows responsibility to stay at the scene.
- I agree with this if there are parameters to further define "bite".
- of course, it is illegal to flee the scene of a car accident, a dog accident should be treated the same way.
- If your dog rips up another dog and you run away you should be charged with something similar to a hit and run.
- A animal Bite is no different than being in a car accident. If a pet causes damage or harm the pet owner should be required to stay and give their information.
- its the right thing to do .
- Just to be able to check in on the injured party
- Yes it would be like a hit and run if you leave but people are scared to lose their dog in this type of accident
- If your dog causes a serious bite yes you should stay on scene and be required to give your contact info to a officer
- It is just like a car accident. Details of owners needs to be exchanged.
- If this rule was in place it would allow quicker identification of possible nuisance dogs. And can allow the owner to receive proper information to curve the aggression or rules to be in affect for their dog. It would also allow owners to trade information to pay for vet bills or if needed to be brought to civil court.
- Thatwould be the sensible thing to do. We do not flee the scene of an accident. Why would we flee a scene where our dog jist bite someone?
- accountability and the truth
- I believe both sides of the story need to be heard. And the owner needs to be responsible for the dog. Some dogs bit for no apparent reason and other dogs bit for a reason. Its important to find out why the dog bit the person or animal.
- Two sides to every story. Dogs bite because they are jerks and some bite because they are provoked or scared. This is all part of fair judgement
- It's appropriate to make sure everyone involved is ok, & if vet/medical care is needed.
- It should be like any other accident that involves 2 parties both exchange information before parting ways
- if another dog attacked my dog, that person better stay and provide me with his info. If not, I would find out who they are and sue them for all vet bills present and future, all mediations, all training for my dog's. entire life. What the city wants to do, that's your prerogative. Me, they will pay dearly.
- Yes. It keeps owners accountable for the actions of their animals



- The owner should be responsible for any possible expenses or fines.
- There's 3 sides to every story. It's important to find out the reason why a situation happened so it can be dealt with properly.
- If an injury is sustained, it's responsible for the dog owner to provide contact information.
- it's the same as if a person hurts another person they're required to stay.
- It is against the law to leave the scene of an accident, the same should apply to persons whose dogs have been involved in causing injury to another person or animal.
- If a incident occurs it should be reviewed by an enforcement office to determine if it was a split fault/provoked indecent
- I believe that's just called common curtesy
- Depends on the severity, case by case situation
- Your dog, your accountability.
- Unless they are helping the other person get to a doctor.
- The owner needs to explain why the dog bit someone (if there was a reason) - need to hear both the victim's and the owner's sides of the story.
- The owner (or guardian) is responsible for the dog at all times. If something happens, they should remain at the scene. No different than a traffic accident.
- If a dog attacks another dog or person, that dog's owner is liable and must accept responsibility. Bylaw officer needs to know which animals are a risk
- If your the owner of a dog. And it bites someone it's your responsibility to make sure the person is okay and safe.
- Common curtesy is to stay.
- People need to be accountable
- Accidents happen, leaving the scene of one - regardless of it being a bicycle, car or dog bite should be something you are not allowed to do without cause (you fear for your safety, child is waiting to be picked up elsewhere - who knows. I also don't think having to wait for hours for a cop is ok either, being able to leave contact info with police dispatch and get a case number or something to say you did that, would make sense. As long as you can be contacted later - add it to the city phone app - grabs a map ping and assigns a number. low tech -Even just a voicemail line pet owners know to call, leave contact info and get a reference number or something.
- If this is to promote responsible pet ownership, the responsible thing to do when someone is injured is ensuring that contact information is shared/being available for discussion with an enforcement officer.
- It's called being a responsible adult and animal owner. No different that hitting someone with your car.
- You're required to remain at the scene of an accident when it comes to vehicles, the same should apply for this situation because a dog bite is still considered an incident. It's important for everyone involved to exchange contact information in case anything happens to the victim after the incident.
- When you take on responsibility for a pet you are responsible for your pet's behavior.
- I think it should be treated like a car accident



- It is imperative to get owners information and witness accounts of the incident, as well as informing owners of the process to follow
- As a responsible dog owner, you stay and take responsibility
- However there are concerns with this. As is proven small dogs bite and act aggressive more frequently. When a small and large dog have an altercation the large or pitbull type dog is always found at fault. Even when defending themselves.
- The owner is responsible for the dog's actions and therefore need to deal with any consequences of the dog's actions
- If the owner leaves, especially if there is a victim (either human or another dog at the scene), it increases the similarities to a hit and run vehicle incident. Owners need to be accountable for their dog's behaviors at all times. I say this as a dog owner, who is always safe and responsible for my dog's behaviors.
- To ensure adequate follow up and gathering of necessary information.
- "No
- Explanation needed"
- I mean, it's like a car crash, don't leave the scene.
- If it was a severe bite and victim calls authorities then yes, all parties should remain at the scene.
- It's no different than a car accident
- The dog owner is responsible for their dog's behaviour at all times.
- If a dog OF ANY BREED bites or attacks, the owner should be available to discuss. That being said, so too should the victim. If a dog is being attacked or provoked by the victim it should not be the owner who is at fault.
- I think that this should apply to every dog breed. The owner should be at fault if the dog bites another person or animal. It is the owner's responsibility to insure their dog has had the proper training.
- I do support it but when the owner does not want to be found how are you going to enforce this.
- A crime is a crime. If you must stay at the scene of a car accident, you should also stay at the scene of an animal related incident.
- When I was bit by a cane corso, the police and bylaw had to search for the owner. This meant I needed to identify the dog hours after the attack and be re-traumatized
- If your dog bites a person, you should remain at the scene. As both a witness and as someone who can bare responsibility in the fact the person was bitten. If you were to leave the scene, it could be considered almost like a criminal similar to a hit and run.
- It is important to get information from everyone when a violent scene has occurred
- Similar to the scene of an Vehicle accident people should be responsible to remain at the scene to give statements and information to the officers that need it
- At the very least it would be helpful to know the dog had been immunized against rabies
- If the person who is bit, or their animal, has health or vet costs, it should be the owner who is responsible to cover that.
- Necessary to hold the owner accountable and establish next steps



- Everyone should be involved in the incident and an official should be there to help determine a correct course of treatment and how to move forward. This also allows for the owner to defend the dog.
- Because sometimes it's not the dogs fault.
- They need to remain on scene to be responsible for their dog
- Owners need to be more responsible
- 2 of my friends have been bit in the past year. If a dog is even slightly aggressive they should never be allowed off leash or near people who aren't aware of it. Owners have to be responsible for their dogs.
- For safety and enforcement.
- It allows for better follow up and support for the victim.
- I think communication needs to be clear in these cases
- Be responsible if something happens
- The owner is responsible for the dogs actions and should stick around to give there side of the story as well be able to provide the dogs health informtion.
- As if a person had harmed another, or as a witness to any potentially harmful act - on purpose or by accident, I feel it's that persons responsibility to stay on the scene until resolution or you are told you can go.
- Holds owner accountable
- Owners should be accountable. I would prefer ownership licensing that requires training.
- To be able to defend themselves if the accussions were false. And also to easily be able to swap contact information.
- I am surprised this already isn't a rule, owners need to be responsible for their dogs.
- There is always two sides to a story, a responsible pet owner would stay the more information given at the time of the incident the better.
- I don't believe any animal should EVER be euthanized or seized from the owner. I think the owner should have the opportunity to discuss what happened instead of the "victim" claiming what happened and the officer making a hasty judgement off one person's word.
- The owner of the dog has to take responsibility for their animal wether it's an accident or ignorance. This also allows the owner of the aggressive dog to defend if the circumstance involved another dog at large in a leashed area. Discrimination should not be put on pitbull type breeds, thats just silly.
- If the victim, wants to contact police or bylaw immediately due to an incident, then the offending dog and owner should be required to stay on scene and under control.
- Accountability is important
- Too many irresponsible dog owners leave the seen and are not accountable
- If the dog has bitten another person or dog, and that person or dog is visibly hurt the owner of the nuisance dog should make every effort to make sure proper care is in place.
- I see little dogs always biting people and other dogs. So it would be nice for them to be charged and held accountable instead of what normally happens.



- I have heard of so many people leaving and then it is difficult to get a hold of them later.
- It is the owner's responsibility to handle the fall out and repercussions of the dogs actions. The owner is responsible for what the dog does.
- Of course they should stay .If anything to tell their side of the story.
- I'm completely against any bylaws that single out a particular breed of dog. I don't believe 1 breed is any more or less dangerous than another, it's how they are raised and trained.
- It is no different than a 'hit and run'.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets
- You are responsible for your dog and if it bites and injures another human or pet you should be able to be held responsible. However "dog bite" and "injure" would need to be clearly defined. Too many owners are quick to say their pet was attacked when a larger dog simply growled at it or them...
- It's the owners dog it's like a car you wouldn't leave a car crash
- People should be held accountable for their animal's actions
- Just like a hit and run you should exchange information.
- Absolutely. I think the fear of their dog being put down is a reason someone may not stick around. If penalties didn't mean instant euthanization, people might be a little more likely to follow this rule. For the record, every dog should be included in any of these laws. I've been bitten by three dogs in my life, all of which were small dogs. I have scars from two of three.
- The other party should be held responsible. They should at least share their information with the other dog owner and not run away.
- more efficient to get the facts
- all dog bites are a result of the owners behaviour therefore the owner should always be held responsible.
- Responsible thing to do similar consequences to hit and run
- Similar to a car accident, I think all information should be exchanged if there's been an incident. If severe enough, both parties should wait for law enforcement.
- Because of infections and medical bills.
- There is always 2 sides to a story
- It's an assault, and a crime.
- I don't care what the breed would be on the dog, all responsible owners should remain at the scene until the police arrive
- Peacefully resolve the situation with the people who were there originally.
- Just like you would exchange information if you got into a car accident, you should do the same if there is an animal bite.
- If my dog ever was responsible for an attack being a decent human being I would wait and assist that person in anyway I could.
- My then-6-year-old son was bit by a large dog and the owner ran away



- It's important to hear both sides of a story, at the time the incident happens. It also helps if there are witnesses. This principle is used for traffic accidents, so why not for these incidents as well.
- As an owner you responsible for your animal
- Your dog has harmed someone running away makes you look ignorant and having to hunt you down is the definition of an irresponsible pet owner you as the pet owner are responsible for your pet running away after they bite someone is ignorance
- Owners are responsible for their pets in public just as vehicle owners are responsible for staying at the scene of an accident so pet owners should have the same responsibilities.
- We do this for car accidents, seems only logical.
- If any dog breed bites, then information should be shared and a FAIR investigation should be done.
- You need to know the other owner to seek medical information of their dog in case of rabies etc
- How is that incident any different that being at the scene of an accident? It's not information should be given out.
- If a dog bites it is not because it is a bad dog it's be cause the owner did not or doesn't know how to properly train the breed
- I believe that the owner of any aggressive dog should take full responsibility for the animals actions and remain on site so that a record can be taken of the incident and their information taken in the event that they need to be reached at a later time.
- Yes to explain what happened
- Dog owners need to be held responsible for their pets. Responsible pet ownership need to be the objective. Breed-specific legislation is not supported by any scientific facts.
- Owners should be held accountable and by having to remain on the scene it allows all parties to assess the situation, contact enforcement if necessary but also exchange information for any further action required.
- I've heard stories of the owner of the dog who attacked another dog leaving and not taking responsibility for what happened. I think the owner needs to be held accountable so that they don't continue to take their dog to places that make the dog stressed and then the dog attacks another dog or person. It seems the only way for people to really understand what they have done wrong, is to have someone of authority explain this to them. I think the owner of the dog that was the one who attacked, should be responsible to pay for the vet bills of the dog that was attacked, or pay some percentage of the vet bill.
- I think that's just a courtesy thing. The owner is responsible for the dog and should be the one to deal with the consequences.
- So both sides can be told.
- I believe people should have to exchange information when a bite occurs, in case there is any health problems that occur later on, due to the bite.
- They should be responsible for their dog if it bites anyone or another animal
- It is important to ensure that both parties understand what happened and share information as needed.



- If the bite is serious they should be required to stay. If no signs of broken skin or injury to other dog or person, there is no need.
- Because the owner of the dog needs to be accountable for what transpired
- Any responsible pet owner would stay at the scene to give contact information for any incident
- Similar treatment as a car accident makes sense depending on severity of attack
- It works with accidents
- It is the right thing to do.
- There needs to be explanation on both sides. "This dog bit my kid" vs "I asked the parents to get their kid to stop hitting my dog and we tried to leave"
- As a responsible pet owner you should stay and give your information if your dog bites another dog or person. I think that should just be common sense. There are many reasons a dog will bite...and sometimes it is very valid to protect themselves.
- First By-law would need to answer a call and show up. Following that minor miracle, a report should have statements from both the animal owner in addition to the one making the claim
- A RESPONSIBLE dog owner would not leave the scene of their dog bit a dog/person. Fine the person if they have left, do not punish the dog for an irresponsible owner.
- The owner of the dog should be held accountable to any incidents that may occur or have happened and documented proof is necessary
- if your dog bites someone. The owner should talk to the person that their dog bit. But there should not be a 3rd party involved. If your dog bit someone it is for a reason...being, the person might of been trying to take something, the dog was protecting their owner. Ext.
- Pet owners need to take responsibility of their animals. I understand however that it is not always the owner who is walking the animal, and that needs to be taken into account.
- Yes. This shouldn't be different than leaving the scene of a car accident.
- I see a lot of cases where a dog bite (to other dogs) is not noticed at the time but later requires vet care, owners are often at a loss at finding the dog in question to seek help with the bills.
- If the people involved in the incident stay then a more accurate story and picture of what happened may be able to be recorded. My only concern though is that this might start more arguments and allow things become more heated between the individuals involved.
- Dog owners hold a sense of responsibility over their animals actions
- I feel that if a dog bites another person or animal you should wait for bylaw and explain what happened because there's a numerous amount of factors that could have caused the animal to lash out. Some of which includes commands from thier human protection reasoning and triggers.
- It's good in theory but I have my doubts about enforcement
- as long as it is safe for both humans and animals to remain at the scene, the humans need to take ownership and remain at the scene. If not, enforcement should be able to be directed to meet them at their place of residence
- That makes sense that they should offer their contact information as a courtesy
- If it is serious only. My dog would never bite someone purposely but I have seen kids come up behind him unknowingly when it is windy out and makes it difficult to hear and they surprise him. In



that case I would not blame him whatsoever if he bit someone. Parents need to teach their kids the proper way to greet a dog.

- Its their responsibility
- The owner should be held accountable for their dogs behaviour and also be given the chance to tell their side of the story.
- The owner is responsible for the dog, they should stay on scene.
- Yes, but they don't anyway. Owners of nuisance dogs rarely care about others or laws.
- If it's save to do so. Sometimes it's important to get the dogs apart. Depending on the situation it might not be realistic to stay, weather, injuries, trauma might force someone to leave but they should leave information
- Absolutely. My dog was attacked in okotoks by a lassie dog, and the owner fled the scene, so nothing could be done.
- should be the same as any other incident, eg. car accidents require people to remain on scene
- The owners behaviours have a significant impact on the dogs. Having a dog off leash when it shouldn't be, or improperly trained is the owners responsibility and not exactly the fault of the animal!
- Like a car accident, that's what they should do. Not run away.
- Both sides of the story should always be available. If a person cannot leave the scene of an accident then why should they be allowed to leave the scene of a bite incident? It also ensures the dog owner is held accountable (if necessary).
- ONLY if the bite was significant enough to need medical attention.
- Just like a car accident, you should need to exchange all information to make sure that you can be contacted if needed
- Would be beneficial as no one could lie or create false accusations, etc.
- A record needs to be taken. On the dog and owner.
- Owner is ultimately responsible for animal behaviour
- Depends on the severity of the attack
- If an owner leaves the scene they should be charged with a crime, the same as leaving the scene of a car accident.
- It's not right that someone may be seriously injured or death and the owner is no where to be found
- Fines for leaving the scene should be comparable to those of leaving the scene of a motor collision.
- There are two sides to every story. To prevent dogs getting a bad rep, the owner should have to stay on scene and discuss what/why it happened
- Owners need to be accountable for what happened
- People need to be held responsible for their pets actions and their poor training of their animal! We need to take specific breed names off of all bi-laws and just focus on nusance dogs of all breed. We need to focus on owner responsibility and commitment to training any animal to be friendly and well behaved!!
- I believe dog owners need to take liability for their animals, and if they cause harm, they need to be responsible, and stay on the scene of the incident.



- Taking responsibility for one's animal is the absolute golden rule of pet ownership. Leaving the scene after an incident is tantamount to a hit and run vehicle accident.
- I believe that pet owners should be responsible for treating their animal in such a way that it feels the need to lash out. I do not think the pet should be punished in any way, as it is the actions of pet OWNERS that cause these animals to lash out.
- This would be reflective of responsible pet ownership to stay on scene and share valuable information such as contact information, vaccine (rabies) details, etc.
- No different than a car accident. You must stay to provide contact information
- "Every side should be considered, not just the side of the victim.
- If the victim was shown to have Provoked the biting dog THEY should be fined"
- I believe owners should be Held responsible If their dog attacks and hurts someone or their pet. If the person with the aggressive dog leaves they may never be found again, meaning the dog has the potential to attack/kill someone or their pets in the future.
- It's just like staying at the scene of an accident. It's the owner's responsibility to give their information and that if their dogs with things like are their shots up to date.
- I do think an owner should at least exchange information if their dog bites someone.
- It's the responsible thing to do as the pet owner
- There's two sides to every story and both need to be heard. Who know if the person hurt the dog and it was a defending itself or it's owner?!?
- The owner needs to own up for their lack of attention and training. A good dog won't bite unless provoked or LACK of training from the owner.
- Leaving a dog bite incident is like leaving the scene of a crime
- Yes unless medical attention is needed asap. Info should ALWAYS be exchanged
- My dad was jogging on a city path and a dog that was on a leash jumped and bit my dad on the thigh - this was near Carburn Park along the Bow River. It broke skin and ripped his clothes. The guy said sorry and that was it. I was mad that my dad didn't get information because it could have become infected or something worse as time went by. I'm all for dogs as pets but I can't stand when they get abused or neglected. I live in Douglasdale and I stopped walking on the Bow River pathway by myself because I had more than one instance where a pitbull was off-leash and ran to me and went up and down the path. I'm terrified of large dogs, pitbulls in particular. Last year my kids and I were playing tennis in Douglasglen. My son was running around the field and went to play in the rink right beside the tennis courts. A couple was in there letting their THREE pitbulls run free and they were screaming 'close the door' at my son. Luckily he closed it before they ran out but it still irks me at what could have happened had those 3 dogs gotten out at him. For all of these instances I called 311 but they said there was nothing they can do unless it's happening as I call or if it's recurring. I have sent complaints about our next door neighbor. They have a small and a large dog. They used to leave the large one outside all the time barking, starting as early as 6am until late in the evening. We had to ask them not to as it was driving me crazy and I wanted to move. What's worse is they let their 2 young boys (under 10 years old) abuse it. I actually sent a complaint to 311 in July. They chase it, hit it, hit it with a shovel...I try to not pay attention but a couple of times I couldn't help



but watch and it's disgusting how the parents allow this to happen. Finally the dog gets fed up and bites the kid to defend itself, the boy cries, then the adults come out and give the dog crap when it's not the dog's fault at all. Sorry for my rants but I had these instances stick in my mind because they impacted me so I have strong opinions when it comes to pet ownership.

- Don't be the scene of a crime.
- It should be treated like any other accident that involves people
- Same as a hit and run.
- It is the owner's responsibility to take accountability for what their dog does. It shouldn't be up to witnesses or victims to try to find the other party.
- Specific breeds are not the problem. The problem is poor training from owners. The owners need to be held accountable, not the dogs.
- Accountability and ensuring correct fog is investigated for previous issues
- Bite and run is the equivalent of hit and run.
- no need to explain if your dog bites you should be responsible
- It's important to take responsibility and remain at the scene
- The owner is responsible for the dog and the dog's well-being. If they are unable to properly train their dogs to behave in a public area around other dogs/people, they should be held accountable for any altercations that occur.
- They can be expensive.
- any responsible owner should remain on site, but sadly we need a rule
- Take responsibility for your animal
- It is important in any situation or accident that both sides of the story be heard as soon as possible after the event.
- I see too many stories about animals or kids being bitten and nothing happening about it.
- Each situation should be investigated thoroughly to ensure the facts are presented and it is not the other human provoking the dog.
- its the dog owner to explain their side of the story. As good dog owner that is the right thing to do.
- Owners must be held accountable if their dog bites someone, if their dog in out of control, they need to learn how to reassert that control.
- So the accused is able to speak up just in case the claims are false and untrue.
- Owner should take responsibility if they don't want to train their dog properly.
- There are many sides to a story and I think both owners need to share their's. It is not as black-and-white as my dog bet your dog so I am at fault.
- An owner must take responsibility for the actions of their dog
- Most owners who own the attacker dog don't stay. It should be treated just like an accident with a car; considered a "bite and run" and should be wanted if the bad owner leaves.
- 100% the owner (or person overseeing the dog) should be required to stay on scene
- Too many times I've witnessed a dog attack another dog and the owner just laughs it off and often leaves the park in a hurry.



- Not necessarily remain at the scene, they or their animal may be injured also and that's more important to seek medical attention, but should absolutely be required for all parties to leave contact information and be allowed to speak with an officer when able to do so.
- I think it's stupid that you are singling out pit bulls. There are hundreds of dog breeds that are aggressive. You're literally playing into the stereotype. Ever seen a chihuahua go ape [removed] on someone? It's not pretty .
- This should be treated like a car accident. Especially if there are medical bills required for after care of the incident.
- Depending on the damage to the other animal or person ie breaking skin, people should be present unless the dog is too agitated.
- These issues should always be resolved. However it is the owner that is responsible, not the breed. Do not make the dog suffer the consequences.
- I would support this only if the dog has been violent (e.g., biting). Responsible owners with well behaved dogs should not be restricted more than other breeds.
- The dog's actions are its owner's responsibility
- It is important that with any accident/incident, both parties need to be present to have at the very least a discussion. In this case, if the bite was severe enough to require an officer's presence, both parties should remain to talk with them.
- Absolutely, again bite/attack could be a result of a defense or protection. If a weaker dog starts the fight and stronger dog (like pitbulls) ends it, that doesn't mean that pitbull is at fault. The facts are to be presented to the officer!
- It's the owners responsibility to ensure their dog is properly trained and under control.
- owners are liable for their pet as a parent is liable for their child
- The dog owner needs to provide information and too many people get away with their dogs attacking people otherwise.
- Bites need to be documented right away in case the bite becomes worse and needs medical treatment
- I liken it to a car accident. All parties must remain to give their statement as well as any witnesses.
- Unfair to victim if dog owner is just allowed to leave without sharing contact information.
- What is to explain, one should always remain at the scene of a serious incident. As well as any witnesses.
- I have seen many confrontation triggered by an uncontrol dogs that claims they were attack because their dog got injured. Witnesses are key to identify the cause of the incident. Making it a penalty to leave before information is exchanged would likely help
- It should always be investigated to see what happened. I owned a pit bull who was accused of biting a man and the officer who dealt with it trained dogs so after a long time of questioning this man and him lying the officer informed him he has never seen a dog bite that looks like that. He admitted that he is terrified of dogs and hit my dog and fell down when my dog jumped on him. (Because that's what happened my dog loved people and got really excited and ran out my front door) I got a



thousand dollar fine for dog running at large but it goes to show people lie about what actually happened because they don't like pit bulls.

- You should take responsibility when things happen. Running away is not ok.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs.
- It's the owners responsibility to ensure the other parties involved are okay. They should be required to pay for the bills associated with the incident
- Yes. Yes. Yes. a Hit and Run if not.
- Yes, under certain conditions. Unfortunately, for the immediate safety of all involved, it might be necessary to get the offending dog out of the area
- People should be taking responsibility for their animals. It's no different from a hit and run. If the victim requests you to stay, you have to stay.
- Yes
- If your dog bites somebody you should have to face the consequences of not controlling your dog.
- It is important that the owner be held responsible in some way. This is not very different than the owner/operators of vehicles having to remain at the scene until information has been shared or investigated by authorities.
- It creates accountability.
- at the very least they must give their info the the owner of the bitten animal/person and show ID
- It's like a hit and run. If you commit an offence and do not remain on scene to deal with the consequences you should have committed and additional offence.
- Yes, people need to be accountable for their animals actions regardless of breed
- If someone's dog attacked another one because they couldn't control their dog a) they shouldn't bring it to and off leash park b) they should have to pay the expense at the vet or hospital if they hurt your dog or the person
- Not sure why I have to explain what I would consider common sense behaviour.
- Yes. The owner is responsible for their dog, they should answer any questions or concerns to law enforcement
- Treat it like driving a car when you hit another car. You exchange insurance, license and registration. This would be very similar.
- The owner should always take responsibility
- The owner should be responsible for all costs associated with the bite.
- Yes so long as the dog does not pose another immediate threat in which case removing the dog from the scene should be a priority
- Yes. There needs to be a record of the event.
- People are responsible for their pets.
- It should be treated the same as a traffic accident; you have to stay on scene if your car hits another car, or another person. It makes sense to stay and talk to an enforcement officer.
- I think remaining at the scene would show the person is trying to be responsible instead of fleeing the situation.



- It is important to get both sides and photos of the incident so the story is not one sided. It is important for the bylaw officer to see both sides.
- It's a safety issue. In order to be sure of the issues leading to the bite, all parties must stay at the scene to give statements.
- If a person is not prepared to train their dog properly, they should be prepared to accept responsibility for their actions
- The owner is responsible for the dogs behaviour. If the dog is violent that's on the owner for not training them properly.
- It would be common courtesy
- Of course, like any accident or incident, all parties should stay to take account of what occurred.
- If they didn't stay and give information, how would anyone know if that dog had done it before.
- It is not fair for an owner to avoid accountability.
- Absolutely with additional punishment to owners who leave.
- Contact information should always be exchanged in any incident. However is an officer necessary in every situation? It would depend on the severity of the bite. First time offenders should be mandated to attend a bite prevention course to better understand their dog's warning signs.
- It is like leaving the scene of an accident. They are legally required to provide information.
- It should be treated like a car accident. Exchange information and make a report.
- All breeds can bite! Bad dog owners should be held accountable (not all bully breed owners are bad, and should not be painted with a widespread, dated BSL legislation. It's 2020 Calgary, come on now)
- If their dog hurts someone or something they need to stay to make sure everything is okay
- Like an auto accident. There should be responsibility assigned and information exchanged for processing.
- If someone has been bit and law enforcement is called. The owner must stay on site
- It's the right thing to do, however, people still hit and run cars so I don't see many people sticking around after an attack
- It is the owner's responsibility to take care of the dog and the dogs actions based on the training it has received from said owner.
- I don't think it is much different than remaining at the scene of a car accident
- The bitten party may require treatment, the cost of which should fall on the owner of the biter. Also, officers should be able to easily find those involved.
- There are repeat offenders that just keep jumping dog parks. They should be identified.
- Important for accountability but I do not think fair to discriminate against a certain breed.
- two sides to every story plus if there was an assault they need to answer for it.
- Just like a car accident, I do believe that if a dog has attacked and drawn blood then the owner should stick around.
- it is the owners responsibility. no different than a child incident or car accident



- Pet owners should be responsible for their pets in public and private spaces and if their animal is involved in an incident they should be accountable.
- Sharing contact information is important but I am not sure that remaining at a scene with an aggressive dog is a good idea.
- I believe it would be important to share information, however it may be prudent for everyone's safety to remove the dog from the stressing situation instead of remaining in the environment, possibly escalating things.
- Something has happened, and an investigation is in order. I feel that the onus should fall on the owner of the misbehaving dog to start that investigation process as soon as possible. Staying at the scene allows officers to potentially make observations.
- Yes I do. However, I do not believe pit bulls need a muzzle in public! It's absolutely horrible that the city of Calgary is even suggesting that. What are the statistics of dog bites in the city? It's not pit bulls biting people. And you do realize, they are much stronger breeds than pit bulls! There are multiple mastiff breeds all over our dog park. They are stronger than pit bulls.
- The injured person has been assaulted (by the animal), the owner of the animal is its guardian (they are responsible for the animal). The owner needs to stay at the scene and be held accountable for the injuries the victim suffered.
- Too many dog bites happen where the owner takes off with the dog, and then nothing can be done about it.
- Targeting one breed like Pitbulls under the guise of any reason is bad. Bad dogs are bad because of their owner training them to be that way or not training them at all. The focus should be on problem dogs case by case.
- It is the owner's responsibility to control their dog. They must be accountable for the dog's behaviour.
- This would make it easier to deal with the incident if they stayed to talk to by-law, like traffic law.
- Dog should be taken right away.
- People should be responsible and accountable for their pet's actions.
- Should be euthanized.
- Treat it like a car incident. Waiting for police or exchanging insurance.
- Responsible ownership.
- Wouldn't be fair if another dog bites around an animal and the owner of the dog who bites gets away with it. ALSO NO BSL PLEASE.
- Yes because if the person accusing the other of their dog acting a certain way, whether it may be true or false, the individual will be able to defend themselves & speak up for themselves.
- Only makes sense for an owner to be present as only an owner knows their dog's temperament best. And the incident should be investigated as to what led up to the bite. And action taken based on if the bite was provoked or not.
- Explain their side. Often dogs are euthanized when the injury was their fault. The city doesn't put down pedophiles yet the offend unprovoked. Animals typically bite in defense. Training should be mandatory for repeat offenders due to poor ownership. Dog should not be penalized.



- It is important that there is accountability for this for owners. Too many people leave and then have no consequences later, leaving the other owner to deal with medical or veterinary expenses on their own
 - Yes because then there is two sides to the story its important to understand what lead up to the bite incident. What was the dogs behavior, what was the victims behavior prior to the attack (was there warning signs that could have prevented the attack? - BTW all dogs show signs even subtle ones)
 - Like a fender bender
 - Dog owners are responsible for the dogs behaviour. They should stay at the scene as if it was a car accident
 - "Yes I think if a god bites a person for sure.
-
- This as a bylaw would become more problematic at an off-leash dog park as dogs get into scuffles all the time at what point in the bylaw would it be deemed an incident requiring enforcement officers. Legislation like this would need to be very clear otherwise it could be easily misinterpreted or abused for nefarious intentions."
 - Just like having a child, the parent needs to take ownership of their "children's" behaviour.
 - Would be no different than when a person hits a car. There's a rule you must stop and give information. I believe you must do the same when a dog bites someone.
 - I think it's just like a car accident and both sides need to be heard to get the story and then you can see if the story was even true for some cases.
 - Its part of being a responsible dog owner.
 - The owner should stay and accept responsibility
 - Because things could be WORKED OUT . They may figure out a plan to be ther to insure this doesn't happen again .
 - I think that it is the responsibility of the owner to be responsible for their animal, regardless of the breed.
 - It is important that owners are held accountable for the actions of their dog. It is not the dogs fault that they were put in an uncomfortable situation that caused them to have no bite inhibition. Absolutely hold the owner accountable - people need to understand that this is a serious problem
 - same as any accidents
 - I think a few irresponsible dog owners take off after their dog bites or attacks someone (or another dog). They need to stay on the scene and share contact information. If they do not- there needs to be repercussion.
 - They should receive extra fines/charges for fleeing the scene as well
 - The owner is 100% responsible for their animal and the training of said animal, if their dog bites someone they are liable
 - Owners should shoulder all the responsibility of their dogs actions including attacks. It's imperative they stick around.



- Responsibility should lie with the owner.
- I have witnessed incidents at off-leash dog parks where a dog owner who had little to no control over their pet (horrible call back) and their pet has instigated a bigger dog who might be deemed "a dangerous breed" and this dog with much restraint has tried to ignore until they can't anymore (dogs have a limit of patience also and are still animals) and of course a dog fight breaks out. But I have seen where the owner of the instigating dog declines to take action and admits it was their fault only to later post on a dog park forum on facebook or other social media platform changing all the details and blaming the other dog for "damages done". Now everyone on the internet is crucifying the "dangerous dog" and the breed and are now "keeping an eye out to report them" . This creates horrible negative stigma and unwarranted harassment when the other party is NOT at fault (but who will believe them now?). Having an enforcement officer come (even when it's a minor issue or no visible damage is seen initially, owners may later find wounds on their pets that they did not see initially in the heat of the moment) is necessary to have an official record of events to protect the owners and the dogs and not rely on a "he said she said" situation.
- Being both a dog owner and a bite victim, staying at the scene is the least a person could do.
- I believe people should remain on scene to take responsibility for their animals's actions.
- Poorly behaved dogs are to the fault of the OWNER ONLY. The owner should be held responsible for the poor training they give their dog.
- I agree that the dog's owner should stay and take responsibility, or provide a contact so they can leave to put their dog in a safe location
- As pet owners we are socially responsible to society as a whole for our pets behaviour. While dogs reactions can be their own and happen quickly, the owners need to stay and provide any information to help
- Take responsibility for your pet.
- People need to be held accountable for their pets actions.
- Am incident where a dog bites a Payson or another animal isn't that different from a person assaulting someone and responsibility needs to be addressed in both situations.
- responsibility and ownership is decent human behavior. Break the circle or [removed]
- I think it's best to get the owners idea of what happened instead of a one sided story.
- Owners should provide contact information in the event of a bite.
- I feel if you leave the situation you know you have done something wrong take the dogs home to de escalate the situation and return to discuss the following steps between owners
- Would help with accountability.
- The owner needs to be held accountable in these situations and they are often not.
- If my dog bit someone severely enough that it required medical attention I would agree with staying and giving contact information for any further questions or concern.
- if the owner is at the scene then they can be held responsible
- If the dog bites someone, there should be a further investigation in to why. It's not always the dogs fault. People can be just as if not more aggressive than dogs.



- If there is a need to escalate this to bylaw or medical attention, then all parties should be involved with all aspects.
 - It could be the person or other animals fault that they got bit.
 - They should also cover the necessary expenses of the incident
 - It is obviously your responsibility to train your dog so if they injure someone you should absolutely have stay and exchange information and a welfare check should be done on the dog to ensure it has the proper environment to thrive.
 - The owner is responsible for their pet, if they are aware their dog was involved in an incident, they should remain present to ensure any parties involved are safe and information exchanged for future use if needed.
 - Responsible dog owners take responsibility for their dog
 - In the event something like that would happen treat it like a car accident.
 - The owner must be responsible for the actions of their pet and it is the compassionate thing to do.
 - "As long as the dog is contained safely away from others, they should be required to stay.
-
- Treat it as a hit and run."
 - There needs to be more accountability on all dog owners regardless of breed. Many small dog owners will allow their dog to bite or instigate other dogs and then leave as they feel small dogs don't do the same damage or need to follow the same rules. All dogs should be held to the same standards regardless of breed or size
 - same as a hit and run with cars if they don't stop
 - Dog owners need to be responsible for their dog's actions. I've had many dogs go after mine and the owners don't give two [removed].
 - If a pet injures someone it is the owners responsibility to deal with the consequences of the situation
 - It's like a car accident, it's an accident. So treat it like one.
 - My puppy was attacked and the girl and her took off running...while I was laying on the ground...these ppl should fined huge for taking off.
 - Any damages (i.e. vet bills) should be paid for by the owner of the dog that cause the incident.
 - Owners need to be held accountable for their dogs actions.
 - The dog obviously needs help of some kind, so the owner needs to be held accountable and helped to change their ownership. It's not the dogs fault.
 - Too many times, dog owners just say they haven't seen there dog do that before and leave the scene of an incident, where it is likely that dog has a history of issues and these must be recorded.
 - This only makes sense.
 - I think a responsible pet owner should take responsibility for their dog. Plus an owner should want to ensure the well being of the victim.
 - Part of your responsibilities as a pet owner is to be held responsible for your animals behavior.
 - Most dog owners are inclined to run and not take responsibility.



- If the owner is on scene, they should by law remain at the site of the incident.
- When a dog bites another person/dog, it should be noted in the event that the dog should require training with an unbiased trainer in order to make sure another bite doesn't occur in the future. Set our dogs up to succeed.
- Common sense
- They should stay and be accountable for their pets actions. No breed is bad, it's is on the owners how the animal acts so it is their responsibility
- The dog owner is responsible for the dog and should do the right thing and share contact info. This may be hard if two dogs are very heated but should still be done but once that happens they should be able to leave and connect later with the enforcement officer if a vet visit is necessary.
- An owner should be held accountable for their pets behaviour.
- It should be treated like any accident where bodily harm is inflicted. People lie about there information and an enforcement officer can make sure this process is easier for both individuals.
- Define if necessary? Information on what the process is or what's that could mean for them would need to be released as many may not wait for fear of having the dog seized or euthanized which should not always be the outcome
- If there are any vet or medical bills because of the bite the owner of the dog should have to pay those bills.
- People lie
- BSL IS COMPLETE BS AND NEEDS TO BE STOPPED. ALL ADDING BLS IS DOING IS TRYING TO DISTRACT FROM MORE IMPORTANT ISSUES. Like how kenny is giving away our taxes and forcing us to raise costs on services used by all.
- Too many incidences of small chihuahua type dogs biting kids or adults have fled the scene.
- you should be held accountable for an animal under your control
- You are responsible for any damage the dog does to anyone or anything.
- Long term effects and if in case of needing records
- Pet owners should be held responsible for their actions, good and bad.
- It would depend on the severity of the incident.
- It is no different than a car accident. Information must be exchanged
- Might be medical bills
- Remain at the scene of the crime, just like a automobile collision
- This should be similar to car accidents where a police report must be submitted and the owner can face additional fines for fleeing the scene.
- Any bites from any size of animal should be equivalent to a car accident. Contact information and follow up should be hosted. Dependent on severity the owner should be responsible for talking to authorities and contributing to vet bills and be held responsible for the re-training, obedience, and safety measures responsible with their own dog.
- Non-responsible owners typically do not remain at the scene of incidents--so can be difficult to track ownership of the animal



- Dogs bite when they are stressed. I believe the owner should be punished, not the dog.
- The responsibility is on the OWNERSHIP. Not the animal. The owner should be expected to deal with the situation.
- It's the owners responsibility of the dog. To give contact information.
- its just like a car accident you are expected to stay at the scene until police arrive. Also keeps them accountable.
- The dog owner should be responsible, if there are vet fees and such. Plus the owner should be held accountable. It's not usually the animals fault. It's the owner who failed to take care of the animal.
- There should be an exchange of information, and if the offender tries to flee that there be strict consequences.
- Should apply to all animal owners, not just dog owners.
- As with any accident causing harm
- dog bites are serious no matter how small.
- If any dog causes harm to another animal or human, authorities should be called and that owner needs to stay.
- Contact information should be shared so the owner of the bitten dog can claim vet bills, etc.
- So people don't run off without fines or punishments
- Owners need to be held responsible for their animals. If a dog bites someone and they require medical attention, the owner should be held liable for any incurred costs as result of the dog bite.
- Dog owners should be responsible and this only what a responsible owners would do.
- That's common courtesy but many don't do that.
- If a dog bites a person or other animal 9/10 times it's the owners fault in some way. So they should take full responsibility for the attack by remaining at the scene and helping in any way possible.
- At the end of the day the owner is responsible for their dog and needs to be held accountable. If the offending dogs owner is not around when enforcement arrive they will be unable to receive the proper punishments and teaching moments that could prevent something of a similar nature from occurring in the future.
- If a dog bites a person that owner should have to remain at the scene and be held accountable
- There need to be more incentives for owners to be responsible for their dog's actions.
- Just like a car accident. Be responsible for your dog
- It would be bad ownership to leave.
- The owner is the one responsible for the dog
- If it was a car accident, they would have to stay. Same rules should apply.
- The victim will at least need to know if the dog has up to date vaccinations (rabies). The owner of the dog is responsible for the dogs behaviour, therefore if the dog bites it's up to the owner to provide information in case it's a serious wound that needs immediate medical attention
- Their dog their responsibility. If someone's dog bites someone it should be handled similarly to assault.



- I think it is very important to exchange information when a dog altercation results in an injury to a pet or human.
 - Yes, only if the dog doesn't pose a risk - the owner must stay with the dog
 - its the right thing to do. i know i am probably in the small group of people who would actually stick around and make sure that the person/dog that was attacked was okay. my husband and i have said that if our dogs ever attack that we would stick around and deal with the situation and then immediately head to the vet to euthanize the dog.
 - The owner of the dog is responsible for their dog, it's behaviour and actions. They should have to take responsibility for what their pet has done. The only exception I would consider is if the dog attacked in selfdefense of itself, or its owner, and with that only if the dog or it's owner are being attacked or threatened by an individual.
 - Both sides of the situation must be shared. Again, knowing why the dog is biting is important. Also if the owner already stated the dog shouldn't be approached, and was approached, the owner and dog are not at fault.
 - "A lot of people don't treat this as an accident when it should be, and many don't want to give out personal information should a dog bite happen.
-
- By having a rule in place this helps victims get the information required, for example figuring out the dogs information to check for rabies."
 - Only in the case of the person or severe injury to animal
 - No bite and runs acceptable. Responsible pet owners should have to remain at the scene to answer any questions.
 - absolutely . An owner needs to take accountability for the dog
 - The owner should share information, with the exception of in the case that they (the owner) was doing their due diligence- animal was leashed and/or protective measures were in place (muzzle, training collar, etc.) Reactive dog owners cannot control what other people/ their animals do, and should not be punished for another person's irresponsible actions.
 - Just like a car accident. It should be the same with animals
 - Owners need to be responsible for their animals
 - Yes
 - It is important for the dog owner to be able to answer questions about their animal and provide any information.
 - This should be required so contact information can be obtained and the dog owner can be held responsible for healthcare costs if necessary
 - As long as there is no severe injuries that need to be seen by vet
 - It's similar to a vehicle accident and is the responsible thing to do
 - Similar to fleeing the scene of a motor vehicle accident. If the owner leaves they should be fined.
 - this gives a voice to both sides



- this is very similar to a traffic accident type situation.
- It's no different than a car accident. It's important the incident be documented and details exchanged for accuracy and transparency.
- Responsible dog owners should always stay to provide their contact information if their dog does something harmful.
- You are responsible for your pet. If they cause harm to someone else, you need to take responsibility for that.
- because too many times no one is held accountable
- When a person flees the scene, it's like fleeing a hit and run scene, especially if there are potentially serious injuries.
- The history and health status of the dog is important information to have immediately. The owner should of course be required to stay on scene, otherwise they are like a hit and run driver.
- It should be mandatory in EVERY harmful interaction (even minor), so that repeat offenders can be flagged not to go to dog parks.
- i believe that owners need to be responsible for the actions of there pets.
- Reducing the incidence of dog bites requires active community involvement; passive attention or a token commitment is not sufficient. By actively focusing on dog bite prevention, the State of Nevada was able to reduce the incidence of bites by approximately 15%. Members of the AVMA Task Force represented a broad range of disciplines and designed the program described during this presentation and published in the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (also available on the AVMA Web site at www.avma.org). It was recognized that a community approach must be multidisciplinary, and that different communities will have different needs based on their level of commitment, preexisting programs, and available resources. Although the best results will be obtained by adopting the entire prevention program, the program is designed so that it may be adopted as a whole or in part. Either way, the goal remains to reduce the incidence of dog bites within communities and improve quality of life for their citizens.
- As a responsible dog owner, you need to take responsibility for your dog's actions, good or bad. If a bite occurs whether a person or another animal , the owner of the dog needs to be held accountable for anything that may come up and an authority person should get the owner's contact information for future contact if needed.
- Anyone attacked by any dog not just the city's arrogance and discrimination against the imaginary breed "pitbull" shame on you for singling out these perfectly normal dogs.
- Again it isn't the dog ... it's the owner not training the dog
- We have to many owners afraid to stay at an accident because they don't want there dog taken away. Weather due to breed or history. By eliminating the chances of the dog being destroyed with put proper counsel and non bias trainers official say. This would greatly reduce people fleeing the scene. By making it a bylaw people stay at the scene and provide license info on the dog, name of dog, owners name and contact information it would make the situation documentable. By having more city owned private parks or more bylaw officials monitoring parks or would make calling in your



report of bite or dangerous dog easier and more beneficial. Officials would be in close proximity and fines could be issued immediately.

- At the very least the dog and owner need to provide contact information
- You need to be able to exchange contact information it's no different then a car accident.
- I agree with the above conditions.
- It's being a responsible dog owner to stay
- Owners are responsible for their pets, these situations should be held to a similar standard as a car accident.
- Able to get both sides incident at the same time. Dog can be accessed in current environment. Owner can show ability to calm down the dog and get it under control.
- Only if severe, it should be treated like any other assault. If it's minor (caused a scare but no damage) then no
- Owners are responsible for their pets behaviour and if a serious incident occurs, it should be dealt with appropriately (owner whose pet caused the damage should cover the cost of vet bills, meds etc.)
- It doesn't matter what breed the dog is. If it bites someone, the incident must be explained to a third party. They cannot rule out the the dog could have also be protecting the owner, and justifiably so!
- Owners have a degree of responsibility in ensuring this doesn't occur. If it does, they need to be present to take the onus
- Owner has to be accountable and responsible for damage or injury to others.
- Absolutely, it's what responsible owners do.
- Damage caused by a dog is the full responsibility of the owner.
- It's just like a car accident you should have to stay there
- The dog owner should be held responsible for any vet bills or anything else caused by said dog.
- Owners should be held accountable for the actions of their pet, however they also deserve a chance to explain the incident to enforcement officers, as animals rarely attack unprovoked
- Just like a motor vehicle incident the owner should take responsibility for the actions of their animal and remain at the scene to provide a statement.
- Many people run off or provide fake contact information.
- You own a dog, you must be responsible for that dog & that requires you to stay at the scene & take responsibility.
- A majority of dogs do not bite unless they feel threatened. If an incident escalated to where enforcement officers are involved all parties should be there to explain their views on the situation.
- This information needs to be provided.
- But if the dog is still showing aggression the owner should be able to leave to put the dog away in a safe place, but not leaving before ID and a phone # are provided in case they don't come back
- Responsible pet ownership
- It's obvious they should have to stay. No hit and runs



- Well, they should want to make sure the person bitten is ok. Perhaps there is an explanation - maybe the dog was provoked? There should be discussion and allowances discussed not just a solution for all. There should be a report for historical purposes - is this behaviour recurring. One bite-one time -one judgement should not be the norm.
- like a car accident, should be illegal to leave
- Owner needs to be responsible for their dog.
- My dog was attacked at a park and owner walked away. luckily only a \$300 bill that I could afford but the other owner ideally should have paid.
- There may be details a victim might not know to ask
- It makes sense that the dog owner remain at the scene to provide contact information. I live in an area with a huge number of dogs and when I have been charged by dogs (small ones, usually), the owners scurry away, pretending they are not the owners.
- If a dog causes physical harm to another body, this is negligence on the owner's part. The owner is fully responsible for damages, not the dog. It is the owner's responsibility to know his dog and to keep his dog, and others, safe. May not need to remain at the scene but certainly exchange information.
- Good to have contact info for after the fact incase of unknowns
- A dog owner should be responsible for their dogs behavior. The dog behavior is a reflection of training/lack of training, abuse/ or no abuse. As dog owners no matter the breed we are responsible for these dogs and should held to accountability. The dogs need rehabilitate and proper training.
- To aid in providing the entire account of the incident. Better to clarify what went down than to allow a befuddled boomer to spin a tale about a "scary" dog.
- Similar to being in a car accident. A responsible owner should stay at the scene and be responsible for damages/injuries.
- Full investigation required on any reported dog violence. If the "scary" looking dog is continually determined to be the issue, or the larger dog that inflicted more damage, people will be less likely to stay at the scene. Often it is the small dog that starts these situations and the larger/stronger dog naturally defends itself and inflicts more damage.
- Common sense.
- Too many people flee when there is a problem.
- For their own protection to verify details I believe it is anyone's best interest to not leave.
- The number of persons leaving when an incident occurred is too high. This leaves all repercussions to the victim and their families (financial and otherwise) as often they leave without exchange of information.
- If an animal has displayed aggressive behavior, the owner should be held responsible
- You don't leave the scene of a car accident, be a decent human and stay at the scene, tell your side of the story and go from there.
- The pet owner and victim should both have to give their story to an enforcement officer at the scene of the incident, same as a car crash.



- It is an incident that has caused injury or damage to someone else. Like car accidents, responsible individuals need to stick around and take ownership for their dog's behaviour.
- I believe this will force the owner, who is responsible for the animal and its behaviour, to be more responsible and accountable to the system
- Yes an owner of offending dog should stay and share info.
- Its the responsible thing to do to ensure everyone involved is able to speak to an enforcement officer. I also think more attention needs to be paid to what led to the dog bite, I.e. how a person interacted with the dog, were they being aggressive or abusive towards the animal. It terms of a animal bite, were both dogs behaving aggressively? More often than not a domesticated animal only reacts violently when provoked.
- If it is safe to do so, considering the dog/persons condition. Just like in a car accident
- Holds people accountable for the actions of their dog, rather than disappear and not face the consequences.
- I feel it's incredibly important I'm hear the owners input as well as having the officer able to see and assess the dog
- The person who owns the dog should at the very least have to identify themselves to bylaw. The caveat to this is that bylaw would have to respond quickly otherwise it is unreasonable to make a dog owner wait for a long time.
- Definitely. This is the owners responsibility to advocate for the dog and the victim and stand witness. But again, **NO BREED LEGISLATION PLEASE.**
- Should be treated just like an Automobile accident. they should be required to wait to speak to an enforcement officer!
- It would be the same for any other incident
- You should be held accountable not the breed. People need to grow up and stop banning innocent dogs like pit bulls.
- It is important that owners can give their statement regarding the incident.
- If a dog bites, it should be the owners responsibility to take care of the situation properly similar to a car accident
- It's responsible, like a car accident they should have to do the same thing
- If there has been an altercation, the dog must be allowed to leave the scene as to prevent any further arousal and incidences. The owner should have to speak with enforcement even if just to have a clearer picture of what happened (ie: both sides)
- If your pet harms someone you should take responsibility and also (depending on damage done) be able to discuss an effective management and training plan. Some dogs just need more socialization in a better controlled environment, some need to ensure their pet is safely managed away from other pets and people (private dog parks etc). And some, of any breed, may need more specific management.
- Often, dog owners will try and explain away their dogs behavior, and then leave immediately to avoid consequences.
- It's just the responsible thing to do.



- Sometimes incidents are not what it may look like and the owner needs to be heard as to what actually happened. A dog biting another person or another dog could be the fault of the person teasing the dog or another dog being aggressive towards another dog to the point where the aggressive dog or person not knowing it's boundaries from the warning signs of the dog until the dog bites.
- Offending dog owner should remain to provide information should further complications arise from the injury. If they leave the scene, they could very well get away with the offence which is not right. Victim owner could leave the scene immediately if the dog requires medical attention, otherwise they should also remain on scene.
- Yes they should be able to explain what happened, but I am very conflicted on the animal staying in the stressful situation. However ai understand if people are allowed to walk away they may not be willing to talk later. That's a tricky situation.
- Similar to a collision: the parties must remain present.
- The owner should stay behind and be responsible for their pets actions.
- Owner have to take responsibility for their pets.
- Held accountable
- Much like getting into any accident, it is the responsibility of the owner to remain on site to discuss how the situation happened and further steps
- My dog bit another dog. I stayed, I gave my number. I paid 1000\$ vet bills for that dog, and the 250\$ by-law fine. As an owner it is my responsibility to take ownership. And my dog is not a pitbull. DO NOT discriminate breed!
- It allows the victim to get health records on the animal as well as get a possible reason for the animals behaviour.
- Dogs can hurt people. If you can't drive away from a car wreck you shouldn't leave the scene of a dog bite
- Yes people can be injured from dog attacks and that should be taken care of properly
- By remaining at the scene the owner can both provide clarification and defense for their own dog if necessary, and be accountable for all actions.
- Well its as if it was your child who harmed another child. Essentially you are the one responsible in making sure all parties involved are taken in account and all make a statement about what happened.
- Proper ownership
- I've witnessed people running away.
- Owners need to be responsible for the actions of their pets.
- Be responsible, if you leave, heavy fines, automatically lose the dog for life. Not allowed to owe a dog for ten years
- Should be same as traffic accident... you must take responsibility.
- The owner should be held accountable for dogs actions
- Unless the dog is injured and needs immediate veterinary attention.



- A severe bite (meaning blood drawn), yes. A little playful or non harmful bite that the victim could be trying to play up, no.
- If this is to happen the dog owner needs to be responsible and assist in solving the problem. The only time to leave would be if the animal or person needs medical care
- If it's a serious incident both parties need to stay.
- They should be accountable.
- Perhaps the dog was provoked, scared, threatened by the victim and law enforcement needs to understand that just because the dog bit, does not mean that it was the aggressor, as they easily could have felt they were defending themselves or their owner.
- yes it's good for all parties to remain at the scene of an incident whether they are the owner or victim etc., in my experience there is always more to the story than one side lets on. often times people are the ones unintentionally escalating the situation and dogs are reacting to them when they bite, so not only do dogs need proper training but so do owners. that also needs to be taken into consideration during an incident.
- taking responsibility for your dog is part of being a pet owner.
- To give dogs health information.
- It should be the same as a traffic offence.
- Just like a car accident, we must stay at the scene of the crime. Although understand if the dog needs to be removed from the situation for safety concerns.
- This way you can get details of the owner, such as name, phone number, insurance, and do not have to chase them down via social media
- My dog had gotten bitten by another dog (small little [removed]) and the owners took off I was stuck with the vet bills for the bite.
- I believe that owners are solely responsible for any behaviour presented by ANY type of dog. Therefor I believe a dog should not be euthanized because of an owners fault. There should be a system in place to rescue and rehabilitate ANY type of dog that is exhibiting dangerous behaviour due to bad owners.
- The person should be held responsible. If a dog is not good with other dogs or humans, it should never be put into a situation where it could bite.
- A person should stay on the scene and talk to an officer. Both sides should be heard. Dogs bite humans because they aren't trained or because they felt threatened.
- Pitbull are strong but they are no more dangerous than other dogs, it's not fair to single them out like this. Some of the sweetest dogs I've met are Pitbulls. This legislation is horrible!
- This encourages responsible pet ownership
- Like the traffic offense - a bite scene is a crime scene and those involved should remain at the scene.
- You should be liable for the actions of your dog
- We cannot criminalize animals. The way the city of calgary is demonizing pit bulls is ridiculous and disgusting. I was raised with many pit bulls from my own family, our family friends ect, and they are powerfully loving dogs. Owners should go through more learning and training to own any dog or



animal, its not about the animal, its about the owner. Start addressing the ROOT CAUSE of vicious dogs rather than addressing a symptom. I very disappointed in the city of calgary for this new engagement.

- The owner responsible for the animal should have to provide their contact information as well as be able to offer their side of the story (especially in the case of animal provocation, see above).
- The owner needs to be accountable for their dog as its likely their fault (or through their negligence) that the dog is behaving that way.
- Dog owners with aggressive dogs should be held accountable.
- I think this similar to road accident and exchanging information is required by law in that case so same should be applied to this accident as well.
- ALL people should share contact information. There are always mitigating factors to reveal. Stop generalizing dog breeds with [removed] owners. ANY continued nuisance breed should have identical implications. Bylaw is uneducated to determine breed based on site. Most "pit bull" looming breed owners are so highly sensitive to breed selective legislation that they are the owners investing in training and responsibility.
- Accountability
- It is usually one word against another's, so this could be a good way to get all parties together to talk in a safe setting, and there will be someone there to interfere if need be
- Yes I think they need to dry on site - however I also believe they have a responsibility to try and catch their dog if it has run after the incident. So if they flea the scene to get their dog their should be a number that they can call to follow up on the incident or report. But yes same as a car accident you are responsible for staying on site and exchanging information or it is a hit and run
- Accountability for their dogs actions.
- Of course, all pet owners need to take responsibility for their pets and their actions.
- I think it certainly depends on the bite, But yes if there's a severity where there's a concern for someone's dog or a person who got better than yes there should be an exchange of information
- We have to remain at the scene of any other accident causing damage to a person's belongings or being so why not with dogs.
- You must take responsibility for your property. Being that a dog is part of your property - you should be held accountable for the actions of your dog. If there is a bit that causes damages to another animal(s) and or person(s) - like a MVA, you should stay at the scene for further measures to be taken
- Dog bites are not a condition of the dog. Its a condition of poor ownership, deliberate aggressive training or lack of training all together. A dog bite should act in similar fashion to a car accident or incident that requires people to take down information and witnesses to make statements.
- Just good morals
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their lack of training.
- This is the case when any law is broken isn't it...?
- Accountability, as a responsible pet owner you should stay at the scene.



- Talking with the people involved is important, however getting enforcement officer involved isn't necessary.
- Identifying owners is actually far more crucial than identifying an animal. The problem and the blame do not typically lie with the dog, it lies with the owner who raised the animal that way.
- Being an owner of a dog that is a hit or miss with other dogs is feel better knowing that both parties stay until enforcement arrives there fire zero he she said
- My dog was atracked by a smaller dog and because my dog was bigger the owner thought it was no big deal. In my opinion there are way too many owners like this and the city of calgary is ignoring THIS problem. By focusing on a certain breed you are creating an even bigger problem.
- Dog owners should take full responsibility for their dog and provide contact information as well as explain their take on the incident to an enforcement officer.
- If the bite is serious enough or draws bad blood and needs medical attention
- I totally agree with this. A dog owner MUST stay of their dog has bitten someone to provide information.
- The owner is responsible for the dog. The owner is responsible for training. Just as the human would be responsible for any ill will they caused to a person, so they should be if their animal does the same.
- there could be situations where information is needed from all parties to come to am decision.
- Humans must be held accountable for their dog's behavior or reactions.
- The owner needs to be held accountable, and understand that all dogs need training, depending on the severity of the bite it could be required for the dog and owner to attend training classes.
- Owners need to be held more responsible
- I agree 100%. Why? Because this is the responsible thing to do. It is no different then a vehicular accident, stay and be accountable for your dog and its actions. It should also be a heafy fine for leaving the scene.
- Dog tags need to be verified, people have to right to sue if damages occurred
- Dog bites can be serious and should be treated like any other serious physical injury.
- Multiple perspectives are necessary to maintain an objective understanding of the incident at hand
- I support it in theory but it could be hard to prove that an owner was aware that their dog bit someone before they left the scene. It could be a "my word against theirs" situation unless you have witnesses.
- A friend of mine had her dog taken away because he bit a jogger. My friend had no say at the incident and couldn't see him for over 6 weeks. It came out during the investigation that the woman he bit had punched and kicked the dog in the face first and then the dog defended itself. When the dog was returned, he was dirty, traumatized and stunk terribly.
- Really? We require people who hit others with a car to remain on scene. If your dog has [removed] behaviour the person should be taking full responsibility
- Your dog is your responsibility and if there is an incident all information should be shared for proper follow up
- It's just like a car accident.



- Fines and Jail time just like leaving the scene of a auto accident
- Taking responsibility is important
- Many people are in severe denial about the behavior of their animals and need to be held accountable. Dog bites especially by small dogs are gravely under-reported.
- It's important to hear from both sides with no bias.
- You are responsible for the animal and must do everything necessary to do the right thing
- Just like a car accident they're responsible and should own up to the incident
- Yes because far too many dogs are being attacked at dog parks and then the owners are left with big vet bills. It should be treated as 'leaving the scene' and fines need to be imposed for those who don't exchange information if caught.
- If they can not have their pet under control then they are responsible for any hospital/vet bills or more depending. I lost my job due to a dog attacking me and nothing happens if it and the owner even laughed and said she had worse. There is no help for people like me
- Some dog owners are simply irresponsible. If an incident occurs they should absolutely be required to remain at the scene. Every situation is different but the owner should be held accountable for the actions of their pets.
- It is the owners responsibility
- With the only exception being that owners/animals can leave the scene if they are hurt and in need of emergency medical attention
- Hit and runs are bad, why wouldn't a bite and run be? I'm not sure what the current jurisdiction is.
- The owner needs to pay for damages to victim
- Have a french bulldog that got scratched and bit by another dog, owner didnt even say sorry or acknowledge the incident.
- Same rules as major car accidents seems fair.
- Absolutely. We have had incidents where our dogs have been attacked and the other owners left the scene.
- If a dog bites, it bites. There has to be something that triggers the dogs instinct to do so. Most notably due to not the owner, but a stranger who doesn't know how to respect a dog's personal space.
- If their animal causes significant damage to your pet they should be held liable for vet fees.
- my dog was attacked by a "professional" dog walkers clients dog at the Sue Higgins offleash, i had to use social media to get the owners attention as the lady who was in charge of the dogs was rude and didn't take ownership. She should have been fined for not taking the dog attack seriously, she also shouldn't have had 12 dogs under her care at one time!! too many dogs for one person.
- As owning an animal is a privilege, we should also be required to be responsible for its actions and therefore if something occurs, the owner should remain at the scene to take responsibility for that item.
- If someone has a vicious dog I don't think they should be able to run away from the problem
- if the bite is severe
- The dog owner should be charged for failing to remain at the scene of the crime.



- Yes, because an assessment of the damage of the bite is necessary to decide on further action. As well, if the offending dog causes the victim to incur medical bills, the cost should be on the offender and not the victim. Also, law enforcement should be required to perform an assessment of the offending dog and it's liveliness to reoffend.
- Owners need to take responsibility, as well there are two sides to every story.
- If a dog bites then the owner has a responsibility to stay
- Bites causing harm need to be addressed. This should not be used as a way to euthanize dogs, but rather to address poor ownership.
- I only support it in cases when an animal bites a person causing injury or a dog in severe cases. Dogs bite each other often in play and some owners have zero knowledge about dog behavior. Uninformed citizens also target larger breeds when making complaints because they perceive them as more aggressive.
- At the very least, contact info should be given, such as a photo of the persons ID and their phone number. It should be treated like people swapping insurance info at a car accident. This option should be available to anyone who would have to wait too long for someone to show up.
- I've had to deal with rescues and negligent owners. I don't believe in bad dogs, just bad owners. And many times victims aren't innocent.
- As long as the situation does not increase the stress of the people and the animal involved.
- Witness to the incident.
- If you get into a car crash you have to wait
- People need to be held responsible for their dogs actions. BSL and blaming the dog doesn't work the problem is always the owner
- The pet is a reflection on how the owner acts, so if the owner has a short temper, why should the punishment be taken out on the animal?
- bite and run should have similar consequences and rules to hit and run
- I feel tracking these incidents will reveal that "nuisance dogs" cannot be generalized by breed
- I thought they were already supposed to do that.
- owner responsibility. regardless of breed, size or degree of damage.
- Owners should be staying at the scene, sharing contact information while the enforcement officer is on route or present
- Should be a norm anyways, it shows responsibility as an owner.
- People need to be accountable - whether that's required training for the owner and dog or a fine, and if the bite is severe it's in the interest of public safety
- I believe a rule about exchanging contact information is needed, but if the dog has to be removed from the scene for safety reasons the owners should have an opportunity to call in their information to a reporting office, failure to stay or to check in with their information should result in a much more significant fine.
- I believe the dog owner should be held responsible for the lack of training or holding back of their dog. The dog should not have to suffer consequences because of an irresponsible human.



- Too often people dodge the consequences of a badly behaved dog by leaving the scene. Given the abundance of cell phone cameras it would also be easy to jointly record a statement by both owners if they were 'ok's with both parties going there own way, in the event that one party changes their mind later
- As long as it's not a dog fight situation.
- It's not the breed of dog it's the owners that are at fault for these instances
- Any incident with a dog should be dealt with with enforcement.
- Justice needs botb sides of the story
- After ensuring the dog has calmed down/ removing the dog from the scene. Owners should have to take responsibility for the actions of their dog.
- Yes, if a dog owners dog attacked someone and hurt them very bad! BOTH parties need to stay on the scene and explain what happened, as well as any witnesses
- As long as the animal didn't accidentally get out, the owner should have been aware of there whereabouts. If owner is present during any attack. They should have to stay at the scene. Just like a car accident
- To assess if the person was in offence of anything else (ie. off leash in a park when the dog has been deemed "œa nuisance" previous etc"
- I thought this was common sense. Just like leaving the scene of an MVA, it should be a bylaw offence
- Accountability must be had for poorly trained animals
- I think all pet owners should take responsibility for a dog biting another person or another dog and should always stay at the scene of the incident.
- Two sides to every story
- Similar to a hit and run with a vehicle.
- It is their responsibility to stay, sane as a vehicle accident.
- If your dog bites a person or their dog, it is the owners fault and not the dog that this happened mostly likely from a lack of training and not properly handling their dog, and it is their responsibility to take responsibility for their pets actions
- As long as it can be done safely, without further trauma for either dogs or humans.
- Too many small dogs get attacked and just left by the other owner.
- They should exchange information for insurance purposes and to keep track on how many incidences the dog has had in the past
- It makes sense for the owner to be present so the next step is clear and followed through with
- Allows for record of incident with the city to track recurrent behaviour. Contact info may be difficult to obtain otherwise.
- people should take responsibility for their pets
- It's common sense but people don't stick around. it should be treated the same as leaving the scene of a vehicular accident.



- I believe that staying at the scene is important as to share any information required. I believe they should be allowed to return home to take the dog home first or have a family member grab the dog as to not cause more stress
- Every dog owner (regardless of breed) should stay at a scene of an incident.
- Like any incident, every person involved and witnesses should stay in order to get all sides of the story. It's not always the dog who bites fault. Taunting and such needs to be looked at.
- It will decrease the chance of future incidences with the same dog.
- The situation needs two sides and the owners information to accurately deal with the situation.
- It requires people to take accountability for their dogs behavior.
- The owner should be full responsible for the dog and it's actions. If training is needed to prevent such situations they should require to do so. They should be held responsible for their dog.
- If we were to treat it like a car collision then the owner should be present to explain what happened.
- People need to take responsibility for the behaviour of their pets. We have to stay in the scene of a car accident, you should have to stay on the scene if your dog bites another dog.
- how is this not already the rule? just like a car accident or other crime, leaving should be punishable.
- I'm a dog owner, I have a 2 year old German shepherd. If someone asks to pet my dog, I usually say yes. I CAN and DO say no. Every owner has the right to say NO. If someone approaches my dog without permission and my dog were to bite this person this should NOT be something I have no say over. Absolutely every pet owner should have the right to explain to an enforcement officer what happened without fear the dog will be thrown into a shelter. That's RIDICULOUS. :(
- It depends on the severity of the bite. If it's a nip I don't see why it would be necessary.
- People need to take responsibility for the actions of their pets.
- Yes! There have been too many cases where people leave the scene.
- Otherwise how do you find them later?
- That should be standard. Like a car accident.
- Seems to me this would be just like a car accident. People need to be informed of what they did wrong and held liable for their and their pets actions. It would be important for them to speak to someone about what they can do to mitigate the situation.
- If i hit someone with a car or bike or baseball how is that different than a dog?
- its part of being a responsible owner and its the right thing to do
- dog bites are serious and should be dealt with immediately
- Every person has the right or responsibility to address this issue of dogs bit someone or pet. They should remain at the place where this happened. The city is liable because of unsafe areas for people to enjoy the green space.
- allows the opportunity for the owner to provide their account of events
- But the officer needs to have a open mind and realize that there is two sides to every story and not just blame the person with the bully breed and realize Dogs bite for a reason. Anxiety, bad owners, defending themselves or their companions, someone or something invaded their space, etc. Dogs deserve respect. But at the end of the day dogs shouldn't suffer. The humans should. Humans should get the fine and they should get the blame. If it's reasonable of course. If they dog was just



defending themselves or their human they shouldn't get in trouble for that. Officers need to not blame and get the whole story and be reasonable and understanding. They should have proper training for dealing with dogs also. Dogs shouldn't get the blame. They are animals and don't understand and if they have bad owners they should get the chance at a new home with someone who will actually care for them and teach them right from wrong well giving them the love and attention they deserve. The dog shouldn't get the blame. The owners should get the blame. The dog shouldn't have to suffer because they have crappy owners. Dogs should not be Euthanized unless they are sick. Not because they have bit someone or something. That's not fair. That's the owners fault. Not theirs.

- It's like a car accident. If damage has occurred, information should be exchanged. If the victim will require expensive medical treatment, there should definitely be authorities involved to keep things safe and fair for everyone.
- Should be an offence if a dog bites anyone
- It's the right thing to do.
- Yes, it is the owners training who is at fault. Not the animals.
- Only if the dog can be safely contained and it's not getting more aggravated at the scene.
- Some dogs should not be approached by strangers. Most people do not think of this, and pet a dog, who may lash out. A large amount of dog bites are NOT the dogs fault. It is people.
- It is the owners responsibility to train the dog properly and be a representative for the dog.
- My dogs been attacked three times and each time the owner fled. (Lab, lab, shepherd mix).
- if you keep the dog there then you can get a sense of what time of dog this is, possible reason for biting and see how the owner treats the dog. If the dog calms down there must be a valid reason, taunting/hitting which made the dog react. I think its time to stop killing dogs for the sake of killing them..an easy way out. Get the owner involved, fine them, proper training/school will go a long way.
- 100% agree. The owner of the attacking dog needs to be held accountable for their actions and in order to do so, must remain at the scene and MUST provide contact information.
- As long as it's safe to do so
- I think If there was injury or damage caused, both parties should remain at the scene until the situation is resolved and a solution has been reached
- As a responsible pitbull dog owner. It would be right for any dog owner to stay behind and until the situation is cleared up.
- That's just common sense
- I would like owners to take ownership for their dogs.
- Too many people think it is nothing and take off with the offender. The owner is left with vet bills or other costs.
- Yes, because a responsible dog owner will likely have important information regarding the incident (ie was the dog provoked by someone). And a vicious dog owner should be available to take responsibility for how the dog was trained.
- I say this to ensure that all sides of the story are taken into consideration. It's not always the dogs fault. As in teasing etc.



- "I love animals, all animals, and I do not agree that certain breeds are to blame. It is 99% the owners responsibility to train their dogs properly. It is not the dogs fault. If they have a health condition or neurological condition that makes them not in their right mind is the inky exception to this.
- As long as there is no seizure of the dog at the scene I agree with this.
- If the dog was being taunted or needed space and wasn't given that, there is always a reason why a dog bites and it is almost never the dogs fault."
- Any one who owns a dog is responsible to look after their dog and make sure that they are behaved and to know your dog some dogs aren't good around kids other dogs etc... It's up to each owner to know their dog and not put them in stressful situations if it can be avoided. If your dog bites someone or something that responsibility is on the owner.
- my dog has been attacked numerous times, all unprovoked at a dog park, and the attacking party just left the second it was over.
- It is important to hear both sides of the story, the only way to do this is to hear from both parties.
- It is important to hear both sides of the story and to make sure the person that got bit is okay
- The fact this is not already required is surprising.
- You have responsibility for your dog.
- I think it's important to share information in case anything bad comes from the bite and as long as everyone is being nice to the owner and the dog.
- Own up to your mistakes. But stop acting like dogs behaviours is directly related to their breed. I know chihuahuas that have bitten more people than pitbulls. Makes the laws based more around the owner and less around the animal
- Too many incidents of owners fleeing after their dog has attacked or bit someone. It should be considered fleeing the scene of a crime. Similar to assault or driving away from a car accident.
- Time is an issue. But I think that in these circumstances everyone should stay until information is exchanged.
- "Pit bulls are responsible for the vast majority of fatalities and too many pit owners are purposely ignoring this fact.
- I believe that even small dogs who bite talk with enforcement. We need more responsible ownership in this city."
- If another dog bites my dog and hurts him, I want to know that my dog will be protected and I will not be the one paying the insane amount of money if he needs stitches, etc.
- Pet owners need to be responsible for their pet and ensure any other pet or human is taken care of if attacked.



- Bylaw will need to get the facts as soon as possible
- As owners are required to be in control, same as driving a car. Leaving the scene of an incident is inappropriate. The bitten person has been assaulted and should have recourse.
- If the owner is there to witness the incident then they should stay to give their side as well as being there for their dog it's just being a good owner
- Just like another incident they should share information so things can be taken care of and the correct people are involved
- People need to be responsible for what their animals do. Hold them to it.
- Like with a car accident, both parties should explain what happened. Some dogs will attack or bite if they are provoked, and so having the owner present will provide context.
- When a human crime happens we are held accountable, dog only learn from their humans on behaviour and what is right and wrong, humans need to be held accountable for how they conduct themselves and the way they teach their animals, like how they would teach a child how to act.
- This is common sense and decency
- It should be considered just like a car accident. If they leave they should be fined even further
- Absolutely. Owner should at all times take responsible or be accountable for pet's behaviour.
- A person should be held accountable for their pets actions.
- Responsible thing to do
- In the case of pressing charges yes or seeing what party is at fault
- If you have to remain at the scene of a car accident, yes, remain at this scene. All apart of being a responsible dog owner
- "The focus should always be on taking responsibility and actively working to correct a wrong. The question is, how enforceable is this rule?"

- Punishment doesn't change behavior, how will this correct behavior."
- You have to be responsible for your pet when you are in public.
- The owner should be there to provide contact information and has access to the dog's medical and vaccine history
- I'd think it's necessary in the case of an attack
- should follow similar protocol as a traffic accident.
- The owner is responsible for the dog from picking up waste to the attitude and actions of the dog. It should be considered the same as a hit and run.
- why wouldn't an owner be required to stay onsite and be accountable.
- the owner of the dog is responsible both morally and financially for any damages or injuries.
- Yes, is important to have a record, and if The dog have all vaccinations
- It's in both parties best interest to remain on scene
- The dog is an extension of its owner. Leaving the scene would essentially be fleeing the scene.
- Like any accident everyone should stay at the scene of the crime.



- It has everyone involved in the account of the situation
- Seems like common sense
- I believe that would be responsible dog ownership. Although this would potentially keep the dog in a stressful situation if it cannot be secured while waiting for the officer
- Due to the nature of a dog bite there are legitimate health concerns to consider. The animal owner should remain on scene to give health and contact information
- This way the dog owner can't run off and get away with out consequences.
- Both owners information should be exchanged and you cannot assume a dogs breed just because of appearance.
- Don't let the person leave if an animal under their control has assaulted a person or another persons owned property (alive or inanimate)
- There is a reason a dog bites someone or something whether they have a prey drive or they were over threshold and then something set them off. It would be response for a person to stand up for their dog and the matters that have been caused
- I believe that the person should remain and aid in the care of the person who's been bit, but it should ultimately be up to that person if they'd like to peruse charges or whatever.
- Your dog, your responsibility to take accountability.
- Sometimes it is necessary to remove dogs from the area to keep from escalating.
- Dog bites are serious and without the owner staying it can be difficult to track them down
- A dog owner should stay on scene because for the most part your dogs do not have a voice you are there voice.
- BSL is unacceptable. Dogs are innocent. Owners should be held responsible and dogs should be rehomed rather than euthanized.
- It is akin to leaving the scene of an accident.
- Too many owners and their dogs leave the scene (seen more with little dogs than bigger 'nuisance' breeds)
- So that owners can't take off without consequences.
- If a person is not in full control of their animal at all times and it bites another person or animal, the owner is responsible for that animal's actions and should be accountable.
- Allows them to tell their side of the story and it keeps them accountable if the bite is severe
- I'm shocked that as it currently stands, pet owners can simply leave the scene. A dog bite can cause as much physical damage as a car accident, and vehicle owners/operators cannot legally leave the scene of a crash. Logically of course the pet owner should have to stay.
- Depending how severe the incident was, and if people or the dog itself requires medical treatment.
- The only exception would be if they can't control the dog while waiting but must still provide contact info before leaving.
- If person bit requests it
- It is the responsibility of all pet owners to take care of any issue caused by their pet



- People must be held accountable and responsible for their pet's behaviour.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions
- The victim has the right to proceed in anyways legally possible to any information relevant to any injuries to any living being. If they run, it should be the same penalties against the owner as it would if they were to perform a hit-and-run
- I think this is an important step in tracking.
- The dog owner should be solely responsible for the actions of the dog, and as such, should remain on the scene to provide information.
- It is common curtesy to do so. Dog owners have to deal with the consequences when something happens to their dog or when their dog injure another animal or human.
- The owner of the biting dog should be there to explain their side of the story.
- The dog owner created the conditions that allowed the dog to bite by not properly caring/training it. There needs to be responsibility on the part of the owner. [removed]
- The owner should take responsibility for their pet
- Yes. Many times these people are not responsible enough to wait and may not be held responsible for their dog's actions.
- It's the same as a car accident, someone got hurt so you should be there to be held responsible for your dog.
- Vet bills are expensive! The owner of the dog who caused the bite should be responsible for paying for the dogs wound care.
- [removed]
- This includes any small breed dogs
- Treat it the same as a car accident. You need all the information before you place the blame.
- This is common courtesy and respects the trauma to the victim.
- Often owners and dogs walk away without taking responsibility
- Yes the owner should remain on scene. Its like a car accident, you are not supposed to leave an accident scene if you were involved.
- Just like a car accident. If both parties can't come to a decision.. bulaw gets called. It really depend on severity. Dogs will be dogs in aserting dominance,its different if it attacks another dog..
- Should be the same punishment as fleeing the scene of an accident.
- The owner needs to be responsible for their dog
- Yes, because often people could lie about their contact info, and then the information is lost once that person leaves. There should be an exception if both or one of the dogs requires medical attention and the officer can be called to the nearby emergency center
- The owner of the dog should either be held accountable or able to contest the situation.
- It is no different then at a car accident
- Any animal incident that results in injury should be treated as a vehicle accident stay until told by authorities or be charged with fleeing scene



- Remain or Return. Once their animal is calm or put at a safe distance, it is an owners responsibility to make sure their animal didn't cause injury and to face repercussions.
- Yes, just like at a motor vehicle accident you are responsible. The same should go for a dog attack, especially because you are here targeting "pit bulls" - perhaps with this rule you will see how many breeds of dogs are actually aggressive that are not pit bulls
- All parties must remain at the scene and must exchange information.
- Absolutely.
- It's the owners responsibility
- There is no way you should leave if someone/something was hurt by your animal. I would treat it like a car accident. You can't just leave the scene. It is almost impossible to find someone once they've left
- People need to be held accountable
- Owners need to be held accountable for the actions of their animals. For legal purposes, it should be considered a crime to not remain at the scene.
- The owner should be held responsible and charges accordingly!! Of course they need to remain at the scene of a dog attack!!
- They need to pay for the vet bills. And if bad enough get put down
- My well behaved, sweet PITS have been attacked by German shepherds and the owners ran away
- People should be accountable for their animals
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their pet. It is likely the owner's fault that a pet was put in a situation it viewed as threatening. Pet owners should require training themselves.
- Obviously yes. We have to stay at the scene of an accident where someone may be injured but the car is damaged. If a dog bites someone I'm pretty sure you should stay.
- The human should be held responsible for the dogs behaviour, not the dog itself. They are a product of their upbringing & can be rehabilitated when given the time and attention and affection it needs.
- Owners are 100% responsible. DO NOT punish the breed.
- If a dog bites a person or animal the owner(s) should be required to cover any medical expenses not covered by insurance, and, as such, should remain at the scene of an incident to provide contact information.
- The person should be held accountable for the dog's actions.
- If it is an actual dog attack. I don't support this if it's a minor spat between dogs with no serious injuries, those happen too frequently to call out enforcement officers.
- If a dog bites another person it is the OWNER'S fault for poor training
- It's important that people take responsibility for their dogs.
- It's an owners responsibility to care for their dog. Typically if a dog bites it's an owners training or lack of training. Also, if the owner was there and explained to the human not to approach or give instructions things might be avoidable.
- If at all possible, information should be exchanged. Although gaining control and removing the animal from the situation might be more prudent so as not to escalate the situation. If possible, the



owner should remove the animal from the situation quickly - but be required to swiftly exchange a name & number?

- People have a responsibility keeping their dogs properly trained for the safety of others.
- Only makes sense. It's assault.
- Just like in a vehicular accident, any incident should be thoroughly examined and proper information shared to ensure everyone is aware of the risks.
- The responsibility of the owner is required for such circumstances, especially if something like that happens off their property.
- As a pet owner you are responsible for ensuring that your pet (in this case dog) is under control at all times. In an event where you failed to keep your pet under control, resulting in injury or harm to another then yes you should be legally obligated to remain at the scene to exchange information and speak to officials to ensure the matter is handled in the most fair, and efficient way possible to all parties involved.
- Yes because that way the person will be held accountable and they will be forced to put their dog into classes or have their dog declared as a nuisance if it is serious.
- Just like a car accident. You are responsible for your dogs actions, therefore you should stay and the scene and provide the appropriate information. Also STOP singling out a specific breed. Pitbulls are not dangerous, all dogs have the potential to be dangerous if not treated properly. It's the owners that are responsible for their dogs. How about we implement mandatory training for people who own dogs, specifically ones that cause issues. I DO NOT support the singling out of Pitbulls over every other breed. I've seen Chiawawa's who are way more viscous than a Pitbull. I suggest the city go sit down and invest some time into watch Cesar Milan and learn a little more about dogs.
- There needs to be multiple witness accounts including that if a dog owner.
- A lot of pet owners aren't taking responsibility for their dogs actions so by making them exchange contact information it will make them more responsible.
- Follow up for health ramifications for victim, further investigation and accountability
- This is so pet owners are help responsible. The same would go for their child
- Shouldn't leave the scene of an incident, just like traffic bylaws.
- Yes but only if the owner is able eg May have to leave to escort dog from site.
- As a responsible pet owner that is your duty.
- Yes- depending on the severity of the bite. If the bite has broken skin/caused injury then the owner should stay. As someone whose mother had her arm broken from a fall as a result of an out of control dog, we were not in the mindset of asking for the owner to provide contact information nor were we supported by a legal requirement that she provide it, resulting in physio etc that we had to pay out of pocket to provide rather than insurance. Having an enforceable bylaw and clear direction on this would be helpful to all in a stressful situation.
- It depends on the situation and even if it's a bylaw terrible people are still gonna walk away
- Too many owners of dogs that bite or act aggressively leave the scene and the other person or pet owner is left with hefty vet bills. This needs to stop.



- As the dogs owner we are responsible for its actions and the consequences of the actions
- I own a reactive dog myself and one hundred percent believe that if you take on the risk of a dog that may have an issue, you owe it to your dog and anyone else involved in a potential altercation to be responsible for the consequences of that choice
- Just yes.
- all situations are different ; it is not solely a breed issue. an untrained, unsocialized, unleashed small dog can cause severe injury in a short amount of time, just efficiently as a larger breed. enforce that obedience training is part of the Registering to Own a Dog process. Owners not invested in socialized dogs should not be bringing them into areas accessible to the dog being in public (a short walk "around the block", unfenced property, etc). being invested in having a well trained sociable dog should be the focus of City actions.
- For victims sake and owners sake, it is important for enforcement officer to be able to obtain the full story before a decision is made.
- It's app responsibility of the owner to own up to any incidents and accidents bites or anything related to an accident or an injury with their pet and another person or another animal as well
- An investigation should be done if a dog bites another or a human - so the owner needs to remain at the scene.
- It is important that the owner take responsibility for the dogs actions. Dogs are not inherently bad or badly behaved, regardless of breed, it is the owner's responsibility how a dog acts and reacts.
- I think people need to be held accountable for their dogs actions. Bites don't happen out of the blue and often a owners refusing to follow leash laws or other basic issues are what cause accidents. I also think we need to look at both parties as well. If an off leash dog or child rushing an on leash dog that needs to be taken into account and the owner needs a safe place to discuss this as well. Both sides need accountability in some cases. Again I think ensuring we don't add BSL to the mix will make people more likely to stay. BSL has been shown to be ineffective in many areas. Responsible pet ownership is key regardless of breed and needs to be the focus. Education needs to be provided to all parties in how to read body language, know the breeds you are getting, understand bylaws in place, and understand how to respect animals. Having both parties stay at the scene may allow some of this information to be given as well as giving both parties a chance to give their story helping determine what actually happened.
- Need to take responsibility for their and the dogs actions
- Treat it like a car accident
- They should have to stick around! It's irresponsible to just leave
- There would be no way to hold people accountable if the nuisance animals owners are not required to stay at the scene
- Only in severe cases
- if damage has been done it's important to get both sides of the story and parties to be held accountable
- extremely important. There could be medical costs incurred that the bitera owner should finance. And it puts them on record



- If possible, remove the dog from the situation, to avoid further trauma for any involved party. Ensure that appropriate information is shared so that liability can be determined, and appropriate action can be taken.
- Yes, that way it gives opportunity for the owner of the dog and the person who is alleging the bite to explain their sides. Sometimes, people who are scared of dogs will exaggerate the incident or lie. Also, if the person who was bit, was tormenting the dog, they should be blamed, not the dog.
- Of course they should remain at the scene..otherwise its like fleeing the scene of an accident
- Accountability for dog owners, hopefully would ensure a fair resolution for all parties.
- The owner(s) MUST be held accountable for the actions of their dog, as they are responsible for its training and behaviour at home and in public. Same as a child with a guardian.
- just like a car accident
- Of course if a dog were to bite a person or dog they should be held responsible!
- I think we as people and a community should own our wrongs and exchange contact numbers or emails so that in the case that the victim needs to see a doctor/vet the aggressor will have to pay the medical bill. No further consequences should be taken.
- No different then a vehicle accident - owner should be held there to ensure accountability and responsibility
- Any responsible pet owner would/should stick around to make sure all parties involved are safe. If a pet owner leaves there should be additional fines (just like walking away from the scene of an accident
- The owner and dog needs to be reachable and held accountable.
- You need to talk to [personal information removed] at Town of Olds. Also there is a new breed that pit bulls are getting blamed for their actions. They are American Bullies. Look them up. You can not blame a breed, the owner needs to take responsibility. And you can not say pit bull type breed or pit bulls in your bylaws (use dangerous dogs instead, and define what that means). Try instagram Alberta bullies and you will see.
- Depending on what happened. If dogs are playing and then a fight breaks out, the owners should talk through the situation. If not resolved, call law enforcement. If someone's dog attacks another dog, or a person, for no reason (which does not happen often for people, but may be different if bringing a reactive dog to a dog park), the owner of the problem dog should be willing to pay for all medical expenses for the dog that was injured. And if things are not dealt with, law enforcement should be called.
- The person's whose dog was bitten, or the person, needs to know if the dog has had vaccinations for rabies and other potentially deadly viruses. Also, what if the bite doesn't seem as severe at first glance as it later proves to be. And lastly, if damage is caused to another person or animal, the owner must be prepared to deal with consequences, whatever they are (legal, enforcement, civil damages etc.)
- Far to often the owner leaves and the medical bills fall on the victim
- All dog owners should remain at a bite scene regardless of breed



- Most owners run and try to hide the fact it was their dog. They should be held responsible for their dogs behavior.
- Similar to a car accident, owners should both stay on the scene until the proper information is exchanged. If necessary, an enforcement officer can be involved.
- Because in most cases it's the owner's fault. The owner should be the one being punished as it's choice in how the dog is raised caused the dog to lash out and bite someone.
- Getting both sides of the story is important. It is the owners responsibility, dogs can't talk.
- It is no different than an incident with a car, information should be shared between parties involved, and authorities called, only when necessary
- It is important to ensure the victim is completely aware of any health issues the dog could pass to the victim.
- Dog OWNERS need to take responsibility for their dogs
- I think it is important to get all sides and the owner is liable for that dogs behavior. Dogs aren't just bad for no reason!
- You are responsible for your pet just like you are for your child.
- The dog is unable to speak for itself. I think it is important that all sides of the story are shared. Also, if a dog has bitten someone the owner needs to take responsibility for it.
- I think this is a good idea in theory but will be hard to enforce. Consider cameras in off-leash parks?
- This is just common sense. Take responsibility for your animal's actions.
- The owner is responsible for their dogs behavior. While accidents happen with animals, the owner of the dog who has bitten should provide their information to the person who was bitten or who's animal was bitten and should stay at the scene to do what they can to help.
- If it requires yes it would be treated like a car accident would.
- It is SO important no matter the size, breed, or severity of bite for people to stay at the scene. A full vaccine history should be required.
- This is serious and the situation and outcome needs to be discussed while fresh in everyone mind. Although if a note had happened it might not be what to keep the dog and owner at the scene immediately after but do a follow up.
- Absolutely!! They need to be there to support the victim whilst keeping their pet in check!
- I support responsible ownership, and as a result I support a rule that requires owners to remain on the scene of an incident
 - unless both parties agree not to get city bylaw involved
- Yes too many bad owners get away and the dogs will end up biting another
- I habe personally witnessed 2 unprovoked attacks where the owners were not held responsible because they left. Both attacks were not Pit Bulls or a bully breed. I feel the responsibility lies solely with the owner and how they train their animal!
- Just like with a car accident, the dog owner needs to take responsibility.
- They should stay to give their side of the story and provide information.
- Dog owners are responsible for the behaviour or their dogs.



- It's impossible to get connect information of other dog owner, even after bylaw shows up.
- Include provisions for when the owner is not at the scene when the bite occurs. Prevent abandonment of said dog as well.
- Yes, unless it is a minor bite to another animal I think the two owners can deal with it on their own without law enforcement (minor meaning no vet visit required)
- Owners must take full responsibility for their pets
- I think it is an act of curtesy and humanity to ensure that the person who was bitten is safe and gets the help they need. As well as required as part of proper dog ownership.
- If someone's animal harms another person/animal, their should be opportunity and requirement for an explanation from both parties. If the dog is not well-trained and is a danger, that needs to be noted and should require some monitoring. If the person/animal who was not was in the wrong (this can absolutely happen, it's not always the fault of the dog who bit) then the person who owns the dog needs to be able to explain what occurred to cause the bite.
- The owner needs to be responsible for the training of their dog. If a dog bites, it comes down to training in most instances. Mandating training for a dog that bites is a better option than seizing and killing a dog that doesn't know any better or how to react when harassed. This can be enforced through law enforcement. I don't support killing the dog, nor just issuing a fine to the owner. Education must be applied.
- It's the owners fault not the dog.
- You need the whole story to determine what happened before the bite. Meaning youll need both the owner an the victom
- It's the same as a car accident, they are responsible for their animal
- It is no different than a vehicle accident. If your pet has injured another person you must be responsible for their action.
- When possible yes but keeping acreactive dog in the situation isnt always right either
- Sue Higgins dog park is one of those places where you see dogs biting other dogs and the owner of the dog biter will take off before anything can be done. Owners should be held responsible for their dogs.
- The cause of the bite and the temperament of the dog should be evaluated at the time of the occurence. A dog that has been harrassed or antagonized should not be at fault
- As a human, you're required to stay at the scene of an accident.
- I think it is just as necessary as staying at the scene of a MVC
- There should be a full investigation on the attack including the owner. Punish the owner not the breed.
- People must take responsibility for the actions of their pets.
- Seems like the common sense thing to do.
- Yes, however it isn't always in the best interest of both parties to keep the animals together for an extended period of time after an incident has occurred. If both parties agree with exchanging information there is no need for either person to stay at the scene of an incident.



- The owner should be held to full account for their animal no matter what the breed. If they do leave or flee and can be proven as the owner who left with the dog they should be fined.
- It seems reasonable, we expect this in fender benders, we should expect this when serious harm is done too.
- ONLY if injury has occurred. Many dog nip as play or as a warning sign - there is nothing wrong with this. If we do not allow dogs to communicate by barking, growling or nipping when they are uncomfortable they will jump right to aggressive and dangerous biting. It is okay for dog to exhibit signs when they want to be left alone, this is how they communicate.
- If the bite had caused damage to person or other animal
- My dog was attacked by a bully cross breed at an on leash park and the woman ran off, i tries submitting a file to court and it got thrown out, despite the 1000 dollars for the vet hospital bill i had to pay because the owner of the attacker told me to "[removed] off" bylaw services despite writing on the file that my dog was on a level 7 of being hurt (which included that the dog that attacked would be put down) nothing ever happened.
- There should be additional fines if pet owners leave the scene of an animal bite or attack
- All of us must accept the responsibility of the pet especially if there's an incident
- Thats the right thing to do
- Dogs should be under control when with owner and off property. Owner should answer for their animals actions. Regardless of breed of dog
- if they dont stay at the scene, they can disappear into the community and be hard to find afterward.
- Obviously you have to be responsible for your dogs behavior, so yes staying at the scene should be required.
- Only if injury occurs.
- Just like a car accident, the person and their dog should stay present.
- The owner is responsible for their dogs actions. They should remain on scene until law enforcement has arrived and taken proper information and statements.
- Too many people walk away and possibly shirk responsibility in dog attacks. They should have to stay and be held accountable for what their dog does.
- As a health care professional, we require information about the dog and owner for doing paperwork following a bite/scratch.
- I would equate this to a hit and run which is illegal.
- An owner should be legally responsible just like a car accident. You do not leave the scene
- Strongly agree that it is the owner who needs to be disciplined for the act. Whether it be required that the owner attend training, etc. There are numerous dog owners (all breeds) that need training on how to care for a dog.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dog.
- To make sure the dog isn't attacking people or animal regularly and should go with the victim to the hospital



- The dog is the owner's responsibility, if the dog bites it's the owner's responsibility to ensure information is given to the victim. This will also help keep record of any owners who are not properly training their dogs.
- An owner of a dog that bites must always remain at the scene. I think there should be more laxity given with a responsible owner who stays vs one that would leave the scene
- It is the owners responsibility if their dog bites. They should need to stay to find out if any vet care is needed, and be responsible to pay for that care, if not in full then partially.
- Contact information should be shared, but they should not have to stay for enforcement eg; if someone is injured and they need medical attention, if the dog needs to be deescalated and removed from the other person or animal and placed in the owners home/seek vet attention.
- People are responsible for their dogs behavior. This should be mandatory.
- Again, it comes down to the owner, not the dog. They should be the one held responsible.
- It is important as in some cases a dog that bites may be defending itself. It would be beneficial for the owner of the dog that bit to present their side of the story. If the wound suffered by the other dog / person is not life-threatening then that party should also be present.
- Actually not sure on this. I support the person needing to give their info, but keeping the person there means keeping the already stressed dog there...
- should be the same as a car accident, passing info afterward
- It's your responsibility if your dog is involved in a incident of any aggressive manner.
- Seems like the human thing to do.
- The owner is at fault for this, not the dog. Therefore, the owner must explain their reasoning as to why they did not train their dog enough to not have them bite another being.
- It should already be MANDATORY that people stop and give info if any sort of altercation happens with any animals because injuries can appear after the fact!!
- It's no different than a hit and run. If you cause damage, you should stick around to help address the issue.
- If possible, the owner responsibly should stay to take responsibility. However, assuming the owners dog bit someone/something out of aggression it seems reasonable that it would not be the best case scenario to keep that dog in the place where it was aggressive.
- To ensure vet records are up to date.
- Any type of breed can be provoked to bite. The owner staying could provide them a chance to explain their dog's behavior. For example, a child pulling on a dog's tail may provoke a bite reaction. If a person is not watching their child who approaches a strange animal, the owner can only do so much. Animals should not be punished when humans are at fault for their natural protective instincts.
- The dog may have been provoked to attack - I feel it is important to ensure you hear both sides of the story.
- so they can get a warning/fine/ or a necessary training for their dog
- Of course the owner needs to take responsibility for their dog.
- The dog owner should remain on scene; however, the situation has the potential to escalate and it would be important to ensure an enforcement officer responds promptly



- A person is responsible for their dog and therefore should take responsibility just as with any other incident
- The situation could be interpreted from either side, the person or other animal that was bitten, and the dog owner. Just like both parties and a witness stay at a car accident to find out who was at fault, these situations should be handled the same way. There is always 3 sides to a story, one person's side, the other person's side, and the truth.
- It's the same as a car accident; you should remain on scene until information has been exchanged between involved parties.
- Assuming it isn't a small bite while playing, where there is no serious injury, I don't think it's necessary to call law enforcement and have to stay at the scene. As long as the parties involved are satisfied there are no serious injuries, I don't think it's an issue. Similar to a fender-bender on vehicles, you deal with it between parties if there is no serious damage.
- Their dog, their mistake
- We all have to be reasonable for our own pet
- Common sense. I know it's a lost art but some of us still have it.
- All dog owners should be required to take full responsibility for the animal's actions, including remaining at the scene of any incident until appropriate medical/enforcement personnel are present. Fleeing the scene of an animal attack is like committing a hit and run.
- It is the owner's responsibility to share what happened in this situation
- If your dog bites anyone or other animals it's your responsibility to share your information instead of leaving like a lot of people do.
- All pet owners are responsible for their pet's actions and remaining at the scene helps to ensure this happens.
- It's important to educate dog owners about why dogs bite. Many dogs bite because their owners are not educated on dog social skills, interactions, body language, etc and put their dogs in situations where the dog feels it has no other way out. 99% of dog bites are predictable, and dog owners need to be more educated to keep their dogs safe. I also do NOT support any type of Breed-specific legislation. In my experience it is smaller dogs that have been more of a "nuisance" and they are allowed to act inappropriately around larger dogs, and when the larger dog communicates to the smaller dog with a growl or other warning, the larger dog gets in trouble - when the owners of the smaller dogs were totally naive to how inappropriate their dogs were acting. More education for owners to understand their dogs better is key, in my opinion.
- Exceptions for those that need to remove the dog from the premise and could be talked to later.
- Simply to make sure the dog has proper shots so no health concerns arise
- It's like a car accident don't flee the scene
- It should be the same as leaving the scene of an accident.
- Owners are responsible for their animals and their behaviour
- Yes. No matter the breed, if my dogs or myself or family are attacked, it's the owner's responsibility, even more so their fault than the breed. The owners should be reprimanded, and blamed. Not the breed. So yes, the owners should be made to stay and share information when necessary.



- If something more serious results from the bite, then it is good to have that information.
- No different than a car accident. If a dog bites no matter small medium or large, the owner should take responsibility and share the information with whomever is involved.
- Yes treat it the same as a car accident
- The owner is responsible for their dog. Yes, I totally agree
- Should be similar to "leaving the scene of an accident" if involved in an auto accident. If you leave the scene, you are considered guilty
- Much like a car accident, there is harm done to the victim party. An owner should remain as an enforcement officer collects information.
- If a dog bites then yes information exchange should be necessary.
- It is similar to the requirement that those involved in a car accident remain at the scene of the incident. The individual owns the dog and is able to provide information regarding the incident but also the dog's regular behaviour and temperament.
- If the bite is severe, needs medical attention/insurance to get involved, responsible pet owners should remain on scene and work together to get a resolution
- Too often dog owners of dogs who attack other dogs flee the scene and there is no contact info available. The owner of the attacked dog usually ends up having to then pay for all the unforeseen vet bills and there is also no way of pressing charges if warranted.
- Similar to a car accident, the more information collected from both view points of the incident the better a well informed decision can be made on how to proceed
- I mean it's similar to a car accident. This seems more than fair in this case as well.
- Be responsible.
- *Key information is if necessary - I have heard of incidents being taken out of context by one party and that can have a very negative result on a dog and it's family. I think it's important to have accurate evidence and correct information before proceeding with any formal components.
- It doesn't work though. I am a member of my community block watch page and in 3 years I have seen as many posts about dogs attacking and biting other dogs and people but the owners flee. Between Nosehill and Confluence park there are monthly incidents where dogs are out of the owners control and they flee without penalty. How do we enforce these laws?
- It's the right thing to do.
- The owner is responsible for the consequence of the incident.
- It is absolutely necessary for the person who was injured to get information regarding the animal and owner who injured them
- Need dog health history, human to take responsibility for dog's actions
- If the victim wishes to proceed with investigation- not all bites would be serious enough to warrant
- I would never leave the scene. A scared person can over exaggerate and make situations seem like they were not In fault. So I would want to have the full story explained before the "victim" tells some outrageous story
- Too many people just flee the scene



- This is the same concept of being in a car accident. We should all remain at the incident to figure everything out
- Making sure everyone is safe is important. Some people are disrespectful at dog parks and have their children running or on bikes teasing dogs. Dogs are animals and should be treated fairly in an understanding way. I have witnessed a lot of dogs chase bikes and children at dog parks at the person's fault, not the dogs. All cases are different.
- Accidents always happen. And to force someone to speak to enforcement if both parties are in agreement. That's an abuse of power.
- Listen. Understand.
- Absolutely, just like a car accident it should be reported and both sides should be there.
- I agree with this as it is what a responsible pet owner would do in my opinion.
- you hear of too many owners of these dogs that just take off. They need to be responsible for their dog's behaviour
- If you as a human injure another person you are expected to give a statement of what happened and what led up to a specific situation and I believe as responsible dog owners the same should happen. I believe there should be an investigation just as there would be with a human to determine if the dog was truly at fault or if the fault would lie on the other individual with events leading up to the situation.
- Yes they should stay, if not it should be treated as when one flees the scene of a crime
- Owners should be responsible for the actions of their dogs, even if the situation is excusable.
- The owner needs to be held responsible, as it is their wrong-doing that lead to the biting.
- Even with the rule many will still take off from the scene.
- Bites can be serious by all types of dogs and it would make sense to have the owner remain on scene with their dog if possible.
- The owner needs to be held responsible for their dogs actions. If their dog contributes to wounds that require veterinary/hospital assistance, then they should be held responsible for any bills. If they don't remain on scene it is nearly impossible to track them down
- TOO many incidents of owners leaving the scene when their dog has bitten either human or other dog..!
- This would just make sense. People need to take responsibility and be held accountable for what their dog does, especially if it causes harm to another animal or a person.
- They should as the dog is their responsibility
- So the person can get the veterinary history prior to seeking medical care
- They should be responsible for their dogs behavior!
- The owner should take responsibility for their dogs actions. Most responsible owners will anyways, but holding the irresponsible owners accountable is important.
- This should be the same as any accident. But by law should not have the authority to confiscate the dog.
- Responsibility and accountability for your pet



- If a dog bites someone, all parties involved (and witnesses) should stay put until officers arrive. That way it isn't he said she said, and the facts of why the incident occurred in the first place is documented. Most dogs don't attack unless provoked and to assume it is the dog/dog owner at fault is unfair
- If a dog bites a person, the victim should have the right to request the contact information and expect compliance. If the owner of the offending dog doesn't comply and leaves, that person should be subject to charges. Similarly, if the victim wants an enforcement officer involved, there should be procedures in place for making that request.
- It should also be a condition the receiver of the bite stay to give information. If the dog owner instructed the bite receiver to stay away from the dog and they didn't listen then the bite receiver should be held partially / fully responsible.
- There's a nuisance dog in my neighborhood that has attacked multiple dogs and the city has done nothing about it. Maybe if more people could their contact info we could build a better case
- It shouldn't be a rule it should be LAW, no different then a car accident. And more often then not it's those repeat offenders that flee. The one ofs, etc, generally do stay. It would be nice to have an officer show up for a bite however depending on severity it may not be possible as medical attention may be needed which would mean one or both parties would need to leave in a timely manner. I do however think that bigger fines need to be in place for those that run from an incident. The owner should absolutely have to deal with the situation but catch 22, if they are staying and taking responsibility then there probably isn't a need for an officer, if they are fleeing then yes an officer is needed but how do you track the person at that point and chances are it has either happened before or will again.
- Yes, that is common respect. But the dogs should not be kept in a shelter away from their parents while someone else decides what needs to be done. I see nothing listed about requiring the owner to have them trained and I do see euthanasia listed as an option... not okay.
- Owners are responsible for the actions of their pets.
- Individuals are responsible for what happens with their dog, if an incident should occur they should stay and solve the problem
- Yes. Dogs exhibiting dangerous behaviour need to be tracked.
- This is a no brainer
- YOu are responsible for your dog NO matter what Breed they are
- Not liking the breed specific rules, its not right, in having loved a bully whom was never offleash or aggressive or involed in any incidents I hate the idea of condemning a breed because they are strong. Its silly and going to upset/enrage responsible bully breed owners, during a pandemic, while people are going broke and struggling.
- the onus is on the owner of the dog, regardless of the breed. They absolutely should be staying!
- I would support this but removing a dog from its home just because of a bite shouldn't happen. The reason why people flee is because they don't want their family member killed or removed from their home.
- Essential the owner takes responsibility, same as any other accident.



- A responsible owner will have compassion for the victim and should cooperate with law enforcement.
- I feel that this should apply to any animal that is in public with their owner, not just dogs.
- The owner is responsible, like a car accident all parties should exchange contact info and both parties info shared to enforcement officer.
- Usually, if a dog bites someone it's out of fear. Dogs need to be socialized and trained. It's usually the owner that doesn't know how to handle a dog. The owner should be held responsible, not the dog.
- As a responsible pet owner you should be required to stay at the scene. If you crash your car you must remain on the scene and that should be no different than your pet.
- Owners are ultimately responsible
- Because then the city would get accurate data to see that pit bulls are not the culprit of most bite incidents: don't bully my breed.
- It is important to obtain the necessary information about the dog from the dog owner.
- Staying on the scene is the bare minimum a responsible owner can do to provide vaccination information and veterinarian information. An owner should, if possible, offer basic first aid. Leaving should be considered in line with a hit and run in a vehicle.
- If the bite was enough to injure. If it was a minor bite that does not lead to blood or injury especially if the party of the dog that engaged in the biting behaviour was not the cause they should not have to stay or get enforcement involved.
- It is the owner that is responsible, like any crime, they should stick around.
- The pet is the owners responsibility. If that pet caused harm to anyone, it is the owners responsibility to see it through.
- Any incid not involving harm to another person should require the offending individual to stay with and offer support/contact info
- a person should be able and afforded the ability to explain their side of why their dog may or may not have gotten aggressive and bit another animal or person. The victim should not be the only voice heard.
- Yes - as mentioned above, when a dog bites/attacks another human or dog, that is a training issue and should fall on the owner. The dog should not be punished.
- It is like a hit and run. Accurate information is sometimes hard to obtain if they do not remain on scene.
- It would be the same thought process as a hit and run.
- But only if there is care and no bias involved, taking the dog right then and there is NOT what should happen.
- Too many bad owners leave the scene and are unable to be tracked down to take responsibility for their pet
- Shows dog owner responsibility
- They need to take responsibility for the situation and so that things aren't blown out of proportion.



- just like a car accident they should have to stay on scene, trade information so the injured can ensure that the dog is up to date on all vaccines. This includes attacks from small breed dogs
- They must stay and be held accountable
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs, and leaving after an attack means they potentially avoid that responsibility. Also a matter of safety.
- need to have description of dog bite - draws blood, vicious behaviour (though subjective)
- There is always two side to the story. It is not always the dog fault for the bite
- Responsible
- If they don't stay at a hit and run with a vehicle they get charged why should it be any different with a dog bite. It's easy to give information and you should be able to control your dog on a leash which you should have with you at all times anyways.
- It is no different than hitting another vehicle with your vehicle. Stay on site. Period.
- It needs to be addressed at time of Incident as sometimes the dog that starts the fight loses and then we just blame the pitbull.
- Remaining at the scene is responsible pet ownership. If they don't and are located major enforcement should take place.
- It's no different than a hit and run if it causes injury to a person. They should remain on the scene.
- People need to be held accountable for their own dogs behaviour. Because we will find it's not the bully breeds and a lot of other ones doing the biting
- If someone has an unruly animal or uncontrolled they need to be educated by bylaw officers
- Contact information should be offered in the event of any accident, including dog bites.
- It maybe required to speak to the person after to have proof of vaccines, etc. Also in cases of dogs that bite other dogs, the owner of the dog that bit should have to pay the vet bills from the injuries.
- Give a chance to explain the case
- Their dog their responsibility no different then a car accident if you hit someone you are just as responsible
- It is part of being a responsible dog owner and human. Keeping a record of the incident saves both owner and victim potential additional stress.
- My puppy was recently attacked by an off-leash dog in an on-leash park and sustained a jaw fracture as a result. The owner(s) were not there, however, the dog was with two girls. I have not been contacted by the owner. If there is any indication that a dog is not obedient/trained/properly socialized, the owner(s) of the dog should always be with it whenever possible should the unfortunate happen and there is an attack. If I didn't have insurance I would be out of packet a large sum of money. As it is, I'm still out of pocket a decent amount which I won't be able to get back as I don't have owner information and they haven't contacted me.
- It's difficult to contact, or trust that you're being given accurate contact information
- Any dog that bites anyone or anything the owner should remain on site. Doesn't matter what kind of dog it is.
- I think it's important for the individual whose dog caused harm to take responsibility for their dogs actions.



- If someone has a dog that is not trained and attacks another, it should that owner's responsibility to pay for any vet or medical bills that resulted from the bite.
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs behavior and need to held accountable if they are not behaving
- Responsibility
- Just like a car accident, you should remain at the scene and exchange information. If you leave you should be charged.
- Absolutely, usually owners run away with their dogs and compensation is impossible.
- If your dog bites a person or animal you should stick around and have to pay vet bill or to prove your dog is up to date on shots.
- Don't think an explanation is necessary
- Yes, owners need to be accountable
- My boyfriends Mom's pitbull was attacked at a dog park by another dog at an off leash park while running towards her mom coming out of the water. She said she would pay for damages, as the pitbull had to be taken to an emergency vet hospital. Then once she got the bill, she refused to pay. Enforcement officers should get involved right away, as it would reduce the stress on dog parents which is already high because their baby got hurt.
- This should be common sense
- To determine multiple offenders
- You should always provide information if something happens.
- The ya re responsible for their dog which means any behaviours that the dog displays or accidents the dog is involved in. It is part of being a good owner - taking responsibility.
- You have to do it for a car accident. You should be responsible if your pet attacks anyone.
- Many owners involved in incidents run away and refuse to give their information to avoid consequences.
- "There is probably a story
- So learning both sides is important"
- I don't believe city officials should be acting as law..unless they are actual law enforcement . Why not set up a program with a rescue or foster to foster the Animal while waiting for court
- Owners need to be held accountable when their animal does something wrong.
- Sometimes things get blown out of proportion so to ensure the proper story both parties should stay on scene, and at NO POINT should the dog be euthanized, instead trained for better behaviour, it is not the BREED it is the OWNER that isn't properly training the dog
- This is the way
- A lot of the time owners [removed] off and don't deal with the issue. It'd be nice to see it treated kind of like a car accident.
- I believe that anyone involved in a dog attack (owner or otherwise) should stick around and ensure than when the incident is reported to the authorities that it is fair and accurate. Not just blaming a dog for the attack and ignoring any triggering or provoking factors that led to the event.



- I believe if a dog bites a person, then absolutely. However, dog fights in dog parks happen all the time.. between any breed, big or small. So to enforce that every single time or to allow people to take advantage of that Bylaw is not reasonable.
- I think the city should be aware of animals who bite people and/or other animals, and by remaining at the scene, it can be ensured that the person/animal harmed gets help. Additionally, if an animal is a repeat offender, the city should know about it.
- Like a car accident. Dont leave the scene
- If any medical expenses arise they are possibly responsible and if the dog is repeatedly biting then it needs to be addressed
- "It's basic human decency.
- Also, it's important for AHS and monitoring of dog bite victims and getting them medical attention, I.e. rabies observation period, tetanus immunization of the victim, bylaw follows-up, etc"
- I think you should share information with any witness party once all parties and animals involved are safe. If an animal or human requires emergency care then sharing any details in a timely verbal fashion should suffice
- I would consider it like a car accident. If someone else's dog has hurt your dog then it's that dog owners responsibility to own up for their dogs actions. As someone who has had their animal attacked at a dog park, it would have been great to get the owner's information as I feel like they should have incurred the vet bill.
- Yes both owners/person involved should both be required to exchange information and both have a chance to explain the situation. I definitely do not agree with taking a dog from its owner. This is cruel, the dog attacked for a reason, was scared or felt threaten and taking the dog will make that even worst...same reason you don't take kids away from their parents...
- Allows for a record to be started to establish a history to reference if there is a pattern to owner/dog to be assessed in dealing with any possible future incidents. Also, depending on severity of the incident, charges may be laid and responsibility needs to be owned up to.
- It instills accountability, as it can be difficult to locate an owner or dog after an incident.
- It's the owners responsibility. They should be going to jail for training the dog to attack. you should also look at the person that was attacked. They (especially kid) instigates these attacks by poking, hitting and teasing them. I have seen it too many times and the dog gets blamed,
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs and therefore need to be held accountable when their dog misbehaves
- Share information but not necessarily wait for an officer especially if there is medical attention needed
- Owners should be held accountable for their dogs actions.
- Yes, BUT the dog should not be taken away or if it dies be put in a shelter for rehabilitation. Dogs shouldn't be euthanized because of the owners. Also there should be fines/preventing from having an animal depending on how serious the attack is.
- If it's a bad bite yes they should have to stay on site.
- Same as car collision - owner responsibility



- If someone has a dog that bites that's on the owner. I have a dog that doesn't do too kind with people so when I'm walking her I'll stop off to the side when people walk by. The dog is not at fault in biting situations it's the owner/person who was bit.
- Owner to take responsibility of the situation.
- ABSOLUTELY! I have had encounters with aggressive dogs but fortunately never been bitten. Typically the owner just moves away, certainly doesn't provide contact info. It should be illegal to run off, especially after a bite or attack.
- Help ensure responsibility
- As in any substantial injury both parties should stay and report unless both owners agree not to report it
- If a dog severely bites another person (not just nips), the owner of the dog should stay (similar to a car accident, all parties need to stay until police arrive). This will ensure all parties are held responsible.
- Everyone needs to take responsibility for their actions. Some times it was a human or animal that was taunting a dog to make them bite. This should be a chance to explain what happened to the officer.
- Too many [removed] in this city who would fled the scene and place blame on others.
- It is the same as a car accident, if there is damage done or possibly damage done they should take responsibility for their pet.
- Dog bites are serious and many owners of bad dogs are quick to leave before trouble comes.
- If one party wants to involve an officer then the other party should remain at the scene.
- Yes I think if ANY dog bites someone you should remain at the scene to share contact information
- Basically the same thing as a vehicle hit and run if they leave.
- If a dog bites a human, I absolutely think they should have to stay at the scene. They must take responsibility for their dog's actions.
- If your dog bites someone you need to address the situation and take responsibility. If the owner can SAFELY remain at the scene, they should. If the dog needs to be removed from the area to prevent further issue or trauma to the victim (like a child who the dog may scare) then that should be done ASAP. But there are ways to mitigate the situation.
- Yes, but only if the dog is able to be brought under control.
- I think it's important to be accountable for your dog's behavior and to ensure that the entire truth is being told regarding the incident. Too often, and I've witnessed a dog bite when it has been teased, or scared - and it reacts in a way dogs do. Human interaction has a huge effect on their behavior.
- I think it is the responsibility of both pet owners to exchange information and or speak with an enforcement officer, if there needs to be a vet visit paid for, injuries sustained to either the owner or pets.
- PIT BULLS ARE NOT BAD DOGS. THIS ISN'T FAIR TO THE ANIMAL. IT'S ALL IN THE OWNERSHIP. EDUCATE YOURSELVES!!! This is what Ontario has been doing for years and it's so [removed] and unfair. Breed specific legislation has never proven to be efficient or to work. Don't



hate the breed. Penalize the owners. You can have a lab, a shepherd or a husky with bad attitude if the owner isn't a responsible person. Like this is not reasonable

- Only to make sure the injured party is taken care of, not because I believe the dog (who bit) is to blame. Honestly dogs generally only bite when provoked. Not all the time, but a high percentage.
- It would be similar to staying at the scene of a car accident, in my opinion, and a responsibility of being an owner of a dog.
- "Also why the discrimination against Pitbulls?"
- They have very gentle demeanor's and are often the sweetest dogs. Not to say that there aren't bad pitbull's around, but that can be the case for any dog depending on the up-bringing and how they were socialized. I think the discrimination and targeting of the pitbull breeds is unnecessary and was a gross oversight on the real issues this bylaw is aiming to address. Because all breeds can be aggressive and I have seen more issues with un-trained Labradoodles than pitbulls."
- Both parties should stay (when necessary and if possible) at the scene to make sure that all information is collected.
- I've witnessed small dogs aggressively attack. But because they are small the owners dismiss it and leave.
- I think it's important to support all those who are involved. They need to be accountable.
- People need to be held accountable. But also feel safe enough to stay and talk through the incident because it could have been the dog protecting itself and being wrongly blamed
- This gives the chance for ownership and accountability for the owner of the dog to uphold. These owners of pets need to realize the consequences of not properly training their dogs
- Yes, a responsible pet owner should stay at the scene and exchange information.
- But people have to understand to not attack the individual with the dog that did the biting. They are wild animals no matter the size, if this is a continued offence then that's when muzzles, restrictions on how many and the use of dog parks should play a factor! Don't punish the majority because of a few.
- I think it should be required for any dog involved in a biting incident to exchange information.
- No explanation required, this is the decent human thing to do when your dog is involved in a biting incident. However, how would the city expect civilians to enforce this if the other party refuses to remain at the scene until an enforcement officer arrives?
- I've been bite and the owner got mad at me and said it was my fault as they quickly ran away.
- Yes as long as they can contain the dog and there is no more danger.
- Just like a hit in run in a car. The owner needs to be there no matter what breed of dog big or small
- Absolutely - the majority of the time it is the owners fault that a dog had to resort to biting. The owner should take full responsibly and remain on scene.
- Yes. I was involved in an incident where my dog was bitten at an off-leash park and the owner of the other dog fled the scene. We got a photo of the man and used social media to find out his identity and he was eventually charged, but it could have saved a lot of time and energy if he had remained at the scene. I'm not sure how you would be able to enforce this though.



- Dog bites happen because the dog is not properly trained. Owners should always be held accountable for a violent dog. A dog, however, should NEVER be considered at fault. There is no such thing as bad dogs, just bad owners.
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- And pay for vet or medical bill
- So that they can be there to explain their view of the incident.
- It is what a responsible dog owner should do
- It shows pet ownership responsibility.
- B
- Owners need to take responsibility no matter what.
- A GOOD dog owner of any breed should have the common knowledge to stay
- Owners need to be held responsible for the actions of their pets.
- Good to get both sides
- The dog owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- Seems like a reasonable expectation, but let's be sure it's really bites, not two dogs playing with a bit of nipping.
- Any dog owner should stay. As well as pay for the vet bill of injured dog.
- it's your dog, you should stay at the scene regardless....
- Would help with follow up
- Only if it is severe
- Should be a requirement to share contact information
- Too many dog owners leave the scene when a bite of any kind occurs. A fine also needs to be attached if they do leave the scene.
- Cause then they will know how and what happened
- I have heard of several incidents where a dog bites and the owner leaves the scene. At the very least the owner should ensure the person or animal that was bitten is okay. An enforcement officer doesn't necessarily need to be involved but yes they should stay at the scene.
- There are always two sides to a story and since animals can't speak for themselves, it's up to the owner to take responsibility.
- Dog bites will always happen, but it's up to us to make it right. The person should take responsibility for their dog and shouldn't get the chance to leave because vet bills are expensive
- If your dog bites someone it is responsible pet ownership to stay
- But it should be equally responsible for the person who caused a dog bite to be held responsible. Often times dogs are just protecting themselves
- It is the same idea as someone who got in a car accident. They have to stay to assess the incident and provide support for any damages done.
- Absolutely! It should be standard to take responsibility like with a car accident!
- "Too many irresponsible dog owners take off, leaving the victims stranded with injuries and huge vet bills - which comes down to training and control.



- All dog owners, no matter the breed, should have to attend training before even considering taking their dog into public spaces."
- Yes, as often the owner quickly leaves the scene before you can properly assess damage. This would be very difficult to enforce though. This would only work if the city could ensure prompt response times (if an enforcement officer was contacted).
- It is the dog owners responsibility to stay at the scene if their animal has cause any type of injury to a person or other animal. It is like leaving the scene of an accident.
- need info on dog
- The owner is responsible for their dog as well it's just a good thing to do
- Your dog hurt someone else... it's like your car hurt someone else. Your car is your property. Your dog is your property. If you flee the scene of the accident with/about your property, especially if it's your fault (ie negligence), you're still held accountable. If your dog bites someone else, you should be responsible for mending that person much the same as your insurance company would be responsible for mending the person in the event of an MVA.
- The owner is liable for all injuries to the person and/or other dog bit. The owner should be liable for all vet bills
- It is important to know who the dog belongs to, if the dog was with the owner or someone else
- its responsible pet ownership
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions and pay vet/doctor bills if necessary.
- I do believe they should just in case the bite of injury is severe enough, just like a car accident, if someone is hurt. You wait
- It is important that they stay on scene because we need to know things about the dog like vaccination history
- It should not be the financial responsibility of the person or owner of the dog your animal attacked if your animal drew blood.
- Having experienced a pit bull breed attempting to "play" with my dog (it would not let go/stop nipping at it and when I turned to say "no" and walk away, it snapped at me), the owner did not seem to care and brushed it off and just took the dog away. The owner must be responsible for their dog's actions and lack of training. When someone hits another car with theirs it is a hit and run, would this not be equivalent as a "bite and run" if they just leave?
- We need to know that the dog doesn't have rabies or any other health issues that could be passed on by a bite.
- They need to take responsibility
- Definitely must provided contact info, though they cannot be expected to wait more than 30 minutes for an officer to arrive, especially if the dog is riled up and might attack others.
- A dog that bites someone needs to be trained, no matter the breed. This should be handled the same was as a car accident.
- Owning a dog has responsibility, owners are accountable for their dogs.



- Yes. Two sides. I've witnessed small dogs attacking large breeds. The large breed defends itself and injures the smaller breed, I've witnessed the larger breed get fined just because they the owner of the smaller breeds dog is more injured although the smaller breed provoked it.
- Dog bites can be sever and even if the victim seeks immediate medical attention can have effects later having the owner and dog information could be necessary for follow up
- Yes, they must be held accountable for their actions. They should remain on scene as long as they have their dog under control and do not pose a further threat. If they cannot control their animal they must provide information where they can be reached.
- I do believe if ANY dog bites someone, the owner should be liable and held up to training requirements
- often when an altercation occurs someone or an animal is injured and immediate steps are required to deal with that which can limit the amount of time someone has to obtain details of owner/dog and often times people that know they are in the wrong try to avoid the responsibility or to simply step up and deal with the issue.
- You don't leave the scene of an accident, this is no different
- To protect the owner or parent the high cost of vet Bill's when the owner of the aggressor has fled
- All pet owners should be responsible for their pets actions and beahavioura.
- I can't believe this isn't a requirement already.
- Its just the responsible thing to do. I don't think the SPCA, Law enforcement, or Vets are suited to give the dog an assessment. Should be an actual behavioralist. Would ypu let your dentist preform open heart surgery?
- A responsible pet owner should always stay on the scene unless its unsafe to do so.
- The offender fleeing leaves the injured party with no recourse and
- Like a car accident, people should exchange information for vet or hospital updates. Should the bite be quite traumatic, an officer should be called to take down the information and how to proceed. Just like any other accident.
- That's just being responsible for an injury you're at fault for. Not different than a hit and run. Maybe at least leave contact info if they really need to leave for some reason
- Owners are responsible for their dogs actions
- That should be a crime for a dog owner to walk away after their dog bites a person. That dog owner needs to give his identification.
- If the dog owner leaves the scene there is the potential for the aggressive animal to attack another person or animal while leaving the scene. The owner is responsible for the animal and as such should stay around to justify and explain the situation surrounding the incident. This would also add a voice to their animal's ultimate welfare and any decision taken after the incident.
- Put the dog owner in jail also. Sick and tired of blame the dog and not the owner.
- It is the owners responsibility to provide appropriate information to enforcement officers
- If you have to stay for a car accident, a dog incidet should be no different.
- They should be on the hook for all medical expenses related to an attack. It should be treated similarly as a hit and run. I believe this should be the case for most offenses



- Any pet owner should have the decency to stay at the scene to give information. That shouldn't have to be enforced, that should just be known by the pet owner. I think a fine should be enforced if they do leave.
- The dog owner should have full responsibility for their pet and their pet's behaviour.
- Any owner of an animal that bites should be required to stay on scene provide info and if necessary surrender their animal
- The owner should be responsible for helping the other dog if necessary.
- Too many irresponsible dog owners. Dog owners MUST and NEED to be held accountable. This is not only for the safety of the public but for the animal as well. This will also allow for proper follow up to occur and proper measures to be put in place to prevent this from occurring again.
- As the dog owner you are responsible for your dog and any actions of that dog, 100%.
- its the responsible thing to do.
- It's like the scene of a crime. No one should be waking away without information and statements
- They need to take responsibility so it does not happen again
- Accountability for your animal's actions is very important.
- Limits the need to try & track these offenders down
- Too many known cases where the owners left denying any responsibility
- I've been attacked by a dog and was glad it's humans stayed and were responsible.
- As it holds the owners who are causing a bad reputation for dogs such as the PitBull accountable. Especially if the dog, no matter the breed hurts someone! What if the dog has rabies?
- Unless they cannot control their dog
- If it's a bad enough bite to draw blood I completely agree.
- "All
- To often people give miss information and aren't held accountable for damages"
- Often times when a dog bites another dog or a person, the owner will leave the scene without sharing their information. I believe that it is their responsibility to own up for their dogs actions and provide their information
- If a dog bite occurs the owner should be held responsible for vet fees or other compensation. They should also not be allowed to leave as they may be attempting to avoid other consequences as well
- The owner needs to be held accountable for their dogs behavior
- This is a no brainer; of course they should have to stay. When you get in a car accident are you allowed to leave without leaving information?
- No explanation required. It's the right thing to do.
- Yes, we need information from that person. Its like a hit and run they get a higher fine and dog gets euthanized.
- It is the responsibility of the dog owner to remain and exchange! This should just be a given in the event of the incident. It may be a dog/owner that this is a habitual and if you don't have contact info how is this tracked!



- You are required to have control of your dog at all times, so it would be like a vehicle accident where you stay at the scene and provide your information. But if your animal is being aggressive then you need to remove the animal from the scene and come back and provide your details.
- There are cases of the owner taking off and not being held responsible for their dog, as well as dogs being wrongly accused because they looked like the dog that attacked.
- Yes they should remain on scene and be able to explain their point of view as well. Dogs biting humans is not always the fault of the dog. Sometimes it's the human who got bit that is the aggressor in the situation.
- All dog owners are accountable
- Yes because if another dog bites someone or animal. The person should be accountable for the dog's actions. Since most dogs, any dog to be exact is only vicious mainly because the owner. And this goes for any breed that's out there.
- Of course they need to remain there. I have seen a dog bit another dog or child but the other dog or child was provoking the dog. If this were the case I would hope the officer would consider this in the investigation and therefore having to stay the owner could explain this
- It's important for owners to take responsibility for their dog but also to have the opportunity to share what happened as sometimes it is not the dog's fault.
- Dogs should not have to be put down for acting like animals. Maybe making the owner put their dog in obedient classes would help. It's all about the owner and not the dog. However, a bite is serious and should be taken seriously, but should never result in euthanizing the pet.
- They have a responsibility to help those injured.
- The owner should be held accountable for the actions of their pet. I would consider an incident such as a dog bite to follow similar legislation to that of a car accident whereby the affected parties are required to remain at the scene of the incident as necessary.
- It's irresponsible to leave after your pet has bitten someone, especially when that means the victim ends up paying vet or medical bills.
- If the person leaves it should be a fine at minimum. That animal is dangerous and the owner must take responsibility
- Seems like a no brainer
- The owner needs to provide contact information if a dog maliciously bites a human or another animal. That said, they should also be given the opportunity to explain the situation in the event that the person who was bitten was provoking the dog.
- I feel it is important to have all the information at the time it happens in order to process more efficiently.
- It's important to get both sides of the story. Whether the person who was bit was bothering or hurting the dog, the dog was acting in self defence.
- There is no reason the owner of a dog cannot be held accountable to explain the situation after an incident. If they are to try and prove the dog was provoked or to plead their case.
- They are responsible for that injury and should be required to be a part of addressing the problem and ensuring the victim is okay.



- The owner must take responsibility for their dogs behaviour and do what is necessary to change it. After an owner leaves the scene it would be very difficult to find and locate them
- "Basic reasonable behaviour - after a car crash or dog bite
- Share contact info"
- Although it may be better for the person to get the dog home to a safe and less stressful space.
- You need to ensure past medical history (updated vaccinations) before proceeding.
- My dog was bitten by a mastiff. It cost \$4000 and I wanted the owner to help pay but they took off
- Most good people are doing this anyways if something happens. I think it would help keep certain people accountable
- This would ensure communication between all parties and would allow owners with aggressive dogs to be held accountable for repeat offences (ie mandatory training, limit to dog ownership, etc)
- Truly beneficial to all parties included in this incident
- There could be extenuating circumstances for what transpired
- Owners should be responsible for dogs
- That's not already a law?
- both sides of the situation need to be heard from the dog owner and the person/animal involved.
- I think as long as there is also an opportunity for the individual to explain their side as well.
- The owner should be legally required to stay and accept personal responsibility for their pets actions
- To clear up any question as to exactly what happened, everyone should remain on scene.
- Animal owners need to take responsibility for their animals. There's always two sides to a story as well and if on off leash areas a small dog attacking a large dog may not cause as much damage but as soon as a larger dog gives a warning bite when being attacked to protect itself the larger dog is now considered at fault. This needs to change .
- People need to learn how to take care of their animals and take ownership for their mistakes
- If the person or other dog has any issues from it, the owner is liable. They must cover all expenses (or their insurance much like a car accident). Also to follow up to report to the city. Again, if a bite happens the dog (OWNER!) should be in obedience to learn how to manage their animal in a way that is safe for them and every one around them.
- Treat it like a hit and run. If you leave the scene after your dog has bitten someone, that's inexcusable, you are responsible and should be required to answer for what had happened.
- Never leave the scene
- You are responsible for your pet, but this has to apply to little jerk dogs not just big ones that people are prejudice against. It should also exclude self defence, if a dog bites my dog and he fights back you best believe that I'm paying no fines for someone else's poor training.
- This should be compared to a vehicle hit and run accident. If the offending pet owner flees, they should face harsher punishment.
- Any altercation with dogs or humans, all parties should remain to exchange information and talk to an enforcement officer. Owner of dog that behaves negatively needs to be held accountable for their dogs behaviour.



- If the situation was felt with and mild, scratch (an oops playing ball, no blood.... maybe fine) however. Bad situation, Why wouldn't they? Any other type of accident it would be needed.
- I had an experience where the owner took off, so yes I support a rule that requires them to stick around
- It's an incident report just like you would if you had a car accident
- The dog owner is ultimately responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- The owner is responsible for their dog, so they should work with authorities
- Pet owners should be responsible for the behaviour of their pets. If after a first offence, there was no effort made to prevent future issues, that would be a sign of guilt towards the owner.
- I think that ANY breed of dog that bites the owner should be held responsible
- The owner is ultimately responsible for the dog and is accountable for its behaviour.
- Every dog owner must be accountable for their behaviour
- There have been too many people give incorrect info or just leave the scene. This must change. Also if there was a way to have dog owners scan the city dog tag upon arrival and departure of dog parks this could help locate people who leave without providing proper info.
- That's just responsible dog ownership
- No different than a traffic accident
- It is rarely the dog that is the problem, it's the owner. When they can be identified, owners should be fined heavily, depending on the degree of injury. Like any other "accident", those involved and witnesses should stay to provide needed evidence of what happened.
- owner should have input as to why bite
- This isn't a thing already? This is like a car accident, if they leave it is like a hit and run.
- Too often people leave and there's no support for the person or dog who was bitten.
- This holds the owner accountable. But if the dog was provoked- improper behaviour from the other animal or teasing from a human. That other party should be held accountable as well.
- Liability should stay with the dog owner so they should have to remain on the scene just like any other incident
- We had an incident and the owner didn't not provide information or stick around so we had to send officer to what we thought the house was. Nothing was dealt with.
- You need to take responsibility for your own animal
- If your dog bites another animal, you should be responsible for paying for the cost of veterinary care required for that animal.
- The owner of ANY dog that bites should have to remain on scene and share information. The owner of the dog that bit should be held financially responsible for any costs the victim may incur including vet bills, reconstructive surgery, shots, etc. If the owner doesn't stay on-site getting compensation is not possible. Additionally, if a dog bites that information should be passed on to the City so that a file may be created for that dog and the owner to identify a long-standing or growing issue with the owner or the dog.



- I think if the event is severe enough and the claimant requests officers, then the owner should stay. This is a traumatic event and it is common for the owner to leave without the claimant even realizing the extent of the bite
- The behavior of the dog is the owner's responsibility
- once a dog bites it should be investigated
- Dog owners/handlers should be held accountable for the animal's behavior.
- Like any accident, incident.
- Some repeat offenders slip through the system because they don't stay to provide help/information - the owner of the injured animal is always going to be more concerned about the health of their dog rather than chasing down the other owner
- I don't think they should flee the scene.
- Its the same as a car accident. Have an accident you access the damage, swap information etc. Only licenced/ dog friendly animals should be able to be at dog parks.
- We all need to be accountable so we can make more efforts to be good and responsible owners
- Typically, if a dog is biting (with the intention to harm, not play nibbling which is a healthy dog interaction), it is 100% the owner's fault - due to poor training, neglect or abuse in the home, and the human needs to bear the responsibility for being a bad pet owner.
- Long-term damage from a dog bite/attack may not be immediately apparent. Additionally, this would be a good way to track dog bite statistics, patterns, etc. to assist with future enforcement.
- Need to stay because a person's property (dog) damaged another person's property (dog) or injured a person. Requiring personal info to be shared in these incidents is very reasonable and concurrent with minor vehicle incidents.
- I'm not sure why any responsible dog owner would not stay at the scene of an incident. It is also important that the victim stay at the scene and explain their actions prior to the incident (i.e. possible teasing of the animal)
- There are always 2 sides to a story . Not necessarily the dogs fault
- People should take responsibility for their pet.
- Or give the person their information before leaving incase things get too heated.
- Same as any damage to property. The owner is responsible for the dogs behaviour and actions the same way they are responsible for their infant child. Not every dog owner has pet insurance or can afford vet visits just cause some stranger let their dog attack another dog and walked away.
- It's the responsibility of the owner to make sure there dog is under control.
- Or leave contact info like a car accident
- I think it is important that the all parties who are involved stay to resolve the situation.
- Common sense, but no owner will do this.
- I don't know why you guys decided to fixate on pit bulls considering the only dog that has ever bit me was a German Shepard. How many attacks have we had in Calgary that were pitbulls because we never hear about them??
- Owners are responsible for their dogs. This should be no different that remaining at the scene of any accident like a hit and run where another is injured.



- It would depend on the severity of the bite and the attitudes/behaviours of the people/animals involved. Ideally, they would stay to make sure each party (animals included) were okay, and if deemed necessary, they can stay until an enforcement officer is there. I don't think having a rule to designate people staying will do much. The type of people who would not stay at the incident are going to leave regardless of a rule or not.
- It is a serious incident for a bite. Law requires you stay on the scene of an accident, a dog bite should be treated the same.
- Just as is required in motor vehicle accidents, an exchange of licence information should be required
- The owner is responsible for the dog, and thus should be responsible for providing information related to any incidents related to their dog, if required
- usually a dog bite is caused by owners who do not understand dog behaviour or lack of training (both the dog that bites and the dog that is bitten). Education for both parties should be a requirement and hopefully although it is an emotional situation, owners will be willing to discuss the incident and try to understand how and why it happened.
- This should have always a rule, like a car accident, if you and your property (in this case; dog) is at fault, you should morally and legally stay.
- It's just like a car accident. If the person leaves, they should be subject to law informant like a hit and run
- To pay vet bills or anything.
- When an incident like that happens it's possible the dog/person bitten might not be in the frame of mind to check thoroughly for injury and realize later. If say a vet bill is involved I feel like the person responsible should pay for that.
- information and pictures should always document the incident
- Accountability
- I think it's only right that the owner takes responsibility and share their side of the story. I don't believe all dogs that bite did it with malicious intent. If a kid is egging the dog on the parents should take responsibility for their child's actions.
- Yes. Even if there is no blood shown to be drawn, information on hand would be helpful in case there is bruising or other damage. I have had dogs make my big dog squeal in pain and the other party just brushed it off because there was no visible blood. Also not a pit bull, by the way! Shepherd mix.
- Only responsible to do so
- Owners should take responsibility, if there dog is involved.
- How is this not a law already?
- It's necessary for the owner to remain present to give any necessary information. Too many flee before any information can be given.
- Ensures the dog and owner can be identified
- So long as the dog and other individuals are not at additional risk



- You need to know if the dog has been updated on shots and I do think the owner should be responsible for vet bills. That being said I think people run away because they are scared your going to take and kill their family member.
- We need to confirm that the dog is up-to-date on shots and that the person who is with the dog is their to provide their statement. A dog may bite for many reasons, such as a child harassing it. You need to see both sides.
- There are many irresponsible do owners, especially under the age of 25. They do not control their dogs and when asked these individuals to control their dogs the response is "Get out of the park if you don't like it"
- I have a small bichon and two pitbulls. My pitbulls have never attacked or bit anyone at a dog park or otherwise but my bichon has been attacked 3x that requires veterinary care by strangers dogs - their breeds were as follows: chihuahua, jack russel, Rottweiler. Not once did the owner stay. The chihuahuas owner laughed even though she was bleeding, the jack russels owner gave me fake information, And the owner of the Rottweilers yelled and swore at me, saying it was my fault because the dogs sensed my fear. (We were literally walking with my dog on a leash when her dogs circled and attacked - they were off leash).
- it is important to gather all information regarding a dog bite. It is important to make the distinction between whether the dog aggressively attacked without reason, or if the dog was provoked. Health history (ie. Vaccines) is extremely important information as well.
- It is the owners responsibility to control the dog. If the owner is unable to control the dog and there is an incident it is ultimately the owner at fault not the dog. There are no bad dogs only bad owners. ALL DOGS Not just pit bulls should have to go through obedience training as much for the owners benefit as the dogs.
- I am extremely against labelling "bully breeds" and pit bulls, aggressiveness is a behaviour not a breed, if you label pit bulls you should name every small dog breed out there as they are more prone to bite.
- So many times the owner runs away with the dog or tgey become confrontational and refuse to give personal info. We need that to be a bylaw, just like when in a car accident, you must remain at the scene.
- Too often, irresponsible owners flee & the victim does not have an opportunity to collect information for vet or doctor purposes.
- Allowing the the bylaw be written to uphold the intent of the law applying to severe or actual instances of a bite. Again there is tremendous fear in me that this will be abused (by citizens in this case much more than enforcement). In all my years at the dog park I have seen more false accusations than actual bite incidents (to be fair it is on the order of 3/2 in actual numbers).
- Same as a hit and run incident
- It's important for records to be share (up to date vaccinations) and to offer to pay for vet/medical costs. The city should also have a record of who has bitten. (Only if the bite breaks the skin)
- Only if everyone can remain safe while doing so
- People need to be responsible for their pets. Period.



- or at least leave information so person can be located.
- Ultimately the dogs behaviour is the responsibility of it's owner and thus they need to be held accountable. They contact information MUST be obtained.
- To many people are not owning up and being responsible pet owners
- Just like a car accident, need to exchange information in case something happens and then they can get ahold of the owner to communicate issues.
- "To hear both sides of the story (was the dog provoked? Did the owner say ""please do not pet my dog"" and someone pet it anyways?)
- To ensure the dog is up to date on rabies vaccine"
- No different than any other offense/incident. Stay at the scene of the crime.
- It's necessary to know the owners info for future complaints and to be responsible.
- Need to better define "if necessary"• . Any bite? Just human? Vet attention required?
- Owners need to be responsible for the pet
- need to know
- the owner is more at fault than the dog, they were the ones whom has trained the dog for however many years - and if their dog has bit someone it is due to the lack of attention or poor training the dog has received. Therefore, if the dog has bitten someone, the human is liable and needs to stay to provide proper information to enforcement officers and/or medical attention to the persons/animals involved.
- Regardless of type of dog this should be reported.
- Every owner is responsible for their dog and their actions
- It is the owners responsibility to care and provide for their dog/pet, and others interacting with said pet. Whether that be humans or other pets, it is up to the owner to be responsible for the actions of their dog. If their dog causes harm to another person or pet, the owner should have to remain at the scene to make sure everyone is okay and do not require medical attention.
- Again. Not all bites come from bully breeds, forcing people to stay when their dogs nips or becomes a problem
- A dog owner should have to stay and talk to an officer to get both sides of the story, to help determine if the dog was reacting to being taunted by the other person/pet or if the bite happened as a result of the owners negligence
- The dog owner represents their animal as the animal cannot defend itself and as such, if a dangerous event occurs, the owner of the animal should be responsible for assisting in data collection. Much like a vehicle accident, those present should wait for authorities to gather data.
- if the person who has been bit requests they stay to talk to bylaw officer, then yes. But if they exchange information and the party who has been bit is fine to go, then that's fine.
- You should always make sure you stay at scene. It's just like a driving accident. You are responsible for your animal.
- If it is a severe bite and the animals can be safely managed.
- I am currently employed in the animal welfare industry and consistently speak to victims of dog attacks. Pet owners are responsible for their animals and should be legally required to take



responsibility for any damage that they do. In situations where the animal is in care and control of someone who is not the owner the guardian should have to stay behind, as well officers should reach the owner and discuss the situation with them.

- So that the issue can be addressed.
- Absolutely. This shouldn't even be a question. If something happens due to the bite someone needs to be held responsible so contact info is a must.
- Ideally information is collected when it's fresh not later when things get forgotten or become hazy.
- It is important that responsible dog owners discuss their dogs vaccinations and any situations of elevated risk with a person or owner of an animal. If a dog owner flees a situation where this occurs, they should be held liable.
- if they don't stay then fine should double
- If a dog has reacted then that is usually sign the dog needs help, yes the one that reacted help!! Some dog owners don't realize that and getting them some helpful information would be good that an enforcement officer can provide. Also there are far to many owners that just take off cause they don't want to pay a vet bill or get in trouble so people are left without answers like "is your dog vaccinated?". More accountability needs to be met from dog owners with this.
- It's the owners responsibility to answer for a misbehaving dog
- They are responsible for the behaviour of their dog and should follow up.
- All owners should be accountable for their dogs behaviour. Ensuring the dog owner stay at the scene so both sides of the incident can be heard and taken into consideration
- Yes, they need to be held responsible for their dog.
- If this was a case that the dog was a repeat offender, if you will, this will give the owner an opportunity to take a class in managing their dog. There's dogs at the dog park that are smaller breeds, like a Chihuahua that have been more aggressive than a large breed.
- It needs to be somehow recorded if someone has had multiple offenses with their dog to determine if it needs training etc.
- Owners should be held responsible for an injury caused by their dog. Especially if it was an unprovoked attack
- I think both parties should be required to stay on the scene - just because a dog bites does not always mean it is the dog's fault (i.e. an off-leash dog charges on on-leash dog and the on leash dog bites)
- As per owners we have to be accountable!
- This seems obvious unless I'm over looking something
- A bite is equivalent to an assault. Leaving after your dog has bitten would be the same thing as leaving the scene of a crime.
- I believe this is fair as there could be complications after and the owner of the dog in the incident should be responsible for any vet bills
- The owner needs to provide proof of rabies vaccines and be held accountable for the damages their pet has caused. It is also in their best interest to stay in order to provide their own version of events



- I believe that if a dog bites a person or another animal, the responsible thing to do is to remain at the scene to allow any gathering of information. By walking away, you are being an irresponsible pet owner and human being and probably shouldn't own a pet.
- I cannot see a reason why the dog owner would be allowed to leave if their dog bites someone. Dog owners MUST be responsible for their pets.
- If a dog bites someone or something the owner should definitely be expected to stay at the scene until they have spoken to an enforcement officer of some kind.
- Taking responsibility for your pets actions. Common sense.
- I would think this is more important than a car accident. If a animal bit my son I would want the owner to stay and get his info more than I would a car accident. Being attacked by an animal can create mental and physical issues so the owner of the dog should be held responsible to cover all costs in therapy if needed and any physical appointments needed.
- There are always two sides to a story so it would be Important to know if the incident was in self defence or not
- if any dogs bites someone, the owner should definitely stay and wait for police, as I consider it the same as hitting a vehicle
- Just like a car accident, the dog owner should be obligated to share contact info in addition to staying nearby
- Increases responsibility of owners to train dogs or understand their dog's behavior
- I think responsible dog owners already do this. The issue at hand is not dog breed, it is irresponsible pet ownership. Staying at the scene is the responsible thing to do as it facilitates follow-up on the dog's health records (e.g., rabies vaccinations) and potentially any history of aggressive or violent behaviour. This should apply to ALL breeds - the only people I know who have been bitten by dogs were all bitten by small breeds not being discriminated against in the language used above.
- Just like an accident scene
- Only if it happens outside of an off-leash dog park. My dog has bit ans also been bit by other dogs as a result of overplay (or 1 way play) at off leash dog parks.
- Seems fair
- Its like a car accident. In case anything else is needed.
- Similar to a car accident if damage is done responsible parties should be required to exchange information.
- the need to collect information and to manage future problems?
- To prove they are a responsible dog owner and to explain the situation
- Owners/person with the dog should be held responsible, so it is important to identify owners/person with the dog.
- Must be able to identify the dog and hold the owner responsible
- I believe both parties should have to remain at the scene unless the dog that was bitten/attacked needs to get to a vet right away.
- Always. The owner should be responsible for any and all vet or medical bills and should be present to talk to an enforcement officer as the typical person is not qualified to assess severity



- Make it an expectation to train your dog. If you don't train the dog, and be responsible for the dog (regardless of breed) it should be treated like driving a car with no license.
- Just like any crime you should stay at the scene
- You'd stay at the scene of a car accident
- accountability, receive a fine.
- The owner is normally the start of a nuisance animal, not the breed.
- Owner of offending dog must be responsible for costs of injured dog, etc
- As someone who has been attacked by a dog and witnessed a dog being bit not too long ago I feel like it is no different than a car accident... Give the information if it was your dogs fault you should be fined and paying for the vet bills as well.
- Must exchange information.
- A responsible owner will be willing to take this step. This will encourage that.
- Obviously a person needs to be held accountable for the actions of their dog.
- This would be helpful if the case is required to go to court.
- I have worked at a vet for 4 years, and since have dealt with easily over 200 dog bite injury patients and their owners, the amount of people that were able to get the other dog owners information I can count on two hands, the amount that actually followed through and contributed to the invoice, paid it in full, or showed the consideration or empathy they should have I can count on one. People would be help responsible for their kids and themselves if they hurt another being, we need to hold owners accountable for when their pets injure something. If owners were more educated on the repercussions of sticking around and were not under the false impression it would automatically be seized and more than likely euthanized, maybe my experience with this would be different. In the mean time I think something needs to be in place to enforce owners to remain on the scene and some sort of repercussion for not doing so.
- They are responsible for the animal and must be held accountable for the actions of the animal
- As stated previously, a pet(s) behavior is 100% the responsibility of the owner. If they dont train and treat their pet correctly things go wrong. They need to be held accountable and be able to explain to the responders what happened.
- This seems like common sense. If your dog bites someone you're responsible.
- Like a car accident, you should make sure the other party is ok or offer first aid if possible. There may be times though where the offending dog needs to leave to deescalate the situation. There should be an exchange of contact information.
- Always, but I don't always agree that the dog that bit was in the wrong. A fair judgment should be made once both sides of the story are heard
- I hear stories of people leaving the scene and it is only afterwards that the injured party becomes aware of a bad bite, etc. Only makes sense to exchange info (just like in a car accident).
- I can't believe this isn't a rule already.
- What about that answer requires further explanation?
- Or just providing information for later contact



- If there is a bite dog to person or dog to dog both responsible owners must assess any damage and discuss if follow up communications may be necessary and contact information exchanges.
- Of course. Do you leave the scene of an accident in a car No!
- Make a statement. Share your side of the story. A copy is given to you but should not be hours of time to wait.
- It seems like many owners leave asap to avoid being held responsible in these situations. Would be nice to have it legally required that they stay and take responsibility.
- The owner should remain on the scene. Information on past incidents etc need to be addressed
- All witnesses should be mandated to be stay as most dog on dog attacks are cause by more the just size. The size of the dog shouldn't be the only factor of wrong doing. Instigating should be equally if not more important.
- It's the right thing to do
- They should be held accountable. However, there should also be someone to keep the other side accountable too if it was a person or dog that was coming up to the other party causing the dog to act defensively.
- I dont agree with removing the owner from the animal as there is WAY to much violence that goes on behind the scenes and to many animals die because of biting someone... honestly its straight up stupid that small dogs just get pushed aside if they attack someone but as soon as a big dog does it everyone flips out and media is all over it... i thought calgary was better then this stuff clearly i was wrong ... seriously disappointed
- It is important all parties are heard and follow through on the incident
- The owner needs to take responsibility
- Accountability has to be established.
- If these owners leave, there is little chance of finding them. By the time someone gets looks after the bit and thinks to get out a cell phone camera, the offender is long gone. Maybe if they know they have to stay, they will.
- Too easy for owners to try and flee and escape responsibility
- More information for statistic and type of dog breed can be verified this way instead a false claim of what someone though the dog breed might be
- If it is serious enough that the other animal/person is severely injured, it's the responsibility of the owner to share details especially when covering other vet bills/ medical bills
- Dogs should not be biting (unless provoked). It is 100% the owners responsibility to ensure their dog is friendly toward people and other dogs. And if not, they should be wearing a muzzle or kept away from others. If a bite happens the owner should be held accountable so this doesn't happen again.
- There should be additional fines if they leave the scene just like leaving the scene of any crime. Too many owners take off if their dog bites and the recipient of the bite is left to figure out who they are and how to process charges.
- It's no different than leaving the scene of any accident. Of course they should stay put (unless there's a medical reason, such as getting the biting dog to the vet if also injured).



- I cant tell you how many times I've been attacked by these mini dog breeds at off leash parks. I have a Staffordshire Terrier I rescued and he is terrified of these pests. The owners take zero responsibility.
- Bad behavior is, in part, the responsibility of the owner.
- But I don't believe the rule will make a difference. People will stay or leave, regardless of the rule.
- Absolutely. How is this different than a hit and run? The idea that a person's dog can bite and injure (or even kill in the case of small animals) a person or dog, and their owner be allowed to walk away is frightening. I don't know why such a law doesn't exist, but it certainly should, with hefty fines to back it up.
- It is important to have BOTH sides of the issue. If the dog bites because someone is acting inappropriately around the animal and is defending itself verses biting for no reason.
- When there's a serious interaction, nobody should leave the scene unless the owner needs to remove an aggressive dog.
- That's taking basic responsibility to the animal in your care
- My son was bitten by a dog and by the time I had him calmed the dog was loaded in the car and owner fleeing the scene. It added to my distress for so many reasons.
- It is a clear incident and the responsibility of the dog owner to stay at a scene. I do not agree with the breed specific targeting made above in the survey (re: bull breeds) "the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." - please provide references for this information if you are going to state this - this targets bully breeds and will inadvertently lead to breed specific legislation which I am not in support of.
- It is impossible to track down dogs and owners in some situations, victims need support
- Dogs are animals and need to be trained. If an owner is not fit to train or handle the dog they should not have one. In the case of the bite the owner should be held responsible. It is also important to get the owners contact information to ensure the dog is up to date on shots.
- Absolutely. This is part of being a responsible dog owner. No different from traffic accidents.
- only if the dog is not continuing to be aggressive and depending on how long the officer make take to get there. If they're backed up and going to take 30 minutes or longer it's not a good situation to stand around and wait
- If your dog bites someone it's cruel to leave without sharing your info. Just like leaving after a car accident, it needs to be illegal.
- Dog owners need to be held responsible for their animals behavior.
- A responsible pet owner will stay. Those who choose to take off should be fined.
- hold people more accountable for the actions of their dog.
- Owners should be held accountable for the dog's behaviour. This includes the owners of small dogs who often display aggressive and dangerous behaviour, but due to the small size of the animal, these incidents are not treated with the same importance as medium or large breed dogs.
- there should be a fine if they don't stay.



- There are way too many animal attacks that happen where the owner of the attacking animal (this includes cats) leaves the scene. I think the owner of the animal that attacked should be financially responsible for any vet bills resulting from the attack.
 - The owner is responsible for the dogs actions and should remain on scene to give all information.
 - This way the owner of dog that bit has a chance to give a statement and say whether or not this was provoked or spontaneous
 - I have seen dog owners try to justify their dogs behavior and put the blame elsewhere
 - Goes the same for hit-and-run you should stay until the police come to give the information Goes the same for hit-and-run you should stay until the police come to give the information I don't need to know that the dog doesn't have rabies they are up-to-date on their shots etc.
 - Many dogs and there owners flee the scene after an incident, there needs to be some accountability.
 - You need to know information about the dog like if they have been vaccinated or not
 - Should be a common courtesy to remain at the scene. First order should be to secure their dog, but then they need to return to the scene.
 - Your dog has caused harm to someone. You should be responsible and be there too see the accident through to a final solution.
 - The owner knows the habits of the dog best.
 - Staying at the scene is integral to sorting out what happened and ensuring appropriate responsibility is taken.
 - The owner should have the chance to explain their side and be accountable
 - This is already what is expected but is not done and when people do they are often blamed when they are only part of the problem
 - "There needs to be an allowance for the owner to take their dog to safety, calm their dog down.
-
- Breed specific laws are discriminatory."
 - The owner would be able to provide much needed information-animals history and vaccination record.
 - The dog owner should be Held responsible for the attack; they need to be available to the authorities to contact; if they don't stay at the scene it can be difficult and inefficient to track them down.
 - I think it's just responsible to do so
 - This isn't the question where an explanation is most important. This survey really feels like it's pushing a preferred agenda Calgary.
 - Owners should be responsible for the actions of their dog so yes they should stay and give information.
 - They should be responsible for their dog, such as training and proper leashes and equipment on while out of the household. If the owners don't follow proper guidelines, and someone got bit because of it, they should face the repercussions.



- It's their responsibility to stay, make sure the person is okay / call an ambulance if necessary and identify themselves so the dog can be assessed if necessary.
- "Absolutely!"
- But how will you enforce this?
- "Offenders often flee immediately"
- It is important that the owner stays so the dog gets proper behaviour training to prevent another incident
- I think this is the same as a car accident. Your dog hurt someone you need to stay at the scene to provide your information.
- Owners of all breeds must take responsibility
- It is easier to get all relevant information
- Like a car accident the police are called this is an actual attack and enforcement should be there.
- There is information you need to know about the dog such as vaccinations, behavioural history, and training history.
- Full details need to be explained while all parties are there at the time of the incident.
- If a person's dog harms another person or pet, it is only fair that the owner take responsibility and remain on the scene
- I believe in responsible pet ownership and a component of that is being accountable when your pet is involved in an incident. Pet owners should be made fully aware of the requirements of pet ownership, and the rules should be made to protect the pets and their owners as well as the general community.
- My dog was attacked in Sue Higgins last week which drew blood. The owner of the other dog quickly commented that yes there was in fact blood, then walked off while I was assessing my dog. It would have been nice to get some information from him in case my dog was more injured than he appeared.
- The owner is liable for their dog's behavior as they are responsible for the training of the dog. If it is determined that it was an unprovoked, unjustified bite, then the owner should be legally responsible for any injuries incurred by their negligence in training their dog.
- Too many people and animals getting bit. My bf was attacked by 2 pit bulls in our own yard. Upstairs neighbors didn't care. They also bit my dog.
- Common sense
- Yes, depending on whether a dog needs a vet appointment immediately.
- Depending how long. The city is slow and I wouldn't expect someone to wait an hour for this. This rule should be applied to all dogs.
- It is what any responsible owner should do. Helps with vet contact info and exchange of info to the bylaw officer.
- So proper info is obtained.
- They need to take responsibility for costs. They also need to be assured that their animal won't be immediately taken away.
- This is the responsible thing to do



- Be responsible
 - Both sides must be considered. Dogs put down because bit kid hitting it with stick is wrong.
 - It's the right thing to do.
 - Part of your responsibility as a dog owner is to ensure the safety of others around you when you are out with your dog. This includes staying at the scene of an incident if it involves your dog.
 - it might be very difficult to find the offending party again, after the bite has occurred.
 - There's always two sides to a story.
 - Need to share health status of the offending animal and have the ability to follow repeat offenders. However many owners do not stay at the scene, particularly in off-leash areas
 - Accountability for your dogs actions
 - "For instance when my pit bull was attacked and I had to pay \$1500 to the vet for emergency surgery.
-
- If my pit bull was the one who attacked they would have wanted her to be put down. It's not fair or proper"
 - Unless the dog is a continued safety risk, in which case they should provide contact information to the victim or those around so they can be contacted.
 - It should be handled exactly the like a traffic accident. Both parties should remain, witnesses and witness statements should be checked so that all necessary information is documented for future reference ie. legal or court proceedings
 - Responsibility, follow up on dog, and pay any damages.
 - Of course they need to remain at the scene. If they leave the scene and can be identified and found they should be facing hefty fines.
 - I think it would hold people more accountable for an incident that may occur. And if insurance is required for nuisance animals they the victims need contact info so they can have vet expenses covered.
 - Yes, because a bite can always be avoided and the cause of the bite should be found before any party leaves a scene.
 - But there needs to be exceptions,such as dog was at large or needs to be contained in a home immediately and you can provide information withing a short amount of time
 - The owner must be held accountable. As I stated previously it is the owner that is at fault rather than the dog in most scenarios. Dogs only act as they have been taught is acceptable.
 - If you shoot someone, do you need to stay nearby? If you hit someone with your car, do you need to stay nearby? Dogs are a symptom of their owners behaviour and when you have a bad dog owner, you have dog with bad behaviours. They are nothing more than a tool or accessory to a bad human. If bad humans are held accountable for their poor rearing of ANY breed of dog, they must be held accountable.
 - It's the scene of an accident.



- Often those dealing with a bite are shocked and worried. They want to get medical treatment right away and sometimes damage is not immediately noticeable. I have been bit by a neighbor's pit bull. Luckily it was minor but the bruising was significant. The neighbor was responsible and came and sat with me while I called Healthlink to discuss steps needed.
- In the event that the victim dog requires vet care, they could get reimbursement
- The owner is liable for damages caused by their dog. They should remain on scene.
- No different than any other incident where injury may have occurred.
- People should not be allowed to run away and hide from their dog biting. As a responsible pet owner you are responsible for what your dog does.
- When a dog bites a person, the owner is responsible and accountable. NOT the dog. The owner should be required to remove the dog from the scene to make others safe and be required to present themselves to police for arrest, no different than in an assault. Someone who leaves without providing contact info or who carries in with no regard to the assault that their animal was part of should be subject to arrest and additional charges. If they cannot stay because their animal makes staying unsafe they had better call 911 and turn them self in.
- Like any accident or attack for any of us we must stay at scene or at least get each other's info.
- If there is enough damage to another person or animal it is the responsible thing to do.
- only in the case of a severe bite where blood is shed. It seems as though many irresponsible dog owners are not responsible enough to stay on scene in the event of an attack though
- You don't know where they live, if they walk away then how can it be enforced. Make it like a hit and run offence.
- Similar to a car accident. They cannot glee the scene of an accident
- As long as the dogs are contained safely. The owner must leave their contact information
- Transparency
- Like owning a car. Must be responsible owner
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs actions
- owners should be held liable for a dog bite, not the breed :)
- It's like a hit and run scenario with a car- don't leave the scene if your dog. It's a human or other dog/cat etc.
- You need to be a responsible dog owner, maybe making people stay will make them train their dogs properly
- Any dog can bite, the owner should be responsible for any and all mishaps
- Any responsible dog owner would stay on scene.
- this is dependent on the severity of the bite.. a small nip that was not intentional or did not cause harm does not warrant enforcement actions.
- No different than a Motor vehicle accident.
- Their dog hurt someone or something and they should be held accountable
- I think it is similar to a car accident and there should be information exchanged and potentially an investigation based on the severity of the incident.



- If your dog did nothing wrong, you have no reason to leave
- Dog attacks should be treated like car accidents and neither party should be allowed to flee the scene until authority comes or until situation between two parties is assessed and appropriate information was handed over.
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs action whether it was provoked or not.
- People taking off are not responsible owners. Like a vehicular accident
- Same as a car accident. Stay at the scene and defend what happened
- Well trained dogs do not bit until there is a reason.
- if your dog does harm to another person or animal then you should take responsibility and remain on the scene, Otherwise be fined at a higher rate for leaving and having the authorities track you down
- because it is your responsibility to care for your animal and others...
- The owner is responsible for their pet's behaviour and should be held accountable for the outcomes of the incident. This could include fines and being responsible for costs incurred due to the incident.
- It shows they are a good owner and want to do what is best
- This should be required for all breeds of dog of any size not just pit bulls and pit bull like breeds. I myself have been bitten by smaller "less aggressive" Chihuahuas. Just for the sake of following up with whom got bitten and make sure the person is still okay after the incident. We are all aware pit bulls have a more intense bite but with proper training and care they are the sweetest breed next to a golden retriever. People who wish to own pit bulls should require back ground checks to ensure they will care properly for the dog and will not be abused that leads to aggression in any dog
- Sometimes these bites are serious and require medical attention especially with another animal and if required that person should have to cover the cost. But they should also consider the situation, sometimes it is the other animal that starts it and the dog is protecting himself. Just like a human would protect himself if someone attacks them, this should be no different.
- Yes, however it is important to ensure the dog is also removed from the situation immediately to prevent the dog from attacking again.
- I agree that contact information should be shared. However, the person with the dog that but may need to get their dog to a safer location to calm down rather than staying around in a stressful situation.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their animal's behaviour
- Same as if a person harms another, that person would have to stay on the scene. Same if a dog does so, the responsible party needs to stay
- Owner's need to be held responsible if their dog bites someone.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions and are liable for any injury
- The owner of the dog is responsible for the dogs actions and should remain at the scene. Just as you remain at the scene for a car accident.
- With any incident both parties should share the appropriate contact information with any all people
- if time is an issue then the dog owner should give his contact info to the victim
- Too many people "hit and run" so to speak



- Owners should take responsibility for their dogs actions. They should stay, exchange info and have to repay expenses incurred by the victim
- Same as a car accident. If there's a problem involving you, you should not be allowed to leave.
- It's the right thing to do. It is what a responsible dog owner should do.
- I believe that the owner is soling responsible for their pet. They need to be held accountable for their actions.
- It would depend on circumstances. If the dog is hurt and needs medical attention they should get it. The contact info should be given to other person/owner that was bit if that is the case.
- Take responsibility.... it's the humans fault.
- The owner needs to be accountable for the dog's behavior
- Just like a car accident information should be shared cause of damages and injuries
- Of course. Just like you when you are in a car accident. Stay and get the incident reported from both sides.
- Because both side are heard
- People must be help responsible and almost to be able to explain if the bite simply wasn't the dogs fault (antagonized or provoked)
- ownership goes beyond just the animal. It is irresponsible to leave a scene where a dog has bitten without resolving the situation.
- Just like a car accident ... people need to be held accountable if they don't stay and are tracked down later there should be a provision similar to leaving a scene of an accident and incur extra penalties
- Any responsible pet owner should be willing to do this
- Depending on the severity of the bite I feel it is required to do so.
- If the dog bite someone, it was out of 3 reasons, one being you were getting too close to the owner and pitbulls are natural guard/nanny dogs, two you seemed thretening or the dog was scared of you. And three, if there was a severe bite, then yes there should be info taken
- I've heard of many dogs and or people being attacked by dogs at the dog park and then the owner of the attacker takes off and leaves the victim and there are no repercussions. I feel like this is absolutely disgusting and the owner should be held accountable.
- A person should have to stay if their dog bites another person. They should be responsible for their dog.
- There is always a reason and explanation . The owner is responsible for the accident. Not the dog if it is put in a place where they are not comfortable and scared that is on the owner . The owner is setting the dog up for failure if they are putting the dog at risk of biting or attacking anything . The owner is responsible for ensuring the dog is in a safe and good environment where the dog can be free and understand it's surroundings.
- The owner of that dog that bites another should be responsible for any vet costs and also it should be noted on the Cit of Calgary website under that dogs name/license
- Absolutely, I think if your dog regardless of the breed the owner needs to take responsibility for their dog.



- The dog is the owners responsibility so should be required to address the issue
- we must be accountable for our pets and its the right thing to do.
- It's never the dogs fault it's an irresponsible owner that has not provided proper training and socialization. The owner is responsible and should be punished for not being able to control their dog.
- If my dog bit someone that is on me not my dog that means I have not trained my dog properly or need to take it to training .
- Animal protection
- If one dog bites another dog, and they need medical help, the owner of the dog that bit should pay.
- It is the same as any accident. You need to be responsible for the actions of yourself and your family (the pet). The owner is usually a large part of the problem by not knowing how to properly train or look after the animals needs. By requiring that they speak to an enforcement officer, hopefully they will get the education they need to prevent future incidents.
- Too many owners quickly leave the scene when a bite occurs. It should be like a car accident
- Again - the owner should be held accountable and fleeing the scene of an "incident"• is not right.
- Get All medical history of dog, law enforcement doesn't usually help and shouldn't be there unless summoned by victim
- Well maybe the dog was provoked . Information from both parties is important to get to the facts. If said dog has never been in an altercation before with other dogs, maybe said dog felt threatened, and reacted accordingly.
- The dog owner is often the one at fault and not the dog. Dogs are raised and act according to the way they were raised. Also dog owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- Just handle things appropriately charging people more money and having pit bulls on the list to add more trouble and money to your bank is ridiculous.
- You can't leave the scene of a vehicle crash, the same needs to apply to a dog bite. If them staying with the dog is not an option due to an aggressive dog or emergency care is required, then the information needs to be left with someone at the scene or the person needs to call the police and report the incident and give personal information for the situation to be dealt with, the day of the incident.
- My little dog was attacked at the dog park and the other owner did not have any consequences. That dog should have been required training or something
- No different than a hit and run if they leave
- It's not the dogs fault it's the owner that hasn't trained or treated their dog properly
- All owners should be responsible for the actions of their pet.
- Treat it like an accident. If you leave before an officer gets there, they cannot fully determine what happened.
- I think it is important to tell your side of the story.
- At minimum contact information should be given; but staying in a heightened situation with a dog(s) in the red zone this may not always be possible



- Unless there is a need to have the dog removed from the scene immediately in which the owner should at least leave contact information with victim and then contact bylaw and explain what happened
- Absolutely, the owner should remain on site to ensure contact info is given should there be medical costs to the individual bit, as well as an investigation into why the animal bit
- Like a car accident exchange info and call city by law officer to at their time contact both.
- Too many owners are not responsible pet owners, and it hurts the responsible owners.
- If a dog bites someone else it's that dogs owners responsibility
- It encourages owners to take responsibility for the actions of their animals (although I am aware irresponsible owners will likely not stay).
- While it will be difficult to enforce, the fact that people can hide a potentially dangerous dog by running away, is unacceptable.
- I don't see how this is different from any other accident scene. I think they should also be charged if they do leave the scene.
- The owner should be responsible to pay for other animals vet bill
- I believe sharing information or having a police officer present would create a safer space and help unfold what had exactly occurred during the incident. Hopefully removing prejudice from the dogs breed.
- Its common decency to right a wrong.
- There should be a specific branch of Bylaw services which handles dog bites.
- The owner of the animal should definitely take responsibility for the bite and ensure that the other person/animal is okay, or pay for any needed medical attention.
- People must be accountable for their dogs behaviour regardless of breed or size
- Your dog is your responsibility, if your dog injures someone or another animal, you should be responsible for the vet costs.
- Dog owners should be responsible for their dogs actions. Staying at the scene is an important part of that.
- You can't hit someone/something with your car and walk away. A dog bite or incident should be no different.
- As long as the officers involved get both sides of the story. A dog can bite someone because they are poorly trained, or because they were provoked. A dog who was provoked into biting someone should not be punished, the person who did the provoking should be.
- Same as a car accident. Get facts and both sides of the story. Sometimes the dogs are threatened and have the right to protect themselves.
- They are responsible for their dogs actions and should be accountable
- If the person do not remain at the scene than it is difficult to gather the information. We need the people involved in car accidents to remain at the scene so why not dog bites?
- The faster you discuss the situation the more chances you get at getting all the information of the incident unaltered which usually occurs when the incident becomes a memory and it is no longer 100% unchanged



- My dog was bit by a large mixed breed and by the time I found the bite the owner of the other dog was gone. It was an unprovoked attack, the other dog was hiding in the bushes and ran out and launched itself on my dog while she was running ahead of me in Edworthy offleash area a couple years ago
- The dog is your "property"• and has been involved in a "crime"• similar to, or defined as assault. Therefore, the owner should remain at the scene to give their account of the incident and be held accountable if deemed at fault. It should require ALL parties involved to remain at the scene to ensure that everyone's concern and account of the incident is given.
- If a dog/human is attacked by another dog then yes they should stay around because it is still an accident. You would stay if you crashed into someone or witnessed a fight so I think it is reasonable to stay and change information, however I think it is also important to separate the animals in their respective vehicles if possible
- Responsibility for dogs lay with the owner. We should not blame a dog for their actions, they can't speak for themselves.
- Owners should not only have to share their info but given the opportunity to share their side of what happened. The dog that bit may not have done it without being provoked or attacked themselves. Unfortunately stigmas against certain breeds automatically put the blame solely on them when often it's been due to defending themselves or their family
- Its the same as a traffic accident....consequences should be had
- As long as they feasably can. If its too dangerous then no
- Any responsible dog owner would share their information.
- It's the fastest way to gather all information
- All dog owners need to be held accountable. It should be a criminal charge just as if you left the scene of a car accident
- Owners should be held accountable for dog bites, as they must be in control of their dog.
- Its common sense!
- Everybody needs to be held accountable for there pets actions.
- No different then any other incident.
- It's like a car accident. Everyone should take care of each other and make sure no one skips out until it's time.
- It depends on the severity. Dogs bite each other from time to time. If a dog bites a person I believe it should be up to the parties involved to determine the next step. If the person bit wants to call bylaw then the dog owner should be required to stay to explain their side of the event
- Owners need to be accountable. Our dog was bit and seemed ok (with only a minor wound). The offending owner left the scene without providing any contact info. Our dog went on to have a terrible infection days later which needed vet care.
- They should stay as there have been incidents of people providing false information.
- Owners must represent and take responsibility for their dog
- Dog owners should always be responsible for their dogs. Hold them more responsible



- It is similar to a car accident - yes, it was an accident but you are responsible for your actions and the actions of your dependents
- If your dog injures another dog or person it is your responsibility, no different than a car accident
- It is ethically right to stay on scene, how would a dog attack be any different than a car accident
- It's like remaining on the scene of an accident... but the problem with dog owners is that they do not take responsibility and will likely leave. There is no "license plate" to track so how would anyone even know who the dog owner is or where they live? Bylaw officers are nonresponsive and have never shown up quickly to any incident that I have seen... and police defer dog incidents to bylaw... trying to get through to 311 is impossible.
- It's important to gather all relevant info from both parties
- To take accountability and to explain the incident
- Pet owners need to be held responsible for their pets, similar to an incident with a vehicle accident
- That is the responsible thing to do
- Dog owners must be held accountable for their pets actions
- People need to take responsibility for losing control of their animals. It is the owners responsibility to train, rehabilitate and secure their animals
- yes, that is proper animal owner care. As they can share their side of the story. Just like a car accident scene.
- If the bite has caused injury contact info must be shared. If urgent or emergent care is needed care is needed this may be more difficult
- Because it is important to find out the dogs information and ensure it is not aggressive, it has up to date shots and to hold the owner accountable.
- dog owners need to be held responsible for their dogs behaviour. If they leave the scene of the crime the owner should be charged accordingly as well as be legally obligated to pay all necessary vet bills for the injured or attacked dog
- "It should include all dogs. The only potential problem is the safety of people and the animals. During these incidents things could be heated which could make matters worse and more heated, waiting for the response time of a bylaw official.
- It would be better to use cell phones and technology to exchange information or photo/ video. Especially in a public park or off leash there should not be a privacy issue."
- follow up is needed , owner info is available
- Must be held accountable.
- As when any crime is committed, it is required for all individuals involved, and all witnesses, to remain at the scene of the crime regardless. IT IS ALREADY LAW FOR ANY OF YOU NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH TO KNOW BASIC LAW.
- They must accept responsibility for their dog's actions.
- I think that is a good idea.
- They need to stay on scene to accept responsibility
- Owners should be responsible and accountable, especially because most of these incidences occur while dogs are off leash.



- Of course! It's no different than leaving the scene of a car accident.
- Just like the drivers in a serious vehicle accident the owner should be required to remain at the scene. This allows the determination if the animal is licensed, has had its shots etc.
- It is no different than a traffic accident. If you leave the scene prematurely you are charged with a hit and run. Same should happen if your dog bites someone and you take off.
- Although if they are unable to control their dog or they attacked person or dog need immediate medical attention this won't always work
- Would be the same as staying at the scene of the accident, get more information quickly
- Owner must understand seriousness of the incident
- You need to know if this dog has been given its shots and the owner needs to be aware of what the person is going through who has been bitten.
- Removing euthanasia penalty would encourage owners to stay at the scene as well
- Yes, due to others as you would want to be done to you. I have stayed. I do the right thing. It is called being a responsible dog owner.
- Same as an automobile accident if you are part of an incident you need to remain on site or be charged for leaving scene of incident
- follow-up may be needed for insurance purposes & vaccinations. Also that way we can track down nuisance animals.
- My dog has been bitten and false contact information was given and they took off as quickly as possible
- Often the dog and owner disappear after a bite and there is no way to know the health of the dog who did the bite.
- Absolutely!!! If not, the owner could flee, allowing the dog to become a repeat offender.
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets.
- so all answers are told and we know the dog and to tell if he or she are good pet owners
Responsible
- People need to be responsible for their pets and if their pet causes damage to someone else they need to pay for it
- This is part of being a responsible owner of that dog. Running away should be like a drunk running from the scene of an accident and extra-fine should be assessed or community service applied.
- I believe it would add accountability for owners, which is the bigger issue than a breed ban that WILL NOT WORK.
- It is the owner's responsibility to look after their pet, so remaining at the scene is vital
- There are too many cases of people fleeing from the scene leaving owners with large vet bills
- Being a dog owner, I understand that it is a risk to allow my dog off leash. I should be responsible and ensure that my dog does not attack or bite anyone but in the event that it does occur, it is important to ensure everyone involved is safe and uninjured.
- Being responsible for your pet.
- This is the minimum amount of responsibility - much like staying on scene of a vehicle accident.



- Dog behaviors typically lie with the owner, meaning, a dog is aggressive cause the owner is aggressive towards the dog. I strongly believe in most cases (if not all) the owner has full responsibility for dogs being aggressive therefor should have to be held accountable.
- Owner needs to be held responsible
- Just like an accident, they need to remain so that any required follow-up can happen. Leaving is likely an indicator that the dog has done this before.
- This allows the owner to explain the situation as a witness and makes the owner responsible for the dogs actions
- I think it's important that the dog and the owner share in the responsibility for the dog's actions.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dog's behaviour. It should not be up to the victim to track them down after the fact, they should be required to remain at the scene and speak with an officer.
- Yes because if ANY TYPE OF DOG !!! Even a Chihuahua bites a responsible owner makes sure everyone is okay and if further has to swap numbers should.
- Same if a human drove into another car.
- Yes, so it can be found out if the dog is up to date on it's vaccination. Also so the owner can be held responsible for not training their dog correctly.
- I answered yes...it's self explanatory.
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets' actions.
- This would give the owner a chance to explain the situation from their point of view, as well as allow the official to educate the owner or notify them of repercussions.
- I see it as no different as a car accident. You remain on scene until authorities are present.
- All owners of dogs should held accountable . As it is their responsibility to make sure their dog is trained properly , it is not the dogs job.
- It is no different than an accident in a car.
- Please don't take bad ownership out on pitfalls. Ive owned one for my whole life theyve never done anything wrong. Go after owners not dogs. Dogs are bad they're made bad and id be disappointed if calgary turned into the east coast
- It's beyond important any dog owner or any shape of size dog be responsible for any other there dogs actions!
- Too often the bite occurs and the offending leaves. More bylaws are required to hold people accountable.
- The dog owner should always be responsible for there dog REGARDLESS OF THE BREED. Stop discriminating the breeds!!
- People need to be held accountable for their pets. (Ie covering a vet bill if your dog injured another dog)
- Both sides should tell their story for full disclosure and information sharing
- They are responsible for vet costs. If they leave and are not located the victim owner is on the hook for costs



- Just as in a vehicular accident. Remaining at the site and exchanging of information should be necessary
- Dog biting strangers for no reason should be put to sleep
- This is common sense for any responsible dog owner unless it's a wild animal
- That's what a responsible dog owner should do. This way they would know who the owner of the dog is and they would be liable to cover any medical costs associated to the incident.
- The owner of the dog should be responsible for its actions. Only fearful, misunderstood dogs will bite and the owner should stay to calm the animals and diffuse the situation. Also the owner should assist in any way they can to the victim.
- I think it should be the same for all animals, if someone's cat attacks my dog I should be able to obtain information from the owner and officers to help myself and my own animals.
- As a dog owner, it really is just the responsible thing to do.
- Always two sides to the coin. I think there is a higher chance of the dog having a case if the owner gives their input on scene.
- I think regardless of breed, anybody who has an animal who has bitten another person or another animal should be held responsible and needs to understand their responsibility as an animal owner.
- I think this is a given. Absolutely inappropriate to leave the scene if your dog has been involved in an incident
- At the very least they should stay on scene to explain what's happened and if it was The dog's fault
- Of course no one should leave the scene of an accident.
- It's required for anyone in a vehicle injury accident and should be the same for pet owners who's animal injures another person or their pet. Trying to track them down after the fact can sometimes be impossible. If you need to be responsibly liable behind the wheel, then you should be equally responsibly liable for your pet.
- There is always 2 sides to every story and both need to have their say.
- You're required to do this in a vehicle accident where something under your control may have injured someone else or caused damage - why would it be any different if a dog under your control may have injured someone!?
- Responsible ownership is the most important part of dealing with nuisance dogs. Owners need to be held accountable for their dogs and breed should have no part in the decision making process.
- My submissive dog has been attacked twice at offleash parks, now. The first time the other owner ran over to make sure she was okay and apologize, and removed his dog. The second time, the dog owner did nothing to discipline or correct. The dog had instigated a few times before our paths crossed. He should not have had a dog.
- Simple. It should be like a car accident. You stay to discuss. You provide info and in a perfect world, offer to pay vet bills.
- Unless one of them are severely injured, the ONLY cause for a dog bite is an ill trained dog. Sometimes that can be the victimized dog as well.



- If you hit someone with your car what do you do? Do you stay and give info or do you leave? Responsible pet owners should already be doing the right thing but there is a few that are malicious or don't care.
- Absolutely, a bite can occurs for many reasons. Dogs bite because they feel threatened. What ever is causing this, is also a problem. The owner should stay on the scene to explain his side of the story. Because many dog owners don't know how to read dog behaviour.
- if you have a car accident you need to stay at the scene. It makes sense.
- More information is always helpful with investigating what happened
- Though not practical if dog is at large when the event occurs.
- It's not always obvious the dog bit someone. For example, it was only after we returned home one day from the dog park that we realized a smaller dog had bitten our dog and drawn a small amount of blood. We knew the smaller dog came up and attacked our dog but did not realize the severity, therefore obviously that owner would not remain on the scene/provide contact information.
- Absolutely! The amount of damage that may (or may not) have been caused could be exponential, and not able to be assessed in the heat of the moment. Out of everything on this survey, I would support this the most.
- Any responsibility dog owner should remain at scene to talk to officers. How else would they know if the injured party requires medical attention and how to get in touch with them.
- People need to be responsible for their pets actions. Held accountable for that dogs actions.
- Its like leaving the scene of an accident. You dont do that. Why would you leave the scene of a dog attack?
- Absolutely, take it in a sense of a vechile hitting another. Everyone should remain on scene unless a common ground is spoken between the two parties involved.
- Just like staying at the scene of a car accident.
- As someone who has experienced my dog being severely attacked by another dog, it's imperative that the owners of the vicious dog be accountable for the incident. Too often they simply disappear with the dog and nothing can be done. However I believe the appropriate amount of resources must be available to actually manage this issue. It's one thing to put bylaws in place, it's another thing to be able to enforce and address them
- Owners must be responsible for their pets.
- You are responsible for your dogs behaviour , there for you should be obligated to give your information to the person. If you know you have a dog that bites don't set them up for failure!
- They need to be held accountable
- Just like a hit and run
- The owner is responsible for the dog and so should remain to be accountable for its actions. Face consequences and review need for additional training, muzzle etc
- Both parties should have to stay and declare their side of the story including witnesses. It is a part of responsible pet ownership.
- Dog bites happen and it is rarely the dogs fault. Owners need to be held responsible for their own training a d that of the dog. Post incident they should be required to complete a minimum of 6



reactive dog classes mostly to teach the owner about responsible handling. We have a reactive dog and these classes taught us about how to handle him in public safely as most people have no idea how to be around dogs. It was training for us the owners that made the difference.

- Dog owners need to take responsibility. Leaving a scene is like a hit and run, however they would have to be at a safe distance as dogs need to be removed from the trigger (what caused them to bite/attack) in order to calm.
- This should be the case for any event where you or your pets/kids cause harm.
- A dogs behavior is a reflection of the owner.
- Dog owners are just as responsible for the incident as the dog. Without requiring the owners (or whoever is responsible for the dog at the time of the incident) to remain at the scene, there is no way to gather both sides of the story. In some cases the actual incident could have been provoked by the person/dog who is claiming they were attacked. If there were a fine for leaving the scene this may also be an incentive for people to stay.
- Thus is tricky as they also need to remove the dog.
- Responsibility for your dogs actions lies with the owner/walker, not the dog itself
- Owners should be responsible for their dogs actions
- dog owners need to be accountable for their dog's behavior
- Same as a car accident. Must stay and take care of the issue.
- No different than a car accident, if someone is injured because of you or your dog you wait for help.
- my dogs have been bit by other dogs. Often the other person doesn't even ask if my dog is ok
- The person needs to take responsibility for what there animal has done. The only reason why they should leave is to take that dog home. Then that person needs to come back.
- Owners need to take responsibility
- The dog owner should be responsible to pay for any vet bills or other problems caused by their dog.
- It's common courtesy. But I think people don't because they're afraid their dog will be euthanized. Sometimes a bite will happen in play or unintentionally. Usually the person who thinks their dog has been attacked doesn't understand certain behaviors in dogs and doesn't know the difference in dogs body language
- This to me would be the same as a hit and run. If someone's dog bites mine, or vice versa, contact information should be shared and the owner of offending dog be required to pay vet bills for the dog attacked. Unless in an off leash area, if my dog (on leash) is attacked by a dog off leash, then the offending off leash dog would be liable
- IF there is a fair process, where people are given options to retrain their dog, and get assistance training themselves how to train their dog then yes. IF the city is just going to euthanize animals, impose massive fines and offer NO assistance then no I do not agree.
- Leaving the scene of a traffic incident is considered a crime, why should a pet-owner be let off the hook?
- My submissive dog has been attacked twice at offleash paros, now. In one instance, the owner ran over, apologized and checked my dog to ensure she was okay. The second time, the owner did nothing to correct or discipline. He should clearly not have dogs. He should not be allowed at



offleash parks - his dog had instigated with a few other dogs before we crossed paths. I would have liked the option to get his information (though I realize that would have been highly unlikely).

- I've had my dog attacked multiple times while running on leash, until I get my phone out and can take a picture of the owner they are always trying to leave the scene and run away. I believe harsher penalties for leaving the scene could encourage someone to see the process through.
 - This is like a hit and run, should be treated as such
 - We need to times a dog bite is because it's protecting itself from another dog. Or from a human having the understanding of what happened at the time is important many times you will discover it is actually the owners fault and not the dog
 - "I think that they should have to share contact information. Depending on severity I think it's necessary for the dog owner to remain at the scene and/or contact ems (for people) or and emergency vet (for pets) if the wound is moderate to severe.
-
- I do not think giving fines is the answer for this stuff I think rather than fining first time offenders we should be mandating training for their animals. It's not the breed of dog that's the problem it's the training they've had from their owners."
 - The bite could be more serious and require medical attention. We need to have medical history (rabies vaccine for example) and owner should cover costs of any surgeries required.
 - How can someone be held responsible if their dogs bites someone and they leave the scene?
 - owners need to be held accountable.
 - It is the owners fault they didn't have control of their dog so they need to take responsibility
 - People need to be held accountable for when their dog bites somebody.
 - It is important that there share in event of vet or medical assistance needed and to determine if pet has adequate vaccines
 - So many people leave the scene and are never seen again . Just like a car accident if you leave the scene should be a criminal charge .
 - Same as any other accident. Take responsibility.
 - An owner is responsible for their animal the same way they are responsible for their vehicle. They should always be in control of their animal. And if you get into a car wreck, you are required to stay to access the damages and provide information. Only makes sense that if your animal hurts someone, you should stay to make sure the right steps are taken. A lot of people would not stay, because they would be afraid of having their animal euthanized. If that option was removed for say, the additional training or a training rehab program, perhaps people would be more likely to remain at the scene.
 - It should be treated as if it were a motor vehicle accident.
 - yes, the offending owner needs to be identified as well and tracked as they are usually the problem and not always the animal.
 - If they leave, how do I find them?



- Will allow for enforcement of bylaw requirements and provide an opportunity for education of owner. Will ensure that any necessary information for treatment of the injured person or dog is obtained or can be obtained.
- Same as a car accident, you remain at the scene and exchange information. Totally reasonable
- regardless of breed or size owners need to be held responsible
- Just to make sure the pet is up to date with vaccines, the dogs normal behaviour and discuss behaviour training
- We should be responsible for our dogs actions just as we are for our own actions and those of our children. It would never be acceptable to leave a scene if yourself or your child injured someone as you would be responsible for damages. The same should be true when your dog hurts someone.
- Dogs can be like a weapon sometimes.
- The dog is your responsibility. The training is your responsibility it's not solely a "breed" situation.
- owner needs to take responsibility just like a vehicle accident
- It is normal to stay because he/she was the dog owner.
- Only if no attempt to seize said dog is made.
- same as a car accident
- Presumes that enforcement officer attendance is timely.
- Yes cause that way it can be sorted out properly
- Rehabilitation is what we use for criminals, it should be the same for dogs. This allows follow up and proper resources for such rehabilitation.
- everyone needs to take responsibility when an incident happens.
- Pet owners must be held accountable for their animal's actions.
- No euthanasia
- Owners need to be held responsible, and take responsibility.
- N/a
- Should be no different from a car accident or personal property incident as long as the parties involved don't require immediate medical care.
- I
- It is the owner responsibility to train their dogs. dogs will defend their territories, but it's up to the owner to correct bad behaviour.
- All owners are responsible for their dogs, just like we must share contact info for a car accident I believe it should be the same for a dog incident.
- The owner of a dog is responsible for it's behaviour, therefore owners should be required to stay at the scene of property destruction or bites.
- if a human can't leave the scene of a crime they are involved in, the animal and it's owner shouldn't be allowed to leave either
- Yes, the owner is responsible for the dog, therefore, responsible for his/her actions.
- The same as an auto accident wait for the authorities
- It allows insurance (if applicable) to be exchanged, fines and court appearances to be issued



- Just like a car accident, people have to be responsible for what happened. Not run away and hide.
- Much like a car accident. If your dog bites you should be responsible and share info
- Of course. Even a person in a car accident should remain at the scene. He said/ she said Happens frequently. One persons depiction on an incident can be completely different then another's. And especially anyone with a bully breed type dog may need to defend their dog. Just because they can do the most damage doesn't mean the other dog doesn't need manners.
- Provided it applies to ALL dogs
- All dog attacks must be treated, and the pet owner should be held responsible for any damages
- If the dog bit is major or harm is done then the owner of the offending dog should be held accountable financially and or legally.
- Most dog bites against other animals don't initially seem to be that bad but once inspected by a vet can be far more serious. By leaving the scene, these dog owners are not being held responsible for their dogs actions
- Fines must be handed out to deter another incident. Owner must be aware this cannot happen
- I expect any animal owner, not just pit bulls, ANY BREED to stay at or report The issue.
- If a dog, ANY BREED OF DOG, has hurt someone, it's the owners responsibility to stay there.
- -
- It requires owners to be responsible
- Of course. Having them not stay at scene completely defeats any reasonable attempt at remediation, restitution, or corrective actions. May as well allow people to hit and run if they're allowed to have their dog bite someone and walk away without concern.
- Too many people just leave and are not taking responsibility for their dogs behaviour
- Ownership of a pet is a responsibility.
- Many individuals whose animals have been the aggressors often leave the scene which means it is very difficult to contact them again regarding the health status of the animal/ connect with them regarding payment for the injuries. I would support both members being required to stay so long as the dogs were being taken care of appropriately (e.g. if a dog was in critical condition and needed to see a vet that would need to be done by the person first or by a partner/ someone who can do so)
- Just like any other accident the owner should be held accountable and stuck around to speak with officers
- Owners of these types of dogs are either very responsible pet owners or the opposite. The dogs that bite are usually owned by the irresponsible owners - they should be forced to account for the incident to police or animal control.
- If the victim animal has sustained significant harm, the antagonist or attacking owner should be somewhat responsible for any cost incurred by the victim owner. I do believe that in some circumstances the at fault owner should not be charged by an enforcement officer but educated and advised to take an appropriate behaviour course with the animal.
- I believe the pet owners should remain at the scene. They should also have to cover Vertinairan costs (in accordance to the attack)



- The owner should give information as to why the bite happened. If it is a one-off, no-problem, but repeat offenders should be given orders for training, fined, and monitored.
- It's for the safety of everyone
- I think the reason for the bite needs to be addressed and explored. The actions of a dog are the responsibility of the owner and thus they need to take responsibility and speak with the individual or other owners. I don't think it is necessary to speak to an officer unless the incident was moderate to severe.
- and no. getting the dog away from the scene and preventing further trauma (mental or physical) to the victim is most important. if the dog owner is able to get someone to come and retrieve the dog, then yes. they should stay. contact information should be exchanged regardless.
- This should already be law. If you flee the scene, further charges should be laid. Though it should be case by case. If someone runs up to a dog and pets it without permission and gets bit. That person should get in trouble as well for now endangering that dog by risking it being euthanized. Dangerous dogs should be labelled dangerous as well when in public.
- As long as officers were timely and non-breed prejudiced
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets' behaviour. This includes paying vet bills when an injury is sustained to another dog. The contact information is necessary to enforce this.
- Dog owners should be held 100% responsible for their animals behavior. Including give the above information after a bite
- If you have to stay at the scene of car accident then why should it be any different for a bite?
- Under the correct circumstances. If medical help is needed for either party. This can be done at a later date.
- we all need to be held accountable for our pets behavior, especially if a person or animal was injured.
- That should be common sense.
- Why do you need an explanation for something that is so obvious.
- The dog should be immediately leashed and moved a distance away. But owners must stay in order to be charged
- often we don't hear both sides!! When a dog bites more often someone has provoked the dog! We never get to hear that side as people are so afraid city will just come and take their dog!!!
- Dog owners should be held accountable for their actions, and the person affected should have the choice in what they're going to do. It should be up to the person who was affected not enforcement officers.
- if a nuisance dog owner remains anonymous how does the infraction get dealt with if they take off
- If harm was caused to another dog/animal. The owner of the aggressor should be responsible for any vet bills.
- If possible. Depending on the severity of the bite. Animal health comes first.
- I believe as a dog owner we are liable and if our dog bites it is our obligation to provide our information
- There are two sides to every story.
- If not proper information could not be documented.



- A dog is a member of a household, The police should have no right to see the dog after the incident occurs because the officer may be swayed by breeds under circumstances and try to execute the dog on site. Dogs are also seen as dependant by the owner, and therefore should be the responsibility of the owners and any damage inflicted should be seen as an assault
- It's how other injury/accidents are handled without animal involvement- why wouldn't it be the same with animal involvement.
- Dog owners should be responsible for their own dogs, and what fines may occur.
- It's important to document these bites and people should take responsibility for their dog and its behaviour.
- Dog owners should not be allowed to leave, the same as an accident. So many irresponsible dog owners cause issues not only in off leash parks and need to be held responsible.
- Mixed because animal may need to be removed from situation but accurate information needs to be exchanged.
- I believe treating it like a vehicle collision & allowing the owner and affected a chance to speak with an officer is helpful.
- If a dad hits my pit I'll be in good fun, that owner needs to hold responsibility for the incident
- I'm still pissed off about the pit bull stuff to have read that we'll enough to have a response here.
- Enforce responsible dog ownership regardless of breed
- Though I do understand the risk of the situation escalating.
- Just like any other accident, the dog is their responsibility, they should have to wait
- Owners should be responsible for the harm of a person or animal. To many people run and don't pay others vet bills.
- To explain the situation and to make sure the dog has all his shots. Make sure the person is okay
- For insurance/health purposes
- The owner of the dog should be held responsible for any damage done.
- If the biting victim (person or animal's owner) wants to call an enforcement officer, then the biting dog's owner should have to stay/give contact info. That dog and their owner should have to take obedience training and a record should be made of how many incidents in a certain time frame a dog has had before it should be considered that restrictions like keeping the dog at home to train or surrendering the dog due to owners' inability to properly train the dog.
- I have seen/heard of people with aggressive dogs just letting it happen and then walking away with their dog. This would add increased responsibility on the owner. Though with the threat of euthanization over their head they may not want to stay.
- Just like a car accident
- If a dog bites another dog or a person (depending on the situation) then that dog needs training to prevent future incidents by sharing contact information and talking to an office allows that dog to be followed to ensure the necessary steps are taken by the owner (appropriate training, muzzling etc)
- Care and control are required of dog owners, walking away from a scene or not providing you information say you lack your own personal care and control. Stay at scene or provide info is simple ie dog tag info



- Yes the owner should be responsible for their dogs actions but pending on the situation it might be better if they give their information and leave instead of waiting around. I.e: leave (after sharing their contact information) if they are having trouble controlling their dog or if the other person is acting aggressive towards them
- Your dog did it own up to it
- The owner should be there to give their input on what happened. Often it is the owner that needs training, maybe the enforcement officer could ascertain this and take the appropriate action.
- Too often bad owners are responsible to dog incidents. In the various off leash park and animal owners Facebook groups all too often you hear about incidents where an incident occurred, and the owner scoops up the dog and leaves, or refuses to share information, etc.
- if the bite is severe and someone has been injured.
- Responsible thing to do.
- I think of it like a hot and run with a vehicle. If you flee the scene of an accident then you are not do your job as a responsible owner.
- The person or persons who own the dog need to be accountable and the first step is to remain at the scene hiding is not an option.
- If contact information is given, the dog is more likely to go through a training process to better the behaviour of that dog. As well as the owner is held accountability for any vet bills caused by the dog
- Xx
- I don't understand why anyone would leave the scene of an attack either animal related or not.
- If there is a biting incident the owner of the dog should be expected to remain at the scene and to provide all contact information
- Absolutely!
- Owners responsible for their dogs. It's not the breed its the owner
- I believe the owner of the dog is 100% responsible for the behaviour and actions of the dog, regardless of breed and they should be held accountable for their dogs actions.
- .
- I've been in this situation before. Was appalled that the person responsible for the dog who attacked was simply allowed to carry on with their day as if nothing happened. Not only was I stuck with thousands of dollars in veterinary bills, but the trauma my dog went through was with him until he died.
- Of course they should stay at the scene so long as the animal can be secured safely.
- I think it's best to have all the information when a dog bite occurs.
- It is the responsible thing to do.
- Just like a hit and run! They need to stay and be accountable for what the dog did!
- Provision of information is essential especially vaccination information. People must take responsibility for the actions of their dogs.
- My dog was bitten by another dog and required 2000\$ in medical bills from that incident, as the owner they were responsible for that cost so they should have to stay, and provide information, or face harsher criminal charges if they dont.



- Creates accountability for the owner of the dog.
- Responsible ownership
- it's simple responsible pet ownership
- Like a car accident, i.e., hit and run... YOU STAY. OR YOU GET CHARGED WITH A COMPARABLE FINE JUST LIKE LEAVING AN ACCIDENT IN A CAR!!!
- There is nothing wrong with pit bulls as a breed it is the owners and how they train their dogs.
- So many people do not acknowledge that their dog has done damage to another and just leave
- It's like any other incident.
- The dog owner is responsible for their dogs behaviour so their contact info is required.
- If there is further contacted needed such as vet bills to be covered, then you have their information.
- Unless it is unsafe to keep the dog in the current situation and there is no way to keep others safe.
- Yes, this should be treated like a car accident.
- As long as it is safe to do so
- I believe dog owners should be accountable
- Seen too many cases where people whose dog attacked someone be it a bully breed or not turn and run off.
- the enforcement officer will be able to get both sides of the incident at the same time and see the scene of the incident. see the "attacker's" breed as some people assume "pitbull" type and the enforcement officer may have a bias against pit bull types.
- Enforced accountability and hopefully prevents repeat offenses without documentation
- It should be treated like any other situation that causes damage to another person or other person's property. When there's a car crash involving other people do we not do the same thing?
- It should be the owners responsibility to cover any associated costs or medical expenses to the person or other animal bitten.
- I've been nipped by a dog, and was close to reporting it.
- Would make contact tracing easier for animal bites for public health / Alberta Health Services - the officers should be issued this form and complete it on site with the pet owner and provide to injured party to provide to hospital.
- To obtain police reports only and gather and witness statements on the scene. Enforcement officers should be objective.
- Prevents bite and run scenarios.
- This will give the owner an opportunity to explain the situation that led up to the incident. It also makes dog owners accountable for their animals regardless of breed or size!
- Yes
- It's the only way to hold them accountable
- I believe most people do this already, unless the dog needs immediate vet care.
- If a dog bites someone it is that dogs owners responsibility to take accountability of that animal.
- Train owners. Please train owners. Nothing wrong with the breed. [removed]
- Accountability



- Because the owner is responsible for their pet
- Owners need to be held responsible if their dog attacks a person or other dogs.
- If something that you own causes physical damage or injury to another person or person's property, you should have to stay to record said damages.
- Absolutely otherwise it allows for the individual to avoid consciences.
- we all need to be responsible for our pets.
- If ANY dog bites a person or another animal is the the responsibility of the pet owners to do just that.
- Share contact information for sure, and same as at a vehicular collision it's the victims choice whether to call the officers or not
- It is common sense that the owner of a dog remain at the scene of the incident
- And I think this should be heavily promoted so everyone knows the law. Too often I hear "but they let so I don't know where they live"
- This would be in keeping with any other accident
- Only to quickly exchange info. If at all possible, the dogs involved need to be separated from the event to avoid further actions
- Owner accountability
- Again, the OWNERS should be assessed and held responsible as well. If the dog is aggressive there is a reason why and there is rehabilitation training that can be done to fix this. If the dog has a bad home environment it is going to be reactive. I believe they should stay on scene if an altercation happens but every aspect of the dogs life should be looked into as well.
- It should be no different than leaving the scene of a motor vehicle accident
- I think they should stick around to give information to the other owner. Only if NECESSARY should an officer get involved.
- I think singling out a breed is absolute nonsense. Why should a dog be discriminated against, when its done nothing wrong. Innocent until proven guilty should apply to everything.
- If my dog required veterinary care due to an attack or bite, I would hope that the owner of the offending dog would take responsibility, If there were a rule, it might cause owners of non socialized or reactive dogs to more seriously consider whether or not to frequent an off leash park
- Like any accident (with a vehicle) , this is the case
- Owner must be held responsible for their pets behaviour
- Their dog, their responsibility. They should not be allowed to flee the scene.
- You want to ensure the dog is made a note of, plus is update on vaccines
- Should be the same as a hit and run. The owner should be responsible for any costs associated with the attack, for instance grief counselling for children or replacing torn clothes. The dog should face justice.
- It's only reasonable. No different than a car accident I figure.
- It's important for them to be accountable as well as present their perspective of what happened
- It would be similar to a car accident. Don't leave the seen of a crime.
- Like an accident there is a responsibility



- As long as the dog can be safely watched and the situation had calmed down.
- Maybe. However securing the dog should be the first priority so if that requires leaving the scene but returning or leaving contact info that should be ok.
- Any dog can bite and the owner must take responsibility. It is not breed specific.
- Same concept as if you hit someone's car
- That's being responsible dog owner and you should be able to tell what you saw that happened with out being judged by anyone there
- This will help ensure, that the correct information is given.
- It needs to be followed up on - the dog is not always at fault.
- I support staying if requested by the victim/owner or guardian of the victim.
- Many people who know their dog could possibly bite still use off leash parks or put their dogs in situations that they are ill equipped to handle. I have seen and heard of people taking off without so much as an apology. I'm assuming that this would carry a fine for leaving the scene which I would support as well.
- Yes the dog owner should have to fully account for the actions of the dog
- it is important that pet owners be responsible and take responsibility for their pet at all times
- This requires no explanation. Of course the owner should stay, and be held responsible for its pet!
- Just like any other accident, leaving the scene should be a crime.
- B
- I was personally involved when off leash pit attacked my leashed dog in Bowness park and the owner left leaving behind severally injured dog. Many people including children were traumatized.
- This helps insure accurate accounting of events.
- Any accident big or small, the owners should always exchange info. It's like an vehicular accident.
- Its their responsibility as a dog owner to remain at the scene. Plain and simple.
- But if the dog could be euthanized then it makes sense for the owner to flee the scene.
- Don't make people believe their dog is toast if they stick around
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dog
- No explanation necessary
- Treat as car accidents
- Either that or able to share with the other person involved and give contact info to them
- Just like any other incident the owner should remain on the scene. There should be a substantial fine for an owner leaving the scene.
- Any dog can bite.
- It's just like leaving the scene of a vehicular accident.
- Pet owners should be responsible for the actions of their companions. A reactive dog is reactive because of lack of training/ proper exercise not because they are a bad dog/breed.
- Responsible owners would already do this.
- Similar to a car accident, an incident occurred and you should remain at the scene.
- If you are a good dog owner you understand that you must take care of what happened



- Absolutely. Fleeing the scene should be considered a criminal offence.
- Most responsible owners know this isn't even a question or statement you just do it. Obviously the owners actions need to be addressed if they are leaving the scene, not just the dog
- Information should be share
- it's the OWNERS responsibility. If the dog bites, the owner is responsible, therefore should be held responsible
- Bad owners should be held accountable for thier dogs bad behaviour.
- 100% yes! They should be held accountable for the vet bills if their dog bites someone!
- They should do that
- As a pet owner and driver the responsibility lies with me. My property damages something I have to pay for it.
- There could be heavy vet bills associated. That I believe would be the owner at fault with the aggressive dog should have to pay.
- Just like a car accident, serious injuries can occur
- To allow for thorough investigation of the event.
- All owners need to held responsible, including providing contact information and speaking with enforcement officers to ensure all necessary steps are taken to protect other animals and humans.
- Finding resolution is key
- Vet bills are costly and the responsible party should be liable.
- Within reason, sometimes distance is okay- persay they return to their vehicle. But yes they should remain at the scene to share information or follow up- much like a car accident.
- Owner should be held responsible
- But only if there is also a witness bc it may be less confrontational that way.
- The liability lyes on the biting dogs owner. Police can make that easier for the victims
- I feel it is reasonable to require a dog owner to stay at the scene if their dog has broken the skin of an animal or human.
- It is part responsible dog ownership.
- because it;s the owners responsibility
- Dog owners need to be held accountable
- Although may not always be possible if injuries occur as one or both parties may need to get care
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets. Lots of Calgary owners do not currently do this.
- I think that it is so easy to take off and "hide" a vicious dog and not have to deal with the consequences. You can pretend to rehome the dog to a farm, when really - it's just a temporary fix andthe dog will be back after a few months. If you are forced to stay there and accept the consequences, we can get these dogs off the street.
- Owning a dog comes with the responsibility of being accountable for their actions, i think any reasonable animal owner agrees
- Owners need to be held responsible for the actions of the dog. Not punish the dog for his owners lack of training



- This is part of responsible ownership.
- I think it is the responsible thing to do if your dog is involved in an incident. I think a lot of people don't stay though because they expect officers are going to seize and destroy their dog without considering/investigating the situation.
- This should already be happening but some dog owners don't care
- I have seen to many stories posted about people running off and leaving while an owner is dealing with their bloody animal and it's not ok. The owner of the dog who attacked should be responsive for the vet bill.
- It is important to give both views, just like any other incident.
- Fines if owner abandons the scene, except possibly to secure the animal indoors, and return
- The owner is the reason the dog does not behave. [removed] The owners need to held accountable and responsible.
- Too many people give wrong information or ignore the request for info. If they had to give their correct info to police it would cut down the times that people would be spending trying to find the owner.
- The pet owner has to take responsibility for their pets actions.
- Of course.
- Oftentimes the extent of damage to another dog isn't fully seen until examined by a vet. An owner needs to be able to collect information from other owners if seeking financial retribution for damages, filing police reports, etc.
- Personal experience has shown that this does not always happen, allowing aggressive and nuisance animals and their owners to avoid a record of behaviour and appropriate intervention.
- If your dog bites something it is only fair that you stick around incase it is costly to the one that got bit and should be on the offending owners cost
- This is common sense
- It's important to remain on scene, you can see what went wrong and also learn from that. A dog attack is an important thing to report, especially if it has happened multiple times, you can tell how that dog is then.
- Absolutely!
- I think information should be traded and then the owner should take their dog home to reduce further stress on their pet while things get sorted out.
- It's damage of personal property (yourself or your animal). The same rule applies for vehicular accidents then it should be the same here.
- Bites are usually triggered from something else. While lack of training is a contributing factor, there is often a reason behind the attack that was preventable from both parties.
- Owners should be responsible for properly training and socializing their dogs. If an incident occurs, owners should remain at the scene to allow for a proper process.
- The owner should take responsibility



- Too many people leave the area after their dog attacks and severe and costly injuries may have been sustained by a person or dog. It needs to be documented to determine if an animal is a threat to other people and animals
 - It's the owner's responsibility. The dog bit because it wasn't properly trained, don't blame the dog
 - Currently, people are scared that their dog will be euthanized or taken away if it bites a person or animal, so they leave the scene hoping they won't be identified. However, this results in a biased summary of events leading to the bite by the victim. By requiring the individual and dog to stay, both sides of the story can be taken at the scene of the incident.
 - Just like in a traffic accident, people should be held responsible for their dog's actions. And also be able to explain their side of the story. If the animal is injured, then they should be able to leave to take the animal to a vet but should give their information before leaving.
 - Take responsibility
 - They need to take responsibility and ensure all parties have contact info for further investigation
 - A responsible owner will stay and do everything possible to own up to what happened and minimize trauma to everyone involved. This includes staying and telling their perception of the event
 - Share contact info for sure. Stay for officer if victim wishes
 - Depending on the severity of a dog biting another dog, the owner should be responsible for paying vet bills
 - As with any other incident procedure, it's the right thing to do and gets to a resolution quicker
 - "This is just common decency."
-
- Since you don't give space to provide thoughts on your attempt at Breed Specific Legislation, I'll provide my thoughts here. You are basing decisions on myths and outdated information and this isn't okay. Please do your research <https://www.pitbullinfo.org/dog-bite-scientific-studies.html>. Singling out a certain breed of dog and forcing their owners to abide by additional restrictions will do absolutely nothing in improving public safety."
 - It is important for the owner of the offending dog to be present to take responsibility of the attack
 - It's called pet responsibility. Live it. Learn it. Own it.
 - Too many cases of people's dogs being attacked either in off-leash or public areas where the owner of the attacking dog leaves the scene to avoid having to pay the other person's vet bill.
 - If a creature you're responsible for is involved in an attack, it makes sense for them to have to deal with an authority when necessary; however, I do think it should be able to be done by appointment if it's not able to be processed in a timely manner.
 - Same as a car accident. Something bad happened and they need to make sure the person is okay. If the bitten says it's no biggie, then they both move on. We've got free healthcare. If they ask for info or cops or whatever, then it happens. But gotta check up
 - Na



- An owner or handler is responsible for the actions of the animal and should be required to show i.d to prevent giving false information
- Responsibility of the owner.
- The owner is the most responsible for the behaviour and actions of the dog and must take full responsibility by being present at the scene.
- This should have always been a rule.
- The biting dog owner should have to pay any medical bills for the bitten dog or human.
- I think that should be fine, but that doesn't mean to euthanize the dog because dogs don't just bite for no reason. You guys need to understand that dogs aren't always just trying to bite other people or animals.
- Similar to a motor vehicle accident, all parties involved need to be identified.
- Too often these are thought of as minor injuries but end up requiring veterinary care
- I know of instances where dogs have attacked other dogs or people and the owners have fled with no consequences. This leaves the opportunity for the same problem to continue if it's not addressed
- If your dog bites someone they should have to stay.
- Definitely a rule such as this would be a very good idea and stiff penalties and large fines should be imposed for those who don't comply.
- I believe contact information should be shared and then they can leave. I don't think they should have to wait for By-law to show up.
- People should all be held accountable, both parties should have to stay at the scene.
- The owner of the dog that was the aggressor should definitely remain there. Because they are the owner of the animal and the animal has caused distress to either a human being or another animal. It is the responsibility of the owner to take responsibility for the actions of his pet.
- The owner should display responsibility and accountability for the situation, and should also be available to explain what happened in their point of view immediately after the incident.
- Yes. However if I feel threatened, I will protect myself and "pit bull"• by taking Steps to defend my dog and myself. I will protect my staffy at all costs so it isn't scapegoated into being a problem when it's other pathetic people and animals.
- The owner should always be held responsible for their dogs.
- Seem obvious
- Health and history of the animal are important to the treatment of the individual that was bitten.
- To cooperate on the investigation
- That is what a responsible pet owner should do without question
- A dog that bites is a dog that isn't under proper control or isn't trained correctly. Owners should be responsible for the actions of their animal 100%.
- Far too often the offender flees the area or gives fake information that cannot be followed up on. These incidents SHOULD BE TREATED AS VEHICULAR ACCIDENTS! This protects ALL persons/pets!



- The owner is responsible for their pet's actions. They should be able to wait and provide information needed, for health and legal purposes
- Yes, if you own a dog, you should be accountable for their behaviour. When I am walking at Nose Hill and I encounter an aggressive dog, most owners will say their dog is friendly. This tells me they are completely out of touch with their dogs' social skills. If their dog bites me or my child, the owner should be reprimanded and have to take obedience training.
- I think they should be held accountable and should pay for some vet bills etc
- I think people should at least be there to give a statement and be held accountable for their animal.
- Yes if a dog attacks another person or dog then they should have to stay. But this should apply to any dog. There are many more dog attacks from different breeds than pitbulls
- No one should ever leave the scene of an incident that their dog has been a part of
- Owner should be held responsible and understand ramifications
- As an owner you are responsible for your pet's behaviour same as when driving a car. You should remain at the scene of the incident.
- Any responsible pet owner would/should stay and exchange information.
- I think this is self-explanatory! If the dog bites a person or another animal, the owner cannot run away. He needs to take responsibility and need to surrender the dog to law enforcement to be euthanised. We cannot allow biting dogs in society! Dogs like pitbulls, rottweilers etc should not be allowed in residential areas!!!
- It's like an accident with a vehicle. Both parties should talk with police
- Not remaining at the scene can be comparable to any accident involving vehicles a bit and run per se
- Owners should take full responsibility for the behaviour of their pet. Train or contain your dog.
- It is the same thing if you get into a car accident. If said dog attacks my dog then owner of said dog should pay for my dog's medical care
- Some dogs aren't aggressive and some may bite out of fear or if they are threatened and instead of making assumptions and type-casting on the dog it's a good idea to keep in contact so that if complications arise both parties are involved in the solution and the dog in question isn't just taken away or treated negatively if the dog has had multiple offences this can also be noted when contacts are exchanged and can further the care and necessary precautions
- I think that should always happen! Just like any accident that happens you always remain on the scene and wait to speak with someone about the situation
- Self-explanatory
- When I was a dog owner I witnessed too many owners grab their obnoxious or aggressive dog and run from the scene of the incident.
- Yes, OWNERS should be the ones held responsible. Training for the dogs afterwards.
- Your animal, your responsibility.
- As long as it is safe to do so. A dog that has been in an incident should be contained in a home or vehicle to prevent further incident. I also believe that people are generally unreasonable if they feel they have the right to act that way, such as being the victim of a dog incident



- responsible thing to do
- It can help sort out issues early on and is helpful if the dog has any special circumstances (ex. The dog is a rescue and is being re trained out of behaviours picked up when being abused)
- This is just responsible ownership
- Yes I think it important for the owner to share details with victims; however, I do think it is also important to get their animal out of the situation (put in car, or house) which may be difficult if they are walking far from their house/car. They should at the very least give their name/phone number so bylaw can contact them.
- It's too easy to lose track and not be able to follow up with the owner of there is no obligation to remain on the scene.
- The owner should be responsible for their dogs actions.
- **ABSOLUTELY!!** It should not be the responsibility of the owner who was attacked to have to pay for vet bills and whatever else comes with it. If you are a responsible pet owner, you instantly have feelings for the attacked animal and would want to make sure it's ok or help rush it to the vet quickly so it doesn't pass away (in rare instances). Not only that, if this isn't the first time the dogs has attacked a person then we need to be 1. Giving fines to the owner responsible 2. Having that owner and dog go through training to fix the problem or 3. Have that animal put into a rescue/rehabilitation, the owner fined and after the animal has been retrained they can go on to their new loving home.
- It allows for both sides of the story to be recorded at a time. However depending on situation I would recommend owners keep distance while waiting for an enforcement officer as things may escalate based off the situation that unfolded.
- Easier to support the person with the injured dog
- Yes, but there should be some flex because if someone agitates my dog and he defends himself, he will be fine if I can take him home but will escalate further if I have to stay, which makes him more likely to be apprehended in a situation that wasn't his fault (btw my dog is a well trained mini labradoodle)
- Said offending dog owner should be held accountable for injuries inflicted on victim dog or human
- It is important for both side to be shared and information given.
- To assess the situation and provide contact info and reimbursement of vet costs
- I have been left with vet bills and training bills due to my dog being attacked and bitten by another dog. The owner left the scene. Not only did I have to pay for the vet bills due to an injury an irresponsible dog owner caused, I now have to get a trainer for my dog because of the trauma caused to my dog by this incident.
- I agree if it's the owner of the dog that bit that other person or animal. Most dog owners that have dogs with multiple offences won't stay so there should be a fine for leaving the scene. However if the person or animal that got bit also has to stay, then I don't recommend them staying because they would need to go to emergency or a vet hospital.
- Only for bites that caused an injury (e.g. at least broken skin).
- This puts accountability back on the owner of the dog that attacked



- As stated, I work at a 24 hour animal hospital. Seeing these cases daily, it is rare if the owner of the dog that caused injury will offer their help. I completely agree with this being along side "leaving a crime scene"
- If it serious I believe the owner should be held responsible.
- It should be treated like any other accident and if you dont abide by it and run away then you get another fine and the dog automatically seized.
- Same as an accident or a fight, yes. Shouldn't be different for biting dogs
- if it is a "hit and run" type situation, if found the owner should be fined an extreme fine for walking away i.e. \$5k
- there are too many dog bites where a person takes off. I am of the believe that it should be the owner held to the highest standard. A dog is only as good as their owner.
- the owner takes full responsibility off the dogs actions.
- The owner should have to provide documentation that the dog is up to date on vaccines. Also, if the dog was provoked in any way the owner should be able to defend themselves
- Like an accident they must stay and swap information at the least.
- Like a car accident, if you are the owner, you must take responsibility.
- In the same way if you are in a car accident you must remain at the scene. However, if someone provides their information, maybe photo of their driver's license or ID and has to go, let them leave. Also should not have to wait longer than 45 min for an enforcement officer.
- I see this as akin to remaining at the scene of an accident in a motor vehicle.
- Obvious reasons
- I can't imagine why this wouldn't be the case. Dog owners have to take responsibility for the actions of their pets.
- he is responsible for his pet, this would be similar to a motor car accident. an example being leave and your guilty of a hit and run
- Owners should be held accountable not the dog. Harsher punishment and fines for the humans behind the leash.
- Too many pet owners get away with it especially if the owners don't have the pet licensed, and they don't like the penalty for them.
- For them to be allowed to leave the scene would be the same as leaving the scene of a car accident. They should be forced to stay, to make a written statement to law enforcement officers, stating what they believed caused the incident/factors leading up to the incident.
- it's the same as a vehicle accident, your liable, so stay there and deal with it. Train your dogs and if they are reactive, make it clear to others, then they will not bite.
- I believe that a responsible owner would already do this so a rule would ensure those less responsible owners are also accountable
- Dogs should wear collars with their license. All dog bites to anyone who is not owner must be reported no matter what (like vehicle accidents)
- Accountability
- The owner is responsible for their dog. They need to deal with the consequences of their animal



- Same as an collision scene. Be an adult and take ownership
- If both parties share contact info and agree bylaw is not emergent, owner does not need to stay, if it's a serious incident or one of the parties wants bylaw involvement immediately, parties should be required to remain on scene.
- Owners are liable for how their animal behaves. Fleeing the scene after they cause harm should punishable.
- Yes, provided the incident it severe enough to require medical or veterinary attention.
- I support the concept but there are going to be mitigating factors like dogs and people being very riled up and if you understand animal and especially dog behaviour, they react to the emotions and feelings of their owners which might make them display other unwanted behaviours or if one person or animal need to seek immediate medical attention "which may not be the perceived aggressor or if the situation is drawing too much attention there may be public aggression towards the dog or owner who is perceived to be the bad guy. For everyone's safety there needs to be alternative plans to get the information to law enforcement" an app which could allow for pictures of animals and owners could be uploaded along with exchanges information...
- This is a double edged sword because if the dog is only responsive to one person, it makes it difficult for the owner to stay at the scene. I do support the rule in cases where medical attention is needed or something of that nature.
- The owner should take responsibility and pay the vet bills. This actually is a real problem at some of our dog parks. I stopped taking my dogs to the off leash for this reason.
- Just like leaving the scene of a car crash. Leaving the scene of a dog involved incident should be the same unless your dog needs emergency vet treatment. But then the owner should be responsible for contacting and updating the police/bylaw of their location.
- Responsibility. You don't leave th scene If an accident you stay and report it.
- More for the animal. And to ensure the right story is told. Also, teaching dog safety to the owner AND others. Teach the public to ask before approaching a dog. Most people do not approach dogs properly (like coming directly at a dog they don't know and touching their head). Even a non-aggressive dog can be triggered by behavior like this as it is threatening and scary to them.
- People need to be responsible for their dogs. If they can't handle their dog properly or need help with a dogs behavior then it's on them to seek help and learn to understand the dog.
- If the bite is sever it is important to get insurance information, enforcing this on small bites, or big bites/attacks will help people stuck with enormous veterinary bills due to other dog bites and attacks.
- It would put the responsibility more on the owner. Officers would be able too see interaction between animal and owner
- Depending the situation, the owner is not taking care of the dog properly.
- Too many times irresponsible pet owners leave after their animal has bitten another animal. There is no excuse for this.
- The owner of the aggressive dog needs to uphold responsibility for not preventing the dog from attacking
- "Owner or person responsible for the dog at the time of the incident m, example



- Dog walker"
- It is the owners fault. Hands down. They need to take responsibility
- I would expect the owner to help with any hospital bills, or vet bills if there animal caused injury or harm.
- You are responsible for your dog. If they hurt someone, that makes you responsible.
- dog owners are responsible for the bite
- If a dog bites another animal, medical bills should be covered by the owner of the offending dog. But waiting for an animal control officer is unreasonable in most circumstances.
- Would be good to have an explanation from both sides to understand the reason it happened
- It shows responsibility and liability for your dog's behavior and and negative outcome caused by your dog's behavior.
- Always you should be the one paying the bill for the other dog if your dog attacks someone else's dog
- Just like a car accident, all parties should be present and accountable.
- It's important if a dog attacks the owner stays to talk with an enforcement officer because this will allow proper tracking of problem owners. I don't believe the issues are breed specific, often times it's irresponsible owner. It would also allow the city to see if a pet owner continues to have issues with the same or different animals.
- The owner is ALWAYS responsible for their pets behaviour in any circumstance, especially one that may bring any sort of harm to another, for which the owner should most definitely remain on scene to take ownership for their pet and tend to those injured.
- It should be considered a crime to leave. If someone is badly injured?
- Yes, to ensure accountability and that the dog receives the appropriate treatment and training to prevent this from happening again. Dogs do not bite when not stressed and for no reason, the dog needs some form of help.
- Personal experience. It is paramount all information is known about the dog. Dog owner or other caretaker with the dog should remain.
- Well it's sort of like a car accident or if you assault someone or if your child does, your responsible for that all and a dog is sort of like a child and you own it so it's your responsibility to take the liabilities that go along with an accident or an attack
- But only if safe
- The fact that it is not a rule is upsetting.
- The dog bit someone. The owner is at fault. This also depends on the severity of the bite. Dogs play.
- Yes, because often times a dog biting is not the fault of the owner or dog but the victim. Encouraging the owners to stay on scene is a form of protection for those individuals to explain their side, but also a way to hold vicious dog owners accountable. It works for both groups.
- My dog has been attacked on several occasions by smaller breed dogs, yet the owners of those dogs have got away with it. Most of the time, attacks by smaller breeds go undocumented due to lesser damage. We seem to only hear about pitbull stacks due to the stigma. If all of the attacks get documented, we might see a different picture.



- The owner should be responsible for the actions of the dog in most cases.
- There should be a penalty for leaving a scene without leaving your information.
- The owner of the dog should not be allowed to leave the area and should be held responsible for the dog's behaviour
- Speaking with all parties involved leads to proper fact finding.
- You can't hit a car and leave the scene without exchanging contact info/etc. You shouldn't be allowed to leave a scene if your dog has hurt someone either.
- This will help police understand who is at fault for attacks, as well as begin a record that could reduce improper owners from getting additional pets.
- That is so they are held accountable for any vet bills that have arisen
- Dog owners should be held responsible.
- I feel like this is self-explanatory and really no different if a human were to assault a human.
- A dog biting another dog or human is no different than if a human were to hit another human or dog. They would have to remain at the scene to talk to someone and since they are responsible for the dog they should have to wait to explain
- Should be treated the same as a car accident
- A neighbour's dog was attacked and the dog owner took off and has never been held accountable. However, like pretty much every existing bylaw now, the likelihood of enforcement and lack of education on rules may result in the person leaving anyways.
- It doesn't matter what size the dog is. Everyone should be required to remain at the scene. If either party leaves the scene they should be charged.
- It's important to record the incident as it may happen again and draw attention to an out-of-control dog.
- Just like a vehicle accident, leaving the scene of a crime should be illegal.
- I would expect the same if your child or your car hurt someone, should be the same for dogs
- If severe enough, all information from both sides should be considered.
- The dog is never at fault for biting and therefore the owner should have to be responsible for their dog.
- Absolutely. Unfortunately, many dog owners who have aggressive dogs will not be aware of or follow this rule because they are neglectful and do not want to be held accountable.
- Unless the bite is minor and agreed by both parties then leaving is fine
- It's the right thing to do and the dog can be supported through programs for their problem behavior that they can learn about from enforcement officers
- Same as a hot and run, if you cause damage you need to be held accountable
- Pet owners need to be responsible for their dogs' actions. Or, be there to defend their pet if the incident was of no reasonable fault of the dog.
- It is important so these situations can be tracked
- The owner is responsible for the actions of the dog, they need to take responsibility right then and there and if they are unwilling to stay then there should be harsher consequences on them



- Any incident (whether with an animal, vehicle or otherwise) should always include the exchanging of information and cooperation from all parties involved.
- You are responsible for your pet. Nuff said.
- Yes that is responsible pet ownership
- Of course they should stay at the scene.
- It's like when someone gets in an accident. They need to remain at the scene to explain what happened. Same thing should apply to this!
- Owners of aggressive dogs need to be held responsible. I frequently go to the dog park and have witnessed several dog fights and owners just walking away without taking responsibility.
- If you are the owner of a dog that has bitten then it's your responsibility to stay at the scene
- I think the owner should be forced to deal with the consequences of their animals actions as most can be trained and i believe animal behavior of pets is based on training not nature.
- people should be responsible. But rules need to apply to all dog owners, not just large dog owners.
- This is a great rule. The owners need to be held accountable
- If a person injures a person same rules apply. A person is rest for the animal.
- Owners of a dog who has bitten someone ARE RESPONSIBLE. They absolutely must be held accountable.
- The dog owner should stay at the scene of the attack (bite) just as a driver should stay at the scene of an accident and should be responsible to provide any information that is requested of the victim/caregiver/parent.
- It is the same as staying at the scene of any other incident.
- If your dog bites someone and draws blood accept responsibility
- Ive seen too many incidents where an owner doesn't take responsibility for their dog biting either a person or another animal and they just walk away like nothing happened. Most cases it's the owner, not the animal that is the issue.
- This provides the dog owner the opportunity to explain the potential cause of the incident as well as discuss follow ups to review all medical records and potentially decrease rates of euthanasia.
- I think everyone should hear the full story
- Better information for cases and will help determine factors involved. Many pets are hurt and owners are left with vet bills they dont deserve or cant afford. Both victim and aggressors plus owners should be considered into it
- That would be logical
- That's wrong. Don't they stay anyhow??!!!
- Owner must take responsibility on the spot and in person.
- Your dog, your responsibility
- When the dog bites, it is the failure on the owner. They failed to train their dog properly.
- The owner needs to be held responsible
- Makes sense to take responsibility for your dogs actions and be responsible owner.
- Too many people take off



- The owner of the dog who inflicts damage on another person or animal should be held accountable for their dog's behavior. They shouldn't be able to just walk away from the incident.
- Though sometimes it's not possible to both remove your aggressive dog and remain at the scene.
- It's an assault and should be treated as such
- Dogs are property by definition of the law. If damage is done to an individual's dog by another individual's dog then the owner of the attacking dog should remain on scene to await a by law officer to collect statements. This process should be no different in how it is handled than when two vehicles are involved in a traffic accident. Owners should be responsible for their dogs behaviours out in public and that includes taking financial responsibility where needed. Owners who choose not to take responsibility for the actions of their own property (their dog) put others in the public at risk and put victim owners in a financial bind for incidences that they were not at fault for.
- They are responsible for the dog.
- It's an accident.. just like a car accident you exchange information and go from there
- At the discretion of the victim/victims owner depending on the severity of the situation.
- It's the same thing as a car accident. The owner is at fault when their dog bites someone, therefore should be held responsible.
- Make people accountable. If they can't do this one simple task they shouldn't have a dog
- I had my dog bitten by a vicious small dog, and the owner fled. I speak from experience that it is unnerving, not knowing if the owner is responsible enough to maintain vaccine records. I didn't care about vet fees, I cared about the well being of the animal and myself.
- Would encourage people to stay and sort out the problem. Additional ticket for offenders who run. May also deter people from running.
- I absolutely support pet owners being held accountable to the actions of their animals. This will also ensure both sides of the story are heard as bites are rarely unprovoked.
- The owner of the dog responsible should be held liable for any costs associated with damage done to another dog.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs and should take care of vet bills as well allow bylaw to fine and declare dog a nuisance if it should be. Owner also needs to be made responsible pet owner
- Any bite is an incident. Just like a fender bender.
- Important for context and clarity
- To many owners and dogs get away with biting and attacks this would be a great enforcement
- To me, this is the definition of responsible pet ownership. If it were my animal (which is a very large Labrador NOT pitbull!) bit someone I would remain their until the issue is dealt with
- If a dog owner needs to be held accountable for the dogs actions. If there is a bite or injury there needs to be accountability and measures need to be taken to make sure it doesn't happen again.
- You should always get both sides of the story. The dog that bit may not be the one who started it. They could be trying to protect them self or their human.
- I see this as similar to hit and run car accidents. If your dog has caused damage, you should be held accountable. One exception might be if your dog has also been injured and requires urgent medical care



- If a bite causes damage it would be worth staying if both parties would or could remain civil. Dogs usually don't bite unless provoked or highly untrained.
- It's important to get both sides of the story and determine cost/vetting responsibilities
- It's the same idea when it comes to accidents while drive, would you leave the scene of an accident? The answer is no, you should either exchange information or wait for an enforcement officer if needed.
- If the owner of a vehicle commits a driving offense, they are required to stay at the scene, this is a dog owner committing an offense, they should have to stay.
- The only issue is it would be a more stressful situation for both the owner and the dog to stay at the scene which could lead to more aggression possibly with the already hyped dog and further Behavior outcome.
- Need to know if the dog was defending itself or owner. Was it a proven med attack? Who attacked first?
- Absolutely should be necessary. This will prevent irresponsible owners from thinking its not their problem and allowing the dog to do it again. Great idea!
- It's ALWAYS an animals owner whom is responsible for the actions of the animal, of course they should stay at the incident until the issue is resolved.
- Common courtesy.
- Drivers are responsible for car accidents, serial killers are responsible for their spree of murders, and so on. Owners are responsible for their animals and what happens on their watch.
- The owner does need to take responsibility but under no circumstance should an owner lose there dog because of this, taken away or euthanized it's not right.
- Owners should be held responsible for the actions of their pet. It is often the owner's poor training and care for the dog that causes the dog to bite and not an issue with the dog itself.
- if necessary - would largely depend on context, many animals will bite out of fear and defensiveness, if there was an altercation with another animal especially, how and why would be relevant
- It's important that this information be gathered to support this initiative
- Too often, the owner leaves the scene to avoid enforcement.
- Dog behaviours are allowed by an owner. The onus of the incident should be placed on the owner, not the dog.
- This would alleviate having to search for the dog owner if the flee from the scene.
- Depends on the availability of the enforcement officer. It may not be practical to wait however if contact information is shared the officer can follow up
- They must take responsibility for their dog. They must provide pertinent info. Just like with a car accident.
- The owner is responsible for controlling their dog while out in public. Including on a leash, muzzle, distancing from other people and dogs if needed.
- A bite needs to be explained, even if its an isolated incident.



- If a dog bites a person the owner should be accountable to the person affected and be available to answer any questions along with collaborating with the appropriate officials on a plan of action and steps to prevent future dog bite incidents
- Any dog any breed should have this law. No different then a car accident
- If you hit someone with a car, would it be acceptable to drive away after causing injury? No. Owners need to be held responsible for their actions and statements need to be taken. It takes 2 to tango when it comes to dog bites.
- I've been bit and the owner fought it tooth and nail. If it had been dealt with immediately, things may have gone differently.
- Like a car accident. You have to wait and talk to police.
- Since there is injury to either a person or another pet, the scenario becomes similar to leaving the scene of an accident where a car hit a person.
- Owner should explain what happened and why, and how they'll prevent it from happening again.
- Like any accident it is important to share information for future contact/exchange of information if necessary
- It would seem to be common sense that the owner remain on the scene.
- It sounds like indirect assault, the owner is responsible
- That is at minimum what should be done
- Accountability.
- Seems straightforward: not being allowed to leave the scene of an accident without sharing your info and making a statement. Especially if your dog was the aggressor.
- They should stay and give all their info and etc. Because the dog is their responsibility
- This seems obvious
- I know from experience the owner generally leaves quickly
- All dogs that do bite, regardless of size, I believe should be documented.
- I think people may flee the scene as they're scared of enforcement officers making life altering judgment without a good understanding of the situation. These situation need to be used for education and to promote better management. Not to scare and punish dogs and owners.
- Owners should take responsibility for their pets
- They should stay there, but only if they are able to do so safely. If the dog in question continues to be difficult to handle, and they have no reasonable way to contain it, they can't and shouldn't be expected to stay. That's just going to lead to more injuries.
- I think owners should be held accountable for the incidents their dogs are involved in so the dog can get proper training to prevent future incidents
- This encourages good dog ownership, if you're required to seek support or training for your animal it helps create more educated dog owners. There are no standards for ownership so if there are behavioural issues owners should be accountable and decrease repeat offenders with no boundaries.
- Both sides of the incident need to be taken into account much like any other accident.



- The owner and dog should be evaluated
- This is something that needs to be enforced with small dog owners as they tend to leave believe that a smaller bite is nothing and people are over reacting , if anything small dog bread are more a nuisance and owner are more irresponsible
- "In regards to the previous question claiming pit bulls have the strength to do more damage. If you factor in the size of the dog Labrador can have a significantly stronger bite however appears weaker due to the strength to weight ratio usually used on comparison for bite strength.
- Punish bad owners across the board. The breed has nothing to do with it."
- Again, without targeting a specific bread of dog and instead looking at the entire situation, without prejudice. If a dog was being harassed or teased and as self defense, bite a person or another dog, it should be treated fairly because they are animals, not humans. They rely severely on their instinct and when people intentional try to tease a specific bread, by law officers should be provided with unbiased training that will allow them to make an informed decision on every situation.
- essentially leaving the scene of a crime so better to stay and explain situation
- The owner is more responsible than the dog and so should be there to be held responsible for the dog's actions.
- Accountability
- I would support such a rule as long as it is applied across the board no matter the breed. There are plenty of small breed dogs that bite as much or more than a large breed dog.
- right thing to do
- Unsure how you would enforce this?
- It's not different than a car accident
- Any other physical interaction considered serious requires all involved parties and witnesses to turn over relevant information to authorities.
- This way the dog/owner has to take responsibility for what happened just like on the scene of any other incidents.
- The owner of a dog should be responsible enough to stay and talk with enforcement officer
- Like any accident, ALL parties should remain present.
- Q
- It is important for accountability
- A dogs behaviour is its owner's responsibility, however owners should be allowed to remove themselves from the situation if they feel that they or their animal is in danger.
- This culture change would be supported if owners knew that there dog would not be at risk of being euthanized for their honesty. There are two sides to every story and a dog being reactive (biting or acting aggressive) is always a last line of defence for an animal that's been trying to express their discomfort long before the bite ever occurred. The animal should NOT be punished for this.
- This will allow them to be charged, the dog placed in care, the victim being able to sue to collect reimbursement for treatment for their dog, pet, child or themselves or damages when there is a loss of life or a disability that results.
- This is being a responsible pet guardian.



- To ask if the dog had it's rabies shot and ask if this has happened before.
- NA
- Help to cover insurance and cost of vet bills fairly
- I think it's important people take ownership for actions of their dogs, as it's often a representation of how they trained or deal with their dog.
- They should be able to explain the circumstances surrounding the bite (if their animal is on leash and a strange animal or person approaches without permission, they should not be held accountable)
- Because information needs to be exchanged. If my dog gets attacked I need to take it to the vet to get checked and I will have to pay out of pocket for something my dog did not do or if a kid gets bitten (I work in an ED in Calgary) we need information on the dogs immunization status and if they are outdoor dogs in the mountains for example
- If a dog bites someone or another animal it shouldn't just be the animals fault the owner should be at fault also
- The owner should stay and take responsibility for their pet and any damages
- Should stay at scene because the guilty party could give false information and not pay for the vet bill.
- Yes
- Both parties involved should talk with the enforcement officer and the enforcement officer should be wary of extended circumstances on either side of the issue. For example an on leash dog at an on leash park who does not like being approached by other dogs has an off leash dog run at them. If the off leash dog is then bitten, the owner and dog who were on leash should not be at fault or considered violent.
- This rule would be very helpful for if criminal or other court proceedings needed to occur after the incident. And it would also be a good indicator if the dog that acted out was being not taken care of properly and the owner should be held responsible
- I view this the same as a car accident and remaining on scene unless both parties have proof that everyone is okay
- Treat it the same as a car accident. Exchange info
- Having the owner stay enables essential animal information to be provided immediately. However, this means the dog likely also must stay which could be problematic if the dog is not well controlled.
- I think it is important to obtain contact information of the offending owner. However, if a dog is in an escalated/aggressive state, the owner should be able to remove the dog promptly from the situation once contact information is provided.
- If the owner of said dog bites someone and leaves then there's only one side of the story for the police to process(the person who got bit). Most of the time the victim of dog bites are the dogs themselves because it got scared by who it attacked. And unfortunately the person who got bit will usually play the victim even though they antagonized the poor dog.



- Absolutely. It's part of being a responsible pet owner- if the person or pet who was but needs medical attention after the fact the owner should know and be willing to accept the consequences of their dogs actions.
- .
- I think the owner should absolutely share if their pet is up to date on vaccinations and talk to an officer about whether it's a first time offence or if it has happened before.
- As the owner responsible for the dog, of course they are responsible for its behaviour and should stay
- If the other party was at fault the dog owner should be given a chance to defend themselves.
- It has been my experience that dogs who bite have owners who either don't care or encourage it. These people are irresponsible and often don't have their dogs leashes.
- The dog owner is responsible for all costs.
- Should be the same as a vehicle accident
- It's only logical
- A dog bite is a big bite, this has nothing to do with the breed of a dog. Have you learned nothing with the BLM movement ? You cannot put any person or animal into a box based on looks alone. Shame on the City for even having these questions.
- People should be held accountable for their pets actions, especially if they are not in control of them.
- Remaining at the scene of an incident is part of being a responsible pet owner. It is also part of being a decent human being.
- On the condition that they Don't automatically blame a pitbull
- If you bites a person you need to take responsibility for your dogs actions.
- You don't flee the scene of an accident, I see this as the same thing. But stop using pit bull and stop discriminating against this breed. Do your homework instead of following a prejudice and see that Chihuahua bite more often and are more vicious as a breed overall...there are no bad dogs, just bad owners/people. Register the breed more so, see who owns them, punish the bad owners and remove the good dog from a bad situation. Don't be so narrow in your thinking and so blatant in your prejudice. Geez, this is CALGARY for goodness sake.
- I have had a dog owner leave the scene of a bite, in this case it was my dog leading to large bills.
- Best way to for victim or bite to obtain dogs medical records i.e rabies vaccination. Also, in a motor vehicle accident, you'd be required to offer your info. Same rule for dog bite, makes sense.
- It's important to get all statements of those involved in (and witnesses) the incident. There's more than one side to a story.
- I don't believe it's the animals fault it's the owners fault when a dog bites or is aggressive. Law enforcement should be involved and assess whether the owners or potentially abusing the animal, which is causing the aggressive behaviour.
- My sisters dog and dad were attacked and the owners left and we couldn't find them after
- Only if there is no immediate potential of the dog being euthanized
- The owner may have to leave the scene to remove the animal but should leave their contact info
- Owners should be held accountable



- If it is safe for the parties involved they should remain. However exceptions should be made if the dog is injured or is not able to be settled at the scene. In this case contact information should be left in some way.
- If there is an incident that draws blood, and both or either guardian HONESTLY believe it was malicious: both parties should wait for an enforcement officer.
- This could be the only way to gain the owner's information
- Important to stay just like a car accident. Unfortunately I think these situations always blame the dog so owners are scared to stay and fear having their dog taken away or they feel that their dog acted appropriately to the situation that unfolded.
- Accountability is key and if they are required to remain, then the real story comes out when you piece the two together.
- Unless immediate medical attention by either dog or person is needed, it should be similar to how car accidents are handled.
- Owners need to be held responsible for dogs that hurt other dogs or people
- Its the mature thing to do.
- Dogs like humans have different temperaments I think it's important for the owners to be able to defend the animal, for example if another dog was off leash and came up to a nuisance dog who was on leash and the nuisance dog lashed out it is not fair to punish the nuisance dog as the other owners were responsible.
- If someone or a pet is injured and the dog behaved this way out of random aggression then yes, this seems appropriate.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs. Dogs are only as good as the owners who train them!
- A responsible owner should do this anyway. A rule should not be required and it's unfortunate that one is, so I support such a rule.
- The owner should have to provide his info and be able to provide vaccination records for his dog. Any damages made by the offending dog should be covered by its owner e.i. vet bills, property damage, doctor's bills, etc
- How else can you track dangerous dogs/ irresponsible owners
- How is this any different then leaving the scene of a vehicle accident?! If the owner of the offending dog leaves without exchanging information they should be criminally charged as they would leaving any accident. I'm shocked this isn't already illegal.
- Owners should always take responsibility for any harm their animal may cause
- so discussions can take place as to who pays the vet bill. it is ridiculous that it is ASSUMED the owner of the biting dog will pay. where did that come from and when?
- Thought that was already the case is someone got hurt.
- it is the responsible thing to do. Otherwise, how could the victim press charges etc, especially if they are hurt.
- same as any other offense



- Yes the pet owner is ultimately responsible for the actions of their animals and should stay if there is an incident where an enforcement officer needs to be called. I assumed this would have already been the standard.
- Like a car accident you need to stay at the scene of the crime ESPECIALLY if you are the owner to help communicate what happened
- At minimum, they should be sharing contact information with the owner of the affected dog (if it was a dog that was bitten), or person that was affected (if the person was bitten)
- If both parties agree to walk away and let it be, they have the right to do so. But someone shouldn't be able to just walk away if the other party isn't agreeing. Moving their dog away a bit, considering the incident is understandable. But they shouldn't leave entirely without sharing information in case medical issues come up.
- treat it like any other incident ex car accidents
- Just like a vehicular accident, stay at the scene of the accident until assessment is completed.
- Unless there is such a rule that can be enforced, dog owners may flee the scene to avoid legal consequences
- I've seen owners pretend it didn't happen or blame the person attacked (or owner of other animal attacked.)
- The owner should show accountability
- Many times when a dog attacks or bites a person or other animal the owners leave.
- no
- If they are requested to stay to give their information to law enforcement, they should have to stay to do so.
- Dogs who bite may or may not be to blame. The only way to deal with these matters is to discuss what happened and determine the level of threat that does or does not exist. A lot of times animals who bite are not well socialized, trained, or are highly anxious animals. It's about the owner, dog, and involved party equally.
- It is important that owners take responsibility for the actions of their pet and the potential cost of veterinary care in the case of a serious attack.
- The owner is responsible and needs to be held liable. Contact information should be exchanged and there should be an incident report.
- The requirement to remain at the scene of an incident makes sense, as long as it is safe to do so. (If someone has to leave in order to remove their dog from a situation if it can't be calmed down, then there should be an option for contacting enforcement within a certain time frame to declare themselves the owner of a dog who bit a person or animal and take responsibility for the incident.)
- If there is a serious dog bite incident I feel that exchanging information would be valuable for the same purpose it would serve following a car accident.
- People must be held accountable for their pets behaviour but this should include all dog bite incidents even regarding small dogs
- It is called responsibility.
- ALL PET OWNERS should be responsible for their animals!



- Common decency
- Obviously you should be required to stay and discuss with an officer.
- Well this is the type of thing that makes sense. Focus more on measures like this.
- "A vast majority of Bull Breed owners take on these miss understood breeds and need to have the opportunity to explain why the incident has occurred. Do I agree that there are people who miss treat loyal breeds and use them for an aggressive purpose??? ABSOLUTELY. Sadly that's not the dogs fault that they are so loyal to their owners. Those of us who understand and work hard to be educated on signs of stress, over stimulation, or feeling threatened for our dog need to have the opportunity to address these issues that may have occurred and created the opportunity for a bite. Whether it's a kid or the pet. At the end of the day the damage caused by ANY breed of dog is 90% due to pet owner training, lack of education, lack of time spent with their pet, and not teaching their own friends/family/strangers and neighbors how to properly approach their pet. It is solely our responsibility to look out for these possible situations and recognize the danger WE are putting our pets Into.
- If you have a reactive, nervous, temperamental, easily over stimulated dog, then why on earth are you taking it to a dog park, why on earth are you expecting it not to defend it self or react to things that make it u comfortable.
- We would never turn our children loose or take them to places that cause stress so why are people doing this with their dogs."
- Only if safe to do so, or they can provide contact info to someone over the phone.
- Yes, definitely. The owner should take responsibility, but this may be a one off and they fear for their dog.
- I believe any responsible pet owner would do this anyways, creating a fine for the irresponsible ones and provide more accountability for irresponsible owners is important.
- The owner should be responsible for the bite. Also, the dog should do obedience training after the incident.
- ** I think if it is a serious/ vicious bite (not an accidental bite to another dog while playing), then similar to a traffic issue the individuals involved should wait/ share contact info as needed.
- Both sides of each story need to be heard and considered. Too many biased situations and he said she said. Right now people are scared to stay BECAUSE of these HORRIBLE breed specific legislation though so good luck.
- The victim should have a way to follow up if necessary. However, pitbulls and bully breeds should not be treated differently from other breeds. Animal behaviour specialists should be an active part of case handling, and enforcement officers should not have the power to require euthanasia.
- I'm surprised this isn't already a bylaw
- I have 2 dogs. I would stay if there was an incident and I would expect the same. That's responsible dog ownership.
- Dog owners, like parents are responsible for their pets/offspring actions and should be required to remain on scene of an incident.



- Depending on how severe the bite is the victim could need stitches. It is also important that all dogs are registered and therefore need to have a record if they have bitten people.
- I cannot believe that this is not currently a rule in place
- only if it is safe to do so
- The dog's behaviour is the responsibility of its owner.
- The owner and those around at the time should stay to clearly provide a case of what happened. This includes other witnesses, and must be FACT BASED
- A responsible dog owner should be there to tell their side of what happen. There is always two sides to a story
- The vast majority of these instances appear to be negligent owners. All parties involved need to be spoken to.
- Dog behavior is, in large part, the responsibility of the owner
- The owner should stay at the scene do to get information just in case the animal has a certain disease or rabies that the owner is not aware of or it's the animal or person was bad enough that they could go through insurance to get their bills paid especially for vet bills cuz they're a very expensive.
- Dogs are our babies and just as a parent would be on and apart of any emergency with their children pet owners should be present for their animals as well.
- For the fairness and a good assessment of the situation, both parties should be present to discuss the situation.
- The owner should stay and share their information like any other accident
- I feel it's important for the dog owner to be held accountable for the actions of their animal.
- Owner must be held accountae for the actions of their dog.
- Dog bites are serious and should be treated seriously.
- Just to possibly help or contribute to any vet bills
- The owner must stay there unless the dog is a potential risk to everyone else around.
- I think this seems like a fair route to go, so long as it is dependent on the severity of the bite, and can be appropriately regulated.
- I do believe bits should be reported but everything is circumstantial
- If the owner leaves the scene they should be fined like a driver that leaves the scene of a motor vehicle accident.
- Communication is key
- Yes because owners should be in control of their dogs at all times and of a dog is ownerless then it was not under control or within control reach.
- Dogs are an owner's responsibility. What their dog does is their problem.
- Owners are responsible for their pets and their actions so much like you'd expect someone who caused a car accident to remain at the scene, pet owners should be required to remain at the scene of any incidents their animals cause
- Is this not common sense? Why is this even a question



- Same as an accident
- The dog owner is just that...an owner. As such, when their property (dog) creates a disturbance they should be available to provide their details.
- It's the same a car accident. If your property causes damage then you must be held responsible.
- I have seen and heard of too many situations where the offending dog and owner run away. Then victim has a heck of a time finding the offending owner. Exchange of information is so important when dealing with bite and injuries.
- This should be a given. Unfortunately it isn't. There should be a fine for leaving the scene.
- ANY breed that bites either a person or another dog, the owner should be present for. This includes small breeds such as chihuahuas and pugs. Not just limit to large dog breeds.
- Responsible pet owners must take ownership of their dog's actions.
- Similar to a car accident, it should be classed as a hit and run otherwise. If a pet has been attacked there will be costs associated.
- Absolutely an OWNER should be held responsible for the actions of their pet and stay to speak with an officer if there was an incident.
- If the severity was at large, one dog may be injured and it's that dog owner that should have to cover vet bills
- Why not? The owner can actually explain the situation and call out if the reasoning was from a person being stupid or not.
- They might just leave and get away with it
- We have to be accountable and responsible.
- They should be responsible for any costs associated with trauma.
- Both parties should be present to assist in a proper investigation. However, the aggressive dog must be kept a safe distance away from the victim so as not to escalate the situation.
- The owner is responsible for the behaviour of the dog and it's not different than staying on the scene of an accident.
- It's common sense
- its important to make sure proper steps are taken and that the owner takes responsibility
- It is the responsible thing to do?
- Responsibility of owner for dog behaviour.
- The person should remain at the scene, but the animal needs to go to a safe place while decisions are being made.
- The person should, at minimum, give accurate contact information, however, if a dog is being aggressive, keeping that dog at the scene might make a bad situation worse.
- If a dog bites, the contact info should be required from the owner
- It should be the same logic/reasoning as motor vehicle collisions.
- thats the right thing to do !!?
- I think if the individual dog has bite then the owner should be punished, after all they are the ones raising the dog it's not the breed its the irresponsible owners. Dont blame the poor breed



- If a dog bites someone, the owner should stay until officers arrive
- The owner should be present to explain what they witnessed in the incident
- they should at least give contact information to the person or owner in case of injury
- A dog owner is responsible for their dog. This includes small, medium or large dogs and all bites should be treated with the seriousness they entail.
- If you crash your car into someone you wait. Your pet and their actions are your responsibility
- As a dog owner , I believe, just like our kids , we always have a responsibility to their behaviour. A dog attack , be it on human or another animal, the costs can be high.
- When you hit someone with your car, you must stay at the scene to make sure the victim is okay and exchange contact details. Why is this different for dogs? Just the same that you are in control of a moving vehicle, you are in control of your dog
- If damage is done to the other person/animal, it should be the responsibility of the one who caused/allowed it, same as in vehicle collisions.
- A dog owner is responsible for their dog. This should include any and all breeds, not just large dogs.
- Similar actions would be taken in a car accident why not a dog bite accident!
- No matter the breed of the dog, the owner should 100% provide contact information if there is an attack or bite.
- I think that this would provide a better source of data on incidents. It would provide better breed identification and more detail in what lead up to the incident as both parties statements would be recorded.
- I think it should be based on the severity of the bite. Some dogs may just nip and have a cranky owner, in that case just an exchange of information would be fine. Of course if it's a severe bite then yes, the owner needs to stay there.
- A person should definitely be penalized if they do not stay on scene to exchange information with the person who is bit/whose animal was bit.
- If a bite happens, all parties should have the opportunity to explain why the incident occurred and the events leading up to it.
- All disciplinary measures should be targeted to the owner(s) involved in a given incident, particularly if it avoids needlessly broad rules (e.g., rules that begin with "All pit bulls must...").
- Safety and accountability
- I think there should be a requirement for owners of dogs that have attacked and nuisance dogs (NOT pit bull or breed specific) to leave information and in some cases carry insurance for potential victims of attacks).
- I think this is about ownership of the incident. People need to take responsibility for their pets.
- If it happens, discuss potential medical issues involved
- This question is not clear due to the conjunction. Contact information should be exchanged always. enforcement should only be engaged as required. I see this like a car accident. Information should be exchanged so that the party suffering damages can assess (including speaking to a vet or doctor if necessary) and then follow up. Those two parties can choose to then part ways or engage authorities if needed.



- but the bylaw needs to understand dog behavior, their needs to be a voice for the pet not just one bylaw officer
- The owner should remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information
- If mutually agreed that it is or isn't necessary by both parties. What's necessary can be determined prior to the law being put into effect.
- Any dog owner who would choose to leave the scene after their dog bites a person or animal is someone who should not own dogs or any pet . Seriously irresponsible to leave the scene .
- Seems to make sense, just like a car accident.
- This only works if the owner is present at the incident.
- Best to explain what, when, where and why it happened upon occurrence rather than going thru tribunal review which can falsely claim events
- See above answer to question 4
- Full circumstances should be heard, otherwise dogs and owners may be penalized unfairly for actions that may have been defensive and not offensive.
- This means that the owner is held responsible for not training their pet properly. **DO NOT BLAME THE DOG.**
- A bite is a bite, contact information is a must!0
- Ensure everyone is ok, vaccinate up to date and enforcement followup
- Only if a dog bites a person and there is trauma caused to that person should this be necessary.
- If there are injuries caused (skin breaking, bleeding, etc)
- If the owner leaves the scene there is no way to follow up or ensure that the owner is held responsible for their dogs actions.
- You are responsible for your dog and should be there to make sure the other person / dog is ok.
- Accountability for the actions of their lack of responsible pet ownership.
- All involved parties should file a report
- People need to be responsible for their dogs and any time a bite occurs an investigation of rabies prophylaxis should occur.
- It would depend on the severity Of the bite. I think just like fender benders sometimes intervention may be helpful or not necessary.
- This should be treated no different than a hit and run type of scenario. Severe fines should be handed out if information is not given, regardless and on top of any other fines administered.
- it only makes sense. Perhaps your dog wasn't the aggressor. There always two sides.
- How else could the dog be declared a problem if the owner and dog can walk away?
- Perhaps there needs to be some guidelines around when an owner should stay present at the scene to have a universal clear understanding of when it is necessary to exchange info
- There needs to be a record . If there is another attack they can not lie and say it's the first time and the owner and dog will be known
- Owners need to be accountable for their animal. It also depends on the bite. Viscious unprovoked bites are what concern me.



- Stay at the scene to stop confusion of the case
- It's not always the owner/dogs fault if they attack. I've had more incidents with off leash dogs that owners let run about come at me & my dog and my big dog is afraid of smaller breeds now. Just because my dog is a certain breed or bigger don't mean it's mean, sometimes they are just scared. I'm constantly moving my dog out of the way of small dogs that come running at her. For some reason people think little dogs are safer. I've been bit as well as my son by only small dogs.
- That's what a responsible dog owner should do
- Owners should be accountable for incidents involved with their dog, in the same way they are accountable at the scene of a car accident.
- Yes as long as it is done in a timely fashion
- if a dog bites another animal or person the owner won't want to give information
- if there are injuries or traumas the pet owner should be held accountable
- If the dog is no longer a threat, then stay. Do not punish the VICTIM for leaving.
- Accountability- only if skin broken and "victim" indicates necessary
- Must be held responsible
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs similar to drivers of vehicles
- I was shocked to discover that this currently wasn't required? It seems morally and ethically correct but I think if there was something legally enforcing this, that would be fantastic! We all need to be accountable.
- Since the bite could cause damage requiring the intervention of healthcare or animal hospital and the animal owner should be held responsible.
- Any dog owner should take responsibility for their dog regardless of its actions.
- Individuals should be held responsible.
- Owner accountability
- The owner needs to be responsible.
- I'm surprised this isn't already a rule
- Owners are responsible for their animals behavior, like they are their children's behavior and their own behavior. If they damaged someone's car, they have to provide insurance info. Same if an animal does damage to a person or property.
- Maybe not remain at the scene, but I do think it's important to exchange information between the parties involved to Be informed if the animal who bit is fully vaccinated. I think this should be punishable by a fine if the pets doesn't exchange info and worthy of investigation.
- This enables dog records to be verified. Also there are many perspectives - the dog may have been teased or threatened by the victim. The owner must stay at the scene as this is "an accident".
- Yes as it can go on record.
- I feel the least offending party can do is to provide proof of dog's vaccination records and have the incident recorded.
- All sides of the story need to be heard



- How is this not a rule already or why is this not common sense? If my pet hurt anyone or anything it should be expected that the situation would be handled before I leave the scene. It sounds like if the person is leaving prior to resolving the issue, than the issue isn't the pet but rather the owner.
- The owner should be responsible for their dogs behaviour. Be good to see if this is a repeat offence or if it has its vaccinations
- If a dog bites a person, it is the OWNERS responsibility to take the blame and they should be held accountable.
- A dog biting another person or animal is a serious community concern and should be reported so that the animal and owner can be monitored for future situations. If the owner is allowed to leave they may not be able to be contacted later.
- There is a possibility if a dog owner does not stay at the scene, he/she may deny being there in the first place.
- Yes if you are involved in an incident you should have to stay until it's properly reported
- If the owner of the attack dog bites another dog, they should be responsible for the vet bills.
- There have been lots of cases of owners leaving to avoid legal issues. It should be treated with the severity of a hit and and run.
- I was attacked in a small county in Idaho by 7 dogs, that ran off someone's property into the community street, as a teenager. The owners needed to be held responsible to prevent further attacks. None of the dogs were put down, but the owners were charged for housing the dogs while they were tested for diseases and the dogs, who were not up to date on any of their shots, were given all their shots at the owners expense. The owners were also required to put a fence up and house the dogs properly so they could no longer run off the property and into the neighborhood. As a dog owner, you absolutely need to take responsibility for damage caused by your dog, remain at the scene, and talk to enforcement if someone is bitten.
- Yes, owner needs to be held responsible
- To help with insurance and monitoring bad dogs
- Yes. I think that if there is a bite then it would be similar to a car accident as well I think the offending dog should be required to do additional training after.
- Common sense
- Dog owners should be held responsible for their dogs, REGARDLESS OF THEIR BREED
- It's part of being responsible for your pet.
- Absolutely necessary
- Why does this need an explanation. Really?
- This question is very situational. If the dog got loose or slipped out of its collar, yes the owner is responsible for whatever happens. If the dog was being provoked or approached without permission from the owner, it is not the dog's fault and the owner should not be held responsible.
- A dog's behaviour is a reflection of the owner, not the breed of the dog. Owners are responsible for training their dog, and should be held responsible for any incidents and should stay to answer any questions.



- If you are involved in a vehicle accident and leave the scene you will be criminally charged. If an animal in your charge causes injury you need to be responsible and explain the situation and be on record if that behavior intensifies.
- It is disgusting that you are considering attacking the pit bull breed like this. Shame. Do not make special requirements for breeds.
- Only if it's safe for all parties to do so.
- Responsible owners would stay around regardless of a bite or not.
- There are far too many incidents with owners not remaining at the scene.
- Owner must take responsibility for dogs' behaviour.
- I think it's crucial for everyone present to provide a recap of the incident t
- It would be similar to a car accident. Both parties should stay on site.
- People need to take responsibility of their dog if it injures another dog or person and should have to pay for those medical expenses.
- Yes, like a car accident.
- There needs to be an immediate explanation at the scene. Please ensure your enforcement officer is NOT AFRAID OF THE ANIMAL(s) or the people.
- The owner is responsible and should not attempt to flee the scene.
- Similar to a car accident
- I absolutely think people should take responsibility for their pets and themselves.
- Depending on the scenario. If the animal is in distress from the incident, remaining at the scene will cause further distress to the animal and it's owner and should be allowed to leave the scene. I agree with the owner sharing their contact information to an enforcement officer as a mediator, not directly to the other party involved.
- It's like a car accident. No one should leave until officials have said so
- The dogs are not at fault owners are..
- I feel that all dogs have the potential to be dangerous and mean, it's not breed specific. In fact some of the meanest dogs I've come across are small breeds such as chihuahuas, poodles and shitzu's. All dog owners need to be responsible owners no matter the breed and going after breed specific dogs show a lack of knowledge when it comes to specific breeds.
- Can't control the dog punish the onwer
- Hear both sides of the story before judging
- A dog is as good as it's owner - the animal is not responsible for their actions the owner is. An animal does not understand our rules and regulations, they act on instincts, fears... etc. It is an owner's responsibility to advocate for their animal, or take responsibility for the actions because of bad training, abuse or lack of care of an anxious or aggressive animal.
- I would support this if the bite was severe. I know the difficulty would then lie in quantifying that but I think requiring the owner to stay would help to gather relevant facts and information. It would hopefully help all parties come to a better resolution.
- I support rules that encourage owners to be responsible, rather than needlessly penalizing we'll behaved dogs of particular breeds.



- Only if blood is drawn
- Unless owner cannot safely contain the dog in order to stay
- The same as a car accident. The owner should stay to explain the incident and to ensure what was bitten is ok
- Hold them responsible for their pets actions and charge them like you would if they ran from a motor vehicle accident.
- Owners need to be accountable.
- BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION IS CRIMINAL!!!!!! I'm not explaining my answer here when there's nowhere to say the above.
- This is an irresponsible dog owner. They must own up to their poor handlings of their dog and offer information and to pay any vet bills that may arise from the injuries caused to the other dog.
- Aggressive dogs need to be stopped in this city. We need to identify people who promote these dogs.
- Offenders know who they are and the majority will try to leave
- An owner should be held accountable if their individual dog has attacked someone/something.
- It would be no different than if it was an motor vehicle accident.
- Pet owners need to be responsible for their pets
- You should probably say your side
- Hit and run is not different than bite and run/hide
- It's important to get both sides of the story and find out if the dog was provoked in any way or not
- It is the individuals responsibility to share their contact info and talk with an enforcement officer.
- This is necessary but in many instances remaining at the scene is not appropriate as the other parties involved may be going to a hospital/ vet clinic. Additionally the dog that was attacking may not be safe to remain out. In these cases the dog owner should provide appropriate contact information and not remain
- Owners are responsible for their pet and actions, so need to stay in scene and take accountability
- Biting is rarely the fault of the animal, so the owner should be present to explain the situation and the dog's history, as both are highly relevant to any such situation
- Absolutely, just like a car accident. Gotta stay at the scene of a crime.
- The owner must take responsibility for their animal
- You should have to remain on scene just like a car accident
- Promotes accountability.
- It is very important that the owner stays at the scene and has their dog under control. Too often they try to take off and you have no way of contacting them. This is especially true if you end up with a large vet bill.
- Accountability is important
- Absolutely, it should be treated the same as a car accident, including fines associated if they do not
- I would imagine responsible owners do this already
- If you can't leave a car accident you shouldn't leave an animal accident!



- information needs to be shared for correct course of action. Except when the owner needs to take the animal home or to a vehicle to remove them from a situation
 - "By requiring the owner of the animal to remain at the scene where an incident has occurred, this rule in question would promote the accurate reporting of facts and would prevent the mislabeling and misrepresentation of breeds as ""dangerous"".
 - Not all people are familiar with or able to identify certain dog breeds. Having the the owner remain at the scene, where they are able to clarify the breed of their dog or, at the very least, provide additional facts, promotes the accurate reporting of data and information."
 - If there is trauma (broken skin) to either a person or a dog the owner should remain at the scene, unless the dog is being uncooperative and aggressive. If there is just a scuffle between dogs there is no need for information exchanged.
 - accountability
 - If your dog causes an injury, it is your responsibility and you should be held accountable.
 - Owner must take accountability for incident.
 - Yes, but this has nothing to do with the breed of the dog.
 - "If a dog/person that was bitten sustained severe damage, then yes, that would be the responsibility to the owner to deal with the situation.
-
- Also, in regards to increasing limitations on pit bulls is ignorant. Smaller dogs statistically are more aggressive than bigger breeds. Also singling out only pit bulls instead of Rottweilers or Dobermans for instance, who have the same capability for causing damage, is not fair. When in actuality, it is all how you train and handle these animals that governs their behavior. Maybe instead of all these restrictions, look into training classes for owners, breeders, and adoption services. That way it could deter people from adopting, and therefore a decrease in ownership. Or seeing a decrease in bad behavior."
 - That way there can be more tracking done on the dogs. If a dog is dangerous to anyone then there should be consequences, if it's not then it should not be treated any different just because of its breed.
 - This will allow everything to be sorted more efficiently.
 - Owners should be held responsible, it's very rare it's the dogs fault. If you as the person owner know you have a problem pet, should be responsible for keeping that said pet away from dog parks, pathways with lots of people etc. It's usually human fault and not the pets. There are some circumstances and these need to be looked at and addressed. No matter what the breed is.
 - Owners should be responsible
 - As long as it is any dog. Equality should be equal.
 - Owners need to take responsibility for their pets behavior.
 - But only if the person who has been bitten or had their animal bitten feels is is necessary.



- This should be treated like a car accident. People should take pictures and get witnesses. The current standard is simply he said she said and results in dogs being wrongfully punished for something they may not have even done. Owners of the offending dog should also be liable for any bills the victim requires.
- People need to be responsible if their animal bites or attacks. Leaving the scene should only be allowed if there is an injury
- If a dog of any breed bites, the owner should have to stay and talk to a law enforcement officer, make sure the other individual is alright, that they get medical care if needed.
- Take responsibility for your actions.
- This should happen with every species
- Pet owners need to be held accountable when injuries occur.
- If a person's dog bites another person or animal, they need to take responsibility for it.
- I believe that if harm has been done by a dog it is the owner's responsibility to handle the situation appropriately. Make sure that whoever was affected is okay and proceed with law enforcement to determine the outcome of the situation.
- To actually find out what happened with factors contributing not always within the blamed dog's control. For example small dogs can be fairly aggressive and not controlled by the owner same with kids who should be patented and not allowed to approach a strange dog. These both examples have happened while out walking my Shepard Lab cross
- The animal's actions are at least in part a reflection of the owner's care, therefore the owner themselves are just as if not more responsible.
- How else are you to track them down?
- Good dog owners are always with their dogs.
- Because that's what responsible pet owners do.
- If your a dog bites someone you need to be responsible for it.
- Once the dog attacks or bites another person, even if it is the owner, it automatically gets euthanized. No questions asked!
- If there is need to follow up or concern
- Yes, because dogs and their owners go unpunished if they just "bite and run". Just like motor vehicles, they need to stay and have fines/punishments applied before taking off.
- It's like remaining at an accident scene until the police arrive.
- Any responsible dog owner should stay at the scene of an incident. It is sad that this needs to be a law.
- The owner needs to be present when a report is filed to ensure all facts are documented
- I believe dog owners are responsible for ensuring that their dog does no harm to a person, property, or another animal. In order to ensure that dog owners are following the appropriate bylaws, they should be required to remain at the scene of an incident (similar to an operator of a motor vehicle being required to stay at the scene of an accident).
- Yes because some incidents can cost a lot at the vet and it's unfair for the owner to have to pay if someone's else's dog attacked theirs



- Owner needs to be responsible and accountable
- I once witnessed a dog bite a 6 year old boy unprovoked and then the owner and dog fled.
- Absolutely, they need to take responsibility for their dog's behaviour. Vet bills should be paid for by the owner of the dog that attacked.
- I think it should be similar to a car insurance claim, if the bite is serious enough that it could need medical attention for an animal or human then they should be liable for the damages
- I think this is a good idea, but only if the incident met certain conditions. Was it a provoked incident? Was blood drawn? Will a vet be required?
- if necessary
- It is important that both sides of the story are understood. Sometimes people approach the dog without asking the owner if the dog is alright with it. The public needs to be educated in this manner, some dogs can't be trained to adore everyone and some have previous trauma that keeps them from approaching certain individuals.
- You are responsible for your dogs behaviour
- It isn't the dogs fault but the owner make owner responsible
- Owner should have to wait for officer if the person bitten or parent calls for an officer. In any bite situation the pet owner should have to give the person their personal contact information/licence number
- Not unlike a car accident both sides have a story and the truth is often in the middle. Both parties should be available to give statements and it does the dog owner no favours by leaving the scene.
- Too many pitbull owners don't want to risk having their dog euthanized, so they hide ! Once a pitbull attacks once !! It's going to attack again , this is a fact that Pitbulls owners deny !
- It is the responsibility of all parties involved to remain at the scene and to give authorities a statement through their lens to determine what happened.
- Of course. The animal has been involved in an emergency. Just as a witness must stay at the scene of a crime so too must the dog's owner remain and be held accountable UNLESS the injuries to animal/human require going to a vet or hospital before an officer can arrive. But information should still be exchanged as should witness information.
- Only if necessary. People's sensitivity towards dog behaviour is extremely variable.
- Our pit bull mix was attacked by 3 dogs and they left the scene. It cost us \$800 at the vet and there was no way to claim. FYI - our dog was not aggressive at all but is considered in City plans as aggressive/nuisance.
- It's the responsible thing to do!
- How else would you gather the necessary information to identify potential nuisance animals?
- Provide both accounts of the situation
- If there are any injuries especially to get the owners information and statement and any necessary reports in case vet bills are required in the case of an injured animal
- Dogs only bite when provoked. Safety for both parties is the foremost concern, and proof of vaccination against rabies etc must be provided. I do not believe police should be involved, Animal experts would be a better choice.



- no explanation needed
- An individual dog should be assessed and owner itself should be assessed for risks associated with possible risk for harming again. It is the dog owners responsibility to ensure their dog is safe in the community
- We need accountability
- It's already the responsibility of the pet owner to stay at the scene or provide contact details for an incident.
- Yes, we need ways of keeping track of the irresponsible owners and possibly dangerous dogs.
- I think it's important they stay, unless doing so would be of higher risk. For example an aggressive dog at large, caught but not under control, should not stay at the scene of a bite incident.
- Wouldn't anything else be "bite-and-run"? Huge fines should be issued for anyone who leaves the scene of the incident, but bylaw response must be timely (can't make people wait for an hour).
- A health history is important to any dog bite victim
- the dog owner should be able to defend their dog in the instance of a person provoking the dog. Dogs do not attack without reason.
- "I think the owner of any animal should be held accountable for the actions of the animal. Not just dogs. Especially not just ""pitbulls"" as you have been referring to them.
- Yes. You stay at the site. Is that not common sense?"
- Dog owners always need to be accountable for their dog's behaviour
- Sharing information helps to find out why the dog is biting and if it is being abused at home
- Stay or give contact information to be able to take the dog out of the situation and still be able to talk about the incident.
- If the bite is serious enough and they seek medical attention
- If their dog bit someone, you should stay with the injured party to ensure they are ok and don't require further assistance.
- As long as there is a requirement for both parties to remain civil and cooperative. No one has to stay in a abusive situation.
- Yes the owner should be there to assist in the investigation, it is not always the dogs fault
- "People who should stay:
 - Owner of dog
 - Person who got bit
 - A witness of there are any
- Some people provoke and abuse dogs and the dog retaliates. Also if the dog bites unprovoked a witness would be helpful to determine who is in the wrong."
- Basic responsibility.
- Pet owners are responsible for training and behavioral issues. They should maintain responsibility for any attacks or incidents
- Yes
- Of course, just like a car accident, be civil and exchange info. Talk to witnesses.



- If your animal attacks another animal or person, they have not been trained right. No animal is naturally aggressive, except small dogs like chihuahuas. The owner is at fault for an attack, they definitely should wait and talk to an officer.
- Dog ownership requires responsibility and accountability for your animal
- As long as it's safe to do so. False claims can be made against anyone who takes off.
- Obviously????
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their dog, this includes providing necessary information to ensure safety and follow-up for the victim and proper actions taken for the dog and owner
- Shouldn't be any different than leaving the scene of a car accident.
- It is asking too much of a person who might have been injured by an animal to have to follow the owner home in order to obtain necessary information.
- Owners should be held accountable for being poor owners. They should provide information in order to track if they respect the obligation they took on by being a dog owner.
- Dog owners need to be held much more accountable for. Or training or have control of their animals.
- If a dog bites someone regardless of size or breed, it is the owner's responsibility. It should be treated like a car accident. You have to stay on scene until otherwise told.
- The owner knows the dog the best, and the dog is most comfortable with their owner. It can help the dog not be as stressful, and the owner can give accurate information about the dog.
- It's important to be responsible for your pets actions. However, I do not support punishing an animal before the crime and forcing certain breeds to wear muzzles. I am a pitbull owner and my dog is the sweetest most friendly dog ever. She's been attacked 5 times and never fought back. Please stop dog racism!!
- It prevents people from fleeing or failing to understand appropriate next steps.
- You, as the owner, are responsible for the dog. Owners should be held responsible to properly train their dogs, the dogs should not be punished for what their owners failed to do.
- There needs to be accountability for irresponsible dog owners.
- Don't flee the scene. Pretty standard for any injury accidents
- Common courtesy
- I've heard first hand heard from many of my neighbours and family that dog owners of vicious dogs often RUN after their dog attacks another dog. There should be a rule to implement that they are required to stay and when they are caught/tracked down - there should be a higher fine for running much like a hit and run of a vehicle accident.
- So long as it's safe to do so (i.e. the animal isn't going to harm anyone else), the owner should remain at the scene. If they can't do so, then providing valid contact details to the other party before leaving is a must.
- It's the responsibility of any pet owner to answer to their animals behaviour. Remaining at the scene of an incident is an extension of that responsibility
- The owner is responsible for the actions of the animal. Therefore, any lack of obedience is upon the owner.
- They should have to take responsibility.



- They are responsible for the safety of the dog and others
- Dogs do not randomly attack or show aggressive behaviour, it is trained or learned. This could help to expose incompetent dog owners if they are held responsible for their dog's actions against other people or animals.
- Same concept as a vehicle hit and run, especially when there is an injury.
- Common sense
- Yes, everyone should take ownership if their dog bites.
- Too many people don't take responsibility
- The dog is considered property and bad owners should be responsible for their actions
- Na
- It's better for the owner to stay there to tell them their side of the story, there is always two sides to every story and if the owner doesn't stay it could lead to the dog being taken away for improper information. Dogs just like any animal will defend them selves and there owners if they feel threatened and accidents happen we can't blame and animal for doing what there instincts tell them to do. It's our choice to own animals but our responsibility to train them correctly and to treat them with respect and not abuse.
- The dog is the responsibility of the owner. In addition, an owner can give more explanation to potential reasons why the dog attacked. For example, if the dog had no history of aggression, why would this type of attack have happened, and if it can be tracked back to a particular reason, why that dog may or may not attack in the future (i.e avoidable behavior).
- "1)People are responsible for their dogs actions
- 2)dog can not explain its own actions"
- The owner must be held responsible, especially in the case that they should be on file. If the owner is having repeated negative interactions, especially if it's a violent interaction, I think it's important to both fine owner and possibly have other punitive actions
- An owner shouldn't be able to leave the scene of the incident, just like in motor vehicle accidents.
- Responsibility for your animal's actions should be emphasized.
- People need to take responsibility for their pets
- They need to take the responsibility for there pet
- As a dog owner we are responsible for the behavior of our animals just as we are of our cars.
- The owner of the dog that bites should be held accountable for medical bills of the person or animal that was bit.
- But how do we make them stay there?
- Yes. Always should the owners of both parties be present to exchange valid info and be held accountable for any vet bills associated
- This should only be used for the purpose of ensuring both parties have resolved any actions that wish to be taken. This rule should not be implemented to allow the City to mandate control of an animal, or decision on how to treat the animal.
- Only if skin is broken on person or vet is required to other animal



- They need to be held responsible and it's very important to know if their dog is up to date on their shots¹
- I agree to let the pet owner to hold the responsibility of the pets' behaviour.
- How else can the offender and the dog be identified if they leave the scene?
- If your dog bites someone then it is your responsibility.
- Liability
- If a dog bites another animal, vet bills can be expensive. Bad owners make bad dogs and that owner should be responsible for that.
- The owner is responsible for their animal and should be present during a claim being filed. It's important to have multiple witnesses in these cases.
- This is a no brainer...should be treated the same as fleeing the scene of a vehicular accident.
- In case vet bills need to be paid
- I do agree that if a bite occurs all of the above action suggested in question 5 should be taken
- Similar to a car accident where neither parties intended for something to occur; it must be handled appropriately
- a person but could need medical care that could potentially cost them money.
- I think they should assuming it is safe to do so. If not, I don't think there is anything wrong with leaving as long as information has been shared
- need to know if bite was provoked or accident
- That's a responsibility as a responsible pet owner
- makes it easier if they have to go to court
- It's important for dog owners to be responsible for their pets.
- The owner needs to take responsibility.
- This aspect of citizenship and responsibility is important in order for a more complete, equitable, and just understanding of the situation only when all parties are actively involved in reporting incidents could appropriate resolutions be found.
- Heck yes if there is an incident.. then you remain.. you and your dog might be the victims/maybe not clear or your dog is the aggressor. like a hit and run you need to stay or it's a criminal violation
- their dog caused damage, they should be liable for any expenses
- Yes, this is necessary so that vaccine information can be shared and if another animal is injured and requires medical attention, they can help with the bill.
- I only agree if the bite was severe and unprovoked or was provoked no matter how severe the bite. If a stranger did not listen to an owner's commands and proceeded to provoke the dog, I believe that person should receive a fine for animal abuse
- if the dog bites someone unprovoked and not in defence of themselves or their owner then the owner should have to stay on the scene. if the dog bit someone in defence of themselves or their owner then the owner and dog should be allowed to leave for their own safety.
- The situation has to be explained in case the dog was provoked which led to the attack which shouldn't be a punishable offence



- You are responsible for your dog
- Yes, the owner is responsible.
- People need to be accountable for their pets actions, they need to train them and care for them and if they don't, they must be accountable.
- It should be similar to a car accident, where the owners need to exchange information and have a bylaw officer come and fill out a report.
- If the owner is there, they should stay at the scene.
- I've seen or heard of too many people giving false information to the owner of the injured pets or they just choose to leave as if nothing happened. Owners need to be held accountable.
- It's the same as a traffic accident. Often, owners of dogs who bite take off to avoid consequences.
- Absolutely contact info should be exchanged so that there can be follow up to ensure the victim recovers and that the dog owner receives, at minimum, an opportunity to be educated on responsible pet ownership.
- I believe the owner is still responsible for their dog. If a child bit another child they would stay on scene I'm sure.
- In most cases, there is more to the story and the owner should be there to explain it. Sometimes the dog could have been provoked
- Same as hit and run accidents
- In my opinion, it is usually the owner that is to blame for aggressive dogs, so the owner needs to be held to a higher standard.
- You never know. Although if dog is in care and control by the owner or authorized individual then it must be determined on a case by case basis
- It's important for the owner to remain at the scene and be held accountable. It's also important for an officer to hear all the facts about the incident from ALL parties involved.
- All responsible dog owners should remain at the scene to explain what happened and provide vaccination history for proper medical care.
- Owners are responsible for their behavior
- This should be at the discretion of the victim. If person is unable to speak or animal does not have a present owner, then yes.
- It is always the owner that manages the environment and past learning history of the dog.
- Don't understand how this wouldn't already be a rule
- The owner is responsible and should be required to remain on scene until law enforcement arrives to get statements
- If a dog bites a person, the owner must understand they are accountable and need to be around to provide information.
- Owners are for the most part, responsible for their dogs behaviour. Behaviour of the people involved is just as important. People have to be respectful of dogs. It is moronic to consider the entire pit bull breed as nuisance dogs. Anyone that any experience with dogs knows his. PLEASE Make decisions based on facts, and advise given by those who have an expertise and are knowledgeable in this



area. What idiot came up with this pit bull ban? Why haven't you properly educated yourselves on this breed?

- i think that owners whos animals have been involved in an attack should be required to stay at the scene. I believe this will make it even more apparent that ALL breeds of dogs can pose a risk and if the animal stays at the scene, demographic information can be more accurate and prejudice will not be the only thing determining who is at fault
- Bites often result in medical or vet bills. The dog owner should be responsible for a portion of the damages
- If the victim of the bite wants to involve an enforcement officer then the dog owner should have to remain. If the victim doesn't want to report it then everyone should be free to go.
- There isn't much to explain. It should be treated the way a car accident is.
- I think too often the owner just takes off so yes the incident is reported the owner should have to talk to the officer.
- To many pet owners flee the scene when their pet hurts someone and this is not acceptable
- And if they dont big fine just like leaving a car accident
- Accountability is important. Most of the time it's improper training, not the breed or dog itself.
- I believe that the person of the dog who bite another person/animal should stay because it gives them the opportunity to tell their side of the story. Maybe the other dog was attacking that dog and the dog who bite defended itself. There are always two sides to every story and if both parties aren't there to tell them, who do you believe?!
- This is just responsible pet ownership.
- If you own a dog that bites a person or animal, you have a responsibility towards the victim.
- it is 100% the dog owners responsibility to remain at the scene if their dog attacks anything/one.
- Owners that have dogs that inflict damage to another should be held responsible of the situation and any medical costs associated with fixing the victims trauma
- Dog owners should absolutely remain at the scene. Not having dog owners remain at the scene seems very irresponsible.
- This would be no different than leaving the scene of a car accident.
- If I hit someone with my car, I am expected to stay and share contact information AND speak to enforcement. Why in the WORLD would it be any different if my DOG attacked a person or another pet? Make it a CRIME to pit and run. It is not a secret that pit bull owners are known to flee the scene after their dog bites someone, that's not news, and that needs to stop. There has to be major consequence; if you want to have a fighting dog breed in your home known for being statistically and genetically more inclined than any other breed of dog towards violence, then you had better be ready to step up when your dog follows their genetic predisposition for aggression and attacks. Point blank, period.
- A persons animal is their responsibility so any harm their animal does to another animal or individual should be treated like any other incident involving bodily harm
- This should be self explanatory and required no different than not leaving the scene of a motor vehicle accident.



- They should be held liable for not having control of their animals and this may help people whose animal was hurt
- Owners should be accountable. If their dog is on a leash however, and a dog runs up to them and gets bit by a leashed dog, the leashed dog should not be penalized. The reality is, if there is off leash parks, you truly know EVER, if ANY dog will react to another, regardless of breed.
- If you are injured in a car crash you have to. Why would this be different
- But it's not just pitbulls ! Ive had a German Shepard attack my dog as well as a chow husky mix. There should be a law for responsible dog owners period. Not be discriminatory against one breed. It's the owner not the dog.
- It is the owners responsibility. The dogs behaviour is a reflection on the owner.
- Both sides of the story needs to be heard, and maintain responsibility
- The owner should be held responsible
- I think the dog owner should take responsibility for the dogs actions
- No
- That is the responsible thing to do but it doesn't happen because people are afraid of the process and that their dog will be euthanized. Dogs bite because they perceive a threat. It is natural behaviour. Help owners get their dogs trained. Dogs CAN be rehabilitated with an experienced person.
- Too many pet owners dont take responsibility for their dogs actions. Staying to discuss especially because medical Bill's are expensive.
- That way you have all the pertinent information
- the owner is responsible for the dog's actions, and should have to deal with the situation.
- If your dog bites another dog, animal or person, by law must be notified and if possible everyone must remain at the scene
- Dog learns from ppl..ppl are responsible
- Dogs who attack are many times just whisked away by their owners.
- My dog and I were attacked by a dog that was let out of its yard by the owners children. I knew what house it was from so I went and rang the doorbell and the owners hid in the house like cowards and did nothing to help or to prevent another attack. There are too many people with this mindset in the city.
- It's common sense that if your dog bites you are responsible
- To ensure there's follow up for safety
- Leaving the scene should be a warrantable offence, And the animal immediately forfeited to the municipality to be destroyed. If the human in control makes bad decisions, then for sure the animal will as well.
- Yes because ALL sides to the story are valid and equally important to have fair and just ruling as per the case.
- Every owner should take responsibility for your dog. Regardless of breed if you know they show aggression, it is your responsibility to manage the situation
- dog owner needs to take responsibility for any offence their dog is involved in



- The dog owner should remain at the scene as described but also needs to have the ability to remove the dog from the dangerous situation.
- Yes or to leave full contact information with others if they must leave the scene in order to control the dog
- "All rules should apply to *all* HUMANS, as they are the problem, not the breed of dog. I am an owner of a Labrador retriever, but I feel that the discrimination against the breeds you are proposing is a massive overreach on behalf of the City. Bad owners make 'bad dogs' - not a certain breed. More resources should be spent promoting responsible breeding and placement of dogs in homes.
- Frankly, I'm confused as to why the city is prioritizing this issue at all when we know that the city will be faced with unprecedented challenges in the next few years."
- Dog owners should be liable, and both dog and owner should take classes. Some people shouldn't be allowed to own dogs.
- People need to be held accountable table for their dogs behaviour regardless of breed. Breed discrimination does not work. Attention to people and stricter enforcement when they allow their dog to become a nuisance or choose to ignore bylaws which can affect others.
- "insurance information, contact information.
- An owner of a dog who was bitten should not be solely accountable, that owner of the biting dog should have accountability ad a role in supporting payment for vet bills etc.
- The OWNER of the animal is responsible for injury of another animal NOT the dog."
- You should be required to stay at scene and take accountability
- Yes in theory, but wouldn't it be safer in some cases to get the dog home and contained? Rather than having a stressed/aggressive dog remaining at the scene and potentially causing more issues. Perhaps just make the punishment reasonably mild eg. \$30 fine for leaving the scene.
- Too often, people involved in these incidents take off and you're left with an injured dog and substantial vet bills. If they leave the park, once found it should be an additional fine.
- the owner needs to take responsibility for their dog.
- Unless there is a medical reason for the owner not to stay on scene, the owner should be responsible enough to answer questioning and potentially bring their dog for professional assessment to determine if the behavior was just a freak accident or if it is a pattern that needs consist management
- Need to have contact info for vet costs
- Be responsible for their animals behaviour and ensure other person is ok.
- For any serious bites
- Dog bites are serious no matter the breed and should be recorded. If the dog has a history of bad behaviour and the owner is not being held responsible that's a problem
- I think it's a part of responsible pet ownership. I have been involved in a situation where another dog went after mine to the point, I had to pick mine up. The owner was lagging far behind, talking on his phone and when I tried to talk to him about it, he told me I should stay out of the dog park and left. I love taking my dog to the park and want to be able to continue to do so, but there are some terrible stories of dogs being attacked and owners not taking any accountability for it.



- Ultimately, the owner is responsible, not the dog. The owner should have to stay on the scene.
 - The victim shouldn't be paying the medical bills, unless it's determined by an enforcement officer it's the victim's fault.
 - Both sides of the story must be heard
 - Actions must be taken so it does not happen again.
 - But, one cannot always remain. Obviously they cannot control the dog enough, so sticking around would not be ideal. Give phone number and go home.
 - You can drive off from a car accident why should you be allowed to leave if your dog does something. You need to be accountable
 - It's usually not the dog's fault no matter what breed it is. It is the owner that is responsible for the dog.
 - Similar to car accidents, having both parties present at the scene allows for a greater understanding of the incident and the possible remedy that both parties can discuss. And it is simply good manners.
 - "As a responsible dog owner, it's important to provide all information necessary. I disagree with targeting pit bull type dogs. All dogs need training as do their humans. Any dog
-
- As a responsible dog owner all information should be provided if an animal bites a person. I dislike the idea of focusing on pit bull type breeds. There are no bad dogs just bad owners and all dogs and their humans need training."
 - Absolutely, that dog is your responsibility just as if your kid punched someone at school the parents get called to the principal's office to deal with the situation accordingly
 - Same protocols as when you're involved in an accident.
 - Responsibility is good.
 - Staying at the scene shows you're willing to figure out what happened and see if there can be an easier answer. Running always means super guilty.
 - The dog owner should be required to remain at the scene of the dog bite and take responsibility for the actions of their dogs.
 - Responsible ownership.
 - It makes sense and is fair
 - I believe aggressive behaviours are learned and not blamed on breed aggression. Aggression could also be from an abused rescue or provoked. The owner should remain on site and exchange



information so that it can be better identified as to why the dog reacted in a manner that was deemed aggressive

- Yes and how is this NOT the law already? Leaving the scene should also include a fine.
- Yes, I think a similar concept to a collision in a car can apply. But, a requirement to remain at the scene should only exist if under conditions such as blood or a fall that requires any medical attention.
- This should be the same as the exchange of information at a vehicle accident. If severe enough of an incident they should have to meet with an officer at the time of the event to provide a statement and not be given the chance to fill it out later. ie have a chance to modify the story to their benefit.
- Responsible pet owners should and would do that anyway.
- Obviously.
- It's just like a car accident. If ANY kind dog is to bite It's the pet owners responsibility to deal with it and remain at the scene until dealt with properly.
- Dog owner could possibly give a false name or contact info.
- Yes. The owner is responsible for the actions of the animal. Wouldn't leaving the scene be the same thing as leaving the scene of a vehicle accident? People must stay and be a part of the investigation.
- No one should be able to flee if someone or an animal has been harmed, proper channels should be followed.
- Most owners of non aggressive looking dogs which are more likely to cause bites (ie smaller terrier types) laugh/shrug off aggressive behavior and attacks by their dogs due to their size. This should be taken just as seriously as for larger dogs. Aggressive behavior is aggressive behavior period and should be addressed as such.
- There should be a requirement to do so in order to uphold accountability. Otherwise, there is the potential of incident occurring, and then false information being provided to avoid repercussions.
- I think the owner should be present to give their side of the story.
- I absolutely think the dog owner should remain at the scene: If the dog has had issues before it needs to be noted by an enforcement officer so they can take action as needed (ie declare the dog a nuisance based on prior biting incidents).
- They should be responsible for their pets behaviour.
- They are responsible for their pet and as such should provide information to help those impacted.
- It's the responsible thing for a dog owner to do.
- I think it's a responsibility in the case of harm but had NOTHING to do with breed
- yes it is your responsibility to follow through with care and concern for the animal that is injured. Pet owners need to be advocates for their pet.
- If your dog has bitten another person or dog you should remain at the scene as you would if you hit another vehicle.
- the owner of the dog needs to be held responsible
- If there are any fees associated with said bite then the owner of the offending dog should have to pay.
- If the bite requires medical attention.



- Yes, they should be required to provide information but if the dog is causing more trouble by remaining on site they should be able to leave their information and remove the dog
- If there is another human being present the responsibility is to share contact information to track potential rabies or other diseases/medical repercussions.
- It's part of being a responsible dog owner.
- It's responsible pet ownership
- I don't support breed banning I believe Humans need to be accountable not the dog . A dogs only jobs are to protect and serve. Let's go after the owners. A no kill policy would be nice to see. I have 2 shi tzu's and I totally keep them away from small kids I know they will bite as they are afraid. This is no reason to ban the breed or euthanize them.
- Dog owner should ALWAYS be in control of their animal and if not should be held accountable
- Anyone owning an animal that has attacked or bitten another animal or a human should stay at the scene and be held accountable.
- Owner should be able to discuss the incident.
- The owner is the one that is ultimately responsible for the pet. They should have to remain on scene to give a statement.
- Responsible pet owners should take responsibility for their pet's behavior
- Take responsibility for your dogs reaction what whatever made it bite, or else to explain why it happened/there side of the story
- It's important to share both sides of any situation.
- Owners should be able to discuss the incident with all parties.
- If the owner runs off there is a large chance the dog will bite again in another situation
- This is something that should be in effect already, so to protect all parties involved.
- I do not agree with breed specific legislation. [removed], the former director of Animal Services stated that in his research and over a decade of experience that BSL does not reduce the incidences of dog bites. BSL can be difficult to enforce particularly if the breed of dog cannot be clearly established. The legislation is discriminatory towards responsible pet owners. Bite rates for different breeds are unreliable because the data is unreliable (breed is unknown or misreported, not all bites are reported, statistics ignore other important factors such as socialization, neutering and proper containment). As said by the American Veterinary Medical Association, "Breed-specific bans are a simplistic answer to a far more complex social problem, and they have the potential to divert attention and resources from more effective approaches." The City of Calgary has demonstrated leadership with responsible pet ownership over BSL. While I would encourage strengthening responsible pet ownership through education and enforcement of problem owners and nuisance animals, enacting breed specific legislation is a simplistic band aid solution to a complex problem and will not make Calgarians safer.
- The owner is responsible. Why allow them to flee the scene if there has been an injury?
- It's simply the right thing to do
- Or provide identification and contact info to a witness or victim, if the animal is too hard to control at the scene or continues a state of aggression or intimidation



- It should be enforced that pet owners of animals that bite should be held accountable and should be made to stay at the scene.
- Thought this was already a rule.
- The owner of the attacking dog should be liable for vet bills, if any, for the injured dog. However there needs to be witnesses. The dog could have been acting in self defence or as a warning to an annoying/untrained dog. If that's the case, the injured dog owner should be liable.
- It shouldn't just be pitbulls declared a "nuisance" all dogs that have attacked or bit in the past should also be declared a nuisance.
- Yes I think if somebody's pet harms another person or another pad and it's bad enough that a third party needs to come in, then the owner should definitely stay unless they had a different agreement between them and the victim. But I would think it would be a similar process 2 when you are in a collision with another vehicle. you staying exchange contact information and depending on how bad it was you decide to leave or call in additional support.
- Absolutely! This is no different than leaving the scene of a crime, and the owner is effectively an accomplice. There should be criminal penalties for any dog owner that leaves the scene of a dog altercation without providing true and reliable contact information.
- I believe that the owner should remain on scene in order to talk to an enforcement officer as this may help resolve the issue from happening again. I think the owner is just as responsible for the action of their pet, as they are the ones that are raising the animal. If the owners are held more accountable, it may influence how people view pet ownership and training. It isn't always the animals fault in these instances, and by directly involving animal owners, hopefully this will allow the owner to understand more time needs to be spent with the animal to get them to where they need to be when it comes to obedience and training. We need to set the animals up for success and most cases the issue is the owner and not the animal.
- There have been too many cases of dog bites where the owner of the aggressor then leaves with the dog, and the owner of the bitten dog (or parent of a child, or other person) has no history and no way to know what they may have to deal with outside of a standard dog bite. If proper information is shared they do not have to stay at the scene (the same as a traffic collision).
- Sometimes when another animal has been there a vet bills that the other owner should pay for if their dog inflicted the wound
- As long as it's reasonable to do so... if it's safer to leave (e.g., to get the dog away from the situation), there should be some allowance for that as long as they either return or talk to the enforcement officer at another time.
- It should be considered akin to any other property or casualty damage
- In case the animal had been involved in other incidents, or is in violation of rules placed for nuisance animals
- You can't just have your dog biting people and walk away
- "If its against the law to drive off from a scene of a car accident, I don't see how its any different if you ""bite"" & run.



- Stipulation should be that it should be safe to do so, ie. dog can be sufficiently restrained & restricted from doing any further damage."
- Exchange information of vet history and everything is important.
- It seems like it makes sense to me, similar to a car accident.
- I just think that's being a responsible pet owner
- Owners should be held accountable for their dogs behaviour, and should be willing to provide contact information.
- Definitely. The owner is responsible if that dog bites someone
- Only in sever cases
- Be responsible
- Why the hell not?
- The owner of the dog that attacked the other person/dog should be held responsible, but if the person can't keep the dog under control and there is no safe place to tie the dog's leash to, I think it is perfectly reasonable to take the dog home and then immediately return to the scene of the incident and then exchange information and wait for police. The person should communicate the plan with the other person first before leaving though.
- It makes no sense that there are no consequences for not doing the right thing which is staying at the scene of an incident.
- Except when necessary to obtain medical attention and or to reduce the risk of further harm to people or animals
- The owner has to take responsibility for their pet simple as that.
- Far too many people in off leash parks let their dogs roam and if an incidents occurs, are quick to blame the other person for their lack of control of their dog. Even if this were a law, these types of people would not stick around because they know they are to blame.
- I think it's best to hear both sides of a conflict rather than just one so yes, the owner of the dog who bites should remain on scene and share contact information and/or speak with an officer.
- However if you need to get your dog under control, and that means leaving the scene, as long as you call 311 or something to identify yourself and your dog I'd be okay with that too.
- If anyone is injured, then the dog owner should be paying for surgery.
- owners NEED education. dog bites are rarely the fault of the dog but the situation the dog is exposed to combined with the lack of training.
- a dog bite can cause severe trauma for the victim, this is similar to a car accident. This should be so as to convey the absolute serious nature of the incident.
- So that proper follow up can be assured because the officer has the contact information. The rules should be the same as for hitting a pedestrian with a car.
- As with traffic incidents, I believe it is necessary to remain on scene to ensure correct information regarding incident and parties is collected and recorded.
- Unless this increases danger/stress, in which case just leave contact info



- Because not all bites are caused by aggression. Sometimes dogs bite to defend, out of fear or if they are being harassed. Dogs who are sick or in pain may bite when approached suddenly or if touched in the wrong place.
- depending on the bite, the hurt person or animal may need to go to the vet, so it would be hard to ensure the person remains, it also might be dangerous to have the animal stay there
- To avoid future problem such as life threatening situation. Dog owners should be more aware in public area.
- If a dog bites another animal or a person and the owner of the dog leaves the scene, the analog is assault and leaving a scene. The owner should also share a hefty fine for leaving.
- As long as it is in the animals best interest to remain there. If there is a fight between dogs and the dogs are worked up, sticking around is not a good idea.
- .
- This would depend on whether there was an emergency health issue. Both parties should be able to leave the scene for emergency health.
- Remaining at the scene is responsible. The fear owners have is breed blaming and that their dog will be declared the problem and euthanized and they will be charged so don't stay.
- You need that information to follow the rules
- This is a no brainer.
- If it causes enough bodily harm to animal/ person, I believe information should be shared
- If a dog bites another dog or person, the owner needs to know about it and needs to take responsibility for their dog.
- It'd be like hitting a car while driving, then driving away. You're responsible, so your attendance is necessary.
- Bylaw would need to be more efficient in responding to bite calls though.
- Owner should remain and then reason owners don't right now is because they fear their pet will be put down. Once again, ITS NOT THE DOG'S FAULT! Sometimes it's an unexpected reaction for whatever reason. So make the situation safe for the owner so they know they get to hold onto their dog and they will stay at the scene of the accident.
- How is that not a thing yet?
- Just to be clear, I agree with a person who's dog has bitten remaining on scene. What I do not agree with is lumping pit bulls as an aggressive and nuisance breed. This is an outdated and problematic view. Bad owners create bad dogs. Pit bulls are not inherently bad dogs. Pit bulls are historically considered nanny dogs.
- Owners are the ones responsible for their dogs lives, and as long as such exchange is done without putting the dog into any further danger.
- I can't believe this isn't already required.
- If the dog and owner are present the owner can be assessed because it is usually the owner that makes the dog s nuisance
- The owner is responsible for the dog. If they cannot manage the behaviour then they need to take accountability



- Absolutely. This way follow up can be done.
- That would be the responsible thing to do
- Ultimately it is the dog owners responsibility to ensure that their dog is not reactive. First offence should not be a fine but education from a caring bylaw officer and owner should have to agree to a few home visits for bylaw officer to observe if there is any further reactive behaviour.
- This is common sense. And should apply where it's a small dog doing the biting or large dog. Doesn't matter. Stay at the scene as you should if it was a vehicle accident.
- Because it's the same as if it was a car accident, you stay on the scene to answer questions that those individuals might have. Like I said before NOT THE DOGS FAULT
- Unless removing owner/dog in that moment neutralizes the scenario.
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- For all breeds and incidents.
- Any responsible dog owner should have no problem with that.
- The owner is responsible for their animal and any actions that animal may take. Therefore it is only sensible that the owner must stay to acknowledge their dog's actions and any consequences.
- It's important to foster an environment of responsibility among pet owners and remind those who might avoid responsibility that owning a pet means proper care/training, or facing the consequences otherwise.
- You are responsible for the behavior of your dog, if you cannot control your dog, you should not have one. And you better be able to stand behind it's behavior. The problem is not the dog, it is the owner. The owner and not the breed. I've been bitten by dogs, small little yappy dogs. Owners think they don't need training because they're just a little dog. Please stop focusing on Breed and start holding owners to account.
- Dogs that bite usually bite a lot of people before they seriously harm someone. Serious harm could be avoided if dangerous dogs get extra training before the biting escalates
- Regardless the size of dog, all owners should be held responsible. The dogs are only as good as the owners train them.
- The owner must be held accountable for the dog he or she has cared for and trained or lack thereof.
- people need to take responsibility. I believe in mandatory training courses for owners and animals.
- People are responsible for there own dogs and the way they act in public.
- Because they are at fault. It is not the dogs fault that they were not trained correctly to know that it is not appropriate behavior
- often people leave after an incident and there may be major unknown damage to another dog/person
- The owner needs to be held accountable.
- In my opinion when a dog bites another animal or person, it is the owners responsibility. They should be held accountable and stay at the scene.
- Have to take responsibility for your pet
- There needs to be accountability to owners



- Exchanging information might help in reducing the repeat offenders
- Yes. For the responsibility falls on the owner of the dog that bites
- Any time an animal causes trauma to another animal informations should be shared
- It is necessary for preventing further incidences that everyone involved be present for this. Also, if another pet were injured it is a way to ensure that its veterinary treatment is paid by the owner of the animal at fault.
- They need to be accountable for their dog and pay vet bills/fines necessary
- I mean it would be basic responsibility. However, if the dog is agitated and needs to be taken away/back home, that should be accommodated somehow.
- If a dog bites another animal or a human there should be both sides of the story heard, large dogs are immediately attacked just because they are larger and stronger while small dogs can run around biting whatever and whoever they want without consequence. Sometimes the large dog is simply defending itself.
- In case of veterinary or medical complications and further information helps.
- This allows both parties to explain what happened during this situation.
- The owner should be required to take responsibility for their animal.
- too often they leave and the victim is stuck with a huge bill
- The owner is responsible for the behaviour so this makes sense.
- I feel that is reasonable
- Part of being a responsible dog owner, and seeing if there is any mediation or agreement that can be made (e.g. mandatory training, vet/doctor bills) that can be agreed upon to avoid euthanasia
- you should remain at the scene so both stories are heard
- I feel like it's fairly straight forward - you're responsible for your dog and how it behaves. If a dog attacks another person or dog and is UNPROVOKED, there should be a process in place to review the event and plan going forwards to prevent the event from happening again.
- Owners should be held accountable for their animals actions. If their dog bites another dog or a person, they should be responsible financially and legally for any damage the dog causes.
- Both side need to be equally heard at the time, so no info is forgotten or misinterpreted
- Of course. In many cases, the fault isnt always on the dog who bit. Some people dont understand appropriate dog communication and allow their dog to invade space, get too excited etc and that may cause another dog to react. Sharing information allows both parties to communicate and come to an agreement on how to settle things.
- a dog owner should understand and be responsible for their dog actions.
- Again, the animal should bot be punished, only the owner up to and including removing the dog from the owner's possession.
- A dog owner should be held responsible for his or her dog's actions.
- Owners need to be help accountable for their negligence and I think they should be treated this way.



- If a dog bites a person or another animal it should be mandatory for them to remain at the scene. How else do you get the persons information? They need to be held responsible for what has happened.
- "Dog bites are accidents. They never happen on purpose, of course the owner should stay at the scene until they can speak with a law enforcement officer. At the very least exchange information with the victim.

- A dog bite should be the Same as a car accident. You wouldn't drive away from the scene of an accident!"
- I believe the owner should be help responsible.
- Absolutely, just like if you cause an accident with your vehicle (your property, since dogs are also considered property in the eyes of the law) you should have to remain at the scene.
- They are the responsible party. The dog is only one part of the equation. Whether the dog was bred to be aggressive or not. Sometimes dogs act out because their owners are negligent and they should be held responsible. You should not discriminate based on breed especially when some dogs have just the smallest amount of that breed in them. It is their training that is important.
- No different than a requirement to stay on the scene of an automobile accident, if there is a possibility of liability you have a responsibility to stay there
- A dog is the owners responsibility. Responsibility should be taken as if they were the ones doing the harm.
- Obviously if a dog is dangerous (to the point where it actually bites/attacks a person or other animal) the owner needs to be held responsible. There should be more restrictions on who can own a dog rather than what sort of dog anyone can own. If an individual does not properly care for their dog, they allow them to be aggressive, and it results in a person or animal being injured, that individual should not be allowed to own dogs anymore. They are clearly an irresponsible pet owner. Sure, a Pit Bull may be inherently more aggressive than other breeds, however it is PEOPLE who are allowing that behaviour.
- They should stay to provide contact information or to speak with enforcement officer if necessary as there is always two sides to the story and someone can twist the story at any time just to make them not at fault for encouraging the dog to bite them
- To describe the event from start to incident
- Just like a car accident, people should exchange information
- Owner is responsible, must take responsibility. Neither bylaw or police should waste time trying to track them down
- Aggressive dogs should be identified.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions and should have to pay for damages to person, animal and/ or property



- I believe that the owner should stay to help in anyway possible! Dogs behaviour is directly related to the care and effort from the owner and you are exactly that. The owner. So your dog and anything involving the dog is your responsibility
- Just like when someone is hit by a vehicle, dog bites can be severe and the owner should have to wait on scene or at the very least give some form of identification and contact information.
- Only if the bite is severe (As in, sheds blood, or causes quite a bit of pain)
- Yes so they can explain what happened.
- If you get into a car accident both parties remain at the scene and exchange information. Same should be for dog attacks. The owners should be liable and held accountable for their pets actions.
- It is important for both people to be present to get the story straight and so that the owner can be held accountable.
- If there has been an incident involving dog attack/bite. The owner of the dog needs to make available information to be responsible for helping to rectify the situation and be responsible for any claims from the victim bitten or animal injured or killed
- Dont let people hide from it... people are a bigger problem than the animals
- Because the owner would need to be held responsible for the actions of their animals.
- This is the best way to get the full story from both the victim and the owner. Was the animal unfairly provoked. Was it a vicious act. All parties should be present for explanations.
- If they are responsible they will be willing to talk about the incident and first hand reports of incidents are crucial because so many factors go into a dog altercation.
- The owner, by the act of having the pet, should by law be responsible in any dealings with insurance and or law enforcement just as any other incident would be handled.
- Demonstrates responsibility.
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs.
- If you're dog harms someone or their dog, you should be held responsible for any cost associated with the attack.
- Yes, I believe that owner should remain at the scene.
- Just like a car accident
- It is important to know the dogs health and vaccine history and this can be provided by the owner
- Explain the situation, understand both sides and not just one. Dogs are not naturally aggressive. It's the owners that are at fault not the dog.
- Accountability
- Take responsibility for our dogs actions. If it bites another dog or a person contact info should be exchanged
- Someone should be responsible for their pet and if their pet happens to attack/injure a person or another animal, then the owner should stay at scene. I believe this because you are responsible for your pets actions and should wait to see if the person/animal is okay and sometimes people don't have pet insurance to help treat their animal and if your pet did that, then you should have to pay for it.
- Responsible pet owner ship says you should have to stay and deal with bylaw.



- So long as all parties can remain safe while waiting. Dog/person who was attacked and the dog and owner of dog who attacked. If unable to must leave contact info.
- This should already be a thing
- Yes, the owner needs to be accountable for the dog's behavior.
- It should be no different than a traffic accident. You, your body, your dog/animal/property has been damaged (bitten) by someone else's negligence which has financial impacts. Those financial impacts should not be the onus of the victim.
- If any dog bites someone or their pet they should be required to do this. Not just bully breeds.
- it's like a car accident they should have 2 exchange information
- Yes I believe the owner should stay on scene to give their statement and discuss. Sometimes it is the dogs (or owners) fault. Sometimes it is the other persons fault for approaching, reaching to pet, petting, etc without permission. Both sides need to be taken into account.
- I think as a dog owner yiu need to be present if a situation arises
- People often give false information or are not known to the person bitten
- A responsible dog owner would remain at the scene. They would not need to be told to do so.
- Owners need to be held accountable when their dog attacks someone, this would also help to create more responsible ownership
- To some extent. If the bite is not severe and the victim agrees, the owner and the dog should be allowed to leave rather than making both parties wait for enforcement to show up.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- Yeah.
- They should be responsible for thier animals
- A pet owner should be responsible and accountable for the actions of their pet
- Dog owner should remain present to take responsibility for their pet's actions, though there should be leeway to allow for removing the pet to a location away from other animals and humans where it can calm down.
- Too easy for them to leave the scene and not face the consequences
- When an accident happens and someone is injured, all parties involved should stay. This is for all cases, not just those involving dogs.
- Only in major offenses not minor infractions between dogs
- Some dogs can cause extreme damage and even death to other dogs or even humans. This should be treated like leaving the scene of an accident and the owner should be charged for leaving
- You should have control of your dog no matter the breed, size or age. As a responsible owner it's your obligation to make sure to pay or file reports if your animal is in a fight and bite a dog and or human
- Its the same as a car crash to stay at the scene.
- An exchange of info is important, but allowing the dog owner to secure their animal in their vehicle or other means can be very important to diffuse the situation.
- The measures I indicated I supported above rely on identifying and tracking repeat-offense dogs



- Pet owners must take responsibility for their animals, on and off leash.
- Unless there is a need for the dog to go to emergency or is need of basic need like food or water or safety (people or animal), all owners should be present as they would if they hit another car and someone got hurt.
- yes & no, accidents happen, & depending on what triggered it or not, the dog could still be in a fragile state & leaving the situation could be best scenario
- Having both parties is key to getting the whole story. This is of course only if the bite is significant and being reported. Don't think it should be mandatory to report for either party if they are in agreement.
- A responsible pet owner should take responsibility for their dog's actions - no matter the breed.
- too many people take off and don't act responsible for their pet's behavior.
- Same as if you hit a person or property with your vehicle, even if it's an accident you need to wait and provide your information.
- As long as this does not include any breed discrimination
- Dog owners must take responsibility for their dog. However, if the dog requires immediate vet care the dog owner may leave so long as they give contact info to other parties who do remain
- If you are a dog's owner you are responsible for their actions and should be financially responsible for any damages they do.
- Doesn't matter what breed or size, of dog. It all comes down to training. More affordable training programs should be offered to all dog owners not specific breeds.
- Yes. Owner needs to be responsible for dog
- Knowledge is needed on the animals vaccination history, and whether it has don't this before.
- 100%.
- It should depend on the offence. How did incident happen where was the owner. What did the owner do, how did the owner react.
- This is no different than a vehicle accident.
- It's an accident. You cant just leave... The dog is your responsibility. Just like a car is your responsibility while driving
- I know people whose dogs have been bitten at the Edworthy off leash area and while their attention was on their injured dog, the owners of the dogs that did the biting disappeared without providing contact information. The owners of dogs that bite need to be held responsible.
- just like a car accident, don't flee the scene
- It should be similar to car accidents. If severe, for sure the person needs to stay. Needs to set up guidelines for what defines severity.
- Most incidents are due to some form of provocation. I feel that people must take responsibility for any vet expenses their dog has caused
- Just like if you are in an MVA.
- It is important to understand the reason for the bite and to come to some type of conclusion whether there was negligence by the dog owner or the person/animal who was bitten.



- To take responsibility
- Owners need to take responsibility. However, this will only work as long as the dog has not been injured (may need to see a vet) and knowing the dog will not be seized.
- Owners have to be accountable for their pet's behaviour. It's no different from leaving the scene of an accident.
- They should fill out information, but the enforcement officer can not take away their animal from them no matter what if they are willing to stay and fill out the information.
- Yes, too often there is a dog bite/altercation and all that is reported it was a black dog, with a generic description of the owner. Then it is a matter of 'hoping' that owner is responsible and comes forward.
- Yes so the appropriate contact information can be documented in case payment is needed for the care of the other animal and so the officer can make appropriate recommendations for the dog.
- Pet owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions
- I have heard to many stories of people disappearing after their dogs have attacked other dogs. And then having them 'stay with friends until the heat dies down. Never being found guilty.
- No different than a car accident
- However if either animal is severely injured the owners should be allowed to seek immediate medical assistance for the animal
- The dog owner needs to take responsibility for any financial issues due his dog biting. Also needs to go into the record in case there are further instances. The owner needs education to prevent further instances.
- But what justifies as a bite? Lots of dogs nip when playing hard. It would be easy for someone to claim they were bit when they weren't.
- Yes but how do you enforce it? If someone knows they will get a fine, why would they stick around?
- 100% - it seems that small dog owners think it's not a big deal. This is NOT the case. A bite changes the scenario for the other dog regardless of size.
- Should be treated as a equivalent to a car accident.
- The owner should remain at the scene, similar to a hit and run.
- It's like a car crash
- Clear and equitable communication for all parties should be of utmost importance for dealing with incidents. It improves the possibility of all parties involved reaching consensus about how to best deal with the situation.
- Owner of dog in question should be held accountable and pay for any damages. Must remain at site to exchange contact info
- I believe this would shed a light on the fact that most times the dog was aggravated by another dog/person. These are animals and should be respected as such. For example parents should be held responsible if their kid is pulling dogs ear etc. Little dogs should also be held responsible for antagonizing larger breeds.
- People need to be held accountable for their pets and the damages caused by them.
- Any responsible dog owner would want to remain at the scene



- The owner can explain themselves and vouch for the dog or try to come up with a solution for what to do about the dog.
- The owner should have the opportunity to explain if this is the first incident that has ever occurred with the dog. And on the other hand, the owner should have to remain at the scene to figure out a solution with an officer if the dog is declared to be a threat.
- if an animal causes harm to another being the owner should remain on scene until it has been dealt with properly- and cover all costs incurred.
- An owner needs to take responsibility for their animal.
- If the victim is hurt and there is legal or financial (ie. Vet bills) the dog owner should bear that financial responsibility. And it should not be the victims responsibility to have to hunt the other person down. Should be treated like a vehicle accident
- Information should be shared and people should stay to properly report unless immediate medical attention is required by any party then treat that occasion as required.
- Same as a car accident, if the injuries are serious and require medical attention then the owner and dog(s) NO MATTER WHAT BREED should stay at the scene until the proper authorities have taken statements and assessed the situation.
- It is important that all dog owners be present at the scene to speak with officials and or police.
- owners need to take responsibility.
- Of course there needs to be some accountability if someone is bitten by a dog. However, it should be a fine levied against its owner, not the dog's life that is the expense.
- This seems obvious for any incident resulting in injury
- Needs to be done for insurance purposes.
- I think that similar to a vehicle accident there needs to be a way to assure liability
- It's the responsibility of the dog owner to train and be a responsible pet owner. Whether it's a pit bull or not should not have a bearing on what the punishment is. If the pet owner runs away he/she should be subject to mandatory court such as leaving the scene of an accident and could be subject to criminal proceedings through POPA.
- In order to determine if the animal is a one time offender or a true nuisance, you have to be able to track them somehow.
- my child has been bit by dogs while riding on the path and the owner every time takes off - this is 100% not OK and should be dealt with. We have tried calling by law and it was completely ineffective - they don't send officers and since I don't have any owner info they do nothing.
- Both sides of the story need to be heard.
- Like any other injury case, this is important.
- If you or your animal are injured and the owner of the offending animal is not helpful and leaves the scene, this could lead to a very serious situation. Medical assistance may need to be called and assistance for getting to help may be required. Medical costs and loss of income may also become an issue. Accountability is of the greatest importance!
- The dog owner should have an opportunity to explain. Some people let their kids terrorize dogs assuming nothing will happen....



- Absolutely! They need to take full responsibility
- Both parties should be present to convey what happened, ie..a dog may have been provoked to biting.
- I feel there are many scenarios as to what could happen in this instance and it may not be the dog that's at fault
- I think this depends on the severity of the bite- hopefully agreeable by both parties. Sometimes minor scuffles just happen by accident and some folks can be overly Sensitive about it. However, there needs to be accountability on part of some really irresponsible dog owners, but the dogs themselves should not be punished for poor training and/or socialization. I think many owners flee the scene for fear that their dog will be euthanized rather than a series of other intermediary interventions that could be used to curb dog bites (I.e muzzling, mandatory training classes, rehoming repeat offenders, etc).
- Common sense and decency
- I think if someone responsibly owns a pet they should feel confident speaking on its. behaviour. This includes the right to defend that their animal may have acted out of fear and has not ever shown signs of aggression in the past. Dogs are not the problem here- the owners are and it's about time our legislation reflected that. Dogs should not be punished for their owners negligence.
- This should not be an immediate opportunity for punitive action. This should be an opportunity for both sides to have their view of this experience shared, and someone versed in canine social behaviour should be consulted to determine what can be done for the dogs or owners to prevent any future incidents.
- How else would there be any accountability?
- it is important to know that the offending animal has been immunized
- It is it the owners fault for a dog attack. Not the dog
- Yes, because the owner should be accountable for the incident and be available to discuss the situation with an officer.
- The behaviour is the owners responsibility and leaving the scene of an accident, such as a bite or aggression towards an animal or human, should be considered an offence, subject to arrest leading to jail time and/or a fine.
- It would be no different if it is a scene of a vehicle accident in which they were part of. if authorities are to come because they were called, owner stays.
- Would prevent bad owners from getting off the hook
- My dog has been bitten and attacked by a german shepherd, the owner hopped in their car and drove away. My dog ended up with a broken shoulder and a chunk taken out of his hind leg. He's a 150lb bullmastiff. Size and breed don't matter - TRAINING DOES. Due to the financial burden of this person's irresponsibility, I am the one in debt and with a fearful dog. Had they stayed, I would have gotten their information, reported them to the authorities to have the dog and owner looked at for behaviour patterns and had them pay for the medical costs.
- Needs to be some accountability. By having the owner stay there, they are more accountable for the dogs actions



- And there should be fines if someone leaves without this happening - like there would be for a car involved a hit and run.
- It should be treated as just like a car accident.
- Similar to an accident, information should be shared.
- They take ownership for their dog
- It gives a witness and report if it happens again, and if the victim needed medical or veterinary attention, there would be documentation on who the responsible party was.
- Too much of this is going on in off leash parks...that's why I don't take my smaller dog. It is unsafe
- I also believe this can be up to the people at the scene. Just like a traffic accident, the expectation should be to remain on the scene. However, every scene is unique and owners/victims are capable of understanding this and knowing what caused the issue and whether further action is required.
- Leaving the scene could mean the owner or dog is uncontactable again.
- People need to be accountable for the actions of their animals
- Be responsible
- To be held accountable for the incident, document the incident, and help figure out ways to prevent more issues in the future
- Absolutely. Dog bites should be considered alongside other accidental harm incidents (like car accidents or other harmful negligence) and owners should be penalized for fleeing a potential crime scene.
- Owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their animals and the lack of training given to their animals. Dog bites/fights can be prevented in some cases and owners should be taught how to read their animals body language to be responsible pet owners.
- It is a good dog owners obligation to take responsibility in the event of an incident although it is important to note that this can take place with any breed (big or small) at any time - not just pit bulls.
- It's important to stay and share information incase of serious injury or longer-term effects resulting from the injury. If a dog bites Me or my pets, I would expect the owner of that dog to pay for any vet or medical bills.
- Then the officer gets both sides of the story not just one
- this would make owners much more accountable considering so many of them take off after something happens. So, much stiffer fines etc. For leaving the scene should be in place!
- Common sense.
- Owners of all breeds should be held accountable for their dog's actions.
- Owner responsibility is imperative
- If applicable, owners should be responsible to voice their side of the story. As a responsible dog owner, they should remain at the scene.
- Pay for the damages to such property so for vet bills and such
- Pit bulls are not dangerous animals !!!! It's the owners who make them mean.
- Everyone should be held accountable for their animal.
- People should be held responsible for the animals in their care.



- Why shouldn't they remain at the scene. It's a serious incident, not unlike a collision.
- Owners need to take responsibility.
- obviously yes, an accident occurred and all parties should stay on site.
- Yes, as long as the dog can be controlled while waiting for an officer to show up. Alternatively they should have to leave their dog registration number with the injured party for follow up.
- If a bite happens the owner needs to assume liability for the final outcome. There is always a reason that the dog bites, usually to protect themselves or their owners, and both parties involved should be required to speak to an enforcement officer in order to resolve the situation.
- I think its necessary just so then its caught in the moment, people know the stories well since it just happened and it gives better opportunity to find out the truth and quickly at that.
- Yes! They should always remain at the scene! As a responsible pet owner they should without hesitation! If their dog bites another animal or human then they need to stay until authorities arrive
- Owner needs to remain at scene so they can be held accountable for the actions of their dog.
- Small dogs bite far more often than large dogs, yet are not treated with the same level of disdain. If this is going to be a rule, then the rule has to be for ALL dog breeds, not just pitties and large dogs.
- It's called being a responsible pet owner!
- Dog bites are the sole responsibility of the owner
- It is the owners responsibility to ensure their animal behaves. This is no different than if you were in a car accident.
- Pet owners should be required to take full responsibility of their pet, good, bad and ugly.
- it seems like a logical and good thing to do
- Owners must be responsible for their pet and should have to ensure the rectify the situation accordingly.
- The owner is responsible for their dog just like in a vehicle accident, so they should remain at the scene of an incident.
- Its important to take responsibility for what happened, but this is only effective if the cases can be handled appropriately and the owner/dog is not treated unnecessarily poorly during the process.
- So that the city can be aware of the potentially dangerous dog if it has a pattern.
- It is important for all sides to be heard and explained. Things tend to get blown out of proportion when just the victims side is heard. For the dog owner/handler to explain why the incident occurred immediately would allow for more clarity on the situation
- Yes the dog owner should take responsibility for their dog.
- Common sense. It is no different than a traffic accident etc.
- If a bite is severe in nature then I agree that all parties should share the appropriate information. If the nip or bite was superficial and wasn't an attack then I don't think so.
- The vet bil should be paid by the owner of the dog who caused the damage
- This bylaw unfairly targets "pitbull" type dogs. If owners were required to stay at the scene of the incident, I believe it would become extremely evident that the issue is poor ownership and handling,



rather than breed specific issues. Plus the owner would be held responsible for the actions of the animal under their care

- Or be requires to share their contact information.
- If there is a serious incident requiring medical attention for another animal or human, this should be standard.
- The responsible thing to do
- You are required to remain at the scene of any other serious accident. Why should this be different?
- Answer is self- explanatory
- As a responsible owner you need to stay and also they need to provide their side of the story
- yes, better to explain what happens, 99% of the time the fault its the human
- the owner is always responsible for its pets actions
- Owner must take responsibility.
- Are a lot of dog bites in the presence of an owner, or not? How will this be enforced if the dog owner decides to just leave the scene before an officer gets there? Will video footage ie phone footage taken by bastanders be acceptable evidence?
- Yes assuming that the enforcement officer does not have a preudjice against the specific breed that did the biting like these bylaws seem to. Pitbulls do not bite any harder than any other dog their size. To say any different is pure ignorance.
- "If blood is drawn then the owner should cooperate with the victim and bylaw officer. My dog has been bitten at the park and the owner just left without asking if my dog was ok.
- Also in reference to question 8 as you don't have an option to type an answer. In reference to coloured bandanas. My main issue with that question is that it is up to parents to educate their children on how to behave around dogs. Colour coding dogs isn't going to stop children from reaching for dogs when they shouldn't. My dog doesn't like people touching him and I find a lot of parents lack the responsibility to teach their children the appropriate manners around animals."
- Responsible dog owners would do this but your proposed bylaws would make even them hesitant to hang around.
- If safe to do so
- They can explain what happened—if the other person or animal were at fault. All sides of the story should be considered.
- Contact information should be shared for the safety of both parties
- if the dog bites another animal the vet bill must be paid for by the attacker.
- It only makes sense.
- I support the sharing of information not necessarily having to wait for an enforcement officer... if it isn't a bad bite that's a waste of everyone's time and money.
- My dog and I have been attacked twice. Both times, the owner quickly grabbed their dog and left. Both incidents were in on-leash areas, where my dog was on-leash and the other wasn't.
- A dogs behaviour reflects how it was raised. If the dog bites it has most likely been raised in an abusive and/or unstable home. Owners should have to go through some form of training if the dogs life is at risk. If a parents is not suitable to raise children, the parent has to prove through evidence



that they are fit to raise kids and can supply a stable home for them. This should be no different for dogs. We need to stop giving people the benefit of the doubt and blaming the dog.

- My husband was chased and bitten by a pair of dogs. A complaint was made to the police however the dogs were moved out of the city and nothing was done. The owner should have had to talk to police before he hid the dogs. Nothing was done.
- Any responsible dog owner would be willing to do this.
- If any laws have been broken, formal statements must be made. Procedures must be strictly enforced, however putting down an animal should be the absolute last resort
- So that any follow up such as seizure of the animal can be undertaken
- People should be held responsible for their animals. However I believe there should be leniency and understanding. Many people have good dogs and most times, dogs bite not because of them but because of other people such as a stranger coming into their space and touching/grabbing at them.
- If a pet is not being raised responsibly there should be a way to track it to the owner to take action
- Vet bills are expensive and the owner needs to take responsibility
- An owner needs to be accountable for their dog.
- It is common sense that if you are involved in any type of incident you should be responsible to correct the situation.
- I feel there are too many dog owners not taking responsibility for their dog's actions. If an owner needs to stay at the scene to provide contact information to an officer rather than just the victim, they are more likely to be truthful.
- Both parties should be able to be contacted for insurance purposes, or any follow up. This information could be used in Tribunal Decisions.
- The owner should be able to justify for their dog's actions should it be serious
- It is important for an owner to be present to a situation to explain what happened and advocate for the dog. They are a witness to the situation just as much as any other party involved.
- Everyone should be held accountable for the behavior of their animals, and answering a few basic questions can help in treatment if the person or animal bitten requires medical attention (eg. Is the rabies vaccine up to date).
- No different than a hit and run with a vehicle.
- This is important for health and safety. Owners should exchange information.
- Many people don't stay at the scene when their dog bites and therefore there is no recourse and no documentation to support a dog being labelled as aggressive. This would make that easier to track and follow up on
- Is there not one already? This is just common sense.
- But they never do..
- Provides clarity at the scene on what has occurred and who was present
- Most of dogs behavior is based off of the training and guidance received from the owner. It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure their animal is behaved in public and does not pose a threat to any other person or animal and have control of their pet. Any actions of the animal is the owners responsibility. All dogs regardless of breed can either be aggressive or extremely docile. My father



was a vet in Calgary and owned his own practice for over 40 years. The smaller dog breeds were usually more aggressive than the large breeds. It is all how the animal is raised and trained by the owner. That being said every dog has a different temperament and level of comfort in different settings and the owner should know this and treat the dog accordingly. This is why the colored bandanna/vest program visual showing a dogs temperament was a good idea and should be expanded upon. If the dogs are still uncomfortable or aggravated in the situation the owners could always put some space between each other to calm the animals down but not leave the scene until information has been exchanged.

- This should apply to a dog of any type, not just a specific breed.
 - I say yes as long as the owner have control of their pet. The owner should be allowed to take the dog inside their home or yard or veheciles if they do not have control of the animal on leash. They should have to provide their info so the proper measures can be taken to investigate and enforce restrictions
 - I think just like a car accident, it should have everyone there. but also we have to realize dogs do sometimes get out or sometimes kids or adults dont listen and pet or dont ask the owner to pet and they get bitten. Again lets not keep blaming the dogs its not always them.
 - People will try to avoid taking responsibility, just as leaving the scene of a vehicle accident leaving the scene of a bite incident should be considered just as serious.
 - If the bite was a one off and the offending animal is no calm there is no reason for the owner to leave. They should stay and give a statement. However if the dog is continuing to show aggressive behaviour or would be best if they left the area for the safety of others.
 - Your dog your responsibility
 - i find that people who own smaller breed dogs get off the hook way to easy. As soon as you see a terrier type they automatically get blamed. I know from experience that my little breed is way more aggressive than my big dog
 - Most people disappear after an offence so they/ their dog does not get in trouble and they are never reprimanded
 - This seems obvious
 - "It depends on the circumstances. Some people have no respect for dogs boundaries. Dog etiquette should be taught in schools briefly each year to children.
-
- Sometimes dogs get disagreeable with each other and that is nature. Usually no one gets hurt and you carry on and work on that behavior with your dog."
 - This way vaccination information can be shared and liability can be assessed. However, the dog should be allowed to leave with someone else if possible, because it is already a high stress situation.
 - The owner has a duty to the people and their dog to be able to explain what happened and why it happened



- 1000% the owner must remain there! That dog is their responsibility, therefore they must stay for all required information.
- No different than a car crash. You are responsible for something that caused harm, and have to face the consequences.
- An owner must assume responsibility for their dogs actions, they should remain at the site to provide additional details to an officer
- There are costs involved.
- Seems reasonable
- As a dog owner, I believe it's always the owner's fault when their dog bites someone. Dog bites can result in a serious injury. So absolutely all owners should be 100% liable
- hit and run ... bite and run.. same thing, Avoiding responsibility.
- It's common sense - it's a violation and all witnesses must stay at the scene
- There should be no breed specific language. You can have a terrible dog if you are a terrible dog owner no matter what breed the dog is. Singling out one breed of dog is like singling out one ethnic minority or male vs female. Very divisive language.
- Dog owners are responsible for the actions of their dog and need to be involved in the solution.
- Absolutely they must stay. Why is this not already a rule?
- It is important the owner take the responsibility not the dog as the owner is the trainer.
- It's a traumatic incident for all involved that must be accurately documented and put into proper context. This can result in the owners' behaviour being observed and evaluated on scene to judge the possibility of reoccurrence and if any further steps are needed (warning, mandatory training, fines, voluntary surrender, seizure, et al).
- As long as they can get their dog under control they should not leave a scene where their dog has hurt someone!
- Common sense
- In my opinion this is no different than a vehicle accident. The owner should stay with the dog and give all information required.
- I feel it is important for the owners to stay around and or exchange information so the people have a right to explain why said person or animal was bit or attacked. Maybe it was provoked or protecting the owner from a situation or other attack. Both stories need to be heard
- Both owners of any bite situation should be able to voice their sides
- It is the responsibility for the owners to make sure all is okay.
- for serious bites defined as breaking the skin. Puppy nips, and mouthing shouldn't need to wait around.
- if a dog bites someone, or another animal of course the owner should have to stay and face the consequences. just like in a car accident if you leave you should face stiffer penalties.
- It's the same as an assault
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets. As parents should be for children.
- The dog should be allowed to be at home with their owner until there is a resolution.



- This is obvious
- As per the answer above, an owner is and should be held responsible for their animal at all times.
- There is always context on both sides. Many times there could be circumstances that are not explained by the victim of a bite.
- Unless it is unsafe for them or their dog to do so, in which case they could provide Contact info
- People stay behind when they hit a car, it should be the same if your dog bites someone or another dog. It's the owner's responsibility to look after their dog and make sure it's not being overly aggressive with other people and animals.
- It should be treated as a car accident would be. Information should be exchanged, obviously police and ambulance called if warranted.
- When this unfortunate situation occurs, yes the owner should be held accountable and should wait until an officer comes so that the owner can do its best to aid the process
- Absolutely, just responsible pet ownership
- It's important for the enforcement officer to have the full story.
- As long as the officer is able to arrive within 30 minutes.
- I want contact info from the owner of a dog that bites me or my loved one so that enforcement and/or medical personnel can communicate with them regarding their dog.
- It's like a car accident; you can't just leave the scene and go on with your day like nothing happened.
- The owner knows the dog best and can hopefully shed some light on why the incident occurred.
- Because someone was attacked
- "Your animal is considered property. Your property caused injury.
- You should be responsible to provide information, the same as any other injury "accident""
- However I don't support targeting specific breeds. Even this form clearly states that pitbulls are not responsible for the most bites and are only being targeted for their appearance and power. If this is justified then people who take any sort of fight or strength training should have to be clearly identified and muzzled in public because their strength or capabilities would result in more damage if an incident occurred. I am so ashamed of this community for even suggesting this level of discrimination.
- Yes. If a loose dog, or pitbull attacks and kills an innocent household animal or injure a human, there should be severe consequences to both the dog and owner
- Take responsibility for your pet. Felony charges otherwise.
- Depends somewhat on weather tho.
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- Many times owners just take their dogs and leave, avoiding their responsibility for their dog's behaviour and consequences for the dog.
- Any dog breed/owner should have to do this. Even the house dogs.
- Most people with problem pets will run away from the scene, how long should one have to wait for bylaw to show up?



- The owners are 10000% responsible for the behaviour of their dog. If it was a child who hurt someone else the parent would have to stay there. Should be the exact same for a dog. The owners are responsible for anything the dog does.
- ultimately all owners need to be responsible for the actions of their pets and children.
- 100% owners need to take FULL responsibility for the actions of their dogs, and must be held responsible for any costs incurred as a result of such actions by their dogs.
- To be able to enforce the bylaw infraction more efficiently by getting all relevant information.
- Dog owner should be responsible for all costs of treating the animal.
- Follow-up rabies testing requires testing the animal that committed the bite. Great hardship is incurred by the bite victim if the biting animal cannot be tested.
- The owner needs to take the responsibility for their animal. Period.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets.
- It's important that there is accountability and responsibility with dog owners.
- Always need both sides of the story.
- Hold the owners accountable for dogs that are not properly trained and controlled
- Owners need to be responsible for their dogs actions.
- People need to be accountable for their dogs harming others, just as much as they would be if they themselves harmed another. They need to remain there to be issued and consequences and most of all to get the help they need to fix the problem with their dog.
- At the owners must be responsible for their dogs.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs behaviour. If they flee the scene this is a lack of knowledge on how to train or control their dog.
- It is the right thing to do.
- The incident would need to be discussed.
- If they leave, the other owner is left with vet bills and no recourse. There needs to be stiff penalties for leaving the scene. Even stiffer if a child is involved.
- If your dog bites a person then you should stay at the scene or exchange information for further handling. If it's a dog attack on another dog the same rule applies unless it's a joint fight against each other where both parties are equal blame.
- It is important for the owner to take responsibility if their dog is acting out. If it becomes dangerous to others that is the time they need to be muzzled
- Owners should be held accountable for their pet's behaviour
- you are responsible for a bite victim.
- I think if there is a bite incident, the owner should be responsible for providing the paperwork showing the dog has all the vaccinations up to date.
- Unless needing medical attention.
- Dogs bite at off leash and then owners leave to avoid consequence
- Again, dog bites occur when an owner has not properly trained their dog. It has nothing to do with the breed, and the owner needs to take responsibility. By remaining at the scene and exchanging



information, we can move forward in finding answers as to why the dog bit in the first place, and agree on a strategy to make sure it doesn't happen again.

- I do not agree with the proposals in section 3. This feels like we are racist towards certain dogs, and dog owners should be held more accountable- not the dog itself. There are plenty of other dogs aside from pitbulls who match all of the above characteristics, it is not fair that we are targeting pitbulls as a breed.
- How is that not a rule already??
- That way the enforcement officer gets both perceptions of what happened and can report on that .
- that is just being a responsible human being.
- Persons that own animals have to be responsible for there/their animals actions
- The owner should be held liable for not training their dog properly.
- I believe it is part of responsible ownership to be accountable for your dog's actions. If my dog bites someone, I would feel it's my duty to stay with the injured person, share my contact information and collaborate with enforcement officers.
- If they don't stay they can continue to take their dog out and not resolve the issue. More bits!
- No different then an mva or kids getting in a fight. Might be minor and there may have been reason for it but still good to exchange info at minimum.
- This should be for all dogs and not specified breeds. small dogs typically go untrained and can provoke bigger dogs if they feel threatened or if someone/another dog goes to close to their owners. Smaller dogs or any untrained dog of any size can be a threat if owners are no taking any sort of steps for training/manager dogs energy. if you're dog is in an incident, information should be swapped and the specific situation should be assessed accordingly. if a dog is chased/nipped by a untrained dog (of any size or breed), and the victim dog defends it self (which results in injury/death) , should be handled completely different than a "random attack". Dogs are like vehicles, without proper steps for car safety like obtaining a license or having automotive insurance (untrained/limited socialization/dog is unable to run&play/ not challenged mentally - for comparison purposes) any vehicle can be dangerous, and not just the larger trucks or sport performance vehicles. I believe local vets should be consulted on what is defined as a "potential dangerous dog" and not on looks alone.
- I feel for the safety of anyone even if it's a Pomeranian or chihuahua the dogs owner must remain. So that all proper vaccinations are confirmed for the health and safety of others. Also payment for vet or medical bills should be incurred by the dogs owner.
- Absolutely. Any dog attack should be documented and both sides of the story taken into consideration and documentation provided.
- Depending on the severity of the bite, especially if the dog has bitten another dog.
- This seems to be the ethical thing to do. Especially in cases where dogs have attacked humans, or when injury to the other dog is severe.
- It is important to stay on scene to ensure all parties involved are ok and do not need any further medical attention from the incident. The owner of the animal may have to pay for the victims



medical/pet bills and bylaw should be involved to ensure this situation does not happen again with the particular animal.

- It is part of being a responsible dog owner.
- It is stupidity itself to blanket ban pitbulls and to put all the blame on them. Responsible ownership is key.
- Currently it is too easy for a dog owner to simply walk away and not be held accountable for the incident. Locating the dog owner after the fact in many cases would be difficult, so they should be compelled by the law to provide information or wait for law enforcement.
- Only if an injury is sustained. But yes, this should be treated like a car accident.
- They absolutely should stay at the scene. It's not ethical that they leave as a person should know if the dog is up to date on vaccines and it's part of being a responsible pet owner.
- Any responsible person should do this!
- Leave good dogs like Pitbull a alone! They are amazing pets. Punish bad owners!!
- Taking responsibility for things that happen with your dog is what you sign up for when you do get a dog.
- Both parties should remain providing no emergency. Enforcement should consider whether dog was provoked or not.
- I have too often been at off leash dog parks and seen irresponsible dog owners just unleash their dogs and let them get into trouble, when an incident like a bite or fight happens they just take their dog and leave. I feel they should be fined, the same if you leave the scene of an accident. I believe that almost all bites/fights are because of irresponsible owners. All dogs can be trained.
- Just like a car accident causing damage/injury, the person responsible for the damage should be required to remain at the scene until both parties have satisfied exchange of information for future claims.
- They are still our responsibility
- If it is safe to stay there, they should provide contact information - the people need to know the dog's vet so they can check for rabies vaccinations
- If safe to do so for all parties.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their negligence and there needs to be consequences for it, just like any other altercation.
- The dog is the owner's responsibility. If your dog commits a violation, which it is not able to comprehend and therefore can not be held accountable, the owner must be held accountable.
- EDUCATE! This is an opportunity to educate the owner and victim!! Offer supports, inquire about the dogs health, etc. EDUCATION IS KEY TO SAFE AND WELL TRAINED DOGS!
- Most dog bites occur from either a dog being in a stressful situation or because of bad ownership, I do think that the owner should stay at the scene until a bylaw officer shows up. I also believe that the owner and the attacker should be held responsible for there actions. Not just the dog. There is usually a reason for a dog to behave that way.
- Blame the owner for dog bites. Not the dog.
- If a dog bit someone or another dog, then the owner has to take responsibility.



- If there is injury to another person or dog, similar to a car accident they should remain at the scene to get things resolved
- I believe the owner should remain on site, because it's possible that the dog bit someone in defence from being provoked.
- How is this not already required.
- This may not always work if a dog is highly excited due to an incident in a public area and there is no way to easily contain or calm them and then share information. But efforts to share info should always be made.
- Pit bulls as a breed are less dangerous than German Shephard, Husky, Great Dane, and other large size breeds. these bylaws are discriminatory to a species of dog. Poor ownership should be the main outlook for these programs rather than blanketing all owners with insignificant measures.
- If my dog attacks anyone or anything, it's common sense to stay on the scene to exchange info.
- Only if a dog bites a person or bites another animal causing significant harm. animals occasionally fight and it is natural.
- Owners should be help accountable
- The dogs behavior (good or bad) is the responsibility of the owner. Period. Victims shouldn't have to pay hefty vet bills because of the irresponsible actions of another dog's owner.
- Absolutely support this. Owners are ultimately responsible for the behavior of their dogs and must be held accountable.
- I support this
- They should remain their as a responsible pet owner. Explain their part of the situation.
- It's about responsibility.
- Injuries should be taken care of by the dog owner not the victim, so it's important that information is exchanged
- Need to know if the animal is vaccinated and ensure owner is held accountable.
- There are always two sides to a story and a victim is less likely to outline what, if any, responsibility they might have in the incident.
- This would provide the full story, as well as information for medical/ vet bills
- Stay to exchange info but not to wait for an officer. If dog is aggressive best to remove it from situation.
- Rlght now there is very little liability for dog owners especially those that say their "dog is friendly". This puts the public at risk.
- This should apply to all breeds and incidents.
- There are always two sides to the story. The dog owner can provide valuable insight into why the bite occurred
- Owners should be held accountable for their animals
- Absolutely! If a dog bites a person or other animal they should remain at the scene to explain what happened from their end to the enforcement officer.



- If your dog bites someone, you are ultimately responsible, unless that dog is protecting you or itself from attack
- Same as a traffic accident ...
- If there is a situation where a vet and or Dr is needed costs are involved. Both parties or the dog of the attacker should be held responsible for any financial burden.
- This is common decency and part of being a responsible dog owner.
- Yes! We have experienced a dog biting our dog and the owner leaving the offleash park and not sharing info. If common sense or civic decency won't ensure the behaviour then a rule might.
- The dog owner should stay at the scene to provide their information/talk to enforcement as long as the person who has been bitten or the owner of the animal that has been bitten wants it.
- Same reasoning as a car accident - no hit and runs
- Yes is self explanatory (it means I agree with this part)
- That just makes sense
- Absolutely the dog owner should pass on contact information and be available to speak to an officer. HOWEVER the dog should be controlled first and if that means the person has to remove the dog from the scene to somewhere safe that should be in consideration. If the dog owner has multiple dogs or is unable to control their animal that should be done first and the person must leave information.
- It makes the owner responsible for the actions of their animals instead of just running away trying to hide that anything went wrong
- You own the dog therefore you are responsible for the situations you put the dog in. If you put an aggressive dog in a situation where he/she could harm someone you are 100% responsible.
- While 90% of the time a bite from a dog will be caused because the dog feels that either itself or it's owner are threatened it can still cause some trauma and if any kind of medical care that can't be performed at home then both parties should be involved in payments
- "ONLY if the situation is safe!!
- If there is not a safe environment while waiting, both parties should take photos, get contact information for witnesses and report asap, go home to the safe environment until an officer can attend!!"
- Exchange if information is needed as the seriousness of the bite not been known plus repeat offenders should be identified
- There are two sides to every story. The owner of any dog who injured a person or animal Needs to accept responsibility for their pet.
- Information should be obtained for future investigation, for example, repeated offences
- Yes, unless it is in the best interest of everybody involved to remove the dog from the situation immediately, which results in the owner having to leave the scent prior to authorities arriving.
- Should know if the dog has bitten people before.
- People are responsible. Not dogs. No bread is more vicious.
- It's obvious, no?? Just like a car accident.



- If a person damages another person or their property with their car it is illegal to leave the scene. Why can someone who's dog does the same leave the scene? If you have damaged someone's person or property (pet) with your own property (pet) it should be no different than a vehicle.
- It is part of being a responsible pet owner. You are responsible for their actions. However most don't stay, because it seems regardless of the circumstances, they are afraid their animal will be seized and eventually euthanized.
- this makes sense, owners have to take responsibility for their animal, however it should be inquired further about the circumstances of how the incident occurred.
- If the dog owner leaves the scene, how will we know their contact information to issue a fine?
- PLEASE do not call out a specific breed. Focus the bylaw on nuisance dogs.
- Support. Just like a hit and run.
- That seems like common sense to wait if your dog has bitten someone.
- A dog owner is responsible for the actions and training of their dog.
- Yes, pet owners should share contact information based on the incident. That would be responsible. I agree in theory, but practically I can see an emergent situation where the dog must be removed by the pet owner to reduce further harm or tend to wounds, etc. and they are unable to share information or wait for an officer. I'm not sure how you will enforce this rule. I imagine irresponsible pet owners will continue to flee the scene. Those that would stay likely are doing this already.
- It should be like sharing information in a car accident or if you witness an assault.
- Staying at the scene is just responsible ownership
- Depending on the severity of the bite, the owner should definitely swap information incase there is long-term effects for the victim.
- the dog cant speak for itself
- To own a pet makes you responsible for that animals behavior and so you must be responsible to deal with any incidents including providing your information.
- Responsible owners take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- If something you owns attacks someone then it is your responsibility to stay and deal with the consequences. So yes if your dog, of any breed, bites/attacks/causes harm then you should be staying and dealing with the injured person or dog
- I think they should stay long enough to share contact information. If they need to leave at that point, to get their dog away from the other person's dog, I would be fine with them leaving at that point. But just walking away without exchanging phone numbers/address shouldn't be acceptable. However, when my dog was bit, I left quickly. I wouldn't have wanted the other dog owner to be in trouble for also going home. He knew where we lived and knocked on our door to apologize, which I thought was acceptable in the circumstances.
- That's the responsible thing to do
- I have had my dog attacked and dog and owner ran away. Never to be seen again or pay for 4500.00 vet bill
- Common sense
- People need to be accountable no matter what pet you own.



- Should be no different than an accident, do not leave the scene
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs behaviours and that includes training, fines and possible vet bills.
- Both parties are entitled to full disclosure and an opportunity to speak on the incident at the time of said incident.
- In all dog attacks/incidents situations need to hear both sides of the story. If a German shepherd shook a chihuahua, it needs to be understood if it was unprovoked or if the chihuahua was incessantly nipping/barking/biting said bigger dog.
- Your dog your responsibility. You need to take charge and responsibility in what your animal did. that means making sure you can be reached and held responsible if something occurred. While still giving your side of the story.
- It is the right thing to do as a responsible pet owner.
- Both parties should remain. that way it should be easier to explain circumstances.
- I think that this way, the owner of the biting dog can be contacted by the individual bitten or the owner of the animal that had been bitten
- Too often the owner is more responsible than the dog and should face harsher penalties. We need to focus on rehabilitation for the dog rather than punishing them for their owner's behavior.
- People are responsible for the actions of their pets, and should be responsible for the damage caused by them
- Pet owners must be held responsible for an animals behaviour and this rule ensures that.
- Information should be shared and the owner should be looked into
- If necessary, then yes the person should remain on scene, however I also believe that the first priority would be for the suspect dog to be removed from the scene to somewhere safe for it's safety (and stress levels) and potentially the safety of others.
- It is necessary to gauge the owner's competency in raising a dog, and how they react to the situation of their dog biting another person or animal.
- Would be the same idea as if you were involved in a car accident, you need to stay on scene and exchange information
- Owner should take responsibility for their animals behavior and poor training
- The needs to be consequences.
- It would be the responsible thing to do if your pet bite someone.
- Vet/health bills are expensive, the owner of the pet who bit should foot the bill.
- Too many times the owner just walks away.
- Common sense
- The human guardian needs to take responsibility for how their negligence had resulted in a anxious fearful dog and be required to follow up with force free training.
- Yes I do. Your dog has committed an offense and you leaving the scene should have the owner charged. Likely nothing can come of the altercation unless the owner is decent and offers to cover vet bills. But if not then it would be nice to be able to sue civilly for your money.



- To ensure that the person affected is safe and well, not to be charged but to ensure the victim is safe and taken care of
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- Shouldnt be any different than a vehicle altercation. Exchange insurance. Ect
- All pet owners should be responsible for the actions of their pets. It is not ever the dogs fault, it is the owners fault. And they should stay at the incident to be responsible.
- It may be a rule but the likelihood of the owner of a dog that bit a person or another animal is next to nil - rule or not.
- As owners we are responsible for the animals and absolutely should be required to remain and provide information as long as it is safe for everyone to do so. If the owners needs to leave to make the situation safe for all then I feel they shouldn't be charged. As longs as they come back and make an attempt to notify someone
- It is extremely important to have history of behaviour from the owner, and also their perspective on the incident. If information is only taken from the other party it sounds very bias.
- Owners must take responsibility for their dogs.
- It's their dog they should face the consequences for it's actions
- They are responsible for their animals, they should stay
- just like at the scene of a motor vehicle accident, people should remain at the scene
- To reinforce that dog owners are responsible for the safe handling of their dog and the safety of those in the presence of their dog
- Instead of staying at the scene, it should be required they report it to police. If they need to remove their dog from the scenario they should be allowed to.
- People can hide the dog if not addressed at the scene
- Yes, as with any attack the offending party must remain to take responsibility
- All bites, people should be sharing information with one another and owners need to be responsible for any care and attention that occurs as a result. Common sense prevails. In addition, I do not trust city or non-city representatives already, there could be a high degree of bias and professional expertise is already questionable.
- This would allow the officers to determine of the bite was of a repeat offender as a result of poor training/raising of the dog.
- How do you contact these people, what is the response time? What if the dog requires emergency vet care? Or the person?
- If there are vet bills or other costs, the owner should pay all or a portion of depending on the circumstances. This can be worked between the two dog owners. If immediate medical attention is required contact information is even more important.
- Seems like a no brainer - any responsible pet owner would stick around to ensure everything is in order and do what they can so it doesn't happen again.
- the owner should be held accountable
- The situation is similar to a motor vehicle accident.



- All sides of a story need to be explored. And often time the dogs aggression has more to do with the owner and their neglect (whether it be lack of training, obedience, or emotional/physical neglect).
- many small dogs bit or nip and the owner thinks it is okay because they are small. Some people think only large dog bites hurt or are worrisome, but statistics show smaller dogs attack more than larger breeds.
- People refuse to admit when their dog is a problem because it directly reflects their training and lack of connection with the dog. Victims end up paying thousands out of pocket when someone flees an accident where their dog was the instigator.
- "Owners are responsible for their pets. No matter what breed.
- Yes, owner should stay and take necessary steps to remedy the situation"
- Owners should take full responsibility
- Hold people accountable for their dog's actions. The dog is only as good as it's training.
- The person with the dog should have to give their contact info and a statement.
- Each dog owner is responsible for their pets. If a dog bites he or she should remain at the scene and should be comply to share any personal information that might be needed
- There are always extenuating circumstances surrounding a bite. Both parties should be present to give their side of the story.
- Regardless if the victim is human or canine, owners need to be held responsible.
- Collecting statements from both parties and bystanders for a fair case to be had in court is the only fair way to decide fate or future restrictions of animals, as is with people.
- No need to explain - it's common sense!
- This is fine - the officer should ask specific questions about which/if any dogs were under control. If the dog bitten was off leash in an on leash area the leashed dog should not be at fault.
- If a dog bites another dog or a human, that dog owner should contain the dog in the wrong and wait until they can be questioned and investigated. Like when you get in a fender bender and have to remain on scene.
- As long as the person could remain at a safe distance, the dog was no longer a threat, or was in the process of calming down, then both parties should remain at the scene.
- Duh
- Only if the dog bites a person, or has seriously injured an other animal.
- If it's a severe bit and they arrive quickly. Expecting people to wait > 15 minutes with no timeline isn't fair.
- To get the facts straight
- because it's the human thing to do?
- I believe that to be the due diligence of the pet owner to ensure the victim is safe, information regarding vaccines of the dog provided, and to communicate the incident from their witness testimony to a Bylaw Officer.
- It's the responsible thing to do as a pet owner. If your dog bites another dog you should cover the vet bill.



- Because it's the responsible thing to do.
 - Yes the owner should take responsibility. But one bite does NOT make a dog a bad or harmful animal. They could have been provoked. You never know the circumstances. As for "bully breeds" trying to muzzle them because of the type of dog they are in no different than treating a person a different way because the color of their skin or their ethnic background. It is all in the upbringing whether its human or animal, no one breed should be singled out. If anything it is certain owners that can turn these dogs aggressive but that is not the case for most.
 - Damage has been done, and needs to be dealt with; it depends on the severity of the bite though
 - Dog owners have to be responsible (and accept that responsibility) for their dog's behaviour. If a dog bites - action has to be taken to ensure that dog is no longer a danger to other people or animals
 - It's no different than a scene of a car collision. Take ownership and responsibility
 - You are responsible for your animal and their actions. No different then a car accident, if your dog is involved in an incident you should be required to stay at the scene or provide valid contact information.
 - Pit bulls should not be grouped like this. I know chihuahuas that are way more dangerous than most pit bulls. Again it sll comes back to training and owners.
 - Offender needs to provide immediate assistance and face the consequences. It's almost impossible to find out the person after they leave the scene.
 - "Not doing so is the equivalent of a hit a run.
-
- As a dog owner it is your responsibility to have your animal under control at all times. If your dog does damage to another dog or human then the owner should be held responsible, issued a fine, and pay any damages caused by their dog. For example, if your dog attacks and sends another dog to the vet, the owner of the dog that attacked should not only be fined, but they should have to pay the other dogs vet bill in full. This could apart of the tribunal process mentioned above.
-
- I also believe that education is key. Pet owners who have shown they do not have their dog under control should be forced to take obedience classes as a condition to keeping their dog.
-
- If people flee the scene and are caught later, their fine should be doubled and their pet licencing doubled for how many years the city seems fit."
 - My pit bull has been bitten multiple times by small dogs resulting in blood being drawn and the owner took the dog and left with no repercussions.
 - Responsible owners do this without rule requirements, Irresponsible owners do not. A rule of law protects breeds and dogs from irresponsible owners.



- This should apply to all dogs! Small dogs are often more aggressive and repeat offenders but they tend to get away with it as their bites don't cause as much damage. This needs to change. Don't pick on Pitbulls. Don't make this about Pitbulls. Enforce this with all dog breeds and sizes equally.
- A responsibility owner should definitely stay and deal with what their dog did! 100% their responsibility!
- Often the dog owners are the ones at fault, the dogs are communicating and the owners are misunderstanding their communication. The dog owners and their dogs need education, having them being enforced by an enforcement officer to seek that education should be the first step before going to tribunal. The education should be coming from a dog trainer or behaviourist that has no breed bias and the people should seek their own dog trainer/behaviourist (No city bias).
- It is the owner Who is responsible for that behavior, not the dog. As a responsible dog owner you need to stay and give your summary of the events that took place.
- It makes people accountable for bad or dangerous behavior from their dog for ANY breed of dog....all breeds being equal and not singling out a particular breed!
- People need to be responsible for their dangerous and out of control animals
- Vet/medical bills can be expensive and you should take responsibility for your pet. Same as a car accident.
- Pet owners should take responsibility for their pets
- Sometimes small dogs provoke other dogs with their big dog syndrome. Both parties MUST be talked to by officer.
- Only in certain circumstances
- The owner of the dog is liable for what the dog does
- I think this is reasonable so that tracking and appropriate monetary compensation if necessary can be established.
- I think you should stand up to what has been done.
- If the injuries prove more severe after the incident than first suspected I think it's fair to follow up with the owner.
- Any pet owner is responsible for the behaviour of their pet, and this includes taking the appropriate steps to support a victim of their pet's behaviour (or misbehaviour), as well as ensuring their pet receives the proper training/rehabilitation to ensure such incidents do not reoccur. If the owner is not held to this standard, it is unlikely the pet's behaviour will ever be addressed which is unsafe for the pet as well as the general public.
- You are responsible for your pet.
- You're are responsible for your dogs actions
- Its almost like a hit and run if there has been an offense and police called all owners and witnesses should stay and report
- Owner needs to take responsibility.
- Dog bites are fully the responsibility of the owner. Dog bites can happen for a number of reasons that are not related to aggression - fear and trauma can cause dogs to react defensively. Owners need to be able to communicate with officers so that the reasons for dog bite occurrences are better



understood and to ensure we are using the best enforcement and compliance options for these instances.

- Because both version of the incident should be heard and equally accessed to make fair judgments.
- Yes, depending on the severity. Dogs bite, nip and make contact when they play fight. Unless medical attention is needed then it shouldn't be necessary. You don't want people taking advantage of a rule such as this.
- Just like with your car, you cause damage, you must remain on scene. It will make follow-up much easier for then victim and authorities.
- pretty self explanatory.
- It's important to know the owners history as well as the dogs history. It would help in the healing both mental and physical health of humans and other animals when seeking medical help.
- If you hit a person with your car don't you have to stick around? Should be no different it should be considered an an incident that requires further investigation with all parties involved
- This creates a record for that animal. If it has repeat offences, you have proof.
- The owner to the pet needs to be accountable for its behaviour - just like a vehicle accident the person needs to stay at the scene
- X
- Responsibility
- This will help THE OWNER to be accountable and get the correct resources needed for THEM and the DOG. Education, training ect.
- If a dog bites another person it is a very serious incident. It should be handled by the police. If there is a fight between two dogs and one suffers an injury that is on the owners to resolve and they should be required to exchange information so the incident is on record.
- Dog owners should be required to remain at the scene, where safe, to exchange information in the event of a bite.
- Allows for a clearer picture and questions to be answered
- Take responsibility for your dog's actions. It's your job to control/train them.
- If that person is in serious harm it is the dog owner's responsibility to ensure that person is safe/okay. Similar to staying at the scene of any accident.
- Poorly trained dogs and owners often leave the scene because they know they're in the wrong.
- Just like a vehicle accident, the owner should be responsible enough to stay onsite, for any breed.
- Dogs that bite someone need to be held accountable. Owners remaining at the scene can clarify what happened. Maybe the dog was being teased and pestered and had reason to snap.
- Owners must take responsibility for any incidents involving their pet.
- I have been bitten by a dog while the owner was present. I went into shock and was not coherent for a short period of time and the owner was no longer around when this information exchange could have occurred.
- "• The ban is unconscionable. As dogs are considered pit bulls unless proven otherwise, the law is open to abuse through false allegations and unfairly penalizes low income individuals, where an



- accusation can mean the de facto death of their dog.
 - Focussing on breeds gives the public a false sense of security, as individual dogs may be
- dangerous, regardless of breed; and punishes many dogs that are not dangerous.
 - It is costly to enforce, both for municipalities (through increased sheltering and enforcement costs) and the province (through lengthy, expensive and high-profile court cases).
- Various jurisdictions have found that BSL does not work because it targets specific breeds instead of irresponsible owners. The Centres for Disease Control in the US noted that, not only is it virtually impossible to calculate bite rates for specific breeds, but dogs of any breed can become dangerous if they
- are raised to be aggressive and individuals who exploit dogs will simply turn to another breed. In an article
- written by Global News in 2016, statistics show that even after 10 years of BSL in effect in Ontario, the
- number of dog bites has increased."
- This would provide the owner to explain the situation, as most times it is not the dog attacking but the individual(s) provoking the dog
- yes cause so many run away and leave victim to suffer and not get justice
- I do support this. But I understand the fear of an accidental situation and a dog owner terrified of losing their best friend and fleeing the scene. Every side needs to be looked at.
- Pit Bulls should not be singled out for their breed and punished for those that are the problem. I grew up in the 70's/80's with German Shepherds and they were the targeted breed back then. It's not the breed, it's the dog owners we should be worried about
- like a car crash you dont leave the scene. also in any legal dispute/problem youre required to stay at the scene so makes sense
- The same general principles as a car accident should be applied to a dog bite. Including a thorough investigation that might find the person with more damage ie the person who got bit at fault
- [removed]
- You're responsible for your pet, this is a matter of taking responsibility
- When a dog bites, the owner needs to take responsibility for that
- They need to share this information so they/their dog can receive the correct consequences
- At the very least owners should exchange ID verified by picture and contact info with each other or a responsible person.
- Just as the owner/driver of a vehicle must stay at the scene of an accident that should be true for accidents involving animals. Both sides of an incident need to be heard and a dog can not speak for itself thus it is the owners responsibility to do so.
- Owners of small dogs often get away with their dog biting other dogs and people because they are not viewed as "dangerous" and rather "cute". These small dogs often come after bigger dogs and blame is often put on the big dog. If owners of small dogs were held responsible for their dogs actions they might actually leash their dogs and train them properly.
- It is the owners responsibility.



- Need to take responsibility and provide explanation of what happened.
- Owner should provide contact info in order to ensure that dog has been vaccinated and won't pass anything to victim if there is an open wound
- Great idea!
- It seems like a common sense response for an owner to take responsibility for the bite and to wait and provide information that would be required for the bite victim and bylaw officer.
- As a dog owner it's my responsibility to take ownership if it misbehaves. As a park user, if I was injured by an animal I would want to know it wouldn't happen to someone else by the same pet (training of the animal, house sentence, not allowed off leash, muzzled or something)
- my dog was bit before by another dog off leash - the owner took off and I was not able to identify them later making it hard to get reparations for medical costs or follow up.
- Any owner is responsible for their dogs actions.
- It's like any other offence where someone gets hurt. You have to remain at the scene of a fight, accident, etc. It shouldn't be any different.
- Its not always the owner/gods fault, ive seen people step over their boundaries despite being warned or eere aggressive and the animal could react to tey and protect and they should get the chance to explain their side to the proper people
- the Dog guardian is responsible for the dog's behaviour, and should be obligated to remain and exchange information similar as required for vehicle collisions. However, many owners hiring dog walkers and trainers to exercise their animals therefore the bylaw should be specify that the person responsible for the animal at the time of the incident must remain. otherwise a paid dog walker could simply walk away and refuse to provide contact information because they aren't the owner. the owner might be very engaged and responsible but is penalized because the person hired to look after their dog did not have full control of the animal at the time of the incident.
- I think they should remain on scene because it's the responsible thing to do. If you're going to own a dog there is a responsibility that goes along with that. I also think it's helpful to get the two differing points of view. Most dogs bite only after giving several warning signs and as a last resort so I think it would be helpful to have someone giving information from the dog's point of view.
- Every person is responsible for how their animal is trained and their actions.
- That is a prime example of responsible pet ownership. The owner must own the actions of their pets.
- I think, much like a car accident, if your animal has caused harm to another, you should be required to stick around. I just hope that this wouldn't mean that the animal is instantly at fault...I'd like for both parties to be present to explain the scenario.
- owners need to take responsibility for their pets, even if it was an accident
- If they leave the dog, the dog will continue to roam, it's harder to locate the owner and dog. Like a car accident, they should remain at the scene to help everyone involved.
- Dogs may react differently to certain situations, a dog bite doesn't make a bad dog and housing a dog in a shelter can cause other issues with the dog. It should be in its home, provided the humans are determined to be capable of proper rehabilitation with the animal. If a dog is seized for reasonable grounds, it should be offered the option of rehabilitation with any number of capable



rescue/sanctuaries, and should be the first course of action to a dog that cannot go back into its home. These dogs should be offered to reputable rescues/sanctuaries that have been deemed fit by their history of rehab. Yes a dog owner should be required to remain at the scene of an incident, unless otherwise deemed unsafe to remain. Information should be shared between all parties involved just as in a car accident.

- As a dog owner if my pets ever exhibited this behavior I would stay and report everything because that's responsible ownership. The bylaw officers cannot act in good faith if one half of the story is missing or the person responsible has fled the scene because they were intentionally teaching the dog malicious behavior. If the person chooses to flee the situation it should be seen the same as fleeing an accident and charged accordingly. Dogs will cross boundaries with other dogs who won't hesitate to stand their ground, so it's vital that each side is present to give an account of what happened. One side is likely to be hysterical and refuse to accept personal responsibility for what transpired, but that would get sorted out in tribunals. Not all dog bites are signs of aggression and I wager some transpire due to nuisance children who's owners refuse to curb the behavior.
- Just a common courtesy . Both sides of every story needs to be told .
- It is the dog owners' responsibility to deal with their dog's actions and also there are 3 sides to every story.
- So things like proof of vaccinations and such can be collected
- If necessary, if my dog were to ever bite another animal or human I would of course remain there. The exceptions would be if my dog was protecting me from harm, then I would not remain.
- Pit bulls do not have a stronger bite force than even a German shepherd. Stop breed shaming for no damn reason! If a damn chihuahua can get away with biting people on a daily why aren't they banned ???
- It should be treated as an assault
- Because it's the right thing to do. How else do you keep track of an owner who doesn't take responsibility for how they have trained their dog. ITS NOT THE DOG. ITS THE OWNER.
- Owners should be held responsible for the actions of their dog. A dogs behaviour is a direct result of their training.
- In severe bite cases owners should take responsibility for their dogs behaviour and stay present on the scene in order to communicate the events and give their contact information
- The owner needs to be accountable as their dogs actions are their responsibility.
- They should remain to provide information so the person but can know if the dog has had its immunizations and it would creat a level of accountability for owners. Or at the least provide contact info if the dog is unable to be subdued or is still agitated to the point of being a danger and needs to be removed.
- it's important for obtaining medical proof of the offending dog being up to date on shots and for payment of vet or medical costs for the victim
- The dog owner is responsible for the behaviour of the dog and should stay at the scene to provide their information.
- Contact information should be shared just like any other public incident.



- If one animal has done harm to any other it is your responsibility as the pet owner to help out in any way and help pay charges or vet bills or hospital bills.
- If the bite is severe.
- To tell their side of the story of what happened
- Two Large dogs on a leash attacked my small dog at an off leash park. The owner ran away. Some resources to find these owners is also required. She should have paid my \$800 emergency vet bill but I couldn't find her.
- The owner of the dog that caused a bite should be held accountable. I also feel they should be there to tell their side of the story as the dog that bit is not always at fault for the behavior.
- Same as a car accident. There are always 3 sides to a story.
- While no specific breed should be considered 'extra dangerous' as a dog's behaviour directly results from its training and not it's breed, any dog that injures another person or dog, and their owner, should be held liable for damages done.
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their dog and should be held accountable. It also allows for a more accurate decision to be made when an enforcement officer hears both sides of the story, within a short time frame.
- they should be accountable for their dogs behavior, even if it was an accident or misunderstanding.
- As long as it is safe to do so and they have a safe place for their dog to be during that period of time.
- It's in the best interest of everyone involved. The person who was bitten can feel more reassured that the dog will be under control and not bite someone else until it's been dealt with. It can have a negative impact if the owner leaves and you start being afraid of every dog. Saying this, it may not have been the dog's fault 100% - the person could've been ignoring what the owner was saying "please don't pet my dog, they aren't friendly." "Please don't let your child poke them in the eye" and ignoring signals given by the dog. If the owner is present, they can explain that too
- It's like being in an accident. You have to remain at the scene. The ONLY exception would be the owner getting the dog away from the victim - in which case they should still return when it's safe to do so.
- It's important that dog owners are held accountable for the actions of their dogs. If a dog owner has failed to properly train their dog, regardless of breed, it's on them to be responsible.
- As the dog owner you should remain to take responsibility of your dog, as well as share your side of the incident. It's not always totally the dogs fault. Are there circumstances that caused the dog to act in a defensive manner. Did the person who was bit, do something to provoke the response by the dog.
- Every owner with a dog who bites should have to stay to talk to an officer to have mandatory training and behavior modification put in place. I don't think fines work, the owner needs to be taught how to properly handle their dog safely and the dog needs training instead.
- Owners NEED to be accountable for their dogs.
- Again, as the person is the problem, they should be required to remain on scene and be held accountable - as with any other crime. We need to shift the focus from punishing the animal to punishing the people as they are the source of the problem.



- I think its important to get the owners information, the victim needs to know the dogs medical history, ie. Shots etc.
- Thats the responsible thing to do. If they were to leave, that should be treated like a hit and run vehicle incident.
- Too many dogs at off leash parks have tried to or have succeeded in attacking my dog that is on a leash. Then the owner just picks up their dog and leaves as if vicious attacks in public places are normal behaviour for a household pet. Usually it's a chihuahua or terrier dog.
- It's no different than a traffic accident!
- Violent attacks from someone's animal should be a reason to legally be required to stay at the scene.
- I believe it is the responsibility of the pet owner to stay at the scene if their dog were to bite someone or another dog/pet.
- It's best to get the whole story. What if that dog was being provoked?
- People should have to wait for bylaw officers after an incident just like with vehicle accidents.
- Of course someone should come help if it's necessary. But dogs don't bite for no reason, it's ALWAYS on the human for provoking it. Dogs can be trained.
- I have had a friend that was bitten by a dog then the owner refused to give contact information. The threatened them with their dog to leave. Eventually he followers them back to their car to get their license plate. This needs to be mandatory.
- There should be responsibility for a pets actions, such as taking on the injured pets vet bills
- I am disappointed to hear that the City is considering discriminating against Pitbulls. There are many examples of Pitbulls being gentle and friendly dogs. The onus is on the owner to train and handle their dog properly, and responsible Pitbull owners shouldn't be punished for poor dog owners. Although incidents occur with Pitbulls, this is not due to their breed being inherently aggressive, but rather the trend of Pitbulls being purchased/adopted by careless owners. Any dog can become aggressive if not trained properly. I suggest that the City consult with animal rescue organizations in Calgary. I'm sure they will tell you that they have many gentle Pitbulls that don't have homes because people are too scared to adopt them, and by implementing measures such as the ones you're suggesting that specifically target Pitbulls, you'll cause more gentle Pitbulls to spend their lives in a shelter.
- owners have to be accountable and present to share both sides of the story
- The dog is your responsibility therefore you are responsible for it's actions. If it causes damage, you are responsible for it.
- This will put more responsibility on dog owners
- It is not the dog or the breed, it is the OWNER and how they have raised that dog. They (and only they) need to stay and accept the responsibility that their dog bit someone or something.
- They should be fined if they leave!
- If your dog bites someone, their information should be taken & steps should be taken to ensure it doesn't happen again.
- For both sides of the story



- The owners need to take responsibility. A lot of the time owners run away because they haven't trained their dog and haven't taken the time to understand the signs of a dog in distress or an anxious situation
- Incidents and unfixed behaviours are the responsibility of the owner and not a result of the breed so the owner must remain accountable.
- I have seen and heard of a lot of small dog breeds biting larger dogs breaking skin and having those dog owners walk away because they do not care how aggressive their dog is because of how small they are. Please do not judge a dog based on their bite. Judge an owner for not providing training and care to have a well trained animal. I'm tired of hearing that pitbulls should be banded.
- You are the responsible owner of the dog. It is similar to remaining at the scene of an accident. The owner may need to assist in controlling the animal, and assisting the victim. The dog owner must be fully accountable for their dog.
- That way it can be tracked what breeds and what individual dogs are actually biting
- Most people don't take responsibility and take off before you can get their info.
- It's the decent thing to do. The human should be held accountable, not the dog being punished. Human should be mandated to take training courses with their dog!! Again, all breeds!
- The more information the better
- If someone feels that sufficient harm has been caused by a dog bite to engage an enforcement officer, I believe the owner of the dog should be required to share contact info and communicate with a bylaw officer.
- It needs to go on record so if it happens again it is known that it is not a one off. This animal is developing dangerous habits. That way they could be addressed before it is too late.
- it should be required and is the responsible thing to do
- Responsibility and safety. But to encourage people to stay a dog bite shouldn't automatically mean a dog will be put down. People may run to protect their loved pet
- My daughter was bitten 13 years ago and nothing was done about it the dog should have been forced to have training and the owner should have had a permanent record of improper training of an animal .
- It's common courtesy
- Depending on the severity of the bite, I believe it would be beneficial to get the dog's health records to be able to catch diseases passed through saliva such as rabies.
- Not sure how you can enforce that most people leave
- Of course there needs to be accountability as the person or owner of the animal that was bit may also exaggerate the story or omit important information that could determine why the bite happened. Example: two dogs playing fine, suddenly one gets a bit snappy and asserts dominance and neither owner is aware of the proper way to break it up without escalation. Dogs play and fight sometimes, it doesn't always mean the dog is vicious.
- If it is bad, sometimes dogs can be unpredictable as they are animals, and escalating a minor occurrence may lead to negative outcomes
- Owner is responsible for dog's behaviour, it is not a wild animal.



- I think regardless of breed if you're allowing your animal to be off leash or close enough proximity that it can bite someone, it should be well behaved enough or restrained (ie. muzzle) and be trained to handle these situations better. And if the dog isn't acting appropriately and does bite, consequences should be taken seriously. Accidents do happen so there should be amends for that (in the same way fights can break out on a playground).
- This makes sense.
- It's common sense they need to be responsible for there per.
- There should be severe fines for someone leaving the scene of a dog bite without exchanging information including insurance/license information.
- A person/animal has been injured, insurance etc will be needed to pay for medical needs to either person or dog bitten.
- its the responsible thing as a pet owner to do
- I don't agree with the tribunal because people outside of the city should not have a say in our city's bylaws. A system should be in place that examines ALL parties involved. That means the owner of said dog, and the "victim(s)." I also think a better alternative to the tribunal would be animal behaviour specialists that can really examine the dog and get a better understanding of what happened, whether poor training and/or ownership, a reactive response to a trauma trigger, or other. The person should have to stay on the scene of a dog bite because the owner is almost just as responsible and should be included in the investigation.
- Absolutely must take responsibility for their dogs actions and stay at scene
- A dog is a part of your family so if it breaks a rule you should be required by law to present yourself to stand accountable for you family member.
- It is important to understand the dog that attacked for purposes of insurance and any disease it may carry
- Its like a hit and run; if you are involved in an incident, remain at the scene until officers arrive, or at least provide reliable contact info if you must secure the animal elsewhere.
- I think it is important that people realise they are responsible for their pet's behaviour, and should be accountable to anybody their dog harms.
- Dog owners should be responsible for there pets actions
- Seems pretty simple. Should be the same as if you're in an accident. If you leave, you're charged with leaving the scene.
- Same rules as a car accident
- Contact information is important in case there are complications
- I think this would be a good idea if there are puncture wounds.
- Only if the victim wants them to
- Dogs don't have a voice. The owner needs to be the voice for the dog. The owner should be looked at in the same respect as the dog. There's no bad dogs, it's bad owners that is not teaching them. If the owner feels the dog is a threat, keep them on leash and handle them.
- See 4.
- They are the owner!! They are 100% responsible for this behaviour and the choice to own an animal.



- Each dog must be regarded as an individual and assessed on its specific behaviors... This comes straight from our own Calgary Humane Society. Please do not use your personal bias to force pit bull owners to mistreat their dogs. By muzzling and treating Pit bulls differently we are doing nothing to help the animals. Please leave your personal bias out of this and instead look at scientific facts/studies which show that Pit bulls are no worse/different from other dogs.
- This should be the normal process for any dog bites. Not just specific breeds
- All owners should take responsibility for their dog's actions and be present to offer a solution for whom ever was bitten (dog or person). Also to determine who was at fault, ie. dog who was bitten was running at large towards a dog on leash/ under control, and dog at large was bitten because owner did not have control of it, owner of dog at large is at fault unless at an off leash specific area.
- Too many owners leave the scene and do not take responsibility for their dog. This must apply to ALL dogs as small dog owners are often ones to leave claiming it was only a small bite. Small dogs are more likely to attack without warning than large dogs.
- Dog owners should be held responsible for their dogs actions. We shouldn't tolerate hit and runs when it comes to traffic so the same should apply to dogs.
- Absolutely, should be treated like any other accident. Stay at the scene.
- At the discretion of the individuals involved
- Info must be exchanged so that the victim has recourse for vet bills, and/or civil action.
- Just like with vehicles, if an incident occurs you should legally have to stay at the scene to exchange information & provide a statement of events.
- only for person bites, requirement for both types of bites would be to share contact info
- I think this is really important
- They should have to pay for injuries
- Just like driving a car if you're inviting an accident that requires officials then you should stay
- Yes only if safe for everyone involved, including the dogs. If stress I'd high then I think the situation needs to be dealt with either over the phone or at a distance from where the situation occurred
- It could be tough to get them to stay and/or identify themselves
- Yes, similar to a traffic incident. However there should be allowances to permit safely removing the animal(s) from the scene to prevent further problems.
- the owner should be held responsible instead of running away
- I believe all incidents should be reported by both parties and both sides given! If you refuse to stay and accept what happened and defend your animal then you should be fined and have to go through a program with dog training that is mandatory or you have the potential to lose your dog! If it's not okay to leave a hit and run then it should be okay to leave an incident where your dog injures someone and you need to take responsibility
- people need to start taking responsibility. There are no bad dogs only bad owners.
- If their dog is at fault they need to remain at the scene as they should be liable for expenses the other dog owner may have due to vet bills or personal injury
- Your dog your responsibility to answer for him/her.
- It's a huge fine for leaving the scene of a car accident. It should be no different here



- n/a
- However, the owner must be allowed to safely secure their dog somewhere else so they can speak to said people.
- I mean... this seems to make sense if the owner is at the location at the time of the biting.
- That way you have a record of such incidents with the actual dog and owner.
- A dog owner is responsible for the behaviour of the animal
- Too many people can just leave with their dog and nothing is done for enforcement if they are not held responsible.
- Owners need to be held responsible for their dogs actions
- I believe that the owner needs to give information however depending on the situation because sometimes your only option is to get the animal removed from the situation so it doesn't escalate and cause stress to everyone including said dog
- Dog owners should be responsible for their pets
- For the sake of the dog, the owner, and the victim, I believe that the owner should speak with an enforcement officer to receive guidance and referrals to resources that would prevent a similar incident from happening again. If the injury is severe, the dog will need to be seized.
- So based on this question if a person is being attacked and their dog intervenes in this essence absolutely do I believe the dog should be praised. Also I believe if you have an animal that bites a random jogger etc etc. That is not on the animal that is 100 percent on the owner and should remain at the scene. Where this is skewed is were so quick to destroy the animal and not look at other alternatives to remove the animal from said environmental where alot of the times if placed in different surroundings with someone educated on the breed "problematic dogs have different outcomes. It all comes down to the owner and responsibility they have for proper care and exercise not to mention correct discipline
- I think if the injury is at a certain severity. Just like a car accident
- I have seen multiple incidents at local dog parks where owners flee after their dog lashes out and attacks another dog. I believe that they should be held responsible for some or all of vet costs.
- That's just simply part of being a responsible dog owner. Plus, there are always 2 sides to the story that must be considered.
- The same as any other incident
- This shows accountability for the dogs actions and therefore the human is responsible for any and all damages done to animal or human.
- It is important to share if the dog is up to date on vaccinations and well as any other needed information.
- Absolutely. If I get in a minor car crash I'm required to stay at the scene and exchange information. It makes sense to have the same criteria for a dog biting incident.
- Any responsible dog owner needs to accept the consequences of not having their animal under control but it needs to work both ways. If I have my dog on a leash and some other dog or person runs up to that dog and gets bit, their should be zero chance of a fine or penalty aside from a warning and a muzzle recommendation. It should be documented in case it persists.



- They need to be there along with any other witnesses to advocate for all involved parties
- I agree with this but there are plenty of other types of dogs who are aggressive towards other dogs. Pitbulls are so friendly and loving.
- It's the right thing to do. Like a car accident or any other incident
- Pet owners are responsible for the damage caused by their pets, whether that be to a person another animal, or property. They should be required to face that responsibility.
- The owners should be held accountable for the dogs biting people
- It's not the dogs fault. It's that persons fault they haven't put the effort in to train their animal. They should have their animal taking away because they aren't a responsible pet owner.
- If someone gets injured by my dog. You can bet I'll stay or make sure they are ok! As everyone else should as well.
- IT IS COMMON SENSE THAT A PERSON REMAIN AT THE SCENE OF ANY ACCIDENT
- It is basic responsibility. If my dog bit a child I would stay regardless to at least ensure that they are okay and see if I could help. However the contact sharing should include ID and the owner should be permitted to bring the dog home first and return to speak with bylaw if necessary
- If another dog attacks me or my dog the responsible owner needs to be held accountable and not be able to just walk away from the damage they have caused.
- A dog bite could be likened to a car accident. Drivers must remain at the scene of a car accident. All parties involved should be required to remain at the scene of a dog bite.
- its the responsibility of the dog owner
- This is common sense. All cases, the owner must stay, and take responsibility. It doesn't mean their dog should be declared dangerous, perhaps the dog felt threatened. It must be reviewed fairly, case by case. Do not stigmatize pit bulls.
- think the exchange of information could be likened to leaving the scene of a minor car accident.
- Of course! Your animal caused potential harm to a human or animal they are essentially committing a hit and run by leaving the scene.
- any incident should require someone to stay
- Owners are responsible and liable for actions of their dogs, they can't be allowed to get away without consequences to themselves for their allowing or promoting inappropriate behaviour in their dog
- A dog owner needs to be held accountable for their pets' actions. The responsibility lies with the owner to ensure that their dog behaves properly.
- There may be criminal or civil liability arising from the incident. Treat this like a collision. Fleeing from the scene and failing to render aid should also be considered serious.
- Absolutely a pet owner should have to stay to be questioned and potentially fined.
- They should be held accountable for the actions and can provide information of whether the injury occurred due to aggressive behaviour or animal instinct as a result of provocation.
- Staying at the scene is common courtesy it's scary to think there ISNT a law requiring this.
- Just like a car accident, the owner responsible for the dog should be obligated to assist the responding officers by filling in any gaps in information they might have. This is primarily for the safety of the dog and potential future victims.



- Both sides of story should be heard by neutral party
- If the bite is severe than yes because it costs quite a bit for veterinarian care
- The dog owner needs to take responsibility and explain events leading to the incident (kids throwing rocks, pulling on collar, etc)
- I was bit in the face as a kid and it's traumatic
- I think every dog (not just the pit bull breeds) should be under the same restrictions. An animals behaviour is engrained in the owners ability to train/commitment to the dog, and I don't think just one breed should be held responsible. I've been bit more times by small (house) dogs than by any other dog.
- The behaviour of a dog is solely based off of the owner. For an owner to flee after it's dog bites someone, that's just irresponsible.
- Owners need to take responsibility of their dog. It's not the dog that's the problem, it's the human
- I have a Pit Bull mix. If another dog attacks my dog and my dog defends himself, my dog is automatically persecuted due to his breed. The dog owner should stay, ask for witnesses to stay and both be present to state their version of events.
- Bites should be investigated appropriately and dangerous dogs do need to be reviewed/documentated to protect the public. This legislative should NOT be breed specific in any way though or designed to target certain types of dogs.
- I think that the pet owner should remain at the incident location to talk to an enforcement officer, regardless of the breed of animal. No one breed is more likely to bite than another.
- It gives all parties a chance to explain what happened and how to move forward. Although one dog bit someone or something, it may have been the other person at fault. Staying to talk with enforcement officers gives everyone a fair chance to explain themselves and have it sorted out. Just like a car accident where police come and then everyone has a chance to explain what led to the accident. No difference. People who leave the scene should be seen as guilty and ticketed for leaving.
- the owner of the dog that caused injury to the person or / and dog may be held liable for expenses of recovery from the incident
- Because it's the right and responsible thing to do. Similarly to a car accident.
- When a dog bites, there is a reason. The owner knows his pet better than anyone else and should be there to explain behaviour. Was the dog provoked? Was the dog badly trained or not trained at all? The owner should be held responsible before the dog.
- For so many reasons! To defend or explain themselves or dog. To ask for witness statements.
- People need to be held accountable for their animals and just in some cases the circumstance is more severe than first assumed.
- Proves owner responsibility. If they leave, unless for a very good reason - should be a fine.
- It's only fair that the owner owns up to the dogs wrong doing unfortunately the several attacks My dog has been subjected to, the owner is either nowhere to be found or takes off. Don't know how you would implement a rule like this but it should be a rule.



- as to any incident (etc. vehicle accident), both parties will exchange information for recourse or settlement. This should apply to all incidents without discrimination of species.
- If they bite and run they should have huge fines/jail
- The owner is fully responsible for the behaviour of the dog and should be held liable for any damages that occur
- The dog owner is ultimately responsible for their pets behavior. If the dog was otherwise provoked (protecting the owner from adult or protecting itself from another dog attack) the statements need to be taken from both parties
- Owners are responsible for the actions of their pets and should absolutely remain at the scene of any incident regardless of the severity. It should be treated just as a vehicle accident.
- you are responsible for your pet
- Allows for appropriate identification of animal to ensure responsible owners are held accountable for animal behaviour moving forward
- People I know that have been victims of dog attacks say that the owner grabbed the dog and left the scene, leaving them with no way to identify, or any other recourse. Penalizing that lack of citizenship is appropriate.
- If your dog bites someone, there might be a reason behind that would need to be expressed by the owner
- People I know that have been victims of dog attacks say that the owner grabbed the dog and left the scene, leaving them with no way to identify, or any other recourse. Penalizing that lack of citizenship is appropriate.
- Dog owners should stay on scene to tell their side of the story. Regardless as to how bad the bite is.
- Of course the dog owner should remain at the scene.
- If a dog bites a person (not a playful bite) I view that as assault in the same way a person hurts someone else.
- Owner should be responsible for the vet bills of the animal bit
- The pet owner has to be responsible for their pet
- People need to take responsibility if their dog bites a person or another animal.
- If the issue cannot be resolved amongst the two involved, best to wait for an officer
- I would support this if done for ALL dogs. Smaller breeds bite more frequently and owners barely ever stay to support the injured.
- Similar to car accident fender bender, owners must stay at the scene to give contact information including drivers license or ID card
- The animal has committed an offence and as the owner is responsible for the animal they should wait for enforcement officers. Most nuisance dogs are owned by the low life of society many of them criminals, they must be held responsible.
- The owner should be responsible and give their information but if the situation is out of hand and they need to leave to put the dog away. What can you do, it has to be done
- If things are taken that far, sure. Figure it out and what the incident was, if bad enough, then yes remain there.



- The extend of injury is hard to know right away. If the injury of a bite is excessive, I would expect the owner(s) of the dog who bit to pay for any veterinary costs associated with the attack.
- Dog bite is an assault, especially on people
- They must remain so dog can be assessed and owners can give their side.
- Sometimes a dog owner will be very aggressive on scene and staying there could be dangerous. An intentional bite or aggressive behavior caused by not having your dog under control or not supervised should be fined and be held responsible for all caused injuries.
- I would like to see more ownership and responsibility from dog owners. Even if the bite was accidental.
- That should be happening regardless of the severity. There should also be mandatory obedience training that they will have to take in case this isn't an isolated incident.
- Owners need to be responsible and if another dog or person is injured by their dog they need to be financially responsible
- Owners are responsible for their pets just as drivers are responsible for their vehicles.
- I agree, and it had better be with ALL BREEDS. There are negligent dog owners of any breed, and this extends to ALL BREEDS, not just pitbull type dogs.
- Dog owner responsibility is IMPORTANT
- depends if blood is drawn in animal cases. Sometimes a dog bites but as a warning instead of intent to maim.
- If it is a minor skirmish between 2 dogs, no. If there is injuries to either person or animal, then require the owner to remain there for bylaw. I've seen dogs defend toys at parks when another dog attempts to take their toy with no major injuries. I wouldn't require bylaw for that. I'd expect both owners to separate and avoid one another with their dogs.
- People need to be held accountable for poorly raising their dogs. Dogs should be rehabilitated with responsible people.
- All parties involved should have to give information the same way you could in a car accident.
- Ownership of any animal should require the utmost responsibility including ownership or your animals strengths and weaknesses. Witnesses should also have privilege of offering information. If an "intimidating" breed bites someone or some other animal and others witnessed poor ownership and obedience of the other potentially non "intimidating" breed the opportunity for defence should be there.
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets. Period. It's illegal to hit and run, why shouldn't it be if it's a bite and run?
- This requires officers to be available in a short time.
- Common sense
- "Owners must be responsible for their animals as they are product of their behaviours and training techniques. Owners must be properly taught animal behaviour and psychology to maintain a well balance mental mind of the animal.
- What is the root of the problem when it comes animals that are aggressive? Is it the breed or the owner?"



- It is a pet owners responsibility for whatever actions and consequences there are caused by their pet.
 - The dog owner should be responsible for their dogs actions.
 - Both dog owners involved have to remain on scene as well as gather phone numbers for any witnesses.
 - As long as parties are safe to do so.
 - Responsible pet ownership must include the owner. The pet owner should be held accountable for the actions of their pet, and this includes nuisance or aggressive behaviour.
 - People need to be held accountable for their dogs behavior
 - Sometimes bites don't look bad at the time, but can much worse within a short time. Any bite to human/animal should be looked at by a doctor/vet. Too many brush off the incident and carry on. For some dog owners they can have numerous incidents like this and no one is any wiser. It builds a history of the dogs behaviour if a bylaw officer is made aware of it.
 - You wouldn't leave a car accident before reporting to an officer. Why would you bite and run? Although, if the dogs cannot calm down, they may need to leave before it escalates further.
 - Yes. Everyone should stay and resolve what happened. Training the human to own and train a dog should be an option. Both parties should be looked at. It takes two to have an interaction.
 - Pet owners must be responsible for their pets
 - Is ANY dog bites anyone, the owners should be held liable in the same situation as a car accident.
 - Just like a car crash, hit and runs never turn out good for the person who left the area should be the same with dog bites
 - It's polite
 - "You would expect people involved in a car accident to stay on the scene, same should apply for any injuries or harm done to individuals at the hand of someone else.
-
- Something to keep in mind. If a dog has been aggressive and bit someone or their animal they may need to be removed from the area or situation promptly as to not further stress out the animals or avoid any further injuries."
 - The dog owner that bites another dog or person is at fault. They should also be paying for vet bills for the injuries dog. They should also be looked at to see if they are a responsible dog owner and should complete a dog assessment from some one that is qualified. Like a dog counsellor if some sort.
 - Same as a Vehicle collision. IF you damage someone else's car you are required to leave contact information. If your dog bites someone else's because you failed to handle it properly you should take responsibility.
 - Owners should be responsible for their dogs actions.
 - people should have to take responsibility for how their pet behaves.
 - The aggressive dog must be restrained.



- If the dog was being teased or other behaviours exhibited by the person being bite then that should have a major play and why the dog bite.
 - It's obvious
 - These incidents should be treated similarly to car accidents. There should be a mandatory exchange between the owners involved and the enforcement officers.
 - It's a pet owner's responsibility to be held accountable for their pet's behaviour.
 - we need transparency with bites and owners need to be responsible
 - Only leave to secure animal on property or in a vehicle, but The incident needs to be recorded and owners both need to be help to responsibility.
 - Need both sides of story and for the person bitten would be good to know if dog has all its shots etc and if dog is bitten contact info for vet bills to be sent to the irresponsible person with the dog who bit
 - It's common sense. Why does everything have to be mandated and made into bylaws?
 - At the very least, the owner of the dog needs to remain to see if the bite was severe enough to require proof of vaccination.
 - unless the person that got bit was attacking them, ie) assault or being robed and the dog was protecting the owner
 - People should be responsible for their pets
 - All incidents should be treated seriously and fairly
 - a bite is assault. If it is serious and can't be settled between the parties, the owner should stay
 - It is the same as if you hit a car. Do not run, but take responsibility for what your dog has done. Same as people do with their children.
 - Responsibility!
 - For every incident regardless of breed.
 - If it is a serious injury, no matter what dog breed, the owner should be held accountable. If required to remain at the scene, there is less confusion and more likely to get the correct culprit.
 - "no different than a car accident, except people care more for their pets than their car.
 - Vet bills are very expensive and the risk of someone fleeing or leaving false information is very high.
-
- an exception would be if contact information is shared in a reasonable manner like exchanging insurance at a car accident."
 - Owners need to be accountable for their dogs actions.
 - A responsible owner would stay around, period!
 - Equivalent to a hit and run if they don't.
 - Dog owners must take responsibility for their dogs behavior
 - Implications if they don't comply
 - Considering that more often than not people panic and leave, it does more harm than good. If the dog really hurts the person or other dog, they need to know that there are consequences. People typically leave because they don't want to be fined. If people were to stay and take responsibility



then we would have a better grasp on the aggressive dog situation, and also understand that it does not also breed-specific as everyone would have a first-hand judgment of the breed as opposed to the people just claiming it was a pit bull when in reality it was nothing like one. It is a smarter idea and then would keep he said she said to a minimum. Just like the protocol with car accidents. Both involved stay at the scene.

- It is necessary for the owner to remain and take responsibility.
- I think the owner should be there at the time to be questioned when memory is the clearest.
- There are always two sides
- My dog was attacked at a park and she subsequently attacked another dog due to trauma. A responsible owner will remain on the scene and provide contact information.
- if you're doing to force owners to muzzle their pitbulls then you should also force people to muzzle their mastiffs, German Shepards, Rottweilers, Cane Corsos, just to name a few. All the dogs I just listed have a much stronger bite force than a Pitbull. Please reevaluate your stance to be more in line with scientific facts instead of personal bias.
- As someone who has owned a small dog having a larger dog bite her then have the owner just runaway was traumatic
- This could be especially useful both ways. Perhaps a disease your dog carries but is asymptomatic can be discovered in the wound of the other party, allowing your dog treatment as well. It just seems like good practice. It's an incident the same as a car accident.
- It is important for the dog owner to take responsibility especially in the victim's case, and so the dog will not have another opportunity in the future to injure someone
- If a dog is aggressive and bites another dog or human, the victim needs to know if the dog is up to date on shots. Plus, the enforcement officer will be able to find out if the dog is a repeat offender.
- As stated above, all parties need to remain on scene including owners of small dogs. I once had a small Pomeranian run up to my collie and was HANGING OFF HIS JOWL while his owner laughed at how cute it was. I finally asked the owner of the pomeranian to control her dog before my collie reacted and would be blamed for anything. By the way my collie stood there and just took it for a good minute before the owner pulled her dog off. Had my collie so much as shook his head loose, he may have been blamed for something he didn't do.
- I think due to liability it should be required. Just in case the bit is severe and law enforcement/the person/medical staff involved need to know the history of vaccines the dog has had.
- Similar to any offense, if you or your "property" are the result of injury you should be held responsible and remain with the victims until help arrives. However the cause of the harm should be put somewhere safe to avoid more issues.
- Owner needs to held accountable, no matter the breed. And also be able to tell their side of things.
- It's the dog owner's responsibility to be accountable for their dog's behaviour particularly in a biting incident.
- That's just common decency.
- Of course, they should be fined if they leave the scene. It should be treated no differently than if someone was attacked by a human.



- Dogs are dogs. They are only a reflection of their owners who have trained them, HOWEVER, there are circumstances where a human may be bothering, teasing, or acting in a manner the dog doesn't like. Dogs typically give a warning before snapping or biting and in that situation it's the human's responsibility to stop provoking the dog. If they don't, it's fair for them to be bit. You wouldn't expect a human to repeatedly be aggressively provoked and not stand up for themselves, why would you expect a dog to?
- Owners should be held accountable
- If it is a severe bite and not a playful bite that some dogs do while playing
- Unless the individual feels that they or their dog is in a situation where they feel unsafe or require medical attention.
- The owner remaining at the scene seems reasonable. It should also help clear up incidents where someone is bit and blames the wrong dog
- Because the owner of the dog is responsible and fleeing should be a criminal offence
- Both sides of the story will need to be heard. If the owner leaves then there is no one advocating for the dog
- Because it's the same as a car accident, if you cause harm to someone the right thing to do is stay, leaving is pretty much an admission of guilt
- I agree as long as the rule is NOT BREED SPECIFIC!
- Too many owners leave the scene of a bite to avoid fines or responsibility.
- This should be done regardless - if people leave the scene of an accident it's a crime! Same should go for a dog bite!
- You need to make sure the dog is up to date on shots and if surgery is needed then the owner should have to pay for half.
- Yes. If there was a bite information could be exchanged for the purpose to prevent the spread of disease
- The owner needs to take all responsibility for it pet and everything that happened
- Responsible pet ownership
- We need to get both sides of the story to make an educated and accurate decision
- The owner should be responsible and accountable for their pets actions.
- Responsibility.
- Serious dog bites causing harm can be seen as akin to car accidents. No hit and runs (without serious repercussions) should be acceptable in either case.
- Yes but only if at least 1 of the people involved think it's serious. (Sometimes there are minor and non aggressive bites when multiple dogs are trying to catch a toy and an ear gets caught). If deemed necessary, both owners of the dogs involved should be required to complete a detailed incident report with their contact information, regardless of this is done at the scene, vet police station, etc.
- If the animal is severely injured yes there should be some contact between animal owners for vet purposes only



- Exchange of information is key for vet bills, proof of vaccination and possible past offences if the owner is irresponsible.
- Just like a traffic accident - you cannot leave.
- This is just basic responsible dog ownership. It's like remaining at the scene of a car accident.
- If possible yes. If my dog bit someone, it's my responsibility to ensure the other dog is taken care of.
- My dog was mauled to death on my property. The owners of the two dogs who did this didn't give it a second thought and refused to contain their dogs after the attack. This resulted in us shooting the dogs.
- Absolutely as dog owners we are responsible for our dogs behaviour
- My dog succumbed to dog bite injuries and complications in November 2017. The bite incident took place in July 2017. The owner of the dog who attacked has no idea. Furthermore, it cost over \$2000 in surgery and medication.
- Owners need to be held accountable for the actions of their dog as should the person who received the bite or aggressive action unless emergency medical attention is needed. There are always 3 sides to the story.
- I think it's absolutely necessary to see who is at fault before leaving the scene. Discrimination against a breed of a dog will always play a part, so the incident needs to be explained as soon as possible to some sort of officer.
- As long as the situation is controlled. Removing the dog as fast as possible is frequently the best way to contain and manage the situation.
- However, they should be allowed to take their dog to their car or somewhere away from the scene as to not escalate the situation any more
- I thought this was already the case?
- It should be like a car accident. People have to remain on scene to not only ensure the wellness of the person that was bit, but to explain their side to an enforcement officer.
- It's like a car accident, if at fault, you need to be made responsible, and provide a statement
- Should either party feel the need to involved bylaw then both parties involved should remain at the scene until enforcement arrives in the same way any other incident between two parties is managed. This allows for both sides to be document for clarity in future discussions as well as an unbiased set of eyes to see any injuries and collect additional witness details in real time.
- A responsible pet owner should always stay on scene!! Also have the dog assessed for behavior problems
- Owners need must be responsible for their dogs. It's the same as a car accident, no one wants a hit and run.
- This will depend on the severity. If its just a small bite, let the owner take the dig home. If its a damaging bite, require owner to remain on scene for bylaw.
- When my dog was attacked the vet bills were going to be over \$2000. We could not afford this. One months pay cheque was less than \$2000. Luckily the owner of the other dog gave us her contact information. We tried calling her but she wouldn't answer. Eventually the vet gave her a call and convinced her to pay. Requiring owners to stay at the scene would ensure that they take financial



responsibility for the injuries that their dog has caused as well as it would allow the incident to be documented so that steps can be taken to ensure that it doesn't happen again.

- Absolutely. It's like a hit and run. Stay on the scene and be responsible
- To explain why the dog bit the victim. May have been the victims fault ie provocative behaviours against dog.
- I feel that sometimes explanations are needed as it's not always clear on what happened or how it was triggered and this will also help for any injured pets to get compensation for vet or medical bills
- How else is a tribunal going to work?
- This will provide the victim with the pet medical history and also assist in resolution. By staying, it gives the attacking dog a better chance than leaving the scene without the owner giving a statement of what happened. By leaving, the attacking dog looks guilty when it may have been instigated by the dog or person that was bitten. My pit bull mix has been attacked at the dog park for new reason but she did not fight back, she ran away. If there was injury, I would make the owners stay for enforcement to arrive because my dog was innocent. She was attacked by a bull dog. Pit bulls should not be treated any differently in the laws as it is not the breed, it is the owners. Other dog breeds are larger and stronger than pit bulls and it is unfair to alienate this breed. My rescue came from Ontario because of these laws and she spent months in shelters and she is the sweetest dog you will ever meet.
- Owners must remain accountable for their animal's behaviour.
- As long as the dog is under control, sharing contact information is the responsible thing to do
- Yes but depending on the situation. A fight between two off leash dogs, no, because that should be sorted out between the owners. Unwarranted dog bites on a dog minding their business then yes.
- Just like when a car accident occurs the driver must remain on the scene but good luck getti a dog owner to
- Of course they should remain at the scene and take responsibility for their pet and ownership.
- There is always two sides to a story so both sides should be heard.
- They should be responsible for the actions of their pet and should remain at the scene to ensure that they are able to advocate for their pet and be fined if necessary
- Common courtesy. If you hit someone with your vehicle you have to stay on the scene.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs actions and should remain present at any incident.
- It is important to get the owners information for follow up.
- The dog owner is wholly responsible for the situation, they should be there to talk to the person/owner and also in the case that the person antagonized the dog in any way they may be able to make that know for the dog who can't speak for themselves
- if they stay they can exchange pet heath records.
- it's important to be responsible for your pet and their actions.
- Law enforcement should be providing information regarding training and where to attend same to a) lower the fine and b) avoid unnecessary removal of the dog.
- similar to a car crash, both parties should be able to provide their account of the incident.



- I believe a dog bite should be treated similar to a car collision. Both parties must stay to exchange information and file the appropriate police reports.
- Owner are responsible for their animals.
- Absolutely. It should be the owner of the attacking dogs responsibility to pay all vet / medical bills and fines
- But I believe that they should be able to remove their dog and come back. If I dog bites, it's usually heightened or over its threshold. So keeping it at the scene could cause more issues. The owner should be able to remove the dog from the area to eliminate any further aggression from the dog, before returning and staying to talk to an enforcement officer.
- OWNERS need to be held responsible not the ANIMALS
- that pwrson is responsible for the damage, just like a hit and run car.
- This is a basic condition of accountability for your pet. I see too many pet owners leaving their pets to roam while they are on their phone. That is the first sign of lack of accuntability. So anything to give the message that you are accountable for your pet's behaviour is good.
- Or to leave name and number to be contacted as some times it is best to remove the animal from an upsetting scene
- Any owner who allows ANY dog to bite a person or another dog should be relieved of ownership of that dog and the dog should be euthanized. This should not be breed specific. Punish the negligent owner behavior, not the way the well behaved dogs look.
- Yes only if it is possible, some cases may not be suitable. Ie a dog fight and both dogs need vet attention
- No one dog breed is bad. The people that own them are bad. This would be like banning certain cars because they "crash" more.
- This would hold the owner accountable for the animal's actions and prevent owners from fleeing the scene.
- If a dog causes another dog or person to bleed from a bite, their owner should be liable to cover vet or hospital bill. Info should be exchanged in a situation like that.
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs - just like any motor vehicle accident they should remain at the scene for dog related accidents as well. Behaviour isn't always breed specific - owner responsibility is key
- Should be common sense. Kind of like car accidents
- Maybe people run off with their dog when they know they are in the wrong or their dog has bitten before. Responsibility needs to be taken by the owner of the dog. As a dog owner myself it is important I am responsible for my dogs at all times including if an incident occurred.
- Both parties should remain at the scene to give their respective sides of the story. Context matters, especially if the dog bit someone due to being harassed or antagonized by the person first.
- But only in circumstances where the animals can be dealt with appropriately
- I don't think that requires explanation. It's an assault for which the owner is responsible.



- For severe bites this should be a requirement. Fines should be levied against an owner who does not comply. I get that this is a bit tricky as it essentially amounts to a citizen's arrest in cases where one party wishes to call bylaw enforcement while the other does not.
- Nothing to explain as the answer is in your question.
- Beyond needing their information for enforcement officers, the person/animal that was bitten needs to be aware of vaccines and potential exposure to disease.
- My dog was bitten by a Dalmatian and the owner laughed and didn't acknowledge the fact that I had to take my dog who is bleeding to the vet
- Yes, only to make sure other party's are okay and to receive the help they need. Not so that they can punish an animal for the mistakes of the owner. Should always be on the human and not the dog.
- The owner is responsible for their dog and thereby should remain at the scene of an incident to provide information and eye witness account
- Always important to get both sides of the story.
- Ensures tracking of bad owners and available follow-up if tribunal measures include dog training.
- My mother was attacked by a dog whose owner retreated into their home. The dog went on to kill another neighbourhood dog.
- responsibility
- It would be the same reasoning behind fleeing the scene of an accident.
- "Well I would think that any dog owner would be adult enough to stay around after this happened.
- But there are a few I'm sure and they should not own a dog."
- So the situation can be dealt with appropriately
- But owner of the dog should be given time to take the dog somewhere safe then return to the scene
- if the bite is severe, both owners should remain.
- There should be accountable by the owner if a abut occurs. Only contact information and vet information should be shared.
- Just like in a car accident info should be exchanged. So if a tribunal needs to be done it can. How ever if a dog bits someone because they are protesting there owner it shouldn't matter.
- the owner should take responsibility just like if there was an auto accident
- This is more a comment on the previous questions. Dogs cannot just be classified by breed - that's pretty much racism for dogs. "All pit-bulls are bad" Hogwash. I know many people that own the most loving, personable dogs that are pit bulls.
- People should be accountable for the actions of their dogs, as they should be for the actions of their children. If a dog is known by the owner to be reactive (regardless of breed) the owner should be aware enough to not put their pet in a situation where something like a bite or attack can happen, and therefore should be made to actually make a conscious effort to make whatever amends to resolve the situation that are required for both parties involved.
- You need both sides of the story. Like I said above was one dog provoked by the other and the owner did nothing to stop their animal provoking the other?



- Barring necessity to seek medical attention for the owner or dog, remaining at the scene, if safe to do so, should be mandatory - and seems in their best interest, as stories can be very one-sided in these unfortunate situations and extend the length of investigation.
- Biting a person yes you should stay and ensure the person is ok and doesn't require medical attention. With animals it can be more difficult due to the other owner not listening to warnings about the dog, and keeping 2 animals that are already stressed around each other after the incident can cause more issues.
- Yes, the owner and its pets should remain at the scene, to call for him, and offer emotional support to the victim, if, the dog can be controlled. If not, provide your info, and call for help, stay until help arrives. Its creating more areas to have disagreements with one's neighbors, and causing the city to possible add more by-law officers to deal with disagreements. Lets put our resources, to feed the hunger and get the homeless of our streets.
- I think if your dog bites someone you have a responsibility to stay and wait for law enforcement. You should be the one to call for help if your dog bites someone. I think this could be beneficial for both parties.
- If the encounter is not serious and the party responsible needs to leave (ex. has to get to work, pick up a child from daycare, etc.) it should be allowed for them to simply share their contact info. (For instance, they could allow the other party to see their Driver's License or other official ID in order to verify their name/address for the purposes of follow-up.
- "Yes of course I believe that. If something happens to the dog because someone else's dog bites or attacks it they should be responsible.
- Also to know what kind of shots and medical stuff the dog has"
- People need to be responsible for their pets. We shouldn't be blaming the animals for poor owners actions and/or training.
- They need to explain the situation and provide there side of the story
- I support this rule because if your dog seriously injures other dog/person, I believe it is the owner of the dog that has bitten the person/animal responsibility to pay for the medical/vet bills. So, this would require gathering each other's information and that person staying on the scene long enough for that to happen.
- Yes, so you can actually see what types of dogs are biting and causing a scene rather than just generalizing and saying "pit bulls" it'll likely be the annoying little dogs that cause issues.
- Owners need to be as decent as their pets are required to be.
- Just like staying at the scene of a car accident. It's about taking responsibility
- It's like a car accident, you should stay and give your information.
- Yes, but only if it is safe to do so and the dog has calmed down and is no longer a threat to anyone or anything else. Otherwise the owner and dog should leave their contact information and then leave.
- so long as they have regained control over their dog and it is no longer a threat to others (e.g. secured in a vehicle)



- Not doing so is irresponsible on behalf of the owner. You should be in control of your pet. Accidents happen and if that is what happened then you should be witness to it and explain the case, even if at fault.
- Owners are responsible for the dog, and there's always two sides to every story.
- If an accident occurs, it needs to be taken seriously. Everyone should be accountable and wait, exchange info, and call police if severe.
- If the dog actually attacks or bites without good reason, I would say the owner should have to stay there. If the dog was being teased or tainted and not left alone after warning someone to back off, it is not the dogs fault and the owner should be able to leave.
- Only if medical assistance is required to a larger extent, not just a couple scrapes. Dogs have emotions and get angered, snapping at each other is how they show this, it happens sometimes.
- It's accountability and responsible ownership. We are required to stay at scenes of a car accident. People that witness assaults are required to stay and give statements. BUT this would require more officers to police all this.
- This should not focus on Pit Bulls. This should focus on the yappy small VIOLENT dogs who are never trained and more dangerous than any PitBull. They get away with it because they are small, they are the biggest problem.
- Similar to a hit and run. They need to held accountable if there are serious injuries or damages.
- It would be the same as a hit and run for example.
- Everyone involved should stay so both sides can be heard
- Shame on you calgary about pit bulls. Its the owners Not the dog get a clue.
- The owner of the dog who bites should pay the vet bills for the injured dog.
- yes , but most people run away from site. it could be a personal safety issues as well. Best measure will be mandatory dog license and microchip. City should offer microchip services to all bully breeds, medium and large breeds of dog for a fee. Decrease the license fee for dogs and cat who have microchip and are spayed neutered. Microchipping should be made mandatory. City is also paying significant medical bills to emergency injured animals, which citizens take to emergency clinic. Most of these animals likely has no ID, so no way to find the owner and get the expense back, if animals has and ID , Owner should be made to pay for those bills regardless, as their irresponsible pet ownership let the animal to be out on the road and get hit by the car.
- I think it is important that the dog owner be present so they can be a point of reference for what happened
- The owner is 100% responsible for any bite that has happened. They are solely responsible for the training and handling of their dog, and if that results in it biting someone then they need to be held accountable. Being made to stay at the scene and provide information is a way to do that.
- It's like a car accident. If there's damage, both parties should share information.
- It is the owner's responsibility to train their animals, and face consequences if they choose not to.
- If something happens both parties should remain at the scene so the situation can be assessed evaluated and coaching etc can be provided on a real case by case method not hypotheticals based on false data.



- That way the issue could be properly assessed and addressed. In addition, it could be determined which person/animal is at fault (whether the dog bit out of self defence or aggression) and hopefully reduce false allegations.
- Because there are always 2 sides to every story. Both accounts should be given. I believe the dog should be removed from the situation (put in a vehicle) while the owner remain to give a statement
- I've been bitten by a dog and the owner left the scene.
- Except if the person or animal bitten is the aggressor in the situation. If someone attempted to stab and rape me I would ve happy my dog defended me and I would not hang around. Likewise if I was attacked by a bear and my dog defended me, I would also not stay at the scene. My safety comes first.
- I agree because of the fact that one any type of dog can bite or get bitten, so just calm the situation having the owner there would be helpful I think
- It is ultimately up to the owner to take responsibility for their pet
- Prevents a 'hit and run' of dog attacks
- I think people should take responsibility. It's not the dogs fault.
- Take responsibility and to explain the situation. Example if someone was teasing your dog or another nuisance dog is aggressive towards you or your dog, and your dog protects you and themselves
- Get the story straight. No confusion. The owner could not disappear.
- Responsible do ownership, begins with responsible owners.
- One must remain at the scene of the incident that they are responsible for as the owner of the dog. This is regardless of what breed the dog is.
- It is the owner who is responsible for the dog and should have control over that dog. They should be fined if the dog attacks another dog or a person.
- Owner is fully responsible for their animal
- They need to be held accountable for the actions of their pet.
- The owner should remain accessible, however, as someone with extensive experience handling dogs, this should contain an option of being able to move to a spot where the dogs are not able to see each other. In the case of a large dog that is over stimulated, it could be very physically difficult and dangerous to the handlers to remain on the scene. In this situation perhaps requiring both parties to call a certain number to be able to have an information exchange would be a good option. Or at least allowing the handlers to remove the dog(s) from the situation whether that be waiting out of site around a corner or confining the dog elsewhere and returning.
- The owner of a dog that would bite another person or animal should take responsibility for their pet.
- The owner is responsible for the dogs behaviour and should understand this.
- A dog owner should absolutely have to stay and provide contact information with the victim(s). This would allow the victim to seek compensation for medical bills or other expenses related to the attack. Depending on the severity of the bite, this would also allow enforcement officers to label a dog as a 'nuisance dog' and suggest behavior training or other options to the owner.



- ABSOLUTELY! Too many owners grab their dogs and run after their dogs provoke an attack on people or other animals. It should be viewed the same as a vehicle hit and run - if your dog attacks a person or another animal and you run away from the scene, BAM! you had a much higher, stronger fine or possible time behind bars.
- I have witnessed dog owners walk away after their dog has but another dog. It is the responsibility of the attacking dog owner to ensure that the attacked dog is ok. As well as to be responsible for any vet bills that come with it. If the attack was in Provoked
- It is no different than a car accident or assault
- The owner is responsible for their dog's behavior
- Similar response to a car accident
- It's just like a car accident. Must share info
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs actions but also be able to tell their side of story.
- There should always be open communication between parties, and a satisfactory agreement should be met before anyone leaves.
- There should be contact information and vet records shared when there is a dog bite.
- With the exception that if the dog cannot be calmed down and contained, the owner should be able to return the dog home and be contacted by by-law when safe
- for many reasons, not least of which to share the dogs side of the story. Often a 'dog bite' isn't a bite at all, but a dog with an open mouth turning their head quickly, often when startled and if a tooth catches someone it is called a 'bite' when it clearly isn't.
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs and thus, responsible for any damage they do.
- There is always 2 sides to an issue. If a dog bites there is usually something to cause it, if the owner is not there it turns into a "he said/she said" situation that is harder to decipher
- It's the responsible thing to do, just like any other accident involving another person
- The owner needs to take responsibility for the dogs actions. They are responsible for their behaviour and should be the ones facing penalty. The dog should be given rehabilitation training.
- This is a part of responsible dog ownership.
- also if a dog bites another dog this should apply
- Accountability is important. However situations should always be THOROUGHLY investigated to insure that fault is determined to the best of bylaws ability.
- Running off is irresponsible
- It is important that the dog owner give a statement of the incident. Depending on the severity of the bite and wait time for the bylaw officer . Dog owners information would have to be left with the appropriate authority.
- Only if the bite produces blood
- Remain at the scene if at all possible. If not possible due to reasons (like needing to remove the dog from the scene), the owner must leave a card or note of how to reach them.
- It is no different than remains in scene at an accident



- The dog owner must share contact information but doesn't necessarily need to remain at scene since this might be dangerous for various reasons.
- I think that people need to take responsibility for their animal. However if a large dog that was on leash hurts a small dog that was running free in a leash only area it should be the fault of the small dog owner.
- I think this rule will keep owners accountable for their dog, i do not agree that this should apply only to 'pitbull type dogs"
- So the can be held accountable
- Yes, but no harmful actions should be taken against the dog. All actions should be taken on their owner
- If they leave it is difficult to find them again, and owners should be responsible for the actions of their pet, including medical costs
- The owner should be held responsible in all cases. Dogs only bite when they are fearful or if they were taught to do so by aggressive behaviour from their owner
- It is not always safe to keep the animal in the area, it might be in everyones best interest to remove the animal from the location.
- Very important so that the vaccination history can be given
- Ownership and accountability.
- So can get things cleared up and not go on and on
- and responsible dog owner would stay to make sure the incident victim was taken care of and that responsibility would include contact info
- Treat it like a car accident. Owner must stay on scene and must provide information or get fined for failure to report. Which should be mandatory court
- Same as a car accident, either party could be at fault information must be shared.
- Best for the health of both dogs to ensure they can access medical history
- I think you should encourage this for all dog bites to bring light to how bad small dogs owners are at training there dogs or keeping other dogs or people safe.
- insurance, tribunal proof on the spot - photos, movies
- Too many owners are not responsible for their dog, lack of training their dog, and showing responsibility by remaining on scene.
- It's only fair that the other person (victim) know the details of the animal that attacked there's. And the person should be held responsible
- Absolutely. Have heard many stories of dog owners that leave scene after their dog bites another, the hurt dog needs vet services and car that is costly. The pet owner that bite the dog should cover or help cover the costs. Can only get that if dog owners don't leave the scene and if they provide their contact info.
- Medical and financial reasons and to be fined by the officer
- The pet owner is responsible
- The owners are responsible to share all details



- Only if an animal or person is injured.
- Once the dog is taken away from the scene (put in the car) the owner should be on-hand to speak to the enforcement officer.
- This makes the owner liable. You have to fix the main problem, not try and fix the inevitable consequence being the dog. The dog is not the issue so having the owner their would have them more liable for their actions of poorly training the dog in the first place.
- this way you can get the whole story and not just the injured persons side.
- Just like any incident this should be expected.
- Absolutely. It should be the same as leaving the scene of any crime. The owners are responsible and can teach a dog not to be aggressive.
- Treat it like a car accident.
- Yes this is good practice for ALL breeds of dogs for health reasons for the person bit. However singling out pitbull type breeds is retarded and does nothing. Chihuahuas are more likely to bite ir be agressive than a pitbull type dog so these owners should be required aa much as any other dog breed owner to control their pet and be responsible during bite incidents.
- owners are responsible for their pets, if an car accident occurs your not allowed to leave the scene why should you be allowed to leave with a dog bite incident
- "They need to be held accountable.
- FOR ALL BREEDS!!!!"
- I think that dogs should get charged after an offence (which requires the owner to be present for statement) and based off of how many charges they have (by doing a background check on a tag number or on the owner themselves) there should be levels to punishment. Such as 1st offence, warning (depending of severity) 2nd, obedience training with weekly/monthly check in, 3rd time, dog requires a muzzle and owner should be investigated and 4th- dog is seen as a threat and should be (at worst) euthanized. Or taken away from the owner who trained that dog.
- This is too arbitrary. Often, the victim, will go to the doctor immediately so the dog owner is supposed to stand around for what? Enforcement can come to their home.
- It would encourage owners be responsible for their pets / actions.
- Yes because the owner should be able to own up that they did not train the dog properly and it was the owners fault for letting the dog become aggressive and disobedient
- people own the dog. It is their responsibility.
- Keeping the dog at the scene could be traumatic for everyone but I support having to share contact information before leaving the scene.
- there has to be accountability for a serious dog bite - and some investigation as to why the bite incident occurred - sometimes it is not all as it seems .. provocation, reactivity etc
- They can give there side of the story.
- A person should take responsibility for the way THEY raise there dog!
- All dog owners, regardless of the breed they have should be held responsible for their dog biting.
- If they don't remain how are you going to know if they are a repeat offender.



- I feel as a responsible dog owner you should be staying on the scene anyways to ensure the victim is properly taken care of.
 - The dog owner should indeed leave their contact information with the victims. It is the right thing to do, as often a responsible dog owner whose dog made a mistake would pay for the vet/medical bills of the injured animal/person.
 - Owners should be responsible for their dog and remaining at the scene of an incident is part of that.
 - It's ultimately their responsibility, so they should remain.
 - our dog was attacked and hurt - we had to pay the bill and couldn't track the owner down.
 - It is what a responsible dog owner would do.
 - "I want small dog bites to be taken seriously. My daughter has scars from small dog bites, I've had to take two large dogs for stitches in one in the tone to the ear due to a small dog attack. When I called animal services it's taken as a joke by the owner and animal services because of the offender being a little dog. No followup on either occasion.
-
- I'm sick and tired of these little dogs and their owners getting away with everything just because they are little.
-
- The mental scars are the same."
 - Seriously, this goes without asking.
 - Knowing their dog may be apprehended, there is no incentive to stay.
 - It's just like in a car you hit someone you stay or it becomes a hit and run
 - It's the only way to track if a dog is a repeat offender.
 - It would be the same as a hit and run if they could just walk away.
 - It must be determined who is at fault. It is not always the dog who is at fault. A person on a bike that comes upon a dog walker and is on the sidewalk and tries to pass without warning is at fault if an incident occurs.
 - Contact information will be required to follow up.
 - Same as assault. Why should the aggressive dog be allowed to leave.
 - I think the onus needs to be on the owner. They should treat it the same a vehicle accident; someone gets bit, the owner should stay and talk to an officer.
 - Responsible owners already do this, but this would provide the injured party legal options.
 - It is important for the owner to give a history of vaccinations to those it concerns. You are also responsible for your pet and their behaviors
 - If children or anyone gets hurt there could be possible infection. It's good to be safe for people as well as animals
 - Important to be able to provide information regarding vaccination and insurance. No different from car accidents



- I think pet owners should take responsibility for their pets actions.
- its the responsible thing to do
- Treating a bite/altercation like any other accident/incident, like a fender bender.
- Yes because dog owners need to be held accountable when their dog attacks.
- There are no bad dogs, just bad dog owners
- Accountability
- Totally irresponsible if a person does not remain at the scene
- Regardless of the breed a dog or size-owners should take full responsibility for their dog's actions. A dogs actions are a direct reflection of the training, care and attention they are given. Only irresponsible owners would ever object to this.
- Incidents resulting in damage should require all involved parties and any witnesses to remain on scene to exchange information until an enforcement officer arrives to mediate unless requiring immediate medical attention. However, whenever possible, incidents should be treated like vehicle collisions in which all parties record their experiences both through writing, sketches and photos.
- I have been attacked twice by 4 at large Sheppards and both times the owner ran away after she got her dogs. I had to go through bylaw and the property management company both times before the dogs were declared a threat.
- If the situation warrants a response from enforcement
- I agree with this. Owners must be held accountable for their pets and their actions as they are direct reflections of the owner's training and treatment of their dog. It's not a dog's fault it has a bad owner.
- In the instance where the dog or handler is injured, they must remain at the scene until they are released by a figure of authority.
- Only is severe. (Bite with intent) If incident is by accident, like a nip, cause by teasing the animal. That should not qualify as biting!
- It is necessary to at least know the health and status of the dog that has attacked/bit a person or another animal. For proper medical care you would need to know if that attacker is up to date on shots, etc. It is for the health and safety of the attackee.
- To receive a full narrative of the incident from all parties involved
- They need information about the dogs vaccination records, home life.. general demeanor for day to day life. If the attack was provoked or simply the dog was the aggressor.
- It's like the scene of an accident you cannot leave if there's damage or someone injured
- Seen too many owners who failed to congtrol their dogs leave the scene and the victims left without recourse for medical fees.
- On the condition that it is atleast at a reasonable severity for such measures
- It would be good to hear both sides of the story. Most dogs that bite need to he provoked first.
- accountability
- If your dog bites anyone, you should stay until proper authorities have come to assess any damage your dog might or might not have caused.



- It's just like when one car hits another. Make sure they're okay, give contact info so you can try and offer help later on. Explain what happened to the officer
 - Everyone is responsible for their dogs behaviour. Information should be shared.
 - Someone needs to know if this is a pattern by a dog/owner. Owners (not just dogs) who have a history of being involved in offences should look at not being able to have dogs
 - All owners should be responsible for their own pets.
 - An incident where someone is hurt u provokingly should be considered a crime and information should be shared like a car crash.
 - If your dog has bit another dog or has been bitten, it should be necessary to share information as a responsible pet owner.
 - Its like when you rear end someone. Its unfortunate, and not always reported. However, it is something we must do as citizens to try and maintain good standings.
 - There are ALWAYS TWO SIDES of a story.
 - Of course!
 - For follow up information in the event of injury and longer term effects
 - I believe it is a dog owners responsibility that if their dog was to attack a person or animal that they stay at scene and explain their side of things, I also believe it should be a dog owners responsibility to pay for vet bills or medical bills for the dog or person if it was an issue the resulted because of their dog.
 - This is a responsibility of pet ownership.
 - "If the owner does not remain at the site of an attack how does one identify the owner of the dog?"
 - If the owner is not going to remain then it will be necessary to restrain the animal, which might involve killing it, in order for it to be identified.
-
- If an owner tries to remove an animal which has attacked a person or other animal then I would have to kill or injure the attacking animal. This would distress me. It would also distress the owner."
 - I think owners must take responsibility for their dog's behavior, including covering costs.
 - Th is would ensure that the conditions surrounding the dog bite were clearly understood before any disciplinary measures were taken. Example: was the dog being tormented, were the dogs on or off leash, were the dogs on private or public property, etc.
 - As the owner, it is their responsibility to stay and take responsibility
 - Should be no different than if you hit someone's vehicle in a parking lot. If you are responsible to damage to property or people you should be fined for leaving the scene.
 - Any dog - regardless of breed OR size. We allow small dogs to remain aggressive due to their size and then are shocked when they attack a larger dog who defends itself.
 - Only if a bylaw enforcement officer arrives, not a police officer.
 - Dogs are rarely the problem, it's usually the owners. Making them more accountable is a step towards improving the situation



- Again, several irresponsible dog owners in this city! Bites can cause serious damage and even more serious financial burden on the victim or their dog
- Too many people flee the scene when things like this happen.
- or provide Name and Address details at the scene
- Within a reasonable amount of time and with exceptions made for seeking medical or veterinary attention.
- "I think both parties should be able to explain their side of the story. I can appreciate that some animals have a prey drive, those dogs should benefit from a socialization course so owners can properly introduce their dogs. As a little dog owner and someone that works in the animal industry, we often see that a little dog is often the cause of them getting attacked, they have poor manners with larger dogs because again they're also poorly socialized, but because they're smaller they have a much higher serious injury rate than a large dog. And although it isn't ok that a dog is attacking another, little dogs are just as at fault as the big ones. I also heavily feel that a dogs body language is often misinterpreted by people.
- My friends dog is a prime example, he's a lab mix and is very nervous around strangers. He wags his tail very fast and wide, and crouches down when someone walks by him. People often mistake that as a friendly dog because he's wagging his tail. But the tail pattern isnt in circles like a happy dog, its side to side and he crouches like a submissive nervous dog. Its behaviours like this that people need to be educated on. I think a training program on dog behaviour would help pet owners as well as training classes for ANYONE wanting to use off leash facilities should be looked at. As well as proper leash system, green/blue leash for friendly dogs, yellow/orange for beware I'm sometimes not the best with strangers, and red for do not approach.
- I think in allthough it is important for everyone to be aware of the situation, the officers to see both sides of a story and owners to take responsibility when need be for their animals mistakes. The only exception is when a dog needs to see a vet immediately, then at least a phone number should be given and they should see a vet as soon as they can."
- It is agreeable to stay and state the facts of what has happened. The most accurate information will come at this time.
- I've seen certain dogs play rough and certain owners being too over sensitive. As long as it is reasonable to exchange information, then yes.
- I have been bitten by SMALL dogs before and you don't seem to want to take them away. It seems incredibly biased to target one type of dog.
- "dogs that are a concern should be held accountable. They deserve to be retrained and they deserve the right owners.



- I've met small [removed] dogs that nip at big dogs with their superiority complex and wonder why the bigger dog barks or nips back. Its a 2 way street. If people are scared of dogs acting like dogs and setting their own personal boundaries they don't need to own dogs. Dogs scrap! Just like kids. [removed]"
- Yes.
- Yes, it is basically a hit and run if they leave.
- Of course this is important
- Dogs are not always the ones at fault it is often the owner.
- In case of any transmission of disease, or severe injuries, the owner of the aggressor dog should be contacted if felt necessary.
- Every owner should be sticking around if they dog bites. It's like leaving the scene of a a car accident. However you guys should stop being racist towards dogs. Its is ridiculous. Be aware you will have thousands of people leave Calgary if you follow through with this ridiculous plan.
- Responsible thing to do to ensure the same dog isn't attacking multiple people and needs to be dealt with.
- To provide vaccination and vet information
- In a timely manner.
- a few years ago, my dog (a boxer) on leash was attacked and bitten by a little dog (off leash) and the owner literally laughed and did nothing, i had to get her dog off my dog and my dog was bleeding and injured. please note it is not always so called bully dogs that are nuisance or problem dogs and dogs outside of pit bulls can do considerable damage.
- with the stipulation that the bite draws blood. Otherwise owners could get into an argument as to whether a bite occurred or not and dogs can nip to say back off when feeling threatened, which is normal.
- This would ensure that both sides of the incident would be heard. Many dog bite attacks could be prevented by exhibiting proper dog handling behaviour, both on parts of the dog owner and the bite victim.
- As it is their dog, it is their responsibility, and as such the owner should be there to share their information and take responsibility for anything their dog has done.
- No difference than a motor vehicle accident, if the incident is severe enough that an officer should be called, both parties should be required to stick around
- You have to do it with a car accident...why not a dog accident?
- As a dog owner, I think that taking dogs away from their owner is only going to exasperate the issue in most cases. There may be cases where the dog would be better off if the owner is teaching the dog to be aggressive or is beating the dog making it aggressive. A tribunal to speed this process up is a great idea.
- it is a good idea for dog owners to remain and give information in case of vet / doctor bills and to keep track of biting or aggressive incidents
- It's always a good idea to get the story from both sides. Sometimes kids/adults are jerks and try to provoke a dog, so it's a good idea for the owner to stay and explain their side.



- Most small dog owners just laugh when their small dog attacks someone and they keep walking! I highly recommend that they stick around and be held accountable for what their “ankle biters” have done!
- The same principle as if you were to get into a car accident. Stay at the scene of the "crime" exchange information and if warranted talk to the police.
- Absolutely an owner should remain to explain the situation; unless they/their animal/their family is in immediate danger
- I think both the bitten and biter should remain on scene.
- if the person or animal gets sick (rabies etc...) its good to know where it came from. People need to take responsibility for their own and their dogs actions
- This is responsible dog ownership if your dog (of ANY breed) bites. Not just “pit bulls”.
- A responsible pet owner would. If they don't, they should be heavily fines for leaving the scene.
- Dog bites, like many crimes are contextual. Just like an accident, people should be encouraged to exchange information at the scene of an “incident”. This also allows for owners to have an opportunity to explain to a peace officer the circumstances of the incident.
- it just makes sense and shows responsibility
- If they leave the scene it to me implies guilt or trying to not take responsibility. No matter the breed there should be accountability by all dog owners for their dogs behaviour.
- "Too many people run away fro
- The scene since they aren't a responsible owner. These are all type of dog ow ears not just put bill type dog owners!!"
- This is what should be done. Taking steps to deal with the “humans” in this equation and ensure that they are being held responsible. Going after a specific breed or look is the same as taking medication for a head ache but continuing to bang one's head against the wall. We must deal with the people, not the breed, in order to make lasting change.
- Need to provide info to the person involved to pay for vet/doctor bills or medicine
- Often times people grab their dog and leave quickly. The owner with the injured dog is then forced to pay for the vet bills (which should be paid for by the owner of the dog that attacked).
- At the very least there should be an exchange of information in the case of vet bills etc.
- As a responsible owner of anything (car) it is law to remain at the scene of an accident or exchange information.
- It's about taking responsibility just like a car accident
- The dog owner is responsible for their dogs actions at all times and needs to be held accountable
- Don't single out pit bulls, please.
- Allows for both sides of the incident to explain and discuss the situation. However I don't agree that the dog biting in the situation is always in the wrong automatically. Hence why the reviewer should be unbiased.
- Taking responsibility for ones actions or their animal. Situation needs to be assessed FAIRLY and there does need to be consequences. Did the dog literally bite for no reason? Or was the dog overwhelmed or being aggrieved?



- Owner needs to take accountability for the actions of their pet
- Take responsibility for your pet
- To a certain degree, some dogs are a little more aggressive from past traumas and some dog owners are a bit over sensitive. Where it is appropriately called for them yes, information should be exchanged
- If the dog bites and owner flees, there should be a fine similar to leaving an accident
- I would compare it to a vehicle accident. All parties involved need to be held accountable & information definitely needs to be given so the owner with the offending animal cannot just disappear
- If the injury to a human or animal is severe, then it is important to understand the full situation with an officer. However, if it is just two dogs getting to a scrap, because they are animals after all, and there are no severe injuries then it can be settled between the logical and rational owners.
- If your dog bites a person, the owner of the dog should take the blame before the animal.
- The owner of the dog should be present to provide vet information to the victim and bylaw.
- Same as a hit and run. Doesn't matter why an injury occurred if you are responsible you should show that.
- All sides of a story must be present to best clearly understand the situation. If one leaves, and the other wishes to speak to enforcement, they should be fined.
- It is the owner, not the dog that is responsible for the incident. If they have been involved in an incident, they are legally responsible for damages. This needs to be enforced by an officer. The owner must be present in order for the offer to investigate.
- Owners need to be held responsible for this behavior in animals.
- That's be an accountable owner, in my opinion it is no different than being involved in a vehicle accident and if they leave and are later located, an applicable reprimand should be given.
- The owner should describe the conditions that lead to the event as soon as possible.
- Dog owners should take responsibility much like a car accident. Remain in scene and provide all required information.
- I think hearing both sides of the story is best!
- It's the right thing to do.
- If there is any incident it is up to the owner to secure their animal and make sure information is gathered as with any incident.
- Only if it was a person that the dog bit.
- Only if necessary. If the note inflicts severe harm, they should be required to stay around to ensure everyone is okay. But if dogs bicker a little and a couple small bites occur with no real harm, then there is no need to stay.
- I think it's important to get a handle on the situation and actually get appropriate data to be able to impose bylaws like is being suggested. Also, if it's a kid that is walking a dog that they can't control, it's an important lesson for both parents & kids alike. The strength of the human walking the dog, even if the dog has never reacted before is a HUGE factor.
- If a dog bites someone it is the owners responsibility to ensure the victim is okay and report what happened.



- My dog was bitten as a puppy at the dog park and the owner took off as I was checking the injury and stopping the bleeding. I wasn't even able to get a license plate. This means it wasn't recorded as a nuisance dog.
- No different than traffic accidents
- Owners are responsible for their pets' behavior in the same way drivers are responsible for their vehicle's operation. You shouldn't leave the scene of an accident.
- Should be the same as when in a car accident
- Should provide history (has this happened before or is it the first time) and vaccination information.
- This needs to be enforced
- Any responsible dog owner would remain present. I don't know if adding a rule would make less responsible people stay, but it's worth a try
- Because if an owner leaves sometimes it becomes a he said she said situation after the fact .
- I consider fleeing after your dog bites to be equivalent to a pedestrian hit-and-run while driving. They should be made to stay and be held accountable and provide information.
- It's their/our responsibility.
- the dog owner should remain at the scene of an incident .
- The owner is responsible for the dog, there fore the owner should be held accountable for setting the dog up for failure and all means taken to rehabilitate the owner in terms of appropriate training and guidance to make them a better pack leader. If this fails or the owner does not want to comply the dog should be removed and rehabilitated and moved to a proper home. Last resort should be euthanasia. People are a failure to dogs.. Also it should be by weight, not breed specific. All dogs over 40lbs have the potential to inflict a damaging bite..
- You should never leave the scene of a crime...
- Its the minimum the dog owner should do
- This is a simple matter of accountability. However the response to these calls should be timely. If the animals in question are stressed, they should be taken to a safe location.
- I rescued a lab cross dog who had a lot of trauma. We worked hard but sadly one day someone came out of nowhere and began yelling and acting terrifying upon the sight of my black dog. He was on a long line practicing his ability to be off leash but her reaction scared him and he nipped her. We were already in training so we let the trainer know. We stayed with her and we did have to go to court. She had a bruise from the bite but no blood. He didn't attack her he reacted out of fear which we continued to work on. The courts seemed to understand despite her persistent efforts to get him euthanized. I found her very frustrating though as she didn't understand what I tried to explain to her and that was that her reaction could also trigger other dogs, maybe even the most well behaved. She kept yelling at me that my dog was aggressive and I explained that my dog had a traumatic past and is not agressive but scared. As a responsible dog owner he doesn't really get to be off leash because we know his fear reaction and it's very engrained since we rescued him at 2. So we actively manage his environment to avoid risks like him getting scared. That being said I understand people moving here from different countries grow up in places where dogs are strays and sometimes aggressive so they are fearful. I think we could do more to educate people on how dogs here are



mostly not stray and how to react when you do see a dog and you are scared. It would help dog owners and people alike.

- That's just being responsible. However, this should not be just about the pitty breeds!
- Unless the incident is minor and information has been taken care of by involved parties and witnesses.
- Vet expenses for an injured pet should be paid for by the owner of the pet that caused the injuries.
- Vet bills
- **BECAUSE IT IS THE OWNERS FAULT AND HE SHOULD PAY FOR IT NOT THE DOG!**
- Dog owner must be responsible for the dogs behaviour
- Both sides of the story need to be documented.
- The owner needs to take responsibility and needs to provide necessary information.
- Dog owners (of all breeds) should be accountable for the actions of their pets.
- This is important in order to know whether the dog has had its vaccinations, in addition to having information to claim any liability/compensation/vet bill issues that may arise later.
- The victim needs to know if the dog has been vaccinated. The owner of the dog needs to be fined. If this has happened before, the dog may need to be destroyed and the owner fined \$5000. And the victim will need the information if they would like to pursue legal action.
- Yes BUT if the dog is continuing to be a threat I think the owner and the dog need to leave.
- Both sides of the story and any witnesses need to explain to the bylaw officer. If one is not available in a timely manner, then the contact information is necessary to determine if one or both of dogs are a danger or liable for any vet charges.
- It's always good to have both sides of the story in regards to the incident, and to ensure that all medical issues are taken care of by the dog owner
- I think this is important to have more answers behind the bite rather than just the victims statement.
- The owner needs to explain what happened with their dog. The person who was bitten may be at fault for the bite and blame the dog. The owner should be there to defend their animals action
- You do not know if the dog that has caused the bite has all of its shots or not. My husband had been bitten and the dog owner refused to answer her door to let us ask if her dog had all of its shots or not.
- To protect BOTH involved. For example, my "pit bull" was bit by a much smaller dog and he did not retaliate at all - stood there and waited while this lab mix shook it's head with his ear in it's mouth and did nothing... owners did nothing and didn't act like it was a big deal at all.. luckily he didn't need stitches but I had no way of contacting them if he did... but if my dog had have fought back I would want to stay around to ensure both sides of the story were told. Sad that it's no big deal when a pit bull type is attacked but if he were to have stood up for himself and the other dog was injured as well all the focus would be on him..
- Kinda like a car accident, if its serious remain at the scene until help arrives or just exchange info and move on



- If a dog (ANY BREED) is involved in an incident where someone or another animal is injured, then as a responsible pet owner info should be left for insurance purposes only. Many individuals flee in fear they might lose their beloved family member.
- People who have time to perfect their story will do so during the time apart. Depending on the severity of the offence I believe this would be in the dogs favor as most dog bites are the humans fault. However I believe that the owner should be allowed to remove the dog from the stressful environment so they can focus on the event.
- Of course you should be required to stay if your dog attacks someone.
- You shouldn't flee the scene of any incident. But don't give cops the right to execute our babies just because they are scared of them.
- The owner knows their dog, a statement should be collected in regards to their impression on the cause of the dogs behaviour. To aid in evidence collection of dogs intrinsic and trained nature.
- As a responsible pet owner it is my responsibility to be accountable for my dogs actions.
- The owner needs to take responsibility. This provides protection for the owner and the dog.
- When a person assaults another person the hope is that law enforcement is able to attend the scene quickly, talk to both parties, assess the situation while it is fresh, and make decisions based on observations. The same should go for when a person is attacked by a dog.
- why would they not stay??? That answers your question right there.
- Responsibility of the pet owner
- If the incident is serious
- If a dog bites a person yes. If it bites another dog it depends on the severity. Dogs are animals not people. They can have tiffs that are loud with no real damage. If it is an attack then yes the owner should remain and share info.
- If the severity demands some sort of enforcement officer is needed.
- The OWNER of the biting dog is the one to be held responsible or penalized; NOT THE BREED OF THE DOG!?
- For the sole purpose of protecting animals from unnecessarily being put down.
- They are responsible for their dogs behavior.
- Seems reasonable
- But only if it is safe to do so. If the dog is not in the owner's control, that can't be safe for anybody.
- It's important to get contact information and get all sides of the story from both parties.
- I feel both side of a story need to be told not just the victim.
- Owners should be held accountable for their dogs behaviour.
- People should not be allowed to run when their dog bites someone or another animal.
- Dogs often bite out of fear once provoked. It is important to understand the owner's side of the story and see the relationship they have with their pet. Also, having the owner present with the dog that has just bitten someone and may still be in a state of fight or flight/aggression, is most likely the best way to calm the dog down and cause the least amount trauma to the dog
- You should be able to contact the other owner



- Dogs who bite/attack should be more harshly punished. NOT breed specific. Of all of the issues that I've had with other dogs, only once was it a pit bull. I've had dogs for many years and was a behavior modification trainer for many years. I'm way more careful around shepherds, personally, but any breed can bite and many can do significant damage. As for bite strength, have you ever been bit by a st bernard!?! Breed specific makes no sense.
- However I am very opposed to any breed specific legislation
- You should never leave the scene of the crime your dog was involved with
- Needed to get history if the dog, where is the residence, etc.
- Yes, this is merely responsible dog ownership.
- Responsibility of owner to ensure their dog is safe, but also that everyone else is safe from their dog. There may be mitigating factors that led up to the bite that must be explained.
- Dog bites from any dog, regardless of breed or the size of the dog, can result in long-lasting damage to the person/people or animal that is bitten as well as many medical/vet bills. Victims of any dog attack, regardless of breed or the size of the attacking dog, should be compensated for any/all costs associated with being attacked. A bylaw forcing irresponsible dog owners to provide personal information for the purposes of victim compensation would be a good step towards ensuring dog attack victims are taken care of.
- if needed the person and dog should stay but we should always remember they are animals and for the most part only bite when provoked.
- It is the responsible thing to do, also because there are always 2 sides to a story. As a bite recipient from when I was 3, it was my fault that I got bit, not the dogs fault. Sadly the dog paid the ultimate price.
- Pet owners need to be responsible for their pets actions and pay any costs that may incur, as well as providing vaccine status and any medical info required
- No dog should ever bite, however the irresponsibly lies with the owner not the animal.
- Along with the dog.
- As the dogs owner you know your pet and can identify why the situation happened. These incidents are not always the dogs fault but the dog is blamed %100 of the time.
- Dog owners should take responsibility for the incident and assist with damages caused by their pet
- The owners need to take responsibility of their dogs actions.
- Dog bites can be extreme and the owner of the attacking dog should have to see the other person/animal is attended to and should have to pay for all expenses faced by victim due to dog bite
- People are the problem not dogs. Poor dog owners should be held accountable. Ownership is a privilege not a right.
- Needed to track for future reoccurrence
- It is no different that leaving the scene of an accident. This is an aggressive act and it needs to be assessed by a trained observer. The offender needs to be identified as not all biting incidents are cut and dry. Was the animal at large, was the animal protecting itself or family member from another potential threat, human or otherwise.
- It is your responsibility to remain at the scene if your pet was involved in a bite.



- The owners are responsible to how their animal behaves, but also, if a person is bitten they should not antagonize the animal either, I have seen this many times, as I have 2 small dogs and when I would walk them they would kick at my dogs and spat at them and kids would throw stuff at them.
- The owner needs to be held responsible for their animals behaviour and/or at least be present long enough to state their side of the story to enforcement.
- this makes sense.
- Shouldn't this already be a rule?
- Because sometimes the dogs are provoked by untrained pets, or by uneducated/not supervised kids and these are huge factors
- dog bites can be serious. Especially when its dog on dog and vet bills are expensive. Owners of dogs who bite should be responsible for any costs associated with the incident
- But there should be a need for witnesses before any charges. Pet owners are usually extremely protective and won't take responsibility for their dog's role in the incident. And pitbulls should not automatically be blamed as sometimes they have to protect themselves from off leave dogs
- Dogs are the owners responsibility and it's actions reflect the owners ability to train and control their dog.
- It's the responsible thing to do
- I support this as it is part of responsible ownership. However, in circumstances where they are unable to provide safety of others against their dog they should be permitted to remove their dog from the area. They should state this and provide information to the other as to who they are, where they are going and that they can be expected back.
- Its like a car accident. You need to stay and ensure your property and the other person are dealt with responsibly
- Yes cause then you have the ability to see if this dog has bitten before, and a responsible dog owner would/should be responsible for the actions of the dog
- Caveat being if the dog is injured, owner should be allowed to go to vet with their animal.
- They need to stay there to deal with the situation, and all the possible consequences, just like with a car accident
- If the dog is injured the owner must still be able to go for vet care. Vets should have a responsibility to report injuries that they suspect are caused by dog fights/altercations.
- If your dog attacks someone you should have to wait and give reasoning ex.(it attacked my dog first)
- Knowing if a dog has his shots and is violent is important
- It makes sense. Dog bites may appear minor at first but can become more severe soon after.
- Just like a vehicle accident
- Because the owner should take responsibility, it's not the dogs fault but the owners themselves.
- It's the same as someone remaining at the scene of a car accident - information needs to be exchanged, etc, and if the law needs to get involved the owner of the offending dog needs to remain on scene. You can't penalize/prosecute someone with a dangerous dog if you don't know who they are.
- Of course the owner should take responsibility and wait for the law enforcement to arrive.



- If necessary means that it is a severe bite then yes they should remain present
- Higher fines should be considered for not staying at the scene.
- Too many just leave and are never found. Thereby not receiving the necessary training to properly care for their dog
- At minimum contact info should be shared.
- It's only logic to remain at the scene of a incident involving your dog
- Yes, they should remain at the scene because it's accountability!!! They own an animal, therefore they should also be accountable and responsible for everything they do, that also includes any incidents.
- Make it easier to track dog history
- What's to explain. It's like being in a car accident. You get the other party's information.
- A record does need to be made and the owner (not the dog) be held accountable.
- The owner should be required to pay for whatever costs occur as a result of that bite PLUS by not staying at the scene, the owner is allowing a possibly dangerous dog to perhaps repeat the bite/attack. The owner is also not allowing the dog to maybe be exonerated due to the circumstances of the bite, e.g. did the other animal bite first or was the animal being teased or threatened by someone?
- two sides to a story
- If a dog bites the owner should be allowed to give reason as to what happened, why, and he allowed a voice for the pet. Often bites are provoked and that should be the fault of the bite victim, not the dogs. Often times, the dog is hauled off, owner told to go home and then bite victim ya all the voice, the dog is punished but no one asked what happened to provoke the incident.
- The owner should take responsibility for the animal no matter the animal
- That way everything can be worked out with the help of an officer
- That's responsible pet ownership
- This is just common sense!
- Act responsibly
- It is responsible pet ownership to remain at the scene and share info.
- Owners should take full responsibility for dogs actions
- An all witnesses
- I have a dog who if he is approached too quickly or provoked he will bark and potentially bite. Having the opportunity to explain the situation is very important. It's the same as having a child who has a tantrum and hits or BITES another child.
- It seems like common sense to remain at the scene of an incident as a responsible citizen.
- I think this works in favor of both parties. The owner of the dog staying on scene ensures both parties get their story out while being able to defend themselves. However this only works if the victim or witness also stays on scene so if one has to stay so does the other.
- Any accident requires both parties to remain there until the have given their statement to an official



- Dog ownership is a responsibility. No different than having children and if my do or my child does something bad or illegal I must take responsibility for those actions.
- I support the above so we can actually identify bad owners, as dogs will behave as dogs do, its the owner that needs to be educated and be held responsible
- no different than a traffic accident, force responsibility.
- Because it was most likely an accident and for example when a car accident happens everyone that was involved or witnessed it needs to stay so we should treat other accidents the same ro make sure the correct information is known
- If the scene can be attended to in a reasonable timeframe I do support this, or at least providing all contact info if that does not make sense.
- An owner is ultimately responsible for their dog
- "I think dog owners should be responsible for bites (unless provoked by other people, including implicit instructions from owners to not pet their dog and kids or adults do it anyway) and should remain at the scene of the victim wants to speak to law enforcement. There should also be some sort of protection for dogs and dog owners for when bites and attacks are not their fault.
- Also I think it's disgusting that the city is even considering putting in bully breed restrictions. Disgusted with the city council for suggesting this when it is PROVEN that bully breeds are not more aggressive or cause more damage. Appalling and repulsive behaviour and suggestions from the city. Shame on all of you."
- Like a crime scene this will allow the investigation to go ahead in a timely manner.
- Regardless of the breed, the dog is the owners responsibility .
- The dog owner should be held accountable for its dog's actions. Similar to a hit and run, the dog owner is responsible for the offence.
- it sounds good but the chance of the owner actually staying is unlikely.
- It's called personal responsibility. This is a basic fundamental of living in a CIVILization. Being civil.
- This is no different from a vehicle accident.
- Owner should take full responsibility of their dogs actions. When you own a dog it is your responsibility to teach it correct behavior. If your dog is biting, that is on you. If you can't control a dog, don't own a dog. Also singling out the pitbulls is breed discrimination. Educate yourselves.
- To show responsibility, the owner should stay to give any relevant information. Unless the animal is still in a vicious state, in which case the owner should secure pet on their property before returning .
- The owner is responsible for how a dog behaves in public, if something happens with that dog the owner needs to take responsibility.
- It's called being a responsible dog owner. This does not include seizure of the dog by the officer at the scene
- It makes sense to have someone stay and take responsibility if their animal bites a person or another dog.
- People of all breeds need to be accountable
- The owner and Dog should claim responsibility.
- Yes with all breeds NOT just PITBULLS



- People need to take responsibility
- When trying to remove your animal from the area, it isn't possible to also stay and give information, but you can remove the animal and return.
- once information has been exchanged they should be able to go on their way without having to wait for bylaw officers
- Not sure an explanation is necessary... this should be standard practice.
- It's responsible pet ownership. Most decent humans would do this
- The owner of the dog needs to be held responsible for its actions— good and bad.
- I think people should be accountable for their pets when an incident occurs, if the other party deems it necessary then the offending party should have to stay at the scene
- If a dog bites a person it needs to be documented
- I believe the dog owner should stay at the scene because it makes getting ahold of the owner easier.
- It's similar to a car accident, leaving the scene of the incident should not be allowed.
- I am shocked that this isn't already a requirement.
- Responsible dog ownership.
- Of course , if a dog hurts another animal OR person . The owner should be held responsible.
- No explanation necessary. The dog owner is as responsible as a driver.
- It's the owner's fault, not the dog
- Please define "if necessary" further. If the victim party wishes it? If a witness contacts authority? What does it mean?
- An adult should be responsible for their pets and BOTH sides should be heard fairly. The problem is the majority of people already have a pre-disposed judgement of any dog that is pitbull, Rottweiler Doberman or otherwise used as a protection dog. If you do not hear both sides the judgement on the dog regardless of the behaviour issue can be awarded out of fear of a breed.
- Owners need to be held responsible for their dogs' behaviour.
- Just like with a vehicle, you can't flee the scene, you need to share your contact information and speak with authorities if need be. This should be no different as people need to take responsibility.
- The dog owner should be known in order to follow up with after the incident and ensure proper measures are taken so the dog doesn't become involved in another incident
- There needs to be owner accountability
- Take responsibility
- If any dog isn't properly trained the owner must take responsibility
- In order to get the correct info and determine what made the dog bite. Owners have the opportunity to defend their dog as well. Get both sides as it takes two.
- The same if you got into a vehicular accident.
- So the dog owner can have a chance to give their side of the story.
- BUT only under certain circumstances and depends on the situation.
- How is this not already the law?



- The biting may have been provoked. Each situation is different and all sides of a story need to be heard.
- Only to provide contact info then owner should remove the dog to de-escalate the situation. Talking with an enforcement officer can take place after the fact
- The responsibility and consequences need to be on the owner. Otherwise its pretty much a hit and run.
- This will allow bylaw enforcement to track breed types and bite statistics so they can prove to themselves that breed specific legislation is backward looking.
- All pet owners must be held responsible for their pet's actions, regardless of breed.
- Common sense and responsible way to handle things.
- Too many times irresponsible owners walk away from the scene.
- This is only fair - at the very least providing information regarding the dog's vaccination status
- This just makes sense. You can't leave the scene of an accident.
- Expect people to be responsible pet owners, no matter the pet or breed.
- Owners should always take responsibility for their dog. Being a responsible pet owner is key.
- Needs to be documented however dog should be punished for lack of training and owner neglect
- Of course. It's public safety focused as well as common decency. Likely this will be hard to enforce.
- Yes taking responsibility for your actions is always the right thing to do. Although not everyone will, increase fines for these people.
- I think that allows for verification of rabies shots etc. And allows for the immediate investigation into the incident including witnesses
- owners are responsible for the actions of their pet.
- Like any accident. Exchange information
- Owner of a dog that bites must stay to share information on if the dog is vaccinated plus any additional information regarding the incident.
- The owner should be there to ensure their side of the story is shared, and to take responsibility for anything that happened. They may have crucial information regarding the situation and their pet.
- The owners should have a chance to speak. To explain that maybe the person who was bit was harassing or provoking the dog. Perhaps the dog was protecting the owner, you must look at it from all sides
- Taking responsibility
- There should have to be some way of contacting the individual who's dog was involved in the incident.
- Must not seize the dog though as no one will stay around if they are in danger of losing their dog.
- If a dog bites a human I think it is reasonable to remain at the scene. If a dog bites another dog, I believe the parties should exchange their contact information and follow up occurs afterwards.
- I believe that that the owner needs to be at scene as otherwise how is by- law to charge owner.
- Responsible owners would do thus anyway!!



- I believe its in the best interest of the dog/owner to stay and explain the situation as not all are the same and should not be judged the same
- you should always stay if there is an issue with your pet
- Investigate both sides of the story
- Any incident where a dog bites, person or animal the owner should remain at the scene. Breed specific bans and certain restrictions for breeds is ridiculous.
- It's a responsibility of a pet owner
- Dog bites are a form of assault and could be repeated unless measures are taken to control that animal. The owner should be responsible for their pet.
- On many occasions the owner of the aggressive dog, simply grabs their dog and walks off leaving the effected dog/owner and any witnesses left no knowing what to do without causing further altercations. I support the rule in theory, but think that in all likelihood it would be hard to enforce and may cause owner arguments. Worth a try though!
- In a dog bite incident it is crucial that an owner remains to ensure that the medical history of the offending dog is obtained so that doctors/vets know what protocol to follow. Also information should be shared to gather statistics regarding repeat offenders & to have the owners information available should further action need to be pursued, or questions need to be answered.
- The dog owner should prove the dog has up to date vaccinations.
- This should be the case for all dog bites.
- A dog owner should take responsibility for their dog's actions. And be present to explain a situation.
- The owner is responsible for the dog behaviour
- As a responsible owner, if that terrifying even ever arose I would never leave the scene without making sure all parties involved were okay, and information had been exchanged, as with a car accident as an example.
- If an animal bites it is best an officer hears both sides. However just because one dog bit someone or something does not always mean that dog is the guilty party, often dogs are protecting themselves. I have watched many people or other dogs continuously pester a dog, only to be upset when the dog fi ally reacts. If someone continued to pull your hair and nip at you (can be person or dog) at a certain point you would defend yourself as well.
- Responsible dog ownership
- I've seen dogs lose it, and the owner just walk away and claim no responsibility. Dogs are property, like cars, and if your car causes damage, your expected to remain at the scene - why would dogs be any different?
- All involved should be required to give their versions of the incident in order to get an accurate assessment of the incident.
- Banning pitbulls is disgusting. You should be ashamed of yourselves.
- The owner of a dog that bites is responsible for their dogs' actions
- As a dog owner we're liable for any harm they cause. So yes, Ofcourse.
- Of course they should stay as that is what a responsible dog owner does and if they don't then the owner should be fined.



- It's the responsible thing to do as a pet owner
- In the heat of the moment it always seems no one knows what to do and at the least an exchange of information would be helpful.
- Sometimes a dog can get spooked and it's a one time thing and little dogs bite more then big dogs and little dog owners always get away with their little dogs biting people
- You don't get to drive away from a car accident, do you?
- Depending upon severity vet bills should be paid by offending dog BUT how does one decide "who started it"
- Makes people more responsible for their dogs.
- Responsible ownership is key to maintaining ANY breed of dog. THIS IS NOT LIMITED TO PITBULLS!!!!
- This would encourage more dog bites to be reported, including those from breeds who do not fall under "pitbull type's". So often you hear of dog attacks that were never reported as the dog was too little to do harm, but these attacks should always be reported no matter what.
- It is a "no-brainer" but most people at fault will not stay. Also remember - a lot of parents let their children run up to a dog and pet them without asking first and this causes problems. Those people should be held responsible and fined also.
- Unless the dog requires medical attention then share information then follow up later
- Like a car crash, leaving the scene of an accident should be a crime. I can't believe this isn't a bylaw right now!
- There has to be a way to track dogs/owners to find out whether dog has had its shots and for civil liability purposes.
- It would assist in the process of the tribunals and also ensure that the right dog and owners information is taken.
- You should remain at any scene where you or your animal causes harm. Take responsibility for your actions.
- Owners are responsible for controlling their animals regardless of breed. They should be required to remain at the scene of the attack until police/bylaw arrive
- Dog owners are responsible for the damage theyve done such as vet/doctor costs
- No matter the breed staying to ensure the victim is taken care of and sharing contact information is important, just as it is in a vehicle accident.
- Bylaw should be structured the same as that for leaving the scene of an auto accident.
- Why run and hide if you have nothing to hide?
- You stay at the scene of an accident. People who flee a bite scene should get an extra charge for leaving the scene.
- It is very inconsiderate to leave a bite victim without any way to contact the owner and receive justice. It is up to the owner to take responsibility for what their vicious dog does to others
- I think this would help ensure the dog is properly vaccinated. But it needs to be a bite that draws blood



- It's not bad dogs it's bad owners with poor training! Raise fines for dog and cat licenses and fines by by law and put that into a owner training program to learn about dog behaviour and how to interact with dogs.
- To get all of the necessary facts stated and persons held accountable, however they have permission to leave if urgent medical care is required.
- As long as the officer arrives in a reasonable amount of time and the dog is able to be kept under control and won't cause further incident.
- Obvious
- More often than not if an owner is guilty of negligence in a dog bite incidence they'll flee without apology or explain action.
- Dog owners of any breed, be it large or small (small dogs can be just as mean) need to be responsible for their animals actions
- Not unlike a scenario like a car crash, both parties should be on hand to provide statements to authorities.
- Dog owners should be responsible for any actions taken by their dog. Staying at scene is the same as staying at the scene of a car accident.
- I support it but know it can't be enforced. Bad owners will take off. They do now and they still will even if there's a bylaw.
- Owners should be held accountable
- Dogs are animals and they do not always get along with other dogs and can be provoked. If a dog bites it's not necessarily at fault and both sides should be heard
- It makes sense to stay at the scene of the accident
- Too often, if an incident happens, the owners grab their dog and leave for fear of having their dog taken away or getting in trouble. As a responsible pet owner, we must show that responsibility by owning up to whatever our animals do.
- Just makes sense. Like a hit and run.
- They must also provide information proving the animal is up to date with vaccines.
- You need to take responsibility if your dog bites someone
- A responsible owner needs to stay a the scene!
- you should always take ownership if your dog makes a mistake. Including small dog owners
- You have a license to own a dog the same as a license to drive a car. If there is an accident or incident you are required to stay at the scene and should be the same with dog ownership
- An owner should take responsibility when their animal does damage
- It is important to know if the dog is up to date on vaccines and it is a nuisance dog already.
- Remain at scene to share contact info as needed.
- In the event of medical bills, the dog owner should be responsible if the animal was not provoked.
- If a dog bites a person, it is common decency to stay and speak to law enforcement. I support this rule because I believes if an accident such as this should occur, everyone should be present to speak to law enforcement to give their sides.



- My dog was attacked and the owner blamed me and then fled the scene.
- People need to be responsible for their animals
- Same premise as a car accident, they happen sometimes by no fault of your own but that still should be explained to the proper authorities
- That is their responsibility. If they left it's like a hit and run.. they knowingly injured a person and then bailed. Irresponsible.
- All owners with vicious dogs must be held accountable.
- This also depends on the severity of the bite. And if the owner can't stay, they should have a way to contact bylaw themselves
- Owner should have to stay. If their dog is out of control they should at least leave phone # before getting their dog out of the area.
- The owners are responsible for the dog, they need to be accountable.
- It seems that most people whose dog bites another dog or person leave so that their dog doesn't get put down
- This indicates responsible ownership.
- Too many ppl leave to avoid paying someone else's vet bills for damage their dog caused.
- It's like a car accident, information should be shared
- "Every dog owner should be responsible and take responsibility for their dogs actions. If they haven't been to the training that would be prevented this, then they should be fined, the dog removed from
- Their ownership, a great training program for the dog and rehoming, depending on situation."
- per ownership is a huge responsibility and pet owners need to be held accountable when their dog bites and behaves inappropriately. Most times these issues can be fixed with the right type of training.
- As a dog owner, you are responsible for that situation. As long as the process is fair - if someone teases and harrasses a dog and then gets bitten, that's self defence. There should be a thorough process similar and it be considered tantamount to a hit and run of people leave the scene.
- Many owner's leave the scene as they don't want to be held responsible. If they are you stay at the scene, they were then to be held responsible for the dog who bit the person/animal and can give any information required.
- Owners should be held active for their pets action, regardless of the breed. Small dogs charging pet and other pets should be investigated even if physical harm is minimal. Small dogs cannot be allowed to bite without the same repercussions.
- "If it is a bite that breaks skin.
- Also it depends on the circumstance. If a dog is loose and runs up to a dog on leash and gets bitten, the owner of the loose dog is just as much at fault."
- I think this is required so long as both the victim and antagonist are safe and do not require medical attention.
- Dogs are like kids. If your kids bits someone you should stick around. But doesn't need you need to put your kid down



- Any pet owner needs to take responsibility for any injury their animal makes and deal with consequences.
- They need to take responsibility
- It's the owner that should be held liable and not the dog. A dog with proper training is a happy and safe dog.
- I think most dog owners are responsible people. Some need more training in how to best manage their dogs behaviour. This goes for ALL breeds. My border collie cross on leash has been bitten by toy sized dogs running off their property,, which would have been disastrous for the toy dog had I not been right there to intervene. In my experience untrained dog owners are those who have "non dangerous" breeds. I think EVERY dog owner should be trained. All owners of an offending dog 100 % reposable for the vet bills their dog initiates. They should definitely exchange information.
- Dog bites are serious. The owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions and remain at the scene to #1 give their side of the story and #2 be accountable for their pets actions.
- It is always the owner's fault. Not the dog.
- Dogs that bite need to be dealt with quickly and city resources shouldn't be used to track them and their owner down. Those costs should be reflected in the fine.
- There is liability on the part of the owner, they should be accountable.
- It is vital that people are able to follow up with dog owners after an attack.
- As with any incident, all parties should remain at the scene if safe to do so. All parties should be expected to openly participate in giving statements to police.
- Take responsibility
- I was always taught that a dog will not bit for no reason, there is always a reason for a dog to bite someone or thing! We as dog owners have to be the voice for our dogs cause they do not have one.
- Contact information is needed in case the dog or person bit needs to phone the offending dog's veterinarian to see if the dog is up to date on shots. It is also important for the City to have that information in their system to be able to class a dangerous or vicious dog for public safety.
- This should say remain or return to scene of an incident (in the event where someone has to chase after their dog).
- It would be the responsible thing to day
- This would not necessarily mean the dog is at fault though, such as in the case of a child being bitten due to running up to and touching an unfamiliar dog, or an off leash dog approaching and trying to interact with another dog and getting bitten as a self-defence tactic. Dogs bite when they feel threatened, more needs to be done to ensure individuals understand and respect dogs personal space.
- background information and accountability
- Both parties should remain at the scene, or if needed at the emergency clinic.
- "The dog owner should take responsibility.
- Animals bite.
- Its how the owner acts is the crime."
- Yes but this goes for Karen and her little yappy Pomeranian



- The owner should take responsibility but also it allows their side of the story to be heard prior to any action being taken
- If a dog has bitten someone or their pet, the owner should be held responsible for the dogs actions. It is very difficult to pursue legal action without the contact information of the owner
- This is a responsible thing to do but I would add if there is another dog or animal involved it would be necessary for the person to be able to find a place to calm the dog down since biting it a reactionary response to something meaning it could have been provoked. Safety for all but especially the dog needs to be considered.
- I believe this should be treated as any accident, you have to remain at the scene.
- A dog's breed doesn't make it a problem dog, the owner does. Please stop furthering discrimination and misinformation against "bully breeds". Identify problem owners and help them learn to be better, and only take away a dog when the owner is not receptive to this.
- I don't care what breed it is. It's an accident you must remain on scene or face further charges
- The same as a car accident, the owner should have to stay and talk to the other party.
- It's now a crime scene, you're supposed to stay.
- The dog owner should be staying around to tell their side of what happened
- It is no different than an accident. Part of being a dog owner is responsibility. That said, there should be safe guards in place to not have the owner fear their dog being put down over one incident.
- I thought this was common sense that if your dog bit someone or another dog you give your information. There can be long term effects from this.
- But only until you share information. Then take the dog home.
- Many reasons for a dog to bite. Example is a dog biting when threatened or owner threatened. People need to be educated on animal behaviour
- The owner should be held responsible. Dogs are products of their training.
- Any dog owner should take accountability for their dog's behaviour. This is NOT BREED SPECIFIC.
- They would have to provide id to a responding officer and a case started.
- There are always two sides of the story , i believe both need to be heard. BSL is an insult.
- If it was unprovoked.
- This is important like a car collision
- Helps to know vaccine history and to hear both sides of the story
- Your dog, your responsibility.
- Proper thing to do is stay and speak to someone.
- If someone's dog bites a person or another animal I feel the owners should stay until someone shows up, it's like if your in an accident if it's a hit and run your in big trouble once caught should be the same for dog owners.
- Often times there is a reason behind why a dog bites. The owners are the best to explain their dogs behaviour and personality. As well, this way you don't just get the "victims" statement and point of view.



- You don't leave an car accident without leaving your insurance, same goes for your dog. ANY BREED.
- No different than leaving the scene of a car accident. There's vet Bill's that the owner will need to be responsible for.
- I believe this should include ALL BREEDS of dogs involved in biting incidents (exception a working police dog)
- Your animal, your responsibility.
- So u have and know the person at fault for the behaviour and damages
- There's 2 sides to every story
- The owner needs to be held responsible for its dog. It's not different than if my kid bit another kid...I'd have to stay and answer for my kid. There are no bad dogs, just bad dog owners.
- If the dog bites medically you need info and owners can hopefully control the dog
- The owner of the dog is responsible for that dogs actions.
- What if the person of injured and required medical attention? It should be necessary for people to take responsibility for their pets behaviour
- We have way bigger problems in Calgary than pitbulls! To whoever came up with this , pull your head out of your [removed]!
- Dogs are animals none the less. The owner has an obligation to stay and share any information about their dog and the incident. It's about taking onus.
- it's too easy for a dog owner to walk away and not take responsibility for their dogs actions. It can be very difficult to track them down later.
- It should be treated the same as a car accident.
- Dog or human may require vet or doctor visit and should be paid for by the owner of the dog that bit the opposing party
- But only if they are able to do so in the situation.
- It's a common courtesy and expected of other incidences that occur (car accidents).
- There are always 2 sides to the story
- The owner must always be the one to be responsible for their dog's behaviour - just as in a vehicular incident, " bite & run" should be against the law!
- I feel they are responsible for the actions of their dog and should have to remain at the scene
- Only if it is safe to do so, if you have some where to put your dog away from harms way. As long as everyone is calm and collected about the incident. Accidents happen, people who have any type of dog needs to be aware any dog can feel scared or threatened and must know there dogs signs
- Reduced possibility that they will disappear.
- A responsible dog owner would stay at the scene
- The dogs behaviour needs to be tracked, and the owner needs to be responsible for the veterinarian expenses
- Not needed
- Any dog owner should do this. No matter the breed.



- I feel that remaining on the scene is the responsible thing to do.
- It's the owners responsibility
- Absolutely. People should be responsible for their pets. My dog was attacked at the Auburn bay dog park and the guy refused to give me his info. I got a picture of the dog and even waited till the guy left to see if I could get a license plate but he walked there aka lives in Auburn bay area. The dog that attacked was a lab/Shepherd mix.
- No matter the circumstances people should at least exchange info and if necessary help each other get the help needed for any injuries
- The dog is that person's responsibility. So is the aftermath.
- You don't flee an accident. Also the owner should be there to share what happened.
- A dog should only be punished if it did wrong not pick on certain breeds
- Similar to a hit and run.
- a dog bite should be held to a similar standard as a car crash. As the owner, it is their responsibility to properly train and socialize their pet. If an incident occurs it is the civic duty of the owner to insure the victim is okay and to remain at the scene until the issue has been resolved.
- If your personal dog causes damage it is important for witnesses and you to stay at the scene and speak to an enforcement officer to actually understand the situation. People who just leave are running away from the problem. For minor incidences people should be compelled to enroll their dog in mandatory training. My personal dog has had more trouble with huskies and German shepherds than any other dog ... he is a boxer that I have attended many obedience classes with but as a submissive dog he gets picked on. 6 years in Calgary and its never been a pit bull that's bothered him
- If it is reasonable to do so. Sometimes it is actually safer for all involved to get out of the situation. However I understand this would be very hard to determine.
- The definition of "nuisance dog" is ridiculous. Specifying that pit bull type dogs are the breeds that pose risk is untrue. As you well know small breed dogs are more likely to bite but saying it is the pit bulls strength that differentiates them is unacceptable. There are many large breed dogs that are just as strong and more likely to bite than pit bulls. Statistically pit bulls consistently perform better in behavior tests compared to other breeds. Responsible dog ownership is not about breed it is about providing a nurturing, safe and supportive environment for your pet whatever the breed in an effort to reduce reactive tendencies. So focus on the owners treatment of the dog and the dogs responsible handling and not the breed itself. Also consider the actions of the victim... Also consider some PSA information around the meaning of colour coded bandanas and telling people to ask permission to approach/touch other peoples pets... There are reasons why dogs react.
- Small dog tries to attack me, my pitbull stands between me & the small dog & the dog bites my pitbull. The small dog owner says nothing, DOES nothing & runs off. Yet, you want to take my dog because it was protecting me & just stood it's ground while the small dog gets NOTHING.
- It's 10000% the owners responsibility. Dogs act and behave like dogs. People are the ones stupid enough to believe dogs should think like them. If there is a problem, the people must be made accountable. Don't punish the dog for human stupidity.



- They must be responsible and take action to ensure it doesn't happen again for the sake of the animal
- That is the absolute bare minimum that should happen. There needs to be more in place PRIOR to getting a dog.
- Only if any substantial injury has been made.. at the end of the day these are animals and dogs will fight from time to time, as well as bite if provoked which is normal!
- The owner responsible should stay but be able to bring their dog away from the scene, allowing everyone to calm down and reduce the risk of more damage. The more crowding done by bystanders can increase the dog's nervousness, which could've been the case in the first place.
- It's important the owner takes responsibility for the animal.
- It has to be a true bite and not one fabricated by the mind of a non-drug owner.
- In many dog bite incidents, owners of the problem dog flee & there are no repercussions. I imagine this would still happen, but might encourage more to hang around.
- A record can be kept of the owner, if the owner (Not necessarily the same animal) has multiple incidents against them, then maybe look into that person's ability to be a responsible pet owner.
- I think we need to track the people as much as the owner. Dogs although wild animals inside are trained by their owners.
- "Yes because i know someone that owns a dog has bitten people at dog parks 7 times and there yet..... Those dogs dont get punished, no one did much about it and yet you guys still want to punish a specific breed PITBULL. IGNORANCE and it hurts to see that for humans.... We are doing everything to support but for animal lets just generalize because it is green or white or black?"
- [removed]"
- Dog owners must be held accountable for dog bites
- People should take responsibility for their animals.
- If that person loves this animal I'm going to fight for its life. So I think anybody should fight for a life that has no voice
- No matter the size of the dog, the owner should be held accountable. All bites have the potential of causing damage. Big and small. Small dog owners should not brush off their dogs biting.
- Unless the dog or owner is physically injured and must get to an emergency health clinic or hospital
- So the incident can be investigated
- Just in case that dog that is attacked needs medical attention.
- It is responsible
- Your dog, your responsibility
- Absolutely but this must be required for all breeds not just potties. What about German Shepherds, standard poodles and on and on. Any large breed can cause injury.
- I agree that they should stay. But how dare you single out a specific type of dog because of the way they look. [removed]
- Yes
- If an animal owners pet bites someone the should own up tobit just like a car accident



- It's better if the policemen can hear both sides the owner and the victim
- Would be the same as a car accident
- There are always 2 sides of a story. The owner of the dog should stay and give their side to an officer.
- It's important for the situation to be explained from both sides. But as long as specific breeds aren't discriminated against.
- Yes but only to do background check on the owner. Any animal has the potential to do harm it's the people raising the dogs that affects their behaviour. Not rocket science people!
- Common sense says
- It would help ensure it could be properly investigated...vaccination history etc could be confirmed etc.
- Same as a Hit and run, except with a dog instead of a car. Should be similar rules and penalties.
- This needs to be treated like a vehicle accident. Both sides need to be heard, before a dog is wrongfully taken away and put down.
- Everyone should be able to first hand explain their side of the story at the owner may view the incident as self defense or being provoked and the victim may view it as they attacked for no reason, all sides of the story should be told immediately after the incident, just like a car crash situation.
- People are too comfortable leaving the scene without any consequences.
- If there is ever an incident the owner should always stay until its resolved. That's how a responsible owner behaves. However bylaws aren't made to be enforced against responsible owners usually.
- It is the owner's responsibility.
- Yes, as long as it is not the police. It should be addressed by an animal control officer who has a better concept of animal psychology.
- It makes sense to stay at the scene so more information regarding the situation can be procured.
- Way too often people/pets/livestock get attacked with the offending dog and owner leaving or giving fake info. The victim's are left to deal with their injuries, in some cases fatal injuries. The public ends up usually picking up the tab with Gofundme pleas for medical/vet bills.
- Dog owner should take responsibility for the actions of the dog just as you should if you hit someone else's vehicle.
- Only if severe. Dogs are animals, we can't expect them to be perfect 100% of the time
- It is the owners responsibility and more than likely fault, most dogs are not vicious without reasoning its bad owners not bad pets no matter the breed there for owners should be investigated and dog should be given fair chance at rehabilitation.
- How else could the be contacted for further question ing?
- It is the responsibility of the pet owner to stay and speak to lay enforcement
- The owner is responsible
- If you're involved in a car accident, you're required to remain on scene, right? If someone's dog bit & injured someone they are responsible



- Similar to a hit and run, if a dog bites someone then more information needs to be gathered from the dog owner. Also similar to a hit and run, if other treatment/removal from scene is required then information for follow up contact would be shared prior to the dog owner, and dog, leaving the scene.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility when their dogs cause bodily harm or property damage.
- hard to enforce and easy to say that they didn't know so not sure how useful it is.
- I believe just like a car accident, you should be required to stay at the scene until information is exchanged, some form of govt issued ID is presented, and in the case of injury to the bite victim (blood drawn, bruising, etc) that an enforcement officer has attended the scene. There should be very stiff penalties to discourage people from leaving the scene. I also would support cameras installed parking lots of off leash parks that can capture license plates of those who leave the scene. The fines can be used to fund this feature.
- I think it is important to get both sides to the story just after the incident happens for accuracy.
- Required only with evidence of injury to person or animal.
- It's important to the law officer to collect both statements. To remain in the scene gives the owner of the dog more liability since he will need to wait just, as same as the attacked individual will also need to wait for medical care if that's the case.
- Should be treated the same as leaving the scene of a motor vehicle collision, your property injured someone barring exceptional circumstances, you should have to stick around to deal with it.
- The owner should be held liable in all cases.
- If the owner fails to train the dog they need to be held responsible.
- all owners should be accountable for their dogs behavior, its not the dogs fault but the owners for lack of training.
- Should be like hitting someone with a car, if damage is done there should be exchange of information and pertinent officer should be called. Person who owns the dog should have to cover vet bills if another dog is bitten
- Yes if you don't take the dog and look at the whole picture because it not always the dog's fault if they were teased or being hurt because most of the time it is the person's fault.
- If an officer is necessary the owner of the dog should remain at the scene in order to take the right steps to resolving the issue.
- It's very rare for a domesticated animal to attack when unprovoked. The owner should stay to show their willing to cooperate and to have the chance to explain the situation from another perspective. Human instinct is to bend reality to fit the situation that benefits them.
- "I believe that if a dog of any breed causes harm to another being that is completely
- Expected to the owner to stay and figure out a solution. A solution being assisting in medical aid if someone was injured, covering vet bills of the other persons animal if it was a pet that was injured and then picking a course of action to ensure this doesn't happen again (obedience training)
- It is not fair to take specific breeds and descriminate against them based on poor training, no specific breed is bad, and especially not these breeds. I have personally had a lot more issues with smaller dog breeds and typically ones that are extremely common in a family household. I have



found those breeds to be a lot more aggressive than any “bully” breed. A dog's temperament can easily be fixed through some training and most of the time these issues come from poor training of the owner, not because of the breed. If negative dog behaviour is a common problem, fix it by making puppy training more mandatory in ALL breeds, or require a higher insurance policy if a dog isn't trained, but don't just pick and choose breeds because that won't fix the issue. All dogs need to be trained properly and it isn't fair to limit how many of a breed a person can have or enforce muzzles on a dog that has a 'powerful bite' but a much sweeter temperament and have no expectations of people who have smaller dogs with much much worse temperaments."

- A dog's behaviour is a reflection of its owner's teachings, therefore I think it would reinforce accountability for proper dog training if dog owners are required by law to remain at the scene of an incident.
- Owners need to step up and be responsible for their animals behaviour
- Better to have everyone present that was involved
- The dog is under supervisions and care of the owner. Their actions reflect upon the owner, their abilities, and level of care for the dog's wellbeing/lifestyle and how they engage with the public.
- Responsibility of owner to ensure everything taken care of.
- The dog harmed someone or something. It is no different than a car accident
- A fine and warrant should apply if owner does not stay
- Yes because if they leave the officer will only hear one side of the story instead of both and ultimately the dog will be blamed in that case for sure.
- If I'm walking my dogs on a leash and someone's unleashed dog is running around and attacks my dogs, I want them to be able to provide the information to the police so that should a court case happen, that there be documentation.
- I believe if an incident occurs it's important to get to the bottom of what caused it, just like a traffic accident
- This is especially true for dogs like Pomeranian chihuahua and jack russel terriers who's owners don't treat them like dogs which leads to further bad behaviour
- The owner/dog should be required to take (and show passing grad proof) of training classes.
- I know many people who've been attacked by other dogs and the owners have taken off and unable to be found and the victims get stuck with the bills and the dogs couldn't go on attacking others.
- This is taking responsibility for something you own
- If one's dog bites another animal or person, the owner of the offending dog should take responsibility for their dogs behaviour. On the flip side, if the dog was provoked due to another dogs or another dog owners poor behaviour, that owner should also remain at the scene. An investigation should take place and all statements should be taken. Statements should also be read with an open mind and without biased, meaning the breeds of the dogs involved should not play a role in determining the outcome.
- BUT They may have to leave the scene to put the offending dog away or to get veterinary help, They should however have to leave identification behind or return to the scene to avoid charges



- Not much to explain. It's the right thing to do to ensure others safety. No different then leaving an accident scene.
- I've seen dog owners flee the scene after their dog has attacked and/or killed another animal. Being responsible for your pets actions should be part of being a responsible owner.
- Yes. It's like hitting someone's car. Need to exchange info so proper channels can be met.
- When a dog bites someone is it most often the owner's fault (except in cases where its a shelter dog who is fearful or someone is trying to approach the dog when the owner has instructed them not to) as such the owner should be obligated to take responsibility for their pet.
- An owner must take responsibility for his or her pet.
- Pit bulls and other similar breeds are compassionate and loving companion animals who do not deserve to be demonized. The behavior of the dog relies entirely on the owner!!!
- I feel like it's no different than if you were in an accident with your car. You would need to stay at the scene to give your information so you can be held responsible.
- Any responsible pet owner would be willing to exchange information and a statement in case damage was done.
- The owner of the dog that causes injury should be legally required to stay at the scene to exchange info
- THis is the same as if you hit a vehicle, you stay at the scene till we can exchange information
- It should be treated as a crime scene, just like an assault or rear-ending someone in a vehicle.
- It should be the responsibility of a dog owner to remain at the scene if their dog causes injury to a person or animal as the dog is their property and therefore their responsibility. An owner should be held criminally responsible for having a known aggressive dog in a situation where it can attack a human (ie. loose in a front yard, off leash)
- It's like a car accident. A Hit and run is not ok. Same with a bite and run. It should not be allowed. Now a days you can exchange phone numbers, addresses, names, etc. Dogs could have diseases that could be transmitted. It should not a be problems to exchange contact information.
- That goes for all breeds, not just big dogs. Most bites and attacks are done by small dog breeds and then a lg dog will get blamed for it.
- The owner should be accountable if the dog bites another animal or human but there could be possible motives so that needs to be taken into account.
- I do, but it may be necessary to remove the dog from the situation in order to diffuse it entirely.
- Seems pretty self explanatory
- Owners should be responsible for their pet and responsible for financial payments of vet bills. If a person is injured the pet owner should be responsible for emergency care or ambulance bill or future wage loss.
- There needs to be an understanding as to what caused the incident. Yes, the dog owner should always have accountability for their dogs actions but should also be allowed to save their dogs life if the dog was provoked. You don't see small dogs being put down when they bite, whether it causes severe injury or not, recognize the double standard.



- Dogs bite when they play and some people overreact to these encounters. However, I feel that if the seriousness of the incident required veterinary or medical attention then I would support this rule.
- Accountability of dog owners is necessary.
- Yes as a responsible dog owner everyone should do this anyway. But even with a rule doesn't mean people will follow
- All parties should remain at the scene of the incident to get an accurate statement of events, including whether the bite victim (dog or human) provoked the dog into biting
- I think it is necessary. It's a responsibility of the owner just like getting into a car accident.
- this is only the responsible thing to do - just like car accidents
- Responsibility of the owner to deal with the consequences.
- It's like a hit and run
- The owner needs to be held accountable, as biting is a serious problem. The dog owner may need more training in how to properly manage their dog, and the dog may need a muzzle.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs and therefore must accept the responsibility for their dogs behavior. No bad dogs only bad owners.
- If it is a bite and there's damage that needs to be documented.
- A dog owner is responsible for the dog's actions. It should be treated the same as leaving the scene if a crime.
- "This is...and say it with me...responsible pet ownership.
- Just don't be a garbage human."
- The owner is responsible for anything their dog does and needs to be held accountable.
- Well I believe that a dog's owner should be responsible for his / her pet
- That is reasonable.
- IF severe and it cannot be resolved between both parties.
- i have been bit by more dachshunds and chihuahuas than pit types. The small dog owners flee faster than anyone.
- Absolutely since the owner is responsible for their dog.
- People are responsible for their pets but Pitts are not bad dogs
- But as long as it is safe to do so.. they may need to distance themselves from the person/other dog to try to ensure no further damage or they may need to put the dog in a house/yard or car while the humans talk
- It is important to get health information from the pet owner to decide if rabies prophylaxis is needed.
- It is like any other crime you should be required to remain or provide id and contact info
- Owning a dog is a responsibility. If a dog bites someone or another dog, i would expect that the human would have to give information to the victim.
- As a dog owner you are responsible for your pets actions
- The animal could be dangerous. And the event must be investigated further
- It is important to assess by an officer who can impartially assess whether the owner is competent enough to control their pet.



- To know the status of the injury and if the pet has been vaccinated for rabies
- In the latter incident mentioned at the end of question # 3 above, the woman with the dog that killed our neighbour's puppy fled the scene immediately with her, not 1 but 2, vicious creatures. If we require a person to remain at the scene to exchange information in the case of a minor car accident even when no one is injured, why do we not require it in an incident where a pet is injured or even killed?
- SIMPLE - far too often owners of dogs that bite know their dogs are dangerous and that they could get in trouble so they flee the scene, when they most definitely should be held accountable for the attack and for any costs involved in treating the victim
- A owner of any breed of dog needs to be held accountable about for their pet.
- It's like any accident...no one should leave until all information has changed hands.
- I have had four instances in Calgary, twice off leash dogs on city streets and twice at the off leash parks. Both park incidents resulted in my pitbull being injured requiring veterinary care. Both times the other owners left the scene. My dog is a pitbull and she did not bite back!
- If in a severe case it should be required, a sever case would include significant trauma to a person or animal where it had no ability to be because of play where the bite was minor to very minor and very possibly accidental.
- Dog owners need to be involved. And held accountable
- People with little dog breeds for example chihuahua leave when their dogs bite and these dogs are never subjected to the same treatment as pitbull and the like of breeds and to my knowledge continuously bite other people or dogs and are never destroyed.
- Just like a car accident.
- The OWNER is responsible for its dogs behaviour not the dogs.
- They should be held responsible.
- The owner needs to be held accountable, just as a driver would need to be if they hit someone
- The owner of a dog must be accountable for its behaviour.
- People stick around after car accident, don't they? (Some level of distance should be allowed to break line of sight between animals.)
- The owner of a dog that bites must take the responsibility
- You should not be able to leave if you are responsible for harm, and ultimately the human is responsible
- Its an accident and you stick around at accidents
- Recently a problem dog attacked our cat and the owners left the scene and did not offer any information.
- Accountability is currently lacking
- Problem dogs often belong to problem people. The people often see no problem with their dogs behaviour or they seem to enjoy getting I to frequent conflicts. It should be like a car accident. There are often vet costs. The person will not be known as a repeat offender if they leave.
- There is 2 sides to every story and they need to be heard.



- I think it is acceptable to expect the owner to stay as long as their side of the story is heard too. Eg if a kid kicks a dog or otherwise harasses or harms it this should not lead to the owner getting fined and/or the dog being euthanized.
- To identify dogs at risk of biting
- A bite is an assault, remaining at the scene should be required by all parties until the authorities can attend.
- Dog owners, regardless of breed, must be responsible for the actions of their dog.
- "Again we need to determine the why...it's not always a black and white answer
- Why is there only "1" a or b or both question regarding g cats?
- Where are the other opportunities to give more feedback regarding roaming cats and irresponsible owners?"
- Owners must be responsible and accountable for their animal's behaviour.
- I believe it would be in the best interest o both the injured person/animal and the dog owner
- When a dog bites and may kill another dog it should be treated like dogs that bite humans, which is not the case currently
- Absolutely! A dog who bites is a threat and their owners should be subject to fines and/or criminal charges. Enough is enough!
- This is comparable to a traffic incident where you are required to exchange information. This information may be required for vaccination history, insurance or other proceedings
- There is a victim and a person/animal at fault. Whether it was a premeditated attack or not. Also only saying yes if it gets reported. If both parties agree no further action is necessary then no.
- Owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their pets.
- "Ability to determine/identify:
 - animal, owner, and victim;
 - vaccination records;
 - animal history;
 - incident details;
 - log incident details etc."
- The owner is responsible for the pet's behaviour and as such must stay at the incident scene.
- Because it is the owner that is ultimately responsible and as such should be available and accountable.
- The owner is involved in a crime. The owner fleeing should carry the same weight as fleeing an accident etc.
- The owner should be held accountable as if they committed the attack themself.
- A dog is the responsibility of its owner and they are responsible for its actions
- Responsible pet ownership ensures owners take responsibility for the actions of their pets
- Doesn't that just make sense?
- If the bite is serious enough to cause an injury, the responsible thing is to remain at the scene.
- A dog owner needs to take responsibility for their animal.



- It's like getting into a car accident. The owner should be charged with fleeing the scene if they leave after such an incident.
- This should be a basic requirement, why is this not happening already?
- The dog bite incident is comparable to a car accident. The dog owner is responsible for the dog in the same way the driver is responsible for the car.
- Don't people stay at the scene of a car accident, same thing.
- If they don't remain at the scene with their dog, they are NOT good owners.
- In the case of a car accident those involved are required to stay at the scene, so it should be at any incident including dog bites.
- It's the most straightforward way to get the correct information. If the parties involved are unable to stay (due to weather or elements outside their control) and alternative must be agreed upon by all parties involved
- The owner is responsible for their pet and needs to assume the responsibility for its actions.
- "It's only fair to the victim. Especially if treatment is needed and expenses to be paid. Only proving if the harmed animal/person didn't cause the attack/bite.
- Too many assumptions that a BULLY BREED is at fault!!!!!!"
- Dog bites are serious. The owner should not make excuses for the dog and should be aware of the seriousness. As well, it may be unrelated but animals don't belong in public places such as Walmart, restaurants etc. Not everyone loves animals and many of them shed, drool etc. And some people have a fear of animals.
- People should take responsibility for their dogs, accidents happen but there should be clear procedures for when they happen
- It would be the owners responsibility to cover for any damages and this would be determined by the enforcement officer.
- It's important that there is accountability for the dog. It's also important that the owner be present to give their side of what happened.
- Being held responsible as the owner of a dog who bit is very important.
- Unfortunately there is plenty of grey area in the term "bite". A playful puppy bite is certainly different than an aggressive or scared bite.
- I think the owner is responsible for the behavior of their animal so should have to stay and share contact info with the other animal's owner and the enforcement officer.
- It assists with responsible dog ownership
- It needs to be investigated as a bite could cause serious harm, and we need to know if an animal has been vaccinated properly, and to report if it's been an offence before.
- Should be the same as any accident why would you ever leave if someone was injured
- They should be required to give their contact info to the Victim like if you get into a car accident
- Absolutely. Just like in a vehicle accident you must stay and give your information.
- If a dog bit me or my kids I'd want the owners of that dog to take responsibility for their dogs actions
- Accountability is a must.



- It needs to be fair and without bias. I have seen small dogs provoke fights with big dogs by biting at the big dogs face and attacking the larger dog, the small dog owners do nothing until the big dog reacts then everyone blames the big dog
- If the owner is present at the scene they should stay if it's safe to do so.
- Just like any other accident
- Only makes sense
- Unless the biting dog is still out of control. It is the same as a car crash, information should be exchanged.
- Dog bite can cause injury or trauma, same as a vehicle collision that requires drivers to remain at scene. Why would dog owner departure be any different than hit and run ?
- Except if there is injury to the dog or a risk of further escalation. Then it would be best if the dog and owner left. There should be an exchange of info for sure but every incident is different.
- I think having them remain at the scene is just common sense.
- Be responsible for your pet and its' actions. You can't leave the scene of an accident without sharing your information, it should be the same rule.
- Too often you hear of dog attacks happening and the other owner just takes off once it's over. And people are left to not only fit the bill, but the owner of the dog who bites is not made aware of what their dog is capable of.
- If your dog bites someone or another dog, you better not be running away. That's similar to a motor vehicle hit and run in my opinion
- Often ppl flee without giving time for the other pet owner to check on their dog after an altercation
- It is important for dog owners to take responsibility for their dog's behaviour. The problem is NOT the dog or the breed. The problem is the bad owners!
- Should stay due to possible medical problems and to determine who has the problem animal
- Yes I believe someone whose dog has bitten, needs to share contact information.
- A passerby near my house was bitten by a dog - apparently the owner had left the dog at a location across the street to be looked after by a friend. When the bylaw officer arrived, they wanted to order the owner to come get the dog, but they didn't have the authority.
- If you're in a car accident, you have to remain on scene and provide contact information. Any incident with physical or property damage should be treated equally
- It's like leaving the scene of an accident. Shouldn't be allowed.
- It forces them to take more responsibility for their dog.
- I believe they should exchange phone numbers and DV license if able . Then remove the dog from the situation that caused the incident
- They need to be held responsible for their pets actions as an owner.
- Self explanatory
- That wasn't already the case!?!
- "this will make it easier for peace officers to get a statement from both parties at the same time.
- This decision will make the process faster and convenient"



- Otherwise they may just take off, and you won't know who they were. Like a hit and run
- Owners need to be accountable for their animal's actions.
- The owner of an attacking/nuisance dog needs to remain on the scene in order to take financial responsibility for the incident if necessary, and provide vaccination history for their dog. It's common for these owners to flee the scene of a bite incident, which also makes it difficult for the City to track the individual dog's bite history.
- All pet owners must assume responsibility for their pets actions
- It's their animal their responsibility, they are accountable for the dogs actions
- If an animal attacks another animal the owner of the offending animal should remain on scene and exchange information.
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs and should answer to an enforcement agent if necessary.
- To be held accountable.
- Like a car accident, the perpetrator should remain at the scene of the crime and take responsibility of their actions (or lack thereof).
- Owners must be held accountable and cannot leave scene to flee responsibility
- Adds safety for the person who was bitten, allows for accountability to be taken
- How else can you hold them accountable?
- They are accountable for their pets actions.
- The owner must be accountable
- Owners should be responsible for their pets' behaviours
- "provided that the person that was bitten didn't provoke the bite!"
- Not all dog bites are reported either."
- Absolutely, everyone should carry pet insurance.
- It is common sense to stay at the scene of a "crime". If your dog was responsible for biting someone or something then they should absolutely be required to remain on scene
- If an incident occurs, a dog owner MUST give their information to the victim, and wait (if necessary) for for an enforcement office.
- I would want to make sure everyone involved is ok.
- Pet owners need to be accountable for the pets, that includes getting appropriate training and not taking them into situations that may encourage negative behaviors in their pet. As a responsible pet owner if their pet bites another person or animal they should be held to the same standards as if involved in a motor vehicle incident as a member of the community.
- It should be at the victims discretion. Bystanders opinions of the events are irrelevant unless needed as official witnesses.
- Absolutely necessary. People will leave the scene of an incident just to avoid fines, medical bills or punishment. At least this would put in place wording saying that by leaving you'd be breaking the law.
- Treated like a car accident. Must exchange info, must stay for enforcement officer if serious.
- It allows for full understanding of the incident



- Simple accountability for both parties. Not all attacks are unprovoked.
- People need to know if the dog has been properly vaccinated and who is legally responsible for the dog for recovery of any expenses
- Everyone has their own side of the story. If only one person is stating what happen it can result in bias views. People in general should be responsible for their pets actions, regardless if the owners are aware of the animal's behaviour or not.
- Human decency and responsible citizenship/ownership.
- All too often the owner runs away with their dog. This has happened to our family when our daughter was attacked/injured (by a golden retriever).
- This is the only way to make the law work. If dog & owner leave the scene how do you get the contact information?
- It's your responsibility as a dog owner.
- It's important to take accountability and responsibility for the incident and be given the opportunity for all parties to come to a fair and reasonable resolution.
- Owners should always be held responsible for their dogs behaviour
- Hit and runs are illegal; It's the same with dog bites.
- This allows for a more fair assessment as the dog owner too is heard
- The owner should be held responsible for any injuries, and might not be found/held accountable if they leave the scene of the incident.
- No different to a car accident.
- Pet owners need to take responsibility for their pets' actions.
- Its obvious
- That's just logical for any good dog owner. Especially for small dog owners as their dogs are more likely to bite and they tend to treat it more lightly than large dog owners in my experience.
- If the bite is serious or is to the point of broken skin or hide then the owner should be required to stay as to have a chance to explain their side of the situation and not have their dog blamed for the incident as there is a chance the dog was provoked prior to the incident.
- The dog owner is responsible for the dog and its behaviour and misbehaviour. The bite is a crime of violence. The owner must remain at the scene of the crime.
- Owners must take responsibility for their pet's actions and must ensure any harm is addressed appropriately, and perhaps, legally.
- The dogs actions are the responsibility of the owner. They need to be held accountable for their actions.
- People need to be held accountable for their pet's actions. That said, this might not be feasible in situations where the attacking dog needs to be removed from the scene immediately.
- There are 2 sides to every incident. Both parties need to give their point of view of the details while it is fresh on their minds.
- No different from a car accident. Dog owners are responsible for controlling their animals. They should have to stay at the scene until enforcement officers arrive or face a fine.



- All people involved need to be held accountable for their dogs actions. There needs to be more public advertising about training your dog and how to be safe with your dog.
- Obtain maximum information hear both sides of the story
- It's like a car accident. The owner should be required my lawyer to stay and take responsibility.
- Owners are responsible for their animals.
- Owner should be held accountable for the action of their dog. Given the dog was not provoked in any way.
- Fleeing the scene of an accident or assault is illegal so why not make it illegal to flee the scene of the dog (that you're responsible for) attack/bite/etc?
- To many people when there dog injures another just leave the scene and then the injured dog owner is left with the bill. Both parties need to stay and any witnesses so that it can be determined when happened because just because a dog is injured doesn't mean that that he is innocent. If he was the one who started it then that needs to be realized. You can't have a dog that is always starting fights but getting hurt get away with it. Just cause a dog fight happens doesn't mean that it's the dog who bites fault.
- However, the dog that has bitten needs to be seen to and secured to reduce/minimize stress and anxiety.
- Accountability
- Absolutely, it is the owners responsibility just as if it were a child. It is also important for records, insurance, the victim and the owner.
- I've never heard of somebody leaving the scene after a bite.
- obviously you can't cut and run
- Just as you are required to exchange information if an injury occurs in a vehicle, dog owners also need to be responsible and accountable.
- Too many irresponsible pet owners get away with these incidents and need to be held accountable to train their dog properly
- To share info. Bylaw can contact owner later. Leaving reactive dog especially if fear based at scene could be problematic.
- Yes is better than no, but what is the likelihood that the owner remains at the scene. Probably slim and/or nil. This is a useless rule.
- Dog owners often run away after an incident. There needs to be a way to keep them at the scene.
- In cases where the incident requires vet care, both owners should be required to provide pertinent information.
- I am surprised that it is not already in the bylaw.
- Absolutely! The owner of the dog that bit it is there responsibility for their dog and everything their dog Does. If they don't stay at the scene their animals should be taken and they should be fined.
- I agree with this because the owner is responsible for the animal. And more at fault if their dog has bitten a person or animal. They are in charge of their pet and should deal with the repercussions.
- People should always remain when their dog has injured a person. If the dog injures another dog the severity of the injury and the circumstances that led to it should determine if they remain. If the



owner of the injured dog does not see the injury as outside exuberant dog playfulness then they can leave. I would only allow owners to leave if they have provided identification and contact information only if the dog in question is unable to be calmed down and remaining there creates an additional hazard.

- It's the owner's responsibility to be in control of their dog, plus I think it's important to understand the circumstances around the event. Someone having a dog on leash and being protective of their dog in an off leash area is ripe for problems to occur. I think it's important for the enforcement officer to understand and hear both sides.
- Everyone has to be accountable despite the breed of dog
- any dog that bites must be recorded, the owners information collected, and that dog should be limited in where it can be in future (i.e. do not walk in playgrounds, no off leash parks, etc)
- Of course. Leaving would be like leaving a crime scene, or a hit and run.
- I dont think enough people take responsibility for their dogs actions so in turn the actions of themselves
- It should be like leaving the scene of a Crime and a serious penalty involved if they don't stay.
- Dog owner must be held responsible for damages that their dog inflicts in others. Must face consequences of having a poorly trained/dangerous dog.
- If I get in a car accident I have to stay so why not the dog owner
- This shows that the owner is willing to take responsibility and consider options like training to improve dog behavior. The owner is responsible for the dog at all times, regardless of incident.
- It would be like a car accident. All people involved should be there for a statement. At the end of the day it's not always the dog that bit whose fault it was. Dogs are still animals with wild animal instincts.
- People should be doing that already, unless immediate vet or medical care is required.
- Absolutely. Vet bills are expensive and the trauma of seeing your pet being attacked or killed is devastating. Dog owners must be held accountable and I 100% feel if a dog kills another's pet it should be euthanized immediately.
- I think it is important that if a dog bites the owner is kept their to determine what caused this issue. Did someone/another animal come up and instigate issues with said dog? Did someone come up behind said dog and scare it issuing a reaction? That way the issue is dealt with properly right away and there's less time for that animal to be restricted in a shelter potentially creating violence because they are scared. Just because a dog reacted wrong at a certain time doesn't always mean they are violent. Consider a situation where you scare someone by coming up behind them and they react by punching you as a normal instinct because they think they are being threatened. It is important for people to educate themselves and their children on how to properly approach animals, not restrict the animal more. A lot of times it is the owner who create a violent animal as well.
- As a dog owner you are responsible for your animal and their behaviour
- It is a owners responsibility to be there and be accountable. Providing info is necessary.
- There are too many incidents when owners of an aggressive animal do not take responsibility during a conflict.



- Yes. Owners should take full responsibility for their animals.
- Just like you must remain at a car accident. Your dog is your responsibility
- The owner of the dog who bites a person or another dog must be liable for any costs incurred to the victim. If the owner disagree then severe consequences should be imposed on the dog owner.
- What part of YES do you need explained?
- If a dog bites and the owner leaves the scene, it is similar to a hit and run. The owner should be responsible and remain there to provide their contact info. People must be accountable for their animals to prevent a free-for-all mentality.
- Owners should be required to stay at scene of incident
- The owner has rights too. Both sides should've heard.
- There are two sides to every story, the media will post the most eye catching headline, but many times where a dog is the assumed culprit, I often wonder if it was being provoked? I think is the offense is serious enough to involve bylaw, any responsible owner would wait to explain why happened and discuss actions moving forward. As I strongly believe there are no bad dogs, it's the owners wouldn't that be the mature and correct action to do?
- If they don't stay around, how can there be any consequences.
- The owner should be able and willing to provide vaccination information, any training the dog has had, the circumstances that led up to the bite and any other information they can provide to show responsible dog ownership.
- Leaving the scene after your dog bites someone is like committing hit and run. Your animal has caused injury to another, you need to be accountable for that.
- Yes if both owners feel it's required.
- No need for explanation. It's the right thing to do.
- Absolutely the victim of the bite needs to know who owns the animal and also to face any possible consequences.
- The owner must accept responsibility. The quicker the matter is discussed more likely nothing is forgotten
- You stay at the scene of a car accident. Why not the same?
- It's called being a responsible dog owner
- If a dog bites someone when the owner is around, the responsible thing to do is offer assistance to the injured person. This would include cooperating with law enforcement.
- That is a no brainer
- Supports evidence rather than heresay
- if the owner of said dog is present it allows for the owner to speak on behalf of their pet. This would also allow for both parties to provide their side of the story.
- Like any incident, responsible citizens should act accordingly and stay
- They often leave, flee or give false information. This would hold them more accountable for their actions.



- If the parties involved feel the need to talk to an enforcement officer about the incident then it could be beneficial however for superficial bites it seems unnecessary as the owners can likely deal with the situation on their own.
- They are responsible for ensuring the dog/person receives treatment. And to pay for any vet bills
- If a dog bites a person, yes.
- It's like a hit and run if they do not, but context must be understood as well, Like was the dog being provoked or prodded at
- Much like a car accident - you should be required to remain at the scene
- Because a responsible dog owner should make sure the other person and dog are okay. If they aren't there needs to be follow up regarding vet bills, etc..
- Responsible dog ownership.
- The owner of the dog needs to be held accountable.
- No different than an accident, plus the attacking dog owner must pay retribution the victim, if the victim's dog is killed then the attacking dog should be killed as well.
- it may have not been the dog who attacks fault and there is always 2 sides to the story.
- The dog owner must accept responsibility and make it right (eg paying vet bill).
- Yes and no. If a dog has bitten someone there is usually a trigger of some sort. So no the dog shouldn't be forced to stay somewhere when it's clearly distressed. How would you feel if someone did that to you. But should you have to provide your information 100 percent.
- Yes, often the owner takes no responsibility. But it's like a car accident - they should stay at the scene.
- Depends on the severity of the bite
- Because jail should be alternative for the owners ...
- Owners should be held responsible, which they can't be if they run away.
- The dog owner must take responsibility.
- This is just basic human decency. There is always a reason for a dog to bite someone. Whether the victim was enticing the dog or the owner was in danger. A dog doesn't just go and bite someone without a valid reason.
- Yes, unless they stay there with the dog creates more danger.
- Responsible pet owners need to be held accountable for their pet's behavior
- AGAIN... there are no Bad Pets ... there are BAD Pet Owners... It's all in the training!
- Of course. Any responsible dog owner will stay at the scene.
- People need to be responsible for their animals. Just like a car accident you need to be accountable.
- It's irresponsible and poor ownership not to
- it should be common sense
- I have had this situation occur and while the person did give me their name at the time they took off. It was much harder to track them down afterward.
- Because it's the decent human thing to do.
- Too many dead beat owners leave owing huge bills.



- This would be no different than a motor vehicle accident, again with all breeds regardless of size.
- To ensure history of dog and/or dog owner behaviour with other dogs AND health and vaccination details of the dog are disclosed
- To support truth in story & evidence to protect the animal who bit someone/something . Gives opportunity for defence as to the engagement prior to the event.
- I think that it is important for pet owners to take responsibility for the actions of their pets.
- The pet owner should be there as they are responsible for their pet and their actions.
- There should be consequences for the dog and owner, they need to stay the same way we need to stay when there is a vehicular accident.
- Regardless of any incident, it is the right thing to do for a the dog's owner to exchange information.
- It is the responsibility of a dog owner to have control of there pet no matter what breed eg Yorkie or Mastiff or Pitti. Like with our human children we are responsible for their actions. And no single breed SHOULD be unfairly judged!!!!!!
- "Of course the situation needs vetting
- both parties should remain until some investigation is conducted."
- Not any different than a hit and run.
- The owner should also be held responsible you have to stay
- If your dog is bites or is bitten there should be a reasonable amount of time for explanation of facts. As a former owner of a large dog who never bit anyone or thing and was often provoked by small dogs nibbling hind quarters, barking intensely and being jumped on aggressively why would retaliation behavior be the big dogs fault. Mine was trained to look to me for assistance in these matters. And yes I was nibbled by a small dog defending my large dog. They laughed when I objected to its behavior.
- How is this not already the rule?
- I myself have had my dog bitten by another dog and the owner left immediately and didn't take responsibility
- It should be required. Same as it would be if a human injured a person.
- Whenever there is an act of aggression or injury, regardless of the cause, the people involved absolutely should be required to stay and the scene and share info. Too often, people just walk away from bike crashes on pathways, Dog incidents etc with no accountability. This is akin to a hit and run. I have been injured by a person on inline skates with a large dog on an extendable leash and they just carried on. The injury to me lasted months.
- Because I have been attacked by an offleash pit bull in a City greenscape and the owner fled with his dog.
- The owner is responsible for that dog and must provide information to the victim(s), much like a car accident.
- It would be the owners responsibility
- Creates accountability on the owner as opposed to putting the blame on the dog.
- "Make the owners responsible and stop punishing the innocent dogs.....they only do as taught!
- People/owners need to pay the price, not the dog!!!!"



- Many dog attack incidents go unpunished because the owner of the dog who attacked refuses to cooperate and flees the scene before giving any identifying information.
- Yes
- You need to be held accountable.
- Responsible ownership
- Sometimes these can be worked out without an enforcement officer, and most times a dog biting another is not a serious bite or the result of a 'dangerous' dog. My one fear would be that IF an enforcement officer attends - the whole thing could be blown out of proportion. I don't think that every dog biting another dog incident should result in someone having to pay a fine and the dog having a 'strike' on it's records.
- Too many owners don't take responsibility, and in some instances shouldn't own dogs because they don't take ownership of their pet and it's actions. By having to remain at the scene, it forces these pet owners to own up to their poor pet parenting skills or lack thereof.
- There should be more accountability with owners. The dog breeds are a non issue. Neglectful owners that don't train their dogs properly should be tracked and have climbing penalties eventually leading to stripping them of the privilege of owning any animals for repeat offenses.
- In a word: responsibility.
- Take responsibility
- yes, dog owners need to take responsibility for their pets behaviors.
- Yes, dog owners have to take responsibility for their own dogs.
- Common curtesy and making sure the person or persons dog was okay.
- Any who has an animal that bites another animal or a human should be required to stay until information is provided as to their name, address, contact details in case further follow up is required. They should stay until police or enforcement officer arrives to sort it out.
- Owners of dog that bite/injure other dog must be held accountable and pay for medical treatment of injured dog.
- This holds owners accountable and ensures that a resolution will be reached.
- The dog is responsible
- Because an injury has occurred.
- that is part of being a responsible pet owner being responsible for their pets actions
- Owners are responsible for their pets & need to provide additional information concerning vaccines etc.
- For any and all animals you own you need to take responsibility for any incident that happens. Example hit and run
- A tribunal or some sort of repercussion for these incidents will be obviously ineffective if the owner and dog don't remain or share information after an incident.
- This is the right thing to do. Do it as a responsible pet owner even if dog hasn't bitten before. No excuses!
- Almost any animal can bite you. They should stay at the scene to make sure the victims alright but there's no need for taking a dog's life for a bite that was most likely accidentle.



- It's often the owner that it the problem, not the dog. There are usually factors that lead up to an incident and compelling the owner to remain would allow investigators to determine if the fault lies with the owners actions, management of the animal, behaviour etc or if it is the animal itself.
- But not the dog as this could be very problematic for the victim. How do you control this.
- Pretty straight forward. If someone I driving and gets into an accident they are required to stay in scene . Same should be said for dog bites .
- The 'biter' has a responsibility to relay health info (has the dog been vaccinated for rabies?) and contact info. 2. The victim may have recourse in a civil suit for damages, but it's useful only if they have identity of the 'biter'. 3. The 'biter' may have a history of bites, but if not reported b/c owner takes off, then it's impossible to document incidents.
- The same as a car accident, the people should exchange information.
- The owner is 100% responsible for the actions of their animal. It would be no different than leaving the scene of an accident.
- I think both sides of the story need to be heard. Dogs don't fight or become aggressive unless they are triggered or feel threatened, much like humans. This is something that should and can be explained when possible.
- "My dog has been attacked by others dogs at off-leash parks and the owner fled the scene immediately. Two weeks after, I witnessed the same dog attack another owners dog. And they fled again. Owners like this should be held at large, as well as their dog. Not to say it is the dogs fault, but the owners for knowing the tendencies of their own dog.
- Short answer. Yes. But who is to stop them from running away? Especially when I am a 120lb woman trying to chase down a 220lb man with a vicious dog.. (this dog was a lab mix, not pitbull)"
- A dog owner should always be responsible for their dog's behaviour and actions, regardless of the dog's breed.
- The sooner the complete 2 sided story can be determined the better we can understand what happened in a particular situation.
- Common courtesy.
- Duh
- Pitbull s of any sort shouldn't be the poster child for this bylaw because. German Shepard, Doberman, Rottweiler all have the same ability to lock their jaws. And honestly it's the owner not the species of dog that is the problem.
- Otherwise they will leave the scene and it might be impossible to hold them to account for their dog 's behaviour
- The dog owner should remain at the scene to give their version of what happened to enforcement officers.
- The owner should be responsible regardless of breed or severity. The dog should not be punished for doing something natural to them.
- As someone who has had my dog attacked the hardest part of my case was Bylaw trying to connect with the offender. There should be penalties for people who avoid owning up.
- It's not the dog it's the owner.



- If I leave the sight of an automobile accident I am fined, the same should apply to pet owners.
- I think all dog owners should be responsible for any incidents that occur
- Owners and handlers are immediately responsible for their animals.
- Dangerous
- Same thing as a car accident.
- In theory yes, but I don't believe people would, so it seems pointless. Maybe as a measure to eventually tack on a fine if the individual is found, otherwise not much value in my estimation.
- It is the ethical thing to do and is part of being a responsible dog owner.
- That is just common courtesy. Come on people.
- They should stay at the scene, as long as the other dog and witnesses to decide how the incident started. It is usually smaller dogs initiating the attack but the larger dogs getting in trouble, which is not fair or right.
- Pit bulls and nuisance dogs are usually owned by people that shouldn't have those types of dogs. As soon as a dog bites it should be surrendered to authorities.
- Safety first-absolutely information should be exchanged.
- Only makes sense
- There is always two sides to a story. Each owner should take responsibility for their part.
- "Same as a car accident
- Bite and runs should be punishable"
- It's like a hit and run accident. Stay on the scene and take responsibility for your pets actions.
- Just like you can't "hit and run" in a car accident, you shouldn't be able to "bite and run"
- Yes. Irresponsible owners are the problem. Not the dog.
- The animal should be obviously separated from the victim, but the owner should have to be there when the police arrive.
- I think dog owners are ultimately responsible for their pets. I would rather see a person/owner disciplined and the animal regimes and trained rather than have specific breeds be discriminated against
- I was badly injured by a dog. The owner disappears and I am left with medical bills and no way of collecting compensation for the medical costs.
- If the owner is on scene and leaves, it should be treated like any individual leaving the scene of an accident, crime, etc.
- They are leaving the scene of a crime otherwise. I very strongly support this one. With severe penalty for fleeing.
- Pet owners should be responsible for their pets actions.
- Like a car accident; you remain at the scene if there is reason to stay there, if not not, exchange information like adults
- If a dog bites the owner needs to face consequences but if the dog was provoked the provoker needs to face consequences
- Similar to leaving the scene of a vehicle accident



- Absolutely
- If a person is involved in a car accident, he is required to stay at the scene. It's the same if a person's dog causes injury - the person should not be allowed to run away like a coward, leaving a bloody, injured animal or person behind. He should be required to stay on the scene and report to the enforcement officer. This should be treated like a crime. You have to be responsible for your dog and face up to any charges due to the damage it has inflicted.
- Unless the dog cannot be subdued or controlled at the scene without further trauma to itself and others
- What's to explain?? No cowards allowed.
- otherwise they could walk away without any info
- It is the owner that has to take responsibility for their dogs behaviour.
- You wouldn't leave after a car accident without sharing information, should be the same if your dog bites another creature.
- Common sense?
- It's fair to want an explanation. It should be properly assessed to rule out why the incident occurred, and what caused it to escalate.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets.
- Like any incident this involved should be required to participate in the investigation
- Please stop dog racism towards pit bulls. Its the owner not the dog. I own a pit bull and she would never hurt anyone.
- Please note my story previously explained.
- This is a qualified "Yes". 100% if the dog bites a person. It is more nuanced if the dog bite is with another dog. What qualifies as a "bite", dogs like to rough-house and sometimes get nipped. Is that a bite? Does it warrant a report to by-law?
- Bite and run owners should be available to express whether this is normal behaviour for the dog. Officer can then determine responsible dog ownership, dog recall, etc.
- Requiring someone to remain at the scene allows all parties involved to express their concerns and provide full context to what occurred.
- No different than staying at the scene of an accident.
- Your dog is your child. You need to explain to the officer your side. Have witnesses if any as well.
- unless unsafe to remain at the scene, but should still need to report
- Just like a car accident doesn't matter how big or small we are required to stay, report, exchange information. This should also be the case for proper dog ownership.
- It can't be as strict as when driving. If your dog has gotten off leash, you don't want the rule be that you can't go after the dog.
- This would assist in tracking dogs that are 'a nuisance' .
- I think it's important that people take responsibility for their dogs.
- Absolutely, if a dog bites a person or animal, it is the owners responsibility to remain on the scene. Everyone is recording anyways. It would be hard to just up and leave.



- Obviously if there is someone responsible for the animal then you should question them to find out what happened and how.
- Owner needs to be held accountable.
- I know many people whose dogs were involved in minor incident but later found injury to be more extensive and had thousands dollars of vet bills
- Same as any other incident causing bodily-harm. People must be held accountable.
- Identifying the dog and owner can be difficult after the fact. Requiring the owner to remain is similar to the requirement to remain after a car accident.
- To prevent further injuries
- Obviously the person responsible for that dog should remain on scene
- Same idea of responsibility that is required of driver of car to remain at scene of collision.
- It's like any crime or accident. You remain at the scene! An owner that leaves the scene should be immediately fined the maximum amount.
- you need to know if the dog has had its shots.
- Like any crime or accident. An owner that leaves a scene without providing contact info or talking with an enforcement officer should be fined
- The owner is responsible for lack of control and proper training of the animal!! DONT BLAME THE BREED!!!
- I do agree!! More information obtained is always better
- It is the equivalent to an accident.....there may be injuries, and a need to contact the offending party.
- Absolutely. It is their responsibility.
- No matter what size or breed of dog , if it behaves inappropriately then its the owners responsibility . It is the owner of such animal that needs to answer why this has happened , all information must be detailed in such a fashion as to make sure of a clear honest judgment with the full information behind the incident.
- Bites can create a significant trauma and often the owners of these dogs do not seem to understand how big the issue is. Ensuring they talk to an enforcement officer after an attack will ensure they are on record and understand that what has happened is against the law.
- people need to take responsibility for their animals.
- no explanation necessary, this is common sense
- Just completely ban pit bulls. [removed]
- It's common sense that they would stay and explain what happened.
- An pet owner should be required by law to stay at the incident and be held responsible for what occurred.
- There are many factors that come into play when a dog bites either a human or another dog. Information such as if the dog has been vaccinated for rabies, the owners drivers licence information , etc should be collected at the scene as well as pictures of the animal for future reference. It does depend on the severity of the attack as well, but I believe the owner of the attacking dog should be held responsible for any major medical expenses.



- Because the owner needs to be accountable. No different to having to stay on scene in the event of an automobile accident.
- Accountability is important. Our son was bitten by an off leash dog (not in an off leash designated area) and the owner did not identify herself and promptly ran away with the dog. I think that some kind of fine would be appropriate if the owner did not remain at the scene.
- If the dog bites a person, the owner must stay at the scene to talk to an enforcement officer. If a dog bites another dog an exchange of info should be required but not require an enforcement officer to attend.
- The owner is accountable for the dog's behavior
- Any dog who bites should be reviewed.
- This is common sense, and important for any required medical or legal follow up
- People are quick to take their dog and run after an incident, leaving the victims without recourse or possible legal action against the offender.
- Of course if a dog harms a person or another dog the owner should remain on scene.
- Not only a bite, but any type of attack including knock down. There is otherwise no way of knowing if this is repeat behaviour. Owner may be responsible for damages.
- Same as a car accident. Accidents happen and should be treated as such, with respect to both parties.
- Own your dog's actions
- Any pet owner should be responsible enough to stay and take consequences for not having a well-behaved dog. It has nothing to do with breed.
- Every owner is solely responsible for the actions of their dog and must act accordingly
- Public injury by something you own is your responsibility.
- Irresponsible dog owners normally take off during an incident. It's the same as owners not picking up waste and walking away. You have good owners and you have bad owners.
- If your dog bites you should give contact info so that the situation can be dealt with
- A dog bite should be treated exactly as seriously as an armed assault.
- If your dog or their dog got bit someone is responsible
- A lot of the time it's the owner's fault just as much as the dog's. They should be held responsible.
- In an ideal world this is the way things should be / work. Unfortunately there are dog owners out there that will not stick around or even admit their dog bit someone or another animal.
- To standardize how these should be handled, it should be required as to remove bias.
- Follow up for dog bites with the dog and owner are required to reduce further incidents with the dog.
- So they can get both sides. Dogs rarely bite randomly. RARELY. So let's hear both sides before jumping to conclusions.
- They are responsible for their dogs
- Yes but it may be dangerous to keep them there if the dog is being aggressive
- It is unacceptable for any dog to bite anyone in public, fines should be very large and no one should have to feel threatened by someone else's pet.



- If they can't get information about the dog/owner it makes it harder to contact
- Only an injury that requires some sort of action
- N/a
- it would depend on the severity of the bite. Animals get scared and react from time to time and this should not label an animal vicious/aggressive.
- Dog owner (or the person with the dog) needs to be responsible for any medical bills, for another dog or person, if it bites.
- Yes, just like a car accident, provide dog tag number and contact info and then can leave scene
- There needs to be formal reporting of the incident to see if this is a pattern of behavior for the dog and owner. The person or animal who has been bitten may require treatment and there should be a check of the offending dog's rabies vaccines. The owner of a vicious dog should be responsible for the vet bills of another dog it injures in an unprovoked attack. This all requires recording of the dog owner's information.
- I think this should absolutely be a rule, just as you would stay on the scene of a car accident. This would allow for on the spot education/resolution of the issue.
- This is important for medical and other liability and to ensure appropriate follow up.
- I have personally owned a dog that was involved in a human bite, mine and my neighbour's male dogs got into a fight after mine escaped our house (sadly we left the gate open to our fenced yard that evening) and she stuck her hands in the middle of two fighting dogs and got bit, with her dog having the only history of biting a person. I felt it was absolutely respectful to be there with her.
- Yes, but the dangerous dog should be isolated from other potential victims at this time.
- My daughter was bitten by a dog on Halloween, the family just took off
- Ownership of an animal is being responsible for the behaviour of the animal
- Any responsible owner should remain where an incident happens or leave their information if they are unable to stay.
- If a child attacked someone the parent would have to stay and share contact info with authorities, it should be the same for dogs as many people treat them as family and they are the owners responsibility.
- Accountability? Seems clear enough.
- If there are fines for this and/or there must insurance coverage it would be no different than a car accident.
- It's the right thing to do. You own an animal you are responsible for your animal
- I have been bitten 7 times in my life, I want to know whom I am suing. I want the owner to help me and wait for bylaw. I have never sued before, I will from now on.
- The dog owner needs to remain at the scene in order to provide any assistance that might be needed (while distancing the biting dog in order to prevent further injury). Unfortunately there is no way to enforce that requirement.
- It is the responsible thing to do & take ownership of the situation
- Pet owners need to take responsibility for their animals' behaviour.



- This seems like common sense. If a dog attack takes place as a result of negligence by the owner, the owner has the responsibility to deal with the outcome, especially if the victim was injured without provoking the dog.
- I agree, a while back I witnessed a dog bite another dog. The owner just grabbed the biting dog and he left ignoring requests for his information. We were shocked we were too far as was the victimized owner's dog to follow him fast enough. This was in an off leash area.
- Often if it is against another dog, the owner incurs all vet bills to their dog, and if it is to a human, it's important to have their information to process this as a nuisance dog or to proceed to more formal charges
- It would be the responsible thing to do , with an exemption if a person or animal requires immediate medical attention and must leave the scene, or in cases where the only means of de-escalating a situation means removing the pets from the immediate vicinity to an area they can be safely contained.
- It is irresponsible to leave for the owner of the dog that has bitten a person or dog.
- Typically it is the owner not the dog that is the problem no training, or lack of attention or control over there animal. And then they runaway when the dog does what they have been trained or allowed todo.
- Absolutely, usually these incidents owners flee and don't take responsibility
- Owner must be responsible for the dog. No matter what the breed is. Small dogs bite more than bigger dogs!
- But it depends on the severity and the length of time required to wait.
- That owner is responsible for the dog's actions. If an owner leaves, it would be difficult to identify the dog/owner
- The dog owner is mostly responsible for dog's behaviour.
- As long as the owner and the attacking dog do not need medical attention. If the owner or attacking dog needs medical attention, officials in charge can contact them/follow up at the medical facility.
- People who run from that responsibility are more likely to reoffend
- My dog has been attacked, by a pit bull, and owner took off. Seems to happen a lot. There should be repercussions if the attackers owner leaves. However, it can be a challenge if the one dog is still in attack mode, or depending on the severity. Stopping to get particulars after your dog has been attacked and needs to go to the vets ASAP is a challenge
- Because both sides of the story are equally important and both owners need to share responsibility of this. Leaving would be the equivalent of a hit and run.
- My dog has been attacked by other dogs twice, and could have been severely injured if I had not intervned and subdued the attacking dog. Both times the attacking dog's owner just yelled "sorry" and took off. Totally irresponsible.
- They are responsible and need to be held accountable and in a way this is very similar to hit and run accidents.
- This makes sense, depending on the severity of the bite. Some people exaggerate encounters and are over protective of their pets.



- The owner and the dog in question should be responsible for any injuries that may have occurred.
- This is just common sense. An owner should be responsible for their dog's behaviours (again, regardless of breed).
- All pet owners should be responsible for their pets. Taking accountability is important.
- Unless the dog is seen as out of control or dangerous the animal and owner should remain behind so the attending city official can record all the information possible
- Common sense
- Dog owners should always remain at the scene unless they need to take somebody involved in the incident to hospital or to the vet
- Getting both sides of a story is important to ensure justice and fair treatment for the animal involved. Just because the dog bites doesn't mean the dog is at fault. Consider what happens to cause this incident
- The owners are responsible for their pets actions. If an incident occurs it's responsibility of both parties to deal with it properly.
- That's the right thing to do
- It is the decent thing to do to ensure that all relevant information is exchanged. Eg dog vaccination updates
- If a dog bites a person, they should eventually be euthanized.
- It is important to get information and apprehend the dog if needed
- Our Maltese dog was killed by a Pitbull in Mission, although there were plenty of witnesses and photos the owner took off and was never found
- With pet insurance becoming more popular this would benefit both parties. Not having this would be similar to a hit and run with a vehicle.
- owner should be held responsible
- However witness statements of outside parties should also be taken into account.
- Owners of biting dogs must be fully held responsible and not be allowed to flee the scene and leave the victims with the consequences.
- All owners should be able to accept responsibility for their animals. If not, they should not have them.
- A responsible owner no matter what breed, should stay at the scene and talk to whom ever to help resolve the issue
- Like if you accidentally hit or ding another car, you *should* remain on the scene to give your details. It is the right thing to do.
- yes in order to do follow up with both parties.
- On occasion the owner leaves the scene and not located
- However, most owners of aggressive dogs quickly leave the site of an altercation. And I expect most would not be aware of this rule.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs actions , especially if the health of other animals or people are in question



- Just like a car accident it should be considered a crime for any animal injury to leave the scene
- the owner should be held responsible for your dog action
- It's like a car accident. The person didn't have control of their property and another citizen was hurt.
- Depending on the circumstances that caused the dog to bite, the owner or human with the dog at the time of the incident should remain at the scene to get both sides of the said incident. Sometimes the dog may have been provoked by the person or people with the person that was bitten. No different than when a human has had enough provocation or teasing. Therefore the animal should not be blamed. However, if the owner/human encourages the dog or teaches the dog to be aggressive then the owner/human should be found accountable and the dog should have behaviour training at the expense of the owner/human.
- "Anyone can cry wolf. If my dog bit a person and I ran away with my dog, the victim doesn't know the health of the dog, if they're vaccinated or if there's any health issues to be worried about. Not to mention this gives an opportunity for irresponsible owners to continue to put others at risk due to their dog (or their) risk to public safety.
- But on the other side of the fence, my "'blockheaded' dog could get seized or PTS if only one side of the story is told. My dog could be attacked and he could retaliate and depending on the type of dog that went after him, he may still be found at fault and penalized whereas the offender gets a slap on the wrist.
- Being present to see both sides of the issue will get a better understanding of the issue as a whole and help offer clarity to the possible triggers that may have been stacking prior to this incident.. which also is where the dog trainer contractors would come into play. They could attend with animal control (or be animal control officers) and address and ask questions direct related to the dogs and their behaviours displayed. When you know what you're looking for, you can pick out problems much quicker"
- Can determine if the dog was provoked, or if the owner is irresponsible knowing the dog is under-trained
- it seems like common sense - I've seen bad owners ignore incidents before.
- a dog owner should be held responsible for there dog action
- Just like a car crash, you stay at the scene to ensure info is swapped and everyone is ok
- Because the owner of the dog needs to be held accountable. Too many cases occur where a dog was bit in the off leash parks and the offending owner ends up taking off and getting away with it
- I believe owner should face criminal charges as well as fines
- If your animal has bitten someone, you need to act responsibility and do the right thing. Ie: paying for the damage
- People need to be held responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- Because of course they should, just like a driver involved in an accident must remain at the scene.
- Only if it is a significant bite that may require medical attention not a nip or superficial bite.
- A responsible and accountable Owner would do this. Being a pet Owner comes with a high of responsibility and accountability.



- The inconvenience would probably ensure people with nuisance dogs would remain alert and vigilant about the behavior of their animal in public.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their pet. I do however feel that some dog owners are way too protective over their pets which could cause an innocuous incident to be blown out of proportion
- Too often owners leave the scene and the victim with a large vet's bill
- Owners should be held accountable for dog behavior. Their training and responsibility is far more important than the breed of a dog. The success of the dog's future is determined by the owner's response to incident, and to ensure their accountability they should remain at the scene, like an automobile accident.
- I have been bitten by a Rottweiler in the past and the owner tried to flee with the dog
- This should be done anyhow by any responsible person. A rule should be in place to enforce.
- Any incident involving injury should require the perpetrator to remain at the scene.
- Accountability. I can not believe that this is a question and that owners leave the scene
- I think it important that the responsible adult be available for discussion with an enforcement officer who could offer direction to that person.
- opportunity to educate
- And a fine and potential removal of the dog from the owner's custody.
- This is no different than you have to stay at the scene of an accident
- If the victim requests it,
- Owners need to be held responsible for their dog's behaviour and thus must remain at the scene of an incident.
- Only if it's serious
- Too often people know the dog will be euthanized for a bite so they take steps not to be found.
- For better information, to provide personal info etc
- If this issue is serious it must be escalated and the offender should not be allowed to simply walk away
- Just like driving...never leave the scene of an incident until statements and information/identification has been exchanged
- Same as drivers being required to stay at the scene of an accident; if someone does bodily harm to another (or their pet does) it seems more than reasonable that the victim be able to seek reparations.
- The owner needs to be held accountable as well as making sure information is shared between them regarding any health issues or contagions either one of the dogs may have that could be spread.
- A pet owner should be responsible the same way a driver is responsible in an accident.
- It's important to know if the dog is up to date on all vaccinations. It could also help prevent future attacks by the same dog.
- This is just like a hit and run, if someone or their animal was harmed, the person who owns the dog who harmed the other should be questioned so they can get both sides of the story when it's fresh.



- It's the responsible thing to do.
- Owner must provide valid identification and contact information. A dog attack is as serious as an assault by a human/
- It would identify their dog is vaccinated
- These incidents can be wildly one-sided in how they're reported, either by the owner or by the person who was attacked. A dog biting a person may be the result of poor handling, or it may be the result of direct provocation. And nobody deserves to lose their pet based on false accusations.
- If it is a serious bite then yes they should be there long enough to ensure the other person is okay.
- Yes, any accountable owner should be willing to share contact information, vaccination records, and such.
- No different than a hit and run
- Broadly similar to the case of damages in car accidents, you should have to remain to take responsibility.
- It is not necessarily easy to ascertain the severity or consequences (such as infection) of a bite. The dog owner needs to have a sense of responsibility for the outcome and provide information so that follow up for educational or consequential outcomes can occur.
- If a person owns an animal they are solely responsible for that animal and their behaviour. If a situation arises the owner should absolutely have to stay, not matter breed or severity of incident.
- They can't be biased there can't be against dogs or fearful of dogs in general especially pitbull type breeds. Need to be fair as dogs are taught 99% of its behavior by the owner the owner should suffer a major consequences such as jail.
- To explain, especially if the other dog was the cause, ie. aggressive or the biting dog was dog shy and the other dog was off leash and poorly trained
- Because you should
- It's like a car accident, be responsible, be safe, talk to authorities
- My neighbor's dog was mauled by a leashed (But owner lost control) Pit Bull Breed and the owner disappeared. Dog required surgery and meds at vet. costing approx \$1000, plus the children were traumatized as well.
- For a responsible dog owner this should not be an issue
- Cannot enforce without compliance
- There are two sides to every story. Both should be heard. Photos of injuries should be taken from both parties of both parties.
- As iterated above, same comments apply.
- The same type of liability as if the owner has a car accident.
- This sounds responsible. There's 3 sides to every story....
- I have heard of too many instances where the dog owner leaves the scene
- Your Dog bites, u R responsible
- I also support persons driving cars to stay on scene. It's a no-brainer....



- It is necessary to remain at the scene of an accident if someone or someone's pet is injured by another animal. Information must be exchanged for insurance, follow-up, civil suites, or criminal investigation
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets. Leaving the scene of an incident where a person or another dog has been hurt is not responsible.
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION!!
- He /she más be responsible for the pet
- Just like in a car accident, all details should be recorded
- Their animal caused damage and you as the owner are responsible for them.
- It's important to understand exactly what happened when an event where there is an attack occurs. There are a variety of factors and all sides need to be heard
- Unless the victim need medical attention
- Thought that was the bylaw
- They should not leave "the scene of the crime", the same a motor vehicle incidents or other incidents where a personal injury may or might likely to have occurred.
- Because they are fully responsible.
- common sense
- as in any accident, the victim and perpetrator should exchange information.
- Owners should take responsibility for their pets action and should be on site to clarify events leading up to the incident
- If the bite is serious (not just a minor scuffle with the dogs), the aggressive dog should be assessed. The owner should be liable for vet costs etc as well
- To collect history data for that animal.
- If a driver hits someone and leaves, it is an offence called hit and run. There may be diseases or other issues affecting either the dog or the injured party. Leaving is irresponsible and wrong. If you own the dog, you should be responsible enough to own up to its behavior.
- Unless it adds further trauma to the incident. In that case the dog should be removed from the scene ASAP
- A responsible owner should see an incident through to resolution by remaining at the scene.
- If a dog bites someone, the owner needs to give info about the dog
- It should be treated no differently than a car accident causing bodily injury, with failure to remain at the scene something similar to "hit and run".
- A dog biting someone or another animal and then leaving the scene is like fleeing the scene of a car accident.
- Dog owners must be responsible for their own pets. If their dog causes harm, it should be illegal for the owner to leave the scene until the matter is resolved. It is illegal to leave the scene of a car crash if you caused it - if you and your property cause harm, you are responsible for dealing with the aftermath.



- Pet owners are responsible for their pets, and that means being accountable for their pet's misbehavior
- Accountability, esp if bite is serious and medical bills incurred
- That is common sense.
- Absolutely. Pet ownership is a privilege and a responsibility. Stay at the scene, your dog may have been baited or provoked. You are their voice.
- Similar to other matters where there has been an injury or possible injury the owner ought to remain at scene
- As long as both parties remain separate but within the vicinity (as long as is safe to do so).
- Again train new Canadians to leave dogs alone. And not scream every time they see a dog.
- I think a dogs owner is more responsible for the dogs action than the dog. There is no such thing as a bad breed of dogs, there are bad owners.
- Why wouldn't they? If their dog is biting they should be accountable, it's never the dogs fault.
- So a proper and full investigation can be done
- No different than a car accident. May have been an accident but there is still financial ramifications
- would you care if I said I was bitten by a jack Russell terrier, or do you only care when it's a "nuisance dog"?
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs
- Unless immediate medical attention is required
- They should stay or be treated like a hit and run.
- At the victim's request, if the injury is serious
- People need to take responsibility for their animal
- It's their responsibility and like a vehicle accident, they should be mandated to stay
- Absolutely they need to stay.
- The owner is ultimately responsible for the animal
- [removed]
- If either party would like the case documented, it should be mandatory to wait for bylaw to take the information.
- It's an accident or incident causing harm. Info should be exchanged.
- It's like a car accident.
- Owners need to be held accountable at all costs. It's never the dogs fault for being poorly trained
- dog owners must accept & take immediate responsibility for their pets actions & be willing to make restitution to the victim of the attack.
- The owner should stay in case the bills need to be paid
- It's the owners responsibility to stay at the scene!
- Dog owner needs to be held accountable and pay for any expenses incurred.
- "Tribunal may be biased
- Exchanging info when there is an occurrence sounds good reality wise people would get into altercations"



- Any dog involved in a bite situation should be tagged by the city. My concern would be enforcing the pet owner to stay and exchange contact info.
- If the owner leaves the dog may not be identified and could bite others.
- Owners are responsible for their pets, and should handle the consequences of improper pet behavior.
- Humans must be responsible for their animals and accountable for behaviour that puts others at risk.
- The owner of a vicious dog is 100 liable for its actions.
- If the owners had to stay and an officer had to come things would be recorded properly at that time.
- I don't think you should have to wait for enforcement officer, but somehow be more similar to when there is a minor car accident and An exchange of information happens
- if there is a bite that causes injury to another dog or person if the victim requests the owner stay to speak to announcer they should or follow up if contact info is provided
- Too many dog owners take off for fear of outcome
- So that both parties can give their explanations around what happened
- This would help both the dog and the person/animal that was bit because the owner would be able to identify more about the dog then if they weren't there and people had to assume things about that dog without having clear facts.
- Yes, the owner should be held accountable for their animal
- similar to any other injury accident the exchange of information must take place
- "A responsible owner should explain the situation leading up to the bite. Was the dog being teased or attacked? Was it a bite in play wrestling with another dog and the other dog's owner doesn't understand dog play?"
- And a responsible owner should acknowledge the potential need for more socialization and/or training."
- If a dog is biting it is the responsibility of the owner to their due diligence. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- I would assume if a dog owner left the scene, they would be harder to identify. Similar to a hit and run situation
- Of course the human must stay and take responsibility. Just like an auto collision.
- Many accidents happen at dog parks where the owners just leave. Put the onus on an owner to stay and exchange information with the other dog owners and law enforcement personnel.
- As with other incidents involving accident or injury, contact information is a good expectation to ensure that follow up, should it be needed, be doable. Maybe something like I'd first aid is required, then contact information must be shared.
- This should be recorded so that enforcement could keep track of if it is a repetitive occurrence and act accordingly
- Owners should be required to stay at the scene just like you are when a vehicle is involved
- Similar to car accident laws, no matter the breed
- It could be a bylaw but again horrible owners are the problem



- Its logical
- Then you can see exactly what the context was, breed, owner and if preventable.
- The pet owner is responsible for their animal. They should remain to provide information and face repercussions
- It reflects the principle of asking dog owners to be responsible for the behaviour of their dogs. It provides a way to hold derelict dog owners accountable for their dogs' behaviour.
- They may have caused unexpected bills.
- Too many owners flee because they fear their dog will be apprehended.
- If the bite or incident is severe then this would be applicable. If the incident is minor (ie. Two dogs are engaged with no injuries, a dog and a person with no or minor injuries) then I do not believe requiring someone to remain on scene is necessary.
- All/any owner whose dog/pet bites/attacks another dog/pet/person should be expected to stay at scene and give information regardless of breed, size etc.
- It is irresponsible owners that cause dog biting not the dog breeds. The owners should be held accountable (not just for pitbulls)
- Emergency vet care is expensive and thus, if someone's dog attacked mine I would want them to pay for it.
- The owner should definitely remain at the scene and the dog should be removed from the owner's custody at that time.
- It's currently too easy to evade consequences for a dog attack.
- If safe to do so, if the victim is threatening or aggressive (even if rightly so) they should be allowed to leave and phone someone to share their details.
- My dog bitten by pitbull. \$1500 in vet Bill's. Never found owner of pitbull. My dog on leash. Unprovoked attack. Pitbull almost killed my dog. I was in shock as was my dog. Owner verbally gave me phone number and quickly left scene. I was unable to remember number.
- If the dog owner was decent they would happily stick around to ensure all is well
- Same as car accidents.
- There is no such thing as a bad dog there is idiot ownership so don't punish the breed punish the owner... And ask yourself what caused the dog to bite?
- If it's a playful bite, absolutely not. If the bite has harmed something so much so it needs medical attention, then yes information should be exchanged.
- Had an experience with a dig that attacked my young children in a park. The owner quickly left the scene taking no responsibility for the incident. When we spoke to bylaw, we were advised to follow the owner to his house if it happened again. Yeah right, follow the owner of a dangerous dog to their house while my children are with me... Punishment for this needs to be severe. Criminal charges if necessary.
- owner of vicious dog should be fined and should pay medical bills of the person or animal that was attacked
- As long as there is proof of injury, the owner should stay
- To take ownership of animal and incident



- The owner should be held responsible for the incident and required to help find a solution
- Just to be safe. Plus two sides to every bite
- It is similar to having to remain at the scene of a vehicular accident. When dogs are involved in an attack or biting incident the dog owner must remain at the scene to exchange identity and residency information in case sanctions or charges are possible. The victim must also have this information if a civil suit is considered.
- The dog and owner need to be able to be identified so it can be determined if there were prior issues and in case there are medical costs associated with a bite or attack. Owner could be held responsible.
- Rule? How is it enforced? I'd hope, with a significant fine for leaving the scene
- Similar to a car accident, the person responsible should not leave the scene of the incident until information is exchanged or an enforcement officer arrives. This ensures accountability.
- Should medical attention be required for the person or other animal contact information shared and witnessed by enforcement may be needed should law suit be required to compensate the victim(s)
- Otherwise you'll never find them.
- They have the opportunity to explain the situation and to follow up with next steps. They must not fear their dog being taken by staying.
- Responsible owners should be prepared to give up a dog that has been involved in an incident.
- To confirm identity.
- Only if the dog bites a person
- This is tricky. If an owner is alone somewhere with one or more of their dogs and an incident occurs then the potential for the animal to require medical care is higher (even if they are the attacking dog) and should not be delayed. If there is no injury then getting their dog(s) away from the situation and secured somewhere should be top priority to avoid further escalation. That being said, I agree that they need to at least provide valid contact information before leaving the scene entirely.
- The dog owner should be allowed to remove their dog from the high stress area and then be allowed to return to defend their position if needed.
- To be a pet owner, person(s) making a decision to care for another life and accordingly has the responsibility and accountability as part of that decision.
- This will be a difficult rule to enforce because problematic owners are quick to run; and next to impossible to locate.
- An example: a recent incident involving a teenage neighbour whose (parent's) small dog was badly attacked. The teenager was so traumatized that she didn't remember any details about the owner. On top of the financial burden of the veterinary interventions required, not knowing whether the same owner and/or the same dog could repeat an attack made her anxious about taking her own dog to the same park.
- It is important for the both owners to remain at the scene when a bite occurs, whether it is a dog-to-dog bite or a dog-to-human bite.
- An owner should be directly responsible for the behavior of their pet and be willing to assume liability for poor behavior thus (hopefully) increasing training in all animals who are looking to use city parks.



- Most self respecting people would stay, it is the people who are not responsible pet owners who leave the scene, how would a bylaw change this.
- You need to stay to take responsibility but this is any dog whether large or small. Small little poodles and smaller can cause more damage than shepherd or pit bulls
- This ensures a vicious dog gets properly reported and labeled and owner held responsible.
- Vet bills!! There is payment owing by the other party
- This is a basic responsibility to share information - no different that a vehicle collision. there must be an exchange of information, even if one party must rush an animal to a vet.
- responsibility owners would not leave and both sides need to be heard
- "The owner should be willing to exchange /share information contact details, etc
- If the dog or other person is injured or the animal requires emergency vet care - It's basic human decency/courtesy"
- The current Residential Tenancy Dispute Resolution Service Tribunal in Calgary is not as effective nor harsh in its sentencing regarding tenancy disputes. I am afraid an animal tribunal would be equally weak.
- I have been bitten by my own dog and a strangers dog. I was protecting my dog from the attack of the other dog. The owner walked off without a worry to my safety or injury. A greater fine should be given to those owners who walk away and are found.
- As an owner of a pitbull I have had multiple dogs run up to mine and try to attack, these are normally small dogs such as a chihuahua
- You should be at the scene so no one can blame the other dog. There are 2 sides to the story.
- If your dog bites a person you need to take responsibility for that.
- The attacking dog owner should be held liable
- If a dog bites another dog, then the owner of the dog doing the biting should be held responsible for any vet costs that are incurred.
- Dog ownership is subject to regulatory laws just like driving a car. An owner of a dog that has attacked a person/another animal should have to remain at the scene just like a driver involved in an accident.
- As long as it does not pose further threat to anyone at the scene. If the individual has to leave to ensure their animal is contained properly, and provide contact details to return at a later time to speak with an enforcement officer.
- DEFINITELY! You have to do that with a car accident, it should be the same with a pet incident.
- This would ensure, the owner and the animal, have the necessary training.
- Should be similar requirements as vehicular hit and run.
- If your dog bites no matter the breed you need to stay there so that your info is shared with everyone who will need it
- The owner is responsible for the animal's behaviour and therefore should be required to provide contact information.
- dog bite that results in injury and the victim requests contact information must be supplied



- A dog owner is wholly responsible for the behaviour of their dog, and should offer their contact information and make themselves available to face the consequences of their dogs actions.
- Owners need to be held responsible for their dogs behaviour. They should not be able to walk away from an incident involving their dog.
- Many owners of these vicious pets do not demonstrate responsibility or acknowledge that they have an animal that is dangerous.
- They should be made to remain on scene.
- This would allow for the enforcement officer to engage with the pet and owner to assess if immediate and or follow up action is necessary
- They need to state their case. No “bite and run”
- everyone should take responsibilities for their pets, and deal with the consequences of mishandling / training. It shouldn't be breed specific though, all dogs can potentially pose as a threat.
- The owner of a dog that bites needs to identify them selves to a by law officer
- If a dog bites either a person or another animal it's a severe problem, therefore an authority figure should be involved to be an intermediary.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to make any reparations due to the victim of their dog's behavior, and so they should be required to give their information in case a charge or claim is made against them
- Owners of the dog need to take responsibility for their dogs behaviour whether it was brought on by the other party involved or the dog just being an a**hole.
- We must all be accountable for our pets, it is not always the dogs fault it bites and both sides of every story should be heard
- Why punish the dog when it is the owner we need to be monitoring. Being there to share information is responsible pet ownership.
- Responsible owners should remain and deal with their actions as the dog injury may be expensive. Also tracking patterns of nuisance animals is important.
- This will help you realize it's not just pitbulls, it's bad owners. Maybe you'll stop trying to make asinine bylaws specifically geared towards bully breeds.
- Dogs that bite for any reason should be euthanized and owners fined heavily. Any dog that bites is a liability and any owner that puts a dog in a position where it can bite is irresponsible at best. Perhaps we should treat dog owners like firearm owners. There are likely far more dog related injuries to citizens than gun related injuries on a per capita basis.
- This is a good idea and makes sure that the dog owner takes responsibility for the actions and train god their pets. This can also help with incorrect or vague and general breed descriptions.
- That way all pertinent information is conveyed and pet owners held to account for their animals actions.
- Common sense. You wouldn't hit a car with yours then drive away would you?
- A dog biting another person is always preventable and is the result of an owner being negligent. It does not however make sense to punish those owners who are never involved in an incident.
- Owner needs to be held responsible



- Because that OWNER needs the training, or the fine, or perhaps a muzzle? The DOG is rarely the problem - the OWNER usually is.
- I think it's important for the enforcement officer to talk to the dog owner. However, if the attacking dog is pumped up and ready to attack again then take the dog home. It's a case by case basis. I would be worried if the aggressive dog was still outside if it would attack again. I'd have to have a dog expert lend their advice on this question.
- The owner is responsible, not the animal. The owner should providing all information and should be under investigation, not the animal.
- They should explain the circumstances/provide proof of rabies shots and insurance if there are damages
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets, too many are flippant and value dogs over humans.
- A dog biting a person is a criminal offense. The dog is in control of the owner just like a bat or a gun. No one who hits me with a bat should be able to walk away and say "Oh my bat did that I have no responsibility."
- all parties should remain at the occurrence
- Just like having to remain at the scene of an accident
- Anecdotaly, there are too many irresponsible pet owners in the city. A law requiring owners to remain on the scene would help curb one aspect of irresponsible behaviour.
- a responsible owner should share info to help defend the dog. Leaving the scene can be seen as an automatic admission of guilt. All factors should be considered in this type of case, especially the behaviors or irritants leading up to the bite.
- The owner should be held responsible for their dogs actions
- The owner is responsible. The dog is at the mercy of irresponsible owners.
- If there is an obvious injury or property damage, yes. The responsible parties should have to provide personal information so that restitution can be obtained.
- This just sounds like common sense - why wouldn't they stay at the scene of the incident to share contact information?
- Similar to a car accident, all parties should remain present until the matter is in the process of being non-biasly settled.
- It's important to understand the situation as well as what actually happened
- The owners need to be held accountable
- It is the owner's responsibility to control the dog's action, I truly believe there is no "bad" dog it all depends on the upbringing by the owner.
- This is no different than a vehicle accident. Owners are responsible.
- The dog owner is always responsible for the actions of their dogs so it's common sense that the dog owner would be required to remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer if necessary. Otherwise, there is no accountability.
- people should be able to discuss the incident with an officer. Sometimes dogs provoke other dogs and the dog owner must be able to give their side. Plus, the person with an injured dog should be able to have someone pay for potentially bad bites requiring surgery



- The owner needs to be held accountable.
- Otherwise there is no accountability
- Similar to owning a vehicle, any responsible pet owner must remain at the scene of an incident, at least to identify themselves and explain their side of the story.
- Yes if a dog bites someone the owner should be cooperative. Noting this could happen with ANY dog.
- It holds the dog owner responsible similar to car accidents. It should also make the bylaw officers job easier for reporting.
- As similar to a motor vehicle, I believe any witness and participants involved in the incident should speak with an enforcement immediately after the incident. This option will only work effectively if the officers can arrive in a timely manner.
- How else can you prevent it from happening again?
- I would say yes to this, as in my experience many people are in denial of their dogs behaviour. Once they leave the scene many people will not acknowledge the incident and ignore the complainants request for help with the vet bills, if required.
- Come on this is basic [removed]
- I do believe if a dog bites a person or animal the owner should remain at the scene, for information purposes.
- I feel all parties involved should remain at the scene if authorities have been called. Witnesses if available as well.
- Information should always be given
- If they leave it's just like a hit-and-run. We wouldn't stand for that in an auto injury scenario, so why would we in this scenario? The owner is accountable for the dog's actions.
- And owner should be liable for costs incurred, including replacement costs of dog including all training and pain and suffering.
- "Walking away from the dog's bite's scene is fleeing the scene of a crime, and practically inhibits enforcement / identification.
- However, keep in mind the impact of the dog's continued presence. Leeway needs to be given for the uncontrolled dogs, and a recommendation that the dog be removed and secured away from the scene's vicinity."
- Absolutely. My dog and boyfriend were both bitten. We left for treatment but thinking back, we should have called it in so the owners would have had to deal with bylaw that way the bites would have been recorded in case it happened again and to get them to pay vet bill.
- There still needs to be accountability
- I think it needs to be documented if a dog bites, if it's a reoccurring issue it needs to be addressed appropriately
- I had a friend but by a dog, the lady said the dog only hates bad people and left.
- As a responsible dog owner, this is considered good etiquette. Owners who do not do this already are frowned upon in the dog community.



- If a person is not training those dog properly they could be getting away with it by simply leaving the scene before the other citizen had the opportunity to bring in authority, thus leaving that owner unchecked. We need a better record of bad owners.
 - This is logical
 - You need to be able to find out if the dog has rabies, and also if the dog has bitten/attacked anyone before this incident.
 - yes if it is a serious incident that one or both parties agree may require some sort of follow up.
 - Context is imporant for all incidents, so if it's safe for the dog owner to remain on the scene for follow up report, I would support this. If it's not safe or appropriate, then post-incident follow up could occur in any other number of ways.
 - The victim needs to have a chance to contact the dog owner
 - No different than a car accident. You should remain at the scene or provide your identification and contact information to the other party.
 - Any responsible dog would do this.
 - Seeems like a no-brainer. The owner should be required to stay and deal with a situation his dog has created. Ther might be further consequences that need to be addressed so we need to know whose dog caused the problem.
 - Lock the owner up it is not the dogs faultobvious the dog was not trained.
 - I believe it is important that the dog owner provide contact information so that they may be held accountable for any financial losses incurred by the victim. If, however, the phrase "talk with an enforcement officer" implies immediate or unfair seizure of the offending animal, or implies that the dog owner may be unfairly penalized for someone else having provoked their dog to defend itself, then I do not support this.
 - This actually makes sense. If this happened I don't know why the owner would leave, unless they're just a terrible person.
 - "We are responsible for any harm our dogs cause harm to other parties. This should be similar to vehicle ownership/operation.
-
- There should be an exemption for cases where remaining on scene would be dangerous or otherwise risk further harm (ie: the offending dog needs to be immediately relocated to prevent it from causing further injury)."
 - Both parties should be present, as well as witnesses in order to better understand why the bite occurred.
 - makes owner accountable for their lack of training the dog
 - Owners of dogs who bite other dogs need to be responsible for vet costs. Remaining at the scene, sharing contact info, and talking with an enforcement officer for documentation of the incident are all imperative.
 - Accountability and assurance that proper actions will be taken so that this won't happen again



- A
- No different than a car accident.
- It's like any accident...if you are involved in one, you should remain there until it is dealt with
- Depending on the severity of the bite and if it is safe to keep the dog there for an enforcement officer, otherwise take the dog home and a simple exchange of information in case the dog owner needs to be contacted.
- With exception of if it's an extremely dangerous situation where the animal needs to be removed from urgently. The owner should then be required to come back, if that's the case.
- To many people will not take responsibility if they leave (hit and run).
- There shouldn't be a need for law enforcement, unless it's clearly a large issue between owners.
- Yes the owner needs to take responsibility with any breed of dog
- Dog owners need to be held accountable for the mean dogs they've trained.
- The owner is ultimately responsible for their dog's behavior and needs to be held accountable.
- Matter of accountability
- It just makes sense. Just like you would do with a car accident.
- This is absolutely paramount. It is responsible dog ownership on a basic level.
- This is something a responsible pet owner would do anyway, regardless of legislation.
- To me this is just common sense.
- In case issues arise from the bite and the owner needs to be contacted.
- Owners must be immediately held accountable for pit bull vicious dog attacks
- Because there is two sides to every story and people think because there dog is small ot cant do any harm. Remember if my dog is leashed and yours isnt or on a retractable leash and your dogs bites mine my dogs bite is going to csuse more damage but i dont see how it would be my dogs fault
- They need to be held accountable, and tell the full story.
- Too many walk away to avoid having to deal with what the animal has done.
- The owner needs to be responsible for their animal.
- A dog incident is no different than a car accident, people should have to talk to an officer for perspective and people should be held accountable.
- Why not?
- This should be no different to a vehicle accident with injury.
- As long as animal can be restrained while owner waits.
- I feel like it should be treated as a car accident. The owner should be responsible for a dog's actions. Poor training can result in aggressive dogs.
- I support this for if a dog bites a person only. Sometimes dogs get into little scuffles but thats no reason to involve an enforcement officer unless its a vicious attack. Sometimes its just dogs being dogs.
- Too many scumbag owners will just leave to avoid consequences.
- If a persons dog bites another animal or human, they need to be held accountable and this would make it easier for law enforcement to get their information



- My wife was attacked by a pit bull and the owner stayed on-site until I could get their details. I was attacked by a pit bull like dog (off leash on the pathway) and the owner walked away and told me to f**k off.
- Shocked this isn't in effect already. Bad dogs often have bad owners, unwilling to stick around to face the consequences because Fido will never do it again.
- You need to know the owner to proceed with the outcomes
- This is common sense
- The dog owner must be held responsible for the actions of their dog.
- This is common sense. A dog but can be serious and it should be the law that an owner remain at the scene
- Absolutely - no different than a car accident
- Identify the owner and repeat offenders
- improves accountability
- With the provision that the offending animal can be controlled at the scene. Alternatively, a requirement to provide name address & contact info
- It's like a car collision. People need to be accountable and remain at the scene
- It's the responsible thing to do. Like a car accident.
- It's just like remaining at the scene of an accident
- If your pet has harmed another person or pet. It is no different than the owner, as a human being, committing assault. The pet owner should be held responsible. The pet owner should be forced by city by law to go to court ordered safe pet handling course. How to become a better PET parent. Failure to attend this course may result in the animal being seized from the owner. And potential he put up for adoption somewhere else with a parent that would be willing to take the time to retrain this pet.
- Makes identification of owner and dog simple.
- There might be a number of external factors that invoked the dog attack. It is important to know these factors and how to safeguard against them in the future.
- Hold all pet owners to the same standard
- It's essentially assault with a weapon. A crime was committed. Leaving the scene would have additional charges for any other crime committed, why is this different?
- The owner should stay if bylaw has been called unless there is imminent risk of further conflict or violence from either party. This way, both parties are there to give their story.
- It's their responsibility as a dog owner otherwise it would be hard to trace where the dog came from and the medical history of the dog (eg. Vaccinations)
- I believe owners should take responsibility for their dogs aggressive behaviour. If a dog bite a person or other animal they should have to shoulder at least some of the financial burden to help the affected person or animal. Enforcement may be necessary in some cases when owners avoid accountability for their pet.
- If it is a severe bite, I agree it is necessary.



- "Take responsibility for what occurred. There are ALWAYS two sides. Was the person invading the space of the dog? Did the dog dislike what was happening and try to protect itself?"
- Is there enough education around 'How to be around a dog you don't know?'"
- All owners have to be responsible for anything their animal does. Period
- Calgary dog parks are dangerous, I have stopped taking my dogs years ago after witnessing way to many dog fights/attacks. However a dog fight is not always the result of 1 dog being aggressive. I have witnessed fights where one owner cries foul stressing their dog was attacked when in fact it was the aggressor in a situation. It's a complicated issue for sure.
- They need to be there to take responsibility for their animal, just like an accident with a car
- Unless it is necessary that the dog owner must remove their dog from the situation first. I have heard countless stories of dog owners leaving immediately following their pet being involved in an incident.
- My dog was attacked when he was a puppy and the other dog's owner left the scene.
- By requiring the owner of the animal who bit a person or other animal to stay at the scene it will allow the enforcement officer to hear from the owner and assess the dog immediately after the incident.
- If your dog were to bite someone i feel it is the owners responsibility to ensure the victim is taken care of an an medical costs should be paid by the dog owner.
- It is certainly necessary for follow up if needed and to provide information in general. A fine should be given to anyone not staying at the scene.
- As the owner of a dog, it is your responsibility if the dog bites another person or animal. STaying at the scene is important.
- There is no recourse otherwise. It's not like you can take a picture of their license plate if they walked off.
- Owners should remain on the scene so the situation can be properly assessed.
- Appropriate behavior
- For punishment to be effective it has to be possible. For it to be possible the dog and dog owner need to remain at the scene.
- This makes sense.
- Just like a car accident - if a person's dog bites, they should remain at scene!
- Owners of a dog must accept responsibility for the situation & if possible without creating further issues, remain at the scene so the enforcement officer can properly assess both the Owner and the dog. Typically it is not the dog that is the issue but rather the owner.
- Yes, it is important to share contact information in the event the injuries become worse after the initial incident.
- The dog should be put down
- The dog owner needs to remain at the scene no different than a car accident. Leaving the scene will make it harder for the person or dog bitten to give details about the incident.
- This should be no different then an automobile accident.
- For safety of all parties involved— dog may need to be removed from scene and brought home, but owner should be sharing information.



- Jerk dogs belong to irresponsible people
- To ensure incident is correctly reported.
- It's important to provide contact info, however, if the owner needs to go home to bring the dog home and then return, that should be fine.
- Depending on severity there are vet/medical bills that should be shared
- Accountability is important.
- The facts need to be made known to the owner and the best way for this to happen is to require the owner to remain at the scene.
- Same as any other property/ injury incident ie car accident, property damage
- All sides need to be heard. All parties should remain at the scene if immediate medical care is not warranted.
- If someone's dog bites something/one, the owner should be held accountable.
- The owner is responsible for their dog and their dogs actions and should provide information on their dog, especially such things as rabies vaccination dates.
- I believe that the owner is responsible for the dog 's behaviour and should be legally obligated to stay on scene.
- It happens far to often that people run away from the incident and there is no repercussions
- Make the owner responsible.
- If the dog bites someone and the owner is there they should tell their side if the story
- It is an owners responsibility to the dog. A dog does what it is trained or encouraged to do. How an owner treats the dog reinforces the behaviour of the dog. Can also provide a list of owners who are involved in incidents and see if it is the same owner over and over again, who is as a result, putting the dog at risk.
- Leads to a clearer understanding of what has appended.
- The guardian should be responsible for further training of dog or make retribution's for injuries, if any.
- If needed of course...
- If the owner doesn't have any reason to run away and hide and stand up for their dog that's a good owner if the dog bit another dog or person in most cases it was to protect the owner I have seen many Doglas jumped their fences or open gates to get to these dogs that are on leash, so who's to blame???
- It's about being a responsible person
- A dog is your property same as a car. Yes they have emotional attachments to humans, but they are your responsibility.
- This is the owners responsibility to stay at the site of the incident
- Dog owners need to be held accountable for their dog's actions.
- Too many people leave. Make it the same as leaving the scene of an accident or crime.
- Owners are, or should, be responsible for their pet's behaviour.
- Rabies vaccination must be proven, so the owner must remain there.



- If a dog bites anyone pitbull or not, the owner should stay and make sure they are okay and give any information. The owner is also at fault and there could be many reasons why the dog has bitten it. It isn't the dogs fault
- It should be treated as an assault and the owner is liable to stay and speak with police.
- Owners are the best person to describe what their dog's characteristics are
- It's like getting your car hit, would you run away? No.
- Protect the majority from selfish minority.
- I was bitten and the owner took off, no apology, nothing
- If the victim would like to proceed via law enforcement a dog bite should be treated the same as something like a car accident.
- Dont flee the scene of dog bite
- An owner must be accountable for their ownership - and how would absenteeism reflect accountability? It doesn't.
- No different than an accident scene
- Yes. So law enforcement can follow up and make sure the owner gets properly educated on the dog they own and how to properly train their animal. It is so often lack of education and understanding of the breed on the owners part that causes problems. A properly trained animal is so crucial.
- Just like a car accident. You should wait at the scene to exchange information and speak with a officer
- if someone or another animal is injured, the owner should be responsible and deal with the situation accordingly.
- Owner is responsible for dog's actions.
- Owners are responsible for their pet and their actions. Period. Your dog acts up, YOU stay and deal with the consequences.
- A vicious dog attack needs to be treated like a traffic accident. Bite-and-run should be illegal.
- As long as the officer will come in a timely manner, and by other animal you aren't meaning a gopher or porcupine or something. I'm sure there are circumstances where this wouldn't make sense, but in general it seems like a good idea.
- Just like after a car accident - responsibility is required.
- Owners are ultimately responsible and accountable for their dog's behaviour.
- vet fees are expensive
- With the exception of having to leave the scene in an attempt to control the situation by removing the aggressive dog from the situation.
- The owners information needs to be documented and the incident on file.
- It is the owners that are responsible for the behaviour of their dogs. It is not a specific breed but poor handling and training. I have seen incidents at Southland where the dog owner high tails it out of the park after an incident so there is no responsibility or chance for re education of the owner and pet. Accountability!



- My dog was in an altercation with another dog (mutually at fault) and I wanted to get contact info from the other party so that we could discuss how to handle this in the future (as we frequent the same off-leash park). She didn't want to, and while I have taken steps to deal with my dog's issues (training, muzzle, qualified dog walker), she doesn't seem to have done anything, as we had another negative encounter while my dog was muzzled and hers wasn't.
- The owner of a dog that bites may be civilly liable or criminally responsible, and therefore must remain at the scene for identification purposes.
- Yes or they need to exchange contact information ... with relevant parties
- Dog owners often vanish after a bite or attack
- People do not take responsibility. They are ready to blame the victim and the victim will be traumatized and not remember all the details
- I was walking my pitbull (shared ownership) through a neighbourhood alley while on leash. Another, much larger, furry mountain breed dog ran out of an open garage and immediately attacked my pitbull. Though my pitbull defended himself and sustained a neck bite in doing so, I had to kick the other dog off of him and I suffered a small bite wound in the process. The other dog's owner eventually came out and accused my pitbull (who was still held by myself on a leash) of attacking his dog (which was not leashed). I corrected him in protest, but his neighbour from across the alley, who had seen the whole event, looked at me and said "well you know that breed of dog has a bad reputation" whilst pointing at my pitbull. I asked him if he saw the events correctly and he again implied that due to the breed of my dog he would take the side of his neighbour. If it was required that the owner of the other dog had to stay to deal with the situation, I could have easily shown the officer my and my dog's wounds and the lack of on the other dog. Instead without assistance I had to take the injured pitbull and my own wound home under the threat of wrong doing happening to the pitbull.
- To prevent someone from running away and not being held accountable, like a hit and run.
- This is an important part of ensuring that the owner is taking responsibility for their animal, just as one must do in the case of an auto accident.
- Shouldn't this happen anyway? Penalize the owner not the breed.
- If your dog bites someone you should give all the info and take responsibility
- ACCOUNTABILITY, LEGAL REPERCUSSIONS.
- -
- But, only after they are separated from the victim.
- It is merely responsible behaviour.
- I do not support the discrimination against pitbull type dogs.
- Their responsibility
- "We have an American Staffordshire Terrier who has been attacked probably a dozen times in dog parks mostly by Australian shepherd type mix dogs (While our dog has never bit or even nipped any dog or human)
- These owners are not taking responsibility for their dog initiating aggressive behaviour which should be the focus regardless of breed....



- If a chihuahua goes under any other dog and bites their nuts the following reaction isn't going to be "breed specific" as much as it's going to be about physics"
- To prevent an owner not being accountable and responsible
- The owner of the offending dog should be required to stay on scene after they are able to contain the offending dog so that things are handled fully and all contact information is shared.
- At the very least, the owner should have to give the victim their information before leaving the scene.
- the owner should be responsible for the actions of there dog
- Bites should be taken seriously
- It seems some owners run off when they are well aware their dog caused injury or death. They should stay unless there is immediate need to get medical/veterinary help.
- Dog owners must be responsible for the actions of their dogs. There should be a heavy penalty for those that leave the scene without providing contact information.
- The person whose dog attacks a person or dog may not be the owner. What then?
- Just like a vehicle hit and run
- damage assessment can not always be determined at the time of attack.
- Too many people run away
- The owner should be held responsible. Like a car accident, do not leave the scene of the crime.
- The offender causing harm should be required to stay at the scene, pet parents need to be held accountable.
- If it's a small minor bite with no broken flesh and does not require stitches or immediate attending, then no. If the bite is severe, then yes.
- Na
- Yes—but don't point fingers at bully dogs. Small dogs bite too.
- Same as a traffic accident- owner should take responsibility if negligent, pay vet bills (at least in part)
- You need this to insure they have provided the correct vet records for the dog.
- it is important for the owner to be responsible for the action of the dog they own
- The person should be accountable.
- If there is an accident between two car, the parties reasonable are expected to stay on scene otherwise it is considered hit and run, how is this any different.
- Duh?
- The owner needs to be able to explain if the dog or the other party seemed to be at fault, it's too easy to play victim.
- People need to be more responsible
- Having a pet means taking responsibility for their actions. You should be identifiable in a situation like this.
- The owner needs to stay to at least give a vaccination history of the offending animal. Also, in the case of severe bites, compensation may be required so exchange of contact information is essential.
- The owner is responsible for their animal. This is obvious to me



- Enforcement officer needs to verify and document the detailed events of the incident.
- Irresponsible owners need to be held accountable.
- Owners need to take responsibility for having a dog and make the right choices raising their animals
- Leaving the scene of a dog bite should be a crime similar to leaving the scene of an accident while driving.
- This should always occur if the situation is serious. However, the bylaw should be written with flexibility.
- it should be no different then a car accident. Animal bites and attacks fall back to the responsibility of the owner.
- This could help prevent the waste of time and the costs of locating the offending dog and owner. Treat this in a similar way as a hit-and-run driver.
- Should be enforced to take responsibility for pet
- The only exception to this would be if they are unable to control the animal and stop it from attacking or Biting again.
- My dog has been attacked three times and in each case the owner grabbed their dog and hurried off while I checked my dog for injuries. It's akin to a driver fleeing the scene of a MVA. Owners of nuisance dogs should, by law, be required to stay at the scene.
- Owners should be held responsible for bites, not the animal
- You need to be able to track owners.
- The responsibility for the dog's behaviour should be considered the owner's, and if an owner is not careful and attentive to their dog or doesn't train it properly to prevent incidents, they should be held accountable. Owners should be required to exchange their information or speak with an officer to determine whether the dog is safe and being trained properly to prevent any future incidents
- This seems like an acceptable suggestion
- no different from any other physical assault, and should be treated as such.
- Unless the dog needs to be taken away for safety I guess
- I know of an incident where a dog (pit bull) severely attacked 2 smaller dogs. The owner had the dog off leash in a small park where kids play. He took the dog in his car and later tried to surrender it to dog pound saying he had caught it after the attack but it was not his dog. Bye law could not prove that he owned the dog.
- Owners of aggressive or vicious pets should be held responsible if their pet bites.
- This seems to be self-evident - responsible dog owners should do this automatically.
- They should have to stay until the other party is ok with it or authorities arrive
- Accountability.
- This gives a clear idea as to what happened and both sides of the story.
- It's the owner's fault that the dog was trained so poorly as to bite or otherwise behave poorly. The punishment should be on the owner, not the dog
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for any incident that may happen. They should stay on scene absolutely.



- Our Jack Russell terrier was bitten by a pit bull on Long Beach near Tofino. The pitbull was unleashed and the owner came up and clipped the leash on and walked away. My sister, who is a by-law officer with City of Edmonton, says that is very typical. Even if you had a law, I doubt people would obey it. There should be a law anyway.
- Need to get both sides to the story as quickly as possible IE was the dog being provoked or not
- Unless it is unsafe to do so. However, the victim should always have contact information for the defendant. The defendant needs to explain themselves to enforcement officers before having time to calculate a defence.
- It's just like a car accident. You can't just leave the scene. Info needs to be exchanged; illness, vaccines, severity of altercation to the bylaw officer, also the officer can determine if it's a first time offense.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs exhibiting dangerous behaviour.
- Far too often these people wander off leaving the owner of the victim left to not only pay for vet bills on their own, but the dog who did the biting could do it again.
- Virtually every story I read about a dog attack involves the owner leaving the scene and avoiding any recourse.
- Owners should always take responsibility in their dogs actions because if they raised the dog correctly it should never bite.
- In my experience at public places -- mainly dog parks -- (have owned 2 docile and friendly dogs in the past), owners of animals that tend to bite or attack KNOW that this behaviour is part of the animal's pattern, and often do nothing to prevent it. They are more likely to try and get away.
- The owner is responsible for how their dog acts, stay and take ownership of what happened. That way people can get these situations taken care of faster and easier
- A pet owner needs to take responsibility for the actions of their pet. Too many times, victims of attacks are left without the proper information from an offending pet, and left with huge bills.
- Share information for sure.
- The owner is responsible for the dog. A dog bite is serious event that needs to be investigated and all parties involved must stay at the scene, like any other serious event.
- They are the party responsible for the dog, therefore they should be responsible for the fall out of said incident
- So many are not held responsible for their animals actions. Just like a car accident, both parties need to exchange information. And it should be a by law to be required to do so. If the owner of the guilty animal fails to do so and is later found responsible for the incident... more fines should be added for not providing information.
- Owners who do not control their dogs and they know they have a dangerous dog/pet should be required to stay in the place of accident and maybe be banned from owning a dog
- It's the same concept as a traffic collision. You can't leave the scene until it is properly dealt with
- In the case of an actual injury
- Just like any accident where someone needs medical assistance, the owner of the pet should be responsible for the assault inflicted by their animal.



- I think leaving the scene of someone is hurt or injured should be criminal
- Like hitting someone's car, people should wait and make sure everyone is okay and if they need to proceed legally.
- For the same reason a person involved in a car accident must stay. Unless the dog bit because it was antagonized, the owner must stay. It is not common for a dog owner to not know their dog has a problem. Bites don't "just happen".
- My dog was involved in an altercation at an off-leash park. My dog lost the fight and needed minor medical. The owners of the other dog were great- they paid half the vet bill and followed up for the next 3 weeks while my dog healed. Neither dog is vicious or dangerous, they just simply had a dog disagreement. This should be the example of the right thing to do.
- They are the responsible owner of the dog that does the biting. All owners are responsible for the actions of their pets. So many owners are not in control of their dogs and are walking them with long leashes and not short leashes where they can control the dog's actions easier should it lunge out at someone or another animal all of a sudden.
- Often owners know their dogs are aggressive and in my experience they don't remain at the scene
- You can't deal with the dog if the owner takes off and makes it difficult to find them or the dog. Leaving the scene of a bite should be punishable in some way and is totally inappropriate
- Just like when a car accident happens, if a biting incident happens everyone involved as well as the witnesses should wait at the scene for an enforcement officer to arrive and take statements with contact details for each person.
- The dog owner remaining at the scene is basic responsibility and human decency.
- This should be common sense and I thought it was a rule already
- Provide proof that the animal has had their vaccinations.
- Owners are ultimately responsible and should be mandated to BE accountable.
- Unless the owner is actively retrieving the animal if loose - assistance at the scene should mirror policies in MVA events
- Leaving the scene should be punishable
- As with the scene of a car accident, if you cause damage to a person or their property you should be responsible and supply your information in order to accept responsibility.
- Frequently persons whose dog has bitten someone the owner takes off
- It is comparable to a hit and run
- The owner must be held accountable
- My pitbull has been attacked 5 times at off-leash dog parks by dogs that are not pit bulls!! he has never related but I tell the owners of the aggressive dogs that if it was my dog that attacked theirs he would be put down and there would be a huge article in the paper about how vicious pitbulls are! This is as small minded as being prejudice as hating a race of humans due to what you've heard or one person's actions!! Open your mind!!! My dog is known as the friendliest, most social and loving dogs at the off-leash park!
- Both sides of story, view dog's behaviour.



- Dog bites, FROM ALL BREEDS, EVEN SMALL ONES, can result in serious injury, and often dogs who bite are put into very uncomfortable situations, unless life threatening, BOTH parties should remain until the situation is sorted out. If someone kicks a dog and the dog bites, that needs to be looked at, not just that dogs are biting randomly, because they usually do not.
- It should be considered an accident and treated as such. It would also keep the wrong dog/owner from being accused.
- Owner should be responsible for dogs behaviour .
- Dog owners must provide information about the health of their animal, as that has direct impact on other people and animals. They need to provide proof that dog has all appropriate vaccines as well.
- Just so the offending dog's owner can pay the Vet Bill.
- Provided circumstances are taken into consideration - if the other person was being aggressive or something similar the person should not be required to stay
- Based on the severity of the bite and the nature of the interaction. If someone is antagonizing the pet and the pet reacts, it should not be the responsibility of the pet owner. However, if there is an unprovoked bite there should be a sharing of information at the very least to make sure the dog has been appropriately vaccinated.
- Yes, because if they do need medical attention that comes at a fee, the owner of the dog should pay for it. Only reason I would not like this to happen is if the dog gets euthanized for the bite. There are no situations that I believe should result in euthanization. It is never the dogs fault.
- It is the responsibility of the owner.
- How is this not already a rule?
- The dog only follows its owner. That's what a dog does. So if a dog bites then the owner is responsible. And should be held accountable.
- This includes all dogs. Cocker spaniels are one of the worst dogs for bites but no one ever talks about that.
- A dog bite is never a dog's fault. It is always a human error, or a lack of training or control by the human. The human owner should be liable for any of his/her pet's actions.
- Similar to a vehicle incident, I think owners need to remain responsible for the actions of their animals and should be willing to work with law enforcement if necessary
- Being accountable for the dog should be a requirement of dog guardianship.
- I believe if a dog, any type of breed was to harm another animal or human if it's the owners fault then yes I believe they should swap information but if it's the other companys fault then I believe information is to be swapped but is told to be the truth about the incident and only should face consequences if it's their fault
- Because they should be responsible for any vet bills and leave contact info (like at a car accident).
- Owners are responsible for ensuring their pets are properly trained and cared for. It is also necessary that they provide their viewpoint, in case the animal was being harassed and bit out of self preservation.
- Just like damaging personal property it is still your responsibility to follow up.
- Why shouldn't they stay and offer assistance and their info?



- Owners need to be in control and if there's an incident, need to take responsibility. This includes a bite victim who was at fault due to not following bylaws or requests for additional consideration. The majority of incidents are actually due to the "victim" refusing to listen to requests for space or having their own dog on leash in designated areas.
- this is so very important - accountability is key to hold owners responsible
- Owners need to be held accountable. They need to train their pet properly.
- Yes, much like a car accident, people should remain on the scene. However, how long can a person realistically wait? From what I understand it can take enforcement officers a very long while to attend the scene. This will be a tough one to enforce. People need to be responsible for their actions and the actions of their pets but there are again many things to take into consideration. Example. Dog A bites Dog B. However Dog A was on-leash and Dog A's owner made it very clear that Dog A doesn't like dogs that they do not know running up to them. Dog B was off-leash. The incident occurs in an on-leash residential area. Dog A is not aggressive and has no history of attacking. Dog B is not aggressive and has no history of attacking dogs. However Dog B's owner goes into a rage and reacts terribly. Accusing Dog A's owner of having a bad dog that needs a muzzle. Dog A's owner feels unsafe and chooses to leave the scene before things escalate further. In this situation perhaps it is better that Dog A and owner leave the scene. They could call the city from the safety of their own home.
- Even for car accidents both parties are required to stay at the scene/give info. Should be no different here.
- As long as it was safe to do so, if an incident occurred in which there was sufficient severity to engage an enforcement officer the dog owner should be able to provide that information if necessary.
- It's the same as a car crash, no hit n runs.
- It is important to make owners responsible. Most cases it is not the dog but the owner not being responsible
- If a specific dog itself has bitten another person or attacked an animal the owner should be liable.
- Owners need to be held responsible for the behaviour of their pet.
- It should be the same as a serious car accident, you should remain at the scene until all information has been collected by an officer
- It's the responsible thing to do
- If your dog bites you need to be held accountable and if it did not you need to defend your animal immediately to avoid false claims
- Information should be collected from the offending dogs owner. Dogs that repeatedly bite should be euthanized
- While walking with a friend and her 2 pitbulls, another dog (lab/shepherd) ran up and bit one of the pitbulls resulting in over \$1000 vet bill for antibiotics and stitches. Because the owner of the biting dog took off, the owner of the victim was left with a scared/injured dog and a massive vet bill and there are no repercussions for the "non aggressive" dog



- Many dogs bites occur between dogs without the owner of the offending dog remaining at the scene and the owner of the victim dog is left with a vet bill.
- Taking responsibility for a dog's actions is part of dog ownership. The only exception would be if it is safer to remove the dog from the situation. Under those circumstances the dog should be removed from the area, but the owner should still report the incident or provide their contact information from a distance.
- If a dog bite were serious resulting in broken skin, injury, bleeding, broken bones etc the dog owner should be required to give their contact information to the victim and have the incident filed with an enforcement officer in the event injuries require additional care, medical bills, time missed from work, recovery time, overall impact to victims life ect. This should be treated the same as a car accident where the owner of an animal is identified and held responsible for the bite.
- It may not be the dog owner at the scene so this would help people to identify the people and animal involved in the scenario.
- Any dog that bites a person or dog the owner of that dog no matter the breed should be held responsible.
- I view it as the same as a hit and run if they don't stay there.
- Also officer should be allowed to remove dog from owner permanently if owner has been negligent more than 2xs
- It's the owner who needs to learn to train the animal. They are the ones who should be held accountable.
- This would show taking responsibility for your dog's behaviour
- Absolutely. I was attacked by a dog when I was young and it is very important that everyone stays on scene until police and bylaw can get there.
- But also to possibly defend the actions of the dog. Get the full picture.
- Too many owners of vicious dogs do not take responsibility for their dog's actions.
- Not sure why you require an explanation. Clearly owners responsibility no different from an auto crash
- I used to be a meter reader. I have had a few occasions where owners would weaponize thier dogs. My worst bite was from a lady I revive assurance she put in the house. But she didn't, the dog she got to protect her kids and property did what she trained it to. Bit me badly when I entered the yard with her still waving me in. There are stupid people with dogs and some stupid people think it funny & cute to tease dogs. I had a cocker x I rescued, was a pretty good dog, a kids dog, but I think his previous family teased him. One day my husband at the time opened the garage door, was going to cut the grass. The dog loved to sit just on the side of the garage. Suddenly shock and surprise the neighbourhood paperboy went by on his bike. The dog shot out of the garage and charge red him viciously growling. We grabbed him and were stunned. The kid left and the neighbours came over to tell us this kid pounds on our front window when we are gone to work, while he's delivering papers. Well here's the thing, we. Didn't get paper delivery. His dad shows up threatening to sue, kid. Has spiked gashes in his shin, from his bike petal actually. The neighbours came over again. Was the



only thing that saved his word our word. At that time Yyc would have seized our dog and put him down.

- Owner may explain why their dog bit I.e. previous injury to part of body that bitten dog may be near, previous attack by similar dog. Not an excuse for their dog to bite but to react. Important owner be present.
- It means you can get health information and follow up if needed.
- I think as long as they don't need to leave to get emergency care for themselves or their dog, they should have to stay. If they have provided accurate information so they can be contacted, leaving should not be penalized.
- The owners need to take responsibility so if that means the victim will have vet bills due to the dog bite, the owner of the biting dog should be paying those bills.
- This seems obvious. Not staying is like hitting someone with a car and driving away.
- As a dog owner I say yes, fleeing the scene of an incident of a dog bite is no different than a hit and run.
- This would be difficult though as when it happens is is very traumatic for the dog owners and dogs involved so standing around and waiting would be difficult. There was nowhere to add this comment but I'm tired of cities targeting breeds, it's a question of responsible, educated pet owners. Make a course mandatory (in person with your dog) before a license is granted. Make people enroll in a Behavior class for their dog. Terriers And Rottweilers are not aggressive by nature, it has to do with the owner, the training and even the breeders. Quit accusing the dogs and go to the source - the OWNERS, BREEDERS. EDUCATION PLEASE!!!
- Your animal bites someone, you should stick around and talk to whoever shows up about it. It's like a hit and run.
- If they do not there should be a criminal charge and fines much the same as leaving the scene of a vehicular accident.
- All pet owners hold have to do this it is no different than leaving the scene of a car accident.
- Yes, but consideration needs to be made for safety factors ie it may be unsafe to keep the dog that bit there if it can't be controlled
- Tired of hearing about pit and run all the time. Pit owners are notorious for leaving the scene when their dogs attack
- Because most times the offender don't want to assume responsibility.
- Yes because otherwise it's no different than leaving the scene of a crime
- Of course. The dog is only doing what is in its nature or what the owner has allowed. The owner should receive the consequences not the dog. These consequences should include medical bills being paid and fines and proof of completion of a training program that is more then obedience and should include canine behaviour and dominance. I have had large muscular dogs and I only do dominance training and have had the most loving and happy and gentle dogs, including 2 pit bulls
- Everyone needs their side of the story being told. My Pitbull was attacked in Regina and Calgary and the offender just said it was my fault because I have a Pitbull when my Pitbull hadn't bit their



dog and my Pitbull would hide behind me. All dog breeds can be aggressive if they do not have access to appropriate training.

- That way if this particular dog is doing this frequently then the mandatory training order can be issued then and there
- owner must take responsibility to prevent it from reoccurring.
- The owners are the problem, not the dog. They often flee the scene, especially because they know the dog has issues and they are irresponsible in not training or staying away from dog parks or areas known to have other dogs ie hiking trails
- The same as harming someone with your car
- Would ensure that incident is handled appropriately
- Their responsibility if a dog bites, just like it is getting in an accident and staying at the scene
- This is reasonable, creating bylaws specific to one dog breed is not.
- if necessary then yes, the rule should ensure they stay but when it is not necessary they should be free to leave
- Too many times dogs that have shown a propensity to attack are encouraged by their owners. Like a car accident, all involved parties should stay.
- It is the owners responsibility for controlling their dog and facing the consequences of their dogs actions especially when it hurts another animal or person.
- Depending on the actual bite. Given the current climate with cops and white privilege, this scenario would need to be handled kindly and properly.
- if it is serious or a deep bite then yes you should stay with them until you get help
- It is important to have full knowledge regarding this dogs vaccinations and health status. At the time of the incident, the victim of the bite may not think to ask these questions. It is important that there can be communication after the event so everything can be disclosed.
- there are 2 sides and usually biting behavior is due to dogs who are off leash (small dogs) that bother and are in the face of well controlled on leash dogs.
- My cousin's dog was bitten by another dog and the woman fled the scene. It took months to track down the owner and my cousin had to bring her dog in for care and treatment.
- This is the definition of being a responsible pet owner. Dogs should not be bullied based on their breed or appearance.
- Details should be given, but again, all details of the incident should be recorded so there is a fair assessment of the animal's behavior. Especially if it is a first time offense.
- Almost impossible to find them after the fact.
- All dog owners should be responsible enough to provide information regarding shots and name, address and telephone of the owner of the biting dog.
- Just like the scene of a motor accident!
- If any dog of ANY breed bites and severely injures another party the owner is absolutely responsible to share information to cover any costs
- Responsible owners.



- Similar to car accidents, you are responsible for your dog's actions so contact information is important somthe dog is not needed to be searched for.
- the owner is responsible for the animals actions. There's a fine for hit and run, why not bite and run?
- This should be treated no differently that a hit and run, the dog owner of a dog that bites should remain at the scene of the offence.
- Both sides of the story need to come out. A dog biting isn't always because a dog is aggressive, the circumstances surrounding the incident must be taken into account.
- Or at least provide contact info
- Vehicle owners are required to remain at the scene of an accident, it should be the same dog owners. In addition, leaving the scene of a dog bite should be an additional penalty, beyond the penalty for the bite.
- People should be responsible for their dogs actions.
- Any incident involving the dog involves the owner of the dog.
- I wish there was a circumstantial answer rather than a yes or no because it's situational. Obviously if a bite was severe, of course I would expect this. I have accidentally been bitten by a few dogs, one a toy poodle, when I was a kid - the bite broke skin but I was fine. Would that dog be as likely to be euthanized than a German Shepard or a pit bull?
- It works the same as a car accident. If a animal bites another animal, the person should stay and wait for help to arrive
- However, if there is a dog that was provoked by another dogs bad behaviour, or the dog is anxious, it might be best/safest to keep a distance and or leave the area. It's not the same as a car accident. The cars don't want to keep hitting each other once they crash.
- assuming this is dealt with in a timely manner and both side of the incident are required to remain (ie the "victim, unless emergency medical attention is required).
- Similar to a car accident, it is prudent to obtain all relevant information from the offender.
- Same as a car accident
- There needs to be more accountability for dog owners and remaining at the scene and sharing their information is a good first step.
- If there is an incident then the owner should stay on the scene.
- So they don't run off.
- It should be treated like a car accident- you cannot leave the scene.
- it's fair
- Within reason. Anything that does not involve a visit to the vet shouldn't be considered.
- This should be common sense, but a rule in place seems to be required nowadays
- Any responsible dog owner will take responsibility for their dogs actions. It's those that don't that cause problems for the rest of society.
- You are responsible for your pet. Every owner of every pet should be required to stay at the scene - much like remaining at the scene of a motor vehicle accident.
- treat it the same as a vehicular collision in that respect.



- That dog owner needs to take responsibility for their pet's actions and behaviour.
- Dog behaviour is the responsibility of the owner & so many owners do not own up to this
- Just like any other incident involving injury like a car accident, then a dog owner should stay. This is putting the responsibility on the owner.
- Often the owners of a dog who bites try to get away to avoid any fines or having a dog taken. These are not responsible pet owners.
- It should be the same as a hit and run if you run off without offering assistance and your information, etc.
- Each person takes responsibility for their dog.
- But they should be able to leave temporarily to secure their dog in car or home but must return
- It's the responsible course of action.
- Same as a vehicle accident. You should stay and swap information
- A bite against a human should require the owner to speak with enforcement officer. Treat this similar to hit and run with a vehicle.
- There are two sides to every story.
- What has happened is essentially an assault. The fact that the animal is under the care and control of the owner/walker places the responsibility on the owner and/or walker. So long as this is available to be applied for ALL dog bites from chihuahua to golden retriever.
- That is basic responsible pet ownership as well as human decency and respect to make sure all parties are ok.
- If you leave that should have a huge fine.
- Just like any accident you are required to stay at the scene.
- Not only for the victim, dog owner should be responsible for their animal and/or be able to defend themselves if the other person or their dog provoked the bite etc.
- An owner is responsible for the actions of their animal and should remain at the scene of an incident to properly convey any necessary information
- Is that not obvious? That is common decency.
- To defend the dog if necessary. Not all bites are the fault of the dog.
- If your dog is in right or wrong you need to stay to explain situation, I was getting mugged and dog bit the mugger or the other dog got loose and came bolting at us and my dog thought we were being attacked.
- The dog owner will know the health history of the dog which will help for the medical examination. The owner can also give an insight to why the dog bit to help against unfair charges due to protecting.
- it is the way a dog is raised and not breed that dictates aggression. The owner should be charged
- doesn't matter what dog it just matters how u train them
- in case of further incidents
- If the attack from the dog was to protect the owner I think enforcement should know that.



- Depending on the severity of the bite. If two dogs get in a fight and there are bites but neither are severe then no. If there is no broken skin, no. If a dog attacks another human or animal unprompted, then absolutely. If the bites are life threatening or cause serious injury, then yes.
- Similar to a hit and run, owners of dogs who cause harm to someone should be required to stay at the scene.
- Just like a car accident, you should remain at the scene.
- Can't flee the scene. Should wait for reasonable amount of time.
- Owners should be responsible for training their dog and should be present anytime there is an offense
- Owners need to be held accountable for their pets actions
- This process could serve as early prevention. My concern is with staffing/process - if one of my dogs were involved in a biting incident, I would share my contact information (and photograph any visible marks). Would "talking" to the enforcement officer be by telephone, or would all involved be expected to wait for an in person meeting? This could dramatically escalate the situation.
- All side of the story should be looked at. And responsible owners would not leave the scene if warranted
- It is good to follow a chain of evidence in case the bitten animal/human develops any type of infection.
- If one adult attacked another adult the correct thing would be to stay at the scene, the same should apply to the pet of that adult in the case if that pet attacks another pet or human
- Banning an entire breed because you can is the wrong thing to do and literally just proves the underlying values of racism that you people live your lives in. If this "law" gets passed the wonderful friendly lives of hundreds probably thousands will be lost and not a single person besides some Karen's in their 50s will be happy. And you'll be to blame.
- A dog that bites is a serious issue - there should be consequences for doing so.
- It's like any "accident" everyone should stay and make a report and a witness should stay as well
- Only if it is safe for everyone involved
- If you're in a car accident or assault someone you need to stay so why would this be different, common sense people.
- To ensure if an offense occurred, it is dealt with and reported to the city for follow up.
- The person should be held responsible.
- There is no way of tracking aggressive dogs if the owners aren't staying on scene.
- I believe the owner should have to stick around if both parties agree the situation warrants it. Depending on the situation obviously. But also any witness's for either side would also need to stick around so it's not a "he said she said" situation
- Keeps people accountable
- In any situation, if something goes awry, all parties should stay on the scene for it to be assessed and proper action taken place (making sure everyone, including the dog, is ok and gets any help they may need).



- People should be responsible pet owners. The [removed] (pardon my language) discrimination about Pitbull breeds is disgusting. Maybe we should have bylaws to arrest people for being crappy humans instead.
- There are two sides to every story.
- Makes sense to get the information right away, however not all circumstances would necessarily allow this in all situations.
- Treat it like you would a car accident
- No different than a car accident. Challenging but there are potential very fees so it sounds like the right thing to do. Need to have parameters - damage done and criteria.
- Seems like common sense. You shouldn't leave a car accident, why leave an animal attack?
- Owner taking responsibility !
- If a dog bit someone that is similar to an assault.
- "It is not only large breed dogs that bite. I and my dog have been bitten by small breed dogs. If the owner had stayed on both occasions then there would be better data and tracking on the types of dog breeds that are more likely to bite a person or another dog."
- The person being bitten needs to know the dog's vaccination background and keep in touch if anything persists.
- This is serious and needs to be dealt with immediately. It will likely happen again if not addressed.
- Totally anecdotal but I have heard a lot of stories about dogs attacking other dogs, and the owner leaving the scene with their dog immediately after it happens. It would be good if they were legally required to stay at the scene (though practically speaking I am not sure if the threat of a bylaw offence will really do that much)
- An owner should always be at fault for their animal's behaviour as they are the one who trained it, intentional or not and are at fault like any other accident.
- The breed of dog doesn't matter at all but I do support the city cracking down on nuisance dogs (aka dogs who have already had incidences and issues) but it's not the dogs fault, the owners need to be responsible and accountable.
- A person needs to be able to give their side of an incident in order to best resolve the issue. This needs to be the case with any breed of dog not just large pit bull breed dogs that you are so wrongfully targeting
- I mean if they are a responsible pet owner, they will take responsibility. If they leave, then you know who to take away because they don't deserve pets.
- Dog owners and their behaviour influence dog behaviour directly. If they remain on the scene, law enforcement can get some idea of the human's influence on the incident and their animal.
- Dog owner must take responsibility.
- As a dog under the law is considered a possession, an owner needs to take responsibility for their possession. Just like a car accident, it's illegal to leave the scene.
- Owners MUST be accountable. Leaving the scene would be an admission of guilt that the owner was negligent.



- I think everyone should be present to ensure that there is a fair investigation, and that there is no bias.
- It is important for the owner to provide contact information as the animal's health history may be required when seeking medical treatment (if necessary) for the bite.
- I am agreeing so the person can defend themselves but it would be hard to keep a dog at a scene of an incident if they were being aggressive or territorial.
- A dog is the owners responsibility, no matter the breed. They need to take ownership over the dogs poor behaviour and live with the consequences of their poor training of said dog
- Too often, owners flee the scene of a bite or attack.
- This will help with random dog attacks that seem to happen and then the owners can take responsibility of their dog.
- It is much easier to identify dogs/owners who are a problem if they don't vanish into the wind
- "The animal is YOUR responsibility, that is your child if the dog did something bad it's your responsibility no, if ands or butts. But training will be a huge difference! Also if the humans are questioned more, as a pose to "making money" then this offense against pit bulls wouldn't be a thing. It's all on the humans, if you were raised with abuse would you get put down it's a food for thought thing and it's unfair. They were
- Here before us and we get to judge how they live or die. Honestly they're genuinely amazing until a human gets involved it's just not fair."
- For tracking purposes and possible fines
- I have been bitten very badly by a dog. It was not a pitbull or any of the other breed listed above as a "vicious" breed. It was a smaller mid sized dog that the owner did not think was necessary to train because of its size. I had to go to the hospital for help. The owner of the dog simply walked away and I was therefore forced to have multiple shots because of the unknown health situation of the dog that attacked me.
- As a dog owner you must take responsibility for your pet. Just like driving a car, if there's an accident you must stay at the scene.
- The owner should be responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- While the rule may encourage respectful folks to stay at the scene of an incident, it would likely have no impact for the non respectful folks who are most likely to be involved in an incident. I think the threat of criminal charges is the only way to make that latter segment respect the rules. I'd really rather see rules focus on the owner and not the breed, though, because in my opinion the owner is the source of the problem.
- It doesn't matter the breed of the dog. It's the training and ownership. A responsible owner would support this.
- "At the end of the day it's the owners responsibility. They are in care of that animal and they have to answer to the situation at hand.



- No different than a parent of a young child who has committed a crime or harmed someone/an animal."
- Offending dog owner should be responsible for any vet bills acquired as a result of their dogs actions. And a fine should be issued.
- I think this is just being socially responsible
- You can contact the owner if you need further info and it gives the owner a chance to explain or make amends
- If a dog bite happened due to a fight then yes. If it was not intentional, say during play and an accident happened, then no.
- Similar to a car accident If there is a severe incident they should have to wait for enforcement officer
- I feel that if someone's dog bites another they should be responsible for any damages caused.
- I don't see how this would be enforceable.
- Dogs aren't born aggressive, the owners train them to be aggressive. You can't single out breeds because people on media platforms show videos of dogs biting. Any dog can bite!
- It's like hitting someone with your cat, except it's living creatures involved. Of course owners should be responsible for reporting to police and remaining at the scene of an incident
- This is necessary to prevent future incidents.
- If an owner leaves the scene they should be fined a larger amount similar to fleeing a hit and run
- Any breed of dog can bite. Small dogs bite ankles and that hurts as well. Yet they get away with being a small dog. Do not point the finger at larger breed dogs.
- If a dog bites someone they both parties should stay. Tell both their side of the story, and decide further action from there.
- This increases the accuracy of incident reports and could reduce the number of dogs being euthanized
- Owners need to be responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- Not sure what to explain - this seems obvious. I'm glad that this has happened with all incidents that I have been involved in - people are generally courteous and act appropriately.
- If there is a dog who bites a person, the owner of that dog should hold accountable for that dog's actions.
- Yes if ANY dog bites the owner should be held responsible. This is not breed specific. Even if it's a chihuahua (who have the highest bite rate by the way!)
- The owner is at just as much fault, if not more than the animal. Owners should be able to read their pet's body language and prevent the acceleration of altercations
- I imagine there are a lot of people who would want to flee the scene if their dog caused an altercation. It's important to have controls in place to prevent this from happening.
- It comes with responsible pet ownership.
- This will help with identification and assuming responsibility for the incident.
- I think that by leaving shows they are not accountable for their actions and that of their dogs.
- Owners are 100% responsible for pet's behavior



- Any accident, you should stay and be present, give your information and your side of the story.
- Accountability is so important. As someone who is allergic to many pets, I get so frustrated by the idea that a person who chooses to be a pet owner could dodge accountability.
- When you own a pet they're part of the family you wouldn't run away if your kid got in a fight or you're in a car accident same thing
- This would depend on the severity of the situation.
- Like car accident trade info then wait for peace officer or head to where ever to report the incident
- Makes sense
- Yes if it is a vicious bite causing damage, no if it is a playful bite or nip
- Contact information needs to be shared but not sure it makes sense to keep dogs who are antagonistic against each other at the scene if it could potentially escalate the incident.
- Like any other accident
- At the very least provide contact info to the other person involved. It's called being decent and responsible.
- Then the dog owner must take responsibility for their animal.
- So that both sides of the story could be heard. Also, to gather information one the owner and dog for future use.
- Yes, if the bite is major/caused significant injury. If it's a nip, no. If it's a bite while playing, no.
- I think doing so is part of being a responsible dog owner. No matter the size of the dog
- If you hit a car, you have to stay and give your insurance. It is the same with a dog.
- It's the responsible thing to do as a pet owner!
- Of course!!!
- I think all parties should remain, unless medical attention is required. Every aspect of the incident must be questioned. The dog that did the biting may have done so in their defence, not out of aggression.
- Of course. The behaviour and actions of the dog are the responsibility of the owner. It should be no different than remaining at the scene of a car accident.
- This should go for owners of any breed.
- Unless the situation requires the dog to be removed from the area immediately for safety concerns.
- Responsible dog owners would do this anyway
- We have to stay on the scene for a fender bender in our cars where no one even gets hurt. We should ABSOLUTELY have to stay on the scene if someone gets hurt by an animal
- n/a
- Any time a dog bites someone the owner has the responsibility to take care of the person or animal that was injured. They absolutely should stick around and make a statement.
- There are 2 sides to every story. The dog is not always in the wrong in this scenario.
- As the owner of a dog in that situation it only seems fair to have your side and take responsibility
- People take off because they don't want to be held accountable for their dog's behaviour (or be forced to pay veterinary fees for damage that their dog has done to other dogs/cats)



- It's like the scene of an accident. You don't just walk away
- Goes to history. Can ease tension a victim may feel.
- Proper reporting and proper processing
- If you own a dog, be a responsible dog owner.
- A dog owner should take responsibility for the dogs behavior, regardless of breed...
- Responsible pet ownership
- Yes. They need to take responsibility.
- It is important the owner be responsible for their dog's actions
- This is effectively no different then a vehicular accident in terms of causing bodily harm.
- Mandatory and failure results in fines
- Like a vehicle accident make dog owners accountable for their dogs behaviors
- Just like a car accident info should be shared
- The owner of a dog that injured a person or another dog should stay to help if they need it.
- Owners should be responsible enough for their dogs that this is a given. This scenario has nothing to do with their breed, I've seen labs that are more vicious than pit bulls and they are just ignored completely as theyre considered a "family pet".
- Breed specific legislation is dangerous.
- No brainer. You should always stay on scene of any accident where first responders have to be called.
- To follow up on dog owner having received more training to correct dogs behavior going forward.
- Long enough to share contact info if bite is severe enough to cause damage.
- Considering the dog is under control at that point.
- I think this is just common sense the same way you don't leave the scene of an accident or it's declared a hit and run
- If necessary. Depending on severity and conditions in hand.
- This would support increasing accountability for owners, ensure easy access to animal health records, and help identify repeat offenders (owners who repeatedly do nothing to improve pet behaviour or take responsibility for damages)
- People need to know the health status of the dog that bit so they can seek the appropriate medical care.
- "It is the owners responsibility to control there dog
- If they do not and the dog bites they need to be held responsible"
- There are two sides to every story so all parties involved need to remain in order tp collect all info.
- Too many people just take off and then the incident is just rumour and misinformation on social media
- Or to contact enforcement to report the incident immediately. Same as car accident.
- It would be a good idea to get the whole context of the situation: was it a provoked or unprovoked bite? Several documents that prove unprovoked bites should be the cases that get escalated, while cases of provoked bites get support or warnings.



- An owner is solely responsible for their dog and their dogs actions. If another dog or person gets hurt, the nuisance dog owner needs to ensure everyone in the situation is taken care of a reasonable amount
- Unless the dog remains aggressive, or circumstances prohibit staying, I don't see why they shouldn't wait for an enforcement officer
- Dog bites can be provoked or unprovoked, if unprovoked the owner should tell their story. They can also be quite serious depending on the severity of the bite, they should absolutely stay put until police arrive.
- As the dog is not the one at fault. The owner is to blame not the dog the dog is doing what they know to protect themselves.
- "Just as you would a car crash, both parties of a dog-biting incident should stay at the scene as the bite could be harmful to the persons health long-term and they may incur hospitalisation fees that they should not be responsible for.
- Also, if the dog and owner has previously been apprehended for a similar crime, it would be helpful for them to stay at the scene so further action can be taken to stop the dog from continuing harming people."
- In many cases, it is the owner, not just the dog, at fault. A dog bite can be very costly at a vet and the owner must take that responsibility. It should be treated like a car accident . If it can be resolved to both parties satisfaction then no enforcement officer is required , but if not ,then one should mediate.
- So it's known who the problem dogs are.
- If a dog bites another person it is not the dogs fault or the breed of dogs fault, it is the owner who is at fault for not properly training their dog. The owner should be held responsible, not the dog.
- Owners should be held accountable if their dog bites someone else
- Just like any accident u need to stay to report
- Dog bites can happen with all breeds. Tracking should occur with no discrimination of breeds.
- The injured person needs to know if they are at risk for anything.
- Their dog hurt someone, so yes, they need to wait and deal with the situation. They are the owners of the dog, and need to be held responsible.
- If a dog were to bite another dog or a person hard enough to warrant medical attention then they should be required to stay on the scene until information can be taken and processed to determine if sanctions should be given. Similar to a car accident wherein the police are called if damage is severe enough.
- I think an owner needs to have more responsibility for their dog. The dog that bites should be required to stay on a persons property for a period of time.
- It's the owners fault. Not the dogs.
- Being a responsible pet owner means that you are just that....responsible for your animal. If they bite a human or other dog the situation should be handled to a level both parties are acceptable with.
- Depends on the severity but if it's bad then there might be medical involved



- BOTH should be required to remain at the scene. Sometimes it is not the offending dogs fault as the aggressor, they may have been provoked or scared.
- Yes, I support this - it's fair.
- N/a
- Yes, OWNERS should be held responsible for how their dog acts.
- Owners need to accept responsibility for their animals.
- A responsible pet owner will stay at the scene. An irresponsible owner or someone who feels as though the rules don't apply to them, such as a small dog owner, will likely walk away. Should someone have a small dog that's acting against these proposed bylaws, whoever handles the case will need to not be bias because of breed.
- I have seen and heard of alot of pitbull attacks and nothing done, this needs to be addressed
- If major hospitalization is required the offending person should be contactable.
- They are accountable for the safety of their animal and responsible for the actions said animal commits on other animals or people in a public space.
- Just as with vehicles, if someone's property causes damage, they should be expected to stay and provide information
- It is the responsibility of owner for their own dog and for the victim of bite.
- Ownership is absolutely required not only for legal reasons, and for public safety.
- I believe it should be like a car accident.
- You need to hear all sides of the story.
- People need to be held more accountable for their animals and there are some people who shouldn't be able to own them if they cannot take care of the ones they have
- I have experienced two dog attacks in my life, one where my daughter was bit and nothing was done (even though it was reported), secondly, at an off leash park where my small dog lost her life by being chewed to death by a pit bull. Both times fortunately, the person stayed on scene; however, I know that isn't always the case. I completely support this and if an owner does not follow said rule, should be fined.
- Yes, I agree that if another person or animal is bitten (by any type of pet not just dogs) that the pet owner should stay at the scene to share incident info.
- The owner needs to be held responsible not the dog.
- if a dog bites a person..or causes serious injury to another dog.. dog fights happen..the onus is on owners to prevent these incidents by being in control of their animal, abiding by leash laws and not leaving animals unattended... all of these things should include all kinds of dogs..not just pitbull type dogs
- to help render first aid and so the officer can get all the information regarding why the attack happen
- I feel that it is the pet pwners responsibility to remain at the scene of the incident and share their personal information, just loke they wpuld in a motor vehicle accident.
- If the parties involved wants to take the matter further, then the offending dog owner should not be allowed to run off without giving contact information.



- Yes, a dog owner who's pet bites a person or animal (UNPROVOKED) should remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer, and deliberately fleeing the scene should be a criminal offense. Exceptions pertaining to ALL biting laws should be made for dogs who are deliberately provoked and/or dogs protecting their owners from attack.
- Though they may need to remove the dog from the situation first.
- But Depends on the severity of the bite
- "It is not always the dog's fault. And there are always 2 sides in a story.
- I have seen strangers, adults and kids, approach a dog without asking the owner if it is ok, and that is when a dog may react.
- Educate people is a MUST"
- This is fair. If your dog does do something, you're responsible for their behaviour.
- Yes but only if there is a safe place for their dog and then as society often tries to take things into their own hands and then more people will get hurt.
- This way its is dog specific information, not breed specific. It irritates me that so many people make incidents BREED specific, which is why we run into issues like this.
- Every dog owner is responsible for their animal; show it if something happens.
- This falls under educating owners.
- A responsible pet owner would do this without question. The people who would run will do so regardless of a bylaw but can now be charged for being irresponsible
- That's just common decency
- If they are able to. owners need to first ensure their animal is no longer causing problems and is under control also may need medical care for their own animal
- Owners need to accept responsibility for the actions they take as owners, and for any aggressive behaviour of their animal.
- If I can't hit someone with my car ajd
- The owner should be held responsible for medical bills and must train their animal.
- Owners not being held accountable is a big reason for aggressive animals and repeating behaviour.
- If there are vet bills, the owner of the biter should pay
- Thats just a responsible thing to do as a pet owner.
- Only if it is a severe bite. If someone's dog badly hurts another person or animal they should be held responsible and fined or something. I don't necessarily think the dog needs to be euthanized or taken away.
- Some people are full of [removed]. You can tell when a dog is aggressive, or afraid and it's important for the owner to be able to say what happened so that the situation can be resolved and the next right steps can be taken to prevent another bite from happening.
- I support declaring nuisance designation for dogs that attack or bite so the identity and contact information must be provided after an incident
- Dog owners involved in an incident must be held responsible for negligence



- I believe if the dog is not in need of medical attention, all witnesses involved need to place a statement and or have a number to call. As well as the dog owner should be present to give their statement of the incident to bylaw. Or police
- Well the dog can't answer for himself...
- Sounds similar to hit and run with vehicles otherwise
- Any dog can bite someone, not just bully breeds. Other dog owners should be held accountable for their own dogs actions. Why is this only about "pit bull" type dogs?!? Chihuahuas, Poodles, Dalmatians are all proven more aggressive yet no one cares about that
- I feel it is necessary to have all the information given from both parties and to make sure the person is okay
- Same as motor vehicle accident. Owner must stay at scen of accident or charged.
- it is the owners responsibility to make sure all parties are ok after an attack
- If a dog attacks a person or another dog and they leave the scene, an enforcement officer may not be able to find them for information later.
- I would hope that they would share contact information but it seems excessive to wait for enforcement. The dog would get much more agitated during this time
- The person or owner of the animal bit needs to know if the biter is up to date on shots, etc. they may be held liable for any medical expenses.
- Owners should be held responsible for not training their dog resulting in these incidents.
- Being able to give both sides of a story is crucial when it comes to the law regardless so by taking both sides into account things may be more fair
- I agree they should remain available if possible. BUT if their animal is hurt and needs emergency attention or they need to go to an ER they should not have to wait around.
- Not as a way to charge them but to make sure any animal who bites has all of its shots.
- For ALL breeds. Small dogs included
- It's is important to hold irresponsible owners accountable. And when there are severe/violent incidents those people need to face consequences.
- T
- If this can be done safely with the dog contained and all people and animals can be calm and distanced.
- It's important to get both sides of the story on record.
- Make people accountable for their pets actions. Reasonable.
- This is an owner's fundamental responsibility
- If you get into a car crash you have to stay on the site and talk to an officer. It's the same logic.
- It is the responsible thing to do.
- Leaving the scene of any incident causing bodily harm is unacceptable.
- If they leave the scene that should be considered fleeing the scene. If anyone was harmed they should be required to stay and speak with victims or officers
- Accountability



- It should be the pet owners responsibility to stay and make sure everything is ok and give their side of the story to Bylaw. Especially in severe situations. Pet owners should take responsibility for their pets at all times. Most of the time it's the owner and not the dog anyway.
 - When a dog is aggressive at the park owners give so many excuses "he's just a puppy" "we are working on it". However you shouldn't be working on it. If I feel that my dog was unsafe because of your dog it should be reported.
 - There have been multiple incidences where owners feel they do not need to take responsibility for their animal, and leave the scene very quickly with no contact information left. This leaves covering fees and such up to the victim of the incident, which is not fair in any instance.
 - Too often the owner takes off and there is no way to track the animal or impose consequence. As well, offenders will often give false information to the victim so they can't be tracked down and the victim is too flustered or upset to realize anything is wrong. An officer could demand identification to ensure follow up.
 - Personal harm towards another has taken place while offending dog was in said persons custody. Therefore, a person with a dog assumes responsibility for dogs actions.
 - It's only logical to take responsibility for it and helping
 - No.
 - If someone was seriously harmed the owner should absolutely remain for give contact information and their side of the story, as with any assault.
 - To make them take responsibility
 - The owner or person responsible for the animal should be present, same as a driver involved in a motor vehicle accident.
 - Should be responsible to offer information
 - Seems appropriate to stay and give information if your dog bites someone.
 - This feels like a necessary step to collect information for billing for related expenses.
 - "The owner is responsible for the pet. If that pet bites someone the owner is responsible and should stay to share information.
-
- The exception would be if the dog can not be settled and the owner needs to get it out of there to prevent more issues."
 - The only time I would disagree is if the dog needed medical attention or they needed to evacuate the area to keep safe.
 - As long as there is a sufficient number of officers. This way the event can be documented properly and the officer can help if there is any disputes
 - Liability. Both views need to be present to find the solution and reasons to why said incident would have occurred.
 - If you get in an accident you stay and give the other person your information same should go for a bite.



- It's the responsible thing to do... people should be answerable for their or their dog's actions
- this way owners side of the altercation is heard
- The owner is the problem - not the breed.
- Because it's not the dogs fault but the owners.
- To help determine what happened accurately and without bias
- This should just be common sense. As a dog owner I could never leaving the scene of an incident with my dog without ensuring the proper steps were taken.
- Tishomingo that there dog is not an aggressive or a threat to others. explain what the circumstances were as to why the dog got aggressive in the first place.
- Breed specific legislation has been proven to be ineffective at preventing dog attacks. I do agree however that nuisance declared dog must go through mandatory behavioural training and that the owner must be responsible at all stages.
- If law enforcement is needed than people should stick around to discuss, and this way the owner can be held accountable for the dog's behavior, not JUST the dog. However I would imagine most situations can be resolved without that.
- "Irresponsible owners must be held accountable It's not the breed it's people --
- Possibly a course the owner has to complete to continue being given the privilege of having companion animals"
- Open communication, ensure all parties are okay, discuss conflicts.
- That is responsible dog ownership
- That is just common decency. The owner needs to confirm that the dog is up to date on shots and remain accountable for possible negligence on the owner's part.
- People should be accountable for allowing their dogs to harm a human, so long as the consequences are uniform. No breed discrimination!
- If someone is bit and the bite gets infected or there are other medical problems they need to be contacted.
- Depends on the situation
- I really shouldn't have to.
- If any dog bites someone the owner should stay present to give information out and deal with law enforcement if the person chooses to go that route
- It is the owner at fault if the dog is aggressive towards anyone or any other pet. So yes the owner should stay put and speak to the enforcement officers. It's not the dogs fault they were given to an incapable owner to train them correctly.
- If there is a situation where a dog has bitten you or your own animal it would be good to have someone there to mediate, if necessary.
- It's like a car accident. If the damage is significant enough, law enforcement should be called and information should be exchanged.
- If a dog harms someone the owner should stay to help and take responsibility.



- if there is any kind of incident, all information should be given to help effectively figure out what happened and come up with a solution
- Alright let me be clear: I think the rules slated to effect pit bulls are short-sighted and anti-intellectual. Dogs need to be dealt with on an individual basis: a friend of mine was brutally attacked by a Poodle. A family friend's child was permanently mangled by a Shar Pei. These proposed bylaws just seem... dumb.
- i think the owner should have to take responsibility for their animal's actions. it is like staying at the scene of a vehicle accident.. if they don't the animal owner should be arrested and charged.
- The owner leaving the situation after a dog bite, could be equated to a "hit and run." Owners should be open to talking with officers if needed.
- Pet ownership is a responsibility and when a dog is attacked, it can become aggressive toward other dogs as a result. Owners need to be held responsible for any behavior of their dog.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs so should be there is something happens. But that also goes along with training. I don't believe that breed specific bylaws are a good idea- it is better to ensure owners have the incentive to train their dogs.
- the owner should stay at the scene of the incident so they are able to share their side of the story.
- This ensures higher accountability
- Yes of course. A responsible pet owner would stay at the scene
- Responsible owners always stay at a bite or aggressive dog situation.
- A poor dog owner is no different than anybody else when causing an injury and fleeing from the scene of a crime is illegal.
- I consider it the same as a vehicle accident. Stay and share info
- any responsible pet owner should and would stay at the scene
- Many owners of dangerous dogs don't take responsibility for their dogs and allow them to get away with injuring or killing humans or other animals.
- It is important to have both sides of the story. What were the actions leading up the the bite, was it provoked or not?
- This is responsible dog ownership
- Owners should be able to be held accountable for any incidents their pets caused, therefore, they should remain at the scene to do so.
- Just makes sense
- Dogs bite because of handler errors.
- I think it's only logical
- Both sides of the story are important.
- Owners should be held responsible for their dogs. That is what responsible dog owners would do. They also owe it to their dog.
- There are quite often mitigating circumstances and hopefully the owner can explain.
- I feel that is part of responsible animal ownership (similar to an accident with a vehicle)
- It's the responsible thing to do



- They need to take responsibility for their pets actions
- Yes, if it's safe for the person to do so and bylaw is attending.
- It is similar to a car incident... don't leave.
- No matter the circumstance if the said "golden retriever" went at my pitbull and hurt him instead of vice versa. Like [removed] anyone would believe it wasn't my fault. That's the Discrimination wrong with this entire survey. "It's all pitbulls" no it's the owner!
- If you get in a car accident you have to stay on the scene unless it's a risk to safety. So same should apply to this.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for his/her pet's actions
- Owner needs to stay at the scene, otherwise there is no enforcement and the irresponsible dog owner is gone.
- AS THE OWNER THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PETS BEHAVIORS/ACTIONS. IT IS ALSO THE MORAL THING TO DO SPECIALLY IF IT IS A MINOR INVOLVED.
- Again the owner is responsible for their dogs action no matter what breed
- If the bite is severe enough to cause bleeding I believe the owner should be held responsible for sharing information to determine what actions to follow up with and if the bitten dog needs medical attention it should be up to the owner of the dog that caused the injury and necessary socializing training should be held for the dog.
- Should be treated like an automotive accident, including fleeing the scene being an offense.
- The owner is responsible for their dog's behavior. In the same way someone would be expected to stay on the scene of an automobile accident where someone is injured, a dog owner should remain when their animal hurts someone.
- Owner should be held liable. It's no different then leaving the scene of an accident. They should be convicted if they did so
- It would be helpful to know history of dog and can track owner if this is a repeated offence.
- they need to be held accountable for their dog.
- An owner should be responsible for their dogs actions and it should be documented properly by law enforcement.
- Yes, if person expresses desire of offending dog owner and dog to do so
- It's like hit and run. If you run after a dog has injured a person you are accomplice in the act. It should be criminal if you run.
- I assumed that rule was already in place.
- If any injury happens to any person on account of me or my pets it is my responsibility to remain at the scene until all information is collected. Really high fines should be levied where the person and/or pet flees the scene.
- It's an accident and just like a vehicle accident, you must remain on scene
- Too easy for people to take off with the offending dog prior to police / bylaw arriving. Bylaw is understaffed and does not work 24 / 7. There should be a known bylaw saying if you don't remain at the scene or provide accurate info then you will be charged. Take responsibility for your dog's actions. And I'm a dog owner.



- The owner is held responsible. It allows the dog and owner to receive proper training to prevent attacks.
- The dog owner should be responsible for their dogs actions
- The owner needs to be held responsible for their dogs behavior in public. I do not support this for people trespassing on private property.
- The owner is responsible for their dog and its actions.
- Once the owner and the dog leave, it can be very difficult to find them if the victim wishes to ask for recompense.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility in these situations, a rule enforcing this would be beneficial in my opinion.
- For the same reason that drivers exchange information following an accident; It seems only common sense; To do otherwise seems irresponsible, however the dangerous dog would need to firstly be brought under control/ removed from situation; it may be challenging to exchange info in that moment - but owners should do their best to follow up and assist as possible.
- Owners need to be accountable and speak to the officer.
- Officer should have training to also be able to assess owner and determine fitness for ownership
- It's always good to hear both sides. The dog owner should and then be present for proper identification and accountability.
- Would be the same as a car accident or any incident. Both parties should remain at scene until information is exchanged.
- Yes, only if it was a serious injury.
- People need to be accountable and liable for the actions of them and their pets. Ensuring proper identification, complaint/incident documentation and tracking is key to this accountability being enforceable. It works for driver id in the case of car accidents, why not pet or other incidents
- As the owner they are responsible for the dog's behaviour and therefore need to provide information and reparation to the victim.
- Just like a car accident, stay at the scene or follow instructions specifically given by 911 operator staff of medical attention is required.
- Why on earth would you leave the scene of a potential bite that your dog inflicted. Of course info should be given.
- The dog owner should have to remain at the scene. However guidelines about what should be done in the event that the victim has to leave to go to the hospital or take their pet victim to the vet should be outlined. I doubt the owner will stay around but there may be cases where the victim needs to leave to get support.
- "In chatting with many dog owners, some have had their pets bitten and had to pay thousands of dollars in vet bills. Not to mention the stress on the animal. The nuisance dog owner should be liable.



- The owner should also be responsible for getting training for their pet. Under no circumstances should a pet be put down. It is not the animals fault."
- It should be required for the same reasons a person is required to give their contact information at the scene of a car accident. The owner should be held responsible for damage caused.
- when this happens at the moment it us easy for the owner to just walk away
- The dog and the dog's training is the owner's responsibility, therefore, they are responsible for any injury that is caused. They should provide their information to the injured person, the owner of the injured dog, or an enforcement officer. This should be treated no different than the responsibility one has to remain on the scene of a car accident.
- That is the responsibility of the owner regardless of breed. Happens a lot with German Shepherds (as they are just as powerful as a pitbull) but should also apply so smaller dogs such as chihuahuas that can bite and not let go.
- the dogs behavior is typically a result of the owner's handling. The owner must take responsibility for and be accountable for, the behavior of his/her dog.
- Owners need to be accountable and held to account, for the behaviour/misbehaviour of the animals they keep. Much stiffer penalties (Large fines) should be awarded to those who shirk their responsibility by fleeing a scene.
- Owners must remain, this isn't a bite and run situation.
- To give their side of the story
- Or else it is a "bite and run" which should be punishable by law.
- It is the reasonable and prudent thing to do.
- Info should be shared, but depending on the circumstances (eg, if the dog is being aggressive), whether to stay or go should be a judgement call
- I think it would be useful to hear both sides of the story
- They can definitely remove their animal from the situation and return to the individual who got injured and talk with an enforcement officer to tell their side of the story.
- Often in the aftermath of a bite there are questions important for medical care to the victim that are not thought to be asked immediately. Follow up for rabies often requires monitoring the animal for 10 days.
- Owners should take responsibility for their dogs actions
- In cases of disease, such as rabies or Capnocytophaga canimorsus, information provided by the owner or victim after testing can provide vital to understand health issues and solutions after a dog bite. The presence of an enforcement officer can provide necessary to understand the true motivation behind a bite (whether the victim was harassing or scaring the dog or the dog is being mishandled by their owners.
- Unless the owner needs to remove the dog to reduce further harm, they should be required to stay, just like if they were to hit someone with their car.
- Accountability is important.
- Similar to if I hit someone with my car and caused damage, if my pet causes damage to someone the onus is on me for my lack of control.



- Dog owners should be responsible for the actions of their animal. It should be mandatory for them to remain at the scene if a dog attack incident and should be charged if they leave the scene.
- Owners should take responsibility for the actions of their pets.
- Of course. If the owners cannot wait, contact information should be provided.
- To Make sure the dog is licensed and the dog received all required vaccinations.
- Shouldn't his already exist. A let us the extension of the owner. They are responsible for the stupid thing. They need to be held accountable
- The person responsible for the animal should be there.
- You may need to defend your dogs actions, it is responsible thing to do
- There are no bad dogs, only bad owners.
- N/A
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dogs actions. By providing contact information, we can follow-up to see how the dog has been rehabilitated or if the owner took any responsibility to send their dog for proper, professional training. All dogs can be saved and their behaviour can change.
- Then problem dogs could easily be identified
- its no different than remaining at the scene if a car accident. People must be held accountable
- Yes, but within reason. In certain situations it would make more sense to isolate the fighting dogs or to calm them down by leaving. Also, how quickly does an enforcement officer respond?
- Pets are owners responsibilities. They need to stay so the officer can get all information and give fines if necessary.
- It is called "being a responsible pet owner"
- Responsibility as a pet owner.
- It would depend on the bite severity. But for the sake of all parties, they should stay and gather witnesses so the story can be told properly from the beginning as there may be the dog was not the agressar.
- It's important to understand all scenarios. Not all dog bites are the fault of the animal and some are provoked by people approaching animals they shouldn't. Strangers should respect the owner when approaching a dog that is unknown to them.
- Same as cars, if there's an injured party.
- They should be held responsible for their dog!
- In other injury-relates situations (like a car accident) where there are potential civil or criminal consequences, parties must remain at the scene to exchange information and ensure accountability. Why should a severe pet bite be any different?
- I think they should stay at the scene if it is serious. That being said, dogs sometimes get in fights. They need to be broken up and checked for severe injuries. But I have seen a lot of dog altercations where small dogs run up to larger dogs barking and biting and if the larger dog reacts, the larger dog is to blame. My friends husky was approached by two small dogs who were barking and nipping. The husky nipped back and caused a small cut. The small dog owner got animal services involved and was trying to blame my friend. So sometimes there are situations where people are dishonest



and try and make larger dogs or certain breeds at fault. As a dog owner and having experience dogs attacking my dog before, you just need to understand that dog fights happen sometimes and you just need to be fast at breaking it up and deal with your own dog accordingly. People who do not have experience tend to freak out and make situations worse than they need to be. I can't emphasize the importance for putting more resources into training people and making sure they understand dog behaviour and that their own energies can make a situation worse than it needs to be. People need to be trained on how to have control of their dogs and how to effectively react in various situations.

- If their dog causes physical harm or damage, they should have to give their account to an officer and not just leave. They should be accountable.
- Absolutely. It should be a crime.
- A person should be liable for their animal's behaviour.
- But there needs to be a system to remove the dogs from the situation
- So people can held responsible for their dogs.
- This is just common sense
- They need to exchange information but may leave to secure the dog after information has been exchanged to avoid any further issues.
- The owner is responsible for the actions of the dog. Therefore should be held responsible for any lost wage due to injuries or excess cost that comes to the victims due to the actions of their animal.
- The owner of a dangerous dog who walks away cannot be held accountable.
- Most owners of little dogs that nip people or animals don't think it's a problem and flee. Those are the people you should be targeting
- The owner must be accountable.
- It should be done automatically, in any case.
- of course you should stay
- "It's common decency isn't it?"
- If the bite is minor (ie excited puppy jumping up On people or dogs wrestling and one gets nipped) then common sense has to apply."
- Everyone should not fear the outcome and right by any situation. Why should the victim pay for outcome if owner was not responsible for their animals actions.
- Both sides of story
- Owners must be responsible for their dog biting someone or another dog. They must be held accountable to provide needed information to law enforcement.
- Because you need to explain what happened, why that dog felt the need to bite. Was it protecting their owner, was the victim acting irresponsible and not respecting space boundaries.
- It's simply responsible, common decency
- I believe owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions.
- The owner knows the dog better than anybody.
- If an animal under their supervision harms someone or something, they need to be there to explain why they could not prevent it.



- The owner should be held responsible for their dog's actions and should be forced to pay any vet bills/damages
- Not staying at the scene leaves more time for the owner to have the problem dog in public again before an officer can follow up. If the owner leaves without giving info they should be charged for not remaining at the scene of a crime they could be responsible for, same as a car accident. They are responsible for their property including damage that property/dog has caused.
- If someone leaves after a dog bites someone or another animal it puts more strain on bylaw or police to find that person.
- The goal should be education and correction as well as the safety of all animals and people involved. If a dog bites you first have to make sure they dog has all his current shots and then also give the owner an opportunity and resources in order to correct the behaviour of the dog so that it doesn't happen again. Reactive dogs are not 'bad' dogs however they may need extra attention to make sure they don't get into trouble. Off leash parks are not for all dogs. Also people need to understand that just because your dog is friendly doesn't mean you can let them approach any dog they want to (if not in an off leash area). There are many responsible dog owners I know who have reactive dogs but keep them out of situations where they get into trouble (muzzles, away from other dogs and on leash).
- It would be consistent with the current rules involving motor vehicle accidents. Logically, both a dog bite or a fender bender would be the owner's responsibility to remain at the scene and exchange information.
- The owner needs to be responsible for his/her pet. Bad behavior is a lack of training on part of the owner. Owners need to be accountable for their pets, if the owner can't be accountable they should not be allowed to own an animal. We also should not single out the breed of the dog. I have never had a problem with pit bulls. Been attacked by a dachshund, and lunged at by a Yorkie terrier. I have had more problems with smaller dogs attacking. Also German Shepards are more viscous than pit bulls in my experience. Again it goes back to the owner training, and taking responsibility for their animals.
- Treated as Hit & Run if Owner dont remain at the dog bite scene.
- Other wise you may be unable to obtain info if they leave
- If you arrive to scene and only judge the animal then your training as a peace officer/ spca has failed you. Bad training and abuse from owners cause a dogs behaviour to swing. Example. You raise a child poorly and abuse them chances are they will follow suit and abuse others. Wasn't there fault but those who raised them. Understand the animal could also be scared.
- An owner should assume responsibility for the animal actions and be present until an officer arrives. The officer must hear both sides.
- For any and all breeds from chihuahua to great dane
- It should be treated similar to car accidents
- A dog bite can seriously harm a person! Leaving the scene of a crime is an offence, dogs can be weapon used and trained to harm people. We need more strict laws for dog owners, we live near a dog park and a playground and it's a free for all with dog owners. There are way too many



irresponsible pet owners on this city. Please do not lessen the rules, increase them so people will follow them. It honestly seems like dog owners have far too many rights.

- If necessary, the owner should take responsibility, however this provides the opportunity for the owner to explain the dog's behaviour and situation that occurred to prevent unnecessary fines or euthanization.
- I believe they should stay and explain what happened. Its easier than trying to track down where the dog lives.
- Dog should be taken away and euthanated.
- The owner is responsible for their pet. Their side of the story is very important as what did the other person do to provoke the attack. It is not always the dogs fault but what a person does to provoke it.
- Owners should be responsible for the actions of their pet. They should have to provide their information.
- Of course - like remaining at the scene of an accident
- To explain what happend before the attack why , and see if it the dogs fault!
- If it's minor not necessary
- Share information just in case 3rd party needs more information, but not seize the dog
- They should stay be to take responsibility for their dog's actions and to ensure the victim is cared for.
- If there is a liability or insuance as discussed above then there is an importance be made on the owner to take responsibility and stay at the scene and follow the proper procedure
- A responsible dog owner takes responsibility for their dogs' behaviour.
- This goes for ANY DOG BIG OR SMALL. I have been bitten by small dogs several times and owners just say "their playing" and bolt away
- Yes
- I think they need to stay similar to if there was a car accident
- Dog owners must be held accountable for any aggression by their dogs.
- The owner should remain at the scene and discuss the situation and exchange information to hold the owner accountable for any injuries or loss of life be it human or animal
- Bit and run is no different from hit and run.
- Much like a car accident, a dog bite could become a bigger/more serious injury as time progresses. PTSD could also occur for the victim of the attack. Knowing dogs can be trained and are not always at fault, owners should know whats best for their dog to avoid the worst
- Just like a car accident
- It's like a car accident. Stay responsible and be present to take responsibility for your dog. It's not bad dogs it's bad owners.
- The person is responsible for their dog. I would suggest holding people criminally responsible for dog behavior.
- It's only ethical
- There are two sides to every story, and it's important that both sides are heard.



- You should take responsibility for you & your animals actions. If something bad happens don't run. But don't put you or your dog in the position to have triggers happen if there are any.
- Similar to a car accident, or in the case of a bite, the owner needs to be held liable for assault and battery.
- Yes as long as makes sense and doesn't put anyone at risk.
- Dogs that bite should NOT be allowed in parks & should have a muzzle at ALL times.
- If dog owners are responsible for the dog, then they bear responsibility for the attack. Fleeing the scene should be illegal.
- Owners should always stay at the scene so that both parties can have a say in what happened.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dogs behaviour.
- Dog ownership requires responsibility including owning any injury caused to another dog. Remaining at the scene is just the right thing to do.
- Its the equivalent to fleeing the scene of a car accident.
- Not requiring this would be the equivalent of a hit and run.
- Owner needs to be held accountable.
- I was the victim of a an unprovoked, vicious attack by a pit bull belonging to the girlfriend of a neighbor. The neighbor had agreed to keep the pit bull on his property, since the girlfriend could not control the dog. However, that dog as well as his own pit bull were free to roam the back alley, where I was attacked. Other neighbors cited instances of aggressive behavior by the same animal. In my case, Bylaw responded, but nothing was done. In my experience, those who chose to own this breed are themselves problematic individuals who are very unlikely to be responsible owners of such unpredictable, powerful animals. I should have hired a personal injury lawyer, but the guardian of the dog in question was a renter, and was unlikely to have home insurance. He was an unsavory character who also liked to plague the neighborhood by roaring up and down the street constantly on his noisy motorcycle. He moved away shortly after this incident. If Bylaw had been at all interested in properly dealing with this case, it would have been necessary to take immediate action.
- The owner is responsible for their dog. They are responsible for damages or injury caused by their dog.
- If a dog is involved in any physical altercation, ownership information should be shared with whomever when necessary.
- Same as car accidents. Leaving the scene of a crime/assault.
- If either parties require medical attention it is important that all information is given out in the event that there are medical bills.
- Of course the owner should deal directly with enforcement if their dog has attacked or injured someone. That is responsible pet ownership.
- Is it v the same as a MVA they need to provide contact information and a statement
- Dogs are getting out of hand. Many people are not responsible w their animals. Strict enforcement is the only solution.



- yes that way we know who is responsible and who is held accountable and if they leave the scene a large fine levied.
- They should be held accountable if the injury is serious.
- I feel it should depend on the severity and circumstances of the incident.
- I would expect anyone involved in any incident to give pertinent information and stay out until told otherwise.
- Yes, that's being a responsible pet owner. Leaving a dog bite incident is like leaving the scene of an accident.
- Dog owner is 100% responsible for the damages and should be held liable!!!
- They need to face the consequences of their dogs actions
- The owner is responsible, they should be assessed that they are treating the animal properly otherwise the animal probably wouldnt have attacked.
- Of course, as a pet owner you are responsible for their behavior and any consequences if they behave poorly.
- I think that should be happening without it being a law.
- Only when the victim has the intention of getting Bylaw officers involved.
- You need to be responsible for your dog but the situation should be looked at properly And all circumstances must be taken into consideration such as other persons actions towards a dog
- Dog owners must be responsible for their dogs, therefore they should give their information and cover any costs
- I agree that it's important to manage the current incident as well as future incidents
- This shouldn't even be a question - an attack of any sort you should remain with the victim to make sure they're okay and answer any questions
- Any dog owner involved in an incident should take responsibility
- Its important for owners to take responsibility and be accountable for the actions of their animal.
- **NO BREED SPECIFIC LANGUAGE!!!**
- Owners need to be held accountable for the action of there dogs, regardless of the breed. Training is essential and most important when thinking of getting a dog. They are WORK!
- I think it is appropriate to share contact information in case of need after assessment of bite. As well, discussion can be made at the time if either party feels the need to talk with an enforcement officer or if it can be avoided.
- Remain at scene and surrender offending dog immediately. Leaving the scene will result in huge fines and euthanized dog.
- How is this not already in place?
- Explain "yes"? Explain my advocacy of responsibility, accountability and citizenship? What's next; "Do you think hit & run is an acceptable way to deport one's self in Calgary?"
- Getting the facts at the time of the incident is ideal especially if it proceeds to court.
- It is essentially a hit-and-run but for dogs.
- Just like the scene of an accident, people should remain on scene to complete an investigation



- Those people must be held responsible for the damage of their dogs!
- Only makes sense.
- Common sense.
- It's not hard to explain that THE OWNER is responsible for their dog's behavior.
- It is only fair
- I think that would be fair
- Just like being struck by a car, an injury has occurred and you must remain until authorities attend.
- It is no different than any assault or motor vehicle incident.
- As in all "accidents" it is a felony to leave the site of the accident. Would this not be the same?
- The only danger is it can increase post event stress and lead to confrontation but there should definitely be recourse for the bitten party
- Yes, but difficult to enforce.
- It's the owners fault when a dog bites for the most part.
- But owner may not be aware of an incident. Must also place reasonable limits on how long they are required to wait for an enforcement officer to attend. If an enforcement officer is not available, should not mean that dog owner is off the hook, but just not penalized for not waiting around. Should penalize owner, not the current handler of dog (similar to photo radar doesn't penalize driver, only registered owner).
- too many people don't see a problem with "feisty" dogs not seeing that its never okay to put teeth on people and even less take responsibility for their dog's misbehavior
- Dogs sometimes bite because they've been provoked. I think gathering information on the incident is essential. Sometimes it's not the dogs fault, but the humans.
- Responsible per ownership
- This is a serious incident and should be attended to by an enforcement officer. It's an assault on an animal.
- Want to get both sides of the story and can't do that if the owner leaves the scene
- The owner should be held directly responsible for the damage their pet has caused.
- I believe that it is logical for an owner to remain at the scene of an incident and take responsibility for their dog's behaviour.
- Should be the same as any sort of altercation
- Too often they walk off
- how else will owner and dog be brought to justice?
- This should be the same as a minor/major car accident. Offender should suffer some kind of consequence for fleeing the scene.
- If both parties are okay with it... They can leave. If not, it is equivalent to a hit and run.
- The owner needs to take responsibility if there dog(of any size) bites,unless the dog was defending themselves or there owner
- If ANY breed attacks, yes, the owner better stay. I am also okay with euthanizing the animal too! But not to ban or muzzle them.



- Self explained
- People are responsible for their pets. If their dog bites someone or is behaving in a “nuisance” manner, then it should be determined if they are able to care & train their pet. Pets behave purely based on how well their owner trains them. Owners need to be held accountable, the dog should not be punished.
- If the dog and owner flee the scene what's the difference betwthat and a driver leaving the scene of an accident.
- The guilty dog owner should be held responsible for the attack.
- That is the MINIMUM that a dog owner should be required to do! A dog bite can be severe and is always traumatic - to allow ppl to leave the site of an attack is to send a message that such an attack is no big deal. Please protect everyone.
- I support this, but NOTHING that singles out pit bulls. They are not the problem, little dogs and big dogs can be a problem anyway. Not just a specific breed. I have owned many dogs and the pitbull was and still is the MOST BY FAR best behaved dog. Hands down. This is disgraceful that the city is even trying to do this to such an amazing breed. What will happen if the city goes forward with this and another dog attacks and tears a pitbull apart because it was muzzled and cant even defend itself? Punish all dogs/cats equally, not just one. Pull up facts and dont just assume. This city is by far my favorite place to live and this is causing me to seriously question why I even live here after seeing that this is even being entertained.
- Absolutely if they don't they should be fined
- Dog owners at all times are responsible for the behaviour of their dogs and must be held accountable.
- The owner should be held responsible and stay to provide contact information.
- Otherwise it's too hard to find owner
- Even though mistakes can happen, owners must hold themselves accountable.
- If police officers are present, owners are more likely to be truthful about their contact info etc.
- This is common sense, the dog owner is responsible for the incident and must remain at the scene.
- The owner is responsible for keeping the dog under control. The owner is also responsible for the dog's misbehaviour, including violence, and must be available to speak to officials.
- Any incident where there is a bite should be reported and enforced. All dogs and all owners are responsible for the actions taken in any shared space.
- Yes to take the proper steps to properly resolve the issue in the best interest of the owner and victim
- We need to be responsible for our dogs at the park and keep them under control.
- Common curiosity
- As long as it is safe for the owner and dog to remain on scene
- Like driving a car, if an accident occurred, find witnesses and keep the involved at the scene.
- I have seen many dog owners flee the scene with their dog after their dog has bitten another. In some instances, the owners of problem dogs have done this several times and have never been reprimanded. This is unacceptable.



- The owner of the dog who bites is responsible for that dog and should be required to stay at the scene and should be required financially for any costs associated with the dog bite. This expense should NOT be a cost of the owner of the victim dog. This seems like common sense.
- Humans needs to be responsible for their pets.
- Only if bite is severe and requires medical treatment
- The dog is their responsibility, and a dog attack should be seen as a crime. They shouldn't be able to flee.
- Owner MUST stay and be responsible or face additional charges/fines
- This answer does not need an explanation - it is a matter of common sense & responsibility. The biting dog should be automatically be euthanized!
- It's no different than a car accident in my opinion. You witnessed someone get hurt, you must remain on scene.
- Often people simply flee the scene when there has been an incident. If this was a law stating that people must exchange contact information and talk to enforcement then it would increase the penalty for simply fleeing
- If your dog harms a person or animal, remaining on scene seems appropriate to take responsibility for your animals actions. Leaving the scene seems like attempting to avoid responsibility
- Remaining at the scene is absolutely required for this type of offence.
- It is in my opinion the best way to get the whole story as to what happened and why if all involved parties are on scene.
- The owner needs to prove he can control his animal - if he's not there it's like a hit and run when driving - leaving the scene. Protect the victim not the dog or it's owner.
- .
- It's appalling to think that a person can watch their animal in an incident and then walk away. Making it mandatory is a very good decision
- There needs to be accountability
- You have to do it for car accidents so its a fair call, *ONLY if applied to ALL BREEDS
- The owner should be held responsible.
- the owner should be required to give all contact information so that the victim can sue for damages, the owners can be fined and given bills for termination and sign over dangerous animal for termination
- since there's no box for comments on the pit bull section it's absurd that you're attempting to put in restrictions for a specific breed because of the "potential" for stronger bites. It's the exact same as if a muscular person stabs someone and the city decides that anyone that attends a gym isn't allowed to own knives and has to wear restricted gloves that don't allow them to hold onto anything when they leave the house. It's not the breed it's the owners and how they're raised. Don't punish good dogs with good owners!!
- This is a must. Jest common sensie and rugby thing to do.
- Seems no different than if you are in a car accident. You stay at the scene and provide required information as required.



- "I think it should be a given that the owner stays. My last dog was randomly bit/attacked by another dog. The owner stayed.
- In 2006, I lived downtown and my dog at the time was bit by a dog while walking near the other dog's house - that other dog was off-leash! The bylaw officer who attended said that I (yes, me) overreacted when it happened. My old dog (9 years old) was bit. Please train your staff. The officer was condescending and blamed me for what happened."
- I assumed that was already the case.
- This is required in a car accident, it should be the same.
- In the case I describe, the owner was drunk. There were 3 police cars, the last leaving at about 11:30 PM. The police came to the house, the victim left (after getting help from one of our neighbours), and the problem continues. It's not realistic to assume that people who mistreat animals, and who have pitbulls which are dangerous, are going to remain at the scene. I wonder why this isn't already a bylaw. I think it's a good idea but I doubt it's enforceable. Presumably, CPS and/or the City are monitoring this situation on my street, but if the owner refuses to pay the dangerous dog registration fee, I doubt there is anything to do besides wait until they are drunk again, and the dog gets out.
- All dog owners should be responsible for their animals actions and should remain in order to resolve the situation and take responsibility.
- The dog owner is responsible for the dog and needs to be prepared to accept appropriate penalties and ensure that the situation is corrected.
- Too many times, owners don't take responsibility for their dog's behaviour
- to take responsibility
- I think the owner of the dog should take responsibility but also bare witness to anything that could have triggered the dog.
- For any other type of accident, parties are to remain at the scene. It should be the same involving pet accidents.
- People have to be responsible
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets' actions
- accepting responsibility must be shown before a second incident occurs
- No need to run and hide
- To answer questions
- I am surprised that this isn't already a rule. That said, I'm not sure I would want the owner's dog to remain at the scene if it is still agitated so perhaps a requirement to report to law enforcement within a certain amount of time after the incident.
- If they don't they should be charge with leaving the scene and surrender their abusive animal to be put down
- Well why would you leave, you need to make sure everyone is ok.
- Yes I think this would be like any other offence. The dog owner must take responsibility.
- My dog has been chased after and bitten by other dogs, and in these instances, the owners have been quick to flee the scene.



- Dog bites should be treated like traffic accidents. Do not leave the scene.
- I think that this is a grey area. Should the other person require information/to talk to an enforcement officer then I guess yes it should be a requirement, but I wouldn't care if I got a bite because any true dog owner knows that it happens sometimes and it is what it is?
- Holds owner accountable for their pets actions
- It would ensure owners are held responsible and a record of a dog's behaviour to help ensure repeat offenders get the training and assistance needed.
- Absolutely yes, the owner must remain at the scene of the incident, and leaving the scene should be considered an offence and liable to fines or even criminal offense.
- Just as you're expected to remain at the scene of an accident you should be required to stay and explain and/or accept responsibility for causing harm.
- They need to be able to contact the owner for further information.
- A dog attacking a person or other animal is never the dogs fault it is the owners responsibility to properly train their dog to not do so as well they should have complete control over their dog if something were to happen it is the owners responsibility and they should have to pay for any bills such as vet bills that may occur from a bite
- The victim (assuming it is a person, or the owner of another animal) deserves to have the owner own up to the offense and the owner of the dog needs to be questioned on their at-home treatment of their dog and be informed of proper ways to prevent such dog behaviour in the future. The owner (at most times) is the one responsible. In the case that it was a freak accident and the owner was not responsible, actions must be taken by the owner to prevent such attacks. If the dog severely injures wildlife that should be protected, the same rules should apply.
- All parties should stay on scene and give both sides of the story.
- NO BREED SPECIFIC SEGREGATION. Targeting pitbulls is dangerous, ignorant and unlawful.
- Same as a vehicle accident
- PLEASE make this the law! Pit and runs are way too common in Calgary and elsewhere! I was stuck with a nearly 2,000 dollar bill after a pit and run last summer. My dog needed 25 stitches on her scalp. The pit bull ran across a street to attack her and the owner grabbed its leash and fled when I was still calling for help.
- Everything needs to be properly documented and tracked
- Clear responsibility
- They should remain so that the officer can document the incident with the owners name and details of dog (picture etc). The owner of the dog that bits someone/animal should be liable for costs if it clearly is the dogs fault ... ie someone wasn't teasing the dog or being aggressive, or hitting the dog ...
- In any other situation leaving the scene carries heavy penalties, like with car accidents. Dog attacks should be the same.
- If an animal bites me out of nowhere I get a allergic reaction I should have every right to sue that owner of that dog.
- You need to be accountable for your pet and it's actions



- It is important to obtain the necessary information (the dog's medical records, vaccinations, relevant medical history, etc.).
- Because there needs to be a record of that dog and there is no other way to know if the owner gave the correct information
- Be responsible! What if it was a car accident, same expectations!
- First hand information given at the scene by the dog owner seems like a good way to gather accurate information, as well as to hold owners accountable for their pets' actions.
- Treat it the same as a vehicle accident.
- as a dog owner you should take full responsibility for your pet and their behavior
- Yes but with restrictions. The dog owner only had to do that if they is damage.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs
- It's called being a responsible owner. However, certain dogs breeds will be targeted.
- This should be the state of the law already. If a person causes harm or loss to another person's property, that person is generally required to do this. Loss or harm to a pet should be the same.
- Owners need to be accountable for all veterinary costs if they attack another animal and attacks on a person or animal must be reported.
- I think all dog owners should be held accountable for the actions of their pet regardless of breed. Often both sides of the situation have a part to play in a bite scenario and should exchange information.
- If someone got into a car accident then have to stay, why would it be different if there was an accident with a Dog
- The incident could cause serious consequences. If the owner does not remain, then investigation becomes very difficult.
- Yes. Share the contact information but also explain the situation. Dogs attack usually in circumstances where they feel they are threatened. Or this falls on the training and discipline that should be in effect with people who own dogs.
- If a dog bites someone, they should take ownership of their failure to adequately socialize and train their animals. Hit and runs are illegal in a vehicle and they shouldn't be allowed with an animal.
- Owners be required to be financially responsible
- Just like remaining at the scene of an accident, information should be exchanged.
- To ensure the appropriate vaccinations of Biter is complete and to give opportunity for the dog that bites to offer compensation. Address And contact exchange is important
- Just like a "hit-n-run", there should be a high penalty if one leaves the scene of a crime they are a party of.
- It's like a car crash, whether there's long term damage or not you need to be accountable for the action.
- Owners are responsible for their pets, and their pet's actions and need to be accountable if the pet is at fault.
- This applies to ANY dog!



- If its a serious event absolutely. I think info has to be exchanged just like a car accident so if a person or animal requires attention or help the owner of the dog should be responsible to pay for it. Depending on the circumstances.
- It is what was done when a lab bit my pit bull at the off-leash park.
- The enforcement officer would be able to get a clearer picture of what may have happened. They would also get any info with regards to the dog's shots and health.
- This seems to be the only way that is fair to both parties.
- This is no different than any other "accident". If a vehicle owner were to not stay at the scene they would be charged with a hit and run. Same sentiment applies to dog bites.
- Owners are responsible for the training, handling and behaviour of their dogs. Too many times owners treat an attack as though they had no idea something could happen. Allowing owners to leave without talking to an enforcement officer is like a hit and run. Owners need to be held responsible for the improper training, and inadequate handling. If you know your dog is or has shown any signs of aggression to strangers or other dogs, then when walking their dogs need to be treated as though.
- This is like hit and run. If owners's dog bites a human the owner should be required by law to remain on the scene and share at least contact information. If owner departs from scene there should be very serious charges. This should be criminal.
- The owner needs to be there to explain the situation (if present) and to represent the dog. We also need to track owners and see if they have multiple dogs that need to be assessed.
- see the answer for 3. owners need to be accountable.
- Pit and run happened so often. Owners must be arrested and heavily fined if they flee the scene, and have their Pitbull immediately euthanized.
- If your pet bites another person, or animal you should by law by required to exchange information.
- Only if it draws blood. A nip shouldnt count.
- Owners should be held accountable for their pets behaviour and should be required to provide all relevant information when their pet causes an injury.
- It's like a car accident. It didn't mean to happen but it needs to be documented properly with both sides of the story being able to be heard.
- Owners need to be accountable for their dogs
- Both sides of the story need to be shared with the enforcement officer. The owner of the biting dog also needs to accept responsibility if their dog is proven at fault.
- Kind of obvious. We can't hit and run with our vehicle, and we shouldn't be allowed to attack and run with our pets
- Only if the dog owners cannot exchange or decide what to do themselves. Not every dog bite or skirmish requires municipal intervention. It requires dog owners to be more responsible and not take their untrained dogs in the public, or at least causes them to think about the consequences.
- For me it's the same as a car collision. Stay to provide information. But remove the dog from the scene (put in car, in house, etc).
- If a dog bites and causes serious injury, the dog should be destroyed.



- People need to be held accountable and responsible for their pets. Most of the time the animal's behavior is a result in an uneducated, cruel owner.
- It us an incident. Everyone should remain on site until reports are taken
- I support it but it is unenforceable. I think civilized individuals would exchange information just as they would in a car accident.
- I think it's important for the owners contact information to be shared with authorities in case, as an example, the person who was bit has to take time off work as the result of the bite, or an animal who was bit requires treatment. In this case, contact info (or a repost from an enforcement officer) would be beneficial in regards to having the owner pay for treatment/lost wages as the dog is their responsibility.
- The owner is responsible for the dogs behavior and actions. Therefore it is their responsibility to remain at the scene.
- People should be accountable for their dogs.
- It just makes sense, if a person has a car accident, all people need to be on scene, so why not the owners of a dog who bites? Owners need to be responsible for their dogs.
- If the dog bites another animal there is potential vet fees that should be paid by the owner of dog owner. So yes, they need to stick around. If the dog bites a person there is the potential for disease passed on from the dog. So again, yes the owner needs to be present in case the dog needs to be tested.
- They need to supply their recollection of the incident, just like a vehicle accident.
- This is an assault, therefore the owner must be present to accept responsibility.
- I adopted 2 dachshunds 4 years ago. My daughter took them out for a walk and the male dachshund was attacked and bitten on the chest by a boxer. The people who owned the boxer told my daughter that they would pay for all the medical expenses and when she called me at work, she was very traumatized. These people did pay but only when I said I was going to call enforcement officers. I believe that if they had and officer that went out to see them, they would have paid right away.
- They should be required to remain at the scene or face consequences .
- As long as all parties involved agree to it.
- It would be similar to a car accident. People should be leaving the scene.
- So they are able to be assessed and held accountable.
- Accountability for the dog owner, as well as pet.
- Too many irresponsible owners that know their animal is dangerous and put people and other animals at risk regardless so need to be accountable.
- Accountability expectations will enforce better training from the beginning
- Medical information needs to be obtained
- Of course yes
- To explain why their dog became aggressive. Is the dog a rescue? Did someone else hurt the dog? Is the owner of this pet abusive? If so, the officer has the right to take the dog away until owner is proven themselves that they are not abusive and has a solid reason on why the dog bit in the first place.



- To explain why their dog became aggressive. Is the dog a rescue? Did someone else hurt the dog? Is the owner of this pet abusive? If so, the officer has the right to take the dog away until owner is proven themselves that they are not abusive and has a solid reason on why the dog bit in the first place.
- It is important that dog owners are held accountable for the physical and emotional damage their aggressive dog may have inflicted, not only to compensate the victim, but to prevent future bites.
- I think that's only reasonable u have to wait for the police if u get in car accident .
- Depending on the severity of the bite. If your dog bites, you are responsible for that animal and should be contactable If medical attention is required.
- If it is a serious wound then yes of course. But the dog should not be taken away from the owner unless it is a reoccurring problem.
- The owner is accountable for all actions of its pet and should be held legally liable if not present at the incident to share contact information to the applicable authorities.
- It should be treated like a hit and run accident. I hear too many times of owners just grabbing their dog and leaving without ensuring the victim is okay and without exchanging information & contact info. You should have to provide picture id and correct contact info or be charged with an offence.
- The owner is responsible for the dog so has to remain on scene just like a car accident
- This way they can be held accountable for their dogs actions as well as ensure the other party is ok
- The owner should stay to help address the issue and ID the dog
- If a dog causes an incident, it is ultimately the responsibility of the owner. The owner should absolutely be exchanging information with the affected person/dog owner and enforcement officer.
- Accountability,
- Identification so victim can seek retribution and so fines/apprehension can be imposed
- Like any accident, it is responsible to share contact information.
- Owners should be held responsible if its their fault
- It allows for accountability as well as easier follow-up to the incident
- It's the right thing to do if it's bad enough. If there is no injuries, then no
- I feel the only time a dog owner cannot stay is due to not being present at the time of attack. I feel owners of dogs who attack, or have an "incident" should be fined HEAVILY and should have follow-ups with officers to ensure the dog is not being mistreated.
- That's what a responsible pet owner should be doing regardless of a bylaw
- Owners are to be accountable and should remain OR have a duty to provide factual information - like you would do in an accident.
- If a dog bites someone that dog should be put down.
- Need for owner to take responsibility
- The owner must be held accountable for the dog attack.
- Owner must take responsibility.



- That's the proper thing to do, if you crash into someone you're supposed to stay on scene otherwise it's a hit and run. Which equals more trouble that individual gets into. So it should be the same for animal owners.
- Too many times, the way to avoid taking responsibility for your dog is to run away and not be traceable. This has happened to me.
- It's no different than if you are in an accident with a vehicle. You should remain on scene.
- It's the right thing to do
- Too many people run off after an incident.
- It's generally the owners' issue not the dog. They need to be held accountable
- Yes if both parties agree? I have reservations about that
- Without contact information it makes it harder to find and report incidents, it would also give the opportunity for both parties and any witnesses to provide statements while the situation is still fresh.
- You are responsible for your dog
- Shouldn't it be like any other incident, where people should have to wait until the proper authorities come.
- It is being a responsible dog owner to do so!
- Should be treated like a car accident, insurance and contact information shared. If the dog has rabies or other diseases it should be traced.
- Owner must remain at scene so they cannot deny incident and so they realize full extent of injury
- If a person hits another vehicle with their car they must stay at the scene. If a dog bites another dog, the owner and dog must stay at the scene until the circumstances can be recorded by a neutral third party.
- It is no different than a car accident, there's an incident, details can be shared and responsibility determined. With the key understanding being it isn't always the larger dog that started the interaction, or it could be the human involved that it's the actions in motion for the bite.
- Because that person is responsible for their dog same as a motor vehicle accident.
- None of the rules would be enforced if the owners can legally walk away.
- Any incident causing harm, a person should remain at the scene. Would you leave a car accident scene?
- Information should be shared when incidents happen. Waiting for a bylaw officer for god knows how long with 2 dogs that have been in a fight is a beyond stupid idea.
- Being attacked by a dog is the owner's responsibility, they should be held accountable
- Dogs, in the past, have been abandoned by their owners when they attacked. That is not the acceptable behaviour of a responsible pet owner, That becomes a court issue not a tribunal issue.
- Seems reasonable that an owner should be required to provide their contact information if their dog bites someone
- If a dog bite occurs the owner must remain and take ownership for the event
- Just like a car accident



- The owner is responsible for the actions of the animal they have in their possession, therefore the owner should be present and accountable
- My wife was bitten by an out-of-control dog in Nose Hill Park, and it was very difficult getting any info from the owner, who was very defensive.
- Take responsibility for your pet's actions and work it out there. Look at facts to determine if the incident was provoked by the victim
- It's the responsibility of the owner to stay
- I'd wanna know if the dog was up to date on its rabies shots.
- You have to be responsible for your pet and any dog causing the death of another pet or serious injuries to a person should be euthanized
- Owner should be responsible for the actions of their dogs not the dogs
- As owners we are responsible for our animals. This includes when the animal acts in a threatening manner or has injured someone or another animal.
- That is common courtesy for both parties involved. Exception would be if emergency medical care is required by both dogs or people.
- All information needs to be collected at the time of the incident. Then all necessary information and details can be collected at that time.
- Right now owners walk away knowing that their animal could be taken away from them or fines assessed
- Yes just like anything else, if your animal hurts someone/an animal you should be held responsible
- Leaving is cowardly and avoids prosecution.
- Sometimes the dog runs away and the owner and dog cannot be found
- The pet owner is liable and needs to be responsible for their pet's action.
- Only to determine if care for veterinary or medical costs for the victim is required, and if tests for disease (has the dog in question had their vaccines etc). Not to punish the dog or human on the spot.
- No explanation necessary!!!!
- Dog owners must show respect and empathy in all dog bite cases regardless of how minor they are. Dog owners who leave the scene of an incident should have their dogs confiscated immediately.
- The owners need to be held responsible pay damages to the family.
- "This promotes accountability for your dog's actions.
- It also shows the integrity of the owner.
- It protects both the owner and the victim. If both are there to account or defend their story."
- People should always remain at the scene of an incident regardless of what has happened
- If a dog (any breed) bites another animal or person the owner is responsible to have this reported in case it is a repeated behaviour of that dog. Or a serious injury occurred and There are costs associated with the dog's behaviours
- It would be hard to enforce, but how else do you deal with bite and runs?
- Obviously if the owner leaves how can bylaw possibly find them



- Need to take accountability for dogs. However, efficient and timely use of an Enforcement officer appearing is also critical to success.
- Both sides can fairly be heard
- Accountability
- Owner takes responsibility for their dog and pays any costs incurred to bite.
- How is that not already a rule. You can't leave a auto collision if you're involved, how's this different.
- "Many owners of small dogs view small dog breed bites as humorous or "cute". As an individual that trains dogs, works with dogs, and handles dogs on a daily basis, it is my experience that small breed dogs may cause just as much damage as large dogs. Thus, I believe that if any dog owner does not stay at the scene and exchange information with the victim or victims animal they should be fined, and (or) their dog should be removed from their custody. Too many times have I or my dogs (all of which are large breeds) been bit by small dogs, and the owner gets off without any warning, and they allow those poor animal behaviours to continue. Yet, if my dog barks at another dog it is deemed "dangerous". These rules are one-sided and dictated by people who either have no experience to pet ownership, or are poor pet owners themselves.
- To arbitrarily discriminate against one specific breed of dog (and the fact that "pit bull breeds" were named specifically in this survey) is unbelievably uneducated and ignorant. In many places, breeds such as poodles, German Shepard's, and hound dogs are regarded as more dangerous. In the experiences of many pet trainers and dog care professionals, there is no ONE breed which should be the subject of bylaws. Rather, the city should enforce a mandatory program training owners, and should fine owners who lack the knowledge and ability to train their dogs.
- If you intend to make bylaws about which pets should and should not be kept, make it include dogs of ALL breeds. That way you can make bylaws that the citizens of Calgary can universally support - instead of pitting owners of different breeds against one another."
- This helps to hold the owner accountable and better track repeat offenders (both dogs and owners)
- accountability
- Do the dog can be identified for strikes against becoming a nuisance
- Owner of dog needs to take responsibility for its behaviour towards other dogs, cats and people.
- Just like a car accident, all parties involved must fill out a report
- Many pit bull owners run after an attack to avoid liability just like a hit and run in a vehicular accident and that is an additional charge.
- It is important to have on record and the dog is the responsibility of the owner and such the owner should pay for any damages.
- Tribunals are not always impartial. A dog owner needs to be held accountable and give out their information.
- Take responsibility for your pets and their actions
- It is impossible to track down a dog by bylaw control once they have left the scene
- Most dogs of any breed can b aggressive because their owners don't care
- I think it's important for owners to be there for each other if an incident happens
- Any accident, should be against the law to leave.



- Not sure what to explain to this. I agree with the statement.
- If a person is attacked by a dog and requires medical attention, it should be put on the owner of the perpetrating dog to pay the medical expenses or be charged for manslaughter if the victim dies.
- That would be the only thing that I would agree with. And a responsible owner of a pet would have no issue doing so anyway.
- That's common decency.
- Like an automobile incident. Stay on scene till authorities get there
- As above.
- I liken it to leaving the scene of an accident which you are involved in. Owners need to be held accountable, to often the animal pays the price for the owners poor training.
- They have interacted with the animal and they are responsible for the training and behaviour of their pet.
- I've been bitten which caused a longer term issue with hand pain. The dog and owner was dismissed. Next time I will seek legal support to sue the owner.
- So there is no confusion as to which animal was involved in the incident as often the victim is unable to recall details accurately especially if there is significant trauma!
- If the owner is required to remain it will be easier to manage any necessary action required rather than trying to locate them later. Unless there is an immediate danger in them staying there they should have to contact bylaw services and let them know what happened
- To get all facts from both parties involved.
- I think it's important to get each other's information in case of serious complications.
- I think they must stay until an officer comes or else there's no way of tracking them down.
- As it will show that you do are about what happen and that you take responsibility for you animal
- The problem is evenly between the owner and dog so someone has to look at the owner to see if they're the problem and prevent them from owning a dog in future.
- Every dog bite is unique in its details. Law enforcement should be aware of all details before automatically determining the dog is guilty.
- It's the owners responsibility to stay and give information and explain what had happened
- This assumes the owner is aware that a biting incident has occurred.
- It pretty evident that the owner by available to deal with the issue created by their dog!
- Dog owners are completely responsible for the actions of their dogs.
- The legislation should focus on responsible ownership, especially for anxious dogs or dogs declared a nuisance.
- It's like a car accident ! Information needs to be exchanged
- Owners should be held accountable and own up to what their dog did.
- I know of people who's dogs have been violently attacked by other dogs in a public dog park and the owner fled the seen with the dogs taking no accountability and showing no concern for the other dog. In a car accident fleeing the scene would be illegal and I think for something like a violent dog attack the same makes sense.



- Only if it is aggressive in nature and injury has occurred.
- Both sides of the story should be heard, otherwise there is too much room for speculation and one sided blame.
- You have to remain at the scene of an accident don't you? Only makes sense that you need to stay and give your information to a person who may have been injured by your dog or cat.
- I think it depends on the severity. A little nibble? I don't think so. But I think if there needs to be medical intervention, it's not a bad idea. I think it's important for whatever authority comes to be able to see both sides (if the dog was being teased etc).
- If your dog bites someone or another animal the owner and dog should be held responsible. That can only happen if the owner stays to answer to an enforcement officer. Too often owners leave the scene immediately after an incident.
- There's no explanation needed. The offending owner needs to be there to accept responsibility for the actions of their animal.
- Owners are ultimately responsible for the behaviour of their animals. Highlighting the responsibility and consequences associated with nuisance or dangerous incidents may increase the recognition of this duty
- Treat it like car accidents. If damage is severe then the parties should stay at the scene. If damage is not severe or both parties agree to go then both parties can leave.
- Owner of the dog should explain why the bite happened. Example is some dogs are on with adults but become skiddish with children. If the child walks up to a dog that doesn't like children and is told to stay away and ignores being told. Why would it be the dogs fault?
- How can u hold someone accountable if they run away after there dog attacks. Part of responsible pet ownership is staying if ure dog bites.
- owners should take ownership, accept their fine as well as financial responsibility for the other pet or person who was injured. The persons information needs to be recorded so follow up can happen
- No different than a hit and run. If there's an injury the dog owner needs to remain on scene.
- This seems prudent.
- The owner needs to be held accountable and this would enforce that.
- Only if requested by the bite victim or victim owner. It should be like vehicle collisions - people exchange contact information and only involve authorities if it's severe
- It's like getting in a car accident, you give your contact information so that you can help the other person.
- I think dog owners should be held accountable if their dog harms another animal or person
- With the caveat that the bits was not done during play. That actual blood is drawn. That the bite did not happened because the person that was bitten was not being an idiot.
- Some owners leave the scene immediately after a dog bite attack and in the case where the person whose dog is bitten is responsible for the full vet bill. Many instances result in the bitten dog being euthanised as the owner cannot afford vet bills. I support a rule to ensure that that owner needs to remain on scene to share contact and he/she should also be sharing all/part of the vet bill.



- You need more than the said victims statement. There are always 2 or 3 sides to an event. People see things differently during high stress situations.
- It seems like a good idea.
- Feel this would similar to fleeing a scene of accident? Also, the owner is responsible for the pet and just as a child requires a guardian to be present so should a pet.
- Both sides should be shared as to how it lead up to the incident
- Of course it should be necessary as they can give a first-hand explanation on what happened. Leaving would be equivalent to that of a hit and run.
- Owners run off and hide the vicious beasts so the law can't cease it.
- Accountability
- If a person injures someone else in a car accident, or does significant damage to a vehicle, they are required to stay at the scene. Why should an owner having a dog who causes injury to another person or animal be any different? Their information should be recorded in case their is another incident in the future or further action is needed against the owner, such as liability for any injury to a person.
- a person should stay like at any other accident...exchange info only to someone in charge and not the other person for safeties sake....car
- The owner is responsible. Not the breed of the dog.
- If there is any follow up information, the victim can do so. It should also be required for insurance and liability reasons similar to vehicle accidents. Also, the victim should have full access to the dog's veterinary records including immunizations.
- As the owner of a Staffordshire terrier I believe too often the blame is placed on my breed of dog due to stereotypes and lack of education. Often it is the other dog that is the instigator and lacks obedience
- To many times dog owners leave with their dogs and leave the bitten victim shocked and traumatized. There should be laws for owners who don't stay.
- There may be another side to the story that the owner can provide ie the person the dog but may have been abusing it or causing harm to it
- It's a no brainer. No different than divulging info at a car accident.
- The dog owner must take responsibility for their pet and their pets' actions and behavior
- No different than leaving the scene of a car accident, people should take ownership of their role in their dogs behavior as it is rarely the dog's natural instinct to attack humans.
- One of the only fair things that have been brought up in this.
- Similar to an a car accident, the owner should remain on scene to provide details.
- Responsible
- It is difficult to get this kind of information as you could be dealing with an urgent injury/trauma. Sometimes problem dogs are being walked by youths who just cannot manage dogs.
- If necessary, but I don't think there should be punished if the person bite was provoking the animal
- If the incident is in an official police report the owner can't lie about their identity or about the incident as well.



- Many times bites can be attributed to stupid decisions from other parties. Officers also need to be non biased towards certain breeds
- Having this rule would help incentivise people to stay of their dog bites another dog or person. Hoefully there would be increased fones or penalties for owners who do not stay
- Too many dog owner leave the scene of an attack because they don't want to be held liable - people caught doing so should be treated as an extra offence
- It's an accident so yes if deemed serious for law both owners should stay at the scene until a third party arrives
- Contact information is vital to find who to hold responsible.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dog's actions. There could be long term health And financial issues from the dog bite and the owner should be accountable.
- It is the owner who is responsible for there dog and responsible to ensure he is well trained. STOP always blaming the dog.
- Too many cases where there are dog attacks, the Perpetrator flees the scene with their dog or gives a false name or number. This should be illegal.
- It's the right and responsible thing to do. Sadly it has to be made law because people do not take responsibility.
- It is foolish to think a person responsible for an offence of any type to remain at a scene of any incident. Unfortunately a person who has a pet prone to an attack will not have an acceptable responsibility for accountability. If there is no reasonable accountability for the offender, there is no reasonable expectation for an offender to comply.
- only if it draws blood. Dogs play with each other by biting.
- This goes for all dogs. Ive been out on walks with my pitbull cross and had other peoples off leash dogs come up with out notice or once had an attack from a small dog and the owner came over laughing. This behavior is dangerous and puts everyone at risk if the larger breed dog doesn't want to put up with that at the time. My one pitbull handles different dogs great and never wants to fight or be aggressive so she would rather walk away. My other bully breed American bulldog mix needs slow introductions, but she is the biggest sweet heart with people and kids.
- Some people may not be following the law.
- Needs to take responsibility!
- Far too often after a bite owners take off and are often not held accountable because they vanish. There absolutely should be a law prohibiting people from leaving a bite same as prohibiting from leaving a traffic collision
- It does not mater the bread as a responsible pet owner you need to share imfo
- This is most fair to both the owner and the victim because each side can state their story.
- Bite and run is like hit and run
- I believe if an incident happens all parties are allowed to state their facts of the incident and witnesses should also be allowed to make a statement.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their dog's behaviour and be held accountable.
- An exchange of information perhaps



- So that the guilty party is held responsible and pays for any damage or vet costs.
- Most owners would run away so it's impossible to catch them.
- Bites need to be followed up on and dealt with accordingly.
- Leaving an accident is a crime, this is the same
- This is what responsible pet owners should do.
- If injury / puncture from the bite occurs and it is necessary.
- The animal is the owner's responsibility. Leaving an incident scene should be akin to leaving the scene of a vehicular accident.
- owners need to be responsible for their pet's actions
- Dog owners should also be accountable for their animals actions and never leave the scene of an incident
- The owner is responsible for the actions of the dog.
- And they should pay expenses associated with treatment for the other dog or human
- the same concept as a hit and run in a vehicle. you are responsible for your dog.
- It would just be part of being a responsible owner, and it is important to hear both sides of the story. You need to advocate for your dog
- They are responsible for their pet!
- It is necessary to know if the dog's medical history and to know if the dog has received necessary vaccinations.
- Drivers have to remain at the scene of an accident, why on earth would owners not have to remain at the scene of an incident in which their dog attacks someone?
- If the dog is a responsible owner, it is the right thing to do.
- A pit bull attacked my senior mom at a seniors home parking lot in calgary, the owners left her bleeding on the ground in the parking lot then she was taken by ambulance to a hosp with a concussion and severe facial lacerations.
- People need to take responsibility for their pets. Biting and running is the opposite of that.
- Really
- Absolutely. Owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their dogs.
- Much like any crime, a thorough investigation of all parties involved should be performed.
- There needs to be follow up with people who are not properly able to handle or train their dogs to be in a public setting. Their information would be required for follow up
- Owner's should be held responsible for any attacks or damages made by their own dog.
- Due to injuries that could be sustained the owner should be held accountable
- Absolutely necessary that the owner owns up. A bad or misbehaving dog is the result of the owner.
- Makes sense to pass along your information for an accident scene
- The owner is ultimately responsible. It is like leaving the scene of an accident.
- It is like a hit and run unless they stay on site!
- "Only if the bite is significant.
- Nips causing no significant injury to be excluded."



- All dog breeds.
- Owner is responsible for any problem dog behaviours
- Owners need to take responsibility, big fines if you leave after a dog bite
- If vet costs occur, the attacking animals owner should be held responsible for vet costs.
- This is common sense, like not leaving the scene of an accident. Owners have been known to leave in an effort to escape fines and/or other repercussions, leaving the victim pet and owner with no recourse. Absolutely in favour...stupid question in my opinion. Sorry.
- if the neighbours are ok
- The dog owner must assume responsibility, share rabies vaccination information and talk to enforcement officer
- If they are not required to stay then the likelihood of trying to follow up with them is near impossible
- If a dog bites a person or other animal it would only make sense that there is a follow up investigation and therefore would require the owner to speak to an enforcement officer
- Like a car accident you should stay
- It would be fair and reasonable to have this rule.
- Yes. Otherwise, it should be deemed as leaving the scene of an accident
- People should be held responsible for the actions of their training and raising of their animal.
- They need to be held accountable
- Why would the owner of a biting dog even think to leave the scene, if not to avoid liability.
- A hard one, having had a dog that I took to an off-leash park... some dog owners are remarkably unaware of the conduct of their dog and after several warnings from other dogs sometimes that shitty[removed] dog gets wrestled to the ground... and oh my god the owner has a fit. Perhaps all witnesses should be mandated to stay on scene.
- This should have always been a requirement. I don't think making this a rule will change that many people's intentions. If a person is generally a responsible individual, they most likely would and will remain at the scene of an incident, regardless if it is a rule or not. Similarly, I don't think making a rule, so that people remain at the scene of an incident, is going to change a person's mind to stay there, if they weren't going to stay initially (without the institution of the rule).
- Good owner = good dogs
- Owners are responsible
- The dog owner is 100% responsible for a dog that bites and must be held accountable.
- Dogs should be able to defend themselves. We are.
- Need to take responsibility for the actions of their dog instead of running away
- No explanation needed; if a person owns an animal that bites someone they must be responsible for that animal's behaviour and stay with that animal at the scene of an incident, just like a traffic accident; failure to do so should result in heavy fines and could result in the animal being seized as well as the owner having a possible ban on owning animals in the future. Simply stated, people should be held responsible for their own (or their animal's) actions.
- Remaining shows responsibility and often will explain why the dog behaved in the manner



- Dog owners, in my experience, may even blame the other dog! or the dog's owner...strange. An owner must be held contactable.
- I imagine it must be hard to get accurate information from some people who would just rather flee the scene and not be held responsible. They should wait for some authority to assess the situation.
- Similar to a car accident.
- I believe if a serious bite happens or a person is bite the owners should remain there, however, this can be hard to determine what a "serious" bite may be from one person to another. This is also something that I would see being used as an omission of guilt. This is a very hard question and I'm certain can't be answered in a yes or no fashion. I'd also like to add that the Voluntary Early Dog Warning System is a great idea and should be widely adopted by owners.
- Any and all animal attacks (against animal or human) should be dealt with by all the parties involved
- Prohibit pit bulls!
- Dog behaviour is owner's responsibility.
- in the event that more injury occurs or there is any to start they should share info in case of payment for vet bills be needed.
- It should be like an accident scene.
- Of course the owner should stay at the scene. I would like to once again reiterate, however, that if any part of your bylaw is breed-specific (e.g., for "pit bull" breeds), then it needs to be reconsidered and rewritten so that it is not so.
- It has just injured someone, why shouldn't they stay.
- People are afraid to do so. No one wants their dog euthanized. Accidents happen. It's hard to choose and hard yes or no for this.
- They need to provide vaccination information and contact information for medical repayment. Also, there are usually 2 sides to every story.
- Identify the person so they can be held accountable
- Owners need to be accountable for the behaviour of the animals under their care
- There is virtually no way to enforce this and the victim will have to be rushed to the hospital. This is a poorly thought out idea.
- Only evidence must be used not one person's word against another. If a small dog bites a Rottweiler nothing may happen but when the Rottweiler retaliates it should be the instigator dog owner that is punished - not the Rottweiler for defending themselves
- Yes. They should be held responsible for their dogs actions.
- Common sense and decency
- Being a responsible pet owner requires that you take responsibility for all actions of your pet. Fines should be levied against owners who neglect to stay at the scene of the incident unless for reason of immediate danger.
- "many times , bites can be instigated by owners with small dogs who feel leasing is not needed for their small dogs and these dogs go up and bite the bigger ones nipping their jowls so both owners should stay and the whole explanation taken down by both owners



- many small dogs owners should have to be subject to the leash laws and fined when their dogs are off leash in leash areas
- Many small dog owners dont think laws apply to them , letting them bother bigger dogs or driving with them in their laps"
- I think its important to be a responsible pet owner
- All too often owners if dogs who bite ir injure people take off before their info can be gathered
- People need to be responsible for their actions and those of their pets.
- Owners should be held responsible for all dog bites or issues. They are responsible for training their dog and therefore responsible for its behaviour.
- This should always be mandatory.
- Owners should be held responsible for the actions of their dogs
- Yes for the OWNER to TAKE RESPONSIBILITY
- I agree that the dog owner needs to do the responsible thing and exchange info in this situation, I just don't want the animal taken away from the owner or in fear of being put down.
- Pet owners should be held accountable for the behaviors of their pets
- "If it's a dog playing then no.
- If it's aggressive then yes."
- It should be treated the same as if a traffic accident. Must not leave the scene or the owner can be charged with an offence. Unless there's an emergency to leave
- The dog owner is responsible for the incident that occurred and needs to give the proper information to all parties involved since legal action may be required
- The owner of the dog should be held responsible if their dog is out of control and causes injury to another person or animal
- Sometimes the dog that does the biting is doing it in self defence, or protecting an owner...
- Too many times have I seen in our community forum that the owner and dog flee with no repercussions
- There should be a criminal charge if they fail to stay at the scene.
- If an incident occurs. All parties and witness should remain at the scene to give a full story and provide all views and perspectives to the incident.
- The owner should be fined with an order to take dog obedience classes. The dog should be removed from the owner in some situations. The dog should be euthanized with a serious attack or bite.
- The owner is responsible
- How would you find the owner of the offending dog otherwise?
- I think a person should remain at the scene and make sure the other person is okay.
- The owner should be at fault and fined if they leave. It's all part of responsible dog ownership
- Responsible dog ownership.
- Reduce time for collecting information and reduce cost in obtaining the required information from both parties.



- Any responsible pet owner WOULD automatically stay at the scene.
- Pets are the responsibility of owners. The situation above describes an owner being responsible for their pet.
- Because there are a lot of liars claiming they got bit but won't show you the bite. An officer needs to view the bite and hear both sides of the incident right then and there.
- There seems to be little to no guidance on this issue. I have had dogs attack my own dogs and the owner is in no way obligated to stay and be held liable for their actions. Many perpetrators leave the scene as they know there are little to no consequences.
- There should be an opportunity to document all sides of the incident from the parties involved. Injured parties deserve assurance that it won't be able to happen again to someone else.
- Yes and the aggressive dog owner must pay any vet/medical bills for animal or human who was attacked.
- To minimize chances of another bite
- [removed] Not different than a car accident, both parties should remain whether it the Dogs/owners or victims fault.
- This would be the epitome of "responsible" ownership
- They are responsible for the dogs actions and need to remain at the scene
- How could this not be a law now? If they have a dog that is not social then the probability that it is up to date on shots is lower. Cost of vet care is their responsibility. This is truly a no brainer.
- The owner may be able to keep some control of the animal after the incident
- The owners should be held liable
- The owner is ALWAYS the one responsible. Not the animal. It's not a gun that is responsible for hurting someone its the person holding it.
- Surely no explanation is necessary for this. Runs off double the fine.
- The dogs aren't the problem. The owners are. That is why they should stay and take responsibility for the actions of their pet.
- In order for this to work, the penalties for "incidents" at a dog park (for example, aggressive behaviour) must not be so severe that the owner will fear an extreme punishment for their dog-- focus the consequences positively (i.e. obedience classes or consulting with a dog behaviourist rather than physical measures such as muzzles or disallowing the dog from going to an off-leash park)
- "just as with car accidents there are always 2 sides to a story.
- Both owner and person harmed should give statement in order to ensure that the animal had not been provoked or that there were not odd circumstances"
- As long as this doesn't lead to people facing charges for taking their animal home, say in a mutual incident, perhaps their animal or themselves are scared or injured.
- Normally it's the owner who's the problem not the animal
- Similar to a motor vehicle incident, dog owners should be required to remain at the scene
- Taking responsibility for their animal should be first priority as well as insuring the injured animal is cared for by the costs of the offenders pet.



- Ownership requires responsibility, and a small minority of dog owners are not responsible for their dogs actions.
- Why would it be different than a car accident in that way?
- It is the owners responsibility to properly train or muzzle their dog (any breed), or explain the situation to the proper authorities
- Both parties (the victim and the owner of the dog as well as the dog) should stay and exchange full information as well as give a detailed explanation to the officer present.
- As in any other incident potentially causing bodily harm or any sort of trauma all parties involved have the responsibility to report the incident. This protects all parties involved.
- "Yes, if there's no law to euthanize the dog.
- If there's laws that are going to reprimand the owner or the dog for being a pitbull or euthanizing the dog for minor bites (or provoked bites) The owner should be allowed to leave the scene."
- Nothing to explain.. they should stick around and not run off
- Both parties should provide any necessary information.
- The ability to leave the scene of the incident disempowers the person or animal who was bitten from an investigation or a fair review process, if this is desired by the victim.
- It is responsible pet ownership. Similar to remaining at the scene of an accident
- This could be required if the victim/guardian of a victim or owner of an animal victim wants to file a report.
- A dog bite might require additional costs to treat the animal or person who was bitten. The dog owner should be responsible for covering these costs.
- Depending on the situation, I have people let their children run up to my pets, I speak please do not. The parents always say its okay, they do not listen. I have wonderful pets, just do not want people running up and scaring them. I always stand in front of my pets and advise them no, unless I say it is okay. The parents then start using vulgar language, saying I am being mean. Where are my rights to say, I said please do not unless, I say let me let them sit and you can now approach. So, put yourself in that situation. I have no problem, with that.
- I would hope this would give victims more power to hold the attacker accountable and request they stay.
- The owner needs to be held responsible if a dog attacks another dog/person. It isn't the dogs fault, no dog is inherently bad, just poorly trained and cared for.
- People should take responsibility for the actions of their dog.
- Any incident needs the involved to share information, should be similar to vehicles incidents etc.
- n/a
- Yes. Treat it like a car accident.
- As a frequent user of Calgary dog parks (primarily Sue Higgins), i have seen and heard too many stories about irresponsible owners attempting to flee the dog park after their dog has been involved in an incident. While a law may not keep people from attempting to flee and avoid their responsibility as a pet owner, there should be consequences for those that attempt to flee.



- An owner should always be held responsible and ensure the other dog and owner are alright, safe, and cared for. Accidents happen, sometimes dogs just don't like each others scent. Both parties should be in agreement with what happens next, but it has to be humane.
 - They need to be aware and take responsibility.
 - it is important for the owner of the animal to be responsible. They should remain at the scene to provide their contact info and inform if there have been other incidents in the past or if there was a trigger for the dog to bite
 - owners should be held accountable for their dog and should provide necessary information should their dog bite someone or another animal
 - Yes absolutely the owner should remain at the scene and BOTH parties should share contact information along with any witnesses
 - You can't cause a car accident and leave, why should dogs and their owners that attack get to just walk away as if nothing happened?
 - Owners should be responsible for their pets 100% of the time.
 - All dog owners not just pit bull style dogs so owner's of dog who bit or instigated I'd held accountable
 - Law enforcement do not have time to waste tracking down unknown owners. It is the dog owner's duty to stay and take responsibility just as it is a driver's duty in the event of an accident.
 - "Any time an enforcement officer is called, both parties should be required to remain at the scene.
-
- NOTE: sometimes incidents seem minor and a separate third party phones the authorities or the owner of the dog that was attacked phones after the fact....if the attacking dog's owner isn't aware that a call has or will be made, I don't feel they should be able to be punished should they leave the scene."
 - People need to be responsible for their pets.
 - If a dog bites another person or animal it is more than reasonable to have the owner of the dog stay at the scene to provide information. That way the person/dog that was bitten has the information in case of any potential cost to them (vet bills, medication, etc.) Also then the owner and dog are on record so if the incident occurs again there can be a resolution whether it be obedience classes, not being allowed at off leash parks, and so on.
 - It makes sense the same as staying at the scene of an accident. But the bite couldn't just be a nip. Also I'm uncertain because then are they not having the dog with them who has already been riled up waiting too. It might be better for them to provide contact info and meet to discuss later.
 - Should always involve an enforcement officer. Would like to see larger off leash areas patrolled more regularly.
 - Dog attacks can be terrible and often leave there victims with ptsd if a dog attacks and bites another dog or person then by law they should have to remain on scene to deal with all repercussions. It should be treated similar to leaving the scene of a accident and if the owners leave they should also incur penalties.



- Dog owners should always be responsible for their dogs
- This only seems reasonable. If you own a dog and are responsible this would form part of being responsible. Dah!
- The dog owner should be liable for any cost incurred by the victim or animal that was bitten
- I don't know how you would enforce this, but of COURSE the owner should be made to take responsibility for their dog's behaviour.
- Owner needs to take responsibility
- Dog owner should carry dog insurance all time whenever leave the house for a walk with a dog. Owner should share insurance documents and his full details by physically showing documents to whoever demands.
- I would say doing otherwise can be similar to a hit and run. It is the owner's responsibility for their dog and their dog's actions. That includes if the dog bites someone, to be a responsible owner and ensure that it is handled correctly UNLESS the victim insists that they are fine and police/EMS are not involved.
- Aggressive dogs of any kind are aggressive because that's how they are treated by their owner. So if a dog bites a person it should fall on the owner
- This will help determine both sides of the story and ensure that dangerous dogs do not continue to harm others (repetitive behaviour)
- Accountability
- It is important to get the dog owner's information. Too many times they flee the scene
- Accountability. Often dangerous dog owners are dangerous people and the victims are often intimidated not to report. And then have huge vet or medical bills or disfigurement. They have a right to sue.
- "1. It's like in a car accident. the owner must stay at the scene to talk to the police.
- This rule will deter the dog owner. He/she must always be responsible for what his/her pet does."
- The owner is the responsible party.
- This is important for both accountability and to hear the other side of the story.
- To complete a thorough investigation it will be required.
- This would force the owner to accept responsibility, or alternatively, share their side of the story.
- The owner should be questioned as to why the dog bit the other person. Is it being abused at home? Was the person not welcome to pet the dog? Was the person being aggressive or not being friendly towards the dog?
- Like a car accident, you or your property causes damage or injury you're responsible for it
- The animal's medical history is needed for proper treatment for possible infections. The owner is responsible for the animal and needs to take responsibility.
- Owner is liable and should then be forced to send the dog to obedience class within a certain amount of time from the date of the incident.
- Only in instances that cause bleeding.



- ANY type of dog can bite or become aggressive, ALL dog owners should be responsible for their dog's behaviour. If something does happen, the responsible thing to do is speak to enforcement officers if need be.
- Why would they be allowed to flee the scene? This seems redundant, unless there truly is no law in place to prevent someone from doing this.
- It should be no difference than if you were in a car accident. The only exception would be if the animal is in a state of extreme aggression and for the safety of everyone needs to be removed or secured. However in this case the owner should call the responding bylaw officer and provide all appropriate information before leaving the scene. In cases when the owner is securing the animal in a location 5 minutes or less from the scene of the attack, they should return to the scene once the animal is secured to speak directly with the officer.
- It is absolutely the responsibility of the owner to ensure he is responsible for any issues, just as it would be at the scene of a car accident.
- The owners should be held more accountable in situations where their dog has become aggressive towards other dogs or individuals.
- Good owner responsibility
- I feel that dog owners must be responsible for their animals and this type of incident is no different then leaving the site of a car accident
- I was bitten by a dog and the owner ran. he should be charged with criminal offense attempted murder
- accountability
- Owner should stay to give his or her side of the story.
- This should fall under the responsible owner act.. regardless of the which dog started it
- With a witness as well, to help keep owners responsible and help pay for vet bills.
- otherwise you would never see that person again possibly
- All circumstances are different. Bites can be provoked or unprovoked. An animal that is kicked, hit, beaten, etc is likely to defend itself. It is not always the animal that is in the wrong.
- The owner can share some of the responsibilities of what their dog did.
- An owner should stay and leave contact info in instances where their dog attacks a human.
- It should be treated like a car accident resulting in injury. Everyone stays on scene until the police can arrive. In the case the offering pupper is too excited/not able to be brought under control, the owner should remove the dog to a safe location and return to the scene.
- Sometimes a dog who just bit needs to be removed from the scene but like a car accident driver (dog owner/guardian at the time of incident) can't leave the scene without proof of ID and location for bylaw to follow up with that day
- Reduces investigation time and expense
- Their responsibility
- This is just common sense and a responsible pet owner
- Biting and run is not ok.



- It should be like a car accident, you remain at the scene until it's been dealt with. There are some dogs that are inherently more violent, but I believe it all comes down to their training. If an owner has taken the time to train their dog (no matter what the breed), then there should be no problem. If any dog, no matter what breed, thinks it's ok to attack a dog or other human, the onus is on the owner as being responsible for their training and response to various triggers.
- This extremely serious. Police should be notified too in case of human bite.
- To make sure the bylaw officer gets all the dogs information and the owner. They will be reprimanded accordingly and not flee.
- Dog owners need to stay at scene and take responsibility or face forfeiture of animal.
- This makes sense. Owners should not be able to run away of their animal does something wrong.
- The owners should be given considerable fines if their dog bites
- If their dog does all the damage they can cause serious injury/death and can cost a substantial amount. Unless at dog park you take responsibility for your own pet unless that pet is a danger/nuisance dog
- The owner should always be held responsible for the actions of any animal, no matter the breed.
- Damage done to property/individuals, similar to car collisions, there needs to be statements taken regarding the situation.
- All dog owners should be accountable for their actions and those of their pets. Responsible pet ownership extends to all pet owners, of any breed or animal type.
- A "Bite and Run" should have consequences, same as a "Hit and Run" in a vehicle.
- I believe that the responsibility is on the pet owner to manage their dog, and especially an aggressive dog such as the pit bull. They need to stay and provide their information.
- It would be similar to a hit and run in automotive vehicles as there has been damage done and the individual needs to be held accountable for those actions.
- My dogs have been bitten while at City off-leash parks and each time the owner has run. It's lousy. Not sure how this could be enforced, though.
- How else are we to know that it was the dogs fault. Possibly the person bit was harassing the dog.
- Too many instances of dogs attacking and owners leaving scene and not facing penalty. A fine might reduce this.
- Self explanatory
- So many people run off after a dog bite, and it turns out there are vet bills that need to be paid or other things to be taken care of. After a bite, dogs should also be figured out on what the cause was, whether aggression or otherwise.
- the dog is the owner's responsibility.
- As a dog owner, I need to be responsible for its behaviour.
- Legal reasons if the dog has bit a child or another animal they should be held accountable for the actions of their pet. You don't leave the scene of a serious car accident.
- The owner can leave and may not know where they live. Charges must be laid
- Owners are responsible for their pets.



- If your pet is responsible for an injury you must take responsibility.
- I believe that both parties should be able to share their sides of the story... not just one.
- It should be similar to a vehicle incident where it is required of you to stay at the scene.
- This shouldn't even be a question. Of course the owner needs to stick around - it's part of responsible ownership.
- Take responsibility for the dog!
- The owner should be held responsible for their animal's actions, not the animal itself
- Hold the owner accountable STOP BREED SPECIFIC BANS THEY DON'T WORK!!!!
- My nephew was bit by a dog and the owner brushed it off as her dog isn't good around people and provided no info to my sister in law. I feel as a pet owner you need to own the actions of your pet
- If we are required to do that in a vehicle accident, we should also be required to stay in a dog attack/injury.
- Like a hit and run, any incident regarding a person or animal should be held accountable.
- Ban pit bulls
- They should remain at or near the scene unless they can produce valid photo ID and location they are going to diffuse potentially bad situations from getting worse
- That's a no-brainer.
- Stay at the scene
- The dog owner is the owner of the dog there shouldn't be any question about it. He/she paid for the dog and cares about the dog.
- No different than a car accident. All people involved must stay.
- If they do not we may never find the owner or dog again leading to more issues down the road. Or a nuisance dog and owner avoiding consequences.
- The dog owner is solely responsible for the incident and the owner took that responsibility as soon as they took ownership of the dog. It's like owning a car and hitting other cars.
- Liability.
- As long as it is safe to do so, the owner must remain at the scene while everything is handled.
- No need for an exclamation. If your dog bites somebody or another animal, you damn well better stick around and provide information. What if the dog is sick or rabid or whatever? I would think most people would like that information. Sort of like a hit and run. You simply do not leave the scene!
- People need to know information about the animal that bit them
- We are required to stay at the scene of an accident and this is no different. If someone is injured, I believe witness should stay.
- Common sense!
- The owner is responsible for the dog and therefore can be held accountable for the dog's actions (depending on attack)
- I believe that staying at the scene is common sense. If they flee, once identified, they must pay a fine on top of any fines that they get issued for the attack.
- Just like if you get into a car accident you shouldn't leave



- Dog owners are responsible for their pets. Regardless of what kind of dog they are. "Bully Breeds" should not be singled out in this. I've seen little dogs act far more aggressive than large dogs.
- Most owners of small breed dogs do not take the actions of their dogs actions seriously when they have bitten another person or animal
- People need to be held responsible for their pets actions
- This is no different than any other attack. However - it may be necessary to have provisions that ensure the dog in question is placed safely at a distance or otherwise contained. On paths or in parks, this may mean taking the dog to a safe place or a vehicle, or possibly even back to a nearby house and should be permitted.
- To help mitigate a helpful solution: what happened/share in vet costs/ticketing if necessary
- Keeping the dog owner there means less work for law enforcement to go out and find the owner and prevent another attack.
- If there is no severe penalty for leaving the scene they may never be found
- It's common sense
- The owner should be responsible for their pets. If they cannot handle them then they should not have them. They should be fined to the maximum. They should be on scene so their information is collected to fines can be enforced.
- I'm shocked to learn this rule doesn't already exist! Of course it's necessary, otherwise how can anyone be held accountable for their let's actions?? It's certainly not the animal's fault that the owner is incompetent to follow pet ownership requirements.
- If the dog does not need to be isolated before it escalates a situation.
- I see this as a similar situation to a car accident. Remain on scene and exchange information.. call enforcement if the situation requires it.
- No matter the breed, it is still a legal incident. Both owners should be required to stay.
- Being an employee of the Government of Alberta I can tell you the Court of Queen's Bench has a back log as well. I do not see this speeding anything else up, and having more hands dealing with the same case will take longer.
- Yes. Is this not already a fine? Seems like this would be the minimum requirement for a responsible pet owner.
- There may be exceptions if the dog owner has to assist the injured party.
- Taking responsibility for your pets behavior is the bare minimum that should be required of any responsible pet owner.
- they can explain what happened and see if the dog was provoked
- As long as the individual can place their animal in a vehicle or away to not cause further harm they should stay and be present to talk to authorities
- Do you walk away at a car accident? NO so why let owners walk away from a dog bite?
- Accountability
- If a dog bites, the owner should be held accountable, other than in cases that the animal was clearly provided, abused, or neglected.



- because that owner has failed their responsibility to train their animal OR the owner warned the victim that the dog prefers it's space and the victim did not listen. Either way there needs to be some sort of corrective action to resuce further incidents
- It makes sense and will make the process of fines and punishments for said dog behaviour go over smoother
- Dog bites are serious and the owner should be held to account and not just leave after the incident
- Yea
- Responsible pet owners already do this.
- The dog bite is the responsibility of the owner. Any dog has the potential to bite
- It's like a hit & run accident. The owner is responsible & should remain at the scene of a bite.
- You must take responsibility for your own animals
- The owner knows the fog and its behaviour and can better explain the whybir how it happened.
- Most dog owners which are involved in this situations tend to leave the scene before authorities arrive
- This is common sense and decency.
- If they leave victim has no recourse.
- Owners of aggressive dogs should bear full responsibility for any injuries caused by their dog and should be heavily penalized and have a compulsory liability insurance after the first attack.
- If the bite was so severe that medical conditions were needed
- Owners should be held accountable. Officers need to hear both sides. Were there any circumstances that led to the bite? Was it unprovoked? Etc etc
- Just for the purpose of proper communication and no loose ends at the end of investigation !!
- If they leave the scene... it should be considered similar to a vehicle Hit and Run and a Criminal Offense.
- Owners should be accountable for things that happen, officers that respond should have a background in animals behaviour to recognize the difference between provoked/unprovoked attacks, this would be opportunity to assess owners knowledge of dogs/their dog behaviour.
- It is important, why wouldn't one stay. I would feel horrible if my dog bite someone or something.
- Owner of dog that bit should take responsibility for bite. Should offer assistance, should stay to give information.
- Well trained dogs should t be biting other people or animals. The owner is accountable and therefore should remain at the scene. Also, the owner should also be under review when incidents occur.
- the criteria for 'incident' would have to be clearly defined as many consider a loud dog scuffle to be an 'attack' (it isn't). So, with clear outline of what constitutes an 'incident' (blood?), I agree that both parties need to remain on site. Charges should be laid if an owner flees with their dog.
- I'm sure it's already a rule that you can't injure a person then flee to avoid accountability.
- Ensures responsibility
- Yes, and if the owner does leave the scene of the incident they should face the same penalties as a hit and run.



- The owner has to be accountable for the dogs action.
- Yes is common sense, isn't it?
- I think you have to determine severity of an incident. A bite needs to be defined. So “drew blood and/or punctured skin”. Dogs will correct each other and that is not aggressive behaviour so it needs to be defined.
- Should be treated the same as a car accident.
- The owner should be given the option to explain their side of what happens.
- If a person is bite by ANY breed of dog it should be the owners responsibility to be there and make a statement. I think it is outrageous that we are profiling a breed of dog based off of there strength! I have encountered more vicious and aggressive breeds outside of “pitbull” breeds. We should be looking at repetitive offenders, not by the breed of dog!! I know multiple “Pitbull” breed owners that have trained their dogs way better then smaller breed dogs. We are basically breed profiling which is NOT acceptable!
- Some cases require medical intervention both human and animal. Offending party should be the one to cover costs, especially if not first time offence. Having enforcement there would help hold the offending party accountable. Also, I believe it's important to procure witnesses of the incident, especially if there may be severe recourse placed on the animal. Many people are breed bias, protective of of own animal, may have caused the offending dog to lash out. Many factors play into the reason why a dog may retaliate, and having people present would help provide the appropriate action to be taken.
- Absolutely the owner has a responsibility to the victim, including paying any necessary veterinary (if victim is an animal) or medical (person) expenses. This should be a law.
- Owners should stay at the scene to take full responsibility on their own animal.
- Nice idea, but irresponsible dog owners won't stay.
- Depends on the situation, for example if two dogs fought. In some cases an enforcement officer may not need to be involved.
- How else will one get to the bottom of this horrid situation along with, (if any) witnesses.
- "It is the owners responsibility to remain at the scene. No different than a traffic incident.
- If the owner leaves they should receive a fine."
- It's basic human responsibility. It's my dog, and therefore my responsibility.
- I have been but by small dogs who do not cause much injury but there seems to be little focus on smaller aggressive breeds (like jack Russells). The issue is the owners lack of care and training and it is not the dogs fault. Because damage is less for smaller dogs, they do not get tagged as nuisance which is inappropriate.
- It is the responsible thing to, no different from any other accident.
- If a dog bites another animal or person at the fault of the dog (e.g the other animal or human couldn't have been causing it by annoying the dog or not listening to the owner) the owner should be responsible for the vet or healthcare bills
- These bylaws are only enforceable if it is possible to accurately report the owner/dog.
- MUST be for bites on BOTH people and other animals



- Owners of aggressive dogs should be treated in a similar fashion as people with weapons
- It's just the responsible thing to do. Like in a car accident. Leave your information, if you need to remove your animal from the situation be honourable.
- It is similar to staying at the scene of an accident - responsible pet guardianship
- Of course they should stay until the matter is resolved on either side; no matter what the breed! Breed specific legislation is cruel and unfounded. "A dog that has the appearance or physical characteristics SIMILAR to those in clauses etc" is too broad a term and banning these dogs from parks and forcing them to be muzzled will only unnecessarily cause them trauma and to lack socialization; which is ironic since you claim to want to spare them of that.
- absolutely but a dog that has exhibited aggressive behaviour needs to be restrained. If the owner is incapable of doing this onsite ie other dogs aggravating a large dog, they identify themselves to the injured before leaving to remove the dog from the situation.
- The owner is responsible for the damages that the dog does... How else does the public get the owners information to seek damages ..
- It should be applicable for y size of dog. As well as if a dog bites another dog
- Yes, as sometimes the dog bite was provoked this gives both parties an opportunity to explain what happened to give the dog a fair opportunity for decision
- Like a car collision, there is damage to someone's Elsa property of self and the at fault party should be ticketed /ggned for leaving the scene.
- It is the pet owners responsibility to pay for any damages committed by their pet.
- Sometimes it's important to get both sides. If a child was repeatedly told not to approach a dog by the owner or parent, even if the dog isn't generally a nuisance, the dog can get mad and injur the child. This is not the dogs fault. The nuisance may not be the one that attacked, but the one who provoked.
- Of coarse a dog owner should remain at the scene, if his or her dog has bitten or attacked another dog or person!!!!
- Only if it can help clarify circumstances of the bite and doesn't automatically leads to killing the dog that bite.
- I'm uncertain about this rule. It's very possible that after a dog bite (even a minor one) the dog owner may begin to be threatened or someone may try to attack their dog. I think in this instance it is perfectly okay to leave as long as they ring and notify authorities.
- Responsibility responsibility responsibility
- Just like a motor vehicle accident; if someone (person or dog) is bitten by another dog (any breed, and size), the owner of the biter must share their contact information with victim. It's pretty simple.
- It is a great way to keep track of the dog.
- they should be able to share there side of the story. and also if something were to happen to the dog or person someone should be able to get in contact with the owner of the dog that has caused the problem incident, no matter the breed.
- accountability is important.



- it's often the owner and their handling of the dog that causes the problem, so this might help the owner with taking some responsibility, and the chance for education
- The owner is responsible for their pet behaviour and therefore should be required to stay on site if a situation like a bite or attack takes place
- People that own dogs that are more prone to biting or nipping are usually in denial about their pet being dangerous. Unfortunately, police are needed to keep people safe even when it comes to pets. People have not demonstrated that they can police themselves well enough to take that responsibility on.
- As long As the dogs not taken from a concerned and responsible Owner.
- Yes, I have other owners bite my dog and leave without giving me any information.
- Owners are responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- This is a no brainer! Pet owners need to be held accountable
- Leaving is equivalent to a hit and run.
- Otherwise, it is no different than fleeing from the scene of a crime
- People need to be more accountable for their dogs actions. Often it is how the animal is raised not the actual breed. People need to be fined and be accountable to vet or health bills, should not be all on the animal.
- It is important for pet owners to take accountability for their animals and be responsible if something occurs
- If the victim is legitimately injured the dog owner should provide their contact information, or if the victim believes they are giving false information, should be required to remain at the scene until an officer arrives to collect the necessary information.
- Just good karma
- Like any incident in which a person is injured, all parties should remain at the scene until enforcement can sort things out. The only reason a person should leave the scene is if it is imperative that they get their do to a vet for life saving procedures
- responsibility of the dog owner to take care of the consequences of their pets actions. I was bite in an off leash park last year, the owner of the offending dog dissappeared and I had no idea whether the dog was properly vaccinated which when dealing with rabies / tetanus shots after the fact made decisions by health professionals more difficult
- You cannot just walk away from a car accident, so you shouldn't be allowed to walk away from another situation in which your property has caused injury such as a dog bite.
- I believe that like a car incident that person should have to pay for any medical attention.
- Owners are responsible for all their dogs actions and should be held accountable.
- People need to be responsible for dogs actions.
- Yes as it shows responsible pet ownership
- You don't leave a car crash.It is the pet owners ultimate responsibility
- I believe that if you are a pet owner it is a responsibility to follow all rules. and so many people I see when I am out walking do not even use a leash, they just carry it. My small dog was jumped on by a dog who was able to scare my dog who was wrapped around my leg, she is 7 pounds and this one



was at least 6 times the size and weight. I was using a cane and trying to pick my dog up and fortunately, I was the one with the injury trying to pick my dog up. It was probably a one off and my injury healed, but this is not always going to be the case. If my dog did that, my job is to follow through to ensure that there was no injury and that should be the case with anyone who has a pet.

- Self explained in the question as an accident has occurred the person should remain at the scene as they are responsible for any damages that his/her animal has caused
- Dogs just don't bite for no reason. Often they are scared by something, like someone running at them or someone who swings something at them. A dog showing to be aggressive is usually caused by the mishandling and training by the owner or just plain old treat their dog mean so they are mean. Any breed can be a good happy dog if treated with kindness, care and proper handling and basic training. Not all dogs are good people lap dogs but that does not make them dangerous if they belong to the right owner who cares
- I got bites by a chocolate Retriever and the owner walk away. That dog attacked my bully who never moved cause she was very well trained
- it is like any other accident. If you hit someone you are expected to remain at the scene. Unless it is too dangerous then an immediate call into report it must be done.
- The owner of a dog is responsible for the actions of the dog and consequences thereof. Thus, the owner should be held to the same standards as a person committing an assault or similar offense.
- This allows both parties to be heard, people to feel safer and addresses the situation instead of blaming a specific breed. It also encourages responsible pet ownership since small dogs can and often do bite and while the 'damage' may not be as bad those owners should still have responsibility to train their pets.
- People should have to stay. It should be like leaving the scene of an accident
- we have been in instances where my dogs have been bit or attacked and the owner fled.
- The owner is responsible and should be held accountable for the actions of their dog big or small. I have personally been bitten by small dogs and have had my personal dog attacked by small dogs. Owners have a responsibility to ensure the best life for their dogs.
- It's a responsibility issue, any damages should be addressed and the victim(s) should be compensated for losses caused ie damaged clothes, vet bills.
- I think it should be treated like a car accident. If a dog bites it is up to the people on site to determine the severity of the bite and call officers if necessary.
- The enforcement officer would have an opportunity to talk to the owner at the time of the incident (not five days later when they've had time to alter the narrative to their own benefit) to collect additional information about the incident, communicate the seriousness of the offence to that person and the applicable next steps, explain the interim order or conditions if applicable to the owner, and assess whether that person is likely to comply with any conditions. If it appears to the enforcement officer that the owner will not comply, the officer should be given the authority to take possession of the animal immediately. The victim would get contact information to support a potential lawsuit against the owner if deemed necessary. This would reinforce the seriousness of the situation to owners of nuisance dogs if they could be open to a potentially expensive lawsuit. The owner would



not be able to cut and run without providing this information which would hold them more accountable for their dogs misbehaviour.

- Any responsible dog owner would be willing to stay on the scene of an incident. If people are leaving the scene, it's once again a sign of a PEOPLE issue.
- It should be treated no differently than a hit and run.
- Owners of any breed, not just pitbulls or similar breeds, should have to stay at the scene and have to exchange contact info. If another animal is hurt, the owner of the dog that caused the injuries should be responsible for vet costs, exchanging contact info makes this possible. Also, if the dog that bites/attacks has done this on multiple occasions, there would be some sort of proof.
- It is important to have all details possible at the scene or wait in the vehicle until enforcement officer arrives. It often creates scenarios of mismatching stories. It is the best to have them remain at the scene.
- Or give the contact info as quickly as possible as to get the dog out of the situation
- I'm shocked this isn't a current requirement, especially if a person was bit.
- How are you going to enforce a law if no one stays on scene? Not much different than a hit and run.
- Yes but sometimes wouldn't it be better to get the dog home and calm it down? Rather than having it stay at the scene where it just bit someone etc.?
- It is the responsible way.
- It will be easier to collect info on dogs that bite when incidents are reported and documented
- All pet owners should be responsible for their pets. Whether it is a cat or dog, yorkie or mastiff, a pet owners must take responsibility for their pets actions
- To be responsible for your dogs actions.
- This can and will identify the owners and the responsibility They have to society to control their dogs.
- Owners should be held accountable for their animals, they should not be able to flee after an incident without repercussions.
- It should be seen the same as a hit and run.
- The owner should be held accountable, not the dog.
- it is important to get contact info in case of disease or costs incurred after such an incident
- Just like if a human abuses a human, they are given a chance to speak. As animals can not communicate with us it is then on the owner to explain. Why was the dog involved in an accident? Was the dog provoked by the victim? Did the victim go against the owners wishes and approach a dog that they were asked to leave alone?
- The owner is solely responsible for the behaviour of their dog
- This should be no different than a vehicle accident.
- I think witness testimony should be considered as well. Was this person or animal harassing the dog that bit them before the incident? In my experience, these incidents are often provoked.
- As long as a secondary entity is in agreement with euthanization of the animal. I don't like that one person can decide the fate of an animal
- Medical info such about the pet that bit is important, ex: does dog have updated rabies shot. Does dog have a history of biting.



- At the end of the day, the owner is responsible for the behavior of their dog. The owner must understand the consequences for their lack of judgement, lack of knowledge/training, and/or their negligence for letting such a situation occur. I believe it is important that they are educated on what went wrong to ensure such a situation does not happen again.
 - This should be a requirement if it can be accomplished safely; however, it may be necessary to remove animals or children from the immediate scene for medical attention or to prevent further aggression, especially given the length of time it can take for authorities to arrive. There should be a rule, that the dog must stay, if possible, and must provide immediate and accurate contact information.
 - I don't know why any decent person would flee such a situation if they are actually a responsible pet owner.
 - It's no different than a vehicle collision. Need accountability.
 - No
 - The owner needs to be identified and accountable.
 - "I work on animal bite follow up for animal to human disease transmission. Too often, pet owners just say that their pet's shots are up to date then leave the area which makes follow up difficult.
-
- An alternative to staying on scene could be a legal requirement to provide the bite victim or their parent/guardian with their name & contact information. Similar to car accidents: minor accidents trade info, major ones wait for authorities."
 - Responsible dog ownership includes follow up of any dog bite or incident.
 - at least dog licence info should be given - the insurance suggestions are only realistic if you can identify people
 - If a pet accidentally or intentionally is involved in an incident the owner should be accountable and exchange information to try to resolve the issue if necessary.
 - There are 2 sides to every story.
 - Any responsible pet owner should stay at the scene to control their dog and give their information to an officer
 - If the bite is severe especially. You have an obligation as an owner.
 - Any dog owner whos pet had been involved in any disturbance should stay to talk to bylaw!
 - Isn't fleeing the scene a criminal offence?
 - You should focus on enforcing the rules you already have in place before adding in a host of new ones that won't be enforced. I walk Edworthy almost every single day. NEVER once have I seen bylaw enforcing rules there or handing out fines. Stop with this pitbull nonsense.
 - Take responsibility.
 - I do not believe the pet owner should be charged, I think law enforcement should hear both sides of the story. Often, if not always, when a dog lashes out, there was a reason.
 - This should be applied to ALL breeds. Not discriminating against "pit bull" breeds



- It should be treated just like a car accident. Stay at the scene to exchange information and if you don't it's a hit and run.
- NOT FOR PUNISHMENT - but resources on dog training and support for people to be able to afford and actually go through with it.
- Similar to remaining at the scene of any car accident.
- Depending on the severity of the bite, when a large vet bill might be required, i think they should be held responsible for there dog if the dog was the first to engage in conflict.
- Need to record and gather info, is it a repeat offender/nuisance dog.
- If the incident requires medical treatment.
- I think if a dog bites a person they should give information to solve the problem however, to simply suggest that the only dogs biting people are pit bulls is a extreme generalization
- Yes, dog owners must be held responsible for all actions of their pet. In the past their has been too much focus on bad animals and specific breeds. It is my belief that it is the owners treatment and training of the animal that will impact whether their pet is a nuisance or danger to public - not the dog breed.
- If an animal or human gets hurt. If it is the owners responsibility to be there to support them since they let the dog run loose. The owner should take responsibility
- Usually there are things and actions that occur prior to the bite which contribute . People and other dogs must also be accountable to there contibutions to the bit.
- Most owners are not held accountable for their pets actions and the victim has difficulty finding the owner after an incident has occurred
- As a dog owner is responsible for their pets behavior, they need to be accountable to the victim and officers so they can be questioned on vaccines, past behaviors etc.
- But only if they refuse to leave their contact info. Better if they leave if tempers are high...
- Same as for when there is a vehicle collision. Who would think it's okay to just leave the scene? This needs explanation?!
- The owner should be required to share vaccination records to ensure the health of the victim. If they do not remain at the scene it can be impossible to find the offending dog.
- For sure he's the one to be blamed and should be accountable for his dog's behavior issues.
- Information should always be exchanged. Involvement of an enforcement officer only if necessary, I.e., someone is uncooperative, threatening or abusive.
- You need two sides to the story
- The dog tag number needs to be shared with all parties involved. Enforcing this rule will be difficult as most offenders vacate immediately
- Leaving the scene should be considered leaving the scene of an accident or crime.
- I think ANY dog owner, regardless of what breed they own should remain at the scene until it is cleared that everyone is okay. Pit bulls are no more vicious than your average dog. The idea of discriminating against a certain breed is an uneducated one. We don't discriminate against race, and now we are being forced to decide is an entire group of dogs should be penalized because of irresponsible dog owners. I have two pitbulls and a dachshund, and they are all equally trustworthy. I



work at a vet clinic and everyone there would agree my dogs are basically bomb proof. Out of the staff pets, the mixed retriever, chihuahua, westie, border collie, Aussie, and the poodle mix have all nipped at someone. My pit bulls have never shown a shred of aggression towards people. So, yes, making a decision based on appearance is ridiculous.

- A car accident requires you to say. Same difference.
- Makes it much easier for an enforcement officer to investigate if the owner does not leave.
- "Interesting how you allow an area for elaboration here but not in section 3 regarding ""pit bull"" type dogs. Your note about how ""pit bull"" type dogs are not involved in more bite incidents than other types but have the ability to do great damage because of their strength should be enough answer for you to not move forward with that notion. Should men be required to walk around in hand-cuffs because they are physically larger and stronger than women and therefore could do more damage IF they were to involve themselves in violent action? no? that seems ridiculous?"
- This action is so incredibly harmful and will encourage stigma against this already discriminated breed. You should instead be looking into dogs with a bite history and encouraging fines, training and muzzling at that point. The action of muzzling all pit bulls when you have already indicated they do not account for the majority of bites will not do anything to help your cause."
- Because my dog always gets attacked by little breeds with no consequences.
- owner responsibility
- I'm surprised this isn't already required. I looks at this as being similar to auto accidents - you have to stay on scene and exchange info.
- Need to know if the dog is vaccinated as well and if they have had multiple offences.
- Please make this a bylaw offence. I've had my dogs attacked a few times by people who have grabbed their dogs afterwards and walked off. If your dog ends up in the vets, it's expensive, and these people get a free pass.
- Just as there are responsible pet owners, there are reckless pet owners as well. Some people will watch their dog seriously hurt another animal or person and run away to avoid liability. If there is an actual enforceable punishment for these types of people, it may deter the behaviour.
- The owner is responsible for the dog and as such must make themselves known to bylaw and or victim of the bite.
- If someone's dog attacks another persons dog, the first person should be the one to pay for vet bills and the like
- I feel it could be up to the victim to decide, but if it's serious enough, yes they should stay and ensure the proper people are notified.
- Many times the owner of the dog will flee the scene and refuse to take responsibility for their dog's actions and behaviours, leaving the burden for the cost of the injuries on the innocent party.
- Only if it is a bite that breaks the skin, dogs play-bite with each other all the time.
- The owner of the dog that bites is the one that should be deemed responsible. It is important they stay at the scene so that it is documented, especially if it is a comment occurrence for that dog.



- Same as a car crash
- only if he controls his dog
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dog and it's behaviour.
- Should be responsible to see if other dog is okay, needs vet attention which then costs the other owner money. Situation should be assessed which dog was aggressor, bite can happen in defence too
- The person bit could require medical attention and the dog needs to be assessed not only for aggressive behaviour but signs of abusive treatment by the owner.
- Yes to reduce repeated incidences
- The owner is typically the problem because of lack of training and structure for their dog. They are responsible for what happened.
- The owner should remain at the scene and take whatever responsible actions the situation warrants
- So that the owner can be blamed cause this has nothing to do with animals
- If a dog causes harm to a person or other animal it should be reported and recorded.
- If a necessary situation occurs, information about the owner and dog is crucial to determine if this is a singular event or repeat occurrence - to keep records.
- Same as car incidents.
- I have been attacked/ bit by peoples dogs before and they always say their dog is a nice one and their sorry and leave. Mean while I had to go to the hospital for the bite, very unfair.
- Yes you are liable and responsible to stay around if your dog was involved in an incident. However if a dog is too injured and needs to get to the vet ASAP there needs to be contingency plans in place. Even calling in to bylaws or a non-emergency police line to report the incident and provide your details would be sufficient in those extenuating circumstances.
- Just like a traffic incident....
- A police report should be filed.
- Owner must take responsibility for the animal and it's training
- Some concern about control of the dog while waiting.
- If a dog bites a person or another animal the owner should be held accountable for the vet bills that arise from that situation
- Both sides of the story are necessary
- Accountability and to avoid future liability
- All information should be transferred between owners including veterinary clinic information. This would insure proper notice of immunization records were gathered to prevent disease/sickness.
- Owner of the offending pet should provide satisfactory ID to the victim or remain on scene for enforcement officer.
- Should be mandatory to share info
- If the incident requires attention by an enforcement officer, both parties should remain at the scene
- The owner must accept immediate responsibility and should remain on scene.
- It's important to get the important facts and information from all parties involved



- The owner is responsible for the dog and its behavior, full stop.
- I would like to think responsible pet owners would stay behind and share contact info and pay for the vet bills for the injured dog.
- Owners should be held accountable for their dog's actions.
- It is necessary for safety of the public and proper follow up.
- Responsible dog owners would already do this, so it would hold the irresponsible owners accountable. There are no bad dogs only bad owners.
- If the bite is severe enough to cause bleeding, and the person bite is considering reporting it
- You don't leave the scene of Ann accident. This will help dial in who the bad dog owners are so they can be targeted for their incompetence in properly training their dog.
- "Tribunal is a feature of communist regime and not democratic!
- This is witch hunt directed at dogs this time that look different. In 21 st century dogs should be evaluated by responsible owner. Good owner- good dog, bad owner- bad dog. To be fair- German shepherds' and English bulldog' jaw bite is much stronger then pitbulls."
- However if this is not possible and it is more important to remove the animal from then scene then contact info should suffice
- It's required for vehicles and you pay for their upkeep and ownership. Should apply to pets (dogs) too since you also pay for their upkeep and ownership. Plus it's entirely likely a dog can kill as well as a car, but through proper training and socialization, a dog shouldn't have to.
- The dog owner should be held accountable for their animals behaviour. We are required to stay at the scene of accident, it should be the same when your animal is involved in an altercation.
- I've been bit twice. Once by a poodle type and once by a Border Collie. It is imperative for the owners to be accountable and provide a history of behavior and health to the victim.
- Yes- if necessary and both owners agree that there should be bylaw intervention, they must remain on site for a proper and supervised exchange of documents.
- Dog bites are uncommon and typically the dog is triggered or threatened in some way. Such dogs need special care and training to overcome this - this is the owner's responsibility and therefore they should stay and explain what happened from the dog' point of view.
- Many owners try and escape responsibility and liability for their dogs poor behaviour.
- Owners should take responsibility for any unacceptable behaviour from their pet. It is not the animals fault that they have not been giving a secure home with proper training.
- Owners of dogs that are a danger to people or other animals must be held to account. If the victim of an incident has medical or veterinary Bill's the owners liability should cover those costs.
- This is common sense. You damage a persons property you are held responsible so why not the same be true for your dog damaging another dog.
- This is a way to gain more knowledge about what happened and can allow follow up if it is an issue with the owner not the dog. Owners should be held responsible.
- Depending on the situation and severity of the bite.
- This builds into my early statement around managing the issue and not just a breed. Owners should be held accountable for the actions of their pet and this is part of that. Enforcement officers should



be able to effectively investigate and understand the potential causes for that situation before making an informed decision on whether the pet should be seized from the owner.

- Yes people should stay at scene if harm caused. If no true harm then no
- as long as everyone is stable, if owner or pet requires immediate attention they should give information to the other person (name, phone number, vet or doctor office they are going to) and a picture taken of their face. Then go to the vet or doctorer
- They owner is liable, so clearly needs to remain at the scene.
- Absolutely the owner of the dog must stay on scene to talk to someone and give their side of the story about what happened. Remember, there are always two sides and sometimes it doesn't always fall onto the 'pitbull'....
- They must be held accountable
- Yes there is always two sides to a story and it is very important to get informed facts as to determine actual responsibility. Often owners whose dogs are attacked have unknowingly caused this incident by their behaviour and their dogs behaviour. Often dogs on those long retractable leashes are not under control . By banning those leashes on parkways it would reduce incidents right there as dogs would ge under better control
- Accountability- and to be responsible for all vet bills
- Owner must take responsibility for their pets actions.
- An assault—and therefore a crime—has occurred. The owner of the dog must remain at the scene.
- Fine for any dog owner who does not remain at scene
- Common courtesy.....
- Responsible pet owners should pay for any vet bills their animal has caused.
- I feel it is no different from remaining at the scene of a car accident.
- The owner of the dog that caused the bite should be held responsible and accountable.
- If a dog bites a person, the owner should take responsibility. What happens if the dog is running loose, however? And if a neighborhood cat damages someone's property (ex: using vegetable garden as a bathroom), should the cat owners also not have to take similar responsibility?
- Too often owners of dogs who cause the incident leave the scene and cannot be held accountable, so owners of the dogs who have been attacked or people who have been attacked are left footing the bill. It also leaves it open for it to happen again.
- owners are 100% responsible for their dogs - it is the owner's fault if there is an incident
- Needs to be a fair investigation, bit all dog bites are unprovoked either so i expect both parties to be investigated.
- During a road accident the driver has to stay. The owner is responsible for keeping the dog under control and needs to explain why they failed in their responsibility
- Knows dog's background eg shots. Trace dog's history eg previous issues
- Adequate follow up
- If your dog bit someone, be there to tell the animal's side of the story. Why did the dog feel threatened enough to attack.



- Policy reason seems similar to reasons why motor vehicle operators should remain at scene of a collision to share contact info and speak with an officer
- Too many just run off and call their dogs distancing themselves from incidents asap.
- Non-dog owners have the right to walk safely and without fear of being attacked by a fierce dog on City sidewalks. I often feel that dog-owners because they are better organized and represented gets their concerns heard by City Council. But there are a lot of people who prefer not to have pets and our rights deserve to be heard also.
- Allows the dog owner to explain their side of the story and what can be done in preventative measures.
- The person is responsible for medical bills that result from there dogs bite. An official report will need to be taken
- The owner of the biting dog needs to provide information and is responsible for the harm cause. Being able to leave the scene is equivalent to a hit and run.
- All dogs, big or toy dogs, who bite a person or another dog, should wait with the owner until law enforcement arrives.
- Just like a car accident it is important to take responsibility for your actions and the actions of your pet who is under your care
- Should be treated no different than other rules ie. Car accidents
- It's not different than any other accident, vehicular or otherwise. You need to exchange information and be present to speak to any officials.
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their pets, much like their children (as minors). The owner must remain onsite and should be liable if it is determined that the owner may be at fault (for reasons of negligence, etc)
- Owners are responsible for the pet's behaviour.
- Responsible pet ownership. No bad dogs, just bad owners
- Yes, but good luck with that. People who allow their dogs to bite are generally not very responsible people and won't stick around after an incident.
- I feel the dog owner needs to take responsibility or get a severe fine if he tries to run, just like a vehicle accident.
- Seems logical
- They need to be available to surrender the animal.
- ANY BREED OF DOG COULD BITE SOMEONE!!! So it is the responsibility of the owner to do what they can to solve the situation.
- The person is the responsible member. Again don't blame the dog.
- As long as they are allowed to put the dog in a safe space first (car) and then return to the scene they may have some insight as to what happened that others would never know.
- No anonymity concessions for people who own dogs that cause harm and then just want to "disappear into the woods" thereafter -- leaving the victim to file the report and suffer alone. If the person (with the "bad dog") still flees the scene, photos taken by the victim or owner of the attacked dog could be provided to the Police who would compare it to a photo data base of ALL such owners



and their nuisance dogs. This data would be shared between municipalities if the person moved to another city or town. There would be no place for them to hide.

- If the 'incident' is specifically related to dangerous behaviour. It should also be mandatory to have your dog's license number clearly displayed on its collar. This would provide an opportunity to acquire the pet & subsequently the owner's information, should there be any need to pursue legal recourse for attacks/biting and also for reporting dogs at large e.g. for safety, you may not want to try and get control of the dog (grabbing them by the collar to read their license).
- If your dog bites someone then the owner should be responsible as well as involved in the aftermath
- Treat it like a car accident, if it's just a little nip out of excitement or play just apologize and be on your way if it's a real bite then you should have to stick around
- Especially in a case involving another animal, the medical and financial consequences can be significant and contact information for the owner of the offending animal is essential to pursue reparations.
- The same thing applies with car accidents, it should with animal accidents
- I was bit by a dog inside a store who was being handled by a young girl. I had done nothing to provoke the dog, I was focused on my shopping. Both myself and the shop owner were surprised by the unprovoked aggression, the girl had wandered close to me, and the dog was "overly protective" she said. The adult owner of the dog never came inside & basically ran off to avoid taking responsibility. The only reason I was able to report the incident was that the store owner knew who the individual was. The store owner issued the incident report. Had this been in a park or elsewhere, no report would've been able to be made, since I didn't know them, and the adult male and girl fled the scene.
- Only if medical attention is necessary.
- The dog's proclivity to biting other people or dogs is solely the result of the person who has been training it. It is the dog owner's responsibility to document injuries accrued by the dog, as one would with a car accident, etc.
- To prevent people from fleeing the scene.
- Same as a motor vehicle accident. We are dog "owners" with licenses for them and there could be costs involved that I think both parties should communicate and be able to reach an agreement. Whether it be directly with each other or reported to the city
- It is similar to a car accident.
- The whole situation needs to be looked at. Yes, owner must stay on at the site. but this is NOT breed issue. This is ALL dog breeds
- Great idea. It reminds me of a vehicle crash scenario, and keeps the owner in check.
- You want to make sure everyone isn't injured and make sure the animals involved are all up to date on their shots.
- 2sides to every story and as a responsible dog owner you shouldn't even have the thought in your head to leave the scene
- This should be treated the same as an assault. If the owner leaves they should be charged as well.
- This is rarely the case and the ones who do are seen as guilty without considering the situation



- No explanation needed - common sense
- If the bite is severe and one of the parties involved doesn't feel resolved with the other owners, I believe they should stay to plea their half. Unfortunately I have seen a lot of crazy people in off-leash dog parks that try to provoke the dogs and get a response as well.
- "I am really frustrated at the use of pitbulls in this survey. There are several other dogs that have just as strong of bites then a pitbull if not stronger. I for one am not terrified of pitbulls. I've owned and have lived around them my whole life. Not one was vicious. I have however been bite by a German Shephard. I have been concerned about many shepherds getting out of yards as they sound like they are trying to break through doors and fences. However I would never condemn them like you do in this survey. Chows can also be vicious and I've been to a house where I thought a Cane Corso was going to jump through the window. It is ridiculous that you allow people's ignorant fears to fuel his survey.
- I hope also nuisance dogs refers to Basset hounds who Bray all day long when neighbours aren't home etc etc."
- I feel as though it's important to handle the situation immediately and get it under control so it does not spiral
- As long as the enforcement officer is only there to gather information and not to try and take the dog.
- People should be accountable for their dogs behaviour. It should NOT be placed on the breed of the dog.
- If the owner can safely stay at the scene, then yes. Important to get details of incident documented as soon as possible
- Owners are responsible for their pets. Period. A vicious dog is the result of upbringing by its owner. Fine the owner.
- the question states "if necessary". in my opinion, necessary would be a serious bite in which the victim doesn't just shake it off (blood, crying, severe pain). not only would it be the ethical thing to stay and explain to an officer what happened, it would make you a better person
- It is your animal and your responsibility to deal with the consequences of its actions
- Responsible dog owners should always give their contact information after an altercation.
- the owner should be held responsible for the dogs actions. As I have had to go through this when my dog that looks similar to a pit bull but is not one and was attacked by another dog that also was not a bully breed dog. That incident cost me over \$800 in vet bills.
- Do not really care if it bites another animal other than the owner of the bitten animal should be paid replacement cost, no more. If it bites a person the dog owner must supply contact information so that liability can be assessed and must render assistance if necessary. (call ambulance, attempt to stop bleeding, etc.)
- They should provide information
- An attack by the owner's dog is same as an attack by owner with hammer... No difference



- Owners of both parties (accused and victim) involved should exchange information. Witnesses should also be obligated under bylaw policies to remain at scene, if present during the incident. Should emergency be required, the pets' health should supersede waiting on the arrival of a bylaw officer. Vets can make a call for bylaw officer to meet owner(s) at their clinic.
- Yes I believe that a person is required to get their dog under control and be responsible for any payments needed to help the other dog or person that was bit but also depends on the situation if a dog is not being aggressive towards a person or dog but is play fighting than this does not require law enforcement!
- That person is responsible for that dog. Also gives you an idea of the kind of owner they are; if they trained the dog or not. If they are an aggressive abusive owner towards that dog which caused that dog to pick up on aggressions habits. Because they will either scold or just grab the dog and go.
- I do believe that owners should be required to take responsibility and provide their information during a dog attack.
- The owner should absolutely not be allowed to leave the area after their dog has bitten someone. They need to remain so that their dog can be tested and evaluated for that attack and potential future ones.
- Makes sense.
- then the dog is able to get proper training (hopefully) and it keeps owners responsible.
- It is unfair when a pet owner leaves anonymously and takes no responsibility for their dog's actions.
- Dog owners should be held accountable.
- The owner can then explain what happened and how/why. The dog is not always to blame for the incident.
- Similar to a vehicle "incident". If you are in control of a vehicle and you have an "incident" (accident) - then you must be responsible for the reporting of all details. In the case of owning a dog - you are responsible in the same way. Losing control over your vehicle is not an excuse - neither should it be for a dog owner. If you can't control your dog - don't have it!
- I do agree if a dog bites unprovoked and random ie walking down the road then yes...but Every situation is different
- It should be the law. Don't what owner running away from their responsibility
- There needs to be accountability for the ownership of that animal. The animal needs to be under the owners control at all times. Too often the offending owner just curses out the victim and retreats quickly leaving the victim even more upset.
- The owner must stay to help handle the situation and explain the dog's behaviour
- Like all incidents there are 2 sides to one story so it would be beneficial to get both stories at the same time, but if the situation is very stressful and the dog is too aggressive, not sure if the owner would be able to control them on scene, so would be hard to enforce?
- I've experienced more dog bites from dogs under 30lbs and their owners always take off. They need to be held responsible for their animals behaviour.
- That seems pretty self explanatory - you wouldn't leave a car accident without providing information, you shouldn't leave the scene without providing at least a phone number.



- Owners are responsible for the actions of their dogs.
- Because the owner should be penalized..... not the dogs. you get the owner out of the dogs life you can turn any dog around. I have witnessed this
- I have been involved with a dog attack and the owner fled leaving an injured dig
- A person is responsible for their dogs action. It's not the dogs fault.
- We need to know if the dog has had it's shots.
- Yes, if the situation is safe for everyone.
- The bite must break skin significantly. We live in a gear ridden society whereas one will claim a play bite amongst dogs, a scratch from the paw etc as a bite. This is not true. Must be significant with broken skin that is more than a paq scratch.
- Of course. The owner's animal is ultimately responsible for their pet's freedom and ability to bite a person or other animal. If the City keeps a "rap sheet" on biting incidents for each animal, this can help to ensure the animal is kept from doing it again, i.e. not allowed at the dog park, muzzled, etc. If the owner doesn't stay or provide the dog's details, how can that animal's biting history be tracked, and how else can all of these rules, i.e. muzzling, be enforced?
- If damage/injury is done, the owner should be accountable for medical expenses at the very least.
- I do support this, as it demonstrates responsibility by the dog owner. However, if their dog, or the other dog or person is agitated, and removing a dog or person from this scene would benefit the situation, I do not think that should be punished.
- Obvious reasons. If the offender takes off, there's no way to track them down unless the victim know them.
- I do support this, as it demonstrates responsibility by the dog owner. However, if their dog, or the other dog or person is agitated, and removing a dog or person from this scene would benefit the situation, I do not think that should be punished.
- No.
- Any dog owner should be required to stay at the scene of an incident involving their dog. Failure to do so should result in a hefty fine, and you are responsible for that dog from the day you bring it home, until the day it dies.
- We all need to take responsibility and be accountable for the outcomes of our choices.
- An attack is an attack. Doesn't matter if your human or canine. Doesn't matter your color or breed.
- Depending on the severity of the incident I would agree that the owner of the dog remain present, of safe to do so. Similar to a motor vehicle accident, information should be exchanged, and authorities should be involved if the damages or injuries are above a certain threshold. Many times dogs can get carried away while playing, and a warning bite which does not cause any bodily harm would not warrant involvement by an officer.
- In the event it bites a person the owner should stay. I regards to another animal that is complicated as I agree if it was a vicious attack but some dogs when playing nip at each other. I think that would be hard to assess.



- There are always 2 sides to each story. The owner of the biter should be able to tell the officer what happened in their words too. Some bites are not truly the fault of the dog but by actions of the person who was bitten.
- An animal bite is a form of assault. It seems reasonable to have the person handling the animal to share personal information and be available account for the incident.
- It's similar to leaving the scene of a vehicle accident. Witnesses would be helpful as well.
- I think it should be if both people aren't in agreement
- Contact information is needed. Waiting for an officer, not so much.
- victim should be allowed to step away.
- I think it's important that the officer gets the entire story, from both parties involved. There are some incidences where a person isn't respecting the dog's space or the warning signs the dog is giving, which results in them getting bit or injured. There are other times where a dog may attack without being provoked, or where a dog isn't properly socialized/trained. I think it's important to know why the incident occurred to decide the next steps. If it was the owner's/dogs fault, the owner should face charges or should have to attend dog training classes. If it was the victim's fault (didn't ask for consent to approach the dog, etc.) then I think it's important for an officer to hear that side as well.
- Any time an animal is aggressive towards another animal or even a human it should always have been called in to appropriate authorities. Usually they are repeat offenders
- Owners are responsible for their dogs.
- I think it's important for dog owners to take responsibility when their dog bites a person or another animal and for them to share information so that whoever has been bitten has the best information when they go to get it looked at by a doctor.
- The owner needs to be made responsible & there be consequences. It's easy for people to blame the dog but a responsible owner will have a better behaved dog. This should not be breed specific. I've seen smaller dogs instigate more times than not.
- It is the responsibility of a dog owner to be present and explain the situation which would determine the future of the dog. A dog can't talk and explain what happened in that situation. It would be unfair to take the dog away and label it aggressive and, god forbid, euthanize the dog without knowing what fully happened in that situation.
- Owner is responsible.
- Places ownership on dog owner
- Too often a dog will bite someone or another pet and the owner will simply walk/run away to avoid its responsibilities. That dog will still be there and might 'strike' again.
- When an accidental bite or attack occurs steps should be taken to ensure an assessment of animal behavior be done, fines and or restrictions and or punishment be issued and owner accountability be addressed. Then a court or tribunal could decide if obedience training or other action be taken in the matter depending on the severity and number of occurrences.
- Pit bull owners take off because they know what can result.
- Owner responsibility



- It is essential a dog owner remains at the scene after a dog bite incident to provide important info regarding his/her animal's vaccinations and rabies status. This should never be a question but the responsibility of every pet owner. Unfortunately, it is not always safe to walk in many of Calgary's green spaces due to the propensity of dog attacks as Calgary has some of the most lax laws regarding pet ownership in the country.
- The owner is the responsible party. Not the dog
- My bully breed dog was bite as a puppy by a golden retriever dog and 11 years later and several reactivate dog classes later. She still has fear of other dogs.
- Unleashed dog attacked our leashed lab by our front door which resulted in bleeding paws. Owner just stood there and watched while I had to insert myself between the two animals. By the time I got our dog separated and inside, the dog and owner had taken off. They need to be held accountable, especially when attack occurred when animal was not leashed.
- This would be difficult to enforce but essential to declare the dog a nuisance dog.
- Dogs rarely attack for no reason. The owner should stay there to take responsibility and/or defend themselves and their dog.
- Important details such as shots being up to date are needed from the owner. And the owner must take responsibility and face any consequences.
- Too often irresponsible dog owners disappear never to be held accountable for their actions/in-actions. Also, post the necessary contact information for enforcement officers at all dog parks.
- It is important to assist the wounded animal however, it should only ever be up to the owners what happens with the offending pet moving forward.
- Just like a car accident- pertinent information should be shared between both parties
- I think this would need to be investigated more. Unfortunately, people always seem to side with the "victim" of the bite when this person was the instigator in the situation. Something to consider is that kids under a certain age must be within arms reach of their parent when at the dog park. I don't even own a dog but I think if parents kept their kids closer at dog parks, less incidents would happen with dogs. The dog park is the only place where dogs can play and run somewhat free. Kids under certain ages do not understand how to approach dogs and dogs can get scared, causing them to try and get out of the situation. Parents should be held responsible for their kids.
- The victim deserves to know history of the dog firstly for health reasons and secondly for the owner to take responsibility.
- You have to stay at the scene of the accident. Share vaccine history and other information.
- Too many owners flee the scene and the injured are left to fend for themselves. Take responsibility
- Then the incident is open and clear as both side have there say. I would hope this would paint a clear and accurate information of what occurred .
- It puts the responsibility on the dog owner.
- Just like a vehicular accident where there may be an injury.
- People should be required to identify themselves and to answer questions if asked
- If injury is inflicted, it's exactly the same as leaving the scene of a car accident.



- Have witnessed dogs being attacked at off-leash dog parks. Exchange of information proceeded much like if it was a traffic accident. But have so seen altercations between owners and dogs being kicked by other owners. Owners will only stay if they feel it will be productive. How do you stay if the dogs cannot be kept under control/away from one another and are possibly injured?
- Contact information should be provided by the offending owner every time. If the bite requires medical attention, then he/she should also wait for an enforcement officer. If the bite does not require medical attention, the provision of contact information only should suffice.
- Many dog owners just run away, I have had that happen to me after a pit bull bit my leg.
- The owner is responsible for their pet's actions, therefore should stay, same as an automobile accident.
- Stops any misinformation being issued to the enforcement officer
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pet's behavior
- You are responsible for your dog. If they cause injury, you need to face those consequences.
- It's illegal to flee the scene of a hit & run. Should be illegal to leave the scene after your dog has attacked someone.
- Dog owners must be held responsible for their charges even if it isn't the dog's fault. For example: the dog is attacked itself or if the dog is defending its owner.
- I'm surprised this isn't already a law
- Reduces problem of identifying owner and reduces enforcement costs. Problematic in winter conditions though. Perhaps requirement to produce ID, like after a car accident, would be better. Tensions will be high!
- Information must be exchanged and witness info too. Especially if the bylaw officer takes a while to get there. Post signs with bylaw phone number.
- If it is not an emergency situation all parties involved should remain on scene.
- Such events often occur where there is no CCTV and are similar to a hit and run where private property is damaged.
- An owner **MUST** be responsible for their pets
- To me it is the same as an accident. You are supposed to stay and deal with the consequences of your actions.
- Often the dog is not known to the victim and it is important to obtain owner information.
- People need to understand that they are responsible for the conduct of their pets. What a concept that they have to work with the training of their pets?
- The offending dog owner is responsible and should be held to be accountable to the dog's actions
- It's important to ensure that an owner takes responsibility for the behavior of their pet.
- Owners should be fully responsible for the actions of their pets. They should know to warn others and handle their animals in a manner that protects the public and their pets as well. (Harness, muzzle, leash...)
- How is this any different than leaving the scene of an automobile accident? You cause damage you are responsible for it. Or if you witnessed it you are responsible to provide what you saw.
- I am surprised this is not already a requirement!



- Accountability
- If something in your care has harmed or damaged someone or something else, you bear the responsibility and must remain at the scene to face the consequences.
- If they leave the record of the incident is incomplete, allowing it to happen again more easily.
- if you own a dog you should be responsible for the dog and its behaviour. if you know you have a reactive dog then do not put them in situations that may cause harm. take appropriate training programs that can help with the behavior. Most GOOD pet owners know their dogs and take responsibility.
- Once the dog that has bitten is secured, the owner should be required to exchange contact information. Too many times the owner leaves and cannot be contacted regarding their financial and legal responsibility.
- Dog should be put down
- If a dog bites any other person the rights of the dog owner stop being a priority and the dog should be put down. Why has our society tolerated any misbehaving dogs? The amount of horrible dog owners out there is on the rise and it needs to stop.
- In case the hurt dog needs medical attention and if that attacking dog has had multiple incidents it needs to attend training or not be allowed at areas
- High Fines should be given if they don't remain at scene.
- Owners shall be allowed to share their side of the story.
- There needs to be an explanation of what is severe enough for this to be required. Some owners get upset by dog play. Suggest evidence of blood being drawn.
- Why wouldn't you stay?
- If you hit a car, do you immediately drive away without the possibility of being fined and potentially sent to jail? Why would it be any different for a dog attack, where you are responsible for the incident that has happened?
- But only if it can be done safely or without additional emotional trauma. If it is safer to leave, they must contact animal services as soon as possible or face triple fines and charge of 'fleeing the scene'
- It seems similar to a car accident. It shouldn't be up to the owner to decide what is worth reporting.
- owners need to be responsible for the actions of their dogs.
- I support this, unless there is a medical need to get to a vet or hospital, but then information must be left for contact.
- regardless of situation someone got hurt by your pet.
- People need to be responsible for their pets.
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- I HAD A DOG GET BITTEN BY A LAB AT THE DOG PARK YEARS AGO, THE OWNERS DID NOT STICK AROUND- THAT JUST TELLS ME THEIR DOG HAS DONE IT BEFORE
- Pet ownership is a responsibility to the community. If a dog attacks, the owner must take responsibility.
- Seems reasonable, but I wonder if it would be helpful to get the dog away from the victim somehow?



- The owner is responsible for the dog and takes on all liability. Bad owner equals bad dog. There is no such thing as a dog being born bad. They are all blank slates and learn certain behaviours as they grow up.
- The owner is responsible and should therefore remain on the scene to deal with consequences.
- it could be not the dog fault
- Yes the owner should remain at the scene unless the owner is out of town and someone else who is looking after their pets should be at the scene.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their dogs. Proof of rabies vaccination should be provided by the owner.
- As long as the dog can be controlled.
- This is just common sense.
- A responsible pet owner should always be able to give their side of the event.
- The individual is responsible for their dogs actions. This would be no different than a vehicle hit and run, punishable if leaving the scene of a crime.
- these dogs are loveable there not visious there owners are and yall may roll your eyes but ive owned pitbull for 9 years who was abused viciously by his previous owner and he just turned 16 has never bitten a soul in my custody nor is he ever been walked with a leash and muzzle and he never ever will however i do think fines need to be harsher for uncontrolled dogs dog abuse cases need to be better inspected and harsher sentences and fines placed
- Would require clarification of what constitutes a “bite”. Dogs can have playful situations that escalate to a nip or bite without a dog being injured that are best handled by the individual owners.
- It depends on the incident if a dog is severely injured then yes. People need to have their dogs under control at all times.
- My answer would actually be YES and NO! As Vet bills can be atrocious, if a dog bites unprovoked then the owner should need to help with bills. BUT I have also seen dogs mind their own business and get provoked by another dog and defend themselves it's a slippery slope!
- Obvious
- There needs to be a record of the incident so that appropriate follow up action can be taken as needed
- I support this only if there is no BREED SPECIFIC legislation
- Owners should be responsible for there dogs. No matter the breed.
- Breed specific legislation is a joke. However, it is the owners responsibility to take ownership of how their dog has been trained. Therefore, the owner should be at fault 100%
- Same reasons as if it were a car accident. The responsibility to make things right is put in the person with the aggressive dog.
- It's the right thing to do
- Unfortunately a lot of dog attacks occur and the nuisance dog will leave the scene. This would help track that dog and whether it should be muzzled or carry heftier fines.
- Just like a car accident. You should have to exchange information
- This is responsible and necessary.



- Then you will be able to declare said dog as a nuisance
- All dogs not just one breed.
- It is the owner's responsibility!
- Staying is what constitutes a responsible dog owner.
- Owner should have full care and control of pets at all times, before and after incident
- Owners should be held personally responsible for the actions of their pets up to and including making a statement with an enforcing officer
- We are responsible for our pets and need to stay responsible even when our pets do something dangerous or that we don't approve of.
- Not all of these incidents are minor. Some result in substantial and expensive procedures to mitigate injury to a person or other animal. How can one remedy the situation through education, fines or impounding if the dog and owner leave without sharing information?
- Of course, how else can the dog and its owner be identified?? I'm surprised this isn't already the case.
- It is important to get the whole story on record in order to better understand a situation and to better understand the particular dog involved
- Providing contact information is key to accountability and subsequent application of consequences.
- It's necessary to get the info so that we know the dog's health history and then secondly so the owner of the dog takes responsibility for their dog's behaviour; be it a warning or a fine. People don't seem to change what's going on unless there is a repercussion either shamefully or financially.
- It is consistent with staying at the scene of an accident.
- Responsible ownership comes with a responsibility to comply with the law.
- "Otherwise it's a 'hit and run' type of idea. Similar punishment should apply as in a vehicle hit and run/ or an assault hit and run.. same thing when your dog attacks and you run.
- Owner must remain at scene and give care to injured person and or dog, until the authorities arrive."
- For the purpose of paying doctors or vet bill in necessary as well as providing proper immunization documentation- this could be attached to information while licensing animal
- This shows that the owner is responsible
- This will not stop an owner from fleeing the scene of the attack, but maybe the thought of a criminal charge being added might help deter such irresponsible behaviour. I've spoken to several dog owners whose pets have been victims of severe dog attacks where the other owner just fled the scene.
- There are probably many more occurrences of dog bites than we are aware due to no reporting mechanisms and the inability to get contact information from people. How to enforce someone giving their information is the problem.
- I like this idea but hard to enforce I think
- I hear regular reports of owners fleeing after incidents
- It is the responsibility of the owner for the dogs behavior and they should be held responsible for their dogs actions. They should also be given the chance to state their side of the story, in case there was some wrong doing on the part of the person or animal that received the bite



- Ban pit bull type dogs.
- How is this not already enforced? What if it's a child? Very concerning that we have such relaxed bylaws when it comes to aggressive dogs in this city.
- People need to be accountable for their pets and they're own actions or lack thereof
- "There is always two sides to a story.
- Obedience training could be a positive solution"
- If they do not remain at the scene it is virtually impossible to identify them later which would include knowing if the dog has had appropriate vaccinations and whether the behaviour has occurred before.
- To track offences.
- To track vicious dogs in the city. Two or three strikes and they should be removed from owners.
- Any person who has been involved in an attack on another is complicit in the crime! Leaving the scene of the attack should have a severe penalty like jail time!
- As a responsibility pet owner I feel that it is my duty to remain at the scene of any issue that arises with my dog. There are always two sides to every story and getting a full picture of what occurred is important in making fair decisions.
- Accountability should be maintained
- If the dog bites a person and breaks the skin then the owner must remain on scene and provide insurance, interactions between dogs are too often misunderstood and a correction can be seen as aggressive
- There must be serious consequences if they do not. There should be a significant fine and responsibility for the costs to track them down.
- People quite often flee to avoid paying vet costs for the other dog.
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs behaviour and need to be held accountable if something happens.
- N/A
- It is important to know the identity of the dog/owner
- It's just kosher. Although people are highly attached to their pets and don't want to see them do wrong, it's the right thing to do.
- It's unacceptable for an owner to avoid responsibility of its pet's behaviour.
- There are always 2 sides to a story
- Its called being a responsible dog owner
- Because the owner has to have some responsibility
- If the bitten dog needs vet care, the owner of the biter, if the bite was unprovoked, should be responsible for the cost of the vet care.
- Accountability.
- Sounds like a good idea. Otherwise the offending dog may never be identified and dealt with.
- Irresponsible dog owners should be handled by the police, not bylaw officers.
- Yes information should be shared



- Same rule as a car accident - stay at the scene.
- People should exchange information just like they do a car crash
- A dog attack is like an assault. Owners should stay on scene.
- Like a car accident someone is injured statements need to be taken to prove what happened
- Info is needed if there are any issues later. Responsible owners would not object.
- Owners need to be held responsible.
- To take responsibility for their animal and be held accountable for any training etc. the dog may require to act more appropriately if at fault. Also to cover any vet or medical bills of the injured animal/person.
- Any person should assist as much as possible. Note that all breeds have the potential to bite and should be treated equally across the board
- This is no different than leaving the scene of a motor vehicle accident. You must exchange information. Although who knows if the information provided will be accurate.
- Info should be exchanged if safe to do so
- It's the right thing to do, to ensure all parties get the help they need.
- The dog owner is ultimately responsible, they should remain on scene until all they have been cleared to leave by either bylaw officer or victim.
- Too often, the owner with the aggressive dog leaves the scene, and the victims have no recourse, because they don't know who the owner is, or how to contact them. If you get into an automobile accident, you are required to stay at the scene, and talk to police if necessary. How is this any different?
- Allows for proper investigation and easier means of tracking and getting statements of both parties. Holds owners accountable.
- Pit bull owners often will disappear after their dog mauled a pet or person. They often give victims false phone number and address and refused to take responsibility.
- Dog owners should be liable for damages/injuries/psychological trauma caused by their dogs' behavior. They should remain at the scene till involvement of enforcement officers.
- You should be responsible for what your pet does
- Too often, a dog bites and the so-called "good" pet owners won't stay on scene because they know they would be held accountable and therefore they become an accomplice to their dogs behaviour.
- But would require some form of use immunity to preserve the right against self incrimination in the case of proceedings against the person.
- The dog actually biting someone should be the problem not the breed.
- I have bitten by a dog at Glenmore a few years back and carry pepper spray with me. Did not use it on the dog and only considered afterward - probably on the owner though! The issue is it's not the dog's fault it's poor handling and training by owners. So perhaps you should think about regulating who can own a dangerous dog. They are more dangerous than guns and same issue - regulate ownership in the same manner as we do with guns.
- Too often the owner of the offending dog leaves the scene. This needs to stop, and legislation could deter irresponsible dog owners



- Their animal has caused harm. Basically, they're fleeing from the crime scene.
- Just like a car accident.
- If a person punches another person, should they be allowed to leave?
- Yes, however this may need to be balanced with a need to remove the aggressive dog from the scene
- As someone who has been bitten before, the other dog owner has a responsibility to keep their dog under control. If that includes a fine, so be it.
- Yes of course. As long as they can move to a secure area where the dogs can be under control and not come in to contact with other dogs. There should be more signage reminding owners that they are financially responsible for their dog's actions.
- an owner is responsible for his/her pet and its actions.
- It is the owner responsibilities.
- The owner should stay in the area but the dog should not. If there is no way to take the dog away (i.e. very hot day and cannot put the dog in a car) the owner should be allowed to leave after providing contact information.
- Owners need to be accountable for their dogs. Full stop. Full Responsibility. No Exceptions.
- As an owner you are responsible for your dog's actions
- That is just the responsible way of doing it. THIS IS WHERE YOU SHOULD FOCUS ON CATCHING IRRESPONSIBLE OWNERS AND LEAVE THE DOGS ALONE
- Both parties should have to wait around
- Dog bites can be life threatening for small children and smaller dogs. Any person who's dog bites another dog or person should be held liable for any hospital/vet bills.
- The owner is responsible for all actions made by their dog. If it was an accident (eg. startled) the owner can explain.
- The dogs owner is responsible for any actions of the dog, accident or not.
- The owner of the dog needs to be responsible to pay for vet bills of the animal it attacked or go to "trial" if it bites a person - leaving the scene is no diff then a hit and run and no responsibility can be placed where it belongs
- dogs can't defend themselves nor can they explain what they did and why, so the owner should be there to provide info on the dog
- Yes they should stay unless they are feeling threatened for their own or their dogs safety. Sometime lunch mobs can form which puts stress on the animal and owner which could encourage more fear aggression in the dog
- Obviously it is fair that the owner should take responsibility for their dogs behaviour. The dog should not get the blame until you absolute know that the human actually trained their dog.
- An owner is responsible for their pet.
- Just like with car wrecks, if an incident occurs by your hand, you need to take responsibility and follow through with the aftermath. Exceptions should be made if the dog or owner are in need of immediate medical care and cannot wait for an officer to show up.
- For things like vaccination history.



- This will ensure that all parties are taken care of in terms of vet bills and medical concerns. All information can be easily gathered.
- The dog owner is responsible for the dog's behaviour.
- This will allow both sides of the story to be explained as well as the ability to inspect the behavior of the attacking dog.
- We do it for car accidents
- Common courtesy
- Too many times dogs are blamed when irresponsible people tease, aggravate them. All parties involved- including children - should remain at the scene.
- Just like car accidents. You have caused physical damage to someone
- It is important that the dog can be identified and the owner take responsibility in these incidents, similar to a car accident.
- Need to exchange vaccine information and also provide details for tracking. Must provide proof of ownership and licensing.
- Makes sense
- There needs to be an explanation
- It is important to have the owner present in order to give their statement of the incident
- There have been too many incidents of a dog attacking another dog or person and then that owner taking off. That is wrong. And irresponsible.
- The owner is responsible for their dog, if they will not teach and control their dog they should be responsible for the consequences, just like a car collision.
- I feel it is necessary to tell information in case of emergency
- Owner can give his/her side of the incident.
- Just like you need to remain at the scene of a car accident...
- Many times the owner of the offending dog has to be tracked down. This way, immediate information is exchanged
- Aggressive dog's owners must be accountable
- The dog is the owners responsibility
- If a dog bites someone or another animal and the owner leaves before speaking to authorities it is the same as a hit and run to me.
- It is the owner's responsibility to control their dog
- is only logical that someone be required to remain at the scene of the incident. We expect it for car incidents, why wouldn't it be expected when an owner's pet is involved in an incident? Owners should be held responsible for their pets behaviour. If owners are required to stay and talk to enforcement, it may help to identify irresponsible ownership or behavioural issues with the animal and opportunities for training or removing an animal from an unsafe home.
- It may otherwise be difficult to locate the owner responsible
- If an owner can't take responsibility for their dog, they shouldn't have it.



- You get in a car crash u wait for cops. Same thing with dog bite. [removed] unfortunate but it does happen.
- Just like a car accident.
- It just makes sense. If your dog causes injury to another person or animal, you are responsible for any damages.
- It is a reasonable expectation that both remain at the scene to provide statements. That helps to ensure that both sides of the incident are documented immediately while as many details as possible are fresh in the memories.
- The owner should have to stay and own up to the responsibility of owning a dog who displayed aggressive behaviour.
- I was recently bite for 14 stitches and many puncture wounds. Blood all over the place. How do I restrain the owner from leaving in rider to get such information? But it is a nice thought.
- This should be standard, like for car crashes
- Contact is necessary for further follow up or civil litigation
- People should be responsible for their pets, regardless if it was a cat, dog, ferret or bird that started the altercation!!
- For the same reason you would half to stay on the seen of a motor vehicle accident.
- Yes they most certainly should so the person who's dog did the damage can be held accountable for their dogs actions.
- It's just responsible
- It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure that they are able to control their dog. Similar to a car crash if an incident should occur both parties should exchange information and make a decision if officials should be summoned.
- It's their training and animal.
- A dog is still an animal despite it being a pet. The owner is 100% responsible.
- People need to take responsibility for their animals actions doesnr matter how small or bug the bute is if a dog is constantly reopening something needs to be done
- The dog owner should be responsible for their dog's actions. Why do they get to walk out of the park and not face their (human) consequences?
- No question. You own a pet, you are responsible for it's actions.
- No different than an auto accident
- Owners are responsible and need to be held to account.
- Leaving the scene of an automobile accident is a crime, surely leaving the scene of a dog assault should be as well
- If we have to stay after a car accident so the victim gets all information, why not when someone is attacked by an animal?
- "Either the dog owner or who ever was in control of the dog at the time of the bite



- There are probably more bites made by humans than dogs... love to see the emergency visit numbers for human bites vs these so called "vicious" dog bites"
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- Only if it is a reasonable length of time. For example, if I were in a car accident and physically injured to the point of needing the hospital or a doctors visit, I would not want to be waiting for the other driver to give information to the police. Same considerations, if the victim dog is injured to the point of needing a vet, they should not have to wait for an officer. If it was an incident without serious injury or say a mouthing with not skin breaking, then (much like a rear ending) both parties should be able to stay at the scene and relay information.
- If an officer needs to be called all parties should remain present
- Pet owners need to be responsible and accountable for their pet's actions.
- No different than a car accident
- It is the only way to register the dog as a problem
- The owner is responsible for the dog
- It is what a responsible pet owner should do.
- The owner should be staying at the scene to give information and cover any vet bills the other owner has to bear due to said incident. Goes for a person being harmed as well.
- If my dog bit someone bad enough you absolutely follow up. You exchange information like if you were in a car accident and make sure they're alright.
- These incidences should be reported in order to keep track repeat offences (relating to the owner, not the dog).
- It is an owner's responsibility to be responsible for anything in their possession involved in an incident.
- As a dog owner I feel it's my responsibility to make sure my dog is well behaved. And if she does happen to bite someone, I'm gonna make sure the person that she bit isn't seriously harmed. Also it is my responsibility to except punishment as her owner
- Owners should take responsibility
- If your dog inflicts injury to another person or dog absolutely that needs for the owner to hold themselves accountable. When I'm at the park and the little jack Russell nips my German Shepherd mix and busts his ear and lip open and the owner says "he's just playing"...
- Owning a pet is a responsibility
- The owner of each dog should be able to be reached for follow up, such as vet bills or other expenses related to the incident.
- I feel like walking away from an incident where there would be liability is like a hit and run in a car.
- Just like at an accident as most but not all bites are generally an accident
- Stay, report it IF INJURIES.
- This will provide an initial assessment of both animals and/or people and the current situation.
- Owners should be held responsible for dog behaviour.



- Yes, however, so long as they exchange ID/share information with the victim, they may not be required to stay there as it may be better if they can take their pet home rather than try to manage the situation while also managing their pet.
- If someone is hurt yes they should stay
- It's part of responsible pet ownership, and akin to traffic collisions
- It is the biting dog's owner's responsibility to rectify any damage/harm caused by their dog as long as it is a clear case of aggression.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their pets actions. The owner is the one who let the pet out and therefore needs to be responsible for it.
- Owners are responsible for the damage their dogs have done to other people. If the dog attacked a victim. But primarily the owner should be fined an excessive amount and their dog confiscated if they cannot do so. It is wrong to ban specific dog breeds, as the blame relies on the owner to train their dog.
- If it is severe enough to warrant an officer attending the scene then the pet owner of the dog that bit should remain at the scene
- They can explain both sides
- Owners should be held accountable to their pets actions. It's no different than a car accident. Both sides of the story should be collected at the time of the incident.
- "Ensures people are
- Being held accountable for their dogs behaviour"
- They are responsible
- Same as a car accident. Exchange info. Can help in case follow up/medical attention is necessary
- It is a responsible way to deal with the situation.
- No explanation needed. It's just a given or be fined
- To take responsibility for their pets actions
- Dog owners should be held accountable for poor management and understanding of their dog.
- But let's be specific here and include ANY DOG in this sentence no matter the breed is to remain at the scene.
- I would say that behavior is responsible dog ownership. If the city is not seeing this then mandate it with a bylaw.
- Yes; it should occur to ensure accurate tracking/decision making as long as it is safe for the person to remain
- Info should be shared in case dog has an infection of some kind and for the peace of mind of all involved like any human dispute that results in violence
- If a dog bite results in a person or other animal requiring medical care, the dog owner should remain at the scene of the incident.
- Accountability is important - while it may be an accident, steps should be taken to prevent further harm



- Just like getting in a car accident. Accidents happen, its okay, but needs to be dealt with responsibly and by taking ownership.
- the owner is partially responsible for the dog's behaviour, and has a duty to ensure that the dog behaves appropriately and is under control in public. They have to ensure that they are reachable if further steps need to be taken
- It's what a responsible citizen and pet owner would do Also, dogs need the proper leash for the size and power of their pet and to be able to control them at all times. This is for protection of officers as well.
- If a dog attacks my dog or a person they need to be held accountable and should have to stay to provide their contact information.
- Unless the 2 parties agree that the incident doesn't warranty an outside party.
- With the condition that both the dog and victim are in a safe area and there is not a chance for a second bite. Ie; the dog should not be forced to stay in an area that will lead to aggression and another bite.
- As the owner you are responsible for your dogs actions. Simply put, you need to stay and try your best to make it right.
- A responsible owner should do this
- This should involve ALL dogs not just 'nuisance' dogs
- People need to be accountable for the behaviour of their dogs. Most dog-to-dog incidents can be dealt with cordially without bylaw officer intervention, but remaining at the scene should be a courtesy that people extend to one another.
- If there is a puncture or other visible injury requiring first aid, the owner of the dog who caused the damage should have to remain on scene until they've provided their contact information.
- Yes you should be held accountable for your dog and the actions of your dog
- Yes, because often the owner will take off and it may not be possible to hold that owner/dog accountable.
- Get the dog somewhere he can no longer harm someone, but yes we need to document these incidents, dogs and owners to determine how this happened, if it happened before and to assess the dogs and owner behaviour at a later date.
- good idea
- This allows for both sides of the story to be gathered by an independent person vs. Just the story of the "victim" at the time.
- For vet bills and vaccination status
- The owner should always be the one held responsible, the dog is the product that reflects the quality of ownership. It is not the dogs fault.
- Contact info should be shared in case there is follow up. This however should be up to the victim whether they want this information or not.
- Helps hold the owners responsible.
- But only if they can do so without further angering the animal or continuing to put other people at risk. I do not think that owners should be able to walk away from issue their animal has created but if



they are unable to control the animal in such an environment, they should be able to access some form of containment or control while waiting an indeterminate amount of time for an officer to arrive.

- That's just being a responsible owner.
- Providing explanation allows more information to be conveyed to figure out what really happened.
- This needs to be done so that there is a record of any behavior issues and can show if there is escalation in the behavior.
- It's like a car crash, if there's bodily injury/trauma then proceedings should be dealt with to ensure the safety of all parties (people, dogs).
- This could be tricky because a dog fight could cause someone to try to enforce this rule where I only consider this situation to be needed for malicious one sided attacks. Too much subjectivity.
- If the injury requires the human to have to undergo subsequent medical treatment related to the health and well being of the dog, yes. All dogs have prey drive, some dogs may chase cats, birds, and other natural prey. The owner should stay to prove their knowledge of their dogs drive and the training done support or control this behaviour.
- Most times the owner or person that was bitten are left with vet bills. Bites are NOT always the fault of the dog biting, we must remember that they're still animals and they can only communicate in so many ways. If they're threatened, biting can be a response.
- It would simply be the responsible thing to do.
- It is the right thing to do
- Accountability is important
- It's important for all animals and owners involved in case there is a serious issue
- Responsible dog/pet ownership.
- They should at least have to provide their contact information.
- Because that's the responsible thing to do if your animal did the biting.
- The owner is responsible for their dogs behavior and should bear any consequences that come with bad behaviour as it is their fault.
- If someone doesn't stick around for something like that, I'd say their pretty suspicious of indecent care of any dog.
- just the dog is not to be blamed, the owner needs to take responsibility
- Seems like the same logic as laws against hit and run. If you are a part of an incident you should be responsible to make sure that the other person or animal is ok, and confirm what follow up is needed. Failure to show this degree of responsibility indicates irresponsible dog ownership in my opinion and bylaw officers should be able to enforce sanctions based on this.
- Yes... how would this be different than a car accident? One vehicle owner can't just leave the scene...
- However sometimes waiting for an enforcement officer may not be doable. People and dogs are upset definitely exchange information and sometimes the best thing is to go home and wait for the bylaw officer to come to the residence. That might be safer for all including the officer.
- Having been a victim of a pit bull bite where the owner gave false contact information I highly support this rule



- Similar to a car crash
- Only if it is severe if it is not then an officer is not needed
- It's like a car accident
- Anyone whose dog has bitten a person or another animal should definitely be required to remain at the scene. It is unimaginable to me that a responsible dog owner would not do so, however, both my husband and I have been involved in incidents where the owner of the dog(s) walked off.
- seems reasonable
- Just like a vehicle accident - an incident that involves an animals pet owner should require by law them to remain at the scene and provide identification/contact information
- Not to necessarily remain at the scene, this may or may not be necessary depending on the severity/circumstances. However I do think owners should be obligated to provide contact details so that any follow up is possible eg check vaccination (rabies) are up to date
- Depends on the severity, and on the situation. 1) Is there blood? Are stitches required? (We don't need Karen from the suburbs calling bylaw because Sir Fluffington III got his ears tugged at the off-leash park and he's a show dog and your Rover is clearly a menace! Look, you can see Fluffington's fur, it's wet and dirty now! His career is ruined. . .) 2) was this a free-use area? Or private property? Did users understand the risk/responsibility? (Like, any time you go to the off-leash park, there is a chance that you might be crashed into by an out-of-control Frisbee-chasing canine, and suffer mild bruising around the shins. Your dog also might get snapped at by some other park user. If you can't deal with that, don't go. [Cue members-only dog parks, where everyone signs an indemnity...])
- This is a good idea.
- Accountability
- I as a dog owner take responsibility over my pup and so should others. Thankfully mine have never been involved in an incident but if they were I would stick around and expect the other party to stick around as well.
- The owner is responsible for their dogs behaviour
- Like the scene of an accident, an owner is responsible to stay and report to ensure that a victim can retrieve proper care (vaccinations, etc)
- Just like a traffic accident
- I am cynical about owners of biters. They might not give honest answers without authority there. But I am concerned about the length of a wait if someone needs needs medical treatment.
- Agree in general but "bite" is a variable term and could be subject to a wide interpretation.
- its responsible thing to do
- The pet owner must remain at the scene of a violent incident
- This should be considered the same as a car accident.
- yes
- I feel that in dog attack/ bite cases it should be required that the owner is present to discuss the incident. Dogs are not bad, their owners most of the time play a big role in the behaviors the dog



shows. Not being trained adequately, being neglected.. etc. so I feel it is important for the owner to remain at the scene

- All parties should be required to remain on scene unless imminent injury that requires treatment. This will help to better understand why the situation occurred.
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- Too many dogs are running loose in parks or on paths, where they should be on leash. They run up and scare other people and dogs or worse yet...attack other dogs. Many of the owners of these dogs just take off and are never accountable for taking their dog off leash.
- Just like with a car accident. Things happen and you should never leave the scene
- It seems like a basic responsibility of a pet owner to have some responsibility over the actions of their pet. If pet owners are required to stay and give information to develop a history of the pet and more importantly the owner, hopefully we can see useful trends.
- People take responsibility
- They should stay and take responsibility for there animal.
- I believe this supports responsible pet ownership, however I don't believe it should be used in a case of one person's word against another, especially if the animal which bit another dog was provoked or acting in self-defense.
- It can be very costly if a dog has been bitten by another dog. It is imperative to see what damage the dog has incurred and also in order to find and investigate multiple incidences.
- Dog owners need to be responsible
- They should be transparent in what happened and responsible for any cost to injuries
- Responsible dog owners would not walk away from an incident
- Any responsible pet owner should be doing this already
- It's imperative that the dog owner cooperate with authorities after any bite attack.
- Just like the scene of an automobile accident, all evidence needs to be collected. Both sides need to be present.
- Responsible pet ownership does not mean breed specific legislation. I DO NOT support any of the measures related to "nuisance" dogs, and I DO NOT support the definition or declaration of "nuisance"
- Yes, is self explanatory.
- Hold the owner accountable for their dogs actions
- If a dog bites a person and the owner flees the scene it is basically a hit and run.
- Dog owners should be held responsible for what their dog does. Pitbulls may not be the whole problem with so many irresponsible pet owners in Calgary.
- Yes, they should remain at the scene so all proper information is exchanged. Including dog breed, too often pit bulls are wrongly accused when they aren't involved, keeping the owner at the scene would be helpful to get all correct information.
- It's just like a hit and run
- Treat it as a case by case basis, but make the owner of the offending dog liable for the attack and treat it as an offense that is similar to a hit and run and fleeing the scene.



- Same scenario for a hit and run in a vehicle.
- Unless needing vet attention, in which case contact information must be left with a witness/other person.
- The owner is responsible for their animals, if they are present they need to remain, unless the animal is in need of medical attention, then they should tend to the animal and be allowed a grace period to report/ ID themselves
- As a dog owner, I take responsibility for my dog. If an incident occurred, I feel it would be appropriate to exchange contact information with the other party involved.
- Dog owners are the problem not the dogs the owner should take responsibility
- This should already be mandatory any scenario where a dog attack occurs and the owner of the animal is not present for the arrival of law enforcement, is a circumstance where they got away with it. If this was a bylaw not only would the dog be punished, but the owner should at minimum be fined for knowingly being negligent to the victim of the attack.
- Emergency vet bills should be paid by the owner of the unstable dog.
- If a dog bites someone or another animal. It should be decided between the bitten party and owner what the next steps will be.
- It depends on the severity. Most responsible pet owners would do this anyway if it were serious enough, but having a law that requires irresponsible pet owners to be held accountable would help.
- Easy. If your dog got hurt you'd want the owner of the dog that hurt yours to stick around. Why wouldn't you extend the same respect???
- Exchange contact information, yes absolutely. But it may do more harm to keep an agitated animal around, I would support the owner exchanging information and leaving the scene instead of waiting for authorities.
- Why wouldn't you stay.
- This applies to ANY animal or breed.
- I think it's only appropriate for an owner to stay at the scene.
- "Sometimes the incident is minor but sometimes it is more than that and you won't know until you get home and have a better look at your pet (or you) that there is more damage than you initially thought. This would allow the injured party to contact a ""responsible"" pet owner to follow up and be accountable (usually financially) for actions taken by their pet.
- I have had my dogs bitten by other dogs before and have always demanded the other parties contact information immediately."
- Owners should be held accountable for their dogs behaviours.
- Leaving the scene is irresponsible and feels like a hit and run.
- It's no different than leaving the scene of a vehicle accident. If you (or your dog) cause damage, you need to stick around to begin resolving the issue.
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their animal and should be held accountable if needed
- Yes doesn't matter the breed. Your dog bites someone [removed] exchange information and be an adult. Ensure that individual is alright. If you can't do that then you shouldn't own a dog period no matter the breed.



- I know of many stories of dog owners who have fled when their dog misbehaves.
- Humans are at fault as much as the animals. Often people ask for permission before approaching a dog. If the owner has the dog under control and a human comes and disturbed it, the dog isn't really at fault.
- really, an explanation? isn't it self evident? dog owners can't be trusted
- Requires no explanation. My answer is yes.
- In servers cases
- Accountability is key. Owners need to be held responsible
- .
- To give an extra account of what happened. That could affect future decisions about the dog.
- Such information is vital to following up and protecting the public
- An owner should not be allowed to leave the site of an incident.
- Bad dog owners should be held responsible
- Far too often aggressive dog owners leave the scene in order to avoid further embarrassment of dealing with by law. It should be a huge fine if they leave the scene prior to resolution
- The dog owner must be responsible to provide necessary information.
- They should stay and talk with the Bylaw officer.
- A bite should be treated similar to a car accident. The attacking dog should be removed from the situation, and informal exchanged between parties.
- We're expected to do the same thing for car accidents, this also kind of make sense. But maybe only if the other person is injured?
- it common sense
- The owner is then forced to take responsibility.
- It makes sense
- It makes sense to me. For the "if necessary" though, how is this defined? Is this that a bitten person or owner of a bitten animal determines if they want enforcement involved or not?
- Yes I agree with the owner staying at the scene of the incident to make sure everyone is ok. It should be treated like a car accident!
- Owner should either take responsibility or defend their dog.
- Within reason. If the animal requires vet attention or needs to be removed from the area for safety or health (including mental) health reasons
- The dog should be under the guidance of their owner, similar to a child, and therefore the owner is responsible for their actions.
- It should be the same as vehicular accidents where both parties remain at the scene unless medical attention is required.
- Should be a fine if they leave just like hit and run accidents
- Owner's are responsible for the actions of their pet and must remain on scene to provide contact information and assistance
- It's the responsible thing to do



- There should be a legal requirement to stay on scene just like any other injury related accident ie. motor vehicle accident,
 - Owners are responsible for their pets.
 - A responsible dog owner would want to explain
 - its kinda like getting in a car accident I think a decent person will stay and do what is needed to make sure all involved are ok , will help weed out poor pet owner.
 - Like an accident. Untrained dogs can provoke trained dogs, people sometimes have bad behaviours or children aggravating a dog, bylaw should see all sides
 - As a victim of a pit bull attack the owners of the pit bull tried to lie about contact information
 - as in any injury accident be it a car or job site you must remain on site, similar goes for an injury accident that involves injury by an animal or to an animal
 - must stay to deal with police
 - This is a criminal offence if owners are not able to keep their pet in line they should be facing consequences and if they fail to remain at the scene they must either call 311 and give their info or face fines and possible seizure of their animals
 - This should be automatic. If your dog causes trauma to a person/child/dog, you should stay on the scene. This should be no different than fleeing the scene of an accident.
 - You wouldn't flee a crime scene so adequate evidence and witnesses need to be present to obtain the most accurate information
 - The owner should be responsible for the incident and provide information to the office. Just like you can't leave the traffic accident scene where somebody was hurt before an enforcement officer came.
 - While sometimes these things happen and it may not always be out of aggression but fear we are responsible for our pets. With that we need to be prepared to do everything in our power to help our pet through the incident in a positive manner.
 - i think any pet owner should be held accountable if they have not properly trained their dog. again, owners are the problem, not the dogs themselves.
 - the owner of an unpredictable dog should have precautions in place to prevent incidents of aggression. if a dog attacks a person or other animal it is the responsibility of the owner for not taking the proper precautions to protect their dog and others.
 - Yes I believe the owner should get to explain their side of the story.
 - You're responsible for your dog
 - Just like a serious accident, they should stay on scene, exchange info
 - Owner must remain with animal until bylaw is on scene to hear facts
 - "What happens if they leave? It's just like a collision, how many times do people hit and run and nothing happens.
-
- Yes of course owners should stay and take responsibility."



- If I hit someone with my car I have to stick around, if my dog attacks someone I should be held equally accountable.
- 100% the owner in addition should be charged with assault and negligence of training and controlling the dog.
- The owner is responsible for their pet. If ANY dog should bite anyone then that owner should shell out money for proper training. If that can not be provided the dog should be taken away and find a suitable home to rehabilitate the dog.
- It is part of being a responsible dog owner.
- Common sense
- This is just good behavior. Same as when you are expected to stay at the scene in a driving accident.
- Something like this would be more beneficial than a restriction on dog breeds in general. It would ensure owners are kept accountable for bites.
- If vet and medical fees are necessary owners information needs to be acquired
- Dog owners should be responsible to stay at the scene just like any other crime or incident. I.e; car accidents
- I've been but to many times and the owner leaves and can't be found to be held responsible
- Dog Owner remain on the scene and speak to enforcement officer and fines and to keep dog in their home
- As with any crime or incident it is always best to talk to everyone that needs to know details so everyone understands exactly what and how it happened. Leaving the scene or trying to get out as fast as possible makes the offending party look guilty or guiltier to third party witnesses.
- responsible action to take responsibility for dogs actions/behaviour
- Well just like any other kind of accident you should be liable is your dog bites someone or another animal therefore you should be required to stay at the scene until everything is dealt with also think of it like a hit and run that's not right
- To many cases of irresponsible owner walking away
- they person whose dog bit if it is a very specific situation should be responsible for all medical costs.
- Explain what and why it happened
- The same as any incident which results in injury/damage to person or property, the person should be on the scene or have produced ID and contact info if the animal needs to be removed to de-escalate the situation.
- Dogs do not bite only because they are aggressive, it's natural defensive behaviour and would be good to give the owner the opportunity to explain the behaviour
- As long as it is safe to do so. If dogs have been fighting, having a requirement that owners stay together following, while the animals are with them and escalated, may be problematic.
- It is the owners responsibility to seek reparation for Safety and costs, as well as fines if their dog bites a human or other dog.
- The owner needs to be responsible for any damages caused by their dog



- They should remain to provide context (sometimes a bite happened because the dog was teased or a person didn't follow the owner's instruction to not touch a dog). Also to provide contact information so the vaccination status of the dog can be confirmed.
- The owner needs to be responsible and accountable for his or her dog.
- The dog/owner at fault should be liable to pay vet bills incurred by the injured dog.
- Common sense. Can't believe this isn't already a requirement.
- They are ultimately responsible for their pet. People who are being jerks and don't care about the attack and just leave should definitely be fined. Incidents need to be discussed by all parties, and often long term planning needs to happen (ie training) to prevent future incidents.
- To ensure that the bite victim receives appropriate care, that public health is considered and that the dog owner is held legally responsible for the dog's behaviour.
- A owner is responsible for their dogs actions and should take that responsibility
- We need to know that dangerous dogs are being recorded and receiving help. Following muzzle laws in public as well as shot records/health.
- It is the ethical response.
- It's important to know both sides of what happened. Sometimes dogs can be aggravated by human behaviour (ie. Approaching without asking)
- Similar to a hit and run
- As a responsible pet owner, we are accountable for our pets actions. ESPECIALLY if someone is hurt.
- If someone's child commits a crime the parents are typically contacted and informed/questioned, so it makes sense for a dogs owner to be held accountable for their pets actions as well.
- This seems like common sense and am surprised if there are no rules like this in place already.
- Only if the owner is able to do so without causing harm to the animal.
- Responsibility needs to be taken by those who have caused harmed, intended or not. Should be same system as car accidents
- Information is needed to follow up
- The owner should stay at the scene, as they are partially responsible for their dogs behaviour, and are completely responsible for the dog (owner).
- if the bite is minor (minor scratch not requiring medical attention) then this should not be enforced
- agree - Unless the dog bite was minor (i.e. made in play that resulted in a small scratch or wound not needing vet care)
- Each dog owner must be accountable for their dogs behaviour
- "Yes to explain. But euthanasia no.
- [removed]"
- an owner should take responsibility of his animals behavior
- You are responsible for your dog. If it is involved in any sort of incident it is the owners responsibility to ensure both sides are ok and share any and all information that might help. Dogs are not the problem; people are.



- It is an injury and should be assisted however why the dog bit the person should also be looked at
 - The owner should stay at the scene because if somebody got hurt you cant just leave them there.
 - Similar to car/vehicle collisions, all parties should remain at the scene.
 - It's like a hit and run- if you don't know who did it, how do you seek restitution?
 - Leaving the scene is an equivalent of a hit and run.
 - Of course the owner should stay at the scene it's the same with an accident. The owner is responsible for their dogs actions
 - The owner is ultimately responsible and there is no way to identify the dog if the owner leaves the scene.
 - This should be treated the same way society treats vehicle accidents. Information from the owner of the dog that bit should be given to the guardian of the dog/person that was bit to allow for follow-up/cost reimbursement for medical expenses as required. If medical attention is required for either a dog or person, vaccination information will be needed. As well, the owner of the dog that bit must attend force-free training classes or agree to surrender the dog to a non-profit animal rescue society that employs force-free training methods, and provide proof to the guardian of the dog/person that was bit. Failure to do so within 10 days of the bite incident may result in immediate seizure and surrender of the dog to a City of Calgary partner non-profit rescue organization specializing in force-free training and re-homing of dogs with bite history. City of Calgary agrees to reimburse said partner non-profit rescue organization for any vaccinations and/or medical expenses (including spay/neuter) the dog requires prior to being re-homed. All other supplies and food to be provided by the partner non-profit rescue organization.
 - If a dog bites another person or animal (domestic pet/livestock - lest we get inundated with complaints from bleeding hearts about every rabbit or squirrel) it should be treated no differently than an assault or negligence which results in bodily harm. Owners should be held accountable for their inability to control their dog.
 - "people should be responsible for their animals behaviour. So staying to ensure that any harm is remedied is responsible ownership.
-
- 100% yes if it bites a human, dog on dog is maybe up for discussion based on severity."
 - Absolutely support this. A responsible dog owner would stay and ensure that accurate information is given. Dog owners leaving a scene could suggest negligence of part of the owner and could also result in unfair resolutions (especially for the animal involved)
 - I see this as requiring a motorist to remain at the scene of an accident
 - It should be treated the same as an assault with injuries or injuries sustained in a vehicle collision; where an individual is required to remain on the scene.
 - Dogs have a different way of communicating and if one person feels that the other persons dog was being aggressive then they should remain behind to discuss the incident if necessary. Most reasonable and responsible dog owners will not need the involvement of an enforcement officer.
 - If mutual agreement both parties could waive this requirement if the incident is judged minor.



- Should be treated the same as damaging another car with own vehicle. If owner flees - treat it similar to a "hit and run".
- I don't see the difference between remaining at the scene of an accident or remaining on the scene of an incident such as a dog bite/attack. Whenever harm has come to an individual, the owner of the damaging item must stay at the scene until the situation has been fully processed
- Responsibility and accountability in any accident scenario should always be upheld.
- It is reasonable that the same principal with a car accident is applied- if damage or injury is done then the responsible party should provide detail to the injured party.
- The dog biting a person in a serious way should be viewed the same as a their owner assaulting that person and they should be required to stay on the scene. However the scene needs to be assessed by a professional to see if the bite was warranted. if it was defensive or offensive in the dogs eyes.
- Like a car accident, you should have to stay.
- Like any other incident , I can't leave the scene of a accident or crime if I witness or am directly involved
- People need to take responsibility for their animals
- If the bite is unprovoked and the victim requires medical attention, the offending dogs owner should be held ac out able. If the offender is not known to the victims owner, there is no way to identify the offending owner. Plus it's the right thing to do.
- Owners need to take more responsibility. I have a dog that has bitten, and we never go near other dogs or within lunging distance of people he does not know. You cannot leave these things to chance, and per owners just do not take the responsibility seriously
- While this doesn't address bites that are not discovered until later, it does effectively assign responsibility for bites that are recognized at the scene, immediately. For me, it is the equivalent of a "hit and run" to allow a dog owner to just walk away after their dog bites a human or animal. It sends a very disturbing message that it's no big deal, and offenders (and I mean the owners) don't have to take action (as in, go to training WITH their dog). Most likely these "bite and run" cases would be repeat offenders, too.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their pets especially if they have caused harm to aother person or animal. Owners should be required to talk to an officer at the scene.
- The owner is responsible for the animal's actions. The animal in question may have not known any better or had the intention of doing harm.
- In the same way as a car accident, it stops people from changing their position of stance after the incident has been dealt with in person. A dog may antagonize another dog and get bit for it, the former owner may admit it was their animals fault at the time then change stance. This creates a they-said situation which is bad for the system and the animals.
- I truly feel that most aggressive dogs are owned by folks who don't understand the dogs needs. A biting incident is a good time to step in and help the owner to better care for his animal. Engage a couple of volunteers to run classes on how to feed, water and exercise he dog. Both owner and dog will benefit.



- Many flee the area when their dog bites. An additional fine for leaving the scene of the incident should apply if you can find the owner
- Dog owners who have an animal that have produced harm to someone should be liable for providing all necessary information required to the victim such as they would be expected to do in a motor vehicle incident.
- Should be treated as a hit and run if they leave
- I witnessed a dog attack and the owner tried to leave the scene with no information as to how to reach them. Should be like a hit-and-run accident...bearing in mind that the owner, NOT THE DOG, is to blame for the situation.
- This would bring a safer sense of security to other pet owners when accidents like this happen.
- If any type of dog bits a person to the point where both parties agree that placing charges is important, then the owner should take responsibility despite the dog breed.
- As previously mentioned, my dogs have been attacked multiple times. Twice was at a dog park and I was able to separate the dogs but the other owner just walked away. Once was in my neighborhood and the owner drove with me to take my dog to the vet and paid for all vet expenses. That was proper dog ownership.
- They should have to provide their personal contact information with proof of identification.
- Accountability is one major issue amongst pet owners.
- No different than a traffic accident. It is your dog and there for your responsibility.
- It is important for the officer to see the dog to get a fair assessment of their character and behavior as well as their owners behavior. If it is a calm dog the is a possibility the victim could be embellishing the story or have provoked it.
- Just like any accidents responsible parties should remain to give information(their side of story) if the dog can be safely contained /restrained by the owner there is no reason they should not stay.
- I think it is necessary as the dog that was bit may require a vet appointment and the owner of the dog that was doing the biting may need to pay for the bill.
- I think for the purpose of best supporting the dogs rehabilitation and holding the owner accountable, this is important.
- Just as with a car accident, I think it is fair for the owner to stay and exchange information
- Accountability is absolutely necessary in these situations.
- to ensure that all contact information has been collected on both sides.
- I support it but I doubt it will happen. In alot of cases dog owners tend to make themselves scarce after their dog has bitten or attached another dog/person. It should be treated like a car accident, if you leave the scene you should be charged.
- Sure if a dog viscouisly attacks another animal or human yes
- Should there be blood drawn both parties should mutually agree if it was a normal dog scruff or further action is needed ie vet care
- Contact information should be shared, but we must keep in mind that often it isnt' the dog's fault. Many people don't know how to approach dogs properly. If a dog bites out of fear, that is partly the



person who approached the dog in the wrong manner's fault. The general public should be educated about how to approach animals. Dos and don'ts

- the owner must be accountable for their pet. Personal information must be shared similar to a vehicle accident
- As with any crime, one must remain at the scene if they were involved.
- Dogs that are "repeat offenders" should be reported as such
- The individual who received the bite should receive medical attention and the person with the dog should help them to make sure they're OK.
- within reasonable time
- Regardless of how embarrassing it is, you are the owner and must take responsibility. Own up, maybe there's a 3 strike system. Regardless if your dog bit someone, it's absolutely necessary to stay and speak on behalf of your dog, we don't know if the other dog instigated it or what tell your side of the story!
- Sharing contact information only should be sufficient for dog on animal [dog] bites. I would support staying on scene for an officer for dog on people bites.
- Yes but you'll have to not threaten euthenazia otherwise they'll run away.
- If your dog bites someone or another dog you must remain on scene until by law officers arrive. If you leave the scene its no different than assaulting another person and fleeing and you should be arrested for fleeing the scene of violence.
- Unless vet care is requires for the pet or care for the owner
- Or at least ensure that the officer knows where u live
- A dog bite incident is similar to a car accident. The owner is responsible for their dog's behaviour. They should stay at the incident to explain what happened and why they allowed their dog to bite someone.
- Absolutely - if the dog owner is able to freely leave the scene before a record is made of the incident, then all these efforts are in vain, as there is no subsequent record and therefore no potential for penalty.
- I believe responsible pet ownership comes down to the owner accepting responsibility for their animal. They should remain at the scene to show their cooperation to resolve the situation and incident, without needing to be afraid of having their dog taken or penalties issued on them. They would also be able to witness to whether the party who was bitten was provoking the dog.
- Any bite attack that causes a visible wound or draws blood should be the threshold
- A dog owner is responsible for their dog - if the dog hurts a person or other animal the owner needs to take responsibility for what the dog did.
- The owner of an animal that bites another animal or person should be help responsible, and should be provided their contact information to cover vet and emergency bills, as well as their information to an enforcement officer to have a report ran and it noted on their pet license account with the city.
- Owners are fully accountable for their dogs. Not the breed of the dog.
- Absolutely, no disagreement here.



- Absolutely. You wouldn't flee the scene of a car accident. If the dog is responsible for an attack, both owners should stay and provide info.
- Their animal caused injury. As its owner, they need to be held accountable for its actions.
- People need to take responsibility for the actions of their dog. They are liable for damage/vet bills occurring from the incident. This should be enforced
- Pet owners need to take more responsibility for their animals
- Just like a car accident, there should be a requirement to share information.
- My dog was bitten by another dog and the owner took off. I had to pay for the vet and now my dog is traumatized.
- Depending on the severity - i.e. if an actual injury is sustained
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs behavior, good or bad, and also advocate for their dogs.
- Seems like common sense. i'm surprised that rule doesn't already exist.
- As someone who has been bitten by an aggressive Labradoodle in an off-leash, owners ought to be responsible for their pets, including consequences when they are poorly trained. Others shouldn't have to fear off-leash parks because owners face no repercussions for their pet's poor obedience skills.
- If an incident occurs where a dog bites a human , the owner of the dog and the victim of the bite should remain on scene to discuss what the next courses of action will take place. If said two people cannot come to an agreement or conclusion an enforcement officer can then get involved.
- "Just like a hit and run..
- if the owner leaves the scene there should be a charge!!"
- People need to be held accountable.
- It seems reasonable as dog owners are fundamentally accountable for their dog's behaviour.
- I believe that it's the owners responsibility to remain at the scene to exchange information or speak with a bylaw officer and they should be responsible for damages done by their animal
- How else can the owner of the dog causing harm be held responsible?
- People need to remain 100% accountable for their pets
- The owner should be held accountable for their actions. If there has been an injury the owner should remain at the scene this should be handled the same as an accident and fines associated with leaving the scene of an accident.
- I believe contact information should be shared but I believe the time it takes for an enforcement officer could be avoided and have separate meetings. If a dog bites a person or another dog it should be taken to a safe space so as to not harm anyone else in the meantime.
- It's the dog's owner responsibility not the dog.
- People should take responsibility for their animals, regardless of the size of the dog and the severity of the bite
- I have never met a mean dog, but I have come across poor owners, who either have not trained and socialized their dogs, or have trained their dogs to be aggressive. I think owners should remain on site and that thorough checks into the owners should be done in the case of a dog bite.



- Same as if you hit another car, you have to remain at the scene.
- It's the considerate thing to do. Less time is spent trying to track dog and owner. Comparable to leaving the scene of an accident.
- We need to hold owners accountable
- So they are able to explain their side of the story.
- Only if a dog bites a person
- Both parties need to stay at scene to discuss what happened
- ultimately the dog is the responsibility, dependent and reflection of its ownership, so they definitely need to stay and explain what they think has happened
- Dog owners should always stay at the scene
- We must hold dog owners NOT THE BREED accountable
- they should be charged if left site.
- I would like a biting incident to be treated the same was as a vehicle accident.
- I think there needs to be an accountability but the other side of that is also that there needs to be understanding and objectivity from officials and all parties involved. If a dog bites someone/something else because it is severely provoked or threatened, that is a natural reaction and the one doing the provoking should also be held accountable for that and remain on the scene.
- Just as in a car accident, the dog owner must provide their information to ensure their accountability
- Owners are responsible for all actions.
- This should go towards all dogs.
- I think this should happen with any dog ... this makes me sick
- Then it can be on record of the owner and the dog in hopes to prevent or recognize other offences.
- Accountability and responsibility on all parts!! It's truly that simple
- Definitely if the dog bites a human. If a dog bites another dog and it is not serious I don't think they need to remain on scene. Sometimes dogs get into small scraps.
- Absolutely. This is so important if we want to prevent repeat attacks by dangerous dogs. Right now there is no incentive to stay at the scene of the crime and I would expect most dog owners to want to protect their pets and leave with them right away. This also means that bylaw would need to be on site quickly.
- If an aggressive dog does bite a person or another animal then their owner should be investigated if they are treating the dog poorly to make it behave this way. If not then they should be ordered to attend obedience classes for their dog
- I've been bit and the owner took off so I didn't know if the dog had rabies.
- For ALL BREEDS. Bully breeds are not the enemy. Those chihuahua's and little ones are. There is 100% evidence that my shepherd bites harder than a Pitbull. They would never. But don't breed shame on no evidence.
- Yes, this should be related to insurance cases and mandatory insurance for pitbull owners. It would work same as vehicle accidents.
- I like this because it is due diligence as a pet owner. The problem is, how would you enforce this?



- AS A 911 OPERATOR I'VE TAKEN CALLS WHERE THE DOG OWNER FLED THE SCENE OF A DOG ATTACK.
- It's the right thing to do.
- The dog owner and dog fevered to be heard and the opportunity to explain. Especially of the dog had been provoked.
- That is their responsibility as a pet owner to take accountability for their pets actions. If they do not they should be fined heavily when caught.
- So the situation is dealt with efficiently, respectfully and lower risk for both parties. Also less stress on the animals. (Let's encourage the owner to take responsibility, instead of blaming the animal. It is NOT the animal's fault. It is the result of poor ownership and lack of training.)
- Some owners flee, leaving the victim not knowing if the dog has an up to date vaccination record..that needs to be disclosed
- no matter the breed or type of animal, if there is a bite the owner should always be present
- It makes sense to share your information however if the officer arrives and escalated as situation it's not on the dog it's on the officer and he should have to deal with the consequences
- Owners should take responsibility for their pets, regardless of how severe an incident is there are reasons as to why it happened and should be sorted out to make sure future incidents don't happen. By not staying present and talking to enforcement officers you'd be passing this incident off as not a problem and therefore the chances of bites happening in the future become a greater threat.
- I believe that there can be several incidents where a dog could bite. It should be recorded whether or not it is linked to animal behavior or potentially incited by another animal or person.
- It's the responsible things to do.
- It is a crime so the owner should stay to answer for the crime. It is no different from leaving the scene of a car accident.
- I have been by a dog and the owner and dog ran away while i sought first aid in a local business. I had to go to the ER to make sure that I was okay and had all required shots
- needs to be dealt with while incident is fresh, and in the event of injury, witness would be a great help in determining exactly what happened and possibly why
- It is no different than a car accident. A responsible dog owner should stay to make sure the individual is ok, unless the situation has escalated and it is unsafe to do so. (Example: Can't control dog)
- This prevents confusions or misunderstandings, by being present and explaining the situation.
- Should it be severe this would be necessary
- Mitigating factors need to be explained to the officer immediately to prevent skewing of events.
- If requested by the victim. Irresponsible owners, regardless of breed, who tend to let their animals out of their control tend to brush off negative interactions without nearing the situation. Particularly at dog parks.
- If the bite is serious and a Person or Dog is Injured then yes action should be taken. This needs to be handled carefully as some people will escalate a small situation and abuse the law to take action based on their own prejudices rather than a proportional response based on the situation.



- Do you allow hit and runs with a vehicle? It's common sense.
- An owner is responsible for their dog's behaviour. If an offence is committed, the guilty party should have to stay where they are.
- ABSOLUTELY. Why would they not?? Why would they leave?? Unless it is to avoid penalties and responsibilities. Responsible pet owners remain at the scene.
- Many years ago my dog was attacked by a dog running at large. Although the owner showed up, admitted responsibility, and offered to pay the vet bill, he disappeared and I was unable to find him.
- It should be expected that when a severe case happens people take responsibility. I'm confused about the box headed dogs, on all accounts box headed dogs are not more aggressive than any other breed nor do they bite as much. Why would we treat this any different than real crime? Because it has the potential to do more damage they are all penalized? What garbage is that? You'll have half of the dog breeds in the city caged up in half a year with these stupid rules.
- Is exactly like leaving the scene of a car accident. Someone/pet has been injured and the person responsible must remain until enforcement arrives.
- yes, because much like my answer above, it is important to know what kind of person is owning the dog. The person is much more at fault than the dog is. An enforcement officer can make sure the dog is in a happy, caring home, that gives it the best chance of success.
- it should be treated like a car accident.
- If your dog attacks someone or another dog, you should be paying for the vet bill of the other dog.
- Just like a car accident, I feel that if any injury at the time occurs then a monetary compensation should be delt with.
- Dog owners flee too often with their dog. It should be considered an offence.
- A dog owner needs to be responsible for their dogs actions, if something happens they need to stay and make sure the right things are done to resolve the issue.
- Law abiding citizens with decent morals will already do so.
- Of course just
- Owners should be held accountable for their dog's behaviour
- The owner of the responsible dog should be responsible for any vet bills incurred
- Owner are responsible for there pets
- owners need to be accountable
- Dog owners should be responsible for their dogs.
- It is the right thing to do
- A responsible owner would stay around, an irresponsible owner will run to avoid consequences
- Pet ownership is a responsibility not a free for all.
- Be a good human.
- Share contact information, they should not necessarily have to stay and wait for an officer. If you have a pic of of them and their drivers license and you have their phone number etc, and a bylaw officer can't be there for a while, no one should have to wait.
- "They should be able to do one of two things:



- Defend their dog in the event the dog was provoked by another dog or a human
- Be held accountable in the event they were in the wrong"
- The owner of the dog that bites needs to share contact information with the victim(s) to be able to find out the health of the offending dog for any issues that may arise regarding the victim(s).
- To verify dog ownership. To ensure owners are made responsible for the actions of their dog.
- To identify the dog for health & safety reasons. To insure owner is accountable for dog.
- It is important to obtain information such as vaccination history and if this is a primary attack or a repeat offence. As well the circumstances surrounding the attack: was the human being aggressive towards the dog or the dogs owner? What is the severity of the bite?
- If an owner is responsible they will stay. The problem with this whole "Pitbull" ban is that it punishes the well behaved dogs and does little to stop the criminal element. Don't forget that Pitbulls are called the Nanny dogs, they are sweet gentle loving dogs that happen to be extremely strong. The owners can make any dog mean.
- Pet owners must take full responsibility for their animal regardless of circumstances. To flee is synonymous with hit and run.
- It's the same as a vehicle accident for example. The dog owner should remain at the scene...tough one though as many dog owners haven't licensed their dogs and run - hence tripling the fines for doing that should occur.
- I think if both parties feel it is necessary then the owner should remain and only if the bite is severe enough to warrant enforcement officer involvement. If it is a minor scuffle at a dog park akin to regular dog behavior then no.
- Only necessary if the bite has caused harm that may warrant medical attention and the person has been the victim of the bite requests the dog owner to stay at the scene
- It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure their pet is not aggressive. If the pet observes aggressive behaviour the owner should be required to pass along contact information to help cover any cost associated with the behaviour. Again, this should go for ALL breeds, big and small.
- The dog owner usually (in my experience) has a role in why the dog has attacked something
- Same as car accident. Most times it's not the dog or the breed, it's the owners fault for either poor training and/or poor supervision and control of dog. Owner is liable for dogs actions.
- People need to be held accountable for their dogs actions. I don't believe a dog is bad, an owner is the bad one.
- The owner is the responsible party
- Should be mandatory already!
- There needs to be a threshold here. Not every minor dog fight that causes no harm at an off leash should trigger this. But if a person has been hurt, or another animal, then the dog owner should be required to stay and self-report because a civil wrong has been committed - damage has been caused. People should pay for their damage, and own up to it.
- Owners of dogs who have bitten other dogs or people must remain at the scene to ensure that all the information is given.
- No different than a car accident



- Why is this not already a rule. Dog bites are assault
- If a dog bites a dog or other animal then they should pay the vet bill . Information Should be exchanged just like a car accident
- I have been bitten by a dog before and the owners fled. Which left me with many questions regarding the vaccination state of the dog.
- Otherwise it allows for belligerant behaviour
- This should apply to all dogs, pitbulls should NOT be singled out!
- The owner should have the right to defend its dog.
- It is only fair to remain present and get statements from ALL the parties involved so that a reasonable result can be made
- All owners no matter the breed or size of dog should be responsible for their animal.
- Too often the owner does not take responsibility, leaving the victims with multiple forms of trauma to deal with and no support.
- Stop targeting pit type dogs [removed] proved it was the owners not the dog or create Lifetime Adversaries -- Coderre went against the people and LOST his mayorship you'll hear us ... at the ballot
- I've had a dog at the dog attack my dog an astounding vet bill and the owner of this dog gave me a false # so they didn't have any consequences. It was not a bully breed that attacked my Yorkie either .
- No dog should be allowed to maul another pet or person without providing pertinent information to the victim. The presence of an officer prevents any difficulties.
- Pure logic. Don't leave the scene of an incident or accident.
- As is reasonable. Owner may need to go retrieve the dog. Some enforcers are unreasonable, looking for any reason to slap someone with an offence.
- If people need to stay after a car accident then they should stay after a pet incident
- Owners need to take responsibility. If owners were to take responsibility of their pets in the first place this survey wouldn't even exist.
- In order to establish if the dog is up to date on rabies vaccine.
- Responsible dog owners take responsibility for their dogs actions
- That's just common sense of being a moral person and responsible dog owner
- Owner should be responsible enough to take ownership of their pet and how they have raised it
- Makes sense. Scene of an accident
- If someone or someones dog was bitten and needed to go to the hospital then by all means information should be taken down and kept on record. If it wasn't an intentional bite meaning to hurt but just an unfortunate incident it should be set as a warning for the dog at fault and owner but information is not needed. It should also be up to the people/dog(s) involved if they would like to make that call for police/bylaw services to be a part of that incident.
- They are 100% responsible for their dog's misbehaviour



- People need to be held accountable for the damage their property (dog) does. Why should it be any different than a hit and run with a car?
- Nothing to explain. Straight forward.
- Too many owners of attack dogs flee scene after their dog commits an offense.
- Yes, if no animal or person is in immediate danger of death, but consideration of circumstances should be given if there is need of emergency medical aid for human or animal.
- Dog incidents should be treated like traffic accidents
- Animals do not carry the responsibility to act civilized, humans do
- All owners should be responsible for their actions and the actions of their pers. Also others should also be responsible for their actions to the situation
- There are just too many dogs attacking humans
- ..? Be responsible for your dog. It is the owners responsibility to train their dog and to be mindful of their emotional state/behaviour around guests/strangers. If your dog lashes out then it is your responsibility to respond to the consequences.
- Accountability
- It's just more sensible and saves the owner more trouble than there could've been in the first place. But it'd be best to not make a big deal about it as dogs don't know that what they are doing is wrong, they just think of it as a protection mechanism, it's not their fault.
- Every owner should show responsibility for their pet. As it's most often not a bully breed going after another dog or human. A dog should not be punished due to owner negligence in training. But owners should be the ones that are held responsible, not the dog.
- Just like a car accident you must own up to what your dog does.
- It's the right thing to do as a responsible pet owner
- Yes ONLY IF the bite is severe enough to cause a person or dog to need stitches. If this is a play bite to another dog and maybe the dog was slightly injured but not because of a "vivacious" attack then no. The dogs are playing this happens and there are many owners out there who will over react and take advantage of a situation. This would be a waste of tax payers money if police are called for small incidents and anyone who has had a dog understands that dogs play like kids and sometimes they are slightly injured but they learn. The owners and discipline their dogs and work with them to play nicer and listen to commands to play nice from their owner while playing. In addition, people will over react and abuse this situation for dogs that nip at people. Often people will run up to strangers dogs to pet them without asking and sometimes if the dog is learning to socialize and they get scared or overwhelmed (especially if it's a large group and not a common occurrence they may nip). This does not mean the dog is aggressive or an owner should have to exchange information with someone who may report this to the police and the dog could be labelled as a nuisance dog defending itself. People like dogs and children learn from these mistakes. It's often not the dogs fault they bite. It's usually the other person.
- Dog owners must be responsible for their dog and the dogs actions reflect on the owner just as much as the dog
- Na



- An exchange of information after a dog bite seems reasonable. Just like any other accident or incident in the rest of society.
- It's important to remain to explain the situation. Animals bite because they are involved, not just because they feel like it. The bitten party could be at fault however if both parties are not there to explain then it could be very one sided. The animal should however remain in an area to reduce anxiety and refrain from causing it further stress.
- An owner should be responsible for their pet. They are suppose to be a part of the family and matter to us like family shouldn't we at least do the cleanse thing we'd do in the case of an accident exchange information ? Wait and clear up everything
- It's like a hit and run. You have the responsibility to stay, and if people don't, that is definitely worthy of a fine.
- i think it's important for the owner of the dog to explain the situation
- Owners need to be responsible and accountable for their animals behaviour.
- Its basically assault and should be dealt with as such. The penalty for not staying at the scene should be severe.
- There are ALWAYS 2 sides to every story, dogs just dont bite for no reason
- If there is a fight and you're seen as the agitator generally you should stay and please your case. If you leave you're generally seen as guilty.
- Dog bites should be treated the same as car accidents
- Information should always be exchanged in these situations however, if the medical attention required to the dog at all sever the safety of the dogs should be placed first.
- Because it was probably the person that provoked the dog then the dogs fault
- Only have too if something actually happens
- To ensure their dog has had proper vaccinations. Not to get the dog taken away or to be reprimanded as we don't know the circumstances under which the dog was inclined to bite
- Kind of like a car accident, make sure other person or animal is safe if not get medical help, and share phone number and I guess make a report to a bylaw officer
- If your dog bites someone and that person wants to call the cops on you. You should remain at the scene to accept responsibility.
- Human beings that exercise poor leadership/control over their animal need to be held accountable much like they are held accountable for poor control over their vehicle. However, dogs should not be punished for the poor leadership/training of their owners: all dogs, even involved in violent, need to be given the opportunity to rehabilitate with a trainer either in a day-program or a residential program for the dog, and if such owners are unable to provide such training, the animal should be forfeited to the humane society where that agency can be trusted to oversee and place the rehabilitation and rehoming of the animal.
- #NAME?
- I thought this was a rule already and I think it should be a rule. (Similar to if someone gets in a motor accident)



- The owner should take responsibility for their pet and the situation by remaining at the scene and reaching out to the victim following the attack
- Unless vet or doctor attention is required, both parties should stay at the scene to resolve the situation. If medical attention was required then an incident report should be made as soon as both parties are safe and able to complete one.
- Makes it easier to find and identify the dog
- to an extent. If the dog bit in response to being harassed then it is unfair for a traumatized dog to remain in an unsafe situation. Bites are often a result of people not knowing how to interact with dogs and are therefore not the dogs fault. The victim or owner are more likely to be at fault.
- It's the owners responsibility to explain the situation. If its never happened before and there is an explanation then that should be considered. If someone takes off then that would show that its the owner thats the problem.
- If I hit your car I wouldn't leave the scene?
- Common sense
- It's just like getting into a car accident: you should be there to share details with the other party.
- Just like any accident, information should be given on scene.
- Every responsible dog owner would do this without needing a bylaw. This would give bylaw enforcement the power to charge owners who fail to do this.
- Too many dogs attacking other dogs and the owner leaves, leaving the injured dog's owner with a huge bill at the vet.
- Be accountable
- If a dog causes harm the owner should have to share information, be liable for damages unless someone is breaking into there residence
- If there is an incident, BOTH people should have to exchange contact information. (Same as an automobile accident).
- Any responsible DOG owner would remain at the scene, regardless of the breed of dog!
- It should be similar to the rules of a traffic accident. You must stay on the scene and provide your pertinent info.
- They're difficult to locate once they leave the scene.
- Being responsible pet owner
- The owner should be held responsible
- As long as it is safe to do so, and does not cause further stress or harm to the victim, the dog, or bystanders. If it is best for the dog to be removed from the situation, then I think it's reasonable for the owner to leave their contact info to discuss with an officer at a later time.
- Responsible owners would do this without the need to make it a law
- An owner is responsible for its dogs actions, not the dog. The owner should be held accountable for bites, etc.
- As a dog owner, one needs to be responsible for their dog's behaviour. If that dog bites a person, or another animal contact info is necessary in case of any litigation.



- Sometimes a dog bite to another animal requires a vet's attention which should be paid for by the owner of the biting dog. Just like with a car accident and insurance you need to wait for an officer for a proper report
- Similar to a car accident, both parties should exchange contact information.
- Yes, dog owners should have to be responsible for their dogs behaviour but also be given the opportunity to explain any extenuating circumstances. Frequently, the erroneous "pitbull" label is put on dogs and they are blamed for dog incidents without any other facts being heard.
- They should be able to speak on behalf of their pet, as they know their behaviour the best. As well, if it is a recurring incident, then other measures can be taken as contact information would be in the system.
- Accountability of an owner when their dog bites any other animal or person seems like common sense and the responsible thing to do.
- the owner should take responsibility and stay to provide due diligence. However in the case of a dog bite, wouldn't it be safer if the dog was removed from the scene expediently to prevent further harm and trauma to the victim?
- Obviously
- If an official is not available.. then a photo of a driver's license is required.
- This way the owner can be given the proper supports that the dog may need going forward.
- Don't leave the scene of the crime
- The owner must stay to offer any assistance as well as supply required information
- It is extremely important for the owner to remain at the scene, just to ensure they are held accountable for the pet's actions and also to take care of any vet bills or hospital bills required due to the attack.
- Yes, with the caveat that the first priority should be to confine the dog to prevent further negative behaviour. If this involves leaving the immediate scene to put a dog in a car or kennel, that should be acceptable. Removing the animal completely before an enforcement officer arrives should be an offence.
- The information should be filed by all parties involved.
- Dog owners need to be held responsible and should be empathetic to others, especially those who are injured or scared
- Yes it's like a hit and run if they leave
- I believe it's important for all to stay at the scene to ensure all sides of the story are heard and proper action may be taken.
- If someone is seriously injured it should obviously be dealt with but it should not always be pinned on the animal
- As a responsible dog owner, you should stay at the scene. I can understand why a dog owner would leave - if they're scared their dog is going to be taken away and euthanized without investigation. A dog bite victim is not always innocent.
- Owning a dog is a privilege and not a right and as pet guardians we are responsible for how our pet behaves - and truthfully humans are more often than not the source of the dogs behaviour (good



and bad). Thus, the owner must be held responsible and accountable for their actions which lead to their dog feeling they needed to bite in order to protect themselves. This needs to come with education to the owner of how THEY contributed to the bite incident as they could have instead helped deescalate their dog and likely avoided the situation.

- Unless both parties agree not to share or report the incident
- To many people are allowing their dogs to attack humans or other families dogs and are getting away with it because they leave before giving out any information to make sure something is noted on the dogs history.
- All information should be documented so both sides of the story can be heard rather than assuming it's the dogs fault.
- If owner does not remain at scene, they should be treated as leaving the scene of an accident with subsequent harsh penalty.
- Take responsibility for your dogs behaviour.
- An incident involving me and my pet, is similar to any incident involving me and my car. A dog bite is an act of violence or accidental injury that involves me and I should remain at the scene of the incident
- [removed]
- No different than staying at the scene of an MVA.
- if a dog bites the owner is the one that should take responsibility as they have not trained the dog properly and are not taking necessary steps for safety. it is the owners fault not the dog
- Same as an automotive incident
- a dog attack or accident should be held to the same standard as any other incident i.e. car accident. This way both parties are able to voice there version of events and come to a reasonable conclusion and resolve the issue fairly.
- If not remain, at least place the dog in a controlled location so they may return to give contact information.
- Owners should be also held accountable no matter what the breed!
- The owner must be the responsible party and receive the sanction.
- Absolutely support it. People need to be held accountable for their animals actions
- It's Would literally be like a hit and run If the owners of the aggressive dog just left.
- Yes because the owner needs to be held responsible. Its no different that a hit and run accident
- An owner is responsible for keeping their dog under control.
- Yes with a caveat, the dog should be placed in a safe situation but the owner needs to share contact information for insurance and legal purposes
- If the incident is serious, the owner of the dog should stay to share their contact information. If the other rosy owner does not mind it should not be necessary. The enforcement officer should only come if crucial and serious.
- similar to staying at a car accident. You stay to tell your side of the incident.
- If there an injury to the other dog or to the person, then yes. If there was no injury, then no.



- Remaining on scene allows the owner to properly explain their perspective and therefore take ownership and defense for their animal. It also requires that the victim remain on the scene of an incident so that they are also held accountable to a more accurate story.
- Like I said earlier, most dog issues are due to the owners own negligence in training their dog or meeting it's breeds specific needs. Therefore, they should be there to take responsibility when their dog causes problems.
- If an injury has occurred, I don't think they should have to wait for bylaw officers, they have no training to deal with this sort of thing, they shoot first and ask questions later!! But the injured party should be compensated for damages.
- How else would you be able to identify the owner?
- It ensures all details (eg whether dog has up-to-date) shots and makes the owner more visibly accountable
- It is important to do so because if an individual or their animal is attacked, it ensures the individual responsible (with the pet who attacked) takes responsibility and isn't careless incase it could happen to other individuals or animals
- As the owner of the dog, they should take responsibility for the incident- whether it was a freak accident or not. If I was attacked by a dog, I don't want the owner just leaving and maybe getting away.
- more emphasis on punishments to the owners and required education programs to retrain the humans who neglect their dogs / animals... humans need to face jail time and high fines to deter being [removed] pet owners
- If safe to do so. The animal may need to be removed which may require the owner leaving the area.
- I had to run behind someone's vehicle to keep them at the scene of the attack.
- Critical to understand dog history and vaccinations.
- People must take responsibility for the behaviour of their animal.
- Same as any offence for anything.
- This can be actively fixed, depending on severity. That being said, regardless of severity all dog owners are responsible for their dogs when it comes to the law of human beings, as dogs do not know these laws.
- The owner should be responsible for the vet bills of the injured dog of their dog instigated and there are witnesses
- This should always have been an enforced rule!
- The owner must take responsibility for their dog.
- If it's safe to do so, the owner has a responsibility to the actions of their dog.
- As long as it does not make the situation worse. If there are circumstances at play where remaining at the scene of an incident would make the situation worse, then, before leaving, contact information should be provided, preferably with proof that the information is truthful. Pictures can hopefully be taken of all involved as well.
- I feel that it is your responsibility as an owner to deal/ help with the situation caused by your dog



- I am in favor of anything that puts accountability on the owner rather than delivers a blanket punishment to dogs who are behaved.
- Only if the bite victim is interested in pursuing intervention with an officer
- Would also be helpful to clarify the definition of a bite and the implication to the owner. All dogs have the potential to bite - there's endless improperly trained chihuahuas out there but the damage they do is less.
- Yes, because obviously that is the right thing to do.
- Staying at the scene is a sign of responsible ownership
- It would depend on the circumstances. And for the record, I was victim to a bad dog attack in Calgary many years ago, I still have the scars from it. The dog was unlicensed, left the property to attack, and the owner verbally abused me. The attending officer did not issue this person any citation, choosing to give a second chance.
- Many dog owners will leave the scene or down play the issue or defect responsibility.
- As an responsible pet owner, it should be required that one takes on the responsibility of reporting to and communicating with enforcement officers in the case of dog bites.
- A dog owner should be held accountable regarding vet bills ect
- The owner must be held accountable and that requires the attendance of the owner or caregiver (if owner is outside the city).
- remaining on scene is responsible ownership
- to leave the scene of an incident without contact information can feel powerless to a victim. In order for everyone to be supported, contact information should be shared right away. No longer than 5 minutes, so as to access resources and remove any animals in distress.
- Otherwise there is no accountability for the owners.
- Like leaving the scene of a car accident which is illegal...
- Your dog bites, you stay and pay costs of vet bills and replacement of victim dog, if it is beyond veterinary care. Your dog bites a person obviously the dog needs to be taken away by proper officials.
- It is the responsible thing to do
- I believe the dog should have a chance to go home, by explaining the situation to prove if the dog was or wasn't provoked.
- Too many people run off without consequences after their dog bites another animal leaving that animals owner to deal with vet bills. The aggressors owner should be liable.
- It is a good idea, however, I can see that if people are scared of a risk of euthanasia from their dogs making a mistake, they might flee the scene. I think if that's not a risk people would be more likely to stay.
- It's the owner that is accountable for the behaviour of the dog, they must have certified training to care for and control the animal, they must be responsible for the animals actions should it cause harm, they must compensate appropriately for damages incurred by the animal due to the owners lack of control. The owner must provide accurate contact information for themselves and their insurance company that covers liability for the animal. ALL animals, not just the "pitbull" variety.



- There are many unreported bites by small dog owners. The City should start tracking these.
- Same as an accident. Owner whose dog caused damage should be held liable and that will only happen if they stick around
- If you hit someone with your car you can't legally leave the scene. It should be the same if your dog bites someone. However, it may be difficult to get the dog under control at the scene while speaking with the injured person and law enforcement, and depending on the situation could lead to more injuries. Perhaps it should be that they stay at the scene, and when calling 911/law enforcement they can request (trained, competent) assistance with a dog that is having difficulty calming down.
- If a dog is attacked by another dog information must be exchanged as the victimized dog may need veterinarian care, and owner of the dog who attacked must be liable for those veterinarian costs
- If your dog attacks someone, then an animal you are responsible for was involved in an assault. You should stay, just as you would in a vehicle collision.
- I think this is equivalent to a fender bender (minor car accident) - all those involved are required to stay at the scene if talk with an enforcement officer is needed
- if the bite is severe; drew blood. as it is only fair to take responsibility for your actions and those in your custody.
- It should be treated just like a car crash. Everyone has to stay and give their information and statements.
- It should not be only if the dog bites a person for a dog owner remain at the scene. I run in the parks and I have been charged by dogs (more than one sometimes) and had to repelled them with dog spray or trying to show an aggressive response to their attack. The fact that I have to track the owner residence for the city to do anything and may be give the dog owner a warning or a \$68 dollar fine is pathetic. Dogs and their owners have more rights then Humans. The anxiety that an attack cause is worth at lot more than \$68 dollar. I was given advice ounce by a park officer who advised to protect my arteries from a dog bite to prevent bleeding out if you can stop it. So it should not be just a bite that counts but an attack by a dog should have consequences for the owner and the dog and they should remain at the scene.
- the person is as responsible for the attitude of the dog and may be the reason for the attitude if treated poorly or abused.
- I think incidents should be recorded, so yes. If the owner leaves the scene there may be no way to identify the owner or dog
- The officer needs to be there within 15 mins. You can't expect people to wait longer. Animals/people who need medical attention cannot wait for someone to arrive.
- owners are responsible for their pets just like parents are for their kids
- To make sure the correct person is charged.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for the behavior of their dog.
- definitely to exchange information. And if a law enforcement officer is called both parties should stay at the scene.
- Its like a car accident. Damages ocured. Names need to be exchanged. Pictures taken.



- Understanding whether the dog is at fault or not is very important before even considering euthanasia.
- The owners have to be accountable.
- As with any “accident”, those involved should remain in attendance however with the number of dogs killed by police over the years, often needlessly, if I had such a dog I would probably get a friend to take the dog to safety first,
- Dog owners should be accountable for their dog, no matter the breed, and act responsibly if there is an incident. This includes sharing contact information and discussion with the appropriate authorities
- I think that the owner of a dog bite should be held responsible for the behaviour of their dog. It's the owner's fault, not the dog's.
- Yes, it's the right thing to do and can de-escalate the issue
- Accountability is important. As long as the animal is able to be safely and respectfully in a vehicle or at a distance from the direct area.
- Often, they leave as the wounded dog owner is in a stressed state. They should be held responsible for vet bills.
- It's part of being a responsible owner
- Proper human beings would do so with or without a law
- If you are in an accident, you must remain at the scene. It is easy for pet owner to disappear without being identified.
- They should have to pay for it too
- Of course the guy should wait. It's not always the dog's fault
- Dog is not responsible, owner is
- It's not the dog's fault. It's most likely from a bad owner, and he should be punished, not the dog.
- I feel it would be the same as staying at the scene of a motor vehicle collision.
- this would leave a consequence for those not responsible enough to own up to what has happened. It would help discover repeat offenders
- Otherwise it is hard to prove to identify the dog owner as they don't want to admit it was their dog that did it.
- Should be considered the same as a hit and run if they leave
- If the owner does not remain at the scene and can be later identified, there should be a significant fine.
- I agree with this statement, as I do believe many dog owners are very uneducated when they get a dog, and instead of instilling fear of enforcement, it should be an educational opportunity for everyone involved, and ensure that the proper measures are taken to make sure the OWNER is aware of the consequences. The owners of animals in my opinion are more at fault than the animal. And on a lower note below regarding the flag system, NO CHILD should approach ANY DOG it doesn't know. The parents should not be letting their child run up to any dog, under any circumstance. I think this should be an opportunity to educate the human beings, because humans are the ones who go into dog ownership unprepared, and always the dog is blamed.
- But this is for all dogs. Not one select breed



- ANY DOG CAN BITE AND LEAVE MARKS
- The owner themselves need to take responsibility for the dogs actions..this has something to do with how the dog is trained.
- You are responsible for your dog. On leash or off. It's the same as driving. You must remain at the scene of a collision. Why is this any different
- As long as it was safe to do so for all parties including the dog.
- It's the responsible thing to fo
- Same as what we would expect in a car accident or altercation between two (or more) people. Not sure how it could be enforced, but a good rule.
- The dog owner should be jailed for leaving the scene.
- Important to keep track so it doesn't happen again
- They just run off and don't take responsible
- I think this is an appropriate measure to have I. Place for ANY dog bite. Not specifically to pitbulls which wouldn't be fair.
- It's the same as if your in a car accident, you stay at the scene and exchange information and make sure everyone is ok
- This is a crime, you have to remain at the scene.
- This may be difficult to enforce in a bite situation but I do support it.
- People who are bitten should know the history of the dog that bit them, I.e the animal has rabies. They may have to pay for injuries out of pocket. I believe the dog owner should be responsible for that.
- It's much like a car accident responsible people stick around and endure everything is ok.
- If an enforcement officer is required all parties in the incident should be required at the scene of the incident
- Key word "If necessary"
- If it's a serious enough incident, than a report needs to be written/fine and have it decided that the dog needs training or special restrictions
- There are ALOT of situations where any dog can bite... I have had many people allow their dogs to come flying at mine saying "my dogs friendly" when I say no .. they have no control over their dog. My dog has been to obedience school and the trainer specifically said dogs are like humans and don't have to like every other dog. Responsible ownership of dogs is key! If I had a strange man walk up to me and I felt uncomfortable my dog is going to sense that ... if that person is to reach out to my dog who is fearful and touch it without permission than the repercussions are NOT that dogs fault ! Pitbull is not a breed it is a poor term to categorize a number of breeds, there is no such thing as a bad dog ... but there are such things as bad owners. I personally think all dogs should be on a leash at all times unless on their own property if that dog leaves that property or is unattended why should the dog suffer ???? I'm sick and tired of humans getting away with this and have no consequences. Bully breeds and many other breeds should be owned by somebody who is educated and has the time to spend with these animals and give them proper training and attention.



Too many irresponsible pet owners out there and the dogs are the ones being euthanized. It's not ok.

- I think if a dog gets aggressive the owner needs to stay and address the problem but it's not just Bolick types of dogs it is all types of dogs stop trying to pick on one breed
- Too many examples of people fleeing the scene after their vicious dog has attacked /injured another dog or person. It happens.
- You should always stay if your dog bites and give your information.
- Treat their action the same way a hit a run with a car is dealt with.
- Any dog owner has to be held accountable for their dog. If your dog bites a person or another animal because you didn't train it properly you are putting your dog's life on the line for your laziness and that is unforgivable.
- If a dog bites a person yes , If a dog off lead attacks a dog on lead yes but If two dogs off lead fight then no
- If it's a severe bite to animal or person yes the owner should be required to give his/her information to whoever was effected and talk with an officer if the severity of the bite is high
- Owners are responsible for their dogs actions. It may be hard but I would like to think I would do the right thing if this unfortunate event ever happened with my dogs.
- Pet owners need to be held responsible for their pet actions
- Yes of course, but any/all dogs not just pit bulls
- The owner is responsible and if they leave it is tantamount t to a hit and run. It is important that it be determined if this is a first offender or not, and the owner's identity is required for tickets or if compensation is deemed due.
- As long as the officer can make a timely appearance.
- Owners must be accountable and liable for their pets' training or lack there of.
- Birds are not an issue, feeding stray cats is. The food attracts skunks and other wildlife, however Birds are not an issue.
- The owner should be held financially responsible for damages. The owner should also be given a chance to defend the actions of their dog, in some situations. If the owner is irresponsible and negligent, they should be fined. Perhaps they should be required to undergo behaviour training. Perhaps they should be banned from offleash parks. They need to be there so that the appropriate actions can be determined.
- It is the dog 'owners' responsibility to explain the actions of the animal
- It is important to track the dogs vaccination history and to watch the dog for 10 days for rabies. If this information can't be properly verified without an enforcement officer then this needs to happen with the officer
- It's pretty obvious, it's the owner responsibility. Dogs, all dogs naturally protect owners, if a dog is hostile, the owner would be able to see it, knows about it. 95% of pit bull breeds don't hurt harm or are aggressive. Little mutts bite more often. This whole thing seems pregedious. Where some people own large dominate dogs, it's the owners that make or let them be aggressive.
- As long as it is safe for both the people and animals



- It's called responsible pet ownership
- many people give fake information
- Makes sense
- Absolutely how else will you get the information on what happened? To stay at the scene of the attack shows that the dog owner is responsible,
- Why not?
- The dog is the owners responsibility and they should be held responsible not the dog.
- These owners of vicious dogs don't want to be known to the public.
- To leave would be comparable to a hit and run. Unless they are unable to control their pet (which they shouldnt have if this is the case). They should be required to stay and make sure that the animal or person receives the care/help they need.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to stay at the scene of the incident as there may be large costs that incur after the attack and the owner should share some of the responsibility of helping with those expenses.
- The owner is responsible for their pet and therefore should ensure the safety of their dog(s) and others around them both human and animal
- Again, dogs that attack should be fined (owners) for first offence. Euthanized second offence
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions
- Owner can explain normal behaviour of canine and explain any reasons for temporary irritability. Explain context of the situation.
- It's what a responsible owner must do
- If you or you dog is involved in an incident where harm is caused then information should be exchanged between the parties involved.
- Must be able to know the dogs boundaries and triggers (from previous care, etc.) If someone was warned, the owner should be able to explain the incident on their own terms. Not just one-sided interview
- Owner of dog that bit should be responsible for any medical or vet bills
- If this owner is a responsible dog owner, this shouldn't even be a problem. It's incompetent, irresponsible dog owners that probably shouldn't have animals in the first place that would leave an incident. In that case, maybe the animal should be apprehended and given a proper home with a useful owner to care for them.
- The tribunal members should be qualified dog behaviorists.
- There are always two sides to a story.
- There is an amount of responsibility when owning a pet and you do get to say both sides to the story
- If you hit a car, you need to stay at the scene. A dog attack should follow a similar rule. Only exception would be if that animal is injured and needs immediate medical attention and the owner must take the animal. No matter what, the animal should not suffer.
- Unless there is a risk of escalation by owners or dogs, or a severe injury.
- Holds everyone accountable



- Treat it like a car accident. No hit and runs
- Owners are responsible for the behaviour of their pets. Aggression is trained, not bred. No single breed i.e pit bull should be singled out, only dogs that have proven to be a danger/nuisance should be reprimanded
- You need to get information from all parties to know what really happened. All too often the bylaws are written that “no dog shall bite a human”, period; but what if the human causes the situation? A TRUE investigation needs to be conducted as to what happened and for that to happen, all people need to be available.
- If your dog bites someone YOU are responsible for them, like a hit and run, it is YOUR fault, not the car.
- Dog owners should be 100% responsible for controlling their dog. Just like you cannot leave the scene of a crime without speaking to the police a dog bite can be a very serious situation depending on the severity of injury caused.
- Not staying on scene would be essentially the same as leaving the scene of an accident
- As a responsible dog owner I would like the bylaw to hear both sides of story
- Absolutely. However, when animals are present and aggressive, things can get dangerous. Allowances for confining the animal or vet care concessions should be made.
- "Information is needed to see what provoked the attack
- I wish to emphasize, it is not just pit bull
- Strains that can be unpredictable
- Chows,, Doberman's. A pregnant female, female with
- Pups. The emphasis must be owners control"
- To many leave the scene now. The owners both need to have their side heard.
- Absolutely. Need further information on the vaccination history of the dog. Need to understand what happened and if something similar has happened b4
- Within reason - securing the animal is of utmost priority in order to defuse the situation.
- it should operate the same way a car accident works.
- Owners of dogs need to be held responsible.
- There are near daily reports of owners leaving the scene of an incident in the Facebook Calgary Dogs group. An extra, significant fine should be imposed for leaving the scene of an incident.
- A responsible dog owner should remain at the scene so both sides are heard.
- Responsible pet owners should remain at the scene or nearby and providing contact details
- Only to explain why it happened. People tease dogs. They let their dogs run loose and they confront a dig on a lead. If the dog in the lead bites that loose dog it's not the owner or dog on the leads fault.
- Liability for one thing, Another is that people encounter more problems with other animals than "Pit Bull" breeds, but the breed of such animals are rarely mentioned unless there is a political racist bent such as the current leaning towards "Pit Bulls"
- Lots of little dogs bite too, owners try to pick them up instead of obedience training and there should be repercussions to those owners same as to large breed owners. Equal and fair to all breeds.



- This is the owner's responsibility to take actions for the situation.
- As long as there is no discrimination on the breed of the dog I believe this is a good idea since a responsible dog owner would do this regardless.
- Makes sense for them to stay on scene.
- Information must be shared, but injuries must be treated as well.
- If a dog is acting in a way that is unsafe to other people or animals that is a reflection on the owner and in turn they should have to stay and be held responsible for what their dog has done.
- It seems like a hit and run if you leave the scene
- Important to have information about the health history of the attacking dog. Important to help the victim call an ambulance if needed, or to take her injured pet to a vet.
- Owners must take responsibility for their animal's actions.
- Conflicts occur, and the owner should be responsible regardless of the size or breed.
- Seems strange that this isn't already a law.
- The owner is responsible for his dog and its behaviour
- Easier to explain exact circumstances surrounding incident if on location and demands speedy processing while incident is fresh in all parties' minds
- The animal's health history should be shared with the person who was bitten and or owner of the other animal bit. If they do not stay this history may not be shared and an animal who is prone to aggressive behaviour could go under the radar.
- In all things "dog", it's ALWAYS the owner's responsibility to be aware of, and accountable for the actions of their animal.
- If that makes someone else feel safe sure. First name and phone number only though.
- Dog owners should be held responsible
- There will be questions regarding up to date vaccinations among other things
- It's no different than a hit and run. If your dog creates damage to property, persons or other animals, owners or those in possession of the dog are required to stay on scene.
- Again this should be enforced for people who attack animals as well.
- Out of complete common courtesy
- Without the dog owner stating what happened to provoke an attack you won't know the actual truth in an incident
- As the owner you are responsible and should give your contact information and calmly remain at the scene. The caveat being if your pet has bitten because they are so upset they risk a second defensive action you should leave your information and leave to remove your pet from causing additional harm and more stress on it.
- Would be beneficial to work out vet bills etc
- Two reasons, one, they need to be held accountable. Two, they need to be able to provide a witness statement. There are two sides to every story. Is it not illegal to flee the scene of any accident?
- Taking responsibility for your animal is key
- I think it is an appropriate measure



- The victim isn't automatically exempt from fault.
- accountability
- The dog is in the care and control of the owner. This is common sense.
- Dog showing signs of aggressivity should take lessons from a good behaviorist. Owner should understand the dog's body language better. That will prevent the situation to repeat.
- The owner is responsible for their animal. It should be treated like a vehicle accident.
- People need more responsibility when it comes to their pets. I have had multiple dogs and breeds each one is trained differently but banning from socializing the dogs doesn't help in the training process, people need to learn how to respond to each individual dogs needs. Proper training and socializing for both people and pet.
- It's important to have input on why a dog may have felt the need to bite and for a reporting officer to see if the dog is behaving aggressively.
- Both parties have* to be present until an enforcement officer arrives.
- I was mauled by a dog and severely affected health wise and the owner never had to compensate me. I d not know if the dog was put down or the owner fined. Injustice!
- This is the same requirement for remaining at the scene of an accident. Yes please!
- I don't think an explanation is really needed - if your dog hurts someone it's your responsibility to ensure that person is okay and follow the proper procedures.
- No different than any other type of physical incident.
- Just like a car accident in my opinion, if a dog causes an injury you should have to pay for it
- Repeat offenders (irresponsible pet owners) need to be held accountable, and education provided as well as financial responsibility taken.
- It's no different than a car accident.
- You should be responsible for your dog!!!
- Yes, the owner should take responsibility of his dog. This also eliminates any misunderstandings on severity of bite and provides the victim information incase they are costs involved. Also, so victim can't exaggerate the bite. With a third party, enforcement officer, it would be documented accurately if the matter goes further.
- If a dog bites another living being the owner is responsible and should be held accountable in a timely fashion. (you'll notice that this reasoning is logical, UNLIKE the blatant attack on pit bulls in this survey. A survey should not be biased.)
- Owner being required to stay at the scene makes them more accountable in the event of a bite.
- Extra fines for someone whose dog injured someone or dog and leaves the scene. Owners of dogs that injure people or other animals need to be held responsible.
- Accountability
- The owner holds responsibility over their own dog's behavior, and therefore must be able to provide an explanation of the situation
- The dog owner should have to explain and take responsibility for their dogs actions.



- It is important to address the situation. The owner should be responsible to the victim and should be held accountable. This may prevent multiple incidents.
- Too many times, the owner takes off while the victim is distracted etc. It should be treated like a hit & run accident.
- It is very important for animal bite victims to be able to have the animal owner's contact information for follow up with bylaw or health care. Animal bite victims might need Rabies treatment.
- As the owner, they hold responsibility over the dog's actions and behaviour, and therefore must be available to provide an explanation
- this is simple the responsible answer.
- Their dog their problem their responsibility
- I would like "bite" to be defined. I would also like the rule to require the 'victim' or all those involved to remain - there could have been provocation.
- The rules should be the same for ALL breeds. A dog bit is traumatizing regardless of the breed. Obviously, if your dog bites someone you should stay on scene, even if it's a small dog.
- A dog is the responsibility of the owner. If it misbehaves, they owner needs to be held accountable. More than anything it's lack of training or lack of knowledge by the owner when a dog bites; dogs give plenty of signals before they resort to biting and it's on the owner to know and train their dog properly.
- An violent assault has occurred, the owner of the animal that committed the assault should be required by law to be present just as if the a violent assault by a human occurs.
- No explanation needed.
- It is similar to a car accident and the parties should exchange information so that parties can be responsible for their actions.
- Staying at the scene is a major part of being a responsible pet owner and taking accountability for the incident.
- Considering the potential for medical and or vet costs, this burden should not be on the victim. Hopefully this is not due to the victim tormenting/inciting the bite.
- SAME FINE SHOULD APPLY TO FLEEING THE SCENE OF AN ACCIDENT
- Yes to talking to the person who was bitten but as long as they left their contact info that should be enough. They should not have to wait for a peace officer.
- Do i really need to explain
- If a dog bites, the victim (person) or owner of the victim should be able to assess the severity of the injury and determine if they would like contact information from the owner of the dog who bit.
- You bump a car you have to, why not a canine incident?
- Because too often the owners make a run for it and they are not taking any responsibility for their dogs actions. Ultimately, the dogs behaviour falls on the dog owner.
- Dog owners must take responsibility for their animals
- Too many times the person just leaves and nothing comes of the incident. Especially in off leash parks.
- Because from the sounds of it whoever wrote this is uneducated.



- How is this not already required!?
- Not sure why this hasn't already been required as the amount of people with badly behaved animals that bite people has been aware of for sometime and there is hardly any accountability.
- It is the dog owners who are the issue, not the dog.
- The owner should be accountable for injuries if they are sustained by the owners animal.
- The dog owner should remain so that they can be held accountable for their dog's actions.
- A dog is the persons property just like a car. When you are in an accident with your vehicle you are required to remain at the scene. This should be the exact same for dogs
- It should be treated like a car accident - everyone should remain at the scene, including bystanders.
- If the bite results in an injury then it is the Due diligence of the owner to remain at the scene
- A dog owner should be responsible. ANY dog owner, I have been bitten by small dogs far more often than a large breed.
- Status quo
- Most bites are due to improper trained owners regardless of breed. Owners who cannot be responsible on training their animals should have a lifetime ban of owning a pet if they cannot care for the animals physical and emotional needs.
- Umm yes ita scene of a crime, like the dog is going to be able to talk to the officer telling it oh well I may or may not have bitten this person on purpose.
- This survey is really inappropriate towards pit bulls. Any dog has the potential to bite and while pit bulls MAY cause more severe bites (as your survey suggests) the way an animal is treated by its owner is by far more predictive of its behaviour than its breed. Irresponsible dog owners should suffer the consequences, not their dogs. If a dog has to be put down by the City because of a irresponsible dog owner let it get that out of hand, that person should be face significant fines and not be allowed to own dogs again.
- This is important for liability purposes and ensuring that insurance is contacted in a timely manner.
- Should the bite draw blood, I can't imagine as a responsible dog owner myself, leaving the scene. I think this should have further details (ie the bite needs to be enough to have drawn blood) and simply not an interaction between dogs.
- It is important to find out information about the dog that attacked and the the incident.
- to obtain owner onfo, and follow up records of the animal having had all rabies shots.
- If a dog bites a human or another dog, the owner should absolutely have to wait for an enforcement officer to provide their information. People leave to quickly and the injured party is left to deal with the incident themselves.
- I am a proud pit bull owner why don't u take the owner of the dog that bites to jail and not put down the dog and to make pitbull owners muzzle their dogs is the most dumbest thing I have ever heard pit bulls. Are a vary loyal breed of dog maybe u should educate yourself a little more one the pitbull breed
- owners must take responsibility
- any injury done to your animal by another animal and the owner is there it is their responsibility of both parties and bystanders to give report of what happened.



- A dog owner needs to be held responsible for any injuries, and speaking with an enforcement officer will ensure this.
- This should be obvious but some people are cowards, and a law is unlikely to stop some people from running from the situation
- The incident may require more evidence that 'said incident' did actually occur and if so, the reason. Ex: Who was actually at fault?!
- Because the dog has bitten someone or another animal it should be addressed and the dog should no longer be allowed in that particular area. If it happens 2 times then we KNOW the dog is aggressive and should be not be taken off the property. So I marked yes but in reality it should be for a written warning where someone should be keep track for the city. Once the warnings been done then 2nd stage is the action of the animal staying in its home.
- The person should be responsible for giving contact information.
- Like having to stay at the scene of an accident.
- An owner is almost entirely responsible for their pet's behaviour. They need to be held accountable and make reparations where necessary.
- As there are always 2 sides to every story, it would be ideal to have an enforcement officer interview both parties. This would also avoid bites going unreported.
- Common decency dictates that a person should stick around.
- Same as with a car accident claim - cell phone pictures of dog and the person in charge of the dog at the time of incident, record image of injury, time and place and circumstance of the incidence, exchange address and somehow proof of contact information, so that the person responsible doesn't just lie about their name and walk off with the dog, so that some other future incident could repeat offence. Not necessary to wait for an enforcement officer unless the attack was severe enough to tear skin or cause vicious bodily harm ... or no ID on person in charge of dog at the time of incident.
- Yes they need to be responsible for their dogs actions
- Obtaining a history of the animal is crucial - are all vaccinations up-to-date, is the animal properly licensed?
- It is up to dog owners to ensure that their pet doesn't become a nuisance, if they are a nuisance the owner should be held accountable and punished, not the dog.
- The owner is responsible for the dog, and therefore should be held accountable.
- Dog owners are ultimately responsible for their dog's behaviour. Requiring them to stay allows them to state what happened, which will help to determine if the dog was provoked, or is just not well trained.
- That way both sides of the story get heard not just one.
- To ensure the reason for biting was a vicious animal not one that was provoked by the person that was bit
- enforcement officers should be more visible in play areas and areas that are not off leash.
- There are many non-pitbull attacks that happen at the dog park and the owners just leave and they continue to bring their dangerous dogs to the park to hurt more people/dogs
- This is responsible and will ensure the same dog isnt in multiple attacks



- A dog owner should NEVER leave the scene of an incident, unless the dog requires emergency vet care.
- If the dog / owner has committed an offence they should be required to stay at the scene as long as they can do so safely. How else are you going to identify the perpetrators if they just disappear? It is a large city and parks are open to everyone.
- If something horrible happens from the incidence whether it's an animal needing to be put down or serious damage to a person the owner should have to take responsibility for it
- Don't be a [removed]. If your dog bites someone/their property it's on you to ensure they are safe and to compensate them appropriately
- The problem is always with the owner, rarely the dog. Bad owners equal bad dogs :(
- It is the responsible thing to do.
- Like a hit and run law
- Of any breed. Legislation should have no reference to breed type and should follow dangerous dog (of any breed) legislation.
- Owners of dogs that bite should be responsible for medical/veterinary expenses incurred by the victim, therefore they should be required to present contact information.
- It would be the owners fault and should take responsibility.
- Its just a common thing for practically all crimes/incidents. Both individuals need to share their accounts and possibly information.
- Dog owners need to be held responsible for their dog's actions.
- It's the responsible thing to do
- Yes because we had a dog that was attacked & bit and the owner & the dog took off & we or bylaw never found them
- For dog bites of humans only. No need to involve enforcement officers in scuffles between dogs. The pet owners should work this out between themselves.
- Yes, as a pet owner you are responsible for the behavior of your animal, good or bad. If you are unable to take ownership of your animals actions then you should not be allowed a pet.
- Yes is there is actual damage done. Not if it's just a little dog scuffle.
- To me, I see it not different than if you got into a car accident. Exchange info since you just harmed another person
- This is a no-brainer.
- Humans need to take responsibility for their dogs. Each situation in which a dog reacts needs to be viewed on an individual basis. No dogs are born bad.
- There must be requirements for proper actions in a civil society and more often than not, owners disappear and are not held responsible for their actions. There must be consequences for their actions at all times.
- Needed for cats too
- Of course! Any incident of biting that causes an injury needs to be reviewed and responsibility carried out as determined by appropriate bodies. It's not always the "biter" at fault (someone poking



at a dog or otherwise provoking a dog) but every dog owner should be responsible enough to take ownership of the situation.

- You need to know what shots the dog has received to determine if the thing bit is in danger
- Its important to collect information as you dont know anything about that pet or its owners or the potential repercussions of the bite. So its important to stay connected
- It is the responsibility of the owner. Fine the owner! It is not a problem with the dog (regardless of breed). It is a problem with the owner.
- Irresponsible pet ownership / socialization / training is at the root of the problem in scenarios with aggressive dogs. Increased rigour around accountability and responsibility for pet owners is crucial.
- To paraphrase Barbara Woodhouse, there are no bad dogs, but plenty of irresponsible owners.
- yes, the dog owner should be there to discuss the situation and should not be removed from the scene. I believe dog owners should be held responsible, not the dog solely because it bit another dog or person. Both need to be held accountable. The dog is not always the culprit in these situations.
- I have seen 5 children be snapped at or bitten by small dogs in my local park. Not one did the owner apologize or take any action to correct their out of line dog. These dogs were not pitbulls, but small lap dogs. The children bit were escorted away by their family and the dog received no reprimand.
- No matter the breed of dog, they are still the responsibility of the owner and the owners should be held accountable for the dogs actions.
- Just like a hot and run you should have to stay. Maybe the rule is if broken skin? NOT a nip because this is often people not behaving properly
- The owner is responsible to the animal's behavior.
- Unless the party attacked releases liability and have agreed no significant damages occurred
- People need to be responsible for their pets no matter what breed
- Unless the dog or the human needs to go to the vet or hospital.
- In many cases the dog who has been charged was either bitten first or put in a situation where it was challenged but because the owner of the other dog allowed the situation to escalate out of control, Both dogs and owners now face a situation that could've been avoided.
- So record is maintained if owner is fit to have pets, and the quality of training the owner has. Also keeping up to date with shots etc for animal/registered.
- Yes, if a dog bites another person or animal, an enforcement officer should be involved immediately and both owners need to stay on the scene to provide their statement of what happened. And provide contact information.
- Dogs are not generally the problem. Typically "problem" dogs are the result of owners who are not responsible. Dogs should not be punished for bad owners. Owners need to remain at the scene of any incident and take personal responsibility.
- It's a crime to not remain at the scene, especially if your dog was involved.
- Rules regarding responsible dog ownership in and of themselves decrease incidents.
- Dogs can't talk. The only voice they have is the people around them.



- Any responsible owner would do that. It's the irresponsible owners that let their dogs roam free or who don't care if their dogs bite that are the problem
- If the person isn't required to stay and give out information how is the City every going to track or identify nuisance dogs.
- This is just responsible behaviour on behalf of an owner. There should be fines for leaving the scene
- they are responsible
- the owner should have to prove vaccinations at the very least
- You have to take responsibility. Even if you have the best trained dog things can still happen. They are animals
- Dependent on conditions and severity.
- Responsible owners should realize that their training (or lack thereof) led to their dog's actions, and should therefore be made to wait to talk to officers.
- It is on the owner. They should have to remain at the scene to provide pertinent information.
- Why would someone not support the owner staying?
- There must be accountability if the system is to begin to work, requiring owners to remain at the scene is a necessary first step
- If a dog bites a person that should be considered an assault and the owner should be charged under the criminal code.
- It's wrong to do a hit and run, so it should be at any incident no bite and run.
- It's an incident that should be discussed and made sure all parties are okay.
- When enforcing responsible pet ownership this is part of being a responsible owner.
- A dogs owner needs to be held more responsible for their actions. If a dog bit someone they need to make sure they stay and either exchange info or see if the person is okay.
- It is the owner's obligation to be responsible for the actions of their dog. You should stay like you would have to if there was a car accident
- Responsible pet owners must do so.
- Its just a responsible thing to do, you would do the same with car accidents, why should that change for animals?
- Dog owners must be responsible for their animal's behaviour at all times. However, the dog owner should also be able to contribute their side of the story, so the victims should also remain on scene
- Any bite should mean the owner stay to ensure they are responsible for damages
- Extent of injuries is not always known at the time. In order to determine what, if any, responsibility the offender bears and what remuneration for cost of medical care or vet services would be appropriate, all participants should be required to remain on scene and provide contact info to enforcement officers.
- If the owner has allowed this behaviour to manifest in their pet, a fine should be given. Depending on circumstance, not race/species.
- Exactly the same as vehicle accident, you must exchange information



- "Little dogs bite too. Owners think it's funny to allow vicious behaviour towards well behaved larger dogs, and run away.
- I just want to know that the dog is up to date on its shots if it bites another dog."
- So they can be held responsible
- Logic mate
- My dog was attacked at a pet store and the guy took off. I got stuck with a 500 vet bill because his dog attacked for no reason. Never found the guy either. (Note the dog was not a bully breed dog) its not a breed specific issue!
- It is far too easy for vicious dogs and their owners to go into "hiding" after these instances, as I've experienced myself after both my dog and my girlfriend were attacked by dogs on separate occasions.
- To avoid confusion and to hear both sides of the story. Not always the dogs fault.
- You are responsible for YOUR dog. Just the same in a car accident, owner is required to be present. Unless a medical emergency ensues.
- If the situation calls for it.
- There is way too many dogs even in my neighbourhood who let their dog off leash and than they run at dogs on leash and either attack or be a nuisance. Similar to bad owners who take their aggressive dog to the off leash dog parks! Please take this more seriously bylaw! Owners need to be held accountable.
- This is no different than a case of a traffic incident. The onus is again, dependent on the party. If the owner is at fault for mishandling the situation, they should be held responsible. On the otherhand, if the victim did not listen to the owner and engaged with the dog and holds more responsibility, they should be the one held accountable. In either scenario, it is important to have a third party there to hear, assess, and understand the situation.
- It is the same as leaving the scene of a car accident.
- As a responsible dog owner that is the right thing too do!
- responsibility
- I do agree with this unless the owner needs to leave in order to secure the dog for safety purposes
- This is self explanatory. It's the right thing to do.
- I would never leave the scene if my dog bit someone. I expect fair and unbiased investigations where incidents occur in every part of my life, so I don't see any reason not to. This also allows both sides of the story to be heard and any necessary testing (rabies) to be completed immediately.
- Its as if there was a motor vehicle accident
- For any dog that bites another person or animal the owner should stay on site and provide their information.
- the owner should be liable of the person.



- Yes, of course, but I can see an owner being worried their dog would be taken away and even killed so I understand why some might not want to remain. Staying should be seen as cooperative and viewed in the owner and dog's favour
- The owner should be 100% responsible for all damage caused by their dog regardless of the cause of incident.
- Dogs' reactions are always traced to their owners. Owners are responsible for all interactions and actions done by their dogs.
- Owners should have the option to defend their animal's response. Example being many people don't ask before approaching and petting a strange dog and don't know how to read dogs behaviour to know that they're giving them warning signs to leave them alone. They may not be an aggressive dog but the stranger might be doing something that is bothering them ie strangers liked to try to pet where my dog recently had a leg removed. His response is reasonable.
- I think this is simply common sense, and it's embarrassing that there needs to be a law put in place for this. Those who flee the scene don't deserve to be a pet owner. Very simple
- "The dog is the responsibility of the owner.
- If your dog attracts another dog or person you as the owner should assume all the responsibility, its an animal."
- Much like a car accident leaving the scene should be a
- The owner should be responsible for doctor/vet fees of the victim and should have restrictions placed on their dog like a muzzle
- It's an accident such as a car accident and it should be taken care of the same way
- Depending on severity and why the situation occurred, just an exchange of information would be important. Not waiting for enforcement officer as it would be better to diffuse the situation by removing animals from the setting
- Owner is responsible for their dogs behavior.
- Dog owners shall remain at the scene of a dog bite until bylaw officers attend.
- Not only for health & safety assurances, but information should be provided to note whether an owner has a recorded history of complaints, sanctions, or conditions. In this case, duty of ownership should be closely evaluated. As well, leaving the scene of a bite that requires medical attention should be HEAVILY fined.
- We should be able to ascertain the identity of the owner and any dog that is involved in an attack on another dog or any person. That dog needs to be dealt with in a safe and efficient manner. If it is a problem dog, we need to know. Is the attack isolated, or have there been other issues with the dog? The problem in general is not with the dogs, it is with the owners who do not train and control their dogs. Dogs should be off-leash ONLY in designated areas. Other dog owners should not have to worry that their dog might be attacked by someone else's dog.
- The owner is at fault for their dogs behaviour. Anger and aggression is learned by the animal from the owner. If the dog bites the owner should be punished not the animal.
- They are responsible for these actions



- Yes the owner should stay at the scene because IT IS THE OWNERS FAULT. Absolutely ridiculous that the city would think of singling out one group of dogs. I personally have multiple families with a Pit Bull related breed and they are harmless dogs because they are TRAINED. All the blame needs to go towards careless owners.
- I was bitten by a miniature poodle and the owner laughed and continued on their way. All dogs should be treated equally. I do not accept the idea of BSL.
- family member has been bitten. Without the owner staying to take responsibility, how is the victim supposed to confirm vaccination history of the dog etc? If your required to stay for a car crash, you should be required to stay for your animal assaulting someone else.
- If the bite requires medical attention/vet bills the offending owner should be responsible for the bills.
- yes, this allows for tracking, accountability and to ensure the victim can get adequate help if needed.
- If your dog bites someone, you should remain to 1. Lessen confusion (maybe you were being attacked — clarification would be necessary).
- Owners are responsible for their pets and should be held liable as if they committed the offense themselves.
- It would depend on the situation.
- It is important to the dog and families to have a fair outcome in this situation as in dog parks/parks in general either the owner has been negligent (not paying close enough attention to their dog/dog has run off), or another owner has let their dog bother the offending dog (or a person has bothered the dog) leading to this kind of incident. This needs to happen to protect owners who tell other people (or their dogs) to please give their dog space, and it is to protect victims who have not done anything wrong but were attacked or had their dogs attacked by someone else's dog.
- If they leave the scene it's the same as someone leaving in a car accident
- It's illegal to leave the scene of an accident/crime so the same precedent should be followed for an animal attack
- It would be no different than two cars that collided. They should both stay at the scene and wait for the enforcement officer to take down their information and hear from each person what has happened at the scene.
- The pet owner does panic and does not want to lose their dog. Some people can also over dramatize a situation (yes, I have witness one) Sometimes even though the one dog is the biter does not mean he/she is the one at fault. He could have been defending or reacting to the situation/energy by the other dog owner. Not saying biting is okay.
- Yes because how else would you find this out if the person left and there would be no evidence to link back to anyone. should be a fine if they leave
- Every owner should take responsibility for their dog in such a case.
- People should be held responsible for the actions of their animal. The animal isn't naturally aggressive
- To investigate the OWNER and demand training. STOP PUNISHING THE ANIMALS DUE TO NEGLIGENT OWNERS
- Dog owners should remain to take full responsibility for their dogs actions



- The person at fault needs to be held liable for their animal and should be exchanging information.
- If you hit a person (or another car) with your car You are expected to remain at the scene and provide contact information to ensure that the victim(s) involved is provided the proper repercussion(s) for the harm/damage you may have caused. Therefore, you should be expected to do the same if your pet causes harm onto another person and/or their pet. You're pet may have committed the horrible act, but as the owner you are responsible for training your pet so they do not engage in harmful behaviour.
- Seems obvious. Owners need to be responsible for their pets
- The dog would need to be moved to a different location to keep others safe if necessary.
- Each incident has to individual reasons or circumstances surrounding them. I do not think pit bulls are worse then any other breed I think it has to do with how dogs are raised and dealt with.
- Be a responsible pet owner and remain at the scene to discuss any incidents, I think many people in this situation run
- Dog owners should be held accountable for their pets, speaking to law enforcement would ensure help ensure that this occurs
- the owner is responsible for the dog and is a witness of the incident
- How can a no be considered an option?
- If there is any damage to the person or other animal attached then yes it is important for the exchange of information.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to make sure everyone is okay. That being said. I could understand why a pitbull owner would fear for their dog and run. If we didn't discriminate against pit bulls as we do, this wouldn't be the case.
- "Absolutely, this is not only expected but also polite and the responsible behaviour to show when their dog bites/attacks someone else. Any other behaviour to this is considered a "hit and run".
- It is illegal to hit and run by all vehicle/driving standards, it should be illegal when someone's animal hurts, attacks, bites, or kills a victim.
- This shouldn't even be a question, this should just be the expected standard, no matter what pet you own."
- To be accountable for costs associated with treatment of involved parties.
- Unless it's dangerous for the owner to remain, there needs to be an explanation provided to a, hopefully, neutral enforcement officer.
- just as in any incident the involved should stay
- "100%
- If you are responsible for the dog, you need to be held responsible for its actions."
- Of course all dog owners must be held accountable for the actions of their dog.
- This seems like common sense, just like you wouldn't leave the scene of an automobile accident.
- Why would they not remain at the scene is this different than any other attack?
- If any of a person's property - car, a tree on their property, bicycle, dog - causes damage/injury they should be required to stay at the scene of the incident.



- This benefits both parties, and serves to provide perspective in the case.
- I'm surprised this isn't already a rule.
- Just like a car accident, information needs to be exchanged.
- If your dog bites someone, it's your responsibility just the same as if you hit someone with your car.
- It's just like a car accident. Information should be given on both sides.
- I think it would be like any other incident; however I would support the person leaving the scene as long as some information was exchanged
- I hear of stories on our community Facebook page of dogs on and off leash (which are not pit bull or look like pit bulls) in various locations of the neighborhood where they have bit another dog. Based on description alone it appears to be the same dogs and owner of the biting dog leave the scene. They seem to be repeat offenders.
- Yes, much like a car accident, you should be liable to stay and exchange information -- and there should be some accountability on the dog owner to do so.
- It should be the same as a car accident, if your dog bites someone or something they should have to provide information
- It is the responsibility of the owner to stay there, similar to a car accident a person cannot leave
- I work in insurance claims, and to me it's similar to a motor vehicle accident. There is a requirement to stay at an accident scene, share your contact details, and speak to police.
- I believe there are many dog owners that know their dogs need better training and they basically run away from the problem. Generally the dogs that get reported are because the owner is responsible and it happens to be a bull breed. The majority of dog fights I hear about are involving smaller dogs and non bull breeds which have left the scene therefore feeding into the stereotypes of breeds.
- I think we need stricter guidelines on what constitutes a bite. As a large breed dog owner we have had our dog bite by small dogs who inflict no real harm to our big guy And therefore those dogs aren't considered as aggressive. When our big guy plays with smaller dogs and they wrestle it could be considered a bite when they are just playing.
- So that the each person can tell their side of the story, and that the enforcement officer doesn't get told one side of the story.
- Too many people leave and the victims have to resort to Social Media to try to locate the dog owner
- I have been bit multiple time as a kid never had the owner take responsibility
- Accountability. The owner may need training as to handling and training and owning a dog. Courses to be a proper dog owner should be employed just as driving a car.
- Should be a fine associated to leaving, if you've caused damage you are responsible for you should be charged, too bad we didn't have demerit points for pet owners
- Similar to other offences such as traffic ones, remaining on the scene provides the best opportunity for the dog owner to explain the situation from their point of view including where all the parties were at the time of the incident, take photos, review everyone's actions just before, etc.
- This is more likely to happen if a clear and fair process is expected in a tribunal or hearing situation.
- Much like a car accident. Assess damage and share information, if severe enough call police/bylaw
- No different than an assault or accident. Need to stay at the scene.



- if officers can get to the scene quickly. If not, having a stressed dog and owner wait would not be a positive.
- Its no different then a hit and run with a car.
- Obviously make the situation safe (leash the dogs) and remain on scene... If there are injuries to be taken care of, the owner of the dog should be obligated to reimburse the victim for costs.
- No different if I hit your car. Remain on scene exchange info
- If someone's dog comes into contact with another person and a hire occurs, then yes, that owner of the dog should stay on the scene and speak with an officer.
- The owner should take responsibility for the accident and see that it is sorted out before leaving
- It's not the animal that's responsible it's the owner.
- I think it's the owner's responsibility to help cover health costs for injuries to other people by their pet
- It makes more sense to pu ish irrisponsible owners than the dog.
- Too often the offending dog/owner run away or give false information. A rule would not necessarily stop this but could assist with gathering the correct information in order to follow up appropriately later.
- You can't profile a dog until theyve comitted an act of violence, if they have then the owner must take responsibility. Until the point that the dog has committed a violent act there is no reason to enforce muzzling, higher fines, or other discriminatory means.
- It forces the owner to be more responsible for the actions of their dog, and may encourage them to take up obedience training prior to severe incidents
- Owners need to be held accountable for the incident at hand, again bad owners have bad pets
- For safety, there are always two sides of a story. What if someone kicked the dog? Who is at fault then?
- Why is this not the case already?
- There needs to be prompt and proper follow up to determine circumstances.
- If your dog has bitten someone it is your responsibility, if your dog shows aggression it is based of what you have taught the dog not the dog breed. Owners should be held accountable for the behaviours of their pet REGARDLESS of breed
- It is important that the officer is able to get the correct details as soon as possible. The only exception would be if the dog required vet attention that could not wait.
- The owner should be help accountable for his dogs action. He should be fined, and forced to attend science based dog training and show his progress. If he isn't responsible, he should be banned from owning animals and there should be a registry to make sure he cannot. He should also be able to explain the situation, ex: an agressive dog off leash came towards him and his dog and the dog defended himself, or someone was yelling at his owner, etc. The context is important. If there are people that saw what happen, their statement should be taken too.
- Take responsibility for your pet
- take responsibility
- A dog will bite for a reason. Usually not because of aggression. I'd rather defend my dog if he bit to be his voice



- Unless both owners / parties involved agree to not involve the bylaw officers, then it should be mandatory to remain at the scene or exchange information, much like a car accident.
- Accountability for situation is important
- There is always a reason that a dog feels the need to fight or flight, in this case if the dog chose to engage there is two sides to the story. I don't believe the owner is always at fault. A lot of dog owners in this city use the phrase "My dog is friendly" and will allow their dog to approach other dogs without the permission of the owner. The dog who initiates the bite could have reasons beyond aggression for the bite. It's should be the same protocol if you would like to hold someone's child, you don't just go up to a random child and say "It's okay, I'm friendly".
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets since they are the ones who trained the animal
- Required to keep these incidents recorded and to hold the dog owner accountable to avoid future incidents
- yes, but the animal must be able to be safely removed from the situation. ie. put in vehicle or house, thereby reducing further issues.
- I believe the owner should stay as they are accountable for the actions of their dog, in any kind of altercation.
- We need responsible dog ownership. Owners should take responsibility for their pet actions. One exception is if the dog is putting the public at risk.
- The responsibility of an owner is to care and train the animal. They are also responsible for behaviours that may be exhibited. Owners usually know the animals best and should act accordingly. If an incident occurs people should take responsibility for thing they have happened and own up to the issue. Whatever that may be.
- Dog bites a person or other animal who advocates the circumstances. Also both parties should account for the situation, unless the is medical emergency needed first
- A responsible parent would do the same with their child. A responsible pet owner should be willing to do the same. Seems ludicrous that this needs to be legislated.
- Responsible dog ownership I believe is the best remedy.
- Common decency, this is already an unwritten rule.
- Of course!!
- If you own a dog it is very reasonable to be asked to stay at the scenes. It comes with the territory of owning a dog.
- The dog owned should pay for damages - vet bills for the affected dog or person
- yes
- It could be good idea, because that will help to know the details of the incident.
- Its the same as leaving the scene of an accident.
- This is self explanatory. The owner needs to answer for the dogs behaviour.
- It should be treated in the same manner as a car accident, showing responsibility for actions, for ANY breed, large or SMALL
- They're responsible for it so of course they should be required to stay
- All parties need to explain what they experienced.



- Sharing information is key but what is the rule re if necessary? If necessary is subjective so it means no one would stay around anyway.
- Have to be held accountable
- They should remain at the scene because their dog is their responsibility
- As long as the person's animal is not going to be seized if they cooperate.
- Should be current practice
- [DUPLICATE]
- They should be held accountable. The dog shouldn't have to suffer but the owners should as they didn't take necessary precautions
- In case the dog has a canine communicable virus, or disease.
- The victim is likely to color or stretch the story, maybe skipping their own behaviour that led to the dog biting.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their animal, however the circumstances always need to be considered. Along with this euthanasia should not be a tactic used to remedy the situation.
- Same as a car accident. If you are involved in an accident (including dog bites) you should not be able to leave the scene
- .
- The dog owner is responsible for ALL actions of their dog.
- It is the owner's responsibility to take accountability for the actions of their animal, the same as a car accident or other incident.
- Common decency
- [DUPLICATE]
- It should be like a car accident, where you exchange information and go through the proper channels with police.
- If your dog bites, you should not be taking off.
- It's similar to a crime (not as bad) but they should still have to share info with the enforcement officer.
- If the dog has bitten a person, proof of rabies inoculation is needed.
- There are so many reasons and sides to a single story. I think both parties should be listened to.
- The dog owner should have to remain on the scene of the incident to give their personal information (name/address etc.) Much like a car accident sharing of this information should be law. Failure to comply is like a hit & run & the dog owner should be liable for a more severe consequences.
- The owner of the dog responsible for the violent behavior should stay and exchange information with the victim/other dog owner and wait for bylaw as required. The owner of the dog that misbehaved should be responsible for all damages.
- Yes and no. If a dog bites a human or dog they almost always know they've done something wrong. Leaving two distressed dogs on the same scene is not helpful to them. I encourage exchange of information but a follow up call from a bylaw officer is better as then you can get your dog home and calmed.



- Yes, as there may be financial implications of the bite - vet bills, time off work etc of course it would depend on severity of bite, may need to seek medical attention first
- I don't trust the tribunal system and everyone should be given a fair and equal opportunity to have their case heard by qualified personnel.
- Just like a car accident, there will always be two sides to every story. Both dog owners* should remain at the scene, talk out and call for enforcement if needed
- Yes, but only if it was truly the dog at fault. There are many instances where people are the problem. An instance like this needs to be very clear to protect dogs from un-informed people
- Yes, except if it is necessary to restrain and remove the dog from the situation. They should stay as close to the scene as possible and stay with their dog, but safety must be the top priority. If they remove themselves from the scene, they should be required to contact Animal Services ASAP to identify themselves and their dog. Failure to come forward within 24 hours of the incident should come with a very heavy fine (up to \$25,000) as well as potential jail time and probationary conditions to discourage people from avoiding responsibility.
- The goal is owner accountability. Not animal accountability. We domesticated dogs and then decided that our responsibility was left to randomness.
- The owner has to take responsibility for what happened.
- Any animal who violently bites a human is poorly trained, or has been threatened - both sides of the story should be told to law enforcement.
- An owner should be responsible to ensure the person/ other animal is ok and should share their info
- Yes, the owner needs to be held accountable right then and there - providing correct information on the incident while memory is fresh and also provide correct contact information should they be responsible for costs. They should not have the opportunity to disappear to shirk their responsibilities.
- I feel if your dog did something your information should be taken yes.
- Sounds like common sense!
- Of course! If a dog bites another dog or human then the person must stay there to make sure that person is okay, and also so that they are held responsible for their actions.
- It's the owner's responsibility to ensure public safety as well as educating those who do not own breeds like these.
- It's the same as a car accident. Both parties should be present as long as it doesn't create the chance for an escalation.
- People should be held responsible for their dogs' actions; this should apply to all parties involved, as a biting dog may have been provoked.
- The owner needs to take responsibility. Same as remaining at the scene of an accident.
- If a dog is aggressive the owner is responsible, NOT the animal
- It's no different than a car accident.
- I support a rule that requires the dog owner to remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer
- Because the owner should be held responsible for maintaining control of their dog.



- Same as a traffic accident...
- This is the only way to for accountability. The goal is to reduce these type of incidents and if a dog is involved in an attack there has to be some accountability so that it does not happen again.
- This should be a given! Any owner who leaves is irresponsible.
- Absolutely ALL OWNERS No matter of the size or breed of dog should remain present. Often small dog owners are so ignorant and assume because their dog is small they do not apply to the rules and the response has often been "oh they are small sorry" the size of the small dog does not and should not be an excuse for bad behaviour
- Certainly, owners are responsible for their dogs behaviour and training. If their dog injures someone, the person injured has a right to get more information to help their treatment.
- That is the right thing to do.
- Yes... unless it is causing more harm than good (like waiting for hours in the hot sun for someone to deal with the incident).. But if the dog owner of the biting dog (and thus the biting dog) remains, then the "victim" should too.... Because typically dogs dont just bite... there is always a reason for it... and assuming that just because a dog bit someone that they were doing something wrong and "victim" is completely innocent is asinine.
- It's the responsibility of the pet owner
- The owner of the dog that bites should be held responsible for any damage caused by that dog and should be required to give all information to an enforcement officer.
- Owners need to be held more accountable for the behavior of their dog. This should be coupled with enhanced awareness of obedience training options.
- I think there is a big difference between a dog that has bitten someone in aggression and one that is lost and scared and bites in fear. I think all parties to have a discussion and the status of vaccines is important.
- To gather information to pay for medical bills, document bite history, rabies information
- the owner should be held accountable for not training and restraining their dog. It is always the owners fault
- If severe or skin is broken, information should always be shared. Many owners brush it off and don't want to provide info.
- It just makes common sense.
- This will allow the owners side of the story too. Was someone tormenting the dog?
- There is a lot of emotion involved in dog attacks. I've had a lot of personal experience with this and enforcement officers can help mediate when emotions run high.
- Yes.
- How is this different than a car accident in terms of responsibility?
- In some cases a dog attack is provoked by the individual who was bitten. The dogs owner is the only person to defend the dogs actions. Not all people who get bitten by a dog are innocent!
- It's the responsible thing to do, although I doubt anyone would adhere to it.
- Remaining at scene would allow enforcement officer the opportunity to get facts from both sides.



- "My own dog has been bit multiple times by other dogs, neither time by a pit bull, once at an off-leash park and once while out on a walk. Neither time did the owner of the other dog offer any support for myself after what happened - At the off leash park, the dog and it's owner left immediately afterwards, and while on leash the dog had come running out of a building and attacked my dog on the street. The person who claimed the dog shortly after would only cede that it was not her dog.
- I also happen to work at a vet hospital and know that dog attacks can cause anywhere from non serious to potentially lethal damage, and that vet bills can also be quite expensive depending on the damage done. I feel it most appropriate that if your dog is responsible for attacking another dog, you should be forced to remain in place and cede personal details to the victim so that you pay for the costs incurred at the vet, minimally."
- "Dogs are like people they have limits too and sometimes they clash
- That being said I think as a responsible dog owner you know if your dog is aggressive prior to taking them out. So owners are responsible for placing their dogs around other dogs and risking an incident. I have a rescue and I don't take him to parks or around other dogs because I know him and wouldn't put him in that situation. It's [removed] owners not always the dogs fault. We are their voices..."
- I do not support extra measures for pitbulls.
- If the dog breaks skin I think it's important.
- You wouldn't commit a hit a run with your car.
- The responsibility lies with the owner and they should pay for damages depending on the situation
- I was bittend by a Jack Russell terrier. Would any of you care, or only when it's a pitbull.
- a bite causing injury should be treated as an assault and the owner must take responsibility for it.
- It would be the same if my child attacked another child. I would remain at the scene and give my contact information and if necessary talk to law enforcement. But I think I would also want to be given the chance to remove my child or in this case dog away from the scene (ie. put it in the car)
- This increases dog ownership responsibility and accountability. If an individual's dog is aggressive, the owner is held accountable. This also allows for the proper legal and medical processes to occur if needed.
- to ensure the dog is up to date on shots
- Like a car accident.
- the owner is usually at fault p
- Too many nuisance dog owners leave the scene and the injured animal ends up at the vet with costly vet bills
- It depends on the severity of the bite and the circumstances that caused the dog to bite, but a report could be made (regardless of breed)
- I think people should stay, but really - a rule isn't going to change whether they do or don't.



- Yes but. Usually during an incident, everyone is upset and reactive. Staying near the scene, in the vehicle if available, a short distance away is advisable for the exchange of contact information, etc. However, remaining directly at the scene of injured dogs, angry dog owner and upset is likely to increase the commotion. A little space is advised.
- No different than a traffic accident
- Just like every similar situation.
- "It is an assault and needs to be dealt with
- However
- It is ALWAYS the owners fault and responsibility for ANY dog"
- This should absolutely be mandatory to get details
- This is common sense, but I know this is an issue in our community.
- its that person's responsibility to make the situation as right as possible
- Many victims are left behind after a dog attack. I don't think that this will change people behaviour though.
- you are required to remain at a car accident. This is no different if your dog bites someone. Exchange some information especially if bylaw is being called.
- Owners need to be countable for the actions of their dog.
- All dogs bite and the owner should be responsible. Don't only do it when "pit bulls" vote because chihuahuas bite too, hold those owners accountable as well.
- I do, but in some cases removing the dog from the scene is paramount to calming them down. In those cases owners may need to be able to leave to remove the dog and either leave contact information with someone at the scene or return once their dog has been isolated.
- Yes, the owner of the animal in question should remain at the scene or provide the appropriate contact information. That is what a responsible dog owner should do
- Contact information is important
- It is the right thing to do as a responsible pet owner
- Yes, since the owner is responsible for their dog.
- Yes all dog owners need to be accountable.
- Tags are not large enough to read easily to later identify problem animals
- It is part of being a responsible pet owner and leaving the scene should be punishable (same as in a vehicle).
- Support responsible ownership
- The dog owner should be responsible for the actions of their dog.
- A person should be made responsible for their dogs actions. Not the dog.
- The details of the incident should be examined to understand why the dog bit in the first place.
- "If all parties are okay, there is no need for police.
- But if one or multiple parties are seriously injured, police would be more effective in the situation.
- If my dog was attacked and hurt & the other dogs owner just left, i would be crushed. Simple respect.



- You wouldn't allow someone who assaulted another human walk away."
- It's the same principle as a car accident; you have to take responsibility for your actions or inaction as a dog owner if those actions result in harm to someone else.
- To gather whether animal has up to date shots etc. My son was bit and the owner didn't stick around.
- As an owner, the responsibility for a pet should include training the pet to be social, remains on science ensures police can inform and provide training resources.
- Dogs, or particular breeds of dogs, are not to blame for aggressive behaviour. Owners are responsible for their dogs' behaviour
- The owner should remain at the scene. The owner should be punished for not raising and/or training their dog properly. This is not the dogs fault in any way. This is the owners fault. The blame is on them and so should the punishment.
- If an incident happens where someone's dog harms another person or animal the respective owner must remain on site until the situation is dealt with, if they leave then they should be fined or something along those lines. Your dog, your responsibility so also your consequences.
- Because it's just human decency. People who leave have something to hide
- If the dog owner is present, they can be a witness as to whether the dog was provoked by the other animal or person or not prior to the bite.
- People should take responsibility for their animals. If one person's dogs are involved in numerous bites that should alert the authorities that there may be an ongoing animal abuse or neglect issue that needs to be investigated.
- If bit- it would be reassuring to find out vaccination status & have to situation being properly handled- perhaps if requiring Professional medical attention only would be okay too.
- Encourages owners to be more responsible/proactive.
- Providing it's safe to do so.
- Every story has 2 sides. What if the dog reacted to something and isn't the dogs fault. What if it's the owner of dogs fault.
- An owner should have full control of their dog at all times, things happen, and if the bite was an accident then the owner of the dog should make it right.
- The owner of the dog that bit should be help responsible, and fined if they leave.
- It's important to keep contact in case of emergencies
- Need to gather both sides of the story.
- This would ensure responsibility is taken where appropriate
- It is important that information about this dog and its owner are entered in the database. I have been bitten by two breeds of dog in my life: a German Shepherd and a Portuguese Podengo Pequeno. The pit bulls and bull terriers I have come in contact over the past 50 years were all great family dogs.
- If a dog bites a person, the owner is liable and should be expected to take responsibility for the dogs actions.



- But if the dog was provoked by the “victim” which occurs frequently they should not face any penalty. The person who was bite also needs there actions up to the incident reviewed.
- "The owners need to take responsibility for what their animal has done. That being said, sometimes they need to get the animal out of there as fast as possible to keep from any further attacks happening.
- In that situation they should contain the dog and come back and find the injured person or owner of the injured animal as fast as possible. Or at least ask where they are going if they need to leave so that contact can be made as soon as possible."
- Yes, but only to a certain degree. Enforcement officers should only be brought into the situation if it is serious and an individual has been SEVERELY harmed or the owner of the animal does not take responsibility. There should be fines for those who waste an officers time due to over-exaggeration and anything of the sort.
- Owners a responsible for their pets actions
- Once everyone is safe this should be required. If unable to do so they should be required to call and report the incident.
- Fleeing the scene is not allowed in any other severe situation, why is this any different.
- Should be made to provide vaccinations records. Payment of vet bills.
- Theres a reason it's called a pit and run, or pit and split.
- owners should take responsibility but it should be determined if the victim has a responsibility for the incident. Approaching someone's pet only if requested and welcomed.
- I think we should require they stay long enough to share contact info, at least. This ensures accountability & follow up to ensure the dog and owner receive the help they need.
- Most pet owners leave the scene immediately after an incident, giving no contact information, and leaving no way for victim or owners to contact the other party
- The owner must take responsibility for their own lack of control of the pet. Has this pet had all their shots? Will this owner pay for the medical bills of their victim? This is a personal injury incident not unlike a vehicle versus person - you do not leave the scene of a crime.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to take responsibility for their dogs actions
- It should be treated the same way as a car accident where you should not run away. One should be responsible for providing contact information in the circumstance.
- This would help all dog owners feel safer and is mandatory for simple collisions why is this not mandatory here as dog bite can cause a much worse injury- but do not dichromate by dog breed
- Unless the biting dog was Injured and needs medical attention both humans should remain at the scene.
- It might be important to stay in case the dog that bit is sick or if some type of restitution is needed.
- The dog owner should remain at the scene and be held accountable for their dogs actions. It is the owner's responsibility to train their dogs properly and face the consequences when they fail to do so.
- Depends on the circumstance. Say the owner or the hurt dog has to go to the Vet immediately. That could be a problem, how long must they wait for an enforcement officer. Could be late in the evening could be 30 below, etc..



- I think it is important that an understanding is met about the situation and if law enforcement has to step in then it is both owner's responsibility to sort out the situation
- Any responsible owner will stay at the scene
- If a dog bites someone in self defence or defending its owner then the owner should be protected from having to stay but if the dog bits unprovoked and the bite was extensive enough then yes they should have to stay behind
- Yes, I believe information should be exchanged to ensure that the medical history (vaccinations) of the dog can be appropriately shared.
- It's a matter of education and responsibility.
- The owner is at fault more so than the dog is. They must take ownership of the dog and the incident.
- If the animal involved in the attack can be secured safely to prevent further trauma to the victim or attacked animal, I support having the owner of the attacking dog remain on scene to speak with bylaw.
- A person should always be required to stay at the scene of an accident, particularly if they are involved in the accident. IE: Dog Owner
- As the recent foster turned adopter of a bully breed constantly struggling with uncontrolled off-leash dogs in areas where it is mandated that dogs be leashed, I know that the only way my dog is ever going to have an opportunity to bite a stranger's dog is if an off-leash dog is permitted to force physical engagement on my dog illegally. This is certainly not a promise that my dog will bite - she is not an inherently aggressive dog - but I will be damned if, as a responsible pet owner, BSL will be leveraged to euthanize/muzzle/imprison my dog because she is a bully breed should an altercation occur with the dog of an irresponsible pet owner who refuses to obey leash laws and allow their dog to be uncontrolled and impose itself upon my leashed dog and our space. Perhaps we should place a little more focus on enforcing leash laws than encouraging prejudice against innocent animals based on their physical appearance alone.
- Yes, although these incidents may be accidental, animal owners must be held accountable.
- If your dog bites someone you should take responsibility for its actions
- Dog owners need to held accountable for their dogs actions as it is usually the humans fault they behave in the manner they do. It isn't possible to follow up and ensure training has been attended if people do not remain at the scene
- It is the responsibility of all dog owners of any breed to maintain control of their animals and are responsible for them. The excuse that it's just a little dog is no longer acceptable.
- Depending on how severe the attack or injury caused and how the victims owner wishes to proceed.
- Accountability, and liability. Basic decency too! Treat it like a hit and run if they leave. They should be fined for leaving the scene of an incident.
- Two sides to every story. If they love their dog they would stay.
- Depends on the situation and severity of the bite.
- To ensure any incident is handled correctly and reduce the possibility of future incidents by the same dog.
- All relevant information needs to be gathered at time of incident.



- acts as a responsible pet owner, accepts and understands these responsibilities especially in areas of human confrontations/bites. In acting there of, is deemed accountable for their pets actions. You would be held accountable just as in the case of an automobile accident, punishable by fine or jail or both for leaving the scene of an accident.
- Safety concerns
- I'm all good with the owners being held accountable, but we can't blame the dog, the owners should require training, and they should receive bans to owning animals and the dogs should get rehabilitated I get it's not for all dogs as some are too damaged, but very possible for a lot of them
- There needs to be an investigation to prevent people abusing this rule to get rid of neighbour's dogs
- Treaded like a car accident. You need to take responsibility.
- This would help to ensure the owner taking responsibility for he incident...there aren't bad dogs, only bad owners
- I would say it's like leaving the scene of an accident or a hit and run.
- It should be a common courtesy that you dog is your responsibility and as such you should take responsibility for their actions. ie; staying to exchange information and come to a common agreement
- The dogs should be identified, but the exception is if information is exchange after the bite. It may be difficult to keep a dog near a dog it has bitten due to it being over its threshold.
- I think the owner should have the opportunity to defend their pet at the time of the incident
- There should be documentation of the incident and an assessment of severity.
- As long as they leave contact info, they should not need to wait.
- Animals can be unpredictable and owners are not always properly educated. An responsible owner would stay and offer their side and provide all necessary information.
- Provided it is safe for the ublic to kerp the offending dig on site, a history of what happened needs to be provided as well examination of the offending dog.
- Again, my dog was attacked by a neighbor's pyrenees. It took bylaw over 2 weeks to even respond to the incident!! And the owners didn't even have bylaw go to their home. No fine, nothing. Disgusting.
- NA
- Just like a hit and run. If your dog injures someone, you are responsible for the actions of the dog and must remain at the scene.
- Any dog that bites another dog or person should be put down
- Because that's called common sense
- So proper measures are taken to prevent it from happening again. (Training)
- I believe if statements are taken at an incident wth an enforcement officer, there is less likely to be "finger pointing" or retaliation. Officers should also follow up on cases.
- Because you need to be held responsible for your pet hurting someone.
- But only under specific circumstances as some incidents are so minor or caused by playfighting and do not need an enforcement officer.



- "However, the dog may need to place in a safe place away from the other dog.
- Dogs react because they are scared, and potentially the other dog started it."
- Otherwise how do you know who the dog and owner is.
- The owner is responsible for their pet. They should have to face the consequences and be told to take training.
- I think it's important to get all viewpoints of the incident so there is less of a bias to favour the victim.
- I have had several dogs bite me and the owner either left the scene with their dog or refused to provide contact information. Similar to a hit and run with a vehicle.
- But it depends if for example my dog bit another dog and the owner of the other dog was aggressive or abusive towards me i dont think I should have to stay in that case.
- If the dog has bitten a person or another dog the should certainly remain on the scene as a responsible human being.
- If someone's dog is bit or bites to the extent that enforcement is needed, then accountability is needed.
- Its like a car accident, you must remain on site to get information and give a report.
- Take responsibility for the action, no different then a car accident
- I do not feel pit bulls should be treated any different than any other breed.
- The owner should be legally responsible for their dog
- It's important to obtain all health records and any liability regarding these instances
- No explanation is needed. All pet owners should re RESPONSIBLE owners. Quit blaming one type of dog!!!!
- There seems to be a certain type of person who owns dangerous breeds of dogs, and these people are not the likely type to stick around a scene. It would be good if there was a law, not because of the dog, but because of the dingleberries that own these dogs.
- I do agree they need to stay there. Dogs don't just attack without a reason
- No different than at the scene of an accident with a vehicle. The owner should remain on scene until the incident is reported.
- People should follow the same procedure as in car accidents...otherwise it becomes like a hit and run...a bite and run.
- Your dog is your responsibility. It's that Simple.
- You're responsible for your pets actions
- They need to be on scene so that the enforcement officer can get the full picture of what happened.
- People should stay at the scene to either defend the dogs actions or because they have improperly trained the dog and the owner should be held accountable.
- They should stay at the scene but the owner should try to put them in their vehicle while dealing with authorities.
- Like any incident, there are two sides & both need to be heard. Not all dog bites are the fault of the dogs behavior directly.
- This should be a law, not just a rule.



- With the owner being made to stay at the scene, EOs can get more comprehensive information about the dog. Plus if owners know that they'll be forced to stay and share contact information and talk to EOs, I would think owners would take steps to avoid an incident in the first place, rather than just be passively reactive (or not react at all) in the event something does happen.
- Too many owners get away with not giving information and can disappear and not receive punishment.
- This a great way to get both sides of a story as to why it happened. And less money spent searching for the dog and owner.
- Dog owners are NOT always taking responsibility here. How else are we to hold these behaviors accountable if not by enforcing this?
- Owner needs to be responsible for their dog
- Like a car accident. No he said/she said later in court. Officers collect all details asap.
- An owner is the equivalent to a parent and should remain when the animal they own is involved in an incident
- There is 2 sides to every story.
- People should be held accountable for not properly training their dogs. It's the humans fault, not the animals
- Proof of vaccines is required.
- They need to be liable for damages
- People should be accountable for their dogs, but also to provide both sides of the story (ie, if the dog was provoked/it was an accident).
- as long as there are additional people who are not primarily law enforcement. This will be a very high stress situation and will require sensitivity, compassion, and deescalation
- Seems the right thing to do if the situation is safe to do so.
- Otherwise they disappear and noone is responsible.
- Dog owner must remain at scene to both provide information and control and protect their dog.
- If a dog (ANY DOG not just "pitbull" type dogs) bites a human or an other animal, their owner should definitely stay and deal with it the proper way. Any responsible pet owner should do so, even if it's a small dog!!
- No different between a vehicle accident or a dog bite. Extreme fines and punishment for those who flee with there dog.
- it makes sense that this information is collected so it can be properly documented and repeat offenders can be dealt with.
- It would be similar to an assault case.
- Because the the owner can explain their experiences and all incident reports can be filled ou with both perspectives.
- Having a dog is a responsibility, and speaking to an officer can clear up any bias or miscommunication there may be.
- I believe that no dog is more likely than another by nature to be aggressive, violent or inherently at a disposition to bite. It is purely the responsibility of an owner to take into consideration their own dog's



temperament (REGARDLESS OF THE BREED) and to train them as such. No dog is better or worse depending on their breed as every dog has their own personality just as any human does that is often a product of their environment. As such the owner should be held accountable for not taking the proper steps to address their dog's temperament, and likely not providing proper outlets and/or opportunities for exercise which is manifesting in aggressive behaviour. By requiring the owner to stay and provide information they are better able to make remedies for their inability to train their dog properly and perhaps this will better help portray that there is no statistically significant indication that pitbulls are more aggressive than other dogs.

- People should be held accountable to their dog's actions
- The owner should have accountability for the dog's actions.
- You own the dog you are responsible
- It is important for the individual to stay at the scene and share contact information and talk to law enforcement if needed
- People are responsible for their own animals
- It is the owner of the dog that needs to take responsibility of the dogs actions as the dog is not at fault. They should definitely be responsible and help if the injured dog needs treatment. Dogs are animals. They were one wild. The best dogs can have random burst outs. It's normal. We all need to be accountable for the actions of our pets as they are our family.
- You are responsible for your dogs actions. That's what you agree to when taking ownership of a dog.
- Like a vehicular accident, pet owners must take responsibility for their pets behaviour
- Responsible owners take responsibility for their animals. It is up to the owner to ensure their animal is properly trained. If an owner does not take responsibility for their animal, the animal should be removed from that person's care. The blame for irresponsible dog ownership needs to be placed on the owners, not the animals. And especially not on certain scapegoat breeds.
- It's illegal to leave the scene of an vehicle accident. This is almost the same thing. It's the owner's responsibility to stay and speak with law enforcement.
- This just seems like a common sense - its the rule when vehicles are involved in an accident, it should be the same for animal incidents.
- often there are issues(vet bills) that show up after the incident..public needs to be assured that proper education/training/ will be carried out to prevent further attacks.
- you are responsible to teach your dog as you teach your children. Bad parents make bad kids weather they are furry or not.
- Unless safer to leave scene, get dog to vet etc
- A dogs owner should be responsible for their behavior.
- Respect to those involved
- Responsible pet ownership requires you to take responsibility for any harm your animal may cause, and deal with the consequences in an effective manner that will prevent any further incidents in the future.
- I believe it would aid in preventing attacks from the same dog in the future.



- Pet owners need to be responsible for their pets whether it is waste pick up or alterations.
- Currently the owner of an biting dog often gathers up the dog and leaves the scene to avoid culpability.
- Responsible ownership
- In any type of injury accident both parties should remain until everything is sorted.
- This also provided the victim the opportunity to pursue compensation for injuries.
- Must remain to take responsibility of their actions.
- It's fair for everyone involved.
- It's the right thing to do.
- That is the most basic example of being a responsible pet owner
- Helps hold them accountable
- Fleeing the scene of any crime is illegal. Obviously if a dog attacks a person or other animal, the owner is responsible for speaking with officers.
- N/a
- This is assault. If Bob assaulted Jill and ran away, I would assume he was trying to evade the police. So, how is this any different?
- The dog could be in training or recovering from an abusive situation. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Dog owner should be reachable for future updates.
- With any dog in any case the owner should have to stay at the scene of an incident.
- This helps identify nuisance dogs and get them into obedience classes.
- it makes sense.
- Dog owners need to be made to pay for the nuisance dogs behavior. In my experience this is mostly small yappy breeds that the owner thinks cannot do damage because of their size. As a residential service plumber working in homes, I have only ever been attacked by small breeds (purse dogs / fashion accessories)
- This should be no different than a human injuring someone else. Stay at the scene until law enforcement arrives.
- Any dog incident the owner should take responsibility.
- I support this as long as it has been a serious altercation. It makes sense to stay at the scene of an accident
- This would place the responsibility of the dog's behavior in the owner's hands.
- Resolve things quickly
- A dog's behavior is usually the fault of the owner, so they should have to take the blame for it, not the dog.
- that's assault... of course you have to stay around and complete required documentation
- There may be extenuating circumstances which may need to be considered. Such as protecting owner of the dog or dog protecting itself
- How is this not a thing already?



- It could prevent repeat incidents and hold poor owners accountable.
- If a dog bites and the owner leaves the scene, it provides limited opportunity for the person who has been bit, or whose animal has been bit, to receive any necessary contact or veterinary information from the owner. There should however be provisions for if enforcement is unable to arrive within a reasonable time, reasonable being within half an hour.
- "Pet owners must be responsible for them.
- If a person or another animal gets bitten, it may not be the other person's/pet's fault, anyway (e.g. if person threatened & dog protecting owner is reason)"
- That's the only way to get some accountability.
- I agree.
- Not needed
- This should be considered the same as a hit and run with a car, if you are in an accident you remain at the scene, the same should apply if your dog bites
- Yes. Ppl who have dogs that bite should take responsibility. And 90% of pit bull owners I know do not have dogs that bite. So please don't single out one breed. Kick out nenshi for being stupid.
- Our dogs were attacked in May by a Boxer that the person walking it let off leash knowing that the dog had behavioral issues. This individual stayed and provided the owner's information. The owner was responsible enough to call us and paid the vet bill. When my daughter's Staffordshire/American Terrier was attacked (unprovoked) as she walked by on leash, the owner tried to dodge the damage her dog did and the cost of the vet bills - not good, not responsible.
- If a dog bite is serious enough to call in law enforcement then the owner should be required to stay on site
- Seems obvious to me
- It will assure that there is accountability. Some owners are not responsible.
- The owner is responsible for their dog and should be responsible for any damage or injury the dog causes. They should remain at the scene to provide all of their information.
- It's like hit n run unless both parties agree to move past and just exchange info no different than a fender bender
- The owner is responsible for the dogs actions. Not the animal itself.
- I agree that the responsibility lies with the dog owner to have to provide accurate contact information and remain at the scene so that the appropriate parties are held accountable.
- If the pet owner leaves the scene of an attack, it should be considered the equivalent of a suspect leaving a car crash or assault.
- I find owners that have dogs that bite like to leave the scene as fast as they can.
- I'm not sure how this could be enforced unless the owner is fined for leaving the scene.
- It's the responsible thing to do to remain on scene and provide your information if an incident occurs
- In cases of repeat incidents it can be beneficial as a method of tracking if a dog/owner is not taking the proper steps to protect others and opportunity to engage with community about animal safety/care



- It's like a car accident. To leave after injuring a person/dog is like a hit and run. The owner should be held responsible for any vet/medical bills.
- In that case you get to understand both parties involvement to the situation. Just as you would with any other court of law.
- That seems like the responsible thing to do.
- If the bite victim needs medical care they need to be able to contact the owner of the biting dog so that they can get compensation. If it is a dog that is bitten vet bills can be very expensive and should be paid by the owner of the biting dog.
- They should need to stay as it has caused damaged to another person's property.
- An owner should be held responsible
- Obviously, we need to streamline the process through which we handle dog bites (the cogs of the court system move far too slowly). However, I do not support automatic euthanasia in the case of a bite. It will need to be handled on a case by case basis with an understanding of the dogs background (ex: is it a rescue? in a currently abusive situation?) and the circumstances surrounding the attack (ex: was it wanton aggression? or was the dog in a circumstance in which aggression is understandable?). As for #5 obviously, the owner needs to remain present in order to actually determine what happened.
- If a dog bites a person or another animal, the dog owner is responsible and should able to provide an explanation on what happened and if the dog attacked unprovoked the human needs to take responsibility.
- Information should be exchanged by owners of both animals.
- It's the right thing to do.
- Of course they should stay
- The owner of the dog regardless of it being a small breed or large must remain at the scene. If they dont they should be charged with leaving the scene of an incident and fined heavily!!
- People need to take responsibility for their pets actions and they need to be held accountable for what ever damages occurred in the accident.
- "The owner would then be held
- Responsible for damages."
- If an owner flees the scene a larger fine/penalty should be issued
- You should have to stay the same as you would a car accident.
- But of the problem dog remains at the scene it may cause bigger issues. People should have to share their identity and contact information such as a drivers license so it can be followed up by bylaw officers if its not safe to remain at the scene.
- There needs to be a way to follow-up with the owner of the offending dog.
- Absolutely agree, the owner must remain responsible for any incident that their dog causes harm to another person or animal
- This is self-evident based on the question.
- Unless the biting dog is at large



- Dog owners are responsible for their pets (property) just like they'd need to be on site for a hit and run
- Dog owners should be responsible for their dog's behaviour. Therefore they need to remain at the scene in order to be held accountable.
- This is common sense. Owners are responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- Dog bites can be serious, and the owner and dog need to be held responsible
- This is a reasonable expectation of a responsible dog owner - any owner should be required to remain at the scene
- Just for insurance purposes and to clarify the story
- The owner of dog should stay and responsible to call emergency crew to handle the effected person.
- Respect common sense they must stay
- The dog owner should be accountable by ensuring the victim is cared for, as well as provide necessary information, without having an officer tracking them down.
- If your dog bites someone or another pet the responsible thing to do is remain at the scene period. The fact we need a rule or bylaw stating such is just sad. But as some people have proven again and again unfortunately, they won't do the right thing. Sometimes even when there are rules or laws.
- It's how all incidents should go. The people involved should stay at the scene of the incident.
- It's only fair to get all the info from the owner of the animal since their pet harmed another person.
- Yes because that is the right thing to do, however I do not support that Pit Bulls are bad dogs. There are no bad dogs only bad owners
- Treat it like a car accident.
- It's an assault
- It's like any other accident, information should be shared.
- too often these dog owners run away and are not forced to pay for the vet bills or have their dog noted as offending
- Owners are responsible for their dogs behaviour/control and should be held as such.
- Any animal that bites another person that is not their owner, the owner should be required to wait with the person who is injured and keep their animal a safe distance away. This should not just be for the Bully breeds. Any dog will bite so it should be mandatory for all breeds not just one in particular.
- Yes because I believe it should be treated as similar to a car accident. If a nuisance dog that is insured bites someone then costs will need to be increased for the owner.
- There are no bad dogs, only bad owners, of a dog messes up it is on the owner to fix the problem!
- Otherwise it's like fleeing the scene of an accident, and should be a chargeable offense.
- Yes the owner should stay. But if the animal is out of control should be placed in a safe place till they arrive as to not cause the dog more stress
- Your dog bites you stay to take responsibility....
- Like any other accident or incident, the dog owner is responsible for their pet.
- Stay and take responsibility.



- It is a dog's owners responsibility to remain at the scene of an incident. This will also give that owner the opportunity to present their side of the story.
- I had an unleashed pit bull looking dog attack my 1.8 kg (not a typing error) harnesses and on a leash chihuahua. It caused \$7500 (not a typing error) to repair puncture near anus, an 7 cm by 5 cm of hind leg skin ripped off, a broken jaw, loose, knocked out and broken teeth. I had 2 puncture wounds on my arm and skin ripped off back of left hand. Without so many neighbors who tried to help me I am sure that given the chance, by the time the owner got there with a leash he would have disappeared with his dog.
- Responsible owners know their dogs and take responsibility for when things go wrong. If your dog bites you should be held accountable and all the evidence/situation taken into account on a case by case basis, for example if a dog bites a human because they antagonised it.
- Owners are responsible for their dog. Leaving with your dog after a bite that breaks skin is like a hit and run.
- Owners whose dog has biten another dog and/or human should remain at the scene of the incident. This way the injured human and /or dog's owner would be able to ensure that the vicious dog is up to date on vaccines, had been to the vet regularly and to contact the vicious dog's owner should any compensation or assistance be necessary. This would help for public safety of dogs and the humans.
- The dog owner shall provide his driver license. But waiting for an enforcement officer might not be possible if the dog/person who got bit requires emergency procedures.
- No different than a vehicle incident.
- It is at the victims discretion if they would like to take it further. If police arrive the number owner should be able to restrain the dog to be prevent further incidents but must return to the scene (ex: put attacking dog in the car or restrain dog at large)
- I can't believe this is a question and not human nature
- People need to be responsible, regardless of the type of dog. I have been several times by little dogs who's owners pick them up and leave.
- I feel as if it should be treated like other similar incidents. Since the animal clearly cannot speak for itself the owner should be required to stay on the scene to take accountability for the actions their dog exhibited.
- Only if the injuries are substantial (needing hospitalization)
- To allow for the officer to speak directly to the owner without delay
- I said yes because they are responsible for their dog/dogs, and whatever their dogs do they must be held responsible.
- MOST of the time a dogs behaviour is the fault of the owner, in order to make a fair judgment on the situation a proper interview of the owner needs to be conducted.
- Yes. We need enforce responsible OWNERS and not blame animals.
- If dog of any breed bites/ or attacks someone the owner should be held accountable for its actions.
- Your animal your problem. Stay there and be responsible owner.
- However it would be difficult to enforce.



- If any pet animal bites a human, whether skin is broken or not, an officer should NOT be dispatched. How about a department within the animal shelters that can dispatch an animal Trainer to try and advise the human as to what set the animal off, and how to curb that behavior. Police have nothing to do with this, or bylaw frankly. There are no bad dogs, cats, rabbits, horses, etc. There are only bad humans who taught the animal to react that way.
- Dog owners need to be held accountable for the actions of their dogs. ASAP.
- I believe they should need to provide contact information so the officer could figure out why the dog had attacked another person/animal.
- My dog was almost killed by a pit bull at Sue Higgins dog park because it was pinned down snapping at my dog and the pit bull's owner couldn't care less.
- nn
- A pet owner is responsible for his dog's behavior at all times, and therefore must answer all questions about an incident involving his dog if it bites a person or an animal.
- It's important to hold potential offenders accountable additionally fleeing the scene is suspicious and makes public servant's jobs harder
- Similar to a motorist remaining at the scene of a collision.
- I think it's always important that both sides of the story are heard and enforcement officers get a full account of the situation
- Accountability for your dog's behavior is important
- Owners should be present to be held accountable and fined.
- Incidents involving dogs should be treated like a car accident. If an owner leaves, it should be considered a "bite and run" and carry additional charges
- But only when the dog can be secured without threat to others.
- As with any other incident. Owners should be the ones held responsible.
- In case the injury requires it
- This might help de-escalate the situation
- Contact information I believe is respected to be exchanged if in a civilized manner, but if the 'at fault' party feels threatened or unnecessary behaviour is being portrayed, they should have the right to call law enforcement as a mediator on scene or leave the unsafe and/or negative environment.
- Owners of a dog that has bitten a person or other animal should take responsibility, so long as the dog was not acting in self defense
- Absolutely owners should stay. They should also be fined to the max if they leave the scene as well as consideration of whether they're fit to be a pet owner and looking at apprehending the dog, if needed
- Owners are responsible for actions of their dogs
- They should provide information and be responsible for any vet bills, required to take training (depending on situation).
- Explain my answer? Are you serious? The OWNER is responsible for the dog, of course they should remain at the scene and THEY should face the consequences. I am not going to deny that the bite strength of a dog within the pit bull family is not on the higher end of the spectrum for dogs.



However, I am absolutely opposed to specific breed targeting. I have known many pit bulls (pitties) in my life and they have all been the absolute sweetest dogs. It is the owner's responsibility to train and provide whatever measures are needed for the safe handling and control of their dog REGARDLESS of the breed. I've known many little dogs that are not trained, qualify as a nuisance, and can be very dangerous even with their small size.

- All owners are responsible for their pets actions.
- It's a form of assault
- It is not the dogs at fault, it is their owner. They should be educated on their breed before allowance of the breed plus obedience training and higher fines.
- Liability and accountability for you pets actions.
- If the dog bites any one the owner has to be responsible for all the cost of it
- Notuch to explain . If a dog bites drone it needs to be reported
- I think it depends on the severity of the incident.
- Similar to a vehicle accident. The incident has to documented.
- "its an accident
- You stay at the scene of an accident"
- That PERSON is responsible not the dog so therefore they must stay
- Common sense !
- Why wouldn't they, it's called being a responsible dog owner or are you once again signaling out pit bull owners?
- Yes, because it would be the dog owners fault if their dog bit another dog. If a pet was bitten, the. The owner of that pet should also stay on the scene to clarify whether they had control of their pet when the bite occurred. Every owner is responsible to have complete control of their pet. If their pet was the "victim" of the bite but the owner did not have control of the pet at the time of the bite, they also should have liability for the incident. If you want to reduce dog attacks, focus on training the pet owners and holding them responsible for what happens not the dog. It is up to the pet owner to be fully trained to handle a pet and have full control at all times.
- Yes they should be held accountable
- To take responsibility and assess the situation as to why the incident happened. Take a strong look at what the environment and situation was including the actions of the HUMANS
- As long as the dog in offence can be relocated easily to avoid continued issues
- For the protection of both parties in the incident
- People with dogs they can't control should be held liable
- "if you are a responsible pet owner, then remaining at the scene would then enable the owner to show that responsibility to an officer and furthermore it would give the owner the opportunity to defend his dogs actions if warranted.
- IE: dog was kicked, or taunted. Whereas leaving the scene gives the impression of guilt."
- It's their dog - take responsibility for it. Dogs bite or are a nuisance for a reason and they should stay at the scene to see and hear everything. They need to help the dog (training, therapy, social interaction training, etc, so it doesn't happen again.



- Dog owners should know how to stop their dog from hurting others. Their dog is their responsibility.
- The dog owner should be held accountable and responsible for any costs incurred
- If their info is needed in the future and to say what had happened from their perspective.
- As long as there is a way to control the dog as they are waiting for officers to arrive
- Then the dog owner can explain their side of things
- The dog's vaccination history is very important and the owner needs to be responsible for the dog's actions.
- Of course the owner should need to provide their info/talk to bylaw if necessary. Responsible pet ownership means taking responsibility
- If there are further complications or medical intervention required, this information will be necessary
- All dog owners need to be accountable for their pet
- Same as a car accident
- Unless it is superficial where no injury occurred
- You should stay at the scene of any accidents or incidents.
- Accountability- cover vet fees, assess dog, i.e. is it a nuisance dog or was the dog asserting boundaries, such as someone petting without asking, dogs not paying attention to body cues etc
- It would be the same as a road accident. Take responsibility of your pet.
- Dog owners must be held responsible for the actions of their pets. If the owner of an aggressive dog leaves the scene, then it may be difficult to hold them to account.
- It's expensive to have your dog stitched back after another dog bites it. I had a husky & it was attacked by a black lab. We were on the hook for all medical bills. And that dog could go on to bite other dogs & people.
- Anyone free willed human should have the right and in good faith stay at the scene, should not be obligated but should be expected.
- They are responsible for the actions of the dog and should be held liable - as such they need to provide information similar to a car Collision a
- You are accountable for your pets behaviour and development. They need to stay at the scene. Should be charged with leaving the scene of an accident if they do.
- It's important for all parties involved to understand the details of the incident. If a Calgary citizen's dog has bitten someone or another animal, it is important for them to be aware of their animals behavior and (for all parties) to understand the circumstances in which it happened.
- Owner should be charged
- If a dog bites someone you should have to exchange info just like if you got into a vehicular accident
- Sometimes there is a lack of parenting or a lead up to the incident and without escalating emotions on either side it needs to be documented and followed up with like a car accident.
- It is our responsibility to be accountable for all of our actions and of those we are responsible for, including our pets.
- Dog owners should be fined for leaving the scene and not accepting responsibility



- A dog could very easily be goaded into biting someone/something and so an owner should be required to describe the situation if they are a responsible owner.
- Should be mandatory for every dog - not just this stupid signalling out of pitbulls.
- This would make it easier to locate the owner of the offending dog.
- It is important to track bites/attacks and to ensure the dogs vaccines are up to date.
- The dog owner is responsible.
- No need to explain, like a motor vehicle accident, one remains at the scene to exchange information and deal with enforcement.
- As someone who frequently uses the off leash parks most of the aggressive dogs I have encountered have irresponsible owners and they shouldn't have any dog. Most are young males who don't even stick around to make sure the other dog is ok.
- They are responsible for damage caused by their pets.
- The owner of the offending dog should have to pay for any physical damages caused.
- Yes, as it would be good to also get the biting dog owner's account of the situation. This should be considered when finding a solution/consequence to the biting dog. Not just get it all from the side of the dog who got bitten, knowing full well that dogs bite when they are also provoked.
- The owner of the dog should be held accountable, but the city of Calgary has no right to seize any animals.
- Yes when any personal injury takes place the owner should be required to remain at the scene HOWEVER I have been In a situation when another Citizen accused my dog of biting her even when there were witnesses present to discredit what she was saying. A clause needs to be added to protect dog owners from false personal injury claims.
- It should be treated the same as a car accident. If someone is harmed, you shouldn't be allowed to walk away as an investigation into why a dog bit is needed. Again, the likely outcome is that the owner didn't recognize the basic signs a dog was giving off of aggression or uncomfortableness.
- Once a bite has occurred, it should be treated the same as assault. I can't bite someone in public then walk away without consequence, why should a dog owner?
- The owner is responsible for the pet and it's trained behavior.
- this way both sides of the story can be told. So as to not put all blame on the dog, but the victim of the bite as well (eg. a child keeps blowing in a dogs face, pulling on its ears or fur causing the dog to react)
- Owners are responsible for their dogs, and any damage they cause.
- No explanation needed. Do you drive away after you hit a car? No, so stay.
- I think that the owners should take responsibility for their dogs because 1. It's their pet, 2. They are the ones who trained their dogs and possibly didn't train them well, hence the biting, 3. It the right thing to do.
- Makes sense
- My daughter's French Bulldog had his ear almost completely torn off by a Mastiff. She was lucky because, although the dog was not well controlled, the owner did stay and paid for the surgery necessary to reattach the ear. There were a lot of witnesses to the situation so, for this owner, I think



he knew he couldn't get away without being identified. Owners of vicious dogs need to be held accountable at all times.

- Of course the animal damaged or injured someone. That is the owners responsibility to be accountable for it.
- They should face the fines
- It's the best way to guarantee correct information is gathered
- Accountability should be requires, yes, but all parties involved should be held to this expectation unless of course a injury sustained is life threatening.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs action
- Yes, however the definition and severity of what constitutes a 'bite' needs to be well fleshed out ahead of time. Dogs nipping at each other at a dog park would be impossible to moderate.
- If necessary.
- Obviously a person should be required to answer for damage or difficulty they have caused, just like any crime.
- of course the owner should remain at the scene but both sides of the story should be taken into account, if someone hits my dog or myself and then my dog attacks them then i think they have every right to do so in defending themselves or their owner
- There have been several instances of owners leaving the scene and the vicious dog has attacked again. - both humans and other dogs.
- Yes. This is necessary to determine why this happened in the first place and to access the state of the victim whether it be a person or animal. I believe each owner is responsible for their dog and their dogs actions, therefor needs to deal with what happens.
- I totally agree with the above. It should be treated like a motor vehicle accident
- I had a dog that once bit a woman terrified of dogs. It really was more of a scratch, and the dog was a puppy. The woman did not speak English and I didn't speak her language. I gave her my name and number, the number of my vet and my dog's tag. She had someone else call me. If my dog bites someone, I feel responsible and would like others to be responsible as well. It's part of being considerate in the City.
- be accountable for your pet
- The owner should be responsible for the actions of the dog.
- Responsible owner
- Otherwise it may be impossible to track someone down after an attack.
- like an accident or crash, if the damages are bad.
- I personally know of a friend who was attacked and bitten by dogs of an owner who allowed them off-leash in a leashed only area. The owner finally controlled her dogs then made a hasty exit without acknowledging my friends injuries or doing anything a responsible dog owner would do. I would be happy to share [personal information removed] contact information if requested.
- This would ensure that both parties have an accurate description of the events.
- Owners are responsible for the training and care of their animals. If a dog bites, the owner needs to explain what happened and why.



- The owner is responsible for the actions of the dog and should be required to stay and provide the necessary information
 - If I or my son are attacked by a dog and the owner is free to leave there's no guarantee of being able to take steps necessary to get the dog proper training or trauma care for the victim.
 - Absolutely! If a dog bites an owner should absolutely stay at the scene. Should share info (insurance) in case of doctors/vets bills. It's owner's responsibility!
 - That should be part of the owner's responsibility.
 - Responsible dog owners would stay regardless so a rule seems fine. Dogs do not usually bite without being provoked so this would allow the owner the opportunity to explain what happened in defence of the dog.
 - "Any dog that bites should be followed up by bylaw. Someone needs to verify of the dog's vaccinations are up to date even if the bite wasn't a serious one or the dog was provoked into biting.
-
- Bylaw needs to be trained to understand that just because a dog nips someone (much different than an attack) it isn't necessarily a vicious dog. If someone teases a dog and pushes it to the point where it has no choice but to give the person a quick nip, the person provoking the dog should be fined, NOT the dog owner! All factors need to be considered but I definitely agree that the responsible dog owner should wait around to speak to officials as per my opening remarks."
 - Dog owner should stay at the scene to hear advice on how to best deal with their dog's behaviour. I do not agree with euthanasia however and do not think that this should ever be a response.
 - better data gathering
 - Same reason as to why a driver needs to remain on the scene of an accident. It is important to hear all sides of the story and give contact information in case the person or animal that was bitten needs medical attention.
 - The owner should remain at the scene provided they are not putting their safety at risk by doing so.
 - the owner of an aggressive dog should be held accountable
 - The owner needs to be there to explain what had happened
 - If you have to do it for a car accident you should have to do it for a dog bite.
 - That's the responsible thing to do
 - "Owners should be responsible for their pet.
 - It is their duty to train them correctly and if an incident occurs they should be held responsible or at least be able to give an explanation as to why their pet reacted."
 - Because if you are in a car accident you don't drive away either.
 - There are two sides to every story.
 - As long as it applies to ALL BREEDS I agree. Much like a traffic accident where the drivers have to remain obscene. The officer involved would then be able to have a live view and judgement of the offending dogs character in person. I believe incidents are a lack of owner responsibility to raise



proper behaved dogs or other pets the same as their children are raised to know to live peacefully etc.

- Our neighbourhood has now experienced two separate pitbull acts on smaller gentle good mannered dogs, latest attack resulted in Vet bills in excess of \$1,000. The owner left the area hoping to avoid notice [personal information removed] and I am not aware of financial compensation has been made. The pitbull is still with the owners.
- Often it's the fault of the owner and not the dog.... owners need to be trained before they get dogs
- Basic accountability. OWNER accountability here is the issue, and this is why your BSL is off track. An owner of a vicious German Shepherd doesn't have to muzzle, but a friendly "pitbull" type does? That's ridiculous. Sorry, that's too long of a word for you guys. It's dumb.
- So they cannot escape
- The victim should be able to contact the owner or have enforcement contact them
- To take responsibility
- They should have to disclose information for future incidents, to be able to track behaviour of owners and their dogs.
- Owners should provide their interpretation of events.
- Most people realize they own a dangerous dog and know they will be fined/have their dog seized and therefore will not stick around in most cases.
- I would have assumed this was already the case. A pet owner must take responsibility for their pet and if their dog bites a person or another animal it is perfectly reasonable to expect the owner to remain at the scene until authorities arrive. Failure or refusal to do so is irresponsible pet ownership.
- They should share information for future contact.
- A responsible pet owner would not leave the scene.
- To me this is no different than remaining at the scene of an auto collision.
- Basic owner responsibility!
- It's just common Accountability
- Responsible owners would remain at the scene and do their best to cooperate.
- Dog owners must be responsible. There are far too many factors when it comes to a dog bite.
- If the incident in question is severe enough then all parties in question have to come to an agreement of the next necessary steps
- so all witness will be on sight.
- These incidents should be treated much like car accidents - sharing of personal information from both parties is required, and not doing so or fleeing the scene is a punishable offence.
- Owners should be responsible for insuring their dog is trained no matter what breed it is. This could also help the owner explain if the dog was provoked, prove the dog's prior training if necessary etc.
- So they can explain why they should be punished for their dog.
- It is the responsible thing to do
- yes if someone's dog harms someone they should have to remain. In no way should any rules about bully breeds be applied. I have never met an aggressive bully breed



- Depending on circumstances, the dog may need to be apprehended if it is considered dangerous. If not the serious of an offence, it should still be recorded and taken into account if there are further issues.
- This is self-explanatory. If you are involved in an incident where damage or harm as been done to another or their property, it should be illegal to leave the scene. You can't crash your car and leave the scene, this should be the same.
- Allows the city to better identify potentially dangerous dogs in the community. Exchanging contact info should be required at minimum.
- Any incident requiring police presence requires all individuals involved to remain for questioning.
- At the end of they day if they do not it should be treated the same as someone who flees the scene after committing any other crime
- Owners of aggressive dogs need to be held accountable. Dog attacks should be treated the same as car accidents.
- Accountability is key when dealing with aggressive pets; similar to having to wait on the scene after a car crash.
- Owners must be held accountable if their dog bites a person or other animal.
- Self explanatory. The person needs to own up to the incident and face consequences. I've been little vicious dogs the owners think they are small so they can't do harm. All owners need to know there are consequences.
- I think having to share contact info is a good idea because if it happens again then you can see that this dog has had more than one attack. And it should be treated the same as a vehicle accident, and a person fleeing the scene.
- They should be accountable for their pets actions
- Need to know about shot if it's the first time need info
- The owner has to be held accountable for the behaviour of his dog.
- I assumed this was the law. Seems self evident that owner should remain on scene unless agreement that matter is resolved.
- Depends on the circumstance.
- A responsible pet owner would stay , ensuring everyone involved was taken care of and voluntarily share information. It is only irresponsible owners that run off . Just like you have to do in vehicle accidents
- treat is same as a motor vehicle accident
- If a dog does attack/ cause injury I do believe actions should be taken, but attacking innocent dogs due to their breed is wrong.
- I have witnessed multiple cases as well as heard more anecdotally of owners panicking after their dog has attacked another person/animal and run away. By creating a legal requirement to remain at the scene, there will be at minimum an increased facilitation between victim and owner about what happened and the best course to pursue after the incident.



- If an animal bites a person or another animal, it is the owners responsibility to provide information and be sure the injuries person/animal is ok. If it happens once, it can happen again. This information needs to be collected.
- This needs explaining?
- Just like a car accident, you can't bite and run.
- I think it's imperative that both sides explain what happened to an officer to get an accurate depiction of what took place. If a dog is truly dangerous it needs to be addressed immediately but if the fault is not on the dog/its owner then they should be able to go home with their dog and continue further investigation from there.
- The owner of a dog should be held liable 'on the record' to trace repeated behaviour and monitor the owner's ability to train animals.
- The owner is responsible for how their animal acts. They are a product of their environment. So the owner should be assessed if they are fit to be owners.
- If your dog bites someone that is the fault and responsibility of that owner, whether it's a chihuahua or a pitbull bad dogs come from bad people. There is no bad breeds
- it should be mandatory to stay with the animal that bit to be fined or have the animal taken away
- If someone gets
- In cases of a bite, the victim is far less likely of recourse if the owner flees (similar to vehicle hit and run)
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs actions.
- But this will be difficult to enforce
- It's just like if you get in a car accident. You have to remain at the scene
- I believe that the dog owner should be responsible for sharing contact info to the involved party.
- People are legally required to stay at the scene for things like car collisions, I don't see how an animal bite resulting in injury should be any different
- I know of more than one instance where owners of aggressive dogs that have attacked people and/or other dogs have simply left the scene.
- Dog owners should be responsible for their pet's actions.
- I would support this so that more ignorance about dogs and Pitbulls in particular is not spread. If the owner is onsite the reason for the dog bite, what provoked the animal and the past treatment of the animal can be addressed.
- However, in most cases from my experiences, often the animal only bites due to being provoked, more than once, by untrained animals & inexperienced people. Also, to be around animals there are proper ways to approach animals & to pet them, etc. I consistently see people especially children, approach animals incorrectly. This is not the child's fault or the animal's fault in any regard, it is the parents/guardians fault. Therefore, I feel that an animal should NOT undergo any ramifications if it bites another after being provoked or threatened by another. If an animal immediately attacks & bites due to being provoked, that particular animal simply should not be around animals or people. But once again, this is often not the case & must be taken into strong consideration.
- Take responsibility for your actions. No different than a car collision.



- Information needs to be shared. If not in person, a call from the victim or assault dog owner needs to be made.
- This is common sense. Same as a hit and run.
- You need to be a good responsible dog owner. When you aren't bad things happen. Need to take responsibility and get proper training to train your dog if needed.
- If a dog bites I would be surprised that there is not a rule in place that compels someone to provide their contact information. If there is a discrepancy I would expect a bylaw officer attend, the same as police officer would attend in a car accident if there is a discrepancy.
- A dog bite may pose a health hazard beyond merely just injury (ie transmission of disease). The owner would be negligent to leave a scene in which their dog has injured someone and poses a hazard to health or safety. It should also be recorded on file when a dog bites someone in public.
- "Un my experience it has been smaller dogs that bite and attack other dogs.
- Its small dogs that are not trained by owners because they are small and if all owners had to stay we would have proof to support this"
- No different than an accident or incident with vehicles or if any issue occurred that required enforcement.
- Sharing information and assessing seriousness is important. Waiting to talk to enforcement only if immediate medical attention is required.
- Responsibility should lie with all dog owners to ensure dog bites are addressed, but only serious bites should warrant an enforcement officer.
- This is absolutely necessary so that the dog's veterinary status (rabies in particular) can be determined.
- If a dog i jury occurs it should be on the owner to stick around an explain the situation
- The owner needs to start taking more responsibility for their dogs. No dog should ever be put down due to an incident like biting. Dogs don't understand right and wrong, they live off of instinct and by what their owners teach them whats okay. Maybe people will smarten up and take more responsibility if the penalties were harsher for the humans and not the animals.
- Duh
- as long as it is safe for them to remain on site. I believe if you are a responsible owner you would remain. Leaving would be like leaving the scene of an accident.
- The owner should be held accountable and not have the opportunity to hide and therefore further endangering other people or animals.
- It's important to have accountability for dog owners to not run away, and to enact major fines for breaching this rule. This rule should also apply to cat owners.
- They should not be leaving the scene! There are to many people who run and do not take responsibility. They need to get the dog under control or put the dog in a car and stay!
- If severe it's important such as if a dog or person is injured and needs medical attention
- "yes if a dog bites a person. Depending on the severity of the bite
- No if the dog bits an animal again depending on the severity of the bite"



- Poor behaviour in dogs is always related to poor ownership. Owners just be made responsible for the actions of their animals, regardless of breed or animal type. Fines for poor ownership should be introduced and stuffer penalties for abuse causing animals to be dangerous to others.
 - If the bite needs treatment the owner can provide helpful info. Vaccines etc...
 - The owner of the dog should be held responsible for the dog's actions. The enforcement officer needs to have the contact info for follow up.
 - Owners need to take and accept responsibility for their dogs. Don't blame the dog for an u educated owner.
 - There are two sides to every story so the full picture should be known. People who don't stay are irresponsible it's like leaving the scene of an accident
 - For documentation purposes
 - of course to exchange information, i want the officers to question the owners as to why the dog would bite! EX poor training, animal abuse! i beleive owners need to be held responsbile for this
 - Obviously dont want people taking off after an incident
 - Just like a car accident, the dog owner and people involved should remain on scene until a police report can be made.
 - When you are responsible for an injured person, you should always stay and help!
 - If your dog bites a person or animal, there may be medical costs involved. If charges are involved the owner needs to provide information to bylaw/ police about the incident.
 - Do agree with it to an extent, if the dog has attacked a person/animal it's not like a car crash that's over and done with...there could be a secondary attack if the dog is anxious or overly agressive but I do agree that the owner should be held accountable.
 - I support it , so they take responsibility for what happened and exchange information if needed.
 - Taking responsibility for your pet is basic dog owner rules.
 - Their dog, their responsibility. Therefore, their responsibility to the injured party(s).
 - Same as we do with most other accidents requiring emergency services
 - "If their dog is not properly trained, or if the bitten person provoked the attack, it should be recorded and dealt with. If the dog has a history of attacking, they have not been correctly trained and that should be dealt with, and options provided (such as obedience classes, counselling for the owner, etc).
-
- If serious damage has been done to the bitten person, the owner should also cover the costs."
 - The owner should own up to their dogs mistake. Also it is the owners fault should the dog bite someone else and they should be held accountable. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners
 - Owner must comply with what is needed at an incident, to assist the injured and provide info and contact info.
 - They should separate the dogs and get them calm. Then the people should trade info do it can be resolved.



- Yes as long as it includes all dog breeds. Pitbulls and pitbull terriers are the sweetest dogs and there are more that can cause harm towards other people and other dogs.
- Too many escape to avoid dealing with the possible consequences of what happened.
- Way to many give false info or take off, however I personally don't agree with dog parks either as its usually the ignorant owners that are the cause of the issue.
- Sounds like something a responsible pet owner should do regardless of the type of pet.
- I am surprised this isn't a rule now. It's terrifying to think owners could just walk away after an incident!
- Just like car accident .
- because, like a car accident there could be damages and costs incurred from the attack, information should be exchanged incase there are injuries
- .
- People should be held accountable for their pets actions.
- Owner needs to be responsible for damages by their pet.
- only if it draws blood. Dogs nip when they play.
- It helps if the dog owner is there to fight for their dog in the case of a bite. Again, circumstances could mean the victim was teasing, abusing, harassing or otherwise provoking the dog.
- I believe they should have to stay so that proper documentation could be made. The only reason I believe they should leave is if the situation is not controlled and would cause more danger then good. If you are unable to control your animal or more harm could be done by waiting then I believe it should be okay to return the dog to the home.
- Because it may not of been the dogs fault, it could of been attacked by another dog, or bothered by another person. I believe they should stay to explain the situation so you hear both sides of the story
- If your dog bites someone of course it's the correct thing to do to stay at the scene. Dog owners should video every encounter as well.
- A crime/offence has been committed leaving the scene is no different than hit and run vehicle offence, they are responsible for property or personal injury. If the owner felt it was best to remove their agitated dog from the area he/she should identify themselves first or contact authorities when they reach their home.
- Owners need to be held liable for the actions of their dogs. They need to be punished if their animals harm others.
- If a dog bite happens it needs to be looked into. Not only for the injured but for the dog, sometimes it isn't the dog that is wrong.
- I was bitten last year by a dog who was on leash as i was running on the sidewalk...I informed them that i would be reporting them and that i required their information. However, i did not want to hang out waiting for an enforcement officer as my leg as bleeding everywhere, and i was somewhat in shock. I don't think the victim of the bite should necessarily have to wait at the scene.
- Dog owners must take responsibility for the actions of their dog. If an incident occurs involving their dog, the should have to provide contact information to the other person and/or enforcement office - similar to minor traffic collisions.



- If your dog bites anyone of course you need to stay and make sure everyone is okay ect
- I think it is important to acknowledge responsibility and cooperate with the city following an attack.
- Most dash. You don't catch them until they get caught by repeat actions .
- it is important to keep track of owners who have a dog involved in a bite incident
- Yes every dog that bites needs to be held accountable regardless of the breed. If it was a chihuahua the owner should stay just as much as a Great Dane or a German shepherd.
- Yes. Because they need to be held accountable for the situation at hand. Not to mention that you'll find that most who end up in this situation aren't bully breeds.
- Sounds like common sense.... didn't they have to already?
- So that they can be held accountable, have their dog/s go on record and enable the enforcement officer to follow up on any restrictions imposed
- The victim should have contact info in case there are any treatments required
- Absolutely support this. Pet owners should be responsible for their dogs actions.
- Most times it's the owners fault for not training the dog so it should be owners responsibility to own up
- putting a claim through insurance for a dog bite will be difficult without the owner information, and requiring the owner to stick around makes sense.
- It's only fair. If a dog attacks another dog it's destruction of private property which is against the law.
- Owners must be accountable for the conduct of their dogs.
- Dog owners should be responsible for their dog, regardless of breed. Small dogs included.
- They need to hear both sides of the story.
- need to hear both sides of the story. Both parties should remain wher the incident happened
- Both sides of the story should be recorded.
- The owner should provide information in the event of injury (animal history including health)
- If it was a serious bite I would definitely think that the owner should stay at the scene and/or help contact medical attention if necessary. However, if the animal is acting aggressively, it likely should be secured or removed from the scene in a timely manner which may mean temporarily leaving the scene.
- Yes
- Yes they should remain to give information
- To provide proof of vaccinations and to ensure all details surrounding the incident be reported
- Saves time trying to track down the owner to get relevant information.
- You won't get that if you start blaming one BREED for all of your bites/incidentcs. If I am a pitbull owner and an incident happens, I will most likely flee knowing you will falsely accuse my dog and treat him as a monster since you are keen to ban them. Responsible ownership and equal treatment of dogs or no one will respect you and your laws. There are many incidents where the larger dog is not at fault but because of their size there is a bias. All pet owners have a responsibility. If my large breed can't run around the city off leash neither can your Pomeranian! It's not cute either way.
- Very important to show that the dog owner shows responsibility.



- Its part of being a responsible pet owner
- It's no different than a hit-and-run with a vehicle. The property owner (car vs dog) is required to remain and provide information for the civil consequences for their lack of control of said property.
- Owner should help cover fees associated with bills from injuries that may occur to opposite party
- There could be injury and the dog should be assessed
- Its just like a car accident. As long as no one or pet needs urgent care, everyone should stay until enforcement arrives.
- I thought that already required
- Just like a car accident. Makes sense. If not at the scene you need to provide follow up information at the very least.
- Yes the owner should remain present to share information. However, the officer should be arriving on scene with the understanding that dog bites happen for a variety of reasons - most often fear and not outright aggression.
- If a dog, any dog bites or attacks a person, the owner should be responsible for the proper procedures to ensure that the person is healed properly. The dog should be reprimanded according to owners choice.
- The owner or caretaker of the dog (in the case of someone else besides the owner taking care of the dog) should be held accountable for the dog's behaviour.
- i say yes if something sevre happened, all dogs nip at other dogs while playing, DO NOT blow your petty ideas of serve dog bites out of proportion
- none required.
- The person or dog bitten should be able to contact the owner in regard to issues caused by the dog or medical expenses which the owner should pay.
- Treat it like an auto accident. Owners must stay on scene to fill out an incident report.
- It is the owner's responsibility for keeping their dog in line and making sure that everyone's in it's surroundings is safe.
- Yes information should be shared, but if there is a significant injury's, the health of person or animal should take priority.
- I have been bitten by off-leash dogs in a city park and had no recourse due to the owner leaving the scene.
- Speaking with the owner could give a general sense as to how they treat their pet/if this has happened before.
- Further checks need to be made to the home after the incident and also a log to make sure it doesn't happen again
- Many times the owner leaves, they should be held accountable
- The owner of an offending dog should be held accountable. This is analogous to why we have hit and run laws.
- It's the right thing to do. No different than a car accident.
- If the owners stay the at the scene it can easily be determined what happened.



- If my child was bitten by a dog I would like the owner of the dog to be present when I am talking to the enforcement officer.
- Both sides should be allowed to state their case, it's easy to twist facts or gain sympathy for your side if it's being told one-sided.
- Owners should take responsibility for their dog. It is not the dogs fault. Pitbulls should not be discriminated because they have a bad name, it's just that the owners do not know how to train their dog.
- It is much easier to get a hold of the owner. Witness the state of the dog shortly after the scene. And hear both sides of the story.
- Too many Pit and Runs by irresponsible Pit bull owners. Which most are.
- This makes sense as many people, when the are panicking, do not know the right questions to ask in order to get in contact with the offending dogs owner.
- I understand a situation can get heated and perhaps the animal needs to be taken home or placed in the car, so maybe the understanding that an owner would return
- We need to be able to identify the dog and owner
- If they leave the site, how would they be held accountable? If they leave the scene and this is a rule, Costa associated with having to find this person could be recovered through fines.
- Yes, if severe and requires medical intervention.
- All owners should be held responsible for their animals or they should not be allowed to have any.
- There are always two sides of a story. Too often, a dog is automatically presumed to be at fault. I have witnessed incidents were dogs have been approached even against the owner's wishes.
- The owner needs to be present as they are the ones that have trained their animal. The breed of the dog is not the issue, ANY breed can be involved in these incidents. It is how the breed is trained by their OWNER
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for the damages their dogs do.
- They should be there to explain their side of the story, and be liable if it was in fact their fault.
- It should be treated as a hit and run type incident if your dog bites someone and you take off from the area.
- I do feel it's important to share their information but it may be better to remove the dog from the situation asap and then come back rather than keep the dog in the situation that is already intense.
- People need to be responsible for their animals
- ALL involved parties should share contact information and speak with enforcement officers as necessary.
- Only to ensure dog is healthy and up to date on all vaccinations. Not to apprehend to dog.
- It's no different than a vehicle collision. The owner must be present to exchange contact information.
- Responsibility for all dog owners. Not focused on a breed or appearance.
- Is this seriously not currently required? People are just allowed to run off with their dogs that just bit someone?



- It's like a car accident, you must share info but if the owner is afraid of you taking away their dogs then it makes sense why they are leaving.
- If I cause an accident (e.g. a hit and run), I'm required to stay at the scene so if someone's dog bites a person or animal, it should be the same -- stay and deal with the consequences.
- Unless the owner must secure the dog to prevent further injuries.
- To take responsibility for their dogs behaviour.
- This way hopefully all the facts are present and no one can spin tales. Depending on the situation I do believe some people should be responsible for vets bills and the like.
- It's common sense.
- There was an accident. Yes the owner should have to wait on scene and not flee.
- It's called responsible pet ownership
- You wouldn't leave a hit and run.. same idea
- The pet owner has the responsibility of ensure the authorities are provided correct details of the incident whether it was accidental or not, keep in mind most bites are due to human error and the owner should have the right to be heard vs a dog being found instantly at fault.. You don't flee the scene of a vehicular accident even though your not at fault so same rules should apply.
- The owner must be held accountable for his/her dog's actions.
- However, this may not be practicable in cases where remaining at the scene may cause an escalation of aggression.
- Too often Pet owners quickly leave the scene of an incident where their animal had injured another pet or person; resulting in no recourse for the victim. There should be strict fines/charges related to leaving the scene following an attack caused by their animal.
- Make sure people are held responsible and bites are on record
- Not all dog aggression is more than a one time occurrence but it's important for owners to stay at the scene and be responsible for the follow up
- This is necessary as some owners may flea the scene. Vet bills should be paid by the attackers owners.
- Yes because that reflects responsible pet ownership
- Common sense.
- You'd never be allowed to leave the scene of an accident without leaving information or speaking with police. The same should apply for animal incidents.
- There should be penalties if the owner leaves the scene without sharing information or talking with an officer.
- Accountability is important, but also getting both sides of the story is important. Hearing the situation from 2 perspectives can go a long way. This would also be an opportunity for education and promoting resources for the owner to look into.
- Because this will make the owners accountable. Most peoples dog bite other dogs and the owners leave the scene and give no information



- It seems proper to have the owner of an animal that attacks or injures someone to be there to represent the animal in question. It also shows responsibility for their animals actions and what the owner should be held accountable for.
- The owner should be responsible for the care, control and behavior of their pet and any consequence of an incident. Especially vet bills if their pet causes harm to another.
- The cases of the offending dog's owner simply walking away are increasing. Scofflaws must be held responsible.
- It is the owner's responsibility for any actions of their dog and they should be liable for that. With that being said the most important thing is cor the owner to make sure they're dog is safe to be around other people in public but this should not be restricted to dog ONLY such as pitbulls. Any dog should follow this law including this like chihuahua's.
- The dog owner needs to be responsible for their pets actions. Contact information should be required so this dog will be flagged as having an incident.
- You should always stay at the scene, at least till help arrives
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their dog, so they should remain present at the scene. It's a form of assault.
- Responsibility for the pet is essential.
- "Multiple" reports need to be made to designate the dog as a nuisance, as stated in an above question, so each incident must be reported properly.
- I think it is self explanatory. It is responsible ownership. Simply.
- Sometimes the behavior of the dog will not warrant staying at the scene -but address info should be given to contact later
- They need to be responsible and have empathy for the animal and other owner. So you can also get both sides of the story. But as long as the biting dog is not seized yet from owner!
- As long as it doesn't take too long for the officer to get there.
- I feel this should be common curtesy
- Unless it was heated and the person was in danger of staying. As long as they immediately contacted the authorities and left their info, that would suffice.
- I support this so long as this is engaged as a level approached situation. If there are mitigating circumstances that lead to the attack (eg provoking the animal through teasing, etc) then neither the dog nor owner should be punished for first time offenses. If the animal becomes a "nuisance" with multiple events then this would come into play as well.
- Bites can be deadly and owners need to take responsibility. Also adding in a comment from above, there is no scientific proof that pitbulls are any more dangerous than other breeds.
- The person should stay at the site just like a car accident or any other type of accident
- The owner is liable for their dogs actions, since they are the ones training it
- The owner is responsible for their animal. Just like a driver is responsible for their car in an accident. Fining bad owner behaviours (leaving the scene) will lead to more responsible owners.
- It is part of being a responsible pet owner, alongside the duties of a driver involved in an accident. Additionally, it would save bylaw officers the trouble of trying to identify the person and track them



down. Derelict owners should not be allowed to escape responsibility simply by leaving the scene and disappearing. It should be remembered that there may also be civil action as a result, and the victim should be given every opportunity to identify the other party.

- Too many people leaving the scene and not taking responsibility for their dog.
- Too many irresponsible dog owners out there hold them accountable
- It's just like a car accident. You're responsible for damage.
- Just like a hit and run, when any damage has been done to a human or pet, by a dog, the owner should be held responsible.
- Small dog bites that do not cause a lot of harm can be dismissed but anything that may need stitches should be forced to stay at the scene
- Sometimes dogs bite because other [removed] dogs aren't being controlled properly.
- yes....if the bitten party wants the owner of the biting dog to remain.
- By staying at the scene, the owner would take responsibility for the incident
- Because if they don't they are an absolute scumbag.
- It is the owners that must be held accountable for their animal. Don't blame the dog, hold owners accountable.
- Owners often run away with the animal and hide it from law enforcement officers.
- The owner of the offending animal needs to take financial responsibility for any medical expenses for an animal or a human affected
- Otherwise they might never be located & the dog will do it again.
- The owner is at fault and leaving the scene would be like a hit and run. They would be fleeing a scene.
- for mild infractions an exchange of information similar to a fender bender is sufficient but for more severe incidents would require an enforcement officer
- Situation needs explanation on how incident happened
- Most of the most serious dog bite incidents that have been reported recently involved owners who left the scene
- If the owner walks away with their dog, fines, need to muzzle/train or tribunal cannot take place.
- It is surprising that this isn't already a rule.
- Your pet is your responsibility. If there is an incident where there is a bite or attack, the owner should ABSOLUTELY have to speak with the enforcement officer and be held accountable.
- The human needs to be held accountable for the animal's actions. Animals do not have a voice and rely on their humans for direction. Bad animal owners need to be held accountable. This bylaw would help that.
- An offense has occurred, and this is no different than leaving the scene of a traffic accident
- I believe that dogs do not bite without cause. All possible reasons should be taken into consideration (ie teasing, leash aggression if more than one dog involved, abuse, and uncontrolled children)
- Owner should be charged with acts committed by their animals



- Unless it is too difficult to contain the dog. The person MUST provide their contact info, to the injured parties/ dog owners, so that there can be follow-up, as there would be in a traffic accident.
- It's common courtesy if the injury is significant
- They need to take responsibility for their dogs actions and so that the officer can evaluate the situation!
- Same rationale as in car accidents.
- Dog owners need to be responsible to the behaviour of their dog(s); this includes acting responsibly after any incident, such as a dog bite.
- No different from fleeing an accident
- This is just plain responsible dog ownership.
- the enforcement officer should be able to assess the owner / dog that is involved in the incident.
- Same as the scene of an accident in this case
- I think that's the way to go
- I believe that many times the owner of a dog that has bitten someone may give the other owner false contact information in order to avoid paying for veterinary bills.
- how else can enforcement measures be implemented and medical contact in case if rabies etc
- It is important to know if an incident like this has happened before. From there, you can eliminate repeat offenders and owners who have not given the dog a proper upbringing, training etc...
- Should be treated the same as a car accident.
- I think it's extremely fair for the owner of the animal to give an enforcement officer their side of the story, it can not be biased though. If you have an officer that hates dogs, they will immediately say it's the dogs fault. Look at the "victim". Were they provoking the animal?
- Yes AS LONG AS it is safe to do so. If the dog in question needs to be restrained then remaining in the situation could further aggravate a situation. If it is not safe or the dog is overstimulated, then safety first, as well as calming the animal so the handlers can discuss matters without the distraction of managing an overstimulated, hyper reactive dog
- Same as a vehicular accident. In case of criminal proceedings, the names of the parties involved need to be available.
- Dog owners should be held responsible for the behaviour of their dog.
- police show be able to say if the bite was the dog or the owners fault, as dogs are only as good as they are trained.
- It forces owner to acknowledge their dog bit someone/dog. Very often these owners don't acknowledge their dog is dangerous. By taking this action it tells everyone the city that we are serious about dangerous dogs.
- It's no different than a car accident. Information should always be exchanged.
- I have seen aggressive dog owners simply walk away when their dog bites and has attacked other dogs. Making it mandatory they have to stay will help the victims seek justice.
- It's the same thing as if your child gets involved in a fight or altercation the parents would want to share information and make sure everything is okay . Situations should be able to be controlled though with proper public training on how to approach dogs and never leaving children unattended



- Owners should take responsibility for their pets actions.
- There are no consequences if someone's dog can attack then they can just leave
- I was attacked by a dog this year. The person responsible for the dog at the time was not the owner. There should be more responsibility for pet owners.
- That is just general decency
- It's important to keep everyone safe
- Why shouldn't an owner have to stay and be held responsible
- They do it for car accidents so animal accidents makes sense
- "Common sense
- Responsible thing to do."
- Same as a car accident. Take responsibility for your actions and the actions of the animal in your care.
- Yes, all dog owners should be held accountable for their dogs actions including any vet or medical bills that might result for an altercation. Any dog owner should be required to stick around after an altercation until either both parties have any information they require and are happy with the outcome or enforcement officers have come and cleared the scene.
- The dog owner should be responsible
- Yes, provided that the dog owner or dog breed is not discriminated against.
- once they leave its hard to track them down
- This was an incident if an animal bites a person or animal this needs to be worked out so it does not happen again. Be proactive.
- If your dog bite somebody you have to wait for the authorities if the dog is on private property and somebody comes on the property and gets bit that's too bad stay off the private property
- The dog owner of the animal should remain at the scene due to the unknown severity of the bite and injuries as well as the expenses that may be involved. If a dog owner leaves the scene they take no responsibility and there is no penalties or measures put in place to ensure it doesn't happen again.
- My dog was attacked at the dog park by a pitbull. The owner wouldn't not speak to us and tried to continue walking his dogs through the park. A bystander called the police.
- I completely support any new measures to hold people accountable for their dangerous dog's behaviour. My dogs were the victims of bylaw case A18-067515 (unprovoked Pitbull attack on two small dogs), and the owners of the offending dog were never held accountable due to the fact they dropped the dog off at Fish Creek Pet Hospital and claimed that it was a stray. Bylaw was not able to prove ownership of the dog, and because of that I was never able to receive financial recompense via legal means for my vet bills that totalled \$17,500. This was the second incident of a pitbull attack by a dog that lived at the same address, and witnesses came forward to identify the dog and declare that the dog had been living at the residence for several months.
- Pet owners need to be responsible for their pets actions, regardless of breed. I guess I assumed it was already a law but absolutely if a dog bites someone or another dog that person needs to be responsible for it. I don't know if waiting at the scene is the best option, probably best to remove the dog from the environment, but information needs to be exchanged and bylaw officers need to be



involved. I could understand wanting to take the dog home right away but they should have to report it that day.

- good luck enforcing that... hey maybe you can make more cash from an incident if you create as many bylaws as possible. Owners are bound to break more than one... heck there should be a bylaw for not having a phone on the person.. or not wearing the right color... or maybe even the right color of their skin. Isn't this how we will be basing our opinions now?
- With bites to humans
- The person who owns the dog needs to be responsible for the dog if an incident occurs, they should not be able to just walk away.
- i have been bit and no one stays and had to go on rabies alert. they should stay
- The owner must assume responsibility for their dog's violent actions.
- If there is no bylaw to the effect, owners of dogs that have just attacked or bitten would feel free to walk away. Leaving the onus of reparation to the victim to track down their attacker. That's not fair
- Dog owners are responsible for the dog(s) they own (which means it is the PERSON who is responsible for the dog's bad behavior, not the dog). So if the dog bites a person or another dog, the owner should be legally responsible for staying at the scene to give contact information. Many dog owners don't have insurance, so if a poorly trained dog owner allows their animal to be in a situation (generally off leash) where they could become aggressive with people or other dogs, they should be legally responsible for the medical bills required to treat the victim person/dog, including long term physiotherapy or mental health consulting. There is a reason why it's against the law to flee from the scene of a car accident/incident.
- It should be set up similar to a car accident. Provide contact information and fill out a report at the Police station or on-line.
- Yes the owner should have to remain on the scene and provide contact information - however if the dog is aggressive its best to remove the dog from the scene and leave the information with a witness if possible
- Heres a funny- my Pitbull has been attacked 5 times in the last 8 years-twice at Sue Higgins-twice at Southwood and once in Canyon Meadows-not one person stuck around that had the vicious animal and so far I have spent over 1000.00 on vet bills. BTW-most of the vicious dogs were labs.
- A lot of people who own pit bulls/vicious dogs are not capable of properly controlling the animal. The people who own these animals are not equipped with the proper knowledge/skills to own a pet.
- A lot of Dog owners think that they are entitled to let their dog roam free in non off leash parks like playgrounds, green space or fields. Some don't clean after their dog and some just let the dog out at any hour day or night to bark up a storm. I think that if the owner is not responsible for the dog they should be prohibited from having one
- seeing as there is no further explanation for restricting certain breeds I will use this box. Naming Pitbulls as the sole breed as being aggressive is wrong and full of mistruth. Owners need to be held accountable not the dogs. Bad owners equal bad dogs. There should be severe penalties for those found abusing, and creating aggressive dogs what ever breed they are. Muzzling and restricting certain dogs is creating a fear of them that does not need to be perpetuated.



- It is the Owners Responsibility when their dog causes harm and should be held accountable!
- It is near impossible to identify a dog and owner when an offense has occurred . I think any attack with or without blood drawn should require an exchange of ID for further investigation. A major issue however is that my first concern is to get out of there and my dog to safety, so I am not sure how the exchange of information can happen in reality. This is why I think nuisance dogs need to carry a vest or easily readable tag or something to identify them from a few meters away.
- That should already happen but ALMOST ALL dog owners walk away. Instead of taking responsibility for there dogs actions. It's so ridicules I like there should be enforcement.
- Every owner needs to take responsibility for their dogs actions/behavior.
- Due process to determine liability of emotional distress inflicted on the dog by passersby. Dogs 99% of the time will only act defensively against aggressor.
- There are always 2 sides to a story.
- The owner needs to be held responsible not the dog
- A RESPONSIBLE DOG OWNER WOULD REMAIN TO PROVIDE INFORMATION. THIS SHOULD NOT EVEN BE A QUESTION. IRRESPONSIBLE OWNERS ARE THE PEOPLE WHO WILL NOT REMAIN OR PROIVDE INFORMATION.
- I think that if the offending animal is unprovoked, then there should be at the very least an exchange of information. I know that arguments happen more frequently, but if the rules are boldly posted at the dog parks, and maybe video surveillance of the parking lot would help deter bad actors
- Yes. The dog and owner should be identified for further action
- You talk about pitbulls its just a fear mongering created by media,there is never a story on the news of other dog attacks for instants there was a 2 year old attacked in the park by a golden lad a few years ago and is scared for life never made the news,ripped half of his face off,and owner never stayed to talk to nobody!
- People have been known to give false contact information. But if the victim is severely injured (dog or person) they should not be allowed to leave until the contact info can be verified.
- It allows proper management and follow up for potentially problem dogs.
- I believe these problems are caused by the owner in most cases. I also believe the owner needs to go to court to see if they are the problem and not the dog. If found it is the owner at fault .. then the owner is not allowed to own a dog for a number of years ??
- I'm not sure what needs explaining.
- To identify problem animals.
- Only when medical attention is necessary
- I believe a conversation is needed to understand how and why the incident occurred.
- much like any other incident, a dog bite usually requires medical services and having up to date information about the animal for rabies/vaccinations would be helpful.
- I have heard about so many people who run away when their dog attacks someone.
- Dog bites aren't reports enough, should be more recoil if a dog bites a child, especially if it's on the face.
- Regardless which party is at fault, exchanging information is reasonable



- "I have had experiences with small dog bites and the owner will just scoop their dog up and flee the scene attempting to explain "oh he's just small, there's no real danger".
- Make dog training a required. FOR ALL BREEDS"
- Fundamentally this is not different from requiring someone to remain on scene if involved in an accident.
- Any incident that ends with an injury should require all parties involved to stay at the scene to provide a statement to law enforcement. This protects both parties from the other giving false witness
- In 100% of my personal interactions with "nuisance" dogs, the owners are a nuisance themselves and poorly trained their pet.
- If you're a dog owner you are responsible for the actions of your dog and should make sure things are dealt with properly.
- They need to give their information and make sure the person/animal is ok , depending on how the incident happened they should also be responsible for the vet bill or a portion of it.
- However, enforcement actions should follow clearly established investigation and enforcement activities. The dogs should not be seized unless there is a clear danger to public.
- Yes - pet owners should be held responsible for harms that their pet may inflict on another person or animal.
- Some dog owners leave the scene and do not want to be reliable to the action of their dog.
- how else do u contact owner if there are further complications..following the incident
- No responsible dog owner would dream of leaving if their dog bit. Anyone wanting to leave has probably had other issues and they need help to ensure it doesn't happen again.
- The focus on lot bill like breeds is ill informed. While pit bulls used to be bred for fighting and attractive to owners wishing to look tough, this has changed dramatically. We walk twice a day in several off leash parks and have not encountered an aggressive put bull in over 10 years in fact they are generally one of the sweetest breeds
- This is only fair, much like a car accident.
- Owner is responsible explaining the dog's behaviour, as long as they are not putting themselves in danger by staying at the scene.
- The current law states that the dog is an object owned by an owner, therefore the owner must take full responsibility for the animal.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs!!!!
- Any animal attack should be handled this way not just breed specific.
- If a dog bites, it would be considered a nuisance and might bite again. If the owner leaves, then it would mean the dog would not be apprehended.
- they are responsible for their animals actions
- Dogs of all sizes and breeds can cause serious physical and psychological damage when they attack. Ordinates and bylaws should be centred around responsible dog ownership, education and accountability.



- If a dog bites then statements should be taken and the responsible party should be involved in payment.
- I believe the responsibility of the dogs behavior lies solely with the owner, and as such requires disciplinary action.
- until damage is assessed, they should not leave. A lot of small dog owners seem to think the damage inflicted is minor, so they don't need to be responsible
- Yes, the dog owner should remain at the scene of an incident when their dog bites or attacks another individual. Often, the problem is only made worse and more traumatic for the victim(s) and the dog itself when the person flees. For example, when an individual is involved in a hit and run vehicle accident, and flees, they are charged with an additional crime when they leave the scene. An incident with a dog should be no different. A dog owner must be equally responsible for their dog as they are their vehicle, if not more so.
- none needed
- The owner is responsible for all costs incurred by those bite by the victims.
- Although, I don't believe that they will stay onsite. I believe that if my dog and I were involved in an incident, that I could take a picture of a drivers license, plate or other "official" paperwork.
- Dog bites are a dirty bite and need to be seen by a vet in some cases and if there is blood present then yes information needs to be shared to have the guilty dog owner pay the vet expenses if any are incurred.
- This is like any other scene of an accident so I feel it is appropriate that they wait to speak to enforcement
- You are responsible for your pet...
- It should be clear that the dog owner is only required to share their contact information with an enforcement officer, and that their contact information will NOT be shared with the other person. The other person may use the dog owner's contact information for nefarious purposes and, having to work with an enforcement officer for any necessary resolution (e.g. vet bills over and above a basic visit), it should reduce the chances that the other person lies to cause harm to the dog and/or its owner. The situations in which it would be deemed "necessary" should be clearly defined.
- However if the bi-law officer is delayed over 2 hours a dog needs to get water and rest and owner must produce ID.
- There should be a review of the situatio
- I think you should get each others information and take statements as to what happened because many dog bites are provoked whether it is peoples lack of knowledge on how to properly approach dogs or read their body language. I think it is also important to ensure the dog is up to date on all vaccines.
- The owner is responsible . A dog biting / attacking someone is Assault , by extension
- This should be treated like any other case of assault.
- Accidents happen and I would want to make sure that the owner is heard



- dogs biting is not okay! It should be treated like a car accident. The owner should be responsible for any damages the animal has caused and proper action should be taken for ensuring it doesn't happen again.
- I would want to be able to contact the owner if I/my dog contacted an infection from the bite.
- Some dog owners don't take responsibility for their dogs' actions, owners need to remain in the scene and share contact information
- Once dog attacked me and owner ran away
- It is the responsible thing to do when your animal has injured someone else
- Information should be shared.
- This might not be the first time a dog has bitten and each time should be recorded with the appropriate authority
- The owner should be taking responsibility for their dogs actions, and if medical is needed they should have to pay for it (in the case of another animal).
- Something or someone could be harmed and bi responsibility lies on the bad owners shoulders. They should have to deal with the consequences.
- Without this important first step, nothing else is likely to follow, i.e. an incident can only be acted on if the people and pets involved are able to be identified.
- I feel it would be necessary to have this information for instances where there may be a concern of rabies and for onsite evaluation of the dog and owners involvement.
- Yes, remaining at the scene would be the responsible thing to do. Unless they are in danger of course.
- I think with all our technology, and data collection at our finger-tips this is a absolute must, and a indication of the pet owners duty.....
- Your dog bit someone, stay there for the reporting.
- Also ensures proper health information is shared and tracked so the right info is provided to healthcare providers in order to prevent extra treatments for the human involved to to a lack of understanding of dogs history.
- If your dog bites another person or animal, you as the owner are responsible to ensure the safety of both your dog and the person or animal it bit. It's like driving a car and causing damage and fleeing the scene. To have a pet is to be responsible for them as you would a child.
- There are several owners who will simply leave when their dog causes damage. Owners need to be educated as to properly train and handle their dogs, especially if they have a bite history
- Too many people don't take responsibility when their dog bites. They should have to.
- This is kind of the same as a car accident. If a bite is severe enough to require medical attention beyond the average first-aid kit, then yes all involved parties should remain and speak to authorities. Again, this is breed-irrelevant.
- Information should be traded just as it would be for a car accident. However, dogs should not be taken away and held hostage unless the person has been attacked to a fatality.
- The owners need to be held accountable for the behavior of the dog. The animals are exactly that, beasts; dogs don't understand how their reaction to something may be perceived as "problematic"



and respond the only ways they can. Humans need to be in control and responsible for their pets behavior and as such should have consequences for any negligence as pet owners.

- There are two sides and the owner needs to explain - what if it was in response to being attacked by another dog?
- Its called being a responsible pet owner.
- Just like a car accident.. you must accept responsibility
- The owner of the dog should be required to remain at the scene of the incident until the dog is put down (which should be done immediately).
- Any responsible dog owner should stay around and have the chance to explain the situation that has happened. Without fear their dog will be automatically taken from them .
- Like any incident, the parties should exchange information in case medical bills need to be dealt with or if it something the dog has done multiple times before. it needs to be dealt with accordingly. Justly but accordingly.
- Similar to leaving the scene of an accident
- Yes because if the animal is injured id want them to pay my vet bill
- people sometimes have poorly trained and disciplined dogs. They must be held accountable for their pets.
- If ANY dog bites someone the owner should have to stay and deal with it just as if they would if they hit someone's car. If vet bills are needed the owner of the accused dog should have to pay for damages their dog causes.
- It's the owners responsibility to ensure whatever damage done by their pet is looked after. If another being is injured by their dog, they should tend to that injury until further assistance can be given. In addition, they must own up to their dogs poor behaviour (provided the bite was not provoked) and reprimand it as they see fit.
- Just like at a scene of an accident, they should have to stay! IF they do not maybe a fine or something. I feel like those that would stay would care enough to get to the bottom of the incident.
- This is not only basic human decency but also basic owner responsibility: the dog can't deal with these kinds of matters!
- The dog is there responsibility therefore should be there to deal with the concerns regarding there dog & consequences of the dogs actions.
- The dog owner is the responsible party. Why would they possibly not be required to do so???
- Owners need to be held accountable for their pets and should have to pay for vet care if needed if their dog was the instigator and speaking as a vet tech myself we need rabies vaccine status of the offender to better help person or pet that's been bit
- of course the dog owner should be there, but sometimes the dog is running loose
- Owners should take responsibility for their dogs, but should also have an opportunity to state their side of the incident.
- If the victim or dog victims owner requests that the perpetrator stay to talk to the enforcement officer. If they don't then they can leave the scene.
- Responsible pet ownership.....duh



- The human is responsible for the animals behaviour. Any damage or injury should be heavily fined and possibly the dog should be removed to be rehabilitated.
- Yes but only if that person feels no imminent threat from the dipshit that got themselves bit.
- If an animal bit my leashed no or unleashed dog at a park, I would love to hold the owner accountable and a third NON BIASED party come and intervene and decide how to proceed fairly.
- Need contact info to confirm that dog is vaccinated against rabies.
- Bit and run = Hit and run, can't just flee the scene of an incident.
- But only if this can be done safely. In some situations, the best thing might be to remove the biting animal from the scene immediately. The owner should still attempt to leave identification behind.
- Answer questions and be accountable
- It is important to track these incidents.
- It is important to stay at the scene of an incident when you are directly involved
- Having children walk a dog is not responsible. Also the owner has the other side of the story. The person/dog bit is always going to say it's the others fault. Parents need to teach children to respect animals. You cannot hit or pull on animals....otherwise you may get bit.
- It's important to hear "both sides" of what lead up to the incident. It's also important to identify repeat offending pet owners.
- As long as the dog and dog bite victim are able to be in a safe place... Victim isn't going to want you "hang around" the dog who just hurt them.
- There needs to be accountability on the part of the owner. People should not be left with medical bills for themselves or their pet. Not having to remain at the scene is like a hit and run. This is regardless of dog size or breed.
- Please consider children under the age of 12 not being allowed to enter off leash parks. I have witnessed numerous times, young toddlers with their parents at the off leash parks and the toddler eating snacks! Cheese in the toddlers hands! This is absolutely setting dogs up for failure by the child being on the ground, eating a snack. Not fair to the dog or the child.
- Unless medical attention is required then they should be able to leave to do that and vets should notify by law like hospitals would notify officials if someone showed up with a gun shot wound
- I think the officer needs to hear both sides of the story and that person needs to understand the consequences immediately.
- Similar to an accident.
- Owners are responsible for the damages their pets cause. As such, an owner should not be allowed to "hit and run" a scene of a dog attack.
- How else would the victim or owner of the victim get the information about the responsible party for health and insurance purposes?
- They need to be accountable for their pets actions ; and or defend their pets actions...ie observed animal abuse towards said pet
- Absolutely! And question the owner to see if they properly trained/restrained their dog. Put more ownership on the dogs owner as opposed to the dog.
- Accountability....



- "It is always the owner's responsibility to ensure their dog is safe in public. If your dog bites someone you are responsible and should secure your dog away from the victim, help the victim as much as you can until the authorities arrive. If it's a fight between two dogs or an outright attack from one dog on another dog you need to separate the dogs, assess the damage to each animal, exchange info and take the injured dog to the vet ASAP. If neither of the dogs are seriously injured I'd say it's up to the parties
- involved what to do about the incident by either reporting it to the authorities or simply moving on with life."
- It helps get all sides of the story. There is one caveat though, where it might be necessary to leave to remove an aggressive animal or seek medical attention. So provision should be made to allow the needs of the animal to be looked after while also not hampering the investigation such as leaving contact information or phoning it in so that they can be reach at a later time.
- In the case that the person who was it was hurt I feel like the owner of the dog who aggressed should be liable to help pay for any health bills
- This is an incident and no different than a car accident. This is part of being a responsible pet owner but these are animals and sometimes it's not as easy as saying it was one dogs fault over another so if people are not penalized for staying that is the answer. People as we know don't always do the right thing.
- In my opinion this is considered an incident and requires both parties involved to claim their personal information for the purpose of follow up and or legal proceedings just like a Motor Vehicle Accident.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their pet
- This shouldn't have to be a rule, but it should be mandatory, and there should be penalties in place for failure to remain at the scene
- Why should the city fine the person? Why does the city benefit? The owner should be required to pay for all bills to the injured.
- Need to know names, address, contact info of offender and the dog who did the biting.
- If it's a vicious and sever bite
- This is similar to an assault on another person so they should be required to stay and explain their side of the events that took place.
- So proper information can be exchanged.
- This is just common sense.
- Separate so the dog does not continue to attack but isolate in the area to allow for proper information to be translated
- These pet owners need to be held responsible for their dog's behavior.
- Remaining at the scene as long as it is safe to do so is part of being a responsible pet owner you are responsible for your pets actions.
- remove the dog from the scene but the owner should be there
- I'd say it would depend on the severity.
- Yes, I strongly support this because a lot of the time the pet owner needs to be educated on RESPONSIBLE pet ownership and how to avoid these potentially harmful or fatal encounters. I also



feel a fine should be issued or at least ordered to attend some sort of information seminar regarding these issues.

- There needs to be reassurance regarding immunization records for both animals and humans
- these people shouldn't get away with walking away it is their responsibility to stay and be present in helping the situation
- If they don't stay, they might get away with it.
- As with anything that causes harm through negligence of another person, the individual who caused harm needs to be held accountable
- As a dog owner myself who owns a large, strong breed (German shepherd cross) I know that the responsibility should land to the owner and not the animal. I take my dog to one on one training sessions, and create very clear boundaries when introducing her to new people, animals, children, etc. If my dog were to bite a person or animal, it is absolutely my responsibility to remain at the scene. It's like any car accident (minor or major), and should be taken seriously.
- If there is a bad car accident you are required to stay on scene I don't see how this is different.
- A dog's behaviour is the owner's responsibility
- much like remaining on scene after an automobile collision
- Absolutely—it is no different than a car accident. Bite and run indicates an irresponsible owner and a vicious/nuisance animal.
- Stay at scene or at least exchange contact information in case person or dog requires medical attention
- If involved in a vehicular incident, you are required to remain at the scene. Why should a dog bite be any different.
- If a dog attacks anyone, the owner of said dog must be available.
- It's like if you hit someone with your car, you should stay and help
- Provides opportunity to explain situation
- Dogs that bite are not a breed issue, it is an owner issue. The owner needs to be accountable.
- This allows the victims to inform doctors of any potential infections that could have been passed from dog to person.
- An owner needs to take responsibility for his/her pet. They should remain at the scene like any crime. The enforcement officer will need to speak to both the owner of the dog and its victim to gather enough facts to make a decision on the next steps.
- If someone leaves the scene of a dog bite, they should be charged criminally.
- If there is damage done, information should be exchanged in case of insurance claims/vet bills etc
- It's important for both parties of an incident to give their perspective of what happened
- Just like any kind of other accident, the parties involved should remain at the scene to exchange information and give statements. It would make sense to apply this to this animal related incidents.
- I support this because the dog owner needs to take responsibility for their pet. There could be conditions when for the owner to stay on site is not feasible - ie extreme weather conditions, if the dog is in distress, if the enforcement officer's response time is a number of hours away.. Having said that the person or owner of the animal bitten needs to stay on site too. If a person needs



medical attention then call an ambulance, i'm not sure who you call if the animal needs medical attention but all parties should be on site. OR, exchange information if it is a minor incident. I guess maybe treat these incidents along the same lines as a traffic accident.

- Just like with car incidents, dog owners should exchange information.
 - Dog owners should be responsible for the behavior of their pet.
 - No different than hit and run. Damage was done owner needs to answer to their/their dogs actions
 - If your dog harms someone then the owner needs to take responsibility and remain at the scene. Is this really a question?
 - Yes, I believe dogs are an extension of our families and should be treated as such. If a child were to punch a kid at a park, parents would be on stand by to comment on the incident and pet parents should be held to that responsibility as well.
 - Not unlike a traffic accident. Wait for the authorities. Otherwise, treat it like a hit and run where the owner faces the charge of leaving the scene.
 - I BELIEVE IF A DOG BITES SOMEONE OR ANOTHER ANIMAL THE OWNER SHE TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACTIONS OF THEIR ANIMALS.
 - Don't make a big scene about it some people will get depressed without a god companion
 - It's morally correct
 - I think that if an animal is involved in something as serious as a bite that the owner should stay and take responsibility for their animals behaviour and speak with an enforcement officer face to face, so they can explain the situation.
 - "The pet is your responsibility, the consequences to their actions are theirs to deal with.
 - The exception being is if the dog cannot be de-escalated and needs to be removed from the situation, in which case the owner of said dog should identify themselves."
 - However, I can't how that would be enforceable, unless the victim were able to identify the owner.
 - Same logic as a car crash. There should be a fine for any owner that flees a scene where their dog caused an injury to another person or animal.
 - It is a safety incident and needs to be documented. Not sure how you would enforce this.
 - Have been bitten by a dog on a run - the owner ignored it and refused contact info. May make it easier if there is a 'rule' in place.
 - If a dog bites a person, I believe it is a small violent crime. I have had friends bitten through two layers of jackets needing many stitches, and the dog owner just walked away.
 - "Like a car accident the owner should wait to give all possible information to an enforcement officer. Officer should not be going into the situation ready to blame the offending dog before gathering all information and hearing the context in which the bite happened
-
- Also since there is no where else to put this, Breed Specific Legislation is ridiculous. Target the owners of nuisance dogs regardless of the breed."



- Same rules should apply as those in a hit and run. If owners leave with their dog after the dog has bitten someone, then consequences should be higher.
- It is the owners who are responsible for how they train their dog, and if they know their dog has aggressive behaviours or is shy of people to accommodate what their dog needs and not bring them anywhere that may cause an incident. It is never the dog's fault. Also asking a nuisance dog to be muzzled is [removed], and absolute crap.
- How is that not already a requirement?
- The owner should be held liable for cost of medical care
- Owners should always be responsible for their dog's behavior.
- It be the same as if you hit something with your vehicle. Your dog did damage and not staying on scene would basically be like a hit and run.
- Exchange info to be followed up later if necessary. Pretty hard to stay at scene if there is a injury as bilateral can't respond quick enough.
- There should be accountability. The owner needs to be examined to determine how their ownership, lack of training, what they need to improve on in order to prevent incidents. They should be set up with a dog trainer for assistance.
- I've been bitten by several dogs in the City of Calgary and by law does nothing other than give warnings out. Please note I have never been bit by a pitbull or a large breed dog I've only been bit by little dogs and even needed stitches from one. So what are the consequences going to be when a little dog bites you and you need medical attention. Does that little dog become a nuisance dog should it be put down should it be put through all the laws and regulations a pitbull or a doberman would. The people at the City of Calgary need to use their brains. There is no such thing as a bad dog only a bad owner. Do not punish a breed punish the stupid people that ruin those breeds. Laws should be there to protect the animals and punish the few that do not follow the rules.
- Dog owners must be held accountable for the actions of their dog, the best way to ensure this is to require them to stay at the scene and speak with an enforcement office directly.
- The owner is directly responsible for the actions of their dogs. The dog should be well controlled and socialized to try and avoid this type of behaviour, but when unforeseen issues occur, the onus of responsibility is with the people to be accountable. BUT, one dog bite should not spell a death sentence for a dog.
- This would be the responsible thing to do albeit I have seen people inappropriately blame a dog for an "attack" when they felt scared even when nothing happened. I have seen many little dogs nip and bite big dogs with the larger dog getting the blame for attacking.
- It should be treated like any other public offense requiring the offender (or owner of the offending animal) to be responsible for their actions.
- Any accident should be handled this way.
- But only if they owner refuses to share his contacts.
- I work for the City and in a role where constituents submit their concerns, and all too often I hear about dog attacks (on other small dogs or people) due to uncontrolled dogs either along a residential street or in a park, and it can be completely avoidable with more safeguards in place. Quite often it is



a pit bull breed of dog. Owners might think their dog is well behaved, but those dogs still possess pit bull instincts. I have owned dogs all my life and have no fear of dogs, but have never really met a pit bull type breed dog that I have enjoyed or trusted.

- I believe contact information should be collected but only for the purpose of investigating the incident.
- This allows for accountability and ensured that both sides of the story are conveyed. It may allow for minimal assumptions to be made on the incident.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions. Bad owners are the issue, not the dogs
- But it may be hard to force that.
- I believe they should get their dog out of the environment ASAP, but should return to the scene to provide information.
- Contact information should be exchanged just like in the case of a car accident
- If a dog bites someone or another animal the information of the dog and owner should be collected to monitor if this is a regular occurrence and further intervention is necessary (it is irresponsible dog owners that cause these issues, not specific dog breeds). This should be true of all dogs regardless of size or breed (I have had my German Shepherd attacked by small dogs frequently and I do not think that they should be exempt just because of their size. I have also been bit my many small dogs to the point blood as been drawn, but because they are small it seems to be acceptable).
- Yes to give information to help cover the victim of the incidents vet or hospital bills
- People need to be 100% responsible for the actions of their pets
- Yes, if it can be done safely - ie if the dog must be removed from the situation and only the owner can handle it, then the owner should give their information at least to people around, so that they can be contacted once the animal is returned to home or car. Or they should be okay with someone (witness or enforcement officer) following r staying with them until they put the dog away and are able to provide Full contact details.
- The owners of the offending dog need to take responsibility. It should be a crime for them to leave the scene of the incident. But many times the owners do not assist the victim and also flee the scene without their dog.
- Would it be okay to crash into someone else's vehicle then drive away? Of course not. If an incident occurs the owner must be compelled to stay at the scene of the incident to provide contact information and statement, regardless of whether any punishment will be levied against the dog owner.
- N/A
- A dogs behaviour is the owners responsibility.
- Other than for injuries that requires medical attention, then yes the owners should remain present. No different than an automobile accident.
- The dog and owner has to be identified to create a register and trending porpoises
- Important to have contact information should further health issues arise or if an insurance claim is processed, much like a vehicle accident protocol.
- Obviously should stay by



- Owners should be held responsible for their pets. Not a breed legislation.
- Sharing information with the other party yes - waiting for enforcement NO.
- The situation should be assessed by both parties involved, police officers, and bystanders.
- As a dog owner I am responsible for said animal, no matter the breed. We require the same for a vehicle accident, why should dog ownership be any different.
- It seems similar to requirements for a car accident so it seems reasonable.
- They should stay and tell their side of the story.
- I think there needs to be clear guidelines on this. Puppies bite and their bites are often harmless but may draw blood. This would be stressful to deal with for the owner of a puppy. No matter the breed. Also the severity of a bite. And the person's behaviour that induced the bite. People try to pet my dog. And she is afraid of people. She never bites anyone. But some people still try to let her regardless. She gets agitated. They are bothering her. In this instance it is their fault.
- "Owners need to be held accountable. Holding specific dog breeds responsible for behaviours taught/incorrectly managed by their owners is discrimination towards that dog breed. All dog breeds have their issues, but it's up to the owners to responsibly handle them.
- Punish the owners not the dog breed"
- It is very important for all animal owners to be accountable and responsible for their pets.
- Support this rule of requiring an owner to stay if an incident occurs. However, authorities must be prepared to respond in a timely manner.
- As someone whose dog was attacked and the owner left scene I was left with a huge vet bill with no sense of responsibility from the other pet owner
- Our dog has been the victim of a nuisance dog and support requiring dog owners to remain at the scene of an incident to ensure all information and testimony are retrieved.
- I believe there should be a requirement for people to have to share their contact info with the victims/enforcement. However they could share it with a witness and leave with their dog so that there isn't the chance of further distress/injury to the dog or victims.
- If necessary yes, but if both owners of the situation can exchange info not meeting an enforcement officer. Then no, I would say it is not required and there for anyone to stay " at the scene".
- Dog owners should be responsible for their pets. If their dog hurts or bites anyone, they need to be held accountable and thus should give their contact information in case it is needed.
- Owners must address issue of aggression and take responsibility for their (the owners) lack of due care and training.
- There are many circumstances that lead to a bite, some of which are not the cause from the biting dog.
- Yes, if the incident is severe they just stay on scene and if necessary press charges.
- they need to be allowed to put their animal away or in a safe place and then return to the scene to exchange information
- If your dog bites someone it's your responsibility.



- Too often owners flee the scene and this attack is not recorded. Victims may be in shock, confused, or embarrassed and are not in a position of power to ask that the other owner stay. A bylaw would be helpful as this is all the victims would have to say “it is the law that you wait here”
- All too often the dog and owner leave the scene and cannot be located.
- most dogs that bite are small breeds and are not taken seriously. Pit bulls and bully breeds are least likely to bite
- The owner of the dog is responsible for the actions of the dog and should be held accountable regardless of breed.
- If a dog bites, their owner should take full responsibility and provide any information necessary to enforcement officers. Most people will flee the scene rather than be held responsible for their dog biting someone.
- Take responsibility, can't leave the scene of an accident
- The owner is responsible for whatever their dog does; so the owner either needs to stay at the scene and restrain their animal Or give proper information on how to get a hold of them if it is not safe for the offending animal to remain at the scene.
- If the owner flies the scene with the dog, the owner should face similar punishment to perhaps, a hit and run or depending on the severity of the bite, manslaughter.
- I think it's necessary.
- I believe this to be similar to a car accident in which the offending party should provide all pertinent information required to rectify the situation.
- If a person is injured, the pet owner has a responsibility to answer for it's acts.
- this is essential otherwise owners will simply take off to avoid the tribunal process.
- Leaving the scene with your dog after an incident is essentially a 'hit and run' should be treated as such
- Irregardless of breed it is the owners responsibility to remain at the scene.
- If the attack is serious enough for enforcement to be involved, then yes. If no injury comes from the bite or only a minor injury is sustained, I do not think enforcement is needed or for the owner to remain on scene.
- Dog bites are assaults against others and should be treated as such.
- I believe that if your dog bites, it has caused damage that may require medical attention. The owner should be responsible for vet bills. Also, I have been bitten by a little terrier dog and when it got infected, the hospital needed to know if the dog had all of its shots. If I didn't have the owners contact information, we couldn't have gotten this information.
- Only during incidents where actual damage has been caused. Many people interpret playing or wrestling as “biting” which is very wrong.
- Dog owners who's dogs bite need to stay to be held accountable for their dogs actions.
- Perhaps they should be permitted to bring the dog to a safe place first?
- Any owner who's dog harms a person or another animal must accept responsibility for their dog's actions.



- I feel this is equivalent to leaving the scene of an accident, and a person should be charged/fined accordingly.
- Owners involved incidents must 100% stay at the scene. Coward if you do not and should be held accountable
- It is the responsibility of the pet owner to take responsibility for the pet's actions. No different than a child.
- The Dog is the owners responsibility regardless of what happens so they must stay and be accountable.
- It's no different than any traffic incident requiring all involved parties to remain present when law enforcement has been called to deal with injuries or property damage.
- The dog is their responsibility and just like in a car accident, they should remain at the scene to provide all of their required information.
- have personally been involved with situations where the owner of the offending animal has left the scene without any consideration for the injured animal or human
- Pit pulls should not be treated any different then any other dogs. Owners should be allowed more than one pit pull. Pit pull should not have to wear a muzzle that cruel and wrong. Any dog can be dangerous if the owner has raised their dog wrong. It has nothing to do with the breed of dog. I'm ashamed of the city for even considering this.
- It is the responsible thing to do.
- they absolutley should be held like in a car accident
- Last week I faced a dog owner whose dog not only was not on leash but also it didn't even have a collar and it jumped right at me. It took the owner several seconds to move his butt and get the dog while I was screaming my lungs out. There must be serious consequences for such irresponsible and self-righteous owners
- To identify nuisance animals
- No explanation needed. This is very straightforward.
- I feel that you should remain at the scene it appropriate and safe to do so. If that is not possible then you must at a minimum give your contact information to the other party involved. It should really be treated like an auto accident. Both parties exchange information and report it to the appropriate authorities to fill out a report. If that can be done at the scene or after the fact.
- Because the owner is the voice of the dog. To ensure the well being of the dog is being taken into account. To ensure no discrimination is being placed on the dog because of breed. This is be the case for ANY dog bite. Both big or little, both bully breed or family loved Labrador. To allow to see if biting is a habit of the animal or a case of mistreatment to the animal, in which case, if self defence is acceptable for a human than allow for self defence of a dog.
- It's important to get all sides of the story.
- If the dog bites it is responsible for the owner to share the history of shots and assist with any medical help needed. However if the pup is distressed the owner needs to get the pup out of there. Leaving a phone number of giving the person a picture of the owner would be suffice.



- Yes, info needs to be shared so the case can be investigated whether it's a chihuahua or a collie, or great Dane. Sometimes there's a reason but it needs to be investigated in a way fair to both the pet and owner as well as the person bit. Pets are allowed to say no. If an owner is following all by laws walking their dog on a leash and an off leash dog approaches and gets bit, that's the fault of the off leash owner and dog, not the onleash.
- The owner must be held accountable for the animal's actions
- Should apply to both parties: the dog owner and the individual hurt. It's best to obtain the story both sides of the individuals when the incident occurs.
- "Take responsibility for your dog."

- **children need to be taught to respect dogs, and be taught how to properly approach an animal! More important than removing ""dangerous"" dogs from society...****
- Owners do need to take responsibility for their pet if aggression is an issue. It's not the pet's fault it's poor training and awareness of their pet.
- Similar to staying at the scene of a car accident. The owner is the responsible party. If the owner and the victim exchange information, I do believe it would be ok to leave the scene similar to minor car accidents.
- As long as this applies to everyone/all dogs not just larger ones that likely cause more damage. I've seen little dogs bite people, bite other dogs that cause fights, and no punishment for them. It's ridiculous that the instigator is not held accountable.
- Having a dog with issues such as bite tendencies means you as the owner understand that a bite could be possible; it is therefore the owner's responsibility to stay and ensure the victim is properly taken care of in order as a result, since they assumed this risk when they brought their dog to a public space.
- It's too easy for the animal's owner to waive responsibility and walk away - it becomes the victim's job to report, identify and proceed.
- Limited contact and personal information unless shared with officer to avoid potential issues with harassment.
- Too many people do not take responsibility for their dog's actions especially at off leash parks
- the owner should be charged
- I've seen a few Facebook posts of owners not staying with a bite victim and it's the same as a hit and run in my opinion
- I support this for situations where a dog bites a person, so the owner can be contacted by public health as needed for the medical care of the bitten person. When a dog is bitten, I think information only needs to be shared if there are visible injuries, or at the request of the bitten dog's owner.
- If applicable or reasonable. If the dog staying will cause more danger than there should be another option
- Unless there is medical attention needed exchange information before you leave to seek help.



- This is no different than a traffic hit and run, if a bit occurs the person and animal must remain for the situation to be assessed for possible charges / tickets / animal control
- This can be a scary for all involved and their beloved family member has harmed another. Understanding that immediate euthanasia is not the first course of action would encourage owners to remain.
- Too many times they leave, so that they don't have to answer.
- If a dog bites a person or other animal, the owner of that dog should be responsible for any vet bills incurred
- Would be good to hear both sides of the story. If the "victim" was teasing the dog.
- Accountability of the owner
- "Yes, for there is always 2 sides of the story.
- I witnessed an incident where another dog attacked a pitty at an off leash park, pitty was on a leash. Other dogs owner blamed the pitty instead of his own dog
- Pit bull breeds are not bad dogs!! It's the other dogs that attack!!!!"
- It is something any responsible dog owner would already do. The problem is irresponsible owners.
- I literally don't understand why a responsible dog owner wouldn't remain at the scene.
- If the attack was severe and/needs medical attention, the owner should be held accountable. If there are expensive vet bills as a result, the party at fault should be paying them. There may be need for mediation to determine who is at fault, and if they leave without sharing their contact, how can it be determined?
- Anything that involves injury of another person is serious. The offender must stay on scene.
- They need to be held accountable.
- I think all incidents should be investigated and ALL owners should be held accountable for their animals actions (small dogs can bite too). However, I think that in bite instances, the owner should be provided with mandatory training support and education/resources, either through the Calgary Humane Society or other Calgary-based animal rescue organization. ALL bite instances can be prevented through responsible ownership and education.
- My dong has been attacked by a aggressive dog at the park and the owner gave fake personal information and fake dog number.
- It's important if there will be a case made against the animal, that the owner is there to be assessed at the time of the incident. You require both sides of the story to paint the picture.
- I feel that if my dog bit a person I would be a responsible pet owner and stay to give and receive information.
- For liability and to get both sides of the story correctly. To many times breeds are blamed because of the type of dog, even though they do not cause the altercations you start with. This is an archaic new bylaw being proposed to attack breed specific dogs. Poorly done Calgary.
- To allow immediate explanation of a dog unfairly provoked by a person or another dog, and provide faster accountability in the case of an incicent so resources do not need to be spent finding the dog/owner.



- The owner should take responsible for their dog. Essentially the actions of the dog are a direct relationship to the owner. Take ownership for what you technically raised.
- Too many bad dog owners try to tune and hide from what happened instead of owning up to your dog bit someone and deal with it.
- It's the responsibility of the owner to stay
- They need to take responsibility for the actions of their pet.
- An owner should remain at the scene so the circumstances of the incident can be recorded. However the dog or owner should not be punished for the incident.
- Owners should be held responsible for their pets actions, this includes paying medical/vet bills if necessary.
- Even if both parties cannot remain at the scene, at the very least, the owner of the dogs should provide contact information in case there are further complications or medical/vet bills arising from a dog bite.
- Either stay at the scene, or provide contact information - perhaps the victim would be traumatized or the animal still not under control. In that case, the dog owner must provide legitimate contact information for follow up.
- I believe that any incident that occurs should be dealt with like a traffic accident. If a pet causes damage or harm, the owner should be responsible and compensate for any required repair or medical issues. It is too easy for the pet owners to leave the situation and assume no responsibility.
- Dog owners are responsible for their pets. Why would he/she not be responsible to remain at the scene?
- Yes for the obvious reason that the owner / controller of the animal should be responsible for its actions.
- If a dog bites another person or animal, the owner has to take responsibility for it.
- We need a way to trace the owner. Contact info is very important.
- Especially with small [removed] dogs that get away with this all the time.
- I think it should be treated like a vehicle accident and the responsible party should be required to be held accountable for their actions
- Dogs are only vicious if their owners train them to be. Also some adopted dogs have come from very bad situations. It's not always the dogs fault and if it did bite the owner needs to be responsible and stay at the scene
- If someone's dog hurts another person or animal (when NOT instigated IE: a human kicks someone's dog and the dog responds aggressively) it is should be a common courtesy to see to it that they do what they can to make amends.
- I think its very important for an owner to be held responsible if their dog bites or attacks another dog or person. But to put an innocent animal in the same categorie as a vicious animal just because of its breed is very wrong and inhumane
- Responsibility and can clarify any misunderstandings
- I believe that the owner (not the dog) should be held accountable for the incident.
- Owners should take full responsibility for the actions of their dogs.



- If someone's dog had harmed someone or their pet. They should remain on the scene as long as necessary to ensure everyone is fine and if action needs to be taken they should be around. It should not be allowed to "bit and run". However if the party injured doesn't feel it's necessary for officers or medical personal to be involved then everyone can go home
- I work in law enforcement and it helps us to determine what went on and complete any necessary investigations. It also helps to show the owner is trying and cares.
- Our pets are the same as any other family member! If my son kicked the [removed] out of some other kid of course id wait til the officers showed up to explain the situation so should the owners of dogs involved in a bite attack, and if said owner does not stay on the scene it should follow the same as a hit and run
- If a dog bites another person or animal and breaks skin which causes injuries that will require another person or pet to seek medical attention, the owner of the dog who caused the injury should remain present at the scene to provide information to the enforcement officer so the case can be followed up on as there is typically 2 sides to a story. Thus in order to obtain accurate information to an incident, information of those involved should be made available. In addition, an injury is a serious case and the owners should follow up and determine the events that led up to the bite to learn how to prevent it in the future using the help of bylaw officers.
- The owner needs to be held accountable for their dogs actions
- If there is injury to the animal or person involved, the owner should stay. It is responsible. It is against the law to flee the scene of a motor vehicle incident and it should be the same for animals
- Aggressive dogs have NOTHING to do with the breed and EVERYTHING to do with the owners. Owners MUST be held accountable. There should be training for owners when their dog attacks. In some cases to dog feels threatened too, that has NOTHING to do with the breed.
- Dog owners are responsible for their pets and need to held accountable for their behavior. Of course they should wait at the scene and share their contact information if their dog bites someone!
- I think every owner should take responsibility for their dog, and especially if it bit someone.
- yes
- It should be law! You are responsible for the animal, you should be responsible for consequences
- They need to be responsible for their dog.
- Otherwise, how would you find where the dog lives?
- I believe both owners and parties involved need to be present if speaking to a enforcement officer is necessary. Important to gather both testimonials as well as report on the animals behavior, condition, environment, etc. All facts and perspectives need to be taken.
- If people are required to report traffic collisions, severe bites should also be reported.
- If the owner has to remain at the scene of the incident, they must take ownership of the dog and its actions. It is hard to find the dog or owner once they have left. Fines should be imposed if they leave the scene.
- It's like a vehicle accident scene, you are required to remain at the scene! However, there needs to be quick response time from enforcement officers for this to be practical.
- A pet owner needs to be responsible for their pets actions no matter the situation.



- Currently it is too easy for the owner to just walk away
- Less time between the incident and getting a statement, keeps the recount accurate
- if your dog messes up, it is YOUR JOB to take accountability
- It's always the owners responsibility, you couldn't walk away from a car accident that was your fault
- Dogs are considered property under the law and therefore their actions reflect upon the dog owner. Dog owners are 100% responsible for the behaviour of their dogs and need to be held accountable.
- The animal is the owner's responsibility period. OWNERS need to face more consequences. I'm tired of seeing stories of dogs being put down because they had the misfortune of being owned by irresponsible people.
- It is the responsibility of the pet owner to control their animal. Therefore, if there is an issue such as a dog bite, they should be required to be interviewed by an enforcement officer in order to properly address the situation.
- like any other incident such as a car accident
- Thus is the right thing to do but usually irresponsible owners will leave the scene to avoid further action
- My daughter and our dogs and I were attacked by 2 mastiffs, nothing really happened. Owner had his hand slapped, both dogs still viscous, worried one day they get out of the house and attack a child
- There must be accountability for dog bites, also to trace behaviour problems and possible disease.
- Your liable for your own dog, and should be held liable. The city should not be grouping dogs together but handling each case separately. Also, a rule should be enforced that kids are not allowed to run and scream in dog parks.
- Your dog your responsibility.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs.
- The owners of dogs who are more likely to bite are also less likely to remain. The behavior of bad pet owners should be punished.
- Many pit bull owners flee the scene of an attack or bite often leaving victims without justice or financial compensation.
- I do not support the enforcement officer apprehending the dog at the scene
- Common sense. If you're responsible for something; own it.
- These incidents should be handled on an individual basis. You should not be punishing an entire breed. Pit bulls are beautiful and gentle dogs. The ones that have issues are due to owners inexperience and mistreatment of the animal. The individual owners need to be held responsible not the dog!!!!
- responsible ownership
- If a dog is to bite another dog or person the owner should remain to explain the situation. There could be more to the situation that needs to be explained.
- Its the right thing to do...



- Too many times, the owners quickly take off with the offending dog. In cases where this occurs, the owner should also be levied a fine similar to that for not remaining at the scene of a motor vehicle accident
- There are 2 sides to every story, like what precipitated the attack. When a dog acts out of protection for its owner, this needs to be recognized.
- People should be responsible for their own animals and thus should be willing to give certain details if anything occurs.
- Nothing further
- This is simply logical.
- Just like a car accident, if damage has occurred to people, property or other animals the human (owner) should be held responsible
- If you hit someone with your car you would be required to remain. Your car is licensed to you. So is your pet. You are responsible.
- Responsibility of the owner should be encouraged.
- The Owner of the biting dog needs to be informed and take responsibility for the animal in their care. Biting incidents can be complex, and the more witnesses involved, the more clarity can be provided to authorities.
- "The same way you are expected to stay at the scene of a car accident. Also very important that witness' remain on the scene. Simply saying a dog that bites is at fault isn't always true. Was it instigated? by an other dog? by a human? or did it act out with vicious intent?"
- The same principles of a car crash."
- If they leave how are you going to know who the culprit is
- Responsible owners don't need to be told to do this, they already do. Just like responsible drivers don't need to be told they can do a hit and run. So adding consequences to a bite and run is a great idea that targets irresponsible ownership.
- It is time owners are held responsible for their dogs behavior. And consequences should be severe.
- "Yes, When the skin is broken.
- If a dog or a pet bites, a person, and blood is drawn. The pet owner should remain on the scene. Clarify with enforcement personal and the victim the pet(s) Vaccination status (with all/any vet references, pertaining to the current status of the pets rabies vaccination, etc). Help address any concerns of infections and or disabilities (ie, nerve damage, etc) from the bite.
- [personal information removed]"
- I work at a vet clinic and the amount of people that walk away from a dog attack is ridiculous. They should have to give the peace officer their info and pay for the injured dogs vet charges.
- How do you identify the dog and owner later.
- Accountability is the only method available to decrease repeat offenses.
- An owner should stay to give their side of the story about why the dog may have bitten the person. It is a respect thing and we need to understand, dogs are part of someones family but also an animal.
- I agree.
- Answer questions for health, if skin is broken



- I agree, I think they need to share their contact information and such. BUT they deserve a right to explain the situation. Maybe the person who got bite provoked the dog, maybe the owner is the issue and the dog feeds off from that. Most dogs don't go out of their way to hurt someone unless provoked. I've got attacked by more tiny dogs than pit bulls and stuck. Most PITBULLS and other large dogs are actually not harmful. My friends owns one and he's actually the sweetest dogs I've ever met. I've never nor will I ever feel scared or threatened by him.
- A responsible owner should provide contact details as a way for enforcement to review the situation
- It would probably be hard to enforce but in a perfect world, this would make sense. It won't happen though because as soon as the injured animal/person is taken to get medical attention, the owner would take the opportunity to leave.
- It is the owner's responsibility to ensure the person or animal harmed is okay and to accept consequences.
- Of course if you dog bites or hurts someone else it is your do deligents to stay at the scene same as an accident it's your dog take responsibility.
- So pit bull owners can be held accountable
- Too often problem owners flee and then resurface in another incident. They should be required to remain on scene to identify when real problems exist
- Dog owners need to take the full responsibility of they're own pet & breeds actions. Nothing is different from a vicious pitbull & vicious chihuahua. Aside from personal judgement & influencing.
- I have heard so many stories of dog owners that provide false info and leave the scene.
- written testimony is important. Contact information makes enforcement easier. This should also apply to cats as they should not be outside without a leash due to killing wildlife on a large scale.
- The issue is how to enforce a person to stay at scene
- If a dog bites someone, they need to remain on the scene just like a car accident. Depending on the situation, the dog should be seized and the owner dinner right on the spot. That way officers don't need to spend time tracking down the dog and owner. If they do flee, it should be treated the same as a hit and run. Larger fines and possible jail time. People need to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- Owners need to take responsibility. They have a large role in the animals behaviour through training.
- When someone is bitten by a dog, it should be treated as a crime to leave the scene
- Owner needs to be held accountable.
- Full info needs 2 b given so the victom knows were they stand.
- Responsible & to supply any additional information required
- Just like any incident where bodily harm occurs, both parties should speak with the officers and provide contact information.
- Common courtesy
- There are too many incidents when a dog bites a person or other animal and the owner of the offending dog leaves the scene.
- What is the argument for a dog owner to LEAVE the incident site?



- Yes, but both sides of the story should be considered. Not all bites are the fault of the dog. A bite history should not be given for a bite that was caused by human's ignorance.
- Dog owner, yes. Dog itself, no. Dog remaining at scene could cause much more anxiety and tension to the incident and could reflect negatively on both owner and dog at large with increased tension being added to the situation.
- There should be severe fines for an owner that leaves the scene of a dog bite.
- If your dog, no matter the breed attacks a human or another animal; be responsible and exchange information with proper authorities. This will likely look more positive for whatever comes from the incident.
- If another person or animal is injured by someone's else negligence someone needs to be held accountable for vet bills and injuries.
- A person who is responsible for the dog that has bit a person or another animal MUST stay at the scene to exchange information like a car accident
- The dog is under the care and control of the owner or handler - if there is an issue or incident, there should be no question about who is responsible. Not unlike a car accident.
- Bylaw officers must be able to determine next steps. Injuries might require responsible conduct from the aggressor dog.
- The owner should remain at the scene to prove that they are the actual owner and that they are not intoxicated or unfit to have the dog in a public space, or some other aggravating factor.
- There should be severe penalties including possible jail time to owners that leave the scene when their dog is involved in a dog bite.
- There needs to be more done to enforce responsible pet ownership.
- I completely support this as long as it applies equally to all dog breeds. I don't think it is okay to require pit bull owners to stay at the scene, but if a Maltese or a Chihuahua bites, the owner can leave because the bite "isn't serious" in terms of physical injury. The intent of a bite is the same regardless of the dog breed. That being said, this rule is a GREAT idea, as long as it equally applies to ALL dog breeds.
- They should give contact information but should be allowed to leave with the animal to avoid any further altercations if needed.
- If breed specific rules are going to be in place, the Chihuahuas need to be included as I have been bitten many more times from them than a "pit bull". [removed].
- How else would any remedial process work?
- Like any other attack, any witnesses should be present to discuss the scene with law enforcement
- A responsible owner would not walk away.
- General responsibility
- This would help ensure the owner takes responsibility
- Because the owner is the one to blame so they should be held accountable. Plus, if their dog was provoked, they should stay to defend it.



- "A dog bite is an accident and should be treated as such!! Like a car accident you would stay at the scene, but as with a car accident you don't have to worry that the police are going to take your car, unless you have driving restrictions or no insurance.
- But if your dog bites someone the main concern is bylaw will take your dog without investigating both sides."
- I had a dog shepherd type dog bite my poodle. I didn't get the owner's information. It cost 10,000 in vet bills. The owner new where I lived and never checked in on my dog. Never saw her again
- Same as a traffic incident, as long as the dog has calmed down and does not require being taken home.
- Dealing with the consequences of your animal's actions is part of pet ownership. Too many owners are oblivious of their own part in their animal's behaviour.
- This seems like an obvious requirement.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs in every aspect, whatever breed you own.
- If there are costs associated with the bite (such as vet fees), the owner of the dog that bit the animal/human should have to provide contact information and is responsible for those additional costs.
- It is like a "hit and run" with a vehicle. If the dog owner leaves, there should be additional consequences
- "Same as not fleeing the scene of a car accident.
- Either way, we should not tolerate dangerous dogs in our community."
- Accountability should lie with the owner not the dog.
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their pet, and they should be there to receive consequences. If they leave it is like a hit and run.
- An accident is an accident. Everyone should stay until it's dealt with.
- If they leave they should be charged
- You dog bit someone and it should be any dog. Again we should be questioning the owner more and not punishing the dog.
- Remaining at the scene is the responsible thing to do.
- I find it ridiculous that people don't need to remain at the scene. The owners need to be talked to
- the owner is accountable for their pet's action / reaction, if an owner is held accountable maybe an enforcement officer can decide if it's the human's fault as to why the dog reacted the way it did
- Dogs are not the problem,
- It should be treated the same as a person attacking someone else. If someone's child bit or attacked my pet, child or self I would want them to be charged and take responsibility. With pets, there is added vet costs for the victim that the attacker should be responsible for.
- People are responsible for their dogs. They must take responsibility for any incidents.



- Dog owners have to be responsible fully for the dogs behaviors. A dog incident should be treated as the same as car accident.
- Owner must be accountable
- To help a victim obtain vet bill costs from owners, and so potentially violent dogs can be identified by the city
- Owners need to be responsible for their dogs. Need consequences if they leave.
- So ownership for the incident is taken
- You need both sides of the story, why did the dog bit, the other one?
- Owner should always be with their dog
- If a dog of any breed has bitten a person, a responsible owner should exchange information so that the dog could receive proper training, hopefully preventing another bite in the future.
- "If not it's like leaving a hit and run"
- Owners are responsible for their dogs actions period"
- no explanation necessary for a ye/no question.
- I think the owner should be accountable for its dog. It's nature verse nurture with Animals much like it is with humans. A dog is generally not bad because of its breed. It's bad because of the behaviour it's own deems acceptable. Hold dog owners accountable by making it illegal for them to have one if they have had issues with their dog attacking an individual.
- No different than a traffic accident.
- But how do you enforce? All transaction need to be video tapped by the enforcer too. I can see power tripping here! Joke
- The owner has to take responsibility for their dog's actions.
- We should all be raised to be accountable for our actions and the actions of the ones we are responsible for! PERIOD. This should not be a question.
- Of course, it's assault.
- In clear cases of bites.
- It would facilitate the exchanged of information.
- More information the better
- Taking responsibility for your pet is a must. If your child vit another child you would inform the parents, and come to an agreement. Same thing needs to happen with your dog. TAKE OWNERSHIP
- Seems logical
- Your dog bit therefore take responsibility.
- Responsible dog ownership
- Ban the dogs.
- Improve accountability for pet owners
- How else are they going to understand the consequences of their actions/inactions.
- I actually thought this was always the expectation.



- My daughter was bit by a dog in our green space. The owner left the scene as the dog had previously bit a neighbors kid. We had to track down the owner. The dog was dangerous.
- This should be treated in the same way as an auto accident. Proper licensing should be shared between owners and a fine applied if one is not apparent in addition to any ramifications stemming from the incident
- the owner should stay present at the scene of an incident such as for any incident to speak with officers
- Too many reports include details of owners leaving the scene. They should stay and give details to enforcement.
- The owner is responsible for the dogs behaviour and should be held accountable
- Toom any dog attacks are unable to find owners. We also need a map showing problem dogs to protect our children.
- Same as a car accident, you exchange info
- Personal responsibility in owning a pet means you take responsibility when it hurts another person or animal
- People need to be accountable and act responsibly to own an animal
- it is like an assault charge
- Responsible to give information and make sure shots are up to date
- Any responsible owner should be prepared to deal with the actions of their animal. This is their opportunity to ensure the enforcement officer gets "both sides of the story".
- To make sure all insurance or medical needs are going to be covered.
- Responsible need to be accountable
- So they can face the consequences
- Take responsibility
- The owner should be there to explain there side of the situation and be given the chance to both give more information but also defend themselves and there dog.
- I often see Dog owners who do not have control over the larger, potentially aggressive dogs. The dog owner must remain at the scene to take full responsibility.
- It is called accountability!
- There is no way that the owner should not be responsible for the actions of their dog
- "Too many individuals with nuisance dogs tend to flee the scene in hopes of not being reprimanded for their dog's behaviour; not sharing their own personal information or staying at the scene. Whether in fear of a fine, or the relinquish of their dog. Having an enforcement officer on the scene would also help the situation between owners.
- Possible Con: the wait time for an enforcement officer to arrive.
- Possible Con: ensuring that the owner of the nuisance dog remains at the scene and that the situation between owners doesn't become more volatile"
- If it is a serious bite or attack, yes the owner should stay at the scene. If it is a minor, provoked bite and both parties agree, then no.



- One of my friends was attacked by a dog and it was 100% the owners fault and she fled the scene, it was a hit and run and it caused so much more trauma and pain with not knowing who was responsible.
- Rabies needs to be proven and the person who is bitten should have the right to seek compensation for them or their animal.
- This should definitely be necessary.
- If any dog (breed should not be an issue it is the dog owner and highlighting certain breeds is ridiculous) bites someone that person is responsible for any costs and should remain onsite. There absolutely should be nothing targeting pit bulls or dogs like pitbulls. A friendly animal shouldn't have to be muzzled or restricted just based on breed. Bylaws should focus on making responsible owners with higher fines and restrictions on owning animals for people who's dogs attack any dog or human.
- If I ran into your car and hurt you doesn't fleeing the scene a procecuted offense
- Severe cases only hospitalization needed.
- There should be a fine if they don't. It is important for the person who is bitten to know information such as rabies shots, etc.
- The pet owner needs to be accountable for their actions and if they decide to leave the scene they should be charged with the fullest extent of the law. They should also be held liable for any bills for injury incurred to the victim's self or pets if applicable.
- I support the b idea; this is a minimum
- If your dog bites someone or another animal you need to be responsible for the consequences for example: vet bills for the other animal attacked
- Them leaving the scene in my view is a hit and run. It can prevent people from finding out if the dog has had its shots.
- I think if there is a bite or attack of any sort an officer should be involved
- The dog owners are ultimately responsible for the behaviour of their animals.
- The owner needs to accept liability for the dog's actions.
- the owner is responsible for the actions of their pet they must face the consiquences and provide what asistance and information they can
- of course!
- It is the responsible thing to do. Give your version of how things happened and officer can educate on next steps, etc.
- I have seen several cased where the dog owner quickly leaved the scene after an incident.
- Dogs shouldn't be allowed to attack and get away with it regardless of the breed
- But it shouldnt be automatic tribunal. They want to protect their animal's rights and if waiting tends to mean euthanasia and the animal in the shelter then no. Also owners should be investigated. If they treat their animal well and it bites the animal should remind at their home not a shelter. If they treat ot questionably or poorly then that animal should go to the shelter. Animal rights should also be considered



- If someone is so shady to not wait and give information and evidence then they shouldn't have a dog.
 - As pet owners we should be responsible for making sure that the victim is taken care of. If your dog bites someone or another animal it wastes valuable resources for officers to track someone down.
 - Responsible owners do this. I don't know how realistic this is.
 - The problem is, most owners would NOT stay with the victim to provide contact information or support. This is the way that dog owners are.
 - Owners should be held responsible
 - It should be like any other accident, like a car accident etc
 - Owners need to be held accountable for their pets.
 - "common sense
-
- NOT ALL PITBULLS ARE BAD! I HAVE SEEN SMALL DOGS THAT ARE FAR MORE DANGEROUS!!"
 - This is no different than a automobile accident. Where harm may have been inflicted due to the negligence of the owner. It is the owners responsibility to ensure their dog is appropriately trained and mannered. It should be the owners responsibility to pay any damages or related costs to the injury that resulted from their neglect (And not a result of the breed).
 - Owners tend to grab their dogs and run, flee scene of the incident. Those that leave and get caught need to be fined. Same aspect as leaving the scene of an accident.
 - This is a responsibility of the owner to take responsibility and represent their pet fairly in this situation
 - This will help make the bylaw more enforceable.
 - I'm not sure how else you would ever contact the owner if they are not required to leave info or contact with a peace officer. Seems like a huge loop-hole.
 - often the phone numbers that are provided by offending pet owners to those involved in incidents are fake and the offending owner can't be traced
 - Anyone with an animal that bites , especially pitbulls have to be held fully responsible for the animal and any damage the animal causes!!
 - People need to be responsible for the actions of their pets. You can't leave the scene of an incident, you shouldn't be allowed to walk away if your dog bites someone.
 - if they flee and run, they knew their dog was that way because they trained it to be. a responsible pet owner would stay at the scene
 - The owner needs to stay (as long as it is safe to do so) for accountability.
 - Similar to a hit and run - remain at the scene until the incident is assessed.
 - It is the owners responsibility to take accountability for their animal and the incident.
 - To remain at scene is the legal thing to do.



- Dog owners need to be responsible for their own pets. If they leave the scene of an incident there is no way of proving the identity of the dog involved.
- It's just like a car accident Situation
- Assault is assault.
- Tracking incidents like this is important.
- Accidents and incidents may happen but it is important for the owner to take responsibility y sharing vaccination history, and vet charges
- treat it like an accident, police always gather information at a scene.
- The biting dog and owner can become evasive and not take responsibility for the actions of their dog, leaving the victim at a loss.
- I can't believe they don't have to today!
- Yes, so the office can get both sides of the story.
- It is a matter of responsible ownership.
- Unless it is unsafe to do so with the dog in question. Contact information must be provided prior to leaving the scene.
- I think that it is important that all dangerous animals need to be identified and the mobility of people(and their animals) makes it necessary to have a means to find them.
- An owner is responsible for the actions of their pet. Biting is unacceptable behaviour at any time.
- Sometimes dogs get into a scrap. As a responsible owner, it should be your obligation to be prepared for any circumstances around this. Proper socialization and training of the animal(and owner for that matter) must come first. But given the fact that sometimes things happen, owners should be required to share information. This would help as if a vet visit is required afterwards, contact could be made with the "at fault" dog owner to establish if their animal is up to date with vaccines, as well as cover the vet costs for the other owner.
- It would require more responsibility of the the dog owner.
- If the owner of the animal leaves, how is one to identify that person? The owner should have to stay and provide their information.
- Absolutely the owner should remain at the scene unless there is a risk to themselves or others to do so. They should also be responsible to assume control of thief animal and engage other citizens to assist the victims. They should also be required to self-report the incident.
- Plus all dogs that bite should be put down immediately.
- Only to share information. In my many years in the city and having owned dog ant cat, have found Animal by law officers rude, unprofessional, and I do not trust them to be honest and fair. I have never had an animal that was in trouble, just lost. Always licensed.. however I have witnessed terrible unacceptable behavior that was never held to account. Are they not public servants ?
- Should be the same rule as a car accident. Get a ticket for leaving the scene.
- Officers shouldn't have to search for someone responsible for an incident they caused. If their dog requires quiet time away from the incident, they could give their info to the other party or someone else who will stay for the officer, and then the responsible person call the city within a short time frame, 1 hour?, to self-report.



- Just like any other accident ! Stay and tell your story
- This makes it easier for enforcement officers.
- Responsible ownership
- Need to do proper reporting and understand conditions for incidents
- Much like remaining at the scene of a collision, this is what separates responsible owners and irresponsible ones.
- Owner must be accountable!
- Vet information should be given (i.e name of vet). Additional info would be good provided the person bitten or the dog can be safely tucked away somewhere.
- I am all for holding the owner responsible for an attack on another animal or person.
- Dog owner is responsible for any dog bite and shall be prosecuted according to avoid any future dog bites and owner shall be restricted to own the pet for next ten years.
- As a responsible pet owner you should stay at the scene.
- I had no idea I could buy a pitpull, use it as a deadly weapon then flee the scene legally! Responsible people stay on scene and share their details, taking ownership for their mistakes. Responsible people don't own dangerous dogs, the demographic who do, are exactly the thoughtless and selfish people that would flee a crime scene.
- Just like drivers need to stay at the accident, so should dog owners after a bite incident
- I think all dog bites no matter the breed need to be addressed
- It is NOT the dog's fault, but a lack of training by the owner. DO NOT PENALIZE THE DOG OR TARGET SPECIFIC DOG BREEDS. IF I COULD MAKE THIS MORE CLEAR THAN MY ALL CAPITAL LETTERS, I WOULD.
- Owners need to be held accountable
- Within reason and to the degree that resources are available. Dogs will assert their own boundaries and need to be provided some leeway for behaving like dogs. That said, more serious incidents should absolutely require owners to remain present at the scene.
- It seems obvious - why would anyone leave the scene if their dog bites?
- Yes they should be held accountable
- People leave because they don't want to be fined. Have people use public dog parks scan a license - this does a number of things- tracks dogs coming and going, ensures licenses are up to date..
- Absolutely, this seems obvious and I'm surprised this isn't already a current law.
- The owner is overall responsible for that pet and should be held accountable.
- This is no different than a hit and run. They need to remain to give out information to the officers and to have the animal checked for rabies etc. An aggressive dog needs to be immediately taken into custody. Many times these people don't stick around and are not held responsible
- Similar to a car accident. Your dog caused an injury. Responsible should be taken.
- It is the responsibility of the owner
- Dog owners have to be responsible, same as vehicle owner who must remain at accident site!! I read too many stories where dog owners took off and the victim is left to suffer, this should stop.



- A dog owner that leaves the scene of an attack is exactly like a driver who leaves the scene of an accident: they both commit a criminal act.
- Because that is obvious. Biting and leaving is like a hit and run.
- The owner of the dog who bit is responsible for the dogs action.
- They need to act responsibly
- It's common sense. Just like a car accident.
- A severe bite to a human should be reviewed by a PO at the time of incident or during a follow-up.
- It's the same as a traffic incident, info should be exchanged in case the victim is injured
- Everyone should be allowed to speak their side of the story. A dog bite can occur for multiple reasons
- Owner is responsible for what the animal does
- Owners should take responsibility and provide contact information, medical information on the dog and insurance as required.
- What's to explain? If your dog bites someone or another animal, you should stick around and deal with the issue like an adult.
- You should do your part as a responsible pet owner
- for better investigations and enforcement of bylaws.
- Only if remaining on the scene doesn't put the owner or owner's pet at further risk.
- The dog owner should be severely fined. They need to be held accountable for their aggressive dogs.
- I would not support this if it meant only "pit bull" owners had to remain at the scene. It should be any dog owners.
- If they leave there is no way to follow-up and enforce accountability for the actions of their dog
- It is part of responsible dog ownership
- Listen, why can't you guys blame the owner and not the breed. If someone has or is getting a dog that requires more training, make it mandatory they take them to training. These bulky breeds have been abused for so long by bad people. It's not the dog. Chihuahua's and smaller dogs are far more dangerous in my opinion.
- But only if the dog is under control again.
- Like any incident whether an vehicular accident, or an OH&S accident witness's or owners of pets should remain to provide immediate statements.
- I mean, duh. We take responsibility for our actions, we learned this in kindergarten. That's what any decent person and responsible dog owner would do.
- One of my dogs had been bitten in an off leash area and the owner took off right away.
- Pet ownership is a responsibility not unlike vehicle ownership.
- Yes, it should be the same as a car accident. At any accident scene all parties should remain on scene until authorities show up.
- it's like getting into a car accident. you should have to stay and speak with people regarding the accident. Fleeing the scene should result in a major fine



- It's no different than a motor vehicle accident - if a bite occurs, the owner of the biting animal should stay and release contact information in case of complications with the bite.
- The ownerS of the dog (s) are fully responsible. The ones that run off are impossible to locate. Also, owners of dogs off leash in leash areas need to be fined, leashed dogs react differently to other dogs, especially if approached by an off leash dog, it doesn't always go well. These people are negligent owners are need to be held accountable. Stop punishing the dogs, target the owner and they will train the dogs properly.
- yes as a responsible pet owner they should.If they don;t when found dog should be removed from so called home.
- Pet owners need to take accountability for their dog so they need to wait.
- they are the owner and responsible for the dog. And should be present when officer arrives
- You are always responsible for your dogs behavior
- It's a no brainer, as with any other accident, of course they should remain on the scene. The animal should immediately be secured first though, whether in a vehicle/shed, etc until emergency personnel arrives.
- Contact information is a must for all parties
- That is just common curtesy, no?
- Just like an auto accident you need to stay at the scene till enforcement arrives
- Names and contact information should always be shared. Police report completed. The dog owner should have mandatory insurance to cover the cost for the victims. If people choose to have large vicious or unpredictable animals that are not leashed, muzzled, trained or they are incapable of handling or controlling they should be held accountable for their poor decision.
- The owner must take responsibility
- Should be treated the same as an automobile accident.
- Absolutely! Owners need to be responsible for their dogs instead of running away. If the victim is another animal, the owners should also have to cover the vet bills of the injured animal.
- It's the responsible thing to do
- For due process, it is important for all parties to at minimum exchange information. Similar to an MVA, parties involved must should be required to remain on scene or at minimum exchange information.
- Dog bites aren't necessarily culpable activity on part of owner and animal, but a record of such incidents would clarify whether or not there was a pattern.
- Responsibility for dog bites needs to be traced back to owners, and owners need to face consequences.
- So we can track them and fine them
- It is an assault, they are responsible for their dogs behaviour and the consequences of any attack. Unfortunately dog owners are frequently errant in their care for others.
- It would help make the owner more responsible for their dogs actions. Owners should be required to carry ID for themselves and the dog and share it with any injured persons or bylaw personnel.
- Forces them to be accountable



- It's akin to a crime. Don't leave the scene of a crime
- Dog owner should be accountable if his dog bites
- If your dog bites someone it's your responsibility to follow up and be accountable for their actions. Dogs aren't bad dogs...people are bad owners.
- To many poor dog owners who don't care or even go as far as thinking it is fine if a dog is aggressive to another.
- Every dog deserve someone to explain the situation and advocate for them. Officers should listen to the owner just as much as they listen to the victim however.
- Way too many owners flee after their dogs attack someone or their dog which could end up in a hefty vet bill. After a dog owner or their dog is attacked they may be too in shock to realize the extent of their injuries should be heavier fines for dogs walking off leash
- be responsible
- If you injure someone with your vehicle you have to legally stay at the scene, a dog is your property just as a vehicle is and if it inflicts injuries on someone, you should have to stay at the scene as well!
- Dog owner should remain at scene of incident as described in #5.
- Must take responsibility
- .
- The Calgary Model is about responsible ownership it's the number one animal control model because it addresses bad owner behaviour ... Don't change it
- Similar to requirements during a vehicle collision
- Yes
- In the case of a dog bite, both parties should remain, much the same as a car accident. Only with both parties input can the true facts be investigated
- All dog owners must take the responsibility of their dogs actions as they are the reason dogs act the way they do. Therefore if their dog attacks they should be paying for any doctor or vet bills that are incurred as a result of their dog. I have heard too many times dogs attack and the owners take off. Therefore payment for their dog's actions become the financial responsibility of others.
- It is the owners responsibility to remain there .
- If a person has been harmed in any format, the involved parties should remain at the location.
- Responsible pet ownership
- I am part of a community block watch and we often hear about dogs biting at someone and the owners walking off to avoid dealing with the situation responsibly. To note, not once has it been a pit bull, but labradors and smaller breeds.
- In relation to question 8 (there was no appropriate space for extra comments). I believe it is equally important to educate younger children to not pet other owners pets as well as for children to understand what the bandana means so they do not spook the animal.
- It is the owners responsibility to do so.
- Yes the owners shouldn't be allowed to flee a scene of an incident and should be fined more if they try to escape



- They run away and leave the victim of the attack to pay the bills too. They should be charged if they fail to stay at the scene where an Injury or death occurs.
- Some Dog owners need to be educated and learn responsible dog ownership
- As a pet owner you are and should be responsible for their behaviour and any results of their behaviour
- As long as there is a visible injury the victim should have a right to know the animal for disease purposes
- I don't believe that every scenario would be cut and dry or yes and no answer. But in most cases yes I would support a yes. My feeling is that in many dog on dog incidents the true aggressive dog may not be the one the city has issue with simply because of who made the initial complaint.
- Of course they need to share the information. Many dog owners seem to not take the responsibility and just leave the scene.
- The owner should be held responsible for their dog, not the dog
- It would be ideal for both parties, unless serious injury occurred, to be present for both sides of the stories to be heard and for proper judgment to be served.
- It's important that someone stays to share information with the other party, but I don't think they would need to wait for an enforcement officer.
- the owner of the dog owner is to remain at the scene as it is their responsibility of the dog's actions
- yes the party that owns a dog that has bitten should wait for authorities to arrive
- As any responsible dog owner should if there in an incident involving their pet
- It's the dog owner's responsibility to deal with the consequences if the behaviour of their dog gets out of hand.
- A responsible dog owner should always take initiative and ownership in such a situation
- Absolutely, if your dog attacks someone or something you should be held responsible for any medical or vet related bills that arise from that incident. I understand accidents happen, dogs play rough and one gets hurt, then stick around and decide with the other party involved the best action to take. There is no reason to leave, without at least exchanging contact info.
- Unless the offending dog is severely injured and requires immediate medical attention
- I've heard many stories of people leaving after an incident with no way to follow up.
- For proper assessment and first aid.
- This puts further accountability on the owner, and less on a frightened animal.
- Treat it like a reportable event. Both sides need to provide statements.
- Yes because the person who has been bit, is essentially a victim of an assault and thus the perp should remain at the scene or be charged.
- Take accountability for your dog. It's an extension of you
- All dog bites should be taken seriously. This will support if follow up is needed
- How else can pertinent data be collected?
- I think the owner needs to stay at the scene therefore he can take responsibility and work with enforcement individuals as requested.



- I don't believe any decent person would leave the scene without resolving the issue in some way first.
- Should remain on scene to ensure all precautions are taken and proper first aid is addressed. I do not believe the dog should be apprehended at this time.
- This needs to be explained? The dog owner should be required to stay and provide required information for incidents so the safety of the community can be restored in the shortest possible time.
- Owners need to be held accountable for their dogs behaviour.
- It's like a car accident where those involved are exchanging Information. It's about liability.
- This seems to force the owner to be more responsible for the behaviour of their dog.
- Just like any incident, a car accident or witnessing an activity that threatens good community and safety, a report should be given.
- you need to stay at the scene of an accident, how is this any different? An incident causing harm is an incident causing harm
- It's like an accident, you hit the person, you remain at the scene...
- It is the same process as with car accidents. Talking with an enforcement officer shouldn't result in any sort of arrest or detainment of the aggressive animal.
- This makes the owner responsible for the actions of their dog.
- Just as in any other accident or incident contact information is priority.
- You should be held accountable.
- No citizen arrest type situations. Swapping of info for sure; both ways, like in a minor accident.
- Duh it should be already
- I think people are responsible for their families. If an accident happens you should be there to make sure your pups side of the story is told
- It should be treated the same as an auto accident. If they leave the scene without providing documentation there should be a charge/fine for doing so.
- I believe that as a responsible dog owner you should remain at the scene of an incident.
- Everyone should be responsible for your animal. Especially if it bites someone
- Well why wouldn't they? This should already be law so they don't give false info
- Details around the incident should be shared and documented on all sides, as well as veterinary contact information in case any concern for disease from the dog may be viable.
- My large dog and I both have been attacked by a smaller dog. The woman was able to get away because she could pick up her dog and run.
- It's called be a responsible pet owner and being held accountable for your pets actions
- It's a serious incident if a dog bites someone, the owner must remain on scene so appropriate follow up action can be taken by bylaw officers
- If someone causes bodily harm to another person they would need to stay at the scene of the crime or be considered fleeing the scene of a crime. . .such as in a car accident. The exception would be if they are leaving to get medical care for themselves or their animal.



- Dog bites can be serious and the owner has full economic and moral responsibility.
 - This is common sense to ensure prevention of communicable disease.
 - Alternatively, it would equate to leaving the scene of an accident.
 - BUT IT CANNOT BE BREED SPECIFIC LAWS
 - Yes, your dog HURT someone!
 - "Definite yes on if bites a human if injury sustained (some tiny nips are common from herding breeds and don't necessarily cause harm).
-
- Unsure on if animal unless it's severe enough to warrant a veterinary visit."
 - owners need to take responsibility for the dogs actions
 - I assumed this was already a requirement. It is ridiculous it is not already.
 - Same logic applies to remaining at the scene of a car accident. Accountability
 - animal must be destroyed.
 - Just like a car accident
 - The same as a car accident.
 - Responsible pet ownership
 - dosent matter the breed if any incident occurs you should do just that
 - There needs to be accountability and responsibility on everyone in the situation. Dogs are not responsible for their behavior but would suffer the most under a lack of care, and training. If a person is required to exchange information, accountable actions performed by them can be enforced.
 - A bite is a serious incident and all sides of the story need to be full understood in order for the enforcement officer an appropriate decision on the course of action. This can not be done if one of the involved parties leaves.
 - Yes, they must at least exchange phone numbers, and stay if it is safe to do so. If th3 dangerous dog is not safe to keep around or the hurt animal or person needs immediate attention they can be in contact afterwards by phone instead.
 - they should stay at the scene with there under control
 - Not only does it not offer any kind of support for the bite victim but also prevents the owner of the dog whom bit/attacked from being held accountable. I'll
 - Its important to open the lines of communication if a dog bite occurs. In the event that medical expenses or lost income become an issue. And to better establish a record for repeat offenders. A responsible pet owner should be financially and legally accountable for the actions of their pets.
 - Owners need to be held accountable as well. Follow up information is necessary.
 - It's important that both sides are able to give their story and the owner needs to be held responsible if at fault. Pit bull type dogs are an amazing breed, but sometimes they are in the hands of bad owners. These owners need to be held responsible and the dogs need to stop being blamed.
 - Any incident should be discussed and follow-up care, expense decided between parties. If that cannot be decided an enforcement officer should be included



- Owners need to take responsibility for the action of The pet
- there should be an opportunity to explain both sides
- I support the rule that the dog owner remains at the scene when a person has been bitten. I do not support the rule when the dog bites another animal.
- Take ownership, show responsibility.
- Every biting incident should be investigated if there are injuries to other dogs or people
- Prove the dog is liscenced and up to date on vet bills so pet transfered sicknesses aren't transfered or made aware of
- Same as hit and run rules
- Yes, the owner of the dog that shows aggression is liable. Vet bills can be expensive therefore it should be on the owner of the aggressive dog to pay for and care the other dog might need.
- I think it is important for the owner to take responsibility for a dog bite. In addition, this should not be dependent on the breed or size of the dog. Small dogs can be just as dangerous and are not taken seriously when presenting aggressive behaviour.
- To make sure that- if there's vet bills it must be paid by them
- Accountability to be expected.
- Owners are completely responsible if their dog misbehaves
- Only if safe to do so though.
- They should share contact information, ideally remain at the scene if it is safe. But if they feel it is safer to take their pet back home, be available later to answer questions.
- One needs to take responsibility for ones actions
- Do I need to? Seems obvious.
- Both parties are able to express their version of events while still fresh in their minds
- Dog owners should be responsible for damage caused by their dogs - to people and to creatures.
- The owner is responsible and must be held accountable, therefore their identity must be made known to officials.
- Responsible owners should remain at the scene. It really is common sense. However there are many dog "owners" who aren't responsible so that's why this rule is being considered.
- This should all be case by case, I understand that is an abundance. There should be mandatory training when getting a dog, criminal background checks and home checks. These problems are caused by people, not dogs. The answer is to educate and train people. Everything else will fall into place after that.
- Just like a car accident
- Owner should take responsibility for not controlling their dog and cooperate as part of the solution
- People need to be responsible for the action of their animal
- This is a no brainer. My experience is that a very large proportion of dog owners do not have control over their dog and do not even seem to understand what that means. There should be some kind of test to even get a license. It's a terrifying place. I can't run there (John Laurie Blvd) any more and even cycling is sometimes dangerous.



- Would be needed for following up on the case and at the very minimum to allow for testing of the dog for health-related issues for the victim (ie. rabies test).
- People cant get away with being poor pet owners.
- Pet owners must be held accountable for the actions of their pets in cases of biting or attack
- The responsibility is on the owner.
- Potentially enough varying sources of review for a fair decision.
- Any breed of dog that bites or shows aggressive behaviour to another person, the owner needs to stay at the scene to speak with any given authorities.
- Owner should take responsibility
- An owner is responsible for their dog and must stay at a scene of an incident, if this is not complied with a large fine should be implemented.
- Individuals should be punished for being irresponsible pet owners. If someone leaves the scene of a bite incident, they should face fines of charges based on the severity of the incident.
- Incidences involving dog bites should be handled the same as car accidents where people are required to stay at the scene and exchange insurance information.
- If there are any medical/vet bills that are needed due to the bite the owner of the dog should be held accountable and to pay said bills, unless the dog was biting in defence of another dog or person trying to harm it.
- I think its best all parties involved stay on scene and discuss the situation that unfolded with an officer.
- anything that can be taken off of the courts, and put into the hands of people with more specific knowledge is best.
- This would allow for nuisance dogs to be logged and ensure the health of both animals is up to date and alleviate the need for humans to receive unnecessary rabies shots.
- If necessary is important. Some owners misinterpret play and distance increasing signals. IE. if your dog is pestering my dog and you can't get it away from mine and mine snaps after telling it off more mildly and nicks the skin, I shouldn't have to stay at the scene and share contact info.
- Yes have to be a responsible dog owner, even the small dog owners!!!
- Too often the owner runs away rather than dealing with the issue. It should be same as leaving scene of an accident with matching fines
- I believe that a dog bites because of its training or lack thereof. And it is the owner who handles all training; therefore, it is the owner who needs to show up and work through whatever happened. The owner also needs to be there to handle questions about the dog's health and vaccinations.
- It should be considered the same as a motor vehicle accident. You don't drive away and wait for authorities to come find you. Your animal hurt someone so be responsible and deal with it. Enforcement should not have to track you down as this also leaves a greater risk of the offending owner & pet to not be traced if the injured person is unable to follow them or get info themselves. Then how is the offending person/pet to be properly charged?
- Only with severe attacks, not little disagreements between dogs



- I think it's the responsibility of the owner to be there and involved if their dog bites a person or another animal.
- Yeah if a dog bites someone they should stick around. If I accidentally run over someone I can't just leave. I see them as the same thing. And often dog bite victims are hysterical and you must hear both sides
- Similarly to a motor vehicle accident, we are responsible for the impact our behaviours / choices make on others. We owe it to our community to be committed to the safety of all.
- It makes sense to require responsibility, but I'm not sure how it would be enforced. You can't legislate stupid.
- By involving tribunal decisions it creates room for prejudice against a breed. If a dog bites another person (badly enough) for it to cause harm then the owner should exchange information with said person
- Owners are responsible for their dog's behavior. Owners should remain at the scene of the incident to share contact information OR provide that information to the injured party or witness so contact can be made with them (in case there's some reason they cannot stay (e.g. picking children up from school)).
- Because it's not always the bigger dogs fault. Quite often they are provoked by another dog and only the larger dog gets in trouble. If someone shows up at least they can get both sides of the story.
- responsible ownership, charged for leaving the scene
- If a dog bites someone or an animal the owner should be held accountable for vet bills, and should provide information to a third party if they aren't comfortable giving their information directly to the victim.
- They are the one responsible for their dogs behaviour and training and should take responsibility for their actions
- Unless immediate care is required for the animal. Just like a car accident info would need to be exchanged.
- Falls back to responsible pet ownership. Owners need to start being held more accountable for their pets. This includes staying at any scene .
- If there's an attack made by any dog in general I think the owner is definitely responsible and should be treated no different than say if it were a car accident. Any sort of accident the owner should be help responsible therefore remain at the scene of the incident and go through the process. This has nothing to do with pit bulls this is just general common curtesy that should be practiced by and responsible adult/pet owner/car owner/establishment or a anything like that.
- The owner is responsible for the actions of the dog and should remain at the scene to speak with the enforcement officer
- Presumably the owner is present when the dog bites. It would be common courtesy to talk to the victim/ whoever's dealing with the incident
- This is a no brainer.
- Pet owners of all types of dogs should be held accountable if their pet bites something else. In my opinion dogs are a result of how they have been trained and the environment they are in. They are



like humans, who are taught to hate and to be racist, it is a learned behavior. This has to do with the pet owners, not the breed of the dog.

- This should include small dogs and minor bites/incidents as well.
- Responsible pet ownership
- Accountability
- Leaving the scene should be heavily penalized and viewed as an attempt to dodge responsibility.
- All dog bites should have responsible ownership
- This seems like common sense and general consideration to me. It's like a hit and run if you don't stay.
- It is important to take responsibility and to ensure that the person or animal that was bitten is taken care of.
- There are many irresponsible dog owners who flee if their dog attacks and the innocent victims end up footing the huge vet bill. The law should include: if your dog attacks another you must pay all vet/medical bills.
- My dog was attacked and the Owners could care less.
- My dog was attacked by a Great Dane who was running at large(my dog was leashed). Thankfully the owner shared his contact info albeit he refused to pay the \$1000 vet bill. By law officers were able to find the owner and charge him which he refused to pay, so the case went to court. Ensuring the owner shared their info is essential
- Yes, however the owner should put the dog in a quiet place before more people show up.
- People need to be 100% accountable for the actions of their animals
- Even though dogs are animals and there's a level of unpredictability (besides some having traumatic backgrounds we can't fully understand), most of it comes to responsible ownership. This would be part of it.
- Transparency of the event is important as well this can serve to limit / penalize bite and run incidents
- This is responsible pet ownership
- They know their dog better than anyone and would be able to be able to tell what happened.
- A responsible dog owner will be willing to do anything in their power to make sure that their dog does not bite anyone again. To remain at the scene is the first part of taking ownership and a possible resolution.
- that is only common sense that they stay on scene.
- As long as there is proof the bite occurred, the owners should be held accountable. However, it's a slippery slope because if someone CLAIMS they witnessed a bite and it was actually an air snap or something they perceived to be aggressive behaviour or the person made the claim simply because they don't like the other owner or the other dog, this could end up punishing innocent owners/dogs.
- Makes sense for severe bites
- just like any other incident people should be waiting at the scene of the crime!
- The owner of the attacking dog should be liable to pay for vet bills
- Unless they need to get their dog out of there and then return? I don't really know



- No different it were a vehicle accident.
- Similar to requirements for automobiles. Proper and accurate reporting and documentation is required for record and analysis purposes.
- The same as a car accident, all parties should remain in order to have clear sides of the incident and to provide information to enforcement officers
- There needs to be a record of dogs that have bitten either children or other dogs.
- To track the dog
- The human is the one who should be responsible for dealing with consequences and making decisions on behalf of their dog.
- It's important for both parties to have an opportunity to provide their stories and accurate pictures / facts collected. However, there also needs to be a reasonably fast response - it wouldn't be appropriate to have to remain on scene for several hours waiting for an enforcement officer to arrive.
- I have seen photos of a dog severely injured by a dog in an off-leash park, where it was described that the owner took his dog and left. The injured dog required extensive vet care and the responsible owner did not allow his information to be collected. The owner of the injured dog had to crowd source information on FaceBook from anyone who witnessed the incident. I do not even know if the matter was ever resolved. I feel that is no way to let the traumatized dog and owner deal with the situation.
- The owner should be there to address any questions about whether the dog is up to date on vaccinations.
- I don't know how this will be enforced but I think it's necessary
- Of course they should stay to talk to bylaw. They are at fault, this is no different than a car accident.
- This seems reasonable and appropriate
- There is often no other way to easily follow up with the owner.
- it should be a persons responsibility much like injuring someone
- Well if a dog accack fit no reason then yes something should be done
- take responsibility
- The dog owner should take it's responsibility and remain at the scene. Also to help out the victim.
- The pet owner is responsible for the behaviour of the animal
- They need to be accountable for their lack of responsible pet ownership.
- It is like an assault, so info should be exchanged.
- Accountability and to lessen the chance of a future bite by the same dog.
- If your dog bites another causing injury, you should be liable for vet costs as you did not control your dog.
- I think it's necessary as it will hopefully increase responsibility.
- The owner of the dog is responsible for keeping the dog under control be it off or on leash so it is very reasonable to require the owner to share information and talk to By-Law if they are on the scene. Vet bills are expensive.



- The owner must provide contact information so that the authorities can proceed with an investigation and the hurt individual can receive remuneration (bills paid) for treatment/rehabilitation due to the injuries inflicted by the dog.
- It's responsible pet ownership (no matter the breed) to remain at the scene of an incident if the dog was involved in an altercation where someone else or their property or pet was injured or damaged.
- Get all versions of the incident. What was going on prior to bite, was there attempt to stop etc.
- I'm surprised this isn't already a rule.
- Just as when a car collision occurs, all parties involved need to remain on scene when damage is large enough.
- It is too difficult to identify an owner after the fact.
- The owner should be responsible
- If someone is involved in a car accident that requires police to attend they are required to wait at the scene. This should be the same in that if an enforcement officer is attending they should wait to provide information/ explain their side.
- Vehicle drivers are not allowed to leave the scene of an accident, so dog owners should not be allowed to leave the scene of an attack. It is a deliberate action on the part of the dog and the owner should be responsible for the dog's actions. Contact info would be needed in case of serious injury, infection, disease, etc. It's only right that the owner makes sure the victim is taken care of.
- IF any dog bites, the owner should stay. No where is it Proven that one kind of dogs bite more than another. The owners need to be responsible. I desperately wanted a pit bull to rescue. I am frustrated at the lack of knowledge. Just because they might bite (like any other dog) doesn't mean every "pit bull" should be banned.
- Absolutely, as long as the purpose of this is a dialog first, to help the owner understand what happened to provoke the attack. That information can be absolutely essential for the dog owners to manage and retrain the dog. If the bite is not severe, I hope this conversation would prioritize dialog and management over punishment (also see my comments to Q3). A dog may be caught up in a dog fight and a biting a human could be a complete, unintended accident.
- Mandatory
- Responsibilities of owning a dog include ownership of the dog AND owner behaviour. Only exception would be if the person bitten does not want to log the complaint.
- Anything else is like a hit and run. If an officer cannot respond in a timely manner, they should be required to share personal identification with victim or witnesses.
- It's just the proper thing to do, stay at the scene with someone who was bitten by your dog!
- Yes, owners should stay at the scene. Far too many people walk away after giving false information.
- They should be able to remove the dog from the situation but remain by to make a statement
- Just like a car accident if there has been an injury information must be shared
- People can sometimes be hard to track down when it comes time to be reimbursed for the veterinary bills of the "victim dog".
- To me this is a necessity to ensure that everyone's protected.



- I have a friend whose young dog was attacked by other dogs being walked on leash with a dog walker. The dog walker has been uncooperative & was reluctant to identify the dogs involved although witnesses gave enough information to identify them as the dog walker's own pets that she was walking with the puppy that was attacked & other dogs. Good Samaritans who did not witness the attack saw the young dog that was attacked in distress on the street i& took him to a vet.
- It is important for the contact information of the biting dog owner to be given to the victim dog owner so that veterinary bills can be send to the biting dog owner.
- Dog owners must assume responsibility for their dog's actions.
- Ultimately the pet owner is responsible for its pet's behaviour, so yes, they should remain at the scene. .
- Same as a car accident. Added penalties for leaving the scene of an occurrence. Added penalties for hiding an offending animal.
- You own a dog, you take responsibility for everything it does. They should be charged criminally if they leave the scene or refuse to provide info.
- Requirement to disclose all information and forfeit the animal
- People need to take responsibility of the pet they own and its behaviour. This way both sides of the stories are told upfront and can help resolve the situation faster.
- People need to take responsibility
- Been many cases of people running off with their dog.
- I feel that having the dog owner leaving creates an issue of trying to find the owner later on if further discipline is needed for the dog and it makes sense for them to have to directly report to an officer.
- Both sides of the incident must be presented fairly.
- An accident requires contact info to be shared
- We need to know who the dangerous dogs are and hold the owners accountable
- Dog ownership is a responsibility the citizen takes on as a personal choice. No one has forced them to be a dog owner. Therefore, just as in a vehicle accident, a responsible driver would remain at the scene of a incident to speak with city's enforcement agents.
- The dog owner is the real problem here and they **MUST** be held accountable for any/all injuries as a result of their dog biting anyone. Any second offense means the dog is seized and that owner and household loses the privilege of ever owning another dog again.
- The owner is responsible for the animal's behavior. Just like in a car accident the owner of the vehicle cannot flee the scene and needs to be provide contact and insurance information.
- Your animal is your responsibility
- I think owners who leave a scene after an incident with the dog should be held accountable and should have consequences
- If you are with your dog and it bites (human or animal) of course you should stay there.
- No different than leaving the scene of a car accident!
- makes sense, responsible pet and citizen behaviour
- Obviously.



- As long as it is safe for the owner/animal to stay at the scene. If safety is a concern, they should remove themselves/their dog for the safety of themselves or the public.
- Like a car accident
- Responsible for your dog that bit
- Similar to an accident involving a vehicle, persons and pets involved in a biting incident should be willing to take responsibility for the actions of their pet.
- As with any accident if people share their information freely then no need to wait for an enforcement officer. But like car accidents a report needs to be filled out by both sides so that owner can be tracked not just the dog.
- Provide essential information to officer
- Yes the owner of an attacking dog should stay. They need to be charged if not. Like a hit and run car accident is.
- People need to be accountable for their dog's behaviour. Just like in a car accident, they should be responsible for damage costs (if any hospital bills)
- There are 2 sides to every story. The owner should stay at the scene (unless medical is needed) to state facts if issue
- "The dog owner is responsible for their dog and should have to talk to enforcement if necessary.
- The only exception would be if the owner and/or dog were in a dangerous situation such as being followed, attacked, harassed, etc."
- the dog owner should be required to stay on scene
- Same as a car accident. Always two sides to the story and dog owner should take responsibility and be given chance to explain if dog provoked
- Owners need to take responsibility for their own pet
- A dog owner should take responsibility for their dog's behaviour, training, and action.
- Everyone needs to be responsible for their dogs behaviour.
- You are responsible for your dog. Period.
- The owner of the aggressive dog should have to pay the vet bills for the injured animal
- Dog owners are responsible for their dog's behavior
- In case of injuries which are not easily treatable that may arise from the incident, owners should be held accountable for any medical attention needed
- The owner is responsible and should pay medical bills if needed
- Absolutely. And vet care needed should be paid for by the owner of the aggressive dog.
- Only if the dog bites a person or causes serious injury to another dog
- The dog owner is responsible for their animal. All dog bites should be reported.
- As a responsible pet owner you should stay at the scene if an issue, be that your dog bites or chases someone, were to occur. I do not agree with the singling out of a breed of dog, yes bully breeds do have a stronger bite but "lock jaw" is not a real thing. This is racism in another form. BSL in other communities has proven not to lessen the number of dog bites. BSL in any form punishes responsible pet owners and paints everyone who owns a "pitbull" with the same brush and solidifies



that all these dogs are dangerous, when this is far from true. I 100% agree with responsible pet ownership but do not agree with BSL in any way and I find it very worrying that this survey has singled out this breed of dog. Why just pitbulls? Why not rottweilers, mastiff, doberman pinchers, cane corso, etc. any type of guard dog? This is ridiculous! Just be a responsible pet owner.

- Yes, if the offending dog can be secured to prevent further harm.
- There is no accountability for owners who have untrained dogs at the expense of their community. Due to this lack of accountability, people can get away with having untrained dogs. Being required by law to stay after a confrontation would be a great idea.
- I live near Rotary Park off leash area. I can't tell you the number of times offending owners and dogs are gone before you can shake a stick. Meanwhile, the owner of the injured dog has to deal with sometimes enormous vet bills through no fault of their own. Make it a HUGE fine for not sticking around.
- The owner and the individual who's animal was bit should both stay on scene.
- These occurrences are usually the owners fault not the dog
- The owner should be held accountable. The dog doesn't necessarily know what it's doing but a person does and should be training every breed right that they own and ensure they are not training it to be vicious one day because we know better.
- It's being a responsible owner
- Regardless of the breed the owner needs to be held responsible for their dogs behavior.
- All sides of a story need to be obtained. A dog bites another dog. Why what was happening. Did the other dog keep pestering the one that bit? Biting a person. Was the person asked to leave the dog alone. Did they startle the dog. Was there provocation
- Any dog owner in such a situation should absolutely be required to remain at the scene in order to share the dog's medical history (e.g., are vaccines up to date, etc.); to provide insurance info should it be required for the person or animal bitten requires medical treatment, etc.; and to provide contact information as mentioned above for any follow-up required.
- If it is safe to do so
- It is an owner's responsibility to ensure that his/her dog is well behaved, and if the dog is not and does attack a person or another animal, the owner should be liable for their behaviour.
- The owner should be charged criminally if their dog attacks or bites a person. They should be charged criminally if they leave the scene of the incident. Their dog should be put down on the first occurrence of a dog bite.
- Absolutely! The owner needs to stay and be responsible for his dog and any damage that is done to an animal or human.
- I have been bitten by a dog while running on a pathway and the owner left without providing any info
- The same expectation as a car accident.
- This is what responsible owners already do.
- If any injuries do occur, the owner of the attacking dog should be held responsible.
- With the exception that if it is unsafe to do so. In that case, contact info should be taken (pictures as well, if possible) and followed up on.



- Not all bites are the dogs fault. The person who was bitten could have teased the dog, gotten too close to the dog, startled the dog, been perceived as a threat to the dog, or been scared or nervous. Dogs do not have the same brain as humans. We can't expect them to just know everything as humans do.
- Responsible pet ownership is a must
- we are responsible for our dogs and there's no exceptions
- Vicious dog attack with owner present is similar to a vehicle hit and run incident.....an escape from responsibility leaving the victim with no recourse for damages caused.
- Rules for remaining at any scene of an accident should be similar to the rules of a car accident
- Absolutely. If any other possession of yours unintentionally injured someone (ie. gun went off accidentally) it would be a felony to leave the scene. Owners must be held accountable for the actions of their animals if they choose to have those animals in public spaces.
- To ensure the identity of the dog owner is known and the necessary steps can be taken regarding the dog and the victim(s) can obtain redress against the owner.
- I have witnessed an off leash dog attack to an on leash dog and the off leash dog owner refused to provide contact information
- Owners should be responsible, but unproven or unsubstantiated accusations should also be fined/punished to dissuade people from bringing nuisance claims.
- Many just leave and then the owner who owns the bitten dog must pay the vet bill.
- There are often incidents where after a bite, the owner disappears and there is no recourse for the victim and they often end up stuck with significant vet bills.
- If the person shares their information freely with the victim family - then perhaps they should be free to leave. But, it should be an offense to leave without sharing info. as in a car accident.
- I don't understand why there would be an alternative. If a dog bites another dog or person, it is their responsibility to stay on scene, unless perhaps their own dog too was injured (dog fight) and needed immediate vet care.
- The more accurate the information - the better to deal with the situation.
- Accountability as a pet owner
- You are responsible for your pet, and its actions.
- It is the owners fault for not training their dog. The owner is responsible and should have consequences if they flee the scene.
- contact information
- Too often they disappear with the animal without sharing info
- But as mentioned when I've had off leash dogs run up to us and I've attempted to address this with an owner they ignore me and or walk away. It's an owner issue
- This is the only responsible thing to do.
- Same as a car accident. Dogs aren't the problem. It's the owners.
- An owner should be contacted if their animal injured another being.
- If it's a severe bite only. Not for play bites.



- It's basic pet ownership responsibility
- The owner is responsible for the it dog's actions
- It would be the responsible thing to do. The problem is how do you define a bite to be serious enough to warrant this? Is a small nip by a playful dog considered serious? Dogs are dogs and use their mouths to communicate. Besides which they may have been provoked to do so.
- Same as for injuries caused by vehicles
- either remain at the scene or have some process in which to follow up with Bylaw if remaining at the scene is unsafe. Further consequences for those that do not exchange information or follow up with Bylaw.
- Responsible dog ownership regardless of breed.
- How else will the city identify problem dogs. If the bite is severe enough and requires victim to make a claim against the dog owner, they must have necessary contact information.
- "To support contact and responsibility of dog ownership.
- To establish location(s) of potential "nuisance" dog."
- Story to be told for every incident.
- Its an offense. Yes, you remain at scene like a car accident.
- Only if the victim is also present and remains at the scene.
- I have personally observed dog owners leaving an off-leash park after their dog bit another one.
- It is the same as any other kind of accident. You need to provide your contact information and take responsibility for what has happened.
- People should be held accountable for the behaviour of their animal in public spaces. If the enforcement officer can arrive on the scene in a timely fashion, then this is a practical way to foster accountability
- that is responsible pet ownership and allows both sides to be heard by ems or police
- you must stay at a car accident and there is no difference - an accident is an accident unless the two parties agree and share info. A minor nip is one thing but a full attack must be dealt with. I need to make reference to the pitt bull questions above as you did not give us space for comments. I have a neice with a pitt bull and he is one who loves to sit on the couch and watch tv. My point is there are some very friendly and gentle pitt bulls as well as the aggressive ones as there are some gentle and aggressive poodles and other breeds. We need to stop looking at one breed and labelling them. The owners in most cases are ones that need to be trained. These people who train their dogs to act aggressive to make themselves feel big are the ones who should be addressed. I realize that is hard thing to do but we can't label all dogs with one brush. In most cases it it the owner that needs training not the animal
- It would save time in question 4 above and start a case file.
- The dog can't talk. An owner must be present to accept responsibility and provide contact info for further actions
- It is a privilege not a right to take a dog out where the public and their pets are vulnerable.
- To take responsibility for the actions of their dog
- Seen cases where the dog owner leaves the incident leaving the victim with no recourse



- why wouldn't they stay at the scene? It seems absurd that an owner would leave the scene if their dog bit someone, doesn't it?
- Accountability as a pet owner is important. I bet the dog has offended before and the owner just walks away to prevent getting in trouble.
- This should include ALL dog bites to humans and other dogs, even if it a bite from a small dog
- No explanation - absolutely imperative. A dog owner should be charged with leaving the scene otherwise, in my opinion. I also don't believe it should be a rule but law.
- Too many owners end up leaving victims (whether people or other dogs) to foot huge medical bills.
- If you're dog, regardless of breed, harms another animal or person the owner should be held liable for vet fees and/or medical expenses
- It is similar to a car accident. As owners of pets, the owners must take responsibilities of the pets (or in the case of the vehicle accident, it would be the car and how it's driven).
- There are often costs incurred with attacks, primarily against another animal and, by staying to share information, they would be easier to contact to share costs of damage/injury.
- Owners have to be responsible for their pets.
- Responsible pet ownership should always be encouraged.
- Yes - besides the physical damage of the bite, finding out about whether the dog has been vaccinated for rabies is essential.
- Possible fines to dog owner or for accountability
- If the bite has punctured the skin or coat of an animal or skin of a person.
- The owner is responsible for the dog's behaviour so absolutely must stay at the scene.
- If they leave the scene of a crime they should be charged for a crime.
- Owners should take responsibility for their dog's actions. If they cause damage to another person or dog all medical expenses should also be their responsibility.
- If it's serious they need to accept the responsibility and consequences
- To exchange information. To receive the fine for their offending dog. To get information to cover vet or medical bills.
- It will be like a car accident. All involved need to stay around to give the particulars.
- Owners are responsible for their dog(s) behaviour.
- Owners should be held accountable
- Unless that dog also needed care/attention and/or if the individual could not wait for an enforcement officer, they took some steps to reach out (ie, called 311 themselves to report)
- Just like a hit and run. The owner/operator/walker of the dog (or car) must take responsibility for that dog's behaviour because by having the dog in public/amongst members of the public, they are implicitly claiming that they have control over it.
- "Yes but only if necessary. I have been bitten by a dog this year and have discussed it with the owner.
- I would suggest calling enforcement only with a very serious bite and if I felt the owner was not interested in working on the dog's behaviour."



- The dog owner is responsible for the behaviour of their dog and should be held accountable for any incidents that come from nuisance behaviour.
- This would ensure an owner taking responsibility for the animal's behaviour, would it not?
- Take responsibility for your animal.
- It's no different than leaving the scene of a crime
- If the bite is severe it is important to get information on the dog and owner to allow for either reports/determinations to be made.
- The dog owner is responsible for the dog
- The owner is 100% responsible for their dog, regardless of breed.
- It is very important that laws are enforceable.
- It's being a responsible owner.
- It is the responsibility of the pet owner to cooperate in all possible ways.
- Can find out health information about the animal
- The dog owner should remain on the scene similar to a car accident to share details and information and take responsibility for their dogs behavior. There are not bad dogs, just bad owners.
- "If a person who owns an animal is responsible for it at all times

- A dog owner is responsible for it at all. Times

- responsible for it at all times"
- As with any other altercation occurring in life, both parties should be expected to step forward to resolve a dispute; however, there may be situations where immediately removing an agitated dog is the better decision, so I suggest the City consider including this aspect in a bylaw rather than applying a hard (black & white) ruling.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions, leaving the scene is a crime and harsh punishments should be handed down on the owners.
- If there is a dog bite. The owner should be responsible for the pets behaviour



- it is the responsible thing to do (like staying at a traffic accident)
- It demonstrates responsible pet ownership to take accountability for damages that your dog has inflicted.
- Owners should take responsibility for the actions of their dog
- Full information should be on the dogs ID.
- I have witnessed dog attacks in an off-leash park and the offending owner has left to avoid being accountable for their dogs actions.
- Pet owners should be held accountable for their dog's actions and should be able to be reached should further information be required of them.
- Only if there is a chance the party bitten could contract rabies or another disease
- As a pet guardian myself I believe it's important to stay and take ownership of any accident that occurs barring that by the owner and the dog staying t doesn't cause additional concern for any person or animals safety including their own. Sharing contact information in imperative.
- If the bite is serious it should be recorded for the fog or person so that if a pattern of behaviour is developing it can be seen.
- They are responsible for the animal and its actions.
- If the person shows remorse and responsibility then the enforcement officer should then look at the owner and whether he or she needs to learn how to properly care for the dog. If determined not then the dog should be taken and then trained and given to a proper home. This includes both parties. It's time owners be held responsible not the dogs.
- The owner/handler is the one that trains, whether intentionally or not the dog to behave in an aggressive way. They must be penalised for their behaviour. The big problem with this is having the owner and out of control dog that has just attacked, staying around the victim.
- People need to be held accountable to the actions of their dogs - I think the bite victim must also be held accountable. Were they following proper dog etiquette?
- If you are in an accident with your car, or bicycle or anything else, it is assumed that you will share contact information with the other party. I believe this should be the same in a situation with a dog incident. A share of contact information at the very least.
- It seems to work for vehicle incidents
- This reasonable of any responsible pet owner.
- This is difficult because you your pet did the attacking you would want to be able to remove your animal from the immediate issue. However, contact info still needs to be shared.
- Both Dog owners should remain at the scene of the incident to exchange contact info and talk with an enforcement officer if necessary
- Owners mist take responsibility.
- People have to be accountable for their actions
- It is an incident the same as a car accident and should be treated as such.
- Two sides of story should be heard and two animals seen by authorities.
- I would mostly agree with this rule, Sometimes its best to remove the dog from the environment in which it bit and as a owner that should be their right to prevent any further escalation. Having said



that there does need to be a way to prevent owners bailing from the expectation of being responsible and taking ownership of their dogs actions.

- Same as witnessing an accident you shouldn't be able to have your dog attack someone and just run away
- Accidents happen just ask car accidents happen stay and figure everything out.
- Clarify situation.
- i say good luck though.
- Responsible dog ownership ownership includes being responsible to stay on scene period.
- The owner is responsible for their dog at all times and the consequences of its actions. Like any "accident" one does not leave the scene.
- Much like remaining at the scene of an accident, the owner of an offending dog should absolutely remain at the scene and be held accountable for whatever is necessary.
- Holds the owner accountable and provides the opportunity for education and training.
- Dog bites happen as a result of poor training and is the responsibility of the owner. It is not the Dogs fault.
- This is the only answer that makes sense in the case if a dog bite incident. The owner MUST remain at scene
- In case further action needs to be taken, owners should provide contact information
- They have to be responsible right?
- I would like to see a substantial fine imposed if a dog owner/ walker does not remain at the scene of a dog bite/ attack.
- No different than a traffic accident. All parties should remain at the scene and exchange relevant information.
- It gives them an opportunity to provide their view of the attack and take responsibility. After suffering a couple of dog attacks, one of which the owner ran away, its disorienting and scaring after trying to fight off the dog while making sure your animal is safe. Then to look up and see there is no one around and you have no idea who that person was or where they had come from.
- Yes but the cops better be coming too because most dogs that bite have owners that get elevated quickly.
- The owner is responsible to pay any medical costs plus dog's medical history re: shots up to date
- What's to explain? The owner of the dog thats bitten and animal or person, absolutely needs to stay there and be accountable!!
- Stop profiling pitbulls. You are all ignorant to the fact that Dalmatians and Rottweilers have been in more incidents than pitbulls. Also, it's the owner, not the dog.
- The dog owner must be held responsible.
- If harm is caused, it's the same as harm coming to a person. Nobody should leave until the matter is dealt with properly on everyone's side.
- It is easy for bad dog owners to just leave and not take responsibility for their pet. They need to be held accountable and should not be able to just leave if their dog attacks a person or another pet.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs.



- I believe the owner should take responsibility. That being said. Sometimes it's the other dogs fault too. Both owners should stay
- Responsible dog owners should & would.
- No different than a motor vehicle collision. There is damage to property, stay at the scene.
- They are responsible for the event.
- Without a doubt. It should be a crime not to.
- Such a rule would remind dog owners that they are responsible for the actions of their animals and that they are accountable to the victim and to City authorities.
- Too many valuable resources are being used to track down irresponsible owners in order to charge them days after the incident occurs.
- It should be like a car accident. If there is a nuisance dog owner that flees that owner should pay steeper penalties
- Both sides of the story should be heard.
- It's the right thing to do.
- People must be made to take responsibility for their pet
- The dog owner must be held accountable
- I relate it to a car crash- if the owner of the vehicle drove off, they need to accept similar consequences
- Will help to get info from both sides for later.
- Agreed, no one should leave a scene of an incident. If my child hit or hurt another child we would stay and not flee
- This seems like common sense. Just like any other incident where bodily harm or property damage occurs, it should be an offence to 'flee the scene.'
- Owner should be liable for damages and thus should be required to provide contact info and should've fined heavily if they do not.
- If someone can't control their dog, & it bites someone, it's an assault. The dog owner is responsible.
- Self evident
- The owner's contact information must be recorded - to leave the scene is the same as leaving a car accident w/o exchanging information.
- Dog owners need to take full responsibility and be held accountable if their dog bites someone
- Makes sense
- Owner needs to take responsibility for their animal's actions.
- as with any other incident involving personal injury
- I've heard too many stories about owners running off and not taking responsibility.
- for follow up with the owner - you need their info
- potential liability & care of injured parties
- If another dog bit mine I would require information to be given from the other dogs owner.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs, period. If a dog damages property or injures other animals or people, the owner must accept responsibility for their animal and it's behaviour.



- Bad dogs are from bad owners so it's their fault for the incident and should take responsibility
- The owner must take all responsibility for their pets actions.
- I believe if the owner leaves it knows it dog has a problem. They should stay till all the facts are stated
- may be a reason for the dog biting
- Depends, if the situation is too stressful for the animal(s), an exchange of information should be done before leaving the scene. Phone number, licence, etc
- "If a dog is loose the owner should be responsible.
- Even with best intentions and proper containment, sometimes a dog can escape and if the dog is involved in an altercation the owner should stand up."
- The actions of a pet are merely a reflection of the actions of the owner. A willful lack of training leading to any sort of altercation should be taken extremely seriously and owners MUST be held accountable for their terrible ownership.
- With a fine imposed if ignored. Provides better identification of the owner and the dog for follow-up and possible medical issues.
- I've seen just across the street from my residence an incident in which a dog attacked another, causing severe injuries. The owner of the aggressor dog intimidated bystanders who rushed to help with loud and very vulgar shouting and threats, clearly heard across the street, and soon walked away with on one knowing who he was or where to find him while others tried to assist the wounded dog who was bleeding from injuries. The owner of the injured dog likely had significant veterinary bills. The problem with this idea is that there is likely no one present at such an event who can compel the owner of such a dog to remain at the scene of such an event and there is an incentive for the owner to get away from the scene of the attack.
- How is this even an issue. Any responsible owner would remain at the scene; no different than a vehicle collision.
- If they leave the scene before an officer shows contact in the future may be impossible. Or they could provide false contact info to avoid dealing with the situation.
- It would be the same if there's a car accident, must stay at scene until enforcement officers show up.
- There should be full disclosure of the name and contact information for the owner of the offending dog. I do not understand why the owner should be allowed to walk away without providing this information. They cannot be trusted to own up to their dog's actions after the fact. Even if they leave their information with the owner of the dog who was bitten, the owner of the offending dog may lie about their name and/or contact information. It could be more difficult, and probably cost more money to identify the owners and find their contact information. If they need to wait for an enforcement officer, then the officer may be able to verify the information provided to them by the offending dog's owner.
- I do think it's important the information is shared (no bite and runs to avoid accountability) but dogs are often treated like family members. I would be concerned for the safety of the offending dog & owner if the other owner is in a high state of emotion. Perhaps the rule should be you have to call



311 and provide your information before you leave the scene, but may do so after if you feel your safety is in jeopardy.

- Owners must be responsible for their pets
- Because then the owner can have a say in what happened, and ultimately be proving responsibility.
- It makes certain that the owner of the animal that does the biting[unprovoked] is accountable for their animal's action
- Owners are responsible for their animals
- The owner is responsible for the dog's behavior in most cases
- Putting the onus on the person makes sense
- As a dog owner, I feel it is the responsibility of an owner to have control of their dog at all times both on leash and off leash. If their dog bites someone they should stay at the scene but also if their dog bites another dog.
- I believe the owner should act responsibly
- too many illegally off leash dogs create hazards for other animals and people, these owners should be treated like owners involved in car accidents - you leave the scene, you get charged over and above
- In case there are medical issues or concerns later they can be contacted and heard from.
- Owning a pet comes with responsibility and if your dog bites someone it is your responsibility to stay on the scene. Much like a car accident.
- the owner should be made responsible for action of their pet and ensure they are trained/supported to ensure they behave well in public.
- It would allow for the responsible party to be identified. Many instances have occurred where bites and injuries have been inflicted and the owners have fled the scene and left the other party with veterinarian and ambulance bills.
- The rightful owner has a responsibility.
- I answered this way as it may help to get the whole story right away
- So the owners of the pet can exchange information. The owner of the pet in regards to wrong doing or harm should pay for any necessary vet bills.
- One incident that I am familiar with which resulted in the death of a pet resulted in the dog owner to abscond with the dog.
- Kinda like a car accident, don't hit and run.
- Any responsible dog owner would do this.
- Ideally they should stay, realistically many won't
- The owner must be responsible for their dog's behaviour. They should make it as easy as possible for the enforcement officer to find them and discuss the situation.
- People need to be responsible and accountable for their dogs behaviour
- People absolutely should be taking accountability for their animals. Dogs are not inherently bad, humans make them that way.
- Be responsible for the behaviour and impact of the dog under your care and control.



- It seems no different than if you cause a vehicle accident you should remain at the scene until resolved.
- If a dog bites my dog, the owner must remain at the scene to determine if the dog has a history of attacking other dogs and to pay for vet bills if necessary. If a dog bites me, the owner must remain at the scene so the dog can be registered as dangerous.
- There are many factors that can play into a dog biting another dog, it should be necessary for all parties to stay and communicate the issue reasonably.
- Unlike a car, there is no license to write down and therefore locate the prep once they've left the scene.
- Responsible owners would be doing this anyway! We need to enforce laws strictly no warnings just fines, and removal of animal if necessary, especially if they are still acting aggressive with the owner present.
- safety and protection of victim
- Need clearer definition of 'bite'. Does it include breaking the skin and drawing blood? What is the difference between a 'bite' and what some owners call a 'nip' or aggressive play. My large, submissive dog was recently attacked by a pack of 3 dogs and one of the owners suggested that I should avoid bringing my dog to the off leash if she couldn't deal with the behavior of other dogs.
- Yes, however the officer also needs to recognize that often dogs only bite when attacked. The person or animal bitten also needs to be considered. If another dog was bitten it needs to be assessed if they were aggravating the dog that bit.
- I consider this is a serious matter.
- Absolutely! It is the responsible thing to do. There is a need to ensure that the dogs vaccination's are up to date. The enforcement officer needs to question the owner regarding any previous incidents. Also, if there any medical or vet bills due to the attack, the dogs owner needs to be responsible for these bills if found to be negligent.
- That is fair but i think that should apply to both parties if possible in order to ascertain why the incident occurred in the first place.
- Also, the dog owner to cover all costs associated with the incident for the person or other animal.
- I am hesitant on this. There are bad owners who should know better and end up with their dog biting and then some bites are the fault of the other person or animal. But this can become a finger pointing scenario and the blame usually goes to the dog who bit making it unfair.
- Yes but only if it's severe enough to require medical attention. Dog bites are not all equal and don't always require any type of follow up. For example, I was bit by a dog a couple years ago which broke the skin on the back of my hand drawing blood but it was not the dogs fault and it was not an aggressive dog. It was simply an accident and did not warrant any type of reporting or follow up so the owner was not required to provide me with any contact information. If it was an aggressive dog, than there should have been some type of follow up.
- It is no different than a traffic crash. You stay until the authorities can assess the situation.
- for law enforcement to be able to interview the owner regarding the incident
- To many dog owners who have an aggressive dog take off from the scene



- The incident can be resolved between the two parties and I don't think enforcement officers should ever be necessary, because it can easily be resolved by the people involved
- I believe the owner should remain at scene with the dog involved. The officer can then assess the situation more easily as well as the behavior of the owner.
- They need to at least provide valid contact information. Like in a collision
- There needs to be accountability from the owner and contact/contact info is necessary
- I believe there are NO BAD DOGS only irresponsible owners.
- It makes sense to know who owns a dog that bites people and other animals. If they leave the scene, they are taking no responsibility.
- If it's your dog you should be held responsible, considering it's your responsibility to ensure your dog behaves at a reasonable level
- It is difficult to find the owner and resources are spent unnecessarily
- dog owners need to be held accountable too
- both owner and victim should be there
- They need to stay in place otherwise no way to follow up
- It is against the law to leave the scene of an automobile accident, why should nuisance dog incidents be any different?
- in case the injury escalates
- Your dog is your responsibility.
- The dog owner is responsible for the dog, so sharing information about this incident is important.
- It is common sense and common courtesy. Not remaining at the scene is akin to a 'hit and run'.
- This would allow each incident to be reported and the behaviour of a recurring problem dog to be known.
- Otherwise they don't have to take responsibility. It might be difficult to enforce.
- I believe this would eliminate a lot of "he said, she said". No different then you can't leave a scene of a crime.
- This seems obvious, of course they should stay. They need to be fined severely if they leave. But figuring out who they are is not always easy.
- There have been incidents where a dog has bitten a person and the owner was not identified.
- Self-explanatory.
- No different than human-on-human assault.
- Contact information needs to be exchanged to enable follow up actions. Dog owner must also ensure dog is controlled and public is safe immediately following incident. This demonstrates the importance for required obedience training particularly for large or nuisance dogs.
- The owner is more at fault than the dog in my opinion and should take on that responsibility and share information like in any other accident situation
- As some people do not wish to be held accountable for their animal's behavior, they will not remain at the scene of an incident. Unfortunately this can cause problems for the victim affected (monetarily).



- People are crazily referring to animals as their children well if a human hurt another and flee the scene that's additional charges right? So treat it as such this should be law, not a suggestion. Shocking it wasn't already.
- Any responsible pet owner would stay to possibly state paying for vet bills or additional medical expenses if required. However, how do you enforce this rule if the person does not want to stay?
- People should take responsibility for anything their dog does because if it misbehaves it is their fault for not training the dog properly.
- How else can bylaw get an idea of why the bite occurred and what the next reasonable step should be? Focus on harm reduction - training, classes, support for the dog and additional training for owner.
- Not different than two drivers involved in an accident remaining on the scene. Owner is responsible for his/her dog and may be able to explain how/why the incident occurred.
- The dog should be secured by the owner and kept under control until Bylaw arrives. Many dog owners do not carry phones with them when they walk their dogs so exchanging information is difficult. Also when someone is hurt the immediate need is to get medical support for the person and secure the dog. It is an emotional time for all involved and exchanging information between the parties is sometimes impossible or threatening. A Bylaw Officer can act as an independent third party in these situations.
- The circumstances of why the incident occurred are important to determine if the incident was 'forced' upon the dog by teasing etc or if the dog is naturally aggressive and unprovoked.
- Information should be exchanged when a dog bites. Too many people take off when their dogs have bitten someone. If it is safe to do so (for both parties), the dog owner should remain at the scene. If it is better for the dog owner to leave (dog has been injured or is not settling down, etc.) then the owner should at minimum provide the victim with all their contact information - including address, phone number and email so that they and bylaw officers can reach them. Should be a fine for leaving the scene WITHOUT providing contact details.
- I find that owners of these dog biters are illiterate and can't read a sign
- You should not be allowed to flee the scene if an injury causing dog attack any more than you would be permitted to flee any other accident scene
- I think it is equivalent to making drivers involved in accidents remain at the scene of the accident.
- Good luck with that. But I agree the owner must stick around.
- share contact information a must
- I think it makes sense since I would equate someone leaving as a hit and run situation. You stay at the scene and ensure the dog is secure. I've seen a situation where a large dog attacked a small one. The small dog was terribly injured and ran away with its owner pursuing it. Eventually the small dog died of its injuries. The owner of the large dog left the scene so there was no way for my neighbour to retrace that person to hold them accountable for the situation.
- They should share contact information if the victims of the bite deem it necessary because the offender should be held accountable in some way, sharing contact information or speaking with an enforcement officer should ensure that.



- This is no different than a car accident. you stay, swap insurance and contact information and speak with the police. Should be the same for all dogs
- Owners do take off with their dogs but they should be held liable and pay for vets based on the injuries
- The dog owner is ultimately accountable for the consequences of their dog's behaviour. This just seems like common sense.
- The owner should be liable for damages and distress resulting from the behaviour of their dog.
- Similar to a car accident, sharing contact info is necessary to hold the owner accountable and have each party's insurance (if applicable) get involved
- Hold dog owners accountable.
- It would seem the responsible thing to do
- Should be fined for leaving the scene of a crime
- The human has to be responsible so must remain at scene and provide information (with some leeway for getting their problem dog away from situation and returning immediately).
- There are some dog owners who do not accept responsibility for unwanted behaviour in their dogs.
- This could become an insurance claim and appropriate information needs to be made available
- Communicating the animal's vaccinations, history, and training is important. Also debriefing the events leading to the bite.
- It's like a car accident. Leaving the scene should be an offense.
- Same reason we don't allow hit and runs. If you are a responsible owner you will take responsibility for your dog. Real [removed] won't stick around.
- They should remain on scene as long as the animal is able to be confined during this time.
- It just makes sense. I was once attacked by a boxer. He was being walked by two young girls and ran on to attack me and my dog (my dog was on leash) not once but twice. The two girls left, never got their name. I was told by by-law that if it happens again that I am to follow the people home so that I can give their address.
- If an incident has occurred obviously all parties must stay and answer questions to determine how to protect society from either a bad dog or bad dog owner. A dog will either fight or flight. I've seen many owners of small dogs think it's funny to watch them bark or be aggressive to a very large dog. It's not always the dogs fault.
- This one is a no brainer. I've been involved in the threat of a dog attack and the women, despite my pleading would not put the dog on a leash and ignored pleas to control her dog.
- people should be fully responsible for their dogs.
- Its necessary for enforcement for fines
- After a dog attack to a person or another dog, having the contact information of the owner is helpful in case of medical or legal follow-up.
- It is not always the dog that is the problem but rather the owner so they need to stay to be the responsible one in the situation.
- It is comparable to other physical assault, so it requires clear and trackable followup



- Owners responsibility of owning a animal
- Committing any offence and leaving the scene is unforgivable and suggests that the party is guilty, and has no regard for the wellbeing of the affected party.
- It might be hard to track them down later.
- Need to take responsibility for the dog.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their dog and consequently need to remain at the scene
- I agree because I think that it is the owners job to take responsibility for the incident that it has happened whether it is to a person or other animal. There was this time that I heard about at a dog park that I go to where a dog severely bit another dog. The owner ran away from the scene with the dog and the victim dog ended up going to the vet and needed emergency surgery. Luckily the dog is okay.
- How else are we going to determine which dog (or dog-owner) is dangerous? A;though, if the dog is out of control, it might be necessary to remove it, so an alternative is to give some sort of identification to witnesses, then leave.
- It's the right thing to do.
- Owners must remain on scene, if not, additional major fines should be levied
- The dog owner has a responsibility for their dog and its actions and is accountable for it.
- I see it as the Owner taking responsibility for what his pet has done
- In cases that I'm aware of, the owner has walked away and doesn't care.
- Case by case, but if human is bitten, owner should remain at site.
- All owners need to be responsible for their pets behaviour, big or small.
- It just makes sense!
- This is an aspect of responsible pet ownership - you must take responsibility for the behavior of your pet and any consequences. Seems fairly similar to the idea of remaining at the scene of a car accident. Would need to account for the possibility that it may not be safe to keep the pet at the scene of the incident - perhaps the owner would be required to make arrangements for the pet to be safely restrained?
- The owner is responsible for the animal's actions.
- The owner is responsible for the dog and must take responsibility for any action of the dog.
- They need to be held responsible and if the pet bitten needs medical care the owner of the offending dog needs to pay the vet bills.
- Yes but the dog needs to be secured somehow. There should be penalties for leaving the scene.
- They should pay costs and be required to take training class
- If an incident occurs that results in injury, the offending party should not leave the scene.
- The owner must assume responsibility for the actions of his pet.
- If a dog bites a person or other animal and the owner is not required to share contact information, there is no access to a person for enforcing the law



- Dog bites can cause issues that may not be known at the time of injury. It is important that owners stick around and exchange information to ensure that, should any medical bills be required, that the owner of the aggressor be accountable and reachable to obtain compensation.
- All dog owners should accept responsibility for their pets and their behaviour, as long as both are treated fairly
- just like with car crashes - be responsible
- Like in hit and run, leaving the scene constitutes an offense and should be punished.
- Owner should be allowed to leave the scene to remove the animal to prevent further harm/trauma/stress but failure to return or exchange contact information should result in consequence
- Both sides should have a chance to explain what happened.
- If a dog bites someone, or even jumps on or charges/chases someone, it's assault by the dog and therefore assault by the owner. It's a terrifying experience for the person who has been bitten or otherwise attacked. If I were to punch a random stranger, the full force of the law would descend on me. I expect that the same should apply to dog owners, who have caused pain and suffering to the person their dog attacked. If a dog owner leaves the scene of their assault, they should be fined within an inch of their life or jailed or both. Why is this even under discussion?
- Requiring the dog owner to stay at the scene eliminates the possibility of the dog owner leaving and not following-up with the incident and/or taking responsibility.
- It's responsible
- It would ensure that dog owners who don't provide proper training or socializing for their dogs would be more responsible for their pets behavior. Right now they know there aren't any specific rules so they don't care about the dogs poor behavior or the problems that result.
- It's just the responsible thing to do
- This should be true of all injury incidents (e.g. cyclists colliding with pedestrians).
- The owner needs to be held accountable
- The owner is responsible for the dog and it's behaviour. The dog owner should face consequences for their dogs actions, and if they don't remain at the scene the incident may not be addressed appropriately.
- the person that was bitten needs to know if the dog had all it's shots etc.
- because if they stay and explain what happened then they can take to time and discuss what they can do for everyone involved
- "This is a tricky one.

- They should remain at the scene but at a safe distance. The public deserves more information to properly assess any actions to be taken."
- Well obviously. They all run off anyways.. but higher fines and penalties if they leave the scene should be in place.



- The owner needs to be liable
 - I think the owner has a responsibility to stay at the scene of any altercation,
 - Same rule as vehicle collisions or people assaults
 - As long as the dog is now under control the owner should be taking responsibility and should support the person bitten or owner of animal bitten
 - Of course it is the owner's responsibility to ensure they have their dog under control and if they can't then they need to accept responsibility for the dog's actions.
 - Proper investigation requires all sides. If someone is not willing to stay, I would suspect they are at fault (them or their dog)
 - How else would the nuisance dog owner be charged? If they left the scene, they might not be tracked down, only to re-offend again.
 - Unless medical attention necessitates doing otherwise
 - It is the pet owner's responsibility.
 - "But should be limited to dog bites that break the skin / cause bruising
 - A scared Chihuahua nipping an ankle is not the same as a vicious dog attacking another animal or a human"
 - I agree you don't leave an car accident you wait for authorities so both sides can explain the situation.
 - The owner of a dog should always take responsibility when their dog bites and harms another person or animal
 - To leave the scene says that the owner is not willing to take responsibility for the dog's actions.
 - People just walk away and deny responsibility for the attacks so your review and revisions do nothing. Enforce the regulations and if you do that we will be just as far ahead without you tinkering. If you are not enforcing the bylaw in the books now what good is this tinkering?
 - Same principle/reason as to why the at fault party has to do so from an accident. If they don't it is a 'hit and run' which is how I think this should be approached. One must stay at the scene of the offence caused by them.
 - Dogs that are hurting others should have a 'record' so patterns can be identified and addressed.
 - "5. Absolutely. Any responsible owner already does this. The only time I can see where this may not be practical would be if their dog was seriously injured and needed urgent medical help.
 - I think, depending on circumstances, there should be a very high fine for not remaining at the scene of a dog bite incident, and providing relevant information.
-
- Because there was no comment section offered for a number of the previous questions in this survey, I have included my comments to several questions below.



- 3. Upon reading this question I find the format quite confusing. First, you refer to problem dog behaviours such as severe bites, but then in the next line continue with “nuisance dogs”, and then continue again on the subsequent line with your specific description of “pit bull”. Reading this gives me the very confusing impression that you don’t know what you want to say, by including problem dog behaviours, severe bites, nuisance dogs and pit bull dogs jumbled together.
- Please be far more clear when discussing these topics, especially when you are introducing them together, as these subjects do not share direct commonality. It would have been far more clear had you simply discussed one subject at a time. First, problem dog behaviours for all dogs, then nuisance dogs, then severe bites, then pit bull type dogs.
- I am also dismayed to find that you presented some type of factual information in the form of “pitbull’s strength allows the potential for a more severe bite”, and did not provide any evidence or cite any reference of this whatsoever. Without showing how this information was derived you are telling people to accept this as truth alone, only the words you provide that we are to trust whatever sources of information and data that you use. I must say I do not accept the way you have handled this information or this portion of the survey.
- Regarding the term “pit bull”, as you provide your definition of this term I expect that you are aware that pit bull is not a breed of dog but a type, and identification by phenotyping, using physical and visual characteristics is incredibly misleading and even more importantly inaccurate, which can lead to devastating outcomes for dogs and for people.
- You refer to the measures other municipalities have taken to reduce frequency and severity of dog bites, but are you taking into account how many municipalities have taken the measures adopted by City of Calgary Animal Services when the bylaw was previously overhauled? It is very interesting, and perhaps telling, that you have not included this information for all Calgarians, and everyone and anyone in the world that would like to take an interest and provide their feedback, that our city pet bylaw has been a model for cities throughout the world. There are so very many places where there are no licencing requirements and no rules of any kind regarding pets, their well-being or the responsibilities of their owners. It is truly astonishing. I think this information is incredibly important to share with all of our citizens so that they know that we are already doing a great deal to make our city safe, peaceful and friendly to its citizens, both people and pets.
- I am also very cautious about adding changes that specify any type of dog requiring harsher rules, and without an individual dog having done nothing to merit these consequences. How anyone,



human being or creature, looks is not a reflection of their behaviour or their personality. Actions will always speak louder than descriptive words, or photos.

- Let us not punish or restrict responsible pet owners for how their dog looks. Even the thought of requiring an owner to have extra insurance because their dog looks a certain way is quite unreasonable. The only result of this type of action would be that irresponsible owners will still be irresponsible, and responsible ones will have to pay more, perhaps even more because of the irresponsible ones.
- Regarding owners of nuisance dogs being required to have additional insurance, you would have to present how that would benefit citizens including pet owners and their pets.
- Is this really considered a useful deterrent for irresponsible owners to take better care of their animals? Or would this have unintended consequences for other people that are not the target of this measure?
- Muzzling dogs that have not displayed any behaviour requiring a muzzle is ridiculous, especially when considering your idea of singling out a specific type of dog by its physical appearance only.
- How is requiring a muzzle for a nuisance dog preventing the dog from being a nuisance? If the dog displays behaviours that actually require a muzzle that would be an acceptable scenario. However the way you have portrayed this, it doesn't sound like it will have any positive effect. Nuisance dogs, from my experience, are directly related to irresponsible owners. Deal with these owners, even to the extreme point of removing the dog from their care and re-homing that dog, as well as providing training it may require to be happy and healthy.
- Again, you are restricting responsible owners when including all dog owners that must have only one pit bull type dog. Who would verify what type the dog is? Who will enforce the number of dogs? By licence only? By complaint?
- Any measure must be directly related to the unlawful behaviour of an individual dog or the irresponsible behaviour of its owners, period.



- I would truly love all pet dogs to have obedience training however that is a completely idealistic notion, as is obedience training for pit bull type dogs or nuisance dogs. Requiring such a thing for all of any type of dog is trying to find a “cookie-cutter” solution to a complex issue. Each individual dog owner with their dog is accountable, period.
- A separate idea would be to have the option to lower a high fine for nuisance dogs when the owners take them for obedience training with an authorised trainer - many dog trainers are not responsible themselves, this must be determined by setting a standard of quality.
- The only dogs that should not be at off-leash dog parks are those that...should not be at off-leash dog parks; those that don't interact well with other dogs or different types of people and kids, and those dogs with either irresponsible or inattentive owners (who are very close to being irresponsible in these instances).
- The problems with off-leash dog parks is there is no one there to keep dog owners accountable for their dogs. Many responsible dog owners no longer attend off-leash dog parks because of irresponsible and inattentive owners who either do not know their dogs well enough or do not take care of their dogs well enough.
- Higher fines for owners with nuisance dogs could possibly work as a deterrent but what is also needed is to have an avenue, or several, for irresponsible owners to become responsible owners.
- Education, access to quality obedience training and even dog owner meet-ups for them to learn what being a responsible dog owner means and how to use that to take better care of their dog.
- I will continue to repeat myself, the irresponsible owners of the individual dog displaying unlawful behaviour are the ones requiring consequences to deter their problematic behaviour.
- As well, answers to some of the questions after question 5.
- 8. A dog early warning system sounds like a good idea. But who will enforce it? It's voluntary so what do young children do about dogs that don't have bandannas? What happens when they fall off? What about when a good dog isn't feeling well or isn't having a good day. This type of measure is misleading in its simplicity and usefulness.
- Education is the best method to help in dog bite prevention. Providing children of all ages the information that they need to understand a dog's body language, asking for permission from the dog



owner, and the dog, what a dog looks like when it's okay to approach and what the dog looks like when it isn't okay to approach. All of these important lessons are essential in preventing dog bites to both children and adults.

- Additionally, can we have this education for adults too? Too many adults don't know how to understand dog body language and dog behaviour. The phrases "there was no warning" or "it happened so fast" means that the owners did not see or understand the dog's communication that something was wrong.
- 9a. Fine increases to pet bylaw violations
- In most cases i would prefer the fines were increased only with the addition of avenues for irresponsible pet owners to lower the fines with improved responsible pet ownership, for example, obedience classes from a quality trainer, pay 2 years in advance for their pet licence for unlicensed pets, for animals at large providing better enclosures - if they animal escapes again then the fine cannot be lowered; etc. Depending on the dog bite incident (severity and conditions) dog and owner training could also apply here.
- 9b. It's hard to say whether higher fines for bites to children would actually help prevent bites. Unless these funds were needed to provide dog bite prevention education. Then I would support increasing these fines over fines involving adults.
- 10b. We want as many pets licensed as possible. This way the welfare of the animal and even their owner can be checked if incidents arise, and citizens are also protected.
- 11. I know that it can be difficult for non-pet owners to deal with all that can come with having pet neighbours, and I also know that restricting the number of animals per residence without the pet owners having done anything to deserve these restrictions seems arbitrary to say the least.
- I also know that we do not live in an ideal world where all pet owners take exceptional care of their pets and only have the number of pets that they can properly care for.
- I would be more supportive of a measure that would require the reduction of the number of allowable pets in a residence if there were incidents where this would be appropriate. Perhaps a partial measure that states that complaints regarding the welfare of these animals and the ability for the pet owners to care for them would mean a reduction in the number allowed. Some type of defined care standard and ability to care for the animals would have to be established.
- One of the main problems with restricting the number of pets per residence, besides punishing responsible pet owners, is that once a limit is in place, it can be continually argued that this new limit should be reduced, again and again. This has happened in many communities and I know we can find a better solution.



- It comes down to only restricting those pet owners that actually require it.
- 12. The more convenient it can be for licencing pets, the more pet owners will do it and keep both pet owners, pets and citizens safe and responsible."
- It's very important that the owner remain in the area as they need to be able to discuss plans moving forward, discuss the consequences for the dog and owner, and it makes it easier to determine the best way to continue.
- How to enforce this is the issue... but yes, I think it is necessary. I also think this should be treated as an accident, if a person leaves the scene of a crime, they are severely fined.
- Owner is responsible to give a statement
- The owner should be fully accountable for the dogs actions as they have taken ownership of the animal and should deal with any consequences as a responsible pet owner.
- You should stay on scene.
- Both sides involved in an incident need to remain at the scene to speak with enforcement officers.
- Just like your car, someone hits it, and needs to stay there, otherwise it's a hit and run and should have repercussions. The dog is the responsibility of the owner, they should stay and take responsibility or review who was at fault (ie) there are cases where people ignore the owners and approach their dogs regardless. This should be reviewed.
- Any decent person would do this anyway, but because people appear to be irresponsible, perhaps having fines for leaving without providing information would help.
- Yes, just like a car accident, you stay on scene unless medical help is needed.
- I have been attacked by a dog before., it would be nice to know the dog is getting a good home and proper training
- The owner is responsible for their dog's behaviour and therefore should take responsibility. The consequences of the owners actions should not be taken out on the dog.
- These situations are already so emotionally charged. The aggressive behaviour of all parties involved regardless of size or breed or ability to defend themselves must be taken into consideration.
- I think if you aren't in control of your dog, and it bites another dog or person unprovoked then you should stay and exchange information.
- Yes, within reason. Person can leave for medical assistance for themselves or their dog. Officer must arrive within 1 hour.
- Your animal is your responsibility and it's actions are also owner's responsibility
- It is important to receive the full story from both parties. In my experience both parties can have very different stories.
- It should be clearly understood by all dog owners that they are accountable for their dogs behaviour and must provide their contact in the case of an incident.



- If the party of the dog who was bite requests information so that follow up can happen the other party/ies involved need to stay so that can be collected. It's like two cars colliding - you can't just leave the scene.
- Had a husky bite my pit bull and it resulted in a \$2000 vet bill for which the husky owner did not take responsibility for
- Own up to your dog and defend them. They can't speak for themselves
- Hard to declare a dog a nuisance if the owner runs away.
- Be a responsible pet owner, regardless of what breed you own.
- My view is that it is similar to a hit and run otherwise
- Owners should be required to share their dog's registration information and their own contact information, but remaining on the scene is likely too onerous, placing too much pressure on response times to events that are most likely to happen in the outdoors
- It feels responsible for the dog owner to remain at the scene, unless it is unsafe to do so (for instance if the dog continues to be violent). However, if the dog owner had to leave there should be a mechanism to ensure accountability and traceability of the dog owner.
- If the owner knowingly leaves the scene there should be similar consequences to that of a hit and run
- All parties can be heard
- If a dog bites someone a responsible owner should stay and talk with that person because it is the owner's responsibility to make sure that their dog is properly trained it is not the dogs responsibility to train itself
- They need to stay and be accountable for their actions and the actions of their dog if others have been injured. If they leave it is no different than fleeing the scene of any other crime, it's illegal.
- Dog human interactions can be highly confrontational and enforcement officers need to attend. As would be required by police to attend an assault.
- It's important to track these dog owners.
- It is the responsibility of the dog owner to remain just like it is the responsibility of a driver to remain at the scene of a crash. If for some reason the person couldn't remain, such as needing to seek care of themselves or the dog, then that should be taken into consideration.
- It's the responsibility of a dog owner to do the right thing
- A dog owner should take responsibility for their animal, though should a situation arise that makes it unsafe to stay (safety of the dogs involved, physical or verbal altercation with the people involved). Individuals involved should also have the opportunity to report the incident within 24hrs.
- Repeat offenders can be identified
- YOU MADE IT A "YES" OR "NO" QUESTION! IT IS ILLOGICAL TO ASK ME TO EXPLAIN MY ANSWER!
- The owner is responsible for the animal and its actions. Recently a dog attacked another dog in my neighbourhood a the owner fled thd scen. This action of fleeing should receive a steep fine.
- There should be consequences for assault.



- Owners should be responsible for their dog's actions. Just like you are required (or charged otherwise) to remain at the scene of an accident.
- It's responsible dog ownership to follow up with an incident. How will the victim know the dog's immunization status? If unknown - the victim will be immunized for rabies as a precaution- an expensive use of public health funds that may not be needed. Not every dog that bites must be put down, right? There can be extenuating circumstances? It would be better for everyone if the dog owner had access to resources if it helps dog and owner.
- Pet owner is responsible for the pet. Being bitten could be a traumatic experience.
- Dog owners should be accountable for their dogs actions all the time.
- the owners of pets are ultimately responsible for the actions of their pets.
- The owner should always be punished not the dogs.
- Information of both and dog owner and victim should be exchanged along with pictures. (a city of Calgary dog bite app would be a nice addition to be able to record all needed information for incident of both parties)
- If requested by the victim or animal victim, then maybe if it is severe bite?
- Owners should be responsible for their dogs actions and they should also be tracked in a system to see if they have a history of owning animals that bite. 1 incidents is a warning and 2 incidents you cannot own a new dog until you complete dog training or animal education of some sort.
- The person must remain, as there can be medical costs to be concerned about at the very least. Also, for records keeping of the owners of nuisance dogs.
- History
- The owner should be held responsible no the dog.
- A statement should be made by both parties
- It is the owners responsibility, and is no different than when a driver must remain at the scene of a car accident
- It's the owners responsibility to take action for their animal. It's the responsible thing to do
- The owner of the dog should be responsible for any vet/medical costs incurred
- To me, this is common sense—of course the dog's owner needs to be available for next steps.
- if possible yes
- If your animal has bitten a person or animal, you have a responsibility to remain available to provide details and of course, be accountable for any injuries your pet may have caused. As owners, the onus is on us to control our animals and protect others if necessary. The scene of an animal attack should follow the same rules (as applicable) as those that apply at the scene of an accident of any sort.
- It's a reasonable expectation of being a responsible pet owner.
- It is obvious that they should stay on site.
- Pet owners need to be held responsible, there are no bad breeds, only bad owners
- Be responsible
- The owner is responsible and should pay any costs incurred.



- The owner is responsible for the behavior of the animal. They should take responsibility, similar to leaving the scene of a car crash.
- Owners and insufficient training are the roots of these problems. Owners must be accountable for the actions of their pets.
- Owners should be responsible for their dogs
- If the bite is more than just a tiny scratch that didn't actually harm the person.
- The owner should stay and take responsibility for the pet
- They need to be there to help and give any information needed for the person or animal their animal bit.
- I only say yes if it is safe to do so. People can get very emotional in this situation and forget dogs react and can escalate when they are fearful or in fear for the owners safety.. I would support staying close by so the owner has the space to calm the dog. I just don't want to see mob mentality and the dog pay for acting on instinct.. they are not people
- Isn't that assault? So sticking around a crime scene is a good idea...
- That would be like the situation of traffic accident, the driver has to remain at the scene.
- That it be not unlike other offences causing injury, such as offences involving a vehicle.
- Accountability and ownership, neither is possible or easily deciphered without the offending dogs owner present or available
- Because the dog isn't to blame it's the owner and maybe how the dog or dogs are treated
- RESPONSIBLE OWNERSHIP OF YOUR DOG.
- This is basically the same as remaining at the scene of an automobile accident, even more so as in this case someone has been injured.
- The situation could be dangerous so leaving contact information should be an option where it would increase tension if they stayed.
- One should take full responsibility of their animal.
- If there was any injury caused, or risk of finding trauma after the fact, then there should be an exchange of information so that the dog at faults owner can be responsible for any damages done.
- Enforcement of responsibility.
- It is similar as not leaving the scene of a car accident.
- It is the owner's responsibility to look out for the safety of their own dog as well as other animals and people.
- If you do this to these breeds I want to see chihuahua's as well. They attack more than any other dog breed out there. But it's cute when they do it? I don't think so. Turn your brain on now, it's the people not the breed. In the 80's it was one breed then the 90's another and not it's the pit bull breed. Again THINK HARD about this one. And maybe slap crazy charges on people instead of this joke.
- It should be no different than if there was a serious car collision.
- I agree with this but do not see how this could be enforced. If a dog attacks a person or another animal, how do you make the dog owner stay at the scene. If the owner is a responsible person, they would stay. If not, they will leave without giving any information. I have seen it happen.



- The owners should be held responsible more than the dog. Mandatory training would be a wise option for ALL DOG OWNERS.
- We need owners to be responsible for their animals therefore they need to remain on the scene and be held accountable for their dogs actions.
- The owner of the dog that bites needs to pay for the vet bills of the dog that got bitten unless the other dog caused the dog to bite, such as behaved aggressively. People who have dogs that bite should put a muzzle on it or walk it far away from contact with other dogs.
- depending on the situation. Some bites are harmless or a result of a dog who gets anxious OR a result of people who don't understand dog behavior and put THEMSELVES at risk as well as the dog (ie: kids who chase and hug strange dogs-this is the fault of the parent, not the dog). Im not waiting around all day because a parent can't teach their kids to respect a living thing.
- need to ensure that owner takes responsibility (like being in a car accident) from issues resulting in a bite.
- If the owner does not stay they can be very hard to trace
- Common sense
- It's just like if your child bit or attacked someone.
- Responsibility is key , people need to be held accountable
- Yes just like in car accidents even though it was an accident it should still be dealt with responsibly.
- Owner needs to take responsibility
- As a responsible pet owner they should be expected to stay on scene.
- If a dog bite another and the owners are unable to resolve the dispute on their own, then authorities should be called and all parties should be accessible. It's not a good idea to keep either animal in the place of the incident, so I think both parties should have the option to return to their residences and wait for someone to meet with them there.
- Seems like common sense
- This is crucial REGARDLESS of the breed
- It can be a very challenging situation when a bite occurs and in an ideal world the owner would be responsible and remain at the scene.
- they should be responsible
- Yes, if the attack is severe enough to require immediate medical assistance.
- Why wouldnt this already be in place?
- The dog is under the adults responsibility they should be responsible for the after math too
- Onus should be on owners to await by law officer if needed. Owners need to know they must ensure both parties have access to personal information
- No different than a Vehicle Accident. Ownership of the incident
- I support this; however, it is highly unlikely to be effective. Having been bit myself at an off-leash park, and my dog being bitten at an off leash park, in both instances the owner left so they could avoid getting caught.
- Much like a hit and run. Beat to stay and explain your side of the situation



- I both have dogs and have been bitten by (other) dogs. A lot can happen and it's the responsible thing for both parties to remain at the scene and get care/support from bylaws, medical, etc
 - Your dog is your responsibility. The same concept as getting into a car accident, as long as the dog will not be mistreated or seized the owner should remain at the scene to exchange information, the same as any other accident.
 - Owner should take responsibility. Not the the dogs fault. No pet should be euthanized for these reasons.....so cruel.
 - The owner is responsible for the dog
 - If the dog draws blood or worse.
 - This is a tough one. It isn't always safe to stay at the scene.
 - Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
 - "However I feel that too much emphasis is placed on ""putbill"" type dogs, these dogs are actually quite lovely. I am all for a bilaw that puts the ownus on the owner NOT the dog. Registered the owner- do a background check, make the owner attend dog training. That would eliminate so many poor pet owners alone based on the comittment.
-
- Yet, there are numerous unfixed male dogs that show aggressive territorial behaviour of various breeds where the owner (usually a male) has opted to not have his dog neutered. This is a big problem and there is no reason to not neuter a dog.
 - Also, small dogs tend to have more biting frequency but seem to get away with it due to their size. A biting dog is a biting dog regardless of the size. A small dog can do large damage to a child. As a responsible dog owner I am sick and tired of the prejudice that automatically comes with owning a dog over 25 pounds in this city."
 - Yes, but only if they have some place safe to keep the animal so them staying does not put the public in danger of the dog biting additional individuals or animals.
 - It encourages efficiency and responsibility.
 - Dog owners are responsible for what their dogs do. If a dog bites another animal or person, then the owner must take responsibility for the action. Breed-specific legislation takes the ownership off the owner and creates the narrative that the dog is responsible for these actions. Owners must be educated on their dog breed and their capabilities, and mandated to train them accordingly.
 - Owners need to take responsibility for their pet.
 - The dog owner should always have to remain at the scene of an incident! This should be non negotiable. Leaving something like this would be like fleeing the scene of an accident and should absolutely be against the law
 - The pet owner should have a chance to present why this incident may have occurred in order to determine what action could be taken.



- It has been my unpleasant experience that dog owners that have been involved in any kind of illegal bylaw activity with their dog are often very hostile and abusive to other citizens (parties) but will not provide information about themselves or their dog(s) when politely requested to do so.
- If the owner leaves the scene, how else will information be exchanged or details of the incident from both sides be provided to any enforcement officers on scene?
- The injured party should be compensated aka vet bills
- This likely would be hard to enforce.
- The dog owner should be responsible for the actions of their dog which may involve fines, obedience classes, etc. Just like a vehicular accident, you should need to stay at the scene to determine next steps with an enforcement officer.
- "The owner of the dog can control his/her pet while an officer discovers the cause of the problem.
- Dogs will become more compliant generally when the owner is present and the officer does not intervene on his/her own."
- Many stories of dog park incidents includes the owners driving away and there is no way to determine who they are.
- If your child steals something and you drive them home knowing they did it, you're an accomplice. Pretty simple.
- Any person who owns an animal is responsible for that animal. The only reason that the owner should leave the scene is if the animal requires medical attention, however contact information should be exchanged
- If you own a dog, regardless of its history or breed, you should be fully accountable for all of its actions, good or bad. The dogs lack of training or socialization isn't the dogs fault, it is however the owners fault is they do not take the proper steps to insure a dog is safe to be around whether it be leashed or in an off leash area. If you hit someone with your car it isn't their fault or the cars fault and its illegal to hit and run, the same should apply to dog bites or attacks.
- People leaving before the conclusion of the matter should be treated like those involved in a hit and run
- Be a responsible owner.
- Just as in any other accident or incident, people need to swap identification.
- Pets are the responsibility of the owner.
- The owner is responsible for any bites, and should remain at the scene until enforcement officers have collected information.
- It's obvious - the dog owner must take responsibility for their dog's actions that harm others. They should pay vet bills, medical costs and time off work if necessary.
- Owners should be held responsible and be accountable for sharing their information with the other owner.
- Dogs behaviour is based on training not breed you [removed] idiots
- The dog owners need to be held accountable fir their dogs actions. Also contact information is necessary if the victim needs to press charges.



- Yes! So many times the owners DOES NOT stay at the scene. But There is no way to enforce this! My dad was bit and the owner was as vicious as the dog! If the owner leaves the scene, they should be charged an additional fine. But how can this ever be ligitamite. It's very unfortunate.
- Because any one can have their dog bitten I have seen fights between lots of small dogs
- too often we see the owner grab his dog and run
- Like a car accident, it should have proper documentation
- should be similar to any accident situation where persons in question should remain at the scene to talk with officials.
- All dog owner's must be present to provide all the facts.
- It's no different then a car accident
- The owner is responsible for their dog.
- depends on the severity of the attack
- It would help expedite the process.
- I believe this a good idea because there is always a reason for a bite. It gives the owners or persons a chance to address both sides of the story.
- The owner is responsible for the actions of their pet, and need to be accountable (ultimately it is the pet owner and not the dog that is responsible for their pet's actions). This is no different than a driver who hits another vehicle or pedestrian who must remain at the scene.
- I only support staying if the animal involved bites a person or child, or the animals involved are severely injured. Playful bites misconstrued as attacks should be left alone.
- A responsible owner would stay & deal with the situation. The ones that take off are the problem.
- Both sides of a story are required to understand the event. As well as witnesses. Observing the behavior of the animal in question is also important. A bite or attack can be traumatic, but could also be a minor event.
- promotes responsibility and accountability on the part of the owner, and permits easier follow up if owner needs to be contacted later
- If my dog is attacked and needs a vet the owner of the dog that bite is paying the vet bill,
- Except when the dog has to be removed for the safety of others. In this case, the dog owner must return to the scene.
- it is important to have the information shared so that the enforcement poeple can keep track of dogs that have more than one incident. And also to educate the owner that they need to take action in respect of behavior training. I have seen many people shrug it off when their dog bites another dog.
- The owner is responsible for the dog.
- People bitten by pets require medical care which all of us pay for. That cost should be covered by the pet own.
- If they don't remain at the scene of the incident the dog might not be properly identified
- If you've got a [removed] dog (likely because you're a [removed] owner) you shouldn't be able to hit and run bite.
- Owners are 100% responsible and liable for dogs actions



- they are responsible for the dog, much like leaving the scene of a vehicle accident, the owner needs to stay at the scene of the bite incident
- It's the same as being involved in a car accident. Owners are responsible.
- It's similar to a car accident. Law abiding citizens will stay and exchange contact information or wait for the police to arrive in that situation and it should be upheld in other situations where someone could be hurt.
- Follow up medical care may be required and the owner should be aware of this.
- I do not believe this requires clarification.
- This is analogous to a motor vehicle accident. We do not allow drivers to leave the scene. You control a car and you control a dog.
- The dog could be sick
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs. The same rule should apply to cats.
- So the person or animal who was bit can seek appropriate medical care by knowing the dogs medical/vaccine history. Also, so the dog can be added as a nuisance and receive adequate support, training, & care and so the owner can be held responsible.
- Common sense tells me an owner should stay on scene and take responsibility.
- They are responsible.
- It's just fair
- Not doing so takes the accountability away from the dog owner
- Everyone should train their dogs and if they fail to and something happens. They need to be responsible.
- Ethically the right thing to do just as you would at the scene of a traffic accident
- So each party can present what happened and the officer can see the animals shortly after the incident
- Responsible pet ownership is being accountable in the situation if at fault, or not at fault.
- It gets rid of the risk of trading false information (i.e. phone number and name)
- Anyone involved should be required to stay at the scene, and if the person who was victim of the incident can speak they should. Both parties should be able to explain themselves without interruption.
- All dog owners need to be responsible for their dogs behaviour. This includes small breed dogs that are not under control and may cause inappropriate interaction if not managed properly by either party
- common sense
- The owner should be responsible if there is an injury to another dog-pay for vet bills or assist if a person received a dog bite
- If there is an incident both owners should be required to be present to discuss with officer. Exceptions may be required if one dog needs immediate medical attention.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their animals actions. Or be held accountable. Or be banned from having animals if they aren't going to be responsible for their animal.



- But how would you enforce this "hit and run". This happened to my brother and my dog when my pomeranian ended up in a chow chows mouth. My bro was too concerned about the well-being of my dog to stick around and try to convince the other dog owner to give her information. When she refused and scurried off, he had no other option than to get to the vet asap and file a report once he was able to. Introduce a fine for failure to remain at the scene of an incident just like for a hit and run.
- While dog bites can be a very traumatic incident for both the dog and the owner, it is a pet owner's responsibility to stay on scene and be responsible for their pet, no matter the situation.
- This helps the victim and can lead to the owner at fault being charged
- This is just like remaining at the scene of an automobile collision, except there should be no ability for the dog owner to leave since tracking them down would be difficult. The term "if necessary" is ambiguous - delete.
- Many owners disappear and are only tracked down by license plates. Yes, they must stay or be fined for a 'bite and run'.
- while this may be impossible to enforce with some people it should already be a rule.
- same as a car accident, if the involved can exchange information and sort the issue out themselves there is no need for enforcement. It should be treated similar to leaving a scene if not.
- People should be held accountable for their pets actions
- Absolutely the owner needs to be held responsible for the actions of their pet
- Absolutely. If owners refuse to take responsibility for their dog's action, there should be further fines.
- Unless takes forever to get to the scene. (Time limit)
- I heard on the news about a dog that was attacked by another dog. The attacking dog and owner left. This creates more time and effort to track them down. They should stay.
- Yes absolutely must remain in scene unless one needed immediate medical attention
- they should give said animals owner there info how ever not to an officer unless there animal is the one injured.
- You are responsible for what your pet does and there needs to be follow-up!
- The owner must be responsible for their dogs behaviour
- It's the right thing to do, especially if the bite injury is significant. If the owner must absolutely leave, I wouldn't suggest any punishment so long as the owner made sure that the victim is OK with it, doesn't need help tending to the injury, and the contact info they gave was accurate to resolve the situation at a later date.
- Yes, this makes the rule similar to a vehicle accident. If you are in a vehicle accident you are required by law to share your contact information with the other party in the event of injury or damage. The same should apply to your dog (your property) damaging someone else in a vicious manner. By adding this rule to the bylaw will help put more responsibility on owners to follow the rules.
- I think that the victim should get the owners number in case any medical problems involving the bite appear but I don't think dogs should be euthanized



- If a dog is injured and the owner doesn't have pet insurance or the cost of going to the vet isn't covered fully by insurance the owner of the dog that bit should pay vet fees. If a dog bites a person and punctures the skin the person will want vaccine records and possibly get authorities involved.
- Owners need to be fully responsible for their pets.
- It's sensible. If it was a person to person incident, all parties would be required to stay to speak with an officer. Same thing should apply to animal incidents, dog AND cat.
- It's like any accident or incident requiring police assistance
- Good dog owners would have no problem with this.
- One cannot go away from the scene without giving details to the victim.
- This should be included in the bylaw. My husband and I have both been bitten when walking in Evergreen Estates and Fish Creek Park. This is unacceptable and there should be consequences for the Dog owner
- I am from a rural community and grew up with dogs. However, when I was a young mother on maternity leave I would be reluctant to visit parks here with my children without being in large group specifically because of reported dog attacks. One time my child ran through a park and a dog grabbed his mitten as part of a chase game. His hand was saved as it was my own large mitten. The owner was inexperienced and unable to control the dog. A different breed would have been better and she should have been vetted (for her ability, she was more upset than I was).
- A responsible owner would do this because the victim would not know if the dog had all its shots especially the rabies shot.
- If they do not stay then it is a crime and should be charged for leaving scene of a crime
- Often the problem with a dog has more to do with the owner than the dog. Owners need to be accountable for their pet's behaviour.
- I thought this was already in place as it is a common courtesy. The owner of any pet needs to be fully responsible and accountable for that animal. It's all about respect for one another. Dog owners are terrible this way in my experience. It's always your fault when their animal acts aggressively, and they rudely dismiss you when you ask them to leash their dog on a public street. I stay away from off leash areas and ask that you keep your dog on leash outside of those areas. Definitely don't dismiss me when I ask you to keep your snarling dog away from me. The animal is your responsibility, take care of it!
- Dog could have injuries and a discussion needs to take place
- However, this would require cooperation from the owner, which doesn't always happen, especially if the owner knows this could be the last straw before the dog is put down (or is not the first offence)
- There could be just cause that the owner should share their version of events. Was the dog provoked despite multiple warnings by the owner to the plaintiff?
- They are responsible for egos actions.
- That's just good pet ownership. It's the same for hit and runs.
- In case follow up is required post incident.
- They need to be take responsibility for the actions of their pet



- The owner is responsible for the behavior of their dog, they should do what they can to assist in the situation
- To hold owner accountable for their dog's actions.
- Obviously any responsible owner would.
- Absolutely yes, and I'm a little concerned this type of rule *doesn't* already exist
- Criminal offence if they leave the scene
- Is this not already a law?? Would this not count as fleeing the scene of a crime??
- If you were involved in a traffic accident, to leave the scene would be wrong, I feel that this is a similar situation
- This is common sense. My dog was attacked and bitten last winter by another dog in an off leash park, and we did not have any time to examine my dog before the other owner left. It ended up costing a couple of hundred dollars for my dog's vet bill as she needed a couple of stitches and medication. The vet costs associated with even a minor injury or trauma inflicted by another dog are substantial and not everyone can afford this.
- I believe animals are a product of their environment meaning if a animal bites someone the person who owns said animal must be held accountable.
- If I own a car and I injure someone, it's my duty to stay until a police officer comes, no?
- Yes, it is appropriate and responsible for an owner to remain at the scene to ensure that the circumstances are fully understood and the owner is identified and takes responsibility for the incident.
- More owner responsibility for aggressive dog behavior
- It's like any injury accident. All stakeholders and witnesses need to stay for veracity to be determined.
- Owners need to be held responsible. It should be no different than leaving the scene of a car accident
- That person needs to take responsibility for the action of their pet. Many times, it's not the animal's fault, it's the human's fault (they haven't trained them, use them for protection, etc). The person should be held accountable and not just the animal and should also pay the bills of whoever their animal may have injured.
- responsibility of the owner to be present to answer questions and to follow up with appropriate response to the situation
- Owner must be available for contact information take responsibility of medical expenses.
- As long as the owner can keep their animal under control, they should remain at the scene. If they cannot, they should give their phone contact to victim/witness if necessary.
- Health concerns and/or treatments should involve both parties to ensure all affected persons and animals are treated and the cost should not fall solely on a victim or victims owner.
- The dog should be euthanized. The owner should receive a criminal charge and severe fines.
- Often the owner takes off and should be fined for leaving the scene.
- The owner should take responsibility and share any information needed. Their dog could pass on an illness that the other person/owner would need to know about.



- The owner should be required to remain at the scene in case, eg, veterinary care is needed for the injured animal in which case the cost of such should fall on the offending dog's owner, and whether animal or person attacked the owner should be advised of possible liability issues.
- A tribunal could be biased on this issue
- Records of these incidents could help to keep an eye on potential problematic dogs, and get them and their owners the resources needed to begin rehabilitating the dog. I do not think a dog who bites automatically needs to be euthanized, but dogs can cause damage, even without meaning to, and a biting incident that causes bodily harm to another animal or person warrants further investigation.
- How is this not already a rule!??
- People need to take responsibility for their actions and their dogs.
- I do however recognize the need for an owner to remove their dog from the situation to prevent further challenges rather than remaining present. I don't think this is a either or situation.
- people need to take responsibility and give important information about the dog. Shits ect
- You are responsible for the situation
- Yes, an owner should have to stay at the scene especially if there are injuries. This gives enforcement officers a better chance of getting all the info they need to handle the situation efficiently.
- [personal information removed]
- We are dog owners and have seen incidents were there has been dog fights and the owner does not care or it is not my fault. They often are too busy on their phone and not paying attention.
- Unless self-defense.
- Need info about the dog. Should be recorded by bylaw
- It's a part of Responsible pet ownership.
- "It would be no different than remaining at the scene of a motor vehicle accident. The owner needs to be able to stay and accept responsibility or defend their animal.
- Having agreed to this, I also think it is imperative to remove the animal from the scene as there would likely be a lot of distress to both the animal and individual bitten."
- They should pay for the medical if one but this has to be a types of dog
- Owners should be responsible for their pets actions, and should remain on site when altercations occur (no hit and run incidents allowed)
- We require it for automobile accidents--why not for animals. My only reservation is that it might be necessary to get the offending dog out of the way fast.
- It is important to know the dogs history, has there been a past history of biting and are all the dogs vaccines up to date.
- This rule would hold the owner accountable to its animal's behaviour.
- Owners should be responsible for the behaviour of their dog, not the dog
- They aren't likely to stick around if they think their dog is going to be "arrested". The enforcement officer should provide information but not be a threat.



- I think this is important to have dogs prone to biting known. I think this is also important to reinforce with smaller dogs. In my experience smaller dogs bite more but because the damage is smaller people do not take it seriously. If a small dog bites a large dog and the large dog retaliates I feel the small dog owner should be held responsible.
- If your dog attacks another dog at an off leash dog park you are liable for the other dogs vet bills 100%
- Yes there should be an exchange of personal information. However, if it is unsafe to keep the animals at the incident they should be allowed to remove the animal from the situation.
- If they are not required to stay, many would leave, and we would potentially never get their name address etc. They could also be charged with leaving a scene.
- Take responsibility of ownership; if you own the dog, you're responsible for controlling its behaviour, so need to be accountable.
- the owner should remain on to answer questions. If owner does not wait then they do not seem like they are not responsible enough to own a dog. We have to be responsible for our own dogs.
- too many cases where the dogs owner leaves, thus requiring a search.
- Owner responsibility.
- How is this different than leaving the scene of a car accident? If something happened, the owner should remain at the scene if safe to do so, i.e. dog is able to calm down, no one physically attacks the dog owner in a fit of rage.
- Unless they need to remove the animal for safety
- If a dog bites a human it should be reported. If it happens again then there is a pattern and the dog should be put down
- If a dog bites they should absolutely be responsible for at least an explanation and required to share their information.
- Our dog had a side of his flesh bitten off by another dog at the off leash park, they were very apologetic but when we asked them to share the vet bill they denied it was their dog. This would have been mitigated if there was a clearer process of gathering information. We simply do not take our dog to the off leash anymore...
- Share info yes. Wait for a bylaw person no.
- This would benefit all parties. Communication at the outset would help to determine if the dog biting incident was a total anomaly or not, and the circumstances leading to the bite.
- I believe individuals do not report all dog bites. This is important to know that it is not just pitbulls. Just because smaller breeds have less of a mark doesn't mean it shouldn't be showcased.
- Otherwise it is too easy for the person to disappear and not be held accountable. Also if a child is bitten someone should stay with them. At minimum they should be required to show the victim official ID so information can be recorded.
- If someones pet causes harm it should be the responsibility of the pet owner to take responsibility and mitigate the consequences.
- It's the owners dog and their responsibility
- Same as any accident.



- It is important for dog owners to take responsibility for their dog's behaviour; talking to victim/victim's owner/enforcement officer would increase accountability in following bylaws
- Not necessarily they always have to remain on the scene (there might be circumstances where this is not possible), but definitely there should be a rule enforcing that the parties involved should talk to the enforcement officer whether at the location or somewhere else.
- That is just common sense responsibility.
- A responsible dog owner would be willing to do the right thing with the dog no matter the breed or size
- Dog owner should remain on scene to take ownership, give details so there can be disciplinary action.
- To keep the animal safe from unnecessary persecution
- Unless the dog needs immediate veterinary care (even if this is the biting dog) and the owner of the biting dog as well as the dog is not in danger of abuse by any bystanders etc the owner should be allowed to safely confine the dog and then be responsible to share their information
- Just like in a car accident, everyone who is involved should stay on scene and provide contact information to the other parties, and officers if applicable.
- Owners should be held accountable for the actions of the animals that they choose to be responsible for
- I think they should have to share their information, however if they dog is at large and does not have a lead - it may be a further risk to keep the animal near humans/ animals. It should be an offence not to leave your details to the owner of the animal your dog attacked - or the human it attacked.
- only if safe to do so. removing the dog from the site may be required to be safe for all in the area
- Yes because of a person or another animal is injured the responsible party should be held liable for medical expenses so you would need their contact information.
- Yes, otherwise owner can just walk away with dog and not be held accountable.
- This is proper owner accountability and the right thing to do.
- Unless an imminent injury occurs either animal or owner that needs immediate medical intervention
- The dog owner needs to be accountable for their dog's behaviour.
- This at least supports responsibility/responsible behaviour and expectations from the owner.
- "Just like a car accident, it a accident they happen. The owner needs to take responsibility of any incident that occurs.
- Just as parents are responsible for their children's behaviour, same rule should apply to the pet you have raised."
- Owners are responsible for their pets. It is necessary to get their information and heir side of the story.
- Yes, as long as the dog is at no risk of being put down.
- Just like in a car accident you have the right to take photo evidence and too get contact and insurance information.
- The Owner should be held responsible for such an event. These types of situations usually happen because of lack of training or poor training. This is the Owner's responsibility, not the dogs.



- I think it's crucial for the dog owner to remain at the scene, not only to take responsibility for their dog's actions, but to also give their account of events as sometimes non-aggressive dogs can act aggressively when threatened or under severe stress. It is important for all relevant information to be considered when dealing with such cases.
- The owner should face serious consequences if they leave a scene where their dog has bitten another dog or person without leaving contact information.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their pet's behavior - pay victim's pet bills, take obedience classes, etc.
- People just run away. I've seen it a zillion times
- Part of responsible pet ownership is being accountable for your pet's behaviour
- you can't make me
- If there is veterinary or doctor care involved, one needs the contact information. If my dog were to bite someone, I would want this information in order to follow up with them.
- I believe dogs that pose an obvious threat should be dealt with but bully breeds are targeted at disproportionate rates and as a dog groomer bullies are my favorite dogs to work with they are sweet babies
- Yes, remain on the scene after the situation only if it has been deescalated and there is no further risk of incident, ie they can remain a safe distance and the other party isn't engaging with them
- Depending on the severity of the bite. If there was little to no blood I don't think it should apply.
- This supports responsible, accountable pet ownership.
- I have been chased and bitten before. Dog owners need to know that they are accountable for their pet's behaviour.
- Responsibility of being a dog owner should be to deal with any issues that the dog causes.
- No different than a car accident. The owner needs to take responsibility for their (or their pet's) actions.
- The owner needs to take responsibility of their dog and its actions when something occurs, especially since many aggressive dogs were trained to be aggressive or were mistreated by owners. At a car crash, it's required that both parties stay at the scene to give information and their side of the story to police. It would be a good idea to enforce a similar rule with animal attacks.
- If the attackee was threatening the owner, they'd wanna be there to explain why the dog attacked
- Animal control must fine the offending owner & ensure they pay for any vet bills. Animal control to assess animal to prevent any further attacks, ultimately the offending dog owner must take responsibility
- It's just like a car accident. You need to preserve evidence.
- You have to remain at the scene of any other crime why not this one.
- The owner is at fault, as much as the dog. The owner needs to be held responsible for their dog, and needs to remain at the scene.
- If any accident takes place and the victim sees fit the owner should be willing to speak to authorities
- Similar to a car crash, remain at the scene.
- The owner should be held accountable if their pet injures someone or is poorly trained



- To provide info.
- Any dog bites from any dog can hurt so then if any dog bites someone and it breaks skin and they get a infection they can contact them
- Obviously, you wouldn't leave a scene of a car accident
- The dog owner must defend their dog. Innocent till proven guilty!
- Like with all accidents, they should have to stay until everything is cleared.
- It will help solve dog attack or bite incidents .
- i think they need to explain what happend
- The police officer should Not be allowed to put the dog down at this time.
- Responsibility.
- The owner needs to see the severity of the bite, and understand that their dog needs more training.
- If it was the owners fault I think they should if the other person was teasing the dog or hurting it / of the owner warns that it may bite I dont think they should.
- It shows a responsible Owner who is committed to the Welfare of theirs and others dogs by staying where an incident took place.
- If necessary makes the question a bit vague. But yes, loosely, a dog owner (guardian) should take responsibility for their dog's behaviour.
- I have a small, friendly toy poodle, and the amount of times aggressive dogs have cornered him, harassed him, or become more aggressive such as attempting to bite him occur on the daily whenever we go to the off leash areas. I am incredibly worried that he will be significantly injured one of these days, but the amount of owners that do nothing to stop their dog, recall their dog, or even address the situation is astounding. The most I get during these situations from the aggressive dogs owner is either an "I'm sorry" or nothing at all. I would heavily encourage a bylaw to enforce the exchange of information or the involvement of an officer during these situations.
- If someone dog exhibits violent behavior, the owner should be held responsible and provide contact information in the case that medical treatment is necessary
- They must be responsible for their pet, same as if they pooped
- This requirement supports accountability.
- The owner tends to be at fault when the dog bites. Either by training the dog poorly or abusing it.
- Definition of bite would need to be clarified
- Dogs do not bite un-aggravated - both the victims and the owner of the dog deserve a chance for the situation to be fully explained at the time of the incident
- similar to a mv accident, I would consider it, leaving the scene of a crime. punishable by appropriate fines, charges etc.
- This is responsible pet ownership
- The owner needs to be able to give context and also take responsibility.
- Of course they should stay at the scene, just like a car accident.
- To me it's no different then hitting someone in a car. Your dog is your property therefore your responsibility. I fully support having to remain on scene.



- Yes needs to be like a car accident. Both sides of the story are written down
- They need to be there in order to be able to pay for medical or vet bills if needed.
- The dog owner should be responsible for the pet fees. If no enforcement officer is there, the dog owner with the aggressive dog might not take responsibility
- Dog guardians should remain at the scene and responsible ones will, however it is the irresponsible ones that have allowed or trained their dogs, regardless of breed, to bite and they will run like the cowards they are.
- It is responsible and fair especially if the bite led to severe consequences (ex. Surgery or vet care).
- It's important to take responsibility
- Of course you need to do this in case the person who was attacked needs to go to the doctor. Owners need to be responsible for their pet's actions.
- Too often people run away. The same as an accident stay at the scene until police arrives or exchange information.
- As a pet owner you should be responsible for your pet.
- The owner should be able to plead the case of the dog if it were an accident or a false charge
- Yes treat it like a car accident scene.
- How else will the responsible owner/dog be identified? It also provides the owner with an opportunity to tell their side of the story
- Both parties must remain at scene. I have a large dog and had a small dog not on leash attached my dog. In my opinion my dog should have eaten the small dog because the small dog was the issue.
- But with understanding the owner may need to step away to deal with the animal but will return or information exchanged.
- .
- This will hold the dog owner accountable should their dog bite.
- You need all sides of a story to make a well informed decision on what should happen next.
- If your dog bites someone you should be held accountable but the dog should not be but down for this
- The owner has to take responsibility and should be connected with appropriate trainers/vets and should be checked up on that they have.
- I think that they should
- There should be a report filled and a plan to be carried out for all involved.
- Dog owners are ultimately responsible for behaviour and should be held accountable
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- People need to be held accountable for what happened just like for everything else
- Feel like it's important as a dog owner to be responsible for your dogs actions
- Allow option in lesser incidences for the enforcement officer to deem it ok to contact both parties later.
- I don't see a problem with that as long as it is safe for the animal/owner to do so. Also, as long as the responding officer isn't going to cause harm to animal, example by gunfire.



- If this is acceptable in car accidents it should be with animals it doesn't Matter if it's a dog a cat or a pet rat
- It's common sense
- The dog is the owners responsibility and if it harms a person, it is responsible to share contact details.
- They can tell you about the medical history of said animal
- I would have believed this to be a rule (and common courtesy). Of a pet owner should have to stay!
- This should be law.. we insist on this for a motor accident.. if flesh has been torn, why would it not be the case to remain at the scene.
- The owner must give a statement to the police, so that if necessary a arrest of the person at fault.
- There should be a significant fine for leaving the scene. Not penalty now in place so many people just disappear.
- the parties to the incident must provide complete info to bylaw officer who will make a report tracking the dogs involved. If the incident is serious, insurance companies may need a copy of report. Only require a written report if blood has been drawn or one animal is severely injured.
- The owner must be responsible
- Yes, if your dog causes physical harm you should take responsibility of what happened and take action to resolve the situation. Similar to what you would do if you rear ended someone, you should share your information after you place your dog away in a safe place for both parties.
- I support the rule because I think it would be a good idea for the owner to stay at the scene to prevent any confusion and allow for further steps to be taken right away.
- The owner is responsible for the dog
- So many times it's a he said, she said situation. It makes it so much easier if the owner stays and actually understands what the issue has been.
- If necessary in my mind would mean that the wound would need medical attention
- I believe that dog owner, of ANY breed, should take responsibility for their pet's actions
- Sharing contact information with the person or owner of the dog that was bitten is appropriate and responsible owners would do so.
- No thanks
- It is the owner's responsibility to train their dogs to behave in public. A dog should not be held accountable for a lack of training by the owner.
- hold the owner accountable for the dog's actions
- Because it's responsible thing to do. On the other hand this must apply to all dogs not one breed.
- Same as hit and run. Why wouldn't offender stay put
- they should have to stay and exchange contact information if the other person wants to press charges
- It should be common sense
- The owner should stay at the scene! Most often, a dog is being prevoked, Be it a little child tugging on them, or an adult trying to get a rise of of them, but because the dog can't explain what



happened, the owner should be able to explain his side of the situation. Maybe the prevolker should be fined!

- If I got bit by a dog that would be a result of poor training by the owner I would like them to stay and explain to the officer what happened
- Unless veterinary measures are needed for both dogs
- To explain to the acting officer what happened from their point of view.
- People need to take responsibility for their and there pets actions.
- To me, this is just as the same as a hit and run, which is not legal. Why shouldn't the same criteria apply to dog owners who have harmed someone.
- If a dog bites another animal or person, the owner who likely trained said dog should be held atleast partly accountable.
- In case victim wants to file a lawsuit
- Information may not be gathered otherwise.
- The owner should partly take responsibility for their dog, unless they cannot controll their dog
- Owners need to be responsible for the actions of their pets.
- Of course they should stay at the scene. This is common sense
- All kinds of dogs will scrap and nip at each other with no impact to either animal. Over zealous pet owners will bog down your system for no reason. People really have no business approaching other animals and they typically react out of a feeling of being threatened. responsible pet owners will be the only ones remaining on site. The ones who are dirt bags will leave anyways so the rule is irrelevant. Punish the extreme cases.
- It should be similar to a car crash that results in injury. In order to protect the victim
- It makes sense if someone was injured then the person responsible should stay and make sure they are all right and dog owners are responsible for their dogs.
- Only if necessary or severe
- But in certain situations it may be best for everyone if the offending dog is removed from the area immediately. At least leaving contact information should be a requirement.
- They should stay if its needed
- "Similar to a hit and run
- All parties and any witnesses should fill out reports"
- Vet records would be required for a doctor or vet.
- If it is safe for everyone to stay at the scene I support this, however, if it is unsafe for any party, contact information should be shared at the scene then later contact an enforcement officer.
- that is the right thing to do
- The owners must be held accountable as you would be if it was a car accident
- The owner is the only responsible for any incident. The animals are not aware of the laws, the owners are (must)
- Owners should be responsible for their dogs, even if the pet acts differently in public than at home.
- It's basic human respect



- Well if the person runs off then how's the person who got Attacked supposed to get compensation for their sustained injuries?
- If a person takes out an aggressive dog, or cannot get their dog under control they should be held responsible for their dog's actions
- To me this is obvious
- the owner is responsible for their dog
- A dog who bites someone is normally taught by owner. This shows the owner is abusive, and should not take hold of pets.
- That should be required as a responsibility of dog ownership.
- They were responsible for the dog and they may need to pay for any medical bills.
- They could possibly be put on a specific diet
- It would be like if someone was to get into an accident. Both parties should remain at the scene.
- Too many people take off when their dog bites
- If a dog bites then it should be reported
- "Last year I witnessed a pitbull attack a small dog, and then the pitbull went after its owner as it tried to pull the pitbull off the small dog. This was downtown, near eau claire on the river path. I called 911, along with other witnesses. 911 said they would send police and an ambulance as the pitbull owner got severely bit on the leg by his own dog. Neither the police nor ambulance showed up. I stayed on the line with the 911 operator (other witnesses did as well) and followed the pitbull owner, as he limped away from the scene and walked down the river path to flee the scene and yelled explicit words at witnesses. The small dog owner rushed her mauled small dog out of the park to take it to a vet. Nonetheless, the owner of this vicious dog left without repercussion. The city/911 operators clearly do not take such events seriously. The only follow up was a bylaw officer phoned me SIX hours after the event, asking for a description of the offender, which I already gave to the 911 operator. If the city will not send the police or ban vicious dogs (remember the Montreal lady who was killed in her own back yard by a neighbours pitbull?), the public should have the right to defend themselves against aggressive animals with pepper spray or other means.
- In addition, is the city liable for attacks by known vicious breeds? If not, perhaps our provincial government should look at making this a reality. It would put pressure on municipal governments to take firm action on protecting the public from such dogs, rather than appeasing to those who feel the need to own such an animal. Public safety needs to come first, no exceptions."
- The owners should be held accountable for the dog's actions
- The owner of the animal who attacked should be held accountable.
- Of course they should. And if the system in place is TRULY FAIR, then it should be no problem to do so.
- Logical and responsible



- Treat dog bite like any other accident involving two parties - both should remain on scene if injuries are serious ie emergency vet and share information including address, phone and drivers license
 - What's to explain? We do this with vehicle accidents - owners should be responsible for the actions of pets.
 - Prevents unnecessary testing a treatment for the bitten party.
 - If a severe bite has taken place, it is the owner's responsibility to remove the dog from the situation to prevent it from getting worse, but also to talk with the other party and figure out why it happened and what needs to be done
 - Those who flee the scene know very well that they have no control, and haven't made an effort to do any training, and will blame the victim. I've seen it myself.
 - Like in a car accident you need to give information to police or the victim for any necessary follow up.
 - Not only required to stay at the scene, but a charge for leaving the scene much like in regard to vehicle accidents. An incident occurs, all parties should be accessible to investigation and enforcement will be able to come to some conclusions as to what happened to the best of their ability.
 - I believe that everyone should have fair chance to be heard out
 - The dog owner should remain at the scene, so they can help with the other dog's injuries, by exchanging contact information with the owner, as well as helping to pay the vet bills
 - By remaining on the scene and sharing information, it could reduce a repeat occurrence. If the owner doesn't stay, there isn't any recourse in the future.
 - Not all dog bites are the fault of the owner or dog, the bitten person could be harassing the dog and having both parties remain at the offense location can prevent false spread of information
 - It should be like a car accident. They need to deal with the outcome.
 - "If requested by the person or other dog owner.
-
- Depending on severity of the situation."
 - To have insurance stuff and be in reach of each other so they can talk in court to see what will happen.
 - The problem is bad owners, not dog breeds.
 - Owners should be responsible for their pets actions.
 - It is the owners fault for the actions of their dog. They have full responsibility for the fees
 - .
 - It is important to share contact information so that the injured party can be assured that all vaccinations are up to date or for any other reasons/data that might help treat any injury. Speaking to an enforcement officer can be done separate from the scene if the officer cannot show up within a reasonable time after the incident (I.e. half an hour).



- Any pet that attack a person or other pet should be looked at to ensure that pet is being taken care of and trained. If the pet is aggressive and attacks something might be going on at home
- The dog owner should give their information but also be able to move their dog to their house or otherwise away from the scene.
- The animal caused damage to another party which is a crime therefore should be treated as such
- People should only have their dogs in situations that they feel the dog is under their control since they are liable
- The owner has to take responsibility on their animals actions as it reflects their ownership.
- People must be 100% responsible for the actions of their pets
- So they can pay for injuries
- It would prevent owners from ignoring the victim.
- This only makes sense. The dog should be identified if it caused the attack, and if it was provoked the owner should be able to make that claim.
- To explain how it occurred and to be responsible for side effects
- Its your dog, you should be held responsible.
- "There are many circumstances how a bite incident can occur. Both sides should be able to
- Provide their understanding of the events including any flags they observed through their dogs behaviour prior to the incident. The dog victim could have been the instigator of the event, and the dog biter could simply be responding to that provocation."
- This is part of being a responsible pet owner
- This is part of responsible dog ownership
- Too many fleeing offenders never caught
- Remaining on scene is part of being a responsible pet owner, and if your animal is involved you should be penalized if you leave.
- I see it like a car accident. All parties involved should remain and share information. Accidents happen and yes sometimes one is more at fault but that doesn't mean the other party doesn't have a part.
- if a dog bites the owner should absolutely be made responsible for medical bills etc
- If a child messes up the parent has to take responsibility, same here.
- Dog owners must be held accountable. This applies for any and all breeds. Fines should be given where necessary, and mandatory training for the dog if it is assessed and able to be rehabilitated/if the bite is Level 1-3 on the Dunbar scale.
- Of course they should stay, that should be a given. If the person/animal who was bitten, the owner of the animal that caused the bite should be responsible for any monetary damages.
- Just as in a car accident or a public dispute, leaving the scene of any incident is like a 'hit & run'. They should be able to remain at the scene to both be able to convey their side of the story and face any consequences.
- The dog issue should be about RESPONSIBLE DOG owners not pitbulls. Punish the owners!!
- if the owner leaves its like a hit and run car accident. you must remain until proper authority arrives.



- We need information to be shared. However, if staying causes continued or increased drama, best to leave, but MUST contact bylaw within 30 min. Hard to police, but if two dogs have an altercation/ you may need to leave to diffuse situation
- In all breed instances I support this, but not in only the case of pitbulls. I have seen multiple bites from other breeds, golden retrievers, labs and other non-bully breeds.
- The dog is the owners responsibility, so if the dog does do something, the owner should stick around to make sure that all the information gathered is clear and correct.
- This would increase the likelihood of the owner being held accountable for their dog's actions.
- Of course. Do you want to be bitten by a random dog? This happened to our family and we had a very useful, courteous discussion with the dog owner. We needed to know if the dog was up to date with its rabies shots.
- This way the proper breed, owner information, shots, insurance, everything is recorded by a professional with a calm and cool head
- Yes and No. If attack is severe and injury has occurred an independent review and assessment of the incident should occur. If possible pet owners should be educated as to how to prevent incidents in the future. I have a dog that has food aggression. Years ago as new dog owner we didn't understand what was driving the behaviour and how to manage it. We had a couple of aggression situations after which we sought professional help to educate ourselves and our dog. We were able to understand what drove the behaviour, how to look for early warning signs, how to manage the behaviour and learned what situations to avoid. This is learning that we will take forward to future dog ownership and share with other dog owners. Since we sought help - we have not had any further issues.
- They should be there
- A dog biting another dog, or a person is a form of assault. As such, I think we owe it to the victim to treat it seriously.
- It is important to find out if this is a one-time event or if the dog has been involved in any other incidences. A repeat offender needs to be held accountable.
- Owner needs to be accountable. Often considerable costs are involved which owner of dog who has bitten should cover.
- It's the same as a car accident, if your insurance needs to get involved you should wait and share that information
- I agree with a caveat that upon mutual agreement the offending dog can leave the scene. If there is evidence of taunting or attack by the other party they should also stay at the scene.
- Owners that are involved in a dog attack should have to remain at the scene to supply information in the dog shot records. People can not leave the scene of an accident (otherwise called a hit and run). So animal owners should not flee the scene of an offence in case
- Because, they would be fleeing from a crime scene, after all it is their dog
- I have seen owners leave without providing any information after their dog has attacked and/or injured another dog.



- Remaining at the scene until a enforcement officer arrives provides an account from both sides with an impartial party.
- no
- It isn't fair to the dog to be held back for that. The other creature/ person must have done something to upset the dog:
- If a dog bite that causes serious physical or emotional damage occurs then the owner should take liability and come to an agreement with the victim
- No different than the requirement to remain on scene after any accident.
- This should be mandatory because there may be medical costs that should be covered by the dog owner and dog medical history may be required
- If the owners dog has bitten someone, they should be required to stay and take responsibility for the actions of their dog.
- 2 sides to every story, the owner of the biter and the owner of the bitten should remain on scene.
- People have to take responsibility for their animals' behaviour. If all dog owners had to get their animal trained before they could get a City license, we would have far fewer problems.
- I think it is important for a owner to stay at the scene so the responding officer can get the complete story
- I believe it is important that the person remain so long as it's safe to do so. If someone hit your car you'd expect they stay, this shouldn't be any different.
- If the bite is severe enough
- So everyone can share their side of the story and resolve the conflict.
- They should be punished for a dog bite, not the dog.
- Taking accountability for the poor training of the dog is ideal.
- Well the city is creating a completely opinionated bylaw for now reason. If a Pit Bull has to deal with this so should every dog there.
- Absolutely, too many owners giving bogus contact info to the victim- from personal experience
- It should be treated like any other scene of accident.
- And the owner must pay veterinary bills for bites their dog inflicted. Too often people flee the scene where their dog bit another dog, as they are clearly accustomed to the occurrence
- I think dog bites are the responsibility of the owner and NOT a reflection of the breed. This is unfair and unhelpful discrimination
- This should be another way to enforce responsible pet ownership
- I don't think it needs explaining
- No worse than leaving a car accident without sharing contact information. Someone was hurt you need to stay and ensure they are okay and deal with the responsibility of the fact your dog bit a person or other animal.
- The owner should be responsible for what their dog does
- If the dog bites someone and the owner flees, the victim may try to spin the story from what it actually is



- I do think that the owner should have a chance to explain/give information to the person who has been attacked by the animal.
- If a dog harms someone the owner must be held responsible
- Owner should be held accountable
- As the driver of a vehicle that hits someone, something etc you're required to stay as you're in care and control of the vehicle. As a pet owner you're in care and control, thus the same standard applies.
- More often than not the dog was provoked and a bylaw official can better explain
- Any good pet owner would stay where the incident happened to make sure the person was ok, an exception would be to put the animal in a secure place where it isn't able to attack anyone else
- People need to take responsibility for their pet's actions.
- Very necessary
- If the dog has bitten a person or other animal it should be looked into. They should remain at the scene to at least provide information and talk if necessary. If the incident is minor I don't think this is a requirement
- You don't have a clear policy and system in place to report now. Keeping people in pets in place in a high volatile situation can be recipe for secondary or ongoing incident. Who are they waiting for? What is the response time?
- At a safe distance, it's important to share contact info. They may need to take photos or video which should only be shared with enforcement officers. They may need to go home and talk to enforcement officer at a later time if they can't be contacted or arrive in a timely manner.
- It makes it more difficult to ensure that insurance would be exchanged and that matters were cleared up between the owner and victim if the owner can leave at any time.
- Owners need to take full responsibility for their pets, and not shrug off what might be a terrifying ordeal for the other party.
- It's being a decent person
- It is important! As a dog owner myself, I am responsible for it's behavior or any incident it's involved in.
- If a dog bites a person or another animal, the owner should be responsible for any payments related to injuries (i.e. vet bills, Physio etc).
- This will avoid the "He said, she said" issue. However, sometimes a dog owner does not discover that their dog was bitten until later. There should be a large fine if someone refuses to share information.
- If there is a vet visit involved the owner of the dog should cover the bill if their dog is at fault
- They have a right to explain what the situation was. Provide medical support to the other person/animal if needed. And promise to go to behavior classes for their dog.
- "Definitely so both sides of the story can be heard and also hopefully there would be some witnesses to see what happened. If the biting animal causes injury, their owner should have to pay for vet costs for the injured animal they bit.
- As well any damages if the dog bites a human should be paid by the offending animals owner."



- Best to engage owners about their dog and make sure they are accountable.
- Yes if there is a biting incident the owner and dog should remain at the scene and wait for authorities. This is responsible ownership
- Accountability
- Just like a car accident there is liability and responsibility. Allow a owner to leave to crate or bring home the aggressive dog but make him call the authorities or return to the scene.
- If an owner has not put in the training for their dog they are responsible for how it acts in public. It's the same as teaching someone to drive. You are responsible for them.
- I feel it would be best to have the owner there to explain. As no one knows the dog better than the owner
- Yes, provided there is injury.
- If they are required by law to stay at the scene, it will make it easier to access the situation.
- The owner does need to take responsibility for their dogs actions
- Should be common decency. Car accident you must remain so should this.
- ? Yes is self explanatory.
- if someone or something is injured, the owner o the dog should stay to be able to provide any needed information to police officers and medical staff. if the dog is up to date on their shots, has any conditions hey could give to others, etc;.
- Yes, but only if they are willing to press charges.
- Yes
- Can potentially shorten time needed for investigation
- The dog owner should remain, similarly to if they were in a car accident
- It seems only fair if the owner was irresponsible enough to not contain an aggressive dog (WHICH IS NOT DEPENDENT ON THE BREED, IT IS DEPENDENT ON THE PERSONALITY) that they should take responsibility for the damage caused.
- Just like a car accident people need to take accountability
- Yes like any incident the owner of an animal or person responsible for the accident should stay with the victim in case they are needed when authorities arrive.
- People are responsible for their animals and their actions no matter the breed.
- Responsible ownership.
- An owner needs to be responsible for their pet.
- You'd probably need to discuss what the recipient of the bit would want as well as your wants
- They need to be held accountable and so need to be able to be contacted/found
- Yes if the bite is severe
- Why would they run away and not take responsibility?
- "I think it's important to
- Get both sides"
- I don't see it as any different than if there was a car accident. The owner must stay and take responsibility/exchange information.



- The dog owner needs to be accountable for their animals behaviour.
- This is common practice in regards to other damage offences (eg. Automotive accidents, etc)
- I view it as no difference than a car accident
- The owner of the dog should have to be responsible to answer for their dogs actions
- If there is blood.
- Dog owners must be held responsible for damage inflicted by their dog up to and including financial compensation
- I agree with owners having to be responsible for their pets. I do not agree with breed specific rules etc. It is not the breeds, it is the irresponsible owners.
- But how do you plan on policing that? I have watched people run away and other chase after and not catch them - are you planning on having designated by-law officers at every dog park for 12 shifts to ensure this?
- Owner is accountable and should be held legally- therefore must be on scene.
- as a pet owner id want the person to stay, therefore I should too
- i dont think dogs should bite anyone but also people should not reach for a dog without permission or tease or antagonize any animal there for an animal will attack.
- A dog owner whose dog slammed into my dog (this was common at the dog park to people and other dogs as it was not under the control of the owner and was new at the park) Although others had tried to talk to owner he was not willing to take advice. His dog would run around slamming into people and dogs. The slam to my dog caused my dogs death. He immediately took off from the park. I found this dog and guy at another park 2 weeks later and got his plate number and reported plate at which time he was charged. He would not pay fine of 250. and 100. so I was supeana to court. In court he was a jerk and ordered to pay or do jail time. Had I had known his fine was only 350. I would have asked for my vet bill paid of over 1000. He should have been ordered as well to take obedience classes or surrender his dog to be adopted. This dog was not a pit bull. The dog was not a bad dog but was an untrained dog. At the very least he should have been ordered to take obedience classes with his dog or surrender the dog.
- Much like any other incident where physical harm was sustained, all parties should remain or face fines and charges for leaving the scene.
- The owner should have complete control over their dog and therefore are responsible for all actions
- Exceptions should be made for people who need to leave to care for their pet if injured or for other urgent reasons. They should be required to provide contact details to victims or witnesses in that case, or to officials by phone at the time of the incident (before leaving)
- They should be required to provide their information in case it needs to be investigated.
- Too many times their dogs do serious damage and the walk away taking no responsibility or compensation to injured person/animal
- If any dog is biting, it requires training and so does it's owner. Enforcement officers would be the first contact to document incidents as well as provide information to the owner regarding the need for training.



- People need to be watching their dog in order to prevent bites. You're responsible for your dog and it's actions. If there is an incident you should be present the entire time.
- Only if the bite causes severe enough damage that a doctor is required. A nip is not a bite.
- The dog owner needs to be there to give the information required
- Owners responsibility
- owner must stay at the scene unless it is unsafe to do so (dog or person requires immediate first aid or there is not adequate resources to keep the animal isolated and therefore others safe until an officer arrives)
- I think those who don't should be equivalent to a hit and run with a car. its negligence.
- It is like remaining at the scene of an accident. Circumstances like if the dog could not be controlled or secured I think it would be okay for the owner to leave if proper identification documents are provided prior to leaving the scene.
- It shows responsible ownership and caring for everyone's safety
- I do not support BSL
- Must stay there. same as a hit and run charge should be in place. For the victim and for health records of the accused dog.
- It is obvious. Responsible pet owners must be responsible for their pet.
- Only as long doing so does not exacerbate the situation or endanger people
- They should also be responsible for any vet bills.
- All witnesses need to remain at the scene to give their description of the incident.
- It's called accountability. However, there should be no fear of the dog being removed from the owner's care. Treat this as you would a car accident.
- Similar to an accident scene
- The offending dog owner has a responsibility toward the injured victim & owner
- if the enforcement officer can be there in short time; I suspect this wouldn't happen. Perhaps the person bitten, or someone with that person get the dog tag information/name of owner to make a claim. Mind you, this could result in bad behavior of the dog owner and the bitten person may be too traumatized to stick around
- Obviously, if your dog is involved you should stay at the scene. This is morally and ethically assumed.
- The dog owner could provide insight on why the attack happened and the story would not be considered one sided as both parties involved in the incident would be there at the same time to explain what happened.
- Be responsible
- This should be handled in the same way that traffic incidents are handled - if an individual's animal has caused harm, they should be immediately accessible to contact. However, there should be exceptions to this if the animal that caused the injury cannot be safely contained from the scene (e.g. in a car while the individuals are next to the car).
- It is the dog owners responsibility to keep their dog under control.



- Any responsible owner would stay to make sure person/animal who is hurt in an incident regardless of whether police/bylaw has been called. Sometimes incidents happen irregardless if one or both dogs are "aggressive " onus also has to be placed on others sometimes though as not everyone understands that you can't just walk up to any dog at any time and expect it to be a love bug. Most aggression happens because dogs are not well trained...or are in the process of training and have asked the other person not to come near their dog and the other does anyway. Animal rights go both ways and not everyone is respectful towards a dog and owner as they should be. A lot of rescue dogs need a long time to be trained and feel safe and secure so people need to understand and respect that. Little dogs van also be very aggressive but people aren't scared of a 20 pound dog even though it can also do a lot of damage very quickly and in fact bite more often than large breed dogs. If any enforcement is changed it needs to be changed for ALL DOGS not just certain breeds of dogs. Discrimination against 1 breed will still bring on lawsuits against the city...who will lose because dogs have rights too and discrimination is discrimination it doesn't matter who or what you are discriminating against
- The owner is responsible for their pets actions
- Of course the dog owner should remain at the scene to explain their side of the story. There are 2 sides to every story and a dog 99% of the time wouldn't just bite for no reason. If the owner leaves the scene without giving a statement, it just makes them look more guilty of wrong doing.
- the first step in the consequences that follow unacceptable, dangerous or harmful behaviour (not controlling your dog).
- Exactly like a car accident. There needs to be accountability in respect to the incident.
- Pet owners need to be responsible and accountable
- Responsible dog owners should provide contact info and stay at the scene
- It is the same as a car accident. You must take responsibility for your pets actions
- Information in such an instance would be required in order to follow up that the owner of the aggressive dog is taking steps to help the dog be better socialized and trained.
- Should have accountability to the actions.
- These matters should be treated just as an MVC hit abs run are. If we don't start deterring these behaviours, they will continue and possibly worsen.
- It makes sense. If it was vehicle damage you have to stay so why not if a dog does damage.
- Both sides of the incident must be conveyed to a peace officer (with proven neutrality of opinion on breeds) as well as recounted by one or more witnesses.
- Pertinent medical information may be needed; owner of the dog needs to be responsible for understanding the gravity of the incident and their responsibility
- They should be responsible for medical bills.
- As in the case of any other injury requiring EMT/enforcement attention, the same applies to dogs and the person (-s) responsible for them.
- It is the responsibility of the owner to either explain why this occurred or info provided on training, or maybe dog is mistreated and that is why the behaviour not dogs fault.
- Same as as a car incident



- Dog owners need to take personal responsibility for their dog's behaviour.
- It is ultimately the owner's responsibility.
- This should be considered assault. That is why the dog and it's owner must stay. Be like fleeing an accident
- The owner should take responsibility for their pet. They should stay for bylaw and exchange information with the person who's dog may have been injured in the incident. They should assume some financial responsibility for the injury, too. Maybe not the whole vet bill, but a big percentage.
- If the damage is excessive
- Like any accident or incident there should be both parties represented & witness statements taken. There is always more than one side to a story.
- I think it's very important that both parties exchange info, just like a car crash. Parties must exchange information and stay if an enforcement officer is necessary. Although it's hard if an animal or person needs medical attention. So perhaps they could both be required to fill out a report at a designated office.
- Provided it is safe to do so (ie they have the means to control the dog on scene).
- Obviously, if a dog bites a person or another animal they should remain on scene and provide their information. I also believe that they should be (fully or partially) financially responsible for damages caused by their animal.
- Because the owner is more responsible than the dog.
- Too many people run away and leave the victims with the vet bills
- A dog biting another person or animal is against the law and it should be considered fleeing the scene of a crime due to that fact. Also if the owner of the dog that bites is at fault they should have to provide compensation to the person or animal that was bit for any medical needs.
- Owners should be responsible for dog behavior, and how they train, discipline and interact with the dog.
- Track the dog and the owner and be able to follow up
- Accountability for injuries
- If a dog can't be controlled by the owner and injures a person it poses a risk to the public (the dog is essentially an uncontrolled weapon) and the owner needs to be held responsible for the injury caused.
- The owner should be made responsible!
- I'm surprised to hear that this isn't already required. Owners should be responsible for providing important details (e.g. vaccination records) and able to be contacted for follow-up if there is an incident.
- Depends on the severity of the bite what penalty should be applied.
- The owner needs to accept responsibility
- The owner of the animal will always know their pet better than anyone else, and as such may be able to provide relevant/significant information about the animal - and it's behaviour/possible causes for its behaviour - that would otherwise not be available in these types of situations
- The owner is responsible for the dog and therefore should be available to give info



- Not remain at scene waiting for an enforcement officer. Just exchange info.
- One needs to know who the owner of the dog is.
- It would make them more accountable for the actions of their dog's behavior.
- no one would leave the scene if injury had been caused. Illegal for a hit and run, can't but and run
- There needs to be accountability if a dog bites another dog. The only exception would be if a dog requires medical attention, at which point owners should be required to exchange information.
- I think that both parties need to remain at the scene. The only way that I think it would be appropriate for a person to leave is if information was shared by both parties (much like a minor traffic accident) so that the enforcement office can follow up with both parties.
- Unless the bitten animal or person needs to leave to seek immediate medical attention
- Owners should be held accountable
- People should be accountable for their pet's behaviour, but there is a serious lack of enforcement for holding pet owners accountable at all
- Just for people, not other animals, to ensure rabies prevention
- I don't know how it could be enforced though.
- The dog owner has to take responsibility for the injuries to the victim. That can only happen if dog owner remains on the scene, helps the victim out and shares his contact information so he can take responsibility for the injuries caused to the victim.
- The owner needs to give their side of the incident. Some times it's the dog who was bit who instigates the problem.
- Yes, or at least must provide their contact information (so they can get problem dog out of area)
- It could be a rule but would be up to the person who got bit or whos dog got bit to call an enforcement officer, depending on the situation. This could escalate conflict between the two parties and it may not be practical to wait for an officer to show up.
- .
- Owners shouldn't just flee and say it was an accident, vividly explaining the situation could actually be more beneficial and understanding.
- Similar practice with motor vehicle collisions, makes sense.
- You wouldn't leave the scene of a car accident or a crime...
- Just like when you have a car accident you stay on scene- however the fog must be in control of the owner- otherwise an exchange if info would be the minimum.
- No one should leave the scene of a incident unless contact info was given and confirmed.
- I thought this was already the case.
- "If they don't, then it might make it impossible to track they down. However, I don't think the victim should need to stay. I was a bite victim earlier this summer and had to go to urgent care immediately for treatment.



- It would be great if there was a QR code on the dogs tag and an app that allowed owners to exchange license information quickly, via phone, so that being physically present at the scene wasn't required."
- Owner must be liable for their pets'actions.
- This i can support. Its the owners job to fall through if the dog bit anyone. It would also be their job to warn anyone if there has been a problem
- "Yes it is common courtesy. This is no different than a car accident. Remain on scene until appropriate help arrives. If the dog can not be controlled step away to a safer place out of the way and Wait for help to arrive.
- If this is not possible full disclosure of personal information for law enforcement to do immediate follow up"
- They should be responsible for their dogs behaviour and commit financially if there is a cost to the other person or dog owner for treatment.
- It is the owners responsibility to take action the moment the dog shows aggressiveness and must do the necessary steps to prevent dog bites.
- YES! all too often the owners leave or refuse to give their info which should be a crime. It should be treated like a vehicle accident. No one move until info has been exchanged. I think it would be ideal if all parties wait until an enforcement officer comes to the scene
- "Stop allowing inexperienced people keep larger so called "nuisance" dogs. The owner is the problem, not the dog. I don't understand why that's a struggle to understand. A dog isn't born aggressive it's either trained to be that way or not trained well enough to know the difference and listen to it's handler. Stop letting anyone who's anyone own a dog and put the bylaws on people not dogs. Larger stronger breeds need proper care and training by someone use to the breed and who knows what they are doing. You look at any animal abuse case across this province. In Calgary people leave dogs out in -40 weather, people have duct taped animals mouths and starved them in storage garages. Why is the city not monitoring who is allowed to care for an animal? Before you start blaming "nuisance" animals and putting a muzzle on them, look at nuisance Alberta residents who harm and mistreat them who like the idea of a "big tough dog" but haven't a clue about the responsibility.
- Shame on this province if they can't see that animal abusing evil people are the issue. Start a law that changes people's behaviour and prevents abuse and mishandling.
- An animal of whichever breed or creation will respond positively if shown proper care, training and love.
- I'm not saying there aren't aggressive animals out there but we all need to realize how our behaviour as humans effects everything."
- Yes that's common sense.
- Leaving the scene of a dog attack/bite/fight should be like leaving the scene of a car accident
- Like a car accident, stay and help if you can
- Accountability should be a basic expectation regardless of the offender's breed.
- Dog Owners must take responsibility for their dog's behaviour



- The pet owner needs to take responsibility, ensure that the victim is fine and cared for and that proper measures are discussed regarding the dogs behaviour (how to prevent a bite from happening again, etc). The public deserves to be taken care of and a dog that has several incidents like this should be documented.
- This is absolutely necessary in order to know the history of the dog plus to ensure the owner pays for all damage done.
- People should be accountable and a rule would be helpful
- They should stay
- Owners should be able to explain their side of the story as well as be held accountable for their pets actions
- disease concerns, liability economic, dog to be destroyed
- This would help identify irresponsible owners
- I can't believe that this is even a question. Pet ownership is a responsibility and if your animal bites someone, you should definitely remain on scene.
- If a dog bites someone or injures another dog, it is too easy for the dog's owner to disappear from the scene, leaving the victim responsible for all costs etc which can be considerable
- the owner is responsible for the pet's behaviour, just as an adult is responsible for a child's behaviour, or a driver is responsible for automobile related events.
- That should be common sense, just like for car accidents
- I do believe it would be unfortunate if my dog was attacked and the other party had left. I would want to be able to get some resolution (if any) out of the possible situation.
- Absolutely! This would be no different than swapping insurance at a fender bender.
- When I was living in BC, I was bitten once by a dog, and in another incident my dog was bitten by another dog. Both times the dogs and their owners left. I was unable to get any contact information because it wasn't required by law or bylaw.
- These people should not be allowed to just disappear. They have to answer for their dog's bad manners. They are the ones that trained or didn't train them.
- It's like hitting a car. You've caused damage with something you own/have a licence for so you have a responsibility to own up to it and deal with the repercussions
- "This seems equivalent of a hit and run. Owners/ person in care and control of the dog must remain at the scene, of present during an attack. If unable to stay safely at the scene due to the dog - must provide info prior to leaving? Arrange pick up of dog? Etc..."

- Hard to see how if walking a dog it would be safe to stay with the dog... bit of trouble here but I think you can figure it out."
- This seems totally reasonable. How else can the owner (and animal) be held accountable?
- You are accountable for your dog and the actions of your dog. Exchanging info in a pet incident would be similar to exchanging info after a vehicle collision



- Depending on the circumstances, the owner could be held accountable for the actions of their dog and need to remain on scene to allow follow up if needed and ensure that the other person or animal that has been bit gets the appropriate attention.
- Bite needs to be defined as injury. Not sure if appropriate between two dogs that nip each other.
- The owner of the animal that bites another animal or person should be held more responsible to the offence than the animal.
- Definitely. I am aware that most dog owners of problem dogs run off. We have to hit their wallets. I spoke with a dog trainer said their money is when they will finally learn their dog is an issue.
- Similar to car accidents. The responsible party should remain on scene.
- This is like any other 'accident' accountability is very important as well as responsible followup during the incident for the most clear statement/assessment.
- They should always stay
- However they should be able to put dog away somewhere first
- They should remain due to the injury inflicted.
- this holds the pet owner to their family members actions just like if a child got into a fight at school the parent would have to come and meet with the child and talk with the other guardian. pitbulls are the sweetest dogs, the dog should not be held accountable for being raised in the wrong conditions the owner should be held responsible. if a owner has multiple pet infractions (attacks, bites, destruction of property etc,) should hold jail time for the owner. just like a parent if they were not treating their kids in a responsible manner. social services would take the child away and the guardian could face jail time
- It is the only responsible thing to do
- I want to see pet owners taking responsibility for their pet's (and usually the owner's) behaviour.
- Information should be provided by both involved parties to enforcement officers to ensure the situation is assessed from all perspectives
- Without contact information how would you conduct enforcement or seek restitution?
- The owner should stay
- The logic in this is similar to a 'hit and run'.
- Just like leaving the scene of a vehicle accident - the owner and the dog should remain at the incident.
- People must be held accountable for the actions of their pets, otherwise, what is the incentive to ensure proper behaviour towards others?
- I have seen people whose dogs bite another's dog and just grab their dog and walk away. This leaves the "victim" without any knowledge of the attacker's vet and vaccination records, and makes it near impossible to find the owner to potentially take action against.
- There should be hefty fines for leaving the scene.
- I don't know how you would enforce this. But any responsible dog owner would stay at the scene or share contact info to begin with.
- It would put more accountability on the dog owner not the victim.
- Duh! They should be charged for leaving a scene!



- Dog owners must be accountable for their dog's actions but it's also necessary to get both sides of a story.
- There should be a bylaw and fine for anyone who leaves the scene of a dog attack with their dog.
- Requiring the owner to stay and provide contact info is necessary in case there is any follow up required by police or bylaw enforcement (similar to the need to stay at the scene of a car accident). An exception to staying at the scene might be if the owner had to leave the scene for safety reasons, e.g., to remove a vicious dog to a safe location, or if the safety of the owner was at risk, e.g., from angry observers of the incident.
- Yes but can't be enforced because most would just take off to avoid fines and vet bills. And folks that is reality.
- Well we need context about the bite, don't we? Is this not a bylaw already?
- There are no bad dogs; there are only bad dog owners. Nuisance dog behaviour is always a result of incompetence and negligence on the part of the dog owner.
- Yes. Leaving the site of an attack and/or not giving contact info should elicit a higher fine.
- Owner must take responsibility and understand the consequences of their pets actions
- If a dog bites, it's the owners fault, they should be held accountable
- A dog bite is due to an irresponsible owner. It should be considered "fleeing the scene", like a hit and run with a vehicle. The dog owner is responsible for controlling their animal and getting appropriate training, or a muzzle. There is something wrong with a dog owner who allows their dog to run freely and hurt someone. The human needs to be punished and there needs to be sufficient penalties to dissuade selfish people. A dog bite can cause lifelong mobility and visible scarring problems as well as emotional trauma. It must be more effectively avoided by owners.
- It is the right thing to do.
- The cost of surgery is often left to the owner of the injured dog, not fair. The person bitten has the right to know if the dog is vaccinated.
- Pet owners are responsible for the actions of their pets. To leave the scene would be akin to leaving the scene of an auto accident.
- Dog Owners should understand the importance of having their dog under control at all times and if a dog bites the incident should be treated like a traffic accident.
- Can't believe this isn't already the case... so a dog can bite someone, and the owner is currently allowed to flee... makes no sense whatsoever!
- give the owner a ticket
- If their dog bites someone they should have to stick around to accept responsibility.
- However, if the dog cannot be controlled or to de-escalate the situation, it should be sufficient to provide contact info to someone at the scene of the incident.
- Its the same as if you left any other accident. Its not acceptable to leave.
- A responsible owner should have to deal with the situation and not just leave. My thinking is it is like driving a car and having an accident, you do not just drive away you must exchange information and talk with law enforcement etc.
- The dog owner needs to be present to provide information as necessary.



- I would like the person who owns the dog to let the victim's owner have their info so that enforcement could contact them
- Need to ensure balanced context and understanding in any given incident.
- How is this even a question? If a dog attacks someone, was it okay for them to leave the scene of the crime before?
- Owners are responsible for their dog's behaviour. Any responsible dog owner would automatically do this.
- It is similar to leaving the scene of an automobile accident.
- yes and if a pit bull bites should be euthanized
- should be a fine if they leave the scene, same as leaving accident scene.
- I hear of too many owners leaving with their dog and they cannot be found after for proper education and follow up.
- It is extremely important for any bite victim to know the animal's rabies vaccination status. If unvaccinated, the animal needs to be quarantined if at all possible to reduce the victim's risk of rabies. Owners should be able to provide said information, and should be required to do so, as rabies is a lethal but preventable illness
- its no different then when a pedestrian is hit by a car. The person at fault need to provide a statement.
- Too many irresponsible pet owners need to be held accountable for their behaviour...more often than not they are the issue with the dogs behaviour..and not the breed itself.
- The owner must be contactable
- I think that is only fair to ensure due diligence is done.
- An account of the incident from the owner should be taken at the scene. All dog owners should take a statement to protect both themselves and their pet. It's also important to keep an account of the dog's behaviour in case it is in a one-time incident.
- This should be required as a bylaw
- There is no excuse for an owner of a dog who has injured another dog or human to flee the scene. Owners should be taking responsibility of their dog's actions whether they are a pitfall breed or not. If there are signs that the dog may cause injury to another being, a responsible owner should not be taking their dog to places where this could happen. Should the owner flee the scene following an incident, once they have been found, there should be an extremely large fine (much more than the \$350 an individual caring for the dog was recently fined in a recent fatal dog attack case) as well as more involvement from the police, rather than simply the City of Calgary.
- I absolutely support this. Anytime a dog harms another animal or person, the owner needs to take responsibility for the incident and provide full disclosure of contact information as well as provide a full report of the incident to bylaw officers. This is important not only for the victim, but also for the future of the dog who did the biting.
- So the responsible owner can be held accountable so it doesn't happen to anyone else
- That's generally the rule for any altercation, is it not? The owner should be there to plead their case, especially if the bite victim is seriously hurt.



- Just like when you are involved in a car accident, you exchange information and discuss with officers if necessary. This should be same rules.
- Remaining at the scene ensures the owners credibility and allows for liability.
- No
- After a human bite it would be ridiculous for the owner to leave the scene. One would have to have a standard to define a dog bite on a dog. Cannot be just a nip.
- It's called "responsibility".
- Dog bites require more intervention with the owner, not laws against breed specific dogs.
- Yes this should be treated similar to a traffic incident
- Remain at scene if an EO responds in a reasonable time period. Otherwise the pet owner needs to supply contact information and pet tag number to the person/pet owner that harm was caused to and or the EO/PO.
- There can be so many factors that attribute to a dog bite, not because the dog is a nuisance. Dogs don't bite without being provoked, so what was that reason.
- This is in regards to Question #3. This question is insulting in its inference that pit bulls are dangerous dogs. They are not dangerous and like any other breed of dog, they are the result of their owners and training they have or have not received. I own a pit bull cross and she is the sweetest dog I have ever known and would not hurt anyone. I have volunteered at numerous humane societies for many years, where most of the dogs are pit bulls and other such powerful dogs. Very few of them were of concern and the ones who were had been mistreated and abused by humans, used in dog fighting rings, or been owned by owners who had no business owning such a breed. Owners of any breed of dog should be licensed and should be required to attend mandatory dog ownership classes and pass a strict exam prior to being allowed to adopt a dog. Dogs, no matter the breed, are not the issue. The owner is the issue, the glamorization and so-called social standing of owning a bully breed is the issue, abuse and neglect of animals is the issue, and illegal dog fighting rings are the issue.
- If an injury has occurred, for insurance purposes. If no injury IE: bleeding has occurred than no.
- Why wouldn't they?
- They should stay close by but at a distance where everyone feels safe.
- Seems fair to make things right
- It is completely unreasonable and cowardly for someone to flee the scene when their dog has injured someone/something. It shows their inability to be responsible for the animal and as such the animal should be taken away from that person.
- Just like being in a car accident, they should stay until authorities arrive
- Yes they definitely need to stay and provide their contact information if their dog is responsible for the bite they should be responsible for the cost of care of the person or animal bit
- It is your responsibility to remain at the scene when involved in a car accident- your dog is solely your responsibility, thus you must be accountable in case of an incident
- Then information can be gathered quickly. This would only work if an enforcement officer didn't take very long



- Just like in car accidents, this would encourage more responsibility for pet owners. A fine for those that leave the scene should be held accountable just like with car accidents
- It needs to be determined what caused the bite and an impartial third party (officer) I see as necessary
- Yes, but...in some cases the dog may be so agitated that remaining at the scene may cause further issues. I think the owner should ensure that the dog is removed to a safe place (that could be distance, car, or home) but that they should return or call the city.
- I think any responsible pet owners should stay on scene.
- This is responsible pet ownership.
- Our one year old Sheltie was attacked severely by a pit bull in a dog park. The owner responded with profanity, took zero responsibility and exited the park quickly. We were left with a \$2,000 vet bill.
- Just like in a car accident, info should be shared.
- No different than at a car accident. Must remain on scene.
- same as a road accident - parties need to remain on scene until proper documentation is complete
- As long as the situation is safe. It may be necessary to leave to de-escalate.
- Just like a car accident, exchange information.
- The owner MUST be responsible for the actions of his dog!!
- By staying on the scene it allows for the potential to resolve the situation in a more positive way.
- Would give the owner a chance to explain what happened and provide their information, rather than it only coming from an injured party in a high stress and emotional situation.
- If circumstances dictate, the owner may need to leave and then return to the scene. Example: securing the aggressive and/or agitated dog at their home or in a vehicle, and if small children are present, would suggest taking them away from the scene if it is traumatic.
- The owner is liable and should not flee the scene of a bite
- If the owner leaves, treat it like a hit and run vehicle/pedestrian accident. Owners must be responsible for their pet actions.
- This should be mandatory should either party involved want an enforcement officer to be come to the scene.
- I see no difference in this in the same way you are required to stay at the scene of an accident. Injury to a pet or the owner must be addressed.
- I am surprised they are not currently required to provide contact information. There should be also be a severe punishment if the owner of the vicious dog leaves the scene of an attack without providing contact information.
- It's the responsible thing to do.
- Dog owners should be accountable for their dogs
- Sometimes there are additional circumstances leading up to the incident, for example, the dog may have been defending itself (bit before being bit) or someone was asked by the owner to stay away from the dog and did not.



- If there are any vet bills or other costs incurred, it is necessary to be able to contact the owner of the nuisance animal.
- If the incident is serious, then yes. Dogs are animals and all of them have the potential to be aggressive towards certain people or other animals. The size of the dog does not matter. It is up to an owner to have control of their dog. Owners of animals that are attacked by any dog and respond to defend themselves should not be penalized for doing so.
- As long as it is safe to do so, I feel if an attack takes place distancing may be necessary.
- It's like a hit and run.
- It's not the animal who is to blame all the time.. owners need to take responsibility so breeds of dogs aren't labeled as dangerous.... like pit bulls, Doberman's or Rottweilers
- Of course they should have to
- This is no different than a car accident. The owner needs to be responsible for their dog's actions
- I think it is important for the owner to remain at the scene to ensure safety moving forward.
- I have observed many owners in the off-leash park in Varsity who walk far ahead of their pets, almost ignoring them and this gives the dog lee-way to "do its own thing" and the only responsible ownership would be to constantly supervise what your dog is doing at all times and stay with it and then you are on hand to observe exactly what happened, plead your case, if necessary, or provide the required information to an enforcement officer if necessary.
- If the owner needs to remove the dog from the situation to then return to assist/share information, they should be permitted.
- Like a car accident a person has been harmed so you should share details
- A dog owner is responsible for its dog. They need to be consulted when an incident occurs. There may be reasons, not the fault of the dog or the dog owner, that need to be explained.
- Any time there is injury involved a proper investigation is necessary. If offenders and there owners can walk away freely this hinders the investigation. Also many dogs mimic there owners behaviour, so if they are aggressive there a fair chance there owners are as well. Having the law simply makes it easier.
- Just like anyother offence Identification is required
- An owner who takes off after a bite has occured is, in my opinion, no different than someone fleeing the scene of a hit n run.
- I would expect everyone to be accountable for their animal, I would alsoNexpect the enforcement to appear in a timely manner... not hours after the incident
- Well if a dog bites my dog I would want information so they can pay the vet bill.
- ALL dog owners regardless of type of dog should follow this. However there have been many instances i am personally aware of where a small dog bites but the owner brushes it off as not a big deal and walk away. The current preposed legislation doesn't cover those people because its too focused on boxer breeds and would effectively give such people the excuse of "but mines not a boxer breed so it doesn't count"



- Yes to share contact information only, not necessarily to wait for an officer as I'm not sure how long this would take and could escalate the dogs behaviour. Best to remove the dog from the incident as soon as possible.
- within reason, again I don't know how you would enforce such a thing or know which dog was the agressor if they both bit someone or each other.
- Yes, if it safe. If victim attacks owner or dog they should be allowed to leave. Should be dependent on reasoning as to why the dog bit and how severe.
- If a dog is causing problems, the owner needs to take responsibility and pay medical/vet bills for the other person/dog if needed. The info is also needed to determine if this person/dog is a repeat offender.
- If it is a serious bite and the dog was aggressive.
- Our dog was bitten by a neighbour's dog - they didn't speak English and we weren't sure where on the street they lived. They didn't appear to understand the severity of their dog's behaviour. We tracked them down and they seemed oblivious. It was an awkward thing to do with a neighbour. If we were to exchange information, an enforcement officer could explain the issue (and maybe have someone obtain interpretation). People should not have dogs unless they agree to a set of rules such as this.
- Of course. Responsible pet owners should.
- It's our responsibility as pet owners to be responsible for our dogs.
- ONLY if blood is drawn/there is serious injury to owner or dog. Being around dogs (in dog parks etc.) means that you accept the risks, including that a dog will try to play with you and your animal.
- Responsible pet owners engage with community
- Within reason. Sometimes it may not be safe for one or both parties involved.
- I believe this is a no-brainer for responsible pet parents.
- They need to be responsible owners, and both sides of a situation need to be heard by the officer. The victim's side and the other side.
- Pet ownership is a privilege not a right. Driving is a privilege not a right. We make drivers wait around after accidents and swap info.
- They need to be held responsible
- The owners need to be held accountable for their dog's behavior.
- Leaving the scene of an incident is irresponsible and brings into question an individuals' fitness to own and care for a dog responsibly.
- Responsible dog ownership dictates ensuring the offending animal is represented and ensure entire story is clear from both sides ! We have had far more small dogs try to attack our large dogs then ever a specific breed ! It's unacceptable no matter the breed ! Just because it's a 5lbs fur ball doesn't make it acceptable !
- They should provide contact info to either the other person involved or to the city official.
- Any dog which attacks another dog or person needs to be assessed and sent for training or intervention.



- This is not a bad idea. However, there will be cases where both sides will not be the same. Possible witnesses may be needed. The dog that bites isn't always the problem dog.
- It's only reasonable if u are a responsible pet owner u would stay then both sides of incident are explained at same time
- Owners are ultimately responsible for their dogs. They need to be held accountable if their dog bites another dog or person.
- the owner should take responsibility for the dogs behavior and should know the dogs triggers and not expose the public to problem dogs.
- It is the responsible thing to do.
- There may be extensive medical and veterinary bills which are only discovered later, The perpetrator needs to stay on scene until all contact / insurance details are recoeded as in a traffic accident. If the victim is satisfied they have all the information they need then the perpetrator can leave the scene.
- this should always be the case
- If it was a person to person incident both parties are required to remain.
- Without contact details how else can a bylaw officer follow up on the incident.
- Owners are the problem not the pets.
- Only information should be shared with an officer and not another person. People have tried to steal dogs.
- If the victim / complainant / their guardian or representative chooses to escalate the process, the owner of the dog which did the biting should be asked to either share their contract information or remain on the scene until a bylaw officer arrives
- If a dog is biting, there is a reason and more often than not, that reason is poor training. It is important that owners of aggressive or reactive dogs are being held accountable.
- Owners of animals who cause personal injury need to be held accountable for the behavior of their animals.
- Why would these people be allowed to leave the scene? It should be law that they stay like a car accident.
- No different than leaving the scene of an accident.
- If a dog bites somebody, the information is needed to be shared, the owner is responsible for any damages that a dog caused.
- there have been many similar incidents reported where it was difficult or impossible to determine the owner of the problem dog or even to locate the problem dog.
- the owner is the one responsible for controlling their dogs behavior. Bad owner means a bad dog. Dogs however can be retrained
- Person yes, other dog no unless it's a severe bite.
- Dog owner is another witness to the event and thus a better understanding of BOTH sides of the story.
- "For health of person bitten.
- To create a record of the dog's behaviour.



- To identify owner for investigation and financial responsibility."
- They share responsibly
- Should provide information and obtain witnesses, this applies to the owner and the person bit as this could protect the dog as well especially if attack was provoked. Exception would be if the owner was trying to defend themselves for example against an assault to themselves or the dog that then results in the dog trying to protect the owner
- Pit' and runs are far too common and irresponsible owners deserve punishment, as well as victims deserving fitting compensation or justice
- Yes of course. It's just as if you got in a accident with your car. You not gonna just run away
- The owner needs to be held accountable and the circumstances need to be considered.
- I view it as being required to stay at the scene of a vehicle accident. Too many people just run off and there is no extra punishment for trying to avoid being responsible.
- It is a persons responsibility to remain at a scene if someone is hurt and that should include a dog owner.
- Yes the owner should be at the scene if it cause my a pet.
- Humans are responsible for their pets.
- An owner with a very aggressive dog should NOT be in a dog park in the first place. If the dog is too aggressive and may be biting more people or dog, perhaps it is best that the dog owner leaves the scene.
- Dog owners have to be responsible for every action of their dog. Leaving the scene after an incident is akin to a hit and run with a vehicle
- All owners should have the expectation of answering questions and advocating for their dogs should there be an incident. This should of course include sharing contact information for follow-up.
- It will never happen but it should so issues like rabies and other shot history as well as being able to recoup vet or medical bills.
- Seems like this might be hard to enforce. And how significant the issue of owners leaving the scene is. I believe that fines for leaving the scene are appropriate.
- Owner needs to take accountability and provide proper support to victim.
- This should be treated exactly like any other incident - all parties (including witnesses) remain on the scene to provide statements.
- As with any incident requiring authorities to be called, both parties should remain on scene. No different than a car accident.
- Otherwise it would be a bit and run. However, staying on scene with the dog may not be possible as containment could be difficult. May need to be discussed in case by case.
- I think the ownership of the dog is essential to know. If the dog bites, this means it needs further training. If that human cannot provide the training, then the dog should be relocated to someone who is willing to educate themselves and train their dog. Every dog needs training, and it is not their fault if their owner lets them down.
- they need to stay at the scene, but a nonresponsible owner will not



- Having had my dog attacked twice by the same dog at an offleash park and the owner does nothing to keep his dog under control, I am totally for this.
- Stay if it is safe to do so. Alternatively, confine the dog and contact Bylaw officer.
- Leaving the scene of a car accident is expected, a dog attack is no different.
- Treat it like any accident. Always remain on the scene
- My true answer is maybe. This also requires more information. I have witnessed very abusive and issues of bullying at the dog park. If someone was feeling at risk then they should not need to put their own safety at risk.
- I feel like they should be fined because they need to control their dog
- Well any kind of dogs are not bad including pit bulls
- I believe the owner in most cases bears that responsibility
- It's like getting in a hit and run accident. You should always stay to make sure everyone is safe.
- It is important to have a person to contact regarding follow up.
- Poor dog behaviour falls on owner training and should be the responsibility of the owner.
- If vet costs occur because your dog bit another dog you should be responsible to pay for those costs.
- This is a reasonable requirement and ensures the owner is held responsible.
- They need to be held accountable for what their dog has done & if they are there, the needed information can be gotten.
- It should be no different than a motor vehicle collision. Those involved should remain at the scene to speak with the authorities.
- I think it is vital to have the offenders talk to the police and share contact info as they would then be easier for the police to contact/find.
- We have to do the same if there is an auto accident. Scene of the crime.
- Nenshi is a Muslim faggot
- It would be necessary to have the dog and owner identified for further investigation into the severity of the incident. The owner must be held responsible for their pet's behaviour.
- Unless both parties agree it's not serious enough to pursue
- If the incident is reported then both sides need to be heard.
- Biting is a crime, and people should own up to the offence
- Just think it's being a responsible pet owner.
- Owners should be responsible pet owners, it isn't the breed of the dog, it is the owner that needs to take responsibility
- A dog owner is expected to be in control of his animal at all times. Similarly a vehicle. If you lose control and cause damage, you are expected to remain at the scene of the accident to provide the necessary information to the other party and police if they are involved.
- Proper thing to do and if the 'victim' was causing havoc to the dog then this needs to be dealt with as well. Possible consequences for them as well
- Take responsibility for your dog's lack of training and care.



- Common sense and common courtesy for the well being of all involved.
- Contact information should be necessary otherwise it's like a hit and run
- Bad pet owners will run away every time.
- The owner must bear responsibility for any actions of the dog
- Whomever gets bit needs to know if the biting dog has had its shots, especially rabies.
- Common sense should apply
- If your dog bites someone should stay pretty simple
- It is like leaving the scene of an accident.. it's common sense..
- If they flee, increase the penalty.
- This should always be the law, always remain at the scene! Heavier fines if they run and animal should be removed from the owners!
- It's like a car accident - remain at the scene unless things can be dealt with easily between the parties
- Owning and controlling a pet is a responsibility. (like driving a vehicle) It is a reasonable requirement.
- A dog who bites/attacks a person or dog (with intent to harm, not playfulness) is a potential danger to society and safety hazard. It should be treated like workplace or public hazards - reported and dealt with accordingly
- Dog owners need to take responsibility for their dog and that includes providing contact info to enforcement officers.
- They have to explain so they have to stay
- Owners need to be held accountable and responsible for the behaviour of their pets.
- I support owners taking responsibility for their dogs actions. This should apply to all breeds. Anecdotally, I have seen multiple cases of small dogs biting someone and their owners simply picking them up and walking away without giving their contact information or the dogs vaccine history.
- No different than a hit and run!
- Owners should take ownership for their animals actions and be responsible for their animals actions
- This way, the owner can be held responsible and help the person that their dog injured/hurt.
- The victim's owner can take a photo of the attackers and give it to the police if they walk away. Walking away should result in the most sever of consequences.
- It is very irresponsible of a person to leave the scene of a dog bite not to mention the cost to the city to try to find the dog & owner.
- All pet owners need to be responsible for their pet's behaviour and it is common courtesy to take responsibility if an incident occurs. The owner is responsible to ensure all parties are ok and do the right thing.
- If they can safely restrain their dog. Otherwise leave contact info.
- People often leave without giving contact info so they don't have to pay vet bills
- This will facilitate a quicker resolution to the issue.



- Owner should take responsibility, unless both parties mutually agree to leave the scene because all applicable information has been shared.
- People must take responsibility for this. People turn dogs into aggressive animals. It is almost always the human's fault.
- Like a hit and run people should stay on scene to exchange information
- Otherwise very easy to avoid any consequences
- There needs to be accountability by the dog owner.
- People should be held accountable for a nuisance dog
- How else can corrective action be taken
- Part of being a responsible pet owner.
- Any dog that bites should be euthanized.
- If the bite results in broken skin then absolutely the dog owner should remain at the scene of the incident to share contact information.
- "Every Situation as a different context to consider
- Case by case is the way to move forward with this"
- The animal owner must assume responsibility for the situation, just as an automobile driver must.
- it should be no different than a car accident. You stay at the scene.
- So the owner is educated on the next steps
- This is responsible ownership
- Dog owners must take responsibility for their dog's actions
- Provides accountability and people can't just leave before they're charged.
- It can be a serious incident and information should be shared.
- If people are allowed to leave the scene, then they can just disappear without being held accountable for their dogs actions. Also would force them to give personal information in case they need to be sued.
- There are too many cases where the owner leaves and is never found again with no repercussions.
- There is no evidence for breed specific legislation
- The owners info should be available so they could be fined, and animal control can follow up
- I think the owner is responsible for damages to the bitten animal/human and they should not be allowed to just leave the scene.
- Just like a car accident, compliance from both parties - and a third party- should be necessary to ensure that the proper steps are taken.
- be responsible
- The same reason a vehicle owners is required to stay at the scene of an accident
- Take responsibility for it plain and simple should your dog be in the wrong
- it is the same as hitting someone with your car, you just do it for common decency.
- It should be treated like any other assault. Bystanders should be asked for their version of the story also.
- Absolutely that's the responsible thing to do and important that it's done



- Opportunity to deal with effects of situation. Exchange of personal information
 - A bylaw officer only needs to be called when a vicious attack occurs on a person. If a minor dog fight occurs and one dog bites another, there isn't any reason to involve an officer.
 - Ultimately an owner must be completely responsible for their pet especially when something harmful or worse has occurred. Contact info is a must and an enforcement officer may be needed and should be available in the case of poorly behaved humans.
 - The owner is responsible for the actions of the dog.
 - The person has to be responsible for his/ her pet and the actions of it.
 - Contact information is important for the person injured or for coverage for the injured dog. I do see a problem if it is difficult to contain the biting dog.
 - Owners must take responsibility for action of their animals. In addition it ensures both sides of the story are presented and the accurate one reviewed
 - This is no different than a Hit and Run driver - owners must take responsibility for their pet's actions.
 - The dog owner should be held liable for the injuries caused by his dog.
 - It would be the same as remaining at the scene of any accident or incident, especially if insurance is involved. It would also be helpful if witnesses remained at the scene as well.
 - A dog bite is an injury to a person. If a person is injured by an automobile, the driver doesn't get to leave the scene like a coward. Why should a dog owner get to do so after their animal has bitten someone?
 - Like any accident, it's illegal to leave the scene.
 - "That person needs to be identified in case there are lasting effects of the bite, where the victim (human or animal) could seek financial compensation for consequences and/or collateral damages as a result of the incident.
-
- Also, the owner would want their statement logged in case there are mitigating circumstances (ie: the dog was provoked etc)"
 - Yes, often a bite requires a doctor or vet visit, often incurring expenses. the owner should be held accountable.
 - To accept responsibility - Apologize at least
 - Larger dog bites can be as dangerous as an attack with a weapon, and as such there should be a strong obligation for dogs owners to act both responsibly and with full respect for public safety. It should not be legal for them to simply walk away if their animal has harmed the public.
 - Owners must take responsibility and be accountable for their dog's actions.
 - Dog owners are responsible for the actions of their animals, so must stay and be accountable...as long as the offending dog is removed far enough away from the victim.
 - People need to be responsible for the damage their dogs do



- Yes I understand that if an incident occurs, it is important that the owner share information so one knows that all needles are up to date, this needs to be shared so the vet knows what he is dealing with or the doctor knows if it is a person.
- These should be treated like crimes, requiring officer involvement.
- The dog owner should share his/her contact information with the victim and the enforcement officer and receive charges on the bite.
- It is critical to obtain accurate contact information and proof of ID from the owner.
- Common friggin sense
- it makes the owner accountable
- It qualifies as a "hit and run"
- If there is a need for an officer to attend the offending owner should provide information or stay
- It can be easy for someone to say they will deal with the situation and take contact info, but then never contact the injured person. If you have to wait for bylaw, at least someone is there to write up a report.
- "They dog is under theie care and therefore they are responsible. This is what it means to be a responsible dog owner.
- I have a beautiful BorderCollie x Boxer dog. She is extremely well behaved. She would fit the profile of physically like a pit bull. I also know many amazing owners here in Calgary with understand there is some strong feelings toward pitbulls and therefore make it a point to ensure their dogs are always extremely obedient and wellbehaved. This isnt right.
- What about husky's?!
- Invest in training. Even if its mandatory!!!!"
- Common courtesy, what more can one say.
- A dog's behaviour is most often a reflection of their owner's behaviour and therefore the owner needs to be responsible for their dog.
- Same responsibilities as if involved in a car accident.
- Good people take responsibility.
- This requires no explanation
- Common sense
- Responsibility is
- accountability.
- Needs to be held accountable
- It's the only satisfactory way to ensure identity and keep track of witnesses.
- That way no dog is neglected from receiving proper training to reintegrate into dog society...all dogs found to be perpetrators need mandatory recertification by a specialized school/trainer that works with nuisance dogs specifically.
- We would need to determine the health of the biting dog in case our dog gets sick. The biting dog owner should assume vet bills. Therefore, contact information needs to be shared.
- Bad owners will just leave otherwise. Add an additional fine if the owner leaves the scene.



- It's just like a car accident where both parties exchange the pertinent information. However, in this case the enforcement officer should be taking separate statements from each of the parties, and any witnesses to the incident.
- If an officer is to be called the owner should have to stay or provide information before leaving.
- Unless the offending dog or the owner needs medical attention
- Same as leaving a scene of a vehicle accident
- I have had a dog bitten and had a dog bite myself. I would have appreciated some sense of responsibility other than " he's never done that before."
- An owner of a dog involved in an attack should absolutely remain on scene until an enforcement officer arrives on scene. This is a crime scene as serious as a physical or lethal assault.
- Ultimately the dog is under the responsibility of it's owner, therefore the owner must be there to defend the actions of the dog and offer their stated opinion of the incident.
- This is assault and owner needs to be accountable
- dog owners need to be responsible.
- If there was a dog bite or attack to another dog that is very minor - more of a touse that went too far, then probably the dog owners can settle it without an enforcement officer. A serious dog bite or attack that leaves a dog injured should require that the dog owners should remain at the scene to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer - or owners should at least share their contact info if the dog has to leave and go for Vet. care immediately - with the understanding that the enforcement officer will be contacted A.S.A.P. regarding the incident. Ditto for a dog who bites a human. The owner of the offending dog has to be held accountable and "Dog (HUMAN) Training Classes" should be mandatory. So often, at "Off-leash Parks" the dog owner is so far away from their own dog that he/she isn't there to intervene. People who attend "Dog Parks", or walk their dog in public places should be very aware that their dog must be under their control at all times, and that the owner must be near enough so that he can voice a recall to his dog, or be near enough to take control.
- Does this really require explanation that I would expect somebody to remain at the scene of a crime to give contact information? You gotta be kidding me.
- I thought the legal code covered this. If it doesn't, then I support including this provision.
- These owners always seem to leave the scene. They must be accountable for their animals actions
- Because it's their responsibility
- It's pretty traumatic to be bitten, the owner should understand the seriousness of it.
- Owners need to take responsibility.
- Absolutely! Incident/Accident/Damage/Injury you stay at the scene.
- I have been bitten at a dog park in Ontario. The emergency dept reported it to Public Health and I had to return to the park the next day hoping that the two dog owners would be there and that I could have them contact Public Health. It was traumatic and inconvenient for me.
- It's the same as a hit and run - you should stay and share information.
- Wouldn't this be common sense behaviour for most individuals?



- Remaining at the scene is responsible dog ownership. People should be educated that it does not mean they will necessarily be penalized or their dog euthanized.
- if the bite is serious enough for medical attention, contact information should be shared for insurance purposes.
- Owner is responsible and liable for their pet's behaviour
- The owner is the legal guardian of the dog and is responsible for any of its actions. They must therefore stay and supply any information required by the enforcement officer.
- We must know who owns the dog and where the dog resides so that the animal can be specifically identified as a nuisance animal and the owner can be identified in order to be fined, sued by the victim/owner and or determine if the dog needs to be euthanized.
- Because their dog has been involved the owner is responsible for remaining at the scene.
- Dog owners are responsible for their animals. Leaving the scene should constitute a criminal offence.
- Because that what a responsible person should do
- My dog was bitten by another dog and the owner ran off while I was attending to my dog. I worry that it has bitten other dogs or people. My dog was also injured and I was also saddled with a very expensive vet bill. I'm not sure a bylaw would help in this situation, but it wouldn't hurt.
- owner should be responsible for any vet or medical bills
- As soon as a person is responsible for injury or damage to another person it is common sense to stay at the scene and offer support, be responsible for its actions and provide identification for the injured/damaged person to follow up.
- It is no different than having a car accident. If a person is bit or a dog attacked then the owner should be required to remain on the scene. If they leave they should be fined! Kind of like a hit and run accident
- One is required to stay at the scene of other crimes and misdemeanors, I don't see why this should be any different.
- to expedite the investigation
- Owners must be responsible for their dogs. Awaiting an enforcement officer is the same as awaiting the arrival of police at a collision. If appropriate detailed information on the owner and the dog could be provided this could potentially make it possible for the dog owner to leave.
- Too many bad owners run away because of fear of fines The dog gets bad rep. when it is the duty of owner to control the animal
- they are responsible for their dogs actions and need to man up instead of running away
- If the owner does not remain at the scene, especially if there are no witnesses, makes it difficult to identify the dog in question.
- The dog owner may not be a responsible owner. Enforcement needs to know who the owner is.
- Dogs should have proper training and the owner should be responsible just like a driver would be responsible for a car collision.
- Injury has occurred- the owner needs to take responsibility. That would include remaining at the scene.



- Yes if there us a bite of a person. This would be very difficult to manage / enforce. Who would make sure that person stays? How long would response by bylaw be? Better to have a requirement that requires (for a bite resulting in injury) that involved owners must exchange information. This would still be hard to regulate but not as difficult as trying to keep someone at a scene until bylaw arrives. Also, this doesn't preclude people getting their injured dog or person to safety or medical aid if needed.
 - Owner or designate is ultimately responsible for the animal.
 - Owner(s) MUST both be held accountable, AND, identifiable....
 - Just like a automotive accident, people must stay on the scene of the incident.
 - Determine whether the animal bites repeatedly.
 - Too many irresponsible dog owners dismiss the severity of a bite.
 - Only in a severe bite cases, meaning broken skin.
 - "I think the owner of the dog should pay for the damage, if any.
-
- And it's the right/responsible thing to do. If my car hit another car - I'd have to exchange info or wait on scene for police. If I didn't, it would be hit and run."
 - Take responsibility for your pet and its actions. If you don't want to be held responsible, don't own a pet. Pretty easy.
 - Leaving the scene should be the same as leaving the scene of an accident. Same penalties.
 - I have seen it where another dog attacks a dog and the offending dog owners just walk off and don't even see if the other dog is ok. I think if there is a puncture or other issue arising from an attack both dog owners should stay and submit information.
 - Owners who leave the scene of an incident should be treated like drivers who leave the scene of an accident. Leaving the scene of an incident without providing contact information is cowardly and irresponsible.
 - Removes any doubt as to which dog it was
 - It is absolutely that owners responsibility to make sure the other party has their information and follows up with financial support (vet visit, medical costs, etc).
 - This will alleviate any concern that the victim(s) may have and it will also help in the quick dispensation of justice for the victim(s).
 - There could be serious injuries that the biting dog's owner should take responsibility for ethically and financially
 - Dog owners must be held accountable for the actions of their dog and be censured accordingly with tickets for bylaw infractions AND financial responsibility for damages ie vet bills for treatment of injuries inflicted - hence why many owners flee the scene.
 - no explanation necessary. |Remain at the scene of your dogs transgression. be responsible pet owner
 - "I support it if a dog bites a person.



- BUT if a dog bites another dog in self defense, I am not sure. Little yappy dogs often attack larger ones, and the large one is blamed wrongly. (I do not have a dog myself, but I have seen it happen many times)"
- This would be a part of being a responsible pet owner. Of course they need to take responsibility for their dog's behaviour in public, unless the owner specifically indicated to others that the dog was not approachable. Unfortunately this would result in a "he said, she said" incident.
- This is common sense.
- Because it is the responsible thing to do, DUH!
- The owner is the one who is responsible for dog behaviour, he/she should definitely stay at the scene
- There have been situations in past where an owner of a dangerous dog has fled the scene, with the dog, after an attack has occurred an another dog or person seriously injured. The owner must shoulder the liability for possessing such an animal.
- The owner must be made to take responsibility for their pet!
- People have an assumed liability as an owner of their pets. This is no different than a car accident where the owner is legally obliged to provide the information.
- First aid and sober questions
- If my dog or a family member is injured by the behaviour of another dog I would want to know how to contact the dog's owner and to be able to ask them to cover any related vet bills. (I would be prepared to do the same if it were my dog causing the problem.)
- If an enforcement officer is called then the person should remain at the scene. At minimum the owner of the dog that bites should have to send in a pic of their dogs tags plus their personal contact info along with a brief summary of the events to the bylaw to a provided link so an investigation can occur to determine if an investigation is necessitated.
- I support this but it will be hard to enforce. It would be better to simply limit off-leash areas to areas that are more conducive to being used by pet-owner - ie not the entirety of McHugh Bluff for example.
- In the event vet bills are incurred and a lawsuit is needed by the victim to recoup the costs of the dog bite, the owner of the aggressive dog should be required to remain on the scene and provide contact information.
- Ideally, people would take responsibility, however, enforcement could be an issue.
- All owners should be accountable.
- The dog owner is responsible for their dog's behaviour.
- It is imperative that the owner takes responsibility and is accountable for the offending animal
- Sharing info allows info regarding dog health and vaccination confirmation to have bet outcome for both parties.



- There is a difference between a vicious bite and a bite that may occur while two dogs are playing together. If one of the animals is injured due to the incident then the owner of the afflicting animal should be required to take responsibility and share information as might be necessary.
- As with vehicles, dogs have the potential to cause damage to other beings. The owner is responsible for controlling their animal and should be held accountable (similar to a accidents involved with a vehicle).
- Of course the dog owner should stay - information is needed such as if the dog has had its rabies shots, who will pay for vet bills if required, etc.
- It's the only decent thing to do. What if the dog had a disease or is sick.
- Common courtesy.
- Ultimately the owner is responsible for the dog so needs to communicate ownership details in case of a problem
- This is no different than a car accident or any other type of damage caused by inattentiveness. The Dog owner should be responsible and provide contact information to the injured person.
- Good idea - helps to track nuisance dogs and demands owner responsibility.
- How can their be any accountabilty for the dog owner if they don't do this?
- The owner should be held responsible for their dog's behaviour, behaviour which may cause the need for medical or veterinary attention, legal action... The owner must provide their contact information for follow-up, unless both parties agree that it is not necessary.
- Much the same as an auto accident, people should be held accountable to remain at the scene.
- Should be the same as vehicle incident in case insurance involved
- Their identification is necessary.
- Take responsibility for the behavior of your pet. Isn't this just common sense?
- This should be mandatory
- The dog owner should be held responsible to answer questions if required.
- Owners are responsible for their pets. They may need to discuss the training they've taken in handling the dog, provide contact info to the person or other animal's owner whose been injured and also be issued appropriate fines if applicable.
- A dog bite should be considered a serious incident and it should be mandatory to share contact information and report the incident to proper authorities.
- As in car accidents, It is better to collect information and reports at the scene of the incident before time has passed and the story has changed or emotion has set in
- This is like anything else where a person inflicts damage on another they should remain on scene and share contact information
- Remaining at the scene is the moral and legal action a responsible owner should be doing now. Those that don't, whether in fear of legal action or the loss of their pet, should face stiffer fines. It should be made clear that by staying at the scene it could go a long way in their favour.
- the owner must be held accountable
- We had a severe bite, the people of the attach dog left, we were charged a huge vet bill to suture the damage



- Nobody should walk away from an incident
- The offence is the responsibility of the pet owner.
- They have to take responsibility.
- It only makes sense that the owner should remain and be accounted for the incident.
- The owner is responsible for the dog & like traffic accidents must remain at the scene. Too often they take off & a lot of work goes into finding them & the animal in order to resolve the situation & determine penalties.
- This includes SMALL dogs whom may not be able to do much damage, if any at all, but are still dogs and should be treated the same as larger dogs.
- "I have had two incidents,
- I was bit by a dog, on leash, and
- My dogs were attacked, while on leash...
- in both incidents the owners took off refusing to supply me with info."
- The owner should take responsibility.
- make sure everyone involved is ok, for actual bites, not dogs being dogs. People need to understand the difference.
- Yes, it's the same as a hit and run accident.
- It would expedite all proceedings.
- You are responsible for your dog and its actions.
- It's no different than a vehicle accident- accountability is required.
- The person bitten, or the owner of the animal bitten, needs to know the contact information in case a lawsuit might follow or charges might be laid. The contact information could also be needed to be able to trace any previous incidents that the offending dog might have been involved in.
- that is absolutely the decent thing to do. Running away and avoiding the problem is not acceptable.
- "It helps to identify who the problem dog is. It may be that the dog that bit was teased into action.
- There are always two sides to the story."
- Some incidents involving a dog can be very serious and I think the enforcement officer should decide what is a minor or major incident and the dog owner should be present at the scene to share his or her contact information.
- Owners must be responsible for their pets behaviour
- It's the appropriate way to handle these situations.
- Yes, too many stories of owners taking off.
- Owners should be held responsible for the actions of their dog, therefore, they should be present to speak on behalf of the dogs actions. It is not always the dogs fault.
- I believe cases have been reported when the owner (s) of dogs that have bitten have left the scene.
- I believe every dog owner should take responsibility for their dog regardless of the breed.
- Any responsible pet owner would remain at the scene. If they don't remain, they are not responsible and should not have a pet.



- I wouldn't want this to be held up for an unreasonably long time waiting on a bylaw officer. Consider FaceTime or equivalent as acceptable alternative for bylaw officer to be engaged remotely
- Seriously? in my mind a crime has been committed
- An exchange in contact information is valuable in situations where medical attention is required. Also, it is a way to track reoffending dogs.
- "absolutely, what if the other dog attacked first and then was severely injured. I want to hear both sides of the story before jumping to conclusions.
- And if the dog attacks a person, they should always remain at the scene, just like a car accident. What are you hiding if you run away."
- Both sides of the story need to be heard to be sure the dog won't be killed just because the person the dog bit doesn't like the dog for whatever reason or to make sure it's a just case, example: I had a dog who was murdered just because he bit a kid, neither him nor the kid he bit knew each other and she smacked him in his face, he was defending himself, the kid wasn't mauled or disfigured but they killed my dog anyways, didn't have a vicious bone in his body at all but he would defend himself and his loved ones!
- Absolutely otherwise false ID /contact info could be provided and person avoids responsibility for pet attack
- I feel responsible owners already do this. It's the irresponsible owners who try to get away with not taking responsibility for having control over their animal that leave a scene. However, I'm not sure how enforcement of owners that don't remain at the scene can be done as the victims are likely dealing with their wounds or wounds of their pets during this traumatic event.
- No different than a traffic accident in my mind. Stay and provide contact info so that authorities/victims/owners can do follow up tracking of the incident to deal with any subsequent fallout.
- It's obvious - they must take responsibility for their animal
- Within reason; if we are talking about a sever bit (dog has broken skin) and aggressive behaviour. Sharing information or having a conversation, yes. On the other hand, I would hate to see a by-law so strict that people become fearfully about owning a dog.
- It isn't any different than requiring a car driver involved in an accident to stay at the scene. If a dog does something wrong (against a bylaw, like biting), the owner should be required to also 'stay at the scene' to assist with any investigation.
- Dog ownership means taking responsibility for how your dog is behaving.
- No different than hit and run incidents, people need to take responsibility
- for sure, they should remain until the officer arrives and discusses the situation
- leaving the scene of a dog bite is like leaving the scene of a vehicle accident. A responsible pet owner must take responsibility for their pets actions.
- Contact information should be shared like a car accident.
- of course the owner needs to stay at the scene to show responsibility for an untrained animal
- Sometimes at off leash parks - owners seem oblivious of their dogs behavior and will leave after an altercation.



- Only if the bite is severe and requires medical intervention.
- I believe it is the responsibility of the owner of a dog who has attacked another animal, child or adult to remain at the scene...provided the aggressive dog is safely contained and unable to cause further harm to anyone.
- I am opposed to anything that hints at breed specific legislation and I think it is shameful that this is even being considered. Most people can't properly identify one breed, let alone lumping in a dog that has the "appearance" or "characteristics" of one. How the hell do they know what the characteristics are or are supposed to be? I attended a seminar several years ago from noted Norwegian dog behaviourist Turid Rugaas, in which at least 2 members of Animal Bylaw Services attended. The takeaway was that in her entire lifelong career she has only experienced one dog that needed to be euthanized - the rest were successfully rehabilitated. If an owner can't control a dog that has been deemed dangerous, then the dog should be turned over to a rehabilitation person - NOT euthanized - and the owner should be banned from owning any other dogs for a period of up to 5 years, AND until it has been proven that the owner has enrolled in, participated in, and graduated from an accredited training school.
- I don't think much of an explanation is needed....it's illegal to leave the scene of a car accident. People should be responsible and do the right thing or face a fine.
- Dog owners should be required to remain at the scene in order for the incident to be properly investigated.
- It would seem to be the moral and ethical thing to do.
- "I had my dog attacked"
- It cost me thousands of dollars in vet bills and the guy just walked quickly away without even saying sorry. A couple years later I had a small dog which was killed by a dog whose owner was letting it run free he also took off. Too many owners take their dogs to these free run areas and let their dogs do whatever even though they haven't been socialized with other dogs."
- This is tough to enforce. You want to remove the dogs from each other and you don't want angry confused and scared pets and owners arguing. But information has to be shared by both parties like in an accident.
- The owner had to take responsibility for how they are allowing their dog to behave.
- I believe that we should all take responsibility for our actions or our dogs actions so if our dog bites someone or their dog we should stay to speak with an enforcement officer.
- Contact information is needed in case there is any injury which requires a vet or doctor.
- Because Pit Bull owners run away after they attack
- This should be treated no different than a traffic incident.
- The dog owner is ultimately responsible for their dogs behaviour. Therefore they should be required to provide contact details at the scene of any incident where their pet has harmed another pet or person.
- If a dog bites another dog or a person, then the owner should remain at scene to give details to enforcement and person who has the injury.
- Responsibility for any damage due to bites rests with the dog owner



- I don't have experience in dog parks or with dog bites but it sounds like a reasonable expectation.
- The negative encounters are caused by a lack of proper handling by the owner/handler. Education is essential. If a dog is biting there is a reason, fear, anxiety, or surprise, among others. Consistent education by the by law officers is needed, so they need to be properly educated first. Slapping fines and removing dogs is not the answer. The owners will find a way to own another dog, the dog will suffer. Please find ways to educate, not litigate.
- How do you prosecute a person that has left the scene?
- If a dog injures a person or other dog the owner should be responsible for any medical bills.
- How are we to verify the breed, responsible owner and up to date rabies vaccine if the culprits leave?
- If a dog bite is indeed an offense, then the perpetrator would be required to be identified. The human companion would represent the offending animal.
- Owners should absolutely be held responsible not only for contact information but also medical costs and lost wages
- For what part of yes do you require and explanation?
- It should be treated just like a car accident
- This should be an incident similar to a car accident and exchange of information should be mandatory.
- I believe it's is required for appropriate follow up/ insurance if required.
- It shows responsibility for pet activity and concern for others involved
- Too often, and owner leaves the location, and makes it necessary for allocation of resources to be put to task to find the owner / animal. Significant fines should be issued for owners or handlers who leave without providing verifiable personal information.
- The owner should be held responsible for any damage (lost wages, medical bills etc.) My daughter was bit a few weeks ago and the dog owner just left the scene. I wonder how many times this dog has bitten someone else?
- All stakeholders need to remain on scene, including witnesses. As well an impartial, unbiased, investigator needs to attend the scene, to arrive at the truth.
- This should not even be a question. It is no different than hit and run. If a dog bites somebody, the owner has to take control over the dog and remain at the scene until the bitten person has been taken care of and an enforcement officer or the police or in charge.
- owners should be penalized if their dogs bite and they leave the scene
- This would be part of being a responsible pet owner, if the owner were to leave the scene I would suggest fines and / or dog seizure be a consequence
- It should be similar to an automobile accident. if a dog bites another dog or a person, the owner must give their contact number and wait for an enforcement officer if the person who gets bit or owns the dog that gets bit asks for such.
- If the owner stays at the scene then the tax payers are not pay to track a person down if required. Or there needs to be a city call number to leave a report for an officer to follow up on.
- Offender should always remain at the scene



- If they get away, they are gone for good. He says...she says...
- Whether the owner or handler remains at the scene of an incident they should be required to provide their contact information by showing valid government id to those present.
- To attain both sides of the story.
- Any responsible dog owner would support this. How do you screen false accusations though ?
- They should stay and be responsible for the incident
- The more information to determine the best outcome for the dog the better.
- If there was a health issue that would involve an insurance claim later on it would be important to be able to get back to the owner.
- Similar to a car accident, all parties should remain to share info and make proper statements
- This is common sense. Any person or animal that injures another should be held accountable therefore would be required to provide details to an officer. You Should not leave the scene of any accident or injury before speaking with an authority or providing identifying information.
- In case of injury or death to the animal or person. To me, it is like leaving the scene of an accident!
- The owner is responsible for the dogs actions AE ALL TIMES
- Unprovoked and/or provoked attacks also need to be assessed for possible rabies prevention. Owner needs to be present.
- Otherwise how would you locate them
- Dog bites happen and are more likely when uses are not separated properly; like runners next to off lease areas or in off lease areas. The owner should be responsible, but there needs to be information provided on any changes through licensing.
- If the owner leaves, the victim or victim's owner has no way of knowing vaccination history of attacking animal.
- Because the City is then aware of this dog & can monitor it in the future.
- That's obvious, same as a hit in run in traffic. Common-sense...
- Owner or caregiver of the animal must show responsibility. Maybe the owner is more dangerous than the dog ?
- The dog may need tested for rabies.
- Dog owners should be responsible for their dogs behaviour regardless of the breed. If there is an injury they should be held accountable for that behaviour.
- They need to provide more details about a dog, and what THEY are doing to prevent such dog behavior.
- If your dog bites someone you need to take responsibility for your animal.
- Too many dog bites have occurred in the City where owners of the offending animal do not remain at the scene. They know their animal is dangerous and do not want to face the consequences. This needs to have harsh consequences just as it does with not remaining at the scene of a vehicular accident. At least vehicles have plates to ID them. Not so with people and dogs. Remaining at the scene would demonstrate Responsible Pet Ownership By-Laws.



- If the owner is a responsible owner, this should be an automatic response on their part. It is also a way to ensure that the owner is responsible and following the City's pet bylaws.
- It's important for follow up.
- To me it would be considered assault. As a result they should remain.
- This should be treated almost the same as any accident. You are required to stay & give information to authorities. If the dog owner flees the accident it is similar to a "hit & run" car accident & increased severity of fines should be reflected.
- the problem of this is that many dog bites occur when the owner is not around.
- Same as remaining at the scene of an accident
- Ultimately owners are the key to a dog's behaviour
- Any details of the pet can be shared.
- Exchange of information necessary for any type of follow up.
- Otherwise how could the identity of the offender be established?
- No different than a car accident involving personal injury - it should be a pet owner obligation to do this
- This does not require an explanation. If your dog injures someone, the same protocols as a car accident should apply.
- Should be required to share contact information, but not necessarily remain at scene to talk with an enforcement officer.
- Is this a serious question? of course the owner needs to stay at the scene. there are hit and run laws in place for a reason.
- Owner is responsible for their dog; they must remain at the scene when their dog bites a person or other animal.
- It would probably be best so they can share their side of the story.
- The dog owner needs to be responsible and extra resources and time should not have to be used to track them down.
- It's not the dog that needs to be punished, it's the owner who has not taken the time to teach the dog basic manners. The dog owner needs to be on site and responsible.
- If a dog bites someone or another animal a centralized record should be kept to catch repeat offenders.
- It's important that evidence of what occurred be gathered.
- For all other kinds of accidents, it is a requirement to remain at the scene. This should not be any different.
- It's important to understand both sides of the story.
- Yes it is only common sense. The owner should also have to pay for any bills for the person or animal hurt.
- same as a car accident, allows authorities to gather the facts at the time and place of the incident vs tracking down days later.



- If possible in regards to safety of other people or animals, the dog owner should stay on site and share information. If the dog needs to be removed from the site, they should leave their information with a designate who can remain at the scene.
- Just like a car accident both parties need to swap info.
- Too many times the offending dog's owners walk away.
- Because any dog owner should be responsible for the dog's behaviour and the resulting pain, expense of any injuries caused by the dog.
- I would only support this if the "enforcement officers" being dispatched to these events have appropriate training and understanding in animal behaviour. This system will not work if the individuals called in to make assessment have the same breed biases/assumptions that support BSL legislation.
- Kinda like an injury car wreck. This speaks to taking responsibility, ensuring harm mitigation through administering first aid, offering help and even mobilizing EMS.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their animals.
- Being a responsible pet owner you should remain on scene to own what your animal did.
- yes, absolutely. If your dog is involved in aggressive behavior, you and your dog should be held accountable.
- The owner should be responsible
- The dog owner is responsible for his/her dog's behavior and must be accountable to follow through on all follow up.
- Why do we not consider a bite a scene of crime, this is a reasonable expectation when one harms another
- You would do the same thing if you were driving with your child And they got into a car accident
- It's like a traffic accident, you can't leave the scene. Not sure why this isn't a rule already.
- If they do not have control of their dog then they should leave and the police can follow up later.
- It's no different than remaining at the scene of a car accident. Forces people to take responsibility for their vicious animals.
- you should not be allowed to not be responsible for your pet. If your animal hurts another you should be required to pay for vet bills, damages or other.
- Just like a car accident, it seem reasonable to ask them to stay until everyone has had a chance to talk.
- It's important to hear both sides. For example if a dog is being attacked by someone and defends itself by biting, the person attacking is more responsible than the dog.
- It's the only decent thing to do. I can't image why it wouldn't be a rule already.
- The owner of the dog should prioritize gaining control of the dog to mitigate further damage and return to scene and/or contact an enforcement officer immediately after the dog is secured/under control.
- They need to stay on scene so that vet records can be confirmed for rabies, it can be determined if there have been more than one incident. That person may be liable for damages.
- They are responsible for their dogs actions.



- Dog bites are damaging and traumatic. Dog Owners should be responsible in a hit and run fashion if they leave.
- Accountability
- It's no different than an accident or an assault. Information should be shared in case future concerns arise. If your dog bites my dog and passes along a virus or disease, both dog owners should be aware so they can take appropriate steps with their vet. A pet owner is responsible for every aspect of their pet.
- A dog attack is an assault on a pet or human. Provided the dog is under control and poses no further risk to the victim, the owner should remain at the scene.
- Owners would most likely try and cover up an incident if given opportunity
- Only another person.
- It's' no different than a car accident. It's the responsible thing to do and shouldn't have to be mandated.
- It's like a car accident. Ideally a report would be taken at the scene or information exchanged.
- More accountability on dog owners is a more common sense approach than victimizing specific breeds
- It's important to take responsibility for your animals actions. If the fines are to great and the risk of putting an animal down I don't blame owners for leaving.
- No different than hitting someone's car. Your dog is your responsibility
- It's about being a responsible pet owner and doing the right thing
- Pet ownership accountability.
- The dog owner need to be responsible. His information is required so that the enforcement officers can do their job as well as the Person affected has the information to sue the dog owner for any damages.
- Absolutely. The dog should be removed from the area to calm it but the owner, much like a person involved in a car accident, needs to exchange info with the victim to ensure accurate vaccination record history and for court records if necessary.
- For the same reason someone should remain at the scene of an accident one should remain at the scene of a bite.
- yes - people should be responsible for the pets and the injuries that they may cause. if the dog bites, the owner should have to provide their contact information at minimum, likely dependent on the serverity of the incident.
- Dog should be put down if it bites person or animal
- Situation. You need to understand the entire situation to best determine the proper outcome.
- If bite occurs, need owners AND injured party to be present. UNLESS need to put aggressive into secure place, injured party need attention
- Absolutely. Owners must take responsibility not the dogs. Its the training not the breed.
- They MUST remain on the scene and MUST pay any expenses related to said incident
- Owners are responsible for injuries caused by their dog. Similar to traffic laws, leaving the scene should be considered an offence



- No different from a pedestrian and/or vehicular accident, all involved must stay at the scene to be processed
- If the attack draws blood from an animal or a person, all involved should remain at the scene.
- Only to talk with an enforcement officer unless the bitten person becomes aggressive
- Owner should be liable for dogs actions no matter breed or size
- As long as the offending animal can be separated sufficiently from the scene
- "I think this is the optimal solution- no bite-and-dash. If the animal was legitimately being harassed by the person they bit (because some people are jerks) the owner has a chance to articulate that to enforcement. If I tap someone's car, I have to stay and exchange information. If my pet hurts someone, why should that be any different.

- ****The bite should need to be visible for this though.****
- Otherwise I see opportunities for pet and owner harassment. ""Your dog bit me"" claims when the dog never did, or only snapped but did not bite at a person who was harming it."
- At the very least if they have to leave or remove their dog from the scene they should give their ID to the other party to record their info to pass on to enforcement as I'm not sure how long it takes them to arrive on scene.
- What's to explain? It should be like an accident in a car. No bite and runs. Every bite big or small this should be mandatory.
- It's no different than staying at the scene of an accident. The owner, however, has to control their dog at the same time.
- "Yes and no on this answer.
- If there is more than one person walking the dog that attacks another person or dog, the dog should be removed from the scene by one of those people. Another should stay on scene to exchange information. The dog who caused the attack would be a stressor for the other owner/dog if it was continuing to be aggressive. They cannot leave the scene without giving the other owner contact information at a minimum though."
- We need to ensure the owner and dog are properly identified, and the incident is officially recorded. Without this process in place, owner accountability is somewhat nonexistent.
- If someone has been bitten/hurt, the owner should be responsible/forced to provide information to an officer.
- Same rules apply when you damage or harm people or their property in other circumstances (e.g. cars/driving)
- Support an exchange of pertinent information as long as victim and their dog is not traumatized by their presence
- It should be required to stay at the scene of an incident for both parties so that problem owners/dogs can be held accountable and increase safety for others



- It's similar to if someone hits someone with their car. Sometimes animals fight and get aggressive. That's normal and should be anticipated. When your dog is off leash you or norm you should be monitoring your dog and be ready to intervene. Should your dog become violent you should stay to not only support your animal but take accountability of its actions.
- You might never see them again.
- I have had more issues with aggressive little dogs AS PER THE ABOVE RESPONSE than PIT BULLS
- all pet handlers should remain at the scene just as in a car accident
- Ppl need to be responsible for their animals
- These events are scary and there are many uncertainties and variables in each event. It is appropriate that the owner provide appropriate information similar to a car accident.
- The owner must be held accountable for the behavior of their pet.
- Animals disposition may change once it has left the scene of offence
- If an injury happens then the owner of the dog is responsible and like a vehicle collision should remain on scene
- Don't know where to write this, but the discrimination against 'pitbulls' is wrong. You cannot discriminate against a specific breed. I have had a rottweiler, who was the biggest baby, but I've seen small, miniature dogs that are more scary than any pitbull and who bite. Absolutely ridiculous to discriminate against 'pitbulls'.
- the owner of the dog that attack should give their personal information and should pay vet bill if applicable. that way you can track how many time this happen with the same person / dog. plus its a way to make sure the dog is register.
- This should be required and there should be a heavy fine for those that leave. It should not be a case of 'hide and seek' to identify the owner of a dangerous dog.
- I think it's only common sense for the owner to remain at the scene if an injury occurs, same as vehicle drivers
- They need to stay in order to assess the incident. As it was their dog that bit. The dog that Infact bit maybe larger but did not initiate the fight and the other dog may have bit them first but would have been smaller.
- Pet owners & pets should be held responsible and not be able to leave the scene without being made accountable.
- A dog owner should be held responsible if they leave the scene of a dog bite incident. I have heard multiple cases of a bitten dog owner having to search for the owner of the dog that bit their dog, because they left the area.
- Attacking. Dogs and victims should be separated immediately.
- Owners of the vicious dogs are seldom present and avoid any or all accountability.
- A dog bite should result in fines and / or charges. Attempted avoidance by the owner should be met by at least a fine.
- If a dog attacks/bites someone it is not the animals fault. Somewhere along the line it has been trained to do this by the owner or someone close to the owner. This is the owners fault. A car doesn't



hit another car the person driving the car hits the other car so you hold the driver accountable not the vehicle. This shouldn't be any different than a pet owner having to take accountability if their pet causes an injury.

- Owners need to be 100% liable for their animals.
- it's important to find out ASAP of vaccine records so precautions can be taken if the animal can transmit disease.
- its important that the owner remain so that it can be understood what caused the incident and what if any further action needs to be taken.
- If the incident is significant enough to warrant an enforcement officer then parties involved should have to remain at the scene.
- Having the dog owner wait at the scene will ensure proper disclosure and record-keeping of the incident.
- Owners need to be responsible for the pets. Regardless of the situation. If your dog has hurt someone, you need to take responsibility.
- I know of too many cases where dogs have attacked other dogs and the owners of the dog that attacked have left tor fled the scene.
- Unless the dog is still going crazy post attack... In which case the owner can put it away at home/vehicle or leash it to a tree/sign... Then return to the scene.
- the suspect can't flee the scene, simple as that.
- There is no such thing as a bad dog, only bad owners. If such an incident occurs, the owner needs to be held accountable and enforcement shouldn't have to take extra time out of their day to track them down to do it
- They should remain at the scene only if they can do so without making the scene less safe. If they need to go because their dog is getting more aggressive or agitated, they should not face punishment for deescalating the situation.
- Any dog owners whose pets are involved in an incident need to stay on scene if an enforcement officer is required. No exceptions.
- Not for a minor nip but yes if there is an unprovoked bite.
- It's important to get the owner's info so that he/she can't just leave without taking responsibility.
- Often the owner leaves the scene, and there is no recourse for the victim.
- It is like a car accident - the parties must remain at the scene until resolution.
- Why wouldn't this already be required?!
- As long as the dog can be safely removed from the situation if it in an excitable or agitated state. If the owner is by themselves they should be able to leave with their dog, but also leave their contact information.
- The owner should be there and be responsible. They should cover the vet costs of the other animal or person.
- Staying on scene only makes sense, whereas leaving the scene is like a hit and run. You must be accountable for your animals actions.



- Just like a car accident, people must remain at the scene until authorities arrive unless medical attention is required immediately.
- Hit and runs are illegal bite and runs should be too.
- Of course you should stay at the scene if your dog attacks another animal or human. Its the responsibility of the owner to difuse the situation and make sure everything possible le is done to aid the victim.
- No one will remain on the scene after their dog is involved in an incident anyway. By "requiring" them to remain on scene you can levy a larger fine against them once they are identified.
- The dog owner must be responsible for providing any compensation necessary for the victim to be made whole.
- My niece was knocked over by a big dog in an off leash area and she was carrying her infant son. In order to protect him she fell and damaged an elbow. The damage has required several specialists operations and has impacted her lifestyle. The dog owner fled.
- I'm surprised this isn't already a requirement; this should be mandatory as expenses may incur due to a bite or attack.
- If a person or kid is pestering and bugging (pulling) and not listening to the owner. The owner has a right to defend its pet! Not all animal attacks are the animals fault
- An owner should always be responsible for the actions of their dog.
- Its the moral thing to do...
- Yes, because otherwise it's like leaving the scene of a car accident. The person who was bitten will need the vaccination history of the dog as well.
- Owners are responsible for their animals actions. They should be legally required to stay on the scene of an incident until the proper authorities arrive or face further fines
- Much like traffic accidents, contact information should be provided. Remaining at the scene would be dependent upon whether the dog's caretaker is able to keep the dog under control at the scene. Remaining at the scene may create further issues or danger.
- Yes we should be exchanging information; however, the magnitude of bites needs to be clearly defined... We should not be exchanging information if it is not an intentional attack, sometimes dogs play fight and tell each other when it is too much, some people panic and take their pets to the vet for no valid reason and could expect others to cover this bill.
- "It's an act of violence and should be treated the same as if a person injured another person. There may also be vet costs incurred to another animal that the offending animal's owner should cover and therefor the other person is required to legally record the incident.
- If a person flees there should be consequences such as financial penalties and record in their files for future animal procession."
- I would agree. A problem could be if the owner was close to home and taking the dog home is the best way to calm the situation. Either way, information should be shared first.
- There is currently no effective means to ensure an offending owner and their dog will stay at the scene, allowing some to go uncharged. If notable damage is caused the offending owner should face added charges for fleeing.



- The exchange of contact info is very quick in the day of cell phones, and helps for the safety of all animals/people.
- In my opinion, dog attacks should be treated like car accidents, going through insurance (which I believe should be mandatory for ALL dogs) and being kept on record. Dogs/owners involved in multiple incidents should be required to do classes (like a drivers safety class).
- Would help to identify potential "nuisance" dogs/owners.
- "My dog was attacked by a vicious dog that was illegally off leash. The owners left and I had to take my dog for surgery.
- The owners didn't provide their contact info and therefore didn't help pay for the very expensive vet bill...or the huge trauma we endured. And are possibly re-offending :("
- severe bites to track if a dog does it often. and also to make sure that it wasn't 2 dogs involved and are both at fault.
- The owner should be criminally charged.
- Owners need to be socially responsible, and information about both "sides" of an incident needs to be available to enforcement personnel.
- Depending on the severity of the bite. There are different levels. I'm on the fence with this one. However, I believe it will help more than hinder. I believe many owners flee if their dog bites, and that does not help anyone or the dogs from both sides.
- No explanation needed. If your dog causes damage, you have to stick around and be responsible, like with anything (car, etc.)
- Offending dog owners should be required to stay at the scene of the incident and provide contact information, to consider splitting or paying for vet bills.
- So police or bylaw officers can note what happens in case of injuries, possible legal action against dog owner
- No explanation needed that's what a responsible person/ dog owner would do
- If the dog bites a person or animal it is likely to do it again and if the owner needs to leave information or talk to an enforcement officer the information is there for any further problems.
- If a human attacks a human, the offender is expected to stay to talk to law enforcement and thus it should be the same for dog owners.
- Yes, this is a no-brainer. A bite causes damage to another person or animal - the owner is responsible and liable for their pets' actions. It's all on the owner, every time, all the time.
- If you are a dog owner you need to be responsible for everything that happens with your dog, especially if the dog bites a person or animal. Dog bites should be dealt with like any other incident with a fellow citizen (ie. car accident). Owners should follow up with the victim and ensure that it doesn't happen again! Also, for pet owners who do not pick up dog feces in off-leash parks/neighborhoods, there should be a better way to deter this behavior. Citizens who observe this occurring should be able to report this to the authorities so that they receive a fine or warning without having to record the incident happening! More needs to be done about this, as it is happening far too often, especially in Nose Hill Park (ie. more garbage cans distributed throughout the park may help).



- It is an assault. The owner should be criminally charged for assaulting someone. And there should be an automatic forced payment to victims for any type of injury. Start at 5000\$
- It should be treated the same as a hit and run. If you or your animal cause harm to another animal or property it should be considered failure to remain at the scene of an accident and carry a charge.
- As with any accident or injury of a human or animal, bystanders should assist unless they are in danger or remaining would put others in danger (remove a dangerous dog but should return to the scene to provide assistance). As a responsible pet owner, you should be responsible for your pet's actions which includes waiting for enforcement in the case of an incident.
- Just like in any other accident or serious incident (car crash for example) sometimes responsibility must be taken.
- For veterinarian purposes
- I believe a dog attack should be treated similar to an assault. If the dog owner flees the scene of the attack, they should be ticketed additionally.
- The owner of a biting dog should remain at the scene, the dog apprehended and a fine issued to the owner.
- Too many offenders flee. An additional, separate fine may act as a deterrent
- All dog owners should be responsible for their dogs. If their dog bites (no matter the size or breed) staying to exchange information/deal with the consequences is the responsible thing to do.
- To my understanding, many dog bites go unreported. Whether it's a small dog or a big dog, poorly behaved dogs should be held accountable for their actions. Thus all owners should be required to share contact information, and talk to an officer if necessary.
- A dog owner should be responsible for its pet's actions whether good or bad. They should be responsible to take action and help correct the behaviour.
- The owner of a dog that bites likely needs to be contacted after the damage has been assessed so they can reimburse the injured party. Also, the owner may have to surrender the dog so they need to be found.
- Absolutely. They should also be responsible for the vet bill of the attacked animal.
- If there is an incident where your animal causes damage to my animal, family or property then it should be treated the same way as car insurance as if your car hit my car. People need to be held accountable and take responsibility for their animals.
- It's an assault to someone (dog or human) and if bylaw is to be called then all parties should stay to exchange info if possible.
- I do support this, in the event that it is safe to do so. More often than not at off-leash parks, both parties have to remove themselves from the situation as quickly as possible to de-escalate and information is not exchanged. I don't believe it's fair that I would have to cover the full cost of any vet bills if my dog was the one that was attacked.
- They should remain as it is the owner's responsibility to ensure the dog is well trained and is safe around others. It would happen again if it occurred once already, so to further prevent it, action must be taken on the owner
- So the dog owner can give their side of the story of what happened



- Any dog that bites another dog or person should automatically be euthanized.
- Of course owners must take respon
- A responsible pet owner would not flee the scene.
- The owner must take responsibility which includes addressing the situation with those involved and the implications of bylaw enforcement. This will also act as incentive for owners to ensure dog registrations are valid and up to date with the knowledge they can be fined for leaving an incident. Without requiring them to stay at the scene, bylaw enforcement will be much more difficult and lack effectiveness.
- As long as the victim(s) are safe while owner remains at the scene
- The dog's owner must take responsibility for the dog's actions.
- Absolutely the owner needs to be fully responsible no matter breed or size
- as a dog owner you need to be responsible for your animal. If they bite someone you should do the right thing as long as the dog doesn't automatically get put down.
- Owner needs to take responsibility
- Otherwise it's like a hit and run
- Should be treated like an accident. Owners who flee should be punished as well.
- Dog owners should be held accountable if their dog bites a person or another animal
- There needs to be accountability.
- In a word, responsibility.
- Should be treated the same as a traffic accident.
- owners of the attacking dog(s) should, of course, remain at the scene. Fleeing the scene of an attack should be an offence for which a fine is levied, unless there is a very good reason for not remaining.
- The enforcement officer should have a full and clear explanation from both sides and make a decision based off that, as emotion can influence exaggerated and far stretched versions of what happened.
- We expect this with vehicle incidents even if our only damage is property. If a body is affected (ie bite) we should expect no less than that of property.
- Incase the dog needs to be taken from the owner and so the owner is also held responsible for any action the dog has done.
- If they flee the scene there should be harsher penalties
- Sometimes it is not the dogs fault when it bites someone, that person could be provoking it and I think it's unfair the dog is blamed. I also think owners who would leave show fault immediately and they should have to stay so the proper fines can be attributed
- Helps get to the root of the cause
- If a dog was to bite your kid and the owner took off how would you feel? Also it would be like some one hitting your car then looking at the damage then running off with no information.
- This is a crime and you should not be allowed to leave the scene of a crime



- Absolutely, its your dog, which makes it particularly your mistake and incident, do not leave feel scene.
- If the bite is serious enough to incur a vet and/or medical bill, the nuisance dog owner should remain at the scene in case charges are laid in which the owner of the nuisance dog must subsidize the bill.
- If the dog needs to go to the vet the owners should be responsible
- Owner must take responsibility.
- They are legally responsible. No different from a hit and run
- It's less work than trying to determine who owns the dog.
- to allow assessment of the type of dog, training, recidivist
- The Owner of such Dog must assist the Victim in every way , and call in Police or appropriate Authority . Dog bites unnecessary and should not be tolerated at all .
- Yes off course!!! But Do not blaim just the pit bull breed!!! I do not own one my self but know many that do. They are the most love able ever.Do Not blame the breed blame the owner!!!!!! Period,
- Owner is responsible for pet and should pay the consequences. Not the pet.
- I think dog owners should be fined if they don't remain at the scene. My dog was attacked at a dog park and the other owners left before I could get their information so I was left paying the \$1000 pet bill.
- That's just responsible dog ownership.
- Must remain at the scene until teport made
- Yes the owner needs to be a responsible owner and take accountability
- Contact information is so hard to obtain in these situations and so if it is a a rule than it can be enforced.
- They should be responsible for all vet bills associated with the attack
- It is part of the responsibility of a dog owner. Makes dog owners accountable
- No explanation required
- The pwrson must be held responsible. If they leave the scene they might disappear and never be held accountable. Flip side, who is going to make them stay on the scene. Bitten pwrson or dog will not even be at the scene. You think they arw going to hang around until someone shows up?
- I think that it's part of being a responsible owner and being a member of a community.
- Our pets are our responsibility. Staying and speaking with an enforcement officer immediately commences a process to resolve a situation. It is more likely to work if all parties can be heard and opportunities for correction rather than loss of the pet or enormous fines incur.
- The victim needs to know if the dog has been vaccinated against rabies, or has shown signs of other zoonotic diseases. Also need to know name of dog and owner if bite is severe, as charges could be laid, euthanasia might be required, etc. It should be illegal to watch your dog be vicious then leave with your dog and not take responsibility for what happened, whether to another person or to another animal.
- I support this. My concern would be that the offending dog may need to removed from the scene. Not sure how practical it is to remove the dog and keep the owner on scene.



- Yes if both parties can remain safely in the area.
- It's no different than an Owner of a vehicle staying at an accident scene
- Common sense
- It's only fair to all involved.
- If the victimized party wants to involve an enforcement officer.
- this is basically like a hit and run. It's illegal to ditch the scene when someone hits your car. It should also be illegal if your dog bites another dog and you run.
- I think irresponsible dog owners should take responsibility - this could mean required obedience courses or fines.
- or charge them if they leave!!! Higher then 350\$
- The dog is ultimately the owners responsibility. The owner needs to know this. Many do not seem to want that responsibility or care about others.
- The main goal should be to train the owner on how to respond to these incidents. Not to fine people.
- Any dog owner in a biting incident should face a fine for leaving the scene without sharing valid contact information.
- It is the responsible thing to do.
- In my opinion an offence needs to be addressed. Without this requirement the dog and owner may not be traceable. An fine to leave the scene similar should result in an additional fine that is greater than the offence, sine the offence was not on purpose whereas leaving the scene would be on purpose.
- Communication between owners is key in understanding how the incident happened and potential future interactions.
- Like a car accident. Owner or person responsible for dog shall stay at incident location to explain what happened.
- If the dog owner can gives information to someone on site it might make sense in some circumstances for the owner to remove the dog from the scene.
- It is reasonable to expect the owner or handler of a dog to remain on scene in the event of an incident, no different than the highway traffic act, for the same reasons.
- i cant believe this isn't the law already. yes please make this a law.
- I agree that they should have to stay on site, it is the right thing to do, it is their dog so their responsibility. More still needs to be done to make sure that the humans are held accountable, it is humans who train their dogs to be mean or do not get their dogs proper training and don't correct behaviours. A dog will do what it is taught and if it is taught to be aggressive or aggressive tendencies do not get corrected so that they will learn that is the owners fault
- If a person is injured by a car the driver must stay. Same goes for dogs.
- Not taking responsibility is not an option. It is no different that leaving the scene of any other crime.
- Ensures issue is resolved properly
- There are too many cases with pit bulls attacks - we need to tighten the law to prohibit pit bull ownership in Calgary.



- Absolutely this should not even be a question
- to take accountability
- If medical attention is needed for an animal, a mediator might be needed to make sure that there is a shared responsibility for medical costs.
- of course, this is reasonable, but we do know that most people are not willing to take responsibility for their dog's actions and will leave the scene asap.
- If the owner can safely segregate their dog (like in a vehicle or with another individual that can take the dog home) then yes.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs. They should show responsibility by remaining at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer.
- They are responsible and need to remain until bylaw officers arrive and deal with the situation. They also need to pay for the other person's vet bills - period!!!
- I would like the dog owner to stay at the scene if needed
- Common sense.
- Owners with a dog who bites should not be allowed to flee the scene.
- The owner is responsible for the actions not the pet.
- Just like in a motor vehicle accident same law applied
- Human yes. Dog depends on severity.
- Sharing contact information is important, just like when there is an automobile accident. The victim also needs some compensation in the event that the aggressive dog caused injury requiring medical attention.
- This should be common sense.
- It might be easy for the owner to leave the scene and not be found.
- Fleeing the scene should be seen the same as fleeing an accident.
- Same as a vehicle accident. If someone is injured because of your dog then you are responsible for said injuries.
- The owner deserves a chance to have their side of the story heard.
- The response of the enforcement officer must be reasonable. I would suggest that it must be under 30 minutes.
- The owner needs to be responsible to share information and take responsibility for the actions of their pet.
- Boils down to responsible pet ownership. I have seen a dog attack another and then the owner leaves the scene as he clearly wants to avoid responsibility for his pets actions.
- It should be a criminal offence same as leaving the scene of an accident
- Owners of attack dogs almost always leave the scene and blame the attack on the victim. They owner has committed a crime and should stay until authorities arrive to take their dog away. The only exception is if the dog owner leaves and proceeds immediately to the police station to report their crime



- People should be responsible, it's sad that animals pay the price bad owners. Please make the owners responsible.
- Handler of the biting dog needs to take full responsibility - owner or handler
- All pet owners should be required to take responsibility for their pet's actions when there is a serious incident
- most Pitbull owners would not remain at scene anyway, seen it many times. Those dogs should be illegal to own
- It seems appropriate that a dog owner should provide contact information to acknowledge their responsibility for public harm and danger.
- "It's difficult to find the animal if the owner and the animal
- Runs away. Easy for the offence to happen again"
- The owner must stay to provide contact information and veterinary info if their dog has rabies vaccinations or other medical info, and proof of vaccinations.
- If you own a pet you are responsible for all of its actions.
- They are responsible for their pet and need to be responsible for their pets actions.
- the offending dog must be reported
- If they leave it is not always possible to identify the dog owner.
- People should be accountable when their animals act out, and the other person should be able to contact them, seeing as a bite can lead to other problems.
- like a car accident.
- It is analogous to a car accident and the owner has liability for damages caused by their pet
- Owners are responsible for the animal's behavior and should be held accountable for their action and any expenses incurred
- Be responsible for your pet! Not all dog bites are from bad dogs, I made a wrong move near a Friends nervous dog this summer and got nipped, my fault not the dogs. But if your dog runs after and harms something or someone, stay and face the consequences, or face a larger consequence later when found.
- The owner must ultimately be accountable.
- The owner is responsible for the behaviour of their dog. It is an animal and should be treated as such. We cannot tell what is going on in their minds.
- That seems to be a 'no brainer'. How else can you find out if shots are up to date and handle the vet costs?
- Just like any incident where a third party has been effected by damages like a car accident for example. It should be illegal to leave the scene. Dog attacks are a form of assault.
- Of course, all people involved should remain at the scene.
- Just like a human or car accident.
- This is a crime, intentional or not, and should be treated as such.



- The owner should remain on scene to provide the second side of the story. There may be a large chance that the offending animal was provoked by either the human, animal or both that it had bitten.
- I'm surprised that it's not required. Why do you need an explanation anyway?
- Often dogs causing problems are off leash whether it be an off leash area or not. It's too easy for owners to be 'absent' and just call their dog(s) away and walk off.
- Too often owners simply walk away from a problem their dog has caused. This is totally irresponsible and such owners should be required, at minimum, to remain at the scene and follow-up appropriately (e.g. pay for vet bill if dog injured)
- "Yes however wrong doing needs be litigated in court. I have seen animals as the aggressor not come out as the "winning" animal in a spat between dogs. Guilt is not as easy as whom sustained what injury. Why did it happen?"

- My Grandmother's dog bit a man who tried to mug my Grandmother. Needless to say the victim of the bite did not stay on scene but Because the fog defended her owner in that manner Police had extra info to help locate a suspect possibly seeking medical attention for a bite wound by a Llasa Apso."
- I think that pet owners need to be held more accountable for their pets actions.
- Common sense- they may need to cover vet expenses.
- how's that different than hit and run?
- Yes if it's a serious attack
- There would be need to know if the offending animal is fully vaccinated, any diseases etc. As well as the need for potential bills placed upon the victim
- Your dog, your responsibility
- Owners need to accept responsibility for pets behaviour and any resulting damage.
- Any attack is serious and should be treated as such. To leave the scene after an attack is the height of irresponsibility, and disrespectful to the community. Pet ownership is a privilege, not a right. Losing control of your dog is bad, but animals can be unpredictable. Leaving the scene, however, is controllable, and indicative of a decision to either avoid accountability or stay, and show concern for all parties.
- It should be like a car accident where those involved exchange contact information.
- We should treat dog bites like a traffic accident.
- This is no different than a hit and run. After a collision, you must remain on the scene
- These types of incidences need to be treated the same as a car accident where injuries occur. The owner of the dog needs to assure that help is called for the injured party, both sides of what occurred needs to be assessed to determine what is further required.
- Those owners who own these types of dogs should have a good idea of how they act. If the dog can be put in their vehicle safely, they should most definitely stay on the scene.



- see previous responses
- depending on the situation obviously if it was a minor incident, no. In the case of a more severe bite that could be necessary. I also feel as long as the person gives their contact information to the other person and is cooperative, an enforcement officer could call them after. Its not always a good idea to stick around after a dog fight or dog attack and wait for enforcement, that could cause even more tension and the potential for another incident.
- Same as a vehicle accident or incident.
- The owner of the offending dog should be responsible for the care of the injured person or pet, be responsible for medical bills incurred, offer all information about the offending animal including up to date vaccinations.
- I have heard of too many scenarios where the owner of the attacking animal has left (often angrily) the scene and is never to be found again.
- Of course owner is responsible
- Owners need to be accountable for their dogs actions
- All dog owners must take responsibility for the actions of their dog and provide all relevant information to the affected parties. Additionally, the party causing harm to another should be responsible for any vet bills associated with an attack.
- There should be a rule that you must remain on site for enforcement OR call 311 and self report within 2 hours so that responsible people involved in incidents can secure their animal or seek vet care
- I believe that when a dog bites someone, it is a crime, and shmpiuld be death with in that manner.
- I feel some dog owners have blinders on, don't believe their precious pooch is a nuisance. Also, in some cases, an abusive human has caused the dog to have anxiety, and hopefully an officer would be able to ascertain the situation, and help the dog. IE: humans screaming and yelling at their spouses constantly.
- They need to be held responsible
- Only a lowlife leaves the scene after his dog kills another dog. How sad and very cowardly
- It is important to have follow-up with the animal owner following a biting incident to determine what occurred, if the dog has been vaccinated and if this is a recurrent issue.
- I cannot believe there is not already a law for this. It is shocking and disgusting to me that someone can leave the scene and get away with it. Absolutely there should be a law forcing people to stay at the scene and a harsh penalty if they leave.
- Owners must be responsible.
- Failure to remain at the scene is a crime in vehicle accidents and should be a crime in an animal attack.
- Similar to the law about sticking to those you discover need emergency care. I can't remember the "law" that is called, but people are required to aid those in life threatening condition (so long as not jeopardizing their own health and well being.). They should have to stay if for no other reason than to care for an injured human; plus to be accountable for their dog's behaviour.
- It is important to hold pet owners responsible for their pet's behaviour.



- No different from fleeing the scene of a car accident.
- It is no different then fleeing the scene of a car accident.
- Although I recognize this could cause additional distress or trauma for the victim, particularly if the animal's handler failed to respect the victim's requests for space or quiet.
- Because is required all the version and all information of the vaccine.
- Yes I think that's part of responsible pet ownership
- It is all to easy for a dog owner to remove themselves and their dog and so not be held accountable.
- Both sides of the story need to be presented. It is possible for the dog or person to have provoked the other dog to bite. We have had a German Shephard that was always provoked by very small yappy, barking dogs that always seemed to want to nip at others. Owners of these very small dogs seem careless as to their dog's behaviour.
- The dog's medical history needs to be known
- As a responsible pet owner they should take responsibility for their pet and the actions of the pet. This should happen when they take the animal into their household and say they, the pet, is now part of their family. Unfortunately problems happen when the animal is not cared for properly and the owner does not seem to care. If you want a pet then the responsibility comes with the pet.
- Accountability for damages, history on dog to be recorded. Really these dogs should not be allowed in the city.
- It should be treated no different than a vehicle accident, with fines or punishment for leaving the scene or failure to provide contact info.
- If an owner isn't legally required to stay on-scene then there is no way actions can be taken with the owner (fines, seizure of animal) and no way to record incident allowing officers to track dogs behaviour through proper record keeping
- The human is responsible for the dog's behavior and should pay for any damages.
- Just as with a motor vehicle accident
- If you get into a car accident you have to remain on scene. It's the responsible thing to do.
- My dog was viciously attacked once and there was no way for my to assure that the other dog's owner faced any consequences.
- The owner is ultimately responsible for the dogs behavior
- To many times the owners are not held accountable for their responsibility(as a dog is defined as property and ownership according to the law) therefore the owners should be responsible for anything that happens. A kid bad at school mean to another kid gets suspended. Ie. you run over a dog & flee the scene. You should be held responsible, what if someone ran over your child. On a side street in a residential street.
- Why should this be any different than a car accident.
- Too many people leave and avoid responsibility
- The owner of the animal that bites needs to stay and the animal be taken and evaluated we can't have animals that are dangerous to public in public
- Dog owners should be responsible for their pets.
- If a dog bites a person, it has behavioural issues that need to be addressed.



- My niece was bit by a border collie and I couldn't find the owner after reporting it. Bylaw officer was able to find her
- The dog owner's name and contact information is required to determine if the dog's immunizations are current.
- All owners are responsible for their dog and how they are treated/ trained. And the owner should be responsible for paying for any expenses related to the incident (vet or hospital bills)
- Owners need to be held accountable for the actions of their pets no different than any infraction.
- Absolutely if your dog bites another dog or vise versa . Information needs to be exchanged
- Just like a crime or accident owner should remain at the scene
- Aggressive dog owners should be responsible for reparations.
- It is up to the owner to ensure that their animal is under control and does not harm to anyone/anything.
- I think this would be hard to enforce. but it is like the scene of a car accident, you can't just run away. if a dog hurts someone or another dog/animal they should be held accountable in this way.
- It's the only humane thing to do, you don't leave the scene of an accident, someone is injured either animal or human it involves attention, medical or otherwise.
- Police and by-law officers should not have to waste time tracking down offenders.
- I think this important to ensure that injured parties get contact info but also that they have the opportunity to provide their statement of events as well.
- It's the right thing to do
- Not staying is similar to leaving the scene of a vehicle accident. Owners should stay until an enforcement officer arrives on the scene.
- It is a crime. Fleeing a crime scene should be penalized.
- I can't believe this isn't a requirement already
- Because the offending dog owner must be held accountable.
- People need to take responsibility for their dog and need to remain on site for Bylaw officer questioning.
- Anyone involved should remain at the scene or at least protective area and able to file an incident report
- That is just what you should do. It also means that you dont have to look for someone if they need to answer questions
- Yes I supported 100% cause I think that person should be held responsible for any medical or anything to do with the incident that there pet did, on top of been fine as well.
- I had a dog that nipped at another dog even though that dog went at my dog first. I gave my contact info, it's the right thing to do.
- Dog bites cost money to fix properly, the owner of the dog should be responsible for their dog and expenses caused by their dogs actions.
- The owner/guardian is responsible for the dog's interactions with people and other pets.
- As an dog owner you should be responsible for the bite/vet bill



- If the owner does not stay, how would you contact the owner??
- They had to account for their actions
- It's a crime, isn't it? So, yes, the owner of the nuisance dog should stay at the scene of the crime and provide their contact info to the police. They ought to compensate the other party, as well.
- Drivers must do it. I can't believe this isn't a requirement already.
- Why wouldn't you? Unless it would require waiting for an unreasonable period of time.
- People must take responsibility. Just like a car incident.
- They must take responsibility for vet fees and to face their dog being labelled a nuisance to which they have to follow a process of testing their dog for aggression.
- This is a cornerstone of responsible dog ownership.
- There should be stiff penalties for a dog owner who leaves the scene of a dog bite without providing contact information to law enforcement.
- Yes, it at all possible. If the animal is out of control then the owner may need to remove the animal to put in a vehicle and return home, but should contact the appropriate authorities within 1-2 hours.
- They should remain at the scene, but definition of "incident" must be very clear.
- This may be hard to do if the dog is out of control. As long as the owner comes forward within 1-3 hours to police that would be acceptable.
- Seems just like a car accident.
- If you own a dog you are responsible for its conduct - this includes taking responsibility if your dog attacks someone. The owner should be liable for such attacks and should be punished for leaving the scene
- A responsible dog owner (regardless of the dog's breed) would (should) want to be responsible for the dog's actions.
- **DOG OWNERS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR DOGS. IF THEY LEAVE THE SCENE IT MAY BE IMPOSSIBLE TO TRACK THEM DOWN.**
- They need to be present so they can be held accountable, and possibly provide compensation if the situation calls for it.
- This is the responsible thing to do if you own a dog
- It is the best way to ensure the owner of the offending animal is identified and held accountable
- If you assault a person or animal, not staying at the scene is... frowned upon. If you have trained your dog to assault people or animals, it is the same as assault with a weapon, as that is what you trained it for.
- As long as the enforcement officer can respond quickly - some situations may escalate quickly to human conflict
- The person with the nuisance dog should be liable to pay for vet bills of the injured dog.
- The owner is always at fault.
- same as a hit and run. If it inflicted damage to a person or animal they should be held accountable



- My friends 14 lb dog was attacked by an off leash out of control Saint Bernard. Came off a school yard field, shook her dog out of its harness off the leash and three surgeries later, my friend is still dealing with complications. The other dog has had no repercussions.
- Be a responsible pet owner
- If you are involved in an incident with your vehicle you are required to stay at the scene and share information. I think the same should be true if your dog is involved in something. Perhaps fines could be imposed for leaving the scene if your dog is involved in an attack or something as it causes police or bylaw officers to spend extra time to track an owner down if they leave the scene.
- I feel like there should a record for the history of not only the animal, but the owner as well responsible for any incident reflecting current and pass incidents involving their animal(s)
- Of course. I cannot believe this is not already a rule.
- Do the right thing not be a coward
- Too many owners don't take appropriate responsibility for their dogs behaviour, and this would mandate them to do so.
- It's the right thing to do. No bsl
- Too often owners take off, trying to avoid responsibility for their animals behaviour.
- That would be similar case to #hit and run# in which the car driver hits another car and drive away or to other criminal case in which someone hits other and run away.
- the owner is responsible for any incident involving his/her dog and therefore must stay at the scene and provide info to the enforcement officer
- You guys are retarted for continuing to use pitbulls as the poster dogs for "vicious behaviour"
- they need to be held accountable and deal with their irresponsible handling of their dog
- If the dog owner of the aggressive dog doesn't remain at the scene, the officer doesn't have ability to find the owner and follow up on the dog's behaviour.
- Treat it like a hit and run. If their dog bites... they need to be there to give their account and take ownership if deemed necessary.
- It is similar to remaining at the scene of an accident or crime scene it is a serious incident someone or something was injured or killed as recently seen when a Labradoodle was killed by a loose dog owner took off with the offending dog upstanding citizen Not!
- If situation is severe and warrants authorities to be contacted then, just like in a car accident, all parties should remain at the scene until situation is dealt with.
- Too many irresponsible owners are not held accountable because they leave the scene and then not penalized adequately.
- Similar to a car accident where you must remain at the scene till Police arrive (or are contacted). Too often the irresponsible owners take off and there is no proof as to their identity. In addition there should be an additional fine if you leave the scene of the crime (so to speak).
- Yes, or otherwise it is considered as a hit and run in my opinion
- The owners should also be responsible for vet Bill's etc.
- Their should be high fines for someone whom leaves the scene.



- They should have to explain themselves. They should be responsible for all vet fees that their dog causes to another Dog
- Yes, it would help make owners take responsibility for their pets behaviours. Injuries can be serious and costly, and are no less important than if it was a vehicular accident.
- IF it is possible . If the owner needs to get the dog out of the situation they should be able to do that, and then return to the scene.
- Because too often the victim is traumatized and not thinking clearly enough to ask for the contact info. Or, the dog owners of the attacking dog flee the scene leaving the victim helpless.
- The offending dog should be contained first
- Absolutely owner is responsible for the dogs actions.
- Owner has responsibility for the incident and must act accordingly. Same as a hit-and-run situation.
- It's just like a car crash for liability.
- A person with an animal (ANY size or breed) that has bitten a person or other dog needs to be 1) able to explain if this is an isolated incident which they would address 2) held responsible for their dogs behaviour.
- As mentioned above, enforcement is key as well as accountability of the owner or whoever is in charge of the dog. And this should not be limited to bites but to other physical attacks.
- we do the same activity when we get into a car accident, it seems to make common sense when damage is done to a person or pet from another person's pet.
- "If they r able too.
- Information should be shared but take care of the dog first."
- Need take responsibility. Cannot avoid issue
- It's the responsible thing for the dog owner to do as he is now representing the dogs interest.
- no getting away with it nonsense
- Shots up to date; extenuating circumstances
- Yes if any breed has a bite incident not just a certain type of breed
- Same as staying at the scene of a traffic accident
- It is illegal to do a hit and run with your car. Leaving the scene of a violent attack your dog caused us the same
- Owners are responsible for their dogs, and should remain at the scene of an incident. Failure to do so should result in an additional bylaw violation.
- In most cases leaving the scene is just trying to avoid prosecution.
- As long as the dog can be secured, they should stay at the scene, or at a minimum exchange contact information with them and the dogs license number
- The owner Must Be Responsible for their dog, "leaving the scene of an accident/attack" should result in jail time!
- Anyone taking an animal out in a public area is accountable for the behaviour & actions of the animal.



- unless the offending dog owner needs to remove their animal from the area for the safety of others - it's rather case dependent
- This is a liability issue and the pet owner should be responsible for their pets behavior.
- They must bear responsibility for their pet. If they flee the scene they should be fined.
- The dog owner is responsible, they should be punished, fined, and held responsible for all losses suffered by any victim. It's no different than a car accident if an injury is involved. Dog owners must be held responsible!
- They are responsible for the care of my animal once their animal bites my dog. I need to know where to send the bill.
- Take responsibility for your dog
- Owners should be held responsible for their pets and allowing people to freely leave is irresponsible
- If your dog hurts an animal or human or breaks something you should be held responsible for it
- obvious.
- Repeat or serious offences or malicious complaints can't be addressed properly without an owner & dog being identified. This may be the best way to address that problem.
- If the owner of a dog has not put in the required care and training to ensure that it will not attack another dog, they must answer to their shortcomings as a pet owner. I also believe that the owner of the dog that started a confrontation should be the one to answer ie. If a small dog attacks a larger dog but is injured because the larger dog is defending itself, the large-dog owner should NOT be held responsible for their dog defending itself. If small-dog owners cannot control their animals, they should have the same repercussions as those who own larger dogs.
- Only if it is a serious bite that draws blood.
- If i hit someone with a car i have to stay on scene as i am responsible, as a dog owner same difference i am responsible and should have to stay.
- The enforcement officer should take away the dog and hefty fine given to the owner. Later the dog should be put down.
- As a dog owner, you are responsible for your pet. You should be required to remain at the scene of the incident and take responsibility for the actions of your dog.
- Responsible pet ownership
- It drives accountability for pet owners.
- Just like any other kind of incident, must stay at the scene.
- Why would they leave? The dog should be seized in any case.
- If the bite is large enough to require a vet assistance, yes. If it's just a superficial wound, then no.
- Owners must be the ones held responsible for a dog's behaviour. If the dog has received negative training (encouraged to bite or attack, trained to growl at certain people and animals, etc.), or has received inadequate obedience/household training, that responsibility rests with the owner, not the animal in question.
- The owner is the person responsible, not the dog. Negligent ownership is the problem. These dogs suffer because of their owners. They lack training. Owners should 'own up' to their dogs poor behaviours.



- Too many irresponsible dog owners who take off instead of accepting responsibility.
- I have personally been involved in an incident where the owner and pit bull that injured a dog simply left the scene
- If the dog owner leaves then they avoid all responsibility.
- Be responsible for your pet.
- It is the mature and responsible thing to do.
- Yes if the bite is severe but stating 'any bite' can be blown out of proportion by the general public. Dogs nip and mouth during play, they also snap and correct each other when one steps out of line. Many owners do not have control of their dogs, especially in offleash areas and do not step in to correct poor behaviour. Many owners are not even within 100 feet of their dog in these areas, its seen as a free for all babysitting service while they chat.
- Their should be fines or payment for injury's to the party hurt so they need to stay and give their contact info to the officer
- Seems similar to a car accident -- if the parties decide it's not a problem for either, they can walk away. If there's an issue, then they could share contact info or wait for an officer to assist.
- I feel like this is pretty common sense.
- Pet owners are legally responsible for the actions of their pets. If you are involved in a automobile accident it is illegal to leave the scene. A dog attack should be treated in the same manner.
- They should have to stay because they should be legally responsible to pay the vet bill of the injured animal.
- This is no different than staying at the scene of a car accident in order to ensure the details of the incident are properly documented, and the party at fault is held responsible.
- I have report dog bite attacks to City of Calgary but no action taken. No fines. Poor or no communication from city planners and bylaw as to making changes to on lease areas in parks.
- Irresponsible pet owners often leave the scene of the crime. They should be required to stay or face additional fines if they leave.
- This is a HELL YES. Just this week a dog owner left the scene after their dog attacked and killed a smaller dog. It should be mandatory the owner of the vicious dog pay the vet bills for attacked dog and their owner
- Pet owners have a responsibility for their pets and should be willing to be held accountable in the event their pet is found to have been involved in an aggressive incident.
- Exactly like a traffic incident - all parties must remain at the scene or addition criminal charges are laid on the party that leaves without providing accurate contact information. It's a hit & run.
- We need to be able to track the dog, hold the owner accountable and be able to track down the owner if compensation is due for any damage.
- it is not the dog you would punish it is the owner, I myself have been bitten by a tiny dog and yet I have met the nicest Pit Bull. so the owner must make sure he/she trains the dog
- Dog attacks, where the owner and offending dog leave, should be treated the same as a hit and run vehicle accident.
- Owner has to take responsibility and public safety is important.



- Absolutely!!! It's the same as fleeing a car accident scene or anything else - you must stay and answer to what your dog has done because you've let it.
- Large vet bills and the offenders owner should be responsible. Easier to locate owners
- Being a responsible pet owner demands you remain at the scene of any incident involving your pet.
- Just the right thing to do
- If an officer is require and they flee there should be a fine for fleeing
- This is no different than a car accident there are potential liability issues involved so obviously the person needs to stay.
- DUH!!!!
- This is the same logic as remaining at the scene of an accident.
- why waste resources on tracking down the individual
- Like a road accident, culpability and responsible behaviour required of both parties.
- Dog owner is the responsible party and needs to stay and deal with the consequence of an incident.
- Yes. Be accountable
- I agree with this statement because it ensures that the owner is held accountable for their actions regarding that dog. It is important the owner remains at the scene to not only acknowledge the actions of their dog, but also let the officer/victim know of anything their dog might have that could be life threatening (if the dog has or hasn't had its rabies vaccination). Going forward the enforcement officer can assess and advise the owner on potential options for obedience training or other behavioural improvement options.
- it same as a driver must remain on the scence after causing car accident
- The person must be held accountable and face the penalties for having such a dog and damages done. The dog could do further damage if not apprehended.
- So often people dismiss incidents such as knocking someone over with I'm so sorry he's usually so friendly (likes it's the victims fault). Having to stay and give info would prevent downgrading the incident esp for biting.
- Isn't already enforced? The pet owner is responsible 100% of their pets actions and should face all consequences like it was done by themselves. Pets must be considered an extension of the owners will.
- It is necessary for the dog owner to remain onsite in order to address the situation and coordinate action plan, including the expenses associated with the attacks.
- This can help with determining rabies status of the animal.
- I've had numerous friends who had encounters while their dog is leashed, had their dog attacked by the off-leash dog (one incident was quite brutal), and then owner of the aggressive dog leaves the scene (a bite and run, if you will). But seriously, I don't see this as overly different from the vehicular concept of hit and run. If your dog attacks another person and/or their dog, it's the owner's responsibility to assist in rectifying the situation, such as remaining on scene/sharing contact info/enforcement officer discussion.



- At the very least, it is damage to property and it would be criminal to leave the scene in any other instance. For example, someone cannot hit a car and leave the scene which would then be considered a 'hit and run' and is a crime.
- Of course! It's illegal to leave the scene of a traffic accident so of course the owner must remain at the scene if their dog attacking a person or animal. It called being a responsible human.
- How is this not already the case. This seems like the common sense answer.
- Hold the dog owner 100% responsible remove the dog and prosecute the owner in the court.
- It is the owner's responsibility.
- It should be a crime to flee.
- If your dog bites a person or animal you should be legally responsible for damages unless there are mitigating circumstances.
- What a "stupid" question.. whats wrong with you people!!
- It's a type of crime the owner needs to be responsible not run away like a criminal
- There is no way to force someone to stay on scene after a dog attack, and keeping an aggressive dog around may lead to more attacks or violence. Cell phone pictures and assistance from other people near the attack may be the only way to capture the owners information (ie licence plate, vehicle etc) .
- If you flee the scene of an accident in a car, it's a crime. Your animal attacking someone shouldn't be any different.
- Yes, but there's no reason they should have to wait if they can share with an authority over the phone and pictures can be taken.
- Similar to a hit & run situation.
- If your dog bites someone you need to stay and face the consequences except for cases of self defense
- An incident should be treated like an automobile collision - exchange personal information, call an enforcement officer to confirm that the information given isn't false information.
- Allowing a dog owner to leave without sharing contact information or speaking with an enforcement officer only increases the risk that the dog involved will offend again, that the owner will not take any significant steps to curb the behavior, or that the owner will try to shield a dangerous animal from consequences. The required sharing of contact information and speaking with an officer could be modeled after laws regarding car accidents.
- It's their responsible to remain at the scene like a car accident. And also to be responsible for costs associated from the bite or attack
- Pretty self explanatory. You have to remain at the scene of a car accident regardless of injury or death, so you should have to remain at the scene of a dog attack if your dog, of which you are ultimately responsible for, is involved.
- Yes, the pet owner should have to stay and be held responsible but only if they are able to de-escalate and calm their animal to prevent further trauma.
- Enforcement officers are able to see if there was a 'trigger' for the bite, how the animal is currently acting (tail tucked between legs- afraid), get accurate owner information and to potentially seize the



dog if the owner cannot control them or the animal appear abused or in pain. Also was the person who was bit at fault? Did they threaten to the dog owner and the dog was protecting, were they warned not to approach the dog? Blame cannot and should not be solely placed on the dog.

- It can be difficult when your dog has been attacked to insist on getting contact info. A by-law requiring owners to stick around would help.
- There are few bad dogs. There appear to be owners who are irresponsible owners...people who don't realize that owning a dog is a commitment and significant responsibility. Implement practices that are time and cost effective to administer. And that make owners responsible for their dogs behaviour.
- If the owner is present and sees what happens then you might be able to get a full story and realize the dog may have acted out of self protection
- Why not?
- Yes, they should be identified so that they may be held accountable.
- The dog owner has a responsibility to the injured party for the incident, and should remain at the scene if safe to do so (i.e. dog under control). Enforcement officers should not have to track down the dog owner.
- "It's a dick-move if the owner of the offending animal were to ditch the scene and run-off.
- If any occurrence of this were to happen, it would be ideal to punish the runner as if they were a driver committing a hit and run."
- A dog bite is essentially an assault. A person who flees the scene of an assault faces additional penalties, and because the owner is responsible for the dog a similar standard should be required.
- Negligent dog owners losing control of their dogs should be there to take ownership of what their pet did to someone else that could cause physical and mental trauma. Bylaw officers shouldn't have to track these type of owners down. If they fled the scene, the fine should be even higher.
- If you're required to do it for a car accident, you should have to do it for a dog accident.
- They should definitely be required to remain at the scene and they should be required to pay for any medical bills for the victim, be it human or animal.
- Most people handle dog bites/dog attacks with the owners of each dog. Therefore treating it more like a car accident has officers see if the dog (that bite the other) has previous bite history and either declare if the dog is a 'dangerous dog' under the bylaw or not.
- The owner is the one who should be held responsible for the behaviour of their dog. The owner is the one who should take care of the entire situation and suffer the consequences.
- How is this not a rule already
- It is the responsible thing to do in any incident.
- I think it's necessary for dog owners to be accountable to an injury caused to another person and follow the same protocol as they would if they were to cause a motor vehicle accident, for example. I say this particularly because pet owners' behaviour is largely the reason for their animals' behaviour, and thus the onus is on the pet owner, not the pet, if their pet acts aggressively.
- unless they need to get the animal to a veterinarian. Then they should not face fines for leaving
- Another dog biting, is like a hit and run with a car. Damage can be small or significant.



- It is like leaving the scene of an accident.
- Similar to a hit and run if someone leaves the scene of an incident they should be charged.
- Unless the dog is still a hazard when leashed and owner present
- Dog owners are responsible for their dogs behaviour
- I believe that the dog owners should be held accountable for their dog's actions.
- Seems like common sense especially with earlier case this week of an irresponsible pit-bull owner fleeing the scene after his vicious dog mauled and murdered someone elses non aggressive dog.
- so there's 2 sides to a story always
- I feel the owner needs to take responsibility and potentially make restitution for damages caused by their pet. Similar to motor vehicle accidents they should be required to remain at the site and provide their contact information.
- Harsher fines and penalties for offending dog owners
- Hit and run already illegal this is dog version
- An attack incident is no less serious than a vehicle accident. Hit and run is illegal.
- I think that the owner should be held accountable for their dogs misbehaving.
- 10x the fine for leaving the scene and requiring the police to spend time and resources in finding them
- They should also be responsible for veterinary bills if they inflicted injury on another animal.
- Really- this actually needs an explanation [removed]!! Ban pit bulls now [removed]!!!
- Keep them accountable
- Because someone who can't bother to train their dog probably can't be trusted to do the right thing when they're off the scene.
- Owners should have to stay at scene as one would in an accident and failure to do so should lead to charges
- Absolutely. This is necessary to ensure the dog has necessary shots as well as if there are any complications that occur after the bite. The dog owner has to be held accountable and is responsible for their dogs behaviors
- The owner of the dog should be held responsible for the dogs actions. Maybe we could have the dog owned declared a nuisance and prohibit them from owning dogs.
- it can be a very hard thing to enforce. People can be flighty. I do believe they should stay. It is just like a hot and run if they don't and it should be treated as such.
- I support this but it is a bit tricky to define a bite. Dogs bite when they play. Sometime there is an altercation between the animals but the bite wound isn't discovered until later.
- Too many owners excuse their dog's aggressive behavior....he is excited...he has never bitten before etc but owners MUST be held responsible.
- It should be a crime to have your dog injure a person or pet and not stay on the scene
- Responsible dog ownership requires taking responsibility for the actions of the dog. If both parties agree that bylaw does not need to be called then the matter ends that point (yes there are cases where dogs bite and parties mutually agree to move on). If one party wants to call bylaw then the



other party needs to stay. Of course if one party needs to get their dog to a vet that gets tricky (is the other to follow them to the vet?). As well, it is not unusual for the owner of the aggressive dog to themselves become aggressive. There cannot be a requirement that the victim be required to stay in the proximity of an aggressive owner of a dog who has just attacked the victim or the victim's dog.

- As an owner you are responsible for the actions of your pet. It should be clear though that staying doesn't mean they will take and then kill your pet. There needs to be confidence that there are steps before euthanasia.
- If you are required to remain on scene after a car accident, a dog attack is no different.
- Too many times dog owners walk away with a dog that should be reported
- If they leave then the fine should increase and be enough to cover a vet bill as if the animal has died. Ex. Fine \$350 person leaves, 10 times that amount.
- This should be required and is the right thing to do in any situation where an incident occurs.
- The owners need to stay to talk to authorities so they are accountable and part of the 'process' of sharing information with the officers. The owner is responsible for the dog's actions and needs to be accountable to the other people and or pets involved. The rights of the dog owner must never come before the victim's.
- Finding an animal after the fact that was involved in something can be way too difficult, especially if those around aren't versed in breeds and such. If somebody asked me to identify a dog that attack another animal and then took off, I would absolutely not be able to provide a shred of useble info other than the color.
- Because it is very important to record all the facts of any incident at the time it occurs, And to ensure the offending dogs owner is identified in case the victim requires it for legal purposes and to ensure the offending dogs owner is identified in case the victim requires it for legal purposes
- Absolutely yes. We have laws against hit and runs, why should it be different with a bite and run?
- This all falls on the owner. Do not punish good dogs for not being cared for properly.
- My dog was bitten by another dog at an off leash park. The same dog also tried to bite me. The owner saw it all and made no attempt to help, or apologise. I quickly checked my dog over to see how bad the damage was, and in that time the owner and dog had disappeared. I shouldn't have had to be responsible for the \$600 vet bill, especially since the owner witnessed the incident and knew his dog was in the wrong.
- If a dog bites someone the owner should remain at the scene and provide there info and depends on severity and reason why dog attacked. The dog should be muzzled until further notice
- No difference than a hit and run
- if the dog owner does not remain at the scene of the incident there is no way of tracing the dog and dealing with the problem.
- otherwise it is a hit and run and should be treated as such, the only reason to leave is if the dog needs to be brought under control but in that case the person needs to leave full contact information and also make sure the person or other animal has help before leaving.



- Dog owner need to show they are responsible for any actions their pet is involved in just like the driver does in event of injured during a car accident involving injuries.
- No hit and run scenarios.
- I've been bitten and the owner and dog took off because they can. There is no consequence therefore no incentive for irresponsible owners to train their dog.
- You cannot do a hit and run with a vehicle, so why allow owner/dog to bite/kill and run?
- A lot of dog owners are declining responsibilities
- You'll never be able to fine them or take their dog if you can't find them when they escape.
- Seems obvious. Owner must remain on scene to provide contact details. May be liable for attacked dog's Vet bills.
- Not remaining at the scene is similar to a hit and run
- Objectively, this situation is property damage. Subjectively, I doubt that a person who has not demonstrated the required responsibility to dog ownership, could be counted on provide any restitution required as in vet bills, etc.
- it should be dealt with right away. I would not want offenders to disappear.
- It is the responsible thing to do
- I absolutely think the owner needs to remain on the scene, as one would for, say, a vehicle accident. However, I think we need to be mindful here of the victim also. If having the owner and dog remain in the same location will cause further trauma to the victim and/or hype the dog up to the point there remains a danger, we need an alternative option. Further, if I play this scenario out, it's possible that both in heightened states, victim and owner may become emotional and exacerbate the situation, so I think we need some guidance here as well.
- The owner should be responsible for the dog at all times. If the dog injured another person or animal it is irresponsible to leave the scene and the person should then be held accountable
- its just like a car accident , if another dog is injured they should remain at the scene and share information for futher vet vills , charges etc
- The dog owner needs to be responsible for the actions of his pet.
- Requiring the owner to remain at the scene of the violation results in the owner being held accountable for his/her pet's actions. Why would any thinking person vote "no"?
- Be accountable for your pet behavior
- Owner must be responsible
- Leaving the scene of a dog attack is not different than hitting someone's vehicle and not leavings contact information. It is akin to leaving the scene of a crime and should be treated as such.
- If your dog bites someone you should wait. You would hope that's common sense but it's not
- The event of an attack should be seen the same way that a car accident should, i.e. both parties should remain at the scene until it is assessed by an enforcement officer. However, if both parties present agree this is an unnecessary step (e.g. if the severity of the incident is minimal) then it should be acceptable to forego the involvement of an enforcement officer.
- It should be like a car accident where both parties have to stick around until an officer arrives on scene and makes a decision on what needs to occur.



- Yes its an offense to leave the scene of a crime and if your dog hurts another one you need to remain there and deal with it or you deserve a ticket for that as well.
- The dog owner cannot be allowed to just walk away, shrug their shoulders, and say "Oh well, these things happen." Support the victim.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for any harm caused by their dogs, and anyone who doesn't should be fined in addition to their other charges.
- We have witness owners walking away from a scene. It's like walking away from an accident
- you have no way of proving any kind of insurance is carried. I am sure bylaw hasn't any time to be checking up on loose dogs and cats. We have 1 owner and 2 dogs always running at large here, nothing is ever done.
- Absolutely. My sister's dog was killed in a public park this summer. The owner of the vicious mastif fled the scene and would not have been found without the help of witnesses. He got away with a slap on the wrist.
- "Take responsibility if their animal
- Is involved"
- I have witnessed the damage a dog can inflict, owners must stay on scene
- It should be against the law to leave the scene and if one does they would face fines and criminal charges.
- No different than a hit and run.
- It's part of being a responsible pet owner. It's like staying at the scene of an accident - promotes accountability.
- This is 100% the responsible thing to do. If someone leaves the scene and is located, they should be fined just as they are during a vehicle accident.
- It's similar to remaining at the scene of an accident
- This rule needs to apply to all dog breeds. I have been bitten and scared by a chihuahua, all dogs can be dangerous.
- Owners should be responsible and held liable for the behaviour of their dogs
- The owner is responsible for the behavior of their pet.
- Same is expected of people involved in an assault or a motor vehicle accident.
- If any dog attacks another dog or a person, the owner must accept full responsibility for the animals actions. Therefore they must remain at the scene, and control their pet
- Owners need to be held accountable.
- If hit and run is not okay for a car, why should it be okay for an aggressive dog?
- It is the responsibility of the owner to answer for their animals actions. By being required to stay on scene owners may be more vigilant in preventing situations or incidents from occurring.
- Owners who do not remain at scene usually never get held accountable
- Injury from a dog but does not show up for 30 minutes or so. We didn't see blood until we got home and went to the vet to find out dog needed stitches.
- Accountability for your dogs actions must be enforced.



- Dog ownership comes with many responsibilities and that includes accounting for your dog's actions.
- There should be a significant fine if one does not remain at the scene of a car accident.
- You cannot leave the scene of an accident, this is similar.
- The dog owner must be held responsible for injury to another including incurring costs.
- Just like a hit & run road incident. Owners can be difficult to locate.
- If possible. If the dog is too out of control and needs to be restrained back in a car or a house the owner should follow up with the city of Calgary or return to the scene once their dog is secure.
- An owner's dog who has harmed another animal or human should be responsible for any medical bills. They should also be identified as a nuisance or aggressive dog.
- Too many nuisance dog owners run away and have to be tracked down and penalty is not large, owners need to take responsibility for their pets.
- Less resources to search for an owner.
- The non-responsible owners must stay on site. Saves time looking for them later with. Fines should be much higher.
- Their dog, their responsibility. Much like a car accident.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets.
- Offending dog owner should remain to provide info and face repercussions.
- Incidents should be viewed as a criminal offence and treated as such. This is not the early 1900's. Some dog breeds are trained to be overly aggressive, intimidate or are raised by people who have anti-social personalities and the animals are ticking time bombs.
- It's like a car/bike/pedestrian accident, law requires you to remain at the scene this isn't much different especially if injuries to person/animal occur.
- The owners must be responsible for any medical cost.
- I believe it should be considered similar to a "hit and run" incident if an owner's dog causes damage and does not remain on scene.
- It doesn't seem practical given the ongoing availability of enforcement officers.
- Owners must take responsibility for the actions of their pets.
- Information needs to be shared in an attack situation.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their pet.
- The owner of the offending dog must take responsibility for the dog's behaviour.
- However, the owner should be able to secure the aggressor dog in a safe place, which may mean temporarily leaving the scene to secure the dog and returning to scene.
- As long as the dog can be restrained and there is no danger to people and other dogs the owner should remain at the scene.
- A dog owner should have to take full responsibility for their dog's actions. Including paying for any treatment. The owner should be charged if there are injuries.
- Any attempt to flee should be taken into account and result in more severe penalties.



- people should take responsibility for their pets, which is difficult if contact info isn't provided
- I am surprised this is not already the law!
- Like a vehicle injury accident, priority must be to immediate health and safety of bitten animal but license of offending animal and owner needs to be identified for liability for medical bills and identifying problem animals
- This is ideal in case there are complications or further incidents with the same dog. However, I feel like irresponsible citizens won't stay even if there is a rule
- Responsible dog ownership dictates that this is the reasonable thing to do. Unfortunately, creating a law will not solve the problem, but it will give the city a course of action should an identifiable owner leave the scene.
- it's about responsibility and accountability, something a lot of dog owners lately don't seem to have.
- People need to be accountable for their pets actions as they are responsible for them
- To get information
- The owner should be arrested and charged with endangering public safety immediately after the bite occurs. Should include jail time (6 months min) and fine minimums of at least \$10,000
- As long as their animal is under control and not going to cause more harm.
- It's not different than an accident.
- Yes for a severe enough bite or if the injured party requests it, and a reasonable amount of wait time. That's being responsible even if your dog reacted out of character.
- Documentation, tracking is important
- Like any accident, the person should remain to share their contact information
- The dog owner should be accountable for their dog
- "Bites dog on dog no unless is severe
- Bites on human yes always no matter the age"
- Human decency. It is the least the dog owner could do in this situation.
- Dogs are a reflection of the owner. The owner should be liable for any attacks that their pet is involved in.
- It is the responsible thing to do. Medical information, vaccination records, etc may be needed.
- Taking responsibility for events that have transpired.
- Dog owners need to take responsibility
- too many irresponsible owners flee the scene after their dog attacks, there definitely needs to be consequences for leaving just as there are consequences for leaving a crash scene.
- Yes, this needs to be a requirement. Owners must take responsibility and know that that they must be able to control their animals at all times. If there is an incident, the absolute least they need to do is remain at the scene.
- Owners should be held responsible for actions committed by the dog as if committed by themselves, penalties of up to \$1000 should be established to ensure enforcement.



- Owners need to be responsible for the actions of their dog. Ultimately they put the dog in that position. If both parties work it out between themselves, to each party's satisfaction, then bylaw does not need to be involved. If not then definitely both parties need to remain at the scene.
- Accountability is key! Any dog is capable of biting. It is the owners' responsibility to know their dog, ensure they have the correct training and keep them out of situations that may trigger the dog. If something was to happen it is on the HUMAN to take accountability for the dog's actions similar to a parent with a child.
- That is responsible dog ownership. Safer for the dog. Only concern would be for the victims- especially if the owner is not cooperative.
- Take responsibility and don't hide.
- The owner is responsible for the dog so they should have to answer for any incidents involving their dog
- People need to be responsible
- But I don't see how this is any more enforceable. There seems to be a trend of people running away.
- It's important for the enforcement officer to hear the information from all sides. If the dog owner leaves, it's not possible to get the information at that exact time.
- The owner is responsible for their pet
- It is too difficult to locate a person after the incident.
- But who is going to enforce this "Rule" when it happens. There is no one stopping someone from leaving. It's like asking a bank robber to wait with the money while the police arrive.
- Both parties should have a chance to explain to the officer what happened. If the dog is at fault (regardless of breed and size), owners should be held accountable for their dog's behavior. Pet ownership should not be allowed by the city to be taken lightly, all dog owners should properly socialize and train their dogs so they can be a part of the community. However, people and especially children should also be educated on how to interact with dogs and they should NEVER approach dogs they do not know in on-leash and off-leash areas. Part of making our community better is to make sure pet owners are responsible caring and training their pets but also non-pet owners are responsible and understand how to interact with pets.
- Too many times after an aggression takes place, the owner and aggressive dog leave the scene. People are left wondering about shots it may or may not have, history, owner information, etc.
- It should be treated like a scene of an accident. If I bite a kid and walk away I will face penalties. Why wouldn't it be the same for a dog.
- Everyone is responsible for the behaviour of their clients or dog.
- Owner needs to be responsible for the actions of their dog.
- People need to be accountable for their pet's actions.
- People must take responsibility for their pet's behavior and be accountable
- "Similar to a car accident the owner should stay and be responsible for their actions or their animal's on action's. so if an animal attacks another dog or person and the owner a
- links away or hides that is wrong and shows no accountability."



- As a dog owner it is my responsibility to exchange information and pay any vet bills if my dog injured another dog. This should be a bylaw here in Calgary!
- "Similar to vehicle accidents, owners should be required to stay until the situation can be assessed by authorities, and contact information should be shared regardless of fault. Therefore if further action needs to be taken (removal of the dog, required rehabilitation or training, etc), the owner can be contacted or the city can follow up with the owner.
- Witnesses should also be encouraged or required to wait for officers to give statements and contact information as well."
- Too many people try to avoid responsibilities this should be mandatory and fines should be levied for owners who do not stay. This causes more expense in looking for them as well as the chance they can hide their dog from authorities Also makes it more difficult to prove it was their dog
- The owner is responsible for the dogs actions. just like a person is responsible to stay on scene for something they've done
- Too many times pit bull owners specifically run from the scene of an attack and hide their animal which leads one to believe this has happened more than once with their dog.
- there should be some sort of contact. It is the owner's responsibility to make sure their dog is trained not to bite. If this is not possible there should be a muzzle and it shouldn't be let off-leash in any public area. If an enforcement officer if necessary 1 they must get control of their dog and 2 deal the consequences.
- It should essential they remain at the scene and take accountability for the situation
- Yes, the dog owner must take responsibility for their dog's behaviour. However, this should only be the case for severe bites that cause injury. 'Dog bite' needs to be clearly defined as there is a difference between a playful nip and a bite that causes injury.
- Depending on the severity of the bite and the situation that dog owner could be responsible for the vet bills of the other dog.
- It's the only way to be able to track these incidents
- My dog was attacked when he was on leash - and the other dog owner just left with his dog, and I was left with a scared dog and a vet bill. Unfortunately, we can't always count on people to do the right thing.
- I think that animal behaviorists need to be part of the conversation. I don't think bylaw have enough training to know when the issue is with the dog and when the issue is with the victim or when the issue is with the dog owner. It's easy to blame the animal but often times they are the primary victim.
- Similar to a car accident, all parties involved should be required to stay until due-process has been completed. Parties who leave the scene should be charged with a "hit-and-run" fine as well
- Should there be a rule, like the bite must have caused the victim to bleed? Just worry about disagreements over what constitutes a bite... puppies like to "nip" for instance.
- The victim shouldn't have to track the perpetrator. It's like a hit and run.
- In case the owner of the animal isn't up to date on his/her shots and rabies vaccine. At least the person bit can ask the owner which shots they have had and if they need to seek medical attention.



- The requirement should be the same as for a person causing a car accident. (Possible exception would be to allow the owner to leave the scene to secure the offending dog if it poses a further hazard to people or other pets, but he or she should be required to return to the scene forthwith after doing so.)
- The situation can be highly emotional for all involved. Exchanging contact information would be preferred so that the situation can be deescalated by removal of the dog from the scene in a timely manner. Not able to predict time of bylaws response.
- Absolutely a person should remain at the scene in case additional information is required or medical attention is advised. People need to be held accountable for the actions of their dogs by being responsible dog owners.
- Dog owner to take responsibility
- Yes, just like the scene of an accident. How can the owner be responsible for expenses related to the incident that just happened if the injured had no contact info? City bylaws state that owners are responsible for damages caused by their pets.
- Responsibility is always on the owner
- It's just like getting into a car accident and getting the other drivers info
- Yes as long as the wait is a reasonable time. Otherwise leaving contact information with the complainant would suffice.
- Dogs that bite are a huge danger - yes the owner should have to stay at the incident. It's incredible to me that they are even given a second chance.
- If the owner of the dog leaves then he or she should also be charged with an offence.
- The dog owner is responsible for looking after their dog while on walks and on/off leash dog parks. If you see the dog is stressed and uncomfortable with other dogs running up to it and wanting to play, maybe take your dog out of the situation so an incident does not occur. I've been to many parks where the owners are doing their own thing while their dogs are running around and not playing nicely.
- All incidents need recording so problem animals/owners don't just go to different parks/trails.
- Similar to hit and run collisions. This would give enforcement some information to locate dogs and their owners, or give grounds to penalize owners for non-compliance.
- Yes, my son has been bit by a dog (not pit bull) and the owners were a neighbour who never said even sorry to my son. They blamed my son who reached into a tree at the fence line and tore huge scars into my sons arm who still has ptsd. That same dog attacked another kid not even a year later almost making him not walk.
- If you pet attacks another person or animal unprovoked you should be responsible for paying for vet bills ect
- Otherwise it's basically a "hit and run" and the dog and owner get away with the behaviour. Also the dog owner should assist the injured person.
- The owner of the dog is responsible for his/her animal. Should stay and assist the authorities.
- All people should take responsibility for a dog attack



- Absolutely! The owner is certainly responsible in some way and must remain at the scene unless emergency circumstances (such as getting the dog away from the victims)
- I support this so long as it makes sense for the owner to remain at the scene. For example, if their dog bit another dog or person out of fear and needs to be removed from the situation to avoid further trauma, then the owner should definitely provide contact information but still leave the scene. Could make it a requirement that the owner return once dog has been taken home, picked up, etc.
- Responsible ownership should include taking responsibility
- To create accountability from the owner
- If it is not taken to extremes (eg. for a chihuahua). It would save time and money locating the dog(s) in question for a health assessment and possibly confinement
- My dog was attacked by two German Shepherds in Shouldice Park, each dog was on a leash. The two German Shepherds were able to pull their owner 50 ft across the grass to the path I was walking my dog on with my husband. We were extremely fortunate that our dog survived and only needed stitches at the event. This whole ordeal made me realize how quickly things can get out of hand when someone has more than one dog, even when they are on a leash. Luckily the owner of the dog gave me her contact information, although I took a bunch of pictures of her instead. It should be the offenders responsibility to pay for any cost associated with their aggressive dogs, and these dogs need to be monitored in case these are not solo incidents and then dealt with accordingly.
- Yes, they should have to stay.
- Necessary for follow-up and punitive actions following the incident
- Yes that's the responsible thing to do and expected
- Responsible
- Just to know if the dog has been vaccinated and depending how severe vet bills
- It is an ethical responsibility to remain accountable for your actions or those for whom you are liable.
- Any dog that bites a person must be put to death immediately.
- You can't take off from a car accident, or from an assault, or accident that involves bodily harm. Why should this be any different?
- Same as all involved in a car accident.
- Or in a close by location away from the victim to not cause further problems
- I believe dog bites essentially constitute assault, and should be treated as a crime of that severity, including more leniency if this is an isolated incident i.e. no prior history of aggression.
- If it's a seriously critical bite that could incapacitate the other animal, there's reasoning for the owner having to be there. Moral reasoning above all.
- Good luck getting them to stay.
- A dog bite is similar to an assault; it should be handled with the same degree of CRIMINAL seriousness. A dog owner running away is similar to a hit and run injury accident.
- The owner is responsible for training their dog. They are at fault if a dog bites another animal or a person as much as the dog is.
- I have dogs and I take responsibility of their behaviour 100%. Owner should stay if there's an incident



- There should be some judgement applied to avoid bylaw officers issuing fines for trivial matters/disputes between dog owners.
- Dogs who bite other people are generally doing it to protect the owner. Many cases a dog will bite a stranger if the owner is being threatened. The enforcement officer needs to know from both sides why this happened.
- A dog showing aggressive behaviour is due to lack of training from the owner. It's not the dogs fault.
- I figured this was already a rule.
- It's the owners fault, they should be punished not the dog
- You are responsible for a hit and run. And you are responsible for your dog. If your animal (or car) has injured another, then you must remain at the scene.
- Too hard to trace if not done at the time
- This is only logical.
- Pet owners need to take responsibility for their poor or unsafe decisions.
- I know someone that not only had their dog bit by another dog, but the owner of that dog beat my friend up..no reason or grounds to do it.
- If another dog randomly attacks then consequences need to happen
- People need to take responsibility for their pets actions, regardless of breed. The dog owner and the person/dog they bit should be required to remain at the scene.
- All aspects of an encounter need to be doc, assessed and interpreted by an independent panel with no stake in the outcome. Owners as well as those impacted shouldn't be able to avoid accountability . We assess this in vehicle pedestrian accidents and same approach should apply. There is a % attribution to dog owner and victim that should be considered.
- It's an attack. A crime. Of course the owner should remain at the scene.
- They should stay and state their case
- Within reason. Some people think a cattle dog nipping at heels is 'biting'. The 'bite' has to have either drawn blood, or the dog did not release right away. Then Bylaw should get involved
- The owner must take responsibility for the dog's behaviour. If the victim (bitee) forgives the human and biter, then I would say no.
- It would ensure that owners are kept responsible for the event that transpired.
- The owner is responsible and liable for animal behaviour and incurrent costs for outcomes of an incident.
- <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/calgary-dog-attack-bylaw-rules-1.5712902>
- just like a car accident - must remain at scene
- There is always 3 sides to a story the left, right and the middle. The only right thing to do is to get the 2 sides to get the most accurate explanation of the events. Many of people will leave out of fear so having a rule may help with assuring that all parties stay at the scene.
- Information should be exchanged for future reference to the bite but it should not involve the dog being taken away from the owner or any other harsh pentaly other than a fine.



- If someone was to hit your vehicle they are required by law to give you their information. Thus, if someone is to damage you or your dog (your property) they must take full responsibility for their actions
- I feel an owner of a vicious dog would flee the area. There must be a way to make these owners accountable.
- The owner needs to be held accountable for its dogs action, no matter what breed. This is all under the assumption that the dog is in under control when the exchange is taking place and hasn't or isn't running around the area.
- any dog that has an issue with another dog or owner should have to stay and deal with the situation, similar to a car accident
- Your responsibility
- This a tough on to vote on because any individual can claim their pup was bit just to cause issues to another owner. As long as there is enough evidence to prove a bite was done by the dog in question, this would make sense.
- If a n incident occur it's the same as drive a vehicle. Information my be exchanged so a proper investigation can take place.
- It's responsible and if it was a joint fault it seems a good way to share your side or the storey.
- Part of responsible pet ownership.
- The pet is your responsibly and any trouble the pet causes is also your responsibility. No matter the breed.
- because it holds the owner responsible for the action of his or her dog
- If a dog owner is held accountable for the actions of their dog and is legally expected to remain at the scene and deal with the consequences, they may be more likely to go to the effort of making sure they don't have an aggressive dog in the first place. Pair this with training programs, more canine behaviourists, a push to license pets and increased education on pet ownership, and I think you have a far better solution than discriminating against bully breeds.
- Owners need to be fully accountable for their dogs behaviour. The only time it would acceptable to leave would be if the dog was still not fully under control or exhibiting aggression and the owner was on foot or in a situation in which the dog could not be safely confine while information was exchanged.
- Owner must be responsible for animals behaviour
- Owners should stay and be responsible
- This only seems responsible
- Owners must be held accountable and responsible if their dog harmed someone.
- This would be the same for any accident causing damage or injury, why different for a dog bite/attack? Responsibility needs to be taken.
- The victim (person bitten or handler of animal that is bitten) should have the discretion of allowing the person to leave, but they should be required to share their contact information before leaving.
- They should share contact information but it may not be possible to remain at scene for long if someone requires care.



- So many dog owners flee the scene to avoid repercussions. A responsible dog owner would remain at the scene.
- I've heard of too many stories where people and animals are bitten by off thrash dogs and the owners run away
- a dog attack is the basically along the same lines as a car accident, it is illegally to hit a and run. The offending dog and owner should be responsible to pay for injuries if any that were sustained, attacks should be recorded and if it's documented then its easier to determine if the dog is aggressive.
- Have to gather the facts of the incident with proper authority.
- Same as the scene of a car accident
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their pet. But the severity of the incident and frequency need to be taken into consideration. Some dogs nip other dogs as a play gesture, for instance.
- This is only is it is serious.
- owners obtain pets and should be accountable for training and behaviour of their pets
- The owner of the dog that bites has to take responsibility. It's the owners job to train your dogs. It's irresponsible pet ownership.
- The owner needs to take reponsibility
- Depending on the severity of the bite
- The dog owner is responsible for the injury that was caused. They would be negligent for these damages.
- For safety and mitigation
- Dogs are only as good as the owners
- I don't think it's acceptable for dogs to display malicious behaviour
- The owner is ultimately responsible for their dog's behaviour and needs to be accountable.
- The owner is responsible for their dog, if it has caused harm they are responsible to be part of the solution.
- if information is not shared, responsibility can be abdicated by the offending owner.
- It is a crime and should be investigated
- As a dog owner you have the responsibility to help in any way when a dog bites.
- The dog owner should stay at the scene to share contact info due to the fact that the incident is equally the fault of the owner. No dog should be punished without the owners being punished as well.
- An owner should be concerned that their dog is biting and be prepared to explain any extenuating circumstances, I.e. if the dog was injured or teased before incident.
- The chances of enforcing this are slim.
- Info from the owner may be helpful to the person / pet owner bitten. Ideally the enforcement officer would collect info about the biting animal i.e. immunizations . Officer may be able to provide resources for training the animal as well.
- An owner should be required to remain at the scene of a dog bite incident so the owner i held accountable and the biting dog is monitored and dealt with appropriately.



- An incident as such a scenario is the responsibility of the owner. Just as a vehicular collision often involves an enforcement officer, a dog bite that breaks the skin should be reported.
- supposedly the owner can control the animal to prevent escalation/furthering of incident
- Owners are responsible for their dogs, just like they are responsible for their children. The City is all gungHo on enforcing animal bylaws, perhaps bylaws for kids running wild, causing disturbances etc should also be enforced!!
- Biting dogs can cause serious harm, but at present it is easy for an owner of an aggressive animal to simply walk away from any incident they may have caused.
- Treat it like a car accident
- Your dog is your responsibility and you must at all times be accountable for the actions of your dog. If dogs have the proper training and socialization and an incident occurs you need to remain at the scene of such an incident, the same as you would be required to do if you had an accident in your vehicle. Police and by-law officers should not be expected to use their resources to spend time locating owners involved in such incidents.
- If there is an injury. I don't want people to call if dogs are play fighting. and there are no injuries
- It is simply responsible pet ownership, akin to staying at the scene of a motor vehicle accident in which you were involved.
- I think it is reasonable for an owner to remain at the scene of an incident or at least provide contact information so they can be easily reached. There may be situations where it is better for a situation to be diffused as emotions and tensions can run very high. Space is often a good way for this to occur. However I would not want people to disappear.
- Scene of an accident.
- Be a responsible owner.
- The owner should stay to explain the circumstances of the incident and take responsibility for their pet.
- Provided the offending animal can be controlled. If not ID should be exchanged.
- this makes total sense to me
- The person supervising the animal should be responsible for the animal in their care.
- Important to get contact information in case follow up is needed
- "Owners need to take responsibility for their animals. It is important that pet owners ensure proper pet maintenance, socialization, and ability to take control of the animal is out of sorts due to aggressive dispositions of other animals and people.
- UNLESS the other attacked first ...then animals , same as people should have the right to defend themselves"
- This would be simple common sense, and would be similar to leaving the scene of an accident
- They are responsible for their dog so they should stay and make sure everything is done properly
- The owner needs to be responsible for their pet's actions
- Sometimes people do not listen if the dog owner says please do not startle my dog. I am training it to not be afraid as it was attacked awhile ago and I want to take this fear away but it is still learning so please leave it alone for everyone's safety



- It would help insure that due process takes place.
- It's responsible.
- Without a question! The owner is responsible for their dogs behaviour. If there is damage whether to a human, animal or property, we as owners are liable. It's no different than your kid.
- "Just like a vehicle altercation; owners are required to stay at the scene
- So the same should apply to animal altercations"
- They should be charged if they leave the scene
- Hold owners accountable for their animal's behaviour.
- Often dog attacks are like hit and runs, where owner are nowhere or hidden at the scene of their aggressive dogs and difficult to connect dog to owners after the fact
- Dog owners must be accountable for the behaviour of their dogs.
- It should be mandatory to wait at the scene for CPS/Bylaw to attend for all dog bite incidents.
- it makes sense
- Yes, I can't believe that this is not already a rule.
- This way there is immediate sharing, no looking for the owner.
- It's usually not the dog it's the owner
- The owner of the dog is responsible for the dog, else there's no accountability for the dog's actions/behaviour.
- It's the same as stay at the scene of a collision or medical emergency and common decency.
- They need to advise if the dog has had all their shots and what exactly happened. Sometimes dogs are provoked so much that they have no other option but to snap. This should be clarified to the officer as it isn't fair that a dog should be blamed for a person being rude or disrespectful to a dog.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets. Too many pretend it's not serious and just walk away.
- Dog owners should never leave the scene of an incident, must be held accountable, especially in case of injury or property damage.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs behavior and the enforcement officer needs to get both sides of the story.
- Too often irresponsible dog owners get away from paying in all ways for not properly training and controlling their dogs. Dogs and other people pay the price.
- "I would absolutely support this if was possible. From my experience bylaw is unable to respond to incidents in a timely manner and all parties often leave before bylaw arrives. Unfortunately some irresponsible owners leave and refuse to take responsibility for their dogs actions by not sharing contact information.
- If bylaw had a consistent presence in at (least) busy parks such as Sue Higgins, River Park, edworthy, bowmont ect...owners/handlers would be forced to have control over their dogs and or be educated first then ticketed on major or numerous offences. With their regular presence in parks the likelihood of them being available to attend an incident in a timely manner could be more possible. The current bylaws are great, they simply need more effective enforcement through education and presence."



- If your dog bites someone, it is your responsibility to remain at the scene and cover any financial costs to the injured party
- Owners need to take responsibility for their animals both good and bad
- The owner needs to give information to the officer about the dog's vaccination status. If the owner cannot be found after the incident, doctors will make the most conservative assumptions: that the animal is unvaccinated and a rabies risk. The treatment for a person who might have been bitten by a rabies-positive dog are much more intensive and invasive than for a person bitten by a fully vaccinated dog.
- Owners are ultimately responsible for their pet's behaviour.
- Unless the owner/person responsible for the dog needs to leave for their own safety, they should have to assist the people their animal has injured. There should be consequences for someone that causes injury to another.
- I think there is very important information that can be gleaned from the owner such as vaccinations as well as the overall health of the dog, all of which would be very important to treat the victim. It would also be important in order for the pet owner to provide required information to authorities such as their address and other contact information for further follow up.
- Except if they need to seek emergency medical attention for their own animal or a human
- It is the owner's responsibility to care for their animal if their animal gets into an incident the owner is 100% at fault not the dog
- If necessary.... If the two owners or person can handle it themselves let them.
- An incident causing harm to human or animal needs to be reported to enforcement officers to address the owner of the offending animal with education and/or penalties.
- Any dog, of any breed that bites a person, handler should be responsible for any medical issues resulting in the bite. ALL DOGS CAN BITE. ALL handlers should be held equally responsible for their dogs behaviour.
- Be a responsible pet owner!
- it's similar to a hit and run, it's nice to share if the dog is up on the rabies vaccine and find out if medical is required.
- Just goes along with responsible ownership
- Was this not a law?! If they don't it should be treated like a vehicle hit and run.
- Yes, in case the damage is more severe than originally thought, also so the city can track if this is a reoccurring issue
- People need to take ownership
- There could be vet bills and that person should pay. We also need to know if it is a pattern.
- Leaving the scene is not appropriate - it suggests irresponsibility
- Otherwise, it is like a 'hit and run' traffic incident. The dog-owner needs to accept responsibility.
- Owners need to be responsible for their dogs.
- The owner is to blame for their dogs behaviour.
- I don't think anyone should bite and run



- It would be similar to a car accident where you exchange contact information like you would insurance information.
- The owner needs to be held accountable as well as share his/ her side. This especially fits for hard mouthed breeds such as apbt breeds as they are way to often stereotyped.
- This should already be required- owners are legally responsible for the actions of their pet.
- The dog owner has a responsibility for their animal and what their animal does. The owner should secure the animal and then stay on the scene. Similar to when there is a car accident.
- If the attack requires medical attention or is a serious attack. Yes, they should be required to speak to police.
- I want all information necessary if my dog were to be victim of another dog's attack.
- Dog bites should be documented to determine what happened and if the dog (no matter what breed) is dangerous. The owner is liable for the things that their dog does
- I have had to write down the license plate of an attack dog owner in order to file a complaint with bylaw. It is a very stressful situation; I asked the owner for their address and they refused to provide it.
- No different than a car accident. The dog owner must take responsibility for their and their animal's actions.
- .
- It seems reasonable to force a person to stick around if their animal hurts someone. Leaving would seem to be similar to the idea of "fleeing from the scene of a crime".
- If the animal is a cause of damage to another person or animal they should provide information so they can be contacted if the severity of the incident warrants it.
- Owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their pets. There are no bad dogs just bad owners.
- A person should stay on scene with ANY incident.
- I think an owner should stay, their dog is their responsibility. If they don't stay at the incident they should be fined if found out who they are. A dog attack could lead to a death of the victim. They should also have to pay for medical cost for the victim.
- Dog owners need to be held responsible for the actions of their dogs, and this is difficult if they are able to leave the scene of an incident without repercussions.
- I would associate this to a hit and run and they should be dealt with in the same manner
- It's basically a "hit and run" if you don't remain on the scene. Sad we have to legislate common human decency but there you go...these are the times we live in I guess. Sigh.
- They are responsible for the dog and thus should be responsible for the repercussions
- and if it is proven that the dog was in the right (harassed, teased, agitated by the bitten) there will be no action taken on the dog or the owner. and they bitten will be held accountable.
- If a dog bites a person. And it would need to be a significant bite not the playful nip of a puppy.
- If an incident happens both owners of the dogs should discuss and make plans to solve what happened. If there is a vet bill because of it they need to work together and figure it out, be responsible.



- Common sense
- It's your dog! You are very much responsible for anything that happens.
- This is fair - and if they flee the scene they may face a monetary Penalty for fleeing the scene of an accident. Similar to a hit and run vehicle accident
- If their animal was in an altercation I would want both sides of the story to be told. Maybe the person reporting who is not that dogs owner will paint a picture that is not true or accurate
- It should be treated like A hit and run. There should be fines for not staying at the scene of the incident.
- I think that a dog owner should show responsibility and be part of the solution if their dog bites a person or animal. There could be many factors surrounding the bite and all parties need to be heard.
- Dogs bite and everyone reacts differently. It should be treated like a car accident
- Both party should remain on scene to discuss injuries to evaluate the situation and if necessary law-enforcement can be involved to dictate fault. If at fault they are responsible for all that bills and examinations for that dog.
- This will help ensure that the owner is identified ASAP and the vaccination records/information for the dog is obtained as soon as possible
- Then nuisance dogs could be specifically tracked and taken care of.
- Yes, because some owners leave and the owner is often notinvestaged, so this would make it a law that the owner would have to stay and talk with the enforcement officer.
- Just like an vehicle accident, a dog fight or dog bite owner and victim should both be required to wait to speak with enforcement officers.
- But the person with the offending animal should also keep a certain distance afterwards as the person/dog that was bitten would be traumatized and should not have the further stress of the offending animal close to them.
- 100% yes.
- As a person who has owned "bully" breeds, but that bully breed was attacked by a random dog unprovoked and the owner fled and left me with the hefty vet bills. Yes I believe if you dog bites another dog or person you stay on site until information is exchanged
- This is the responsibility of a dog owner
- It should be illegal for a pet owner to leave the scene of an attack. Not only should a rule be set in place, but hefty fines should be added for any pet owner leaving the scene of an attack their dog took part in.
- If the owner doesn't remain, they should be fined
- Responsible behaviour is an expectation of a community's members. The only responsible behaviour upon one's dog causing harm to a person or animal is to remain at the scene.
- It's like a hit and run. You can't just leave the scene of a crime. There should be time and opportunity to work towards acknowledgement of the damage/injury/stress inflicted, future prevention and resolution.
- Leaving the scene looks like a way to escape from responsibility



- A dog attack (on a human or animal) can be MORE dangerous than a hit and run! If we treat our vehicles with such respect (in fender benders), we have to treat our humans and pets with such.
- dog owners should always be responsible for their dog's behavior
- Many things can cause a dog to bite, and it's important to determine if the dog is actually placing other dogs and humans at risk, or if it was a fluke situation.
- Yes; however, this rule would need to very explicitly define what a "bite" entails. And that definition would need to be explicit, reasonable and enforceable. Do you mean a nip with no skin break? Dogs nip each other as part of play and communication. Or, do you mean bite with skin break? Or bite and shake? Does the definition differ if it happens to another dog, or a person? The general public has a very poor understanding of normal dog behaviour and dog communication. Dozens of times, I've heard people say their dogs were attacked; however, they had poorly behaved dogs and other dogs were simply telling the offending dog to back off. I am concerned that uneducated people would try to enforce this in inappropriate situations.
- It's important for owners to take responsibility and share information such as dog vaccination etc.
- It is the right thing to do.
- I'd like them to be required to share information, but not necessarily to stay; the dog owner will probably stay with the dog, and if the dog just attacked someone, it might be better for them to leave.
- Yes the owner should stay and provide all necessary information
- When my son was young (11) and he was walking his dog, another dog owner (Adult) walking their dog had attacked my sons' dog and left the scene. My son did not know what to do and carried his bleeding dog home and was crying. I believe all dog owners should stay at the scene, especially in case their dog has disease that no one is worried about or in my case leaving a child with an injured animal does not know what to do.
- Info should be shared with victim owner or enforcement officer. Having to wait for an enforcement officer (several hours) is not reasonable. No different than being involved in a vehicular accident!
- The victim needs to talk to the dog owner to ensure rabies is not a concern, and to enable reporting to officials.
- Assuming that it can be responded to in a timely manner (under 20 min) or provide online reporting software so both parties can share details
- The dog needs to be recorded and described.
- Same logic as the driver of a car remaining at the scene of an accident.
- there are bad owners more than bad dogs. penalize the owner. NOT the animal
- Pit Bull owners usually run away after their pit bulls attack
- I know someone whose dog was killed by a pit bull and the pit bull owner ran away like the cowards they are.
- It may be more difficult to locate the dog owner after the incident.
- However, I believe that the animal should be immediately contained in a safe environment (vehicle, backyard, house, etc) so as to reduce further stress, to all involved.



- Leaving the scene of an accident is not responsible behaviour in this situation, the same as a traffic incident. If possible/necessary, the dog could be taken home by a friend or family member if it is continuing to be aggressive.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs. Some incidents may be minor and not need an enforcement officer but for a serious situation the owner should be required to share correct contact information.
- I support a rule that requires dog owners to remain on scene after an incident if it is warranted. I would equate it to a car accident... if the dogs are not injured or not seriously injured, the owners should be required to exchange info, work it out amongst themselves and potentially file a report over the phone/internet. If injury occurs, then an officer would need to get involved and owners stay on the scene. Obviously an incident that requires immediate medical attention owners and dogs should exchange information and continue to vet or hospital. Bottom line, common sense should be used.
- to hard to track if they dont stay on scene
- Need owner to provide details on dog's health record in case of problems from bite
- But how are you planning to enforce that?
- To avoid miss understanding, false blame and/or 'disappearance' of the dog's owner
- It's like a car accident - you should not be leaving if your dog causes injury. The burden of proof should not be left up to the bite victim. They are traumatized and may not be able to process what just happened, let alone get photo evidence of the offending owner/pet. The more that pet owners understand their responsibilities of pet ownership, the better our citizens can get along. With increased pets in city comes increased responsibility.
- If the victim resides to persue the owner at fault should have to provide information, or face more charges
- the owner is responsible for the actions of their pet. As much as the pet has a level of free will, the owner should be aware of cues in their pet in new situations.
- similar to car accidents, involved parties should be obligated to remain at scene.
- This allows communication pertaining to the incident, causes as well as positive decision making
- I believe it to be very similar to a vehicle accident and see any accident where a dog bites a person there could be liability on the pet owners part and information should be shared.
- There have been many instances just this summer of people trying to identify a dog's owner who has left the scene after a fight or bite.
- No different than a hit and run.. you don't leave the scene if YOU were involved
- NA
- This should be deemed the same as an an accident. If you get in a car accident you exchange information.
- There are no bad dogs, just bad owners, or inexperienced. Owners must stay at a bite incident to talk with officers.
- If I hit a car I need to stay, same if my dog bites someone.
- A dog bite is essentially assault and therefore is no different than leaving the scene for other infractions. It gives the bylaw officer an opportunity to get both sides of the story and also for



additional education to happen. I also wonder why only bites are being explored here. I have often had dogs jump on me and this also causes distress and indicates that the dog is not under control (against the bylaw). Trauma can linger much longer than the wound (whether there is a wound or not). There should also be more parks and open spaces where pets are NOT permitted, on leash or off. And fines should be double for altercations with off leash pets in on leash areas.

- Similar to staying on the scene at a car accident..
- Pit Bulls in this City are out of control - please do something!!
- If you own a dog that bites a person or another dog you should be held responsible for the dogs actions and record the incident.
- Fine the owner, dog bites are the owners fault, not the dog. Breed specific legislation doesn't work.
- Basic responsibility of ownership
- Having a dog owner remain at the scene is important. I feel that most people's response when their dog does something bad (biting a person or animal) is to flee with the dog. I had an incident a few years ago where a dog attacked my dog and I had to chase the person down to find out if there were any health concerns in their dog I should know about. This is not the way it should happen. But how can this be required?
- Pit Bull owners tend to run off when their dogs attack someone or another dog. Show what kind of low lifes they are.
- In past incidents of this sort, i have not received accurate contact information from the owner of the aggressive dog.
- Absolutely the owner NEEDS TO STAY however how will this be enforced?
- I think untol the severity is determined both parties are to remain at the scene
- Duh!! Just like a car accident, you need people to stick around so the full story of what happened can be understood. Plus if the dog is a nuisance, you may not be able to identify the owner if they leave.
- Well it would be the same thing with your kid if your kid badly hurt another kid you need to wait it out and make sure the kid is fine
- The problem would be timely arrival of bylaw. People won't wait.
- This way the victim can have peace of knowing that the situation will be fully handled with. By keeping the owner of the dog at the scene, you are keeping and holding them accountable for their dog's action. There are far too many times where dog owners don't care or bother to put in the time when their dog has gone out of line.
- I feel dog owners are solely responsible for how their animal acts. I feel this is no different then remaining at the scene of an accident. Owners need to remain at the incident and take responsibility.
- Tribunal only if non breed specific adjudicators are on the panel
- Common sense and courtesy.
- I believe in responsible pet ownership.
- Own up to issue, be responsible.
- It's the responsible and moral action.



- It's not ok to not be accountable for your pet
- The owner should be required to take steps to address the dog's behavior problem.
- How would the dog be held responsible if the owner doesn't stay on scene? How can you identify the dog without this in place?
- My dog has been attacked at the dog park and the perpetrator and their husky/GSD left. I was unable to get contact info for vet reparations. It would be great to hold people more accountable.
- If a dog bites a person or animal, the dog owner should be required to share contact information with the affected individuals. As a former victim of a dog bite, the owner of the dog who bit me did not provide any contact info or vaccination status info for the dog. This led to me requiring extra vaccinations and months of worry over a potential rabies infection. If the owner had been required to share contact information, the vaccination status of the dog could have been checked.
- Better chance of owners being held responsible.
- it would be akin to remaining at the scene of a car crash or any other incident involving an injury
- In case the dog has an infection, it would be good to ensure that they stay at the scene
- Yes. If you fail to properly train your pet you are the on responsible when an accident occurs.
- The dog owner should be responsible for vet bills and legal action
- I think that all people involved in the incident should have to remain at the scene. People assume its the large dog that is always the problem. Often, small, yappy dogs instigate many instances but don't get blamed because of their size. Having any specific legislation against any specific breeds is absolutely ridiculous. Owners of all dogs should be held accountable but it has nothing to do with breed.
- I support it.
- The same as a car accident or any incident where there is a damage to a person or pet
- Yes, the owner of the dog that bit another person or animal should be responsible for this behavior and should stay at the scene.
- All dog owners are responsible for their dogs and their behaviour. If they cannot control the dog, they should not be in charge of one.
- Owner should be required to pay expenses resulting from his /her dogs damage
- Just makes sense.
- It's no different than the requirement to stay at the scene of a car accident.
- Owning a pet means you accept responsibility when it misbehaves. Should your dog bite, the owner should be there to provide a statement and contact details.
- I agree with this, but I doubt you could enforce it. There are never enforcement officers around in the parks, so the dog owner with decide what they will or won't do. Decent owners will stay and deal with the situations. Jerk owners will just leave. If they leave and the person or owner of a dog attacked, is able to somehow identify the aggressor, that person needs to be charged and fined for leaving.
- I think having the pet owner remain at the scene is just common sense. Information and feedback from the pet owner would be crucial in making decisions about each case if they went to a tribunal.



- I totally agree in the sense that it is the owners fault at the end of the day. I do believe irresponsible owners should be the ones penalized for their animals actions.
- Yes and witnesses may be asked to stay as well. To protect the breeds you are vilifying from being victim to prejudice if the other animal has instigated/antagonized
- Unless there is a need for an emergency vet, I think it only makes sense for both parties to exchange information just like a traffic incident
- Don't leave the scene of an accident nt no matter the type.
- I suppose, I just hope that this doesn't make people make things appear worse than they were.
- I think absolutely nessary to enforce owner of dog that bites to remain and do the right thing to prevent alot of unacceptablity and reduce reoffencesive
- Yes, everyone need to be responsible for their or their pets actions.
- In the event of injury the owner should be required to compensate the injured party if necessary.
- It no different then an accident where one person is a fault and they need to provide info.
- Kind of like a car accident. Makes sense.
- They need to be there to assume responsibility.
- It's important to find out crucial information like vaccine history of the dog who did the biting.
- Part of being a responsible pet owner
- The owner needs to take responsibility and work with an enforcement officer to find the best course of action.
- The owner needs to be 100% responsible for their dog.
- 100 % owner needs to take responsibility of the actions of their dogs behaviour
- I like the idea of a tribunal but it needs to have mutilple individuals with a unanimous decision
- A response of 'no' to this question would create a double standard for dog owners and imply that they are not fully accountable for the actions of the animals they keep. The onus should not be on the victim to ensure that an offender doesn't leave the scene.
- It's important to get contact information and perhaps vaccination history from the owner in case the bitten person/animal requires medical/vet attention.
- Why would this not be a given responsiblity of a dog owner?
- A dog's owner is responsible for the dog's behaviour in public spaces.
- There needs to be accountability for animal behaviour, and that accountability rests on the shoulder of the owner.
- It is too easy for the offending dog owner to simply walk away.
- Although I support it as frequently the owner is not present, I am not sure how this could be enforced
- That's a courtesy. Otherwise it's like a hit and run
- of course! if they leave how does the officer know anything
- Anything but staying at the scene of the crime should be akin fleeing the scene of a crime.
- I'm surprised to learn this isn't already a requirement.
- Treat it like any accident. It's a hit and Run if they leave without sharing contact information.



- A dog owner allowed to leave the scene of an incident can be difficult to trace. At least with a rule to stay at the scene there is some chance of reconciling the incident with those involved.
- It depends on the situation. If the dog actively looked to attack another pet or person, then the contact information should be given to an officer to keep an eye on the dog in case it is vicious. If a person or animal provoked the dog into defending itself, then it should not be necessary, as self-defense is not the same thing as viciousness.
- the obvious accountability that's required
- The owner needs to be responsible for the animal in their care, whatever type of pet animal it is.
- no need for an explanation it's just the right thing to do. And if you don't know that you shouldn't own a dangerous dog
- Responsible dog ownership should be mandatory for all dog owners regardless of breed
- Sharing of information should be required. Only if other commitments eg. child care, are not negatively effected by waiting for enforcement officer.
- no different than remaining at the scene of a vehicle collision
- As long as they leave there information before they leave
- Seems sensible.
- This is a similar approach used for vehicle accidents.
- If I am required to stay at the scene of an auto accident, this seems reasonable as well. Simply a matter of personal responsibility.
- Just as with a human incident/accident where it is a responsible behavior to stay and report an incident or accident.
- Pending on sevaritu not a nip and. Not an over embellished case of some one looking for a hand out or pay day !
- It is as much, if not moreso, that the responsibility should fall on the owner of the dog to have control on their dog in public. To make sure all parties are safe, so such incidents do not repeat in the future.
- Similar to vehicle accidents the owners should be held responsible.
- I think if a dog bites, they owner is responsible for the situation.
- Failing to provide important information by leaving the scene of an incident puts victim at greater risk.
- All pet owners are responsible for their actions as well as the actions of their dog. If their dog has injured a person or another dog they should ensure their contact information is shared in case the injured party requires medical attention.
- The owner should be present to exchange information with by law officer and those impacted.
- Many owners take off and leave the victim or other animal hurt.
- Why wouldn't they have to?
- This is still an assault and needs to be reported appropriately.
- All pet owners are responsible for the actions of their pets and must not be allowed to walk away from the incident.



- I have had my dog bitten and the other dog and owner fled the scene leaving me with a \$1000. vet bill.
- The dog owner takes responsibility and should not be allowed to leave the scene of the crime.
- Gee, that's just consideration - - but, the officer needs to listen to the dog owner and be reasonable too. Otherwise, no-one will stay.
- This would show responsibility as a pet owner as well as towards the victim in a serious incident.
- It's similar to a car accident in that people should exchange info and wait for the police
- It is similar to a hit and run situation. They shouldn't leave the scene.
- Just like in a car accident, the harm caused may not be reveal right away. In addition, now that we know covid-19 can infect dogs and dogs can infect people, this can be the only way to track covid-19 spread.
- An incident like this is traumatic, but it is taken to the next level when the dog owner disappears. I consider it akin to a hit-and-run accident with a vehicle and pedestrian.
- The owner is at fault, not the animal.
- Been involved in a few incidents where another dog bit my dog and the owner refused to acknowledge/stay there to resolve the issue.
- They are responsible for their dog and should be accountable for its actions and make sure they are available to answer any questions or respond to any concerns.
- I think any responsible pet owner would voluntarily stay at the scene of an incident to exchange info/make a statement, but there are jackasses out there. Unfortunately we have to pander to them.
- This requirement would place more responsibility upon the dog owner. In such an instance as described, if the dog owner were to leave, then it would very much be a "hit and run" with a motor vehicle. How many of us have had "dings" in a parking lot without anyone owning up?
- It is very easy for a dog owner to walk away and how would you ever find out who he was or track down the dog
- Entirely irresponsible for an owner to leave the scene.
- Part of being a responsible pet owner means taking responsibility for your pet and their actions, therefore you should be willing to provide your contact information for follow-up when there has been an incident involving your pet
- We want to discourage the immediate instinct to hide your dog and deny that it was your dog, if found.
- Veterinary care for the victim should also be the responsibility of the owner of the animal that bit.
- As a responsible dog owner, I it is important for the owner to stick around, same as if it were a car accident.
- No different than a driver leaving the scene of an accident. Dog owners should be exchanging information in the event of an incident (excepting an owner that has to race their pet to emergency care). Owners who leave or refuse to provide truthful information should be fined.
- The person needs to take responsibility for the actions of their pet.
- if it is severe enough
- It's the correct think to do



- This is needed for owners to take responsibility for their animal in SEVERE cases, but what about minor bites?
- ONLY if the dog bites a person. Dog fights and bites if they are at a dog park is a risk you are willingly taking if you go to a dog park.
- It is important to know if the offending dog is up-to-date with Veterinary vaccinations. Also the victim should be able to bill the Offender for any medical or vet costs. And is this the first time or one of many?
- Bites should be tracked to determine if a particular dog has a history of biting.
- only to make sure the information of the incident and personal information of the dog owner is given rightfully to law enforcement, the victim should not be bothered beyond reasonable time
- Owners are responsible for their dogs actions
- This seems obvious? If someone assaults someone else and the police are called they need to be restrained until the police arrive.
- if I get bitten at a park and the owner and dog walk away, I have no recourse, and the incident could happen again
- dogs can't talk
- Must take responsibility but also to so the enforcement officer may hear both sides of the story. It is not always the dog's fault and there must be an investigation, not just a fine.
- Dog owners need to be responsible for their pets behavior
- Owner should be expected to take responsibility for their pet.
- I hear too often of people or pets being bit and the other person leaving
- My dog was once bitten and the owner offered to pay the bills. Later I heard that the biting dog had a history of biting. This policy would alleviate the likelihood of multiple bites through record-keeping and possible fines, training etc
- A person is responsible for their pets actions.
- For a dog biting a person I believe the owner should have to stay at the scene.
- I think it is comparable to a car accident. Whether it is minor or major, If the damage caused by the pet are severe enough that follow up information or care is needed the victim should have the information from the owner who had the aggressive pet. during an attack or incident the shock can stop people from thinking clearly and the situation cannot be dealt with properly.
- Obviously to be available for next steps in process and to take responsibility
- Dog bites are serious and should be taken as seriously as a car collision. This is REGARDLESS of breed. Small dog bites can become severely infected and cause serious trauma as well.
- People need to stay at the scene of a car collision, they also need to stay at the scene of somewhere their dog caused a problem to better track nuisance dogs and to better ensure that impacted people/animals are getting adequate help.
- contact information shall be given to the injured party if injury occurred
- Absolutely owners need to be responsible no matter the size or breed
- Other incidents, like traffic collisions, require the parties remain at the scene, these incidents should too.



- Accountability/responsible pet ownership.
- "Yes to staying on scene if the owner is around to exchange info. Not if a person has to wait around for a bylaw officer... should be able to
- Report that day."
- The victim should know the history of the dog and be able to seek compensation from the owner. The owner needs to be fined.
- Responsible pet ownership means taking accountability.
- Too many incidents where dog bites occur and owners do not take responsibility and leave the scene without identifying and contact information!
- Need all the info for bites.
- Follow up will need the exchange of details
- You are responsible for your dog. It would be no different than leaving the scene of an accident or crime.
- This sounds like common sense!
- Any incident where there is a question of liability, parties involved in said incident should remain on scene if authorities are required to be called. **Except where medical care is required or a party is leaving in order to gain control of their pet. (I.e: chasing a loose dog to prevent other incidents)
- liability, learning from the past.
- It is the respectful thing to do. And you can see what kind of person the owner is.
- absolutely the owner is responsible for their pet if your dog bites someone you better be staying there to talk to the police
- Owners must be identified in case charges must be laid
- If my dog had bitten someone or another animal I would surely call police to report the incident and I would stay there so I could explain the incident. That way no one can lie.
- They have the responsibility to stay and share as much information as they can.
- I think both parties should remain on scene. Not just the dog owner and the dog who bite someone or another animal.
- Owners need to take full responsibility of their pet, no matter what! If a dog bites anyone, it is the owner who is accountable.
- Owners must be made accountable for the actions of their animals.
- a dog owner should be held responsible. And also both sides of the story should be taken. Not all bite cases are one sided and this should also be taken into account. What if a dog is leashed and is walking and a dog off leash is running and the dog on the leash bites because they feel threatened. The owner with the dog off leash should also have to answer to this.
- No different than any other assault. Contact information needs to be supplied for legal and/or medical issues.
- People need to be accountable for their dogs behaviour



- If a dog bites a person, yes. If a dog bites another dog, it is a bit more of a grey area. Was there a provoked attack? was there no injury? seems like this might be very hard to enforce and have clear guidelines.
- To many people run away to avoid taking responsibility of the actions of their dogs and them selves
- The owner is responsible for the dog or whatever animal. They have a ethical and vicarious responsible to remain at the scene of the incident. Significant fines should be imposed if they do not.
- Any reasonable pet owner and considerate human being should absolutely stay at the site of an incident!
- Ultimately dog ownership is a responsibility and if your dog has harmed another animal or person then you need to be held responsible for a lack of training/supervision. Being available to confirm information is the least that can be asked.
- Yes if the person who is bitten would wants them to
- It's not always the dogs fault they bite a person or another animal. The "victim" could have done something to that dog or to it's owner. If we won't put murders, rapist, and molesters why are we putt down dogs?
- Owner needs to be held accountable
- I would hope the owner would be responsible and want to assist with whatever else may be required. If my dog bit someone, I would definitely want to make sure that person is ok and if not, provide any help/information they may need.
- It is necessary that the dogs vaccination and/or health record be available
- Owners need to stay and provide all the information regarding their dog
- The owner needs to be able to provide contact information and health information for the dog (vaccinations, etc.). If they don't do so, the health of the bitten person or animal is at greater risk, and this is unacceptable.
- Dog bites are a serious matter, however they reflect the environment of the dog and not the breed. In my experience, most dog bites are smaller breeds (chihuahua, terriers).
- I think this can be hard because it is also nice for everyone if the dog leaves asap. However, most important is that the dog owner takes responsibility and discusses with the victim what is best.
- The dog must be found and the owner sued, so you have to know who it is.
- Having a dog in the family is serous and a responsibility, and as such people need to treat their dog with respect and accept the responsibility it involves.
- If a person or pet is injured, there should be means to contact the owner of the animal responsible.
- For bites on people or their pets, I believe this would be a good rule, but not for all animals such as squirrels and birds.
- There has been many times I have seen owners walk away from their animal biting or attacking others, and have refused to give a name or even accept responsibility for their uncontrollable behavior. At least if there is a responsibility to remain on scene, the attack could be recorded, and the behavior (in the owner and pet) can be addressed. I would only see this as a deterrent if the



enforcement officer cannot be on scene in a very timely manner. A park is easy enough to walk away from, and no one is going to stick around for more than two minutes.

- Yes absolutely the owner no matter the breed or size should be held 100% responsible
- Sometimes that dog is an asshole because it's not trained properly . Ideally, this sort of intervention would encourage the human to train the dog.
- As a veterinarian, I commonly see dogs bite (even kill) other dogs, or bite people, but the offending dog's owner leaves which is disgraceful. Make it an offence for anyone to leave the scene of such an incident.
- The owner should be held responsible for what their animal does and should therefore be mandated to provide the necessary info and documents
- If their dog bites a person or more likely another dog the circumstances could dictate that they are responsible for vet coverage.
- The owners are often the root of the problem & they must speak to the officer with all the pertinent information given to the officer
- There needs to be accountability in the incident and the owners need to be documented if required.
- I've been bitten and the owner disappeared sharpish before I could ask for ID.
- I support this unless it is necessary to remove the dog from the scene to de-escalate the situation or reduce fear for the victim. In this case, the owner should provide full contact details for follow-up by the bylaw officer or call in the leave contact information prior to leaving.
- Owner needs to take responsibility, otherwise it may occur again.
- It's the same as an automotive accident or if two persons were involved in a fight you should remain at the scene until statements and contact info can be given to police.
- Responsible and respectful to stay
- The per owner is equivalent to an Auto driver at an accident scene.
- An decent dog owner would stay behind to make sure the other dog / person is okay and provide necessary support / help if needed. This shouldn't need to be a rule, but I completely support it.
- It would depend on the severity of the bite.
- Getting the offending animal's information is critical for ensuring people/pets who are bitten, know if they are at-risk for communicable disease. Additionally if the bite requires the city intervene, it might save city resources (or allow a mechanism to recover costs) locating an animal no longer present.
- The owner is responsible for the boundaries of their own pet. They should be the ones to take the blame and be there if enforcement is necessary.
- Just like a vehicle collision , both parties are required to provide all pertinent documents so continuity can be established
- A person should have to stay to provide contact information so that bylaw could follow up and provide warnings or tickets as needed.
- Your pet your responsibility.
- It's just a matter of being. A courteous dog owner
- Yes and No. It depends on the severity of bite and the circumstances behind that bite.
- How else would they be held responsible if they can just leave.



- In the event of a future lawsuit, personal information on the dog owner is necessary.
- "It's like a car accident.
- You need to exchange information - not just walk away.
- However, their dog may need to go in a car or their yard to prevent further incidents."
- If they left, it would be like a hit and run.
- My daughter has been 'assaulted' (not bitten) by aggressive dogs and the owners just slink away. I'd have no way of contacting them if an injury is found.
- This allows enforcement of the above measures.
- Responsible pet ownership involves being responsible for your pet. You are required to stay at the scene of any other injury accident and this should be no different. With the obvious caveat that the offending animal has to be under control and not causing further harm potentially.
- A dog owner should take responsibility for the actions of their pet.
- Dogs are an increasing nuisance and danger in Calgary. Owners need to be held accountable for their animals.
- Similar reasoning as not leaving the scene of an accident/crime.
- A responsible dog owner would stay at the scene
- the owner must be held responsible, and
- Yes, absolutely. Owners must remain accountable for their dog's actions. If your car caused an accident, would you flee the scene (hopefully not, as that would be illegal) ? By everyone being upfront with the incident, it hopefully brings out the truth in the incident and causes all parties involved to look at their actions that may need to change in order to avoid the incident again.
- The owner should be able to tell their side of the story, like if their dog was being hassled or teased by someone before that person was bitten.
- Damage to property or person has occurred. I see this as no different than a hit and run in a motor vehicle.
- It's obvious, no enforcement can take place if there is no information.
- Absolutely!!! One dog bit my dog, and the dog walker just walked off and said "Not my dog" like they didn't care. I found out she was walking her daughter's dog. It took me 6 weeks to track the owner down.
- It is common courtesy!
- All sides of what happened need to be documented. A friend daughter was bit and she had to post on facebook to find the owner.
- If a dog attacks owner should be responsible for any medical bills. STOP BULLYING PIT BULLS, they are not the most violent dog, it is disgusting that you want to hurt them for no reason.
- The officer should be able to hear both sides of the event
- If the owner is not responsible enough to remain at the site of a dangerous incident to explain the situation to law enforcement then they are already exhibiting irresponsible behaviour that will likely lead to another incident in the future.
- Leaving the scene of an accident is a crime. Why should a dog attack be any different?



- to verify and observe the animal at the time it happens can make an assessment of situation at that time.
- I have had a personal experience of my dog being attacked by another dog and the owner leaves the scene with the dog
- It is similar to a car accident - both stories should be gathered.
- Responsible pet ownership.
- How on earth would this be enforced?
- I've been at the dog park multiple times and my dog has been attacked (thankfully nothing severe) and the owners of said dogs didn't even come check to see if my dog was okay, or tell the dog he was wrong for attacking my dog therefore reenforcing the aggressive behaviour. I believe this will help keep owners accountable for their dogs actions
- It's an accident and the owner should be held liable for damages.
- good time to educate owner and assess the dog behaviour and what led up to the incident. Increase dog ownership responsibility. Testing for disease
- The owner of the offending dog needs to be required to proffer identification so that follow-up can be exercised!!
- Dog behaviours are trained into or out of. Responsibility falls onto the owner.
- No different than a car accident
- I don't think this is a yes or no answer. It depends on the situation and the situation can be assessed by the owners and then a determination can be made if law enforcement would be required.
- A description of the incident (at the site of incident) should be mandatory by all involved parties.
- Just as in any incident where an injury has occurred, the parties involved should be required to exchange information for future needs
- If the dog is attacking others, it should be recorded, including information from the dog owner.
- The owner of the dog needs to be responsible for any costs involved in treating the bite. A bite may seem initially minor but can easily become infected. Also, the incident needs to be on record and if this is recurring behaviour for the pet, bylaw needs to further address with the owner.
- Owners are responsible for their dogs actions. Both parties involved should stay at the scene to answer questions by-law may have. This will also help eliminate 'he said, she said' and hold owners more accountable.
- If there is any kind of altercation or attack involving two humans or a dog and a human, it is basic human courtesy to exchange information. This will ensure that the injured party is not left without help.
- All vet bills must be paid by owner of nuisance dog
- It's the appropriate behaviour for any responsible and mature adult
- How can we follow it up otherwise
- It's the equivalent of a traffic accident
- As a responsible pet owner you need to stay and exchange information. Be responsible.
- Especially in a dog park, dog and owner anonymous and quickly disappear



- People should be responsible for their pets. If you were in a car accident, you would need to stay at the scene, I'd think a dog bite would be similar. Provided it doesn't create more trauma for all parties involved.
- I think this is similar to a traffic incident. All owners need shared information. This is also necessary for health risks.
- Self explanatory - just like a car accident, you remain at the scene and exchange information.
- It is the owner responsibility for the dogs action. Bad dogs are almost always bad owners.
- Be responsible and provide both sides of the situation
- Without staying at the scene, how would the offending party be charged with an offense properly?
- Owner should be held responsible
- It's important they take responsibility.
- A bite can happen with any dog if it is scared or surprised. The owner has a responsibility to stay to help
- Owners should stay at scene to provide information on the health of the animal, i.e rabies, distemper, etc.
- Pet owners must be held accountable. You shouldn't own an animal if you cannot control it.
- Of course people need to take responsibility for any injury caused by their pet(s).
- A person's property (dog) has injured another person. If it was a car accident, you have to remain at the scene.
- Not to be harassed by any parties, including officers obtaining information. Simply there to exchange information with parties involved.
- Similar to any accident particularly involving an injury, you should exchange information to place an insurance claim
- The dog can't explain to the officer.
- I think that's good etiquette, if the bite is serious enough
- I think it should follow the same idea as cars- if there's serious damage (or in this case a bite) that requires a large number of stitches or surgery then yes. But a nip or a small bite, especially if the person wasn't properly interacting with the animal, shouldn't require enforcement officers
- My dog was attacked by a pit bull puppy and the owner disappeared with his dog while I was left with a bleeding badly damaged dog and the by law officers could not find the owner or the dog.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs
- dog owner responsible for dogs behavior
- This is most crucial and important for all involved! One that does not stay on scene is fined heavily and/or loses their dog (not by euthanasia unless in serious cases)! The dog owner must know/provide all recent information on vaccinations etc. via their veterinarian office, not just in person. Yes, all parties information should be exchanged just like a vehicle accident.
- It is unacceptable that a dog owner should be allowed to leave the scene of their dog's bite incident without sharing their contact information. That would be similar to drivers being allowed to leave the scene of a car accident without reporting the incident or sharing their contact information.



- It is important to get all sides of the story and for declarations to be recorded by an enforcement officer
- A dog owner is responsible for his animal's behaviour! Avoid bite and run incidents.
- It's like the scene of an accident you were involved in - you don't leave, it's just not right.
- Of course why would they be allowed to leave? How would you be able hold the owner accountable? Shocking this was not LAW or mandatory already.
- Process becomes hindered or rendered useless if the offending pet owner/pet leaves the scene of the incident
- Owner must be accountable for the dogs behavior
- Absolutely. Responsibility must be taken for the course of action. It is like a car accident. Leaving the scene is kind of like a hit and run.
- The owner of the dog is responsible for its behaviour. It is important to have the owner's perspective, as well as those involved in the incident.
- Similar to a car accident, we do not want “dog hit and runs”
- It's like a car accident. It makes sense to exchange information and ask for witnesses. It helps both the victim and the offender
- If your dog bite someone or another dog you should share contact info or talk to police. That way you can inform the officer what happened. I.E was your dog provoked.
- If you dog causes injury to another you have to fully pay the vet bills.
- Owners should shoulder the accountability and be mandated to accept responsibility and additional dog training.
- Same rule as traffic incident. Staying at the scene and providing contact info seems basic common decency.
- To ensure the owner of the animal takes responsibility for the animal.
- Very important to understand if the dog is vaccinated against rabies. Owners must be responsible.
- Every person is responsible for the actions of their animal.
- There are too many irresponsible dog owners who thinks it's okay to off leash in parks. I got experience bitten by a dog but the owner didn't seem to care.
- The owner is the responsible one. The victim or officers should not have to find them. Isn't this obvious?
- Dog owners need to be held responsible for their pets. Just like a driver involved in an accident has to provide their contact details, so should dog owners have to do so.
- I think it's important to be held accountable and to make sure that it is clear about an animals history with the authorities
- "If possible, the owner should remain on seen. The owner should understand that there are 2-sides to every story, and they are the voice of their dog. A dog does not attack or bite unprovoked. If the dog was provoked, it is extremely important to outline exactly why the attack/bite occurred so the party responsible for provoking the dog is dealt with in appropriate fashion.
- There are a number of reasons why a dog and owner might leave the seen if a bite has occurred. The main, would be the safety of the dog and surrounding people. If a bite occurred, the dog may be



stressed out and/or nervous. Remaining on scene with the dog could pose further risk of incident. If this is of concern, the owner and dog should leave the scene, and return once their dog is safe.

- As a pet owner, your main responsibility is your dog. You must do what is necessary to keep your dog safe, which in this case may be to leave the scene."
- Regardless of the breed, I think it's the right thing to do - as the owner of the dog you should remain at the scene of the incident. If someone or an animal is injured by your dog it's your responsibility to share contact information and take to an enforcement officer if necessary.
- Owner's are responsible for their dog's actions and should be held accountable when injuries/attacks occur.
- "All witnesses should remain at the scene including the owner.
- This way all statements can be recorded and the facts will determine the true sequence of events."
- This is no different than a vehicle hit and run. If they do not remain, especially if a human is bit, charges should then be laid under the remain at a scene scenario.
- The owner is responsible and must be present.
- Accountability of ownership is needed. Poor ownership is the reason for dog issues. Abuses to animals needs have higher importance. It's too easy for anyone to get a dog or cat.
- Only if one of the dogs or people has an injury that may require stitches or a trip to the vet for assessing injury(s)
- Owners should be held accountable
- If a dog bites a person or other animal the owner should share contact information in case bites lead to further complications for the human, other dog or the dog itself. Example: infections
- Dog owners should have to exchange info by law, not stay on scene.
- No different than a car accident. Having the owner remain on the scene will help ensure the incident is correctly reported and assessed.
- Also the victim and bystanders should stay too
- A dog is a possession and if a possession causes damage, like a car, the owner is accountable. Leaving the scene should result in an additional fine.
- It is simply responsible dog ownership. But it has to be a purposeful bite, not a playful nip. Dogs often play by mouthing. But if it is an intentional dog bite, the owner needs to be accountable.
- 100%
- They absolutely should be required to stay at the scene. A guilty party will run away from the scene right? They should be there to give their side of the story, same with any witnesses.
- There are instances where the dog was provoked by someone, often a child. The owner has requested that the people stay away from their dog and are ignored. They can explain their actions to the officer.
- owners are and should be held responsible.
- Your responsibility is to stay.
- The Owner is responsible for their pet and needs to be held accountable for all actions. If they can't deal with this, they should not be owning an animal.
- The owner needs to be responsible for their dog's behaviour.



- So many times I have heard of owners running away and then the owner who has experienced the attack has no recourse and the dangerous animal continues to roam. Frankly, I'm surprised this is not a requirement already.
- The owner needs to take responsibility. Leaving the scene means that owner potential has minimal or no consequences.
- Without this rule, a dog owner has no responsibility for the dog. Unthinkable!
- Just like a car accident, a dog is only as bad as it's owner. It's the owners fault not the dogs.
- I have had a dog owner give me a bogus phone number after their dog bit mine and mine obviously required stitches.
- If the accident occurred, the person involved should have to give statement.
- Yes if safe to do so (nobody is injured or an animal is out of control and needs to be removed from the situation). It Would help gather information on repeat owners and dogs as well as if they have other animals. Also allows for responsible parties to be held accountable and/or the situation to be investigated. And any medical history can be provided.
- Deterrent for irresponsible owners to leave the scene without providing information. May expedite the resolution of issues and prevent them from going to court down the road if an enforcement officer comes to the scene.
- If they leave they should be fined
- Yes, being a dog owner means that I am responsible for their actions. No dog needs to be euthanized however for actions like this. Use training instead of euthanizing several dogs.
- There needs to be accountability by all parties. So all parties should be required to talk with the enforcement officer as soon as makes sense.
- Dog owners shall be responsible for the actions of their animals
- Dependent of severity of bite and circumstance. Example; nipping vs. Biting intending harm. And dog feeling threatened or defending its self against another dog.
- No different than the rule regarding hit-and-runs in the Traffic Act. Stay and report.
- This is just common courtesy. But it may not always be possible if the owner is the only person with the dog. The owner may need to leave to secure the dog somewhere away from the scene, then return.
- Often incidents happen and the victim has no way of identifying the dog or owner if that info is not shared. A bite could lead to serious infection/health issues that would require such identity. Many owners just walk away from an incident. We are not allowed to do so following a vehicle accident and dog bites could be just as serious. Owners need to start taking a way more responsibility for their actions as owners. Things are getting ridiculous in Calgary. I often do not feel safe walking on paths in Calgary, because animals are so out of control. How can an animal stay to right on path when the owner uses their left hand with the leash?
- If the incident escalated beyond the two parties sorting it out. Have them call a bylaw officer.
- May it law, not a rule, for those dishonourable people who will not automatically stay as a matter of course.
- The context of the event is lost if they are allowed to leave the scene of the incident.



- This should already be a rule
- Owners must be responsible for their dogs.
- If a dog bites someone one time, accidents happen. If a dog constantly bites, then it is a nuisance, and one way to confirm repeated offenders would be by having the owner share their contact information/talk to an officer (especially if it's a bite that requires medical attention).
- This is imperative. Dog owners must take responsibility for their pet and accept the consequences if their dog bites another person.
- If people or animals are hurt because of a dog in your possession why wouldn't you stay to provide your information and side of the story.
- Its the responsible thing to do.
- My friend was bit by a dog and the owner picked the dog up, walked away, and said nothing. Owners should have to take responsibility of their pets actions. Exchange of information is necessary in case of later medical problems or anything. Enforcement offers don't necessarily need to be involved, the victim can decided if they feel like they need cops involved. But for the most part they should at lea set be required to exchange information.
- As an owner, they should be responsible for their dogs' actions, so they should be at the scene to deal with the repercussions such as provide support to the victim.
- That person is responsible for any damages occurred during an incident. All parties involved, and witnesses should have their information and statements taken for future disputes over the incident... Just like a car accident.
- Otherwise the owners run away with the dog and you have no idea who they were or where they live. How can you take any legal action if you don't know the owner?
- A dog Owner should be available to provide a statement and accept full or partial responsibility as ruled by a tribunal) in regards to medical costs and restitution etc.
- People should be responsible for their animals and take accountability for their actions. If an attack was provoked or was not the fault of the animal that should also be taken into account as they have limited defenses available to them.
- If the bite is serious, and if the person bitten/guardian of that person or owner of bitten animal wants them too
- The owner absolutely should be required to remain at the scene to ensure proper processes are followed and take responsibility for the dogs actions. Additionally, there are usually 2 sides to every story and the dog owner should be allowed to state their view of what happened.
- If there is an incident where someone overreacts, this could be a good way to properly assess the situation.
- Do not understand why they would not be required to remain at the scene of an incident where someone or another animal was injured.
- Owners should be accountable for their pets.
- "Would depend entirely on the people involved and severity of the situation as well
- If it's not something that requires medical attention then it should just be up to the parties involved."



- Only Yes if the owner is able to. In some situations it might be better to remove the dog(s) and have information relayed by another person
- Seems like a common sense measure. If my child attacked someone I would be expected to do the same.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions . . . no matter what type of pet it is.
- Both parties should remain at the scene and exchange information like they would if it was a car accident. It is incredibly stressful for any person to endure an attack on them or their pet. This is a minimum courtesy.
- If the owner will not be discriminated against based on their dog's breed and if all factors surrounding the bite are taken into account, including the 'victim dog's behaviour and owner's behaviour...yes I believe the person whose dog did the biting should remain at the scene but if staying means a witch hunt and an unfair and discriminatory trial, I could see why someone might leave the scene.
- This would indicate the owner accepts responsibility and hopefully make resolution to the incident faster
- Better tracking for problematic owners that don't properly care for their pets.
- It is similar to hitting a car as you have caused damage to someone or their property. as such there are certain steps that need to be taken to ensure that the issue is resolved
- Taking ownership of your dog and your actions regarding training, unhealthy environment where its raised, etc. is the sole responsibility of the owner. The dog only knows what it has been taught, which is to be aggressive. The owner needs to be held accountable for the actions that occurred.
- It is only common sense and the actions of a responsible citizen and pet owner (or the care giver assigned to the animal in question)
- Unless immediate medical attention is needed for a person or animal they should remain at the scene.
- Dog owners are responsible for the actions of their dogs, so they must remain at the scene of an incident to provide whatever information an enforcement officer needs.
- This would increase owner accountability and ensure that the appropriate measures are taken swiftly.
- Owners must be accountable for their pets!
- It would be like a driver leaving the scene of an accident, they most certainly should remain at the scene.
- A qualified yes, as it may or may not be better to actually create some distance to facilitate treatment or to remove the dog to prevent additional problems.
- If someone's dog injures a person or another animal, they absolutely need to take responsibility and face consequences.
- The owner of the dog that attacks another dog or human should always remain at the scene and pay for any vet/medical costs. It's the moral and courteous thing to do. If they don't stay, they should be fined.



- It's a common courtesy. Sometimes because the affected may be upset and one or more parties may need to leave the scene, it is important to provide contact information to bylaw/authorities for further communications.
- They should remain at the scene of the incident or face a fine for leaving.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions. Part of this responsibility is remaining and explaining, advocating, apologizing and accepting actions required.
- The owner needs to take responsibility for his pets actions.
- Dog owner is responsible for his dog he should take accountability for his dogs behaviour
- Humans must be fully responsible for their pets.
- It is their animal and should be held responsible.
- How are you suppose to find someone who takes off during an incident like that? We have to stay after a car accident, same should go.
- Should be current practice
- Only because, from my experience, the larger animal is always to blame when they did not instigate confrontation were merely defending themselves. Human passerby need to understand how to approach and greet dogs. See a lot of people rush up or make quick movements getting around dogs which startles them. By sticking around the 'scene' the owner can atleast explain and defend their side of the story.
- Yes, assuming the aggressive dog is not in range for a second attack.
- To resolve any conflict
- More information can be obtained to better track nuisance dogs and bad owners
- Shows owner responsibility
- Innocent until proven guilty, most of these incidents seem to be caused by the other parties bating the dog or not controlling their little dogs that go crazy at other dogs, because small dog owners seem to think that little dogs don't need training.
- If there is a history of the dog biting people, any new bites can be properly recorded.
- I support this except in the case when the animals require immediate veterinary care. If a dog fight has occurred and the animals need care, an exchange of information should be sufficient so that the animals can receive treatment.
- I have been attacked by a dog before, the owner brought me to the hospital but there wasn't any exchange of information afterwards
- accountability
- I'm surprised this isn't already the law. You should have to stay if you dog bites someone until they say it ok for you to leave.
- I have heard of numerous incidents where an aggressive dog attacks another dog at a dog park, then just leaves without taking responsibility for the aggressive dog or the damage/injury.
- There have been incidents in the past when we were children where myself or my siblings have had our own dog attacked by other dogs while walking, and a number of their owners have been of the mindset that clearly it's not their fault and just leave, leaving us with an injured animal and no idea



what to do from there. (One incident had myself at 14 and my brother at 8, what asshole decides these weeping children trying to help their dog should be told to get over it and leave?)

- If their dog bites a person or animal, remaining on the scene to give contact information or talk with enforcement officer is essential if say the bite causes the affected person an injury (ex: rabies) and that person with the dog needs to pay for the injury caused.
- More emphasis needs to be on the dog owner not the breed. If people were screened prior to getting a dog, less incidents would occur. Not the dogs fault if they were not trained.
- Owners need to be held accountable for the actions of their pets and there are always 2 sides to a story
- I support this if it's a serious bite. If it's only a nip and no blood drawn then I don't see a reason for this.
- This should include small dogs as well!!!! I have had more small dogs attack my large breed and never a large dog.
- I feel that the officer needs to take a witness statement from both parties. The statements can also serve as a record for any future incidents involving the same dog. The officer should also follow up with both parties to ensure that the owner of the dog that was attacked was reimbursed for any vet fees.
- Dog owners should be held liable for the actions of their dog.
- The owner is responsible for training a dog and keeping them under your control in public. Any behavior of the dog is the owner's responsibility.
- All dogs, it just breed specific
- Mandatory for sure
- As long as this applies to ALL dogs not just specific breeds.
- Bites that break the skin and cause bleeding or damage to a person or pet should stay at the scene.
- Any owner should be responsible for their dog biting. Regardless the size of dog.
- if necessary, if pet owners are involved in an incident then they should be neighbourly and come to a resolution together. If they don't or can't then they should remain on scene until a bylaw officer is called.
- Absolutely
- Sometimes the owner can help investigators with details they might need.
- Treat it like a car accident. Involved parties must remain on site.
- If the dog actually bit another animal or person hard enough to draw blood.
- As long as the person in question wants to have a report of the dog bite, they should be under law to stay and give their information. If the person that has been bitten does not want to move forward with a complaint than no.
- Responsibility of owner to take control of dog's actions. More training required for fierce or insecure biters.
- Dogs are not the problem. Bad owners are. They should be fined to the limit, have a criminal record, banned from ever owning another pet, and the dog should be rehomed and retrained. NOT euthenized!



- Yes all owners no matter size or breed should take full responsibility
- This way context can be given. Not all dog bites are due to the biting dog's aggressiveness.
- They shouldn't be able to waive their liability by leaving.
- It is no different than a car accident. You still need to give your information/statement or whatever is needed during that time of when the incident happened. I 100% agree that the owner needs to stay n give their information if requested by a enforcement officer only
- "It's not always the dogs fault. Some times the victim aggregates the dog. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners and unfortunate circumstances.
- Remaining at the scene decreases the chance of it seeming suspicious."
- The owner should undertake a role of responsibility for their dog's behaviour and be accountable for it. The dog may have been unjustly provoked so hearing the owner's side of the story is important.
- Accountability for ones pet is a key part of the responsibility of pet ownership. These need to be addressed with behavioural supports for both the owner and the pet. A new owner for example may not understand what is available for mitigating the reactions
- The owner is responsible for socializing the animal, if the animal bit a person, the owner failed and should be held responsible.
- My dog was just chased off by two dogs today. It took us 3 hours to find her and strangers swam into the river to save her. The owner of the dogs took off. I think she should have been held responsible if anything were to happen to my dog as it was her lack of control that caused it. Again, I don't think breed is an issue- it's training.
- Similar to a car accident it should be the owners responsibility to ensure everything is in order. This should apply to everyone regardless of dog breed.
- Yes, as a dog owner, I feel it only prudent to deal with a dog bite, especially if it was my dog biting. I believe that there are good dog owners and bad...not the dog..but the owner's fault and responsibility!!
- The situation should be discussed with the enforcement officer as soon as possible
- The owner has the civil responsibility to stay and offer help and give the support to the victim
- I would also hope that the officer would perhaps be able to provide that owner (of the dog who bit) with information on training/help to manage the issue with the dog. It is not the dogs fault, but the owner's.
- The owner should take responsibility to make sure the person/animal is in a fit state and does not require medical care
- The owner needs to take responsibility.
- The procedure should be no different than an automobile minor accident.
- I feel that if an incident is serious enough to warrant someone wanting to talk with an enforcement officer, then everyone should stay at the scene. First that could help owners of nuisance dogs take their dogs actions more seriously. I also believe that it would be a good way to collect proper and potentially crucial information such as vaccination records on the offending dog (rabies) as then treatment could begin to be administered immediately.
- to make sure this has not happened before and to ensure the animal has had all its shots up to date



- They should be required to provide legitimate information to the victim, but exception should be made if the owner needs to return the animal to a nearby home or vehicle if they lack the ability to safely restrain the animal (such as leash or kennel). If they do choose to remove the animal from the scene additional fine should be placed if they remove any evidence of the attack before an officer can detail it (ie: wash blood off of dog's coat).
- I do agree you should remain on scene to explain the situation. Because somebody could have invaded your personal space and the dog attacked the person invading your personal safety so I think the dog owner should remain on scene to hold idiots who try and pet your dog without permission accountable.
- The owner is responsible for their dog's actions and should be required to take ownership of that responsibility in any given situation.
- Contact information needed for follow up and to record the incident.
- Helps hold owner accountable
- The owner should be held responsible for their dog's behavior.
- It should be obvious that a dog owner needs to remain at the scene, no different than a hit and run.
- Dogs are dangerous and if they hurt someone, the owner should be held accountable.
- Yes, same as any other incident, an owner should be present to provide a report
- I believe the owner should stay on scene I don't believe that it is necessary to wait for enforcement only unless there appears to be a dispute between both parties.
- This also allows the injured person to commence legal action.
- They need to take ownership of their pet
- Owners should definitely be accountable for their dogs and the behaviour of their dogs. Preemptively muzzling all dogs that resemble a pit bull is unnecessary.
- Yes, the owner should stay. I have seen too often where dog owners leave the scene of the incident and then they cannot be found later. And try to hide from the victim so they don't have to be responsible for any part of the attack from their own dog.
- "It is about being responsible for your dog; your training or lack of training of your dog.
- My Wolfhound was bit in the lip by a Terrier while I was getting a coffee. The owner saw me watching and instead of talking to me, he and his dog fled. I had no way of knowing if his dog was up to date on his shots, etc. My Wolfhound didn't do anything except sniff the Terrier when his owner walked up and approached my dog with him.
- What will you do when another person threatens to kill your dog because they are "one of those breeds?" I no longer use the 14th Street off-leash part because a dog owner of (2) Golden Retrievers has threatened to kill my dog, including telling me if he ever found her alone, in my yard or tied up while I am getting a coffee he will take her and kill her. Explain this to me? Explain how this is what Calgary has become? My dog is NOT a pitbull which wouldn't matter if she was but an American Bulldog."



- 100%
- Many times when a bite happens so much anger from the person dog that has been bitten that no one wants to talk with a clear head. More worried about the dog. But just like a car accident information should be shared with all parties involved. Instead he said she said
- The owner of the offending dog must be held accountable for their dog's behaviour including paying for any vet bills incurred by the victim dog's owner.
- Rule should be for any personal injury
- The dog (pet) is the owner's responsibility.
- The City needs to keep a record of dog bites for future reference in determining problem dogs.
- More responsibility from dog owners is a good thing.
- Owning a dog is big responsibility and a lot of people think they can put in little to no work and don't understand why people are upset when their dog is vicious.
- The human should take responsibility of his dog and he should be obligated to consult a professional dog trainer to help his dog.
- This way both sides of the story are met. This is important as it may come down to vet bills or hospital bills if necessary. I don't think it should be narrowed to just Pitbulls as any breed of not raised appropriately can display these nuisance behaviours described. This involves toy breeds as well which often gets overlooked and this is an unfair result. This knowing all angles in decision making is important to determine who antagonized the situation whether it be the other dog or the other person.
- Only if it was an actual dangerous situation.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets.
- If your dog causes injury, you should have to be present to talk to law enforcement. If you flee the scene, there should be a fine.
- Medical information should be required from the owner for shots etc
- Of course. They should have to explain themselves, and if necessary be held responsible for the incident .
- the same should apply for a Dog incident as a car incident.
- This is essential for accountability and for needed medical followup information.
- It's like a remaining at the scene of a car accident. There was damage and information needs to be exchanged
- Even minor dog bites can be serious (infection, trauma, fear, etc.) or in some cases, people have provoked an animal to bite
- The bite victim needs to know medical history of dog (i.e. vaccinated against rabies?). Once contact information has been exchanged, then both parties can go their own way unless peace officer has been called: then should wait.
- Get more details from both sides.
- If the owner cannot restrain the dog sufficiently to maintain safety, the owner must then leave full contact information prior to leaving the scene.
- Why are you even asking this---it's a No Brainer!!!!



- I think this is just common sense
- It is part of the owners responsibility to take responsibility for their actions. No different then if you were involved in a vehicle accident.
- This should be a law already if the authorities have been notified
- Many times people are in shock and so worried about their pet, that they miss the opportunity to get information from the other pet owner.
- Again it is the responsibility of the owners to protect is dog and others around is dog. If a incident happened the owners responsibility is to be sure the other life who is affected by the incident is taking care of .
- people should be required to stay at scene of a bite and exchange info like a car accident. If they leave the scene things like license plate or description should be used to track them down same as a hit and run car accident
- Much like car accidents, the party at fault should not be able to flee the scene after their dog attacks.
- The only time this should ever be an exception is in a dire emergency medical situation. This is without question the what a responsible pet owner should do.
- Spending longer in a shelter will only hurt the dog. The faster these can be resolved, the better
- Dogs are products of their environments. Their owners are the reason the way they are. Period. Don't. Blame. The. Breed.
- Only if it is safe to remain. If they are able to control their dog, on a leash, at the scene, they should stay. If not, they need to take their dog home or to a secure location and then return to the scene.
- Pet owners need to be responsible
- The dog is the responsibility of his/her owner; therefore, the owner should take the necessary precautions to prevent their dog from biting a person or another dog. If a bite occurs, the owner should be expected to speak to an enforcement officer if needed. The owner, though, should NOT be required to give their contact info to the person who was bit.
- This seems like a no-brainer. I frequently get harassed by off leash dogs while out running. A person who is bit needs to know who the owner is so that they can sue the owner.
- There can be expensive vet bills associated or therapy for people that ha d been bitten so knowing contact info can help with insurance claims. Also it is easier then for bylaw to process incidents if the "perpetrator" info is known.
- Just makes sense to remain at the scene.
- Owners must be responsible
- Unless a person saw the incident the true details of it are not necessarily available.
- Yes, but ... how is this enforced if a victim has to leave immediately for Emergency treatment?
- I feel this is apart of the responsibility of the owner to exchange information and hold themselves accountable
- I would consider it like a hit and run. Both parties should remain at the scene and provide contact information for follow up.
- Dog owners need the obedience training



- If the owner is irresponsible they should be held accountable, if the attack was provoked the person that was bitten should also be held accountable.
- If there is a risk or the dogs keep going at each other they should exchange information and attend mediation.
- This way the 'victim' can't paint the dog in a poor light when they were antagonizing or torturing the animal
- Too many pet owners do not take responsibility for their pets actions.
- Your property has caused personal damage to someone, and you're responsible for it, like in a vehicle accident.
- Dog bites/attacks can cause substantial damage to humans, other animals and properties. There should be a way to get a hold of the owner in order to ensure they are aware of damage, the costs and this would also allow information to be easily distributed.
- Just like a traffic accident, all parties should remain on scene or at least close (as long as it is safe) to speaking with an enforcement officer.
- 100% yes! This is no different than having an accident in a car. If your dog bites it should be mandatory to talk to the other party involved and share your information if they want it. There should be huge fines for leaving the scene if ALL parties involved don't agree that it's ok to leave. Running or fleeing the scene should have a "hit and run" style charge.
- Dog owners are responsible for their dog's behavior. I see too many dogs that need obedience training and owners that cannot handle them.
- I feel a dog bite situation is similar to a car accident. If a dog attacks another dog or a person there could be injuries that the owner of the attacking dog should be responsible for financially and a statement should be taken by enforcement so there is documented proof of the incident.
- I feel that dog owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their dogs.
- Yes, the owner must be held responsible and in the case where the victim has no insurance, the owner of the dog that bites should be forced to assist financially.
- Any dogs owner are responsible of their pets any breeds any sizes any physical characteristics it doesn't matter , Owner is responsible for his dog period
- Unless both parties agree that the situation does not require intervention, both should have to remain so the situation can be explained by both parties
- This rule makes perfect sense. However, I don't know how it would be enforced. Generally, when a dog bites, the owner is quick to take off.
- If a dog of ANY breed harms another dog or another person, it is the human thing to do to stay. This goes for all breeds.
- Its same logic as leaving the scene of a crime. One caveat I would add is that the dog in question would need to be appropriately restrained to prevent further injury.
- I think this rule is proof of a responsible pet owner. Accepting responsibility of what your pet or the pet you care for has done. Also allows the pet owner to enlighten the authorities to the specifics of the dog and situation



- Dependent on the level of injury to person/other animal. A small scrap between two dogs does not require an enforcement officer.
- Accountability should be taken when pet owners do not have control over their animals. It happens and it's a scary thing, however, it is still their responsibility to remain at the scene of the incident to explain their side as well as any underlying causes.
- All parties should remain at the scene to provide the proper information with the law enforcement. Not all parties are always willing to cooperate and will need an officer to mediate the situation.
- The owner should be able to be contacted to pay fines, pay vet bills
- It is an injury issue and information must be made available.
- It would be safer for everyone that way. A mediator is needed in these kind of instances.
- When there is an incident involving a dog it is difficult to find the owner or personally identify the dog after they have left the scene. Similarly to a motor vehicle incident.
- Yes absolutely then owner should remain at the scene no matter the size or breed of dog
- A person could be severely hurt from a dog bite. Just like it's considered a "hit and run" in a vehicle incident, it should be considered as a "bite and run" if the dog owner runs away knowing that their animal injured a person.
- No different than hit and run.
- Pretty much common sense
- Owners of dogs who bite should have to share contact info with victims at the very least.
- No different than leaving the scene of a vehicle accident.
- I hit someone with my car I need to stick around. Same dealio here for me. The OWNER is usually the where the problem and main correction lie, NOT in discriminating against certain breeds.
- It makes sense and it holds people accountable
- Responsible behaviour
- It is important for owners to be responsible and provide necessary info such as a proof vaccination if an injury has occurred
- Hold owners accountable they have allowed the dog to be that way
- Pet owners are responsible for their pets and it's actions no matter the breed or size and we should be held accountable for training our pets properly
- Same as vehicle collisions. It may be difficult for enforcement officers to find an owner if they leave the scene.
- This speaks to being a responsible dog owner. If you can't control your dog, you should not have one.
- Yes, the victim needs to be aware of the dog's history and shots
- As any assault, remain at the scene.
- How would you know who they are otherwise? I was bit by a dog, I'm lucky to still have my face... it was a nice dog normally, but even a nice dog can bite and in my opinion those dogs need to be taken care of. If the dog needs to be put down, so no one else gets hurt, then the police need to



know where to go, if medical and therapy bills to recover exceed what a bite victim can pay, Then the dog owner's insurance should pay - just like a car accident victim.

- The owner is responsible for the dogs actions. The owner is responsible for the cost of medical treatment if required
- dog owners must take responsibility for their pets.
- If the bite is severe enough yes it would make sense for The proper information to be gathered
- It's the decent thing to do. Vet bill costs if incurred can be discussed between both parties.
- It's part of the responsible ownership
- There is a liability issue, also there are additional costs to the victim (meds, psychological impact etc) which need to be addressed by the owner of the pet.
- Seems like a reasonable thing to do.
- Hit and run is never acceptable.
- wherever harm occurs, both sides must present their experience of the incident as there are two sides to every story. sometimes critical factors can be glossed over by either party. (escalation factors, not asking to engage with dog, harm mitigation/reduction not addressed (dog not wearing 'do not approach -- in training' vest and muzzle).
- The owner needs to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- BE RESPONSIBLE. EXPECT RESPECT.
- Owners need to take responsibility for the actions of their pets
- It helps enforcement officers and victims to communicate.
- as a responsible pet owner it is the right thing to do. We are responsible for our pets - and if there is a risk of them biting - have the brain to muzzle them and perhaps some training for the dog is in order.
- "So the responsible owner is present when/if authorities are
- Called. Only exception should be if the offender dog requires urgent care. In those cases the victim/a should be allowed to check the dog tags and if they don't have tags a photo of the dog's owner and their license/cc etc."
- The owner of a dog that bites needs to be held responsible for their dogs actions and an enforcement officer should be there to make sure that it happens so the "victim" of the attack doesn't only left with the financial burden aswell as physical
- Yes. Of a dog bites another person the owner should certainly speak with the victim after the incident, if that is what the victim wants at that time.
- I believe dog owners are responsible for their dogs.
- The opportunity to discuss both sides of the story must be available.
- Of coarse. It's the responsible thing to do anyway.
- This is common sense.
- responsibility in case of further complications, liability, etc
- Prevents irresponsible owners from running away and hiding
- Obviously the owner should stay around to provide contact information.



- Sounds reasonable
- If the behaviour is concerning and /or bite is severe. Witness statement or contact info as well.
- Pet owners are responsible for damages their pets create and contact information can be used to ensure they take full responsibility.
- Every owner should be held accountable for their dog
- Absolutely and it must be made mandatory to pay for veterinary visit
- All pet owners are responsible for their dogs behaviour and as such should be required to participate in all investigations required.
- Why not, if you're in a car accident where someone is hurt you would stay there
- Can't believe one persons story. Gather as much truth as possible.
- Minimizing trauma to all parties is important.
- If a person or dog is injured, the owner of the dog which carried out the act should be held accountable.
- I believe the owner should exchange info in case the bite is severe.
- How else do you track the dog which is an issue
- There has to be some flexibility in this. Some dog bites are defensive nips that cause little damage and are not a sign of a "bad breed", but I can see someone making a mountain out of a molehill because they got a defensive nip. Would I stick around in this situation, I ask myself? I don't own a dog currently, but a carte blanche for a rule like this would be worse than no rule at all.
- There are 2 sides to every story, if police will listen to each persons account with empathy than yes the owner should remain on scene if another person or animal is hurt.
- I think it is good for the enforcement officer to be on the scene of an incident. I think they can help deescalate the emotions of the victim(s). Also to enforce the seriousness of the event to the dog owner. That also gives each party the chance to hear the same information from the officer.
- "This would be ideal, however, as is often the case, a person who owns an aggressive dog, is not a responsible person. Unfortunately, it is often the owners fault a dog is aggressive.
- Each case is individual and must be reviewed carefully. I know from experience, my previous dog was toy aggressive, if another dog would go for his ball he would not stand for that. I would avoid playing with toys when other dogs were around to prevent problems. Each owner needs to know their dogs and how to avoid problems."
- Similar to how I would appreciate all assaulters remaining at the scene for the same
- This should be obvious. It's their dog, their responsibility. Just like if you hit someone with your car you would need to stay at the scene or it would be considered as a hit and run. Its the same. It should definitely be a bylaw.
- Responsible dog ownership
- It's just common sense.
- "1. The owner is responsible for any medical costs incurred
- 2. Ensure their animal was up to date with vaccines



- 3. There is a history of the dog which caused the injury so there is a database and so innocent dogs are not unfairly blamed"
- The owner will be able to better describe the incident
- Have respect and stay if your animal bites another
- It would be the dog owner's responsibility.
- Only to share contact information, if dog is upset it would be best for them to go home. Sometimes it is the person who was bitten who first provoked the dog.
- If an attack happens then of course information should be exchanged. And if its serious then an officer should be call just like a car accident
- It is important to know the vaccination and behavioral history of a dog that has bitten a person or animal
- A person is responsible and liable for actions taken by their animals
- seems reasonable
- Only if the person affected or the pet owner of the animal affected deemed necessary.
- Yes, but it might be better to remove the dog from the situation and secure it's / victim's safety first. So remaining on the scene might not be best. Phone in to report within 24hours perhaps
- All too often they leave and there is people or dog injuries
- Person needs to be held accountable
- If course I support a pet owner staying after an attack. Pet owners should report when there dog attacks
- I believe that sharing contact information is a responsible behaviour which should be required.
- The owner is responsible for their dog. Speaking with an enforcement immediately after a situation happens allows the information to be shared sooner. I think this is extremely important. It also allows the opportunity to share if the dog was provoked by a person and any witnesses can share what they observed as well.
- If your dog inflicts harm on another person or animal you must be a responsible owner and deal with the consequences.
- A responsible dog owner should remain at the scene if any officials are contacted regarding the bite unless otherwise instructed. This way the incident can be dealt with efficiently and officials can determine cause and severity of incident.
- An owner should stay and take responsibility, not just take off.
- If my Dog were to bite somebody I would expect to remain to administer first aid, to provide information regarding vaccinations offer to pay medical expenses.
- Only if injury is more than a mild wound. Depends on what caused the dog to bite in the first place.
- The owner is responsible for any medical costs associated with injuries or medical attention required by the victim. The health information such as vaccinations being current and up to date should be made available to both parties by exchanging information. Finally, if a dog has shown a history of aggressive behaviour that information is important in order to make decisions such as whether the dog should be considered a threat to others as a 'repeat' offender



- Calgary is a hot bed of irresponsible dog owners. Just go to any park in Calgary (especially Sandy beach and Lincoln Park). Off lease area ignored and pit bulls running off lease.
- pet owners need to be accountable. (Like an automobile)
- As the owner of the animal you are responsible for it's behavior and should have to stay at the scene of the incident, the same as a car accident.
- Owners need to be held responsible for the actions of their pets
- If there is a dog issue, there is an dog owner issue and that owner must take responsibility for the dogs actions by staying with the animal and talk with an enforcement officer to ensure prevention of future incidences from both owner and animal.
- All dog owners should take responsibility if their dog is involved in an incident. This action does not reflect guilt in an incident as we all know there are many factors that lead up to a biting incident. All parties involved should share information.
- The answer doesn't require further explanation.
- It's a crime to have your dog bite someone. You should've known that your dog had a temper and it should be wearing a muzzle
- A responsible pet owner would not leave the scene of an incident with their pet.
- "Taking responsibility for their pet
- Informing of any potential diseases the pet has
- Any previous offences, first time etc"
- Seems like a reasonable request
- The owner of any small or large dogs who cause any lasting damage by being the instigator in an attack on any other pets or people should be held accountable for their pets actions.
- Hard to enforce by-laws without the proper information.
- Officer or bylaw should never be aloud to take your pet if you stay and do the right thing.
- Dog bites have potential for long term damage/injury. People need to be held accountable
- The owner needs to be held responsible for the actions of the dog.
- Absolutely. Tracking and monitoring of a dog's aggressive behaviour must happen to reduce the prevalence of bites in the future and rectify the damage done.
- Yes, I have been bite by two dogs different dogs while jogging through the dog park. One was by an old mangy dog whose, owner was old, there with an oxygen tank and clearly could not handle his dogs (he had another one there too). It was very tramatic and I didn't know what to do at the time. The dog jumped up and bite through my jacket. The owner took no responsibility for his dogs action. Another time, I was nipped by a big poodle dog, who jumped at me and again the owner did apologized or discipline her dog. Very bad pet ownership. I own a French bull dog and I am very cognizant of the dogs behaviour and I pick up dog poop dutifully! I wish all dog owners could be as diligent with their dogs behaviors.
- Just like if you hit someone with your car. You have to stay at the scene.
- Recently witness a dog attack another dog. While the owner of the dog on the receiving end of the attack was in shock and trying to help their injured dog the owner of the attack dog put their dog on a leash and walked off.



- Owners should be liable no matter the size or breed of dog
- people with bad dogs leave
- It is important for the dog not to disappear from the scene and it would be important to know who was responsible for the dog when an incident occurs.
- It is always the owner's responsibility to manage his/her/their dog.
- Well not exactly. I support a requirement for the pet owner (not just dogs) to remain at the scene, OR to provide accurate contact information to the victim or associates, with the exception that the owner may leave the scene to contain or restrain the animal safely.
- within a reasonable amount of time...eg 1 hour
- Opens communication between parties effected
- I think it is important that the situation be resolved in the best way possible for everyone involved, the dog included. Having everyone remain at the scene to discuss and understand the incident and find a resolution is an good step in that direction.
- It's like fleeing the scene of an accident.
- Pet owners need to be responsible for their pets
- Fleeing the scene should be discouraged with a fine for doing so.
- Owners need to be held accountable for the actions of their pets, particularly when someone/something is injured. Victim should have the ability to properly report to Bylaw/Police before offending dog leaves
- Not staying for an animal accident is like doing a hit and run with a car .
- This is no different than any other accident
- Dog owners need to take responsibility and be criminally charged when their dog causes physical harm. If they don't remain present at the scene then they're admitting their irresponsibility. This should be no different than the severity of a hit and run.
- A responsible owner should care about the welfare of the parties involved.
- This is no different than remaining at the scene of a car accident.
- It's the least that the dog owner can do.
- Yes it's the dog owner's responsibility, it's not a breed specific problem, tiny Yorkies bite it's just not severe because of size , it's dog owners who don't put in the time for proper training and teach pit bulls to be aggressive for their protection
- Yes because there are two sides to the story and if a responsible pet owner you take responsibility for your pet
- What happens if you dont remain at the scene of a car accident hmm
- Your protection your own animal by explaining what's happened, maybe it's not your animals fault.
- Just like with car accidents or the scene of assaults, owners need to be accountable for their dog's behaviour. That means remaining at the scene until law enforcement arrive.
- The only concern is that staying at the incident scene can conflict with removing the dog in order for other dogs to calm down
- the owner should be held accountable



- Because there are too many incidents where the owner and dog get away with bad behavior, and there are no consequences
- So they can provide their side of the story
- To ensure the owner takes responsibility and the dog can be known.
- depending on wait time for bylaw officer
- It's like a car accident. A dog or cat bite can be an accident so the owner should not be afraid
- It is important to provide contact info/stay to provide medical assistance just like in car collisions. However, if the dog is at large and the person/animal bit is ok or cared for the owner should leave to contain the dog.
- Absolutely, the owner should remain just like we would expect a person who was involved in an incident to remain
- Unless both parties agree to settling it without bylaw officers
- If the incident is bad enough to engage with an enforcement officer, the owner must stay at the scene
- But with the exception of minor bites, similar to how minor vs major car accidents are handled
- Especially to talk with an enforcement officer. I feel that this is important because it would allow for owner accountability for their dog's actions, and assist in getting the owner/dog the help and resources needed to prevent future occurrences (i.e. mandated training classes). Similar to liability / responsibility of individuals involved in car accidents.
- It should be seen in the same way as a car accident. This would ensure that the owner is known, and that mandated obedience classes can be enforced.
- To be held accountable
- The "bite" on another animal might not require exchange. I'd say has to be severe. Any bite on a human must exchange info.
- Yes, provided the dog has been caught and brought under control.
- I think any pet owner needs to take responsibility for their pets behaviour. This includes sharing insurance coverage and dog tag # with the injured party. It also means they need to cover the costs of the behaviour.
- Some dog owners will refuse to exchange identification information to avoid taking responsibility for their dogs actions.
- Two incidents in the last two years. In one, our 30 yr old niece was bitten by a dog and she was so shaken she did not ask the owner's name. He disappeared. The other was a similar incident with an older lady -- I think the owner finally came forward, but she should have stayed to help the victim. If people need to be told to help, it is sad. But I guess we need laws to support the obvious.
- Owners need to be held fully responsible for the actions of their pets
- Owners are responsible for their dogs behaviour and should assume the risk of that dog. Owners are the problem when dogs misbehave. Not the dog.
- Need the contact info
- Often owners take off and are never located.



- I think that the owner of a dog involved in an incident may need to be responsible for the costs if necessary, however, the injured person or owner of the injured dog perhaps can not wait as they may require medical attention as soon as possible.
 - This would encourage more responsible animal ownership.
 - You are responsible for your dog. Therefore responsible for damages or medical
 - The owner needs to be held accountable, as long as the dog is removed from the scene immediately.
 - Just like a car accident, there was an incident with the dog so the owner should be responsible and stay at the scene.
 - The owner must take responsibility
 - Well duh
 - My dog was attacked by a pitbull back in 2016 and the owner tried to hide the dog instead of paying for the fine and vet bill. I don't want others to deal with the same situation
 - It should already go without saying that it should be law for the owner to stay onsite
 - details on the animals health **MUST BE** provided.
 - Under ideal conditions the owner would be around and leave contact info before leaving
 - Absolutely they must be responsible for their dog that has bitten and cooperate with authorities to collect proper information so can be handled properly
 - If an incident occurs then information for both parties should be shared, just like in any other incident cases.
 - "If the dog and owner leave, the probability of that dog being found and checked for rabies, distemper, etc would likely decrease.
-
- However, if this law is put in place, specifications would need to be made as to what constitutes a bite. Nipping while playing usually isn't a problem, but a healer chasing a kid on a bike and biting the tire could be (some herding dogs hate wheels)."
 - Treat it similar to a car accident. Serious consequences if someone just leaved the scene
 - The owner should be present to hold them accountable, look into their history (previous criminal charges involving animals, unpaid fines regarding the animal)
 - I can't imagine leaving a scene where my dog bit someone
 - Remain at the scene, yes. But enforcement officers should ensure that the full story is heard, e.g. if a person was taunting or provoking the dog or if the other animal was unlawfully roaming (dog off leash when supposed to be on) then those factors would need to be considered before any enforcement action is determined.
 - Not taking responsibility for the action of your dog is unacceptable especially if bad damage was done
 - People should be accountable for their pets.



- If there is a serious injury, like in a vehicular incident, the owners should decide if they need to exchange information.
 - They need to be accountable for their dog. Any kind of dog.
 - There could be other reasons why the dog attacked.
 - The dogs owner could explain some information about WHY the dog attacked the person.
 - The person is ultimately responsible for the dogs behaviour. Would a person who commits a crime leave the crime scene? That would be a bigger crime then right. Same should be for bad owners.
 - Two pit bulls bullied me and my then 1year old golden retriever golden . The owner said that he was going to put them in his car and come back to talk to us. Before we knew it he sped away .
 - They should be there to offer the dogs health information. And to make sure the person or pet is okay. But not to be taken from the owner.
 - "There should be sharper penalties placed on the dog owner, not the dog. Consider mandatory pet training or education courses. Theres no such thing as a bad pet, only bad pet owners. Education should be priority
-
- NO TO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION"
 - absolutely yes. too many people just walk away & try to avoid responsibility; its no different than a car crash. 8f you are found walking away from the scene of a dog bite, & your dog was involved, you should be criminally charged & your dog should be seized.
 - It would be helpful to assess the capability of the owner to handle a dog
 - If the dog can be controlled. A dog may bite because the owner does not have dominance over the dog. A dog may also bite if provoked or if it feels threatened or if it feels their owner is threatened. Too often an owner does not understand the natural instinct of a breed and may not understand how to deter that instinct. An owner may also intentionally raise a dog in a manner that encourages a natural undesirable instinct.
 - Accountability needs to be taken by the owner for the actions of their animal/pet/family member.
 - It's common sense to hold those accountable for the accident so long as it's NOT based on BSL
 - You would be able to better rule out which dogs are nuisance dogs.
 - I think it depends on how severe the wound is, and potentially for what reason the dog may have bitten, which I suppose would be helpful to explain the owner's end the case to an officer.
 - A collie bit my pitbull left blood all over his nose. My dog literally just backed off and growled at him. Luckily my daughter's friend is a vet she told us how to treat the wound. The collie owner acted like nothing happen and just walked away. Clue in, and stop this bs focus on pitbulls. Like I said I'm a teacher, and a home owner in Calgary, and I would move (Airdrie, Cochrane, Strathmore) before allowing my dog to be treated with such inhumanity as to have to wear a muzzle. Also, maybe you could put out a warning to people who think it's a good idea to stroll though offleash dog parks who literally know zero about dogs and are surprised when big dogs wrestle with each other. They think it's scary and violent. They bark and growl and people think they are being violent. It's like they



expect the dogs to recite the Iliad. Put warning signs up so people understand that yes you could actually get bumped by big dogs that are playing. Yes dogs do play in the dog parks especially big dogs! Also in Edworthy dog park I've seen old couples who shouldn't be there, if they get bumped they are going to get hurt. Get some warning signs up, big dogs are at play! Then the city wonders why people call 311. Signs should encourage people who are NOT dog owners to attend places where dogs are on leash. Big dog owners go to off leash areas to allow are big dogs to wrestle and blow off steam. Get some signs up and get the 80 year old couples with no dogs out of off leash dog parks! It's like they threw a pair of skates on strolled into the middle of a hockey game and are shocked when they get hit by a puck. Jesus - your the city it's your job to Educate the public - I do it at work all the time. Get some Signage up! btw same goes for people who bring their toddlers in and let them wander aimlessly. I've made my point. Take care have a good day and please stop the insanity. (don't punish my pitbull for people who are irresponsible dog owners)

- That's responsible pet owning 101
- This is very reasonable, but will be difficult to enforce.
- Accountability is paramount. Those whose dogs have behaved dangerously have missed something in their own or their dogs' education, or they are out of their depth and need to seek professional training/behaviour therapy help. It is our responsibility as dog owners to do everything we can to ensure our dogs are balanced and protected so that they do not need to resort to violence.
- So long as it is safe to do so, though I am fine with the owner sharing contact information if it is not safe to stay at the scene.
- Because they are the owner and have legal documents!
- Both animal and owner are responsible. If the dog bites or attacks, it's the owner responsibility, not the dog.
- The owners of all dogs involved should exchange contact information, as well as any witnesses to the incident.
- There have been incidents where after an attack or biting, the owner has grabbed their dog and left, leaving someone or another dog injured. Seems to many times a little old lady is left. Also owners of offending dogs should have to help with the vet costs, which can be in the thousands.
- The owner should be held accountable and possibly charged/fined
- It's the animal version of a hit and run. Obviously the owner should remain on scene. Unless the owner isn't present, in which case it's a run away dog
- Too many incidents involving nuisance dogs result in no action taken because the owner walks away without disclosing any contact information to the injured party. This encourages repeat nuisance dog incidents because the owner is never held accountable.
- Owners with problem dogs should be held accountable to possible injuries or damages, so yes I think that's fair.
- Anyone involved in any type of incident including animals should have to stay at the scene to exchange info or until authorities arrive.
- Owner must take responsibility.
- If they are not required to stay you may never see them again



- Bad dog owners should be held responsible for their dogs behaviours
- Since a majority of people, sadly, don't wish to take responsibility for their actions there should be consequence for abandoning that social responsibility and leaving the scene of an offence.
- unless immediate danger for any parties to stay, information is to be exchanged. Hopefully honest information. I have seen false info in past at an incident.
- They should always have to stay and there should be penalties if they don't.
- If the dog has bitten, the owner should be held responsible and the bite should go on record in case of further incidents
- Because there are many dogs other than pitbull type dogs that do attack humans or dogs. All dogs that attack should be treated the same.
- You cannot leave the scene of a crime
- Other wise people lie. They also, change their mind, and will not file a complaint.
- It should be a law not just a rule, vet bills are not cheap and everyone knows that, so a bad owner would leave the scene.
- The owner can then explain why the bite occurred if the animal has up to date shot etc
- Individuals need to be held responsible
- If they don't stick around the dog could hurt or kill someone else.
- I am less concerned about this rule for bites to other animals, but certainly if a dog bites a person that is an assault the owner of the uncontrolled dog is responsible for. If the bite-ee was provoking dog, that side also needs to be told. Reasonable wait time needs to be considered if eg outdoors in winter. Could also require reporting in person to animal services enforcement within 24 hrs?
- Common Sense
- It is their responsibility to remain at the scene and provide the required information
- This is required for evidentiary reasons - very often, it is very hard to prove damage (injuries) against a particular dog owner precisely. A responsible dog owner has to "step up to the plate"- it is his or her animal that caused injury / damage.
- I'm shocked this isn't already required.
- People should be responsible for the actions of their pets
- If the dog is able to be calmed down, they owner should have to stay at the scene and exchange information with the victim, however, if the dog cannot be calmed down it should be taken home by the owner who should then return to the victim and exchange information and talk to law enforcement if necessary.
- However, it may be difficult to get the dog under control while waiting, so alternatives may need to be provided.
- Taking responsibility for your pets actions.
- It is the responsible thing to do. However, if the owner/guardian knows the only result is the death of the dog, they won't be inclined to stay. A fair system would encourage them to stay
- this would be the responsible thing to do. If they need to leave the scene they should provide the dog license, verified by their own ID or they will be subject to additional fines



- since I've supported insurance premiums for nuisance dogs it flows naturally that just like in case with car insurance - dog owner should remain on the scene and provide information in case insurance company should be involved etc.
- The owner must take responsibility for their dog.
- self explanatory, stay at scene state your case.
- The owner is accountable for the dog
- It is essentially like fleeing the scene of a crime if your dog bites someone
- How else will you be able to follow up with them? If a dog bites someone or kills another animal, then they should stay, otherwise it's no different than let's say a hit and run.
- A responsible owner should also provide vaccination information that may be relevant. Also puts responsibility of cumulative cases on an owner.
- It should be the same or similar to fleeing the scene of an accident.
- yes because it will show both sides of the story if the dog owner is at fault it allows them to pay for any damages if the person bitten was at fault it keeps the dog safe from repercussions
- The responsibility is to the owner and the same rules are applicable when in a car accident.
- They often don't
- all parties should be involved and share information in case follow up is required and should the animal or owner be involved in multiple incidents it is easier to track.
- I believe that if someone's dog causes a severe injury to another person or animal, for that person to leave the scene before exchanging information/speaking to an officer, would be the same as if they got in a car accident and left the scene.
- Citizens do not have the right to demand contact information including name and bylaw may not be able to find the dog owner without it.
- dog owners should be held accountable for their dog's behaviour.
- Just like a hit and run, the owner is responsible and should remain at the scene. Locating the owners maybe a difficult process.
- Similar to the law that you must remain at the scene of an accident, I feel that pet owners whose dog bites another person or animal should be required to stay at the scene and provide all necessary information required for follow-up on medical/veterinary bills or for legal purposes. Far too often, these owners get away without consequence, and these dogs need to have extensive follow up done to ensure that they are not an ongoing risk to society.
- My dog was bit a year ago at a local Calgary dog park and the owner ran away.
- "The dog owner needs to take responsibility for what their dog has done. It may need to be registered as a vicious dog or they could be required to pay for medical treatment for the other person/dog.
- Hard to achieve those if the dog owner leaves the scene."
- Dog owner would be the best person to contain or control their dog.
- It should be treated like a "hit and run" type scenario if the owner leaves the scene
- [removed] its not always the dogs fault



- Owners must take responsibility
- it really all depends if the person is in a rush to get somewhere Etc then I don't think so or if it is not that severe people should no do not approach a dog when it is on a leash Etc. But if it is a severe situation yes.
- I do believe the dog owner will be required to be there to share their side of the case, it would also make a positive impact to have both sides when engaging to an enforcement officer regarding these cases.
- The dog owner should be held responsible for the incident.
- Yes because it's the owners fault not the dog
- It's the owners fault if the dog is biting other animals or people
- There should be a standard of contact in the case of a bite, especially a severe one.
- Only if it is really severe and needs be called
- I do not think breed specific bylaws are necessary.
- The owner to be held accountable for their pets behaviour.
- We need to treat this seriously, as many owners don't. But, there would need to be an education campaign to explain play-biting or mouthing other dogs vs aggression.
- It is the dog owner's responsibility to take ownership of what their pet does.
- Owners of vicious dogs tend to flee the scene asap.
- I think it makes sense. A person or animal could be injured and it is important to stay there until the issue is resolved with an officer. Owners need to be held accountable.
- It seems like this should be treated the same as an accident that caused damage to another person's vehicle. Why should a bite be treated differently?
- It's fair.
- Responsibility is a part of ownership
- Dog owners need to provide information about the dog's current health status. Also, if their dog causes injury to other dog they should be responsible for vet bills.
- Yes, this is ethical and the owner of the dog should show some responsibility for their dog.
- This ensures fair compensation/negotiation for all parties involved
- Is this seriously a question? Of course they should absolutely be expected to remain at the incident. This is no different than leaving the scene of a car accident.
- responsible pet ownership requires that you take ownership of your pet's behavior good or bad
- This should always be the case.
- a dog bite is similar to an accident, it shows responsibility for your pet if you provide your contact information. particularly if a disease is identified, so the owner of the dog can take appropriate action to treat the dog.
- No different than fleeing the scene of an auto accident.
- Increase the level of responsibility
- I think this would cause more dog owners to understand the gravity of having a dog that is not under control. There's a difference between having a nuisance dog and having a dog that is not under



control. Dog owners should understand what having a dog under control means. If sticking around after an incident is required, perhaps more dog owners will be educated in appropriate dog training and behaviour.

- This is just what's right. Bet, the majority of cases will be chihuahuas and not pit bulls...
- Reports should be made to a dog obedience service. I think officer involvement should be minimal and only to keep peaceful relations.
- A friend of mine and her (leashed) gentle dog were attacked out of the blue on a city sidewalk by two pit bulls on the loose. She was knocked down and hurt, and her dog had to be rushed to the vet. The owner of the pit bulls showed up and said he "would just put his dogs in his car and then come back." Of course he took off and she was too afraid to call the police. Pit bulls SHOULD BE BANNED COMPLETELY!!! They are much too dangerous and the owners are almost always bad. They WANT a vicious dog.
- All dog owners need to take responsibility for their animal. Any dog can attack, not just pitbulls. Owners of other breeds need to be held accountable for their pet's lack of training too.
- The owner should be held responsible for the actions of their dog, as proper training would significantly decrease dog attacks.
- Yes so it can help more better with investigations and serve the justice to victims
- It should be like a car accident. Because thats what it is.. an accident!
- Dog owners know they are mostly anonymous if they walk away. This is required to be able to identify the dog and owners.
- The owner is responsible for their animal.
- Same as determining responsibility in a car accident. People wait for appropriate authorities. This depending on severity and the mutual owners agreements on sharing information/legal id if not waiting.
- Any person present at the scene of an incident should be required to exchange information with other individuals & if bylaw or police are called should remain to provide details
- I think people should take responsibility when an incident occurs however, i can understand why owners flee the scene, dogs laws are very prejudicial towards certain breeds and law enforcement do not tend to look into why an incident occurred. They only look at the animal that attacked, not the reason behind the attack.
- If a dog bites a human or other dog. It is like a car accident it is our responsibility as a mature productive citizen to stay there and exchange information regarding the incident.
- Too many incidents seem to occur that the owner leaves. There is no sign in or sign out of parks. This would assist in keeping the general public safe and following up as necessary to incidents.
- Everyone needs to take accountability for their dog and it's actions and keep their dog and others safe.
- It depends if there is another dog involved and if they are at right of getting into a fight then both parties should part and do separate police reports. Whenever it is safe, both parties should remain on scene



- If it were me , I would like the opportunity to explain what happened before it's plastered all over the news as an unprovoked vicious dog attack and have my dog seized. It could be a one time thing with a valid explanation. Not all dogs are mean and nasty. All breeds can be aggressive. The behaviour of any dog is the responsibility of the owner.
- The owner can give personal information and say what happened.
- Owners should take full responsibility of their dogs actions.
- I think it's important that the bylaw officer talks with the owner as well as the victim. If they can't stay I'd at least like to see them leave their contact information (e.g. if they need to remove the dog from the scene to calm down the situation until the officer arrives).
- If the dog can be properly controlled while remaining at the scene, otherwise they must report it. If a dog is hyped up and the person who was bit is excited that energy can pass to the dog not allowing for the situation to de-escalate
- The dog owner is 100% responsible for any incident that may happen. Dogs are animals that requires a responsible owner.
- Owner is responsible for their animals. If the animal commits an offence, the owner shouldnt be allowed to just walk away and go home.
- No different than a hit and run if the owner leaves the scene of the accident
- In theory, a good idea. Fully Support more accountability for dog owners. But how to enforce? Owners of a dog that bites or attacks generally want to get out of there ASAP, often to avoid this exact scenario. Worried they will be fined, have to pay for expensive vet bills or their dog might be labeled dangerous. Victims are often too worried about their own dog/selves to get contact info of offenders. How to ensure you're getting their proper info? People don't have license plates on their person, so identifying can be difficult and lead to confrontation.
- Owners are responsible for training and controlling their dogs and should be held accountable for any incidents.
- The dog owner is responsible for the actions of their dog. If the dog is prone to biting, this should be taken into account and acknowledged prior to the outing.
- Yes!!! Common decency and sign of responsible dog /pet ownership is to take responsibility by at least staying at the scene and exchanging information - this should not be an assumption of assuming vet bill cost if any
- I think the "if necessary part" is important here. If the owners can manage and come to an agreement on their own, then it shouldn't be necessary to involve an enforcement officer but if the bitten person/owner of the bitten dog can't manage then absolutely the offending owner should remain at the scene. That is a responsibility that we take own as dog owners.
- It is simply the responsible thing to do
- I like this idea because it makes the owner responsible for what has happened. It's not the dogs fault it's the owners
- Just like a car accident, information needs to be exchanged to ensure both sides can explain what happened, especially if it is a severe injury.



- Yes, the owner should have an opportunity to explain the circumstance and be held accountable if necessary.
- Yes!! I've been attacked by dogs while riding my bike and the owners always blame me.
- Absolutely all owners of all breeds need to be responsible at all times
- ALL owners of aggressive dogs want to be away from the scene of incident as quickly as possible so as not to be found. I have first hand experience with this. City officials have told me there is nothing they can do if they don't have the aggressive dog owners name.
- Bad dog behavior that causes harm to people or other animals should require the owner of said dog to be held accountable.
- I think it's like any other accident. Of someone is hurt it is your job to be responsible & discuss it & exchange any important information. Just like you would if you read ended someone or clipped their vehicle in a parking lot.
- It is illegal to leave the scene of a human on human assault, so it makes sense that it should be illegal to leave the scene of an assault caused by your property (dog, in this case).
- Only for proof of story. Both sides to these stories are important since the person whose been bitten, could have been antagonizing the dog. Majority of the time, it is not the dogs fault.
- Like a traffic accident we have a public duty to remain on the scene
- If a bite occurs it is resonance to ask that they follow similar protocols to any car accident
- How is this not already the law?
- its important for bylaw to be there and have all the information so they can respond properly.
- Owners should be held 100 % accountable for the actions of their animal no matter size or breed.
- Yes, because it's only right to take some responsibility, BUT dog owners need to feel safe with staying (I.e., their dog will not be taken away from them and instantly punished if they stay at the scene). As well, both sides of the story need to be fairly heard (e.g., maybe a stranger cornered a dog and the attack was provoked). It can't just be victim statements. I understand there are irresponsible dog owners out there who would lie or refuse responsibility, but I consider myself a responsible dog owner who wants my dog to live a full and happy life and will always want the opportunity to be heard and my dog's story to be heard.
- A responsible pet owner, includes ensuring the safety of those around them. If their dog bites, they need to be held accountable if injury is inflicted on someone.
- Unless the dog poses risk to others. In that case, they should have to pose/provide a snapshot of their drivers license, themselves, and their dog
- you wouldn't walk away from a crash would you?
- Otherwise it may be difficult to provide enforcement.
- I believe a complete report including both sides of the story is necessary.
- Is Like any other kind of accident, if something happens be responsible and stay there share contacts
- It should be treated as a car accident



- Owners are responsible for any damages and injuries caused by their pets. Animal attacks are caused by negligence of training and supervision. All involved persons in any animal attack should remain on scene to assist with any investigation.
- If the dog bites for whatever reason (provocation, fear, self-defence) and the owner bolts, the owner does not deserve to have dogs at all. If the dog was defending kirsself, the owner needs to be the dog's voice in the matter.
- It is morally the correct approach
- There is no way to identify the dog otherwise. You are not going to lean over to read the dog tag number after a bite scenario. The owner has no reason to provide valid information or any information.
- I agree with this, as it's the same idea as a hit and run.
- It's being a good responsible citizen and dog owner. The rules we have our kids abide by should be the same for dogs
- The dog owner is responsible for the dog's behaviour.
- I believe an owner should have to remain at the scene of an incident, if it is safe for them to do so and remaining there does not pose a risk of another possible incident. If the animal in question can be properly secured with no further risk to the public, the owner should stay at the scene. Otherwise they should have to leave contact info and remove the nuisance animal from the situation. If there are multiple owners at the scene of an incident, one of them should have to stay.
- Because the owner is either an idiot and no training or the dog has been mistreated or such
- As the owner of any animal you are responsible for that animal and need to take responsibility for the actions of said animal
- Owners should be held liable for the actions of their dogs. If injury is sustained by an animal or person and medical assistance is required, the onus should be on the owner of the offending dog to provide financial aide for all medical treatment. Therefore the owner should remain on the scene to provide their contact information to the enforcement officer.
- The owner is always responsible for their pet and their actions.
- If the bite is an actual bite, not a dog to dog play. Also, only if it can be ensured enforcement officer will arrive in a timely manner and not be biased
- "Yes, unless they or the other party, human or animal, needed to be taken for medical care and they were assisting with the transfer.
- Also depending on how long authorities were going to take to get to the scene. There are many different reasons as to why the party may not be able to stay at the site."
- All parties must remain otherwise this rule would not apply
- Too many times the owner of an offending animal disappears never to be seen again. Just as you wouldn't leave the scene of an accident, nor should you leave the scene of an incident. This would allow both parties to be heard so there is not a rush to judgment.
- Just to inform an enforcement officer of up to date shots if nothing else.
- Responsible Ownership, which is what Calgary is all about. Not BSL but responsible owenship.



- In cases of dogs or people being injured by aggressive dogs, there have been many cases reported in the news recently of victims having to turn to social media to try to get justice (i.e., to identify the owners of aggressive dogs to the police/bylaw or to receive assistance in paying for vet bills for injured dogs). Owners of dogs who injure others should not have the option of walking away from the consequences.
- Should either owner feel bylaw needs to be called both should stay at the scene so all proper documentation can occur.
- I believe anyone with any breed should be required to provide contact information if their dog bites.
- It's the right thing to do. Owners are responsible.
- Responsible dog ownership requires the owner to be responsible and accountable while remaining on the scene of the event
- Again not all bites are a form of aggression! The owner has a right to relay his dogs side of the story not just remain there for punishment
- It is an owner's responsibility to ensure that the person or other bitten animal is safe and able to get the care they need.
- It's not fair for a dog owner to flee the scene when damage has been caused by their dog. Fleeing the scene should result in jail time.
- Seems like it should be the same as any other incident such as a collision or assault
- Victim should be able to receive contact information if needed
- If someone's dog bites anyone or animal it is still an accident and you should talk to someone as people can get upset about their animals and if the situation was severe it would be best with professional help to solve the problem.
- Just the law
- As there could be a risk of rabies, it is very important for the owner to share information
- Owner accountability and proper investigation
- People need to take responsibility for knowings dogs temperament - including third part Care. Such as dog walkers and sitters
- A responsible dog owner would be accountable and also a point of contact for resolution (whatever that may be)
- Depending on the severity of the bite I think this would be a reasonable action.
- Dogs shouldnt bite. End of.
- Should be treated similarly to a hit and run. If the owner leaves the scene additional fines should be placed.
- Similar to a car accident, you must be able to exchange information, so long as the dog would not become more aggravated Or stressed for staying there.
- A dog is the owners responsibility and the owner should be liable for their dog. Dogs are reactive based on their owner and how well they were trained and how much time an owner spends with their dog. An owner is responsible over the dog.
- You should have to speak for the dog and offer support to right the situation.
- As long as their animal can be controlled at the time they should be there



- Who is going to enforce this?
- Pet owners need to take responsibility for their pets actions.
- It depends on the situation, if the dog is under control after the incident, then the owner and dog should remain at the scene. If the dog continues to show aggression he dog needs to be secured in a safe place for both the dog and surrounding people.
- This falls under owner responsibility and human decency.
- we have hit and run laws for vehicles why not the same for dog bites?police time shouldn't be wasted as many people in these circumstances can sort it out between themselves
- Rule just insures both dog owner and victim each have documented contact info and documented record of biting incident. Enforcement Officer may be required to settle disputes at time of incident or ensure appropriate bylaws are followed at time of incident.
- This is reasonable for any dog (not breed specific), if the bite was unprovoked.
- It is important that contact information is shared and the full story is kept on record. It is also important that the victim and the aggressor are treated promptly as often it can go both ways (ie. both dogs are bitten). One party of the incident leaving the scene prematurely can cause the story to change and untrue information being published/shared.
- That's the right thing to do.
- The person at the scene with the dog is responsible for the dog, regardless to the ownership of the dog.
- They have to take ownership
- Much like the scene of the collision, it is imperative that dog owners are held legally and ethically responsible for the actions of their dogs
- Or provide contact information
- There is always 2 sides to a story and both sides need to be present and any witnesses as well.
- Both sides need to be heard
- Absolutely this should happen!
- The dog is the responsibility of the owner and I see it in the same way as if one human had assaulted another, therefore, they should have to remain at the scene of the incident.
- Please have the number of dogs being walked by one person (professional dog walkers) to be no more than three or if more be sure to be on a leash and dog walker should be licensed. Example one dog walker in our area walks sixteen larger type dogs at one time with no leashes. It is very frightening to encounter these dogs and single walker who seems to have an attitude.
- Absolutely owners need to be the ones being held responsible when their dog has behavior issues. It's not the dogs fault!
- As a responsible pet owner, I would expect the dog's owner to wait.
- responsibility is on the owner
- That is a logical and responsible action a dog owner should automatically gravitate to
- Exception to take dog to vet if injured in the altercation
- Or owner provides contact information and allows the victim to take a photo of owner & dog.



- It's the right thing to do I.e. taking accountability for your pet
- I think this is necessary if it is a serious attack
- I have had this happen and the owner left and still walks her bite risk dog (her dog bit my dog through our backyard fence. I felt powerless (after vet fees I had to pay for) and I still see her walking her dog past my yard. Frustrating. The bylaw officer did nothing after I requested him to.
- If necessary, it's fine
- As long as others are not in danger. However a picture of the owner/handler's ID and the individual and dog might be a way to get the dangerous and agitate dog away from others.
- It's the se thing if you are involved in a car accident. If there is injury or damage done, the dog owner is at fault and needs to take responsibility.
- Absolutely! They should be responsible
- I absolutely agree and believe if your dog is involved in an attach your should have to be around to answer any questions to law enforcement and not just leave.
- As a veterinarian, there are many cases of owners who are left a paying often costly vet bills even though they were at no fault! Too many people do not accept responsibility for the behavior of their pets in public.
- Best to hear both sides in incident.
- If a person is harmed by an animal, the owner is responsible but the dog should not be euthanized or seized - there should be a fine given to the owner and a demand that the dog be taken to obedience class.
- The responsibility of the incident is on the dog owner, much like you would expect the drivers of a car in a car crash to stay at the scene of the incident.
- People should be responsible for their pets actions. You train the animal, therefore, you are liable.
- Owner should be responsible
- If injury to the victim is deemed serious, the dog and the owner responsible need to be present.
- Vet bills are expensive and the owner of the attacking dog should be held accountable.
- I would like to see laws about hit and run applied to dog bites
- I have been bitten 3 time in my life: Mauled by a Saint Bernard, and still have scars 40 years later. Attacked by a Pomeranian and still have scar 30 years later. And have been repeatedly charged at recently by 2 shih-tzu that escape from their yard. None of these owners, were or are, being held responsible for their dogs actions.
- 100% their are always 2 sides both must be heard. Its like leaveing the scene of a crime and ought be dealt as such. Weather it be to be issyed a fine or medical expences or making sure both sides heard.
- Absolutely necessary, especially if this is not the first time the dog has been involved in an incident.
- It forces the responsibility onto the owners.
- There should be a record of all bite incidents involving all dog breeds. Dog owners need to be held liable for the violent actions of their pet. They should also be required to pay for any damages caused by their pet.



- EVERY dog incident that involves an injury should have some mediation. However, a lot of folks overreact when a dog nibbles another dog. If there's no damage to anyone or anything, the case should not be elevated. There are dramatic people in Calgary that are also opportunistic, and will use mild incidents to promote their agenda. This needs to be a focus point for law enforcement. Just because someone complains, doesn't make their concerns valid. This should be at the judgment of a mediator, not the whiny person trying to create a scene.
- It should be noted if dogs are vicious or aggressive towards people. Clearly that person needs help with their dog, and they may need professionals stepping in so that they see that fact.
- just as any other incident, you have to remain at the scene until its properly dealt with by authorities.
- When an incident occurs it's important to get all the necessary supporting information, and the dog owner is responsible for supplying that. The dog should not be taken from the owner pursuant to investigation without permission by the actual registered dog owner.
- Most times when a dog lashes out it is something that the owner has or hasn't done for their dog and should be held responsible.
- The owners tend to flee the scene and claim it never happened.
- It forces accountability and a responsible pet owner shouldn't have an issue with it. Unless the owner can't control the animal and staying would pose more of a threat.
- 100%, I was bitten by a dog (small terrier dog) for absolutely no reason at all. They decided to walk ahead of me and while they were passing the dog snapped and the owner begged me not to call city of Calgary because he risked being euthanized. After explaining that my leg hurt and that I thought it would be in my best interest, and the best interest for his dog to call someone, they ran off. I have yet to see the pair ever again. There should be laws protecting civilians from animals of all breeds, of all stature... dog attacks, both big and small should be allowed to call 911
- If I hit someone accidentally or not I have to stay on scene to explain the situation, I don't think asking responsible pet owners to do something similar is asking too much
- Provides Responsibility and accountability.
- The human should be held accountable for their dog. A dog is taught behaviour same as children are. Aggressive behaviour on the dogs part is a result of failure to train appropriately.
- Often times aggressive behavior in a canine is a reflection of its owner. All pet owners are responsible for the conduct of their animal and the consequences of its actions. If an individual knows their dog is prone to aggressive behavior they should not put the dog in situations in which it will become stressed or aggravated and act out. There are plenty of dogs of a "more aggressive" dog breed that have zero issues when at off leash parks/ public spaces. It is the owners responsibility to understand how their dog behaves and act accordingly.
- This should not even be a question. If a dog bites a person or other animal they should not leave the scene until their contact information has been shared with an enforcement officer.
- I believe that all owners should be held accountable as it is not the fault of the dog but in fact a result of poor training
- Dog owners need to be held responsible for their actions, no different than parents are liable for their children's actions.



- But only if the owners can safely calm the dogs down to exchange contact information and no animal is critically injured.
- Because some people just leave after an attack and never found
- Should be responsible for the dog's behaviour for costs associated with any injury.
- As an owner of the animal who committed the attack it is their responsibility to be present in the event of such an incident. An extension of ownership is that they carry a responsibility for the animal, as a result they carry a portion of blame in regards to the attack.
- It seems difficult to enforce, and it assumes that the officer can attend the scene in a reasonable amount of time. However, it is important that the owner of the dog make themselves available to share contact information, discuss vet bill payments and other remedial actions.
- The owner is the legal party and should be the one responsible.
- A dog's behaviour is a result of its training and upbringing by the owner. The owner is more responsible for negative incidents than the dog.
- Absolutely. Same as leaving the scene of an accident, as a decent human you should stay until there is a resolution
- A dog can bite for many reasons. Having a detailed witness account from all parties would give more insight regarding the situation.
- Difficult to hold the dog or owner responsible if they don't.
- Yes because sometimes people claim not to own the animal
- common sense
- Have witnessed dog fights with injuries and people walking/running away
- Just seems like common sense, like being involved in a fender bender. If the person or owner of animal that was bitten isn't seriously hurt and is fine with the offending dog/owner leaving then that should be acceptable.
- my sisters dog lost an eye to a German Shepard and the owner just ran. This should be a chargeable offense
- This should be done anyway, but I support a rule enforcing this.
- If it is a serious bite, the owner is the animal's guardian and is responsible for the animal's behaviour.
- Just like causing damage with a vehicle, if your dog causes damage or injury you should be required to provide information and/or remain on scene.
- Yes. Just like during in an auto accident the person is supposed to stay on the accident site, the dog owner would be remain on the site if the dog bites. This way, insurance information is shared for medical expenses and bylaw's can be enforced.
- The person is then held accountable. It's their fault if the dog isn't trained properly.
- It will help to get a better sense of the dog and it's home life, how it was trained if at all, and the personality of the owner.
- Certainly. The owner of a dangerous pet must take responsibility for the behavior of his/her dog.
- They should have to remain on the scene, similar to a car accident. The injured person may be entitled to reimbursement of expenses and would need their info



- I think it's important to have this apply to all dogs, not just "pit bull" type dogs. I'm sorry there wasn't space after question 3 to note this. Too often pitbulls are labelled as the bad guys for biting when it's other dog owners who are irresponsible about having their reactive dogs off leash or in dog parks.
- Yes, absolutely to sharing contact information. Waiting to talk to an enforcement officer might not be practical
- Some people train strong dogs specially for attacks. Those people won't stick around to speak to a officer, likely because their using that dog as protection for illegal activities.
- Must be responsible
- DO NOT RESTRICT PIT BULLS THEY ARE FAMILY TOO
- Taking responsibility shouldn't have to be enforced. Your are responsible for your dog. If something happens be an adult
- there are no bad dogs, only bad owners, as such, the OWNER should be punished, and the dog assessed for personality. Upon character defect the dog should be rehomed, or stipulations put in place for owner training (dog obedience training is for owners, not dogs)
- As a pet owner, you are held responsible for them.
- Yes it's important to gather all the information on the incident in order to accurately assess the situation and the appropriate measures
- If a dog injures another dog then the owners of both dogs should stay and talk with an enforcement officer and they should also decide if they are liable for any vet bills. Plus the dog that has caused bodily harm needs a record started to monitor behaviour problems.
- I believe the owner is ultimately responsible for a dogs behaviour, when owning any dog it should be taken very seriously and ALL dogs need obedience.
- "walking a dog is like walking a ""bit machine"" dog owners should be responsible of how to walk that dog and for the behavior of the dog.
- anything to prevent people from keeping dog off-leash anywhere that is not on-leash...i am sick and tired of people telling me ""my dog is friendly"" when i don't want close any dog ...friendly or not I don't want to be touched / sniffed by any dog!
- also i am really sick and tired of people telling me that ""my dog followed you because of the way you are dressed!!"" that's when i am wearing a hoodie!!!
- and ""dog can sense that your scared of them then they attacked you!"" really????!!!!!!"
- Helps to hold owners of all dogs that bite accountable.
- If my dog were to bite another dog or human I would gladly wait at the scene until an officer showed up. Same goes for witnessing a car accident. It should be law for people to stay at the scene so they can both tell their side of the story and share their necessary information. People need to be held accountable for their own actions, and their pets .
- Unless the situation is dangerous. Removal of both dogs (involved in fight) or the offending dog must be the priority, then the owners can exchange info.
- It is important for everyone to remain at the scene of an incident and file the correct paperwork and ensure correct actions and follow up actions are completed by those who are to be held responsible.



- Same rule should apply for owners of animals that owners of vehicles have (if an incident occurs, owner of vehicle remains on scene).
- Depending on severity of bite and/ or response time from officer
- Accountability. It's like hit and run.
- If the individual doesn't remain at the scene I would consider the individual not a socially responsible dog owner...and unfortunately there are many of those;
- I believe the owner needs to take responsibility for their dogs actions.
- but they should also have the option to call 311 to report the bite and give contact info (in case it is cold out or an officer can't get there in time)
- Sounds like common sense to me.
- I am shocked that an owner of a dog that just bit someone/another dog, would leave the scene if a by-law officer had been called. How irresponsible and rude!
- Are criminals ever legally allowed to leave the scene of a crime? Pet laws are so backwards
- they are responsible for their dog and the dogs behavior.
- As long as the other owner is not belligerent; which they often are. Otherwise, a person should be allowed to leave the scene for their own or their pet's perceived safety, and contact Bylaw Services within 24 hours.
- That person might be responsible for the person or dog's injuries. However investigation needed, my on leash dog was repeatedly body slammed by an off leash dog in a area where dogs are to be on leash. My dog bit the other dogs face to get him away and then it's owner blamed me for having a vicious dog. My dog is elderly with chronic back pain and was defending himself. The other dog was rudely demanding rough play and owner admitted he can't have the dog kn leash or she gets pulled over.
- Similar to a car accident both parties need to be around otherwise it should be considered a hit and run.
- This should be a criminal offence to leave the scene where a dog causes broken skin to another animal or human
- Accountability is key!
- Pet owners carry the responsibility of their pet and should be called upon to give their statement to the authorities if necessary. A pet owner who leaves the scene of a bite does not sound responsible and should be reprimanded.
- Like you do with car accidents
- Absolutely. They must remain with the injured party.
- The owner is ultimately responsible for the dog.
- I've seen too many bad owners run away from a scene because they are afraid their dog will be taken away and they do not want to be responsible for the vet bill of the injured animal. These are the same people who are creating the problems with nuisance dogs in the first place.
- My dog has been attacked on trails, at dog parks and have caused injuries to me or my dog and the owners have ran off. I think if your dog attacks another dog unprovoked(due to dog aggression or lack of training etc) this is a damage to property and should be dealt with as such. I have had to rush



to the vet and it cost me a lot of money to fix him up due to an aggressive dog. If a dog is a nuisance dog there needs to be better rules so people are more responsible. As dogs are powerful animals. My dog is a large breed, so when he has been attacked he was usually the large dog and so the damage was puncture wounds and scratches but for a smaller dog these kinds of acts of aggression could be fatal.

- If owner remains at scene the type of dog will be known and owner will be present to describe the situation of what happened. Because the incident may be due to the other animal present every owner and animal should have the legal right to defend themselves in court not to be unjustly punished just because of the dogs pedigree.
- Owner must be able to show they can keep control of their animal at the scene or the pet is confiscated. The owner should be able to move to a safe distance but not leave the scene.
- The situation should be assessed to determine what caused the situation and if it's a one off occurrence or the start of a problem
- Its do different than a car accident. its part of being a responsible citizen.
- It is unfair if an owner of an animal that bites does not provide contact information to the authorities which can then make a reasonable decision as to future actions that need to be taken.
- There is always two side to the medal. Both parties should explain the story from their point of view so the law enforcement can make an unbiased decision - regardless of dog's breed or look
- Your pet is ur responsibly
- Hit and run is illegal, why would other injury causing activities be exempt from similar?
- I have been bitten twice and the owner left both times. I was left to handle all costs and trauma alone.
- As with any accident, both people involved must stay
- It's like any other accident and should be dealt with properly
- Depends because severity needs to be a factor. If both parties stay and an outside person can come to investigate, presumably they can gather a more accurate understanding of what happened. As opposing parties may have differing views. If it is a bad attack, witnesses would help because maybe the injured party will need to leave to seek medical attention immediately.
- Seems like the right thing to do.
- I believe that if your dogs bites someone or my dog gets bit then staying at the scene is the right thing to do
- Because it is your responsibility since it is your pet to resolve the problem.
- If someone is bitten a dog's medical history is necessary for proper treatment of the person bitten.
- It's no different than a human on human crime. They need to stay and accountable
- so it makes it an easier situation for the dog and owner of the dog. Actually hearing a story may help the situation because witnesses can help too save a life.
- It is common decency to remain at the scene (a "bite and run" is not acceptable).
- If your dog injured another dog or human, it is your responsibility as their owner to be in communication with the person you injured, and if necessary, pay for any vet bills. As well as speak to bylaw in regards to your animals behaviour going forward.



- I believe the owner must show responsibility for the animal by remaining at the scene and not trying to avoid law enforcement.
- This is the right thing to do.
- Owners should take responsibility for the action their pets take, so in case of an incident there should be someone representing the dog.
- There are no bad dogs only bad owners
- I believe that an owner should stay. My dog bit a lady who hit me after my dog only approached her dog. The lady hit me when I pulled my dog away from her dog .. she was trying to HIT my dog, but hit me and then my dog bit her ... This lady should have had TRAINING on how to handle another dog approaching her dog .. if she did not try to hit my dog (hit me instead) she would have never been bit. I called the City and reported the incident and I stayed while SHE left .. the officers understood that my dog was protecting me .. but MY DOG should NOT have had to go thru that .. if every dog owner had to go thru training on how to handle their own dog in different situations .. my own dog would have NOT experienced this terrifying incident that the irresponsible dog owner created
- Owners responsibility
- Depending how bad the incident was
- For follow-up and to track repeat offenders
- Much like vehicle incidents/hit and run, people need to take responsibility for their dogs' actions.
- Dogs that exhibit violent behaviour toward people and other animals need to be known about -- the more documentation, the better their case can be assessed. Too often, owners will shrug off the actions of their dogs that may have harmed others.
- Does "personal accountability" sum it up?
- Pitbulls arent any stronger or more likely to bite than any other breed.
- Owners are still responsible for damage/injury caused by their animal, its a criminal offence to leave the scene of a car accident without at least exchanging information first, should be the same with an incident with an animal too.
- There is a good chance that the owner either won't stay or the information they provide could muddy the situation.
- Zero chance of identification and prosecution of the offending dog and owner if the owner does not remain on scene
- For the same reason people are not allowed to flee the scene of a car accident or a crime.
- This is common logic. The dog needs to be removed from scene, however the owner needs to be at the scene at the time of event, just like a car crash.
- The owner should always stay at a accident.
- It would be ideal, but perhaps difficult to enforce. Perhaps attach an appropriate fine to "leaving the scene"
- Some dog owners may deny being at the scene if allowed to leave. This would also mean that the response time must be in a timely manner.



- Treat it like you would any other accident, whether it be a car or otherwise. Swap contact information, and assume the responsibility.
- Similar to a car accident, the owner of the animal should remain on scene to exchange the appropriate information, barring extenuating circumstances such as the pet having gotten loose and owner needing to find the pet, or the pet being too hightened to remain in the immediate vicinity, at which point a primary phone number should be provided and followed up on.
- Any dog owner should remain at the scene.
- I think this is the right thing to do. We should stick around at a car accident, why should it be any different that an incident like this.
- not necessary to explain
- As long as the bylaw enforcement office is not biased towards "pitbull" types breeds, or other large breeds. As a large dog breed owner, many smaller dogs initiate attacks/fights, and unfortunately end up being injured more severely. These cases need to be handled with caution and care so as not to put 100% blame on large breed owners when their dogs are only defending themselves. Having a witness involved would be beneficial as long as they are not associate with either party.
- i think that's the responsible thing to do
- The dog is their responsibility, it is no dissent than an automobile collision.
- To get information on the dog's health, vaccination status, etc
- The owner is accountable for their pets actions.
- Owners are responsible for their pets actions, and should be held accountable.
- The dog owner is responsible for the training/handling of the dog, and should be held accountable for it
- but needs to control the dog first. and if injury of either dog, that should be seen to first so a better method of identification should be applied rather than the above as enforcement officer may not be quick. and if minor injury, becomes a training problem, for both dog and owner.
- Dog owner needs to take responsibility
- Because lots of ppl just walk off with their dog and then you have to try and locate them if there are injuries, etc.
- This is a no brainer. How can an investigation happen if the owner takes off? Same logic as a hit and run accident in my thinking.
- I agree with this
- Dog owner needs to take responsibility for there dogs behavior.
- the dog owner is 100% responsible for the dog's behaviour therefore he needs to be there to respond to a law enforcement officer.
- We should get information and make the owner of the dog responsible legally for vet/medical bills but we shouldn't rush to put the dog down and we shouldn't do this at all
- Most dog attacks are provoked. It is important to have both sides of the encounter.
- Because it's the right thing to do!
- I do think the owner should stay at the incident. However since all the dog bites and attacks I have witnessed in Calgary were done by every other type of dog except bully types maybr the city should



check themselves on trying to attack bully types. My friends dog was attacked by a german shepard last week. Stop going after bully type dogs!

- Staying at the scene of an incident to share contact information seems like the responsible thing and reasonable thing to do.
- The dog is their responsibility
- As long as it is within an appropriate time frame. Making the individual wait more than 1-2 hours at the scene of the incident is unreasonable.
- To ensure the dog has all its shots up to date, and to be responsible for injuries caused.
- I think all dogs are capable of biting people and other dogs if they are not properly raised, I do not think this is limited to just pit bull breeds.
- The owner should be familiar with the offending dog's personality/body language and should be able to provide an accurate account of the event to the enforcement officer
- If a dog bites a person or animal, yes, the owner is responsible and should stay on the scene to provide information, This should also pertain to small breed dogs which are known to be aggressive and bite.
- Yes they should remain, unless they need to take an injured animal or person, theirs or someone else's for medical attention
- if you dog bites someone you need to make sure that never happens again. Take responsibility and deal with the consequences.
- Information should be exchanged in cases of injury resulting in veterinarian care.
- The dog owner needs to be responsible, many dogs get bites at dog parks and the owners of the biting dogs just Walk away, not taking responsibility.
- "Dog are family and should be treated the same as a person in this matter.
- Medical bills can be extremely expensive."
- Common sense
- Too often dog owners blame the victim for somehow 'inciting' the dog to bite or otherwise show aggression. They then feel blameless and free to walk away from the incident.
- It's only considerate and responsible ALTHOUGH it may not be possible if the dog needs to leave the scene for safety reasons and there is no vehicle/ home for them to be placed in.
- It's similar to a hit and run. If your animal is causing harm, both parties should stay and fill out an incident report that can be on record somewhere. This enables the authorities to follow both dogs in case of another incident.
- Is this not already a bylaw that owners are expected to follow? Pets are personal property and it seems reasonable to expect that owners, or caretakers acting on behalf of owners, would be required by law to exchange information in the event of a violent incident between pets, just as a driver would be expected to exchange information in the event of an incident involving their vehicle.
- This is like a criminal assault. If they leave, they should be heavily fined and the animal removed from their possession. They should also be prohibited from having another dog.



- Information sharing should be mandatory between those involved, however I am not convinced about waiting for an enforcement officer. More clarification about the need to wait for them would be required.
- although "if necessary" is vague. i believe most responsible owners will stay anyway
- Owners should be responsible for the dogs actions not to dog and definitely not the breed of the dog.
- Fault or non fault, all parties should stay in the area for proper reporting.
- ALL dogs should be held accountable. Not just pit bulls.
- Of course if an incident happens all parties should stay and speak with bylaw.
- There is already I law in place where you cannot flee the scene of a crime/car accident, therefore why should it be any different if your dog bites someone else.
- It is the responsibility of the owner for their animals behaviour.
- This is absolutely necessary. Bites can happen for so many reasons. Information about the dog, veterinary history and information about the owner can all be collected and assist in providing a full picture and highlight opportunities for remediation.
- Similar to if your car is in an accident. Should apply to dogs caregiver if different from owner at time of attack.
- Depending on the severity of the bite and circumstances.
- YES as I said earlier it is not the breed of the dog that concerns me it is the human behind it and people need to understand that it is their responsibility to socialize their animal with people and other animals. therefore yes the person whose dog bit someone or another dog should stay and give not only their name, but also the name of their vet so that the officer and the other person can get information on the dog's immunization records.
- if and only if they dog bites
- If you have an animal it is the owners responsibility for all that happens to and from that animal. It's not the animals fault, punish the owner.
- To get name of person responsible for pet.
- Have everyone and everything present at the scene if at all possible;
- your dog, your responsibility
- The owner needs to be accountable
- If you cannot handle your dog, on a leash, then you should not have one.
- Its the dog owner who is responsible for their dogs actions and needs to be there to help .
- When my dog was younger, and not much younger, a man surprised him by talking to us, and then breaking out into a jog right beside us. The dog jumped and nipped (no bite, grabbed coat, didn't rip coat) we told him our dog would've thought you were friendly and playing, and he seemingly understood but was unhappy. This was in an off leash park.
- It should be no different that a car accident. Information should be exchanged and the person with the dog responsible for the bite should have to pay for the other dog's vet care if needed. Also the dog that bites isn't necessarily the dog that starts the fight between dogs. More dog owners should



be educated in dog language and the signals they give off and what is appropriate engagement and 'play' at dog parks.

- Both sides should be heard and this would help. It would also help people take accountability for their pets.
- Dog owners should take responsibility for their animals. It is their job to train and take responsibility.
- ownership.
- if they are there, a record can be taken and possible replacement of the dog if needed. Plus if the person or dog is injured, the owner should be responsible to pay the medical/ vet bills required.
- Just like with drivers of cars are to remain on the scene of an accident, so should dog owners when an incident occurs.
- It's an assault. And I think small dog bites should be considered a behavioural issue and owners should require obedience training.
- I've had my dog attacked and the owner of the other dog run away from the scene.
- I think any responsible pet owner should stay at the scene. The caveat is if their animal has been badly hurt and needs immediate vet attention
- Dogs are rarely bad or aggressive by nature. Aggressive primarily happens for one of two reasons, A) If they have been hurt (ie kids throwing rocks at them) or because B) their owner trained them that way. In either case the owner should be present to explain the circumstances. If the dog was reacting to pain then the owner should want to be involved to protect their dog, and if it's because of how the dog is trained then the owner must also be involved as they are really the one at fault not their dog.
- I believe that we have the right to defend ourselves in court and by talking to the enforcement officer you would be using the system that is in place for us as citizens to get a fair and just trial in the court of law. An example being I'm walking my pitbull and someone's chihuahua attacks my dog when walking by so my dog reacts and grabs the chihuahua it gets hurt. Why should my dog be the nuisance dog and I be the one charged for owning the animal that reacted to protect itself. Not only that but it would cut down on the number of attacks in the unknown breed category involved in attacks.
- Owner should pay for vet bills
- I have heard of people leaving the scene so they don't have to pay vet bills of the other person
- As above, I personally strongly believe that the owner of any dog bears a high degree of responsibility for said dog's actions. It should absolutely be a crime to flee the scene where your dog bit/attacked a person. If we don't hold owners responsible for their dogs actions, then they have no incentive to be responsible dog owners.
- That's assault. The owner is responsible for the dogs behavior and if he is known to be aggressive, he should wear a muzzle or not be brought to a dog park.
- Dog owners should take responsibility for their pet's actions if an incident were to occur
- It is important that dog owners take responsibility for the actions of their dog. In order to do that, they may need to provide contact information and other details so that appropriate actions can be taken.



- The dog could be sick and victim needs to know, the dog owner needs to cover financial cost to victim, dog and dog owner needs to be assessed to see if they are safe or if it was a one-time thing caused by unusual trigger, etc. It is like a hit and run if they don't stay. Fines should be higher for those who run away.
- Only if it's a serious bite (the person or other pet is seriously hurt/bleeding)
- People have been really hurt before or there animal has been really hurt and owners of other dog leave the park and other owners are left with the animal and medical bills
- If there is a bite by ANY dog, NOT JUST PIT BULLS, the owner absolutely needs to stay on site.
- That's the respectful thing to do. The owner of the aggressor should be allowed to defend their dog, but shouldn't be able to get away and disappear if something happens
- Just like a car accident, if there is an incident there should be no running from it
- Yes, if a dog hurts someone their owner should be there to exchange information
- It's an attack. Similar to hit and run idea. Be responsible.
- responsible guardianship is key to the Calgary Model

Responses below include those that responded 'No' and provided an explanation.

- Enough laws already.
 - depending on the circumstance, maybe the victim is afraid, might increase he/shes anxiety, maybe the dog isn't comfortable, ie too hot/ cold out. lots of variables
 - Depending on the what the bite severity is obviously, but a lot of dog bites require zero medical attention.
 - "Yes, if a dog attacks a person and the person requires medical assistance.
-
- No, because people have a different levels of what is acceptable dog play and what is aggressive. How would you determine the type of dog on dog bite requires law enforcement?"
 - What if it was a wild bird or rabbit. I wouldn't stay at the scene. If it was a person yes. But pending that may not be the best idea to keep the frustrated dog at the scene either.
 - I think the dog should go home and the officer can go talk to the owner there. No need to put additional stress on the animal
 - I don't think people would follow it.
 - An exchanging of information between the involved parties should be required
 - They should have to remain only if there is damage from the bite. Most dog bites are warning bites and don't cause (or cause very minor) damage and shouldn't require involvement of an enforcement officer
 - You cannot expect to wait for an officer to show. What if you have other pressing commitments (pick kids up at school/daycare)



- This sounds dangerous and potential for a further altercation. The owner should have to give contact info and be allowed to leave. It should be another infraction if they refuse to give info before leaving though.
- How long could this take for an enforcement officer to show up? Owners, dogs and victims are shaken up and scared, I'm sure most will do the wrong thing in the heat of the moment. A cooling off at home period should be allowed. The threat of death, fines, and serious restrictions will limit the number of people who get help for their dog.
- Someone unfamiliar with dogs may just claim a bite to be intentional or vicious, when in reality, some dogs are triggered by certain things. A person may have instigated or approached a dog without speaking with the owner, putting themselves at unnecessary risk (ie. Did not take responsibility for their own actions and so full responsibility should not be assumed by the dog owner)
- I think the 2 parties should just share information
- There should be an information exchange but some situations may become worsened by the remaining presence of the dog or involved parties
- As adults we should be able to deal with this matter before bringing the law into it.
- Don't get close to a dog's face unless the owner says it is safe to do so.
- Let's say a dog got out bit another dog. The owner was able to stop the dog but was so exhausted and told the other person to run away so that they could escape and eliminate the situation by removing one of the dogs. The last thing you want to do is try hold back two dogs or more that are fighting and keep them all together in that situation. But there definitely needs to be a way to contact each other after just like a car accident. Not always necessary to have the police involved.
- Dogs bite sometimes. It's not fair to punish them because most of the time it's the other people bothering them or wrong treatment of them. Not everyone cares if they get bit.
- So long as both parties share information and the incident (based on severity) is able to be handled between owners, police don't need to be involved.
- If a dog has been involved in an incident such as a dog bite. The dog more than likely is scared. Feels threatened. And should be removed from the situation to cause less distress to not only the dog or dogs involved. As well as the victim of the bite would feel more comfortable I'm sure being away from the dog and owner that is responsible for the incident
- What if the person bitten was being a jackass and caused the incident? What if someone is lying? No. This will be abused. Are you guys bored or something
- Depends on the severity.
- Waiting for an officer with dogs who got into a fight would make matters worse
- I believe people should figure this out without wasting police/bylaw time
- It would be more important for the owner to remove the dog from the stimuli, especially if they are having a difficult time controlling the dog. Working through process would be challenging when all parties are stressed and worried.
- Owners can swap information just like a car accident, no need to involve law enforcement, they can be doing better and more useful things.
- Doesn't seem necessary.



- not for all bites, but it would be reasonable in the case of severe bites or injury
 - situation dependant. Perhaps for major bites/causing actual injuries.
 - If a dog bite takes place it is most likely due to the dog being triggered by something that it is fearful of; the dog will need to immediately be removed from the situation to prevent the dog becoming further stressed or agitated and for the safety of others
 - The dog or owner could be injured as well and may need to visit a vet or hospital.
 - At times it is nessisary for safety for the dog to be secured elsewhere while law enforcement is called. I've also seen witnesses grow violent. The law should be mandatory contact with enforcement after the incident, but not always on site.
 - If there are injuries involved, I would support it. However, I have seen multiple incidences at dog parks in which one party is very dramatic when there are no injuries even involved. This would allow those people to put "nuisance" labels on dogs who do not need the label
 - How much sense does it make to keep an allegedly aggressive dog in an escalated situation? If safety is the main concern, then shouldnt the dog be removed from the area?????? Common sense I would think.
 - Need to de-escalate the situation.
 - "This is dependent on the case. If both parties are in agreement that enforcement is not needed, they should have the right to settle without enforcement involved.
-
- Where parties cannot agree and the incident is severe, it would be more mportant to involve enforcement."
 - Animal could hurt other people if they are left in the area where the attack happened
 - Calgary should provide more options and support for dog training - prevention over punishment
 - I was bit by a dog that attacked mine and had to rush to emergency to get my hand stitched up
 - Remaining at the scene with the dog may increase the tension and cause the situation to be more dangerous and traumatic to the victim. They should provide their information and be able to leave. This rule does not differentiate between minor and major incidents, which should not be treated the same.
 - Often a dog that has bitten is extra excited, hurt, and needs to be removed from the scene to calm and be able to be examined for injuries. They should be required, like a vehicle accident, to share contact information then leave.
 - If the dog is put into a situation where they do not feel safe they may bite. It is not a good idea to keep the in that situation chancing that it may happen again if the dog is uncomfortable.
 - No as I feel necessary is a very ambiguous term, as well as the care of some animals may require rushing to a vet, and waiting for an officer is not an option, as long as information is shared between injured party and dog owner that should be enough.
 - Lot of bite incidents are result of improper behavior towards the dog.



- If you have worked it out with the other person there is no need to remain on scene unless other party wants it
- Any dog bite is provoked. It is the persons fault. Not the dogs. Why are dogs not allowed to defend themselves if a stranger rushes at them? Hmm?!
- No. Because dogs also bite when they are playing. There is a difference between play biting and biting to kill/injure. A lot of people don't know the difference. Lots of people are naive when it comes to this.
- Remaining at the scene could only inflame the situation
- I think if there's already been an incident the best course of action is to diffuse the situation. As long as they leave information or the other person has a picture of their id the owner and animal should be able to return home while the investigation continues. Forcing them to stick around just adds to the overall stress of the environment.
- The owner should be available for questioning, but to have to sit at the scene and wait for someone to arrive when the person bitten or the animal would have probably gone to the hospital or vet clinic is a bit absurd. Maybe the owner should have to bring the animal home or placed with someone while they attend the hospital or vet clinic with the victim, and wait to be questioned at that time. Depends on how long it takes for officers to respond to that sort of thing and how they prioritise it as well.
- I do believe that contact information should be necessary, but the animal should be removed as quickly as possible to mitigate further harm.
- It doesn't not suggest the severity of the bite. I do not believe accidents or small bites are worse enough to risk the owner being fined and losing their dog. If they are responsible enough and the bite is severe, they should stay and work it out with the other owner or person.
- You need to have a better definition for severity of bit and what if necessary means
- The dog should be immediately removed from the situation and taken home, therefore the owner must take it there. Information should be exchanged first between involved parties before the owner departs.
- it depends on the severity of the attack. I would say yes only in the case of severe bodily harm I.e. requiring EMS.
- I feel its the right thing but not necessary
- The owner and dogs are likely stressed waiting for a call to be placed and arrival can be traumatizing and make a stressful scene worse
- This will be very hard to enforce.
- In some cases, the owner staying on scene could further increase the stressful situation on everyone involved. It is best that the owner removes their dog from the scene to safely contain it.
- Responsible people will stay. Irresponsible people won't stay even if there is a bylaw. They don't care about bylaws and won't change their behaviour just because there is a bylaw.
- I support it for dog bite human not for dog bites dog. Dogs are dogs and they tell each other of when it is necessary: severe mauling is different story.
- Case by case. Sometimes dogs fight and removing a dog as quickly as possible is most effective.



- It completely depends on if there was serious injury to the animal, or any injury to a person. Dogs will always be dogs and will settle their differences on their own.
- I don't think this rule would be feasible to enforce, especially in the instances where the owner is injured during the altercation to the point of needed medical attention.
- I don't believe there is any way to effectively and properly police this
- It is the same thing if you are involved at the scene of a car accident.
- That is not fair why attack a single breed
- If there is a problem, the dog should be removed from the area before things escalate more.
- I don't support the idea of punishing the dog whose owner is not educated enough to train the dog. And I don't support punishing a dog if it was teased, abused or threatened by a person or another dog who is further perceived as a victim. The existing system doesn't investigate the cases enough, therefore I don't support remaining on scene to get your dog killed at the end.
- If a person is bitten, they need to seek medical help. They should get the info from the owner, and be free to leave, so too should the owner.
- Impossible to enforce. The people with the real problem dogs because of their own lack of training the dog or otherwise, won't stay regardless of the rule so it won't result in fair consequences.
- The owner should provide a way to contact them and take their animal to be secured not to remain in a dangerous situation that often escalates.
- If an incident occurs the owner likely needs to de-escalate the situation and deal with the dog. Contact information should be exchanged. However, this could end up being false information given. So, maybe? As long as it's safe for everyone.
- They can provide the information to the owner of the dog that was bitten. It is better for the dog to be removed from the situation to calm down vs. remaining in the area & continuing to get stressed.
- If it's self-defence for owner, or a dangerous situation for someone to stay in (if a dog bit an attacker in owner's self-defence)
- Exchange of contact info and availability to speak to enforcement but at times to separate parties would be best to de-escalate the situation.
- Owners need to get their animal out of any situation that has caused high stress. A dog bite is a high stress situation.
- If a dog bites a human it should be mandatory but dogs often bite other dogs for a myriad of reasons some legitimate. Let's focus on the serious cases.
- Yes owner information should be given but I believe the animal in question should be safely secured on or off site
- Sometimes if there is a dog fight, the best thing is to remove both dogs from the situation. Owners should have to exchange information, but waiting for an official could lead to increased agitation to one or both animals and their owners.
- I strongly believe that if a dog bites another person, it should be investigated as to why the dog bit the other person. Sometimes it is the other person's fault or the owner's. I do not believe the dog should be penalized for this. I think the owner should be held accountable. Not the dog.



- I would support this rule for severe bites requiring the person or dog to visit the hospital/vet. But as it's difficult to define what's severe and what isn't I don't support such a rule as I wouldn't want a dog who isn't aggressive, violent, or a nuisance to be labeled as such because of an overreaction, and by requiring an owner to stay at the scene and share contact information you're leading small incidents towards being blown out of proportion.
- The whole situation will be full of tension, anger, fear, shock. It might be easier to exchange phone numbers or at least agree to meet without the animals at a later date or time pending injuries.
- I do not believe this would be effective at dealing with the situation. They should be required to give contact information, not to remain at the scene
- If a dog is in an aggressive state and has already bitten a person/animal, it is in the best interest of the dog to remove it from the situation to an area where it is able to calm down. Requiring a dog to stay in the initial area would increase the stress and subsequent level of aggression in the dog.
- I do think that the owner should have to share their information, however if there's a reason that their animal is being reactive it is probably best that they bring their animal back home and out of that situation that way nothing else unfortunate occurs
- If it is a serious incident most people would stay on site anyway.
- I would support this rule for severe bites requiring the person or dog to visit the hospital/vet. But as it's difficult to define what's severe and what isn't I don't support such a rule as I wouldn't want a dog who isn't aggressive, violent, or a nuisance to be labeled as such because of an overreaction, and by requiring an owner to stay at the scene and share contact information you're leading small incidents towards being blown out of proportion.
- In an attack I think it is best for the owner to give a number and then leave scene for the safety of the person that got attacked and the aggressive dog to leave scene and go home and be confined there until matters can be taken care of
- I do not think this is always necessary, for example if an off leash dog approaches an on-leash dog, in an on-leash area, if the off-leash dog is bit by the leashed dog, it's still the off leash dog owner's fault. It's usually the right thing to do, but every case is different.
- This can be traumatic for the owner, victim and dog. I agree details need to be swapped but waiting around for god knows how long will only exacerbate the situation
- Sometimes failing to remove the animal from a situation will result in further negative interactions. However, I feel the owner should be required to remove themselves only as far as is necessary to calm their dog and no further.
- It should be required to provide information to other parties involved, but not to wait to talk to an enforcement officer. It is safest to get the dog to a safe location, instead of waiting around. If anything needed to be clarified, a phone call should be sufficient.
- I find this problematic for certain situations, such as no damage was done to the person or animal; or in the case of two dogs who both were responsible for a fight with one another. Minor incidents for level 1-2 bites can easily be resolved with just the owners.
- It might be in the best interest to separate in order to de-escalate the situation.



- An agreement between the two parties could be met. Also, I'm fearful that this decision would make people more likely to flee for the safety of their dog. Also, cats who are roaming at large can present issues for dogs who are non-aggressive but who have a prey-drive. Of course owners do their best to prevent anyone's pet being harmed, but if a cat was roaming, hiding under a car or in some bushes, a dog owner might not be able to catch their dog in time.
- Difficult if owners need to remove involved animals from situation. The question does not provide adequate detail of proposed rule to appropriately answer.
- I do believe most people should stay the scene and try to give and get contact information, however, I vote no because sometimes the person who was bitten may leave upset and this could then turn into blaming the other person for "leaving" when in reality it was the other. These situations are stressful and may cause people to act out of character and not think clearly right away.
- This makes it difficult for owners to take their dog out of stressful situations and calm them down. There are not always two people walking a dog
- Owner will have to deescalate the situation and staying at the scene could make that difficult
- I don't want a stranger having my private contact information. Exchanging that type of information isn't even required for a car accident. Is the City of Calgary going to be liable if the other party starts harrassing me? What if the other party is lying and causing a scene...and now they have my phone number. It would be extremely inappropriate for City Council to impose a bylaw that forces me to hand over my phone number to private citizens.
- I think the priority should be removing the nuisance dog so the owner should stay to exchange info but not necessarily have to wait for bylaw.
- How is an enforcement officer going to enforce that? You're just asking for trouble between the two owners. They should be required to report their dog bite but not remain at the scene.
- Not if it bites another animal only if it bites a human
- Depending on the situation and who is at fault
- Tired of living in a police state
- depending on the situation. If someone's dog attacked mine first or a human did or was attacking me, any dog could bite.
- The dog and owner would already be stressed enough, there may be many causes ending in a dog biting another dog or person. Removing the dog from that situation would be better and for the owner to meet up with the enforcement officer at home or wherever suitable.
- "If it's a bully breed it'll already be a one sided story.
- So many other breeds are more violent"
- I think the owner should be able to leave the scene but must provide identifying information so a report can be made before doing so.
- In some situations the dogs would need to be separated and removed from the situation, the owner should give contact info but not be forced to keep dogs in an unsafe environment which could make the situation worse
- The remain at scene escalates the problem, doesn't allow dog to be handled safely



- Having consulted on hundreds of dog bites in Calgary over the last 8 years, I have found that people are varied in how they want to follow-up from a bite. Some people just want their animals to the vet or themselves, some people become angry and or violent in defense of their animal. I just think "the owner" is unclear language in yet still other cases where two dogs have been in a fight and in an attempt to break them up, both owners blame the other dog. I still find that the rate of reporting is quite low in the community and I just don't see this being a viable mandate at this time. It could be, but I believe a period of targeted campaigning for increased or mandatory reporting would need to proceed in order to be effective.
- "As long as information is exchanged. Provided there is consensus between the parties. Then these matters can be handled between individuals.
- HOWEVER. If the opposing party declines to exchange information. Then enforcement is required. And should be treated as leaving the scene of an accident. And be tracked down as the same
- Though the definition of bite must include the breaking of skin . As dogs in play often look as if they are fighting. But there is NO hostility between them. They just don't have hands. And have you never accidentally bumped into someone making them stumble?
- Please remember animals are not people. Even we'll trained animals can react in unexpected ways due to stimulation we do not understand."
- You can do it all by phone and email.
- Depending on the severity would change potentially change my response . Does law enforcement really need to be involved with something the individuals can potentially come to an agreement on?
- There's always two sides to the story. A little dog might instigate or even bite a larger dog. If the larger dog reacts they will likely have more of an impact, though it was the smaller dog that bit first.
- Sometimes dogs bite because they are in danger. If a dog bites someone because that person is being aggressive to the dog (and people have more sense than dogs) then it is not the dog's fault and is best for the owner to take the dog to a safe location.
- In most situations this is sensible but what if the situation is aggravating the dog? It should be compulsory to identify oneself in these situations.
- In some cases it is best to just get the dog out of there, so that should be allowed.
- No, because the owner needs to get the dog home as quickly as possible to calm the dog down.
- Typically a dog bite is not a result of the dog and more result of bad handling. I don't ever believe that a dog should be punished for the owners negligence.
- Bites happen. People should be responsible



- Dog's adrenaline is elevated, only more harm can come to the dog and possibly others. Dog needs to be extracted from the situation ASAP.
 - They should share contact info, but the situation may be that it is better for the dog to be removed from the situation and put some place safe while the owner deals with the aftermath.
 - In some cases the dog needs to be removed from the situation to a calm and secure place. Exchanging info is necessary though
 - Libertarian
 - Dog and/or people will be in a heightened state of anxiety. Keeping the dog in that environment is not healthy or potentially safe.
 - only where bites are serious
 - It depends on the situation. If you have a hysterical third party and the situation could escalate both human/human violence or agitation of the animal could occur. Some people consider playful interactions an act of aggression, as many people do not understand full dog behaviour but are still passionate about their beliefs. Certainly if a serious incident occurred, an enforcement officer should attend to take statements.
 - These situations can be very traumatic and emotional for both the people and dogs involved. Staying on scene could also cause another incident especially if it was due to gear failing (leash, collar, harness, etc)
 - Remaining at the scene with a dog that bit is inadvisable. There's a reason the dog bit, e.g., fear, and getting the dog out of there quickly is important. I think the dog owner should quickly provide information to a nearby person then leave to a safe distance.
 - If the owner remained so would the dog and potentially could bite again. Would be better to have to share contact info (ie cell phone number to be tested & answered on the spot)
 - "Bites and attacks can be an extreme source of trauma and forcing the victim to stick around with the dog is troublesome. Keeping the owner there will ergo keep the Dog on scene
-
- Instead, have a hit and run type bylaw where info legally is required to be given (including drivers licence information, dog registration info, etc)"
 - The dog is obviously agitated & needs to be removed from a stressful situation, the owner is the only one who can move the dog to a place where there is no longer a danger
 - People panic. It is natural.
 - I would not support proposed rule.
 - Sometimes it makes much more sense to get the offending dog home and away from the stimulation.
 - "If they have provided contact info to the other person, it is best to remove dog immediately from the situation.



- I agree with a law that says contact info must be shared with those impacted"
 - Provide details but do not make them stay. Staying increases risk of interpersonal conflict and the dogs need to be removed from the situation asap
 - Leaving information and being available. But returning the animal home to avoid additional trauma is reasonable
 - "Removing the dog from the situation could be necessary to calm it down to avoid further issues. If the owner of the dog is there alone (and required to stay), the dog would be staying in the stressful situation that caused it to bite in the first place.
-
- Exchange information: yes.
 - Required to stay: no."
 - If a dog bites a person, yes. If a dog bites another dog, no.
 - Well because for whatever present situation, that dog was agitated enough to bite. The SAFEST thing is probably to isolate the dog from the situation IMMEDIATELY. Staying in a situation/set of circumstances with said animal after the incident seems reckless and foolish. Since that exact situation was already proven to be an adequate recipe for a disaster. After the altercation most likely emotions will be higher and odds things will continue to slide sideways... very high.
 - These events are traumatic and getting all dogs involved away from the scene is critical. Waiting around lends itself to additional problems.
 - If a cat or a dog bite...its because the animal is in distress and something has triggered the fight or flight response. Get the animal out of the stressful situation don't perpetuate the problem further.
 - This depends on the severity of the bite and whether the victim received / listened to the animal owner's warnings. Yes if the victim is severely injured, no if the victim got nipped while playing with a dog and the owner asked them not to.
 - The owner should leave contact info and remove the dog from the situation asap.
 - The situation has already escalated and to remain on scene does nothing to calm or decelerate the situation.
 - The animal is already under stress. Give your information and leave. You aren't required to wait at the scene for a fender bender as long as you give the other party your information
 - I think it should be an offense to leave the scene without exchanging information but remaining could be unsafe for the victim, the dog, the owner and could escalate situations. However, for legal and civil purposes, information should be exchanged.
 - Certain dogs bite because they were mishandled or cornered or scared. Not all dog bites are malicious and shouldn't be treated as such.
 - People over exaggerate all the time. The city is full of Karen's. PIT BULLS ARE NOT VICIOUS KAREN GO HOME.
 - Because people lie and officer give out tickets.



- That then requires said dog to stay on scene, which could cause more distress to all animals and people involved.
- Best to get the dog home and away from the area that can cause further stress
- I wouldn't want a dog that bit mine still around me and my dog for however long it took an officer to arrive. The people should exchange numbers and pass along to the officers
- "No, because we are all responsible for our 'children,' while you might disagree they're our children if my HUMAN child bite another HUMAN child I wouldn't have to stay there for to share information.
- Yes if it was severe enough for stitches/hospital visit."
- "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." This is completely false and who'm ever put forth these certifiably false claims on a government website should be let go. All I can say is, this had better be changed because it's 2020 and bigoted government wont be tolerated.
- I would support it if it had a stipulation about the owner being allowed to leave if they were unsafe in the situation. Ie: if the dog bit an attacker
- Could aggregate the animal further depending on the environment (dog park or similar stimulation)
- An owner should be required to provide contact information however there may be legitimate reasons for needing to leave the scene Dash for example obtaining veterinary treatment for an animal in the case of an altercation were multiple animals were responsible for bites
- How can you get this to happen when hit n runs with vehicles are so high still?
- Person should be required to share contact info (drivers license, phone number, etc) just like at the scene of a car accident. Owner should be required to call and report incident to bylaw via phone afterwards. This is because otherwise they'd be at the scene all day waiting for an enforcement officer to appear on scene.
- If an incident has occurred it is best to remove the dogs. Staying there could lead to further issues.
- Only if they are able to control their dog or remove it from the situation.
- Support exchange of contact information only.
- It really depends on the context. If its a violent attack, yes. But some dogs 'mouth' as a means of exploring the world
- That won't solve the problem or make people more accountable
- Normally i would say yes. And it should be mandatory to give contact info but if the dog is still aggressive or hurt, the owner should be able to at least take it away/put it in the house/put it in the car and come back.
- Sometimes bites happen in confrontations and the accused dog may also be hurt and require medical attention.
- "most attacks are from dashaunds and chihuahua animals..
- please use real science instead of whatever this is made from."
- If the person or other animal sustains a significant injury then yes, they should stay. Otherwise the owners should be able to work out next steps, such as exchanging information in case something develops later.



- It would likely be better for everyone involved if they took the offending dog home and spoke with an enforcement officer there.
- Unfortunately there is no way to enforce this since dogs don't have visible licence plates like cars do
- Likely better to de escalate an emotional situation
- "No. They're dogs, it happens sometimes. My dog gets nipped at in the park often and she puts the dog in their place and everyone moves on. So many people aren't easy going like me and are going to call the cops or bylaw everytime one of those dogs comes around and nips their dog.

- And DO NOT do that to all the sweet pitbulls out there. What about German shepherds, Huskies, shitzus, chihuahuas, labradors, doodles, malamutes, ALL the other breeds that I have personally witnessed being aggressive.

- There are so many pitbulls around this city that don't deserve this. And neither do their owners.

- I'm ashamed of this city right now."
- No because not every situation needs police assistance, and it will just tie up resources better used elsewhere.
- Bites need treatment, rule may require contact information to be shared but waiting while bitten seems silly.
- If both dogs are injured, delaying medical care and the ability to seek it would be detrimental to the health of an animal potentially
- Because people are hysterical morons about dog behaviour.
- The dog needs to be removed from the situation immediately.
- There may not be an officer immediately present to assess the scene, especially availability on weekends.
- People get very heated when incidents like this happen. We can't give a guide line like this because no incident happens the same and you don't want to risk anyone's safety. Please contact me to consult on this project. I'm a science based dog trainer. My name is [personal information removed] and you can contact me at [personal information removed]
- I believe many dogs on leash bite offleash dogs and this should be an offence by the owner of an offleash dog!
- They should be able to take the dog home/away.
- "It is possible the dog
- Was provoked - would be better for them not to remain at the site.
- This could be confrontational... better to part. Leave information with the person bitten. (swap info like a car accident)"



- I think it's best to remove the dog. However it should be necessary to provide owner information
 - This can be a horrible time, a rule holds any party at fault for leaving the scene when they should be seeking even minor medical attention for them selfs, others, or their pets. Would be a hindrance more than it helps.
 - I dont think it is reasonable for the owner with the dog involved to stay in the scene as it may not be safe
 - It may not be safe for the owner to stay at the scene with their dog, as it may further escalate the situation.
 - Contact information needs to be given to the appropriate authorities for later questioning. It is not necessary for the owner and dog to remain on scene.
 - Law enforcement response times are poor. Let people work out the problems. If a person flees to avoid accountability, encourage reporting. Requiring people to stay at the scene will not hold serious offenders responsible. They will still leave to avoid consequences and you will just tag another charge on them should you ever find them.
 - Exchange info but owner must be able to leave with the problem dog in order to deescalate the situation and not drag out an unsafe situation.
 - The dog is obviously stressed and needs to be removed from the situation
 - The person should be able to go (to get their dog out of there) but with the condition that their contact info be given for follow up from the By-law officer. I imagine if the dog attacked someone it would be difficult to keep the dog under control with the situation being very elevated.
 - only if safe to do so. Sometimes it is better to separate the dogs/owners I think information should be exchanged and officer can contact both parties.
 - How can this be done when the dog is at large and unattended? Otherwise, yes, vet Bill's apply.
 - it's not practical, the owner may be required to go to the vet/ hospital as well, depending on the nature of the incident
 - If the dog owner stays, chances are the dog stays. That would do nothing to de-escalate the situation and could lead to more problems. Humans are much less predictable and more aggressive than any animal.
 - The dog should be removed and isolated from a situation immediately.
 - they are responsible, but removing the animal from the stressful incident is most important.
 - Impossible to enforce
 - "Biting a person and biting another animal are 2 completely different scenarios that should not be in the same question at all.
-
- Biting a person - yes exchange information and be available to talk to an officer.
 - Biting another animal - totally dependant in the situation."



- While “dog bite” seems obvious, in reality when dogs play at a dog park there are occasionally nips and some owners over-react. Creating an enforcement process around vague “bites” seems onerous and serves to increase the reporting of non-incidents.
- I was recently involved with a dog bite incident where my friend was bitten quite severely by a foster dog we were meeting to photograph. I knew the foster parent and asked them to leave with the dog as I knew how to get in contact with them. I really think it needs to be a "situation" base.
- As a dog aggression expert, it is usually more important to get the dog out of the area first to prevent further incidents. This may require that the owner leaves the scene. There should be a way for the owner to self-report after the incident with no penalty.
- Often it’s the humans trying to break the fight up that causes damage to the dogs and it’s not always clear who is to blame. Sometimes it’s best for people to sort these issues out themselves rather than involving an officer.
- Similar to a car accident, everyone involved should share their information. But if an animal is hurt and in distress, that person needs to get their animal home immediately.
- yes and no, you would want to get the dogs in a safe environment for them to cool down. Obviously it should not be a hit and run scenario so there must be a way for them to contact or leave contact information before going to find a safer place.
- Isn’t it already required and they still dont.
- Separate the dogs
- Everyone will have a different definition of a "dog bite". Forcing someone to stick around or share contact information could create issues between the two parties, especially if someone considers a warning a "bite". I would focus more on canine communication at place where situations could arise (like an off leash park) so people remember that dogs are dogs and not all dogs are going to like each other, get along, want to play, etc. Teach owners the importance of knowing their dog, their limits and over all canine communication.
- Typical “Karen” people will exploit this
- I think they should be allowed to leave their contact information with the other person and be contacted later
- I think the information should be exchanged, ie, contact info, etc., or call 911 if severe injury but I think the offending dog should be removed from area which means owner takes it away not remain at scene and cause more stress to others
- If a bite has just occurred it would seem to me you would want to exit a potentially volatile situation for everyone’s well being. Could the dog owner and the enforcement officer not connect after?
- It could take hours for them to attend the scene
- If medical attention is needed for animals or humans it takes priority.
- Dog owner remaining at scene means the dog is also remaining at scene.
- Not black and white. If a dog bites another dog to protect himself from an attack, that should not be the same as a straight attack. Be very careful with how you word this bylaw. You may cause innocent dogs and their owners a huge amount of stress, grief, and you may cause a dog's unfair



death. A big dog defending himself from a vicious small dog, does not deserve to get the blame. The small dogs are the worst, but are never controlled (by the owner or by bylaws)

- May be better for the situation to be diffused by everyone separating
- I think it should be no, if the bite is minor. Most of the time, dog bites happen because the dog is fear reactive. However, if the bite is more serious (only), then under certain circumstances it should be yes.
- I don't think so. It all depends on the situation.
- I think information can be collected anywhere and sometimes it would add heat to the moment if everyone was required to stay.
- While I would like to agree with this rule, it may not be safe to keep a dog that has just been involved in an incident such as a severe bite at the scene without the situation escalating and becoming more dangerous. However, I believe that owners should be legally required to exchange information, and if there is a refusal to do so then they must stay put (or somewhere safer nearby) until bylaw arrives.
- There is no way COC could manage the volume.
- Exchange info yes, wait for an enforcement officer no—that could be all day
- Who determines "if necessary". Dogs will tussle once in awhile and end up with a scratch. That can have an owner upset (and, boy, can that escalate). People without medical training of any sort will often think a scratch is severe because they dig through the fur and find a spot or blood or their "pride" is hurt when little Fluffy was the problem and got put in its place. Requiring staying for by-laws will be used unnecessarily.
- Yes, but oftentimes the victim of a bite needs to leave immediately to receive medical attention, or the owner of the offending dog needs to get to an area where the dog can safely be contained. It's not cut and dry.
- They should share the correct contact information with the victim.
- I believe the person should be required to provide contact information to the injured party and when possible to remain at the scene. If it is necessary to leave the scene to remove the animal from the location (for the safety of the individuals and the animal) then I think it should be ok for them to do that once contact information is provided. (As an example, I would not support having to place an animal inside a vehicle in the summer just to ensure you remained on scene until an enforcement officer arrived.)
- Too dangerous.
- remain at scene or provide contact information for later discussion. Cooler heads might be required, and people have commitments
- Sometimes the best thing to do in these situation is to separate the dogs, so this isn't always practical. In an ideal world owners would exchange contact details and connect after with each other and if necessary enforcement officers without their dogs.
- I fully support contact being mandatory after such an incident, but staying at the scene can be too difficult. I know this makes it harder to enforce, but I feel being able to meet with an enforcement officer after the situation has calmed down would also make for a more productive engagement.



- There could be extenuating circumstances around the bite that would make keeping the dog at the scene more dangerous than removing the dog entirely.
- These are high stress, emotional situations that can be made safer by allowing people the freedom to leave
- I think that removing the dog from the scene so that no further injury happens is a good idea. Hanging around with a stressed dog and person that is injured can be a nasty scene. If possible yes stay.. but if creates more trouble then no. Need to make it mandatory that the person provide contact info and picture taken if possible.
- I find that little dogs are more aggressive and bite than larger ones, but owners do not take it as seriously because they are small. This seems like a great way to ensure a conflict between owner and victim, no matter the size of the dog. Who is supposed to ensure a person remains at the scene?
- Severe bites: yes. Nips or barely draws blood: no.
- If the dog is nuts, staying at the scene would be dangerous. I suggest ppl give their gov ID to the victim to take a photo of or record along with phone number and email.
- There should be allowance for contact info to be shared by phone, since waiting for bylaw can take a long time and might interfere with other necessary events.
- This idea supports the expanded role for bylaw officers so in theory YES but the practicalities would need to be thought through to be to implementable and effective. It is more important for the person or animal bitten to seek medical help immediately.
- A person agree to the liabilities and risks when attending a dog park. Dog flights are most often a he said she said account of the incident and there is no need for a person to provide their contact information.
- "If the dog is over threshold or extremely agitated. Keeping them on the scene makes things worse (science has shown us this).
- Owners should exchange information and parties should be separated."
- Removing the dog from that environment is critical. It's obviously in a stressful environment and could hurt others
- The owner may need to secure the dog, get medical or veterinary treatment. The owner should have to leave contact information if they have to leave.
- I think it should be required that they provide contact information, however in an incident where a dog bites a person or an animal, it is often a high tension situation. Remaining in the situation with either dog (the biter or the bitee) is extremely stressed/ reactive because of the situation could lead to more issues, and be a dangerous situation for all involved. Sometimes the responsible/ safe choice is to remove a dog from a situation and you shouldn't be punished for that as long as you have done due diligence to reach out to animal control or provided your info to the other party.
- To much of an honour system
- "Weather extremes. If enacted bylaw services should be liable for injury to the animal if they were unable to attend the scene in an appropriate time. What response time is acceptable for +30c or - 30c with strong windchill, or a thunderstorm or tornado warning in effect.



- Then consider the situation where two dogs have attacked each other, is it really sensible to keep those dogs in the same space."
 - This is a "no but" no. No, because it is unenforceable, and impractical to wait for a bylaw officer. However, sharing information should be required.
 - "I say no, only because there will be times when the safest thing to do is to remove the dog from this situation. The owner may have to walk their dog back home and away from the scene to calm the dog and prevent further reactions.
-
- Not every situation is going to be black and white. Many dogs that bite are doing so out of fear. Keeping them in that moment does more damage to the dogs mental stability and cause the dog to react further.
-
- Isolate the danger then return to the scene or contact bylaw. That should be the rule."
 - Information should be exchanged (along with any potential witnesses.) Photo's etc should be take as evidence.
 - I think it's about being able to followup or contact the owner about the incident - if a pet has been involved in an incident it may NOT be wise to keep them at the scene
 - If a dog defends its owner in a dangerous situation or altercation, they should not be subjected to the same rules as a dog who randomly attacks without provocation.
 - People can sort this out, this about responsible guardianship.
 - We don't have a problem with dog bites. We don't need more restrictive laws about dogs.
 - As long as valid personnel information is provided they shouldn't have to remain on scene.
 - I have seen people bitten at off leash parks because they have kicked or abused another person's dog. These confrontations are tense and emotional, people should not be forced to continue to engage when the situation is heightened and unsafe
 - Enforcement officers are out of control many times - they do not use common sense and are full of their authority and power - their egos are so fragile that they cannot handle pushback without going on a major offensive and exercising their authority in an over the top way.
 - I support this, but think an "incident" should be defined - if dogs are playing and one nips, or play gets a bit rough, I don't think an owner should have to stick around for who knows how long before an officer arrives. Maybe even some requirement that the owners call a number to provide their contact information would be better.
 - Because 'another animal' would include things like birds, squirrels, and other small animals the city kills en masse anyways.



- This can increase anxiety in the dog and owner - it can be very difficult on the dog to remain in this situation, although I'm not sure what the alternative is - maybe just exchange information as easily as possible and quick follow-up at a different site/home by enforcement officers.
- I feel this is too vague. What if a dog bites a wild animal? Or a dog bites a cat that's running at large? Most responsible pet owners will use their judgement based on the situation. Remaining at the scene could amplify the situation. There should be options for people - ex. go home and phone in an encounter etc
- Perhaps the dog was triggered by its surroundings and circumstances, you could be stressing that animal out further by forcing it to stay in said situation with its owner, which could possibly lead to a preventable incident.
- The individual should share contact information with the affected persons. Remaining at the scene could be problematic for the animal
- They could provide identification to the other owner & remove their dog from the park (avoid other incidents/ dog in hot/ cold weather or car)
- Dog might need to get out of the situation; human/other animal bitten may be in need of immediate medical attention
- While responsible ownership should make this a good idea, keeping the aggressor at the scene isn't necessarily wise.
- I don't agree with having to talk to an enforcement officer but I do agree with having to share info
- There need to be a consideration to get the animal to a place where they are not in heightened aggression mode. Keeping them in a situation where they have already attacked seem like it would be inviting further violence
- The dog should be taken away from the area to prevent further stress or harm
- If there dog has bitten a person I think remaining might cause some stress or chaos... they can get the info of the offender and deal with them at their residence.
- Its common sense that one does this.
- There absolutely needs to be contact information for the owner. However, if the dog has already been involved in a biting incident, keeping the dog at the scene may only escalate the issue. Follow up is essential but so is ensuring everyone involved is safe first.
- I don't want people trapped by strangers
- Response times for bylaw is brutal.
- Some situations require separation to de-escalate it. Provided the individuals contact the authorities to deal with the situation
- I believe that contact information should be explained, however the dog should be removed from the location, as you want to prevent the situation or the animal to escalate again.
- Because photographs and other testimonies and even videos can be taken on location. So long as that is done it isn't necessary to wait.
- If an animal is in an aggressive state you should remove the animal from the situation to prevent further contact with animals until they can relax
- If it can be resolved between the person's involved it will save time and resources.



- Sometimes dogs fight, it's a natural instinct. Doesn't mean they always come out hurt. If a human is attacked, wait for authorities and make sure you consider what happened for the dog to attack, and also consider the age of the animal. Is it blind or deaf and didn't know what was coming it's way etc.
- is NOT a NAZI state YET.
- Most situations can be handled privately
- Obviously the animal is distressed for whatever reason. Keeping the animal there longer would likely result in more stress on the animal. I think a phone number would suffice.
- My problem with this is that there is more to it than just the biting. If the bite clearly causes an injury, e.g. blood, bruising, than they should be required
- The dog owner may have to leave an escalated situation to safely contain their dog.
- Is the one that was bitten going to remain at the scene of the incident or will they go and get medical attention? Trade your information and go about your business, the bylaw officer can locate them at their residence.
- Not if the dog or person is injured and needs medical attention
- I have a large breed dog and have done extensive training with her due to her size. Often we run into people with small dogs that have received zero training. She has gotten prey drive before based on being given an aggressive social cue by a small dog that was not socialized Or trained properly which ended in her pinning/ nipping the smaller dog. Many dog owners don't recognize this as their untrained small dogs issue and the big dog always gets blamed. If anything there should be more fully fenced dog parks with a big dog/ little dog section (like the one in Whitefish, Montana).
- Contact information should be shared, but better trained officials should be called. For example, medical professionals for both humans and dogs if necessary
- I think the focus should be primarily on removing the aggressive dog from the situation, as keeping it there would heighten the anxiety in the dog and may cause it to attack again. Also, the victims may need urgent medical care. However I do agree that there needs to be some way of getting the owner's information to hold them accountable
- The dog may be somewhere it could cause more harm if it had to remain in the area with its owner.
- I don't think this is a bad idea per se except that it seems to take awhile for bylaw to arrive at times. Especially if its a minor incident I don't think its fair to force people to wait long periods of time for bylaw.... however they should be forced to provide all necessary information before leaving.
- Sometimes if a situation has escalated it isn't safe for anyone to remain in place.
- Collect contact info rather than stating at the scene.
- The person's own dog might need medical attention. Plus an environment that caused injury will probably escalate if iwner (and dog most likely) needs to remain on scene
- Responsible people can use their problem solving skills and come to an agreement. Keeping the bite victims in the same vicinity as the dog that bit will cause stress on the people and the animal.
- "That person should remove the dog from the situation and take it elsewhere for safety.
- Also, the victimized dog and its owner should immediately seek treatment."
- The owner should only remain if the animal is a known nuisance or has cause harm to person or persons property. The culpability is on the owner not the animal.



- I only believe this should be answered as a yes if there is blatant evidence that the damage done by said bite was severe. Puppies nibble on things they shouldn't, are you saying that a puppy who might accidentally bite another animal at the park should be forced to undergo what could be a traumatizing situation?
- This leaves too much room for someone to claim and exaggerate a bite or attack that was merely a nip or didn't happen at all. Many people do not know or listen to dog owners for proper introduction etiquette and having this rule could put many undeserving dogs at risk, in all breeds. If a bite results in serious injury where medical attention is needed, it should be called on spot and in which case it would make sense to have a rule the dog owner must stay on scene then.
- That pup needs to be taken out of the situation and to some where he/she feels safe. The situation can be dealt with from home.
- As someone who has been bit by a dog at a city dog park, there are times when accidents occur due to human negligence. I fear that this requirement will increase tensions and aggression between people and dogs. Also, as a pet owner, my dog growls and plays rough, dogs bite each other in play. I have more of a problem with off leash dogs running up to mine on paths than anything else. If my dog grows and bites a dog that run up to me, after communicating that my dog is on leash and needs distance, that is the other owners fault entirely.
- Owner should leave contact info then get the dog home so there isn't another incident
- not if it is unsafe for them or the animal to do so in the example of mob me tailing and taking the "law" into one's hands
- To share info yes but not remain at the scene as it might be more stressful for both dogs and people
- The owner is like to be anxious, frantic and/or scared. This is felt by their dog also which may escalate the situation. The dog can continue to act out of nature if kept in an uncomfortable atmosphere. One needs to remove themselves and dog from the situation before it can be analyzed effectively. Name and number quickly exchanged agreed.
- They should, but this is not necessarily safe for the dog, other dogs, or people.
- Just because its a rule doesnt mean it will be followed. How would it be enforced?
- As you would want the dogs to be far away. But people should be required to share there info.
- Personal/contact information should be shared, but injured/agitated animals should be transported to vet/safe environment
- I'm not sure... maybe?
- What is "necessary". Who decides? Based on if skin is broken, situation leading up to it?
- I don't want my dog taken away
- It's not necessary to bring law enforcement to a situation like this. In some cases, maybe. But I would rather see qualified individuals, not police officers.
- An owner should provide personal information but needs to get the dog out of the situation as soon as possible. Waiting for an officer can increase stress for animal.
- Accidents happen. Sometimes a small, excited dog, like a Yorkshire Terrier or Shiba Inu may escape from someone's house and playfully nip at someone. This is an accident and nobody really gets hurt. Neither the dog owner nor the dog should get into trouble. People need to be



understanding and know that there is a difference between a dangerous dog attack vs a minor play/nipping incident. People need to be reasonable and fair. No dog should be unjustly in trouble or euthanized or fined for a minor accident where nobody was truly hurt. People have the right to settle/forgive situations on their own that are harmless. People should not be forced to press charges. Accidents happen. People need to have the option of working things out by themselves.

- Go [removed] yourself [removed]
- It can't be enforced
- If someones dog bites me it's between me and them. It has nothing to do with a cop or the city.
- If my dog bit someone, I know have to remain there with both my dog and the person my dog bit. This is asking for a disaster. What happens if it's +20 celsius out, or -20 outside, and by the time the officer gets to site it's now 30 +degrees outside. Sorry I wont be sticking around.
- The situation would most likely escalate and it would not be a good idea to have the parties involved try to work it out and not have a neutral party involved.
- the owners should be able to come to an agreement. Law enforcement officers are unnecessary unless you have an uncooperative person.
- No if a dog bites a stranger it means you royally pissed it off so you can kick rocks let the dog be a dog
- No- Dogs bite and play rough all the time. Especially for young puppies who are NOT NEUTERED, lots of adult dogs will snap or bite to tell it off. Thats how dogs work...
- Stop German Shepherds.
- At the very least an exchange of information to pay vet bills etc
- If it's a minor incident then no. If it's a major one then yes.
- Pit bulls are not the problem!!!!
- If a dog is aggravated or aggressive, it seems stupid to keep them there as something more could happen
- There are too many scenarios in which there is room for interpretation on what happened and assumes the the animal is in the wrong
- If the bite draws blood, my answer is yes. If it doesn't not draw blood or puncture, I believe it's under the discretion of the people/owners involved.
- This is common decency. A person that wouldn't stay won't be inclined to because a 'rule' is made by the City.
- Responsible dog owners do stay and work with the victim
- response time is prohibitively slow for this kind of rule. Sharing contact information, vet information, etc with the impacted parties is sufficient. No one should be standing around waiting for hours when their own animal may also be injured. (Consider a fight between two dogs. with this rule, both parties would need to wait for an officer. Bylaw can take HOURS to respond to requests. This would be hours in the heat, cold, etc waiting for bylaw.)
- Yes, and no! I think for safety reasons, it might be best that the suspect leave however, they NEED to contact Bylaw ASAP! I suppose you could say they need to stay on scene but, in their vehicle or in a safe place and not causing more issues for the victim.



- Owner's should be responsible for disciplining their animal. I.e. proper training
- I agree with the sentiment, but in practice, if a dog just attacked someone, that dog should probably be removed from the situation before it does any more harm.
- If there is a conflict, the last thing you want to do is have the involved parties stay in the heat of the incident. The parties should exchange info and handle the matter as adults.
- The dog needs to be removed from the situation quickly. I think it's important to let them know where you live and to meet up without the animal to discuss. Or put the dog in a vehicle to allow communication without further stress to the victim
- I've been bitten by a dog before but I don't see how police or enforcement officers have anything to do with it and aren't necessary.
- People have brains, freedom involves disputes without a governing party that feels authority should be inserted into any dispute. Let the people decide on a per case basis. Severance Or fines should not have a place in these disputes. Mistakes happen when you try to live a free life
- Involving bylaw enforcement officers in dog bite incidents introduces the possibility of unnecessary escalation, disproportionate force against minorities, unfair treatment of dogs owned by minorities, etc.
- Takes to long..
- I feel that this is too generalized an approach and does not take into context the severity of bits or when to talk to an enforcement officer.
- A 'bite' is not always an obvious thing and can be very subjective...what if a dog playfully without force 'mouths' a child in an off leash park....and open to abuse by the "self righteous", "we will police you" crowd. We see this already with the 'you can't leave the dog in a car" tonthe point where I won't leave my dog even on a sunny winters day...and yes I have been accosted by someone in that exact circumstance...
- Enforment is usually biased, unfair treatment.
- This should be determined by severity of bite or wound
- It may be imperative to take the dog away from the situation to avoid further escalation, thereby putting a person into contravention without intention. Contact information is a must, however staying at the scene may not be possible.
- I don't think they need to stay there if they've already exchanged contact info.
- I would like to say yes, but there has to be enough flexibility to account for extenuating circumstances
- It is a personal situation, law informers should not be involved
- Way too many variables. It is time consuming for law enforcement agencies and it doesn't solve symptoms of the problems
- If there is an incident where the animal was stressed out enough or felt they needed to react in this way, it is irresponsible to require the animal and/or person to be forced to stay in that environment without being able to leave.
- information can be exchanged without waiting for enforcement officers to arrive. If the incident is severe enough then the officers should be required to be on scene immigration/ASAP.



- Like any animal bite go and get checked out and if the dog is feral then look into the case and blame the owner not the dog
- There is too much fear of losing a pet. The system is so flawed. Accidents happen. I have had my dog bit by a German Shepherd. Dogs get jealous and accidents happen. Had I reported that incident there is a chance my friend would have lost her German Shepherd.
- In an ideal world staying at the scene would be perfect, but if the animal is in a high state forcing the owner and most likely the "nuisance" animal is unsafe to all parties involved. Get the animal to a safe place first to reduce the hazard.
- We don't need more laws/bylaws. Period!
- The owner of the dog should have all responsibility to report to an appropriate location with details themselves as keeping the dog in an area it has already proved nuisance may encourage other attacks while waiting.
- As long as contact information is available the dog should not have to remain at the scene as it may cause more issues.
- Owners are fully capable of getting contact information on their own. Make it bylaw that you must show identification to other dog owners in case of accidents and they should also be responsible for filing reports about incidents.
- Contact info should be exchanged between parties. Requiring a dog/owner to remain on scene can escalate the situation.
- Seems difficult to enforce. Especially in an off-leash park. Different owners will have differing opinions about what actually happened.
- If the dog is violent it's likely the owner is as well. And how does one person actually have the authority to make another stay? Wouldn't that be considered unlawful confinement? It's not a motor vehicle accident. People should be trusted to figure this one out.
- That could take a long time. I think the owner of the offending dog should have to provide their information and/or contact the enforcement agent later or immediately by phone. Pictures can be taken as evidence, but sometimes medical care needs are immediate.
- The majority of time (in the off-leash areas) small dogs running around are aggravating other dogs and owners. When told to call off these small dogs, the owners are not able to get their dog to respond. If those dogs get bitten I don't think the owner of the other dog needs to remain at the scene. Therefore I would not support this rule.
- Oftentimes that person needs to leave with the animals to deescalate the situation. That being said, they should self-report right away. And if they don't and they are found out (never underestimate social media community groups) they can be charged.
- If you have exchanged information, you could scale it down so cops aren't racing down streets to get there, or they can go to the police station if needed
- What happens if your dog bites someone attacking you!
- If the bite was caused to a stranger getting too close by no means should the dog owner need to be there



- As long as the Owners contact information has been provided, there's no need to stay at the scene. Best to get the dog away from the area that induced enough stress to bite
- I believe that the owner must provide contact information and proof of identity but should not have to wait for an enforcement officer especially if both dogs or the person and dog have to stay at the scene as this could be dangerous for the owner of the dog that attacked because emotions would be high.
- Some people over react to a some dog disagreements. What one person may deem a bite could just be playing hard and this is a way to criminalize the owner.
- Information should be exchanged, but animal should be taken away from scene
- How would you know that they didn't stay at the scene? This could be a he said she said situation where by-law is taking the side of the person stating that their dog was attacked by a bigger dog when the truth could be a smaller dog attacking or biting a larger dog. I've personally experienced this scenario.
- Clearly information must be shared but the animal should be removed from the area as soon as possible to prevent an escalating situation. Dogs pick up on their owners emotions and a reasonable owner would be upset that their dog was involved in this type of situation, therefore causing the dog to be increasingly so. Exchange info and have the dog leave ASAP. Owner can return in a reasonable amount of time. I can't imagine that an enforcement officer would be there any time super quick.
- Enforcement officers do not need to be involved in these sort of situations.
- Remaining at the scene of incident to give you information implied that there is some fault on behalf of the owner and the dog. This is not always the case therefore I cannot support this.
- Dogs, however well trained are still wild animals. All dog owners should understand that potential (though differently if frequent and encouraged by owner) bites as part and parcel of animal ownership. Dogs are sensitive creatures and are not inherently evil or aggressive. Circumstance, fear and owner engagement shape dogs into aggressors. I think owners, not dogs, should be penalized for incidents.
- It could take too long for the officer to arrive. If under half an hour response maybe but the victim should be taken care of rather than waiting for someone. Instead information should be shared like at a small car accident so that the owners can then talk to the officer that day.
- Tired of the City trying to enforce common sense and the ever increasing nanny state surrounding us.
- Details of owners should be there exchanged
- Exchange info with the other party and work out the vet bills between yourselves
- Owner and dog should leave contact info, but it seems unsafe to stay at a potentially volatile scene.
- My dog is a staffordshire terrier. He has never bit anyone or any living thing in his life. He does better off leash than on leash in any place. He's PETRIFIED of men. If he were to ever bite someone, it'll either be out of protecting me or himself from someone trying to hurt us. I would never stay on site to accommodate the person who tried to attack me or my dog.



- I feel they should exchange information, but the situation would get worse if the dog can't be removed to a safe location. In those cases, the owner needs to get the dog somewhere safe so no further damage can be done
- Incidents like these are extremely traumatizing for everyone involved, but also the animal. To have to stand there and wait for an extended period of time may not help with all that.
- Most of the times my dog has been attacked it's been by a dog that's running around the owners property unleashed.
- The animal should be kindly removed from the situation.
- The owner should be able to remove the dog from scene and return to prevent further incident.
- If a little dog attacks a big dog and the big dog defends itself. The owner of the big dog is already at a disadvantage due to the prejudices against the big dog. No sense sticking around for a biased, possibly trigger happy, enforcement officer to come around. If you have an animal, you should be an adult about it and two adults should be able to sort a situation out without big brother getting involved.
- This does not happen with responsible dog owners.
- as long as the owner and victim can resolve it there should be no reason to stay at the scene, if the owner is being non compliant and thinking it's no big deal, they should face fines.
- just don't make this yet another thing under the police umbrella. When redistributing police funding, make sure it goes to the appropriate organization that deals with this. I only say no because there's situations that could become worse by staying. I do feel people need to be responsible and stay when it makes sense to and is possible to, but you can't penalize people for acting in a way to protect others.
- People have lives, can't wait for officer. Police have more important duties
- The person with the dog that has bitten may just be trying to get their dog out of the situation
- In the circumstance of a dog bite the public and authorities will always rule on behalf of the 'victim' as history has determined. If my dog were to have bitten someone I know it would be out of poor judgment or care of the 'victim' so I would not stay to be questioned and accused and based on how others answer the [removed] questions higher up potentially euthanized, I would leave and deny to protect my baby. So no. I do not trust your system based on what you are trying to do to bully breeds.
- It is a highly charged situation that may increase anxiety and stress in people and animals that will make the situation much worse. While I agree that the situation needs to be dealt with, there has to be a safe way to de-escalate.
- dogs have a natural heirarchy. they are not to be punished nor their owners. this is completely ridiculous
- absolutely not ! DISAGREE
- When an incident like this occurs there is going to be a lot of fear and panic from every party involved (including the animals). People should have the option to retreat to safety rather than a legal obligation to stay in a "hot-zone".



- this is an open concept. The owner never knows how long they have to wait or if officers were called. Too many unknowns.
- Little dog nips are common, large dog attacks are uncommon. To require all dog bites, regardless of their severity is extremely restrictive, not necessary and a waste of resources.
- Contact information should be shared but the dog should be removed asap from the situation to calm down. Situation may escalate if dog is in a high stress situation.
- When a human being is in an accident that requires EMS does that individual wait at the scene to talk to an enforcement officer? Or do we remove the victim to EMS to ensure that the individual is on way to recovery? If an animal or person is injured in anyway that could lead to either option to bleed out/fatality THEY should be taken to a hospital/vet for medical assistance instantly.
- I don't see why law enforcement needs to step in. Person to person conversation on what to do is enough.
- If a dog will have aggressive behavior and will attack a person or another animal unprovoked... I completely agree, but if a dog will bite to protect itself or accidentally, I completely disagree. Not all pets have obedience training and most are extremely spoiled.
- at least give information to the other person so that things can be discussed at a later date. It may be more harmful for the animals involved to stay in the area when tensions will surely be high after an incident.
- Yes and no depending on the situation. If two dogs had a fight it makes sense to get them away from each other as soon as possible. Little dogs are provocative too, larger dog is still just an animal with instinct to protect themselves and owner from any threat. It happened several times that when I had my pitbull leashed in the dog park we would get approached by unleashed small breed dogs and they would bark and growl at us continuously and owners wouldn't do a thing to stop them. Both parties must take responsibility for their dogs behavior. Not just a dog that reacted to aggression with biting. If a leashed dog was provoked to bite by an unleashed dog no matter the size, owner shouldn't be punished with fines or lose his dog.
- bites can range from severe to minor. This is too broad
- yes contact information should be shared however the dog/cat owner should remove the animal at once because emotions are heightened in the people which can add to an already stressed animal
- I believe that that person should be able to leave with their dog, to get that dog away from the situation. However, once the dog is back in a safe space (ie vehicle), then they should have to stay to share contact information with the victim.
- In some cases it may be safer for the dog owner to provide his/her contact information and leave the scene.
- unlikely that an enforcement officer can get there in a reasonable time. also need to define a dog bite. a nip in play is much different than an aggressive action. you need to define your terminology
- As responsible owners you should be able to handle the matter individually in a respectful manner.
- It may be safer to remove the dog from the situation first, (take it home, place it in a vehicle,) before returning with information.



- Because staying at scene could increase trauma. But information should be shared and reported to authorities within 24 hrs.
- "Very difficult to enforce, your stats dont justify this - focus on your licensing and your officers investigation skills
- Why would you put a subject dog owner and victim owner in this predicament - where things are likely to escalate."
- In the event of a dog bite, I think it makes sense to remove the dog from the scene as quickly as possible. The owner can provide contact information, but to reduce tension they can leave the scene.
- Often dog bites are the result of the dog protecting itself or it's owner. Forcing the owner to remain on scene forces the dog to remain on scene and may colour the bylaw officers opinion of the issue as the dog is already full of tension and adrenaline.
- There are far too many nuanced circumstances. I have seen cases where a person reaches down to pet dogs that are mingling and get a nick on their hand from a tooth. No one is upset, it happens. Technically, what is a bite? And why is biting the only form of injury being explored here? Dogs have knocked people over, legs get tangled leashes, etc. All kinds of injuries can happen. People need to take some personal responsibility when walking in parks, in areas where there are other people and animals around. If an injury occurs, my first instinct would be to separate the dogs. Rarely is one dog solely responsible for injuring - dog behaviour is complex.
- How will that calm the situation, please stay there with your dog does not make sense.
- Leave this up to personal responsibility.
- Sometimes in cases of "attacks" it's better to remove the dog from the situation so it can get out of the headspace that it's in. Many cases of fearful or previously abused dogs who lash out on a trigger that the owner may be training out; will benefit more from being able to go to a safe place.
- it would depend on the severity of the bite. at a minimum the dog owner should be required to share contact information with the person or owner of the animal the received the bite
- I believe it would be more appropriate to separate the dog from the scene of the incident as fast as possible. Perhaps a rule requiring the dog owner to leave contact info would be an alternative?
- The dog may be agitated and most people who have been bit would be as well
- Need to cut costs of program and less enforcement officers are needed.
- too many variables. officers do not work 24/7 and may be, even during working hours, not able to attend in a timely fashion. too difficult to enforce.
- the dog may be im distress
- Often, the majority of dog bites are not serious. If a person is bitten, then contact information and vaccine status should be shared, this also applies for serious dog bites involving another animal. Smaller incidents should be sorted out between the owners.
- This rule implies guilt on the part of the dog and/or owner, so its ridiculous to require that. It also sounds like you're trying to create new opportunities/ways to fibe people. Quit trying to impose rules on citizens and leave us be.



- The dog is most likely unsure of the issue. They are innocent animals and the owner should be persecuted. The dog could be being abused by the owner. We need to protect all animals
- How do you enforce the infraction? Raise the infraction into a misdemeanor or outright charge the individual with fleeing a crime scene. So that what you crowd the already overcrowded court system? You change a bylaw into a police matter? Sounds like inventive busy work, would not solve any currently existing problems. A more sound idea would be to use bylaw officers to check up on households that are reported to have problematic pets and offer courses that the owner can be enrolled in.
- Both the dog that attacked and was attacked need to leave the situation. Information must be exchanged to properly deal with damages but it is not always realistic to stay at the scene of the incident until law enforcement arrives. (For example if a dog is still acting aggressive/fearful or needs medical attention)
- Yes for contact info, too long to wait for an enforcement officer
- the best thing you can do when a dog is stressed enough to bite is get it out of there. Making them stay WILL make the situation worse. Let's use our brains here
- I agree with sharing contact information, on the off chance the person/animal bitten needs stitches or any other medical attention. But I do not agree with needing to talk to an enforcement officer who will likely escalate the situation more than necessary.
- This is for the protection of all parties involved. Specific scenarios could have taken place to encourage an altercation and statements should be mandatory from both sides via enforcement officers contact of both owners.
- The dog needs to be removed from this situation immediately for everyone safety, including the dog's.
- Information can be exchanged after parties disembark. Most important is getting care to the animal or person
- If a dog did bite another animal or person I presume that person and animal would be taken straight to the appropriate hospitals. What would the point be for the owner of the dog to stay. By law should be in place that contact information is shared immediately just like car accidents.
- Yes if it bites a person, no if it bites another dog unless that dog becomes severely injured. I often find at the dog park that dogs will give a "warning snap" to other dogs who are overbearing or playing too aggressively. Defensive biting is just that, defensive, and the owner shouldn't have to stick around waiting for by-law to explain that their dog was defending themselves
- The offending dog may have sustained injuries.
- current system is sufficient, we don't need more regulation
- The owners side of the story needs to be explained, but what if the dog is protecting the owner from an attacker? Why would you stay near the attacker? That would be my only stipulation.
- if a dog has just bit someone, the first priority should be removing the offending dog and the victim of the bite. This sort of thing makes sense after a car crash, but an aggressive dog is less likely to wait patiently for a bylaw officer or exchange of information



- Severity, causes and variables leading to a bite vary. A large majority of small bite incidents can be settled between involved parties with out the involvement of officials who may have not actually been witness or in attendance to the incident. Bites happen for a variety of reasons and it's not always the animals fault. Any animal can be pushed to the point of reacting or defending its self
- It may not be safe to keep the animal in that area, so I dont think they should have to remain but should provide their information. Honestly resposible owners would stay regardless.
- At the desecration of the person/animal involved. Similar to a fender bender, if its just a minor nip or something, exchange information and move on. If there is blood, gash, etc,. call a officer
- This would further agitate the animal, being forced to stay at the scene. Especially if it's at a dog park and there's so much chaos. Exchange contact info, yes of course, but it shouldn't be required to remain there. Take photos. Take a video. We all have a camera in our pocket.
- Leaving the scene may be the best was to de-escalate a volatile situation. As long as as both parties exchange contract info they should be able to leave the scene.
- If the dog is worked up and stressed out keeping it in that situation could escalate the problem. Information should be shared and the dog should be brought to a safe space where it can calm down and realize its mistake.
- It may not be required at all times. If it's a serious injury or a repeat offence then yes.
- Yes and No. If there is serious injury, then absolutely. If someone runs up to a dog and sticks their hands in a dog's face, and the dog nips their hand, then that's a learning opportunity for that person. I have older dogs that are less and less inclined to be manhandled and get scared easily as their eyesight deteriorates. I have to be vigilant as an owner and more protective of how they are approached. They are great dogs; but if you surprise and scare them, they can nip - though never aggressively and never drawing blood. Where is the line on dog bites/nips?
- I think the owners can talk through it just fine.
- Contact information can be shared if necessary, but it is better for the dog (s) involved to leave to scene to calm down and prevent further incidents.
- "Rules are not always the answer and shouldn't always be the go to.
- unfortunately in cases like this, the problem is often false accusation that we need to be concerned with, a rule will give individuals who like to cry wolf over every little thing even more power.
- Lets face it, if something truly happens responsible people will try to help and stay and talk things out as expected, a rule won't change that, and those who are unethical won't stay regardless of a rule.
- Rules don't change things, fostering respect and engaging people to make change changes things..."
- Information should be exchanged. It is in the best interest to remove both animals from the scene right away.
- Animals run on instinct you can't punish an animal for acting as they should
- Because most bites are a redirection of fear and anxiety. Most of the time animals snap at the air and we get caught in the middle. Unless it's life threatening the dog and owner should be able to go about on their way



- Removal of the dog should be priority. People can return to the incident after taking the dog home. Or leave a phone number.
- I think it is best that the owner leaves as they would likely need to remove their dog from the situation to keep everyone safe.
- If it is not serious then it should be left alone
- This rule could easily be abused by people who want to harass dog owners, with little accountability on the plaintiff's end.
- Making bylaws against a certain type of dog is the same as making bylaws against a Person of colour. Just because they're born a pitty, does NOT mean they'll injure more than a golden retriever. The dog isn't in control of what breed it's born as. It's bad owners, not bad dogs. Shame on you Calgary. It's things like this that make me disappointed in living here. I should not have to vote on why it's horrible to pin all bad things on one breed of dog. What are we, Quebec??
- This squarely blames the owner of said dog that bites. Often dogs have to defend themselves with unruly other animals that may bark or be physically intimidating to other animals, because owners don't take care of their own dog or don't know how to manage their own animals.
- I think if that occurs one must do what it can to calm an animal. When it's upset, the owner is upset as well as the person that was involved then the animal can't regulate.
- Getting the law involved in a situation that has zero reason for being there seems like a waste of time and tax payer money.
- Dogs often attack at a moment of danger and looks for the safety of themselves and their owners. Choosing to euthanize or punish a dog purely on their breed instead of looking at the owner and how they trained the dog is wrong! A breed doesn't define how every dog acts smh
- Too many variable. Hostil third party, emergency situations, timing of bylaw.
- It's not always the dog's fault in these incidents. While if it is, I think the owner should stay and be responsible, if it's defensive I think that both parties need to be present/contacted.
- dogs are animals. sometimes unfortunate things happen.
- If the dog is aggressive, the owner has to do their best to get the dog out of the situation before they hurt any one else and to calm the dog down. However, after the dog is secured, I think the owner should have to reach out (maybe through some type of hotline) to talk to an enforcement officer and/or the victim and sort out what needs to be sorted.
- People's interpretation of a bite or reactive dog can vary. I see this fuelling a lot of unnecessary calls to bylaw. If someone doesn't give another person their contact info, they should take pictures of the person, dog and location of the incident and report it to bylaw.
- There would need to be a more clearly defined line for what constitutes a serious enough bite before I would support this rule.
- Dogs don't react without being stimulated. If a dog bites someone it's because they saw it as a threat to themselves or their owner. The person being bitten is usually the cause for getting to close/personal. Therefore no the dog owner shouldn't have to stay put for enforcement officers to arrive.



- A lot of times it is just dogs being dogs and people blow things out of proportion. Cases need be dealt with singularly and bylaw needs to be doing better checks for unlicensed dogs. This way dogs can be better pinpointed and the owner dealt with. It's not dogs or breeds, it's bad owners. Dogs licenses should be attached to car licenses so that information can go hand in hand for better reporting of problem owner/dogs.
- Information should be shared with both parties and dogs returned home in secure environment
- "Rule should be that owner must provide their info to the victim OR choose to wait at scene to provide their info to enforcement officer.
- If forced to wait at scene, likely aggressive animal is kept at scene as well/not contained."
- Most dogs dont bite people for no reason. Maybe we need a program that teaches people how to raise their pets safely
- If the pet owner shares his/her info with the victim, then the enforcement officer can contact via the reported incident. Forcing a dog that is already under duress to stay at the "scene" is deplorable.
- Responsible owners will stay to provide information, having a law won't stop the irresponsible from fleeing the scene.
- Sometimes you need to remove your dog for everyone's safety. Yes leave contact info but if you need to put the dog away that should be exempt.
- When you own a dog you should be aware that sometimes something just sets your own or another dog off that you can't expect. Dog owners should know that they are responsible for dealing with these situations and that they can happen from time to time. I don't think we need to bring in law enforcement. I think people should be capable of dealing with this on their own and not use law enforcement resources.
- I think this requires a stronger definition of a bite - if two dogs are playing rough and one nips the other would you have to remain? If a dog mouths you and does not break skin, do you have to remain? For serious bite incidents something should be done to ensure the information is processed, but keeping two dogs involved in an incident in close proximity also keeps both in a state of stress, which is not ideal for anyone handling them.
- Because that may just escalate the situation if the dog who bites is reactive. I think they should be required to leave contact information when asked for it.
- I think that contact information should be required to be shared, however the owner should be able to remove the dog from the situation to prevent a bigger issue from occurring.
- In the event of an extreme incident, staying at the scene could inhibit medical care needed to both the pet and/or human. It should be required that information is exchanged, but not required to remain at the scene if those involved have severe enough injuries that a hospital/vet visit is warranted.
- I don't believe an enforcement officer is necessary. There are bigger problems that tax payers money can be focused on.
- As long as they exchange information with the other party.
- Most bites are nips and such and rarely serious or life threatening. As long as information is exchanged between parties, I see no reason to remain at the scene.



- you are asking a dog or other animal to remain in an unsafe situation. Best to de-escalate the situation and deal with it later when tensions are not as high
- I think they should be required to give their information to those involved/contact enforcement officers etc. But having to keep the dog in the area may be a difficult on all involved
- I want information to be exchanged but the right to leave for vet/medical attention. With the exchange of information the enforcement officers (if necessary) can attend the homes of those involved
- Some dogs play which looks like biting. A person should only stay if there was an actual issue at hand.
- Dogs get excited and sometimes biting is a way they play. It is unfair to single out these “bully breeds” because whoever is reading this is too scared to be around them long enough to get to know how sweet and gentle these breeds actually are. Whoever created this bylaw is a coward and guarantee they’ve never been around a “nuisance” breed and quite frankly this bylaw is a nuisance.
- The dog owner may feel like the other person is at risk, and instead would like to get their dog in a calm environment
- I think depending on the severity of the situations it can be handled without the need of an enforcement officer.
- Its not so black and white. You should get the injured away and investigate the issue, was the person/ other animal threatening? Approaching a dog that was not their own or suffering from trauma? Like wake up.
- This can’t be enforced in any practical way.
- I agree with sharing your info but what's best for all animals involved is removing them from the scene.
- A large majority of dog bites are caused by the victim themselves as they tease and threaten the animal.
- Yes leave contact information, however staying in the situation will only upset the dog more because they react to the emotions of the people around them and the energy they are given. Best thing for the dog and victim is for that dog to be removed from the situation.
- Because this may stress the dog and the victim more.
- I think sharing contact information is important, but also I think the dog should be removed from the situation as soon as possible. I think that would be hard to do if the dog owner has to stay.
- if the dog is such a threat it must be removed from the situation, keeping it in the situation without further incident would prove it was a "one off" happenstance and perhaps both parties are to blame, or the "victim" was at fault for unbecoming behavior towards the animal
- I think they should be required to leave their contact information and return to the scene as possible. But their priority is going to have to be to put their offending dog away. So if they need to walk home or go to their car, that should be done after they’ve given their info. Then they should return to the scene.
- Often times there is more to the story than a one sided testimony of a historical person



- The dog just bit someone you need to take he or she home. Keeping the dog on the scene isn't going to help the situation at all
- Sometimes animals are in defence or taunted. So their only defence is this. It could cause conflict between the two people.
- This is a difficult one. In many instances, dog owners are responsible, and would volunteer their contact information to the victim. In that case, having everyone wait around for an officer seems unfair to all involved. However, in the case of an uncooperative dog owner, such a rule may sound good, but then there is the question of how to enforce this? It is that uncooperative person who would ignore the rule and leave. Those that would follow the rule and wait are probably ones who are going to “do the right thing”, whether there is a rule or not.
- If a situation arises where there is serious injury, the owner of the dog will likely not wait, regardless of if it's law or not.
- depending on the situation
- Only if it is severe
- I think if they leave contact information that's okay.
- In my experience, most dogs react with members of the public approach or harass dogs (even if the owners intervene), however the bylaw officers will always default to blaming the dog. In many cases, the dog may have reacted because the other party was aggressive or harassing their owner and this bylaw would force the owner to stay in a potentially dangerous situation.
- Sometimes, depending on the situation, its best to remove the animal from the situation and have someone come talk with the person with the dog away from the emotions and stress
- I support but also see how difficult it would be to stay at the scene of the dog was with you. If something like that happened to me, I'd want to return the dog home and then come back to give details.
- Only if the victim requests the person to remain. Minor incidents between pets walking Can often be resolved privately and amicably without resorting to City officials.
- I think the owner should have to talk to a bylaw officer however remaining at the scene with the upset dog could instigate the situation. Also the owner should not have to share there address with the victim as this is confidential.
- If a dog bites a person or dog, the logical thing to do is remove the dog from that environment. This is likely what a pet owner will initially do. Requiring them to remain at the scene while the dog may still be agitated is not a good idea as this may result in further injuries.
- Too many people are aggressive about this and it could become a problem to make both parties wait together.
- This seems excessive
- Too many circumstances that lead up to a dog biting. I've seen people antagonize a dog and then they get bit...that would not be the dogs fault in my opinion.
- Only if the bite was severe and was considered an attack.
- Yes they need to provide contact info and insure the victim that their animal is up to date on vaccines but they also need to get the animal away from what is triggering it. If the owner is alone



they should be allowed to remove their animal from the scene and return if necessary but they must provide a way to contact.

- "While I do feel that a person should be required to provide their contact and residential information, I do not feel that keeping and agitated animal at the scene of an incident is safe for the animal nor for other people present.
- Bite situations become very emotionally charged especially when there are bystanders who are uninvolved in the situation, and I have personally witnessed on more than one occasion, bystanders who have physically confronted owners, attempted to take possession of or injure the animal in question, make threats towards the owner etc."
- People can bend stories in their favour and you never know the actual facts of a situation. People should deal with the situation appropriately by yes, sharing contact information, but enforcing an officer is one step too far and can lead to unnecessary judgment calls.
- I think the information should be shared and yes the owner should be there, however to de-escalate the situation it is probably best that the dogs is removed from the situation (taken home) prior to this happening.
- It could take to long for a officer to arrive. And could lead in to more aggressive behaviour from animals and or owners. A picture of the owner license and or dogs license should be exchanged and possible witnesses contact information.
- Mostly because taking the dog home to calm down should be the main priority.
- I support the requirement to share contact information. I see no benefit in requiring engagement of enforcement.
- I feel like removing the dog from the situation would be best. Get some type of ID/Dog tag information to give to the Officers.
- Not sure. There are many reasons a dog bites. Unfortunately, there is discrimination against larger breed dogs. Dogs could be legitimately protecting their owner. They could also have been unprovoked by a "nuisance" dog. I could support the requirement for an owner to stay at the scene if officers are non-biased. Unfortunately, as you have written this engagement survey so far, I cannot support much of what you are proposing because you have already shown discrimination by specifically naming Pitbull breeds. Shame on you Calgary. Do better.
- I think that the dog should be removed from the scene, but contact information left at the scene or reported into enforcement immediately after
- I believe that should be the responsibility of the dog owner and the other human involved
- If a dog bite has occurred and the owner is the only one with the dog, it may be safest for everyone to get the dog out of the situation immediately in which case the owner would have to leave the scene to get the dog contained.
- too long to respond by by law. Greater education is needed by by law services
- "CUae everyone is heated , people will automatically put blame on the dog and not even Consiser that a human action cause a dog to react / hitting it etc.



- Let both parties go home calm down"
- This "biting" could be very subjective and a rule like this could be abused by someone overreacting to a situation. Our law enforcement should surely have more important matters to attend.
- If the dogs are injured and require medical care emphasis should be on saving the animals life.
- If a dog bites someone, you would want to remove the dog from the seen asap.
- Depending on the severity of the bite and individual circumstances the owner of the bitten animal and/or a bitten person may need to seek immediate medical attention and cannot wait around. Under this circumstance the owner of the offending dog may be left alone at the location, possibly not remaining there. In the event of a bite the owner of the offending animal should provide the tag number of their animal for further contact by authorities.
- Dog parents can be absolutely crazy at dog parks. I'm not going to stand around and wait because they felt my dog "attacked" their dog if my dog was being terrorized and simply standing up for itself.
- They should have to give their information but it could be dangerous to have the person wait around as if their dog just bit someone they clearly have no control
- Depends on the severity of the situation. Not a one size fits all rule.
- Some individuals could place unnecessary blame on animal and owner that would not be justified
- If they need medical attention they should be able to leave. I support it unless medical attention needs to be given
- Bite is not defined and dogs nip each other a lot at dog parks where they never draw blood or break skin and are just playing. This could be used to harass vulnerable people with dogs.
- People often do not listen when asked not to pet a dog.
- they should leave this contact info for a later discussion
- There isn't rampant bite and run activity so why create more rules for the sake of rules?
- Owner has to remove aggressive dog from the scene
- Getting back to their house allows the pet and owner to calm down and become safer as it is in an environment that it's comfortable in.
- After an incident, it's best to remove the problem dog from the situation. The owners info should be given so they can be contacted after.
- Things could escalate for the animal. It is not a way to diffuse the animals anxiety or behavior.
- If both dogs are injured they will need to leave and go to the vet. Or if one is agitated I wouldn't want it staying out on the street.
- I want to support this, but considering the danger of police to Black and Indigenous people, I cannot support it
- I think it is fair that information should be shared between those involved in the incident but not required to go to law enforcement
- Dogs don't bite for no reason. They only attack if they feel threatened, or if they have had a traumatic past with other strangers and animals. If the dog were to bite due to past traumatic events, the person should understand. Just like humans, animals have dealt with much trauma and fear. If the dog bites another person or animal, the owner of the dog that bit than animal or person should apologize and provide them with whatever care is necessary due to how severe the bite was.



- I believe an owner should not have to wait for enforcement but should still ensure the well being of the victim
- Sometimes in the event of an incident removing the dog is a better alternative then waiting. But the dog owner must make contact with the enforcement office within 6 hours to be accountable and responsible
- Depends on the situation.
- A person yes, another animal no. That is between the owners
- "With how some people react I would want the dog to be safe. Most times they bite when threatened, uncomfortable or can't escape. Most times the person receiving the bite is in the wrong, and the dog needs to get somewhere safe. Forcing them to stay is counterproductive towards this.

- 99% of the time I've seen a dog bite could have been prevented by the person that got bitten or the owner of the pet that got bitten. We punish the dog that reacts while not charging the owner or person that assaulted the dog that did the actual biting. We allow a plea of self defence for humans but don't seem to have this consideration for animals."
- both parties should be required to stay at the scene not just one as there are always 2 sides to the situation and both need to be fairly investigated
- Remaining at the scene is not always a safe situation nor is sharing contact information. Unless you have a permanent enforcement officer at the dog parks, this could be a very dangerous situation.
- "It ask depends on the situation. My dog was playing with another dog at a park in the winter a number of years ago and a chunk of ice got stuck in the other dogs paw. Although playful biting the dog started yelping due to the salt and ice. The owner demanded my information to which I would not give once i saw the dog was fine after the ice fell out of the dogs paw. She was still very insistent even after our dogs continued to play.

- On the other side, my puppy was used as a rag toy by another dog on leash in the street and he was hurt but not life threatening. The owner ran away as fast as they could using something about how they couldn't give the dogs information anymore."
- Sometimes the most important thing to do is remove the animal from the situation. Why would you require an animal that is acting aggressively towards an individual to stay at the scene? They should be required to report the incident themselves or provide contact information to the affected parties at the scene, but after that, they are free to go. You can't hold someone at the scene.
- Calgary is not a police state. Stop acting like one
- An enforcement officer is not trained to deal with a dog bite, a vet or a doctor would deal with that. Issues regarding the incident can be dealt with person to person and the decision can be made to involve an officer
- This is wrong and you don't know if the person was aggravating the animal to make it act like that.



- I feel that this could lead to heated altercations between the dog owner and victim. One of the parties should report, including the names and numbers of each party and then the enforcement officers could follow up afterwards.
- In the interest of avoiding situations becoming violent I believe it would be better to exchange information, and then let an enforcement officer contact each individual.
- Depends how the dog is acting. Staying at the scene with a dog still at a level 10 could cause it to bite or be aggressive. Best to remove from the scene and place in a quiet location
- ONLY if serious injury has occurred, a lot of timid dog owners or people timid around dogs make situations out to be worse than they are.. Unfortunately not enough dog owners understand normal animal behaviour and react to displays of dominance as if the dog be submitted is dying. More likely than not the animal is fine. PEOPLE NEED TRAINING in these situations, not the animals.
- Because it may cause to more stress for all parties involved
- Discrimination is alive and well with canines. If a pitbull bites a human that was provoking it, the situation will become a "he said, she said" scenario. The owner and dog should not have to prolong themselves to that scenario. If the dog is well trained and the bite was deserved I'm sure the owner will leave their information anyway.
- Not practical. However, info must be shared with person who was bitten.
- Let the people involved exchange info. People don't want to wait around for hours for the "enforcements" to show up for an incident report.
- Up to owners to decide
- As long as the offending dogs owner is compliant and provides contact information to the victim
- I don't agree.
- It might be prudent for them to take their aggressive dog away from the scene. Perhaps some sort of insurance or licensing information could be exchanged? I suppose it also depends on the severity of the incident (like car accidents).
- Dogs at off leash areas will do dog things. My female dog has had to run off "frisky" male dogs.
- I think it's a decision that who was hurt has to make, if they want their contact information or not.
- Only should occur if severe injuries are sustained to humans or dogs
- Only acceptable in serious situations in which blood is drawn.
- Lots of the time if a dog bites another dog it stems from playing that got too aggressive. There should be no rule enforcing that the owner should remain at the scene. If a dog bites a human most of the time it is because the human triggered the dog in a way that could have been prevented.
- Most bites are handled by the owner and the person or animal that was attacked without needing police intervention. If someone's dog is aggressive to the extent that the owner declared unsafe to others, the owner should be left to handle the situation. Police don't need to be involved in everything, just because they can, doesn't mean they should.
- It should only be required if the injury is serious, or if witnesses believe the owner to not be in control of the dog. Fear biting could be taken as a misbehaved or viscous dog when in actuality, the situation was probably caused by mishandling by the owner, an uneducated stranger attempting to interact with the dog, or both.



- People are liars.
- In cases where the person bitten was attacking the dog's owner/companion, it forces the victim of an intentional attack to remain in a dangerous situation.
- Time limits required
- Only if damage is severe
- Depending on the severity of the bite. If it is a serious Injury the owner of the dog should be held accountable. If it does not break the skin and the dog is under control then the owner should be allowed to leave.
- If the dog(s) have calmed down and are no longer a threat to those around them then this could work. However if they are high energy or still angry/acting out, I feel like it might not be the best idea to keep them in the current situation. If the owner is alone with said dog and needs to get the dog away from the situation that might be the best option at the time. I think there are too many grey areas here.
- Unless it's a severe accident and unprovoked they should not have to remain at the scene as most things can be dealt with between two people.
- I don't believe that is fair as the situation should be assessed on a case by case basis
- You typically want to remove the dog from the scene otherwise they don't calm down.
- I think it depends on the situation
- This may not always be possible, for multiple reasons the person may need to leave the scene, mainly to prevent further issues if they need to calm their dog down. Other reasons may be that people involved may be confrontational or threatening in a high stress situation and it may be safer for everyone involved not to directly share information.
- If an animal does bite a person there is usually a reason (although this is not always the case) - dogs often need to be removed from the situation that caused them to bite. Keeping them at the scene may be a stress on the animal and a public safety concern
- Enforcement should be last resort not primary interference when parties might mediate between themselves!
- The offending pets owner gives their contact info.
- Often the dog is continuing to be aggressive and there is already a problem with control. The dog would have to be secured and safe for this to happen.
- Not all cases should require this but in larger cases where there is severe harm, the owner should be required to stay and exchange information.
- At times it is not possible due to aid being needed or to control the dog which bit. Contact info should be given, and an easy way to do that would be a good alternative.
- Cops are sketchy , trigger happy cops will often shoot the dog on scene . I wouldn't stay and wait around for the reason alone
- I would like to think we can act like adult guys, and don't want to over regulate everything
- Staying might further traumatize the victim. Require sharing of info, not remaining to wait for officer.
- People's dogs bite my dog all the time- specifically Poodles. I think it is up to individuals to assess injuries and accept that sometimes pets get injured, and it is important to understand how to assess



an injury if you're going to be a pet parent. This all sounds like Big Government getting involved in things that should be settled by reasonable adults making discretionary choices on how to handle situations. I see a dog get bit or scratched every other day in Crescent Heights. Are we really going to start focusing on spending time and money on punishing dog owners and their pets?

- Keeping everyone in a volatile situation is not a good idea
- It would be complicated to enforce this as the degree of bites that happen at these parks are challenging to regulate, who's to say what is deemed as a "serious"• bite and what is not? Maybe if that is clarified then sure but this seems too broad
- Dogs bite each other as a normal part of their behavior. Only if severe injury occurs that requires medical attention should the owner share information and even then its dependent on the situation. If the dog who bit the other party was provoked, was protecting their owner or felt threatened then no as the fault is on the other party.
- Sometimes it is not only the dogs fault why a stranger got bitten. Sometimes people provoke other people's dogs and do not listen to the dogs owner when they say the dog isn't friendly or whatever warning they have.
- Dogs play with one another, there might be a small incident that is not even a bite and then authority must be called, this will lead yo inefficiencies. I believe that if there is a bite incident, parties will exchange detail on their own.
- Removing the dog from the scene to prevent more injury or trauma for anyone involved in the event should be a priority.
- This rule could be abused by some dog owners that may overreact to or misinterpret certain circumstances. For example, another dog owner may mis-interpret playing for biting, and then insist that the other owner stays at the scene when it is not necessary.
- Often they need to deescalate The situation and seek medical treatment for animals. The animal control folks do not have time or resources to attend to every dog scuffle.
- Enforcement officer sometimes can't get there for hours. People exchanging info should be good and follow up by officer can be done after.
- Probably safest for the individual to leave their contact info and remove the dog from the scene as something has caused the dog to act out.
- it may not be safe for the owner to remain, however they should try when possible or be able to provide their contact details. any case involve a fatality or serious injury they should stay. I want to be mindful that one dog bites may also be a result of other people, not the owners, causing the problems, and no where in this is there a clause that can hold others accountable for instigating a dog bite or attack, or not listening to the owners direction leading to a bite or attack. Majority of dog bites are fear based, and irresponsible people can be the cause of a dog bite, not necessarily the owner. (I've had many people refuse to not pet my fearful foster dogs, or bring their strange dog close to mine saying that dont worry, their dog is friendly. I have to be extra diligent around these irresponsible people to make sure they dont get bitten. It's very challenging!
- Way too vague. What does "if necessary" entail? Who decides what is necessary. The potential for abuse of this rule is too extreme.



- Please just enforce the current laws
- Why? It's a dog , an animal, they can bite for a lot of reasons for which we cannot always explain why. What will the enforcement officer do after the dog has already bit someone? Obviously make sure that person is ok but what is a bite? To draw blood or to nip as to warn someone to stay away. I think these are huge differences as a dog may be protecting their family and people tend to approach dogs when they shouldn't. People of the public need training and understanding of animals.
- Sometimes people or their pets provoke other animals and it's not fair to the animal or owner defending themselves.
- Situational. if you're dog attacks mine for no good reason and my princess defends Herself and kills yours well sorry maybe you shouldn't be taking you're dog out that going to be confrontational. [removed]
- Dogs that are panicking/being aggressive/being defensive need to be secured and away from the scene before considering anything else. Juggling a panicking dog while exchanging contact information or waiting for an officer in a high stress situation is just another follow up incident waiting to happen.
- if a person is coming up to a dog or letting another dog attack them, why should they have to stay and have their dog put down for protecting itself?
- Dogs bite when they feel threatened. Forcing an owner, and therefore the animal, to stay in an area that has already been assessed to be dangerous/threatening is likely to result in further issues.
- I think that if a dog is injured a delay to treatment puts them at risk
- Because sometimes there is a reason why a dog bites another dog and it's not being it's acting mean, it's because it's acting like a dog. Dogs bite each other when they're upset. It's what a dog does to show its behaviour. What this world is turning to? Trying to form a dog to what we believe is right.
- "The owner should give his name, phone and address but can leave to get the dog home.
- THIS SURVEY IS BIAISED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON, IT SAYS ""It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds (...) SO WHY DO YOU WANT TO DISCRIMINATE THEM????? (...) the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite - MORE SEVERE BITE THAN WHAT???? IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY PROVEN THAT THE POTENTIAL STRENGHT OF A PITBULL BITE IS ACTUALLY LESSER THAN OTHER BREEDS. THIS STATEMENT IS DEROGATIVE, BIAISED, UNSCIENTIFIC, AND FALSE. THEREFORE, THIS PART OF THE SURVEY REFERRING TO PITBULLS, OR THE WHOLE SURVEY, SHOULD BE NULL AND VOID."
- Most dogs do not bite u less provoked. My dog doesn't not get along with other dogs. He was abused and I will not muzzle him because of that . If another dog should come up to my dog after I warned the other owner my dog is not in the wrong to protect himself. Dogs do not think like humans and rationalize
- If medical help is required for animal or human, that is a priority. Not to stay and wait.



- The person or dog injured need to leave quickly to get treatment, the dog who attacked needs to be removed from the situation to deescalate their aggression. Contact info is a must though. An easy way to obtain - say taking a picture of the dog's license?
- The person or dog injured need to leave quickly to get treatment, the dog who attacked needs to be removed from the situation to deescalate their aggression. Contact info is a must though. An easy way to obtain - say taking a picture of the dog's license?
- Dependant on bite and person who was bit. If they aren't concerned about it, then you shouldn't have to leave information.
- If it was a stressful incident why keep the dog or dogs at the scene of the incident any longer than needs to be? De-escalation can happen if the owner and pet walks away. However, a rule saying you must exchange truthful information may be best.
- Unless the bite is severe or fatal, this doesn't seem necessary.
- The priority should be caring for the person and the animal in the situation to eliminate further harm.
- Unless the situation is really bad, I feel like the owners should be responsible to exchange contact information between themselves, it is the owners responsibilities after all.
- Seems too broad- dogs bite other dogs often at the dog park, usually in play.
- Often dogs bite as a means to protect their owner. Remaining at the scene with a threatening individual seems unwise and dangerous and could result in escalation.
- Contact information should be provided, but people should not have to wait around for four hours until you can get around to them.
- An owner removing a dog from the environment to limit further damage could be a good thing. Leaving contact information should be appropriate
- Contact information could be given but it's not always practical to remain the scene until an enforcement officer is free.
- I was bit and my dog was attacked I don't believe this being mandated would have changed the situation. The other owner wouldn't have stayed at the scene and I needed to leave to tend to my dog and my wounds.
- I do feel that owners should share contact information with the victims owners if necessary and speak with an enforcement officer, however I do not feel that requiring them to remain at the scene of an incident with their potentially worked up/stressed out dog is helpful to preventing further incidents or in the best interest of the dog. Owners should be required or allowed to take their dog home before returning to speak with an enforcement officer
- How long does someone have to wait for an officer? People can exchange information without an officer there. Same as a car accident
- "No.
- People are irresponsible, they don't use leashes and when a bigger leashed dog bites a
- "Nice" but unleashed dog when it wanders over,
- A person shouldn't have to then stand there and explain that the bitten dog should have been on a [removed] leash"
- Depending on severity of bite, if needing medical attention then yes.



- I support contact information to be exchanged. Dog's often bite because of an incident that traumatizes the dog and the dog may need to be placed in a calm environment, which would not be remaining at the scene.
- If my dog was not the instigator then I should not be legally bound to stay and talk with law enforcement.
- Dogs sometimes lightly nip each other while playing, normally not meaning to cause harm
- This is not a black and white scenario. If there are small kids running around a dog park (which there often are) and a dog who isn't used to children sees this as a threat or opportunity to play and bites, I would be very upset if I had to wait around to talk to an enforcement officer. The parents of the kids would be completely in the wrong for allowing kids to run around at a place meant for dogs.
- It can be unsafe to remain at the scene. People involved should self report to 311. However when an honest citizen participates willingly they may open themselves up to legal harm whilst the dishonest people are free to go about their day with no repercussions.
- I would support this for biting humans but not other animals.
- Not all dog bites are harmful, dogs are animals and dog bites (for the most part) seem worse than they are.
- The severity of it would need to be clear.
- Dependant upon if someone is hurt- if there dog who bite was provoked and is hurt they should be able to go to the vet
- If it is a case of the dog protecting the owner from an aggressive or potentially aggressive interaction, it is unreasonable to expect the dog owner to remain in a dangerous situation.
- NA
- Often dogs involved in incidents like that are over threshold and significantly distressed. Making the owner stay at the scene makes it impossible to remove the dog from the stressful situation and increases their distress and the likelihood of further harm (to the dog and other people).
- It depends on the severity of the incident. A lot of the time it is better to get the dogs out of the situation because the dog is over stimulated and could lead to further injury to any of the involved parties
- It could be a dangerous situation for the owner and attacking dog to stay at a scene and traumatic for the attackee
- People lie about dog bites
- The owner should be contacted by bylaw
- The owner likely needs to get the animal out of the situation that caused the bite. Hopefully some exchange happens or they can come back after. But the animal requires care at that point.
- Most people do this anyway. If they don't it's because they don't care and will avoid this process anyway.
- Awful idea. Have them go home and take their dog home. Call them it's not serious enough to need to stay it's not a car accident.
- Its interesting to hear it the dogs bites, there r ppl who do agitate a dog....so it should discussed any situations where a animal was harassed, and then did the biting



- What if the dog was just defending itself because the other dog or person lunged at it first!
 - Good people already do this. How do you fine someone who runs off before you can report it anyways? Are you going to start following our self taken pics of offenders to post online to find them?
 - Depends on severity. Case by case. If bleeding then yes.
 - "This is a very biased questionnaire. However..."
 - This is not a safe procedure, just use your heads for a minute and think about it.
 - It would likely cause escalation between parties.
 - The problem people would simply ignore it.
 - A concerning number of owners can't tell between playing and injurious biting between dogs.
-
- A better way would be to have some sort of smart-phone usable registration system that allows someone to report a pet of issue (Dog, cat, pig, goat, anything that could attack someone and is found outside)"
 - "1. Enforcement officer is extremely unlikely to attend in timely manner.
-
- 2. Between dog owners there are vastly differing opinions of a "bite". Some consider anything that draws a yelp to be a vicious bite while others consider anything less than a severed limb to be "playing". This leaves the definition of a bite as one more ambiguous thing to be argued over.
-
- 3. This potentially puts a dog owner who is accused of having a dog who has bitten someone in a dangerous position. As an example, I was at Sue Higgins dog park when a mid 50s man tried to grab a ball from another dogs mouth. Prior to this the man had been aggressive, loud and disruptive with other dogs and owners. The man loudly accused the dog of biting him and began screaming profanities at the dogs owner. The dog owner, and other bystanders, expressed concern that he had been bitten and offered aid. It turned out the man had no broken skin, no any redness or visible skin impression. Regardless the man continued to scream at the young female dog owner who was there alone. Along with several other owners I ensured that the young women was safe and able to leave the area as there was a very real possibility the man would become violent.
-
- In this situation forcing this young women to give her contact information to this man would have been dangerous. Likewise, requiring her to remain in the presence of this agitated man would have placed her safety at risk.



- Please note that my dog was not involved in this altercation."
- I believe that both parties of an incident that results in a bite by an animal to be present and BOTH PARTIES should be responsible for their role in the interaction. People should not have a bypass for teasing and agitating an animal.
- It depends on the severity, and what happened.
- There is plenty of cell phones, cameras etc now days. It's easy to share info and process later on
- What triggered the incident? Often people will twist the stories to play the victim.
- I think it is best to remove everyone from the situation.
- This is the most stupid idea I've heard. Every dogs energy is different, dogs get in arguments just like humans. They're living breathing creatures. Not a car.
- It's better if the owner takes their dog to a controlled environment (such as their home) to prevent further potential negative actions / stress on the animal
- It depends on the situation so difficult to put a rule in for something that depends.
- The priority should be removing the animal from the situation immediately. If the owner is alone, they must be allowed to remove their dog from the situation and this may require leaving. They should come back after their dog is secured to share contact information.
- THIS IS A SLIPPERY SLOPE TO BREED DISCRIMINATION FOR FINANCIAL GAIN, DO BETTER ELECTED OFFICIALS.
- dogs can bite for many reasons. Train the person not the dog
- I don't think it's logistically possible to require an owner who is trying to manage a dog who has just bitten someone to remain there and thus keep the dog in that high stress situation. That is placing undue stress on the dog and potentially putting more people at risk, hypothetically.
- That could be a very stressful situation. I believe responsible pet owners would exchange such information regardless. People who cannot be responsible pet owners should not have an animal.
- Why is this being considered a major issue? How do you define a bite? How would this be enforced? How would an incident be mitigated if one owner considers it a bite and the other does not?
- If their animal is injured it may require immediate medical attention.
- This does not allow for de-escalation of any situations. While i support the exchange of information requiring all parties to stay in a potentially hostile, escalated situation can make everyone involved more stressed than they need to be.
- It depends on the severity of the bite.
- I support the owner being required to provide information, however I feel this can be done away from the scene. Emotions are heightened with dog bites and I am concerned that these situations can escalate, resulting in further harm to both dogs and humans. Perhaps a 24 hours reporting window could be mandated, with calls going to 311.
- Adults handle it on their own. Enforcement officer only needed if it escalates .
- If dog bite on human enforcement should be involved. But animals get into shuffles occasionally and owners can handle themselves



- I think contact info should be shared but waiting for hours with an upset dog does not work. So like car accidents why not require info to be traded and parties to get in touch and report after the fact.
- This seems difficult to enforce and that it could lead to escalated violence between the people involved.
- Studies have shown that a significant amount of dog "attacks" have been caused due to other people coming up to the dog without talking to the owner prior and ensuring it would be okay. Majority of dog "attacks" are a fear and stress response caused by unfamiliar people. It is typically not the dog or the owners fault, but that of the person who approaches the dog and fails to ask permission.
- Unless the dog is now calmed down by the owner, the owner should take the dog away from the situation.
- Seems untenable to enforce.
- If a person decides to pet a dog without asking the owner if it's okay and they're bitten, they invaded the dogs space, same goes for a person that decides to let another dog interact with your dog without asking if this action is okay
- Dogs will snap at each other as a communication process. Too many people don't understand this, or understand canine behaviour. There are too many "Karen's" around that create problems for us all.
- As long as they have provided their contact information it is best for all dogs/people involved to get away from the stress of the situation
- Both parties stay or no one stays . I also believe that people need to keep their hands away from animals and stop assuming they are in a good mood animals have emotions like people and u don't see us require muzzles or licensing to have children. Start fining people for touching with out asking
- If the situation is critical to health authorities will be involved. If it isn't reports can be made as soon as possible by one or more parties.
- If the dog bit die to stress, staying on scene, possibly surrounded by more people or the trigger of the dogs aggression could make things worse. Ideally the person should leave a contact, but then be free to go bring the dog home.
- "A) potential physical or verbal conflict could ensue between parties
- B) often a dog bites another animal only when provoked. I have called animal control / bylaw officers numerous times on a dog in a downtown dog park who often provoked my dog (who is a 25lbs ESA/therapy dog and has his good canine certification, which means he is literally the most stable version of a dog you can find) to snap at the provoking dog. My dog had clearly told that dog numerous times that he was not interested but that dog continued to bark at, paw at and hump my dog. Unsocialized dogs often cause the bites. They are just as likely to cause the bites as they are to bite themselves."
- Depends on the situation. If two dogs were playing and it was consensual but got out of hand, the owners should have a discussion and figure out the best course of action. If a dog bites a person...Did the dog get off leash and attack someone or was it a dog whose owner was being harassed and the dog reacted?? Obviously some reporting is needed but case by case is



appropriate. I also don't know that The City has the personnel to dedicate to this sort of enforcement activity.

- If the dog is stressed and out of control the safest course of action would be to remove and secure the dog in a safe location. Ideally, yes, the owner should remain at the scene, and contact info needs to be provided, but I'm not sure this is practical.
- How long will it take for an enforcement officer to arrive? We know how slow CPS can be to arrive to a non-emergency. Will this be the same?
- There are two sides to every story. 90% of aggression is fear
- What's to explain?
- Discussion can happen over the phone. Dog owner may be under high stress after the incident, therefore perception of the incident may be screwed. It's also a very traumatic moment for the person/dog, so being in a safe place might reduce long term traumatic effect on the owner.
- There are extenuating circumstances that make it better that sometimes the parties involved go their separate ways
- Making two dogs that got into a fight stay together for a longer period of time and bring out more aggressive behaviour!
- A lot of smaller dogs are aggressive towards bigger dogs and it's not their fault that they retaliate.
- Because this could be abused in instances where a person/animal is bite but not bleeding. If you say when necessary, what does necessary mean? It's very vague
- I feel that dogs should not be punished for their actions and neither should the humans, if they are aware their dog will cause harm they can take the easy step and leave their dog at home
- Because mitigating circumstances are not taken into consideration.
- This is a waste of bylaw resources.
- Exchange information, take photos and remove the animal from the high stress situation.
- No, often hostile environment and need to look out for safety of humans and dogs.
- People should just do this. Moat will.
- PEOPLE need to be held responsible. But it is not always the dogs fault they were reactive depending on the situation, it may not be helpful to keep a reactive dog on the scene.
- Forcing the person to stay at the scene would not allow the person to remove the dog from the aggressive scenario and I believe would lead to more biting incidents. They should exchange information and then be able to remove their dog to their home for seclusion. Also, this does not protect the dog owner from persons wanting to make false reports with malicious intent towards the dog owner.
- I think that it is ridiculous that people are singeing our pit bulls they are amazing breed of dog
- Too many people don't understand dog behaviour. Some dog scraps are just that and may result in minor injuries to a dog, to ya e to wait until bylaw shows up will clog up the system. It is better to have an education system in place to educate people on dog signals, calming signals and normal dog behaviour.
- I think these situations need to be on a case by case basis. I have seen dogs that are playing that accidentally knick another dog with there teeth. I think it should be situation dependent.



- The biting dog may have been provoked or bitten first etc.
- I believe that if the owner is not willingly giving out information than an enforcement officer can or should be involved to diffuse the situation. If the owner is providing proper information I do not think this is necessary.
- Unless it draws blood or breaks skin.
- I think it must be mandatory to share contact information, however if a dog is in a heightened state they should be removed from the scene. If contact info is shared, enforcement can contact them in a timely manner
- I only disagree if the bite is life threatening or severe to the human or animal they need to get medical attention first but I still think the story should be figured out because good behaved dogs don't bite for no reason
- Define "other animal" . Can't leave this open to interpretation.
- Exchange information and leave
- The dog owner must share contact info with the other person involved.
- I doubt enforcement would respond in a timely manner and dog bites are debatable. There is a big difference between a "dog bite" and a "dog that plays"; the majority of people making complaints do not likely have dogs and could consider a dog's play as aggressive (some people approach a dog without consent)...I understand that working dogs do need this extra training but when they are puppies you can only control the brain to a certain level.
- There isn't enough animal education any more. I can't even count on my fingers and toes the amount of times both children and adults have run at my dog without putting their hand out for the dog to sniff, and my dog has backed away and perceived these people as a threat. Education of the public is where we should be spending money. 9/10 it's human stupidity.
- "Depends on the situation. Was it aggressive? Play gone wrong? Wrong time and place?"
- Protective? Called for (ie: someone was harassing the owner and the pet took it on) not saying that is good but I have been harassed by very altered people downtown and although my dog has never bit any of them, she certainly keeps them at bay."
- I think the basic info should be shared but the dog should be taken home or out of the situation immediately.
- I believe in this situation keeping a scared/easily excited or aggressive animal at a scene where there is going to a lot of commotion and stimulating energy is not going to help.
- Because even in this questionnaire there is threat of euthanasia. In a perfect world sure but not in this one.
- Lots of situations can be turned into a complete bias with this. If you have an aggressive chihuahua and a tame pit bull looking from an outside perspective 9 times out of 10 people will assume the pit bull is at fault. This may be the case sometimes but not always. This leaves a lot of room for an officer or an outsider to make assumptions. If this were to be a bylaw, witness should be NEEDED to move forward unless visible damage is done of course
- Up to the people involved
- It's the owner not the dog!!!!



- This has nothing but potential to hurt the dog and the people. Yikes.
- Dogs feed off of people emotions and after an incident emotions will be running high in a negative way. This could result in another incident between the parties involved.
- More likely to judge a dog by breed. Law enforcement not required for every incident.
- We're adults..
- This is not always necessary and would likely cause a back log for officers
- Dog owner should exchange information with the victim, enforcement officer doesn't need to be involved unless escalated
- I say no only because it may cause the situation to escalate further - the dog may need to calm down elsewhere if it continues to be a risk or to be protected from possible retribution.
- I have had experiences in the past where people have said they got a "loud neighbor's dog" euthenized as revenge for something the owner did by lying about being bitten by the neighbors dog. Every dog owner I have met is responsible enough to know when a statement is necessary without law enforcement
- I think a person should have to stay if the dog bites a person but not another animal.
- If a bite is serious the victim will need to get emergency help, ambulances are not sent out for animals.
- It is between them what they would like to do, just like everything else in life
- What is a bite? How do we measure that? Incidental mouth play?
- Take the dog home first
- Should be common sense, if injury's permit you shouldn't leave without contact information.
- They should have to exchange their information with you in case there is an medical issue that arises from the incident but I don't think they should have to stay unless an animal or person is seriously hurt
- Treat it like a car accident. Exchange information and remove the dogs from the situation so there isn't more unnecessary trauma for the victim OR attacker. Sometimes things happen and the context dictates the behavior instead of the nature of the animal.
- It may not be safe for the owner to remain, either due to need to restrain their dog or seek medical care for themselves or their dog or because the other parties may be escalating the situation.
- How long might someone have to wait for an "enforcement officer" to arrive? There could be inclement weather or it could be too hot outside to wait for any length of time in the elements...
- Myself and my dog have been bitten at dog park before, and because my dog was larger and theirs was smaller we didn't even get a "sorry" they just walked away. I think depending on the severity, environment, and scenario of the incident should play a huge roll in determining if law enforcement or information exchanges should happen. But usually it's pretty minor and not a huge deal from what I've seen.
- This would cause vigilante justice, attacks on the owner by third parties who were not involved and have no knowledge of the situation.
- The offending animal should be removed from the scene as quickly as possible.



- The owner should give contact information but not stay at the scene because if the animal is aggressive it could become violent again
- This is [removed]
- How are you supposed to remove an aggressive dog from the situation and remain at the scene at the same time?!?
- If dogs are 'playing' with other dogs, and an incident occurred, it would be one person's word against the other. Most responsible dog owners would do the responsible thing. Don't establish a rule that inappropriately affects all, because of a few
- If a dog owner is a good owner the dog will not bite randomly
- I think they should go to the persons home. This gets the dog out of the situation. Keeps the persons involved safe and the dog safe. It can also show how the dog interacts at home and how the home owners are looking after the dog
- Animals may need immediate vet attention and it might not be possible to remain at the scene. I'm fine with the exchanging of information but waiting for an officer to arrive won't always be possible.
- A lot of the time when a dog bites another dog. It's the dog that got bit's fault, a lot of small dogs aren't trained properly and act aggressive towards bigger dogs. It's not their fault that they are defending themselves
- Only in the case where the severity is high when the owner remain at the scene IF it's SAFE to do so
- Sometimes dog owners don't follow the rules and let their dog off leash. My dog is sweet, but if a dog comes out of nowhere and invades his space, and bites the dog off leash, why do my dog and I get punished for it?
- If it was a dog biting a human. Perhaps. Dog on dog bite usually occurs because one owner does not respect dogs and their space. If you pass this BOTH parties should be involved. It can go both ways.
- This question is vague - what kind of bite are we talking here? Small bites or nips between dogs should not require an enforcement officer to attend.
- Define the severity of "bite" please.
- I believe owners can take the correct steps. Only in certain situations should enforcement officers be needed
- Sometimes the best thing is to remove the dog from the situation and let everyone calm down. Staying at the scene does not allow the dogs to calm down. Keeping two owners together (who are not seeing eye to eye) for an extended period of time will probably just escalate the situation!
- Sometimes dog owners (usually small dog breeds) are overprotective of their dogs and make false claims that their dog has been but or injured when they clearly have not.
- You cannot make 'rules' or 'bylaws' strictly singling out any kind of breed or dog. It's disgusting and I'm quite disappointed in the city for even doing this. As a pitbull owner myself it's extremely offensive and disrespectful.
- Only because people get so angry and emotional I think the circumstances can be enlarged and lies. If a dog bites, it can often be from fear because a human does not respect the dog.



- If someone is hurt very badly or an animal is seriously injured then someone should stay but minor things happen and no need
- The person or dog might need medical attention. The victim might be scared or threatened of the other or dogs people on scene. After a negative experience a dog will need to be removed from the situation to calm down.
- The dog needs to calm down, and be reprimanded at home, where the animal is safe and comfortable in their environment.
- Dogs bite while playing all the time, and if your sticking your hands near a dogs mouth you shouldn't be shocked if it bites you
- Who knows how long it would take for someone to show up
- The first priority is for the owner to remove the dog from the area and to secure it for the safety of others. I would support a rule that the owner must contact an enforcement officer within 24 hours if remaining on the scene is unsafe (no one else to take the dog, no vehicle to secure the dog in, etc.,)
- remove the dog from the incident
- Sometimes the dog that bites someone is not the aggressor. I've seen multiple scenarios where a person's dog starts the fight but is the only who gets seriously bitten in self defence. It should be up for discussion by the owners instead of law enforcement.
- Information should be exchanged at a safe time. After an attack the animals and individuals will be extremely agitated and the situation could become worse. Also there may not be time to wait if an animal has suffered an injury. The time waiting for an officer to arrive could mean an animal dies there instead of being rushed to a vet. I agree information needs to be exchanged in some way but sitting and waiting is not the answer.
- Removing an angry upset dog to prevent more damage is better
- I think it depends on the severity of the situation.
- dogs bite if provoked. people need to stop being idiots and blaming dogs when it was probably their fault anything happened in the first place. dogs shouldn't be blamed. blame the owner not the dog!!!!
- In a bite incident removing the animal from the scene to avoid further issues or potential escalation is more important.
- There would be conditions to this I'd it's a pet and the other animal is in the area. The person might need to get their pet away from the area. The other animal could have run away
- Not only would the animal(s) be a pain for the owner to sit and wait for an officer to show up, I do not think it is a good idea to stay at the scene if a dog, or multiple dogs, have already been aggravated. Not separating the animal could lead to another incident.
- I cannot fully support this as a small bite between dogs is normal. A sever bite is something else but we have technology to follow up with these situations. You will have people running around all over to complaints that may be erroneously made. My puppy got a small bite on her face when she was six months and is fine. It happens, they are dogs.
- This can be handled without an officer.
- they must leave it with someone, if they must leave to remove the dog from being a further danger.
- No, I don't feel like city resources need to be used this way.



- Their information can be taken and bylaw can go to their house.
- In the case of any altercation, the best course of action is to often get the animals away from the scene as quickly as possible.
- I believe humans in general are good in nature. If this unfortunately happens it'd be on my way to a vet with the affected party. Not waiting around for a bylaw to hand out a ticket while an animal is suffering needlessly.
- Depends on situation
- How long does it take for an enforcement officer to arrive? The parties involved need to exchange information and get names and contact info from witnesses. This is a traumatic event. If bylaw does not arrive within 30 minutes, people should not have to wait if they have exchanged info.
- Situational, if there is medical attention needed yes but blame should not be put immediately on the dog
- If the dog aggressively initiates yes. If it's a minor dog fight and provoked by the other dog no
- I think it depends on the situation there are many people and situations like where people over exaggerate and this would lead to many people making phone calls that would be in needed.
- If the bite does not warrant vet examination, move on. Animals communicate with their mouths and teeth.
- I would hope that if in fact in incident occurs both parties would exchange info and deal with it accordingly. I do not think we need another "rule"
- Dogs bite sometimes... what are you trying to enforce here?
- If a dog bites a person or another animal it's because it felt unsafe or provoked. It's entirely the fault of the person that got bit.
- What if the other person instigated the dog and then causes the bite? Lemme guess, still the dogs fault? Quit punishing innocent animals for dumb animals mistakes (humans)
- This is vary vague on what constitutes a "bite" if a dog were to nip at another dog for disrespecting boundaries, being dominant, etc there should be no reason for contact information.
- I think it depends on if the dog is provoked/unprovoked/situation Ie on leash park where someone has their dog off leash and that dog gets bitten by another dog due to them being uncontrolled and running up to the other dog, etc
- The circumstances may be unsafe for the owner and the dog to remain at the scene. It may be better for both parties to return to their home (safe space) and have the enforcement officer speak with them there.
- I think it can be handled with the other owner to exchange information If needed
- A lot of people overreact when their pets or their loved ones are involved. So there will be a lot of incidences When the dog didn't really do anything wrong but there still expected to stay and talk to an officer. The dog will still be in the unknown agitated state at that point so you're putting more stress on the animal. As well as all the people Involved
- If the dog is not under control at the scene it is usually safer to remove the dog and report after the dog has been contained.



- If the dog was provoked or is agitated by the individual it would not be a good idea to have them together.
- Its a loaded question..I was bitten by a large poodle breed,the owners acted as if it was my fault,then they took off..I left soon after..I prefer to never involve the legal system,it makes things worse...Punishing dogs for poor human behaviour(lack of training and knowledge)There is no justice, and the animal, who is like a child,suffers the worst..its never the animals fault..Quit targeting bully breeds they are beautiful dogs.And you state,.. they bite no more often than any other breed..
- Dogs may bite people for a number of reasons. If someone provokes a dog to bite them the owner shouldn't have to remain at the scene.
- Only because if there is a person or other animal injured they they should leave to get proper medical attention
- I am not sure an animal bite should be treated the same as a human bite.
- Why not speak with an officer at home?
- People will consider a small altercation a bigger deal than it may be.
- The dog Shld be removed from the situation immediately and the person should either call 311 or leave their information if possible
- If the dog was triggered by something or someone at the scene, remaining at the scene would prove more dangerous. The dog should be removed from the situation to maintain safety.
- I agree that accurate information should be provided, but assuming you were alone with the dog, how could you keep the dog at the scene if they were being aggressive?
- Not always the owners fault, could have been provoked.
- Emotionally overwhelming for the owner as well. Also muzzles on pit bulls? How about the city decides to actually solve the problem by educating rather than muzzles. The ignorance and stupidity in this city regarding pit bulls it's awful. Do the research, any dog is aggressive when the owner is awful. Provide educational programs, assistance. Claiming that pit bulls are too strong that's why they need a muzzle? Pit bulls can be as gentle as a lab if the owner is good. You guys are ridiculous with that. Maybe don't let every idiot be able to own a dog and have more regulations on the BREEDERS.
- Perhaps the dog needs to be taken home first or placed In a safe Area
- Unless it is severe
- Stay unless both parties involved agree it is not necessary.
- If a serious bite were to occur, I believe it would be prudent for the owner to take the dog away from the scene to minimize the chances of escalation.
- Dogs shouldn't be held accountable for bites only the human is responsible. People take things too far when half the time it was someone else or someone else's poorly trained dog - human fault- for bite incidents.
- I believe it should be a rule, although insuring the safety of all involved should take priority. (Getting the dog removed from the scene)



- Any dog bite should require the owner to exchange contact details with the person, waiting around for an enforcement officer to come may escalate the situation with either the owners or dogs, some of which may need to seek medical assistance.
- They should be required to provide contact info - what is the response time of the enforcement officer??
- This is not descriptive enough. A nip of the shirt to the wrong person could result in a poorly managed situation with a requirement to stay on scene.
- It is best to remove animals from the situation.
- I agree in an exchange of information. if an incident were to occur, to avoid stress from both parties (dogs especially) they should be separated/ confined immediately (back in a secure area/yard/kennel/vehicle etc.) This allows all parties to come down from the adreneline rush that usually occurs during these high stress type situations.
- Information should be shared between both parties and then depart. Keeping g the dogs close can cause stress as well as another bite.
- That would already apply if harm was done. Dogs bite eachother at parks all the time. Unless harm is done it is not an issue.
- If it's safer for everyone involved to not wait around, this rule could put more parties in danger. However, the intent behind the rule (for people to responsibly stick around to resolve an incident) is good.
- "This is a vague question. When did the animal "bite." Has there been canine dental taken to prove it was this dog. It's their word against whom?
- Animals have natural instincts what is being don't to protect them? This is deplorable!!"
- I think it depends if the person or animal that was bit is hurt
- Bites a person yes, bites another dog no
- It is reasonable for dog owner to provide verified contact information and they should ethically offer assistance to victim. However it may be more prudent to provide contact information and remove self and dog from the area, for the safety and well being of all parties involved.
- I would imagine a bite incident would be highly emotionally charged & keeping the dog at the scene could exacerbate tensions. Return to the scene should be appropriate, once the dog has been removed.
- What defines a bite? Does blood have to be drawn? If one dog plays rough and the other nips back, now they have to wait for an officer? Seems like people could easily abuse this rule, and that those who can afford legal counsel will always come out on top.
- I don't see any reason for this, especially if the guardian is still with the animal in question. In my opinion, they should be required to provide their information, but allowed to leave with the animal to prevent further stress or violent behaviour from the dog.
- Sometimes when dogs play they nix each other and sometimes they bleed a little. A bite needs to be defined
- Depends on the bite to be completely honest. This is vague and stupid like the rest of this [removed] survey



- I would say Yes, however, if staying there at the scene causes more aggression or concern I don't think that's safe for any person or animal in the vicinity.
- It could take hours for animal control to show up.....was told that when my dog was attacked by another dog. So doesn't seem practical
- People enter dog parks and interact with other animals at their own risk. They assume the liability that they may be harmed while using the park.,
- This could stop the owner from getting the pet out of the area and cause continued danger.
- my dog doesnt bite. so if he ever does, it means he was violated. we all have a right to protect ourselves, man or beast.
- This is no different than a car accident ... the person who is bitten should also be there. But it should not be forced by law, only in the event of serious/life threatening bites. Many superficial bites by people who fear & harass/tease dogs are over exaggerated & those would be a waste of the enforcement services time! The dog should also not be forced to remain in conditions that could cause it undue harm - the cold, the heat ... dog should be treated like any other citizen and given the opportunity to have access to the necessities that it needs to be comfortable
- If dog senses danger to the owner and protects it, last thing anyone would want to do is stick around.
- Only if it is serious. Dogs play around, sometimes nips happen. Also, this should be applied for small dogs as they are usually the aggressor since their owners don't take the time to train them.
- I support providing and exchanging information. However, to deescalate a situation, leaving with the dog is often necessary.
- If the dog is not getting along then you leave if the bite does occur give them a number
- I think this question is loaded and very poorly worded, the term "bite" can cover a broad spectrum. the wording needs to be defined more clearly. i don't think someone should have to wait for an officer is the dogs get into a little spat but if damage is done or it was unprovoked that is a whole different case.
- The vast majority of incidents in which dogs are aggressive are instigated by a person or child not treating the dog with respect. Parents should teach their human children who are more easily trained, how to approach and interact with dogs instead of blaming the dogs.
- bite needs to be defined appropriately before I would support this.
- If it was a severe bite which requires hospitalisation, yes. Dogs play with their mouths and some owners may consider that a "bite" even if its just play and not aggressive.
- Often the dog will be stressed out and the best thing would be for the owner to get it home to its safe place then focus on the reports.
- I believe it would be best if they were allowed to take their dog away from the situation but legally required to file a report.
- If the dog bites another person they may be under stress. Moving the dog from the scene could prevent further injuries.



- The rule as stated is not clear enough. I assume that you are not seriously suggesting that dogs biting each other while playing (without causing injury) would trigger this rule but without clarity this is exactly what a malicious actor could cause to happen.
- If a person runs up to your dog and tries to pet or engage with your dog without asking the owner if it is ok, it is their fault for being bitten by the strange dog.
- My dog has been bit a few times by other dogs who were just telling him they wanted space. He was not seriously injured and no blood was drawn from the bites.
- It would make more sense for the owner to remove the dog from the situation first by appropriately containing them. Then a follow up should occur once the dog is appropriately contained either at home or in a vehicle.
- Exchange information. No need to get an officer there unless one party is not compliant.
- Impossible to reinforce.
- They may need to get the dog home to prevent other issues.
- This is a loaded question. What is the definition of a bite. Some people consider play fighting an attack. Some consider a hyper, jumping puppy an aggressive dog. When dealing with the public, the subject can be widely misconstrued or exaggerated. Certainly in the case of a severe injury, where purposeful aggression was the cause, there needs to be intervention.
- No
- Depends on the situation. What's the severity of the attack, are parties disagreeing on how events occurred, and are witnesses present. What would be an acceptable response time of authorities if they are expected to remain in the area. Is it safe for the dog to remain or do they need to be brought to a familiar place to destress or become calm
- Information can be shared to each party similar to a minor car accident.
- The situation and area is already high stress for the animal allow the person and offending animal to leave the scene as long as info was gathered.
- Staying at the scene can lead to further issues and would be emotionally difficult for the animals owner.
- Depends on the severity of the bite. Dogs get in spats often, and I think some owners will take this too seriously
- This puts added stress on the animal. Get info and address it at home
- Yes, but only if it is safe. If the dog continues to be a threat they should leave with the dog.
- If a person is attacked, the attacker is not required to remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer. An animal has animal instincts, therefore holding them to a higher standard of morality than we currently do for actual humans is simply unjust. I also do not believe that an enforcement officer is the correct person to respond in this type of situation. We should be funding people and not-for-profit organizations who know and work with animals so that they can respond accordingly.
- The dog is the responsibility of the owner and the owner gets to decide the action taken against the dog if an incident occurs
- If I dog bites a person/animal they are agitated and need to get to a familiar place to calm down.



- Only if absolutely necessary. If there's any loss or damage, exchange contact. Otherwise, it can be handled at the scene.
- The animal should not remain on scene, causing further aggravation to it. Information should be exchanged with victim or authorities via phone
- Depending on the severity of the bite, as dogs do use biting as a form of play with other dogs. If the bite is significant and not in human error then yes. Some dog owners would abuse the power of this enforcement so i have answered no
- A stressed or aggravated dog needs to get home where they feel asap. Contact information should be shared quickly so the dog can get to a safe place and the victim of the bite to get medical attention. Waiting for an enforcement officer could take WAY too long.
- With the tension and adrenaline involved in a bite incident, the aggressive need to be made safe for others in the area, which may not be at the scene of the incident. As long as someone at the scene has the owner's information, whether on camera or written, the dog owner should be allowed to make sure the aggressive dog will not injure anyone else.
- I think would be sufficient to exchange information ie) photo of drivers license and get their contact info
- The animal would have to stay at the scene too, which could stress the animal even further and potentially causing the animal to lash out again. The animal needs to leave to allow it to calm down.
- Take pictures of the bite (s), dogs involved and ID of the dog's owner/manager, have an online submission form. There is zero need to waste anyone's time waiting around for what could be hours for an officer to show up.
- Most times when a dog bites, its because it feels threatened. Best measure would be to remove the dog from the environment.
- It's [removed] should be all digs then I've seen way more bites and attacks from small dogs
- I do think that information should be exchanged, but I feel that it could make an already tense situation worse.
- If a dog is provoked by another dog, the owner has not provided consent for that person to pet the dog, etc this is another way to discriminate against "problem breeds"
- If a dog is becoming uncontrollable, staying at the scene means you have to stay at the scene with a dog that needs to be taken out of the scenario.
- The dog should be removed from the situation ASAP. Exchange contact info with the person who was bit
- Only if severe bites to other dogs. Dogs get in scuffles once in a while and typically looks and sounds worse than it is. They have their own social system and figure it out. Some people overreact and would insist the owner stay behind for insignificant bites. Biting people is not acceptable though by any means.
- I dont think you should limit this to one Breed TYPE, this question should be used in any and all breeds
- Too many variables for a black and white answer



- There is too much grey area around a "dog bite" - people who have a dogs teeth contact but not break skin could take this way out of hand.
- Remaining at the scene with a highly stressed / reactive dog just involved in an incident could be the worst thing for all parties. Owners should provide contact info / dog license info and be free to do what is necessary to remove their dog from the situation (into a vehicle, at home, etc.).
- The dog should be taken back to their home after sharing contact information with with the other owner
- I think they should absolutely exchange information but be able to leave to diffuse the situation.
- if a dog bit someone or another dog, keeping the dog on site would only stress it out further. Number should be exchanged for contact by authorities
- It happens. Just like fights with human. You should not have to call the cops and exchange information unless it causes damages that would cost vet attention
- That could take forever. A follow up or online complaint reporting process might be beneficial with follow ups.
- A dog will only bite if they feel threatened.if you dont want a dog to bite do not go near them or ask to pet them.by asking to pet a dog you are risking being bit, no matter what type of dog it is
- If someone comes up to my aggressive dog with warning this is their own fault.
- If the dog is behaving aggressively, it should not remain in the location where it can do more harm. The owner should be held accountable, but should be able to secure the animal for everyones safety
- depends on situation, talk to person without getting friggin law enforcement involved.
- Often can turn into a hostile situation. Best information is exchanged like in a car accident.
- You need to deal with actual problems in this city. Cut the [removed] budget, fire half of the staff, and deal with the drug crime.
- Contact Information should be shared at time of incident but if enforcement officer takes a long time to get there or if medical attention is required, the animal should be removed (ie. taken home) from the situation to prevent further incident and officer can go to owner's home for further information
- In the case of a dog walker or trusted friend this does not make sense. I also don't think bylaw needs to be involved in every situation, only extreme cases.
- This cannot be enforced and most dog owners are normal people who would stay and exchange info
- if the dog is stressed, making the owner (and therefore the dog) stay in the situation does not seem like the smartest move
- "No only because if the dog bit someone or another dog, keeping them in that situation will only make the dog more anxious and aggressive.
- Let's say I'm walking my dog alone, and my dog gets freaked out and bites another dog, what am I supposed to do with my dog when I need to exchange info with the other owner? The dogs need to be separated, and that is difficult if you need to get close to someone to exchange info.
- I do think that the dog owner should be responsible for any bills due to the attack, but I think it's ignorant to assume keeping a possibly aggressive dog at the scene is going to be productive. I think if the dog is too worked up for the person to stay there, then they should have to call into bylaw or 311 and provide their contact information for the victim."



- It's the responsibility of each owner to handle the situation. Bringing officers into the mix when they could be solving other issues is not efficient.
- For minor scuffs and aggressive dogs, often the most effective solution is to separate and leave. In more severe situations, I think contact information of all parties involved should be shared so they may speak to an enforcement officer but they should not have to remain at the scene.
- There should be a rule that the owner has to share their information with someone at the scene but as its usually a high stress time and environment the best course of action is to get the dog contained, if possible in a vehicle nearby but if unable than away from the scene is best.
- It's a bite get over it animals are animals...
- Severe bites Yes. But dogs will bite either too defend themselves or because they were prevoked or a clash with another dog. I do not believe a bite in itself equals a dangerous dog. There are so many other factors to take into consideration it is absolutely NOT black and White!
- I've seen many "bite" or aggression incidents at offleash parks and emotions and tempers flare wildly. The threat of violence seems to escalate very quickly and heatedly and often times the best course of action is immediate separation of both parties. Hanging around the scene waiting for police to arrive for what often amounts to a very insignificant event seems like forcing escalation of conflict. Sharing information or giving a license plate and allowing parties to separate and then police to determine intervention is best. I've also seen many bite accusations that have no blood or physical evidence of a bite, and requiring staying at the scene of an accusation seems counter productive
- "It depends on the situation. It may be better to get the animal contained or treat any injury immediately (in the event of a dog fight for example).
- For a person, I would agree, owner should remain at the scene, but another animal I don't necessarily agree with..."
- I believe it should be able to be agreed by both parties that law enforcement is not needed. It should be required if either party wants enforcement involved
- I agree that this should be the case if the dog severely bites a person (the bite needs medical attention) however, in less severe cases it is more important that the owner is able to quickly remove their dog from the situation to avoid any escalation or further injuries.
- I don't think 'remain at the scene;' rather an alternative such as report it to 311. Reasons being bitee might require medical/vet treatment immediately and also bitee might be too stressed if bitor remained on scene for fear of another attack. I think parties should be separated asap, with requirement that within 24 hrs. the bite is to be reported. Bitee can take pics of bitor owner and bitor and be able to submit them with report. Also having to remain at scene might take too much manpower on an emergency basis. Different subject, but I think license fees should be zero but that animals must be 'registered' with the City.
- numbers should be exchanged. The dog needs to be removed from the situation asap. Some peoples fear would make a unnecessary stressful impact.
- They should have a period of time to contact enforcement. When there is a dog incident, some people and pets will not be able to remain calm while waiting for enforcement.



- Having the owner remain at the scene so long as contact information is exchanged puts a higher risk that the dog may attack again and/or will not deescalate any emotional response by the owner, victim etc.
- Would you really want a dog and it's [removed] owner to remain at the scene to keep yourself in danger? Use your head
- I think it should be reported for sure but the scene of the attack could increase aggression in the dog. A nearby area, less populated, would probably be best
- If a dog bites another person or animal they are likely highly stressed and should not be made to remain in the stressful situation. Contact information should be shared and then the dog owner should get the dog home to calm down.
- People commit hit and run with vehicles all the time and that is certainly illegal. Time could be better spent on other initiatives.
- This leaves them 100 percent at fault. Dogs don't attack unless provoked. ~Dog trainer [personal information removed].
- Emotions are high. Information needs to be shared but the dog should not have to stay. Stress needs to be minimized
- It depends on the situation. Sometimes people get bit by dogs because they are not being respectful of the dog or situation. People should be as responsible as the dog and owner. If a dog bite is truly unprovoked the two people should discuss this issue without formal enforcement.
- If a dog is the aggressor, sometimes the safest next move is to remove the aggressive dog from the situation. I believe it should be mandatory for the dog owner to return to the scene within 30 minutes to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer.
- Enforcement of this would be difficult, especially if medical care is required for animal or person bitten.
- If my dog with no history of biting was protecting me from a bad actor I would want to get away from them.
- I would be concerned that the situation may be made worse by this rule. I support the intent of the rule (ensure contact is made with enforcement Office) but would be cautious in the implementation of the rule.
- removing the animal has to be a priority, allowing the owner to take the dog home before being questioned removes the dog from the situation to help calm everyone/thing involved.
- It should be decided between the "victim" and the "offender" whether or not they involve the authorities.
- If a dog is put in a situation where it feels the need to be protective, then it's for a reason.
- If the dog can be tamed in the situation. Many times it will be a single owner and the best situation is to remove the dog from the situation but that isn't possible in Thai scenario.
- Removing the dog from the scene is more important to safety than waiting on a civil servant.
- "If someone attacks me and I'm with my dad I'm not staying around after my dog bites them and makes it possible for us to get away from an attacker.



- NO I do not agree with this one"
- People are stupid and prevoke the dog bite
- If the dog is enraged, it may need to be taken from the scene, but there should be a clear way to get in contact with the owner. If the dog is not enraged, yes, they should need to remain at the scene.
- Will enforcement officers be able to come in a timely matter? Does playing and biting count?
- I think I information should be shared and animal should be taken home away from further confrontation
- Information should be shared but the owner should be removing the animal from the area to reduce the possibility of compounding the issues.
- An exchange of information between the owner and the victim or owner of the victim is sufficient
- I think information should be passed on, but waiting for An enforcement officer is ridiculous.
- Maybe the dog was protecting their owner and the dog could have been the victim too.
- Maybe we need to ask WHY the dog bit another person or animal. Dogs bite when they feel threatened. If a dog bites a person because they're causing the dog stress that IS NOT the dogs fault, it is the person who was bitten.
- Criminalization of any dog orndog breed is not axceptable. If a dog bite happens it should be the responsibility of the owner and not a city official.
- Focus on real issues in the city. This is an absolute waste of tax payer dollars and I am ashamed to call you my city councilors.
- The burden of proof is on the crown. If an assault is committed, that's on you guys to go find them.
- Generally people are bit because they do not respect the dogs distance. Eg hands in the face without and intro. Some people want to take advantage of people at the cost of a dogs life and a huge lawsuit. I don't agree that my dog should be held accountable for being attacked by a stranger.
- Because it's up to the owners.
- I know of a case where an offender just gave a fake name and address and could never be contacted again. You can't MAKE a person stick around or show you I.D. Also I don't think we are required to carry I.D. at all times so the bylaw officer would have to follow the offender home. If you had to wait for a bylaw officer it might be -25 or +30 degrees.
- This is NOT enforceable.
- Because the term "bite" is subjective to an individual's interpretation. A playful mouthing of a dog may be addressed as a vicious bite. This is not as black and white as a vehicular accident.
- Exchange information and seek medical attention. Make a report later. This is not an event an officer needs to be on scene for unless there are bigger problems at hand
- Response time could be an issue and the victim would potentially need to seek treatment
- Dogs usually bite for a reason, ex. If they are provoked or feel threatened. If it bites for no reason- that it for the owner to train or seek training for their animal.
- No
- Because that's wasting time money and effort on more important matters.



- Dog bites are almost always caused by the person who is bitten antagonizing or attacking the dogs. Legislation like this is unfair to good dog owners.
- waiting for police can cause trauma for those involved as police may take a while to arrive. It can also increase tensions between both parties which can increase the tension the dog is feeling and increases the risk of another attack due to stress. I agree information should be passed, but waiting for police should be done in separate locations
- Removing the animal from the situation is the safest action.
- The dog should be removed from the area, and contact information should be left with the victim.
- This rule is too generic and sweeping. Was this suggestion based on an isolated incident? There is no room for discretion here. It is wide open for abuse, over-reaction, etc.
- It depends on the severity of the bite. If the bite breaks the skin or otherwise injures the animal or person (e.g., broken bone, strain or sprain, etc), then yes, the owner should stay, provide contact information and speak with an enforcement officer. It is generally courteous and ethical to check with the other person to ensure that they or their animal is OK, that they can access medical assistance if necessary, and assume responsibility for the vet bill.
- Why would you require a so called dangerous dog to stay at a scene yes exchange contact info make sure they can be contacted by forcing them to stay at a possibly bad situation makes no sense
- if a dog is an issue and can't be restrained after causing a problem, they might create further problems
- If the bite is severe contact information should be given
- I do, but only for human bites
- Human yes. Other animal no. Dogs who bite are not necessarily the instigator
- Dog may be aggressive and need to be removed from the situation, may not be that person's dog, that person could leave information to be contacted at a later date.
- No. Because in a lot of situations these are hear say scenarios. I'd also hate for the situation to be escalated as I don't believe enforcement officers would be there in a timely fashion.
- Hard to enforce and may not be safe to stay put if an injury or aggression is taking place
- The priority should be making the area safe for everyone including first responders. Get the dog out of there and secure. Contact police to report where you are so they can come to you. If you do not contact police then fines are issued.
- The dog should be removed from the area as it will be on high alert and anxious. Place the dog in the vehicle or walk it back home. The dog would have been triggered and needs to be brought to their safe space.
- Sometime a dog bite in self defense if the dog or the human is being assaulted there should be no obligation to stay in a dangerous situation both the dog and the human deserve to feel safe
- It depends on the severity of the situation. But the law enforcement does not need to be involved in every single case.
- Dogs bite other dogs all the time. - Dog owners know this. Wasting the time of an enforcement officer to come down to analyze that a dog was displaying dominance? This is a natural thing that animals do. Or a person giving a dog a treat and the dog accidentally nipping at the hand - The



owner should wait around to report this? No. I think the laws are fine the way they are and work well as these things don't happen often enough and if they do happen it is easy to report.

- Keeping the owner at the scene means keeping the dog at the scene which could be a bad situation. I would support the owner needing to leave contact information before leaving the scene.
- Dogs just got in a fight but you want them to stay together and wait? Recipe for more dog fighting
- I think this could cause more issues than it would cure. Keeping victim and dog at the scene while waiting on the city to respond could cause more harm.
- The dog would need to be taken out of the situation that has lead to the aggression. They should exchange info before leaving if possible.
- That means the dog must also remain there which could be stressful for those involved and the dog. I would support necessary follow up.
- Sometimes if a dog bites it's because another dog has provoked it or they are protecting their owners. You should not have to stay if another persons dog has caused the incident to happen.
- I think contact information should be shared, and if necessary an officer may get involved after the incident, or the victim may file a report.
- It's not the dog
- I understand wanting them to take accountability but also if your dog bites someone, you should probably remove your dog from around people.
- I think it depends of severity. If a bite is hard enough to seek medical attention, absolutely.
- Emotional situation and could escalate even more. Give all contact details and wait for enforcement to go to owner's residence.
- If the dog attacked somebody he's clearly agitated and staying at the area would further aggravate it
- If the dog is injured they don't have time to sit and wait.
- Both parties should be required to exchange contact information and take photos if the incident is minor and the victim should contact bylaw to report while the other individual takes their pet home to de-escalate the situation and wait for bylaw to contact. If there is severe injury/violence requiring an ambulance or police to be called, then the owner of the offending pet should remain until emergency services arrives to give a statement and contact information.
- I think it's best to remove the aggressive dog and de-escalate the situation. Leaving a dog in an already uncomfortable scenario you risk a second bite.
- What happens in the case of a dog walker is in custody of the animal, does the owner then have to come out to the scene of the incident?
- The first job of a dog owner whose dog had just bitten is to remove it from the situation to stop any further aggression.
- If the bite or attack is bad maybe
- Removal of the animal to prevent tension and stress in animal and people. Provide contact to be followed up with. Keeping people and animals in high tension situations is not setting anyone up for success.
- I think this depends on the situation, information should be exchanged, however the dog will most likely be scared and staying at the scene could exacerbate the situation.



- I agree with everything except having to talk to an enforcement officer at the time of the bite. If officer needs to step in, i believe it should be after the fact. I don't trust police officers can make best decisions for dogs however.
- In many cases a 'victim' has not exercised proper etiquette with a dogs owner. They ignore the owners warnings and touch or approach the dog when told not to. And then they use bias against a breed to have it wrongfully charged when something happens to them because of their own actions. The most dangerous and angry dogs are usually little breeds yet because they don't have the power to do real damage they're laughed off and ignored when they attack.
- Bc yhey would seize my dog
- It should be treated like a motor vehicle accident. If personal information was exchanged, there is no need to wait for an official.
- After a dog a bite the dog needs to be removed immediately. If a dog bites one would assume the dog is asking for space from the situation, if they do not get that immediately one could presume the next interaction of that type may be more severe. If a situation allows a dog to be separate while the owner stays then fine, but that is not always going to be possible. If two dogs are lunging at each other in a park how are the owners to stay and wait for an officer and keep the dogs separated while they continue to escalate and not expect worsening behaviours
- "I think it depends on the situation. If it was a minor accident that was out of the owners control and the victim is okay, they decide it is okay, I don't think further enforcement needs to come into place where a dog is taken away from their owners for a minor accident.
- If the person is in obvious pain, then the person should wait around until there is bylaw."
- I think that dog bite incidents can become chaotic and leaving the scene can be the best/only way of de-escalating a situation. The owner of the dog should be required to exchange license & contact information before leaving.
- It's the owners responsibility to exchange information the city and bylaw officers don't need to be involved
- how do you currently enforce the requirements in this situation - how would you enforce this that doesnt create conflict between citizens?
- A lot of times, from what I have witnessed, in public places the dog has often been provoked or his space not respect resulting in a bite or something similar. It's not the dogs fault and often people do t listen when you ask them to stay back or give space. They insist their dog or child is friendly and just wants to say hello and that is where the problem lies. If you can't respect space when asked to stay back then the owner shouldn't have to stay behind or give any information. Everyone should have the right to use outdoor spaces regardless of any issue an animal may have as they could be using the outdoor space for training and therapy reasons and it can be done if people respect boundaries
- Information can be provided in other ways, animal enforcement wait times are long.
- If a dog goes to the extent of biting it is best to remove the dog from the situation ASAP and go home. Staying when a dog is in a scared state can worsen this.



- I believe the person should provide drivers license and phone number to persons involved, allow their dog and their own picture to be taken for information purposes, however they should be bringing the dog home so as another person is not effected.
 - Cuz everyone is going to fight/escalate; get your information from the other person and get out.
 - Sometimes it's best to remove a distressed pet from the situation. As a responsible pet owner 1 , you should be offering help to the injured party, 2, provide your contact info for follow up 3, remove your pet from the environment where the incident occurred
 - If an animal attacks in a place its probably because it felt scared or threatened in that area. Why would you keep the animal in that situation
 - "My answer is dependent on the situation:
 - No: If the dog is protecting its owner from someone threatening them, they should be allowed to seek immediate safety.
 - Yes: If it is an unprovoked bite, it could be a symptom of a physical or behavioral problem so in that case my answer would be yes."
 - Share info with endorcement officer yes but not with other party to remove harrassment or reprisals. Not fair to animal owner to have to remain at location if dog will be seized.
 - If the person or animal that was bitten doesn't have to stay at the scene of the incident, I'm not sure there's any reason the dog owner cant be contacted at a later time.
 - It is important for the owner to regain control of the dog and sequester it. As long as they leave contact information and make themselves available later that should be fine.
 - This goes against the fundamental rights and freedoms in the Canadian Bill of Rights, which is a far higher authority than any statute you can pass.
 - How the hell would you enforce that?
 - "I want to say it depends.
-
- If there is a fight between dogs and it's no big deal I think both parties should be able to leave. If one dog viciously attacks another dog I also don't think they should stick around or the incident will keep happening."
 - I could see why a dog owner would want to remove the dog from the area if it were to bite. To prevent any further harm to the dog or person that was bitten. Also, the "attacking" dog could have also been provoked and led to it defending itself.
 - The owner should provide contact information, but not be required to remain at the scene of an incident until and enforcement officer arrives
 - Both the dog and the owner would be stressed and more likely to escalate. They should be in a controlled environment at least, but required to report the incident.
 - Sharing of contact information if important if vet fees are required.
 - If it's life threatening go to the vet and exchange information
 - It may be a matter of continued safety for the owner, the dog, others involved.



- If the owner is present, I would support it, but in my experience it is more often the case that the owner is not present when an incident occurs.
- Removing the dog from the situation to ensure no one else is hurt is important. Forcing the owner to stay may force an out of control dog to continue to be in a situation where others or the dog may be injured.
- A human is smarter than a dog, as an owner of such breeds, I believe that if a person who is scared of dogs like that should take precautions to not engage with them or the owner in any way and should respect the animal's personal space and not provoke them in any way. These animals require special care and needs more than other breeds or species and should be respected and not tampered with. I believe that all bites and attacks occur due to poor human understanding of such animals and stupid human actions. People are the problem, not the dogs. The people should be trained and taught that not every dog has such a happy personality and that not every dog wants to say hello to them or be pet by someone who is not of immediate family. Again it is the people that are the problem, not the animals.
- "it depends already of the bite. Example: dog nips at his mother dog not causing any damage= no
- Dog shreds skin of a child= yes"
- Info should be shared but if the dog is aggressive it needs to leave the area to decompress, not stay where the stressors are.
- I have heard of instances where a dog has scratched another dog in a play fight and then tries to bill the owner for vet costs unrelated. Some people abuse these situations.
- If a dog has bitten someone you need to remove it from that situation. However I do feel like their contact information should be available if the damage done to the other animal or dog requires a vet bill so that it will go on their insurance.
- People should be responsible for damage their pet causes. But if the damage is minor i don't see the need for an enforcement officer.
- If the dog bites a person, yes. If there is an altercation with another dog I do not think so, unless it is a serious incident. Our dog has been bitten at the park before and also bit that dog. Both owners worked to separate the dogs and leave immediately. There needs to be a clear definition of when you stay for bylaw and when you don't. There also needs to be onus put on an owner that is not minding their dog. If their dog is not under their control and they are not nearby and that dog instigates an altercation, that is an issue, especially if it means that their dog is the one hurt in the altercation. They were not minding their dog. I have seen this so many times at off leash parks. Personally, I can tell you that I would not wait for bylaw due to the fact that you have BSL language used in an above question which furthers the public's misunderstanding of those breeds and spreads fear of them. If I'm afraid that my dog could be targeted or seized due to their breed, I will not wait for bylaw and I would not allow someone to take my dog. BSL has been proven to be ineffective and is ridiculous and I can't believe that the city would consider this on any level. The language should reflect that of targeting irresponsible owners regardless of breed.
- Wouldn't you want to get the dog out of there?



- Dogs bite to play, and communicate. It should not be the owners responsibility to wait for a by-law officer if another dog owner believes "play" is an aggressive behavior. Further, this would simply become a he-said-she-said situation as both parties will have different opinions about the situation, should a bite occur.
 - I think most people would be afraid their dog will be put down or declared vicious even if there were extenuating circumstances and would flee. Trying to enforce this would be difficult and rather pointless.
 - Having them stay together doesn't make sense, there's clearly been an escalation and often the safest thing would be for both parties to leave the area and deal with it afterwards.
 - Within reason. A dog is not a car, so for the dog's safety and well being it should be taken away from the scene by the owner. But the owner should stay close enough to be able to report at the scene if necessary. Exchanging information with the effected party should be enough.
 - It would depend on the incident. If an owner's dog accidentally bites a dog who has been persistent in displaying annoying and threatening behaviour to your dog, given warnings and the other dogs owner has neglected to take control of his/her dog and has received a nip or bite then No. If a person or dog (other than circumstances previously stated) and certainly requires immediate medical or veterinary attention then Yes.
 - Some issues and bites are extremely minor and this would be a major waste of resources and time
 - If it is minor I do not feel that sharing contact information is necessary
 - "I believe it is important to share contact information. However if not a major bite I feel it is just added stress/work on the law enforcement system to come to the scene quickly for non-urgent cases. If no urgent medical attention is required I don't believe it is necessary to wait at the scene.
-
- In addition in the case of a small child/person with a fear of dogs it may cause more trauma for the person to remain so close to the dog after the incident. This is ONLY if it is not a major incident."
 - If it is a minor bite then no. If it is significant injury all information should be exchanged so when an investigation is done then they can talk with an officer. If it's a heated arrangement staying around will only upset the dogs involved and owners.
 - There is not enough information about this proposed policy to possibly support it. What is the purpose of making the dog owner stay? What happens? Are victims required to stay as well? Witnesses to substantiate the claim? How long will this process take?
 - just share info with the involved party. Same as a traffic incident.
 - depends on the context. Why the dog bites.
 - Dogs need to decompress away from the incident. The owner should be accessible, but keeping everyone together will result in another incident. Maybe they separate but remain in the area?
 - Depends on how the dog is reacting, it can be worse for it to stay
 - Why keep the dog at the scene, which would be stressful. Instead the owners should have to provide their information to the necessary person & be allowed to move their dogs away from the situation.



- Cyclists are not required to stay at the scene when they cause an accident or damage. Why would pet owners be required to?
- Leave their contact info so they can remove the animal hastily
- That can cause more harm than good how would you feel if a dog bit your dog it would start a scene of vigilantism, vindication, and violence sometimes owner vs owner
- Bite is a very general term and can include near misses and air snaps - this is very vague and could result in owners being less likely to walk their dogs or have them interact with others / socialize / get exercise (for fear of repercussions) which could actually increase the instance of negative behaviour because the dogs would not be as well socialized. As well, biting is often the last step after a series of calming signals (warning signs that the dog is uncomfortable) are ignored. Therefore, requiring the owner to stay would not reduce bite incidents - the focus should be on education rather than enforcement. Most owners will remain if the bite is serious.
- Sharing contact information is fine, but they shouldn't need to wait for an official
- Sharing information should be the extent that is required by the owner of a dog that has bitten a person or animal. The person who had been bit is not always in a mindset that would be safe to continue spending more time with for the dog owner that has bitten the dog or person.
- They should be required to share their contact info with the party involved to be included in the report for enforcement for follow up.
- How long would they be required to wait? There needs to be more information.
- If the dog is already agitated it is not prudent to make the owner (and consequently the agitated dog) at the location where drama is occurring
- I have been bitten by dogs - I didn't understand dog etiquette and it was my fault. Others who have been bitten may not be so gracious. There's an assumption that dogs that bite are problem dogs. The dog that has bitten is not necessarily the only problem. There are a number of reasons a dog may bite a person or animal. If the dog is provoked to bite, the dog is still considered to be problematic even if it may have been provoked to do so by, for example, a poorly behaved dog. The scene of the incident may not be safe for the dog owner. Accusations may escalate and the situation may grow heated, resulting in further conflict.
- it is more important to get the animals separated therefore it should be the owner that would have to take it away.
- Define "if necessary" and then maybe. Must be clear cut situations in which this rule would apply
- I think it is best to remove the dog and owner from an emotional situation and give everyone the space needed to calm down
- If the two owners have exchanged information that should be enough. The officer can contact or meet the owners if needed.
- Because if their dog has not calmed down yet, how do you expect it to wait for the appropriate measures to be taken. Give your information and leave, wait to discuss further measures when the dog has been taken home.
- The information should be given to the victim



- Dogs bite and play all the time. If this was to come into effect, would a person be expected to stand in -30 waiting for a bylaw officer to come and decide that what happened wasn't that serious? If an incident is serious, a person could take out their phone, take a picture of the dog and the owner, and post it to a park specific city board to file a complaint and report an incident.
- "These are animals, not children, animals. They bite, bark, run, and play but they don't know that it's wrong or bad most of the time when they do bite usually they do because they are 1. Protecting 2. Playing. 3 confused . 4. Scared
- The owner should be able to look at the situation and decided what the next best option is."
- "As long as you've spoken to everyone involved. There's no need to call police. That's ridiculous and a waste or resources.
- Trying to have restrictions on pit bulls is completely bull.
- Get ready for a rage"
- The person may need to remove their dog for the safety of others, but could return after that.
- It may be very difficult to keep the dog in a situation for a prolonged period of time where tensions will likely be high. Dangerous
- The best way to defuse a situation is often to leave. It seems perfectly acceptable to exchange basic information and leave to safely secure animal.
- "Because 99% of issues are non-issues. We don't need to waste resources on this! Exchange numbers if necessary. Or
- Grab their drivers license number."
- Contact information should be shared and the animal removed from the situation to avoid further aggravation.
- Put simply, enforcement of this just doesn't make enough sense to me in all cases.
- If anything, information should be reported and an enforcement officer should go to BOTH parties houses and see their living conditions to see if they are actually fit to be taking care of animals
- There is no clarity in "a dog bites a person or other animal". There are disagreements at dog parks, and I know my dog has gotten scratched and bitten - but I'm not going to make the other person hang around for a minor incident. There were times we didn't even notice until we got home it was so minor.
- Depends on the severity of the bite. You need better survey questions because these questions are far too open ended. Dogs sometimes play bite with other dogs and people without hurting them. These incidents are subjective and should be treated individually.
- People are bullies and mean. I would be supportive of the owner providing their contact information and then removing their dog from the scene, as people feel entitled to attack the perpetrator, and that increased state of upset can cause a dog to become more reactive as their owner's anxiety increases. For victims, education about what to do, possibly getting a license plate, photos of the offender, dog description would be helpful.
- Way too broad. I find that these bylaws will be used to demonize dogs. What stats are there to promote such changes?



- Information needs to be shared however the dog that bites should be taken home where it is potentially more calm
- Dogs get stressed. There's a huge probability that staying at the scene would make it worse. Just like humans needing a break/breather, removing the animal from the area is the action.
- No i dont think they need to stay at the scene but they do need to provide contact information.
- It could become unsafe to remain at the scene. Both people and the animals involved could escalate further resulting in more injuries. Between weather, traffic, and aggressive dogs it is better for the people involved to get somewhere safe. Information should be exchanged.
- I have had a dog bite me at a dog park. Waiting for enforcement officer would be waist of my time and the officer's.
- Both parties may need to attend to their animals or themselves. It should be sufficient to share contact information with each other and, if phones are available, pictures of dog, owner, injures.
- If alone, the owner would need to remove the animal to a safe location.
- Less govt rules mind your own damn business.
- Keeping the dog at the scene will cause more stress on the dog and other dogs there. They can pass info on, or witnesses can call them in next time they see them.
- They will have the dog present with them. Share information and take dog home. Then have enforcement officer involved.
- depends on severity of a bite. if someone approaches your dog without permission I do not feel it is the dog or owners responsibility to ensure the uninvited guest does not approach.
- If the dog just bit someone (no matter what breed) you should remove them from the situation
- Only if necessary not all dog bites require a big scene
- N/A
- My answer is yes and no depending on the severity of the bite, if it's just enough to break the skin or less then no. They can exchange details if need be but there is no reason if the person or animal that got bit isn't seriously injured.
- I'd the animal is angry enough to bite, the situation likely requires that the dog be removed to avoid further issues.
- I literally cannot believe you guys are even considering this. WHY do we pay taxes to you [removed].
- This is ridiculous. HOW WOULD YOU CALM A DOG DOWN AFTER AN ATTACK AND WAIT FOR AN OFFICER? Remaining at the scene increases the chance of another attack and increases the liability for the owner of said dog.
- Depends on how severe the situation is. Dogs shouldn't be judged and owners should know how to handle their pets.
- Share contact information but to force them to stay will only cause the people involved as well as the dog(s) involved more damage than good.
- It depends if the individuals involved can resolve it on their own
- They should separate the animals immediately and then get info traded.
- Enforcement officers have little to no training on the issue to begin with. They are not equipped to mediate situations between a heightened situation



- These incidents have a huge potential to escalate. Also the dog could still be agitated.
- It would be safest for the dog to be brought home but I believe information should be exchanged so they can speak with enforcement officers afterwards.
- The owner should be required to provide all personal information required but should not be expected to stay at the scene. It's a very emotional Adrenalin inducing experience, the owner should be able to go somewhere safe and private.
- I believe exchange of information is necessary, however, when there has been dog aggression it may not always be possible to "remain on the scene" in a calm and safe manner. I would support a By-law that requires owners to exchange information with each other as well as with witnesses if necessary, but tensions can run high and may cause further escalation between humans and animals.
- People have lives to live. The person or animal that was injured can exchange information and then carry on their day if a by-law officer needs to inquire more information they can contact the owner via the other person's contact.
- "This is murky water. Because if someone's dog nips a person and the person says everything is fine. Generally you would want to get the offending dog away from that person because it's something about them the dog doesn't like. Just to have an officer knock on that person's door a few hours later with a fine over something that was a non-event.
- On the other hand. You can't just have people leaving if they have an animal that is going around seriously injuring people.
- It's a tough call because you know some people will take advantage of the system no matter what you do."
- I think you should provide your information and bring your animal directly home. The animal may have bit due to distress?
- Stop bullying dog owners and stop making up new rules and regulations to justify your jobs and increase your bureaucracy
- Situational
- If the intent is to get the dogs away I don't think staying at the scene is the first priority.
- Waste of city resources
- I think it would depend on the bite; was this a little nip or a large bite causing harm to the dog/person.
- The dog should be taken somewhere quiet - maybe put in a car (if available). Reactive dogs are often traumatised by bites too, so removing them and allowing them to calm down is probably safer.
- Depending on the severity. If it is a small nick that just scratched the surface and was provoked, then no. If it caused significant damage to the person or dog, then yes, but that does not mean they deserve a fine if they don't.
- If medical attention is required information should be swapped and the due process handled after treatment received. Health and safety over fines and punishments.
- Exchange of information is sufficient.
- I think they should be able to go secure their pet somewhere then come back



- Pass information along. Remove dog from the scene and make sure all parties have seemed medical attention
 - Could lead to many false calls of bites if someone is just upset at a dog.
 - Why are small dogs not being considered. They're worse than any big dog
 - If a dog has bit someone, it should be removed from the scene so that it does not continue to be a threat. The owner should leave with the dog and return, call in to 311 to advise where they will be, or leave information at the scene with their details.
 - I believe its best to share information yes however, getting the person and dogs out of a volatile situation as fast as possible is best. if enforcement is needed they can come to the parties involved
 - Take the agitated dog away first but yes, must share info.
 - An owner should be held accountable however, its often in the best interest of the dogs to separate them right away to prevent further issues. This may require leaving the scene.
 - "If a person that is not the dogs owner is trying to play with a "dangerous" dog and does something to the dog that the dog doesn't like and the dog then bite the person to defend itself, I don't think the owner of the dog needs to give any contact information. If a person is scared of said "dangerous" dogs, than that individual shouldn't interact with any dogs.
-
- If the bite was meant for harm, the owner of the dog knows how society views their "dangerous" dog and will act according."
 - Grown adults should be responsible enough to exchange contact information on their own and don't need an enforcement officer to do so.
 - Life is rough, people get bitten by dogs, if it's that bad then you need to go to the hospital and not get that person's contact information, and I'll wager it was the person who got bittens fault and not the owner, and if it is a "feral dog" that's real worrisome there isn't going to be an owner to harass for contact information
 - Could be dangerous with humans being capable of escalation as well. Trade information though!
 - I think we have enough bi-laws & rules in this city. I give people the benefit of doubt that they'll do the right thing without Big Brother's assistance.
 - This is not a criminal offence - could lead to potential safety issue for both dog owner and victims - other means can be used to obtain dog owner information
 - Many dog interactions are situational and one off situations. Unless unprovoked. The police do not need to be involved in this.
 - This will allow citizens to "Detain" other citizens and will further allow the police to abuse their power, they arent regulated to begin with. Please try to extrapolate the results of a bylaw. IS this your first bylaw?? Damn.
 - Removing the dog from the scene of the accident may be the only thing that can calm them. Why keep them in a vulnerable position?



- People would use minor nips from a dog that cause no actual physical damage as an excuse to have someone charged or investigated. Resulting in the dog being at risk of seizure and owner getting fined with restrictions put on said dog for no real reason.
- How long would you expect someone to wait around if no one is available exchanged information if there is a person present who is not bylaw
- I do think it depends on the severity. A couple of my dogs have been bitten over the years in a minor scuffle that was broken up immediately with no long lasting damage or vet intervention required.
- If it is safe for the animals and owners to do so Yes they should stay at the scene. IF the animals or person needs medical attention they should seek that then file a report.
- no no no.
- a responsible person would. do really think that a loser that has not control over his/her dog is going to stick around because there is a by-law that says so? There needs to be a huge penalty if they do not,
- It not always safe (especially for women) to be required to stay on the scene.
- Most dog owners will stay but rules regarding that are too dictatorial. Dogs are like kids. Is there a rule that when 2 kids have a squabble that everyone waits for police? I have seen too many times - people over-reacting to an incident and grossly exaggerating the incident. A man claimed to be attacked one time by a pitbull when actually the tear in his pants was from one of the dog's claws...he got jumped up on by two dogs (his and another) that had a squabble. It was a non-incident but the owner of the pitbull stayed and the bylaw officer was threatening to take her dog! It was absolutely ridiculous! I saw the whole incident and it was nothing! The guy made it into something just because his pants got ripped.
- They should leave contact information but remaining at the scene especially if the dog is still with them seems inflammatory
- In theory, yes, however I don't trust the judgement of the Calgary SPCA staff.
- If you are a responsible dog owner, then you need to provide that information, however, being on the scene could cause other issues that could escalate into violence.
- Taking information should be enough.
- Most dogs that bite other dogs are playing or if there is aggressive behaviour it should be dealt with, between the people present, bringing more chaos to a chaotic scene is stressful for animal and owner and may cause more issues that could have been avoided entirely. I do believe that in some serious situations that you should meet with an officer outside of the situation.
- it would depend on the situation. I think if owner information is exchanged that is OK. This could problematic in real-life situations. What happens if the person or animal have to go to the hospital? What if its 100 degrees outside, what if it's after hours? What if all by-law officers are busy? What is the expected response rate for officers? What if there is no damage cause by the bite? Say, torn pant leg? We dont require people to wait at the scene of an accident for minor incidents as long as the information is exchanged, how can we expect people to wait for response for bylaw??? And in



the case of a bad bite that person or animal should be seeking medical attention as soon as possible.

- If the dog has attacked it may be difficult for the owner and dog to stay in one place until someone arrives
- They need to get the dogs away from doing anymore harm first then return
- This is not necessarily realistic as when dogs play there are different degrees of biting (Ex: nips). Hard to enforce.
- This should be between owners. If the bite is severe enough to require medical attention for either person or animal, then it should be necessary.
- owner needs to take responsibility, no authority needed
- I support this, but I think it would be very hard to enforce.
- That person and/or their dog might be a danger to the victim if they have to stay on scene. Some instances might be better for the victim to get away asap.
- It is likely that if the owner remains, so does the dog. After a biting incident, the stresses, screaming, crying, etc is not going to remove the tension from the situation
- The owner should give information, but it might be hard to remain on the scene with the dog.
- If a child misbehaves in public and creates a fool of them selves are you going to send them to obedience training
- No
- [removed]
- There is no reason to remain at the scene when they can be contacted.
- If a situation of human biting occurs the trauma to all parties is severe, and to calm down and bring the dog back safely it's best to leave for a safe place (home) and keep the dog and others safe.
- If the people involved sort it out there is no need for bylaw involvement .
- I think the most important thing at that point is to remove the dog to diffuse the situation. This can't always be done by waiting at the scene.
- Only if it is a severe bite.
- Keeping the owner at the scene means keeping the dog at the scene, which could result in another attack. The dog should be removed from the situation
- It is possible that the owner, seeing that they are possibly the cause of the problem, can escalate the problem. This might be unsafe for others involved. It might be safer to follow up when the opposing parties are not at the same location.
- This question seems like a trap ... if the dog became "œvicious" because it first was attacked (eg. Dogs at a dog park are interacting aggressively with eachother and a human who is trying to break them up gets bitten) the dog may need to go to an animal hospital for wound treatments and the owner should be allowed to go with their pet. I do not understand why an owner would leave the scene unless absolutely necessary
- The owner has a responsibility to remove the dog from dangerous situations. Remaining on scene would require, in many cases, the dog to be on scene as well - which could severely worsen the situation.



- If time does not allow. (I.e. they have to get to work or an apt) They can have the other party involved take down their contact info. (Take pic of drivers licence) and have bylaw officer call them later
- I have a reactive dog. Although he has never been involved an incident that required an enforcement officer, if something did happen I would want to take my dog home. I often walk my dogs alone so having to deal with the dog while waiting for an officer would be very stressful. Would make more sense to leave contact information and follow up without the dog present.
- I do not think that OUR city has the best interest for our animals. *(obviously with the pitbull questions you guys are literally on some REALLY good [removed]) THE peace officers that I have encountered ALWAYS demonize dogs and cats. They ALWAYS will take the side of the person who got bit. It will not matter if the said person is beating the [removed] out of the dog as long as the human is safe that is all that matters. You guys have [removed] lost it.
- Because people lie about what dog bit them, and people do not understand that just because a dog is big and black doesn't mean it's a dangerous dog.
- This type of enforcement officer intervention is often not needed. Dogs and people work it out more often than they don't. I understand that there are a number of serious 'bite and run' type incidences in the City each month, but it is not the norm and we should not build our system around the smallest number of incidences.
- Keeping the dog at the scene could escalate the situation further. Requiring the owner to stay would mean the dog would likely stay too.
- Information must be exchanged like a car accident thats under 2000.
- The owner should be required to pass on all contact information to the victim. Keeping a victim, the dog in question and that animals owner in the same location with heated tensions could end up causing far more issues. And I'd assume would be very unnerving for the victim themselves.
- It's up to both parties. If both parties would like to share information or not. Let the people involved make decisions.
- How is that helpful? Leaving both parties on site including the animal that is likely upset and distraught and unstable. Dumb question. Get the information from the party the same way you would in a car accident. Both parties aren't required to wait on scene.
- The best thing to do at the time may be to put the dog away and locked up safely, It would be difficult to stand there and hold a dog whose lunging and wanting to attack Kama that could lead to the dog getting loose again and continuing the fight.which means the person would have to leave the scene but they should not be allowed to leave the scene without giving their contact information,
- Because many years ago I was forced to wait for 4 hours in the dark and cold sitting on the grass alone and I was a young adult. Crying waiting for 4 hours for the Calgary police to show up!!! It was traumatizing and awful! Leave your info with a bystander and get the animal home. Or call it in with your address and have the officers meet you at your home..this was such a disgrace when it happened to me.
- Contact info should be required however in an attack situation you may need to leave to go to the vet etc and not have time to wait for an officer



- Any jerk can claim anything if they don't like the look of your dog. My neighbor yells at me that it's illegal to let my dog pee at the park (where she can see from her deck). I can't trust people to not lie about getting bitten. People are prejudiced against pit bulls.
- Share information, yes. Remain at the scene, no. That's a waste of time considering the response time is never quick.
- I believe the dog owner should get the animal into a safer location, then come back to discuss/ deal with issue.
- If a dog bites a person yes I agree. However My own dog was bit by another dog. That's where is disagree. My dog missed body language from the other dog asking him to not bother him. He corrected my dog, and we moved on. It depends on the bite. If they bite the backend it's a warning and basic body language for dogs. If they go for the underside of the neck however that aggression. People need to be educated. Otherwise you will have a thousand calls a day from noisy neighbours who think a dog is aggressive when they are just playing or teaching their fellow dog manners.
- Response times are atrocious already in Calgary, when a bite occurs the dog is usually in a very high mental state and remaining there isn't going to help calm the dog down and could lead to further incidents. Share address and have the officer meet them at the safe place instead.
- I believe they should share the information but not have to remain on scene until bylaw arrives. The dog should be removed from the situation as it is likely wound up and could be traumatizing to the victim or result in more bites.
- If there is an incident. It makes sense to get the offending animal away from all interactions that may increase risk of further problem.
- The dog that has bitten someone may be very agitated and should not remain close. The owner should exchange contact information but not stay to wait for an enforcement officer. The office can call the owner.
- They should have the freedom to leave if it doesn't cause damage. Too many people would use this as an excuse to keep owners there for no reason.
- A dog bite situation could quickly escalate if people stay at the scene. Better to exchange information and talk to each party independently.
- Person yes but not animal as it could be in defence.
- Often it is best to remove the dog immediately from the situation to prevent further escalation. Regardless of a provoked or unprovoked bite. For example, if a dog bites another dog, both dogs need to be removed from the situation. The bitten dog (if minor) will continue to feel vulnerable and may become defensive to other dogs. The dog that has bitten would also need to be removed from the situation otherwise they may stay in a state of mind (fearful, aggressive, unsure/insecure, etc) that could lead to another attack.
- This may cause more stress for the dogs if they are unable to be removed from the situation.
- The owner should be responsible but sometimes its in the best interest of everyone to leave/remove the dog from the scene.
- Could you provide clarification on what "necessary" means?
- If someone is bitten they were most likely in the wrong



- I don't think that bylaw will get there in a effective amount of time. Also if the animal is severely injured it's best they they go to the vet and many good owners would opt to follow the victim to the vet. I think the goal would be to share contact information, not stay at the scene.
- All scenarios no. Some people are bad / antaganoize dogs and dogs may bite as a warning signal but not actually to bring pain. This causes the pontential for a he said she said situation and the person bit can say whatever they want with no proof. People should be expected to leave dogs who are not theirs alone. If everyone has their dog on leash and people understand STRANGERS boundaries no one would get hurt. People should not believe any dog is theirs to pet, people don't try to play with strangers kids so people should not try to play with strangers dogs.
- Depends on severity of bite. Dogs do play bite.
- Contact information must be shared, including handler information (ie dog walker or owner), and license number of dogs involved. If there are witnesses to the incident (including animal behaviour prior to the incident), their contact information should be obtained. If medical attention is required, after the information is exchanged, the dogs should be assessed by a veterinarian immediately, if necessary. Staying on scene for an enforcement officer isn't necessary due to the dynamic situation. There is potential for a second incident or human altercation if people have to remain in the same area until enforcement arrives.
- Call me and find out.
- I feel that the laws expect dogs to be perfect and humans to be able to do what they want and have little to no understanding of the creatures they live with. If a human tries to touch a strange dog without the owners permission, the responsibility should be on the human not the dog. Dogs are held to a higher standard than humans. Not all dogs love being touched by strange people! I would support a law that included more responsibility on the humans that also included the above. Dogs should have more rights and protections. They are animals and not toys.
- Sometimes it is best for everyone including the animal if they are removed from the situation. If I was bit by a dog who was acting aggressive I would not want to wait with the dog for an officer.
- I support this in theory however would worry that the interpretation of some might extend to incidental behaviour while playing so the bylaw would need to be very specific.
- Dog should be removed However information should be shared.
- I think people dont always need an officer involved. in minor situations people can handle it on there own. if some one is refusing to provide info or refused to be accountable then call an officer
- I would not want that rule to interfere if the dog also needed medical care
- Depends on the severity of the bite and the response of the owner.
- There are cases where a dog is truly protecting itself. There have been times where the other owner is being careless.
- Rule wording needs to be modified. Giving contact info should be mandatory but leaving may be the best way to diffuse an emotional situation.
- The enforcement officer should meet them at thier home
- I believe owning dogs are similar to having kids. If kids were to get into a brawl, parents talk it out and figure it out. Not call 911. Vicious dogs shouldn't be in off leash parks.



- If a dog is exhibiting that behaviour, it is stressed. It should be able to go wherever it feels more comfortable.
- I think it dependant on the severity of the bite. If not vet care is required o do not think this is nessecary.
- Because the system is not fair right now. Especially for some breeds that are miss understood
- Sometimes the owner must leave for the safety of others. They should make their best effort to provide contact information. But to ask someone to stay put in a situation where they have an agitated dog, may actually cause further harm to bystanders.
- This is extremely subjective obviously if a dog injures someone wait for the police but I've seen dogs get into small squabbles a hundred times at off leash areas it would be impossible to regulate. Most of the time people are pretty darn responsible.
- I think it would be up to the owner of the dog and the person it involves. If contact info needs to be shared it should be shared. But say if the non owner of the dog provoked the dog then that is on the non owner to get it fixed and shouldn't involve the dog or dog owner at all.
- As with a minor motor vehicle collision both parties could swap info and move along. I don't see people standing around perhaps for hours waiting for a bylaw officer.
- They need to share their information to be contacted and also take their dog out of the situation.
- "Kind of a loaded question. I do support this, however I also think that enforcing a person or animal to stay at the scene and not taking either away to a safe space could extend the traumatic experience. I would support the exchange of information,
- if it is possible to do so without being in each others space, but I think everyone needs to get home or to a hospital, safe space, asap. Speaking to enforcement can happen after the fact."
- Exchanging information should be sufficient; as getting the dogs out of the situation is a priority. Attacking a human might be taken care of differently
- Unless someone else can remove the dog from the situation I do not feel that is a good idea. The owner can provide their contact info and someone can follow up with them after.
- It could already be a hostile situation so staying could mean more harm.
- This can only increase the anxiety to the animal who may have only bitten because of the situation. If information is available for contact getting the dog out of the situation may be the best.
- Most dogs only bite when attacked to protect themselves or their family and staying in that situation is only going to cause more issues and potential danger.
- If the dog is out of control, the dog should be removed. It could also escalate the issue if the owner, victim and dog(s) had to stay. I think common sense should be used when dealing with this situation. I think there should be rules if there aren't any that require the owner to contact 311 to notify of the incident. Bylaw can then follow up.
- Yes there is insurance. But I'm not crashing a vehicle.
- Yes it's fair
- Until I can believe that this will be fair to the dog and owner, I do not support this. There are so many situations where the "victim" is at fault, but that would not be listened to. Approaching a dog improperly and without asking, scaring a dog, etc.

- "As this is singling out ""pit bulls"" it is prone to misuse and overhanded enforcement.
 - The truth is, a good ""pit bull"" should never bite anyone for any reason. Back when they were fought for sport you couldn't have a dog bite a person even when it was worked out. Dogs that bit were called curs and were euthanized. Now, no one culls and pit bulls are being crossbred with other dogs. This crossing increases the propensity a bite occurring. If you truly want to stop ""pit bulls"" from biting the general public then perhaps you ought to look into controlling crossbred mutts before you disparage a breed that is meant to be bred to avoid biting a human at all costs."
 - It's unfair to ask any dog owner whose dog has just bit to remain at the incident. If the dog has just bit the mindset of that dog and likely owner are not going to coincide with remaining calm and waiting in an unhealthy environment for an officer. It's u reasonable to even ask.
 - Not necessarily. The owner might need to remove the dog from the situation. The owner should then return or make other arrangements to meet law enforcement .
 - Need to ensure the dog is quickly removed from the situation.
 - It is not always safe to remain (but they should remain and exchange info if possible). But they should be required to contact the authorities within a set amount of a "grace" period.
 - Unless it is a unprovoked bite or attack, understanding the way animals communicate would help situations like this alot
 - If you are dealing with the situation and have a dog that you are trying to get undercontrol the last thing you want to do is have the dog remain there with the owner. There needs to be allowances to remove the animal from the scene.
 - "The dog needs taken home immediately, all contact info should need to be given immediately and help should need to be called but the dog should be locked up in a home first. Law enforcement should go to the persons house so that the person bite is not further traumatized.
-
- My brother in law was had his ear by off by his childhood dog and could not see him because he was literally traumatized. So imagine the dog that just bit you hanging out 20 feet away from you. It would not help the victim."
 - Well if the incident happened they should still provide info but obviously remove the dog from the situation to prevent further issues. So sometimes maybe they can't stay at the scene
 - Animals act in instinct . Animals act upon reflection of their owners behaviour.
 - If the rule cannot be applied to children it should not be applied to dogs
 - Ppl can work together to resolve issue without a third party getting involved.
 - I a green in the exchange of contact information, but if a dog bites they are in a high stress environment, which it is better to get them away from. Or in the case of a fight, seek medical care.
 - If contact information is shared bylaw can contact the owner after.
 - Unless a dog or person was severely injured it's just a dog bite, keep your dog in check if you know they're not good around other dogs.



- I support the idea in the case of a severe bite (torn flesh, significant bleeding or obvious signs of new disability) but do not support it in the case of dog on dog bites. Who is the judge at the time of whether the bite was in play, or an aggressive act? Dog on dog play can get out of hand and nips are exchanged but rarely are there enduring problems beyond hurt feelings on the part of the dogs.
- in a case like that the owner of the dog may need to remove the dog from the situation as well as help the victim with hospital concerns
- If an animal has been distressed to the point that it feels threatened (and must defend itself) it does seem to me that you would want to remove that animal from the threatening environment and return it to safer, more comfortable, surroundings (ie. it's own home)
- Dogs may be injured and require medical care. Owners should have to share contact information.
- It depends. The person must share contact information but the safest thing may be to take the dog home as well. How do you manage that?
- Contact information should be sufficient. What is likely best for the dog in that situation is to remove it from the setting, and take it home. Keeping everyone together will create more stress and tension.
- If a party is seriously injured it is a social duty to remain. However I can see this "rule" becoming a problem with small minor issues that could be settled on their own instead of paying officers to enforce this, which will cost us more money and take officers away from larger issues that should be focused on.
- It is not always the dogs fault. Have basic education for those who walk in dog friendly parks to not approach dogs without communicating with the owner first.
- I support this much more for biting people. I think dogs biting other dogs can occur far more easily and is only an issue if it's severe.
- I would alter that to provide contact information and/or require them to call 311 to report the details. If the dog is agitated, sometimes the best thing is for the owner to take the dog somewhere private to settle the dog. I don't want to see dog owners punished for doing what is best for the dog.
- The dog is clearly reactive. Keeping it in a stressful situation is only going to make it worse. I get that it's important to keep people accountable for their pets, but you would only be asking for more hurt on the people and animal if the owner has to stay and doesnt have a way to remove the dog from the situation
- This should be figured out the the parties involved. No need for an enforcement officer
- The city needs to stop over regulating. Start subsidizing humane society's so they can train the dogs in the shelter more efficiently.
- Would make more sense to remove the dog from the scene to avoid triggering it more. Personal information considerations - FOIP Act
- Unreasonable people would abuse this over minor incidences. Too many irritating overreactors around for a rule like this.
- I think that should apply in the case of a severe attack.
- A lot of the time bites are provoked. I dont trust that there will be fair reporting and no bias.
- Often occasions, people are not following on leash rules and may approach a dog that is skiddish or unfamiliar with other dogs.



- Dog play bite all the time and often times when people are involved they didn't respect the dogs space very rarely is it the dogs fault.
- Dogs often nip and snap at each other, and sometimes at people, without doing harm. I suspect that such a bylaw would immediately become a source of time-wasting, melodrama and attention-seeking behaviour. People would waste each other's and officers' time over non-serious incidents.
- The dog would need to be removed from the situation - sometimes requiring the owner to leave
- Logistically, their focus should be obtaining and maintaining control of their dog. Recognizing that this may necessitate leaving the scene, I suggest that the provision be re-drafted to mandate an exchange of contact information.
- This can't always be the case. I think exchange numbers but if I was in that situation I would want to get my dog out of the area and then come back. Perhaps they could follow and then exchange numbers. I have a dog who has extreme trauma and fear, I want to keep her away from all dogs at any time so my main focus is to remove her from those situations as it causes further fear and bad associations.
- Having law enforcement can increase the tension in a situation, considering they arrive after the scene and cannot fully comprehend the situation.
- Because a police officer is likely to shoot the dog and that I am not in favour of
- Incidences can be random. Unsubstantiated claims and over reactions at off leash dog parks are not uncommon. Waiting for dog police and red tape bureaucracy is taxing. User beware. Caveat emptor.
- Slippery slope. Are you going to penalize some one who goes with the other owner to the vet to pay the bill? Technically leaving the scene of incident. And if you implement a bylaw like this, are you now taxing the police services when bylaw is done for the day and something happens off hours? How long are you expecting people to wait?
- Do you think the irresponsible owner is going to follow this rule?
- "A dog biting a person could be the persons fault. In the case that it's not the human's fault then I support this suggestion.
- A dog biting another dog is NATURAL. It's absurd to punish a dog for hurting another animal. We don't punish human beings for hitting dogs with cars. Be realistic."
- I think sharing information is very important so the incident can be followed up by the necessary parties. But for an animal in distress the owner should be allowed to leave in order to separate and reduce stress
- the words "if necessary" are far too vague and subjective.
- depending on the severity, authorities are already busy enough. both pet owners should exchange contact info/vet bills
- If it's safe then yes but obviously the most important thing to do would be to de escalate the situation and remove the aggressive dog from the situation.
- Except in rare circumstances, some bites/ incidents are very minor in nature and this could possibly be a huge waste of time. I think common sense should rule.



- They should remove the animal from the situation. They should contact the enforcement officers, but requiring them to remain onsite heightens risk.
- "When my dog was attacked the owners and 2 friends. 2 girls 2 boys could care less that my dog might die. And acted like that was everyday life. Last thing I would want is to hang with these a-holes.
- Having said that. The attack was at a prov park so cops and everyone were useless."
- Dogs only bite if approached by strangers. Never approach someone else's dog without permission while out walking
- In a case a dog is experiencing high anxiety it is best to get out of situation. Get immediate medical care for victim (if required) but leave scene after sharing contact info
- If you have a stressed upset person and require a stressed upset dog to remain in the scene both dog and person are experiencing more trauma.
- Providing info was exchanged, it may be best to get the dog away from the stressor and environment . The bylaw officer can contact late-night necessary.
- Animals interact and bite each other often. If major harm occurs, of course the owner needs to stay.
- In situations that are high tension, especially those involving animals, distance is best for all parties to calm down and prevent it from escalating.
- dogs may bite for protection, fear or they werent trained otherwise...if my dog protected me from another dog or animal, its because he is protecting my family from what he thinks is a threat. If i cant handle his actions i shouldnt be a dog owner
- Yes swap details, cops aren't needed it's just extra tension and aggression
- When a dog bites, it was provoked. It is not the owners or the dogs fault.
- They may need to get their dog out of there if they just bit someone... a rule that requires exchange of information without the need to stay makes more sense
- the owner should take their dog away from the scene to reduce the chance of another incident
- If people can work the incident out amongst themselves without sharing contact info or talking to an enforcement officer they should be free to do so.
- If a dog bites someone else, that dog needs to be removed from the situation to ensure no other harm comes another person or animal.
- No, they need to remove the dog ASAP, but should leave contact info or call in.
- Personally, I think if a dog bit an animal or another person the authorities shouldn't get involved unless it was life threatening. Regardless of the breed, an animal will always have animalistic instincts and when provoked will resort to their instincts no matter how well trained the dog or any other animal may be.
- I want you all to realize it's not the dogs fault.



- The dog may have bitten the person because they were threatened or injured. I do think the person should remain on the scene but don't know if this is practical in all cases . Allow for a system similar to car accidents where exchange of information can occur
- You want to remove the dogs from the situation. They do need to give information but only once the dogs are safely away from each other.
- In some cases it would be best to remove the dog and owner especially if provoked
- There are many reasons why a dog may bite and it does not always indicate that the dog is a danger. Owners should be required to give contact info but should have the opportunity to remove their dog before anything further occurs.
- Share contact information, yes. An enforcement officer can follow up later.
- I think they should only be required to stay if the bite is bad enough that it is clearly severe and needs medical assistance, but they can go if they can organize and make amends with each other by themselves.
- In non serious cases, this will be used to target specific breeds/people, in cases where serious injury does happen, police would already be called and they would have to stay/be contacted regardless
- But the dog shall be tied away or in vehicle. This could be increasing danger by making owners afraid to flee the scene.
- This past weekend my 6 month old pitbull puppy was attacked and latched onto by a shitzhu. He was ok, and the owner apologized. I think depending on the severity of a situation an owner should remain on scene.
- If the dog had just attacked/bit, it might be safer for the people involved and the dog for the dog to be removed by the owner. Taking the dog to calm down. Information should be exchanged before any party removing themselves.
- Depends on the scenario and severity. Owners can discuss and exchange necessary contact info. It could be dangerous to keep two reactive dogs in the same area waiting on enforcement officer.
- If a dog was upset enough to bite, they should not be required to wait around while information is disclosed. Dog owner should be free to take their dog home to calm down immediately.
- If there is a dog bite that is between animals then the enforcement officer was not present to see the incident and it is very likely that the bite was provoked and this method makes it so that the biting dog is automatically the guilty offender. I believe if it is a minor incident and the parties can work it out themselves then that is acceptable. If it was bad enough that someone runs away, everyone these days records things on cellphones anyways. I think this would be overkill and a waste of resources for small incidents.
- If the dog bites, it may need to be removed immediately from the situation so that those impacted can receive treatment. It makes more sense to share contact information with those impacted to then share with enforcement as soon as possible.
- Leaving the scene may be the safest option so long as the parties involved share information, similar to in a vehicle accident and then go to enforcement on their own
- What if the owners dog was also bitten. What if medical attention is needed.



- Because you should be able to exchange information with the other party that was involved without including enforcement officers
- Bite severity can differ from one person to the next.
- This would require the offending animal to remain at the incident and could pose further risks to the public instead of immediately removing them from the situation.
- the dog should be removed from the premise immediately, not made to stay at the scene in an elevated state.
- A photo and information exchange should be sufficient. Tempers flare and forced restraint of either or both an animal and owner can escalate.
- Stop wasting people's time
- They shouldn't have to stay there with their dog who is clearly already in a state of stress as is everyone involved and I feel it would be more likely to cause another incident. The owner should be required to provide contact information and if possible some sort of ID so they can be contacted appropriately
- If it is minor and no dogs or people were badly hurt in the process and everyone is okay then no, but if there is an incident where one was badly hurt then yes
- It is important to get the dog to a place where it can be contained so it does not hurt someone else.
- This would likely mean the aggressive dog remains in an environment where it may bite someone again. They should be required to provide contact info and then ensure the aggressive dog is taken away from the area as quickly as possible
- Leave your information, go somewhere the dog and human aren't threatened or triggered. Assess the situation. Why provoke more?
- "Don't feel
- The need to get an officer involved if a bite hasn't punctured the skin . If either dog needs medical attention then an officer should be called."
- Very vague question. Where did this occur? What's the "other animal"?
- Should be necessary to exchange information as per a car accident. Staying at scene dependent on situation/severity/circumstances.
- Staying at scene may be unsafe or not possible If an animal requires care. I support the exchange of identifiable information such as dog license number, drivers license number, license plate number or any other number that can identify the parties involved to authorities with out disclosing too much information that jeopardizes any party.
- There will always be exceptions to this rule, where the owner will need to take their own safety and their pet's safety into account. There may be situations where it is in the best interest of the people and/or animals involved to leave the situation. It can not be a hard fast rule when this could lead to potentially even more dangerous situations.
- No different than an accident. Mutually exchange info. [removed]
- Decrease interactions with law enforcement. These interactions lead to disproportionate impacts against people of colour and indigenous populations.
- If there has already been an incident, emotions are high and things could progressively get worse.



- I don't think both parties will want to wait, particularly if it is winter. Perhaps a hotline would be a better alternative.
- depends on the situation.
- Dog should be removed from the area.
- The Enforcement officer will simply ensure the dog gets put down, it has happened many times even if the person who was bit does not want it. So, the owner shouldnt not have to wait at the scene given that this is a likely scenario.
- Not every situation can support people (and dog/s) waiting an undetermined amount of time for officers to attend the situation. Eg; exposure to elements, further trauma/discomfort to the individuals involved.
- There are times if a dog is protecting its owners that it may not be safe to "wait" around.
- "I think they should be required to remain at the scene and share contact info, if the dog bites another dog, in case vet care is required. but not have to talk to an enforcement officer.
- If the dog bites a human, also contact info etc but also enforcement officer if necessary."
- If a dog has bitten it needs to be removed from the situation. Both owner and dog are at risk if they are required to stay on scene. There should be a duty to report to the police station or the city at a later date or later that day. Also if a bite is sever the victim will need to leave too.
- Could cause un needed added stress to the dogs and the escalate a situation that could've been prevented if they were allowed to walk the dogs away from eachother.
- I believe that is you are in an area with multiple animals you have to expect there will be scraps. They're dogs. Do your kids fight with their friends? Probably. So do dogs. But if the owner is properly trained they will know what to do in these situations. If there is an altercation with an individual and a dog or two dogs it should be able to be delt with between the parties involved. I believe law enforcement should only be contacted if an animal is unaccompanied .
- Sometimes removing the animal from the situation is safer for those involved. I am in favor of them requiring to leave contact information.
- In the majority of cases when a dog bites someone it is because the dog was provoked. Punishing and animal and it's owner for someone elses bad behavior is a horrible practice.
- The owner should be allowed to leave to remove the dog from what ever the stressor is to prevent further issues. But the owner is required to give the victim a name and phone number to be reached at.
- Only if it is safe to do so should the dog and owner be required to stay at the scene
- Just provide information to the persons involved and let the paperwork be filed after. Remain in scene of medical attention is required.
- The owner MUST provide contact information. If possible, he or she must remain at the scene. I answered no out of concern for the victim, dog, and all involved. Remaining on the scene with your aggressor can be traumatic. In some situations it may be best for the dog to be completely removed from the scene. Ultimately, the owner MUST provide contact information.
- No definition of "incident"



- Remaining on the scene could result in further problems. Person should be required to leave contact information, ie. name, phone number.
- Prolonged chance of human to human conflict
- If someone has a dog on a leash that has just bitten someone or something.... that dog should not stay on the scene. That scene and dog need to be removed from each other. There needs to be a better way for the humans to resolve this.... than to keep the dog in a situation it isn't comfortable with! Honestly.... the suggestion to all remain there to exchange info..... makes me question the knowledge of dogs at all, if this was a considered suggestion. You need to remove the dog from the place it felt it needed to attack.
- a responsible pet owner would already do this to ensure said person who was bit knows that the dog has been kept up to date with all of its vaccinations.
- No, because you might need to leave in order to calm your dog down and to de-escalate the situation. But you should have to leave your name and number, if remaining there is not a safe option.
- Ideally they should remain at the scene, but it might be easier for everyone if the dog is removed from the area promptly.
- Should be handled between owners .
- Dogs may need to be removed from the situation for medical or to cool the situation. Number exchange should be required, and photos should be allowed.
- They can be reached at a later time.
- For the same reason as above; I am leery of giving power to anti animal advocates. Biting people is one thing, biting another animal – there are too many variables and extenuating circumstances to require someone to share their info etc. Dogs get upset at each other for different reasons; as long as the owner has taken all reasonable steps to control and avoid a conflict, I don't think bylaw should have the authority to force someone to remain. There are also privacy and jurisdictional issues with this proposal.
- This is challenging. While of course you want the contact information shared, safety in this situation is paramount. It may be safest to return the dog safely to its home and have the conversation after, as long as contact information can be shared in another way.
- It may not be safe for human or dog to remain. A risk of the dog reoffending.
- Of course an owner should stick around, but minor dog spats do happen. If the owners are satisfied and agree on a resolution why is it necessary to bring in an officer? Don't they have enough to do already?
- Firstly separate them. you don't know what happened, the two parties should exchange information and from there deal with it with both animals/people in their own safe space.
- Because in a self defense situation all cops do is charge the good guy. If a dog protects someone from an attacker I would not want to subject them to BS with cops and courts.
- People should be responsible enough to exchange numbers. Our police and bylaw officers have more important things to do than show up for every bite.



- Info exchange is a priority, but if there's an incident - it would be less traumatic for everyone to vacate the area as soon as possible.
- You're going to cause more stress for the dog. Information should be exchanged and the owner can be contacted at their house if needed
- Things happen. The animal owner should be responsible enough to talk to the other party without spending tax dollars to wait until an enforcement offer if called.
- How is a bite defined? in the most simplest of terms, if its a bite like a nip and no injury or blood is drawn, why? what is the need. In the event that the bite causes severe injury and draws blood, then i could see the need for enforcement and incident debriefing.
- Because the other dog might attack again
- "People can make up up stories about whose dog bit who, and make the person stay when maybe there was no incident. I dont think the power to drain people should be put in the hands of someone claiming that something happened. Unlike a car crash they there is sometimes no evidence like let's say a warning nip if a kid gets in a dogs face but the dog doesnt burst skin and the parents shouldn't let the kid get in a strangers dogs face for example again I dont think this should allow people to forcefully detain others. If there was severe injury then they'd should call the cops and give a description and not follow the perpetrator with a dangerous dog.

- I agree with the tribunal and I think there should be more information and awareness about calling immidiately if a dog attacks not necessarily bites or every bit BUT ATTACKS , that you should call the authorities and provide the number as soon as possible.
- I didn't know this I had a child attacked and by my mother in laws dog and I called later and showed pictures to animals services officer, the dog was detained and then there was no record held on that dog, at some point when i called back after years of the other family calling my crazy for bot letting my kids around that dog.
- I own three dogs i love dogs big and small. I am at dog parks on and off leash all the time, I grew up around dogs and would dogs and pits and every and many many other breeds among my extended family and our many visits, sometimes sharing a property where all the dogs would become a big pack in the summer and kids everywhere with a private beach on inveremere... anyways I have a fairly good understanding of dogs and dogs behavior and I like to as a hobby study humans and their psychology and behavior as well."
- I support sharing contact information, but not remaining at the scene. Tensions may be high and it may be more beneficial to give space and allow follow up with an officer afterward as well as opportunity to remove the dog from the situation and allow the victim to seek medical attention elsewhere if necessary.
- take photos, get witness info, and let the owners get the dogs to a safe place. Keeping the animals still in that environment is less than ideal. Everyone should be held accountable but this rule would only lead to more trouble between the parties involved.



- Dogs fight all the time no matter the breed, if you cannot control your dog they must be required to take obedience classes. Perform background checks on dog owners before allowed to adopt for criminal history and violent behaviour.
- Only a bite that is severe enough to warrant this should have the person required to stay
- Owner should remove their dog from the scene but still leave contact information and be reachable
- Remaining at the scene is likely to cause more issues and confrontation. There needs to be communication with an enforcement officer or sharing of information
- "If the dog is stressed out from the incident it may be better to remove the dog from the situation so more incidents do not happen at the time. However, I do think contact information should be given at the scene, and if there is a safe place to put the dog (ie vehicle) then they should stay."
- Very traumatic. Need time to think and process
- In the event the owner does not recognize their dogs behavior or they themselves become indignant, the situation could escalate.
- Some people do not listen to other owners, so they end up getting bit. My dog is great with kids and other animals but when it comes to men, if you put your hand over his head instead of under, he gets nippy. He's a rescue and was abused.
- I don't believe that the city can enforce
- People become irrational very quickly. Remaining on site with the canine present only serves to escalate the scene. However if they choose to leave, they must provide contact information and identification before leaving otherwise its a whole new crime...
- Yes if dog bites a human. No if dog bites another animal. Depending on the severity of the bite ;No outstanding injuries from bite, no further action. Dog and other animals are just animals they will bite, they will get in fights.
- I've witnessed dog bites/attacks in off leash parks, and the majority of the time both parties know that they must exchange phone numbers and other pertinent information.
- Because people are basis and don't know the dog breeds
- It should be dependent on the severity of the bite
- A reasonable person would share contact information freely. Nanny state legislation will not encourage people to do the right thing and will criminalize good people with reactive dogs.
- If you honestly believe that those who are irresponsible enough to walk away when their dog attacks another will stick around waiting for an officer just because there is a bylaw, you are kidding yourself.
- If your dog bites someone, you probably should get it away from the person. So leaving contact information would be adequate.
- Share quick information yes but they should be able to take their dog home and away from the situation to de stress so nothing further happens.
- Depends upon the severity and situation in which the bite occurred.
- Owners priority must be to remove the dog from the situation
- The dog should be removed from the situation to prevent further damage. The dog owner can't necessarily stay while keeping their dog separate.



- If both parties agree that it is a non-issue then there is no need to use law enforcement. If it is severe or there is an injury that needs to be addressed then it is up to the person who was injured (or their animal) to determine whether or not law enforcement should be brought in. Then, and only then, should law enforcement be called.
- not all dog bites are severe enough to warrant sending an enforcement officer to the location.
- Is this not normal?
- What if it is a small bite. An officer may take hours to arrive. I am ok to share information with the other person if we need to.
- Are you expecting someone to do a citizens arrest?? How do you expect to enforce that rule An honest owner would already stay and those that wouldn't will just leave or give false information. A rule in paper will not change anything.
- I would support this for human only bites. In many incidents dog fights begin when both dogs engage. How are you supposed to identify who's dog instigated a fight or bite when it is one persons word against another.
- The dog needs to calm down and not removing the dog from the situation (where there are other dogs or people who are not calm - who may be raising their voice) may make the entire situation more volatile.
- Owners should exchange information, conflict can be dealt at a time that does not inconvenience any party
- The owner may need to remove the dog from the situation.
- like i said you arent the law, you arent god!
- What if emergency treatment was needed ?
- they should legally have to exchange information not wait at the scene. if an animal or person is hurt they should go to get medical care not wait around for an officer.
- I believe contact info should be exchange in an immediate fashion so those involved can remove themselves from the intensity of the situation. To wait for an officer I believe would create more stress for those involved
- Depends on the circumstance. Some situations can be made worse by a bad owner staying around.
- That's a loaded, and [removed] question. Was the dog being tormented? Attacked? Etc is that person in fear of their safety? You guys are absolute morons.
- To share their contact information, YES, absolutely. To remain on the scene? Not necessary & may cause more duress to those involved.
- Bite severity can be too vague. Perhaps define a bite in this case to only those times when blood was drawn. Prevent frivolous abuse or attempted shakedowns of dog owners by the victim when no visible injury occurs. Dogs can bite with varying force. A grab may be interpreted by a victim, as a bite.
- if the dog or victim needs to be taken out of the situation, the owner must be able to have the flexibility to leave. Remaining on the scene may just lead to further harm to everyone involved



- Many variables. I have kids and dogs. If I had to run out of my house in a panic because a dog attacked mine, or something of that sort, I wouldn't want to be in trouble for not staying there while my dog was hurt and I had kids in my house.
- If a dog bites a person or another dog it had a reason and most likely felt threatened. It is the owners responsibility to be in control of their dog and if there was proper training that is mandatory for all dogs, there would be way less attacks.
- Remain at the scene does not address the reality that the dog should be immediately secured, and the victim may require treatment. The requirement should be to provide information and present oneself to/contact the bylaw or enforcement office within 24 hours. The goal should be to ensure identification, not require waiting for an enforcement officer to attend.
- Information can be exchanged. No need to sit there!
- Only if they bite another person that draws blood. NOT if they bite another dog as dogs rough house regardless and some owners have zero idea what a real fight or rough house looks like so they would blame any dog that bared teeth or growled. The owners will always blame the other dog even if their own dog was annoying, jumping on, or trying to dominate the other dog. Bottom line, they are ANIMALS. And they scrap from time to time! It's how they communicate. They are not humans and do not reason!. But a dog biting a human or child is not good and so when that happens they should wait for an officer to come by.... only if it draws blood.
- Don't get bit by a dog. It's called natural selection for the [removed]
- Civilians should not be used as law enforcement
- I don't know how this could be enforced and may lead to physical altercation between dog owner and other people
- This is definitely an issue of severity and circumstance as dogs can be cruelly provoked and then blamed for their reaction. Taking a dog out of that situation can be better for the animal instead of forcing it to remain in the stressful situation. Sharing contact information to reach out later when the dog has been returned to a home and a conversation can happen effectively would be best
- Depends of severity of the situation. Similar to a vehicle accident or incident.
- It should be on the owner to control there dog.
- This allows for anyone involved in an incident to plead their case with the officials however if two dogs are trying to hurt eachother, keeping them right beside each other is never a good option, no matter what breed or size they are.
- If the dog shouldn't remain at the scene it should be taken to a safe place
- It always takes along time.to have anyone attend this could increase stress for all involved
- If the dog needs to be removed from the situation to prevent furhter incidents then the owner cannot be expected to remain there for an indeterminate amount of time. They should of course be required to provide contact info.
- I fear too many people have unfair bias against dogs especially certain breeds and I am uncomfortable giving these people the power to influence the dogs future.
- If someone was attacked and their dog saved them, would you fine them for running away from a potential murderer?



- What if it's a small bite that caused no harm, puncture or anything other kind of damage? Got to be more specific in this wording. Maybe for a bite that causes damage or harm.
- Many people behave inappropriately around dogs. Remaining at the scene may put the owner or the dog at further risk
- This is so broad. What if a person was being abusive to the dog and they were defending themselves? What if, while playing, the mouthed a person or another dog and it was misconstrued as a 'bite'?
- Do we have enough enforcement officers to make this work? Will people be waiting around for hours? Should be the same as car accidents - exchange information and go.
- I think that you should have the option to get the offending dog out of the area as soon as possible to prevent another attack or bite. A responsible option would be to exchange information if the dog could not be secured properly
- I think it would take too long for police to respond - people wouldn't wait. Animals and humans could also be hurt and needing medical attention while waiting - and sometimes it's better to remove the animal from the situation. Someone who doesn't share information should be fined when found - so many people have phones for videos and people it should be easily to locate someone fleeing the scene.
- This should only apply in the result of blood drawn. Animals play and nip. One sensitive dog owner could claim another owners dog bit their dog simply because it yelped. Unless clear damage (blood) it would be a he said/she said situation.
- I think it would be very stressful for both the victim, owner, and dog involved to be kept on location. I think that the animal should be allowed to be taken out of the situation and back home to avoid anymore issues and allow them to settle down. The owner can then come back, or have the officer come to the house in order to share all the contact information and details moving forward.
- Dog bites between animals can be a result of play.
- These incidents should be reported but it's unreasonable to expect dog owners to wait at the scene for a bylaw officer and unfortunately I can't see the dog owners waiting
- Yes if a dog bites a person, no if a dog bites another animal. We as humans have no idea what may have been going on between the two dogs to warrant a bite.
- This just seems like common courtesy, however, if one or both parties need medical attention this rule is much more of a hinderance than a help.
- "Two reasons. First, if the owner has to stay, the dog has to stay. This creates an extremely dangerous situation for all parties. Exchange contact information and part ways.
- Second, Covid. Keep your distance."
- Not all cases of dog bites need to be addressed by law enforcement. If the owners talk amongst themselves and determine an appropriate way to deal with the issue, that's all that should be needed. Why burden law enforcement more with many minor issues.
- I don't solely because if a dog bites a person, the dog likely needs to be removed from the situation immediately. Clearly the dog was experiencing some sort of stress or duress that led to them biting,



they should be pulled out of that stressful situation to prevent further harm. I understand why you might want them to stay, but a different solution needs to be figured out.

- It depends, if it's safer to remove the animal they need to do that first. As long as they identify themselves as soon as they can, they should not receive additional fines for leaving the scene. It's not black and white
- I think every situation is different and it is up to the people involved in the incident to decide how best to handle it.
- How do you enforce that?
- If a dog bites someone and the owner has to stay at the scene then that means the agitated dog also has to stay at the scene. The animal should be removed from the scene as quickly as possible and brought back to their home where they can calm down. The person should absolutely have to give their information but to stay on scene puts other people in danger.
- Provide information but obviously with a bite - the dogs need to be separated. Only stay long enough to exchange information.
- After an incident, it can be tough to contain the situation. Especially if involving untrained dogs, emotional humans and/or children. I believe it would be a crime to pretend the incident never happened especially if physical injury occurs. Instead, I believe that the owner of the offending dog must provide a contact name and phone number, but is allowed to leave the scene and be willing to follow up later with enforcement officer. After one offence, if your dog is considered dangerous, you must carry with you a contact information card to hand out to the victim/victim's owner immediately if another incident were to occur.
- Remaining at the scene could cause more stress to an already stressed animal. Contact information must be exchanged, then removal from situation into neutral territory.
- I don't think it's necessary
- Unless the bite is serious and caused damage/drew blood then it's not
- if a dog is aggressive, the owner should leave contact details as quickly as possible and leave the situation before it escalates. IF they flee the scene without contact details, they should be charged as such.
- Suggests they should stay but there shouldn't be law against
- If it bites a person yes, if there is a vicious dog on dog attack yes, not for minor instances, dogs can bite a little even when they're playing without hurting each other
- Because if you were to keep an animal that was just attacked near the dog that attacked it. The dog would have a lot of prolonged issues dealing with dogs. As the same as the person. When I was attacked by a dog I didn't want to be anywhere near it and the family gave the bylaw officer the contact information along with their address and was asked to stay there until a Officer came by to check on both parties.
- There's the potential of too much he said she said. Because you're already trying to unnecessarily label these dogs as bad, even though the vast majority of them are very mild mannered, I'm concerned that it would be a very one sided story that is believed by bylaw.
- Conditions that qualify as "necessary" are undefined



- Dogs bite each other all the time. Unless a dog draws blood I don't think you should have to wait for law enforcement
- Too much potential for he said she said finger pointing
- I think there needs to be an exchange of information but keeping the owner (and consequently offending dog) at the scene could result in a dangerous situation for the public and dog.
- Its best for dogs to be removed from the situation and each other if there has been a fight or bite. How long would it take for an officer to come?
- If either dog needs to go to the vet then it could impede on care. Also if its a minor inccedent the option to just walk away is best.
- A officer can be biased towards dogs so no
- There are too many other high-risk or more severe incidents happening city-wide that enforcement offers should be attending too. Worrying about dogs possibly biting other people should not be a top priority. This is not a criminal offence, nor should it ever have to involve enforcement officers at scene.
- Dogs may need medical attention right away and enforcement can take too long to show up for the animals to get the treatment they require on time.
- [removed] if 2 dog get in a fight yeah it [removed] but that what dogs do, if two stray got in a fight no one would know it's called life it happens, Banning pit bull (like) dog it's absolutely ridiculous, it's not the dogs fault how it acts ITS THE OWNER. I have an American bully he's the best freaking dog you could ask for, he loves kid and other dogs because we raised him right I had a blue nose pit bull when my dog was a baby and he learnt most of his behaviour from him, stop banning and killing dog, punish the owner
- You want to exchange information but remove the animal(s) from the scene as quickly as possible for medical attention or other reasons. In most cases a bite is defensive behaviour and the animal will be stressed and situations can escalate between animals and or people who may have instigated with or without knowing and continue to do so.
- There is already so much trauma at the event, the dogs and owners should be removed immediately to calm down the situation.
- They need to share their information and talk to authorities, but if it's safer to remove the dog from the situation, the owner might also have to leave.
- Why put more people in harms way unless the animal can be temporarily be but into a vehicle at the scene
- The owner needs to give contact info, so they can be reached for information. In the event of an incident the dog will be stressed and should be taken home to a stress free familiar location.
- Definitely need to be able to reach the responsible adult; however, I believe there are often very high tempers and injuries on both sides.
- They would only need to stay if the dog is the aggressor, owners usually issue warnings that the other person should back up because their dog does not like it. And the other owner should know better either way.
- This can be dangerous for the animal or people involved.



- Overly broad of a requirement - too vague and almost unenforceable. Not to mention could be a violation of charter rights. Not to mention- the circumstances under which this scenario would arise vary greatly— unfair to owners not at the scene at all at time of incident. Plus charter violation. Give your heads a shake. Some of these suggestions in this questionnaire are borderline offensive and truly ignorant in where they are going.
- This whole questionnaire is geared towards more enforcement not less. Entirely an over reach and clearly the department who created this decision process is disconnected from the population. The sad part is, only those who have issuance will fill out your survey. What's more the survey leaves little room to contest increased enforcement. Whoever made this should really reconsider their approach.
- This is a problem between individuals and should be resolved by them, not by law enforcement. If damages occur it is up to the victim to sue the owner. City should not be involved at all.
- Too hard to enforce, too hard to decide at the time if required, too easy to abuse as just an 'add on' charge (not convinced it would change any behaviours)
- I'm concerned keeping the owner at the scene will often necessitate keeping the dog at the scene, which could result in a more unsafe environment than if the owner left with the dog.
- Another incident may occur if the offending dog cannot leave the situation. There may be instances where the dog would not be able to be put in a vehicle or crate and the owner may need to get the dog home to a secure location.
- Keeping the dog at the scene may encourage them to feel they did the right thing by biting and reinforce the behaviour. They could be biting because they are scared and keeping them in the same place would only make the feeling and resulting behaviour worse. You have to snap them out of the environment.
- The first thing you would want to do is get the dog out of there. The dog and the owner would be scared/shaken up and should be allowed to return home to process.
- Yes they need to leave contact information, but it is potentially more risk to have said animal remain in the area. It would make more sense to take the animal home or if required to a veterinarian to receive care.
- Sometimes these instances can mean their dog is injured as well and being a responsible means getting your dog out of that situation. They should be required to leave their licences or something but not necessarily stay on scene.
- Share contact info yes, remain at the scene no. If there is an incident, keeping the animals near each other is a bloody awful idea.
- If a dog remains in the situation it was stress in more problems will arise. They should be allowed to return to safety indefinitely
- A responsible pet owner will share contact information and then remove the animal from the situation before another incident can occur.
- Actually for the most part yes I would support that. They may need to go home and secure the dog. They should provide contact information. How long does it take an officer to show up?



- If the dog has bitten a person or other animal I would want that animal as far away as possible because I would be concerned that the dog would attack again
- I fear that no does creation will be used. An incident would be terrible to be involved in. Some people may flee out of fear.
- This depends on the severity of the bite if it is very minor or a scratch then no but if it is sever one absolutely.
- If a dog bites someone, their dog may still be elevated and scared. The people should exchange contact information, put dog in secure location and discuss after
- I agree with sharing contact information and talking with enforcement but it would be best to take a stressed animal or person away from the area so they may calm down.
- There should be a couple options here. If a dog becomes provoked/aggressive and there has been a bite, sometimes the best option is to remove the dog from the situation. That would be difficult if you were required to wait for an enforcement officer.
- Not all dogs attacks are the dogs fault, if people get to close or try and pet a stranger's dog and get bit, then I feel the dog owner has the right to walk away.
- The dog owner can give their information to the officer, but the owner and dog should leave the tension of the scene and go home. This is basic common sense when dealing with behavioural needs in all animals. If the animal remains at the scene of the trauma, their fight/ flight instincts kick in. Likewise, if they feel that their owner is in harm because of the stress coming off of them, they will protect their owner. This can all be avoided by leaving the location of trauma and going to a safe space (ie. home).
- Animals are animals. Leave it at that
- A dog only bites someone because he feels threatened of scared. If you are to keep a dog where he just bite or attacked someone that dog will continue to go insane and will continue to get worked up. This dog is scared. do not continue to torture it. Dogs are not humans.
- My answer is yes and no. If a dog approaches my dog(who is a pit bull) and attacks my dog and causes damage, then yes that owner should have to remain on site. If someone reaches for a dog without permission and gets a bite(not using my dog as an example because she LOVES people AND dogs) then I don't think the owner of the dog that bites needs to remain on the scene. There needs to be more clarification on the city's definition of a bite. Does it cause damage? Was it a fight? Was it an accident? Was it an escalation in play? Was it in an off leash park or was the dog at large? So many scenarios to consider.
- I agree they should exchange information. Waiting at the scene could be difficult if it takes too long.
- Dogs will play bite all the time and owners will take a nibble too seriously. People overreact all the time, dogs don't deserve to be put in that kind of stress for no reason. Also people who stress out other people's dog and get bit is their own fault.
- Maybe figure out what provoked the bite, it's not always the dogs fault
- I support the owner being required to provide contact information with picture ID. However, it may be best for the dog to be removed from the situation which would necessitate the owner taking the dog away.



- They should exchange information. But waiting for an enforcement officers is too much. It takes way too long.
- In cases of severe bites I think an owner should exchange contact info with the other person but for the safety of everyone in a bite incident the dog must be removed from the situation immediately and not wait around for an officer. Dog behaviour can be hard to read and dogs can growl, snarl or fake bite as a defensive tactic. Because many people don't know the difference between these I would specify that in cases where blood is drawn an owner must provide contact info to the person or owner who has been bitten.
- No, the dog owner should go home after swapping information.
- If the person has to remain on scene, so does the dog. It would be best to get the dog to a place where they won't be stressed and possibly hurt someone else.
- Dog bites are often extremely circumstantial. If there is something in the area that is triggering that dog to act out, it would be dangerous to have them stay at the scene. If the dog can be removed without the owner leaving the scene, then yes, this would be a great idea.
- This is going to use up a bunch of money and resources that are not needed. If you don't have to stay at the scene of an accident that has minor damage, why would you have to stay for a bite if it's minor? For serious bites, sure, but definitely not for every bite.
- The owner should be allowed to remove their dog from the scene to reduce the risk of antagonizing the situation, but be required to return to give a statement. Perhaps owners should be required to carry some sort of identification/contact information that they can quickly leave with someone in case of an incident to insure they don't just disappear.
- I'm uncertain as to what the procedure normally is. I'm selecting an answer because I have to. My immediate thought is that if removing the animal immediately will prevent further damage/injury, there should be a workaround.
- If there has been an incident it's apparent the owner has lost control over the dog, and both animals need to be removed from the incident. Full names should be given, once there is a separation, each take a photo of the other and a number where owners can call report the incident along with name of the other person.
- People act stupid around breeds they think are dangerous. It has nothing to do with the dog. I witnessed a lady throw her phone at a pit bull one time because he barked. Once. And then he destroyed her phone and she tried to sue and the whole thing went to court. A family almost lost a loyal and loving pet. Three small children lived in fear for weeks because a grown adult didn't have any common sense.
- Must leave contact info but get animals out of stressful and potentially dangerous situation.
- If a dog bites another dog it is not necessarily that dog's fault. A dog can display a range of inappropriate behaviors without biting first that might antagonize another dog. For instance, if someone is being responsible and has their dog on a leash, and an off-leash dog runs up with an aggressive stance, would the fault be that of the dog and the owner's? Why should they have to take responsibility for this?



- If they are alone with their dog and they can't leave- that means the dog can't leave either. Often dogs need to be taken away from the situation in order to de-escalate
- They need to bring their dog home, and they are the culprit. As long as they have shared their info or given contact information they can go. It won't be dealt with any more timely if they find themselves waiting with a group of anxious people
- So long as contact information is shared between the two parties.
- I think a picture of id is sufficient as the situation needs to dissipate. Officers can follow up with owners post incident and bring police if necessary
- It would depend on the situation. Perhaps there is a dog fight and both dogs require vet attention
- Exchange information and allow dogs to be removed from the stressful situation.
- If a dog bites he is extremely emotional (scared, anxious, insecure, possibly angry, but most likely defending himself/his owner) and NEEDS to be removed from that situation. Information needs to be exchanged but dissolving the situation that led to the bite is priority
- They need to provide quick information but often they need to get their pet off the scene. If they must stay that creates conflict. They must provide a phone number, license plate number and government ID to the other person on the scene quickly before being allowed to leave.
- If a dog is BITING, for WHATEVER reason, then said dog needs to be removed from the scene IMMEDIATELY and appropriate measures are taken to calm all affected beings...
- I think contact information should be given by the owner to the other owner/person. In most cases, if the injury is severe enough, the person or animal will need medical care. And unless enforcement can get out fast, I do not see anyone waiting at the scene.
- As long as contact info is exchanged the offending dog shouldn't need to stay at the scene making things worse.
- as long as proper information is exchanged why keep an already agitated animal at the scene. De-escuoate the scenario and take the animal out of the stressful situation.
- If someone is injured then yes but dogs are pack animals so sometimes small scuffles occur
- To stay for a period of time with a distressed dog does not help de-escalate the situation.
- This really depends on severity if the bite. Has an injury occurred? Was it accidental (someone grabbed the dog from behind and scared it?), was it playful and being misconstrued as vicious? If the incident is serious enough, most people try to get their dogs and themselves AWAY rather than stick around.
- People should exchange information and interviews can happen in a less stressful environment for everyone. The are 3 sides story and reality often lies somewhere in the middle.
- You cannot legislate morality.
- "It may not be safe to keep the owner at the scene with their dog if a dog needs to be removed from an attack and safely secured. The wait time would also be an issue. It should be a requirement that people carry and provide proper ID and contact information in the event of a bite or attacks.



- I also STRONGLY OPPOSE breed specific legislation. The current legislation is fair, science-based, and holds owners accountable. Other cities such as Edmonton, Montreal or Quebec as a whole, or even cities in the USA have tried to use Calgary's animal control bylaw to develop their own. Calgary is an example to other jurisdictions when it comes to breed restrictions and fairness and there should be NO change to that aspect. Again keep owners accountable. Laws should only be to make better pet owners, not to punish good people with good dogs because
- Of how they look. Breed profiling is the same as racial discrimination, which is rightfully condemned in this city and Country."
- Dog specific legislation is completely unnecessary and ignorant.
- As a responsible dog owner would already exchange info with the other party. No need to involve an enforcement officer. Sounds like fear mongering.
- Some bites are harmless and people will still try and get the dog euthanized/taken away for a small harmless nip. If they are given the authority to always be in the right, dog owners will be the ones who suffer.
- Contact information should be shared and a statement given if necessary. However if the dog owner still has the dog who has attacked with him/her they should safely remove that dog from the scene so as to not cause more trauma to anyone involved.
- They don't need to stay on scene, as long as the proper information has been exchanged.
- Share contact information and get the dog out of the environment that cause the incident. By allowing the dog to stay at the scene you're risking aggravating it more. I believe everyone should be accountable but we also need to trust that owners know what their dog needs to diffuse potentially more situations.
- As long as both parties exchange information this is adequate similar to a car accident
- The dog should be brought home as to not have an option of this happening while waiting for bylaw
- Only if they bit another animal. Otherwise, why should they? Dogs only bite humans when provoked. I was bit by a dog badly and I realize this, so should everyone else. Learn to respect animals.
- Sometimes removing the dog from a situation is the safest for both the dog and victim. There should be a way they can get in contact after though.
- It may be unsafe for the owner to do so.
- "No for minor nips or bites. Most times I've witnessed, teasing, annoying or irritating the dog causes the bite.
- Yes for major bites or attacks."
- No, any reports that need to be filed can be done at home.
- In some cases the dog may have been provoked and remaining at the scene may cause further harm to the victim and or the dog. I believe there should be mandatory reporting by the owner to bylaw services; Similar to a hit and run.
- No.. that's a weird situation.
- Not unilaterally. The dig may have been protecting its owner from a legitimate threat from that individual.



- This is a highly emotional situation...the dog needs to be removed, they sense tension etc and it will only exacerbate the situation. I feel work needs to be done to help the person that was bitten also. There should be a program that reintroduces the person the was bitten into the dog community and educates them on dog behavior and interaction as well. Some people have worse behavior than dogs and cause these events.
- After an attack information should be shared but often the injured dog will need to be rushed to an emergency vet
- I've had people complain about a dog bit several hours to months after and didn't even know it happened or wasn't told. If its serious enough and there is a severe injury then yes. But if the person continues to go on there way then how am I supposed to know it even happened. This has happened several times now. All of which were provoked bits, such as sticking their hand through my fence, taking away a ball that the dog wanted thrown and not throwing it so the dog took it back, feeding my dog at the dog park (that's a big NO, especially if you don't know the dog). All these were provoked and all of these I didn't find out about until a day or in the case of the fence a few months after (so not sure how true the fence one was then, I have my doubts it even happened because bylaw was never involved).
- Often the dog needs to be put away in a house or car. Making it remain at the scene only prolongs the problem while bylaw isn't always able to arrive for a long time.
- The person may have caused the dog to bite them. The owner should not have to stick around when the dog was defending them or itself.
- Enforcement officers are overloaded. There is no way that someone is going to wait outside in -20 for hours with a dog for them to show up.
- Often when a dog is being aggressive, it needs to be removed from the environment in order yo calm down. If the owner remained at the scene with the dog, it could worsen the situation. The owner should be able to leave the scene, calm the dog, or put the dog away (in a vehicle or building) and return to the scene.
- The owner staying at the scene means the dog is required to stay at the scene and further incident may occur
- I can see the two owners being together waiting for an officer causing an even bigger fight between the people and causing more unnecessary stress on the animals who should be taken out of the situation to calm down
- The owner of an animal that bites should exchange all contact information with the victim. The owner should also remain if the situation warrants it, i.e. the victim requires medical assistance, or the attack is severe.
- It's best to get said animal away from the scene to prevent further attacks.
- Regardless of what actually happened the dog is always deemed at fault.
- That puts both the dog and the owner at risk for a further altercation with the other people involved in the incident. Alternately, if somehow they did not know of the 'bite' (possibly a puppy nipping a child) and it was unreported to them it is unreasonable to expect this.



- If the owner can effectively keep his dog under control after the incident, then staying at the scene would make sense. If not, and if there is a long wait time for authorities to arrive or if medical attention is needed, then if personal information is exchanged between parties, leaving the scene makes sense
- Only should be taken to this level if the bite is more of a wound than a scrape, responsible dog owners will ensure it is handled on their own
- The 2 parties talk it out and see where it goes
- "Treat these as vehicle accidents
- If police are called all parties involved stay...,if no law enforcement is called it is a private matter between the effected parties"
- You don't know if the dog was already beaten, you don't know if the stranger came up to pet the dog without asking. Dogs on leashes prevent this.
- If the dog is protecting its owner, the owner should legally be allowed to leave. Dogs only bite when provoked or when they feel their owner is in danger. Requiring the owner to stay puts the owner in legal trouble for fleeing a dangerous scene.
- Responsible owners should be able to take care of things by themselves without getting a paid officer involved- other things are more urgent I'm sure!
- The victim of the bite human or dog may have antagonized the dog to the point of biting. The scene of the bite could continue to be too stressful for the good dog. The owner should be asked to contact enforcement but they shouldn't have to wait at the scene.
- When dogs play even small ones they can play bite, as well as accident bites where the dog went for a toy and accidentally got a person's hand. Exchange of information should only occur for severe issues that occur
- I believe they should have to discuss it with law enforcement however you've just had a dog bite someone. The dog needs to calm down and sitting and waiting for more people to show up is asking for a repeat offense. The dog should be taken home and the dog owner should be contacted for questions
- Owner should give contact info and remove the dog from the scene. The dog will already be stressed and if people are arguing it won't calm the dog down.
- The dog should be removed from the scene to prevent further confrontations. Obviously if there was a biting incident the dog felt threatened or was trying to protect its owner. The owner should remove the animal from the situation and be required to call in and give a report.
- Not sure an enforcement officer could get to the scene in a timely manner.
- Something like that would need to allow for them to remove their dog from the situation immediately and/or take them to their veterinarian for treatment of injuries if necessary immediately.
- I think this is a very vague question as it only gives yes or no options without further going into detail. Was a child pulling a dog's tail and after multiple warnings the dog snapped? Then no, I do not think anything reprocution should be had to the dog as the child and the child's parents so clearly lack intelligence but because the dog can't say anything you automatically assume the dog has anger issues and must be put down? Do you put children down for biting other children???



- the dog is stressed, it will be more stressed with officers around. Horrible situation for everyone. Let the owner go home and speak to them where you can't just take their dog
- Requirement should be to give contact info to other owner unless severe issues caused. As we know enforcement officers do not always come/cannot come in a timely fashion
- Removing the dog from the situation immediately is safer for everyone to prevent further bites.
- While this situation is ideal. The best thing for safety is to remove the animal from the scene as quickly as possible to limit future damage.
- not unless it is a severe bite.
- Sometimes owners need to leave to avoid escalation and violent retaliation aimed at them and their dogs even for as little as a nip or a scratch
- Dogs get into altercations occasionally. If it's short, minor and dealt with by the parties involved why add extra layers and create a problem when there isn't one.
- It is not a big deal unless the bite did serious damage in which case yes, the person should stay to make sure the injured person or animal is okay.
- Exchange information and go home, allowing each party to de-escalate and/or seek medical/veterinary attention.
- I would say yes, if it were rephrased to say "if a dog bites a person, or other animal causing injury". Sometimes dogs nip each other during play, and no harm is done. It would be a waste of resources to have to have an enforcement officer come out for such an event.
- If someone is injured maybe, but if both parties are fine then nothing should be held against the dog and the owner should take liability.
- It is important for people to accept their own risk when going out in public
- Are we going to require this for every dog bite? I've had more small dogs bite me or be aggressive than big ones ever have. You need to get a clue about pit bulls. It's absolutely ridiculous
- Contact information should be exchanged but getting the aggressive dog away from the situation should be priority
- The situation may be such that remaining at the site could result in a dog becoming more distressed and attacking again.
- It all depends on the severity of the bite. If it was a minor one that caused no injury i do not see why we should waste both parties time including pulling an officer to the scene.
- Only in cases of severe injury caused on propose. For any other reason we do not know if the other animal instigated something , or if the dog in question bit to defend oneself.
- The owner should share contact info with the person involved and both can agree to stay if really needed or discuss later.
- People fighting other people find conflict resolution. so do dogs. If they don't, it is an owners responsibility to understand the nature of their dog and avoid situations that may cause a violent attack.
- In my experience, dog bites are ALWAYS due to the behavior of the person. Whether they did not understand the way the dog was feeling, or they caught the dog unawares. I've been bit plenty of



times, and it has NEVER been the owners fault, nor should they have to deal with the repercussions of ignorant strangers.

- Information must be, at minimum, shared with the victim. If refused, must wait for enforcement officer.
- places to be sometimes. Dog bites are not crimes, people need to just avoid animals if they dont think they can protect themselves.
- The aggressive dog being removed from the situation should be the first response, after that the owner should make every attempt to provide contact information.
- Needs to be defined more clearly, as to the severity of the bite. Dogs often nip at other dogs while playing, or wrestling, or chasing each other.
- "Yes because there needs to be accountability for dog bites and for the safety of the one bitten. Contact exchange is a MUST.
- No, because of a dog has gotten so anxious they're biting/being aggressive, that dog needs to go home or away from the stressful environment - for the safety of EVERYONE involved."
- The owner may need to remove the dog from the situation asap due to the over-stimulation. I agree info needs to be passed on, but it may be traumatic to the people onsite, the victim, the owners and the dog to be forced to remain on scene to talk to an enforcement officer directly.
- I do agree that the owner of the offending dog MUST give their contact information to the person injured (or owner of the injured dog). I don't think remaining at the scene is always necessary and may sometimes be bad (offending dog needs to be removed from area)
- People need to take responsibility for their children- walking up to strange dogs, sticking hands in their face etc- the blame and responsibility should not all be on the dog owner
- Unless they need medical attention, no. It's between the two people and how they want to deal with the situation. If they feel a officer is necessary that should be there choice. It would just waste peoples time.
- It is better if the owner removes the animal from the scene immediately to prevent further injury.
- I think leaving information is good but they should be allows to remove their animal to a safe location to keep the incident from escalating.
- Dogs sometimes injure each other yes. Perhaps the dog that got bit was the problem and not the one biting. Dogs need to learn how to read when a dog isn't happy with them and when to back off.
- It is often the person bits fault but no one will believe that anyway
- If there are no serious injuries no enforcement is necessary. Minor incidents happen.
- Exchange of information would suffice.
- Often can be resolved talking to the parties involved
- I think the owner should leave their personal contact information with the affected person. I think it is safer for everyone if the owner promptly secure their dog back at home rather than waiting for bylaw to show up. The information obtained can be given to the bylaw officer to follow up. Staying at the scene with the animal could make the situation more unsafe.
- This won't help those who wouldn't stay anyway. Anyone with any morals would stay and exchange info anyway.



- Cause maybe the dog did it because it was unsure of a situation or wasn't comfortable with a situation so the best thing wouldn't to stay there it be to take the dog out of the situation
- A dog owner can offer his help to a person or his dog and provide it.
- If I am bit by a dog or my dog is bit by another, I can handle it myself. I do not need an "enforcement officer" to be dispatched. Furthermore, this could result in the need for more officers to be hired if this becomes legislation and who will have to pay their wages? Me. I do not feel like paying another government official's salary through my taxes or potentially seeing increased taxes to accommodate that change.
- Depends on the situation and impact of the bite, if there is an injury then yes for sure, if a minor graze or no sign of anything then no
- Sharing information should be sufficient rather than having to also stay and wait.
- Depends on severity
- Let me outline this scenario: if a dog is acting aggressive towards my pup (pit-bull lab mix) and is not leaving us alone due to the lack of training on the other owners part, and their dog bites mine, then mine bites back in defensive, you're telling me I have to stay on scene regardless of the incident not being my doing nor my dog's? Rather than seeking medical treatment if needed or leaving the situation to prevent further escalation? If an "enforcement officer" come to scene after such a situation, how is there to be a fair decision? The officer wasn't present during the incident & in my experience, people lie and begin twisting events once law enforcement is present to sway favour in their direction. I see this going only one way, the dog receiving the short end of the stick due to lack of evidence or facts and potentially being labeled vicious, unpredictable or a nuisance. Let's say a chihuahua and a American Pit Bull Terrier are involved in an altercation, the stigma regarding bully breeds will unnecessarily be dragged into the situation and now we will already have the cards stacked against us. In the animal kingdom touch is used as a form of communication between dogs, whether its a nip, a bite or a paw swat. It is used to say "whatever energy you're bringing right now is not calm and controlled enough for my liking." And the worst culprits for chaotic energy are puppies who have not yet learned discipline, commands and calm energy. So the best way for dogs to communicate is through their touch - they can't talk, so they may nip to correct another's behaviour. Even mother dog's can bite their pups to correct their behaviour and snap them out of their bad forming habits. So if this were to be legislation, and for example, a crazy, untrained, wild energy puppy or dog comes around me & my dog and my dog nips him without harm, you're telling me I have to stay on site and talk to an enforcement officer? When all my dog was doing was correcting another dog's unstable behaviour and snapping them out of a chaotic state, and now we have to talk to an officer? I would rather leave the situation so both dogs can be separated, not drag out the situation if no harm is done.
- I would support it if the bite resulted in obvious injury
- I feel like maybe exchange information similar to a car accident. But if there are medical issues that need to be seen, I rather have the owner take the dog to the clinic.
- Sharing information should be required but the victim should not be forced to have prolonged contact with the dog.



- I agree if a dog bites someone or another animal then definitely the right thing to do is cooperate with the other owner and enforcement officers... but I don't necessarily think this needs to be made into a law. Sometimes both parties are fine with not going forward, sometimes it's only a little altercation and not a big deal etc. But maybe something involving serious altercations only would work?
- Dogs are animals. Biting is a natural way of communication for them. This would make the way that dogs interact a legal issue and to me that is unacceptable.
- If the dog is provoked, then staying at the scene will make it more stressed and increase the severity of the situation. If the owner could return home with their pet then the animal can calm down before being looked at by officers. There should be an exchange of information, but then they should be allowed to part ways.
- That would prolong the trauma to the bitten person. I would support a rule that said they couldn't leave until they provided contact info and a photo.
- That could aggravate the dog and make them seem more aggressive
- I support the mandatory exchange of information but provisions need to be in place to limit the victim's exposure to the offending dog.
- I support the mandatory exchange of information but provisions need to be in place to limit the victim's exposure to the offending dog.
- Unless there is a standard of immediate response this is not a good use of resources.... Better to have a standard format for exchange of information - and signage that makes the general public aware of the information needed to trace and follow up. Such as picture of the dog tags with numbers and the driver's license of the individual. Put the onus on the dog owner to properly provide that information and to report the incident. That ensures that the victim does not have to stay exposed to dog that is a concern.... AND forces the accountability of such reports on the responsible party...
- No because the situation could escalate, instead information should be exchanged and the situation should be resolved when owners are hands free
- Remaining on site with an agitated dog is not a good idea, and there needs to be a de-escalation of the situation. Otherwise the dog is likely to continue showing aggressive behavior which makes the situation worse.
- Dogs when playing xan nip but I don't really think that counts as a bite so I think a lot of scared people will be reporting stupid [removed] and wasting everyone's time
- "Person yes another animal no
- People in dog parks over react and freak out when dogs are just playing. Accidents happen dogs get excited it's the nature of pet ownership"
- Just be honest and level headed with person and swap information why get an "officer" involved.
- Only if it's safe to stay. But they have to give their contact info
- Some times people just think they can come over and touch your dog it's not always the owner responsibility
- I don't think the dog should stay at the scene



- Too few enforcement officers for this to be timely and therefore realistic expectation.
- Dog might be hard to handle and could potentially harm someone else. Maybe require personal information to be given so police can follow up.
- If the dog requires medical care or needs to be removed from the situation for the safety of others then I don't the owner should be penalized for that.
- Depends on the severity. If it's at an off leash park there is some inherent risk in being there. If someone/ animal is obviously injured then yes.
- The severity of bite would determine if staying at the scene were necessary.
- Leaves grey area. Is the bite minor? Do we really have to stand around awkwardly if our dogs were smelling each other then one nipped the other and we both talk or say sorry and everything is dealt with? I think it would be a no, but the rule as stated says incidents. Is it against the bylaw/law to walk away and will the people be held accountable for a mutual agreement?
- There's just not enough information. How long would it take the officer to arrive? What if the weather is horrible and staying in it for an indeterminate length of time could harm the dog or owner? What if there is a hostile crowd and they don't feel safe?
- Absolutely not. It is unconstitutional to require any person to speak to an officer.
- I think this should be based on severity of the injury. I also think that this would create staffing issues for bylaw officers if they are required to respond to all incidents especially if they are minor. As a responsible pet owner, I believe it is your duty to exchange information (just like in a car accident). If a person or animal is severely injured, I believe bylaw officers should be contacted.
- Unnecessary.
- Who's responsibility would it be to enforce the dog owner remain at the scene?
- The victim will only see the dog attacking. The owner will see everything, including whether or not the victim drove the dog to attack.
- I work with dogs on a daily bases and I have learned body language and behaviours of dogs I am also working to become a fearful and reactive dog trainer "aggressive" if an incident was to happen it most likely happened out of fear from the dog so keeping the dog in the situation would make it worse. That is my professional and knowledge based opinion
- I do not support requiring someone to remain "at a scene" for what could be a minor incident or one triggered by another. I do support required exchange of contact information. That should be enough. We don't require drivers to remain at the scene of an accident if no injuries or damage above a certain amount. Minor first aid could be a guideline. Heavy bleeding wounds, broken bones or ambulance being called should be requirements for people to stay at the scene.
- Despite your desire to rid Canada of the Charter we still have the right to not incriminate ourselves.
- Question is unclear. Define "if necessary." Rules are not meant to be left at discretion of enforcement officers. When it comes to biting it depends on the situation. If a dog is protecting against violent assault, they should not be made to remain at scene of incident.
- Unless extenuating circumstances present, such as seeking medical care for human or pet. But must provide contact information to someone at the scene, or contact bylaw within 48 hrs of the incident



- NOT ALL BITES ARE FAULT OF DOG.
- It's simply the right thing to do. If people are going to leave the scene I'm not sure a law would change that.
- I don't think that you should be forced to give out your personal contact information with a stranger for safety reasons
- It may not be positive to keep and agitated dog there
- Some incidents can be trivial or a result of play behavior, and this rule is very susceptible to overreach. This would be too complex to manage & enforce.
- The offending dog may need to be contained if it is in an frenzied state.
- Dogs bite each other, it's not always an 'incident'.
- As an individual who has been attacked by a dog, I think the most important thing in such an event is to ensure the safety of all involved. The 'nuisance' dog should be removed from the immediate scene, which in many situations requires the owner to leave as well.
- no
- Yes, but they do need to be allowed to remove the dog from the scene and place the dog under control. Medical treatment for human or dog may need to be sought first. A requirement for sharing contact information should be all that is necessary.
- Pitbulls are not vicious. The owners are the issue. I can't believe you guys are even considering these options about innocent breeds. Shame on you
- if people can sort things on their own why does there have to be a rule. People instigate problems
- I don't support this because the priority would be removing the dog and deescalating the Immediate situation which I believe in most situations would require an owner to leave with and tend to the upset dog. A follow up system/protocol could be explored instead.
- Stressful for dog, unfair to keep in stressful situation
- I don't agree with this at all for the simple fact that usually when a dog bites someone/animal it's because it was scared hurt or antagonized..... and if a dog is aggressive towards another dog it's because it wasn't socialized properly
- If the people exchange information that should be sufficient. It can take a long time for someone to get there
- Share contact information yes but if whatever caused a dog to reach the point of a bite I do not think it is wise to keep the dog in that situation for any longer than absolutely necessary.
- A dog that just bit someone or another animal must be removed from the situation immediately. I think it's fair to say that they must return their dog to a safe place then come back, but it is important to remove an animal from a situation that induced enough fear for them to bite first.
- It should be reported and there should be contact information shared. It should also be possible for the owner to remove the dog from the situation to prevent any further issues.
- Dogs can be scared or feel threatened in an unknown place. A home visit would be much more appropriate. Then you can assess the living quarters and life style of the people who own the dog.
- Just get a peace officer give them a job
- Give information and leave. Situations continue to escalate.



- Just exchange information
- honestly, I don't trust bylaw officers and worry that they would apprehend and punish a dog that may simply require some behaviour training, or that may have been provoked or triggered in some way before the bite
- Not always possible or necessary
- Privacy
- Support mandatory exchange of information but do not support prolonged exposure of victim to offending dog.
- I think if the dog has bitten it may need to be taken home as to not be aggravated more and as long as someone has the contact info it can be followed up with
- I don't agree with police getting involved in something so trivial. Unless the dog kills someone or another dog there is no need for an officer.
- Based on other parts of this survey, it seems possible that an enforcement officer could seize the dog, require euthanization, or have breed-based prejudice. Dogs need love and care in order to not be violent, and the measures an enforcement officer could take could make things worse for the dog rather than better
- If authorities are called, sure it may be a good requirement. Some people do not press any charges, so what's the point of waiting around
- would support exchanging of information but the victim of a bite should not be submitted to longer exposure to the offending dog than necessary, this would be very traumatic to the victim.
- I don't think the enforcement officer is necessary. They can exchange info if necessary and not be required to remain at the scene until an officer arrives.
- Sometimes it's safer for an owner to remove a dog from the situation. Requiring them to stay if they can't control their dog in the first place could force them to choose between getting a ticket or risking the repetition of the aggressive behaviour.
- I feel like they should provide their contact info but if it is safer to remove the dog and the owner with the dog then they should not have to remain at the scene. As long as they have their contact info to ensure proper follow up and tests.
- I would rather that contact information is shared and that the dog is taken home to prevent further incidents. If a dog was stressed/scared enough to bite, it's not going to help to keep it in that situation longer.
- If there has been an incident - I think it's better for the owner to be allowed to leave to take the animal home and de-escalate the situation immediately.
- Some scenarios only require a 'sorry'. For 'attacks' yes. Most dogs that bite only bite because they were provoked by the other person.
- Some dogs nip when people invade their space. I've had runners for example waving their fingers in my dog's face as they run up to my dog... if she was to bite in that situation it would be a nip to tell whoever's she doesn't like what is happening. Should I spend time waiting around for someone... no. If it draws blood then I would stay and report.



- I would support this if there the language was more specific. I do not think it should be necessary for nips and small bites that do not resolve in injury.
- Not if the dog bit a trespassers or was protecting the owner in a volatile situation.
- There needs to be a better definition of “bite” before enforcing a rule like this (e.g. caused visible harm) in order to prevent prejudice (people calling enforcement for a fake or exaggerated incident because they don't like dogs or the owner).
- No, sharing of information should be between the people/animals involved in the incident to decide the outcome. No involvement of an enforcement officer should be required.
- Often in these situations, when dogs are involved in an altercation, the dogs need to be separated and removed from the scene to calm them down. I would be concerned that being required to stay on scene for a long time could bring some stress to the animals.
- Depends on the situation. There are reasons dogs bite..
- Dogs only bite if they feel threatened or were trained badly. Don't stick your hand in front of a dogs face if you don't know that dog.
- This should not be required unless the bite is so severe that it requires emergency medical attention
- The owner should be allowed to get the dog out of the situation.
- depends on what happen and the pet owner should be at fault not the animal
- Contact information should be exchanged. The victimized dog may require immediate attention and the owner departs the scene. As such, who is holding the aggressor accountable to stay on scene.
- Check what you did wrong and what the other person or dog did wrong.
- because if a dog is biting they are exhibiting a stress response, likely caused by the person they bit. They need to be removed to a calming environment.
- As long as the dog leaves the scene then the owner can stay.
- As long as the dog owner's contact information is passed along so that an enforcement officer is able to contact them, in certain situations allowing the owner to remove the dog from the situation may be the safest action.
- Tough one. I think that when incidents like that happen everyone involved is highly emotional and I can see it deteriorating to fighting between owners. I don't think they need to remain but they absolutely need to share contact information. There should be severe penalties for providing misinformation though.
- There is no way that it can be enforced. By law officers will take hours to get there. The Police will never show up. This would be waste of City tax payer resources.
- If an attack requires emergency care or if the animal was acting in defense of their owner, this rule could leave victims or at risk parties in peril. (le delays in medical care being received, lingering in unsafe area waiting for bylaw officers)
- That could create a situation that could escalate even more. The owner should remove the dog from the area, however should be required to call to provide necessary information or have someone remain back at the scene (if an option) to provide that information



- I think the person should be accountable, but if the dog just bit someone, it's probably stressed out. I guess giving contact info should be mandatory, but staying and waiting for cops will make it worse and lead to more bites.
- Unless the bite requires hospitalization of the individual the dog owner should be free to continue. Especially if all parties are present in a location where they know dogs are.
- While it is important to share information. I think it is much more important to remove the distressed animals first. To prevent further harm from occurring
- If the dog is in a frenzied state and there is no way to contain the dog, other than returning home, they should be directed to return as soon as possible though.
- There are many situations where the owner may need to leave the scene of the incident, such as to find the dog if it's run off or to take the injured to the hospital, etc. The owner should be responsible for regaining control of the dog (back on leash), getting help for the injured (calling 911 or assisting in transport to a hospital), and for reporting the incident to the police (even if the incident has already been reported by the victim or victim's owner)
- It would be better to leave ID or contact information so the dog can be taken safely home and away from the bite victim.
- I support it being necessary to share information
- This event is traumatic for both the owner who's dog has bitten another, and the victim. The dog owner may often need to remove their dog from the heightened state of that incident for the safety of everyone, and the wellbeing of that dog for what may have triggered them to react that way. The dog owner should provide contact information to the victim, and be able to be contacted by an enforcement officer, should that person deem reporting necessary. It should not be a detriment if the owner needs to take their dog away from that environment.
- If a dog bites a person, the owner should be able to be contacted later, but they have a agitated and upset animal to attend too. Dogs don't bite for no reason and keeping an owner and an agitated pet at the scene doesn't sound smart
- Too stressful for animals involved
- The animals may need to be removed from the situation ASAP and could get worse if they have to stay at the scene
- If the dog is acting up, best to remove from the scenario as soon as possible
- its to general if a dog bites a person then yes other dogs no that's not uncommon in dog parks each situation is different a blanket statement is to broad
- Dogs will occasionally bite/nip each other and half of the people around can't tell the difference between play, warning for nuisance behavior, and actual aggression. Every insecure pet owner will be calling bylaw as soon as two dogs start playing/wrestling and wasting bylaws time. There has to be a better/narrower classification than "bites a person or other animal"
- It would be best for owners to share information and bylaw officers to meet with all parties after the animals and victims safety can be insured. Long waits for a bylaw officer in a place that is away from home is not appropriate. This could further traumatize both the victim and/or animals involved.



- Why do you instantly assume it is the dog who bites fault? Most dogs who bite do so because they're stressed or scared.
- No info on how long an enforcement officer would take, no info on what would happen to human or dog involved, there needs to be a set and clear process so that everyone knows what is going on - and no wonder people would run if this happens
- Law enforcement do not act responsibly and there is a reasonable chance they would provoke the dog, and/or shoot to kill the dog or owner. This isn't a job for the police. The dog needs to go home after an incident like this. Not stay in the park with crowds, blood, yelling etc. (I'm concerned in what ways your research for these proposals has been balanced)
- They or injured party may need to go to Vets or hospital. They should however give their details to the other party. Enforcement officer may not arrive for an hour or more.
- I think the queen is stupid
- This opens the door for bored, agitated dog owners to start calling every time their dogs are playing at an off leash park, as dogs often play with their teeth.
- [removed]
- No
- Some people are nasty and judge dogs on breeds, like yourselves judging pitbulls with this survey which can I point out is disgusting and ignorant, and no dog deserves to be put down, which some people would ultimately try to push for out of spite.
- This one's not as simple. Situations like these can become challenging, especially if it isn't clear who's dog was at fault or if both dogs were fine in the end. An owner may have to leave the scene quickly if their pet needs medical assistance or they may not have time to wait around for bylaw to arrive. Furthermore, if the other party, human or dog, is (still) confrontational, then this poses a risk to those in the area and it would irresponsible not to remove the aggressive dog from the scene. It would also be difficult to police a situation like this as every time a fight or dog disagreement happened, emotions run high, defensive mechanisms kick in, and people want to protect their pets. Forcing people to stay could contribute to further issues.
- PIT BULLS ARE NOT A BAD BREED
- I don't believe this is a black or white matter. It's subjective and every situation is different.
- If the dog needs to be removed from the situation, the owner needs to be able to get the dog away from the scene to prevent further attacks to people or other animals.
- Sometimes taking an upset animal away from the situation is the best solution.
- In some cases animals are provoked. An animal that it taunted and then bites is displaying a reasonable reaction. It is a case of he said she said and often the dog will lose out.
- Owner may/should stay & speak with Bylaw Officer only if the dog has a history of aggressive behavior. Also, Not a rule of law but case by case.
- it should not be necessary, and this bylaw is not necessary either.
- I think it is important to be able to get information from the person, however if their pet is still being aggressive it could be dangerous to do so.
- Only if safe to do so



- If this situation happens I feel both parties involved can work things out by themselves. If that can't happen in a civilized manner then you could involve an enforcement officer.
- Leave to de-escalate the situation. Then converse at a calmer place
- the dog could have been provoked by the person or animal. dog's do not bite simply for fun
- In theory the owner should stay on scene, but if a dog bites/attacks, the owners first priority should be removing and securing the dog. Next step should be to Formally report the incident.
- The dog doing the biting is likely heightened and is a continuing risk to others and should be removed from the area. A phone number should be given though.
- How do you distinguish between a predatory bite or a superficial play bite?
- As long as adequate info is exchanged between dog owners (ie, proof of phone number working and pic of ID or address) then owners can separate and talks with the enforcement officer on their own.
- Only if a dog bites a person. This is because dog to dog interactions may be hard to determine exactly what happened and what the severity of the incident was.
- I can see this becoming an abuse of power. People will wrongfully accuse owners, especially at dog parks if your dog is not close.
- Sounds like it could be opaque. Also not a good use of enforcement time and money.
- Bites can happen for a multitude of reasons. It is not always the dog doing the biting that is at fault.
- This rule is ignorant and misguided. If you expect the dog owner to remain, that means the dog remains as well. A large number of "dog attacks" stem from a dog feeling threatened or feeling their owner is being threatened. Sure, let's make them remain in an unsafe environment. Good work Calgary, really looking out for the safety of your citizens!
- Depends on the situation. If a dog that wasn't leashed approached a dog on a leash and was attacked I would blame the owner for not having control over his/her dog. If it is a serious bit that requires stitches absolutely but if it's a child or an adult that petted the dog without seeking the owners approval or teased the dog then I don't think it's necessary.
- I have a dog who was legally identified as violent. I keep her on a leash at all times however there are idiots who leave their dogs off leash no matter the location and if they ever approach my dog, she will kill them. I will not waste my time to stand there to explain my dog's behaviour when other people are irresponsible.
- It's rarely necessary. If Everytime a little dog bites an ankle you have to wait for bylaw... That would be ridiculous.
- "I actually became involved as a victim in a situation involving an uncontrolled dog.
- Having the owner stick around any longer would have made things worse because they didn't acknowledge their dog had an issue in the first place. For safety issues, I think sometimes it's best for victim, and dog/owner to go separate ways. This is a difficult question though, because if they are not obligated to share contact information they dog/owner might "flee" the attack, and leave the victim without resolution. I'm not quite sure how you would problem solve this. In my case, my family contacted the police department afterwards and filled out forms describing the event. I am not sure what happened to the owner/dog.



- This next comment pertains to 8) "Bandana Program":
- If a dog is at a park where children are expected to be present it needs to be trained properly. End of story. This proposed "Bandana Program" is a disgusting idea. I will tell you why. It places responsibility on children to monitor dog behavior, rather than the dog owners. In addition, a dog is either a) safe to be around or b) not safe to be around. Having "bandana colors" creates the idea that there is a gradient of what is deemed to be safe. Safety is one of the few things that is not a gradient. Whoever came up with this idea should be given a swift kick in the behind. Yes, I am talking to you."
- Owner should leave contact information & remove the dog from scene to a safe, secure location. Location of dog & owner needs to be left at scene as well.
- This will only escalate problems. Allow people to proceed away from each other and remove the dogs involved to a safe location. Then, allow for a peace or bylaw officer to examine the facts in a deescalating manner.
- The environment they are in could be what is causing the animal to be aggressive. I think it would be better to let the dog be in an environment where it feels safe before a stranger approaches them
- Depending on the severity - more severe should be required to stay if necessary.
- If serious enough a enforcement officer should be involved if not the owners should be able to exchange info
- Only if the bylaw officer can arrive within 15 minutes.
- I say no, hoping that for the most part people are able to work out the issues with their dog. Depending on the severity and the type of incident bylaw should be involved. I honestly don't think bylaw officers would be able to decipher the breakdown of a dog fight anyway. Unless they're properly trained in dog behaviour.
- Minor bites don't warrant this but severe ones do.
- This could take way too long. What if the officer doesn't show for 3 hours or something?
- I think it should be required to share contact information, but not require the dog to remain at a scene as the dog may be dangerous in the case of a severe bite, or simply highly stressed/defensive/reactive in the case of a minor bite (which could have been provoked unintentionally through someone approaching and reaching in on the dog without permission). Best for the owner to take the dog home and debrief with enforcement officer at home or over phone.
- I agree that information should be shared, but I feel that it would be safer for everyone to remove the dog from whichever situation or stimuli that may have triggered the aggression.
- Exchanging info's will be sufficient
- The dog bite may have occurred due to an attack on the owner or the dog themselves, in self defense. Having to remain in that dangerous situation does not make sense. They should absolutely be responsible for following up with an enforcement officer at a time when it is safe for all parties involved.
- Dogs will bite. Get over it.



- City must really be hurting for money since covid, eh?
- There are some 'victims' that over dramatize the event and cause unnecessary stress to the dog and the owner of said dog. Also, if the dog bit out of defence or terror it's on the 'victim' not the dog or the owner.
- At the off leash animals bite other animals in play. Bites are not always vicious. I think if a dog bites an animal or human in an act of aggression then the owner will and should take the responsibility and ensure it is dealt with.
- Encourage exchange of information, but don't believe the victim of a dog bite should be exposed to offending dog longer than necessary. That dog should be taken home/to safety as quickly as possible.
- Unless you can guarantee the dog wouldn't be taken away on the spot and that there would be no more than a 30 min wait. I feel like an exchange of information would most like suffice.
- I think it is responsible for them to provide contact information and talk with an enforcement officer, but staying at the scene may put them or their animal at risk and should not be a requirement.
- This seems like a no brainer that the answer would be yes, however, continuing to expose the dog to the stimulus could lead to further bites or harm. This could in fact be more dangerous to the people, animals and dog involved.
- [removed]
- Sometimes it may be necessary for an owner to remove the offending dog from a situation for the safety of other people/pets as well as their own safety.
- It doesn't need to be law but it should be done.
- May be best to take the dog home and meet w/ the officers later that same day.
- Depending on the severity of it and also the situation. What happens if a dog attacks another dog but the dog who did nothing gets blamed because of its breed. I see it on the daily with pit bulls. Someone's dog will bite a pit bull and walk away without a scratch and still try and blame the person with a pit bull simply because of their breed when the pit bull literally did nothing and tried to run away. People are very extra with things and there are way too many people who just like to complain over nothing at all. Why should someone lose their dog because an ignorant person just had a bad day and wants to make other people pay for it.
- Contact information needs to be shared however I think the dog should be removed from the situation which is not always possible if the person is required to stay while waiting for an enforcement officer
- Does not always work (eg. animal needs medical attention). I feel that others will abuse this policy.
- If it was just people I'd say yes but you are grouping both together and I think two very separate issues.
- "This rule relies far too heavily on the character of individuals. Those who are law abiding and 'consciously good' citizens will stay with or without rules present, as in auto accidents. There is no need to enforce rules that come with potentially serious charges upon good citizens, and make a stressful situation even more so. The presence of enforcement officers should only be required if the humans involved become confrontational.



- Those few individuals who will “run away”, are akin to those who “hit and run” in auto accidents - you can impose rules and fines, but they care little."
- If someone was messing with your dog and got themselves bit, that shouldn't interfere with your whole afternoon waiting on useless police to show up
- It could be in self defense. Many people walk their dogs off leash, and if that dog approaches mine (which is always on leash), mine will likely bite out of defense. My dog and I are not at fault because the other person has no control over their dog. No leash, no control, no right for me to explain why my dog may bite.
- I think it is common decency to remain at the scene with your dog and to exchange contact info, etc but enforcing that by law would be tricky and is I think unnecessary
- Absolutely not. They should have to disclose name and contact information, as well as dog tag information, however they should be able to remove the dog from the situation to ensure the safety of the animal.
- As long as all information is exchanged if owner is not comfortable sharing with victim or family then wait for officer
- ONLY if it is a bite as some dogs are mouthy and use their mouth to direct and it is not a bite
- "Contact information for the owner of
- The dog who bit will be taken and an officer will contact when appropriate. As a veterinarian, leaving the dog to wait will set the dog up to bite again if it's still near its trigger for biting in the first place"
- What constitutes a bite to one person is a playful nibble to others.
- What about if a kid fights another kid, or a person scares another person. This is negative IQ.
- Just like in a motor vehicle accident it should be required to exchange info and complete a report. Also with an MVC the officer completing the report should not be the one deciding fault (in an MVC police complete the report but do not decide fault - insurance companies decide fault)
- "They're animals. Bites are going to happen.
- If the event causes immobility or the dog requires serious surgery, yes. Similar to how we file an accident report when the damage is beyond a certain threshold."
- The dog should be taken home away from where it is causing problems.
- Sometimes it is safer to immediately remove the agitator to a safe place, then return to give info.
- I would say if a young small pup nipped another animal, or a minor skirmish between dogs the owner should consult with the other owner and if they agree everything is okay, fine. If any injury warranting treatment to a human, by law officers and possibly police should be brought in depending on circumstances. The owner should definitely remain at the scene.
- If a dog bites someone or an incident occurs, the dog is not in the right frame of mind to stay around the people involved.
- "I believe that the animal(s) should be removed from the scene as to not escalate the situation. Dogs can feed off their owners energy. If there is heightened emotions and/or voices, this can cause another incident to occur.
- An exchange of information needs to happen and enforcement should be notified as soon as the situation is deemed safe."



- Provide contact info, yes. But may need to separate the dogs for safety reasons.
- No because the number one goal after a dog fight is to get your dog away from the other dog
- Other animal is too vague
- having the animal present may cause more trauma for the victim
- If the dog bites, the dog needs to be taken home and not left to stay and possibly cause further problems. Common sense.
- Dogs often play fight at off leash parks. Owners sometimes get in the way unnecessarily, or in an inappropriate way. There would be a lot of calls for very minor bites or scratches, and it would be a waste of resources to have an enforcement officer come out every time.
- Remaining at the scene after a bite incident could further escalate the situation or put others in harm's way.
- But must provide contact information to other party
- It might be necessary to seek immediate medical help for the animal
- they should give their info yes but if they have a vicious dog they should immediately remove it from the situation.
- Separate the animals and have bylaw contact each owner separately
- Yes and no. If it's for the safety of others I think the dog that has bitten either a person or another dog should remove the dog from the situation and take them home immediately. I think if another dog was attacked the owner of the attack dog should be responsible for vet fees if the dog requires medical attention. If the dogs were play fighting, as they do, then both owners should be responsible for vet fees if required.
- People could abuse this rule and say that their dog was bit with no evidence as to the perpetrator
- Let the owner go home and get their dog settled but they must share their contact info with someone to pass onto By-law and they can go to their house. Can be a heated situation when this happens
- Must normally stay on scene if not threatened. If threatened, or feel unsafe, must go directly to police station. This rule should also apply to traffic collisions, to prevent vigilante "justice".
- People will take advantage, causing more harm. It also puts people at risk of being harmed by the person that claims to have been bitten
- No it is more dangerous for a dog that has already attacked to stay at a scene for bylaw to arrive as risk is higher for another bite
- Depends on the situation - in some situations, the offending dog should be removed from the scene as soon as possible so no further aggression occurs, in which case the owner cannot stay
- "Dog bite when the play"
- One needs to know the difference between aggressive behavior and playful."
- I think law enforcement is busy enough without adding this problem to their list.
- At large dogs in an off leash area can aggressively approach packs being walked by responsible business owners. Should a pack animal defend the pack by biting an aggressive, at large dog, the business owner should not be required by law to remain at the scene. This could impact owners and walker's schedules alike.
- I support the rule if a dog bites a person, but not if it bites another animal.



- get the information of person and dog. it can take a long time for an enforcement officer to show up. and another thing, enough on the 'rules' I am so tired of this..just more tax money being spent in areas not necessary.
- I think that it's fair to require owners to provide contact information, however it could be the case that it might not be safe to remain at the scene. I.e. an agitated dog might need to be removed from the scene of the event (example, bite incident at dog park, unsafe to remain in the dog park, but would rather need to go to the parking lot or a quiet space away)
- If it is serious then yes, an owner should clearly remain or hurry to provide contact info but it's important to note an owner would also be responsible for removing the dog from the situation as quickly as possible and in the moment both the dog owner and the person/owner of dog bitten may also wish to remove themselves from the situation (de-escalate). It would be one person's word against another re who left or fled the scene, and it would be difficult to determine without willing witnesses. It is easy to demonize a dog/owner for behaviour and important to remember that many good dogs can react due to another person or dog's behaviour. I've seen incidents at parks in which someone's dog was the problem dog but another dog was blamed when it escalated. So it's often best to leave when there is a non-serious situation.
- If an animal has been in that kind of an incident sometimes the best thing is to take the animal home instead of keeping it in the environment that escalated to a bite.
- The dog should be removed from the situation and taken to a safe place - ideally put in a crate/kennel. Leaving them there in a high emotion/stress situation is a recipe for disaster.
- in recognition of the inequity surrounding the safety and welfare of racialized calgarians already at risk from inequitable police enforcement, it must be allowable that if someone's pet defends their owner's safety, they are not under pressure from police or the city to prove their victimhood in a situation.
- Take the dog to a safe place so no more incidents happen then wait for an officer
- Support mandatory exchange of information but do not support prolonged exposure of victim to offending dog. Staying at the location would only escalate the dogs and not provide a quick deescalation of the situation.
- It should be like any type of accident, information should be exchanged and any witness info as well but I don't feel you have to wait you could be waiting for hours
- If you have any experience with animals a dog bites because they are scared or hurt. Staying at the scene would not diffuse the situation. The enforcement officer should be met or go to home of attacker you discuss and hear what happened.
- Support mandatory exchange of information but do not support prolonged exposure of victim to offending dog.
- Is a dog bite from defending the owner or is it from defending itself. Dogs bit not only because they are bad animals it can also be a reaction to a bad situation. There can't be an automatic assumption of a crime or bad behavior if a dog bites back. I have seen many times where informed people know how to approach a new dog while others just jump in and scare a dog when greeting it. Like a



vehicle accident. Take down information and proceed as necessary. But a blanket rule cannot be enforced.

- Most incidents are caused by the person or other creature that entices the dog to defend themselves
- I have owned, rescued and trained dogs, never a bite. The person bitten and dog owner can work things out (medical / vet assistance) and reimburse costs. If not, the person bitten can call police or bylaw to report it. People are the problem, rarely the dog unless cause (to protect owner, invasion of their space, prior abuse). Potential dog owner needs to invest time to get right dog breed for them. Public needs EDUCATION and respect boundaries (permission to touch owner's animal, stay out of fenced backyards, keep their dog on leash away from another dog, don't get upset at owner when told to not touch their dog). Any dog is capable of biting due to fear, skittishness and protecting owner from another person or dog. Most dog bites are from small breeds' anxiety when large breeds bite it's due to interpreting a reason (threat). Responsible owners know their dog's limits, walk and control them on a leash. You see many people walking their dog without and letting them stray into situations. Uphold the dog leash law and provide a Education Program: Understanding the Different Dog Breeds and How to Find the Right Dog for You. Education is badly missing for the public and you have to dig to get the right information.
- It depends on the severity and circumstances. Law Enforcement are not called to minor traffic accidents (fender benders) The same thinking can be applied here. If enforced both parties must remain and any witnesses to avoid bias against breeds.
- I think they need to share information however it is important to get the dog to a calm space so that another incident doesn't occur while waiting for an enforcement officer.
- Dogs may be provoked into biting, dogs may be legitimately defending their owner.
- We are not a police state. Respectable people and owners will voluntarily stay on scene and provide info.
- They had done so because of a reason. And thus it could be a mistake. So having such drastic measures such as contact info over a bite is a bite too much.
- It may be best to remove the offending animal from the situation for their safety or others.
- Can be done by telephone
- Time. What is the response time going to be in regards to these instances? Is the other party required to stay as well and any witness to occurrence?
- If the dog is injured then yes, if not no.
- "As a physician, I have to deal with dog bites and the reporting paperwork.
- I have 1 suggestions because staying on location is not always appropriate or possible for either party. Similar to exchanging details after a car accident, if a dog owner involved in a bite can provide their contact details/area in which they reside and verbally confirm vaccination status, that is all we need. Contact details get forwarded to public health to follow up on the dog. Vaccine status and area of residence help us decide whether or not they come from a higher rabies risk environment. This then helps us decided if treatment with rabies immunoglobulin is required or not."
- I think a responsible owner would take responsibility for the actions of their dog and willingly supply contact information. All dogs bite; what does the city classify as a bite? (ie. dog mouths another



animal or person, dog breaks skin of another animal or person, dog bite requires medical attention etc.)

- If an altercation between dogs and/or people occurs there are usually high levels of arousal in both the dogs and people involved. It is best for everyone to exit the situation to allow emotions to de-escalate.
- The owner of the offending animal should be able to get their animal to safety to prevent further attacks. They should be able exchange information and leave or call bylaw after the fact
- If the animal is violent or agitated, the owner should probably take it home to avoid further risk of injury. This question proves to me that the wrong people wrote this questionnaire.
- Calgary enforcement officers a indecent people, we have seen how they handled the pandemic and I would avoid them at any cost.
- sometimes the best option is to remove the dog from the situation to prevent further issues
- Dogs bite all the time, different breeds for different reasonings I.e) anxiety, people will take advantage of it and use discriminatory reasons to stay there against people or other dogs, or not understand what the offence means and go overboard.
- A nip does not break skin. There is no need to stay
- The information could be exchanged between citizens without waiting around for bylaw to attend...this extended exposure could make things worse.
- In order for this to be enforced there must be a degree of severity associated to the bite. In my experience any owners I have encountered when an incident has taken place has been generous to share their contact info and have followed up to know how the victim dog/person is doing without requiring a law to govern them.
- Unless the bite is unprovoked there should not be a reason to have to stay on the scene if the animal is protecting itself or it's owner
- I dont trust you or your enforcement officers.
- In the case of a separate emergency going on at the same time which might require the owner to leave the scene.
- I feel this could create conflict between people perhaps even start a physical altercation.
- They should give information but should not have to remain at the scene, they should remove their animal from the scene as quickly as possible as to not escalate the situation. The officer can follow up once the animal is back at home and detained and the situation is diffused
- Not if staying would continue to agitate the situation
- If the dog had bitten something then the owner should be allowed to leave to remove the dog to keep everyone safe, as it could still be highly aroused. Owners should return without the dog to talk to the necessary people
- I agree that information should be collected but having the dog and owner stuck waiting around puts everyone at risk because the dog is most likely going to be stressed and fearful therefore could bite again. Holding them there to collect information puts owner and dog in an unsafe situation.
- I think depending on the severity of nip or bite there should be different avenues taken.



- Animals may require vet attention. Eg dog to dog fight may produce two injured dogs. It might not be safe to keep the offending dog at the location of the fight (Eg off leash park or pathway system where there are other people/pets). It seems odd people would need to stay on scene until a bylaw officer arrives. There should be an online reporting tool for both parties to exchange information, maybe even upload pictures, and have authorities follow up.
- It wouldn't be effective. More often than not the owner of the dog doesn't stick around or runs off.
- When I dog is so upset that he bites, space is needed for the dog to calm down. The truth of the situation will not be found until all have calmed down.
- Often owners are not near the scene. Dogs sometimes fight each other or bite each other in play. Some people see this and think it's an attack.
- Support mandatory exchange of information but do not support prolonged exposure of victim to offending dog.
- If the dog is under stress he may be hard to control, and an enforcement officer could take time to arrive endangering others. I support sharing contact information.
- In theory I would say yes, if you're pet bites someone/animal you should stay to a) ensure they are okay, and b) follow up. However, there can be cases where a dog may have not because they are you were in danger. I have had many encounters where my dog has growled and barked at men who have approached me walking at night, in a manner that made me feel uncomfortable and unsafe. He has never bitten as he is trained, however if he did, I would have a proem with a law expecting me to wait in. Situation where I feel unsafe.
- Dog owner needs to deal with the dog. Remove it from the scene to discipline it.
- Up for abuse on small bites or ones where the sink is not broken
- The wait time for bylaws can be unreal, which could be unsafe for the dog if it's hot and without water which owners may not plan for if they're going on a shorter walk. Just as with a small car collision, the people involved should share contacts, get any witness numbers, contact bylaws and meet at their home.
- The owner should take their dog home and meet with the officer in a more appropriate location and at a more appropriate time. Dogs bite when distressed, keeping the dog in the spot where it felt so distressed that it bit for extended time will do nothing but exasperate the situation.
- Not enforceable and will likely result in further conflict
- They would need to take their dog away from the situation, so couldn't stay and risk it happening again.
- The animal is in distress the owner needs to share their information and remove their animal from that location. The amount of stress coming from everyone involved is affecting the animal and potentially setting you up for another bite situation if the animal Feels it can't get itself to safety
- I understand and agree for humans. But there's no guarantee that it was your animal if someone just walks up claims their dog got bit
- It's not really yes or no but in such a tense situation it's important to de escalate so for example if two dollars gas are involved on a fight and they're both staying there or worse a person has been



attacked and the dog remains there it's not helpful but it is important to share information speak to police etc.

- If that information is already communicated to the other party, why should someone need to stick around, instead of removing their dog from what was clearly an anxious scene and continue letting their dog over process...they can just be contacted via phone.
- Law enforcement is not qualified to handle this task
- I'm attempting to open a new business in Calgary and hire a lot of people.. we have changed our mind as our family is no longer welcome in the now NDP state of banning dogs.
- What would be expected turn around time?
- "If an on leash dog bites an off leash dog that has ran over from its yard, the on leash dog owner should have zero liability.
- Way to many dogs run off yard to me and my dog. Over ten incidents each summer minimum!"
- For medical reasons; owners should provide vaccination reports to the other person/animal. They shouldn't have to wait for law enforcement, as regardless of the reason for the bite, the dog will get taken away, which is unacceptable! Again, incidents like this happen because of the environment and uneasy/uncomfortable position the dog is put in.
- believe this is unnecessary
- a responsible owner should be responsible for their dog and provide their info to the victim/other animals owner.
- It may be best for the owner to remove the dog from the area. But contact information should be left with witnesses or victim.
- In theory this is a good idea but I am concerned the rule would be abused
- I support this if it is a severe bite. However, what constitutes 'severe'? Or can a citizen demand an owner remain on-scene for any level of bite? This needs to be figured out first. If a dog bites but it doesn't do any damage (for example, if it is a small dog) do you need to wait for law enforcement? What about a big dog if they bite but leave no mark? The rules need to be clear when a person has to stay on the scene. Also, if there is no bite mark left behind it is tough to say what even happened.
- I think leaving contact info is important but it might be more important to remove the dogs and de-escalate the situation.
- It takes too long for peace officers to get on the scene. As well everyone thinks they are in the right. So there will be fights. Giving people time to come up with new reasons to wrongfully accuse bully breeds or others because the dog is bigger.
- Unenforceable if you the dog owner simply denies the existence of the incident or denies they saw it
- enforcement officer is not necessary but sharing contact information should be required
- What if the dog owner is not at the scene of an accident because the dog was in the care of a dog walker? How would this nuance be addressed in the rules?
- Bites are a relative term, dogs naturally nip at people or other dogs as part of their play rituals or as a warning. Some could misinterpret this as a bite.
- If there is an incident the dog should be removed from the scene to calm the situation
- UNCONSTITUTIONAL



- Not necessary to have others involved
- I don't support any measures that violate charter rights, including but not limited too, unlawful detention/detainment.
- No, I think in this situation it's best to get the bitten dig to a vet and the buyer away from the scene. The people should exchange info including the dog license number. The bylaw officer can followup.
- "A, enforcement seems difficult
- B, sometimes for safety, it would be best to remove from the situation"
- The requirement to talk to an enforcement officer is contrary to Canada's constitution.
- Requiring anyone to talk to an enforcement officer is unconstitutional.
- An exchange of identity and contact information should be suffice.
- Depends on the situation and what is classified as a "bite" if no skin is broken then no.
- I agree with the dog owner remaining on the scene to exchange information but not the involvement of the Calgary Police or enforcement officers.
- "There is currently no leash law in Calgary which is wrong .
- Another large non pitbull breed off leash attacks me and my dog and my dog defends me . I am liable 50/50! . That is wrong. This has happened to me already . Now under your new law my dog would have to be muzzled when that big dog off leash comes around. (not in a dog park) And THAT is wrong. Someones dog is off leash . Attacks mine who is on a leash . AND mine can be destroyed. Under your current and proposed system. and THAT is wrong"
- This logistically doesn't make any sense. Additionally, too often people do not respect a dog's space. A dog cannot tell you with words that they feel uncomfortable.
- It's a stressful situation for the animals and people. The proper information should be traded and they should all go home and be in contact.
- In the age we're in, we do not need more law enforcement running around the streets. Let adults handle things like adults.
- Should exchange information but not remain at the scene after.
- Waste of their time
- I think just as long to attain information. If there was an incident between dogs, I feel it is important to tend to the dogs needs primarily. Leaving a situation to calm down or go to vet.
- It is better that the people and animals are separated as these incidents often escalate. The requirement should be to call the enforcement officer, not share information unless it is voluntary.
- If a incident happens with the dog, it is best to get that dog out of the situation as quickly as possible. By making both parties wait, we increase trauma for all parties. It would be best to share contact info and later be followed later up by an enforcement officer if necessary
- When a dog bites, don't you want to remove them asap from the scene? If the owner does this, but the rule is that they remain on the scene, then they would be breaking the rule, right? So, is there some other way to get the info?
- If a dog attacks a person the owner must wait for an enforcement officer. All other incidents the owner is not required to be at the scene.



- If the dog has a behavioral issue, waiting around for me people to come might be more stressful to the person/dog. Leading to more aggravation etc.
- In general I support sharing info and responsible dog ownership.. And abiding by the law and waiting for enforcement officer if one can show up in a timely manner. Less than 45 min..
- Staying in the immediate area could be very stressful to both dogs and possible the owners and whomever got bit. Way to many Karen's out there escalating things without cause
- If the other dog was the aggressor, my dog could have just been defending itself.
- There is too much gray area with this question. Yes they should wait if there is a serious bite to a person. But minor dog nips happen in dog parks and if you open the line for everyone having to stay around when this happens this would become a nuisance. Some people don't understand dog behaviour and can make a bigger issue out of a little nip. Also, sometimes their dog instigates it and it may be better for the two parties to separate it and handle it on their own. I think everyone is taking some risk when they are close enough around other animals to be bitten (not the case if the animal is off leash and uncontrolled in a non-off leash area). So everyone should deal with that risk on their own should something minor occur.
- If there's a dog on person or dog on dog attack, I think most important is to quickly exchange contact information, but then get everyone to a safe place. Making both parties stay in place (which could be an arbitrary street corner or field), could leave both parties at more risk for violence/fights/attacks with people or animals. Increase the fine if they take off without giving contact information, then allow people to go home.
- As this can escalate the situation between the owners and between the dogs. However, contact info must be exchanged.
- This needs to be case by case. Contact information should always be exchanged. If both parties involved agree that there has been no serious harm than no authority should be contacted. Why bog the system more while Kenney keeps cutting?
- I feel the dog training and tribunal efforts will avoid the bites in the first place. Being required to remain at the scene could cause more confrontations, as well as a person or dog being automatically seen as 'guilty' of an offence.
- Pit bulls should not be treated differently then other dogs there is no such thing as a bad dog including pit bulls only a bad owner.
- Remaining at the scene can just escalate tensions rather than de-escalate which can lead to more serious outcomes
- Assuming the bite is serious, and the victim requires medical attention, information should be exchanged if further action is required.
- A small nip where some fur is gone is not worth this and may be accidental while dog playing Although it is a warning for owner to train dog it is not worth a police record
- Dog bites happen, and when they do the owners often stay to ensure both dogs are okay. People do not flee the scene, or at least not that I've seen. I don't feel an enforcement officer needs to be involved unless the owners are unable to deal with the situation themselves.



- if the dog is in a state of distress i would recommend removing the dog from the environment . But to provide the victim with contact information so the matter can be resolved safely.
- I think they can provide their information to be contacted but then should be able to take their dog/animal home and away from the scene, for safety and privacy reasons.
- Depending on how severe the bite is. Sometimes dogs playfully nip eachother and this rule would be unfairly used against large dogs while smaller, more aggressive, dogs would not be held to the same standard.
- The owner must take responsibility for the action their dog, and then hand over the dog to by law until the investigation is complete.
- Dogs play bite all the time. Sometimes they draw blood. Consider the severity and magnitude of the bite first before getting law enforcement involved. A dog should be taught to not bite hard on people and dogs but every case should be evaluated based on maturity, level of training, etc. It is a waste of law enforcement time and taxpayer money to make a case out of every nip
- If your child walked up and grabbed a dog because they love them and the dog is frightening or injured , nips at the child. This could raise a very heated conflict that would be better addressed later.
- Tough call - I guess you said "if necessary" so that suggest that if there's a gathering at a park with people and one person's dog bites, then the people (all associated) would make a decision to severity... don't want it to become a have to do every single snip. Could waste a lot of enforcement officer time and cost and stress if it was a very marginal scene. Understand though that owners should be respectful and accountable for their dog just like we have bylaw that they should pick up their animal's poop.
- I think the two parties should exchange information but not have a enforcement officer because adding another human the animals don't know can escalate the situation
- There are many situations where this would put both the dog and owner at risk.
- While a good idea in theory, much like having to provide details following a car accident, I don't see any way this could legitimately be enforced.
- I think it is important for people to be accountable but feel like the people involved can make the decision whether or not they want to involve law enforcement.
- Ideally they would stay but realistically they should immediately get the dog put away safely first. Also most in situations there will be very emotional people involved, so it may be best they are not left together, waiting for an officer
- Only for significant bites. Also keeping the animals together would not be a good idea after an altercation.
- Because it could cause the animal and people around to be more anxious.
- Because this can be expedited by making it mandatory to report it online. Having to wait for officers to arrive to the scene sounds like a big waste of time for all parties.
- There are enough rules in this city and I bet that the majority of people already do stay and discuss. This is just another form pf policing and it's unnecessary. The more you make "rules" the less people of going to abide by them. This is a stupid study.



- to vague - "bite" is not specific - sometimes dogs might tell each other off at the park but it is not a bite or attack...
- If a dog bites after having been approached unsolicited by a stranger, they should not be subject to punishment. Especially if it is a teething puppy.
- The dog owner and person who suffered from the bite should try to resolve the situation first. If both parties cannot mutually leave in peace then I would suggest both parties to remain at the scene of the incident to talk with an enforcement officer.
- The police can't even police the city. How's a dog cop going to arrive on the scene of the crime?
- This should not be criminal on the dogs part. And people won't listen if you get law enforcement involved regardless. If they cannot train a dog it is animal abuse and should be handled as such. Situations require specialized care for animals. Leave it to the trained professionals. Or refer pet owners to them
- The stress while waiting could lead to escalation of the issue after the fact with the people involved.
- If the other dog antagonized first the dog is allowed to defend itself if it uncomfortable.
- A rule is fine, but not enforceable. Only responsible dog owners would stay and most likely will even without a rule
- The dog owner should provide contact info or can call 911 to provide their contact info but they need to remove the dog from the scene immediately and contain it at home in a crate or room. Having the dog remain at the scene is a terrible idea.
- They should be allowed to take their dog away from the scene and then return promptly.
- If a dog is escalated by the environment the best situation would be to remove the dog from that environment. The owner should definitely provide their contact information but I don't agree they should have to stay at the scene.
- Dogs are animals. There are many reasons that a dog may bite a human, they could feel they are a threat, could be territorial, or just weird with people. This is not the dogs fault removed] This whole survey is a farce, pitbull are an amazing dog who are completely misunderstood & persecuted for no reason.
- It opens the door to very small accidents (90% of them) being treated like big ones
- I agree with sharing contact information but the rest can be followed up on by the enforcement officer. Leaving the scene of the incident can allow the dog which bit to be safely returned to a secure location to help prevent further attacks
- I support mandatory exchange of information. I don't support requiring the dog owner to remain in place until an enforcement officer arrives. This prolongs exposure between the victim and dog in question.
- "Remaining at the scene with animals can increase the chances of additional incidents. Removing the animal from the scene should be priority and identifying parties as the second.



- Much like accident scene triage, people should not be legally burdened to remain in danger simply to fulfill an administrative step. Remove the danger, then deal with the scenario."
- As long as an agreement can be reached between the humans involved (ie paying vet bills) I don't see any reason to involve an enforcement officer
- A dog walker or relative might be at the scene of the incident. In this situation the owner should just be called and info should be exchanged over the phone.
- It depends on severity.
- Sometimes it is necessary to remove the animal from the situation if it is unsafe. I do believe that the owner should be required to provide their information for follow up.
- This is not a straight yes/no answer. A bite might not be unprovoked
- i think a person could give their info and they may leave and take their animal home.
- I think this should only be under extreme circumstances sometimes other animals and people can provoke protective dogs to defend their owners.
- Dogs nip and are mouthy when they play. What definition of bite should be used?
- To ensure safety, sometimes it is best to get the dog(s) out of the area
- The owner may need to take the dog home. Standing around waiting for an officer increases the chances of conflict escalation with others involved. Everyone's emotions will be running high. Knowing the owner's contact information should be sufficient - maybe verify by seeing the owner's photo ID to make sure they're not lying, and get the pet ID number of their Calgary license tag.
- Must of the time if a dog bites someone it's either because that person was teasing him or their owners, which could be a case of a dog protecting their owner and could be because immediate danger that the owner it's supposed to go away ASAP
- This would be very difficult to enforce. My dog has been bitten twice by a neighbors dog that gets loose from its yard - but this dog is a 5 pound Yorkshire terrier. Will the same rules apply? Technically it is an aggressive dog though no one seems to care because of its size.
- If it is a minor event an exchange of information is acceptable. If it is a major event you should wait for authorities to arrive. Treat it the same as a motor vehicle accident.
- Dogs often play bite when at the dog park, this would create too many complications if one owner thought their dog was non-aggressively biting and the other owner disagreed.
- keeping an agitated animal somewhere they feel unsafe or where they are misbehaving is poor practice. Providing contact information via telephone and meeting at their home or elsewhere would be better.
- Bylaw enforcement takes too long to respond to complaints. Unless an officer can attend immediately, it isn't reasonable to expect a dog owner to remain at the scene for hours.
- What if the alleged victim is actually harassing the dog owner.
- Exchange of information required but owners must be allowed to seek veterinary or medical treatment if necessary.
- The information should be shared with the other person/dog owner, but to wait on site for an officer to arrive is likely unreasonable and not a good use of police officer time unless the incident is



serious or fatal. Similar idea that you don't have to inform police of a small fender bender on traffic if the damage is less than \$2k

- Unless the pet owner went out of their way to use the dog as some sort of weapon, there is no reason for the owner to be punished. They are simply Animals and the way we as people treat them as a family member in our homes will determine their lethal-ness. NOT because of their Breed.
- While I believe that a responsible pet owner should share their contact information, requiring people to stay at the scene could create an unsafe situation for the people or animals involved.
- This would be a complete misuse of tax dollars and really not have much if any of a benefit
- It depends on the severity, if a dog is hurt badly, I would want to take it to the vet rather than wait for an authority to get there. If a dog bites a person, then yes, I feel it is important to contact authorities.
- I don't think that establishing additional "rules" is really going to help the matter. Instead, focus on education and what must be done in the case that an incident occurs. Educate for responsible dog ownership, not coming up with more rules. What additional benefit does having a "rule" bring? The only impact that I can see is that if the offending owner leaves, there is an additional penalty because a rule was broken. This doesn't really help the situation in the end and just adds more bureaucracy.
- Usually the aggressive dog needs to be removed from the situation asap. Waiting for enforcement officer or to exchange info is extremely difficult. I do think info needs to be exchanged but if the aggressive dog needs to just be removed from the situation, that is the best decision.
- I don't think this on necessary and I believe this creates a window for abuse on authority and prejudices. There is already quite a bit that citizens can do that require a little bit more time when a bite occurs.
- This one is difficult because people interpret bites differently. I've had people accuse my puppy of biting because he jumped and touched someones fingers as he walked past them. I think if someone believes their dog has been attacked, they should take photos, try to get information, call bylaw and give bylaw all the information they have on the attack. Bylaw should be taking the reigns on this one vs leaving it in the dog owners hands.
- Some people may overreact to a situation and waste time and money for an officer to respond.
- Sometimes dog interactions are complicated and require the removal of the animal from the area. At times the owner of one or both dogs can really complicate matters. I think, similar to a vehicle incident, information can be exchanged thus that bylaw officers can then address the parties involved outside the situation/environment at hand.
- Deal with your own [removed]! You should be adult enough.
- I imagine it would be difficult for all parties to stay at the scene if a bite has occurred in order to access medical attention or remove the animal from the situation where the bit occurred or otherwise. This would result in an escalation of behaviors from both the parties involved and the dog.
- "Only if it's a person.
- Individual circumstances should apply."
- A person yes, another animal no. Some bites are provoked by other poorly trained animals



- The dog would still be at a heightened state and may be anxious and more likely to attack again. The dog should return home. Contact info should first be shared and then the owner should contact the enforcement officer
- The owner should provide their contact information with the person calling bylaw, however keeping a potentially aggressive animal on scene would increase trauma for a victim (pet, child, etc).
- It should be treated similar to a vehicle incident. Dog license and owners contact information should be shared with the victim. This information could be shared with CPS or Bylaw over the phone so that the attacking dog can be removed from the situation to reduce the chance of more trauma to the victim. If I was bitten by a dog, I would not be comfortable waiting around for CPS or Bylaw while the dog was in the same area, even if it was placed in a vehicle or other containment while we waited. I'd also want to be able to get to a hospital or vet, depending on who/what was bitten, to have the injury looked at.
- Contact information should be left. However it may be best to remove the dog from the situation asap.
- I believe the owner should be able to remove the dog from this situation. Kinda hard to do that if you have to stick around and swap info. A responsible owner would return after ensuring that the dog is secure.
- The definition of what constitutes a bite would need to be clarified. What one person thinks of as a playful nip might be considered an aggressive bite by another ..
- It can take a while for the officer to show up. Simply providing contact info to the recipient of the bite should suffice
- The dog may continue to be a threat to others, or become more agitated due to uncontrollable factors in the area. It may be safer to move the dog to another location, where the environment might be calmer or safer.
- Keeping an aggressive or injured dog at a location is not only not safe for others in the area, but not safe for the dogs involved
- What's wrong with the way things are currently done ? No trust in human kind anymore
- The owner has a right to remove the animal from the situation to allow safety for both parties. Most dogs don't bite unless they have a reason or they are improperly trained. Owners MUST provide their legal ID and contact information to the victim party for legal actions to be followed.
- It may not be practical to wait until the arrival of an enforcement officer. Parties involved can exchange contact information and settle among themselves for minor incidents.
- Who defines a bite? Playful, minor or even imagined.
- that is the risk you take with any animal.. any wildlife on hikes or anywhere in the city. the dog could've felt threatened and is just doing its job. lots of rambunctious dogs are the cause of many incidents simply because they're full of energy and the owners can't control them. but they get bit and its the other dogs fault... it ends up being a he said she said event.
- The owner should take the pet home and then return.
- If a dog has shown aggressive or scared behavior and acted out the owner needs to get the dog back to a safe environment where it can calm down.



- People yes other dogs no. Some people are snow flakes and freak out when dogs are playing.
- Dogs usually bite out of fear. Removing it from the situation is best to calm it down. It de-escalates the situation and prevents further potential injuries to humans and dog alike.
- "Intensity, strength, and emotional response to a bite can be subjective and may result in a disagreement over the severity of the situation between parties."
- Contact information should be exchanged but remaining at the scene seems, to me, a disproportionate response to the situation."
- Depending on the circumstances, dogs are animals, sometimes dog play gets a little rough but a quick correction (used with being properly trained human and dog together) then there would be no further issue. Simply like when a child accidentally hits another child or slips and hurts someone. You can't identify a situation with dogs without the proper education and without that. This is where you are getting all these misunderstood dogs, and unknowledgable owners with situations that escalate out of their hands. Training for humans with their companions is key!!!
- "I selected no in the event the dog bit another human they saw as a threat. Or if this was a dog fight situation and the dog bit the human on accident.
- Removing yourself from the situation before it can escalate further would be my first reaction."
- Depends on the severity.
- As long as it's non lethal. Otherwise share your information, get witness statements and go about your day calling the authorities if it has drawn blood
- This is all ready a high stress situation. Bring police into the equation increases stress levels even more. Take contact information and allow dog to be returned home
- "Bite" is not clear cut - dogs nip one another playfully often. Puppies "mouth" harmlessly as well - fhis rule is highly vulnerable to abuse. I would only support this if the definition was amended to the effect of "a severe biting incident" where severe is specifically defined as "causing physical bodily injury to another animal or human which requires immediate medical care"
- It is unreasonable to ask a citizen to remain at a location for an indeterminate amount of time.
- it depends on the situation.
- Some people and their dogs are unsocialized it instigators that cause a scuffle.
- Not necessary
- Dog bites can happen because of other dogs being untrained and having lacidasicle owners. I feel this situation would poorly protect those whose dogs are biting in self defense
- A bite isn't always agression based.
- Depends on the context.
- My dog was bitten at an off leash park on her ear and was bleeding. The owner gave me her phone number and proved it was her by texting us and said she would pay for vet bills. Since it was a fight over a ball I was fine with just taking her info, as that's normal between dogs, and my dog didn't need stitches or anything so it was all fine. there is no need for an officer to come for this type of situation if a proper exchange of info is done between parties.



- There will always be, he said she said. Many small breed of dogs initiate a conflict. Many get bitten because of size difference. Everyone will be biased against a bigger dog / pitbulls. Unfair conditions already.
 - If it is severe case because people make up false accusations against people and I'd only like it for legit claims
 - A bite is very subjective, some people are just scared of dogs.
 - If a dog needs medical attention they should be allowed to leave for this reason. When a dog is being aggressive they need to remove the animal from the scene
 - I think it is appropriate to have a bylaw officer attend the person's residence to receive their statement. Keeping a dog that may be experiencing behavioral issues in a stressful environment does not seem productive or helpful at all.
 - "Yes and no. Not every "biting" incident is such simply because a person calls it that. Different dog breeds exhibit breed specific behaviours not necessarily understood by a lesser educated dog owner or passerby; for example herding behaviours, including nipping. This is particularly problematic in multi use areas where there aren't only off leash dogs.
-
- Having said that, where there is actual harm done and the incident is obviously severe in nature, I believe it is appropriate for the owner to stay at the scene and this should be a requirement."
 - I think the situation could escalate if they remain on the scene. They should be required to give all contact info to whoever is there & provide proof of residency & ID before leaving the scene.
 - Animals bites can vary DRASTICALLY. Some bites are accidental, and those need to be taken into consideration too. I think people should be able to settle things between themselves without the need for a rule about contact information sharing, most people are old enough and mature enough to be able to decide whether a bite is severe or not.
 - Only if the two parties cannot come to an agreeable solution is an enforcement officer needed.
 - Get the dog somewhere safe.
 - Where is data that supports this possible change
 - Depending on the situation the dog may be defending someone in danger. Making them stay would put them and the animal in greater danger.
 - If there is a case where the dog is exhibiting violent behaviour, the owner should be getting the dog away from a scenario where it could cause more damage as quickly as possible. If the dog is able to be adequately restrained, then it would be good to have an exchange of information to allow for follow up on training needs, etc.
 - Give number and address and let them go home. [removed]
 - I don't want a dog to be euthanized for biting someone.
 - I believe the dog owner should only remain on scene long enough to exchange information so law enforcement can follow up. That way the dog can be removed from the scene reducing risk to the dog and the public around the dog.



- Staying there could increase the risk of escalation and increase emotional responses. Information should be exchanged but they should be allowed to go.
- You cannot expect the situation to remain calm. Emotions would flare leaving pet and owner at risk.
- If dog needs to be separated or is aggressive, staying at the scene will only make matters worse. Need another way to track down owner to take responsibility.
- We do not know if the dog bite because the dog was antagonized.
- For bites that damage another animal, the owners should exchange contact information and the incident should be documented with photos/video, etc. to ensure that reports of injury are accurate.
- It should be handled on a case by case basis, as if the incident is a result of the dog, owner or both being at risk, it makes no sense for them to stay where they would continue to be at risk.
- Too volatile of a situation. Will lead to greater trauma or violence.
- It is better for the owner to be able to take their pet home after a traumatizing incident to reduce further stress.
- As an enforcement officer may not attend the scene in a timely manner. The offender must voluntarily give their information. Exchange license information like in a car accident. There may be a need seek medical attention for injured party before officer arrives. From personal experience after calling 311, operator took a complaint as it was after hours and I did not hear from an officer right away. I'm not sure if there are after hours officers that would have attended if the bite was to myself or more severe to my dog.
- [removed]
- My concern would be people's reaction and the feeling of threat for the dog.. this is not a good plan.. maybe expand it to 100 feet of incident so owner can calm and reassure dog so the stress level is lowered.. many of these incidents are caused by fear or perceived threat
- The offending dog should be removed from the scene, exchange information.
- This should be up to the two owners. Dogs that sometimes bite other dogs are provoked in wrong ways, that's in their nature especially males to males. These things just happen sometimes between dogs. If a dog(of any breed or size) runs up and aggressively attacks another human absolutely unprovoked, yes I think enforcement officers should look into the owner/why the dog acted this way(Dont always believe the attack was unprovoked). Give the dog a chance
- only in severe cases should an enforcement office be need. Exchange of information between parties should be require for medical and vet bills etc.
- exchange information like rational citizens
- "Support mandatory exchange of information but do not support prolonged exposure of victim to offending dog."
- I believe that there are 2 sides to a story and need to be discussed. However if an animal is feeling threatened and made to be kept at the scene there is potential for further disturbances. Legit contact information must be left though.
- While there are problematic owners who don't properly train their animals, there are also many members of the public who behave inappropriately and incite dogs to defend themselves.



- "I would support this if it went into more detail. Not all dog ""bites"" require this level of care, because some people can't identify a dog bit properly.
- E.g. I've seen children have their finger go into a dog's mouth and yell that the dog ""bit"" them. To which their parents respond outraged, when in reality, the dog did absolutely nothing.
- I fear this will only increase the ridiculous notion that people seem to have against bully breeds as well. People can't be trusted, and those who are in favour of BSL will only throw this completely out of proportion, as they already do."
- So if a dog is only 5 lbs like a chihuahua you should hold them to same standards regardless of breed!!
- The OWNERS, the RESPONSIBLE ADULTS, should be required to provide information and talk to enforcement officers if necessary. The animals should be given a safe and comfortable place to calm down after an incident.
- I think they should be required to exchange information with the other pet's owner or human who was bit.
- Depends on the severity of the bite and the ability of bylaw officers to attend the scene.
- enforcement can take far too long to respond to incidents. The owner should just need to leave contact info for the enforcement officer to follow up with
- As long as they exchange information that should be good.
- As long as he/she has given information to the victim, they should be free to go. I'm sure at times an enforcement officer will not be able to get to the incident in a timely manner.
- As long as both parties have exchanged info, follow ups can be done elsewhere
- Contact information should be shared and followed up on.
- The term "bites" needs to be defined.
- I used to believe that was the right thing to do until my dog had been attacked on 3 separate occasions and he defended himself. Because he was the larger animal and resembled (but is not!) a pitbull, he was blamed every time and he was the one with the injuries and the blood while the other animal was unscathed. He would hold them down by their collar. It is most often the small dogs who do the most damage to other dogs and situations at a dog park escalate quickly with people butting in when they don't even know what has happened. My vet advised me that when you enter a dog park it is buyer beware and you better have your wits about you so if you don't want the risk of injury, don't go to the park. My dog was attacked and infected out of the blue - just walking - by a homeless girl's dog on 17th ave. and it got severely infected! The city did nothing and she was known to people. and my dog who has never hurt anyone, is loved the city over and known to many, many people as a loving gentle soul- should be muzzled because he resembles a pitbull? or could be labeled a nuisance because he defends himself? How is that remotely reasonable or fair.



- Once contact information is shared, the owner should be free to remove their animal from the scene, so every one involved can get the attention of vets/drs asap. This would also help to calm the animal(s) hopefully de-escalating the situation.
- It's best to remove everyone from the stressful situation as long as the owner provides contact information and dog licence info to the other party.
- Contact information should be given but if the dog was in a bad enough State to bite, they shouldn't be forced to stay in that environment
- For human bite yes for biting another dog no as cumbersome and can happen often
- It is hard to enforce. Particularly when the owner is often not near their dog when the incident happens (and just call their dog away). If the victim or victim dog's owner is dealing with an injury, they wouldn't be able to run over to the owner to get them to stop.
- I should only have to stick around if there is a dog fight and the other animal has been hurt badly. Depends on the situation. Dogs sometime bites other dogs, even in play and draw blood.
- Some situations may require the owner to remove the dog from the incident site to prevent further incidents. By requiring the owner to stay, there is a likelihood in some situations for the owner to be able to remove the dog. However i do believe contact information should be shared
- I believe the owner should deal with their dog either bringing it to their house or other secure location first to calm down.
- Need to remove dog from situation to ensure no future incidents occur
- At the end of the day the owner is the communicator during incidents, the dog does not need to be present.
- Because if a Pitbull bites it'll instantly be deemed a Vicious aggressive blood thirsty animal and put down. But if fluffy the inbred, over weight untrained Labrador Retriever bites it's going to just be deemed out of character and allowed to carry on with its neglectful and incompetent owner.
- Was cell phones most of the incident can be documented as 98% of the public carries a phone
- They should have to give their phone number and plan to return to the scene, but should be able to remove their dog if they think keeping it there creates more risk.
- To avoid further potential stress (to all party members involved), I believe an exchange of information is adequate to start an investigation process. While it seems that cases of individuals giving false information and leaving the scene seem to happen on a regular basis, those same individuals are still going to leave the scene and or give false information.
- The dog and it's owner should be allowed to return to their place of residence to prevent any further trauma or potential issues that may arise if they remained at the scene. In fairness, this would require some good faith in both of the parties involved to share accurate and truthful information.
- It would be more beneficial to the offending dog and all those involved to promptly remove the offending dog from a high stress environment.
- No
- Having a rule to contact 311 with the information. This way the dogs and people are not waiting in same area. Its like a cooling off period.



- It can be very stressful and place them in a poor position leave contact information and follow up too many other factors to consider having them wait
- Owners or people should be able to exchange info on their own. We don't need police involved unless someone doesn't follow that order. Comparable to a hit and run.
- Provide contact information, yes - but remain at the scene may not be necessary.
- I think there would need to be a stronger definition of the types of injury the person/animal sustained from the bite. A dog could bite another dog out of play and the owner could be dramatic and then the dog and it's owner could be in trouble for nothing.
- It's up to the parties to decide if officer is needed. If skin wasn't broken and the person did something stupid like invading a dog's space and realizes it then that's up to the parties
- If the owner needs to remove their dog, then they would need to leave the scene. If the dog must be removed to avoid further escalation, it is not reasonable to ask the owner to stay on the scene.
- Not always does it makes sense. My dog bite another dog and it was minor. I gave my number and paid the vet bill. It would have been over blown to have an officer there. Common sense needs to prevail.
- There should be a "maybe" option. I worry that this type of rule could be used against responsible dog owners.
- They should be given the opportunity to prevent further injury in the event that they cannot control the animal. This should be the only exception made to staying until the authorities arrive. Information should be exchanged though.
- There are varying degrees of a bite. More hysteria, better chance for hostile interaction
- It is not the dog owners responsibility to have to explain why their dog was pushed to the limit of biting another person or animal. People should respect that not all dogs want to be pet and played with by people or other dogs and should ask permission therefore reducing the risk of a dog biting another animal or person.
- I feel that it would be in the best interests of all parties for the dog owner to provide reliable contact information and immediately remove the offending dog. Talks with enforcement can happen when/where the dog is calmer and more secure.
- I have a pitbull and I am sickened by the judgement these dogs face based on their breed alone. The people who believe these animals are more dangerous than any other dog are uneducated. Despite the studies that have been completed, there is no scientific evidence to support that Pit Bull -type dogs are more dangerous than any other. To introduce any rules regarding this is to perpetuate the stigma. My pittie has never bitten any dog, but she has been bitten. We would NEVER stay at the scene for fear that we would get the blame based on her breed alone. Bad idea.
- A dog bite event is just as scary and traumatic for the owner of the offending dog as the victim. A 24h time window to self-report should be implemented. Cause of the dog bite is sometimes due to the actions of the victim (i.e. a dog starts a fight and the other bites). Furthermore, having a dog who is in a high-stress state following a bite stay at the scene is not given an opportunity to decompress.
- That's tough. There may be better to have the dog go home and discuss there.
- If there is a dog-dog incident, why does the owner need to stay at the scene vs seeking help?



- If a dog bites, the owner should remove the offending dog and secure it. Then they should return to the scene, but only after leaving their address to witnesses so we know where the owner lives if they do not return. Failure to return should result in higher fines.
- The person may be on a schedule for work. It may take a long time for enforcement to get there.
- Bites is ambiguous. and can be part of normal dog behavior. I could be support for a rule regarding remaining at the scene if an owners down INJURES another animal. I don't see the point of remaining at the scene if a dog isn't injured.
- It would be better to share the information with the other person involved so that the dog owner can remove the dog from a stressful situation if needed
- if injuries occurred, it should be expected that the nuisance dog's owner exchanges information with the other party. they should be under no obligation to wait for an enforcement officer.
- Having had experiences with people being extremely aggressive towards me and my dog (just because they do not like dogs) this may result in more problems as aggressive "victims" can escalate situations that a dog did not want to be a part of in the first place.
- As long as it isn't a severe bite then they shouldn't have to wait for an enforcement officer but information should always be exchanged.
- Owner could provide information, but law enforcement is not always the fastest to arrive
- Some dogs are agitated and act defensively. This should always be looked after by the owner but sometimes accidents happen. If no damage is done and everyone is fine with the situation the dog should be taken home immediately and the owner can reflect on the situation. If the situation is more serve than police intervention can be useful.
- The dogs may require medical care and it is best to exchange info and leave to de-escalate the situation.
- Too bad. Go get a bandaid. [removed] Laws won't apply to me. Ever.
- It depends on the definition of bite. A small bite between dogs that get in a scuffle shouldnt fall under this however a dog biting a person needs to.
- Unenforceable. People run off too quickly already.
- not necessary, contact information can be provided and then parties can go home or get medical care.
- No as it would really depend on the situation, in some cases the person and or animal you are dealing with could be putting you and your pet in more danger by sticking around waiting to speak with an enforcement office. Although exchanging contact information should be a recommendation as you want to be able to resolve this in the best possible way.
- This doesn't seem like an issue law enforcement needs to be involved with
- It can take up to couple hours for an officer to arrive. I think a phone call would be fine.
- during the time of the incident, emotions and anxiety are at an all time high. The owner of the animal should be allowed to go home to compose themselves and the nuisance pet before speaking to an enforcement officer.
- This would be difficult to enforce and potentially dangerous since the owner would be forced to keep their pet in a high-stress situation, rather than removing the dog from the scene and allowing it calm



down (i.e. by taking it home). Of course everyone would ideally stay at the scene of the incident but requiring this opens up criminalization of people who try to deescalate the situation by getting their dog back inside (e.g., if a dog got loose from a yard then bit someone, wouldn't you want the person to get that dog secured instead of trying to hold it at the scene while owner waits for police?)

- Again, always caused by human error not the animal!
- With the exception that if there was an injury to the person or animal then they should be required to stay at the scene. A small scuffle between dogs with no injuries is going to happen from time to time and shouldn't require enforcement officers.
- Could increase the danger. Victim should be able to get info and report immediately.
- This should be up to the dog owners not a bylaw or city employee. Pitbulls are no more aggressive than other breeds. It is irresponsible owners who are to blame. Stricter rules and screening to own a pet.
- When you say "dog" what you mean is Pitbull, therefore I disagree #dontbullymybreed
- I do not believe every incident requires this approach, it is simple minded and insinuates the dogs guilt with no consideration to the situation the rendered the incident in question
- People should exchange contact info immediately but the dog should be taken home quickly rather than continue to be traumatized and triggered by the environment. Violent behaviour could persist if the animal has to remain at the scene while waiting for an enforcement officer.
- Matters can be handled 1:1
- They might need to be doing other things.
- Maybe it be best if the situation was dealt with later in a safe environment
- Only if a dog bites a person unprovoked, or has severely attacked another dog. Causes a vet trip
- Seems ripe for abuse.
- How are you supposed to remove the dog from the scene and keep other safe if you have to stay at the scene
- Owner would still have aggressive or prey driven dog at scene which could lead to more damage or injury.
- Depends on severity, and the context of the situation.
- Of course if the dog bites a person but what if the two dogs get into a tussle as dogs sometimes do I don't think so what or how do you gauge what a dog on dog bite is as I have seen many owners think it was a fight to the death when it was nothing more than lots of growling and barking
- Don't waste more tax payers money making silly laws and bylaws
- The owner of that dog may not be able to stay there while they calm their own dog or seek medical attention for their own dog. In most cases the owner should wait to speak with EOS but not always
- For all you know the other animal or human could've been aggressive towards your dog.
- Removing the dogs from a high stress situation is of higher importance, they don't know what's going on.
- Because I think the owner needs to deal with their pet first. Calm them down and get them into familiar territory (ie. home) or for treatment (veterinary practice).



- I think contact information should be obtained and can be followed up with but requiring an agitated animal and upset owner to remain at the scene seems indignant.
- I believe that exchanging contact information between all parties would be the ideal. If either parties are not concerned about the dogs fighting, there shouldn't be a bylaw that requires the humans stay to talk to an officer. Also, dog owners may not always be present during an incident. Some owners enlist the help of dog walkers and dog sitters.
- So long as the owner provides necessary contact information, reports should be made whenever most convenient instead of necessarily immediately, which may require a long wait
- The dog is only as good as it's owner, it's owner should remain at the scene. A lack of proper training is the fault of the owner not the dog.
- Exchange information like at an accident scene and call it in
- It is an waste of enforcement time
- Dogs dont understand this. Its the humans responsibility. Get a number, get a dog ID # and deal with the situation one on one. Not both dogs still around each other. Who ckmes up with these questions? 75 year old grannies?
- "Dog walker might not be owner. Owner could give statement later by phone or on line. owner might be essential worker due on shift or parent needing to pick up child from school or nursery.
- Might be better to remove dog from situation or for owner leave an aggressive person when a dog bite incident is claimed (but disputed by owner)."
- I think it would be better to require them to exchange information quickly and remove the dog to the home. The situation is very traumatic and can be chaotic. Remove the dog from the situation and allow the victim some space.
- People need to control their animals period. Don't discriminate just one one or too dog breeds. [removed] Poodles are a close second. I'd ban shit tzu dogs instead. [removed] ankle biters is all they do
- Without enforcement it would never stand. And enforcement costs money so I am not open to having the city spend money at tax payers expenses. As well dogs tend to nip each other to tell them the rules, those that draw blood either were protecting their owner or felt that they were threatened in some way. For human interactions bites can be avoided through knowledge, many people dont know what to do when encountering a dog. I had an incident with my dog off leash where a child around 10 years old was scared of my dog and he was running away from my dog, my dog thought he was playing, I had to yell to the child to stop running, after that while his parents were present I had to inform the small child that if a dog comes up to you don't run because they will chase you thinking you are playing with them which can escalate quickly if the person becomes aggressive towards the dog (shouting, hitting, etc).
- Nobody reports small dog bites this would only further skew data suggesting bully breeds are more prone to biting which is nonsense
- The dog should be returned home and the owner should talk to an enforcement officer there.
- "You are not clear as to what ""if necessary"" means or what type of ""rule"" you are implying.



- Most altercations are of a minor nature: contact information should be required: enforcement officers take far too long to come and their presence raises the level of infraction."
- There are many variables to a dog that bites. Maybe, another dog provoked it (or a person) and the dog that is biting is in self-defense mode or protecting their owner. The owner should take the dog (that bites) home immediately.
- I think they should absolutely share contact information and be accountable, however, depending on the minor/or severity of the bite, talking with an enforcement officer feels unnecessary.
- when dogs play with each other it may look as though they are biting each other. How or who will have the non bias decision that the bite was or was not 'play'???
- Support mandatory exchange of information but do not support prolonged exposure of victim to offending dog.
- Remaining at the scene may cause additional incidents to escalate. The parties should leave all relevant contact information and move to a safer position.
- Not practical, depending on where the incident occurred (ie large off leash park like NoseHill you may never see an Enforcement Officer). We don't need additional rules / legislation on this. I don't see this as a practical solution. 99% of pet owners are responsible / understand their pet as well as others / In 20 years of daily walking with our pets, we've never even seen an incident outside of numerous Coyote attacks involving our or other dogs.
- No
- I would support it if there are injuries.
- If the dog needs to be taken home or inside or to the car, they should be able to do so for the safety of the dog and to diffuse the situation. Once information has been shared, they should be able to remove the dog from the situation.
- A dog has a mind of its own. All an owner can do is train and treat that dog right
- Most dogs bites occur when the person being bit has ignored all the warnings signs. Ie runner who can see if dog and dog owner is a little distressed and trying to correct or teach obedience decided to run past the dog and owner instead of reading the situation and taking an alternative route or giving space. Scares doge who bites then dog is in trouble not the person who already can see a situation and then without or with knowing escalates it. Each situation is different and requires more public education
- I'd like to answer yes but there may be circumstances where it is best to remove the animal or the person from the situation to prevent escalation. In an ideal world, the dog owner would remain at the scene to provide contact information, vaccination information, etc but making this an enforceable rule could be problematic. Also, how would enforcement be possible where an irresponsible dog owner simply leaves the scene?
- Depends.on the situation. Was I attacked by a man walking my dog and my dog attacked, and you now want me to sit with the man who attacked me and wait, it isnt going to happen.
- Situationally this could be understandable, but sometimes it's not safe to remain at the scene for either the dog or dog owner. Due diligence is all that is necessary.



- Just picture the owner standing there for a long period of time waiting for someone to show up. Their dog is angry and upset, the owner is angry and upset and so are all of the people around them who are aware of what happened. It's would make matters worse, not better
- It can be easily handled between two grown adults instead of getting police involved.
- There could be extenuating circumstances requiring the removal of said dog at the time.
- leave contact info, if its a violent dog it wouldn't be smart to keep it close.
- Exchange info just like a car accident. City bylaw and their response times are a joke 3 + hours
- Only if the injury sustained was severe should someone have to wait to exchange information.
- The dog is aggravated at this time and best to be away from the trigger that made it violent in the first place. Owner must take full responsibility and may come back to the scene after taking the dog home to it's safe place.
- Let the dogs be.
- Well yes and no, they dog might get aggressive again or something else might happen. The dog should go back home stay in a place or crate and the owner should go back to the scene and talk.
- The dog is obviously in a hot spot if they are reactive. Keeping the dog there could result in more incidents.
- I would think this is already required like a motor vehicle accident or assault. As such would be covered under fleeing the scene of a crime. We dont need more city bylaws that already overlap actual laws.
- If the situation is mutually resolved between both parties it is not worth the time of everyone to have to wait for an officer.
- While it is preferable to have the owner remain at the scene, there could be cases where remaining may escalate the encounter and removal from the scene would be the safer thing to do.
- Owners should exchange information similar to a vehicle accident. Where will the resources come from to attend an incident and what's a reasonable timeline to arrive?
- Not all bites are alike. Only serious bites should be included in this.
- People often misrepresent the situation regardless. If a bite is serious it must be treated by medical/veterinary services, not police
- A dog owner needs to be able to leave a situation that they deem unsafe, i.e. an irate bite victim attempts to hurt the dog or dog owner or becomes abusive and threatening after an incident. In addition, many dogs bite when afraid and unable to flee a situation, and should be quickly removed to a different environment.
- No, the dog should be taken away from the place where a bite occurred and the people should likely be separated too to help de-escalate the situation. Exchanging contact information is the only logical course of action.
- People do not currently stay at the scene. I don't think a bylaw will help it any
- It is up to the parties involved to determine the course of action. Allocate these resources elsewhere.
- Though it would be more expedient for dog owners to be required to remain on scene of a incident, dogs whether they are the victim or attacker whom are injured may need to be taken to the vet. Further emotions run high and the situation could escalate could escalate between the owner of the



dog who is the victim and the owner of the dog who is the attacker. As long as information is exchanged and the incident reported it promptly I don't think it should be required the dog owner to remain on scene.

- Dogs will often play-bite. No owner needs an over-righteous troublemaker insisting they do not leave a dog park after play-bites without injury.
- This is a traumatic experience for everyone and sometimes it's necessary to get the dogs separated and calmed and emergency care if needed, so standing around with a dog that's freaking out waiting for an officer is unhelpful to the situation. But people need to be responsible and provide contact info in a safe way.
- If the Bylaw officer was not an eye witness to the incident, there is no value in obtaining the information at the scene. It is a disturbing incident for which details can be gathered by a bylaw officer when visiting the people involved
- Law enforcement can take too long to get to the scene. Person should pass their information along and take the dog home where it is safe from any further issues
- Obtaining information can be done quickly and should not have to wait for law enforcement. Remove the animals and/or people involved to lessen the impact of the confrontation. Removal and treatment should always come first!
- I think the person needs to remove their dog from the scene.
- I would support a rule requiring both owners to cooperate to get veterinary help immediately in the case of a severe bite, and bylaw should be contacted. Dog owners should exchange information in the event of any moderate bite between dogs. Minor bites are a normal component of dog behaviour and are to be expected if you allow your dog to interact with others. Bites to a person where there is visible damage should require the exchange of information and the investigation by a bylaw officer.
- I think all dog bites are situational. Depends on the severity of the bite. I think being a responsible pet owner (no matter what the breed) should be in full control at all times of their animals. If the bite is severe enough then the proper authorities would already be involved.
- for severe bites and attacks yes.
- It would be horrifying to wait for a serious dog bite when one needs to get to the hospital. The two parties must be separated immediately.
- They may need to leave to remove the dog from the situation.
- If any living thing is involved in the incident needs medical attention(which they probably would) this would prohibit them from getting it in a speed manner
- it should be treated like a car accident. exchange information before they can leave the scene, and if they refuse have the police / bylaw officer attend the scene.
- Exchange contact info with other dog owner / person
- Most dogs only bite in defense of themselves or their owner. Prompt removal from the situation would probably be best to decrease stress on the animal. If there is a dog exhibiting severe behavioral problems, it might be better to investigate their owner, who would likely be the one teaching them these behaviors either actively or passively.



- Should expect the two party's to exchange info independently just The same as if in a fender bender.
- I dont believe in bylaws that arent possible to enforce. I think this is just considerate and courteous behaviour but if one of the dogs is in critical condition get to the vet asap and deal with the other shi(t later
- Dog owners must share contact information to all parties involved and contact local authorities to report the incident
- Respible people will exchange information and can makes reports after if required rather than use enforcement officers
- This would be situation dependent. For example, if a puppy is learning not to play bite or an inadvertent dog bite inflicts no harm, there is likely no need for further action. However, if an animal or person is hurt, it would be reasonable to expect the dog owners to share contact information and report the incident to an enforcement officer. However, I don't think it's realistic to expect people and pets to wait at the scene to speak with an enforcement officer as the officer might not be able to attend the scene quickly.
- Dogs bite when they feel threatened, if the victim provoked the attack then the owner shouldn't have to explain themselves.
- "There should be a requirement for contact information but staying at the scene is difficult for a number of reasons. The dog might be injured. The dog might be in distress. My dog was bitten by another dog that was off leash in an onleash area and I just wanted to get my dog way from the other dog and bylaw response isn't immediate.
- I would also be concerned if the owner/dog would be harassed if they remained at the scene. I would fully support requiring contact details and license number being exchanged or some type of middle ground but not sure what that would be."
- It depends on the situation. Some bites occur because people act inappropriately. I get a dog should not bite however, if they feel trapped and the person doesn't listen, the dog is acting in self-preservation. Example: I have seen adults physically pick up unknown dogs at the park and carry them, for no good reason ("I was just trying to be his friend"). The 2 times I have seen this happen, the dog didn't bite, but if it were fearful, how is this the dog's fault. A kid wouldn't be condemned if a stranger picked it up at the park because the adult was trying to be his friend.
- People are becoming increasingly violent and I would not stay around someone who is upset and may escalate. Its not always the right response so forcing it makes it a crime to leave if its not safe.
- I have seen human onlookers become a a mean pack after a dog incident. I have seen them shame and bully the owner of a dog that has behaved badly. Also, it is often best to remove a dog from the scene. (I am not the owner of a nuisance dog.)
- Leave this up to the pet owners. It is their responsibility in the particular situation.
- I would hope a dog owner would do this regardless of a bylaw. However, I don't think a bylaw is necessary unless there has been a high number of people not doing so in these incidences.
- It depends on the extent of the injury and how long it takes enforcement to arrive



- Owner must exchange information. It's probably in nobody's best interest to prolong the stress and victimization of the attack in the moment.
- If the owner is alone he or she' need to get there dog away from a stressfully situation. A rule to share correct information should be in place. A quick exchange of phone numbers and name should be done at the scene and followed up at the people's home after.
- If information is exchanged the dog owner can be contacted by enforcement
- Owner should only have to remain if the individual/owner of the animal who has been bitten asks them to. Sometimes bites can be a form of playing and are not intended to hurt, in this case it would be frustrating to have to share contact information with another person.
- I don't believe these measures are necessary
- I think the owners should exchange info.. if owner with dog who bit leaves, the police should be called
- While owners should ensure information is provided/self reported if necessary, remaining on scene with a reactive dog will perpetuate the issue and cause additional stress and possible harm to all animals and humans. If able to remove animal and return quickly when animal is safely removed that should be done.
- Unlikely officer would be available in reasonable time. Better to have requirement to provide all info to attacked animals owner. Needs to be significant penalty for failure to do so. (Similar to drivers in fender bender.)
- In some situations I could see needing to get a dog out of the situation (either to deescalate or to seek medical attention). I could support it if there were caveats in place to make safety a priority, but I do think dog owners need to be held accountable.
- Only if the dog bite was serious enough for the person to require medical treatment
- I believe that the welfare of the public and animal come first so you can talk to me at the hospital or vet clinic .
- as long as contact information is shared, name,phone number and address are shared, dog owner does not need to stay at the scene. statements can be obtained later
- Case by case base. Law enforcement can find people it's there job.
- If a dog has bitten then people are panicking and upset which can upset the dog further and could cause the situation to escalate. I feel the owner should be allowed to secure the animal and then return to speak with enforcement
- That is not always possible. Securing the dog and removing it from the scene is necessary. They do need to be contacted.
- If the dog has just bitten person or animal the best thing to do is take the dog home and therefore the owner with them. They should however provide their information to the person or owner of the animal that has been bit.
- I've seen numerous times owners have walked off with there pet after an attack
- Dogs need to be separated and the enforcers need to be aware of both sides.
- People won't follow this rule anyway. It's hard to prove these kinds of cases. This could lead to people having more heated arguments while they wait for an enforcement officer.



- I want to say yes as I think it is important for both sides of the issue to be heard by the officer, but also have concerns about the safety of the dog owner if the person bitten or someone who was with them becomes aggressive. I've had a couple of nasty incidents in the dog park that did not involve biting where I was concerned for my own safety (and one where we ended up calling the police). Speaking with other dog owners that situation is fairly common, so have to balance safety concerns with accountability.
- Every incident is deferent.
- Most dog bites happen because of the lack of knowledge and understanding of dog behaviour. Why should a dog owner be held accountable for someone else's mistakes.
- If a bite has occurred, the owner and animal need to leave the situation I order to de-escalate.
- This would be stressful for all involved, including the victim. It would be better to exchange info and have both parties talk to an enforcement officer separately.
- I do believe it should be a requirement for all to give information and treated like a minor traffic accident. In some cases, people need to get animals to help, or in a minor case, have to get to work.
- I do and don't. Bystanders could get involved and escalate the situation on either side. I've seen it happen and it isn't pleasant. I support information being given, but not while bystanders are present in any way. And bystanders should be forced to delete any video once obtained by police (if required)
- I dont think the answer is black or white. If my dog is attacked by another dog, fights back and is injured, I will need to care for my dog eg: take it to the vet. As long as I leave my name and contact information with the other owner, I should not have to remain "at the scene".
- "I would hope that information would be exchanged immediately if it is safe to do so. In the case of animal to animal confrontation, it is often more prudent to remove them to a safe distance to regain control. This could mean taking the animal home to a safe enclosure/familiar surroundings to calm down. In this case, I would suggest self-reporting.
- How fast could an enforcement officer arrive on scene?"
- A responsible owner would make sure if their dog bite someone is looked after.
- i would agree to remain at the accident site generally unless the animal is so problematic resulting with the owner taking the animal home - obtain contact information. safety for others in the area should be considered rather than waiting for an officer to arrive.
- It really depends on the severity of the bite and if it caused any actual damage.
- It may not always be practical, safe, or wanted by emergency services for an aggressive dog to remain on scene. An escalation of tension may occur if the owner and the dog remain on the scene when police arrive. It may be best to be sure that information is exchanged or left and the issue was dealt with in a more controlled environment.
- If pets or people need medical attention then they need to get it. The person should have to leave their name etc. like in a car accident, but having people stay behind could increase tensions and reduce safety
- If there has been an incident, it would not be ideal to keep the dogs / people at the scene as leaving the scene may be the only way to diminish / end the incident. Also, medical attention may be needed



for either dog or person. I would like to say that the dog owner must remain to provide contact information and talk with enforcement officer but realistically I don't see how this would be safe in many cases. There should be some obligation that they cannot flee the scene with no responsibility but I can't see what the alternative is. Must exchange phone number or address? My dog was attacked by a dog but I didn't stick around! It was too dangerous. I don't think the owner was even around. I couldn't see anyone.

- If your dog is scared or angry you have to take the dog out of the situation
- My dog (shiba) nipped a small child who hugged him and the best solution (as my dog was agitated and upset as he knew he shouldn't do it) was to remove him from the situation as quickly as possible to avoid anything else happening. The other person already had my contact info
- It may not always be safe to do so.... they must leave their contact info.
- It is idiotic to keep an animal who is stressed out and misbehaving in the same location where they misbehaved and expect a different result. Take the dog home and meet with officials there.
- I just think this should be handled by vets and people trained to work with dogs not the police who will likely do more harm than good.
- I believe that most people are able to come to a solution without involving the law. It would vary from situation to situation.
- No
- I think bad dog behaviour comes from the owners training. If the dog is trained well he/she won't attack.
- Simple dogs usually bite because someone is threatening or causing stress to the owner or the dog itself or other dogs and if the dog bites out of instinct that is because of the area they lived in like for example a dog living in a more aggressive area would be more likely to bite rather than one raised in a nursery thus it is the one getting bitten's fault not the animal
- If the dog is likely to stay vicious while in the situation, there could be additional victims if the owner can't control the dog. However there should be some way to verify the owner's identity prior to them leaving (e. g. a bystander takes picture of driver's license)
- It is far more important that the dog owner assist the person bitten if they need medical aid than to remain waiting for a bylaw officer to eventually arrive on scene
- It is dangerous to remain in the same situation that caused a dog to feel the need to bite. All parties are at risk.
- If an animal bites someone it is clearly stressed or scared. The animal should be taken by the owner somewhere safe that it feels comfortable(ex. A car or home), then the owner should go back to the scene and discuss.
- Dogs often feel the emotions of those around them. Keeping a dog in a high stress situation would be inviting more attacks.
- Depends on severity
- Less rules, less government



- How do you force someone to remain at the scene or even provide their contact information? How long would it take an enforcement officer to arrive? Aggressive (and all bully) dogs should be muzzled in public to prevent these situations in the first place.
- It is best to remove the dog from the situation. Also one of the dogs if injured may require immediate medical attention
- If the owner arrived by car, place the dog into the car. But if the owner and dog walked to the place where the incident took place, provide the address or location in which the dog will be. Take photos of both animals before leaving. Provide phone numbers to be reached at. The reason so that the dog in question wont get spooked and lash out again, or get loose and potentially get hurt or hurt another animal or person.
- Someone other than a police officer should come. Maybe a nurse to assess the bite, and the victim and dog owner can exchange information on their own.
- This is just getting ridiculous. Before Calgarians know it no-one will be allowed to step out their door without permission or some kind of permit. Stop with this insanity.
- If a dog is worked up and aggressive, sometimes the best thing to do is provide distance and break sight lines. I don't think the dog and owner should be required to stay at the scene for everyone's health and safety. Staying within an area for contact or a way to report 'this was my dog' and 'im at /this location/ now' would be okay.
- It may be necessary for the owner to leave to secure the dog and prevent further harm.
- Often the owner staying means the dog staying which could mean more bites. Especially with higher tension.
- If contact information has been provided, then enforcement officer has method to get in touch with people. But what happens if the person runs off before that happens?
- Get a reporting system in place first. They should have to exchange details only. Work with AHS on reporting bites that break the skin. Get a history record started on actual offending dogs. Microchip etc.
- Self defense, if the owner is in distress or being assaulted, then i dont think they should stay at the scene where it's unsafe.
- So your telling me that dog owners should [removed] sit by at the scene of an incident. Because oh their dog but someone. Oh no The world is gonna explode. No the [removed] it isn't. You stupid pieces of [removed].
- Why are you being such crybabies over a dog bite? Maybe take a second to consider why dogs are lashing out and do something from there instead of taking away and killing pets because they hurt you and you're too much of a little piss baby to deal with it properly.
- No because I think you don't I I I think you don't need to give information but I still think you have to wait till medical professionals are there
- Dog could be protecting owner
- Dog
- Why? I shouldnt need to explain why all dogs should be treated equally and not abused
- Why even its really how yhe dog gets trained sometimes its not the current owners fault



- The dog owner should be mandated to hand their information to any victims of the attack so that enforcement officers can contact them, and remove the dog from the public somewhere where it can cause no further incidents until officers arrive:
- At times with the emotions, and risk of retaliation it can be safer to remove the dog, that means the owner as well. Leaving a means of contact, or making contact afterwards obviously needs to be done.
- Off leash dogs occasionally fight. In this case its hard to assign blame. If dogs are on leash and a fight breaks out the owners are responsible for what happens.
- this is not necessary. Again, put things in context. If a dog on leash bites an aggressive dog that runs up unleashed then nothing needs to be discussed.
- I think it would be stressful for the dog and its owner to remain at the scene everyone just wants to leave in an incident like that happens I think with her should be is a duty to report within 24 hours answers to a required set of questions: date time place of incident other name dog name.
- It really depends if the bite is a nip or a severe altercation & bites but I think in general the people on hand should solve the problem ... and if it is a major problem then it should be reported.
- Depending on the severity of the bite. If severe, then yes call an officer if possible.
- they should simply have to share their information with the victim/owner
- It would be an incredible drain for enforcement officers, law enforcement, or even animal services to attend EVERY incident (assuming they happen at all). Instead, let us do what we normally do, what majority of responsible pet owners do, which is to stay anyway. But please do keep in mind that not every bite (or nip) is an act of aggression. It could be a mistimed grab at a frisbee etc. Leave it up to the owners to decide if it is severe (like get the dog to the vet immediately severe) vs accidental, minor, or even non-aggressive. Mandating that everyone needs to report and stay is an incredible waste of time, taxpayer dollars, and can blow up incidents that are often completely resolved in mere minutes wherein the dogs are off playing together again.
- I support a rule saying that owners involved in a dog bite should give their information so that follow up can be done. I don't think it's reasonable to expect people to stay on scene, as, depending on the severity of the bite, it may be necessary to seek immediate medical or vet attention.
- The owner should be required to provide contact info however their priority should be to contain / control their animal, then report back to the scene or to bylaw enforcement.
- Keeping an owner AND a dog that had just done harm around is risky. Better that a quick picture if the dog and owner and if possible dog tag and everyone go seperate ways. Emotions and further interactions need to be min. If the dog owner leaves without exchanging information then it should be same as Hit and Run in a car
- No, but there should be a requirement to share contact information with other parties to the incident.
- If an owner of a dog that has bitten has to remain on scene, won't that mean that the bitten person/animal also has to remain to ensure details are accurately given to an enforcement officer? Wouldn't delaying any needed medical attention be unwise and add unnecessary stress to the situations?



- By staying at the scene, the animals get increasingly defensive. Its better for them to dis engage and the only way to do that is to walk away. They should definitely exchange contacts.
- It is a bit difficult to do this. For example it can take a long time to contact a bylaw officer if you don't have your cell phone with you and the incident takes place on one of the city pathways of offleash parks. There could be a system (like in auto accidents) where the owner of the offending dog gives contact info to the injured party but how can anyone know if that person is giving true information?
- Leaving contact information would be best so they can get the dog home and away from more potential issues
- Not all bites are severe or intentional. Some don't even cause damage. What a waste of taxpayer time and what a loss if we aren't trusted to be the responsible pet owners 99 percent of are.
- Keeping the owner there at the immediate scene of such a traumatic incident would likely lead to more escalation. I worry about overreactions causing mishandling of this resource.
- Keeping the animal at the scene may cause greater distress.
- Sometimes it is better to remove the offending animal rather than remain in the immediate area. Both parties share responsibility to communicate. Often one dog owner asks another if their dog is OK and the other owner stomps off or refuses to answer. What is the first owner to do?
- Information should have to be shared with the other individual.
- Require contact information exchange. Keeping the owner and pet at the scene will heighten the tension and may lead to further incidents.
- I chose 'No' because having the dog owner remain at the scene would take unintended time from the owner that they probably don't have. I think a dog tracking system would be more convenient on both sides
- There are no safeguards to protect dog owners or their pets from exaggerated or bias towards specific breed claims/complaints. Dogs use their mouths to express themselves, they will naturally fall out sometimes with other dogs who invade their immediate space too excitedly or too confidently. It's a dog's way to use their mouths whether it's to growl, bark, lick or bite. It's too ridiculous that dogs are categorized as dangerous just because some dogs are trained by stupid people to be aggressive. How would you like to be muzzled just because a small minority of people behave aggressively? Why do that to dogs. Pitt bulls etc can be so loving absolutely child friendly but you go on about them like they were all aggressive because you are bias. Why don't we for example restrict how big people can socialize in the outside world, because they have the potential to do far more damage than a slight built person when/if they lose the plot? The reason is because it would be downright unreasonable but you are doing exactly this to animals. Muzzling a dog takes away their quality of life - that is cruelty
- I believe similar to any other incident or accident the owners should be mandated to supply each other with contact information and/or exchange licenses.
- I think providing contact info is important, but often the best thing to do is get the dog out of the situation as this is usually triggered by fear /'d remaining on scene may worsen things.



- "I could support it in the first scenario (dog biting a person), only if the person was bitten for no apparent reason. For example, if my wife is attacked and my dog bites the attacker to defend her, I don't see why she should be liable for that bite.
- For the second scenario, dogs are not people. They communicate and interact with other dogs in very different ways than we do. Unable or untrained to recognize those ways, I see too many people just calling for imaginary bites that actually never happened. Often in dog language, what looks like a bite to the human eye is in fact normal administration, a way to say ""give me some space"". It all comes down to owners education and, consequently, dogs education and socialization.
- On the other hand, if a dog bites for no apparent reason, the owner should face the consequences, not the dog. The owner should be required to undergo a rehabilitation program to address the aggressive behaviour showed by his/her dog."
- The only concern with staying at the scene is where they will put their dog during this time. The dog could cause more harm by staying at the scene for officers to show up.
- Should be applied to EVERY dog bite if this becomes a rule/law. This rule is too vague. Would the bite need to be severe enough that medical attention is required?
- If a dog is aggressive towards some one or something you want to remove them from the situation. Not wait for 40 minute for an enforcement officer to come by. You should have to share your contact info though.
- "We do not yet have an effective reporting system to support this. There are missing steps here. Who are they waiting for? Info exchange yes but keeping all parties of a high stress situation together is a recipe for disaster.
- Can AHS work with the city on reporting dog bites that break the skin and treated at a medical facility?
- We need a better tracking system a dog's history us often lost. Dogs are rehomed fir biting but the new adopters are not made aware.
- We got a dog from a private rehoming told the couple were too busy for the dog. The truth came out later and reading deep in his vet file that he was exhibiting aggression. This was not made clear at time of adoption. Once we experienced his aggression and learned his true history we were able to have him retrained and address his issues. He did respond well and became a valued well adjusted pet. In many cases he would have been rehomed again and if left unaddressed become a nuisance dog. By the way he was a Puggle likely from a puppy mill and bought by the original owners from a pet store. Had we not bedn his next owners he may have continued the rehome cucle to



unsuspecting new owners with potential of growing aggression and danger to public safety. More accountability is needed on reporting dog bites and liabilities.

- Our dog before the Puggle was a Rotweiler adopted from Calgary Animal Services. The Rotweiler was a suck a gentle giant. We had him privately assessed by a dog behaviourist to confirm his temperament. She gave 3 out of 10 for ability yo be aggressive. The Puggle the dominant pup with the higher potential for aggression. As responsible owners both dogs went through professional training. Both dogs responded to different training methods due personalities. Breed does not pre-determine aggression each dog is an individual and needs to be raised responsibly. Perhaps rewarding through discounted fees and training for all dog owners, regardless of breed for taking their dog through accredited professional training."
- Why would the dog bite rationally or just out of nowhere
- If there is a bite or an accident there should be contact information traded and be on your way. If you scratch someone's car, leave a note or wait till they return so you can give them your contact info. Don't call the police, fire, an ambulance and your grandmother to come over and cane you. Deal with it so there is less stress on the system.
- It is a matter that should be discussed between the parties involved. Involving enforcement should be determined by the individuals.
- Gotta get the kids from school, get to a job interview, doctors appointment. People walk their dogs when they have a convenient time in the day. Most are too busy to wait for an officer for a minor bite. If flesh is torn from the bone, then absolutely, the dog owner must stay to cooperate.
- There may be delays in an enforcement officer's arrival and/or a reason why an owner must be on their way.
- I think it should be handled like a traffic accident. People trade information and take pictures of any injuries, the dogs, etc. They then call in the incident. If it is serious, then bylaw should investigate. The giving of tracking information should be required --- dog license number and owners name and number.
- EVERY DOG/ANIMAL has it in them to bite. I used to have two chihuahuas that bit people and bit very hard to make one bleed, do not let size fool you. I now have two American pitbull terriers that are brothers and are the sweetest and most gentle boys.
- Not all bites or even percieved bites require law enforcement and can be resolved between two owners. (time money and officers at a time when government funding is cut or reduced and officers have more significant calls)
- If the person bit agrees to part ways then it's been resolved and parties can leave.
- If the dog is aggressive it should be taken home after contact information is given to the victim
- Information should be shared between owners. If necessary an enforcement officer may need to be involved.



- This bylaw would escalate many altercations that do not need to be escalated at all. How many times do we have severe dog attacks a year? And how often can the offending dog and owner not be found? Let's not make bylaws just because we can.
- I would hope responsible people would do this. I disagree because who determines the severity of bite requiring someone to stay? For every dog squabble in a park is bylaw to be called?
- If the two parties are in agreement that the dogs were not harmed and it was just play then no. If this is an attack then yes they obviously should stay.
- I support this of course if there is a significant injur from the bite. But this would unfortunately be interpreted to apply to dogs playing with each other, or puppies mouthing which is normal puppy behaviour. I do not support this initiative. We do not need more bylaws in this city, we need fewer bylaws.
- I believe there should be a rule that contact information must be shared; however, I don't think keeping the dog/dog owner in the vicinity of the incident is practical - often the best way to settle the situation is to get the pet out of the situation asap.
- Sometimes it is safer for all to have the owner remove the dog from the scene but it is important to get contact info -not know how this can be done.
- I agree with the premise of sharing contact information but having an enforcement officer present seems like an AWFUL idea. Why would you put someone with a gun in a situation where a dog has potential to be aggressive? I would change my answer if another solution were to be found in that regard.
- However, the dog owner must exchange contact info with the person bitten, as with car accidents.
- Yes and no. If the dog is visibly agitated, he/she should remove the dog from the situation ASAP before more injury is incurred. Leave name and number? Owner of dog should call police and report their own dogs as well? A lot of it depends on the severity of the bite(s) as well. Serious injury should require owner to remain present.
- The dog should be removed from the scene to be calmed down we have phones for a reason
- They should be required to report to authority within 6 hours of the incident or face additional fines, not remain on scene. Tensions will be high in a lot of cases where there is an attack. Exchange of information should be made between those parties, followup by officers does not need to be made immediately.
- It might take hours for enforcement officer to show up. However contact should be made within a time limit to bring all parties together. Our case in point, I suspect the officer would have made a different decision to lay the charge if he (they) had heard from both parties. There was no reasonable way the charge would have stuck and should not have been laid in the first place.
- If the injured party will not co-operate there is no way the owner can stay indefinitely at the scene. If the injured party will not comply and goes behind the owners back, the owner cannot be expected to stay at the scene indefinitely. The owner can only do what is lawful, expedient, kind, and considerate. The owner cannot second guess what the other person will do.
- You aren't specific regarding the bite including the severity. This wording is too subjective.



- Having been involved with a scary dog incident, I would have been more traumatized to have the dog stay on location, especially given the owner was unable to control the animal. If the enforcement office cannot arrive quickly, how long of a wait is reasonable in the dead of winter?
- If an animal bites a person or other animal I think the most important thing is to remove that animal from the scene. Forcing the dog owner to remain at the scene of an incident with their animal could escalate the situation. If there is more than one owner present, then one person could remove the animal and the other could remain to talk with an enforcement officer.
- Depending on the severity of the incident . MOs incidents will occur in an off leash scenario and ideally all off leash parks should be abolished . If cats have to remain on the property why should dogs be allowed off leash .
- In my experience, most dog owners are very good at exchanging information when there is any kind of altercation between dogs or dog & person. I like the idea of the rule, but believe it simply needs to state: In the event of any altercation, contact information MUST be shared.
- Dogs are going to bite, always.
- If it's severe, yes. But dogs get in to minor scraps on walks all the time, this is part of normal dog behavior and should not be considered serious.
- If it was a significant incident I would say Yes animal in distress and hurt but No for an insignificant incident small wound or nick . Animals can have have conflict owners need to take precautions using leashes and muzzles when needed.
- In theory this makes sense; however, it may not be the safest option. A dog that has already been provoked to the level of arousal that caused a bite may not be safe to remain on scene. I would rather see a person given the opportunity to safely remove the dog and return or report in within a specific time frame.
- If the dog bites a person yes, not if the dog bites another animal (the latter can be part of establishing pecking order or just playing)
- Having been attacked by a few dogs while out with my dogs and child if a dog has already attacked it's likely to attack again if left in the same situation. I would like for more education of all dog owners in general, not just breed specific. I don't think an agitated dog and owner waiting to talk with bylaw is going to improve the overall mood. Also, how long would it take for bylaw to arrive? What's a reasonable amount of time to wait. Why not just have owners exchange info like in a car accident and make separate reports.
- Not all cases make this safe for the animals or people involved to stay at the scene. Also, many incidences this is just not appropriate. Again each situation can be different. If my neighbors 3 year old slaps my three year old I am not calling the police for assault...same idea. If my old dog roles a puppy that jumps in her face, that is appropriate behavior for an old dog telling a young dog what behavior they will accept from the rude puppy an uneducated puppy owner could see this as aggressive or an attack...dog behavior does not equate to people behavior.....they are dogs and behave differently, I find people often miss that point unless they are educated in dog behavior.....we need to better educate dog owners.
- be responsible



- I feel like this would lead to a lot of he said - she said. There are many reasons why a dog bites and many times they are provoked and the "victim" side does not see it that way.
- I think they should at least provide contact information before leaving. In some cases it would be better for them to take the animal home and secure them to prevent further harm to all involved.
- if the dog is aggressive they must be removed from the scene. The owner must provide info.
- Some bites could be so minor that we would be tying up city resources if enforcement officers were required for every bite. This would lead to higher fees whether paid by pet owners or all Calgarians. I do think it is necessary for individuals to exchange information. We should be required to carry a pet ID with owners info on it at the very least.
- That could take hours
- I feel that contact information must be shared. I don't think it is feasible to have to wait for an enforcement officer.
- It depends on the severity of the bite but as long as contact information is shared, it would be best to get the offending animal away from the scene and possibly get the injured to medical attention.
- Yes - if the dog bites a person. However, dogs in off-leash parks often fight - it is in their nature when too much is happening around them or they feel threatened. It is different than if a dog attacks unprovoked. This bylaw is too broad.
- Getting the dog out of the stressful situation may help them calm and reduce chance for second bite. Owner should have to provide contact info to victim though
- Up to the owners and victims discretion.
- It may not be appropriate for the dog to remain on the scene after such an event, and the owner may also be flustered so giving contact information to someone else and leaving to take the animal home may be the best option in many scenarios.
- Enforcement Officers would be very busy
- I think I that can escalate an already tense situation. to diffuse trauma for all involved the dog owner should be required to return home and not leave until they have spoken with an enforcement officer
- Some stories are fabricated (doesn't claim the other dog was the aggressor.) resulting in more innocent animals especially "pitbull" breeds to be put down. When in reality it's the lab that started the fight.
- I am cautious of 'broad' based conditions.
- I am supportive of they bit a person, however a dog bite to a dog can be such a grey area (bite vs play or rough play). I would hope people are able to judge the severity and do what is right.
- The dogs should be removed from the situation
- People should do this already. It's called common decency. Here's an idea: piss off and leave people alone.
- I experience a lot of aggressive dogs as a child, usually the small breeds that go untrained do to laziness and the seemingly lacking threat. Dogs in my hometown were the communities pets, we knew their homes and their owners. My reaction would never be to put the dog down, make more time for your pets and this can be avoided.
- Requiring the owner to remain at the scene with a dog that is already riled up is asking for trouble.



- Bylaws are not to prevent due process and presumption of innocence.
- If there should be the unfortunate circumstance that a dog of any breed(not only pit bulls) happens to bite another dog or human we should be adult enough to discuss and exchange information. There are some incidents that are minor enough to not involve bylaw which would only affect the parties in a negative way. Of course in severe cases, bylaw is necessary. We are so fast to financially penalize people for everything rather than discuss and educate. The whole reason this Pitbull propaganda has made its way to Calgary now. ALL Breeds of dogs can bite, the same way all races of people can commit a crime but we don't rush to single out or ban a certain race of people that may show a history of committing crimes.
- This rule is too open ended, and enforcement officer response times are often hours long for low-priority incidents.
- The dog should be removed from that situation if it occurs. If an owner has to stay there it would be more difficult to control the dog.
- If there is an issue with a dog, the owner should be taking the dog off scene/home as quickly as possible. Clearly they are struggling to control the animal and should not be able airing anywhere publicly with it.
- Stop babysitting citizens
- The dog should be removed (brought home) from the scene to Remove any more danger
- You have give insufficient information to justify my support for more laws.
- They always blame the bully breeds it's never the "little dogs fault"
- if necessary being the critical term: my dog has been nipped by another, but no harm done, so what is necessary in that situation? My say-so? Doesn't seem fair to the other owner.
- Do not care if a dog bites another animal
- People do not tell the truth when it comes to things such as this. When a animal like a pit bull hurts another one it is always the pitbulls fault. So why should the owner stay on the scene to just get crucified.
- if the incident is serious enough to call ems, the people involved would be applying first aid. As a dog walker, I find smaller dogs a constant nuance, that doesn't mean I don't want people to own them. pit bulls are no different than any other dog, its all about how an animal is raised.
- It could be hours before an available officer arrives.
- But they should exchange information similar to what happens at a car accident (exchange name, phone number etc)
- You cannot enforce it. Make work project.
- To suggest this without describing the resulting penalty of failing to comply to remain at the scene has me left to disagree.
- Just req to share info and go sort it out later. Too much man power to enforce.
- dog attacks for a reasons, just like all of these karen's out there, expect all of these karen's attack for no reason! ban karen's, protect humans from karens
- Emotions are running too high Stay nearby and only talk to law enforcement.



- I would have to say no due to the fact that trying to get a hold of a bylaw officer to do there job [removed]
- Enforcement officers take too long to arrive.
- The owner probably needs to get the dog somewhere safe first. Making them stick around to talk with an officer doesn't make sense. Staying long enough to give contact info does.
- Because the last thing that people need is other people to come up and harass the individual who's dog has done damaged.
- As a rule that should be the standard practice. But if both parties agree the incident was not severe, they should be allowed to decide for themselves if it is necessary to call bylaw.
- Unless very serious injuries arise people should sort it out themselves.
- Its not fair to lump two different scenarios into one question. A dog biting dog vs dog biting human are two different scenarios. Separate them and i can give a more appropriate answer. Conflating the 2 means they are equal when they are not.
- If situation involved a serious injury I would expect people to share that info, vs situations arising from aggressive play styles
- I think society is quick to villainize a dog who has bitten, when rarely they bite for no reason. If our culture could shift to where the dog's best interests are prioritized then I could see myself changing to support something like this, but currently I think people use "reporting" as a threat/scare tactic and reactionary measure. I'd prefer an emphasis on proactive measures.
- This is too broad & not required in all situations.
- Assuming that an incident generally would happen outdoors, cold temperatures might prevent this enforcement from being realistic (or humane unless if there can be a prioritized and rapid response time). However, in the case of a bite, it should be mandatory that the dog's owner provide contact information to the person/dog owner that was bitten.
- If a dog has just bitten someone or another animal then the safest thing to do is to remove the dog from the scene immediately. Keeping the dog near the victim could potentially exacerbate the situation even further. For whatever reason or severity of the bite, the dog needs to be given physical space from the victim. For some dogs that may be a few feet, but others may need to be out of sight. Not to mention for the owner, their dog biting is an extremely stressful situation for them. Their heightened stress and emotions could further impact the dog's behaviour/reactions. There's also no way to predict how the victim may react. They could further incense the situation. I believe the safest action for everyone involved is for the owner to take their dog away from the scene and phone in the incident.
- Dogs get into fights. It's a normal thing. Unless it's a severe bite, this is an over reaction.
- Get both dogs away from the situation immediately
- Sharing of license information for a follow up should be mandatory and sufficient.
- Only if the doesnt have a collar with dog license number. The person should be allowed to see it and record it.
- I believe that after a dog bites a person or another animal it is best for the dog involved to be removed from the situation by the owner



- You guys are getting way to extreme.
 - The animal is already in fear mode. Staying at the scene may give someone a reason to attack the person.
 - The owner must get in control of the dog, whether putting it in the house or car. The owner should come back once the dog has been removed from the situation.
 - It may not be safe to do so. E.g. they may need to get the dog somewhere that he/she cannot cause further harm. It should be required that the dog owner share their contact info with those on scene.
 - What constitutes a "bite" could vary greatly. Rough play has been called biting by some.
 - Sometimes the owner may find it easier to get the dog home and it doesn't really help the situation to have people yelling at you. I do think they should have to provide their contact info before leaving the scene
 - I think these scenes can become quite heated and it may be best to have a reporting number/location. An officer can often take a very long time to respond. Exchange info like a MVC. What is a bite? I have seen many times where an uncontrolled dog pesters and challenges a controlled dog, who is forced to defend itself. And then the dog owner whose dog started the whole thing is upset that the other dog defended itself.
 - But they should be required to provide contact information to the other dog owner.
 - Generally yes, but in some situations this could lead to a more risk. I have been accosted numerous times by off-leash dogs while walking my (now deceased) dog on-leash on the streets, and it's often best for everyone to get distance. Additionally, enforcement resources seem to be scarce which often means long wait-times - even next day call-back - so waiting at the scene seems suboptimal for various reasons.
 - This is the same as saying a robber is required to stay at the scene of a crime until police arrive. Stupid. And what if the owner is not with the dog? More stupidity.
 - They should have to give contact info to the offended party.
 - It must be reported in very serious cases, otherwise settled between owners and witnesses and victim.
 - "Sometimes dogs play rough and sometimes owners of tiny dogs are the worst. Because the dog is small the owners don't see it as a risk and don't properly train it. Then it attacks my larger dog and the alpha will put the other dog in its place. I don't think one dog should severely hurt another but I also believe these poorly trained, ill-mannered little dogs cause a lot of problems for other dogs
-
- If dog bites a person - that is different and they should stay put"
 - It's too hard already for someone to stay at the scene. There's no additional way to endorse this.
 - A dog bites for a good reason... they're either protecting their human or protecting themselves
 - Depending on the severity of the bite. If two dogs playing and one nips another's ear, the two owners may decide to handle it on their own. This could be dealt with in a similar manner as car accidents where severity dictates the involvement of an officer on-scene.



- just swap information like car accident
- Someone could have been "asking for it". As in teasing, aggressive behavior to owner, lack of awareness. But this is obviously a "he said she said" ordeal. Some people may even be "out to get" pitbulls based of their emotions towards one, even escalating the situation by being over dramatic to induce more severity into the punishment. Because once the dog has inflicted damage onto , its hard for the owner to have any sort of defense because evidence against is clear. Unless witness.
- How can they remove the dog from the situation if they are forced to stay there?
- there is more than likely a necessary reason for that dog to be acting out, I also think the person who got bit should be in question. an animal does not act out or bite for no reason, there are just as many dangerous people if not more than there are dangerous dogs... please evaluate these ridiculous dumb questions. People who do not own dogs or are Unknowledgeable of these kinds of animals should avoid owning them and avoid approaching them like an idiot, it is purely common sense. A dog lets off many signs that it does not want to be bothered.
- May put the dog or owner in danger.
- Small dogs are involved with more bites than any other dog. If no damage is done why waste everyone's time.
- If it's a minor bite.
- Sometimes dogs bite in response to aggressive behavior by other dogs
- The owner should be required to provide contact information but it may be safer for everyone if the owner took the dog home right away.
- What is considered a bite? Dogs bite/nip each other sometimes at play. I am not against reporting and being responsible for vicious dog bites, however, this bylaw May be taken too far by uneducated dog owners who don't recognize dog play or by ignorant people in general.
- I do support the exchange of information, but I can see this being very difficult with two or more animals involved (especially two that just had an altercation). I think phone number and name should be shared (quickly) at a safe distance with follow-up individually from an enforcement officer (not at the scene). Pictures of IDs may also be helpful. This is similar to a fender bender way of approaching a situation.
- Having the owner remain with the dog while waiting for an officer may escalate the situation
- I think their contact information should be shared, however if a dog is acting that way it would be best to first remove the dog from the situation. They should be required to share their information for follow up.
- It is not always possible to remain at the scene of an incident nor is it always wise. Think about this for a moment....emotions are running high, niether the dog(s) or people may be in much control and sometimes it makes sense to get a little space in.
- As long as information is exchanged, so an officer can come later on to the dog owner's home to get additional information
- Responsible ownership means remaining at the scene of an attack if it is safe to do so. If things have escalated to the point where a dog has bitten a person or another dog it is probably prudent to



remove the dog from the area to avoid more bites or escalation of violence. I feel the rule should be that and owner should have to exchange information so that an officer can contact them later.

- If the human doesn't want to report it, then it is a none issue
- The officer can meet the owner at the owner's residence.
- I understand that, given such BSL, people may be afraid of having their dogs taken away or euthanized. By implementing such legislation, the City is actually making it less likely that owners would stick around to suffer the consequences. Further rules restricting the actions of pet owners will only seek to make thing worse, especially where specific breed are singled out. If this rule is implemented, then BSL cannot be - BSL only seeks to further stigmatize certain breeds.
- Incident implies far too much of a grey area - allows for far to much opinion of what an incident is. Before I'd support, a better definition needs to be considered.
- A rule/bylaw should not be required considering it can't be enforced. It should be common sense.
- "You have not been specific about the extent of the bite. Dogs bite one another in the dog park when playing. You are now leaving the extent of that bite open to interpretation - furthermore this could be a huge waste of police resources if they are required to attend everything that is deemed to be a bite.
- If a dog nips because it is scared but no damage is caused to the person or the other animal should an enforcement officer have to attend this situation.
- If a dog gets angry at another dog at the dog park and pins it but doesn't cause any damage should an enforcement officer have to attend this situation.
- If a dog bites the air and scares a person is this considered an issue.
- People do not need excessive legislation for how to operate in a civilized society. A dog owner knows when their dog is in the wrong - we do not need the police involved in every dog incident. Surely the Calgary police have better things to do with their time."
- You never know what the case is when a animal bites another etc. I think children should be kept beside their parents because they can treat animals poorly resulting in a nip. I think owners are responsible for their pets , of something happens , they should be left to decide amongst themselves how they will go about it. Discrimination towards pitbulls and breeds alike is the most popostrous law I've ever heard. ANY dog can create a dangerous scene , so I think its absolutely absurd to make them wear muzzles, or ban them from public parks. Come on calgary give your head a shake.
- Not all circumstances include the owner as a witness to the scenarios. As a witness to the animals general demeanor they are useful but only parties present are of any use when these situations occur.
- Provide contact information for follow up but no need to waste time remaining at site.
- Enforcement officers are not always available and the ones I have dealt with need training.
- "This seems awfully like someone did some brainstorming and forgot to do any analysis of second or third order effects.
- I'm not sure it is really all that sensible to have two animals that have bitten each other and their owners kept in the same location. Especially given that it is usually the case that aggressive animals are associated with aggressive owners.



- Nor would it be sensible to have owners hang around in extreme weather situations."
- The owner needs to be able to remove the dog from the situation and leave so it doesn't escalate, for the dogs sake and those around it.
- If the dog has bitten someone, they are a danger to others. Forcing the dog to stay at the scene only invites further incidents.
- While I agree that information should be exchanged, staying at the scene is not always practical and could make the situation worse or even escalate into a mob vs owner scenario.
- "While contact information should be exchanged. Remaining at a scene with heightened emotions (anger, stress, fear, etc...) Is not a good environment for any dog at the scene, especially if the owner of the biting dog needs to remove their pet from the situation.
- Also, people don't rationalize or think with a clear conscious in the heat of the moment, words and decisions may be said/made without thinking."
- Too easy to abuse - should strongly encourage rather than require
- Individual should be required to exchange info and ensure other party is safe, but staying at the scene in some cases may further agitate the issue and should be handled on a case by case basis. The severity of the bite may also be a factor.
- People should be doing this anyways! It's common sense and the right thing to do.
- Owner should remain providing offending dog can be removed by someone else
- "The pet may require medical attention the pets may not be able to be contained if people do not have car or home
- in proximity."
- They should have to speak to an enforcement officer but if their dog bit someone it is probably safer for the dog and public for it to be taken home
- There are not enough enforcement officers to respond in a timely manner. Not exchanging information with the dog bite victim should be an offence. This would allow the officer the time to interview each owner and arrive at a conclusion.
- Bylaw can take hours to arrive . If both parties are ok with departing then fine , if either need medical assistance then they should be able to go
- Sometimes the dogs and/or owners are in need of medical attention and if this is the case, it should be sought immediately and without delay so that there are no negative repercussions as a result of delaying. This in mind, they must disclose as soon as possible, to officers via phone, their location and if treatment is being sought, provide proof and/or be willing to meet outside of the facility or nearby so that the matter can be addressed. Exceptions to this are where medical attention is not required, or there is no other emergency, and in these cases, the owner must be in control of their animal but gentle to keep them calm, move away to a quiet corner and/or an area free of distractions that is close by. If it is an open area where there is risk of others being in danger, then they must be obligated to disclose immediately to officers via phone before leaving the scene, where they are able to be safely located, such as their home with the animal for further assessment.
- Can leave information with those associated with incident and promptly remove the offending dog from the area



- No, because the other dog may have been the aggressor and it may be unsafe to stay at the scene because of the other dog and it's owner. All situations are unique.
- Sharing contact information should be mandatory, but not prolonged exposure to the biting dog if further safety being compromised is deemed by any party involved to be a reasonable threat.
- They may need to get the dog safely away or obtain treatment. Say "Should stay unless further harm could be prevented or something"
- Only in circumstances where the bite is severe, and/or witnesses are needed, otherwise the offenders owner could go to the place of work of the enforcement officer. Those officers have enough to deal with
- Ppl can talk and fix it without enforcement officer
- There is too much room for abuse of power by enforcement officers
- These enforcement officers have a lot to deal with on a day to day basis. Asking them to attend too every incident would be adding a lot to their plate. Also how long will it take for them to respond? Its un fair to ask a person to wait for hours for someone to show up to take a cell phone picture and a statement when there is other ways of doing this.
- I think a "bite" needs to be defined before requirements are enforced. Also by making the owner remain present, the offending dog would also have to remain present.
- I think both parties need to exchange information regardless. I suppose it depends on the severity of the bite and if it requires immediate attention. If the person or animal needs to be rushed to hospital/vet then their might not be time to wait for an enforcement officer. Also, the attacking animal is probably better off not being in the location where the bite occurred and should be taken away from there for the safety of others. I think contact from both parties and any bystanders needs to be made by an enforcement officer. I think it is important for an enforcement officer to see the scene, but I don't think this is practical in all cases.
- Depends on the circumstance. If the dog bites as protection if it's human why should the human stick around with a potentially dangerous person? Perhaps the owner of the biter should be required to self report.
- Depends on the situation. By owning an animal, you are taking on the responsibility that comes with that. If your dog bites another dog you have to take the entire situation into account. Was the dog that got bit not listening to the leave me alone cues from the dog that bit? Owners should be able to handle these situations on their own by involving or not involving an enforcement officer.
- Follow-up post incident and apart from all others involved is best, I think.
- In theory, I do. But in practicality, if the dog owner is at the scene, it is probable that the dog in question is at the scene and that is not always the safest/most responsible behaviour for either the dog or the victim. If the dog continues to lunge or attempt to attack, it is best to remove the animal from the situation. I think they should have to share contact information and if possible wait.
- The handler of a dog which is involved in biting another person may have been at risk to begin with. I would never ask a person to stay in an area where they were potentially attacked or harrassed prior to an incident taking place. Dogs will protect their owners.



- If there has been an incident you need to put the dog in its safe spot, most likely home. You don't investigate the cause for a fire to start while it is still burning out of control. Same thing here.
- The owner should remove the dog from the situation immediately. They should have to provide contact info so they can be reached later.
- The dog should be removed from the area. Contact information should be given and contact made once dog is removed.
- "I there should be a rule that the
- Owner of the offending dog must talk with the owner of the other animal or with the person, and the offended person or owner of the offended animal should have the right to decide if they wish an enforcement officer involved or not. A dog "bite" can range from normal play behaviour to significant injurious action, and to have a single blanket rule covering all possible incidents in between would be overbearing."
- You use the word "rule" when you actually mean the word "law", Further your question presumes guilt and doesn't take into consideration Defensive bites. Law enforcement has also proven they can't be trusted, and there are more than enough laws Already on the books for dealing with this type of stuff.
- Why would they? This is not currently an issue.
- Sometimes they'd need to get the animal away from the scene quickly to decrease further escalation. In this case they should still leave contact information. Can't just stand and wait around while their animal is stressed/in distress
- People are often walking their dog right before work or fitting the walk into their schedules. Unlike car collisions, there wouldn't be any additional evidence gathered by the officer at the scene. This would be an unnecessary nuisance to have to wait for an officer when it could be described over the phone.
- I do support this actually. Just like a car accident. It's only fair. However we are talking about live animals who may need to be calmed down. Sometimes people do not have heating systems or air conditioning in their vehicles. Their vehicle might be the only safe place to put their animal. How do we ensure another attack doesn't happen with the two animals if they have to stay in the same area? How do we ensure medical help if the bite or attack is bad? How do we ensure animals and humans have fresh water and snacks if they have to wait a long time to have an officer arrive?
- If a dog has bitten someone or another dog, requiring the dog to stay on scene in that heightened condition could lead to a second incident. Bylaw could take a long time to get on scene and both animals need to have time to decompress from the situation and that doesn't happen by requiring the dog to remain on scene.
- I think there are exceptions to every situation; this is too vague. I.e. if a dog bites a wild rabbit we are to remain? Just need more clarity before adding blanket bylaws
- Wording needs to be more refined. Dogs play bite and the current wording does not describe the severity or if there was triggering event.
- This seems impractical. What is an "incident"? Dogs often play rough, but there are no injuries. It's the owners that create the incident.



- i feel that the length of time for an officer to respond to an incident is too long. Mandating that the owner remain at the scene for an extended period of time may result in other issues. Best to exchange information and remove the animals from the scene.
- As long as proper ID is given, I feel it would be OK for the offending dogs owner to leave the scene
- If the dog was injured due to what just happened and the owner had someone else to take the dog to the vet then yes the owner should stay at the scene, if they didn't then no, waiting could be deadly to the animal.
- If an animal is escalated to the point of biting, it should be removed from the scene and allowed to return to a safe environment where it can de-escalate. Forcing an angry, fearful, or overwhelmed animal to remain still in the environment where it bit is dangerous. Ideally, information can be shared quickly and an enforcement officer should be able to follow up with the owner after they have removed the dog from the situation.
- Leave info as required or take picture of license. Be smart yyc
- It is important that this information be provided so that the incident can be properly handled, but parties should be separated to prevent possible further conflict.
- Dogs can bite while playing, which is normal, so this could be abused. If the dog attacked a person or animal they should share contact info but the dog should be removed from the situation that caused it to lose control in the first place.
- Critical to share contact info, but the owner may need to prioritize controlling their animal and/or getting help.
- If it is a tiny dog that nips because another dog has run at it and scared it that would be an example of why this is unreasonable
- I would worry that this would increase stops to BIPOC or profiling.
- The aggressive dog needs to be removed immediately for the safety of all parties including the dog. The offending dog info must be left prior to departure.
- I think the priority is to separate and deescalate the attack by removing the nuisance dog to a safe place.
- It seems like a good idea, but the most important thing is to remove the dog from the scene and the owner is the most likely one to be able to do that quickly and efficiently. They could remove the dog and then be required to come back.
- I don't think the rules need to be changed for animals I think people will always find something to be upset about with animals and this will change nothing
- Just like car accidents, exchange contact information is fine
- They should share contact information and talk to an enforcement officer, but should not have to remain at the scene; the dog could possibly become riled up, stressed, and/or scared after the incident. They would be safer at home or in their vehicle, where the dog can be behind a door/wall/barrier while the owner talks to the proper authorities or call in.
- Enforcement officers are statistically more likely to discriminate against people of color. Requiring people to wait for the cops to show up is like asking someone to leave their hand on a burner.



- Because sometimes it's just dog politics and everything sorts itself out. And also sometimes people aren't dog savvy, don't keep their distance (even when warned to do so), and/or taunt the dog, whether intentionally or unintentionally. The number of times I've had to body block my dog from strangers and other dogs is truly mind boggling.
- This is perhaps not the appropriate way to handle the situation for the animal or the person bit. Exchange of information and taking the animal somewhere safe would be ideal
- I support mandatory exchange of information but do not support prolonged exposure of the victim to the offending dog.
- I would support this rule only if the bite is severe enough to require medical attention. If the question was re-written to specify this I would select yes as my answer.
- It could potentially be very difficult to deescalate a situation when there's been an incident. This could be anything from continued dog behaviour problems to aggressive adults being physically violent with the other party, including for example, a teen walking the family dog. The requirement to remain at the scene is an undue burden in the face of confrontation, which is highly likely in this context. I recognize the need to gather information and hold parties accountable, but there needs to be a different way.
- Depends on the severity of the incident. A minor altercation like a small nip or bite that could be caused by many reasons (being startled, self defense) should be dealt with reasonably and rationally and there is no reason to get law enforcement involved.
- Tricky - it's probably better to get the dog home or away as not to escalate further. If dog & owner walked to park - there would be no place to contain animal to calm down if have to wait for officer.
- "My dog was bit and it wasn't by one of the listed dog types.
- Remember a dog bites for a reason. What did the other dog/person do to provoke the situation. Then it becomes a very angry situation."
- If removing the dog from the situation is safer than the owner to remove dog and then return to the site.
- This could get out of hand quickly with people calling in simply because dogs were being dogs. We would spend way too much money responding to frivolous calls. You already track dogs that bite so this is not necessary and will simply cause delays for everyone involved.
- I'd like to say yes, but the dog owner may need to remove the dog from the area / situation to calm the dog down.
- If a dog is being aggressive towards another dog, often the problem is the humans, the dogs can feel their stress, fear etc and become more excited, a dog will also generally follow its owner, so to prevent further confrontation I would say it's ok to get out of there. And then return once dogs/humans are under control.
- If a dog bites, it is protecting itself. Most dogs bite due to stress not aggression. Both individuals should be given training options to avoid this again. BOTH.
- Law enforcement officers aren't likely to be at the scene in a timely matter. I do think it would be right to share information and talk with law enforcement over the issue, but I don't feel it's realistic to assume an officer is going to be at the scene of an offense.



- This question needs to be more specific. Minor bites that do not bleed or need medical attention vs major bites that require medical or veterinary attention. I could potentially support a rule that requires the dog owner to remain at the scene should the bite(s) be very serious, ie. Requiring stitches.
- I don't think that is the issue with dog bites remaining at the scene
- If some clown teases a dog and gets bitten, the dog is the victim not the clown
- My dog is the sweetest but if he were to bite someone (which he wouldn't) i would want him in the most comfortable, relaxing environment. He would have to be provoked pretty bad to bite someone so it would be best for him to feel safe and calm so that others don't judge based in a fair, scared reaction from a dog.
- It may reduce the likelihood of further altercations for the person to go home and provide contact info only or call the 311 rather than remain on scene
- Depends on instance and severity. Sometimes dogs nio at each other when first meeting. Some Karen has no right to ask for info an minor scuffles
- The first imperative is to have the animal safely restrained so that it can not do any further damage. The owner must leave name / contact information, ensure that medical help is coming if required, but then should be able to leave with the animal if necessary to restrain them on their own property. They would, of course, need to speak with enforcement if / when they arrive, and continue to maintain safe restraint of the animal.
- It's not the city's responsibility for the two parties to exchange whatever needed information.
- I believe that contact info must be given and that the person be available for questions as required.
- If the animal is under stress or is worked up or being triggered by something to someone at the scene, they need to be leave the area so both the owner and animal can collect themselves.
- Again too much government control over issues that can be sorted out by people involved.
- Dogs play hard and enjoy the play with other dogs at the park far to many inexperienced dog owners will take this to an extreme.
- If the dog bites another person then the owner should definitely share contact information. The dog bite something like a skunk or a rabbit, the owner shouldn't need to wait around for anyone.
- I believe safety should be the primary concern. A bite is an emotional charged situation. Either the offending dog or its owner could be a safety threat, or have their safety threatened, by remaining on scene. It should not be an offence to leave the scene if that de-escalates a situation.
- Some people train strong dogs specially for attacks. Those people won't stick around to speak to a officer, likely because their using that dog as protection for illegal activities.
- More often than not dogs only bite when they aren't being treated properly or people are ignoring the dogs warning signs before biting and i donnt think the owner should be liable for others' actions
- I think they need to get there dog out of the situation as soon as possible, but then come back to give there information.
- Unless there is clear evidence of what happened, the owner should not need to stay at any scene, they could be accused just because the city of Calgary declared a certain breed a nuisance and creates the possibility for thoughts who hate animals to use it against them. At some point it is he/she



say and more then likely humans will point the finger at animal who was only protecting. Sometimes people look guilty when talking to law enforcement even when they did nothing wrong.

- I think staying there can increase the tension between the animals and the people. Exchanging information is fine, and talking to an officer later when it is more convenient.
 - If a dog has already bitten someone they should be removed immediately to prevent the possibility of further bites. But that's just common sense
 - Depends on the context and severity. Some people are overly dramatic.
 - "If the dog bites someone you need to remove it from the situation, escalating emotions tensions and prolonged exposure will likely make the situation dangerous for animals and people.
-
- Say dog fight/bite, now both parties must remain together with their animals that have already provoked. Also if an animal or person is injured they may need to seek medical attention"
 - If this is not law now why should it be?
 - This seems like a common sense measure, but if the dog is agitated it would make more sense to bring it home and kennel it right away rather than waiting for officers to attend.
 - This is a grey area. Has the dog been provoked and has the bite been severe.
 - it is a dog. any infraction on the dogs behalf is direct correlation to the owner and not the breed of the dog. trying to hold a dog accountable will not work.
 - Just exchange information instead of waiting for bylaw to show up. They can come to the owners house easily enough
 - Tension and conflict could escalate
 - This process could take a long time. Or if the bite is serious then the victim would be gone anyways to the hospital. Could this instead be phoned in to describe the events with an in person follow-up from officer?
 - Dog and owner need to be removed immediately to deescalate the situation and reduce trauma on the victim.
 - We don't have a climate that would make this appropriate. Also if the animal is agitated it may be nest for the owner to get them to a calm and familiar place.
 - Look into dog behaviours. Learning appropriate behaviour
 - This can cause massive harrassment and stalling, property damage, can affect your job. Giving personal information to a stranger who thinks you wronged them is a BAD idea. I shouldn't have to be forced to exchange my person information. Just like with an accident I only have to produce my insurance. I don't have to give the other person my address or phone number.
 - I disagree entirely with how this city and others handle dog bites and repeat offences.
 - Responsible pet owners with provide necessary information. A rule is not going to stop someone that isn't going to hang around from staying.
 - As a pitbull owner... IF my dog attacked an innocent dog .. I would 1. Give my information and 2. Pay for the vet bill .. BUT I am removing my dog from the scene of accident.



- Owners can discuss expectations and share contact information without the need of a third party.

Responses below include those that did not respond with yes or no however provided a comment.

- I totally agree that it makes sense for pet owners to exchange information. Owners running off with a dog that has attacked someone or their pet, should face consequences. However, there may be situations where you need to separate animals or seek medical attention. So a prolonged wait may not make sense. And it seems unclear what criteria would be applied for determining if an enforcement officer would need to be involved. So, I'm finding it difficult to say yes or no to this.
- I want to put yes, but I also want to put no. Because at times I feel like it can be necessary depending on the severity and such, however it can also not be necessary depending on how understanding the other person is, for example if a dog is trying to get a rise out of the other dog, the other dog in question bites the other dog, the owners both see this, understand the situation at hand that it wasn't necessarily the dog being aggressive more defensive over aggressive and can be handled in a personal manner through exchanging information whether it be phone numbers, contact information, information on both dog's shots and medical history.
- Depends on severity of bite. If blood or torn skin. If a warning snap, then no.
- Exchange of information should be given. The dogs need to be separated from the scene quickly so the incident doesn't escalate as both are feeling traumatized.
- If there is a visible injury exchange contact info or if necessary file police report. Sometimes it's best to remove the aggressive dog to allow it to stop attacking so this may be a barrier to enforcing the bylaw.
- I believe the owner should be accountable, however, immediate resolution may be very difficult. Situation: two dogs get into a fight at a dog park. How do you expect the owners to share information when both dogs are still present and likely still wound up? The risk for another immediate incident increases.
- Depending on the situation, sometimes it's best to remove certain dogs from the situation. Dogs feed off of the energy so if it's high energy I don't feel as the dog would be as behaved as usual
- forcing a dog to remain on the property only because of a piss poor owner is not fair to the animal. Punish the owner for being reckless in not training their pet. Also investigate incidents without prejudice and thoroughly, I have heard of too many biased investigations resulting in the execution of an animal who just did what was natural and did not know any better unlike their useless owner who should get slapped upside the head for being such an incompetent owner.
- If the o
- Singling out breeds is unfair to the dogs and responsible owners.
- I don't know enough to answer this question.
- Feeding- allow...teasing/animal cruelty NO
- "Yes and no.
- if the dog is able to be secured somewhere to remove it from the situation (less stressful) then potentially the owner could stay around. Otherwise it may be best for that owner to take the animal home to secure it .



- It really is all dependent on each situation that comes about and the safety of everyone involved."
- Yes To determine if the dog is a possible nuisance if bite is a person only. No if another dog.
- What's with all the pit bull nonsense?? None of this was mentioned in Phase 1. You're proving that you have no idea about anything involving dogs - it has been proven time and time again that BSL does not work to reduce bites and many communities are getting rid of it. GET EDUCATED!!! The people you have working in animal bylaw obviously know nothing about behaviour and haven't done anything to learn more.
- The owner of the dog that bites should be held accountable
- Where did all this BSL garbage come from?? There was NOTHING in phase 1 about BSL - who are you consulting on this?? EXTREMELY disappointed in Calgary Bylaw; this questionnaire proves me right, animal bylaw in Calgary know NOTHING about behaviour or care to learn. Many places are doing away with BSL because it doesn't work (look at Ontario) and Calgary wants to digress and implement it?? We need [personal information removed] back, animal bylaw is being run by [removed] since he left.
- Irresponsible owners won't care whether or not there is a bylaw.
- Stop targeting pit bulls. Or any breed treat as individuals
- Yes and no. I think the owner should have the opportunity to bring their dog home and remove it from the situation, then speak with an enforcement officer if necessary.
- I think by law for pit bulls is discrimination against this breed. All pit bulls I know are friendly and well behaved. No I don't own one. Any breed can turn. I have two dogs I never let off leash as small dogs and it's for their safety. I have seen huskies labs shepherds I wouldn't trust. Should consider a dog's personality not the breed.
- Neutral opinion
- If possible it is a good idea as in at any incident for enforcement to get all the information as soon as possible but it should be considered that the owner may need to remove the animal to ensure safety of the public.
- "Sometimes" should be a choice. If the bite is severe enough to break skin and draw blood, then the dog owner should be required to share contact information. To expect anyone to remain at the scene of an incident until an enforcement officer showed up would be considered cruel and unusual for all parties, however.
- Hand over the authority to the trainers who are professional and educated on breed type, behaviour, and genetics .
- All life deserves to be treated with respect. Mistakes can happen naturally which should be recognized as so when needed.
- Not all animals interacting with humans are a crime.
- I do not like this as a YES or NO; There should be a choice: Clearly the owner should stay unless there is a situation with the animal that requires the owners immediate attention
- That's a hard one to answer yes or no as it depends on the situation as different situations yield different outcomes, as well as reasons for the bite or attack if the dog is provoked and bites I



believe the dog should not be blamed again going back to. Stop blaming dogs for the bad decisions people with their pets. Start holding the owner responsible.

- It depends on the situation-are both dogs or owners in need of medical attention? I would think IDs, photos of bites, dogs and owners, emails etc could be obtained before leaving for treatment
 - That's stupid.
 - I'm unsure of this as circumstances of the bite are important
 - Dogs will be dogs, they play and sometimes get on each others nerves. If my dog starts to get agitated it's my responsibility to remove him from the situation. To stay at the scene if there were a scrap, would only lead my and other dogs to be more and more agitated.
 - Explain why there is no option not support the tribunal. Explain why pitbulls are the only dangerous dog breed.
 - Depends how severe and how long it would take an officer to arrive
 - Just like any traffic or offense that has caused harm to humans or their belongings; common courtesy
 - "Yes and no
-
- Sometimes the safest thing to do is to leave the situation so tensions don't build , but name and address should be given"
 - Yes and no. It depends on the situation. It may not be safe for the owner and the dog to remain but they should contact police or bylaw to give their contact information should they need to contact them
 - It would depend on the severity of the bite and the negligence of the owner/incident. Some dogs provoke others and that needs to be accounted for. It can't just be blame on the dog that bites.
 - only if the situation is safe for all
 - No BSL !!!
 - how about reducing the amount of food? Do I need to remove my grass to prevent feeding animals? Let's think for a second.
 - attacked person/animal could have been at fault (taunting, unleashed, did not ask for permission to pet dog)
 - Medical attention takes precedence. An Enforcement officer is not always readily available but if an owner is not responsible and reaches out to enforcement when an incident occurs then definitely fines.
 - That is common friend decency
 - "# 1 - Depends on the response time of the enforcement officer. A person that is bitten should have the wound attended to as quickly as possible. A person that owns the dogs needs to get it away from the environment as soon as possible. Exchanging info should be done & followed up later.
 - Exchanging info is adequate."
 - Yes, if it is safe to do so.



- [personal information removed] needs to go. This is a form of racism and he steals from the city. He needs to be followed by Nenshi who once was a great mayor but has allowed his ego to cloud his judgment. This is absurd and I will play the racism card if anyone comes near my dogs....
- Yes if there is injury, not any and every bite (particularly between animals). Just exchanging contact info should be sufficient, there would have to be objective criteria.
- What is the response time for enforcement officers? I believe that as long as the dog owner provides verifiable contact information then it might be better for them to leave the scene to keep both their animal and the owner calm and remove them from the stressful situation. That being said, I have heard of too many stories of owners running away from situations in which their dog has caused hurt to another animal or person.
- I'm not sure. I don't want an encouragement of some people playing the victim in these cases so they can get their 5 minutes of fame.
- Small birds are not the cause of wildlife problems
- It is not always safe to keep the dog on scene following an incident. Information must be exchanged but safety needs to be the priority
- As a dog owner you should take responsibility and if need be defend your dog if it was provoked
- wild animals are just that "wild", leave them alone so that they remain wild and not dependant on us for food
- I feel this is case specific. For example: what if the dog bit a person but the person was not listening to the owner or the dog's warnings or in cases where the other dog provokes the attack and the other dog was defending itself. I've read of stories where smaller dogs attack a bigger dog and when the bigger dog defends itself to get away, the bigger dog gets in trouble despite it being the smaller dog/the smaller dog's owner in the wrong.
- I believe that the person should however only if the dog in question can be subdued or removed from the situation.
- Statistically, targeting a breed doesn't lower bitea and is expensive to enforce/train and I do not support this.
- Common sense 101
- Need to define more. Bird feeders? Occasionally throwing a couple leaves of lettuce i have no problem with bating animals I sure do.
- Pitbulls are no more dangerous than any other dog. If forcing anything force classes for ALL Dog owners to train them. Its not the dog breed thats dangerous its NO training that is the problem!!!
- Not sure if it should be the case or not.
- If it could be done safely. If I have a small dog that was attacked by a larger dog, I probably would prefer the larger dog was removed from the scene.
- Only if the dog/owner were physically able to. IE- If neither were also hurt in the incident. Dogs fighting may require both parties to seek medical attention.
- Small animals are ubiquitous and often add to a family's enjoyment and appreciation of nature, but hazing (or even) attracting deer, coyotes, other large animals should be discouraged



- Yes to above question and fine unless contact with police / city officer so that they can go to a veterinarian with injured animals. About tribunal system, insurance for or cash payment up front for kennel costs(food shelter medical socialization) within 48 hours or further fines and stopping of agreed upon medical aid beyond basics.
- I think it is important the owner of the pet be held accountable. At the same time, if the owner has a dog that is acting out, staying at the scene may be putting others at risk (ex. In an off leash park). Ive been told by trainers to always remove a dog from a situation where it is exhibiting 'red light' behaviours. Maybe this only needs an exception - that the person stay in a safe nearby location (maybe their vehicle). It is unclear in this question whether the person would need to share contact information with bylaw only or with the affected party. If it is between citizens I wonder if that would result in abuse towards the person whose pet was responsible.
- Dye to the regressive BSL language, the panel members are of great concern. However, my concern for the animals well being makes me feel cornered into supporting this with huge concerns.
- They should go home and be talked to there
- I'm
- It's difficult to make that work everytime, like hit and runs there are laws in place but offenders still leave and some are never caught
- I think every situation is unique & must be handled as such
- Civilian input
- Depending on the severity of the attack I feel it is the responsibility of the person on the scene to get care for those injured first - people or pets. Then they should be responsible to own the remediation after the incident - sharing contact information and speaking to enforcement officers.
- Bird feeders in yards should be allowed as they allow for diversity as well as feeding birds when food is sparse (winter)
- [removed]
- I think owners should take responsibility but I also feel there may be times when it is best to remove the dog, take home and return. Ex hot day when dog cannot stay in car. Or remove dog if person is traumatized by it remaining there
- Depends on the severity of the bite and the circumstances.
- As long as the tribunal consists of impartial participants that are involved with animals (such as veterinarians)
- They should exchange info and then be allowed to remove the dog from the situation and return
- Too general a statement, how long would one be expected to wait for an enforcement officer, do you still need to wait if you have already provided the information to the other person involved?
- I think it depends fully on situation. Ie, if being attacked I would not stay OR if the bite happened because of an animal being teased (people who are warned dog might bite if you get close)
- Yes
- Common sense
- OMG.... Encourage normal human decency.



- Feeding the native birds especially during winter helps with survival with very little impact on the ecosystem
- I've never been more ashamed of this city. This kind of ignorance is truly disgusting. I never wanted to leave Calgary but if this is the sort of pathetic fear mongering we're going to resort to I will be packing up and getting out.
- BSL is discrimination and I don't support it.
- It would be more fair if the owner took part in the process and his point of view could be expressed and heard as well.
- Provided the ppl involved are unbiased in opinions (including history of their own animals) otherwise it's not productive. With at least 1 trainer & 1 veterinarian to give opinions.
- Please do not discriminate against pitbulls or those breeds that look like pitbulls. These are the kindest sweetest dogs I've ever met. I understand that their strength is strong and could cause harm, but so can many other things in life. This harms so many innocent dogs that are incredibly sweet and great dogs. Please do not do this.
- Depending on the severity of the attack, if they have to transport to emergency.
- Seems obvious
- I think this depends on the situation if the animal is under duress and may bite again due to stress then I would say no. If dog is calm then yes.
- [removed]
- It is NOT the breed, it's the owner
- Depending on the severity of the situation; if both parties can safely remain on site, it would make sense that the offenses be addressed immediately.
- there are already enough court cases
- Sometimes remaining at the scene could result in further aggression both by dogs and owner. I believe a call should be made to the authorities to report the incident but if leaving the scene prevents further bad behaviour then leave.
- While pit bulls don't bite more frequently than other breeds, pit bull attacks are far more likely to be fatal than any other breed. Pit bulls should be outlawed for that reason alone. [personal information removed] But I feel it important to encourage the city to research the number of fatal attacks by pit bulls and related animals, in comparison to other dog breeds. My beloved German Shepard is the dog most often blamed in dog bites and dog attacks. I have often defended Shepards in conversation, but honesty forces me to admit that if you are bitten, you were likely bitten by a Shep, or a mongrel Shep. It's time for Pit Bull lovers to admit that their dogs kill more people than all other breeds COMBINED. Owners should be held liable for keeping menace animals. Thank you for allowing an outsider to comment - and I'll show myself to the door now. Have a nice day!!!
- feeding of birds from feeders should be allowed
- If a pitbull has never had an incident with someone why should the owner or dog be penalized
- the person should take the dog away from the scene. Then be required to question after.
- LOL, and how do you expect to enforce that? The same way you enforce people not to that leave accidents? Or how you handle people not breaking into others homes, businesses, vehicles?



- This is a case-to-case situation and can not be a Yes/No answer
- I believe the owner should be trained properly .. it's the owner that is the problem.. once they can prove they are responsible they may have this breed .
- Unsure. How long would that take?
- "It's poor owner ship
- They were called the nannie dog for a reason.
- The myth they have a stronger bite than other dogs is just that a myth
- My st Bernard could bite a hell of alot stronger than my staffi
- And she's not classified as mean or dangerous .
- This by law is a cash grab from responsible pet owners who have never had any issues ."
- I would be concerned the courts do not need to be tided up with dog issues
- It depends. If the incident is minor and if the offending owner agreed to cover costs and they exchange info (like a car fender bender) then I think they can go their own way
- BSL doesn't work. I have been bit 7 times by small dogs. If you are going to restrict pitbulls, why aren't you restricting small dogs? Calgary has one of the best animal by law programs, why change it? Why follow Ontario? These good dogs, and good owners don't deserve to be facing a BSL against their dogs when they have little ankle biters running around and everyone thinks it's cute. Give your head a shake!
- I think it depends on the severity of the bite. Are we talking when blood is drawn or also when there is a nip?
- Dogs play, knicks happen. Our dog has ended up bleeding a few times. I think there needs to be some thought given to severity here or people could significantly overreact.
- It depends the problem with that is that if it was two dogs. It could create more aggression between the dogs waiting around for bylaw to come.
- If remaining at the scene means the dangerous dog remains at the scene it is not better for the owner to remove the dog.
- Yes if possible, but since the situation is stressful enough already, like in car accidents below a certain monitory value, share contact information should be mandatory.
- if nessessary? More clarification
- This is a non-issue. Fix the God-awful infrastructure in this city instead before it caves in on itself.
- prefer tribunal rather than taking up precious time in the courts.
- depends on severity-need to get aid, etc
- Depends on the seriousness of the incident (ie potential for medical treatment needed) Sometimes dogs get in a minor tussle, lot of noise, no injuries, owners break them up and move on, do we need to waste an officers time for something like this? No.
- I need to hear more of the thinking from both sides of this issue.
- I don't have a good enough perspective to give a proper answer
- Speeding up the process is in the best interest of the animal.



- That would depend upon the definition of bite. There are inexperienced people who think that a dog mouthing is the same as a bite and it's not, so I would qualify this to place parameters around the severity of the situation in regards to whether or not anything further were needed.
- Enforcement and safety an issue.
- BSL is arbitrary, unfair and targets your resources at the wrong people/in the wrong direction. Singling out pit bulls under "nuisance" breeds is just lazy legislation in my mind.
- This is a difficult one. If the owner stays at the scene then the dog will have to as well which could lead to further or worsening incidents. However information needs to be shared. This is something that should be looked into more.
- I believe the owner of a dog who bit someone should take responsibility and exchange information however I also think it's important to remove that dog in question from the situation to reduce further consequences
- A bite needs to be defined . If a dog snapped at me but made no contact I would not say I was bit. Some people with fear of dogs would claim this was a bite
- Yes-if the dog and the owner leave they will never be found!!!!
- I'm unsure of the implications.
- It may not be safe if the owner has to stay on scene with the dog that was aggressive. They may have to take the dog elsewhere. This is difficult to manage.
- A tribunal just adds another layer of complexity and bureaucracy.
- I'm unsure how to answer this. Ideally they should stay however Enforcement officers are not usually available immediately so it wouldn't be enforceable and if a dog or its owner is injured, treatment is needed right away. In my situation where my dog was attacked it was a few hours before the officer was able to come.
- If the person has any moral character they if stay, help and ensure the situation is under control. Unfortunately we no longer live in that society and choose to "shame" them on social media now. Very sad world we now live in!
- I agree that it's important because it would be important to have the dogs medical/vaccination history, but if people are scared of losing their dogs or the situation being misjudged because of the breed of their dog and because they feel that the rules are biased against them I can understand why an owner wouldn't want to stay and I'm not sure a bylaw would change that
- As long as they can control their dog while remaining at the scene and the length of time it takes for a bylaw officer to arrive.
- feeders for birds are a typical backyard practise.
- Sounds like a lot of money would be needed to enforce this. Maybe it should be lawful to share contact info. and to provide licensing info of the dog in question.
- If the owner remains at the scene, so does the dog. Better if they share their info then take the dog home, away from the situation and potentially other issues.
- I do not agree with this as a yes or no question. All dogs are animals at the end of the day, and saying that one person has the right to judge that animal based on one action is not fair to anyone involved. An enforcement officer can be easily biased based on their own views of a certain type of



dog. Even if, that dog was acting in self defense. Most people only see what the dog did to defend itself, or what it has been taught. No one judges the owner on his or her abilities to control or correct said behaviors. That's the real problem.

- It depends on the circumstances, generally yes but it really depends on what caused the dog to bite.
- Depends on the severity of the bite.
- I think it depends on the severity, and what caused the bite to occur
- This one isn't Y/N: I do think there needs to be a mandatory contact with dog owner and officer, but I think if a lone individual with offending dog, likely need to remove the dog in order to de-escalate the situation. Not sure how that could be accomplished.
- How ridiculous clearly somebody has an issue with Pitt bulls, I don't even know how you can begin to judge this issue a vicious dog is a vicious dog dog that bites is a dog that bites an owner's lack of responsibility is the issue if you have the stats that show pitbulls don't bite as much as other animals what are you doing such a waste of time and money no I don't have a bit bull but I do have a dog and fully aware if it bit somebody it's my responsibility and as a responsible dog owner I take full responsibility of my dog and this is what you should be looking at the owners not the animal how dare you judge a certain breed when they aren't the ones that bite yes the impact might be worse kind of like if a guy punched you in the face compared to a girl well I think the guy should be punished more I didn't even know how you can bring up such Ludacris subject you're certainly judging making judgment it's like I have a black dog people are frightened of a black dog with nice white canine teeth all lives matter white yellow black no legs 2 legs one leg for leg shame on Calgary for judging it's bad enough other provinces judge the breed of dog why don't you show them what you guys are really made of keep things the way they are find the owner take the dog from the owner do whatever you have to do to put that dog in a safe environment a dog loved trained respected is a well-deserved dog and should be judged by its breed colour or ability and strength regoup and think about what you're saying.
- Depending on the severity
- Any breed of dog that bites should be ordered for training..not euthanasia
- Contact information should be traded and the dog needs to be removed.
- The fact that one dog breed is here simply on its features and not statistics shows how ridiculous this government is

Livestock

In addition to hens, we are exploring criteria for the potential approval of other livestock to be permitted in Calgary. Criteria for other livestock would include:

- Offers community benefit/ will have positive impact
- Support from adjacent neighbours
- Suitable living conditions can be provided for the animal
- Exceptions would be evaluated on a case by case basis and the decision would be at the discretion of the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer



Participants who indicated they would support this bylaw amendment are listed here.

- Providing the animals are well cared for, cleaned up after and don't interfere with neighbours, there is no reason for not owning small livestock. This can help many Calgarians. For example, a family having a couple of hens will help feed the family
- Hens yes.
- if folks want to keep hens, as long as they are well cared for and are not a nuisance (and neighbors are ok with them - sometimes they can be loud and smelly) - don't see why someone couldn't keep hens
- I think it would be great to allow hens in the city
- Obtaining support from adjacent neighbours is unnecessary. The law should be that for a lot with a certain zoning and minimum size x number of chickens are allowed. Period. Set out the obligations of a chicken owner (set backs from lot lines, standards of care, coop and run size, acceptable feeding practices and cleanliness) and if those are violated and a complaint occurs, THEN bylaw enforcement can step in. People will raise a sink about urban chickens, but having lived in cities with them, the reality is that actual problems are very rare. Maybe prohibit roosters if you are concerned about noise, but be prepared to address the problem of what to do with roosters since people often have trouble telling if their one-day old chicks are female or male.
- only if I can occasionally get fresh chicken eggs or honey if raising bees...I think that's a fair compromise since I don't want animals at my home...
- If the chickens are safe and healthy, and their habitat is well maintained, then I see no problem with keeping them in yards.
- Fresh eggs!
- Yes however there needs to be proper oversight. Already there can be issues of abuse with regular household pets I worry that this could create a greater issue however I can also see the benefits
- Suitable living conditions and feedback from neighbors should occur before livestock is obtained.
- Yes it's about time because it gives people a chance to have fresh eggs as well.
- Would love to have my own eggs for cooking.
- Why would hens be an issue within the city if they are well looked after.
- I think as long as people are being respectful and diligent, what's wrong with having a few hens for fresh eggs and companion. We as a society need to be more self sufficient. Once again, as long as potentially dangerous animals are not allowed.
- free run eggs! Local business will be more supported!
- It must be supported and approved by neighbors and community affected in city limits
- I think hens would be sustainable livestock and easy to maintain.
- I'm open for any animal to be loved and supported but if we are going to give more animals homes then there needs to be more mandatory training for people to go through. People need to appreciate animal lives better.
- People are trying to be more self- sufficient with food and this would help.



- Provided that all animal needs are seen to, were management doesn't become a health hazard to the human population, and noise is not significantly greater, why should there be a problem? People are already allowed to keep exotic animals including large, highly intelligent birds. A few hens or a small goat would be significantly easier to provide for than a macaw.
- Some small livestock like hens maybe. I don't think many other livestock would be suitable for the city. And of course livestock should be in limited numbers.
- I think this is a great idea!
- Only on certain sizes of lots. (Larger)
- I support chickens and stuff. Yes I think this can be a great learning experience for children etc. But I am worried about additional noise pollution and being woken at the crack of dawn. Would be curious to know what issues have arisen from jurisdiction that currently allow it. And why would anybody want a pigeon? - ok reading the most of answers below is STRONGLY making me say I don't support this anymore. Ok so now Condo's allow dogs and cats now we going to have pigeons on our balconies. You know, go live on a farm with all your animals if that's your preference. People are going to just do this for shits & giggles.
- Hens and small milking goats should be permitted in the city.
- Seems like reasonable criteria.
- I think it would be cool! Fresh eggs and a great way to teach kids about where their food comes from and how to care for animals.
- If the above guidelines are followed I see no issues
- People should be allowed to have chickens if it's not being a nuance
- I have always wanted to own a couple chickens and have long lamented the restriction.
- Provided the animal is treated well, in a healthy environment and is not creating a disturbance.
- Limiting the number of hens in a yard, consulting with your neighbor. If there is a smell or mess constantly it needs to be removed immediately.
- Why not. Dogs, kids, cats and people can be loud, smelly and annoying, so why not pulley. Hell i'm game, just but an entire farm yard In one yard. Proper confinement, homes, sanitation, etc.
- As long as the animal doesn't cause excessive noise, odours, or dangers to the community and the animals are able to be provided everything necessary to live happy and healthy (i.e. enough space etc.), I don't care what kind of animals are kept by people
- I believe if the animal has a good life with someone who loves it what does it matter what kind of pet that is?? Animal racism #livestocklivesmatter
- Humane treatment of the animals must be considered. Please make it clear that no slaughter take place at homes. Perhaps start with chickens for egg production, with requirement of vet care and vet euthanasia if necessary. See how chickens go... then start looking at other animals. Please let people have their pet pigs though.
- Urban hens is a great idea! I fully support this.
- Sure, as long as there are adequate and strong limits to noise, smell, etc, for neighbours to complain if they need to, and to have their complaint and concerns addressed adequately.



- I think so long as its hygienic (picking up of feces regularly, general cleanliness for the animal grazing areas and bedding) then it should be allowed. Noise and smell should also be a factor.
- Of the animals are not being harmed and are being taken care of humanely then there are low risks.
- A small number of hens is less annoying than a neighbour who smokes and the hens aren't a health hazard
- animals are taken care of
- Have requirements about animal welfare and vaccinations so as to not spread disease.
- If the room is available why not have a goat mow your lawn
- As long as neighbours are on board, I fully support an individual's attempt to feed themselves sustainably
- if they are in no danger to other animals or humans and well trained or no complaints sure.
- Controls need to be in place to prevent salmonella and protect public health. There are currently a number of salmonella cases/clusters related to back yard poultry.
- Bring on the chickens!
- as long as there are no roosters there should not be an issue if the person follows the rules
- As long as animal, yard and home are kept clean and neighbors are supportive - why not.
- "Honestly, this amendment should have been made ages ago. Chickens, bees, and others...there's really no fundamental difference in keeping them vs keeping cats, dogs, rabbits, etc. You need to provide the animal proper living conditions and care- it's simple as that. It's typically once someone is no longer doing that, that problems start arising- no matter what animal we are talking about.
- So I really don't see any good reason to continue to ban backyard chickens or bees (or others).
- If the people are required to provide proper care as they are required to provide proper care for dogs, etc., then I think it should be fine."
- You want chickens and you follow rules and don't disturb neighbors, then have a few chickens.
- access to food is a basic human right. NOT allowing someone to responsibly keep chickens or eggs or any reason should be considered a violation of basic human right.
- why not? If its not hurting anybody.
- Backyard chickens are a good thing!
- Pot belly pigs should be allowed in city limits
- who wouldn't want chickens in their backyard. As long as neighbours are aware.
- Calgary is so sprawled most people have yards more than large enough to support a safe and sustainable coop.
- Chickens make great pets
- not much knowledge on the topic but not opposed
- it's a good idea
- As long as adjacent neighbours agree and they are looked after, aren't smelly, and are not noisy during quiet hours (after 11pm)
- Some people need therapy animals, but are afraid of/allergic to cats and dogs. This may satisfy the needs of those who require comfort animals, but cannot adopt.



- I feel that livestock would not affect me in my neighbourhood setting
- Certain livestock would be okay such as hens provided that the person has the proper facilities to have livestock in their back yards.
- Good for fertilizing gardens and for urban farming.
- Illegal hens will get the vet help and better care they need
- Allowing access to local and sustainable food options is always worthwhile
- I have many allergies and food sensitivities, many of which are protein based, (both meat and plant alternatives), and eggs are something that I can eat. Having my own chickens would mean that I have easier access to eggs and more control over the conditions to ensure that none of my allergies are secretly included (like unlisted corn, which is a prevalent problem).
- Yes I would support it if the land size permitted live stock. Side note - with regards to question #8 - people and children should ask before they pet. So let's teach our youth that.
- As long as pens are kept clean and away from neighbours.
- na
- Hens ok, no roosters
- As long as the animals are clean, healthy and happy this should be reasonable. Dont let people shove rhem.in tiny cages all day.
- Benefits outweigh negatives
- It's a chicken and they can be helpful on keeping the big population down.
- Individuals should be able to have hens as pets
- As long as they aren't noisy
- I like fresh eggs I wouldn't own hens but as long as they were keeping me up at night or waking me up at the crack of dawn
- We can learn a lot about conservation simply by giving them the opportunity to cultivate their own food and livestock in their own backyard.
- Livestock can be wonderful pets as long as they are properly cared for. I do not agree with the bylaw if they are being raised for slaughter.
- If taken of properly, having private livestock is a great way for self sustaining food for families as well as educational purposes.
- I support people's being more self-sufficient but not at the expense of their neighbours.
- As long as the animal is living in appropriate living conditions, and not experiencing any sort of abusive living situation. Animals in urban areas should not be exploited for profit.
- No issue with animals in the city as long as they are being cared for adequately
- Responsible animal husbandry in urban areas is not difficult and provides many benefits.
- As long as the pet/lovestock, owner, neighbours and community needs are balanced, there is no reason to object to a more diverse range of animals within the city.
- Limitation on how many and required living arrangements
- People should be able to have hens and other types of fowl.



- If proper measures taken for neighbor acceptance and quality animal care management, I don't see an issue.
- Chickens aren't loud, it's roosters that would be problematic.
- "If they are being cared for and are useful to the environment of surrounding areas then why
- Not try"
- As long as above criteria are followed and enforced.
- I think if people having a few hens to get their own eggs or whatnot is great!
- People should be allowed to have eg. a chicken coop as long as it's properly taken care of "cleaned regularly " and that they have adequate space for it
- Ok
- I would like to have the option to provide my family with our own eggs. I have no issues with anybody having a chicken as long as they keep it clean. No messy, smelly coops.
- Only if they are quiet
- Provided the immediately surrounding neighbors have no objection and the livestock does not attract any unwanted predators, create noise or mess (eg pigeons)
- Its our right we pay taxes.
- People should be allowed to source their own food. It's local and it encourages sustainability!
- Yard chickens are fantastic and further our ability to be self reliant and food secure humans
- If they are properly cared for and owned by the right people.
- yes, but also to take in to consideration that animals are more often than not used as support animals be it domestic or other livestock.
- I dont care pitbulls are pure bad owners should be hung
- Hens and other live stock are great low nuisance pets.
- Yes, I think it's important for the people who want to have their own source for such things. However, I only consent if the animals have the proper care needed and the kind of resources that are being used from these animals are dealt humanely.
- The animal-human bond can be extremely beneficial to both animals and humans for physical, emotional, and mental health for all parties. I would be most concerned about the living conditions for the animal.
- We should be allowed chickens
- "A person should be allowed to provide some sort of food fo their family off the land they own. Also cleanliness and smells must be kept under control.
- Also maybe another bin system could be provided to these home owners for the excrement from the hens. The city could use that to provide a community based fertilizer system for gardens as well."
- As long as they aren't causing a disturbance I don't see any reason to ban livestock.
- Whoever needs an emotional support animal it should be anything
- seems good
- As long as it's reviewed case by case, & not going to cause problems.
- provided odor and noise does not become an issue



- If adjacent neighbours pull their support on reasonable grounds then bylaw need to ensure animals are in good care and not too loud.
- I believe other animals can be a benefit and well homed within City limits but it should be managed on a case by case basis with permission.
- Hens and other birds can be beneficial to the landscape. Just like other pets, the expectation should be that the owner provides appropriate and decent living conditions re shelter, food, water, and mental enrichment while keeping them safe and secure on their own property.
- Hens are great
- I am in full support of furthering a self-sufficient community. It seems wrong that agriculture is outlawed in Alberta of all places.
- Let people have reasonable livestock. Allow it. With specific rules and conditions. Such as neighbour approval for example if it could be a nuisance. All must be registered.
- However, what counts as “other” livestock? Cows seem large for urban...
- Don't have a problem with hens. Helps teach kids skills.
- I would like to have chickens.
- I have lived in cities where hens were permitted and it worked well
- It seems to have the best in mind for neighbors as well as the hens.
- I support this bylaw only if all of these conditions are strictly adhered to. I feel that a bylaw should be included that require urban farmers to have a veterinarian approve of their farmer set-up and animal health.
- I have nothing bad to say. I think that all the benefits are completely valid and I have full support
- Please let us have hens!!!
- Allow people to use their own hens instead of paying a ton of money for eggs?
- Allowing people the opportunity to access support animals and animals that provide food is a great idea! For the health of the animals I would like to see that approved livestock owners have their situation assessed in person on an annual basis to renew their license.
- As long as the animals are taken care of and have the proper space, food and shelter... I support it.
- People seem to want them and I'm not one to stifle them.
- With agreement from neighbors
- N/a
- If people have hens, they should keep to 1 dog or 1 cat. Pigeons shouldn't be kept as pets. Let the birds roam free and be with other birds in the wild not in homes.
- This is fair so long as the above regulations are held in place and the livestock is cared for ensuring the best living conditions
- As long as the hens have a suitable winter shelter and a limit of how many
- owning livestock would not harm the city or anyone as long as they are being well cared for. Welfare checks can be done to make sure that the animals are well cared for.
- Hens are florets gor the community
- Education and great benefits! So hopeful for this alternative



- As long as it is only HENS being allowed. The access to fresh eggs will be beneficial.
- As long as the animals are well cared for I don't think it should matter them being in Calgary.
- Hens can be lovely pets and provide eggs.
- Hens can be beneficial for calgarians. I'm times of covid 19 when things are uncertain, keeping animals can help people's mental and physical health.
- if its done following rules then I dont see an issue
- Urban chickens are a wonderful addition to sustainable backyard food production.
- These would not be a nuisance.
- It's a city not a farm
- Increase food security, build community through bartering and mutual support.
- "Yes and no. Right now we dont even regulate propper winterozed, summerozed hpusing for dogs. And so many are neglected in yards and homes. Until we have better regulations on animal cruelty we should not allow breeding and housing farm animals in the city. Also is the city prepapred to deal with potential urban slaughterhouses? This will likely happen as well if folks are allowed to keep meat animals.
- -----
- There is no comment section for pet licenses, lower income families should not get a fee waver, rather we should own pets if we cant afford them. We need more fines for neglect and faster response times for cruelty. We should put more effort into over breeding domestic urban dogs and focus there, rather than the shock value of pitbulls. Yes headlines drive opinions but lets be sensible not stupid."
- If it doesn't negatively affect the surrounding neighborhood it should be allowed
- It is great for families to be able to be sustainable
- If the animal is being properly taken care of and can help with someone's emotional or physical needs I dont have a problem with it.
- Under the right conditions, people should be allowed to raise chickens for their eggs and its good for the kids to experience.
- As long as owner follows guidelines and animals are properly taken care of.
- we pay house tax, own the land should be able to keep animals that can provide food etc
- I agree with this, as long as neighbours are in agreeance and the animal is housed properly,
- I agree
- So long as proper environment is provided for animals
- Allows Calgarians to provide for themselves.
- Not high on my concern list
- if people have the resources to care for any kind of animal why not? Do we not live in a "free country"?
- Let people do what they want as long as its safe and humane.
- This is a fantastic idea! It works well overseas!
- I see no problems, personally



- Long as there is a limit on how many you can have
- All pets should be allowed in city limits.
- As long as the animals are taken care of I have no concerns. Noise would be my only concern but I don't see them as being louder than wild birds (crows, magpies, jays, the occasional peacock).
- If they aren't bothering anyone and if they are treated well I do not see why it couldn't be expanded
- Having "town hens" in the past while I lived in Didsbury was an incredibly therapeutic experience. The hens improved the interaction with the neighbours because who doesn't love free, fresh eggs?
- I like chickens as long as they were safe and kept very clean
- As long as these individuals can adequately take care of these hens financially and have proper housing and are cleaning everything properly I don't see an issue with it. There would need to be inspections by the city to ensure these individuals would be staying up to standard
- I think keeping hens within city limits would be completely acceptable, provided requirements for their care (such as adequate space & coop) are clearly laid out.
- If the owner can properly take care of the animals without disturbing the peace of their neighbours, why not. As it has been shown during COVID, there was a shortage of certain products in grocery stores, such as eggs. Other people were able to acquire chickens for their households to help with the strain and have their own eggs.
- I think this is a great idea but also think there needs to be support from neighbours and suitable living conditions for the animals.
- Yeah, the support from adjacent neighbors is important. Hens can be smelly if not properly maintained. Perhaps a complaint process can be generated for those said neighbors in case the owner of the hens, is obviously negligent.
- It allows city dwellers to create food for their families and if done in the right space it would be a great addition.
- They're cute and helpful
- If the areas where the livestock will be are somewhat controlled/monitored and clearly posted signage is available, I don't see why there should be an issue
- People should be able to have livestock on their property to encourage eco friendly ways of living.
- As long as everyone is in agreement livestock is beneficial in a community
- I have friends in the US who live in a suburban area and have chickens in their yard without any neighborhood issues.
- If it isn't hurting anyone why not?
- I support sustainable food practices
- I would love to have poultry.
- I have first hand experience with family raising chickens in a neighborhood with great success.
- If the animals are cared for in a way that they are happy and healthy the I see no issue. Again, people should be required to pass a course to show they are capable and knowledgeable to care for the animals they bring into their care.
- I believe that as long as they are properly cared for, there should be no reason not to support this



- I have no issue with small livestock in yards
- Ensure engagement with neighbours for issues such as allergies (like beekeeping), and size of the livestock enclosures and number of livestock do not become a nuisance
- as long as the owners properly care for the animals it should not be an issue
- As long as the neighbors agree and the welfare of the animals can be guaranteed, I think it encourages more community involvement and allows people to grow basic produce and goods in their backyards.
- Chickens are an amazing opportunity for cities to become more modernized and progressive. Chickens offer allot of diversity and allow people to have another source of food. Chickens make great pets and are quite quiet when you have 2-3. If people whom have them are responsible they shouldn't even smell. I would love to have chickens as this would support healthier lifestyles.
- Urban chickens would be great
- As long as these "pets" don't become a nuisance to neighbors and community
- obvi
- I feel having a few hens in a pen in a yard is better than someone having a loud or aggressive dog in their yard. It would be nice to raise our own hens and have our own eggs.
- Hens are quieter, tidier, and easier on the ecosystem than dogs. They are incredibly beneficial for gardeners, contribute to food security, and present low disease risk if kept in clean, appropriately sheltered environments (i.e. proper coops). MANY urban environments have already proven the feasibility of hens in urban contexts.
- people also use different animals for support and asistant animals
- I think it would be a great idea overall, maybe having a limit on ownable chickens for square footage of space.
- Only if beneficial impact could be demonstrated and humane, adequate living conditions provided for the animal.
- As long as they are properly cared and the Neighbour's approve
- Chickens!
- Goats!
- I don't believe that any domestic species should be illegal to own in the city.
- Many other cities have had positive experiences. Well done, it would be great!
- I would like to have it specifically laid out that chickens are not to live on balconies. Fecal matter and dichotomous earth can get in the air and litter down to lower tenants. That needs to be very specifically stated.
- A logical progression to meet the desire for local food sources.
- I think it is already happens widely without the majority of the population knowing
- With limits this is great.
- Small, animals like chickens are certainly no issues and very good for family food intake etc.
- if the animal is in your yard why would the City intervene?
- I think hens in CORRECT properties would be fine



- Many other cities have already implemented. Guidelines should clearly state requirements. ie a coop is not a box, size etc to be outlined for the wellness of the animal.
- i would love to have access to farm fresh eggs and support people in my neighbourhood. Plus, hens are really not annoying, peoples dogs can be more annoying. No roosters please.
- We need specifics on "other livestock" - hens are one thing. A braying donkey, or horse next door (as much as I love them), smelly and fly attracting pigs, no thanks.
- Provided proper care and maintenance on limited number without roosters , and adequate housing.
- Hens are valuable and would allow for more sustainable farming within the communities.
- Hens should definitely be allowed, they are quiet, easy to care for animals that provide companionship as well as eggs. Pigs make excellent pets as long as the have the necessary yard space
- I believe in being able to provide for yourself if you desire and that the contribution to the community is almost always positive.
- Adjacent neighbours agreement should not always be necessary, particularly in cases where there are existing disputes.
- Neighbours in Calgary aren't very neighbourly. If I want to own hens, I should be allowed too if I give them the proper home and take care of their needs. Yes the welfare of the hens and all animals matter, so the part about making sure there are suitable living conditions I agree with
- Only if "suitable living conditions" actually means large enough grazing areas, the animals are not chained up in one spot at all time, the animals quality of life isn't simply determined by the availability of 'food and shelter', but that the animal is actually cared for. Bylaw officers should have to do occasional rounds to ensure animals are being cared for responsibly.
- Animals are a great addition to a household and I believe it will help children learn how to be more respectful and potentially where their food actually comes from
- Yes as long as things are kept clean and doesn't contribute to more dangerous wildlife coming into neighbourhoods.
- Urban hens can be great contributors to home raised food! They have been successful in other communities with proper guidelines.
- doesn't bother me as long as animals are treated well.
- I'd like to have hens.
- Needs to be restriction on number of animals, animals must be provided appropriate shelter and must be cleaned up after. Noise and or smell could be potential issue...
- I like case by case approval.
- As long as animals are humanely kept all needs met and not disruptive to the neighborhood, I don't see an issue.
- Permits could be given to responsible land owners that coup their livestock in reasonable and responsible conditions.
- chickens!!!!!!
- However, I feel that the hens would need to be sufficiently distanced from neighboring properties.



- If animals are properly cared for, can be contained to the property and all adjacent (beside, behind, kitty corner) neighbours are ok with it, I don't see a problem.
- With criteria, can regulate what's deemed as responsible livestock ownership within city limits.
- Chickens are perfect for having. Just do due diligence and learn how to keep them
- Urban livestock provide a local and sustainable source of food
- I believe this would be beneficial and help to provide adequate living for the livestock versus people hiding them and not providing the best living conditions.
- Society needs the freedom to have more sources of food closer to home.
- In these tough economic times, allowing people to raise their own food is an excellent idea, as long as there are rules in place for sanitation and maintenance of the animals enclosure.
- This is a great idea, and would be a great step forward for Calgary.
- Excellent idea and bringing that rural feel to our community back yards
- Because of our climate, proper winter accommodation would be required for these animals. I think this would help many in the community as well as be educational for children.
- I think so long as the animals are not creating a nuisance issue (noise, smells etc), then I would support small livestock like hens or small pigs.
- Chickens only
- Small chicken coops aren't a nuisance.
- Why not?
- Livestock within reason, maybe a size/weight maximum as well as number of live stock restriction
- Can be maintained like any other pet.
- YES I would love the ability to keep backyard hens. The current bylaw forbidding backyard hens is the main reason I am considering moving out of Calgary
- Dogs owners are unjustly made to pay for license their dog, while cats license is at a much more reduced rate.
- Controlled perimeter to neighboring property
- Only would support horses
- Providing there are conditions in place for health and sanitation. As well as noise bylaws, just like any other animal.
- There should be a minimum land use requirement to ensure the animals are provided enough space for their well-being and ensure the animals are not a nuisance to neighbours.
- Only if there was plenty of space and the owners were required to keep the coops odour free. Also they have to take the proper precautions to prevent predators.
- I would want to have a say because I would not want hens next door to me
- As long as it would be able to be enforced, I agree. The neighbours must be in agreement, the livestock cannot create a nuisance, much like a nuisance human neighbour would not be tolerated.
- Max 3
- As long as animals are kept in clean and humane environments
- "I think a permit application,



- And livestock licenses should be done as they are for cats/dogs. With the criteria above.” Support from adjacent neighbours
- Suitable living conditions can be provided for the animal..”
- I support this bylaw as long as community members have some say as to the impact this would have on their neighborhood within city limits
- I support this as long as all of the above is addressed. There's no reason someone can't provide for their family in a small way by raising different livestock. As long as the impact to the neighbors and the animal are kept in mind.
- Yes. I wish my city allowed chicken and other livestock.
- I don't know that support from neighbours should be required for all livestock. If they animals are quiet and well cared for, involving neighbours seems unnecessary.
- Yes, with strict rules in place and regular inspections to ensure health of the livestock. Also cannot be a nuisance with noise or smell to neighbours.
- We are human. We should have access to our own food source. Like anything be responsible
- Yes, so long as mice are kept under control. Chicken feed is an easy source of food for them and nobody wants to have a mouse infestation
- I think, if a homeowner can get proper support from neighbours I don't see a problem with this. I think there's should be some kind of rule that hens can't live in backayrds or properties of less that a certain square footage, and continue to leave strata laws up to the decision of property/community owners in instances where someone is in a townhouse with shared backyards, it would not be as feasible.
- People who can't afford groceries can have a semi-steady supply of food.
- Good for food
- positive impact for everyone
- I would love to be able to produce more of our own food, teach children animal husbandry, and chickens are smart and loveable animals.
- Growing and harvesting our own food is imperative in society- hens should be encouraged.
- But it really depends what other animals you are thinking of. No examples were given other than hens.
- If it does the community good (ie. provides a local good such as eggs for a local restaurant or something like that) then I see no problem allowing that
- Chicken Is are fine! As long as they are humanely kept, have sufficient space, food, water.
- I would support the idea of having livestock that would help feed people. Having 5 chickens as pets is silly.
- Neighbours should not need to support.
- Providing the animal is properly cared for and it doesn't cause problems for neighbours, I don't see why smaller livestock animals could t live in the city
- Well conceived concepts could improve the City
- But would suggest regular checkups to prove living conditions are still being met.



- I would support this with strict regulations. My one concern is regarding the possible attraction of more coyotes deeper into neighbourhoods putting those livestock (hens in particular) at risk while then increasing the risk to other small pets (cats and dogs).
- I would support this as long as the animals are well cared for, provided with proper enclosures so that safety measures are being taken for the animals and for the neighbours.
- I think this could make Calgary stand out.
- Chickens!!
- I see no reason why livestock shouldn't be allowed in the city so long as the specifics to the animals care is followed.
- Great idea and the parameters make sense.
- People should be allowed to have hens if they're willing to take care and clean up after them like any other pet.
- Hens are wonderful! Fresh healthy eggs for the family and neighbors. There's nothing wrong with that at all as long as they're kept in clean conditions.
- I fall under the low income despite working full time with 2 kids. Fresh eggs and meat not to mention giving the kids some chores is great.
- Please no roosters as many of us work shift work and sleep is hard to come by as it is. Noisy animals would be a nuisance to me. But I think allowing a Vietnamese pot bellied pig or hens or animals that are well cared for and not incredible noisy would be fine
- I want a goat
- The goat in marda loop seems chill af
- There are many benefits to allowing people to own hens or chickens as long as the requesting person has the proper knowledge.
- As long as the neighborhood is not affected.
- Keeping Urban chickens for the purposes of having eggs promotes local food sources, which is environmentally conscious. Tens are also not a nuisance animal, as they are very quiet.
- Im unsure what i think of this but there is no 'unsure' option. This is Tricky in urban settings due to noise smell etc....you need to educate people about disease risk (salmonella, e coli et) because this is a public health issue
- I would support backyard hens
- How do you obtain support when property changes hands, or similarly publish permitted addresses so new or potential owners can make educated decisions
- It's a great source of food(eggs) for many who struggle, animals are amazing to have around all humans but especially children. I do not support raising hens for slaughter. I do believe they would make amazing pets.
- Hens are small, quiet, and provide food that is high in protein. I absolutely support making a move toward city folk being able to source more of their own food.
- Hens are productive. Vicious dogs aren't
- I think hens would be great, as long as they are cared for properly. Other small livestock would be good as well. People are becoming more serious about being able to grow and make their own food.



- I believe if you are raising your own food you will consume less, and more responsibly.
- I am open to urban hens, not sure I like the idea of other animals.
- Hens can aide the natural ecosystem of the area they are kept in, which benefits the community overall with an increase of fauna, and therefore an increase in bee population.
- I see no issue as long as the homeowner follows the above mentioned conditions
- These animals can be kept much like other animals (dogs and cats) and only need minor revisions to property.
- As a homeowner, I would like to have the chance to weigh in on livestock living in adjacent yards and I think that livestock living conditions need to be suitable for both the animal and our unpredictable climate.
- As long as neighbors are required to agree in writing to livestock living adjacent to them.
- Only if an educational course is received so they know what they are getting in to.
- I'm not sure what defines "other livestock" but I do support hens, within some restrictions on quantity, neighbour engagement and potentially involve regular inspections to ensure appropriate upkeep.
- People who have chickens should be allowed so long as they follow the rules. One of the rules should be to have consent of direct neighbours who could be negatively affected.
- Urban hens are great! I had some in Calgary for 9 years. No one was upset with them.
- I like that exceptions would be evaluated on a case by case basis.
- Producing your own food (ie eggs) has a lesser carbon footprint as compared to purchasing goods that need to be shipped. This is an environmental and sustainability plus as much as it is an owner rights plus.
- I like fresh eggs
- Cautiously I say yes. I think these animals can have many benefits but risks include increased potential for disease (salmonella in chickens is a big problem, because they're natural carriers of this bacteria) which can make people very sick. If there are free ranging cats and or wildlife in the area, this can lead to increased human-wildlife interactions. Permits, with stipulations that an accredited course on how to actually raise these animals (good welfare and husbandry, proper biosecurity), must be taken first would be my recommendation
- I have someone who raises pigeons on my street. Hes been responsible for them for a long time and they are not noisy nor a problem in any way. Id love to see urban agriculture bc i think it offers so many more opportunities for business and care and alternate lifestyles for those who chose to raise livestock in the city. I believe there would be proper regulations. And im aware that someone will always try to take advantage of this new pet ownership avenue and to be ready for bumps along the way in terms of learning how it fits in our city. 2
- Chickens are no more of a nuisance than dogs and cats and as long as owners are responsible and take care of them I have no issue with hens. No roosters in the city however as they are noisy and would be hard to live with.
- Urban farms seem to be the way of the future. If it is properly policed with rules then I see no issue.



- Hens would be very valuable for a lot of ppl in the city. I would much prefer raising chicken for eggs then buying from store.
- Mini goats and pigs make excellent pets. They don't bark or make excessive noise.
- Hens are a good idea
- Having university degree in Agriculture, I see tremendous value in approved families having productive "pets" (hens, ducks, etc.)
- As long as a healthy environment can be provided and it does not cause disturbance to the neighbours then I am in support.
- Chickens are a brilliant way to extend your food sources. Pls don't allow roosters as you don't need them to have eggs.
- It's a way to have a more renewable source of food.
- the criteria are balanced, so what difference does it make if the animal is a chicken or a small piglet that are often pets. they all make noise, eat and scat/feces/pee.
- Only if the applicant can get the sign consent of their immediate neighbours
- I like that there are the above conditions to be met. I think it could get out of control without some limitations.
- As long as the above criteria is followed and if the neighbors change they must also support the livestock
- Yes to all of the above besides support from neighbours - just because I don't feel like my neighbour shouldn't have chickens shouldn't stop them from it as long as they're responsible, clean and adhere to the bylaws.
- 🙅
- I think if the animals are cared for properly and the neighbours approve it should be ok
- If they can be kept safely and they are not a nuisance they would help a family's sustainability
- As long as the animal is well taken care of and isn't a nuisance.
- Urban chickens should be allowed, but with specific criteria adhered to
- If livestock can be adequately cared for within the city and not be a nuisance to others, I see no reason to restrict them.
- I think hens should have been permitted a long time ago. This "review" has taken way too long. However, as a matter of animal welfare, all persons keeping ANY livestock (hens, rabbit, etc) ought to be licenced and registered, and have their premises subject to regular inspections. Whether this would fall under the Health Inspectors (like restaurants) or another/newly formed dept, this would be an essential part of the bylaws.
- Fresh eggs!
- Yes again
- I think that if the number of hens is set in the by law, proper care is mandated and noise considerations are met (surely hens can't be noisier than a barking dog??), hens would be great to have in the neighbourhood
- I feel that well kept hens with proper care and cleanliness would Benefit the community



- I think raising chickens safely and in a clean manner would be great for the city! Also Goats. Goats are cool. They eat weeds!
- As long as proper care was being given, and the area the animal is being held is appropriate for size, eating habits, etc.
- Urban hens are important to food security and can be a healthy part of the urban ecosystem
- Yess! Farm animals make great support animals and pets! As long as they are properly taken care of.
- I think having hens would be a good way to be self-efficient. I think that there needs to be rules in place though.
- Hens would allow households and communities to become more self sustainable. As for other livestock I think it would depend on the type of livestock and how well the household or community is willing to accommodate it.
- Hens can be very beneficial for the community (food source)
- If at least one neighbour agrees, needing full approval from all neighbours will be a disaster. Agree w the last bullet.
- It has worked in other municipalities
- I agree with this but there needs to be more clarification as to what " must benefit community or have positive impact " means?
- I don't see a problem with it, however, getting approval from an adjacent neighbor who then moves away might be replaced by someone who would not approve.
- Hens are great! They're quiet and chickens can be great pets as well as provide food for families (eggs I don't mean they should eat their Pets)
- Lots of large properties within the city to provide ample space and lifestyle.
- Chickens and other birds provide food, and help control waste. Sheep and goats should also be considered to help maintain healthy grassland environment
- I like the idea of urban chickens and I suppose if other animals like goats for weed control can be around that's a great way to reduce pesticide use in yards.
- We support urban farming and livestock fully, everyone deserves food security.
- I see no problem as long as owners can adequately take care of their animals and are keep their living quarters clean.
- As long as it's monitored for no hoarding or illegal stuff
- Allowing people to provide for themselves, as well as give first-hand experience to food production and animal care, is a great initiative.
- It could be beneficial. But a limit on how many can be at a single property, and ensuring animals have enough space
- If a suitable place for the animal and they are well looked after I would support this bylaw
- I live in a community that has urban hens already and have not had any issue with it. The city also uses goats for weed and grass control. This just seems like a natural extension.
- Only if strict rules are put in place that would ensure proper care of the animal and follow ups by by-law officers check in on the welfare of these conditions.



- But there should be provisions to rescind authorization if it becomes a nuisance (e.g. roosters at dawn) or if it attracts wildlife (e.g. coyotes or bobcats)
- It's a sustainable practice which for families with children has huge learning value. Just like we love having a veggie garden to enjoy fresh produce, it would be wonderful to enjoy fresh eggs and maybe share them with our neighbors which will build community.
- As long as they have the appropriate space and can protect them from predators then should be free to have a pure food source
- I have always wanted hens !!!!!
- As a me ya health professional, I see a benefit for some people to have livestock as therapy animals. As long as the environment allows for it then I agree on a case by case basis.
- I support this ONLY if there are clear regulations in place regarding the animal's comfort and welfare. I would not support raising livestock for meat.
- Free eggs and morning alarms
- Nothing more then chickens and pit belly pigs
- i support urban chickens and think they should be allowed in city limits
- As long as the above bylaws are being followed and the animal is being well taken care of and cleaned up after, I'd be okay with a neighbour having approved livestock
- Giving an animal a safe place to live is always great!
- Sure
- I believe there should be a greater connection between urban communities and their food sources. Urban hens would help facilitate this connection and also allow people more control over the quality of care that 'free range hens' have access to.
- Times have changed
- any way to save money is a good tbing
- As long as no roosters are allowed.
- If adequate living conditions are met, I believe urban livestock are beneficial.
- I don't think it would hurt anyone so I see no reason not to.
- Every case is different
- Chickens are great!
- May increase coyote present
- Yes Urban Hens that are properly taken care of :)
- I think this should be on a case by case basis with an application process
- Hell yeah
- People should be aloud to have a few chicken or ducks as long as they keep the area clean
- We would definitely like to see urban hens in the city
- Yes! Yes!
- I believe in being self sustaining and this is one way to do that, as well as a good resource for the children to learn from.
- Responsible ownership and care of animals is never a bad thing.



- Hens would be a great addition! I don't care about the noise. How awesome would it be to wake up and ask my neighbour for some fresh eggs lol please give us hens, it's Covid. We need something to make us happy. Hens are love, hens are life.
- I would love to have hens
- Urban hens have several uses and are less (and certainly no more) of a concern than roaming cats or barking dogs if cared for correctly.
- There is no reason to disallow this
- I support this fully!
- People should be allowed to do what they like on their property so long as it doesn't interfere with others.
- If the animals are well kept and healthy I don't see a problem
- If there is enough space on the property for the hens then why not. Fresh eggs!
- Yes this is an amazing green step
- If there are sufficient regulations and the means to enforce them I do not see an issue
- Many animals can bring comfort, joy etc to many people. I don't believe urban animals should be restricted to feline and canine.
- Hens are a valuable addition to increase food security in the city
- As long as some restrictions are applied. Maximum allowable animals etc. taking into account noise, space and smell.
- Having animals is great! Especially ones like hens which can produce resources for families. Why are people allowed to have pigeons and not hens?
- Who wouldn't want fresh eggs
- It would depend on the type of livestock, the space available and type of home including Distance from neighbors
- As long as the animal poses no threat and is in no way a nuisance to any person.
- There are many potential species that can be blended into a family unit successfully.
- I love the idea of urban farming - sustainable, local, supports a sense of community and cooperation
- families who want to produce their own natural sourced eggs instead of mass produced eggs.
- I think we should be able to be more self sustaining. I've lived in other cities where many people keep chickens / hens.
- People should be able to own them but with restrictions and respect to neighbors
- I would love to have hens in my yard
- I feel like this would be beneficial for people that want a pet but cannot have the typical ones
- I prefer animals over people anyways
- I would support this if it was highly regulated to ensure that the animal has a good living situation and is not abused or subjected to horrific conditions. Also I think that this would be good if the hen was for laying eggs, not for meat (I believe if someone that was untrained tried to harvest the hen for meat it could cause undue pain and distress)
- People use chickens for support or egged.



- having the ability to raise chickens for eggs and feed on small scales would help many families on a hard economy
- Chickens for everyone!
- I see no reason this shouldn't be allowed as it doesn't do anyone any harm.
- Most people are responsible. Pets come in all shapes and identity
- People can have more sustainable living and choice on the healthy choices of the foods they eat
- If it helps the person and doesn't affect me I don't care what pet you have
- As long as the animal is properly cared for and cleanliness maintained
- Who doesn't love fresh eggs! Outdoor meat rabbits are great as well, easy to keep in a backyard. Maybe not sheep/goats/pigs unless they have a few acres though.
- I understand neighbour support but what happens when a new neighbour moves in and doesn't want hens next door?
- My sister in law keeps hens and loves them
- Let people have animals that they want as long as they are not a nuisance
- Yes, but I'm on the fence/more neutral. Livestock is very high maintenance to keep up with smell, cleaning, etc. and could lead to more problems than a dog or a cat if people do not know how to properly care for their livestock.
- The city should have less oversight on what is done on private property.
- Potential someone inside city limits might have sufficient space for other animal. Exemptions from standard rules could be applied for from bylaw officers.
- Absolutely. As long as animals and livestock are held properly and as long as there is guidelines including approval by neighbors I think this is a great idea. So many people would benefit from a more self sufficient lifestyle as well as the mental health benefits gained from this.
- Should have to apply with special permits to house Hens on property.
- I feel that urban hens should be allowed in Calgary but with specific restrictions that way animals are not being mistreated and is not affecting neighboring houses
- Feed birds/ egg laying should be acceptable
- As long as the animal and it's related housing and care is not causing disturbances to the neighborhood, they should be allowed no matter what species.
- People with yards should be allowed to have hens or meat rabbits if wanted. They should be educated on proper care and avian flus
- If you can handle, care for and maintain the hens, why not?
- i like the freedom of production of my own food
- Some live stock animals like chickens and goats can be very beneficial
- I would expect a registration process and accountability for people to ensure they are keeping a clean yard and not creating a health risk
- As long as it is clear and registered with the city - this way they can be monitored for compliance and proper care of the hens



- As long as the animal is housed properly and has access to a vet specialized in their care, owning them shouldn't be an issue.
- Lots of community benefits.
- Provided they are hens only (no roosters, as they are a noise nuisance).
- It's important for the community, I see no issue as long as the community can provide input and come to a consensus.
- With proper housing for livestock and ability for neighbours to voice any concerns if there are issues (noise, smell).
- As long as there are rules about appropriate care, I don't see the issue.
- I think it's important to allow people to explore a sustainable lifestyle in a responsible way that ensures the animals are well cared for.
- as long as the urban livestock doesn't prove to be a nuisance to surrounding community members there is no problem with one person having some. this should require a case-by-case analysis with additional fees by those who apply.
- As long as the living situation is maintained
- Would love me a few chickens
- There is no valid reason to not support it but there must be bylaws in place to ensure these animals are cared for all year round, including winter months.
- I think it's forward thinking. Excellent example are the goats.
- As long as the animal is well cared for and isn't causing an issue with neighbours it should be allowed
- As long as the hens are provided proper living conditions and do not disturb neighbors, then sure, why not
- Bees and chickens at a limited number may be ok
- If the animals are taken care of properly and respectfully no problem
- If chicken coops required a licence (and thus revenue generating), the City could ensure regulations are met to minimize nuisance to neighbors
- The ability to grow our own food supplies is helpful for sustainable living
- I think owning small livestock and hens can be done humanely and well within city limits provided there is 1) enough space for each animal to live freely, 2) have access to shelter 3) have access to food and clean water, 4) owner establishes perimeter so that the animals cannot escape the enclosure/yard
- having pets are amazing for peoples' mental health! but not everyone wants a dog or cat. I think if the living conditions are deemed suitable (and there are check ups to make sure it continues to be suitable) why not!
- Chickens for everyone!
- There are a lot of animals that cannot be reintegrated into the wild and living in a home/city setting would be ideal for other rescues.
- Hens are in many urban cities and often times livestock can thrive and be a positive impact to families or communities



- everyone should be able to own whatever animals they'd like, especially as beneficial as hens, as they provide food
- As long as neighbors are respected and the animals are cared for properly. Animals should be removed if they are not being cared for properly or being abused. Also, I do not support raising these animals for food and seeing my neighbor run an abattoir in their backyard. Emotional support animal yes. Food no.
- because everyone has the right to make sure they have accessible food and income, which hens would provide. the city of calgary will let you starve and blame you for being poor, but a hen at least provides eggs.
- sure, I think people would just need to comply with nuisance/ good neighbour bylaws. Do chickens make rooster noises? People would freak about that (I wouldn't, ive lived by a rooster and I liked the wake-up calls)
- If the neighbours want chickens, they should be able to have them.
- As long as the animals aren't a nuisance to neighbors I think this is a great idea.
- Would be great to provide knowledge to kids, food and lawn care.
- "I don't agree with the "offers community benefit/will have a positive impact" but love everything else.
- I'm all for community and being neighbourly but I wouldn't want them coming over and picking my eggs or harming my hens."
- I would like the bylaws to mandate the size of yard these hens will need and to consider other animals carefully or you'll end up with more problems than the stray domestic breed rabbits we see everywhere.
- Hens are not dangerous animals.
- I think having livestock in the city would be fun and extremely educational for the community, especially children.
- Urban hens offer sustainable food with no negative consequences
- Encouraging urban farming is an important for sustainable and independent food supply.
- .
- Yes as long as all parties agree
- I would want a chicken.
- No roosters or noisy animals however
- If there are regulations in place, i support livestock in the city.
- Homesteading is very sustainable and can prpvide lots of benefits for a community
- If theres strict guidelines and follow ups.
- I don't see why it would be a problem
- The neighbor support is a big issue because of noise, smell or even allergies.
- Let's stick to hens.
- They can be great for mental health . Teach kids about farms and help low income families feed themselves
- I support hyper local/home grown food sources



- good idea
- Hens a definite yes. I am surprised we do not have this already. Children are so robbed out of experiences like these.
- i fully support urban hens, maybe a limit on numbers, but am not well versed in keeping chickens.
- I think thiamin a great idea.
- Current bylaws are far too restrictive on livestock vs pet. Pets come in all shapes and sizes and it's not the city's place to say otherwise unless it is having a negative impact on the community.
- More inclusivity
- Hens and pot belly pigs as in home pets should be allowed. We allow large dogs why not pot belly pigs?
- I think this makes sense
- Cleanliness is key with chickens! Roosters should not be allowed there is zero reason for city folk to be breeding
- As long as the animals are well cared for and not disruptive to neighbour's they should be allowed in an urban setting
- Lowering our carbon footprint by bringing our food sources closer only makes sense.
- applying and paying a small permit fee so the city keeps track of urban hens.
- Yes but you should also allowed small pigs
- I think hens could safely be raised in Calgary only providing that they have enough greenspace and proper living conditions and that the person owning them is educated on raising/keeping them.
- It makes sense for people to raise their own chickens for eggs.
- I think if the home owners are responsible and respectful enough to their neighbours to have certain live stock, and to take care of the animal's needs, i think it'll be ok.
- As long as they aren't noisy and owners cleaned up after them daily.
- There does need to be clear rules. No roosters, a hen limit, ensuring heath of the chickens, ensuring that noise and smell is kept down, ensuring their safety from wildlife or feral animals, etc.
- Laying hens, milking goats, and similar livestock would be hugely beneficial to many families, and do not require large farmyards for good quality of life. Not more annoying or smelly than other large pets!
- I adamantly support a change in bylaw that allows hens. The restrictions should only be based on being able to provide adequate care to them. I also support allowing miniature goats provided adequate care can be maintained. These are animals that provide enjoyment and food and should be allowed in our city.
- Some breeds of goats and pigs are no different then a large breed dog.
- Should be allowed for the pupose of eggs and pets
- Shouldn't be a problem if adjacent neighbour's need to give approval
- its 2020 support animals come in all shapes and forms
- I love the idea of urban hens, if the correct bylaws were in place.



- I think having hens, who are treated well and raised responsibly is a great idea, especially since we should currently be limiting grocery store trips....
- Please do not bully breeds
- As Long as there are limits to the amount of total animals.
- I don't think the neighbours should need to be in agreement, but should have recourse if the animals aren't properly kept/cared for.
- A similar bylaw is in Kelowna, and the ability to have hens is very cool. My only concern would be come winter time, and ensuring these animals have appropriate shelter.
- Only if the livestock has been rescued from slaughter
- Many other urban cities allow this, it's about time Calgary caught up with the times.
- Adjacent neighbors must approve
- As long as the aforementioned livestock is not a public nuisance. Or a negative influence on a community or other persons a person should be allowed their personal brand of lifestyle which includes pets of various types. EXCLUDING Rats. We are in Alberta and proudly rat free.
- They are pets that people love and care for, the same as a cat or guinea pig, or dog.
- Pigeons for instance, are an animal that we tend to consider as a nuisance animal, but early settlers brought pigeons here as companion animals, and then left them in the wild to fend for themselves. Hens are of no concern, because they provide food (eggs and meat) for the person raising them. As long as the hens have a suitable place to live, they are of no more nuisance than pigeons.
- Allow citizens to own for food (eggs) and or pets as long as they are properly cared for
- People should be allowed to have chickens to produce eggs for their family. I do not believe people should be allowed to have bees for honey though
- Owning livestock in the city is a great idea!
- Provides people with fresh food
- Except for support from neighbours. If there is adequate space, the hens are properly cared for, and the hen house is on the owners property only I don't see why the neighbours should get a say in the matter. Hens are way less annoying than some dogs or kids for that matter and neighbours get no say in that either.
- Na
- I think having local animals to produce food and such is good for the economy. I always prefer to support a local store over a chain.
- Raised properly chickens are a great addition to the urban environment
- Worthy of examination.
- I generally support this although it would be good to know what is meant by "other livestock". Does this mean I can put a horse in my backyard?
- Hens would be great to help with pest control in a back yard as well as eggs.
- If a strong case is made and there are no objections, why have a blanket prohibition?
- It's nice to grow your own food.
- I know people that live in communities that allow hens and they love it



- Would be a case by case basis. For example very small yards or zero lot lines property not great candidates.
- I am okay with chickens, but no other livestock.
- Small livestock. such as goats, I would find to be acceptable. Larger livestock can result in the area becoming undesirable because of space required noise, odor, etc.
- This could help families whom have experience, or want to experience, livestock handling to help sustain themselves. My neighbor has a huge garden and grows all her own vegetables yr round, if she had chickens as well, she could have eggs too and become more self sustaining and help each costs of living that the city keeps raising.
- If animals are being provided proper care and the IMMEDIATE (ie, either side, back and front) neighbors don't have an issue, I don't see why not.
- chickens within reason are fine. It's only when they get so stinky I can't enjoy my yard that they become a problem.
- As long as the animal is small enough to live well in it's yard, is well taken care of and the yard remains clean I think they should be allowed.
- If these criteria are enforced, families would have some means of self-sufficiency.
- Limit of one hen per family member
- I think that the chance to have livestock within reason should be allowed. Being self sufficient would benefit individual families and help to provide more local food options that would otherwise be costly.
- Urban chickens are great for communities. Let the people eat the eggs!
- I think certain non noisy animals such as quail are a positive addition to households especially with young children so they learn to care for said animal and also so they learn first hand where food comes from
- If someone wants hens/ live stock and have space and means why not? Obviously if they do not take care of the space, keep it clean and safe for people in the area that would not be acceptable
- With food insecurities becoming a real concern during a global pandemic I fully support the keeping of hens and other livestock
- If there can be rules I support it
- So long as these animals have a safe adequate home I don't see anything wrong.
- So long as neighbors aren't affected, and everything is set up with no neglect, I don't see why someone would be restricted on what types of animals they have on their property if they can appropriately care for them.
- I think that there are many animals considered "livestock" that can provide enrichment to not just their owners but to a community. I also do not believe that these animals would pose a greater disturbance to a neighbourhood than pet dogs or cats could so I don't see why they shouldn't be allowed if the proper measures are taken.
- If neighbors support, I cannot complain.
- I think it should be someone who is versed in livestock care not some random bylaw officer who might not have any actual idea what is a good living condition for that animal.
- Only if numbers are limited. Would not like to live near a mini farm in the city.



- I am in support of urban hens when properly cared for
- As long as the animals are not being abused, causing harm, and have proper care.
- Everything should be case by case
- A “yes” or “no” answer is difficult in the absence of a deeper understanding of requirements; how nuisance issues would be managed, which livestock would be permitted and so forth, but generally I’m supportive.
- I agree with the criteria above.
- I grew up on a farm. Having a couple of chickens for fresh eggs would be wonderful. When properly taken care of, they are not a problem.
- As the current pandemic has shown, people need to be allowed to grow/raise their own to the extent that it is practical. This should be encouraged and supported by the city rather than discouraged
- doesn't effect me
- As long as it’s not hurting anyone. Must keep in mind wild predators that we have a lot of in Calgary (coyotes, bobcats)
- I think it’s a good idea and know some of those animals can make great pets too.
- As long as people can care for the animals why not let them have animals as a companion?
- So long as the adjacent neighbors agreed that it was ok.
- Livestock that can live a safe healthy life in the city should be allowed.
- Yes! We need livestock in Calgary. We can build a better community with more variety.
- A potbelly pig can be just as much a companion animal as a dog or cat, so why exclude it?
- Only if there was enough room for the livestock to live comfortably not cruelly
- Join the other large cities in Canada allowing backyard hens. City aldermen need to be educated, e.g. dumbest comment was that hens die and children would be traumatized!!!! Using that logic, I’m guessing that alderman would like to outlaw cats, dogs, fish, hamsters, etc. People are far removed from their food. Time to get them in touch. Calgary holds the Stampede - back to our ranching/farming roots but the city council seems to be trying to create some pompous image of the city. Many newcomers come from areas where backyard chickens are the norm. Seems like council is forcing their ideas on these newcomers. Is this a class issue from council's perspective?
- What's wrong with chickens?
- Hens are a good idea, provided they can be kept safe from wildlife such as coyotes.
- Other large urban centres allow small livestock, ie chickens. Not only are some people emotionally attached to these animals (ie, emotional support), but allowing chickens in particular would help with food insecurity for some people
- As long as the animals are safe and cared for and the smell/coop/ pen was maintained, and no neighbor complaints.
- If the animals are kept on owners property and cared for, why wouldnt we allow this?
- There are many cities, towns etc that allow the housing of hens for eggs. Other animals like pigs can be cared for in the same manner of dogs/cats. As long as they follow local bylaws and the APA I would have no concerns with my neighbours having these animals



- backyard gardeners would love to have hens for both eggs and pest control.
- Home henkeeping is good sustainable urban farming!
- If it enhances ones live, one should be able to own such animal.
- I agree
- Needs to be monitored
- Provided there was a requirement that neighbours sign-off on said livestock.
- As long as the animals don't become a nuisance then go for it
- F
- I believe keeping hens is a right that Calgarians should have. The ability to produce food is our right. Bylaws should only be based on making sure they have proper living conditions. I would also like to see Calgary allow residents to keep miniature goats. Also provided that they can maintain adequate living conditions for them.
- Hens provide eggs and have the capacity to be emotional support animals. If kept humanely , they can contribute to communities.
- I support hens but I would need to know more about what other animals/livestock are included in this. Noise and smell is a concern for me.
- Support from adjacent neighbours is important for livestock. Noises and smells will affect neighbours
- Provided there being cared for and not become a nusences or smell from cages not being cleaned etc
- criteria is vague and up to discretion. Also, who approves the livestock? is there a permitting process, or, is it (dis)approved when the enforcement officer investigates and decides keep vs no keep. I argue many dog owners don't provide suitable conditions, don't have neighbor support, and some dogs have zero positive community impact (i.e. poop and barking). why would dog owners not be subject to the same rigor?
- Subject to change if neighbours change
- Limit the number of each per parcel of land and make stipulations about housing of whichever kind of animal (i.e. a winterized chicken coop / shelter from wind, snow, or rain for other animals.)
- Chickens are wonderful pets and can reduce the pressure in factory farms by allowing people to care highly for their chickens and receive eggs in return
- I believe support animals are necessary for many individuals, helping them through anxious and hard times. Reduces stressors, calming individuals, maybe reducing suicide, confrontations and increasing an individuals self worth as well as their worth to our city.
- I think that yards are a waste of resources. We should be encouraging urban farming instead of fining people who participate.
- Would need to be in an enclosure protecting them from other animals when not supervised
- I do not have an issue with proposed amendment.
- I think the ability for people in the city of Calgary to be more self sustainable whether it be through gardening or animal keeping is important. As long as the keeping of livestock is done in a responsible and ethical way, both for neighboring citizens as well as the animals.
- The current laws are to lax



- Chickens are quieter than dogs and provide food.
- As long as they're not a "nuisance" I don't see a problem
- Service animals come in all forms.
- As long as the animal is properly cared for and the area is kept clean and tidy, I'm all for it.
- People should be allowed to have chickens, provided they take proper care of them and provide them a good and healthy life.
- Reasonably cost effective food source for eggs etc
- Hens are great natural pest control, are affectionate and friendly, easy to contain, provide food and are not noisy.
- As long as the animals can be properly cared for. No roosters
- As long as these animals are being cared for as pets and not being used for food
- I support hens in Calgary
- All animals should be welcomed.
- Some guidelines are needed, however if situation meets these then people should have rights to house on private property.
- Can you please allow pot bellied or tea cup pigs? I've always wanted one.
- Small amount of chickens for a family is fine. Not for selling purposes. Let people feed themselves in a healthier way if they can be responsible
- As long as the animals are properly being cared for, no objections.
- If it's on your property and they are taken care of there is no need for concern
- So long as the permitted animals cause no additional noise or smell of an already allowed animal, I don't see an issue.
- As long as neighbours agreed, but that's hard because people move
- Animals must be properly contained in private property and there must be a mechanism to deal with noise/smell
- I have no strong feelings against hens.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and are kept at a limit this is a great idea.
- Yes but also have rules regarding pen size
- Fully support this, I think hens are a great pet, and when done responsibly has little to no impact on neighbors
- Regular visits from bylaw officers to check in on animal welfare and clean living situations should be required.
- ALL of the criteria need to be addressed as well as odor and attractiveness of the structures erected to house the livestock. Honestly, some of the so called greenhouses in Calgary yards are shocking.
- Up to 3 hens, or one pot belly pig wouldn't have more impact than dogs and cats
- I think this is a fantastic idea and would do wonders for our city
- Why not.
- Implementation of home Hens, with the approval from neighbors on small lots would be essential to preventing unnecessary complaints.



- I think backyard hens would be amazing! Of course a limit should be imposed and square footage of lot should also be considered.
- However there needs to be BASIC SECURE coop options as the city has a large number of predators who would love a feathery snack.
- "No roosters. Hens only.
- Chicken owner should have to answer questions on a form when applying for a permit to demonstrate that the owner understands the care and feeding of chickens and the rules for keeping chickens in an urban environment. Wouldn't hurt to have a picture on file of the chicken house/coop setup."
- I would support it as long as no roosters are allowed.
- Each person has different needs and if we are trying to be inclusive, this must be considered. Calgary does have a history of livestock living in the city.
- Many Urban Canadian towns and cities allow it. There are some good rules, like not allowing roosters, which really in urban fowl keeping are the only problem. This is a good initiative.
- as long as there is no disturbance and the animal is cared for and the environment is appropriate, I do not see a reason why you should not be allowed to own livestock.
- I am a big supporter of urban hens, and if owners can keep them or other livestock in suitable and humane living conditions then they should be allowed to.
- I don't see why not
- I see having a limited amount of chickens beneficial as long as they are well looked after. It would be easy to neglect them and then they would become a nuisance problem [lice smell ect]
- Living along side animals can be rewarding on many levels including the ability to raise your own food source
- As long as these animals are not creating damage or nuisance to the public people should be able to have them. If some owners cannot be responsible than they should be penalized.
- Yes, but I feel proper homing/space should be required for hens. People should have to pay a higher fee to have hens and should be monitored if possible.
- Chickens are great! They provide eggs, and in some cases even comfort to owners
- It's absurd that certain animals which are considered livestock such as hens, ducks and small pigs are not allowed. I understand the spirit of the law (to prevent my neighbor from having a bull) but there are no reasons to ban the above animals.
- Doesn't bother me
- Hens are fantastic animals and much quieter than a lot of dogs, and don't run around wild like cats and rabbits. They make fantastic pets and also provide eggs. LET US HAVE HENS.
- Honestly a sheep or goat in a yard would be quieter than most dogs and just as friendly.
- Hens are sustainable sources of food and provide good companionship.
- I would comment that there should be a limit on the number of animals and they must pass regular checks by Bylaw Enforcement Officers.
- Include ducks with hens, as they are more prolific layers. Limit males. Require clipped wings to minimize at large birds



- For hens only.
- No issue provided they are properly cared for.
- This pandemic situation and global affairs have people looking for more opportunities to embrace the ability to become more sufficient in being able to produce their own food. There is no reason to restrict responsible ownership.
- Yes, and case by case acceptance of pot belly pigs should also be considered.
- I would only support for hens and only as long as neighbours agree. If they become a nuisance with noise etc then warnings need to be issued and escalate from there
- must have neighbors approval,
- All animals have a right to be looked after in a suburban setting. Each case should be looked at.
- I support growing food within the city where feasible.
- Can provide families with cost effective food (chickens can give eggs)
- As long as there appropriate living conditions for the hens.
- I want one, and now my husband won't be able to say they're illegal.
- Yes, if they do not disturb the neighbors
- Not everyone can own a cat or dog due to allergies, and a pot bellied pig or goat or chicken may be a good substitute.
- So long as they are taken care of and not unnecessarily disturbing neighbors, does it actually matter?
- I don't have an issue with it as long as the animals are cared for properly
- Good idea
- I think it could be beneficial for the city
- They are no worse than other pets, and things like fresh eggs from the backyard are a positive
- I want my hens back safely raised them in the city for 15 yrs
- Hens are awesome
- I support urban farming and « livestock » therapy animals - like pigs and roosters - as long as the animal is well cared for
- Family have hens out on rural property and they lay eggs that are eaten for breakfast every day. The hens also eat all table scraps and leftovers, so less waste.
- Needs to make sure animals are treated properly and have proper pens etc
- It makes sense, chickens can also provide eggs as well as companionship and are a great learning experience for children.
- Some livestock can be pet & some can be non-intrusive.
- Yes
- If done responsibly, this could be a very real benefit to our community
- Could show children how to raise animals and provide support to families.
- If there is mutual benefit I support
- I like fresh eggs
- Who wouldn't like fresh eggs everyday?!



- It needs to be quiet, not stinky, and cool with the neighbours, but I think small livestock are cool
- Everyone should have a right to farm and be food secure.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and not a nuisance to anyone then they should be allowed.
- As long as the needs of the animals are met, and they are not a big nuisance to citizens
- I have no issue as long as owners are responsible of them.
- I think they aren't any louder than a child and I like that it adds a level of sustainability.
- Obviously there would need to be control over what kind of livestock and how many animals per household. I don't think that the Chief Bylaw Officer should have sole discretion though, if needed, a plebiscite should be had to determine the exceptions
- Backyard chickens should have been allowed years ago, with proper provisions in place.
- Each case is different and should be evaluated differently
- I want chickens!!!
- I have no issues with people having hens. I personally would love a goat, miniature horse or donkey
- "If someone wants a hen, they should be able to have a hen.
- I really have no opinion on this."
- I think it will allow people to have their own fresh eggs and meat and I don't see a reason on why a person can't have the right to do so.
- All animals need proper enrichment, shelter and veterinary care.
- Case by case, check the welfare of the animals regularly
- Yes every animal should be taken care of
- I think that backyard chickens and other small 'livestock' provide benefits to families and communities. Companionship, caring for others, and eggs are all community building!
- I think an evaluation of the living situation for the animals would be good. At time of permit and maybe a follow up. To make sure they're okay.
- Heck yes!
- Community support from neighbours would be nice to have
- Evaluations on a case by case basis are important and if the owner EVER violates the bylaw (doesn't properly care for the livestock, doesn't clean properly, receives multiple and repeated legitimate complaints from neighbors) they won't be allowed to have the livestock again.
- When done in a positive/safe manner for animals and neighbours livestock ownership brings nothing but benefits for everyone involved no matter their age.
- people who live in suburban areas should be able to keep hens / other food sourced livestock much in the same way those people can keep gardens.
- Yes but it would depend on the details of the criteria, such as description of suitable living conditions, how one proves positive impact, as well as consistency of enforcement.
- Na
- it would depend on the livestock and why they are there. Therapy pets yes. For killing no.
- I like the idea of being able to have hens to get eggs.



- I want some chickens, a lot of my neighbours do as well, and none of us want to do it illegally
- I think as long as they have to have appropriate permits and have ensured the hens will be properly housed and cared for, that people should definitely be allowed to do this.
- as long as the area is kept clean and animals are cared for, I see no issues
- Chickens & goats can provide great benefits for local sourced food & better understanding of farm animals
- Urban livestock can provide food, support for plant life, and social opportunities that all benefit individuals and neighborhoods. As long as the requirements are met, there is every reason to allow urban livestock.
- would love to have chickens. Also like that neighbors have to be ok with that.
- Community hens would fill the same role as community gardens. Education, enjoyment and self-subsistence
- we lived in area that allowed chickens and our neighbors chickens never bothered us.
- As long as the area is kept sanitary and tidy
- Yes, I believe people have the right to own any animal as long as there is suitable living conditions and that the owner has enough to support for proper nutrition. They must research and have proper understanding and documentation to have other livestock animals.
- Guidelines would need to be clear and followed, however many livestock animals could make good pets
- I think that hens could be a reasonable option if neighbors are in agreement.
- Sometimes we need to get out of the “not in my neighbour hood”. The past few months have shown us all to “love thy neighbour” and so long as they clean up the mess if my neighbour wanted a cow in his yard I honestly would have no big issues, life is changing and so should we.
- I think it is a good idea to allow inner-city livestock.
- "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." This is completely false and who'm ever put forth these certifiably false claims on a government website should be let go. All I can say is, this had better be changed because it's 2020 and bigoted government wont be tolerated.
- All 6 of my surrounding neighbours are pro chickens and would live this idea
- Sustainability in any form should be explored and if it does not interfere with the neighbor's quality of life, it should be allowed.
- Becoming more self sufficient is good as long as the animals don't annoy the neighborhood
- Citizens should be allowed to have these animals
- I love all animals, I don't see this being a problem
- Chickens are quieter than dogs. They also provide sustainability and can help with pest management in the garden. I do not believe support from neighbours should be required as we all have experienced a lousy neighbour who enjoys making their neighbours lives miserable.
- Anyway people can provide for themselves that doesn't negatively affect neighbors is a great idea
- You need to have insurance on livestock within city limits.



- There would have to be conditions and limits on how many
- Chickens and other small livestock would be fine. Allows for some self-sufficiency
- I'd love to have my own hens
- If there is proper care and housing for the animals, and they are not an annoyance to neighbors I don't see a problem with it. I do not agree that livestock should be in residential areas, however on rural properties I agree.
- I love chickens
- Support from neighbours is a tricky criteria. One person can say no just because they're selfish and crotchety? What if someone says yes and then sells their home and is replaced by someone who now has a problem with it? I think there should be a process for notifying neighbors and allowing them to come forward if they have concerns. in the absence of concerns, and if the applicants are otherwise suitable to have the animals, then their application should be approved
- Animals are amazing!!!
- Makes sense
- There's a fine line between "livestock" and pets now (I have a pet micro pig. Hens are great and promote a sense of responsibility, as well as contribute to the household. They are easy to maintain. There should be a set number and space requirements however. And for pets like pigs etc there should be a stipulation that they are to reside indoors with the family as a pet/household member not live in the backyard (same as with a dog).
- Urban hens have worked well in many jurisdictions.
- I believe pigs should be allow within City limits as pets.
- Urban hens is a brilliant idea, and would be beneficially to many Calgarians.
- There needs to be clarity on distance from residential homes, dealing with doors and cleaning requirements.
- Please limit the number of chickens a person can own
- If neighbors support the choice and suitable conditions exist then other livestock should be allowed, example pigs. But I think the adjacent neighbors should be expanded depending on the type of livestock, with exceptions outlined in the last bullet point
- As long as they are kept in a clean and healthy environment and not roaming.
- Yes hens are good to have for eggs as long as area for hens is big enough for suitable quality of life for the hens.
- Hens are awesome
- As long as owners follow rules and the animals are treated humanely and have good living conditions, I support this bylaw amendment. All kind of animals provide all kinds of benefits to all animals.
- noise would be a factor. three strikes you're out?
- Under the right conditions for raising and housing hens, they are not extremelt intrusive. However insurance that no birds escape and become an feral problem is required.
- There is no reason we could not keep chickens in Calgary.It provides a sustainable food source and keeps the insects down organically.



- I would like yo see the number if animals allowed be proportional to the size of the property.
- the more people who eat sustainability, the better for our planet
- I do not see many negative effects of this bylaw
- Responsible ownership of Hens. Must keep their pens clean and well maintained.
- Yes, I support this with the development of material that outlines clear expectations regarding having hens.
- If the neighbours were considered BEFORE the animal was moved in and it will be properly cared for.
- Case by case basis seems like a good way to go
- urban development of viable food sources ie. egg production helps communities and people in general.
- What a great way for Calgarians to be more self sufficient.
- As with any animal, there should be some sort of registration for urban hens or other livestock.
- I'd LOVE to be able to be able to have a few hens. Home grown eggs, and a couple of sweet feathered friends.
- I think it would be okay to have small farm animals in the city as long as they have proper shelter and clean up after them
- I think it is good to allow hens in the urban areas but there must be sufficient bylaws in place to deal with neglected hens. For instance, the living quarters for the hens must be clean and cared for, etc, etc.
- I support this because of the criteria listed.
- I have lived in places with urban chickens before. I never found it to be a problem.
- Cows, pigs,
- I have no issues with this.
- A positive option where appropriate
- I see nothing wrong with having hens within city limits as long as the above conditions and requirements are met.
- Why not?
- As long as it's controlled and supervised regularly
- I think as long as there is reasonable caps on how many and rules it should be fine. Odor management and cleanliness would Need to be addressed
- "I'm all for more animals and less humans any day ;-)
- Seriously goats eat weeds and you can get milk, ducks eat insects as do chickens - and you have eggs, maybe it's crazy but llamas or ponies would keep coyotes and foxes out of the area that attack people's pets (not that they should be roaming free anyway...another rant for another time). The poop is the most natural fertilizer available. But, I'm a horsewoman so...I'm biased."
- I would love to have hens in my urban setting for eggs. I believe the owners should require a license and the coop should be inspected For appropriate conditions as winters in Calgary are very cold
- chickens are no more annoying then construction, loud vehicles, children screaming.



- I think responsible neighbours should be allowed to have other livestock.
- Should have a minimum acreage.
- As long as they're kept in a clean matter and contained. It's a great idea.
- Hens and other livestock animals can provide a positive community impact and a closer connection to the food we consume.
- I'm an old farm boy and miss having animals around. But they must not be a nuisance and need to be properly cared for.
- I don't have a problem with backyard chickens provided the conditions are suitable and are cared for. Perhaps there could be a yearly or every second year inspection/renewal to ensure compliance? If neighbours change, so could the support for the hens. And complaints must be investigated so that people respect this privilege.
- As we progress to a more environmentally and socially conscious culture urban hen ownership makes sense. Roosters should be restricted to avoid noise disturbances.
- I would like the idea of having hens on my property as pets and for eggs.
- As long as it's well kept
- Would be nice to have chickens for eggs in the backyard.
- A few (3-4) hens or a mini horse on a large property would not cause more odours or waste than dogs and cats
- It is fair.
- I think if the animals are well taken care of and owner ensures he cleans up excrement on a daily basis to minimize door, etc. I'm all for it.
- Livestock should be allowed especially chickens. Having chickens and the availability of chickens can provide people with a great protein source and can reduce poverty (eggs)
- Good for the environment and get fresh eggs.
- If the neighbours are irritated, hens go.
- chickens are not pests or nuisances. Let people have them
- I think it can benefit everyone to keep and raise hens.
- It's important that there is not a disruption to neighbours. Ie. noise, smell, etc.
- If done well, don't have a problem with small livestock.
- If all neighbours agrees and the housing requirements are met then yes it should be allowed, with follow up check ins to make sure it's being maintained proper/ responsible
- I don't see why people can't have a hen or two.
- Would need a limit on the number of hens
- Animals like hens and goats are useful!
- We encourage community gardening why couldn't we encourage community farming with standards around cleanliness.
- I don't see a problem with hens, as long as the owners are responsible and can care for them appropriately
- "Chickens, goats and pigs.



- Pigs alone would decrease compost by 50% or more."
- Why not? Animals can be less of an issue than a crappy neighbour.
- As long as the animal/s doesn't disturb the community/neighbors then I think it's a great idea.
- Urban homesteading is trending and a great environmental initiative that should be supported
- One or two hens only though.
- Allowing hens, goats, and other small livestock would be beneficial to the community if the owner of the animals is donating their harvest to food banks and local shelters/school/etc.
- I believe we should be able to have hens for providing our family with eggs. They are a staple and way over priced in the grocery stores.
- High propensity for lack of proper care for animals not suited for an urban environment
- If the city is aware of "hen" ownership and the owner has complied with the city by-laws and the owner has neighbour agreement
- Diversifying animal ownership for community benefit/improvement is a great way to support animal welfare through education and grow community ties.
- I've lived in other municipalities where this was allowed and it was fantastic. No reason not to allow it.
- I think there are benefits for people having hens, as long as living conditions are strictly enforced and neighbours are given the ability to weigh in, such as with public engagement for secondary suites.
- Support
- Neighbors would have to be on board with the type of animal
- It would be nice if we could prior the same level of care for people people living on the streets.
- It would be wonderful to have backyard hens - with the way the economy is going their eggs would be a good food source for Calgary and
- As long as they are licensed and have appropriate housing and care knowledge it's fine.
- There are different animals that are considered to be for emotional support. Whether it is an animal that is considered "livestock" or a pet.
- Hens could provide a serious support for low income families and allow for some food security.
- But could have limit, don't want a a neighbour with 200 chickens or something. Maybe like four/five.
- As long as he animal isn't annoying neighbours, have it.
- I would but proper licensing and fees to pay for supporting the program would be vital. Who will administer the program, who will check living conditions what will be the penalties for non-compliance to the rules?
- No
- This sounds fair to me. Those I,packed by the decision would have a say in it.
- Pets are very varied and you see this working in many other situations
- I would support this step towards allowing livestock, only if acceptable conditions are provided to the animals. There are advantages to families and increased sense of community through urban farming



including access to food and soil propagation. However this move should ensure potential owners are knowledgeable of animal needs and care particularity during winter months.

- I support hens in the city
- As long as the animals are cared for this could be great
- Neighborhood support is essential
- We should be able to own domesticated poultry so long as their hutches are clean and do not smell or offend neighbours.
- If it makes the person happy and the animal has enough space then why not.
- Support animals are vital for some people, and as long as the animal is cared for appropriately I think it's a great idea.
- I don't want hens but don't see a reason why people shouldn't be allowed to have them as long as they're not too noisy or stinky, and that they're looked after.
- I don't see why people can't have Serbian animals on their own property as long as the animals are taken care of properly.
- Hope the animals aren't too noisy- otherwise, this could be amazing
- I personally know the woman that got the rules changed for the LESA chickens and have met the birds. They are NOT noisy (although they are female) I think we have to be careful though. Hens yes... cows and horses no
- important neighbours have input
- permitting small agricultural animals would permit residents to better control what they eat (eggs)/grow
- As long as it's taken care of properly, I see no problem with it.
- I would like to keep 3-6 special breed hens in a clean pen on my property. No roosters, as they are loud and will wake up the neighborhood.
- I think that there is a large number of people that would like the opportunity to have urban hens, and I support the idea. That being said the health of the animals are paramount, eg winter and cleanliness of pens.
- Neighbours should be allowed to say as our homes are extremely close together
- But support from adjacent neighbours should not be a requirement. Some neighbours object to anything/everything. Adjacent neighbour input should only be considered if a nuisance/problem becomes apparent/proveable/demonstrable.
- As long as the animal/S are not bothersome
- Conditional Yes that does not grandfather in and thereby defeat revision based on changes (in ability of care and maintenance of animals) of ownership through sickness, incapacitation, financial problems or death.
- I think allowing other animals such as chickens, etc could greatly benefit people because that would allow them to become more self sustaining (cows milk, eggs, etc) also pigs are cute
- People should be allowed to have chickens and whatever benefits the community.
- Hens are useful



- I am for enabling Calgarians to have availability to different options to support their families which includes keeping a reasonable amount of hens on their property
- They don't bother me.
- Yes if the home has an inspection to check the living arrangements for them. As well as there should be NO slaughter allowed. . Yearly inspections should happen
- It has been proven effective in other cities to have hens and other animals.
- Only if the animal does not cause issues for neighbours (smell, noise etc.). This is exactly what happened with Airbnb licensing. Now I have constant noise and problems next door and The City won't address it because it was not considered in the original "brainstorm" and I use that word VERY loosely.
- I am in support of backyard chickens to a maximum of six hens. No roosters. I would also consider other small animals as well. All as long as people keep their yards clean and free of smell and flies.
- Hens may help lower income households feed their families
- Not everyone can have dogs or cats as pets. However there should be some clear restrictions on the types allowed
- I believe people should be able to have livestock on their property if they so choose as long as they keep everything clean so that neighbours don't have to deal with the smell
- As long as the conditions above are satisfied and the animals are in a suitable environment I like the idea.
- Well behaved animals provide comfort to many people and should be allowed on a case by case basis
- I think having hens is a great idea, as long as they are properly cared for
- I support small unintrusive urban farming for food producing animals such as chickens, ducks, rabbits, and bees. I'm small numbers for personal consumption
- I think pet ownership is a responsibility and that pet owners need to be able to handle the animal they're in possession of.
- I have no issues with this
- More livestock in the city will help Calgarians mentally, as well as be steps moving forward in the right direction to save this planet.
- Has long as neighbors are on board of said animals
- Very important for the needs of the environmental if people treat them well
- I support this as long as people are following proper hygiene and care for the hens.
- Hens are great.
- YES to support from adjacent neighbours. This should also be required to disclose when potentially purchasing or renting a home beside urban hens.
- I would support this as long as there is enough consistent funding to enforce issues such as cleanliness, health and welfare of animal etc.
- I don't see a problem with people owning livestock in city limits if it's done in a safe manner for the community and the animals



- Yes for all the conditions stated animals are healthy kept in clean conditions neighbours are not affected by smells or noise
- Why not? What's the big deal. Unless of course it's like the bad neighbours that don't even clean their yard up, and have piles of poop/stench for days/months.
- As long as there's a bylaw to protect the rights of the animal
- Let people have a choice. It's a shame an individual would have to relocate just to have a potbellied pig etc
- I think as long as animal and community welfare were taken into account the addition of animals in urban spaces can be very positive
- Support from adjacent neighbors should not be required.
- As long as neighbours are not impacted
- I want to have chickens!
- Livestock does not belong within city limits. Waste management, disease and noise issues outweigh the benefit of raising your own eggs when you can buy them for \$5.
- My family has wanted to have a few chickens for years, but of course this hasn't been a possibility. I see no problem with allowing a certain number, as long as they are properly homed and taken care of, and there is no negative affect on the neighbors. I understand the issue many have with chickens is the mess or smell, and while I agree that there should be measures to ensure they don't become a nuisance, I do think that people should be given a chance.
- Urban hens can be a manageable animal if housed responsibly and treated with care.
- "I think it's a humans rights violation to tell citizens they cannot have hens.
- Hens provide eggs, and improve sustainability of our communities."
- It seems a step to a more self sustaining environment....if the neighbours have no objection.....why not?
- Yes, I would support this as long as it didn't cause a noise issue or smell issue with adjacent neighbours.
- Who doesnt love fresh eggs?
- If living conditions are suitable why not? Neighbours cannot complain about the hens in order to keep on property.
- Only if it is properly ensured that suitable living conditions for the animal are followed. The city can't do that so far for dogs, cats, etc. So why would they think they could for even more animals?
- Urban hens would be AWESOME. We can use other jurisdictions as templates and do this safely and well
- Chickens are useful and harmless
- As long as the animals are being properly cared for and given the necessary enrichment for a good quality of life.
- Sure, in theory, I'd be interested in more information....
- As long as they are not a nuisance and owners must pick up their mess



- As long as they are required to pay licensing fees also that they do not disrupt or disturb any neighbours
- sustainable food options.
- This inclusion might support financial needs for some.
- Allowing hens would help food security for some families as well as provide an education in food to table which is missing from the majority of the population
- If neighbours all agree.
- Chickens goats sheep small livestock?.....yes.....we are getting to distanced from where our food comes from AND the benefits of an animal in our lives (beyond food and lawn cutting).
- re: no chickens - roosters like to crow. Florida has a problem with loose chickens
- I think that the ability to have livestock animals kept on residential property would enrich lives and the community.
- would not require neighbours support, it's an endless debate and non existent consensus, creates more frustration
- If neighbours are okay with it then why not?
- I would support as listed about if conditions are good for the animal. Certain livestock can be beneficial to do learning and companionship.
- There needs to be a limit on the number of hens, there also needs to be an annual review of the living conditions and a way to winter the animals
- Hens are cool. They feed you and it keeps production local and ethical.
- With neighbour support, this is a great idea
- There are likely urban properties that are somewhat removed from neighbors similar to an acreage where livestock would not 'bother' neighbors. In our regular neighborhoods though, I can not see having noise-making animals.
- I believe this is a solid plans for families to reduce food costs. Owners must maintain a clean and sanitary yard, limits to how many should be in place.
- I am in favour of livestock being permitted in the City. My main concern would be that they get proper care and living conditions. I don't like the idea that one cranky neighbour could stop someone from having an animal that was being properly cared for and posing no actual issues to the neighbourhood.
- I hear that chicken feces is smelly but that shouldn't stop someone from having chickens. Perhaps the bylaw should include proper management requirements.
- Hens are cool
- However, I am concerned about people mistreating these animals. Will regular ongoing inspections take place for these instances? (To verify appropriate shelter and care for these animals)
- As long as the immediate neighbors have no objections.
- You should need a permit so there is traceability for issues
- However, if there is even one objection from neighbours then it is not to be permitted.
- Chickens only



- I feel giving people the option to have different live stock with bring some country into the city as long as they get taken care of it's a learning experience for everyone
- If they have the means, space and want to, why cant they?
- Allowing livestock within the city is great, restricted to a number to support the occupants of the property.
- Hens are not dangerous. Annoying yes, but not dangerous.
- I like the idea of being able to keeping hens for eggs.
- I think that within reason this is helpful to household and communities by teaching Children where food is sourced and how to take care of them.
- Within regulations I support people having livestock
- Please let us keep bees! Bees help everyone and have no downside.
- Hens are great!
- Who am I to define what a "pet" is to someone
- Many animals would make great community members
- Depends on the livestock.
- Just yes.
- As long as the population be kept small.
- I've always considered trying to move and raise chickens
- Chickens only
- I think it would be fine as long as they don't get out into public.
- Hens are safe animals that provide food sources and are not a nuisance. They absolutely can live in the city.
- Hens are not noisy and provide food for their owners and neighbours.
- How are pigeons better than hens?!
- I dont really see an issue with hens as long as there's not too many in one household.
- If care is taken to ask neighbours and they are abiding by smell and noise rules then I don't see an issue. Need to make examples of smell and noise infractions though.
- Bird people are unfortunately human as well and birds deserve compassion.
- I believe that people should have the choice to own an animal if they are going to take full responsibility and take care of it and provide it with all its necessities that it requires and provide further support if required to maintain responsible ownership.
- We should be able to have hens and other livestock for those who cannot afford an acerage or "farm life"
- except don't allow evaluations by anyone to create exceptions, the main problem with all city bylaws is the ability of a city employee to create exceptions, something is either right or wrong based on the reasons given for the bylaw in the first place
- If a lot size (or yard size) is big enough, I see no issues with Hens
- I think having hands would be fabulous.
- Livestock is not a nuisance unless poorly cared for.



- Don't require neighbor consult. Don't make the rules impossible to meet.
- If suitable living conditions are provided and the owner has proven to be a responsible pet owner, I don't see why not. Strict enforcement of humane treatment and respecting neighbours should be applied.
- If they are well taken care of AND the neighbors have no issue, I don't see the problem with allowing it
- I used to live next to someone who had chickens in strathmore. I do not see an issue with this as long as the yard supports it. Obviously you can't live in a condo and have chickens
- Animal welfare must be considered, and capacity to intervene in neglect or cruelty must be available.
- I would LOVE a chicken!! They are excellent pets and getting fresh eggs would be amazing.
- The city should not be involved in what people do on their own properties if it is not harming another person.
- Regulations must be followed
- Let people have chickens. Increase local sustainability
- Quality food production should be encouraged.
- Hens do no harm they lay eggs and provide food and are also good companions for people
- Fresh eggs! Yes please!
- Hens and other non-annoyance livestock should be permitted... as society members seek to be more self sufficient, or whatever their motivation... people should be able to do so on their own property regardless if they are in the city or not.
- As long as neighbour consent/support is provided, I'm in support.
- I think backyard chickens work well in a lot of places, and we could do it thoughtfully here.
- I love the idea of getting my own fresh eggs!
- I would like to see a license system in place to ensure that people understand the correct care, including the lifespan of these animals.
- as long as the standards for living conditions are high, and the animals don't create a nuisance for the neighbours.
- Because why not
- This is not only a healthy hobby for some people, but an alternative means for food and well being. My only concern is strict measures are put in place to ensure the hens are kept in a safe and clean "cage or pen" at all times. The animals wellbeing is most important and the neighbors not having to suffer with intense smells etc is also important.
- If all of those requirements are met, there is no harm being done.
- It should be a citizen right to procure & sustain an autonomous food source.
- Permission from all neighbours within a set distance (500m perhaps) with a required renewal every 5 years (in the case neighbours change)
- "Hens can provide the similar benefits as (noisy) dogs in regards to mental health, also provide a food source for the household, and teaching tool regards food security :-)



- p.s. if firepits are allowed, which tangibly contaminate the air space beyond their property with toxic carcinogens, there should be no problem allowing hens on private urban property."
- I would allow chickens if they are cared for the right way
- Chickens and other livestock provide as few negatives as do cats and dogs, and they have more positives such as providing eggs for keepers. Caring for livestock is, in many ways, reflective of caring for any other type of pet given that one provides the necessities for a happy life for the pet.
- Depends on the animal
- People should be allowed to do what they want on their property.
- Goats are great at weed control, very social and usually bring smiles to people's faces.
- I would love to own a small flock (3-5) backyard chickens
- I fully support chickens in the
- I'm not really against people keeping whatever pet/livestock in healthy, safe conditions where the animal can thrive. But....there are smells (e.g. pigs, goats) and noise (e.g urban roosters) that I think could be problematic for neighbours.
- Pets of any kind should be allowed as long as the living conditions are correct
- Mandatory education is again paramount to preparing the public to respect, care for, maintain and house any animal or bird
- As long as the animal is taken care of and will not be a nuisance to the neighbourhood, I don't have an issue with other animals being allowed.
- With the recent instability in the food chain (and coming instability), it only makes sense to allow people to take survival measures to ensure their families will be secure.
- I don't know. I can see a lot of people treating the hens badly and some people giving them a good home.
- All animals including livestock deserve care and support. Any person wanting to have livestock should be required to prove they can care for the animals
- As long as owners behave responsibly and ethically
- If they take proper care of the animal, I'm all for it!
- I would love to have chickens for eggs only
- Love the idea of hens and livestock being permitted
- Get with the times. Edmonton allows it.
- Any animal should be allowed to reside within city limits with responsible pet owners
- I suspect that some people would use livestock like chickens or goats or sheep to annoy other neighbors. I also suspect there are many who are not responsible enough to maintain a quiet clean yard.
- I believe this would greatly benefit our community and work to promote families in building a sustainable way of ensuring they eat safe and healthy food.



- "I worry that it would just give neighbors more things to fight about. There would have to be fully informed consent.
- It shouldn't be left to the neighbors to learn all about what impact the animals would have; there should be thorough presentations vetted by the city that can help them know what to expect; good and bad."
- I think we need to make our urban areas more animal friendly.
- I have no problem with hens in the community as long as they are well taken care of. They are quieter than dogs and contained to the owners property unlike cats.
- As long as the animals are kept in suitable living conditions and are not disturbing anyone (eg rooster waking everyone up at dawn) I don't see a problem.
- I think sustainable food options are in our interest as long as there are parameters around it that people can abide by
- I believe that small livestock should be allowed as long as it is cared for properly
- If people want chickens, can provide appropriate habitat for them, and the neighbours don't mind, them I think it's fine.
- As long as people are screened and the animal treated well. Animal Cruelty cannot be given a pass
- Allowing cats and dogs but not some types of livestock is kind of arbitrary. Ultimately it's about whether the animal is appropriately housed and cared for, and whether it's a nuisance to neighbors. Same as with dogs and cats
- We are all learning that more is needed urban wise than what can be provided through general markets. A way to get eggs or milk in a neighborhood without going to a grocery with Covid would be nice. Helping a neighbor would be good as well
- Small numbers of certain animals can be beneficial to the owner. They would need suitable space and care, so may need additional permits beyond what traditional pets require.
- If animals are looked after properly and provided adequate space.
- I would like people to be able to have hens
- I fully support a bylaw to permit livestock in the city.
- Let people feed themselves for god sake
- As long as an owner can provide proper care and accommodations for the animal and the neighbors are ok with it then it should be fine.
- I think having hens would be a good idea as long as they were well cared for with adequate clean housing etc.
- If people own the appropriate space, they should be able to have livestock there.
- if well cared for I believe some animals (chickens) would be beneficial to neighbourhood atmospheres, there would have to be many restrictions and inspections however...no roosters, sufficient room for the chickens, sufficient shelter and food and so on, cleanliness...
- Fresh eggs
- Because I said so



- i would support the ownership of hens with a possible requirement of inspections for proper housing and care.
- Seems reasonable to get the neighbors approval if you have farm animals.
- I think it's great that people are getting back to raising their own food, be it for eggs or the actual chickens. If there is structure put in place I think that people should be able to have a certain allowed # of hens. As for other types of livestock, I guess it would depend on what type it is as well as the space they are being housed on
- living conditions/control of waste etc must be addressed. Neighbours should be consulted out of courtesy.
- Above
- perhaps just having someone check their conditions once a year to ensure they are taken care of properly
- Urban farming is important and a valuable resource to those on social services.
- If yard is large enough to sustain and noise not an issue
- There are horses smaller than dogs as well as pet pigs. Housing requirements could be specific. There are service horses available and their life expectancy is longer.
- if it is evaluated case by case then that seems fair
- We have a vegetable garden and we grow all our own veggies. Would be nice to have our own eggs too.
- I would like laying hens in our yard
- many calgary yards are large enough to accommodate chickens- numbers should be restricted though. Smaller yards shouldn't qualify
- I worry about the conditions animals would be kept in if enforcement isn't sufficient but a small animal like a pig or a goat can be wonderful to have around.
- People need to be more self sustaining
- I would like to keep some quail myself.
- If you have the room for an animal and they can have a proper life then I believe it's okay
- If there are strict rules and animals and living areas are very well maintained
- I think its a neat idea and could open more doors to community programs.
- As long as the animals are cared for and don't break other bylaws like noise, I see no issue
- Sustainable living and community gardens can greatly benefit co sumers and our economy, low income families could feed and nourish their children and neighbours . Ponies and goats on larger properties maintain lawns and weeds as well as fertalize. They are winderful companions . It can create awreness for farming communities and food sourcing and create more protevtion and understanding for livestock.
- My only concern here would be for the animals and ensuring they are well taken care of and of no consequence to neighbours. Cleanliness of living quarters and noise
- As long as the household and adjacent neighbors are in agreement, suitable living conditions are provided for the animals, bylaw standards are met I don't see why not.



- Hens when properly cared for should not present as a nuisance to neighbors.
- People should be educated that you don't need a rooster to have eggs as the roosters cause the most annoyance. The hens will produce eggs as long as they are comfortable. I would limit the # of hens though, so no stench is developing.
- I support this bylaw but I'm worried that the live stock you refer to may be obscene. If we are talking about having chickens then sure. But if we are talking about goats, and sheep I wouldn't be on board for this bylaw.
- We already allow [removed] "emotional support" chickens ([removed] btw), allowing them as pets makes sense.
- I agree with allowing livestock as long as they're treated well
- I've never had problem with this. However, I think this should be limited to smaller animals.
- As long as guidelines are clear so people cannot hoard them or that there are caveats that allow for neighbour input whenever a person requests a permit for livestock (assuming a permit is necessary, which I would hope it is)
- But only if there is recourse for neighbours having problems with the livestock eg. not being cared for properly or too noisy.
- I agree with all the terms
- I love chickens and I think letting people have them in the city (with the appropriate habitat and yard set up) would be really awesome.
- Backyard hens are wonderful, even in urban environments.
- Why not. I see no reason as to why a person should not be able to keep hens. Dogs, and cats can smell just as bad. And can be more of a problem, than a little chicken pecking around a yard.
- I agree with most of this, but I disagree that livestock needs to offer an active benefit to the community to be allowed
- A way to connect with other animals.
- Get written approval from neighbours and allow neighbours to report violations of any of the criteria (e.g., drop in living conditions). If all parties agree and the property owner abides by all rules, this should benefit all involved!
- To a limited extent, ie 3 chickens, it should not turn into a business but rather self sustainability, if they would like to run a business then they should have to go to a different zoned area.
- Hens don't make noise so as long as neighbors are agreeable, and the animals have appropriate living conditions, I think hens are a great idea. I would be ok with other livestock as well provided neighbors agree and clean living conditions are provided. There should be a limit on the quantity of any animals though.
- Max limits per house must ply. Hens are a non issue
- Depending on the type of livestock. I think animals such as cows, goats, etc could become a nuisance to neighbors. There would have to be some restrictions regarding noise and smell. But hens would not be a problem I think.
- I would love to have 1 or 2 hens and a rooster to promote egg laying and bug population control
- As long as the livestock is not being raised for slaughter.



- Yes, as long as the property owners properly maintains the livestock. Cleaning up after them, providing adequate shelter, food and water.
- With the support from the closest members of a community, small numbers of productive livestock should be allowed.
- If city people can reduce the cost of food I am all for it.
- as long as we don't have roosters in the city. Why not, there are many forms of therapeutic support, if this helps with an individuals mental health, go for it. again as long as they are a responsible owner.
- important for all animals to have proper care and responsible owners
- Key word is balance ..numbers of chickens / smell / noise would have to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- Allow the chickens!
- Yes, with limits and rules.
- I think this would be a great idea. However I don't think it should just fall on adjacent neighbours. Some people are jerks for no reason. I think there should be exceptions to getting neighbour approval depending on the property, and the city should carefully look over why a neighbour says no and go from there
- Only if no unpleasant odor could be detected. Dirty chicken litter is strong .
- Many urban jurisdictions have livestock options that work well if Proper guidelines are in place.
- I like farm animals
- I had hens as a kid in Vancouver and loved the eggs and training it
- Contact with animals has the potential to improve mental health. I'm sceptical about the space and conditions but in theory it sounds great good.
- If neighbors support the livestock and suitable living conditions can be provided then I would be supportive.
- Chickens are great for killing insects. Healthy eggs. Other cities are managing fine with urban chickens. Good way to use up our scraps too.
- Chicken would be good to have for eggs
- Hens / bees both make a positive impact for backyard 'farming'.
- Under these conditions, yes
- Keeping of small livestock should be allowed.
- I am in favor of allowing urban hens with appropriate restrictions. There seem to be little downsides that are unique to hens vs. what we see with dogs (e.g. noise, smell, etc.).
- Noise and smells need to be addressed.
- If proper husbandry and care is provided I believe this is low impact on neighbours (and I do not like chickens myself!)
- people should be allowed to have hens if they are properly caring for them
- Community benefit and positive impact is subjective and based on personal perspective.
- These requirements would definitely make it a more realistic goal.



- I think these are good strategies for promoting local food resources and self reliance
- Important to ensure cleanliness and care of animals is ongoing and that neighbors do not have an issue.
- I have no issues with hens for laying eggs and emotional support. There should be a maximum allowed to minimize smell.
- As long as there is no negative impact (odours, noise, nuisance), this should be acceptable, as long as there is an annual review process.
- Needs better definitions for positive impact.
- not permitted in row housing back yards
- As long as neighbours agree
- There should be more small scale farming (chickens, bees, etc allowed)
- Increase enjoyment of personal property, increase food security
- I came from suburban area with backyard chickens, goats, etc. and they weren't much of a nuisance if at all
- Provided the hens/livestock due not become a nuisance.
- I love having a self sufficient neighbourhood. If someone could benefit from having hens, then I'm all for it. As long as they do not interfere with others personal property or wellbeing.
- I think Calgary should allow individual to own a few laying hens. Hens do not make noise, and produce fresh, healthy eggs for their family to eat. We are behind other cities and counties with this one, I think there would be a lot of enthusiasm for a project like this.
- Provided no reasonable complaints from neighbors and the hens/livestock are not a nuisance, there's no reason why someone shouldn't be allowed to own and keep other types of animals
- Livestock are fundamentally no different from dogs and cats. I assume there would be a limit on the number of animals.
- Chickens in factory farms are horrendously treated, hopefully allowing people to have hens would take business away from these mass abuse farms. There would need to be accountability and education to be sure they were being cared for properly. I am a Calgarian currently residing in Didsbury and my neighbours across the alleyway have hens, they're not a nuisance at all!
- As long as this is not disruptive to the neighbourhood - smell, mess, noise, etc...
- I live in a new neighbourhood where we are stacked one on top of another I sure wouldn't want hens in our area but there are areas in the city where there is room between houses for hens.
- Companion animals come in many forms. Allowing chickens and even other livestock would be an enlightened action.
- Sounds good.
- I support having more local livestock in the city limits
- The trend to onshore and localize food production needs urgent municipal support particularly in the wake of COVID; offering guidance on urban hens is an investment in food security, personal health and community resilience.
- If they're not a nuisance to the neighbours or public at large they should be allowed.



- If the property can sustain livestock and the owners ensure the area is cleaned and maintained on a regular basis plus the livestock is/are properly cared for. Then yes.
- This can help low income families with food. I also like the idea of a goat maintaining my lawn
- I think it would be wonderful to allow certain livestock if the premises were suitable and there wasn't an obvious reason for neighbours to oppose it.
- if no roosters are present and the situation is well looked after then having a few hens should be okay
- I think as long as the animal is properly cared for and has what it needs, then I think we should be promoting taking in animals. Like I think raising hens for eggs is awesome!
- Provided the hens are well kept for and I was notified if someone was getting some, I fully support urban hens.
- I love hens.
- Thought: What would be done if the neighbours agreed, but then were unhappy with noise / smell / other factors after it was implemented?
- Neighbour support is important, but what if neighbour moves?
- Urban hens is a fantastic idea. But control, reduction in composting material (chickens can be fed scraps from certain food sources with only positive effects).
- If folks have the proper housing and conditions, I don't see an issue. However, the number of animals allowed on a city property, should be considered
- I am for allowing hens in Calgary - not sure about other livestock.
- We should be encouraging people to blend urban and rural parts of life together
- "As long as it doesn't smell like a farm
- And animals are pets not a Commodity Or being used for
- A
- Profit"
- Housing regulations and sanitation considerations so that poultry bourne illnesses are not spread.
- Absolutely. Farm fresh eggs and other types of livestock will provide food locally in case of a disruption in trucks bringing foods to Calgary. Self sufficiency should always be supported. There are ways to minimize chances of disease by having local livestock.
- Depending on the distance hens are kepts from neighbours. Townhouse yards can be extremely small and wouldn't be suitable for coops.
- as long as owners are responsible for the care/welfare of them and make sure their housing/yard is clean and a limit to how many they can own.
- I support chickens and livestock in urban areas for the uplifting of the community and educational opportunities for urban people to learn about keeping livestock etc.
- I fully support free citizens caring for livestock in a responsible manner and I feel that the city has responsibility to ensure this process is not unnecessarily drawn out, ie, a decision is made within 45 days or automatically approved.
- Neighbours shouldn't have veto



- This would be a fantastic way to support local sustainable agriculture
- I would as long as there was sufficient staff and resources to monitor the program. As livestock animals are less common to the average person, their needs are not as obvious, and may not be properly cared for/ contained due to lack of education.
- Hens can be used for food
- This seems quite reasonable although it will depend on how close an adjacent neighbor is defined
- Everyone's house and lot size is different. Some times people can provide a great come for a little pig or a few chickens within the city as long as it doesn't disrupt neighbors.
- I would have no problem with a small backyard chicken coupe for hen if it was kept clean. Roosters however, should not be permitted.
- I can't see an issue with small animals like chickens. Larger animals, like goats, cows, pigs, etc, need more care and space than a city backyard can supply.
- If those conditions are met, I'm fine with it. That would be ALL adjacent neighbours though. I would not want my neighbours having a rooster waking me up, but so long as the hens are taken care of and used for eggs and food, then so be it.
- As long as pet owners are responsible and take good care of their pets, as well as take into consideration anything that may bother their neighbours (odors, noise, etc), animals such as chickens should be allowed within the city of Calgary.
- As long as reasonable limits place on numbers and that no roosters permitted. Must be clear rules to how the chickens are contained and space required.
- As long as said animal is not able to roam or making noise constantly, I see nothing wrong with it.
- Good lesson for kids, economical and sustainable
- But noise concerns must be met.
- adjacent neighbors should not be allowed an opinion
- Urban livestock can help with the environment.
- Companion animals should not be exclusive to dogs and cats.
- As long as livestock are well taken care of (including vet care, clean, spacious living area, healthy food, etc) & not a nuisance or hazard to anyone, I don't see a problem.
- Why not?
- NA
- Along with upgrading the cities bilaws to more cohesively include guidelines for care of dogs and cats, more extensive outlines should be the same for other such animals including hens etc.
- Support from more than just the adjacent neighbors should be required as the smell would not adhere to the boundary of a property and would mitigate to neighbours close by.
- I would love calgary to open the door on more animals. Goats, hens. More!
- So long as it does not infringe on the rights and comfort of neighbors, I see no problem with this.
- If neighbours are good with it I don't see a problem unless it becomes extreme
- Only if the owners are responsible.



- As long as all the conditions above have been met then I do not see any problem with livestock to be permitted on private property in the city. One more condition would be that the livestock reside at a detached, single family home.
- I don't mind sustainable living within the community
- If proper balance and harmony can be achieved for positive effect then animals should not be discriminated against based strictly on species classification, more details and criteria should be considered to determine overall impact.
- I see nothing wrong with having select livestock on ones property as long as it/they are being humanely cared for, there is adequate room on the property and it is not a nuisance to the neighbours.
- As long as there are suitable conditions for the animal, I don't see why it matters.
- Why can't a person have a chicken - chances are it'll be less of a nuisance than someone's yappy dog.
- Needs to have additional bylaws in place for hens and adequate space, shelter and plans for the well-being of the animals. Example being winter, how will they be cared for? How close to the neighbors can the coop be? How many chickens per square foot of green space? Adequate fencing?
- If there are no complaints from the community and the owner is responsible there should be no problems
- I think if the conditions are right for the animals responsible owners should be able to have live stock in the city.
- Ensure animals are cared for and not a nuisance.
- I would have no problem with this as long as the bylaws were very clear on what the expectations are from the city on the care of said animals ie; daily cleaning to control odors and that said animals remain on owners property and possibly a limit on the number of livestock allowed on one property also that the any fines be large enough to make the owners want to comply quickly with said bylaws
- Having hens is no different than having dogs in terms of owner responsibility. A responsible owner cares for their animals properly, cleans up after them, etc. whether their pets are hens or dogs or anything else.
- As long as guidelines and protocols are adhered to
- Not all pets are dogs and cats.
- Those make sense except for the neighbors portion. It's private property after all. Or are we not capitalists?
- As long as the animals aren't bothering neighbours (noise/smell), I don't see any issue in which animals people choose to have on their own property
- Livestock such as hens provide a community benefit.
- Why wasn't this done years ago! The city needs to get out of people's lives.
- I don't have an issue as long as the animals are properly cared for and the neighbours are respected as to potential noise and smell problems.
- no harm



- i don't see how this isn't good.
- As long as owners are responsible, I see absolutely no reason for people to not be able to own hens in their yard. This is something I've been wanting for a long time. It is no different than any other pet, which all have their own rules and restrictions. Same goes with other livestock following the above mentioned guidelines.
- If all of the above suggestions are met, I would support the bylaw.
- This is a great opportunity to explore new ways of self sufficiency and alternative options like weed control from goats can be considered instead of harmful chemicals. As long as the owners are responsible and accountable for their animals.
- I'm in favour of any animals that don't disturb neighbours
- Hens should not be a problem provided that the owners care properly and enclosures are kept clean and no unreasonable noise.
- Hens are fine
- If people want chickens and as long as it's done responsible then why not
- i believe our food chain is polluted and it would be nice to have natural eggs.
- I think owning something small like hens or pet pigs is perfectly acceptable. Maybe not cows or horses though if it's an urban environment. Large animals can produce bad odours.
- It makes sense
- Unsure. Would need a lot more information.
- Urban hens, when not neglected, will be beneficial to communities. Further, they help the city address inadequacies with food access, and move closer to match the UN recommendations in regards "right to food", which Currently the city is open to human rights law suits for no real reason.
- I believe there can be some positive environmental benefits to having a hen house on ones property. Less green house gases.
- Like any animal/pet feel their living quality and respectful noise levels for neighbors should all be a factor with odor etc. I encourage the idea we can produce our own food but also respect our neighbors with the pet/animals living quarters not be neglected or abused.
- I am in favour of Urban Agriculture/Livestock if done in a deliberate and thought-out manner. Neighbour support is essential for those directly impacted. For instance - geese are loud and their impact could reach beyond those lots immediately adjacent. There should also be a way for neighbours to put forward their concerns/objections to the city without being identified outwardly. Neighbour relationships are vital and the pressure to permit despite concerns could make some reluctant to voice their concerns.
- I love chickens!
- It seems reasonable to allow other certain types of livestock, as long as criteria listed has been met
- I know of such a situation in Red Deer and chickens next door are not an issue.
- Chickens are awesome and it would be great to be able to have some in the city.
- Chickens maybe. But with NO ODOR and NO ROOSTERS (crowing at dawn). And NO LARGER ANIMALS - goats, sheep, horses, etc.



- But depends on size of livestock, number allowed on property, noise, smell and distance from adjacent houses; and if become nuisance, what rights to the neighbours have to get them removed (see pigeon additional rules below - 7B).
- I wouldn't choose to keep hens, but many others would like them. There should be a limit though.
- as long as neighbours are okay with the situation and the animals are well taken care of. The owners could expect surprise visits from bylaw officer. There should also be a contingency plan in place if it is not working out, where can the animals go instead of the present location.
- We need to be flexible and adapt to what people want. I know people who have multiple chickens in their yard in the City even though they aren't allowed to and they say that they provide a lot of companionship and also help to produce food for their families. The noise is minimal and the mess is minimal. Animals can provide so many benefits for people and we can't always say no to things just because we haven't tried them before.
- I feel there is nothing wrong with owning other animals if they are looked after according to rules set out. The question is will these rules be informed.
- I think that if done correctly and responsibly it is a great step in sustainability
- Yes I support it, but I feel like this would cause some issues for others who or irresponsible
- I have lived in cities that allowed hens without concern. Neighbour support was not required, nor would I consider it necessary.
- As long as the owner has adequate space and can provide the animals with better quality of life.
- This is tough because I don't want livestock next door. What is support from adjacent neighbours? Would I have to "approve" my neighbor having hens? What if I move into a new house, can I tell which houses have hens? I have a dog and don't want to live next door to that.
- Food resiliency should be encouraged as long as it is done responsibly
- No skin in the game but I don't see why people shouldn't be allowed to if kept properly.
- As long as there is consideration for the neighbors and surrounding area, I have no problem with it. But people shouldn't be inconvenienced by it
- I think urban farming is great, allows us to diversify our food supply a bit and become more self-sufficient.
- As long as adjacent neighbors were consulted, I believe a yard is mostly for what you would want to do with it, with proper sanitary checks on an annual basis.
- If done responsibly, no harm.
- It really depends on having sufficient resources for Bylaw Services to enforce the rules (e.g. noise, smell, etc.).
- As long as livestock is being handled in a safe way and the area is being kept clean I don't see any issue with it
- its a great way to self supply and farm and teach kids about it as long as animals are in an appropriate environment
- I think it is a fantastic idea to allow hens. Save some people some money on poultry products.
- If the animal is well kept, and not annoying a neighbour with noise or offensive odours, it should be allowed.



- If it is not infringing on anyone else's rights then why not.
 - No issues with this as long as they are in good living conditions and the owners have the ability to maintain these animals without causing disturbance
 - I think it's fine
 - Welcome urban backyard chickens for everyone - do not waste taxpayers money by pre-qualifying people
 - Aslong as the animals are cared for properly and provided the correct shelter without affecting neighbors, they are not much different from a domestic animal.
 - Why not! Everyone loves chickens
 - Provided the number and living conditions are good, other livestock may be kept as pets.
 - if the neighbors are okay with chickens, because of rbe potential added noise it should be up to them.to come to an agreement
 - Urban hens are a fantasitc idea and would be of huge benefit to our community. I have a little concern about some people trying to abuse this and having too many hens in a small space and the owner's need for a profit from meat and eggs being a priority to the health and conditions of the hens.
 - "I've seen it done in Ontario. My father's friend had a few chickens and stuff in an old farm that they built around.
-
- Neighbors didn't seem to complain."
 - To my knowledge this is allowed on acreages, so yes I agree.
 - I think positive interest would be most important. You wouldn't want constant noise disrupting neighbours with a large flock or large livestock.
 - Sure. I don't see why not, assuming the above criteria are imposed.
 - Allows people to be just a little more self sufficient. More humane source of eggs for people interested vs. factory farming
 - No explanation needed, saved everyone money.
 - Could help people of lower income to supplement their groceries
 - By allowing this, you are also obligated to provide a set of rules so people have to provide their livestock with a good quality of life. They should already, but animal hoarding situations for example prove otherwise. Regulations will help to keep everyone, animals included, in a good situation.
 - Would be beneficial for all of Calgary to have their own livestock
 - Eggs are good
 - Hens are nice animals :)
 - As long as a maximum number of animals is set, animal welfare is considered and those animals do not prevent the neighbors from enjoying their properties They should be allowed
 - As long as the living conditions for the hens promotes a good quality of life for the animals, whether sold commercially or used for product (eggs, meat, etc.)



- As long as there is proof of suitable living conditions for the animals this is a fantastic idea.
- Current circumstances make it clear that food security and food independence is a must for Canadians
- I believe this would be an advancement in our community
- Good for food supply
- Pet pigs can be a wonderful and clean pet to add to a home
- I don't see an issue with livestock as long as rules are followed for the city and neighbours aren't bothered
- Choice of pet
- Depending on what is meant by "positive impact" and whether the animal has the necessary space and care
- I would support this bylaw amendment if it ensures livestock is living in suitable conditions.
- There would need to be a lot of enforcement for this to work though. I don't want someone's chicken flying into my yard and my dog killing it or something.
- I would have no issues with neighbors having hens, used to have chickens myself and didn't find them an issue
- Hens can be very quiet and clean animals when taken care of properly. Livestock can provide emotional support to humans in need and should be granted the same treatment as seeing-eye dogs.
- Promotes healthy living
- People should have the right to grow their own food, including livestock.
- Depends on type
- The more the merrier, if it means lives will be happier and enriched on all sides
- Because I like chickens
- Should expand, if people are responsible
- Hens and other suitable livestock can be considered pets also
- Its about time! The call for self sustainability is getting louder. Giving people choices with parameters is a positive move.
- Pot belly pigs are fabulous pets, quiet and clean. And who doesn't like the ability to have fresh eggs
- It's appropriate
- As long as the animals have suitable living conditions than it shouldn't be an issue. It could provide fresh eggs for people and lower certain carbon footprints
- Chickens are cool. Local sustainability is a good initiative as well. If urban beekeeping is permitted, why aren't hens?
- Hens are a great means of sustainable eating in an animal friendly way
- hens are very therapeutic
- With all the above criteria and support from the entire block, not just adjacent neighbours.
- I support owning any animal that will provide community benefit as long as it is provided with suitable living conditions and doesn't disturb others.



- Fresh chicken eggs. Who would say no to that?
 - Fresh eggs are the best and folks should be able to grow their own food.
 - You shouldn't need a neighbour to say it's okay to build a chicken coup. Nothing else that you do on your own property is their business. Why should this be?
 - Animals are amazing, we need more!
 - Inspections by bylaw would need to follow a regular cadence to ensure all parties were fulfilling due diligence. If animals became problematic, a system would need to be followed whereby a protest could be lodged to reconsider the application. Property sales would be required to disclose presence of neighbouring animals
 - I don't believe you will have an issue with responsible people. Having to apply for a special license for it would help keep honest people getting them. And random checks to assure the animals living conditions are adequate and not being a nuisance.
 - Definatly needs neighbor/ community depending where and size
 - As long as it is done responsibly, I don't have an issue with urban livestock ownership.
 - as long as the animals are being taken care of and are healthy, i don't see a problem.
 - Urban agriculture is important
 - H
 - But their should be should the numbers of livestock allowed
 - Provided people do not attempt to run a commercial operation and things are kept clean, no issues should arise.
 - As long as the owner can prove they have sufficient education regarding care of animals
 - Yes I think it is fine to have other animals
 - I've wanted hens for a very long time! They're lovely and I would love to have some :)
 - "Animals must be taken care of
-
- That is number 1
-
- Other than that nothing wrong with keeping alternative pets"
 - Hens are incredible, our friends outside city limits have them and they are so sweet
 - Keeping Hens is beneficial as long as they are cared for properly
 - I am open to explore whatever makes sense for local food security and sustainment
 - As long as you don't single out Pit bulls. The welfare of our animals is very important to me, all animals, specially pit bulls.
 - If hens are not a disturbance to neighbours (noise) and are properly being cared for (ie - fed and enclosure kept clean), and there was a limit on the number of hens.
 - As long as it does not create a noise or smell nuisance for neighbours



- As long as there were strict standards and strong enforcement to ensure the safety and happiness of the animals.
- But permits have to be made, and all neighbours affected by it have to agree
- As long as it meets all of the requirements it seems like it would be a fantastic idea.
- Include rules regarding noise and odour management
- Only small animals in small batches with complete support from neighbor's
- If the noise can be managed and the conditions suitable for the hens, it should be allowed
- Urban hens make nearly as much sense as urban gardens as long as they are not a nuisance within the community
- More hens please.
- As long as the person can properly care for the animal, I see no harm.
- Assuming the living conditions are acceptable for the livestock and don't interfere with neighbours.
- Livestock should be in health, more than fair, safe environments & this needs to be enforced/watched
- But no roosters
- So long as people are properly caring for the hens I see no issue with this.
- I think it would be beneficial for the community
- Many people are now thinking of livestock as pets
- If proper training was mandated for the animal (ie. understanding chickens and how a chicken cope works)
- Chickens also need a healthy environment to live in. If people in the city can't provide that, then they shouldn't be allowed to own chickens.
- As long as proper rules are followed, i see no reason this bylaw shouldn't be allowed.
- I would accept hens, provided they are properly cared for and numbers are limited. Other animals on a case by case basis. I would not like to live next door to a domestic zoo!
- Lots of barn animals can live happily in a responsible persons yard
- Hens should be allowed but only if the property size meets a certain standard. Some infill properties are so narrow that there is not adequate space from the sound or smell of those animals. Also, there should be restrictions on how close those animals cage can be to any neighbors house.
- I think this could be a very good thing, provided that excellent living standards are upheld and maintained.
- Limited numbers and size of the animals.
- I believe in this day and age of recalled food and sustainable living people should have the right to make healthier choices for their families as long as it isn't a nuisance to others.
- People should be allowed to have any farm/domestic animal as long as properly taken care of
- I agree with the statements above.
- hens a proven to reduce organic waste.
- Urban agriculture is a growing trend and I believe it can be done responsibly. Limit the number of hens, and no roosters.



- As long as the homeowner can prove a humane area for the animal.
- The idea has a good appeal, as long as done in a responsible way
- As long as you need neighbour's approval.
- Look at Detroit ; their economy crumbles and they allowed people to build farm land on empty lots.
- it is food for poor in this POOREST canadian city.
- Supporting the keeping of livestock within the city with Neighbour consent is a quality of life issue and should be allowed as long as owners are responsible animal owners.
- We need more farm to table animals in the world. It also benefits children with caretaking
- All animals if treated appropriately should be able to have an owner.
- The animals must be properly cared for and it must not disrupt neighbours (sound, smell).
- It bridges the two solitudes of urban - rural divide. Hens for eggs but not for slaughter. Household consumption and not sales, only exception being gifting to friends, neighbours, and relations.
- I think these are suitable key points
- I would be okay with hens, but I cannot imagine what "other livestock " would be.
- Helping the family financially
- Animals should be kept in good health condition and not become a health hazard for neighbors and neighboring pets.
- We saw good and working models in England and in Nova Scotia. So better late than never dear Calgary.
- People should have livestock if and only if they can provide a safe happy environment
- chickens in the city don't bother me, as long as they are safe, looked after and contained in humane ways
- Yes
- Everyone benefits from chickens. If properly kept they don't smell and are relatively quiet.
- Na
- if everyone is safe and sanitary who cares
- If neighbours don't object and suitable husbandry practices are achievable there should be no reason to prohibit livestock. Suitable does not mean minimum. If only minimum care requirements can be met it shouldn't be allowed inside Calgary. Good to excellent standards of care should be required. This should deter nuisance owners.
- I would support this only for properties with large yards. I would not support livestock in new communities with small yards.
- My worry is that it would be extremely difficult to evaluate what is acceptable living conditions.
- There are several animals that are therapy pets.
- I absolutely support having urban hens allowed and I understand and respect the need for neighbors to potentially agree, but sadly neighbors who don't get along will never get this opportunity so it should weigh in but not be a deciding factor.
- I think as long as neighbours are consulted as this could directly affect them and that the owners are responsible for their animals and care for them appropriately then it's fine by me. I think there should



be a process to assess whether the animal owner are apt and knowledgeable in animal care prior to allowing it.

- Hens provide positive benefits to the owners and community.
- As long as there are proper housing structures, consent from direct next door neighbours and safe living conditions for the animal, the city should have no reason to intervene.
- Hens are a good way in adding to a persons ability to be self sufficient. People plant gardens for the same reason.
- I absolutely think that with rules for noise and smell hens should be allowed in Calgary! It's about sustainable and accessible food!
- It allows for sustainable living
- We should have the option to have a up to max number of each kind. For example - 1-3 goats or sheep up to 10 chickens.
- Support from neighbours for chickens should not be necessary. They are quieter and less of a nuisance than dogs, and nobody is currently asking the neighbours if it's okay to own a dog. Or a roaming cat for that matter.
- Harmless animals should be allowed. Chickens for example are known to be therapeutic in some cases.
- Not sure how I feel about it , but definitely not something commercial.
- Positive impact !
- Only if the above conditions are met
- backyard animals are okay with me
- Anyone wanting to have livestock in the city limits should go through an information session to be aware of the pros and cons of owning livestock.
- Suitable living conditions must be shown, a specialist in livestock management should approve. maintenance of facility should be reviewed regularly
- provided they keep the smell to a minimum.
- I think livestock would improve our living conditions significantly
- why not? as long as it does not result in danger or disturbance.
- I am okay with it
- There needs to be very specific rules and bylaws involved to ensure the hens are of good health and well being
- I support the option to keep hens or other livestock for positive community impact, whether that is a local community or larger.
- Yes chickens are a valuable resource
- As long as the animal is well taken care of I have no problem with hens being in the city
- It is critical for neighbour support to be considered given the potential for noise issues.
- Why not, it's your property
- As long as it does not disturb the peace and the waste is managed properly.



- People should be allowed to have bees, chickens and even goats! Need more farm to table opportunities.
- This can be beneficial in keeping money in the community/Calgary area by providing food items.
- Safe conditions should be considered for any animal
- As long as proper research and preparation is done beforehand and there is appropriate accommodations for the livestock, it sounds beneficial
- I believe that in some cases people could raise livestock without interfering with others. Again on a case to case based....people have a love for different animals
- Not everyone can live on an acreage so why not allow certain livestock, within reason of space and if the living conditions of the livestock is approved
- (Under the assumption that everyone will take good care of the hens, and that the City will talk to animal experts as to what the minimum space requirements are for 'x' number of hens to live HAPPILY), I am in full support of the City permitting hens, they are endearing animals and I think it will prompt more education as to how our food is made and where it comes from. My only concern is that if a chick (whether bought or somehow hatched) turns out to be a rooster, that it is NOT euthanized. If the owners decide to kill it for meat, so be it, but it should not be killed simply for being a rooster, and the rooster should be relocated to a shelter or sanctuary. Also, cockfighting and any other sort of animal abuse should be at the very least heavily fined AND the animals relocated to a trusted owner such as a sanctuary.
- it is a great idea so long as appropriate guidelines for care are in place
- If there are sufficient regulations in place to govern the wellbeing of the livestock, I would absolutely be in support of anyone having livestock of their choosing on their own property.
- I want to have more stability in my home by producing my own food.
- Feels more natural and humane than keeping chickens in pens. People would have to take care of their chickens if they wanted success.
- Because why not!
- With restrictions. Amount of chickens and cleanliness rules to follow. No roosters pls.
- Animals can improve ecosystems
- If chickens can be kept then there are other animals that need to be considered as well as the criteria for keeping them.
- Backyard chickens can be very beneficial to the community
- This could be beneficial to the city
- Urban livestock allows people to get involved in sustainable eating habits that connect them to the earth and its animals. The benefit to owners and the community largely outweighs the risks to the city.
- Significant benefit to urban farming (bees, chickens,etc) and some livestock (ex: pigs) make wonderful household pets
- They should have to apply for a permit to own chickens/hens etc.
- If neighbours are supportive and the animals are properly cared for, there is no reason not to.



- I think as long as the animals are cared for properly that it would be nice to have urban hens and other livestock potentially. I wouldn't not want to live close to any livestock that was particularly noisy though
- a course on chicken care should be required prior to ownership.
- provided they are adequately cared for and responsibly owned I don't see a lot of downside to this.
- People should be able to have hens to lay eggs for food for themselves or share as they see fit
- Chickens should be permitted
- As long as the animals are cared for I do not see a problem with people owning livestock on their property.
- I would LOVE to keep hens and fully support this!
- This is an excellent community initiative to create self-sufficiency on obtaining food locally.
- I would prefer to live next to chicken "noises" than to marijuana smoke smells; only one of these is currently legal.
- Chicken's aren't any louder than a dog or other bird so I think they should be allowed. They're friendly animals and can make a nice pet plus gives you eggs.
- If owner's are responsible, have adequate space and the ability to care for such animals in the city, I don't see why not.
- Let them have chickens
- Only if this is disclosed when buying a new house
- Yes
- As long as the above criteria are consistently followed! Reports of abuse to be immediately addressed.
- I cannot think of a reason to not allow hens. Allowing people the ability to harvest their own food is a no brainer
- Backyard beekeeping is important for the promotion of pollinators and community education around ecology and the importance of sustainable naturalization projects. Backyard hen's are a great community project that brings neighbours together and sustains local needs for food. Many other municipalities have allowed them without issue.
- It might be beneficial to have hens in the city
- animals if cared for humanly and are checked by vet visits and the enforcement officers there shouldn't be an issue
- As long as it doesn't bother anyone and animals cared for why not
- Hens sound like a great addition to neighborhoods
- Nikki Pike
- Making a sustainable urban living can help to increase physiological and mental health. Also, it can help to reduce the dependency on social program for balanced meals.
- Why not? Really, why not? They can produce not only food for the owner but in this down economy, could potentially become a potential semi income
- It's worked elsewhere. Why not?



- Though it really depends on the animal - and the purpose for keeping the animal. I would not support urban livestock for slaughter.
- Live stock animals that sustain ones personal food chain while providing the stock also provides a secondary function such as pest control. Chickens are an excellent example of such a situation.
- Who doesn't like hens
- As long as the animals are properly maintained and cared for, as well as vetted for illness, there shouldn't be any issues.
- With city approval of space and care plan. Random/ periodic animal Welfare checks.
- people should be allowed to have hens in their properties only if they have a proper enclosure and they are protected from the elements and the harsh Canadian winters
- I think you should be able to have your own livestock.
- I know people that live outside the city with a fainting goat as a support animal and that goat is as cute and sweet as can be. Plus you allow people to have snakes and tarantulas, so what is wrong with a few farm animals? Common sense should obviously be used when reviewing these - small property and cow equals not plausible or sound.
- Personal livestock will help with global warming.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and the neighbours approve I think this is a positive step
- There are plenty of ways humans and quiet livestock can coexist.
- As long as the animals are kept in small enough numbers to not be crowded and destructive to the environment, any person who can keep proper care should be able to add that benefit to their lifestyle.
- I think that hens are a great idea. They offer a lot of benefits without a lot of fuss. Other small animals could be considered as well
- I support the balanced needs that are met.
- Never heard anything about phase 1. If paying a lincnse think City should be in touch with all to have input
- Responsible pet ownership, including livestock, should always be encouraged.
- As long as animals can be properly cared for and not disturbing neighbours.
- It does not matter what type of animal it is, it should be allowed within city limits as long as the surrounding neighbors are ok with it.
- Limited animals with appropriate housing condition. So not pigs sheep and such all crammed in a hen house
- humans have always kept small livestock in urban centers
- I support urban hens but believe quantity of hens to be limited, as well as by-laws to control noise and odour of hens
- I support hens at a small amount but anything over size like doneys horses etc are not suited for a small yard like calagary that isnt over 1 acre. So in my thoughts hens yes or if its a emtional support animal then yes. But other wise large livestock isnt ment for the city.



- I believe it's fair to have neighbour input, but to also have the availability to create a self sustaining environment with animals and animal byproducts within your domicile and property.
- Chickens have no place in a city
- I think that the requirement of 4 adjacent neighbours would be beneficial, but can see the benefit and joy of this hobby.
- If you want to farm chickens for eggs i think it should be allowed
- Hens have many benefits, eggs, compost and they are a true joy to keep
- I know tons of people who have "emotional support chickens" simply because they want fresh eggs. Put a limit on it and allow it. Let us provide our own food!!
- Because who doesn't like fresh eggs.
- Love chickens!
- As long as it is not bothering your community I think it is ok
- People should be allowed whatever animals they choose on their property, within safe boundaries of what's best for the animal.
- Neighbor approval should be mandatory
- I support people owning urban hens
- I think there are certain livestock that can be fairly easily accommodated in the city and provide some sort of benefit
- Maybe is my answer. While it could be a good project, no dog breed should suffer for it.
- I think with responsible ownership and accountability as long as the animal has proper care and is not a nuance to adjacent neighbors then what would be the harm?
- Domestic livestock is fine if smells and sounds are acceptable to neighbours.
- No explanation needed. If u want a chicken full send.
- Urban hens are an asset.
- Hens and chickens that are properly contained should be acceptable
- I think that responsible guardianship will need to be monitored.
- Small animals that can be used to supplement food in a household should be allowed
- Hens are rad.
- As long as they do not create odour or excessive noise, and are kept in good conditions I see no problem living near chickens
- Hens would be a great idea for Calgarians provided that their living conditions are well-maintained.
- stop breed specific blaming!
- If properly and responsibly housed and cared for some livestock could bring value to people even in the city (mental, emotional, and economics benefits)
- As long as they are well kept and cared for, I don't see anything wrong with it.
- I agree with positive impact to whom ever owns the animals as long as they are living a good life and are not in any danger or in bad living conditions
- With support from adjacent neighbours
- People like raising animals but don't live on a farm. Great idea.



- ...
- Livestock, within reason, should be welcomed in the City of Calgary. Specific guidelines in place should protect both the livestock and city residents
- We need more chickens.
- Sustainability and independence
- I support responsible hen owners
- The wellbeing of the animal is of utmost importance, and that includes a healthy environment surrounding it. Upsetting community leads to animal abuse (see Canmore Alberta, last ~10 years, show roosters 'kidnapped' for disturbing the peace..)
- Must have some noise management but urban hens are a great idea
- Hens yes; Roosters no
- Hens and other livestock are a pleasant and sustainable activity if managed correctly.
- Agreed it is time to review and potentially allow this.
- As long as they're being well taken care of people should be allowed to have live stock as pets.
- I have concern about it being unpleasant for neighbours, but if this is managed it's a great way to add something to a community and offering an alternative food source.
- Certain livestock depending on the property and proper care i feel is beneficial
- If the animals are in a well kept area and the space and yard is to their needs I feel livestock in limits should be allowed.
- Chicken ownership is happening in Edmonton, and so far there have been very few negative instances.
- As long as the pet does not pose a threat to the community, is in safe and a habitable environment to live with the best of care and does not belong in the wild (such as a bear, wild cat, coyote, etc.) it should be fine.
- annual inspection/approval required
- Yes as long as the animals are cared for
- Must be approved by at least neighbors on either side. Also, should be made aware to new homebuyers when looking to purchase an adjacent home.
- The city bylaws are outdated.
- Neighbours must be able to rescind acceptance if the presence of the livestock proves problematic
- More modern approach
- as long as proper space is provided for livestock animal
- It would be beneficial to the community.
- Animals need to be properly respected for their well being. Also neighbours need to be okay with it
- If it can be deemed a benefit to the community it should be able to be seen as an option
- Self sufficient nutrition is excellent for the environment and a closer connection to animals will hopefully lead to a more thorough understanding of the life to food process in the average citizen.
- Providing conditions are sanitary and adequate space, water food, light, heat are provided for the animal, human being have a right to keep their own animals for food as we always have done.



- Direct rules are necessary to keep the peace
- Food!!!!
- Also would depend on yard size. And noise.
- Hens are dope
- As long as the animals are secure and there is support from neighbours ,why not
- Provided adjacent neighbours are supportive, and it is limited to things like laying hens that are properly housed, I see no issue. Please include a No Roosters allowed in the bylaw though!
- Giving people the option to have hens for eggs and being somewhat self sustained is great. Some sort of permit should be required to do so. And approval should depend on the quality of housing in which the owner can provide for said animal
- I like the idea of a case by case basis where the neighbours are mailed their own documents to share how they feel, and the living standards for the animal are met.
- They should be sure the livestock will be safe
- Yes if all care and cleaning aspects are met
- Allow miniature horses under this bylaw. They make awesome pets and therapy animals.
- Animals are just not cats and dogs but I think there is a reasonableness clause that needs to be considered. For example a horse living in a condo
- I believe that they should have to get something in writing agreeing to ownership and permission from ALL neighbours directly located beside their residence prior to owning livestock in closed quarters (such as a city residence) Especially since most places do not even permit clothes lines anymore.
- Would be okay with having backyard chickens
- Not opposed
- More and more people want access to local or homegrown food sources. Allowing for hens provides opportunity for fresh eggs. Would like to see this allowed with rules such as licenses, coop plan approval and number of hens limit.
- I don't know a lot about hens but I believe what goes on in other peoples backyard is none of my business. However I wish to not be responsible for accident or injury to their escaped livestock.
- I fully support allowing urban hens and other livestock within the city of Calgary, as long as licensure is required and minimal care requirements are enforced. I believe licensure would make it easier for the city to ensure that these animals are receiving proper husbandry.
- I think this can be a great thing for others but it's definitely not for anyone and everyone. Responsible owners that can provide good quality life for the farm type animals.
- People should be allowed to have livestock so long as they can properly take care of them and neighbours have no objection.
- It is fine to have hens, roosters, pot bellied pigs, ponies, small goats, reptiles, mini horses or other livestock in the city. If they are taken good care of they should be welcomed. Some city lots are huge and could support full sized horses, like some properties in Spring Bank. People should be allowed to have these types of pets if they are taken care of.
- "Let's have the whole NE smell like a barn."
- Awesome."



- Animals are family.
- Has to be on a case by case basis. Neighbourhood support is essential in a urban setting.
- It adds a fun and diverse element to communities.
- Look, the economy is tanking, anything that enables people to provide sustenance for themselves is a great idea as long as they are responsible
- People should be able to own hens
- Hens can be amazing pets to care for. They provide eggs and all have many differing personalities that can be explored. Teaches children the value of work and an animals trust.
- However adjacent neighbors shouldn't have any power of persuasion. It's not their property or life. They should have ability to complain if warranted and the city can investigate.
- I don't see an issue with having urban hens if they are given a suitable living space and used for eggs and educational purposes.
- I don't really think there's anything wrong with hens? What's the worst outcome of them?
- Some livestock, while unusual are great pets. My cousin has an affinity for pigs. She would prefer living in city for work, but is not prepared to give up her pets.
- Hens I support if taken care of properly
- Responsible ownership and support for welfare of all animals should form the basis of regulations regardless of the animal
- Backyard chickens pose little risk to other animals, if maintained correctly. As long as no roosters are kept, they should not cause major problems.
- I would support with strong regulations and notifications to neighbours to allow for input.
- Why not? As long as the livestock is safe, has proper space and is adequately cared for.
- As long as the animals are taken care of
- CHICKENS!
- Backyard chickens would be amazing.
- Livestock is essential to providing for one's self and in the current situation of society i find it beneficial.
- It's kind of nuts that we don't allow hens. Please no roosters. OMG please no crowing all night!!!
- Friends in the type if animals
- I would love to have a chicken or two.
- As long as it is managed properly it should not have a negative effect on other citizens
- The designation of "pet" should not only be reserved to dogs and cats, small animals such rabbits and hens can provide the same human - animal bond.
- Sustainability is everything these days and being able to have livestock that is housed probably within these restrictions allows individuals who live sustainable lifestyles to make further improvements to their quality of life
- Hens aren't as loud or smelly as some people think. Many people in Calgary have ample space to sustain chickens so why not allow then the opportunity to have some if they wish?
- "The only thing I care about is:



- Wellness of the animal
- Noise, if i remember right, roosters are noise and annoying."
- I believe this should only be considered if the lot size is adequate. However, the majority of the newer neighborhoods are smaller than a postage size lot. So in that case no I would not support it.
- I agree with the bullet points above therefore I am for it as long as those conditions were met.
- ONLY if living conditions are adequate.
- Neighbours should be in support of your new livestock
- As long as the livestock animal in questions isn't a nuisance to the community and is properly cared for like any pet, I see no reason to disallow these kind of animals in the city.
- As long as these animals are in a large, safe space that can cater to its needs and the animals are fully cared for, it sounds wonderful.
- I am not knowledgable enough on the benefits of farming inner city. However, I do not have any reason to believe that it would be fair to say no in this case. So long as neighbours agree, and the proper regulations are in place, it sounds like a wonderful opportunity for those ready to handle it properly.
- Other animals are fine.
- Why not?
- I think urban farming is a great idea if done properly, allowing people to more easily provide for their friends and family is beneficial.
- You do you, boo. If they respect my space and it doesn't affect me negatively I've got no problems.
- Hens are a good idea
- "I just really love chickens.

- Also, people benefit emotionally and psychological when near animals, so having some that are potentially more accessible or can be viewed by the public might benefit mental health."
- As long as the hens stay in the yard of the owner I'm ok with it.
- As long as they are not a nuisance. Noise & smell would be my biggest concern.
- On a case by case basis, small livestock within city limits is not an issue as long as they are getting adequate care.
- As long as they are properly cared for and the neighbourhood isn't being inconvenienced, then it seems fine.
- I think this will help the economic situation for many Calgarians; it is also a very sustainable practice.
- This is a great way to help promote self sustaining healthy living.
- I feel that as long as bylaws are explicit about appropriate cleanliness and neighbor engagement being included, it could be supported
- Hens are quiet and as long as they are taken care of by the owners Nd the neighbours are in support I think it is a good idea
- Please no roosters. I support calgarians being able to utilize their property for food.



- All animals deserve homes
- Bring diversity to our communities and give people the opportunity to raise their own food sources
- This would be a good idea for therapy animals
- Especially hens so people can lay their own eggs instead buying them from the supermarket
- I support this as long as the animal is safe healthy and has a proper living environment
- As long as the overall well being of the animal, including living condition need to be met.
- I caution against having "support of adjacent neighbors" as a criteria, this gets into really mucky and unfair territory, especially if people are just being bitchy due to a dislike.
- As long as bylaw is required to inspect premises yearly
- As long as they are not a nuisance to neighbours there should be no issue
- "Due to the wide variety of animals,
- Noise complaints, cleanliness, odours could be issues that would not be considered"
- As long as it doesn't open the door for other livestock type animals.
- Absolutely! Urban hens are excellent pets, help connect individuals with their food and environment, and help further the goal of having a well fed, sustainable city. A potential expansion to this bylaw that I feel might be warranted is allowing for urban hens and urban laying ducks. It is little known outside the agricultural community, but ducks in small flocks have fewer health issues, more cold tolerance, and a longer productive life than do laying chickens, all the while laying just as many eggs.
- "Sanitary issues should be addressed as fowl carry many diseases
- Have no impact on wildlife
- Limit what animals can be kept"
- I don't think people keeping hens would bother me. So long as there are rules and regulations in place including some sort of a noise restriction on these animals I'm for it.
- I absolutely support urban hens and other livestock (goats or sheep). Especially in times of economic hardship, allowing people to raise a sustainable, inexpensive protein is a responsible decision. Especially given success of similar programs in Red Deer and Edmonton.
- (Proper) Care of animals had been repeatedly shown to be a net benefit for individuals and communities. Exceptions made on a case by case basis, while more expensive, would result in higher levels of compliance and satisfaction.
- Chickens are absolutely wonderful additions to an ecosystem! Anyone gardening could benefit, and it would allow so much potential for local-food production.
- Keeping hens for eggs is a much better option than the factory settings that keep thousands of chickens in questionable living conditions.
- As long as populations of hens aren't put at risk, and the people of Calgary don't suffer for any reason.
- Chickens are cool with me
- With responsible ownership, good things can happen
- I agree with outline above



- Livestock can make good pets.
- If there is adequate space on a property and neighbors are on board, a goat to mow the lawn and fresh laid eggs could add to quality of life. Again, as long as the animals are humanely cared for.
- I have no issue if this has a positive impact.
- Only to ensure the well being and proper care of the animal(s)
- Be responsible and there shouldn't be an issue.
- Bees
- There's no reason not to expand this if it can be done responsibly - livestock animals can be beautiful parts of life!
- Great idea!
- Livestock are not any more annoying than regular pets. If the owner can meet all criteria then I don't care if its a dog living next to me or a steer.
- Hens are great; they help control slugs, bugs and ticks. They do not need a lot of space. Keeping a small number should not increase smell, or noise. They provide food and fun for people, and it is important to have options that are sustainable and educational. Imagine children experiencing hatching and caring for a chick, raising it to a hen, then gathering eggs from it. Maybe we will be able to address food security with amendments like these. Other small livestock can also be educational and fun. Some people keep smaller livestock as pets, with additional benefits of eggs, milk, wool, etc. I think it is important to make sure people are well educated on the livestock in question. Maybe make a short online course mandatory before they can be allowed. But I think this is wonderful.
- As long as people are responsible pet owners I see no reason not to have chickens
- Hens (if cared for properly and efficiently and ethically) make great ways to feed a family and save money purchasing eggs and egg products.
- So many people In Calgary have chicken coops and other livestock. Being able to live off of your own food from your own garden and animals should absolutely be encouraged and allowed. Those who don't provide humane environments or are ill-equipped to handle them should be exceptions on a case by case basis. I'd take livestock over yappy, annoying dogs that don't stop barking any day.
- I can't see how this wouldn't require strict regulations. People start things with the best of intentions but don't necessarily think of the long-term. This can create an unhealthy environment for animals and a disgusting environment for neighbors. I like the idea and have considered it myself but For me it lacks a certain sustainability in a city with such unpredictable weather.
- if people can properly care for their animals I feel they should have every right to take care of them.
- As long as it is safe for the hens
- Hens are a great animal to keep around as long as people keep up with their demands and care. Would like regular check ups to make sure people do not have more than the legal amount of hens.
- As long as protection laws are in place to protect the animals from abuse and neglect. Stricter laws need to Be in place to protect current pets before we should allow other live animals
- If people are going to care for the livestock properly, then it doesn't bother me, and it shouldn't impact me if amended.



- Hens should only be allowed on private property
- As long as the goal is to provide a safe environment for the animal
- Need to be managed effectively and not be a nuisance.
- If a homeowner has adequate space, they should have the right to own livestock under certain conditions within the city.
- Provided accurate care and housing by the owner
- Hens can live good lives in a city under the right circumstances and I think it would be good for Calgarians to have that option
- I think having a size and/or number restriction is reasonable, as well as proper living conditions.
- "Sustainable food is a good thing.

- Also this survey is very confusing and questions are not worded clearly. I think this will be reflected in your survey results."
- The only issue with this is attraction for other wildlife such as coyotes in neighborhoods.
- As long suitable conditions are provided and kept clean, why not have livestock
- I would support the hens with appropriate restrictions etc. Other livestock becomes tricky and not sure that it makes sense given yard sizes.
- "case by case with reference to the health and wellness of neighbors and animals involved.

- On #7, I know nothing about how many pigeons is healthy for the coop. This should be decided by people who know more about these animals"
- Think it's great having animals in unsuspecting areas. Brings more life to the city
- We would definitely get hens once approval is given.
- A few chickens power household would be great. Adhere to noise bylaws and keeping pens clean and humane
- Emphasis on suitable living conditions and cleanliness
- I think there could be many benefits for allowing some people to keep hens. The main issue is if people aren't responsible and create messes, noise issues, etc.. but as long as there is recourse for neighbors who are bothered, I think this is a good idea.
- The bylaw should except roosters.
- Who doesn't want fresh eggs in the morning. Along with people being able to throw them at cars that speed through neighborhoods
- I like chickens.
- I have always thought you should be able to own a hen in the city. I think we should be able to have them on single home property as long as the hen is quite and cared for
- I have no opinion on this.
- As long as all laws are followed, certain livestock is okay in the city.



- Yes I want a Billy Goat, a Horse and a Donkey.
- Knowledge is always good
- I don't care I'm only here to protest your [removed][removed] idea of singling out pit bulls
- As long as the neighbours don't have a problem with the animals and the owner of said animals are responsible and take proper care of their animals, and the land lot is spacious.
- I believe hens and certain livestock would have a positive impact to communities - upon approval to house them / property inspection of the conditions or area the hens or livestock would live.
- People should be permitted to provide a humane environment for hens they use for egg production or a pet if they like. Wonderful alternative to factory farming environments & an affordable option for fresh cage free eggs which are quite expensive in store.
- Only in places where it's a house NOT in apartments or townhomes or shared living. Suitable pen is a must for hens.
- As long as agreed upon by neighbours and noise level is kept down.
- For two reasons. For consumption/food, I would argue that local agriculture and food security is important. But most importantly, we need to stop considering farm animals as livestock and less than other pets, like cats and dogs. This is a form of speciesism, placing higher value on one living being over another. There is no difference between a goat and a dog, or a budgee or a chicken, a cat or a pig. They are all equal and should not be treated like property for us to own and exploit. When people profit from animals, the animals' welfare is never a priority.
- Livestock provide many benefits to families.
- I believe we can safely have urban hens and other livestock.
- This does not affect me in any way. I have no valuable opinion about hens.
- Food security
- As long as the animals are being well taken care of and the neighbour's cock doesn't wake me up at 530 every morning.
- Great opportunity for all
- Urban hens support local, sustainable food initiatives
- As long as the animals are well taken care of and are not negatively affecting the city I don't see any problems.
- I believe that as long as the animals have the appropriate space and are being properly taken care of, the species is irrelevant.
- Would have to be agreed to by adjacent neighbours.
- So long as the hens are well taken care of and do not cause a disturbance in the way of either noise or more importantly smell (Rural friends of mine own dozens of hens and they smell a great deal), I see no problems.
- I want chickens. And a pig. Maybe a goat (lawn mower)... and an emu!!
- There is a cleanliness aspect that needs to be dealt with
- Neat idea to have hens



- Allowing urban hens and other livestock in Calgary is a win for small businesses, our economy, our local product production, and for reducing our ecological footprint.
- What about renters & landlords, and those living in condos or townhouses, perhaps wanting livestock on balconies?
- Don't care what people do with their pets as long as it doesn't impact their neighbors.
- I have no issue with livestock within city limits if they can be provided suitable living conditions.
- I think having chickens in a great living environment in the city would be a fantastic idea.
- I feel like having a suitable home for certain animals would be beneficial to them.
- Other places do this and as long as the animals are being treated well
- I think it would be great to make Calgary a more sustainable city. Covid really showed how much we need to work on this
- If an individual meets all of the following criteria above and has support from their adjacent neighbours and their livestock will not be disruptive to other neighbours, then go for it.
- requires approval of bordering properties
- Bring more life to the community
- Seems like a good idea as long as the criteria in the bullet points above is adhered to
- Let people live their life through free choice. This is a waste of your time and mine.
- I would love to have some chickens for sustainable food
- Providing that the having of said animals does not impact on me. Smelly chicken coops, loud roosters crowing at 430am, animals escaping into my yard..An urban environment is not a place for barn animals.
- Opportunity for broader access to fresh foods, reduced pesticides use, control of invasive invertebrate and plant species.
- I'm not keen on having chickens in a neighbors yard
- With proper care and education it is beneficial to everyone
- Urban hens and livestock - as long as they were properly cared for and had appropriate conditions to live and did not create a negative impact on communities or neighbors would be a valuable resource for owners
- Hens, quail, rabbits and other small livestock all seem appropriate where suitable conditions exist.
- As long as the community benefits and the health of the hens is looked after it is a win/ win situation.
- As long as direct neighbours are ok with hens. Then why not ?
- "I support urban livestock,as i believe the benefits outweigh the drawbacks.

- However, i do believe that adjacent neighbours should get to veto/approve this."
- If neighbours don't mind then no problem as they would be the ones complaining in the first place
- A few chickens is fine (5 or 6) but a case for case basis is best for other animals.
- To benefit the community



- I think have a hen or two to supply food for a family should be acceptable if they have neighbors okay and they are taken care of properly
- It would be beneficial for mental health
- Personal live stock would be helpful to pollution.
- Allowing responsible ownership of livestock is essential for the well being of many.
- Again. Letting us do what we please on our property with little govt intrusion is best.
- If the animal can be properly cared for people should be allowed to own what they want
- supporting the ability for people to become more self sustainable is never a bad thing.
- The property should have to apply and show how they will maintain and care for the coop without bothering any neighbour's. It should have to be inspected and approved by the city and only so many allowed per area of the city.
- Urban hens can be a great addition to a household/community, and urban livestock can be great depending on the species.
- food security and minimize our disconnect with the food system
- Small livestock, seeing it is properly cared for, would potentially be beneficial for more than just the keepers.
- As long as the yard was big enough for sufficient pens and coups and everything was kept clean so the smell didn't bother neighbours
- Suitable living conditions
- With a major condition that the animal is taken care of properly and as its own biology requires. In addition, the animal not be directly subjected to traffic, distressing sounds, unfit environment, unfit food, neglect, etc.
- As long as there is support from adjacent neighbours
- I want chickens!
- As long as there are rules in place to ensure the suitable living conditions of the animal..
- I like this idea as long as there are quality of life standards in place for animals and neighbours
- If neighbour support is given I see no problem in allowing chickens in the city
- Unsure what animals might be considered, so cannot really answer this.
- It makes sense to allow people to do what they want on their own property, as long as it isn't negatively impacting those around them.
- It must have ongoing support by neighbours - ie: if they become messy/noisy or otherwise a nuisance they should have to be removed without question.
- 100%. It's oppressive to prevent ethical hen ownership
- Yes I want chickens!
- I like eggs
- Not all support animals are dogs.
- This is a long time coming. I hope this change occurs.
- Self sufficiency and keeping livestock can be done effectively and is beneficial to communities and households.



- Based on 4 bullet points, there's no reason to not agree
- If it doesn't bother the neighbours and things like waste are dealt with properly it is a net benefit to be able to raise smaller livestock in the city limits.
- In the case of chickens, goats, rabbits I think this is acceptable. If they are in a safe environment have permission and have a positive impact ie goat chewing the grass down. Why not?
- Everyone should be aiming for local and sustainable ideas such as this.
- I struggle to see why ascertaining support from neighbours would be necessary for the ownership of hens, but not for the ownership of other animals (i.e. cats, dogs) that could also be a nuisance to neighbours that live in close proximity/in an urban setting. I do not support this aspect of the proposed amendment.
- Why not
- I wanted hens as a pet. Fresh eggs. A pet duck.
- I feel calgarians should be allowed to be more self sufficient in growing and harvesting their own food.
- I think chickens and other livestock are very different things. This needs to be addressed separately in the bylaw.
- As long as they stay in their space properly care for and are no offensive orders I am ok with it
- I support urban hens if they are well kept and not a disturbance.
- Providing the animals are well cared for.
- As long as the project was positive impact.
- People should be able to own whatever animal they want as long as it is not a nuisance.
- Yes people should be able to raise their own food
- I think the city could benefit from having a urban goat population. It would help with weeds specifically.
- Animals that are born to be wild and are wild as of now (i.e. foxes, squirrels, deer, etc.) unless they are in need of rehabilitation or unable to be realized back into the wild.
- Miniature goats and hens should be allowed, maybe pot belly pigs. Just keep up with proper care.
- To be more sustainable in our living backyard hens can play an important part of food security. They are far less of a nuisance than pigeons. The rules for both should be equal.
- I would like it for educational purposes also with the schools.
- Na
- This would enrich lives. Big yes from me
- A small amount of hens or livestock could be beneficial to persons wanting to sustain their own food sources, and diets.
- Growing one's own food is one of the most environmentally responsible things a person can do.
- People should be given the opportunity to explore urban farming.
- This works well in other countries so there should be no problem here if managed properly.
- Hens are helping support communities
- I support this.



- Chickens, goats and other small livestock can be beneficial to a neighbourhood.
- This amendment ensures that the livestock is living comfortably.
- We can sustainably live and if you have the support from your peers and the animals needs are met then I believe you are capable to raise livestock
- yes, as long as the animals are not mistreated and have the resources they need.
- I think it would be great to allow farm animals in the City as long as the living arrangement is appropriate for the animal. I think as a City we need to allow people do the things that bring them joy as long as they are not creating a large impact on others. Connection with animals and nature is very important and is therapeutic for some.
- As long as the animals are looked after and cleaned up after I don't see a problem.
- "Urban people are currently very disconnected from their food sources.
- However, no roosters!!"
- When having chickens on your property, as long as they are maintained properly, they produce eggs as well as manure for the gardens.
- If the animals are well cared for and aren't an issue for neighbours, then why not. What happens if the neighbours change their mind? Should be standards of care like in #7.
- If this is successful, there would need to be measures in place for animals to also be removed if not being taken care of properly. Fines should apply if certain requirements can't be adhered to by the owner, such as safe and humane management of animals, noise and smell issues, slaughtering practices, etc.
- Would be fun
- It would be beneficial to have your own chickens laying eggs. To an extent and not have too many in an enclosed yard.
- Considering things like eating cleaner (ie: close to home) reduces the environmental impact, I support this with consideration to the community.
- This would be very beneficial to citizens of Calgary.
- It's much better for the environment to raise our own food locally when we can. I would approve my neighbors having hens.
- Although I don't have a hen and don't need a therapy chicken, I support the movement. Having a few fresh eggs would be nice, too!
- N/A
- I'm all for this amendment. As long as livestock animals are provided with good living conditions and are cared for appropriately by the owners (including keeping them from free-roaming in the street), I would have no problem with chickens (and others) in my neighbourhood!
- The world is changing.. bylaws need to reflect current requests.
- Yes on a basis to basis as an emotional support animal comes in all different kinds but no if it is just to have
- I've always wanted to own a chicken. And also a hammerhead shark.
- As long as there were regulations as to number and type of animal and that the property was suitable



- yes approval should be given for the above Criteria
- They are no more of a nuisance than a neighbourhood dog or cat if they are cared for responsibly. Why are certain “pets” deemed ok and others not.
- No issue with hens at all, love the idea
- People should be allowed to do what they want in their own yard.
- Livestock must have appropriate lodgings and be agreed upon by all whom would be exposed.
- An urban hen bylaw would alleviate people from abusing the system saying their hen is a service animal when really they just want an urban hen
- I would love to have fresh eggs from my own hens. you make it very difficult to do this without a great deal of preparation and aforethought- so why not?
- Great idea
- Small livestock are acceptable and not a nuisance provided they have proper care and shelter.
- It would be great to have the ability to have your own eggs provided it was done in a safe and non-disruptive manner.
- I see no issue with urban hens/other urban livestock as long as the criteria stated above is met. Animals must have their needs met and be in suitable living conditions. Adjacent neighbours must be supportive of the presence of urban hens.
- Yes if neighbours approve on both sides and no roosters. The hens should be checked upon to ensure that suitable living conditions are being provided, especially in our cold weather.
- Love this idea, with support from adjacent neighbors
- I think having other livestock as pets could prove as a benefit (such as hens or a mini house-pig) to those who have allergies to cats and dogs.
- good for the environment
- Urban hens would be amazing an more affordable access to eggs and meat. And I completely support the idea of pet pigs, they are very intelligent creatures and can be very clean when properly house trained.
- I believe individuals should have the right to own animals that make their lives easier and help provide food
- Only if all neighbors are consulted and agree. Chickens can be noisy and could disrupt neighbors quite a few houses away
- As long as the hens have a proper coop and are comfortable and there is no environmental issues then why not ?
- Animals are animals. It's great we can help the livestock and our economy by having these programs. I believe that as long as the person responsible can show all of the above, then livestock should be allowed.
- I believe that nature balances urban living. With careful planning I believe this could work.
- Small back yard chicken coops are no issue if maintained.
- There are more support animals than dogs
- As long as the pens are kept clean I see no issue with this.



- As long as the animals are being properly cared for, in the correct living environment and not negatively impacting neighbors, I don't see an issue.
 - I think it's great that people want to own livestock. And it allows people from rural areas with livestock as pets to move to the city. (Pet pig/chicken/goat)
 - As long as animals are properly cared for I think we should be allowed most animals.
 - I feel people should have freedom to choose what they have in their yards. Within guide lines set forth above. Some livestock...like chickens provide eggs. Others companionship. Also great for childrens learning. Such as responsibility, education and lots more
 - Chickens and other small fowl or farm animals are not going to be a problem in the city as long as they're cared for responsibly.
 - As long as they are properly cared for and property is kept clean
 - I'm a huge supporter of people growing their own good in all manner. I do think the noise could be the biggest concern, and the safety of the animals(comfort and there are many coyotes in the city).
 - with adequate space and food, hens are easy to take care of
 - Neighbour consent is the main part of this. However, there should be something written in to allow for that consent to be revoked on specific criteria (like the person doesnt clean up after them properly and the smell is overwhelming, or other reasons)
 - No explanation just agreed with it.
 - It would be very positive to have livestock allowed in the city. If neighbours consent and an individual follows all bylaws/regulations, I can't see any issue with this.
 - Certain livestock can be great to have around, though winters in Calgary are hard and appropriate housing would be required.
 - As long as there is enough space to keep them it is fine.
 - As long as there is approval from neighbours and proper care of the hens, I don't see why this would be an issue.
 - As long as suitable living conditions and neighbors are agreeable.
 - Unless these animals will be killed for food.
 - As long as the proper regulations are put in place, I completely support urban hens.
 - It's a good idea to take into account both the animals and the neighbors.
 - As long as they are properly kept and aren't a noise issue, I don't see a problem
 - As long as the person who wants these animals can take care of them properly and safely for the animal and the community which needs to be reassessed over time
 - "Imagine the movie Chicken Run but set in the city. Amazing!"
-
- I actually don't care about this..."
 - Having hens in the community can help feed our communities in these dire times of unemployment.
 - With restrictions. Maybe a maximum number of animals. So to not have a farm next door.



- Seems reasonable, especially support from neighbours. Keep in mind chickens are loud and smell, so anyone affected by that should be included as well.
- N/A
- As long as they are in properties with a fenced yard, it's the owners business and none of mine
- I want a pet skunk. They can come deskunked (spray sacks removed).
- As long as the animal's needs are taken care of and the neighbours are fine with it there is no problem.
- This amendment should be allowed as long as the animals are provided suitable living conditions.
- I don't see it as a problem
- I think chickens can be a great addition to a yard/family.
- As long as the livestock is properly taken care of and stored, there is no reasonable reason to forbid other animals on a person's property.
- It would make for a more interesting neighbourhood
- All animals are dope and should be welcome.
- Only if there is also a requirement to obtain proper education in care of said livestock.
- As long as the animals are protected, live comfortably, safe and don't disturb neighbours too much
- Livestock can indeed be beneficial and urban livestock can help to address such issues as transportation of goods etc., but they can also introduce zoonotic pathogens and diseases into an environment so suitable living conditions and support from neighbours would ensure risks are mitigated and everyone is aware of the risks.
- I already grow my own vegetables, I would like my own ethical and clean source of eggs as well.
- Hens don't seem like they would pose a large threat or inconvenience on anyone.
- If cared for in a safe manner could be an asset to communities.
- "I do not support raising livestock in urban areas - if you want livestock you should be in a rural area
- The only exception I support is the LESA"
- It is a great idea to allow hobby hens kept in good conditions.
- I support the choice to have hens and livestock in urban yards, and I want a bylaw that permits livestock in the city but ensures the wellbeing of the livestock and consideration for neighbours.
- urban hens can contribute to food security, and there are many successful examples in practice in other major cities
- Chickens don't kill people
- I would love to have hens or ducks for eggs and natural pest control.
- It's 2020.
- Hens provide a renewable food source and can be kept more humanely by private citizens rather than big businesses.
- who doesnt love eggs?
- If the pandemic response has shown one thing, it is that we need to be more self-reliant for our food supply. Urban hens can help meet some of these needs.
- If there is a positive outcome, I would support this. But not if it becomes noisy, smelly etc.



- So long as the animals dont pose any danger or nuisance, they should be allowed.
- It is better for the planet, and a better life for the chickens than industrial egg farming. As long as the owners are responsible and keeping things clean and safe from coyotes/foxes, I see no down side.
- Hens are cool.
- N/a
- Require consent from neighbours.
- Provided that neighbours do not object and the animal is being care of properly I have no issue with this. How are pigeons not considered other livestock? I didn't even realize people had them in the city...
- I don't see an issue with having livestock within city limits if they have proper housing for them.
- As long as the hens are contained this shouldn't be an issue to others.
- There looks to be like a lot of benefits
- Limit the amount of farm animals that can be kept in city limits due to smell and noise.
- Backyard hens should be allowed in Calgary
- As long as there is suitable living conditions and neighbour support I don't find anything wrong with this decision.
- I love the idea of having fresh eggs and it is a great pest control
- Responsible Calgarians should be able to bid with these rules.
- As long as the animal, individual, neighbours and community needs are met and a balance is achieved between the desires of the individual and the capacity of the community.
- sounds reasonable
- Urban hens are undervalued - they do not take up a large amount of space and can produce eggs and meat - two important sources of protein in a cost-effective way. Other livestock would be acceptable depending on the size of the animal and the amount of space it has.
- Hens should be allowed
- all the chickens!!!!!! So good for people.
- It would depend on the animals allowed, how big and ho aloud they were and how smelly for the neighbours.
- I have no issue with responsible, ethical ownership of livestock in suitable areas
- As long as the neighbours are cool with it, why shouldn't people be allowed?
- As long as the animal has a proper living space within the home owners property then they should be allowed
- I am interested in having backyard hens.
- As long as the household had to check with neighboring houses and is very clear on the maintenance required with strict penalties if not maintained.
- Chickens are quieter than most dogs
- Particularly in the case of hens and potbellied pigs, there's no good reason why people should not be allowed to own them as long as the owner is providing adequate care, shelter and ensures any issues that might arise are not a nuisance to neighbors.



- I would love my own hens and have always wanted them. It's a great way for kids to understand where food come from as well.
- Food security via husbandry is a positive thing for all of us, provided that it is carried out responsibly and the rights of neighbours are respected.
- If someone wants a goat in their backyard, why not!
- I want chickens so I can have my own eggs!
- As long as the animals have suitable living conditions and the neighbors aren't bothered by noise.
- Chickens are fine
- Why not? If they are well taken care of, there should be no issue. Fines for those who do not follow the by law.
- As long as its being followed up on and they also have to identify and pay for licenses for animals
- My concern would be on quality and aesthetics of hen housing on a property to be secure from predators, good husbandry practices to contain odor and not attract pests and to not be an eye-sore structure a neighbour is subjected to viewing from their home.
- As long as it's not for people to kill these animals for food. You cannot provide an animal with a nice living area, keep it happy, and then slaughter it for taste. Using hens for eggs only.
- I don't think anyone should be told they can't have any specific animal on there own property, but proper regulations should be in place to prevent failure on both side. For the safety of the animal and the owner.
- Self-sustainability is something we should be supporting
- It is cool and helps people respect where food is from
- Strong supporter of urban hens as long as they are cared for and not interfering with pleasant enjoyment of neighbours (house kept clean etc..). Would be great for community.
- Animals make people happy. More the merrier.
- thatd be awesome
- I support this criteria
- Bring on urban chickens!! Let's join the rest of sustainable/progressive cities around the WORLD
- As long as it does not cost me additional taxes.
- Creates sustainable living
- If it benefits everyone we should do it. But not at a sever cost
- I believe a person should be aloud to raise a reasonable amount of birds to supply their family with fresh food. As well as companionship. Bunny's are a great source of home grown meat and should also be allowed. Of course the enclosures need to be a sufficient size and need to be kept clean and sanitary.
- If you have a large enough space it could be nice to have other animals at home.
- With the consent of neighbours, this seems reasonable. "Community benefit and positive impact" is vague. The only potential downsides are noise or smell. However, neighbours would consent to the potential noise and cleanliness is a factor in suitable living conditions and responsible ownership so I see no downside.



- Sustainable living is sustainable living, as long as it doesn't become a problem for every one else
- I think most certainly livestock can be held in the city when done correctly. However, they should only be permitted in homes that have suitable yards/living space for them. So a person shouldn't be allowed a lamb in an apartment or something. I think as long as the law is well thought out and covers all basis, then it could be good for some back yard farmers.
- I like the idea because it would help more people to fend for themselves if need be. Also animal rearing has a lot to teach adults children everyone. And is a wonderful experience.
- Providing this livestock was not a nuisance or infringed on the communities abilities to enjoy their own living space.
- Fresh eggs and domestic "pet" livestock are no worse than dogs or kids
- So long as the neighbours are supportive and suitable living conditions can be met I believe this could be approved.
- A low maximum number allowed and as long as they are not noisy and oder is controlled.
- The criteria outlined seems realistic and responsible, provided everyone affected is on board. of course, how you define affected matters- would the neighbours 6 doors down be considered affected?
- As long as they are cared for and the neighbours support it, I'm behind it.
- If it is not a disturbance to neighbors, I would not mind livestock within the city.
- This would be great and allow the opportunity for people to be more sustainable.
- As long as the animals have an adequate space, not crowded and well contained, I'm OK with this.
- Each case is evaluated. And if a house effected by the animals is sold. There should be full disclosure.
- I think that this is a great idea! Giving people the ability to provide their own food for themselves is amazing! Also chickens make great therapy pets! Same with goats, sheep, cows, and pigs, although it's is much more difficult to suitably house these animals
- could benefit the community and city
- Great for the community.
- People should be able to have the means to produce their own food including eggs etc.
- Hens are of great benefit and can help provide eggs. This allows for families to be more sustainable and have fresh eggs. As well, some animals such as pigs make good house pets.
- You would have to get neighbour approval, but what happens when a neighbour changes and the new person says no? Is the case grandfathered? It seems unfair to make me listen to other peoples chickens or them to mine if one side of the fence does not like it. You can take a barking dog inside, but you cannot tell a chicken to be quiet.
- Urban hens are a wonderful addition to large cities around North America without issue.
- All animals should be welcome in the care of responsible humans
- Please allow hens in Calgary, I support Calgarians who want to grow/raise their own food
- As COVID-19 has shown us, our global food supply market is fragile. It's nice to know that we may someday be able to raise hens in our yards as a method of becoming self-sustainable.



- Especially now during a pandemic where people need to rely on affordable food options.
- It would be great to have some livestock to provide for ones household.
- I think this is great for children to learn from
- Neighbours should not have any input on what is done on private property, period. NIMBYism must be stopped in Calgary it is a social disease.
- A blanket no is too restrictive, however its case by case
- having chickens to rise for food or companionship is awesome.
- Yes, allowing for resident to have and care for smaller livestock such as hens can help that resident to save money on things such as eggs.
- agreed
- Every little bit helps. We not only get back to our roots and cleaner living, we support local businesses such as butchers, and granaries. Keep the money here!
- Only if the animal choice is reasonable. A chicken or miniature pig is a lot different than a miniature horse. Some animals are just not appropriate.
- Livestock within reason, like hens, can be pets, without being a nuisance
- If there is a benefit to the community and no harm to the animals, I would support this. If the situation begins to resemble farming and would result in killing of animals, I would not be in support.
- Chickens are awesome.
- I would say definitely yes, but you should need to have sound proof pens at night to be respectful to neighbors.
- As long as rules and standards are set regarding the care and treatment of these animals I think it is a fine idea. The support of surrounding neighbours is important.
- I think urban farming is okay. If we can do beehives in our back yards why not hen houses? We use to urban farm in Calgary in the 1950s. Why did it go away. As long as animals are cared for and the yards are adequate spaces. I do think you should be considerate and make you hen houses not an sore for your neighbours.
- This is something practiced all over the world and it's time Calgary caught up. This city was brought up on ranchers and livestock.
- Some small-scale urban livestock could be a benefit to the citizens of Calgary. However, it is important that any livestock does not negatively impact neighbours.
- as long as it doesn't effect others, why shouldn't people be able to partake in all the benefits of having more in their life.
- I agree
- As long as neighbours don't have an issue with it, people should be able to do what they want in their yard. This will be tricky though because chickens are very loud and noisy.
- I don't believe the hens need to have positive impact to the community so long as they aren't causing harm or nuisance.
- These animals can provide personal food / milk. As long as they are properly cared for with proper housing and kept clean.



- I would support this amendment as long as there are strict conditions that must be followed and are enforced.
- We should be allowed to take care of livestock with the criteria above included.
- The criteria above address the concerns with allowing livestock in residential areas.
- I think if people get approval from their neighbors and follow protocols to offer a safe environment for livestock animals that they should be allowed in the city. There are so many positives to this.
PLEASE DO THIS!!!!!!
- As long as the animals have good living conditions and aren't a nuisance to the community then I see nothing wrong with this
- If there is enough oversight and the neighbours are consulted, if the owner can prove that the animal will not be a nuisance and will be cared for properly it could work.
- If people can show that they can properly care for animals. And they have the space to do so, then I think it should be considered on a case by case basis.
- Local food is important. Many municipalities allow chickens, pet pigs or goats.
- The above criteria should cover the issues.
- Urban farming should be pushed.
- if anything provided a positive impact on the community or even an individual, it is the duty of the community to support it.
- Especially in uncertain times like this you should be encouraging and supporting people in providing for themselves. Additionally this could be the start to shutting down food industry business that treat animals inhumanity. Allowing people to provide their own eggs and chicken for themselves and their family and friends would reduce the need for these types of toxic industrial norms.
- Suitable, safe and healthy living conditions are a priority and will help support the other criteria.
- this could enable an increased amount of fresh, local, and lower-cost food products food to be available to communities and could also increase community engagement with neighbors.
- I've lived in other jurisdictions where chickens and livestock were permitted. If there is sufficient space on a property for a coop/pen and decent lifestyle, then they should be allowed.
- To each their own as long as it doesn't interfere with the noise bylaws
- Given that suitable living conditions are provided for the animal, Calgarians should be allowed to own hens/livestock
- With the support of neighbours and appropriate housing conditions for the animals there's no reason why they shouldn't be allowed.
- Unless it's a nuisance and the animals are contained, healthy, safe, and are in an appropriately sized enclosure, there should be no problem. ie. chickens are ok, large animals penned up - no.
- I have no issue with this
- Support from neighbours is highly subjective. Would encourage that the instead of 'support', a rapid assessment of any detrimental effects on neighbours should be done. One should be able to own livestock if it does not *objectively* detrimentally effect surrounding neighbours even if neighbours don't 'support' the operation.
- lots of benefits, as long as animals are properly cared for



- As long as the noise bylaw is followed with these animals. For instance I don't mind the idea of chickens but roosters are way too loud! Pigs aren't very loud either and can be great pets. Just for a couple examples.
- I like hens
- As long as the livestock are adequately cared for (clean enclosures, appropriate feed, disease-free), and the neighbors are aware & undisturbed (by noise, smell, waste, etc.), this is appropriate.
- Take into account the smell.
- Chickens are okay as long as they are being taken care of the
- I believe is having hens within city limits. And see where it goes with live stock.
- As long as an appropriate amount and living conditions for the hens are kept tidy and clean.
- If the animals are well cared for, and the neighbours are supportive, I am supportive of having hens and other livestock in the city. There may need to be a number limitation to ensure animals are still being well cared for and the neighbours are supportive; if for breeding, could allow temporary increase in population number while livestock grow to appropriate age to be re-homed.
- Let people do what they want.
- I think pigs should be allowed
- As long as neighbors can veto the decision I'm fine with it.
- If people want to keep livestock in Calgary, as long as they are not causing a disturbance I think that's fine.
- the responsible and ethical raising of urban hens should absolutely be supported
- YES
- Provided cleanliness rules are enforced
- I do not have a problem with livestock in the city given the above conditions. It has been successful in other municipalities
- I don't have a problem with livestock being kept in the city as long as living conditions allow for proper maintenance and upkeep of animals and enclosures
- I think it would be wonderful to have more fresh, local produce and means of caring for your property. I also think this could leave to amazing community involvement!
- I think animals are a way for Calgary to go greener. Goats mow the grass and eat weeds, which limits the use of gas or electric powered equipment.
- n/a
- Support the bylaw amendment with the understanding that neighbours have the opportunity to renege their support should the owner prove themselves incompetent.
- I think urban hens falls under the Calgary values put out in high level documents about increase local, resilience and environment sustainability
- Urban microfarms are a great way to emphasize green opportunities within the urban setting.
- I have no issue people keeping animals, as long as they are safe and well kept.
- Beneficial for community and individuals to be able to keep some limited livestock as long as they have the facilities and means of caring for them.



- I agree with this whole heartedly. Hens are great for eggs and meat, goats are great for milk and meat. So long as the bylaws above would be implemented approval from neighboring houses and proper living for the animals. I think it's a great idea.
- I believe is all criteria is met there would be no issues again as said person takes care of the hens or livestock with care.
- As long as there is property permitting the hens range
- Hens provide fresh eggs and also can teach responsibility when they are cared for in proper manner.
- All animals are good
- As long as it's fairly hygienic and all neighbours surrounding said property are on board.
- As long as there is community benefit and neighbour support I don't see why it would be an issue
- I believe there could be benefits, and if the situation fits then it would be okay. However, in order for individuals to have animals that potentially make a lot of noise and smell, I think there should also be a requirement that the individual has to have a certain amount of space for the animals in which could lessen the noise and smell for neighbours. Also, maybe in order to be allowed to bring these animals to their house, they must contact the closest neighbours and have them give their consent for the noise and smell that may or may not be present with the animals.
- As long as this amendment to the bylaw offers a safer environment for livestock and a beneficial outcome for all parties, I will agree to it.
- Solving problems by introducing ecological solutions sounds like a good idea to me. Plus, it also could allow income supplementation (selling eggs, goats milk, etc)
- No explanation needed
- No roosters or pigeons
- Yes, under the condition that their welfare is protected by Peace Officers, just as domestic pets in Calgary.
- All sorts of dogs need homes
- Yes, but only if it isn't a nuisance. Urban hens, ok. Roosters crowing their lungs out at 5am, no thanks.
- The definition of an emotional support animal is growing, people can bond with more than a cat or dog and rely on that relationship for support. I would therefore support animals such as hens and pot bellied pigs to be able to live in a household.
- As long as the animals are being cared for and have the appropriate environment i don't see why not.
- Hens are good
- Urban agriculture is being done in several other Canadian cities very successfully. Calgary is behind on this.
- It is very important to ensure that the animals are safe, and that the community is okay with having the hens there. Neighbours being the most important as they are directly impacted
- I think small scale urban farming is generally beneficial as long as their is appropriate support from the community and the needs of the animal are met in a humane manner.



- I think having hens is a great way to provide for a family, what I think should be considered in the bylaw is the cleanliness, smell and living conditions of livestock. I would not want a rooster next door as an example, or to live next to a literal pig pen in a suburban setting.
- I think it's a great way to make Calgary more self-sustaining.
- "Approved living quadrants, enough space for them and ensure neighbours are okay with it
- Make sure owners know what they are doing. Education before approved to have hens"
- people should be able to have whatever pets they want. As long as its safe for the animals and people.
- If the animal is cared for properly.
- I realize some people have animals such as a pig or mini horse as companion animals, and as long as the property is large enough to sustain the need of such animals and the animal waste is disposed of effectively, and if person is a renter the landlord should be able to control what animals the renter brings to the property.
- I am allergic to some animals, so I'd like to say, but overall it would be great for many people to have a goat or sheep for milk and wool plus clipping the lawn, etc, hens for eggs, that sort of thing.
- Hens are a great backyard / urban pet that are good for morale and the community!
- There is a benefit to allowing certain livestock, ie. chickens, in that people are able to produce their own food, as long as their property is kept clean and noise bylaws are adhered to it should be encouraged.
- case by case. some people are just awful neighbours - whether it be the hen owners or their neighbours. Perhaps an assessment process also
- I think having proper assessment and an application process in determining the requirements for housing hens, keeping their health and safety in mind as well as the property and neighbour considerations, would be a great addition to the city.
- As long as the animals were in suitable housing and provided a benefit to the owner (producing food or providing support) then I support it.
- if and only if the adjacent neighbours are consulted
- I think if done right, with proper education and respect for those involved, allowing certain livestock in the city is a great idea.
- Chickens are fairly relaxed animals so I have no problem with hen ownership as long as larger animals such as horses and cows remain at farms outside of stampede season.
- ensure appropriate mitigations are in place to limit spread of avian or other viruses.
- Urban farms are becoming more and more appealing to individuals, not only for a cost saving/lifestyle change but also to give families something to do together.
- I don't see any problem with people having chickens, pot bellied pigs or any other animal considered small "livestock". As long as the animals are well taken care of and neighbours approve. The animals should always come first. Too many are neglected or abused. That's a problem for me.
- People should be able to use their property how they wish so long as it isn't damaging anyone else
- As long as everything is done fairly for people and animals



- I would like to participate in having urban hens
- But training needs to be mandatory so owners can recognize diseases that impact birds (and ones that can spread to humans!)
- Within reason
- It's been well received in other cities
- As long as it is done in safe and human ways for both the caregivers and animals, and the animals are not overcrowded
- Having your own hens or milk producers would be beneficial.
- With support from neighbours and humane practices, I see nothing wrong with this.
- I have lived in an another city that allowed 4 hens per yard and it was successful.
- Responsible ownership rules must be followed.
- As long as livestock owners are responsible they should be allowed to have these animals.
- If people can provide an appropriate home for the animal, they should be allowed to care for it.
- Everyone should have the opportunity to have a self-sustaining lifestyle.
- urban ducks could help with slug problem
- Just because someone lives in the city, they could have adequate spacing for the animal and it could bring the community together more
- As long as the hens are cared for properly, it would be a good local alternative for eggs that doesn't support larger corporations with inhumane practices.
- I think it is very important that only hens are allowed, and not roosters. I think that there needs to be minimum property size requirements for this as support from adjacent neighbors is only helpful until your neighbors move
- Some livestock are harmless.
- Support from adjacent neighbors is huge because chickens smell so bad
- As long as animals are well cared for and not a nuisance to their neighbors ie Rooster cawing at dawn would be a nuisance if it was outdoors however if it was indoor until a little later in the morning 8am it would not be a nuisance
- Depending on the animal. Quiet, Smell, safety would all have to be considered.
- I honestly don't care as long as the threat of property or bodily damage is low. Pls no cows or hogs or other animals over 50 kilos though.
- I like the idea of being able to have your own hens and/or livestock to feed your family.
- Hens can make good companion pets and should be allowed with the right support.
- I support this bylaw amendment provided that the context of the urban hen house is suitable. There should be setbacks for where hen houses can be placed within one's property. Adjacent neighbours should be consulted and must agree with the hen house.
- You should always be able to get into sustainable farming as long as you take care of the animals
- Allow people freedoms but manage it.
- self sustainable
- Proper living And eating conditions Must be provided for the livestock.



- More efficient and cost effective
- As long as the animal is in a safe healthy environment then I believe it's okay.
- If one chooses to have a certain livestock, as long as kept clean and decent.
- Livestock have different requirements and deserve to be evaluated on a case by case basis.
- As long as neighbours are supportive, and there is enough space for the animals.
- Supporting small scale animal husbandry has a great many positive benefits, mainly in the form of humanely raised food. Highly support.
- Urban agriculture is a great way to leverage scarce land and resources.
- people should be able to make their own decisions about what kind of animal they want on their own property as long as they have proper containment for said animals
- Better for population to be close to livestock.
- I would support this if there was a stringent review process for these applications.
- No battery cages and limit on the amount per home.
- They can offer many benefits to the community as well as the owners. --- provided the level of care for said animal exceeds the necessary level of care.
- Sustainable resources. As long as people take care of them doesn't let them fence for themselves comes winter I think it would actually be a great idea
- But the parameters would need to be provided to gain my full support. In particular what licensing, accommodations, protocols and even certification before these people will need before they can have animals in their yard.
- As long as the adjacent neighbors are consenting, there should be no issues.
- Fresh eggs.
- I don't see a problem if people have livestock.
- I would love a couple hens! Fresh eggs!
- Urban farming should be utilized far more for sustainability
- It's the right thing to do, let people have their pets
- I'm indifferent as I have limited knowledge on livestock care.
- better for mental health, food sustainability, income or lack of. So may more + than - for this question
- There are many other pets besides dogs and cats
- As long as the animals are being treated humanely and aren't a nuisance to those living around them.
- As long as the animals have the resources they need
- Would like to see urban hens and mini cows allowed in Calgary with due criteria met.
- As long as it does not impede on neighbors enjoyment of their property
- Housing hens is great and it is better for us to get our food this way.
- many other livestock can have benefits but as long as hygiene standards are enforced strictly
- As long as they are well cared for, this would be a great idea



- As long as regulations are followed, with the economy as it is people should be allowed to have livestock that they are able to self sustain themselves and/or their family with
- As long as livestock is kept as companion animals not as meat....this would be my biggest worry about people abusing this and running their own farm and butcher shop out of their home (I know of people inside of the city who do this with rabbits and it is vile)
- I would like to have a miniature horse, sheep, or goat on my property, which is large enough at 14,000 sq feet (1/3 acre). They are smaller than many dogs, are less of a nuisance than dogs - they don't make continual noise like some dogs, never attack or accost people like some dogs.
- If someone raises them responsibly I have zero issue
- If done well could offer lifestyle benefits
- Livestock could be permitted as long as there was not a busy nuisance concern
- I fully support this. it is a great benifit to the community to be able to provide high level of sustainablility and education in producing some of your own food. .
- I don't think they should need neighbor approval
- Certain cloven-hooved animals (with quantity limitations) should also be allowed. Goats and other small animals would be extremely beneficial to weed control, mental well being, etc.
- Chickens are good additions to city neighbourhood food supplies.
- there are many benefits to allowing residents to have small livestock including food resources and emotional support
- Our winters are too cold for the coops typically used by back yard owners and its animal cruelty. Must require a heated coop.
 - provided 'suitable living conditions' is followed-up on, and urban livestock is provided security from other neighborhood pets.
- If they don't bother anyone else, why not?
- Local food production is always a bonus
- "Urban" wildlife can provide many benefits to both family and community life
- the opportunity for fresh products is abundant and could potentially add value to a larger space, such as whole community involvement/benefit.
- urban farming as long as it is not disturbing others.
- Hens are productive, useful and not a problem when taken care of properly
- As long as thorough research on how it will affect the water and urban environment says it's not harmful!
- Small/non dangerous livestock would promote sustainability in the city.
- Provided that support from adjacent neighbours is a requirement, I would support this bylaw amendment.
- Hens are a great way to control garden pests organically. Pigs are great pets.
- Need to respect the neighbors
- "Hens can be wonderful part of our lives.
- No to roosters!"



- As long as everything is done as stated above, it can be a cheap solution for low income families to acquire food.
- Sounds fair. I am fine with hens and pot belly pigs.
- I think as long as they have neighbors support, they should be able to have hens.
- Urban hens would be great if managed appropriately.
- I'm on the fence for this one. I'm mostly concerned about unruly teens hurting these animals.
- I do not have a problem with people owning livestock within the city
- As long as the animals are safe and do not become a nuisance.
- As long as the animals can be safe, happy and healthy, then I don't see an issue.
- People shouldn't keep livestock just for the sake of it. They need to know how to properly take care of them and provide suitable living conditions. Adjacent neighbours may have problems with the noise as well so while it shouldn't be totally up to their input, they should get some input.
- I think allowing urban chickens is a great way to support self reliance
- Everyone has an animal preference and also some can use these animals for food depending on the type of animal it is.
- nothing wrong with birds I don't think a cow would be appropriate
- I like the idea of Henson provided they are cared for and maintained
- As long as it doesn't become a nuisance to the neighborhood.
- I think all neighbours need to agree for the person to have hens
- I don't see a problem of having a limited number of hens in inner city back yards as long as they are properly housed.
- It would be great to allow this in the city.
- prospers sustainable living, ect.
- Dont let it become a problem for your neighbors
- Have live around urban hen before and they cause no real issues to neighbors. They provide food for local families and can be a great teaching tool for children.
- People r too selfish and can learn a lot from animals.
- I don't believe we should prejudice what pets people can and can't own if they do so responsibly
- I would love to have laying hens in the city.
- Na
- With a license that is given once suitable housing provided
- I am curious to see how that turns out
- as long as there is minimal interference with the immediate neighbours, they are in support, there is limited or no risk to the public, and the animals are properly cared for, i see no harm in opening this up.
- Confused
- i love animals
- As long as the criteria is met, this should be allowed.
- If it is safe and in the best interest of the owner and animal yes I support.



- Husbandry Danimals is critical to a sustainable future
- Should be limited to a certain amount of hens
- If all neighbours in the area support a household getting chickens and such, I don't see an issue but noise and smell are a high priority on my list.
- It doesn't hurt anyone and animals deserve to be free.
- We support sustainable living and the local food movement. This is a very important city step towards support healthy living for its citizens. Those that participate will have to understand the commitment but this community is usually a very reasonable crew.
- I like the idea of people being able to have their own eggs and food potentially.
- With the rising costs of food, having access to eggs might help some people.
- It is more sustainable for people to have their own livestock if they choose as well they can provide emotional support as pets
- People should be able to do as they please on their property.
- Only if the purpose of "other livestock" is not for the production of food. In no way.
- I believe responsible ownership of hens in the city is a great idea.
- Chickens are cool.
- If the animal could be cared for appropriately, I don't see why there would be any issues, unless it reduces the quality of living for adjacent neighbours (for example, if there was a significant smell or mess).
- This does no harm to the residents of Calgary
- .
- If people want to own an animal they should be allowed if it's safe.
- I think it's a beneficial option for people to have
- I think this is a reasonable thing to consider with proper guidelines in place
- Having a couple of hens can be way less of a nuisance than a neighbor with three or more constantly barking dogs who never picks up their waste. Allow people who are responsible and considerate to have some control over their own food supply. why are unlimited pigeons, rabbits, dogs and cats allowed and chickens are not? just do not allow roosters if noise is a concern.
- Backyard hen programs have been very successful in other major Canadian cities.
- As long as suitable living conditions are enforced
- As long as suitable living conditions are enforced
- it has worked well in other communities for the most part
- SAFE and LOVING temporary places for animals is what I want for these dogs. There are clear issues with the dog mentally to be attacking, rehabilitate!
- Livestock is good for everyone.
- No issues with chicken, goats small animals
- As long as proper care and space can be provided for the animal, and there is no negative effects to their neighbors lives.



- Given they are in a safe environment for themselves and others and that it has some environmental or community benefit. Most animals have some sort of prey drive and it cannot be expected that dogs won't react. Especially that most will be seeing them for the first time ever. Dogs are curious animals.
- If it can be done reasonably, I think one should be able to do as they please.
- Food security is becoming an issue. Local or private operations should be encouraged
- Chickens another livestock can be great additions to life but they take a lot of work and time. People should be educated on the needs of the livestock.
- I love chickens
- nice to have fresh eggs
- Allow people to have their own eggs!
- I think size of yard should influence this decision. I think keeping a small flock of chickens can be very advantageous to those who love to organic garden in the way of fertilizer and bug control.its a great project and learning opportunity for families.
- I think there should be a limit to the number of these types of livestock.
- Animals like pot belly pigs can be good pets
- As long as they weren't free to city roam I don't see an issue.
- Really, I just love fresh eggs. If a neighbour was keeping hens, I would be ecstatic.
- this would be a welcome addition as many people struggle with basic food needs
- I believe having hens in the backyard would be great and offer little downside to adjacent neighbours
- I see no problem with this.
- As long as they are not at large I am okay with that. My dog is high prey drive and if they are at large it is hard to walk my dog.
- with the cost of food today, certain livestock allowances would help families feed their kids.
- People should be allowed to have livestock as long as conditions are healthy, humane, and do not affect surrounding wildlife and neighbours
- Let people have their chickens or whatever responsibly
- Property taxes are expensive so you should be able to do whatever you want on your property as long as it doesn't affect neighbours and the quality life with animals
- Urban hens could be a really awesome way to build community.
- Hens should be allowed providing the property owner has adequate yard space & proper chicken house. Most important owner actually knows how to care for chickens
- Some people have space to keep these animals and they should be free to do so if it's not causing trouble to the neighbors.
- As long as there is a cap on the number of chickens a household can have
- I think that urban livestock approval, especially hens, would be an amazing step forward for our city! What a way to promote food security and benefit our community.
- If the livestock is well cared for by a responsible owner I would support allowing them in the city.
- I don't see a problem with what's being proposed



- If the animal can be properly cared for and not negatively impact the community, why not?
- If the home has a proper area that he a could be in and it doesn't affect neighbours then why not?
- As long as there are complete neighbor support and rules in terms of animal waste and care from the City.
- Calgarians should be allowed to house hens so they can meet their dietary needs
- Urban hens don't pose a threat, however the same rules should apply to hen owners as other animals (ie. Keeping their living space clean)
- Depending on the collateral impact owning these animals can have (I.e. smell, noise)
- If people would like to raise chicks or hens on their own property it shouldn't be a question. I think there should be restrictions to size and quantity but noise shouldn't be an issue, especially considered other noise factors that are out of control and not regulated
- I just support animals in general and if they can have a better quality of life in the city, well I agree.
- Seems responsible
- As long as the animal has a "met-all-the-requirements" home and not one that was good enough for them to live in.
- BUT with like chicken, the area must be kept CLEAN, else mice will come and cause a problem
- I think the idea of hens/live stock could support the city and neighborhoods alot as seen with the "goat cutting crew" but suitable living conditions would have to be a primary concern as to keep livestock well and neighboring homes happy.
- I would support urban hens
- I think this is a great ide.
- We could have our own little cottage industries, sharing food with each other.
- Not sure what to think ... some neighbours may have animals that could get out and attack/harass
The livestock
- I would allowed select live stock as long as they have the appropriate needs met, such as ample space to roam and grow, proper food, water and shelter and then to also look at the quality of life, making sure the animal is happy, not stressed, not abused, still acting as a animal. Also a license to keep such animals must be given out with inspection of living spaces before the purchase and sale of livestock or urban use. Permits displayed (like dog tags)
- A great way to produce your own food and reduce environment impact.
- Following the aforementioned criteria, it could be feasible.
- Exclude large breed animals (cow/horse/pig (standard, not pigmy)/alpaca, etc)
- This could be a fantastic opportunity for people to raise some home-grown livestock, and could potentially provide restaurants with more local produce!
- As long as everything is kept clean all is OK.
- Love the idea of urban ag and hope that communities can get into this!!
- The support of neighbours is important with this, because it is not solely the livestock owners that are impacted by the livestock being present, both positively and negatively.
- Chickens can be a valuable pet that enriches people's lives



- No thanks
- It allows for people to have their own agricultural experience in the city.
- Chickens are cool
- Absolutely. Hens would be an amazing addition to urban back yards. Not sure about larger livestock including pigs/sheep/cattle/goats. Depending on size of the yard etc
- Food security is very important and laying hens, dairy goats, etc are an easy, multi use option.
- Chickens can be raised responsibly as demonstrated in other cities. It is important to provide a local food source and to teach kids about respecting their food source.
- They would help with the amount of bugs.
- As long as all neighbours agree I'm fine with it and the owner keeps the area clean of feces and feathers, limiting any smells and noises to houses outside of the adjacent neighbours
- As long as care for the animal is taken seriously and hens have appropriate living conditions this could be a great movement toward more sustainable and connected living
- absolutely 100%. This pandemic has shown lots of us how much more self sufficient we can be. Please, please encourage this wise, safe idea. I'd like three chickens, no roosters.
- I think it would be amazing to have the opportunity to raise your own eggs or other resources that the animals could provide. Just another opportunity for sustainability.
- excessive noise need to be considered and clearly defined. some animals like to talk more than others and different people have different levels of discomfort with animal noise
- Chickens are less of a noise, cleanliness and environmental harm problem than dogs, cats, and pigeons
- Roaming cats could be a problem for these hens
- I think having hens and other non-disruptive livestock is a great idea for both our health and the environment. The animals welfare is key, as well as realistic expectations from neighbours and communities.
- I live close to the lady who pushed to have the hens deemed legal pets. And I support her and anybody else who has pets that don't meet the general standard. the hens bring her such peace and calm that if another animal can do that for somebody else I'm in full support
- If suitable living conditions (ie. smell/noise is controlled), then a small number of hens should be allowed on single family dwelling properties.
- But no support from neighbors requirement as jerks will just veto it if they have a beef with the neighbor for any reason. If it's just a few hens and no roosters, it should be fine
- I think this is an amazing idea !
- I fully support urban hens.
- Don't ban a breed
- I think a minimum backyard size and distance between neighbors would be important
- Chickens and hen's are awesome and precious creatures that can be silly cheerful companions. As well as provide fresh eggs during lay season. Good plan to allow this bird as a 'pet'
- If it meets the things above I like the idea of local farming to reduce environmental impacts



- As long as you require support from all neighbours and if neighbours are able to revoke approval do to changes in conditions.
- I think it's fair if neighbours are consulted.
- As long as the livestock are not causing a problem to the neighbours it should be nobody's business but the owner's
- Home grown food such as eggs cared for responsibly is a benefit
- I fully support any movement towards a more sustainable future. I think urban livestock should be a community level decision meaning some communities have more opportunities for urban livestock than others.
- "If it helps get the job done without adding man hours, and unnecessary expense
- it's a great alternative."
- Chickens are useful, easy to keep, and help families be more self sustaining
- Yes, if everyone around is fine with it
- As long as the people who the animals keep the living space clean, having small livestock in the city would benefit many people.
- right now, lots of people are spending a lot of time at home. if they want hens or other reasonable livestock, and they do it right, cool!
- If proper conditions are provided for the humane handling of small livestock, I am in favour. I think the other concerns would be noise and handling of waste and smell associated with it
- Yes, let's utilize natural resources
- If people want to be able to start having their own food sources, why not? It's a great way to bring some basic human skills back into society.
- see no issue with it
- As long as the appropriate measures are taken to ensure the animals are secured properly and there aren't so many it causes a nuisance I fully support this
- Ability to keep appropriate livestock within city can improve food security and be beneficial for homeowners and neighbours (eg: chickens eating pest insects)
- As long as the adjacent owners agree and the animals are properly looked after. When I lived in Bowness some one had a rooster, I often heard it crowing
- Some people connect with a specific animal that falls out of the standard domestic cat / dog / guinea pig / ferret paradigm. If someone has a rather spacious land inside city limits, and the capacity to care for a Horse (for example), it would only make sense to allow it. As well, people having hens and other such livestock will allow for independence, so they can produce their own eggs and such. For Seniors especially, having something to occupy their minds while their body is still able to care for animals could help ensure a greater quality of life.
- I only support livestock in the city has companion animals and not used for exploitation i.e. eggs or slaughter
- The criteria to meet is reasonable. Provided all criteria is adhered to, I am comfortable with the amendment.



- Calgarians need more opportunity to have sustainable practices and bylaws outlining same are necessary
- Doesn't affect me if someone wants to have a chicken
- Within reason and with neighbors approval i see no issue
- As long as the neighbors are aware, and there are proper living conditions and standards in place, I agree.
- It cannot negatively impact lifestyle of neighbours, specific defined rules about conditions so it's not arbitrary.
- Limit the amount of chickens a person can have and where allowed on the property
- Always praise self sustainability.
- Small livestock animals should be allowed as long as owners prove they have suitable living arrangements for the animals
- I have personally dealt with a neighbour who had livestock and it was no problem at all. They livestock was friendly and provides eggs which they shared with all of us. Community togetherness was what came out of it before bylaw took the chickens away which was extremely sad.
- If animals are well cared for, I don't mind where they are
- It would be wonderful!!! Other municipalities have had successes in Alberta and elsewhere with urban hens, and provided they or other such animals are not a nuisance to others, why not?
- As long as animals are kept in a responsible humane manner
- I think as long as it's being owned by someone responsible in suitable conditions I support
- Beneficial to the community
- I support the urban hen initiative and support requirements be met.
- As long as this is community supported and there are standards for appropriate animal welfare that are enforced.
- I would expect that there would be criteria the city puts in place as far as acceptable housing for the animal
- Goats as gas powered lawn mowers are a great alternative.
- As long as the animals are well cared for and don't cause a nuisance to neighbors they should be allowed. Yearly licensing reviews with affidavits from adjoining properties should be instituted
- I believe individuals should be allowed to keep and care for animals considered as 'livestock'. If an individual wants to own any animal, a background check and living conditions should be investigated to ensure the animal will be provided the proper care. As a person who cares for the well-being of all animals, i believe if a person is going to own a animal, it is because that person is looking for a companion. If the individual genuinely wants to use a animal for livestock purposes, they should have to request a permit that would register them as a livestock owner, and be reviewed regularly for humane care of the animals.
- the idea of it is great, i just want to be sure that enforcement of these criteria are met, particularly the suitable living conditions
- Allowing people in the city to raise some livestock would reduce costs on food and transportation for food as well as more efficiently use the space we're occupying.



- I think proper space and hygiene requirements and noise issues should be considered for the safety of animals and in consideration of neighbours.
- With restrictions on numbers and cleanliness.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and aren't a nuisance to neighbouring homes.
- There are so many benefits to having small livestock in the community
- Chickens are great pets and are a delight to have around. Roosters should be closely examined as they are dicks.
- Yes, the hens where properly housed and not allowed to roam the neighborhood.
- I think it would be beneficial to owners and neighbours to have livestock in the city, assuming proper living conditions can be provided for the animal.
- It's very important that suitable living conditions are provided, as many livestock require bigger amounts of space and different care. When evaluating the case, it needs to be ensured that the people are well-educated on how to provide for that species (E.g., food, shelter, husbandry, training), and the animal is suitable for being a 'pet' as supported by published scientific literature. The species should not pose a significant threat to public health and safety. The species should not represent a significant threat to native wildlife. Species ownership must be permitted under provincial, federal or international laws and regulations.
- Farm to table is much easier when you can have your own hens. Help reduce carbon emissions.
- The animals **MUST** be treated humanely. People wanting chickens **MUST** be educated in the the physical and **EMOTIONAL** needs of the birds.
- Yes as long as the livestock can be contained on the property and provide no risk or detriments to the neighbours.
- As long as they are raised in the correct environment, and not allowed to roam freely in public, it is acceptable.
- I support the right to own livestock given their needs and space requirements are meant. Limits to the property size should be in place to avoid hoarding situations. Free registration should be in place to encourage owners to add their animals to the database.
- It will benefit the community
- If they are secured. Wander wildlife can cause hazards to people, drivers and other animals.
- Urban farming is a great sustainable option for the Calgary population. It would be great to see this happen.
- Every home owner should be able to raise their own food provided they are caring the for the animals in a responsible manner
- Allow community input before approval
- Evaluate case by case basis
- hens and chickens can help reduce the cost of living.
- Thoughtful, responsible urban animal husbandry benefits the animals, their owners, and the community.
- it would provide a healthy alternative to buying eggs for some calgarians
- I don't know any reason why it would be an issue



- if they're properly being cared for and have a certain degree of living expectations. If animal cruelty occurs in any way they should be fined and any animal in their care should be removed
- I don't see a reason why not.
- Before giving permits need to make sure they have proper enclosures and rules when the hens need to be put in and out of the coop.
- If animals are cared for properly, hens are an incredible option for eggs and natural pest control in your garden. Removes the need for harmful pesticide and factory farmed eggs (or ridiculously expensive "free-range/organic" eggs).
- Since I can't explain the next answer (pigeons) I'll do so here. I hate pigeons, I think the correct answer should be none, HOWEVER some people have carrier pigeons and pet pigeons I get it. So I put 1-10. Again, difference between pet pigeons and wild pigeons.
- Hens are a way to provide food for your family
- As long as health and safety is maintained. And are not drawing in predators from outside the city. Coyote, lynx, etc.
- If they are given the appropriate safety measures, yes.
- If the animals have proper dwelling/space there is no reason not to.
- Huge benefits to the community. Community farming, connecting kids to food, more local food production etc. I don't think support is necessarily needed from neighbors. Some neighbors will just be a pain and object without having a good cause.
- I've had chickens, love fresh eggs. As long as they have a secure place to roam and sleep, and don't cause too much noise, everyone should be able to have them
- With changing needs for sustainability and self-sufficiency amid the pandemic and climate change, allowing urban livestock could be a positive impact for food security and community growth. Ownership should require proper training and understanding of the needs of these animals and proof of knowledge of care.
- We can allow hens but are not allowed to make decisions on our own pets? Irresponsible pet owners should be facing consequences. Not citizens as a whole.
- Should allow when reasonable. Part of a Sustainable city.
- Don't see the difference between dogs and chickens. I'd rather have chickens that stay on their property than dogs peeing and pooping everywhere.
- Should be a limit to how many and need a certain amount of space for every one of them.
- I think it is fine as long as neighbors agree to it and the owner keeps the animal under control and does it does not become a nuisance i.e.: smelly, loud, running at large.
- I think it would be great to have urban hens or other livestock if their needs are met.
- no
- I love being able to self-sustain as much as possible. I currently have a fruit and vegetable garden, and have always dreamed of having farm fresh eggs. I do think proper protocols are required to make sure the animals have a suitable living environment for our harsh winters.
- everyone deserves to have a pet they want, even if they are stinky.
- No loud roosters.



- Anything that helps people be less reliant on grocery stores is a good thing
- Decentralization of food production, like more sustainable.
- People who would be able to have local livestock would benefit all the communities with fresh eggs etc
- So long as it is not harming anyone and has the potential to provide some good, why wouldn't the city allow it.
- I think chickens in the city would be fine as long as they follow your criteria
- Who doesn't like fresh eggs? As long as the animal is well cared for why not?
- They must also show that they have an adequate understanding and the means necessary to provide optimal care for said animal.
- Giving people the option to have hens in their backyard allows those who would rather raise their own food the chance to do so.
- Not bothered by the idea, also love fresh eggs
- the care and upkeep of the animals should be priority
- Chickens, when handled by responsible individuals, would be a boon to local communities.
- Seeing as long as bylaws are met such a noise/ clean up & housing their should be no issues with owning livestock
- ONLY if the animals are maintained in the way that the person advertised after community engagement. (IE: if they agreed to clean cages daily, they must clean cages daily or forfeit the animals - swiftly!) Also, does a person have the physical and mental capacity to care for something on a structured and regular basis. Are they financially able to support regular medical, food and shelter bills. Most of my comments are in the interest of "Is the project maintainable over the long term after the blush of excitement over)
- i think it would be nice for people to be able to have chickens etc. within reason
- because the criteria is valid and makes sense.
- I know that chickens provide a lot of joy to people and as long as they have a home that is maintained (as I would expect for any animal living outside) I would be all for it.
- A species specific maximum number of livestock animals
- Livestock can be pets too.
- Sustainable homesteading in an urban environment is gaining popularity and technological innovation is making more alternatives possible. Given the already high cost of living in Calgary, as well as the exorbitant food prices we are already subjected to, having the option to source more of our food from our own resources such as domesticated stock is an excellent alternative to continue to feed ourselves. Moreover, the byproducts of such stock, like manure, can be used in gardens throughout the community to add nutrients to the clay-like soil of Calgary, and in the case of hens, you get even more benefit with both egg production for several years and then eating the hen herself after she's outlived her egg-laying years.
- If the neighbours don't object, why should anyone else?
- I like hens, just be a responsible hen owner.



- As long as the animals are not a nuisance to surrounding neighbours or able to escape then they should be allowed
- People should be able to make their own food on their own property.
- Hens ain't hurting anyone... as long as their coop is maintained and isn't a nuisance. Give it a try. Wait and see what happens. Call it Hen and See... rappers will love it.
- So long as they are monitored and the animals/livestock are being taken care of and treated properly, areas are kept clean etc. I don't see the issue.
- Absolutely yes! Other municipalities (Okotoks for example) have implemented this in an urban setting without incident. I do think that getting approval from neighbours may be onerous in many cases though and what happens if one of the neighbours you got permission from moves and the new person objects? Do you have to get rid of the animal(s) that you have been caring for and are attached to?
- As long as the animals can be well provided for, including proper food, shelter (from weather conditions and temperature), and enrichment, I see little issue with allowing people to have them. That said, the consideration from neighbours needs to be heavily weighted--perhaps requiring signed agreement from neighbours within a specific range--as not everyone will appreciate a crowing rooster at or before sunrise.
- Barking dogs and at large cats cause more of a disturbance than chicken would. As long as there is a maximum number of hens and the owner cleans to avoid a smell.
- I don't understand why they are banned in the first place
- being wary of people who want to abuse the livestock bylaw and become nuisance pets. but if enforced bylaws were in place hopefully these issues will not become a problem. I do not agree with every type of livestock should be allowed.
- If people can prove they can be responsible by thinking about the big picture in an urban environment with their pets, then they should be allowed to have the opportunity to care for those pets. However, a minimal standard for some animals is not humane in such cramped settings. IE goats and small ponies/ mini horses. Also noisy or odourous birds is not fair to neighbours. So minimal requirements yet more than basic necessary needs for the animal should be a set standard.
- I totally support an initiative to allow livestock inside the city.
- I think there are a select few "farm" animals that would do well in an urban setting
- it's important to have a safe space where you can grow and engage with your food. we don't have that anymore living in a city relying on grocery stores.
- Fresh eggs
- Responsible pet ownership is necessary for any animal
- I support local livestock as long as neighbours are in agreement.
- As long as there is buy in from all parties (within reason) then I have no objections to the amendment.
- As long as the owners tick all the boxes for requirements I think this would be fine.
- If I had the space for a chicken and by laws allowed it, I would love to have a chicken.



- As long as the animal, the community, and all others affected/involved have their safety and well-being prioritized, I see no issue with this.
- Hens are a great benefit for the owners, cleanliness of the coop is critical for hens & neighbours. Other livestock would be case by case.
- everyone has the right to grow thier own food, or care for thier property naturally and holistically
- Love it! I think that would help bridge the gap between city folk and farmers. I think that there is a lot of positive learning here. I also like the above requirements. This is helpful in ensuring that people are actually ready for the commitment of caring for another living being.
- I have no issues with other raising hens as long as the hens stay on their property
- I think small livestock such as chickens, hens, ducks are beneficial for the health and wellbeing of people and of land.
- Would love to see more animals in the city! They can bring many benefits.
- Many other large cities in Canada have adopted an urban hen bylaw.
- Chickens help with sustainability, they teach kids reasonably and treating animals with respect and knowing where their food comes from
- Urban agriculture can enhance the productivity of land that is otherwise wasted. As long as livestock is well maintained with proper care and conditions this can enhance a community while reducing environmental impact
- Assess properties based on inspections. Many people will think they want urban livestock but don't understand the means to care for them especially during winter. Create a detailed questionnaire as well asking all the means the owner will take to ensure safety of the animals and cleanliness of the property. Definitely create a fine system for too many animals , hoarding, dirty properties etc.
- As long as all is well in place.
- all living animals deserve a quality life
- I would love to have a hen in my backyard
- Back yard chickens need to be allowed for egg production. Up to 4 per household. Education should also be included so neighbours know that noise won't be an issue.
- How many chickens??
- Any domesticated animal can be a pet.
- I believe it would help out people who like to grow their own food to better off rely on themselves more.
- The more local you can get something, the better.
- Chickens have proven to be a small to non issue in other cities
- Chickens are cool, even though they are kinda creepy. My only concern would be the noise. I think both neighbors would have to consent to have chickens next to them.
- Why not, if there is no detriment to the community or the livestock. Neighbour consultation will be key
- as long as factors such as smell and noise are accounted for and the people around them (their neighbours) are okay about it



- Hens have long been something many people in the city would enjoy. There are good responsible people out there who should be allowed this privilege
- This is a huge trend in many cities
- Yes, if unreasonable neighbors can be overcome
- I have zero objections living by livestock as long as they're in a suitable environment.
- I believe urban livestock can help with people with low income feed their families.
- If the community one lives around is accepting that one wishes to raise livestock then it should be fine. This should be a community aimed question aimed at different zones of the city and reviewed from that data received by the separate communities.
- Urban Hens would be amazing for strengthening community and food security in Calgary especially with the recent opening of the Calgary Community Fridge in Crescent Heights!
- Fresh eggs. Economy
- The community benefit/positive impact would be great
- I think it's good for everyone
- Responsibly done it is a great thing to have
- If the people living nearby have agreed, I don't see why responsible owners shouldn't be allowed other animals
- Cheaper eggs!!! And healthier chicken for dinner
- Hens aren't noisy like dogs
- Doesn't really bother me either way but if a neighbor asked if they could have chickens or something I would agree
- Just like building an addition to your house, the decision to have livestock needs to be approved by your neighbours as the animals could affect the nearby environment - through odour, noise, etc.
- I would vote yes, only if the shelters were kept clean and did not smell.
- As long as the owner of the chickens kept their properties clean and their chickens clean then why not
- I see no issue with keeping a sustainable food source. As long as the amount of hens is capped and if a complaint about smell/too many hens is reported it's taken seriously.
- The hen debate has gone on for 15 years. Enough already. Waste of time and resources to keep revisiting. Just allow it permanently already. We are
- As long as the laws protect the animals, with appropriate limits, could be great!
- I've seen other cities adapt an urban hen program with much success. As long as the livestock has suitable housing during the winter I see no issue with allowing small livestock on private urban property.
- This would give help lower income families raise food for themselves
- As long as people are willing to raise the animals responsibly, then I fully support backyard chickens. It allows for families to provide food for themselves, their community and also it's good for the environment and reducing emissions, etc!



- Animals are therapy for a lot of people. Calgary boarders have a lot of big acreage lots so it would be nice to be allowed more animals.
- I support it in theory, but I would be concerned with noise and odour.
- Having a diversity of animals in the city would only be beneficial
- Livestock is a way of living and the city should let it be allowed to have them as long as they are cared for correctly
- "Urban hens, within the limits set by Animal Bylaw (whatever they may be) are a great idea!! Hens are great pets, provide a healthy fresh food alternative, can assist in pest management and will eat compostable food items. However, there needs to be guidance from the City regarding numbers, and husbandry, and smell control :)"
- Also, I believe special regard must be given to pigs, as they are a great alternative for families with allergies to the usual pets and their dander (i.e. rabbits, cats, dogs). Pigs are easily trained, and quite clean & their allowance within the city (again, with guidelines provided by the city) would be a positive influence :)"
- This could get out of hand, max + of chickens for example, or other animals will be important. Coming from a farm, look out come winter when people start giving up these animals, try to house them in their home and/or start doing a lot more butchering at home.
- I believe it should be extended as well to include teacup pigs and other small farm animals that can also be raised as pets
- As long as the livestock are appropriately cared for there would be no issue with allowing them within city limits.
- Hens yes with proper housing or cages. No other livestock should be in a city environment it is too traumatic to animal to be constantly caged or annoying to neighbors
- Wildlife is good
- Suitable living conditions should be assessed to obtain pet licenses regardless of whether they are livestock or not.
- Minimal QUIET livestock who dont make excess mess/stink shouldn't affect neighbors
- As long as there is space and the owners are responsible they should be allowed. Not everyone can afford an acreage or farm to have these animals.
- I've seen it work in Vancouver, BC
- As long as they treat the animals right, I don't see the harm.
- As long as steps are followed and all parties involved are in agreement
- I'm unsure. Cattle in the city, no. Chickens, sure. So long as they are being treated humanely and being kept in safe and well conditions.
- I love this idea. My only worry is if neighbours have disputes. I think I thought you meant actual chickens? Is this referring to pigeons instead?
- The only thing I would be worried about this would be that's hens could become a nuisance by increased noise.
- I think urban hens are a great idea to add to the community. As long as hens are in humane living conditions.



- As long as there are rules in place this seems fine
- Can't explain just like the idea and possibility
- most cases deserve a case by case review
- Chickens/hens would be a great addition to communities. Minimum space requirements is a fair stipulation.
- The points listed above seem fair.
- As long as they are not backyard butchers, raising meat for slaughter.
- Love urban hens and small urban livestock! For noise complaints etc a threshold decibel level should be set at night, this will keep enforcement more consistent and less subjective.
- As long as their well taken care of and dont cause issues with neighbors I don't see why it would be a problem.
- But no roosters!
- It makes sense for livestock to be responsibly handled, as well as with the consent of surrounding neighbors. Also, allowing people to have more than hens can only be seen as a resource boon for individuals, families, and communities (given responsible handling).
- Mostly no but there should always be room for exceptions e.g. a home that has no other homes around it.
- If the animal is well trained, well cared for and has enough space there should be no restriction. (Not applicable to exotic)
- I believe small livestock should be allowed and encouraged, such as chickens, pigs, maybe even a goat, but nothing larger. I think it's important for urban residents to be able to sustain their own living, food, and engage with animals.
- I'd much rather get my eggs from my neighbour whom I know looks after her small number of hens well and in with care than a giant manufacturer where the hens are treated like egg-producing machines. I also think hens have been emotional support animals for some people.
- Chickens are great for eggs! Someone who wants them should be able to have them
- Only if it's actually case-by-case basis not every cases the same
- buck buck
- Eggs!
- As long as there is _____ amount of space between the pen and the surrounding Neighbors. No one wants to hear or smell that right under the window! I can't comment on how far is reasonable because the wind does pick up the smell and it will also carry the drying faeces which can be dangerous to inhale. Also, some people are more sensitive to smell a noise than others 12 I guess as long as, for example I was at the back end of a longer property and far from the houses then it sounds like a really good idea!
- If people are properly providing for animals that are not causing anyone any problems and remain on the owners property , they should be allowed to have them.
- I like the idea of more sustainable living
- I see nothing wrong with keeping hens, pigs, etc being kept as pets in the city. So long as they follow the same rules as having any other pet.



- Yes, I believe everyone should have the right to keep animals as long as they can provide suitable living conditions for them.
- So long as the person/home applying for this has adequate care and knowledge and support from the immediate neighbours this holds no opposition from me.
- Provided all requirements are met for animal safety and Neighbors are not negatively impacted by noise or smell
- I believe people being able to have livestock to support themselves is a great idea.
- Yes if the animals are properly taken care of
- This amendment has the best interest of hens and the people caring/dealing with them.
- So long as the conditions stated above is upheld, this seems like a good idea on paper.
- Yes, but with a limit of the number of livestock per property.
- less livestock in huge farms CAN make for less animal abuse (obviously not in all cases)
- If people are responsible and caring properly for their animals I don't see harm in allowing them in people's yards. I think they would need to prove that they can properly care for the animals and give them a safe life
- Maximum number allowed should be about 4-5
- No harm in chickens. Anything else I think you would need neighbours to be okay with it
- But the Hens would need microchip identification tags. Many people, I believe, don't understand the time and effort to raise hens. I think after the first month, they would let them out.
- Consultations with neighbours on such a decision would be the prudent action. It's very sad that this is something the city needs to be involved in.
- If urban livestock (within reason) could benefit a community and has to be approved by various parties and regulations then why not.
- If animals are treated properly and cleaned accordingly, there is no reason to allow them in urban settings
- This is of course assuming appropriate noise conditions be met as well. It's difficult enough to have a barking dog in the neighborhood. I can't imagine goats or roosters at dawn.
- Put a max of 3 on it. Chickens are not that healthy and can bring over diseases.
- As long as it's something not too outrageous in numbers, people should be able to support themselves and grow food
- I see no harm in it
- Only if it is not a nuisance to the neighbours.
- yes as long as they are being cared for properly, especially in winter.
- I would love to have a couple of hens! I think this is a great idea that needs to be considered with great care.
- I love the idea of livestock in the City! Of course, with very daunting fines to discourage laziness when taking care of these animals.
- I would have concern for proper care being an issue with inexperienced people handling or keeping livestock like chickens



- Livestock can help people become more food secure and self-sufficient.
- I would appreciate a further definition of “community benefit”. Would this include rabbits kept outside as personal pets?
- I have wanted to have chickens on my property since I was a young boy. I’d love to have my own fresh eggs.
- Personal responsibility is of the utmost importance less enforcement
- As long as the hens are taken care of and not causing a nuisance to neighbouring houses, then people should be allowed to own and care for them.
- Chickens and coops should be inspected as part of licensing
- If it can be a suitable living condition for the hens, I would support it.
- As long as it is well regulated, it could support people who want to have small livestock. It would have to be kept very clean and only in certain areas as it could become a problem where people don't realize how much work these livestock animals are.
- If people have the space and want to have hens, I do not see the issue. As long as they are taken care of the same as any other pet.
- no issue with a few hens or other "barn yard" pets...so long as they are not a nuisance to neighbours
- Owners should maintain a healthy living environment for livestock with adequate space, odor management
- Need to address smell, noise and size of animal
- As long as noise or filth which comes with a stench is not a concern owning these animals in urban areas.
- must have approval from all connected neighbors
- As long as the animals are quiet and don't produce strong odour and are well kept.
- I see this being beneficial to many communities households. However, when it comes to enforcement, I think more resources would be required. Especially if larger livestock were to be kept.
- There would need to be something in place so the neighborhood doesn't smell like a farm.
- This has the benefit of helping people be self-sufficient in addition to the aforementioned reasons / criteria.
- With neighbour approval is important as long as they consider neighbours moving or the house next door being sold and re-evaluate as people around change.
- No concerns regarding chickens
- As long as proper environments, permissions, and social cooperation is maintained, then I see no reason that Urban Hens should be disallowed.
- Having 2-3 hens in a backyard if they are managed appropriately would not impact neighbors. Many communities around Calgary have successful programs and have mandatory classes you have to take before you can get the license to keep hens. This ensures people have the information to properly care for the livestock.
- Livestock must be on a the owners personal property but not allowed in apartments, condos
- Support



- I would also suggest a maximum amount of livestock allowed per residence (including cats & dogs).
- Neighbour agreement this is a- no case by case basis. If animals prove to be a problem - smell, noise, this should be revisited. Suitable living conditions a must.
- Possibly providing there is suitable living conditions for the animals and ALL neighbours agree.
- With covid highlighting how food pipelines can be disturbed there is an increasing interest in providing for your own food. Gardens, chickens, beekeeping come to mind. In this case as long as it is not a disturbance to others and not cruel to animals I think we allow people the option of having livestock on private property within the city.
- Hens should be allowed if the owner can take care of them properly
- If owners can be responsible, i do not see an issue.
- A main thing to focus on is the amount of predatory animals that venture into neighbourhoods. It is important to also make sure the animals living residential will not attract more of these dangerous wild animals to the neighborhood and put more animals at risk or people
- I like the idea of community farming
- I think anytime people can be more self sufficient, it's a good thing. There would need to be bylaws that protect neighbours from dealing with the noise/smell (if there is any).
- Having livestock in the city is a learning experience for children and refreshing for adults.
- It makes me feel weary that exceptions would be evaluated case by case by one person. The other points seem reasonable.
- It would take strain off of farms that are inhumanely producing meat, eggs etc. to meet the heavy demand from society.
- I think that people should be free to do what they want, within reason, on their own property as long as it doesn't annoy neighbors.
- I used to live in Nova Scotia and we raised chickens. As long as you don't have too many animals in one space it can be done safely for both animals and neighbouring humans. People should be allowed to raise their own live stock in city limits within reason. Chickens and small livestock are within that reason.
- Support from adjacent neighbours and suitable living conditions , ie . Cleanliness of enclosures being very important
- As long as they aren't a nuisance I am fine with it
- My only concern is smell and caring of the animal as a neighbor. I will not be keeping hens so I'd just like the consideration from those who are.
- I think when kept in smaller numbers in a responsible and clean environment, some livestock can greatly benefit communities and individuals.
- I believe pigs and ducks should be able to live in loving homes that treat them as pets. Both animals are very smart and loyal/loving. I have always wanted to own a pig but I know this is not allowed for the time being...
- Case to case scenario
- as above, why do humans own other living creatures.
- I want hens.



- It makes sense
- I believe urban chickens can be beneficial
- I see no issue with some livestock in urban areas. As long as neighbors are in agreement and the animals are well cared for and not a nuisance. The amount and type of livestock must be mutually agreed upon as well.
- There is much to be gained (community involvement And educationand self sufficiency)
- I [removed] love wild chickens
- I don't know enough about the issue
- if nobody is bothered by it and it puts food on the table might as well
- Why not.
- I am very big on sustainable living. Domestic hens would allow more people to lower their carbon footprint (in respect to transport distances for their food) by having a farm to table eating lifestyle. Is better for our environment.
- Limited numbers with licensing required. No roosters.
- I think as long as it is being handled properly on then this is okay.
- As long as there is a small maximum allowable amount of animals.
- As long as individuals are being responsible with their hens, households should be able to collect their own eggs for personal use.
- As long as there is no detriment to the neighbors, urban farming can be a good way to get fresh fresh eggs
- Support from neighbors should definitely be required- but new people moving in should also be informed BEFORE they move to avoid contention arising afterwards.
- Hens and other livestock within the city can help promote various farmer's markets and encourage local economic growth.
- As long as neighbours don't have unchallenged veto power because they want to be (forgive me) dicks, I have no problem with hens or other livestock, provided they're well cared for and the owners have appropriate training to manage them.
- As long as odour and noise are adequately managed, it brings us closer to animals providing our food.
- Chickens are great family pets. As long as they are cared for and not a nuisance.
- Bring more livestock to the city! The limitations in place are causing a generation of depressed people with no feeling of responsibility
- I think hens and livestock are a welcome addition, provided the neighbours gave consent and were aware of the consequences (noise/smell/ property value)
- As long as the owners are responsible and the animals are taken care of, I see no issues.
- Livestock can be useful
- I support measures that are humane for the animals that allow people to grow & raise more of their own food.
- What's the difference between livestock and pets. They are both animals we take care of.



- As long as surrounding neighbours are in agreement.
- As with other household animals the hens cannot be a nuisance to neighbors.
- Suitable living environments and support from neighbours should be the most important aspects when looking at livestock in homes
- Chickens!!!!!!
- If the neighbours are okay with it then it should be fine. Because we live in somewhat close quarters out of respect the people around the livestock should be able to have a say.
- Yes but with a mandate that urban hens or other livestock in the city should be subject to review by the City of Calgary to ensure suitable living conditions can be met as well as agreements from surround neighbors is important...If someone moved next door with roosters and hens that are howling I would probably want to know ahead of time. Or if someone has a type of livestock that lives under smelly conditions, again I would want to be notified.
- Why not
- I would love to hear roosters crow in the morning.
- Hens in the city is a fantastic plan! Locally feeding families. But definitely appropriate care should be enforced. Just as bad pet owners shouldn't have pets, we should not permit bad hen owners. Humane standards should be set early on to avoid misunderstandings and mistreatment of hens.
- As long as they are properly cared for and in a large enough space that they are not in a drastically environment than if outside the city. Neighbours would need to have a say possible, to lessen complaints.
- As long as the animal is treated humanly and checked up on by bylaw, it should be allowed.
- But, I've lived near hens before and the smell was overpowering. So there would have to be some plan for ensuring the owners understand proper care and cleaning of coops
- I like the idea of raising chickens but people need to be educated and go through a mandatory education and approval. Do many animals are put in harms ways for the dreams of humans.
- As long as the animals are taken care of properly and cleaned up after I don't see an issue with it. Maybe they should have to get consent with neighbors X amount of space away to have any livestock and they should be completely fenced at all times.
- A more robust food system is a safer food system especially at a time where you can suddenly be required to isolate for 14days
- as long as it is not detrimental to the surrounding urban wildlife
- Encouraging home owners to be a little more self & inter dependant. Having the support of adjacent neighbours is extremely important.
- As long as the livestock is not out of control/following reasonable expectations
- I think it's important that all animals no matter what they are should have appropriate living conditions
- Allowing us to urban farm is a great step towards lowering our carbon footprint. Eating fresh eggs from your own hens, or drinking milk from your own goats is something that myself and many of my close friends would love to be able to do. The "buying local" movement should also help out urban farmers. Calgary should pave the way for this!



- There would have to be limits imposed and guidelines for proper housing and care, but children need to know where some of their food comes from and care and consideration of livestock
- Depending on the size of the animal. Chickens should be allowed. Roosters no. Pigs should be allowed.
- As long as it doesn't create noise, smell or danger to dogs and or neighbors
- Animals are all innocent humans need animals to have humanity and kindness
- Cool!
- Eggs!
- Where space permit to keep animals it should be allowed
- As long as it would have a positive impact and animals would have suitable living conditions.
- Provided if an adjacent property changes ownership the permission be reviewed again.
- Certain livestock animals make great pets and could be reasonably accommodated in houses within the city limits.
- Sounds good.
- This would need to be supported out of respect for the neighbours, and there would need to be proper and adequate living conditions. Maybe a follow up once a year to ensure these conditions are being met?
- Good idea for people to reconnect with the food chain
- Only if they have explicit permission from all neighbors. Chickens are loud and smelly, which can carry within a block.
- Different types of livestock....a pig makes a fabulous pet....
- I think it is important for individuals to be able to grow and supply themselves with food like eggs should they wish to do so. There is no harm to the public to allow hens. Amazing idea.
- I absolutely support urban backyard chickens. I also feel that residents should not need pre-approval, or maybe if they have a large number of hens they should have more stringent requirements around housing/care to ensure the hens. & communities health. And if someone has 3 or less hens, there are less strict requirements.
- I believe as long as a person can submit a request to prove they are able to meet the requirements to maintain well being for the hen's, I think this would be a great idea.
- As long as there are measures in place for removal and elimination of escaped chickens.
- as long as the animals are suitably cared for.
- I love chickens
- I love chickens. I think they can be a positive thing for people in Calgary, as pets, and as egg-layers. I have no objection to people having a couple hens provided they are well cared for, especially in winter conditions.
- hens and goats if they remain on property with number of animals restricted based on yard size and fencing.
- As long there is cross property agreement.



- People should be able to support themselves by being able to provide their own basic needs. As long as a person has a suitable space and isn't torturing the animals they should be able to keep them. It should be a right to grow and produce your own food.
- As long as the hens are not going to bother any of the neighbors, there should be no issue.
- I think as long as the animals are being cared for they should be allowed. Also given that they aren't bothering neighbours, of course.
- Owning urban livestock is no different than owning pets really. Just as long as the same basic rules are complied with.
- When cared for appropriately, live stock carries the same risks as having a dog
- I think hens and chickens in a safe place is great.
- If the owners are responsible, shouldn't be a problem. Think it important to enforce limits on number of animals, including hens, as they tend to smell awful and neighbours would be affected.
- Increasing the ability for Calgarians to be sustainable should always be explored.
- I feel this would need to be regulated and tracked to ensure the hens are well cared for.
- Animals are animals and if you have the space for them, it should be fine
- I fully support that people should be able to have livestock or to keep unconventional pets, as long as they are being responsible and considerate of neighbours.
- Allow people to become more self sustaining, helping out communities with organic, happy hens. But hold those accountable to ensure the safety of wellbeing of the animals.
- Being able to have a small chicken coop would be helpful for those that may need to save money, and learn about more agriculture practices.
- Adjacent neighbours must be on board
- Urban chickens are a great resource for fresh eggs!
- as long as you're keeping the animals to a level where all neighbours agree and don't care about the noise, or if the noise can be kept to a minimum, im all for it.
- would be great if everyone could have access to fresh eggs.
- **ONLY IF THEY ARE GOING TO BE TAKEN CARE OF PROPERLY.** I dont really know how, if your considering condemning certain breeds of dogs we cant control, you are going to enforce ethical laws about the treatment of other animals.
- I feel people have a disconnect from their food now day - I think its good for people to earn and know where their food has come from
- As long as there's not too much smell.
- As long as the neighbours are ok with this why not?
- I believe people should be able to raise hens to increase self-sustainability, without interference from government, and without having to demonstrate community benefit.
- Adjacent neighbors **MUST BE IN AGREEMENT.** If livestock becomes a nuisance in a neighborhood, the livestock goes!



- I believe this would be great, allowing this would allow people to be more “off grid” and self dependant! As long as the animal has the proper space and environment it naturally needs as if it were wild
- I support hens or rabbits or other small animals. As long as a largish radius of neighbours approve. And no slaughtering being allowed on the property.
- As long as the owner keeps a clean area and noise and smell does not bother the neighbour
- As long as they're well taken care of, it would help feed calgarians locally and is environmentally friendly.
- People need to be given cheaper ways to feed their families with high food costs at supermarkets
- If someone has the means to create a suitable living space for livestock and they have support from their community than I have no problem with anyone having livestock.
- Around strict rules to size of property. Limit to amount of hens. Standards for expectations. Authority for the city to remove if a nuisance
- Makes sense to allow people to grow their own food!!
- Sure, let's license the pets/ livestock like dogs and cats, or in the case of fowl, the coop. And provide a database so we know where these are legally located.
- As long as the property and owner can provide suitable living arrangements and care - there should be education mandates in place to ensure the owner knows how to care for the livestock properly
- While looking for a future home my husband and I have decidedly not looked in Calgary because we cannot have chickens, and instead have been looking at moving away and commuting.
- As long as it's managed well and not bothering neighbours, I don't see why people can't have hens or other livestock on their property.
- So long as there is approval from current neighbours, I don't see why this would be an issue.
- Definitely need to ensure the nearby neighbours have the ability to veto this on legitimate grounds (noise, smells, etc.)
- As long as the animals are maintained and bylaw should have yearly inspections of their circumstances
- By including the community benefit and the adjacent neighbors this insures the well being of the animals.
- As long as all the needs of the animal are being met and can be taken care of
- Neighbors will control nuisance if any by discussion.
- As long as an animal is well cared for and provided for in the city I think more species should be allowed
- Every animal should be able to have a loving home
- If you have the space and the means to provide for the livestock I don;t see why it would be an issue, there are other bylaws governing noise etc..
- If surrounded by the appropriate regulations, other livestock animals (e.g. hens) can be well cared for without disrupting urban life. Regulations need to be explicit and well laid out with regards to number of birds, housing requirements, and what to do with sick/dead birds. There is a veterinarian (and right now a master's student) at the University of Calgary's Faculty of Veterinary Medicine



currently studying backyard poultry flocks in Alberta who is very knowledgeable about the subject and may be worth consulting.

- Please allow urban hens! They are a wonderful addition to families and neighbourhoods
- People shouldn't own pigeons though
- I think having chickens is a great idea! As long as they are kept at a limit of 1-4. I do not think it is good to keep any other live stalk other than chickens.
- Hens have been allowed in other municipalities and it has gone successfully. I personally would like to have a pet hen if allowed.
- I love this idea!
- As long as the 'support from adjacent neighbors' is an open and clear process. The onus must be on the candidate who wants the livestock to seek to the support, not the neighbors to show that the candidate doesn't have the support.
- Hens are not noisy and if the owner cares for them, they have no smell. Hens are a better "neighbourly pet" than a dog. They cannot kill a person, don't hunt in packs, provide a sustainable animal friendly food source, good for insect pest patrol, etc.
- owning something as chickens could be beneficial. Maybe those who can't afford eggs or something can get their own eggs or sell them. And it helps with the grass to have them in the backyard, but they would need the proper care and space for them first.
- Smaller livestock such as goats or sheep, however I'd be concerned for any large livestock such as actual cattle. My main concern would be the proper living condition and/or being able to have multiple based on the space as they're social creatures.
- As long as there is no nuisance for the neighbourhood, and the owner has the habitat and animal experience and funds to properly care for (food, medicine, shelter).
- Provided the animals are safe and happy with enough space to live comfortably, this is a sustainable option for many families
- chickens fine, smaller pet pigs fine, rabbits for food fine as long as it's not too many, non canine service animals fine, but larger food animals not fine.
- I think this would be a great, as long as the hens are cared for and your neighbours don't mind!
- I think hens are a good idea provided they are taken care of just like any other animal in the home. I don't think other livestock should be considered such as goats pigs etc
- This is an important part of supporting sustainable communities.
- The positive environment and support from neighbours is important to avoid confrontation and a nuisance. The well being of the animal is important to provide a fulfilling life and health for everyone involved.
- Should have to obtain a license. Go through a process that is somewhat difficult so only committed people do it. Not people just trying something out that will get bored and neglect it. Otherwise chickens will become another animal people dump, sell on kijiji, abandon at the vet. Etc. when it gets too hard, too expensive, not enough fun, etc.
- I'm in favour of a small number of chickens for food (eggs). Concerned about extra cost to the City if cases have to be addressed individually



- Allow pet pigs and chickens
- This is a healthy and economical food option for many and also allows people to address ethical concerns about cruelty of factory farmed eggs and chicken
- I fully support this movement. I believe it's important to teach where your food comes from as well as utilizing kitchen cut offs and other grains to a fuller potential.
- "ONLY under the circumstances there are thorough processes to ensure livestock are actually under proper living conditions ONGOING.
- Checks throughout the year. Check each year at minimum."
- Yes! Certain animals can have a practical use and purpose in an urban environment, aside from the therapeutic or emotional/physical benefit of owning pets: i.e. pest control, provision of food, educational experiences, less waste, etc.
- A limit on the amount of hens and with approval of neighbours.
- Can't see why having hens would be an issue
- if people want and can care for chickens they should be allowed.
- Many animals less common to domesticity can make amazing pets, so Calgarians should be allowed to pursue that goal provided they have the consent of their neighbours and fellows
- This may help families raise their own source of protein therefore costing less in the end for groceries.
- people should be free to do what they want on their property
- I strongly support backyard chickens and would get them if it were permitted. My family is considering a move to the country because of limitations on livestock in the city.
- As long as the written support of neighbours was received
- Hens aren't a nuisance and can be delightful creatures. However they can be really really stinky so please limit the number.
- As long as livestock aren't a nuisance and adequate space is provided for the animals, I support it.
- Hens, in my experience, are not loud so there shouldn't be any noise problems. In small flocks they don't need a large yard to roam. Properly cared for hens do not have a strong odor. I don't see why not if the owner is capable of providing proper care.
- Sounds good
- Yes, why can't people have small livestock? This shouldn't be an issue, it should be allowed.
- Chickens are great for environment. They eat ticks and are great for composting
- In limited numbers. Chickens are cute and a great source of food. They are messy. & roosters are loud.
- As long as the hens are in clean living conditions it seems logical to allow people to have them.
- The animals will likely have a better life this way than most other ways animals are kept for food or other purposes. I think this is a great idea
- there would also need to be criteria in place for the # of livestock, etc. I feel all animals bring a benefit to their communities
- Between the support from neighbours and ensuring proper living conditions that should be enough.



- Other bylaws should still apply
- I think this is a great idea.
- Although some animals can be noisy and dirty, and rules would need to be established and enforced, small animals like hens should be allowed. Larger animals should not.
- Various types of livestock with in reason provides a healthier more sustainable environment. Would have to abide by noise and smell type bylaws.
- Hens in Calgary are a good idea in my opinion.
- We want chickens. Could stipulate a maximum number allowed.
- People can become more self sufficient
- so long as the noise level and smell from urban hens (i.e.) can be controlled. Chickens/hens/roosters are very noisy very early, and their coops are horrible for smell (speaking from experience)
- Sounds good to me
- If the animals are safe and won't be an issue for your neighbors then having a small number of livestock should be allowed
- If the living conditions for the animal are sufficient and adjacent neighbours don't mind any potential noise, I don't see any issues.
- The discretion should be the decision of a tribunal.
- If people can maintain small live stock well without bothering others I think it's fine
- As long as the living conditions of these animals are of quality and clean.
- As long as the above conditions are met
- Assuming the criteria listed above are enforced, I see no reason not to allow households to provide themselves (and possibly the neighbourhood) with a source of food.
- as long as the livestock did not impact neighbour's in a negative way such as smell or excessive noise
- People in urban areas should be able to feed themselves
- This is an important food security issue, particularly during this pandemic.
- We used to have chickens next door...they always came to the fence and said good morning.
- Allowing urban hens would be great! They provide a great source of eggs and residents in Calgary with better nutruence than store bought. The living conditions are better as well this making them my ideal choice for eggs.
- I think it's crazy this isn't already approved. Many cities and towns already allow this and it works well. I think as long as the above criteria is met then it should be a no brainer.
- na
- Properly housed hens are less noisy and cleaner than my neighbours dog!
- There of course must be rules on the numbers.
- I like the idea of community benefit, would have to have a limit and have permission from neighbours
- Backyard hens are a great idea.
- If above guidelines are followed I have no issue with this.



- Bring on the chickens. I want a baby goat
- Everyone has a right to homestead.
- Responsible owners would benefit from this.
- I see a lot of positive impact in the community by having hens and goats around. Would this bylaw approve the animal to be eaten? I would like to see regulations on that so the animal gets treated with respect, killed humanly and have hygienic methods
- Calgarians should be able to responsibly own farm animals for their own use.
- I dont see any issue with livestock in Calgary as long as they are properly cared for.
- I have known people with urban hens and they care deeply about their animals. I believe urban livestock to be of benefit to the community. With proper inspection, I see no health concerns with allowing them into the city. The only thing I would encourage is size requirements and restrictions. A cow cannot be kept in a tiny postage stamp, city size backyard, neither can a goat.
- as long as rules are followed i see no issue. Again the goal is responsible pet ownership not singling out specific breeds or in this case birds etc.
- As long as they are taken care of a cleaned up after, fresh eggs would be a bonus for the homeowners
- Sounds reasonable, support from adjacent neighbours is important.
- As long as they remain on their property and are cared for, they can do as they please
- If some one is responsible why noy?
- Perhaps having hens around will lower risk for dogs being attacked by wildlife such as coyotes.
- As long as the animals are safe and healthy and that the people in the community are happy, I don't see a problem.
- I am supportive of homeowners obtaining their own food. Ex. Eggs
- Pet pigs sound lit
- With limits on number of birds and no roosters
- I would love to be able to have goats. I have a huge yard.
- If suitable and safe conditions are met for the animal I see no problem keeping other animals in the city.
- Hens are no different than any other pet and actually provide something useful to families. They should absolutely be allowed
- Yes. But no, the neighbours have no say in what I do in my property. Now I just want to do it behind your back and not get approval at all. I don't get a choice of Becky next door wants 40 babies in 5 years. She doesn't get a choice if I want some chickens in my back yard. Her children are noises and smelly. No different than hens would be.
- These criteria seem reasonable.
- Most important is neighbor approval.
- I am apprehensive due to the smell and mess these animals can have and would not want to live next door to anyone with these pets, however, if regulated properly, don't see that it would be any different than having dogs.



- While I'm all for allowing Calgarians to raise fowl, I'd be in favour of starting with hens and seeing what problems arise and benefits are derived before moving on to allowing other livestock, and ultimately having size limits in place.
- If neighbours are on board and there are appropriate living conditions for the animal I don't see the harm. However there should probably be a maximum number allowed.
- Bylaws should be animal specific, be evidence based, and consider the welfare of the animal.
- I think hens would help with community engagement and sustainability. There was a yard with goats where I used to live in Yellowknife and their manure was provided to the neighbours for free. They were also a tourist attraction and the home owner gave tours about his sustainable lifestyle.
- Chickens are pets too
- I love animals. Goats and chicken would be fun to have
- I support this idea moving forward, so as long as complaints and issued are handled accordingly.
- As long as its done right. Having access to free range eggs will help communitys
- I think if people's living situations and ability to provide a happy life for the animal are assessed it's ok
- I support this based on that criteria. I would not support an all out allowance without some sort of criteria similar to that listed above.
- Hens lay eggs, eggs are food, people need food. Pretty simple.
- I agree with this but there is no need for roosters. It will become a noise issue in the future. Plus hens can produce eggs without a rooster.
- They can be a pet like any other animal just not in a large quantity
- No roosters
- Only if it's suitable and fair for the animal.
- If someone to properly care for an animal and provide for all of its needs then they should be able to keep it and care for it
- Sustainability. Good for composting. As with anything, keeping an animals living area clean and minimal smell is important for good neighbours.
- Its a good way (if done correctly) to let people have a bit more freedom to provide for themselves
- With the cost of living rising the public needs something to help even though it's just eggs they would get
- Like having urban chickens for personal fun ie eggs and for kids
- Welfare of the animals is most important and community support
- I'm all for allowing livestock in Calgary. As long as the animal has adequate space and shelter and doesn't create an eye sore or unkempt backyards
- I'd be interested in having hens and would like to know more about the possibility of using goats as a resource to control grass and weeds in the city
- Urban farming and livestock is a great step toward sustainability in our food supply
- If done correctly hens can be valuable food source for the community via eggs.
- Sustainability



- With appropriate enclosure for the hens. Pre-inspection process and license for animals.
- I fully support this.
- Livestock can be both pets and/or providers, Calgaryans should be free to own/care for animals provided they can meet the above requirements.
- Livestock tend to be less noisy than dogs really. So I do not mind them in the city, if housed properly. Hens are also good support animals, provide fresh eggs which can help people who are struggling financially as they are very cheap to maintain.
- It is reasonable and shows responsibility
- more and more people are finding means to save money and earn additional money. Any way that people respectfully can sustain their families without fear of contaminations to their food, I am supportive.
- Yes
- as long as the animal is properly cared for and kept in clean conditions what type of pet that makes someone happy should be their own business
- They belong on farms not city
- People should be allowed to keep animals as long as those animals are properly cared for.
- As long as there were clear bylaws outlining the health and safety requirements of the animals, and these were being ensured through licensing and bylaw checks, etc
- But it must be supported by neighbours.
- As long as these animals have what they need and the owners understand the caretaking of the animals
- How is a chicken for example different then keeping a pigeon on a property. also there can be significant good that comes from keep wildlife on property as long as it is well managed and cared for. By law officers would need training in what constitutes suitable living conditions.
- As long as rules are enforced, I'm fine with urban hens.
- Let us have hens
- People should be free to do what they wish on private property, as long as the animal is properly cared for and not a nuisance
- A pet is a pet no matter the type of animal. As long as they are treated well it sounds good.
- Seems positive
- Of course. The more we can rely on ourselves, have natural food and help animals live a suitable life is great.
- No more then 2-3 and must be well kept and clean with out smelling up the yard
- Chickens don't tend to make a lot of noise at night and only really cack when there's an issue or when paying an egg. Dogs actually are much louder. Quails also are mostly quiet pets that can provide eggs for food.
- Chickens would be nice as long as maintained.
- If the animals will not cause grief to neighbours, and the animal is able to be properly cared for I see no issue with someone wanting one!



- Raising minor livestock in the city is growing increasingly necessary in our current recession, which will only be worsened in the fallout from COVID
- Limits would have to be considered.
- I think we need to be more accommodating of animals in general. If the neighbors are good with it and the animal can be cared for in that location then it should be allowed.
- Sustainable for private consumption
- livestock should be allowed but only if the appropriate living conditions for the animals are met
- allow hens to be kept as long as there are rules to keep the hens in proper conditions (space, terrain, etc)
- Giving people alternative options to sustainable and healthy food sources (like eggs and free range meats) will improve the health of members of our city. It also has other benefits, for example, it's proven that children raised with livestock develop far fewer and less serious allergies. It may also have an impact (however small) on climate change and animal abuse; people raising animals like free-range chickens may reduce their need to buy products like eggs and chicken meat. This in turn reduces the need for chickens to be raised commercially, where they're often kept in inhumane conditions (and commercially raised animals for food supply is a massive contributor to global warming). If a property has the size and proper facilities to house livestock, the owners want to raise said livestock, and even the neighbourhood is supportive? Not only do I see nothing wrong with it, I believe it will add to the list of the many wonderful and unique reasons the City of Calgary is a great place to live!
- So long as the owner is responsible who cares what they do. The animal does not decide.
- Unban hens and other small livestock such as birds, goats, sheep, pigs should be allowed in urban properties with bylaws for high expectations of animal living conditions.
- Chickens and other small farm animals should be allowed as long as people consider their neighbors and work together.
- I believe that people have the right to have urban animals as long as safety rules are followed.
- I think the city should become more self sufficient and people should be allowed to own hens on their property. In addition, pigs make great house pets and should be considered in the amendment
- Benifital for community
- I think small livestock is okay and only if there's enough space for the animal to roam
- a few laying hens in a personal garden does present more positive benefits than negative.
- Hens can be therapeutic for some people.
- Social distancing. Get me away. Chickens.
- It could be a great opportunity for people as long as there is compliance with the bylaws
- Some folks need a special animal to help them cope with mental illness or other disabilities.
- No comment
- Chickens in a controlled environment would be suitable pets and urban farming to produce eggs for the household.
- Hens are of little nuisance and a great first step into urban agriculture and education for children.
- It could help with food insecurity in some households .



- Sounds good as long as the hens are well cared for
- This provides another resource for the community of done responsibly. We need to take in account the living condition of the animals and the disturbance it may cause surrounding neighbors.
- I think it would be a great thing for any community as long as there are suitable living conditions for the animal.
- Citizens should have the choice to have hens within their own private homes. As long as adjoining neighbours agree and the livelihood of the hens are up kept.
- All natural resources for food and such items would be good for the entire Calgary community and also provide an opportunity for parents to teach their kids more responsibility and give them an opportunity to invest in their future and see if it's something they may want to do for their lives
- Allowing hens into Calgary is fine, as long as it doesn't do extensive harm to a community or person, it's fine.
- People should be encouraged to be more a part of the animal to plate process.
- Aside from the smell that certain animals may have, I don't see this as an immediate issue.
- Hens can be produce for families. For eggs, and meat. They are beneficial to farms and I think in Calgary they would be as well.
- Hens are a food source and require minimal space. Having appropriate conditions for hens and keeping them allows people to take charge of their own food supply.
- [removed] YESS GIMME DEM BACKYARD CHICKENS AND BEEHIVES
- IF other livestock are cared for well, benefit the community or have a positive impact, and are not a nuisance in the community, I feel urban areas like Calgary will benefit from a larger variety of animals in the community serving various purposes.
- Urban Hens would be a benefit to communities.
- People should be able to create and support a sustainable lifestyle, should they do so responsibly.
- as long as they are pets, not being raised for food. NO backyard butchers.
- People should be able to bring hime any animal that makes them happy.
- I want hens and other livestock
- If owners are following rules and regulations on their property, I don't see any issue.
- I would love a couple hens in my garden to feast on my abundant slogs and other pests as well as giving my family some eggs.
- I fully endorse all local food growing and sustainability initiatives.
- If a resident lives in a home where they can care for the livestock, not create a community burden such as an eye sore, noise violation and are respecting their neighbors around them then sure. Even better if they are willing to offer up resources to their fellow community members.
- Yes, within reason and care
- As long as the animal's welfare is not compromised by living in the city and it doesn't disrupt the community, livestock could provide several services that would be useful



- I do however the support of the neighbours should have a condition that is an acrimonious relationship can be proven it shall be waived. The reason to decline the animals by the neighbours should fall under certain conditions, allergies, cannot care for current animals, smell, noise, etc.
- I'm on the fence about this to be honest.
- Hens are cute and fun
- Because livestock in the city sounds awesome.
- people should be able to keep whatever animal they want on their property, as long as there is mandatory enclosure cleanliness standards. As well as a consideration for neighbour's with regard to noise and smell
- If the animals are taken care of properly, there shouldnt be restrictions on what people should and shouldnt have
- As long as it does not affect neighbours and proper living conditions can be provided
- Urban hens would be a great addition to the cities diversity and allow people to explore self stustainability
- I think it's a great idea.
- I think it's helpful to the environment
- I would like to have my own chickens.
- Some people have animals and abuse them. It should be mandatory to see if the animal(s) are living in a safe, healthy and happy environment.
- urban livestock is the best answer for personal/community sustainability.
- I would support if adjacent neighbours had to give permission - including if someone new moved in.
- Chickens provide fertilizer, eat insects, and provide breakfast! They should be allowed
- I think this is a great idea, and that if someone has the knowledge and set up to take care of these animals properly, then who is to stop them.
- My mother in law raised her own chickens where she lived (out of town) and I think, along with community gardens and peoples desire to be more self-sustainable, this would be fine.
- Assuming that the animals do not cause nuisance or disturb neighbors.
- Why not?
- I am not familiar with untraditional "pets", but if they are not a nuisance and are well cared for I do not see a problem
- Love the idea. As long as people do it responsibly.
- As long as all parties are happy including neighbors and the animals are healthy and not causing problems with the neighbors
- If am I visual has the means to provide and care for the live stock, having it in Calgary should be okay
- Self sustainability is a human right. If being responsible, it should not be denied
- Animal welfare is my only concern
- As long as any livestock is well taken care of it is fair for someone to own them. If it were to benefit the community or neighbours in some way that is just a bonus.



- Only if properly regulated and animals aren't hoarded, being made to suffer and are properly taken care of
- Livestock could live in the city, but there is very rarely a cause for that. Would need to ensure they have adequate space.
- If the animal can be properly cared for I think the benefits it can provide for a family and the community is amazing.
- Many cities allow for their residents to own smaller livestock which can save the residents money.
- If a case by case basis is looked at for the safety of the animal and any possible impact of people around it should be fine
- I support as long as all cases be thoroughly investigated.
- I have always been open to the idea of backyard chickens in the city.
- As long as the living conditions are met and everyone in the area is agreed, this seems like a fair amendment.
- Why not? Hens don't even crow at dawn. There is literally no drawback unless you don't like eggs
- Other small livestock that provide eggs like Ducks should also be permitted.
- As long as the animal is well cared for. That the property doesn't suffer/decline and doesn't become a bad nuisance that it really shouldn't matter.
- If they don't make a nuisance I agree
- Common sense
- I think it's a great improvement
- Open to changes
- If it was evaluated on a case by case basis I would not see a problem with that
- Farm fresh eggs and hens are amazing.
- If my friend wants a goat, and is capable of giving that goat a good life and maintaining a healthy lifestyle, I say go for it.
- You would require a certain property to have chickens. It can't just be anyone.
- As long as they have enough space and the smell is controlled
- Only if the livestock benefits the neighbourhood and they approve and support the animal(s). This could be a nice addition to any community.
- There's no reason smaller livestock animals (hens, dwarf goats, etc) shouldn't live in the city provided they are not a nuisance
- Only if they served as pets and treated the same as other pets we currently allow. They should not be allowed as sources of food.
- If someone wants hens, let them have hens.
- "Urban farming is immensely beneficial to individuals, families, communities."

- I do not support neighbors being able to provide input in the application process."



- As long as the animals are well taken care of and the neighbour's don't mind, I don't see any harm in it.
- It's a good thing
- Chicken provide food a good way to support our local community
- I would love hens
- The more people can accessibly farm their own food the better.
- I believe that allowing certain livestock to be raised within the city limits has many positive impacts from education about raising animals to more organic food opportunities.
- Absolutely - fantastic idea as long as it is carried through properly. And well thought through by a qualified city employee.
- Why not? Lets encourage real food, food accessibility, and life-style choices that are good for physical and mental health.
- So many other places around the world are doing it and it is a sustainable way of living, growing food and being able to provide eggs for yourself would be a positive for more sustainable living. I've also heard chickens being emotional support for people. I cannot see any cons as long as they are contained properly, and they are being maintained as well as their coop being maintained properly.
- Yes, hens would be great.
- I don't see anything wrong with it but it would depend on the type of livestock.
- They should require a permit.
- People should be allowed to grow their food as long as it does not interfere with others
- As long as they would be properly taken care of and housed properly the yes I agree
- I don't see any harm in fresh eggs, as long as the hens have an adequate environment to live in the city.
- I think this would benefit communities and households while also taking weight off the environmental impact of the livestock industry
- I feel it is just.
- It can be an opportunity for opening a business and jobs.
- a great way to promote community engagement as well as self sufficiency
- A balanced approach is needed
- More and more we need to rely on our own gardens and if possible sources of eggs or maybe Goat milk :) to help lower industrial food production for the environment.
- It would help community and self sufficiency
- Just a good idea. Why not as long as it's not bothering the neighborhood
- If they keep the peace with neighbours, why wouldn't someone be allowed hens?
- By allowing livestock you allow people to obtain their own local products.
- As long as the animals are properly taken care of and provided for, I don't see an issue with this at all.
- Suitable living conditions needs to be of utmost importance, along with neighbour support
- Some animals currently considered livestock can live comfortably as pets or support animals.



- I think that as long as the impact would be positive and the surrounding neighbours are consulted it would be a great addition
- So many reasons to support increasing the connectivity to our food chain and ensuring our plots of land are productive whether it be a chicken coop, permaculture or xeriscaping. 100% supportive of this!!
- I see no reason to say no. But people must be conscious of animals' well-being.
- Provided the City makes sure these animals are well taken care of and not a nuisance (noise, smell etc)
- Urban Hens are a great hobby project for a lot of responsible Calgarians. They should absolutely be allowed in the city.
- Limited numbers in appropriate space with set distance from other properties to avoid pollution from noise or smell would be acceptable.
- As long as proper Cleanliness and living conditions are met
- Individuals need to be more self sufficient and be aware of where their food comes from. Factory farming needs to be reduced as much as possible with people producing as much as they can for themselves in an ethical, safe way.
- I'd prefer my neighbor to have chickens over barking dogs. Chickens are rarely a nuisance.
- Urban chicken coops are good for the community
- I want chickens, I have the yard for it, and my neighbors would love the fresh eggs I can give them.
- Provided the animals are cared for, and have a suitable home - go for it.
- Essential to obtain support from neighbours & have this regularly reassessed
- I feel hens would be a great addition to some families.
- I support this only if there are limits and strict guidelines on cleanliness and where they are to be kept.
- Because it would be educational to younger kids to learn where their food comes from and how to look after animals.
- "If the neighbours don't mind the hens, then I don't see the issue
- . Provided that the hens are in a suitable enclosure fit for all 4 seasons."
- I love chickens
- don't want farm next door but if done responsibly would consider.
- I feel that if anyone is going to own any kind of pet or animal then the living conditions/standards for a healthy living environment should be met.
- If the criteria are met, why not have urban livestock.
- Yes, hens should be allowed in limited numbers, up to maybe 6. They would be no more annoying than all the magpies squawking.
- Other livestock if sufficient space is available and neighbours have been consulted. Especially for therapy animals.
- Hens are good for local food sources



- I think there are many benefits if someone wants to raise their own hens for eggs; especially if they're able to share the wealth for the community.
- But only with a low number of hens to reduce smell.
- if the owners know what they're doing they should be allowed to do what they like.
- Urban hens are a benefit to their owners and their communities, complaints can easily be dealt with in the same manner as dog/cat complaints.
- People should be able to grow/raise their own food if it is not disruptive to others (smell and noise)
- Permission from adjacent neighbors should be required for livestock animals like chickens and even backyard beehives
- It's someone's right to have what they would like on their property.
- Having chickens are good for ones health for having eggs.
- There is the potential for livestock within an urban setting to be a nuisance to the neighborhood. Noise, smell, feed, etc... there should be zoning as to what livestock can be raised in which type of dwelling/property.
- Important that people have rights to pets that are not common for the majority
- Local is sustainable!
- It provides families with the ability to raise their own food source.
- as long as the home in question is a single detached, and other nuisance bylaws are being followed
- I believe small goats make great pets too and are considered livestock.
- If they can be housed and breed safely then I don't see any reason to disallow owning them
- I think people within the city should be allowed to have chickens as pets or a few other types of animals. Many different animals make great pets. Restrictions on how many of each animal per household should be in place.
- I approve with the conditions that the owners are held to high standards of care of the animals and the number of each type is restricted, which if done properly, should ensure the community is protected.
- It would need to be controlled. In cityscape currently there is a hard that has probably hundreds of pigeon type birds. They make a massive mess and are actually quite gross. I wouldn't want to live by hens if it was the same.
- Small livestock could provide diversity to a community.
- Many people prefer farm animals, so as long as the animals can be properly cared for and the city agrees to it, I don't have an issue with it.
- Having livestock can allow people to have a low impact lifestyle, however they would need to be educated on the needs and behaviour of the animal they wish to have.
- A few Henson make no more noise, mess or stench than a dog in fact on a noise level it's likely significantly less.
- I think this would be a wonderful opportunity for people trying to avoid the mass farming industry where animals are not treated properly. owners of hens should be offering suitable living conditions and the welfare of the animal wouldn't be compromised for profit.



- Hens should be allowed
- As long as living conditions for the animal are indeed adequate
- "I have a large double lot, and hand made enclosures for chinchillas and a rabbit. Large 8x6 pens with all enrichment they could want.
- I would love to have 2-3 birds. It should be allowed if proper animal welfare was maintained."
- i think if the right rules are put in place this type of expansion to other animals can work. But needs to be followed up for compliance
- Yay chickens.
- Having grown up around farm animals, as long as the animals are humanely treated, it is within reason (property too small for cattle and most pigs) and if neighbours agree, go for it.
- If people are properly knowledgeable about the livestock, they should be allowed to have the animals they choose.
- As long as animals are receiving proper care, urban farming is great for sustainability.
- If suitable living conditions are met, and the neighbours have no issues, why not?
- This pushes self sustainability and food production in the city. Surprise surprise though, the owners must be reviewed.
- I agree with the criteria
- Why not let people keep chickens?
- Given proximity of homes to each other - and differing needs of households it would be imperative to allow neighbors to weigh in on the ongoing effects, maintenance and challenges.
- If the animal is being properly taken care of, and is not creating a nuisance, why not allow them to be kept? What separates these animals from the typical "pet" animals?
- Growing your own food should always be allowed within reason and with no encroachment on your neighbors.
- If all of the above conditions are met, there's no reason not to.
- I think it would be great to see more animal breeds in the city
- Fantastic idea!
- Only if the animal isn't for human consumption for example, raising rabbits only to kill them in order to eat them.
- Yes, with the condition that all neighbours are agreeable to hens or else the owner has taken enough precautions to ensure that their neighbours are comfortable or not disturbed by hens. I personally do not like hens/chickens/etc. As long as they never get in my property or are super disturbing, or any of their messes end up on my property (feather, feed, feces, etc), I don't mind.
- It's a great idea!
- But with strict requirements
- I would support this with the use of animal control officers to inspect properties before obtaining the animals and after to ensure proper care, living conditions and food
- I would want fresh eggs every morning this knowing the animal is properly cared for
- Only makes sense



- I would much prefer some livestock over my neighbours dog who they let outside to bark all day long! As long as proper care/husbandry is in place and the animal is not nuisance to neighbours I have no issue.
- As long as it's done right and it doesn't affect the neighborhood why not allow an animal to be cared for
- If people are responsible I see no reason why hens can't be kept. It can have an educational impact on children in the community as well as a source of
- As long as it is not an animal that poses an obvious substantial danger.
- I hate the bylaw about hens and small livestock. Times might get lots harder. There is no good reason for the hen bylaw and it infringes on rights to provide food for ones family.
- As long as responsible pet ownership rules apply
- If its within peoples yards and there are regulations, i support this!
- I don't have anything against it as long as there is no animal abuse.
- just chickens, no other livestock within the city. How will the approval from neighbour's work? What about niwghbors who rent? Or when someone new moves in?
- If the outcome is positive I'm for it
- It's important to encourage sustainable living
- If the city had programs for kids, teens even adults to take care of the hens it be a fantastic program.
- Chickens
- Chickens are a great way to teach responsibility to children and supply food.
- I think this is a progressive approach to increasing urbanization that allows urban dwellers to be more engaged with their own food production (eggs, honey, etc.) and with nature in general.
- I like the idea of a case by case basis and not broad application but recognize that it would require a lot of time and resources from bylaw enforcement.
- Eggs!
- Permitting live stock in Calgary may help our economy. People might be more inclined to buy local produce
- Why not let people have hens. As long as they are looked after and cared for correctly.
- Only if the home isn't fenced
- I think having urban hens would be a good idea as long as they are well taken care of like any other pet.
- I believe urban farming is beneficial to all. As long as the owners of such animals take care of them, so not put them in dangerous conditions (poor weather), and are considerate of neighbours I think this is a great idea.
- I support having well cared for livestock pets who may be a comfort or support to someone or a resource such as eggs
- as long as they keep the birds clean and healthy I have no problems
- Support chickens, goats, sheep, small livestock, not large such as cows



- Localizing sustainability and food production is a wonderful opportunity for all generations and teaches empathy, care and humane treatment
 - If the owners are responsible, and the neighbors don't mind the smell and sounds of them, then they should be allowed. But issues arise when new neighbors move in. So it should be reassessed on a yearly basis.
 - If adequate living conditions for the animal can be provided then I support this bylaw. Livestock should be more accessible.
 - As long as there isn't enough to be a nuisance or cause a lot of foul smells it should matter. It's not like someone having 5 dogs is less than 1 or 2 chickens
 - Yes I believe this is sensible criteria of hen ownership and I approve.
 - Only if the hens are treated and kept responsibly.
 - Fresh produce
 - As long as there's distance between houses and minimal to no disturbances to the neighbours
 - Only if noise from hens can be controlled and does not impact neighbours
 - As long as the animal is cared for properly and proper space anyone should be allowed to care for them. That being said they would have to be cared for properly (space inside/out as applicable, feeding, exercise, attention)
 - I do not see the harm.
 - "I fully support hens and other animals on city property. The benefits are great, this would support families ability to provide for themselves and creates an opportunity to share and bring community together.
-
- I have been speaking to many people about this topic and have not yet encountered someone that is against this. I hope we can allow people to live how they choose and not allow the few complainers to prevent this."
 - Everyone should be able to support their own food needs!!
 - Dogs and cats are not the only pets people need.
 - Calgarians should be able to support themselves with fresh and organic food if they so choose.
 - If done responsibly it's possible
 - Many cities allow hens. As long as people are being responsible.
 - Animals and their welfare should be part of our daily life.
 - If the animals are taken care of then livestock should be permitted
 - Seems fine for people to want hens or livestock if they have support from neighbors.
 - Chickens are good pets
 - It has worked in many other urban settings, so as long as community members are notified and feedback is collected, it's worth a shot.
 - As long as numbers don't exceed an unmanageable amount. Or I suppose in other words, disease and bacteria is manageable.



- If the care of the animals and neighbors is taken into account there's no reason someone shouldn't be able to keep hens.
- As long as the animals are of an appropriate size, are well cared for, and don't cause a disturbance in their neighborhood, there is no reason for people not to keep those kinds of animals on their properties.
- Strong property rights are a cornerstone of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Being able to obtain an economic or social well being should be encouraged, urban chicken and livestock programs are a positive.
- I would love to have chickens, and I think anyone should be allowed to have chickens, either as a pet or therapy animal.
- As long as the living conditions were suitable and the neighbors were ok with it. My concern is for the well being of the animal and noise/odor/etc is not effecting others.
- Hens and other small poultry (ducks, quails etc.) but nothing larger. Should be caps on numbers and subject to same animal protections as any other pet. Would not support sale of produce or meat from such livestock. Personal use only.
- I agree with Hens specifically
- If it is beneficial for the community and everyone agrees to them being there it makes sense to allow it.
- If the animals are treated well and aren't disturbing anyone they should be allowed to have them.
- As long as animals are well cared for.
- Chickens/ ducks provide a source of food.
- As long as people aren't overcrowding and are keeping coops clean, etc...
- I have a friend that houses chickens and they are freaking adorable, I would love that. Plus I am an animal lover have had many different kinds over the years giving in to my kids w rabbits, chinchillas, snakes, rabbits, hedge hogs, dogs, cats and almost anything else you can think of.
- I feel keeping small livestock such as chickens is a great way to help provide some extra food for a family.
- I think if the people are responsible and understand the animals needs, why not?
- I think there needs to have assurance for responsible ownership, ensuring their health is a priority and completing training. Particularly around what you do with them when they stop laying or 'stop being useful' for what the majority likely expect they are for. I also don't think neighbour support should be required.
- As long as the neighbouring houses are okay with it
- Have small livestock in a controlled space can provide both economic support and emotional support to a person or family buy providing grocery items.
- As long as it does not disturb neighbors, I see no reason for people to not keep/ have small livestock on private property
- On a case by case bases - and with support to neighbour much like we have backing regarding noisy dogs in the neighborhood
- I would support chickens



- chickens, small pigs, miniature horses and donkeys could all be kept in a large property. There would have to be good housing for them as well as good sanitation.
- As long as not bothersome or eye sore to neighbors and neighborhood.
- As long as there are good living conditions and a large enough penalty to deter people if they are found to be abusing the animal.
- You should be allowed chickens on your private property.
- As long the situation is monitored by the city, and all parties affected by the by-law change are happy, I see no reason to deny people livestock if they desire them.
- Chickens provide both eggs and meat and help cut down the cost of groceries.
- None
- Hens can help low income families provide food
- other places support it, why are you being a stick in the mud
- I think urban agriculture and farming to increase knowledge of food sources is a great idea!!
- I like the idea of folks consulting neighbours, and creating a great environment for other critters
- If you have your adjacent neighbors permission
- Just no roosters
- I do feel there is a strong need for the collective benefit - all neighbours should have a right to weigh in if their property is not rural, as this would affect property value, potentially increased noise pollution, bad odours etc
- Letting people grow their own food shouldn't be an issue in a First World Country like Canada.
- On a balance of nuisance, no one is banning kids or dogs in backyards. If someone wants to keep a couple chickens or a small pig or goat, then as long as they're following bylaw, then I have no issue with it. Backyard animals are more humane than commercial farms, you gain some food security/independence, and you don't need to worry about commercial industrial chemicals (ie hormones or antibiotics)
- Hens and support animals add value to the city
- As long as they are clean and taken care of, local production of products is amazing!
- Because it's funny
- Support from neighbours is key. All neighbours residing two houses from the home which houses livestock in all directions should be petitioned for approval.
- Yes but only if these chickens are getting proper veterinary care and there is a record of it. They would need to keep their pens really clean as well to avoid over whelming smells
- As long as people know what they're doing and the animals are well cared for.
- Sustainability
- Na
- Urban hens are sustainable and environmentally friendly
- As long as the animals are properly and humanely cared for and not a nuisance to neighbours.



- It would be a good way for individuals to be able to live in a more sustainable and healthy way. Hens make little noise, can be kept in a fenced yard, and would have no negative effects on the community.
- Totally Fine with it, if probably managed
- I support chickens and pigs within the city as long as they are properly cared for.
- As long as adjacent neighbours are ok with having livestock near their homes and the livestock are not a nuisance to the neighborhood, I would be fine with that. However, frequent visits to the home where livestock are being raised should be done to ensure that their living environment is still suitable.
- I'm against putting restrictions on pit bulls. I'm disappointed with Calgary that they are even considering it.
- They're not much different than cats or dogs.
- I support the above conditions and requirements.
- I worry about NYMBism from neighbours and wonder if their support should not be needed in order to have hens. I think if suitable living conditions can be provided for the animals there is no need for neighbours to approve.
- I think hens could provide a valuable resource in Calgary homes
- Happy with the criteria
- These are animals too
- Hens are not a nuisance and provide food. Who wouldn't love fresh eggs in the morning!
- If the hens offered a benefit to the community without creating noise, smell, or property value/appeal of neighboring houses to decrease.
- I think urban hens would be a positive sustainable addition to neighborhood, as long as the neighbors are taken into account if their are complaints
- Hens can be a great source of protein in eggs and with economy and many people food poor. City residents deserve the the benefits that non urban residents have.
- If someone is taking care of and supporting an animal properly, why not?
- Animals need to be protected
- Definitely agree to sign off from neighbours, noise restrictions (eg no cockerels!!) but small livestock kept well and cleanly should be permitted.
- I support the option to keep hens in backyards.
- I like the idea of urban livestock. Appropriate green space would be needed though. Could potentially grow into something like a community garden which would be a very positive impact for communities.
- As long as proper chicken coop is also necessary and that the yard/coop can be inspected by animal welfare. And that the cops must be cleaned on a regular basis.
- I've grown up around poultry in a farm setting and do know that a small flock in an urban setting could be a beneficial addition to yards. Chickens are less bothersome than dogs or pot smoking neighbours, both of which are legal.
- I've been in backyards where there currently are chickens and if kept properly you can't even tell.



- Many of my friends have hens in Bowness and it has been a positive experience. As long as they aren't loud, smelly, or mistreated, I think they're great.
- Many 'farm' animals make really good pets and it would provide healthier, more affordable options for people. As long as that animal(s) can be provided for and are cleaned up regularly, I see no reason to disallow them.
- Urban farming in small, manageable numbers should be considered.. it could be very helpful to efforts of sustainability and "buying local". As long as it is all manageable, as in noise, odours, etc.
- I think this would be very beneficial to have.
- Far too many restrictions on this. Time to get back to the earth.
- I would love to have chickens.
- This question is confusing. Hens, absolutely support. Other livestock? Not really.
- Why not.
- I like chickens.
- Many people have pet pigs. This should be ok.
- Sustainable living should be encouraged by anyone who wants to engage in it. Having hens for eggs is part of it. They also are great recyclers of kitchen scraps, are great at catching and consuming pests, and their droppings, mixed with compost make fabulous fertilizer.
- it's legal to have a pigeon coop in your backyard in calgary.... or 20 parrots. Responsible pet ownership should be the foundation of the bylaw. If chickens can be kept responsibly (proper animal welfare, not stinking up the neighbours, not aggressive, etc) then thumbs up to having them.
- I see no issue with allowing people to keep livestock provided they are able to care for the animal properly.
- People should need to prove their knowledge and commitment to the animals prior to obtaining a permit for them. If there was no regulation I suspect that they would be obtained on impulse and become a huge burden on our farm animal rescue groups. Hopefully with proper education more people would be able to help these animals and provide homes.
- I grew up on a farm chickens are harmless but they are noisy (roosters). A requirement for them to be kept a minimum distance from neighbours would be necessary.
- I don't see why a person should be prohibited from owning hens, especially in light of nuisance bylaws. If the hens are treated properly and the hens don't impact neighbours enjoyment of their property there is no reason no to allow it.
- I love having chickens growing up and I believe that Calgary should look inward for day to day resources instead of importing them or buying from a supply chain.
- Chickens are a great addition to the the city! They help the neurodiverse and they can provide food. Other livestock like goats and pigs have the same kind of effect for the neurodiverse as well.
- It seems like common sense
- I like the idea of people growing their own food, would maybe bring neighbours closer together.
- Hens make great pets. Not just for feasting.
- Idk
- I agree with the above conditions and would love to see people with these animals as pets



- I want free eggs!!! Fully support urban hens pending immediate neighbours' approval and agreement.
- I believe that we should allow low scale urban agriculture with livestock, subject to standards that must be met
- I couldn't believe this was a law when I looked into it. People have a right to enjoyment in their own property, this falls under that category
- As long as these animals would not create excessive noise, smells, or other adverse impacts in the neighbours and neighbourhood, I do not see why this would be a problem.
- As long as people are taking proper care of their animals I don't see why it would be an issue on their private property.
- I think chickens are lovely additions to homes
- In support of hens - if someone wants their own eggs and organic food for better quality of life, why not?
- With limits
- I support having limited livestock on one's property provided there are clear rules that must deal with cleanliness of property, noise, safety etc.
- Having raised chickens, both free ranged and penned, chickens are great pets. They're no more of a nuisance than an ill trained dog. And let's be honest, there's tons of those.
- Hens make eggs. Eggs feed people. Less processed foods are better for people. Free range eggs are better. Why NOT let people farm their own eggs. Healthy for us all. Hens are not noisy.
- Finally!
- I think this would be super beneficial for families and community well-being, as well as educational for kids, particularly during this pandemic when we are all having harder times and need to be more resourceful.
- No
- I think exceptions would be good to explore
- small groups of chickens, all maintained are no problem
- If it is controlled I see no issue with allowing beneficial livestock in the city.
- As long as they had no more than 2. The smell and mess doesn't get out of control
- The fact is as long as the animals are cared for according to their specific needs there's definitely no issues.
- I should not have to explain to you why we should be able to responsibly keep care for and harvest eggs from chickens when someone can have an iguana or python as a pet
- Bring in the hens !
- I think support from neighbours is key here.
- Urban farming can be good for citizens and their environment.
- Urban hens are doing fine in so many jurisdictions.
- No killing of livestock and humane treatment must be enforced, but otherwise this is a good idea. They're no more of a bother than nuisance dogs.



- As long as potential owners are accountable and responsible for the animals and the animals are receiving proper care and husbandry in accordance to their species, there should be no issue in ownership of said animals.
 - This is a great idea, as long as animals are kept in good conditions.
 - Animal welfare needs to be ensured.
 - A way to assist in people lowering their food bills and providing education to the youth and the community. As long as the hens are taken care of humanely
 - There would also need to be restrictions on noise concerns along with proper clean up and disposal
 - I don't see why not
 - Many people in our city have large properties and could easily have a well cared for animal on their property. I believe the option (with criteria to be met) would be excellent for our city
 - As long as they are well cared for! But they should be checked on occasionally by the city.
 - Why not? Donkeys, hens, geese, and more are no less disruptive to a neighbourhood than the dogs that never shut up, or the cats that are released everywhere with no care.
 - Allows for more sustainable living. Along with therapy animals
 - "Only yes if 1) all adjacent neighbours support it (or if one vetoes it it doesn't happen). 2) the project needs to reapply every 3-5 years with full adjacent neighbour support (same as new application), and 3) Allowing backyard chickens does not grandfather them in to the property. A new owner should have to reapply as a fresh application.
-
- I am mostly worried about the smell and noise, and would be concerned if a neighbour had this in their backyard. I would also be worried about saying ""yes"" to it, because if it turned out horrible, there would be no trial period or chance to say something at a renewal."
 - if someone has appropriate room on their property they should have the right to do whatever they want with it
 - covid has made it harder to buy food. Having chickens would solve some of the problems.
 - Self provision is healthy in a multitude of ways. Cost savings, covid/supply chain. Farm animals (type dependent) are not far from domestic cats/dogs.
 - Clean living conditions, and ensuring smell does not affect neighbours would be important to me.
 - Chickens are good
 - With proper bylaws in place and appropriate education for owners and neighbors, urban hens can be an enriching source of food and companionship for owners.
 - Good way for children to learn, fresh eggs and meat
 - If you can have a garden for vegetables, you can have a chicken for eggs
 - all of the conditions listed i support for people to have other types of animals. neighbors/neighborhood approval is most important to me.
 - Yes, but livestock and chickens should be registered or licensed
 - I would like to be able to keep a goat or chickens on my property.



- As long as my neighbour maintained a clean and presentable yard and well kept animals I have no issue
- I think this seems reasonable, i think case by case might be important, as I wouldn't want to live next to a full on farmyard, however I totally agree with being able to self sustain on my own property while respecting my neighbors quality of life.
- I know multiple people who would like to be able to own hens and I have nothing against any neighbors choosing to own livestock as long as the animals are cared for well.
- Hens are great!
- Hens are fantastic pets and supply healthy food! Let people keep up to 4 and there will be no smell or harm.
- Hens to rid of ticks. Also allow chickens for fresh eggs.
- Urban farming is a great way to reduce environmental impact
- Strict regulations as people could set them free
- I fully support it as long as the resources are there to monitor it. That would be my biggest concern.
- The amendments are agreeable
- If the animals are being well cared for, have an adequate living space and are not impeding neighbours ability to enjoy their own property, urban livestock could be a great way for people to supplement their groceries, as well as provide enjoyment for their owners and also serve as a teaching tool about the food chain and how to respect nature
- This is great, caring for animals like these are a great therapy for urban livers
- It's fun
- Hens are sweet pets. I grew up on an acreage and we had pet hens. I would love to have a couple to have a humane way to obtain eggs and teach my daughter about caring for animals.
- Nieghbours can be unreasonable/have personal vendettas for others and should maybe not be a large factor.
- we need urban hens!
- Hens are sweet pets. I grew up on an acreage and we had pet hens. I would love to have a couple to have a humane way to obtain eggs and teach my daughter about caring for animals.
- I think it's a great opportunity for urban livestock with the following rules you've placed above! Could be very beneficial for communities!
- As long as the animals were well cared for and kept in suitable conditions I have no issue with this.
- Having a hen for eggs would be very useful for some families
- Food security is important, as is agriculture of al sorts in Canada.
- As long as there is sufficient space, care and clean up for/of said animal I think it should be allowed.
- Yes. But I think the rules can even be more lax than this, but this is a start.
- Up to 3 hens per household
- You property your responsibility.
- I think it is a private property and they can have them. As long it is kept clean and doesn't affect the neighborhood



- I think it will allow many people with fur and pet dander allergies to still have a pet. They also get the bonus of eggs
- Ensuring suitable living conditions are available for that animal should also be more widespread to include more household pets as well.
- People should be allowed to keep backyard chickens as in Edmonton, but complaints must be looked into by animal cruelty services.
- As long as the hens are kept in clean and proper conditions with a established standard of living and are not disturbing others, I feel that people should be allowed to own urban hens.
- Farm animals can bring peace and can be part of a good mental health regime
- As long as there is a limit to the number of hens owned.
- Yes, we should be able to have chickens.
- As long as its clean and safe for the animals. I'm sure they are just as noisy as some peoples kids.
- As long as all the animals needs are being met and not being a nuisance to the neighbours.
- Coming from Australia, we are allowed hens in our yard and its wonderful for self produce. Regulations would need to be in place to ensure proper living quarters during the winter.
- I think people should be allowed to care for what ever animals they want. Assuming that the animal in question is being properly taken care of.
- Provided they neighbours are supportive and reasoning is justifiable and does not cause disturbance I would be supportive.
- as long as there is the space required for the health of the animal and its needs are met. With this in mind, donkeys cattle horses pigs and other large livestock are unlikely to recieve the space needed in someone's backyard, and should only be considered in a communal or very large private property with adequate space
- To be honest... I want a pet monkey. Who doesn't want a pet monkey? In all seriousness, if an animal can be cared for in a city environment and it doesn't disturb or potentially cause harm to others, then I feel it should be considered. I don't want an Alligator next door but I'd be okay with a pig!
- We live right next to someone who owns chickens in Calgary and they have never been a nuisance.
- Every situation is different. Just like anything else, it should be researched and discussed; reviewed in a proper timeframe.
- This is in place in other municipalities and appears to work
- not worth a comment
- Urban hens sounds great, perhaps minimum lot size, distance from neighbours
- As long as it is controlled, I think it is fine.
- As long as the animals are taken care of
- If it is an animal that does not cause a lot of noise or smell then I think it could work.
- I think urban hens encourages and supports food sustainability and security.



- As long as laws are in place prohibiting roosters and requiring certain cleanliness levels and a maximum number of hens I think they can be very beneficial to humans. Also they can be great for children
- urban chickens in a proper pen and house. taken care of can be in a city environment
- If the yard space is suitable and I would hope neighbours would be consulted prior to bylaw approving a space.
- I don't think that chickens would have a negative impact on anything.
- These are reasonable criteria. I support them.
- Provided that positive living conditions are provided, increased family food independence and sustainability would be welcome and small livestock provide fantastic responsibility lessons for youth and children.
- I think urban chicken projects are excellent ideas! Providing food for the home and a great learning experience for children raised in the city
- Goats are great for managing weeds
- We want hens. So get it done.
- There are a number of other livestock that would make great pets and/or excellent backyard food producers - ducks, small goats, etc.
- There are a lot of big lots and good people that could support animals. Adequate living conditions and owners possibly licensed to understand the care for livestock.
- I have lived in a city with urban hens and it was nice. I strongly support the need to monitor suitably living conditions.
- Why not?? Personal goats and hens would be awesome. As long as there is room for them on the property.
- I like the idea of neighbour support.
- None
- urban pigs are great examples of where responsible pet ownership leads to a happy symbiotic relationship between owner and pet plus they are hypoallergenic and would offer a great option to those who want a pet but can't have one
- I don't see an issue if everyone is informed on the matter.
- It shouldn't always be what the owners want. It should be in the animals best interest, and ensuring their needs are being met. Healthy living environments, suitable living conditions, etc!
- the opportunity to experience and appreciate a true core level of self sustainment is imperative to a persons well being
- If there is a positive impact for the animal and people it's worth trying
- "Backyard chickens can give people a sense of purpose and self sufficiency. Really any small livestock, rabbits, possible ducks/geese.
- Not sure about other livestock, unless you owned a large acreage in calgary"
- Great idea!
- With some restrictions this could be positive



- in consideration of neighbours and community standards, people should be allowed to work towards more self sufficient food production. As a means of reducing environmental impact
- Yes not
- If the neighbours are amenable and the home owner has demonstrated they can provide proper shelter and care then Hens should be fine. No noisy Roosters please!
- Let us raise our own food, urbanites.
- As long as the welfare of the animal is prioritized, there is a licensing program and twice yearly welfare checks, and you have the full support of surrounding neighbours who may be effected by the animal. If even one neighbour disagrees the livestock cannot be present.
- As long as it's regulated, individuals with previous bylaw infractions against animals should not be allowed to participate
- Promotes a community spirit plus living in a city a lot of children don't have any connection or knowledge about farm animals.
- If its manageable and not causing noise complaints or other problems I dont see the issue
- I see no harm as long as they are be treated properly
- Why not
- I support this as with proper care livestock can be kept in the city and I think it is great for the community
- Bonding with animals is never a bad thing, people all have their own love for their own animal, bringing more non dangerous animals into our lives isn't a bad thing (assuming the animals are being properly taken care of)
- I don't agree with BSL. Each dog has their own personality. It's not breed related. It should be based on case by case basis. Not breed specific.
- Hens are a great food source that is easily contained.
- many calgarians are turning self sufficient and this change in lifestyle needs to be accommodated
- chickens are only another bird that just lives outside and provided proper housing can be provided for them i see absolutely no issue with urban hens
- The urban hens/livestock should be checked up on regularly to ensure no decrease in animal living conditions.
- As long as it's done ethically it's a benefit to the community
- This would ensure the needs of the livestock and urban hens are being met and the approval and support from community members is genuine while opening up opportunities for community and individual benefit.
- As long as the chickens are housed properly and taken good care of I see no problem with people having them. No roosters tho
- Seems like a good idea-
- Livestock can benefit a community in times of shortage, like during a pandemic
- Being able to have certain livestock if properly taken care of would allow people to support themselves.



- I would love to have chickens. This bylaw could make it easier to be self sustaining within city limits.
- Another sustainable option for people to explore. If people are providing suitable living conditions I don't see why not.
- I believe there are responsible pet owners and if the above criteria is meet they should be allowed.
- as long as they do not become a noise issue for the neighbors or an odor issue for the neighbors.
- I love the idea of urban hens
- A small number of chickens are generally quiet and could provide supplemental food for low income families.
- Other municipalities have done this and it works very well. Hens are quiet, clean, and allow food to be produced for the owners in the form of eggs.
- There needs to be very strict guidelines and these animals must be provided a good quality of life. Shelter must protect them from our winters and still give them room to move.
- What is the reason not to support this? If people want to own hens and are taking reasonable means to care for and minimize effects on neighbors have at it
- As long as they are responsible owners and not harming the animals
- Input from those affected would be required. Those not affected would not be allowed to contribute. Fair.
- There are other animals besides dogs and cats that can make excellent pets, i.e. mini goats, mini pigs. These are not typically all that noisy and many people would enjoy seeing/interacting with these animals in their neighbourhoods.
- Hens and other livestock if taken care of properly can be beneficial to communities
- If people took the necessary steps to ensure people and animals are safe, it would be fine
- Having animals is a good thing and would be feasible especially with neighbour support, and appropriate living conditions for the animal based on the type and care requirements
- If it does not affect the community as a whole and does not present harm to the animal, there should be no reason to prevent someone from caring for these animals.
- As long as the noise or smell isn't a concern I support having hens in Calgary.
- There must be oversight - no excuses from the city that they are understaffed or overworked. The animals' health and welfare must be protected.
- As long as appropriate upkeep (waste removal, etc.) was kept in regard it shouldn't bother anyone else (nieghbours)
- Why not? As long as they would be subject to same noise restrictions as other domesticated animals.
- Its 2020, we have a right to feed ourselves.
- If the neighbors are okay with hens, and there are suitable living conditions then there should be no reason why we can't have hens.
- I'm interested in getting urban hens myself.



- I think beneficial livestock, if raised humanly and in consideration of neighbours is sustainable and teaches the community to work together and teaches kids work ethic and how to care for something other than themselves.
- Chickens are great, and it's excellent that people want to keep them for personal enjoyment and fulfillment (via eggs and companionship)
- I would love to own a pygmy goat in one of the south communities where there is enough room and support.
- As long as those rules are followed
- Have you seen the prices at grocery stores.... i should be allowed to have a farm in my yard to feed my family lol.
- If livestock was kept to a reasonable amount given an owner's physical capacity/ability to support them, then I think it could be beneficial to have some within the city of Calgary (e.g. a small hen farm for small families)
- Hens yes, More no.
- There can be many benefits to owners and community.
- Hens and other livestock that are properly cared for can enhance community and family life but need close monitoring
- People should be able to have the animals they want in the city provided that the animals are responsibly taken care of
- Seems strange for in town
- If you are allowed to keep rabbits in the city you should be allowed to keep chickens.
- why not?
- Lots of animals can be pets, but they need the proper living conditions. But no exotic animals!
- As long as the needs of the hens and calgarians are balanced, there should be no issues.
- People need to get back to growing and raising their own food sources.
- But there needs to be limits to bids, care etc.
- No reason not to permit non dangerous livestock.
- Provided things like smell/noise during low noise hours do not affect other residents.
- Bring em on! The more the merrier!
- I think that livestock could be beneficial to Calgary .
- As long as the animals are kept on a suitable environment and it does not cause issues (such as noise) for neighbours
- Not an issue of there is enough space for the animals.
- I think urban hens are a great idea
- I mean in Asia chickens roam freely in big cities and don't cause many issues. As long as then hens are well looked after and it doesn't smell bad, why not?
- We see the city using goats to maintain grass in parks areas, why not allow citizens to own a couple on larger properties. As long as there is respect and agreement between neighbours, why can't it be allowed?



- I believe certain livestock are beneficial to our communities as long as they are raised well and kept healthy and not a nuisance to the neighbors.
- I think this would help with increased sustainability in Calgary if neighbourhoods could be able to get eggs within their neighbour hood
- As long as the environment is suitable for the livestock.
- As long as the noise is not a nuisance
- There is much urban husbandry that would support food security, and mental health support. If there is enough land that no harm is coming to the animal, there should not be restrictions any different than on farms. Yes, I recognize much abuse happens on farms, a whole different topic.
- Hens provide cheaper and healthy alternatives for Calgarians should they choose to eat eggs & chicken.
- Small livestock with suitable living amendments with knowledge for the chosen livestock should be considered however, those individuals wanting a hobby With no knowledge around said animal, this is not suitable for the animal.
- If managed and registered this would be a good idea, but the city of Calgary should have methods in place to ensure that these animals have adequate housing and nutrition and people are not abusing the right to own them
- N/A
- If animals are properly cared for and neighbors are considered then why not allow
- Chickens fine. Roosters can be a nuisance and will be. I'd hate it if my neighbour had a rooster
- I only support it if the bylaw is actually enforced. Not given multiple chances to continue to break the bylaws
- We should be allowed to have chickens or other livestock if room and conditions permit.
- I see no issue with it if the hens are properly cared for. There are a lot of people struggling financially in Calgary and this may be a way to get access to affordable proteins.
- Suitable living conditions and appropriate vet care as required
- N/a
- .
- limit of 2
- As long as they are responsibly maintained, there should be no reason against this
- fresh eggs are delicious
- I would support it as long as the criteria were met and abided by over the long term.
- Could offer a positive impact
- Allowing of micro farming leads to a potential economic stimulus and private sales of eggs should be allowed as well
- Doesn't bother me if maintained well.
- Why not? If you have responsible pet owners that can provide a proper and suitable living environment that has no affect on neighbors or surrounding area, let responsible people have the choice and weed out the people who have no idea how to take care of certain animals



- Urban farming is an up and coming environmentally friendly practice.
- Having livestock on your property, as long as well maintained is a good example of self sustainability in the time of covid
- as long as the livestock are sustainably taken care of and are living in ethical situations i would support this
- This could be a useful way for people to increase the productivity of their property. As long as the welfare of the hens was regulated appropriately, this would be a boon for urban food production.
- As long as all of it is human and sanitary I see no issues.
- Perhaps require licensing to promote responsibility and fund oversight of conditions
- This is a great planet friendly way to support our ecosystem
- As long as it does not interfere with traffic
- Urban hens would inspire individuals to have access to healthy eggs!!
- If neighbours are in support of it and only hens are permitted I can't see why it would cause a problem.
- As long as acceptable living conditions are available for the animals.
- We should be able to sustain ourselves naturally especially now with covid
- Responsible livestock ownership should be permitted.
- If kept in humane conditions and there are no reasonable objections from neighbours livestock could be beneficial
- People should have the right to have their own food providing source however I would suggest hens only.
- SO YOUR GONNA LET PEOPLE HAVE URBAN HENS, BUT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST AN ENTIRE BREED OR DOG THAT LOOKS LIKE PIT BULL? DO BETTER!
- Sustainable food helps those suffering from food insecurity.
- Must have suitable living conditions and the support of neighbours
- As long as they don't create an issue I don't see any problem with it
- For people on low incomes, having a source of protein like fresh eggs is vital, and properly kept chickens can be an ecologically sensible way of providing this - and they can work in tandem with rabbits etc.
- I'd love to have chickens!
- Because of the case by case basis
- I would only support egg-laying hens (not for slaughter or food) or hens that are for therapy, Number of hens would be contingent upon size of yard. No roosters or peacocks.
- As long as it is humane for the animal(s)
- This sounds like it would have a lot of benefit for families and communities.
- I think it will help not only educate people on where their food comes from and give In addition to this it could definitely help educate people from an environmental standpoint. The biggest reason for global warming is agriculture and this could potentially help people to critically think about not only their food consumption but the production and how it affects not only them but everyone.



- Hens are a great way to have fresh eggs and teach children important lessons about the world and animals around us.
- I think it's great that we are considering to allow livestock within the city such as hens! More fresh eggs for everyone!
- Fresh eggs :)
- Why not.
- As long as the animal isn't a nuisance, it should be allowed.
- If people have the knowledge and space to have a domestic animal let them
- It should be a given.
- Urban hens provide an opportunity for home grown, organic egg production that is to the benefit of both owner and other families who may receive the eggs.
- I have no issues with chickens or livestock provided the space is adequate and they are cared for properly
- If the rules are followed it should have no impact on neighbours.
- Responsible care of the animals is the key.
- As long as living conditions are suitable it shouldn't matter what species of animal resides.
- This could provide food for families.
- chickens kept in clean quarters are welcome addition.
- Some cultures and people are used to living in close proximity with their animals. The biggest thing is that the neighbours, and not just the immediate ones, approve.
- as long as they are controlled by the city, why not?
- People deserve the right to have their own livestock if provided proper environment and isn't a nuisance to neighbours.
- Coming from Australia where it is common to have chickens in urban areas I think they are a great addition to a household and not a nuisance when cared for correctly
- Hens, goats and other livestock can be easily well cared for in small spaces. Limits on numbers and agreement from neighbours would be positive criteria.
- as long as its kept clean, no odor, and limit number. No roosters! Roosters are loud!!
- Good for eggs or support animals
- Having a pet that can provide eggs for consumption is amazing! Also chickens are a great companion for children
- People should have the right to participate in urban agriculture. But it's important to ensure it's being done responsibly with respect to the animals and neighbours/the community.
- With support from adjacent neighbours and tracking/some kind of licensing for these homes, I think it's a great idea!
- I have no issue with any farm animals being kept in appropriate conditions in people's private backyards.
- Raising hens is a great idea, being able to essential farmstead your own eggs is a two for one food and friend!



- Society should be supportive of people raising chickens in a humane way in order to supplement their food.
- As long as all criteria are met, I don't have a problem with backyard hens.
- as long as the livestock has sufficient room, proper housing and the support of neighbors this should be considered.
- animals are great soothers thus responsible owners should be allowed to have such animals as long as the responsibility is clearly mandated and followed.
- Community support is crucial to how we can withstand any sort of political or medical ailment. The pandemic has shown that living divided is never the answer.
- I think urban hens would be a good change for Calgary but their needs must be met
- Sounds like a good idea to me
- Limitations on quantity and size based on land size should be considered.
- Sounds like a good idea to me
- If the neighbors can agree, it should be okay for people to keep small numbers of non-traditional pets. Cleanliness, smell, and noise should all be strong considerations
- why not??
- As long as all above rules are abided by
- Hens can provide more means for families
- So people can have control over their food source if they choose to.
- I think this is great if all those criteria are met.
- I think as long as the animal can be properly treated and taken care of and that there won't be any problems being caused because of them, then patrons should be able to have livestock or whatever.
- Urban agriculture, done with respect for the community and animals well being is a positive way to reduce food waste and environmental impact from agriculture.
- Sustainability
- As long as the hens are provided a humane amount of space, and this may sound counterintuitive to my yes for support but I almost feel as though it should be on a permit bases that can be contested by neighbours. I know as someone who works often until 2-3 am id be a little upset about my neighbours having chickens waking me up at dawn.
- I think certain things like chickens (for eggs) would be acceptable in a certain size yard and proper housing and up keep must be maintained to avoid smell and diseases. As well as pigeons, or even a bird atrium.
- people should be allowed to raise their own hens for egg laying purposes. Hens should be limited in numbers and all fecal matter removed regularly.
- as long as the animals are actually in a good living environment with plenty of space etc. must check in frequently to ensure people are following the rules.
- Let them have hens
- Animals are An important part of people's lives
- This type of program has worked in other cities.



- I believe there are many individual and community benefits to urban livestock.
- I support allowing hens and other livestock within city limits provided they meet the criteria listed above.
- Cleaning the pen and care must be assured and jail time for mistreatments of the animals
- Only if the owners are responsible and take care of the Hens.
- Chickens are great!!
- Hens are great pets and a good way to provide eggs and meat. Livestock should ALWAYS be allowed.
- I support urban hens and potentially other if they don't disturb neighbours with odors or excessive noise.
- Urban livestock offer a variety of options for individuals that would otherwise not have the option. It offers individuals to control their own food market. The only caveat would be that adequate excrement and other waste management systems must be in place to ensure that it does not pose a risk or hazard to other or prevent others from enjoying their space i.e overwhelming smell.
- As long as normal noise bylaws would be in place for the animals as well
- I think urban hens are a good idea for the community
- The criteria should only be if the area the hens are in is suitable. And support from neighbours.
- I agree with animal husbandry if it's done ethically.
- BUT will this end up like the process to approve secondary suites? That was a nightmare, if this is case by case a better system needs to be put in place to make it reasonable for people applying and not waste so much time and money. Again who determines what suitable living conditions for livestock is? This should be someone who has scientific AND animal welfare knowledge. I do not agree with any sort of animal slaughter happening in the city so if people are raising chickens fine but please no slaughter.
- So long as the property is large enough and the living conditions are adequate and do not disturb neighbors. Also the smell cannot leave the premise, once smell travels then this needs to be removed.
- Love the idea of people being able to sustainably farm for themselves.
- Fine with hens and other livestock given neighbours are ok with it and there aren't noise concerns (e.g. rooster)
- I agree with all amendments except the one stating support from adjacent neighbors. It would not be fair if those neighbors were not supportive of livestock because of a reason that has nothing to do with said livestock (personal grudges, etc).
- growing and producing our own food has become so important to so many people, with all the recalls, and restrictions regarding COVID19, the more we can do for ourselves the better
- I would love to have a therapy goat or a couple of chickens.
- More ethically raised animals should be allowed in Calgary to promote local community and economy.
- as long as it does not disturb the neighbors



- Other animals can be good alternatives if people are allergic to cats and dogs but scared of snakes and spiders
- We need more yard farms. You can't go wrong with homegrown food.
- I have no reason to be against it.
- I think it can be a great use however, chickens smell and that would need to be cared for impeccably. Goats are great pets and can be used on boulevards that take forever for the city to mow (btw why not plant wildflowers on medians to save watering and mowing and make the bees happy)
- Urban farming is the future. The more individuals we have partaking in it, the more we can improve it.
- As long as the animals are well cared for. That is the biggest issue
- As long as it's in suitable conditions and it's not bothersome to the neighbour, I don't see an issue.
- unfair to allow someone to have a rodent(ferret or pet hamster) and not allow a working animal
- I have seen this work in Denmark and hens don't bark all night
- Special permits should be required, part of the process being permission/informing neighbours that may be impacted (by noise, smell, ect)
- As long as the owner is being responsible with their animals, I feel that livestock ownership in Calgary can provide many people with opportunities to learn about these animals and animal care. These bylaws seem to be within the idea of responsible ownership and can be supported.
- Urban farming and gardening!
- As long as the person and their neighbours consent and the animals are properly cared for (which includes not being a nuisance to others living in the area) then I have no issues with it.
- I believe that chickens should be permitted for food sustainability and personal food use.
- Make communities more sustainable
- I think some animals can improve the physical and mental health of their owners
- only if it is maintained and operated the same as a community garden to ensure all criteria will be maintained.
- Yes as long as the livestock was kept appropriately and if the livestock got out and onto a dog property, the dog and owner was not responsible for any possible dog bites
- All of this seems reasonable.
- I would love the ability to have egg laying hens in our backyard.
- If it is supported by the community and is not overly noisy or smelly this appears to have little harm. It must also be humane.
- If its handled well, it shouldn't pose an issue
- As long as proper guidelines are in place, I like this idea.
- Urban hens have been a great idea and well implemented in other cities. The conditions above sound very reasonable.
- People should be able to provide their own food



- Hens should be permitted to live in Calgary homes, although only for purposes of companionship or rescues. Urban hens should not be permitted to be used for consumption of any kind (eggs, chicken meat) or breeding purposes.
- I would love hens in the city, as long as people have enough space to not upset their neighbors, and are treating the animals humanely.
- The approval criteria seem sensible
- If sufficient conditions are met (such as those above), I see no reason why the allowance of urban hens need be halted.
- I support urban agriculture and the benefits livestock provide to families that otherwise may not have access to without. I think with proper care it can support feeding families affordable as well (eggs, garden benefits etc)
- definitely time for chickens and support livestock!!
- This sounds fine.
- If the animal is well cared for in proper living conditions, then why not?
- .
- Small livestock should be fine as long as their needs are being taken care of
- If the animal has suitable living conditions and has a positive impact on the community, I do not see any disadvantages to allowing this
- Only if hens are required to have their wings clipped to prevent them from going over the fence and/or running into traffic. Appropriate conditions (size of yard, proper housing for summer and winter, cleanliness, etc) and care must be mandated to ensure the safety of the animal.
- I believe it is a good means for people to support themselves.
- It's a neat idea. As long as everything is sanitary and purposeful. Probably have a limit on how many hens per household?
- I think that's a cool idea.
- Yes, provided there's a means for limitations in the event of a nuisance.
- More options for individual choices, builds community business, cultural/traditions upheld.
- People should be allowed to have hens as long as they are properly cared for
- I dont care haha
- You should be able to have whatever animal on property you own
- Backyard hens support sustainable food source and provide comfort.
- I want chickens
- I believe small groups of chickens or other livestock -type animals can be managed in a responsible and respectful way if the owner has appropriate space and care systems in place
- People should be allowed to own livestock on their property as long as it does not interfere with those around them
- Chickens are harmless.
- More food produced at a lower cost to the individuals
- There is nothing wrong with a few hens.



- Only of there is less noise and kept clean
- Obviously within the reason. Im not sure.
- As long as the animal is taken care of and isn't a smelly or noisy nuisance.
- I think it is important for neighbors to be consulted before it is allowed. But otherwise if it is a small number of animals it seems reasonable.
- If someone has appropriate facilities for hens that is non disruptive, they should be allowed to house hens.
- As long as they are kept in proper conditions, it doesn't bother me what small animals people keep as pets
- As long as they do not bother neighbours, because of noise, smell, etc., I have no problem with it.
- Allows consumer choice while reinforcing accountability and responsibility.
- I support in town hens if its not over crowded and santized properly
- I think urban hens could be a positive addition to the city if implemented correctly. I do think other larger livestock does need to have strict and well thought out legislation.
- If neighbours support this, then sure give it a try.
- Provided that they are kept clean Hens are not an issue.
- If adequate facilities are present
- If neighbours support it and there is a positive impact as well as suitable living conditions it should absolutely be allowed.
- As long as they are not abusing the animals and have the space for said animals.
- Strict guidelines are needed (# of hens, type of habitat, confinement, strict penalties for those that don't comply)
- If no neighbours mind, then there's no real harm being done, assuming of course that all other criteria are met.
- Why shouldn't people be allowed to raise their own food
- We have wanted urban hens for years. We have a backyard with a suitable size for a coop. It is my belief that hens would teach my children responsibility, encourage relationship and cooperation between neighbours, and have positive environmental impacts. It is hugely beneficial to have the ability to farm your own food in your backyard.
- as long as the animals are kept in acceptable enclosures, and are well cared for. Well kept includes clean areas and minimal odors. Specify a maximum number of each species
- I believe that people should be allowed to have Hens and possibly other livestock animals if they have prove that they will provide a humane environment and be responsible owners s
- There are situations where this is feasible but criteria should also define what suitable conditions are
- Chickens sure! Larger animals no.
- If people can be responsible livestock owners and keep the animals healthy, it may help reduce the harm large scale farming operations can cause to animals
- Within reason, the type and number of animals allowed to be kept, as well as the size of the property in relation to the type and number of animals.



- Great idea! My niece has hens in Nanaimo.
- I agree if both neighbours adjacent agree and are in full understanding of what living close to birds would entail (noise, smell, and bait for predator animals like lynx's). I also think there needs to be an objection period (maybe 30 days?) in which the neighbours have the opportunity being any concerns to the homeowner's.
- I support having hens in Calgary as they cause no damage or harm to neighbours and communities.
- I think this amendment is great, being able to own certain live stock in the city could be beneficial for many calgarians.
- I think if you provide proper care and support for any animals than why not allow them to be kept in the city? They must be properly cared for though.
- Yes I would like hens in the city.
- All animals can be pets if raised right.
- I don't see why not
- As long as the majority are responsible, and there are resources for neighbors to air concerns, there is very little downside to giving people liberties.
- It's a good law, hens are natural pest controls and can provide food
- With appropriate safeguards, rules, and an approval process, I would be okay with this.
- As long as the hens are well taken care of it and not causing issues then I don't see a problem.
- I believe the neighbors/community should have an opinion & input into what's going on in their area & how it it going to affect them.
- People like chickens, ducks etc so why not as pets
- i believe we should have animals of all kinds here
- As long as no one, especially the animals, are negatively affected
- It would be a very great environmental impact to our city. I think this is a fantastic idea. It would boost morale and create a healthier population.
- Some people have them as support animals
- However, if the neighbours are annoyed with any smells, or sounds or general cleanliness of the chicken coop/area, Bylaw has a responsibility to remove the chickens and prohibit that citizen from owning chickens.
- I think being able to access local food, including fruits, veggies, honey, and now eggs is a great idea, and as long as the hens are treated well and other neighbours are not disturbed, this is a great addition to Calgary's neighbourhoods.
- The neighbors around the person that wants "livestock" on their property should be required to fill out a form either giving consent to it or protest it.
- Only for small animals, of course. They should be held to the same standards of any other animal, and subject to the same rules if they are a nuisance.
- If there is enough space to safely own an animal on a property it should be allowed
- Hens or other animals can have a positive impact on a community, if they are taken care of appropriately and if the neighbors are supportive.



- People are wanting/needing to be more self sufficient
- People should be able to do as they want so long as they aren't being a nuisance or creating a harmful or stressful environment for the animals.
- Provided the animals welfare is looked after and no one objects homeowners should be able to have small livestock.
- As long as the safety and health of the animal and health of the people who care for the animal are good, there should be no issue.
- I'd be fine with my neighbour having chickens or goats. Not bees.
- Enjoy raising chickens for meat or eggs, very therapeutic.
- Chickens give us food! They aren't terribly loud or difficult to take care of. Small livestock that can be maintained and cared for should be allowed.
- As long as the animals well being is the highest priority, I'm ok with this. If the animals are not being cared for properly, the person should have them removed from the property.
- I believe this is a good step to encourage sustainable and diverse living in Calgary that can also be very educational to people living in the city. I support the approval of other livestock (besides hens) on a case by case basis determined by an enforcement officer. I do not support roosters in city limits due to noise.
- I love chickens and hens
- Allows for sustainable living
- With very strict limits. Not ok in areas with high density or houses crammed together. Should be a minimum yard size and setbacks from property lines where animals can't reach unless neighbour specifically approves.
- As the city grows we are getting closer to Rural areas. I would be heartbroken if a family had to surrender a family friend because of changing land lines
- Many other locations allow other livestock with limits with no to minor problems
- As long as owner is responsible this should be allowed
- YES I fully support people being able to PROPERLY care for livestock without leaving the city.
- I think that allowing livestock in Calgary within reason will support a more sustainable living practice and reduce the use of importing if people can have their hens lay eggs in their own home.
- Chickens area vital part of the ecosystem and economic system. Provide food for families.
- as long as the animals are treated well I don't see a problem with them being in the city.
- Calgarians have such close relationships with the local rural communities and an interest in independent food sources, I think this would strengthen both.
- I believe responsible owners should be allowed to own hens in the city.
- Chickens provide locally sustainable food sources.
- As long as all points above are accurate, then I support this
- As long as adjacent neighbours and communities are in support, I think urban hens and potentially other livestock could add value to communities and mental health. However, each owner would have to strictly adhere to guidelines for health and safety of both their animals as well as neighbours and



wildlife that already exists in our cities. These must be taken into serious consideration. If having urban hens creates a problem with wild bobcats, for example, and bobcats are then shot or euthanized if they attack hens, this is not an acceptable balance of affected parties.

- No reason not to allow livestock if they are housed and cared for correctly.
- We should all have hens.
- i want to be legally permitted to have chickens in my house
- Not every property would be suitable
- I suppose this on a small scale (very limited numbers), assuming the property has adequate space for the animal(s) and the animals / chickens are maintained /looked after so there is no adverse impact on the animals or neighbors.
- In a world of reduce, reuse, recycle encouraging urban food support makes sense
- As long as there is not too many hens (e.g. 5)
- As long as there is not an excessive amount, and there is adequate space for the animals, then it should be allowed. If there are noise and smell issues, then those should be quickly enforced with stiff penalties.
- Provided no roosters
- Better for environment. Local.
- Provided the animals are kept with proper animal welfare /husbandry standards it could be a good way to educate the public on the importance of agriculture
- Neighbourhood chickens only enhance a neighbourhood! However, there should be a limit to the number of hens PER house. No one, in a city, personal use way, needs more than 5 or 6 laying hens.
- Would love chickens, needs to be limits and sq ft/property size requirements
- No roosters
- Possibility implement a maximum number of hens per acre, and as long as space permits and the owner can consistently offer suitable living conditions and adequate space, livestock should be permitted.
- Allowing urban farm animals allows individuals to support themselves, and others if they chose. It might also support buying local if an individual sells by products from their farm animal.
- As long as the livestock are in a safe space and the neighbours are alright with their presence, there is no reason they should not be in town.
- There needs to be strict rules about coop cleaning, odor, and how close the coop can be to a property line
- As long as all the criteria above would be considered, I think it could be okay.
- In many areas of the world hens are legal as pets I think they should be allowed here aswell.
- This is a safe way to ensure that livestock are well taken care of
- I like the idea
- I think it's fine to have livestock if they meet the criteria.



- Nothing wrong with keeping chickens and the like so long as they aren't super noisy, and we don't go to the extreme and let people keep horses and cows in their backyard.
- Only if thoroughly researched and with neighbours approval.
- If people are responsible for their livestock and ensure their needs are met I don't see an issue as long as they are not disturbing the community.
- If London England, Vancouver and New York are ok with backyard chickens why is Calgary so far behind. There should be though a provision NO Roosters
- I see no issue with small livestock such as ducks, pigs, and chickens.
- My cousin has hens and they are not a nuisance, it is all on the owner and how they take care of them
- Considering how many barking dogs I have in my neighborhood chickens are quieter. No roosters though should be allowed.
- As long as they don't smell and make noise
- If livestock animals meet domestic animal criteria (noise, etc.) - why discriminate?
- Owner responsibility of any animal in the city is key - as with dog or cat or other domestic pet ownership.
- yes
- as long as things are controlled and appropriate
- Those are fair criteria for livestock
- Allowing urban chickens helps promote food security for Calgarians.
- My answer is yes because I support it...
- Really sustainable idea for many people, but there should be a limit on animals per square foot of yard/property
- If there were guidelines on enforcing any noise / odour restrictions I think it would be beneficial to homes with suitable living conditions
- Yes, as long as there can be proof on a semi regular basis that the animals are being kept in humane conditions.
- I think it is important that the hens are well cared for and the neighbors will not be disturbed as well. I do also think it is important to explore the situations on a case by case basis as sometimes different circumstances require different answers.
- Great ideas
- If owners are responsible and adhere to rules should be allowed, if not they lose the privilege
- If they want to be in any neighbour hood a questionnaire should go around to the neighbours asking if the birds are wanted. My neighbour has some and keeps getting more. My pet can't poop on his property but his PETS poop all over mine and there is nothing I can do!!!!
- I have no problem with hens in my neighborhood.
- Hens would be a reasonable addition
- As long as it does not bother the neighbors
- Hens have never severely bitten anyone



- It would give an alternative for people who are allergic to cats and dogs
- A few chickens won't hurt anyone. No roosters though.
- Should include a clause that adjacent neighbours must sign off.
- Within reason people should be allowed livestock with space and means for the animals to live happily and healthy.
- There needs to be monitoring system in place to ensure the animals are treated humanely.
- The regulation seems reasonable for all parties.
- If regulated properly this could help people be more self sufficient
- So long as they animals have adequate space and living conditions it should be allowed
- Roaming Livestock, when properly maintained and supported, could add value to the living conditions in the City, as well as help manage other matters such as grass care (ie. grazing)
- Yes, as long as I'm not having to deal with animal smells, be woken up at dawn by roosters and worry about bee stings for those who may be allergic because my insensitive neighbors have livestock. I hope a lot of thought about where livestock in the city is well thought out before a permit is granted.
- I think hens and other reasonable livestock could be a benefit to city residents.
- I think it would be extremely beneficial to have chickens kept in yards (in appropriate enclosures). This allows for a constant fresh food source (eggs). I do however believe there should be a condition where chickens kept within city limits cannot be butchered for food.
- Hens are a good source of food and restrictions against them are unnecessary.
- growing up on the farm, I was always able to provide myself and family with fresh eggs. This should be strictly monitored with written permission from your neighbors, and watched closely. There needs to be a limit on the chickens, and law enforcement should legally be able to enter your back yard to check on housing situations. Fence must be so tall, oyster shells provided, proper food provided, clean water, a heated shelter in the winter. You must also have a sign on your gate if you house chickens in your back yard, and how many, along with a permit per chicken and a coded anklet on it the city can identify it by.
- I strongly support allowing urban hens
- With food security being an issue I think it's a good idea
- Love this idea! Full support
- I strongly support allowing urban hens
- Anything that helps an animal is something I support. No matter what type. So long as it's in the animals best interest.
- Great for community engagement
- Not totally sure what this will do but if it's sustainable then sure?
- I think it is a great idea to have hens in the city
- Yes on the condition that keeping hens would require approval (through the city) of all neighbours (next door, adjacent, alley adjacent)
- But within reason. I think any one who shares a property line should be allowed to say yes or no



- N/A
- A limit would be needed
- Laying hens are good for the environment and peoples good health.
- If all surrounding neighbour's are in approval of it, there shouldn't be an issue, until an issue arises.
- I think this should be allowed because it is proven to be functional and helpful in other cities
- As long as they aren't making a profit from the eggs and have a proper living condition for the property. Chickens to be possibly licensed and treated as any other pets
- I don't see a problem with having hens and other livestock as pets, so long as they have adequate space and proper nutrition for a good quality of life.
- Anyone but [personal name removed] can have chickens in a small roost.
- Calgary is a large sprawling city and many people have large lots that could easily accommodate owning livestock. I agree with this as long as suitable living conditions can be provided and it does not negatively impact others in the community through excessive noise or smell.
- This is an example of responsible pet ownership, holding owners accountable for the conditions of their animals.
- So long as people can contain their animals reasonably I see no reason why other animals considered livestock shouldn't be allowed. We have rules for cats, dogs, and other common pets, why not hens?
- Proper coops must be provided and proper sanitation must be strictly adhered to.
- If a person wanted this, they should have to go through a through application process to see if they are fit to do. There should also be annual or semi annual surprise checks on the home.
- Why not
- Everyone needs a companion of some sort and cats and dogs arent for everyone
- What is wrong with a properly looked after pets that generate food.
- Yes, as long as it accompanied some clear husbandry outlines.
- Like just wild hens running around? I support
- Urban sustainable living is of utmost importance.
- As long as they have an adequately sized property and noise levels are kept at a minimum I dont see anything wrong with it.
- Becoming more self sustainable and in touch with where our food comes from is always a positive.
- Animals, so long as they are treated properly, should absolutely be able to be kept in Calgary no matter what they are
-
- doesn't seem harmful
- If animals are cared for properly, don't contribute to spread of zoonosis or illness to other animals and don't become a nuisance for neighbours I would support urban livestock.
- Chickens are great slug hunters!
- Depending on the situation of the home and the animal



- If adjacent neighbour's don't have a problem, there is no problem. But if neighbour's change and the new neighbour's do have a problem then owners of hens should be ready to give up the privilege awarded by the city
- As long as no roosters and they maintain a clean chicken coop why not
- Why not?
- I think it would be lovely if there were strict guidelines to enforce the safety and wellbeing of the animal. Hens can also provide food for the community, which I think is great and self sufficient!
- Only hens, in suitable yards. Must be kept clean.
- People should be allowed to do this as long as they maintain property and animals
- I would support thos bylaw as proposed but also mandate specific humane living conditions be ptovided. Size /condition of hen den and that the property be a specific lot size or greater. Specify # of hens permitted.
- I support the idea of having livestock such as hens in urban areas.
- I think urban hen keeping is great if done responsibly
- Provided the owner is responsible, I have no problem with allowing small livestock within city limits.
- Yes purely because the city controls enough of our lives.
- Allowing urban ducks would benefit.
- As long as everyone in the immediate vicinity is ok with it, then why not allow hens in the city?
- Local food sources and also grass management
- The support from neighbors requirement should probably be a recurring requirement since people move, sell/buy and new neighbors may not be as amenable.
- I dont mind when people have hens. Its actually an eco way of supplying basic food. When taken care of and meeting criteria hens are actually very good animals. Hen owners should go through some inspection process to ensure that they properly take care of the place and cleaning the yards etc so this not became an issue for the neighbors.
- Support animals cone in all forms. Miniature farm type animals provide community benefit.
- As long as it's safe and everyone can be happy/healthy
- The animal doesn't matter. It's how the animal is raised. If it's raised in a proper environment there should be no issues.
- I agree as long as they are kept as pets , and are not slaughtered !
- keep a coop on site for noise control
- I absolutely support this. As well as bee hive programs.
- Backyard hens aren't a nuisance. I'd love to have some in my neighbourhood. The foxes would too. Though this might go against my statement above on feeding the wildlife.
- If there are proper enclosures/ enough property, people should be able to keep small livestock. With the potential of increased food costs. People should be able to provide for their family with their own means
- Full support provided proper living conditions are met and checked at minimum on a semi annual basis.



- if you can have a dog you can have a chicken
- If everyone that could be directly effected agrees to the idea, then any risk of damage to property or property values or other risks, such as disease management, have very likely been considered in the decision. So long as the animal can and is being properly cared for and NOT being raised for meat (which creates many issues including no way to ensure any standard of care or cleanliness in the process), it seems like a positive step forward. If this bylaw was going to include the possibility for the animals to be raised for meat, I would absolutely say no. It poses a risk of being dangerous to the community, cruel to the animal, and a source of major neighbourhood conflict.
- I fully support the ability to raise livestock such as hens and goats within city limits so long as minimum required yard space is met. It is a great way to get city kids involved in agriculture and become less dependent on supermarkets
- As long as all the above are followed.
- I think we need to think about the definition of "suitable" living conditions and whether or not the city has the ability to enforce this on an ongoing basis. You may also want to limit the type of animal to a property size (for animal welfare).
- As long as the animals are well taken care of and not disturbing the surrounding neighbours, then it should be okay.
- As long as proper husbandry is maintained and it does not impinge on the the neighbours, I support the amendment.
- As long as standards for appropriate living are available to the animal and that the hens are controlled and not allowed to be at large.
- neighbour support should be mandatory
- As long as there are NO ROOSTERS, and people must have inspections before being granted a permit, then fine. Permits should be renewed annually and an inspection done annually too. The permit cost should cover the admin & inspection costs.
- I fee that there needs to be highly regulated laws that can control to what extent animals are being kept on personal property.
- Assuming the community is ok with it, I don't see why they shouldn't be allowed
- If someone can't control their animal they should not bring it to dog parks during popular hours, they have gated off sections in off leash parks for training purposes. At the end of the day the OWNER need to be more responsible and held accountable, how the dog acts comes purely from how they are treated and how they have been trained. If everyone was a more responsible pet owner we wouldn't have these issues. pet owners need to be held accountable for how there pet acts and behaves. If your dog is acting out and having problems then they obviously need to adjust what the person themselves is doing. IT ALL COMES DOWN TO THE OWNER NOT THE BREED. ESPECIALLY PIT BULLS. Pit bulls are one of the best family dogs and its the people who train them to be fighting dogs that ruin it for the rest of us.
- this is more a maybe... there would have to be rules that if the livestock become nuisances or are neglected that an enforcement officer can quickly do something about it.
- Urban chickens are a great idea.



- Hens usually stay within their yard and generally doesn't cause a nuisance
- Hens can be very clean and good pets. Urban farming should be allowed so a family can secure their food supply.
- So long as they are assessed case-by-case
- No harm, no fowl ;)
- No roosters in urban areas. 10 hen limit.
- Time to give new things a try. It gives people the ability to control what they eat
- chickens should be allowed as long as all requirements listed above are met
- Depending on the live stock they can take up very little space or cause very little disruption or issues (ie a chicken coop with a max number set by the city is something easily managed)
- As long as its approved and not putting anyone in harms way. That includes the animal. Live stock of anything need the space. If you don't have the space and could be dangerous or stressful for animal. Then they don't get approved. End of story.
- As long as the bylaw takes all sides into account, I see no reason why someone could have a cat/dog but not a hen if that was their so choosing.
- Sounds reasonable to me...
- Nothing wrong with raising chicken meat and eggs.
- home owner conditions need to meet a simple but minimum requirement for animal welfare.
- Yes, but there needs to be a way to ensure that smell/waste from chickens or the chickens themselves don't become a nuisance to neighbours.
- I think it depend on yard size and care of the animal and should you choose to have hens or other allowed animals, they should need a permit and be checked in to make sure rules are being followed
- It would be nice to be allowed say up to 6 laying hens to a property provided that the coop can be inspected and protected from elements and predators
- A source of food as well, not a bad thing
- There is no negative as long as cared for by owner and numbers do not exceed space available.
- Yes to avoid mistreatment of fowl their needs to be more laws for their protection.
- Yes
- Very limited on the amount.
- No concern
- No farm animal should be allowed at the cost of those close or impacted ... even for the animals should have safety and care
- Many animals can be trained and used to educate people if they are visible in day-to-day life.
- Everyone on the street must agree to the chickens as they smell. Also if they get out of an inclosure, it cannot be other people's fault if neighbouring cats or dog get to it first.
- if someone wants to raise hens, as long as they are handled properly let them
- Animals improve human lives and as long as the animals are being taken care of appropriately and disturbance to neighbours/the environment is minimal, the animals should be able to be kept in urban areas



- Hens are a great resource for food and I think could do greatly in an urban setting
- responsible pet ownership is responsible pet ownership, dog, cat, birds, etc; must stay on property of the owner and not cause nuisance, require licensing preferably
- Absolutely! I hope that it comes with mandatory training on Animal husbandry and there are limits of how many hens to keep. And no roosters !
- Why not
- Yes!!
- As long as the hens do not go outside on their own.
- hens don't hurt anyone
- Urban hens are a great idea to help feed a family.
- My wife wants hens.
- I answered yes mostly because of the hen idea. I believe a definitive list of what other livestock includes would need to be provided before agreeing to the additional amendment of other livestock. Certain animals need considerable room to grow and live and do not belong in people's backyards.
- Not every dog owner should own a dog as they are unable to meet the needs of the dog. Also they are incapable of supporting a mentally stable dog.
- Chicken good!
- I see no issues
- " -Support from adjacent neighbours should not be considered because no one else should tell you what is right for you. Neighbours should have no say in your life. Maybe your neighbours could be used as a reference, but not a condition of approval.
 - Urban hens should absolutely be allowed. I very strongly support this. Urban hens would improve food stability, public health (improved connection to food), reduced food waste, reduced carbon footprint, improved quality of life for a species which is typically factory farmed and treated very poorly. There could be limits on them, possibly 10 but it should be dependent on the individual situation and space and based on animal quality of life rather than an arbitrary number. For example, acreages would have a higher reasonable carrying capacity."
- As long as owners can take proper care of them.
- Would love to see chickens allowed to be kept.
- I support urban hens and other urban farming initiatives, we need to encourage local food production
- Just allow the hens, don't make it cost more with extra human resources from the city.
- Urban hens would be a great addition to Calgary
- ...dont have one. I like livestock. This plan sounds good.
- Chickens are very abused in factory farms having local chickens would reduce that abuse
- Chickens can get messy VERY quickly, so i think there would need to be random checks in the beginning to ensure people know what theyre getting into.
- Chickens and goats that are kept in hugh standard so smell doesn't become an issue.



- Providing for your family is amazing... 4-6 hens/ no roos in a suitable contained yard and coop would be amazing!
- More animals always! Making it a considerate and courteous process that maximizes the potential for the owner and neighbors to harbour amazing creatures that benefit everyone
- Can bring positive impact on the community
- Chickens not only provide food, they also eat bugs. It would make our mosquito season more tolerable.
- The animal cannot become a nuisance to neighbours
- Urban hens could contribute to a more engaged community and connected neighbors.
- Hens and other livestock are beneficial to the community in so many ways - would just want to make sure any rules are enforced, such as rules against waste/smells/cleanliness of their outdoor areas to ensure the neighbours will support these ideas
- People need to have a closer connection with nature and their food source(s)
- Many other large cities have seen success with this program and Calgary can as well if it's managed properly.
- Hens aren't particularly dangerous or demonstrate nuisance behaviour and as such their ownership should be contingent on the standards mentioned.
- I am all for allow Calgarians being self supp sorting by raising their own food.
- Promoting self reliance is great for the generations now a future. We have lost alot.
- As long as the owners clean up after their animals and there is no noise complaints
- I don't know if it's appropriate for cattle to live in the city because of the space they require to roam, but I have no issue with other types of urban livestock.
- Why not?
- Providing animal needs are properly met.
- It could make it easier for low-income households to be more self-sufficient in terms of growing and raising their own food
- Backyard chickens and birds aren't a problem
- I think you should be allowed up to 4 chickens
- If you can care for and provide ultimate living conditions for the livestock and they do not cause disturbances with fellow neighbors they should be permitted.
- While hens or other domestic livestock can cause noise and odour issues, requiring the support of adjacent neighbours should minimize future complaints. Raising your own food, both plant and animal, should be encouraged and should be supported where possible.
- Raising your own hens is a great source of healthy eggs
- If livestock are well taken care of and not a nuisance they should be allowed.
- Provided support from adjacent neighbours is considered in all cases. All adjacent neighbours - either side of home, and directly behind home - must consent. Livestock is contained and humanely managed.
- If neighbours agree on it sure



- As long as the animal does not pose a noise violation or a risk of attacking community members livestock should be allowed
- They're animals no more different than cats or dogs. People should have the ability to care for them just as those two animals.
- Domestic eggs are sustainably oriented
- I'm sure most would not approve of a rooster being close by.
- Urban chickens are a great idea
- As long as it doesn't pose a threat to anyone, it should be fine.
- The impacts on other members of the community caused by this sort of urban farming would not outweigh the positive effects for the people who would use it.
- I see no problem with hens or any other animal that can be of use.
- I might support a small number of hens, but no other livestock. approval with neighbors should be done yearly, as people may move and new owners may come in who have health issues that may be triggered by having livestock or hens around. e.g. severe allergies to hay.
- As long as folks are responsible, I see no problem with raising hens.
- Provided there's a limitation on the number of animals.
- As long as neighbours are keen, I think this is a great idea. Self-sustaining food growing and cultivation is good for communities.
- As long as the conditions are suitable and they remain on public property
- Exceptions need to include the reasonability of neighbours and whether they've considered it
- I co own a farm, and hens are vital to the ecosystem and would be beneficial for both egg production and reducing unwanted insects
- I don't have chickens/hens.
- service and support animals are not limited to dogs. If its a chicken or horse (for example) the person shouldn't have to move to cater to a bylaw.
- Chickens make good, quiet pets that can be relatively well cared for in an urban environment, therefore allowing it in calgary is a natural step. Plus not many people would choose chickens over a dog
- As long as there's no roosters there's no chance for excessive noise and should be no issue
- I would support backyard hens as long as the people who keep them are made to take some form of class or training to prepare them for keeping livestock.
- not much to explain
- Everyone deserves the right to feed themselves and their families. Chickens are low cost and make great pets
- There should a big emphasis on the impact of the community
- There is no difference when compared to buying meat from a grocery store. NIMBY is never a solid argument, sustainability is needed now more than ever. Get rid of dogs and promote the healthy and ethical upbringing of USEFUL animals in our society.
- I think it's a good idea



- Yes, but NO ROOSTERS
- As long as citizens show responsible guardianship of an animal they should be able to choose their pet from a wider range
- Be responsible for your animals
- The adjacent neighbours should have the choice to give their approval. I would not give my permission as chicken are noisy and smelly
- Chickens should be allowed in all urban areas with husbandry rules in place. Small companion animals such as mini-pigs and goats should be allowed with adequate protections in place for neighbouring properties (noise, odour)
- Small livestock like chickens make sense to reduce waste, emissions, and reduce costs of food.
- I have wanted urban hens for decades. They usually stay close to home, eat lots of bugs, provide food, and are great companions.
- I believe that both urban hens and other types of small livestock (i.e. goats) can be beneficial both for mental and physical health and can help with sustainable living efforts. Enclosures, and living conditions should be investigated and approved before the animals arrive. Support from adjacent neighbours should NOT be required however...so long as the animals are properly cared for.
- cluck!!
- Responsible ownership
- make sure we are not running a commercial animal operation in your next door neighbours basement
- As long as neighbors are ok with it and the hen or livestock keepers are respectful in regard to smells/ noise etc.
- It's a wonderful idea
- All animals deserve proper conditions to live
- it makes sense
- Many people have chickens and they should be permitted to do so in the city.
- I like Chickens
- It's a great idea.
- As long as people take proper care of their animals and it's not affecting others, it shouldn't be an issue. Some people even have emotional support animals that are chickens.
- Turk, the Ramsay turkey was killed by a coyote. I think more protection would have possibly saved his life
- I would only support this bylaw if all neighbours affected by urban hens agree to it.
- I would not support roosters in city limits due to the early crowing but strongly support people having laying hens if they wish. They also must provide adequate care and environment for these birds.
- locally raised chickens will be a good addition to our urban community
- Many cities allow this!



- Sustainability would increase per household if some people wanted to house chickens and things, but support from neighbours sounds like child support for chickens. It would make sense if you word it as acknowledgement or acceptance
 - "Yes, but hen owners should not need to prove that owning hens will benefit the community in any way outside of the ability to grow their own food.
 - I also don't really think it's the neighbors business if someone wants to raise hens, ducks, pigeons or any small bird for food so long as suitable living conditions with adequate space for the hens."
 - I would love to have hens in my neighborhood and maybe even in my backyard one day
 - As long as it does not affect neighbours with cleanliness & noise.
 - As long as there is enforcement that it does not interfere with neighbours and that the animal conditions are acceptable.
 - I want chickens & eggs!!
 - As long as owners are responsible and get the approval of their neighborhood
 - As long as the animals are well kept and cared for, I see no issues allow hens or other select livestock
 - People should be allowed to have whatever pet they want as long as the pet is safe, healthy and well taken care of, and they pet is not a danger or causes a negative impact on the living experiences of the neighbours. (No smelly yards, loud roosters, etc)
 - Hens can be good for community
 - Urban livestock is not a problem if smell and noise are controlled by the owner.
 - why? I support it... obviously the neighbours have to agree and we know a large won't, so moot question!
 - I'm just okay with it
 - If the surrounding neighbours understand the potential noise levels and still support it, why not?
 - As long as the animals aren't a nuisance or pose a health issue, why not.
 - I think the support from adjacent neighbors is key, and should have to be provided every two years (as neighbors move, or maybe find it impacts them after it's there)
 - With proper regulations livestock are okay. This should include number of animals per amount of property owned.
 - "Small livestock can be safely and humanely kept within city limits in suitable space and housing. Hens, ducks, rabbits, and other small animals can be safely kept in a yard without severe negative impacts to their well being.
-
- Large livestock (horses, large pigs, cows, llamas) probably cannot be kept on any reasonably proportioned city property due to the space they require for well-being.



- I am unsure if any property in the city could safely contain goats and sheep without taking many precautions for their capacity for climbing and jumping.
- The city should also consider the potential for noise from any livestock animal and make their choice based on its capacity to disrupt life for neighbouring humans."
- I like eggs, but more seriously I am not well educated on the situation. I've seen backyard hens work in urban environments. As long as the hens are healthy and provided for without too much public disturbance then I cannot see why not.
- I like the idea
- It's the 21st century and so many other places already have this in place.
- More food and education brought into the backyards
- Let them have chickens! As long as the neighbours are ok with the noise/smell
- I believe that Calgarians have reached a point in which we consider a more sustainable life style in harmony with nature. There would be great benefit, not only for the community, but also for individuals to share a natural approach to living.
- I believe that if pigeons are allowed in Calgary, that a certain amount of Hens should be as well. 2-5 hens should be permitted if one has a suitable place for them to live both in winter and summer and a large enough green space to contain areas for the hens to have space.
- As long as neighbours are in agreement.
- Hens can be very beneficial to the city overall but this program should be carefully considered by all parties involved. If the city is considering other livestock, this program needs to clearly outline the definition of other livestock so that everyone is well informed. Every citizen has the right to approve or reject an application if the introduction of such a program would have a negative impact on any of the parties involved. The city should disclose how they plan to monitor, assess and approve or deny such applications. Again, full transparency.
- Why not ?
- Great way to get food stuffs
- I think it is a good idea.
- I think this is a fantastic idea, I know many people that would love to have their own chickens within the city.
- I don't care what other people do.
- I'm good with it as long as owners are responsible
- This has been an experiment in California and has worked quite well for their communities. It's at least worth giving it a try.
- As long as they are well taken care of I agree with being able to own them
- Yea don't see why it would be a problem as long as the neighbours don't mind
- If this will have a positive impact and benefit a community, and the owners are committed to providing excellent living conditions for the animals, then I support this.



- People have had hens for thousands of years.
- Suitable living conditions.
- I think it would be neat to have backyard hens, but I would be worried about neighbour hens escaping and entering other property, smell, noise. There should be strong rules around proper care and needs for hens. Also strong rules about barren hens and what happens to them.
- If people want hens as pets then they should be able to
- we have bigger problems in this city than worrying about chickens.
- I would love to have a few hens
- I believe that's a great idea, could support local Calgarians if they were to sell eggs.
- If neighbours are on-board (not just direct side by side, but also neighbours who back into the requesting property all agree, then why not? However, I do believe there should be "upkeep check-ins" to ensure requesters are keeping pens in shape in accordance to bylaws.
- The person should make application, provide written support of the requirements.
- I think it is a great idea to have urban chickens lots of smaller towns allow this and it is successful
- I feel if people want backyard hens or other species they should be able to do so as long as the needs of the animals are met.
- Urban hens provide fresh healthy homegrown food options. This should be encouraged.
- Raising food in cities is a great idea, if done responsibly
- Approval up to a limited number of animals
- Done properly chickens can be a great animal to own.
- Like bees not everyone will be comfortable with this but if they are it will allow people who want to create sustainable food production on their property the opportunity to do so.
- Urban food is an increasing issue. Buying from grocery stores can mean buying from stressed chickens. This is a healthier option.
- As long as the rules are applied to everyone.
- I'm all for chickens in neighbourhoods
- So long as there are no negative impacts I think this is positive.
- I see nothing wrong with this going forward as long as by laws are strict and straight forward in the best interest of the animals.
- It's your property should be able to do as pleased as long as conditions are suitable
- I like the idea of urban hens as they can convert feed and waste food into eggs and meat. Having proper living conditions and sanitation is also important as animal waste does smell unpleasant. Chicken waste compost is also good fertilizer, so it would go to nicer looking and producing gardens. As for other livestock, so long as their needs for space, food, and sanitation are met and so long as they are not exceptionally noisy, I see little problem. I am less concerned with support from adjacent neighbours, as some people will complain about anything. Unless there is some concern like someone being severely allergic to bee stings, well cared for urban livestock should be no problem.
- Good food source



- Self-raised livestock can provide ethically-sourced goods for much of the neighborhood. So long as the community is in agreement, I see no issue with it.
- It should be everyone's choice what type of animal they have
- With an addendum for non-commercial use, or restricted commercial use to prevent large scale hen houses in residential areas causing disruption.
- Hens are a wonderful way for people to have access to healthy, affordable food and can be extremely helpful to families. I also believe ducks can serve the same purpose and that neither are a nuisance.
- One cannot judge what is a support animal. Support comes in so many forms... Including all types of animals... Other than endangered species.
- I don't feel that the neighbors should have any say. It's the other three points I fully agree with, especially that the potential owner has the appropriate living conditions for the animals' safety and well-being
- Urban Hens should be allowed as long as owners look after them & house them appropriately.
- I don't see any problem with it. Also by having livestock it could help decrease the cost of buying food.
- Because people should have the right to grow food, be it plant or animal based.
- As long as the needs and care of the animals (such as hens) are cared for, and the household keeps the environment clean (therefore managing smells that could offend neighbors), I think allowing people to have hens would be an excellent and cool opportunity. We lived beside a house with chickens and besides the very odd cluck or coo, you would never know they were there. Fresh eggs everyday... who wouldn't want that?!
- Allowing the collection of eggs I do not find an issue
- If the hens have a suitable living condition and are not distracting or causing a nuisance to neighbors, they should absolutely be allowed in the city
- Cities need to start implementing internal and sustainable food systems. The introduction of urban farming and livestock should be a part of this.
- As long as the neighbors agree, I think it's a great idea.
- If the well-being of the animals is the main focus (size of environment and amount of animals)
- Chickens can be kept well in Calgary if proper management is exhibited
- People should be allowed to have non-distractive animals on their property
- I think it's fine
- If conditions are met, why not.
- Responsible animal ownership that is a benefit should be encouraged.
- Yes with limitations. Hens' cages for instance smell very bad if not properly maintained and I would like to see a limit imposed. Also they attract predators which can be a danger for small children
- Hens are no different than the pigeons we're already allowed to have.
- As long as the proper housing for the hens is abiding by the current building regulations on residential properties within city limits, hens are not a nuisance.
- It can only help.



- I've experienced hens in backyards in England however proper housing, cleanliness, and care is required.
- I would, if there were strict conditions in place to ensure a happy and healthy home for the animals, with the right level of care necessary. I would also stipulate that there needs to be ongoing check ins to ensure that the animals continue to be taken care of properly.
- Yes as long as the neighbours are OK with it and the noise is kept to a minimum (noise bylaws)
- I would also like to see domestic ducks allowed
- Let people do what they want.
- People should be required to uphold a quality standard of living for the hens. I think this is a great idea.
- As long as the owners are respectful of adjacent neighbors and are taking care of the animals welfare then there should be no issues
- Living conditions of the animals and the impacts to the neighbours of these owners should be considered.
- As long as those involved and those who would be affected are on board, and the animals are safe, fed, and taken care of, why not??
- As long as someone can properly raise an animal, whether a farm chicken or a cat, the city shouldn't care
- "If and Only if the animals are provided with absolute 100% care and living conditions that do not impeach on their neighbors.
- I live close to the woman who has the 3 Emotion Support Chickens.
- THAT is how animals should be treated and taken care of.
- She couldn't be a better example of how to provide an amazing home and environment for their required needs."
- Need a certain size of property for certain animals, certain distances from neighbours.
- If the hens aren't bothering people and are being cared for why not.
- Yes because some stock animals are good for the environment, like goats who eat grass.
- If there is support from neighbours and the community, why not allow it
- As long as they are taken care of properly I see no reason livestock should not be allowed in the city
- I would rather have livestock around me than Pit Bulls! A hen has certainly never killed anyone.
- This would work well in more suburban neighborhoods where the livestock has a higher quality of life and room to house.
- Good
- If the owner had permission from neighbors I see know issue with this
- Some people who want support animals are allergic to traditional pets such as dogs or cats.
- Generally in favour of urban livestock. Would like to see fewer restrictions
- I support the bylaw as a way for calgarians to become more self sufficient by providing a natural and organic food source.



- Society needs to shift to allow individuals to be more self sustaining, living within a city (and not being able to afford farmland) shouldn't prevent them from doing so.
- If criteria met, can't see why not.
- When kept responsibly animals are not a nuisance. A dog or a cat that's poorly behaved could cause more issues than keeping hens in a yard. As long as everyone around is in agreement and the animals are safe and taken care of there should be no issue.
- some livestock animals are used for therapy, I think taken into consideration of why that livestock is being asked for should be detailed looked into.
- Why not as long as they are cared for properly and not bugging the rest of the neighborhood
- Yes we need to be able to raise chickens for eggs.
- Hens can be great for managing pests, provide comfort and companionship as well as eggs. Other animals such as goats or rabbits should have the same health and shelter requirements as outlined by the Farm Care Alberta
- It helps people become more self sufficient while supporting the community.
- If the neighborurs are fine with it I see no issue.
- This seems reasonable.
- Small live stock if properly taken care of should be allowed.. rules and control along with safety to be assured.
- Yes Calgarians should be able to have hens for eggs.
- Hens or other appropriately cared for and sheltered animals are no more disruptive than normal urban noise.
- This is fine
- I would support allowing Calgarian's to responsibly own livestock within the city limits.
- Would LOVE urban hens!
- There should be restrictions on square footage per animal-- please no multi-chicken coops in a suburban backyard that is only feet from the neighbors!
- If the conditions are humane and the neighbours are okay with it I see absolutely no problem with this.
- House pigs and chickens, on a case by case basis where space allows
- I would love to have hens on my property
- I would love to raise hens and have fresh eggs in my apartment (could it live on a large balcony if kept clean?)
- as long as they are in enclosures
- as long as they are kept in an enclosure.
- I only support this if bylaw enforcement has the means to adequately and effectively investigate claims of abuse and neglect.
- People should be allowed to do what they please with their backyard. Having hens is a way for people to have food sources
- I would like to have a few chickens. Especially in these hard times.



- No neighbours approval!!! I don't get along with one. Why should I have to suffer his disapproval if it's a benefit to me and our other neighbours.
- I really want hens and would be open to any kind of bylaws or rules that would allow me to have backyard hens
- Urban hens can be an amazing addition to a community!
- Provided there is a limit in numbers.
- Although I believe having livestock would be better outside of the city, on an acreage or farm, as long as the livestock is being properly taken care of, given love, and treated right i don't see a problem.
- As long as hens are on private property
- Certain livestock can be good alternate pets for some
- I would love to have hens and be able to provide fresh food for my family!!
- As long as space permits and animals are treated correctly, it doesn't bother m.
- As long as they don't cause major nuisance to neighbors.
- Encourages greater sustainabilit efforts in the local community.
- I think it is a good use of property for anyone, to be able to keep animals that can produce some sort of food source for their family needs.
- Good to have a balance of different (and legal) pets.
- If animal conditions can be maintained and the animals are very properly cared for, I'm open to a variety of animals being on personal property
- I see no problem with households raising hens in their yards
- Responsible ownership of animals should always be allowed if the rules are adhered to.
- I think hens only at first.
- Power to the people to grow their own food!
- I would as long as each criteria is met. Especially that of requiring support from adjacent neighbours.
- As long as it is done ethically it should not be a problem.
- Live stock to meet daily requirements are a persons right
- Hens and goats should be allowed.
- as long as their are rules in place, such as noise restrictions, people having to keep the chicken living areas clean, and they should have adequate spacing between houses/location of coops
- Could be a great way to engage communities and relationships with neighbors.
- Community/Neighbors should be polled for approval
- There are many environmental benefits.
- I believe that there need to be stringent regulations in place to ensure the hens are being cared for appropriately, but I otherwise agree with the idea of allowing urban hens.
- they allow people to sustain their lively hoods with hens that lay eggs or to eat
- There has to be buy in from anyone who hears a rooster or smells a chicken
- Just like any other animal.



- Chickens are cool and urban farming is important. Everyone should be allowed to grow or raise their own food, to a certain extent.
- This is a great initiative and would love to have a hen for fresh eggs
- Chickens would be great to keep around and will save many low income families money on groceries/eggs.
- pigs, chickens, ducks, there are many companion animals besides dogs and cats.
- Giving people the chance to be more self-sustaining is a great idea
- This furthers the opportunity to have sustainable urban living with unobtrusive livestock.
- Humans have kept small livestock for thousands of years. If well kept, there's no reason to restrict reasonable amount of urban hens.
- I believe people should be able to have hens and have their own fresh eggs. Hens really wouldn't cause damage or fly around. But people should need to have proper living environment for them also.
- Having the ability for neighbors to weigh in is absolutely necessary. Small livestock shouldn't be an issue as long as proper treatment is followed.
- If Not too loud
- If the property has enough space and the neighbors agree then sure. If there in a condo no space=no way
- Don't see a problem
- I would love to have my own chickens to lay eggs
- small livestock and proper care should be no issue and helps with family's food costs
- Backyard chickens are fine with me.
- Healthier lifestyles, community supports. Could help people financially
- Having fresh eggs is a benefit to many in the community. Proper regulations should be in place to prevent the spread of diseases and there should definitely be a limit on the number of hens. There should also be education around the care of these animals and the disposal of bird waste.
- It is our right to acquire our own food etc in a natural way and choosing to provide for ourselves opposed to store bought products. As long as it does not affect the community as a whole in a negative way.
- It is environmentally friendly and often a stress relief for people to be able to live more sustainably with community gardens and local livestock
- The number of hens should be limited (to five) and standards should be in place for the chicken coop - the coop should look good (match the house/neighborhood) and heating should be provided in winter. Odor prevention and cleanup standards should be in place as well.
- This can help communities and also individual mental health.
- If I can have a dog why can't I have a chicken?
- Hens can be of use to almost all people. Although they are hard work it allows people to learn and value the work others go through to support the people in need of the resources.
- Stop restricting people and let us live our lives.



- I like the idea of people being able to have their own hens as long as they are cared for properly.
- This seems logical.
- As long as neighbours are involved in the discussion, I am in agreement. If owners are allowed chickens without neighbour consultation, I am not in agreement.
- It has to be clear that the hens are pets and not used to be raised as food. The consumption of eggs is okay. Whether they lay eggs or not, the bylaw for any pet must apply to hens.
- I don't believe that city dwellers should be precluded from small livestock ownership if it can be done respectfully and responsibly.
- I'm fine with backyard chickens
- Needs of the animals first. They must have a high quality of life.
- This would promote a large sense of community, as well provide nutrients for soil
- Housing is suitable
- There isn't a spot for this but I must say that it is never the animals fault, it is how they are raised by the owners and bylaws or increased insurance against specific animals, such as pit bulls, is wrong. A small dog can be just as dangerous in the wrong persons hands.
- This would promote a sense of community
- As long as the animals are being properly cared for I don't see an issue.
- No harm
- Urban hens and other livestock, under appropriate living conditions, contribute to the vibrancy of a community much like a garden or greenery does. We see this in many other urban cities.
- Sure why not
- As long as it was not a pain for the neighbours to state their concerns or disapproval.
- If the neighborhood likes the idea, do it.
- Owning livestock should be no different than owning other animals as long as their needs are taken care of.
- N/A
- There is no reason a person can't have hens.
- I think that if hen owners are responsible and have a suitable living situation for the hens they should be allowed to have them.
- As long as animals are cared for accordingly
- "Assuming noise and smell issues are considered
- le no roosters"
- Evaluated on a case-by-case basis I can see the value of allowing hens in the city. Those who wish to raise hens provide a service to the city and reduce the need for large-scale farming to a degree.
- If everyone agrees on it (neighbours, owners, bylaw) why not!
- If the property allows for the animals to have a proper standard of living that should be whomever is purchasing these pets to keep them
- I would like to have hens. I think it is a great idea as long as they are ensured that they can be kept well.



- as long as they are not a nuisance to the community or have foul odors and meet certain criteria then by all means, allow it
- It can be well managed
- They can be very beneficial to a community!
- Rosters should not be allowed in city limits
- Hens and other small farmyard animals (like quail, potbellied pigs) are no more noisy or disruptive than plenty of dogs that are allowed to live in the city
- Chickens
- Livestock can be pets too. This is an excellent amendment
- I want to so long as they are housed in a way that doesn't bring the coyotes in after them. We don't need another wild turkey incident.
- I am on board with giving people the ability to feed themselves (eggs) etc. as long as there are healthy checks and balances.
- Chickens!!!
- Suitable
- I have only known one pet hen, but I was impressed with how smart and affectionate they were!
- People that struggle financially may struggle less to feed themselves
- Freedom, it's my property I should have access to any animal I want
- hell yeah, chickens are dope
- let the people have chickens, who cares!
- As long as the livestock are smaller (maybe animal size / number is based on a ratio of yard size). If yard gets stinky, fines.
- I don't care if my neighbour has hens as long as they don't impact me.
- As a "community" project, this could be a great way for people and children to learn about livestock and appreciate animals in a more meaningful manner.
- If the animal was treated well (no hoarding) and wasn't a nuisance to neighboring properties.
- As long as there are rules in place for the well-being of the animal and the humans around, and enforcement from the city, I see no problem
- Chickens can smell. So I think a certain distance away from neighbouring houses is in order.
- As long as the chickens are correctly cared for, I would support it.
- Livestock were meant to have large spaces and areas to roam, if this can be provided in the city I support it.
- I think as long as they are in a good home and supported this is okay.
- Small wildlife enriches an area, as long as they are given the best and safest chances
- It's extremely beneficial to citizens to have access to home grown/fresh food (eggs in this case). Also I see no difference in the noise level of hens clucking, vs dogs barking vs lawnmowers.
- As long as said livestock was cared for, and provided an ideal living situation I don't see why not.
- People should have the ability to care for some, smaller, easy-to-care-for livestock animals, but only if there are strict and enforced laws regarding the requirements to ensure their wellbeing.



- I would support this is there is mandatory vaccinations and flock containment and biosecurity to reduce disease transmission
 - Prevent food shortage. Support local. Save money.
 - Some people find comfort in chickens
 - Livestock can be beneficial and I think there should be a system that makes this possible
 - It would be nice if the city could have goats now laws instead of just lawnmower.
 - "If you're thinking of getting rid of a certain dog breed, you're already in the wrong.
-
- If people want a hen, sure as long as it's properly taken care of."
 - See above.
 - We live in a large property in the suburbs and think this would be a sustainable option to be able to have eggs.
 - All animals deserve happiness and love
 - I think that the support of the neighbours is key, and there should be a probation period where at any point in that period the neighbours could express a change of mind if it isn't working out
 - With same rules as pigeons listed below
 - As long as not doing any harm, I have no issues with this
 - Let people support themselves! Hens are a wonderful contribution to a household and a great learning experience for children
 - Urban hens provide lots of benefits to local communities.
 - Some animals such as chickens and pigs are known to be great support animals
 - pigs make great pets!
 - Yes, they are a bit noisy, but something like chickens can be incredibly helpful for the community. There is plenty of fresh eggs!
 - I believe that other animals and livestock should be allowed as long as it doesn't interrupt the community.
 - Nothing should ever fall under 1 persons discretion,ever.Thats a dictatorship in action..We need a panel. Including balance and with educated members of animal advocacy included. Not a slanted elected by 1 political party for life b.s. position.
 - Hens are natural pest control for rodents and bugs and provide food.
 - Hens allow for a more sustainable lifestyle and improve food quality and enjoyment of life.
 - No issue as long as noise, cleanliness, etc addressed. Also what conditions should owner need/decide to slaughter? Eg: Are chickens considered food or just their eggs?
 - I think it is unfair that hens are not currently permitted within the city as they can be quite beneficial in keeping ticks and other pests at bay while providing food and a great learning experience for those raising them.
 - I think that as long as there was a limit on the livestock. For example maybe 4 hens per household and if adjacent neighbours are okay, then it should be good.



- Why not
- I think offering people the opportunity to have laying hens, or other small livestock, could make a very positive impact on the City of Calgary.
- Seems reasonable.
- I love the idea of a real life, backyard way to show people (eg children) responsible care of animals other than dogs and cats, plus where their food comes from (eg eggs)
- Because my household personally would be interested in having hens for our own purposes.
- Fine for larger properties where they won't be too close to the neighbours.
- I think there is no difference between a hen and a cat nor a dog and a small goat
- Why should the City get to tell taxpayers they CAN own a cat but CANT own a hen. If the taxpayer has not shown themselves to be irresponsible (habitual offender of animal bylaws) I dont understand why you would get involved at all.
- Hens and chickens are a source of food for many
- Ethical treatment of animals is key - increases food security for all.
- Promotes healthy eating!
- 100% I want Hens!!!
- This gives the opportunity to maintain a fresh food living environment
- Some small livestock are great for local environment (recycling)
- its ppl's lands. They pay taxes. They should have every right to do what they please as long as they are responsible.
- Small livestock animals can be a benefit to owners and the community if handled properly, for example the production of eggs from chickens or milk from goats. Some consider these to be pets.
- "Urban hens are fantastic, quiet, productive and relatively easily kept pet.
- No need for a rooster, low-cost and plenty of fun! I would adore a trio of hens for our neighbourhood block."
- Because all animals are beneficial for good health of all the people as long as they are not nuisance.
- Community/neighbour approval required.
- I think that any opportunity to allow people to harvest their own food - be it eggs from hens, or honey from bees, should be allowed.
- Hens are non disruptive easy to care for and a great source of protein
- Hens can be great pets if kept properly however I would advise an inspection of the pen or area it will be kept is up to a high standard before a license to own one in city limits is issued
- People should have the right to self sufficiency.
- So long as there are clear parameters for the care and living arrangements of these animals I think they should be allowed within Calgary.
- Na
- Hens would allow for laying and greater food independence
- If it's not gonna be a problem why not



- Provided strict adherence to the highest standard of housing and care for the animals are in place, and severe penalties for any breaches are in place, then I would support this.
- I think this is great as long as there are requirements for what kind of living conditions they can be kept in and that they do not cause problems for other people
- If the owners are able to keep the animals under control and make sure they are not a nuisance to others, I see no problem with this.
- this seems fair to all involved
- Animals such as hens, goats, pigs, etc should be allowed given that their living situations are acceptable
- I think having urban hens would be a great idea
- I have had chickens and they are easy to maintain and quiet. Better than dogs even.
- I believe livestock animals such as hens and pigs should most certainly be allowed in urban properties so long as the owners are responsible and have the knowledge to give said animals a happy and healthy life.
- Locally and ethically sourced eggs.
- Self explanatory
- I want hens.
- It would be good for the people's mental health and the community at large.
- As long as the person keeping them follows the rules, keeps their yard clean and have no roosters to wake me - go for it.
- Any animal that can be cared for in a residential area and that doesn't pose a risk to either neighbors or the animal in question should be legal to own and maintain on a private residence.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of and premises are kept clean.
- Hens would be a good way to promote perma-culture in Calgary. But it should be monitored appropriately.
- First and foremost is the care and cleanliness of the animals and their enclosures. I also feel limiting the number of hens/livestock a person can keep to be important. Community coops/social programs should be allowed to keep more, provided they can properly house and care for them.
- You should be able to have any animal as long as it is cared for
- Allows for access to local eggs, they can be domesticated very well in the correct environments, decreases travel time to access a staple in many diets. However, I would not support butchering the animal in their house and would encourage creating relationships with butchers for this part.
- Yes, I believe live stock, including chickens, can be kept within the city properly and without causing issues as long as they are properly cared for.
- Urban hens would be great.
- If animals can be kept in suitable living conditions and follow the same rules as other domesticated animals (such as the ones surrounding the 'nuisance' animals), I believe they can be beneficial and should be able to be kept in the city.
- Why not? A pet is a pet.



- There is zero issue with having hens in Calgary.
- If the stock doesn't hurt or annoy neighbors and the owner took proper care without any issues I see no problem
- Needs restrictions in place for proper enforcement
- I see no reason not to
- As long as the animal is cared for properly (including having enough space) and not causing any issues with neighbours there should be no reason why someone can't have those animals.
- Hens are quiet, and it's a good learning opportunity for kids to grow up around animals such as chickens. It will also allow for the family to harvest their own eggs.
- If COVID has taught us anything, it's that we need to localize and re-learn how to sustain ourselves without relying on massive amounts of imported goods. Learning to keep hens and other small livestock is a great way to reconnect to our food systems and to the land. Ideally, training programs should be made available for people who want to keep hens but need to learn how to care for them properly. This would probably reduce the need for bylaw enforcement down the road.
- I believe if the livestock can have proper shelter and care that allowing them within city should be allowed with conditions which would be dependent on the animal
- with a thorough application process. What if the neighbor moves and the new neighbor is not in favour?
- More freedom of choice.
- Hens and bees, goats and other small livestock do not create negative outcomes.
- A lot of animals considered "livestock" are also pets for many people. For example, pigs & goats.
- People should be able to raise animals for sustenance on their property, even when I'm urban centres.
- I like the idea of assessing cases as they arise and not umbrella-ing each case as if they have similar circumstances.
- As long as the above criteria are being weighed heavily in consideration of allowing livestock on someone's private property, I see no issue. However, this must also be monitored after the livestock has moved to the property. Moreover, neighbours must be made aware that they are not to change their mind after agreeing with said livestock moving in next door, except for in extreme cases where the animal is being neglected or abused in any way.
- It's 2020. People want to fend for themselves more and more when it comes to food.
- Be a good neighbour first. Who doesn't like Pygmy goats.
- There is no reason any animal should be banned from anywhere if proper care is met.
- If the farm animals are beneficial then they should be allowed in, however if more restrictions are put on pitbulls I will not support it because it is not fair to target that breed.
- Great idea!!!
- I believe if an individual is responsible, competent, able to provide an appropriate environment and meet all the animals needs then they should be able to have livestock in their home.



- Urban hens are a sustainable way for a family to provide a healthy source of protein in the form of eggs. I fully support an urban hen program as long as these programs are being closely monitored by appropriate enforcing bodies. The hens welfare and safety should be a priority.
- Hens should be allowed as long as it is regulated.
- As long as the animals are being taken care of and not a disturbance, it should be allowed.
- Urban hens can be life changing for many people, including those seeking a more self-sustaining lifestyle where they rely less on traditional food sales (large stores). Urban hens do have the chance of becoming a nuisance, so having conditions on the ownership of urban hens, such as support from adjacent neighbours, seems like a good idea.
- I think chickens could be a great addition to our city as long as they are kept cleanly and humanely.
- There could be many benefits.
- Raising food should never be an issue
- Urban hens and livestock have been shown to have great benefit in other communities where they are allowed. I am very excited about the introduction of this bylaw amendment as long as it is done in a responsible and fair manner. From experience in other cities these animals rarely cause significant issues.
- People already do this so it makes sense to create a bylaw so there are suitable living conditions and that other Calgarians are aware of the bylaw.
- As long as the pet owner can keep the area clean then there is no reason not to allow it.
- Assuming neighbours are okay with it and the living conditions for the livestock are more than acceptable. I would be in favour of this bylaw .
- It's totally reasonable.
- Fresh eggs! Plus it would be nice to have some chicken in the yard.
- I support urban agriculture initiatives for the purposes of community-building, education, and food security and permitting responsible ownership of backyard hens would be a great amendment.
- With guidelines and regulations in place, having a few hens in a backyard pen, well contained, shouldn't create strife amongst neighbors. Regulating square footage per animal (as per humane, not farming, practices, and ensuring the housing and waste regulations are met would eliminate many issues.
- Proper research must be done.
- As long as there are laid out expectations this is very beneficial for families and communities. I have some concern about adjacent neighbors outright.... I'd prefer adjacent neighbor if the coop or the chickens are within a certain distance from the property line. The living conditions must be laid out clearly. I also support licensing to pay for annual or as needed inspections
- Not to many per household.
- "Keep a minimum on how many hens, max 2 hens per household
- Quality control of living conditions"
- A maximum number of hens is important to set. No more than 3 should be allowed, that is plenty to serve a family.
- free eggs



- In a proper environment, small livestock could be very beneficial to a home and community. People that wish to have pet pigs/ ducks etc would be able to have these pets as well
- Why not?
- We have a right to have small farm animals that can help provide food or companionship if taken care of probably
- If someone can keep a barking dog, why would a chicken coop cause a problem, as long as the hens are well cared for.
- Eggs
- We should be able to have a few small animals like chickens to help off set the supermarkets. We should all be somewhat self efficient
- Citizens should be allowed to have hens as long as they are fully capable of caring for them and their enclosure remains tidy.
- All livestock should be allowed anywhere in the world.
- Chickens in your backyard laying eggs for food is a great idea as long as you have enough space and they are not a nuisance
- I think as long as the animals are cared for, do not cause disturbances to neighbour's and are not considered nuisance animals they should be allowed.
- Following suit of what an other municipalities have successfully implemented this could be a very positive program for Calgarians however there should be strict bi laws to enforce safety and well-being of the hens and also ensure that people are educated before acquiring them.
- I think urban farming is the way of the future, people need to be able to be more self sufficient, the type of livestock should be closely monitored however, cattle might be a little much, but goats and maybe even pigs could be ok.
- Everyone can benefit from taking care of animals, children especially, which most people cannot afford (living outside of the city is expensive). In addition, some small livestock can help provide food supplements to their people, helping ease financial strain.
- As long as the animals welfare is of utmost importance
- Exceptions should be evaluated by an animal health professional such as a veterinarian not an unqualified chief bylaw enforcement officer.
- As long as it is noise compliant. I do not want a rooster waking me up at 5am
- It sounds beneficial and worth a try.
- So long as suitable living conditions can be provided and the animals will not be a nuisance to adjacent neighbours, I think this type of program would be very beneficial and sustainable
- capitalism is failing, we need to start becoming for self sufficient and support locally. This would benefit the economy and people
- As long as it doesn't disturb neighbours in any way.
- Suitable living conditions for all animals must be ensured- that much is obvious. Having the consent of the neighbours can be important because there may be animal allergies, or other animals there.
- If the animal is properly cared for and has adequate living space, why should people love limited to certain animals?



- I don't think support from neighbours should be a requirement
- No. Are we dating? Why do I have to explain my answer? If you aren't getting enough info from my answer, ask better questions. Jeeze.
- I don't see any issue with this so long as the additional criteria above is implemented.
- As long as it is not disturbing peace of other neighbours it should be allowed - noise and odor must be managed
- As long as they are not a nuisance to the neighborhood there should be no issue.
- I like cows
- Low maintenance animals, quiet, lotsa eggs. Pro chicken.
- alpacas make excellent pets!
- If you're able to be responsible for said creature, you should be permitted to do so.
- I like the idea of having eggs if the birds can be managed.
- I think urban hens are a great idea as long as there is education readily available from the City of Calgary on how to properly care for hens.
- Having personal livestock is a great way to have food security and provide residents with alternative experiences.
- Max of 2 or 4 hens
- The line between livestock and pets can get blurry sometimes, I think given the opportunity to keep other types of animals in the city is a good idea as long as reasonable conditions are met
- If the community is okay with it, animals are being treated okay...I don't see why not.
- This could be a great way for people to be able to ensure their egg supply comes from ethical sources (their own home! With suitable conditions). If only factory farms had the same rules...
- Let people have their chickens or other small livestock. It's no big deal.
- Small livestock such as chickens can be fun and provide benefits, but I feel this must be supported by neighbouring residents due to the possibility of smells and noise.
- as long as suitable care is provided living within the city should not be a restriction of ownership
- I'd love to have chickens or a goat or an alpaca
- As long as people are responsible, can provide proper care to their animals, and have ample space and housing for the animal residential areas shouldn't restrict people from owning live stock as long as it doesn't effect the quality of life of the animal. You can't put a horse in a 2 bedroom condo but you can easily have a chicken. It should be assessed based on that criteria.
- Don't see why people can't own unconventional pets.
- I don't agree with the community benefit, but I do agree with having the support from neighbours as that would be really the only people you might bother, and suitable living conditions is a must!
- As long as the animals are being treated properly and they aren't disruptive to the community.
- hens and birds. I think livestock might get messy, as they are generally larger animals.
- Hens ..not pigeons
- I like hens. I would just hope that there are some regulations and rules in place to protect the animals from harm.



- No roosters though
 - It is a lot more green and sustainable to raise your own livestock. I am 100% in agreement that hens should be allowed. Other livestock could be great as well, as long as the animal is living in proper conditions.
 - Hens, yes. They are small and quiet. Other livestock, probably not. I would not support goats, sheep, pigs, etc. These are animals that require more space and care than a backyard can provide, plus they are noisy and stinky. I love animals, but if someone wants livestock then they should purchase an acreage and move out of the city.
 - Having access to eggs is great and so is monitoring animal welfare and living conditions
 - Urban agriculture is an avenue that i think is worth exploring
 - These animals are positive to the environment and economy. More people should be able to have access
 - I support adding live stock to communities
 - There should be no issue with keeping a handful of chickens or smaller toy pigs on a property as long as certain criteria are met and enforced (ie, keeping the smell down).
 - I think having hens and livestock in the city is fine as long as there is enough space and suitable living conditions are maintained.
 - "Home food production is a good thing
-
- Would want to know how much noise they make before agreeing as a neighbour"
 - So long as conditions for safety of animals and measures for reduction of negative impact to neighbours is maintained.
 - If other animals can safely be added to the bylaw and the animals and neighbours do not suffer... Why not?
 - i support community hens, but no roosters
 - Hens, yes. Large livestock like cows, pigs, etc. should not be kept within city limits as they require more land to roam.
 - This could be very beneficial in many ways provided that the space is sufficient for these animals and there are maximum measures taken to ensure they are not accidentally released.
 - given the conditions above I think this would be a great idea.
 - Urban chickens has proven to be effective in other towns/cities.
 - any animal can be a companion to someone and I don't feel like species should depict whether or not they can reside in the city
 - Must have written permission by neighbors
 - Raising hens should be allowed in the city with conditions just as any animal. Needs are met, noise etc.
 - I have no issue with personal keeping of livestock so as the animals are treated well, and they do not become a nuisance to neighbours or members of the community.



- The above conditions are fair
- Hens should be allowed with proper care and rules to follow
- Yes, if proper care for the animals is provided. Perhaps through licensing or education requirements on proper livestock care. Although I'm curious on what kind of livestock this would include? Other than chickens, I don't think most Calgary homes/yards have adequate space for common livestock.
- Other cities do this, people should have the right to grow and raise their own food
- if it has a positive impact, neighbour's are ok with it, and the animal is happy, whats the problem?
- As long as it is not a disturbance to the neighborhood
- Chickens can be a great source of food and companionship. As long as the ownership is being performed properly and safely, I see no reason not to allow it.
- There are other municipalities around the world that have shown success in allowing small livestock to be kept on urban properties. The precedence is set that it would be beneficial to Calgary as well.
- Hens can be a nuisance noise-wise but they provide sustainable benefit to urban life.
- I want my own hens
- I see no problem with this as long as they are treated humanely and are in an area that is spacious for them to move around in.
- I think this would be a great option here in Calgary. I know Airdrie is already having success with this
- I would support but it would need to be a large home lot area and neighbours would need to be consulted as not everyone is on the same schedule and would like to hear louder animals so early and or late
- Good idea
- If people want to have hens and other livestock, as long as they don't have too many to actually take care of, I don't see the problem.
- Only if routine, unannounced inspections are carried out and neighbor approval is required and should include type and proposed location of any structures (both sides, and behind). Any documented negative impact on neighbors is grounds for immediate animal removal (in adherence to approved plan (location/size of structures, sound, smells, unsightly care structures (coups), other pest problems (eg. mice) due to feed or improper waste disposal.
- People being able to get fresh eggs in their backyard will decrease their carbon footprint and those people can be sure of the welfare of the chickens they get their eggs from.
- Fresh local eggs is more economic and less of a foot print
- If these animals aren't causing a nuisance, there shouldn't be an issue. Farm animals typically aren't any more of a problem than cats, dogs, and other pets.
- Having a logical policy for urban hens would likely lead to more discussion and compliance than no policy or a overly strict policy.
- I think this a great idea as long as livestock can be properly taken care of and all living conditions for the animals are up to standard.
- I think self sustainability is always a great option plus having backyard livestock would be a great addition to any community.
- Hens are a wonderful source of eggs.



- There are many types of pets that are loved and important to people so it's a good idea
- For greater food security and better use of backyard space in suburbs, I think it is a great idea to allow chickens and possibly other livestock in the city of Calgary.
- I think this would be lovely, and a good way for people to look after their own food needs.
- I believe small livestock should be feasible, within a specified number of animals, within a person's own property if they can ensure the animals aren't nuisances.
- The community needs to support the breed and their owners!
- Food self reliance will only be more important in the future
- Within reason....I would not support my neighbor having a cow. However hens for eggs would be acceptable.
- Hens are fantastic pets and can live happily in adequate urban environments. And nothing beats fresh eggs!
- Hens are easy to keep and can provide sustainable food for families. In a yard, they help manage pest and insect populations. Cleanliness of the chicken coop and associated property must be a priority though
- This would encourage sustainable food sources and cheaper access to food
- No roosters.
- urban hens are a good thing-as long as it's done right.
- as long as it ensures the animals are treated well and housed properly, I have no problem with it.
- Homegrown food is one of the best methods to reduce our ecological footprint. why restrict it?
- Initial support from adjacent neighbours is fine, but people move all the time so it seems a bit redundant.
- Backyard eggs. No roosters. Hens only
- Only if there is a strict limit based on available outdoor space.
- certain animals
- As long as the animals are clean and do not create too much noise
- I have thought about keeping chickens myself and have always wondered why it wasn't allowed if you have the space.
- Other than possibly roosters, which are often very loud
- As long as there is limit on the amount.
- As long as there are requirements for the animals to have enough space and maybe a minimum yard size so that neighbors are not inconvenienced (I could foresee a neighbor's dog being very agitated by chickens on the other side of the fence), this seems like a fine idea.
- Chickens!!! Hens are wonderful!
- Owning small livestock is fulfilling, helps with laying hens
- As long as they are not allowed in individual backyards etc. the noise from chickens and roosters makes it impossible to sleep
- If you can provide a proper home for the animal why would you say no?



- Written and rescindable (with notice) support from neighbours would be required, plus appropriate space available per hen (not sure what that is)
- Assuming good animal husbandry is followed, don't see any issue.
- If consideration is entertained then I feel like this amendment allows for new animal/people dimensions.
- This is a wonderful way for people to live more sustainable lives! This would be a huge benefit to so many people
- Fresh eggs, duh!
- The right conditions must be present.
- chickens are cool
- I would like to be consulted before hens move in next door. I would also like to understand the scope of activities. For example, will animals be butchered on site? That would be a definite no.
- It is better to have criteria in place so it can be done safely with some oversight.
- It would be an amazing way to connect with animals and allow the community to learn more about food sources.
- With adjacent neighbor approval, being able to own small livestock animals like hens helps the community with food costs, however requirements for house and smell need to be considered.
- Nothing better than fresh eggs.
- As long as animal is properly cared for and neighbours provide written support.
- As long as the rules regarding noise, smell and clean up of pet mess remain, it seems fair.
- Hens make amazing pets and yard animals. However, the only part I do not agree on is getting the consent from neighbors. The hens would be on my property, and be my responsibility, it has nothing to do with my neighbors.
- Some mechanism for monitoring or assessing the wellbeing of the animals and environment needs to be in place.
- As long as the owners are responsible and it doesn't bother their neighbors backyard chickens provide a valuable food source.
- Support from neighbours is critical.
- With the conditions listed above it seems these animals wouldn't be an issue to the neighbours or community and would be a safe addition
- Livestock would be cool ngl
- If it benefits the community and is an ethically safe way for the hens to live there are nothing but positives in this situation.
- If supported and not going to be an issue to the surrounding mahouts then I see no problem as long as the property is in fair condition to the animal and the animal receives sufficient space
- Chickens are excellent
- Allow all animals by default. If the City of Calgary or community members want to exclude particular animals from specific sites, require the active support of a majority of neighbours for the exclusion.
- Let folks keep chickens if they want



- provide someone owns ample space to care for the animals without disrupting their neighbors, they should be able to do what they want with their property.
 - As long as the hens are safe, happy, and free of disease, I have no problem with living with chickens in my city.
 - As long as the hens are living in a safe and fair environment.
 - A couple hens won't be back for a back yard upon proper care
 - I think urban farming is an important step that the City could help kickstart and maintain. This includes, but not limited to, providing a conducive environment for such activities. Thus, a balance between the need of neighbors and those of urban farmers can be attained in many cases.
 - I would expect any animal ownership to have little or no impact on a neighbour. I don't want to know if my neighbour has a pet - that means no excessive noise and says on their property.
 - I think it's important for animals to have suitable living conditions and to be considerate of others if it could affect others :Ex noise
 - I feel if you want to keep a certain animal you should be able to if it's not a nuisance
 - As long as the hens are cared for and not disruptive to the neighbourhood then it is a sustainable practice
 - as long as the animal is happy and healthy and is not hurting anyone I see no reason why they shouldn't be allowed
 - I don't see why not unless the person is not a responsible animal owner
 - As long as adjacent neighbours support it and the resident takes full responsibility, they should be allowed to have livestock.
 - Personal hens and other providing animals are beneficial to people and communities.
 - Depends on the animal. Can someone have a cow? What are the limits?
 - Proof of responsible ownership, regulated (in care and limited number of hens) and willingness/agreement by all affected parties (adjacent neighbours) should be sufficient
 - I would love to have a pet chicken and I'm sure I could create a great home for one.
 - I think this gives people an opportunity to be more in touch with where their food comes from. That can only be a good thing.
 - Good idea!
 - Hens would be beneficial to community as long as there are strict rules in place to ensure the well-being of them
 - "Urban agriculture is important. We have a disconnect between urbanites and where our food comes from. Many children think that eggs come from a carton in a store. Anything we can do to encourage urban farming (laying hens, food forests, community gardens, native grasses, etc.) should be encouraged.
-
- Pot-bellied pigs are also excellent urban dwellers. They are clean, quiet, and well behaved."



- I believe the approval of livestock would be beneficial for many Calgarians although there must be strict bylaws and enforcement to ensure the protection of the animals.
- I don't see any issues.
- Hens are wonderful and sustainable and this is a fantastic idea!
- I believe that we have to ensure livestock will not be at risk and have a suitable environment, this includes ensuring that the neighbours are on board and support this. Also to ensure that the calgarian is suitable to raise and care for the livestock.
- People should be able to raise their own animals for food, within guidelines, if they so choose.
- I think thats fine if people want to bring in barn yard animals.
- Let people get their own eggs.
- I don't see anything wrong with having urban hens as long as they are properly cared for.
- Hens fine - just no roosters. And as long as they have proper living conditions
- If hens mean chickens then Im all for it. people should definitely be allowed to own and keep any bird that produces food (eggs) for their family. No roosters though for noise control
- If rules are followed than why not?
- N/a
- Urban hens would be nice to have in the city. I would say you need a limit on hens if anything and a certain amount of space required.
- If the owners clean up after the animals and take care of/train them properly, it should have no more impact on the owner's neighbors than any other pet would.
- "Could be a source of sustainable food (eggs).
- More farm animals will be treated in a humane manner."
- Allowing individuals to have livestock on their property would be extremely beneficial
- As long as the property is kept reasonably clean and tidy and noise and smell are not excessive I would have no problem with urban livestock.
- I think if maintained well that hens should be allowed in the city
- If the rules are followed and enforced, I see nothing bad coming from allowing small livestock such as hens from being allowed within city limits, it's also especially good for kids to get involved with livestock and the responsibility of having them.
- I want fresh eggs
- I believe certain livestock, such as hens, ducks, potbellied pigs make excellent pets, provided the individual is committed to excellent care of these animals (as they are required to be of non-livestock animals).
- The benefits are huge for both humans and environment alike.
- Livestock can be a useful alternative for insect and weed control. By products such as wool, milk, eggs are a great thing. Education of care must be available and applications should be knowledgeable in the required husbandry.
- As long as an animal it treated well and not a concern to the surrounding community.



- If the animal is well cared for and does not pose any problems to neighbours, I don't see why they shouldn't be allowed.
- Allows more of the general public to care for these animals in a humane manner
- I would love to own hens within the city.
- If the suggested criteria are met, specifically with hens as they are messy and can smell which could be a major concern if you are a neighbour.
- Have a source of livestock should be a fundamental right to Calgarians. If they choose to offer suitable living spaces for said livestock. As the world transitions to a healthier, source of food. It should be a fundamental right of citizens to have access to livestock!
- If done properly it could add value to the lifestyle of people.
- I would support the bylaw with strict rules and regulations. Both for the animals safety and effects it could have on neighbours. Cleaning up poop regularly to avoid smell just like for dogs would need to be in there.
- Allow the hen's, but no more than a certain amount per household
- As long as conditions are clean and each hen has enough space to live comfortably, I'm in support of the amendment
- I believe that the benefits of having backyard hens outweighs the downfalls as long as they are looked and cleaned up after properly.
- I support more opportunists for live stock as long as conditions are met
- I support backyard chickens and bee hive
- Yes I think chickens should be allowed in Calgary
- I believe hens are an excellent idea, not my cup of tea personally because of the work involved, but I would never be bothered by hens on neighbouring properties, I grew up in a small town and we had the full chicken house next door including 2 roosters and even they were not a bother. I believe that small livestock such as goats or perhaps smaller pigs could work IF the property size is large enough, properly fenced, and the animals had proper shelter and 24/7 access to running water (keep it from freezing). I do understand that this may necessitate more city staff in order to assure animal safety as well as bylaw compliance in neighbourhoods so it is probably best to just start with hens.
- I think its a great idea
- I know a girl who has two pet pigs as support animals and they act just like a dog. So if these animals are trained and their environment at home is tidy and proper for them to reside there I think I it's a good idea.
- Chickens are hella cute
- As long as appropriate living conditions and space are given, rural animals should be fit to live in the proper housing within Calgary limits
- Having other livestock would promote the local community to support each other. As long as the animal's needs are met (living space, food, care, etc).
- Maybe less people would get dogs and get animals that are easier to take care of and we would have less dog problems.



- "I think it depending on land size and how many animals per household you are allowed in other words animal units.
- 1 unit is equal to
 - Cat
- 1 dog
- 1 bird
- 1000 bees
- 1 pig
- 1 goat
- I would then say you can have
- 2 animal units from the domestic side and 1 animal unit from the livestock side.
- Or 1 domestic animal unit and 2 from the livestock side."
- I think that there should be a permit for these animals, but I do believe it should be legal to own livestock as long as they can prove that they have the proper requirements to care of the animal.
- Less limitations are good, so long as owners are responsible.
- As long as the noise/smells aren't an issue to the neighbours it should be ok.
- I live in Bears paw and have raised chickens. They are clean, quiet and excellent for pest control
- Hens can be therapeutic to some people, with limits and cleanliness maintained
- Absolutely agree. I've had hens in my garden for a long time and they are fantastic!
- I always felt this bylaw to prohibit livestock and hens/chickens in the city was outdated. There are more and more people that would like to raise their own animals to better feed their families with home grown food.
- I think having access to urban livestock for the purposes of obtaining fresh, organic food should be an option to Calgarians.
- I think responsible animal husbandry should be encouraged.
- It is possible to have animals that do not fall in the typical pet category, ex support animals. There must be a limit however on the number allowed in ownership per household as well as size limit, this will help keep from having inappropriate pets that cannot do well in city out of households, such as a cow
- It's common sense
- sustainable food could help ease financial burden on lower income families. (Eggs)
- I think people being allowed to have hens is a great way for people to get back to understanding about food and animals.
- It would be a great way to increase people's ability to use local resources and foster community, especially in lower income areas
- Small livestock would not hard Calgary properties and allow people to have more locally sources food options.



- I think it would be fantastic for Calgarians to own their own chickens and get to experience fresh eggs for breakfast. My only concern would be if they are too loud (which I have no experience with, if this is the case) or not kept in a maintained environment that is morally appropriate for the livestock.
- As long as the animals have the proper housing and are properly taken care of, there is no concern for them in my neighbourhood.
- If everyone is okay with it and the animal will not be harmed I see no problem
- Hens would provide food and money to the cities poorest communities. They would be a great source of simple income while providing fresh eggs and meat.
- I think having chickens/other livestock within the city would be beneficial as long as appropriate and safe housing and care practices are mandatory
- I support having livestock in the city. I also strongly support the idea of training being mandatory for people who have dogs to limit any incidences.
- Grow your own food
- I think small livestock would be appropriate, but in terms of larger breeds it would be important to take into account the size of the property, proximity to neighbours, and the reasons for having such animals.
- safe environments for Any animal should be provided, no over crowding. complaints taken seriously.
- Fresh eggs!
- Chickens and other animals could help with food security for some agencies as well as families. As long as they can be cared for and are not a nuisance there shouldn't be an issue.
- Most people don't own other types of livestock just for [removed] and giggles, they would provide suitable living conditions.
- As long as there are no roosters. Absolutely no roosters.
- Chickens are fine. Don't let people have cows, horses, pigs, or any type or herd animal in their backyards.
- With restrictions around land size. Would not support on small inner city lots. Must have neighbours approval.
- Any and all animals should be allowed within the city.
- Yes, of course. This is a sustainable and environmentally friendly way to produce your own food.
- Engage the neighbors, and ensure clean and healthy animal standards
- I just think it's a great idea
- Helps to be more food-secure
- as long as the criteria above is followed, I see no harm in this.
- There should be a trail period, can have them for 3 months, if the neighbours have sufficient complaints with facts behind them then maybe they should not own hens. If no one complaints then don't think it hurts anyone....also they should have some sort of yard reinforcement, dogs and cats will be curious....
- why not
- More wildlife would be great!



- If people wish to have urban hens, then they should be able to have them, granted there are rules in place for this type of animal.
- The criteria look reasonable.
- There are some farm animals that are currently not allowed that could be accommodated - pygmy goats, Japanese piglets, weasels etc. At the same time, some order has to be done with respect to farms at the outskirts of the city. I think certain accommodations have to be made for them too
- The size/type of an animal might affect more than just the immediate neighbours, with noise and smell, especially since the houses in most neighbourhoods are so close together.
- Yes, if there is appropriate bylaws stating what, when, where and how the people within city limits are able to have them. Then yes. But the animals well being must be always in consideration.
- Sustainable living is important
- More goats and pigs please
- Allowing people to raise hens provides safe food and local options and it is more environmentally friendly.
- I think the idea of urban hens is fantastic. The idea of people being able to have secure food sources is a wonderful thought. If people clean up after them adequately, I don't think they would cause much pests to come to the area.
- Good for people experiencing food scarcity, responsibility for kids
- I think hens are a great pet and addition to our urban areas.
- Hens are great pets, will allow for people to get their own eggs, and ensure a more self-sufficient environment. I know people with dirtier children than most chickens.
- As long as the living conditions are good I don't see why people couldn't have those animals.
- The more people can make their own food the less strain on the whole food system.
- Owning hens or livestock in Calgary should be fine if the owners are responsible.
- Seems right to involve those around you in the decision to care for an animal that could be considered a nuisance to some.
- I think it is a good idea to allow livestock and hens. I don't see in what world it would be dangerous.
- As long as the living conditions are suitable, I see no issues with this.
- The number of neighbours to be consulted should correlate with the volume and smell of the animals involved (may impact more than just the adjacent houses). However, once a neighbour has agreed, that support should remain even if a new family moves in.
- But there needs to be vets in the urban area to support these new owners. Due to medication availability changes small chicken owners don't have the ability to get meds to treat problems. Hell you can't even get louse and mite powder anymore. Vets who treat commercial chickens can't treat private flocks. Yay the chicken mafia. And where are they getting their PID number so they can get disinfectant for their coops and vitamins for water that is so needed in this heat.
- Neighbouring houses should be in agreement with allowing the livestock to be held, if not, it should not pass
- I have no problem with this so long as the animals are properly cared for



- One of the biggest problems facing society today is a disconnection from our food. Urban agriculture such as laying hens should not only be allowed, but encouraged. It's a public health risk that we are so disconnected, leading to obesity and other cultural dilemmas.
- Yes yes yes!!!
- Why not?!
- "I would love to have backyard chickens, ducks and/or quail.
- I feel certain species of livestock can be adequately reared withing city likits, provided the owners are responsible.

- However i think it should be required to have a property/backyard of X size before you can obtain chickens or X size for q pet goat or pig. An apartment building is no environment for these animals"
- As long as all the above criteria would be met, I do not see why this is a reason to stop Calgarians in having alterative pets.
- I believe that if someone owns a home either in town or not. If you have a back yard you should be allowed to have a chicken coop, or dogs. Now if you wanted to have livestock you should be checked by the city for yard size depending on animal, and that they have a solid wood fence and have to comply with their neighbihrs that they yard doesn't smell like a livestock farm like once a month with gets reported to the city or something
- As long as it can be a safe home for the animal but noise and smells don't affect the neighbours
- If an animal will be cared for, it would be awesome for neighbours to provide eggs for their community, or goat milk or other animal by-products.
- Why can people not own whatever they would like as long as it is not on the specific not allowed animal list.
- I would love chickens!
- As long as the animals are safe and healthy - i think they can offer many benefits
- As long as the animals are well cared for, i dont see any problem with it.
- No roosters though
- Give people hens
- We have neighbours with hens and they are well kept, healthy, have a great environment, but I could see the importance of limiting numbers and ensuring the well-being of the animals especially with Calgary's unpredictable weather.
- Reviewing on a case by case basis enables the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer to determine whether the exception is warranted or not and will allow them to evaluate the likelihood of owner bylaw compliance. PLEASE NOTE: I do not support urban beekeeping under any circumstances, as bee sting allergies are common and often life-threatening. There is no way to keep bees contained on a property without destroying the entire purpose of keeping bees. Honeybee colonies should not be allowed within city limits at all.
- All animals should be treated with compassion



- I believe that most animals can be pets. As long as it's determined it won't be stressful for the pet to be in a smaller environment (backyard vs acreage) ex. A hen or two would be fine as long as they had the proper space/amenities and people would benefit from having fresh eggs.
- As long as the animals have suitable living conditions and everyone's okay with it, why not?
- Could have positive impact on community and it's members.
- I see no harm in having livestock on private property
- Urban chickens and pot belly pigs would be great!
- anyone should be able to have animals & gardens.
- no harm - only positive outcomes based on those criteria above.
- Urban hens should be allowed but the conditions needed must be regulated
- Urban hens are source of protein (eggs) for food Insecure individuals and acquaint youngsters with animal husbandry and where food comes from.
- As long as the animals have an appropriate environment for living and are not a nuisance to neighbours.
- Provided people license their animals they should be able to keep them within reason. Size/number of animals should be considered relative to property.
- there should be way more allowance for sustenance animals
- n/a
- As long as the animal is controlled and not a nuisance, there should be no problem.
- Keep them quiet, keep them clean
- Calgarians should be allowed to own animals considered livestock if they are able to meet certain standards/conditions to owning them
- We are in a time that has shown that hobbies and interactions with nature helps the physical, mental, and psychosocial part of humans lives. To allow for hens and things of this nature. We would be opening up another opportunity for people to live more fulfilling lives.
- Promotes people learning how to raise farm animals while also getting eggs.
- The criteria listed seem adequate, along with perhaps some restrictions based on area of the city, etc.
- I love chickens
- Yes as long as the person clearly has support from their neighbours
- People should learn to self sustain to some degree. Having the freedom of being able to have something like chickens within the city would be good for that.
- Eggs!
- Standards must be maintained. Similar to expectations we have with any animal.
- "Dogs and cats are no different then chickens and goats. No matter what way you look at it- there will
- Always be responsible owners and irresponsible owners. Any bylaw complaints should be dealt with accordingly ."



- I think that this is an excellent way for communities to both come together (in the case of neighbors benefiting from the eggs of another neighbor) and offers an added level of control over what we are consuming.
- I think it is good to source local animals and products. I have no issue with anyone wanting to raise hens as long as the neighbours are on board and as long as they are treated well
- I struggle with this due to the fact that it attracts wild predators to the area, but also support an individual's right to sustain their own food sources.
- In favour of chickens but not necessarily other livestock
- The owners should take proper precautions before setting up the urban animals (such as chickens or goats) with proper housing, shelter and feed/water, ensuring that they have proper medical care for the animals with yearly check up's and ensure that they won't disturb neighbours or the neighbourhood.
- But please, just chickens at this point
- If a person can show suitable conditions for livestock then of course they should be able to own what they like and provide for themselves.
- I support all of these proposed amendments relating to livestock. Specifically the areas relating to the space and cleanliness of the animals living quarters as well as the surrounding neighborhoods support.
- Many communities have been allowing hens in backyards for decades without issue. This pandemic has proven that citizens need more control over their own food security.
- urban chickens are a great way to ensure you are ethically obtaining eggs and meat rather than supporting inhumane conditions at factory farms
- A general set of base guidelines for eligibility should be used to first review the case, like size/weight, the food-production ability of the animal, and a proper waste disposal plan.
- ethical egg consumption
- Having local food sources is great for the environment
- As long as limits on noise, smell, and nuisance are upheld.
- If a person has reasonable space and chooses to raise animals, as long as they aren't a nuisance to neighbours- why not!
- Restrictions to small number of animals per household.
- As long as the live stock are not a nuisance, neighbours should not have a say in which animals are kept on a property
- Urban hens with the correct bylaw support could be a huge asset to communities, so long as cleaning/noise regulations are put in place and enforced.
- "I think there should be restrictions for herd/flock size per yard area within the city. There should be regulations related to waste and there will need to regulations for selling/giving away of product (e.g., tracking who you give eggs to so if there is a salmonella outbreak, the appropriate people can be informed) and fines for violating these regulations. I think people should have to take an online or in person course regarding flock or herd management before being given approval to have a



herd/flock, so that a bunch of people who think it is cool to have chickens and have no idea how to care for them don't lead to animal welfare issues.

- In terms of the pigeon question below, I think animal welfare specialists should be consulted and a minimum area per pigeon should be determined. Calgary has a wide range of single-detached home property sizes - for some I would say "
- hens are quiet and lovely animals. With proper pet care they are not as smelly as people think and can serve as a great experience for young families.
- I am a supporter of urban livestock as long as there are bylaws in place to make sure they are being properly cared for
- with the food shortage we almost experienced. If we can be more self-sufficient it is always best
- To discourage consumers supporting battery farmed hens and egg industry
- I think the key is support from the neighbours-noise, and smells from livestock will need to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
- As long as there were proper procedures in place to ensure that the owners were taking proper care of the animals and that was checked on regularly.
- I would appreciate being able to keep chickens in rural places for food production.
- I trust that you guys will be able to provide a good outline for what is okay and what isn't and living conditions of the animals (size of the enclosures or whatever).
- The neighbours must agree though. There shouldn't be a blanket acceptance of animals that will cause large amounts of noise or smell without consent from neighbours.
- As long as the livestock is not disrupting the neighbourhood, then it should be fine.
- If the animals are kept in clean and a safe place then I'm all for it.
- Allows for people to raise some of their own food and can help people understand where their food comes from.
- As long as the livestock has benefits to the owner and community I think it's a good idea
- The more self-sufficient we are, the better. As long as people properly maintain their coops, there's no reason they shouldn't be able to keep them.
- Sustainable living. We need to collectively be able to handle our own matters and require big business or big government to make all the decisions for us.
- As long as the hen has suitable living conditions I don't see why they can't be allowed
- I think it is a great idea if people can have urban hens and have fresh eggs from the hens as long as there are proper living conditions
- I think as long as there are no major disturbances there is no reason not to allow urban livestock.
- Livestock such as hens provide food it makes the city more sustainable
- it's great for people and animals
- I see no issue with allowing chickens or other animals as long as they are properly cared for. I think this would help people with self-sustainability along with helping the community.
- I do not see any harm posed by owning urban hens
- Yes if they are held to the same standard as domestic animals there shouldn't be a difference



- I think hens are a great idea
- doesn't phase me
- Livestock should be allowed provided the effects of housing them on neighbors are limited.
- I think this would be an awesome idea to allow people to connect to the earth in a more organic way. Animal husbandry can be very good for people's physical and mental health and be a very fulfilling hobby.
- Chickens can be kept in sanitary conditions and not be a nuisance with proper care. Families should be allowed to take part in providing for themselves and teach children about livestock and food origins
- I feel that if a household could prove to be a safe, humane, comfortable home for the livestock animals that this wouldn't be a problem.
- The main criteria should be support from neighbours and suitable living conditions. Remove officer discretion and community good. Being able to grow your own eggs and meat should be enough to justify it if everyone is happy.
- If properly cared for I think this should be allowed
- I have not heard a good argument from the city against Urban Hens. Yes, what the neighbours smell is a concern but could be managed by limiting numbers. Number of Hens allowed may need to consider property size, as well. Too many in a small
- Why not?
- As long as proper space and care can be provided, I fully support the possibility of allowing urban livestock.
- Great idea to allowed livestock within the city as long as they are appropriately cared for and kept.
- Within reason; i.e. reasonable distance from neighbouring homes.
- As long as there is a requirement for consent from neighbours. But I feel it should be a radius and not just the adjacent neighbours.
- Could assist with lower income areas, etc.
- Someone with enough land and a clean property should be able to own chickens, for example. But only Responsible people. Anyone who owns over one animal should be subjected to evaluations.
- Chickens would be excellent to have to ensure they are free range and well cared for
- we should be able to make better use of our yards and lawns as long as it doesn't disrupt the neighbourhood around us
- I'd love some chickens or at least the Porto have some
- Hens don't cause a lot of noise, give food to the owner, and can be good pets. I see no downside to allowing hens within the city so long as owners take care of them properly.
- If people are raising small livestock for food purposes or comfort is there legal right I think if supported properly it's okay
- As long as owners are being responsible for the noise, smell and well-being of the animals I believe people should have the freedom to own them.



- But only with a minimum lot size. No duplexes, row housing, condos, zero property lines etc. or any high density housing. Single family homes only with a minimum of a 900 sq foot back yard for hens only. No grazing animals like sheep, horses etc.
- Hens would be fine and suitable living. Bigger livestock like cows and horses should not be in the city without the acres needed to support them.
- Seems like a good idea
- There should be a minimum backyard size for hens to free range. Backyard hens should be treated as pets and not livestock.
- Chickens And similar animals cause no harm to anyone as long as they have suitable accommodations.
- I would like to see a requirement for a suitable veterinarian lined up as avian care is more difficult to source. I would also like for humane society to have permission to enter and check on any livestock when a complaint is received re: welfare of animals
- Yay Chickens!
- I support the bylaw so long as neighbours in the area have to agree to the animals being allowed
- If 'other livestock' included such wild animals such as, say, monkeys, large cats such as tigers, or any exotic type of animal, I am not in favour of this at all.
- Increasing self-sufficiency and supporting/eating local is something we can all do to lessen our impact on the environment, so yes, as long as the animals were not suffering or living in squalor, I would support freedom for my neighbours in the city to be able to raise animals.
- If they are cared for properly and safely, there is no reason not to.
- chickens are fine so long as the living space is adequate and cleaned properly to not cause sickness.
- I dont care what circus my neigh its have as long as they can comply with noise/smell/wandering pet bylaws.
- As long as the owner can care for the animals I am fine with this
- I would love to see urban hens allowed. Food management for eggs and compost are needed in our city. I'm not wanting a large flock, but to have 4-6 chickens would be lovely.
- Urban hens have worked in many other places and are a suitable addition.
- i think it's a good idea
- Yes to chickens and maybe goats but the line should be drawn at large mammals like cows or horses, unless they somehow have end land in the city to support that.
- Responsible owners of livestock can benefit the community.
- Stop taking pigs from little kids
- I want chickens
- Good opportunity for people to produce their own food/save money/be independent.
- Great learning opportunities and sustainable resources for the entire community!
- Suitable living conditions and proper disposal needs to be spelled out more clearly.
- I like the idea of more households becoming self sustaining, if possible.



- as long as the animal is taken care of and that they be monitored on an ongoing basis to prevent abuse to the animal.
- I would consider having hens within the city, however there must be strict requirements for veterinary attendance to prevent the spread of disease (i.e., avian influenza) between the domesticated animals and wild birds. Additionally strict control on their impact to natural wildlife due to spread of spores, bacteria or other pathogens via fomites (i.e., feces) would be of great concern for both avian and non-avian populations and raises a significant number of questions around biosecurity that would need to be addressed and investigated further.
- It would be important to me that the caveat is that the neighbours unanimously agree with the individual's request to have animals such as urban hens.
- Only two be allowed and for the eggs to be only for personal consumption and not for sale
- "Urban Hens are great! Lived beside someone who had some when I lived in a different city, and it was no problem.
- I see a problem providing suitable living conditions for some other animals in the city, but as long as the licensing fees cover city inspection of living conditions for the animals, I do not care."
- As long as there is support from neighbours, no animal cruelty, and good care from the owners of the livestock, there is nothing wrong with this.
- Sounds like fun and encourages us to be more concious of animals
- Specific livestock species must be considered and found reasonable before allowing them to live in the city
- As long as the people around you don't mind, and you take proper care of the animal I don't see any problem in keeping hens or any animal for good reasons.
- Provided there were oversight to ensure animals were being well cared for
- As long as the neighbours are welcome to the hens and the owners provide proper living conditions, there is no issue.
- Having the option for organic/home grown food options and/or pet benefit can be balanced through restrictions on quantity. I would want a permit/license to determine the suitability of these animals as it is important to consider the welfare of the community and the animal.
- There should be a limit of hens and livestock based in the size of the space available.
- Hens are great for the environment, and gardens. There should be a limit of how many you can have per sq ft.
- Chickens are great for the environment and especially poor soils in the city
- Let me have chickens!!!!!!!
- Urban hens are a great way to support the ethical consumption of eggs. I agree with the criteria that hens and other livestock should have suitable living conditions; however, requiring support from adjacent neighbours can create tricky situations and be a barrier to an otherwise positive experience.
- medium to small sized "livestock" should not be classified any differently than a cat or dog.



- I don't see a problem with hens in the city. I know of some who have had them and they haven't caused any problems. Also, I know that pigs can be used as service animals, but it should be on a case by case basis.
- This sounds like a reasonable approach.
- As long as care and living space is sufficient
- Urban farming is becoming a sustainable way for folks to save both money and carbon; allowing it within city limits is a great idea
- I'm fine with this. If someone wants to have farm animals in the city and in their home, let them. Not going to affect my life.
- I think owners should be required to pay a fee for an inspection of housing facilities by the City, similar to a building permit that ensures the animals are housed properly.
- Support from neighbours so you don't annoy them.
- If the person can provide sufficient care and shelter for livestock then it should be allowed.
- a goat or two on a property would allow for a natural means of maintaining the conditions of lawns
- If people can properly and safely take care of livestock without negatively impacting their neighbors, go for it.
- The cost of living and food is constantly increasing. If people want to grow or produce their own food that is absolutely their right. Food is a right, not a privilege. As long as the chickens are treated properly, and it's not a complete nuisance to neighbours, and their enclosures are well cleaned and maintained, there is zero reason why people should be barred from providing food for their family.
- I think that as long as there is support from adjacent neighbours and not excess noise then individuals should be allowed to have urban hens and/or other urban livestock on their property.
- It is important that people are able to raise and choose their own food sources.
- I agree with allowing only laying hens within Calgary as long as the living conditions are suitable and they are not used for their meat.
- Yes, if they aren't a bother to neighbours.
- If people have the proper set up, I don't see the problem in owning and caring for hens. I think it's a good move towards more urban farming
- As long as the neighbours are ok with it and smells are kept to a minimum for the neighbours then it would be acceptable.
- Don't see why not, as long as it doesn't disturb the neighbours and fecal matter can be properly taken care of
- chickens are beneficial to urban gardeners as pest control
- As long as this is done properly it shouldn't affect anyone in a negative way.
- Proper care of the animals and how they live
- Having animals would reduce the household's carbon footprint and improve quality of life. Less dependency on stores.
- Great source for fresh food. Long as they are kept in good health and are well taken care of
- People should be allowed to make use of their property to generate food or goods.



- As the cost of food is going up if a livestock animal can be safely raised on a private residence then there should be no issue.
- Would be nice to allow chickens to be kept in city limits
- I believe that urban domestic agriculture should be allowed, but must be done responsibly, and with respect for neighbouring properties. (Proper husbandry and hygiene).
- The term livestock is limiting. Animals such as hens or pigs can be excellent pets.
- Criteria seems reasonable.
- Hens should not provide noise issues to neighbors. Roosters will. Proper education regarding care and maintenance is necessary, however. That way, odors would not become problematic.
- Would allow for great community feeding programs, educational for kids too, they would love it
- If there is buy in from neighbours, and the animals are well cared for this should be sufficient. If the owner goes beyond the neighborhood, then it can be a bigger issue.
- As we move more towards community gardening and personal gardens, having a few chickens to help maintain and contribute to the ecosystem would be a nice option
- Food sustainability is an important issue and this could alleviate food scarcity for families in need.
- There would have to be strict conditions met to be granted an exemption, such as minimum space requirements, grazing area, etc. Would also be subject to random inspections by bylaw.
- Suitable living conditions are a must when housing livestock, i'd remove the necessity for community improvement though.
- SA long as people are responsible for their animals and are respectful of their neighbors, they should be able to have a few hens on their property.
- As long as there are standards put in place and animals are well cared for
- I think offering sustainable food options on our properties should be encouraged.
- The conditions of approval from neighbour, suitable living conditions, and case by case assessment are good ideas.
- Sustainability is key.
- What's wrong with hens? They help with sustainability. You should ensure that each person who decides to get hens is taking a course to receive some sort of certification - like a fishing or firearms license.
- Hens, when well taken care of offer a great many benefits. With good animal husbandry practices, they are not a nuisance animal.
- Alternative animals are an eco conscious option.
- I dont see a issue with having other live stock on people's own property
- As long as it's a suitable living condition
- People should be allowed to have other types of animals on their property. Adjacent neighbours should only have so much impact on what an individual does or has in their yard.
- Hens and goats would be great!
- I support urban livestock provided their living conditions are appropriate.
- If the animal can have good quality of life I support it.



- This is a simple yes or no question. But please, let us have hens.
- If the hens are well cared for, then there shouldn't be an issue with people raising them.
- People care take for their animals in all different ways. Case by case would be the best case
- As long as there is responsible owners - this can be allowed. Sufficient cleanup as well should be part of this phase 1 engagement
- While allowing community members to own and keep certain livestock on their private property could prove beneficial for some people and the overall treatment of the animal, certain considerations should be taken to ensure that the keeping of these animals does not create a nuisance for the overall quality of life in the community. Steps should be taken to ensure the animals have adequate space and not subjected to unnecessary stress from urban living.
- Hens are amazing
- If one of my neighbors wants to have hens and they can provide a safe enclosure for them, who am I to stop them
- This is very important for food security (eggs) and sustainability. It needs to be permitted and regulated or people will just start doing anyway. They are good for bugs too.
- Hens are technically not a dirty animal and as long as the owners keep on top of their living conditions, I would be in favor of this.
- I want chickens.
- As long as all fencing is secure from other animals/predators ex. Coyotes. Limit the # of livestock per household. Odour/feces management
- as long as animal manure does not contaminate the water or surrounding properties. Noise from animals would also have to be kept to a minimum.
- I support this initiate as it helps to add biodiversity to the urban centre
- I think that it can be expanded, but must be done so carefully with conditions depending on what kind of animals are allowed.
- There are lots of animals that can be kept as pets which currently are not allowed due to the current restrictions. As an example, miniature pot-bellied pigs can make a great pet but are currently restricted under Calgary by-laws. An animal of this nature would cause less of an impact and would be less of a nuisance than chickens and therefore I feel as though all animals would need to be considered without the bias if chickens are now allowed. The other consideration is the impact chickens would have on natural Calgary wildlife like bobcats and coyotes. Chicken coops would attract these animals and could lead to a higher number of incidents in populated communities.
- As long as all areas are looked at. The owners maintain suitable quarters and keep clean so that neighbors are not disturbed.
- Hens could be a reasonable addition to pet life in Calgary, under controlled conditions.
- I would like to have three backyard ducks for their eggs. They are charming creatures and I love the sound of their laughter. Any animal should be licensed though, and the license fee should not be high nor be waived for low-income. Having an animal is expensive - if a license fee is a barrier, the animal will not get proper vet care during its life.



- If the property has a big backyard and is suited for a chicken coop then allow it; as long as they maintain it.
- My only concern is animal welfare for the hens. Are there suitable living conditions in the city for hens?
- I like the idea of urban livestock improving access to locally produced food. I would like the City to take it slow though to ensure that any failed types of livestock can be appropriately rehomed.
- what additional criteria is required, such as size of private property lot, number of animals allowed, noise control
- Urban hens and other livestock are great for sustainability. Plus people should be involved in food processes, education is key. Further, they just make great pets and why should the city stand in the way of a responsible pet owner who can provide the conditions needed for an enriched life for chickens and other livestock!
- K
- options for food production on a small family basis
- Would be nice to be able to have your own livestock IN city as long as appropriate land is provided.
- There are animals that should be aloud ie chickens and pot bellied pigs even goats should be considered for lawn care on larger properties
- I want eggs and a pet chicken.
- I support a balanced approach to allow hens while ensuring large disturbances are not caused
- Would love to be able to have chickens within the city, this is a great amendment. We need to support urban farming to create a more sustainable food system. COVID just reinforced how much risk there is with our dependancy on large-scale farm systems and imported food.
- Chickens are not overly aggressive animals, and they provide a service to the humans that own them. As long as coops are kept clean and warm I am in favor
- As long as the animals needs can be met and there is support from neighbors I to k this is a great idea.
- I believe backyard chickens and other small livestock should be allowed within reason and as long as living conditions are acceptable.
- I wish to own hens on my property so I can have my own eggs. I believe these, and other livestock if cared for Properly, are acceptable within the city.
- I think done correctly it could be beneficial to our city
- I agree with urban hens if they have suitable living conditions and neighbours are agreeable. I'm not sure what other kind of 'livestock' could live happily in an urban setting.
- If exceptions would be evaluated on a case by case basis.. For chickens.. Why would you not do the same for dogs? Just going to lump all dogs that look alike into one group and label them dangerous? When chickens are loud and smelly and carry diseases. Smarten up.
- Depending on the noise (and possible smell?), they may not be any worse than the dogs that are already in the neighbourhoods.
- Provided neighbours are on board
- Small livestock is feasible and beneficial!



- I think no more than 3-4 at most
- This is an excellent idea. As long as people take care of the animals and keep the property safe, this is an enriching hobby that would likely reduce stress and help the mental health of citizens.
- Animals are sentient beings. What one considers livestock could be deemed a family pet.
- Hens are wonderful alternatives for birdkeeping that are domesticated and are much better than parrots. They also are wonderful for helping maintain an engaged and healthy yard.
- This allows for a fair resolution
- Strong YES!!!! Food sustainability and training / education for children makes this a most critical change that would bring Calgary in line with other jurisdictions.
- More and more urban micro culture and personal food security are things we will need to consider as ways to deal with environmental, community, and economic factors changing in the future. This is a good first step.
- More ethical eggs for everyone!
- I like chickens
- Sustainable and make good pets
- Only if approved by neighbours and bylaw. Don't want a free-for-all.
- I love all animals living in the city as long as they're not bothersome in anyway.
- Every case is different but there should always be proper suitable living conditions
- Since everyone is started to urban garden and other neighbouring communities are slowing chickens for the purpose of eggs and meat, due to covid, I beleive this has merit.
- As long as all parties involved are cared for, there should be no reason to ban ownership of hens on your land.
- As long as the animals are living in good conditions and are being treated well.
- i dont see why its a problem , if people are being appropriate there should be nothing wrong with having livestock in city
- As long as the neighbours are okay with it (some animals are noisier than others). I don't see an issue, they can provide eggs, milk, ect.
- Great idea! Make sure there's a limit - 2 or 3?
- If they own the property and are able to provide proper life habitats and have the room, they should be able to provide themselves the animals of choice to feed their families as they choose on their property only
- livestock can be extremely beneficial in the city when properly handled
- people should be allowed to own livestock as long as they follow guidelines
- I think urban hens would be a nice idea, provided slaughtering them was illegal
- Rules and regulations are being met, and the safety of the animal is being acquired.
- I want to support my family with eggs
- As long as the livestock are in appropriately sized and properly maintained, clean enclosures, I personally don't really care what other people keep.
- Should confirm that the pets won't escape the backyard.



- I support urban chickens
- Chickens should be allowed
- A pet is a pet. As long as adhere to laws and take care of animal who are we to judge what someone wants as pet
- As long as the animals can have a safe and comfortable living situation and it's not affecting everyone around them. (with smell of poop etc.)
- I think this is an important ownership opportunity for people who could do it responsibly.
- As long as the animals are taken care of and noise/smell doesn't become an issue, have at it.
- Yes, but if the livestock becomes a nuisance the neighbors should have the legal right to appeal the livestock on property.
- Most major cities are now allowing people to have small farm animals
- As long as they make sure it's alright with everyone I see no problem. Lots of people are growing/producing their own food. Let them.
- I think having animals/live stock in city limits is a great way to enrich the community.
- I think this is a great idea. but neighbors should also have to agree.
- In some parts of Calgary, goats are used to get rid of vegetation already. If the neighbours are ok with it, why not have hens and/or goats, if you are properly taking care of them and they are not wandering around.
- Pot bellied pigs are excellent city pets- less of a nuisance than dogs and cats (which I own. I don't want a pig but prohibiting them makes no sense)
- I have wanted urban chickens for many years. I think as a responsible pet owner, having a food sourced pet would be great. I know of places that limit how many birds, to 2 or 3 and they have to be licensed like you would a cat or dog and you must register to own urban chickens. I think for those who know how to be responsible for animals, this would be a suitable option.
- N
- I think as long as the animals are cared for correctly there should be no issues!
- As long as they are small livestock animals yes. Sheep, goats etc.
- If kept responsibly, these animals are a huge benefit. Rules do need to be in place to ensure balance.
- Must have home owner approval and suitable space property and not be a nuisance to neighbors
- YES!!!
- Community benefit, positive impact, and support from adjacent neighbors is key here. Also type of livestock - I would support something like a goat or sheep but not a herd of cattle for example.
- As long as you take care of the animal, it's fine.
- I would like more people to be able to have hens in Calgary.
- Quiet, non nuisance or smelly animals shouldn't be an issue
- "I was thinking chickens for eggs not pigeons. A mandatory education class to be taken on care of chickens and how to spot disease must be taken before issuing a permit to have chickens.



- In an urban yard 1-5 chickens would be taking into consideration the space 1 bird would need vs how much space you have."
- Depending on what animal and how responsible the owners I would. Its all on people though, just like cats/dogs you can be a great responsible owner/neighbor or you can be terrible. I'm ok with it on a case by case as long as they are held to a certain standard
- I could see some people wanting to get their own eggs, instead of store bought, or other things with livestock.
- The more people can grow their own food and be self sustainable the better.
- If it is not bothering the Neighbor's, then it wouldn't be a problem. We should be able to have livestock if cared for properly.
- I do not mind chicken at all.
- Adjacent neighbour support should be like Development Permits -- notice put out and ability to respond instead of requiring actual approval. Approval can't be withdrawn (assuming all other conditions are being met) once animals in place or we have a dumping problem.
- Hens should be allowed in calgary. I want eggs.
- Approval of other livestock would be supported
- If the animals are being taken care of properly I do not see why they can not have them.
- I think everyone should be allowed to raise food to feed their families. Hens if properly cared for are not even a nuisance.
- I would like to see more goats mowing lawns.
- When done properly, it is likely a benefit. That said chickens smell atrocious. I'd hope that your involvement would weed out the bad people.
- Providing neighbours agree and they do not become a nuisance
- No issue
- I have lived next door to hens and never been disturbed by them
- This is a fantastic idea, as long as the animals are kept in safe and humane conditions!
- I believe people should be free to do as they please as long as it doesn't affect anyone else.
- There are conventional pets that are more disruptive than people raising simple livestock ie barking dogs
- As long as the regulations are clear and enforceable
- I like hens
- Need strict rules if animals become a mucin even including smells the animal should be easy to remove, also rules for where the livestock is allowed off premis and rules for picking up after them
- I believe that community livestock if managed appropriately would be a valuable asset to community engagement, cultural roots and the overall well-being of calgarians
- Hens and no roosters!
- It will be good for the animals
- as long as it is kept clean and healthy for people and animals.



- I am very interested in using goats and sheep as a means to cut down in lawn mowing in certain areas.
- Free country.
- With education foremost on proper husbandry, and clear and concise laws easily understandable to the public
- I think case by case must be looked at because it would work in some locations but not others
- Yes
- So long as neighbours are still able to peacefully enjoy their own premises, I believe allowing urban hens would benefit many people greatly. It would reduce the need for hens in factory farms, which have a significant environmental impact.
- So long as it is a safe environment for animals and owners/surrounding people
- they should be kept on private property but I don't see any harm in owning urban hens or other livestock
- Let people own chickens
- As long as the animals were cared for appropriately and not a nuisance to neighbors (ex, by infringing on their property etc).
- I think people having their own live stock can help families with lower income and help calgarians be more "green"
- Absolutely! With our economic downturn having access to eggs provided by loving family animals is an awesome way to ensure families can eat. The cost of keeping hens is significantly less than owning a dog. A 50lb bag of feed is \$14. A 50lb bag of typical dog food is \$50 and up.
- Chickens are not a nuisance to anyone
- Hens are a sustainable alternative to factory farming for eggs! I'm all for this as long as the neighbours approve and hens are treated properly.
- So long as the animals are properly taken care of, I do not see a problem as to why they would not be allowed.
- As long as the animal is not a nuisance and can receive proper breed specific care above just food and water then I am open to different animals being owned in a humane and responsible way.
- There does need to be consideration for limiting numbers
- Involving other livestock In the bylaw would be beneficial to our community as long as the criteria is met and brings no harm to neighbors
- The people have the right to provide sustainable food for themselves
- I agree
- Hens are not quiet animals and having the support of the neighbors helps keep everyone happy.
- As long as the livestock is not a nuisance.
- I think it's very good to make sure all the animals have a proper home and living conditions. Why does that need to be explained LOL
- Eggs good



- I think keeping animals such as hens can have a huge positive impact on the community. It teaches people the importance of livestock and where we get some of our important ingredients from.
- if these questions are answered: Will there option to reevaluate or reassess if the conditions are not being met or if there are issues. How are changes in adjacent neighbours going to be managed? Will some areas/types of dwellings be deemed unsuitable ie. townhouse or very small/close proximity backyards?
- Chickens and other birds in small numbers are not a problem and give some self-sufficiency.
- I believe small farm animals should be allowed on private property.
- I don't see a problem with it
- So you want to ban pitbulls, yet let people have hens? Makes no sense? Lol
- I think having livestock could benefit the community as long as yards and homes support it.
- As long as quality of life for the animals is actually being observed and enforced by the city ppl should be allowed if the space they have or have provided for the care of the animals is at a level of quality of life for them is acceptable
- Given that owners of livestock will be responsible, these bylaws make sense
- Like hens, I think other livestock can be harmoniously introduced into the urban environment. The criteria seem very reasonable and the benefit to communities through increased interaction with livestock is large.
- Small livestock animals don't cause disturbances if cared for properly. No more than a dog or cat. If neighbours are OK with it, I see no problems.
- If neighbours agree and the animals have the correct housing/enrichment then people should be able to have livestock
- Hens are relatively quiet and friendly, I have no problems with them.
- As long as they are being cared for and housed appropriately in something they cannot get out of, I fully support having livestock in the city as they provide food and as a result there is the potential for people to make money from that.
- When I lived in BC my landlady had chickens, built a sustainable coop and the sounds were minimal.
- If there's enough space for the animal to live happily and healthily then I don't see a problem as long as the appropriate enclosures are in place to avoid the animal escaping.
- They're just chickens!
- If it is safe for the animals and the humans in the surrounding areas, then I don't see an issue with it.
- People should be allowed to have chickens on their own property providing they dont bother the neighbors with noise, smell etc
- Livestock, bees, etc are great for the community spirit, flora diversity, soil health, and they encourage people to garden and do small farming activities. It is healthy and educational.
- if you have the space and resources to raise livestock on your property, then i dont see the harm in it, as long as it is not a noise, health or safety risk.
- As long as hens are cared for correctly this would benefit the community, no roosters
- There would have to be restrictions (ie type/size etc) and support from ALL adjacent neighbors



- with a permit anyone should be able to have livestock if criteria is met
- As long as it can be done in a safe and clean manner I see no issue with this. I do not think I would support large livestock except for in more rural areas of the city
- Very fair
- As long as general decency and other calgary bylaws are followed
- Within reason. I do not support letting cows or larger animals being allowed in residential. Neighbours must be involved in the approval process just like they have to be contacted when building an in law suite on top of your garage
- Turk
- Yes, but I do believe there should be limits on the number of animals (or beehives) on a property.
- Hens are great for keeping pests down and they support a healthy and local economy.
- If they are taken care of properly and not being a nuisance why not.
- Livestock has a positive impact on a community
- If the owner meets requirements for safe keeping of the animal and then neighbours don't mind, then it should not be an issue.
- I support allowing goats, pot-bellied pigs, ducks, turkeys and chickens in the city if they are kept as pets and not raised for consumption, and if minimum space requirements are established
- As long as there is accountability for the owners to ensure the animals safety and well-being and they are able to provide for them.
- Ppl who have hens can have fresh eggs and the chicken can be used as food
- I don't see the harm in this as long as the person isn't breeding animals for commercial purposes
- I fully support hens and other small livestock for personal pets/use. (example: eggs)
- Must have a minimum yard space and enclosure size per hen. Example 100sq/feet per hen
- Chickens are a useful animal when it comes to supper.
- If people want to raise chickens in their yard for their own food so be it
- Some livestock could benefit a small community. Preferably not raised to slaughter
- Chickens are great
- Sustainable local food production is positive when done well
- As long as there is no issue with neighbours, residents should be allowed to own and raise small livestock like hens - not, for example, a cow or horse
- I agree with the amendment. I think communities will need clear guidelines and rules for something like this to work and be beneficial
- I feel like neighbours should have a say as well.
- We should be allowed to have chickens. Calgary has been ridiculously behind the times on allowing in yard coops.
- As long as all the criteria are followed I see no issue with livestock within city limits.
- My aunt lives in another city, with hens and she loves them
- Everybody should have the option to raise there own food if they so wish.
- I would like to see more Calgarians taking initiative to put in hard work and effort to care for animals.



- As long as they are well taken care of and have enough room to roam and be comfortable yes !
- As long as they have the proper care
- Fair treatment of animals as well as respect for neighbours is important.
- Having urban hens is good for the environment; less carbon footprint and its healthy source of natural protein (eggs and meat).
- I've lived in countrys where chickens and goats are part of the community. I hit used to it and I like the idea.
- I think that so long as the approval of neighbours is given (eg. to prevent disturbances, etc) urban hens are a great idea for access to fresh eggs.
- Community benefit should not have an impact. Hens are quiet and pleasant animals and should absolutely be allowed.
- Having chickens is awesome
- If it doesn't have a negative impact on the community then people should be allowed to own livestock.
- Some small amounts of chickens would be okay. Big animals no and owners must keep premises clean or they get fined or lose their right.
- I think that Urban livestock is a great use of space, but can be unfair if the neighbours are unaware of a homeowner wanting to bring it on to their property.
- Animal safety and welfare is of the utmost importance
- As long as someone is treating the hens properly and they are being cared for, I don't see why they can't be in the city
- I believe if someone can take care of a pet. And they truly want one. They should be able to get it and provide a happy life for a pet they love.
- As long as the animal can be well taken care of and has enough space and resources to live a healthy and happy life!
- I'm not sure what other animals are being considered, but urban hens are worth a try. (I've always wanted an alpaca, are they on the list?!!)
- As long as theirs measures in place to ensure the animals are kept safe and have suitable living conditions during winter months.
- we shouldn't need some law to allow us to feed ourselves however pest control may be an issue worth addressing at a bi-law level
- I think having hens is not a big deal. They provide food for a family
- Conceptually, I support this. The problem is that there is always someone who is irresponsible, makes life miserable for their neighbours, and ruins the opportunity for responsible individuals to have urban hens or other appropriate livestock in the city.
- Yes only if people couldn't get around the system. Example: having a large animal restricted inside or in too small of a pen, not cleaning it frequently, etc. I think anyone who is approved for this should also have a 3 month review EVERY 3 months or so to make sure they are still taking care of the animal and that the animal is in a healthy happy condition. Because people tend to get bored of taking care of there animals....



- As long as the care requirements are being met, I believe that urban hens should be acceptable.
- As long as it isn't a problem for others in the area and the animals needs are met I don't see a problem.
- Food is food
- I think that urban hens would be a great addition to any neighbourhood!
- na
- As long as it's looked at as unique cases, that it involves neighbors opinions and acceptable living conditions are provided, I see no reason to restrict some animals considered "livestock."
- If people want to live in the city and become self sustainable. Then they should be able to, however I feel as there should be designated areas in the city for those who don't want to be woken up by chickens.
- Sounds great as described! Hens in particular would be great.
- If neighbors support the application.
- I think we should be allowed to have liver stock such as Hens as long we they are looked after and provided for properly.
- Living in victoria many people had hens and I think it added to the community spirit.
- It ensures that people are not abusing this bylaw
- If the owner is qualified to take care of the livestock appropriately-maintaining it's quality of life in city limits and is respectful of those around them I see no issue. How ever it could be a one strike policy-break one rule and warning next time policy is broken then the animal cannot stay in those conditions.
- As long as the animals can have an appropriate home and care then I don't see this as a problem.
- As long as the above apply.
- As long as adequate living conditions are maintained for the animals, there's no issue with allowing hens within the city.
- As long as they are well kept, chickens are wonderful
- Hey if people can farm responsibly and can't self sustain themselves then go for it. Just don't be a jerk.
- I think people should be allowed to have a reasonable amount of animals as long as it doesn't disturb the neighbours
- Hens are an easy way for a community to supply themselves eggs and become more self sufficient
- I do support this, however, the owners of such animals need to maintain cleanliness, noise factors that do not disturb the neighbours
- Support from adjacent neighbors is very important.
- I love fresh eggs and as long as the neighbours dont mind, it should be okay
- Certain livestock could have a very positive impact, if done right.
- As long as they are taken care of properly this would not be a problem
- You should definitely be allowed hens.
- Good



- Neighbour complaints should be taken into account for any application. Proper cleaning and maintenance is a requirement for keeping hens. No one should be allowed to raise pigeons, they cause far too much damage to neighbouring properties. We have had visiting pigeons during the fall-spring feeding from our bird feeders and all they do is shit all over the place.
- This helps support sustainable living
- But only if they were closely monitored and approved, we have enough poorly treated and neglected animals around let's not add to that. Please.
- People should be able to have livestock for the purpose of food production. Creates self reliance and potential for a community or group to rely on each other for food.
- Livestock should have suitable living conditions and should not be a nuisance to neighbors
- I support the proper husbandry of a small number of Hens but not other animals. Most livestock require significantly more space for their welfare than any single yard within the city limits can provide.
- I would support if Permit needed to be pulled for livestock, to approve proper Accommodations, also permit needs renewed every 5years and to be post where public can see what is allowed for that residence
- Only if neighbours opinion is heavily weighted in the decision (e.g. the applicant must address neighbours concerns or application is denied). Often approval gets given for things with complete disregard for neighbours' concerns.
- Support from adjacent neighbours is most important.
- I see no harm in allowing hens or other livestock where there is space and care for them available.
- "No
- Roosters Urban hens rock!"
- But there needs to be a way to ensure welfare standards are being met for the type of animal. and I would say no large animals, like a cow or horse or large pig
- The fact that urban chickens are illegal is embarrassing and reminds me of the illegality of rain water. You are literally forcing people to waste money
- Makes sense.
- So long as owners are responsible and respectful of their neighbours, I do not feel that livestock, particularly urban hens, within city limits would be an issue.
- We must stop trying to take things away from one another, but support each other. Laying hens can teach children lots on the circle of life and where things come from and how to love and care for things.
- Individuals must pass a test of some sort showing they know how to care for the animal, have the proper means to care for the animals, track how many animals the owners have and reviews on the facilities to check they stay in order
- as long as rules and regulations are followed i don't see why not
- every situation is unique and needs to be taken care of with facts in mind.
- The city can reasonably allow livestock such as hens, ect
- chickens are cool, my grandpa had pigeons so



- I want eggs!!!
- .
- You should be allowed any pet you desire as long as you can provide and take care of the animals.
- I think some urban livestock (that can live comfortably in smaller quarters) are a great idea
- I believe people should be allowed to have animals that they wish to have (with the exception of exotics)
- Goats have a profound impact on weed control.
- I want to be able to keep hens in my backyard
- People want a cheaper alternative to what is out there in grocery stores, and with COVID - people not wanting to be in stores
- I think it is great to support people having animals. I think its beneficial and many people already have them so it might as well be allowed so long as it's not too loud or smelly. However, I think there should be rules to support proper training for someone to have these animals such as how to ethically put down the animal, how to ethically collect eggs or other by products, and how to ethically house them.
- If monitoring and neighbours are okay it's okay. Noise and odour are my 2 concernc
- Why not? Lots of livestock are capable of living in urban environments providing their needs are being met for food, space, and cleanliness.
- I feel this would be dependent on the type of livestock
- I want chickens
- More criteria to better evaluate feasibility is great
- Allow chickens!
- As long as the owners are responsible and keep the animal area clean, I have no issues.
- if the livestock was for person use and didn't turn into a farming production for profit
- As long as they don't become a nuisance, why not.
- I have no issue with farm animals as long as they abide by noise and smell bylaws
- Potbellied pigs should be allowed
- We need to have more sustainable, local resources in Calgary.
- Farm animals can be kept safely inside city limits.
- Livestock in the city should be regulated to ensure proper care and housing for the animals.
- Small scale urban farming, assuming it's a healthy situation for the animals and people around them, could be a great way to produce food and cut down on reliance on factory farming
- Sustainable living and natural personal food source. Healthier then store bought too. Could help feeding low income families
- Love this idea
- But only if the animals won't I truly the neighbours with noise or smell
- As long as there are stringent guidelines that are heavily enforced
- People should be allowed to have chickens and pigs up to a certain amount
- As long as they are well kept and cared for I have no issue



- Depending on the definition of "livestock"- is someone going to be keeping pigs in their yard? Cows? Sheep? There would have to be a way to deal with the animal waste, and it would have to be extensively monitored- I wouldn't want any runoff getting into my yard, or into the river system, when it rains.
- Consideration order community first, health and wellbeing of the livestock second and lastly the owner.
- Pigs and chickens are able to live comfortable in homes as long as their needs are met.
- Urban livestock can have a positive impact on persons.
- The addition of other small livestock animals could enrich communities by providing educational opportunities and reducing food costs for some.
- as long as the living conditions of the hens is sanitary, and they have the right amount of room to roam
- As long as people treat their animals right. I don't see a problem with having unusual animals in the city
- Seems reasonable
- If you are following all the rules I encourage hens at homes
- Size of the property and proximity to neighbors should be taken into consideration
- I see no reason why chickens or other small livestock can't be in the city if the premises are clean and sufficient for the livestock.
- Fresh eggs would be amazing. As long as the owner is responsible and clean.
- A fantastic way to shorten local supply chains for eggs, repurpose kitchen scraps as food, and ensure humane treatment
- It will help Calgaryans provide for their families themselves
- Sure, why not; people should be allowed to choose what they own as long as they are responsible and do not infringe on others.
- As long as it is achieved humanely, and the animal does not cause a nuisance. People should have the option to provide for themselves
- I think it would be great to have urban farming again!
- Self sufficiency and sustainability are important for urban dwellers too! And hens (and other livestock) can be raised without causing issues for neighbours if done responsibly.
- No roosters should be aloud as the crowing at all hours of the day would be super annoying.
- I love the idea of urban chickens and find it ridiculous that they are not allowed.
- Stringent measures must be taken to limit the amount of livestock allowed in urban areas. Livestock animal dwellings are loud, smell bad, and have lots of bio-waste. Efforts should be taken to limit these activities to community co-ops or non-profits as opposed to commercial operations
- As long as there are regulations for care of the hens and noise regulations.
- Airdrie has done it and the program has gone well
- Ruralization if our urban cities can increase efficiency, decrease carbon emissions via less need for large shipments every week to grocery stores.



- I think support from adjacent neighbours would be the most critical point in approving livestock.
- I think the criteria is fair - support from adjacent neighbors is reasonable.
- Hens give us eggs, move forward to a self-sustaining household
- Hens provide eggs, it's better getting fresh eggs than from the store.
- Chickens should be included as livestock and if people want to raise their own for eggs or meat, they should be able to as long as certain requirements are met (appropriate husbandry and veterinary care etc.)
- I like eggs
- The right to have livestock for personal use should always be upheld.
- As long as the person has enough room and experience with livestock it should be fine
- Let people have some freedom.
- I support livestock being kept in backyards as long as they are not a nuisance and they are maintained. This means the pens etc are kept clean and there is no overwhelming smell.
- As long as people are following rules with hens
- Yes we should have the right to have our own hens within reason and without the destruction or disturbances to neighbors or their properties
- Allowing the public to have access and take care of a wider variety of animals is a great thing. But the rules would need to be followed in order to allow the animal to have a healthy lifestyle and no one is able to be hurt.
- I have seen urban hens work wonderfully in other cities. It is part of growing your own food.
- As long as owners can accommodate and be responsible, they should have the choice
- I can't see how this would affect me in anyway so why would I be against it.
- All about responsible owners.
- Should be able to supply your own household with fresh eggs and other small livestock the same as if you were on a farm
- Hens are a good and cheap source of meat and eggs
- As long as the area is kept clean and is respectful, it should be fine. No roosters in town though.
- Animals such as small goats and chickens can provide emotional support for people and I would support those. I do NOT support the owning of bees in anything but a rural area as bees can disturb and cause harm to others that are allergic to stings..some having anaphylactic reactions. It is NOT acceptable to potentially cause harm or death to others including allergic children with the owning of bees.
- As long as conditions are safe, clean, and not harmful to neighbours it should not be an issue!
- Family is family, human, cat, dog, hen, goat.. who cares if it's being cared for properly?
- If they meet a certain criteria put in place so the animal is happy, yes
- I'm all for responsible, sustainable urban livestock.
- People should be allowed to own whatever they want as pets, within reason. Exotic cats and endangered species, or Exotic reptiles should have some sort of licensing.



- It would help naturally control nuisance bugs and rodents in gardens and allow for healthier lifestyles for many Calgarians
- I've wanted fresh eggs forever. Would seriously look into having them if it was an option. Cleanliness would have to be heavily enforced
- Urban agriculture is a good way to educate consumers about where their food comes from, as well as encourages more involvement and engagement in the agriculture industry.
- Sustainable living for people who are trying to have a smaller impact on the planet.
- I believe that measured urban livestock keeping is valuable. It assists economically, and teaches us urban dwellers about our food and caring for animals other than domestic pets. Knowledge is valuable and, most especially, teaching children the value of keeping animals and how our food supply chain functions.
- why not
- I grew up in the country. Having animals is fun for kids, good for humans. I think the animals should provide a purpose. like eggs, honey or something. Pigeons as an example - provide no value in the sense of sustainable food sources and just make noises and carry disease. We have phones now. People want a pigeon, keep it indoors.
- I believe there wouldnt be much issues to this.
- If they are being taken care of and are not causing any sort of problem I don't see the issue.
- I like cows.
- I support ethical and humane options for the care of livestock
- I want a chicken
- Under the circumstances that livestock is given an appropriate environment suitable to its needs, passing a bylaw that allows livestock within the city would be beneficial to some people
- With increasing societal changes/global warming/global instability, allowing people to raise chickens (for eggs and food) on their own property or other animals (I STRONGLY support allowing people to keep pigs as support animals) makes increasing sense. If their animals are treated humanly, and secured on their property, I have no issue with this.
- Within reason and adequate limits in city
- I hesitate to include the portion: Offers community benefit/ will have positive impact and Support from adjacent neighbors, as if its your property, the community doesn't need to be engaged with it. It's silly to think the quality of life of a neighbor would be severely affected and limited if their neighbors had chickens.
- As long as there's no horrible smells for neighbours and animals are healthy and have a safe environment
- As long as the livestock is well cared for.
- I want chickens
- Under case by case basis people should be allowed to have support animals provided they don't cause a disturbance to the community
- It's a long time coming
- Some people like other times of animals.



- Strongly in favour of needing neighbours approval for keeping livestock.
- I think it's great
- People feed pigeons and have them around their houses all the time so whats the difference if its a chicken
- The case by case evaluation will allow the city to determine if individuals and the property are suitable.
- My main concern is the care of the animals and their living conditions. Suitable doesn't mean optimal. Allowing the decision to be at the discretion of one individual is not wise - having a list of very specific requirements to say yes or no to would be better.
- Livestock have the capability to become an individuals companion. It isnt just dogs or cat. All animals should be welcome as long as they are being taken care of and not being neglected then there shouldnt be a problem.
- Based on location, property size, community and owner experience. Smell and sound need to be controlled and effecting managed.
- Emphasis should be placed on noise and waste disposal (including odours that can easily waft across properties)
- Fresh food, fertilizer
- Yes given that the noise and smell of livestock including hens is controlled in some way
- I see no harm provided the needs can be met without disturbing your neighbours, in owning a few hens and or other live stock depending on yard size distance between your neighbours etc
- But it should not depend on the support from adjacent neighbours. My house, my property, I should be able to do as I please as long as the other conditions are met.
- Urban hens and livestock should have been permitted long ago, provided they are safe
- With strict enforcement of the above criteria, do we have the funds to support enforcement?
- I've always wanted one! I wasn't aware they were not allowed but I don't see the harm in allowing people to house them with the proper care.
- I love my pot belly pig and she provides so much comfort amd love she is really better than a support dog.
- hens are fine, we already allow pigeons to be kept as well as Common Grackles so why not hens?
- adjacent neighbours must include all houses within ear shot of the livestock house because livestock are very loud and often can't be silenced.
- As long as the animals are kept safely and humanly there really should not be problem with any livestock kept on private property
- Licensing to have costs of enforcement of people letting their roosters crow, or animals getting loose.
- Neighbours are consulted.
- Only if the conditions are favourable for the hens and the enclosure is kept clean.
- I'm fine with bi laws looking out for the animals and there well being so they don't end up in poor living conditions and neglect



- Some residences would benefit from backyard chickens, pet pigs are desirable to some people. However I believe approval from neighbours would be essential. For example, someone who is allergic to bee stings should be able to oppose a neighbour's potential backyard hive.
- As long as the guidelines outlined above are followed I am in favour. When adjacent property owners are affected, their rights have to be taken into consideration.
- I want to be able to provide fresh eggs to my family
- If it's suitable for the animal and is not a hinderance to neighbours, there should be no reason why they can't be in the city.
- Small farm animals should be allowed
- They can't be worse than dogs in terms of noise and mess. They can provide emotional support to vulnerable persons, and provide food.
- I believe that as long as it is done in a safe and sustainable manner and those in the immediate area are in support of it Calgarians should have the option to have small livestock on their property.
- Yes on the condition there is involved community engagement to gain support from neighbours.
- I think if managed properly, this would be a cool project.
- Due to the growing want and need for natural and organic foods and products, I could see that allowing livestock in urban areas would make people happier and feel healthier.
- I think this is okay as long as the hens are being treated in a humane manner and are in suitable living conditions.
- Why not
- So long as the conditions are favourable for the hens, and the living conditions kept clean and humane.
- As long as the community is on board this is a great initiative. I'd be happy to have one of my neighbors have chickens and a close resource for fresh eggs.
- No issue with hens
- I don't see chickens as a big threat as long as they are looked after properly. I think Dog owners should face the same process
- Seems fair.
- It's rare a home can provide needs for livestock but if there's a process and regulations I am ok with it
- Only if they are RESPONSIBLE!!! Some people slack at the care of their animals and animals hose people should not be allowed to even have animals!!!
- Family is from England and it's natural to have your own chickens for eggs. Shocked that it is not allowed here.
- Every animal deserves the right to live a happy and healthy life. Education towards keeping livestock animal should be done to ensure that the future owers of these animals understand what it would take to upkeep the animals properly they
- If the animals can be raised in a healthy & happy environment, without disrupting the community, there is no reason people shouldn't be able to have them.
- Support local, community based resources



- Smaller livestock such as pot bellied pigs end up in shelters all the time and could find loving homes within the city if the bylaw was amended to allow them.
- Hens would be a great addition to food sustainability, I also supports points made above.
- I have no problem if people want to have a couple of chickens in their backyard so that they can get their produce fresh as long as the animals are being taken care of properly and have adequate room to roam. I do believe though that people should not be able to keep animals on the property if they are just going to slaughter them. I would not want to see that as a neighbour.
- Within a reasonable amount of chickens
- I think we should be aloud to own certain live stock in calgary as a means to help those who can't afford a farm but would like a chicken for eggs or a lamb to help eat grass and make wool.
- As long as it doesn't interfere with neighbors quality of life, I think it's a good idea
- I have no issue with hens as long as certain rules and standards are met
- As long as they are being treaged right.
- Hens should be allowed as long as they are properly cared for.
- Seems fair
- Everything would have to be strictly regulated, and make sure that people aren't keeping animals inhumanely and not providing for livestock in a city environment properly.
- I don't understand there's a bylaw against it to really have an opinion
- If livestock has the adequate space required and isnt bothering anyone it should be allowed. Other major canadian cities allow this, and towns, Calgary is behind. Look at verson! Lots of goats and chickens, and happy people.
- I'm not against it.
- It's a chicken. What harm can a chicken do? None.
- N/a
- However I also believe that most people have absolutely no idea what is needed for care of said livestock so will need strict guidelines and easy access to reliable information. Also need availability of appropriate vet care
- as long as noise and odor are not caused, this is fine to allow.
- Could help our city
- The amount of yard space needs to be a factor in wether a citizen can have animals. Some yards are just too small and to close to neighbors to make owning animals a good idea.
- No one has ever been harmed by hens. Also the noise from hens is minimal to the barking of a dog, whether is playing or protecting.
- As long as the hens are being kept reasonably and safely then it is a superb choice to let them be kept by responsible owners.
- If supported by those around you, this promotes sustainable living! The problem becomes if a new neighbor comes into the community and doesn't like this, how would the city handle this considering the livestock value and impact on owners way of life.



- If the above criteria are met, I think this is a positive change. One thing I would add is that the livestock should not be bred and sold for profit.
- As long as neighbours and the community agree, I don't see any harm in having hens in the backyard.
- I think having hens, as well as other live stock is a great thing. I love that the city is supporting this.
- I support urban agriculture.
- Somebody wants to have hands, and they want to take care of them properly. I am OK with that
- Less red tape
- So long as a limit on number of hens is enforced. A few hens is ok.
- having chickens would be nice and why not a pet pig they make great pets
- It would Support community engagement and encourage self sustainability
- Livestock animals can be loving pets as well. As long as they're housed right and treated properly, I don't see why not.
- As long as it doesn't cause nuisance
- Hens and other small livestock, so long as they are cared for properly, open the community to more locally produced food and would be a net benefit.
- Nice way to encourage sustainability.
- The esthetic of a community must be maintained. With so many different cultures living in Calgary now, there is going to be a wide variety of opinions of acceptable shelters, noise, smell.
- Being able to produce our own food in our backyard/neighbourhood reduces the need for long range transportation of goods and adds to environmental sustainability. Additionally, home grown food helps humans better understand where their food comes from.
- I think it would be a great idea to allow people to have chickens
- As long as no harm comes to the community I have no issue supporting.
- Having hens would be a benefit to many families.
- Chickens!
- Hens and livestock are peoples pets and loving animals. Not everyone may have them as pets, but to some they are. We need to include them and allow them to have their pets in their lives no matter what animal they are.
- As long as someone is cleaning up after their animals and it is licensed there shouldn't be an issue.
- I would be in full support of urban hens. It's hard to comment on other livestock, as I have less knowledge of their living conditions, required care, noise/smell levels. and other significant factors.
- People are so out of touch with where their food comes from, it's educational, has a healthier environmental impact than factory farms, and provides alternatives to spending money where you want not where you need.
- I definitely think it's important to make sure people are treating livestock well
- Responsible owners should be providing this care and suitable living conditions to begin with.
- No reason why people can't have hens based on the above criteria
- No need.



- It's a great idea
- I think it would be a great idea to allow for urban livestock, I believe it would enrich the community.
- As long as the living conditions of the animals are monitored and maintained, I see no reason someone couldn't have other types of animals living on their property.
- as long as a responsible owner there is no concerns
- Laying hens are a fantastic addition to the city of Calgary
- For chickens and hens yes for other livestock this should be farm / hobby farm only and not within the city limits
- Not everyone should have hens or chickens. But some should be allowed. A case by case basis seems fair.
- Urban chickens should be allowed.
- I like that cases would be evaluated on a case by case basis; I hope noise concerns would be part of the evaluation for inner city animals.
- the support from all Adjacent neighbors is key for me
- Adjacent neighbours must be notified and support this as they would be affecting your everyday life.
- let the people have hens, why not
- I would be open to hens but not in favour of larger livestock. The exception may be on a larger parcel of land. EG. 1/2 acre and larger. Still would require the same criteria.
- Hens allow independence and community activity.
- If people have the property and are able to take care of say chickens they should be allowed to have them
- As long as the neighbours are in agreement & the needs of the animal are met, there is no reason to not allow it.
- If the owner has a suitable area and needs are met for livestock I don't see why this would be a problem
- N/a
- It dependa
- I don't see an issue as most of them are not a nuisance.
- As long as it's not disruptive to the surrounding neighbors, why not? Disruptive can include noise/odour but as long as those aren't an issue I'd have no problem with it.
- Smaller towns have had chickens for years with no issues. Not sure about other animals - but there are some miniature horses that are therapy animals and if your yard was big enough this seems like it would be okay.
- Sustainable communities include livestock.
- Why not
- People should be able to make their own food.
- If it helps, why not?
- I like chickens
- I support small livestock, such as hens, I think it's a great idea.



- I absolutely and unequivocally support urban chickens and ducks in Calgary. This program should have a large budget to ensure safe and ethical conditions for animals, and provide bylaw officials with the power to fine, confiscate and enforce changes.
- I fully support urban chickens. In a responsible environment these animals can provide comfort and sustainability to backyards. And they are no louder or fowl smelling than a dog.
- Cool I guess
- Positives outweigh the negatives.
- People should be allowed to have their own source of food
- Honestly would make a huge difference for struggling families
- As long as it is a healthy environment for those animals.
- I think it would be good for the city to allow hens on private property. I do think it should be monitored and there should be limits per household/street.
- It's a harm principle thing. If people can safely enjoy a behavior like hen ownership with minimal/no effect on neighbours and community, it ought to be allowed.
- Fresh eggs and they're very smart. Also great for getting rid of insect /pests
- Can be helpful and more humane
- As long as anyone affected is okay with it, and the hens are taken care of then I agree.
- If people are responsible and manage the care and treatment of their animals without having negative impacts to their neighbors, it should be permitted
- As long as the animals are kept in a healthy environment and they are not a nuisance.
- If neighbors are responsible owners, I see no problem with urban hens.
- We should allow pigs as well as hens. Pigs are amazing, smart animals. They are also quiet, and can substitute as an emotional support animal better than a cat. They are clean, quiet, eat compost and weeds, and don't escape from fences.
- As long as the animals aren't a nuisance for the neighbours. If a rooster is crowing at 3 am, then it would be the same as a noise complaint. If it kept happening every night, that wouldn't be acceptable. If the animals are causing disturbing smell, and disturbing the neighbours enjoyment of their yard, that would be a problem too
- If you can provide a proper life for the animal then why not?
- Small livestock such as hens are good for reducing carbon footprints, as long as there is minimal negative impact and support from neighbors there is no reason not to have hens or other small livestock. Pigeons are already allowed, and as hens provide a resource (eggs, meat) and a similar nuisance to neighbors, they should also be permitted.
- They seem like reasonable criteria.
- doesn't bother me either way
- No problems if animals are treated well and neighbors are okay with it
- Similar idea to community gardens
- As long as the animals are being taken care of and given the best life, individuals should be able to own and care for their animals.



- Love the idea of having hens in calgary
- Livestock provides so many benefits to people and as long as there are restrictions, responsible owners, and community support i think it would be a wonderful thing
- Yes because chickens need specific living conditions and it wouldn't be fair for them to live in unacceptable living conditions
- Smell & noise must be controlled
- Sure as long as there are strict rules on waste clean up and fencing/enclosure guidelines.
- I think it's a good idea as long as animals are cared for properly and do not disturb the surrounding neighbours.
- I just think it's a good bylaw to have in place
- I believe that animals should have the same rights as people to a degree. It is a living being and needs to be treated as one. To be equal to humans and have rights to a safe and secure environment.
- I have had chickens before and they are awesome animals to have around. They are usually very clean animals that help to support self sustainability for families.
- I have nothing against people having small livestock in their own personal yards.
- Sounds reasonable
- As long as there is a limit and no roosters are allowed, urban hens can safely be kept and provide food!
- Having access to one's self grown food should be a basic right. Obviously hens can be noisy so requesting permission seems fine.
- As long as noise and/or smell is managed and the welfare of the animals is considered, I am in support of this.
- As long as the animal is protected, well cared for and is not bothering or creating a problem for neighbors I believe this would be acceptable. I believe random audits would be needed to ensure owners are following the laws at all times for livestock in the city. An agreement would need to be signed by the owner when owning livestock
- As long as the chickens are cared for have proper space and I cleaned up properly then I have no problem with Urban chickens.
- hens can be kept clean and in a small enclosure. far less noisy than most dogs left outside.
- I don't think someone should have to prove there could be community benefit. That's ridiculous. One persons chickens may not benefit the community. Also, I think there should be a checklist of conditions to be met, rather than random 'discretion' of the by law officer.
- Within reason, considering space available, number of animals involved, etc that we can't incorporate responsible ownership
- There is opportunity for small livestock to be very beneficial to areas especially is there is cooperation between neighbours. This can also allow people that have lower incomes a chance to supplement their food sources and those of their neighbours through this initiative.
- If the animal can be cared for properly they should be allowed to have it.
- Helps with animal welfare.



- If they are not noisy and restrictions are in place for their shelters/cleaning up after them
- I think that allowing residents to have their own hens is a great step towards sustainability.
- people should be able to have their own chickens
- No roosters, if they break noise bylaws they're out.
- as long as everyone involved and surrounding is on board, why not!
- As long as there's no roosters, eggs are awesome!
- Chickens are quiet. Roosters are not and if the eggs are important there is still no need for a rooster.
- Chickens are quieter than a lot of dogs. I think they should be allowed.
- It would be kinda cool
- Like any other animal responsible owners should be able to have these options. Of course cleanliness, noise, numbers etc should be taken into consideration.
- Each case should be assessed individually to ensure the chickens are taken care of.
- If neighbours agree, sure.
- I love the idea of being able to have hens within city limits. Just like any other city noise (airplanes, buses, construction, loud vehicles) neighbours will adjust and get used to the noise of the animals eventually.
- I would love to see hens providing eggs in the city, done humanely.
- I think we need to move towards more sustainable farming options like this.
- Hens are needed for organic resources
- I think it would be amazing to be able to have hens in the city but would be worried about noise.
- If someone wants a pet chicken they should be able to do so. Who am I to dictate what someone can/can't have?
- N/a
- Because chickens provide food and no one should be punished for that
- home raised eggs are excellent
- Why not
- Within reason I think this could be a benefit to the community to experience a bit of where our food sources come from.
- Having hens in the city is a WONDERFUL idea. Especially when families can come together and learn about animal husbandry and get some fresh eggs
- If the neighbours are ok with it and they have suitable conditions for the animals they should be allowed to have certain livestock on their property.
- Why not
- More backyard farming = more self sustainability
- This follows with the direction Calgary is naturally growing in. Allowing certain smaller breeds of livestock is a great idea so long as livestock is declared and registered with the city, similar to pet ownership.
- Chicken coops in the city would be expected to meet minimum size to hen requirements and care of would have to meet farm level regulations.



- I want backyard chickens
- chicken is fine. But don't allow pigs or cows. Those are large breed farm stock that will not adjust to being in the city. And are disruptive to their neighbours and could cause more damage to a property than a dog.
- I believe there are a number of animals that can live comfortably within a city as long as the owner is caring for them properly and has the space.
- All neighbours adjacent to your property should need to allow it. You should have a certain amount of land
- If it is done and kept in such a way that its provides benefit for those who have them and they maintain the area then i am all for it
- Support from adjacent neighbours should be paramount.
- Works in other cities
- Urban hens can be a great food source for families, if limited in number to 2-3 per household they are not noisy and considerably more neighbour friendly than many dogs.
- I don't have a problem with people owning chickens in the city
- People find pets in all animals. Just because one finds more joy in a pet goat should not mean they have to live on a farm. As long as the animal is cared for appropriately.
- I am all for it as long as it doesn't interfere with the peace of the neighbors.
- If the animals have suitable living conditions and space.
- If people can care for their livestock and they aren't a nuisance for neighbors why shouldn't they be able to?
- Everyone needs hens!
- Why not?
- I have seen how this can work in Okotoks. It really promotes sustainability and innovative urban gardening.
- There are many benefits to city hen coups.
- As long as the animals are given adequate space and neighbours are okay with it, I don't have a problem with it. I would like the city to perform checkups on the city if the bylaw is expanding to other animals with complicated and specific needs, it's not the same as owning a dog or cat. We don't need to add to the amount of animals being neglected in the city
- If it doesn't interfere with me who am I to stop it. If someone wants hens to feed their family, by all means allow it.
- Cool idea.
- as long as it was limited and there wasnt a heard of large livestock
- I would be afraid of many people taking advantage of having livestock in the city, so to have it monitored/controlled would be best.
- As long as appropriate fines were in place for cleanliness and minimizing noise, I don't see why people should be allowed to own hens
- Amazing step forward for urban farming!



- People should be allowed to own livestock in humane conditions, as long as it doesn't cause nuisance to neighbors.
- Urban livestock are a responsibility that most people are not really willing to bear. For those that are willing to put in the extra work they require, I support them being allowed to have them. I think it's important that the city manage them though, as it's too easy for people to jump on a bandwagon without considering all the implications.
- Yes
- Livestock can provide important benefits to communities.
- I support this as long as urban hens are not allowed to be slaughtered.
- As long as it does not harm others there is nothing wrong with it
- No issues.
- as long as people follow the rules it would be fine.
- as long as the community supports it and peoples health is being considered i think urban hens is a great idea
- Urban centers should be encouraging sustainable and local solutions for agriculture.
- As long as the owners are responsible and noise/smell is not an issue
- If kept properly, hens are no more of a nuisance than other already permitted animals.
- that would be cool if they don't all just get hit by cars
- Support of neighbors and community associations. There must be a law in this that they only need one time support form neighbors, if a new neighbour moves in beside an already established hen house or exotic animal holder permits cannot be pulled unless it's determined abuse or neglect to the animals in the permit holders care.
- urban farming is great.
- I agree with the above conditions.
- As long as the neighbors approve, then its fine.
- We should be able to raise hens on private property as long as bylaws are followed.
- If people want to raise hens for fresh eggs, why the heck not.
- There would need to be limits on the size of livestock, and the permitted areas this can take place.
- allowing urban hens to become part of the community would offer better ability to be self-sufficient as well as educational experiences and therapy for the owners.
- If a suitable environment is provided and maintained, humans should be able to raise animals to feed their families
- Chickens and pigs are quite clean to begin with. Chicken feces are amazing for gardens and pigs are great support animals. Allowing city folk to be self dependent assists the community by allowing them to make and spend money.
- Love this idea!
- Live stalk can support mental health as well as provide a sustainable food source.
- As long as the chickens stay in the owners yard and aren't all over the road



- They don't use public spaces (dog parks, roaming, defecating on lawns etc) and are a great addition to those who can support the animals properly.
 - Animals such as chickens and goats are good ways to control weeds/ bugs and are low maintenance. They're also a source of food for low income or large families
 - Hens would be fine, but not roosters
 - I support freedom of the citizens
 - Only if the animals didn't interfere with the lives of the neighbours
 - Calgary is behind many other urban cities in allowing home owners to keep hens and other livestock. I fully support a licences, and structured approach to keep 1-5 urban hens to help families support themselves, feed themselves, and for children to learn more about Calgary's agricultural roots. Engage 4H and make them a partner in the process.
 - "If the animals have good living conditions & it's not a nuisance, why not?"
-
- **SIDE NOTE:**It is incredibly disappointing to see the suggestion of breed specific language being added to a bylaw that was once world-renowned for its success. Furthermore, the City is not asking for a postal code or any other measure to verify that you are a resident of Calgary. With the survey being accessible to anyone, we anticipate that spammers and pro-BSL (breed specific legislation) lobbyists will skew the results. Calgary needs to take lessons from its own past, when it was a world leader in animal control legislation in the early 2000s. Only breed-neutral, evidence-based legislation will have any chance to address dog-related problems in the community.
 - The fact 'pit bulls' are being discriminated against causes fear towards the general public, when you specifically state that they don't cause the majority of bites within our city. It's a 'responsible pet ownership bylaw' not a 'lets ban and discriminate against pit bulls and their owner law'. This is absolutely ignorant and very narrow sighted and I am disappointed to see Calgary hurt and fear monger a breed based off of an uneducated perception."
 - I think being able to raise your own chickens needs to be highly considered
 - This should be allowed if criteria met.
 - Only if there could be a guarantee of no bad smells from the livestock
 - We could all benefit from a less "sterile" city - -let people live. During this pandemic, we have all learned that getting back to basics and nature is a good thing. We need more flexibility and being animal friendly helps make Calgary the hospitable place we claim to be.
 - yes
 - Hens are fantastic! If allowed I would have some as well. We consume a flat of eggs a week in my home and garden. This would be amazing.
 - The size and amount of animals can vary depending on property and smells and noises
 - As long as they are looked after, cleaned up after often and they don't disturb neighbours.
 - I have nothing against hens, roosters in the other hand... NO
 - Chickens can be very beneficial



- It's not my property, not my business.
- As long as the animals are not causing neighbors any issues, I do not see why any animals should not be allowed if their quality of living is deemed very good.
- These days, it is important that individuals have the opportunity to keep some "small" livestock. A clucking hen is likely less intrusive than a barking dog at 5:00am. As with anything, we need to ensure that responsible care and behaviour are observed. Examples: ensuring the yard doesn't turn into a foul stinking mess... good neighbours and all that.
- As long as people are responsible, there shouldn't be too many limitations
- I think this would be a positive move for Calgary
- I have no issue as long as there are reasonable limitations in place. I.e. there isn't wild hens and roosters outside of yards.
- If the hens are safe and being well taken care of, I have no issue.
- As long as they have adequate living conditions, why not
- Other livestock, like pigs and goats? The smell and noises would be unbearable. If I wanted to live on or near a farm, I wouldn't be living in an urban area. Support from adjacent neighbours is an absolute must
- Fine for people to have.
- Urban hens are good for the city as a whole
- As long as there are husbandry requirements and welfare considerations built in for the protection of the animals
- Ensuring that future neighbours can not cause a change in the ability to own a pet. It is irresponsible to force people to later rehome their animals, such as pot bellied pigs who are similar to dogs. There would have to be a system similar to dogs in place for bothering neighbours etc.
- I support this because of the "Support from adjacent neighbours" stipulation. If surrounding neighbors approval is not considered, then I revoke my agreement.
- Sustainable food source.
- That sound like both animals and owners will benefit from this and both will be safe. Owners held accountable.
- hens are a great idea
- If people want hens and will care for them, let them have hens
- If the owners show responsibility and education on the livestock's needs I think it would be acceptable to have such animals.
- N/A
- As long as an animal is treated right, why should it be a problem for owning it?
- self explanatory
- Would be a benefit to community, providing living conditions for the animals are strictly enforced.
- Amazing idea and great for the community!
- Chickens are quite and provide sustenance to many people. As long as regulations were in place that held people responsible if bylaws were breached



- I love the idea of more variety in the city. I'd love to have a hen or small pig.
- I'm for more animals allowed as long as neighbours agree and animals are safely cared for
- I think the more we can switch to natural resources (goats for lawn mowing and hens for fresh eggs) as long as the animals are treated properly, then go for it!
- I agree but subject to noise restrictions. I have lived next to a hen house and it was very noisy. Might not be best suited for high density areas.
- More self contained living = more money saved
- if urban livestock is properly managed it can be a benefit to the community
- as long as everyone is safe, happy and healthy - why not?
- Hens are amazing creatures full of personality. I'd rather hear clucking than barking.
- I think its [removed] that you need permission from your neighbour. I pay property tax and I don't need permission from my nosy neighbors to do anything. I keep to myself yet I get barking compliments for other dogs in my neighborhood. How do I know this, we put my dog down in December of 2009 and got another one in May of 2011 and we were getting barking complaints the entire time. Even though we called your joke of a city to tell them that we didn't have a dog and even had an officer come and check, and yet complaints still kept coming in. So I'm getting a chicken without my neighbours permission.
- The well being of any animal should be top priority.
- Adjacent neighbours should have a say when it comes to keeping hens and roosters due to noise.
- People should have the option to raise hens for eggs so that the community can be more self sufficient if desired. These people should have to adhere to standards that will benefit the hens wellbeing/safety, and to prevent neglect/animal cruelty.
- As long as there are rules in places about the living conditions for the hens and support from neighbours... why not?
- I think it would be wonderful to allow livestock in calgary
- Yes on the condition that the live stock doesnt prove a nuisance or inconvenience for other calgarians or neighbors.
- I think support animals shouldnt be progressed to just cats and dogs. With over a million people in this city - everyone has different animals that can be comforting to them or something they have a deep love for (snakes, rabbits, fish, pigs, chickens etc.)
- Responsible pet owners and neighbors should have the freedom to assume the responsibility of caring for an animal
- I support
- Why not
- As long as noise is kept to a minimum.
- I support the allowance of smal livestock animals in the city such as hens & pigs.
- Absolutely!!
- Folks should be educated on the necessary health and safety conditions best to keep these animals well taken care of, even if for food. It goes without saying that review of the home and space is important.



- Suitable living conditions MUST BE upheld.
- As long as the animals have space and are cared for correctly I see no issue.
- I agree, but with guidelines and some restrictions in place, so there are standards of care and numbers of animals in place.
- I would if they had restrictions. Cannot be in just anyone's yard, as they require a lot of space for them to have a high quality of life and a lot of Calgary backyards are too small for that
- Would increase urban sustainability and has not been shown to have detrimental effects.
- If the necessary measures are in place to promote the wellbeing of livestock, then people should be able to possess them and care for them!
- I grew up in a small town where neighbours had hens, there were no issues.
- Should be limits to if you have the space to provide where the animals are not encroaching on neighbor's property or causing a disturbance. I support urban agriculture and mixed use properties but also respect that individual's decisions affect others
- I think urban hens are a great idea. I think larger livestock would need to be case by case pending inspection of the individuals property and accommodations. Again circling back to the idea of a license to ensure competent ownership.
- As long as the livestock is well cared for.
- Raising your own food is always a good thing
- I would support a limit on the amount of hens on any property. As long as they're cared for properly, I don't see an issue with it.
- I think the criteria is well thought out and if people are able to care for and own livestock on their property it is a nice privilege.
- If everyone is cool with chickens or otherwise, why not?
- Times are tough. Home grown eggs can mean the difference between starving and living.
- Having owned Hens before when it was legal, I support this.. when I talked with neighbors none of them even realized we were keeping hens lol.. they were shocked and pleased that it wasn't even a bother to them. If cared for appropriately the birds pose no risk to others :)
- Pets come in different shapes and sizes, as long as they're not creating significant noise, smell they should definitely consider it
- people should be able to do what they want, as long as the criteria is met for a healthy living space for the livestock.
- I think within reason it would ok to have certain livestock (i.e. chickens) on one's property within a strict set of rules/regulations.
- As long as the animals and being taken care of and not abused I see no problem with this
- I have no issue with livestock in the city as long as they are cared for in a way that is in keeping with the standard of living (space etc) they would receive outside of the city.
- Hens and small livestock such as goats should be allowed with a cap on the number of pets allowed per property example: no more than 5



- The city needs to request proper licensing and permits for urban hens, and needs to instate a law regarding ratios of hens-to-cocks to control reproduction and population. That being said, I support the idea if properly executed.
- Much rather a goat to eat the grass than a lawn mower.
- As long as there is suitable housing for everyone and animal involved. Proper inspections, licensing and training. In addition to approval from immediate neighbours
- Small animals are fine as long as they are maintained correctly. You would not want someone with 2 cows in a residential area
- Urban farming is a great use of otherwise useless land
- "It's important to allow this because the restriction makes zero sense. Other animals can be equally loud and dirty. Hens are relatively quiet and make very little environmental
- Impact."
- I'd love to have chickens!
- This would be a positive change.
- Love the idea of urban livestock as long as it is regulated
- Excellent idea
- I believe this law is beneficial. Livestock help food supply, soil productivity (thus helping us grow healthier gardens to sustain our family, livelihoods, it reduces costs and pollution since less feed, fuel and water will be used as opposed to intensive farming.
- Small farm animals often have similar probability to cause "nuisance" as animals already permitted as pets. The bylaw must consider the number allowable so hoarding can be avoided. As well, proper winter housing must be provided.
- But only if limited, and in consultation with the local community, and under similar process to changing the land use for a dwelling or secondary suite
- Suitable conditions should dictate this. If no issues- why not?
- I think support of surrounding neighbours is most important within city limits.. otherwise no need for a by-law outside city limits
- Backyard chickens are amazing learning and community resources
- As long as there were limits on the number of hens, and the size of the yard.
- As long as it is okay by neighbours I don't see a problem with it as long as they are properly cared for
- Hens yes, can't imagine larger livestock could be cared for in someone's back yard.
- If the animals can be properly cared for and are not interfering with others, I don't see why there would be a problem.
- No issues with this
- Livestock are important, and can improve life.
- Just makes sense, to keep everyone happy
- More agriculture close to home could be beneficial for many families and smaller markets and communities
- "1) Hens have the potential to enrich a community. Eggs can be shared with neighbours.



- We have arbitrarily categorized chickens as "livestock" and dogs and cats as "pets"; many folks have indoor chickens as pets.
- Keeping and caring for hens can boost peoples' mental well-being, particularly during these times of isolation."
- If the environment is safe and healthy for the animal then yes and it should be followed up on after a certain amount of time to ensure it's staying that way
- I support urban livestock as long as the needs of the livestock are a top priority.
- If the animals are safe and being cared for and not being a problem.
- well maintained smaller livestock should be able to live in the city if the owner looks after them
- Urban farming, including farming eggs, can be part of great sustainability plans. But killing animals for food should not be allowed generally (I think this is obvious but had to say it)
- As long as they are well kept and non disruptive
- The hens need a certain amount of space and quality of care/housing, you should need a permit, and you should be required to have them a certain distance from the road and neighbours.
- I think the world and our individual communities only benefit from urban farming. Having hens allows people to start that process, which is important for global warming and income equality.
- As long as the neighbours on both sides of the property were okay with it and there were benefits to doing so I suppose that would be fine.
- I think animals help to enrich people's lives.
- If limited in numbers and not affecting neighbours.
- I like the idea that the neighbour's are to be consulted if an owner wants hens.
- I would be fine with this, as long as neighbours were consulted.
- I think owning chickens would be a wonderful way for more people to begin eating more local eggs! Better for animals and environment.
- We allow pigs as service animals
- I'm all for people having urban hens but want them to have the proper shelter and care.
- We need to be more sustainable and produce as much food locally as we can. I would also be in favour of mandatory potato plots on properties where that is feasible. They're easy to grow and would could be donated to those in need.
- ?
- Hens are beneficial
- some people get pets for the novelty of it. If the had to actually change something in their lives. maybe they would put better thought into it.
- People should be allowed to do as they wish provided the animal is cared for properly and humanly
- I think this is a great idea. In my home town of poland, they have small chicken coops fenced in like we have here with fenced in community gardens. Allows families to get out, clean up, feed and collect eggs as they come. This is also good for those who are struggling financially. Small food goes a long way.



- As long as they're not bothering neighbors, and their well-being is being taken care of, then why not have them in the city.
 - What kind of Livestock? A cow??...No! Chickens/Ducks ...okay sure if kept properly. NO PIGEONS
 - I don't really understand the need for this but I don't have anything against it
 - Support animals do wonders for their owners. We cannot say what works best for one works better for another. Some people are in need of an animal but are afraid of dogs. Services should be open to whatever animal they need.
 - person must apply and be approved.
 - "I support sustainable living. But I don't support it if it hinges on my rights as a neighbour to a serene and quiet lifestyle.
-
- If you want a house that houses animals and makes a ton of noise and mess then please but yourself an acreage.
-
- If the animals don't cause a ton of noise, smell, or mess then I feel it's fine."
 - Allowing hen dens and other livestock would be able to help support our local economy as they could sell eggs or other food and could also help lower income families put food on their table
 - As long as the animals are properly cared for and neighbours support, I see no issue.
 - The biggest thing is the possible nuisance for other neighbours. If other neighbours are in support of the hens on a property and there are regular "check-ups" from enforcement officials I don't have an issue with it.
 - I'm indifferent.
 - I think more people should be given opportunity to provide food for themselves whether it's livestock or converting their lawns into garden boxes.
 - Having egg-laying chickens does not require a rooster. It's a more humane and eco-friendly choice for households than buying at the store.
 - Sustainability and self provision of food can really help the economy.
 - Support animals are very important for some people. Different species should be considered.
 - As long as they a responsible pet owners and don't affect other people
 - There is a demand for urban livestock but it needs to be regulated for health, humane treatment, and neighbour relations reasons.
 - I think urban hens are a great idea. Larger livestock would get smelly and noisy much faster and shouldn't be allowed.
 - I think much like community gardens, open or vacant spaces could be used for hens, goats, etc. that the community takes care of together. I see it positively impacting food security, education, and community building.



- I think it's important to support all ways for families to provide food for their families. Urban hens would be a boon.
- Livestock are a very good way to have sustainable food, and fresh food in a humane and caring way for animals should be encouraged
- Most cities give people the right to have laying hens.
- each case should be looked at and neighbour's should be ok with it.
- People should be allowed to have the pet of their choice
- Chickens would be great
- This came up in 2011. Yes, why not.
- Within one life time we've gone from hens in the yard being normal to restrictive rules against them. With food security becoming more and more an issue we need to make practical changes to our laws that remove archaic and impractical restrictions and allow more people to take good security into their own hands.
- On the condition that the livestock (in this case hens) did not attract predatory or vermin animals like coyotes, as well as contained any smells associated with housing such animals.
- I think urban hens would be a welcome resource in Calgary and is long overdue
- Many neighbours hate each other and therefore you shouldn't have to ask your neighbour. You don't have to ask your neighbour when you get a vicious dog or roaming cat. Why pick on the hen people?
- People should be able to provide for their families with hens for eggs, milk from goats, any use not for slaughter.
- Right to use property.
- People's property they should be able to keep whatever animals they want as long and they are properly cared for
- The fact that this bylaw already exists is silly. I can understand the restriction required for roosters but otherwise it is ridiculous.
- I just don't see the reason someone couldn't have a hen or any live stock if they have the proper space.
- Because I want chickens
- It makes everything legal and be supported by bylaw
- Food security and sustainable sources are important
- This would be a great way to engage people in animal rearing
- It will give people the ability to produce their own eggs
- A return to self sustenance is welcomed. Backyard hens are a good step in that direction. Some issues could be raised, specifically if you raise any other animal and intent to butcher, it could get a little trickier. Maybe they need to do it in a garage or something instead of right out where a neighbor infant can see.
- Chickens are fine.
- Hens need to be cared for properly. Rules for animal abuse extend to hens too



- Hens provide good that is needed for homes. There will be a time where hens in backyards will help feed people.
- I have no issues if a person wishes to own a hen, but if the quantity of hens in a single property starts to produce noise complaints, then I feel the owner should either take steps to reduce those instances (IE: noise damping fencing, or insulated hen house) or should be asked to remove them all.
- Chickens can be great for people and they're only little.
- While I do not like the idea of leaving the final call to the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer whose expertise will likely be too nonspecific to be of use and who will likely be overtasked with other issues, it is a good opportunity to address community food needs in the form of cooperative neighbourhood gardens. Consumers today value healthy and happy livestock, and have an outstanding appreciation for farm to table. Allowing chickens and other livestock (goats, etc) on private property will keep money out of the hands of factory farms where animals are notoriously abused and encourage local production of eggs, meat, and dairy.
- If there is a new adjacent owner (neighbour) there must be agreement or an update that doesn't require a full application but the new neighbour must start the process if they have grievance with an already approved situation.
- We need hens
- So long as the animals are not impeding or disturbing neighbours, there's no reason someone shouldn't be able to own a pig if they'd like, so long as the animal is being rightly cared for
- Hens eat nuisance bugs when gardening; hens provide eggs. We need to encourage more self-sufficiency.
- If it allows people to support themselves, why not?
- Chickens are cool
- If someone wants to own livestock and has proper property for it, they should be allowed to. It is great to have your own source of eggs, milk etc.
- This gives people the option to adopt a farm to table lifestyle.
- Urban chicken for eggs are a good idea
- I don't think neighbors should be consulted. If there are noise or smell issues they should be handled the same way we do with dogs.
- I think having hens is a great idea so long as they have adequate living conditions.
- As long as animals are well taken care of, and the neighbours do into mind (regards to smells) I don't see any issues.
- All of the criteria make sense and I think these animals can provide a lot for certain people.
- Persons wanting this must provide a certain amount of space per animal
- We should be allowed to grow and have our own food.
- This supports environmental and healthy living
- fresh eggs are delicious
- Hens require little space and can improve a person's life greatly. As long as no rooster is present the noise would be no greater than any other pet.



- Hens are fine, just keep the smell under control.
- As long as the animals are well cared for and the owners have approval from neighbors.
- Backyard farming and small livestock should be encouraged and incentivized.
- Let people have livestock.
- Change is good
- Hens are good. Owners would be able to sell their eggs to locals, helping their household income, ultimately bettering our economy in the long run.
- All animals have merit. I support any healthy relationship. Do not discriminate.
- The keeping of urban hens and other livestock, providing that criteria involving sanitation, animal welfare and support from neighbors are met, contributes to local food security, provides learning opportunities for children and teens, and can serve as a consistent source of income.
- This could be beneficial for both families and the community.
- if the owner is responsible, I don't see the harm in it
- I think having the ability to create your own food and be more sustainable is incredibly important in easing stresses with the environment.
- Sustainable living is necessary.
- Livestock really has no place within city limits, that being said should an individual be able to garner 100% support from their neighbours and community (no more or no less) than yes each case should be given some level of consideration. However I truly feel that it is not fair to the animals to be living within the city, as there are natural space constraints that do not allow them to live their lives as nature intended. I believe everyone has the right to present their case but I do feel this amendment requires more scrutiny.
- Livestock can also be amazing support animals
- I think it's a good idea as long as the surrounding neighbors agree.
- I think this would be an excellent way to move forward in progressing towards a more balanced and sustainable living.
- Urban farming is positive and should be encouraged safely.
- Why not? If people want to own them and look after them properly why the heck not?
- Yes
- If pet pigeons are allowed in backyards, so should chickens.
- I like the benefits of it, as long as regulations and animal welfare and well being are at the forefront.
- I think more urban animals make for a more diverse population
- Having hens doesn't just impact the owner but those around the home that has them. It needs to be something everyone is okay with.
- I have heard many citizens bemoan the fact that they cannot keep hens for eggs or bees for hives. I support any initiative that encourages ethically sourced food.
- Home grown eggs!
- It would make it easier on our lives if we had sustainable food that we didn't always have to go to the store for



- I don't see harm.
- I don't think that you should need support from a neighbour especially with all of the other criteria.
- Hens are rad.
- As long as it is on a case by case basis, I see no problem with approved people having the ability to own livestock. This helps to support the greater community.
- Pigs can be great companions. Chickens can provide food, and are gentle. So long as they aren't any more nuisance (noise, waste, aggression) than any other pet (dog, cat, bird, snake, etc), and do long as the owner can properly provide for them. I see no reason that a person can't have the pet of their choice.
- Upon neighbors approval
- If they had the proper enclosures and it was supported by their neighbours, then yes. It would be important for the conversation to happen in the community as, like other domesticated animals, this could become a nuisance.
- As long as conditions are suitable and safe for all parties, I don't see a problem with keeping urban hens.
- Pets are pets, if taken care of properly let them be.
- I think it's a good idea to always handle things case by case.
- It's a maybe. All animals should be rescued. The procurement of livestock concerns me. This needs to be thought about and how it will take part in the promotion of livestock breeding. This should be a rescue story. Shouldn't be buying chicks. We should be giving life to the hens deemed not as profitable. Hens 1-3 years old.
- Having "livestock" in a yard promotes healthy eating and living. This also supports some of those who cannot get out to the grocery store and money is an issue when it comes to fresh items such as eggs.
- Food security is important and other urban hens projects have proved this to be a mostly non-problematic way to increase food security
- Having lived on an acreage, hens are easy to care for properly and quiet
- I'd love to be able to have some chicken for fresh food for my family
- I think it's great to allow hens in the city. If suitable living conditions are established and held to a good standard, it sounds great that people want to have a sustainable lifestyle.
- If a person can make it work with the neighbours and community, they should be allowed to have animals that could benefit that community. It would have to be complete sign-off of immediate neighbour's and they should have to prove they know how to properly take care of the animals.
- No explanation needed. Just yes
- "Food should be produced in the city, and people who wish to raise their own food, while living in the city should be able to.
- As long as no animal is living in sub standard conditions, and noise and smells are within reasonable levels for the neighborhood, I don't see any problems"
- no problem with chickens



- I think self sustainability and urban farming is great! as long as they are abiding to bylaws and keeping the animals safe and properly cared for.
- I think it is important that the animals have proper living conditions.
- Yes. Any means of facilitating the inclusion of amicable livestock within the city helps encourage community, diversity, and economy.
- If it has a positive impact, why not!
- If the community is on board then why not
- Hens for eggs only
- Noise & smell should be primary considerations. I've lived next to dogs where owners didn't clean up & left dog to bark. I've lived next to clean quiet chickens.
- I would like to have a pet chicken
- if a person can handle livestock responsibly, why not.
- Hens and pigs should be allowed. As long as the owners are taking care of them and they are not noisy
- Raised on a farm! I think a chicken in a yard is no different than a dog or a cat.
- As long as animals are kept on the owner's property and given suitable living conditions, they should be allowed.
- Yes but.... if new neighbours moved in would they also have to approve? If they didnt what would happen to the hens?
- I live in the community with the support hens and they are wonderful!!
- If it is ok with neighbours and supports the community, why not.
- People can have chickens if they want. Who cares?
- Allow hens as many other jurisdictions do.
- Allow for ducks as well, they are cleaner, and don't damage the grass
- As long as the rules are followed and no liberties are taken e.g. excessive numbers of animals, breeding etc.
- I think a key part of the city's responsibility should be to provide information about biosecurity and provide proper health treatments for hens because Canada does not currently have many health products for hens who contract lice, mites, and other parasites (internal and external). I would also like to see there be a requirement to have the hens or household with hens be registered with the city.
- I think if people would like to have hens or a handful of other livestock type animals, with suitable conditions and support from their neighbors, they should not be prevented from doing so.
- If everyone in the area agrees and the chickens are well cared for, I see no issue with a family having access to chickens.
- They are not hurting anyone
- I think with sufficient planning small livestock shouldn't be in issue in residential.
- I think as long as the person owning hens can provide the necessities of life then why not. I would love to have fresh eggs from my backyard.



- Chickens are good
- Chickens rule!!
- limit sizing but must contain odour, cleanup.
- Strongly support this, though with appropriate regulations in place to protect all parties, including animals and neighbours.
- Urban hens like any other pet should be housed and cared for properly
- These pilot projects have done very well in other cities, I think it would be good for Calgary's food system to allow hens at the bare minimum.
- I am very much in support of hens and other livestock. This is a sustainability issue and should be our right. I do not believe it is fair to ask for support from neighbors. If you have a grumpy neighbor you won't be able to get hens? That doesn't seem fair.
- Backyard chickens should be allowed, with neighbours support.
- let the people have them
- I think well cared for hens are a good idea. it teaches children responsible pet ownership.
- It would help in fight against cruelty to animals in factory farming by providing locals with cruelty free eggs.
- I don't see any issues with urban hens, however roosters would be an issue for noise. Other livestock might be questionable though.
- N/A
- I think can be positive for both citizens and livestock.
- N/a
- As long as the owner is knowledgeable about the care of the animal and can provide a good home for the animal they should be allowed the animal.
- Cleanliness and amount of animals would be the big factor for me personally. Must be kept clean and odor controlled.
- If it "will have positive impact"
- I think it is a very good idea for people to raise hens if they wish. The implementation of many community gardens would work well with small livestock rearing.
- I support it - not really sure what additional explanation to put
- As long as there is no issue to a neighbor I don't see why not.
- Food security is critical, responsible urban farmers should be allowed to raise reasonable livestock on their property.
- With clear guidelines for both owners and neighbours, this seems like a feasible idea. However, what happens if a neighbour moves? Will the new people who take residence have some say in wanting an urban livestock house there?
- As long as the neighbors are all right with it, I don't see a problem.
- Hens would be great, I can't quite imagine which other farm-type animals people might want, but if support is required from the neighbours then that would seem to be a good way to be fair
- its nice to have fresh food, and pigeons are smart creatures



- "My question would be why not?"
- Noise maybe the only issue or maybe it would bring in more unwanted coyotes etc to neighborhoods."
- I don't know why anyone would want an urban hen on their property, but to each their own
- This helps people to save money on groceries and use natural resources. There are goats in Lethbridge that eat the grass on the Coulees, it's amazing.
- People should have the freedom to own animals in city limits especially if it helps with providing income and food.
- I think it's a great initiative to help people sustain themselves and take full advantage of their property for something other than grass. It also sounds like community engagement could increase with a project like that, similar to community gardening
- People should be allowed to have an animal as long as they can provide proper care and housing for the animal
- I think chickens for eggs in backyards would be great as long as those keeping them are educated on how to keep them properly and humanely, and how to keep them clean and tidy.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of and have the right space.
- Horses are cool man
- Hens are fine as long as they are taken care of and not too loud. Nothing wrong with fresh eggs!
- I'm just on board. There's lots of benefits of allowing more ways to produce food and take care of their animals.
- If the livestock contribute to the stability of Calgarians.
- Free eggs for the neighbors!
- If people want hens for the sole purpose of eggs and they are treated properly and humanely then why not allow them.
- People should be allowed to have hens or goats etc if they can be cared for
- It totally depends on each individual case. Limit ownership to two animals per household. Ensure cleanliness and any noise concerns are met. Only small animals allowed ie chicken Investigate what other provinces have done like B.C.
- Living conditions should touch on "smell/odor". Chicken houses or coops can smell very bad very quickly. This will surely bring conflict with neighbors and/or the community.
- Better
- Producing our own food is vital. As long as ownership of the coop maintains a clean environment and keeps the smell down to its minimum.
- As long as the hen coops are maintained and not causing a large odour
- Local food sourcing is important in maintaining regulated prices on big chain supermarkets
- As long as the animals are cared for in an appropriate way and facility (fenced, clean, and housed properly) and they are not disturbing neighbours (noise and smell), there is no reason to prohibit animals such as laying hens for personal enjoyment (not commercial production) - especially considering 6?! dogs are allowed!!



- As long as the resident had support from neighbours (addressing concerns around dogs or cats that may possibly come in contact with livestock) and provided the best care for the livestock, I would support.
 - This is a great concept! I had quail for almost 5 years in Rockyview county and harvested eggs as well as sold birds for meat, it was a great side hobby but had to get rid of them to move into the city. Hens are bigger, require more space and are more messy in my opinion but I see many people with excellent set ups. I actually know [personal info removed] on a personal basis and love what she is doing with her hens and the impact they have in her family. I fully support animals in the community and would even like to see community hen houses just like community gardens!
 - If my neighbour can't keep a clean yard they should not be able to have hens.
 - I think it's a great way to have people start organically living !
 - It is good for the community as a whole to have more contact with domestic and farm animals
 - Yes but depends on the animal as it has to be proper living conditions for said animal.
 - Must have support from neighbors who can withdraw their support at anytime
 - Someone in my community has chickens, and it took her such a long time to have them approved.
 - Only chickens
 - Support from neighbors is unnecessary. If the livestock is negatively impacting neighbors/community then address it.
 - I think there are potential benefits that make this worth exploring. However, people need to be held accountable to meet certain standards/requirements with how they keep any type of livestock in an urban setting.
 - As long as proper vet care and vaccinations were in place. Also, if cleanliness standards were in place
 - I live in a condo. Won't apply to me but as long as the animals are safe and taken care of I don't care.
 - As long as the hens are properly taken care of and their owners are held accountable for their livestock then it should be okay.
 - I fully support urban hens
 - I also think there needs to be a limit of hens on a property. As with pigeons, neighbors do not want to smell the hens.
 - It is healthy for a community to have self sufficiency and raising meat is essential for people to achieve that. It should be allowed for backyard chickens as long as it doesn't result in too many birds or a big mess.
 - Pot belly pigs should be legal
 - "It increases people's control over the food they eat and promotes a healthier lifestyle.
-
- I also want to talk about the bandana program. It is a choking hazard to dogs playing (they can get their jaws caught). A better idea would be to promote the concept of asking. Children should not be



running up to play with dogs regardless of bandana colour without asking first. That's common sense."

- "If a person wants to have an uncommon city pet, I don't think they should have to get neighbours approval (exceptions needing approval would be if it's a noisy pet ie: chickens, however that pet should not/can not impact their neighbours/city, obviously this would mean if you want to have an uncommon pet their should be virtually no trace that you own it.
 - You shouldn't be able to smell it (excretions primarily)
 - You should have sufficient food, water, shelter if it's an outdoor pet and requires a certain structure it would need building approval and shouldn't impact your neighbours (ie: view
 - It should not increase traffic (extreme example: if you have a zebra in your backyard word of mouth may spread and more people may frequent the area to view it)
 - Noise should be at a minimum similar to noise bylaw and restrictions, it shouldn't be calling out at all hours of the night
 - Size - obviously animals require a certain amount of space, obviously the animal needs enough space to live a healthy life (someone with an animal background should make a list for this ie:
 - 4 acres/horse
 - chicken qty = size coop
 - Goat = _ x _ space (increases with size of goat and qty)
 - All home owners require licensing of said animals (this should also go for exotics (meaning any animal not native to AB or even CGY). And perhaps even once every x amount of years they would have to pay to have an inspection done on their animals living conditions (I think this would weed out a lot of people who don't realize what it takes to raise animals not in their natural environment and those following a the moments trend)"
- I think it's dumb that this already is not allowed.
- Suitable living conditions are regulated for animal safety and a limit to the number of hens allowed, for instance.
- neighbors should be consulted
- Chickens are awesome! Ive only heard the stories about waaay back when you could have them!!
- I think if livestock isn't anymore offensive than a dog or cat, have at er! We need to be far more open to allowing people to live their lives without bylaw knocking at their door from others trying to control everything around them.
- "Urban hens allow for additional food security.
- I don't necessarily support the requirement for neighbour support. Unless there are terms to allow for majority support rather than allowing one or two neighbours to stop someone from having a coop arbitrarily."
- I support only if again responsible ownership happens. No cruelty, No neglect, Good clean living areas.
- Something like goats eating grass is fine by me.



- I don't think support from neighbors should be required because it really isn't feasible and personal feelings can get in the way. I don't think community benefit is required as long as there is personal benefit.
- It's a great way to provide more sustainability within the city that most would want to move out of city to achieve
- They provide a source of food and are not a nuisance.
- Chickens, goats, etc build community and both provide additional revenue streams for residents but also a nice connection point between residents. Chickens in absence of a rooster are no nuisance whatsoever. Other livestock should be considered in small numbers.
- As long as it does not become a nuisance to neighbours (noise disturbance) etc.
- With limits and neighbour approval in writing
- Support bylaws that are for animal protection against abuse
- So long as the animal owner has space, knowledge, and ability to keep animal healthy/safe/secure livestock should be allowed. Due to Calgary property sizes immediate neighbours should be consulted if animal or animal waste will be near their property line. Minimum space requirements should be considered for each species and qty of animals.
- I think this opens up a whole chance of disease from farm animals being brought into community, it also attracts larger cats to come more into the city as well- thus I'm sure, will result in those cats being caught and euthanized if they continue to enter the city and communities.
- It should be fine as long as they don't disturb neighbours
- Responsible Ownership
- As long as the bylaw requires people to provide proper living conditions for the hens I think it is a wonderful idea.
- I think depending on the animal more than the adjacent neighbors should have say. Sound travels.
- A
- I think there are enough criteria to make it acceptable.
- Other livestock such as goats are beneficial in keeping grass short and well maintained so if the owner can properly care for them and they aren't being a bother why not let the owner have them.
- Who doesn't want chickens or other animals. Great step in a positive direction
- Resourceful food growth and consumption is beneficial
- There are a lot of animals currently considered livestock that make great pets
- As long as the animal is taken care of and the animal is not a nuisance, it would be fine by me.
- If you can be a responsible owner and care for the animal all while respecting neighbours it would be worth a shot and also more budget friendly for a lot of residents where they wouldn't have to pay for boarding elsewhere which in turns will give more money to local businesses etc.
- Sounds like the appropriate steps will be taken.
- As long as they aren't a nuisance and the owners are responsible, I am fine with this.
- Certain farm animals would do very well in the city. Small goats and chickens are good examples. They don't stink, they're not loud, and are not dangerous. They also help mow lawns.



- If a person has a large property on the edge of town, yet is technically still in city limits, they should be granted the same liberties a property further out of town would have, especially if that property was there before the city expanded. As long as an animal is properly cared for, with the proper living conditions for the animal, then I don't see why the person shouldn't be allowed to own it, no matter what it is, as long as they are respectful of their neighbours.
- I don't see the harm in this, I think animals bring joy and happiness and decrease depression and experienced traumatic feelings.
- If the conditions are appropriate, it is more environmentally conscious to have your own hen
- I think it is fine to allow livestock under these conditions
- bring on the chickens!
- Chickens are an amazing asset.
- People should be able to own a few hen if they have the means to take care of them.
- No different than any other animal, needs are met, owners are held responsible
- I think Hens should be allowed in single family households.
- As long as there is enough room for the animal (s).
- Support
- people really like them. But they stink so it must be maintained
- Any animal should be allowed as long as it is receiving proper care, activity and has room to play/roam/exercise. (Exception being large animals like horses etc that need lots of space)
- As long as the animal is well cared for I don't see a reason why you can't own it.
- I have wanted hens for a very long time, but I live in the city and they're not allowed. Rescuing factory farmed hens gives them a better life and caring for these animals can teach community members about where their food comes from and the importance of proper livestock husbandry.
- Makes sense
- Backyard chickens is incredibly sustainable for the community. They also help with pest control. I'm all for this.
- As long as animals are being cared for properly I am fine with urban hens
- As long as clear guidelines were provided and neighbours have an option to reject it. Like planning permission/permits.
- Allows people to still have a small urban chicks.
- Allow people to raise for food
- They can be pets, sources of food and excellent learning for children
- Some livestock would be fine to have in the city limits.
- This seems suitable and allows for a case-by-case basis of approval for the evaluation of community and livestock well-being
- As long as animals are housed and cared for properly and don't smell, I have no issue with livestock in the city
- If it will help with mental health yes, but just because, no.



- Hens are a great hobby to have to help those with special needs, mental/physical disabilities, and they are not a large enough nuisance to seriously hinder a neighborhood but can bring one together.
- I think it would be great for people to be able to have other animals as long as they can take care of them properly
- Who wouldn't want fresh eggs as long as the animal is taken care of, and it's not harming anyone, owner is responsible. what's the problem
- I think this would be great! Learning where your food comes from is very important.
- As long as there would be NO roosters.
- A few chickens never hurt
- As long as they don't become a nuisance to neighbours.
- I think with proper regulation and screening to ensure proper ownership certain animals could be housed within the city without problems.
- "If support from the community and direct neighbors is granted, people should be allowed.
- I might suggest a size limit, based on the yard size."
- As long as when new neighbours move in they cannot disapprove and force them to remove animals
- We should all be free to grow our own food, especially in this uncertain economy.
- As long as neighbours are okay with it, and the livestock can be well taken care of, I think it is great to allow this.
- As long as the number of hens is very limited and they are quiet (not providing a nuisance) and the birds are properly cared for as COMPANION animals it's fine.
- Supportive of urban chickens
- I would support it but fear that "suitable living conditions" and is subjective. How would this be monitored? It's hard enough getting someone out to respond to an animal welfare complaint now!
- Getting neighbour approval is super important.
- Animals should be provided a decent living otherwise they shouldn't have them.
- Asking as living conditions and needs are met, I do not see an issue with it. Not all living arrangements (like condos) would be able to accommodate livestock, but some communities have large yards that can accommodate such animals, to an extent.
- I've always wanted to get hens and other farm yard animals would be good.
- I think chickens are great. Ducks and geese too. Goats should happen as well. But limit them the same as pets. No more than 3 of each. And make it a licensed venture. Makes for a more responsible owner.
- Hens provide a food income source which could be shared and lead to greater stability. Animals also can lead to improved mental health and encourage people to spend more time outdoors
- numbers should be limited
- I'm in support of this as long as it's well-maintained, the animals are healthy and treated well. And the owner is accountable and respectful of their surroundings.
- Pigs are cleaner the dogs



- I think it would be a great idea to facilitate livestock animals in a regulated system in the city. This could help with giving people more options for their pets and could inform and educate people on the importance of these animals in our day to day lives (home education themes/topics)
- People should quite frankly have that option as this is our owned property. We pay a lot of money for our land and it should be ours.
- As long as sound and smell are under control there should be no issue. But if there is neglect, then that individual should no long be allowed to have the hens and livestock
- Everyone gets a free chicken
- This is an amazing idea! Let's live in harmony with the hens and all animals in our city! No need to kill them when we can make friends with them and eat something that isn't sentient
- As long as the animal isn't a nuisance to neighbours, urban hens can provide healthy food and a hobby to Calgarians.
- They should never have been taken away.
- For us, we would love to be more self sufficient in the city with growing our own food and having hens.
- Goats are fantastic animals to have in a proper sized yard. As a small pig would be.
- Support from adjacent neighbours would be 100% necessary and very strict rules would need to be in place
- So long as the animals needs are top priority, in the city people should have to get approved before adopting livestock by proving they have the space, knowledge and financial resources to provide for these animals.
- As long as everyone in the immediate area is okay with it and the livestock are properly taken care of and provided for then it's all good.
- Love this
- Most people need animals for emotional support. If that animal is a house pig or another form of farm animal than so be it.
- I have friends who have had illegal backyard chickens without issue for years
- If these people can take care of these animals properly and have the appropriate space/equipment, it does not bother me.
- Support from neighbours and suitable living conditions are crucial.
- Self sufficiency and getting back to basics is amazing
- As long as your portentous neighbors don't more sway, and there should be more then one person to approve, in case the chief is friends with someone who has a problem,
- We should be allowed to grow or raise our food
- Small non intrusive livestock would be beneficial
- Surrounding areas have already allowed urban hens, including airdrie. Even TORONTO allows urban hens. Hens are an enrichment to people's lives. They are hardy, peaceful creatures, easy to care for and can teach children about animal husbandry. hens can be a decent option for low income families to produce nutritious meals. There should however be a rule on noisy roosters and hens. Certain breeds are louder than others.



- Many types of "livestock" are now considered pets. If they are provided for properly and not causing damage to the community it would be fine.
- We live in Alberta :)
- Livestock and hens are a great way for the Calgary community to have organic, self-sustaining food in their home
- I support this for hens and animals that are about poultry sized or smaller. I do not believe other livestock species can have their needs met in an urban setting
- I think the criteria are fair and provide good care for the animals. I am not opposed to livestock in the city at all so I think this is a good compromise
- I personally love the idea of being able to have fresh eggs and such. Long as they are cleaned up after properly, and country education on how to care for hens is offered.
- However, I do worry about the noise and smell
- Providing the animals have adequate space and care and do not create a disturbance.
- Yes, if the criteria above is met. Neighbors allergies must be taken into account. People with lung conditions etc... specific dog breeds are more prone to chase chickens etc. My personal opinion a dog takes precedence over owning a chicken.
- I would support this bylaw if there is agreement from adjoining neighbour's so they do not impose unnecessary disturbances.
- As long as the property and owners are suitable for care of livestock, there's no reason to not be allowed them.
- I'd love to have chickens. And I feel if it was monitored correctly and people had a limit on chickens they could have I think it could be done properly.
- Livestock including hen's offer food and sustainability to households
- All situations should be case by case and reflect neighbouring houses concerns
- Urban farming is becoming a more popular practice. As long as health standards are maintained I see no reason why a person with an appropriate set up should not be allowed to own specific, city appropriate, livestock.
- Seems reasonable.
- I feel as long as the person with the animals provides a good environment and cleans up after the animals they should be allowed
- I think people should have the right to farm in their own back yards as long as they don't overly upset the neighbours with animal smell and noise. I think a reasonable amount is okay.
- Yes provided the animal is not a nuisance to surrounding neighbors
- There will be a positive impact from this
- Hens are kept in many places throughout Canada and the us. It can help feed their family in a troubling time. I believe this is a good idea.
- Just like other pets in the city, I believe all these livestock should have to be registered with the city.
- Calgarians having hens would be beneficial to their community.
- Chickens provide food and in some instances support for some individuals



- Having a hen would be great for eggs! Food for the pandemic!
- All animals deserve suitable living arrangements
- Small scale livestock, when managed properly, are beneficial to the individual and the community.
- I do not support allowing urban hens in Calgary but if the bylaw goes ahead then these amendments will be required.
- It's worked in other cities.
- Urban hens would not be a nuisance to others if properly cared for, people should be able to keep what they want as long as it isn't hurting others.
- .
- chickens are awesome
- I see no issue with this
- I am in full support of urban hens and other livestock as long as the owners are accountable to the animals wellbeing.
- Support from neighbors critical. The smell...
- I want a pig and a goat.
- Urban hens can benefit a community through neighbour communication and sharing. Urban ducks and goats should also be considered.
- Having chickens is a great form of a sustainable food source. As long as the care is correct and they have proper living conditions, I am all for people owning a few chickens.
- Why not!?
- I would absolutely support livestock animals in city limits provided they are cared for properly. Taking care of animals can be great for your mental health and it's adds to a community!
- Suitable living conditions is my main concern. This would have to be described very well and be strict
- Fully support the concept of urban hens as long as there is a limit on how many each household can have on their property.
- So long as property owners can properly care for the animals and cleaning up after them to avoid smell.
- Options
- Hens aren't a danger and provide food so why not.
- Worked well in other cities if done right
- If people are interested and able to support themselves, feed their families and supplement their income this way than I don't see why not.
- Wait, I can't have chickens?
- as long as the hens/animals being kept are not for human consumption.
- However - there should be a proximity rule prior to requiring neighbour feedback.
- If someone can have a 100lb dog, I should be able to have a chicken. Freedom.
- I think they could benefit families
- Some people need chickens so they don't have to pay so much money for eggs



- There's no downside as long as there's no roosters and the hens are properly contained. I don't understand why it was ever not allowed.
- Let people do what they want to some degree, if the neighbors don't have any problems then I don't see the issue.
- I think chickens would be a great addition and the eggs they provide can reduce the grocery bill of many family. I think a noise bylaw should be in place for male chickens as it is unnecessary for a rooster to crow in the am in an urban environment.
- Grew up on a farm. Hens, when taken care of are great. Teaches more responsibility for children. Also, the smell isn't there if cleaned up appropriately, and noise isn't ready and issue when there are not 20. Roosters are the problem. I don't see a huge difference between chickens and dogs and cats. Other than the outside house and running room needed.
- More animals would be good to add. Hens are great, but there are other options as well.
- As long as it did NOT impact the neighbours.
- Seems reasonable
- No pigs!! Bees are great, but in an urban yard, number of hives must be limited. Chickens OK, but noise levels must be low. All sites must pass regular inspections for cleanliness and proper animal husbandry procedures.
- I have no problem with small livestock, such as chickens, pigs, sheep. Large livestock can not be safely housed in an urban environment
- As long as their living conditions are regulated and they aren't being put in inhumane living conditions this is fine
- A city like Vancouver allows Hens but Calgary doesn't. So bizarre. I would like to have hens and fresh eggs from my back yard on my property.
- Appropriately managed urban hens and livestock should be allowed but require outlines for ownership.
- If followed I see no issues
- I think the idea of allowing a small number of hens or other small animal as emotional support animals or for eggs is good AS LONG AS owner can demonstrate that they have met all care requirements for the animal and have a veterinarian vet for the animal to see (agricultural veterinarians aren't really in the city). Especially important would be housing requirements through the winter cold and summer heat.
- If the livestock has the appropriate provisions and enough room on the property (size of the animal to the size of property ratio) then I don't see a problem (I personally would like a mini goat!)
- Yes, but it needs to be well laid out. The owner of the livestock must ensure that the animals are properly cared for, that they are not a noise or smell issue. The number of animals must be kept small and manageable (no hobby farms on a small residential lot). Fecal matter from these animals must be properly disposed of on a regular basis. The animals must be fully contained on the owner's property, no digging under fences. The animals must be small in nature. Guidelines need to clearly indicate what is and what isn't permissible or people will fill in the grey areas with things that are unacceptable.



- This would ensure neighbours are not impacted.
- Chickens!
- Why not?
- Being able to supply one's own eggs should be a basic need
- As long as adjacent neighbours are consulted and are comfortable with the hens, I think they can provide benefit to the community.
- Urban farming with reasonable types and amounts of livestock is a good idea. It creates a more vibrant and diverse community. It allows citizens to engage in meaningful daily activities.
- I would support things like hens, pot belly pigs and other reasonably sized and regular volume animals.
- Benefits the community as a whole. If the chickens are in good health and don't attract coyotes or other predators then good.
- Allow hens would be fine. May need to have larger yards
- I fully support responsible hen keeping.
- I think we need to be careful with this, but having the ability to potential approve in case-by-case would be OK. I am concerned that people will not understand what they are getting into with owning livestock type animals.
- I don't care.
- Sustainable living is more important than a few community aesthetic changes
- If all the criteria listed are met, I see many positive potential impacts of this kind of neighbourhood diversity
- as long as neighbours are okay with it, why can't people have fresh eggs. I do think that there should be an education component to allow people to have livestock in the city. How to care for, house and control livestock.
- I knew a few people who had, and took good care of, hens. As long as there is close monitoring of cleanliness to avoid aviary type flu.
- Urban hens would allow people to be self-sustaining. They don't cause any bigger issues than a dog or cat. If you have urban hens, you would have a licence (low registration fee only) and be under the same rules as dog or cat owners
- Better for semi-urban farmers. Who want to live both worlds.
- when suitable, these animals should be permitted on private urban areas.
- To a certain extent, I believe that there should be a limit on the amount and the type of animals depending on the space needed/given.
- I think it would be beneficial for many people to be able to have chickens etc.
- As long as the welfare and health of the chickens are appropriate (enough space, diet and shelter) then it's a great idea.
- Hens are a food source.. if they are properly taken care of sure np
- I think this would be a very positive step to allow people to keep chickens.
- It's a nice way to engage the community in a more eco-friendly manner.



- I fully support this idea as hens are no more annoying than dogs in that they are no more noisy or smelly.
- It would depend on what animals it would be.
- Sustainability is crucial. We should also be able to grow vegetables freely in our front yard.
- People should be allowed to keep hens.
- most important to enforce animal welfare. If these animals are to be kept in the city limits, their health and well-being should be far superior to such "fads" of having backyard chickens
- Urban farming (ie hens producing eggs) promotes community sustainability
- People should be allowed to do what they want as long as it doesn't infringe on another's freedoms. The bylaws seem currently quite biased towards what people consider "infringement".
- Providing there is sufficient land for the animals to roam free during daylight hours.
- Certain livestock in the city can do well if properly cared for.
- The more people we have capable of doing even minimal sustenance farming at home, is a net good.
- I would love to have a few hens and agree that this could/should be regulated for the hens well being.
- You can have a garden to grow your vegetables, why can't you have a chicken to get your own eggs
- Having hens or other livestock permits you to have your own food daily which could potentially bring costs of living down.
- As long as their are rules around cleanliness, smell, noise to ensure no disturbance to neighbours
- I think many people could benefit from having differing types of animals on their property
- If you have the means to have hens on your property and provide for them, it is a better way to keep them rather than factory coops.
- As long as the livestock are being properly cared for and aren't a nuisance at early hours I don't see an issue with keeping hens
- As long as the hens are kept in a roam area that's healthy for them and the neighbors (ex: the pen looks fit and there is no waste spilling into other property, smell included, etc.). People should have the option for more sustainable living experiences as long as they do not impede on existing rules and regulations (safety).
- Why not?
- As long as it is handled responsibly, I believe there are many benefits that livestock can provide to within the city.
- It should not impact neighbours or surrounding areas if an individual has Livestock and all the proper secure structures must be in place and health and safety measurement should be required
- Having a limited number of chicken in the back yard is no different than having barking dogs or cats. They're not as noisy as people would think certainly no worse then a barking dog. Teaching our children about appropriate animal care and food production is a great idea. For many these animals provide lots of emotional support (even if previous trauma is not the reason for need of such support).



- So long as people are taking care of their animals and it's not negatively effecting our property or life (noise, bad odour, mess).
- I think it should be upto the people of what animal they would like to keep.
- There are often many benefits to having animals such as hens. I also think it will reduce animal cruelty and dependency on factory farm eggs.
- Urban folk should be able to grow their own livestock.
- Love the chickens.
- As long as they are being taken care of and aren't bothering neighbors then I don't see an issue with someone having them.
- Remove the neighbour consultation.
- Provided these are laying hens, and they can be properly taken care of I have no issues
- Like many other things in life if it is done respectfully and with no ill will...it is none of my business
- The rules against live stock have always baffled me
- As long as the livestock could be properly contained and the neighbours are willing to tolerate the noise and smell, it wouldn't be a bad thing to get a bit more country into the city.
- As long as they're living in a proper condition and aren't a nuisance to anyone
- I support people having as much autonomy on their private property as possible. However I am also wary of the possible consequences to livestock on property, including strong odours, increased presence of wildlife predators, and damage to our city's ecosystem
- It would be nice to allow people to have hens in their own backyard providing they follow regulations
- Why not allow people to have livestock animals so long as neighbors are aware and okay with it.
- As long as there are no roosters I'm fine with hens.
- As long as a suitable habitat is provided and they are not a nuisance.
- Do not necessarily support requirement for support from neighbours unless if they can prove the livestock are disruptive or impacting their lives in a significant way
- Yes
- No roosters
- I think having hens is an amazing idea, as long as owner is responsible and hens are properly cared for
- Small traditionally rural animals that are not a nuisance and can be properly cared for should be allowed.
- having involvement from all parties allows bylaw officer to manage situations where these animals have the potential for the disturbance of others IE noise or Smell
- I believe that with the right living conditions various animals would thrive in back yards, and in turn they would help with education and self-sufficiency.
- As long as communication is made between neighbours this will work
- With the above criteria, I would support this
- I think you shouldn't need permission from neighbours



- Depending on if you're letting us use the hens as a source of food, it could bring eggs to low income families.
- Suitable living conditions is important - this point needs follow through and enforcement
- Organic living.
- I cannot see a negative to this.
- I've raised chickens myself and have been part of the Edmonton backyard hen pilot project as a chicken mentor. I think backyard hens are wonderful and would be happy to provide mentor ship for poultry husbandry in my neighbourhood.
- As long as the animals have adequate living conditions, their existence in urban areas won't affect much
- Allowing people to produce food (eggs meat etc) is fantastic and should be allowed
- But... limited animals and city approved accommodations for the animals
- It offers a solution to a more economic lifestyle if residents wish to explore that.
- Within limits. I'd be concerned if horses and cows started to appear in the yard next door.
- people should be allowed to raise their own food sources. I do want to see that animals are humanely raised so ensuring they have suitable living conditions should be a priority.
- Having a small coop in a home would be feasible and allow for a more sustainable lifestyle for a family
- So long as the hens are well cared for and have the space they need
- Hens are ok if clean but could easily get out of hand
- Yes I support, however I do believe potential for attracting dangerous wildlife (bobcats, coyotes, etc) into neighborhoods should be considered.
- People should be able to own the animals they want as long as they are cared for properly and under consideration for neighbors and other animals in the area.
- If it helps of course
- Sanitary conditions must be kept. Fines for noise and disruption and excessive excrement/waste
- I would support smaller animals chickens etc.
- My dream has always been to have a pig so id love to see more livestock in and around Calgary provided they have everything they need to survive
- Hens are great for urban homesteading, non-nuisance animal, and teaching our child/future generations how to live for themselves.
- Allowing food security and community benefit
- I don't think there's any harm.
- Urban Hens have proven to be a good thing so long as they are properly cared for
- Emotional support animals come in all shapes and sizes! As long as they are well cared for, given the correct environment, and aren't a nuisance- why not?
- If it is safe for the animals, why not? It's healthier and more sustainable for us to have our own eggs.
- I think it would be great to allow additional pet options in the city. We foster for the humane society and the option to foster pigs or hens, I would love to be able to help out more!



- As long as everyone is safe and the animals are happy and well cared for, sure (pigs, chickens, goats, etc.) I'm not in favour of cattle or horses, though. The city is no place for excessively large livestock.
- This would deter people from "impulse buying"
- Support from adjacent neighbours is important, while recognizing that sometimes neighbour relations can be difficult- these cases should be evaluated on a case by case basis to determine where problems might truly lie.
- Hens provide food. We need to understand where our food comes from and it's not a clean quiet grocery store.
- Other towns already allow for certain livestock. Why is it even a thing to not allow animals like hens, small pigs ect.
- I can't see why it is not allowed in the first place.
- n/a
- As long as owners are responsible, bylaws are enforced, and the animals are not dangerous they should be able to be kept on property.
- I see no reason why this would have a negative affect and therefore I support it.
- I think small livestock animals in the city would be ok if bylaws were followed. eg: hens; small breed pigs, goats, horses. These newer breed mini animals can be smaller than a lot of dog breeds and don't bark and aren't worse than aggressive dog breeds
- urban hens will not bother me.
- People should be allowed to raise their own poultry.
- As long as the animals are treated humanely and the neighbours are on board, why not? Individuals must demonstrate that they are able to care for the hens throughout their lifetime.
- If suitable living conditions are given I see no issue
- there needs to be proof of sanitary and appropriate living conditions for the animals as well as some education on the persons behalf on raising livestock.
- Hens and livestock when properly taken care of, provide little negative impact to a community n
- Support only if strong bylaws in place to ensure community engagement is considered prior to bringing in livestock. If livestock become a nuisance (smell/noise), options are available to mitigate the concerns.
- Suitable living conditions still needs to be further fleshed out. Alberta Farm Animal Care Association (<https://www.afac.ab.ca/resources/urban-hen/>) offers urban chicken courses that could be made a requirement to have hens within city limits.
- I have no problem with the above provided the animals are WELL cared for and the feces is cleaned up regularly
- There is benefit to this but could also attract coyotes and other predators into yards
- Urban livestock can be accommodated if done correctly-proper living conditions and minimal impact to others. I believe it can be done in a responsible manner-hens,miniature goats, rabbits- these could have a positive impact both environmentally and socially.

- Hens provide improvement to the urban flora/fauna. They reduce the amount of food waste going into the compost/garbage. They are quiet and friendly animals that pose little risk to keeping in the city
 - This is long overdue, the correlations listed have been realized and studied in many municipalities already. No brainer.
 - People should be allowed to raise their own hens. But do not allow them to be surrendered to the humane society. Do not let people have that option. Otherwise when they stop laying people will just leave them at the humane society and take up space for other animals.
 - I support Calgarians being able to own hens or other livestock. It provides fresh eggs and meat to households, allows families the opportunity to show children where food comes from, and can be a positive impact on communities and programs who also want to be able to raise livestock.
 - As long as their living environment is suitable
 - There really isn't a difference between livestock and 'pets'. The important thing is that the living conditions are good.
 - "Urban livestock is beneficial if done properly. Chickens dont take much.
-
- Yard size and a waste plan should be considerations to get permit approval.
-
- I honestly don't think neighbours should be involved as neighbors dont even abide by noise bylaws or fire bylaws but would throw a tantrum over animals."
 - I see nothing wrong with chickens pot belly pigs small livestock being in town as long as it is housed and cared for properly.
 - I believe having urban hens would be a positive experience for many people and families. It has been successful in so many other urban centres. I feel like Calgary is years behind on making this an option.
 - It's each person's right to decide what tupe of pet they would like to keep
 - Any animal can provide support why limit to just cats and dogs
 - Non intrusive livestock should be allowed within city limits, with a number restriction per household.
 - raising chickens for eggs and meat would be fantastic considering cost of living prices
 - I support farm animals in city limited
 - I have no issues with livestock as long as they are cared for properly.
 - Not really a nuisance so why not
 - Self sufficiency is necessary
 - Hens are pets too! And therapeutic for some people :)
 - allowing a small number (6 or less) chickens would be amazing in urban areas.
 - Growing and raising food locally is important not just for food chain supply but also for teaching the public where food comes from.



- I think this is a wonderful idea. Obviously there should be limits on number of livestock, and ensure proper housing that limits affect on environment and on neighbors.
 - I think that food security is important, and allowing urban Calgarians to have pets who produce eggs would be beneficial. As someone who has owned laying hens in the past, I can attest to the fact that if they are properly housed and cared for, they are quiet and do not smell. If feed is kept in a secure container, there is also no issue with rodents. Chickens actually kill and eat mice if they catch them! They also eat ticks and fleas.
 - As long as proper care guidelines are established.
 - "Wow. From Pitbulls to this.
-
- Allow chickens. They produce food and comfort to families. Kids can learn where food comes from in an urban area.
-
- This is the only good questions you have so far."
 - I feel we need the boost to food security and connection with our food. I volunteer with youth and many have lost touch with where our food comes from.
 - I would love to have hens for fresh eggs in my yard! Calgary is know for farming/cowboys/live stock. This would be amazing
 - Keeping of livestock is the responsibility of a person, not their neighbours. It should not matter whether or not the neighbors approve. Furthermore, if the city is to address the widespread food insecurity facing Calgarians, livestock must be allowed.
 - Small livestock is okay,
 - Done responsibly and non-intrusively, I am always for the freedom of people to do what they want on their own property and not to be stifled by the mounting number of bylaws that exist.
 - As long as they are managed responsibly
 - Seems like a good idea.
 - I think people should be allowed to have pets other than what is considered traditional in North America. It would help the community and help people other stand/work with different animals.
 - As long as appropriate shelter is supplied for weather conditions
 - Hens would be a great way to improve food security. There needs to be support for (quietly) killing a hen when is it no longer laying eggs to use for food too.
 - As long as the owner is responsible for said animal it shouldn't be an issue
 - Urban Hens can provide, eggs, enjoyment for their owners and valuable compost.
 - As long as they don't keep me up at night, and are kept in proper conditions. What other people do, doesn't matter to me.
 - Hens can help control bug/pest population on your property without using chemicals. Also an opportunity for fresh, organic eggs.



- Love eggs and chickens in homes our neighbour had one years ago in another city.
- I do think there needs to be a restriction on cockerels as they tend to be noisier, maybe limit number allowed
- Livestock are a valuable source of income and living
- We should be able to provide for ourselves in small ways, even in the city. Having a small number of chickens isn't going to cause harm, so long as they have the proper space, not too many chickens per household, and they're cleaned regularly.
- I think chickens would be great or even a goat if the space is avail.
- If the property is large enough to sustain a livestock animal and a protective shelter it should be permitted. Duplexes and townhouses should talk to their neighbors if their yard is shared. There should be a limit of what type of livestock and the number of livestock.
- Small livestock such as chickens would increase sustainability in our city and provide people the opportunity to grow/raise more of their food similar to community gardens.
- Urban hens would be a great idea! I would love to have hen eggs available and would put in effort to make sure it was done correctly.
- I think this would be beneficial for many people
- Yes because I myself would love to have a chicken pen.
- I have no problem with someone who is responsible owner having hens, as long as neighbours agree.
- Chickens and other livestock should only be allowed within city limits if the owner is willing to have the right conditions for their animals without having it disturb the lives of their neighbours, such as bad smells do to uncleanliness and other animal waste and buy products causing a nuisance to the neighbours or the community.
- I think that the annoyance to neighbours does have to be factored in and that the hens should be kept in a clean and smell free environment. The city should be allowed to investigate the hens living situation and take them away if they are found to be in an inhumane or unacceptable condition.
- I believe that hens could be an excellent addition under these conditions
- Chickens can be a useful pet, providing food, education, entertainment, comfort, etc to their owners. Hens are no (and often less) noisy then some other already allowed pets, and if properly taken care of do not produce [much if any] more odour then a dog would.
- I think urban farming is great if the proper care can be provided. There should also be a limit on the number of hens allowed.
- Hens would be awesome!
- Urban hens would allow for more sustainable food for a household and potentially a community
- Hens should be allowed provided they are adequately cared for and no more than 2 per household.
- As long as the animal is fo Ng estimated or looked after in a loving way this would be amazing.
- Only under the conditions that they be monitored by animal control and must actually be HENS not Pigeons. The amount of them and keeping them under control, not loose and noise levels, filth and health enforcement of both the living arrangements and the birds themselves. This include other animals near the cop. Cat / Skunks and wild dogs etcs



- Good education opportunity for kids. Support animals and provide food with rising costs due to govt forced shut down for a fake pandemic.
- As long as the animals are well cared for and not a nuisance they should be allowed, with reasonable limitations on numbers
- It would be great for family's to be able to ease some foods costs
- Not roosters!
- As long as animals and people are taken care of it is fine.
- I think everyone needs support animals no matter the animal
- if the correct and healthy living conditions are met why not? Why restrict hens? It seems rather elitist to say this person or that person can't have them when there is a monopoly on hens in the farming industry. Support for self sustainability should be a focus for the city.
- Support from adjacent neighbours may cause people to be unable to keep hens if the neighbours have a poor relationship
- Hens are therapeutical and offer a great source of food.
- If people have rescued farm animals or wildlife animals, they aren't going to be accustomed to living in the wild with their kind. We find stray farm animals for a reason.
- As long as they have neighbour support and will take care of said animal, I do not think it would be a problem.
- The goats do a great job with weeds and helps with it spreading so as long as it has a positive impact on the environment.
- Hens are no dirtier than a cat or dog and if they want to raise a hen for eggs or whatever who cares??
- Keeping hens would allow citizens to supplement food/income
- As long as the neighbours on in the chickens looked after them properly . Are they kept for producing eggs or slaughter .
- Animals protection and welfare
- As long as they are well taken care of, I see no issue.
- Helps with the impact of accessibility to a food source
- If the animals are well taken care of and are not hurting anyone else, there is no reason they shouldn't be allowed.
- Chickens should be allowed it's absurd that they aren't permitted
- As long as they're clean it would be a nice addition
- As long as it does not impact a neighbour or neighbourhood negatively. Having these kinds of animals can have educational benefits for children and families, provided they are well cared for, and the location is properly maintained to manage animal excrement and Calgary's seasons.
- Being able to have a few chickens on your property to provide fresh eggs or meat is a great idea. However again education is key and rules on the coop need to be put in place.
- As long as noise levels and odours are reasonable, and there is sufficient plans for enforcement
- I want a back yard donkey



- We are interested in having chickens as pets.
- I have always thought prohibiting livestock/farm animals was stupid.
- As long as they can show they are capable of care and the equipment to care for them.
- It needs to be on a case by case basis.
- If the animals can be housed with no negative effects to neighbours or the animals themselves, It should be allowed.
- Urban hens could provide a great boon to citizens of Calgary. However, this must be done respectfully of their neighbours.
- I'm from the Netherlands, where this has been legal for as long as I can remember. There have never been issues.
- Let people have their own little farm house
- I believe keeping small livestock in the city is positive as long as it is suitable
- Becoming more connected to nature is something we all need.
- I would have no problem with hens, as long as their coop is properly maintained and they are contained to the individuals property. I do not agree with any roosters within City limits
- The world belongs to nature and animals humans just think they own it.
- hens make good pets and offer resources at little to no disruption to others
- Dogs and cats are allowed so why not other animals.
- I think there should be a walk through of the property to assess whether having that type of livestock will have the care it needs and whether there will be unwanted issues for the neighbors due to the livestock
- If suitable living conditions are provided, neighbours consent is given and bylaw officers are competent in evaluating exceptions I think the amendment is acceptable.
- We live in a farming province, as long as conditions are proper I don't find I have the right to take away people's love for animals
- I would love to have hens, and believe its beneficial to families
- If they have the correct environment I don't see why not
- As long as the property is large enough and the neighbors are consulted for noise / allergies
- Hens, rabbits, and small game birds are a viable source of food, like small gardens.
- Not everyone is an acceptable pet/animal owner and should be held to higher standards of care
- I believe urban hens should be allowed within reason. They need to be properly cared for and housed
- If it's evaluated on case by case, same as any other animal.
- Hens and ducks can be good pets and a source of food. Small goats make great pets and help keep your yard trim.
- Backyard chickens can be beneficial to the individual and to the community
- there has to be a limit, say 2 hens, and there needs to be agreement from neighbors on all sides.
- As long as all conditions are met, why not?!
- Doesn't bother me



- Yes, urban farms are amazing
 - If neighbours are opposed they need to provide rationale beyond they just don't like it.
 - If it benefits the community and causes no issues then i agree.
 - If they can be kept cleanly and responsibly, why not?
 - As long as animals can be kept safe and healthy, at the same time, not being a constant nuisance to neighbors, then an individual should be allowed the chance to do so.
 - "Urban hens have worked in many other cities, reducing food scarcity and providing a source of protein.
-
- Its time for Calgary to do the same."
 - I support small, local livestock for sustainable living.
 - Any animal can be well kept
 - As long as the living conditions are safe and suitable and there is not excessive noise (ie no roosters)
 - As long as owners are responsible
 - I like the idea
 - I am all for different animals in households, as long as they are being cared for.
 - No issue with owning them but your direct neighbor should be informed.
 - I think if they are being looked after properly and the neighbours don't object there should be no issue. Even in some cases with neighborhood objections it could be allowed ie for support animals
 - Plenty of animals in town. I've no problem with livestock.
 - I think more people should be able to have chickens for fresh eggs
 - As long as the smell and noise level isn't offensive then why not.
 - Make people take a course on proper care first. People need to do better
 - Supported provided the above conditions would be met, and assuming an appeals process could be in place where a solid case is made but neighbours are against without reasonable cause.
 - there are people within the city who would make great hen guardians, but this would need to be monitored closely as hens are more complex than most people believe, and are more than just egg machines. heated winter living conditions would need to be made maditory.
 - .
 - Urban hens and livestock can provide both a food source and comfort to owners. As long as they are able to be cared for appropriately within city limits they should be allowed.
 - yes, only if people with urban farms have licences and support from authorities and neighbours.
 - There a number of animals that would be acceptable inside city limits as long as the above conditions are met.
 - Hens would be beneficial and quieter than my neighbours dogs
 - If the animal can be cared for properly, I don't see why not1



- I keep a hen outside of the city where I lease my horses. Would be more convenient to keep her home instead.
- Would be great for sustainability and local food production.
- Nothing wrong with natural farming
- People who want chicken should be allowed to have them as long as they are registered and random quality checks are done because people don't look into the health concerns with housing chicken.
- Strict rules required.
- I believe it's a good idea to allow families to have low cost, healthy, sustainable, renewable food source as long as the animals are being well taken care of and proper licensing is enforced.
- I think it would make our city a bit unique and allow for citizens to experience something here they can't in other places.
- Allows income for Calgarians by potentially selling the eggs, and healthier people from home raised eggs.
- if people have the space and proper living conditions, they should be allowed to do what they want on their property as long as it's within reason and responsible.
- We have chickens and are low income. It insures we can always have a healthy meal.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and monitoring is in place for wellbeing
- As long as urban roosters don't become a thing because of noise I think a small amount of agriculture within the city would be a benefit to people and great learning for kids
- A few chickens should be allowed
- There are lots of type of animals that can live in thr city as long as they have suitable living arrangements
- As long as they take proper care of the animals, and have adequate space, people should be allowed to choose what 'pets' they have.
- Hens are pretty docile creatures and should not be a problem
- We should start acting more like a community and supporting our neighbors. If the animals are well taken care of and we could all benefit from it, why not?
- Allowing Calgarians to own chickens would be beneficial for local economies and allow diversification!
- hens are honestly lovely. But maybe put a maximum of 3.
- I fully support urban hens.
- Why not. It couldn't hurt if everyone in the vicinity of the hens is on board. Very progressive and forward thinking
- Chickens are great pets and for companionship Also, eggs! Please no roosters allowed.
- I would also like to add Goats to that.
- If its their property or they have permission from landlord then they should be allowed. Private property means exactly that.
- I would love to be able to have a couple chicken and enjoy fresh eggs



- people should be allowed to own what they want provided they are keeping the animals and people around them safe and secure.
- Livestock within the city can help those of lesser income be able to maintain a livelihood. Certain limitations should be taken, i.e a limit of coops, and/or livestock within a property. Depending on property size will also depend on occupancy
- It is no more bothersome than pets in a yard
- I would love to have livestock at my urban home
- Yes for chickens. No for anything bigger that people wouldn't bring inside during cold months
- Why spend time and resources on something that has never been a major issue in calgary?
- Case by case basis is most important. Need to be careful with people who have no idea of basic animal husbandry who would feel it would be "cute" to have livestock as a pet, and ultimately the animal suffers. Home inspections at initial license, and also periodically to ensure adequate husbandry is necessary.
- Only if neighbours were consulted and agreed to hens
- As long as proper living conditions are provided small livestock i.e. goats, pigs, chickens should be allowed.
- I do not see hens, ducks etc as a problem in the city of calgary
- Responsible, licensed pet ownership should be encouraged. Love of animals and sharing space with them is natural and should be encouraged. It gives humans better respect for other creatures and encourages conservation-positive attitudes towards other forms of life.
- Remove support from neighbours. People don't need permission for a dog even if it barks a lot - we have methods to deal with that. We can have methods to deal with smell and noise similar to existing permitted animals.
- It would be good for people to learn where their food comes from
- I have no issue in case by case basis. I think on zero lot lines could be an issue for neighbors if there is noise
- ONLY if it doesn't cause any disturbances and if neighbours have the opportunity to confidentially provide there input if the animal(s) are causing issues (noise, smell.... etc). People won't give there honest opinion if they are asked by the owner or bylaw officers. People are to afraid of causing a ruckus or drama, so they lie.
- I support this so long as the criteria above is enforced through an application process.
- Love the idea of people being allowed chickens and livestock with approval from neighbours and enviroment enforcing
- Hens yes, I see nothing wrong with a few chickens provided they have shelter and heating in the winter
- You let people keep pigeons but not chickens?
- We need to start acting more like a community and actually supporting our neighbors. If we could all benefit from it, and the animal is well taken care of, why not?



- Settings can be tight and can be locked on leashes are many standards that reflect it having a hen is no more devastating than having a potbelly pig or a dog or a cat. Owner is responsible for keeping the hand clean and healthy
- Yes I think it is important for people to have chickens, it helps with landfill waste as chickens eat a lot of compost scraps. It helps people feed their families too!
- As long as the animal is being cared for properly and they have proper space to roam and graze
- I think Urban hens are acceptable
- Keeping hens in the city would be greatly as long as there were laws in place to protect the animals; limiting the amount of birds one could safely keep, establishing the rules for their habitat, etc.
- This would promote healthy habits.
- On the condition that all neighbours in a reasonable distance must agree to allow not just those immediately beside the residence. Approval should be revoked if multiple complaints.
- Having hens is a great idea
- It should be only animals that are quiet, and should not include animals that need a lot of space to run for a satisfying life.
- Minimal government restrictions. In fact, the city should expand the list of animals allowed along with defined conditions.
- People should be able to supply thier own food
- Helpful but pointless
- Families having hen's can be beneficial, and wouldn't be anymore louder or annoying as dogs that bark.
- Depends on the livestock and numbers should be capped per household regarding livestock.
- Good for sustainable eating
- Fresh, local eggs are wonderful and hard to come by.
- Owning hens would be another step closer to households becoming more self sustaining. That is a win in my books
- Required training for hen owners regarding proper animal care and community/neighbourhood standards in relation to keeping the hen
- there needs to be strict laws insuring the safety and care of these animals. You cannot allow them to be treated as horribly as they are on a farm
- Any complaints of negligence or impact on neighbors investigated immediately
- I think this is a wonderful idea and a great way to provide eggs for ones family etc.
- However, not requiring neighbour support as this unfair to those with uncooperative neighbours...should not hold sway over rights that other citizens can enjoy.
- I think pets such as goats could be a benefit to weed control. Rooster are not appropriate in the city however.
- I think this is a great idea
- "Laying hens should be allowed. Rosters should not.



- So many live stock animals are beneficial. Its situational depending on providing the right living conditions for the animal. Neighbor support should be required as well."
- The description above wasn't very specific but I believe that if the animal is being taken care of properly and each case is being worked out individually it could be a possibility.
- Why not allow people to have chickens etc, they do everywhere else. We are behind
- sustainable food, better conditions for the hens supplying food for a family.
- I am on board with this so long as there is a "trial period" after approval by community members/neighbours, and that ultimately the approval for livestock can be revoked if the neighbours file complaints and agree that the livestock has become an issue since prior approval, with proper evidence provided before a hearing/tribunal, etc.
- I would not mind my neighbors having hens
- So long as appropriate health, welfare, and care standards are being met for the animals I would support this.
- I am fine with these propositions, as long as there would be licensing, or investigation into complaints from neighbours for noise etc. Possibly no roosters allowed.
- I support urban hens/ livestock based on the criteria listed above.
- Animals like chickens dont need much room just adequate shelter. However the actual needs of the animal need to be considered. For example goats probably dont belong in a small backyard.
- Hens can teach kids the value of healthy food and how to care for animals. Get them out of the house.
- I just. really like animals and seeing them in the city makes me, personally, happy
- Chicks are better than children.
- It provides legal opportunity. People will do this regardless illegally.
- I've previously owned 12 hens in a different province. They helped with bugs and were a great pet to have. I do think a no rooster law should be added as they most likely will be aggressive and loud. Hens should be kept to under 6 for inter city properties
- It would support local
- A maximum number of hens should be set. They are beneficial to keeping pests populations down.
- Things like backyard chickens help sustainability and are environmentally friendly.
- Any measure that takes an animal out of a factory farm situation is a positive one.
- Animals can and will become accustomed too there surroundings and if adequate Food, shelter and mental health is available there should be no problem
- Livestock kept responsibly is an excellent addition to any community.
- Livestock can be beneficial and if it does not impact others there is no reason not too.
- As long as these animals are not a nuisance and are kept in a suitable, clean environment...I see no problem with it.
- Would support up to 4 hens as pets and egg layers. Concerned about rooster crowing before 6am in the summer.



- I think allowing small livestock to be kept on city property is a great idea & no different than keeping a vegetable garden.
- I would, however this runs in to the problem of noise. If my dog can't bark, but a rooster can crow (can't train a rooster or collar it like a dog), that feels unfair.
- It is none of your business if someone wants to become more self sufficient for food or if they want companionship from a non-conventional pet. The municipal government needs to learn it's place and show more respect for freedom for responsible people.
- We as humans should be able to raise our own animals of any sort for food or for mental health given we pay outstanding amounts for properties as is.
- hens are an excellent sustainable choice! And goats are a natural weed solution that it not harmful to other animals (like fertilizer is)
- There would need to be strict regulation to encourage responsible ownership
- As long as the animals are being properly cared for I'm ok with it
- As long as suitable, well-kept conditions are provided hens are a positive addition to the neighborhood.
- Other jurisdictions have allowed these type of conditions, and it appears you have taken the consideration/support of the neighbors into account before approval. If properly taken care of, hens and other livestock can be no different a pet than dogs or cats.
- As long as the property is suitable for the animal, and the owner has the meNs to take care of it.
- People should be able to have any pet they want within reason and as long as the pet isn't a nuisance to the neighbourhood then why shouldn't the owner enjoy their pet.
- Hens are able to provide even just a little bit of food for the community, which everyone deserves to eat
- Xx
- As long as it's done respectfully and the animals are not a nuisance to other neighbors I would support this.
- As long as there is a limit to the number of hens per household
- Backyard hens and other livestock can be an excellent addition as long as the program is correctly researched and enacted.
- I think we should be able to have chickens within city limits, as long is they do not cause issues for neighbours or those who wish not to have chickens.
- This is no different than having pets, as far as I'm concerned.
- I have no problem with hens and other potential livestock in the city as long as they are well cared for.
- Chickens are great.
- Chickens are a great support to the community! And making sure that they are given proper living conditions is beneficial.
- This is acceptable provided there is a limit to numbers of livestock and the noise level that may result in them being housed in an urban setting



- I don;t think you need your neighbour to agree. Some people in the city are really hard to live beside. They are just violent, mean and not worth engaging with.
- Allowing people to provide for their own food security, i think is very important.
- As long as neighbours are supportive and aware, and the animal is looked after appropriately, owning a hen is beneficial for education and providing food.
- Limits on numbers of livestock must be in place.
- If someone can properly care for that animal? Sure.
- If people are allowed to have a dog on their property then it would make sense to allow chickens and other livestock.
- It's worked other places in the world so why not here.
- I think more people should have access to learning the care of livestock.
- I think it's a good thing
- There are few places in different cities around the world with small urban farms but with limits of how many animals.
- In areas of Calgary with very large lots and distant neighbours there is no reason someone shouldn't have hens... but in areas with small yards and urban density backyard hens are not appropriate as they would not have good living conditions.
- As long as living conditions are suitable
- I would love to have hens
- I think hens should be allowed as long as they are provided with proper living conditions and there are no issues with neighbors in regards to smell.
- As long as it is not a nuisance to me or smells like farm in my yard I don't mind my neighbours having livestock.
- As long as the animal is domesticated and provided a good home there should be no reason to take it away.
- As long as it is done properly and the neighbours approve, then it only makes sense.
- Chickens are safe pitbulls are not
- Receiving approval from adjacent neighbours is essential, and NO ROOSTERS for heavens sake.
- Creating sustainable food sources through urban livestock is a great idea that has worked for other municipalities.
- I see no issues with livestock animals provided they do not cause issues regarding noise or smell.
- Urban hens would be a very sustainable and positive step forward
- But not for food.
- Within reason this is beneficial. Grandfather clauses would need to be included so that a new neighbor could not cause a previously approved animal to be disallowed. Home buyers should be told as part of disclosure.
- The government should have less control over what happens on private property
- Why not. If there are suitable living conditions and everyone is fine with it.



- As long as they are just used for eggs. I don't want to see chickens getting their heads snapped off. Repulsive.
- I like fresh eggs
- Although I think agricultural animals like chickens should be allowed, the size of the average Calgary yard is tiny and barely provides enough room for a dog or cat let alone an agricultural animal larger than a chicken. Furthermore, if a neighbourhood had a high concentration of agricultural animals the actual capacity/animal would be too small leading to a crowding issue that would never be allowed on an Alberta farm.
- Hobby farms and self sustainable living should be an option for all
- Health and welfare of the animal is important as is neighbour support
- If the animals are being cared for properly then why not?
- Hens seem harmless. People should have their own eggs.
- It's important to have parameters around this because there are always some who will attempt to push for more and more. The criteria outlined above are good
- I don't see a reason why not.
- As long as animals were properly cared for.
- We need to move towards sustainable urban farming
- I don't think it's a bad thing to have chickens as long as you're being responsible
- Urban gardening and farming is one of the pillars of a healthy city - the access to locally grown food eases poverty and supports the environment.
- Livestock within the city is fine as long as the animals are being properly cared for
- Other than support from adjacent neighbours. It should either be legal or not. Asking your neighbours for permission is ridiculous.
- If owners follow the bylaws they shall have right to practice to limited version raising their own organic hens
- People should be allowed to have an amount that is relative to the size of their property.
- I support it
- It's ok as long as there are clear guidelines for noise and cleanliness
- Everyone should be able to own a pet as long as they can care for it properly and have the right environment for it. A pet is a family member and to deny someone that isn't right in my opinion
- If someone wants to have a few chickens they should be able to
- why not let people keep hens if they are doing the best by the animals and the law.
- I have no issues provided the animals are properly cared for.
- People should be able to keep hens
- If cared for correctly and it is not a disruption to a neighbour people should be allowed to keep hens
- Hens
- Why not as long as we don't end up with people that hoard livestock and use it for family and friends (eg.eggs) then I would support it.
- Many animals (goats) can be quite helpful (keeping park grass short and weeded)



- As long as standards are met, and neighbors agree
- Backyard chickens will reduce the amount of organic waste placed in the green bins and it allows people to raise their own organic food source if they do choose.
- If one have the space and proper hen house it should be allowed
- Support animals are not limited to domestic animals.
- Let us have livestock for personal use such as chickens for eggs. A cow for milk? It would be weird for me for someone to raise and animal for eating though if they were allowed to slaughter them in their open back yard. For animals to be slaughtered for eating they must have an enclosed slaughter area that has water access/drainage to sewer for cleaning. Have a minimum yard size for larger animals. If someone has a tiny yard with no pasture than limit to one or two chickens.
- There would need to be a check-in process to ensure cleanliness and allow neighbors complaints to be handled quickly, but I support this measure.
- As long as there is support from neighbours and hens are well cared for I would support this
- If dogs and cats are allowed so should other animals
- Please take neighbours into account. It was not done for legalizing pot and now there are days when I can't have my windows open because I find the smell offensive.
- I would love to see backyard chickens. I think most people are responsible and this allows us to have a bit of self sufficiency and an ability to provide another affordable source of food.
- Neglected care of livestock brings terrible smell making neighbours (and the livestock) suffer.
- People should be able to have access to eggs on their property if they have the space.
- Urban hens will improve local food supplies
- Raising chickens in an urban setting is a great way to teach and learn
- There would need to be a class on proper rearing
- There should be a limit to how many livestock and they have a specific purpose whether they are a pet or have some other purpose like providing eggs for the family.
- Why not?
- Again common sense
- As long as they are clean.
- I don't mind chickens.
- If my neighbours wanted hens, why not? They can make wonderful pets. As long as they have my support then I'm fine with it.
- As long as their are strict guidelines around quality of life for the animals and restrictions on living conditions. The animals should also be licensed.
- I have seen responsible owners with house chickens and small pigs. They have benefitted the community
- I think chickens can make lovely pets!
- Chickens are amazing! Let us be somewhat self sufficient!
- Hens are not loud, not only can they provide food but they hep keep away bugs



- This is a healthy life style choice and if it is well organized could increase the life style level of many communities
- If someone wants to raise a hen on their property it doesn't affect mw
- Responsible ownership will benefit the community
- If the hens didn't cause disturbance or danger to surrounding neighbours it should be allowed.
- I've yet to see a typical "Farm" animal owned by a hobby farmer or animal enthusiast living in anywhere near as poor of conditions as mainstream farm standards. Definitely need to ensure that they're treated as what they are though, a 700lb sow can pose a significant threat on a good day with a careful owner, much less a bad day with an irresponsible one.
- CITY SLICKER CHICKENS HECK YEA
- Na
- If done properly its a great idea and helpful to families but point number one should be removed.
- I was unaware of urban hens existing in the city and support the criteria given that these livestock are communal and respected
- As long as there was a limit on the number of hens a homeowner was allowed. Hens can be noisy and smelly.
- As long as it's kept clean and quiet- neighbors should have a say
- Urban Chicken keeping has become extremely popular and is allowed in many bedroom communities surrounding the Calgary area. However, I do believe that this should be regulated in some form. I think that people wanting to have Urban chickens should be required to purchase licences to cover some of the costs incurred by the city.
- As long as the animal has adequate living arrangements and is properly cared for. It must also be for the well being of the animal.
- Livestock as in farm animals
- As long as the birds in question are not causing any distress to the neighbours I don't see a problem with having Urban hens.
- As long as people are okay with it why not. It is cow town after all.
- Home grown eggs and chickens are ok if the surrounding 5 homes on all 4 sides of the proposed application are ok with the coop
- Urban chickens have been successful elsewhere.
- As long as it's not bothersome to others why would it be an issue?
- Having pair of hens for Laying eggs should allow big help for the community to have additional source of daily egg on the table
- Responsible pet owners and true animal activists adapt and can manage well these situations.
- In this day and age, people should be allowed to become more self sustaining, providing eggs for their families would be incredibly helpful in feeding people who may not have some luxuries.
- I believe that they can be properly housed and maintained in the city without offence to neighbours when done properly.
- As long as they are limited to 2 per household



- "I encourage the keeping of other livestock with the approval of surrounding people (with reasonable objections) as long as there are standards for the keeping of said livestock.
- I don't see an area on this page regarding breed specific rules for dogs. I am strongly against all breed specific laws or regulations. If there is believed to be an issue then insist on training for such animals and their owners although I'm not sold on that either as there are many possibilities for variance."
- I don't think it should necessarily have community benefit. Unless the community would be willing to contribute to the care and upkeep of the livestock
- I think there would be a lot of benefits to this, including lowering food costs.
- Small food producing animals are essential to some to eat!
- As long as the animal is safe, healthy, well cared for, and has the proper living space I think it's fine with in reason. Some animals should not live in the city but that's because of the lack of required space ie. horse or cow. I think it should also have to be something your neighbours should be ok with. Fresh eggs are good, with that said if you want to have a bunch of live stock no it's the city, move to a farm. It's better for the animals to be in more open space and away from the toxic fumes of the city.
- I think if the circumstances offer the possibility for a safe, healthy and nurturing environment for the livestock and fellow Calgarians then they should be able to raise certain animals. I would however recommend making some kind of rule or law that there be animal welfare checks made 1-2x a year for anyone who has registered with a livestock program or have registered livestock animals to protect both animals and citizens.
- Hens make great pets and provide eggs! They do not disturb other people. I would limit it to two hens per family though.
- as long as not a nuisance to others why not
- An animal that offers emotional or physical benefit to owners and can be provided suitable living conditions should not be restricted. Again, owner takes full responsibility of their pet.
- It would have positive impact on the community and would be a great success
- Calgary and surrounding area has many larger residential areas and houses that could be more than suited for livestock such as hens, I do feel that there should be some sort of like inspection or something to make sure that the animals have space and won't be neglected etc. But as long as it's done properly I don't see a problem with it!
- As long as the animals are cared for properly and aren't bugging anybody else I think it's fine
- Yes, urban hens is a fantastic idea which would provide countless benefits to the families involved. Locally sourced food is a huge factor for reducing ones carbon footprint, for starters.
- People should be allowed to raise hens as long as the practice acceptable poultry husbandry
- Well cared for chickens can provide many benefits to a family.
- If the animals can be properly cared for they should be allowed.



- More animal diversity, especially for agricultural purposes in the city is a good thing
- Livestock can provide food and grazing to citizens.
- As long as the backyards are kept clean and there aren't a huge amount of chickens running around making noise, etc it should be ok
- Food security and engagement with the food cycle is crucial. I am so grateful for this proposed change
- As long as they are being properly taken care of I do not see a problem
- As long as these are suitable conditions. I don't agree having a horse living in my backyard unless I have an acreage.
- I think that if a family owns a rooster, they should give up their right to operate a gas-powered lawnmower or leaf/snow-blower. (trade in right to use noisy equipment for right to own rooster).
- If proper rules for the betterment of the animals and community health, this could be great. My biggest concern is the rules broken or ignored.
- "Suitable living
- This also lowers environmental"
- I think backyard chickens are beneficial and would keep pest control down as an alternative to chemical treatment.
- no roosters and we're good
- I don't mind urban livestock in the community as long as they are well taken care of and don't become a nuisance.
- Backyard hens are a great way to get fresh eggs! Fantastic idea!
- We should be able to have hens and other animals of cared for properly!
- Only if it did not affect the lives of neighbours (as stated above, must be supported by people living adjacent). I don't think having chickens in an apartment is proper, but if you have adequate space it could be ok.
- Any legislation that allows Calgarians to be more self sufficient in their food is a good thing, I think.
- Helps support families.
- Hens can be a valuable resource for healthy food and could be rewarding for Calgary families (teaching responsibility to children, and bonding with them as pets)
- I think it's natural for people to have livestock. It would help citizens to provide for themselves.
- I don't see these animals being anymore problematic than people keeping domestic pets.
- I think people should be allowed to own hens and other livestock if the animals are cared for, I don't see a problem with it.
- I think everyone should have the option to own chickens if they want to and do not get to love rural. They are wonderful pets.
- I support house chickens. They are bring value to a family life.
- When tended to properly they are of use and can help with good costs for some
- If everyone that will be affected is involved and supports the presence of the animals then let it happen. Why should someone who is not involved or impacted be able to stop it?



- People should have the right to raise their own food, provided they can be cared for humanely, and that noise or pollution isn't an issue for neighbours.
- As long as there are some forms of noise control or bylaw.
- Go hens! Yay!
- The idea of producing food has benefits on so many levels better understanding of the food we eat, a relationship with animals that we don't normally have, support for income management with self-produced food, non-chemical pest management for other crops and best of all education for citizens of all ages and stages
- Yes, because factory farming is often very cruel and Not environmentally responsible. But there needs to be regulations and Check-ins so that animals are safe and healthy.
- As long as noise isn't crazy and the proper care of the animal is met, I have no problem and see no issue with this.
- This would be a phenomenal way to promote local food development and sustainable living (raising your own chicken for eggs, for example).
- If the animals are being treated humanly and they have sufficient living space.
- If it's good for the environment, why not?
- People and animals are a natural pairing. There is no real reason why people can't have chickens. Or other animals. My neighbour has no animals but makes noise all day. We can all live together and relearn to be respectful of each other. And by respect, I don't mean to be quiet as to not disturb other people, I mean to respect each other's way of life and chose not to be bothered by the noise of people living a happy life.
- Hens are not a detriment to the city therefore shouldn't be banned
- Chickens good. Roosters bad.
- I want a duck
- I see no harm in allowing these animals provided they are well cared for by responsible, considerate, competent owners.
- Something as small and harmless as hens would be a fun addition to city living
- Yes as hens are a source of food and could help low income family's
- I want a chicken myself.
- I think it's important that we start looking at feasible ways to urban farm.
- It is okay as long as these conditions are met to ensure the neighbour's are not bothered and the animals are safe. However, I have concerns as typically a rooster is kept with hens for their protection, and roosters are loud.
- You are allowed hens in BC and it has been a great addition to many city/town people's lives by providing eggs and other by-product of hens
- Community food is healthier, cheaper, and more sustainable if done properly. Less gas, packaging, animal abuse, the carbon outputs would greatly reduce.
- If the hens are kept in suitable living conditions and do not disturb the neighbors, I don't see any issue.
- I think this could also help with supporting sustainable and local food options (eggs)



- As long as they are taken care of and cleaned up after.
- I think exploring urban farming would be beneficial to the city and its culture, and will help people learn more diverse skill sets.
- As long as they aren't loud and disruptive and they help the community out/ keep them safe why not do it?
- I think it is a great way to teach children about where our food comes from
- Chicken lady lives in my neighbourhood. We have way bigger concerns than her chickens.
- "There should be limitations set in place so that animals and people can live in peace.
- Example - 2 horses in a inner city backyard"
- As long as the owner is responsible and cares for the animals and community properly, this is fantastic.
- If someone wants a chicken let them have a chicken
- As it is healthy and the animals are safe and happy
- Urban chickens are an amazing benefit to communities and neighbors, and contribute to self sufficiency of households
- As long as the animals housing and food etc (quality of life) is regulated and neighbors/ neighborhoods are considered then it's fine
- Hens and any other animal that can benefit a community and be properly housed and cared for and agreed upon by all neighbours, should absolutely be allowed!
- Animals must be kept safe, contained and well cared for. No objectionable noises or odors are permitted. All adjacent neighbors and others that could be directly impacted agree to animals presence.
- I think it is well thought out although I am terrified of birds and chickens, I think it urban hens will have a positive impact on the community
- I mean if people have the room and money to keep it going, Why not?
- We should always be allowed to have and grow our own food as long as there is sufficient space to do so
- I think it can be fun and beneficial if done responsibly.
- I think it's a good idea
- depending on the livestock. I would not support roosters, farm pigs, cattle, or horses
- I think that the raising of chickens and other livestock can be a source of pride for a family or community, an educational experience for children - and of course, a source of delicious eggs and other scrumptious animal products. I think it might also encourage people to garden more, and to allow their yards to become habitats for indigenous plant species instead of just grass.
- There is no harm in exploring the idea and testing feasibility.
- as long as the welfare of the animals are forefront, I have no issues with any animals.
- I am/have never been/am not looking to own any livestock. I do not feel qualified to make an in depth decision, but feel whichever option is the best outcome for the livestock is appropriate.



- Only chickens should be allowed at this time and a special license or permit should be required. I do not see what other livestock would be suitable living in an urban setting at this time.
- As long as an animal has sufficient living conditions and not a nuisance to neighbours, I don't see why it would be different from owning any other "domestic" animal.
- I would say as long as suitable living conditions are provided and people approve, I don't see why there can't be hens hanging around.
- in support granted that both the welfare of the animals and the cleanliness of the enclosures are maintained and not a disturbance to the neighborhood.
- N/a
- Just awesome!!! Why not?!
- I support all options to help produce sustainable and affordable food
- Bugvthere should be strict rules for it for the people that are not responsible with their hens. It will already be hard to regulate and chicken manure produces bad smells ammonia when not removed regularly.
- I would love a hen but there should be a restriction on how many
- I don't think keeping *certain* smaller livestock should be illegal as they pose no threat to the land or community (ex. Chickens)
- As long as the livestock animals are not causing a disturbance to neighbors and animal waste is kept clean, I don't oppose people owning hens and possibly other livestock.
- Support from neighbours is the most important thing, as chickens and other urban livestock can be problematic for many.
- I believe that people in Calgary should be allowed to own specified livestock as long as it doesn't hinder the natural and peaceful living of their neighbors. For example, I find that it would be unreasonable to expect an individual to own animals in which smell of animals is pungent within the city and having a negative affect on the lives of those that live around them. Noise levels of particular live stock would also need to be addressed. It should not be suitable for a rooster to start making lots of noise at 5AM which would disturb the peace of surrounding neighbors. Just like a dog is not allowed to be barking all day and night.b
- Fresh eggs
- As long as they have a space and needs for livestock.
- Commercial eggs are known to carry disease from mishandling in factories. Responsible urban keeping reduces this factor and is a more sustainable practice for urban dwellers. I do think there should be a limitation on how many hens are allowed, and there should be regulatory inspections and fines for hen welfare.
- As long as neighbours aren't affected give it a shot!
- As long as the neighbours approve And standards for health and cleanliness are maintained I have no objections.
- I think 3-9 hens is reasonable, with lot size and animal welfare taken into account
- If they help and are not causing an issue to anyone what's the problem
- As long as approvals go through the proper terminals and processes



- Yay chickens! Fresh eggs!
- Encourages biodiversity, healthy living alternatives in urban farming
- Chickens is a great way to produce your own food (eg: eggs) and to teach children a responsibility most city folks don't receive
- Support from adjacent neighbours....people move, so this does not make sense. May support case by case!
- I agree that citizens should be able to own livestock however I do not agree that you must get permission from neighbours to enjoy private property.
- I think starting with hens to see how that goes could provide further insight into other livestock.
- I don't think you should need neighbours approval for something on your property
- Neighbors should not get a say otherwise I would support this
- It is fine. Does not need amendment
- Everyone has the right to own livestock as long as it is within their property, has adequate living standards, and is not a disturbance to the community.
- City should not have authority over people who choose to raise livestock in their own property. If they are responsible and keep things clean and quiet they should be able to do as they wish on their own property.
- Livestock such as goats, chickens, and pigs are wonderful animals provided their needs are attended to and I support this change with one small caveat. I would suggest that the community benefit be removed. Personal benefit whether physical or emotional, in conjunction with the other criteria, should be enough to allow for livestock.
- "Support from adjacent neighbours unnecessary, if living conditions are suitable for the hens and noise control is possible.
- Requiring adjacent neighbour support could leading to prejudice and bullying from neighbours who may not favour the resident"
- Puts onus on the neighbors to be the bad guys and say no I don't want to live next to a small farm with smelly and/or noisy animals is unfair. Set standards of distance to next residences, allow neighbors to voice concerns and consider. And follow up with inspections and with the neighbors after a reasonable period of time.
- I don't think it is fair for your neighbours to have a say in what you put in your yard. As long as it wasn't affecting them, it's not their place.
- "I don't think the hen needs to benefit the community. It can just benefit the owner and that should be fine.
- I don't the neighbours should have a say as long as there is suitable living conditions for the animal."
- Support urban hens but I would have concerns about what is meant by other livestock.
- Less input from adjacent neighbors. There is too much "not in my backyard". If the property or housing for the proposed livestock is insufficient, the city's assessment will reflect this during the case by case evaluation.
- Chickens are cool [removed]
- I do not believe that adjacent neighbours should have input.



- Anyone should have the right to have hens if they can prove they have suitable living conditions for the hens needs. Neighbours may not always agree & often times those who don't simply don't like that other person or are intoxicated & incapable of socially acceptable human interactions, or other reasons certain people don't get along. One person should not have their right taken away simply because the person next door doesn't like them! Hens in residential setting may not always serve the community but rather the resident to which they live ... why would owning hens require it to serve the entire community a benefit?? If hens are raised in a sustainable manner, they actually reduce waste & aid that owners efforts to live in a more sustainable fashion ... again the manner in which the hens are to be living/raised should be the only consideration!
- I don't think neighbors should be Able to veto you have a hen on your property. I fully support looking at more sustainable living by caring for hens rather than buying eggs that need to be shipped and packaged and evaluated. Hens should be allowed.
- Ensuring that animals are well cared for is important and I do agree that cases should be assessed individually. However, Calgary has a large population of people who would pull the "Not In My Back Yard" arrogant attitude, and thats not fair to everyone else. I think neighbors should have an opportunity to give the city feedback when someone seeks a permit for livestock, and that feedback should be considered, but I don't think neighbors should be able to fully veto it unless they have very valid concerns, like evidence of mistreatment of animals or something.
- What exactly is "offers community benefit"? Look after the needs of the animal period, standardize/provide adequate housing, forget about getting consent from what be ignorant/contrary neighbours.
- Assume that someone is providing correct living conditions, as you would with any other pet they might get. Support urban livestock without any ridiculous hoops to jump through.
- if people want chickens or other livestock and they are kept healthy and happy why should you have a say at all? Overstepping per usual.
- Size of yard should be discussed as well.
- What is done on private property is the business of the property owner. If things such as noise or waste complaints from neighbours are an issue, by law already has a foot to stand on and can look into loud animals in this case. But if someone wants to care for an animal it is their responsibility and not anyone else's, and therefore should not be required to get permission (support) from others who will not be taking responsibility for the issue at hand.
- As long as the hens are not posing a nuisance or threat to neighbours and are being properly cared for let people have them.
- I dont feel personal hens should have to help or impact the community, their should be a 4 -6 hen limit similar to that of other cities also neighbors should not be able to have say what is happening in your yard, if I needed neighbors approval they would say no, they already come over and yell over my fence if my kids are using the backyard or if we use the bbq he will yell about the smell.
- I don't think neighbors should have to agree on this. If you can have a pack of screaming children then I can have a chicken. Other than that I support keeping livestock 100%.



- I believe if the animals are healthy and safe the neighbors should get no say in what you have in your fence. Some people unfortunately want to make other people miserable and would outright deny any animals on their neighbors property.
- As long as the animals kept responsibly, it is no different than owning any other domestic animal.
- "The choice to own animals on your property should be in full responsibility of the owning party. I do not see why they should get support from adjacent neighbours unless all the parties are in agreement. I would not want to move into a new neighbourhood only to be saddled with supporting my neighbour's private choices.

- I don't see a requirement for it to be a community benefit, just as long as it is not a community hindrance.

- Suitable living conditions for the animal and case by case exception evaluations are agreeable terms for someone to own livestock/pets."
- Only if it's hens. You don't have a list of what other livestock would be allowed in the city.
- I like the idea but am tired of our law enforcement deciding what happens
- As long as the animal has all it needs, it should be no one else's business.
- neighbour's should have ZERO say in the animals you can keep so long as you have a proper space for them
- Should be allowed to have what you wanted on your property so long as the animal is taken care of. sometime neighbors will do and say whatever cause they don't like you
- I would like more neighborhood support.
- I shouldn't have to have my neighbours support to own a chicken
- Calgary is behind the times. You should not need neighbour support for your own property if the owner is abiding by the bylaws. If the neighbour is continuously complaining about smell, it should be looked into. It does not mean it is a worthy complaint. Some people don't have good neighbours. The other amendments I would agree with.
- We have all the rights to have animals and live off the land.
- Less govt rules mind your own [removed] business.
- Animals can be loud, and it's difficult to have a chicken or goat learn to be quiet. I'd recommend a special permit system, where the property is large enough to ensure noise from the animals does not impact others in the neighbourhood.
- Livestock can have an individual benefit but community benefit should not be required
- I should not require the approval of my neighbors to do something in my yard that complies with city bylaws. Too many poor neighbor relationships that are created out of spite



- It would be nice to know if your neighbours have hens in their yard but as long as they are looked after and not causing issues to the direct neighbours, there is not a need for them to seek community benefit.
- I own my land. I can do whatever I want. I do not need permission from ANYONE to do what i See fit on MY land.
- I don't like the idea of exceptions at the discretion of chief bylaw officer. It either yes or no and if complaints are received then officer can go by
- I support suitable living conditions for the animal, but not the other 3. Who determines community benefit? What if a neighbour withdraws support; how to determine if a neighbour's reason to not support is "valid"?
- Agree with most of it but it shouldn't require support from neighbours.
- If neighbours can have hens then neighbour should be able to have a cow or horse. They are both farm animals.
- do not agree with requiring support form neighbors and discretion of CBO. Animals should be permitted provided they meet certain care/condition requirements. Allowing neighbors to have a say is an unnecessary infringement on personal property rights, and allows neighbor disputes to "weaponize" bylaw against each other. Discretion on a case by case basis complicates process and is needlessly complicated than writing approved animals into a bylaw
- Puts the pressure on the neighbours to say yes or no. Makes it awkward.
- Should not be at the discretion of bylaw officers.
- No bylaw necessary
- Living by chickens even if they are not roosters can still be loud, having lived by some. If the bylaw is put in place there should be a minimum required distance from any residence other than the homeowners.
- livestock should be permitted only on larger properties that are a certain distance away from any other properties
- There may be an overall negative perspective for some that urban areas should not have hens. I think it's unreasonable to have to gather support from adjacent neighbours.
- It would depend on what livestock, smaller animals would be okay as long as they have space to live comfortably
- People should be allowed to have livestock in limited numbers.
- I support everything except the support from adjacent neighbours. Responsible pet ownership should apply. As long as what you are doing is legal on your own land, neighbours have no business intruding.
- I think a person shouldn't have to have their neighbors approval for what they have on their land and I don't think it needs to benefit the community as that will hurt people who have livestock to feed their families.
- people should be able to have chickens without a law in place other that proper care
- I don't see why there shouldn't be any urban hens if properly kept
- I dont see a problem with livestock in the city so long as they are managed responsibly



- I believe people should be able to raise their own food, humanely and with proper resources.
- Bylaw to include waterfowl (ducks/geese) in limited quantity.
- Let's be progressive and get on board with urban hens and dangerous dog legislation - breed specific legislation is a load of BS.
- Depending on noise or smell. There would definitely have to be input from neighbors prior to allowance
- I see no downsides to this amendment.
- It should be mandatory for all owners for animals of any kind have to be properly taken care of
- I would like to have hens in my yard.
- yes BUT - owners should register prior to owning and a program should be in place to educate owners on public health risks (zoonosis, etc) as well as welfare requirements for keeping hens
- Provided that strict enclosure and cleaning protocols are in place. Chickens only.
- So long as the above criteria is followed, it seems reasonable.
- If they are kept responsibly: clean, low numbers, well cared for for personal use, Fine. Adjacent impacted people must have input.
- As long as the resident cares for their animals properly, humanely and the animals are not being neglected or left in poor living conditions.
- The right person/group and right environment demonstrating capability to be safe should be allowed to have any type of animal.
- With the criteria, it would be feasible and not create problems.
- Would support as long as there is a limit to the quantity of animals and that it is for personal purposes only (i.e. not a business)
- love hens
- Urban hens (in moderation) are not a hazard to a community.
- Yum eggs!
- If you allow hens and other livestock pit pulls should not be muzzled.
- I would especially like to see the ability to have 1-2 hens as well as see more urban beekeeping.
- As long as the animals are happy, why not?
- I think people would become more connected to the land and where their food comes from if they were allowed to keep livestock
- as long as animal are properly cleaned up after and cared for.
- I want go have a few chickens for eggs.
- I agree
- Inclusivity.
- I don't necessarily believe that the neighbours' support is necessary unless it's a potentially dangerous or especially disruptive animal. If it doesn't go wandering out of their yard or threatening safety, then why should they mind?
- I love my pet chickens!
- If done properly this can improve quality of life for calgarians



- Hens are not harmful to a community, and provide a sustainable food source through their eggs.
- The distance between city dwellers and agriculture is always increasing. When well cared for, hens and other livestock can be unobtrusive, educational, and good for the local economy.
- Support of neighbours is key.
- I think it is a positive to allow small groups of these animals to be owned by people within the city
- I think if owners can maintain them without causing unreasonable odor or noise, it should be allowed.
- I
- I think people should be allowed to have animals they wish as long as they are responsible and provide a mutually beneficial situation.
- If raised in approved conditions they should not be treated in any manner different than a cat or dog
- Self reliance and ability to provide ones' own food source
- Very vague question. Why does the deciding factor have to be community benefit.
- As long as there was a limited number of animal on any given property.
- As long as these animals have strict bylaws on how they must be taken care of, and this doesn't become a way for residential wet markets to pop up.
- As long as people are responsible for there animals
- People should be allowed to keep livestock on their property ONLY if the animals needs are being met and their aren't a major bother to neighbours.
- I think it is a step in the right direction and a freedom people who follow the law should have.
- I would support the approval of certain livestock only for personal use and not for profit and with strict enforcement of the conditions in which the animal would be allowed to be kept.
- Having hens is a valuable learning experience for children, they are a great source of entertainment, a food source. Most of Alberta allows them its time for Calgary to catch up.
- Having fresh eggs daily.
- NA
- I think people can be responsible with livestock - there should possibly be space requirement for having them though i.e. no shared outdoor spaces (duplex), houses without fenced yards or small outdoor spaces.
- As long as it doesn't disturb people in proximity to the areas lives I don't see an issue with it.
- Providing smell and noise is within reasonable limits. which means responsible ownership.
- As long as the habitat is safe for the animals and they remain on their property. But no roosters
- Chickens are fine!! As long as they can be cared for properly.
- yes
- I'm all good with chickens.
- This would help support the local economy and still keep humane animal treatment in check
- Suitable living conditions and neighbour support will create a positive experience
- However, I am worried about noise, smell, and attracting pests (like rodents). There should be a way to have the problem cases dealt with quickly and efficiently.



- Urban farming is very doable in many communities. As long as there is suitable space for the animal and neighbours agree then it why not!
- Absolutely! I do think bylaws should state a specific size of yard is required so the chickens have the space they need.
- I don't love the requirement of support from the neighbor, but ensuring that the animal's living conditions are suitable is wise.
- As long as a "farm" animal is well looked after, have decent housing and is cleaned up after I have no problem with livestock living within city limits.
- It is about time. Thank you.
- [removed]
- Hens are beneficial to have as long as numbers are managed, they are properly cared for, and no roosters are allowed
- Rural aspects can enhance quality of life in urban settings when executed in a safe, considerate fashion.
- As long as the coop is kept clean and the neighbors agree
- If people are properly understand how to care for hens then sure
- If they are kept well, clean, safe, protected from natural predators.
- Many cities allow urban farming. It could be a wonderful way for people to pick up a new hobby and create a food source or just Have the opportunity to raise and care for animals.
- I believe people owning hens and other small livestock could potentially be good as long as the animals are looked after properly and not slaughtered at the home. There needs to be a bylaw in place the protects the animals from any cruelty.
- This ensures responsible and humane raising of animals and use of animal products
- Absolutely I support allowing urban chickens and agree with these guidelines. 100% support, I eagerly look forward to introducing my children to some backyard chickens.
- Yes, unless the adjacent neighbours are bothered by smell or noise.
- As long as they have proper living accommodations, are well cared for, and not becoming a nuisance why not!
- As long as the animal has feasible room to graze they're should be no problem with allowing them within city limits.
- As long as hens are given proper living conditions I see no issue with it.
- they can provide food to which every human has a right to produce for themselves
- Chickens are cool
- Owners must contain animals and if they are loud they must either bring them inside or otherwise muffle the noise
- so long as they are used for eggs only. slaughtering an animal in a back yard is not cool
- I think this is a great idea with many added benefits, as long as it is done right.
- Hens provide a wonderful source of eggs and meat while eating insects.
- If you wanna add livestock [removed] you can't try and cap the dogs that were there first [removed]



- hens are fine, with neighbour approval. Large animals would not be appropriate.
- we should be allowed to have hens
- I had urban hens in Calgary for a year (I had originally thought that I was participating in a pilot program but later learned it was not approved at the time). I talked with my neighbors and decided to keep 3 hens. It was a great learning experience. I support allowing urban hens in Calgary. I think that permission from immediate adjacent neighbors who share a fence is a good idea, NOT the whole block or neighborhood. I also would support a cap on numbers. My hens were mostly quiet and no one knew they were there with the exception of the neighbors I originally discussed it with. From first hand experience they didn't bother anyone including those sharing a fence and were less disruptive than a neighbor with a barking dog. I would have them again if approved by city council.
- Chickens don't bother me, home eggs are great
- There should be a standard for the coop built, proximity to neighbour's, limits on noise if at all possible but also the standard should be achievable at a reasonable cost
- As long as city officials are actually going to uphold and investigate complaints
- u cant make me
- If they have a safe living situation I see no reason why they shouldn't be allowed
- Owning livestock is 1000x less harmful than factory farming. The government should strongly encourage self-sufficiency.
- My neighbors had hens and they were fine. As long as they keep it clean then I'm fine with it.
- Let people grow and raise their own food
- People should be allowed to own animals given they are able to provide proper living conditions for them.
- Not everyone wants dogs or cats. If a hen makes someone happy, and provides something they need, are well treated and properly looked after them why not!!!!
- As long as guidelines are followed and the hens do not disturb other residents.
- As long and the owners are being responsible and care for the pets unique needs while keeping the neighbourhood in mind, I am okay with anyone having any pet.
- [removed]
- Having a few hens is a great way for families to get eggs, hens can be good pets/ provide responsibility to kids
- If the conditions outlined above are met I see no reason to not grant approval.
- This is long overdue! Hens and small livestock are vital to healthy urban ag.
- I'm all for it!
- As long as the animals are pets, and not used for food, entertainment or any other kind of cruelty.
- As long as the animal is properly cared for then there should be no issues.
- It must not effect neighbours or the status of the community
- If we are going to continue to lose farm land to urban sprawl then city dwellers must find ways to more self sufficient and food secure
- As long as certain criteria are met as far as living conditions go (suitable living space, shelter, etc)



- Hens are great!
- If Adequate housing is made and research is done on the animal there should be no reason why someone shouldn't be allowed to own livestock
- Self sustainability should be encouraged.
- Everything must be human while keeping in mind sound pollution.
- Allows people another option to provide their family with food via hens eggs.
- Hens not roosters
- I mean....let them have hens. Why not?
- I would be fine with living next door to livestock as long as the animals were well cared for, kept on the property and reasonably quiet.
- As long as the animal is taken care of properly and the neighbours are not disturbed, I would support livestock in the city
- as long as the animals are kept healthy and in suitable living conditions.
- If the neighbours don't mind, then I see no problem with hens. Horses and cows might be a bit much
- If there's no noise issues, there's no need for concern.
- I think livestock has a place and should be with people who want them. Alternatively, I also think that people don't move to suburban areas to have livestock as neighbours. Furthermore, should this bylaw go through, I don't think people with hens or other livestock should have to provide benefits to their neighbours as part of the bylaw but because they want to. It's not a job they're applying for it's a lifestyle choice.
- I don't really care
- Hens can be very positive to people's lives.
- This should only be allowed in designated areas, similar to public gardens.
- Case by case.
- hobby farms are fun
- I have no issues with it
- Hens are a great addition for fresh egg supply and the enjoyment a backyard flock provides. Other livestock are also great additions if they can be properly kept
- I think that livestock to an extent should be allowed if they don't cause distraction to the neighbourhood.
- I'd love backyard hens
- I just like the idea .as long as there is rules about living conditions
- Anything that allows people to act in a more sustainable manner I support.
- Keeping animals like goats/hens around would provide sources of food, lawn management and emotional support for owners. Yes please.
- As long as the animal and their habitat is well maintained and taken care of.
- I am for urban food production even if it's for individual house consumption. That said as long as cleanliness and husbandry is followed, so licensing and regulating by the city would be required with frequent inspections.



- Must have fairly restrictive sheltering requirements in addition to spacing enabling odours or sanitation to be a non issue
- If you really think about it, we're imposing on them.
- Both the animals and humans safety and well-being should be taken into serious consideration. And also that humans and pet owners have a significant impact on animals behaviour.
- If owner abuses this law they get a warning and then a fine
- I support hens and potential other livestock within Calgary
- The more animals we can care for and support the better. This is a fantastic opportunity for people to engage and connect with these sentient beings, rather than them ending up dead on their plates.
- As long as it requires support from me (as a potential livestock neighbor) as well as suitable living conditions for the animals (most important factor I think)
- Update existing bylaw due to more instances affecting safety of communities
- I love hens. Roosters are the worst. Ban them in the city.
- I support people raising their own food.
- animals can be amazing companions
- Not a problem.
- But I think people need to apply and prove proper ownership or ability to care for the hens.
- Why not
- The third bullet is most important.
- As long as these animals are being cared for and given the space , yes !
- Support obtained by immediate neighbours and one neighbor further. Or anyone within a certain radius, within reasonable ear shot of the noise they make.
- Potentially yes, but not if the hens aren't kept well.
- No roosters, free eggs and a cuddle buddy
- Hens are fine but cows well that's a different story.
- Livestock should be properly cared for and should be kept in a manner acceptable to the neighborhood regarding noise, waste, etc.
- Maybe
- I believe this needs to be a permitted(yearly) approval process. I Would support as long as neighbours 3 doors in every direction of a home wishing to house hens agrees/supports the application. This should be a yearly renewal process to ensure every is happy and safe.
- as long as people care for their animals properly and don't inconvenience others over their livestock
- I think mental health wise, this would be a good choice.
- Hens are good
- Some properties can accommodate this
- Fully support responsible livestock ownership!
- I think this is a good idea; brings people back to their roots if we have more freedom in growing and raising our own animals, even within town/city limits.



- Mandatory minimums on size of pens for animals comfort and well-being, restrictions on noise caused by animals, restrictions on where they can be located so as to not disturb neighbour's.
- We need to localise food as much as possible! I have supported renegade hen farms within the city.
- "I would like to raise chickens, however, there are many issues with animal husbandry that must be mandated - the animals must not be raised for slaughter. The property must be of a significant size to accommodate chickens. Some livestock should not be in an urban setting - goats, sheep, pigs because of the potential contamination from feces. Noise, smell and the inexperience of urban ""farmers"". Would there be an increase in the number of bylaw officers?"
- I do support bee hives - this is a vital contribution to the world."
- So long as they are properly cared for I see no reason for chickens to not be allowed in the city
- This is a fantastic opportunity to have your own eggs, as long as there are parameters set by the city and enforced. For example, having a permit, and perhaps being checked on once a year.
- People should be able to keep hens as long as they have a proper life
- If this bylaw gettings passed it needs to be done correctly and with regulation. If there are not strict rules and guidelines set in place for the ownership of livestock, people will be careless and animals will be hurt. It's not enough to say 'suitable living conditions can be provided for the animal', the bylaw requires more detail and I support the decision of the city to review an application for owners wanting to own livestock prior the purchase and housing of such animals.
- Chickens are fantastic pets and provide year-round eggs for the owners (thus cutting down on food costs), eat insects that are on the property, and fertilize the lawn/garden. I am totally for other livestock as well; great idea!
- Depending on the animal and the accomodations, they can be very beneficial to a home or even community.
- If suitable living conditions can be provided then it's okay
- As long as there are no excessive noise issues with hens
- Easier access to animal resources. Serves as educational as well
- Pens must be inspected before hens allowed and checked up on occasionally to make sure they are on good health and then odors are kept under control. Similar to what I have answered for Q7.
- Considering the criteria is met, it seems unreasonable to restrict people's freedom in this regard. Only thing Id argue with is that the first criteria is a little vague and seems unnecessary. Are the neighbors okay with it and are the living conditions for the animal okay seem the only ones necessary.
- It's up to any individual if they wish to raise chickens. It no different then any other animal
- Yes I think we should be allowed back yard chickens
- I think it will have a positive impact on the community.
- With the stipulation that there are noise and odour bylaws as well as bylaws for the care of said animals, including extreme weather care.
- No roosters. Not allowed in areas that have preexisting coyote or wildlife issues. Approval of neighbours multiple houses down mandatory.
- Only if all impacted neighbours agree. If the neighbour changes, approval must be resought.



- There is benefits to having more self sustaining food sources. BUT a there would need to be considerable discussions with not just the directly adjacent neighbours but 2 to 3 houses away as well.
- Many communities successfully have hens.
- I have been around chickens all of my life and not once have I been bitten by one or kept awake all night by constant barking. Not once have I experienced stepping in chicken poop outside of the coop or found some digging in my vegetable garden. The notion that a person would not be allowed to have a couple laying hens is ridiculous. Every major metropolitan center in North America has by-laws supporting my opinion. By disallowing this, Calgary comes across as a back-water. Please take an example from the town of Taber that gets famous for ridiculous by-laws like swearing. We don't want to get on the National news for that.
- Hens yes. Not sure about livestock would need more information
- As long as agreement is reached among neighbours, it should be fine.
- As long as there is no harm to the animal and neighbours I see no issues
- Bring on the hens
- As long as the hens are being taken care of properly i have no problem with them.
- For the points noted, if it does not cause disturbance to the neighbours by way of noise, strong smells from fecal matter and if the premises are appropriate for the care of the hens.
- Egg laying hens are economical
- I think having chickens properly would be excelent and some animals like pot belly pigs are not a nuisance.
- I think it's a good idea
- So long as the animals are properly cared for, I would support this.
- Sounds reasonable and balanced
- Provided the livestock is not dangerous to the public and can be well cared for it should be permitted.
- As longs as the hens are well kept is would be great. If chickens are going to be allowed though the city should have no say on whether people can have more than one pit bull.
- It would be great to have your own chickens for eggs or rabbits for eating. Healthy and affordable
- Potential owners should have to prove that they can provide healthy living conditions for the hens.
- I fully support a self sustaining lifestyle.
- Small animals don't present a risk to our community. It would be great for kids to see animals in a different light.
- Chickens deserve space to live their lives.
- As long as the animals are cared for and aren't a nuisance to neighbors then there is no difference between a chicken or a dog
- Improves environmental impact.
- As long as the safety of the animals, and people are primary, then laws should be enforced
- As long as the space is able to actually host and maintain without interfering with neighbors.



- I fully support allowing the keeping of hens. So long as the living conditions of the hens is humane.
- People should be allowed to raise and source food as they see fit.
- It seems fair and I wouldn't mind hens in my neighborhood
- Responsible chicken ownership sounds amazing!
- "The criteria listed above seems fair; owning livestock (especially hens) promotes self-sustainability, food independence, and intercommunity relations on a smaller scale. A cost/benefit analysis on a case-by-case basis may be necessary.

- In this situation however, there are possible complications that may arise:
 - NIMBY
 - Hens and roosters look similar up until maturity, so it may result in an increase in noise complaints (crowing) if roosters are not removed ("fall through the cracks")."
- As long as there are suitable living conditions for the hens and precautions taken to protect them, they should be allowed.
- If everyone involved (neighbours) is ok with it then I don't see an issue. Why can people own 10 dogs and 10 cats but they can't own 10 chickens?
- I support self sustainability
- As long as regulations are followed, there shouldn't be any harm in owning hens.
- Allowing hens would be a positive addition to families who own them: bug control, steady egg supply, great fertilizer for garden/yard
- Urban hens are a great, sustainable resource for many families. Neighbor support and proper living conditions are crucial
- Chickens are amazing creatures.
- I would love to see pot bellied pigs and miniature horses to be allowed. As long as the owner is responsible and both the animal and owner isn't a nuisance, I fully support it.
- I think the ownership of hens for the purpose to provide eggs for a household is a wonderful idea
- I can support the idea of having more diversity in an urban setting as long as the animals have been domesticated and/or tamed to not cause harm to citizens in the communities.
- This is a movement toward more sustainable urban living so I'm all for it. Goat lawn care- ethically produced eggs. I think inspection would be necessary to ensure animal welfare
- If you have a yard, urban hens sound cool! Just a different type of pt
- livestock is fine
- The property would need to be titled as having livestock so potential home buyers in the area can know BEFORE they move in if a property has previously been approved for livestock.
- If all of the appropriate conditions are met I feel there isn't any reason to not allow them.
- As long as they are not disturbing anyone, I don't see the harm in allowing certain animals within city limits.



- This would be a great idea! A lot of calgarians left because the way of living has changed so much here. It would bring a sense of community if we could have hens to produce eggs and have them to eat . As well as some livestock, permitted the living situation is proper
- Hens can contribute to communities. Abiding by specific regulations and having permits would help make it successful
- People should be allowed to have chickens!
- I don't see a reason why this shouldn't be approved.
- Letting people have hens is a fantastic for sustainability, and nutrition
- Livestock such as hens offer people the opportunity to have their own eggs to feed their family and hens are very beneficial for bug control and lawn maintenance. The only concern could be the possibility of a predator like a coyote being introduced to the neighbourhood due to the new prey presented
- Why not??
- Hens=food
- Nothing to explain. I support urban hen projects permitting the animals are treated humanely.
- If it's working then keep it working.
- Small livestock can be good and benefits the food chain and/or can be a non allergic alternative to costs/dogs
- This makes sense.
- sounds neat
- I would support hens and possibly other poultry and goats but not larger livestock.
- I can't see any good reason not to
- I think owning hens and other livestock is fine as long as the amenities and good living conditions are provided for them by the owners and don't impede the enjoyment of property by neighbours.
- Chickens and ducks can be beneficial and are great for providing food. They do not take up a lot of space and aren't a danger to the community.
- Emphasis on suitable living conditions.
- As long as there are proper accommodations for the animal. For example, I don't want to see/smell a cow in my inner-city home.
- Got no issues with a hen in someone's yard as long as it isn't a rooster that wants to crow as the sun comes up.
- Give people more freedom in their homes.
- Urban hens has been successful in many cities
- Sustenance farming is a great way to get quality product while also reducing ones carbon footprint.
- Hens and other small livestock should be allowed! Food security and sovereignty is so important.
- Does not offend me. Good idea for healthy living
- If animals can be adequately cared for and do not create disturbances for neighbours.



- On a case by case basis I don't see an issue with it. Having a laying hen wouldn't be an issue. Smaller farm animals could be allowed if their living conditions are maintained and don't cause a nuisance.
- I think it's a good idea
- Edmonton has already expanded the urban hen project and it's going great
- I think hens and other animals that provide for people is important
- With the proper means to care for the animals I don't see the problem. I'm not educated enough about hens to say more.
- Do not restrict ownership
- With more public consultation and proper guidelines for animal welfare, so long as neighbours are not bothered by sounds/smells, this should be okay.
- Provided the animals are being cared for properly and not a nuisance I do not have any concerns regarding the animals kept
- As long as the animals can be taken care of properly and on a property that is large enough for them I see no reason why not.
- Livestock is and always has been a crucial part of everyday life, and forcing people to eat supermarket meats is annoying. If the person has support from neighbours, I see no problem with said person keeping chickens or even a pig.
- Hens appear to be wonderful pets and the organic eggs are certainly a bonus
- Limit the number though to 10 or less. No roosters in residential areas
- If the animal is not a nuisance to the community then what is the harm?
- Hens for sure. Would be hard to properly care for larger animals in an urban setting.
- Would provide a more eco-friendly option for food, provided the location is appropriate and nearby residents are not disturbed.
- As long as it were monitored carefully to ensure they are humane conditions.
- As long as enforcement is consistent.
- Expanding on livestock is a wonderful idea! Being able to support local farmers or even backyard farmers is a huge help to neighborhoods and communities.
- More freedom, more local food!
- I love eggs.
- If it benefitted the community and wasn't a nuisance I think it is a person's right to have livestock
- Livestock can be used for food for families. With the increasing cost in meat/dairy, people should be able to be self-reliant even if they live in the city.
- I don't have an opinion on this. While I would not want livestock living nearby, others may not mind. If this is handled on a case by case basis in cooperation with neighbors, that is fine by me.
- Good to have fresh eggs
- A limited # of chickens should be acceptable.
- Raising farm animals like chickens can be a good hobby, food source, education, and allows people to know where their food is from



- Na
- I believe owning livestock is a good thing as long as the conditions are met, they need a good place to live and enough room to roam around they can't be put in small cages and forgotten about since that would be animal abuse. But owning chickens for the eggs or meat would be beneficial as some people have a hard time buying meat from the stores but as long as they kill the animals correctly and properly, there needs to be good laws about this before it should be considered because we already have an issue with puppy mills we wouldn't need a new issue with livestock.
- I think this is a great idea! It's a super healthy and engaging for Calgarians to have this option as long as they are following guidelines
- I support urban agriculture
- If the neighbours are in agreement, I don't see a problem with this. However, if a problem occurs, there needs to be a simple process for review in place
- That is fine as long as the animals are taken care of and its ensured that they have the right needs and are safe.
- Its a chicken who cares
- I want chickens!
- As long as each case is indivisible assessed.
- As long as the proper measures are taken (housing, feeding, care), and it's not causing harm to neighbours, I'm all for it
- I think it's a great idea and furthers individual families to have more nutrition and food accessibility. I would expect regulations and welfare checks (on the animals) for adherence to said regulations.
- I don't think you need to have the neighborhood approval.
- Some municipals already allow urban hens and I think it is good to implement the system in Calgary. There's a trend of healthy living and this idea would beneficial to many Calgarians.
- Edmonton does it
- As long as the rules are followed I have to problem.
- Chickens are great
- Enlarging opportunities for people to have animals like hens is extremely positive.
- its good for the community
- Provided their is no impact of neighbours.
- Only if used only for eggs
- People should know where food comes from and this can reduce waste
- Chickens are fantastic
- Chickens are a brilliant way for us to eat more local, as well there have been many studies on chickens being excellent support animals. they also add a more natural ecosystem and their excrement adds a lot of nutrients to the ground.
- Good to be self reliant. Chickens are great for pests.
- As long as it doesn't impact the immediate neighbors.
- Absolutely amazing idea, this would be great for the city!



- As long as the neighbors are okay with it and the hens are treated humanely I think that's great
- Only on certain sized properties. Zero lot line and legal rental suite/high density homes should not be allowed livestock option
- For example chickens. If living quarters are appropriate and neighborhoods are on board why not?
- I would welcome the opportunity to have hens. They would be wonderful for pest management.
- As long as the live stock are being careful properly and their feces is cleaned up, I support hens!
- I would support this as long as living conditions are amenable for the animals and the neighborhood was in agreement.
- Having livestock in an urban environment can work with some guidelines to assure neighbours and the surrounding communities are not negatively impacted
- These measures need to be reviewed on an on going basis every x number of years to ensure the animals are looked after and neighbours are supportive
- As long as the livestock is kept to reasonable numbers and appropriate sized living areas I would like to see the option available.
- I like hens
- I think that as long as the other animals aren't causing a problem or being bothersome to the neighbors, then why not welcome different animals.
- I think if , On a case by case basis, a property and owner can successfully and properly take care of the animal, it should be allowed
- I support urban livestock but don't believe adjacent neighbours have a right to determine whether or not an individual can have it on their personal property. There is potential for abuse of the regulations here, eg a neighbour could threaten to withdraw their support for reasons not related to the livestock during disputes, or blackmail individuals into sharing the food with them
- Anonymous survey of the neighbours should be conducted before anyone is allowed to have livestock in the city
- Yeah but good luck with those hens if you're going to allow a dog breed that was bred to have a tremendously high prey drive and animal aggression to roam loose with zero repercussions.
- I myself would love to have hens and I know many others probably feel the same
- As long the the property is maintained, animals are taken care of and there are enough officers available to enforce the bylaws. I dont think adjacent neighbors support is needed.
- back yard hens are a great addition to any back yard. controls bugs, gives you protein, don't bite :)
- I see no reason not to
- If people want animals to a source their own food, let them have them
- Hens are quiet and provide a good source of eggs for families. They eat bugs. They are a great animal
- Why not....it's a wonderful idea.
- As long as the animal is cared for appropriately and the neighbors see no issue.
- Hens allow for families to provide more for themselves.
- Present is not working..needs change



- There is no valid reason to not allow livestock like chickens in the city. Banning them is ridiculous.
 - As long as the coups are strictly monitored for cleanliness etc.
 - I would like urban hens for myself
 - If everyone nearby agrees, it's no problem.
 - As long as they are not disruptive to neighbors and you can care for them, go for it!
 - "I don't think one should have to have support from adjacent Neighbours to keep hens on their own property.
-
- I 100% support a person's right to access food and urban hens are one way to do this."
 - Food security is an issue however health and disturbance issues must be strictly managed
 - In agreeance with this as long as neighbours agree and hens are kept responsibly.
 - But make sure these people know how to care for these animals. And approval should be required from neighbors just like building permits.
 - I believe owning a hen can be fine, if the conditions and care of the hen is acceptable.
 - If the animals not a nuisance and can be taken care of properly I don't see why you can't have any kind of animal !
 - I think as long as it's not disruptive to the neighbors.
 - I don't see a problem with hens in the city as long as they are properly contained. animals can be therapeutic.
 - I believe that this could have a very positive impact on the community. The situation must be appropriate and beneficial for the animal and the owner must be responsible.
 - If neighbours and everything are fine with it . Why not
 - sustainable food is something I support
 - As long as suitable living conditions can be provided.
 - More sustainable living
 - I just think it's a reasonable situation to allow for, as long as the owner remains responsible in terms of caretaking.
 - Assuming there will be restrictions on the type of livestock and the amount of space required, I feel this amendment would work.
 - Having hens don't bother me
 - Seems to be more pros than cons. Must be check ups done for animal well being
 - Good for the mental health of people and children as long as they are well cared for and it is strictly monitored.
 - As long as the living conditions for the animal are optimal, which I find one of the most important factors to enforce, I see Calgary and and communities benefitting from this consideration. I can see how allowing Calgarians to raise and produce more of their food sources will bring more awareness and support for the local farm industry, but again, only as long as living conditions for the animals is fair.



- As long as it is not harm to anyone or the environment it is fine
- having an opportunity for increased organic living would be amazing
- Backyard hens would be awesome, and in keeping with the times!
- Hens in town are good for the environment if contained correctly.
- its peoples right to do what they want on their property. Stop abusing your power.
- Again, responsible ownership.
- Hens are a great example of urban livestock that bothers no one. They cannot jump a fence, they do not make noise, they don't even interact with other humans/animals outside of the owners property.
- This should no require support from neighbours who can just have a "dislike" for their neighbour, if the person looking to breed, raise, etc the animal can do so in a manner that does not directly affect their neighbours
- A pet is a pet. As long as it is cared for adequately.
- They have it in red deer and it seems to be okay. As long as it is kept clean and smell isn't overwhelming.
- I think it is a great idea to encourage people to bring in more sustainable food sources for themselves. I think case by case scenarios should be evaluated by more than one individual.
- I'm all for urban hens if there is support and agreement from neighbors and was monitored to ensure the animals are being appropriately taken care of.
- So long as they are properly managed and contained, this should not be an issue. It is perfectly common in other countries' major cities.
- If the animals are being properly cared for and are not a nuisance to neighbors, there's no reason they shouldn't be allowed.
- I have many friends outside city limits who raise hens and they adore them. I personally haven't owned any but have enjoyed interacting with them.
- If animals are well cared for only.
- Livestock shouldn't just be for the country, if regulated properly it should be allowed
- There are a lot f animals that can become pets. As long as their needs are met, why not have a hen.
- People need to become more sustainable in their food production
- as long as its done responsibly and doesn't impact neighbors adversely
- It can be allowed as long as the animals are kept properly
- I have no issues with backyard hens
- If the neighbors don't care why not
- Hens are cool! No crowing roosters please.
- Food security is an issue that can be assisted by increasing the food sovereignty of a community. Eggs are an important source of nutrition that can be easily shared amongst a few households.
- If they are Properly taken care of then why not
- I see it as progress. And I'd much rather live next to someone with chickens than a dog. Granted hen owners need to follow bylaws around odour and noise.



- Citizens should be able to raise their own food and have appropriate support animals as long as they are cared for and maintained well, and not becoming nuisance animals.
- I think livestock on property can offer many benefits.
- No identifiable harm.
- If they can help the family/families and can be taken very well care of.
- Hens are wonderful friendly animals and are beneficial to the people they live with.
- A good way to provide for your nutritional needs, teach kids about other animals etc. The hens should be well cared for and not a nuisance to others.
- That sounds good.
- If they are all properly cared for, this would be good.
- But 'support from adjacent neighbours' can be tricky depending on relationship - control, intimidation. Again, perhaps a tribunal is an answer. What would be community benefit? Chickens, goats, pigs benefit the person, not the community. You will have to more adequately address whether butchering is allowed in a residence or not. Currently, as you probably know, this is happening.
- I think Calgarians should have access to options for more sustainable living; urban livestock is a part of this.
- As long as the animals can be properly cared for and in a suitable environment, I see no problems with this.
- I like this idea however there needs to be more research done and many rules in place. If livestock are allowed in the city, there needs to be adequate space etc which is difficult since the houses in Calgary have barely any vacant land (ie a large backyard). The threat of predatory animals coming into the city more needs to be explored as well, such as more coyotes coming into the city and needing to be dealt with, getting killed by cars and attacking animals and humans.
- I think people should be allowed to have hands on their private property. Obviously in a condo type home that wouldn't work. But if someone lives in a house and wants to make that decision and they should be able to. I think the role of the government is to provide guidelines to ensure that the owners, hens, those living adjacent are and stay safe. I don't support the rule that a person would have to get approval from their neighbours if they wanted to get hen house. As long as it's not interfering with neighbours then they should be allowed to get a hen house.
- I think people should be given the opportunity to own certain livestock as long as its' living conditions are appropriate. Of course you will always have the odd bad apple that will abuse this privilege, and therefore their needs to be consequences such as fines or tickets.
- "A conditional yes. Support from adjacent neighbors may be withdrawn. Then what?"
- Houses having this livestock need to be open about it when it comes to things like real estate
- How will this impact the property value of both that house and the ones around it?
- Will bylaw have the ability to check on the animals at any time
- Strong security measures must be in place - this is a situation where vandalism and cruelty could be high."



- "I think allowing urban hens or other small livestock should be allowed in small numbers (per yard/owner), as long as they have sufficient room and are properly looked after, and do not pose serious health risks to other community members.
- (There is nowhere to leave a comment for #9, so including it here. I think fines should increase for repeat offenders, e.g., \$100 for first offence, \$150 for second, especially for things that are likely to happen again, such as animal at large... I'm not sure if this would apply to the owner or the animal, but it seems that owners who cannot control their pets should have more severe consequences than a first time offender. One thing that comes to mind is errant cats... I know several people who let their cats roam repeatedly, and don't seem to understand or care that errant cats are responsible for killing large numbers of wild birds and small animals...)."
- Some people have yards big enough for some chickens to produce their own eggs
- I don't see why not, as long as there are certain restrictions in place to ensure neighbors & the community can still be enjoyed by everyone.
- I think urban livestock (within reason) should be okay as long as minimum standards are met and maintained. It would also depend on the reason for the livestock.
- I think people should do proper steps when owning any animal for safety of the animal, themselves and others. But if they show they care for they animal they should be able to have it.
- People are focusing more on local sourcing of their food, knowing where their food comes from etc. Particularly as food supply chains have been altered and may be affected again with the pandemic it seems reasonabel to help people be more self-sustained. I think it is a progressive step.
- it is important for individuals to become more self-sufficient
- As long as the animal is cared for it's not a problem
- It's a great idea especially for animals like chickens where you can use the eggs.
- allow
- I think it would be really cool if people could get eggs from their own backyard. Also it would be neat to own goats in Calgary if you have enough space for them. Bee keeping would also be great in Calgary as well because it would help increase the bee population.
- If everyone is in agreement and the animals are treated well, there shouldn't be a problem.
- People should have the option to raise smaller animals, IF it does not lower the community appeal / housing value or increase thigns such as noise (sunrise roosters....no thanks) or smells / pollution
- It is more sustainable for people to raise their own chickens in some circumstances so it would be amazing to have that possibility in the city.
- Obviously cattle won't be approved but maybe some folks could have little pigs.
- banning livestock outright is unfair and pointless.
- anything that supports growing or raising our own food is a means to self-sufficiency.
- As long as the neighbours are okay with the hens, and the hens are cared for properly, I don't have a problem with allowing them.
- Provided community is on board and owners are responsible, I see no reason why chickens shouldn't be allowed on private property
- Hen owning should be allowed but certain numbers only.



- The key is "support from neighbours" and "suitable living conditions" - if this can't be met, no permission.
- Having livestock can increase the mental health of a community as well as educate.
- Small animals such as hens and ducks would be acceptable, no roosters or drakes as they are noisy
- I have no problem as long as they don't become a nuisance to neighbors
- As long as there are strict guidelines, I do not see a problem with this.
- But also being aware that more food options for wildlife will bring them closer to urban areas. And therefore being prepared to deal with that but NOT BY JUST KILLING THE WILDLIFE. It seems every answer to human's nuisances is to kill what's in its way. Relocate wildlife or those who want hens be ok with them being stolen by wildlife and therefore more wildlife being in your backyard. And no, they don't just get to kill coyotes or bears as a reason to "protect" their chickens.
- If the adjacent neighbours are good with it then that's cool
- There are many city homes/properties that have adequate area for the proper welfare of the animal. Animal welfare to be determined by modern research and scientists.
- So long as animals can be kept in appropriate conditions with appropriate space, I think it's beneficial.
- Livestock to one person is a pet to another. City dwelling livestock should not be raised for slaughter.
- I've been to many parts of the where backyard chickens is the norm. This city just interferes with everyone and raises taxes.
- Great idea
- It's been proven time again the animals help humans mental health
- Should be strict rules and monitoring
- In my opinion the most important part of that is the support from adjacent neighbours.
- This is a great idea to reduce impact and add to our communities!
- In the current world climate, urban farming movements, and the like it only makes sense for the expansion of rules to allow for livestock and hens within city limits.
- Whether an animal is classed as livestock or a "pet", I see no problem with allowing people to have any type of animal on their private property as long as the animals are looked after properly, have appropriate living conditions, and don't cause substantial neighbourhood disruption (i.e. noise).
- Fresh eggs! Yes!
- *** because you have not allowed a space for further comments, I completely disagree with BSL legislation it is archaic and wrong. Working in the animal industry there are plenty of breeds that show aggression both of similar size and power to bully breeds. So many communities in Canada and the world are working to get rid of BSL legislation why do you think enacting it is a good idea. We need to enforce responsible pet ownership and not blame the breed.
- This would allow people access to farm quality eggs at home on hand.
- Chickens should be just fine. One should have the proper amount of land.
- it fine with me



- Don't care what type of pets people want.
- No explanation needed
- I think livestock in urban areas where people are educated on that specific animal can add enrichment to the owners and community
- Yes for hens, no for other livestock
- If it was hens or live stock that would be a benefit to the communities
- There is literally thousands of birds in the city. Hens won't have a large impact on life in the city
- Chickens can make good pets
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and causing no harm I believe that they should be welcome.
- Hens are cool. Free eggs.
- Having Hens for eggs etc can't possibly be that much of a nuisance.
- Economical
- Having chickens is educational and sustainable
- I'm all for this as long as my neighbours have to ask me and get written permission. I don't want to wake up to the sound of a rooster.
- As long as noise and smell can be minimized and the animals are kept as pets not used for food OR allowed to be sold for slaughter. I only support this if they are treated as any other pet like a dog or cat.
- I've lived in other cities where hens are allowed in yards. Its totally fine, but needs to include informing neighbours as there tend to be more predators like coyotes/owls in the area (important to know for owners of small pets like cats and small dogs).
- With appropriate space and noise control, I support expanding urban farming.
- A responsible owner should have this opportunity
- If dangerous dogs are kept contained, these livestock animals would be safer and they create benefits for families to eat (eggs, meat)
- As long as any issue that come up are dealt with as with any other animal
- As long as everyone is in agreement on everything, i dont see an issue
- As long as criteria for care and cleanliness is met
- I think this idea is great as long as the animals are registered and treated humanely and given similar rights to other animals like dogs cats etc.
- I believe urban hens would be a great way for everyone to learn how to treat animals which are not ordernarily kept as pets.
- as long as they can be taken care of properly and the population doesn't get out of hand.
- Chickens are quiet and clean creatures that are an easy and cheap way to have local food.
- Why not? Let us give it a go
- Livestock are less harmful (noise, mess, smell) than many other hobbies.
- Sustainability and affordability



- Within reason, my concern would be a smell if a neighbor has too many Livestock animals. We have to remember this is a city, not the country.
- I think having certain forms of livestock can be a good thing in the city, within reason.
- I don't think there should be exceptions. Either you meet the criteria, or you don't get to keep hens.
- I think that responsible owners should be allowed to keep hens on their property as they can be a good source of free food provided that neighbors do not mind
- the bylaw needs to be updated and clear rules need to be in place to ensure that owners of livestock are clear as to what is allowed and for neighbours to be able to have their rights ensured if keeping of livestock gets out of hand
- At least as a pilot and neighbor approval should be VERY important
- I feel it is important that, in all stages of these reviews and in the enforcement of any amendment, the deciding party is an individual with formal training on the matter at hand. Agriculture and animal behaviour specialists know more about these topics and should be consulted.
- The more we can support local the better.
- Who will be deciding there are benefits to the community?
- Local food security and independent food security should be considered extremely important
- I think that livestock should be allowed in Calgary as long as the animals needs are being met.
- Why not ?
- Again this should already be a thing
- Tending to hens in an urban setting is fantastic. It promotes sustainability and caring for animals could teach so much empathy to owners and owners to be.
- People should be allowed to own a reasonable amount of backyard hens if they wish to and are responsible about it.
- Food security.
- Yes.
- As long as the livestock is well cared for
- Responsible owners should be allowed to keep livestock. Excellent source of food, and wonderful for mental health.
- If the neighbours agree, then sure. But what happens when they move? As someone purchasing a property, how are they meant to know about this agreement. I mean...Have you smelled chickens? It's a hard sell to people who are not interested.
- If people own their own property why wouldn't we allow them to do with this property as they please. If people want the hens for the sake of being self sufficient and having a healthy and more natural source of food then let them
- Helps people!
- If neighbours change once you have an animal, you shouldn't have to give it up. Chickens can affect more than just adjacent neighbours with their sounds
- As long they are properly cared for and don't disturb (legitimately- not just a. Cranky neighbour being an [removed]) neighbours, I think it's a great idea



- The animals should be happy and well kept. It should not cause excessive disruption to the neighbours.
- Small no noises livestock can be great therapy and a healthy hobby
- Please bring back making our own food
- Better for the environment and support local.
- I'm in support of urban livestock and feel the listed criteria cover the range of associated concerns. I would recommend that 'support from adjacent neighbours' may be more suitably addressed as an absence of evidence-supported objections, where they have to prove that it effects them negatively to be able to deny their support
- If animals are safe, loved, cared for, I support this. The problem is confidence in the city to hire people who actually like animals.
- i would love to have my own fresh eggs every morning & i think others would agree
- People should be allowed to own chickens if treated humanely
- Yes but... the living conditions must be kept clean so as to not be a source of disease or draw rats etc
- If the personal property is large enough within the city, chickens and small livestock should be acceptable. I would also like NO livestock in rental properties.
- As long as conditions can be met, including space, noise, care, cleanup and smell, then they should be able to be had. There would be a need to have limit on amounts, but all should be considered.
- As long as it doesn't cost me money
- I wouldn't mind having a neighbor who has small(ish) livestock if they are well cared for and aren't a noise nuisance. I think it would be good for the community.
- I think any animal can be a beloved pet. I would not support having animals to slaughter.
- Live stock must be contained and not able to wander in and out of citizens properties. Also there is no guarantee that live stock will not provoke animals or people out for walks.
- Animals should be able to live theirs if there is a healthy safe environment for them that they will be supported in.
- why not as long as the number of hens is limited so it doesn't become a smell/noise issue.
- Yes, but in order to have livestock there should be mandatory education.
<https://www.cdc.gov/salmonella/backyardpoultry-05-20/index.html>
- For me it would depend on what purpose the animal serves, the enclosure must be suitable and maintained, and overall space must be appropriate.
- The above criteria supports the practice.
- provided they are taken care of properly, I think it's great. But I do think possible a license or mandatory weekend or evening course to get your 'bird' license. To ensure everyone knows what needs their birds will have, especially if they've never had livestock,
- From a community sustainability standpoint, urban livestock is a good way to involve and educate citizens of more sustainable agricultural practices. As long as there are requirements to ensure the presence of livestock doesn't negatively impact other community members, it should be looked at similarly to that of community gardens.



- There is no reason why not if it does not become a nuisance to others
- As with other pets, as long as the owner is responsible there shouldn't be an issue with neighbours
- I'm from BC where everyone I knew had two hens and a coop in their backyard.
- As long as it is beneficial and your neighbours do not mind then it should be ok. As long as the animals are being raised ethically and are being taken care of.
- As long as the animals still have a safe living environment that is not severely impacted by city noise or pollution, then I think it could have a very positive effect on the community.
- There has to be a way to guarantee neighbours can protect the value of their property value, (ie. Bad smells, unkept and messy coops, noises, etc.)
- Allowing things such as laying hens is a good idea so long as it's done responsibly with proper guidelines
- It's great to hear about possibly allowing hens. While I don't personally have interest in having them, I am from a city in the USA where they were allowed (and so were goats). Honestly, they were a delight as neighbors gave tours and shared the produce with others. Most times, you'd never even know they were any animals there. Also, our observation was that folks who had them actually took better care of their houses and yards and were more community-minded than the average resident. Let it happen. I think you'll be pleasantly surprised at how few bumps, if any, there are in that transition.
- People have too much open/free space in their yards. Would be nice if citizens weren't limited to what they're able to grow / keep in their yards to feed themselves.
- Yes allow for livestock that can make for a sustainable living
- I'm on the fence. There is a lot of room for negligence and mistreatment, but it will save lives in the long run.
- I think as long as the living conditions are appropriate for the animal and not a nuisance to neighborhood individuals that allowing people a means to produce their own food should be allowed. Such animals as laying hens and pigs I would think to be acceptable. However, cows and horses are too large to be kept in the city
- Who wouldn't want fresh eggs every morning? Vegans don't count.
- eggs!
- As long as proper living conditions can be provided.
- So long as they have proper housing and are not a nuisance, they should be allowed
- Hens are quiet, make great pets and give you eggs.
- It would be great to reintroduce certain types of livestock into our communities to better our relationships with these animals, with our food, and decrease reliance on mass commercial herders (especially for eggs)
- Hens are legit. Stop being [removed].
- I don't see a problem with it as long as the owners are responsible. Maybe require a cleanliness check for anyone owning them
- Keeping hens within city limits offers families a chance to source food locally, share fresh produce in their communities, and minimize the global impact of large scale food production.



- If they are kept in clean, maintained cages and looked after appropriately I think it's a great idea.
- By receiving the support of neighbors, suitable living conditions, and each case evaluated then every one involved has been taken into account.
- Contingent on approval by neighbours and surrounding are within your community.
- I would love to have my own eggs.
- More sustainable local farms and or and a richer local economy by allowing more coops
- I believe chickens would be great IF adjoining neighbors agreed
- We need to become more sustainable
- As long as the chief bylaw officer isn't biased
- If someone can adequately care for an animal and has the space, they should be allowed to have it.
- It makes sense that all parties including neighbours must be involved in the process.
- Encourages sustainability
- hens = eggs. Sustainable food. Easy.
- This would be beneficial to support people sourcing their own food and being less reliant on factory farming. However, requiring licensing may be a good idea to track who has livestock and so follow up can occur to ensure people are properly caring for the animals
- As long as the livestock isn't a nuisance and is safe and treated well, I have no issue with neighbours having them as "pets"
- If neighbours/neighborhood agrees to hens next door then why not?
- Chickens and livestock when taken care of properly don't smell much and wouldn't cause any issues besides occasional noise issues during the day and as long as they are being taken care of they should be allowed in town.
- As long as they are treated humanly and not nuisance than it is fine
- As long as the hens are in proper care, I support it.
- If all goes well it would be very beneficial.
- Edmonton has had the urban hens program for quite a while now and it has had little negative review. Owners must be responsible for proper care of the animals, proper enclosures and supervision and proper hygiene of the environment around their coops. When all rules are followed, it is an interesting, fun and innovative urban practice.
- Urban hens are a great way for City families to have the ability to have their own fresh eggs. Not only that but hens really can be beneficial to a persons mental health.
- Chickens are very smart animals and can be used as therapy animals, as well as providing food stability to low income families. The eggs, obviously, but chicken manure is also VERY effective when urban gardening and allowing low income families to grow their own food.
- Hens can be beneficial to the family for food. When properly taken care of they are less annoying than a dog left out to bark all day.
- Some home owners would like to have their own egg supply.
- As long as the animals are well cared for and not causing harm to the area or neighbors i believe small live stock (is. Chickens, ducks, geese, baby pigs, goats, etc.) should be allowed within the city.



But, owners (as well as neighbors-I say neighbors because not everyone knows how to respect or handle a farm animal) must be held responsible and be well advised of the bylaws.

- People are more focuses on sustainable food supply in light of covid, hens at home can support this in a safe and fun way
 - No roosters.
 - It's good to make sure the conditions are suitable for the animals.
 - Yes I have no problem with any other animals as long as it isn't disturbing communities.
 - Hens, when raised responsibly, are a noninvasive and nondisruptive means to increase food equity. For other livestock, I would suggest looking to rural MDs as to how they manage more animal units than an acreage permits
 - Suitable living conditions
 - Only if proper care and cleaning is maintained
 - I agree that hens should be allowed. So long as neighbours do not have issues and the animals are provided suitable living conditions, it should be permitted within reason (i.e. no more than X amount of hens).
 - Organic, well-tended animals reduce the industrial impact of farming - which is rarely capable of giving an animal a respectable life.
 - Answer is self- explanatory
 - If the criterias above are implemented
 - we need some control on this, people with absolute no clue are having these ideas of having farm animal on their backyards, this needs proper control, plus hens are smelly, anyone that has been to a chicken farm can tell you
 - with covid 19. People having chickens would be good
 - I think small animals might be okay, and depending on the neighbourhood and property size. My greatest concern is having adequate space and amenities for animal welfare. I think having a unique feature of a home ie a pet chicken or dwarf pig, would be a great talking point for neighbours, but where do you draw the line at how many animals, what species, etc. For me, the most important issue isn't about the person, it's about the animal's needs. We don't want a bunch of hens or other animals just abandoned (like feral rabbits that were once someone's pet) or dumped on the Humane Society. That is animal cruelty.
 - As long as the suitable living conditions are strictly enforced and offenders are severely punished.
 - My neighbor had chickens growing up and they often invited me over and taught me how to take care of them and why they are good for sustainability. It was a great experience for a child to understand where food comes from.
 - "I like the idea - with conditions:
-
- I would like to see careful regulation of the size of the flock (perhaps proportional to the size of the property) and the condition of the shelter hens are kept in. Ultimately, whether they are regarded as



pets or livestock, chickens in Calgary should never be abused or neglected. Animal welfare should be the highest priority. While the city already has laws that address abuse and neglect, animals kept in numbers, or breeding or producing animals are probably more vulnerable to casual abuse or neglect owing to crowding. Any owned animal in Calgary should have healthy access to ample food, fresh water, clean warm shelter, and - in the case of hens - outdoor space for exercise and forage. The city would need to ensure compliance through reasonable monitoring.

- And neighbours should have a reasonable expectation of cleanliness and quiet."
- I love chickens.
- Not as familiar with livestock but it sounds fine.
- Bring back the farm! Sustainable living and supporting your neighbouring communities with small , local farming is the best idea!
- [removed]
- As long as the animals aren't a nuisance, and they are living in the best of the best most humane space, I think it's okay.
- Why not?
- Without knowing exactly what other kinds of animals people are wanting, I can see the benefit of having a hen for eggs for some families. With ever increasing grocery costs, many people are now starting to grow their own gardens and trying to make a more sustainable life for themselves.
- Most importantly points 2 and 3 MUST be met- support from neighbors and suitable living conditions
- So long as they are reasonably kept and looked after, why not.
- This would have to be widely regulated, as shown above most people can't properly care for dogs or cats, let alone more exotic animals. People should have to prove their knowledge about the animals they are looking to receive permits for.
- Regular weekly clean up of animals area to reduce odour attractants to wildlife
- There's pigeon farms already in peoples back yards in the north east. This poses the same or higher threat to the local environmental health
- I have nothing against people keeping chickens
- I don't care
- There is a pair of illegal hens in my neighborhood and they are beautiful and you'd never even know they were there if it weren't for someone telling me (I walked by this house many times before without noticing) and they are even in the front yard haha!!
- As long as people are responsible to these animals, it is acceptable.
- i would love to have a hen!
- There's more and more animals a year that need homes but have nowhere to go
- As long as they're contained, properly protected, and cleanliness is maintained what does it matter? They can't be any more obnoxious than a neighbor with a dog that never shuts up, so who cares?
- Permaculture, including owning livestock, is a great way to provide for one's community.



- nothing wrong with critters.
- We need to support this - families should be able to have a small Pen like they would for a vegetable garden
- It's about time.
- Is neighbors say it's fine I don't see the problem
- "More people are wanting the option to source their own food, which can lead to increased community and communication between neighbours. Also giving neighbours the opportunity to vote if they are comfortable with adequate poultry housing in close proximity is paramount.
- Coops/ housing/ upkeep should be subject to periodic random inspections and adhere to a strict number of live animals (hens>chicks) and provisions for over-hatched broods (sell/surrender to rural farms)."
- As long as they are not causing a disturbance or affecting neighbours people should be allowed to have specified wildlife on their property.
- Some people with PTSD find comfort in animals that are not dogs or cats. I support this in those instances, but not as a general pet.
- As long as rules are in place to keep noise down (no roosters) and sanitation/quality of care up.
- Bees/ Hens/ Goats....great way to teach people to appreciate food chain. I would also support fines for those abusing said animals, just like a cat or dog. ZERO PIGEONS!!
- As long as you take care of your animals.
- As long as the animal is not smelly or going to be loud after hours similar to existing noise bylaws.
- Let me have a cow for all I care so long as the neighbors don't mind
- owners of said animals must abide by the code of practice for the animals in question. Seizure from Animal Protection services must be implemented if the animals are not well cared
- Urban hens are a huge success in much of the world. Brings people in touch with animals, allows you to control where your eggs come from, local food, etc! It's time to get on board with this Calgary.
- I think it would be cool to have some more nature around calgary. People might be able to see where part of Alberta's economy comes from and their food. It seems like a great opportunity for new learning experiences, given the persons neighbors/ neighborhood is fine with it.
- I see nothing wrong with this amendment as long as, as said, each differing case is evaluated and the animal is being cared for in the proper conditions.
- I think it's a great project, a limit to how many should be enforced and also bylaw on housing for the birds
- All immediately surrounding neighbours must be notified and have the ability to decline consent.
- Hens would allow poorer Calgaryans to achieve a certain degree of food security.
- All of the above criteria seem suitable for urban hens.
- I strongly agree with having a Chief Bylaw Officer assess livestock on a case by case basis. There are residential places in the city that could accommodate livestock being part of the community, and there are definitely places that could not.



- Chickens are great. The eggs are fresh. And if the standards are met, and neighbours are okay with it, why not?
 - If neighbors support it and the "license/exemption" is revoked if the applicant lied on application.
 - More options would benefit all and I see no negative consequences from this
 - If they are kept well and maintained properly there would be no issue with having hens in backyards
 - Who doesn't like fresh eggs?
 - Chickens are acceptable pets.
 - As long the animals, are cared for properly, clean & do not create a smell!
 - People should be allowed to have small live stock on their property. As long as it is well cared for, both the animals and the surrounding land, I don't see why people should not be allowed to have small live stock, especially birds. People are allowed to own parrots and budgies, and other types of birds, why not chickens.
 - Urban chickens are a norm in many large urban cities around the world. They help keep families connected with the food chain and combat food insecurity. They eat slugs and other harmful garden grubs and provide rich garden fertilizer.
 - Not the city's business what food I produce on my property
 - "The disposal of manure will need to be evaluated. Chicken feces can contain dangerous amounts of bacteria that could make people sick. They would not only need suitable conditions for the animals but also measures in place that mitigate any run off of manure and feces to enter our water system or onto a neighbours property.
-
- Also roosters in the city would be terrible as they are sooo loud and would crow every morning. Roosters are a no-go.
-
- Lastly there would need to be continuous check ins with these live stock in the case where the owner doesn't clean up the manure well enough and smells travel into the neighbours yards..."
 - If people can support multiple pets now (cats dogs) why not hens? If they are responsible then it should not be an issue.
 - As long as the neighborhood are supportive and the animal is cared for properly it should be allowed.
 - As long as individuals are responsible for their pets and respectful of others properties. Cleaning up after them, keeping them contained to their own yard etc.
 - If properly managed, this could be very beneficial for families and communities.
 - Small animals fine. No horses or cows (animals that smell)
 - I think people being able to have hens in the city would lead to more education in regards to the needs and benefits of hens and having fresh, traceable eggs.



- I think this could be beneficial for the community as long as there are guidelines in place that take into consideration the animals' well being, and are also respectful of neighbours and the community.
- If conditions are good for the animals and people involved why not.
- If it benefits the community and surrounding neighbors are on board, i don't see an issue with this.
- Also follow up surprise visits to ensure proper care for livestock.
- Having lived in other countries/cities that support urban hens I have consistently seen it be very successful and allows the city as a whole to engage in more sustainable and environmentally conscious practices
- This is a great idea.
- I have no issue with small livestock in urban areas, as long as the noted conditions are met.
- standards and expectations would need to be set. Regular inspections for both bird and community
- I don't see why hens in particular couldn't be kept on someone's personal property as long as they are well taken care of and not disturbing surrounding neighbours.
- Small barn animals should be allowed. People can use hens for food. Poy bellied pugs should also be allowed, as well as small (Pgymie) goats.
- Having chickens would be great.
- I'm not really sure why most of this is necessary with hens when it is NOT necessary for yappy dogs, etc. But I do think that it should be required that suitable living conditions can be provided.
- If they are properly taken care of I don't see why not.
- People should be able to attempt to provide for themselves. Let them have animals as long as they are taken care of
- Food sustainability is an issue that we need to be aware of so having access to fresh eggs would be a huge benefit. Also in many areas they are using goats to get rid of problem weeds, the goats eat the weeds, they get fed, and in turn they fertilize the area. A win win situation.
- Only with the regulation that hen houses and yards must be at least four metres from neighbouring property/fence line, and there is a restriction on number, no more than six, and no roosters.
- I support responsible ownership of backyard chickens and other livestock deemed suitable.
- As long as the owners are responsible, people should be allowed to enjoy the benefits of livestock.
- I think this is a good idea as long as they are given good living conditions, and dogs will not be blamed if an attack on a hen happens.
- In a small numbers on property, well maintained and not a nuisance to neighboring property
- If a property had sufficient space to accommodate hens and the neighbours supported it, I'm not in objection to people keeping hens
- There shouldn't be a problem as long as they are being properly taken care of.
- Urban animals should not be restricted to only hens
- Livestock animals can be used as therapy animals and people should also be allowed to have the benefits of home grown eggs
- humans should be allowed to care for reasonable livestock as a means to provide for their family as long as the livestock are protected and properly cared for.



- I support the hens
- Why not? Everyone should be able to it's part of growth and learning how to grow in agriculture and raising your own food(eggs).groceries are getting expensive and I think this would actually help some of the lower income people feed themselves.
- So long as the animal is not a nuisance in the neighbourhood and is being properly cared and looked after, I see no issue.
- Anyone should be able to have livestock as long as they have the means and space to support them.
- limit the number that can be owned
- You should really have a "maybe" answer that allows people to consider an amendment based on conditions the City would impose. You're forcing people to agree or disagree, which is bad form in a survey.
- Hens are not harmful to neighbours. Minimal noise and no concern of damage to neighbours' property (unlike pigeons!)
- Hens and other livestock can help sustain a family economically as well as emotionally
- I think domestic hens is a great idea!
- There needs to be a specific reason why the request is being made and the neighbors should have a voice in the decision
- I agree only if the living conditions are acceptable and nextdoor neighbours are contact prior to and have given their ok.
- I think community hens with proper checks and balances in place are a great idea. They support mental health and can be a great way to teach children about where their food comes from. Plus delicious eggs.
- Responsible ownership can create a great environment for other livestock within the city.
- What animals my neighbours keep does not matter to me as long as they are cared for
- Teach children how to look after an animal that supplies food
- I think urban farming is great as long as there is the proper resources for the participants
- I'm always happy to have more local food sources
- Yes! Allow chickens! Those low income individuals would then have a source of food and potential income, and sourcing locally is always better than importing.
- People should be allowed to have whatever kind of animals they want as long as the animals are being cared for properly
- Having hens is great for teaching kids and you get locally sourced eggs that can be shared with the neighbors
- As long as hens are properly cared for and neighbors agree!
- Health considerations would have to be considered for the handling of stool
- Communities that allow Hens could provide eggs in farmers markets, ect. Boosting small community economics.



- Fresh eggs from chickens, pot bellied pigs are wonderful pets. The city needs to be less restrictive in what animals are allowed to live in the city. Obviously large animals like cows and horses wouldn't be acceptable.
- Yes but with strict policies to ensure as time goes on and neighbors change things remain fair for all involved.
- As long as someone is a responsible, good pet owner, then the type of pet (size depending) shouldn't matter
- this seems reasonable
- Would like to see support for responsible animal ownership, for example chickens.
- I agree to the criteria in general, but am curious as to what animals are being considered. I fully support the option for having laying hens in the city as per the criteria.
- Factory farm produced eggs are far more cruel than backyard eggs. It is a sustainable way to shorten food miles and provide food security. Hens should not be butchered however, they should be protected as pets.
- its about time!
- As long as support is given from neighbors that no smell, noise or other concerns arise. This would need to be revocable so if there are complaints it could be felt with ie excess noise, smell
- As long as the livestock isn't causing a nuisance then I'd be for having livestock in a city
- Other cities allow them and have no issues
- I support urban farming/ranching as long as adjacent neighbours are consulted and in agreement first.
- Urban hens are a great way to teach children where our food comes from, creating food for their people, and brining an overall joy. Allow urban hens!
- Must be monitored by the City for proper shelter, living conditions, animal health and ongoing impact in neighborhood.
- I personally would love to have chickens given appropriate care is available
- As long as one has support from all neighbours. I agree with all points that were listed above.
- Yes, but with a limit on the number of hens as birds can become stinky
- Livestock can provide calming and therapeutic effects, as well as help our ecosystem
- As long as the animals would be cared for properly and their living habitats kept up to not cause any foul odours, then I don't see an issue.
- I see no issue with allowing livestock in the city
- This is an excellent move and brings the city up to date with the latest urban planning
- The ability to keep hens on private property allows for food for families and sustainability learning for household members.
- nothing wrong with Hens
- I think a case by case basis for other animals is great!
- Hens should be allowed in the city but definitely need to be cared for properly.
- If neighbours don't care. Why should anyone else?



- because they are a food source
- Like other animals they should be cared and cleaned up after without breaking noise bylaws.
- As long as they are not a nuisance to the neighborhood. And respect the animals that already live there. Like beehives intuitive. You have to disclose to your neighbors you have them, and agree to respect habitats.
- Lots of other cities allow this. I believe Edmonton does.
- As long as the owner can provide for the animal, and keep it safe, and cared for in a good space, then I support it.
- If the correct precautions are taken to exercise, food, shelter and provide the animals with a positive environment, I believe it would positively impact the communities and those considering moving to Calgary.
- If the neighbours say yes, go for it.
- Sustainable backyard food growing should be allowed and supported, including chickens. Anyone who abuses this freedom and does not support the chickens adequately should be punished to the same extent as other animal abusers.
- urban hens would be a fantastic addition to the neighbourhood
- With ever increasing grocery expenses, I feel people should have the right to own livestock for the purpose of their own survival so long as the owner is courteous of their fellow neighbors and providing the necessities for the animals well being.
- Another great local food source.
- Yes with the above criteria
- Animals bring a lot of benefits, from providing food to teaching responsibility. However there needs to be a sufficient team readily available to respond to cases asap so there's no unnecessary animal suffering.
- As long as the animals are taken care of properly, we should be able to be more self sustaining.
- These bylaws have been successfully implemented in other jurisdictions.
- I think urban livestock is fine, so long as they are properly caged, especially at night. Something like this could potentially Lure in predators such as Coyotes, which could harm residential areas.
- People should have the right to have small livestock for personal use if all is humanely kept.
- As long as the animal is cared for and the property doesn't end up a complete mess, owners should be able to provide for themselves. Whether it be eggs or anything that helps people be self-sufficient, but with some rules in place to protect homeowners around them.
- If the involved animals are well taken care of and the neighbours agree there is no reason to not allow these animals
- Hens and small livestock - yes.
- Great educational tool for children.
- Chickens should be allowed anywhere in Calgary as long as they have proper living conditions. Just please don't allow roosters
- .



- With a limit to how many animals a household can have. They also must be humanly taken care of. Those rules should be relatively strict as well to insure they are being cared for properly.
- Strict guidelines on how many hens a person can have and purpose of having them.
- I want a pet cow.
- I believe livestock ownership should be introduced as a collaborative effort with City and residents, with information sessions, and plentiful resources available for first-time owners on proper care and sanitation requirements.
- As long as it doesn't bother your neighbours, why not?
- I want a pet pig.
- Suitable living conditions should be enforced for an animal
- I love this idea so long as the animals are properly cared for
- As long as hens are kept in safe/humane conditions, I do not think they are a detriment to the community. I do feel it is important to limit the number of hens allowed per lot.
- It shouldn't need to benefit the community. It shouldn't disturb others, and should have adequate seasonal living conditions.
- I don't see any harm in this at all. Could be beneficial to communities.
- Calgarians should be allowed to have livestock as long as they have the space and resources to care for the animals.
- I don't see anything wrong with someone having livestock as long as the animal is in a good environment.
- Seems acceptable, however antagonistic neighbors may choose to attempt to assert negative impact based on personal animosity. Case by case evaluation of antagonistic neighbors may prove to be time consuming, delegation of investigation of facts may prove to be necessary.
- If we can have dogs and cats, why not goats and cows.
- There would need to be enforcement on proper hens accommodation (protect against predators and enclosure to prevent hens escaping, safe heating), location of accommodation (outdoors, garage), noise control, sanitation (smells, insects, discarding off, products allowed to be used to control any of these)
- It is important to many families to be able to eat locally sourced food were they can control and know exactly what they are eating (organic, non gmo, no hormones, antibiotics etc
- I would support different kinds of animals in the city as long as they are following the same rules that dogs and cats have to follow by not being let off property and not being a nuisance to neighbours and people surrounding them.
- Chickens are fine in a city but maybe not larger livestock.
- I think the point about neighbours is critical but also potentially difficult to achieve-neighbours move out and new ones move in.
- Keep in mind adjacent neighbours WILL change and neighbours now may approve but future ones may not.
- Hens are a great addition to an urban garden.
- The criteria needs to be strict to ensure the animals welfare is indeed met



- I grew up in a community where livestock was permitted given the conditions of the living area was adequate and it had a profound positive effect on the community.
- As long as nuisances (odour, pests, noise) are under control, these animals could be of value in terms of mental health
- X
- I hope your bylaw enforcement officer is at least trained in Zoology, or has Agricultural knowledge and training, so that there are no surprises or mistakes on judgements.
- Have a proximity to neighbours minimum requirement and square footage of land requirement
- People deserve this option.
- As long as suitable living conditions are provided and neighbors are not disturbed, hens should be allowed, like a cat or dog
- As long as neighbour approval is received. Neighbour approval should be able to be revoked if the livestock becomes a nuisance.
- If benefits are proven, neighbours agree, suitable living conditions provided for the livestock, no objections.
- Sustainable living and humane raising of animals within reason should be allowed. Especially if the intent is to use the livestock animal as food.
- I like hens.
- People should be allowed to keep a limited number livestock as long as they are properly educated on the care of the animal. Maybe there should be a licence for it to ensure people can properly care for the animal.
- Don't know much abt hens
- As long as the animals have suitable living arrangements and can be cared for properly, I'm not opposed to people caring for livestock in Calgary.
- Animals of different varieties are no problem in some situations and not good in others. Case by case provides a fair assessment
- they are hens, let them exist here
- It would be good for the local economy (small resteraunts and possibly entrepreneurs)
- Backyard chickens for collecting eggs would be OK.
- Let people do what they want on their property do not interfere you communist local government
- I think that if all neighbours are fine with it people should be able to have urban hens. If people can treat their own hens properly this would reduce factory farmed hens in the egg industry.
- It doesn't affect me one way or the other. If a person wants to raise said animals it is their prerogative.
- If neighbours are in agreement that an animal is suitable and possible in their neighborhood and it would not be a hindrance to others then there is no logical reason to not allow it.
- Yes, as long as there is written consent from neighbors.
- Only if there are precautions sk that neighbors arnt impacted.
- With support from neighbors and positive impacts I agree.



- Hens are a great idea to create a somewhat self sufficient household for eggs.
- Food security and sustainability should be a priority for the city and for citizens interested in urban agriculture I fully support bylaw changes to facilitate urban agriculture needs.
- the benefits of owning laying hens is well known and their needs are low (small space, contained coop, do not fly etc.)
- I fully support bringing more self sufficiency in to our communities.
- "If you can responsibly provide for livestock on your property, then you should be entitled to Ownership"
- As long as there is neighbor and community support this should not be an issue
- I think it'll be a great addition to any community who support local livestock. The community can reek the benefits and provide an environment for children to learn from right in their neighbourhood.
- As long as the neighbors affected by the new additions to the backyard continue to be ok with it. Hens provide exceptionally valuable self-sufficiency our government is very much against, but they absolutely can be noisy and create unpleasant smells that would impact the neighbors from rightfully enjoying their own property. An appeals process should be in place so if neighbors previously agreed but have changed their mind, the owners of the livestock must be given an opportunity to address the concern to alleviate the problem and keep their livestock. This could just be handled with some kind of write in situation if the neighbors wish to remain anonymous or cannot resolve the situation between them amicably. Neighbors send their complaints to someone overseeing the program who then works with the livestock owner to either remediate the situation or supervise the removal of the livestock. Take the cost out of one of the mayor's two pensions. It's our money, let's do something useful with it.
- As long as people are taking appropriate care and they are not nothing anyone else you should be able to have what ever uou want as long as not a danger to others . If I had a mini horse in my backyard who is that hurting?
- No real reason to seclude them!
- If you allow hens, why not other livestock? They would need a good sized property to support the animals and neighbours support, so I would support this amendment.
- There no reason why we shouldn't allow this already.
- As long as the hens had appropriate husbandry and approval I think it would be beneficial for people to have their own hens
- Other cities allow hens... why not Calgary
- I think overall having certain farm animals could be a positive, provided they can have an appropriate habitat and they aren't a nuisance (smell).
- I think as long as animals are not a nuisance to the surrounding neighbours (ie smell and sound) people should be allowed to keep them.
- I think more people are looking for food sustainability. More natural management of green spaces and just the education of having animals in correlation to our existence can only benefit our society. Perhaps getting us further away from Factory food settings and back to more sustainable humane living



- As long as the animal's needs are met with access to proper care and enough space to be suitable.
- Allowing people to produce their own food (eggs) is a positive thing for residents.
- If the conditions can be met I don't see a problem
- Hens are not noisy or smelly. One concern I have - what happens to the roosters?
- As long as the livestock were not disruptive, taken care of properly and removal of waste was done regularly.
- I feel small livestock for food should be allowed. Nothing bigger than a pig. Also providing the neighbors say it is ok prior.
- Sustainability is something modern societies need to work on, and individual households providing food for themselves outside of the carbon emitting factory system is a great start.
- It will teach a life lesson and also how to get and make own food.
- I'm unsure of the condition of ensuring that neighbors are supportive. I think for residence that are close together this makes sense as a courtesy, but if the hens wouldn't impact neighbors in any way I think it wouldn't be as necessary.
- Good way for people to learn about how difficult it is to keep livestock and where their food comes from. Should have mandatory training done by people in agriculture/university so that they can learn about biosecurity and disease prevention (etc).
- Only if it's done in a way that is able to keep the hen houses clean and sanitary and is not a nuisance to the surrounding neighbors. You could even go so far as to require permission from neighbours surrounding the property, for houses close together in suburban neighbourhoods.
- As long as it doesn't cause harm or inconvenience to others, it's all good.
- Having a hen or two can help control weeds, plus provide eggs for the owner. As long as the area the birds are kept is maintained and kept clean it's no different than keeping any other animal, whether it be a pet or otherwise.
- As long as hens are living in safe and sufficient conditions they should be allowed.
- As long as the animal is safe and healthy
- As long as the rules governing this are fair and equitable to ALL involved
- I believe hens would be great to help with certain bug problems like ticks
- As long as proper living and eating conditions are met, citizens should be allowed to own any animal not banned or prohibited by endangered species or domestication laws.
- I think there is a way to have hens within the city. This helps with food sovereignty and health of those that have them or share their eggs
- Urban farming has been well received and benefits shown in other jurisdictions.
- I don't think it needs to support the community but it would likely support that family and those associated with it but it would need to be monitored to make sure the animals are being cared for
- Chickens are awesome
- Sustainable living.
- As long as they do not disturb others by noise or smell it would be fine.
- Hens don't make much noise and it's wonderful to have fresh eggs



- City hall needs to let people be people. Stop regulating everything all the time. Some chickens don't hurt anyone and our kids don't even know where food comes from anymore. Let them learn.
- I would love to have the option to raise my own food!!
- It's a delicate line...are we going to have urban goats, cows, horses?
- Responsible owners should be allowed
- As long as the property is suitable and the livestock isn't being kept in poor conditions just because someone wanted them as a novelty, I don't see why not.
- Well why not!
- If lack of support from adjacent neighbours were a sufficient measure to prohibit someone from owning an urban hen, I'd like there to be some reasonable and tangible basis for their lack of support to be a prohibitive criterion.
- I think allowing hens has the potential for a great deal of positive impact.
- If there is a proper environment for them to live in, adequate space and housing. I think certain animals can provide an opportunity for children to learn about responsibility and caretaking.
- urban hens can be a great hobby and are social birds. They can also provide provide a good harvest of eggs and poultry
- On the approval of those living nearby. And that the animals are properly cared for.
- I don't care
- I believe there is a benefit to hens with proper training and facilities available. Of course this is something that would need to be submitted upon application if the resident did not have a large enough yard to build a proper chicken coop with roaming area.
- If they can be kept happy and healthy and not cause a disturbance to the neighborhood I think it could be a wonderful idea to help diversify urban farming/gardening.
- Hens are allowed in Toronto, we should have them here too, as long as their welfare is maintained including winter care.
- Calgary is behind so many other cities that have already implemented similar bylaws.
- There should be a cap on how many a home can have... ie 2 per household.
- have no issue with this
- I have a pig living in my apartment building and he's extremely well behaved, a positive almost mascot for our building, and has been well trained and well cared for. If other people wish the same, I agree as long as the animal can be properly cared for and the space is available.
- Think there are more support animals than just dogs or cats.
- I support people keeping hens to collect eggs for their family. I also support someone keeping a small goat or pig as a pet but no more than 2 goats or pigs per household.
- Chickens and livestock are great if they are kept in suitable living conditions
- Please allow urban hens!! I think that with the criteria listed above for approval of other livestock seems reasonable.
- The more hens the better!!
- Common sense



- Laying hens have always been beneficial as long as adjacent neighbours are supportive and owner properly handles them
- Animals have rights too. We as people just need to enforce them
- If they're properly maintained and guidelines taken care of and met. I'm for it. Don't see an issue promoting opportunities.
- It's a sustainable way to produce food and landscaping.
- BUT... support from adjacent neighbors policy must include scenarios of renters, change of home owners. Support must be renewed as neighbors change.
- Some people can derive a great deal of comfort from a support animal that is other than the usual dog/cat selection. I support the right to responsibly own/have animals in your home regardless of the species. I feel that neighbours should not have a say in these types of decisions if it does not effect them.
- Fresh eggs 100%
- I'd rather hear a rooster crowing, sheep beating, or cows lowing rather than a domestic dispute or my neighbours loud music.
- I think urban livestock is great! Especially hens!
- Should be a case by case matter and you have to be able to provide the space for these chickens where they aren't constantly locked up and have room to roam
- Having chickens or other quiet livestock animals in the city should not be an issue as long as they are taken care of and their living quarters are kept clean.
- Edmonton allows this.
- chickens, ducks goats and even sheep can all be useful.
- Urban hens provide education opportunity to kids, a way to grow your own food, and when contained, cause much less problems than comin roaming cats.
- I think animal raising and urban farming should be a fundamental right.
- Having small amount of urban hens, or other wildlife that would benefit the community and owners is a good idea. As long as you have responsible owners for their livestock. If they're not responsible, have a lot of valid complaints against them etc, they wouldn't be allowed to have any on their property.
- Urban hens are a great contribution to the city and can really emphasize a backyard, a lifestyle, and promote sustainability within the City of Calgary.
- There are many other animals, such as some breeds of pigs and goats that are small enough, that make good pets, and can teach children a lot.
- I see no issue with this
- If a single-dwelling home has backyard space, why not? Why does the government need to be involved in every decision?
- "Again as long as these animals were cared for and kept quiet to adhere with bylaw and people being able to lead a normalized life in their own home.
- Same thing as a dog or cat , nobody wants to hear a dog barking all day all night or a cat meow all hours of the night etc."



- Yes!
- I have no problem with that as long as it's dealt with respectfully and responsibly.
- I would support any bylaws that allowed a person to raise their own food within reason on their own property.
- Makes sense
- While I see the need to be able to live more sustainably, and that includes having the right to raising livestock, you need to be able to do it safely, and in a way that doesn't negatively impact your community and neighbours.
- "Pet bylaws shouldn't be about specific animals. It should be about educating people on responsible pet ownership and if they fail to be responsible they lose their rights to own an animal."

- Irresponsible pet ownership such as, not training of dogs, letting cats free roam; is animal abuse and should be treated as such. These animals are innocent. People are the problem."
- EGGS ARE VERY EXPENSIVE SO TO ALLOW CHICKENS IN THE CITY - WITH A LIMIT TO NUMBER - A FAMILY COULD REDUCE THEIR GROCERY BILL
- So long as it is being done responsibly and with little negative impact I see no wrong in raising chickens. Yes their needs and safety are my main concern if urban arrangements are being set up but I would personally like a chicken or two for the eggs. Self-sufficiency is a valuable factor
- "If the spacing between single dwellings allow, and neighbors support is in place then hens should've allowed.
- Reducing noise from the coop would be my main concern."
- As long as the owners are responsible.
- Neighbours must agree to the increased smell, noise.
- Allow laying hens as they are quiet. No roosters. Limit the number of hens per residence. This is for personal use not commercial.
- Depending on the definition of "other livestock" I agree with this. I don't understand why chickens aren't allowed to be kept. I think as long as the rules for other pets applies (no/low smell, no roosters to avoid the noise that would come with that, I'm all for allowing this. I don't think the "support from adjacent neighbours" needs to apply. You don't need your neighbors support to get a cat or dog. What's the difference with a chicken?
- All for urban chickens
- I believe it is a human right to be able to grow and harvest our own food, but we should be required to be mindful of neighbors that may not support the concept.
- just dont let me smell the [removed] we are not a farm
- Provided the criteria are met.
- If the livestock are pets and arent being bred for slaughter
- Chickens being prime example if supported by community and they have a proper coop/ area for grazing.



- Urban hens are a great way to make a more sustainable community!
- If people want chickens and can properly care for them, why not.
- I want them
- Why not if it helps the family with food, etc...but only small to mediumish size.
- With only 2-3 allowed/property with getting a yearly permit. The property must also be a minimum size. See town of Rocky Mtn house bylaw on this
- As long as neighbours agree to it
- As long as they have support from adjacent neighbors and can provide suitable living conditions, more than happy to allow whatever people want.
- If a person has the means and room to have livestock, it should be allowed, especially during this time when food prices are rising. It is also likely that only those who are truly invested in the animals would take on the raising and care for livestock. For many it would be so foreign to their experience they wouldn't even consider it. There would need to be monitoring of care and housing of any livestock.
- I think its a great idea if done properly and enforced properly. Some people prefer other animals then dogs or cats and as an example hens are fun and produce food.
- As long as the animals are well cared for & not offensive to REASONABLE neighbours, it's a win-win.
- There is nothing wrong with owning livestock if you OWN your house/property and are properly taking care of them. I do not believe renters should have this right as it's a lot of mess for the home owner to deal with when the renter ups and leaves.
- without discrimination of species. With the exception of supporting infrastructure in place for the animal (on private and/ or public property). using the example of bull; if person(s) owns a bull and decides to keep in the backyard. The supporting infrastructure would be strong fences (expenses on the owner) - Covenant to neighbors agreement.
- With the stipulation that the animals do not cause a nuisance / noise issues for neighbours, or the owner does not clean up after the animals
- Support this bylaw amendment to a limitation of the number of animals.
- makes sense
- Chickens are great pets and they give you eggs. What's the problem?
- If there is licensing required that would go a long way in ensuring urban hens are properly cared for
- Neighbours' support should not be required
- Livestock if cared properly should be allowed
- The owner needs to have permission, in writing, from any neighbours that share a fence. If the neighbor moves, no need to get new permission
- I would be worried about too much noise or the animal escaping and running loose in the neighbourhood, if these concerns can be addressed then I would feel better about this amendment. Support from adjacent neighbours would definitely need to be included for me to be okay with this.
- Open to people having some livestock if proper conditions are met
- This would allow for a more sustainable food supply.



- They are harmless unlike nuisance dogs.
- As long as the noise isn't too much why can't people have hens.
- I would add that these additional livestock animals would have to be acquired through adoption only. For example, I'm very against the selling of so-called "teacup pigs" because they don't exist and owners after their pigs reach their full size are very quick to dump them which overwhelms rescues.
- It places onus on neighbours to say NO if they don't want chickens and the associated noise/mess which is unfair. Acreages should be allowed as per the above rules.
- I think having urban "farms" allow to provide food sources (eggs, goat milk, etc) for families/communities and it helps provide a sense of community to neighborhoods
- I think everyone should have the ability to do what they want on their property they choose. I also think consideration of neighbours especially those communities where houses are so close to each other you need to take in smell, sound etc to the fellow neighbours around.
- People have the right to secure food for themselves. It is not up to the city or the persons neighbours to decide on how an individual does this.
- Property size should be a factor - a few hens are less likely to be a bother if there is a decent amount of space between properties.
- People should be able to do what they want as long as they're considerate of their neighbors.
- Of a neighbor can responsibly have a beehive or a chicken coop in reasonable number. Keeping cleanliness and animals/neighbours happy. One should be able to do so.
- Provided the proper health and safety measures are in place for the welfare of the animals, and consideration for neighbours, I see nothing wrong with this.
- No reason this cant happen
- It is good to allow people to produce their own food, if the co ditions are healthy and enriching for the animals.
- Urban livestock seems like a great idea as long as they are managed properly.
- I think that key elements of this for me include: noise and smell concerns, the ability to override community fencing requirements to allow for higher or solid fences if livestock is allowed at the expense of the livestock owner. For example, our community fencing requirements call for an open style lattice fence with a total height of 4 feet. I would not support my neighbour having chickens, goats or pigs with that fence style.
- As long as there is a reasonable expectation of what these changes mean, and that those looking to bring livestock into The City are fully aware of their responsibilities.
- I don't think the neighbours should get a say. The owners need to manage the smell though.
- Hens help keep big numbers down and are a source of food (eggs) for those that have them.
- Animals are great and should be allowed to live and be adopted by people who can properly house, feed, train, afford all items and healthcare for the animal(s). Like adopting a child. All people should be screened.
- no issue with urban hens, as long as they are looked after - cared for and the areas are kept clean and up to standards



- With exception to community benefit, neighbor support, and case by case evaluation. A dog, cat or other currently acceptable "pet" is of no community benefit, or any other reasons listed above. I would not be getting a chicken or a goat to support my community or neighbors. I would be raising them to support my family with fresh eggs and milk. Interested participants should have to apply for a permit, and have certain criteria based on land size available, as well as number of animals, but not have neighbor input as a deciding factor. Some neighbors already don't get along and would deny the request due to personal agenda.
- Hens are wonderful companions, and, when cared for responsibly, can be a wonderful addition to a household.
- As the city expands some farms may be swallowed by the city limits. It is feasible for the farm to still exist inside city limits if it was preexisting.
- It would be nice to have new wildlife in Calgary as long as it's not more predators.
- as long as the livestock smells are contained and disease managed.
- Make sure any animals are well cared for and not being housed in bad conditions (ie left outside in very hot/very cold temps) etc. Removal of animals if they are not being looked after
- This should always be considered on a case by case.
- Heck yes hens
- it is a good educational tool but needs to monitor for cleanliness and noise. Number of livestock should be limited. Maybe a number per surface area limit
- I think it would be beneficial to a community if one neighbor had chickens with eggs. Bring back the old sense of community.
- Properly cared for chickens provide inexpensive nourishment for families.
- Done within management and care standards many small livestock animals can be beneficial for having a fresh supply of eggs etc. Can be good for community engagement, and any can make wonderful alternative companions.
- Helps with people wanting to live a more self-sustaining lifestyle, as long as the animal is properly cared for. Hens are not as loud, as long as a rooster is not introduced.
- As long as safety is maintained for animals and people nothing to oppose
- I think that the urban management of livestock and poultry increases the community.
- would need to be reviewed case by case to ensure the welfare of the animals.
- Raising hens seems completely fine. The only possible issues I could see are noise complaints, or maybe outdoor cats/dogs attacking them.
- As long as the property is visited first for there to be proper care and space for the hens and the owner has a permit, it seems fine.
- As long as livestock/property are clean, healthy, well kept, and respectful to neighbours, I do not see an issue with having smaller livestock, like hens.
- I support this to an extent. I believe that hens/livestock would have to have the benefit of having a large place to roam, and be owned by someone who can continually maintain a clean and appropriate living conditions where the animals health/quality of life isn't being put at risk. Being a



farmer/rancher is a full time job that requires experience, therefore, would require someone who has time to care for the hens/livestock

- Case by case is important. Every situation will be unique. The support for adjacent house holds is also important and should be considered... Some people don't want to live by avian smells... Absolutely no animal should be housed in inappropriate habitats. Our climate is unique and if an animal will be housed outside there needs to be appropriate heat sources, cooling sources and environmental enrichment.
- As long as everyone's needs are met, I don't see a problem with this.
- Chickens can be beneficial
- If the neighbours approve I don't see why not
- For rescue purposes as well it seems fitting to make exceptions to allow urban hens and small livestock
- if the animals are on the owners property and are healthy and well cared for I have no issues
- Creates more jobs and sustainability in Calgary
- I like chickens, as long as it is ok with neighbors and the hens are well cared for I don't see why not
- As long as the owners are responsible and respectful, this should be allowed to give families an option to raise hens.
- I think that this is a great program following the other community's that allow it. Great for family bonding and mental health
- People are looking for ways to save money & raise their own food - as long as it wasn't a nuisance I don't know why it would be an issue?
- As long as hygiene and nuisance standards are clearly outlawed and enforced.
- Fresh is best in my life, so I think if I could raise my own with proper care then why not ?
- If the neighbours have no problem with it, then should be allowed
- Must attend classes
- Limits to the number of hens per square footage of their living conditions imposed. And a majority of "neighbours" instead of merely adjacent (we have troublesome next-door neighbours who would reject our proposal for hens just because they could - if, say 5/6 of people surrounding our place - across the back alley, for example - agreed, majority should rule to bypass jerks)
- Local produce is better for your immune system. As long as this is regulated and enforced properly it can help our community.
- Some animals yes, cant fit a horse in a bungalow yard. Cant be slaughter animals. Proper care must be given to the animal but should be able to have egg hens.
- Chickens would be great for more locally produced that people know havent been injected with hormones etc. The only thing I would want to see is that the City do a regular inspection of people owning livestock to make sure they are being cared for properly.
- I guess I support this, but would be concerned over a possible increase in dangerous wildlife like bobcats and coyotes within residential areas.
- City has no place in how people get to feed themselves, a very basic human right.



- If it is possible for them to live healthy and not disturb/or have support of neighbours, then I don't believe it can be seen as negative.
- If there is suitable coups for the hens to live in this makes sense. The problem will be the cleanliness of the property over time.
- I feel with proper standards and quality of care implemented this could allow for a connection to nature for those living in the city and create a greater sense of community!
- If all the criteria is filled it can be a great learning experience as well as access to fresh homegrown products.
- There are many types of livestock that would be happy living in a backyard and they wouldn't cause a whole lot of grief to the neighbours. I like the idea of the neighbours needing to approve it first as well.
- This will protect livestock rather than have people hide animals in poor living conditions.
- I have no say in what my neighbors do with their land. Raise a damn velociraptor for all I care, as long as it is sufficiently contained.
- Not new ownership but perhaps be grandfatheres in.
- Neighbors on either side of property must agree and any odor issues should be addressed immediately.
- If there is space and neighbours are respectful of one another, I don't see a problem
- Seems fair if the animal is thriving.
- I believe that calgarians should be allowed to have other livestock as pets as long as their abide by any bylaw regulations and that the animals won't cause a nuisance for other neighbours
- Any way to allow people to be more self reliant is a good idea, as long as it does not interfere with neighbours.
- Hens and other live stock should be allowed on private property
- As long as it was controlled and managed appropriately.
- If all criteria above were met then I do not see why not but I cannot think of other livestock that could happily live within the confines of an urban yard. I do not support this for livestock larger than a dog.
- Sure, have a hen. But how can we be sure it doesn't spread disease?
- Because not everyone can afford rural living & would still benefit from growing their own, even if it's in town
- When cared for properly hens make wonderful pets and provide food
- If your going to allow Hens that would be rather loud and nosey adjust your current definition of a nuisance dog. I'd rather live next to a dog that barks at people passing by then hens.
- All animals should have this criteria, owners should be able to prove they can provide a safe and healthy home for all pets
- Again if the animals are well cared for this is a non issue
- Especially during covid it would give people who may be unemployed income potential and a way to feed themselves. As long as there are no male roosters.. they are loud



- The benefit of raising hens has to be balanced with the safety of the animals as well. They provide a positive environment and resource for those who raise them and there should be bylaws that protect them as well
- Hens can do a lot of good in a home from bug control to feeding people.
- The river city chickens have done well in Edmonton. I think it's a great idea to also bring this to Calgary.
- Who doesn't like working for their food ?
- I want a pygmy goat :) and also I don't see why someone can keep pigeons which provide no benefit but can't keep chickens. Noise bylaws would still apply.
- I support this amendment fully. As for the question on pigeons below, they should be considered livestock. If a racehorse is livestock then so is a racing / homing pigeon, if a chicken is livestock then so is a pigeon raised for meat, and if a pet goat is livestock then so is a pigeon kept as a hobby.
- I would love to have chickens on my property to provide eggs and assist with pests in the garden. I'm happy to discuss with any neighbours about this decision and take their opinion into account with this decision.
- Giving Calgarians the option to become self-sustainable with hens and access to farm fresh eggs is a wonderful idea.
- As long as it doesn't effect any neighbors I don't see any issue with it.
- I agree with allowing urban hens and livestock however I feel that the criteria for livestock could be better. For instance, neighbours should not dictate what animals you have, and offers community benefit seems unclear to me.
- As long as there was something to ensure individuals kept properties and cages clean
- Backyard hens should be allowed.
- As long as they did not become a nuisance
- encourage people to eat healthy with their own eggs, garden produce etc.
- It doesn't bother me if neighbours keep hens, so long as the birds are kept in suitable living conditions.
- as long as the animals are kept in a safe and well maintained area and the neighbors have no disruptions there should be no issue
- Urban hens are a fantastic way to build food security!
- It is a good thing for people who are responsible and able to prove that they are capable and qualified to care for a livestock animal to be asked to provide proof of their abilities, and the housing situation.
- It should be required to have written support from neighbors. Noise levels should be taken into account.
- Strict rules surrounding proper treatment of the animals must be in place and must be enforced to protect against the neglect or abuse of these animals.
- as long as we aren't having farms in communities
- Raising livestock provides people/children with food, teaches responsibility and respect, and provides an emotional/mental support system.



- I don't see any harm in this. It may become a problem if these animals ever got the chance to wander off property as there is sufficient wildlife (bobcats, coyotes) in the city that could cause harm to them.
- Turk would be an example of how much a community can love a livestock animal. If they provide benefit to individuals or the community and are not a nuisance, then I support the allowance of them.
- People should have the right to provide eggs, meat, and dairy for themselves
- There is a greater need than ever to be able to grow your own food, and to be able to respect the process of growing those foods.
- It should be restricted to hens.
- Livestock is good anywhere
- Only if the living conditions are suited for that animal
- As long as they are not a nuisance to other Calgarians and are properly cared for I do not see this as a big issue.
- If they are being cared for appropriately, I think hens are fine.
- Keep backyard hen numbers limited based on appropriate biomass, how many hens can live a sustained life in a given area. Hoarding animals can get out of hand fast.
- "Ensure that proper care and space can be given. If the animals need larger groups to feel safe, and enough space can't be ensured, than no.
- Make sure the owners will take care of them.
- Maybe only in select areas of the city, so people can select a residence accordingly, but make sure the areas aren't because low income families can only afford it there, but instead which would actually be safer and better for the animals.
- Also make sure that the chief bylaw officer isn't playing favourites, and is fair with who is and isn't accepted."
- Urban hens provide a slug eating service, help control the pests in gardens and provide organic eggs. All beneficial to the community and it might help reduce factory farming of eggs and chickens.
- If it's on private property and the person who owns said animals can care for them effectively then I don't see a problem.
- Ensuring that the animals are beneficial and properly cared for. It could increase predators in the area.
- I do NOT support the need for "support from adjacent neighbors" -- it is not their property, nor their choice.
- It would allow for people to have farm fresh eggs at home!
- It sounds like a good idea
- Hens are undisrupted if cared for properly.
- some children are more annoying than livestock and they're not banned...
- If the animal isn't being a nuisance and taken proper care of.
- As long as the neighborhood is respected in terms of noise and smell, I think that encouraging personal sustainability through mini agriculture including livestock, is a good thing.



- As long as there is responsible ownership
- Having small livestock can be a good source of education for children and it can provide food security. The manure from these creatures can be used as fertilizer and their presence can reduce pests.
- Airdrie has a chicken pilot project and so far it seems to be going well. As long as people in Calgary actually take care of these animals and they aren't abused, neglected or left outside in the winter to freeze to death.
- I believe as long as the animal has the right living conditions. Why not have it as a Domesticated animal
- I think livestock in the city limits should be allowed if taken care of. They can allow for a more sustainable food system and can benefit the community.
- Promotes a healthy biodiversity
- Allow public to learn where their food comes from
- As long as high standards remain for the treatment of the animals on the property, I agree.
- hens are easy to care for and quiet
- During such uncertain times in a pandemic, having the ability to harvest eggs at home along with our small yard gardens would help tremendously for those of us who are immunocompromised and would prefer not to go to the grocery store.
- People should be allowed to provide their own food security at home when appropriate
- Allowing people to keep hens or livestock gives people the chance to be more in touch with where their food comes from. It also allows people to make more environmentally and economically conscious efforts with how they consume food.
- People should have access to their own eggs, and improved life in caring for such things
- Other cities allow backyard chickens. Why wouldn't Calgary?
- I agree with the criteria above
- Growing up on a farm with many animals has taught me lessons I otherwise would not have gotten in a City. Having hens on your property (to me) is more than a pet, it's food.
- Hens provide food sustainability
- Seems to support idea of urban food sufficiency. Training must be required in all aspects.
- Backyard chickens and other urban agriculture is historically appropriate and improves environmental conditions
- If you have enough room and resources to have hens then I don't think there is anything wrong with it.
- Yes
- Livestock, when there is space available, make great additions to the community
- Calgary is literally the only city that doesn't allow urban hens etc. they are quiet and if taken care of, not smelly and enjoyable for the most part
- Why not? As long as it doesn't impact others, I don't see a problem.
- Livestock needs room and if they have everything then it's good



- I don't see a problem with hens.
- More sustainable local food with minimal impact. A good idea.
- Yes, as long as it is VERY specific conditions. Most locations are not set up for holding livestock. I think if an inspection were done, this could work though.
- Many forms of livestock can live harmoniously with population.
- Yes I like farm fresh eggs
- This is a great step forward
- hens are great if well maintained.
- I'm a dual citizen that lives in both the Portland Oregon area as well as Calgary. In Portland hens are allowed and cause no problems at all. I'm definitely for it
- Gives access to food
- "Chickens are awesome
- And provide food!"
- I think hens would be good, other animals too large.
- I would support people owning hens, pot-bellied pigs as long as they have the space to do so.
- If the above criteria can be met I see no issue. I would only suggest regulated numbers of livestock be kept to a minimum and suitable to size and type of property apply.
- Sure. As long as the animal has a good enough living environment and it doesn't infringe in the neighbours property or peace while in their home.
- As long as your neighbors are in agreement and proper living conditions and treatment can be established this seems to be a good responsible way to bring hens and other animals to a city setting.
- If they're properly taken care of I don't see it being an issue
- People should be allowed to keep animals as long as they are responsible owners. It will ensure quality food. Organic eggs are to expensive and factory farm eggs are cruel to animals.
- As long as the animals are being respected and taken care of, it's not my business unless they're in my backyard
- As long as the animals are not a nuisance or bad odour, all good.
- YES. All the yes. Why is Calgary, a farm town, so far behind on this? Food sustainability for the win!
- keeping of chickens can be dirty and smelly and not all areas are suitable - has to be some input from neighbours but should not be completely disallowed either
- Urban agriculture improves communities. It's science, they have multiple university classes explaining the benefits. Talk to an ag rep or the sociology department and do it properly but overall a great idea.
- Of livestock can be kept in the city without causing undue duress to neighbours then it should be allowed
- Good idea
- I do not support factory farming. I don't believe it's possible to properly care for each animal when you are processing hundreds or thousands per day. I think that residents being permitted to have a



few hens on their property would be a good way to encourage people to be responsible about where their food comes from. However along with this I would hope that there would be regulations in place to ensure animal welfare as it can be a challenge to inspect welfare conditions when its on someone's personal property compared to a larger farm.

- As long as there was a limit on the livestock the owners would have to ensure the cleanliness of the coop.
- as long as animals are not noisy and don't have bad odours
- Keeping hens is a great eco friendly option and is successful in many surrounding cities and towns
- If you can provide for that animal it's needs why should anyone be able to say no
- Hens are a low nuisance addition and can provide a valuable food source. If we want a more sustainable and food secure city this is a good idea. Plus, it is a harmless hobby.
- I believe that livestock, like chickens don't have a place in the city.
- It's important for people to be able to grow and produce their own food; not everyone can afford the inflation in grocery stores and this affords them food independence and security.
- This would be good?
- Why not? Hens, goats, and alpacas are great pets
- No roosters and limit the # to prevent excessive odor and noise. Proper confinement with time restriction and noise suppression for sheep or goats.
- raising hens is great
- Having citizens have the right to have hens in the city limits would allow any person who wanted to to harvest their own eggs, raise their own chickens, which could be an incredible aid to families looking to eat less factory-farmed foods, and also allow others access to food more freely.
- They're harmless
- Certain animals of course
- If animals such as urban hens can be kept humanely and in a sanitary fashion, there is no reason why it should not be allowed
- As long as there would be no roosters allowed
- With permission of neighbours and that the upkeep and cleanliness is maintained
- As long as rules and regulations are in place to make sure it's being done properly and in a health conscious way, sure.
- However a minimum number must be set, no roosters and roasts must be inspected yearly or two times per year to insure the living conditions of the hens are acceptable and do not encourage pests/rodents.
- How cool would it be for my neighbour to have a goat.
- Hens lay eggs. What's wrong with being able to supply our own food?
- na
- I would only ever support this decision if the animals were properly cared for.
- Citizens deserve the right to support themselves.
- Having animals in your own yard should be your right as a property owner.



- Especially for support animals
 - Chickens have done well in other urban environments
 - There is no viable, scientific evidence that indicates a negative impact of responsible controlled livestock on a community.
 - "spillednt to the bylaw to allow owning hens but with strict standards and criteria to be followed.
-
- When I was a child my family kept hens (in the UK, a temperate climate).
 - Keeping hens results in vermin presence due to spilled feed, hens will kill and eat mice but rats are too big."
 - As long as properly cared for (like all animals), hens and livestock should be no different than having other animals on your property.
 - Food insecurity is a challenge faced by many Calgarians. Allowing people to produce their own food through urban livestock continues to decentralize local food production and increase access to food.
 - If it makes sense and the livestock will be well taken care of, then why not
 - I'm all for some chickens!
 - As long as these animals were given proper homes/enclosures, etc.
 - Urban hens is a great idea that has worked well in other cities in Canada. I would love to have take part in this program.
 - Livestock are good for cutting grassy areas. Goats are great for potentially even helping the city with a dandelion problem without the use of herbicides. Pigs and Chickens make great companions for kids with autism. I maybe wouldnt allow a horse or cow to live in the city just space limiting, but smaller livestock I dont see a downside to.
 - no issues with this.
 - seems fair.
 - .
 - Urban hens are incredible, they offer so many benefits to the owners and are less irritating to neighbors than barking dogs, wandering cats, or loud children
 - I always support organic living if you want fresh eggs everyday this is a good way to do it
 - So long as rules for minimum living conditions for livestock are stringent.
 - Great pest control
 - many livestock are beneficial to the environment and community. Seeing and interacting with livestock also can release endorphins, reducing feelings of depression and suicidal tendencies.
 - Chickens are fun
 - Opening up options for people is a good idea.
 - Yes yes yes. Hens are a lovely sustainable animal; however would just want to make sure they are kept in clean and appropriate conditions
 - Only for fowl, no other livestock
 - hens are a good thing



- Responsible pet ownership = all animals deserve a loving home.
- Chickens are gross but each to their own I guess.
- N/A. Sounds good.
- Large lot residential or acreage only
- Owning hens/other livestock is a wonderful opportunity to be more sustainable.
- Urban chickens have been successful across Canada.
- If they're kept appropriately I see no issue with it.
- To each their own! If it's a healthy environment and ok'd by neighbors it shouldn't be an issue
- Although support from adjacent neighbors would be preferable, it should not be a requirement
- Concerns about attracting wildlife need explored. Coyotes etc
- As long as sufficient space & suitable enclosures are present, I think it's a great idea for people to be able to urban farm.
- If animals are being neglected, starved, abused, mutilated and or anything of that nature, people should be charged and not be allowed to pets.
- There is no good reason why hens should not be allowed on private property . The current bylaw makes no sense.
- There is no harm.
- As long as owners are clean and quiet.
- If a person can raise live stock responsibly without adversely affecting neighbours, that is their prerogative.
- This would have to be permitted and inspected to ensure proper welfare of the animals.
- As long as the animals are well cared for, it is not imposing on the neighbours, I think it's a great idea. If promoted properly, it even has the potential to create a stringer community environment. i.e. selling eggs to neighbours.
- Yes! Everyone should have access to a sustainable protein food supply at home. Urban hens have been very successful in other large municipalities around the world.
- As long as people can take care of the animals, and they are only livestock, nothing exotic/endangered, they should be able to have whatever pet they desire.
- If you can have pigeons I don't see why you can't have Hens or other livestock
- I think being able to have a couple of hens & depending on the other livestock is great. It gives people a sense of accomplishment, in being able to provide for their families in a more sustainable way.
- Only urban hens. An urban environment is no place for larger farm animals.
- it would ne good for the city
- There are other livestock animals that are very useful like goats for yards and such.
- Backyard chickens are part of food sustainability. They should 100% be allowed.
- As long as people kept there yards clean and smell free.
- It's important to have neighbour approval.
- Common sense supports this.



- Better than going to the grocery store and not knowing what you are getting
- At any time the neighbors complain about cleanliness/smell the animals can be assessed by the city and the owner may be fined.
- I would be ok with it as long as I don't have to smell any obnoxious odors.
- As long as they'd are well cared for, I'd support urban chickens. Perhaps with a permit scheme that helps pay for an official who will check in on the living condition.
- Responsible Calgarians should be allowed to have a chicken.
- There should still be a limit on number of animals allowed per property.
- exploring ideas is ok
- Hens are a great resource
- I want a goat! Well I would never get one but a mini goat would be so cute, I could do naked yoga in my back yard with one, it would be so zen.
- I think having hens who produce fresh eggs would be great to have for people who want to help reduce the load on farmers to produce eggs
- Small quiet animals would be cool
- If Approval from neighbours provided, I believe livestock -Hens in particular- could only enhance a community
- If the number of hens is not a large number, and the welfare of the chickens is maintained, I support Calgarians be able to raise and home chickens.
- If the livestock is not a nuisance and is providing a benefit then why wouldn't we allow it?
- People should have ethical livestock available if they so choose. It can be another food source for the individual household or community, and allows for more hands-on experience of where food comes from. It is also an alternative to a super market, as we know how pandemics can affect food supply chains.
- Urban chicken farming has been demonstrated to be a feasible option that often does not interfere with the ability of neighbour's to enjoy their property.
- Having back yard chickens can be very clean, non smelly and not loud.
- if people want chickens, let them have chickens
- Hens provide food and are a bird smaller than a dog; they should be allowed everywhere.
- If the neighbors don't mind where is the problem?
- I only support if it is an emotional support animal. Livestock in a neighborhood can get stinky, attract coyotes, and trigger severe allergies. Also, agitate neighborhood dogs. Putting them in an unknown situation.
- As long as the community benefits from this, and good living conditions are in place, it's a good idea.
- However, I Would say no roosters, they are loud and can disruptive, only a low number per household like 2-3. And like any other animal, proper care must be maintained, which includes, cleaning so the smell isn't bad cuz they stink, making sure they have proper shelter for all weather including heat in winter, and proper food and clean water.



- Livestock within the city would improve the communities appreciation of those animals and allow for even closer farm to table meals
- Hens are no bigger than some exotic birds, it just makes sense to allow.
- Specifically for hens, many other major urban areas in Canada allow for this. I feel this is a positive move to make and would have a positive impact on communities.
- The UK and Europe allow it
- With a one day "how to actually take care of this animal" certification course in order to have a species-specific livestock permit.
- Livestock such as rabbits and hens can be a food source for many, and most certainly eggs are. People who wish to help feed themselves should be given the opportunity.
- Pets are pets! Whether they are pigs, hens, mini horses etc. If a person has the appropriate space and means to care for an animal, whether it is considered "livestock" or not, they should be free to do so on their own property, so long as they are not causing undue stress or disruption to their neighbours.
- Chickens are awesome, it'll give people access to healthy food without paying extra and still not know where it comes from
- Only in a coop not free to roam the yard/neighborhood with very strict cleaning rules of feces
- being able to safely raise certain livestock given they have good living conditions and neighbours are not bothered can be a practical and beneficial activity
- With responsible animal care and shelter this can be a benefit to the community.
- To some people they are pets too.
- This would have to be approved on a case by case basis, with all neighbour support, and a way to follow up and ensure safe practices continue to be observed.
- urban farming could bring balance to peoples lives.
- hens are a great way to cut back on some family feeding costs, and aside from roosters are fairly low in noise and neighborhood disruption
- "Some live stock in the city allows for possitive interactions for community Members"
- I don't feel that all livestock are a nuisance. If cared for and kept properly, they can provide many things to their owners, from companionship to cheaper food on the table.
- I see no problem with hens as long as they are well cared for.
- Why not. What's the big deal about chickens. No more nuisance than the dog that barks non stop
- Urban hen programs are hugely successful, and the benefits are great.
- Hens are beneficial and I'd like to see them allowed.
- chickens for eggs, or support animals within reason, ie pot belly pig. No slaughter allowed on residential property.
- Keeping chickens could help families save on grocery costs.
- Chicken and domestic geese make great pets
- As long as they are not a nuisance.



- I would support hens, limiting the number to four to six and providing they are kept clean and with ample space - and it is monitored. No roosters due to their noise. No livestock meant for slaughter. Other livestock for pets only providing space is adequate and must also be monitored.
- if all the above were to be followed
- as long as the livestock is a food source (nanny goat) and not a pet (donkey)
- It's a chicken. Provides food, and are most often an easy to care for.
- A few hens yes 30 no
- Responsible pet owners should be allowed to responsibly own hens on their property
- If certain criteria are met, including welfare of the chickens, size if property, cleanliness etc, 8 would support this.
- No rosters
- I desperately want a city hen. For eggs and companionship.
- I don't see any issue with hens or livestock as long as it is supported by neighbours and it does not become a nuisance.
- I like this because it is evaluated in a case-by-case basis
- Individual people should have the right to have livestock to be able to help support themselves
- I support the above only if the criteria is clear and we have a process and the ability to regularly review the animals and habitat,,, so enough bylaw personell to enforce
- There would need to be guidelines around suitable, cleanly living conditions, but having certain domestic livestock within the city should be embraced.
- Urban hens are a wonderful idea
- Full support of urban livestock if the living conditions are appropriate.
- Urban livestock, if cared for properly would be a benefit to the community
- For all bullet points above
- If the owner has proper shelter and the animal isn't loud or out of hand, what is the harm.
- I think it's a good idea
- As long as it's a case by case basis and they animals are being taken care of, I see no issue. As well as the neighbours are being considered in the decision as well.
- Roosters are a definite no.
- I believe any person can own any animal such that it's basic needs are met, nay, surpassed. A city is not a hens natural habitat and they should only be allowed when that habitat is mimicked to the best standard.
- As long as there are rules for maintaining a clean coop so any odors won't bother neighbours and noise can be kept to a minimum maybe by only allowing them at the back of the yard away from houses
- As long as it doesn't become a problem with noise or smell
- I think small chicken coops should be legal, as long as they are being taken care of properly and aren't frustrating the neighbours.



- If properly cared for, other livestock their caregivers AND the community can benefit immensely from Living together in an urban environment.
- I think any type of urban farming is beneficial.
- That really depends on what other "livestock" you are considering.
- I don't see any harm in people having hens for eggs.
- Urban farming and food production can be done responsibly and respectfully and can support the needy within the food chain
- Backyard hens are a great idea!
- This is a good trend towards making urban spaces more liveable
- When well cared for livestock can provide many benefits. Especially chickens.
- "Considering size, noise, smell (I.e. Pigs and Rooster)
- Chickens would be fine"
- I think that most people that want these animals would know how to care for them responsibly.
- Would be a great way to support the community and local agriculture. So long as strict rules are in place to ensure proper operations.
- Responsible animal ownership is good for people and communities.
- I'm Pro being self sufficient with growing/harvesting your own food sources so feel this would be beneficial
- Its grass roots. There is a lot of learning and community growth that can happen in having livestock. Also, thinking of community gardens - why not community pastures/farms?
- I love the idea of urban hens. And urban farming options and techniques that allow citizens to be self sufficient and responsible about their food supply.
- Support from neighbours is crucial in cases such as this; and I like the idea of taking each item on a case by case basis rather than a blanket statement. All cases are not going to be the same
- Small livestock such as sheep and goats can help with weed control, they also make great fertlizer (their poop) so that can help grow fruit and vegetables gardens in the community.
- So long as above criteria are in place and sufficient resources exist to enforce them
- Pets are pets. if they are well taken care of, not bothering the neighbours, and abiding by appropriate bylaws there is no harm.
- I think it is great to allow for sustainable food sourcing
- If they can properly be taken care of in town why not. It's much more good then harm.
- In the case of keeping hend within the city, people can obtain eggs from them and thus take some of the load off of factory farming and potentially decrease the need for hens in battery cages (providing that those looking to own hens learn proper husbandry involved).
- Calgary is highly populated so to have livestock on your property they would need the appropriate living area and room to move around. Its not fair to have a large animal caged in a tiny yard.
- Good Guidelines are here for number of animals.
https://extension.unh.edu/resources/files/Resource000471_Rep493.pdf



- Great for therapeutic reasons. You can harvest the eggs. The droppings and bedding make excellent compost.
- I do think that support from the neighbours would be imperative. For example, if someone had a rooster that crowed loudly and woke the neighborhood, those neighbours should have some input.
- what reason would we have to not
- as long as they don't bother the neighborhood and are kept clean
- Urban livestock is used for grass cutting for example so would enhance our city. I support it as long as the animals have the proper care and living conditions.
- Urban livestock are a neat and helpful part of a growing city. We have hens in our neighborhood and they are enjoyed by all the surrounding houses. Responsible ownership is key, we don't need more abandoned and neglected animals. Again a short course based on the animal wishing to be obtained would be ideal.
- Urban hens not only provide food they also help to keep down the number of bugs.
- People should be able to choose their family
- I think having a sustainable living environment would be very beneficial. Only if ample living space is provided for the animal and the living conditions are satisfactory. Neighbors also have to approve this.
- I'm indifferent to this
- So long as neighbors don't object, and the conditions are clean, quiet, humane I see no issues.
- Pets like chickens are quieter than dogs, less of a both than roaming cats and provide the owners and usually neighbours with a food source. Goats keep the grass weeded and mowed and again are quieter than dogs with less offensive poop, rabbits are another good animal, turkeys are even quieter than chickens and make nice noises, ducks can be quieter as well and help keep the mosquito and bug population down, naturally. Chickens, turkeys, ducks, etc. Can all also help keep rodent populations down.
- Since the city allows pet animals for pleasure they should allow kept animals for food in a similar manner.
- Why not? If there is appropriate conditions for the animals it shouldn't be a problem.
- Support from neighbors is critical
- They are important to the health and well being of those who need them
- It would have to be on a case-by-case basis and depend on the
- The government shouldn't have a say in what animals I choose to keep. Within reason...
- Being more flexible in what we allow is important. As long as not a noise nuisance
- Sustainability is important and should be promoted
- As long as the owner is responsible and taking care of them I see zero issues.
- Why not? As long as no roosters are allowed. You're not needed for eggs buddies! Goats would be cool too.
- It would help ensure people who had hens were providing good care for the hens. It would educate urban people in raising animals that are used for food and help people be self sufficient



- I like animals.
- I grew up with hens; loved it. Minimal noise and provide an excellent source of food.
- Fresh eggs!
- As long as the animals are housed species appropriate they should be welcomed
- Should require support from ALL residents (including owners and tenants within reasonable radius- no roosters)
- There is ample evidence that backyard hens can be kept in a city without issue. It also helps provide food security to more vulnerable populations.
- I live in a small town where we have hens all over the place.
- The use of farm animals is very beneficial to people and the community as a whole
- Case by case basis sounds great! And don't discriminate about the way a hen looks, the strength or a hen, how strong it's peck is. What color or feathers the hen has or the length of claws it has. Apply the same laws and fines for dog at large and cats at large and hens at large. Owners need larger fines as in like \$6-7hundred per event. Having pets is a luxury and if well taken car of should have no issue.
- Self sustained produce, therapy, and an alternative to domestic pets.
- The more self sufficient people and small communities can be the better! I am all for this!
- Under the right circumstances, these animals can be of great value and benefit to individuals and communities
- A max of 3 hens and the living conditions and method of disposal must be clearly outlined. There are a number of different cultures in Calgary, each with it's own way of what's acceptable.
- If hens or livestock are aloud within the city , pit bulls or any other dogs from that family group should be aloud within city limits without special rules , it's not the dogs that are dangerous it's the humans .
- As long as it doesn't negatively effect other people and there are care standards in place
- Only if livestock is properly cared for and not tampered with as you would make sure of with wildlife
- As long as neighbours agree and the animal is safe and is provided for, I see no problem with it.
- I wouldn't want my. With or in my condo having a chicken but there are numerous yards in Calgary that can accommodate it. I feel like adding a square footage to the chicken space needed will help avoid the caged chicken sitch.
- Strict procedures would need to be in place as this could easily be upsetting to neighbours, particularly around smell or sounds
- With education, having hens is a great thing for people.
- There should be a minimum size yard beyond the chicken coup with minimum distances from the house and neighbouring house as well as from neighbouring property line. As well, chickens can be smelly, but with a good system they are not bad. Owners should be required to produce plans for a well designed chicken coup /yard to ensure the best possible conditions for everyone
- Sustainability to the family. Allowing fresh eggs for families. Compost of certain foods.
- Let people own livestock, if they want to raise and take of the animals and have the space for it



- People should be allowed to raise whatever they want so long as its done responsibly and doesn't disturb neighbours/the community
- Positive community impact
- People can be dirty and gross and it could translate outside. Animals make a lot of noise.
- I wouldn't mind having chickens
- Needing support from neighbours is key, however if the neighbours that support you having hens move, then what? (if new neighbours disagree). This will be a tough one.
- chickens are food, should be able to have them.
- Suitable living conditions is key. Ensure follow-up from bylaw officers for any applicants.
- Great learning opportunity for families and provide food
- I think we need more nature in our lives. I grew up with chickens and would very much like to have them again.
- I would support this as long as there are restrictions based on how much space a person has, and that the animals be well looked after
- Hens are great! It's good for people to experience animal ownership and the sourcing of food other than a packet in the supermarket.
- Requires a permit and neighborhood to be notified
- If a resident can humanly maintain hens without the objection of their neighbours there is no harm
- Hens do not cause any issues if they are taken care of properly and housed properly. I don't see it as an issue.
- Food independence is a good thing
- Urban hens are great for improving access to sustainable food sources.
- As long as smell or noise does not become a problem
- as long as noise issues and cleanliness is enforced.
- 4-6 urban hens would take up less room, make less noise, and be less of a mess than a dog. This would also allow people to get their own eggs. I do however think people who own the hens should be accountable. Coops should not be run down and be an eye sore, should be maintained, and be cleaned regularly.
- This would allow more people access to fresh eggs
- Hens only. No roosters.
- "Public education is key to the success.
- Clear guidelines would need to be in place, for the sustainability of livestock within the city.
- What constitutes suitable living conditions for the livestock.
- What uses of the livestock are permitted; pets, food, etc.
- If livestock is kept for food purposes, clear guidelines on where the processing of the animals is permitted and carcass disposal."
- As long as your pet behaves who cares
- Livestock can be great companions/helpers for people who need them. Example: emotional support. As long as al bylaws are met.



- I don't have anything against it
- As long as the person's neighbours agree to these animals I do not see a reason they could not be included.
- Owners must go through a livestock responsible ownership training course (Could be provided online).
- Small livestock such as hens and bees can be massively enriching for city dwellers, and especially in the case of bees, these insects greatly improve the natural world around them through their role as pollinators.
- great idea
- As long as the animals are in a safe and healthy environment. Not causing issues in the area
- would support allowing poultry species, bees, goats, sheep and pot belly pigs in urban areas. Would not support allowing larger livestock in urban areas such as bovines, equines and pigs (other than pot belly pigs).
- Having well kept hens has been proven to provide positivity for both keepers and the neighbourhood as children love them as well. Having your own fresh eggs also provides people with a sense of stability and accomplishment. Hens have been proven mental health support animals so it would be beneficial for city for so many reasons to allow hens
- Food security is important. I fully support urban chickens
- The introduction of chickens and regulated livestock allows for an integrated and wholistic systems as long as conditions and consideration for the animals are first and foremost.
- I don't see any good reason not to allow this.
- Self sufficiency would be with a chicken for eggs
- Na
- I have lived in a community that allows hens and it is a beautiful addition to anyone who owns them. Allows for local homegrown options.
- People are trying to be more sustainable. As long as all neighborhood parties approve it there should not be a problem
- There is nothing wrong with having a pet goat etc. So long as it is well cared for and has a suitable living area
- But there was to be a very outlined manual regarding this.
- Animals should be cared for properly
- Feed ur family with them
- Chickens have so many benefits including emotional
- I think this is a great idea for people in thr city as long as the neighbors immediately affected by ot are okay with it.
- Hens, chickens, small livestock pose no threats in the city
- As long as the owners are taking care of the hens properly and keeping their space cleab. I don't see an issue.
- Why not?



- If an animal is properly cared for and can live happily within city limits, it should be allowed.
- No roosters
- I only support it if the quality of life for the animal is exceeded
- Because it's 2020 and we've been talking about this for over a decade. Hens don't make noise and provide food from your yard.
- Emotional support animals come in all shapes and sizes.
- Goats
- "Love the idea of having chickens. Love the idea of knowing people who take in old farm animals etc.
- Love the adequate living conditions part by I would like to see what that entails."
- I think the proper number of animals considered it's a city and then of course proper husbandry, respect for neighbours. sounds , smells , sights all under control
- Hens are no bother. No roosters however
- Chickens r good
- I am all about urban hens in Calgary. They offer so many benefits locally and globally. Hens are just like household pets. They love cuddles and have distinct personalities. Plus you can eat the eggs so we can get rid of all those nasty gmo'd caged chicken eggs and start supporting local food and self sufficiency
- I had chickens growing up ... provided necessary coops are created, maintained and clean it's not much different than any other pet ... however roosters crowing may be unacceptable for many perhaps urban hens are only allowed when people have a certain amount of property or they are kept in a similar fashion to urban shared gardens
- It is great to have more animals in the city as long as there are standards and standards are met.
- I think the amendments are fair- welfare of the hens is important and getting permission from the neighborhood is a great idea
- People of Calgary should be able, under the right circumstances, have a pet under the list of livestock. More homes for animals.
- As long as neighbours are okay with it.
- An animal that keeps to themselves and benefits the ecosystem is a yes in my books
- As long as the individual seeks consent from all neighbours who would be affected.
- There are some people with limited income that if they properly care for this animal will gain food security. Also very educational for children.
- I believe that the hens could be a natural source for food and this would be a good idea.
- People should be able to own whatever livestock can properly be accommodated on their land. It is our right to eat.
- I think having hens etc. In the city would not only provide doos but a community coming together. Who doesn't want fresh eggs instead of purchasing them? Self sufficiency with this virus is the only way to go! Aa well who says dogs and cats are the only pets you can have, goat mow your lawn so no loud noise on a sat or a sunday, I would rather listen to a goat then a lawn mower on the weekend



- Within limits I support the proposal
- People should be allowed to raise hens and poultry
- Grand idea
- Everyone should have the ability to produce their own food. Chickens especially, are easy to keep and are actually entertaining and relaxing to watch, which is something we need in times like this
- welcome all the animals
- Would help out a lot of people
- It is necessary for the animals to have a good life through support and good living conditions.
- Common sense says...
- As noted in that is being considered is supported.
- Some times these animals will be a support animals, unconventional yes, but the person may be allergic to the conventional animals
- As long as coops, yards animals are kept clean and its in an area that's kept clean and has enough space that I'm not being kept awake all night or woken up early in the morning by it what business is it of mine what my neighbor does.
- As long as the animals are NOT being exploited for breeding, selling, and/or eating. As well, living conditions should be equivalent to that of a pet; habitable and healthy for the animals.
- Nothing wrong with other livestock given the criteria.
- It should be on a case by case basis as long as the hens have a safe place to live.
- If proper measures put into place Good quality of life in all aspects living space, feed, treatment, etc responsible owners should be allowed to have the choose of what they own.
- Everyone has the right to grow and produce their own food if it doesn't cause a substantial nuisance
- Decisions should be made case by case
- I like all the requirements
- As long as the hens are being looked after properly, I don't see a problem with people having them.
- This opens up educational opportunities for growing & caring for ones own food sources & accessibility to these things for communities
- If the chickens are kept in a clean and quiet manner, not being a bother, and are elevating their owners' enjoyment of life then why not?
- backyard hens are awesome. Would def need to be limited to certain neighborhoods so people can move away if they don't like being around them
- I feel this is an excellent amendment. As long as suitable living conditions are ensured, having urban livestock is a sustainable practice that offers a better quality of life for the animal as opposed to farmed animals.
- Hens are less of a nuisance to neighbors than many dogs.
- Hens can be reasonably kept in coops and can provide a source of food.
- Livestock in moderation would help struggling families during these difficult times
- These guidelines seem just
- Limit number of animals and have enforcement of acceptable living conditions



- Allowing people access to local produce is extremely important. Having the ability to supply your household with eggs and other such food items would help a lot of struggling families.
- As long as the animals are well cared for, I think this would be a great addition to our communities. That being said, the penalties should be clear and concise for those seeking to harm these animals.
- Sourcing your food as locally as possible is in most cases environmentally sustainable - will likely reduce in factory farming that is both harmful to the environment as well as the wellbeing of the hens.
- Hens and other livestock should be allowed in urban areas as long as all they have suitable living conditions and are not a nuisance to neighbours
- I feel the hens could bring a goodness into our city
- In particular, having chickens would ease some of the poverty in some of the neighborhoods. Having fresh, free eggs for a family can help ensuring that they at least have some protein if they can't afford other basic foods. Plus it can help provide some small monetary gain for whoever owns the laying hens. No roosters though. Roosters are far too loud for residential areas.
- I think you shouldn't be limited to living on a farm to own livestock or hens provided they are cared for appropriately
- I believe there are many animals that would be wonderful in the city for enrichment and food sources.
- If done responsibly, there is no issue
- Many types of animals can be turned into a pet and so long as they aren't a nuisance (smelly, loud, etc.), I don't see a reason why they should not be allowed.
- Food production (personal) is important in today's uncertain world.
- Yaaaaassssss
- As long as the animals have proper care (food, shelter, comfort), I do not see an issue.
- Cost effective. Low maintenance. Healthier than store bought poultry and eggs.
- AS long as the hens are cared for properly, I see too many animals outside in the freezing cold in the winter, I am assuming that there should be some additional education or licensing for people to make sure the hens are well taken care of
- I really see no reason not to support this, if reasonable restrictions/conditions are followed.
- I believe hens and other livestock such as small goats can be beneficial for the community and owner and can generally be non intrusive to the public.
- You should be allowed to have whatever animal pleases you as long as it has room to flourish and doesn't bother neighbors. Bothering neighbours should be limited to smells, sounds and potentially destruction of property. Eye sores should not be considered because it is a personal opinions if something is ugly to the eyes or not. Removal of some birds if you keep offending the basic rules.
- Only if they have a shelter or housing for the birds and a system in place to take care of the sanitation etc,
- hens are completely fine to own within city limits. During my childhood I lived in a town that allowed this and it was fine. Still unbelievably dumb that the city is wanting more animals and less pitbulls.
- As above



- Wellbeing of an animal should be at the forefront of these decisions. That being said I'm all for anything that takes away from the large corporations that do not treat their animals in such a way.
- If enough space is allocated, why not
- I think if the individual has sufficient funds, expertise, and space to provide adequate situations for the livestock it should be okay as long as the livestock does not have the ability to go onto other property and as long as a majority vote of the neighbours agree to the terms.
- If neighbours are okay with hens, and if people applying to have them take a course in care, then I would support hens.
- More hobby farming and regenerative farming is necessary. We should do all we can to encourage people to avoid factory farmed meat.
- Chickens in particular, if well managed can be so good for gardens as insect control and fertilizer, not to mention fresh eggs.
- Will allow residents to start seeing where their food comes from, educational for kids
- I don't see a problem with this
- If the environment, space, care and health is adequate for the animals. Written support and standards to follow (ie. health, cleanliness of animals and environment) from surrounding neighbours may be beneficial for any future issues.
- By all means have hens but don't punish responsible dog owners
- I think urban homesteading will help our economy and bring people more stability and home joy. Chickens are great!
- Only if there is good collaboration from neighbors.
- I would have no issue with neighbors wanting to house hens.
- "Support local
- Farmers - even in your backyard."
- This bylaw looks to be in the benefit of the animal, so I approve.
- If neighbourhood is okay with the smell and noise it shouldn't affect anyone else. I'm not sure people entirely know that chickens keep early hours and need constant maintenance as well as attracting coyotes so community should be informed.
- Make sure there is adequate space and living conditions are healthy
- Common sense 101
- Why the heck not?? I am 100% in support of this as I see it as only a positive action
- I would love an opportunity to rent hens from a farmer to produce eggs for my family Within City limits during
- .
- What is 'other livestock? Need more clarity to fully support this
- free run eggs so much better with suitable living conditions.
- If the person whom wishes to keep these animals can care for them properly and they will pose no issues then it should be allowed
- I think many people and communities would benefit from this



- Considering the price of groceries why shouldn't people be able to raise livestock for family consumption.
- Yes if this was a mutual agreement from surrounding neighbours, there was adequate space for hens and between homes, and humane conditions.
- Heck yes let's get agriculture into urban spaces. Monotype areas lead to sprawl, one of the worst things to happen to a city.
- "Having lived on a property with livestock (chickens included) a hen house smells bad. And you can smell it for about 200 feet away. Further if the wind is blowing. It's bad. And the smell doesn't go away when the chickens do. That smell permeates the ground.

- Also, livestock living in cities and urban centres was how plagues kinda happened for the last 1500 years. If people are having difficulty picking up their dogs poop in a park, do you really think people will figure out how to safely stop livestock viruses/parasites/bacteria from entering a heavily populated area? (I got cryptosporidium from the farm with the chickens. You don't want that spreading to people who, say, prepare food or care for elderly.)

- Inner city livestock, if it is going to happen, needs more restrictions than anything else. Livestock in urban centres are so very dangerous."
- It's absurd that sustainable use of homes is restricted, if we can grow reasonable amounts of food we should be able to have reasonable amounts of food animals.
- As long as livestock have appropriate living conditions and are not a nuisance to neighbours there is no reason they shouldn't be allowed in the city.
- Sustainable living.
- "If each Calgarian had two chickens, they could provide enough eggs for a family of four! Chickens are fairly quiet & easy to take care of.
- BUT the adjoining neighbors should be able to object and have a right to have chickens removed if they are not taking care of them properly and causing a smell in the neighborhood due to improper care."
- With proper guidance and rules it could be a positive situation for some lower income families as long as the animals are treated with respect
- I have heard of it working well in other cities
- Responsible ownership supported by neighbors. However an annual review with consultation with neighbors would be required. Owners would need to demonstrate that they continue to uphold high standards of care with no "disruption " to neighbors. In saying that, this could become an onerous task and financial burden on the system.
- Yes, this is in line with many other municipalities across Canada
- Pets are pets.



- So long as the animals are well cared for, and are not a nuisance to neighbours, I'm all other livestock to be considered.for
- I strongly support having hens in residential homes
- Why limit this to hens only?
- However discretion can not be 1 person. Opportunity for appeal.
- It is a good idea moving forward from the debacle of 2020. Self sufficiency and community support by way of therapy animals and food (eggs).
- The stipulations are adequate. Urban chickens are a great idea!
- I believe the city of Calgary is leading behind in allowing creative options for citizens to manage their own food supply within the city.
- Chickens/rabbits/ goats etc can be a huge learning and financial benefit to owners and their children that can not live on a farm.
- As long as the animals don't create a nuisance (noise, smell etc.) backyard animals can give the owners, fulfillment, additional food etc.
- Hen cages and bee hives would be amazing to have in the city, as long as there is adequate room. Large livestock is unnecessary.
- Fresh eggs are good.
- It'll give people a actual mindset of animals on a farm
- As long as everything is kept clean and organized, and there wasn't any more noise than a dog would make, I have no problem with any animal being kept.
- I used to enjoy seeing horses on 14th st near 90th till the ridiculous barbaric bylaw was slammed on us.
- I am very supportive of urban hens especially as a way to be more in control of where our food comes from, specifically eggs. Urban hens is something I have wanted as a calgarian for many years and I think it's a wonderful idea so long as people care for them properly
- If the animal doesn't affect the neighbors because if the current neighbors are fine with it but they move and the new neighbors aren't, there could be a problem.
- I trust that people that want to do this will have researched what is involved and if there is issues they could be dealt with through bylaw services.
- Easier access to farm fresh organic eggs and better living environments than most chickens
- If the animals can be contained safely, kept healthy and aren't a nuisance, then why not.
- Perhaps only when the property is large enough to support the livestock. Infills with their narrow lots may not be suitable
- I just think this is a great direction to head towards.
- As long as the living conditions are very good for all beings, I support them in all communities.
- every person should have the right to domesticate any harmless animals. I don't see any harm from hens(if they all are fully vaccinated)
- As long as neighbors are advised, have chance to oppose (like secondary suite zoning)



- As long as there are appropriate parameters around this I think people should have the option to provide for themselves and their families.
- I think there should be a limit to the number of hens any household can own--maybe 5 max. To comment on other livestock, I think that size and number should be taken into account, as well as whether that type of animal is typically considered a nuisance.
- Good for communities
- I have a giant garden with a massive slug population. If I could have ducks or chickens helping me out, my yields would be much higher. AND I'd have eggs! Amazing!
- Can't have a chicken unless the proper dwelling is acquired for our extreme temps
- If you can do it with the neighbor's permission, why not?
- Urban farm animals such as hens or other livestock when maintained correctly can be a great addition to a neighborhood and allow many great learning opportunities to children
- It's a great idea.
- With support from neighbours I don't see an issue. Living area and ability to provide an adequate lifestyle for any animals under your care would be important, but you seem to be heading in that direction.
- Especially in our current economic climate we should be exploring ways for people to be more self sufficient.
- Great for sustainable life
- Good for local sustainability
- Livestock should absolutely be allowed so long as there is adequate care provided.
- As long as the animal is properly cared for I support this.
- As long as the hens are treated humanly and is regulated by the city to avoid over populating a small area. However the noise pollution and sanitation may be a problem for alot of people.
- Fresh eggs
- I don't care if people own livestock
- 100% in support for making responsible urban agriculture a possibility.
- Urban livestock is good for communities.
- Many other cities now allow urban hens. Calgarians could benefit from the ability to own hens, and they are not substantially more of a nuisance than any other house pet.
- There is nothing wrong with hens. When treated properly, they are an effective way of sustainable living.
- this depends on the owner and adherence to reasonable care and nuisance reduction.
- People wanting to become more self sustaining should be fully supported by the city and neighborhoods
- As long as there are living conditions that follow the Five Freedoms, the homes neighbours have been consulted and the situations have been examined by someone (or more then one person) having higher knowledge of bylaws and animal health and wellness then I agree with the changes.



- Urban farming and some livestock husbandry is an efficient and ecologically sound practice in many parts of the world. I would not like to see this abused so some strict regulation would be required, but it is a sustainable way of life that should be allowed within certain, clearly defined parameters
- My husband would really like to keep urban hens
- I am in favour of anything that increases food security and reduces reliance on grocery chains.
- pot belly pigs are lovely pets and live well indoors. Calgary covers such a wide area now and some people have large lots and could accommodate some livestock
- Why not? But it depends on what kind of livestock we are talking about
- I have no problem with people keeping hens. People are allowed to keep rabbits which are small livestock.
- I think chickens and such are a great thing to help families that are in poverty help to get a cheaper food choice and also teach children how to care and raise animals
- It would be nice to see more animals around.
- If coop checked and neighbours agree.
- As long as all neighbors are OK with it. And are asked again if one neighbor moves and a new one moves in.
- Chickens are wonderful pets and beneficial animals to have.
- I support urban chickens. Not other livestock unless it's a pot bellied pig.
- Animals including livestock need to be properly cared for. Appropriate guidelines and criteria need to be met to house these animals.
- Sure, why not
- Fresh eggs! Yes!
- If animals/birds are being kept safely and not a nuisance to neighbours- should be allowed.
- Noise considerations should be an important aspect of the permission to own his animals. Completion of a 'care and well-being' specific to the species must be proven to have been successfully completed.
- As long as the animals well being is being met and there's no issues with neighbours Y not
- Livestock needs to have protection and be properly cared for. If this can be proven and all nearby neighbors are okay with said owner having livestock, then no problem. Fresh eggs are nice.
- As long as someone has a location for the animal in a non-shared space or backing onto a green space.
- If the owners are responsible and communicate with their neighbors I believe this can work. Suitable living conditions is a must.
- Definitely support hens, would love a lawn service that brings goats for a short period of time.
- If the animals are properly cared for there should be no reason they should not be allowed
- I think on a suitable property, hens would be a great addition to a larger yard.
- Just so long as the animals are well cared for a not a nuisance to the neighbours. This includes not being too noisy.
- owners should be allowed to responsibly raise livestock in the city



- Sounds fair and reasonable
- I think its important to know where your food comes from and we factory farms are one of the downfalls of our lifetime.
- I think there is so much benefit in having certain small animals in urban areas.
- There should be a limit on the number of hens (say 6-10 depending on the size of the family), no roosters, pre-purchase inspection to ensure adequate facilities. Along with the same enforcement as for pigeons. The only other livestock I would consider within city limits would be a mini pig (inside, 1 per household, registered with city) or rabbits, with limits on the number.
- Controlled amounts of small livestock are very beneficial to all segments of society.
- Love chickens
- If it's anything like using the goats as lawnmowers it's a great idea.
- Sustainability and environmental impact
- I would support this as long as there is adequate space for said animal, and as long as neighbors are in agreement
- Having backyard hens if they are maintained properly are a sustainable food source. Food security is important. Knowing where your food comes from is important.
- as long as the animals are not too noisy, smelly or generate excessive pollution on neighbours property (eg pigeon poop) and kept humanely keeping them should not be a problem
- Don't care either way
- As long as the criteria is enforced. i.e conditions are regularly checked and also can be spontaneously checked (officers can drop in at any time).
- Let's start getting our eggs from our own hens
- If people need emotional support then I will support any animal in that fassion as long as the city approves of the animal but not allowing endangered animals, or snakes or siders,,, ew
- I would love a chicken.
- Could care less but it might up the amount of apex predators coming in for an easy meal
- Urban farming is important and small livestock can benefit people mentally and get them food.
- Food security and self-sufficiency benefits the owners and their community.
- I don't see why not, as long as the hens are properly cared for.
- I like the idea of hens in urban settings, but any other livestock would need considerably more space to provide for the animal. (Pot belly pigs, goats, etc)
- Some Hens/ chickens are Beneficial to People as a Personal Comfort and Stress Reliever Physcologically..LESA
- As long as they aren't bothering the neighbors I don't see a problem.
- Providing there are minimum yard sizes and control requirements I have no issue.
- As long as the neighbours are consulted and in agreement.
- As long as criteria are followed.
- As longs the hens are flightless and limited in number there should be no problems.



- I am all for allowing hens and other livestock in the city as long as suitable living conditions are provided. So maybe some sort of permit system where the owner has to prove they have the space and accommodations to support the animals first.
- I think that having a self contained method of accessing livestock is much more ecologically sustainable.
- I believe that as long as the animals are well taken care of then they should be allowed.
- Absolutely!! That would be fantastic for the health of calgarians nutritionally and emotionally.
- Chickens be ok in city.
- Why not!?
- Chickens are a good back yard animal
- I don't see why not.
- People already keep chickens they just do it in secret so the animals may not be cared for probably. You could limit the number of chickens that allow them to be social but not a nuisance.
- No license fees! We keep chickens to be more sustainable and to save money. Maximum of 6 hens. Maximum of 12 meat birds. (They would be kept for only a few weeks). No roosters at this time.
- I think it's a great idea to have livestock if taken care of properly
- Promotes self sufficiency.
- Again it is about the people's responsibility, if they are good animal owners then fine [removed]
- Urban livestock provides another way for people to source their own food and have more control over what they feed their families.
- Yes
- People should be allowed to own whatever they want in their home.
- I think it would be very beneficial, but people need proper education, and again - sadly - people have to behave responsibly (not sure that it possible :()
- Allowing these animals in the city provides people with a more direct source of food (eggs, etc.) that help with reducing carbon emissions.
- If people are responsible with their animals and keep the appropriate conditions for them and their neighbours I don't see any issue with allowing other livestock.
- The above sounds reasonable to me.
- I support this as long as there is no danger, such as avian flu-like diseases that can be transmitted to human beings.
- support from neighbours essential for this to work.
- There would need to be laws around slaughter and ensuring the meat/eggs was being sold with standard food regulations. I wouldn't mind people owning pets or for personal use.
- As long as it was a need for the home owner to own this type of animal and it was monitored to make sure animals were being taken care of and causing problems for neighbours
- No roosters too much noise
- If people have adequate space and resources to have livestock, fine by me.
- Someone in the law enforcement needs to keep an eye out for things like neglect etc...



- Chickens are great
- As long as there is no harming to the animals involved.
- Within limits... what animals, types of animals, number of animals, noise limits, a more robust complaints process, inspection of health and sanitation and far more robust penalties and fines for abuse, neglect etc.
- Would want assurances on specific requirements that must be met to allow hens in Calgary including housing requirements, food/shelter/water requirements, noise control, cleanliness controls
- Certain livestock, like hens and bees, can be beneficial for our environment and our citizens in an urban setting.
- As long as enforcement is available to ensure that the rights of the animals and Calgarians are protected.
- As long as these animals are properly housed, I think it is acceptable to have hens and other animals in urban areas
- Allow for eggs and natural food source
- Why not try it?
- Practical farming
- I used to have a chicken in Airdrie and I think it is a amazing thing for children to see the entire life cycles and where food comes from
- If the animals are well cared for and are not a nuisance to neighbours there should be no problem.
- Most livestock can be programmed to turn in at night and sleep. Living conditions should need to be assessed annually or every couple of years to ensure they are being kept up to acceptable standards and to ensure the positive impacts to the owner and species is still intact. Otherwise, you end up with someone who decides they don't want to clean out the hen house any more so the hens have moved into the family home.
- "As long as the livestock is not
- Interfering with neighbours or city inhabitants, then it should be fine."
- I would love to have laying hens I my back yard or a goat for milk.
- How many laying hens per property? ?may attract other 'wild animals...coyotes.
- Added benefit to a healthy living.
- Food production should be allowed in every home
- I didn't know hens weren't already allowed. the only exception should be that support from adjacent neighbours shouldn't be required a priori as it is private property, and other pet ownership does not require neighbour support. Neighbours should have a mechanism to submit complaints if other criteria are not upheld, or hens are deemed a nuisance (just like all other pets).
- I'm fine with this as long as the animal is well cared for.
- But there must be limits on numbers of animals.
- I'd love to see hens in Calgary, they provide eggs and education regarding our food supply to children and family's.



- As long as there are rules in place and bylaw responds to issues in a timely manner. Please add No roosters!!!!
- As long as no roosters. Chickens are helpful to reducing insects like grasshoppers. Spraying chemicals is dangerous chickens aren't
- I would be worried about a lot of unwanted chickens- increase of abandoned or birds not cared for properly. You would have to set STRICT guidelines for care
- Hens only
- We absolutely should be allowed to keep eggs and bees in our yards.
- I think it would allow opportunities for people to have more direct and humane access to food provided by livestock, benefiting the community.
- As long as it's safe for the animal it's ok
- Sounds cool as long as people don't abuse the privilege like they abuse Lime scooters.
- It's good for the environment
- There is no reason to prohibit keeping of livestock if their care and the care of the community is looked after.
- Yes, but only animals that do not create noise and smells
- Limit number of hens per household.
- Only a max of 2 chickens per house. No other livestock
- Maybe 2 chicken per property but no livestock should be permitted.
- As long as they dont become a noise or pollution issue.
- Yes if the above conditions are enforced. They should not be raised for eating or other immoral acts & noise bylaws need to take place.
- But the conditions must be humane and set up so as not to increase the coyote activity in a given area of the city (no free roaming, etc)
- i think calgary bylaw enforcment needs to make sure the area is sufficient for the animals , and discussions with neighbours to make sure eveyone is happy with the situation.
- Let us have urban hens but no consultation with the neighbours are necessary
- Opposite of no!
- I do not see any harm in allowing people to have chickens, as long as their welfare is priority and waste/noise is kept to a minimum
- OK as long as neighbors don't feel presurised to say yes.
- I support urban farming
- Contingent on the setting rules on husbandry (eg. space per animal, etc) to protect livestock welfare
- I am all for urban hens, so long as there is a low limit to the amount of hens per household (3).
- I don't believe in keep live stock for human consumption. But as a loved pet it's okay.
- Yes, as long as adjacent neighbors consent
- Several types of animals make amazing pets and should be allowed
- Long as you fan't have roosters, and must keep clean, not a big deal.
- "it would allow people to save some money on things by raising small livestock to consume.



- As long as the noise & smell does not get out of hand."
- Urban farming is healthy for responsible persons
- They are as well domesticated. Licence then. Hire people in bylaw that actually know something about animals, not just police academy dropouts
- As long as hens are kept in a safe and secure facility, why not?
- Hens make good neighbours, provide health and food benefits, and as long as they're maintained properly, are less of an impact in yards. Its a good idea
- Chickens are alright.
- Living conditions must be upkept
- Good idea
- If, and only IF, noise and cleanliness are not an issue. If you are in a high density neighborhood, the restrictions should be higher .
- So long as they don't cause a noise/nuisance I don't care.
- The criteria of "offers community benefit/will have positive impact" is ambiguous and difficult to evaluate. The other criteria are reasonable.
- Would expect special licensing and inspection of living conditions.
- There is nothing wrong with people having their own sustainable food source, eggs and meat, and chickens make fantastic pets!
- As long as livestock are cared for and not a nuisance to others, it should be permissible to have them.
- Wildlife brings a HUGE benefit to mental illness. Especially with farm animals that do not require 24/7 care and can be set to a certain area of property. So long as proper arrangements are made and there is a cap on how many animals someone can have I see it as a great benefit.
- I garden. Chickens would help with insect maintenance.
- "Any animal should theoretically be allowed as a pet as long as it poses no inconvenience to the surrounding residents.
- For example:
- Small numbers of ducks and hens could be allowable because of their small size, relatively low noise, and low risk of harming others if escaped.
- Examples of unreasonable animals would be:
- Cows and horses: too large.
- Roosters: too loud, potentially aggressive.
- Goats: aggressive, potentially too large."
- Chickens aren't a big deal in an urban setting so long as they are contained in a fenced property and roosters aren't affecting the schedules of neighbours.
- Hens are safe and provide a good outlet for people who love having them.
- As long as the animal in question is cared for and is not causing a problem. It's great.
- As long as they meet the requirements which should be pretty strict.
- Bring the rural and urban back together



- If there is a consultative process that involves neighbours, and considers suitable housing and care for the animals, I think that's better than a blanket bylaw
- Many cities allow hens, and as long as their living conditions are well met and they and the environment are taken care of they should be allowed.
- Sweat shop eggs are a huge problem (especially for the poor chickens), it's good for people to connect more with where their food comes from, and Calgary is way too uptight with its NIMBYism, this makes me happy to hear we might be lightening up!
- Within parameters
- The first point is a bit vague but I support the idea of it. The rest is common sense.
- hens only, no roosters, no laying hens if no roosters
- If they are housed and cared for humanely.
- Urban chickens would be good
- they should be able to
- As long as the hygienic standards are increased to meet smaller urban spaces due to disease and infection becoming a greater risk to spread to domestic animals. I would expect property sizes and shelter accommodations would require many adapted guidelines. Also, noise complaint stipulations should be considered as repeat offenders would prove that this may not be a successful modification. Perhaps an annual review for a set duration should be considered with a four year pilot or trial period should be considered.
- These animals do not belong in the city.
- If it enriches the community, then it is a good thing.
- yes as long as they are not disturbing others and are well taken care of.
- Food security is an issue. Urban farming is essential.
- No roosters and I'm fine
- no
- This is only acceptable if the yard of the people seeking to have these animals is large enough for the animal and would not negatively impact their neighbours. Absolutely no Roosters.
- if cared for carefully and noise and mess aren't a problem, animals only bring benefits. Wonderful education for children, it supplements one's food bill or provides an income.
- as long as people follow the law they should be able to own livestock
- I like the idea of being able to have my own eggs
- As long as the chickens are properly cared for and not being a nuisance in the neighborhood, why not? Farm fresh eggs, keeps the bugs down, great pets to have.
- Lots of animals provide therapy for their owners. If their living conditions are clean and do not deter the neighbour's property value, then I would not have a problem with a chicken or pig living next door.
- It is past time for urban hens to be allowed in Calgary. They offer multiple benefits and no downsides.



- As long as it has restrictions in number of livestock and does not cause a property or neighborhood to decrease in value due to nuisance livestock
- However, would we be inviting/risking cross transmission of diseases to humans.
- People with large enough space who are responsible should be able to own chickens
- Responsibly kept livestock is beneficial for the environment, food security, owners, and animals.
- Must have approval from Neighbours
- Chickens are not significantly louder or disruptive than other animals.
- Diversity is great. Local is better
- urban hens could be a positive, under the right conditions
- If someone wants chickens for example to feed their family. As long as the premises are kept clean and the numbers are limited .
- Urban hen programs have worked successfully in many other cities
- As long as theres room, the animals are provided care and it doesn't disturb the neighbours I don't see an issue
- Support from adjacent neighbours and suitable living conditions can be provided for the animal are very important.
- Urban farming is the future.
- I see no harm in it if the animals are well provided for and the neighbours do not object.
- As long as the humane treatment of the hens is considered
- There are many places that allow for keeping small amounts of small-scale livestock in urban environments for various reasons. Provided proper measures and standards of upkeep are kept, it offers an opportunity for self-sufficiency and some experience in what raising livestock-type animals actually involves.
- As long as feed isn't left out and it's kept clean so that mice are not drawn to the area
- As long as the needs of the animal and the community are well balanced, I am in complete agreement with this.
- If everyone agrees it's alright is a fair enough restriction.
- I do not support having to gain support from adjacent neighbours. They don't have my consent to blast loud music, use their garage as a mechanic's shop etc. Citizens have the right to a certain amount of discretion on their own properties, including hens. I think it is more important that safe and clean housing is provided for hens, and the ability to inspect the hen house by the city.
- As long as they're cared for and not causing disruptions in the neighbourhood i see no issue.
- Clean up and its fine
- Good for the environment & mental health
- If you are responsible and animals are small, contained and looked after, no different than having a cat or dog.
- I love the idea of backyard hens! It's environmentally responsible too.
- Seems sound



- But must take into consideration the smells, sounds and anything else that might affect surrounding properties and people
- Very important to ensure neighbors are ok with it.
- Absolutely yes. As an elder person, I would dearly love to be able to have eggs for my diet to supplement my pension. I must however point out that obvious good care and cleanliness is most important. Some leniency should be expected during very hot weather as the cleanest coop will have smell issues during very hot days. A coop owner should be allowed to use as much water as they need, without extra fees. Most owners would be giving back to their street or small area, so it would be awful to penalize them with more costs. Such fees could prohibit ability to afford good ownership.
- Please include bees
- As long as the urban hens are housed safely, why not?
- So long as the animals live in humane, safe and healthy conditions.
- Noise Control, pest control, and overall cleanliness Must be factored in to prevent disturbances to neighbours.
- As long as the animals have proper/safe living conditions and enough room, being well taken care of
- Rearing your own animals has many benefits. As long as noise, smell etc is acceptable to neighbors
- The world is changing and there are new realities with respect to how people get their food. This is one way people might get food.
- I think it is a wonderful way to develop sustainable living practices
- I think having access to fresh eggs is a huge asset to people inner city that can responsibly care for hens.
- Only if whatever animal is approved by neighbours. And is taken care of
- With the exception of the second bullet point. Adjacent neighbours should not be given a veto. The remaining safeguards are robust enough to discourage nuisances.
- Food insecurity is a problem as is importing food. Allowing people alternative sources of food by having urban hens or other livestock seems reasonable.
- Just like any animal, if livestock/hens are being provided a good quality of life in the city I don't see why they shouldn't be allowed. And just like dogs and cats, improper care of livestock should result in a fine and/or seizure of the livestock.
- Smaller livestock companion animals acceptable, not large livestock like cattle, enforcement of living conditions and noise, maintenance etc important
- Hens provide eggs and meat. As long as they are kept in clean conditions and well looked after I would support this.
- I always wonder about end of life for these animals. The slaughterhouse?
- if people can care for the animal, its safe and ads enrichment to peoplea lives it should be allowed
- As long as the animal can be properly looked after it shouldn't be an issue.
- That would be amazing
- as long as the criteria above can be verified



- Absolutey chickens, goats, sheep need to be allowed with the rule that you can only have a certain amount of each on your property.
- I believe urban agriculture should be encouraged. Food security, freedom to feed and care for your family, all of that.
- Organic
- Eggs bro
- On a case-by-case basis there should be no problems as long as Neighbors are in agreeance
- This would be wonderful! Eggs year round and allowing children the opportunity to take part in the care and instruction about hens.
- A few chickens are ok but it must be regulated.
- My only concern is appropriate care if the animal: proper shelter, food, water, cleanliness, and adequate space for the species.
- Farm animals can offer many benefits if the environment is right. A few hens in the city that are looked after is amazing!!!!
- I think people should have to apply so that it is ensured they have appropriate facilities for the animals
- People should be allowed to own chickens for egg production as long as they're properly cared for. However, a bylaw needs to be in place for the proper disposal of the chicken once it no longer can produce eggs. I also think there should be a limit on how many chickens are allowed on a property.
- I'm not informed on the issues but I can't see a problem with having a couple chickens. As long as there is a set amount and it's not too high
- Broadly, people should be free to use their property as they see fit. The current ban is government overreach already.
- If neighbours don't care, they should be allowed, if safely and responsibly done.
- As long as neighbours are on board, I see no problem with urban hens
- As long as hens have adequate outdoor space and plenty of fresh air and good and safe shelter.
- Assuming other by laws also applied...eg house bylaws
- No comment
- I support it but I don't think that approval or support from neighbours should be required.
- I think the support from adjacent neighbors is appropriate however the positive benefit and living conditions is highly subjective and I think is already handled with current animal abuse laws.
- "Love city chickens, quieter than dogs too
- "
- Hens are good pets, source of food, and entertainment
- Other municipalities allow hens and I think we could do it too
- Sure, it's not a large animal that needs acres to roam, but shouldn't be penned up continuously either as that's cruel
- If there is responsible ownership in terms of care of animals and pens, I don't see how it is all that different from those who have cats and dogs. Indeed, it is more likely that these livestock would not



roam the neighbourhood freely like some cats are allowed to do. Also, I strongly support the criteria of community benefit and adjacent neighbour support.

- I could have a chicken
- Suitable living conditions is the only important thing. A neighbour's opinion of what a person has in their backyard has no merit. If a person is responsibly keeping hens then their neighbours can mind their own business.
- Must be careful with not ruining others' quality of life.
- Being able to consume eggs from hens that you know are healthy is a good thing
- Neighbours would need to agree but how would the city handle a case where neighbours changed and no longer agree.
- I am all in favour of urban hens and think the limitations are reasonable
- Important for city people to learn more about animals (other than cats & dogs)
- Cities need to get on board with urban agricultural options. We are heading towards a food security crisis!
- I would support people in Calgary being able to have hens. However, I think this amendment should include minimum requirements for the animals (e.g., space) and maybe only allow it to people who have a big space, who can clean the animals often, can manage bad smells, prevent disease spread, etc.
- Why not, as long as safe and not intrusive to neighbours in either or one of noise, smell and hygiene.
- If everything was done the right way then I don't see a reason to not have them in city
- Number of livestock. Size of yards
- Local and secure food sources are increasingly important.
- I would support provided that yearly inspections be required prior to yearly permit being issued.
- Very good idea for people to have food sources other than store
- I live by a couple that has chickens, it is a sustainable choice and no nuisance.
- Teaching kids our heritage, biology, taking care of pets, organic food supply.
- Provided they are well provided for, bring benefit and are not nuisances then I see no reason why we wouldn't allow it
- As long as they don't stink or make annoying noise, why not?
- As long as neighbours give support I think this is a great idea
- Thought is needed along with fair considerate guidelines so all can benefit and those who choose to care for another life is willing and able to take full responsibility for it.
- It's not the animal, or the numbers, it's the owner and their ability to manage, keep quiet and clean.
- Assuming neighbourly support and good animal husbandry, the only question is what constitutes community benefit? If, using an example from elsewhere, pygmy goats were utilized in targeted weed control with local support, I would reverse the implied question to ask why shouldn't we do such a thing?
- I think if the right environment is available for the animals then it could be a positive situation for all.



- Having more local food options is good, as long as it is balanced the animals well being and it's respectful to the neighbourhood.
- As long as animals are contained in yard
- Hens are not dangerous and provide healthy food.
- I'd be happy if livestock were permitted as long as they are well cared for and not a nuisance to surrounding neighbours.
- Urban chickens would be a great addition to the city
- The keeping of any form of livestock should only be permitted if the neighbours don't have any reasonable objections.
- I think it would be great for people to be able to own small livestock like chickens! Makes urban and suburban land more useful!
- May lead to more sustainable living.
- If they can fix any issues with the animal why take it away... just give a deadline for it to be done
- I vote only yes if the neighbourhood should has a say in these types of places and maybe it should be restricted to only certain subdivisions that have the space/capacity for such things
- Tribunal evaluations can be a review process as well when there is controversy
- I think urban hens are a great way for people to access sustainable food. As long as they are cared for adequately.
- I have no issues with livestock in the city as long as they are properly cared for
- hens yes, but not other livestock!
- I think it's a great idea, my only concern is that some people may get carried away and end up having a hen farm in their backyard.
- Would need to pay for ingestion on annual basis and respect Neighbours issues
- Urban hens would provide eggs for the owners, which could theoretically reduce the need for the industrial farming of chickens, and I see no reason not to allow responsible owners the opportunity to have chickens if proper conditions for the safety, health, and humane care of the animals is provide.
- Hens are very beneficial in so many ways.
- If someone is able to provide suitable living conditions and care for an animal, whether they are raising it for food or pleasure is a freedom in my opinion. Neighbours who cant stand animal noise should live in a no pets allowed complex and leave others to their freedoms. I would prefer my neighbours had chickens or pigs then screaming children but I dont have the right to stop my neighbours from having kids now do I
- Again. I have no issues with the animals. Control your humans.
- The ability to raise and properly care for personal livestock animals would increase general health of an urban population. As long as proper care and conditions can be met and the animals pose no risk to the general population. And that waste is disposed of properly and securely
- I don't feel as though I have enough information, but if there is a social or economic benefit to the community and it can go through some sort of trial or we can use another similar urban area as a case study then I don't have good reason to say no.



- So long as the animal and it's excrement is taken care of
- Chickens and Eggs are a food source and people need food security. If having chickens can help someone make ends meet of kids have food, then I support it.
- hens are great pets, and fresh eggs, and teach kids to care for creatures. I've had hens, they are easy, quiet, and fun.
- good to have hens in the city. it has worked well in other municipalities, like Edmonton
- I am in agreement if support from adjacent neighbours is first obtained.
- there are great benefits to keeping hens (in proper habitats) including the fresh eggs, learning responsibility for children, and an alternative to composting for kitchen scraps.
- I don't mind animals but I don't want a rooster crowing or the smell from a pile of manure left.
- You have been "exploring" this for a decade - perhaps you can just get with the 21st century and make it happen
- "Urban hens is a phenomenal idea.
- These animals are excellent livestock, and also provide a multitude of benefits such as natural pest management (for gardens, etc.)."
- As long as the above criteria are covered. Neighbours must be consulted. Chickens can stink and make a LOT of noise. Case-by-case scenarios would be a must.
- With restrictions on numbers, noise, and smell. Distance from property line. Etc.
- I think people should prove that they have adequate space and clean living conditions for these animals
- "As long as owners act responsibly and take care of their pets, along with respect for their neighbours, a pet can be any animal. Why restrict ""pets"" to cats and dogs?"
- This does bring about some limits. It is not feasible or responsible to have a horse or cow on the average city lot."
- Why not. Grew up seeing people have hens and pigs in back yards where I spent my summers in Europe.
- It is important that the well-being of animals is looked after and that issues that may arise from livestock or animals of that nature living in the city are reviewed in an appropriate manner.
- I think calgarians should be able to have some smaller livestock in the city such as hens
- I would support this initiative if it was limited to hens. I think raising of any animals in the city for food will eventually create problems. For example, in the instance of perhaps goats, could lead to people owning far too many goats on one fenced property. Roosters are noisy, and would result in increased noise complaints. Most people have good intentions when the first put in that chicken coop, or goat shed, until all of sudden they have 3 yards of rotting manure, that they cannot transport or are not willing to pay to have removed. This will result in nuisance complaints and possible health risks.
- I think this is a wonderful idea !
- I don't understand why there's such a big issue for chickens specifically. I'd sooner have a neighbour with a few hens than a yappy loud dog. We have a green bin program that can take care of the manure from a few chickens so smell isn't likely to be a big issue. Obviously the same rules would



apply regarding noise, smell, etc as with any other pets. Consider separate rules for roosters, but consider allowing them, because no roosters, no new chickens.

- It's dumb folks can't have hens or a small pig, or what ever. Use guidance numbers of pet per yard/home. And make it so reasonable folks can have what they take care of. Throw a bylaw in to prevent smell/noise and each animal needs some licence, or licence the home.
- Blanket bans on moderate animals do not solve a large issue. People complain about roosters because they are loud by-nature. This is a reasonable complaint. People complain about hens because they naturally slightly smell, and are visually messy. This is an unreasonable complaint. Both property and people are imperfect, and this should be tolerated to a reasonable extent.
- Some concerns though for neighbours would be the smell and noise!
- I already have experienced neighbours with ducks and they cheer me up, there's no smell, and they are not too noisy.
- "I think any animal
- Is beneficial to have"
- I would love to have a backyard hen.
- If the owners are being responsible, the animals are happy and healthy, health and safety concerns are being adhered to, and theirs no extensive environmental harm then why not? Who are they harming?
- the community should be allowed to have chickens and other small animals on their property.
- This is a great bylaw to introduce as it's done in many municipalities around the world with great success (Melbourn, AUS... Portland OR, etc.)
- Not only dogs and cats etc can be pets
- I think having Chickens in the backyard isn't a problem at all as long as they are in a suitable living arrangement.
- I believe having animals in urban areas can be very beneficial to people and the environment.
- As long as the owner kept the property clean
- Provided the animals are not disruptive to neighbours and are given humane living conditions, I support this.
- Many cities allow this and it is great.
- Assuming the animals can be properly cared for, and are not a nuisance to neighbors, there is no reason not to allow "livestock" animals to be kept on private property in the city.
- People should be required to prove that they can responsibly maintain hens.
- Most important is support from the neighbours as they would be most impacted
- Don't see a problem with it
- As long as an animal isn't a nuisance, and is suitably provided for; it should be allowed.
- Need adequate space for these animals to live happily. While not effecting neighbors with things like noise or smell.
- It makes sense



- Support from Adjacent neighbors is important. Perhaps an application with signatures before approval of permit is required.
- The ability to own hens could help food security in the long term.
- OK to Chickens, ducks and goats
- I would like to think that most people are responsible
- There should be standards for the welfare of animals.
- As long as it did not become an issue to neighbours by way of smell, sound or destruction of the property being housed on.
- So long as suitable living conditions are provided
- Urban farming is a great idea.
- As long as they are housed and cared for in a humane and clean environment. Additional conditions and criteria need to be in place for winter living as well.
- Should be allowed only if neighbours consent to it
- Urban hens would be great for sustainable agriculture.
- No issue with it as long as there is a way to address issues and enforce people not following the rules.
- Hens eat a lot of nuisance bugs. A natural way to treat the problem
- I think hens, chickens, goats and pigs would be great addition, with rules in place to ensure they do not cause nuisance to neighbors
- People should be allowed to raise chickens if it doesn't impact their neighbor in a negative manner.
- Noise wise, I find a barking dog more offensive. Plus the hens can eat garden pests and provide eggs.
- I like the idea of safely/respectfully having animals in the city
- As long as the homeowner can produce proof that they can provide suitable conditions before they are given the permit. And a public notice supposed to be made to surrounding neighbors. A street sign of 30" x 30" should be put on the lawn of the homeowners property. 30 days prior to being given the permit. I would put an email on the sign. That would be attached to the homeowners email address. But an email issued by the city. I believe we have some thing of my account profile. That email will go into the homeowners email. It would be forwarded to their actual email. By doing this, it would allow surrounding neighbours to try to take their concerns up personally with the homeowner. The homeowner may be inclined to adjust the potential conditions to make it more suitable for neighbours support. However some neighbours are just unreasonable. There's nothing that can be said. Their concerns would have to be disregarded.
- More variety and eggs.
- Again, hold all owners to the same standards.
- As long as they are taken care of, provide a benefit other than companionship, and noise and nuisance is kept to a minimum, I don't see why not.
- Chickens are a great way to supplement the food needs of a home as well as emotional/ mental support for people.
- I think this is fine as long as you have enough space to house the hens.



- The proposed criteria are appropriate.
- As long as noise bylaws are kept intact. ie. no rooster crowing at daybreak.
- The owner needs to share with their community what is new and how to deal with new animal.
- If my neighbor had hens, and they did not disturb me in anyway (noise/smell) I would have no problem. However if a rooster is waking me up (as a shift worker at YYC airport) or the smell or hygiene is a problem then there needs to be swift and direct resolutions for that.
- Chickens don't make much noise.
- This would help families and communities to support local and to possibly make a business.
- Animals other than dogs and cats can be accommodated in an urban situation. This includes pot bellied pigs and other smaller animals. Feces management is an issue with some livestock (goats etc.) as it can get out of control rapidly. These animals should be required to be dewormed or show a clean fecal sample every six months or year. "Latrine" type animals such as pigs are easier to keep clean and maintain in a smaller yard setting. Hens are definitely fine to keep in the city.
- I think we should start and/or continue supporting local food initiatives within an urban setting. We are far too out of touch with where our food comes from.
- If the type of livestock would offer a community benefit I would support this.
- I would support urban hens as long as there are laws in place to prevent owners from neglecting their care
- If it can done in a manner that won't cause excessive noise complaints.
- I don't see anything wrong with having hens
- I'd like to see goats approved.
- We need to learn to live with the animals in which we share land with. This could start exposure for some that do not interact with animals.
- Max of 4 only in residences with back yards.
- As long as the animal is properly cared for and is not a nuisance to others living in the area most domesticated animals should be fine. Case by case though.
- I would love to have backyard chickens. They're a sustainable way to provide your family with fresh eggs.
- I see no harm if approval is required.
- As long as the animals have proper living conditions, this is great.
- With above stipulations
- Good idea
- The idea of the urban environment excluding many animals is changing. Permaculture is teaching us to grow our own food, store our own water. Small scale animal husbandry is another means of securing our own food supply plus add a level of interest and vibrancy to our communities. However, there are some ideas that need controls such as limiting certain numbers. Pigeons for instance.
- "People should be allowed to provide for themselves. Hens provide a food source, just as a garden would.
- FYI.. goats should be allowed as well."



- I believe that other livestock animals with the right husbandry in urban areas can thrive and live wonderful lives. Why should city folk not be able to enjoy these creatures in their homes?
- we should get with the times of sustainable living. We just need to put limits on animal numbers to size of property.
- Having a hen to supply eggs is fine with me.
- People should be allowed to own animals they want as long as the living space is adequate for said animal, within reason.
- Yes, I support it
- As long as neighbours rights are respected
- "There is ABSOLUTELY NOTHING WRONG with having pet hens in the city!!! The ONLY reason the idiotic bylaw was passed in the first place was that Council had a knee-jerk response to bird flu many years ago. This is a fact! I was there!!!!

- If pet chickens are not allowed in Calgary because of zoonotic disease risk, then dogs ABSOLUTELY MUST be banned immediately, because they can transmit MANY more zoonotic illnesses than chickens do. You would also have to ban parrots, budgies, lovebirds, finches and canaries for the same reason. Any claim that public health is the reason for the ban is patently unfounded.

- The chicken ban was enacted by [removed] council members, and was opposed by medical experts themselves. It was a stupid, regrettable action, taken by people who were pathologically clueless.

- There is NO reason whatsoever to prohibit pet chickens in Calgary when there appears to be no limit to the number of dogs, cats, ferrets, birds and other pets.

- Want to keep people from exploiting chickens? Limit the number to 4 per household. While you're at it, dog breeding in Calgary is FAR more obnoxious, unhealthy, noisy and dangerous than chickens will EVER be.

- Allow pet chickens, and specify that their care MUST follow all current animal welfare and wellness laws. Preventing cruelty is a must, just as it is for cats and dogs."
- Having small chickens and ducks or one goat would not be harmful to the neighborhood.. but maybe a cow wouldn't be.



- Urban farming should be given a fair chance.
- Think that this is a good idea
- Urban farming can increase community engagement and learning about food and health
- Unlike a dog for example, productive livestock offers a means to sustain our community.
- Chickens should be allowed
- I think this is a great thing as long as the owners are taking care of everything included cleaning up after them
- As long as the animals had acceptable living space.
- I think sustainable living is a positive approach, as is an increased understanding and awareness with where we get our food (i.e. eggs).
- urban farming has created many positive outcomes. I lived in Vancouver for a few years and saw how urban or shared garden concepts and increase happiness and community involvement from a base level. It should be noted that with animals an livestock proper education is required for the success of raising animals in this way.
- If there is suitable space and pen and the approval of immediate neighbours and regular check ins for maintenance.
- Chickens are a good source of nutrition and keep insects and ticks at bay.
- I believe this should be allowed but permitted at a community level
- With regular inspections to ensure the above is being met.
- As long as neighbours have a say and can have recourse if it doesn't work out
- people should be able to have livestock as long as they have the space
- As long as health and safety standards are met, I have no problems with urban livestock.
- This really does rely on people being held accountable and responsible, and if they are, having chickens in the city would be wonderful. This will encourage predators so as long as coyotes or other animals coming in are not killed for doing what is natural for them.
- some small livestock is beneficial to the environment.
- There would need proper upkeep of pens and not bother others.
- Please keep urban support animals allowed for the vulnerable population who requires this unique support.
- I think that urban hens, provided that they have the suitable living conditions that need like space, then I agree. Urban hens could provide people with eggs for personal consumption
- Na
- As long as there is enough room, adequate nutrition, and they are cared for, they should be allowed.
- I like the idea of people having the option to have livestock in Calgary
- I would like to see ducks allowed as pets in Calgary
- Being able to have hens for eggs is awesome if they are freeroaming in your backyard. They must have adequate housing and space though. I imagine many people would complain though about noise and maybe smell.



- As long as suitable living conditions for the hens are provided, including indoor shelter in winter this would be a great way for people to have access to fresh eggs and meat.
- Ok but neighbours cannot be disturbed by smell or noise.
- As long as the animal is not causing disturbance, destroying property or violating noise by-laws. This will give our residents opportunity to potentially eat better (eggs) at a lower cost.
- Provided the hens and livestock are properly contained, keeping them from private property and roadways where they could cause traffic accidents.
- Eggs are good
- As long as the livestock are for personal use in residential areas, not for breeding/ sale of the animals or their products (eggs, etc.). For restaurants or markets, then the sale/use of their products would be ok by me as long as rules above are followed and enforced.
- As long as the animals are well cared for and the owner's know how to care for animals (including respect for any affected neighbours) I have no trouble with the amendment.
- If the live stock is too loud they should not be allowed within a certain distance from neighbours
- I support people being able to feed their families
- Great idea
- animals of all types have been raised in all environments for as long as we have recorded domestication. As long as hygiene issues are resolved and this doesn't impact neighbors. There should be no issues. There are many benefits to urban animals
- I believe urban hens, have the advantage of being both pets, and, providing fresh eggs. Other livestock, e.g. goats may be beneficial on larger residential lots for environmentally friendly weed control. Any individual(s) who have urban livestock would need to have appropriate knowledge for care (it would be wonderful to have some City sponsored education and support programs), and, have the appropriate amount of space for the well-being of the animals.
- As long as the animals are not a nuisance or disturbing the new neighbours then they should be allowed. The initial consultation should be with neighbours adjacent and 2 doors down then make it known when selling the house that there are these animals and the new home owner can't complain about them being there as it was an existing condition prior to them owning the property.
- If small livestock is allowed it's crucial to have Bylaws in place to insure the well-being of the animals and insure livestock isn't a nuisance for neighbours (noise, smell, etc).
- People should be allowed to she any animal they want as long as they take care of it properly and it doesn't bother anyone else.
- If adjacent neighbours approve it and the owner can demonstrate safe, healthy living arrangement for hens then I think there should be no problem in allowing them
- "nothing wrong with having chickens as long as the neighbours don't
- mind"
- Food diversity and sovereignty for at risk communities and everyone in general benefits from less strain on food chain supply.
- Exception-only permission to be granted, only upon evidence of (i) noise/smell/pollution mitigation measures; (ii) animal-welfare measures; and (iii) informed neighbour support.



- I would support this amendment because of the case by case evaluation. I have no problem with urban hens.
- Hen laying eggs are a great asset
- Urban farming is a great way to be sustainable
- Yes, but only if living conditions for that animal are met.
- Hens, provided their housing facilities are kept clean, are a good source of eggs. They are also very calming to watch. I love hens! And bumblebees.
- Support from adjacent neighbors - not including rental neighbors. Even if the neighbor has been a long-term renter, I don't think a renter should have a say in what a permanent resident is doing. It is much easier and cost-effective for a rental neighbor to move if they don't like it. Plus, a rental can change tenants and the hen owners shouldn't have to get rid of their hens if the new tenants don't like them, nor should they have to wait until new tenants are there that support it. Tenants should not have a say.
- I have no problem with people providing themselves with other means for household food. As long as it's clean and humane.
- As long as the owner is able to properly care for the animals and they are determined beneficial for the community it is a good idea.
- I have seen hens kept successfully at several houses in Victoria BC. I think it is a great way to promote food security. My only concern is that the chickens be provided proper protection from wildlife and the elements.
- It will increase food security, connect the owners to animals and their food and just improve the world in general.
- If done properly, this could lead to healthier lifestyles
- I love urban chicken coops! Lived in a neighborhood that had many in Somerville MA and it was delightful
- Are roosters included? They can be loud. I would support hens but not other livestock.
- Only if criteria are strictly enforced. This has the potential to flood CHS with surrendered and seized hens. Could cause significant impact to neighbors if left unchecked.
- Hurry up with this, please.
- Hens can be used for emotional care and city farming should be permitted at some levels. weed growing is allowed
- Urban farming is something that Calgary should be embracing much more and the fact that small farm animals aren't allowed has been beyond frustrating. Goats, hens, and other small livestock are not only fantastic companions but useful and can provide nourishment.
- Urban hens allow people to meet their food needs in ways that should be accessible to more people. So long as the animals are cared for and the neighbours needs are met this should be allowed.
- Increases the ability to have a self sufficient lifestyle
- I think many city properties should be able to create pathways for sustainable living. Having small animals to assist in providing food for families should be encouraged.



- Livestock should be allowed in city limits to an extent. Having consent from neighbors is good. What would the legal tape to get through be? Will the city make the process so difficult that no one will be able to acquire livestock? How expensive will the city make it to get livestock? Will a permit be required? Will you have to register the livestock with the city? If so, what are the related fees?
- As long as a livestock animal can be properly cared for in an urban environment, I can't see a reason to exclude them
- This would need to be strictly enforced and licences issued, neighbors in agreement etc.
- Hens are good for the environment and provide a stable food source, especially to those who are lower income.
- I want chickens.
- Hens are quiet and easy to maintain. We have chickens on our acreage and they are wonderful!! No roosters though :)
- As long as the existing neighbours within at least a 5 house radius agree with a household having chickens, then I don't see a problem with it.
- Immediate neighbours should be afforded greater veto powers
- I would like to raise Hens for the potential food & health benefits they could provide.
- support from neighbors must be obtained
- As long as there's a limit on how many per household
- It should be a human right to keep livestock on private property
- As long as animal needs are more than met and these standards are upheld, I see no problem with it.
- Makes sense
- Provided that conditions are in place for properly housing urban hens, I believe this can have positive impact on people's lives. Having said that, support from adjacent neighbours has to be in place to avoid conflicts.
- I think urban hens are a lovely addition to neighbourhood - obviously granting that they are well homed and properly taken care of.
- Chickens all the way!!!!
- All animals deserve a good place to live.
- I support the consideration of neighbors, as well as the possibility of exceptions. Some clarity as to what "offers community benefit/positive impact" is could be useful.
- I believe that, as long as the animal is properly cared for, people have a right to choose what type or breed of animal they wish to care for.
- Any law that involves animals being treated with respect and having homes is a good law to me
- Anything is worth exploring and trying out.
- As long as the hen cages are kept clean, there is no detriment to having a supply of fresh eggs.
- Provided they can supply and keep up with the animals needs with ample space and time I think small livestock would be acceptable
- Urban agriculture is a positive movement for cities!



- Having hens on property is a good and healthy way to grow your own food and if cared for properly don't cause any harm
- I grew up with a chicken coop in my backyard in a densely populated European village and there was no nuisance, only fresh eggs
- As long as the welfare of the animal is continually checked upon. No residential killing of the animals should be allowed ever.
- Yes but would limit the number allowed per household
- It's not okay to disallow people from providing themselves their own food.
- As long as the animals are not being abused and have the space/ needs met then I support it.
- I think as long as the above criteria are followed livestock should be allowed.
- It would need to be highly regulated as the privilege could be abused and the animals may not be cared for correctly.
- People should be able to have hens if they desire
- Many different species of animals can add to the quality and enjoyment of human life. It would be beneficial to add this small rural value to urban living as long as it was not a nuisance to the community and neighbors.
- If a plan can be presented where there is adequate space/shelter/care provided for the livestock and impact to communities and neighbours is positive the livestock should be approved by the chief bylaw officer after reviewing each case application.
- Any animal can be a pet.
- Yes.
- What if the citizen is an excellent poultry parent and you have a crappy neighbour?
- I support any animal ownership that is in the interest of improving health and in the animal's best interest.
- This sounds like fair evaluation criteria.
- With restrictions
- Great Idea
- Only if the owners are responsible for mess, noise and other costs. Owners must be responsible chicken owners.
- Only with proper restrictions, licensing, insurance and enforcement.
- I believe if a suitable living condition is met and neighbour's are supportive, why not!!
- Yes, as long as they aren't a nuisance to neighbors and smell.
- As long as proper care and cleaning are done to minimize odour and disease
- there can be any benefits to having controlled livestock in the city like many other places in the world, including food security, agree with above criteria and kept to a limit.
- They dont hurt anyone
- as long as the correct living conditions can be provided the animals should be allowed
- Being able to sustain your family is not a government right to be given or taken away other than for the safety of the animals.



- There should be yearly check ups on the proper way of housing livestock and their needs.
- As long as hens are taken care of and in a suitable coup i have no problem with this
- "As long as hens are used for eggs and not meat. I would not want my neighbors killing hens next door. The smell and screams would be unbearable.
- Otherwise I think this would be great."
- Positive impact for community but must ensure safety and care or animals.
- So long as the animals are well cared for, their coop/living area is kept clean, and not causing a disturbance (ie: escaping, destroying property, smell becomes pervasive).
- Other small livestock in very restricted numbers.
- Urban hens can provide citizens with eggs which is a source of good protein.
- many people can benefit from this!
- "Limit #s of animals based on size of property.
- Licensing required"
- As long as neighbors agree and living conditions are suitable there shouldn't be an issue
- Calgary is so far behind in allowing urban hens compared to other districts, the city needs to catch up on this, however licensing of chickens should not be needed or required, only approval of the neighbours. Other livestock should be allowed provided they are not a nuisance to the neighbours based on noise and smell concerns. Example: horses and mini-horses, donkeys and goats allowed, pigs, roosters and cattle should not be allowed.
- As long as the adjacent neighbours are not negatively impacted then it should be fine. Dogs barking every time someone walks by and cats roaming are dealt with through enforcement, noisy chickens or odours could be dealt with the same way.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of I don't see an issue
- My answer is contingent on Case by case support - the degree to which this is acceptable is case dependent
- This is a great idea!
- Yes, especially with COVID being more self sufficient is an important thing. Animal health and safety should absolutely be top priority
- Hens allow for greater self-sufficiency and joy
- Regular inspections should be a condition of annual licensing.
- Could be good idea if criteria are followed properly
- It is important that neighbouring property owners are notified and are supportive.
- Suitable living conditions are key. A horse obviously would not do well in a city. Therefore, I feel with this provision, any livestock to be approved would not be inappropriate in a city neighbourhood. Support from the neighbours is also extremely important. Livestock can be loud and smelly.
- Yes! Having worked on farms myself as well, and lived in places where most people have chickens, I don't see it being a problem at all. I would say it's more important that we educate people as to how to take care of them, just like pets. It's not the hens or livestock that are problems, it's the negligence of the owners. It's important for community resilience, and food security.



- Calgary is far too populated to have livestock in most areas. This should be looked on a case by case and possibly limiting the numbers
- hens should be allowed to be owned by everyone
- Provided the livestock have appropriate living space, quarters, healthcare I would be fine with people having them
- I would accept this as long as they have a clean living area
- If people want livestock let them have them
- Urban hens should not require support from adjacent neighbors. Would 'other livestock' be a defined list of species? I support a flexible law able to accommodate unusual situations.
- Domesticated animals should be allowed in domesticated areas as long as they're properly cared for and not a nuisance to adjacent properties.
- If someone wants a chicken or other livestock as a pet or otherwise they should be able to, so long as the relevant bylaws are followed.
- So long as neighbours are okay and it provides mutual benefit
- I've wanted urban hens for years and think it's great for sustainability and self-reliance.
- I have no problem with this.
- Livestock have practical benefits and are less of a nuisance than conventional pets. Dogs bark, cats often wander or get into gardens. Hens are quiet and provide a source of food/income, as well as properly maintained goats.
- Producing local food is better for everyone and the environment
- I fully support this bylaw and would more than like to take part in this
- Only if there are strict protocols about manure disposal and noise.
- This would depend on how many, property size, cleanliness
- There are certain livestock that provide opportunities to reduce our environmental impact.
- I think it would have to be pretty seriously regulated so that chicken illnesses don't affect farmers
- Hens must be kept in community 'housing or spaces'. Not allowed in each person's yard, as that would cause more problems than what a pit bull causes!
- Food is expensive and people want to be able to grow and support themselves and shouldn't be fined for doing so. Many of my friends want to have chickens and can't for fear of bylaws
- Providing hens are monitored to ensure adequate conditions. Should be a site inspection and permit granted.
- It's time to change the way we think and this helps
- Depending on the space available and living conditions for the animal can be supplied and they are not a problem for those around them
- If the animals are treated humanely and if it reduces the purchase of people buying animal products from slaughterhouses e.g. eggs. Then I support this. Again as long as the animals are taken care of and not abused
- As long as animals can be cared for properly and are not a nuisance to neighbours then they should be allowed.



- everyone should have the right to grow their own food and if they can do it safely then it should absolutely be allowed.
- Owning chickens is fantastic. Fully support that. Not sure what other livestock could be applicable but the criteria sounds reasonable.
- By having hens we are allowing people to have a healthier option for fertilizing lawns and gardens as well as food source.
- As long as everything is regulated.
- OK with this if noise and smell are controlled.
- Love the idea - locally sourced eggs to share with neighbours etc - as long as they do not become a nuisance to neighbours.
- As long as there is space, I see no issues with this.
- Having chickens is a delight. Source for eggs and improves soil
- I don't wholly support it but think there are circumstances it would be beneficial.
- "I don't believe we should be restricted from raising chickens as pets or as a potential food source. As long as the situation doesn't get out of hand and affect o
- Neighbors negatively, it shouldn't matter what animals
- People choose to keep if they're caring for
- Them properly."
- As long as a household can properly care for and maintain said livestock they should have the ability to do so as long as it does not impede the welfare of themselves or others
- Yes bc it's okay.
- Chickens are by no means mindless farm animals. They are incredibly smart and so long as adequate care is provided and the chickens are not used for food, they may be allowed to be pets. However, they should only be allowed on their owner's private property.
- I think it's a great idea! Hens are awesome and are a sustainable food source!
- Encourages those hoping for a more sustainable lifestyle. Should be regulations for space, noise, smell but neighbours should not be part of enforcement
- Citizens should have the right to self provide.
- Animals' needs are important. They don't have a voice so we must give them one.
- It would be nice to have chicken to supplement our food supply.
- As long as the animals are well cared for, and not a nuisance to the neighborhood I am all for diversity of animals. It teaches children about other animals and can provide animal byproducts you would normally buy from the grocery store, making your life a little more sustainable.
- Chickens are not a problem
- Backyard chickens and ducks would be great pest control measures - limiting the numbers of animals each yard is allowed.
- They don't harm any one
- I'm all for more farm animals living around us. It's urban farming. It's a great way to support the community, eat local, and hold onto useful historical knowledge.



- As long as there are strict rules
- Goats maintaining grassed areas are cheaper and more efficient than City of Calgary employees.
- I think it would add value to our community and offer greater focus on gardening, growing our own food and connecting to where our food comes from.
- I believe that chickens in a back yard coop would be very beneficial. However I wouldn't extend it to any livestock
- I think this would have a positive impact on food security, etc., but perhaps the tribunal option could be employed here as well, to ensure impacts on neighbours are reasonable. And to ensure that every NIMBY doesn't get their way just because of their tenacity.
- Again responsible ownership and this could be an extremely good thing for Calgary.
- I don't think that owning hens should be at the whim of my neighbours. There are already provisions for my neighbours to make a complaint to by-law if I don't care for my chickens properly.
- As long as these conditions are met it's fine
- Should review living conditions prior to owner getting hens
- Yes, only if these animals would not be a bother (sound, smell, digging, etc.) to neighbors
- I think that properties being allowed to have chickens is a great idea. I would hope the city would support in providing informations for enclosures that made the chickens safe from coyotes and predatory birds, as both are prevalent in my area
- Okay
- Each case needs individual assessment to make it more efficient.
- I always support growing/producing local food (grow food, not gardens!). We would love to have a couple hens.
- the animal needs certain things to keep healthy and if you have chickens they need specific requirements to stay healthy, like cleanliness
- Backyard chickens and pigs!
- "Support from adjacent neighbors is really important as they will be the secondary most-impacted people by livestock animals.
- But all neighbours on the same block and the immediate block behind the house (livestock will typically be housed in backyards) should be able to protest or appeal the existence of livestock animal should they become a nuisance with a majority vote."
- I think all the listed conditions are reasonable
- I have no issues with it. My concern would be to ensure that if a complaint is received that more extensive research/investigation be done before jumping to conclusions.
- Would need to have regular inspections and be licensed.
- As long as everyone agrees then you should be good until someone move and the new people moving in have a problem
- As long as livestock are not making unreasonable noise or smell, I see no reason to keep them out.
- But should have noise levels checked as cockerel s could be super noisy



- People should be able to keep hens as a pet provided they are in humane conditions and relatively safe from stray animals attacking them
- For the most part, I don't believe that livestock would be comfortable in someone's back yard, but hens could potentially be an exception, as long as the chicken coop smell can be fully controlled.
- If neighbors are ok with it and there is bylaw enforcement
- Must have approval from neighbours. They should be subject to inspections for hygiene and welfare. They should be required to obtain a license. (Similar to dog/cat owners). Not on every animal but the herd.
- It could be beneficial to families and the community.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for, and aren't a disturbance to neighbours (excessive noise, etc)
- I think it will be a great bylaw as long as it is kept an eye on
- We need to move away from the mass consumption and slaughterhouse economy and get people back in touch with sustainable farming.
- Depending on what type of livestock you're talking about! I don't want cows as neighbours. Also neighbour consultation and agreement must be part of the plan.
- It is needed in the times we are in for sustainability. Growing our own food. Reducing or completely eliminating the use of pesticides. Goats and chickens are useful.
- Blanket prohibitions on wildlife in the city make less sense as the size of the city grows. As the city themselves have demonstrated with their weed eating goats, there are some really strong reasons "livestock" should be in the city. I know many people who would like to purchase chicken manure for their gardens, and would be happy to have a local supply. As long as the decision is made on a case by case basis, I have no problem with allowing different animals in the city.
- let people have livestock even if they don't benefit anyone.
- Urban farms are a great way to teach kids where our food comes from.
- Urban farming is an important piece of our food system
- There are many "livestock" breeds that are great house pets and backyard chickens are great for providing eggs
- As long as the animals are well taken care of and there's no disruption to the neighbourhood, then why not?
- Urban hens and small well cared for small scale urban farming are a wonderful addition to add food sources, engage children in food production. Eliminating or reducing traditional grass lawns that negatively impact our environment and are a drain on water supply's for more beneficial ones or alternative yard spaces should also be included
- Urban farms can be great if the animals are cared for!
- Having hens could be beneficial to others.
- If they are being properly cared for I don't see a difference in having them from other pets.
- Only if suitable living conditions are provided for any livestock and follow ups are enforced to ensure living conditions are actually what household said they would be.



- Responsible owners should be allowed the chance to Show that This possible and a viable practice with hens
- Hens don't stink, they don't need a lot of space and they provide great benefit in eggs.
- I feel there is no downside to having hens. I don't want to have them for myself, but I wouldn't stand in the way of my neighbours.
- These animals can be used for therapies also some provide food
- Some people have the maturity and the urban space required to give other animals a happy life. We should let them.
- As long as winter/cold accommodations can be made and are sufficient
- Properly done, urban farming is a asset to the community
- Sustainability to grow and provide our own food is a wonderful idea.
- It is not an issue to allow other animals within the city so long as the needs of the animal are being met.
- Urban hens are an amazing idea, as long as they have proper living conditions and regular cleaning.
- They provide more food and are beneficial to the community.
- Make for a more self sustaining people. Need to ensure there's limits and officers to ensure the potential hen owners have created a proper setup for the birds.
- Hens and other livestock can make good pets and generally are not destructive if given the appropriate care.
- If there is approval from neighbours I don't see an issue with it as long as they don't have a whole farm in their backyard
- need to manage number of hens, the city is already making a mockery of this with the Goat heard for weed control (wast of taxpayer money)
- Yes, however, I cannot see why neighbors must consent to this. If the hens remain on their owners property, it should be the owner's decision. However, having a limit on the number of hens is fair.
- As long as they meet a certain criteria for owning livestock. Example: Own an amount of land feasible for owning animals, proper shelter, food, and water, Coop/Barn standards
- Anyone that cares for a living animal needs to provide for its need.
- All for urban farming
- Ot all depends on what the animal is. Small animals, like goats aren't so bad. It's the larger animals that most likely will be an issue.m due to space.
- As long as the living conditions were suitable people should be allowed livestock. If they cannot meet certain strict standards they should not be allowed animals
- It would be amazing to be able to get fresh eggs; however, only if it is not a nuisance to neighbors.
- Great way to help out for families that may to reduce their grocery expenses. Also good foe pest control as they eat a lot of bugs.
- As long as it doesn't impact my ability to move about the city with my dog I don't care what kind of pets people have.
- This allows for individual families to become more self sufficient. I support urban livestock practices.



- Yes, urban hens should be allowed to be kept by homeowners as long as the animals are adequately cared for and do not become a nuisance for neighbors.
- If someone wants to keep hens, why not
- Provided that people have gone through the correct channels and there are follow ups to ensure the health and conditions of said animals.
- Personally I just think that would be cool. " wanna come over and see my livestock "
- Back yard chickens are a great idea!
- Animals can enrich a neighborhood and give those who don't have pets of their own a chance to learn how to be responsible around them
- If someone wants to own animals and can care for them, I'm ok with that.
- backyard chicken program
- Hens and Ducks
- I believe people should have the right to raise animals, including chickens, game birds, or small livestock, such as sheep or goats, as a method of land maintenance, and as a good source for their own family use. This does not include raising animals for sale.
- Small farm animals can be positive as long as there is no overt smell or noise.
- Great idea :) sustainability
- I think urban hens are a great idea.
- it is important for people to be able to feed themselves
- As long as conditions are controlled to avoid creating a problem for adjacent neighbours, permitting urban hens should be allowed
- Khaki Campbell ducks also do well in an urban setting and produce large alkaline eggs
- Hens are kept to provide a healthy food source to family's if everyone is in support I don't see a problem. With a healthy home provided for hens
- "We had an incident with an orphaned calf, we own livestock out of city limits. This orphaned calf needed care , milk and warmth and due to no other cow accepting this and weather conditions and no home on farm for us to stay in. We had the calf at our home in order to care for it and improve its survival. We had all the proper needs in order to assist in this calfs growth at our home in Calgary and no bother to neighbors. Our only intention was to assist in its growth and health, until such time it could join the herd at 3 months of age. We had many concerned citizens calls, complaints if you will. We had stipulations in place, but the time line was only 30 days to have calf removed. Fortunately for us by the 30 day our calf was old enough and healthy to go back to our farm. But what could we have done if the 30 day notice was not enough time?
- I also feel chickens would be wonderful to have as either support animal or peovide eggs. No roosters as they can be noisy. As long as the owners follow the guidelines of city bylaw"
- I love that so many regular people in England have hens to lay fresh eggs in their yard, and they seem perfectly happy
- Hens are great!
- As long as the environment is health and neighbours are in agreement
- They need to be kept in suitable areas, not a tiny cage



- If the animals are well cared for and their presence doesn't disrupt the neighbours within a one block radius, they should be allowed.
- It might be better for some pets to be rescued from farms/kill houses.
- Chickens will not hurt anyone, as long as they're well kept why not.
- As long as it is done ethically and that the needs of the animals are top priority
- Sustainable options need to be more available for people given the climate issues.
- T
- With proper guidelines in place, this amendment allows for diversity and sustainability
- If someone wants fresh eggs who am I to crack up their plans.
- Urban hens can be wonderful for the owners, but they need to be cared for properly and having neighbourhood support is important for the safety of the animals.
- Responsible owner should be allowed to keep hens
- We are becoming too disconnected from nature/animals in a natural environment. So anything positive to re engage is good.
- More people are looking for ways to be creative and manage their needs locally. This could help that happen. The only concern, as with any pet, is noise/ smell/ and conditions. I would expect that to be heavily monitored.
- Chickens are wonderful
- As long as the premise is maintained in a healthy manner I see no problem.
- Sounds reasonable
- Yes
- I want a chicken in my backyard.
- Pets may chase them so they'd need to be in a fenced off area/out of sight.
- I would like to keep a small coop in the city. I would love to see limited livestock available for inner city limits
- I like the idea of being able to raise chickens at your home.
- Small pigs are like dogs and should be allowed, therefore, I am sure there are other animals that this would apply to. It is not always easy to say specifics and perhaps these bylaws need to be flexible and reviewed like mentioned one a case by case basis.
- chickens are good
- I am uneducated on the topic. It does sound like a plausible idea.
- I think that livestock add a great deal, not only to individuals, but to the community as well. They provide the same pleasure and enrichment that any other pet would. They add fertility to gardens of all kinds, and encourage healthy soil structure. And mostly, people need to have some connection to where their food comes from. As long as the animals are well treated, housed and cared for, they will lead a good life. And as long as they don't make more noise than a gas lawnmower, a barking dog, or a party next door, and smells are kept in check, then no one should have cause to complain.
- as long as the animal is cared for i see no issue with them being in the city
- I think it would be amazing to have chickens and different livestock in Calgary.



- Have a few hens without any roosters (due to noise), could indeed help utilize available yard space (e.g. below deck area) and help people in this current pandemic stay sane while getting some comfort from taking care of their own hens (and obtaining fresh eggs in return).
- If animals are being treated with compassion and respect and responsibly than I do not see the issue.
- Pigs can make great pets
- "Yes to livestock.
- People should be able to have whatever they wish on their own property as long as care is taken of the animals and it does not harm your neighbour - harm, not "annoy" or something based on aesthetics."
- I am not knowledgeable on the specifics of keeping alternative livestock such as hens. As long as the rules are reasonable and actually enforced I don't see why not.
- If it doesn't cause harm to anyone else, then they should be entitled to it on their own property
- Caring for animals has proven community and individual mental health benefits.
- It's just a small animal and as long as they are well kept and don't make a nuisance of neighbors they should be fine
- Sure, seems like a positive thing for us Calgarians
- But how is agreement from neighbours obtained. Can it be reversed and what if owners and neighbors move?
- As long as it's well maintained supporting the ownership of hens could be a positive feature of living in Calgary
- As long as the animals are being tended to properly and not causing any issues for anyone else, why not.
- I don't see why not.
- Uh, hens are amazing. Incredible animals to have in your yard. Absolutely integral for composting and for food production. Plus they don't really make noise? My backyard neighbours have parties every weekend, that's way worse.
- ONLY if a solid and VERY STRICT animal welfare system can be in place with standards and monitoring. Pets are mistreated and breeding is not regulated, until that can be changed - no need to add more animal welfare issues to the table.
- I would rather see a hen house in my neighbor's yard than the pitbull puppy mill that is there now. Also many people use different animals as therapy pets and that is important
- Hens are great animals, they can be lovely pets and laying eggs can also save money in the long run for citizens.
- If they're cared for properly I see no issue
- Properly maintained chicken coops would be acceptable
- Fully support so called hobby farm for personal use. Especially to cut down on expenses in this inflated market we currently have. Even more so important with the lack of jobs and work due to covid
- Chickens should be allowed in Calgary.



- If people are able to take care of these animals and get food from them at the same they should be able to
- If people clean up after their animals, why not allow them to have a hen, goat or pig.
- Great source of food and a connection with the animal that provides it.
- Case by case
- Can help sustain the owners a bit more
- Yes, however I don't think large livestock such as cows should be permitted.
- Keeping animals that can provide food: chickens, goats eases the financial strain on urban families.
- Decision not by the Chief, rather by community group affected
- As long as they are responsible owners and they take care of their animals for their health be as my d well being and make sure they're not a nuisance, I don't care what kind of animal they are
- In theory - as long as the list of livestock doesn't get too long and that there are strict requirements for keeping livestock in an urban setting
- I have no issues with urban hens! More locally sourced eggs and food :)
- Emphasis on neighbors supporting it.
- As long as the animal is cared for in a suitable environment and is not a nuisance to neighbours, I see no problem with considering allowing other animals to reside within the Calgary city limits.
- It's a good idea. Some people use them as support animals. There should be a limit to how many can be housed to prevent abuse and noise levels
- If the animal has enough room and a good life, yes. However, no large animals like cattle or horses.
- I believe hens should be allowed within the city limits.
- I think small live stock that is properly cared for would be fine.
- I really support hens in Calgary (not roosters). They are no dirtier than parrots providing the owners are responsible and they do not make nearly as much noise as parrots. Yet parrots are legal. I strongly support allowing up to 3 hens per household.
- This would allow animals to have a happy life away from a factory.
- Hens can be really great pets so can goats, pigs and sheep.
- Hens well cared for are great addition to life in a neighborhood.
- I think allowing hens and other livestock in the city is an excellent idea. I would support this bylaw amendment.
- Yes, but with education around this and some follow up to ensure compliance. Close neighbours would need to be agreeable.
- As long as 2-3 neighbours on each side did not have objections. Noise/smell carries and can impact a person's ability to enjoy their home
- As long as there is some oversight and this wouldn't cause issues with neighbour's, people should be free to have their own pets on their own property.
- If the owners of the animals are taking proper care of the animals and they are not a threat or cause disruption in the said community, then it's fine to have hens and other livestock on property as pets.
- It seems innocent enough but i wonder about noise.



- I would love to own urban hens if i had the knowledge and space.
- As long as the owner and surrounding neighbours are okay with it, and the owner can properly care for it, this should be acceptable.
- If you're going to consider doing this for livestock, please do this also for household pets.
- If it's not bothering anyone it's fine
- I like the idea of hens! Would hope there would be a limit though on the number that can be kept at any given time. Just because you have the space doesn't mean you need dozens of birds in your backyard.
- If it harms no one, then why not
- Depends on what the livestock is; I wouldn't want to live next to a noisy or smelly yard. If livestock benefited whole community then maybe it would be ok
- As long as owners can provide a safe and comfortable living space for the animals, they are not a nuisance to neighbours and not detrimental to city infrastructure, smaller livestock should be allowed.
- We need more opportunities to expose our children to animals and have animals (that are not a nuisance) for ourselves. Lot sizes need to be considered.
- If a person can safely raise a goat or chicken on their property they should be able to. With that said they need to be held responsible for the cleanliness the pens and noise caused by their urban farming.
- As long as the animal can be properly cared for, and doesn't impact the health/safety of others, I see no problem
- I think there is a distinct benefit to have some livestock animals in the city. Hens for fresh eggs is one, a goat or two for yard/weed maintenance and companionship can be another. Miniature cows are apparently excellent pets.
- Bringing nature and more natural approaches to food production into our cities is a good thing.
- Not my business as long as they don't exceed a certain amount of noise.
- Easy way to provide food to the surrounding community.
- N/A
- If neighbors agree and animals aren't creating disturbances all night
- People who can care for chickens should be allowed to.
- AS long as all avenues are discussed properly and thoroughly. I would have no problem unless a rooster moves in next store..Then I may an issue.. :)
- I've been in communities with chickens and there are far more benefits .
- I think it is a positive thing for people to understand more about where their food comes from and I support this initiative.
- If people keep a clean and happy environment for the animals, there should be no laws against having them.
- Provided the above criteria, it seems almost a non-issue that someone should have personal chickens on their own property. Chickens in particular are not any louder than certain dogs.



- But perhaps a licensing agreement to ensure hens or other livestock are cared for properly
- It should have positive change within pet owners
- I would support the relaxation of the bylaws. This could help to provide food security but needs to be done carefully and no roosters! Dog warning system good but not fine-able. Do not single one dog breed and focus on education and training were possible.
- There is a large movement for being able to support the household yourself (yard to table)
- I don't have a problem with this.
- This all makes sense.
- As long as people take care of the animals small animals/livestock can contribute to a person's food supply and well being. As long as it doesn't interfere with their neighbors enjoyment of their yard and home. Smell and noise...
- Sometimes having livestock such as chickens can help feed the family.
- Please stop classifying pot belly pigs as livestock
- If an animal is able to have reasonable living conditions and is not disruptive to the community I do not see an issue with someone having hens.
- As long as there is adequate space for the animal, why not?
- I think most livestock, if properly cared for and in suitable housing, is no different than having any other outdoor pet
- I would love to have egg laying hens! I have the space in my yard! They are also very affectionate and great pets .
- Could be a Natural, valuable and vibrant addition to our communities.
- I would imagine a well maintained chick coop would no more of a nuisance than a neighbour with pigeons.
- I don't have any issue with it as long as it doesn't create issues with neighbours and that owners are properly educated on what they are getting into. My issue with urban hens is that chickens don't lay eggs for their whole lives and people need to be signing up to take care of the chickens throughout their lives.
- As long as the owner is responsible for the animal and can provide the proper living space it should be fine. The owner should also be able to prove that they can properly care for the livestock before they are issued a licence.
- If they are contained and not noisy I don't see a fault.
- As long as the hens are cared for, fed and kept in a clean coop I would agree. Any animal must be cared for properly
- Assuming the person has the land and a considerable amount of space, seems fine.
- Secured for the animals sake
- I think hens should be allowed within city limits with responsible owners.
- As long as its suitable to the hens I see no issues with keeping hens within urban areas
- Yes



- Use animals in a respectful manner to provide food for human is a ideal way to avoid food storage and a way to educate people where food are coming from
- Everything looks good.
- Some apartment buildings dont even let animals at all (even for anxiety related reasons). To allow livestock of anykind should be allowed so long as it can be managed in the city
- Proper living conditions/room/ respect for animals are necessary. Not using these animals for food(eggs could be exception but no butchering). Apart from that, sure.
- If It's fair and unbiased with no harm to any animal
- As long as the animals are suitably cared for, and the neighbours are in agreement.
- A hen is far more benign than most other pets and far more pleasant than my neighbors. It makes no sense they are not currently allowed.
- With the current economic conditions aggravated by Covid19, people need to be able to find some sustainable source of food and livelihood. Of course, there should be a limit to the number of hens that can be raised in an urban setting as the noise and smell could become a source of disputes between neighbors.
- How cool would it be if everyone in this city could eat local eggs?! raising hens is also such a great learning experience for children and will help bring communities together.
- support local
- As long as they follow the bylaw people can own hens in the city.
- As long as there is follow up from bylaw to ensure that the sanitation is being upkept and the quality of life for the chickens is humane it would be great. Perhaps quarterly visits or twice a year.
- I think as long as it can be shown they are responsible livestock owners and the neighbours are ok with this.
- As long as the neighbours are ok and the animals can be proved to be sanitary and clean environment. If not, no animals.
- If it were a possibility for ourselves, I would have urban hens as I like the potential of gathering my own eggs. Any other animal(s) to be considered should definitely be ensured safety, shelter and complaint free.
- With a limit as to how many on each property and if any issues arise they are dealt with fare and equal for everyone.
- Any household should be entitled to have livestock on their private property as long as other properties are not physically damaged. Smells and noise don't count as a nuisance.
- If having chickens is feasible for a property then I think it is great that people can be more self sustainable while living in a city.
- Makes sense
- Why not? My mother grew up on a farm south of Calgary. She has fond memories of tending to the hens, goats, pigs. Not so much the geese and larger cattle. Hens create no issues - mean dogs do.
- I'm in support of responsible ownership of urban hens - eggs are delicious!
- Limiting numbers of livestock and it would be important to monitor their upkeep to ensure they are inhabiting a clean living space. Like any animal, not neglected.



- I don't understand why we aren't allowed hens in the city - they're not loud, or messy outside of their enclosure... I would love for this to be changed!
- Hens on private property is reasonable. Fighting cocks? Maybe not. This one's a no-brainer; let people raise hens at their private homes.
- Provide a list of acceptable livestock. Ensure issues such as number of animals, smell and noise are considered.
- I would be happy to be able to raise my own hens for eggs in my backyard. I love hens. But they should be well kept and cleaned up after.
- As long as animals are not kept for meat consumption and for pets only.
- Keep people in touch with where their food comes from.
- I support the introduction of goats in communities/parks that will benefit from them.
- Providing animal does not damage property and or break house and waste bylaw.
- Na
- In so far as animal welfare is a priority and neighbours are unaffected by noise, odours or sanitation issues it's ok.
- Eventhough it might be hard for neighbors to support this I think it would be important for the community dynamic
- So long as there are clear requirements for parties interested in raising animals- including how to exit the strategy if it's not as attractive as it seemed at the time of conception...
- Yes, as long as they are not a nuisance.
- The animals should be protected as best as possible
- Depends what the "other livestock" are
- Yes but suggest with restrictions on lot sizes. I wouldn't like to see livestock on inner city homes such as duplexes or fourplexes where they have no room to to be free
- I think that would be a benefit to the local economy, selling fresh eggs
- Ok with chickens
- Why not. People need food animals and they can't be more annoying than the barking dogs in my neighbourhood.
- No cows please!! Unless on a LARGE acreage of land. Minimum land requirements for large livestock than chickens.
- Provided noise bylaws are amended to include nuisance noise associated with urban hens and other livestock.
- As long as the support from the community is updated on an annual basis.
- It would be nice for people who want to have livestock to be able to choose to live in a part of the city where space/ provision exists for such an endeavour. It would give people the ability to provide food for themselves and have more autonomy.
- Help the animals, not the humans.
- Property owners should be allowed to raise hens as long as they do not affect the quality of life of their neighbours.



- Any support system can be beneficial, the system should allow and require approval from neighbors/neighborhoods. Consent should be required by adjacent neighbors or those that may be impacted.
- Fair for the animal
- As long as the animals are taken care of I see no reason why not.
- Not a strong opinion but would support.
- Limit per household required
- Seems fine, helps create more sustainable food sources.
- That's a great idea. Allow people to grow their own protein.
- I think allowing hens in the city would be an improvement
- I don't see the big deal with allowing urban hens.
- Legit who cares
- Chickens would be fine as long as there are limits to numbers per property or per grasses yard area.
- as long and scent and sound is not much different from dogs / cats / birds or other common pets, not sure why other animals would be prohibited.
- As long as surrounding neighbors agree I see nothing wrong.
- As long as they are well cared for and surrounding community agrees, I don't see why it would be an issue.
- Chickens are tolerable, beneficial, and harmless.
- I support having hens only... for now
- I assume "adjacent neighbors" will be defined based on expected range of sound or air pollution for each type and number of animals.
- I think urban hens and other livestock like ducks can be extremely beneficial for individual households and communities
- "People should be able to have a couple chickens for eggs
- If people can have pigeons flying through the neighborhood shitting on things why shouldn't responsible people be able to have food bearing animals"
- If someone wants to breed cattle in their yard they should be allowed, it's their property. Is [personal name removed] paying their mortgage? I think not
- People are starting to want to more organic products so if they can have their own livestock, this will allow people to live a healthier lifestyle.
- I think if people can prove they will take good care of their hens and get neighbour approval there is no reason not to offer it.
- I want chickens!!
- If you can responsibly house and care for hens without disturbing your neighbours you should be allowed to have a couple.
- As long as responsible animal ownership is established, I am supportive.
- I want a pet goat or chicken one day and it would be awesome to be able to have them in the city
- All that matters is that the animal is properly cared for and in a safe and healthy environment



- No hens running down streets. They need to have proper fences and be treated with space and good food but not allowed to run wild. Hens running wild could cause increased animal attacks from other animals towards hens, and would be unsafe for those driving, young children, etc.
- I would be interested in keeping hens. I would be willing to pay a little for a permit for them - could be a small source of revenue.
- I think it's perfectly reasonable to raise your own chickens
- As long as the don't disturb neighbours.
- No explanation needed .
- I think that urban livestock can be very beneficial if properly set up
- there are many other animals that can be amazing pets and sustainable food sources that do not cause any issues and are sometimes far more clean and quiet than cats and dogs
- As long as the animals have a decent living conditions.
- If people want chickens, live in the country. Chickens require room to move and many city backyards do not have room for this. Also, I wouldn't want to live next to a chicken coop.
- If people intend to raise livestock, they should be responsible for all actions and care of the animals. Including their affect on the neighbours.
- As long as the number of animals are limited by the space/needs of the animals. This would need to be very well waatched.
- Hens are dope AF
- With strict enforcement of criteria. Otherwise owners may surrender or provide inappropriate care resulting in overwhelming shelters.
- New owners should have to take a course of some kind on how to care for these animals.
- Having lived in Australia we saw the benefit of backyard chickens, a great idea!
- Many animals have a positive impact.
- I think as long as the animals are being taken care of and aren't causing harm there is no reason to ban them.
- This will ensure other livestock live in a healthy environment and are taken care for.
- As long as someone has the ability to properly contain the animals, they are no different to having any animal.
- There would need to be a system in place to ensure that the hens are cared for in a manner that provides a low risk for transmission of disease from hen to human. It also needs to ensure that the hens are not bothering the community/neighborhood with smells or noise.
- Citizens should be allowed to own some livestock within city limits when certain conditions are met.
- I'm ok with this
- I cannot see any reason why not
- No roosters.
- I think as long as the livestock are well taken care of and don't negatively affect the lives of neighbours or the public, it is good for people to be able to keep livestock in the city. Hens are



especially good for this, as it allows people to access eggs without worrying about how the hens who produced it were treated or what hormones they had been injected with.

- Animals that make produce, such as chickens, would be great for many people in Calgary to have and fairly low maintenance.
- As long as the hens can be cared for and are not a nuisance to the neighborhood, people should be allowed to own them and support self sustainability.
- So long as they are not a nuisance in terms of noise and smell I have no issue with this bylaw amendment.
- Hens only, no roosters. They serve no purpose.
- I would support this.
- Should be able to have hens because could have eggs. Would need to ensure a limit on amount and space so it didn't get out of control
- So long as owners are responsible I see no issue.
- It is no ones business on what others do, as long as the animals are safe.
- It is no ones business on what others do, as long as the animals are safe.
- As long as the livestock is not hindering neighbours I think we should encourage self sustainability via livestock.
- Fresh eggs!
- If you want to have livestock go ahead it's your life just don't disturb the peace.
- As long as all factors are considered and reviewed, I don't see a problem
- Hens provide food for families. No roosters should be allowed in the city.
- As long as bordering properties have no objections
- As long as calgarians and the animals can live cleanly together.
- I love the idea of having hens as a source of eggs.
- Not all livestock is suitable for urban environment
- As long as the animal is not a nuisance in the neighbourhood and it properly cared for to limit risk to the animal and others. I don't see why it would be an issue.
- I have no objection to urban livestock provided the proper controls and approvals
- As long as the animals have ample space and proper care in an urban environment! Having some training and education sessions prior to giving licence to people to have such animals in the urban environment could help reduce bad situations for the animals
- Raise goats in the proper fenced yard to reduce compost and fertilizer usage. Chickens if one is permitted for eggs.
- Caring for, and raising animals, pets and livestock alike, provide a mental health benefit and lead to more balanced children. Understanding where our food comes from is also crucial for urban children. Urban livestock must be monitored closely however both for the welfare of the livestock as well as the potential for nuisance in close quarters.
- If they are well cared for I think hens is a great idea



- As long as they are provided food, water and shelter and odours are managed then it shouldn't be a concern.
- faster processing i would assume.
- No roosters
- Will be a positive addition to many communities
- I think people having little urban farms is a great way to engage with the agricultural sector
- I support multiple uses in the city, so long as they aren't a nuisance.
- Opens doors to other pets to be kept responsibly
- About time
- There is nothing wrong with having hens within city limits
- Had Chickens all my life it was a positive experience
- Finding ways to be able to sustain ourselves without putting other people at risk is so important. As long as each animal has a registered owner, go for it.
- Ensuring that the health and wellbeing of animals is taken in to account, the presence of small livestock animals within the city would likely be a net positive - increase organic food production and local merchants, individual awareness of agriculture and livestock, increased youth engagement.
- This sounds like all bases are covered, concerning all involved.
- Responsible pet owners should have the ability to raise urban poultry in order to increase food security
- I have known a few citizens that have hens but they are on large properties and are responsible pet owners. Neighbours must be in agreement before hens are allowed on adjacent properties to keep all parties satisfied.
- If animals are being well cared for and are not causing problems with neighbours, it shouldn't matter what species they are.
- Nice that neighbors have to be contacted as some animals can become extremely annoying
- It may be difficult to get support from neighbors, especially if neighbors are at odds before this. an issue may arise if the owner moves and wants to take the livestock with with to an area where it's not suited; would have to be reviewed again. Neighbor has homing pigeons which do not harm anything ; they circle around in flight and return to his property. Wild pigeons are becoming more prevalent and are dirty. For Q7 below, answer refers to homing pigeons.
- They feed people, provide fertilizer and self sufficiency
- Why not it's 2020
- Given relevant community support and animal needs are met, I think there are many benefits. Food, companionship, and promoting the skills of caring for livestock.
- if approved by immediate neighbors. Times are hard, fresh eggs are healthy and cheap
- Biodiversity
- "And please, let's allow backyard hens!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Let's stop just asking this question on surveys and make it happen!"



- Other kinds of animals other than dogs or cats can be very beneficial to a person's life if they cannot have those types of pets for whatever reason
 - Ability to leave about animal husbandry
 - Hens can be a soothing animal for people with anxiety issues
 - It's beneficial to allow homeowners to raise their own food source on their property, While ensuring the animal's welfare and containment.
 - As long as the animals have freedom in their land and are not pestering neighbors
 - Chickens are a great idea, I support.
 - As long as it has neighbours approval too I have no issue with this
 - Love eggs
 - if people want to own livestock why not
 - It depends on the size of the property and the responsibility of the owner.
 - Got years I wanted to responsibly own a pet pot belly pig (don't care if it is 600 pounds) i earn my money and should be allowed to spend it on family pets of my choice as long as neighbors are not put out by it
 - "If the rules above are followed then I see no issue. Rather be woken up by chickens compared to the drug addicts breaking into my car, garage and yard.
-
- Yard protection chickens."
 - Owning hens and other livestock could be a source of food stability as well as a good learning experience for children. The needs of those animals must be adequately met and neighbours must be considered prior to acquisition.
 - Grocery's are becoming expensive for some people and providing for themselves would help them
 - Chickens or other livestock should be permitted. Limits on numbers could be established based on property size.
 - I think the possibility of allowing livestock in the city would open doors to community building and engagement, learning and education, and new approaches to food
 - Urban owners can be responsible livestock owners. Make it a requirement that the housing is appropriate with the discussion of a veterinarian
 - As long as the animals are well taken care of and not impacting nearby neighbours negatively.
 - Urban farming is needed.
 - I think people should be able to have those animals so long as they're responsible with them.
 - The impact of livestock in Calgary would be quite large considering how many neighbours would be impacted. Considering many people are not responsible pet owners, livestock would have to be watched carefully. A case by case evaluation would be definitely needed.
 - If the neighbours and community are supportive, this sounds sustainable and better for the environment and increased education/awareness
 - Cause it does not hurt anyone.



- For people that can find relief in having any animal that helps them why not. Dogs have helped me through so many things why should it be restricted! I've seen chickens, goats, mini horses, chickens, pigs etc help propel
- Nothing better than providing fresh eggs, meat and milk to your family
- I would support small animals, provided they aren't noisy.
- As long as people are informed and allowed to say yes or no.
- Permission of neighbours sharing property lines would ensure it's not infringing on other people's ability to enjoy their own property.
- I think it is a good idea.
- Provided they do not attract coyotes to the area I'd support hen houses
- Omg, I love this idea! They allow hens in Victoria and it's such a great idea. I'm so game! I love this!
- Least amount of city restrictions should be the starting point.
- I think that as long as the animals do not cause issues and have a proper living environment there is no issue with having livestock within the city, and there is a possibility that it would help to boost the economy as well.
- If neighbours are supportive, and a suitable home can be accommodated for the animals, I don't see an issue with having livestock in the city.
- I feel everyone should have the right to raise chickens provided they are well tended and no roosters.....no goats and sheep or cows either
- Neighbor approval is MUST
- I would say yes if they have the support of neighbours within a 2 block radius. Also if having livestock subsequently creates a problem, there would have to be measures to deal with it. For example, what if a neighbour sells their property and the new neighbour does not support having livestock next door? How do you address it?
- So long as approval was not revoked if neighbors moved and the new neighbors didn't approve.
- As long as animals are care for properly and neighbors aren't disturbed i see no problem this type of scenario.
- I believe this will have a positive community impact
- I think it would be a more ethical way of getting eggs
- I think that hens are a great idea for urban owners.
- There are other animals that can be wonderful pets. Pot bellied pigs. People are a loud to have Parrots why not Chickens.
- Like the request of a business in a housing neighborhood. Their should be no objection by neighbours. There needs to be a limit of how many animals are in one place.
- You should be allowed to produce your own food, chickens, eggs, honey etc.
- Important to ensure that the animals will be properly cared for (ie shelter, food, etc).
- Livestock can be beneficial in an urban environment.
- We support community sustained agriculture through a farm so this would be under the same category!



- Homes and yards can be big enough to support small livestock. It should be reasonably expected that neighbours can coexist with livestock.
- interested in permitting chickens for eggs.
- As long as the hens or other livestock are well cared for and the yard is kept clean, I think this is a wonderful idea!
- As long as living conditions are healthy.
- I'm fine with hens. But I can't imagine having a cow or pig or horse or whatever next door.
- Hens are a benefit in many ways. Food, insect control and as pets.
- But once you have been approved to have whichever livestock on your property it cannot be reversed because someone in the area disagrees with it.
- Size and quantity restrictions
- I say yes but strict policies must be in place for hygiene and cleanliness. If a person fails the guidelines set out they must halt operations immediately. Basically 1 warning and that's it!
- Goats, pigs and more should be allowed in proper enclosures on private property.
- Yes only to hens, as their waste and noise is minimal with only a few hens. Anything larger and there is manure to deal with. Do we really want manure piles in people's yards? That will attract flies and will stink. And other livestock can be noisy. Goats can be very noisy in particular. Pet goats tend to be spoiled and will yell for food and attention at the sight of people. Hens however tend to only get noisy for a brief time after laying an egg, their 'eggs song'. Not nearly as obnoxious or continual as barking dogs.
- Do the same in the above as well.
- I support the keeping of hens in the city if the owner or renter of the property is caring for the animals properly
- As long as it's not causing harm or bothering others then it's fine
- If the hens are safe, why not?
- I really don't care about this one.
- Really
- The only issue would be a new neighbour moving in to something they had no control of.
- As long as we can enforce the bylaws I have no problem with other species being allowed
- Hens are often treated inhumanely, so this sounds like a positive alternative as the living conditions would likely be required to be humane.
- I believe everyone has the right to fresh products.
- if the neighbours are ok with it why should it matter
- Urban hens would not bother me.
- Hens may be okay, but anything larger is going to have noise and smell issues that may not be appreciated by neighbours
- Just limit this to urban hens. No roosters.
- It would add more to the quality of life Seniors, Persons with Disabilities... something to care about when no one gives a [removed] about you.



- More hens please!
- As long as all who would be effected (ie listening to the noise) are in agreement
- Not sure of the pros and cons. My worry: who would oversee the well being of the animals. Would the animals be treated kindly? be slaughtered at home?
- Again this is very situational. I think a case by case process is the correct manner. People should have power over their own property but not at the detriment of others
- Chickens don't hurt anyone. They are great to produce eggs.
- Positive impact on urban environment.
- With the caveat that the living conditions are properly maintained and do not impede the quiet enjoyment of the adjacent neighbours.
- It all comes down to responsible animal care.
- Within reason for space, smell and noise restrictions
- Might be a great step towards reducing factory-farming, and foster nicer communities (sharing eggs, teaching neighbor children about raising animals for food...)
- Should be a low maximum number of animals per property.
- People should have the freedom to care for the pet of their choosing.
- If there are rules that keep the owners responsible for a clean and well maintained hen shed, I would support it
- Hens are harmless
- I think you should be able to have a chicken on your own property if you are able to care for it properly
- Chickens, and other small livestock should be allowed within city limits
- Provided that urban livestock, as well as any other pets, are cleaned often and well cared for, including having appropriate access to veterinary care, there is no reason to exclude any kind of pet within the city.
- Providing all recommendations are met, licensing should apply here too
- Would like more information.
- If the neighbours approval range is wide enough to cover smell and noise.
- Hens are great. Less of a nuisance than most other animals and they provide food. Granted they are taken care of properly.
- As long as the animals are not a nuisance or create noise that can disturb others
- I have always found it strange that Calgary doesn't allow some animals, which have been used as pets in many other places (pigs, goats, hens, etc.). As long as the owners have the space and means to take care of them and can ensure that the neighbours are not disturbed it shouldn't be a problem.
- It depends on the size of the yard and how many hens. They do have an odour so that would be a concern
- Local food sources are better for the environment and climate. Contributes to a culture of symbiotic living with the natural world.



- neighbours are disagreeable and can be vindictive. there should be rules and guide lines to the number of livestock in the city and it should have proper housing and space.
- Great idea. Suits broad values of Calgary having roots in farming background
- As long as neighbours have no problem
- As well as licensing and maximum number of chickens per household and proper accommodations
- If it's done properly and the hens are cared for and not disturbing the neighbors it seems fine.
- how/what defines "community benefit/positive impact"
- chickens are fine, however we live in an area close to fish creek and can already hear the coyotes at night. It is important that wildlife is not attracted to the hens/hen house
- There are many animals beyond the normal hamsters, mice, ferrets, cats, dogs etc. that can be great pets. Like with any animal, if you can fulfill its needs and provide a good quality of life for it without interfering with people living around you, why not?
- If all criteria are met there should not be any adverse effects
- As long as the above is taken care of and the surrounding community members aren't bothered by pet waste, noise, smell, etc.
- Urban hens are fine if they have a suitable area to be at large in. Cockerels are not a good fit because they do wake up very early and crow a lot!
- Hens and other livestock provide multiple benefits if raised and cared for responsibly
- As long as the livestock are not overcrowded I think this is fine.
- As in any animal ownership there needs to be laws to protect these living creatures, even if they are to be used for human consumption at some point.
- I would support urban hens so long as the adjacent neighbours are supportive and there is sufficient space and infrastructure for the hens.
- As long as animals could have proper care and not be a nuisance to the neighborhood. Periodic checks or licence renewals based on these factors would be helpful.
- I don't see why there should be a prohibition of hens in urban areas as long as the owner is adhering to bylaws and the hens are treated humanely and live in quality living conditions.
- With bylaw ensuring that it is acceptable. Hold the OWNERS responsible!! The animal only does what OWNER makes them do. They are very complicated with that....
- Provided neighbors approval was a mandatory part of this process, this bylaw amendment is agreeable.
- n/a
- As long as they are taken care of and people can call and complain about poor conditions. Maybe they would need a license and some sort of inspection scheduled
- Pending neighbours approval
- I support this bylaw amendment if all the above criteria is met and the welfare of the hens are ensured.
- Enforcement shall be paid for by noncompliant owners. Foul smell is cause for closure.



- Totally depends on the animal. Chickens provide eggs for people and are relatively easy and clean.....clearly pigs wouldn't be the best of ideas.
- It would be great to have that in the community; however, it should not be up to the neighbours or neighbourhood association because it's not fair to let them have that much control over your life.
- I agree
- I don't see any issue with people having hens in the city so long as they are being probably looked after and cleaned up after
- These are the type of changes we need to explore when looking for lower carbon solutions to the environment. Done right this could have a very positive impact on a communities wellbeing. Done wrong could set it up for problems. The risk is worth the return.
- As long as these rules are actually going to be enforced via permits, etc. and not having to tattle on the neighbours for keeping a cow in their backyard...
- Having other animal options, public will consider other than dogs which are usually aggressive
- We want backyard hens!
- But noise and odorous must be contained
- Livestock can pester neighbours.
- If the coop is clean and hens are well treated, why not?
- Owners should be allowed small livestock as long as they are not a nuisance
- Why not?
- N/A
- People should be able to raise them if they are properly cared for
- As long as these conditions are met I would see no issue in owning hens.
- As long as the animals pose no threat to the community and the owner can meet the 5 animal welfare laws, there should be no issue. However for animals that are non-native or exotic, pet owners should have to apply for approval prior.
- As long as neighbours support and good conditions are found it would be of minimal disruption.
- People should be allowed to raise animals as they wish within reason.
- Noise and cleanliness will need to be taken into consideration
- Exclude neighbors , too many nimby jerks.. actual judge noise levels when there are complaints
- need to be done
- All support animals and maybe others should be allowed.
- Dog, cats, rabbits, hamsters, gerbils and fish are not the only companion animals for humans.
- I have always liked the idea of urban hens and I think Calgary is way behind the times making them okay.
- Livestock can be kept in city if done properly and should be allowed if done properly
- As long as their are evaluations on a case by case basis
- I support the ownership of backyard hens and other agricultural animals: goats etc.
- Why? It seems simple enough.



- I am a little hesitant about this proposal. But as long as people are responsible and dont bother the neighbors with smalls or noise.
- As long as there is a cap on how many hens and coops can be on a property.
- I think this is a good idea
- As long as there is a cap on how many hens can be on a property
- I see no reason to shoot this down. It could be beneficial to all involved and very educational for children
- I suspect that as long as the 'hens' were not too much a problem with noise, etc., no one would mind.
- Self explanatory
- Animals such as pigs & goats can sometimes make lovely household pets
- As long as the livestock is well kept and not greatly disturbing anyone I dont see why people shouldnt be able to have a hen house.
- As long as communities are in support and the animals are not disruptive ie through noise or odour issues, livestock should be permitted.
- Absolutely... there are pros to having certain animals available if desired.
- Sure I guess.
- Yes as long as the noise and other byproducts of these animals were regulated
- They can be very beneficial to have, but we would need rules in place to ensure the health and cleanliness of the animals as well as a maximum limit to ensure there is not too many on one property.
- Yes as long as no smell or noise from animals
- If it is done well this would be amazing for our city
- I think we should be allowed to have chickens, creates a healthy ecosystem and allows healthy food for owners. other livestock- no.. ability to maintain physical barriers is not as easy. chicken coop and chicken house is an easy build and doesnt take up a lot of space.
- Fresh eggs
- There isn't only one way to do things.
- Love this idea. Support that neighbours must support.
- I would support this but it should have a maximum number of hens that can be raised. Large numbers should be in farms and not in the city. Large numbers could disturb and bother neighbors when it comes to noise and smell.
- As long as there are limits and guidelines out in place so that people don't end up with too many animals
- Hens aren't super loud or make much stench, they produce eggs and are a better alternative than store bought eggs.
- "I believe that if the animal is taken cared of is given the room to live a good life (no tiny cages or multiple animals to 1 cage) then I am ok with this.



- There is not a place for any additional comments. I think that all dogs at parks or even when they go out on walks should have a mandatory traffic light flag."
- If homeowners have the reasonable space to accommodate, they should be able to house them. Homeowners though will have to be responsible to keep it clean and managed.
- People should be able to provide food for themselves if they so wish
- Support of adjacent neighbours is critical and extremely complex, as residence can change. If this law is passed, these agreements should become part of the documentation share with new home owners or residence (renters). It would be unfair to permit this, have a neighbour move out, and then new neighbours be unsupportive and the owner required to divest of the significant investment they may have made when all neighbours were in agreement.
- As long as there is a guarantee that the neighbors or adjacent home owner won't be experiencing noise of offensive smells.
- Backyard chickens etc aren't a Nuisance
- If the animal is safe and well-cared for and does not cause a disturbance to others, why wouldn't it be allowed?
- I come from a small town farming community. Animals almost always benefit the owner whether it be companionship or meat. As long as animals are safe and healthy I would love to see more in cities.
- Would love to see urban hens and agree that there will need to be balance. Education and limits on numbers would be key with reasonable enforcement. A detailed info package and waiver might be nice when purchasing a licence.
- The suggestion that hens smell and are loud is spurious at best. any animal kept in excess numbers or in unsanitary conditions will become an issue whether that animal happens to be; dogs, cats, chickens, or elephants. common sense regulation, limits on numbers per household, and enforcement are the answer rather than an outright ban.
- Yes, providing the conditions for the hens can be monitored and there can be a dispute resolution process for conflicts within a neighbourhood
- Chickens are beneficial and can reduce food costs
- You want chickens? Get chickens.
- Other kind of livestock can be very beneficial to the people who own them for example if you have a problem with overgrown bushes goats are an easy way to fix that problem
- Yea
- No additional comment.
- I believe that animals are an important to people's well being. Not everyone has a cat or dog as a pet, companion or therapy animal, so allowing for livestock is crucial to people's mental health and wellbeing.
- We need livestock in the city it helps people be self sufficient (food secure)
- Works in other jurisdictions
- As long as neighbours agree and animals have appropriate living conditions.



- Hens and goats can make great city companions but should be housed properly and living quarters clean and not smelly. This should not turn into people having mini farms either and there should be limits on the number of animals.
- It's a good idea
- Emphasis on requiring the support of neighbours, as it can be a polarizing topic
- I would like to see chickens, bees, etc. allowed on private city properties, but not to slaughter. And consistent check-ups put in place and performed, regarding the quality and welfare of the animals.
- I have no issues with this if people take care of animals.
- I think livestock provide the community with a lot of benefit. I like community gardens, community live stock. More about local produce and products
- Chickens, if well looked after, are like any other pet or garden!
- I support responsible ownership of other types of animals - provided the owners are not infringing on the enjoyment and quality of life of neighbours. My biggest concern would be noise and smell. Many communities are built too close to each other to accommodate a lot of animals.
- The people who want livestock are absolute whack jobs, usually people with mental health challenges who won't be able to care for any animal let alone one not traditionally domesticated, but I am in general in favour of fewer rules, so sure, loosen things up.
- As long as they are kept under humane conditions. It would be good for family and children to learn the importance of providing food and taking care of animals.
- Fully support this bylaw so long as there are limits to the number of animals based on type that can be kept.
- I see little reason why a responsible owner cannot care for livestock on their properties if the animal has its needs met, including appropriate habitat and being reasonably protected from wildlife such as bobcats, coyotes.
- Regular assessment needs to be done to ensure that standards are met. Courses completed for proper education
- I think it would help to diversify the city and allow people who would like to care for chickens the opportunity to do so with out having to move out of the city.
- If animals are taken care of and the immediate neighbours are okay with it, then it should be allowed. However, I would make it a yearly permit approval as neighbours change along with the promises made but not kept by the owners.
- There would have to be rules in place and be regular checked by city personnel for this to be ok
- In this day when we want to be more self sufficient it would benefit those wishing to raise their own food.
- Sounds good!
- I think a certain number of chickens would be okay for egg laying. Like up to 5.
- Backyard Hens are great!
- I don't think there's any good reason why some hens couldn't be kept. Many other large and small cities have done the same thing. It's green and low risk.



- Only if criteria are strictly enforced. This has the potential to flood animal rescues/services with surrendered and seized hens. Could cause significant impact to neighbors if left unchecked.
- Hens don't take as much room to have a good life as other animals. And if would offer a good way for people that love animals to have animals other than cats and dogs
- I honestly just like the idea of chickens in the neighbourhood. I think it is also good to let people have the opportunity to be more directly involved in their food production.
- Neighbors should have the right and opportunity to oppose legally.
- Agreement by neighbours are important with agreement by hen owner on conditions, care etc... think it could be worthwhile to have a contract in place in an effort to protect parties should a neighbour move
- urban chickens are a great idea for food security so long as it can be done humanely
- Hens are fine. No roosters.
- As long as the owner takes care of the livestock and that they are not a noise problem or problem to the neighbors....
- I would look at Kamloops urban hens bylaws seems like they have their crap together.
- I just really want a pet goat.
- Only if criteria are strictly enforced by Bylaw officers.
- If everyone affected consents then I can't see the issue.
- I have zero issues with prudent and respectful management of livestock in
- There's no reason not to support this--I would love fresh eggs from my neighbour!
- I believe Calgary should allow more livestock & bee colonies etc. on more properties, provided the maintenance and care of those animals does not create increased noise (audible machines, construction sounds, vehicles, etc.) for the neighbours.
- I want hens.
- As long as they are properly taken care of and sanitary
- Why not
- Nothing to add
- receiving Support from adjacent neighbours
- I do not see how urban hens would harm anyone, as long as there are standards for their living conditions to prevent maltreatment of the animals.
- SO long as the animals are being well cared for and the slaughter is humane and not done in view of anyone who could be disturbed by the sight.
- let people have their criters
- it will be good to have fresh farm eggs on the back yard
- I honestly could not care less about urban hens and other animals as long as they are well taken care of, have enough space, and the smell/noise does not bother neighbours.
- with the exception that we should not allow livestock everywhere. I believe it would be better to have neighborhoods that allow livestock while others can refuse. If I can get in trouble for having grass grow higher than 10 centimetres to save on watering I believe having livestock should be looked



upon as something more than just something somebody can have in their yard in any neighborhood if they so choose.

- Times are tough, help people get the resources they need to support themselves
- Could provide food for people
- Hens, ducks, etc = self sustainability
- So long as the animals in question are not being placed in detrimental living conditions, I see no reason that responsible ownership and urban food sustainability initiatives can't proceed. An urban hen is much lower maintenance and threat/nuisance than many dogs, so opening bylaws to accommodate a greater range of animal companions seems logical.
- Animal ownership should be based on merit and outcome, not species. Any animal that provides net benefit and causes little to no harm should be permitted, regardless of species. Any animal that causes harm should not be permitted, regardless of species.
- Keeping hens is a great way to cut down on factory farming, provided the hens are properly cared for. Chickens are sensitive creatures who need to be recognized as more than a profit margin.
- Provided there is a numbered limit allowed.
- But it HAS to be case by case.
- It can have possible noise complain. But as long as neighbours are supportive, it should be allowed.
- Provided poorly kept hens or other livestock is addressed by city should a neighbor complain.
- I would support any grow your own food program.
- Allows for those looking to integrate a sustainable life style into the city, cuts down on costs of food
- Don't see why not.
- As long as it's managed properly I see no issue with this.
- Livestock should be allowed in calgary as long as they have the proper living space.
- People should be allowed to provide for their own families in a way that does not increase the damage currently being done to the environment.
- Some animals are used as comfort / support people (Mt. Royal University) during exams. I do not have a problem with my neighbor have chickens, rabbits, pig, mini horse. I would not want a Rooster (morning call) and they do not allow a smell to permeate the area. Responsible pet ownership regardless of animal is the key.
- Times are tough and fresh eggs would be great!
- The proposal, as outlined above, would allow Calgarians more latitude for meeting their needs/chosen lifestyle, while prioritizing the needs of the animal(s) and considering the needs of the community. Case by case evaluation is definitely called for given the broad scope.
- Honestly, as long as care and a good standard of life for hens / other livestock can be DEMONSTRATED, I'm all for the bylaw amendment.
- As long as conditions for the animals are good and neighbors accept this seems reasonable.
- Money is not flowing for people right now, If they can grow their own food on their owner property, then why not! I'd rather spend money to feed my food, than grass that does nothing to improve my livelihood



- As long as the owner can responsibly provide for the animals needs they should be allowed to keep the animal
- Urban farming is a safe practice that can also be used in early childhood education settings too!
- We need to be allowed to be self-sufficient. Eggs, chickens, rabbits, goat milk eg.
- People should be able to have the animals that they want as long as the surrounding community approves it, the animals have proper living conditions and the owners have proper knowledge and training.
- This all seems fine to me.
- This is a great opportunity for children to learn responsibility and to assist with groceries and natural food sources.
- As long as there was not an increase in unsanitary conditions and more pests (mice, rats, squirrels, etc) are attracted to neighbourhood.
- I have no problem with urban hens / small livestock within city limits, as long as certain criteria is met including: animal welfare, size of lot, animal housing facilities.
- Chickens provide more organic resources the public can use to their benefit. They can also be used for social innovation to all public communities
- Other animals ie. Hens can help provide healthy food for families and neighbours, and help the public appreciate the benefits of other animals not typically found in the city.
- Hens would be okay if properly done. It's done successfully elsewhere. "Other livestock" is so broad a term, I'd need more details.
- If all the conditions listed above are met, it seems reasonable.
- If the right conditions are met. Why not?
- It is good for people to know where their food comes from. Our food supply is often contaminated with toxins. It also makes people give farmers of free range livestock more respect as it is a lot of work to care for animals properly. Good education for children as well.
- If it doesn't affect others then why not?
- Hens are fine. Pot bellied pigs are fine. Miniature horses are fine. Roosters - nope :-)
- If we are able to keep small livestock like chickens, we will be able to be more independent of stores, and be able to sustain ourselves using the space on our property.
- This is done in other cities in Canada
- As long as it does not affect the peaceful enjoyment of properties that are nearby, smell and noise
- As long as people know what they're doing, follow the rules and take good care of the animals I don't care if people keep animals like chickens.
- I think it would be great if we could have our own chickens! I love fresh eggs.
- I lived in a residential agricultural neighbourhood in Powell River. Loved buying fresh eggs off neighbours on both sides, They also had rabbits and all kinds of food! We need more local sources of well treated animals for milk, eggs, and meat.
- Livestock is great
- if CBEO can support his decision with fact-based reasoning and there is a review possible



- Only if there was a limited amount of hens and they would need adequate living and roaming space.
- urban hens would be great
- Should have human rights to food
- Any livestock would need to be properly fenced or cooped in to prevent noise from roosters and attracting of predatory wildlife to urban areas
- Chickens are fine.
- I like
- Calgarians want to be more self-sustaining and support local. This by-law would encourage that and set a positive precedence for economical and environmentally progressive urban living
- As long as long as the animals are well cared for.
- The ban on urban chickens is antiquated and should be updated to align with modern trends and demand.
- I see no issue with responsible pet ownership or livestock ownership.
- As long as the animals have the space and care they need.
- this is SO progressive. Having urban livestock can help urban citizens become less disconnected from our food. We are a farming province, why not. Plus chickens and goats and pigs are awesome.
- As long as the neighbors are fine with it
- A small amount of hens should be allowed on properties in Calgary. Other livestock should be considered on a case by case basis.
- Only on approved land and with a maximum amount no sales to be made from the property
- People who pay taxes should within reasonable limits, be allowed to utilize their land the way they choose to as long as noise and sanitary levels are adhered to.
- Neighborhood should have a say for allowing livestock. There should be limits in place per animal type and an overall limit of animals per household.
- I agree with the above criteria as being reasonable for allowing additional livestock
- I think support animals are very important and much needed resource for people suffering from mental disorders. The animal must be well cared for with proper living quarters etc pen/hutch and animal waste left on property for out if respect to all neighbors and community.
- hens and potentially other livestock may have little offsite impacts, but may be a fantastic addition to certain households
- Sure for smaller animals or ones that wouldn't interfere with neighbor's enjoyment of their property
- As long as the animals are properly contained and trested well, not a nuisance to the public.
- As long as the animals are cared for properly, I don't see why people can't have them.
- Conditional approvals with a 1 year evaluation period. During which neighbours can rescind without justification their endorsement of the permit
- I think it can be done without disturbing others and will contribute to sustainability. Hens are not more annoying to neighbors than pigeons or dogs that bark all the time etc.
- It is time



- Not all people can afford to buy land or farm in order to own 10 hens for fresh eggs. No all people can live in rural areas. I am a nurse and need to live in city, but would not mind to have few hens in my back yard.
- I support urban hens. I'm not sure about other livestock. Depends what you mean. I would not want people to start buying pigs as pets that would then end up in a shelter.
- As long as there are rules regarding the number of hens allowed in a yard I don't see how this should be any different than having a different type of bird.
- If a safe environment can be achieved, why not?
- Chickens can be a healthy part of a productive garden. I would worry that many would get chickens without proper heated enclosures in the winter or space for the chickens to roam freely.
- Livestock do provide good things to the community.
- All animals, including birds should be properly cared for. There is no acceptable reason to have any living being housed or confined in poor conditions
- As long as they are housed in a humane and clean environment and there is a cap on how many one can have
- This doesn't sound like it is opening it up for just any property. I support a case by case decision making. This will ensure there is enough property to house and care for the animals properly.
- Appropriate policy should be in place to ensure that the needs of each animal is met. IE, guidance on the requirements of a chicken coop that ensure the hens can survive the winter in the coop. Also clear guidance on how to dispose of a dead hen.
- Not animals to be butchered only eggs/pets
- Prevent roosters or limit to 1
- As long as suitable living is provided I think it is a great idea.
- As long as they are being kept as a pet and not being used to sell their eggs and etc
- Love the idea of back yard chickens
- Give people a place to go with their pet pig etc
- I support hens but not other livestock just yet.
- Seems fair. Worried about noise levels.
- If people can support local and NOT horrific factory farms then yes yes yes allow hens to be cared for WITH SPACE to roam in people's backyards.
- As more people strive to improve their own access to food and teach the younger generations how to manage this, I have no issues with chickens as they aren't a problem. Roosters may carry some noise concerns but are only needed for breeding, so aren't mandatory when having a back yard chicken coop.
- Support from neighbours should be optional if the owners of the livestock can provide for the animals on their own.
- Hens are useful and do not crow like roosters
- I don't care what pets people have as long as they are properly fed, sheltered, clean and reasonably quiet.



- As long as they don't have a rooster that crows loudly
- Seems to work well in other municipalities; supports policy reason of eating locally produced food
- Urban hens, as long their numbers are controlled should be beneficial.
- Self sufficient neighbour's will equal in a stronger neighborhood
- They are relatively quiet and provide eggs to family and possibly neighbors, it could be the start of us cooperative to help each other
- Yes if this includes goats
- Hens and any other sort of livestock should be allowed as long as people have space and take care of them. Not everyone can afford to go to the grocery store every week and it's also a healthier source of food.
- So long as all affected parties are happy, it shouldn't be an issue
- I would like to buy locally produced eggs, or raise my own hens.
- I am ok with hens and ducks, not ok with larger animals...people would get ridiculous ideas about having cows and full sized pigs.
- People must ask all effected neighbors if this is acceptable with some sort of form to be signed by all of them.
- Makes sense
- People should be able to responsibly have chickens and small barnyard animals (goats and sheep - not to exceed four per household); but only if they have at least a quarter-acre of land for the animals to roam in and the appropriate shelters.
- Goats are an eco-friendly way to keep grass short. Hens provide eggs/food. As long as noise and upkeep of property bylaws are enforced like all other property, why not?
- If people are able to properly care for animals in an urban setting and not cause damage or harm while doing so, why not
- Why not really
- I believe that as long as any animal's needs can be sufficiently met by the owner then they deserve the privilege of housing any animal they so choose.
- Safe living environments for all animals
- If handled responsibly, I think it's fine if people want to keep a few hens and produce their own eggs.
- So long as the animal is treated humanely, they should be permitted in city spaces.
- If suitable and supported, count me in.
- If everyone in the area is on board then why not?
- So long as it doesn't impact my property value.
- As long as rules are followed and the chickens/hens are safe and healthy why not!!
- Yes, if you had to meet with an bylaw officer and prove that you have sufficient living conditions for chickens.
- People should be allowed to have animals if they can take care of them and have appropriate comfortable living conditions for the animal. As well as on going vet care
- If people have the facilities to house them within city limits and want them let them



- As long as the process is fair for everyone involved
- Assuming enough guidelines are created to ensure proper care, noise, waste control
- chickens are cool. as long as these chickens do not disturb the neighbors, are provided with a proper living condition and treatment it will be alright. but there needs to be a way to monitor whether these chickens are being properly cared for
- I don't have a leaning one way or another on this matter
- Detachment of society from the basics of nature is damaging to the human physic and turning us into a society of nieve twits.
- Nothing a prior wrong with livestock. Regulate and enforce but do not ban
- Yes/no is too broad. Certain livestock (goats/llamas) are cost effective for landscape control. Aviary (chickens) can cause noise disruption. Therefore, my current answer is 50/50 split with your current answer system.
- Anyone should be able to own any animal as long as they have the required space and supplies to care for the animal. Aka, not having a goat live in your apartment, it needs so many square feet of yard and outdoor home for it
- I don't mind when people keep livestock as long as they can prove that they have the proper resources to care for the animal.
- Livestock is too broad a term, it needs to be specified so we are not greeting "barnyards" in the city. This is a major metropolitan city-not a good old western town. Absolutely neighbours need to be consulted and limis put on how many of a species in a specified area.
- I believe we should consider this as there are benefits to the community (education of our food sources for example) that should be investigated. My concern is - we can't control dog issues. This is an added burden on bylaw staff. More would have to be hired to handle the increased work load.
- Depends on the livestock and size of property
- If the number of coop permits are limited and dispersed broadly through a vicinity. Neighbors must agree. The area must be well kept, the animals must be in good health and it must not be in an area that attracts coyote or dangerous animals.
- Hens provide no disadvantage to surrounding neighbours
- I think all the above criteria would address concerns about having livestock in Calgary.
- I would like the option to own some chickens
- Hens should be allowed not roosters.
- As long as there is a limit to the number you can own, I support this
- I support responsible ownership of animals, like hens and other small livestock. Owners must ensure enclosures are kept clean and that smell does not become a problem.
- Hens and other live stock should be allowed in homes because they can give resources to the people who might not have the money for the resources living in the home
- Humans should not be prevented from raising livestock for food, eggs, etc. if they are doing so while providing proper care, feed, living space, shelter, etc. for the livestock.
- animals such as pot bellied pigs, miniature horses and donkeys, or rabbits can be considered as pets. As long as breeding of these is excluded,



- Yes.
- If done responsibly, this can be beneficial.
- What is there to explain? As long as people are appropriately catering for their animals why can't they have them?
- I believe urban hens can be a great addition to a home, so long as the owner is responsible in ensuring the hens are in a suitable environment and that they practice appropriate cleaning of the chicken coup/yard.
- I see no problem with this if supported in the above mentioned manner
- Sure why not.
- Allowing people to be more self sufficient by growing more vegetables and/or having hens is beneficial to everyone in the long run.
- I too would like chickens.
- Only so long as every neighbor within audible/scent range has input.
- I think there should be a mandatory course for these calgarians to take. It should cover material in the Canadian Codes of Practice for that specific species to ensure the needs of the animal is covered. They should also be obligated to vaccinate their chickens, since there's the risk of diseases spreading to/from the wild bird populations, as well as diseases spreading to/from people.
- I think it's a great idea to allow urban hens as long as the above is followed. It would be great for the community and also lead to more sustainability by less eggs needing to be shipped from other places leading to more greenhouse gases.
- With what is outlined here and given they have proper amount of land and distance between neighbours (roosters are especially loud) there should not be a problem
- I want a couple chickens
- Bring on the backyard chickens!
- My neighbour can have pigeons fly all over but I can not a few hens in a hen house. I do not understand how that is fare.
- However, there aren't enough bylaw officers currently to enforce bylaw offences for the many tens of dogs owners allow off leash in city parks, playgrounds and school ground on a daily basis so how is the city going to ensure hens etc are being properly housed and cared for on an ongoing basis.
- Health and safety of the community should be a priority when considering animals in yards.
- There needs to be some sort of mechanism to deal with potential noise/smells associated with urban hens as well as other livestock.
- It allows people to be able to grow and harvest their own food without the heavy cost and responsibilities that a large farm has
- Goats to mow the lawn
- As long as it's not causing problems
- I would support this given that animals receive adequate care.
- As long as they aren't disturbing the neighbours and can be properly cared for on the proposed property.



- Permaculture and self-sustainability are coming to the forefront of many people's minds. No harm in being ahead of that curve to layout guidelines before people go rouge first.
- While I would support it, this could be called teasing/feeding wildlife. I imagine there would be an increase in coyote/bobcat incidences.
- As long as the above conditions are met, I would support this amendment.
- As long as neighbours agree it should be fine. Neighbours must have a say.
- growing chickens would be an amazing. In addition, people should be allowed to have a pet mini pig or other small livestock of they can properly provide for them.
- Having a few hens in a large (not small) garden should be ok if kept clean. No cockerels.
- The lifestyle of the animals always need to be the chief concern but hens can live happily in urban settings.
- There can be zero disruptions of neighbouring property including sights, smells, and sounds.
- Would support free range hens and more local sustainability
- As long as a good standard of care is observed and neighbors support there should be no difference if it's a dog or a goat
- Only if criteria are strictly enforced.
- As long as adjacent neighbors are in agreement and all the requirements for the hens are in place this should be allowed on private property.
- Chickens are birds . If you can have a budgy. You should be able to have a damn chicken
- Needs to be closely regulated for sanitation purposes and waste disposal.
- This is very straightforward.
- I've had hens on a farm before and know that 2-3 alone are quiet and easy. Also, the animals have a good life, the eggs taste amazing and everyone involved loves watching their personalities and being active taking care of them.
- As long as they won't be disruptive to those living near the home in noise, smell or unsightly views that would detract from their ability to enjoy their own home. And the animal is being cared for.
- Neighbours must be on board!
- If you can provide adequate space and care for animals it should matter if it's a cockatiel or a hen, a pig or a dog. The only thing that matters is the animal is adequately cared for.
- Some livestock make great emotional support animals.
- Promotes food sustainability. Application must include proof of ability to maintain and support and of training on purposes livestock.
- If done properly certain animals can be quite safe and clean.
- Urban hens and other farm animals are usually only a nuisance when the owners are irresponsible. Perhaps a training course requirement before you can get a permit would be wise.
- No problem with people having chickens in the right environment.
- I support greater integration of humans and animals.
- Seems reasonable
- If the owner can suitably take care and handle the livestock it should be fine.

- As long as the manure is removed regularly, hens can be a great way of eliminating bugs.
- There are many people who would love to rescue animals who are unable to based on limitations.
- I support -
- As long as animals are well cared for and have adequate space, they should be allowed in communities that want to allow them.
- Homeowners should be allowed whatever they choose as long as the animals are looked after properly are they aren't a nuisance to surrounding neighbours
- Traveling the world where chickens are kept there can be more benefit than nuisance. Worry about them in our winters though.
- I have no problem with this
- As long as the livestock and other animals don't get out and begin roaming, this would be fine.
- Depends on what other livestock are and what rules and regulations are put in place to ensure animals aren't being a nuisance to other Neighbours.
- As long as there is appropriate space and does not cause problems for neighbours
- As long as it's a small number of chickens
- I think that as long as all of the neighbours (within a certain distance) support the hen owner, it would be ok.
- We should be allowed to have any animal we want if proper care and well being can be provided
- Good for sustainability though i support more of a plant based diet.
- For all dog complaints.
- Evaluated on a case by case basis makes sense.
- Everyone should be allowed to have chickens. Only roosters should need agreement from neighbors, as roosters are often [removed]
- As long as they are cared for
- With the assumption there would be a limit on the number of support animals in one home, and that the impact (odour, noise) would not negatively affect neighbours.
- I would love to raise a hen, collect the eggs daily
- As long as there are no unwanted noises, smells, or animal attacks.
- Townhouses, duplexes, multi family units should not be eligible to house chickens. Other than that I support chickens in the city no more than 4 adult hen's per house hold. Do the vets in the city know how to treat a chicken? Owners and care givers of chickens need to know what they are doing.
- Provided the owner took on the expense of insuring a safe and healthy environment for the chickens. Cleaning up after chickens is a big job.
- Neighbours must know and be in favour
- I would support this if there was an application process to have them on your property, and the application process included statements from neighbors on support or non-support. Also there would have to be bylaw enforcement follow up on complaints
- If there is adequate monitoring of the hens and perhaps a limit to the number of hens allowed so they are not considered a nuisance



- I believe people should be allowed to raise chickens if they have the space and numbers are controlled.
- The city limits are further expanding and it allows individuals with larger properties to have different throws of animals. Restrictions and bylaws would be needed to ensure people are following the rules and not causing undue duress to these animals if they are confined to small spaces.
- With a maximum number of livestock all animals should be allowed
- Leave me alone on my property
- People have differing concepts of pets. Non-traditional urban animals are not much different than a dog, cat or rabbit. There should be a limit on numbers for any animal type after which any higher number must be approved based on a knowledgeable assessment of living conditions.
- Although would be concerned about smell, noise and feed attracting rodents or birds
- N/A
- There should be some after-the-fact review capability. E.g. the animals weren't as quiet or contained as they were expected to be.
- Similar rules for other animals as long as looked after and not annoying neighbors.
- This could be an option for diet specific restrictions and help keep the importance of live stock in our chain supply
- I think people should have that choice
- I support this amendment, also limit the number of animals allowed given the living space.
- As long as the odours are kept to a minimum, people without AC, sleep with open windows, we don't need to smell the stench. Have you driven by a pig or chicken farm? Very stinky!
- I am not sure why urban hens are banned in the first place. I could be convinced by clear well constructed and logical arguments.
- Keeping your own hens would allow people to grow their own food and allow to save money.
- As long as the animals needs are sufficiently met.
- Keeping hens offers easy access to food (eggs), teaches children/families about nature/the environment/ agriculture, developing understanding and empathy for these things.
- As long as the animal is not a detriment to the neighborhood, ie smell, noise, etc I see no problem.
- Depending on size and safety of the animal. Supervision and strict requirements for environment and treatment be enforced and review on a timely basis.
- I agree with the limitations placed above, and would be ok with livestock being permitted, based on those limits. But even if you don't approve this, please approve the urban hens!
- I've experienced people having chickens in my neighbourhood (across the street) & there were no issues at all - a responsible owner
- Yes as long as there are resources to ensure adequate care.
- n/a
- Only with present and future neighbors approval.
- They can keep chickens in Vancouver, and there seems to be no negative association.
- educated hen ownership can be green ways of pest control and urban self sustainability



- Yes but “suitable living conditions” needs to be well-defined and must require owners to maintain conditions that don’t create a nuisance for neighbours. There will also need to be a process for when a new neighbour moves in. It wouldn’t be fair to the hen owner to have to get rid of their hens because someone new moves in next door. The new neighbour should be required to go through a trial period before rejecting the hens.
- It seems as though you have covered all you bases.
- As long as people are taking care of them and aren’t too close to their neighbours. They’re a lot of work and can be a nuisance quickly if people are allowed too many.
- I want Hens
- livestock have been in alberta since its inception. only recently have we not allowed it in city areas. As long as issues are addressed and cleanliness and noise controlled. this shouldnt be a issue
- we should have the right to grow/have our own food.
- As long as clean & hygiene and no noise or odour issues. A limited number of animals.
- Most cities allow small and quiet livestock to be kept in urban areas. The only issue I can see is an increase in pests & animal abuse by those not particularly educated in animal husbandry. Permits and spot checks should be utilised to prevent this.
- Why not? If you provide a healthy environment for an animal and it won't bother the neighbours, I'm all for it.
- no need for such strict measures. case by case basis is just bureaucracy; an invitation for bias and discrimination.
- Postive benefits
- Its just a good idea
- They are part of providing food!
- As long as they follow the laws and do things the way they are suppose to be done. I don't see the problem in raising livestock if one is doing it right.
- As long as they are properly taken care of.
- I see no problems with owning livestock and farm animals as long as they are well taken care of and live in safe, suitable environments.
- Hens are loving pets, but they have specific requirements.
- As long as the neighbours approve I see no issue.
- Urban chickens are a great way to support food security and contribute to a greener and more sustainable environment.
- IF: all neighbors within a distance that thec animals could be seen, smelled or heard we're approached and were in unanimous favor of the animals being permitted.
- I really want chickens!
- Hens can provide nutrients / organic food (eggs), for families / individuals.
- As long as the animal is cared for properly and neighbours are aware then i do not see a problem with owning "livestock" animals as pets.



- Hens could be introduced in certain neighborhoods and only if coops are pre-approved as humane and safe.
- Good idea
- As long as there is appropriate living conditions and appropriate care, why not?
- For anyone trained, with suitable housing, there is nothing wrong with having hens for the fresh eggs. No noisy roosters though.
- I find it could be recreational to have types of livestock in your backyard
- To me, an animal is an animal. As long as they are looked after responsibly and do not annoy neighbors, it should not be an issue
- Couple chicken in every other household should not be of risk to a large city
- People should have the right to raise small quantities of small livestock on their private property.
- home chickens would be a great local thing.
- Provided the animals don't make excessive noise or have excessive smell and can be reasonably cared for while providing companionship and food security, I don't see a down side to allowing them. Imagine, never having to mow your lawn again because your goat loves to do it for you. I don't even have a lawn, but I still think it would be great.
- As long as neighbours are not opposed I think it is fine
- As long as proper rules are in place, I see no problem with the idea.
- As long as all parties that may be impacted by someone raising livestock at their home are ok with it, and cleanliness, odours & noise are kept at an acceptable level
- I think everyone has a right to pets on their property, even hens.
- If suitable living conditions were available for specific livestock and public safety was not compromised.
- Hens are great for people, they provide food and can be incredibly helpful for this with mental illness.
- I lived with Chickens as a kid (not in Calgary) and there are lots of benefits.
- As long as proper precautions are taken into place I would support this. This means that prior to purchase, an official would have to deem the above clauses to be true.
- Na
- Chickens are great and can have benefits to lots of pest
- Community benefit
- Urban farming is a good way to alleviate food insecurity.
- That just sounds great! As long as all the conditions are followed.
- hens would be a good source of income for some (selling eggs etc.)
- Knowing that I could provide a loving and appropriate home to "urban hens", I would support it. However, knowing that some others on my street who have demonstrated horrible animal welfare would also be granted the opportunity to have these hens, I would not support it. Much like any animal, these hens would be considered pets and should be granted the same considerations as a dog or cat would be. There is also the risk of stray hens flooding either the shelter or becoming a neighbourhood issue.



- I fully support urban hens being allowed
- fully support this provided that owners are responsible. I believe a standard needs to be set in order to maintain and uphold the quality of care needed to do this.
- Live stock is a broad term used. If people care for their animals and take into consideration their well being we should be allowed to own them. In some countries rabbits are raised for food so they would be "live stock" yet we consider them pets.
- Some have allergies that make a dog or cat an unsuitable or unwanted pet.
- More control over no processed products such as eggs
- I think livestock is a great idea
- As long as there is not a lot of noise and they stay on said private property
- Animal livestock facilities in city should have an inspection performed and must obtain city permits.
- Why not. If a person wants hens as a pet, let them have it. But it should be kept to a certain number that isn't too high
- It is a great idea
- If owners adhere to bylaws
- Small, properly housed livestock should be permitted with neighbour approval.
- Urban hens is a great idea!
- I am for urban hens as long as they aren't noisy I suppose.
- Allow hens. Just noise levels should be maintained along with proper enclosures to secure the animals and keep out predators.
- I think as long as the hens were kept safely and their coops were kept clean and the smell wasn't bad for the neighbours, this would be fine.
- It will add freedom
- I don't see why not
- I think this can create strong community building, and aligns with the values of Calgarians
- That sounds wonderful! I love hens, my uncle has some. Let's please AVOID ROOSTERS though. Way too loud and they should be prohibited.
- Small flock 1-5 hens only. People are looking for greener gardening and self sustainability options now more than ever with food security being a growing risk factor for our population. Get Calgarians working again. Focus on attracting industry and safely opening businesses, lowering taxes. Don't allow pigeons, not a source of food, they easily can fly away and we could end up with large wild flocks causing damage and added cost to our city.
- I chose the answer yes, because what was proposed are red herrings to deter the person engaging in their survey about specific dog bans.
- I have no problem with chickens in Calgary
- As long as people are responsible and respectful, let them own what they want.
- Doesn't really affect me
- Very supportive of hens with proper care and proper building permits.
- variety in raising different animals can improve quality of life



- Citizens do this anyways without the bylaw. May as well allow it at this point.
- So long and they are cleaned up and cared after properly
- As long as the owner has a safe place for the hens and there would need to be a limit on how many can be owned. Again the chicks are very cute but hens can be noisy and a little messy but can provide food. I think a licensing system (questionnaire) would need to be in place to keep control.
- This is tricky one for me. I think having livestock can be done properly but I think this could also open our city up to lots of headaches between neighbors.
- Urban hens should be approved by a city representative and property owners should be subject to regular inspections.
- Only IF the city has the proper resources to ensure compliance and do welfare checks regularly.....given dog parks, green space off leashes are not monitored regularly....I'm skeptical that this can be delivered correctly. And the only ones who will suffer is the animals
- So long as the animals are well cared for and not a nuisance to neighbours than I see no issue. Though ideally you should have to apply for a permit. Show your space to an official, prove knowledge of the care of the animal, and check in with neighbours.
- Chickens and the ability to have your own fresh eggs
- Eggs for all
- Allow goats too.
- You should be able to raise and have a more sustainable life
- If it's of benefit for a person, animal and the community then it's an amazing thing to allow the freedom and options to have other types of animals on property.
- given the crisis we are in and the fact there were food shortages, this should be highly considered
- Adding hens and other animals that offer natural grass and weed control options would be a welcome addition to our communities.
- No roosters.
- People should be allowed livestock as long as the livestock is being cared for properly. This allows people to be more sustainable.
- I believe livestock should be allowed in any home as long as the owner can provide appropriate accommodations for the animal
- Absolutely because I think they could also be used as support animals
- As long as animals are appropriately cared for (and the bylaw states this), there is sufficient space for the animals, and they are not a problem for surrounding houses they should be permitted. Obviously not all animals could be appropriately cared for on a city lot. Laying hens would be a great start to this as would rabbits for meat.
- Fresh eggs.
- All animals show affection. Chickens are very affectionate and can help for emotional support. Chickens are quieter than most dogs so as far as noise level goes I wouldn't be concerned. Fresh eggs can help a low income household feed their family. Raising chickens is very inexpensive.
- I think having small livestock can bring more joy to neighborhoods and provide food (eggs)



- Must be a closely watched and extremely regulated process. Animals MUST have good living conditions and abuse should be completely unallowed, with permissions to have live stock revoked immediately, if not permanently.
- This would be a benefit to individuals and communities. The cities current restrictions are ridiculous considering we are a city that was built out of the agricultural business.
- My uncle had a hen in Calgary in the 1950's
- As long as animals are taken care of and being watched/maintained
- Support from neighbors essential. Suitable living conditions also essential. There would have to be a reasonable, timely way to resolve issues between neighbors should they arise after everyone has approved the animals. Ex. Maybe they aren't keeping things as clean as would be safe/reasonable etc.
- As long as said livestock is cared for and does not produce any undue disturbance, third fresh produce (i.e. eggs from hens) could be very beneficial for better eating habits and better knowledge of where our food comes from.
- I think hens in the city would be a great benefit to communities all over Calgary. So long as the hens are properly cared for. Nothing beats healthy fresh eggs from a happy hen.
- Long as it does not cause problems i see no issue with that idea.
- Providing ways for people to responsibly increase food security and local food production is a net positive in my books!
- some properties are quite large and have the rooms to be able to house a small amount of livestock for ex chickens for eggs
- However would be concerned about noise, predators, smells, sanitation (could be unfounded, just speculating). There should be some limit as to the number of hens.
- From what we have heard from other communities, having hens in cities has been successful.
- Responsible pet ownership should be mandatory as well as the animals permitted not being a nuisance
- People have been agitating for this for years. If the livestock is safe from outside interference (I don't want random weirdos feeding my hens corn chips or trying to "save" them) and is adequately cared-for, it would be a great addition to the neighbourhood. Would also welcome bees, as we have many fruit trees and bushes in the area.
- If it can be ensured that livestock owners are responsible and do not affect the neighbors around them I think it's a great idea
- As long as suitable living conditions are met it should be allowed. Also provided that the animal doesn't cause major odours for neighbours.
- Less cruel and eggs!
- When kept clean, would benefit both naturally and financially.
- This is a positive step towards food security
- Hens would be ok. Not as convinced for other livestock.
- If there are limits (reasonable amount, say under 3 chickens or other animals)and they are subject to the same nuisance rules



- yes
- I think if a person is willing to take in a livestock animal they should be allowed to. But I think they should be required to prove the animal is living in good conditions with proper food, and space. I know the Calgary humane society has previously had chickens up for adoption and I think it is amazing if people want to give them homes within the city limit, as long as the animals needs are being taken care of.
- Many other municipalities have successfully introduced these programs with rules and restrictions that also protect the neighbors.
- Hens are not a nuisance
- I believe if more people knew they could have live stock this would promote more a healthier life style. (Eggs, chickens, honey)
- No roosters. Just hens.
- I would be supportive of this so long as it did not cause harm or detriment to neighbors, including lowering of property value.
- Neighbors should be alright with it.
- Healthy eggs!
- Many cities have tried this and it is working well. I have no opposition to hens.
- On a case by case basis, some livestock is not meant for the confines of the city.
- Chickens
- Livestock can enrich the area
- Hens can be great pets
- Alberta should allow hens throughout the whole province as long as permit/processing approval is fulfilled, there's no harm.
- I would love to see this occur; however, training, and strict bylaw implementation would be required with limited number of hens (4 per household). I do have concerns regarding coyotes, or bobcats attacking them at night, and smell, noise, disease, neglect and other extended issues that may occur. (escapee chickens.....)
- I like the idea of a case by case bases and involving neighbouring properties. If you involve everyone in the beginning it's less likely that you'll receive complaints later on
- Additional livestock can be beneficial, as hens are, but taking the proper precautions like those listed (neighbour approval and suitable living conditions for the animal) seems essential.
- If the needs of the animals are met, then I have no opposition.
- This is a fantastic decision! Hens and other small livestock would be welcome and promote a healthy alternative for families to source their food.
- I would hope that if this was approved people would be required to meet Serrano requirements such as housing ect and numbers based on space.
- I have wanted to have hens in my yard for years - they are quiet, friendly and can contribute to a beneficial neighbourhood (eating food scraps, eating bugs, producing food, education for young and old alike about where our food comes from)
- I think the proposed stipulations adequately cover the potential concerns/problems.



- If all neighbors agreed. . What happens when my dog barks at the birds for half the day ?
- We all need to be a little more sustainable these days. As long as you're not bothering anyone around you and the animals are well cared for, where's the harm?
- Urban livestock is awesome
- I think it supports more sustainable living and potentially can improve mental health.
- With minimum property sizes and in predetermined suitable neighborhoods
- As long as animals are being cared for properly, I see no issue with this
- ,
- I support more forms of sustainable and small scale agriculture.
- Allowing raising of chickens for egg purposes ONLY would be acceptable but slaughtering of any kind should remain against the law to prevent inhumane treatment. Chicken coops should be subject to random by law visits
- I support any animal being kept as a pet as long as ALL necessary conditions are met to keep the animal healthy, happy, and safe. I support keeping chickens, goats, sheep, cows, mini horses, as long as there are proper guidelines met such as pen and shelter sizes, and an inspection once a year to make sure guidelines are continuously followed for the well-being of the animal.
- As long as it is done responsibly, I don't see an issue
- This is great financially & environmentally.
- I support urban farming in general. I believe livestock can be included as long as it is done thoughtfully and safely.
- As long as the animals have more then enough room to live happy and move And the owner can keep everything clean and not stinky. Smaller livestock would be more suitable.
- I agree that there should be hens in Calgary because they can be great support animals!
- I grew up with backyard chickens and rabbits they are no problem, as long as they stay on your own property.
- Unsure. Would need more info
- Hens can be safely and ethically raised within city limits without hindering neighbours and causing disruption.
- Having livestock would benefit the community and lead to a more sustainable alternative than just going to the grocery store
- I believe other animals can have a place
- Livestock should be allowed in city limits if properly managed
- I am all for this wonderful idea.
- No reason
- as long as said animals are being qell taken care of and all health and safety standards are being meet , i say to each there own
- had chickens beside us and no issues. quieter than others dog that was left out all day and noise from garage workshop, less stink than neighbours smoking.



- Calgary has a unique position in the use for livestock in urban settings, this criteria could potentially allow for such animals like goats eating grasses, or other exotic pets that contribute to persons mental health, such as a pot belly pig that grew too large
- These animals can be used as support animals and long as accommodation and no one is annoyed or harmed and animals is not abused
- The criteria makes sense and is good for everyone, not only the owner.
- I think that's great, being able to have hens gives us nutritional value and they are great to own.
- i believe that urban livestock would be beneficial for communities if the animals are properly housed and treated ethically. this would benefit communities by offering a supply that is more cost effective than grocery stores.
- As long as everyone around them is taken into account more livestock could only benefit us.
- I support having small livestock (hens) as long as they are cleaned and noise kept at a minimum
- Case by case
- It is mind boggling that this is up for debate..... with all the problems in this world and the crisis our city is facing, this is priority.
- If small livestock are properly cared for and aren't bothering anybody why not? Chickens make sense, they're quiet, stay in a hutch and can provide for their community.
- this is an excellent idea as long as the hens are kept in an nurturing, healthy and safe environment. no slaughtering. You have not defined the use for these hens. Use foe eggs and garden helpers only., otherwise this leaves a grey area for abuse.
- With support from neighbours, and suitable living conditions provided for the animals, this provides opportunity for Calgarians to work more closely with their community members as well as it allows community members to eat healthier and fresher food, increasing quality of life for Calgarians.
- Sustainability
- My cousin and her partner were involved in one of the City's pilot hen projects a number of years ago. I think it is a great addition to a community and enhances quality of life.
- If they are quiet, I think hens are good pets and egg providers
- Proper amount of land needs to be paramount, along with living conditions
- You can't have a pig in your backyard unless everyone affected agrees
- Pygmy goats make great pets!
- Hens are a very odd pet to have in a residential area and as long as it has to offer a community benefit as well as support from the neighbors I think this is a great way to drive community engagement up and brings everyone closer together
- as long as the neighbors are in agreeance and they are responsible, people should be able to own the pets they like.
- as long as they are not a nuisance have at it
- We have 3 dogs, I can imagine that well tended animals other than the typical can be equally well cared for and no more of a 'bother' to neighbours and neighbourhoods.
- Urban chickens are awesome!



- I think backyard chickens (not roosters) could be beneficial and also support food sustainability. In some circumstances, animals such as goats, could be beneficial in yard card.
- Strict sanitary measures must be upheld for odors/ noise etc
- Hens on private property should be allowed as long as they are not a nuisance to neighbors or other property owners.
- No roosters please! Noise and property damage complaints must be addressed.
- I really don't have an opinion on this.
- This would be so amazing and a great step in the right direction!
- Urban hens are an additional avenue towards food security for all
- Considering there are guidelines to ensure public H&S is considered, why not?
- As long as there is support by adjacent neighbours.
- Since people are allowed to own and cage birds from other countries and wolf hybrids it only makes sense to consider therapy animals or chickens for eggs
- I support Calgaryans owning livestock as long as they are following bylaws.
- I agree with chickens and potentially other animals under these conditions
- hens and chickens will provide fresh eggs, possible meat and help gardens.
- As long as the animal is properly cared for and the owners are respectful of their neighbours small livestock should be allowed. Again, assuming they are being properly and humanly cared for.
- just yes
- If the animal has the appropriate space, the owners are able to care properly and the neighbours don't mind, I think this is a great idea.
- The care for the animals should be ethical and humane if the requirements for the birds can not be met then the person shouldn't be allowed to own them
- My biggest concern is that the animals are well taken care of and that any mess or smell associated with the animals is taken into consideration (seen to regularly by the owners). It should be established that the owners are well versed in the characteristics of the animal, what is required for proper care and that they are prepared and willing to commit to the on-going care. If they are unable to continue care of the animal that they have to notify the authority and make arrangements themselves for someone else to commit to the animal's care. Also that they are financially able to provide the care. Also that those who are renting are not qualified for such animals due to the possibility of abandonment of the animals and the potential for damage to the landlords property. Abuse, neglect and abandonment should be dealt with swiftly and severely. The rules of care for all animals should be very strict and any violation should be promptly seen too.
- There are numerous benefits to having animals, including livestock, so if it can be done without compromising sanitation in the city limits it would be a good thing.
- Great idea. Would love to see more responsible owners have chicks or other livestock in the city.
- As long as the addition of livestock to an area isn't negatively impacting any neighbours I see no problem with this. I lived in an urban area that had them and the owners made it easy for their neighbours to accept their presence.



- It is well known that hens are very beneficial to a natural environment. It is also well known that few people take care of hens properly and the stench that can be produced. I would absolutely love to have hens and would support logical bylaws regarding their safekeeping and the sanity of neighbours
- Suitable living conditions is key here, but I don't see an issue with this.
- Truly believe that everyone has the right to try and grow or breed their own food in a sustainable and self sufficient manner where possible. As long as the animals were kept in suitable conditions and not harmed or caged cruelly or a loud nuisance to neighbors then it is reasonable to keep animals. Similar goats for milk and cheese and to keep grass down etc. This all should be determined by the outdoor sq ft available on a property as to what can be kept to reduce the chance of hoarding or animals living in abusive or overly restrictive conditions.
- as long as the animals are well provided for and kept in their designated areas I see no problem
- .
- The hens bylaw was poorly thought out legislation, by an uninformed and out of touch council. Only the " rich " areas and aldermen and women opposed it.
- I think hens for eggs would contribute greatly to our quality of life and it is a suitable animal in an urban setting
- I have many conditions to agreeing to this, as I am a vegan, which means I don't believe any animals deserve to be "kept" / confined, or used for any purpose. In an ideal world, no animals would need rescuing either (I do have a rescue dog!). BUT if it means some animals could be rescue animals, and maybe it would open up some dialogue around animals' roles in our lives... then I'm all for it.
- With strict conditions, and only certain types of birds or small animals.
- If the chickens are well cared for and have room to peck, I have no problem with this.
- The problem is that hens must be kept clean and in clean environments in order to reduce odour. How do you regulate that?
- The more people can provide for themselves and rely less and give less money to big corporations, the better.
- As long as the hens are kept humanly and not overbred, this should be allowed.
- If supported by neighbours, I support this
- Backyard hens is a great project, but there needs to be bylaws in effect that protect their well-being.
- Support farm initiative and letting people know where their food comes from as long as they follow guidelines set out to keep the chicken healthy.
- If it was limited to a small amount of hens.
- Urban hens and small livestock would be a lovely addition to communities, allowing education and stimulation. As long as animals' safety and welfare are taken into consideration, this is a lovely engagement bylaw.
- Anyone who chooses to maintain independence in food sourcing should be allowed to
- I think it would be nice for people to have livestock (fresh eggs) if they have the space for it and it does not affect their neighbours.



- agriculture is an important part of society
- Let me own a lama
- n/a
- the hens must not cause a nuisance-excessive noise, smell, attraction of other wild animals
- But only if they are not keeping the animals with the intent to harm them. Micro-sanctuaries are a great idea.
- As long as the owner is responsible and the animal is not overly loud, I believe small quantities of livestock should be permissible
- Yes but with approval from neighbors because of the increased risk of predatory animals, noise, smells, etc. I think this will be difficult to manage.
- I have nothing against chickens. I sleep with ear plugs so no one is waking me up
- Hens/chickens should not require neighbor support, like dogs, and nuisance compliant process should apply
- I would like some hens.
- I want hens
- People should have the right to source their own healthy natural foods free of preservatives and garbage ingredients. Its absurd we can not do this already.
- Nothing wrong with having a few chickens
- I think it's healthy for people to have their own livestock, such as hens to harvest eggs. However the criteria would absolutely have to be abided by and enforced to ensure the safety of the livestock and consideration of the neighbors.
- I have no problem with livestock, if they are evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
- As long as the animals don't become nuisances either by excessive noise or by unsanitary conditions.
- No reason to not have chickens in the city. A cap of maybe 10-15 hens might be good due to space
- Allowing citizens to raise chickens will allow people to be more self-reliant when it comes to procuring eggs and is a more environmentally friendly and humane way to have eggs without supporting factory farming. Arguably, chickens are less of an inconvenient animal to have than a dog or cat as an outdoor pet. Provided citizens must follow bylaw in regard to having chickens and neighbours complaints are taken seriously, I think chickens should be allowed in the city.
- I feel like if you own your property in the city, you should be able to have whatever you'd like if legal.
- Supporting livestock in the city should be considered. So long as it is reasonable based on space and the animals are kept under proper conditions and care.
- If a person wishes to own an animal within city limits, and the animal is not a danger to the public at large, I see no reason why they should be denied ownership.
- If the resources to care for the animal is in place and there are no objections from neighbours that may be affected by their presence then this seems acceptable
- It's about time Calgary caught up with urban hens!
- I especially support this because of the case by case basis. Urban Chickens should be allowed.



- I see no issues as long as the hens are taken care of properly and do not attack anyone or any animals
 - Love the idea of being able to be more self sufficient while within city limits.
 - I am against keeping animals within the city but if the city passes the law to allow it, it must be supervised tightly!
 - My speculation would be the people interested in pursuing urban hens & other livestock would be responsible.
 - As long as there are clear definitions around providing the animal's needs and also respecting neighbours I would support this
 - No roosters, just hens. So many people will have organic eggs, which promotes sustainable living.
 - Less noise than our neighbours barking dogs
 - This should be allowed as long as animals are not being grown for food and slaughtered on premises For support pets this is okay
 - As long as neighbours are not affected there should be no problem with having livestock
 - We need to try to educate people to get food from their own backyards. Hens is a great way for that.
 - I believe it would lead to better food security in communities where hens are present
 - If a person wants to keep chickens and collect their own eggs, or just have a chicken as a pet, that's fine, but like any pet. There is a reasonable expectation that they will be cared for, not abused, and that they will be kept off of neighboring property, unless it is already established that the owner of said property is ok with the animal on site.
 - All long as the animals were cared for appropriate living area and were not a nuisance, meeting the above requirements I would support it.
 - As long as the animals have enough space and will be adequately looked after, I don't have a problem with it.
 - animals when cared for properly cultivate better ecosystems, sustainability and education to communities
 - Urban livestock if managed properly is a great way to have your own sustainability
 - Sounds like a forward-thinking option!
 - Allowing livestock and in particular hen's provides the opportunity for more food security as well as a unique opportunity it for community support and engagement.
 - That's the best way to manage it
 - "Yes. I think that's fantastic. As long as people register their hens, just like they would a dog or cat and are keeping up with appropriate conditions for the hens., ex. Clean living space, appropriate housing from weather conditions, such as roofing, warmth and feeding, water etc.
-
- As long as there is a law in place that limits the number of hens allowed at one residence and upholds a restrictive breeding guideline.



- As long as there are laws to which restrict people from letting their hens roam out front of their house so that predators don't have as easy of access to them and as long as there we fines set in place if all the above laws aren't followed."
- ONLY IF the needs and health of the animals are priority (I.e. urban living is not particularly appropriate for livestock)
- Yes! What a wonderful opportunity to let people provide for themselves.
- I think people should be able to have a chicken coop if they want it
- I don't have an opinion on this section, but don't see it being a problem unless the hens roam to off-leash parks.
- All types of animals deserve a good home. If the owner is responsible, and has the space for them.
- However letting one person have the final say in whether or not animals are to be kept in a home isn't really fair
- I'm not really for or against this, as long as it's not posing any problems with the neighbors and community and the animals are cared for then I have no issues here.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of and do not cause a disturbance.
- So long as there is an understanding of how the noise bylaw will be an integral part of the process
- Raising livestock would allow for many families to save money and reduce exposure to grocery stores with Covid 19.
- N/A
- people shouldnt have to fight to provide themselves and or family with sustainable food options. Especially when there is no harm in doing so.
- I don't actually approve having hens or other such animals due to cleanliness, noise, smell and possible neglect of such animals
- Urban farming is the future and the sooner we get a framework in place, the sooner we can find what works for our city.
- As long as it did not effect those who do not own the livestock.
- It seems thought has been put into the living conditions of animals approved with consideration to the neighbours.
- If everyone in the living situation, Such as neighbours, are okay with it and the animals themselves are taken care of properly I don't have any arguments against this amendment.
- ONLY IF SUITABLE LIVING CONDITIONS can be ensured!!!! And the neighborhood agrees. Hens are messy, noisy creatures. The owners NEED TO PROVIDE PROPER CARE.
- Hens are mostly quiet and unobjectionable creatures, and no smellier than dogs. Roosters, on the other hand have no place in the city. Other livestock needs to beevaluatd on a case by case basis.
- I think people should be able to do what they want with their own property. As long as it does not infringe on someone else's rights and keeps to city code.
- This does not mean everyone gets to have pet anythings! The entire situation must be considered (noise, smell, etc) and neighbours must have a say! How about a minimum space area for different kinds of animals? Do not want overcrowding of animals/birds!



- if people want chickens, that's not that terrible a thing. We already keep all sorts of other animals, why not hens too.
- Let us support ourselves and become self sufficient
- I feel it's freedom for people to be self sufficient.
- If livestock can be properly cared for, there is no reason they shouldn't be allowed.
- Community livestock is a great idea. Helps sustainable living and teaches understanding between rural and urban communities. Ensuring noise and smell can be kept to a minimum
- Any time a person is looking at options to fend for themselves (food wise) it shouldn't be discouraged! Perhaps, if an abundance of eggs or meat from chickens is occurring- donations to foodbanks would be ideal.
- I support it but to your point, have to ensure the owner meets the standards and parameters that would allow for suitable hen housing/living. If not, then it will attract potential issue such as other predator wildlife into the neighbourhood because of hens...so need some safety measures. Can their property be secure enough that would ward off pests/predators that could pose danger to others vulnerable citizens (children, seniors, able-bodied, etc)
- I think urban hens are a great idea and other urban stock ideas should be explored.
- Priority on adequate space for livestock and proper fencing and care.
- My only concern would be the expense and feasibility of monitoring the animals in yards. Who is going to make sure the backyard coop is well maintained and the hens are well cared for?
- As long as the animal isn't causing undesirable disruption (smells and noise) neighbours shouldn't have a say about your private property.
- If the owner of the animal is demonstrates to be considerate and responsible, I see nonissue with owning livestock.
- As long as neighbourhoods are supportive and suitable conditions available, then yes I would be supportive.
- There's already a process for my neighbours to complain, I don't think they should have to give permission.
- Exceptions to be evaluated.
- I think people could own hens
- The conditions for the animal must be suitable, and the animal can't be causing odours or excessive noise that would annoy neighbours.
- It is good for people's mental health and financial budgets to be able to produce some of their own food.
- Food security is inherently valuable and sensible. Engaging in something responsibly and without bothering your neighbours is a no-brainer and should have been status quo years ago.
- As long as the farm animals are not to be killed on residential properties, animals kept for milk/eggs/wool/pets is the only accepted case.
- Urban chickens allow people to be a little more sustainable and rely less on outside sources. Especially when there are limits in the grocery stores like there has been under a state of emergency.



- I am not opposed to ownership of any animal, as long as the owner can properly take care of the animals in question
- As long as animals are being cared for and NOT used for food
- I want chickens
- "As long as these pet owners are responsible!! Takes one person to ruin for everyone that's why there needs to be more rules in place for people wanting to be pet owners.
- These animals aren't to be discarded when the person has no funds or just gets tired of it."
- As long as the community and neighbours allow, I do not see a problem.
- Only if feed was kept in closed containers or behind closed doors to prevent rodent infestations and if manure was disposed of in closed containers on a daily basis. Keep it clean.
- If an owner is giving appropriate care then good.
- Why shouldn't we allow them? It's common in most places for people to keep chickens, etc.
- Livestock if properly maintained in the proper setting would be great I feel. Sounds and smells would be an issue but if this is dealt with I fully support this.
- animals enrich community
- As long as things don't get out of hand allowing livestock to live in a urban setting and everything is well planned and properly taken care of i see no problem.
- If people want goats and can properly care for them and have the space- let them have goats. If people want a donkey and can properly take care of a donkey and has the space for it- let them have a donkey. Etc.
- As the world becomes more crowded and land for large scale food production is in ever increasing demand, I believe having fresh eggs, goats milk, etc., should be encouraged for those who wish to do so. Whether its for their own family or as a co-operative neighbour helping neighbour effort. As long as the animals care, comfort and health are maintained, I don't see a problem with wanting to have fresh eggs, etc. For those who have the space and time, providing as much as of their own food as they want should be embraced since sourcing food locally is an environmentally responsible choice.
- Urban micro farming is a great way to support food sustainability and biodiversity.
- Lots of positives
- Livestock are still yet animals, so before they die, they should have at least some sort of a nice life.
- As long as all the neighbours were fully made aware with a news letter or email that is confirmed to be received.
- Hens are a good source of eggs
- Hens and certain livestock should be welcomed into the community. I don't think it needs to be a community benefit I think even an individual family benefit is good enough. It also encourages people to continue farming. There are often livestock that are in shelters that may not be able to live in a farm like situation and there only other option is to be adopted by a family in a more rural area.
- It is important that livestock is taken care of properly
- I would love to see more of this!



- Calgary is one of the last cities in AB to not allow backyard chickens - many other communities are successfully allowing chickens. I think they can be a valuable addition in Calgary that will benefit families and communities, under appropriate guidelines.
- Na
- who would determine if the living conditions are suitable?
- It's a great idea, however the animals should have strict criteria for a clean and healthy environment.
- Animals have proven to increase standard of living both for their owners and their neighbourhoods. I have lived in areas where people were allowed to keep goats, chickens, even horses in appropriate backyard spaces and it was a wonderful experience. Furthermore, many people are trying to return to some forms of self-sustainability, which is increasingly important for our mental health and to be connected to the land.
- i think livestock should be allowed in calgary
- Also it depends on the type of livestock but the amount of land also needs to be considered as many livestock's animals need more land than urban suburbs can provide. Welfare of animals needs to be topmost priority.
- So long as its clean.
- This bylaw would ensure that if livestock is kept in the city, it is well cared for and not neglected
- Already allow other exotic animals, not sure why livestock that are beneficial for the community and adequately cared for would be a problem.
- If they are treated right then it should be fine
- As long as people treat those hens well and there is proper oversight to ensure this, we should totally let people keep hens.
- Canadian citizens have the right to decide how, when, and what they eat, including by providing food for themselves. As hens offer both meat and egg for citizens, such animals should be permitted within city limits, as they are an animal that can be humanely, cleanly, and quietly maintained within city limits.
- Home owners should be allowed to keep a few urban hens on their property if they choose to do so, if there are suitable living conditions for the hens and if the neighbours do not object. Keeping hens to supply eggs for the family is part of sustainable living and a good use of backyard land. Personally, I have been looking forward to keeping a few hens myself and look forward to the day when the bylaw is amended to allow for this.
- Only if neighbour's support is not required.
- Small animals should be allowed as long as they aren't causing problems in the neighborhood. Again, that would be an owner that's the problem and not the animal.
- animal rights ..
- More benefits to community. Local fresh eggs.
- I think urban hens are a great idea, provided they are properly cared for and managed
- Fair
- Doesn't seem to hurt anyone and can make people happy.



- I feel this is a good idea for a couple of reasons. 1 is so that families that have a tuff time can feed there families. The second is that this could be a great experience for kids to learn how to raise and take care of these animals.
- People can have a sort of food that will support feeding.
- There should be a maximum amount of hens allowed to prevent noise and overpowering smells.
- I like the idea of backyard hens.
- As long as there is a limit, set by knowledgeable persons, on the number of animals.
- As long as the animals have a healthy and suitable living environment. Except pigeons - they are an invasive species and carry communicable diseases.
- Great idea!
- Some 'farm' type animals can be beneficial in an urban environment, as long as they are properly housed and cared for. They must not be a nuisance.
- Hens are a wonderful for families to teach children about sustainability and care for animals.
- As long as the environment permits a healthy life for the animal it should be allowed.
- Case by case with all parties n agreement is reasonable. Perhaps there could be some sort of periodic follow up to make sure conditions are being met.
- There is value for children and adults to be around farm animals, learning more about where their food comes from and discovering their personalities, natural behaviours and the work involved in caring for them. Hens in small quantities do not make any more noise than some people's dogs. When cared for properly they do not impact neighbours in any way.
- People need to feed themselves
- So long the criteria is met I cannot think of a reason why this shouldn't be allowed.
- Chickens are small
- As long as there is limits and restrictions on the owner
- There should be enough support for sustainable living conditions.
- I love animals
- Allow people to keep livestock to support themselves.
- People should be able to support themselves how they see fit
- That's awesome.
- Only in support if animals are kept humanely and their well being and environments and health are being monitored by bylaw to ensure compliance from owners. Also, only if the owner has the adequate environment set up to house the animal safely and appropriately for both its physical and emotional needs.
- Natural laying of eggs would be good for everyone.
- Keeping hens is a sustainable low impact activity and should be allowed with conditions
- Hens are the cat's pajamas. Fire [personal name removed].
- Hens can provide healthy food and garden fertilizer. They are also excellent companions..
- Henson kept for eggs seems like a wise chose



- as long as they don't disturb neighbours (being too loud/smelly/escaping), I don't see why they are any different from another pet. Just as long as they have adequate living conditions.
- About time.
- It's a good idea
- As long as people are being checked on by the City on a regular basis to ensure compliance with safe and clean conditions for the hen's, this could be a good thing.
- With proper wording for care and not being a nuisance hens can be a wonderful way to keep a yard healthy without pesticides
- If there's no roosters crowing every morning at 4 am I have no issue
- I want chickens
- Freedom
- Livestock, when kept responsibly, are no more nuisance than any domestic animal. Roosters should be given special consideration due to noise.
- It might be more convenient and easier financially to keep livestock in the city rather than paying to keep them on a farm out of the city.
- There are many forms of livestock that could be raised within the city without causing stress the animals or neighbors if kept in suitable numbers, suitable facilities and suitable maintenance.
- As long as there is a coup for the hens and they are properly cared for, perhaps with legal inspections every few months of their living conditions, I don't see why not
- If people are able to keep livestock, they would be able to support themselves more independently, which in many people's lives, is a big thing. Not to mention that strengthening community bonds is more important now than ever.
- big emphasis on neighbour support/ approval
- I support urban hens. I have kept urban hens when I have lived in other areas of Canada. Urban hens provide access to eggs from a more humane source than factory farming, require limited land and are quiet animals.
- Animals best interest should be number one. Don't approve someone simply because having a pet chicken would be cool
- It's a step towards ending factory farming and may help reduce carbon emissions by cutting out the transportation aspect
- When dealt with in a way that both supports the community and the neighboring families, this would be of great benefit to creating a sense of community that people may be missing as well as beneficial to the owner of the animals.
- The future need for people to be able to grow simple food and provide for themselves instead of grocery store for basic human food requirements should be supported. Consideration for the safety and healthy living standards for these animals needs to be ensured.
- Too many animals are killed because humans are [removed]. If anyone can offer a safe place for an animal in need, regardless of their location, then it's our responsibility to allow that person/family to help.



- However, replicating factory farm type conditions is NOT what I have in mind. Any animals should be given good lives, what would be normal lives for the animals - not like factory farm hens, for example. Animals in the city should be more like well-loved pets.
- I believe in food sovereignty. Obviously there are constraints on a city lot but as long as people are respectful of neighbors, they should be able to provide for themselves as they see fit.
- As long as hen housing and keeping is well defined so that it doesn't result in people being able to log Bylaw noise complaints, I like the idea. Again, we need the experts to define what a hen house it, how far it should be from fences, neighbours, how to keep them in the yard, what to do if one or more escapes, maintenance information, max numbers per square feet, etc.
- Must have neighbor support
- Because the animals are no harm to people, unless in a non suitable living condition. Such as abuse, teaching the animals wrong behaviour or somewhere the animal can get out onto the road. I would definitely support this bylaw amendment.
- For the Keeping all animals In the city, you must have sensible laws
- It would be a wonderful idea if the property could support it. Add a bit of life to the city urban feel here.
- I just want to make sure that the animals welfare is taken into account (no animal hoarding)
- As long as there are no roosters and neighbours agree. I also support replacing noisy, polluting lawn mowing equipment with shepherds, sheep and trained corralling dogs to trim grass. This has been done effectively in Sherwood Park, AB.
- must have support from neighbours
- Only on properties large enough to not interfere with neighbours enjoyment of their own properties, or with the consent of neighbouring properties if smaller.
- It supports food sovereignty
- As long as you're not affecting your neighbours, and being ethical, why not?
- Some people are have a genuine love for different animals and that's fine as long as they're needs are met.
- I think it is fine as long as it is supported from all surrounding neighbours.
- I fully support chickens being allowed in the city. I am ok with other animals on a case by case basis.
- As long as they are not a nuisance to neighbours - dirty, smelly, attract bugs, noisy
- Absolutely support! Growing and providing your own food is great for the environment. I have a large garden to supply fruits and veggies for my family, and adding hens to that would be great :) There would definitely need to be clearly defined rules about what would then be deemed nuisance livestock though, and how to deal with that. I'm not sure I have any suggestions, but getting neighbour approval sounds good. Get an agreement that you can't teach a hen not to cluck or goats not to bleep!
- An annual inspection to ensure the health of the animal and the cleanliness of the facility.
- I support sustainable agricultural practices and enabling people to provide for themselves. I believe this can be done hygienically on a small scale in cities.



- My only concern is WHO would responsible to ensuring these animals living conditions are "suitable" and who determines what is suitable. A city official with no experience should not make this decision, rather a veterinarian or expert farmer with experience in observing and raising these types of animals in certain environments.
- I like the idea of community benefits
- As long as animals are supported with emotional well-being and physical care and exercise. Distancing requirements from neighbours. Neighbours should not be disturbed or bothered with noise, smell.
- Urban chickens can have a positive effect on a neighborhood, providing there is no rooster.
- As long as they are responsible owners and the odor doesn't become overwhelming.
- I don't care if people own hens in their backyard
- Great idea.
- Noise, smell, size, and cleanliness should be considered. Some dogs or cats can display worse behavior than other animals.
- If the hens aren't a nuisance to people near the henhouse then let them go for it
- Within reason - i dont wsnt my neighbor to have roosters crowing at 2am or a pet pig that is not clesned up after.
- Gimme them eggs!
- I'm just a bit concerned that allowing urban animals would lead to more being neglected/ dumped at the Humane Society.
- Urban chickens are very successful in many cities. There is no reason to ban responsibly handled chickens
- Responsible pen ownership is not animal specific.
- Chickens are amazing for bug control, and, given the right living conditions and care, are quite lovely animals to have around.
- Giving people the option to own livestock not only reduces the success of mass farms that use unethical techniques like battery cages, but helps people (especially low income families) to reduce grocery costs and their carbon footprint (less waste from grocery store packaging)
- Backyard chickens are great low maintenance animals.
- Even as someone with animal allergies - I highly support this proposal for all of the environmental, personal, and community benefits. Please do not let allergies sway a decision against this. Those of us who suffer animal and environmental allergies have to deal with trees and plants and domesticated pets (and wildlife) already. Having urban hens and other livestock in the city has many benefits to outweigh potential risks.
- Why not have some fresh eggs
- I see no problem in that happening as long as the well being of the animals is ensured
- As long as livestock does not impact neighbors, and the home is kept in standards of the neighborhood
- People should have the ability to self sustain.



- I believe people should have to take a course and get a permit before they are able to have live stock for 3 reasons. 1) most people can't properly take care of their domesticated animals 2) the course will ensure that people have full knowledge of the animal they are caring for, how to care for them and resources they can call upon if they have any problems 3) requiring a permit will keep most people from getting live stock because it "Trendy" and the permit fees can go towards the training course
- Yes if they aren't being used for human consumption.
- Hens should be allowed as a test run in City. Hens would be allowed only after owner proves they have proper location and set up. After 1 to 2 yrs the city can decide to continue or end the backyard hen test based on complaints and issues.
- This would allow people to have their own chickens
- I like the idea that people can have other animals
- So long as the neighbors are on board and all the bylaws are being followed urban livestock only serves to have a positive impact on everyone involved. It's also an excellent learning opportunity for children.
- It is great for mental health
- I support this if the criteria are strictly enforced. If left unchecked, livestock (chickens etc.) would become a nuisance to neighbors and potentially create a flood of surrendered animals to the city/ calgary humane
- We should be encouraging local food sources.
- If one chooses to raise show birds (rare or purebred chickens) and they are not for consumption but the owner also maintains a clean and odorless pen/hen house. I would have no issues. Someone not cleaning up and the pen stinks or raising them for food, then I'm against it.
- It depends a little on which livestock you are referring to and how many. But if the conditions above -- particularly the one about support from adjacent neighbours -- are followed, I don't have a problem with it.
- every calgarian has a right to raise an animal. Hens are quiet and eat kitchen waste that eliminates our compost and landfill sites
- People are looking for resources to be self sustainable and hens are a decent way to do this
- Other animals also make good pets
- Animals other than dogs can provide benefits to the community, such as teaching children how they get their food or in therapy settings.
- Chickens are food
- It is nice to be able to have your own hen and perhaps pigs for slater and also meat chicken, these last two take 6 months and 10-12 weeks for growth to slater, if the property can handle the livestock I do not see why not, pigs are very clean animals, not noisy (can get out) meat chickens are not noisy either, this way people can produce their own meat and now where it comes from and what it was fed.
- Why not?



- owned chickens and they are extremely beneficial such as educational, good source of food, eggs, and are wonderful pets.
- Within reason, noise and conditions are always a factor as they are with any animal. But i do believe people with proper knowledge can have "livestock" in comfortable conditions within the city.
- Provided that they are being properly taken care of and live in suitable living conditions.
- Due diligence needs to done to make sure there are little to no negative outcomes
- As long as it doesn't disturb anyone else - do what you want in your yard
- If they can prove the animal will be cared for then they should be given the opportunity.
- Individuals wanting to be able to support their own household (eggs, meat) should have the right
- If they have proper care, why not.
- I've lived in towns and cities that have allowed chickens in backyards and think they are very useful to the community. Free range eggs are better for you and chickens. You also do not need a rooster for chickens to lay eggs, so there's a lower noise risk.
- It would be nice for people to own alternative pets within the city.
- I think it will help with community food I. E. Sharing eggs with neighbours
- As long as conditions are appropriate that should work well
- "It for neighbours to agree and the conditions must
- Be appropriate to the animals welfare"
- We need to remain self reliant.
- The strong benefit of hens as a food source as well as a pet and potential learning opportunity for younger people greatly outweighs any concern of odour or nuisance sound.
- Fresh eggs are good and healthy
- Some houses are equipped for chickens. Good practice to incorporate local sustainability practices
- Hens are not disturbing if kept in safe enclosures and clean coops. Owners should be required to pass a test on chicken husbandry.
- Urban flocks have been successful in other settings. As long as there is a clear expectation for welfare and care including housing, feeding and veterinary care.
- I think it would be ok to have a few hens if you could look after them properly, also if the space provided and proper care a larger animal could be fine as well.
- Keeps urban dwellers in touch with nature and encourages them to learn how to farm/provide for themselves
- A long as a cow doesn't move in next door, and there isn't a noticeable smell from the chickens, etc... I'd be okay with it.
- Goats are great for lawn management and people should be able to know where their food comes from especially chicken eggs
- This would need a lot of work to put through, however, I can see the benefit of allowing a limited number of poultry to be housed in a residential area.
- If laws are abided by.
- Having fresh eggs is important & animals are a good learning experience for children



- Hens are great! Just no roosters and they need to be well cared for like all animals.
- I think having urban livestock is a great idea, as long as all the neighbours are on board and there are regulations in place for the long term care and treatment of the animals ie. What happens to the hen when she stops laying eggs? Is it acceptable to slaughter the animal or not?
- "Small residential
- livestock opportunities will positively impact communities and stimulate local markets and create independence from giant evil corporations."
- Are we talking goats or are we talking chickens. I think it should depend on yard space/ or coop space for number of chickens kept and neighbour approval for other livestock such as goats (they eat everything, and smell) or pigs (can smell). Not sure that anything larger should be allowed..
- The most important part about being an owner of any pet is being held responsible for your and your pets actions. Proper living conditions and treatment of animals is essential and should be top priority.
- There are too many careless people out there
- I think as long as they're cared for properly hens in urban areas are a great idea!
- Chickens and ducks can be wonderful emotional support animals
- You should be allowed to have whatever you want as long as it's not hurting anyone or the animal.
- A great source of good in an uncertain time and easy to keep with all of the land home ie eta have access to!
- As long as the criteria above is met, I think it is a reasonable amendment.
- Support the idea of growing vegetables and animals locally.
- Chickens kept properly should not be a nuisance to neighbours but would be beneficial
- Calgarians deserve the ability to have small livestock like chickens, quail, rabbits, even goats or pigs if they have an appropriate space. Many benefits could come from having the freedom to raise our own meat/eggs for our family. Pigs and goats are great pets too, with much less incidents of predatory behavior.
- As long as other people are not negatively effected
- With suitable living conditions and care, permitting livestock in Calgary would provide multiple opportunities for community education as well as personal benefit regarding physical and mental wellbeing.
- Maybe chickens. I think hens would be very annoying for any neighbor.
- Having personally had hens on two different properties in Calgary, I am strongly in favour of approving small scale urban chicken activities within the city. The sound/odor impacts on adjacent neighbors are both well below the levels associated with dogs. I would scratch the element of the bylaw which would require support from adjacent neighbours. If one does not need support from an adjacent neighbour to have 4 dogs barking in my back yard, I see no reason why one should require such support in the case of a few friendly birds. If it's rendered legal in the bylaws, then it is entirely inappropriate to allow a single neighbor who is opposed to the idea to shut it down. In no other instance I can think of do we give a single property owner veto power over a neighbours lifestyle choices/activities on their own land. Thanks!



- As long as neighborhood is okay with it.
- As long as the animals are cared for PROPERLY and have EVERYTHING they need and do NOT disrupt the neighbors I don't see any harm.
- "I have no problem with urban hens or small livestock within the city limits.
- I do not support pigeons in any way."
- With proper regulations, living conditions, and care, many opportunities such as community education and personal benefit could be created
- Properly cared for they should be allowed
- Fully support, as long as animals are safe and healthy.
- I think having hens would be awesome. It would support the community, and let people become more self sufficient.
- I like chickens.
- No explanation needed.
- As long as they are not a nuisance and causing an issue with the community.
- I think there should be more be keeps around. Especially with declining be populations.
- Beekeeping should also be allowed within the city.
- If it doesn't affect or on the other hand it benefits, don't see a reason not to
- If all needs are met I do not see an issue.
- People should be allowed to grow their own food. Even eggs. However, too many complaints of stench or odour should be grounds for removal of the permit. Oh, people should apply for a one time permit.
- Chickens to make good pets and they lay eggs
- Hens are no more a bother than the indoor/outdoor cats that people let roam freely.
- I like chickens.
- The case to case basis is the best option for this in order to prevent strain on shelters if an owner can't handle those animals
- If someone has livestock of any kind that were originally supported by neighbours they would be grandfathered in as acceptable even if a new neighbour moved in and objected.
- In an appropriate environment where the animals can thrive and the community isn't negatively affected
- We should be allowed to have small livestock, it is a smart way to live more off the land and have something to care for.
- Like the opportunity to have other avenues.
- Urban farming is the future. Getting ahead of this inevitability, creating education, standards, licenses...these are ways to make urban hens a positive situation instead of a nuisance.
- especially with Covid, we are seeing an increased need to be self sufficient. There does need to be a limit of the # of hens dependent on the size of the property
- If there is a need then I support it as long as the requester is responsible



- As long as the are is kept clean and the animals are treated well/humanely. This would require additional enforcement officers, however, and that would increase costs to the city.
- important
- as long as the person with the livestock abide by city rules and have the understanding of how to take care of them and they are not neglected or abused or kept out in unsatisfactory conditions
- I want some chickens!
- I dont understand why more animal types can't live in the city I think its ridiculous. Having many family from the country I feel we should definitely implement more animals allowed.
- I support the amendment to allow chickens and other livestock animals as pets.
- As long as hens and other livestock are quiet and well kept, and of no danger to the public, I see no reason not to allow them.
- I think we should be allowed to have farm animals in the city under the right conditions.
- Being self sustained is beneficial
- I don't know enough about animal husbandry but I would be willing to explore this bylaw amendment if the above criteria were reasonable and sound.
- Caveat - ONLY animals NOT raised for slaughter. Example, hens for eggs, or just as a hobby - no problem. There should be some discretion allowed for the types of animals, as long as everything is properly registered with the city.
- If problems arise from allowing urban hens, amendments can be made to address specific issues
- As long as criteria is met then it should be allowed regardless of neighbor support. Adjacent neighbor should not be allowed to deny ownership just because they don't like it or want it next door. They should have to provide ample proof of reasons why their neighbor should not be allowed.
- If the neighbors are okay with it and the living arrangements are suitable I don't see a problem.
- I was a farm girl growing up and I think it's beneficial for kids to learn how to take care of different animals and know where their food is coming from
- Would allow many families access to high quality protein, teach young children about food the the responsibility that comes with caring for chickens.
- Absolutely. Chickens are an important part of a healthy garden ecosystem, and I know there are ways to manage them so they don't become a nuisance to your neighbourhood.
- Fresh eggs
- Yes, I am in support of hens and livestock in my community.
- But only smaller livestock like chickens, anything bigger is just a tad ridiculous for 'in city' in my opinion.
- Urban hens are an excellent idea.
- Suitable living conditions would be critical
- As long as you are responsible, and follow the rules, you should be allowed to care for any animal.
- There's people who would like animals besides cats & dogs.. and we need to make sure they have the proper environment as well.



- As long as the animals are taken care of and it does have clear rules regarding animal care, removal of feces/manure and addresses noise, then it should be no issue. Include a minimum area by animal type as well for guidelines - ex a horse must have minimum 2,000m² of pasture area to reside within city limits.
- Could be a good opportunity to encourage local food production
- As long as people are civil about raising their food, let them have the freedom to have better raised meat.
- With some great guidelines and rules, this can be a fabulous idea. Any owner and/or animal can be problematic. The balance of regulations and freedom is needed but should not exclude people being able to provide at least some food, practical assistance and enjoyment from these animals.
- I don't know enough about this but as of now, I don't see why not
- Neighbors must agree (smell/noise) - not just consulted. Animal welfare must remain a top priority.
- Helps us be more self sustainable
- "I don't agree with the neighbour part of community benefit - this is a personal opinion. All it takes is a neighbour to not like a tweet and you're done."
- The rest I agree with."
- If the animals are being cared for properly and they're not bothering anyone what does it matter?
- With proper living conditions, and the animal(s) not being used or worked to gain a profit.
- As long as not ruining the enjoyment to other property I don't see why not
- Alberta is a province with farming roots. Let's teach our next generation about responsibility and livestock wherever possible.
- Chickens aren't any different than rabbits or parrots.
- Local food sources are great!
- I think people should be able to have what pets they want
- Provided additional livestock requests are reasonable and slaughtering/processing is not completed on site.
- Given the changing situation on climate and food supply lines, it would be prudent to review a way to raise livestock on a smaller, urban scale.
- I support urban livestock, and agree with the above criteria except for support from "adjacent neighbours". There are already provisions for neighbours to make claims for loss of use and by-law enforcement of animal care. Why allow an unrelated poor relationship with a neighbour to dictate urban livestock ownership.
- I think urban livestock can be beneficial to both families and communities alike. Livestock can offer food for families and add to our local economy.
- Provided the proposed livestock is not a nuisance to neighbours and negatively effect quality of living in the neighbourhood (noise, smell, parasites, etc) there should be no reason for a species-specific ban.
- All animals deserve good living conditions... If somebody wants an emotional support animal, they should have one. Chickens included
- Responsible pet ownership isn't a crime



- He a can produce local eggs
- As long as the livestock is properly cared for, and is not disturbing any neighbours in any way, it should be allowed.
- chickens or any pet should teach responsibility and affection for another life.
- It sounds reasonable that all parties (owner and neighbours) are all in agreement and that the environment is most suitable for the chickens. I don't believe it is necessary to have the livestock needing to offer community benefit/have positive impact, but I can understand why that might affect the decision of the owner and their neighbours.
- Urban farming is great for sustainability
- As long as the coups are kept clean i see nothing wrong with people being allowed to raise xhickens for eggs or food!
- It's important to have a relationship with animals we eat. I have no concerns with citizens having a couple of chickens, I do think there should be a maximum amount though. There are plenty of benefits of having chickens - emotional and physical benefits!
- I want a hen
- It would be great if the city, after ammending this bylaw, could provide support (resources to gain care items, educational training, etc) for people wanting other livestock
- I would like the option to own livestock.
- I believe as we move to more sustainable ways of living this provides a viable way to house livestock. I believe weight limits combined with respect for the neighbourhood and agreed on inspections is key.
- They are a source of food
- With proper care and attention, animals like hens are a positive addition to a neighborhood. They can allow for more interaction amongst Neighbour a and can provide a food source (eggs) as well. Chickens cause less issues than cats can. Roosters(males) however I fell should not be allowed in the city
- Having hens in all areas should be allowed because in times of crisis they provide a source of food.
- As long as nobody suffers, why not.
- A thoughtful and objective definition of "community benefit" and "positive impact" is essential. These are very subjective terms and are an obvious point of conflict. It is also critical that any consultation process is transparent and fair for all parties. My experience with some City public consultations involving neighbourhood developments has been that the opportunity to provide input is short, access to information is limited, and there is limited notification provided to neighbouring properties. However, I think the additional criteria are reasonable.
- Hens can be excellent support animals and are not a nuisance to neighbours.
- I would love to raise hens
- It's good to encourage people to have hens and be self sufficient with eggs
- As long as the area is suitable to ensure safety from animals getting loose, and noise/cleanliness is maintained then Urban Henneries are a great idea!
- I would support this amendment as long as the animals are kept in healthy and safe living conditions



- There are livestock that can co-exist with city dwellers. But make sure the crowing of roosters does not become a nuisance to neighbours (hey, I should be able to use the CANADIAN spelling on a Calgary survey).
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and taken care of, I have no problem with this.
- When you adopt you are now responsible
- Yes, If it doesn't bother their neighbours
- As long as the animals are cared for properly and not a nuisance.
- Allows people to be more self sustaining.
- As long as there are suitable living conditions for the animal, I do not see why they should not be allowed to own them.
- Local and healthy livestock for the purpose of community betterment sounds marvelous.
- We are taking away habitats and farms for industry and selfish large homes. If people are willing to house them on their property, and keep the property clean. Then I see no problem with it.
- Yes, but there should be a certain amount allowed per property, and people would need to have proper housing/coops for the chickens. I would also think that a course in disease prevention would be necessary to take as many diseases jump from farm animals (including poultry) to humans and this needs to be communicated about properly (whether in a course or other ways) to prevent people from becoming ill.
- I'd like to have 3 chickens and we have enough space I think it's a great idea as long as the animals are cared for the same way inside pets are cared for
- Hens (not roosters) are less noisy than dogs and help contribute towards a self-sufficient and healthy lifestyle.
- If you want to have chickens and you have the room to properly look after them then you should be able to.
- Chickens/hens - as long as things are kept clean and under control. Limit to the numbers because they can get noisy.
- The more sustainable we are the better
- I mean a cow or a horse might be a bit much and I wouldn't really want my neighbors BUTCHERING and killing animals in the back yard. But for pet purposes I don't see an issue.
- Living conditions would be need to be inspected regularly to ensure the animals are well taken care of and ethical practices were in place.
- I like the idea of being able to keep some livestock in personal residences/yards.
- I think approval from neighbors are critical and, in my opinion, there should be a process developed that would allow neighbors to revoke their approval on a yearly basis
- having hens allows people access to fresh eggs and and in side the city many people would enjoy this and that's all the livestock some people want so there's no point in moving into an acreage or farm
- The process should be pretty rigid as everyone wants to be a 'farmer'. The questionnaire should be very detailed as to living conditions of the animals (especially in winter) and the number of animals should be limited.



- As long as there is a rigorous process for approval and these animals are being kept in good and healthy environment I would allow.
- I support all but the support aspect. People will not support it just because they feel like it.
- It's an organic way for families to supply their own food.
- I love the idea of urban farming and like the protection provided to the livestock by the proposed amendment.
- I think its good to have people connect with their food and nature in this way. This is also a way to reduce grocery costs with fresh eggs!
- I have no issue, as long as the owners control their pets and are held to the same standards as dog/cat owners.
- Responsible hen care can encourage food security, an understanding of animal husbandry, household efficiency and opens the opportunity to enjoy beautiful animals that easily and happily can coexist in an urban setting, as seen in many other Canadian contexts that have already allowed the ownership of urban chickens. The changing of this bylaw would be something we would joyously celebrate
- I believe we have enough bylaws and laws to ensure that hens would not cause any additional detrimental effects to neighbours, beyond what a fire pit or swing set already could.
- So long as criteria for living conditions are specific, and criteria met by the owner (with repercussions in the case that they aren't), I think this is a fantastic idea.
- Again responsible ownership should apply. Education courses to explain what's involved. Children would benefit from the experience
- As long as the livestock does not interfere with the neighbours. Noise, smell etc.
- If the space allows, hens are not a nuisance
- As long as they are properly cared for why not?
- Limiting the number of animals, and follow up if complaints by neighbours
- Must have support from neighbours
- I would support urban hens, a certain number depending on the yard size. Also, their coop would have to be away from the neighbours' property line. I wouldn't support roosters. I would support goats, again, the number would depend on yard size.
- There are many responsible people that can raise these types of animals. There should however be periodic checks on the living situation as they often will not meet the standards because they do not know any better.
- It's awesome to have different animals as pets but as long they don't have a certain livestock and up eating.
- Yes, dependent on level of support for adjacent neighbours.
- The properties need to be large enough for live stock to be well-cared for, i.e. older neighbourhoods or acreages. The newer subdivisions do not have large enough yards to maintain hens or any other livestock without causing noise and potential health issues to the neighbours. Pigeon cooing can be heard several houses away and can be just as disturbing to as dog barking or howling to some.
- As long as they are maintained responsibly I don't see why not



- also proof of vet able to care for animal, maybe online class covering basic needs and bylaws.
- Example is goats being used for grazing. It's important to limit the number to reduce waste management.
- Has to be livable conditions and not running rampant
- I support this if all the criteria above are followed, however this will require a lot more resourcing from community standards in order to follow up on complaints and/or applications.
- So long as the presence of urban livestock is mutually beneficial to the animal, the owner, and the community, I see no reason to oppose this ammendment, and exceptional circumstance may be evaluated
- We need to support a community that is self sufficient for basic food needs
- Hens are sustainable
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and are in a clean and safe environment, why not?
- Person should have to show that they have educated themselves on the proper care and treatment of any livestock animals as many have very specific care requirements.
- As long as the animal is able to have a healthy and happy life, and he does not disturb the neighbors or environment, it should be ok. There must be a distinction between pets and livestock, and standards must be set for both. It is important that the animals have all their needs met.
- Limit number of hens to number in household. 1 egg per person per day.
- Don't care about hens. Keep it clean
- Provided the needs of the animals and citizens are balanced than I fully support this. Have the registered but not with any sort fo substantial fee. Have a system where in which houses with registered livestock can be sent a notice of inspection and have the inspection occur 24 hours afterwords.
- as long as the person gets a permit and has the proper space. Would be a shame to see hens kept in poor/cramped conditions.
- I think Calgary needs to move in a direction of sustainability, there is room for growth in our city. I don't believe everyone has the capacity to own Chickens. Maybe a submissions form before they are allowed to by them. Also a bylaw that you need to own the property.
- Although a neighbor might block due to SPITE, urban chickens are an asset in the community. Perhaps restrictions on roosters to keep noise down.
- I think it would really depend on the reasoning behind having the animals. There should be restrictions as far as what the living conditions would be and I think that strict bylaws on square footage should apply.
- Fresh eggs
- It comes down to justifiable need and owner responsible
- There is no reason to not allow other species, so long as they are properly cared for, conditions are maintained, and sound/quality of life of neighbors are not affected
- In don't mind supporting the Hen idea. Just with suitable living conditions etc.
- yes
- Good idea



- As long as there's not too many, I don't see how a couple of chickens are much different from dogs and other animals.
- If they can meet criteria then it's worth seeing where this will go in the future.
- Not much of a difference as to having dogs or rabbits as pets. As long as roosters are not allowed, since they would likely make a lot of noise crowing, I can't see why chickens shouldn't be allowed.
- so long as there are enough bylaw officers to enforce this and there are stringent rules that are enforced and if deemed the animals need to be removed then it is done very quickly and not drag on for months and months
- Love me some egg
- I think hens can be adequately cared in many family homes - but larger livestock can't so would require approval on a case by case basis.
- I would like the option to have other animals
- I would like the option of having additional animals
- As long as bylaw would be fast responding if there is a rooster
- As long as it is properly regulated I see no problems.
- Would love to have goats
- Hens are a great way to support sustainability and food security. I think this is a great idea but will need to have a strict and well thought out pilot program.
- Proper animal care that is not disruptive to neighbours should be allowed.
- Chickens are simple to maintain. But owners should be required to allow 'X' amount of space for chickens to roam. Not just their Hen house.
- I would love to be able to have hens for eggs in my yard.
- Depends on the livestock and the feasibility of managing it safely, hygienically and without it becoming a nuisance to neighbours. Things like chickens, goats, fish farms, etc should be fine at reasonable numbers and with proper infrastructure and procedures in place. Applications for approval should include handling procedures and plans for how the animals will be cared for when the owner is away and in the event of death or illness of the owner.
- It would be wonderful to finally allow hens, etc in Calgary, with their health and safety secure.
- People should be allowed chickens.
- It would allow for further alternative options for financial stability
- small flock chickens would provide enrichment and nutrition for families
- This is a benefit to health and would be the same as growing your own vegetables.
- I have no opinion on this subject
- Because it would increase the area in which the weed control goats can be used. Also, many livestock animals are no greater nuisance than other pets.
- I want chickens to be allowed
- As long as these animals are being cared for properly and do not become a source of food
- I think having animals enhances our lives, but also the animal must have enough room to live.



- Food security. Everyone is so disconnected from their food and the ability to have some hens to care for and get eggs from would help everyone who may be "stuck" in the city.
- Food, not pets.
- It would enrich the community
- As long as animal living areas are clean and well taken care of
- nothing wrong with letting people be independent. Government controls too much
- Why not?
- Many livestock animals have been deemed great emotional support animals and should be allowed.
- Having smaller farm operations for a single family household could be a good environmental option.
- As long as the livestock has enough space and are taken care of properly
- Case by case allows for most suitable homes to be considered and less suitable to not be.
- I believe that with some restrictions, urban hens can help offer a number of benefits to the household and the community. The number of hens, the type of enclosure and conditions that the hens live in must be monitored for both the animal's welfare and the community's overall well-being.
- raising your own food is a great idea
- Animals have coexisted with humans forever. Allowing backyard chickens, for example, provides some people with not only a food source, but the potential for education in the community and a positive impact mental health for some.
- If you are going to be bringing in farm life into a small cramped city property, sounds more like animal abuse. There needs to be strong rules for proper space required if having livestock brought into city properties.
- If the animal fits nicely in your yard, you can afford it and it doesn't hassle the neighbors, the choice of pet should be up to the home owner. With limits of reasonableness on quantity.
- It would be good for everyone
- As long as properly done why not?
- Support from neighbours is a big one if there may be a noise or other issues
- Let people have the animals they want-as long as their property can sustain them and they are not bothersome to others.
- chickens and other low impact livestock should be allowed to help people with self sustainable living
- As long as the chickens are in a suitable environment and are not an annoyance to the neighbors I support this.
- Hens provide fresh eggs and they are easy to keep
- As long as it is not disruptive to the neighbors I don't see an issue with having hens.
- As long as they are well provided for and not tied up outside
- As long as the person cleans and keeps a tidy operation
- only in limited numbers
- Zero issue with this - great initiative
- Fresh eggs



- If it was well regulated and would be held to the same standards as dog nuisance claims, I don't see why owning urban hens or other domesticated livestock is any different than owning a dog or a cat. That said, it would be important to hold urban livestock owners to the same standards as dog and cat owners, with similar regulations and consequences.
- It's fine as long as every case is evaluated and approved accordingly. Whatever animal they want to keep must have enough space and have its needs met. Personally I wouldn't want my neighbors to have farm animals hanging around because it would smell but other homes in the Calgary area that might have a bigger plot or better conditions to hold the animals in would be cool
- I am always in support of people having the right to keep alternative pets besides cats and dogs provided that they can properly care for them and they are able to keep them from posing a risk to public safety.
- As long as they are well-cared for, small urban "farms" can be beneficial in many ways.
- I think it is a good idea, but to limit the amount and size of animals to reflect the lot size and welfare of the animal..
- I think it's a wonderful idea if someone wants Henson or other manageable livestock to sustain a healthy and productive lifestyle.
- As long as the animals have suitable living conditions and neighbours aren't bothered, why not?
- I would support this bylaw, provided the Calgarians involved are able to provide proper care for the hens. The ammonia produced by their waste and the odor that comes with it will be one of their greatest challenges.
- Certain areas in the city where people have more space outdoors, they should be allowed to own a wider variety of animals as pets, if given the proper housing and husbandry
- It allows for zero-tolerance of animal abuse, even if the animals are livestock.
- Livestock keeping in city limits is highly beneficial to people and animals as a whole.
- All of the above
- If they aren't bothering anyone and they are being cared for properly, I can't see why hens wouldn't be allowed!
- A hen, living in appropriate conditions - is quiet, does not leave feces on neighbours lawns, no biting or attack issues, helps control insects and other garden pests, can help provide food and a little fertilizer. A hen makes more sense than most other pets.
- This would need to be looked after with extra care to ensure housing and habitats are kept to standard
- I think there might need to be requirements in terms of how much space is available and proximity to neighbors
- I would like my own eggs
- If the animals are responsibly cared for, and there are clear guidelines for their care, yes.
- Good for community
- I would support as long as proper animal care includes maintaining the living enclosure for waste and proper disposal to ensure no odours.
- It encourages sustainable living in the city.



- If a person can be found to care for an animal providing the appropriate nutrition, housing, and training if necessary I don't see why they should be denied provided the animal is not a threat or nuisance to neighbors.
- I agree with the community benefit and positive impact they may have.
- If the environment can be proven safe there is no need for this bylaw
- Should require support from a broader radius due to potential noise and smell.
- suitable living conditions must be met, no question.
- I have nothing against having hens in a city
- As long as it didn't create offensive smells or loud noise, then I have no issues.
- "Urban chickens are very environmentally friendly and can provide people with fresh organic food with a low carbon foot print and less food waste from the house hold.
- There have been many instances that this has been proven"
- People should be allowed to provide food for themselves, Calgarians are struggling right now and this could be very beneficial.
- I believe the bylaw should be extended to other livestock within reason - based on the property and yard size, the animal is adequately cared for.
- Goat fot it
- Na
- As long as people clean up and the hens have proper living space its fine
- Farm or not, Calgarians should be allowed to have whichever animals they choose on their property as long as they are not harming other people or animals and they are not endangered creatures.
- I have no issue with urban livestock as well as they're not overly disruptive.
- I have no problem with hens in Calgary, as long as their taken care of properly.
- As long as there is an enforced limit on the number of chickens and that they must be kept in a fenced area to avoid traffic accidents and/or incidents with dogs walking by on public property.
- Why not i guess.
- This helps families
- I think this could be a great way for neighbours to become more of a community.
- As long as the animal is well cared for
- I support all of the above except for the support of adjacent neighbours. There is too much NIMBYism in this city already and neighbours are frequently not very kind to each other.
- Hens yes maybe goats I think that's about it for livestock that should be allowed
- Given adouquate space could be provided. I feel there is no harm to allowing people to own select types of livestock to raise on their property for personal consumption only.
- Not noisy animals, substantial food source. Funny as it is, good companion animals.
- Some farm animals can easily be introduced to everyday city life without causing any issues
- You must follow proper animal rights and they must have a yard and room to grow and live. Not in a cage.



- So long as the animals are proven to have adequate living situations and are not slaughtered on an urban property.
- People should be able to feed themselves however they choose to.
- With an average person not having the proper educational back ground raising these types of animals, having something in place could be best
- Positive impacts help our city
- As long as there is no lingering odour and no noise.
- Limit the number of birds, allow for composting or disposal of fecal material, proper hen house inspections, and husbandry certification classes offered by Agriculture based retailers like Federated Co-operatives Limited and their retail Co-operatives Associations
- If and only if the neighbours have a say and the owner is responsible. See pigeon rules.
- Would love to be able to have urban hens! Fully support this.
- Many other Canadian cities and towns allow Hens. It would be a good step towards sustainable and ethical food supply, providing that the living conditions of these animals are suitable.
- The introduction of urban livestock presents profound agricultural and self preservational education opportunities.
- As long as well maintained, livestock is easy to manage and fairly clean. It poses no risk.
- The ability to raise hens encourages individual sustainability and which I believe will have minimal negative impacts to a neighbourhood.
- Chickens are rad and support sustainable cost effective living
- Small livestock would be great if taken care of properly.
- They would probably live better and happier lives then on a factory farm anyways. Laws have to be obeyed and regulations made and enforced though.
- Urban hens and other livestock can be fulfilling. Support from neighbours is a difficult item and can be a huge barrier if not written and enforced effectively.
- Urban chickens are a great and sustainable way to live, as long as the people who have them understand the needs of the animals and that they will only lay eggs for about 5 of their 10 year lifespan.
- I think it would be great to be a city that supports livestock including chickens, pigs, bees.
- conditions must be met and approved BEFORE such animals are allowed...not after the fact..
- explain why not exactly. Especially if the holding area is clean and well built.
- Permits should be obtained by those who seek to appropriately House such animals within the city, and would need to prove their care would be adequately provided.
- Seems overwhelming to need to get approval from all those parties! People don't need this approval for other pets! Why this special case for hens?
- I love the idea of having more urban farming/food production provided that nuisance to others is mitigated/avoided.
- Why not? People can have gardens to grow food, why not chickens to grow food?
- Why not? I don't see this being an issue to anyone.



- As so long as the animal has proper means of living and lives a happy life I feel it should be okay.
- Food security, fun for kids.
- House chickens are very useful to have around especially in poverty areas or as a community project
- "The livestock would have to be small and able to be reasonably kept in a back yard. Cleaning of penned/yard area would have to be frequent enough to avoid smell.
- Number of hens (no roosters) should be limited.
- Possible restrictions on certain types of livestock that are hard to control, noisy, smelly, destructive, and/or non-beneficial."
- I think well behaved animals and livestock that can be kept with community benefit and support should be legal
- Require all above criteria, including blueprints/plans of accommodations for animals. Require a minimum land size to have a certain animal type and/or number of animals.
- Urban hens are fine as long as there are parameters regarding number of hens and living conditions.
- I like the option of owning other animals.
- Self sufficiency for food is important
- I think people raising their own animals as pets or food source is likely to be far more humane than the commercial facilities offer. healthier for the animal and for people... on soooooo many levels
- If the hens are not causing problems, are properly housed, and the neighbours are not concerned, there is no problem
- People should always have the right to provide for themselves. Hens provide a good source of food in the eggs they lay
- People should be allowed to produce their own eggs in the city.
- As part of a sustainability and self sufficiency initiative, being able to raise hens allows for residents to be able to provide food for themselves, as well as their extended family.
- Would need to meet all those specific requirements. And be Licensed, cared for, contained, not attract wildlife, create undue noise, smell...could be very controversial/slippery slope given how small backyards are these days & how little regard some folks have for animals in general. Proceed with extreme caution.
- Hens increase sustainability
- I agree
- Would love chickens in city.
- Not really keen on having chickens in the city. If they are, there should be a designated area away from homes due to the smell, noise and other nuisance effects that will absolutely be a problem.
- Great idea as long as the animals are well cared for and their enclosures maintained.
- As long as there was limitations on the amount of livestock someone can have in a residential setting, I don't see a problem with it.
- My daughter has wanted ducks or pot belly pig



- Owning livestock can be very beneficial from person to person. Cut costs of leaving the home to go to the store.
- If a problem wants to care for an animal, as long as reasonable and safe living conditions can be met, let them have whatever [removed].
- I think this is a great idea so long as roosters aren't present. It's always fun to see some chickens since it's not a normal thing!
- If individuals are wanting a at home family based food growing opportunity then everyone should have the ability to do that such as having hens for eggs. It offers family building time, as well as a more affordable way to have certain food goods
- If the person is able to provide the right conditions to house said animal to help feed/support/sustain their family, they should be allowed. As per a case by case basis.
- Having the ability to provide necessary animal products to the public would create more competition within the market place therefore lowering the cost of food if people wanted to buy off of someone. I would say at that point the livestock owning party must declare this as a supplementary business on their taxes just like you would with any other business.
- If suitable living conditions can be provided for the animal.
- Properly raised chickens would reduce green bin waste and allow for more sustainable food source.
- Great way for people to raise their own food. I like that support from surrounding neighbours is required.
- Chickens have just as much of a right to live in peace and comfort as a dog or cat does
- Plenty of cities have urban chickens. They do not cause disruptions, they are regulated, and they are good for the environment. Need I say more?
- Chickens correct? I don't care as long as they're well kept for. But chickens will draw more predators into the city.
- Extreme case by case basis given only to people with adequate land.
- Not a bother
- I support live stock and think it's a good way for the community to come together.
- Yes, as long as no coqs are allowed and enough space is allotted.
- People should be allowed to have livestock as long as they are properly cared for.
- I would love to have my own hens.
- We have friends with chickens and all the neighbours love them
- We should all eat local
- Good for the city.
- I have a neighbour that clhas had hens in the past and we didn't even know. They can be great pets
- If the animal cannot be cared for properly with the provided living space or care it should not be permitted
- If the bylaws are followed I don't see an issue.



- Especially necessary for vulnerable, low economic, Calgarians or those with for insecurity. The bylaw should also cover people in apartment or condos who have limited space, so they can have an opportunity (space-wise) or by co-owning to have hens.
- I wouldn't want to see a yard within the city full of livestock, but I don't see the harm in allowing a few hens(say maybe 4 or so), and possibly a couple goats, or a pig as a pet.
- I think neighbors all around (up the street) not just neighborhoods right and left should be allow to say yes or no for it. Like a house party happens, the whole street notices, it's not just the neighbors beside notices
- Livestock within the city (chickens and bees primarily) can be managed safely and effectively with little impact on neighbours; strict rules around humane best practices for care of livestock are important, and there should be a process for inspection and licensing of these residences.
- As long as the animals were taken care of properly, everything would be ok.
- I think this encourages sustainable living and greater educational opportunities for children.
- Adjacent neighbor approval is key
- self-reliance should be supported.
- Local husbandry can be beneficial to all communities.
- Yes we absolutely should be able to have small livestock with the intent of providing food.
- As long as the animals welfare is the number 1 priority.
- I believe hens can be a beneficial addition to a community and do not present problems or risk.
- I think case by case is a good plan.. for instance Hen's eat the bad bugs in your garden and give eggs.. could be a good idea
- Although I don't see the need for support from adjacent neighbours as the same support is not required for bothersome pets such as chihuahuas
- There are many miniature animals that can be as affectionate as dogs and good for the environment as in eating bugs and helping to keep the grass short
- I don't believe we need urban hens, hens belong on farms, like you believe Pitbull type dogs should be muzzled, I don't like any creature with wings. Birds terrify me.
- Hens are not not a nuisance it's the rooster who like to do all the yelling. Other livestock is acceptable if the yard is large enough. The last thing I would want is a resident taking advantage of a new bylaw and putting the animal at risk.
- Assuming the animal is well taken care of and follows a regulated living environment and is not a nuisance I believe it should be ok.
- Having hens is an excellent healthy food option
- If people can have dogs (who can be noisy, messy, dangerous), why can't others have hens?
- Limit of 5-6 chickens
- Small animals like chickens are beneficial to society and to become more sustainable
- I don't see anything wrong with having livestock, as long as they're being taken care of
- "Only if criteria are strictly enforced. This has the potential to flood CHS with
- surrendered and seized hens. Could cause significant impact to neighbors of left



- unchecked."
 - As long as the rules set in place are obtainable, and not something completely far fetched that make using this new bylaw even possible, it sounds like a great idea.
 - This supports community engagement and provides a safe outlet for companionship and self sustaining as well as environmental benefits.
 - Provided the animals and yards are well-tended, I agree with this.
 - .
 - I think allowing urban hens will positively impact Calgary
 - If the animals have the appropriate accommodations, and are well cared for, what's the problem?
 - I want to be able to keep hebs in my backyard
 - It should be assessed on a case to case basis
 - I believe this is a positive progression bylaw movement.
 - Great for the environment, affordability, and mental health
 - Provided the animals are provided with comfortable living conditions and their presence is not disruptive to neighbors or their property I don't see an issue.
 - Assuming this would not be large livestock, or herds of animals.
 - "No issues with well kept hens.
 - And furthermore,
-
- Nobody here but us chickens!"
 - Expanding our ability to have gardens and self sustaining food sources
 - Look at Europe. Many countries have not had any problems with this.
 - the types of animals allowed in Calgary is far too limiting
 - It would be very good if Exceptions would be evaluaron a case by case basis
 - Because chickens and or ducks are very good pets. Stop being elitist, responsible pet owners are responsible regardless of species.
 - It is a natural way to maintain public spaces and I imagine would be a cost savings.
 - There are all ready hen owners in the city, maybe it legal that way the City can insure the animals are being looked after properly.
 - I believe that hens can be humanly raised in backyards (much more humanly than industrial farms). I also believe that it is important for people to be more exposed to where their food comes from and this is a great way to do that.
 - Only if livestock owners can be monitored at a reasonable cost to the city
 - If the owners are able to safely and effectively care for the animals without the ownership affecting other neighbours



- chickens should be allowed
- I would be in favour providing there was a specific number of hens allowed to be kept as well as a noise cancelling system is also being used.
- Neighbor support should be the 12 houses closest to the requestor. Clarify that NO harm can be done to the animals on the property or there will be consequences.
- As long as the smell and sound of the livestock does not bother neighbours, there is nothing wrong with having livestock around.
- Because someone wanting livestock for themselves as long as it does not negatively impact other around them sounds fine to me
- It's a great way to start raising our own food when we can't afford to move out of city limits
- Responsible owners should be allowed to raise livestock
- Eggs are great!
- Food costs are high, let's do what we can to support each other during these times
- If done properly, why not?!
- A few hens in my neighbours' yards would not bother me provided they were contained.
- Not a fan of beehives in town but other than that. All good
- Natural pets that could enhance living in Calgary. Strict rules should apply
- Healthy benefits family
- Hens are a source of health and happiness to those that are responsible. They don't cause damage and Calgary has limited predators. I see no reason to now allow this as its monitored for animal abuse.
- In these uncertain times, I believe living in a sustainable environment is of utmost importance.
- As long as the appropriate precautions are taken and all surrounding neighbours approve, they should be more than welcome to have livestock on their property.
- Let people have hens and chicken if willing to properly maintain the livestock.
- it depends on the animals. If they are noisy and disturb people sleeping after they work hard I would say no. If they are not causing disturbance to neighbors then why not.
- I am fine with livestock in the city as long as they prove to be beneficial.
- If the livestock is treated right and living conditions are conducive to the city. Ensuring that odor is controlled and yards are kept cleaning especially if owning chickens.
- If suitable conditions can be provided for animals, and these conditions can be reviewed yearly, then urban hens should be permitted.
- I've found this bylaw to be very silly and unnecessary for a long time. Having city hens can help teach self sustainability to Calgarians.
- "As long as there is no issue for the neighbours and the hens are kept safe and well cared for.
- I do not know what "other livestock" would include. So I am only answering about hens."
- The suitable living conditions is the most important. Whoever has hens should be subjected to monthly inspections.
- Having chickens isn't a big deal as long as the number is controlled.



- A lot of people are allergic to traditional pets, meaning they would have to look at other animals to have a pet. If they are responsible and care for the animal, I see no harm in this.
- I believe that if someone has a suitable environment for the animal(s) and takes proper care of their animal(s) they should be able to have different livestock.
- I see no drawback to responsibly owned chickens within city limits
- People should be allowed to keep whatever animals they want on their land. So long as the animals are safe and happy.
- On a case by case basis and neighbour approval.
- These animals offer great potential for communities as well as allowing city folk to enjoy our Alberta roots for the love of livestock and for all the animal lovers out there. I do agree that living conditions must be suitable.
- I'd like to keep a couple of hens for eggs. My spouse's family had some on their farm, so we're pretty familiar with how to handle chickens.
- Many animals can be pets, why restrict which ones?
- The criteria listed sounds reasonable.
- YES! Please allow hens!!!
- As long as the owner is able to provide adequate care & the neighbours are on board I don't see how it is a problem
- Provided every animal is licenced or permitted so the city knows who to go to if the animal in question becomes a nuisance for the community.
- Hens make great pets to certain individuals and would have a positive impact on the community.
- urban foxes need more of
- Allowing people to raise animals can allow them to produce their own food, and food for the community. (Ie: eggs from chickens, milk from goats). This is of vital importance as food supplies around the world become increasingly unstable.
- ...
- Hard to draw line but if noise, smell, etc. can be controlled, I would have a problem telling someone they could not have ex. a duck or goose or a small goat. Compliance will be the most difficult aspect to control and so the manner of further municipal costs certainly come into play at a time when I believe municipal expenses need to reduce.
- Chickens don't cause too many problems in other cities.
- I have nothing against chickens.
- As long as there is a cap on numbers and the hens are housed in a clean and esthetic manner and no roosters.
- This seems like a balanced and reasonable approach.
- As long as there is proper housing and care for the hens. It should be checked first before allowing them.
- I want a pigmy goat!
- Fresh eggs



- Would provide a possible food supplement.
- As long as the animals are not at risk or put in harm and or danger and can be properly maintained then it should be allowed if conditions are suitable. There should be someone to assess animal welfare and conditions before hand.
- I like the case by case.
- I think having hens and other appropriate livestock is a wonderful idea to have in Calgary. There are other municipalities that already have this available and we could easily follow their lead
- I like the idea of having hens.
- That's great! Let's explore sustainable living options for the city.
- It just makes sense
- As long as the neighbors are ok with it I don't see why you can't have certain livestock this is Alberta after all.
- Odour management
- as long as the animal is properly taken care of, people should be able to choose whichever pet they like
- I think the opportunity to expand the urban ecosystem is great for community members.
- I support the amendment. People should be allowed to raise certain livestock.
- As long as everyone follows the rules and proper can
- It may be a nuisance to the neighbours.
- Dependent upon noise level of the animal. Approval from neighbors a few doors away not just next door.
- Hens allow for self-sufficiency, increased community awareness of the modern food supply chain as well as potential mental health benefits from the rewarding activity
- Families should be able to look as providing themselves with sustainable food sources.
- In other communities, urban hens have been a huge success, and if taken care of properly, will be a positive influence for other communities to pass same legislation.
- If the criteria is always followed then there shouldn't be any major issues.
- as long as the animals are for companionship and not raised for food and the living conditions provide for a good quality of life.
- Support from neighbours and suitable living conditions is key. Neighbours should be someone considered anyone within ear shot of hen noises.
- Let people have things and enjoy life
- people should be allowed livestock in Calgary as long as they have suitable conditions for them
- I would want assurance that urban animals would not be an attractant to other wild animals such as coyotes, which would put them at risk for more human wildlife conflict.
- As long as the animals are cared for and the neighbours do not object/are not in any way inconvenienced by the animal I don't see why this would be an issue
- I have no issue if direct neighbours support it.



- I don't care how many animals a person has as long as they are properly & consistently cared for on ALL fronts. Also, as long as the pet owners ensure the animals have sufficient dwellings & ALL odors/waste/noise are rectified daily. I'd like to point out, when having any birds or pheasants, etc. they can often carry harmful disease & parasites therefore, protocols must be 110% enforced to not just minimize this but, to 110% ensure any issues are ultimately rectified. We do NOT need another disease similar to Covid-19 generated by Calgary!!!
- I would want neighbour approval
- There are many rural communities capable of supporting a hen
- Let the people have chickens who cares
- Being self sufficient enough to feed yourself should always be allowed.
- I would support urban hens, but I would also have concerns. I am on the fence if I would like to participate in having my own hens. I am not against the idea. But, then my number one concern would be if my neighbours had hens and they were noisy.
- Having hens allows people freedom to grow their own food and increases food security.
- Urban farming/livestock is great for the ecosystem.
- As long as the animals and property are well-taken care of there should be no deleterious effects.
- should be able to have some livestock on your property like chickens but a larger livestock animal should get approved
- I think if people can keep them from wandering onto others' property, it's a great idea.
- Duh
- A limit on the amount of chickens, ie: only three. Stringent hygiene and no flies/mice issues must be in place.
- As long as it is regulated and permitted, and the animals' welfare is considered, we should have backyard chickens.
- If someone wants 1/2 pet chickens cool. If someone wants a coop then no way.
- No reason not to.
- As long as "support from adjacent neighbours" statement was clarified. In rare cases this could be used to exploit or manipulate neighbours, or be used in a vindictive manner by those who can suddenly retract their support causing the family to give up their hen(s).
- Hen doesn't do any damaged they would have to be in their yards as well as have proper housing built
- Shouldn't need support from neighbors.
- Hens are great, however, owners need to learn how to care for them to keep them healthy, contained and not disturbing neighbours. Like any other animal.
- I support the ownership of any animal as long as it is properly housed and cared for long as the neighbourhood is on board.
- As long as the people are responsible owners, maybe the people who would like some Hens registered to get approved as long as they have a proper set up for them.
- It would be fun, and allow for more diversity in the city.



- I think this is a great idea. Most farmed chickens are in terrible conditions anyway, but in a home farm (with suitable limits, maybe some type of licensing to show they know how to care for them) could be better quality of life for them. It also potentially allows reduction of carbon emissions due to transporting eggs to stores from farms.
- In an attempt to move towards a more sustainable city, this seems like a very good step in the right direction.
- Strict humanitarian laws needed though. Calgary gets cold, hens will die. Fresh eggs are a good sustainable source of food and if done properly more humanitarian than farms
- As long as the animals are looked after. Are clean. And do not interfere with my sleep. Like the cop sirens going at 3am for over 1/2 hour.
- All animals need to be treated with care
- Hens are quiet and clean. Roosters are annoying
- Urban hens can be a source of locally grown food for the city.
- I think it sounds OK, as long as it is not too noisy.
- because I would like fresh eggs too.
- Allowing alternative livestock within the city would help citizens be a little more self sufficient while at the same time saving money, knowing where their food is coming from and provide a broader understanding of how important farming and livestock are to us all.
- .
- Eggs are yummy.
- Hens are wonderful animals and they provide essential meat and eggs to households
- As long as they are well kept, smell isnt overwhelming and proper training on how to take care of and raise is taken. I also think it should depend on what type of livestock. Hens and Chickens make sense but not a cow in the city.
- As long as they're well maintained and taken care of it don't see the issue
- As long as they can support it, they should be able to own the animal.
- However if the owners of the hens want eggs I think they need a rooster as well and they can be noisy.
- Chickens are okay as long as it meets an expected level of sanitation, growing your food should never be wrong. Within reason, no to dairy cows.
- I love chicken
- This is a more organic, sustainable way of living. But what happens if new neigh doesn't like it. Not fair to allow it then take it away
- As long as the hens are well cared for and they are not causing a nuisance to the community I think it is fine
- I think this is a great idea. I would love to have hens or even honeybees- that would be another "livestock" I'd like to see considered.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and the noise doesn't bother the neighbours.
- Don't like vetoes by neighbours, but like urban hens.



- Chickens are great
- People should be free to live with as little government interference as possible.
- as long as they have suitable living conditions all animals should be welcome
- If there is community support and education, I think this is a great initiative
- It has been shown that there are many benefits of having hens/wildlife in urban areas. They provide a cost-effective and local source of food, a connection to nature, and provide education about our food system and animal care.
- Yes
- With proper living accommodations, hens are great pets
- It would be important to get support from adjacent neighbours.
- Only if there is a ban on slaughtering and harming these animals. They are not objects.
- Provided that noise issues and smell issues are taken into account, that's fine. Additionally, an appeal/complaint process that is robust for the neighbours needs to be in place - we have friends who were forced out of their own house by our weak cannabis bylaws (ie - no taking into account second hand smoke from their neighbour smoking directly under their child's window). Someone else's hobby shouldn't be given more weight in the bylaws than the neighbourhood's ability to enjoy their property.
- Chickens good
- Must be a maximum number per property but love this idea!
- Seems fine as long as its within reason and poses no threat to surrounding neighbours.
- As long as the animals have good living conditions and neighbours have no issues it should be okay.
- chickens are good for communities when kept in appropriate homing .
- As long as the livestock have suitable living conditions, then there shouldn't be any problem.
- I'd love to have a few chickens to get fresh eggs and teach my children about sustainable and ethical livestock.
- If there is a required class that people must take (and pay for) to ensure their genuine interest in the hens well-being, I think it could be beneficial.
- I like the idea that battery hens can be rescued and love out their days in someone's garden
- Self-sustainability should be promoted in our city, especially in light of certain highly publicized issues at various meat packing facilities during the pandemic.
- Positive impact
- As long as it meets all criteria, there shouldn't any problems.
- Does not bother me if they are quiet.
- I think urban farming and livestock can be achieved
- As long as the above stated criteria is met, I have no issue with this
- If the living conditions for this livestock is sustainable, they should be able to have them on their property



- As long as they are taken care of and their coops are cleaned regularly, they're no different than outdoor rabbits.
- As long as all criteria are met and confirmed, it should not be a problem.
- If someone is willing, able and educated enough to provide for an animal or livestock then why should they NOT be able to own one?
- As long as it goes for any breed or type of animal
- It is a good plan
- Urban hens that are properly kept can be fantastic.
- As long as they are taken care of I don't see why we cannot keep animals on private properties within the city.
- As long as the criteria are met and the livestock aren't bothering neighbours (e.g. noise, odours, debris/feces), I'm in favour of it.
- Criteria are thorough.
- As long as animal needs are met and they are not causing a huge impact on the neighbourhood ie extremely loud at all hours, horrible smells etc. Then I see no problem.
- Properly kept animals are fun.
- After living in Europe for 3 years, where almost everyone has backyard chickens and bees, it's a move in the right direction towards sustainable living
- We need more options for being self sustainable.
- If a party is going to take proper care of them and follow the rules and regulations laid out then they should be able to.
- However, my neighbours do not require my support when they decide to get a pet like a cat or dog, so chickens should be treated on the same basis. There are means to deal with complaints should the animals not be cared for properly. Also, the suggestion could be made by the City to only keep hens, as they are quiet.
- There should be a limit of number of hens based on yard square footage to better protect the animals but having a hobby egg "farm" would be good for the community and result in less mass produced eggs where the hens have very poor quality of life.
- good use of fowl
- I think as long as the animal has proper living conditions/all needs are met they should be able to have livestock.
- Decisions Should be on a case by case basis in regards to animal ownership
- Having livestock in the home setting would allow for a healthier and more sustainable food source for families and could potentially open a community supported / community oriented program for the adjacent neighbors to participate in. Creating a benefit for multiple households
- Have small farm animals in urban settings is inky a benefit to the city. The animals would need to be well cared for.
- "ENSURE the animals should have proper living/housing condition, perhaps enforce a standard.
- Odor management.



- Feces clean up."
- If their property meets requirements such as community support and adequate space.
- If you have the support from your neighbours - all of them (both sides of you and you backyard neighbours and they (owners) are responsible then fine.
- I see this decision the same way I see a vegetable garden. It is a sustainable and potentially cheaper way to put food on the table.
- As long as the owner is keeping things clean, urban livestock is great - it can help provide food (eggs, dairy, meat) for the owner, and can also contribute to community building (food exchanges, etc.). Plus kids think it's awesome.
- As long as everyone one was following the rules and regulations!
- As long as everyone is reasonable, it should be allowed
- Having a small number if hens is good for food accessibility. There should be strict guidelines as to the size and structure and ongoing cleaning of pens.
- I think this is a good education for kids about the ecosystem.
- As long as they are well maintained they are no different from taking care of a dog
- Urban husbandry is an excellent idea, and so long as their is sufficient owner responsibility protecting against nuisances and requiring registration and vaccinations, there's no good reason it shouldn't be allowed.
- As long as the animals are not a nuisance and are well cared for they should be allowed.
- There should be limits on the number of hens or other livestock.
- I agree that having hens should be based on support from adjacent neighbours due to possible noise and smell issues, ensuring that the hens have suitable living conditions is paramount.
- There needs to be a limit on the number of hens allowed on a property, but I'm ok with the idea.
- With the criteria of neighbour approval and official approval of living conditions and it benefiting the community I think why not.
- as long as a limit of animals is defined
- Why not?
- I think it's a good idea, provided the owner is responsible and the living conditions are suitable and not a nuisance to neighbours.
- If the animal owners are responsible.
- If my neighbor is looking to apply for the right to have hens or other livestock, I would like to be consulted.
- Not an issue if all rules followed.
- I support this as long as other neighbours agree to it and the livestock animal isn't a nuisance in the neighborhood (for example, a rooster crowing at dawn).
- "Support from adjacent neighbors.
- Suitable living conditions can be provided for the animal."
- A comprehensive evaluation of animal living conditions, owner's need to have the animal, nuisance to adjacent neighbors.



- Livestock do no harm. If you can raise local and feed local, why not?
- Livestock, such as chickens, encourages learning, responsibility and home grown food resources.
- I think as long as there aren't an excessive amount of SMALL animals adequately housed on private property, it's okay. NO COWS
- So long as the animals are able to be appropriately cared for and are not a nuisance I think it is a good idea to allow Calgaryans to become more independent in their food collection.
- Chickens would be great and a max of 10
- Domesticated animals are just that. You need new people to update these ridiculously antiquated laws
- If it is done I a. Way that is cruelty free then why not
- Why not??
- If the animals are cared for, licensed, and have a safe home, it should be fine. There needs to be structure around this for it to be successful.
- Hens should absolutely be allowed in Calgary as long as it is not causing an issue to adjacent neighbours and they're being kept properly
- With the way the world is headed being able to raise our own food is important.
- I am fine with this as long as the animal is well cared for
- If the animal is living in a suitable living condition and is receiving what they need then why not.
- As long as the amount of hens are limited and the neighbours are happy with the arrangement and the chickens are well cared for I am okay with it.
- I have no issue with livestock-provided it is not to be eaten-rather for eggs-mowing lawns, etc. The exception would be a rooster as in my area, people would be ticked off with the cock a doodle do at 5 a.m.
- It's a basic right to produce food as long as it causes no harm to the animals and no significant nuisance to the neighbours. Also, frankly, dogs cause all kinds of nuisance, yet we have decided that they're worth it. The city needs to expand its views. I don't have hens but sympathise with those who want to own some. Kids live to interact with these birds. They can be used for clicker training etc... Hens can enrich lives in many ways.
- As long as the adjacent neighbours are supportive and the owners are responsible.
- More eggs are better!
- As long as the community supports it, they should be allowed.
- We have neighbours who have chickens not bothered by them.
- It would be great to have a hen
- As long as the animals have everything they need (enough space ex.) and the neighbours are ok with it I think there shouldn't be a problem with having livestock in Calgary.
- So long as the hens are properly cared for I don't have an issue. They should be inspected a couple times a year to make sure they are in compliance
- The case-by-case method should be implemented.



- Many people need a friend .. animals can be the stop gap. It helps reduce stress and helps people with health problems. Its science .. it works
- N/A
- What's wrong with hens!?! No reason not to have them, with some reasonable rules to follow.
- It really depends on the type of livestock and if there is a enough room for them to be properly cared for. There can also be a noise and or a smell issue.
- would be awesome
- Should to be able to have chickens in your back yard.
- I think it's a great resource
- Case by Case ONLY - with specific conditions, pending on the animal
- I'm unsure about this question in general as a "pet" and "livestock" are essentially the same thing. There is no difference in ownership of a chicken or cockatoo.
- I'm all for more urban farming if done properly with respect to other homeowners in the area.
- why not if people can have hens then why not other animals
- There are definite benefits to families both in terms of mental health and food supply.
- It doesn't hurt anyone for people to have urban hens and other livestock, with reasonable limits and pre-requisites to ensure that these are not a nuisance to neighbours.
- I grew up in a farm outside of Calgary. Having hens in the city are not an issues as long as their is education. A license should be required with proof of suitable housing and a chicken max per household.
- Hens would not be disruptive as long as they are cared for responsibly.
- Allowing urban hens would build a sense of food security and connection to land for Calgarians in a way that is appropriate for an urban context.
- As long as you were a good neighbor and responsible pet owner. Then a chicken or two should be allowed.
- The amended/clarified criteria, such as, adjacent neighbor support addresses a way to keep all parties appeased.
- Urban hens is a wonderful idea. I hope that the city is also cognizant of vehicles and pedestrians who may try to harm the birds. Please put in place protections for the birds to ensure their safety from anyone who may try to harm them.
- Goats for lawn maintenance.
- urban hens are the tits
- Designed properly, this shouldn't negatively impact the lives of neighbours to any extent. Consideration should be given to situations where neighbouring properties have pre-existing pets, such as dogs or cats. The presence of hens on the other side of the fence can instill or activate prey drive in the animals, creating unintended consequences (e.g. fences damaged, hens being killed).
- I think with proper inspection and care there is no issue
- Strong yes!
- As long as they are not bothering other I don't see a problem



- I'm in favour of having hens but not roosters as the latter are too noisy
- "There is lot of grass in calgary and goats are most beneficial and noble animals, so specially children will be very happy to manage and learn and there will be less mental isolation, stress and autism cases in children, while due to dogs children can not go outside and even adults avoids outside due to dogs, and dogs owners use their dogs for misbehaviour and threats to innocent citizens, city homes should be place for humans and benign animals and not for fierce and bloody dogs.
- I know that due to dogs children and ladies are unable to go outside , in fact dogs and their owners are vandals of our society."
- With the appropriate care hens offer a benefit to the community.
- It would have to be case by case and the people would have to pass some sort of course proving they are capable of caring for said animal. In reality a goat isn't much different than a dog for example
- I support radical homesteading
- It makes the neighbor safer for people and other pet owners.
- There are multiple benefits from allowing people to have urban hens, while the risks and drawbacks are minimal providing this is regulated closely and immediate neighbours rights are considered.
- As long as these animals are not a hazard or annoyance (ie extreme noise or smell) to their neighbours, I see no problem with this.
- Animal husbandry and alternative pets would be a healthy distraction from our Covid-19 situation and provide possibilities for struggling Students studying from home.....
- As long as there are provisions for odours. Some will care appropriately but some will not.
- It is important that livestock animals kept within the city are provided with proper space and care
- What people want to keep in their own back yard is none of my business, unless what they're keeping is somehow hindering the peaceful existence of everyone else. If my neighbor wants to stuff 10 cows into their yard, I don't care so long as their noise, stench, by-products, etc do not interfere with my activities. This is no different than the noise bylaw or unsightly premises...If someone was keeping all their garbage in their backyard and never disposing of it....that's a problem. If that garbage doesn't stink....and it's out of site...it's none of my business. Same would go with animals. This is very subjective and difficult to put a sweeping blanket on. Let people have chickens...if the chickens cause enough noise for the neighbors to complain, then handle it like any other noise complaint.
- I support any initiative that will integrate animals into our lives in a positive way. I believe it will be highly beneficial/educational for everyone to be closer to their food sources and hopefully will help with sustainability.
- Why not but noise could be an issue.
- If the ridiculous covid 19 enforcement continues with support from our Liberal Mayor, then people need to start relying for themselves rather than grocery stores. If the land owner has a proper set up and has proper shelter, feed/water and room for grazing, then yes. Or, if the animals will be stressed and are NOT provided for, then no!



- i'm all for chicken coops or other livestock as long as the animal is cared for properly and it doesn't cause a huge issue with the neighborhood. nothing wrong with this!
- Support from adjacent neighbours is tricky: how would one deal with renters vs landlords or moves?
- If they want a chicken let them have one as long as those regulations are followed
- I saw yes, but with a caveat. I would be to know if you are referring to cattle, sheep, goats, etc..
- But it would have to be a case where it's a very big yard and they are technically in town but not really near any other houses
- case by case, and if neighbors agree
- why not? Decided on a case by case basis.
- Maybe with a large lot and high fence. If it takes 10 neighbors to agree to remove a boulevard tree then livestock should take more than just adjacent neighbors.
- This is a great idea! I fully support hens and other livestock within the city limits and with responsible ownership. This gives people better control over their food and allows people to raise healthy local food themselves.
- Why not it's chickens not cattle
- It's ridiculous that chickens aren't allowed in Calgary.
- Why is it okay for people to have any animal under the sun except pit bulls? I'm all for allowing hens
- Times are tough. Let people raise chickens.
- Great opportunity to grow your own food.
- Reward responsible ownership
- It would allow more people to have access to the benefits that can be gained from owning hens/livestock
- Supports animal health as well as community.
- I support this with the exception that an adjacent neighbor would have to provide a relative explanation for any non support.
- I think as long as neighbours are okay with it and the animal has ample room to live and and be happy and healthy then this is great!!
- I think any pets should be welcome however some livestock ie. Roosters can create some unwanted noise for their neighbors, or the live stocks can be a little more stinky than others but it should be up to the owners to maintain the property and clean up after any and all pets
- I think hens are fine. People want to grow/produce their own food.I guess additional animals may be okay if they aren't an excessive nuisance.
- This sounds like a great way to eat local!
- as long as other community bylaws are upheld (noise, etc.)
- Hens can benefit a family, but strict care is of the utmost importance ...feeding, cleaning , housing, and noise control
- So long as there is strict enforcement of rules and it does not impact other people with noise and smell.



- I see no reason why a person couldn't have a couple laying hens for eggs. We grow gardens to reduce the cost of groceries, being able to have your own eggs would also help reduce grocery costs.
- As long as the animals do not interfere with the enjoyment of other people's property (e.g. noise, smell, etc.) I have no concerns.
- Positive Impact to the community and responsibility of the owners to provide the environment required to suitable for the animal involved
- I don't have a problem with people having hens or goats as long as they are looked after
- Every backyard & neighborhood is different. Case by case basis should be looked at.
- As long as they have the right facilities
- Having a small amount of Hens would give residents the ability to collect eggs and be more self reliant.
- The criteria make sense.
- Maximum of 4 and no roosters.
- There should be limits similar to the bylaw amendment for urban hens (limited number, verifiable reason for having the animals, vet care, maintenance and feeding requirements).
- I think support of neighbours is pretty important.
- I think it would be a very positive change to allow certain livestock within the city in designated "safe and approved" neighborhoods because it is an opportunity for humans to build an ethical relationship with animals and gain a new appreciation for their lives and what they provide us with.
- Offer community benefit.
- Absolutely people should be permitted to keep a limited number of hens for fresh eggs, and provided the conditions for care can be met, some other small livestock (goats, ducks)
- I think depending on the owners and the location, having animals like chickens, goats, etc would be an excellent community building opportunity and could possibly be operated much in the same way that a community garden is operated. It should be cleared by neighbours, and discussed in advance.
- I live in North Vancouver for a while and some people had Horses in community areas. as long as the owner took care of the animal and cleaned up, there wasn't a problem.
- Limited number of chickens that are well cared for should be home owners choice.
- But I don't agree with having to have neighbour approval. If there is a bylaw then use compliance with that as the rule
- That's pretty cool
- As long as it is supported by the community and everyone is on board.
- Urban hens are loud. Noise is my main concern. Unless the property is remote I can't see how allowing hens in an urban setting can be humane. Those applying for Urban Hens should cover the costs of administrations and the enforcement agency. Written approval for also be required all neighbours. It's easier to get their approval before than try to remove them and deal with complaints after.
- People just can't do what they want; there must be a process.



- As long as the animals are being treated humanely and are well cared for I have no issue with people wanting to keep them on their own property AS PETS ONLY. I don't agree with people wanting to keep animals on their property with the intention of raising them for food.
- If families want to be more self sufficient that is a good thing. It helps children of those families "know where the food comes from"
- As long as animal owners are responsible and know how to properly treat the animals I have no objections.
- however, suitable living conditions for the animal should be reviewed before license of "other livestock". Also, case by case review with respect to "other live stock" i.e. location, other pets in permises.
- I am okay with livestock in the city so as long as the property is maintained and the hens don't run amuck.
- Any amendment would need to take into account existing noise, noxious odours, nuisance by-laws.
- I am concerned about the health of the hens - requiring welfare checks would be a good idea. I'm sure there will be some crazy people who will jump on this band wagon.
- If the owner can prove that all of the criteria can be met, and continue meeting it I feel that allowing hens should be allowed.
- May need to give guidelines on minimum lot size and how to deal with early AM roosters. They can be disruptive when we rely on open windows for ventilation.
- I think it is great if people can have hens and create their own food source. There must be something down for noise if there are any issues with neighbors. I am absolutely against any kind of roosters, however.
- By allowing this you help members of the community become more self sufficient, it can supplement small amounts of income and reduce grocery bills in some cases.
- Why not give live stock a chance to be in a different environment.
- I think it can be a great way to support healthy eating and healthy communities, as long as there is some thought put into safe livestock housing;and cleaning standards) that would minimize the attraction to predators within neighborhoods.
- As long as the animals are cared for properly.
- I think allowing urban hens is a great idea, it makes people happy, gives them a way of being a little self sufficient and its also eco friendly since you would be able to feed a lot of table scraps that we'd other wise have ended up in the garbage.
- It's reasonable
- If proper criteria is met for animal welfare, I agree.
- I don't think anyone should be slaughtering pigs in their garage, but hens for eggs, and honey bees I see no issue with.
- Yes for a hen, no for other livestock. I don't want cows next door.
- "Urban agriculture and livestock has the potential to be huge boon for places like Calgary that have larger lots and areas to contain urban livestock.



- Additionally, The COVID-19 pandemic showed how unprepared many are in North America for disruptions of food shipping infrastructure. Urban agriculture and livestock rearing could be used to help bolster family food supplies in a variety of ways.
- Beyond just using animals for meat, dairy or eggs, their byproducts help immensely in terms of manure generation and rejuvenating lawns and plant beds."
- There is no concern for noise, there is enough space with the city, can have access to fresh "bio" eggs.
- I believe homeowners should be able to have backyard chickens/other livestock if they wish to, if they have the consensus of their neighbours and go about it in a way/build their habitat that is not a nuisance to their neighbours.
- I support this idea as long as there is control within the communities of these urban hens.
- If the criteria outlined above is met, there are no concerns. There should include a limit number of livestock per space available to ensure that it does not get out of hand.
- Those with livestock need to be checked in on. Owning just animals is not like owning a dog. I agree that they can be in the city, but owners must be ok with check ins
- If there is neighbour support and the owners can take care of the animals, I think this would be a wonderful way to have sustainable local food communities! A lot of people come to live in the city for access to city services and being closer to the work, family, schools, and the like. Many of these people (like myself) are already experienced with raising hens and livestock, so giving them the opportunity to do so would add to their quality of life, especially if they are elderly who are no longer able to live in a rural location, or have immigrated to Canada to join their children and grandchildren. I believe this would give a lot of elderly immigrants a sense of purpose and a continuation of something they have done at home, because many come from countries where having a garden, hens, and other livestock is quite common among people who are retired.
- So long as the animals are being properly cared for and residents are not disturbed having livestock in urban areas would be a nice addition to the community (sustainable way of obtaining eggs, good for kids to care for animals etc.).
- There are lots of injured livestock that need a home but can't live on a farm
- i think its a good idea for children to learn
- As long as the animals have good health and welfare and so there are systems in place to educate or intervene if these aren't occurring. I would also consult with poultry vets in Alberta to determine these needs, and community veterinarians who may suddenly have clients with the expectation to be treating these animals in the city. I think there needs to be a good plan for support and phasing it slowly.
- N/A



- Owners would need to maintain their property so that animal odours weren't noticeable for adjacent residences and if this could not be maintained the animals would be immediately removed.
- If neighbours are in agreement and the animals are adequately taken care of, supervised and do not disturb neighbours surrounding.
- With a permit and limit to the number of hens per property.
- I agree
- As long as there is a limit (ex. 6 hens max) and the household can properly provide and care for said hens, then I see no issue with them being within the city.
- I think it is important to allow people to own the types of animals they please as long as they are responsible pet owners
- ???
- If having livestock on your property can be maintained and clean. Then why not !
- Backyard hens are important for learning and experiencing about our connection to our food supply. It's also important for access to food.
- As long as it is not a nuisance to other neighbours.
- Sustainability is important and it's also important to encourage and support the community in that.
- Support from neighbors must be in writing. This cannot include animals that roam or are a noise disturbance such as roosters.
- Chickens are a great addition to family neighbourhoods.
- There should be a limit on how many hens. Big difference between two and twenty. Should be a plan for their manure.
- Neighbours should have a say as the noise and smell and mess could become a negative in market value of homes
- If your neighbors are alright with it. Good luck trying to convince them. Not allowed to get livestock till all the above is met.
- I would support this bylaw amendment as long as the appropriate background checks and regulations were in place to ensure the safety and humane treatment/care for these animals
- Sustainable alternative to factory farms
- If they are not a problem and well taken care of
- Chickens are fine, but larger animals like cows etc are out of the question
- If not disturbing others, there should be no issue.
- As long as licenses as required and bylaw officers can enforce standards.
- About time this happens! How can you have unlimited pigeons but not hens? It's outrageous and hens should be allowed. Neighbour consent should NOT be a factor as long as I follow the rules.
- Neighbors are involved; care of animals an important factor; case by case decision
- I think it's a good idea but Calgarians have to be prepared to overwinter the hens or butcher.
- I think homeowners responsibly having livestock like hens or other appropriate animals in the city is a great idea



- Having hens/quails in a proper domesticated backyard setup provides necessary self reliance skills and redundancy that our generation have lost. I think this a great idea!
- urban farming is very sustainable. If a resident is able to accommodate the livestock on their property, I think it is a viable option!
- As long as the owner is responsible and the pet doesn't cause problems for Neighbors.
- So good to have local food
- Urban hens are a good way to support sustainable and ethical farming practices.
- I think the criteria above is reasonable.
- As long as there is adequate provisions for their safe keeping and not a burden to neighbors
- There must be an explicit and mandatory process for consulting with neighbours and for addressing neighbour complaints.
- I think small scale urban farming is a really interesting and progressive idea that the city should allow under the right circumstances!
- within reason other types of livestock can be raised in an urban environment, but the potential owner must present a plan to control the odours emitted by droppings and bedding materials
- I don't see a problem with people having live stock as long as they keep everything clean and nice looking.
- If the property these livestock and hens are kept on is large enough so as not to cause annoyance to neighbours, then this is excellent!
- As long as the well-being of the animal is met then allow and treat the animal as you would any other form of pet.
- People have the right to own animals as long as it's in the proper living conditions suitable for the animals
- All for the urban hen! As long as people are educated on the needs of the birds. I.e. appropriate winter living conditions, dietary needs, etc.
- Hens are very peaceful and harmless. It is relaxing to watch them. They are not noisy, sometimes they cackle for a short time to announce they have laid an egg
- About time
- I am fine with chickens in the city under the listed conditions; however there should be a max per household i.e 3 as chickens can be disruptive and smell quite aggressively in the hot summer months.
- People should have chickens in their backyard! I like eggs, who doesn't?
- Having livestock in a residential area can be similar to having dogs and cats if suitable living conditions are provided. Allowing animals such as hens allows opportunities for families to provide food for themselves and others.
- it adds value and supports a quality of life improvement for Calgarians
- I like the idea of having goats permitted in Calgary, providing lawn care and joy!
- Yes as long as consideration is given to noise, smell, cleanliness etc.



- concern is that on smaller lots, the noise and smell could become a nuisance. Coops would need to be cleaned and I believe a minimum lot size should be required with placement of coop being important.
- Goats, for instance: they are quieter than most dogs and they smell better! They would cut down on weeds, naturally, too.
- Hens sounds great.
- Only if the living conditions for the animal are suitable! But goats as lawnmowers - wouldn't it be great for the environment if each community had a designated flock?
- My friend in London, UK raised urban chickens and had a wonderful experience.
- Chickens and other farm animals do not belong in city limits
- Small livestock animals such as chickens, rabbits, guinea pigs, mini or potbellied pigs, mini goats take up no more space than licensed cats, dogs, birds, or reptiles and are just as intelligent and deserving of a caring home.
- I would love if chickens would be allowed!
- I don't believe that you should require your neighbours consent to raise hens on your own property. I do, however, believe that should the hens not be taken care of and neglected or any animal rights have been compromised anyone who share concerns should be able to report the issues.
- As long as the neighbors don't care and the animals have enough room to be healthy and happy... Who cares! Let people have a goat if they want. :)
- If people want to raise hens and have the space they should be allowed to
- It is crucial that the animal's living conditions are suitable and the animal is safe. Living conditions should be monitored.
- I have no answer so I would rather vote yes in order to facilitate more research than no and potentially shut it down
- There would need to be strict regulations around this, such as ensuring cleanliness of the yard (neighbours shouldn't have to deal with smell, noise and disarray from other people's pets) and responsible ownership of the animals.
- Providing no negative impact to the neighborhood I would support small livestock in communities.
- Yes, but within a reasonable density and considering should be given to noise and pollution.
- As a responsible owner, you need to provide the proper conditions for the livestock. As a responsible neighbour you have to ensure that the livestock won't be a nuisance.
- I think people should only be allowed to have backyard hens if they do an online training course in animal husbandry and biosecurity.
- I don't see an issue with allowing small livestock as long as they are well cared for and are not a nuisance to the community.
- Chickens are a great idea for the city people to understand where their eggs and meat come from would reduce the need for these in stores, decrease transport and better the environment
- With the appropriate space, I do not see why having other livestock within the limits would be an issue unless odor was a concern. However, restricting excessive odour could be an amendment for restricting quantity or keeping a reasonable amount of livestock within Calgary.



- hens should be allowed as long as people follow the correct steps
- I don't have an issue with having urban hens
- It could be a way of boosting Calgary economy and providing Calgarians with fresh organic meat.
- No need to ban these things of animals from home owners. Builds resilience.
- If the animals are kept correctly then people should be allowed to keep them. Especially small animals that don't cause any large issues like hens. It's unfair to limit people so harshly if they keep the animals correctly
- I support sustainability and allowing (even city kids) the ability to care for various animals.
- They should be allowed.
- I'm not aware of this so I have no comment, I'm taking this survey to hopefully have a voice against muzzling and into more in depth reference checking to new owners
- Literally why not let people do what they want on their property?
- As long as the animals are cared for appropriately and being kept in suitable living conditions that do not impede of the health and living conditions of other people and animals, I have no concerns regarding urban hens.
- If it brings a community together and isn't a nuisance, I don't see an issue. However, I'm not educated in the subject so I shouldn't be commenting.
- some owners don't care about their neighbors while handling animals.
- conditionally, size of the animal, feeding area and animal waste would be limiting factors.
- Clean (vaccinated & cared for) animals of any kind should be permissible within city limits. I would support licensing (to ensure the vaccinations are up to date and ensure owners are keeping them in proper living conditions - ie. clean coop / room to roam etc.)
- Being able to grow one's own food should be a protected right as long as it doesn't become abused
- Dogs and cats are originally working animals, whether for herding, hunting, guarding, mousing, etc. To allow dogs and cats, which are traditionally farm animals, and not other animals is inconsistent and based on peoples' biases (eg. a dog is a family member, a goat is not).
- I think they are lovely and I hope my neighbours share eggs
- more people would be allowed to grow their own food and live off the land
- That would be a great sustainable way to get food for a lot of families/shelters
- People should be given more freedoms and coming up with alternative own food sources is a good idea. Obviously, those freedoms should be removed from those proven irresponsible, not everyone as a whole.
- so many varieties of hens- I want the ones that lay blue & green eggs! Hen house would have to be substantial due to calgary winter.
- As long as livestock is handled in a safe manner I do not see the issue.
- As long as neighbours are ok with it and is not disruptive (ie rooster crowing early)
- I feel this is a good move, as long as there are stringent rules to ensure the animals have suitable and ideal living conditions. I worry this will be abused and animals and neighbours will suffer



- I think small livestock is a good idea as long as animals are properly cared for, and backyards kept clean.
- Chickens are great.
- There are a variety of animals classified as livestock which could be reasonable owned within the city, especially near the outskirts. Also, services which use goats and sheep to manage lawns should be encouraged.
- responsible ownership
- I think this would be beneficial.
- While I can support keeping hens within city limits, I am not in favour of allowing other livestock
- In some instances urban chickens could be good, but other situations it would be bad. It would depend on space, security, etc
- It would not make a difference in my life if neighbours had livestock in the city limits.
- I would support it if the neighbours of the individual wishing to have hens is supportive.
- People are allowed to have rabbits; they too are categorically "Livestock". The only reason livestock was banned within municipal boundaries is because of the sounds and smells (a century ago). Times have changed over the decades. Especially since indoor plumbing and garbage/recycling/composting slowly came into effect in cities, towns and villages. Look at it in a different perspective, the homeless – people don't like seeing, smelling and hearing them; but the city isn't doing anything to help put a roof over their heads! As long as the area is maintained, people should be allowed to have livestock in the city. Pot-bellied pigs included!
- The criteria has the key points that matter to me.
- Animal is taken care of properly - neighbors do not mind - and exceptions are possible.
- Urban chickens provide healthy, local food and compost that enriches their community
- Livestock are great
- As long as the chickens do not smell, run free, attract other predators and are not noisy, go for it. Should be case by case though due to close back yard proximity in the suburbs.
- I support Clean well managed urban livestock of an appropriate density, the smell won't be any worse than the compost bins.
- I agree that people should be able to have hens for their eggs for sustainable living
- If he's unbiased and the livestock is not being hoarded, will not disturb or inhibit neighbors peace and quiet I support this. I do not support keeping pigeons.
- Neighbours support should be unanimous.
- "Yes" to a Trial period that allows flexibility for amendments to fine tune issues
- T
- As long as there is minimal impact to neighbors, people should be allowed to grow and harvest their own food.
- As long as the neighbours are okay, animals are registered and all is good, then it should work
- -
- Animals safe conditions



- Responsible ownership
- Only if humane living conditions were provided
- I love this! Some people don't like having dogs, etc. Others just love farm animals but can't afford or have the opportunity to live on larger land. So why not let me have the animal they want!
- Responsible owners should be allowed to keep hens
- I think urban hens are a great way for people to have fresh resourcing without shopping at the store
- Chickens are neither pit bulls not cats. Cats have been responsible for the decline of many bird species and should not be allowed to roam outside freely.
- As long as the animals are not overly loud, and the owner cleans after them regularly, so the neighborhood doesn't smell like a farm, there is no problem in having small animals on the property.
- I support. This helps support local and reduce emissions used in the harvesting/production/delivery process!
- Urban hens would decrease the suffering of hens in factory farms.
- If all requirements r met
- provided noisy roosters are prohibited and there are rules regarding cleaning yards to avoid deleterious odours.
- I support the initiative
- Hens add to the urban ecosystem and ar a great addition to Calgary
- Nothing wrong with growing your own food
- Edmonton has urban chickens.
- I think as long as the animal has proper living space, is properly maintained and is actually cared for this should be aloud. It will also likely cut down on the cost of food for those who obtain a livestock animal
- I think hens and other live stock would be a good thing as long as it's done right and not disruptive to the neighbourhood
- I had neighbors who had chickens for many years (not sure if they were legal) but they annoyed the entire neighborhood. Caused lots of cats to roam the area. And they were not cared for / cleaned properly. The next door neighbors said that it stunk terrible too, they couldn't sit outside due to the smell.
- Bylaw should investigate and approve every application to ensure proper care of the animals and agreement of the neighbors. As an aside, this should also apply to dog and cat breeders.
- I've been interested in urban hens and have been looking forward to a time when they would be allowed in Calgary.
- Yes but no roosters, they are too noisy in early mornings.
- This would be a good idea as long as two conditions are met. Firstly, as stated, neighbours must be okay with this. Obviously, not everybody is okay living next to livestock, which is why neighbour approval would be very important. Secondly, adequate resources must be in place in order to assure the livestock are being properly taken care of. Some sort of system could be implemented where bylaw officers come inspect living conditions every so often to ensure the animal is being cared for. Additionally, other factors than just the property itself should be included in this assessment. For



example, a family could have a big backyard and neighbour support, seemingly able to care for livestock. However, if this family is VERY busy, and never has time for the livestock, this can lead to neglect and should be considered before approving livestock ownership.

- as we move forward as a city, many people are exploring new greener and more sustainable ways of living and feeding themselves. the presence of chickens or other small livestock within city property is not a stretch and would be an excellent way for calgarians to feed themselves.
- Very much support having different types of small livestock in the city as long as there will be rules for controlling amount, odour and noises that could annoy neighbours.
- Only if conditions are met to ensure this is not adversely affecting the neighbourhood.
- I believe it would benefit positively
- Bring on the hens
- If there are suitable homes within the City of Calgary that can provide for "other livestock" and have the support of neighbours/community, they should absolutely be allowed to do so.
- Hens perhaps, no roosters please.
- "As long as they are well managed I see no downside to permitting chickens and other livestock. There should be an associated increase in bylaw policing to ensure this is well
- Implemented and maintained. The impact on neighbouring properties must be well managed and policed with a clear system in place to manage complaints in a timely manner."
- Hens are a quiet and beneficial pet.
- Food production is important and hens don't cause many issues.
- Support it for livestock under 40 lbs.
- as long as they follow every bylaw and that is it taken seriously by all
- "Provided there is support from MAJORITY of adjacent neighbours.
- Agree with all other crieteria."
- Only if support from adjacent neighbours and that the animals would not increase noise. Proper training and check-ins for the new animals to ensure they are being taken care of properly would also be helpful.
- The people most affected would be neighbours and this seems to cover that.
- As long as strong regulations are in place...
- people should be able to raise chickens
- there is nothing wrong with having fresh eggs :)
- I support people owning hens for collecting eggs. How would the City monitor livestock animals from being slaughtered? If the livestock animal is used for animal-assisted therapy then I support it. This might open the doors to animal cruelty. If the livestock animal becomes sick it is likely that the animal would be slaughtered.
- We should have the right given the appropriate space to raise animals that will benefit ourselves and communities.
- as long as proper care and shelter are provided in a home that and individual 'OWNS' for their livestock it should be allowed. Tenants of properties should not qualify as they do not hold the responsibility for the property.



- I like the idea as long as this bylaw is informed.
- Only if criteria are strictly enforced.
- I think as long as neighbors are okay with hens then there should be no issues. However the homeowner should be required to share the eggs with neighbors too lol
- "If the owners of the birds are able to care for them properly
- And neighbours approve they should be allowed to have fowl"
- Allow hens
- Case by case makes sense
- Only in specific areas. Not in areas where your backyard faces green space, apartments or in condos. If you don't have a fully fenced backyard or adequate space.
- As long as the animal is recommended in writing by a licensed medical practitioner to provide assistance to the owner
- When is providing even a small portion of your own food ever a bad thing?
- Only if mandatory visits held to ensure the health and welfare of the animals are being maintained.
- Limited to numbers
- I want to make sure the animals are taken care of properly
- On one hand I think livestock does not belong in an urban setting, however, if livestock is not disruptive to the neighborhood and is provided ample space and necessary housing, it's hard to disagree.
- I've been in favour of this for years.
- Strongly support!
- As long as they're not a nuisance (noise/mess) to other neighbours people should be allowed to have hens or other similar domesticated animals.
- responsible ownership is key
- I think it could promote positive and healthy relationships with the environment and provide people with other options for milk and eggs if they so desired. It would also allow a better pest and weed management alternative than toxic chemicals.
- Chickens are a must for food sustainability which should be a focus of all levels of government start at municipalities level
- hens and other animals can make wonderful additions to a family and neighbourhood. But they must be kept in optimal conditions. The animals needs shuld come first
- Lovely idea
- Lots of animals would be great pets and I'm fine with it, as long as people take care of their pets.
- As long as it's not damaging properties
- In the understanding that butchering should not be done at home and hat the bylaw is very clear on what animals are allowed.
- Great idea. Hope this includes bees.



- I love the idea of allowing hens in the city. I would be able to easily buy eggs and meet the hens and the owner to make sure they are treated well. Instead of buying eggs from the grocery store and I don't know how they treat their hens
- Chickens are pets too.
- We need more bees.
- Responsible ownership and animal husbandry should be permitted wherever an owner has the means and grounds necessary to provide and properly care for these animals.
- Yes, if strict restrictions on numbers are enforced. checks / inspections every 2 years
- I believe urban hens can be kept responsibly in Calgary.
- If you have enough space and it doesn't bother anyone, then why not.
- I think it would be a great addition to our city. I support the sustainability of cultivating our own food.
- I'm one of those people that would like to have egg laying hens in my yard.
- As long as there is neighbor approval this would be great.
- If everyone is in agreement I think this could be very positive
- Everyone loves hens, I bet the neighbours would get some eggs every now and again, and I bet the kids in the street would have a blast.
- Maximum of 3 hens, more than that the poop stinks
- There must be a maximum number of animals and a minimum distance from neighbouring properties.
- Tentative yes - I like the idea, but I don't believe most city properties are large enough to support suitable living conditions most other types of livestock besides poultry.
- The bylaw against urban hens and urban homesteading is outdated.
- Any hen ownership should require approval of adjacent neighbours
- I definitely think up to 3 chickens should be allowed, they are very quiet and add to a more wholesome lifestyle
- Fresh eggs are good for everyone.
- Nothing wrong with people having their hens as long as they have proper environment set up for them
- For thousands of years this has been the way of life it is only recently changed, and to the detriment of peoples health and well being. People want to feed themselves, it is a basic human right, even the poorest of folks can enrich their diets with livestock such as hens. It's dehumanizing to allow large corporations to have a monopoly on what we can feed ourselves and our children.
- Especially with everything going on it would be beneficial for people to have a source of food readily available.
- I'd like to have egg laying chickens
- As long as the birds are well cared for and not causing a nuisance to neighbours, people should be able to have them.
- Support people wanting to have their own sustainable options, like eggs from their own backyard



- There would need to be guidelines on the number of hens allowed and strict guidelines on the coop size and cleanliness.
- I think people need to learn to share space and responsibilities. Most bylaws are created to help maintain order it's people that seems to be the nuisance.
- .
- Chickens are fun
- No issue with hens - should have been allowed years ago.
- It holds owners more responsible.
- Having your own livestock would promote sustainable living, I 100% support this lifestyle.
- Hens are quieter then people think. This is also a massive opportunity for people to live more sustainable lives for food & eggs. With the pandemic on-going this would provide people a great way to lower the amount of money they spend on store bought eggs & poultry
- I agree in principle but would need more details on the proposal before fully committing to it.
- As long as the animals are cared for and not abused and the n3ughbours agree, there isn't any harm in having livestock but there shoud be restrictions like you can't own a cow or bull in a normal sized city backyard.
- It's difficult to see downsides to residents being permitted to responsibly produce their own food.
- I want chickens
- As long as all health and ethical standards are being adhered to, and different livestock at each household are known to be harmonious.
- Those with allergies cannot always have a 'standard' pet.
- Do not allow roosters.
- People should be able to determine their own lifestyle if they are not causing any harm.
- fresh eggs are way better than store bought and we should be able to raise and grow food in our yards. To a point of course.
- Pigs and chickens and other livestock should be allowed. You had a famous turkey in your city. Had people been able house him he may have lived a better life.
- The last 'expert' that testified determined that Backyard Chicken's could pose a risk of Avian or Bird Flu. I personally contacted the WHO who responded that there has never been a case of Backyard Chickens transmitting such illnesses or outbreaks. I invite the 'City' to contact the WHO themselves to confirm this, instead of basing their decision on the 'personal opinion' of one testifying 'expert'. Other municipalities have integrated Backyard Chickens with very few incidents, there is no longer a reason why Calgarians are being denied this right.
- For smaller animals - a size restriction should be specified and certainly the permission of the immediate neighbours.
- Urban livestock and agriculture are healthy and positive initiatives.
- Egg laying hens are a good option for food justice/security and are no more challenging than existing domestic animals that are allowed in the city.
- It'd be a great way for families to raise chickens and eggs!



- I think a couple hens would be fine if used for eggs. It could start getting messy if people started chopping heads off chickens in their backyard so they could at 5he chickens.
- Yes, Calgary is so large, this bylaw shouldn't limit those with adequate resources for these animals. If you have a good yard you should be able to have chickens.
- Chickens are as clean as you make them! Good hygiene and regulated living conditions for the birds makes for a healthy and environmentally responsible way to provide oneself and family with fresh eggs.
- Like all things responsible ownership is key
- As long as the well being of the hens are ensured via licensing, inspections etc.
- Everyone should be able to have chickens.
- I think that people should be able to have small livestock on their property as long as they have adequate living conditions for the animals. i.e. A yard that can support a chicken coop for chickens. There should be a limit to the number of livestock a household can have.
- Yes, but with the option to have the decision reviewed and reassessed if needed.
- N/A
- Livestock can be enjoyable and useful
- Having hens on ones property is a great method of insect control. Chickens will eat just about any insect in their path, including underground insect. Chickens are very easy to care for and it's an affordable source of eggs. They produce less waste and noise than a dog, all while eliminating pests and feeding people.
- I support animal welfare checks
- As long as neighbors are ok with it.
- It can be useful for some, given right and suitable conditions for the hens, to be able to raise them in their own backyards. Even more so now with covid. This is as long as guidelines are being followed and noise and odour are kept to a minimum.
- I would be open to it, but there would need to be a lot of rules, limited numbers of hens, a permit and inspections. Neighbors would definitely need to be agreeable. But how would it work if someone new moves in next door?
- As long as you require support from neighbors
- As long as it's responsibly pet ownership in safe and humane environments. They should be registered with the city as well.
- Responsible individuals should not be punished for their choice of animal
- Why not. Food prices are ridiculous and its private property, we should be allowed to do what we want on our own property anyways
- Bylaws are way to tight in this area on people who would be bothering no one else
- I believe there's room for this in our city and it could have great benefits in many areas if done properly
- As long as these animals are not infringing on other people's property or their enjoyment of their property the city should have no say on what a person does. That said neighbours should sort that out themselves we dont need the city intervening.



- If people are responsible for their animals, they should be able to have them within their private property.
- As long as the hens are not a nuisance and being well-cared for, this seems awesome.
- I would like to raise hens, they don't require much, they don't make big mess plus you get organic eggs
- as long as there is enough funding to hire animal welfare officers
- As long as someone isn't interfering with the enjoyment of others property, let people be responsible.
- Hens provide sustainable food for families and are a reasonable animal to keep within city limits.
- Case by case, taking neighbours views into account.
- I think urban farming is awesome
- Seems good with consent
- If the community, especially surrounding neighbours, is in support of the addition of livestock, the people should be allowed to keep them on their property.
- Yes as long as it is heavily regulated and I would say that this bylaw should be reviewed after a certain period of time to see if it is still a good idea because I am worried about the smell/noise
- Urban hens are FINE, as long as proper sanitary measures, upkeep, and inspections are done to prevent the spread of disease.
- If an animal can be loved and cared for in a humane way, Doesn't disturb the neighbours why not?
- I believe local livestock is important and being able to farm at home.
- I would love to be able to support myself and the community. Bee Hives should be the same!
- Yes. Rules such as limit of numbers allowed (possibly dependent on location and size of property), breeding and roosters (noise complaints will rise if roosters are allowed).
- With the shortages of food we have seen with Covid, and the massive increase in cost, we need the ability to produce our own food. Chickens, rabbits and even goats can easily be raised within the city. We already allow flying rats (pigeons), that defecate all over neighbours property, so I do not understand why simply livestock that are maintain on ones property are not allowed.
- Hens can be a vital resource of food for some families.
- Yes as long as the noise can be managed at nights.
- This allows for sustainable living, and would provide healthy and private alternatives for dietary needs and wants.
- Animals can greatly enhance people's lives. The City should not legislate the type of animals people can have as long as the animal is well cared for, housed appropriately, there is no potential danger to other people and the neighbors are in support.
- Only if they were not a nuisance to neighbours with noise, smell, etc.
- Evolution comes with change and so does opportunity. Encouraging urban farm-steading is one initiative to help younger generations grow
- As long as measured are taken to prevent nuisances to neighboring houses (such as the aforementioned support from neighbors) I support this amendment.



- Chickens etc can be useful / supportive to communities. So long as it is hygienic, non nuisance and is humane.
- All points seem fair and reasonable
- Less chance for strays or wild animals to become hostile and more frequent
- Responsible hen ownership can have positive and sustainable impacts on the community.
- Only if appropriate land to house animals...
- I believe certain breeds of hens would be a great addition to calgary
- Would depend on existing zoning for what livestock is being considered.
- Would like to see diversity in Calgary, including unusual pets, if they are safe and well-cared-for, and have support from neighbours (with grandfathering, to avoid problems if neighbours change over time)
- Yes. Eggs are expensive
- Yes only if guidelines are followed and TRIALED first. I grew up on mixed farm, all animals have excrement, chicken shit stinks to high heaven if out of control, trust me, and I will feel very sorry for a neighbour living next door to anyone not following guidelines, however it could be wonderful if done right
- Hens provide food - eggs and meat - and are excellent at managing garden pests
- It would be a good opportunity for people to raise their own food
- Sometimes livestock animals have much to offer and in some cases are therapy supports for individuals.
- Many livestock animals can be a benefit to humans beyond cats and dogs if they are provided for appropriately and responsibly.
- No reason families can't have a few chickens in their yard. This is not a hazard to anyone and certainly not as much as the many dogs which bark constantly at neighbours or anyone walking by.
- As long as the animals' welfare is assured and there is agreement from neighbours.
- Responsible ownership is key - those owning hens must follow these guidelines and ensure the health and safety of both the animals in their care and neighbours in their community.
- If the animal can be well cared for and is not causing an issue in the surrounding area, I don't see a reason for someone to not have any animal
- as long as the animal can be kept healthy and happy, and is not a nuisance, i think it should be allowed.
- Could give some hens a much better life than in a factory farm, I would love for factory farms to lose business! Would need vets available in town to work with chickens and regulations to make sure they are properly cared for
- Provided animals are cared for and rooster is a late sleeper...
- Hens don't bother anyone as long as they are flightless breeds. Certain heritage breeds should remain banned. People are screwed by government price fixing on eggs so they should be allowed to raise them this isn't Nazi germany
- Other large cities allow hens in city yards, and have found positive impacts of this bylaw.



- As long as the by law officer is trained properly to assess the situation, (ie genuine care for the animals life rather than their personal beliefs of the owners) then I believe it could work. Only if they are trained with empathy for humans and animals
- I think urban hens are a great idea. The lock down has revealed food insecurity is a problem so having eggs from your own hens would be helpful to any family.
- as long as they have adequate shelter, especially in winter
- Why not? It sounds fun and healthy.
- Just support it no explanation
- Responsible ownership
- I think chickens or other livestock should be allowed to be kept as food sources, BUT they should be restricted to a maximum number of them per home.
- I feel unable livestock is a great investment, again making sure responsible ownership including duty of care is met for the animal and neighbors.
- Hens would give our city a lot more character if we had domesticated ones roaming around. I think it's a cool idea. But just like any other pet they should be given proper shots if necessary and they should be chipped.
- Livestock like chickens are increasingly being seen as pets and are part of life. As such they should be allowed to exist in homes and backyards if well cared for
- Not every one wants a dog or a cat. There are plenty of animals eg) pigs.. that ppl should be able to responsibly owned
- If people would like to own other types of animals on their property and can provide suitable and positive living conditions, I am all for it
- Hens provide a natural, organic food source and it goes hand-in-hand with growing a vegetable and/or fruit garden for fresh food. I do believe that the animals need to be well cared for properly and not create a disturbance to the neighbours.
- Provided the animals are kept for pets only and are well cared for.
- Other city initiatives people have been against something on their street passes anyway
- Hens are intelligent and emotional animals
- Urban hens are a fantastic idea although I wonder if it would draw more wildlife into the neighbourhoods? Coyotes and other predators may become more problematic.
- I would consider this only for chickens.
- Chickens can be kept for food security/egg production and make less noise than dogs. They can make great pets if kept in a clean manner.
- Criteria proposed is mindful of the community and the neighbors of the individual whom desires to have urban livestock as well as the livestock's needs. As long as the individuals with the livestock are limited to number of livestock allowed and they do receive periodic inspections to ensure the livestock is being properly looked after I don't see a problem with it.
- As long as people are aware of the needs and space needed for the animal. It is worth trying. The owners should be willing to have inspectors see if they are following the rules.



- I'm in support of urban livestock as long as the sound/smell is not negatively impacting or disrupting neighbours or the surrounding community.
- More animals, the better. Also, grazers could help build sustainable city development.
- I like the concept.
- As long as the animal is taken care of and not caged it should be okay for other animals besides normal house pets live at your house.
- Urban chicken raising is a fantastic idea as long as reasonable standards of care are upheld.
- I am in favour of backyard hens IF: 1) they are cared for and housed in the excellent way as in the case of my acquaintance who has the emotional support animal hens, 2) there is no mess or nuisance odours to bother the adjacent neighbours.
- Yes as long as they are looking after the animals and none of them are dangerous.
- require all urban poultry owners to take a course in looking after urban poultry
- I think any livestock should be permitted in Calgary if the property has a suitable space for it and if the owner takes responsibility for the behavior of the livestock and for the consequences.
- Providing the owner has neighbour support. Also adherence to detailed documents on suitable living conditions
- I would only support hens with strict bylaw conditions,
- Yes as long as the animals are being kept properly!
- I 100% sport urban hens. If people can have dogs, cats, snakes, parrots chinchillas, etc, they should absolutely be allowed to have hens.
- Hens are useful
- as long as they are considerate od neighbour's, this could be a nice benefit for the communities
- If the people want it...
- Limitations need to be made a head.
- I think allowing other livestock is a fantastic ideas, as long as it's not a nuisance for the neighbours. Eg. chickens, goats, piglets etc. :) And as you said, as long as animals are provided with adequate living conditions and not crammed in in a tiny urban yard. There should also be procedures in place for assisting abandoned or neglected animals, and animals in distress. Also, please no killings of animals on urban property (e.g. a chicken for dinner), for some people this could be highly distressing. Licensing livestock would bring another revenue to the city.
- Absolutely support! We are losing our rural culture!!
- If the neighbours are okay with it, the birds are properly housed and cared for, then why not?
- Chickens are just as "clean" as cats and dogs when cared for properly. They will increase people gardening and interacting with the land, which will improve health and wellbeing for everyone.
- As long as there is no negative impact to neighbours and the community at large, there is no down side to this. If people want to have hens, they should have hens
- Pet pigs can be house broken and be socialized to get along with the public and other animals. They are smart and can provide a great deal of comfort and pleasure to their owners; they shouldn't be relegated to homes in the country only. And having one's own hens guarantees a supply of healthy eggs that did not originate from any kind of mass-production facility.



- Hens but not roosters are okay as long as they do not get out to disturb the neighbours or attract predators like coyotes & bobcats to the neighbourhood. Other domesticated animals that are pets rather than livestock could be considered.
- we need to evolve, and work together. As long as owners are responsible and adhere to procedures, there should be no problem to co exist
- I fully support managed urban agriculture. Limits to animal populations and each species assessed by size and purpose.
- Providing the living conditions and suitable for the animals and not a nuisance to neighbours. The city also needs to be active if animals are suffering and not just give warnings until the animals die. If you let people do this, you need to take care of the animals.
- There are a lots of different livestock that would work well in the city, as long as they are looked after. Goats could take over from lawn mowers, etc.
- "Chickens can be quite smelly, need to ensure they aren't a nuisance to neighbours.
- For fines (noplacelse to put this), the fines need to have a range for first attack vs a subsequent one. Puppies can cause minor injuries unintentionally. Has to be some consideration for cases where a person was antagonizing or hurt the dog first."
- If a person can care for and provide the adequate level of support for an animal, while ensuring that it's not a nuisance for their neighbours, I feel they should be allowed to have it.
- Hens lay eggs and can also be used to supply meat to a family
- Hens/Livestock cannot create noise or odour problems for any neighbours.
- As long as the amount of livestock is limited and the ownership does not generate any issues for neighbours (e.g. extra noise, smell, etc.) I don't have any issues with this.
- Chickens make great pets that contribute sustainably to backyards. For the people who want chickens having bylaws in place protects them and others from irresponsible pet ownership. Having bylaws allows proper guidelines in place for people wanting to have pets.
- if done responsibly for animal and neighbor impact, I think there is no reason not to allow.
- I am assuming there are other animals similar to hens that fit the criteria
- There should be support from neighbors in case of noise.
- It is great to see people trying to engage in at-home farming and providing food for their families. Self-sufficiency is a wonderful tool.
- good conditions for animal, respects neighbors, food security
- All of above
- Reasons stated above
- If the animal can have a good quality of life in the city as they would in the country it should be allowed
- Yes to hens! But no other livestock
- As long as there is no negative impact on the neighbourhood or community what would it matter
- I think a person should be allowed hens and livestock if they have space.



- As long as the hens and/or livestock is in a suitable living environment and is being taken care of I believe it is a great idea and opportunity.
- yes yes! Food security, beneficial to gardens, teaches city kids more about caring for nature! 100% onboard
- urban livestock should be allowed if requirements are met
- ok...as long as the owner keeps the smell and noise down, and cleans up regularly. In close city neighborhoods, poorly maintained living conditions can make it difficult to enjoy the outdoors, if your neighbors are not keeping it clean.
- Chickens are awesome! If your neighbors are okay with you having chickens then I think it should be allowed, up keep is a must!! Clean their pen often!
- Sustainable source of eggs and poultry for families of different incomes. They're cute as hell.
- I believe people should be able to have laying hens/fresh eggs but a maximum # based on space.
- absolutely support this effort to increase food security and support local food production
- The current bylaw is outdated and does not directly address the perceived problems. Urban hens have been allowed in many major Western cities, successfully, for decades.
- As long as the animals are being cared for in a proper manner and are not disturbing the people living in close proximity.
- Having hens would be fantastic for everyone who wants one.
- Owners should apply for a licence which will allow these situations to be monitored.
- This could be highly beneficial for Calgary and with the city feeling financial pressures it could save the waste management department a bunch of money as the birds can be supplemented with food scraps. There is a great example of a city in Belgium that had 6000 birds put out and the first month they reduced their organics to landfill by 100 Ton.
- As long as someone is monitored on how many they can have and checked up on to make sure they are not breeding in large amounts therefore to reduce the quality of life of the hens then I see no problem. They should be kept as pets and to take the unfertilized eggs for eating. But not to slaughter themselves or at all, urban hens to be as pets and that is it.
- I think the idea of back yard chickens is great
- So long as they are only used as pets or free range eggs
- Chickens are a great learning opportunity and good source for families. And great pets
- If owners are required by law to consider the needs of both their neighbours and livestock, this amendment would make Calgary an even more progressive city and would enrich the lives of many of us.
- Limitations should be placed on the breeding of 'agricultural' pets.
- So long as the hens are treated well and have safe/comfortable living conditions. There is no where to provide an explanation for question number 8 so am doing so here: children should be taught not to approach any dog without asking an owner for permission first so I think the 'early warning' is redundant - they should be taught to be cautious of all dogs that they do not know.
- Calgaryans should be allowed to have hens and other livestock like small ponies etc.
- Chickens can be easily taken care of as long as people only have 3 or 4



- Urban hens are great in small numbers. There is no reason a family shouldn't have a small flock of no more than 6 hens, provided they have adequate space and then animals are well taken care of.
- As long as it is a limited number of livestock and the adjacent neighbours have some input, I believe this makes sense. I do believe if new neighbours arrive after the livestock is already established (ie/ house is sold, new renters), they should be able to have some input as well, but it should be very limited, and mostly if there is concern about the animal welfare.
- Having fresh eggs is a huge benefit
- They need places to live and sometimes they can't afford out of city
- City dwellers need to be able to grow their own food...whether it be vegetables, fruit or chickens, eggs etc.
- Hens would be a great source of cheap eggs/protein, but each community should be able to vote on/enforce their own acceptance/adoption of this by-law.
- Supply food.
- I am in support if the people are being responsible. But, again this is a big "new" area that could be a big can of worms.... and need a lot more enforcement officers....
- I agree with the criteria however, suitable living conditions should be a top priority in granting approval.
- Have chickens is extremely beneficial to food security and permaculture a like.
- I think hens, etc should be allowed.
- It's a human right to grow own food
- adequate space must be determined and available for said livestock.
- it is time
- As long as noises and smells are managed also
- Need limits on number of hens allowed, noise levels need to be evaluated as well as strict clear rules on unsightly coops. Maybe have a predetermined minimum sized property before allowing hens?
- As long as the individual is responsible
- If set up properly and noise/smell was taken into consideration.
- Should not need neighbors approval
- Livestock can be companions just as well as a dog or cat can, as long as they're being taken care of properly of course.
- I support urban hens. It used to be common to have urban hens. I support a wide range of urban animals provided that the owner can provide the animal with a good quality of life.
- It seems a positive BUT I believe it should be conditional to owners having to provide suitable accommodations for the hens (or other livestock) to meet the needs of the animals having a healthy lifestyle. People should never get "pets" on a whim and must be responsible for their well being. The City should review an owner's setup before allowing hens etc. to be allowed in an urban yard.
- "As long as the living space and conditions are suitable for the animal.
- Ensure the living space of the animal is not offensive to neighbours."



- Chickens (hens) are great for gardens. They eat insects and fertilize. No roosters!
- I want my own hens
- Our communities can benefit from allowing Responsible Owners to keep livestock such as hens and goats. The property would need to be evaluated to ensure the animals will be well cared for and that surrounding neighbours won't be negatively impacted by sounds or smells.
- please please please for non rooster fowl in calgary
- As long as the animals are kept in clean and safe conditions I don't see a problem with having chickens but no rooster. Looking at the next question concerning pigeons, they can be a pest and can be very noisy
- We should have been allowed to have hens a long time ago, this is 2020.
- I would love to have a back yard hen. So this is an easy yes for me.
- Well cared for livestock would be a huge step forward for the city, helping lessen the global problem of large scale commercial animal facilities.
- A lot to consider here. A limit on # of animals. Welfare of the animals in questions comes first > I believe people should need some sort of training/certificate to do this (all in contact with the animals) that covers animal care; city bylaws; hygiene, etc. Do you have enough Bylaw officers to investigate your "case-by-case basis" in timely manner?
- Hens are a sustainable food source for the environment and can provide food for low cost.
- Having the option of providing your own food source, ethical livestock raising, and the decline of factory farms is important for the health and wellbeing of society and the environment. Also Calgary needs some equestrian facilities that are within city limits, especially as the city seems to expand ever outward, causing existing facilities to move further and further away. Participation in activities such as 4-H, or horse riding lessons, is something that has been proven to improve the lives of lower income families and children, but its unrealistic for many families in the city who rely on transit or can't afford the time to drive 40 minutes out of the city to attend such activities.
- As long as the owners of the fowls (hens in this case) are responsible and loving.
- If neighbors are in agreement and safe and suitable living conditions are provided there is no reason why they should not be permitted.
- As long as we can truly implement the law and have enough staff to follow it.
- Backyard hens are great for pets and eggs. We don't need approval from a neighbor to get a dog and shouldn't need to for a hen. They are no more disruptive, less so actually.
- The criteria seems acceptable
- It has been a dream for me to have a few hens in the yard. There are many options such as rent-a-hen for the summer. They eat bugs and fertilize the yard. Less pesticides used.
- I would support hens and pigeons with a limit. Not with neighbor consent. No other livestock.
- Hens would be an amazing change for many Calgarians
- As long as conditions are good and terms are acceptable
- Hens would be a lovely and welcome addition to the city.
- "Animals can support the mental health of their owners, which is very necessary (and not financially supported) at this time.



- Re support from adjacent neighbours: I think this should depend on the size of the owner's property. If the animal needs the whole range, then the owner needs support. But, if the animal can be kept from the neighbours (for destruction/noise purposes), then the owner shouldn't need neighbour support."
- I do not think neighbour support is necessary and would be an obstacle to housing/owning urban hens if relations between property owners were already not good.
- Animals other than cats and dogs can be beneficial companions. Now that covid has restricted travel this would be a good move, and also more gardens replacing lawns should be considered.
- As long as animals are not disturbing those who live nearby and do not have nuisance behaviors there is no reason to not allow them.
- Everyone benefits assuming the animals specific living conditions are met.
- As long as those living near by agreed and there were no issues - smell, noise...
- People should be able to raise hens on their property, and not require neighbors permission
- I agree
- Hens for example can have a community benefit.
- As long as the animals welfare is appropriate for the type of animal and the existence of them in the community doesn't negatively impact normal living conditions for our fellow neighbors. ie smells / noise / faeces complaints etc.
- As long as it does not impact the neighbour's livelihood and peace of mind
- That would be a good benefit. For all
- I don't see why people can't have a chicken or a duck as a pet. a maximum should be enforced for sure. but i don't know what that number is.
- They must be kept clean so as not to attract rodents, insects, etc.
- As long as the animals have a good quality of life - are well cared for, have enough space and environmental enrichment.
- "but with the same rules as for pigeons:
- Locating the coop within a specified distance of adjacent houses
- Odour management (eg. clean coop, etc.)
- Enforce coop standards
- Removal of some or all birds if problems arise
- Cleanup of feces"
- Having hens or other livestock is a good way for people to "grow" their own food.
- With care and hygiene, hens are no nuisance. Lots of cities allow hens.
- I feel if there are rules to address animal welfare and possible nuisances to neighboring houses then Calgarians should be afforded the positive rewards that come with other livestock... within reason of course.
- Hens should be allowed but perhaps there should be a limit of the total amount allowed on site, depending on their living conditions and amount of room for them to roam their yard.



- Poultry would enhance food self-sustainability for families and could benefit children in that they could learn more about our foodchains. They could also build greater empathy for animal welfare through hen care.
- Only concern is difficulty of enforcement if conditions are not met.
- Seems reasonable
- As long as there's a maximum number allowed and the animals are treated properly
- As long as you have the support of your neighbours I'm fine with it
- Hens, rabbits and maybe other livestock should be allowed in Calgary backyards to provide local food and reduce emissions.
- Yes, but if someone with medically provable allergies lives next door they should be allowed to veto.
- I love this idea. I hope if this amendment goes through that the city will mandate minimum sizes for the coup and enclosures as well as guidelines for ensuring their feces are cleaned up regularly.
- I believe it is positive for individuals to be more self-sufficient if they have the means to be. Urban hens would be a positive thing for Calgaryans!
- Fresh eggs!!! Chores for kids that belong to parents who let them play games on internet all day!!
- It is a fair amendment.
- If someone wants a chicken or other livestock, I don't see how it's any different than having a dog, iguana, horse, etc. As long as the animal is cared for and happy/healthy, as well as not bothering neighbours, power to them!
- livestock can be very beneficial in the right setting. I do think it needs to be closely monitored though
- I believe there are a number of benefits to having a variety of small livestock within a community. I agree with making sure there is a balanced approach and that neighbours are consulted.
- Food security
- I have no problem with people raising livestock as long as the animals are treated humanely, it's a clean operation, and it doesn't disturb the neighbours.
- Only provided that the livestock is monitored regularly for proper living conditions and limiting the number of complaints before following up with the option of revoking permission for the animal to reside there.
- As long as you have the support of your neighbours.
- Access to more sustainable food sources in urban areas is a must. Chickens make interesting pets and do not carry any more inherent problems than other animals considered pets do.
- I feel urban hens add to the pleasure of a city. Fresh eggs are wonderful. No roosters are required. Proper checks must be maintained to make sure that cleanliness and proper feeding is followed
- Certain areas have the required yard space for larger /different types of animals
- Urban hens would fill a much-needed void in local, sustainable gardening. In addition to providing eggs they would also provide natural pest control from garden visitors such as slugs, cabbage moths, and aphids, as well as fertilizer and the scratching up of space to prepare it for planting. It will also give families, especially children, the opportunity to experience first-hand where our food comes from and the cycles of Nature.



- will permit be required?
 - I think it is great to have more urban hens and other livestock in Calgary. it adds to food security and it is great for kids to see where their food comes from.
 - Hens provide households with natural and organic food source. It is very valuable support during challenging time like Covid-19 pandemic.
 - For chickens if there was a cap on how many they could have, and bees if they are classed as livestock. Do not support larger animals, e.g. pigs, goats, cows, horses etc.
 - Sounds fair
 - Hens can be good pets if well cared for.
 - responsible chicken ownership is a benefit to people and communities
 - As long as they are kept in manner that they remain relatively quiet and no smell - I think it helps promote local food production.
 - a couple of hens ok, but many more hens and other livestock no
 - "I support this bylaw if the animals are properly cared for and the following needs are met: shelter from weather conditions, food and water, social and emotional, physical and medical, and they do not cause an excessive disturbance to neighbours in comparison to other domestic pets. (For example, a pet pig that is loved and properly cared for is akin to a pet dog and there is no reason the guardians should need to move outside city limits.)
-
- Regarding the number of pigeons allowable on a residential property, I said zero because I'm not well enough informed and don't understand why people are allowed to keep wildlife captive on their property."
 - if the environment is safe I have no issue
 - As long as the animals don't bother people are aren't being abused it should be fine
 - Some emotional animals are not your average pet for most people
 - I think allowing people to have livestock is perfectly ok if it's done in a sensible manner.
 - I have no opposition whatsoever.
 - "Quiet, clean, and managed livestock, with consideration for neighbours should be permitted.
 - Roosters waking people up at 5:00 AM would not be considered appropriate."
 - Based solely on the welfare of the animal, if you can afford and provide proper care, why wouldn't it be allowed? It's just an animal like a dog or cat.
 - I am interested in this idea. Even if I were not I would not want to deny someone else the opportunity. I don't know if it's economically a winner, but it is emotionally healthy and a character builder. Locavore.
 - Assumes that there are limits on numbers and that the definition of adjacent neighbours is clearly defined.
 - If the animal and its environment is being cared for, the space is sufficient for the number of animals, the animals' Five Freedoms are fulfilled, and it is not causing the neighbours any harm, why not?



- I support having egg-laying hens in the city. If you can have a potbellied pig why not chickens or other livestock if they are being taken care of in a suitable manner.
- I support city hens provided they are not causing disturbance with too much noise, smell, or distraction of land.
- As long as the owner of hens has approval from neighbors surrounding the owner's property
- If it benefits the community and animals are well treated
- If people have urban hens responsibly then that's a good thing to do. Expectation of specific rules for having urban hens kept must be communicated clearly.
- If there is a suitable environment established for the animal I would be okay with other livestock. Noise considerations for the community should be considered.
- I think that having livestock increased mental health and in the case of children is very educational.
- As a community we need to be supportive of our neighbors with mental health issues
- Lots of folks like to have livestock as pets or to supplement their diet. As long as they can do so without being a bother to their neighbourhood they should be allowed.
- If people can provide good welfare and conscientious humane care to other domesticated animals without undue inconvenience to surrounding neighbours that should be allowed. Loud children, fire pits, music and parties are far more annoying and disruptive than animals.
- As long as they have support from their neighbours, go for it.
- Hens are a great alternative to other in-home pets. No roosters!
- We are not food based agriculture. I would only support the keeping of hens or pigeons or duck as pets, not food animals. And so I support a limit of pet numbers just as with other pets for the well being of the animals.
- Chickens provide a food source, reduce unwanted pests require little space and are reasonably easy to care for. They are a great learning experience for families.
- What other livestock is being considered
- Hens are cool, lay eggs and eat garden pests, even NYC allows residents to have up to 5 backyard hens (no cocks).
- Why not? Makes sustainable sense and good for communities.
- choice and freedom if controlled
- As long as there is no significant detriment to neighbours and the livestock have enough space.
- "Except for roosters and other very loud livestock."
- I would want the same bylaw process as is used for a home business (placard announcing the request, opportunity to oppose it, etc.)"
- The animals should still be cared for and there should be penalties for not providing adequate food and shelter and care.
- An animal that is considered livestock is only considered that because we use them for food or profit which doesn't mean they will be a nuisance or destructive, etc. Pigs for example can be great family pets as they're incredibly intelligent, can be housetrained, and don't bother neighbours by barking like a dog might. Some cities in BC allow residents to keep hens on their property and as far as I know they haven't had any problems. It's a great alternative to store bought eggs as egg farms are



incredibly cruel to chickens (even free range). Maybe if there was a limit to the number of hens per household or per square foot of land.

- As long as the birds don't encourage coyotes and other wildlife from coming into Calgary to eat them it should be ok.
- support animals should be allowed, hens can help provide food (eggs) for people - do not support killing & butchering on private property (there has to be a solution to the ultimate requirement for this)
- Hens for sure
- "Strict rules should be made regarding cleaning routines and coop distance from the house as the smell could affect neighbours. In addition, if someone makes a smell complaint or one chick turns out to be a rooster, which is crowing at all hours a prompt response and clear criteria should be signed off on by potential owners before being allowed livestock.
- The majority of people are responsible, but there are always those who flout the rules and no repercussions are followed through."
- I think this is great
- People interested in having urban hens should be required to prove they have sufficient training and approved set up for the safety of all concerned.
- Many major N. American cities allow chickens and it seems to work.
- As long as the hens have a good shelter and are treated fairly
- We need to develop food sufficiency
- I think all the criteria mentioned is important.
- I would love to have hens for fresh eggs.
- Seems like a good idea so long as the above criteria is met and that the ongoing well-being of the animals is being met and followed up on on a regular basis.
- I support self-sufficiency and self-sustainability with regards to food sources.
- Any measure that enhances a family's capability of self-sufficiency should be vigorously supported.
- Support from adjacent neighbours that may be impacted by noise or smell must be required. But I agree there are some community benefits when this support exists.
- If your willing to properly take care of a pet and give it a good life then you should be allowed to do so
- Calgary needs to allow hens
- As long as the pets are not being kept as a future source of food. Hens can used for their eggs.
- Yes
- I like the idea of hens within Calgary limits, as long as the hen owner is taking good care of the animals and being respectful of neighbours (odor mgmt). Meeting a neighbour with hens would be a good learning experience for young and old. Am curious about what other livestock would be considered. Alpacas? Goats? Geese?
- Providing all the aforementioned criteria are met and owners are monitored for compliance.
- As long as neighbours (right next door - assuming a typical yard size) who do not want to live nearby to livestock (I personally don't want to live beside chickens) have their say and can veto a request



then yes. The neighbours should have a more powerful vote than the requestors as it will potentially be a major interruption/inconvenience to them.

- Responsible urban farming should be allowed
- With neighborhood consultation and buy in and with consideration of medical issues (allergies eg), neighbours who can agree on things is always preferable to enforcement. However, we have not had good success with Bylaw enforcement on other issues illegal suits etc. So beware!
- Hens are much quieter than dogs. Hens increase meaning and purpose in life. They also lay eggs!
- Rules must be followed and enforcement when necessary
- Clear guidelines would need to be established by the city so everyone is on the same page. There should be city inspections to ensure animals are treated well and are healthy.
- As long as all the criteria are met, I see no issue.
- If done right (for the animals mostly, but also for residents) certain types of livestock encourage sustainable, local food sources and food security that should be a priority for all cities.
- I kept four chickens while living in Victoria, BC, and never received complaints from neighbours. They are quiet and sweet animals. They also provided eggs for us, and anything that can increase food security during the time of climate crisis is a good thing.
- as long as there is enforcement of conditions that would allow urban hens etc. This might be problematic as enforcement of off leash dogs is lacking.
- As long as the welfare of the hens is paramount.
- Yes to all of the above except adjacent neighbors' permission. A bylaw should impose standards and if it's met then a license to raise chickens will be granted.
- Support from adjacent neighbors, suitable living condition reviews
- They have to share the eggs!
- The real answer is maybe. It all depends on the type of the animal and the reason for having. I can tell you that in order for hens to be productive, you need a Rooster. Roosters can be quite loud.
- as long as the animals are not in distress or extra mess is affecting their neighbours.
- Food security, connection with nature, diversion of food scraps from the landfill into compost that can be used in the garden! Yes!
- I would love to eat eggs from healthy happy loved chicken. We need to get rid of some of these huge warehouses filled with chickens that never seeing the sun. I've already talked to my neighbor and we would love to share the chicken responsibly and eggs
- Case by case is the key. Time intensive but necessary.
- limited to 8 hens per household
- Personal property should be used for personal purposes-while not being a danger or nuisance to others.
- Needs to be licensed to allow, needs to be in proper care for the animal(s), need to be aware. of a bylaw for best neighbour practices.
- Livestock can offer great benefit to agricultural practices, including increasing biodiversity, developing richer soil, and reducing waste
- Providing needed food for families, we need to support our neighbors



- Let's limit the number of hens. What about roosters?
- Support from neighbours is important, unless the animals were there before the neighbours. Then a lack of support is less important.
- Only if these animals were kept in human conditions and neighbours were in agreement.
- I think that it's important that adjacent neighbours are kept informed and are happy with the situation. Also, it's important that the animals are treated properly.
- We would finally follow in the footsteps of other communities across Canada. Hens can pick up bugs (one can deal with bugs in the yard in an environmentally friendly way), hens can act as support pets, kids can engage in taking care of them, etc.
- If animal can save people's life in any way, why not.
- Should have very specific rules around acceptable species, space requirements (x square meters of fenced yard per animal depending on the species), maximum number of animals, noise and odor limitations, aesthetics and location (e.g. backyard only), caging & fencing requirements, etc. Process for concerns to be raised by neighbors should be very simple, and investigation/enforcement should be very quick. Must not have an unreasonable impact on neighbors' ability to enjoy their own property.
- As long as each request is evaluated on its own merits and common sense is used in the decision process I see no objection.
- Other types of livestock can be beneficial to Human population and to the environment | lawn and weed control without any pesticides or chemicals needed with the use of small livestock
- emphasis on suitable living conditions
- As a gardener, I am interest in the hens to provide removal of pests to reinforce organic gardening
- Many other municipalities are allowing urban chickens. I strongly support having urban chickens because it's a great way to educate children, they are quieter then a barking dog and they make great pets in normal households!
- I support hens in an urban setting but I think only emotional support livestock animals should be in an urban setting. Most people do not have the space or knowledge to accommodate livestock
- Many orher cities are doing it successfully for a long time. Time for Calgary to catch up!
- Hens would be a wonderful thing for the residents of the city
- When livestock are properly managed and taken care of, they can bring a lot of community and family benefit. Creating a more sustainable food environment (ie. hens) and community engagement
- Good for community engagement
- Hens are a wonderful idea as they are fun and bring community engaging for people of all ages
- I think that people who'd like to be more self sufficient should be allowed to do so, provided it doesn't negatively impact the animals or the neighbours.
- it brings in rules so everyone feels safe
- OMG YES!! As long as people are providing a decent living environment and are caring well for them, we should be allowed!!!!
- My daughter is autistic and would benefit from caring for a chicken as a pet
- Hens are an amazing contributor to food security and they are great pets.



- I am in support of this as long as the owners are responsible for the care and maintenance of their animals and are held accountable if they don't
- Additional criteria maybe required moving forward.
- Chickens are a great source of protein with providing eggs for the family!
- Chickens should be allowed
- We need to become more good self sufficient and quit importing from so far.
- Backyard chickens and other support animals should be allowed in Calgary city limits.
- I believe there would have to be rules and regulations that has the health of the animal and the consideration for the public first and foremost
- Pending noise/nuisance complaints. Extra insurance for having them.
- I know that people are different and have different interests and find other animals more to their liking. As long as the animals are properly cared for (standard of care must be defined) and the community can support these animals with a responsible owner (responsible must be defined as well, i.e. proper maintenance and care to not affect neighbours if possible, etc - must be understood by animal owners before animals are obtained), this could be beneficial.
- If they are useful and all neighbors consent, there is no reason they shouldn't be allowed with the restrictions above.
- Seems fair
- I believe urban livestock would be a positive impact in calgary, it would create new job opportunities and could possibly help individuals in personal ways such as, personal controlled food sources, give people new hobbies, and in some cases emotional support.
- Would not be opposed to neighbours having hens (limited in number). Would be more concerned about allowing other livestock.
- Seems reasonable
- So long as it provides for a full assessment of animal welfare and animal purposes are verified to be just. (Not just backyard breeding and selling animals whatever species)
- Just yes for now
- I think allowing people to keep chickens and other small livestock will encourage people to be interested and respectful of the agricultural industry. Having animals around also provides emotional benefits to people.
- Neighbour support within a one block radius - these are not quiet animals, nor are their living conditions particularly 'good' smelling. This will impact many more than just adjacent.
- Hens are the best.
- Need to be limits on number and type
- Having the opportunity to incorporate chickens in the by-law is forward thinking on food security, and catching up with cities who are already doing this successfully.
- As long as the animal is well taken care of, not a bother to the neighbourhood, and is not causing the homeowners yard to be unsightly (mud and unkept yard because of the animal)
- There are lots of livestock that could be safely and enjoyably kept within city limits. I currently keep livestock outside of the city on an acreage but would love to have options.



- I think as long as there is appropriate space and care, chickens should be allowed.
- Animal safety, community benefit most important.
- I don't think that support from adjacent neighbors needs to be a requirement - there is no such requirement for dogs or other domestic animals
- Hens for non-commercial use or for small operations could improve food conditions, decrease ecological footprint of industrial farming practices.
- Survey all neighbours not just complainers if a report is filed
- I would personally like to own a hen. I keep a very clean yard and would continue to do so with a hen in the yard. I think that a hen would work well to improve the biodiversity of my yard and soil and at the same time help to manage nuisance insects such as mosquitoes and slugs.
- Urban kids need exposure to animals we use for food.
- I support laying hens in urban backyards provided there are restrictions in place regarding their care and numbers allowed per household.
- These owners need to be held to the same responsibility for their pet as the owners of dogs and cats.
- If the animal is well taken care of and neighbours are supportive then why not
- Conditions would have to be set to ensure neighbours are approve of any application to allow live stock
- Backyard farming has multiple benefits.
- **POST-COVID-19 URBAN LIVESTOCK WOULD SUPPLEMENT FOOD SUPPLIES ESPECIALLY FOR LOW-INCOME CITIZENS.**
- Yes, except support from neighbours. It isnt required for acquiring cats or dogs and would be unfair gor hen ownership.
- Raising chickens can be done responsibly and safely within the city limits. Important for food sustainability.
- I think as long as those who are responsible for such animals are actually held responsible.
- Hens are quieter than other animals allowed and humans. They ate absconded creatures and I'm surprised this is even a question.
- "In theory I'm not opposed but as a native Calgarian I've never lived next to chickens - Are they loud? Stinky? Do they escape and possibly hurt people? Do they carry disease? Also - what is included when 'livestock' is mentioned. Donkey? Roosters? Pigs?
- I'm not able to answer question 7 - I don't have any experience whatsoever with pigeons as city pets. Wild pigeons in my neighborhood are messy and damage eves and rooflines and are difficult to 'evict'. I can't imagine how pigeons as pets in the city might be different and can't begin to suggest a limit. What do people do with pet pigeons? Send messages to their friends via pigeon? Do they leave the property? So many questions!"
- Support from neighbours is essential, and this proposal has this
- Hens or even mini cows are fine. Mostly herbivore mamma or birdl pets are acceptable.
- benefits owner and have positive impact
- I think it is a good idea, but must have rules, such as these.



- Can provide eggs to owners which is good.
- I feel if someone wants livestock they should get livestock, as long as said livestock is properly cared for.
- This is a fantastic idea. I don't see why hens are not allowed, yet cats and dogs are.
- Hens, if handled properly, can be no more or less annoying than dogs that bark a lot. It seems odd to not allow hens or other livestock that can actually benefit the community when we allow dogs to many benefits.
- No roosters. A part of the bylaw should state what the process is to get rid of the rooster, if it is found that a rooster exists (hard to see when they are little). Rules as to how many are allowed.
- As long as the livestock is not disturbing the neighbours with excessive noise or causing offensive odors due to cleanliness issues, I would have no problem with it. For instance, a rooster crowing loudly at regular intervals would not be desirable. I would prefer that the decision not be made just by one Officer; I would prefer a decision be made by more than one person.
- Bring in the chickens
- No harm, no fowl. :)
- I would support a limited number of Henson.. they are great eco friendly pest control for gardens and fresh eggs is a plus.
- Don't see anything unusual about allowing hens.
- Positive community benefit is a very good thing.
- There would be another source of food
- As long as proper shelter and husbandry is followed and supported in the community
- If people treat and look after the animals they should be aloud to have certain pets other than just dogs and cats bunnies birds
- Proper living conditions for livestock is important.
- I would add the criteria that the animal(s) are humanly contained (containment not potentially injurious to the animal), and clarify that the "living conditions" include proper nutrition and "reasonable" protection from predation (it would be difficult to protect hens or pigeons from hawk predation).
- As long as guide lines are strictly followed livestock should be permitted
- It could help people be more self sustaining.
- Love the idea of having more livestock
- I absolutely do not want chickens next door to me. It's bad enough that I have to deal with roaming cats driving my indoor only cats crazy and not being able to keep my windows open in the summer because of neighbors dogs barking outside all day while their owners are at work.
- Chickens are awesome!!!!!!! As long as the people who want to keep them are ACTUALLY prepared (no weird puppy-mill-like operations.
- promotes eating locally, potentially reduce reliance on factory farms/animal abuse, supports food security.
- Common courtesy



- chickens provide not only food, but pest control and can be considered support animals
- Depending on the situations though because livestock can be very loud and messy.
- As long as they keep their yard clean just like a dog owner should
- I have always wanted a couple hens, so I am not opposed. But it could cause homeowner disputes, because of noise and smell, so adjacent neighbors would need to be on board.
- People can own what they want as long as it meets bylaw restrictions
- people should be allowed to grow their own food
- The current criteria makes sense.
- All animals have souls.
- I'd strongly support having hens and other smaller livestock on city properties. Would like to see restrictions on numbers and a way to make sure living conditions are appropriate and humane.
- Access and provision for care must be regularly monitored. Continued needs of neighbours must be evaluated and re-evaluated
- Chickens are good for eggs. They offer great fertilizer for the garden.
- Hens/Chicken can be beneficial to gardens. Also provides food (eggs). Best to be controlled and monitored.
- Without neighbour approval
- Hens have been successful in most major cities all over the country, we are far behind the times on this issue.
- In appropriate settings livestock can offer practical and emotional benefits.
- Allowing urban hens creates a food source for low income families, and teaches young children the value of food and caring for an animal that provides.
- As long as neighbors have a true opportunity to refuse. I don't think anyone in the city should have to live next to livestock if they do not fully consent.
- I feel that this is a great opportunity for a city such as Calgary to have the opportunity for residents to participate in urban hens which I feel would be a great idea to explore.
- This allows Calgarians to provide food for themselves.
- I don't have an issue with people wishing to keep small livestock as animal husbandry can be enormously beneficial on numerous levels e.g, education, teaches responsibility, food source (eggs or milk), emotional comfort, gratifying experience, natural fibre source (wool, fleece)
- [removed] Seriously we need to have rights to have these animals [removed]. And question 1 was [removed] don't give fines and don't chop the balls off of cats just let them be geez
- I don't have enough knowledge in this area to provide an explanation, but it seems like a reasonable exploration with the appropriate guidelines.
- Many cities are allowing hens in their communities and presently there has not been negative comments in the newspapers. I believe the hens must have a proper pen and that the City is allowed to inspect them from time to time. People tend to want to have eggs but do not know enough about the care of hens. Education is essential.
- Let people have chickens.



- Chickens are generally friendly and super harmless to neighbors and kids.
- "doesn't matter to me"
- let people do what is best for themselves and their families.
- i just dont want to smell the chickens"
- Allowing people to harvest their own food is an excellent idea, provided the hens are properly taken care of and sheltered.
- I think something like this would be beneficial for younger people as well as adults. There is a big disconnect between where food comes from and this will help to build a more conscious community. Goats used to help keep down grass or weeds in certain areas can also cut down on emissions and would also allow for employees to be put elsewhere that may need extra hands while also creating jobs(Shepard's). Also who doesn't like goats or chickens?
- If a bylaw is in placed, only responsible owners will be given licenses to keep chickens. We don't need our neighbors permission to keep chickens. It will only create friction among neighbors.
- I support this idea, however it must be easily accessible public information where these exist, possibly on the property listing like an easement? ie: my neighbours may approve now, but if they sell their house, potential buyers must be aware of the situation otherwise if they don't, will I have to get rid of my animal?
- Neighbour approval should not be required.
- I support hens and other livestock in the city. People need to move toward home grown food and a more natural way of life with less dependence on commercial processed food.
- .
- Cool
- as long as no one else is negatively impacted, persons who can properly care for animals should be able to have them. Am i niave to assume that you would not keep animals unless you knew what you were doing??
- Seems reasonable
- Hens should be allowed. Support from neighbours shouldn't matter if people take care of them and clean up after them. It's their property, not their neighbours
- if all are in favour and the criteria set out is met, I feel this could be beneficial
- Hens make great pets and we can educate our children on where our food comes from.
- Calgary residents need chickens, but we shouldn't be subject to neighbour's consent.
- Anything that promotes living with animals, especially when children are involved, would promote a kinder way of treating non-human beings.
- I think we need to have some flexibility, however, I do not support an environment of unregulated livestock ownership.
- As long as the hens have proper care and housing, are taken care of and not a nuisance (not running around outside of a yard or noisy) they should be allowed.
- If proper restrictions are in place, why would neighbour support be required?
- people should have the freedom to do this if it is not creating nuisance or hazard for neighbours



- Hens should absolutely be permitted. I am less concerned with other livestock, though given proper care, suitable living conditions and in appropriate number, I support a citizen's choice to own other animals as well.
- Unless they are pets and not livestock! Backyard chickens for food (meat/eggs) is not good I don't want small slaughter houses in homes,
- People should be allowed to keep hens as long as they know how to properly care for them
- No need for neighbour approval. If there are neighbour concerns, it would only be because people are not caring for chickens properly, which is already a condition of having them. Unnecessary bureaucracy.
- noise levels need to be low, odor needs to be minimal - treat them like pets. They are not livestock if within the city and should be treated as a pet and follow the responsible pet bylaw
- "Local, sustainable, (potentially) affordable food production should be important to the city. This is a good way to start the conversation and develop strategies for the future.
- The expansion of urban livestock will enrich childrens experience as they learn about animals and farming."
- Livestock animals should only be located on properties of greater than a quarter of an acre in size.
- Hens could be a great addition especially when protected from cruel conditions.
- It should be allowed to have few hens if the owner keep them in good clean environment
- Strict inspection schedules must be maintained by the City to ensure the health and safety of the animals. Surprise drop in checks should also be part of the program.
- We want backyard chickens for eggs and how about a goat to mow the lawn?!
- Please allow chickens!
- they can be very good benefit
- This is a great way to help communities
- Chickens for eggs should be allowed as long as they are properly cared for
- With annual permit applications and monitoring I think this would be feasible, along with annual feedback and support from the livestock owner's adjacent neighbors.
- It potentially offers a community benefits or create jobs for people.
- Kept properly for species on owner's property and not bothering anyone else, why not?
- Only is this bylaw was properly enforced and livestock was properly cared for at all times!
- Provides a means for sustainable living
- Hens are quiet and harmless, and owning them increases individual food security.
- I personally think allowing livestock could benefit our city in multiple ways. In light of the current pandemic it could help with food security and sustainability. It has the potential to positively affect mental health issues such as depression. I believe it would provide opportunities to youth and adults to connect with their roots and the cycle of food. I do however have some cautions that butchering of livestock either be done by a professional butcher or that an owner prove adequate knowledge of butchering for personal consumption. I do think the number of animals should be determined by factors like space, food availability, care provided, shelter. The owner I think should have to inform neighbours but not that neighbourhood approval be required to own or keep livestock. I think it



wouldn't be a bad idea to get care plans and purposes for livestock animals. I think if someone intends to slaughter animals that those animals should be counted differently that something more permanent like egg laying hens. I also think it might be a good idea under some extra laws to make use of livestock to graze certain areas of the city. Obviously there would have to be rules about how close and fecal matter management if they are on public land. Something to consider though for some of the larger grassy areas of the city. Not in parks though just in like sides of roads or other low use grassy areas.

- Man the more hens we can get in backyard situations the less hens are being cramped, tortured and abused in large scale ag operations. [removed] I would love to have a Nigerian pygmy goat chomping my grass. Cute [removed]
- Chickens are a very therapeutic and gratifying animal to aid in emotional and mental stress for many people. They are a low maintenance domestic animal that provides companionship, natural human-animal bonding, and are a physical and/or mental stress to no one.
- Small pigs should also be permitted
- It allows Calgarians to sustain themselves in a positive way. Less environmental damage, etc. As long as the animals are properly cared for, who cares?
- It is ridiculous that hens and other small livestock are not allowed in the city. The benefits would be great as long as the animals are cared for. Bylaws should support this and be enforced.
- "There is an increasing trend for many types of 'assistance animals' which I feel is valid.
- And many people are keeping pets/participating in activities which were once considered rural but are now urban such as pot-belly pigs and bee-keeping."
- Hens without Neighbor approval.
- n/a
- I love the idea of backyard hens. To protect people who have chickens, there would have to be strict and clear guidelines in place for building chicken coops so people before proceeding so they wouldn't have to change everything later on. Likewise if new neighbours moved in next door to where hens were already living, there would need to be protections in place for the chicken owners.
- Limit number...maybe miniature goat, or pot belly pig or 2 ducks if backyard big enough. In the house at night since a pet.
- Great idea
- fresh local products greatly improved many community's and will do the same for Calgary
- Proper licensing would be needed.
- Why not ?
- I don't know enough about the pros and cons of urban hens to offer anything of substance. However, I'm willing to accept it as a trial if the idea is popular enough, and the regulations can ensure that problems don't arise as a result.
- I would like 1 chicken
- I think small quantities of small livestock animals kept by people in the city is okay. I expect there would have to be a more extensive registration process as well. My one concern would be that regulating, monitoring, and policing of these types of animals might be more costly for the city of



calgary. Would this be offset by higher registration costs to owners. I think livestock can become a nuisance (noise/odor, etc.), I can see people setting up coops without going through proper protocol and that can become a nuisance quickly, that will require policing/bylaw enforcement. I do have a concern about what rules would be placed around where one could keep a hen or other livestock at their residence. I think these types of animals would need to be prohibited from high-density communities (apartments, townhouse/rowhousing style living, etc.) I would not want to live in a dense neighborhood with sounds and smells of livestock.

- I think urban hens is a great idea!
- Urban agriculture is a good thing and we can look to Australia as an example of successful urban chicken keeping. There should be a bylaw in place for abuse and suitability of living conditions. Neighbours should not be given control.
- Chickens are wonderful. They don't harm the environment. They give fresh eggs.
- Chickens can be useful in the garden. Most chickens only live 2 years. People who interested in chickens are likely responsible. Also chickens can't get far. One risk is drawing in predators.
- I agree to this but only with responsible owners who will feed and clean up after their owners.
- Only for hens though. A limited number. No other livestock
- In order to support this bylaw, ALL neighbours would have to be in agreement; the person wanting the hens should apply for a permit and all neighbours would have to agree. There should be full disclosure to all neighbours (i.e. not just adjacent houses but 2 or 3 houses away) on what will happen (i.e. noise, smells etc)
- This is how we feed ourselves. Neighbor approval should not be required.
- I think other animals can be beneficial to the city as long as the owners are responsible, and they do not disturb neighbors
- If it's beneficial why not!
- As long as everyone is okay with it and the animal is healthy and living a quality standard of life then it's fine.
- Emotional support animals might be one good reason to have them and I think as long as there are not any horrible smells emanating from the property, then allow hens or pigs or lambs or other livestock. I would personally love to have fresh laid eggs from a hen, although my current lifestyle would not allow me to have them as I would not be able to take care of them.
- If there are more livestock it would overall bring the community's moral up.
- Dogs, cats and birds aren't the only things that act like pets.
- The measure of animal control should be a question of nuisance. If my neighbour wants to keep a few hens that's none of my concern. Live and let live.
- This kind of animal is beneficial to the community and individuals. This should have been done decades ago.
- I think that animals provide a lot of good. Properly cared for and loved animals of any variety is a good thing and will create more diverse and interesting neighbourhoods.
- If people have large yards or space for other types of animals on their own property, it should be allowed (if not deemed a nuisance animal).



- As long as there is consultation with neighbours and no complaints
- As long as the conditions above are met. However, there is additional risk of the hens being attacked by dogs or other animals with high prey drive or attracting in wildlife like bobcats. So that would need to be considered.
- Food security, connection to growing food and livestock, (provided suitable living conditions are provided) are tremendously good reasons to support having hens / other small livestock in our City.
- Care for animals and increased self sufficiency (food wise) are important skills for critical thinking for all citizens.
- Hens should 100% be allowed in Calgary outdoors. They cause no smell, no noise and provide food and emotional support.
- Government needs to educate the public on how important animals are in an individuals life.
- I have no problem with any of that provided the City carries out frequent checks on the proper care of such livestock and prosecutes cases of neglect or abuse, as with any other pet.
- Responsible ownership of livestock, especially laying hens, should be allowed. Permits, living condition inspections, etc. are a good way of ensuring animals are being raised in a suitable environment. I do not think support from adjacent neighbours is needed, as proper care of the animals should cause few problems, so long as reasonable numbers are being kept.
- Urban Hens are an excellent addition to our city.
- Chickens are amazing ! They are not at all noisy it's a miss conception! They provide eggs and are very low maintenance. They free range and woykd be way more beneficial to a back yard keeping mice and pest pipulation down. All major cities in Canada like Vancouver and Toronto allow this. Calgary is way behind .
- If there are appropriate bylaws surrounding livestock, I don't have any issues surrounding them being permitted
- [personal information removed]
- Can keep hens safe and neighbour's are fine.
- My neighbors and I are looking forward to having hens. We promise to be responsible pet owners.
- I love the idea of urban hens. I think this provides a great opportunity to Calgarians. I am uncertain about the neighbor approval though. What methods would we need to prove the neighbor agreement and what happens as neighbors change?
- All livestock need good living conditions
- Excellent idea! Makes use more sustainable in our own community and can help bring neighbors together. Also a great learning experience for the children in the community.
- Fresh eggs for myself. Share fresh eggs to neighbors too. The bylaw will help in the promotion of the hen's welfare. Gives guidelines to best practices in keeping chickens. Owners don't see the need to ask permission from neighbors as long as the chicken owners are compliant to the bylaws or standards set by the City. Chickens are generally harmless, quiet, and clean. **ONLY RESPONSIBLE OWNERS** can be allowed to raise urban chickens.
- As long as chickens are maintained they shouldn't be a problem
- It's not my business what animals my neighbors choose to have.



- in limited numbers per household.
- This is a successful program in many cities and towns across Canada; there is really no reason to deny hens. As for other livestock, the odd goat to keep grass down, but I'd suggest nothing bigger or bovine.
- No explanation needed. Calgarians need this support to have the right to own one
- having eggs available out my back door would be awesome. but i would have to ensure I clean up regularly and they do not become a nuisance.
- Like the idea of Hens, as long as numbers are limited
- With urban hens my counselor Ward [personal name removed] issue is the protocol that keeping chickens requires. It is very easy to create an urban backyard chicken manual that people would have to complete in order to house chickens in their back yard. This would alleviate [personal name removed] concerns. This is akin to what is happening with ABC Bees and the training that is done there. Already there is a vet keen to be seeing that the health of chickens is maintained. I am sure there are several people that could assist in developing these protocols (that incidentally will improve upon the industrial system and thus the quality of the benefit to everyone).
- I don't feel I need to
- If the person has the proper facilities, can supply the care necessary for the animals and is responsible enough to respect the neighbors. Also they would have to be willing to have the animals in moderation and not have more than they can handle.
- If the number of hens are limited, and the living conditions provided are excellent, not just OK, having hens can be a wonderful experience for everyone.
- I'm 50/50 on urban hens. I worry about the hens being attractive to bobcats and coyotes. The hens would need to be in a large enough enclosure that they do not spend unsupervised time loose in a yard. I'm also not sure if people are prepared to deal with their hens as they get older and produce less eggs. Keeping hens requires daily work and I am concerned that well intentioned people may end up neglecting their hens as they are out of sight in the backyard especially during the winter. Urban hens are presented as a way to increase local, sustainable food but there are other sources of local, free range eggs. On the other hand urban hens have worked in other cities so I'm willing to support the initiative.
- I think allowing livestock within the City limits could provide a huge community benefit and I support the involvement of Bylaw Enforcement Officers to ensure living conditions are optimal for the animals involved
- As long as animals cannot be killed for food.
- If it will have a positive impact and provide better living conditions to the animal, I don't see a reason not to support it.
- I disagree with having to get approval from adjacent neighbours. I didn't get to decide whether or not I wanted partying, drug dealing, renters beside me! Or a group home for "troubled" people. I would take chickens, pigeons, pot belly pigs etc anytime over that!
- Urban hens provide some food sustainability in the area and independence as long as proper conditions for the hens can be upheld



- As long as all the above rules are followed, I see no issue. Maybe there could be a minimum amount of acreage requirement depending on livestock?
- I think that there needs to be support from the neighbours considering the possible disruptions. I think it would have to be at the discretion of more than one officer however.
- Without needed support from neighbors.
- I don't have any issues with people having livestock as long as they meet the above criteria and it does not create an issue for others
- the need for urban farming is going to be a growing need and if it has positive impacts then there shouldn't really have any negative results to be included in the City bylaws
- Having livestock is great as long as they have proper living conditions and it's not to the detriment of your neighbors.
- Egg laying hens are not just sustainable food source, they are also excellent pets. Having the ownership legalized, it will enforce that owners must be knowledgeable, responsible and accountable for the wellbeing of the hens. That is in parallel to their responsibility as a good neighbour and citizen.
- What a great idea!
- Yes, people should be able to have hens as pets
- In this day and age, people should be allowed to keep livestock that is used to feed and provide for their families needs. Of course numbers of any livestock would be restricted dependent on the amount of land needed/recommended by current Ag practices/standards (i.e. 10 acres for each horse, 5 chickens per 1/5 of an acre, etc....)
- Small backyard animals, like goats, have to be shown to have a purpose
- I love my chicken and so does my neighbour, not to mention free fresh eggs every morning
- Hens are hardy animals, easy to care for and a great source of joy. Plus, they produce eggs for food and can be butchered for meat. Properly looked after, there is very little noise or smell.
- Chickens are super cool. Heck yeah. We should allow waterfowl as well if we're allowing chickens, cause waterfowl are significantly more intelligent.
- Chickens are great to have!
- I'm fine with hens in the city as long as the animals are well cared for
- It allows for animals but keeps the neighbors and community in mind
- The private keeping of livestock, when kept in safe and suitable conditions, can greatly benefit the environment and contribute to a more sustainable future.
- I am in full support of urban hens. But, neighbour support should not be needed. Instead, you could put bylaws in place to regulate potential issues a neighbour may wish to report.
- Yes! This is awesome!
- City livestock is supported by many cities with amazing benefits. Calgary is behind the times on this one
- let people have animals if they can care for them [removed]
- Hens are quieter than dogs.. You won't hear a hen at the end of the block at all hours of the day or night.



- Livestock are a wonderful and enriching asset to any community.
- They are better than pesticides for a lot of cases
- Sustainable and enjoyable. I'd love to see goats considered as well.
- Covid has highlighted the importance of citizens being able to produce their own food. Backyard chickens are an essential part of this.
- If the owner can provide suitable living arrangements, and the adjacent neighbors have no problem with livestock, I don't see why it would be an issue.
- I support the idea of urban farming, but a balance bylaw is crucial.
- If they have the space and neighbors are ok if close by, why not
- We need the option of growing our own food in every way. The law should not prohibit this.
- People can have a goat which is considered live stock.
- If all the requirements are followed, there shouldn't be an issue.
- We must support urban self sufficiency
- Because
- Hens are quiet and useful. No roosters, though.
- I see nothing wrong with it
- Urban livestock would be good. But there shouldn't be a herd of cows on a roof.
- More people should provide for their own needs.
- Chickens would be a wonderful addition to backyards. This would encourage and teach agricultural growth for children especially being able to care for and produce ones own eggs. Not to mention chickens make wonderful pets and can offer calming outlets for our growing anxiety.
- It has to be case by case but it's good to make sure they have healthy living conditions
- I think it would be nice.
- I would support this amendment only if it doesn't cause any Abuse, Neglect, or Slaughter of an Chickens, Etc. on the property.
- Unsure as to what livestock would be permitted and how "suitable living conditions" are determined. However, so long as individuals are screened, it seems reasonably likely that the animals would have a better life than those in factory farms, but I think this question needs to be flushed out a lot. I would support further exploration of a possible bylaw amendment.
- As long as the hens do not become a nuisance and are taken care of properly I would not have a problem with my neighbours having hens. Depending on the definition of other livestock, I would prefer the bylaw to be restricted. I do not like the idea of my neighbour having a wallow of pigs or other various animals on their property in an urban area due to the close quarters and spacial needs of the animals.
- There would have to be a curfew to ensure they are not making noise while others are trying to sleep.
- Hens are very affectionate creatures. I believe we, as a whole, can benefit from being around hens and other livestock. As long as the animals are cared for and the neighbours don't object, there should be no problem.



- If all requirements listed above are met, allowing urban hens seems reasonable.
- If people can properly raise hens, they should be allowed to.
- Space would need to be part of the suitable living, number of animals, size of space and distance from neighbors.
- Hens are great for the community as long as their living conditions are closely monitored. No roosters please.
- As long as the animals are not a nuisance and neighbours are not inconvenienced
- I think the consent of neighbors would be given significant weight.
- On a case by case basis given the property.
- If the hens will be considered pets then yes I am ok with it. I am not ok with people bringing hens into the city to use them as food.
- Research documents mental health benefits when a variety of animals allowed to coexist with people
- Hens are fine.
- An orphan infant needs a loving home and so does livestock.
- Animals should be properly taken care of.
- Having livestock can be beneficial for many reasons
- But they must be registered with the city. If not registered there should be fines given out.
- Provided that appropriate measures relating to hygiene, noise and safety are taken, people should be free to own whatever animals they want
- Absolutely!!! This should be in all cities!
- It benefits people and potentially ensures the animals are well taken care of.
- People should be able to have hens and other livestock on their property as long as they are not a disturbing the neighbourhood and kept clean
- Seems reasonable as long as getting permission isn't a long process and if current owners are notified of any changes.
- With the caveat that there are regular inspections and follow-up to complaints (smell, noise, vermin attracted)
- Main priority must be the welfare of the animal and no slaughtering allowed. Must be enough in the budget to support monitoring and enforcement of regulations.
- It's only right
- .
- I would support this if the hens are required to have a set amount of space in a coop (not cramped).
- They allow sustainable to living for households
- From what I have read and heard from other municipalities, holding hens causes no issues to neighbours. We live close to dogs that bark constantly, owners that don't pick up dog poop in the public field behind our house, cats that use our property as a potty - how could hens possibly be a concern?
- Keeping livestock in an urban area is an important step towards sustainability.



- I am not aware of any specific issues as long as there is enough space.. possibly a case by case basis.. neighbours would have to be involved.
- they can be pets.
- anything to move forward using environmentally sensitive remedies.
- Yes, if the people living next to you are okay with you caring for livestock and it is beneficial to the community I do not see a problem as it is not causing issues or harm. Reconsider if harm or if I creased nuisance.
- I support the bylaw because as long as they are being taken care of and they are living in the right conditions there should not really be a problem with this.
- Yes, as long as the animals are not a nuisance to neighbours, noise, smell, waste etc.
- This is great! People should be able to have hens (within a reasonable number). Some people would want chickens or dwarf goats as emotional support animals.
- As long as they are caring for the animals properly and they aren't disturbing anyone, then I don't see why there would be any issue with keeping other livestock.
- It's a very good idea.
- A household should have the option to provide their own food for the family, especially in the event of a pandemic such as the one we are living through. Thank goodness people only got stupid over toilet paper this time... what about next time?
- If the person can provide an adequate living space that the animal requires they should I be allowed to have it
- Hens/ducks would be a wonderful natural pest control method
- I do not believe that livestock of any kind are suitable in a city.
- Hens are good for slugs! Also good to teach responsibility to children.
- You appreciate food more if you raised it.
- I feel like all critters have a place with humans
- If someone wants bens and it doesn't cause others any problems, then they should be allowed to have hens
- Animals need to be in a place that is healthy for them.
- As long as all needs are a balanced and benefit the local area and animals
- Only with very specific rules to make sure it doesn't become an issue for neighbors (noise smell etc)
- If noise and smell are not a problem.
- Eggs!
- i like this idea
- As long as the animals welfare is top priority id support
- I think it is time to allow this amendment to allow people to be more self-sufficient as long as rules are followed and animals such as hens are kept safe from predators.
- Having locally sourced livestock products can greatly improve people's diet and cost managements
- I would support this law, but if I may suggest that if livestock is found in other property, and dies, this is the owner's fault for letting their live stock out into other's homes.



- If more pets can have suitable living locations where the owner can take care of the pet properly then yes
 - I've heard they're really good therapy animals for children with disabilities.
 - Urban hens are less noisy, less messy, and less dirty than your average dog. I do feel that the coop needs to not be an eye sore though.
 - Urban hens are a great way to allow those who want to be more self sufficient to do so and are a great resource in an emergency
 - This is an amazing idea!
 - people should be able to make their homes more sustainable for living which includes growing gardens and some livestock
 - Those who want to keep chickens etc. Should know what's involved and that it's a huge commitment.
 - Chickens would be beneficial addition to back yards
 - I am curious how 'support from neighbours' will be measured, and what the threshold would be for positive impact. Why is positive impact (and not simply the absence of negative impacts) required for these animals?
 - I think it's perfectly fine to keep animals like that on a Property.
 - The animal should definitely have safe living conditions. As long as the animal isn't disrupting anybody else, it should be fine. Any issues with the animal should be solved out by an officer
 - I don't support "Support from adjacent neighbours". Hens are not a problem for others. If a person is already dealing with a difficult neighbor BEFORE having hens, they would only protest again, to be difficult.
 - If suitable housing is required for livestock, it can increase the health of the livestock
 - "I think if the neighbours
-
- I think if all the above criteria are met it should be fine"
 - In today's day n age, to see people going back to their roots and working to support their household with urban hens is a breath of fresh air. As long as the animals are not mistreated or neglected. I'm all for the people to be able to do more for themselves in supporting their household.
 - I support hens, but our neighbour feeds the pigeons and we sometimes have upwards of 25 pigeons on our roof. It's loud and there's shit everywhere. Our neighbour doesn't have the same problem. They eat at her house and [removed] and hangout at our house. It's brutal.
 - As long as they are properly taken care of then there is no issue
 - If you can provide proper care of an animal, especially if it provides a benefit, I don't see a problem with people owning some livestock.
 - Chicken yes
 - I don't think the livestock has to have a positive impact for the community but should not have a negative one either. I think the neighbors should be able to object, with good reason.



- People are allowed to keep very large pets within the city, and urban hens (when kept properly) would create a positive impact while still having less of an impact than certain other large pets in other instances. However, neighbor support must be obtained to a certain degree.
- All animals deserve a home as long as it's safe and suitable living conditions.
- This is so important to me and my family as we do our best to eat as locally as possible. Put a limit on how many per family, say 2/3 and let us have our hens. This will have so many positive trickle down effects on our environment and food. It will increase people's awareness around food and get us reconnected with where our food comes from.
- I think this would be a positive change as it would allow people to produce their own eggs and have a better understanding of where their food comes from.
- Source of income and food
- It just sounds nice.
- I like to keep hens
- Chickens are no problem. If we don't need neighbour approval for cats and dogs, shouldn't need it for hens either.
- I have no issue with this
- Quieter and cleaner than dogs, don't jump fences and bite people. Why are dog owners so privileged?
- chickens should be allowed as they are quiet and unobtrusive and not a problem.
- I massively support this! We need access to healthy local food and this would be a great way to get people into raising their own food (eggs in this case) but it may have effects like people growing more food to feed the Hens and things like using less pesticides and herbicides because they would be conscious of the effects on their hens and the food they eat.
- it seems fair
- Individual livestock (hens) for those who can provide proper care can have a positive impact on not just the individual but the community around them.
- if chickens kept properly on property where no predator can come in or, they not escape.... i think it would be great, for eggs, for teaching kids about life cycle, where our food comes from etc.... great compost for the gardens that are 100% organic.... but here should be a limit on how many. and there should be fines if they are not properly maintained as flies and odors could possibly offend neighbours.
- If a person would like to have an animal as a pet, and can have the proper means to take care of said animal, then it should be ok.
- Yes as long as proper care of animals is maintained.
- I would support the law
- Due to our relatively small urban lots, neighbour impact can be substantial when noise and offensive odors are involved. Neighbours must be advised and have veto power.
- Lots of cities allow hens so why not. why not try out other livestock under above rules and see how it works. Hope we don't have unpicked up horse dung on the roads or pathways! Actually we probably don't want horses on pathways - too much other traffic.



- It would help to improve the lives of animals
- Urban hens are no different to other animals currently allowed on private properties with added environmental and food supply benefits. It has been demonstrated to be an easily implementable program with a lot of community support in numerous municipalities across North America.
- Raising hens is an excellent activity/responsibility for children. It also allows people to have fresh eggs!!!! They are no noisier than dogs!
- Urban livestock Cultivation on a case by case basis seems like a great idea with the right measures in place.
- People should be able to raise hens
- Hens are harmless and if you keep them in your yard it should be fine.
- Seems reasonable
- Support in principle but there must be serious considerations regarding cleanliness, health and pest considerations. How would the City enforce this is unclear. City has trouble enforcing the myriad of by laws it already has.
- There are many benefits to allowing a small number of Backyard hens (should depend on yard size). Should not need neighbour approval.
- You should not need neighbours support. The purpose of the rules is to make sure there is no impact to neighbouring properties.
- Support from neighbours and suitable living conditions is a must.
- You should not need support from your neighbours to have chickens. If people are following the rules, there will be no impact to neighbours at all.
- Yes to backyard hens. The neighbour consultation can be removed. If the acquisition of a new pet meets bylaw requirements of housing and husbandry then neighbour opinion is irrelevant.
- I think certain livestock like domesticated pigs would be acceptable
- As long as the animals are well kept they should be allowed.
- We own our property, so why we are not allowed to have hens on our property. Disagree that there is a relation between rats and hens. My house my rules.
- I think letting people have pigeons is a good idea.
- As long as the animals can be cared for properly, there's no reason for them to be prohibited.
- You are actually trying to take care of a dog instead of hurting it like you would if this bylaw was accepted.
- No reason for hens not to be allowed if cared for properly.
- As long as animals are well cared-for and do not create a noise or smell issue and can be seized if owners do not comply
- As long as the neighbours are in agreement and the animals are looked after the city shouldn't have an issue with what people want to do
- People should be able to have livestock to provide, or just for the experience. I don't really like the support from adjacent neighbors part, I don't think they should have to help you if they don't want to, it's not their livestock.



- Animals are living things like humans therefore they should have suitable living conditions and should NOT be treated poorly or live in a poor condition that does not suit the animals needs
- We should make sure their needs aren't overlooked
- Keeps it all to one authority
- Yes if it is safe for the animals it would also be a more local source of food.
- The neighbour consultation should be withdrawn if all other measures of responsible ownership are in place it is not the business of neighbours if a citizen can have pets on their own property. I do hope housing type is considered when putting this in place. A. Single family dwelling can better sustain than an apartment or town house.
- Animals must be well cared for, healthy and have enough room to move freely and conduct natural behaviour necessary for the physical and emotional needs of that species.
- As long as the animal is being taken care of, then it shouldn't be a problem. And if it can benefit the community, win win.
- Any domesticated animal should be allowed to be a pet under proper conditions.
- It's a great way to ensure some food security while having a pet. With proper bylaws in place chickens can be incorporated like any other pet! Its up to the owners to be responsible and take care of their animals!
- I think the criteria are sufficient to address the issue.
- As long as the owner of these animals can take care of them they should be able to house them.
- I think as long as the animals are well cared for and given proper shelter and the property is kept clean, such as raising chickens for example, I'm fine with it.
- [removed]
- I said yes because certain livestock animal can live a comfortable life in an urban environment.
- hens and other farm animals are not welcome in the city. If someone wants to own farm animals, they should live outside the city.
- Provided it could be established that the correct facilities were available to the animal.
- As long as they are being well taken care of and are clean I don't see why there would be an issue.
- If all conditions are met this should not be an issue
- As long as it doesn't adversely impact neighbors etc
- Again.. just yes.
- if you want to own an exotic animal, that's amazing as long as they are properly taken care of and you know what you're doing.
- Yes
- Hens can restore soils and reduce pests like insects naturally. They benefit the community as a whole
- I think it's awesome chickens on their house but they need to have a lot of land as they have to be free range and have a certain amount of footage chicken
- It seems reasonable
- Yea



- They don't do anything harmful so why not
- Livestock can be good
- As long as everyone agrees then why not?
- Hens are a great way for citizens who have the opportunity to make some money and learn to raise animals other than house pets.
- I see no issues in keeping chickens as long as there are rules about how many, how they must be kept, and the support of neighbours.
- This amendment is overdue. In as much as the owner is responsible and conscientious of neighbours, there is no difference between currently allowed pets (cats may arguably even be more detrimental) and any other.
- Urban hens that are looked after properly may be less troublesome than some dogs that bark and owners who don't pick up after them and roaming cats.
- I think allowing a small number of hens (perhaps 6) in urban back yards would be beneficial (environment: hens can contribute to local food production, recreation & mental health: caring for animals can help keep people active, and small livestock could provide the same mental health benefits that pets in general do, particularly for individuals who cannot have a cat or dog). Roosters should possibly not be allowed due to noise issues.
- Sustainable food systems
- It should require a license and inspection of housing for the hens as well as a course/test offered by the city. We have enough animal cruelty in Calgary, we don't need to add abused, neglected and frozen chickens to the long list!
- Urban livestock has many benefits to individuals and neighbors
- Minus support from neighbors.
- Yes, but - why need support from neighbours? That's a nice thing, but it isn't required for dogs and cats, both of which can be trying for some neighbours. Chickens are often less obtrusive than dogs and cats.
- In Red Deer County - they only allow 3 hens for property larger than .5 acres and smaller than 2 acres so hens have ample space and resources to roam and eat to be healthy...with backyards being so small in the city - what is the responsible number for a city lot?
- I believe individuals have different needs and if a goat or pig makes someone's life better then I am supportive
- If the animal has the space, shelter, living space is cleaned regularly, will not be a nuisance to neighbors (e.g. roosters would be a nuisance or excessive smells that cannot be controlled by the owner) I would not care what animals my neighbors would have.
- Hens are fine, don't like the idea of roosters
- Hens, bees and other beneficial animals are awesome.
- Only with support of adjacent neighbour and only if they are properly educated on the care of animals
- I have no issue with someone keeping chickens as long as they keep their living area clean.
- Only for a limited number of livestock or birds



- I believe hens can be part of a healthy urban garden, which I would like to see tried in Calgary.
- Support from neighbors is important
- Suitable conditions and care of the animals being the most important
- The issue should not be type of pet, but ownership. A responsible owner of urban hens should be ZERO issue for neighbours. They can be clean, quiet and beneficial in so many ways
- Two chickens per household is reasonable and minimizes noise and odour
- But very important to have full support from neighbors
- Owning livestock can have many benefits in urban areas. Knowledge for children, more fresh organic food, more options for farmers market businesses.
- I'm not sure why this isn't already allowed... folks should be able to carry out these types of activities on their private property as long as it does not cause harm for the animals or members of the community (just like domestic pets).
- If reviewed first before giving the go ahead.
- People should be able to have hens or small livestock such as goats if they follow all of the guidelines provided by the city.
- I would support allowing livestock as long as certain appropriate living conditions are met much like having a regular pet. As long as needs are met and neighbors are not disturbed by the ownership then it should be fine.
- Hens should be allowed as long as proper living conditions are provided
- If some one can keep pigeons, why can not some one have a couple chickens?
- I feel that urban hens, as well as other small livestock should be permitted because pets come in all shapes, and if someone wants home raised eggs, it shouldn't be a problem
- Support for this as long as all adjacent neighbors are in agreement.
- Great opportunity for kids, local food, can eat scraps (good for the environment).
- New home purchases should also be notified if their adjacent neighbour has hens. This will help avoid any disputes and prevent the hen owner from having to re-apply.
- As long as there is suitable conditions and none of the neighbours mind then why not? It's not hurting anyone.
- If all above criteria are met, urban livestock could potentially provide more positives in terms of health, wellness and community.
- I am thinking of potbelly pigs which make ideal pets.
- Having animals as pets is beneficial to people. The key point is that the animal is considered a pet and not livestock. They would have to abide with noise bylaws also.
- If all above were followed.
- As long as there is a limit and their area is kept clean and organized
- Provide a budget for bylaw officers to check approved properties (once every six months) to ensure animals are well cared for and neighbours are still supportive.
- Sounds fun! Fresh eggs, cool animal friends. WHats the downside as long as the homeowners comply with the applicable bylaws.



- "Depends on where exactly.
- We have to consider the living conditions for animals first."
- My only concern would be increased bobcat activity trying to get a people's chickens
- So long as livestock is managed properly, no reason to oppose.
- Many smaller livestock can live and even thrive in city environments, which has been proven many times. Cats and dogs can prove to be just as much of a nuisance as any livestock if they are not properly managed and maintained, so I don't see the necessity of disallowing livestock in the city.
- Food shortages will likely be an issue in the future and increasing self-reliance in urban areas will benefit not only the owners of livestock but also society as a whole. Raising and tending animals responsibly can also be an amazing educational and emotional experience in sustainability for children.
- I would so love a little hen to love.
- All points have been proven over and over again that backyard chickens are a POSITIVE. I think it's a little shameful that Calgary is so far behind on this.
- Backyard chickens is something that has worked well in other cities, and I would be in support of it happening in Calgary. I am currently a renter of a shared unit with no suitable outdoor space of my own, but I would be interested in having backyard chickens if/when I move to a more suitable property. I would be 100% supportive of my neighbours' decision to have urban hens - families being able to be more self-sufficient is hugely important when you consider the cost of food.
- Suitable living conditions MUST be provided for livestock.
- We fully support allowing hens in Calgary with appropriate owner education/living condition requirements.
- Small livestock are decent community builders, hens are generally not super noisy. Who doesn't want neighborhood eggs?
- this must have severe restrictions. The neighbours must agree, in writing, before allowing any livestock in the city
- Within reason
- There should be more acceptance of hens - ie eat slugs, provide eggs
- I support hens in the city if housed safely.
- allowing hens into the city fosters relationships between people and animals. Often we take for granted the 'work' or important role animals perform for us just by being present or there. It is time we looked at integrating animals more in a respectful, compassionate way.
- If the animal is there for mental health support, maybe that's a good thing. It would also depend on what other livestock we are talking about which is not clear in this question. Still has to be fair to adjacent neighbours and noise.
- as long as they are not neglected and/or butchered. Pets only. Milk and eggs are not an issue.
- I think that allowing for small livestock, such as hens and some pig species, would be acceptable.
- I think there has to be strict and very clear regulations on this for the number of animals allowed, the size of the animal, how much noise they make if outside, and the how "suitable living conditions" is

defined. Plus, would it be a requirement to disclose to for potential home buyers that livestock was living next door? Current neighbors may agree, but what about new homeowners?

- Local sustainability can come from some small ag projects
- Livestock done properly and at the right (small) scale will enrich households and communities in Calgary.
- Provided hen ownership also needs approval from adjacent neighbours, suitable living conditions
- Yes to an extent- neighbours shouldn't have the power to decide. Limit the number of hens to 2 and there will be no problems with noise, mess, etc.
- Chickens make for great pets that add to a sustainable lifestyle and help take power away from corporations that abuse the lives of farm animals
- I think backyard chickens should be allowed. It's a great way to get fresh eggs and they make incredible pets. AND they eat slugs and mosquitos apparently. Like any pet (like dogs) owners should have to ensure they manage odours of poop
- Would need to have a license, and register and be subject to all sanitation protocols, inspections etc to prevent spread of diseases like avian flu. Same goes for beekeeping. we need to protect agricultural producers. Is there a club or association that hen owners could join? Public education necessary. Is there a facility that spent hens could be taken to for killing, butchering? I support urban food production but there are many questions regarding food safety and production protocols that need to be addressed. Any bylaw should be supported with education enforcement and inspections that would be said for 100% through licensing fees or non profit societies. Good opportunity for kids through 4H type clubs. Good opportunity for new Canadians to learn about Canadian agricultural standards. Good opportunity for food security and supporting local, self sufficiency.
- As long as they do not be one an attractant to wind life such as coyotes/bobcats.
- .
- Livestock is a great way to achieve self sufficiency. Cleanliness and humane/considerate (of neighbours) practices are required for keeping any animal. Why should chickens be any different? Having been on many properties that keep chickens I can say from experience- they only stink when they are not properly cared for. No different than any other negligence. They are not disturbing with noise (without roosters).
- As long as animals were well cared for and it's not exploited in any way
- I support allowing urban hens
- Just have to be aware of the hens at all times and make sure they have no way of wondering around
- Hens, pigeons should be allowed as described above. Other animals on a case by case basis with a limit per property.
- This would provide individuals with food security, and other options for companion animals. Animals have been cited as an excellent tool to reduce stress and anxiety. Two conditions that have dramatically increased during the pandemic.
- sustainable food resources.
- It makes sense to allow Hens in backyards within appropriate enclosures in Calgary.



- Yes with limitations on numbers of animals on a property and an official process for handling any complaints. Bylaw would also need the authority and power to ensure animal welfare is balanced with neighbours wanting to enjoy their homes.
- Sometimes it's not about what breed, but how it's been trained.
- Provided, as I already stressed, that the city look into the PERSON requesting application and assess experience and criminal and mental health checks
- Chickens and other animals inside Calgary make 100% sense. We should be moving forward as a City. Especially with sprawl, many areas would do exceptionally well with this regenerative and self sustaining practices within a larger community. It's a great thing!
- Hens would be pretty cool
- The concerns most people express about hens are applicable to all pets; noise, smell, general care. Bad owners are bad owners regardless of the species. There are dogs the size of small horses and no restrictions to ensure they get the appropriate care. We just trust the owner to be responsible, hen owners should have the same level of trust.
- Allows for a variety of experiences for city residents
- this is a difficult answer because I have excellent arguments from both sides. And who will be making sure these animals are well taken care of?
- We need to move forward with this, food sovereignty is our right as humans, this would be a very positive step forward for our communities. But this should not be at the discretion of one person, One person should never get to choose for everyone else.
- Anything people want. Freedom is important.
- Their needs to be a maximum number of hens allowed, as well as education ensuring the well-being and needs of the hens are met (food, water, heat in winter, etc)
- traditional part of city life
- I am pro the idea of having chickens and 1 rooster
- I support for smaller animals such as bees, chickens, rabbits. I do not support for larger livestock as City yards do not necessarily provide the space and living conditions that they require.
- Chickens are a great animal to allow with parameters around the world keeping them
- yes. But I don't think you should need to get a permit. Also goats.
- I think owning chickens in this day and age is a fabulous idea that can only help the economy, as well as people's emotional health.
- Support from adjacent neighbors should not be a requirement. Just that the animals be kept clean and proper
- With provisions to ensure cleanliness and minimal impact on neighbours, I think backyard hens would be beneficial.
- COVID has highlighted the limitations of our food system. Backyard chickens provide eggs and possibly meat bringing homeowners greater food security
- If the above criteria are met, I see no issue with allowing other livestock within the city limits.
- It's an opportunity for animals to positively engage with the community, let's give that a shot



- I think it's more important to focus on the living conditions of the animals. Good living conditions would improve community support as well as maintain a high level of care for the animals.
- I think given the potential food shortages we faced during Covid this could be a good alternative.
- Support from neighbours and suitable living conditions
- There should be a limit on the number of hens. No roosters (noise in am).
- This could be done with proper criteria met on an initial assessment and occasional check ins as followup.
- I think as long as the adjacent neighbours are in support, it's a lovely idea.
- Chickens, goats. Anything that can be penned, does not make a lot of noise, and can be kept relatively clean with caregiver upkeep.
- People should be allowed to have alternative types of pets (ie chickens). Especially with COVID, concerns around food security etc.
- Yes, with the exception of feeding animals on my private property.
- I firmly support Calgarian families keeping hens.
- Numbers would have to be limited
- I have no issues with this amendment, as long as owners are held responsible for providing appropriate living conditions
- Chickens should be allowed based on sustainable living resources if provided with sufficient living quarters.
- Provided the neighbours supported having the animal next door, and could rescind the support if it becomes apparent that noise, smells, etc. negatively impact the use and enjoyment of their home property.
- Hen's are a great source of food for families, and people shouldn't be restricted by the government in how they grow/raise their own food (provided the animals are being properly cared for).
- We really want to own urban hands so we support this amendment.
- As long as the animals are cared for and the property is well maintained, I see no reason to ban.
- As long as it is not a public nuisance (noise, smell, aggressive/dangerous animals, etc), I support this.
- with all the criteria mentioned it would be ok.
- We need to be able to take care of our own food security, and rebuild the basic skills of self sufficiency.
- People should have the right to be self-sufficient, but NO Roosters!
- Growing your own meat is a human right, but maybe we can have some bylaws about keeping roosters quiet!
- I think this would be a great opportunity for people to produce their own food at home and for kids to learn more about our food. Not only that, but people raising their own chickens would surely treat the animals better than giant companies do, therefore a better source of food for Calgarians.
- Please don't let my neighbour's stop me from having chickens



- Chickens and possibly goats are no more a nuisance than cats and dogs and yet can help provide food for a family
- Food security! Chickens are much quieter than most dogs!
- If same bylaws applied to livestock as they do to cats and dogs, acceptable noise levels, not allowed to roam off owner's property, no stockyard smells.
- Allow responsible hen ownership. No different than any other pet. Allowing pitbull-type breeds that can cause injury and death to other pets or people, but not allowing hens, seems like a gross injustice!
- I'd like to have some chickens myself.
- Again, as long as the owners are responsible and there are no implications on others then I would think this is acceptable.
- I think it needs to be explored as you plan to; can't say I would support it until the actual bylaw was ready for passing.
- I think chickens can have a positive effect in terms of providing food, slug control and the joy of a creature in your yard. There does need to be a limit of the number of hens. Animals are our relatives. We just need to consider what they need to live well in a community of humans.
- Given success in other municipalities and the need to ensure balance in all types of urban animal interactions hens are potentially a good thing when managed well.
- More hens
- There is no reason to prevent responsible owners from having hens on their property, and many reasons to allow it.
- I like the idea of a case-by-case basis rather than a rote decision.
- Hens provide valuable food and provide education/compassion to children. Hens should require to be in an enclosure.
- Urban farming in general is a fantastic idea. However, regulations would have to be put in place to deal with the noise nuisances of roosters.
- If the person can properly care for the animals and the neighbors have no objections, then it should be approved
- I'm ok with hens but I believe if it causes problems for neighbors (smell/noise) then the approval for that location should be re-assessed.
- This seems reasonable if everyone else around approves too.
- Allowing urban hens in Calgary would be beneficial to individuals and communities providing they can give the right care to the animals. It's a sustainable way to provide yourself food. So long as individuals are respecting the bylaws in regards to owning livestock and respecting noise bylaws and their neighbors' property.
- This is an excellent idea and anyone who wants hens on their property should be allowed, as long as they have a yard that is suitable.
- As long as these criteria are met, I don't see an issue with this. However, the owners of these hens need to be aware that there are feral cats that roam the neighborhoods, as well as coyotes and



bobcats very frequently. This could in turn cause many more issues, therefore this needs to be a consideration.

- I support anyone to have any animal as long as they are educated on how to properly care for it and they are financially prepared to spend the money to ensure the animal has a high quality of life including medical and nutritional care.
- AS long as support from neighbors and the animals best interest is involved then I support this initiative. There should also be a measure to report and remediate noise, poor living conditions, etc. types of complaints
- self sufficiency should be supported to the best degree possible. A self sufficient person/community needs less help from the government when [removed] goes sideways, freeing up resources to help others/reduce overall costs of aid. It's a win/win.
- Hens are fun to keep If kept in good conditions. Must be kept clean otherwise they smell though.
- "As an owner of hens* (not roosters), I can confidently say that if kept within reasonable numbers (ex: 2-3 hens per household), noise impact remains low (for instance, compared to a hound dog) and if a responsible owner can clean up after their dog, they can easily clean up after hens. I would support annual licensing for hens as is expected of all pet owners (dogs, cats...).
- *outside city limits"
- Chicken good
- But eliminate "Offers community benefit/will have positive impact". The benefit is for the owner, not the "community".
- People should have the opportunity to own hens
- As long as the animals are not a nuisance and stay on private property I see no issue with it
- Ensures all livestock and other animals that may fall through the cracks are accounted for to ensure they are reasonably cared for and housed.
- I totally think chickens should be allowed! Had them as kids and they are easier than most animals
- Neighbours need to be involved, as these animals cause noise, can carry pathogens, and can attract wildlife depending on the area.
- The community benefits and advances in urban food security vastly outweigh any argument against the amendment. 100% support.
- As long as there isnt a disturbance to the neighbors then there arent any issue.
- I would add humane care and living conditions for he animals be ensured.
- Backyard hens and potentially other animals would enrich the community, giving people the ability to connect with their sources of food. They can help take responsibility for feeding themselves and their families as well as feel confident about the comfort and safety of their livestock. It would also be very fun and satisfying the get to care for such lovely animals and get to enjoy the results of their care in the form of fresh eggs!
- important for food security
- Except suitable living conditions for the animals, which must be provided, the other criteria such as community benefit are unnecessary.



- Hens can provide a vital and nutritious food source with little to no impact on the surrounding community.
- Allowing urban hens could allow fulfillment in the community and for individuals who have them granted they provide proper care and have space to provide a good quality of life. The old ways of living provide purpose, joy, and a sense of pride in doing a small part to provide for oneself, especially for those who cannot afford to live on an acreage close to the city where they work. Nowadays people have distanced themselves so far from how their food is produced and obtained. I have personally seen the joy and excitement people get from obtaining or growing their own food.
- Our family would definitely have urban chickens if it was allowed.
- I think that if someone wants livestock on their property they need to be monitored. I think the licensing fees would need to cover this additional cost.
- The integration of domesticated animals like chickens offers so many benefits. Urban chickens contribute to localized food resiliency, provide free and organic fertilizer and pest-management services, and provide plenty of opportunities for children and adults to learn more about where their food comes from. I would love to see backyard chickens in Calgary!
- This is a wonderful way to connect people with their food and gain some food security.
- As long as the chickens are well cared for.
- Feeding your own animals ensures they are taken care of well. I'm nervous of people who could abuse this rule.
- As long as animal welfare and hygiene are ensured.
- Would need to be with in reason the # of birds. It would come with a cost however as I think more bylaw officers would be needed to check on the condition of the birds. It quickly could become a hoarding or neglect situation.
- Some livestock animals should be permitted - so long as standard of care implemented and maintained. However, if the city is already struggling to enforce current bylaw - should additional items of inspection really be added to that list of responsibilities??
- I support it as long as they are well kept and do not cause harm to anyone or pets. The living conditions must be kept extremely clean as to not cause smell etc to the surrounding community.
- It's the right thing to do.
- As long as there is support from adjacent animals and the yard is a suitable size to support the animals
- Sounds cool
- Properly looked after and with the right amount of room, livestock can be beneficial. People do need to be properly educated in the husbandry of the livestock they want to own.
- There are some livestock that aren't noisy and as long as the owner takes proper care of the animal(s), then there shouldn't be a problem.
- I don't care what pets people keep, as long as they don't annoy me. No pigeons though!
- I would suggest it would need the approval of neighbours within 50 metres, AND the approval would need to be reviewed every 2 years, and the suitable conditions evaluated at least annually.



- If there is sufficient space for the animal(s), and if the animals aren't being a nuisance to neighbours, then sure. But with a limit
- Seriously, hens?? This is a farm animal and belongs to farm belongs to a land where they could freely walk it doesn't belong to a small backyard in the city! cats and dogs more than welcome but not hens its farm animal.
- Chickens should be allowed provided people do not own more than 5/property within the city.
- Certain livestock with the right conditions would be less disruptive than other "pets" and contribute to sustainable and environmentally friendly food production
- Fully supportive - I hope my neighbours get hens; share eggs, and build friendships. So much added value to the city!!! Please do it!
- Because no pet should be treated like it doesn't matter
- Based on the conditions outlined, i feel this would be a very positive step
- A process would have to be provided for people to deal with the issues, smell, noise, and insects.
- Nothing to explain!
- As long as the Criteria Above is followed
- Backyard hens should be allowed
- People should be at liberty to do this.
- It's time to allow citizens the ability to feed themselves via the extras that chickens or other animals provide. Excellent for eggs, pest/ insect control, fertilizer, calming for the soil. No different than Owning a cat or dog.
- All the rules sound responsible
- Of course I worry about it being approved by the neighbors and then somebody else moving in next door but if it's going to be monitored and approved then why not
- Only if all the listed criteria was followed and all close neighbours are notified to respond.
- Hens would be welcome, larger animals not so much unless on larger pieces of land within the city.
- Why should they not be allowed? They benefit greatly, they aren't a nuisance, they can be like a pet as easily as a cat or dog.
- There would have to be a comprehensive approval and review process to make sure animals are safe and well cared for and not hoarded or a nuisance to neighbours.
- I think it's a great idea to have backyard hens as long as people keep them clean, safe, and well cared for.
- Keeping a limited variety of species in the city would create fewer problems especially with human responsibility waning these days.
- People need to know where their food comes from. By bringing livestock into the city limits it helps to educate the public.
- No neighbour approval
- "Community engagement is key. Neighbors must support it. (Example allergies)



- Experts need to explain make rules regarding easily accessible through multiple formats. Example living conditions, to many google opinions to decide. Once a city group of experts comes to a conclusion, the motion should be adopted.
- Finally For the same reason I don't feel feeding or teasing wildlife is appropriate. Like all things in nature balance is key."
- Backyard chickens are a benefit to many families, providing eggs, fertilizer for gardens, entertainment and pest management. They have been incorporated into many municipalities successfully throughout the world. Calgary is at a point where we cannot afford to lag behind in terms of food security and progressive ideas.
- If there is regulations and monitoring i think it would be a good idea
- Live stock within inner Cory limits is fine within reason
- No issue with urban hens.
- If the animal is healthy and taken care of it's fine, as long as it's not causing problems for the neighborhood such as noise or smells
- "No stipulation needed to ask neighbours.
- Maybe a license or permit of some kind needed like for dogs to ensure people are committed to caring for them. Or use the rules listed below for pigeons."
- If the livestock are for community benefit and could provide opportunities for work, food for homeless and low-income.
- I see a plus for fresh food and children to learn about where it comes from. As long as they are humanely housed.
- Small animals that can be cared for properly.
- Allow chicken and other animals. And do not make it reliant on "permission" from neighbors. We have a right to grow our own food!
- If the environment and habit are suitable people should be able to own these animals.
- Yes! I believe that accessing cruelty free animal byproducts through the responsible ownership of livestock is an important part of living in a community. Of course, there would need to be restrictions in place regarding roosters (noise) and to ensure the wellbeing of the chickens.
- "Chickens are better than most house pets!
- Limit roosters.
- A progressive community acknowledges chickens are welcome in sustainable gardening and food sourcing."
- No roosters please.
- BUT, Urban Hens should ONLY be zoned for specific neighbourhoods or lot size of the property.
- as long as it doesn't interfere with another person's enjoyment of their own property, there's no harm in it. Smell might be an issue in tightly compact neighbourhoods. Chickens stink.
- Chickens are absolutely harmless.
- I support people wanting to be self-sustaining and having chickens and whatever small livestock is a great idea. As long as their are regulations regarding health and safety.



- Within reason ! Cleanliness is huge !
- If owners can meet criteria outlined, yes.
- With proper care and space, there should be no limitations on animals.
- If they are not a nuisance why not.
- urban hens are a great way the city can reduce organics being trucked to the compost facility, provide food security to dedicated, educated people who are passionate about urban homesteading and sustainable lifestyles. To ensure compliance with standards, the city should require people to complete courses, inspections in housing, care and maintenance.
- I believe that hens can be beneficial to the particular individuals who may be keeping them--they fertilize the ground, eat insects, and lay eggs!!!
- I like urban animals if kept responsibly.
- I believe it is the right of a citizen to have appropriate livestock on their property. I do support regulations involving how the animal is sheltered, but believe these regulations should be accommodating and simple while doing the best to ensure animal well-being.
- raising chickens for eggs only, qand in very limited numbers. Ruled by hygiene and noise.
- As long as proper set up and conditions are maintained.
- I would only support this with a ban on chickens in multi-family complexes such as condos, townhomes, etc
- Chickens I think would provide great help, just have to be mindful of coyotes.
- I have no problem with any type of animal being within the city limits as LONG as he/she is loved and well looked after.
- Provided that a reasonable case can be made, little too no nuisance is caused, and the animal is well cared-for people should be able to own animals categorized as livestock.
- I like fresh eggs
- Hens are non-invasive. We have hens in our community which are not heard or smelt.
- balanced human vis-à-vis hen needs is an appropriate starting point.
- hens are not as noisy or messy as people seem to think. However they can attract predators such as coyotes so large fences and/or pens are needed to contain the hens
- As long as neighbors agree and the smells/ noise is kept to a minimum
- I would like to have hens for eggs permitted withing the city
- "It's a food source
- They keep unwanted bugs under control
- A first hand learning experience for children"
- Hens are a great way to start with urban livestock, very easy to manage and make great pets. This would give people a chance to learn about them and help alleviate the misconceptions.
- Hens are much quieter than dogs. They help keep pests like slugs and insects at bay. Their droppings provide a natural fertilizer for the garden. They provide eggs to the community. They also teach our children about where food comes from.



- This could be a good source of local food for the individual or the community provided they are well treated. Hens are also used as a natural agent against bugs in protecti fruit trees such as blueberry bushes
- Only for duck, pigeons, etc. I don't think it should be for larger mammals (i.e. goats, pigs).
- So long as the quality of life of the animal is sufficient and they do not bother neighbors, this is good. Especially if it helps reduce the amount of food/items imported, which causes pollution.
- All animals should be allowed
- Having a few random hens is fine with me, but we need strict laws regarding animal noise/waste/treatment. There should be no more than a few, as in 3-5 max. There should be a requirement that you actually own the property, and that you have an appropriately sized yard. The coop should also not be positioned close to your neighbors property. The last thing I want is a chicken pen/coop up against my kitchen window. It should be placed centrally in the yard.
- Yes because animals/pets need the best caring and treatment they can get.
- However, I wouldn't like to be waken up at 5 in the morning by a rooster...
- If the animals are safe and treated well and it is agreed upon by neighbors, then what's the harm?
- Provided the animals will be kept in a caring, humane manner, the neighbours are ok with it, and by-law will consistently follow-up periodically to ensure animals are being cared for properly.
- As long as living conditions are regulated I have no problem with this
- This seems reasonable although I am not here for this portion.
- Improves community life!
- Livestock animals are wonderful for educational purposes and for mental health! Coming from a farm, livestock animals don't roam much (if properly introduced to the area) and provide a lot for people and communities including field trips for kids, educational purposes, and for volunteers!
- I support all of this other than no approval needed by neighbors. I don't need approval from neighbors to own pigeons, cats, dogs etc. It would be unfair to require this for chickens.
- As long as the animals can be taken care of in the proper way.
- Nutrition.
- There are no drawbacks to urban hens
- Bring it on!
- the law sounds as if it would be fair
- I would love to be able to own a chicken or duck, but don't live on land. If taken care of properly I think we should be able to own any sort of live stock. It is quite common these days.
- This bylaw is sensible to my thinking.
- Our daughter lives in central Auckland, and many neighbours have hens in their backyards, apparently without issue. We support it, as long as there is a reasonable limit on the number of hens in any one yard.
- I think there is a movement towards "grow your own food" and this could be a part of this movement. Very important that neighbors support.
- Everyone else does



- I do not think having chickens on someone's property would be a disturbance to their neighbours. As long as they are not disruptive or offensive by noise or smell, I would support livestock on personal property.
- Only for chickens and no roosters
- I don't see a problem with it. I certainly wouldn't have any issues if my neighbour decided to do so
- I assume the Chief Bylaw Officer will be reasonable in assessing 'suitable living conditions'.
- Chickens are great
- Within reason. If someone wants to have 3 or 4 hens on their property is a very different thing to having 30 or 40. Cleanliness of the coop and smell to neighbors should also be a consideration.
- I would support this as long as the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer has proper training and be knowledgeable about livestock
- We are interested in keeping urban hens
- A limit of 6 - and no crowing roosters! - is tolerable if the birds are cared for properly and kept under control
- As long as there is continued support from all neighbours.
- I especially support hens (for laying eggs).
- I am ok with livestock being in the city, so long as the living environment is the appropriate size and proper measures are taken to keep the animal safe and secure on the homeowners property. Depending on type of animal, a limit per household should be in effect.
- Hens are a great addition and I would be happy to consider other livestock to support families.
- As long as neighbours are consulted - sound, smell would need to be considered
- There would need to be restrictions on the number of animals or birds, etc.
- Smells and noise should be not a nuisance to neighbours - there should be a process to address this.
- If the hen is a pet and not killed for food
- I have no issue with folks enjoying their yards as long as it does not materially impede my enjoyment of mine. The rules being proposed would seem to create that environment.
- It is possible to keep hens in proper living conditions in an urban setting. Also, I support families who are trying to grow and harvest their own food at home.
- I would enjoy hearing hens clucking in the neighborhood but NOT rooster crowing at 4 am. Also would have to keep pens clean to avoid the smell chickens have if not cleaned regularly.
- I think any animal should be allowed to live in urban areas as long as the above criteria are met. There is no need to discriminate based on species, but rather on the impact it has to the community. For example, noisy dogs could have a bigger negative impact on a community compared to a pair of quiet chickens in a backyard.
- I think so long as they aren't a nuisance, smaller livestock should be allowed
- When properly managed and enforced allows people to grow their food at home.
- Why not have chickens as long as they are not a nuisance to neighbours. However many inner city properties have covenants which disallow any farm animals.



- This decision is a tough one. I care for the well-being of the animals and I can see a hoarding situation happening. And who will enforce proper care and yard cleanliness? Nobody enforces bylaw now.
- As long as taken care it appropriately and sound and smell not an issue. There should be a maximum amount allowed
- I think neighbours must be on board as they are indirectly affected.
- I feel support from adjacent neighbors should not be required. I feel that the person must properly take care of their Urban hens and if they are in violation they may lose this right. None had to get approval from their neighbor to get a dog or a cat, so I don't think you should have to get approval for chickens.
- Chickens are great for urban Families
- "Securing sustainable local food is important. Demonstrating proper care or mandatory education should be conditional of ownership of small livestock to ensure its' safety, well being, health, & neighbour relations.
- Hens are quiet, easy to care for, free ranging on property can reduce vectors such as ticks."
- "Food sovereignty for our city is very important urban farming and gardening is a growing and a much needed resource in our communities
- we need to move forward and encourage resilience and responsibility within community
- I believe this would be this would have a very positive impact intertwined into our communities"
- I do support this amendment but also realize that having more livestock in Calgary will increase the bylaw officer's work load.
- Only if animals are in humane conditions
- I think people can responsibly have hens.
- As long as they are respecting their neighbours around the area I don't see the issue with having hens on the property
- Ah long as space allows it.
- If the property is large enough that they have space to move around, but the owners must control the smell as it can be offensive.
- I think that this is a great initiative, as long as people are following bylaws 100%.
- If not an issue for neighbours and community neighbourhood
- Backyard chickens are overdue to be allowed in Calgary. Food security is a human right.
- Neighbor support for this would be essential.
- Yes to urban hens but I have great difficulty imagining other livestock in a neighbours backyard.
- A limited number of hens of 2-3 per family would allow them to get healthy food at lower costs and easy access and also hens are fun to have for young's and adults helping in a great problem today which is mental health.
- The majority of city lots should not support "livestock", but in semi-rural areas of city owned land, the Owner should have the ability to work through the above stated criteria with all (not just adjacent) neighbours.



- If properly cared for, hens are not a nuisance and they can provide sustenance and education to families.
- "Great idea!
- And keep the bee hives allowable."
- Personal Opinion
- Given Calgary's current economic freefall, we honestly need all the side-jobs and produce we can get.
- If the care of the hens is regularly monitored, then theoretically having them would be a positive thing.
- I support responsibly owned pets of any kind
- Proper hen houses and animal enclosures would be appropriate with neighbors approval.
- Food sustainability should be a top priority. The fact that we are not yet allowed is so outdated!
- As long as the animals are being kept in a suitable humane environment, are cared for properly and are not causing problems with the neighbours and community.
- As long as there are not any excessive odors....ie smell like a barn/farm
- Chickens are minimally noticeable, they can easily incorporate into an urban setting without neighbour disruption.
- Consent from neighbours shouldn't be needed. A hen makes as little noise as a dog. I don't need consent from my neighbor for that.
- Food security is so important and should be a top concern for large cities like Calgary, we are faced with low employment and expensive housing we need to support food security.
- Livestock can be safely incorporated into city living with many benefits to society
- Must be kept on site. Neighbour support needed be unanimous; i.e. a single no should not necessarily rule it out if many other neighbours support it. Noise, odor, and pest (insect) control must be maintained. Don't limit it to chickens, allow other critters and even worm farms.
- Sounds reasonable.
- Limits on the number and approval needed from all neighbours at least 4 houses in circumference
- I fully support hens and other livestock being permitted in Calgary. I see this as more beneficial than pets as it offers food security and companionship / connection with other species at the same time. It also empowers people to have access to healthy food without income being a barrier.
- All people should have a right to raise their own food on their own property, providing all the animals needs are met.
- seems fairly comprehensive and reasonable. if the animal is not creating problems for anyone, and indeed a benefit to the owner, why would we want to get in the way of that?
- There are only two choices supplied. I would prefer to answer "Not Sure" but I don't have that choice. Poor construction of the question.
- I think if hens are properly cared for they should be allowed.

- Backyard hens are great, we need to allow people to live on their property as they want. Hens do not disturb surrounding homes people just don't understand yet. We can show them. We should not have neighbours preventing people from approval, they won't understand until they see it.
- As long as it is on their private property and it's not a massive, stinky animal like a cow.
- Hens are an amazing addition to Calgary, what a forward thinking future minded way to support citizens.
- I do not wish to have hens but I fully support and encourage anyone that does, it is a great way to help reduce poverty and support the community.
- there can be benefits to having live stock in a community as long as neighbours agree.
- Rather have a chicken coop next door or Hundreds in the neighbourhood than One pitbull or nuisance dog!
- Would love to have my own eggs. They eat bugs that would destroy vegetables and plants.
- Backyard hens were allowed in Calgary for years and supported families, we need to support food security. Neighbors should not be able to refuse, hens are far less disruptive than dogs. We need to foster good neighbour programs not encourage NIMBY behaviour.
- I grew up on a street in Calgary with chickens, and they were no problem to anyone. If other livestock is not creating a problem, they should be allowed.
- Chickens are so important to food security. I do not feel that neighbours should be able to restrict someone from having them, too many do not understand that it is not intrusive and can be a great community builder. People will need to see how easy it can be incorporated to understand.
- If we had a small number of urban hens this would help with food security and help with controlling insects in our backyard.
- However the housing and general well being of the hens in question must be vetted by a qualified person (vet ?) The city allows urban honeybees; small scale animal husbandry as I see it. Roosters should not be allowed in the bylaw.
- I support backyard chickens
- If guidelines are followed and enforced Hens can bring value to a community
- Smell and noise must be considered. Also, possible a size limit. No horses, cattle or 300 lb pigs.
- The more people can provide for themselves the better... that includes hens kept in yards etc.
- Gone are the days of green grass mowed and watered frequently. Today, and the future are about sustainability: gardens to grow your own food, and hens to help with slug and bug problems, plus provide food as well. Keep neighbours noses out of each other's busy please!
- As long as it is okay with the neighbours and the animals are happy and well cared for.
- Hens can play a crucial role in a self sustaining house hold. It is cost efficient and environmentally safe and friendly.
- why should my neighbour have to support my right?
- Urban agriculture is awesome! If we can have gardens, hens would be lovely.
- I support this, however only with additional funding to Animal Services and Bylaw enforcement, as it would certainly increase their workloads.



- Hens provide a sustainable, local food source. However, they should be subject to the same regulations regarding noise as other animals.
- If my neighbour wants a hen and provides adequate care who am I to judge
- As long as there is suitable living conditions I don't see an issue.
- I think hens should be allowed with a permit.
- Neighbours need to be included. Not many people would like a rooster crowing early in the am
- Urban hens are part of human life environments - I grew up with most of my neighbors keeping chicken for eggs and for meat and it was very educational and beneficial to a healthy society. At least people understand where the food comes from.
- Provided the animals are appropriately cared for and there is no increase in danger to the surrounding residents (i.e. an individual setting up beekeeping adjacent to an individual allergic to bees), personal livestock maintenance is an appropriate step towards self sufficiency.
- Would love to raise my own meat and have fresh eggs each day. would love to have a goat to mow my lawn
- Small and managed well would be the key for me.
- I would say yes to hens but not roosters
- Urban hens have been allowed in other areas to great success. They should be allowed here too.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and they have a proper living situation, I see no issues with other livestock being allowed in the city.
- Yes-absolutely I support this bylaw. For some people pets are a vital part of their life no matter what it is!
- Definition needs to be developed to allow personal use holding of hens, if it is for a home based business then different criteria should be used for assessment.
- Appears that ALL Neighbors must be satisfied as to Noise, Smell, Etcetera....
- Some can't have "fur" pets due to allergies, and have knowledge of caring for other "farm" pets. This is a fair option if the family can adequately care for the animal.
- i would consider chickens if allowed
- Whatever the animal, adequate food, shelter and attention to well-being should be contingent on ownership. I see no reason why back yard hen houses should not be allowed, as long as extra care is given to the hens ensuring their survival during Calgary winters.
- Yes as long as it is not a business for selling the animals or products produced by the animals.
- All neighbours should have a say and understand how the animal is living, why it living in an urban setting, just like a development notice on the front lawn does for changes to homes. I would be concerned about noise, and smell coming onto my property so would want to have say as we live in very close quarters with our neighbours.
- needs a bylaw and officers to investigate complaints and check on compliance
- Livestock on private property would be acceptable as long as living conditions and any other bylaws are not impacted. Other impacts would include an over abundance of smell or noise, which may be disagreeable to many.



- Long overdue, but can't be left to the "discretion" of the bylaw officer. Evaluated on a case by case basis with criteria that can be flexible to a limited degree.
- There is no reason that chickens etc should not be allowed
- I am very much in favour of properly managed livestock in the city, especially chickens.
- The bylaws should address the factors that affect others: noise, smell, danger, etc... If my pets are not bothersome or dangerous, why should anyone care?
- Responsible ownership is responsible ownership
- It has worked well in other communities.
- People have the right to have livestock if they can do so in a humane way while providing minimal intrusion to neighbours
- If you can manage noise (hens vs roosters) I think its kind of a nice idea
- Provided animals are adequately cared for in an urban environment, producing more food locally is a vitally needed step towards increasing sustainability.
- Again, assume people would/could be responsible/respectful.
- If properly implemented, neighbourhood chickens could be a benefit to the community.
- Have limits on hens, noise level, proximity to neighbors; ensure sanitary and suitable living conditions for the birds.
- As long as suitable winter accommodation provided and licence
- Fabulous idea! This would cut down on dangerous pesticide use!!
- Increased ability to provide for our own food needs leads to stronger communities
- This bylaw would help protect all involved. It only makes sense to protect the animals and hopefully limit "mills" popping up.
- Hens should not require support from neighbours. They make less noise than dogs, are easily contained in a fence (unlike cats).
- I have no problem with this
- As long as the hens are not a nuisance to the neighborhood, noise, smell etc.
- Why not as long as proper care is taken regarding health hazards and possible contamination
- Must have strict restrictions & actionable penalties relating to noise, smell, etc. No roosters allowed, no peacocks etc.
- people should be allowed chickens.
- If they were maintained properly, they would definitely be a benefit for the owner and Could be for the neighbours.
- As long as they do not pose a threat to surrounding humans as a vector for disease AND are not likely to prove a nuisance due to smell, noise, or containment there are gains to be made from bringing back a little bit of what life is about outside of urban centers. It's easier for some people to find comfort in a pet than in 'neighbors' and the learning potential for children is immense.
- If living conditions are not maintained the permit can be revoked.
- Hens can provide comfort for owners
- I support this amendment as long as all rules and regulations can be enforced without delays.



- This would depend on the animals in question and the potential impact on the neighbourhood.
- Hens would be ok, but no roosters please, due to noise
- I see no problem if just a couple of hens.
- "Chickens lay eggs = Food source.
- Chickens create excellent fertilizer.
- Chickens make great pets.
- Chickens help clean your yard.
- Chickens are like a natural garbage disposal.
- Chickens are fairly easy to take care of.
- Chickens help control bugs and weeds naturally."
- I fully support having livestock as long as they are taken care of the way they deserve to be and have all their needs met
- Hens can be a benefit for providing food and a comforting creature.
- Assuming animals are well cared for and don't disturb neighbours (noise, smell, etc) a property resident should be allowed to use their property as they wish.
- Livestock such as chickens, ducks, geese and turkeys could be allowed but with a number cap such as only two. Roosters should not be allowed or any animals that are too noisy or too smelly for neighbours. Then, as they say, "get a farm!"
- As long as they are treated humanely and do not cause issues with neighbours, I support
- We are facing a food shortage and other shortages due to Covid. Our governments overacting to this concern will leave us without resources. Backyard hens, bees and other resources can only help this issue.
- As long as livestock can abide by the city's bylaws concerning noise, living conditions, or issues over cleanliness and odor, I think they could be a good addition our city. Are beehives considered livestock?
- I think hens cause very little issue and backyard Ben programs thrive in other areas.
- my answer is really ---I don't know. It depends on the size of the animal & how noisy & if it is for therapeutic reasons
- support a small number of hens
- Provided all criteria are met by those wishing to raise them, I have no problem with hens in the city.
- What's the difference between someone raising a few pet rabbits, and someone having a few pigeons or hens? As long as noise, cleanliness and odor are not affecting neighbors and the animal (hens or livestock) is being housed and receiving good care, it shouldn't matter. Admittedly with pigeons, there is more of a risk of impacting neighbors simply because they can fly beyond the confines of their property.
- Noise would have to be part of the amendment. Hens should be OK though.
- "I have no problems w hens.
- Is this considered ""baiting""? Does this attract bobcats, coyotes etc."



- This is something a lot of Calgarians want and offers great value to the community. Goats would also be a great addition.
- YAY! I miss this so much! Growing up in BC I had a small group of 4 and had all the eggs all year round. They should require a license to legally have that required proper living conditions and cleaning and vet routines. The last thing we need is another Turk RIP.
- I feel that if the livestock is well taken care of and the owners clean up after the animal then there shouldn't be a problem with them having the animal.
- I would like Hens
- would love permission to keep chickens
- I believe this will benefit the community in many ways, and allows novel education of urban children. However, noise and smell pollution affecting neighbours must be considered carefully. Also, how much space is needed per animal, and this needs to be carefully monitored. Too small a space will cause more problems for the animals and neighbours. I feel that goats used by the city to control weeds also needs to be more widespread, with a view to ending the use of pesticides completely
- Would love to be able to get fresh eggs from the neighbourhood.
- As long as the animals don't pose a problem for neighbours and the property is large enough to support the animals and the people can afford to look after the animals, I would support the bylaw.
- I would love to have a couple of hens! No roosters though as they are far too noisy.
- Food prices going up. Increased food security for many households. Many calgarians losing their jobs. Global food supply chain disruptions an increasing concern. Those that can raise their own hens and grow their own food will reduce the current strain on own food supply system.
- I support livestock on personal Property as long as the property size supports the type and size of livestock.
- As long a roosters are prohibited
- However, I am concerned about noise. IE Roosters crowing at all hours of the day. Additionally if people are raising livestock in the city, are they processing these animals (killing them and disposal of remains)? I would also be concerned about the smell of chickens and other livestock.
- Hens, and other reasonably sized livestock, if cared for properly, and kept clean, can be of significant benefit to the community, both through tangible and non tangible effects, including mental health.
- Chickens and goats are beneficial.
- With limitations. We do not want commercial operations in backyards. Perhaps "less than ten" birds, or something similar.
- Why not, this is quite common in other parts of the country and world
- I think small amounts of small livestock can be accommodated without concerns.
- As long as ok with neighbors and suitable conditions
- Love the idea of sustainable living, great for the community and children, fully support this!
- Roosters...no. Don't need crowing at sunrise
- Chickens or other domestic animals should only be permitted where they can be appropriately housed and do not create an issue such as noise or excrement or property damage for neighbours.



- It's very important to inform the neighbors.
- I think a lot of thought should go into this...maybe community Hens .
- The Calgary Stampede, U of C Veterinary program, Butterfield Acres, all of the rural properties annexed into the City of Calgary...etc. may all have livestock. The noise and healthy conditions of keeping livestock need to be enhanced by this bylaw so that manure, cleanliness and best practices for keeping livestock are defined and enforceable. The standards for care and maintenance need to be defined.
- Goats and pigs are cute, but support from adjacent neighbours is essential before introducing these smelly animals to a backyard.
- My main concerns would be mess, smell and noise. If an enclosure can be kept clean, and as smell-free as possible, in addition to keeping noise at a minimum between 7am and 8pm.
- Responsible hen and other animal ownership and to provide suitable conditions for these animals.
- benefit--limit the numbers
- Only if people had a large enough back yard to accommodate livestock.
- As long as there are no roosters I don't see an issue with a limited number of hens in Urban back yards.
- Obviously having livestock on private property within the City Limits would need to be governed properly and closely, but other Municipalities have made this work. Many Calgarians are returning to being partially self-sustaining with gardens. Perhaps this could be encouraged with laying hens. In fact, maybe some could own goats to deal with nuisance weeds on their properties as well - reducing the use of electric and gas mowers that are noisy and produce green house gas emissions.
- I would support this only if the animals were being properly cared for and not attracting pests due to availability of feed. For example, backyard chickens have been known to attract rats in some urban areas.
- Overall, I do support this idea. However I think "livestock" should be defined; there should be limits set as to how many would be allowed per household; there should be bylaws regarding the type of housing "livestock" would require; there should be some sort of licensing
- As long as neighbours are in agreement, and conditions for the hens are inspected to ensure they are good for the hens, it should be fine.
- If the animal can be cared for properly and is not disruptive to neighbours, I see no issue.
- I like the idea of appropriately considered livestock in Calgary in appropriate private residence scenarios with the unconditional support of adjacent neighbors
- No concerns as long as basic cleanliness and security protocols are followed to minimize predator draw.
- Subject to appropriate conditions as noted above, I support urban hens.
- I see no problem with people owning farm pets as long as they are being kept responsibly and not harming anyone else.
- As long as its within the rules and reason and it's a nuisance to neighbors, I dont see why not.
- Anyone with sufficient land to support a few domestic animals in a peaceful manner should be allowed the opportunity.



- I think that this could work if the right conditions were imposed and there was support for it from neighbours. It would meet a food need and a human one.
- There is a benefit to having urban hens in communities.
- Other animals should be allowed for mental health.
- The potential for community programs/enrichment programs is great here. The safety and well-being of all involved (animal and human) would need to be the main focus, however.
- Hens clean the yard and eat lots of insects.
- Good to be respectful to neighbours while allowing the possibly of the meeting the owners desires.
- I like the idea of having my own chickens and bees
- Hens should be permitted within city limits- weed/pest control, sustainable living and well-being of those who care for them are all reasons for.
- I am into local, healthy food and the best can come from your own backyard. The ability to have chickens would be amazing
- i would love 2 or 3 hens for my garden and eggs.
- Hens would be amazing as long as they were looked after properly. Eggs for everyone!
- A mix of biodiversity helps the planet and people.
- Yard chickens are awesome, eggs are great, they provide pest control, they are so quiet!! They are excellent all around animals.
- Urban chickens provide more value than pets that are already allowed and are less or equally disruptive (ie barking dogs are more of a nuisance)
- There should be a limit on the amount of hens allowed per size of property.
- As long as the animals are not annoying the neighborhood or attracting other wildlife I think it is ok
- This should only be allowed if the animals are rescues and not being used for food.
- Neighbour support should not be a requirement. Individual property owners have landowner rights and neighbours should not be entitled to veto or decide what landowners are permitted to have on their property. I agree with the other criteria listed (except neighbour support). Having said that, neighbors could be informed but should not have any weight on the decision. This idea of neighbour support can result in “complainers” getting their way.
- I support urban hens as it allows people living in the city to be more self sustaining.
- Animal conditions are very important and I think a critical point of enforcement to make this change a long term success.
- This would have to be strictly monitored to prevent ANY harm coming to the chicken. Also, the smell from a poorly kept coop could be problematic.
- If it harms none, what's the problem? Chickens have been shown to express emotion and make wonderful pets. Same as goats.
- Limit the number to two (2) hens per household.
- I have no problems with any animals as long as the owners are responsible.
- Its private property, unless thier livestock is disturbing the peace it isnt right to dictate thier rights to responsible ownership



- Chickens are wonderful animals that make great livestock and pets, and can provide much-needed sources of ethical protein through egg and meat production. Divesting from factory-farmed egg and poultry production also lowers COVID-19 exposure risks for workers in meat production.
- As long as its noise level is treated like other loud animals (dogs), and they have fencing capable of keeping them in the property, I see no reason why no. Mess with these animals can be toxic and easily spread
- yes, yes, yes to this enhancement
- With in reason. Downtown City living is not Country Living. Meaning. You need to have proper space and accommodation so to speak. Animals need to be in the Country. Cows chickens pigs etc..Lets be smart here.
- Avoiding noise related nuisance is key (e.g. early morning rooster noises)
- More urban livestock and farming/gardening should be encouraged for food sustainability
- Can be a source of food and a hobby that can help alleviate mental issues
- People have the space & ability to look after animals like miniature horses/donkeys/pigs etc. Not everyone wants just a cat or dog
- Need to restrict number of hens/animals and have a good escalation process for neighbours that have issues.
- If the animal and the neibours are all benefiting there is no issues in my opinion.
- Only hens
- As long as the negative aspects are controlled, i.e., smell, noise, look of the property, and doesn't affect house prices.
- If it's not bothering the neighbours, I don't see why someone wouldn't be able to care for them.
- On the conditions that owners would need full approval of all surrounding neighbours, there would be strict control over any nuisances (noise, smell, etc.), cleanliness of habitats, quantities of animals, and that all sites would need to registered with the City.
- As long as bylaw is strictly nforced
- It's 100% about the well being of the animal. As long as the animal is well taken care of and not in crowded, cramped, and dire conditions then, yes.
- Provided there's room and in the yard and the owner provides adequate shelter this would be a sustainable way of proving food to ppl.
- Hens or livestock could not make any noise, smell or danger to anyone in the neighbourhood.
- I hear more and more positive experiences with people raising hens and I think it can be a good thing.
- Hens for eggs but not for slaughter
- Urban hens are a great idea! However, just like any pet proper research and care needs to go into them.
- Carefully granting permission for backyard hens would be a good way to go.
- Great for community
- I would especially support having urban hens since they provide a beneficial food source of eggs.



- I would support the amendment based on the type of animal. Some people have pet pigs which are very similar to dogs. I'm ok with this. I'm not sure I would be thrilled with a crowing rooster throughout the night. Also, there should be requirements on ***daily** cleaning up of fecal matter, so the property does not resemble or smell like a barnyard.
- Other communities successfully have allowed hens in urban settings and Calgary should too.
- as long as it doesn't cause too much noise (ie roosters), or affect adjacent property. I would not support keeping pigeons or other birds that can fly
- Having chickens kept in tandem with community garden or school garden would promote healthy outdoor schooling opportunities. Plus I have a larger (almost 1acre) lot and would love to have a couple chickens for household needs. Or community!
- Provided the animal has enough space and is properly being cared for then I don't see why people can't own the animal on their property. I come from a small rural town being living in Calgary where my neighbors were an auction mart the smell for 1 or 2 livestock is not going to cause a problem if its being cleaned up after like a responsible owner would have to do anyways.
- Limit number of hens but I don't mind a few
- I believe that having properly kept livestock enriches the community
- As long as the animals are properly housed/cared for, smaller than a large dog, limited in number, and they do not disturb the neighbors then I think people should be able to have hens for eggs or other animals considered "livestock" as pets.
- a couple of hens would be great.
- As long as the animal isn't going to negatively affect neighbours (ie a rooster crowing at 5am etc...)
- This amendment is long overdue and I support most of the criteria above with the exception of support from adjacent neighbors. We've been dealing with blatant discrimination from ours for years, it's highly unlikely we're the only ones and it takes little imagination to see this as another way for people to continue such behavior. However, in a rental situation the landlord would need to supply consent
- "Having chickens is an important aspect to food security. With economic insecurity on the rise, a simple alleviating measure the city can take is to allow people to have a consistent source of eggs.
- Calgary is a uniquely situated community to responsibly raise other livestock as well as chickens due to the strong rural connections and farming backgrounds of many Calgarians."
- Not every situation is black & white. Sometimes there needs to be discretion.
- I support the overall bylaw amendment, but I don't think permission to have chickens should rest with the neighbours. I don't think neighbours necessarily need to have a say on whether or I should be allowed to have chickens but I do think ALL pet owners need to be mindful of their pets' impact on their neighbours and their community. Chickens are a very quiet, low impact animal, and are much less of a nuisance than many barking dogs. And my neighbours who have dogs don't have to seek my approval before getting a dog - so I think this is an unnecessary bureaucratic hurdle.
- It would have to have little impact on neighbours much like having a dog or cat next door.



- In my neighbourhood, there is a lady with support chickens. She provides excellent care for them, and they improve her quality of life. Everyone should have the same opportunity - with proof, on a case-by-case basis.
- As long as there are a clear set of rules and the animal owner is following those rules
- No roosters. Just hens to produce eggs.
- This is a great idea provided the talking points above are followed.
- I'd love to see urban small-scale farming
- chickens are relatively quiet and I don't see any harm in having them around. As long as they are well taken care of.
- I think this needs to be on a case by case criteria
- I am fine with urban hens as long as there is a cap to the number that can be kept, as well as the size of the yard and proximity to other houses they are.
- It would be great for people to be able to source eggs from their own chickens that they know are treated humanely as opposed to from battery hen operations. However, I think there needs to be a pilot project. The Montreal SPCA has recently been inundated with abused and abandoned chickens, so I think we need to proceed with caution. In terms of other livestock, I think there should be discretion to grant exceptions in extremely limited circumstances where it is absolutely clear that the people seeking the exception have the means to adequately care for the animal. I would suspect that this would be rare and would be concerned that trendy pet livestock (such as "teacup" pigs) would be at risk of being quickly abandoned in many cases.
- I agree provides that there is a limit and there is adequate cleaning of waste. It doesn't smell up the neighbourhood.
- Domesticated livestock is not very different from a cat, dog or other more typical "pet like" animal.
- I am for urban chickens.
- So long as there's a good system in place to insure proper treatment of the animals, why not give people the means to provide for themselves and community members?
- "As long as the owners great the animals in a humane way.
- Which is why I believe would occur with animals raised at home. Inspections should be made mandatory."
- No explanation needed, all around YES. I want to rescue chickens and have a pet pig!!
- Noise and smell have to be acceptable to nearby neighbors; animal has to be well cared for.
- Neighbours should not be inconvenienced by livestock
- Hens help to keep bugs down and weeds but, I don't think it would be wise to have a rooster included in that.
- I support this because it encourages local food sources / community markets
- Keeping backyard chickens allows you to become a food producer and not just a consumer. In addition to fresh eggs, there are a lot of benefits to keeping chickens in an urban setting.
- I am in support of livestock in Calgary as long as it doesn't impact neighbours (noise, smell, etc), attract unwanted predators, and ensures that the animals are well cared for.
- As long as it is done responsibly then no problem



- Make allowable on applicant basis, case by case investigation, with decision at the discretion of the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer.
- Currently a resident can have a large number of dogs, typically causing a nuisance in the neighbourhood with barking, greater chance and frequency of feces left in public areas etc. Hens are quite, and don't leave the property. Likewise goats, sheep, miniature horses etc. Unlikely to attack and bite anyone. Why do dogs get such latitude?
- As long as the hens are properly cared for and they do not become an issue for neighbours, I don't see this being a problem.
- I'm in support of small collections of non-destructive livestock. For example, 2-3 hens (NO roosters!) in a back yard would not do damage to the neighbor's property. However, goats are known escape artists and I would not support city goats. The potential for damage to a neighbour's yard, as goats eat everything, is high.
- As long as owners are providing proper care and Suitable living conditions for hens ... maybe making owners apply for proper licensing to prove that they are willing to provide proper care as suitable living in order to have hens on the property
- There are huge benefits to allowing city dwellers to become more self sustainable by providing more of their own food sources. It's important that the animals aren't a nuisance to neighbours and are kept in a safe, clean environment.
- If someone wants to have a couple chickens and has the ability to maintain a clean space so that the smell does not affect their neighbours and the health of the animals is number one, then I support this. If people are lazy and just want to have fresh eggs but do not want the responsibility of cleaning and maintaining that I do not support this. Also no roosters! Too loud!
- "The cost of living is getting greater and greater, so anyway some can offset the cost by growing or raising at home is a benefit to lessening the stress of the community. Having said that, if you choose to get hens for egg laying, then you must take a course (in person preferably). Where an expert will show you different hen house models, cleaning, caring etc. Once you have taken the course then you can get your licence to have hens.
- This should really be the same for dogs! Even basic dog training should be required within 6 months of getting a dog, or your licence cost increases."
- People should be entitled to keep any animals they see fit and can reasonably provide a good life for.
- As long as animals are housed properly and they are used for proper means I think it would be ok. I don't know enough about livestock in urban areas unfortunately to provide a better answer. It might be necessary to check on these homes and animals
- One household keeping hens, or other livestock, can impact multiple, adjacent, households with issues that include: sanitary conditions, potential for viral/bacterial outbreaks, noise. Any consideration of keeping livestock within the city would have to be accompanied by strict bylaws concerning the health of livestock, livestock living conditions, licensing, and the opportunity for input from adjacent neighbours before a license is provided.
- Hens are not a nuisance to neighbours



- I would love to see urban hens and other livestock within Calgary
- as long as the hens have a good environment I see no problem with it.
- Other big cities like Edmonton and Vancouver have legalized urban hens, so Calgary can use them as models to form our own livestock bylaws.
- Having hens would be beneficial to low income people to access food
- Hens only. Absolutely no roosters. For those of us with allergies, only small numbers of hens should be allowed.
- As long as rules are being followed, I don't see why not.
- if the neighbours are OK with chickens and precautions are taken to discourage wild predators raising a few chickens seems ok
- So long as the animals are being well kept and healthy, and are not causing a nuisance for the owners neighbours, and the property is kept clean then I believe having small urban "farms" would be great community benefit.
- It makes sense for more of us to grow food.
- If the animal is well taken care of and not a nuisance why not.
- I think case by case is wise. Not every home or set up is the same.
- It would be nice for family's to collect their own eggs.
- Raising your own livestock is a healthier lifestyle and I support local food
- hens are a great addition to the house for supplying eggs, eating organic waste, and for the yard
- As long as they follow the guidelines outlined
- I support urban hens. Maybe just have rules about how many hens people can have so it's not too loud.
- provided there is a limit in how many hens can be on any one property.
- No explanation needed
- If hens can be kept in clean environment, sure.
- Case by case. We are more concerned about chickens than miniature goats for example.
- As long as proper living conditions can be created, it should be up to each individual what kind of animals they wish to own.
- Why not
- Because livestock are animals and have rights too.
- As long as the livestock isn't causing a major inconvenience or hazard to the neighbours they should be absolutely allowed. Allowing residents to raise their own food is a good way to make the city more sustainable.
- We have raised egg laying hens outside of the city limits in recent years as well as in Calgary before livestock became prohibited in early 2000's. Several noteworthy positives were a result, in particular positive interest of the community, especially by children, who within the city limits have little exposure of where food comes from. Neighbours were delighted with fresh eggs when offered to them and we became more connected to them due to the chickens being a point of interest and a topic of discussion. Neighbours made a point of stopping by to chat when walking by. It also created



a greater interest in responsible food production because our chickens had significantly more space than the majority of store bought eggs. It created an appreciation of responsible food production and added to a connected community.

- I agree with the criteria as outlined.
- I see no reason that responsible and ethical ownership of small livestock can't be integrated into the community as long as there is no tangible impact on neighbours. (noise, smell etc..)
- As long as people are taking care of the animals and it doesn't start to smell i would be fine with it
- Having hens in an urban yard is a fantastic idea. It builds community and provides eggs for families. No harm to this. Crazy rule that is in place and I don't have and would never have hens - so I am speaking as a neighbor who would be totally thrilled if my neighbors had hens.
- IMHO - this enriches the experience of living in a neighbourhood. I grew up in a "rural/urban" setting, and we were the lucky recipients of their labour!
- allow reasonable freedom to do as like on own property
- I would like sheep to cut my grass. It would reduce the clippings that require to be picked up
- As long as the animals are housed appropriately and do not bother neighbors (noise or smell) I am fine with other animals in the city.
- "I have personally experienced having neighbours with urban hens.
- They followed all the rules and it was a nice experience to have them in the neighbourhood."
- I support quiet egg laying livestock but not livestock that would be killed for food. I do not support roosters.
- Fully supportive
- Fully support chicken coops.
- Support as mentioned in criteria and have limits to the number and types of animals. Odour management, cleanliness
- I strongly agree that urban hens would have a great benefit. However I believe that the limit should be lowered to 2-4.
- I shouldn't have to move out of the city to be slug sufficient when it comes to feeding myself.
- This idea makes sense environmentally and provides an educational opportunity for young and old alike.
- As long as there is enforcement and make the owners responsible.
- As long as the criteria are met
- As long as people follow the rules, I think it is a great idea
- Backyard hens were a part of Calgary since inception, many families relied on this to support food supplies in their homes. It is only recent that people became disengaged with the food system and it is very harmful. We need to support a healthy understanding of the food chain and allow families to create anti-fragile systems. This would support community engagement and anti poverty initiatives. We have a future with uncertainty, we need a city that supports initiatives that help to create food security.
- Support from adjacent neighbours is crucial for all livestock including chickens. If support is not given then the permit should be refused.



- As long as people can care for the animals and not disrupt the neighbourhood, people should be granted the responsibility to take care of these animals.
- On the condition that the livestock owners' rights to enjoy their animals doesn't impinge on the neighbours: odour, noise or safety
- There should be a restriction depending on property size and if cleanliness is not maintained they would lose the privilege. (chickens are pretty stinky)
- Sustainable lifestyles are a good thing, let people raise their own micro agriculture
- There must be a positive impact from alternative animals.
- I think it should be treated similarly to a building permit
- Urban agriculture is important for many reasons.
- Food security is an issue for some Calgarians; as long as owners are responsible, raising hens can help this issue.
- Proper housing and husbandry are my main concerns who inspects this? Housing needs to be predator proof and feeding method pest proof (they cost more but pest proof feeders exist). Fly control, traps etc. This is important as pests and predators are attracted by hens and could ruin home enjoyment of neighbours too.
- Having animals other than your typical cats/dogs would be beneficial as far as food (ie eggs) and education for children
- Chickens are a great source of fresh eggs and poultry, especially for lower income families.
- I think it could be a positive experience for children learning to care for them, and like a garden, gathering eggs is a good food source. The smell can get quite bad quickly, and if conditions are found unclean, the city must revoke the privilege. I would like to see a more stringent application of dog feces in back yards as well.
- Only with support from adjacent neighbours!
- It would depend on the type of livestock and how large the lots are.
- A limited number of hens per household should be fine in the city. They don't generate noise, but if there should be straight enforcement to allow by-law officers to enter to count the number of hens if there is a complaint.
- If anything, we need now more than ever to support local food production.
- I can see no downside based on the criteria listed above.
- Not offended by this bylaw
- Depending on conditions. But if done correctly, chickens would be a lovely addition to some families.
- I believe people with their own property can decide what to do with it under certain conditions as were listed.
- I strongly support urban hens and community education around this.
- Food security, local food, there is a pandemic for heaven's sake please let people feed themselves
- I would love more hens in Calgary!
- Backyard hens would be a fantastic opportunity for communities.
- Hens can make wonderful pets. Fresh eggs could help many families too.



- Hens are fine, they can help us eat
- As long as they are not a nuisance to anyone else then yes I support this.
- I like these ideas.
- Chickens are awesome
- There should be a maximum capacity per unit of open land for livestock types (including for combined livestock) as determined in accordance with federal (?) agriculture standards, adjusted downward for urban livestock
- I agree that it would have a positive community impact!
- If supported by adjacent neighbours and securely restricted to the property
- Hens have a positive effect on people within the city.
- I grew up where chickens were allowed so it seems normal and natural to me.
- Don't see the harm
- Female chickens are fine.
- I believe there is no harm to hens on private property, assuming clean conditions are maintained, and there is no disturbance to neighbors.
- If home owners can have homing pigeons then why not hens?
- Definitely believe that animals, including livestock, are important for people with mental health, a which would apply to this scenario.
- I do not see an issue with an appropriately cared for animal, even small livestock. I do not feel large livestock should be included - nothing larger than a goat.
- There is great value in people connecting with livestock; we have become so urban and removed from animals and the land, that increasing access to these creatures would provide lessons and value. In addition, people's property is theirs to do with as they please, provided it doesn't harm others or the animal. Therefore, finding ways to expand what people can do on their property is important.
- The noise is the primary issue, but if that can be discussed with adjacent houses or properties and the solution is reasonable, people should be able to do this.
- It would be based on proper facilities of the livestock and no negative impact of the neighbouring residences
- Not all livestock would be problems to neighbors.
- I support urban hens and other potential livestock that would have a community benefit, such as goats.
- Chickens are way less of a menace than dogs.
- People can grow their own food but not every yard is a good space for rearing hens
- As long as they are being taken care of I'm for it
- I think as long as they are taken care of well and they have a suitable living space and that they won't disturb any other people.
- I agree with this as long as people have the proper housing and space and neighbors are consenting with noise etc.



- Owning hens has tremendous benefits in an urban setting, including food security, educational implications to children, sustainability and emotional wellbeing.
- If the neighbours agree, then, sure.
- Absolutely should be permitted. Nuisance issues regarding neighbours are moot - there will always be irritations in a community, so if they have problems with a few animals next door, they ought not live around other people.
- Not everyone can have the usual pet but still needs the companionship.
- There is a lot of interest in urban hens but they must not be allowed to negatively impact neighbours (smell, noise, predators)
- Yes to hens. Curious as to what other livestock you have in mind?
- If done responsibly, there is no difference between "livestock" animals and domestic pets
- I dont have a problem with people having hens or small livestock. They should be subject to the same rules as pets (eg fines for being too loud or attacking people) and there should also be bylaws governing cleanliness (eg cannot have excessive manure or smells that affect neighbors)
- It doesn't really matter what someone wants to do with their yard, so long as it's safe and sane.
- many people are returning to rural practices. The concern would be if they are a nuisance and if our climate is feasible
- I feel that people should be allowed to do this if it is okay with their neighbours. The welfare of the animals involved should come first in terms of their needs being met by the proposed environment and owner.
- The owner has to be responsible regarding their livestock for example be held responsible to engage in maintain cleanliness and order in their neighborhood without exception (no chicken / its feces in neighbor's backyard or on the street or public space) and there is limitation of minimum available space to rise livestock (fenced yard, not allowed in condominium / apartment / in confined space building, location of the animal cage the farthest from neighbor's property)
- I wanna farm chicken eggs. Also they cute.
- Some people are narrow minded and would not like to allow chickens, however, if it can be shown the person who wants them will be responsible and provide excellent care, maintenance and living conditions, they should be allowed to have them. **In addition, if an owner is EVER reported to not maintaining their coops property (constant odour, noise that bothers neighbors, etc.) they should have the privilege of owning chickens taken away. No exceptions!
- This is a fantastic idea
- As long as an animal is appropriately cared for it doesn't matter the location.
- The approval of adjacent neighbours is key and should be in writing due to noise, smell, etc.. Also, should be some limits on number of animals (e.g. no more than 5 hens, etc.) as well as total number of animals on the property (including dogs, cats, etc.).
- Urban hens and other livestock is a great way to collect a simple food indigents and save the family money.
- Why not
- why not. If area is keep clean and no harm comes to the animal.



- I.e chickens
- but no wild animals - only those habitually kept such as by farmers. NO VENOMOUS SNAKES. Or no snakes at all.
- I agree with your criteria for other livestock.
- Good with that
- As long as it's not a nuisance, e.g., excessive feces.
- As long as there is a restriction on the number. Fresh eggs and bug control is always a benefit.
- As long as your neighbours are ok with it
- I have no concerns with animals in the city provided no undue deterioration of quality of life for neighbours.
- I have owned laying hens in the city for 4 plus decades, never had a complaint, only people asking for extra eggs
- Great way to teach kids about animals other than dogs or cats.
- As with any pet or animal being taken care of, as long as the conditions are suitable keeping livestock or other animals that benefit people would be an important step forward
- Each case needs to be addressed on it's circumstance.
- As long as the city follows-up at regular intervals to ensure the comfort of the livestock as well as the neighbours, to ensure that the livestock owner is not allowing standard-of-living to diminish for either their animals or their neighbours around them. This would include cleanliness of the area, smell, and noise.
- I think those conditions should provide an adequate framework.
- As long as the owner is properly informed on how to take care of the animal, and the hen becoming urban doesn't negatively effect its conditioning, than I support it.
- I fully support having backyard chickens. I think it's good for the environment, it's good for children and all people to learn where their food comes from. I think it's an important part of food management and is it benefit to all society.
- There must be a guidelines around the effect adjacent Neighbour's can have. One bad/overbearing Neighbour can be a problem for pet and livestock owners if they (the human) is not controlled or limited
- Hens are not well understood and are less disruptive than dogs. Families should have the ability to provide food and companionship.
- All for allowing hens.
- I see no problem with keeping a few chickens for eggs
- If agreement can be reached between the owner and the neighbors then anyone objecting should mind their own business.
- Support allowing urban hens
- There are plenty of different types of livestock that can be pets.



- I do not agree with support of neighbors being needed. As long as the animal is not a nuisance this should not be required and if it is a nuisance it should not be permitted. A few hens is not an issue as long as kept clean, a rooster on the other hand will be a nuisance each and every morning!
- Limited number but hens should be allowed if neighbours support or are not nearby
- The criteria all sound good!
- I think this is a great idea as long as participants have a license (small one time fee?)
- As long as neighbours are in support and there is no offensive noise or smell associated with the hens or livestock, and the property and surrounding community isn't visually negatively impacted by the presence of the hens or livestock and the structures needed to house them.
- Need a large enough yard and proper structure.
- Permit and permission from neighbours required.
- If the neighbours are in support, the living conditions are suitable, and cleaning/waste issues are dealt with, why would we not allow other livestock.
- If the neighbours agree and if the animals cause no NOISE issues or impact their neighbours in other ways. I have stayed in places where they have chickens and I do NOT appreciate a 5 a.m. cockadoodledo wake-up, and again at 5:05 and 5:10 and so on. The chickens did not bother me otherwise.
- As long as they're well cared for and not bothering the neighbors....it's all good.
- Livestock should not be in Calgary. Ridiculous!
- As long as the livestock are given good living conditions, access to ample necessities and the owners can afford veterinary care and a high quality of life.
- But please address noise and smells from chicken coops, especially downwind on windy/rainy days. Limits to number of chickens owned. Ability to address nuisance owners.
- I support it as long as long as odour management and is part of a condition.
- As long as the livestock cannot cause grief of ANY kind to neighbours, and it is contained in a humane way.
- Only if all criteria are met. Constantly cleaning and waste disposal requirements must be delineated too. Noise requirements must be delineated too.
- It would need to be regulated so that parasite and bug infestation does not occur.
- If they are properly cared for, there is no reason not to allow urban hens.
- What does everything in this city take 20+ years to come to fruition? I've been hearing about urban chickens for 23 years. I will be retired and living in another country before Calgary can make a chicken decision. Many other cities made the decision and their citizens have had urban chickens for decades. Calgary is still discussing it. Heavy sigh.
- I fully support keeping of livestock type animals so long as they are cared for and the yard is suitably sized to accommodate the animal.
- Meet some residents needs.
- They're just as, if not more, useful than companion animals. There's no real reason why Calgarians shouldn't be allowed to keep smaller livestock. Whether it's smell or noise concerns, those things happen with dogs.



- Let people have chickens
- If adjacent neighbours agree, living conditions for the animal are suitable then yes.
- As long as the animals are taken care of properly (limit the number of animals, appropriate space and shelter), the noise is minimal and the owners have taken the proper courses to take of the animals, I see no issue
- Keeping some fowl is reasonable if living conditions are kept high, and an enclosed roost is provided to reduce noise.
- I think with some careful regulation people could keep chickens
- all animals are equal
- Hens are cool. Fresh eggs? I'm all for it.
- It is important to get the support and feedback from the neighbors as they could be impacted from livestock either due to allergies or other ailments.
- I think small livestock should be allowed, providing they do not cause any noise problems or bad smells to neighbors.
- People should be free to keep whatever pets they wish to, as long as the pets, whatever species they might be, are not a danger to the community.
- I feel it's a positive move forward.
- I am extremely supportive of any initiative that allows for those living and working within the city to grow and produce their own food. Livestock plays a hugely important role in organic and self-sustaining growing systems and it makes total sense to allow it in the city, especially chickens. This could be a great way to help Calgarians survive rougher times a little more easily, if they are able to access locally grown, affordable protein like eggs.
- This will help healthy living, of to standard. No broad stroke of a good owner, and a "bad" owner.
- Any animal should be allowed if it is cared for properly and does not cause problems with the neighbours. This includes dogs and other 'pet' animals which often are smelly
- If everyone around is ok with it why not. NO BALCONY COOP
- I didn't realize chickens were illegal in Calgary as I used to live near people who had them.
- I think it depends on the livestock and the neighbour hood
- Allowing hens will not negatively impact most homes and will allow for sustainable urban farming
- As long as animal welfare is maintained - urban farming is great
- Helps families to provide for their families
- Regular routine visits from an official should be required.
- I would 100% expect there to be community/neighbor involvement, given the likely noise and smell concerns.
- If these Listed criteria are met, I can see no reason why a persons wish to raise such livestock should be denied
- I think it's incredibly important to have more hens in the city to provide food (eggs and meat) locally to families willing to put in the work and effort to raise them responsibly.
- live stock can be loud, and smelly. I think its good for community centres with a large property.



- as long as they are not disruptive to neighbours and there are suitable living conditions im all for it
 - I am all for urban hens with proper living conditions available and responsible ownership. I'm not sure what "support from adjacent neighbours" requires and I feel that some potential owners may be cock-blocked (HAHAHAH, sorry I couldn't resist) by neighbours they don't know or perhaps are not on friendly terms with. Also, how would this be handled with regards to renters, both as potential owners and/or as neighbours?
 - Hens would be fantastic as they are not noisy
 - Urban livestock is fine as long as the quality of life for the animal is acceptable and adjacent neighbours are in agreement.
 - De-emphasize neighbour support. Some neighbours object to everything. Detail the neighbours non support.
 - These animals have huge benefits for owners. I find livestock/poultry to be much more calming and far-less of a nuisance than dogs everywhere. We would love to have hens to help provide nutrient-dense food stability for our family as well.
 - I completely agree with urban livestock if done with the most humane treatment and as long as it is not a disturbance to others.
 - Yes, I believe there can be a lot of community benefit from supporting urban livestock
 - I think keeping hens would be beneficial for some people, as long as roosters are not allowed to be kept in residential areas.
 - YES TO HENS!
 - I think small live stock such as chickens should be allowed in the city for sustainable food production
 - Especially with support of neighbors
 - Hens and other animals are great support animals
 - "I keep bees in Calgary and have an extensive vegetable garden in the yard and have found both to be immensely beneficial for community building and engagement with neighbours. It seems to me in post-covid times its pretty difficult to argue against people's right to produce their own food and increase food resilience.
-
- I work on a small mixed farm outside of Calgary where we keep chickens and I can attest that chicken's needs are reasonably easy to meet and anyone capable of responsibly keeping a dog in the city is capable of responsibly keeping chickens in town."
 - I have owned hens in the past and enjoyed having them.
 - As long as the animal does not become a nuisance no problem
 - As long as there is no noise or smell or annoyance of livestock
 - I feel it should only be for home owners and not renters.
 - I used to have a pet pig that monitored my heart condition
 - as long as animals aren't a nuisance what is the difference between someone owning a large dog like a St. Bernard and say a pig or a goat?



- I believe the criteria set is appropriate
- I would support neighbors having chickens.
- Hens only and only with ongoing support of neighbors.
- Could be beneficial as long as there are limits on how many there are on a property, acceptable living conditions being provided for the animals
- I think there should be licensing required for any urban livestock and this would include testing of knowledge and/or mandatory education. I think follow-up inspections should also be considered.
- This is a fair way to deal with the requests
- I want backyard chickens and I am a responsible pet owner.
- I like chickens and they would be a good food source (eggs) for low income families
- As long as the animals are not noisy and the property is being kept clean and free of offensive doors to neighbours it should be allowed.
- Support in theory as long as owners are responsible & considerate
- Private individuals should be allowed to do on their property as they please as long as their actions do not affect their neighbours or the outlying community.
- Hens and small livestock are no different then owning a pet.
- I do not see an issue
- Chickens in, hens do not make a lot of noise and neither do goats
- so long as conditions for approval/removal included (as above), and perhaps mandatory training of how to properly care for the specific animal
- I absolutely think Calgary should allow hens and other livestock if adequate and comfortable living conditions are met and the health and well-being of the animals is maintained. I think Calgary is behind the times and needs to catch up on this!!
- I think people should be able to have chickens, ducks, and geese for eggs but also as pest control.
- I think this would be a benefit to all to allow livestock in appropriate locations.
- Suitable living conditions must be evaluated by bylaw prior to approving. Support from adjacent neighbours also needs to be documented.
- As long as I didn't smell them while sitting in my backyard I'm fine with it. Chicken coups can get dirty and stink if not taken care of. Would Animal Services/Bylaw check in on these barnyard animals for quality of care? Are they Licensed to have them ?
- As long as this has a positive impact to the community and the animals are living in good condition and this does not pose a sanitary threat to the community.
- We should be able to raise chickens in our yard. Food security
- I have no objections provided that the welfare of the animal is ensured and neighbours do not object.
- I love the idea of urban agriculture as a way to educate and increase stewardship of our relation to nature and animals
- If someone can meet all the required needs of a domesticated animal (suitable space, shelter, can meet their social needs, etc.) then why shouldn't they be allowed to have whatever animal they want on their property?



- I believe that as long as the animals are taken care of properly and have enough space on the property to not impact other neighbours this would be a benefit to our community.
- As long as they are properly cared for. This must be enforced
- This is essential in providing food security for families.
- Must be cared for in a manner that prevents adverse impacts on neighbors such as noise, odors and attracting pests.
- If you could provide animals with decent living conditions as well well clean up after if and feed it and it doesn't pose danger to others I have to problem.
- A reasonable number of hens for personal use would be good.
- I believe it could have a positive community impact
- As long as the animals are safe and happy I have no objections to them being within Calgary.
- providing there are guidelines for noise and minimum size of space and setback from neighbours.
- People should be allowed to have more control over their food.
- Only if annual reviews of the animals living conditions are completed to ensure welfare.
- As long as the owners are looking after and giving the livestock proper living conditions. They should be allowed to obtain such animals. In a town/city I would say maybe have a cap of 3-4 in city as sometimes they can be a tad clucky. Other than that let the folks have hens as pets/egg layers.
- Application and consideration would be best option.
- Some lots could easily handle a couple chickens, ducks or a small goat. As long as there is an approval process and rules, I could see this being beneficial, just like all the bee hives we now have around the city. I would not want a full farm on a tiny lot next door though, so there would need to be limits.
- Hens are a wonderful addition to a backyard and allow for local food and food independence.
- If the animals are treated humanly while alive, then there should be no problem having livestock. Why not? With so many dogs running around, why not have an animal that provides food, opposed to using the city as a huge dogrun/dog toilet.
- If the owner of hens does not follow rules they should then have to remove these animals.
- I believe if you have the space and means to provide for livestock, you should be allowed to have them, even if you aren't a farmer. Some people grow up with livestock and can't afford a farm or that many acres when they move.
- Chickens are awesome
- Hens and other live stock in reasonable numbers are less annoying than dogs who use my yard as a toilet and bark loudly. It seems preferable to have a pet that contributes food such as eggs or milk. The same number limits as for dogs or cats should apply.
- Lovely
- No to pigeons they too easily can escape and become a feral issue in the community taxing resources and tax \$\$\$
- Bylaw should do regular checks to see if rules are followed.



- Many metropolitan centres in North America allow hens and it's not an issue... funny that animals that can maim or kill other pets, kids and adults are allowed (pitbulls), but the city finds hens so objectionable!?
- I support this as long as livestock is not being farmed for meat - eg cows for steaks, chickens for chicken breasts. I would be deeply troubled to know that neighbors are slaughtering animals nearby. Also, number of livestock must be kept very low.
- Miniature pigs are pets and should be permitted in Calgary.
- "If properly housed and cared for a small number of hens based on feasible lot size to give neighbours privacy. Added expectation on pest and predator deterrents would be needed too. I.e. requirement for pest free feeders (they cost more but keep rodents out).

- Hens provide food security, natural garden fertilizers, insect control."
- Why not
- Freedom of choice is paramount. Guidelines would of course be necessary
- Urban hens would be a wonderful option for many people. It would be great to be able to produce as much food as possible out of your back garden, eggs included.
- As long as the adjacent neighbours are not identified if they disagree and they are made aware of the details: type of animal, number, etc.
- Allowing urban farming practices (including livestock) would allow for residents to save money and rely less on industrial farming practices. I think it's a great idea, assuming care is taken to ensure animal safety and welfare.
- It may be helpful to provide options where we do not need our food to travel as far as it currently does.
- Yes... provisionally. Only if nuisance issues of odors, waste, noise, and potential harm/injury were mitigated. Case-by-case basis, as anything - even dogs or house cats - can be taken to the extreme.
- Good food security. Not that smelly. Not that loud.
- Why not?
- I don't see a problem as long as they are provided for and offer some kind of community benefit. I do believe people should have a right to not want their homes disturbed by proximity to livestock however.
- Livestock, if well cared for, can enhance the community, and also have a positive benefit on peoples mental health
- I would not want roosters due to noise, but hens are fine
- I think it would be fantastic to have Hens!
- To a degree. There should be strong limits on what individuals can have. And it should be encouraged for communities to work together for larger co-ops or boards, just like the community



gardens. For example my irresponsible neighbour should only have 1 or 2 chickens if they want eggs, not 20. If they want 20, it needs to be a collective effort for checks and balances.

- "If there is enough space for the animals to roam but also be contained on private property.
- A potential nuisance is Roosters. They crow so early on summer mornings."
- Only if they stay on owners property and are properly contained at all times. If they are caught off property they can be fined.
- It must be balanced- have to have ability to properly care for hens and not have their natural behaviors negatively impact others in the area
- provided they take proper care of their chickens and keep it clean i don't see a problem
- Base it on property (lot) size, and ensure that pens are set back a minimum distance from the neighbours
- While I don't want to own chickens, I respect a person's right to want them. Having said that, I don't want to be SURROUNDED by chickens. With the above criteria in place, I think we can work with more livestock around.
- I feel that this would provide a good opportunity for people to become more self-sufficient in an urban setting.
- Uncertain what is meant by "will offer community benefit". Perhaps "Family benefit" is a better choice of words? If animals are properly cared for, and do not disturb neighbours, then it should be fine. Nuances should be evaluated on a case by case basis.
- Urban hen keeping makes sense. They are less noisy than dogs and help provide food security.
- they are just fine and less noisy than a dog
- As long as there is the man power to assure that the above mentioned items are followed. If these item cannot properly be monitored then no I do not support this.
- Hens and other smaller livestock are a wonderful opportunity to bridge urban and rural communities in a small way.
- this is great
- As long as the livestock are well taken care of, I don't see how this could be an issue.
- Assuming the animal can be properly provided for and not being a problem for the neighbourhood than I don't see an issue.
- My main concern would be the well being of the animals. That owners know how to care for the animals they are bringing into their backyards.
- My rights should not be subject to my neighbour's whims
- I like chickens
- As long as neighbours are not bothered, chickens in particular are a good, healthy way for families to live more sustainably. I think there should be limits on how many chickens, though.
- If a property owner can maintain suitable living conditions for the animal(s), including proper sanitary provisions, and prevent the animals from being a nuisance in the neighborhood due to either noise, unsightliness or unsanitary conditions what harm is done? Violations of the proper guidelines for humane conditions, sanitary conditions unsightliness or excessive noise should never be permitted.
- Within reason and only if there are no concerns from neighbours for door or noise



- "Support from adjacent neighbour's could stall any plans that otherwise meet all by-law requirements. Make the by-law as such to thoughtfully address common good neighbour concerns and practices to avoid undue and costly tie-ups and processing.
- I oppose pigeons due to flight ability and ease of roaming communities, escaping owners and establishing feral flocks that become an issue and costly to cull and back within controllable means."
- The pandemic has taught us that food shortages are a possibility and many people can not afford basic food for their family. Having healthy, well cared for animals can help entire communities.
- Hens are just another animal that people can handle responsibly.
- If anything covid has taught us is that sometimes we will need to be self sustaining
- Hens are allowed in other jurisdictions.
- You have covered all criteria I believe is essential for this decision.
- I have had backyard chickens. They have been a wonderful addition and have not caused any trouble for neighbors. Additionally they increase food security!!
- No concerns as long as the animals are properly cared for
- Urban hens are a wonderful idea! Perhaps the city could consider which breeds may be most appropriate for urban life, such as breeds that are known to be quieter? Also, is it possible to create guidelines on how many hens a person may have on their property depending on factors such as the size of the proposed living space, as well as proximity to neighbours?
- for personal use only (can't sell eggs on the street!), "reasonable" number (not a herd of goats), Animal Control implications for escapees, noise/odor considerations, reproduction control
- So long as adjacent neighbours support the livestock, it shouldn't be a problem.
- So long as chief bylaw officer has final say.
- Livestock can provide numerous benefits from food security to waste management to soil amendment. If controls, restrictions & regular inspections are in place to contain noise, malodours, and health/safety issues, it's a feasible plan.
- I think that as long as the number of hens is reasonable and they are in clean healthy living conditions with limited noise, it is reasonable to have them.
- Fresh eggs is healthier than eggs that are several weeks old in the store.
- Allow farming experience in an urban setting.
- Could be positive for sustainable living, if rules are followed.
- Chickens, hens, pot belly pigs and possibly other smaller livestock would be great. However owners must take responsibility for proper care of them and the space they are residing.
- Chickens and ducks and pigs are fine as long as they are annually checked in or something. Last thing we need is a cock fighting ring in Calgary
- I support the option of hens but not large domesticated animals such as cows, pigs, donkeys, horses, etc as I believe you can not provide sufficient space and proper care for such large animals



on a city size property. Also, neighbors have the right of refusal without fear of reprisal due to noise, smell concerns.

- "If hens can be raised in clean safe environment that is a supply of food
- Perhaps the hen owners s would share this food with neighbors and end up causing more goodwill to the community"
- I think that as long as neighbours aren't affected, it would be fine.
- Acceptable urban farming.
- Builds self reliance and healthier living.
- However it depends on the type and size of the animal. Also I would not need the neighbours support to be mandatory.
- I like the consultation with neighbours before allowing other livestock to live within noise or smell range, with ongoing engagement yearly
- Individual freedom of choice.
- Chickens should be allowed as long as they have a coop and are properly maintained.
- Birds/rabbits are easily raised in smaller spaces and provide food.
- A few hens or other livestock helps folks reconnect with nature. I had to be capped at a certain number of livestock, else the livestock may become a nuisance.
- I am a huge fan of urban gardening to ease the pressure on the food supply system. Eco friendly and organic should be a requirement as well as limiting the number of animals.
- As long as the animals are kept with a reasonable amount of quiet and cleanliness as well as no large livestock like horses or cows.
- The stipulations when adhered to are reasonable and would be fine with me.
- As long as the animals are treated humanely, given adequate space, and do not impact the daily living of others in the neighbouring houses, then yes.
- It is sensible to allow exceptions to this rule, and it should be subject to the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer's discretion. There should be guidelines published for their decision making though, and there should be some sort of appeal mechanism in case they get it wrong.
- Please consider a "grandfathering" clause for those pet owners who obtain(ed) neighbor support but then the supporting neighbors move away to be replaced by ones that do not support the situation. It would be unfair to everyone if this wasn't made crystal clear from the get go. It could impact people's ability to resell a property and/or result in some people in having to make a gut wrenching decision to get rid of their animal and/or move.
- As long as the animals are well cared for and do not disturb neighbours with smells or noise I am supportive
- As long as smell and noise can be mitigated
- If the animal is well cared for and has suitable living conditions and is not having a negative impact on the neighbours and neighborhood it is no different than owning a common household pet.
- Residential live stock can add not only food to the residents, but also greatly increases the quality of life for many.
- Be good for families to have fresh cheaper eggs from chickens, milk from goats etc.



- goats are awesome pets and deserve homes too
- Chickens would be alright
- I believe that as long as the animal has access to a happy and healthy life with the individual, and the individual is able to provide all necessary needs for the animal that this should be allowed
- We should have a choice
- I support the keeping of hens in Calgary. I don't think the neighbours approval should be necessary, any more than it is currently necessary for keeping dogs or cats.
- I support other animals being explored.
- Equality for animals
- Must be suitable for the livestock and the surrounding area
- I believe people should have the rights to raise and grow their own food regardless of where they live. I do not agree that a neighbor has a right to weigh in on this decision. With the condition that they may contact by law if there is a problem that cannot be corrected after a negotiable conversation is had with said neighbor.
- As long as it's limited so that neighbors aren't disturbed by the sound
- I have no problems with people keeping livestock in Calgary including hens as long as they are well taken care of and have suitable living conditions like any other pet.
- livestock functions like a small urban community, bring people (neighbors) closer together
- It would fully depend on what type of a "livestock" - small chickens are fine. But we can't have larger animals in unsuitable living conditions- they require land, it's why they live on farms. Not the city.
- no roosters and measures to reduce odour. should not be visible to adjacent properties or street.
- If someone is able to maintain an animal in the city while providing the correct type of environment for that animal to live, I don't see why we wouldn't allow them. As long as they are not noisy or disruptive of the community
- If neighbors on all sides sign off on it and if they are not a disturbance.
- Animals are an essential need in everyone's daily lives.
- .
- Livestock animals raised within the city can allow citizens to be more independent when it comes to food and should be allowed as long as they can provide proper care and living space and take precautions to reduce the chance of disrupting/ harassing neighbors.
- If the animals can be taken care of properly, and they are not disrupting surrounding neighbours. Then why not.
- Fresh eggs.
- I think raising hens would be a great way to engage in our food chain and allow residents the ability to have a hobby.
- Food security is a huge discussion the world over and our increasingly urban populations need to cultivate different ways of meeting local needs in a local manner. This proposal COULD help with this. BUT do I want any neighbor within 4 houses to have a rooster? NO thank you.
- No downside to allowing this



- if people want certain livestock given they have the adequate space, time and resources to care for the animal/s then they should be permitted.
- Yes, if there is the opportunity for input as an adjacent neighbour.
- It wouldn't bother me what other people have in their yards
- As long as the owner is maintaining proper care for the animal, as well as the environment surrounding others, themselves, and the animals. And disposing of waste properly.
- I mean as long as the animals are being taking care of. And cleaning up after. I don't see an issue.
- Having chickens is a great way to put food waste to use right away and to help people get access to awesome quality eggs. Any families with kids can be helped as well by this as it provides an opportunity for children to learn about raising animals that are not just pets.
- More homes for hens means more hens are taken care of. Hens can also be a great educational pet for kids. Its important for young calgarians to appreciate the farm life even if they cant get a whole farm.
- Go for it.
- So long as their living space is clean and they are quiet I think it could be a great learning opportunity for many people about where food comes from.
- I would have no problem with allowing urban hens in Calgary as long as the owners are responsible as far as keeping them on their property, cleaning coops regularly and not allowing them to be a nuisance. The downside I could see with allowing urban hens is if people get complaints or get tired of them they would probably get dumped on shelters which can be overburdened with unwanted animals already.
- This is a wonderful idea. It allows people to enjoy eggs humanely.
- I know of an individual that keeps urban hens. He does so responsibly and with the knowledge and support of neighbours. He also does it illegally. He, his neighbours, and his hens appear to have a positive experience, and I would like for that to be a legal activity.
- If the conditions mentioned above are met
- I like the ideas of hens, possibly pigs, and such being in an urban environment.
- As long as noise isn't an issue
- If a person owns a home and property than that person should have the option to own certain livestock, as long as it abided by the rules listed above. I would also say that they should need yearly, "check-ups" to ensure the livestock are still in conditions that abide by the rules.
- So long as the quality of life for the animals would be good, and people are respectful of the animals as well as their neighbours, I see no reason at the moment to not support this bylaw amendment.
- I see no concerns in allowing urban hens given the above criteria
- I support this as long as the animals are not a nuisance to neighbours and suitable living conditions are provided.
- As long as the listed above suitable care, houses, etc. Is followed.
- No need for support from neighbours - neighbours move, what happens then?



- I'm hugely supportive of urban hens and other sustainable urban livestock. If anything, I think these criteria are too restrictive - demonstrating community benefit/neighbour support is overstepping. I don't think my neighbours should get a say in what pets I have or what livestock I keep.
- As long as the animals needs are tended to and they are not disrupting the neighborhood
- Chickens Please!!!
- Please allow back yard hens
- Animal welfare would need to be ensured and monitored.
- I would support most incentives that move us toward improved urban farming and self sustainability vs. the large processing plant model which is abusive to the animals and, as shown recently, often also not providing good working conditions for staff.
- I would definitely support a limited number of hens as long as owners are responsible and clean.
- limit the number
- Bylaw will help ensure health of animal, since people will keep them anyways
- What pets people want to keep is their own business.
- You should be able to have livestock that are manageable in the city and provide benefits and nutrition
- yay, chickens!
- NA
- If people want to keep chickens and have their own eggs that's totally cool. I do not want to see my neighbors slaughtering them for food. Pets/eggs only.
- I do support hens being permitted in the city provided they are properly cared for in protective environments.
- If all the mentioned conditions can be met, having food security and connection to urban farming can be a positive experience.
- I would like to have some back yard hens
- I said yes I would support it because I believe that it is possible to be positive for the community to be involved with livestock. But at the same time, I grew up on a farm and I am concerned that there will be many people who with not be responsible or capable of handling animals. This could cause problems.
- Chickens are easy.
- If neighbours have also approved it and wouldn't become a nuisance. Ie smell /noise etc
- There should be a limit to how many hens you can have, and not have to ask permission from neighbours.
- Many cities in Canada have successfully introduced urban hens with great success. I think Calgary could be the next success on that list.
- I would like to have a few Urban Hens.
- Chickens make great pets, excellent fertilizer, help control bugs and weeds naturally. They clean your yard are a natural garbage disposal and are easy to care for.



- Support from adjacent neighbours along with suitable living conditions would be important criteria in my opinion.
- Must have adequate green space and fencing. People in townhomes for example would not have enough space, but someone with half an acre might. Very important.
- honestly, it would be interesting to see hens in Calgary.
- I feel if the livestock is only allowed because it will benefit the community and have a positive impact, why would we not allow this. If there is reasonable criteria in place, I believe this can be a positive decision.
- If all criteria are met the introduction to small livestock would be a welcome addition to the neighbourhood for both adults and children.
- I think urban hens, kept to reasonable numbers, provide multiple benefits.
- I think chickens should be allowed for pest management and eggs
- I would support having hens for eggs and having rescue animals but I would not support raising any animal for food other than eggs because I don't think it would be dealt with responsibly and humanely.
- More independence is better
- If people want to own livestock they should have that right, although there should be regulations such as size of pen, proper urban setting, etc.
- As long as there are no crowing roosters.
- "Why not? Care for animals is an important responsibility. This applies to dogs, cats, rabbits, chickens. If someone wants to have chickens, I expect them to care for them in a way that respects that animal as I expect folks with other pets to do.
- Chickens would add to the life experience of Calgarians and would be a testament to Calgary for the better."
- I support it
- Chickens can be properly cared for in the city. People need to be responsible and know there are consequences if they don't maintain certain levels of care/ cleanliness. Requires education to compliance.
- Backyard chickens will bring affordable protein to many, natural soil fertilizer, insect control, a closer connection to nature.
- Urban hens add food security to families going through difficult financial times. They are no noisier than dogs. There are many precedents of other urban municipalities allowing Hens across North America.
- There are other pet animals that provide mutual love and some are less destructive than cats or dogs.
- Projects like these done responsibly help encourage a green culture of sustainability in an urban environment. Very progressive and a natural step for our city.
- Necessary step to more food security.
- Obviously, putting a limit on the number of hens (4 or less).



- I think that it would be okay in some areas, but the owner must be held responsible, just as owners of dogs are. They must be accountable to keep their hens, a pet pig, or whatever, clean and fed and not bothering neighbours. But this is a big city now, and I can see the potential for troubles between neighbours. I think you would need to be specific to the requires for each type of livestock.
- But only in Single Family neighborhoods. Hens in a Townhouse Complex/Condo/Apartment etc, would be somewhat ridiculous and could cause unnecessary resentment and problems within smaller communities such as these.
- I do think hens would be acceptable if satisfactory living conditions are met for the animals, however do not think that any urban living environment would be suitable for animals such as pigs.
- Free eggs! Kids won't worry about break fast
- The more animals the better :)
- I'm in support of chicken being allowed under these conditions
- I think a licence should be required and those hoping to have hens should have to demonstrate that they have suitable arrangements in place.
- I don't think you should require neighbours approval as you don't need approval for any other animal or pet.
- They are good to manage pests in the garden and provide a food source at a time with a lot of economic uncertainty.
- Chickens are a good way to add food to a family whether its laying hens or fryers
- I see no issue with this bylaw amendment.
- I support urban hens, and other livestock
- So long as the criteria for livestock are met I support the allowance of these types of animals in urban areas.
- If the criteria is strictly followed. Bylaw officers seem to be extremely lax.
- I'm in support of the home grown food movement. With covid, we should be a more self contained society.
- I support it, but feel that there has to be a limited number maybe dependent on the area available for the urban hen.
- Nothing wrong with having your own hens. Why not !
- This is a long time coming. It is reasonable on a number of levels to allow basic livestock husbandry within city limits.
- Noise, smell and what the livestock attracts needs to be strongly considered. Neighbors shouldn't have to put up with any ill effects.
- Calgary needs to become more in-touch with nature and animals in general. As long as the animals are relatively small (no cows or bulls please, but goats and hens are fine), well cared for and the areas surrounding the urban livestock are kept clean, there is no issue.
- Chickens are a wonderful urban animal that helps with self sufficiency and brings great joy to people
- As long as animals are well taken care of and it helps urban and environmental sustainability, it is a good idea
- I believe the criteria is sound.



- What other countries/communities are doing, has taught us that we can grow certain foods and look after small livestock within city environments. Also with the COVID-19 pandemic, I think we need to realize that we can be a bit more self sustaining in certain areas if we have the right tools, guidelines, and community standards.
- I see no issue with hens they are less noisy than dogs and help compost food scraps and till soil so using less harmful chemicals or weed killers!! As long as maintained and cleaned there should be no problem what so ever with a few chickens or Rabbits!
- It would be great to have a sustainable environment for eggs as long as the animals are kept in good clean conditions with enough space.
- As long as the situation is humane
- I wish to have autonomy over my backyard choicecto raise chickens freely without municipal oversight. 9nly enough to be considered useful to support a family.
- I am in agreement to this as long as the livestock are properly cared for, don't cause excessive noise and their areas are maintained and cleaned properly.
- As long as the neighbours were in support and standards were met, I see no reason why someone shouldn't raise their own livestock
- Okotoks has had urban hens for 5 years. 4 hens. No rooster. \$50 yearly license. They have a bylaw. It's going great!!!!
- As long as the animals are well cared for, this is good for food security, the economy, children's education and mental wellbeing.
- Food would be affordable for people
- City life was becoming too sterile -- allowing more animals is a good thing IF they are well-cared for and if, for any reason, a neighbour cannot handle it for health reasons, then a discussion needs to be had to mutually agree on a solution.
- Excellent proposal
- I should be able to have hens if I can prove i can care for them
- Hens yes, roosters no (too noisy)
- If all those requirement are met, this should not be an issue.
- "I think the primary factor involved would be the amount of yard space to house and support any animal, not just livestock. Many yards, especially in newer neighbourhoods, are nothing more than ""postage stamps"" and can't support more than a few plants, let alone any animals.
- So, some formula of available lot space to animal (domestic or livestock) ratio would be required."
- Hens are a great addition to our community and allow for urban food supply choices that are very beneficial. Soil improvement and pest control are also great benefits of keeping hens.
- There are many animals that could be very beneficial and people should be able to raise them (properly) on their own properties.
- Minimum sizes of enclosures must be met and restriction on number of animals housed together
- "The global pandemic, and the interruption that it caused to the food supply highlights the importance of ensuring that city dwellers have the opportunity to grow as much of their own food as



possible. Furthermore, it is difficult to find eggs that weren't raised in a factory farm environment. Raising them yourself is the only way to ensure that they were raised in an ethical manner.

- Lastly, as omnivores, chickens are excellent for organic pest control, for things like mice and insects."
- Everything except support from my neighbours....
- as long as it is more so for pets, and not slaughtering livestock in residential areas
- Yes, however I believe a limit per household should be in effect.
- Should have neighbours approval
- Source of food, connection with nature, education, entertainment
- As long as they do not disturb and are properly cared for.
- If the pandemic has taught us anything, local food supply is very important. We need to encourage more people to produce some of their own food, not discourage it.
- As long as safe conditions for hens, bees, pigeons, pot belly pigs are maintained and they are not a nuisance to others
- Backyard chickens are a wonderful source of fresh, inexpensive eggs. They provide a great learning experience for children.
- Chickens should be allowed within city limits as long as the coop is kept clean
- If we're talking 4 or less hens they are much less disruptive to the neighborhood than a dog or a free-roaming cat.
- Hens are OK, no rooster. Maximum number on one property.
- People should be able to own whatever animals they want, so long as those animals are well taken care of, fed, watered, kept warm in the winter, and have enough space to live comfortably.
- I lived in Europe and I really like the idea of chickens. Communities in Belgium give them for free or very cheap to citizens as an excellent way to better manage kitchen waste.
- This should only be allowed on single family homes AND for those homes that have a specifically large property size (ex. 1 acre). This rule should apply for pigeons as well!
- The approval from neighbors would have to be included
- Each community should have a chicken & hen coop where the community can pay to help with the chores and and then in turn get to eat the eggs for free!
- Why not?
- I would love if chickens could be allowed in Calgary
- This was common practice before and hens are no different then other small animals. But I do not believe that exceptions should be decided by just one individual. This needs a panel to remain unbiased.
- I support people having a limited number of hens on their property. I also support allowing other livestock based on the criteria above.



- I think owning chickens could be a wonderful addition to many peoples lives. I definitely think proper care is needed and they must meet the criteria laid out for owning the animal. I believe there should be guidelines for owning any animal and that people should be able to meet the basic needs of the animal to own it.
- It is better for hens to be kept by responsible owners as opposed to factory farms.
- Private property rights should be respected as long as don't interfere with rights of others. Hens or small animals (pet pigs) should be at the discretion of property owner not city.
- Local food is important, and as long as there is no mistreatment of animals and neighbours are inside, this is good.
- provided it does not become a nuisance for neighbors
- Backyard chickens ... all for a few in one yard. Chickens can be dirty....strict guidelines would need to be In Place
- If a citizen can provide proper care for any animal they should be allowed to do so. Small livestock can provide comfort to some people.
- There shouldn't be a restriction on livestock permitted if proper criteria are met. It is not the animal in question - it's the responsibility of owner regardless of hen, or dog/cat or goat.
- Self sustaining lifestyles should not be limited to rural areas. Everyone has a right to live off their own efforts in their property wherever they are.
- As long as there is no nuisance element for the rest of the community.
- More sustainable food resources are need as peoples incomes go down.
- nature
- Why is neighbour support a requirement? Fulfill the other asks of the conditions. Number of livestock i.evhens should be dependent on space requirements To humanely care for the animal and lot size of dwelling to a percentage of use calculation. Rules should differ for housing types and density on number of animals etc. No to pigeons as the can easily fly away from owner property and escaped/ released pigeons can easily multiply to disrupt local wild species, cause property damage and hazards and be costly to regain control if wild flocks establish.
- i dont raise hens bit why not its a hen gives eggs to people helps low income folks eat better
- Stated conditions are reasonable.
- It would be great to have a few hens in the back yard for eggs. If people while hens then they will have to follow the guidelines for having them as well as having to clean the cages.
- I think anything that supports urban agriculture should be considered by our city.
- so long as the animals are probably penned and being treated humanely then yeah livestock is fine.
- Only if the animals are being given enough living space and are not infringing on others
- if urban hens are done in a modest, back yard scale and with enforced cleaniness they are helpful to the environment, to the overall community and to cost saving. The documented consent of adjacent neighbours is an absolute requirement and if such consent is withdrawn, the raising of urban hens must cease. Odour managment, clean up of feces, no roosters (noisy) must be respected.
- Having a reasonable number of certain farm animals is an excellent way to encourage wholesome food options within the city! Excellent idea, obviously with guidelines.



- If someone is willing to properly care for and respect the impact of animals on their neighbors, I don't see why they shouldn't be allowed urban hens.
- As long as they can care for it shouldn't be a problem
- I would support my neighbour if they wanted to get a hens or a goat as long as they provide food, shelter and care of the animal. As well, they would be respectful of their neighbours if their animals get out of hand or make too much noise.
- Currently accepted pets, dog, cats, birds, reptiles, fish, provide so much enrichment for people. Hens, as all animals, have individual personalities and would also contribute to enriching peoples lives. And as long as Hens were designated as pets, with a benefit of producing eggs, and not butchered after the egg laying days are done I would support the bylaw amendment. This would go for any other future urban livestock, it would have to be designated and raised as pets and not raised for food, to be butchered when they reached the age or weight for butchering.
- As long as the urban hens are kept in sustainable and comfortable environment, I would view them as a great benefit for the home and garden. Obviously not all yards will be large enough to house a coop and they will require a type of veterinary care that would need to be established and laws for the number of urban hens allowed in space. But I personally very much support the diversity in this type of livestock in the city.
- Why not If it's not hurting anyone? Let's have a bit less regulation into peoples private lives . If they wanna share their yard with hens , so be it .
- I have raised hens (illegally) in a city and they are calm, quiet and friendly and provide food for owners. If done responsibly, there is no issue with them. Problem dogs are a much worse issue.
- If the adjacent neighbours are okay, the city should be okay
- I dont think the next door neighbours should need to agree with the chickens, as long as there are no problems with them.
- Chickens should be allowed without the need of consent by neighbors. Hens could be limited to 6, roosters should not be allowed due to noise. A well kept hen house doesn't smell and has very little noise. There should be no need for neighbors to be consulted.
- As long as the animals are quiet and not disturbing and maintaining a clean environment it shouldn't be an issue.
- Urban hens could provide stimulus for children and promote a caring attitude towards animals, providing the urban hens are not for slaughter.
- You should be allowed to own hens on your property so long as they are not a nuisance to neighbors. I do believe however that neighbor should not be able to outright veto the decision to put a hen house in. there must be a reasonable reason why one should not.
- I support allowing hens in backyards, but this question, like many in this survey, is woefully poorly written and the epitome of ambiguity.
- As long as the hens are receiving proper care and love, I have no problem with the amendment.
- Urban hen keeping is already being done in other major cities in Canada to support food security and establish ecosystem services that have been and will continue to be desperately needed as we deal with the effects of climate change and increased economic instability in the years to come.



- Dogs are more of a nuisance than chickens! If people are allowed to have their dogs out an about all the time I see no reason why we can't have backyard hens.
- I AM OKAY WITH IT
- Let people have their chickens!
- Implemented with a descriptive, principle led mindset this could be a good way of promoting neighborhood cohesion. Maybe even allow Coasean like solutions to occur given the small number of actors involved.
- Urban hens are a great idea. Case-by-case for other exceptions makes good sense.
- Since the pandemic, a lot of people are taking up gardening in their homes, and community gardens are already well established all over the city. There are more and more people interested in urban homesteading. This can be an incredibly positive thing to help offset spending on groceries, encourage local trading/markets, enhance connection to community and nature. I already grow a small food garden in my back yard and love a couple of hens and even a goat. We have a very steep hill in the front yard and it's hard to mow/landscape. It would be really nice to have a goat help eat up weeds and trim grass.
- A small number of backyard hens for education/eggs/companionship kept properly away from houses in a suitable hen house and looked after daily is only a benefit. I would say no to roosters however 3 to 4 hens would fulfill a families egg needs as well as the birds social and mental health needs while still being quieter and less intrusive than many dogs. They are also great for helping with pest elimination and fertilization in home gardening. I would say they must be well maintained and contained always within the yard they belong in. A great addition to many families and individuals when undertaken with proper education and responsibilities.
- The bylaw amendment covers all sectors
- "greater food security and keeping people closer to their food sources is an important step.

- I would want it to be very easy to gain approval for backyard chickens specifically, and a clear program for people to follow when adding other livestock."
- As long as the animal is treated humanely, is capable of being domesticated, and does not present a serious threat to safety or health, livestock should be permitted.
- I don't mind this as long as there is a strong education piece attached to the project as well as ongoing visits and follow-ups. Many of us want to be farmers or ranchers, but not all of us SHOULD be farmers or ranchers. People have good intentions, but with poor education and monitoring, livestock may actually suffer in the hands of well intended uneducated individuals.
- No neighbour support required.
- Many responsible people would love the opportunity to have Hens producing fresh eggs & possibly meat also.
- Please do not require neighbor approvals. Good neighborliness is expected, but a requirement makes people's rights different depending on who their neighbor is.



- I think hens would be totally fine, provided they are cared for, inside the city. Ensure space is adequate and maybe have someone apply and take an online course before getting them?
- As long as they don't become a nuisance to other residents and they are well cared for, I see no issue.
- People should be allowed to own and maintain a limited number of hens as long as they are well looked after and housed to a minimum standard.
- I think it's reasonable for people to own a small number of these animals for food and or emotional support.
- Urban livestock in the right conditions can contribute to food security and promote learning where our food comes from.
- let people do what they want
- The hens would provide eggs that I could trust, knowing that I fed them organically.
- Suitable living conditions should be weighted more highly than the first two factors.
- I support bylaw amendments that allow individuals to grow/raise food outside large scale commercial practices.
- I have raised hens on a farm for 8 years, and they are quite, docile creatures. When taken care of well the cause less disturbance to neighborhoods than cats or dogs with a much higher reward. We have cats in our yard unwanted daily and dogs barking and have no choice to put up with that. Hens, no roosters, would not cause any inconvenience to our surrounding neighbours.
- rules needed to ensure the humane treatment of hens and more food security for citizens.
- So much community benefit! Great education for kids too!
- Annual bylaw visit to confirm living conditions of animals are adequate and safe
- There are livestock animals that have shown to be great pets and service animals. It's time to start breaking down the barriers of what is considered a pet and get away from speciesism.
- Hens can provide localized food sources for residents while contributing to fertilizer for gardens and our green cart program.
- Urban hens are amazing, they provide food for families, and they live a life of quality. They make lovely pets.
- I think backyard chickens and livestock can be a positive addition to a community. We have had a neighbour with a goat (LESA) and it was positive for our community.
- As long as the owners are responsible and doesn't affect or interfere with my living.
- Animals are animals. Why can dogs and cats be pets, but not other species? People should be free to care for any species of animal in need.
- I think Calgary is very behind the times on this amendment. Only good can come of urban chickens and small livestock
- Urban hens can provide both monetary reward and in lieu of typical domestic pet can be quite engaging depending on species.
- Other possible factors can be taken into account this way
- The measures are reasonable



- I strongly feel that hens should be allowed.
- I like the thought of having a community egg house.
- Numerous city already allow chickens with very few if any issues. 6-8 birds should be allowed to provide good flock size for wintering, flock health and production.
- Chickens are much less of a nuisance than other pets, don't kill songbirds, bite people, and they're an important part of food education and security. It's bizarre that they aren't allowed.
- This criteria allows for community involvement.
- Needs careful consideration especially around sanitation, smells, and disease.
- I think it makes sense from a food security standpoint to raise food close to the home. I raise chickens in my farm and I think a reasonable number of chickens would do well in most of Calgary's backyards.
- I like farm animals
- Yes, a small number of hens treated properly and housed properly can be beneficial
- No explanation required.
- Who is the City to stop us from producing our food on private property.
- Local food and an increase in biodiversity are things we should be encouraging whenever we can. In the past we had hens and they were fine from the perspective of neighbours. They were however another responsibility and I doubt many Calgarians would choose to keep hens. Those few Calgarians who desire to keep hens should have the right to do so. We also keep bees and have done so for years. It is satisfying to produce honey and we have never had any issues with neighbours
- "Owning hens or other livestock:
- Only on the condition that the eggs/livestock are for personal use and not for sale and consumed only by immediate members of the household that the hens/livestock reside. Owners must go through adequate training based on the livestock they are raising, and learn of proper hygiene, maintenance and be comfortable with random and unaccounted checkups, learn how to properly house the hens and other livestock and must have adequate and safe spaces to maintain the hens/other livestock. A balcony would not seem adequate, so types of dwelling need to also be considered. Weatherproofing and appropriate care should span across all weather conditions. Ongoing mandatory training for owners should be implemented at no or little cost. When cleaning the areas of the hens/livestock, nothing should leave the owners premises and overflow to the neighbouring properties through water, etc. Areas must be safely disinfected at all times to prevent diseases or infections since urban living has exposure to a larger population than rural lands would."
- Backyard hens increase food security and do not cause noise disturbances.
- I think it's high time we are allowed chickens. Especially in a pandemic world where food chains may break, having access to chickens and eggs could be very beneficial. I believe they're an important part of a vegetable garden ecosystem, and help individuals be more self sufficient
- I support backyard hens/ducks, but would suggest 1. a cap on the number kept (e.g. 4), 2. setting a minimum space requirement (e.g. 4 m² per bird), and 3. it should not be necessary to have support from neighbours to possess the birds.



- I would raise hens to provide food for my family.
- I want a chicken.
- Having chickens is acceptable as long as the number are restricted.
- I think this is a great idea for local food security.
- no one wants to buy for expensive retail chains with hens fed by antibiotics. there is a healthy trend to get rid of greedy retailers and take control over feeding family by healthy food
- If all of the above criteria are met, then I have no issues. Chickens SHOULD be allowed, without a doubt! They provide food (eggs) for those that are not financially secure.
- However I think the neighbors approval should be evaluated as some people have bad neighbors no matter what.
- Understand that not everyone wants a dog or a cat and that other cultures privilege livestock that feeds their household. Understand also that this runs counter to white Anglo expectations - a laying hen that is past her prime, or rabbits in a hutch are often destined to end up on the dining table. Accomodate these realities.
- This is just an extension of changes that have already been made within the City when it comes to livestock ownership.
- No one should own farm life within the city of Calgary
- They can provide nutrition (eggs & meat). Can help with social isolation. Provides a companion role. Gives meaning to people who need an activity as well as to reduce loneliness. People can have something to look forward to on a regular basis. Can reduce insects, pests, rodents.
- A case by case evaluation would seem to be the best course of action.
- This could be a very positive benefit. Need to have input of those wishing the animals and those neighbours affected.
- Urban chickens should be available and permitted as long as the community AND chicken are both supported and happy
- As long as it doesn't impact neighbours
- The ability to have Hens supports anti-fragile food systems and is critical for future supply chain.
- As long as owners are reasonable, i see no problem. Enforcement comes from irresponsible people, not animals.
- This criteria should be strictly enforced to prevent an influx of animal surrenders.
- It should be approved on a case by case basis and neighbors need to be consulted and considered.
- Hens are an important part of food security as well as being an important part of food recycling!
- I support having any animal as long as owner is willing to obey bylaws.
- We should be allowed to grow our own food, on our own property. They are not as bothersome as most people think
- Provided the applicant has the support of their neighbors and sufficient living conditions and ample space. Owing livestock shouldn't be any different than owning a dog or a cat.
- I am happy to support others having small livestock
- Having chickens is a great way to teach children where our food comes from.



- Other animals are important and should be allowed within reason.
- All animals should be considered as long as their needs are /can be taken into consideration.
- Only to ensure the animals have proper living conditions and neighbours don't have to deal with smells or waste on their property
- case by case this could have a beneficial impact on communities
- As long as the hens or other livestock are not noisy or smelly. Has to meet existing community bylaws.
- If citizens are responsible and considerate of the community, there is no reason they should not be free to do as they please on their own properties.
- Allow more flexibility and permit people to enjoy their ability to raise food. But also provide limitations for eg neighbors to protest
- There's no reason chickens should not be kept in the city as long as they are not creating a nuisance.
- i've been wanting chickens FOREVER
- Fabulous idea, about time. Chickens would compliment our home grown veggies and be a real asset to the community as well. No cruelty egg purchases from industries.
- I support if it is not a nuisance to neighbours and has adequate living facilities (is humane).
- As long as it's done ethical and animals are treated humanely, not allowing individuals to own hens or other livestock within the city is absurd
- there is no good reason that this has not been undertaken in the past..
- However, if you're going to allow one household to have livestock then all households should be allowed. The only reason why they might not be allowed should be if they're neglecting said animals.
- As long as bylaws will be enforced if unforeseen consequences arise: noise, smell, belligerence by owners, etc.
- Depends on other guidelines, size of pen for example. I've heard from others that chicken coops stink and I have enough issues with my neighbours barking dogs.
- Local, small food production should be incentivized. Hen eggs are a great source of protein. Local food production reduces the carbon footprint of the city.
- Hens, but no roosters.
- As long as the owners of the livestock clean up after the animals.
- Hens are a sustainable source of food which don't take up much space. It's not like having a whole cow in your backyard. I think there should be a limit to number of hens per household as to reduce noise or other issues. But why not have fresh eggs for breakfast
- I like that you would need the support of neighbours, but I think it would need to be more than just adjacent. Animals can be noisy and pungent, both of which can disrupt more than just a next door neighbour. I agree there has to be a positive reason for the livestock, though I'm not sure where I would draw that line. I think there would need to be 2 additional measures included in the bylaw: 1. There should be a trial period before complaints can be made. I suspect there will be a lot of people who will outright say no to livestock two doors down, so I would try to make it so people have to 'give it a chance' before they complain. In conjunction with this, I'd like to see examples of what this



actually looks like and studies done regarding the impacts. So realistically, do a trial run somewhere in Calgary, see how that goes, and then expand it into an actual bylaw. 2. There needs to be some kind of regular inspection or checks to confirm that the animals continue to have a positive impact and that conditions remain suitable for them.

- Some yards in Calgary would allow for small amounts of livestock without the noise or smell.
- If the animals are being properly cared for and do not impede the comfort of the surrounding neighbours I do not see a problem.
- "I think having hens is a very positive thing for the community for many reasons including increased food security, food awareness and just general knowledge and life experience. I have personally kept chickens in another city and had no issues at all.
- I think it is actually a bit of a crime that people are as of now not allowed to keep chickens on their own property."
- Would be great to see.
- We must support community agriculture as a means for low income families/individuals to provide nutrition for themselves.
- "I absolutely support backyard feathered friends! For emotional support, fresh eggs, and fun! As long as they are cared for properly ! ^_^ ♡"
- I do not support the need to have neighbour's approval though. As long as the hens are housed and being cared for properly, everything kept clean, there should be no issues! :)
- Educate and inspire! ^_^"
- Everyone loves their pets (even hens or other livestock) however I do think it is important to obtain permission from neighbours and to ensure living conditions for the animals is suitable
- As long as basic bylaws are met and no disruption to neighbours there should be no problem.
- Absolutely! As long as the animals are well cared and not a nuisance, they should be allowed. Particularly hens. People should be free to source their own sustainable food
- I would love to have backyard chickens
- As long as they are in ideal living conditions, it seems a positive move to allow this.
- Animals are animals. livestock is not extremely different from domestic household pets. As long as they are properly cared for there should be few issues
- Adjacent neighbors definitely need to provide approval because they will have to live 24/7 with whatever animal kingdom that person wants to have.
- As long as there is a limitation to the number of birds and no large scale commercial entity associated.
- I'm fine with chickens as long as they aren't disruptive.



- I wholeheartedly support the allowance of urban hens. This is an important step to encouraging Calgarians to become more connected to their food system, increase food security and also has the potential to act as a community-building activity if done right. I think having this allowed would decrease the chance of urban hens that are not kept in the correct conditions or treated well and would increase public literacy about caring for this type of livestock humanely and hygienically. Urban hens are not disruptive and the benefits are myriad.
- Would need to be strictly enforced. I would like to have more information about how other municipalities deal with this.
- I fully support this amendment as long as the needs of the animals are met and maintained.
- I see no harm in this as long as hens are properly cared for and do not become a nuisance.
- As long as neighbours are all in agreement with owning any livestock, I think it would benefit the community because having chickens that lay eggs can be an income for low income families or they can be gifted to families who are struggling to feed their families in the community.
- I am all for urban chickens as long as they are regulated that proper care is given (as with any animal/livestock)
- Provided adequate housing and living conditions for the animal are met as designated by vet or safety protocols. As long as the animal is not a nuisance to the neighbourhood (either noise or smell).
- With food insecurity looming globally, calgarians need a chance to secure a food supply they can count on, such as eggs and meat. Hens are an integral part of urban farming and we all need to be able to learn to not count on the food supply chain for survival.
- Diversity and inclusion.
- Chickens keep bug populations down and people need to be able to use their yards to produce food for their family.
- Responsible ownership and production of foods at home, especially now, should always be a top priority and the many should not be punished for the few who didn't do things right in the past. This is the way of the future and many places are allowing it around the world.
- Options to have different animals is good
- "Followed for a while to see if there are any 'harms' to the community, I.e. having higher numbers of predatory species (Bobcats, coyotes etc) popping up because of livestock.
- Evidence would suggest it is a benefit to community and sustainability having such animals in communities."
- What happens if neighbours change?
- Good compromise
- I myself would like the option to own a couple of hens and would follow any rules that were in place.
- Hens and other small animals can be an important food source, and greatly reduce numbers of bugs and pests like slugs.
- Let's urban urban farming and greener communities
- other animals are OK, as long as they are do not disturb neighbors



- Hens don't really fly and can be contained to the owners yard. It really doesn't hurt anyone if the owner maintains conditions of the chicken pen.
- I support being able to grow/have my own food sources instead of having to buy at a grocery store (ex hens). Creates a more sustainable future.
- Urban chickens are an excellent way to provide food as well as learning opportunities for children and families. Provided other animals are receiving the support needed in terms of appropriate care and housing, I would support their inclusion as well.
- I had hens in our backyard as a young child in the 80s in Australia and they were perfectly fine. I do not understand why Calgary remains one of the few municipalities not to allow chickens in backyards. Please change this!
- Love chickens & would love to have them in the city
- If standards are met why not have fresh eggs
- The support from adjacent neighbors is a bit vague.
- hens are a great idea!
- I feel chickens will be a positive addition to our community. Other communities like Edmonton and Vancouver has successfully allowed chickens. I would like to add however that people in the community interested has the right to raise chickens in their backyard without the consent of their neighbors.
- Backyard chickens enable Calgarians to secure our own personal food supply, something we all started thinking about a lot more after the covid onset. It's time for this. it's the right thing for folks willing to do it safely and humanely.
- If allowed hens should be registered and facilities should be regularly inspected
- I'm really not sure why keeping chickens isn't allowed in the city already.
- Before a permit is issued the applicant should have to prove they have adequate space, appropriate housing for the animal, knowledge of how to care for the animal, and approval from neighbours.
- I want to raise my own chickens
- I am not sure why this was ever disallowed. EVERYONE benefits from being able to have a small chicken hen. It must be kept small and clean though! I would say no more than 5 chickens and 1 hen per dwelling.
- Backyard chickens being allowed is long overdue. I fully support this
- As long as these are not being used for food
- Hens would be better cared for in backyards than factory farms. Responsible animal ownership should be permitted
- Neighbors should absolutely have a say.
- Great education for children!
- I think certain animals, especially hens, offer many benefits and and certainly no more of a nuisance than other animals allowed as pets.
- As long as it is not for food
- If immediate neighbours are amenable, and there are suitable living conditions, it makes no sense for the city to get involved.



- Yes. But I would only agree if it was with a farmer or someone who owned enough area to make sure living conditions are met and everything else. I wouldn't agree to just anyone in the city owning livestock
- I think it could be important for some Calgarians to be able to raise chickens for eggs/food. Support from their community/neighbours would be important. Chickens may also help reduce some insects and slugs in a local green space.
- Hens for example provide an opportunity for additional sustainability for a family, education, enriched fertilizer
- Any animals should be allowed as long as the owners provide suitable space and conditions for such
- Going to your next question. I think chickens should be allowed before pigeons
- I believe there are benefits in having other livestock
- I think fresh eggs are a benefit
- A better free-range environment for the hens.
- Urban livestock in, reasonable numbers and on properties that have complimentary lot sizes, are beneficial to communities.
- I absolutely feel that is a wonderful, and very progressive idea. Many livestock animals are not a nuisance when in small numbers and can be helpful in providing healthy, home raised food. Many livestock droppings are also excellent for the soil and for compost. Hens are an excellent source of fresh, daily eggs and to be honest, they are amazing for your mental health. I would not allow roosters at all within city limits however, and pigs are something that should be looked into closely before being allowed, as even the miniatures can get quite large, and most start as pets but end up on farms anyways as they are difficult to manage when they get big.
- Owners must be required to keep animal enclosures a certain distance from neighbours' air intakes or windows.
- We should be allowed to create our own food source in the city it's a right.
- There would need to be rules and regulations in place that people would have to abide by if having livestock on the city, including rules that pertain to not disturbing other neighbors
- I feel it is important that adjacent neighbors have a say.
- Possibly OK in small Numbers, I.e. 2-4 hens.
- As long as people are responsible then I have no issue with other livestock.
- Sustainable resourcing
- Small livestock are acceptable, so long as they are safe and happy and not disturbing surrounding residences.
- Yes, if the it is on a case by case basis to establish a proper environment to support the animals. Hens and other livestock or not kept in the house and should have their needs met for living comfortable in a yard setting. It's kept limited amount of hens and other livestock.
- People are looking for healthier lives, lifestyles, and being able to have ones' own eggs (from one's chickens) is one way to do it.



- No to pigeons as they can easily escape and overpopulate as feral wild birds within our communities. Yes to hens in limited numbers and only at properties with adequate yard space to limit proximity to neighbours such as large traditional single family lots. No zero lot line or smaller for outside year-round keeping. Regulated to pest proof chicken feeders, pear control and predator proofing.
- A limit of both numbers and types of animals must be set.
- good idea
- We would love to be able to have chickens. Having our kids involved in the raising of their own food is important to us. We, however, do not support our neighbours having any say in this. We believe there should be guidelines for what is expected, if we are in breach then neighbours should have the right to report it.
- If animals are well taken care of and not bothering neighbors they should be allowed.
- Animals would need to be quiet and no smells that would bother anyone in that community. Wind carries sounds and smell so approval from community neighbours, not just adjacent neighbours would be needed.
- If rules are met this could be a positive for the owners.
- .
- With proper laws and licensing in place, I think it would be a great benefit to have urban hens
- Availability of qualified vet care for the species nearby - or all vets are knowledgeable about all species
- Limits to how many, proper enclosures and clean up and neighbour approval
- Would support some/small allowance for chickens/birds within reason and well cared for.
- Yes as long as the laws are very tightly strict and applied probably in all time. And assure that animals are never in poor living conditions and disrespect.
- urban hens and ducks should be allowed . They are good pest control and provide local food options
- I support limited urban animal husbandry as long as the above animal welfare guidelines are adhered to
- As long as animals' welfare is taken care of and there is no nuisance factor such as increased noise, disease or harm to people. I don't think neighbours should have to approve for hens or bees, but should be informed and have the right to complain where necessary if issues arise.
- Doesn't matter to me.
- I don't think the issue should be geographical restriction. As long as the right infrastructure can be set up in an urban setting, this is ok.
- The enforcement Officer must be aware of the actual need of this particular species in order to adequately assess its needs.
- There are already rabbits and pigeons, why not hens. Not supportive of larger livestock.
- I think if there are suitable and safe conditions there shouldn't be an issue
- I am fine with people owning approved livestock under specific criteria
- Fully support the allowance of urban hens in Calgary. My wife and I have done some research on this topic and hens make great pets, provide (limited) food, do not smell, and do not make noise. If



cared for in a responsible manner, urban hens would only enhance quality of life for those who choose to keep them.

- I think if people would like Chickens to provide eggs or have as pets they should be allowed to. Rooster are often required however for pecking order and protection of the flock from predators so people should be able to keep them as well. If it's ok to listen to loud neighbours music and mufflers than how is this any different than listening to a rooster? I would rather hear a rooster than loud mufflers and construction.
- So long as the owners are responsible and the hens are clean
- We should support urban farming and support as much independence and local food sources
- Hens are quieter than dogs which are already permitted in yards. Chicken owners shouldn't need special permission but they should be held accountable for adequate care as should dog owners. I wish our neighbors would clean the dog shot out of their yard. It stinks.
- I think people should be able to keep chickens and other small livestock, as these are profitable and positive contributions to the community.
- Chickens make good pets, as well as providing food. I would like to see included the right to raise chickens in your backyard without the consent of your neighbours.
- Calgarians should be allowed to own and care for a maximum number of 6 hens
- Hens are an excellent addition to a family. They are great pets, quiet and less invasive than most dogs and cats. I do believe all animals should have permits as there are too many people that have animals that shouldn't.
- Many folks rely on animals for emotional support, as long as the animals are well housed and properly cared for and as long the owners keep up with their responsibilities of what it takes to have those animals on their property I see no issue.
- I believe this is ok as long as the neighbours approved. There needs to be in writing that if at any point the neighbour is not ok or the animal becomes a nuisance or ownership of the neighbouring house changed that your right to have these animals could be revoked. The city would also need to have a backup plan for how those animals would be cared (an organization or farm willing to take them) if the owner was no longer allowed to house these animals.
- Chickens are clean and provide great benefits. Responsible ownership is important, but especially in these times can provide so many benefits to people
- Chickens are quiet, and eat garden pests. People should be able to raise their own food in their backyard as long as conditions provided are clean and the numbers of chickens allowed is controlled.
- I like the idea of keeping small livestock like hens and I find the idea of harvesting eggs from a hen I've raised very interesting.
- If the neighbours are agreeable (on both sides) and the hens or other livestock do not impact on the neighbours and are regularly cleaned up after then they should be allowed. It might even be a learning experience for children and during Covid when so many of us are expanding our backyard gardens and planting fruit trees to help with food expenses adding a few hens would certainly help us out. I would rather gather my own free run eggs and use my own hens for meat. At least we



know where they come from and what they have been fed. Regular inspection by bylaw officer might be a good idea where they could inspect what is going on once a month or so and make sure that there are no complaints. A milking goat doesn't take up too much room. Would that also be a possibility?

- I support backyard chickens 100%. It's important that people have the option to raise them for meat and eggs. Shortening our food lines provides many benefits to the people who own them and our environment.
- As long as the hens are housed and cared for appropriately and any associated smells are contained I have no problem with urban hens.
- As long as the standards of care are high, I do not see an issue with it
- As long as noise is kept to minimum (no roosters, for example), and the owner is responsible for care and upkeep (with periodic checks) then I am all for it. The right of people to feed themselves should never be abrogated. Also, instruction in the care and keeping of chickens is very important!
- If there are suitable living conditions and they are responsible owners the community could benefit from urban hens.
- do not require neighbours support
- Hens are quieter than dogs, easy to care for and provide food. One should not require neighbours approval to keep hens as they are often less a nuisance than dogs, which do not require neighbour's approval.
- "Hens should be allowed without the consent of neighbors.
- Containment and cleanliness need to be defined."
- With food shortages, it would be beneficial for a household to have this kind of opportunity.
- Small livestock such as hens, rabbits, goats, etc. That can provide positive neighborhood impact and be kept safely, humanely, and nuisance free in an urban setting. Should be considered for allowance within the bylaw.
- As long as these are not being used for food.
- I don't mind if people set up proper chicken coops.
- Great to have to maintain weed, grass clipping, leaf and insect control. And of course eggs!
- I see the benefit of more people being connected to their food source. I see benefits to communities that embrace our relationship to animals. I do not think chickens would be any different than any other animal.
- My choice to have chickens should not depend on my neighbour's consent.
- Don't personally care and likely won't have hens, but for those who like I don't see a problem with it.
- Hens are a vital part of a permaculture garden, offering valuable organic fertilizer, speeding composting times, and reducing harmful pests without harmful chemicals. It's a no-brainer.
- Urban hens should not be a problem as long as neighbours are consulted.
- I strongly support citizens ability to have hens and other livestock. It supports the ability to provide for family and builds community engagement.
- I'm concerned however about stink and mess affecting neighbours. Same kind of things you listed with pigeons below.



- Hens are quiet and easily kept.
- A chicken is similar to a cat or a dog in the care that they need. A chicken can be beneficial to a family and the yard. Chickens help reduce waste that ends up in either the compost bin or garbage. They help keep yards cleaner as they eat grass clippings and weeds. They also help to reduce the bug population that can occur during the summer months. If you are a gardener they also produce great fertilizer. They teach people about where food comes from and allow for families to become a little more self sustaining. On top of that due to their personalities they become excellent therapy animals. Please pass this bill so that people can have chickens.
- Chickens are less dirty than a dog shitting all over the place
- This is a good initiative.
- Animal welfare should be enforced
- If done right is a cheaper and safer way of feeding your family
- Only if the animal is under a certain size/ height/ weight i.e. the space it has to live in must be equivalent to what it would have if it were a wild animal or the same requirements as a farm.
- I love all animals, and if skunks can live next door in harmony, so can goats (or whatever)
- Support from adjacent neighbors is the key phrase here. The number of chickens would need to be limited as well.
- I have space to support a hen
- Raising chickens can promote healthy eating
- Very strict rules needed
- if they are not bothering neighbours this is fine
- small animals only, like chickens
- Other cities have had great success with urban hen programs and I am excited to see Calgary catch up with other urban centres! Urban hens are one aspect of resilient, hyper-local food systems!
- I am most concerned about smell from live stock. I am also concerned that people will acquire these animals and have no idea how to care for them. I would recommend training program requirements prior to obtaining a license to purchase.
- As long as approvals are seen as exceptions and not the rule. I think farm animals as pets are reasonable but you shouldn't have a farm in the city
- If the guidelines are followed and does not cause any disturbances in the neighbourhood, I do not see why not.
- Hens could help sustain the family; taking care of some livestock animals can help emotionally
- Chickens in cow town
- It's important for citizens to be able to feed themselves in case food shortage becomes a real problem. Locally grown nutrient dense food is sustainable where shipping in food from other countries is not. Backyard animals help contribute fertilizer to home gardens (reducing productivity eliminating need for chemical fertilizers) and control bugs in a sustainable way.
- home-reared eggs have the potential to be much more humane than store-bought. and chickens/roosters are a good way of reconnecting us with the knowledge that our food comes from somewhere. that we are engaged in an ecosystem and must respect each other.



- Yes!!! Let's have city chickens and goats! I'll never have to mow my lawn again with buck the goat cruzing my backyard.
- Hens , to a limit, are good for all...
- Owners would need to keep odours and noise levels down. Proper containment would be required. I have a neighbour whose pigeons fly around and they freak me out when they all flap past my bedroom window at once.
- If living situation and welfare of the animals is good and the neighbours don't have a problem, I support.
- Ok but depends on 'suitable living conditions'. Minimum space per type of animal and living standards should be researched and implemented.
- Chickens are great backyard animals and it may help more folks understand where their food comes from.
- As long as criteria are met and everyone involved in proximity is in agreement.
- Animals can benefit the community so why not if it is done right.
- A small number of animals that are well-cared for supports mental health, environment, potentially food security.
- Might potentially be ok but should be subject to strict and careful evaluation of population densities, public health, potential for disease transmission, etc and with costs of application borne by applicant. Should not be for profit or for small scale revenue generation.
- Urban hens are a choice relating to sustainability which is something that should be promoted not just allowed.
- it seems entirely reasonable.
- Many livestock can be managed without much disturbance to neighbours and provide a number of benefits to those who manage them like extra income and a sense of responsibility.
- I think this could be a great way of teaching people self sustainability.
- If needs are met and there is support if surround property owners as well as proper care for the hens, yes this bylaw should be available to people with different animal needs or wants.
- I think the city will show a fair individual evaluation of each case. There should be a way to revisit the decision as well.
- As long as the animals are well cared for, their habitats are clean to avoid offensive odours, noise levels are minimal why not? To each their own. miniature pigs, goats etc.
- That would be amazing
- All these points are fair and extremely reasonable.
- Buck bocka bock bock
- As long as the animals are well treated and proper permits are in place, there's no reason livestock shouldn't be allowed
- As long as the animals are looked after and aren't really loud
- Raising hens responsibly would be a more sustainable way of living and obtaining food
- Hens if fenced in property can be great pets that can supply fresh eggs to the home owner.



- Keeping chickens (humanely and respectfully) should be a right, allowing people to appreciate agriculture and the feel more connected to food, as well as being able to supplement one's diet with eggs where one has total control over the process/enrichment and care of hens.
- Only on properties that are big enough so the livestock would not become a nuisance to neighbours. For example roosters noises, messy and or dirty backyards.
- I like the idea of urban hens and would love to collect eggs. Not sure how I feel about my neighbours keeping chickens but would like to try !
- Yes to chicken and goats
- Reasonable ways for citizens to responsibly ensure a portion of their own food supply should be encouraged.
- Things like chickens teach basic animal stewardship and important lessons in regards to understanding animals and where our food comes from.
- I have no issues with allowing hens etc being raised in the city as long as people provide proper space, shelter etc and city has clear guidelines on requirements.
- A neighbour had a few hens in a small heated coop and it was no problem for neighbours. Good idea really if well cared for.
- My concern is winter.
- There are far more responsible people in our world; we can not punish the responsible people due to a few irresponsible people -Most people want to get along with their neighbours - I like the idea that neighbours need to be on board with a majority rules rule (to weed out that one cantankerous neighbour who is never happy with anything)
- Being able to keep small livestock with support from your surrounding neighbors would benefit communities.
- I want hens
- "The mental health aspect has been fully explored and so long as neighbours and owners behave in a responsible manner, other livestock could be tolerated. HOWEVER< each request for unusual pets needs to be evaluated individually.
- Unusual' pet"
- noise and odor should also be considerations (ie, livestock ownership within the city shouldn't impact neighbors).
- Love farm animals In the city!
- As long as the needs of the animals are being met and they are safe, cared for and comfortable then people should be allowed to keep urban livestock.
- If the live stock can be cared for and treated properly it should be up to you to own them
- I want to raise rabbits in my backyard.
- Responsible pet owners shouldn't be prevented from keeping egg-laying hens to provide nourishment for their families if no issues arise from neighbours. This can be done responsibly.
- However not for food purposes
- Maximum 4-5 Free-ranging poultry only. No mammals used as livestock.



- I strongly support opening Calgarians up to keeping chickens and other small, domesticated animals, with reasonable restrictions on noise and responsible care of the animals.
- I believe this would have positive neighborhood and community impacts, provided the animals are in the care of responsible and caring owners. The animals would need to have proper and sufficient living space, with considerations for all types of weather throughout the year.
- I think that urban hens are a great idea, however, I think that it is important that checks are done to ensure that the hens are properly cared for and have heat and shelter etc. during the winter.
- Chickens can be great pets that supply food, but they need proper care.
- having your own source for fresh food would be amazing and help families put who cant afford certain foods , with prices rising .
- Urban farming is our right to sustainability.
- Pot belly pigs
- If they don't disturb neighbours by way of noise or smell.
- Support from neighbours would be a requirement and perhaps a rule on how close the facility like a hen house is to the neighbouring property.
- No hens in high density inner city neighbourhoods (e.g. infills)
- Livestock should have suitable living conditions
- As long as the animals welfare is the first priority. The law should be the same for everyone.
- I would support only if the animal's are cleaned regularly and the noise is not a issue.
- Chicken houses owned by large businesses are disgusting and a hazard to the environment. They can house 40,000+ chickens, and their feces can be smelled for kilometers around and is toxic to breath and contaminate the local water supply. ANYTHING that we can do to reduce the impact these large companies have by allowing small and local chicken ownership should be explored. Additionally, the supply chain between Canadian farms, to packaging plants in CHINA, only to be shipped BACK to Canada is a ridiculous notion and should be abolished. The impacts to the environment is too great. There should be more local support for neighborhoods to have their own small urban farms which would include local grocery stores within their local supply chain.
- as long as smells and noise are kept down
- I would like to see small stock allowed.
- I support small livestock ie pot belly pigs as intelligent companion animals.
- Helps with sustainability
- As long as cleanliness is kept up as smell can be an issue for unclean chicken coops
- I think having hen's in the city is awesome.
- Chickens, quail and bees are all less of a nuisance than dogs can be and provide positive impacts for the owner, the environment and the community by pest control, interaction/healthy hobbies, food security, biodiversity, nutrient cycle etc.
- I would support chickens and bees
- Chickens should be allowed



- I think everyone should have the right own or possess one a sustainable food source and second the right to possess what the earth provides there should be no restrictions on livestock or animals just the humans that possess them.
- I feel having hens would be an excellent resource for calgarians both for emotional support and as a food resource.
- As long as the welfare of each animal was being met, I fully support individuals caring for community-appropriate animals.
- If the neighbour's are OK with it, and the animals are well cared for, I see no reason not to allow them to be kept on someone's property.
- Would be nice to allow a three or four hen coop. Or to allow people to have pot belly pigs
- Yes providing sufficient room and housing accommodations for said animals can be provided.
- Having grown up in a rural community, I am used to having pets around. That said, there needs to be enough room, proper care and environment. I especially like the fact that there would be a support agreement required from adjacent neighbours.
- As a society we should be ready to try new ways of life, and learn from our mistakes.
- I think chickens (for example) would be excellent for keeping down garden insects and I would not see a problem if any of my neighbours had them.
- Hens are fine
- As long as the animal is well cared for and they are not a nuisance to the neighbours people should be allowed to keep livestock.
- I think it's good, but likely comes with a LOT of education on what "suitable" living conditions are.
- I've had chickens, with proper daily maintenance they are a great pet / provider
- Backyard hens provide food security. If it's done properly there's no smell or noise concern.
- Chickens provide huge benefits in terms of social engagement in the neighbourhood, food security, and reduction of pests in yards and gardens.
- Some livestock are beneficial to urban living. Chicken, goats can help a garden/yard. Just like any pet they enrich our lives and the people around us. I wouldn't keep chickens but if my neighbour did I would have no issue with that.
- We need affordable food in this very expensive city
- Love hens
- I see nothing wrong with some livestock as long as they are cared for properly
- people should have the rights to have any pet they want in their home and feed whatever wild life in their property
- Would only support this in a case by case basis as the animal needs must be met and neighbours agreement.
- Potbelly pigs are technically classified as livestock, although I've never heard of a hog farmer owning one. They can actually make really good pets. And miniature horses are the only animal besides dogs that can be classified as service animals, but are also technically considered livestock.
- Can't let it get out of control or we will have petting zoos all around.



- Finally!
- I support chicken raising.
- Allowing people to “farm” their own eggs or “chicken” allows for more financial independence and environmental sustainability.
- Makes sense to use the land we have...
- I want some hens myself
- goats for lawn and herbicide
- urban hens sounds like an excellent idea!
- There are so many unhealthy growth enhancements added to marketable livestock either through feed or injection that some of the food we eat is becoming unhealthy with negative repercussions on humans in the long term.
- food security has been highlighted due to Covid
- Community farming is excellent.
- I think there are no problems as long as their is proper living conditions and containment.
- Yes
- Great experience for kids to raise hens. As a teacher I think this would be very healthy for children and adults of all ages.
- This is out dated rule needs to be updated. Hens would provide a quality of life increase.
- Hens, pigs, and goats for example are all permitted in other manor centers in our country and those communities seem to do well with them.
- Urban farming is a valuable asset to the entire city in many ways. The more, the better - with humane and appropriate management of the stock and community highly important.
- Free the Hens. Increasing food security I think is more important otherwise I think the larger concern is animal welfare then if the neighbors like it or not. Quail and other quieter birds should be indicated as alternatives.
- My family keep hens through the 20's 30's and 40's, in Cresent Heights! Hens help with insect control. I can't speak to the "other livestock" are rabbits and bees livestock?
- End the stupidity of “urban green spaces” as the only viable option
- With appropriate controls other livestock can live in urban communities without cause for complaint from neighbors. I understand there is such a thing as 'therapy hens' for traumatized individuals. Why not?
- I think it's a great idea. I feel that there should be some kind of licence for the ownership and care of livestock animals to ensure that they have proper care, and cannot be exploited.
- People should be able to have livestock so long as they do not impact others (e.g. noise, smell). Allowing a limited number of backyard hens seems perfectly reasonable.
- it is not the place of government to limit the self sufficiency of the individual. Limited number of live stock, kept in humane conditions and not causing a loss of enjoyment of property to others, never should have been restriced to begin with
- People should be allowed to own chickens if cared for properly



- As long as suitable conditions are provided for the animals, I believe it will have a positive impact.
- Growing your own food is great! Having your own chickens to raise is important! But in winter's they would need good protection, and if left outside with no shelter the owners should be fined and no more animals
- With people wishing to have food that is grown or produce within 100 miles this would aid in supplying food especially for people who have been raised in this kind of environment.
- All animals can be emotional apart/ therapy animals
- Raising chickens and other livestock supports local communities, the economy, and reduces greenhouse emissions. It is a great idea!
- I love the idea of having urban livestock as long as they are kept in a safe, suitable environment! I personally would love to have my own hen so I am able to have eggs without worrying that they are from hens in terrible conditions in factory farms!
- Very few urban dwellers understand the complex needs of so called livestock animals. They need space, correct shelter, food, stimulation and should be allowed to live out their natural lifespan. This includes seeing a veterinarian when needed, and that can be very costly. I would only support this on a case by case basis, and there would need to be safeguards in place for the animals.
- Hens only
- Suitable living conditions is extremely important combined with adjacent neighbour support. If a dog owner isn't very responsible and they decide to get a few hens; it probably isn't going to work out.
- Urban hens and livestock can bring life back into neighbourhoods, allow for better self-sufficiency for some, and providing more environment-friendly means of garden maintenance etc. (like grass-grazing animals vs noisy and polluting lawn mowers)
- They are not as dangerous as other pets.
- Support from neighbours critical and support gathered regularly, should neighbours or conditions change. And would include language around eyesore, noise and smell obligations.
- If chickens/livestock are kept in an area where it's appropriate (not close residential areas) it could be feasible
- I think factory farming is terrible. If there's a way that these animals can instead enjoy a better life, then why not?
- I like chickens
- small numbers of livestock (hens, small goats, smallish swine) and, if kept in clean and suitable living quarters shouldn't be any different than owning dogs or cats.
- As long as the animals are living in safe and healthy environments, and are treated properly, I think it would be a great idea to allow inside the city.
- I am for allowing backyard chickens as long as the number of chickens were limited and/or no roosters allowed.
- I think that it can be an asset for communities if cared for properly and adequate space provided.
- Animals increase the happiness of people.
- "Support from adjacent neighbours should be mandatory and if this is not possible then permission should not be granted.



- Also, suitable living conditions-> needs to be very specific as to what is required.
- How many animals and what kind? No roosters for sure! Don't need cows and donkeys in the city either."
- it creates a stronger sense of community and can offer healthier food choices
- Only if inspections were regular
- As long as the Owner is responsible and knowledgeable in the care of livestock I'm in favour of people having livestock kept as pets.
- But there should be bylaw enforcement to ensure the livestock does not have diseases
- If they can make sure the animal is taken care of and has the proper necessities
- I feel like more local small farms could be good for the well-being of people struggling.
- As long as the animals are being taken care of, I don't think there should be any problems with it.
- Neighborhoods should have some say in chickens next door. They can be very smelly
- Only if the owner upkeeps the clean up of the waste.
- Provided the chickens have a proper chicken coop and are managed and fed, chickens would not be allowed in peoples homes.
- Reasonable measures can be taken to prevent disturbance, and it makes Calgary a more sustainable city.
- Only if proper arrangements are made. I would not want to be a neighbour to someone with livestock if they do not properly care for and clean the animals and their living space.
- I only support this if there are checks on the animals to ensure they have a good quality of life, and only if it is regulated.
- My answer is really maybe: I am unsure whether Calgarians have enough space in the city for hens to give a good life. It might be difficult to provide oversight to how they are treated, how the space is managed after approval is given by neighbours and others - wonder if community hens could be created, similar to community gardens.
- Chickens are cool
- I don't believe pet owners should be limited to typical pets. If a person can provide reasonable care and conditions for livestock in city limits without causing disturbance to their neighbors there should be no reason they cannot keep them.
- As long as it isn't used for farming meat and an excessive amount of hens where the smell becomes inhabitable, I'm all for hens.
- I would support this bylaw if restrictions on the number of livestock is enforced and if livestock is kept within owner's property, which must be fenced.
- I definitely agree it should be on a case by case basis. I like that this would include the opinions of the immediate neighbors, as well as property size and enclosure standards.
- as long as e1 is in agreement and the animals are properly cared for
- I'm all for it
- I have no desire for livestock but would not be opposed to someone having some ducks or chickens with the qualification that the noise and smell is not burdensome for neighbours.



- Don't make it hinge on neighbour support. Just make clear rules and consequences for not following. Someone doesn't have to get neighbourhood approval to have a kid or get a bunny or a cat....just make the rules explicit and prescriptive for animal and human health. (Structures approved, proximity to property lines, number of birds per square footage/property, etc).
- Providing the area is of sufficient size and offers suitable housing, I would be fully supportive. The only potential issue would be if hens were to be killed for food and blood/feathers were scattered around the yard with potential for blowing into other yards and surrounding neighbourhood.
- I think plenty of people would be able to raise hens responsibly. They're less dangerous and disruptive than other animals allowed in the city. I really don't see what the difference is.
- Chickens are great
- Chickens aren't inherently a nuisance, and with growing economic insecurity calgarians need service animals to provide them with food, and psychological wellness. Chickens have been proven to enhance quality of life and setting up grounds for proper care and training would create jobs for those with experience with poultry animals.
- As long as the hens are well cared for, we would be fine if they lived next door.
- Having hens live in suitable conditions is vastly better than the terrible places they live in chicken farms or egg farms. Anything to reduce animal cruelty is a win.
- People are allowed to grow their own gardens; why not have their own access to eggs? Plus some livestock would make great pets, like goats.
- It will help many to get emotional support and will bring the good change in communities
- Providing that the owners have a large enough space to accommodate suitable living conditions and it not impacting neighbouring properties. Support from adjacent neighbours is paramount.
- Pets and urban livestock are not an issue if properly maintained and the property has enough space for the animals. Proper bylaws need to be created and enforced for issues to be addressed.
- If adjacent neighbours are supportive and things are well maintained and not disruptive, supporting initiatives that help people support livelihood etc appears beneficial. I feel it would depend on the property as well though (size, fences with neighbors and to the alley, potential noise issues)
- It is a great idea to allow people to grow their own food.
- For the safety of the hens and the public please do not allow people to swap hens over Kijiji or online. This is how disease spreads. Basic livestock husbandry course should be mandatory to obtain a license. All hens should be vaccinated and provided a clean coop.
- I would support this as long as the animals are not being kept in Calgary to be slaughtered and eaten. This should be prohibited.
- I think the points above adequately address concerns and give Calgarians an opportunity for keeping these kinds of animals when it makes sense.
- If proper care can be given to the animal and property without disturbances to the neighbors, I don't see much difference than having a bunny or dog.
- More bees please! Provided animals are in a healthy environments. However I do not think neighbours should get to dictate /overrule as this will be based on personal bias - eg. "just don't like the idea of chickens next door" or "my kid has a bee allergy so no to a hive next door"



- I would support hens but only if the protocols are such that they cannot negatively affect a neighbor. Yards should be large enough, pens kept away from neighbours etc.
- See other cities.
- A few chickens for fresh eggs seems reasonable - only for that homes use not to be sold commercially out of yard -
- Except I think the 'support from adjacent neighbours' point needs to be considered a bit more. Many people do not get along with their neighbours for various reasons and I think that if someone interested in getting backyard hens/other livestock were to have to obtain permission from their neighbour, it could get even more contentious.
- A small animal such as chickens should be allowed in the city as they are able to produce food (eggs) without taking up too much space and are lower maintenance than other livestock. Before getting urban chickens, the owner in question should have their yard inspected for a suitable area for the chickens and checked in on after a certain amount of time to ensure the chickens are still taken care of.
- Absolutely! So many communities are allowing hens and they are great. Not very noisy, wonderful animals.
- Not for food
- Allowing people to provide for themselves, whether they are used for eggs or as support animals, only seems like a good idea.
- I think there's nothing wrong with owning hens as long as they are well cared for.
- As long as everyone (including hens) is happy with the arrangement, I see no reason to prohibit it.
- As long as this is not meant for food
- As long it is not affecting neighbors quality of life
- Animals can be a large part of a fulfilling life (e.g., mine provide emotional well-being, exercise, etc.) and there's no reason to limit that opportunity to your "usual" pets. Livestock can teach any age how to take care of animals, can provide food (chicken eggs, goats with milk, etc.), and can provide a positive outlet for energy and time that could otherwise be wasted.
- chickens are amazing for sustainable living.
- People should be allowed to have animals that do not impose on neighbors. Hens are quiet and provide many benefits.
- Gives people better access to healthy food and increase food security of our community so I'm all for it as long as not a health issue, overcrowding etc and animals are being taken care of humanely. And that City would then support more bylaw to actually enforce bylaw.
- Conditions would need to be purely recreational farming and humane
- As long as the livestock animals are not interfering with other citizens lives in a negative way, there's no reason to not permit them.
- The bullet points above seem to cover needful criteria well.
- i think fresh eggs would be very nice and all my neighbours would love it and also me as well
- Having hens in Calgary would be great.
- Sounds good to me



- If you're capable of great care of your pets why not if you can't then don't have a pet
- I think people should be allowed to own and care for a small number of chickens, on the conditions that they are humanely kept and have the correct living conditions and space.
- I don't feel I know enough about this matter to provide an educated argument one way or another, but I certainly have reservations about various livestock being permitted on residential properties. If allowed, would like to see strict criteria for what is allowed, a high level of enforcement of bylaws, and tight restrictions on the number of livestock permitted.
- As long as the hens are not causing a nuisance (smell or noise within reason). And are being kept humanly.
- Ensure bylaw remains a positive impact for the community. If at any point it becomes negative, restrictions should be imposed.
- As long as neighbours have a say and everything is kept in a clean state
- A case by case basis would be integral, I have raised chickens and in the winter mths in Calgary they need a warm coop or they will die a miserable death.
- hens are cute.
- Greater freedom of personal choice and seems positive
- Hens are fairly quiet and healthy fresh eggs is never a bad thing.
- There is a lot of community interest in keeping hens in Calgary. Keeping hens for eggs may provide economic and environmental benefits as the hens produce food very locally. I would, however, suggest that noisy and/or aggressive roosters are not kept regularly in residential areas.
- Urban hens have been successful in other cities
- Neighbour approval is very important
- Chickens are awesome.
- They are animals in captivity and must be looked after accordingly
- It would be positive to allow Calgarians have back yard chickens for a variety of reasons. It's important for people to do it properly so completing an online course and getting a type of license before would be good.
- Hens should be allowed in private yards if the homeowner is following proper guidelines provided by the city. As well, owners should not be allowed more than 8 hens. Owners should have a proper coop and appropriate space for the hens. Roosters should not be allowed in residential yards.
- Livestock in the city should not be permitted. My neighbour has a hen and a rooster and he's constantly making a fuss or whenever anyone walks in there home he just goes nuts and I can hear him even with my windows closed. Livestock is a nuisance in the city.
- I agree as long as it's allowed with reasonable thought. Ie. winter time and space for heated shelter on land, land space, neighbour proximity etc
- Livestock is a far reaching word but as many are finding they are urban contributors of health and welfare of a diverse animal groups. This may assist with connectivity to other animals and their well being.
- People should be allowed.
- I think this is a great idea, support community and possibly provide food for lower income families



- Communities and individuals can benefit greatly from having accessible livestock if acceptable conditions can be provided.
- Food grown at home
- If the animal is not a nuisance to neighbors, then they should be allowed.
- It would be important to ensure that each owner of hens or other livestock are well educated on the needs of the animals and are able to care for them for the duration of their lives. Similar to canine/feline adoption, evaluations should be done and possibly a training session (potentially ongoing support- i.e. health questions etc.) for those who choose to take on these animals, aiming to prevent abuse and encourage proper living conditions.
- I think this makes sense in our world of factory farming.
- I have no issues with a few animals as pets I just don't want farms in my neighborhood.
- Love this! As long as hens and other animals are treated well by people. Great for food security and fun pets for owners.
- Other livestock such as rabbits, turkeys, geese, guinea pigs, etc. should be allowed if space and accommodations are suitable, and if all nearby neighbours are fully informed of the possible issues (smell, noise, other pests, etc.) and agree that it is feasible.
- Livestock can be raised and treated like a pet
- I think hens are reasonably non intrusive and it would follow the lead of other municipalities.
- As long as there is sufficient space for the animal
- I like the idea of people controlling where their food comes from. Especially after COVID shortages, local is always better
- If they are provided adequate shelter and provided for appropriately
- This may open up suitable homes for many species
- As long as surrounding neighbours agree, they should be able to have chickens!
- There are no problems with livestock in the city, no more problems than any other animal as long as there are regulations, as there are with any other animal.
- Chickens are fun. But the term other livestock seems vague.
- I agree with this.
- Hens are pets that poop breakfast. It could enhance the community to share eggs. I don't really know about keeping other animals in an urban situation, but the amendments sound like they will be effective in determining feasibility.
- I am completely on board bringing live stock into the city
- There are certain areas that have large enough yards to support such an endeavour. With certain square footage and neighbour approval I support hens
- Its a beneficial situation for evryone.
- If this program is being enforced and monitored by the City, it would be for the greater impact on our environment.
- If people want chickens and other livestock living on their property, they should be allowed to do so as long as the animals are being taken care of properly and remain on the designated property.



- This will need to have an application policy, and will need to regulate the care of the animals and consideration for neighbors
- There is nothing wrong with people having this. The fact your asking this is ridiculous.
- if it can be done safely without reproccussion to others, there should be no reason not to be more self sustaining.
- As long as chickens amd other livestock have the appropriate living conditions and the correct amount of space given I don't see a problem with it.
- As long as suitable homes and large enough spaces are able to be provided for the animals, I support this.
- Like any other pet/domestic animal, the living conditions and general health of the animal needs to be upkeep. A mandatory semi yearly or annually checkup needs to happen. That being said - the checkup fees/cost should be affordable so people are able to keep up with the testing/vet care.
- As long as the livestock is safely contained in the persons yard I don't see why someone shouldn't be able to house them. That being said size limits should be considered, nothing larger than a large breed dog
- Hens rule
- As long as neighbours were good with it.
- Urban hens are both rewarding pets as well as contributing to the nutritional needs of households. They are also excellent educational tools. They also provide nonchemical mosquito control.
- You should be able to have livestock so long as your property can properly support them. I suggest a home visit occur if you apply for a permit to assess the property to see if it can support livestock.
- Animals should be allowed as long as they are properly taken care of
- I like the idea of having my own chicken. There are wild grouse around my neighborhood and don't find them to be bothersome at all.
- Ownership of livestock animals should be allowed as long as the owner can carry the burden of owning such animals. As stated prior ownership extends into responsibility and if an owner cannot carry said responsibility in regards to an animal they should not be allowed said ownership.
- Keeping hens seems like a great idea (more utility out of a chicken than any other pet), provided they can be managed so they don't attract coyotes, cats, bobcats, dogs, raccoons into the area.
- People have a right to grow and raise their own food.
- Smaller livestock can be well taken care of in the city with considerations for the appropriate space, shelter and basic needs. The owners of the small livestock should also be appropriately vetted and receive training before becoming involved in raising small livestock.
- Backyard chickens, love everything about the idea
- i think that small livestock could improve the quality of urban life.
- Limit on the amount of animals on a property
- Less reliance on factory farming is important for the environment
- Urban chickens should be allowed as long as the owners are responsible to both the animals and their neighbours.
- "why not? Chickens are dope.



- Leave the pitbulls alone."
- The hens must NOT be killed for food. That should be part of the agreement, and illegal. The commercial agricultural farmed animals industry is horrific and inflicts untold pain and abuse and suffering on all animals in it, but especially chickens. Canada is backwards in it's lack of protections for all animals. Owning hens, who may lay eggs, can allow them to be treated with some dignity, or even as a beloved pet. And it can help people to avoid supporting the abuse industry. There needs to be strict guidelines about the housing and proper care of the hens so they have access to being in grassed areas, roosting, and other normal hen behaviour.
- As long as the welfare of the livestock is monitored and thought is given to how these animals impact the neighbors and their property (potentially) I support all aspects of urban farming.
- As long as the animals are not a nuisance , not abused and bring benefit and positive impact to people or the environment, why not
- As long as there is some strict rules and bylaws limited amount of animals and proper treatment
- I think as long as the animals have suitable living conditions to thrive and the appropriate resources to be cared for (ie. vet) then it's okay.
- If having some hens brings my neighbours joy so be it.
- I have had backyard hens in other cities in Canada and I would LOVE to keep hens as pets again! But there should be a mandatory training to complete before newbies get hens to ensure they are warm in the winter and stay safe and healthy.
- If it doesn't bother neighbours, why not?
- It would be amazing for the neighbourhood to have people educated on how to raise hens with the support of your neighbours.
- My partner would like to raise hens for eggs
- Would not suggest cows or horses unless over 2 acre property, if applicable. May need limit on roosters.
- Urban hens can be lovely. Noise, smell, nuisance, and other considerations would be relevant considerations.
- Should be a limit on the number of animals aloud & how noisy they are.
- Welfare on the animals in paramount. The animals cannot be slaughtered on the property.
- with exception to larger animals cows, horses, and pigs... alligators, crocs, and poisonous snakes
- I support urban hens!!!!
- I disagree with support from surrounding neighbour's, it's incredibly frustrating to have to deal with those who nitpick or abuse the legal system to make your life more difficult. Almost as if they constantly need a holier than thou validation
- Where sufficient conditions allow, having hens or other non-obnoxious livestock would foster a more sustainable, and resilient community.
- We need to get back to basics of supplying our own foods. Gardens too should be encouraged and lawns taxed.



- Responsible guardianship is needed
- As long as livestock don't cause a nuisance to neighbours, citizens should be free to keep and raise livestock, like hens, as they would be both beneficial and, to some, companions to their owners.
- Hens should absolutely be allowed.
- I support opening up the bylaw to support households maintaining a SMALL supply of livestock. There needs to be a limit. My concern is the City's ability to enforce it.
- I think this is fine as long as it's regulated and the owners responsible.
- This would give people to have a home based food supply if the commercial food supply falls apart or not enough supply brought in like we have seen in the recent past due to Covid 19.
- I think if people responsibly care for urban hens that it can help address food security and allow people to be involved in their own food procurement process. I would also love a zero tolerance policy if people are not caring for their hens responsibly
- Small livestock should be licensed the same as cats/ dogs. No large livestock (ie. larger than dog breeds).
- Urban farming needs to be more popular. People need to learn how to feed themselves
- Many, many more goats should be used for weed control in public parks. Whatever by laws need to be amended for this to be possible should immediately be amended. This should happen irrespective of the results of this particular outreach.
- If someone really wants to have hens and it will not be a nuisance to neighbours, then why not? If there is a rooster involved, maybe not so much. But reasonably sized livestock suited to urban living seems okay if looked at on a case by case basis.
- If the needs of the animal are met and it won't cause any disruption to the community; why not?
- This in theory should be fine. But could be abused in the case of apartments or small farms ran in back yards. It becomes problematic when too many people in one area have a large quantity of those animals due to waste, feed, and inherent living conditions
- I would LOVE to have hens in my backyard, as they would be good for the garden and taking care of the bug infestation problem. Grew up on a farm, so familiar with taking care of livestock.
- As long as procedures protect against cruel conditions and the living does not become a health concerns
- Although I support the amendment, I would be concerned about possible noise and odours. Also, people move so I wonder how complicated it could get if adjacent neighbours move and new neighbours don't support the idea.
- Could help sustain families and possibly communities.
- I believe anyone should be able to have a pet as long as they're able to provide the correct living conditions.
- Gets Calgary more in touch with what is surrounding it. And pets are not just cats and dogs.
- With responsibility comes accountability. If they are properly taken care of this poses no issue.
- Why not! As long as the hen owner is responsible and CLEAN !! Must maintain CLEANLINESS !! Mandatory cleanliness!!!



- it's environmentally friendly. they may be using the hens/other livestock to try and live a more sustainable life.
- Cannot be a nuisance to surrounding neighbours and must be in a clean environment and properly looked after
- There should be limits on the number of livestock (depending on kind) and a requirement for suitable, clean living conditions
- Depending on how livestock are sheltered and cared for, they can have a positive impact on communities by fostering engagement and care-of-place in addition to the many ways that it could contribute toward educating people about food systems and creating food sharing programs.
- ...
- Home owners should be allowed to own their own small livestock as long as it is not disturbing the neighborhood, should be a limit on how many animals can be owned for smell and noise reasons and depending on property type if they can be there at all, should require a permit and only certain parts of the city can obtain the permit, ie. cant own on a townhouse property or close living spaces.
- as long as the possession of these animals doesn't negatively impact neighbors i see no issue. Eg as long as the neighbors can't smell the chicken or something like that its fine.
- As long as the livestock is regularly inspected for health and safety and good neighbor compliance
- Referring to the section below on fine increases for violations. It has been largely proven that fines are only a deterrent for those that can't afford them. Or in other words, if you have the money, it's not illegal. A different model of punishment and deterrence should be explored.
- If your animals aren't bothering other neighbours, then whats the harm? If you want livestock, you should have to have approval of all neighbours connected to your property, or potentially impacted by the animals.
- People should be allowed to own hens. People in England own them in their back yard why can't we here?
- The reason not to just never made any sense.
- This supports many food trends - local shopping, knowing what's in your food, etc.
- I see no issue with livestock in urban areas, as long as they have appropriate living conditions and access to waste disposal
- As long as all the above was met, and, like domestic animals there is some type of limit set to how many a home can have it can have a positive impact on communities. Education for young children learning how to care for chickens and benefit from eggs would be awesome!
- i think having animals like chickens within city limits could prove to be beneficial
- If the birds are supported by the relevant people, neighbours, etc. , then it should be fine.
- It has been successful in other cities.
- sustainable living
- Provided that there is oversight and review of urban livestock then this would be fine
- There should be a licence for flock/pack and quantity which finances possible clean up after a bad owner leaves and the hens remain. Note experience of meat pigeons left after owners let them go becoming a nuisance, and rabbits.



- I believe that urban livestock such as hens would contribute to food security and vibrancy for the city. As other municipalities have now demonstrated how to integrate hens successfully to urban settings, the information and blueprints exist to implement this in Calgary.
- Seems like a good idea
- Initial support from neighbors as well as support from neighbors on an annual basis (or every 2 years?).. people might not know what to expect but they'll know a year later whether that was a good decision..
- as long as the living conditions can be provided for the animal, people should be allowed
- Live stock can be around Calgary as long as our property taxes won't triple again.
- Some livestock animals are also pets.
- Individuals living in the city would be more aware and included in what they are eating.
- Chickens are awesome
- The cost of living in Calgary is too high. Keeping livestock in the city can reduce that
- If you have the proper needs for the animal and it doesn't affect others why not.
- Urban hens could be suitable so long as there is no detriment to the community and local flora/fauna
- As long as there were proper steps in place to ensure the quality of life for the animal; visits completed on an annual basis (at minimum) to ensure compliance.
- I think this is a good idea for people who can't afford to live outside the city. Small animals such as donkeys, goats, ducks and chickens are good for pest and weed control as well as mental health. With proper shelter and feed they would be fine in enclosed yards.
- I support this bylaw amendment provided that urban hens will be licensed so that fees can be collected to hire more bylaw officers and pay for training regarding the health and wellness of hens.
- I think some options could be explored with limitations to kinds of animals and amounts allowed to be owned
- Worth trying this idea given these criteria.
- I would love to be a chicken owner and would support neighbours who are interested as well.
- I would love to have chickens if I could!
- I do support, however I do know that livestock could create a bad smell for neighbours and the community if not tended after appropriately. My experience was on a farm with multiple hens, so maybe urban hens wouldn't be as smelly but I do not know.
- As long as the animals are taken care of and do not pose a threat or nuisance to neighbors, then they should be allowed.
- Hens are a safe low nuisance animal but required consent from the neighbours is a flaw. It will not pass the legal Department review (as happened in Medicine Hat). My neighbours can not decide what happens on my personal property. Additionally this is not a requirement for other pets and does not make sense.
- having 3 hens would supply a family with fresh free range eggs; this could be seen as cost saving -- but I would not allow any animal bigger than a goat. and the goats could be trained to go on walks on leashes; and as long as they are fed a vegan diet; their waste can be used as fertilizer.
- Good for people to be self sufficient



- Support animals of any kind.
- Community based, community supporting; self-sustaining;
- I think having small farm animals like goats and chickens in the City would be fine if they have suitable living conditions.
- I think allowing a small number of hens is a great idea
- You should be able to raise a few chickens for fresh eggs..
- Lots of people would like the novelty of having livestock but do they know how to properly care for them. Proof of a course in this should have to be provided.
- Urban farming can have lots of benefits
- hens should be allowed in numbers no greater than the number of people residing in the home plus 1. Area for the hens must be adequate to provide a comfortable space for the animal, and must be kept clean and safe to prevent the spread of disease.
- Why not allow urban hens. It is just like keeping any other animal captive.
- I believe in supporting self sufficient food growth. It's cleaner and healthier and we know where our food comes from.
- Adjacent neighbours should be left out of it: whether we like it or not, there are adjacent neighbours who unfortunately will not offer support - either because of mental health, whether they rent or own, just don't like you. If the adjacent neighbours offer support, and then move in future (unrelated to livestock), would realtors or landlords have to disclose where livestock resides if near the property they are viewing? - could pose difficulties in the long run (needing neighbour support?).
- Eating close to home is always best for every body
- Having small livestock, like chickens in your yard can be good for a family. Kids can learn responsibility as well as appreciation for animals. But I do think that strict guidelines on enclosures, care, noise and numbers will be needed. While I'd be ok with my neighbor having a couple chickens, I would not want to be kept awake by dozens of them as the noise and smell would get too much. Bee hives should also be allowed and encouraged. Bees are very vulnerable and so anything that helps sustain their numbers is a good thing.
- I believe as individuals we should be able to have a system in place to feed our families in case the chain of supply falls apart as we have recently seen with the Covid 19 pandemic.
- I think that just about the only bylaw I support for private property are noise and odor complaints. If your neighbors can't sleep because your chickens won't shut up, or if the smell emanating from your livestock permeates their property, they should have some recourse.
- As long as noise and cleanliness don't become an issue, I don't see any problems.
- This could lead to fostering more community enrichment and could also be used as a positive learning experience for children in certain situations.
- Hens can be a very valuable addition to urban properties, for the following reasons: 1) Food security. A steady and secure supply of fresh eggs for the residents of the property increases food security and reduces the number and frequency of trips required to the grocery store. 2) Food responsibility. More people in urban centres taking personal responsibility for the production of a portion of their food supply, means less environmental pressure is put on local and remote ecosystems that are



facing destruction due to increases in industrial agricultural production. 3) Hens are beneficial to urban gardens and food production systems because they eat slugs and other garden "pests", and in turn provide nutrient-rich manure that can be used as fertilizer as well as a valuable addition to backyard compost. 4) Hens and other animals can provide companionship and caring for them can provide a sense of purpose for those who provide the appropriate care and level of responsibility.

- Promotes food security
- I have no issue having hens in the city.
- If there were only a certain amount of animals allowed on property to reduce the noise then I think it would be fine to own
- As long as the needs of the animals, public and wildlife (particularly with regards to health and zoonosis) are considered, I think this is great.
- I believe urban livestock could be extremely beneficial to the City of Calgary as it will allow for more people to purchase eggs from local sources rather than unethical farms selling eggs in grocery stores
- Some people claim these animals as pets. Supervision can help out.

Participants who indicated they would not support this bylaw amendment are listed here.

- I think people would own animals like hens to murder and slaughter for their own food. We come from a country who provides for us without our neighbors doing this act next to us. Don't allow it in the city
- Too small of lots in Calgary for this not to be a noise or odour concern for nearby neighbors.
- Farm animals should be left on the farm outside the city
- Just live on a farm
- We don't need to increase the risk of allergies and viruses if any due to livestock.
- It's so congested in an urban setting how are these animals not going to be a nuisance, plus have enough room to live comfortably?
- Most housing in Calgary is close together and dense (ie: shared fence lines). There is potential for additional parasites, infections and allergies. Farm animals do not belong within city limits. Bird feces is problematic (look at how many complaints there are for so few dove keepers).
- You can have an agreement with a neighbor and then they sell their house and the next neighbor may not agree with the livestock. Allergies to live stock and animals are a huge issue. No one wants to hear chicken or other livestock in the early morning, during the day, or at night.
- "It is no longer the 1800s
- Chickens and other livestock (pigs, horses, cows, etc) have no place in an urban setting as they attract vermin, cause bad odours and can be annoying noise wise. We had them on the farm and know what can happen with them. If people want livestock they should consider moving to the countryside."
- Too loud and smelly
- If I wanted to smell livestock, I'd live on a farm.



- Livestock belong on properties where they can be cared for properly. Not in backyards.
- I don't want hens in Calgary
- i do not think chickens, goats, pigs etc belong in a residential setting. people that wish this should buy a farm.
- there should be no farm animals too much noise and smells
- Farm animals do not belong in the city and if people can't be bothered to appropriately care for cats and dogs and respect neighbours I have zero doubt it would be different with farm animals. It would be worse.
- These animals belong on a farm they are smelly if people want them they should live in the country
- Hens are farm animals, a city environment is not appropriate. too noisy, not enough space to give proper housing and husbandry. I do not feel that this will be monitored by the city and properly enforced.
- Not at all excited about livestock being my neighbour. Isn't that what acreages and farms are for?
- Hens should be kept on farms and not in dangerous city limits
- Hens belong to farms. Really.
- Keep them on the farm
- Farm animals are not meant to be kept in the city and despite these stipulations, it will be increasingly hard for bylaw to keep up with the amount of people abusing this.
- I do not think we need any livestock living within city limits. This should be for farm or acreage only.
- Suitable living conditions for the animals matter. The opinion of neighbours do not.
- Noise, respect for neighbors, minor offenses and infractions usually go unreported or neglected
- Livestock are noisy and smelly and belong outside the city.
- I have been around chickens as a child as I grew up on a farm. They are noisy, stinky, and should be kept inside someone's home as the norm rather than outside when the weather is nicer. We have issues with coyotes and other nuisance domestic animals, why continue to attract attention?
- Livestock smells, and can be noisy
- Livestock should be given adequate space. Most city residents can not accommodate this
- I think it's fine to allow a small number of livestock for personal food consumption but I'm wary of exceptions being managed with full discretion.
- Smell, noise, disease
- This would attract coyotes which are already an issue in many areas
- Livestock do not belong within city limits. Even the largest properties within the city limits are not suitable for livestock. May also constitute problems with enclosures having to be built and maintained, etc...
- People don't pickup after their pets as it is have you smelled a hen house even when they are clean not a nice odor
- I don't want chickens.
- I do not support livestock in the city
- People shouldn't be raising animals to use them.



- We don't need more noise and stench in Calgary.
- People are going to get tired of having these urban hens. The animals could be treated wrongly and abandoned.
- It would be important to define livestock
- Neighbours are too close for additional types of animals. They would be disruptive
- they are messy, they attract predators like pigeon hawks.
- As I have grown up in a rural area, I know and understand the noise level that certain livestock, such as pigs and goats, have. They would be a nuisance.
- Hens and chickens should not be allowed in the city period. They attract unwanted wild animals like coyotes.
- An urban area does not provide living conditions suited to livestock.
- They smell and they're loud. I don't want to hear them or smell their scat. I don't want to have other livestock either. Go live on the country.
- They are dirty. And a loud
- Picking one breed and saying they can't do this or that is wrong and I'll leave Calgary
- Animals that can survive in small huts with minimal noise should be allowed. Other animals belong on large farm land with adequate care and owner having the expertise. Also don't want the smell in my neighbourhood!!
- Invite more animal attacks
- Support from adjacent neighbours isn't enough. What about when neighbours move and the new ones are stuck with a situation they didn't approve of? In addition, it wouldn't only be those adjacent affected by the smell, etc.
- Not all owners will abide by rules. Just see all the roaming cats.
- Unless there is enough space for the livestock, i.e. in rural areas, I don't see how they would not be a nuisance in Calgary and to neighbours.
- IF YOU WANT LIVESTOCK MOVE TO A FARM - SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED IN THE CITY LIMITS
- Unsure of the practicality. So many people can't seem to care for their property, let alone livestock!!!!
- Livestock belongs on a farm not in the suburbs. Livestock cannot have a balanced life in 6x6 pen in a backyard
- "Could lead to people living next door to a big problem.
- Chickens are fine. Other livestock, just no."
- Chicken and livestock should stay on farms where they are properly cared for. Disease can easily spread through city populations through uncared for livestock and chicken.
- Yards are too small for livestock. Not fair to neighbors who don't want it. Chain link fences will not block the animals
- Bs
- They don't belong in the city
- Foreign animal disease



- With how many coyotes we have out, this is a recipe for disaster.
- You'll allow hens in the city which you damn well know will become a hoarding issue, but because people are ignorant and scared of the way a dog looks you're trying to enforce these dogs to be in muzzles. Disgusting and ignorant! You need to get some proper education on the breed, you small minded homosapians.
- Farm animals belong on a farm where they have the space to be happy and live their normal lives
- It would increase predator population in high populated areas of the city
- [Removed] [removed], chickens belong on farms.
- How do you enforce this. The city can't enforce and ensure safe living conditions for existing and approved pets.
- Chickens are noisy and annoying
- They are farm animals and no city animals
- I don't think in any situation having livestock in an urban environment is safe or responsible in any situation.
- Livestock belong on farms. Hens included.
- Livestock does not deserve to be in a crowded city. I don't believe it's healthy to the livestock.
- Livestock should not be on private property within the city. If you want to own a farm move to farm land
- Livestock don't belong in cities.
- I do not think livestock animals should be allowed. They are smelly and noisy.
- I do not feel that hens are appropriate for urban areas and belong in a farm. They are not pets.
- Hens don't belong in the city, they need a heated place that they can stay in during the winter. There aren't enough veterinarians that can care for these animals
- I do not need to listen to roosters at the crack of dawn.
- Noise. Smell. Small yards and lots
- You can't be serious. We don't live in acreages, we live on postage stamps. Too dense
- Tension is high enough amongst neighbors without adding this potential noise and odor conflict.
- They are gross and no neighbour wants to be next to it
- Hens have no place in a city and there is way more rural space available for them.
- There are not even proper laws to protect dogs and cats that are being neglected, abused, left outside summer and winter, inadequate food and water and bedding. Livestock such as goats or pit bellied pigs require specialized food and vet care. That is not even available within Calgary. Too many people think it would be cool to have one without knowledge or financial resources. Then what: abandoned, starved, sick, or surrendered (To where). Please no.
- People shouldn't be allowed to have farms in the city
- "When I consider that we are in the middle of a viral pandemic that began with animal to human transmission,
- this seems like a bad idea."
- I don't see this very feasible in the city.



- I don't see the benefits.
- I wouldn't trust humans to manage themselves responsibly, the chickens wouldn't be the issue.
- If I wanted to live on a farm I would.
- Livestock should not be allowed in city
- I don't agree with having other livestock in urban areas
- Humans are not meant to live with certain types of animals. It is in our DNA and Covid -19 is likely an example of what happens when humans interact with animals in ways we haven't quite "evolved" in to. It will open up "fad" pet owners who eventually get rid of their animals when they grow tired of them and it will be the start of widespread Calgarians eating their pets and that will add to our global image of being a redneck city which is apparently more Alabama than Alabama from the perspective of us being red necks. Let's become a less red neck city and not live with barn animals.
- I live on an acreage and people regularly complain about the smells of the farms. This smell could potentially be in your neighborhood now. Keep livestock where it belongs.
- I do not want hens next door to me, in part as that would be the trigger for my dogs prey drive and likely result in nuisance behaviour such as barking or increased aggression. I would also be concerned about how this might increase the presence of rodents seeking the food.
- Livestock in the city will only encourage more predators (cougars, coyotes, etc.). Small dogs and cats are already being preyed on by predators; allowing livestock will only make that worse.
- [removed]
- I feel that livestock need more area to live on then a property in the city could adequately provide
- Enough already.
- Livestock should not be allowed in the city our neighbors have pigeons and it just awful and bylaw has been called several times will not solution.
- Noise
- If they want hens buy an acreage
- I'd be concerned about the noise of such animals in the city.
- Farm or other similar animals, including flocks of birds, are not suited to city living when cages, odour and noise may be difficult to manage
- Noise bylaws in this noise are lacking. Imagine a person getting funded for clucking hens but not for installing an air-conditioning unit between two houses.... Ludicrous. Let people have chickens, crack down on noise pollution
- I do not want to smell livestock nor do I want the noise. People are complaining about coyotes and the safety of their pets. I grew up in the country and I know the coyotes and feral cats would love to snack on city chickens.
- Hens are livestock. Not pets.
- I do not support using animals for food production.
- "People don't pick up dog poop. They are not going to clean up chicken s#!t!



- Any additional animals attract more predatory animals into city."
- Move to a farm if you want chickens.
- "I am not sure what kind of livestock or what need one would have for it in the city.
- Hens can be an issue of the get out or aren't properly enclosed, goats are escape artists, eat everything, and like to jump on cars. Sheep you might be able to get away with. Cows need to be moved often and will turn grassy yards into mud. Horses maybe, but again need to be cleaned up after daily and exercised well. Most livestock are herd animals and don't do well alone, and all of them require proper shelter and feed/watering areas"
- Keep livestock out of urban areas.
- I don't want chickens waking me up in the morning!
- The idea seems interesting. However, the smell, mess and noise within a community with close residents would be terrible and frustrating.
- Don't want the noise or smell
- if I have chickens, and current neighbors are ok with it then they move and new ones do not like it? I would have to give them up.
- Livestock, their waste, noise and potential diseases should remain in areas zoned for agriculture not in urban residential.
- The presence of hens would be irresponsible with the population density of Calgary. It would attract predators in such as coyotes as most people don't have experience in making a secure hen house.
- No this is stupid it's not fair to the animals
- This would be the first step towards becoming a third world city.
- Chickens do not belong in the city.
- If I wanted to live in a farming community, I'd move to a farm.
- I'm not opposed to someone having one or two chickens but I would not want the noise and smell associated with hen houses in my neighbourhood.... even worse if it's a pig or pony.
- Noise and smell
- Having those animals in yards in a city only invites predators causing other issues.
- There's a reason they live on farms
- I do not feel that urban house yards are large enough to provide suitable living conditions for livestock, including chickens.
- I grew up on a farm. Hens in the city is not a good idea for neighbours or the birds.
- Livestock should live on a farm.
- Process sounds cumbersome and a waste of taxpayers money to allow someone to have chickens or other livestock
- You're discriminating a dog based on its breed
- Our city stinks enough farms belong on farmland
- Loud, smelly
- They are noisy and they smell, houses are too close together in the City



- People will get chickens thinking it's a good idea without understanding the sanitation required. I feel like the chicken coops will start to pose problems
- As a property owner I would not want livestock beside me.
- Hens/chickens are far too noisy to have in a community.
- This has the potential to cause conflict between neighbours and enforcement is very subjective. The bylaw officer may feel it doesn't warrant action though to the complainant it is a serious complaint and impacts their ability to fully enjoy their property due to smell, noise etc. The interpretation of too noisy and too smelly are subjective so there is a high probability one of the parties will think the outcome is not fair. Do not create more conflict by allowing this amendment.
- Livestock belongs outside the city.
- These are NOT urban animals, shouldn't be held inside the city.
- Livestock need a great deal of living space and specialized care, and since most of them are prey animals, they are high stress. A city is not a good environment for livestock.
- We have wild cats and other wild predators in our neighbourhood. I do not want them more interested in our area because of pet chickens.
- I do not support the keeping of livestock or hens in a suburban environment. These are farm animals.
- Farm livestock belongs on a farm, cared for by farmers who know what they are doing not city slickers who's care of the animals borders on animal abuse due to their lack of farm husbandry knowledge!
- Chickens are not clean animals and stink. Bad enough having a chicken coop on the farm let alone in tight urban spaces. There is not enough room in the city for residential coops.
- We live in a city for a reason. Chickens can carry disease and be a nuisance.
- I would not want to listen to half of the city with livestock as pets I would increase too much awful smell as well as extra unnecessary noise.
- "Suitable living conditions" for livestock are almost never "suitable" and do not promote animal welfare.
- Chickens are noisy, smelly, and can harbour all kinds of bacteria. If people want chickens. They need to move to the country.
- I worry about the smell and noise
- Hens should not be in the city
- We don't live in farms. If you want farm animals, go live on a farm
- Livestock belong on an average or farm. Calgary yards are too small and will affect neighbors.
- Chickens are filthy
- Chickens are one thing but not a lot of large yards to accommodate anything. Plus houses are closer. Can be more of noise complaints.
- I think there is a very small population within city limits that can properly care for livestock, they are also often kept as pets that people think are cool and fun and do not do enough research into their care. I also foresee lots of noise complaints with roosters because man are they loud.
- Disruptive in city



- There's no need for other livestock in the city, and no real way to police it. Hens are ok as long as there is no rooster and no more than a specified number of them.
- No need for hens in the city limit. That's what farms are for.
- I agree with all but the neighbours input. It isn't needed. Especially if you own your home or the landlord is in agreement.
- It may take too long for complaints of noise, smell to be addressed by the city.
- No chickens please
- I don't think livestock needs to be within the city.
- This could create problems with neighbours like odours or increase amounts of flies, etc
- We've seen the results of human animal interaction with Covid-19, why introduce this dangerous behaviour in Calgary?
- Attracts wild animals and are a noise concern.
- Chickens should not be in the city.
- That would be so annoying
- "Livestock belongs in rural areas not in a big city like Calgary.
- The negative impacts (noise, odors, reduction in property values, garbage, livestock feed attracting vermin/pests) are greater than the positive impacts.
- Calgary real estate is already depressed relative to other cities and if you permit livestock.....this may be a deterrent to living or moving here."
- I would worry about the living conditions these animals live in.
- The city is not a place for urban hens (noise, smells). It certainly is not a place for other livestock either (noise, smells).
- Support from adjacent neighbors could change over time. Just because a neighbor is ok with it doesn't mean that if they move the person who moves in after the will be ok with it.
- I live in Woodlands and we already see bobcats, and coyotes regularly. They hunt rabbits and cats in the area and having outdoor urban hen enclosures - my concern is that this will encourage more predators to venture into our area and I imagine all areas in the city.
- I feel this would cause more cases of neglect from people who do not properly understand care and maintenance of these animals. If this is allowed I feel the city should offer educational resources around this.
- I don't think hens should live in a city environment with the pollution and especially wildlife such as coyotes and bobcats would just be enticed to hunt/kill them therefore putting humans and pets more at risk
- Animal waste management can be challenging, and the definitions of suitable living conditions rarely define adequate waste handling criteria.
- Bylaw is already not keeping up with what is happening. How is adding more to manage going to help anyone or anything.
- While most people would take care of their animals properly, some would not and livestock can become a health hazard.



- I do not agree with urban hens in Calgary.
- "Living next to hens or other livestock in an urban areas would be undesirable and devalue property (noise, waste, odours, etc.)"
- Also urban areas are not ideal environments for livestock (lot size, etc)"
- The noise, the smell, the potential to bring predators closer to the city (the couotes are bad enough). And the potential for negligence.
- It will create more noise and odour. It will also creat more issues then benefits
- Housing devalued. Cleanliness. Chickens running in street.
- livestock have needs and requirements that can not be met in a city suburb
- Please ban campfires in the city.
- I don't think it would be good idea, they are more work than one thinks and what happens when people realize this? The chickens are set free or taken to shelters? Unclean dirty coops can lead to flies and rodent infestations. If neighbours have cats or dogs this could also be another problematic area.
- "Other livestock is too vague for me to support this.
- Can adjacent neighbours revolk their support?"
- People cannot pick up after their dog and cats. This will turn calgary in a pig pen and create even more unhygienic properties and lower property values.
- Livestock, by their very nature don't belong in small city yards. I want my urban neighbourhood to stay an urban neighbourhood. If I wanted to live near livestock, I'll move out to a rural acreage.
- I don't want smells and noises that cannot be controlled by the owners.
- this is a city, not farmland. If a person craves country living move there. I don't want to be woken up by a rooster or have a stinky pig next door.
- Certain animals really do not belong in a city
- Livestock in residential areas would be a pure nuisance
- Too much government regulation.
- Livestock belongs on an acreage or farm.
- people are lazy as it this woild jusy increase issues with other livestock. And neighbour's people live in the city to be away from farm animals
- Very few residences within city limits would be suitable for livestock.
- Noise would be a big factor. I would not allow it next door if they squacked all night, next you will be letting people have roosters, I see dead ones if this happened.
- I believe that if a neighbour did not support having hens/other livestock living close by, that it would not matter. I think this is just a way to allow this to be permitted and I don't want anyone living near me to have hens/livestock. The smell, noise of those animals, etc. is not something I want and if I did want that, I'd own a farm or live near one.
- It's a bad idea.
- Livestock do not belong in the city



- I don't think live stock or hens should be allowed in the city. They could attract more predators deeper into the city and it's not a place for live stock. Chickens can be smelly and noisy and if people want them they can move to the country where there is space for them.
- I value freedom
- Livestock of any kind does not belong in the city.
- I'm scared of birds. I don't want to see birds where I might be walking...like you lot have a fear of pit bulls, I was attacked as a child by birds...it's traumatic for me to see loose birds
- Smells get too bad
- If I wanted to smell a farm or have an abundance of flies around my home I'd live on a farm...
- Would require so much more bylaw and neighbors issues. People will dump them and abandon when tired of them.
- Don't want noise and smell and more potential for disease
- The amount of people that would just get certain live stock for "fun" and not end up taking care of the animal. Where would the live stock go? They would be released to the street.
- No roosters
- Diseases that we don't and know like SARS.
- There is no reason to include livestock. That's why there are farms. The last thing I need is to woken up by a roaster.
- They are a mess., the smell and are loud. I
- Noise concerns, attraction of other predators and wildlife
- If someone wants farm animals, they should live on an acreage
- Hens make a lot of noise
- I don't agree with livestock being within city limits.
- No they are filthy, smelly and noisy. We all should be able to enjoy our yards and and I don't want mine to smell like a barn. If I want to live on a farm I move back there.
- No, hens do not make anymore noise than dogs barking. If you own your property and have suitable living conditions then I don't see the issue
- Homeowners should not be put in a position to declare support or otherwise for their neighbour's infliction of livestock in a city environment. There is a good reason livestock are raised in rural communities.
- Seriously chickens are for farms. If you want a chicken move to the country.
- People can't clean up after their dogs and cats, why add more livestock. They are smelly and some are loud and annoying.
- At this point I don't think most people are set up for livestock.
- Livestock should be on farms
- chickens are loud and smell awful. Those living with zero property lines or shared dwellings such as duplexes would be significantly affected
- Calgary homes are in close quarters. Chickens and hens are noisy and often increase unsanitary conditions. I would only support this in areas where properties are further apart.



- Livestock belongs on a farm.
- Hens do not belong in the city
- Just one more animal for the city to have to govern. There is enough of a mouse problem in and around homes as it is, chickens and the feed are another attractant. Also potential for skunks and now present raccoons to be attracted to them. There will always be people who don't manage them properly or humanely.
- livestock not suitable for city life in terms of space, noise, attracting wildlife
- Hens do not belong inside a city. It is problematic enough with dogs and cats. Current enforcement is scarce enough.
- Too much opportunity for noise and odour.
- "People can be rude and while it seems a lovely sentiment to try and be an urban farmer and save the planet. What will actually happen is owners in over their heads will leave a mess of unattended fowl. Bird crap everywhere and unhealthy "livestock".
- Massive pass! Not appropriate for condos or apartments. Someone will want to break the case by case rules."
- Livestock doesn't belong in the city. It's cruel and they can be a nuisance for neighbours. Other than hens
- Chickens are loud and stink
- Will bring in more mice and voles. Already a problem this year
- Now houses are so close to each other . Smell would be too much to handle
- This could attract predators such as coyotes, bobcats etc into high density areas and put their lives, the lives of pets, and the chickens at risk.
- Livestock have certain needs and requirements. The city suburb is not appropriate.
- I do not believe hens should be in urban areas unless they are support animals
- I do not think appropriate living conditions is achievable in urban settings
- Noise and smell concerns
- Sounds and smells of livestock have potential to get out of control
- Neighbours change, so what was once acceptable by one neighbour will be a hassle/legal issue if a new one moves in and hates livestock
- I lived next door to roosters. They stank and were noisy.
- Noise, cleanliness, neighbour relationships and appropriate animal care are all significant concerns with animals in an urban setting.
- It is impossible to silence animals raised for consumption or for consumption of their byproducts. These should not be allowed within an urban development.
- The likelihood of unkept pens is too high and in a city the space is limited causing a nuisance to those nearby
- This would just create awful relationships between neighbors and community members
- Support from adjacent neighbours only works until the neighbour that agreed to it moves.
- Farm animals need space to have a full filled life



- Livestock of any kind do not belong in the city .
- sooner or later these animals would be neglected and hurt by other people. This will bring slaughter in our own backyard. No laws can protect these animals. Humans will always find a way to bend the law to hurt livestock. I have seen way to many.
- neighbours are too close in urban settings. add outdoor farm/ non domesticated animals and it's just not pleasant for us. extra tax dollars to support enforcement. You already jumped the taxes and it will only go up more.
- Raising farm animals involves odour and noise that is not appropriate for an urban setting. Children and adults often have allergies etc. that would be greatly affected.
- Livestock shouldn't be kept in Calgary. People can't control the animals we have, why add more into the mix?
- I don't see why someone would need to ask their neighbours for permission if the hens are stayed on their property. Everything else is fine.
- "It would ha
- Be
- To be heavily regulated"
- Zoonotic diseases should be taken seriously.
- Livestock does not belong in urban areas.
- I don't support any livestock type animals to be in the city at all.
- the city is not farm land,I could see this getting out of hand very quickly!
- Bylaws and standards for owning the livestock would be hard to enforce. Many people in the city have issues as it is properly caring for cats and dogs. I would not support introducing different types of livestock.
- I would not want the smell of a hen house near my yard!
- I do not want any other livestock in the city. Not really comfortable with chickens.
- I fee they are noisy, and add to an overpopulation of other animals, hence hurting the system with extra fines, peace officer usage, etc.
- I don't want to be around chickens. And I don't want to be singled out or asked about not wanting my neighbors to have them.
- Livestock does not belong on city residential property.
- The smell would be the biggest concern.
- I'm just don't know enough about hens and how noisy or smelly a hen house would be
- Chickens are can be loud, and they smell bad if not cared for correctly. Not everyone is going to be responsible and it can really bring down property values if abused.
- I have cleaned chicken coops before. Stinkiest thing in the world. What will happen to the chickens who stop producing eggs? Have prospective owners thought this through? Chickens simply aren't clean.
- Calgary's weather is too harsh
- Livestock do not belong in the city



- "If you want chickens live
- On a farm"
- They don't belong in a city
- My community is too small and the homes too close together to consider this.
- Farm animals can carry diseases that can be harmful in an urban population.
- Livestock belongs in a farm not crowded into someone's back yard.
- Try living beside this.
- No urban hens or roosters. No farm animals as pets in the city.
- There enough urban noise and problems eith pests and garbage, we don't need to add barn yard animals into the mix.
- SMELL. Noise, people are what terrible at being aware of cat/dog bylaws, and so I don't know that many people would offer proper facilities to these animals... maybe if they had to supply, like when you build over your garage? Then they have to know the expectations prior to setting it up?
- I believe people will take advantage of this.
- chickens can be loud and smell, they are a farm animal
- City is not the place for live stock and can create some neighbors issues and issues with domestic and livestock
- I think it's a nice idea, but property value could be decreased simply because a neighbour is keeping hens that might not be looked after as well as they should be.. ie. A mess, smell, noise, etc.
- Bad neighbours can already easily get away with being big problems in too many ways as it is. Why give them more ways to disturb others.
- Chickens require acres of space to be kept in humane conditions, and this is simply not possible within city limits. Furthermore, backyards chickens could be a nuisance to neighbours due to smell or sound.
- Calgary is a CITY not a farm. There is no need for any livestock to live in a city - they belong in the country. This is ridiculous.
- We should not have livestock in the city. No hens or any other livestock. The are too loud and since they live outside, you can't control the noise. They also can be messy and stink. Live on a farm if you want livestock, as that's where they belong.
- If my neighbor can have chickens, then I can have a burn barrel and a clothes line. I come from the country, if you want country, live out of town. Prey attract predators.
- I don't support the use taxpayers dollars for this. Pandemic costs have meant we need to focus on needs, not wants.
- The wants of few shouldn't supercede the needs of many. If you want to keep livestock, live in the country.
- Livestock will create a nuisance for neighbours.
- Noise levels would increase, especially in early morning hours. Would attract coyotes and other predators to the residential areas
- Lots in most areas of Calgary are not large enough for this type of occupancy



- If you want livestock, move to the country.
- Slippery slope. Besides hens for eggs, people don't need to keep livestock in the city.
- I don't like how your asking about muzzling pit bulls but then at some point it would be okay for my neighbor to have chicken? Seriously?
- This will only cause problems between neighbours
- I feel the city is not the place for livestock. Could they rent space outside the city for livestock? What happens if supportive neighbors move and the new neighbors aren't supportive? More conflicts for city to deal with.
- I don't think livestock should be considered pets. To many people will abuse this privilege.
- Not appropriate for city living to have livestock
- "The smell alone.
- Also, as with ferrule rabbits, having chickens attracts Coyotes to any neighborhood."
- Move to a farm i don't want neighbours who have them. They are loud smelly and a nuisances.
- If you want chickens, move to an acreage.
- this could get out of hand. More information would need to be obtained to make an informed decision.
- I don't believe there should be hens in an urban environment. Many people do not know how to care for them, or clean up after them. Also, there are not a lot of veterinarians within the city with the ability to care for hens, and not many veterinarians who would be willing to come in to the city to care for these animals.
- We aren't doing a good job with cats and dogs. Let's get that sorted first
- Do not agree with adjacent neighbors, must be surrounding neighbors regardless if they are next door, 2 doors away or even across the street/laneway
- Live stock needs to stay out of the city
- It's a city, these animals belong in the country.
- Hens are OK Don't open it to other livestock, people will abuse it.
- No I do not support this.
- I moved from the farm to the city - farm animals should be kept in the farm not the city. No need to add more stress to the stray population of animals like cats and now chickens or other farm animals...goats? Cows? Sheep? No thanks.
- People may not comply with the bylaw and Calgary does not do enough enforcement as is
- I do not want chickens next door to my home . . .
- "Livestock does not belong in an urban setting. We have
- Coyotes in our area and if livestock is lost, dog owners may be blamed."
- Poop noise and smell. That's all chickens are good for if not properly cared for on a farm set up for the purpose. And anyone who thinks a chicken is a therapy/support animal is a whack job
- We live in the city, we did not choose to live on the farm and be awakened by farm animals
- I do not support hens inside city limits. There are already enough problems with dogs barking, I don't want to hear hens while enjoying my backyard.



- The smell and noise is unacceptable. Grew up around farms.
- keep the farm out.
- Don't want or need livestock living next to me in the city
- inevitable smell. sanitary concerns. no doubt theft.
- I think will open doors for animals living inadequately or not being humanely taken care of. This would be too time consuming to police.
- Given that we have just had a pandemic related to the keeping of "animals", we don't need to add other creatures to the City limits. Leave them on farms where they belong. If ANY neighbour objects, NO exceptions made by any bylaw officer. There may be communities who would support hens, but again, if a direct neighbour says no, no means NO!
- Would only support if there was a mandated size of yard for each individual animal.
- Not in the city, move to a farm.
- Would support more if limited to certain identified communities. Although current neighbors may support it - new neighbors might not. By restricting to certain areas, people can make decisions on where to live based without worrying about re-applying for permit if they have to move or about future re-sale of their home if they support their neighbors permit.
- Chickens aren't city creatures
- Bring wildlife in, make noise, carry diseases and smell. I believe that this devalues property and gives the neighbours yet one more reason to fight over something new.
- Farm animals including chickens will bring potential health concerns with diseases , potential smell, noise, and will encourage more wildlife into the city where they do not belong and potentially threaten local domestic dog and cats. if you approve such a bylaw all neighbours within 3 or 4 houses in all directions must agree and the requesting must take full responsibility any wildlife attacks or damage..
- Farm animals don't belong in the city, period. There's enough problems with pigeons, we don't need to add chickens to the mix.
- Livestock do not belong in a city.
- If residents want to raise livestock, they should move to a property with over an acre of land.
- Livestock does belong in the city. People will take advantage and there will be way too many.
- We have already problems with a noisy dog next door. I can't imagine dealing with the noise and smell of chickens.
- Farm animals should not be allowed within city limits. They smell and their noises cannot be controlled as barking can.
- If calgarians want to farm they should do it in a rural area as there are already enough animals for bylaw to chase I don't like the idea of an escape artist goat running a muck in a school field.
- Farm animals do not belong in the city!
- "How would my owning a goat or pig ""Offer community benefit/have positive impact""? They will become dinner for me and my family.



- ""Support from adjacent neighbours"" clause. If my neighbour can own a coop full of pigeons that fly around the neighbourhood freely without consulting me or my other neighbours, I should be able to have a proper chicken coop and run in my yard without asking for my neighbours permission.
- There must be an appeal process in place if I feel the CBE Officer's judgement is wrong."
- Chickens (limited to 3) are reasonable. Pigs, goats, sheep, horses, cattle are not.
- "If pit bulls are under bsl we will move
- This is unacceptable.
- Very disappointed in calgary."
- I think our climate is too cold and I don't trust people to properly care for the animals. I also don't think people realize the smell chickens produce, and they won't clean often enough. I think it will breed conflict between neighbours.
- People can't be trusted to keep their cats safe, plus with ongoing bobcat issues this will be another reason for them to come to neighbourhoods
- i don't feel that livestock belongs in the urban setting with the care/upkeep of animals and their living areas, etc and due to the close proximity that houses are to each other
- This would cause more citizen disputes within communities.
- other animals should be on farms
- It's too easy for people to abuse because the lack of by-law enforcement.
- chickens do not belong in the city. They are loud and will cause more coyotes, foxes, and other carnivore animals to come into the neighborhoods more.
- Chickens belong on farms where people are experienced in caring for them
- I don't want chicken noise any where near my house.
- Raising livestock of any kind should be left to the rural communities and not a large city like Calgary. I certainly wouldn't want someone raising chickens living next to me.
- they belong on farms
- I do not support having hens or other livestock living in anyone's back yard. That is animal cruelty plus it's a recipe for feuding neighbor's.
- I live in the city for a reason
- Chickens and hens are dirty, stink, create additional noise. Seems like the city has enough issues with animal bylaws as is, focus on fixing what's an issue already.
- I can't imagine the nightmare of living next door to someone in the city with a rooster or hens r other animals that likely can smell and if people want an agricultural self sufficient lifestyle they can move to a small town or rural area.
- You should not be told that you cannot have a certain animal unless in the cases it is completely unreasonable. IE a cow in a .25 acre backyard, etc.
- Would need to figure out the noise and spread of disease from birds to humans. Birds are noisy creatures and I would not be happy to live next to someone with a hen.



- Livestock belong on farms not in neighborhoods. What will the penalty be if a hen attacked a child . Same punishment as dangerous dogs ? Hens can inflict just as much damage to a small child as a dog.
- This is a city not a farm.
- You can't control the noise of hens because they are hens. If a cat or dog is barking you can simply bring them into the house.
- livestock regardless of hens or cattle should not be in Calgary
- ownership of fowl is high maintenance. Dung is highly alkaline, stinks to high heaven. Many people "want" the idea of urban farming without the responsibility or associated work to maintain clean, healthy and odor controlled coops. (we did have a urban coop and between winter and dung - I consider this a urban fail) As well chickens may coo but their overwhelming response is to crow - depending on your tolerance this could be a noise issue at any time of the day.
- Our houses are so close together as it is, could not imagine the noise and smell if my neighbours had hens, chickens, pigeons! If people want this then go live on an acreage!
- Houses are too close together and lots are too small. How do you contain chicken or goat smell to 1 property
- Smelly and noisy m. Need to have land.
- People don't pick up after their dogs or stop their cats from roaming. The smell of manure wafting from a back yard, especially on a warm day would prevent people from enjoying their backyard or even being able to keep windows open.
- Can't say I wanna listen to chickens or hens all day long
- The noise, mess etc. We cant even get unruly neighbors to take care of their yards, noise etc. It would take forever to deal with these issues. If they want these animals they should be living in the country
- Livestock consumes large amounts of food, produces large amounts of waste, can be noisy. They were banned from city's for food reasons.
- Likelihood of disease transmission. Poor husbandry and noise and smell concerns. Also inadequate housing and attracting wildlife
- If people want chickens they should move out of city limits, they are loud and stink and I believe the resources required to police this would be better used elsewhere.
- We are an urban environment not rural.
- Animals shouldn't be kept in pens and small enclosures.
- Doesn't make sense.
- If you're trying to enforce laws about barking dogs to reduce noise, allowing squawking hens is contradictory. They will upset dogs, get loose, and will give another outlet for poor animal care to take place just so they can get "free" eggs. Bad idea.
- Livestock belongs on farms. I have lived in a farm, I'm not interested in doing it again, that's why I live in a city.



- It is an urban city and not a rural area. If you let animals that are not domesticated in an urban environment you risk the chance of those animals having diseases that city vets know nothing about it.
- Livestock belongs outside the city limits.
- If you want farm animals live on a farm
- Please look to the example of Toronto where allowing urban hens failed dismally. My family raises chickens and the average city dweller does not know what they're getting into.
- I believe this will cause more problems with other wildlife. Predators would be drawn in by the available "food" in people's yards
- It may attract too many rodents or predators.
- I don't want to hear chickens nor do I want to smell them when I'm in my yard or house
- Coyotes are already becoming a bigger problem in many areas in Calgary
- They're chickens!!! This is a city environment!! Chickens don't belong in an urban setting!!!
- Livestock should remain rural. Smell, noise has no place in a community.
- All adjacent neighbours must approve. With the case of chickens/roosters, it should be more than adjacent due to noise.
- Have neighbours that can not control there cats , am sure that they would not follow bylaws for chickens . Also , noise from wildlife
- Livestock should not be in the city. Noise, what is their quality of life, tidiness/mess
- It would start out positive but end badly eventually. Keep clean or healthy then start sliding with noise, mess, smell, animal abuse etc.
- We are already dealing with a household with 18 dogs ranging in size from Great Dane to Chahuahua
- Noise issues
- This is ridiculous! Only people with LESA permits should be allowed this.
- It's not the place to have these animals in the city.
- The city is no place for agricultural livestock.
- If people want to have these animals, they should live on an acreage.
- I do not want livestock next door.
- Live stock (chickens) should not be allowed in city limits
- You lower the property value and you won't keep control of it
- Live stock is for farms not for the city. If you want live stock buy a farm where you can have them. Neighbors should not be forced to deal with the neighbors live stock
- Farm Animals
- I'm not sure what other livestock could peacefully coexist within a suburban neighbourhood without disrupting those around it either by sight, smell or sound.
- The very last thing any community needs is a chicken coop.
- Livestock can be noisy, dirty and cause issues for people walking their dogs in the neighbourhood.
- No hens please



- This is exactly how disease is transferred to humans. Absolutely no chickens, pigs, or other livestock. If you want to live on a farm, leave the city.
 - The noise and smell of chickens is difficult to control. The risk of viruses and other diseases that comes from humans living in close quarters to livestock.
 - It will attract kid life such as coyotes, bobcats etc.
 - livestock should be limited to suitable locations. If inside city limits there should be a minimum land requirement. Less than this, in my experience, proves a nuisance for neighbors.
 - They bring mice and rats
 - "Pigeons? The noise is annoying.
 - Are you really asking time if I want people in my neighborhood owning piegon coops?
 - Wow city of Calgary. You are really going backwards.
-
- Targeting pitbulls while there are many other breeds with higher attack rates, but we did not speak of those breeds specifically. I know MANY wonderful pitbulls that behave better than my neighbors shitzu.
-
- Now you want to al"
 - Livestock do not belong in the City
 - It opens Pandora's box. I don't want a neighbour with 3 support roosters
 - People have a hard time looking after and being accountable for their cats and dogs. Livestock would make the problem worse
 - I feel hens stink. I wouldn't want hens next to my already densely packed back yard in the inner city. I also wouldn't want to tarnish relations with my neighbour over declining for them to have hens... out of the city in bigger yards, sure, but not inner city due to density concerns.
 - Not enough information
 - I don't have faith that individuals would properly follow rules or that bylaw officers would enforce
 - I do not want to live in a community with livestock - I live in the city not the country for a reason.
 - livestock do not belong in the city.
 - No livestock as it is too difficult to really ascertain the need for such and monitoring would be another expense the City does not need.
 - Nuisance for neighbours
 - Chickens are noisy, smelly animals. I worry too about the reduction in property value if I was next to people who raised chickens. I grew up on a farm and there is no reason to have them in an urban environment. Let wild birds eat the bugs. I support local farmers.
 - livestock should be in country areas with lots of room for their lifestyles.
 - Why do we need livestock in the city
 - Noisy, smelly and possible disease transmission



- Livestock should not be permitted in residential areas.
- Urban hens and livestock should not be allowed in Calgary.
- Livestock have no place in an urban setting.
- I don't want roosters waking me up at all times of the day. Too many allergies also. Want livestock equals moving to a farm.
- Birds are noisy and smelly
- Hens may be a nuisance or trigger to current domestic animals causing more issues.
- There is just not enough room in most city lots to accommodate livestock and to control the odor that arises from them. It is not fair to the animals to be kept in these small spaces and be subjected to city life.
- I see no purpose in this.
- People are loud and inconsiderate enough of others, I would not appreciate my neighbours having farm animals making extra noise, mess and smell.
- There are not many areas in Calgary where the owners have enough land to provide an adequate space for live stock.
- Many people already have great difficulty caring for their current pets ie: keeping cats indoors, picking up poop, walking dogs responsibly and on leash at all times. Adding chickens would create an urban nightmare. Chickens require proper feed, care & exercise to reduce disease and must be confined to one yard. If ppl can't confine their cats, I can't imagine what will happen with chickens!
- A neighborhood is for houses and children, it is not a farm. I don't want to hear chickens and smell them. At what point does this stop? Mini ponies? Goats? If people want to keep livestock they can live on an acreage outside of the city.
- Hard to enforce proper handling, environment, etc.
- If I wanted to live by a farm I would have do so ... livestock, no matter what, has no place in the city due to density
- This will turn backyards into farms, not very appealing if they're your neighbours.
- Livestock can be a nuisance when in close quarters. People who choose to live in the city are also choosing a lifestyle that doesn't include proximity to farm animals. Also, it's already had enough for by law to deal with all the nuisance complaints from permitted animals - this would just add more to their work
- I think it would become a tricky situation to manage between neighbors.
- The presence of coyotes and Bobcats
- A metropolis is not a farm yard. Everyone wants to eat an organic egg until their hen dies of winter cold exposure. This is ridiculous.
- Wild life in the city will definitely happen, not smart when kids are outside until 9pm or later
- Noise and smell issues will effect the larger communities apart from neighbours.
- There was a rooster a long way from my home when chickens were allowed before but I could drill here it. If people want livestock I believe the appropriate place for that is not in a city with small yards and close neighbours.



- I don't wanna see people keeping chickens to use them for eggs. If they were kept as a pet then my answer would be yes
- The smell of chickens and pigs is atrocious. I've lived on a farm... No thank you. Move to a farm if you want farm animals in your yard.
- People are not responsible with their domestic animal
- Am allergic
- Increase in coyote activity near residential areas that could be a problem for household pets.
- We don't need caged animals in the City
- Until other animals are under control with current bylaws - ie. dogs and cats at large and nuisances - I don't think we should be added another animal that the city has to monitor and "police"
- I am in support as long as they are responsible owners, however I would have serious concerns with people thinking it's a great idea and not really understanding the effort it takes to take proper care of these animals.
- The smell is enough, if I wanted smelly animals next door, I'll move to the country.
- I do not agree with these types of animals being in the city as the population is too dense. If someone wants to own them they need to be in an area where neighbors are further apart.
- I don't think hens are needed in the city...
- Hens and other livestock belong in rural areas period. This idea is totally ridiculous!
- Caring for any animal is a large responsibility and has no place in a City setting. The noise, smell and disruption will only cause further negative interactions among complaint and defendant.
- Don't belong in the city
- Farm animals belong on a farm.
- Livestock should not be permitted in residential communities. Dog and cats cohabitate with people in residential homes. Other livestock (e.g., poultry, animals with hooves, etc.) do not.
- Livestock in city limits can be a true nuisance especially with noise issues and uncleanliness by the owners NOT keeping livestock pens/feces kept clean
- There would be offensive odour from livestock/poultry being raised within city limits.
- Allows for too many negative interactions with neighbours.
- Urban hens can stream zoonotic disease and don't belong in an urban environment (for the hen or people's sake)
- I don't want hens in my neighbourhood, the noise, bird poop - it would be a nuisance. I also don't approval of bees unless someone's yard is large enough and contained from neighbours. Inconsiderate neighbours with Bees in too small of yard and too close of proximity to other's with no regard for young children and pets create a very unliveable yard. We all pay taxes and it isn't fair for one person to create a nuisance. Regarding the Pigeon question, no one should be owning those birds!
- They are agricultural and should be kept on acreages or farms. They are noisy and can be quite malodorous.
- Chickens and other livestock draw coyotes



- I don't like urban farms.... we live in a city and not on a farm
- I don't believe livestock should be in a residential area and to have "support from adjacent neighbours" could put neighbours against each other causing a negative impact with all neighbours. I live in a neighbourhood that is quite dense and zero property line so there's not a lot of space between houses -- I don't want to hear roosters at the crack of dawn.
- Living with livestock in close quarters leads to disease transmission. And almost no one has a yard large enough to properly support even a single hen without turning it into a dirt wasteland.
- Don't agree with farm animals in a city setting.
- Hens are dirty, I don't support any livestock being kept within the city limits, if you want chickens, buy a farm!
- Noise issues
- I do not support the noise or smell of chickens or other livestock in the city
- Just brings rodents into the population as a result
- This would encourage mice and some people are pretty lax about keeping these areas clean. Possibility of disease to neighbours
- "Give them an inch and they will take a mile"
- It would get out of hand"
- City is not the place for farm animals
- Roosters are loud
- Improperly cared for livestock are a huge risk when urbanising them. They are a large nuisance in noise pollution too.
- Livestock and other farm animals do not belong in residential communities
- Why would I want a farmyard located in my neighbourhood? It's a ridiculous idea.
- Livestock of any type should not be allowed in the city and I definitely don't want to have them next door! If I wanted a farm odor I would live on one!
- Very messy. Encourages wildlife such as coyotes into the area
- I have been around chickens & unless scrupulously maintained they smell. They are also noisy. Bees are a necessary part of the ecosystem but I do not want hives near me
- I've lived in a small town do you know how loud and obnoxious they are? Also their poop really stinks. On hot days like these I might not be able to use my back yard because of the smell
- I fear that hens will be acquired by folks who haven't got a clue. This will increase the likelihood of abuse and mistreatment.
- Smell and noise from the neighbour. Don't want to hear roosters in the early hours.
- Chickens smell and carry disease
- Any and ALL farm animals should be prohibited within city boundaries
- I said "no" above but it should really be "maybe". It depends on the purpose of the "livestock". If it's just a reclassification in order to allow non-traditional pet animals such as pot-bellied pigs or domestic ducks, for example, to reside within city limits in a loving home, I'm all for it. However, if the



"livestock" animals are intended to be slaughtered for human (or animal) consumption, then I most vehemently disagree with this bylaw amendment.

- Should not be allowed, noisy and smell.
- Farm animals should not be allowed in an urban setting
- There is no way to contain the smell and noise of livestock animals. As the odor can really dampen any outdoor activities in other neighborhoods backyards. As the noise as well animals are animals and make noises throughout the day and night.
- For goodness sakes, quit this nonsense in a large city like Calgary with very small yards. No chickens . Stop this insanity.
- Livestock does not belong in a fully urban environment. They need space and disposal of manure and bedding. Hens are borderline in urban spaces and should be carefully evaluated for the health of the birds and the community. Strict permitting is needed.
- It still seems unrealistic to be able to provide clean environment for for hens
- I would like to see a process for approving chicken first, and then potentially add other livestock after a period of time to evaluate the successes and problems of keeping chicken. One consideration that is not mentioned is the potential for disease transmission (e.g. Newcastle Disease, Avian Influenza) that can potentially be economically devastating for commercial producers. It is also completely unclear what the requirements are for enforcing these bylaws, what additional resources (e.g. additional bylaw officers, vehicles) would be needed, and how this would be financed. I would also like to see the implementation for mandatory prophylactic treatments (e.g. mandatory vaccination for Newcastle Disease) and a plan that defines responsibilities and mitigates the risk in cases of an outbreak.
- If you want a farm, go and buy one. Does not belong in the city
- How do you effectively enforce who can & cannot have these animals? There are those that would break the rules
- Explain the benefit of this. I see none listed above.
- I do not like the idea of urban livestock
- I do not live in the country for a reason and do not feel I should be subjected to someone else's desire for country critters
- There is no good case to be made for livestock to be permitted in the city.
- You want to take away my pitbull but bring in nasty birds? NO chickens
- It will not play out as planned i see livestock at large in the city
- There's no way the noise factor alone can be controlled and no damn way I want to be woken up by a friggen hen. Dogs barking excessively are bad enough, and I own a dog. If ppl want a farm lifestyle, they should move to a farm.
- Hens/chickens only belong on a rural facility.
- I do not agree that the city is a healthy environment for livestock
- Other livestock should be on acreages, not on a city lot.
- No livestock within city limits



- This initiative seems counter productive to the City's goal of increasing the current living capacity of existing Calgary neighbourhoods in order to support population growth in the City. With increasing the amount of residences in an area this inherently will reduce that amount of useable green space to support livestock. Example is infills - the backyard sizes have decreased with a closer proximity to neighbours and permitting livestock in these scenarios would be irresponsible - the usable area would be too limited to support livestock and it would most definitely be more than just the immediately adjacent neighbours impacted by sounds and smells. It is not advisable in inner city; however, perhaps could work as an exception in unique scenarios in outlying neighbourhoods.
- Would attract more Varmin into the city. Chickens are not clean at all
- Dogs, cats and other household pets already create challenges in neighbourhoods. It is not necessary to create more by adding other livestock into the mix.
- No farm animals should be kept within city limits. Irresponsible owners could release the animals, and it will turn into more feralschickens roaming, like the domestic rabbit situation releases in the neighborhoods, within the city. People not ckeeping the conditions of the livestock clean. I do not want the smells or the fecal matter left over. Our winters are too cold,as it and now it will be the city or spca to take in abandoned farm animals. No thanks, properties are already too close together, it is just going to cause problems, i do not want roosters crowing in the morning, and chickens fluttering all over, farm animals should only be kept outside city limits. FIRM NO. It is just asking for trouble. Buy your flipping eggs in the grocery store
- Livestock should not be allowed inner city. With proper space outside of inner city i think is acceptable.
- Would open Citizens up for Animal to Human cross contaminating. Hoof and Mouth disease can be transferred from Animal to Human. A very limited amount of Chickens okay, even a Duck or 2 but Farm animals belong on Farms. Even Goats/Sheep/Llamas have no place in Residencial areas.
- No livestock in urban neighbourhoods
- My neighbor believes cats should freely roam, and their dogs bark at all hours. Can't imagine what I would have to deal with if they owned hens and other livestock. For 18 years I've tried to get them to be responsible, and they don't care. Nor does the City, as they have never been fined for this. If the City cannot enforce current bylaws like this for cats and dogs why is it considering adding hens and livestock to the picture. "Being willing to testify in court against your neighbor" does not solve the immediate problem of cat shit in my veggie patch and my kids not being able to get a full night's sleep because of barking dogs.
- Do not want live stock in calgary community.
- We've chose to live in a city/urban area NOT the country or a farm.
- Do not want the noises
- Unless there quiet or kept away from neighbors
- I prefer not to have hens or livestock next door to me.
- This is the city not rural. The smell alone is enough to deny. If you want to keep "farm animals" , buy in rural Alberta



- I don't believe all people will necessarily be responsible owners even if they have initial good intentions and enthusiasm. The rules would have to be very strict and I can see enforcement would be difficult. There are also animal welfare issues I would be concerned about. I can see many people starting this hobby and tiring of it just like with other activities.
- People do not properly care for cats and dogs livestock is for rural areas
- I don't want to noise and smell of livestock in my neighborhood.
- Livestock should not be kept in urban areas no exceptions.
- I wouldn't want chickens next door. Pets stay inside most of the time. Chickens do not so there would be constant noise. I'm also worried about smell if people do not clean up after them on a consistent manner.
- I support urban hens completely. However without knowing what other types of livestock you are considering allowing I can't support that part.
- Seems the city has enough problem keeping dog and cat bylaws fair
- This includes no urban hens - urban environments are not compatible with livestock operations.
- Calgary is no place for livestock.
- "What happens if a person gets "approval" and then their adjacent neighbours move (rental or sale of neighbouring property)? New owners of the adjacent property should not be burdened with the "approval" given by previous owners.
- Also what about rental properties? In the case where a rental property is adjacent to the requesting house, the owner of the neighbouring house should be asked for approval, not the tenants. Tenants should not be able to "approve" livestock nextdoor as they have no long term interest in the property and might only be there for a few months."
- Any livestock should not be allowed at a residence inside city limits
- I don't want to hear or smell these types of animals in an urban setting they should be in a more rural setting
- How about communal hen farms & such in the country similar to community gardens idea. But no I don't want to wake to sounds & smells of hens & pigs in my neighbourhood. Dirty dog runs are bad enough especially in summer heat when you want to be in the yard.
- I would support it in theory, however I would hate for the same neighbors that currently don't take care of their property, now also were allowed livestock.
- The last thing I want is cackling hens and / or a crowing rooster / stinky domestic animals next door to my yard. They belong on a FARM. The only animals I want in my backyard are natural critters that enjoy my back yard. ALSO...living close to Nose Hill and having chickens in the neighbours yard may attract dangerous critters (read: "coyotes and bobcats") in for a quick "snack"...
- goes too far
- Hens in a cage have no effect on neighbours, so neighbour approval is problematic and needs to be stricken
- The city already charges too much for dog licensing. Most people are barely making it by and you want to implement more things that will charge calgarians too much money
- I am not In favor of livestock animals within urban areas



- I do not want chickens, hens or any other livestock living next door to me. Those animals do not belong in the city.
- I do not believe we need livestock in the city.
- no place for these animals in a city
- Hens in Calgary are not required.
- Livestock belong in farms. Property values of neighbors would likely decrease due to perception. There is potential for a lot of disturbance to neighbors.
- Difficult and expensive to monitor and ensure a sanitary, safe (avian flu) environment that does not smell, so that neighbors are not affected. This would result in diminished enjoyment of the neighbors yard.
- Nuisance noise and odor, vermin attracted to the area by feed
- I do not feel that there is enough separation in the yards in Calgary to have hens or other livestock on them. Our neighbor had chickens/hens and they were all over the place.
- I am a light sleeper and would not appreciate the additional noise implication.
- Few if any chicken coops can be kept to a level of stench acceptable in our tight residential area. Leave farming to lots greater than 1 acre.
- The noise and smell
- I don't think a city is any place for livestock
- I am not living next door to clucking, smells, etc. Are you kidding me? I know that neighbours don't have much say in what a person does, so that does not cut it. If people want livestock, they can live in the country. No bees allowed in the city too (NO bees, if they leave their hives and go to the neighbours, that would be horrible, and it happens, I know, from people who keep bees and their bees swarmed their neighbours yard)
- To much risk to go wrong, not enough enforcement as is. Is a nuisance to the neighbourhood for one person to have fresh eggs
- I dont want to have a neighbour with chickens/livestock. There would need to be rules regarding space.
- Those are farm animals who have no place within the city limits (for ANY reason).
- If you want livestock, move out of the city
- I do not want hens or other livestock, and their unique needs, to be allowed in the city. That is what rural Alberta is for. Ask the hens and other livestock what they prefer - I'm pretty sure it isn't living in the city.
- The need to get approval from neighbours is excessive and will prevent most people from being allowed this option. I support a bylaw that allows them as long as safety of animals is followed
- How would you enforce this - logistically ridiculous - lets hire another 100 city staff to keep up with these ideas. Have you heard there's a pandemic and people are without employment?
- Most people can't keep their yard clean put livestock in there it would be a mess
- we do not live on a farm
- While I am somewhat for the idea of livestock in residential areas I think people will try to wiggle their way through the system so they can have any sort of livestock animal they want. If someone wants



to have chickens then why can't another person have goats, sheep, pigs or mini horses? It could all end up causing issues in the future

- Considering our current pandemic where the virus moved to humans from animals, I am strongly opposed to any loosening of regulations regarding livestock/non-pet animals in a dense urban environment.
 - no hens or chickens. they are noisy and they smell.
 - I support people having hens if they want, anything other than that is not ok. Its not fair to expect people to be ok with someone deciding to have a goat farm next to them. there is a reason its called LIVESTOCK and not pets.
 - Chickens are not needed in a city of this size.
 - "There are too many people who have domestic animals that do not exhibit responsible behavior. Chickens and other livestock along with their waste, smell, noises, etc, do not belong within city limits. It is irresponsible of the city to even pursue this, especially with the potential of disease spread such that these animals could cause.
-
- Also, someone in my neighborhood has pigeons and they leave a horrific mess on our roofs, bins, outside furniture, etc. Why is this even allowed in the city?"
 - Don't belong in the city.
 - Farmyard animals are just that, farm animals. Hens can be messy, noisy, and it opens the door for people to apply for other animals
 - I would not want someone with hens against my fence with dogs. If allowed would have to consider what is neighbors have dogs. This is an accident waiting to happen, or torments the dogs
 - Difficult to monitor and enforce.
 - As a farm raised human I do not believe that most of the people in this city can provide a clean quality of life for livestock. Once you add in vet bills and feed - it is going to be a mess.
 - no need and would be hard to police. Potential for health risks. It would be 'like opening a can of proverbial worms'!
 - Livestock should not be on small properties.
 - I like the bylaw as is.
 - Chickens are noisy and dirty and don't belong in the city.
 - We have enough problem with cats and dogs..
 - I do t want livestock in my neighborhood
 - noise, smell, and other problems are difficult to contain or reconcile in an urban residential environment.
 - Last thing i need is the stench of an unkept animal. I already have to deal with the stench of pot, i don't need to listen to chickens, next we'll be keeping pigs, cows and maybe a horse or two. These are "farm" animals, we live too close together, not good for humans or animals.
 - This is a city, not a barnyard. Farm animals belong on a farm, not running down residential streets.



- Few have sufficient animal husbandry education
- Allowing other livestock such as pigs or "micro pigs" (there's no such thing) be allowed in the city could increase cases of animal homelessness. People buy these pigs thinking they stay the size of a baby (which they don't) and when they grow up and become a huge 200lb+ pig they are given up, sold for meat or dumped. This is not fair to an animal that has the intellectual capacity of a 4 year old human child. Its also not fair to the animal rescue groups that will ultimately take the burden of caring for these animals for the rest of their lives.
- I don't believe farm animals belong in the city.
- This is not something that would work in the city and would really be annoying if it was my neighbour.
- seems like you are making more work and therefore increasing taxes on this
- I don't want to be woken up at sunrise by a rooster crowing
- Feral rabbits and cats as well as hares already attract Bobcats and Coyotes we should not add in chickens.
- Farm is for farm animals! Houses are too darned close together now to allow for clucking, squealing, etc amongst the already annoying incessant barking and growling. Are we kidding here?
- No place for livestock in the city!! My sister had chickens in the house beside her and it stunk and was noisy!
- The potential for nuisance, people not following the rules as well as the cost of enforcement makes it not worthwhile. If you want livestock, live in the country, there's tons of rural properties available.
- How do we ensure proper setups without wasting tax dollars on enforcement.
- No thanks. I don't want to hear them, or smell them near my home. Nope nope nope. People will not take care of them properly in the city. No way!
- Livestock stinks. Some people can't even be bothered to keep their dog runs clean. I can't imagine if livestock being allowed in an urban setting wouldn't cause even more outrage
- This is a city and agricultural animals belong outside urban areas. It's cleaner, and more considerate to neighbours. What happens if one neighbor approves but then moves? New person ends up living next to farm animals. Also extra expense to tax payers to check on reported unhealthy living conditions.
- "People do not look after their yards half the time and now let's add hens. I do
- Not want the smell, the look of the yard and the noise. Move to a farm if you want chickens."
- Just think at 25+ C keeping a chicken coop in the city, the stench and/or the stench of the chemicals who are used to cover the original chicken stench. If people want to keep a pair of decorative miniature chicken as family pets should be OK- but not as food source.
- Living conditions are too close in the city leading to problems with noise and maintenance (smell)
- Calgary is urban, hens deserve farm area.
- Noise and smell would bother surrounding neighbors.
- Hens will attracts more wildlife such as skunk, coyote and fox therefore more complains and phone calls to report the guy next door.
- Livestock are smelly and have no place in an urban environment.



- too noisy - already have issues with noisy dogs.
- "Support from adjacent neighbours" is useless. Either something is allowed or it's not. My neighbour doesn't need my support to run multiple noisy smelly diesel trucks and generators on his property, which is more of a nuisance than hens.
- I would personally love to have chickens but I know that many people would not take care of the animals properly and it would be difficult to enforce properly. I vote no because I am concerned about the animal welfare and the cleanliness required to keep livestock properly.
- Speak with breeders and trainers who are on the front lines first.
- Farm animals have no place in city limits.
- While I support the idea of self-sufficiency and food security, unfortunately few people would actually take care of the animals/poultry properly. The last thing I want is to live beside a chicken coop.
- don't want chickens in city limits....
- Allowing hens and other livestock is likely to be very problematic and given ineffectual enforcement of other bylaws do not expect any bylaws and their enforcement - or lack thereof - to adequately address the issues.
- I do not agree with livestock in the city. That should be kept to rural property I think the city has enough trouble enforcing the bylaws we already have
- Livestock tend to create a lot of noise and generate a lot of waste. I think allowing livestock would devalue property values and it would be difficult to enforce and ensure owners are taking proper steps to mitigate issues with noise and waste.
- I already have homing pigeons in the neighborhood and they are annoying
- These animals have no place in the city and should only be on farms. People are naturally not responsible and it will create a ton of mess, noise and other issues including possible disease.
- The city is not a place for agriculture. Our bylaw officers cannot keep up with the issues at hand, let alone deal with animal complaints. For every new bylaw passed, Council should remove 2 old, ineffective bylaws.
- People will not properly house these animals or clean up after them. It will be more of a problem than anything.
- This is a city of 1 MM+ people, not a farm... please use some common sense - not everything needs to have a green socialist agenda
- Allowing for livestock or hens would lead me to believe that slaughter would soon happen. I wouldn't want to live next door to someone slaughtering animals.
- I live inner city, I would be concerned with smell, noise, increase in coyote/bobcats to area.
- Livestock doesn't belong in the city. Move to the country if you want hens and other livestock.
- I see no need for urban hens, and wouldn't be happy if either of my neighbours got them.
- Houses are too close together and would impede on neighbors rights to enjoy their properties based on smells and sounds coming from livestock. There is enough dog owners that leave their dogs barking for hours as it is.



- Usually people with animals have the opinion that everyone else also needs to like their animals, no matter how loud they are or how much they stink. This isn't the case though. Other peoples animals are mostly annoying.
- NO livestock of any kind should be allowed within the city limits.
- Noise
- We don't have enough by-law enforcement for the currently allowable pets without adding a new species
- Our homes and yards are too small and too close together. The smell, noise, dirty water run off and flies would be overwhelming because it's unlikely that the average person would properly clean up after these animals everyday.
- There needs to be a limit on what is allowed in an urban environment. If you want to raise hens there are millions of acres of land in Alberta where you can do so without causing an annoyance to neighbours.
- Livestock typically have a smell and are loud. They cannot be trained like a dog and future neighbours would have no say in regards to if their personal outdoor area smelled terrible due to livestock feces.
- Livestock don't belong in a city. There is rarely enough room for them and the noise /odor produced could lower property value of neighbors. It could also lure predators into the community which endangers pets. I would not want livestock in my community and certainly not close to my house.
- Neighbors should not have a say unless the birds/animals are a problem just like the owning of dogs or cats
- I don't want farm animals in my neighborhood. i don't want the noise or the feces.
- Who will clean up the mess when the owner moves on...what about rental homes. No we don't need chicken coops in the city.
- I would prefer that people raising hens/livestock did this on rural properties that are not as close to their neighbours.
- City is too crowded environment to keep livestock. There always be unhappy neighbours filing complaints. Right now Calgary is unable to keep roaming cat owners or barking dogs owners in check, no way they will manage additional complaints about livestock.
- I don't believe that any livestock larger than a hen would have sufficient enough space to comfortably live at most urban homes.
- Urban hens are a noisy nuisance, and are dirty
- If we're talking about a single animal, then I could support that. However the idea of having a neighbour who has multiple animals makes me wonder about the sounds, odors and mess of livestock.
- There is already a wide variety of animals that can become "pets" adding traditional livestock such as hens, pigs will be a disaster potentially pitting neighbours against each other.
- Rural livestock have no place in an urban environment. Notwithstanding the stress of city pollution (air and noise) on the animals, the noise and smells neighbors would be subjected to is not acceptable....not to mention the drop in nearby house values.



- livestock should be kept on large open properties, not in the confined spaces of a community backyard, the smell and upkeep can be neglected and put neighbours in a less than friendly scenarios
- The noise/smell is not acceptable in most cases. It would be too expensive for the city to monitor trouble cases.
- Excess noise for neighbours
- People don't follow regulations and problems will increase.
- They belong on farms, not backyards. The noise and stench would be awful.
- They attract mice
- Yards in the city are far too small and close together. This would cause a lot of nuisance (sound and smell) to neighbors.
- Livestock in urban yards does not have a positive impact. It will create more tension and issues between neighbors.
- This is not a good idea. The amount of disease that can come from livestock including chickens is tremendous. How will the city ensure that outbreaks do not happen? I am pretty sure this is why previous councils have not explored it. If you want chickens get a farm.
- The feet used for hens can attract pests and rodents. We do not need more rodents in the city.
- I am extremely sensitive to smells and to odd sounds, both of define livestock activities. I worked and visited farms for many years so appreciate what livestock can be like. If people wish to raise livestock, move them to rural property.
- Noise - early crowing of cocks
- There is great potential for abuse. People hardly obey bylaws from my personal experience. My neighbour's dog poops on my lawn and has on one occasion run into my house.
- No Livestock in the city limits, If you need this type of support, move to a farm.
- No, we have enough irresponsible pet owners in the city
- Impact can go beyond adjacent neighbors. Onus should not be on neighbors to complain.
- not needed
- Unnecessary and fraught with noise and smell issues.
- Salmonella is endemic in poultry species and this increases the possibility of food-borne illness. There are also numerous reports from other jurisdictions that hens are abandoned at animal shelters once their ability to lay eggs has passed. Many people don't realize that hens have a longer lifespan than the time they're able to lay eggs.
- Noise issues. 'Support from adjacent neighbours is likely not enough distance and other neighbours will be impacted.
- Calgary properties are very close together. The smell and noise of livestock could impact quality of life for a neighbouring home.
- city lots are too close. I like my neighbours but I don't appreciate backyard chickens. At. All. Why start adding to a list of things that cause friction in a neighbourhood? The needs of hens??
- I'm concerned about fire but otherwise open to the idea.



- I don't support farm animals in residential areas.
- Hens and livestock in the city are an unnecessary burden. They create noise and smells unwanted by everyone blocks around. The cost of taking and enforcing the thousands of complaints that result from this could be better spent elsewhere.
- I wouldn't want to live beside a neighbour with a bunch of farm animals in their back yard. The smell alone.
- I don't trust people to have hens responsibly - coops may be unsightly, the chickens will stink, etc.
- I do not approve of urban livestock. I feel that it proves itself to be more of a nuisance to the surrounding community than it is a benefit to the urban farmer.
- If you want livestock, move to the country. Increased density is already causing issues by increasing residents proximity to negative environments (fire spread rates, fire pits, noise...). Now adding livestock?! Noise, smells, negligent owners, it's just NOT necessary in a City or suburban environment. Focus on getting people to take care of the property they already have before making our neighbourhoods into barns.
- This is what rural properties/farms are for.
- There is no place in a city for this type of animals. It would be noisy and smelly.
- Chickens are noisy, covered in salmonella, and smell.
- Chickens are gross
- Absolutely not. People choose to live in a large city for city amenities not livestock.
- "Too much noise
- And smell"
- It would be bias to support this without a full investigation and all parties viewpoint.
- Farms, ranching and their lands are important and critical. Taking the livestock care and production out of the hands of professionals and putting it into recreational the hands opens the door to animal cruelty through mismanagement and ignorance.
- I would agree with this bylaw amendment if I knew 100% the actual breed of the dog was kept from the chief officer until after the decision was made. I think this is the only way to create a true unbiased opinion in these decisions because the chief officer will only be focusing on the actual situation at hand, and not the dog breed.
- chickens are not meant for large city living, if anything create a small community farm for all in a quiet community
- Livestock need larger space beyond a urban life
- -properties are too small and smells, noise would be a problem. Most neighbours do not want the messes or coops in view of their own backyards do tend to put their 'junk' or 'messes' between homes which impedes the neighbour's ability for 'clean' views.
- Why should their be hens?
- Prefer not to have chickens in the city
- If a beautiful dog like a pit Bull is a nuisance imagine what chickens or a hen would be like
- No livestock should be allowed



- I believe there is not adequate enough space in the city for the size of cage livestock would need to comfortably live. There should be enough room for free range as well as a caged coop area. I believe the smell and sound from livestock does not belong in the city and that is why they are farm animals.
- I would not support this amendment as lot size in Calgary does not allow for adequate noise mitigation, and I have seen other cities that have allowed backyard chickens and now have feral chicken problems
- I'm not sure of the communal benefits of hens in the community.
- While I like the idea of urban hens there would be the same issues that there currently are with irresponsible owners of dogs and cats
- Too many people irresponsible. Will only create problems
- If you want livestock, live in the country. The city is no place for livestock
- The noise and smell of chickens cannot be contained to only the owners property. Neighbors may see it as a nuisance
- I don't care
- Too loud
- "Livestock belongs on a farm where people know how to care for them. As well as the fact that they care disease and parasites.
- As well as the smell and noise can be very offensive"
- Every bully breed I know is amazing and friendly. Majority dog friendly as well.
- Many people work shift work and hens would be noisy.
- Livestock is not meant to live in the city.
- noisy
- Livestock is not appropriate for the city. The noise and smell will easily get out of hand.
- Farm animals aren't appropriate for in the city.
- Chickens are not good for night workers
- Livestock do not belong in the city.
- Not everyone will take care of animals. They stink their noise...go buy an acreage.
- Livestock are for farms not for city living
- By law officers are already involved in all of initiatives and quite frankly won't have the time to visit each incident in a timely manner. This will cause more escalating issues and could possibly involve police calls.
- There was a hen running loose on the streets in my community this week. I could foresee it as being more of an issue in the future
- There is already an overload of work on our Bylaw officers. This would add another layer.
- Farm animals belong on farms. Chickens can be very noisy. Not fair on the neighbours.
- I don't believe that hens should be kept in the city, the city does not provide the appropriate environment for such animals.



- Unless they are kept indoors, I would not support having livestock in anyone's yard. It can become a potential health problem if the pen is not kept clean and the noise could be very disturbing for neighbours. There's not enough room in Calgary, houses are built way too close.
- People barely clean up after dogs and cats, livestock would be smelly, more diseases, the noise.
- I do not support livestock in an urban area. Chicken feces are plentiful, gross and smelly. I would not support this in any way, shape or form.
- Opens up the potential for human health issues. City lots are not serviced to accommodate livestock.
- Some people will not enjoy the noise or foul smell that also comes with farm animals
- I think it opens to many issues.
- "Urban areas are not for chickens and such"
- "Want a chicken, move to the country"
- Livestock would stink up the city I think
- I don't believe in breeding livestock or any animal for any human use.
- I would not want to live next door to someone with a chicken coop.
- In people's yards? No, I don't need added noise of hens along with the magpies, prairie falcons, chickadees, crows, ravens, Blue Jays, grey jays, etc..
- Livestock belongs on farms, not in the city. Move to a farm if you must have livestock. In addition the smell can be horrendous.
- Livestock doesn't belong in urban areas
- You want to get rid of a beautiful breed like Pitbulls, but allow livestock in people's backyards?
- I am totally opposed to urban livestock. Our forefathers thought this one out and they were not stupid. If people want to keep livestock, go live in a rural environment
- So much missing information. What is included in the term "livestock" and just how are "suitable living conditions" defined? I'm having difficulty imagining a typical urban property as having the space to provide suitable living conditions. Don't get me wrong because I'd love to have a pet alpaca but my rational self says I need to move to the country to do it. And what the heck does "community benefit" even mean in this context?
- More animals will be surrendered when people get tired of them.
- Noise and attracting mice and other wild animals
- I don't want my neighbours having a backyard farm. It is already bad enough that my alley neighbours have rescue dogs that they clearly don't take care of well.
- City no place for farm animals
- Dislike the idea of urban hens.
- They belong on a farm, not in the city.
- Nuisances from noise would be much more prevalent. Unless it was only outskirts of towns/large lots or an appropriate indoor space for keeping them.
- Hens belong outside the city on a farm.



- In general, livestock require living conditions that cannot be provided in an urban environment and would inevitably result in conflicts with neighbours.
- Noise and health and smell
- We r not a God damn farm city. Keep livestock and hen's on the farm. You are asking for coyotes and wild cats to gone into the city. DUH!!!! They will kill the stupid chickens. They stink...their feces carries disease. Wake up!!!! HOW STUPID!!!!
- There is not enough space in a Calgary home to sufficiently house live stock.
- You want live stock live outside the City. That why we have rural areas.
- I'm a very firm believer, that farm animals should stay on a farm to avoid them becoming a nuisance to humans and avoid the stress these animals should not be subjected to.
- This is difficult. I would love my own chickens but I know so many people would take advantage of it. In my neighborhood I would be concerned it would attract wildlife that could put my dog as risk.
- Livestock do not belong in city
- I come from a farm where we had laying hens and they are their pens are dirty and smell terrible. This is fine when they are on a farm but not in a city where people live in close proximity. Unfortunately not everyone can keep their homes and yards clean as it is and I think it would be an absolute disaster to bring hens into the mix- NOT A GOOD IDEA.
- No livestock in the city. They make a mess and are loud
- Adjacent neighbour support seems unreasonable if other criteria are met
- I don't feel your neighbors should have any say.
- Unless the proper lot size is provided I don't believe livestock should be in suburban communities.
- Noise and smell
- Houses generally to close together. So many people have allergies to hay And wood chips. Some barely take care of regular cat and dog don't need chickens and rosters too
- I find they are more suited for country lifestyle
- Most city people have no concept of what it takes to raise any form of livestock including hens. I believe it would just lead to mass neglect. Most dogs and cats are not looked after according to bylaws - what makes you think animals requiring more intelligent care would be a good idea?
- Livestock comes with noise and smell pollution. Plus they might carry pest. They can attract rodents and wildlife as foodsource for these
- Livestock does not belong in a city. Too stressful.
- Bylaw enforcement is complaint driven. As long as this remains our method, it will be adversarial between neighbours. We need less of that.
- Make it a permit as well, If they want Hens or other livestock I'd prefer if they jumped through hoops and had to get a permit, not everyone should be able to keep livestock
- Issue with noise.
- "Move out of city limits if you want a farm.
- If we all have self sustainability even in the city why have shops? why buy local? The agriculture all around Calgary would plummet astronomically if everyone (and their hen) weren't buying."



- People can hardly keep things clean without livestock. Let's keep livestock to farms and rural areas.
- I don't want to deal with a neighbor living next door with a smelly noisy chicken coop. They want one they can move to an acreage.
- Animals belong in farms, not cities.
- May become a noisy and smelly problem
- I believe these types of animals should not be allowed in the City.
- Hens do not belong in homes.
- City living means generally living in close proximity. a crowing rooster or squeaking hens can be very noisy and disturbing. Never mind the smell if not properly cared for. Livestock should be limited to acreages , farms, or people with large lots.
- Chickens bring vermin
- Proper training for owners
- Don't want livestock in neighborhoods
- This does not define what suitable living conditions are. And the term positive impact/community benefit is vague. The idea of obtaining support from adjacent neighbors is also questionable; would there be a form made?
- Dogs are not dangerous because of their breed. Some of the nicest dogs I have met are pit bulls. They are dangerous because of the way they are trained/their environment and experiences.
- Livestock needs to be on an acreage or farm not a back yard.
- Why should people be allowed to have hens in their yard/house... but some people can't even let their pitbull or "aggressive" dog not be muzzled or be in an off leash park?
- I don't trust humans to take care of animals they belong on a farm or acreage.
- Live in the country if you want livestock.
- Pit bulls are no more dangerous than other breeds. Pit bulls are not born aggressive, they're taught to be. Doberman's, Shepard's, Rottweilers, etc. If you wanna ban a breed, make sure you ban all them.
- Bird flu.....
- Our city always stood behind responsible pet owner ship if any breed specific bylaw I would sell my house and move away as I would refuse to live in a city that thinks that discrimination is acceptable as long as it is against something that has no means to defend it's self
- Risk of disease due to close human/livestock interaction, serious potential for limited alternatives to enforce problems arising from feces, urine, pest insects, etc.
- Absolutely no to labelling Pitbulls as bully breeds or as high risk. I do NOT agree with all the bylaw changes at all.
- Do not support backyard livestock
- I feel it would attract predators such as coyotes
- Livestock Do not belong In any city. Most new communities barely have 4 feet between them. Hard NO



- There are enough dangerous animals in the city partially as a result of additional land required for these animals. They contribute to other unpleasant issues when housed in restricted areas and may encourage other predatory animals residing or coming further into the city putting the communities at further risk.
- Yards are too small in the city and houses are far too close to allow any livestock. Smell and noise cannot be regulated. It should not be up to neighbours to disallow an application by voicing an opinion in reference to a sign.
- chickens are delicious, but filthy. They attract mice and other vermin.
- nobody wants to live next to chickens
- To many lazy people that wouldn't properly maintain the clean up of these animals
- City yards are not adequate size for farm animals.
- I like everything except for needing a community benefit
- Our city backyards are not big enough to house these types of animals. Larger lot sizes might be okay but new communities are not great just because outdoor space is limited.
- Don't let people have chickens, you will have more noise complaints then you can handle and those [removed] stink when not taken care of and let's be honest half the Calgarians can't clean up their dog shit let alone their chicken shit
- It would be disruptive to neighbours and the animals themselves to be kept in a strange urban setting
- Health concerns over keeping the hens and to avoid people selling the eggs of livestock.
- I dont believe that chickens can be kept in residential areas while keeping neighbors happy. They are not a city friendly animal.
- I don't want hens in Calgary neighborhoods
- Go [removed] yourself [removed]
- Chickens smell.
- The are loud and smelly
- Not a fan
- Livestock belong on a farm and not within the city limits
- It's too dangerous for the animals, too easy in an urban environment for someone to sneak into a yard and harm and/or steal the livestock, etc. The safety of the animals must be the top priority in this particular matter.
- If taken care of, someone owning birds does not offend me.
- It is unnecessary to have livestock in an urban centre. Perhaps having parameters based on lot size.
- farm animals have no place in the city. We have small yards. People can't keep yards, alleys, etc free from dog mess, how can you expect them to clean up properly after farm animals.
- My neighbours run a [removed] sawmill and wood-burning facility in their backyard in the SE and ByLaw has done nothing about. Therefore, I refuse to get permission from adjacent neighbours because they are [removed]s.



- Hens are not pets. They are animals that deserve a proper home where they won't be killed for food or mistreated for eggs
 - If you want to raise livestock move to a farm. I don't want chickens and other livestock living in the city.
 - There would be issues with renters & landlords which are likely to outweigh potential positives. Another challenge would be enforcing animal welfare standards & monitoring for transmission of disease. Livestock husbandry requires careful sanitation.
 - Putting this on a neighbour to decline a request will cause future issues between neighbours.
 - I don't want to listen to hens or livestock in the city. Outskirts where the properties are bigger for sure. I don't hear them over there.
 - Livestock should be kept out of city limits. There is more pollution in the city which could cause concerns for the animals. If they are producing something that could be consumed it could cause harm.
 - Farm animals belong on farms or land larger than 2 acres.
 - "Noise
 - Smell"
 - Farm animals are for farms, not for houses in urban areas. These animals require sufficient range to roam which is likely not possible in City limits.
 - Charge owners and not the breed. Bully breeds are not the issue, owners are. Do not discriminate against bully breeds
 - Hens are noisy & dirty.
 - I do not support the noise or smell of chickens in my neighborhood. Farm animals are for farms.
 - I don't support raising livestock in an urban environment.
 - Why do we need live stock running around? The city is a joke, not a farm
 - "Support from adjacent neighbours should be a very minor consideration. Considering how picky/offended many people get from minor disturbances, I feel like this would result in most permits being denied.
-
- I see nothing wrong with having a few chickens (for example) in a backyard as it is eco-friendly and would harm nobody."
 - I am concerned about animal welfare and humane handling for end of life. Where would these birds be slaughtered? Euthanized? I fear they would be set free to die a "natural" death which I do not consider humane for a bird that has spent its life in captivity. Additionally, I am already concerned about the bobcat population in my neighborhood and backyard chickens would only increase the bobcat population.
 - It's hard to enforce, and it risks the safety of more animals. Most animals need more space/resources than can be provided in the city.
 - Health reasons



- Some of those animals have a heavy smell.
- So many people In Calgary have chicken coops and other livestock. Being able to live off of your own food from your own garden and animals should absolutely be encouraged and allowed. Those who don't provide humane environments or are ill-equipped to handle them should be exceptions on a case by case basis. I'd take livestock over yappy, annoying dogs that don't stop barking any day.
- Noise
- -
- Domestic animals should be the only ones allowed in the city.
- Concerned about potential hygiene and cleanliness issues and noise pollution
- Hens and some other livestock are noisy and smelly, I think many houses in Calgary are too close together to feasibly allow ppl to have livestock in the city
- I dont think the city is a place for livestock. People will try and cram animals in places where they don't belong and aren't treated well. I doubt the city will have enough funding to manage this properly.
- Chickens will become a nuisance, their excrement leaches into the soil and can contaminate it, they smell and undoubtedly there will be cases of negligent owners who dont take care of the birds properly and have no regard for any nuisance the birds may cause for neighbours. Enforcement of the rules will cost more taxpayer dollars.
- What other livestock is being considered?
- I don't think livestock should be in the city residential areas.
- City housing is too close together and neighbours should t have to deal with the noise and stench of farm animals in the back yard.
- Nobody needs farm animals as pets
- Some areas of the city are already prone to the presence of other wildlife such as skunks, coyotes and bobcats and the addition of urban hens would likely increase the presence of these predators which are a hazard to pets and children.
- that brings coyotes and other wild life into the city
- "Why do
- We need hens in the city???"
- Other live stock require room and yard in the city are becoming smaller by the year.
- I have no opinion on this. Default option is no change.
- Animals should not be kept for slaughter within the city. They are more susceptible to stress, noise and other issues. It is not safe or necessary.
- I don't believe "farm" animals belong in a city setting!
- Hens are for rural areas.
- It would be uncontrollably noisy and unable to guarantee health and safety in a casual setting like that.
- If dogs and cats are already such a big problem, the last thing we need is love stock for people to manage. We already have large numbers of complaints about noise and cleanliness with normal



pets, livestock will bring this to an astronomical level. It also has a chance to attract predatory pests such as coyotes, foxes, weasels as well as larger wild predators such as large cats, wolves and bears. Livestock animals such as chickens can create massive unhygienic problems with waste and smells, as well as noise.

- The city is not a farm
- My concern would be noise, animal attacks etc.
- No livestock
- I don't believe Hens and other livestock would benefit the city as a whole they require more space and I would be concerned about the smell and noise. I can't imagine what the necessity would be for this. I don't agree st alk
- No live stock of any kind should be allowed in the city. The lots are too small and I don't believe any type of farm animal should be cooped up in a city.
- Hens aren't for cities. Hens are for the country. I'm sure it wouldn't smell great and it would look like we lived in a third world country. No way.
- Animals should be free
- Until coyotes can be better maintained in urban setting you are just providing live food.
- Depends on the kind of wildlife, but Noise complaints would skyrocket.
- Hens should not be kept in your backyard, loud and uncontrollable
- Keep it simple. Bylaw officers cannot enforce all this by themselves. Chickens and/or a Rooster make plenty of noise. Touchy subject.
- No livestock in city limits
- I live in a high rise
- Houses are almost stuck onto each other, I would never live next door to someone with chickens, that noise is for acreages not the lots we live in in Calgary
- Concern with noise, Smells untidy yards
- I feel like this could become very messy. Animals are meant to live in large areas not cooped up in the city
- this is an urban city not a farm yard
- No hens. Cats and dogs in the city. We're not farmers here. A lady in Shawnessy has geese. They are noisy.
- I believe you need to live in the country to keep chickens.
- It will be soon be abused. People won't clean up after their animals. I mean REALLY one of the vectors for virus transmissions is close proximity to pigs and ducks and potentially others. Why do we want to go back to living in medieval cities because of claims of needing a 'comfort' animal.
- They stink and make noise keep them on properly zoned farms
- I've never heard a good outcome from anyone's neighbor owning livestock
- Don't need livestock within city limits.
- Going to create too many neighbourhood issues and disputes. Smell, attraction of pests into coops, noise complaints



- Hens in town will promote the likely hood of [removed] Fights
- I lived on a farm, I hated the smell then and I hate it more now...and would not be ok being awoken on non work days by barnyard animals
- Unfortunately the smell would be prohibitive
- no it will make the communities smell/sound like a farm and less appealing. Also very annoying for the neighbors to listen to.
- This could be another situation for animals to not be taken care of properly / abuse / neglect , ect
- My daughter has chickens in the country. They are very noisy and their coup smells very bad. It's ok when it is a long way from a residence. They also attract predators.
- Excrement from poultry can be overwhelmingly smelly and carries disease. Would not want hens near my home.
- I owened hens, I know is impossible to avoid smell and keep clean for an urban standard
- Noone in the city should be able to raise hens. That is very sloppy and makes the city look bad. Go live on a acreage if you want to raise a hen or chicken
- Livestock belong in open spaces on averages or farms. There are enough animals in shelters and poorly treated in the city and the shelters would become even more burdened to care for livestock when their owners tire of them and throw them in the street.
- I think we should start with hens and see how that goes before considering other livestock.
- Farm animals belong on farms
- Chickens are loud and can carry disease
- Livestock belongs on a farm
- I don't agree with hens living in Calgary
- Because these animals are not objects to be used. We're already having a problem with global warming and we're gonna add onto it by allowing people to own their own livestock
- "Farms in a creatures are where farm animals

- Farm and acreages are where livestock should live not in city limits"
- They are noisy and smell bad, they belong on farms
- bad smells and bird diseases
- This will pit more neighbours against each other



- I support this other than the exceptions on a case by case basis
- Having livestock in the inner city doesn't seem beneficial to most people and the animals.
- The city is not a place for livestock.
- Coty doesn't have the resources to be able to deal with complaints/incidents related to these other animals. The city doesn't even have the resources to deal with dog/cat complaints so we shouldn't add more animals. This could lead to issues with cleanliness/noise in those areas. How can you possibly obtain support from all neighbour's when New neighbour's could move in at any time?
- People are irresponsible, allowing anyone to have livestock is a horrible idea. If it is allowed there should be applications, rules and follow by the city to ensure the livestock is living a good quality of life
- Hens create very a offensive odour problem, totally unfit for the urban environment. You must know a substantial percentage of urban chicken farmers will not have good cleanliness standards and will not keep odours down.
- I don't want chickens etc living next door to me
- I don't think hens should be allowed in the city.
- Additional noise & smell Animals like this should be where there is lots of acres between homes.
- A standard city lot is not large enough for any livestock. Noise, smell, annoyance, danger are not restricted to the owner's lot. All of these affect adjacent lots automatically; the owner cannot control that and therefore it should not be allowed. PERIOD. This includes bee-keeping, which I can say from first-hand knowledge, is both annoying and dangerous and affects my enjoyment of my own property.
- They are dirty and disgusting
- My concern is that people will want these animals without the know how of how to take care of them and the majority will end up abused.
- You have a right to do what you want on your own private property. I DO, however, agree with the making sure of suitable living conditions can be provided point.
- Don't make things complicated that don't need to be. We have more important things to spend our tax dollars on.
- It creates a possible toxic environment between neighbours if a neighbour declines. Better to just avoid it all together.
- I do not want to "urbanize" our back yards any further. Birds can be noisy, messy and dirty. I moved to the suburbs precisely because it's quieter. Please don't keep trying to make us become some place we don't want. You're already allowing more basement suites and taking away seniors only residences, how much more damage do you want to inflict on us?
- Don't want the smell or sound of livestock in the communities.
- I don't think the general public is aware of zoonotic infections to ensure that humans are not threatened by keeping livestock in close proximity. Covid-19 is a great example. If I want to live near livestock I'll buy a farm, not a municipal property.
- I don't believe the welfare of livestock can be maintained in the limited city space.



- There is no need for them in the city and it would be dangerous for the already wondering animals and hens.
- Do not support - as one example, even though one may not be adjacent to the person whom decided they wanted a rooster as 'other livestock', the racket at dawn would definitely carry/bother several blocks in distance.
- Livestock need a particular environment and domestication of certain species is a potentially animal rights situation
- The noise, waste and smell remains to much of a concern to allow this type of so called urban farming.
- Chickens smell really bad. No matter how clean you keep the coop they stink.
- Hens need to stay on a farm not in a city
- They are loud , dirty and should not be in urban areas
- Live stock belongs in areas that can provide appropriate room for them to live. Noise and smell is also an issue.
- I think too many people wouldn't know how to properly care for hens or would get lazy over time and coop conditions would end up poor.
- Some neighbours would never approve anything even if not truly impact them
- The smell isn't worth it
- "Absolutely no livestock in the city!!! No one wants to smell chickens or hear chickens every morning if they did they would live on a farm
- Absolutely not, not to mention the increase barking complaints because the dogs wont stop barking ay the chickens absolutely no there is no need"
- Think hens would be intrusive, noisy and smelly- attracting predators as well
- I don't believe the average person has the ability to properly care for these animals, and would be worried about animals like this getting free. As well, non-domesticated animals are more likely to carry viruses and other illnesses that may be detrimental to human health.
- "This is not a rural situation
- I don't want animals that should be on rural properties"
- City lots are small, animals are noisy. It requires space and distance from others which I don't see feasible in the city.
- Farm animals belong on a farm
- Livestock doesn't belong in the city. It would lead to noisy/ unsanitary conditions. Your neighbors do not deserve to have odors and loud annoyances imposed on them. Additionally, one must be able to afford to provide a high quality of life for livestock, therefore one would be able to afford to move out of town if this was the case.
- To noisy and stinky
- They are loud and can kill people
- I see the potential for too much abuse of this bylaw and envision yards full of chickens or goats that decrease others' property values and quality of life. If it was extremely limited in scope as to what is



considered livestock, how they are to be housed and strict number limits, it may work, but I don't see people abiding by the law on this one.

- Lets stick with hens and bees.
- Flock/hens safety and disease prevention is complicated and must ensure that human food safety is not compromised.
- Livestock does not need to be in the city
- Hens are not considered a domestic animal.
- The public is uneducated about livestock especially those who live in the city you need a minimal 8 foot high fence to keep Chicken from flying over. Next you're going to have neighbors complaining about the smell and noise. Who's going to round up the chickens when they get out? Who is going to police and make sure people are abiding by the numbers? For example if you're allowed for chickens at one location and let's say everyone in the city own chickens how are you going to follow up with everybody every single time to make sure they're abiding by the law? People can't even drive proper in the city and you're wanting to give them chickens. There is a huge skunk problem in Erinwoods.... Chickens/livestock only bring in predators.
- Do not want livestock in neighborhood
- Since we seem to be moving into an age where work / education is done from the home thanks to COVID I can't see myself getting much work done while my neighbors chickens are loud and disruptive. I see there being lots of fights between neighbors on this.
- Whenever rules are changed to allow people to allow people of a community to start altering their homes to take in more animals too many people take advantage of the situation. A good portion of people will take care of their home but many will not. Then if a neighbour's life is affected from the new altercations from not properly maintained hen (ie. smell and noise) it becomes very difficult for the neighbour to get the situation fixed.
- Because if that chief has something against that breed or anything he/she can make it go their way instead and I do not agree with it. The law system is already flawed as it is.
- bylaw should remain as is. no livestock other than for emotional support.
- I do not support existing City oversight in way too many areas, let alone any new bylaws.
- livestock within city limits is a "nuisance" as put best in the earlier engagement
- Houses are very close together in Calgary. We live together well because we have some basic rules. I don't think that this is a fair environment for urban hens for either people, or the hens.
- BSL are going to increase kill shelters capacity and it is wrong to assume a dog is bad because of their breed. It's sick and evil. I am ashamed the City would even suggest such a thing.
- "I was raised on a farm and I know that's where animals belong .For exmple, chicken yards and fences stink,as does daily Animal urination. We have enough noise in the city without roosters crowing and cows mooing. This is not ""the wild"" .BIG crazy idea.If that happens in Calgary,I am outta here.
- urination."



- I believe there needs to be more regulation in pet ownership as there are a lot of irresponsible owners. But I do not believe a ban or extra regulation on a certain breed/type is the correct way to go about it. Don't punish a dog or owner that has done nothing wrong. But more effort into dealing with actual incidents and bylaw offences
 - We don't need chickens in the city
 - You cannot blame a specific breed. I have been bitten by a number of dogs over the years and 100% of the time it has been small shitzu type dogs that bite. I have met more pit bulls that I would feel comfortable around. You cannot pick on pit bulls without including shepherds, Doberman's, Rottweiler.etc
 - this should be approved, no need any additional restrictions.. this will benefit many people especially during pandemic
 - the last thing I want to smell while enjoying my yard is the "barnyard smells" that are associated with having livestock. I would not trust the owners to keep their "barnyard" clean and smell free. The City doesn't patrol stray, free running cats whatsoever so have not faith in enforcing these additional bylaws.
 - I don't care about hens. Leave them on the farm.
 - Not in a city
 - Livestock should not be in the city.
 - Hens produce a noise and smell that should not be allowed in the city. Neighbours would not have the option to approve/disapprove and that may impact resale values of homes.
 - Chickens should not be allowed in the city. They attract skunks and cause a bigger issue with their presence.
 - There isn't enough land in Urban setting
 - "Many animals are a nuisance by nature - crowing hens at 5am, the smell of chickens or other livestock and their feces - which could adversely impact enjoyment of homeowners and residents who choose not to raise livestock.
-
- If people want to raise farm animals then they can move to a farm or outside of the city where such activities are already permissible."
 - people rarely consider all pets
 - Livestock can be very noisy, and smelly as well. This can have a negative effect on more than just the adjacent neighbours.
 - Huge NO. Property values and contentment with life would drop immensely. If you want a hen go live on a farm. I do not want to listen to or smell them
 - All livestock type animals shd be rural not urban areas. Also noise is a big consideration and livestock animals do make noise



- The city isn't designed for livestock. Even though I would love to have chickens I see the risk for animal and potential community disruption. I can also see how we couldn't limit to just chickens as definitely not large livestock
- It's hard enough now to keep the coyotes away, without having livestock around. Beyond this, the smells and noises involved do not belong in an urban neighbourhood.
- Livestock can attract other wildlife- eg. coyotes, bobcats - into residential areas making it a safety issue for residents and pets
- "Yards are not big enough in Calgary, your neighbours would be negatively impacted by smell, noise, etc.
- Minimum yard requirements of 2 (two) acres or more would have to be imposed.
- Neighbours move so what happens when a neighbour who supported the ownership of livestock moves and a neighbour who does NOT support it, due to allergies, smell or noise, etc, moves in? Or if a neighbour who thought they could support the situation discovers after the animal(s) are there that the situation is not what was expected or is, in fact, intolerable and they do not support it after all?
- Is there going to be a set limit on how many livestock animals you are allowed? How would you determine the limits? Will there be a determined amount of livestock/acre? How many chickens or roosters or pigs or cows or horses, etc, or combinations of them will be allowed and how do you determine that? What would happen if someone exceeds the set limit of livestock?
- Are all livestock going to be allowed? If not, how do you determine which will be allowed and why and which won't and why?
- Will there be an appeal process? If so, who will set it up and organize it? How would you choose the board members? Who would be in charge and how would it be paid for?
- What happens to the animals if the living conditions and/or care requirements are not met? Will there be a fine system? If so, who will determine the fines and enforce them?
- What happens if the animals are at large? What happens if the animals are abandoned or seized? Where would the animals be housed? Who would care for them on a day to day basis and who would be financially responsible? Where would the additional finances come from? How would rehoming/adoption work?
- There is simply too many issues that can and WILL arise from this for it to be allowed. No animals other than cats, dogs, birds, fish, bunnies, guinea pigs, hamsters, and most reptiles, snakes or other domesticated pets than can be quietly and responsibly housed within someone's actual home, whether it be a house, apartment, condo, duplex, etc, should be allowed within city limits. Animals that are deemed to be livestock or wild should not be housed within city limits, unless they were/are grandfathered in, or are on properties deemed as ""farms"", especially if the property is less than 2+ acres."
- The only one I disagree with is the support from adjacent neighbours- they will not be impacted greatly by the hens, so not necessary. No different than if someone got a dog, you don't need approval from your neighbours for that. A dog has the potential to be much more noisy than hens.
- I don't like it



- This is opening up another can of worms and increase problems with wildlife looking for food
- If people want hens they can move to an acreage or buy a farm.
- I do not think people in Calgary know how to deal with them, and could see way to much time and money wasted and complaint and etc.
- You have not provided enough information to say yes. What type of livestock? How is adequate land, water, sanitation determined for a horse or a pig or a goat? What happens when the community or neighbours change or change their sentiment over time?
- Dirty, would create yards that are disgusting
- Too loud
- I do not want livestock if any kind kept in yards near my home !!!!!
- house values would go down,, do to the mess from livestock. Very noisy and disturbing to neighbors
- Farm animals including chickens do not belong in the city.
- Livestock should be kept on Acreages and Farms. This will only attacked wildlife more into the City ie; coyotes, bobcats etc
- Birds stink
- Remove discretion of the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer
- if you want hens (or bees for that matter) live more rurally. People live in the city, not in towns or near farms on purpose.
- I do not think hens belong in a suburban community. And as a neighbor would find this a nuisance (I.e. smell and/or noise)
- I don't think it is appropriate to have livestock in the city. The smell/noise of livestock could travel much further than just the adjacent neighbours and other neighbours could suffer the consequences
- Hens mean roosters, roosters crow at ALL times of the day and night making noise violations a serious issue, and if not properly maintained and regularity cleaned all livestock pens can easily become a public health hazard.
- I feel people would treat this as a novelty and then not take care of the animals properly.
- Animals, unless they live in the house should not be allowed in the City.
- Livestock has no place in an urban environment.
- It will become very hard to draw the line.
- absolutely not ! this is ridiculous! DISAGREE
- Don't make your job harder
- Those animals do not belong in the city. Neighbours will always be upset, even if not direct neighbours, the community will be.
- Again, too many unknowns can enter the equation.
- Noise at the crack of dawn.
- Chickens are not for neighbourhoods, but farms.
- Livestock should be kept on farms or homes with adequate space. Not in the city.
- Chickens are loud, stink and there is no way to isolate them from other diseased wildlife
- We need to stop exploiting animals for our own pleasures.



- urban hens/livestock could increase noise, odor, and predators in the community.
- Livestock need areas to live (secluded them to a small yard in Calgary is in humane). If you want a wild animal go to the zoo.
- I don't want to live next to live stock otherwise I'd live in the country not inner city
- livestock doesn't belong in the city. it would be a disturbance to neighbors and majority of people are irresponsible and don't understand livestock needs. i worry that people wouldn't properly care for the livestock and they would be surrendered or set "free" where they wouldn't survive
- They would bring more inconvenience and disturbance to the neighborhood. For example, a rooster makes everybody up at dawn everyday and there is no way to train them.
- Where does it stop
- Living in the city, i don't think a lot of people would be happy with the sounds and smells that would come with livestock on a constant basis. It's a nuisance to most - especially light sleepers. I personally don't want to hear livestock at 430am. I think this would drop the value of houses in the city because farms that house livestock typically are much dirtier in nature. Not to mention, it could increase or predator animals from the wild to frequent the cities more which could harm pets/people (ie. cougars, coyotes)
- Noise, and especially odour from hens and/or wild stock would not be acceptable. This topic is just too stupid to talk about. Theses critters belong on a farm. Calgary, stop bending over and taking it to satisfy the wants of the few over the needs of the many!
- Most Calgary neighborhoods are way too crowded (with very small yards) to allow livestock without affecting the neighbors.
- I don't think hens and other livestock are needed in city limits. If properties with hens are not well maintained, then there are problems for neighbours. There are enough problems with dog owners who do not clean up after their dogs and the smell and flies are terrible. Bylaw does nothing for these problems when reported and neighbours have to live with it. Why add more problems to the list?
- I come from the country. Chickens have to be one of the worst smelling livestock around.
- Will be hard to enforce. Is enough poop everywhere from rabbits, cats and dogs...having livestock in backyards might cause a big issue. Imagine a hen escaping and running in a yard where free dogs or cats are in...
- Livestock doesn't belong in community neighborhoods.
- "My neighbor already has hens... (illegally apparently)
- If folks wanna raise other livestock they can buy a farm..."
- I grew up on a farm and would not want them living next to me!!
- Also, NO HENS in the city.
- They belong on a farm. People can not be trusted to endure the animals well being
- I do not want farm animals in the city. I know many people who are afraid of (including children) chickens and it I believe there is a risk that it would devalue my property if my neighbors had chickens.



- Chickens can be loud and disturb piece. They smell bad and i wouldn't want to deal with the smell coming from neighbors backyard. Especially of we are sharing the fence.
- I would be concerned about noise, smells and what happens if the animal escapes its enclosure? If the person needs poultry or livestock for their won benefit, it's a lifestyle choice; they can move to a rural environment. I cannot see any positive impact to the community of having poultry or livestock in a neighborhood, other than being an accessible "petting zoo" for kids.
- Livestock belongs on a farm with farmers that are dedicated to caring for them.
- It isn't the breed that is the problem it is the owner & regardless of the strength of a breed if a dog is going to bite it will bite. I have been bit more times by small dogs than large dogs.
- Support from neighbors can be hard to attain
- Noise, smell.
- There is no need to have these type of animals / birds within the city limits.
- I can't see how they're necessary for an urban dweller, they make noise, smell and can carry diseases.
- Because it's stupid.
- They have poor hygiene and should be in the country
- The city does not provide enough space for humane treatment of farm animals.
- I would but I don't think you should need neighbour support. We too often allow our neighbours to dictate what we do in our own property - unless it's physically spilling over onto yours or breaking an existing noise bylaw then it should be fair game.
- if i wanted to live with livestock I would move to a farm. There is no place for a farm fowl or animal in the city
- I think livestock are noisy and smelly and dirty and could cause disease
- livestock if not taken care of smell. once someone has it, it will be impossible to get them removed. It would make a difference to my purchasing a property. and could devalue others peoples property.
- We live in the city for a reason. If I wanted barn animals in my community, I'd move to the country.
- They are extremely dirty and noisy, does not support a clean upscale city environment
- It's too random, and the choice of livestock would be dictated by people's ethnic backgrounds and eating habits. It's getting more common to hear about goats being slaughtered around the city and at campsites. No one wants the neighbours' noise and smell.
- If someone wants chickens or a cow, they should move out of the urban environment. We have the LESA bylaw for emotional support animals. I would not support my neighbour having chickens or sheep or other livestock in the City.
- I don't think a city has a proper environment for hen
- Livestock belongs on a country residential, or property zoned for agriculture.
- I do not support citizens having farm animals (eg. chickens, ducks, geese, rabbits, pigeons, pigs) in the city because we are already seeing too many by-law infractions with pet owners in general
- Enforcement of bylaws is already stretched to thin so they won't have time to police urban livestock issues.



- Chickens, fine. Other livestock, no thank you.
- I had a neighbor with hens and it was noisy and smelled.
- People should move to an acreage if they want farm animals.
- I believe livestock should be kept on farms, or larger pieces of land in the proper living conditions meant for them.
- That would encourage predators and wildlife into the city e.g. cougars, bobcats, etc
- It has nothing to do with the breed of dog.
- Hens and livestock can't be controlled in the same way as domesticated animals. They are noise, smell and most certainly do not know how to adhere to noise bylaws.
- "The City should be focused on finding ways to reduce its operating costs not increasing them, particular in a time of a shrinking tax base. Allowing livestock in the city will require staff and resources to regulate
- Secondly, there is a reason livestock require lots of space and mechanisms to clear waste (faeces, carcasses, bedding, food and so on). What is the strategy to allow people to clear waste safely, hygienically and cost-effectively? This should totally be a user pays cost.
- Thirdly, this seems to be a self-interested request .
- Fourthly, what consideration will be given to mitigating other risks such as noise, safety (e.g. disease, aggressive behaviour, animals getting loose, running into traffic etc.
- This idea has to be one of the most ridiculous. If people want to own livestock. Simple solution. Buy an acreage outside city limits."
- We have lived by this in Mount Pleasant, it was not pleasant.
- We have had experience with neighbours having hens in backyard. Noise issues.
- City people don't need farm animals. the risk of neglect and abuse would be too high.
- Absolutely not. People cant take care of their yards or pets as it is. I would be choked if a neighbor had a hen house
- Chickens should be in a farm not in an urban setting.
- A bylaw officer shouldn't be able to make final decision on his own it should be something with everyone involved
- why attract wildlife ...we have enough that we are trying to live with
- Too many people would get into this without understanding the needs of the hens. This is going to lead to animal cruelty and unnecessary harm to the hens.
- The smell makes me gag
- Coyotes, owls and countless other dangers to the smaller livestock (traffic too and people who don't know animal handling that would want to take pictures with small kids too. Too dangerous for the animals.
- They are noisy, smelly and can pass on disease through their feces.
- too much of a hassle and henning can be dangerous and attract more wildlife such as coyotes, wolves, lynx, bobcats etc.
- We just went through covid-19, we don't need more dirty livestock in our city to give us diseases.



- Shouldn't be in the city
- Avian flu
- I am not in favor of livestock or other farm animals being kept within the city limits
- A member of our household is anaphalatically allergic to poultry, by ingestion or breathing. If a neighbour was permitted to house poultry we would be forced to sell our family home and relocate.
- They are never properly taken care of (as evidence by other communities that rescinded this bylaw).
- Chickens do not belong in the city, they smell and cause other rodents to seek their food. Not to mention the noise
- Smells and/or noise from livestock, their feed and feces are not desirable and would negatively impact property values.
- Because all animals are innocent, it's the owners that are guilty
- I don't want livestock in close proximity to my house
- Enforcement of all the criteria would be difficult and likely costly.
- No need for this within city limits as it causes nuisance for neighbors.
- Do not discriminate against breeds focus on holding pet owners accountable, training and other resources
- i dont believe keepinng hens is at all necessary or important enough for the city to act on. no one needs a hen.
- an emotional support peacock or puma is funny but makes a farce of real support animals
- Farm animals need to stay in farms not in urban areas where neighbours are packed close together. There are lots of flea markets for people looking for "farm fresh" choices therefore it is not necessary within city limits.
- Backyard chickens will cause influenza in the city as owners will not keep their environment clean.
- Not only would the city eventually receive odour, and noise complaints this would become a animal mistreatment issue. It can and should be avoided entirely.
- Farm animals and livestock not required in city
- I would not want animals besides dogs and cats living next door to me.
- So I have to smell chicken shit and watch my neighbours slaughter their chickens. Yet I can't have a pitbull? Whats wrong with you?
- All livestock should be banned within City Limits. The noise and smell would create nuisance behaviour and aggravation for neighboring properties. Despite good intentions, initially, many owners of animals, including domestic, neglect their responsibilities associated with the proper care and maintenance required for owning animals.
- The only one I agree with is hens. But I think if the resources are not there to ensure proper care and housing Of the hens I wouldn't be ok with it. Furthermore, I don't agree with other livestock. I think that could cause issues with neighbours Who perhaps move into a house a where maybe the previous owner was ok but the new one is not but also unlikely people can provide what a larger livestock animal needs living wise within the city and creates more work and time on the park of enforcement officers and court system



- Cost too much money to administer. We are in difficult financial times and our taxes are already too high.
- Because we don't need to turn our residential areas into farms.
- I grew up on a farm and am well aware of the smells, disease, noise, pests AND dangers associated with chickens and livestock. There are other animals people can have as pets to obtain the same support and community benefit. Eggs and poultry can be purchased from outside the city. We can't allow everything in the city that occurs in the country. Citizens must make a choice: urban living or country living.
- I don't want livestock in my neighborhood
- It's not hygienic to have livestock in urban situations
- I do not agree with majority of the By-law presented its racist towards the breed and unfair to those loving non aggressive dogs who are completely fine out in public.
- ITS NOT THE BREED ITS THE OWNER. DO SOME RESEARCH
- livestock do not need to be in the city, how can you train them? house them? They need to stay on acreages or farms not in the city. They are loud and have bad odours and I don't see this essential
- Livestock does not need to be in the city, this will create more problems than they solve.
- Livestock belongs on farms or acreage not in the city. I don't want the noise, smell, attraction of wild animals and vermin.
- I don't believe that livestock belongs in urban areas.
- As long as everything is kept clean all is OK.
- Raising of wild animals, especially noisy and/or smelly animals such as livestock should not be permitted as it causes a disturbance to the rest of the neighborhood. The city is not a ranch, if people would like to ranch they can move outside of the city and get adequate space so as to not be a nuisance to others
- No
- Noise and smell would be a huge problem and who wants a roosters loud noise awakening one at 4:30 AM?? The City of Calgary seems incapable of dealing with loud racing cars and motorcycles in the City and the needs of Calgarians are not at all "balanced" regarding that nuisance, so why introduce more problems you will be incapable of dealing with? Generally, Bylaw Officers in Calgary are impotent and incompetent and would never be able to deal with urban hen problems. If the City can't even afford the cost of pesticide to kill the noxious thistles patches in off lease dog parks, how the heck would anyone think the City could deal with the additional problems of urban hens? The City needs to show it is capable of dealing with the problems it currently has and demonstrate an ability to "balance" Calgarians need for adequate noise and weed control before introducing additional problems.
- I feel this is very unfair for neighbours of chicken owners. They do not have a choice in the noise and sanitary conditions of a place that is right by their home. Even if the hen owners are responsible, there will still be smells as hens are livestock. They will smell. The whole neighbourhood will smell awful if there are multiple hen owners on a street.



- The newer communities are becoming more and more congested! Chickens should be raised out on acreages, they need the space!
- I support raising hens for their egg laying but larger livestock would prove problematic in my opinion
- Although there are aspects of the bylaw which have always validity, I think the restrictions to pit bull breeds is unreasonable and discriminatory. Decisions as to whether or not a dog is to be considered "a nuisance" should be based on individual cases, not breeds.
- No farm animal should be in the city limits, if the person wants a farm animal they should buy land to keep them on. If farm animals are kept in the city eg. chickens then I should be able to keep a horse.
- That's what farms are for! Having livestock or hens or chickens is ridiculous!
- I do not feel it is fair on the neighbours. It could affect the sell price of their home. Only agree to the above on acreages.
- Noise and smell
- pressure by adjacent neighbors may cause issues.
- Allowing these animals will increase enforcement, I don't think it's practical or something where best resources are being used.
- Not fair
- i own a pitbull and never had an issue with her but i have issue with smaller dogs that bark and are a nuisance
- livestock is not for cities. health impact is too great.
- We are in a crowded urban environment. We should have to "balance our needs" with hens - the City is for people!
- Chicken smells and cause a multitude of problems with mice and other animals. They belong on farms and should not be allowed within the city limits.
- Livestock should not be in cities. They need room to move around
- Livestock smell and are noisy
- Ability to keep appropriate livestock within city can improve food security and be beneficial for homeowners and neighbours (eg: chickens eating pest insects)
- If I wanted to live on a farm I'd move to the country!
- Many type of live stock animals require specialized care and space requirements and I don't feel live stock animals belong in the city
- Neighbors SHOULD NOT have say in the decision-making process to obtain urban hens. Bylaw should be given powers to enforce in cases where hens are not cared for and/or become nuisance animals.
- This is racism of the animal world. Pinning one breed because of a trait you consider "dangerous" is essentially racist. Make it fair, don't pin out one breed and the law would be effective. Signed, the owner of a calm, "lovebug" pitbull. (Who I will mention, releases anything when I press the roof of her mouth. Yes I can put my hand in her mouth when she is latched onto a toy and she releases without any harm to me.) Support proper dog training. Not dog bans.
- Why the heck would we want livestock in the city??? They wouldn't like it either.



- Livestock is not suitable for an urban environment
- You really need to understand bio security and the kinds of disease that chickens can spread — livestock and people don't mix in Covid times. Also, most people who want to raise chickens in the city have a Romantic notion about raising chicken and then when the hens get past their egg laying years, they surrender the chickens to the local shelter causing another huge issue. Please talk to knowledgeable groups, like Alberta Egg producers or Alberta chicken producers, before proceeding and allowing this. There needs to be mandatory education at the very least.
- I don't want the noise, smell, and pests that come with barnyard animals
- If you allow hens then it would smell plus the city would smell and there could be a mouse and rat infestation
- We have enough wildlife entering the city, these will only encourage more wildlife into the city
- Noise & smell problems for the neighbourhood / neighbours
- How do you measure community benefit ?
- I don't think livestock of any kind belongs within the city limits
- Because the singling out of "pitbull" type dogs is not ok, especially since the city has stated that they aren't responsible for more bites. Rottweilers and German shepherds have a stronger psi bite force than "pitbulls" yet no specifications are made about them,
- Animals need a bigger and more quiet environment than the small confines of a yard and noise of traffic in the city.
- You want to impose bylaws against barking dogs and then I am supposed to be okay with listening to chickens all day. How would the city control smell, pest control (if any), and has the city researched how it would affect home resale.
- I do not believe that livestock should be allowed within the city limits. They are disruptive to others in many ways - noise, smell. Neighbours can, so the permission of one, does not guarantee the support of a new neighbour.
- I lived beside a pigeon coop growing up. These were poop everywhere because they would let them out to fly laps around the neighbourhood. They resulted in dead birds because they would hit the power lines all the time. It brought coyotes in from Nosehill at night time. Not to mention it was just gross. Chickens would be the same and I'm sure would make too much noise.
- Too many variables. Here's another livestock need to be on rural property.
- People that want to own hens and livestock can move outside the city limits and purchase a farm. These animals bring diseases with them and homes in a city are too close together to provide safety for neighbours.
- I do not want livestock in town.
- This may potentially cause disruptive behavior to the neighbors
- "Let's support our farmers, and let the farming and housing of farm animals be to them. Pet owners cannot pick up their dog poo, how are they going to keep their yards clean, provide adequate care, noise issues associated with animals, we have enough irresponsible pet owners in this city, why have more. Let's face it, pet owners are on average very irresponsible.
- Hens, and other such animals belong on farms, where they are not caged, and have room to roam."



- urban areas are NOT farms. Noise and excrement smell would diminish quality of life for neighbors
- Because this is a city. There's no room here for livestock that require space to roam. If you want livestock at home move further out of the city
- We have farms for this. The noise smells poor maintenance by neighbours the increase attraction of wildlife like skunks, Coyotes and snakes In the outlying areas of the city. I think this would cause more issues than what it's worth
- Hens are extremely loud and smelly
- I do not want Farm animals in Urban households I feel risk of increased predators and rodent activity in such areas
- Farm animals smell really bad
- I don't think turning Calgary into a farm is a good idea for anyone.
- This is ridiculous!
- Hens are more of a nuisance than actual pets (dogs). There would be plenty of unnecessary birds dying because many pets aren't exposed to this and would go after the at no fault of the dogs.
- Hens are on farms. These will be more of a nuisance than dogs and cats.
- No need for farm animals in a city
- Bylaw has a problem controlling unruly neighbours, barking dogs and illegally parked vehicles let alone adding hens or other livestock into the mix.
- I foresee issues with this. We don't need urban livestock, there are tons of rural properties available around the city.
- Urban settings should not support livestock especially because enforcement could be challenging when infractions happen
- Farm animals belong on farms.
- Because of the noise and the smell
- City is too busy for animals to be calm and stress free. Along with most property's out door space not large enough to accommodate most farm animals.
- Absolutely not they don't belong in the city
- Livestock do not belong in the city. There is too much risk of disease in the close confines of city properties along with attendant noise and odours. I include pigeons in this category. The Anderson LRT station is an example of pigeons creating a nuisance. They should be removed and kept away as they are dirty and noisy.
- City is not an appropriate place for this type of livestock
- I support therapy animals! One hen, no more. If I see a coop in my neighbors yard, will I be mad, YES! What other livestock? Will I have a cow next door and like it, NO! Be more specific!
- Noise
- I do t think the city has enough enforcement to handle more animals.
- I think this opens the door to alot of challenges regarding other livestock. It could turn into a legal mess. Which equals more expenses for the city. We dont need that.
- It's cruel.



- People need to be fully educated before taking care of any type of animals. So I believe they need to take some type of course or test so they fully understand how difficult it is.
- If I wanted to live next door to a farm I would move out to the country
- All livestock belongs on a farm.
- Farming chickens takes practice and skills which will now fall on neighbors to be subjected too. The noise and biohazard wastes will be an issue as well.
- Livestock does not need to be in the city
- Livestock can't get the car they need in a city property. It increases risk of disease and is entirely unnecessary.
- I believe it will lead to unsanitary conditions
- No chickens in city limits
- I think the bylaw will be abused. It is also hard to define community benefit / positive impact as those could be different to 2 different people. Support from adjacent neighbors could be forged, and also what about neighbors moving? Any livestock approval from a neighbor almost needs to be conveyed if the neighbor plans on selling their property; otherwise a new neighbor might not approve of livestock next door.
- No people do not always follow guidelines.
- Livestock should be kept out of the city. Animals like hens are dirty, smelly and noisy.
- This is a stupid idea, there are already enough irresponsible pet owners around (no picking up after their dogs, noise, not following leash bylaws...), why would you want to create more? Chickens are noisy, smelly and create a lot of waste, it is definitely no suitable for an urban setting. People that need chickens should consider moving out of urban setting.
- Chickens cause noise and a very strong, noxious smell
- Livestock smell bad. I would only support this if their were designated "zones" that someone could move to and raise the livestock. A livestock district, if you will.
- No need in the city
- Smell and attract of other animals
- Do we live in China now?
- This is a city. Not a small town
- Noise and smells would get out of hand
- Livestock produces too much odor and fecal matter, and should never be permitted in urban environment due to close proximity of residential dwellings. Livestock should never be permitted in urban setting.
- This will be to the detriment of the livestock animals. There will be many people who are uneducated on how to care for the animals and we will see an increase in abuse and neglect.
- My neighbor can have hens waking me up in the morning but you want to muzzle my dog and not let him go to his park to see his friends anymore?
- Not interested in having chickens in my neighbourhood.



- Hens and other livestock should not be kept in an urban dwelling. It is not fair to them or to the neighbours.
- As an urban area, this doesn't seem to fit/work.
- Hens are ok but when you say other livestock, where does it stop?
- Chickens belong on farms, not in inner city backyards.
- Livestock do not belong in the city. They are loud and will cause neighborhood disputes. If people want livestock, they are free to move to the country.
- With the current population of Calgary, I just don't see how this will be properly regulated/ evaluated. Chickens don't belong in someone's 4 square foot backyard, they belong in the country
- Those animals are not meant for city living
- In an urban environment, there is zero way living conditions for the animals can be suitable.
- I think it will create more space for dirt and disease as these animals belong on farm land, also certain animals can create noise etc.
- I don't believe that everyone will take proper care. and it will draw more wildlife like coyotes into the city
- Farm animals do not belong in our backyards. I grew up on a farm and their care needs to be daily and extensive. City dwellers have no idea what it takes to keep chickens and other farm animals healthy and happy. They will be abused, neglected and become sick and flea ridden in the small spaces where they will be confined due to lack of knowledge and money needed to keep them healthy. What does an owner do when they come to the end of their life? Will there be a law against ending their lives, or what? And where do the remains go?
- If someone wants livestock (including hens) they should be on a proper acreage, outside city limits. There are plenty of livestock farmers within an easy 1/2 hour drive of Calgary that most Calgarians don't even take advantage of purchasing from.
- I feel people would start keeping chickens for food or keep too many chickens, although I did see a pet duck in Jasper this weekend....
- The specificity as Pit Bulls equal to a nuisance dog.
- No livestock
- In many cases, livestock require much more room than what most inner city/suburban backyards are able to properly provide.
- Noise, and smell
- There is enough problems with people caring for animals that are already allowed, do we have the resources to ensure the well being of additional animals?
- Chickens and hens can bite hands. You should definitely make sure they have their own rules, own insurance, deemed a nuisance....
- As a home owner I would be concerned about noise and smell
- Farm animals belong on a farm not the city
- We have enough nuisance around the city. Irresponsible pet owners. Hens belong on a farm not in a city. Noise and waste associated with it, want peace and quiet.



- Too much danger of disease being passed on from animals to humans ie bird flu. Noise and odors could be a big problem.
- Noise, animal neglect, airborne particles and potentially diseases, allergies of neighbours.
- Having farm animals in the city creates extra noise, smells and other nuisances. They could attract wild predators that would cause other issues in the city.
- Why do we need this? Please go live rural. Smelly, noisy, virus ridden.
- Most livestock will not have adequate space in urban areas. The smell of livestock animals is also not enjoyed by many people.
- We live in a city, not a farm
- Farms should be outside city limits
- Noise and smell concerns.
- Unless there would be a way to enforce loud or nuisance hens.
- "Farm animals should not be in enclosed places. They should be roaming free in a large environment. Smells, fights, cleanliness of the neighborhood.
- Might attract more wild life such as coyote, cougars, foxes and wolves in the neighborhoods at the limit of the city. I.e : redstone neighborhood has coyotes very close to the houses."
- No thank you
- Hens are farm animals. They're smelly and loud in the city. I would be concerned about people also acquiring roosters. They're also bait for coyotes, which are already an issue in Calgary.
- I don't trust the people of this city to do it in a hygienic way and inoffensive way or purpose.
- It would take more clean up efforts and there would be a decrease in air quality. Cleaning efforts would most likely be paid for with tax money and would not be beneficial to every Calgarian.
- "We live in a city, if you want to live on a farm, then move to the country. Who wants to be awakened by a hen early every morning, not me.
- Plus all that hen poop, smell, seriously city is trying to be too much to many people. Stick with the basics, city dwellers don't own hens.
- And there is no way a hen can provide emotional support for anyone, they are not cuddling animals, and they like to roam free, they need space to roam I.e. farm."
- Chickens, yes. Other livestock, no.
- Absolutely NOT! It is animal cruelty regarding the urban hens. How can there possibly be humane living conditions for Urban Hens - area available, type of runs etc impossible. Public health. Smell/ noise. What if neighbours agree and then new neighbours move in and disagree? The rights of the neighbours? What happens to the hens?
- Breed specific legislation is disgusting. Perhaps mandatory training. Dogs of all breeds may bite. It has nothing to do with breed. This is beyond disgusting if you know the slightest thing about dogs.
- Livestock do not belong in the city
- I'm a vegetarian. Would not want to live near any animal farm.
- The city of Calgary does not have the resources necessary to monitor and regulate livestock within the city sufficiently.



- I can see this going sideways and an increase in complaints that the city will then have to manage.
- is city of Calgary animal services going to be able to house livestock of found at large? Do they have to pay for licensing? There also aren't really large animal vets within calgary.
- I will not support this bylaw because you are allowing livestock on property but you're making it mandatory for bully breeds to have obedience training, more insurance etc. this is ridiculous, figure one thing out at a time, instead of trying to give one thing while you take another do your research on your bully breeds because they are not vicious dogs. They are strong, and since when do we punish someone for being strong...oh right we actually praise it, so grow up and stop trying to give us livestock to distract us while taking away bully breeds.
- It perpetuates bias towards particular breeds of dogs. If the city is concerned they should offer Mandatory free obedience training for "higher" risk dogs instead.
- I do not approve of allowing urban hens or other livestock within City limits. It will greatly increase the number of predatory animals in communities, which will most likely result in a greater number of those predatory animals being euthanized due to Calgarians' improperly providing safe live conditions for their livestock.
- it is wrong
- don't need farm animals in the city
- Really?? Let's talk bird flu!!! Look at all the shit coming out of China!! There are reasons we do NOT live in close proximity to live stock. So are you planning on opening up some chinese wet markets too???? GIVE YOUR HEADS A SHAKE!!!
- This is a city
- My concern is for noise and appropriate space available to the livestock.
- livestock does not belong in the city
- Some people will take advantage of the system and have all kinds of pets in their yard without knowing how to care for them .
- The crowded conditions of the city will create problems for neighbours of people who have livestock and it will only cause more problems among neighbours that will be difficult to resolve.
- This will add so much noise pollution and likely animal neglect / harm as not enough people will be property trained on how to care for the hens properly.
- I do not believe that city lots are large enough to support the living conditions hens require. they're dirty, they smell, they're loud, it will just end in more nuisance calls.
- Livestock belong on farms.
- I don't believe bylaw officers would be able to manage this at the current time. There are enough bylaws that are already barely enforced the introduction of livestock bylaws would be laughable to be honest.
- No leave live stock and would animals out of the city they have no business here, unless you starting up a meat packing plant [remove] off.
- Chickens are far more aggressive than dogs.
- Chickens smell, I don't want chickens living in my neighbours yards so I can smell them. Well taken care of birds shouldn't have a smelly area, but we all know how people are with things in their yards.



- There are a lot of people who think they know how to be self sustainable, but require much more knowledge and education. Till such has been achieved by the individual or household, there should be a full assessment required to attain such animals/livestock.
- That what farms are for!
- Livestock should be only allowed on properties which allow for a significant distance between houses. Most Calgary homes do not have backyards large enough spaces.
- I don't want livestock in the city
- No need to have other livestock in the city. Chickens are fine. If you want other livestock move to a farm.
- Urban hens lead to maltreatment issues for roosters, as they are not wanted/allowed. As well, it often happens that when backyard hens become inconvenient (ie, a move, sickness, or job change), their welfare is often disregarded as owners attempt to relieve themselves of the burden.
- Why on earth are hens needed in the city..
- I do not support urban hens within city limits
- At times we have to deal with noise, destruction of property and feces from others pets. Livestock animals will be exceptional worse for all these items, especially noise and feces (ie. smells). It is much harder to train a livestock animal than domesticated dogs and cats.
- there's just no need for agriculture in the city. That will cause neighbor issues almost instantly. Maybe an exception would be if they own "x" amount of land (like 1 acre) within the city limits
- Livestock of any kind need more space than a Calgarian's backyard
- Livestock does not belong to a city.
- I am concerned about noise and odour.
- They belong on a farm.
- I only say no because it's not clear to me how the well being of these animals would be assured. Who will verify that their living conditions are suitable, and would there be follow up to ensure that the suitable conditions are continuously maintained (particularly as the seasons change, and new needs arise as a result).
- These animals smell terrible and are usually loud so the noise would be disruptive to none owners and would cause more issues
- Noise, fecal contamination, possible vermin infestation from chicken feed
- Farm animals belong on a [removed] farm. A solitary therapy chicken is fine, but if I can't have a free roam pit bull they cant have a flock of chickens.
- Chickens create extra noise and smell.
- Hens are not pets.
- Houses are too close to support urban hens and livestock.
- Chickens are on the farms and production facilities. The fecal matter produced by chickens is not manageable by individuals and can cause E. coli bacterial infections to increase.
- Cats being unregistered and roaming around attracting wildlife needs to be curbed before introducing new pet bylaws.



- Livestock should only be in rural areas not in the city too much noise and problems.
- Farm animals belong on a farm
- Hens are noisy and take up a lot of space
- Livestock isn't meant to live in an urban area.
- If people want farm animals live on a farm.
- You can not force farm animals to be quiet in an urban setting. Plus keeping pest free, clean, etc, would require too many bylaws.
- These animals don't belong in a city.
- livestock belongs on a farm, not in the city. No livestock permitted in the city.
- The noise, the smell - don't want that beside me
- too noisy and smelly
- too many things can go wrong
- I used to work on a farm that had a chicken coup. They stink and are noisy
- No chickens in the city.
- It's not just billy breeds that's are only strong breeds. It's all big dogs . So if you're going to make this a bylaw night as well do it with all big breeds. This is the exact reason we don't come to Calgary anymore. You over react and you guys are ridiculous. If you have the proper training with your dog and you don't abuse it why would it be aggressive ? It's the owners you need to worry about not the [removed] dogs .
- I'm concerned that people aren't aware how noisy chickens are.
- I feel livestock has it's place, not in urban households.
- If you want farm animals, then live on a farm
- What is the definition of "live stock"? I certainly do not want goats/cows in my neighbourhood!
- Alberta drivers run over wild animals with no care! It would just add more bodies on the street!
- The noise, smell. Risk of too many people not knowing how to properly take care of farm animals in the city.
- No hens in urban setting, noisy, smelly, keep them on the farm please
- "Farm animals receive poor enough treatment (and abuse) in the so-called well regulated environment of commercial farming. Allowing the ordinary public to keep, house and ""care"" for hens and ""livestock"" is simply opening the door to far more widespread animal abuse cases. Without frequent inspections backed up by regulations and severe penalties this will be yet another area where humans treat animals horrendously. Animals are mistreated and abused on a daily basis with animal protection laws consistently failing the animals they're supposed to protect.
- Allowing even more animals to be put into situations where the public own them is disgraceful. I am appalled that Calgary would even consider this."
- Some people do not clean up after the pets now, one can only imagine what would be the result if a bylaw was passed to allow livestock and chickens. Calgary Is a City not a barnyard.
- I am not sure people could create a suitable living space. The hens should be free range running around if anything.



- Urban hens in other cities have not panned out that well. They would likely be a noise nuisance
- the city is constantly dealing with bylaw issues without animals or livestock of peoples yards etc.
- I do not agree with livestock in the City as people seem to stretch the limits allowed.
- I do not see how suitable living conditions can be offered in an urban environment.
- Why do we need livestock when ppl cant even take care of their kids, or other pets
- I would support if the animals were quiet. The idea of hens early in the AM is a "NO" for me!
- noise and odors are not suitable for city lot sizes
- unfortunately some owners will neglect to clean the cages and this will bring more undesirable animal like skunks, mice etc..and smell
- Livestock shouldn't be in a city, space, smell noise.
- Chickens are noisy and smell. They do not belong in the city.
- I really like the idea of allowing livestock, but I think there is a pretty high chance for the rules not to be followed and neighbours disturbed. I just don't trust that people would follow the rules and animals shouldn't be caught in the middle
- No chickens in city limits. Please. I've been against this publicly for many years.
- I don't believe people would follow this by law if passed. I'm also confused why chickens are involved in a pet by law?
- I live in the city, if I wanted to hear chickens and other livestock, I'd move to a farm.
- "So that people can not store them properly and they can run amok? It will happen
- They are dirty and extremely smelly and would be an absolute disturbance. They also attract coyotes and foxes which will wander into the city to investigate"
- I'm not down with the smell of livestock
- Although there is a lot of potential for benefits from having livestock within the city, there is too much room for irresponsible ownership and I feel we should focus on the domestic pets before creating a program like this.
- I don't think there is enough room/space in the average Calgary yard to adequately care for hens. I worry about animal welfare as it is a huge undertaking to care for hens. If there was a course required for anyone interested on how to properly care for hens, etc., then I might support the idea
- Farm animals do not belong in the city limits!!
- The noise of livestock animals would spread past the immediate neighbours,
- Let people be
- Hens and chickens promote rats, alberta is one of the few places without them.
- I don't believe this is necessary. City people should not have the OK to keep farm animals. There is enough waste from these animals out in rural areas that it doesn't need to be expanded in to the city
- I feel the sound and mess would get out of hand. Due to the size of the properties the city has been approving now. Such as zero lot lines. It might have to be a larger property. And would need approval from 4-6 Neighbours
- I think its unfair to bully any and all bully breeds.



- Livestock should remain in rural areas, if someone wants to own livestock on their property then they should move out of the city.
- Terrible idea to allow poultry in the city
- Bylaw already does not have the man power or understanding of animal welfare to control this. Your officers don't even pull animals out of bad situations now, you just call the humane society and plead ignorant. How are you going to deal with livestock when you don't have a shelter/rescue to work with? You don't even take in rabbits for crying out loud. Don't bite off more than you can chew. Calgary already has shown it cannot be responsible for animal ownership.
- Years ago my neighbours had a rooster in their back yard that woke us up at 4:30 am every morning. It was awful
- I don't think farm animals should be allowed in the city
- Concerns about disease, odour, noise and the risk that people will neglect their animals next door and I would have not be able to cope emotionally with it. Bylaw officers are in short supply and have too much to do already and most bylaws are not upheld now. The current "enforcement by complaint" system is a failure already and I couldn't accept that lack of response would result in more cruelty to animals. I also think that this could create a lot of conflict among neighbours. For example, some like pigs, others hate them or have religious problems with them. Raising animals for fur is an ethical offence to most people. Rabbits are pets to some and food to others. It goes on and on.
- Pigeons are not pets & should not be allowed as such unless their wings are clipped.
- Why would someone in an urban setting need chickens? I cannot imagine having a neighbour with chickens and being forced to listen to that all day long.
- Livestock are usually louder, smellier, and require more space than can be provided in an urban setting
- Terrible idea - very serious and long term impacts to neighbours
- Chickens spread disease. Would you let people own ducks and geese next? Or how about rats and pigs. Instead of Wuhan 2, we can have the Calgary flu.
- Livestock are made for farms. Keep them there. The noise and the smell doesn't fit city life.
- The noise level of farm animals in the city is unacceptable. Especially when we can not control clean standards.
- This is one of the most prejudice and judgemental bylaws I've ever read. You can not act with this much prejudice to a dog breed when jack Russell terriers, chiuhas, golden retrievers and other such dog breeds are far more aggressive. Dogs don't attack based on breed they attack based on the way their owners raise and train them. This seems like the councilor proposing this has extreme prejudice based on their on personal feelings about this specific breed and is not attempting to utilize their position of power to control and enforce something so discriminatory.
- Livestock belong on farms. I've lived next to people who owned a rooster.... The whole neighbourhood can hear that whenever it decides to cockadoodle doo!
- The keeping of livestock in a major urban area is completely inappropriate given the negative impacts of noise and odor on the community.



- There is not enough room for livestock in the city
- Lot sizes are too small to allow this
- There is no need for this amendment as there is no need to allow for livestock of any kind in Calgary.
- This is noise that cannot be contained.
- My concern is that neighbors with hens would not properly care for them causing a smell, noise and unclean environment for all those in the area.
- Seems like a slippery slope. If neighbors agree to you having hens in your yard and they move is it grandfathered in?
- Fowl and any other type of farm animal belong in a rural setting only. This would include pigeons.
- Farm animals belong on a farm.
- Unless there is adequate space, it's not fair to the animal
- Chickens are loud and messy. What if the neighbours approve the chickens and then move?
- No livestock in the city. There's always the one person who won't take care and it'll be a nuisance for all.
- Having hens in the city is just one more noisy, disgusting, unnecessary complication that the city governance doesn't need to waste its time, energy, and citizen money on. Buy an egg at the grocery store for 10¢. Good God.
- Livestock shouldn't be raised in the city.
- "The amount of people that
- Would buy them not realize the responsibility and just let the out would be terrible. Along with the improper caging that would happen along with the noise"
- Seriously. Hens. We do not live on a ranch. They belong on a farm.
- livestock do not belong in the city. If you want to raise chickens move to a farm.
- Many people are unfamiliar with farm animals and therefore their care may be substandard. Also the noise, smells and small lot size makes this unwieldy
- Hens and other livestock do not belong in the city
- Too much of a nuisance
- What a nightmare. Absolutely not. The smell. The sounds. The one inevitable lack of care, especially in winter. The unwanted animals chickens will attract.
- No
- Urban environments are not the right environments for livestock. Livestock in urban environments would also be nuisances to neighbours.
- You want livestock, go by a farm. Livestock does not belong in the city. Properties are too small to house any sort of livestock!
- Property lots in Calgary are generally small making it difficult to safely and humanely house livestock. Not everyone would have the same rights because some properties are ill equipped due to size in order to support animals.



- Livestock comes with specific health concerns and training. If everyone had hens chickens roosters cows it should be outside city limits
- Not entirely sure how this would look.
- Without knowing what “other livestock” includes, I cannot support this.
- Livestock needs to have lots of room which several communities do not have. Inhumane to keep them in small areas within city
- There should be no bylaw created based off of a dogs physical appearance. And a “pit bulls bite” is not a reason as there are much stronger dogs that are not related to the pit bull breed (ie. Grey hound, Cane Corso, etc.) where as those dogs listed as an example, do not look like a pit bull at all. Any dog can be aggressive and it is up to the OWNER to have the dog trained properly in order to take it out into public to socialize. I do not agree with this bylaw what so ever and if this is passed you will see myself leaving Calgary as that is disgusting behaviour.
- Loud and noisy and dirty. Also cause disruptions with other animals ei cats and dogs
- If people want to keep barnyard animals, they should purchase a farm. I do not want to smell animal waste, or be disturbed by the noises these animals make.
- If you want farm animals move to a farm
- it is not fair to punish pit bulls who are docile, the problem is that whoever raises it, not everyone can have pitbulls.
- "To many variables. What do you do if neighbors agree then one set sells their house and the new neighbors object to the livestock or hens? How th [remove] do you tell the hens owners that what was acceptable now is not?"
- Farm stock should stay out of cities. People that want animals live that should be in one of the many smaller communities or on a farm or acreage."
- It encourages hoarding behaviours and could increase The draw of wild animals into the city
- Livestock doesn't fit in a city. It is unreasonable and abnormal to take a animal out of their comfort zone which is a rural area.
- Live on a farm if you want livestock. Houses are too close together and already do not allow for adequate distancing for noise and nuisances.
- I think there will be too many problems with owners not adequately cleaning causing odour issues. Also hens could attract predators endangering other pets and children. We already have coyotes and bobcats.
- The country is where farm animals belong not in the city
- Chickens can be noisy. I would need to see a size minimum on yards to be able to hold chickens as I wouldn't want to hear my neighbors chickens all day long.
- I don't believe we need livestock instead we should be pushing for animal rights instead of continuing down the path we have been
- Go live in the country or on a farm if you want farm animals. It's not fair to these animals.
- Some neighbours are going to say no just to say no. I believe they need to be screened for adequate living conditions for the animal and that overall benefit is positive. I think family benefit can be just as important as community benefit.



- Hens don't belong in the city
- I am concerned for the well-being of the hens, it seems unlikely there could be proper monitoring of their treatment/living conditions.
- roosters are LOUD
- I need to know more about what other animals this would include. Noise, smell, and nuisance are considerations.
- Chickens smell if not taken care of properly and the coop not cleaned, they also need room to roam and many backyards in the city are not large enough to do this effectively.
- I would not be happy if my neighbours had hens in their backyard. Namely because my community only allows chain link fences for yards.
- Noise messy smell
- Although I would like to be able to have hens I don't think Calgary properties are large enough for other livestock.
- I am concerned that they would be abused and bred for slaughter.
- I don't want to live next door to a cow. My neighbours aren't responsible enough to own a dog, let alone a goat.
- I think COVID highlights the risk associated with mixing fowl, livestock and people in urban setting.
Thanks
- I don't want live stock in Calgary. That's going to attract more wild life that we don't need in the City.
- "Suitable living conditions" is extremely vague. There would need to be concrete rules in place that are ENFORCEABLE as needed.
- Why do I need Hens in Calgary?
- Hens have roosters roosters crow.....do you really want to open that can of worms? Smell, attracting coyotes and other wildlife. Now there is abuse....
- Hens and other livestock do not belong in the city.
- Why shouldn't people be allowed to raise their own food
- Farm animals are better suited to farms. This can lead to noise issues and unwanted messes/smells.
- No
- Obvious is it not
- If it's on a farm yes not in a house in the city then no
- Livestock belongs on farms.
- no.
- No
- I am at a loss as to what exceptions there would be where someone would require an absolute need to raise livestock in the city. I do not think exceptions should be allowed. It permits a grey area whereby loopholes can be exploited.
- Most people do not properly clean up or care for hens. In a city setting this could get quite messy and smelly. Plus dogs not properly leashed or fenced may want to get at the hens.



- livestock should be kept in farms or acreages
- If my neighbor started raising a backyard farm (hens, goats, etc) - I would be beyond irritated.
- Nop
- But... I was raised on a farm and most people have problems picking up after their dogs ... smell WILL be an issue.
- No
- I live close to downtown. Its already busy enough and the noise levels are high all day and all night. If I have to factor in the sound of chickens, im buying myself some oil and firing up the deep fryer. Keep the coops in smaller communities.
- More wildlife is net good
- No thanks
- I don't want to live on a farm if I did I would move
- Urban hens should not be allowed. There are enough hens in the farming industry living in horrible conditions. There is no need for more.
- too loud
- We have farms for these kinds of animals
- We don't need chickens in the city
- Farm animals do not belong in the city.
- Livestock belong outside of the city regardless of what it is
- Birds smell and make noise.
- Rural livestock should not be allowed in urban areas
- This is wrong and animals behave differently than humans and humans can aggravate an animal or scare them and they naturally get defensive when they are vulnerable pit pulls are just like any other animal and not all of them are aggressive.
- Noisy, dirty, disruptive for others.
- too many areas in this city where wildlife would be drawn to the chickens as food
- Livestock should be keep in rural areas, not in the city. Living in the city is not a conducive environment for livestock.
- Livestock is not appropriate in city.
- We have had hebs and roosters kept by a neighbour in a confined space that have been disruptive day and night. I do not support this.
- Potential noise complaints? I mean they're not kept inside houses in order reduce the noise levels but are kept outside instead.
- They are not meant for residential
- So many reason this shouldn't be allowed. City is not meant for hens or other live stock. They require room, they can smell , be loud. Houses are so close together. Zoonotic diseases
- Livestock don't belong in the city. This is how disease can spread. "support from adjacent neighbours" means nothing when homes change owners and then do they have veto power? Would they be informed by their realtor of hens or whatever living next door? Would there be a registry



anyone could look up? What about a house next door to a condo complex? Too many variables and living arrangements to make it an equal opportunity for all to be a fair program anyway.

And...diseases...still a problem.

- "While an urban environment can be quite adequate for a limited number of hens on a residential property, the same cannot be said of other livestock such as cattle, horses, goats, sheep, pigs, alpacas/llamas, or other livestock animals larger than chickens, quail, or rabbits.

- It also seems like it could easily become a source of resentment and/or anger between neighbours, which would not contribute to civic harmony."
- Chickens stink
- We are a City not a farm.
- Current bylaws
- "Urban hens are one thing, but urban pigs and sheep are another. Animals need daily exercise, adequate space, and enrichment (among many other things) and the backyard of a house in suburban Calgary is not adequate.
- If a property was pre inspected, the potential owners of the urban livestock had a proven record in animal care and applied for and received the proper permit, only then could the city of Calgary even begin to consider opening this can of worms."
- Unsure
- "Unfortunately a lot of times, people get animals on the basis of they are cute, and as much as they are, rarely can a city home have appropriate living conditions for livestock, nor can most people provide all
- Their needs."
- or a medical reason, yes. Let's not let it go to far, chickens in every yard,,no, goats,, etc no
- chickens are noisy and smelly. I foresee a lot of poor conditions for livestock. People don't properly care for their domestic animals, what makes you think they would care for livestock adequately?
- I don't feel as though people living within the city could provide adequate homes and care for the animals. I believe this would lead to many animals being seized for abuse or lack of care.
- Farm animals belong on the farm where there is adequate space.
- The city is not the place for livestock. They can be noisy, smelly and can contribute to the spread of disease - especially poultry and swine. They are a wonderful addition for people living rurally but not for people who live in such close proximity to others. Enforcement and disputes on livestock issues will also waste time and efforts needed in other areas.
- Chicken are noisy and smell
- "Many housing communities do not have adequate spacing for other livestock.
- Chickens may be an exception, however, how many are allowed to one household? How is the smell that is often associated to chickens be managed? Etc."
- Livestock does not belong in an urban or suburban environment.



- Livestock belong on farms, not in backyards.
- Loud, smelly, I would not want to live next door to someone with chickens. Imagine trying to sit in your backyard when there's a chicken coop 8 feet away. It's beneficial to only the owner, not anyone else. Lot size and location of the coop would have to have rules with no grey areas and strictly monitored.
- Absolutely not necessary to have livestock in the city
- Should not be in the city. I would love hens but I know they are not city pets.
- Noise, smell and small yards are a concern.
- I think these livestock belong in farms. They're not domesticated like dogs and cats.
- Larger livestock have no place in the city. It would be impossible to create appropriate space for them.
- I feel this will raise concerns of noise, smell, disruption to the general living areas surrounding the proposed livestock locations. This could have a significant effect on the perceived value and potential sales of surrounding properties. The raising of livestock should be in a more rural setting.
- I don't see how having a hen would impact a community positively.
- Issue of noise and smell for nearby residents. Most people don't know what goes into raising chickens
- Smell, noise, lack of space between houses, impact on neighbouring animals.
- farm animal should stay on farms. If you want chickens move to the country. They require more maintenance than a dog or cat ,ie cage cleaning. Most people cant pick up their dog poop that they leave on my front lawn. I grew up on a farm and all animal enclosures create some nasty smells, especially chickens.
- Unenforceable. Poultry en made is a health hazard in inexperienced hands. Think rampant bird flu!
- Enforcement problems. Te smell of hens and other farm animals.
- Cows shouldn't she running around the city
- I hardly believe suitable living conditions and proper care can be provided to livestock in the city
- Chickens smell. Personally I would not like to live next door to a coop.
- If you want livestock and stuff. Buy a farm. I dont want to be hearing and smelling farm animals in the city.
- Farm animals should remain on a farm
- I don't feel people should have chickens in the city
- I worry about the noise, smell, and property damage
- Noise and health & safety concerns.
- Noise and smell
- I don't see the need for livestock in the urban areas, with so many farms/farmers in the surrounding areas.
- Chickens will be more disruptive than dogs
- They are dirty, noisy and people fight too much already about dogs and cats. This is stressful
- Live stock is for farms but on a basis to basis being a support animal would be considered



- Noise, smells would not be appreciated. If this could be completely mitigated (such as indoor/basement only), that would be fine.
- I'd support urban hens but not other livestock.
- I don't want to be living next to live stock or chickens
- We live in an urban centre - if people want to own livestock, there are plenty of rural properties around the city to do so.
- I choose to live in the city for a reason. It is bad enough that we allow smelly firepits. I have no desire to live next to a smelly, noisy flock of chickens. People will not keep the pens clean. Some people have allergies and are bothered by grains being fed to the chickens, feathers etc. They want a farm animal, let them rent space on a farm to keep them.
- Neighbours who may originally approve may change their mind when they witness the noise and smell firsthand. It would likely be too late to reverse the decision.
- Noise and smell. There is no list of what livestock would be permitted to make any other judgement
- "This could go wrong in soooooany ways
- What if you get a new neighbor that doesn't approve?"
- This will get out of hand as there are not enough bylaw officers to handle all communities
- Noise and mess
- I don't know of any neighbor hood that has enough space for livestock and people to easily cohabitate.
- The noise of chickens in these small yards would not be enjoyable in the evening while sitting outside. These type of animals need lots of room, but the normal size of yards cannot handle this. Fire department have complained about how close the homes are, now you want chickens. Coyotes would become more of a problem than now. My parents and their neighbours have lost small animals to these animals. I back onto a green space that is an alleyway for coyotes, birds, ducks, ocelots and other wild animals. I love it. I do not want to here in the middle of the night that chickens are being killed by coyotes and ocelots.
- The potential for owner/neighbour disputes and conflict is too high.
- Chickens have no place in the city.
- I'm concerned about the animal's quality of life and what predators might be drawn into the city by them
- Unnecessary.
- Its stupid
- Birds carry disease they are noisy and this form is already complaining about nuisance dogs why are we trying to add nuisance chicken
- I don't believe livestock should be allowed in the city with the exception of emotional support livestock animals.
- Pitbulls belong in calgary. Not chickens.
- Lack of consistency to the care and treatment of the animals and risk of imposing conflict amongst neighbors.
- Livestock does not belong in an urban environment



- It would cause too many problems.
- Chickens stink, goats and stuff would be eaten by the owners that want fresh meat - no for me
- I don't want to smell them.
- Farm animals don't belong in the city
- A lot of people can barely take care of normal domesticated animals (dogs, cats, rabbits, etc); should not be increasing the pool of animals to pick from. The noise and smell is greatly downplayed by those who are pushing for urban livestock.
- Livestock are smelly and require a lot of room for a proper living condition to be met. That should not be within city limits.
- I don't believe that the space within urban Calgary is enough to support the amenities these animals and practices need
- How and why would live stock be allowed but a well trained dog would'nt be. If owners can't be accountable for cats or dogs. How could they be for livestock
- Attracts wildlife.
- loud . Dirty
- Livestock does not belong in the city.
- You are trying to control dogs and allowing people to have livestock as well. Then offcourse a dog will bark if he sees chickens etc and then he is a nuisance, that is not fair.
- I do not believe that livestock should be kept within the city limits.
- Chickens bring disease that many aren't prepared to deal with, are dirty and noisy.
- I don't feel that any livestock should be in the city limits
- Livestock had no place in the city (farm animals)
- People are not responsible enough and not enough yard space in Calgary properties.
- Live stock does not belong in the city. Between unwanted notices and smells it will reduce the neighbours ability to enjoy their back yard.
- Chickens and other rural animals do not belong in the city. They can be loud and smelly and disturb other residents.
- We already have enough issues with owners not properly caring for existing pets. The city is not the place for livestock.
- They stink
- I think this teeters in a slippery slope
- N/A
- There would be no follow through to ensure proper living conditions, etc. So the person would file with proper documentation and ideas and not follow through on it.
- They are not meant to live in urban areas.
- How are you going to regulate and ensure the animals are well cared for?
- This could become a hindrance to neighbors.
- We don't need chickens and livestock in the city. Move to a farm if you want livestock
- Please just enforce the current laws



- Don't want the smell of livestock or disease associated with uncleanliness in the city
- There are many health risks associated with keeping livestock with the general public. Hens are fine but other types of livestock require much more attention and care in order not to be a public danger and nuisance.
- Don't need another alarm clock...
- Houses are too close together in new communities with too small of yards. The smell and sounds would be very difficult for surrounding neighbours.
- Farm animals do not belong in the city. Not all property owners will be responsible enough to keep a clean pen. Risking animal to human virus spreading.
- It's a city, not a farm. I can barely get a place to rent with a cat or dog. Imagine someone losing their residence. What do you think will happen to it? It will be killed. Change the attitude of Landlord's and renting to animal/pet owners. MAYBE then this could be further discussed.
- Chickens are noisy and smelly.
- Regular citizens have no idea of how to properly care for the animals
- Too loud
- Livestock does not need to be in the city. Keep them on farms and in rural areas.
- The city has enough on their plates they do not need to get into animal farms.
- You have not lived on a farm chickens are loud and they do stink even when you take good care of them. Pigeons are a messy bird there is no cleaning up their feces that is an impossible criteria to even put in your rules.
- Backyard flocks are the biggest disease contributors.
- Hens/chickens are not meant to live in small back yards. They are meant to roam free, on farm land. I suspect the other pests they will attract will become more of an issue.
- Birds are loud and not every neighbour is going to want to hear that.
- I would not want my neighbors to keep hens in their yard, the noise and the potential mess are not appealing. Hens don't belong in a small backyard.
- If there was a way to keep noise and smell under control I would consider changing my answer
- I don't want livestock or hens in a city neighborhood at a private house. We have enough noise in the neighborhood already.
- The City is not a farm.
- Farm animals belong on the farm not in the city.
- If you want livestock move to an acreage and the country.
- As long as there are backyard breeders, puppy mills, chained dogs, neglected/abused dogs and cats and maybe even dogfighting or cockfighting rings, the City should not consider extending the variety of animals in the population. When there will be no kill in the shelters because of pet overpopulation, then the City may consider adding to its budget for the control and monitoring of other pets.
- Hens should not be allowed as pets in urban areas.
- Livestock should not be permitted in city limits due to noise, smell and hygienic reasons



- Hard enough to enforce other birds in city
- Bylaw can be very biased. They Cannot say yes to one and no to another
- Makes too much noise.
- Hens shouldn't be allowed in the first place. You guys can't get tough on vicious dogs but you want to allow hens? What is wrong with this picture? (Wait until the first normal, nice, well-adjusted dog gets into a henhouse - imagine that on the news.... Dogs hunt hens as they do squirrels, rabbits, mice.... Who thinks of this?!?)
- Concerned about noise, waste, and smell.
- chickens and livestock are not meant for cities
- Not as explained above. The first 2 points are lacking objectivity instead they rely on opinion & feelings. Support from adjacent neighbours - I may not like their dog - but I have no recourse on that.
- hens would be ok, but not other livestock. Roosters in cities are a noise nuisance, for example.
- [removed]
- I do not believe that city people would provide appropriate care to hens. Also keeping hens in close quarters with people can increase chances of disease spread in those communities.
- No need for people to have other farm animals in the city. That's why there are farms and ranches.
- It is your property, you don't need your neighbors approval to have a dog, why for a bird?
- Noise & smell
- No livestock
- No
- Would require more information on this issue before being willing to vote for or against this amendment.
- Room for too many neighbour issues
- It is impossible to keep chickens from being noisy, and creating odours that affect neighbors. If I wanted my home to smell like a barn, I'd live in a rural area, not a city.
- In most situations livestock is not suited to city living, sufficient space cannot be provided for these animals. People would abuse this and keep the animals in unsuitable conditions.
- Its a farm animal. Belongs on a farm
- Noise/smell.
- I don't feel livestock can get the required care, space, etc in a regular home environment. Plus smells, noise etc not fair to the neighbors
- Only if you can humanely prevent cats/foxes/other predators from getting at your chickens
- I don't like chickens. Noisy and smelly
- Homes are already way to close together in Calgary unlike they are in most parts of airdrie, chickens would just make too much noise and during unwanted times of the day.
- Live stock belong on a farm. I do not want to hear or smell them. I live in the city for a reason.
- It would be a noise, health, and cleanliness nuisance in high density areas
- We need to draw the line somewhere. This is a city not a rural environment.



- Animals such as these do not belong in a city. Average yard size in Calgary is quite small and properties are too close together to support livestock in backyards.
- I don't want the smell or sound of hens in my neighborhood. We live in the city, not on a farm.
- Chickens and livestock belong on farms not houses.
- Unless I'm regards to outskirts where there's space; I think livestock needs better spaces to roam, therefore in the city wouldn't be ideal.
- Your considering breed specific laws but you want to put hens and dogs across the fence from each other.. disaster..
- The smell and the noise would be a nuisance for more than the immediate neighbours. In the city, it is rare that someone has a large enough lot to actually give hens the proper space they need and respect their neighbours' right to peaceful living.
- My neighbours are already breaking most bylaws. Chickens would be a clucking disaster
- I believe that should not be allowed in urban areas and requires too many resources/ tax dollars to monitor this.
- No way to control everyone with owning livestock
- I like that my family has livestock on their farm or acreage. But I don't want to live beside rooster etc.
- Poultry belongs on a farm/acreage
- NA
- I don't think it's a good idea to allow farm animals/livestocks to be living in people's backyards.
- Noise complaints would sky rocket wasting peace officer's time, when we already have overworked staff in this department.
- Livestock need more space than can be provided in a back yard in the city. On a side note, they are quite smelly and still noisy.
- Noise complaints in suburban areas
- I see it as a potential issue with neighbors, smell, etc.
- Unsure...sounds like a slippery slope, negative effect on property values.
- I would not want to live next door to the smell, odor or noise of chickens pigeons etc
- I would be worried about noise and smell. Not sure what other livestock would entail. If you can let us know then I could comment further or change my answer.
- I feel like we don't have to have animals keep the grass down and that this will take away jobs which would harm our economy further
- after all the fuss over the Chicken plant in Ramsey, it would be hypocritical to allow chickens in yards.
- Parasite control and easy prey for wildlife to venture closer to homes
- Livestock are noisy and not domesticated animals
- Livestock can bring diseases and I just don't think it should be kept in urban areas.
- Farm animals are meant for farms, not the city
- Farm animals should not be in city limits. Noise and smell would be a problem



- I don't want my neighbours rooster crowing at 5 in the morning. There is a reason I live in a city and not a farm.
- I don't think other livestock are suitable for city dwellings.
- "Suburb land is limited, yards are small.
- Though I like the idea of a constant supply of fresh eggs, my fear would be that some residents may butcher the chicken for meat."
- Thus would result in more animal cruelty and more animals needing homes
- People aren't responsible enough, and would result in more animal abuse
- I can't see any livestock other than chickens doing well within the city; they wouldn't have enough room to make their life enjoyable in my opinion.
- Livestock should be in a rural place, not a city.
- This bylaw will just end up amplifying the current animal related disturbances occurring between neighbors and community members
- Livestock should not be raised in residential communities. People are not equipped to take care of livestock that are not trained
- I do not support livestock in urban settings including hens and chickens.
- I would want to see more details specifically with regard to cleanliness, smell and noise. As well as what percentage of the neighbours need to be in support of this?
- Cities are not the place for livestock
- I don't believe that farm animals belong in a city lot
- There should be no hens or farm animals allowed in the city. If you want to fine dogs and cats why make your problems worse
- Farm animals don't belong in a city.
- In my experience, urban chickens are universally a nuisance and are rarely properly managed.
- Limited space already, too many people with decrepit yards etc already
- Depends on the animal and size of the grounds where animal will be kept.
- I'm allergic to most farm animals so I'd like to breathe
- Livestock should not be permitted in the city. The livestock would not have enough space to live a good life.
- We are too large a city to have close neighbour communication and confirmation of support.
- The noise and smell would be an issue
- "The way you phrased that makes it sound like you are asking about the second, not the former.
- Have you been on a farm? Chickens are loud, even a cow would be a less obtrusive suggestion."
- You want to ban pitbulls but allow chickens in people's yard? Completely malicious and irresponsible
- No hens
- Unsightly and increased management. Neighbours can;t controls dogs and cats let alone an untrainable more difficult to keep penned chicken.
- This opens the door for many more problems for the city. Noise. Waste. Animal abuse. Chickens should not be in city limits.



- Hens are noisy.
- I don't know what you mean by other livestock. Cows? Horses? Or ducks? There's a big difference.
- Too much disease can come from livestock/hens!!!!
- "Our houses are already so close In the city never mind Adding hens ... you will issues with dogs and cats taunting barking you name it at the foreign animals to them . Livestock do not belong in the city and most people do not have the resources in their yards for a proper coupe it could also add concerns with smells
- Skunks coyotes you name it on a farm owners can prepare themselves for those animals however in the city to bring hens is bring more Prey for the coyotes which is already a huge concern in public areas ."
- livestock should not be permitted in urban areas due to noise and other nuisance and impact to the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties
- If people are basically not going to be allowed to own pit bulls, we don't need pigs, horses and chickens to add to the mix. Those animals belong on farms not backyard of people living in the city.
- Seems like having livestock in close vicinity of other homeowners would present additional noise, smell and potential waste issues. I dont think its fair for neighbors to have to deal with it, and could potentially calling city services more often.
- If you want livestock go live on a farm.
- I have concerns about the animals being slaughtered on the property
- I do not agree with hens or other livestock allowed in the city.
- Leave the hens to the farmers
- I don't think people will take the time to research the needs of the livestock, or really consider the impacts of noise, smell, and increasing attraction for predators in the area.
- People keeping farm animals in their back yard does not give them adequate room to move. Also, chances are they are also going to be slaughtered in the back yard as well.
- positive impact to a community is a vague term. Be specific. What does support mean
- Chickens are loud and smell
- Inner city isnt a farm.
- Many yards are too small/too close to neighbours
- I don't want to hear or smell neighbors animals. They belong on an acreage or a farm.
- That would be a nuisance to neighbours
- I would not find it acceptable to live next to a hen house in the middle of the city. This could also greatly decrease resale value of surrounding houses.
- there's no need to have livestock in Calgary. They should. Move to a rural area if they want to keep livestock.
- I don't feel that livestock belongs in the city - that's why you live on an acreage or rural property.
- It we'll bring disease if it not controlled nor process properly giving power to those who will abuse the law
- There are already issues in other communities with Chickens let's not add to it.



- Hens are noisy and messy. Farms are better for them.
- I am against this because the housing is too close together... A lot of people can't even care for the dogs and cats in the city..... The smells, and who would be responsible for these animals when the novelty wears off.
- I honestly don't understand this question. Therefore I cannot comment.
- Hen coops stink, and neighbourhoods already reek from marijuana and firepits. Where will there be any fresh air left?
- Opening it up to any animals is a bit absurd in a city
- I don't think livestock should be kept in the city. It would create unwanted noise and smell.
- Needing permission from neighbours may cause conflicts. Size of property should be a consideration, especially considering how odours and noise may impact neighbours' enjoyment of their homes.
- Space is limited and livestock other than hens and small poultry require more space. P
- Do not support urban chickens. If I wanted to wake up at the crack of dawn by a rooster, I'd live on a farm.
- This is a city. If you want to raise livestock, purchase a home in the country where farming is considered a normal practice. I also don't believe livestock should be retained under the guise of therapy animals.
- The noise and/or smell could be problematic.
- I do not think majority of the public will provide appropriate care and medical treatment for chickens. If voting yes, these people should have requirements for yearly exam and fecal testing.
- If I live in an urban setting I do not want to be dealing with the sounds and smells that come with a small farm or hen house. It would be very disruptive.
- I am not sure this is a safe or healthy idea.
- Introducing livestock possibly to neighborhoods could introduce many more issues like under the counter sales or even smells and such. I also don't see a need or any of the pros to adding the livestock to our communities.
- There is a potential for livestock to overrun a residential property.
- NO. Just NO. Don't do this.
- I would support the guardianship of animals considered livestock only if their welfare was the primary condition. But given how badly the rules regarding the welfare of domestic pets are enforced, I would say absolutely not. More animals don't need to be abused.
- Considering the fact that people are not even required to prove they are qualified to own a dog, it seems ridiculous to think that you can ensure that livestock are being properly cared for and that enforcement is forthcoming.
- The city is not a farm. If you want a farm, move to the country.
- The smell... they belong on a farm
- I do not support the ownership of livestock in the city for animal welfare reasons.
- Hens are for the farm. Keep them on the farm



- Some yards are simply too small for this... and as well I would have big concerns regarding the owner keeping yards clean
- Calgary is too crowded to not have others view these animals a nuisance
- If you want to have a farm animal the go live on a acreage
- I would want more information on what is meant by suitable living conditions and impact on neighbours
- City lots are not even big enough for people to live cleanly and peacefully together, unless you live in an older area where the lots are not yet redeveloped. You can play farmer on a rural property.
- Keep livestock for acreages and farms it smells terrible. People living with animals is how we have things like covid and bird flu.
- People can barely handle domesticated animals. Would not enjoy loose livestock getting hit by neighborhoods cars. People Who currently have livestock animals as pets REALLY want them breaking law or not. There for, they will give proper care. As soon as the doors are open for everybody.. I'm not sure what would happen.
- People already complain of noise hens are loud and can be very territorial. Also if I lived next door to someone who had hens and was trying to sell my house, it may be a massive turnoff if potential buyers which in turns hurts the finances of everyone.
- Too much potential for noise, smell and disruption of the peace.
- It is not necessary to open the door to other animals.
- Farm animals need a farm
- The smell, waste, noise, disease and who will be honest and follow the rules or bylaw put in place. What if people use the animals for fighting?
- Hens do not belong in the city. Often times people don't have the space for them. I think that allowing hens will isn't appropriate for a city environment where people will just build small cages to put many hens in.
- I understand the reason for hens and goats, but based on how people tend to not put their best foot forward I think the animals would either suffer or be a nuisance to neighbours.
- The coops stink
- Again owners need to be responsible. I wouldn't want to live next door to noisy chickens or the stench if the owners neglect to clean up after the animals.
- Farm animals belong on the farm.
- I love the idea of allowing chickens, however the noise and the smell is a huge deterrent.
- That is the reason for "FARMS" Chickens DO NOT belong within city limits!!!
- Livestock require space. That is not feasible in an urban setting.
- Some animals, don't need to be within city limits, especially animals that require more then one to be happy, a proper (they aren't cheep) set up, and need more space then what the now typical back yard in Calgary is sized as.
- I don't want any livestock within the city limits.
- I am worried this will draw in more coyotes to urban areas.



- How do you manage the sounds and noise violations that would happen as they are animals not trainable pets?
- No wildlife in the city
- Working in a shelter we frequently see hens that have been abandoned when people realize that they have actual needs, they are often in incredibly poor condition and are rarely provided proper medical care. There is a severe lack of knowledge in the average person on humane care, and they tend to be "used & abused" then dumped if they out-live their usefulness.
- I do not want to hear roosters at 5 am
- The city is no place for livestock.
- If people want a farm, move to the country. Hens and other livestock belong on farms, not in the city. The LESA lady is a fraud, she just wanted to keep hens!
- My neighbours had hens for a while. They woke us up every morning - they are too loud for close-together city housing. They belong in the country not the city.
- I prefer no urban hens
- Noise and smell. This can carry further than adjacent neighbours.
- Chickens are dirty, then what goats, pigs?
- Leave the farm to farmers.
- Chickens smell.
- [removed]
- Farm animals do not belong in the city. They can be noisy, dirty and produce unwelcome odors. (I grew up on a farm!)
- There should be something about noise the animal makes included
- I do not want livestock of any kind next to me. I live in the city, not on a farm.
- You want to have livestock, then move out of the city. I love all animals but a city yard is not the place for livestock.
- What is the definition of livestock, does it include pigs, cows, goats and other animals?
- hens would attract more coyotes and bob cats when there is already a big enough problem with them.
- I would not welcome the noise of chickens while trying to sleep or enjoy the peace and quiet of my backyard.
- It a rural animal. It will attract wild animals like coyotes putting neighbours at risk.
- Livestock should live where they have proper space and can proper care
- Enforcement will be too challenging to take on effectively.
- I'm thinking about noise, smell, what if they get loose?
- This is a city, not farm land. If people want to own farm animals they can move outside city limits. There is no way people would take proper care of these animals, plus it would decrease the life enjoyment for these animals if forced to live in tiny backyards. Also, could you imagine a rooster waking up a neighbourhood everyday? I would be furious if I had to deal with that inside the city.
- It would be too hard to enforce this from a bylaw officer perspective.



- Game and farm animals belong outside the city. This should only be allowed if you have a larger plot of land
- Farm animals do not belong in the city.
- I don't think livestock in the city is a good idea. Also coops are dirt and probably will smell.
- Live stock presents a cleanliness issue, noise and smell issue, and can attract predators into otherwise quiet areas, putting others at risk for encounters.
- They stink SO BAD. This isn't setting anyone up for success.
- The city is not the place for livestock
- Leave farm animals on the farm.
- Most properties in Calgary do not have sufficient space to adequately care for livestock.
- They are noisy and smelly and disrupt neighbours
- This isn't a huge farm! Redicilous
- Problems with hen is that they can be noisy, and also can stink. I have experience with family that owns ranch and has hen.
- Think our climate is too cold especially if owners are novices at this
- My next door neighbour had them and they were a nuisance! The noise was very frustrating. There is no need for them in the city.
- Concerns over manure, smells and noises.
- Livestock does not belong in an urban setting. There are too many dangers for the animals.
- How are community stakeholders engaged prior to introducing livestock on a property?
- I'm not sure Calgary is ready for livestock in our backyards yet.
- No exceptions though, farm animals can create an extremely offensive smell and residential is in too close proximity to neighbors.
- They smell and shy of removing 6-8" of top soil there is no removing the smell
- The city is growing and the boundaries are getting tighter, nuisance pets are the norm now andthat will not be changing anytime soon so why add on to the problem with more pets that may smell create more noises or atrack other predatory animals. In our neighborhood we have a huge problem with barking dogs however, one household may have only 1 dog but combine that with 5 - 10 house in the immediate area and if each animal barks, each takes a seperate time, the peace is destroyed and none of the owners think their pet is the issue.
- I do not support this because I believe other issues will arise in the future if this is allowed. I believe people will do whatever they want even when rules are in place.
- Chicken feces really stinks.
- Laying hens are short lived and Calgary WILL see them being released into the public or tossed into the compost bin.
- I disagree with livestock being allowed within city limits.
- Regarding other livestock: bylaw should remain as is - no livestock other than emotional support ones allowed in city.



- Having hens in town brings in more coyotes, foxes, and other predators. Those predators would end up causing more problems and probably getting hurt in the end.
- I would not want my neighbour to have hens - the smell and noise would be very bothersome in my opinion.
- Although there are bylaws of the number of livestock becomes unreasonable to maintain by bylaw it will get out of hand and be yet another issue that needs to be dealt with
- Worried about the noise and the smell.
- so somebody can own a damn rooster then slaughter for food in their backyard, but you're targeting pitbulls?
- Livestock belong on farms not in the city. Opens up to many issues and potentially increases other Wild animals (coyotes, bobcat etc) from being drawn into the city
- Farm animals should be on a farm not in suburban neighborhoods
- I don't believe the smell would be controlled & adversely affect adjacent neighbors. I have a Neighbor with 2 dogs. She decided spreading wood chips in the backyard of approx 12x12 would handle the smell if she chose not to pick up the waste. Has resulted is an awful smell, plus an influx of swarms of flies and has been a nightmare trying to get this stopped. Livestock next door would very likely be even worse.
- You are looking for new revenue, greedy city hall!
- The homes are too close for me to support this.
- I've lived other places where livestock is a problem in urban areas.
- Only no because this is too vague for me to have a whole opinion. What type of live stock. Horses and cows kill more Canadians every single year than dogs have... ever. And you are Henny Pennying over 40-60lb "pit bulls" like weirdos.
- I don't agree because chickens etc create smells and noise that belong on a farm - I opt to live in the city. It is enough to put up with the chaos that unattended pets cause.
- Having raised chickens on a farm, they do not belong in back yards
- Government control is always lost
- This is urban living, you want hens, live in the country
- Don't know enough to provide an answer
- I would not want to be next door to livestock, live in the country if you want that.
- Noise
- Livestock should remain in rural areas only.
- I would rather live next to a pit bull than a chicken
- I don't feel this is a good idea opens too many options for nuisances and also improper care of the hens
- "I live in a major urban center intentionally. If I wanted to wake to the crowing of roosters and braying donkeys, and dodge horse droppings as I walk, I would have moved elsewhere. It can be tense enough living in such close proximity to this many other humans, under no circumstances am I willing to introduce even more creatures to the same space, especially creatures that don't have the mental capacity to understand that it's not always an appropriate time to scream. There is nothing



reasonable about that suggestion. A huge benefit of living in an urban center is that your house doesn't smell of chicken shit. I'm at something of a loss trying to explain my answer because I can't imagine why anyone would want their figurative farm-animal neighbors to acquire literal farm animals. I would never move into a home that had livestock next door... If I already lived there, I would only stay long enough to find another place. The idea that my drug-addict neighbors with no education but an art degree, that can't even care for their own hygiene are about to be encouraged to let livestock loose in the neighborhood is disgusting. You claim that this is a suggestion from phase 1 feedback... are there any humans reviewing the feedback?? The idea is so short-sighted and childish, has no one considered the consequences? What happens when I can't find feed for my chickens? What do we do with all of the animal waste? Am I expected to keep them quiet during noise pollution hours? Who will deal with it when I insist that the neighborhood cat is stealing my eggs? What will you do when I get bored of chickens and let them loose in the alley? What am I expected to do with them when I move? What happens when my chicken finally dies of eating table scraps and garbage (because I can't find or afford feed downtown) and I eat it's diseased meat? What happens when my chicken inevitably attacks my neighbors infant? Is there no one involved in this project with cursory experience with farm animals?

- This idea is obviously foolish. If you are still unconvinced, talk to at least one rancher."
- People could take this too far. As well, these animals could attract more coyotes into urban areas. How do you prevent licensed cats outside from attacking free range hens?
- Who wants to listen to chickens at night
- They belong on farms and will bring the community down, due to smelly, noisy etc.
- My neighbor has 2 dogs and he never cleans after they poop. If these people get hens or other animals, I would be afraid of the consequences of bad hygiene.
- Spreading of communicable diseases and those that transfer to humans.
- I don't agree with livestock or hens in the city
- Bad smell
- Leave them alone. They belong in their environment not man made
- Noise. We live in a city with most residents not having air conditioning in the summer. Windows are open during the evening and early morning. It will be a disturbance.
- Hens belong on farm land not in the city
- not in the city neighborhood. Maybe allotments like in the UK
- They smell and too many people are irresponsible
- I am not sure that I am comfortable with a Bylaw Enforcement Officer making the final decisions.
- Chickens require a high level of care, and I cannot see this being followed in a city setting. Most yards are not large enough to house or provide room to run for these animals. enclosures would require heating in the winter - there are far too many variables to allow the general public to have these animals unfortunately.
- Messy, noisy and unnecessary



- I fear the mis-Treatment and lack of adequate care that may occur if owners are not responsible
- When I was younger our neighbors had chickens. The noise and the messy conditions where they kept them was awful. People struggle with taking care of cats and dogs, other livestock as personal pets I completely disagree with.
- Increases animals in captivity for no reason. Increases likelihood of animals being abused/neglected
- Noise concerns.
- Don't bring farm animals into the city, it's dangerous for themselves due to the traffic and high number of people. Additionally, most home owners within the city do not have the property space to adequately support a farm animal.
- Live stock is for farms not the city
- if you are looking to ban specific breed of dogs but allow specific live stock which can create just as much if not more harm/issues i feel the whole picture is not being looked at.
- If you want a farm, buy a farm.
- I would not want livestock animals loving next door to me (the noise, smell, etc)
- How do neighbors say "yes" and then when they discover the noise, smell, etc., go back and withdraw their approval. Most people don't know what this would look like beforehand and hindsight's 20/20. Also, when people started being allowed "emotional support animals" this went crazy with all kinds of stuff. Opening the door to this creates this kind of potential. Also, you would be increasing the number of animals that are neglected, not cared for humanely (like a puppy mill) and then where is the funding for new/diversified shelters to take on these animals? And what's the demand for rescued chickens? Already shelters are overrun with cats and dogs and other household pets. We don't need to add to that.
- So likely to be abused...buy an acreage if farming is your interest.
- I do not want any livestock in my neighbors yards. The noise and smell would be terrible. Many people dont pick up dog poop out of the yards, i believe unless people clean out pens every day the smell will be terrible! I grew up with chickens & know the smell that can waft across a yard.
- You're all for bringing in obnoxious animals, who stink and will bring other forms of wildlife into the city further to hunt them, but when youre given generalized info on A BREED of dog, you just penalize them and chastise those who own them. None of you should be in the position you are in if you're not willing to do PROPER research. You ignorant [removed]
- Could see this getting out of hand.
- "No. Unless in rural areas.
- Noise, smell"
- Support from adjacent neighbours may only be temporary. If they decide after the fact, for any number of reasons, that they no longer want the animal there, what happens to the animal? Also, if new neighbours move in, how do they get a say after a decision has already been made? Does it possibly affect resale of surrounding properties? Will it possibly put further strain on bylaw officers if complaints start rolling in? Livestock should remain outside of urban areas! Maybe there could be some sort of community farm, like a community garden, outside of residential areas??
- No



- Noise, smell, attraction of wild animals into the community.
- Farm animals belong on a farm not in the city
- There are going to be negligent livestock owners. Waste and disease will be a problem.
- Urban farm animals of any kind should not be allowed. If you want to raise farm animals you should live in a rural area.
- I think neighbours should have a say in whether hens are next door to them.
- Livestock larger than chickens/ducks need lots of yard space. Calgary lots are very small in many communities and won't accommodate any animal bigger
- Houses are too close together within Calgary. I think this should be for rural properties or acreages.
- If you want to raise livestock move to the country.
- .
- chickens stink. livestock shouldn't be kept in the city. there is enough farmland around calgary that a suitable system can be designed to create a community farm.
- Farm animals, especially chickens, are loud and smelly. They should not be permitted in the city unless land size meets a minimum criteria. Animals should also then not be permitted within a minimum distance of property boundaries.
- Livestock are for farms not urban backyards
- Stupid
- for so many reasons ,, #1 research this idea ,, its not new ,, unable to control the dogs and cats so let add so more to the list ,, buy an acreage that what they are for ,, why my tax dollars to evaluate case by case reviews from 0.000000001 % of population --really .
- Chickens smell beyond immediate neighbors.
- The noise and odour from them would be a major disturbance to neighbours. If all neighbours were okay with it with written consent then perhaps it could be allowed.
- Livestock in the city is not ok.
- I live in a city so I don't need to live next to livestock!
- This is not a rural environment. It is a city. Farms are rural.
- Inner city yards are no place for livestock .. The health concerns from chickens outweigh the necessity for them.
- I believe there will be an increase in rodent and other wildlife activity creating issues in other ways. Disease ect
- Residential properties in Calgary are close to each other.i do not want to smell the animals or their excrement.
- We need to keep other livestock out of the City. I don't think it is a good idea to have anyone exposed to disease that could be carried by Other Livestock.
- nobody wants squaking birds all night and day.
- Livestock do not belong in the city! They belong on a proper rural farm.
- Farm animals do not belong in the city.
- I don't want hens and chickens in my neighborhood



- Farm animals belong on a farm.
- No urban animal farming should be allowed.
- We don't need urban hens.
- I don't think livestock animals should be allowed in the city, they are messy and smelly animals even when taken care of, barking dogs are something we deal with on a daily basis I don't want to live next to someone who has a hen house or any other type of live stock. People that want to own livestock should look at living on property away from the city, I don't agree with it and think a city yard is not big enough to hold such animals.
- We live in a city, not a rural, agricultural environment. This is a slippery slope leading to livestock bylaw issues requiring investigation and enforcement costs. If you want a rural setting, move to a rural area.
- Livestock deserve open outdoor space to roam
- There is no scientific evidence to support the claim that chickens are emotional support animals and they are an inappropriate pet for a city setting.
- Livestock does not belong in the city limits. Smell of excretion is the biggest issue.
- I don't think people could build suitable living quarters for them - how would they remain warm when it's super cold out?
- farm animals belong on farms. If my neighbors can have hens and farm animals which make more noise than regular house pets then I should be able to make noise all night too. Or if we allow farm animals in yards then I should be able to grow my marijuana outside too
- I don't understand how a hen can help the community
- It will attract other wild life (coyotes, lynx, etc) into the backyards of Calgarians.
- Farm animals do not belong in town
- I would not support hens or other livestock in the city.
- If you want hens, live in the country. Would not like to live next to people owning livestock. Urban beekeeping okay.
- I would not want to live next door to a house with hens because of the smell and or noise.
- You're going to outlaw pitbulls but allow people to have chickens???? Seriously? No.
- "Brings predators around
- If you have a chicken, eventually you will have a coyote or weasels or tons of mice"
- Neighborhoods change as do neighbours. What is acceptable at one time may not be so in the future.
- Hens and pigeons will disturb neighbourhoods with noise and fecal matter. People wanting to own hens or game birds should go take care of a farm, not an urban backyard.
- Livestock should not be kept in someone's backyard. They are animals that deserve a life too.
- Good people will be good, and bad will be bad. I can see chickens being abused, abandoned or not properly taken care of. If you can't police this, don't allow it.
- "So now there is a kill facility at each house with animals
- Who monitors - really



- Who manages - really"
- Noone should have to tolerate chickens or livestock in an urban setting.
- I have no interest in living in close proximity to livestock
- Homes within a 100 m radius must be consulted and would have to agree. Grew up on a farm and keeping hens can be noisy and odorous.
- Livestock needs an open space not between houses. They smell, they're noisy. They should have a designated area for the community, much like community gardens.
- I see a case for urban hens. I can't see a case for any other livestock.
- Hens do not belong in cities.
- Noise and smell. Livestock need to live outside the crowded city. Maybe one chicken per household.
- No livestock in the city
- I'm ok with chickens but where will it end if other livestock are approved. Most city dwellers don't have the room for other livestock.
- they don't belong in the city only farms
- Noise
- Figure out the dog and cat issues first before adding to city bylaw workload
- Livestock need room to roam Calgary residences cannot provide that
- Dont believe city communities should allow hens or any livestock within city limits.
- Calgary is a city. One of the cleanest and nicest in the world. Allowing hen houses and the like would make a big difference in the maintenance of the city
- Livestock should stay outside the city. It's more healthy this way. The increase in deadly ailments such as swine flu, bird flu, and Covid-19 should highlight this is not the direction any city should move towards.
- Noisy
- No livestock in calgary. It's not kind to your neighbour in COMMUNITIES
- We are not a farm.
- Urban chickens would quickly become a nuisance to neighbours. Chicken coops attract rodents and other pests, predators, and keeping chickens is a filthy business. Anyone who has ever been near a chicken coop can attest to the overwhelmingly foul stench.
- I believe hens should be on a farm and not within city limits.
- I do not want to listen to a bunch of hens clucking outside my bedroom window at 6am. If I wanted that, I would live in a farm.
- Will hunting of such non-pet animals be permitted within the city on any given day?
- Noise nuisance
- Hens are not an urban animal
- ..
- The houses are so close together impossible to control smell noise etc
- Hens are noisy and i personally wouldn't want to have neighbors with hens
- [removed]

- Livestock do not belong within city limits. They will be disturbance to the neighbour hood.
- [removed]
- I don't want to deal with the noise or smells that having livestock in my community could produce.
- The city is not the place to be creating farm environments. This is Pandora's box.....
- I only support individuals who have "livestock" such as chickens, pigs etc. as a pet therapy or support animal. I am too afraid of diseases spreading through "livestock". Look at how viruses are started. Quite often a pig or chicken is the "Middleman" for diseases spreading to humans.
- I do not want a Hen squeaking or crowing at the crack of dawn. As well they are very smelly animals.
- There will be no end to it once you open this up. I lived in a farm. They're load and attract predators. People will end up with all kinds of livestock in their backyards.
- Outside of city limits for non domesticated animals.
- No need to go to do many approval requirements
- [removed]
- Urban and hens should not be in the same sentence. There is absolutely no need for farm livestock to be in city residential neighbourhoods. The City already has enough to deal with. This is simply ridiculous and unnecessary. If individuals want hens they should be prepared to live on a property designed for this. This scenario is absolutely not creating the best of both worlds.
- Live stock should not be kept within city; there isn't enough space and facilities to accurately keep live stock. For example, what is done with live stock for slaughter and what regulations are there? I wouldn't want backyard slaughter houses, etc.
- I do not feel like livestock should be allowed in the city.
- If I can't have my very docile and child friend pit bulls why should I let people have chickens. They're noisy and a nuisance and dirty
- I do not feel people in the city would do right by having livestock. This should remain in areas of open spaces or have their land assessed prior to.
- Hens? There are already someone other issues bylaw can keep up. I wouldn't want hens next door to me for multiple reasons.
- [removed]
- noise/smell.
- Leave livestock out of the city, city smells like crap already.
- Livestock? So now people can have sheep? Goats? Chickens? In their backyards/property? No. You will run into issues with smell, noise, damage to private and public property, animals escaping, animals being stolen, accidents and injuries to people and children in the household, neighbours and/or general public.
- Livestock belongs on a farm. No one needs a cow next door. Adequate space, enrichment, living conditions and shelter would be a concern and difficult to enforce considering animal welfare and rights are to relaxed and not enforced enough as it is. Chickens are fine.



- I feel the city struggles to keep up with dog and cat complaints. I would rather my tax dollars be spent on doing two things better than spreading what appears to be thin resources even thinner. Not to mention the additional stress of adjacent homeowners
- Bylaws already currently favour noise makers and nuisances. Nobody wants to be the neighbour of someone who owns chickens. They are loud, dirty and smell. It would bring a larger weight of issues with people not being respectful than any benefit to our city
- I appreciate the thoughtful effort put into drawing up regulations, but I'm doubtful that it could be successful. There are already so many potential conflicts between neighbors, this seems like creating more.
- It is an urban environment not a farming community.
- We don't need hens in the city
- Chickens and other livestock animals don't belong in a city, they belong in rural environments so they have the necessary area to stay healthy
- Hens for eggs ok, but farm animals belong on farms.
- Wildlife will come into the city to eat them. Want chickens, move to an acreage
- If you want to raise livestock, move to an area that allows it. As someone who has been around livestock, the smells and sounds alone can quickly become a nuisance to anyone in the area.
- Noise level, messy
- I don't think other livestock should be kept within city limits.
- No hens. No livestock.
- livestock that live outdoors have a tendency to be loud and create smells that would have a negative impact on more than just the adjacent neighbours.
- These people can move to a rural area if they want to own livestock.
- If you want farm animals live outside of a city
- For the work involved in monitoring this I don't think it is worth it. The last thing we need are chickens that escape and cause other problems.
- All livestock and yes that means hens/chickens don't belong within city limits. They belong on farms where there is little to no impact on neighbours or neighbourhoods. Live stock in a city brings unwanted smells, scavenger birds, and other vermin/rodents.
- More strays getting out of the house or yard and roaming the streets
- Having livestock in city's and urban area might be wildlife such as coyote ls and foxes, which will endanger small house hold pets and children.
- They smell
- This will be abused.
- Livestock should not be allowed in urban areas
- ..
- livestock cannot be effectively cared for in an urban setting and are likely to experience neglect or abuse.



- No need to have chickens and cows etc roaming the streets of the city, as with pets has showier owners aren't going to be smart about this. Just something else to take advantage of
- Livestock should be in rural areas not within the city.
- Farm animals don't belong in the city. Yards in the city are not large enough to appropriately distance noisy and/or smelly animals from the neighbours property.
- [removed]
- I think a neighbour having hens would lower the value of neighbouring homes, therefore I am against it due to noise and the mess they create in a backyard.
- They belong on a farm not an than area
- I personally do not understand allowing livestock in the city. If my neighbours had livestock that would be loud, cause foul odours, etc I would not be okay with that. If you want livestock move to the country.
- You are already limiting the number of pigeons, why oh why would you now allow livestock?
- There is a reason we have farms. There are plenty of local farms with livestock that Calgarians could use to support.
- Don't agree with criteria
- I think it's asking for trouble to have hens around urban areas if all these aggressive dogs are such a problem
- This is a city not a farm
- There is no need for livestock to live in the city. That is cruel and unnecessary. These are animals that rely on a "farm" lifestyle which the city cannot provide.
- We are in a city. Hens are more noise. And more mess for the owners who could forget to clean up the mess
- If you want farm (hens and chickens) animals go live on a farm, dogs can be trained not to bark no dog needs to bark if you train it you cannot train a hen or chicken to not make noise
- [removed]
- Chickens smell horrible and I would not want a coop anywhere near my home.
- Not all animals are meant to be in a city. I would not want to be woken up by chicken, roosters or smell outdoor enclosures.
- Allowing more animals into the city would create a need for more policing. Calgary can't afford this extra cost right now. We do not need another property tax increase.
- This will lead to more animals being mistreated or abandoned
- farm animals belong on farms not in my neighbors back yard.
- Farm animals do not belong in the city
- Buy a farm if you want farm animals. This is a city, but a farm.
- In the city living, the most of the sizes of properties are small/limited unless the potential owners live certain sizeable properties noises nor order cannot be under control. Should have clear guidelines ex: how big the property should be. How far apart from the houses between etc



- With how close together and how small lots houses are built on these days, I do t think it's appropriate for home owners within the city to have hens/livestock. Also, the smell these animals give off through feces etc is disgusting and a health hazard. If I was buying a home in an area, I would not even consider being close to these home's with hens/livestock.
- I would not want hens/ live stock in the city limits. That will attract more wildlife in city too.
- Urbanites are barely capable of caring for dogs and cats in a responsible manner. There will be great harm to other species of animals if they are allowed to be owned by people who have little or no clue about animal husbandry. Abuse, neglect and/or abandonment will abound.
- No if you want to have farm animals on your property in the city move to a rural area.
- Hens are stinky
- I live in an Urban city because I don't want to live next to a farm.
- Dogs can be quieted and birds can be scared off. Chickens or hens make noise ALL THE TIME.
- Too many uncontrolled and barking dogs now. Too many loose cars pooping and killing birds. We don't need more animals not being cared for responsibly
- It has the potential to be taken advantage of. I have good relationships with my neighbors and don't want to be put in a position that doesn't support their livestock choices and tarnish those relationships. Leave it alone.
- Having grown up on a farm I fully understand the effort required to properly look after livestock. I would doubt that a lot of people appreciate what would be involved.
- Don't allow livestock in Calgary when clearly you think a solution is putting a muzzle on a dog.
- Livestock are meant for farms not city dwellers. I do not want hens/ cows/ sheep/ etc. In my neighbour hood
- Urban back gardens are no place for farm animals
- "Chicken or hens are not only an order nuisance they are a noise nuisance.
- In addition they can damage rental properties and homes and wreck it for the next person that comes along."
- Why would we even need this
- [removed]
- Who wants chicken poo smell in their area...
- People can't even take care of basic animals like dogs and cats and you're going to allow them to have livestock in their backyards?
- Too much mess
- Want livestock move to the country. We see how some people maintain their yards, now add livestock. No!
- Smell and noise would be too much
- Farm animals live on a farm for a reason. You're just going to cause stress to the animal.
- There is too much irresponsibility and the enforcement people have enough to deal with, I grew up with hens and no matter how much you clean the smell never goes away
- [removed]



- These are not urban animals. You want farm animals -- then move to the country. I have lived on a farm most of my life -- and these animals are not pets. They smell when not looked after properly and tend to be very noisy.
- This is not an urban animal.
- I don't think people would follow the rules
- Livestock does not belong in the city.
- third part, no
- I would only support this if they were responsible pet owners.
- ?? Seriously ? Ban and restrict bull terriers but bring wild animals. People are the problem. Why add to a problem. Is there a need for this. Is there space for this ?
- This would set the scene for even more complexity and potential conflict in relationships between neighbours. Our experience with the multitude of dog owners in our area of the city is probably a fair indication of how too many of them (even if just a small number) are persistently irresponsible (off leash in on-leash areas, not cleaning up after pets, etc.). Also, when we have as much wildlife around the city as we do (moose, deer, skunks, coyotes, weasels, rabbits, etc), there will be increased potential for conflict and attraction of predators.
- Most livestock barely have enough space as it is, I don't see the benefit for livestock to come live in the city. Maybe I'm not understanding this correctly.
- Could negatively affect property sales at a later date
- The city backyards are not a farm or zoo.
- If I'm a neighbour, I don't want the Noise and smells that will be created.
- I don't want smelly dirty livestock within city limits
- I don't think they need to live in Calgary communities. Even a few doors down from someone might drive their dog crazy.
- There's enough domestic animals without adding live stock to communities.
- Livestock in the city would have great potential to be a nuisance
- Unless inside the home, I think that hens are too much of a disturbance for neighbours. In addition, it would be difficult to ensure hens within Calgary are receiving appropriate care and vet care, so I don't think it is appropriate to keep them in the city.
- Chickens should be allowed or not allowed by the city, and it shouldn't be based on a neighbour's preference. Other livestock should not be allowed in the city.
- Not a good idea
- waste concerns and smell
- It's ridiculous to even allow hens - stupidity - if you want hens / move to the country
- Livestock do not belong in the city. Too often, people take them on thinking it's easy. I have owned and worked with many species of livestock, and it is far more to manage than people realise. If dogs can't even be managed properly, why add livestock to the mix? A city environment is also stressful for livestock. They require more waste and feed management than people realise. It's overall a terrible idea.



- I only support this if all neighbors within hearing and smelling distance are okay with it, unanimously. I personally would never be okay with living near livestock especially considering how many diseases can come from animals.
- Chickens won't be able to thrive in the city. They'll get out and be loud.
- I do not want to see an increase in hens living in poor conditions. Unless there was legislation that protected hens in abusive situations (the way there are protections for dogs), no, I do not want to see this.
- There are already enough animals in this city - 135000 dogs!
- Nuisance in the city. Many people do not even take care of dog crap and stuff in their own yards. This just opens us up to more problems.
- We don't need chickens or roosters in the city it will only invite more coyotes and other predatory animals
- Farm animals should not be 10 feet away from other houses.
- I don't think Calgary properties in the city/suburbs are appropriately prepared or set up for this kind of livestock. For example, hens, would require special structures in the yard and may lure coyotes or wolves/other predators to the neighbourhoods.
- Any other livestock would need more space than what is available in any residential area. Chickens/ducks are fine because they don't need a lot of space to roam and forage to supplement what they are fed.
- Livestock require significant space, can be very noisy, and can produce significant smell. Small urban or suburban properties are not appropriate for them.
- "If these are livestock then out of control issues arise,
- Chickens for eggs No
- Goats, pigs, sheep, miniature horses, cows, lamas are not acceptable for city backyards"
- I believe the close proximity of homes in most of Calgary's neighborhoods, especially the new developments, is not conducive with the added potential for additional noise and smell complaints.
- I would worry about smell and noise.
- calgary is not a farm, we're supposed to be moving forward not backwards, hens are disgusting.
- The city is not for livestock they should be kept in the farms to enjoy their existence.
- this bylaw is is far to over-reaching
- If people wish to raise livestock they should live outside city limits
- I need to understand more what livestock we are talking about. And what happens if they are approved and then cause issues for the neighbours or are not being properly taken care of.
- this sounds silly
- It's a recipe for disaster between smell, neglect and abuse. It's bad enough people can keep pigeon coops.
- I don't want live stock animals in my community. Especially chickens, too noisy and the smell.
- No livestock in city limits. Small house pets in the city limits only
- Chickens make sense, but other animals do not.



- Most families have little understanding of appropriate care for chickens and would not provide vet care.
- Hen houses are very smelly no matter how much it is cleaned
- Anyone who ever been to a farm with hens/chickens knows the smell can be very offensive. Given that wind can carry the smell of an off leash park to all surrounding homes I do not think support from just the adjacent neighbors is sufficient. It should be those within the block radius.
- I am concerned about potential noise and smell.
- Smell, noise, attracts predators such as coyotes which puts children and pets at risk
- Noise and smell
- Concerns that this may be in humane in regards to lack of space & health considerations for people.
- farm animals belong on farms, not in the city.
- case by case' leaves a lot of room for personal bias from officers unfortunately
- Would be too hard to monitor/keep track of
- Hens are noisy, smell and draw in predators. It appears that there has been more wildlife entering the city with the decrease in human traffic during the initial lock-down months of COVID-19. With additional livestock around it could lead to increased incidents of Cougars, Bobcats and Coyotes coming into yards.
- I just do not feel that chickens, hens, pigs, sheep, big snakes etc, etc., belong in an urban setting.
- "The LESA is the only livestock that should be allowed on someone's property. Too many cases of animal abuse to livestock could occur."
- living next to a chicken.coop is stinky and loud.
- There is already problems ensuring animals aren't abused or neglected. I just see this adding to the problem.
- I believe noise and smell would quickly become issues with irresponsible owners. Also strict rules would have to be in place to prevent the spread of disease.
- It is too difficult to ensure that the animals would be treated humanely. Enforcement would be nearly impossible.
- Farm animals should be on a farm not in the city!
- don't need the neighborhood smelling like [removed]
- You're worried about stray animals and aggressive dogs yet you trust Calgarians to run a hygienic well kept farm on their property?
- [removed]
- I doubt many people understand how to properly care for livestock, and I worry about people who get them as a novelty; that it could become either a hazard or a disease issue
- Smell and noise, as well as neighbouring property values.
- Unless there was a rule to re evaluate it annually with neighbours or upon sale of house.



- I don't see how livestock would provide community benefit. Plus if adjacent neighbours saying no can be overruled what is their other option ? To move ? There is no purpose to keeping livestock inside city limits.
- No livestock of any type should be in a suburban or urban space.
- Noise and smells may affect neighbors further away
- I would have concerns about noise, smell, diseases, etc...
- Live stock shouldn't be within a city.
- .
- In suburban setting sure not in the city core
- I fear it would create tension in Neighbourhood a due to noise and potential smell.
- Chickens are so smelly. There will always be complaints
- I have a phobia which is untreatable and caused by childhood trauma. My one voice would not supersede if the other neighbours didn't care. It also makes buying a home more difficult and would reduce the value of adjacent properties.
- I think it's best to keep animals within cities to those that can function as stereotypical pets. By which I mean they can live in the house, and have neighbors exposure to them controlled, limited, or temporarily eliminated by the owner, when necessary.
- Belongs on a farm
- Additional resources spent on useless options. Hens should remain on farm, not be a city animal. If there is an issue with neighbors or excessive noise or smell, the office is tied us with this instead of attending to other more prompt issues.
- With the recent outbreak of Covid 19 coming from animals, is now really a good time to allow farm animals in close confines of a city lot? i think no. Calgary simply can not police everyone to make sure they are clean and safe so no hens
- I think neighbors within hearing distance from these animals should have say WITHOUT exceptions!
- I do NOT want to hear roosters at 4 AM in my neighborhood. Animals belong on farms and acreages only. Other animals - people in Calgary can't seem to contain their cats - how are they going to keep rack of livestock?
- Livestock should be kept to the larger land properties.
- "I dont believe farm animals need to be living in backyards. Chickens smell very bad, and are very loud as well.
- I do agree with using the goats to mitigate weeds, but not in backyards."
- Allowing people to breed and exploit any animal is wrong. You should not allow this as all of your criteria is acknowledging how humans will benefit - what about the hens? I am interested in what can be done to ensure the safety of the animal is put at the forefront of this. Keeping an animal in a coop is abuse.
- no farm animals in the city limits



- Sure ban a cute pit bull and try to bring yucky birds into the city see how unfair that would be?
- Pigeons should not be housed.
- They smell and many think chickens are easy to look afterward and I'm worried they maybe treated badly
- Chickens are loud and smell bad
- this poses not only a health risk but an increase in wildlife that will prey on the hens in the city.
- I'm not sure how well this would be regulated especially in terms of providing suitable living conditions. The time frame to get proper help for dogs or cats in unsuitable conditions itself is so long - I don't see any concerns about a hen's living condition being attended to any faster.
- It is too difficult to enforce and ensure people properly care for livestock. Hoarding, cleanliness and environmental concerns would not be supervised. You want to limit pitbulls, but you think its fine to have a house with pigs, and chickens and whatever other livestock YOU deem appropriate??
- That will took much time, money and resources to enforce where it should be spent elsewhere. Everyone will push these boundaries constantly, and these animals will get out of control.
- It would be to hard to make sure all the different kinds of animals are being taken care of properly.
- [removed]
- Chickens are loud and neighbours have no say which is unfair
- They would be annoying
- Livestock should not be in the city
- As much as I would love a goat, I don't think it's appropriate living conditions for wildlife within the city. Many communities and households do not have the space to properly house livestock.
- If you want farm animals - go to a farm. I don't support this.
- Noisy and dirty.
- "I consider chickens(hens) farm animals and therefore they belong on a farm! The only exception would possibly a support or emotional reason and then there should be a limit to how many could be kept at any one address. If you keep chickens in an urban area why not pigs, horses, sheep, goats or roosters? See the can of worms opening?"
- livestock do not belong in the city! It will create so many noise and smell complaints, chickens are very noisy and odorous, and it would be so difficult to ensure the wellbeing of the livestock. Chickens are also easy targets for predators such as lynx, coyotes, etc and the city doesn't need to see an increase in those animals as a result of allowing livestock in the city
- Farm animals are not meant to be in cities. It's unnatural and honestly just immoral. Those animals need room to move around freely. Livestock gets out in the country often enough, think about how much worse it will be in the city. They will cause damage to so much of the city.
- Run down places like forest lawn, do not need welfare hens.
- Neighbours change, living conditions change, numbers of animals change.....I don't see how this could possibly be adequately monitored and enforced. Personally, I'd be an unsupportive neighbour on this.
- "Livestock does not belong in the city.



- Also, I am concerned that hens would attract more coyotes to the community."
- I lived on a farm. It stinks
- I don't believe farm animals should be within city limits
- The impact on the community. Worries about the needs of the animal, smells etc that will impact others
- I think if you are going to balance the needs of hens you should balance the needs of PITBULL TYPE dogs also, Im incensed by this conversation
- worry about the smell
- In a town I previously lived in, there were no resources available to ensure chickens etc were living in appropriate conditions. I saw some terrible "chicken runs" in back yards, people who had no idea of what was required to ensure that the animals were adequately cared for.
- Urban environment is not where chickens should be: huts stink, hens are noisy and attract predators into the area.
- No , we have farmers markets and supermarkets for a reason. My neighbours don't need chickens.
- I don't have faith that people owning hens would upkeep the houses and it would start to smell horrible for the nearby neighbors
- There is no way of effectively policing if every owner is properly caring for the animals (eg. Neglecting picking up waste, giving them the proper livable space they require)
- I have no idea why anyone would need other livestock inside the city. Having hens is enough, not sure I even like that idea, considering the poor sanitary habits of some of my neighbours egads.
- If you want livestock, move away from the city.
- Neighbors change, they can complain. Hens make noise, smell, people may not think of these things when they agree to having them as neighbors.
- People can't even look after their dogs properly and allow cats to run loose. Chickens will not be any better.
- N/A
- Not enough room for hens
- Noise concerns.
- In light of COVID and a number of other avian diseases we've seen come through our world, no thank you, this is just asking for more exposure for disease development and spread.
- Chickens can smell extremely bad for the neighbors in suburban areas.
- Chicken are annoying early in the morning.
- I do not agree with having other livestock.
- if a decision to allow a farm animal is made, if the decision is made in perpetuity, what happens when people move and new people move in - they have to deal with it? This decision wouldn't allow for the co-existence of people. Cats already roam freely causing issues amongst neighbours.
- I don't believe livestock should be kept inside the city.
- I don't think people truly understand hens and worry that they will not be treated well if they do not lay eggs etc



- That puts too much pressure on the officer. The law needs to be the same for everyone.
- We don't need livestock in the city.
- Farm animals belong on the farm.
- Leave the agriculture out of urban areas. Chickens belong on farms, not in the city.
- While this is something I would like to see, I don't think the urban dwellers of Calgary are ready for the noises and smells of urban livestock. I think this would cause more problems than it would solve and City resources would be stretched to the limit in trying to manage this.
- My dog would go nuts. He'd be declared dangerous for following his instincts if he got near live stock
- YOU NEED TO DEAL WITH THE DRUGS AND CRIME THAT INFEST THIS CITY UNDER [removed]
- People don't take proper responsibility when having livestock
- There are enough challenges with pets as it is let alone allowing other livestock within city limits.
- No chickens as this would devalue neighbouring home values, create a draw for feral animals such as cats and draw in nuisance dogs running off leash. Also drawing in urban wildlife such as coyotes, bobcats and foxes.
- You are going to discriminate against dog breeds but expect support for livestock? This is nonsense.
- If you want livestock move outside the city.
- Hens are not pets
- If you want livestock, get a farm or acreage. Animals deserve a proper place to live.
- Resources for enforcing bylaw doesn't outweigh the benefit. Would this not promote predators within the community ie: Bobcats, Coyotes, Fox?
- I don't think that a city is really appropriate space for livestock.
- I do not believe the size of yards in Calgary are sufficient for other livestock
- Hens require roosters, and roosters in an urban area is absolutely absurd. They crow at all hours of the morning, day, and night. This would be significantly more of a con than pro.
- People will take it to far
- Where do you limit other livestock? Cows, horses, goats, peacocks? There are several animals that create environmental impacts (manure, disease) and would need constant inspection.
- If I want to live on a farm I will move there. I don't want to hear or smell chickens, goats or other animals in the city
- Chickens do not belong in city dwelling backyards.
- I don't believe live stock has a place in Calgary and it would be a problem for the surrounding Neighbours
- There is no need for this.
- If you want hens go live on a farm
- there is no way to see how they could be controlled in the environment without wrecking gardens and other property
- SPCA's in other cities have tried this and ended up inundated with the hens come the colder seasons as people didn't want to invest in over wintering the animals



- Animals could easily fall into dangerous urban situations, this could cause coyote problems to get worse.
- Waste of tax money to monitor and police. I believe it will also create neighbour - neighbour drama.
- This is absolutely ridiculous. You'd stink up the whole neighbourhood, and livestock makes way more noise than your average dog. If people want livestock go but a farm [removed]
- I do not want chickens in a yard next to mine. Both the noise and the small and increase in mice as well as fleas, flies and disease.
- I don't think any livestock should be permitted in the City of Calgary, not even hens. I believe it is cruel and would be very expensive to monitor to ensure animals are properly cared for.
- [removed]
- No
- Livestock don't belong in the city.
- Livestock do not belong in my neighbors yard
- If chickens why not goats or sheep perhaps a hog or two how about a horse lowering my carbon foot print riding to do errands or work.
- "Bridgeland rabbit explosion of the past 10 years. Domesticated rabbits escaped a private enclosure where the animals were being raised for consumption. populations exploded and it became a real problem in the neighborhood being over run with domestic rabbits for several years.
- Policing of these animals being allowed in the city limits would be difficult and costly. Money better spent supporting other animal issues within the city structure."
- Contrary to popular belief Calgary is not a farm
- Livestock belong in a rural environment. I don't want to hear chickens chirping near my house.
- Farm animals should not be allowed in the city at all. I would not appreciate a stupid chicken waking me up at five every morning as I'm sure that people who work at night and try to sleep during the day would not either.
- Would open up the potential for many complex issues/problems/conflicts. As just one example, a change of ownership or residents in an adjacent property could easily result in feuds, and the animals having to be re-homed.
- Calgary is a city. Not a farm. In light of live kill markets related to Covid I think it's a terrible idea to allow urban animal farming. I would not want it next door to me.
- Chickens and live stock should not be in the urban environment. If people would like those animals to be part of their life, they should look to live in a rural environment.
- We do not need wildlife in the city. They are dirty and noisy and can be smelly.
- Don't know enough about having hens in on the property. How much noise, waste, smells. Is there always a male rooster? Sounds in the morning.
- I worry about the "support from adjacent neighbours" clause and how an individual might be impacted as their neighbours change.
- chicken shit stinks
- Hens and other livestock tend to be loud and smell. Not suitable for inner city life.



- Should this amendment not be included in the land use bylaw?
- City lots are too small, infringement on neighbours with concern of offensive smells, noise, animals escaping, drawing in predators, lowering community standards and property values, rising conflict between neighbours and their rights. Concern of irresponsible ownership, animal care and neglect.
- Once urban livestock starts, where does it stop? Hens can be as loud as roosters. Consulting adjacent neighbours is fine, but when they leave, are the livestock allowed to stay?
- Control factors and I don't want farm animals as my neighbours.
- Farm animals produce offensive smells. People don't clean up there dog poop can we really expect that people will clean up daily after farm animals? Chickens/roosters are noisy and would be a nuisance. Farm animals need large areas of outdoor space even if they are pets. Most yards would not be big enough. Chicken coups, animal fencing and shelters if not done properly can look very unattractive ruining views for neihhbors. Urine and fecal matter run off into a neiboring property during lawn watering, rain and snow melting will be a big issue and very unhygenic. Could devalue neiboring properties substantially.
- I've been in a hen house. A well kept one. The ammonia smell was beyond toxic. I do not want that anywhere near where I live.
- If I wanted to live around farm animals I would be living in the country not in the city so absolutely not. If people want these animals then they shouldn't be living in the city.
- The bylaws cannot be enforced enough to ensure animals are treated properly. Smells that can be associated are unpleasant and the noise.
- I don't want these animals to be allowed because what if they escape their enclosures? Then you have these large animals potentially causing incidents.
- Hens do not belong in yards
- The neighbours may have numerous complaints about gens such as noise or smell, which should not impact an individual's ability to support themselves with eggs.
- Hens should be kept as close to their natural habitat as possible. They need a large quiet area to roam and a urban city would just destroy that.
- Excess noise from animals, increased smell, decreased valuation of surrounding and adjacent properties.
- [removed]
- I do not believe chickens should be allowed in the city there are acregages and farms
- How to you control someone who does not clean up and deal with the smell etc? It's like people in our community who have garbage all over their property. Do you constantly complain and make an enemy? We had renters we drove off because of this but there are homeowners who are pigs.
- Move to the country
- Farming dies not belong in the city and it increases several health risks. Calgary does not have enough resources to monitor the animals we have now.
- We're an urban area. You want more livestock, move to the country. Support from neighbours tends to pit neighbours against each other and doesn't help when new people move in and are subjected to livestock next door that they never had input on.



- "Noise issues. Hens wake up very early!
- Another opportunity for people to mistreat an animal. How many folks actually know what hens need for a healthy life?"
- [removed]
- The noise, smell and we already have an issue with skunks and Coyotes... We don't want to attract more
- "Absolutely NO. There is no possible reason why hens or other livestock should be allowed in the city for neighbours to be subjected to stink and animals noises. And then just imagine when won wants to put their property up for sale. Good luck with that. Aren't barking dogs and dog excrement enough? I live across the street from The Lougheed House historical site. The park at the site is just a dog toilet and the lawns are ruined."
- I would not agree to livestock in a city. You can get the support of adjacent neighbours but what about the person 3-4 doors down that works shift or nights.
- Noise, odour, reduced property values
- Criteria is too vague and would be open for people to abuse the system
- No urban hens and no other livestock! Those belong on farms. Do we really want to be the city who brought avian flu back? I also didn't know properties within the city can own pigeons... that's very dirty...
- Farm animals belong on farms
- Residential dwelling areas are in tight proximity to each other. The disruption from neighbours housing livestock would be unprecedented for city living. I would highly oppose
- It's a trendy thing. Once people get bored or the hen stops producing eggs. What happens to the hen?
- I live in the city and not on a farm. If I wanted to live where there are livestock, I would live in the country. It is not fair to expect me to have to listen and smell livestock in my neighbors yard.
- I do not think farm animals should be allowed in the city. Our houses are too close and the smells would trigger allergies. If you want farm animals, move to a farm.
- I don't feel that a fair system could be in place to accurately get "support from adjacent neighbours" and the additional noise / smell could be difficult, especially as neighbours come in and leave the area. As an example, if I was a shift worker I wouldn't want to deal with the sound of chickens first thing in the morning from two or three homes over, but I didn't qualify to approve since I'm not adjacent.
- People cannot currently take care of their properties. Can you imagine the smell of an unkept livestock pen
- farm animals belong on a farm. If someone wants hens its so they can have the eggs, in which case they require a rooster. Do you have any idea the noise complaints you would receive from neighbours if someone had hens and roosters??!!! This is so ridiculous that the city would even consider this
- I see no benefit in hens or urban livestock. The city already spends too much money on dogs and cats, this will just be an additional cost to taxpayers



- They are noisy and smelly.
- I don't think you should have livestock in the city. I'm assuming they will build coops for hens in their yard which can create issues.
- Have lived in jurisdictions with these laws. They raise more issues and don't provide a net benefit
- Livestock aren't needed in the city. They bring the potential for disease and they may attract other pests. Allowing livestock will embolden people to have livestock without following bylaws. Lots of people act and then deal with the consequences. The grey area you're introducing will lead to conflicts between neighbours and disharmony in our communities. I don't understand the overall benefit to be honest when you consider the potential negatives.
- this is not a farm it is the city!
- They are farm animals not house animals
- I think the animals would be happier in a rural setting.
- At this time I would say no but likely need more information. I am unsure of what other livestock would be appropriate for an urban environment.
- Livestock create a smell; noise and loss of property values for neighbours.
- Barnyard animals need to be zoned in an agricultural setting. Not residential.
- People are not always going to remain in a house for long. What happens to the livestock when they move? Livestock are noisy, and smelly, I'm not sure the property values of the people around wouldn't be adversely affected.
- Chickens and hens are loud and noisy and I would rather not have them in the neighbourhood.
- [removed]
- Keep livestock on farms
- If I want to live on a farm I would move there. You cannot even police cars wandering in Calgary. So how much of a mess would live animals in the city be!?!?!!
- Na
- As most Suburban neighbourhoods have a dense family population hens are not suitable for backyards
- I'd rather not have my dog freaking out over clucking chickens at all hours of the day
- Livestock are not meant for urban life environment.
- Chickens and hens are load and stinky. Calgary is not farm land and should not be treated like so, first comes the chickens then the pigs and goats.
- The smell/noise could be a nuisance to the neighbourhood.
- Some People are not responsible enough to own cars and dogs without allowing another animal especially again with our winters being so cold
- Unless you have the capacity to inspect the cleanliness of the owners yards and the animals living quarters, this shouldnt be done. People will just keep unsanitary conditions that create problems for neighbours. The houses in calgary are built just too close together for this and unless you can inspect what you expect regularly, this is just a disaster waiting to happen



- I feel like this would be adding more 'policing' by bylaw officers, which will increase case loads of officers. I feel that this change would not be supported by a lot of the public at large, and create a situation where unhappy neighbors will report on the most minor of issues (particularly noise complaints). While I personally don't have an issue with urban hens and support a community that increases sustainable food practices, I just think the increase to complaints and the subsequent resources required to patrol this area does not justify the practice.
- There are not enough educated people living in the city to understand the responsibility that comes with owning livestock and the proper care it would take to raise such animals.
- I believe this would cause more problems down the road.
- Hens or livestock should not be in residential locations. It places a burden on neighbours how may have allergies or don't care for the noise, smells, and lack of providing adequate care that is placed of a neighbor to call to check the well being of these animals.
- It takes a lot of work and knowledge to provide proper care to livestock. If not properly implemented the animals may become sick(how would they be disposed?), mice may come into the community or have wild predators in the community(like coyotes). This would put adults, kids and domesticated animals at risk.
- Farm animals belong on a farm, not in the city. I do not support the initial bylaw not this amendment.
- Could cause issues with coyotes coming into town to kill hens, and cat/dog aggression instincts to chase hens
- I just finished reading Spillover a book on zoonotic diseases such as Covid, influenza, etc. (Excellent book, worth reading, BTW). Many spillovers are due to a combination of poor animal conditions, unexpected contact between livestock and wildlife, keep different species together (eg ducks and chickens). The potential risk of this in a loosely regulated environment just seems too high.
- Chickens are noisy and can be very smelly. Not appropriate on small lots where they would impact neighbours. Plus they can attract predators like foxes to neighbours which can put pets/children in danger
- No hens. No livestock. NONE. Calgary lots are small; no one should have to live next to livestock. It's ridiculous. If you want livestock or hens, live outside of the city limits. Eggs are cheap at the grocery store! It would cost a lot more money to raise hens than buying eggs at the store.
- I don't think livestock belongs in the city.
- Do not support hens in an urban setting. Houses are so close together in some areas that only asking adjacent neighbours isn't enough
- farm animals belong on a farm. Not in suburbs.
- These animals can be incredibly loud, smelly, and aggressive if not cared for properly. If people can't even maintain and train dogs properly I don't feel they can handle chicken or livestock
- This is not the country. Allowing people to have chickens will cause a great deal of misery for neighbors as well as a higher cost for AS to enforce the bylaw.
- I do not want to deal with the additional noise and smell of a chicken coop in my neighborhood.
- Noise, smell, possibility of abuse
- [removed]



- Noise; they are noisy creatures and invite coyotes
- [removed]
- I don't think that urban hens are a good idea.
- Its either available to all or not available
- Hens and livestock should remain prohibited within City limits. They can be loud and pose a health hazard if their living area is not cleaned and maintained properly. If people want to have livestock, they should move to less populated centres.
- I support urban hens, however I believe any other livestock, larger than a chicken/duck/goose has too much potential to be a nuisance or pose a danger
- This will result in more vermin.
- [removed]
- We live in an urban area. Move to an acreage if you want to raise livestock.
- There is already a plethora of companion animals/birds/fish/reptiles etc. to choose from. Livestock provides us with food. You'd need several hens if you want a supply of eggs - hens go through "broody" stages and stop laying. Heated outdoor living conditions large enough for roaming as well as equally adequte outdoor roaming is hardly likely in a city environment. My grandparents had a very small pigs & poultry farm so I know. My gran had O.C.D. where cleanliness was concerned. Most people don't, and chicken-shit is amongst the most foul-smelling animal waste there is. Where are people going to put all this animal excrement? In the compost bins? That'll be great in the summer's heat. And what about eating them? Are my neighbours going to be slaughtering creatures in their yards? You don't say what other livestock is being considered but my arguments are similar. Adequate indoor/outdoor roaming spaces, noise, odours and slaughter.
- Hens belong on farms
- Hens attract coyotes and bobcats making our neighbours more dangerous
- I feel like if you want to own farm animals, you should live in an area where they have the proper room to live. You wouldn't want to own a dog in a small apartment with no yard, same applies
- exotic animals don't need to be pets, lots of dogs are in shelters, this would just open up more "exotic" animal shelters
- Chicken, pigs, duck, cows, horses,lamas,and any other animal that you want to let live and breed in the back yards do not have enough space place to roam and swim. The infills that the city is granting permits for are cutting back yards down to the bare minimum . There is not enough land,property to support such animals. unless I can go scoop some for supper.
- In such tight living conditions neighbours would be subjected to the sound of the animals. If there is enough space between houses, sure.
- Livestock on farms. Not backyards.
- We don't need chickens waking people up in the early am.
- Go to a farm and smell them, that's why NO
- It takes a certain skill to bring healthy livestock into the world.. getting average joe to do it would be irresponsible.



- High-density living and farm animals do not mix. As stated above there are several main issues even with just cats & dogs... now we're going to add barn animals too?
- [removed]
- As much as I love all animals, livestock is meant for farms. It's not enough room to give them a balanced life in the city.
- Noise and odor concerns.
- There shouldn't be any other livestock living in the city. That's torture to the poor animals being cramped
- Chickens are disgusting and loud
- The city is no place for livestock. If you want to have livestock move to the country
- livestock like to roam and need lots of space and consume alot of resources to keep fed and watered, if live stock were to escape it could cause serious implications in neighborhoods or even busy streets
- if a person would like a farm style animal i believe that they should be in an area where they are likely to thrive without the potential for any problems. if we put this bylaw into place, and someone gets an animal which then causes problems therefore the animal be taken away, we now have a stressed animal and have upset a person. good heart for the idea, but i just don't think it will work out. this also has a high potential to create drama within neighbourhoods (ie: people who can hear the hens/other livestock and are bothered by it)
- "Urban living is not for livestock. Not ideal conditions for animals and potential issues with neighbours, state of the property (cleanliness) lower property values, less attractive to potential buyers in case of buying/selling.
- Just leave the animals outside of the city."
- Farm animals can carry serious disease and spread same. A populated area is more susceptible to quick infection. Look at all the diseases out of China.
- No backyard zoos
- livestock should not be kept in a city, it's very rare there's enough space for them
- [removed]
- People wanting hens need to go live on an acreage. They are dirty animals and city dwellers have no idea how to care for them. We live in a city, not a small town. These animals do not belong in a city.
- "I don't own
- Livestock"
- The yard space in Calgary is VERY small in most places. It feels inhumane to keep them in such conditions. Plus the fecal matter for chickens in town would be hard to manange
- We live in a city - if i wanted to live in the country with farm animals I would.
- Livestock are a nuisance within city limits. They are noisy and smell. They're on the farm for a reason
- [removed]



- Even with the criteria for neighbors to approve of urban livestock, it kind of forces their acceptance to stay "neighborly".
- get an acreage
- I don't believe there is a use for any other urban animal other than hens
- Not if you're planning to take my rights to own my dogs
- "If people want hens I think they should have a certain amount of land. (Ex. Bigger back yard)
- A traditional yard is not enough land to house hens."
- chickens are small and do not bother much neighbors but other livestock like goats, pigs, cows... can cause more problems between neighbors (odors, noise...) Unless the property is an acreage, complains from neighbors will happen.
- farms are the place for livestock
- There is mostly not enough space in the city dwellings for livestock/hens
- Limited space in backyards to support this amendment
- [removed]
- I would be supportive but I believe that it would be too easy for people to take advantage of this bylaw and not care for livestock properly.
- The diseases chickens carry are dangerous. If you want eggs or anything chicken support your local farmer
- Why do we need this?
- Livestock should be on a farm, not in a city.
- If you want farm animals then live on a farm or acreage
- Unless you are removing the coyotes from all the city parks as well then you are essentially just providing them with a source of food
- honestly i already get enough feces on my car from birds.
- If you want livestock, get an acreage. Hens are dirty and loud and the smell stays in the yard and travels far in the air. They are not quiet at night and the provoke dogs and coyotes in neighbouring yards and parks.
- People can live on a farm if they want farm animals
- This bylaw shouldnt even be considered. This is shameful.
- Will cause too much chaos.
- Simply the noise and smell would not be appropriate given how close Calgary housing in suburban areas is
- The city is not designed for farm animals. I don't think it is appropriate to keep them in a small a back yard. There is always smell and noise associated with them and it is not fair to the neighbours.
- People are dirty and careless and we do not need neighbourhoods smelling like a chicken coop just so a few people can have access to fresh eggs
- [removed]
- I do not support livestock in city limits



- People complain about a dog that barks once or twice a day, never mind hearing roosters, goats, ducks or any other live stock in your neighbors yard. The smell of livestock in a small space like a city would also be horrific for neighbors.
- This situation is complicated by the kind of weather we have in Alberta, the handling of waste and attraction these animals present for some some wild animals.
- livestock belongs on farms, not in cities
- Hygienic & nuisance concern. People have choices of where they want to live in Urban, Rural & Farm according to their own priority in life.
- not prepared to tolerate barnyard noises and smells in the city
- livestock belong on a farm, pets should be inside
- Poultry can carry diseases and attract wildlife. They are not meant to be pets. Their excrement stinks and would be a nuisance to neighbours. If they remained indoors and were treated with the same disdain cats are then I'd accept them as indoor only pets.
- all farm animals should remain on farms not in a city or town.
- Feces and feed can attract pests
- [removed]
- Larger animals than hens require grazing and pasture - not enough room on most lots within the urban scenario. Also, larger animals tend to be smellier. And for the well-being of the animals, it would be kindest to not limit the herd to one, so there would need to be much more room, and mitigating steps to prevent smelly manure and noise.
- Do not want hens and livestock should be in the city
- Noise is likely to be a nuisance to more than just the adjacent neighbors.
- Farm animals pro create and can get out of hand really quickly. If this was allowed I would want there to be strict rules on who can own the wildlife to prevent hoarding.
- [removed]
- livestock does not belong in the City. At present we have wildlife entering (coyotes, Bobcats, occasionally a bear) and could cause conflict. Wildlife is already threatened enough
- They are noisy and noisome and will attract predators. We already have a large number of bobcats, coyotes and even the odd cougar.
- As someone who grew up in a rural environment, I can speak from experience that chickens are NOISY and SMELLY. As well, you're going to have increased instances of high prey-drive dogs and cats taking advantage of these new "opportunities". Nobody in their right mind should want to live within 10 acres of livestock.
- As a former resident of Vancouver where they allowed chickens there were problems. 1. odour 2. noise (esp if roosters involved) 3. poor quality of care (with our very cold weather this would be even more of a problem)
- I don't think livestock belongs in the city. They make noise, they need space. You're also putting the neighbour in an awkward spot. Say yes, and be annoyed by clucking hens all day. Say no, have an upset neighbour until you move.



- I don't believe chickens should be in urban areas. I don't want be awoken by the sounds of chickens/roosters, etc. Don't want the smells of unkept chicken coops. What happens if owners get chickens and don't look after them or neglect them. It is like people that own dogs and neglect them.
- it might create too much noise at very early hours of the morning.
- Livestock can be quite smelly and people already have a hard time cleaning up dog and cat poop. Livestock would be no different. Livestock are also very noisy at early hours and at late hours.
- I do not agree with having livestock in the city.
- Livestock (including hens) should not be raised within city limits.
- There is no need for an urban dweller to raise chickens, as it would be more of a nuisance for neighbours than it would benefit the community or individual
- You don't move to or live in a city to start a farm.
- Tired of seeing neighbours kill chickens and livestock for food in their backyards
- farm animals belong on farms .
- The yard space in many calgary yards is not suitable to support livestock
- Noisy little cocks
- Chickens, sure but nothing else should live in the city, animals need space and we don't have it in tiny backyards. Move to the country if you want a goat and cows
- I don't trust people to be responsible enough to have hens. Coyotes, Bobcats, those animals love easy prey and already their presence is considered a nuisance to many. I would hate to see another natural predator die because of human irresponsibly
- animals are safe unless saying other wise
- Livestock is meant to be living in rural areas. I would not want to live next to someone with hens, pigs etc.
- "Livestock stink!
- I would be so upset if I couldn't use my own backyard because the smell of someone's livestock is beside me. That's what farms are for"
- The smell
- Farm animals can be loud and destructive. They do not belong in the city.
- Noise and smell factor is not something I want.
- If we lived in a region without sufficient agricultural land or access to agricultural goods, I would be supportive. However, there is plenty of rural space to have chickens etc. I also have sanitation concerns. We need to address the larger issues of food security and access to food for people, particularly underprivileged communities. I would be supportive of having a community-run, urban agricultural space as there would be more oversight of the sanitation and the animals to ensure they had proper care.
- Chickens lead to increases in vermin and an increase in wildlife predators. This is a dumb idea. Calgary is not a giant farm.
- The city is no place for bard yard animals



- Even hens can become a nuisance to neighbours because of the smell and mice activity when not properly cleaned. Again another non-enforcable issue and where do you draw the line on type of animal.
 - People want livestock? Live in the country. The city already has issues with mice.
 - Hens attract vermin which everyone in the community is exposed to
 - Disruption to urban looks, sounds and smells.
 - I don't see the benefit of having livestock under the city's care
 - No need for livestock in city limits. Smell and noise for neighbour's should be considered as with any animal
 - It just adds another animal problem
 - Noise and sanitary problems are a concern
 - Chickens and other livestock bring on their own challenges that people who have never lived or worked on a farm do not appreciate. Also, if not properly cared for or housed it could attract more wildlife, like coyotes and foxes.
 - It shouldn't only be the adjacent neighbors but also the neighbors further on the street. Noise and smell will affect them too
 - Improper management of bird diseases and i worry that people who should not own/ are not properly educated about hens would be able to have them thus causing distress and overall bad situations for the animal.
 - Carry disease, multiply and escape. Filthy noisy nuisance. Smell.
 - Opposed to hens as they can be very noisy for neighbours. Other forms of livestock may be ok.
 - These animals do not belong in the city . They should be on farms and acreages.
 - "Hens are livestock meant for a farm not an urban dwelling.
-
- Allowing this is more ridiculous then implementing rules against only pitbulls"
 - Farm animals belong on a farm not in a yard in the city this is a terrible idea even to allow hens what is this
 - Too noisy
 - If you need farm animals move outside the city.
 - I do not believe hens or other livestock should be allowed within the city limits.
 - Chicken coops smell and will make it harder to sell a house if neighbor has chickens next door.chickens belong on a farm not in a city
 - Livestock live on farms. Calgary is a city. There's enough therapy animals out there. If one needs a chicken, Airdrie and Chestermere aren't very far
 - Hens are noisy and the smell wanders. It could have a negative affect on dogs around that area.
 - Calgary is growing, and it is growing fast, what use to be a farm or an acreage outside of calgary limits is now inside calgary limits. It is unfair for someone's lively to be ruined when a city is growing so fast.



- I don't think that allowing other livestock than hens is necessary.
 - Due to the limited space between residences I don't believe that the smell and the noise can be sufficiently mitigated in an urban environment. If I wanted to live on a farm I wouldn't be living in the city.
 - Noise and smell of feces
 - Chickens, Goats, etc. Have no place in the city. Most pet owners do not properly take care of their animals. The only way I would support this is licensing the live stock and having random checks like AHS checks in restaurants
 - [removed]
 - It would be very hard to provide adequate living conditions for some livestock inside the city.
 - The city isn't a farm and we shouldn't have to listen to hens clucking or anything else a farmyard animal does. Including the smell they make.
 - Roosters crowing all the time and the smell is bad. Farms are farms and city living is city living. You wanna own farm animals- move to a farm
 - We already have problems with noisy dogs and cats and dogs that are left to wander out of their yard. Complaints to bylaw are met with comments that there are not enough officers to enforce this behaviour. Livestock would just add more complaints that do not get addressed.
 - I say no just because I'm clean and organized but most people aren't. I see a lot of people having these animals and not keeping them properly cleaned and looked after with no regard to their neighbours having to hear, smell and put up with their slack.
 - There are enough livestock animals that only live to be killed for food
 - No place for hens in city loud and messy leave them in the farm
 - "We are in the middle of a pandemic. Birds and pigs are just two of the sources for some of the world's major pandemics in the past century. It is a mistake to introduce potential pandemic sources to urban centres.
-
- Poultry and pig farms have stringent health and safety, but ,in spite of these safety measures, we have seen major disease outbreaks at those facilities here in Alberta. Homeowners will not have requirements like foot baths and full PPE.
-
- My neighbors were already chopping up chickens on their driveway to serve in their family restaurant. What's to stop unlicensed meat vendors from doing this, especially in light of recent provincial relaxations of meat processing rules? We are putting the food chain in jeopardy by allowing urban farming. Some of the so-called pets will be butchered for food, possibly in your neighbor's driveway or yard. I did not sign up for this!



- Livestock attract vermin. Livestock belong in the country. Kindly move to the country if you want to farm."
- livestock require a lot of room to roam. Unless you have lots of room, I don't think livestock should live within the city.
- Birds are gross disease carriers and shouldn't be in neighborhoods
- Hens, belong in a rural setting. Don't want farm animals next to me. If I did I would move to an acreage or a farm. Noisy and stinky
- This opens a whole new field of possible conflict, neighbourhood planing, architectural controls, property values... It could open up years of complaints, court cases appeals on land use bylaws. and cost us millions of dollars that we no longer have available in our tax base. Just opens a hole can of worms.
- Small game and livestock will increase our influx of predatory cats. Endangering our smaller house hold animals ie. cats the are allowed in our yards
- Keep the livestock on acreages where they have enough room to have suitable living conditions for these animals. I wouldn't want my neighbour in the city to have chickens any more then they would want my dogs barking in the backyard.
- They smell awful and how will their waste be dealt with,
- I believe this would encourage more wildlife to enter our city and put the wildlife in harms way.
- Urban areas are too densely populated and the cost with outweigh any benefit.
- if you want chickens, move to a farm. There will be added costs fort his bylaw that Calgarians don't need.
- We live in the city for a reason. If you want livestock, move to the country.
- This would be very difficult to enforce, and the problems of livestock in an urban environment are numerous. Examples are: maintenance of living conditions, noise, increase wildlife attacks on hens therefore more danger to the public.
- Farm animals go on a farm
- They attract coyotes to my property/area.
- no farm animals in a city.
- People keep too maybe pigeons and chickens in the city especially in neighbourhood makes a mess and they are loud
- You don't need hens or other livestock in the city
- Do we really want to waste our time, resources and money on monitoring hens and livestock in the city? I don't.
- I am not in favour of Farm animals in the city
- Our yards are so small in some areas - the smell and noise would be terrible for many neighbours. I would not want such things so close to my home and yard where we like to spend time outside - and we have allergies. Smell and noise at night and early morning when windows are open would be bad too.



- Nit everyone would be a responsible owner to keep clean etc. They would attract more wildlife such as mice and coyotes. We already have issues with coyotes. Calgary is an urban community, not a rural one
- I don't particularly want livestock within the city limits, that's what farms are for.
- Having spent a fair amount of time on a farm with chickens, they are dirty and noisy. I would not want to live in close quarters like a city near hens.
- I don't think any livestock should be within the city, that is what outside farmers are for, the city doesn't need to take responsibility to bring in farm livestock, reach out to other farmers/ranchers if there is a need for something.
- They should stay on farms.
- Urban hens can become problematic and/or a nuisance to urban dwellers and should be left for rural living arrangements
- Most city yards would not provide sufficient space for these types of animals which would lead to inappropriate living conditions for them
- no one wants a rooster waking them up in the early morning. i feel like there would be many complaints from neighbours if this were to happen
- I would not like to have a neighbor that had chickens, based on their smell, and noise.
- We do not have the room needed in the city for livestock
- I would support animals in the community but not at individual residences.
- If people want to have livestock they should live in the country, not the city.
- While there would be restrictions in place I feel unfortunately they would not be followed by everyone. I believe there would be more mistreated animals in unacceptable living conditions that would get out of hand
- Livestock belong on farms, not in cities. Cities should NOT have farmland inside it
- Like stated above it's ridiculous
- what is considered support from adjacent neighbors? And if you don't support, what avenue do you have? I believe this would only contribute to more neighborhood tension, environmental issues.
- Livestock should only be allowed on farms and large properties that have a lot of land. Not in the communities.
- More coyotes and cougars.
- Livestock should not be subjected to urban living conditions and neighbours shouldn't be subjected to any nuisance caused by urban livestock
- Too much effort will be put towards noise complaints by neighbors. Not an efficient use of tax payer dollars.
- So you're going to allow other livestock to live within Calgary, however you are going to limit the number of pit bulls that people are allowed to own?! I don't think so.
- Livestock should not be allowed in the city. Proper living conditions cannot be met. And the potential for livestock theft and livestock running around the city will increase.
- It may cause bird flu



- I don't think hens and farm animals need to be allowed on residential properties within the city. They stink, make a lot of noise and can be potential nuisance, if they escape and are harmed by a dog or cat it's just going to cause more problems.
- We struggle with responsible ownership of pets, let's not add poultry and livestock
- Why the heck are we bringing livestock into the city when the city is trying to get rid of dogs ?!?!? Livestock is meant for a farm.
- It is difficult to manage whether there are appropriate living conditions or space for livestock, and what training is available for taking care of these types of animals.
- Livestock belong in rural and not urban areas.
- Noise and smell are a concern of mine if a neighbor is allowed farm animals right next to my yard and house.
- [removed]
- I do not support having hens or other livestock in residential areas
- I do not support livestock in the city at all
- Livestock belongs on the farm, not in major cities.
- These animals are often not cared for appropriately and belong on a farm not a back yard.
- I'm not sure responsible hen ownership in the city could or would be followed by all citizens.
- Would provide a nuisance to other residents, encourage pests and wildlife into the city. Bylaw cannot keep up with animal cruelty cases at the moment without adding further laws involving animals. Penalties are not harsh enough. If people wish to keep livestock or chickens they should invest in suitable property outside of the city.
- If people want farm animals, they should live on a farm. You will have so many cases of neglected animals if this goes through
- There is not adequate space for livestock in Calgary to be humane.
- I like animals, but I don't need more noise in my neighbourhood, especially from animals that make a lot of noise. A city is not a farm.
- If the city is considering the bylaws for pit bulls, it shows the city's lack of animal knowledge and understanding. Therefore, for the city to decide what conditions are appropriate for livestock, clearly won't be comprehensive enough and I'm worried that there is room for more animal neglect and impulse buys.
- NO! The city land is not for livestock. There's plenty of farmland outside of city limits for raising them.
- [removed]
- Most houses in Calgary do not have sufficient space for livestock. Also would draw in predators, who would be euthanized if they kept returning.
- Farm animals should not be allowed in the City, and if they are there needs to be extensive training for handling on the new owner side
- I live in the city for a reason. I do not want to be woken up to roosters, deal with the garbage and debris from hens, pigs, and whatever livestock there is.
- Would depend on how this is done. If I had support from one neighbour and he moved, the new person should have to also give approval or I can't keep the hens. Could be a very slippery slope!



- Hens are noisy and their living conditions can become a nuisance smell
 - noise and smell in tight neighbourhoods
 - barn animal belong on a farm due to the noise and smell and space requirements for the quality of life for the animal
 - [removed]
 - They are too loud and not appropriate for city lots. If someone wants farm animals they should move to a farm.
 - Livestock such as hens do not belong in a city environment where houses are too close too each other. As well the fact that we do have a lot of wildlife such as coyotes roaming the city seeking food will mean that they will come in more often for the hens.
 - Farm animals belong on farms
 - Livestock is not needed in this city. If I had someone with chickens and other animals in their backyard, I would be [removed].
 - These are farm animals and should stay on a farm. We have enough issues with pet dogs, cats, birds, mice, snakes etc without adding pigs, hens, cows, etc to the problems.
 - Hens attract foxes and bobcats. I foresee you euthanizing the wildlife whom would come for the hens, when that isn't right. It is their nature
 - Homes are too close together. More allergies, smells & sounds come with this. Not for suburban or city living homes
 - Chickens are borderline ok but anything else isn't. If you want to raise live stock move to the country
 - No livestock witching city.
 - I don't want random chickens running around [removed]. Who is going to clean it up ? I don't want them wandering into my yard and disturbing my pets.
 - After going through potential issues with dog bite bylaws, why would you allow livestock?
 - [removed]
 - Birds can be viral transfer species. Don't we have enough problems with viruses currently?
 - I can't imagine that the smell and sound would be pleasant for neighbours.
 - I don't think hens should be kept inside city limits
 - "It's just extra burden on the city to create new bylaw and administr those.
-
- No need ofthat during this time."
 - Livestock within urban limits is equivalent to baiting/teasing the wildlife
 - I don't support this initiative because I believe sanitation enforcement and noise concerns would be an issue. We also already have issues with coyotes in communities trying to eat dogs and cats. Bringing chickens into the city would be another alluring point I believe.
 - This would largely be influenced by WHAT livestock and suitability for them to be in an urban setting. without examples, this is hard to support.



- Farm animal require special attention and space which we do not have in the city. My neighbor already tried to have chickens in there back yard and within 2 days a skunk moved in to our area. I leaved in fear that my dog was going to get sprayed by it. As soon as they got rid of the chickens Mr skunk left.
 - Don't want to be living beside a stinky hen house
 - "No roosters. Other livestock can smell bad. Suburban homes are too close together for this. If I'm an acreage, yes. Or larger inner city lot, maybe.
 - Not in newer suburban areas."
 - Just dumb.
 - noise and odor problems
 - Not sure what the quality of life would be for larger livestock in small city lots.
 - [removed]
 - If you want to own livestock move to the country
 - Most people do not understand the care processes and needs for livestock
 - [removed]
 - Hens belong on farms
 - Too much noise and mess
 - [removed]
 - "So many issues with animals released from homes already, we don't need hens too
-
- Too many cats at large."
 - City is no place for luvestock
 - Keeping livestock/hens on residential properties, can create health issues and will impact the property value of neighboring residences. If people want livestock, they are free to go live on a farm.
 - Absolutely not
 - It's difficult to meet a chickens needs in a city environment and I don't see it being a good welfare situation for the birds in the long run.
 - Livestock should remain on a farm
 - Something else to monitor
 - Calgary is a city last time I checked, not a farm.
 - Unfortunately people are not very clean and this will bring more pests (mice, voles, ants, etc) to neighboring homes
 - Too many people would not look after their hens or bees. As soon as money is tight, people will stop providing the necessary care.
 - I just don't see the need to own a pet hen. If people want livestock, buy an acreage or a farm.
 - Urban areas do not seem an appropriate place for livestock. Houses are too close to each other and smells and noise would be a nuisance.
 - smell would be my concern



- Do not agree with hens within the city limits. They are a farm animal.
- We live in far to close quarters to have livestock/chickens. What if the neighbors says yes today and then no a month after they realize the noise&smell? What if a new neighbor moves in and does not support?
- hens needs farm lands, city's are too loud.
- The city isn't the place for farm animals
- [removed]
- We live in the city of Calgary. There's placing like farms for this. If you want them contact a farmer.
- I don't feel any livestock belong in the city due to noise, smell
- It's not fair to the animal.
- Most farm animals and noisy and smell
- Who wants to live next door to someone who owns chickens in the city? That would really annoy neighbors
- Animals can be very smelly and noisy. A place for farm animals is on a farm.
- These animals are a nuisance.
- I think is no healthy to have hens inside at home in winter time .
- Costs to police this too high. Other pressing matters ie car thefts
- Noise
- Hens belong on farms, it's in humane to have them in urban quarters
- Farm animals are for farms and should not be in the city
- [removed]
- The allowance would be abused and animals would become a nuisance.
- I don't agree with livestock within the city
- Hens and livestock attract wildlife.....
- Noise and smell of hens in urban neighbourhoods is unfair to those surrounding neighbours.
- Farm animals belong in the farm not the city. This will cause more neighbours issues and complaints to the city. At this point the city can't control roaming cats
- I don't have enough information to support this.
- Hens will likely attract predators to come into urban zones.
- Bringing other animals in would attract coyotes etc.
- [removed]
- If you want livestock move to the country
- Hens are loud and stink, if you don't want dogs barking then how her hands any different
- Move to a rural area if you want to keep farm animals
- I know of someone who keeps hens. That's fine but the last thing we need are people keeping chickens, a pig etc for food and saying it's a pet.
- There is currently enough issues ensuring that the animals currently allowed are cared for and safe and healthy. Also currently there is almost no enforcement of the current animal bylaws until if is too late so let's work on the current animal bylaws before we add more.



- I do not support raising animals just to eat them or eat their offspring.
- [removed]
- I dont want farms in the city
- Animal services has enough to deal with already
- If people want to livestock and farm animals - they can move to a rural environment.
- This would generate more noise and smell, people don't take their responsibility seriously, by law would have to have authority to fine not monitored situations
- Chickens do not belong in the city
- That's what farm's are for.
- No farm animals in urban areas. I definitely would not want chickens or anything else in my neighbourhood.
- I don't believe support from solely adjacent neighbors would be enough and smell or noise may be a problem for those farther away than just the adjacent houses
- Noise and smells.
- In the city, i would not want hens or other livestock.
- [removed]
- You're saying dogs a nuisance but want to allow noisy farm animals that live outside 24/7. Seems silly
- Da animals do not belong in a court environment, not only does it pose a threat to the animals but to people and the resident pets as well.
- The city is a city. Having livestock in the city can cause irreparable harm to the animals. The stress on them from loud noises, vehicles, people teasing or bothering them from over fences is just to much. It will ultimately create more problems for owners, tenants, and the city.
- I do not support livestock permitted in the city of Calgary.
- Animals raise for food belong on a farm, not in the city.
- People,can buy an acreage for keeping chickens, pigs etc. I can't even get my neighbours to control cats, let alone feral roosters (who can be vicious)
- [removed]
- Hens are for a farm not in the city
- Chickens are loud. If you would like to run a hobby farm relocate to an acreage
- [removed]
- Pet owners can barely (if at all) follow the rules of the animals already allowed. Adding more will only cause more of a problem and cost to the city and to neighbors.
- Chickens are loud, over populate quickly, and lead to an increase in dangerous wildlife in suburban areas
- Noise smell sanitary needs garbage disposal
- I'm doubtful that any consideration of and communication to neighbors will be consistently followed, not sure the Bylaw folks will be strict enough with violations and where there are hens, someone will slip in a rooster and that will be too much noise in an urban setting.



- Livestock should not be allowed in the city. If it is only rural properties with minimum yard space behind houses should have it permitted.
- its ridiculous
- My concerns stem from irresponsible ownership and husbandry. Noise mess, smell etc.
- If you want livestock, buy a farm.
- I have a neighbor who has roughly 50 pigeons in their backyard, the coop goes above the fence line, extra noise is emitted and overall is an eyesore in the backyard and I would argue has decreased property values adjacent I do not support this under any circumstance.
- People do not take care of dogs and cats so the cost of enforcement does not seem to be worth
- Hens and livestock are loud, and smelly.
- People already neglect domesticated animals. We don't need to throw more species into this mix.
- If people want livestock, live outside the city boundary
- chickens for example can be very loud i think they should only be allowed on farms outside of the city
- Hens and other lives stock are loud and have a considerable smell. They can't be returned to a house when they are bothering their neighbours.
- Just like louder dogs can be complained about, I'm assuming that hens and other livestock would be complained about. For example, the smell or the noise.
- I do not want more noise living inner city. Also if you have an owner that will not keep up proper hygiene in there back yard the smell can be horrid
- No, unless this law is enforced with permits and there is SPECIFIC education/training provided for people who would like livestock.
- I think the potential negative effects (noise, smell, living conditions, lack of adequate/humane space in urban yards, etc) outweighs the potential benefits.
- I grew up on a farm and Chickens stink they are loud and annoying.
- A farm is farm, hens belong to a farm. A home is a home.
- [removed]
- Farm animals are always noisy and smelly. Also, even well intentioned situations will have incidents and a community should not have to deal with that in a city.
- I think that would excite coyotes and bob cats leading to more of them in the city. Which wouldn't end well for the poor wild animals.
- I will not support any changes until pitbulls are not singled out.
- It will just create more problems, noise complaints, health and safety issues.
- I don't think the public needs to be keeping more animals in cages in the city. Leave hens to professional farmers.
- Unfortunately, chickens make a lot of noise and mess. Would not want that next door.
- City lots are to small and close together. If a neighbour had hens it would affect multiple people surrounding them. Not fair. They belong on farms and acreages.
- Noisy, manure odour, carries fleas/ticks



- This is a city/urban environment unsuited for this
- I believe the potential to increase a readily available food supply for the small predators already living in our city (coyotes, bobcats, etc.,) would increase their presence and put them at greater danger in an urban setting.
- Livestock require a lot of training, work and space to maintain. What would happen if the owner goes on vacation? It would be detrimental to the health of the animals and people living in the area. There is also a higher chance for spreading diseases linked to livestock in rural areas.
- Livestock is more of a nuisance than any dog or cat, have an odour, attack when slightly agitated and cannot be brought inside during quiet time hours.
- You should not be allowed to have farm animals in the city. Citizens are unable to have cows or horses in a backyard so others should not be allowed to keep hens in a coupe in the city.
- Because you are catering this one specific breed. This doesn't enforce realistic rules, and won't deal with other breeds when and if they bite.
- Livestock does not belong in a city.
- I believe it would depend on the livestock. But there are health concerns for both people and livestock to take into consideration. Ex. If people were allowed goats or pigs on property they can be highly destructive animals and can eat and dig through fence lines.
- People can't be trusted to make sure the smell of the chickens is kept to a minimum
- Stop making up new rules and regulations to justify your jobs and increase your bureaucracy
- Na
- Lots too small to support this theory. The smell and noise is substantial. Leave them in the rural areas where they belong.
- The only other livestock I can think of are big, smelly and noisy.
- I don't support any kind of livestock animals inside the city.
- I don't believe livestock needs to be within Calgary city limits.
- The city is no place for farm animals
- Farm animals do not belong in the city. They don't have the room they need in the city.
- Don't want livestock living next to me.
- noise, odors, messes
- Because in the winter when it's not fun any more you are going to have a problem. 2. If people can't control or make time to train and take care of house pets how do you the farm animals are going to make out.
- not a fan of farm animals in the city. there should be a limit of at most two if they were to be allowed. most city dwellers have no idea how to care for farm animals. there are a lot of irresponsible animal owners. there needs to be a quick resolution process to disputes about animal disturbance. maybe two strikes and you're done. there has to be some recognition about neighbours quiet enjoyment of their property without having to deal with odour or noise. Keep the number of animals at a minimum as other cities have done and it would go a long way to solving this problem. ownership limits should also be put on dogs and cats. few city lots can really support more than 3-4 dogs.



- Bylaws are often not enforced to begin with based on lack of resources. This is just going to cause more issues amount neighbors and neighborhoods.
- LIVESTOCK DOES NOT BELONG IN THE CITY!!!!!!!!!!
- I think there would be too many people who don't know how to properly care for these animals. There would be more cases of animal abuse than ever.
- "We don't need more random livestock on properties.
- Before you allow more animals, maybe you should review the pros and cons of the people with chickens (and their neighborhoods)."
- No one NEEDS livestock in the city. If you do, move to a farm.
- I don't feel livestock belong in an urban setting. While someone may have support from adjacent properties initially, what happens when properties sell or people move and feelings are not the same with new owners??
- Support from adjacent neighbours? What if one supports, one doesn't? Puts us in the position of opposing a neighbour which doesn't make for good relationships. If you want chickens, go buy an acreage where you won't affect those around you.
- Other livestock needs more space than what city limits can provide.
- There should be no farm animals in the city. If you want chickens move to the country.
- If you want farm animals buy a Acreage and purchase farm animals for your farm not in the city
- While I love the idea of possible other livestock, I'm concerned about neighborhoods where the houses are quite close together and the noise that livestock would make. You cannot teach a chicken or a goat not to make noise and you cannot bring it inside if it is disturbing to your neighbors, like you can a dog
- If I wanted to live beside a farm I'd move to the country. I've lived beside a neighbor who had a duck farm. It was terrible. Not keen waking up to the sounds of cows outside my bedroom window either.
- Don't want the extra noise and smell.
- By law enforcement is ineffective. There will be an increase in cases of neighbor against neighbor. Smells, sounds will deter people from enjoying their backyards, especially in high density neighborhoods. Farms animals belong on farms.
- I do not wish to have urban hens living within city limits. Farm animals should remain to live on the farm.
- The chance and likelihood of hens and other livestock being inadequately cared for within city limits, on urban and suburban properties is far too high.
- We don't have the funds to enforce that the laws are being followed.
- Having to smell bird feces every day? No thanks. You want to be a farmer, move to a rural area. It's bad enough that we have to smell that horrible marijuana everyday, & now this? This is a city, not farmland.
- "urban hens - yes for eggs only
- Other livestock - no"
- I don't want livestock to be kept within the city, Calgary will start looking like a 3rd world country.
- Way too difficult to enforce and I see it being far more intrusive on neighbors. Keep it in the country



- Livestock need more than the BASIC care and unfortunately having the bare minimum isn't enough especially in an enclosed city.
- Hens stink and are farm animals.
- Livestock deserve to be on land large enough to roam and not cooped up in a suburban backyard.
- Livestock in the city will just get as bad as the feral cats problem. When people can't afford to feed these animals anymore they will just let them go.
- Love stock should not be in family homes
- I don't want pigs, goats, cows, and other farm animals to be allowed to live in the city.
- People can't even properly care for dogs and cats and the city does a poor job of enforcing animal welfare. Adding more types of animals that people have even less knowledge about will be detrimental.
- There is nothing like the fresh air of a farm!
- I believe farm animals belong on a farm, not in the city. I.e. chicken, pigs, etc
- [removed]
- I live in a new area, and our lots are already so small. I would not be comfortable with having urban hens next door to me, knowing what goes into roosting and keeping them from personal, hands-on experience in a rural setting.
- Pests will be attracted to properties noise and smell of chickens is terrible green carts already attract more pests so chickens could lure coyotes into neighborhoods causing safety issues
- Hens are filthy, allergenic and could spread a future bird flu. If people want to raise livestock, there is plenty of land outside city limits.
- I grew up with hens and they were great but the people who abused the leniency and had multiple goats etc made it hard to enjoy our yard
- Given the close parameters between houses, potential smell or noise may become an issue which can cause unpleasantness between neighbors who sometimes are not always approachable. Owing livestock should be allowed only outside of the City limits. Owing animals can sometimes have the best intentions but get out of control for any reason
- Livestock doesn't belong in the city, it isn't fair to them nor the people living near them
- Livestock and chickens are grown on farms where they have space to be taken care of. If people want to raise hens or livestock, then don't live in a city. Move to the country or acreage so that you can properly care for the animals and have the space to do so without disrupting people who like city living. It could open up a can of worms for health conditions/concerns for neighborhoods, well-being for animals that has to be monitored, noise complaints, neighborhood disagreements etc. It will add to more bylaw calls and complaints than its worth.
- "Farm animals belong on a [removed] farm
- If you want them get the [removed] out of the city period
- Sick of minority groups whining and getting their way"
- No farm animals in the city.
- Chickens smell terrible!
- Hen? Seriously?



- They're farm animals
- I do not believe bylaw has the manpower to address potential animal welfare issues regarding hens. Inspections of husbandry areas to ensure the animals are properly taken care of should be required.
- I don't trust that a large amount of the urban population is able to care for livestock properly. This will end up negatively affecting the animals in some cases.
- If people want hens they should move to a farm or acreage
- I live in a community that spearheaded the LESA for chickens. I don't believe that livestock should be kept as pets for any other reason. We have enough issues policing cats/dog owners as it is.
- I don't feel that the place for livestock is within the city limits and feel that this is going to be a big headache for neighbours that would live beside people who do put livestock in their backyards.
- Livestock only bring coyotes and disease to the areas. Livestock is for farms and out of city areas.
- If people want to raise livestock they should move to the country.
- This is a slippery slope and there are people who will take advantage of this. It will decrease property values.
- I can see hens, but depending on the livestock I feel it may become an annoyance to house anything larger than that for the neighborhood.
- if you want to raise farm animals, move to a farm. Chickens, cows or pigs on the other side of the fence are going to increase the incidence of dogs barking.
- Chickens are stinky and loud. They also bring coyotes and skunks into the area. There would be a need for some licensing and training before I would be okay with my neighbours having chickens.
- I don't like the idea of exceptions at the discretion of chief bylaw officer. It either yes or no and if complaints are received then officer can go by
- livestock does not belong in the city. hens are messy and their feces stink. we have enough problems with skunks and coyotes in this city without adding new sources of food.
- Houses are too close together in most communities. Chickens smell, and can be noisy. Need to be kept on places with some distance between the neighbors
- Within the city, there is not enough land far enough away from neighbours that having livestock such as hens that would not be disruptive. I think it is best kept outside of the city.
- Chickens can smell very bad. Also we lived in other areas where roosters would wake us up.
- I believe by allowing this, people will get these animals and next thing you know they will be slaughtering them as well! I also know that there is way too much animal neglect and cruelty happening already and allowing hens etc will just increase an already huge problem. Unless hens etc. are going to be actual pets and part of the human family and treated as such, then that could be an exception but it would have to be heavily monitored and regulated so that these animals don't become victims of cruelty and neglect...or end up on the dinner table.
- Calgary properties are cramped as they are. Many livestock animals make lots of noise (much like dogs) which can create unneeded noise complaints. If someone wants livestock, they can move outside the city and commute.
- Houses are too close and a lot of back yard space is too small.



- I think that City of Calgary really needs to start planning for increased urban density. At what point is the carrying capacity exceeded? Population biologists will tell you that increased population densities results in increased anxiety and violence. We are seeing that in Calgary. The last thing that we need is to put animals into a city setting! My neighbour already doesn't follow bylaws. Now I'm going to let him have animals. Perhaps first the City of Calgary should reduce our crime rate and bylaw infractions before we add this into the mix!
- the city is no place for livestock. not enough land.
- My area is residential. Would not expect to have livestock introduced.
- I do not feel neighbors would be supported well enough. Noise adjacent to livestock could become unbearable with no recourse.
- IF hens were allowed they need to be restricted to certain locations due to the possibility of disease they carry
- fowl do not belong in the city, they are a health hazard
- livestock in the city causes too many noise, smell and disturbance issues with neighbours.
- my neighbours barely look after their lawns, garbage etc. I would not want to live next door to chickens/hens/goats etc
- livestock belongs on a farm or rural property. the smell they can generate would be a nuisance to others.
- Biosecurity reasons that can transmit diseases to other flocks
- [removed]
- I believe that City and CPS resources are already strained and don't need the extra obligation to respond to complaints re: smelly or noisy hens/livestock
- Livestock should not be in urban areas, they are for rural/farm life
- Livestock should not be in the city (rural).
- I don't agree with people raising animals to kill them and eat them.
- If you want livestock or chickens - rural animals - move to a farm. I don't want to have chicken feed lots in yards near me.
- Urban hens can be loud and smelly and attract other pests. Given that properties in Calgary are relatively close to each other I do not support this as it will not be possible for urban hens to not impact immediate neighbours.
- Livestock belong on a farm setting.
- I don't want livestock next to my home. I don't trust that the city has the capacity to monitor complaints or oversee standards
- It would cause far too much nuisance to neighbors, and would cause issues with neighbors etc. Livestock belongs on farms and rural areas. It would also mean a new tenant could be forced to live beside a previously approved hen house, even if they weren't ok with it.
- Allowing hens or livestock could attract more pests to the neighborhood and as a homeowner I wouldn't want to have to deal with more issues around my home due to that. It could add more cost to me which isn't fair. As well, it could perhaps add unwanted noise from said neighbor.
- There has to be noise restraints put in place first



- I don't want to be subject to excessive noise and smell. If they want to raise livestock they can move to an acreage where there is the space to minimize impact to neighbours
- I don't think farm animals should be kept in the city. There is not enough space and it could encourage coyotes or other animals to come closer to homes
- Many people, neighbourhoods will start chicken farms in their back yards. This will depreciate the values of a property depending on what area of the city you are in.
- I would not support this due to the mess, smell and noise that would come along with allowing hens in the city
- Waking up to my neighbours dog barking is enough to tip me over. If i hear chickens, roosters and goats I would not be okay with that.
- The land area size in calgary does not support these types of activities due to small lots and proximity to your neighbors. People still think it's okay to let there cats out.. let's start there before we allow livestock.
- Where there are hens, there will eventually be a rooster waking the neighbours up at the crack of dawn and all through the day. Have lived near roosters - awful
- Having grown up with livestock, this would be difficult on the animals to be in a city environment. Unless the owner has ample space and livestock experience and/or training, in addition to the requirements you listed, this is not supported.
- Will there be more money in the budget to manage the enforcement of the bylaw
- Livestock dont belong in the city and I believe people who dont know what they're doing could acquire animals they dont know how to properly care for.
- My neighbours can't even clean up after their dog, and the stench makes us uncomfortable in our own yard. Can you image if they were allowed to have hens and other livestock?
- No livestock by individual citizens within city limits. People can barely handle dogs and cats, let's not give them cows and chickens
- no need
- farm animals belong on a farm
- The city does haven't time to follow out complaints of what's already going on. People here cant be trusted and we dont have the resources to follow up on chicken complaints
- Hens attract rodents, specifically rats.
- I don't like the idea of it being on a case by case and the bylaw officers discretion. People need to feel their are rules. If a person were to get a chicken or pet pig, they would always worry that a bylaw officer in a bad mood would decide it's not okay, possibly even after another said it was. Also some of these amendments are strange, offers community benefit? What does that mean, and would you suggest cats and dogs offer a community benifit
- in the City we are so close together. Dog & bird noise is enough without adding to it.
- roosters crowing at early hours can not be trained. Hygiene, disposal of surprisingly large amount of chicken dung
- Noise, mess, smell
- No livestock can be smelly and decrease property value.



- One concern I have is how the city would be following up to ensure the living conditions of the animal are indeed suitable, when we have so many issues already of inhumane living conditions for pet cats and dogs around the city.
- I do not want hens living next to me unless they are quiet.
- Are you going to introduce new bylaws, if we're only allowed one dog in the house then you can't have more than one kid in your household.
- People within the city leave their dogs outside in-30 for hours and allow them to bark daily. Couldn't imagine if we handed them goats and hens.
- Bringing a farm inside city limits wouldn't be wise, look around, I'd guess that an average of at least 50% of the residents in Calgary can't be bothered to properly maintain their property as it is, and now you want to add farm animals to their yards?
- [removed]
- Far too many people don't clean up after their dogs, I am concerned it will be the same with other animals.
- The hens/emotional support chickens argument is ridiculous and nothing more than an attention-seeking move from people with mental health issues. Laughable.
- Most livestock is bigger than a dog and I don't believe they belong in the city.
- Residential areas are not suitable for livestock especially in Calgary with many communities being zero lot lines
 - belong on an acreage or farm. Noise, smell.
 - Noise and smell
 - Chickens, Hens and livestock belong on a farm not in a city.
- We do not have the veterinary resources to take care of the influx of rural type patients that would be coming in. I think too many would get these animals while being too uneducated on how to care for them, especially in a city.
- Want to live in rural areas live there.
- There shouldn't be hens inside the city
- Criteria are too vague
- I believe that livestock in City limits can be noisy and messy
- I grew up on a farm. Animals are not suitable for this compressed city lifestyle of living. They are noisy if they are chickens and most animals refuse creates doors. If you want to raise animals, you should live on an acreage or farm.
- Unneeded/unwanted Noise and smell
- Farm animals belong on the farm. Keep your [removed] chickens out of your backyard, I shouldn't have to smell or hear them when I'm trying to enjoy my time outside.
- As a person raised on a farm, there are certain livestock that would not fit in with urban living (pigs, cows, goats, sheep). The animals behaviors would not fit within the current infrastructure (hosing to close together).
- I believe livestock belongs on a farm, not in a city



- chickens are very stinky.
- It's a city, not a farm.
- People will abuse this privilege and neighbors will be negatively affected
- Farm animals need to have lots of space
- Chickens are for farms
- I already can't get my neighbour to take care of their yard or their keep their dogs from barking so I certainly don't want to have to deal with other animals.
- No
- Barnyard animals do not belong in the city.
- Suitable living conditions needs a clear definition.
- Chickens and their waste stink. Unless you have a very large property where the smell wouldn't travel, no chickens
- Too much more to change & worry about. Keep farm animals on the farm. That is where they are happy & healthy
- Not interested in having this amendment in the city. I do not trust people and their motives with hen ownership, plus additional public funds would be needed to bylaw enforcement to deal with irresponsible livestock ownership in the city limits. absolutely not interested!
- Some will be good but if u live by someone not responsible, it affects your day to day living. Livestock is for the country.
- No, no, no!!! I have a hard enough time with peoples junk and garbage piled around their house as well as the alleys and roadways. I do not want someone to move in with pigs or goats.
- I don't think have other livestock would benefit the city. With more noise complaint from the animals or the livestock escaping. I think it will cause more harm or trouble than good.
- If a person wants livestock they should move outside the city limits. Cleanliness and odor control would be an issue for direct neighbors, especially in areas where properties are only 28-32 feet wide
- Chickens are loud, smelly, messy and a farm animal. LIVESTOCK. If I have to live next to a chicken coop in the city, I am going to call DAILY on noise complaints. They are a nuisance and disgusting. Calgary should not engage in allowing these pest animals into residential areas.
- We don't live on the farm
- As a child I lived next door to a man who kept chickens in the city. He had a rooster and it was a terrible experience as an owner has no control over its behaviour. It was burden on everyone who lived nearby. Chickens are less bothersome than roosters, but you can't train them to be quiet and hey attract predators. Your house cats and dogs in your back yard will die because your neighbour has hens that attracts wild predators who will stalk your neighborhood.
- The city is not for wildlife and do not believe it is good for the animals . You also could cause problems with neighbors who say no to them wanting wildlife. That's not fair. If want chickens and other livestock please move to the country.
- Farm animals do not have a place in an urban environment.
- Farm animals stay in the farm.
- Animal husbandry should be practiced in rural areas only.



- This is a city. Not a farm
- This is a joke right?
- Hens are bad enough, we don't need other livestock.
- The city is no place for livestock. Period.
- I don't believe the community benefit/positive impact is great enough.
- Additional animals will require additional city workers to police and enforce. We need to cut costs not increase the. Yards are small and neighbor issues will increase creating more enforcement issues.
- if people want farm animals they should live on an acreage or farm
- The smells and the messes are not worth it, especially with neighbors who are careless
- Considering the current pandemic I don't think we need closer living relationships with livestock
- We don't need more animals in the city that will be neglected. Our winters are too harsh for people to have chickens without the proper equipment. The little heaters that are available to keep them warm start many fires. I believe that it would increase our fire risks and animal neglect.
- It isn't the animal. It's the humans that are the problem
- [removed]
- I don't want the smell or noise in my neighborhood. If you want chickens move to a farm outside of the city.
- No livestock in city
- Too much noise in an inner city environment. Noise affects all neighbours, not just adjacent.
- Hens should not be allowed in the city. They will not be happy and it will lead to neighbourhood disputes.
- I fear it will attract predators that may attack pets
- I think people will get animals that they may not understand how to care for and the animals will pay the price.
- Livestock does not belong in the city. Why would anyone want for example chickens living next door causing a nuisance.
- This is a city, not rural farm yards. There is enough issues with noisy dog owners, let alone increase the number of complaints about other animals.
- I don't think livestock belong in the city.
- [removed]
- I am on the fence on this topic. I could see having livestock as a great learning opportunity. I have raised livestock from horses to chickens, and they are a lot of work. I could see if this bylaw passed, that a lot of people will buy livestock for the sake of it but not really understand how much work it is.
- Excess smell and noise far exceed the benefit, if you urban setting doesn't fit with your bohemian ideals, please move to the country
- Noise and sanitation issues. As well as safety if animals escape/are poorly penned.
- I don't believe urban hens are necessary at all.
- I don't want the noise that hens would be making throughout the day especially in the early morning/bedtime nor do I want to smell the excrements.



- "Support from adjacent neighbours? What if they move?"
- Also concerns for animal welfare. Chickens I'm ok with (I think) but other livestock seems too much"
- Urban livestock opens it up to not just chickens, but pigs, horses, where does it end?
- I'm worried about noise and smell from livestock. I'm also concerned people who have no idea how to raise livestock will give it a try to the detriment of the community and the livestock themselves...
- I don't think livestock belong in the city
- Don't live on a farm for a reason
- This opens up too many possibilities for people to own animals that don't belong in a city environment. Hens are acceptable, as are pot belly pigs, but opening this up to other livestock is not responsible. If you can't control dog and cat owners, how are you going to reasonably enforce other animals?
- [removed]
- I grew up on a farm. If you allow chickens in peoples property you will attract coyotes, raccoons, dogs ect. Which will lead to many confrontational problems with predatory animals wich defeats the purpose of the past question about feeding wildlife in your yard. You will now have to resort to killing the predators to keep the chickens safe. Build a community livestock facility where people can keep & raise their animals in a safe setting.
- No farm animals in city
- Birds and other fowl should not be within the city.
- I don't want to live next door to chickens so I can't ask someone else to do so
- Too noisy. Hens should be on farms.
- Urban hens are not necessary in urban areas
- Control of livestock differs from pets. Homeowners cannot control nose from chickens, and the city would surely fail at odor control complaints
- no unless the person lives on an acreage or farm. Hens are too loud
- How about we take things one step at a time. Fix the issues we have first before inviting more
- I don't want the noise and smell of livestock next to my home, livestock needs to stay out of city limits
- "If you are interested in livestock, live on a farm.
- Smell, noise are potential issues."
- farm animals belong on farms not in the city
- The noise is a problem and smell if not taken care of
- Livestock should be on a farm. Much like feral cats, pretty soon there will be feral livestock in the neighborhoods. Whose responsibility is that?
- We are a city! If you wish to have hens then live in the country. People tend to slack off with the maintenance of these animals once they get their approval to have them.
- we don't need chickens and other animals in the city we already have a problem with coyotes and lynx . we have lots of little kids playing in our yards and parks that don't need to be under predator's eyes.



- Chickens can add a lot of noise to an area unkept chicken pens can be repulsive. You want chickens to move out of town.
- It would create way too much noise
- So you want to allow hens in Calgary but are trying to muzzle and treat peoples dogs like [removed] because of there breed ?
- They just using them for their eggs. Enslaving them
- I don't believe livestock should be allowed in urban areas in the city.
- If you want livestock, move to a farm.
- Livestock has no place in a residential area
- There need to be more restrictions in place to protect the welfare of the animals and put forward guidelines to ensure they are being raised and cared for properly. People raising animals who do not have appropriate knowledge about an animal's requirements can cause undue stress and harm attempting to raise that animal.
- noise and disease
- Don't want to hear chickens.
- Please no. I do not want my back yard to smell like a farm nor do I want to deal with any increased noise from animals. If we are trying to say - do not feed wild animals - then allowing farm animals will only attack these wild animals. This is counter intuitive. If this is allowed what types of recourse Will neighbors have should the farm life be noisy and interfere with my space in my backyard that I have worked so hard to make relaxing? Will my complaint be taken serious? Should it become too much will the owner of the farm animals be told to remove them? What are the recourses here?
- These types of animals are typically a nuisance.
- people already don't take care of their animals. This just adds more to be neglected and increased workload for police and bylaw.
- City properties are not big enough for livestock.
- Chickens and livestock belong on farms not in the city.
- People will not properly take care of chickens as they will expect them to act as domestic animals (like dogs/cats) and not farm animals.
- "Would you want to live next to the stench of hen poop on a hot day eliminating your ability to have your windows open for fresh air? Would you want your sleep disturbed by constantly clucking hens? Would you be willing to accept that it would have a potentially negative impact on the resale value of your home as a neighbour to hens or other livestock?"
- The only exception I'd be ok with is horses provided the property is no less than half an acre and they have proper feed/water and shelter.
- Any other livestock should require an acre or more of land and cannot be housed near the property line."



- Live stock should be kept on farms! I have enough problems with rental property not being looked after and to add something like this to situation would be larger mess! Not enough by law to monitor! Birds are dirty!
- Chickens do not belong in urban areas. They make noise and smell. I would not support one in my neighborhood at all.
- I do not believe there is any place for livestock within the city
- What kind of livestock? Most city properties aren't suitable for animals that require much more space.
- Who needs hens in the city? And houses are way too close for this. I don't even like hearing dogs bark excessively or birds chirping outside my window.
- No reason to have livestock in the city
- Have you ever smelled livestock?
- Suitable living conditions MUST be provided. Just because they CAN doesn't mean they WILL.
- Animals are not food!!!!
- I believe this is a slippery slope. Hens become goats that become cows etc. Also, if the current adjacent neighbours agree, what happens when those neighbours move? Are the existence of these animals required in the real estate descriptions of the house? I would need more information on this change to possibly support it.
- hens are too noisy and do not belong in the city
- if people want livestock, they should live in the country
- Farm animals belong on a farm
- livestock requires space, that can not be done within city limits.
- It only encourages predators (dogs, cats, coyotes, foxes, badgers etc) which is not fair to them. You would be leading the predators to slaughter. Predators are REQUIRED or this city would be infested with rodents and rabbits. Take a look at the skunk population, because skunks have only a few predators. BEFORE making any bylaws regarding animals, City council should have to consult with wildlife experts, Dog Trainers and Veterinarians! Licenses for pets should be free with vaccinations and at least they would be kept up to date! And STOP with the pit bull blame and shame! ALL working/protection/herd dogs can cause major harm..that is what they were bred for!
- People don't need hens as house hold pets.
- The potential for noise, smell and mess can cause conflict. many yards in Calgary are very small and even if one neighbor says okay, what about when they move and another person moves in. There are enough pet choices already where the pet stays inside the home and doesn't affect people that live around them. Want a hen, move outside the city.
- Concerned about noise/smell with other livestock.
- The city of Calgary is not a farm
- Too much noise and smell. We're don't need livestock in the city.
- If you want a farm move out of the city. Are you kidding me? Pushing dogs out bringing chickens in? [removed]



- Enough problems with cats and dogs with irresponsible owners. Livestock belongs in the country. Can't believe this is being considered
- [removed]
- If they want to raise livestock they should move to China where it is legal and encouraged. Heard of swine flu...bird flu...
- This will attract rodents
- more detailed criteria required, amount of land required for the specific animal
- unless you have over 1 acre size yard you shouldn't be allowed chickens/hens/livestock
- Livestock, including hens belong in rural areas outside the city. The only exception to this should be if farmland is annexed by the City and there is livestock on that farm. There should be a grace period to allow for the removal of the livestock.
- I don't think livestock of any kind belong in the city.
- unless you have a limit on how many hens one household can have. the owner would need to provide documentation as why the Hens are needed from a DR.
- [removed]
- According to the City people can't even deal with their dogs and cats. Why would anyone be on board to add to this problem.
- Hens roosters are very loud, and I don't know if these enclosures for them are being inspected to ensure these livestock animals are kept where there supposed to be
- You can't train a hen to be quiet like you can a dog
- Livestock spread disease. Why would we have that as a possibility in an inner city like Calgary. Fact is, some pet owners are ignorant and will not do what is required to keep diseases away.
- I have no desire to live next to an urban farmer.
- You want to essentially introduce BSL (breed specific legislation) to wards pit bulls but want to allow people to have chickens. NO!
- Live stock does not belong in a city environment. It increases noise pollution and smells. It also invites the likes of additional coyotes and other predators. Which raises more concerns for city staff and citizens alike.
- People will take advantage of it. If people want livestock, they can move to a farm.
- Livestock is dirty and noisy. I do not want it in my neighborhood
- we are in a city if people want livestock they should move to the country
- Urban hens do not sound like my idea of a good time.
- I do not want to live beside chickens/hens or any other livestock I'd go live in the country if I did
- With all the different kinds of disease these chickens carry they should be kept on a farm where it's manageable.
- Cheif bylaw is usually someone with kittle to no experience
- people who claim they need hens for food (eggs) due to low income are not transparent. It costs less for eggs than to properly maintain a hen. People will push boundaries and urban wildlife wont



end at hens. This is a very slippery slope and a horrible idea. why not designate green spaces in neighborhoods for hens to be kept communally instead.

- Live stock can be smelly and noisy and I don't feel that all people would be responsible with the care and cleaning. Please keep this to outside city limits
- Hens in residential would attract wild animals more... Common sense.
- Livestock would likely be difficult to train regarding noise levels at certain times. They should also have large living spaces which calgary does not necessarily afford.
- Will be loud and stink
- If someone wants farm animals move to the country, this opens up a whole level of bylaw we havent thought of. Community centres could offer a hen houses that it shares like a community garden thus many people ensure its success verse one person unable to control or loses interest. Causing what was a good plan now a bad neighbour.
- [removed]
- Noise, smell
- the City has enough trouble enforcing by-laws currently on the books including the fines in #9
- this is not farm land, I would not want hens living beside me in an urban setting.
- Livestock belong on a farm not in the city.
- Isn't there enough cruelty to animals we have (and poop) !!! You want livestock, don't live in a City.
- Don't need chickens running free in the city
- Noise mostly
- Noise
- If people what livestock, they should move to an rural community.
- [removed]
- To many people out there would not give the animals proper pens.
- There is no need to have larger animals like goats, cows, pigs etc. to be kept in an urban environment. It's not fair to confine the animals to small spaces or create the nuisance for your neighbours.
- who would need a urban hen? Why would someone need to have a chicken in their home.
- Livestock has no place in the city
- Urban farming not appropriate for animals.. It's best kept an out of city activity, and there isn't any NEED for in city farming
- Animal living areas can smell if they aren't cleaned on a regular basis
- [removed]
- I grew up with neighbors who had chickens, they were extremely loud in the early mornings
- I do not want to hear chickens or livestock first thing in the morning. Let alone the fact people don't pick up after their pets as it is. There is a reason even acreage developments don;t allow livestock. Think of what the run off is going to do to our waterways in the spring.
- I would not want to live next to livestock, most city lots are too small for "livestock" to be kept properly.



- A city is not a farm and neighbours should not have to listen to or smell livestock or chickens
- Chickens are disgusting and shouldn't be kept in urban communities. If you want farm animals go by a property on the edge of city or farm.
- I think it would create noise
- To vague to support a yes answer
- We are a city not a small town with super large yards
- No farm animals in urban areas
- there is no place for livestock within city limits. How could the city possibly enforce the rules in the absence of public help.
- I don't feel the city is any place for hens or wildlife. If people want to own those pets, they should move out of the city, where the animals will have a better chance for a good life.
- C
- People will abuse this allowance to livestock
- Suburban houses are very close together. Chicken coops smell!
- Livestock can not be properly cared for in the city.
- You're having a hard enough time regulating pets. Livestock won't be properly regulated.
- any kind of live stock should be in the country. as the lot size in calgary is to small for this. I do not want to have the smell around my house or the noise that could come with it.
- Your plot in city limits is not a farm.
- Backyard are not enough in the city
- Smell, noise, nuisance for neighbours!
- Chickens are dirty and noisy.
- Attract coyotes and skunks
- hens belong on a farm.
- People should NOT have sheep and goats in their city backyard. This is a recipe for disaster. You will have people butchering and hanging animals for their neighbors to see. The city has a hard time with managing roaming cats and dogs, how will they handle it if someones sheep or goats got out? If people want livestock they should not live in an urban setting. Chickens are one thing but even too many of those and you get foxes, weasels, birds or prey and a pest problem if people don't keep their chicken space clean. People need to be responsible and when they get too many animals in a space they tend to get overwhelmed or used to the smell.
- It would devalue surrounding properties
- It opens a can of worms
- "No. I chose to not have live stock and do not want to be around it. I would have no say if my neighbours chose to have hens. We are already living so close in small lots next to each other. I would be very upset.
- This would also cost money for the city to set up and then later enforce."
- Not unless the bylaw specifies that Roosters are not to be kept within the city.



- I am simply not confident majority of people in a city dwelling could or would provide adequate care to livestock animals. There still exists issues with in humane living conditions for domesticated animals/pets which need addressing.
- lived next to a chicken pilot program and the noise and smell is not for the city.
- They smell and people will not take care of them properly even if there are standards.
- Don't know much about live stock
- They dont belong in the city. People are too mean and irresponsible.
- Chickens belong in the country. You allow chickens in the city the same thing will happen as what has happened with domestic rabbits.
- Don't want the noise and smell
- Neighbour support would be tough to apply - if they move or change minds then you would have to get rid of your hens
- I wouldn't want chickens in a suburban area
- Any larger animals produce excess noise and waste. If we wanted to live in a rural area we would move to one.
- They attract rodents. They're a nuisance to the community.
- We have enough trouble trying to enforce people to keep their properties tidy and organized and now you want to bring livestock in to the mix? No
- I don't think livestock belongs in a city setting with population density so high. It would be impossible to avoid noise and smell complaints on a constant basis
- Chickens are smelly, dirty, plague rats. Way too many people dont clean up after thier chickens
- I think that an additional criteria should be that the chickens or pens be placed where noise and smell aren't issues. I have a recreational home where the neighbors have chickens and it certainly wrecks the serenity of a beautiful morning. The cackling also drowns out the songs of other birds, particularly if there is a rooster. This is a change in my initial support of urban chickens after my experience in my cabin property.
- Chickens or hens stink, in the height of summer, smells can become unbearable. Hen attract other animals and likely to (despite the climate) attract more rodents too.
- Having more animals at home could increase the chances on zoonotic diseases that could impact our health care system.
- I love the idea of urban farming bit do not trust my neighbours to run a clean operation.
- Look at what happened when people let their unwanted rabbits out. Introducing domestic livestock into the habitat of wild animals can upset the ecosystem. In addition released domestic animals are easy prey that attract more wild urban predators.
- Not appropriate in a city
- Hens are one thing, I don't think farm animals are necessary in the city. Hens will draw predators.
- Livestock do not belong in the city
- It just doesn't seem to mesh well with a city that has coyotes and roaming cats etc



- I don't believe livestock (including chickens) should be allowed within city limits. I grew up on a farm and can tell you that even with proper care they stink!
- Most lots are too small. Hens or other livestock would cause noise and Odor from an irresponsible owner. I could support if the fines for noncompliance were very high.
- They stink
- This is a city, not a farm / green space where those kinds of animals belong. I worry they would be too noisy and too much pet waste. Most houses are too close together!!!!
- We don't live on a farm if i wanted to live on a farm I would move to a farm
- We are a city of over 1 M, not a farming / ranching area
- They're living beings and not just decoration for the city.
- I don't want livestock living next door to me.
- when there are issues with regular house pets there is very little bylaw will do, widening the scope further complicates things.
- Potential for abusive living conditions due to lack of education, finances and preparedness of the individuals attempting to raise livestock as a hobby. Also likelihood of a lack of adequate city resources to properly monitor the animals for cruelty concerns.
- I don't believe livestock should be allowed in the city where large groups of people are exposed to farm animals and mix of animals more likely that carry disease. Think COVID
- Livestock belongs on a farm, not in the city.
- Move out of the city if you want farM animals. Case by case approval is timely and expensive
- Farm animals are difficult to predict and not trained/socialized like other pets. Should not be allowed in urban settinf
- too much possibility of abuse of the chickens
- Allergic
- No body wants to wake up everyday like they live on a farm @ 4am to Cock a doodle doooo in a Urban area. Chances are many of the residents there work in the city
- Most people already have a hard time cleaning up after their animals, most live stock are much larger than chickens. So no, people want live stock they should live in the country.
- Who wants a smelly chicken coop living right next door to them?
- Smells, noise , not professionals .
- I do not waht chickens and other livestock in the city limits. They are loud and few clean up after them fully so it smells and is potentially unsafe
- I live in a city, not a farm. There are lots of choices for people who want to own livestock.
- Lived next door to chickens in Killarney - the noise and the smell was horrific
- This is unnecessary in a city setting
- The smell. It's too much. I would love to have egg laying hens in my yard but I would never do that in the city. I feel that anyone who really wants hens or other livestock can choose to move to a property outside urban/suburban areas. Fresh eggs are available in plenty of places, there is no need for this in the city.



- Once you start its to hard to go back.
- I wouldn't want the noise or smell of other livestock beside me.
- I think any kind of livestock should be in a rural setting(acreage). Not in any inner city or suburb.
- It's called a farm, go live on one and have all the animals you want. Neighbours are bad enough without hens or other livestock. Ridiculous.
- I wouldn't be living in the city if I wanted to be near farm animals.
- I don't support people having animals as live stock to benefit from them. Animals are here with us not for us.
- I would support a bylaw to allow other types of animals, but only if a strict approval process was in place, which included immediate action on any complaints by neighbours. This includes having the privilege revoked. My experience with this city shows that it lacks any consideration for neighbours or neighbourhoods, and will not act to remove a problem; thus I would likely not support a bylaw amendment.
- Noisy, smelly, loud and can spread disease. Do we need to add another thing that's gonna need monitoring and money.
- Concerned about increased predators, noise, smell and how waste will be managed
- Could see potential problems when it comes to this, especially with neighbours.
- As a vet student, I have learned that backyard hens is an excellent way to spread disease amongst chickens and some of those disease being able to spread to humans is a major problem
- You think dogs are nuisances? Haha.
- I would be concerned with an increase in wildlife such as coyotes and other predators who may seek out hens. Increased predators is a safety rush to the predator as well-they could hurt or killed unnecessarily.
- Concerns of noise, odour from livestock animals
- If you are eliminating a dog breed because it is a nuisance, why invite livestock.
- I think it should be more than just the Chief Bylaw to make the decision. They may not be very knowledgeable about the animal that the request is about and either refuse or accept without properly educating themselves
- Please keep the livestock on the farm / ranch where they belong and not in the city.
- I don't think it's necessary. If people want that they should move outside the city.
- Keep chickens in the country
- I am concerned there will not be enough checks on animal welfare, concerns with excess noise and smells.
- Will lead to a worse feral cat problem and potentially bring wildlife into city limits. Not to mention the smell.
- Livestock do not belong in the city, they belong on large acreages or farms where they are able to freely and healthily roam, without and unnecessary noise or disturbance.
- I hate birds. Waking u up. No way. I was in Jamaica and they had chickens. Worst ever! If I wanted to live in a farm - oh yeah I don't hats why I live in a city. Move out of the city of u want a farm



- They are noisy, smell and a nuisance.
- Keep the farm animals on the farm where they belong.
- It's a city not a farm
- Bylaw officials have too little information on the laws or appropriate training to be arbiters. With a strong possibility of biased judgements or owner behaviour that would be detrimental to the livestock in question to avoid inspection/officials involvement.
- Why would you restrict pit bulls but allow hens to live in Calgary
- Livestock of any kind including hens do not belong in cities. If someone wishes to own livestock there are plenty of rural communities that allow this.
- On an acreage go to town. I do not want to live beside a hen house. Duh.
- A person can't control smells or noises of livestock animals
- Depends on the livestock being considered
- Insufficient access to veterinary care for livestock in an urban setting
- Cause we don't need more ridiculous laws and restrictions on our lives
- Livestock don't belong in a city, it's stressful for the animals
- "I don't want farm animals in my
- Community."
- See no reason for this
- That's what farms are for
- In my area we already have a large amount of animal feces left and strong odors, really do not need more
- Yards should be big enough, lots in calgary are not
- It will stink up every neighborhood
- It could get out of hand
- What if you move to a house that has hens or other live sock that was previously approved and you have no choice. These animals do not belong in an urban setting. I would be very angry if any of my neighbours in ear shot got hens.
- I love chickens and birds but not in my neighbors back yard. If you want live stock, move out of the city. Also what will you do if there is an outbreak of Avian Influenza in the wild bird population? Make all people with chickens euthanize their birds?
- If this passed more rescues would be needed to help hens and other livestock. There are enough stray, abandoned and abused dogs and cats I can only imagine what would happen if hens abd other animals were allowed.
- Standards of living, containment and community upkeep would be very difficult to patrol
- I think it will cause more friction given people working from home.
- Discretion of the Chief Bylaw enforcement officer. So leave it up to one person? Nah. Rife with problems.
- I don't think chickens have a place in an urban setting. I worry about their living conditions and people taking advantage.



- Live on a farm if you want to have a farm.
- Livestock (of a size larger than hens) are intended for large open spaces, not City backyards.
- Hens are very loud, dirty and smelly and should be prohibited within the city limits. They are more disturbing to the peace of a neighborhood than a barking dog.
- I do not support house owners having hens in their yards.
- Don't agree with Urban farm animals.
- We do NOT need stinking chickens in the city. People cannot look after dogs and cats never mind chickens.
- Other livestock could include cows, pigs, horses, etc. not all animals are meant to be in the city.
- Livestock does not belong in city. Chickens fine, nothing madger
- [removed]
- I think livestock has a place and should be with people who want them. Alternatively, I also think that people don't move to suburban areas to have livestock as neighbours. Furthermore, should this bylaw go through, I don't think people with hens or other livestock should have to provide benefits to their neighbours as part of the bylaw but because they want to. It's not a job they're applying for it's a lifestyle choice.
- You do you. Just don't have a farm on your urban property. I don't need to be woken up but 65 farm animals every morning.
- Hens should stay on farms
- I don't think it's in Calgarians best interest to allow other livestock in the city, nor is it in the best interest of animals. The only way this could be remotely feasible is if there is a minimum land size requirement.
- I live in a city and not a farm for a reason. I would prefer to not hear or smell livestock at my residence. I would agree if there was a provision that your property had to be larger than the typical small city lots in newer developments.
- I wouldn't enjoy a chicken coupe as a neighbour
- There is no way to enforce noise issues with livestock
- From this description, it is not clear exactly what I would be supporting.
- Livestock tends to carry diseases. Also "adjacent" neighbours may not be sufficient. In communities with zero lot line or reduced distances between homes the noise, disease and smell could impact more distanced neighbors.
- Too many allergens
- The type of livestock should be clearly laid out...would love to have a horse in backyard but obviously not feasible.
- These types of animals are not for suburban areas! You want to raise animals like this buy a farm
- Farm animals belong on the farm
- [removed]
- People are ignorant as to farm animal care and need to move to the country if they want chickens, goats, sheep etc.



- Livestock belong on a farm not the city.
- Maybe. How are you going to measure community benefit? How do deal with neighbors that will never be satisfied? What will define suitable living conditions?
- I don't believe within the city properties have adequate space for other livestock.
- "I would like to raise chickens, however, there are many issues with animal husbandry that must be mandated - the animals must not be raised for slaughter. The property must be of a significant size to accommodate chickens. Some livestock should not be in an urban setting - goats, sheep, pigs because of the potential contamination from feces. Noise, smell and the inexperience of urban ""farmers"". Would there be an increase in the number of bylaw officers?
- I do support bee hives - this is a vital contribution to the world."
- This will be difficult and costly to enforce and can become major annoyance for neighbours.
- They are loud, and the smell is disgusting.
- Hens should be on farms not cities
- bylaw can never be fair to all persons considering different venues and different neighbours. A goat may be condoned on one street, and not another, because of bias, and this would not be fair.
- Noise issue. Nothing is being done with dogs barking constantly in our neighborhood so I can't imagine anything would be done to enforce noise of hens if that arose.
- Loud, can't be trained
- Livestock belongs in the country, not the city
- They are loud and disruptive not to mention the smell if not cared for properly
- "Increased risk of zoonotic disease between poultry and humans.
- Requires advanced husbandry that many owners cannot provided in their back yard."
- get a farm.
- Not sure what this would look like
- [removed]
- Have you ever seen a chicken coop! You want to muzzle a dog, but think it's okay to have a shit factory, in your neighbours backyard.
- I have lived around chickens in a rural area and do not want to live near them in a city. I do not want to be in a position where I have to say no to a neighbour request to have chickens either.
- What training/skills does this " Bylaw enforcement officer " hold to give an educated decision?
- Too many variables and too many people would abuse the system or not follow the rules.
- You aren't trustworthy
- houses are too close together for livestock
- My concern is that people will not take adequate care of the livestock.
- We are not a farm
- Chickens would be kept outdoors and as such can pose issues such as noise and odor for neighbours
- Livestock should not be allowed in the city
- Dogs and cats only please in the city. NO chickens!



- [removed]
- Chickens do not belong in someone's back yard.... that would be like putting a lion in a pig pen.
- Keeping livestock in any situation is wrong. They are not meant to be cooped up in houses and back yards.
- I am a livestock veterinarian. Urban residents are not equipped to deal with livestock. They usually require a significant amount of space and come with other challenges such as noise/odour/special feeding and care requirements/etc.
- Livestock are meant for the country
- Hens are farm animals not city pets
- they are noisy and they stink! absolutely not on small city lots in close proximity to neighbors. Have any of you ever lived in rural Alberta like I have? If so, you would never ask such a dumb question!
- While inside animals can be controlled for the noise they make, livestock of any sort cannot. That along with the smells when the only way to keep houses cool in summer is with open windows, I don't think it's fair to neighbours. As it is, pot and campfire smoke is bad enough when it fills the house from neighbours.
- If you want to own livestock, you are free to leave the city. I don't see why livestock is needed by anyone within the city.
- Livestock should be in the country. It is unfair to have livestock animals in the city especially since most yards are small.
- I can't see how any livestock outside of a chicken can be ethically kept in the city given species requirements for animal welfare. This makes it too easy for animals to be abused.
- I see too many risks of zoonosis here, these animals probably won't be getting the vaccines and herd health management that farms can provide, and this will increase animal and human health risks
- Need specific guidelines for adequate living conditions and should be explicit for different species
- Where some properties can accompany livestock most can not. It also requires there a standard to be for every type of animal all of which people will dispute over and over if they don't get their way. This costs the city money and I do not want my taxes to be wasted because someone wants livestock for any reason. There are more than enough domestic animals suitable for the city.
- We already allow chickens for people who are sad... Why not let the city turn in to a zoo.
- If you are going to pass multiple by-laws about pitbull breeds, or dogs who are "nuisances", it is questionable to introduce more livestock that could also be considered a nuisance. Even if neighbors initially agree to it, what happens once these animals become a "nuisance"? This is incredibly unbalanced and biased.
- Neighbor's barking dogs and roaming cats are bad enough and current process for dealing with such issues is ineffective. Don't want noisy chickens.
- City is not a place for birds. That's where farms come in.
- They are loud, dirty and if you want them, live outside of the city. Not in the city where it could be temptation to wildlife or neighbours' pets to get at.



- Hens and other farm animals belong in a farm. Hens in the city will bring in predators resulting in more calls, more \$\$ for bylaw.
- I understand there are some people who wish to pretend they are living in the country while they live in an urban setting. But it simply isn't reasonable to allow livestock, and the issues which come with them, into an urban setting, with the density which we currently have (and hope to increase). While slippery slope arguments seldom seem compelling, they have a great deal of merit in real life. Once hens are allowed, it is only a matter of time before other animals are included. A bright line test is enough. No emotional support lammas in the City.
- Noise and fecal matter smells
- noise and smell problems
- If animals are raised as livestock, aka for consumption, the treatment, wellness and slaughter of the animal cannot be properly monitored by authorities/animal wellness groups.
- It's a city, not a farm.
- "I feel that e
- too many people would abuse this situation - noise of hens, other livestock, smell of feces/waste and failure to cleanup, etc. Enough people let their cats roam and crap in neighbour's yards and leave dog feces on sidewalks, lawns and alleys that I don't trust others to follow rules for livestock in the city."
- I don't believe that the average person has the appropriate knowledge to properly care for "livestock" animals.
- There are too many ignorant animal owners with no respect for their neighbours or the animals they keep. Urban yards are not suitable for housing livestock. Livestock will attract mice and various predators to the city as well. People wanting livestock should live on an acreage.
- Livestock do not belong in city communities
- No chickens
- Unless they are used for support animals
- Live stock belong on farms
- There is no way to ensure people will actually provide good care for their livestock, proper management of animal feces so it doesn't run off or seep into the neighbouring properties, that the animals will survive the winter.... just multiple issues and they're not enough city employees to check every single household that would have livestock.
- farm animals belong on the farm
- livestock belong on farms/ranches.. not in my neighbours yard
- I wouldn't want to hear chickens or roosters in my neighbours yards. The sounds would be a nuisance. If they want livestock, they can move out of urban areas.
- I have concerns regarding the animals welfare.
- Hens could be allowed as long as they don't disturb the neighbours. I fear that people will have to many, stink up a neighborhood, and they'll be too loud, if there's a rooster involved. People have a hard time looking after their dogs and cats already. I'd be open to the idea of the animals are not a



nuisance, yards are kept clean and coops are tasteful and clean. I fear they will be sorry, full of feces like their back yards are now with dog feces.

- Nuisances and neglect would occur. Farm animals should stay on an acreage or farm.
- they stink
- People can't even look after their own dogs and cats; throwing live stock into the mixture is asking for increase in city resources.
- [removed]
- People will not care for them properly. They should just buy eggs from a farmer.
- Keep livestock in the rural areas
- Way too much potential for abuse. Is the City going to regularly inspect the housing conditions of these animals? I think not. This is a terrible idea.
- No. I believe it will lead to people abusing their privileges. I chose to live in a city, not on a farm. I don't want ANY farm animals near my property. I don't want to see, smell, or hear them. Also, won't chickens attract coyotes?
- hens are very smelly make alot of noise and require more care then people realize this is a horrible idea
- I'm sure whomever would be raising these animals would be eating them and butchering them at there home and dont think it's safe, sanitary etc. NO NO NO and they wont clean up after them
- I have little faith that the city would be able to properly regulate hens being in urban settings. I might consider supporting this if there are standards like only places with fenced yards may obtain hens and anyone wishing to obtain hens would have to recieve a license aswell as I do not believe neighbours should be subject to the nuisance of hens so the person wishing to obtain hens would also have to gain permission from their community to obtain hens.
- If they are going to be allowing chickens in the city you are inviting diseases into the city limits. That's why theres farms and farm areas. If you're allowing chickens and other livestock, which being bacteria and disease to close proximity, leave the pitbulls and bully breeds alone.
- I think the only way someone should be allowed to have livestock including urban hens is if they receive approval from surrounding neighbours. I personally would not want my neighbours to have livestock.
- Livestock within the city limits is likely to be a nuisance due to smell and also noise
- This is a city not a farm yard.
- Half the time by law doesn't do anything about dogs being outside in all weather conditions with just a dog house. Stating it's "suitable"
- Nothing about the cleanliness and proper disposal of the fecal matter has been listed. Hygiene is an important factor to be made aware of.
- No
- Good job taking care of livestock
- No
- Hens can be very noisy.
- Too many issues caring for birds



- Chickens stink. I would never want an urban coop anywhere near my house. Gross.
- I dont know the current by law.
- Concern over the smell and mess caused by livestock and people too lazy to clean up the mess.
- This can be abused. Restrictions on numbers needs to be enforced
- Having animals in the backyard is not appealing to very many neighbours. What happens when some neighbours agree and others don't? Then there will be fights between them and we all know how that turns out.
- No
- This increases the work of bylaw officers and there aren't enough as it stands. Also, the ownership of an animal is a huge responsibility. People need to follow strict rules and it is very hard for people to make sure they can do this. Furthermore, owning animals like chickens can be a nuisance, dirty, and loud. With many newer neighbourhoods with very small yards and houses closer together, I am not in favour of hearing chickens cluck all day and night while I'm in my yard.
- hens are for farms not cities
- the country is for livestock.
- This question does not provide enough information to make a decision.
- Bring in more farm animals this will draw in coyotes and such.
- Livestock do not belong in a city
- I dont believe any livestock should be allowed in the city.
- I am not sufficiently knowledgable about livestock for a reasonable answer. Main concerns would be noise, unpleasant odours and risk of disease which should be addressed.
- Farm animals do not belong in the city.....noise....smell....
- If you want to get rid of pitbulls but allow hens, yall have something wrong woth your heads!
- Livestock belongs on farms not in the city
- I dint think livestock have a place in the city
- The urban areas of Calgary are no place for live stock leave it to acreages. I don't want foul smells from man urban farm entering my home and yard. And I certainly do not want to be woken everyday from a crowing rooster
- I would not want to be the neighbor where live stock is next door. It's smelly and should be kept on farms.
- Live stock deserve to have space and don't deserve to be Stuck in a city
- .
- Livestock do not belong in the city.
- you have lots of land surrounding your city, so there is no need for farm animals in the city
- Unless the public wasn't able to access them.
- People can't take care of the dogs and cats that they have. How would they take care of other livestock?
- This makes no sense.



- Chickens stink. I know people say they keep them clean but they don't. Behind my moms house a big bag of chicken shit was found behind her house. Want chickens move out of this communist city
- Hens and other livestock attract rats. It is not possible for the average person to keep a pen clean enough not to smell.
- Just because suitable living conditions can be provided for the animal doesn't mean that it will stay that way, leading to smells and unsightly enclosures. Also hens and livestock can draw more predators into the city limits and dwelling areas
- N/a
- Smells and messes. Already enough problems with other animals roaming around such as pigeons and cats.
- Hens should be for average properties, not cities
- Houses in the city are too close together to allow for livestock. Hen houses are loud. Livestock bring the smell of manure and are an eyesore in an urban setting.
- Can't keep communities clean already.
- "I feel there are too many domestic animal owners that do not adhere to the animal bylaws so I do not feel that there would be any difference with livestock.
- I also think this would be a potential to attract more coyotes and skunks etc., to neighborhoods"
- Chickens stink and are loud. I would never be willing to live next to one.
- If someone wants farm animals, they should move out of the city. I think it will cause more of a problem for neighbourhoods. Noise, smell, potential of animals becoming loose and damage to people's property
- It's an urban area. Livestock belong on farms, period. Smell, noise, mess will affect too many people. Way too long a process to get the problem resolved. Lots are small, houses too close together. Also what happens when animal is old or when stops laying?
- Farm animals are loud, dirty and need space. No place for them in the city.
- This can have many undesired effects such as land value degradation, noise issues for further than adjacent neighbours and likely other items not listed
- Livestock should not be living within the city limits. If you want a farm move to the country
- We have enough noise in our neighbourhood with dogs barking incessantly and kids screaming.
- Do not believe hens can be kept within city limits without causing a nuisance to others.
- There is no scenario would I ever enjoy living beside an urban dwelling with live hens. This is mainly from a noise and smell standpoint. The smell is absolutely atrocious.
- Having hens in the city is not acceptable. There are enough people abusing the animals we are allowed to have now.
- Hens require land, space, pens, and constant attention. They will also attract predatory animals to the city.
- Livestock does not belong in town. Having grown up on a farm, it is not fair to the animal, nor should neighbors have to deal with the noise or the smell.
- I don't want chickens in the city.



- Livestock should not be allowed in the city under any circumstances.
- Don't need chickens in city
- Chickens are dirty and gross
- keep the chickens outside of city limits please
- Calgary lots are small therefore livestock would create a stink/smell, increase bugs and predators. Not safe for households. Perhaps a communal livestock location away from houses.
- They are a disturbance when outside of the house. If they are a service animal, then they need to be inside with the owner.
- Hens ok other livestock no.
- This is an urban area not farmland.
- Livestock should not live within city limits...
- Livestock does not belong in the city. Period. I grew up on a farm, and I know the smells that come with this.
- Not everyone is a responsible pet owner which ruins it for the ones that are hens can be a great addition to a community but are also dirty and a health hazard if not cared for properly
- They stink and the noise
- It's too costly to enforce. Too many would be careless.
- This has the potential to get out of control. Livestock have certain requirements that living in a city can not provide.
- We have enough noise in the City already.
- Noise and smell. Your neighbours can change so if they move and new neighbours don't support it what can be done. Affects resale of property adjacent to.
- Keeping chickens for eggs yes. Keeping chickens for slaughter in my neighborhood, absolutely not. Butchery in unprofessional settings breeds diseases, and we already have coyote and fox problems, we don't need to feed them hearty meals.
- Hens could disturb a lot of neighbours in the community. What happens to the hens if living conditions are no longer feasible? Neighbours have enough. Also, with hens comes the attraction of scavengers...foxes, badgers, even neighbourhood dogs and cats that it's in their nature to chase/attack hens. Not not considering hens, but I think they'd only be feasible on acreages, nothing goods Going to come from hens raised in cramped neighborhoods within limits of city.
- My concern is that there wouldn't be enough city bylaw support for inspections, permits and complaints to be handled in an efficient manner.
- The spread of disease is of the utmost importance, especially with Covid-19 and the Pandemic. With the growing population of the City of Calgary and the already overworked Bylaw officers, we do not feel that "farm animals" are a good fit for Urban living. Complaints may take a long time to be addressed and health and smell concerns may already be causing a problem.
- if you want livestock then move to a farm. These animals can be noisy.
- Not necessary
- There's enough animal overpopulation in the world



- what other live stock could reside in the city?
- It puts neighbors in a difficult position if they have to object, unless they can do so anonymously.
- Chickens stink and should stay on farms
- Livestock are expensive, loud, messy, and unhygienic. They should not be allowed near residences. Asking for adjacent neighbour support will put social pressure on members who may state support when they are actually against having livestock.
- If you do that soon with the amount of houses being built there won't be any "feasible" Place for them
- K seriously u want to get rid of mans best friend because of their "breed" and bring in birds..... what in the hell is wrong with this world
- Most newer yards are small and very close to neighbouring homes. You want livestock move to a rural setting! Doesn't matter if it's for eggs etc. I'd love a cow for milk and cheese but it's not appropriate. So no to the chickens etc!
- Yards are small, too many smells, attracts too much wildlife, messy
- You need to be specific as to what animals are allowed
- I would not want to live next door to any livestock
- There should be a requirement for the size of a property to properly care for these animals as lots sizes in Calgary cannot accommodate livestock
- Livestock does not belong in the city! Would ruin neighborhoods and relationships between neighbors.
- Livestock should remain on farms not in the city
- Urban properties are too close to support this kind of thing.
- Given we don't know all the details about how Covid19 originated, it is speculated that farming within the city was the factor in having the virus jump to humans. Livestock should be kept on farms for this reason and others (noise, smell, sanitation)
- Too many infractions would occur such as dirty, smelly pens and cages etc.
- "I'm not interested in living next door to chickens, or other livestock.
- Noise and smell would be my concern. Preventing me from enjoying my backyard."
- No farm animals should be allowed in the city. Move to a rural area if you want to keep farm animals.
- I have been around hens and the odour can be offensive.
- Chickens stink and are noisy need to be on a rural property, not in communities where neighbours are close.
- Noise, cleanliness and smell. People have a hard time picking up after dogs, I don't believe people will responsibly clean up after chickens with frequency required.
- There is a reason why we don't allow Elephants in an Urban setting. Same should be true for Livestock. PEOPLE are unpredictable
- Homes are built too close together to allow for hens
- n/a



- There's pigeon farms already in peoples back yards in the north east. This poses the same or higher threat to the local environmental health
- Increase in vermin, sadly although province likes to consider itself Rat free this is no longer the case.
- let people live
- "Turning Calgary into a 3rd world country?
- Where have all the founding father's good clean living standards gone?
- Most of the city has become urban high density ghetto.
- Hope someone will stop all these endless spending and madness going on at city council."
- Livestock in the city?! Sooo many more diseases will come.
- Livestock require more care than cats and dogs. They are also loud and potentially quite smelly. It would be a nuisance to the neighbour hood if a chicken coop or pig pen was in somebody's back yard
- Farm animals do not belong in the city.
- Hens should not be in a city. There are too many predators. (cats, dogs,etc) and it wouldn't be fair for any neighbors having to deal with the esrly morning noise and the smell.
- Too many variables and our yards aren't big enough.
- Most of these animals need more space to live in e.g. farms
- Urban hens present a disease risk through avian influenza
- The city is not the correct environment to raise chickens. This would open the door to the hens being abused and un-cared for.
- Keep the livestock at the farms
- Attract predators to area that maypose risk to household pets
- Not within the city limits.
- livestock belong on a farm or rural setting.
- Livestock should not be allowed in city limits unless as an emotional service animal. There are too many risks as well as disease and I think that people, as a whole, will not consider their neighbors before they consider themselves.
- I do not believe livestock/farm animals should reside in a city. I don't feel that they can be properly cared for and sanitary conditions maintained in a urban environment.
- Urban environment is not an appropriate place for livestock and will disturb the urban quality of living by creating smells and noises.
- Until you take the BSL legislation off the table there is no support to bring any other animals and problems into city limits.
- Don't want the noise and smell. We are building more densely which could make it worse
- Creation of new bylaws for every scenario will create a pharisaical society
- They cause damage.
- Huge potential for disease/ odour if not properly handled
- Nuisance will be occur even though responsible owners.
- The city is not a farm. We already have covid we don't need a bird/swine flu due to unclean cages.



- Its ridiculous that the alberta government thinks its a good idea to let hens roam around the city. Hens and chickwns are not nice animals.
- Too many people will not provide safe living and it will be a nightmare to police this. If people want to raise hens, they can live outside the city.
- Have livestock in city limits is a bad idea. How is the animal was supposed to be dealt with? Bylaw enforcement will never be able to deal the additional issues let alone there current scope of work.
- I don't want to be exposed to the smell or noise from these animals. Plus it makes the yard look messy and can decrease propert value
- I am concerned that animals won't have proper living conditions in an urban environment
- Bylaw enforcement would be difficult. Chicken coops are extremely dirty
- These animals smell worse than cattle. If I would want this I'd move out of City
- Roosters make too much early morning noise.
- Most home sin the Calgary area would not have sufficient space for livestock, this will increase calls for service regarding untidy properties, noise ect ect ect
- Concerned about noise.
- I would not want to live next door to a neighbor who kept hens. Hen enclosures are noisy and smelly.
- Some people might be responsible in this regard but I can imagine many who would not maintain their properties well and neighborhood problems such as unpleasant odors and unsightly property could arise. Things do not always work out as planned and can get out of hand.
- You should really have a "maybe" answer that allows people to consider an amendment based on conditions the City would impose. You're forcing people to agree or disagree, which is bad form in a survey.
- Worried about the noise and the smell from neighbors that may want hens.
- This to me is opening up a "can of worms". We have enough problems with no bylaws for the number of animals you can have in one house hold, what about the smell from the hens and other livestock when the owner is not probably taking care of them.
- Livestock should be kept on farms, not in cities.
- "If I don't need permission from my neighbours to get a pet, why should I need permission to get a chicken/bird?"
- I think that clause should be removed and there should be a limit on the number of chickens, prohibition on roosters, and mandatory chicken owner classes"
- I don't want to wake up to the sound of a rooster crowing
- Live on a farm for animal producing food.
- Livestock belong on the farm not in a city backyard
- Livestock has no place in the city. Most livestock are herd animals and should not be kept on their own. I think this will result in more abandoned and abused animals once people realize how much work and the responsibility involved in keeping livestock
- I could see lots of problems with cold weather and people not providing good enough shelter during the cold months



- "Noise and smell
- Attracting other wildlife"
- Livestock of any kind does not belong in a city
- Having livestock in the city could damage property that could go up for resell.
- Livestock does not belong in the city and the majority of yards in the city are not large enough to provide the environment they require.
- If people want livestock, they should live in the country. There is no room/need to livestock in a big city.
- Urban hens are not necessary. Takes away from animals natural environment.
- Will be a big problem in high density areas.
- "City yards were not designed for keeping livestock, including chickens. Houses are too close together and, now houses are larger, the yards are getting smaller.
- Perhaps an option would be green spaces for to be used just for community gardens and small livestock."
- Should be based on case for case . Most cases it's a matter of ownership training
- Urban dwellings are not an appropriate place for livestock such as hens and goats etc. These animals need more rural settings and space for a decent quality of life not a city backyard.
- People always start with good intentions, but then life happens and things get neglected and it becomes an eyesore or a neighbourhood problem. If you want farm animals move to a farm.
- People already neglect domestic animals, this just opens up opportunities for more neglect, plus many city vets aren't knowledgeable about livestock
- These kind of animals belong outside city limits.
- Wuhan
- It is not clear what other livestock are to be considered
- livestock do not belong in the city. Most city dwellers do not have the education to properly care for these animals. Farm animals belong on the farm.
- I can't imagine being the neighbor of this. It should be a vote of your neighbors and if they don't want it then they should not be allowed. Just like having a business in a residential area.
- There is no need to have livestock in an urban setting
- People are already slob and don't look after their yards. Garbage is not picked up frequently enough to manage the garbage and stench that would come from this venture. They belong on the farm not in city residential properties.
- I do not support Hens in urban settings.
- Urban hens seem like it will only increase the amount of attacks by people's dogs or cats, as we have already seen that humans don't understand animals prey drives, this would only increase bad things.
- Noise/smell. As an adjacent neighbor I would never agree.
- there will be impact on noise, smell, predators, butts, insects from dejects and other consequences that I prefer not having to deal with it.



- Go live on a farm!
- I believe the negative impact to surrounding residents, including reasonable enjoyment of their property, would outweigh the benefits of allowing livestock in the city.
- too hard to monitor and enforce if you want chickens move to the country as a neighbor I don't want a rooster wake up call or the barnyard smells also could attract coyotes Bob cats et
- Calgary is not a farm. Lol.
- "Absolutely not. I do not support farm animals living in my neighborhood. I do not want to be woken up at five 6 o'clock in the morning and do not want to deal with the smell constantly. If you want farm animals you need to buy space in the rule areas just outside of Calgary or a larger plot of land in this city is no place to have a farm animal roaming around. I pay a lot of money and each year the taxes seem to go up and up and I would like there to be a separation a farm and city life.

- However the most important reason is my daughters allergies she is allergic to feathers and dogs cats grass. The only safe haven that we have for her is our backyard and I would not want my neighbours horse feathers, chicken feathers, rooster feathers or any other feathers blowing into my yard constantly giving her an allergic reaction. It is frustrating enough when we have to leave a park because an owner of a dog has allowed their dog to climb on playground apparatuses."
- People are not responsible. They can't even take care of just cats and dogs let alone now chickens .
- I have seen them at my friend's home - they are noisy, dirty and there is an odor. The city is no place for livestock.
- Livestock smells bad
- If this is a question when you are thinking about doing the certain things to pitbull breeds all I have to do is laugh
- I don't think the final decision about anyone's animal or child should be at the discretion of the chief bylaw enforcement officer.
- [removed]
- I think most properties in Calgary are too small to allow other livestock to suitably live in the city.
- gonna get so many that wont look after animals and clean up, want a farm then move to country
- Pet chickens? Chicken coops are filthy. Actually a little surprised bylaw enforcement is not busy enough
- Do not think it should be within a city
- There's a reason farm animals are called farm animals. I think all these animals will eventually become nuisance animals. If you want animals that badly, move to a rural property where you have the proper space.
- I recently learned that we're one of the few places where urban hens are not allowed. Would I love to be next door to them? Probably not. But, maybe I'd get some eggs out of the deal.
- livestock should stay on the farm or acreages



- Urban hens are actually exploitative to the animals. The only true benefit is given to the humans. We need to do better in this world and it starts by recognizing animal rights. Absolutely no urban chickens.
- We are talking about pet animals here. If the city is proposing a limitation to how many bully breeds dogs are allowed in a household, how can introducing other livestock into a community be a good option?
- No livestock
- Chickens are annoying
- It will lead to more conflict within communities
- We don't have the room and I don't want the smells that go along with livestock.
- I wouldn't prefer to have livestock where I live
- I don't believe the animals would be cared for the same on a property in the city like they would on an acreage outside the city
- Don't police people wanting chickens
- Pens attract small rodents. This is the last thing we need in the city. If you want to own a chicken, move to an acreage. I for one DO NOT WANT mice and other small rodents taking up residence in my neighbour's yard.
- I think more information needs to be provided. Livestock often need particular living conditions that are not always available in a more urban setting. Will this also attract and increase interactions with urban wildlife - particularly predators?
- Confining farm animals to small yards is cruelty
- Chickens carry disease and are FILTHY
- I don't feel that livestock belong in the city.
- Stinky and belong on a farm. Not residential land
- I oppose the idea of allowing hens in the city
- Due to noise
- City planning policy keeps pushing higher densities (which I don't agree with). Where do you expect people to keep farm animals. It would be a real nuisance in high density scenarios.
- It could end up like wet markets and spread disease and viruses if not policed.
- Livestock and farm animals do not belong in the city. People will go overboard and it is too difficult to patrol this. If you have farm animals in town you will have problems and I came from a farm the animals stink even chickens. Even if you only have 5 or 6 they stink. And how do you control how often the pens are cleaned and where does the shit go, into garbage bins? People are lazy and that will cause problems. Responsible people will still have to use or dispose of the waste somehow. Mix into a garden. What about in winter?
- Livestock stink
- Having to get a neighbor approval can be time consuming and costly for the city. If hens are allowed at one property they should be allowed at all with proper enclosures.
- An urban environment is not an appropriate location for livestock of any kind.



- Livestock belongs on a farm or rural area
- Livestock don't belong in a city
- This is an URBAN setting. If they want farm animals - buy a farm and move.
- livestock is for farms not rural life
- I would agree with this if the conditions were that the support from adjacent neighbours would have to be 1) unanimous (not majority), and 2) not 'grandfathered' in (so a new neighbour would be able to veto it). This is probably not feasible, so I would not support this.
- Livestock does not belong in city limits. If you want livestock move to suitable land to efficiently take care of said livestock
- this will lead to some people raising and slaughtering hens for food, this will create unsanitary conditions and possible inhumane practices. It will be too hard to control hens for eggs and pets and hens for meat.
- This is a fine line in which needs to be very thought through. I understand support animals are great for people also saving on food cost these days. But this may not work for a lot of people. Houses are so close together with smells and sounds
- The City is not a Farm
- I don't like the idea of live chickens in my neighbourhood
- I just don't support it
- n/a
- Allowing livestock would open the door to situations where owners are not caring for their animals appropriately, or maintaining acceptable sanitary conditions.
- Farm animals need room to roam around and often have a very strong odour.
- I live in the city and do not want the animal noise and smell of a farm around my home.
- Agricultural stock do not belong in urban settings, they belong on farms. I do not support hens in any city
- Opens the door for more problems- some animals just belong on the farm
- Properties in Calgary are too small for raising any type of livestock. If people want to raise livestock they should move out of the city to a property that is adequately sized
- Attracts more dangerous wild life. I guess I would need the pros and cons and more info to make a wise decision.
- This city has jammed too many houses too close together to be able to properly support an urban livestock option.
- "Encourages predators in residential areas
- Coyotes"
- I do not want a neighbour with hens.
- Chickens smell. I would hate for my neighbors to have a chicken coop in their yard.
- There is no way to ensure the hens health, are they pets or food?
- Calgary needs to focus on other things at the moment.



- I don't think livestock or fire pits should be allowed in urban areas. Too many people who aren't responsible and don't follow bylaws. If I want to have livestock I would move to an acreage
- Livestock should not be kept in city limits, with exception to maybe chickens (limit 2). If you're talking goats or other larger livestock, then they should remain on farms.
- Humans do not know how to properly care for multiple livestock animals living together and they will take advantage of this. I so not support more than urban hens.
- It will smell. It can increase neighbour hostility. Roosters are loud and obnoxious. It will increase work for bylaw and cps.
- are you serious ? We have a coyote problem and you're just going to throw breakfast lunch and dinner out for them now? Give your heads a shake !
- Who wants chicken shit everywhere? Honestly. This is not a farm town, keep it modern and civilized. Leave the farmers out of the city.
- Chickens Stink. Obviously the person who created this idea and the people supporting it have never had to take care of hens. They STINK. Neighbors will regret living there.
- Livestock need large and open property in order to live humanely, and the city is not the place for them.
- too many steps, waste of money
- if people are already complaining about domesticated dogs and cats, adding hens would start a steep slope precedent for any and all animals (including non domesticated) in town and complaints would rise.
- If the question is in regards the security of the hens - any dog breed would chase - not just pit bull breeds. I would also be concerned about droppings contaminating water that dogs would drink from or children would paddle in.
- You live in a city
- livestock should be raised outside city limits, support our farmers in surrounding communities.
- Livestock belong on farms. There is too much noise already, adding livestock will make this worse
- There is really no need for livestock to be within the city limits. They can carry several diseases and the problem is people are going to take advantage of this and by the time they get caught it will have gone too far to fix. Just keep it to domestic pets.
- Too much noise too early in the morning for residential area.
- Becomes a nuisance to neighbors
- Livestock don't belong in the city.
- livestock may introduce additional health concerns
- Local produce is better for your immune system. As long as this is regulated and enforced properly it can help our community.
- Farm animals should live on a farm.
- "Purchase an acreage-
- Livestock of
- Any kind in the city will encourage more stray animals."



- Residential = residential. If you want livestock on your property buy a rural property.
- They are too noisy and uncontrollable for city living
- The smell and noise is a nuisance
- Farm animals should remain on a farm.
- If you want livestock buy a farm
- Concerned about the door, smell and containment
- I don't want hens living next to me. It would be noisy and could aggravate other animals.
- It's a lot of time and resources to ensure there's support from all neighbours, and to verify suitable living conditions on multiple occasions not just when they first get the animal.
- Working in a municipality myself I know first hand adjacent landowners who are against this will have negative impacts on them and the neighborhood moral.
- While many owners will be responsible it only takes a couple to destroy a community. I live in erlton where a neighbour released some pet bunnies in the early 2000's and we now have an absolute infestation.
- Urban goats, sheep, pigs and equids could all fall under this law and are a considerable nuisance regarding escape and subsequent destruction of neighbouring properties, smell and noise. Hens are quiet. Roosters are not.
- I would be afraid that livestock would be killed and/or abused by owners who are not experienced in their care, or for consumption.
- Calgary is a city not a farm. If this was allowed I feel it would increase to a point on nuisance
- this is a city not a backyard farm
- cows? pigs? goats?
- I've been attacked by more livestock in my life then any dog of cat. A city is not the place for live stock.
- If you can't control what's happening now, why introduce more animals
- I don't know what this is so I can't say yes if I don't know why I'm saying yes to.
- "You want hens, or other farm animals please go live on a farm. The poor neighbors, have to put up with the noise, stink, and looks of hen coop and the waste they create. Plus, one's property value with decrease accordingly, i personally would not buy a house, knowing there is a hen coop next door. Also, with our climax, winter temperatures going down in the -30 and lower, how is the owner going to keep the Hen or Hens warm, I think this is inhumane. Please leave the farming to the farmers and Lets Support our local farmers.
- What about those people that are allergic? What about the people that have sleep issues, and those shift workers, that is all we need to hear is a Hen at 5 am in the morning. Plus, where is the Hen to roam, our city lots are not big enough to adequately accommodate a Farm Animal."
- Increased risk of bird diseases and things like bird flu. Better to keep them out of the city
- I don't like birds hahaha
- They should be on a farm where they have more room
- Keeping livestock in the city, especially birds will spread diseases. It's unhealthy.



- people will jump at the chance to own a "miniature/teacup X" without doing any research and when it turns into too much work will dump the animal
- If you want livestock move to an acreage
- People abuse these kinds of situations and then the animals suffer
- Some people do not take the animals welfare into consideration.
- I think that is a little much and would cause more problems for people
- "Noise, smell , nuisance .
- Abandoned chickens
- Increased cost for animal services- will need funding to keep the abandoned, lost, at large chicken, feeding, medical care, more staff requirement etc.
- Zoonotic disease"
- Barn animals belong on farms not in back yards . If you want animals invest in land and care for them where they belong. This is too much for a burden to neighbours especially when normal domesticated animals are not handled properly why add more problems. Leave farming to farmers. Period.
- Livestock is smelly with chance of disease transfer between them and humans.
- Farm animals don't belong within the confines of city limits.
- I live in a city so I don't have to have farm animals living next door. It would drive my dogs nuts.
- Stinky. Noisy
- Farm animals belong on the farm, not in cities!
- I don't see why neighbours need support it. I don't have to approve of my neighbours having dogs or rabbits.
- "you can't have regular people raising livestock.
- These will only set the animals up for neglect and abuse.
- NO to livestock in city's"
- Livestock shouldn't be in the city. People live too close together and there are varying degrees of standards of care, noise/smell tolerance, etc. It will cause neighbour disputes.
- Livestock don't belong in urban areas.
- Houses are too close together In The city and the noise, smell would quickly become a nuisance.
- it raises the opportunity for wild hunter ex bobcats to come into the area
- Livestock bring unpleasant noise and smell to a city. Most city lots aren't big enough to properly accommodate livestock, even small livestock like chickens
- Hens belong on a farm, not a city dwelling.
- noise, smell
- So noisy! We lived in another provinces. A house, in our neighborhood, 5 houses down had hens... they were super loud.
- people will start housing without permission. Hard to police
- Do not allow livestock to in city limits.



- The smell concerns me. Birds and livestock are STINKY. I don't want to be unable to open my windows because my neighbour has a backyard farm.
- Smell issues
- They will draw in Foxes & Coyotes. In turn this will open up opportunities for attacks on family pets & potential attacks on small kids. Leading to the destruction of the coyotes & foxes for having been nothing more than coyotes & foxes.
- livestock/ hens don't belong in a city setting. It can be traumatizing to them too. Also what happens when i buy a new home and the neighbors already had hen/livestock approval i didn't know about that make me enjoying my house difficult?
- Few people would house and care properly for them as well what veterinarian in the city would they have to take them to? These animals need to be vaccinated, dewormed, hoof care, exams etc. depending on the species. So these animals would never have proper veterinary care.
- Hens should be outside the City. We have enough issues with domestic animals roaming , including skunks, we don't need more animals to be out of control
- They belong on a farm
- Livestock should be on a farm not in a city
- I don't think you need support from your neighbors or permission/ inspection
- Homes are not farms, with the cities reduced lot sizes, this is not a reasonable idea.
- People have enough difficulty looking after their current pets.
- They are meant to be on a farm. Would cause noise violations.
- Why add another animal to the list that will not be taken care of properly or be given an appropriate amount of space.
- Chickens smell. I dont want a smelly neighbour
- Chickens are noisy and they stink. I'd like to believe owners would keep them clean and quiet but given how people handle dogs and outdoor cats I am not convinced.
- I don't think most people who love in the city are equipped or able to be equipped to handle or keep livestock. Most livestock are herd animals who are accustomed to having lots of space which can't be provided in the city.
- Who would monitor the situation? How would neighbours know it's being kept clean and tended? It could cause more neighbour strife.
- Farm animals can carry and infect our pets with diseases and parasites. The only way I would support this is if these farm animals require a health certificate from a licensed vet, stating the animal is clear from parasites and diseases.
- Seriously??? Get rid of one and bring another??
- Domestic rabbits are released into neighbour hoods and multiply , and do a grave amount of damage. Do you really want a smelly bunch of chickens running around and backyard butchers around?
- I would support this for hens but not roosters. I don't support this for other livestock.
- Chickens, hens, turkeys belong on farms. Pigeons belong...in the wild.
- Want to raise live stock...move to a farm.

- Chickens are annoying. They make noise, they smell and they irritate dogs, making them bark, and then the dog gets blamed. Want a chicken or eggs? Go to the damn store.
- Should not be allowed.
- Stop creating issues Calgary!! That's what farms are for! No livestock!!
- I don't support the exceptions being at the discretion of the bylaw officer.
- They belong in a wide space.
- I don't see how this can be properly enforced or monitored
- Livestock or hens do not belong in the city due to smell and not enough space to roam.
- Although the initial compliance will be demonstrated, the follow through will be very time consuming to enforce
- Support animals can be managed by exception but general livestock bylaw is not acceptable. They come with noise, smells, etc that are not appropriate for city living.
- I grew up on a farm. A city is not the place for livestock. There will be many people abusing this bylaw
- Livestock should NOT be kept within the city limits.... opening a huge can of worms!
- Stinks , loud , animal abuse increase, lower property value . Hens and pigeons belong in farm areas where your neighbours don't live side by side . Increase health issues , breathing in feces . Bad bad idea. It be different in places such as small towns but in a city really stupid idea .
- If people want to keep a few chickens for their own consumption-as long as they are cared for properly, and not a nuisance- the neighbors shouldn't have a say in the situation
- Having livestock in neighborhoods that are built in such close proximity to each other only encourages dogs to bark because there are new sounds (which then they are deemed and nuisance) or cats to become intrigued and roam. Livestock belongs outside the city limits.
- These animals belong on a farm period
- We have local farmers we can support for livestock
- Hens or other livestock are noxiously aromatic and can produce a lot of noise at all times of the day. Plus they can attract undesirable wildlife such as coyotes, wild cats, and other predators into the City.
- hens and other livestock do not have a place in our neighborhoods . Our city lots are too small for proper care of these animals . they belong on a farm or acreage setting , not the city . I am totally opposed to this idea.
- Personally I'm against animal agriculture as it causes unnecessary harm to a living being!
- This will get out of hand quickly. People will own these animals and not look after them properly.
- Hens stink. they also make a lot of noise and most yards are small and too close together
- Chickens stink!!! I don't want to be that neighbour downwind of a coop.
- Many pet owners are negligent in removing excrement as it is. I would not want to have any odour what so ever in my yard caused by having birds
- I don't want my neighbors having a chicken coop in their backyard
- Unless you have a large 1/2 acres you can buy you chicken at Safeway or from a Hutterite farm



- These are farm animals and should be on a farm
- I do not want to live next to a fly infested chicken coop and chickens carry lice. Do you research.
- Just worried about the mess and the smell
- People complain about wildlife now. Can you imagine the complaints and waste of government money when fox, bobcats etc go after chickens.
- "Farm animals are filthy. Pigs burrow and dig, chickens if not cleaned regularly stink. I would not allow roosters as they are very loud. Goats climb and chew everything and if they got into my back yard i would not be happy at all, especially the amount of time and money i put into my landscaping.
- If people want farm animals, move to a farm"
- I wouldn't want to live next door to hens, etc.
- Livestock does not belong in a city.
- Chickens will increase the coyotes and skunk problems
- If not watched carefully, this can get out of control.
- Livestock do not belong in the city. Potential for parasites, attracting predators etc is too great to outweigh the benefits
- Livestock needs space which a city setting cannot give them.
- Livestock need more room than what a residential lot can provide, and there will always be that person that has no regard for their neighbours. This good also add to the degradation of neighborhoods, and neighbour relations.
- If we start allowing other livestock on people's properties within the city limits, this could cause more issues for their neighbours. We already have people complaining about dogs, you'll have them complaining about goats too?
- Live out in the country if you want farm animals. The city is overcrowded and the noise and smell is not fair to the neighbours
- noisy
- No livestock in the city. No chicken. No pigeons.
- Impossible to administer and control
- Without further information regarding what animals and types of conditions I cannot support this.
- City bylaw doesn't even follow up on dump yards as it is.
- It's dangerous that are the issue. NOT pit bulls
- There's no way to keep livestock in a city ethically. Even with just pollution and noise.
- Livestock need a lot of space to live a good life. Being cramped in a small pen is not ethical.
- Opening up the city to livestock is a potential can of worms and issues for neighbours. The smells, sounds and potential fights could be high.
- This is simply a move to gain more votes towards the eradication of a sweet and loving breed of dog. Based on the views of uneducated individuals whom have no business weighing in on the matter prior to getting said education. Should we lock up / all children because there are a few that make bad choices? Or do we hold the specific parents responsible and offer corrective actions on a



case by case basis! The two issues here are separate from each other and have no place being presented side by side.

- 90% of flu's come from living in close proximity to chickens in China. We don't need to extend bad ideas here.
- Livestock in the city is loud and smells and would be a general nuisance to neighbour's.
- y'all don't need to raise no [removed] pig in your yard. support farmers instead.
- Again people should have the freedom to decide if they want chickens. The enforcement officers shouldnt do a thing to get in my way until it becomes a problem.
- Calgary back-yards are too small to ensure smells and sounds don't bother neighbours.
- This has a huge potential to create over population of chickens and live stock at large
- Hens are FILTHY and carry numerous diseases. They can roam but pitbulls are dangerous? Are you dumb?
- homes are too close together in Calgary to allow for farm like animals in neighbors yard. The smell would effect the neighbors yards.
- you want farm animals, live on a farm
- If I wanted to live on a farm, I'd live on a farm.
- Chickens are dirty, stinky and can be loud. I used to raise hens on my farm and they need appropriate space to live healthy lives.
- Keep it simple. This complicates things.
- No livestock animals in people's backyards!! This creates abuse potential, backyard butchers, and other avenues for neglect & abandonment, stressing out neighbours, rescue organizations, and the animals in question.
- Your uneducated proposal is DISGUSTING.
- Our weather is not conducive to keeping hens year round and that means the poor chickens would have to be sent somewhere over the winter. Also, how would you monitor correct handling/feeding of livestock animals.
- You can't control the sound and smells of most animals. We have enough dog owners who don't control their pet's barking. What if the animal gets loose? What if the owner doesn't clean up regularly. What are the rights of the neighbour in this case.
- If you think bedbugs are an issue now, just wait until there are hens allowed within city limits. Not only do chickens attract bedbugs, chickens also have a very offensive odor.
- Chickens don't need a lot of space to roam, however, most other animals do and if they don't have it, they become a nuisance. Its cruel to the animal.
- This is silly and livestock are a nuisance.
- I don't want livestock in my neighbourhood!!
- this could get out of hand very quickly. if you want a cow, go live on a farm.
- We don't need any more animals.
- Will create conflict as people will say they follow the rules to purchase hens then ignore the rules as time goes by.



- Too smelly, dirty and noisy
- These animals should be for a farm setting.
- Don't see the upside
- No because then it would require by law checking regularly to make sure owner is abiding by the laws. As in how many chickens allowed. Noise created and clean up.
- Livestock is meant for farms
- They're annoying and they stink
- You want a farm, live on an acreage. Our homes don't need to smell that everyday. Hens alone is fine.
- Why do we need livestock? Also, in a city, I don't think there's will ever be suitable living conditions
- Animals need space, i live in a city because i dont want the country smell , dont bring animals into residential areas
- It would be a noise annoyance. Disturbing to urban neighbours along with domestic cats and dogs
- With covid-19 out there you're actually considering this? That seems very myopic to me.
- It would be too hard to enforce and too many people would "push" the bylaw and not follow it. Livestock belongs on farms. Even acreages have limits on the number of animals allowed.
- farm animals belong in rural settings where they do not annoy neighbours. Even pens that meet your requirements still attract other nuisance animals, mice, magpies, ravens, skunks etc
- They are farm animals! They stink!
- Our communities/houses are too densely packed, having to listen to someone's livestock I would classify as a nuisance
- we don't need livestock in our yards while our yards and homes are growing smaller and smaller.
- I have seen this in the past. It is a dirty mess and should not be allowed in the city
- Other livestock would likely include pigs which have an extreme odor. If Covid has taught us nothing it is that crowded conditions of animals in urban areas increase the risk of zoonotic disease
- Allowing urban hens (but not roosters) naturally leads to a large number of animals that will be abandoned when chicks are found to be males instead of females. This puts excess pressure on local rescues for these unwanted animals and leads to a large number of animals either suffering or being killed simply because they can't produce eggs.
- I do not see the need for additional livestock within urban city limits. I feel this could be a larger issue down the road.
- Noise and smell nuisance. Will just create conflict with neighbors.
- We don't live in a farming community
- Livestock would create more nuisance....noise and smell, not sure how this is okay with the other things listed regarding dogs.
- Chickens are loud and smell terrible. They don't belong in an urban setting.
- Unless the homes are on the out skirts of city limit
- Hens are much more vocal than people realize, not just roosters. I believe that people are unaware of this and there will be noise complaints. Hens also require large enclosures that depending on the



space in a urban yard could not be met OR if they are not allowed outside of their enclosure/coop an increase in behavioural problems are likely to occur.

- You can't ban a dog and let a chicken and goat run wild together.
- live on a farm them...
- Livestock does not belong in the city
- Livestock does not belong in the city. If people want to house animals they should move to an acreage for the health and well being of the animals. I support hobby farming, but responsible owners recognize the need for space.
- Hens only
- Hens & other livestock in the city is ridiculous
- An urban setting cannot provide for the animals needs.
- Livestock in an urban setting could attract vermin (due to feed storage), or create smells and noise.
- There is great potential for this to be misinterpreted and misused.
- I would not want hens nor do I wish to have them as my neighbours in the city
- Attract more wild life into city, such as coyotes and skunks. They are already a safety issue.
- Farm animals don't belong in the city as they are not house pets
- You want a farm, move to the country. Hens are going to cause so many problems, it's like you guys are trying to create work for yourselves.
- Neighbors don't want to smell or hear livestock. Dogs are noisy enough
- I don't want a barn yard for neighbors
- These hens will end up in animal shelters once the novelty wears off or after they stop laying eggs (2 years) further burdening the system.
- If you want livestock you should live in much bigger lots than the city provides.
- I do not want to be woken by chickens or smelling a coupe while trying to relax in my own yard
- Calgary houses are packed too close together for livestock.
- chickens shouldn't be in the city, dogs are natural prey driven animals as well as cats if you believe putting chickens in the mix is a good idea you should not own animals or be choosing the rules for the city.
- There is not enough space I. Back yard to properly clean, maintain and consider the needs of the animals. Smell and noise would be excessive
- The balance wouldn't stay balanced for very long
- While I support the use of goats for weed control, allowing other livestock could lead to serious problems and health risks for said livestock.
- If you are going to put severe limitations on blockheads (pit bull breeds) who don't even show signs of aggression then no other animals (livestock) should be included. You can't segregate an entire group of dog breed and then try to appease the masses by saying they can have livestock instead.
- I don't want chickens, hens feathers etc in my neighborhood



- Just as in the case of nuisance dogs - barking, running wild, defecating outside of their yard, complaints, follow-up, & owners response or lack thereof & more follow up - all takes time - meanwhile the problems still exists!
- I don't believe hens should be in the city. Neighbors of that household would most likely have to deal with noise and smell from the hens
- There's not an objective way to measure community benefit/positive impact.
- Na
- I think we have enough irresponsible pet owners in the city that introducing livestock is just a recipe for disaster
- Hens are farm animals and I don't believe they should be allowed in the area.
- You can't make the decision based on whether the neighbours approve... and it shouldn't be up to one person either. There should be a way to give the home owner more freedom in their own choice.
- No one needs to enslave animals for non-pet use.
- Hens are a nuisance.
- It would be a severe nuisance to have a neighbor with a hen
- Hens are farm animals. They do not belong in the city, they stink, they can be loud and alot of people do not care for their pets let alone a farm animal. It could also cause an increase in theft.
- Although I love farm animals I only see problems with allowing them in the city.Noise,smell getting out of their enclosures.
- No
- We don't need livestock running around the city. All that will happen is people who shouldn't be owning livestock with procure livestock and then neglect/abandon it.
- "Nuisance concerns..... smells. Noise. Hygiene. Once livestock allowed it is the neighbors without livestock that have to suffer a reduced quality of life from living adjacent to those with livestock. If city allows livestock the city should have to waive property taxes for all adjacent homeowners whose properties lose substantial resale value. It is absurd that a family can spend their life savings to purchase their dream home based on an understanding of the rules of their community and then have city bureaucrats turn that dream into a nightmare with no redress or relief. Any of you city policy wonks who think otherwise have your head up your ass, and should be required to put your own skin in the game by being forced to purchase anyone's home who wants to leave an area affected by this ridiculous bylaw. Purchase price to equal 20% over and above the greater of sellers purchase price or market value - sellers choice.

- If you think it's so great you live next to it and pay for it with your own money,

- Livestock belongs on a farm."



- I think hens are fine, but other livestock might be too big/disruptive for a backyard setting. So I would not open it up to other livestock
- I don't understand what livestock, other than maybe hens, would be wanted in the City, it seems strange to me, because I don't understand it. I would need to have a conversation with someone who wants the amendment, to help me make an educated decision.
- In most cases, livestock doesn't belong in the city. The smell and noise can cause a deterioration of enjoyment of others, even beyond immediate neighbours. There are also people with allergies to different animals and as these animals may spend A fair amount of time or even live outside. My kids are allergic to fur bearing animals, and so goats, horses, etc in an adjacent yard would make our outside completely inaccessible for them. There is a duty not to cause your neighbours misery and we wouldn't even be able to open windows in the summer if a neighbour had certain livestock. The City should work to first do no harm and I don't think it's fair to expect me to accommodate a neighbours desire to live outside of normal urban perimeters. Many smaller towns near the city allow certain types of livestock. Just like I shouldn't expect to be able to run a business that becomes a nuisance to my neighbours or have loud parties, let my dogs poop on the neighbours lawn, or bark all day, let junk pile up, or run a grow op that vents just outside my neighbours window. There are certain things that need to be limited when people live close together and chickens, goats, sheep, horses, etc are not quiet, or unobtrusive animals. We shouldn't be making exceptions that cause distress or reduce enjoyment for neighbours. Farm animals in most cases should only be permitted outside the city. Just like other city rules, people can choose to live in places that allow them more freedom, such as the country or small towns. We shouldn't punish the innocent neighbours of someone who wants an exception. I love farm animals for the record, but they aren't appropriate for the city. And for those who want fresh eggs, we have farmers markets for that.
- Regardless of the conditions given in a household, I don't agree these animals should be allowed in residential area. I still believe hens belongs to farms only.
- Sounds like a lot of people submitting paperwork for someone to go over, thats expensive. You are discussing a tribunal process above to reduce costs and time, makes no sense to add the same problem back again.
- This would be very costly and time consuming to maintain and enforce
- I'm concerned owners will not keep living conditions up to standard, and will cost money to inspect/enforce
- If someone keeps and animal with the intention of slaughtering for food, I as a neighbour, DO NOT want to be forced hear or see it happening.
- Seeds for hens attract mice and rats. Hens and eggs attract raccoons. We are still in the middle of a pandemic. There are many valid reasons not to include urban animals.
- Farm animals smell and make noise, this could bother neighbors. How will all the animal waste be dealt with
- Livestock should be on a farm and not in city limits.
- A city is not for farm animals. I do not agree that any property should be allowed to have them in the city.



- I have enough issues with the smell of pot from the neighbours, I dont want to have to deal with the smell of "live stock" in the urban centre.
- I do not think approval of animals that could cause a next pandemic should be mix with humans. Avian influenza, swine flu, etc. Risks should be thouroughly analized.
- "Odour. Noise pollution.
- You can't teach a hen not to cluck. And I don't recall ever seeing an owner pick up after these types of animals. If you cant clean up after your animals, you shouldn't have them."
- Chickens belong on a farm or acreage with lots of space. Lots of people that don't take care of their yards/property will let it get filthy and unhealthy for the chickens.
- It would lower my property value and do not want to live next to a farm
- What the hell are you guys talking about? Chickens out in the road becoming road kill & causing accidents? Stupid kids murdering them and putting them places? We also have lots of protests recently. You want these animals trampled? Who runs our city to suggest dumb [removed] like this.
- Would you live beside someone who has such animals in their yard?
- Hens and livestock do not belong in the city. Yards are too small and neighbors are too close.
- Support from adjacent neighbors would be hard to attain in most cases
- If we spend time considering livestock within the city limits then we have the time to consider more than breed shaming pitbulls.
- I do not believe the city has sufficient resources to monitor and/or enforce new bylaws related to livestock.
- Heck yes let's get agriculture into urban spaces. Monotype areas lead to sprawl, one of the worst things to happen to a city.
- Livestock should not be allowed in the city.
- Nothing good can come of livestock ownership in the city limits.
- Chickens are moist and attract coyotes, dogs.
- No Hens should be allowed in under an acre of land and should require agreement from the community
- There is no way to control smell.
- "The biggest concerns are:
 - Proper care of the animal
 - Noise
 - Smells
 - Dirty or unclean yards"
- I don't think hens should be allowed in the city.
- This would pit neighbors against each other in the event an adjacent neighbor does not support the application. Furthermore, I have concerns about the potential impact on my enjoyment of my property
- Animals are currently enslaved to humans. Stop the cycle of abuse against them.
- They would be a nuisance and the city sucks at enforcing any bylaws



- Livestock do not belong in the city
- Neighbours can be intentionally unfriendly and shouldn't have a right to make the decision.
- Livestock can be noisy, smelly, messy and attract predators into the neighborhood such as coyotes and bobcats.
- There is no need for livestock in an urban setting.
- I don't need to hear chickens in the morning
- We don't need any more animals in Calgary. Go visit a zoo or farm
- The noise is a nuisance
- The noise and I strongly feel they would attract more wildlife such as coyotes.
- Livestock and hens aren't appropriate for city living.
- I do not think any farm animals, including chickens, belong in the city.
- I do not want a neighbour with hens
- Cities are compact and the smells and conditions do not provide adequate living for people or animals. They belong on a farm.
- It's not fair to the animals, the noise and smells of the city can be overwhelming to a farm animal and they need more space than what the average city back yard can provide.
- I would need a complete definition of "other livestock" before supporting this amendment.
- New neighborhoods denser and City wants older neighborhoods to densify. Too much opportunity for unintended bother.
- Livestock does not belong within the city limits
- No farm animals in the city, please.
- I don't livestock should be kept in the city.
- I don't feel farm animals should be in a urban setting .
- Neighbors will have to deal with the noise, smell and any other issue that may come up with poorly managed hens
- If I wanted to hear and smell livestock I would live in the country not the city
- Hens are very smelly and noisy
- I feel chickens belong on a farm or acreage - not in town.
- Urban...HENS? Plant more gardens..
- I believe that in a city we don't need livestock - including urban hens. Livestock belong in the country.
- Too many possibilities for abuse of the rules with very little overall benefit to the public.
- Hens in the city will not have adequate space and amounts to animal cruelty.
- Noise, smell, disease, cruelty to hen with winter and weather changes, people on holidays and neglecting
- Noise and smell- there is absolutely no need for this in a city. If you want to raise livestock, move out to the country please.
- The yard would be smelly and dirty. Get eggs and chicken meat at the store.
- Possible noise, smell and nuisance on smaller city lots.



- Hens, roosters, ducks, Other fowl and Barnyard animals do not belong in the city regardless of yard size
- Noise, smell, untidy sheds/coops, other mess
- Unless an animal is designated a support animal, livestock should not be in residential areas.
- Higiene and proper cleaning could be a problem (decease transmission)
- Noise and cleanliness within the city
- Very small properties will generate smell and noise
- no one needs to keep hens
- I think hens are too loud especially in the Morning when people are sleeping
- Concern around noise, smell and in increase of coyotes in residential areas
- The bylaws for cats and dogs are not enforced at this time; therefore, why would you think that the bylaw would be enforced for livestock (which belong on a farm, not the city).
- Could limit property values of adjacent properties due to smell, noise, nuisance.
- The bylaw amendment would put family that do not support livestock in their neighbour in an awkward position...creating neighbour conflicts.
- Not really a good fit for being in a city. Also noise and odor issues.
- Haven't we learned anything from Covid? A city is no place for farm animals. Eggs are cheap. Let those who want to grow their own move to a farm or an acreage.
- Smell and unsightly premises will become a major problem
- They are noisy and dirty.
- I am opposed to farm animals living in urban areas
- I think livestock belong on an acreage or a farm. I would hate my neighbor having chickens or hens or any other farm animals that would not be spending nights in their home. It could easily become out of hand.
- Livestock should never be allowed within the city limits.
- How do you regulate this to prevent abuse and/or lack of proper care and cleanliness? Most city yards are too small to grant proper space for such animals.
- I do not support livestock in city surroundings
- Firstly, how is this legislation what we are concerned about right now in August of 2020? Secondly I do not want to hear roosters, smell chickens, hear sheep or goats in my neighbourhood. What if the people who wish to bring such animals into the city choose not to vaccinate them and their property is next to mine? I do not wish to live next to such activity. If my concerns about noise & smell could be satisfied, then I am more willing to let such animals live in the municipality. But keep in mind that similar to dogs, sheep, goats, roosters and hens can all bite, scratch and harm another animal or human as well. So it's ironic to hear the city talking about limiting the number of animals a person can own while simultaneously wanting to bring in more into the municipality.
- Most city yards are not large enough to support livestock. If you allow 1 you must allow all
- Livestock does not belong In the city. How do you control the smell of these animals?
- Livestock is not domesticated animals and therefore could create issues



- Because we live in a city, not a farm.
- Hens and goats can be a nuisance and don't belong on city property
- Old get messy, are hens pigeons.
- Look at China and live animals COVID-19 ...
- If we already have a problem with feral cats and dogs why would we bring other animals into the mix that will unbearably cause more of a nuisance than domesticated mainly indoor animals.
- Messy, smelly and dirty. What if
- "Inside the city limits, there should never be livestock. EVER!"
- Livestock create excessive noise, waste, disease and putrid smells."
- Hens create smells and flies.
- Odours and noise are too difficult to monitor and handle in close urban areas
- Tell me how you're going to create responsible dog owners by allowing these same under educated individuals to own f-g chickens ?
- We live too close to our neighbours to have this happen. Unfortunately not all citizens will follow the rules or hygiene of owning animals like this, I'm referring to waste clean up
- If all persons could be counted on to keep their yard smelling nice it might work but this is the real world.
- Absolutely not this would decrease the value of adjacent properties.
- I would not want to live anywhere near hens in an urban area. They are noisy, smelly and I think allowing it will lead to many complaints. Upping enforcement is an additional cost to taxpayers. Better solution is to not allow it in the first place.
- I used to live on a farm and cleaned out the chicken coop on a regular basis. In the City, not everyone knows how to look after hens including waste disposal in a sanitary manner. Then, how would the waste be disposed of by the owner? In the green bin? What about the risk of Salmonella and E. coli contamination in the waste? How would the owner control the smell of the waste? Plus, new comers who may be accustomed to raising chickens in their country of origin may have different practices. Any enforcement by the City could lead to human rights issues and legal implications for the City. There are many factors to consider.
- No need in the city
- Livestock does not belong in the city.
- I do not believe it is necessary to have livestock in an urban environment.
- Live stock including chickens belong on a farm not Nextdoor to me.
- I feel that there is no need for livestock within the city and it's improbable that there would be enough space and appropriate living condition for livestock.
- Raising livestock should be a rural hobby.
- This is getting out of control people do not look after their animals yards and it will be next to impossible to have dealt with
- Need more information regarding the general health impact to the community, and enforcement. i.e. cleanliness (removal of fecal matter), potential disease, & inadvertent escape of animals.



- Just there are people with terrible neighbors.
- Pit bull and pit bull like breeds are a nuisance but livestock is okay? That doesn't sit right with me.
- We do not need chicken pigs sheet or other livestock in city limits
- I want a quiet neighbor. I can't believe we let people smoke pot in their yard either.
- Livestock doesn't belong in people's backyard
- Livestock results in the potential for increased nuisance complaints and communicable diseases in that cannot be limited in the confines of an urban environment.
- Hens and other livestock belong in rural areas. They are a nuisance and have immediate negative impact on neighbours.
- Think regardless of the rules, animals would end in substandard accommodations too often. Love the idea in theory. Also, it seems a shame that some people could house these animals and others not, regardless of their fitness, but based on their neighbour's preference.
- Because the city won't enforce proper storage of animals or noise complaints.
- Where do you draw the line if you allow chickens... pigs and cows next?
- I see no reason for livestock in the city. Many people around us don't even take care of their pets or follow current by-laws. I have up to 5 cats in my yard at any one time. There is no by-law enforcement so why would we add more rules that aren't enforced.
- I believe it would introduce more problems than benefits. Predators, environmental impact, noise, animal welfare. People choose to live in the city for a reason, if people want to have chickens, etc. acreages are a better suited environment.
- I'm not ok with my neighbours having a hen house, if you want that move to a farm; not a residential area
- Livestock belongs on farms
- Most people who try owning livestock in the city will soon tire of the cleaning and care required, and their yards will be reduced to stinky, noisy, disease-ridden dumps, becoming a torment and a health hazard to their neighbours. Our houses are built too close together to allow urban farming. If you want a farm, move to the country!
- Hens are a lot of work to keep clean, avoid noise and smell. Fleas, salmonella, mites, other diseases the province regulates to avoid biosecurity issues cannot be followed in a city in close proximity. Also no veterinarian sees chickens in Calgary. What is the owner going to do for vet care and bills??
- I have grown up on a farm and the smell of the animals and waste (manure) they produce can be extremely offensive. As well a lot of people are allergic to these animals and can have severe reactions to them.
- I don't believe hens should be kept by people to provide food. They should live free from exploitation.
- Because the city will not be able to / have the resources to enforce proper care and stop people being bad neighbors -allowing excessive noise, or smell, or whatever the issue might be.
- These animals do not belong in the city.
- I don't believe an urban environment is appropriate for chickens



- Although I love all animals I do not want to pay \$500k for my house and then have to live beside farm animals. Mainly because not all owners are responsible i.e. picking up messes. Also many pet dogs may have prey drive so may end up trying to dig under neighbours fence to get the chickens.
- I don't have confidence that the city will have the staffing, budget or enforcement legislation needed to ensure the criteria are met and maintained.
- The city is not the place for urban hens or other livestock due to additional problems with smell, noise and other such issues that impact on neighbouring properties.
- If you want to own chickens buy an acreage
- Seems overly complicated. Can't imagine what other livestock would be permitted. Also having it contingent on neighbours approval seems like a potential for conflict.
- Noise and smell
- If hens are allowed there will be discrimination charges if all other livestock are not allowed (sheep, horses, pigs, cows). A very slippery slope.
- I had a neighbor with hens and it caused a lot of noise. They didn't take care of them. Some of them died. I think anyone having livestock should have required training and be monitored.
- We have more than enough kinds of pets within the city and do not need to add to this.
- Livestock should reside in rural areas so as not to hamper the quality of life of urban dwellers. Chickens are loud smelly and attract predators like coyotes to urban areas.
- Live stock belongs on a farm. Not in the city
- The city is not a farm.
- No livestock in an urban environment. That is why we live in a city and not in a rural area
- Urban area is not the place for farm or large animals. Backyards cannot handle the feeding, exercise, poop, cleaning, and care of these animals.
- If owners can't even follow bylaws with dogs and cats, why would we add other animals to the mix.
- The City of Calgary and City Police already do a poor job controlling noise and nuisance bylaws and smoke from fire pit and marijuana odor issues. The last thing we need is another noise, smell and animal welfare issue in our city.
- Farm animals should not be in a city
- Livestock does not belong on private properties in the city.
- The noise effect from such animals is much broader than direct neighbours.
- I do not support additional livestock in the city, I feel there are an abundance of dogs pooping and peeing in public places, it's destructive to private and public property and smells awful in the public dog parks. Until pet owners can be held responsible for pet damage to private property like lawns etc...I do not support additional pet ownership within the city.
- Foul create disease risk
- Urban hens and other livestock can draw more predators (coyotes, cougars, bears, racoons) into urban areas. Acreages and hobby farms are more suited to livestock
- I worry about the safety of the animals. Are they going to be kept in a humane manner? Who would check on the animals.



- Having various different types of animals in proximity to humans could open the door for illness and disease
- We live in a city not the country. There are human allergies, animal odours and noise we need to consider. Am I allowed to have a pet hippopotamus?
- You are opening to ban my therapy dog but bringing in [removed]? Give your head a shake.
- I worked for The Federal Agriculture dept for 35 years to prevent bird flu, and 40 other diseases you can get off of poultry. I do not want any next door. Buy an acreage. Not in a city, feathers fly everywhere. My sister raises them on an acreage in BC, works fine.
- Sounds and smells from livestock can travel beyond adjacent neighbors.
- Want chicken buy a farm
- The density of the neighbourhoods & close proximity to neighbours would not be a suitable place for hens or other livestock
- Unless the property is more remote, noise may be an issue. The hens causing too much noise an may attract other wildlife. The hen owners must find a way to reduce the noise and secure the property so that other wildlife does not get onto their property.
- Noise and hygiene would have to be monitored and there arent enough bylaw officers to monitor this effectively.
- Chicken coops or pens stink and you know not everyone will properly clean them, and if you do they still smell.
- Livestock are noisy, can smell, they can attract predators
- Livestock should not be allowed in city.
- I live in a condo. This is My nightmare
- Neighbours dont need to support it, and id doesnt need to benefit the community
- Many of Calgary communities live near open fields and parks where coyotes live peacefully! The introduction of live stock could encourage them to enter communities and be injured needlessly
- I really want to say yes. I would personally love hens and fresh eggs. However people already can't manage their yards and there's not enough enforcement of junk on property or poorly maintained yards. I also don't think people who have no experience raising farm animals Should be allowed to have them without training and supervision
- There will be home owners who won't take care of chickens. It will be too much for the city to police
- Urban livestock is an oxymoron. A backyard doesn't provide a proper environment for farm style animals. If pet ownership bylaws (dogs and cats) are still an issue they should be addressed first.
- Agricultural animals belong in a non-urban setting. Farm animals are not pets.
- Seriously? We're in the midst of a pandemic with zoonotic origins. H1N1 a decade ago was bird flu...
- Need to limit location. Multi family, high density locations would be a problem. Should only be considered in single detached homes.
- I grew up on a farm and that is where they belong. Chickens are dirty and people with breathing problems are affected.
- If your property isn't large enough to house these animals, and prevent the smell and sound to disturb someone on a neighbouring property then it shouldn't be considered.



- Agree except that adjacent neighbours would have to support. Assuming there is no impact to how they enjoy their property, there is no reason for them to help decide
- I don't feel livestock should be allowed in the city. Could a facility be build outside city where people could maintain the livestock
- I worry about property values of homes beside someone with a chicken coop. I would have a big problem with my neighbour doing that. The smell from the yards of dog owners who don't pick up after their dogs is bad enough during the summer, never mind livestock.
- Many lots are too small and noise and odor would disturb neighbours. Move to an acreage if you want to keep animals.
- Please don't expand the list because most people neither have the skills or space to properly care for farm animals.
- too many risks of noise and smell for neighbours
- Almost all yards are far too small. Hens attract coyotes.
- farm animals do not belong in the city
- Noise and smell would be an issue especially in inner city communities that have small yards. If a neighbour decided to raise hens it would considerably diminish the value that my backyard brings
- Having grown up with chickens in an urban setting...defining "Neighbours" is difficult. Chickens, if not well managed can be heard or smelled a long way away. Thus having your "Neighbours" approval is very problematic. I suspect the same would be said for horses, goats or lamas. If I wanted to smell livestock I'd live on a farm...not in the city!
- I think the administration of this concept would be too cumbersome with subjective and indefinite rules.
- Firm no to farm animals in the city. Cops in backyards the is not a desire for any neighbour.
- As much as I love animals, a city environment is not the best place for livestock.
- Farm animal need space and there facial matter is smells and its intrusive and flat out no if people want farm animal live on a farm or acreage rural area not city
- City living isnt for Livestock. Move to an acreage if you want to farm. Opening this door will be the floodgates to having farms in neighborhoods. DONT DO IT!
- Live on larger property outside of the city if you intend to have livestock.
- Do not want noise from livestock.
- Livestock requires space
- absolutely ridiculous to have people raising animals. They are not professionals at it. Silly when we just saw Covid transmitted to humans from bats.. Have you hear of bird flu??
- Want a farm move to a farm and be a farmer. Leave the customs of the 3rd world in the 3rd world
- Noise and smell concerns
- Unless there was mandatory registration and more personnel were added to monitor the situation, I foresee a lot of animal abuse being overlooked.
- we live in a City. If people want livestock other than dogs/cats/birds, they should have an acreage or be in the outskirts of the city. Or, builders can get permission to have their development able to have these extra different livestock AND those who buy these homes are aware at the time of



purchase. I do not want to live near a "hobby farm", I did not buy my property with this intent. This will certainly lower our resale values of our homes, if this is not regulated properly. We can't seem to control people picking up animal wastes already, I don't want pig, hens, etc wastes to be an issue and I don't want the extra noises.

- It will be difficult for individuals to meet these standards
- Urban hens will attract mice, fleas and coyotes.
- These "other livestock" belongs at the farm not in city.
- Hens yes but other livestock no. Livestock is noisy, smelly and would be a nuisance
- Hens and other livestock should not be part of urban living
- Livestock belong on farms/acreages, not in cities. They are smelly, noisy and need room to move. Apartment dwellers and 25 foot wide city lots are an inhuman home for livestock and chickens.
- Chickens and livestock spread disease!!
- We live in a city center and farm animals should not be allowed in the city. If people want to own pets that are not domesticated they should move out of the city to do so.
- seriously? Fine, along with my nuisance dogs, can I keep a Llama in my yard? They like to spit, what fine will you give.
- Danger of zoonotic disease
- Dirty and noisy. I wouldn't want to live beside them
- Livestock doesn't belong in the city. This includes "emotional support" livestock.
- Encourages predators to come closer to people's families.
- there are already enough problems trying to get owners to control their noisy barking dogs, picking up their dog's waste etc. Also, having to get your neighbour's support of your pet choice is just going to cause friction & bad blood between neighbors if the proposed pet owner is denied.
- People have difficulty being responsible for their cats and dogs
- How much noise do hen's make? Is the owner responsible for keeping their homes clean? and how does the city enforce this?
- We don't need farms in people's suburban yards.
- Livestock stinks up neighborhoods. Encourages other pests like mice, coyote, to hang around urban areas
- I would not want to listen to chickens
- In high density neighbourhood this would be a disaster - noise - clutter does not belong in a dense urban area.
- I don't care about urban hens
- I lived in the country. Chickens are loud! We had 10 could hear them over 3 acres away
- I believe if people wants hens or livestock then they should live in the country.
- If someone wants to run a farm, run it outside of the city. The smells and sounds of livestock would be disruptive to neighbours. Also, it's not fair for livestock to be raised in an urban environment.
- if people want chickens, get an acreage or get out of the city. If i had a neighbor with chickens I would be so angry



- Livestock doesn't belong in a city
- It's too hard to regulate and our seasons are harsh
- Having grown up on a farm I know what is involved in raising livestock and I don't think that the average city dweller has the necessary experience with animal care to be able to provide for livestock.
- Not in inner city
- I don't want increase bugs, noise or smell. As a neighbour it could create tension if I deny my neighbours ben request
- Hens and small livestock in urban, residential lots will attract predators such as raccoons, coyotes, cougars and bears.
- The Calgary bylaw enforcement takes far, far, far to long to resolve any justified complaints. I have first hand experience in this matter: 14 days to respond to a complaint, an initial warning, a second warning and then followed by an order to solve any identified issues in 31 days. Fines or potential fines are minimal and ineffective.
- Go buy a farm
- "This does not cover the myriad difficulties of urban living. Neighbours may move; a neighbours' health situation might change; they may have a falling out.
- Enforcement is insufficient to the task should this be opened up. Who will police a situation where Hen keeping is used to cover a cock-fighting group? A domestic goose once caused huge noise issues in a neighbourhood I frequented. Laws are made for the lowest common denominator, yet there are people who will flout all laws. Good citizens will follow the rules, we know that. Opening up this question means opening up too many loopholes. The cost of enforcement is a public expense and increases of this nature should be avoided. The City is not able ensure the safekeeping of the dogs and cats presently allowed."
- the city is not a place for hobby farms
- Chickens do not belong in the city.
- If you want livestock than move to a farm. Livestock bring additional problems such as increased waste, smell potential diseases and increased predators in the area.
- Barking dogs are already a problem especially in warmer months when you can't sleep without a house window open, imagine adding roosters' to the mix early morning and you're just asking for problems. These should be left to acreages and/or farms - not within city limits.
- Livestock does not belong within a city and should be rural only
- not all people are responsible regarding animal health. Chickens need to be looked after & kept clean at all times.
- Health reasons and odour
- Where do you draw the line? No chicken owners next to pitbull owners No crowing Roosters before 7am? No pigs if they snort too loudly? No horses if you only have a one car garage? And take a large size garbage bag with you to pick up cow poops when walking Daisy on a leash (City bylaw - all cows on leashes).
- Livestock smell is pungent



- People aren't responsible. Enough animals already live in terrible conditions and I do not trust the city to regulate or monitor it properly.
- As nice as chickens are, and as dutiful as the owner may be, they SMELL.
- Livestock belongs on farms. How do you control the number of hens someone can have? Will you be licensed to have hens and conditions inspected regularly?
- We are a city, not a farming community.
- Do not support
- No hens in the city period
- I don't think that most people have the proper understanding or education to care for hens within their backyard and in the city. As someone who works in Agriculture and has a degree focusing on chickens and livestock I think this could go poorly and could lead to diseases within bird populations increasing and other issues due to improper education
- Hens attract wildlife.
- Really? Living in an URBAN part of the country most people do not want clucking. If people want chickens they should live in RURAL Canada.
- I am 100% against this. Unless the animal in question are on an acreage or farm, it becomes an all-too real possibility that these hens would become a nuisance to adjacent neighbours. As an urban homeowner, I shouldn't have to worry that a neighbour would acquire these hens and affect my ability to live without the accompanying noise and mess. The presence of these hens could also very realistically affect my ability to sell my home at all, much less for it's full value for all the above reasons, not to mention that the yard containing the hens would bring down the look of the community. No one expects to find hens in an urban setting.
- Noise of hens
- So many more pressing issues atm
- I agree that the rights of neighbours should be considered, in terms of smell/noise, etc but how does a person prove community benefit and getting support from neighbours is not always reasonable.
- I wouldn't want my Next door neighbour To have a bunch of farm animals in their yards. Stinking up the whole block. Farm animals should not be taken to live in a city, that's not a suitable living condition
- I don't want to live near a farm
- If animal can be cared for allow that animal. Why does it need to "offer community benefit"??? Who cares about neighbour support??? If you can care for animal on private property leave it alone and let it be.
- Concerned that owners will not care for these outdoor animals properly due to lack of knowledge and experience. Better to support commercial farmers who raise the hens humanely and responsibly.
- A
- People have a hard enough time cleaning up after their house-pets in public and private spaces, which makes it hard to believe that the spaces of livestock would be kept clean for both people and animals. It would be important to have neighbor approval if livestock were to be allowed.



- Let's keep farms outside of the city, we have enough barking complaints, now your just adding noise and smell complaints!!
- Farm animals belong on the farm!! I would not appreciate a rooster crowing early in the morning everyday, not to mention the smell!!! This goes for @ll farm animals!!
- If you want animals live on a farm
- I have lived in an urban area that allowed chickens (Brisbane, Australia) and the smell of a chicken coop is terrible in the high summer. Wafting into the kitchen it is not acceptable.
- Loud, potential for disease spread, would this request consent of new neighbors?
- Don't want them in back yards
- I don't think farm animals belong in a city.
- Creates to many issues for enforcement and neighbour complaints. May result in more neglected and unwanted animals when people thinks its a good idea or fun idea then decide its not.
- I don't support livestock at all!
- Spread of dease
- I dont support this if the owner would be allowed to slaughter the animals for "food"
- We are in a city, not farmland
- We have had a lot of coyotes, some bobcats and hawks in my neighborhood. The chickens would be vulnerable to attacks. I also do not want to hear chickens, and their presence would bother my dog. Because my dog is a retriever and retrievers were bred to hunt small game, he has an interest in certain types of birds. (ex: ducks and pigeons) If someone has chickens, he is going to be quite interested and want to get to the chickens.
- Hens are noisy and smelly, i wouldn't want my neighbors having them, nor would I want them
- Too many people would take advantage and not follow appropriate rules and guidelines. Potential for noise, smells etc.
- Most people do not know how to take care of animals. And farm style animals even more so.
- Its bound to cause annoy neighbours and create conflict.
- You shouldn't need permission to own an animal on your own property from a neighbor
- Livestock are for farms
- The city unfortunately already has multiple reports on a regular basis of wild predators (coyotes, bobcats, cougars) in Calgary communities. Having livestock within the city limits would only further increase these interactions increasing the risk to small children and household pets. The only exemption to this should be agricultural land already designated within the city limits.
- I would love to support this initiative but I fear that the monitoring of the adherence to the guidelines for this to work would be grossly immense and costly for the City. In a perfect world, individuals would follow the guidelines and adhere to the requirements but we all know there are many individuals out there who would run with this opportunity and not adhere to the rules/guidelines which in turn would create complaints & follow up. Possibly a trial run could be suggested to see how those individuals handle the offer ? If it proved to be too much of a monitoring issue then it could be withdrawn.
- I do not support Livestock in the community.



- farm animals belong on a farm
- Farm animals belong outside the city
- Property values could be impacted if your neighbour has livestock in the city.
- No farm animals in the city.
- This bylaw has inherent flaws that make it easy to be abused/misused and the potential for animal abuse.
- To hard to “police”
- "Too many things would go unchecked.
- Cleanliness/ bird health/avian flu. Leave it on the farms."
- You are looking at putting restrictions on certain breed of dogs but want to allow livestock with no Idea of effects on the communities
- Chickens stink and are mean (usually to each other - put a mark with a sharpie on one and the others will attack it). They are also noisy.
- People move to the city to get away from the “farm smell”
- Any livestock in urban area would inflict nuisance to neighbors.
- i do not think it would be fair for the livestock and i do not think they could live comfortably within city limits.
- Yards are too small in Calgary for adjacent neighbours not to be effected by hens and livestock.
- Livestock doesn’t belong in the city. There is too much potential for noise and odours.
- Livestock in the city should be a no-go
- The idea of crowing roosters and clucking hens in the neighbourhood adding to the noise is not my idea a peaceful neighbourhood. If you want hens get an acreage. I do have friends in Mapleridge, BC who have urban hens. Difference is they have a large yard, lots of trees and space between lots and houses. Calgary's newer neighbourhoods have very close together houses this could be a huge contention and issue for home owners who do not want barn yard animals and their noise close by their open windows.
- Noise and smell issues. We have more than enough noise in the city, without turning backyards into farmyards. If people want to farm, let them move rather than impacting their neighbours.
- No , there are currently not enough guidelines or information to support this initiative . I think we will end up with feral chickens running around just like the bunnies
- People are not compliant on rules and I would not want to live next to chickens
- Without specifics on what type of livestock you are talking about, it is impossible to determine if the adjoining neighbours would be adversely affected by noise, smell and other possible contaminations (feces) from the livestock someone might have in their backyard.
- Chickens smell
- I don't particularly want to wake up to stinking chickens, or goats, or god knows what else stinking up the neighborhood.
- "As a neighbour you don’t want to be smelling a barnyard next door.
- People move to the city to get away from the farm life."



- Life stock to exotic pets should no be allowed in city limits. ..and no more than one pet per household...and only after competition of a course in planned 'pethood' by the owner.
- I do not support hens in the city under any circumstances.
- Livestock DO NOT belong in the City. Have you learned nothing about animal to human transmission of disease? Looking to start the next Covid?
- "Animal to human disease - eg. Avian flu
- Noise and odour issues."
- Live on a farm if you want livestock.
- Calgary is known for its small yards and property sizes - where are people going to have room to have hens? Make it a minimum of a 1 acre lot to be able to have them.
- No. Guy in neighbour hood had a rooster. Cock a doodle Doo! No livestock for homes. A zoo of live stock with many types of each animals at edge of city would be nice. Pigeons removal upon complaint
- I think it would create more neighbour issues/complaints to make it worthwhile
- The animals should not have to offer something within their community, it prevents the animal from holding any religious purpose. Such as cows in the Indian tradition. It also prevents people who need to own them for their own lively hood and providing for their family if they have to share.
- Neighbours will control the home owners too much it needs criteria
- To think having additional wildstock in urban environment would have more positive impacts than a significant increase in nuisance claims is insanity. Wildstock does not belong in an urban environment.
- I grew up in Ramsay and lived there since 1956. There was a neighbour who every year raised chickens in his back yard. I found them noisy and not very pleasant smelling.
- If you want to own farm animals move to the country. City is no place for any farm animal. You will always have neighbours who don't take care of messes and smells. Thus us not wht we live in the city.
- Too many people jump on the bandwagon but don't sustain interest and that leads to abuse of the program and animals.
- Don't mind hens if the owner has a huge plot, but in most Calgary suburban areas the hens noise would be a nuisance.
- Keep farm animals on the farm.
- no livestock in The City proper
- Dogs are the owners responsibility no matter the breed
- Chickens are extremely smelly and need a lot of room to properly live, which is not possible in most city lots.
- Chickens on farms
- Our neighbor had chickens for a little while until we called the city to let them know. My only problem was that my dogs barked at them because they didn't know what they were and then someone would call for a nuisance barking complaint!
- To complicated to implement and enforce.



- "Livestock do not belong in the city. Period. It's bad enough I hear neighbors dogs barking.
- I am not in favor of the smell and noise to name just 2."
- Worried about waste / disease
- Noise smell mice and they only lay eggs for a limited time
- Hens wake up very early and make quite a bit of noise and impacts quality of life for many. Hens should remain on acreages or farms.
- Chickens and other wildlife should not be in the city limits
- farm animals should be on a farm. city yards are inappropriate places for livestock and too small, they are a poor environment for animals
- I don't want livestock living next to me. Being noisy or stinky with feces. My house is 4ft from my neighbor in these new developments with small yards. Children, dogs, cats, rabbits, birds, etc are enough!
- Chickens don't belong in residential neighborhoods.
- Livestock should not be allowed inside city homes. Farm animals only
- Farm animals shouldn't be allowed in an urban/suburban neighborhood - too much potential to create problems.
- No
- We'll end up with people trying to run farms on city property. Limit each animal the household can have.
- Chickens & Livestock belong in the Country.
- I don't think farm animals should be allowed in city limits. City officials are busy enough with dog and cats without the added work of chickens.
- There is no feasible or inexpensive way to enforce the adequate care of these animals.
- If people want livestock they should buy a farm
- Besides chickens, WHAT other farm animals would someone NEED to have in their backyard. No, you want a goat, move to a farm or buy co-op goat. I don't need to wake up in the city and hear AND smell McDonald's farm at 7am.
- nuisances, potential noise, disease, etc.
- Noise and smell
- It may not be possible to train other animals to not be a nuisance to neighbors. Each time a new neighbor moved in next door there may be complaints and or mediation required which is a waste of time and money.
- The level of noise they produce and care they require is not something suitable for the vast majority of urban areas in Calgary
- I would only support if neighbours,2 adjacent on all sides,were in agreement.roosters can be very disruptive.cows can be very smelly.
- City properties are far too small to allow for farm animals to be kept
- No multi animal livestock dwellings due to potential for odour and noise



- People may acquire hens without proper education about hygiene and the prevention of disease/zoonosis.
 - Chickens stink and should stay on farms period.
 - "I am not sure an urban environment can support 'livestock' as they can be smelly (chickens), goats etc and noisy!
-
- Would definitely require approval by your neighbours if this bylaw was allowed. Maybe make a course mandatory for people who want to have urban livestock as so many people know very little about 'suitable habitat, cleaning and care of animals'."
 - The noise these animals make is not suitable for city dwellers who live close together. If that happened beside me I would expect compensation for decreased property values and loss of wages due to the noise affecting me. If I can't sleep I can't work my shift work job.
 - Would like to say yes, but unfortunately the few irresponsible ones ruin it for the others. Most yards aren't large enough. Too many cats and dogs live in poor conditions. Would there be permits and ongoing yearly inspections of the coops?
 - This is a city not a farm. The more livestock (hens) would bring more coyotes to the city. Downtown already has that issues because you feel like having the domestic looking bunny rabbits are a great idea in parks...
 - I personally would not want to live around urban hens - especially if they are not pets and being bread to eat
 - Noise and cleanliness issues
 - Training and noise control for livestock can't be achieved the way it can for domestic animals. They aren't appropriate for urban settings.
 - Hens don't belong in the city.
 - Noise and filth - again, responsible owners
 - Livestock including urban hens should stay rural.
 - Community benefit doesn't really tell me much? Too subjective
 - Maybe other farm animals, but hens/chickens are so loud
 - I do not feel that I want to live next door to a "farm" when I live in the city
 - I don't believe livestock has a place within city limits.
 - Hens should only be allowed on a farm, they smell, they make noise and shouldn't be allowed in the city.
 - I don't think a standard urban home has sufficient space or enrichment for other livestock.
 - It's not just adjacent neighbours that would be affected, it should be the whole neighbourhood.
 - It brings in so many rodents. It's gross.
 - Farm animals belong on a farm!
 - hens are smelly and can be very noisy



- I don't believe livestock can be properly cared for in majority of inner city dwellings. I live in the suburbs and I know my yard is not big enough to properly care for livestock.
- Zoonoses. Best guess is that Spanish flu originated from ducks or pigs living too close to large number of humans. If you want a farm, move out of the city.
- Properties are not large enough to support this.
- While many individuals have the ability and yards to raise hens properly, too many who would "try" would fail. Caring for hens is a daily responsibility, without proper care the coup can quickly become disgusting for anyone residing nearby and inhumane for the chickens.
- You shouldn't keep wild birds in your yard
- I would be concerned about the noise and smell coming from my neighbor's yard
- Why [removed] should my neighbours be allowed noisy smelly chickens if I can't have my sweet living dog.
- Hens belong on a farm. Not in a city.
- Live stock should not be allowed in Calgary. Most yards are very small especially in the new community's.
- smell and noise can't be contained or within noise bylaw hours.
- I'm sorry, but we live in an urban environment with ever decreasing yard sizes. If people want livestock, they can move to the country. I'm also very concerned about impulse decisions and "fads". We already have too many unwanted puppies and kittens when the initial enthusiasm dies down and the realities and daily obligations of responsible pet ownership become clear.
- I support having backyard hens but not sure about other livestock. I would need to consider their size, noise level, activity level, yard size, etc. And the feasibility to have those animal in an urban setting.
- Livestock do not belong in the city.
- Hens are not city animals
- The feed often attracts rodents. This has been evidenced in other locations where they have chickens inner city.
- The noise and smell would be offensive
- If you live in the city, don't get chickens. If you want chickens, don't live in the city.
- I want a farm in my backyard but nobody in the city with small area can give the proper lifestyle
- We need less government not more
- I would like to know what other livestock people are requesting.
- Livestock can be loud, smelly, and could impact my ability to peaceable enjoy my neighbourhood. People already fail to follow bylaws about dogs and cats (roaming, leashes, poop pickup). I'm not optimistic about how that would unfold with livestock.
- Hands are fine as they can be contained and provide eggs for the owners any other type of livestock would need too much space and may cause disruption of the neighbourhood
- No chickens in yards.
- Hens are farm animals. No room for them in a city. They are loud and messy and stinky.



- Livestock of any kind do not belong in the city!!!!
- farm animals like hens are very smelly
- I grew up on a farm. The last thing I would want is a hen house in the property adjacent to mine. Could also cause hard feelings in neighbours who really don't want livestock in their vicinity, but don't want to be the one to hold out if the other neighbours agree.
- It is awful that because of different cultures that all of a sudden we can have a cow in our basement. No wonder Canada is screwed. Keep bending to every culture but our own!
- The city i. My opinion has houses on top of one another and builders are knocking one house building two to create even less space. I feel this would create a lot of issues for neighbours and complaints.
- You wanna ban dogs so your chickens can roam? are you serious???
- No live stock of any kind should be in the city. Only in rural areas
- This will easily get out of hand
- Can hardly control the feral cat population and problems with dogs, why add more animals that people don't even know how to look after.
- No need for these animals in city limits.
- Your going to let someone have a cow or a goat (which does an INCREDIBLE amount of damage to the environment if not properly vtaken care of) but you won't let someone have a specific breed of dog all because of their appearance. Literally during a time where we are tearing down racism you bring out a law that is quite literally racist to dogs.
- They are noisy, smelly and filthy. Backyards in calgary for the most part are much too small to keep hens in a clean way. They would be a nuisance to neighbours.
- Hens are fine. NO one wants a cow in the neighbour's yard!
- This is stupid and ridiculous. Livestock should not be in urban areas.
- We had a neighbour with a Rooster and the constant crowing was crazy at all hours.
- There is no place for urban hens or livestock. You want to introduce hens and livestock but ban a certain breed of dog? Absolutely absurd.
- We are opening the door for further abuse of animals, by causing stress on them, improper confinement, possibility of other wildlife coming into urban areas and becoming more aggressive trying to get food eg. coyotes . These livestock animals need space, and people not used to having livestock will not have the proper education to look after them. Just like bunnies, we will see chickens roaming our cities because people didn't want to look after them anymore so let them go.
- Livestock does not belong in the city due to noise, smell, aesthetics, etc.
- The smell alone will never be controlled and will draw in more wild animals
- Indifferent
- Livestock belong on a farm not in the city.
- chickens are diseased and loud. And dirty
- Suitable living conditions is vague wording, consider appropriate living conditions for livestock.
- Urban area for livestock not healthy.



- "A political quagmire—
- As a guide dog trainer and past animal control officer, I would not want the door opened to the prospect of “anxiety” companions or the plethora of novelty companion animals."
- The mess and the noise situated around chickens and hens is not something I would want to see in my neighborhood.
- Properties in the city are not big enough to offer the animal good space to live in
- Smell and noise. Would attract wildlife and cause safety problems
- You're worried about feral animals and you want to throw livestock in the city too? Unbelievable. If people can't be responsible enough to take care of their cats, chickens are not going to be much better.
- livestock belong in farms outside the city
- n
- This poses risks to the livestock being cared for appropriately and safe at all times.
- Urban areas (in my opinion) are not suitable for intentional livestock operations. It would also most likely devalue neighbouring homes.
- [removed]
- I don't believe “support from adjacent neighbours” is necessary provided the animal's owner isn't breaking any rules.
- this will get out of hand
- Nothing to do with yous
- Farm animals should be on a farm, to be properly cared for.
- I think it could create an additional problem with more animal being strayed. As well increase more wild predators to urban areas. The coyote population is growing as is already an issue in some neighborhoods
- "I don't have any concerns about people having hens in their yard, I
- just would be very cautious of people wanting designer animals and facilitating the black market on animal trade."
- As it currently stands, there are enough issues and problems with bylaw and CPS enforcing other matters. If you have a community that collectively wants a single area to raise chickens, then that could work. But on an individual basis, it will lead to more problems.
- Ones freedom to determine how they use their own property should not be determined by their neighbors.
- I am against animal exploitation.
- People always take advantage of situations and things will get abused. Keep farm animals where they belong.
- I don't think anyone wants to live next to a hen
- farms are where farm animals stay chickens fine if its not right ontop of your neighbour



- Livestock belong on farms
- Buy an acreage or farm. Chicken manure smells.
- People will not follow guidelines and officers will not be able to keep up to calls and complaints.
- I don't support holding animals for humans own gain.
- There is already too many problems with cats wandering and dogs barking or not being removed from careless owners. We don't need to add to the already thinly spread resources we have for animal bylaw enforcement.
- If you want hens, get an acreage. A city plot is NO place for a foul run.
- I live in NE Calgary. Certain ethnic cultures will deliberately "misread" the bylaw and claim English as a barrier to understanding. They will possess 8 hens per person, not household and wait until the overwhelmed bylaw officer to finally visit. They will only correct the hen count for a few days and resume their commercial size hen lots knowing the entire NE will have only one assigned bylaw officer to do enforcement. This is an absurd idea.
- Livestock belong in a rural setting
- I considered buying a house but was saddened by the neighbors owning ducks and bunnies and they were fenced in right beside the house.
- All we need are more viruses to come out as a result of poor hygiene and not having proper facilities for raising and breeding hens. Farms outside of the cities and facilities that are built to have live stock are right places. Suburban areas in a city are for pets that you can control when they make noise. You can't stop a rooster at 4 am when your sleep is most needed.
- Hens only at this time
- Hard to predict how the noise/smells/ etc would affect the neighbours.
- if you want to raise cows and horses in in the city, move to a farm. Let's not get carried away. We already have people who can not own a dog or cat responsibly, next they'll decide they want to try raising cows and horses in their home.
- Should be on farms and in rural areas. Will create a nuisance and problems within neighbors.
- We're going to have hygiene, rodent and noise / smell issues (as well as increased coyote activities and other complications) . If people want to raise hens, pigs etc. they should move to a small acreage or farm... not live in the middle of a city.
- Smell and noise would both be things that the owners couldn't control as well as they can with a domesticated animal.
- I do n out think any livestock or hens/chickens should be allowed. Far too stinky and noisy for city neighbourhoods.
- Hens will crow. No one wants that.
- Retarded.
- We hear hens clucking all day from a house 3 -4 doors away. I certainly would not want that noise coming from my neighbours yard.
- Extra risks and challenges. Deal with the current issues prior to adding on the pile
- The city is no place for farm animals. Leave them on the farm. Domestic animals, pets are nowhere near the same as livestock.



- I don't think it is fair for livestock to live in an urban area
- At present I have found no clear answers in concerns to how would policies be enforced, whether under wildlife services or Humane societies. In regards to tracking escaped poultry or livestock would a chip or collar be required? Are there appropriate veterinary services presently within the city of Calgary? What zones of Calgary would be prohibited due to living conditions, space limitations and natural spaces? What standard are poultry coops going to be held to? How will the city take care of wildlife attracted to the coops within private property? None of these questions have been answered for me, along with multiple other questions revolving around the topic and I feel until these questions have been adequately researched, answered and justified poultry should be kept outside of Calgary city limits.
- This is gonna bring coyotes in big time. Seeing as how you guys can barely control the coyotes in the nw Evanston area you really want this problem everywhere? More bobcats too. [removed]
- As much as I love animals I feel a lot of people wouldn't do the correct research resulting in more animals not being cared for and surrendered.
- How would you know, if they have already gone a head it would be harder to remove after
- there are too many irresponsible owners. My neighborhood is already turning into a shanty town with sketchy car ports and people paving their front lawns to make room for 6 vehicles to park. We don't need chicken coops just because one neighbor will share eggs with another neighbor
- I think there are too many people who would abuse this
- These are rural animals. These are not pets, and should not be raised in an urban environment for feed.
- Noise of chickens, allergies to most farm animals, hay, etc.
- Hens should not be raised in the city. The smell, noise and space would be hard to control and impact the neighbourhood and neighbours.
- "Noise, smell, coops are ugly and dirty. Move out of town if you want a barn yard.
- I don't need a rooster waking us up every morning.
- There is NO way you can have a coop that will not be a nuisance to adjacent property."
- Farm animals DO NOT BELONG IN THE CITY. Get them out of the city, if you want farm animals then live outside the city
- High density Urban living doesn't mix with the risk of increased zoonotic infection risks
- will be noisy and also waste management of the owner could be an issue
- Who would be inspecting the suitable conditions for the animals and what dictates suitable in a city where it's winter almost 6 months of the year and temperatures below -30°C
- Concerns over noise, smell, affect to property values.
- It's a slipping slope.
- Chickens and livestock carries disease, We don't need to commingle the two in the city. Dog owners are hard enough to control and penalize. We don't need to add chickens, goats or other livestock owners pushing the rules too. Just say no!
- How can you think in exploring the feasibility of allowing urban hens in Calgary if our current pet bylaws is full of holes i.e why allow dangerous breeds as pets (pit-bulls)? Why don't you think on



strengthening how to enforce current bylaws i.e dog owners who throw the bagged poop or even do not pick the poop at all (please go to any park in Calgary around 9 pm and see how many poop or bagged poop you find, see how many people/kids are traumatized by dogs unleashed in leash only parks or beaches. It seems we the citizens of Calgary are under de dictatorship of pets and soon it will include the dictatorship of the hens.

- We are in an urban environment. If you want livestock move to the country.
- This is not a problem to my knowledge, and would likely result in some kind of unintended consequences.
- farms do not belong g in cities. Space is already a large issue
- I don't think livestock should be allowed in the city except for support animals for health reasons, to be approved by the bylaw officer.
- No livestock in the city. We aren't farms and our neighbours are too close to deal with other people's livestock.
- Chickens are noisy and they're feces are very foul odoured.
- Livestock belongs on the farm
- Hens belong on the farm
- Odour, noise, and cleanliness are potential issues that neighbours will have to deal with.
- Only acceptable if no neighbours within 100 yards have a right to veto.
- No livestock in the city. Its annoying soundwise and smell.
- Hens are farm animals, they are analogous to cattle, sheep, goers, etc.
- Smell. Noise. No thanks.
- There are too many people that will not take care of these animals and they will be lose in the city.
- Urban and suburban private residences are not the place for chickens who can be noisy and create noticeable odour.
- There is no place for smelly, noisy animals in the inner city.
- Noisy
- I do not want hens or other livestock to be allowed in city limits
- The city is no place for those animals. If you want to own them, then move to an acreage
- Majority of city lots are now 8 metres wide; there are basement suites, garage dwellings, lane house etc. Calgary is high density. Hens require free range and are a great deal of work to maintain a healthy hygeinic environment for both the birds & the humans. Research confirms viruses including the bird flu, resulted in China due to housing livestock in crowded conditions. Residents can't even maintain their yards, such as weed control & sidewalk snow removal, picking up their dog's excrement let alone caring for chickens. Will you have a chicken patrol to check up on the welfare of the birds. What a non-sensible proposal and for what purpose?
- Na
- My experience with bylaw reinforcement for barking dog complaints is poor so I imagine reinforcing nuisance livestock complaints would be poor. I don't believe livestock in an urban setting is good.
- I would not support hens in the city limit. They are farm animals. They stink and are load.



- Chicken bring other pests to the area i do not believe they belong in small spaces
- Too difficult to control the noise and smell when owners are irresponsible. Onus on neighbors to file complaints. Residential lots in Calgary are way too small
- Non domestic animals brought into established residential neighbourhoods are often very disruptive to the neighborhood. Noise, smell & nuisance factor are not conducive to a relaxing, clean family environment. This should include de-scented skunks, ferrets, chickens, goats & pigeons etc.
- Having livestock will cause increase in predator incursions into city which is becoming more of a problem every year. Move outside city limits if one wants livestock
- Calgary is an urban city with over a million citizens and developers pushing houses closer together. There is no room in this for these types of animals. It is not a farm or rural area.
- Livestock shouldn't be allowed within city limits.
- No livestock in Calgary!
- Live in the country of you want chickens. Simply outrageous to have this in a city like Calgary.
- why hens?
- Calgary is a huge CITY, not an urban living area. Though it sounds like fun, hens are. Not meant to be raised in the close quarters of a city area.
- There should be a clear demarcation of livestock in urban environment and rural. Imagine every condo owner having a hen in the beltline? Certain areas of the city, rural like, can be permitted to have hens
- For medical purposes only.
- Farm animals not necessary in city
- Farm animals don't belong in personal residences in the city. If people want farm animals, they should move outside of the city
- Livestock does not belong in the city
- I believe that we live in a CITY not in the country....
- Farm animals can stay on farms.
- It's absurd to have livestock in the city. We already have too many issues spinning out of control. And we CAN'T AFFORD IT.
- livestock should not be permitted in city limits.
- Livestock does not belong in the city.
- Livestock and hens do not belong in urban areas.
- noise, smell, mess
- any livestock(including hens) on small city lots will cause noise, smell, and waste issues.
- I grew up on a farm and the smell, noise, attraction of coyotes/mice etc and the fact hens only lay eggs for a few years cause me NOT to support hens in the city
- Farm animals/ livestock belong on farms, not in a city. They need more space to live & roam, expel excrement that needs to be disposed of, are noisy & not domesticated. Allowing animals in a city is a recipe for another bubonic plague. This issue should be dead in the water forever & it is ludicrous to even waste time considering allowing animals to reside in the city.



- We're not living in the country - chickens smell and most people don't take care of them properly.
- No body needs a farm downtown or smell it
- Farm animals belong on farms
- animals belong on large plots of land not found in Calgary and are not suitable for our urban situation
- Sorry, no. I live in the inner city. I see neglected cats, stray cats, loose dogs and I live across the street from a dangerous dog. I think it is a fad and I'm afraid the amount of care needed to handle urban hens is not going to be taken seriously. I think we'll see the same issue that we saw with people dumping pet rabbits. Every time the train goes by the Ertton train station (I think that's the station), I see several pet rabbits living outside (dumped and have become "outside" rabbits). I'd like to see people keep their cats inside. Once we have this down I think we can move to urban hens. Re: pigeons. Absolutely not. I think the City should assume that they'll become "food" birds. Same reasoning as above. I already have pigeons being fed in my area. I don't think it's a good idea to give people the option of pigeons as "pets". What is the rationale for having pigeons as pets?
- Livestock really do not have a place in the city. Those who really want to take care of such animals will need to relocate outside the city (to a farm). There are risks including attracting other wildlife and potential for more animal based diseases.
- I have no faith that a bylaw officer would be enough to prevent abuses of the new rules.
- too broad and hard to monitor. for example support from adjacent neighbors, how many, how close, moving, new neighbors etc
- Farm animals should be on the farm
- the city has enough difficulty controlling cat and dog issues let alone free range whatever situations
- No need for this in a city environment
- They belong on a farm
- Because they should be on a farm.
- Hens are preyed upon by measles, foxes, coyotes and other animals. The presence of hens will attract predators to the neighbourhood. We already have trouble with roaming cats shitting in the garden, skunks taking up residence under the deck and wasps setting up home in the composter. We do not need more vermin in Calgary.
- There is no need for other livestock in Calgary
- I don't live on a farm for a reason and I don't want to live next to livestock.
- live stock belongs on farms not in the city
- It would not be long before there would be goats, sheep, llamas, pigs included.
- This can be one a major issue for those neighbours that are on either side where the animal(s) are kept. The smell, the untidy nature of the yard/area/noise etc. This could affect someone's house value when trying to seek ones home as buyers might be turned off if this is next door. I could see people thinking this is a "cute" idea at first then lose interest and things go downhill for the animal(s) and there area they are house in.



- Such animals are unable to comply with current noise restrictions/by laws. Hearing these types of animals throughout the night and early morning is disruptive to neighbours, and is something the owner(s) may not be able to control.
- It's not fair to neighbours. Hens can smell, noisy, carry disease and homes are too close together to not affect neighbours
- I don't think it is an appropriate use of land and to expect all your neighbors to be happy to listen to the "rooster" crow at 6 am every day is unreasonable.
- Might attract a higher amount of wildlife into communities (coyotes, etc)
- I do not think that there is any need to have livestock within the city limits. Hens included. They can attract predators (i.e. coyotes) and we already have enough issues with coyotes within city limits, without enticing them to come closer.
- Loudest dirtiest animal
- There is an abundance of rural land and rural-urban (towns) in Central Alberta with much more lax restrictions on this issue. A person in an alpha or beta city should not have the expectation that they can have livestock on their property. There are so many opportunities to live a more rural lifestyle if that is what one desires - a city like Calgary need not be and should not try to be all things to all people.
- Concerned about health issues due to hens at urban areas
- Ridiculous idea to keep livestock in the city. This is opening the door to abuse by irresponsible owners.
- Give people an inch and they will take a mile. Start allowing all kinds of animals to be homed in neighbourhoods and you will open a Pandora's box of issues. I want a cow, well I want a bison, I want an exotic cat... Recipe for disaster. 2 chickens max based on the above criteria but maybe have a size limit based on sqft avail and living conditions (acreage vs backyard in Ramsey)
- Rural animals do not belong in an urban setting. They require more space
- I think it is unsanitary you have hens and live stock within small and personal properties in the city limits. Farm animals should remain on farms.
- Calgary lots are generally not large enough to properly and humanely house animals with proper shelter space and enough space to roam.
- I do not want more animals in my neighbourhood. Livestock belongs on a farm/range, not on residential property.
- Live stock should not be in city limits. Chickens are one thing, but other farm animals belong on a farm
- We are all in lockdown because of CV-19 and now you want to let farm animals all over the city? Only morons would think this is a good plan . You want farm animals buy a farm.
- Farm animals belong on a farm, they stink.
- I wouldn't support this because of the possibility of noise and smell.
- I don't think people are capable of caring for farm animals in an urban environment. There is not enough space in most yards, there will be noise complaints, and it may bring predators such as coyotes or bobcats into the area.



- No livestock whatsoever in Calgary limits. They are not required and this is standard in every major city in North America. Do not fix something which is not broken. If you want hens move out of Calgary.
- Usually other livestock other than fowl, end up being slaughtered for food. Will there be rules around not slaughtering the animals in your back yard?
- The city is too dense (properties too close together) to allow this without potentially impacting neighbours negatively. It's bad enough we have to deal with the smell from fire pits that we would have to deal with the smell of livestock.
- live stock are for farms .
- If I wanted to own livestock, it shouldn't be based on if it benefits the community or what my neighbour thinks. Living conditions definitely matter and should be looked into for sure.
- Some people have a hard enough time taking care of their dogs and cats let along an exotic animal
- Livestock should not be in urban areas unless the property is an acreage.
- I do not believe city conditions are suitable or humane for larger-than-poultry livestock.
- [removed]
- If you want to live like on a farm - then you need to buy property out of city limits and live on a farm.
- The noise, & smel.
- Main reason that I don't support this, would be what happens if the neighbours move and new ones move in. Do they have to go through the process again? If not, that wouldn't be fair to the new neighbours.
- Not a good idea in a residential neighborhood.
- Noise and door are concerns
- I'm vegan, we don't need more animals.
- Noise and smell
- I don't thing livestock need to be in Calgary . Move to country if u want livestock.
- Hens are farm animals and do not belong in city residential communities. City residents and neighbours shouldn't be forced to live alongside with farm animals, nor should neighbours need to be consulted on these ridiculous matters. If the assenting neighbours move and new neighbours don't share the same decision, what happens to the hens? Issues already exist in neighborhoods with owners not cleaning up their animal's waste and the associated smells that go with it. Once hens are allowed, what's next? Pigs? Cows? Horses? It's important to keep the city a city and the farm animals on a farm, both for the human and animals' health and well being.
- Noise
- Sanitation issues
- Because there is not enough space in a calgary backyard to operate a farm
- Chicken last do not belong in the city
- If we don't have responsible dog or cat owners how will this work?
- Most urban neighborhoods are too dense to be able to raise chickens without having some type of impact on immediate neighbors, whether by sound, or smell.



- Farm animals belong on a farm not in the city. I would strongly oppose the noise, smell, and mess
- Livestock do not belong within city limits
- Bringing chickens in just bring more mice.
- Chickens, unless supported by a medical professional, should not be living in the city. They belong on a farm.
- Too many challenges would exist. How many animals? How big? How noisy? Other environmental challenges.
- Hens roaming loose are food for coyotes - coyotes are already under a lot of stress and don't need to be painted black by irresponsible chicken owners
- Too many people are irresponsible with the animals they can currently legally keep. Hens should not be added to the list they are stinky, loud, a nuisance to neighbours and will further impact real estate as it'll remove resale value.
- Not in favor of farm animals in city backyards in any capacity
- If they are well cared for I think hens is a great idea
- Noise & Nuance.. I would not want to be living next to a neighbor with Urban hens, chickens etc. Keep that to acreage & farms. City is a City.
- I don't have enough knowledge on the subject.
- People have a hard enough time looking after dogs and cats in residential areas and now we are going to introduce more livestock that will be at large. I can guarantee this will not be a good thing
- Hens belong in farms or acreage homes, not in the city.
- Chickens are not clean animals and people don't always take care of their animals in a manner that is best for that animal. Chickens fall under that category. Chickens don't belong in an urban setting, they belong on a farm.
- Wild animals do not belong in the city. Period.
- Provides a disease vector for bird to bird transmission as well as bird to human. Risks of disease transmission to the commercial chicken industry
- Stinks up the neighbourhood
- If I wanted to live next to a "farm", I'd move to a rural area!
- I don't want hens or other livestock living new door to me
- What standard is there for the care of chickens or livestock? There must be history showing people can provide care and knowledge of the breed. Livestock is a lot of work, and can be a nuisance to the community if someone does not know what they are doing.
- There is no need for other livestock to become pets
- Loud ongoing noise that can not be mitigated by training or placing inside the residence. Like a dog or cat. Hey honey can you go bring the rooster/goat/ pig inside as they are getting a bit loud out there isn't an option. Ex 5 am rooster crow (when you work nights) not a trainable trait. Noise
- This is ridiculous
- Livestock belong in farms and not urban areas.
- Livestock belong on a farm not in the city.



- Livestock and chickens can spread vires. Some livestock would cause noise violations.
- Livestock belongs on farms, or in rural areas wherein they have the freedom and space to live healthily and free. Hen coops (or other confined urban livestock enclosures) are not only detrimental to the health of the animals, but (in large) cause nuisances in the neighbourhoods they live in. Any people who want to own such enclosures should only do so as a business, thus requiring a business license, and properly inspected facilities. This way, the city would benefit from the purchase of City business licences, the animals would benefit from proper living conditions, and the owners would benefit from either proper training, or potentially profitable enterprises.
- When homes are built very close together and privacy is at a minimum, it is NOT respectful or appropriate for hens or rabbits or other livestock to be right next door- noise, smells, concerns for animal welfare etc...
- these people need to move to a farm Calgary is a city I do not support any livestock within city limits
- No chickens please
- Farm animals are not appropriate in my city
- What we need to address first is get the compliance and enforcement in place for what we have, not introduce more things like hens.
- I don't want to live by any kind of livestock
- It's going to start with hens and then it's going to be some other kind of farm animals. If you need farm animals around you, move to a farm.
- Within reason unfortunately you'd you will hire a person with 2 weeks training to run the program and make the decisions anyways
- due to the ever increasing density of calgary, there are limited suitable locations that would permit urban livestock without significant noise disruption to the surrounding community.
- I would support community based, in no residential areas
- There would be a noise issue. Let farmers do this!
- It is a slippery slope..... it would require significant increase to monitor and would easily devolve into a nuisance situation! Numerous home owners unable to keep property clean as is!
- Livestock does not belong in the city
- Farm animals belong on farms, not in backyards. Roosters crowing at dawn can be heard for blocks, not just at adjacent houses!
- Farm animals do not belong in urban areas. They belong on the farm!
- Too noisy and smelly.
- belong on a farm not city
- Chickens should be outside of the city
- In the city, the population density is too high
- Too loud.
- I believe this is a trend for some people and they don't understand what's involved in their care.
- Farm animals do not belong in the City



- In the case of loose hens it may increase urban road kills and increased chances of disease spread if not kept responsibly.
- Depends on the type of livestock that doesn't infringe on noise bylaws and cleanliness
- Livestock does not belong in the city. Including chickens
- Chickens equal mice
- Stinky. Noisy. Unclean. I live in a city, not a farm.
- Livestock belongs in the country. And, who decides if a miniature pony is acceptable but a Clydesdale is not?
- Noise, stench, lowering property values
- Livestock should remain outside of the city limits.
- I don't think the city would be giving very fair condition guidelines for these animals. This would absolutely leave too many animals left in horrible conditions/unfair conditions.
- I can see this becoming a problem. Attracts predators, can be noisy and smelly.
- Case by case exceptions are not acceptable
- Urban areas are not suitable for keeping livestock like hens given the very close proximity to neighbours in many areas of the city. Too many judgement factors to consider. Just no.
- Too noisy
- If they want a farm move to one. Otherwise could create issues for neighbours.
- The city is no place for farm animals
- If I was woking by a rooster at 5:00 am I work be pissed off. Pig's also has to go.
- An urban environment is not appropriate for livestock or chickens. The city properties are not large enough to accommodate livestock and it could be more harmful to the animal and human health. It could be a disturbance for neighbours and will create more issues in neighbourhoods.
- Calgary currently has a very great dog program. People with all dogs need to be more accountable. ALL DOGS
- I have lived in other countries where urban hens are allowed and they attract rodents and other vermin. Also it increases urban smell/pollution.
- All that bringing chickens in will do is increase smell / flies & the potential that the hens themselves are attractants for nuisance wildlife
- The adjacent neighbour part of the amendment is good. Does this mean if a neighbour says no then the issue is dead? The smell and the noise can't be mitigated enough to make them an appropriate animal for city life.
- who cares
- Livestock do no belong in the city
- Several primary concerns - noise, smell and poor treatment of the animals. Chickens drive me nuts first thing in the morning and the smell is gross. Although rabbits are quiet, folks usually have a difficult time keeping them confined - for example, we had a neighbor like this and their rabbits dug holes all over our yard and destroyed our garden. If the animal can be keep indoors, then I have no serious problem with it. However, city lots are typically too small to support "exotics" you would



normally find on a farm, and I am dead set against allowing them in the city! You have enough trouble with feral cats and barking dogs which are very difficult to manage.

- Property area is already too small, not large enough for mini-farms. Animal smells, ticks and noise would add health risks. Would not be able to enjoy the too short summers. House values decrease in neighbourhoods that would allow livestock rearing. Neighbour squabbles would increase which will add to mental illness. Will increase City's expense in odour and cleanness/hygiene monitoring.
- "Hens do
- Not belong in city limits"
- Not within city limits.
- It's not fair to neighbours that have no say in what someone may get yet they'd have to put up with smell, noise, etc. Bad enough that we have to put up with barking, howling dogs.
- I don't want to hear or smell them
- Livestock are for farms
- Hens and other farm animals should not be allowed within Calgary city limits. Noise and odours are two obvious reasons for this.
- They will spell up the neighbourhood
- I don't believe we need livestock in the city. Imagine listening to a rooster crowing early every morning and throughout the day, as many are known to do.
- Too many resources would be required to monitor and verify each instance. Pigs are a huge concern. If you grew up on or near a pig farm, you wouldn't offer this possibility.
- Seriously.!? This is a ridiculous concept.
- NO LIVESTOCK IN THE CITY!
- "Chickens and livestock belong on the farm.
- Not in the city."
- Calgary is not farmland. If a person wants hens or any other livestock, they should move to a farm.
- I have noise concerns
- Properties are too small for livestock. Noise and smell concerns are paramount.
- These can be very smelly animals to raise
- Noise, smell and attracting coyotes, skunks, etc
- I support the amendment but do not support hens or other livestock to be permitted in residential areas in Calgary
- But have neighbours that have pigeons, and I consider them a nuisance, so not sure about adding.
- Thing will get out of hand
- This is an urban area not rural
- I am concerned about the level of noise and odors, given numerous communities in the city have housing with minimal spacing between / among them. It also becomes quite subjective, as to what an acceptable level of noise and odor can be. For individuals, who are particularly sensitive to either of the above impacts, allowing certain urban livestock to reside in close confines can greatly impact



the quality of life (ie less sleep, depending on time of noise or nausea and other physical responses to excessive odors).

- We are not farmland
- Dogs and cats alone cause enough issues. More animals = more issues.
- Poultry animals are smelly dirty and noisy. Let's start policing dog walkers who don't clean up after their dogs before allow more stench and disgust in the city
- chickens can emit odours that then can permeate the area. Many have lived by irresponsible dog owners who don't pick up and it's not nice. They will also attract mice. I also worry about keeping chickens in Calgary's brutal weather. Once the novelty wears off who will police that they have heat and adequate unfrozen water etc?????
- Chickens okay. Other farm animals would not have the necessary quality or life in the city. They need more space and would likely be considered nuisances based on smell, noises, etc
- Livestock of any kind do not belong in the city given many residents inability to properly care for dogs and cats
- the Needs of the many outweighs the needs of the few- live stock belong on a farm for the well-being of the animal as well
- The city is no place for livestock. No matter how you do it there will be no real way to control this not to mention it will attract predators, etc. People who want to own livestock can move out of the city.
- Noise and smell considerations in urban areas. Nuisance owners using bylaw to raise animals for consumption.
- who wants hens next as a neighbor? they are farm animals and who know what is in their feathers
- I believe that with all the current problems we have with animals in the city, it would not be wise to bring in livestock without having an influx of problems and complaints.
- Too loud and annoying
- I don't want to have to be the "no" voice of a neighbour wants to get an unusual animal.
- Yards of recently built homes are smaller than previously built homes which does allow adequate space for the health of the hen and to reduce negative interactions with neighbours.
- I do somewhat agree with this amendment in that if hens were allowed in urban setting, they need to be treated well with a good home environment, but I'd rather they stayed in rural environments where they have more room to run around and live a better life.
- Just let them have animals. We are too separate from nature and the 'support from neighbours' is just a recipe for conflict.
- Fear that coyote population will increase and roosters will make a lot of noise
- I do not believe livestock is necessary within city bounds. It opens up too much possibility for enforcement which we do not have the budget for increasing this oversight and monitoring.
- What a stupid idea in a crowded city. Chickens stink you know!!
- Noise, smell
- Rats.
- This is an urban setting, if you want livestock, move to a rural property.
- The city is no place for livestock of any kind.



- I don't want to hear a rooster or smell chicken poop while at my house
- The smell might be an issue especially if you are living right next door. Rural areas fine but not right in the city.
- Farm animals belong on a farm
- I'm worried about the smell
- our taxes are high enough. Cost of more bylaw officers is prohibitive. Lots in Calgary are too close together and small. They do not support livestock.
- You want farm animals - move to an acreage/farm
- I like the idea but I don't have the full picture of what this would look like or smell like.
- I think the smell and noise from livestock would be difficult to manage in an urban setting.
- Livestock isn't appropriate for a city. Particularly on small lots or at townhouses/condominiums.
- "Because there's not enough enforcement of animal protection laws in Canada.
- Allowing livestock in urban areas would allow inexperienced animal caregivers and owners access to these animals and they will become the new puppy mills"
- Our neighbor had them.. dirty and noisy
- I wouldn't care for any of my neighbors having livestock. There is no space for them to have any quality of life
- Not many people would raise the hen well. Now, there's more option to buy organic eggs. Yes, of course it costs more money.
- Hens are not pets and they make lots of noise and the smell very bad. They cannot be trained like dogs.
- I would like a clearer definition of "livestock". I would have to say that livestock does not belong in the city. Lot sizes are too small, particularly in new neighbourhoods. Odours, noise concerns. I have no issue with pot belly pigs. However, where do you draw the line? I don't wish to see or smell my neighbour slaughtering livestock!
- Livestock belongs on a farm.
- Some people already do not adhere to current land use bylaws or maintain the property of weeds, etc. To allow them to have livestock would end up being a further nuisance to the neighbors
- I have enough noise in my neighborhood without having chickens and whatever other animals you deem acceptable
- Animals are noisy and smelly. It's bad enough we have to endure barking dogs and dog feces smell from neighbours, we don't need to add more animals.
- No hens if going through with bully breed legislation - stop bullying my breed
- Livestock belong on a farm or small holding. They are not, never have been and never will be urban animals. The needs of the animals should also be taken into account and that is a peaceful setting in which to live the lives as naturally as possible. In addition, they are usually noises and with the restricted space between homes, can only become a nuisance (getting woken up at the crack of dawn every morning is only one aspect. Sick people need peace and quiet and having a farmyard outside is no such environment. There is also a smell and disease factor: hen food attracts rodents, for example.



- Where does it stop...goats, pigs, cows. Hens are farm animals pure and simple, not standard pets such as cats or dogs.
- I have been around them they are loud and they smell.
- I don't believe that the animals' needs can be adequately met in an urban setting. Nor is proper veterinary care enforced which can result in public health concerns.
- Think of the escapes.
- This proposed amendment, is arbitrary and discriminatory. It has no basis in fact.
- I don't see a reason to have a hen in a city
- If the five freedoms cannot be met for that animal, it should not approved for city living. For example, if one owns a goat in the city, how can it have enough room to walk around and enough grass to graze on in addition to the hay. You could take your goat on a walk I guess but how would you pick up after it considering all the fecal material are like small marbles?
- I do not think the city has proper abilities in place to properly monitor this. I think it will just get out of hand and to many issues will arise from this. Costing us tax payers more in the long run. So no.
- I don't believe it is ethical to use animals for our own benefit- I would also wonder about the consequences if people are using these animals for food (will they be butchering animals in their backyards?)
- Livestock do not belong in the city!
- Lived next door to someone who had chickens and rooster. Noisy and smelly.
- "This is a city. Live outside a city if you desire such animals.
- There is no benefit to neighbors from ownership of such animals. People move, neighbors change."
- Potential to be too much of a nuisance in an urban setting. I certainly would be upset if one of my inner city neighbors had hens in their yard.
- Should not be allowed in residential areas.
- No is no
- Farm animals are meant for farms not to be stuck in a backyard in a city
- They cause disease and noise
- what do you do if you get new neighbors, the last ones said yes but maybe the new ones dont want support it - do you slaughter said hens?
- Farm animals should be on the farm
- if you want to farm move to a rural setting
- I don't want to hear chickens next door
- livestock belong on a farm or rural area
- It is too easy to have them in an environment that affects others, unlike a farm or acreage . You can't control the noise they make. There could also be a problem with sanitation and odor.
- The city is not the proper environment to have farm animals reside in, it is not feasible to start this program as it could lead to more problems down the road.
- I do not support the idea of livestock living within city limits. It is cruel to the animals and unfair to neighbours.



- Chicken coops and chicken feces are filled with organisms that can be dangerous. Chickens can escape. Chicken coops can smell.
- Odor, noise and invitation to predators
- having chickens increases mice etc...which increases cats roaming...just to get trapped
- People don't take care of their in door pets properly so farm animals should stay at the farm.
- Noise can be an issue. Unfortunately more opportunity for irresponsible owners.
- Farm animals make noise, carry disease and smell and require special care and attention that is not easy to provide in an urban setting with harsh winters. Not all people are even responsible enough to pick up dog poop much less care for other animals. And chickens would also attract other animals (coyotes, raccoons, slums) into the city as they look for food. Bylaws will never be enforced properly and animals and neighbours will be the ones who suffer, not the irresponsible animal owner.
- People can not be trusted at present to even manage their cats and dogs and you want to allow even more animals to be kept domestically? No way
- Hens would be a nuisance on most properties and would just cause more issues. City people don't want a rooster crowing in the morning or periodically throughout the day
- Chickens are noisy, dirty and subject to disease. They attract predators such as skunks, foxes and coyotes.
- I need more information what this would look like in practice. Will there be restrictions on the # of hens; what kind of living quarters they will have, etc.
- If someone wants to play at Farmer, they should be in a rural environment.
- Control of Sanitary and noise issues are paramount. I would have concern as current bylaws and the time by law officers have to deal with car and dog issues are inadequate. Education is great, but we have seen repeat offenders being able to get away with only a letter time and time again. They know that there is no real penalty so do not try to change. Unfortunately this leaves neighbours to suffer and "pay the price"
- Absolutely no livestock belongs within city limits
- so if your neighbor gets ten stinky disgusting dinosaur birds and all you can then do is sell your house and move that's not fair to the neighbors
- depending on the neighbourhood house are too close together and everyone should be able to enjoy their back yards.
- Livestock needs are different than what a small city lot can provide. Neighborhoods are not built to support livestock. Plus, the odours from livestock will carry throughout the area. If you want livestock, you need to live in a rural setting.
- Chicken coops are filled with organic that can make people sick. Birds can escape and get into others yards. They can also get smelly.
- Disease, smell if you want a farm buy one. You open the door to hens then what?
- Dirty, smelly and no need. If they was hens, chickens in their yard buy a farm. What's next cows
- You would have farms inside city limits and that doesn't belong.
- It's the citythey should be left on the farms



- It is hard enough for bylaw officers to police cruelty to pets. We should not add more animals to become pets and subject to cruelty.
- Seriously? Cities aren't meant to be farms. And vice-versa.
- I've lived in neighbourhoods allowing livestock while in BC. Fastest way to become overrun with rodents.
- I wouldn't want a hen house for a neighbour.
- if a neighbor is fine with having chickens, what about renters that leave in a year? The new renters? Would it be up to the owner? Can the neighbor withdraw support if they become a nuisance? What would happen to the chickens? We have pest problems already, what if skunks become more prevalent in the neighborhood? Will there be a limit?
- Bringing my predators to the city by doing this
- the city is not appropriate to raise farm animals
- Too much care and responsibility for farm type animals needed within an urban area. Also, smells and noise complaints might increase substantially.
- Our backyards should not be a hen house. If you want livestock then buy yourself a farm.
- People barely care for dogs and cats. I don't need hens and roosters next door. And they will probably just be eaten by the Bobcats in the neighbourhood.
- that's disgusting
- I believe this could cause issues with other animals and pets especially depending on the area of the city if it's close to park and could draw coyotes and other animals into communities if they believe there are food sources
- i think livestock should be raised on a farm. Those animals need space. And maybe the neighbors say ok, but what about the next person to move in to the adjacent house?
- By and large people are very irresponsible with animals. Having hens and other livestock in the city will likely lead to endless noise and safety issues for neighbours
- If people want animals they should move to the country or a farm. No animals in the city.
- Work nights. Wouldn't like roosters waking me at 5 in the morning or during weekends
- Chicken coops are smelly and unsightly.
- livestock belongs on a farm or in the wild. Should not be sold for financial gain to be known as pets in a household/municipal environment unless, they are kept at the zoo (common sense). Like who thinks up these stupid ideas ??
- The property lot needs to have a standard minimum size and the hen house needs to be so many meters from neighbors and this won't be possible in MANY neighborhoods in Calgary
- If I wanted to live near a farm I would move to the country.
- Livestock should not be permitted within the city in residential areas.
- On a farm yes, but not in suburban areas.
- On the whole, majority of people have no clue the needs of any animal be they live outside the home or inside. They do what is appealing to themselves be it housing, feed, maintenance of any given animal. Also is the outside animal wanted as a Pet, or for food for the humans?



- Adjacent neighbour's may simply decline without an acceptable reason as to why.
- Hens and livestock should not be allowed in urban areas.
- Noise
- cities are for people ,country is for farm animals.
- NO farm animals in city - NO chickens or Pigeons
- That is a nuisance in a city neighborhood. People looking to raise hens should move out of city limits
- Livestock are to be on a farm, not in the city
- Many people do not know how to care for their domestic animals as is. Many SPCA's and shelters see an influx of abandonment of hens when cities allow them.
- Noise and smell. I do not want to live next to a barnyard. That's why we live in the city!
- we don't have enough space in the city but if it's in a community center maybe.
- I don't believe livestock should be permitted in an urban setting.
- Hens? Really? There are not many properties that can support setting up a proper hen environment that would not interfere with neighbouring properties
- Chicken can carry bird mites which can spread to humans and other pets. Infestations are very difficult to get rid of and can materially change the quality of life for those who have been infested.
- I don't like the idea of farm animals in the city! Should we not be concerned with the virus they may carry?
- Livestock is for Farms not for the city. We have enough issues with lost animals do not need to add to it.
- Urban means urban... rural means rural. Don't get confused
- Move to the country if you want live stock in your yard
- I would 100% not want to live beside someone who owned chickens. They are livestock and belong in the country.
- Most people are not always home and if the pets are being a nuisance to anyone, they cannot properly manage them. Not all pet owners do the basics of walking their dog for exercise, and they bark when they are bored or not walked. I have seen how easy it is for chickens to get loose even when caged, so that is not viable when nobody is home to watch. Pets need us to be around to have a happy life, and we want them for a happy life of our own. If we are not there , it makes no sense for them to have pets. Cats are not controlled, and nobody pays any attention to where they go. The answer is to someone else's yard to do their business and stink up the whole house. (first hand knowledge) How is that fair to the majority of pet owners who pay a licence fee and keep their pets under control at all times?
- As with any animal ownership. It is the owner who needs to be caring and responsible. Unfortunately in today's world you can easily have those who think it is fun or unique to have some hens or something but then just cannot be bothered to really spend the time to properly care for them. Same issue with lots who get a dog and then just lock it outside in the yard day and night and then wonder why the poor thing barks or howls or cries. You will have same issue with other types as people who are not really committed to the ownership eventually abandon the proper care and leave the animal on the sidelines with minimum interaction.



- "I do not believe that people will provide the appropriate care and welfare for 'other livestock' within the city limits.
- I do support backyard chickens but I think that it would be too hard to properly enforce rules for other livestock and that citizens would try to find 'loopholes'"
- Somebody is going to abuse this law and bring something dangerous into the city. If you want chickens go buy an acreage
- Chickens belong on a farm not in the city
- I don't think farm animals have a place within urban areas.
- Hens are one thing (no roosters please), but I think this would open things too much to who knows what kind of animals that are just not suitable for an urban environment. You don't define "positive benefit" or "suitable living conditions" in a way that I can properly assess the impacts. For instance, are you considering that some animals may attract other pests? What are considered suitable living conditions for an animal? How large of an animal would be considered suitable for an urban environment? It also places way too much pressure on neighbours who don't agree -they could be vilified in the neighborhood (that mean person who didn't let them have animal x) or bullied by their neighbours. This needs more boundaries. Plus if things don't work out, what actions are available to neighbours, and will they be able to appeal the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer's decision in the case of an exception? The onus should be on the owner to prove the animal will not become a nuisance to others, not on the neighbouring owners to prove that it will negatively impact them. This places too much authority on the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer to allow these animals at the expense to others. In summary, if you want to farm, buy a farm.
- Livestock belong on farms with people who know how to care for them and have the space/facilities to care for them properly.
- Unless it is monitored closely this could get out of hand. And Calgary has small yards not enough room for a farm animal
- Hens are smelly and loud, i wouldn't want them living near me.
- Condensed living smaller property the city limits is not a place for these type of animals
- There is enough urban noise and hard to tell a chicken or rooster to shut up
- No roosters
- As a veterinarian, I have seen numerous cases of humans infected with salmonella due to ownership of backyard hens. Most people do not have the knowledge or training to properly care for these livestock, and both animals and humans suffer as a result. There is often not proper veterinary care given, there is no biosecurity to prevent zoonotic transmission of disease, and no vaccination/deworming programs. Unless there are proper programs in place to train people on the proper care and safety of keeping these animals, in which they are then allowed to purchase them, I do not support this change to the bylaw.
- Will always be too much effort to enforce and cause too many complaints.
- Livestock is too broad a term here. A person does not need a herd of goats in their backyard and larger livestock (cows, pigs, horses, llamas, etc) belong on a larger acreage or farm. Ducks, geese or other small birds may be OK.



- has covid not taught us anything about risks of bringing farm and other animals into higher density urban areas?
- Livestock should largely be maintained outside of the city. Whether for personal or professional use.
- Seriously?? A pet is a pet. A barn yard animal belongs in a barn yard. Do we need to have more potential for virus/influenza spread from animals to humans than we already do? Given the state of our world right now because of a virus from an animal that is not a pet, why would you approve that? Do your civic duty and protect the city.
- No we are city you want farm animals go to the country!
- Livestock belong in rural settings not urban settings.
- urban environments are not suitable for livestock
- Livestock in residential areas are not ideal due to noise and smell. Requiring support from adjacent neighbours creates the potential for animosity between neighbours who do not wish to have livestock living nearby.
- It sometimes spreads diseases to humans
- A distinction needs to be made between urban and rural properties and this includes livestock. Allowing hens simply opens pandora's box to a whole host of problems.
- I don't think livestock bering in the city
- If people want Hens, move out of the city. It's not something that any neighbour wants.
- Chickens stink
- There is the problem of smells, rodents, skunks etc. if a home owner wants livestock within an urban setting, they should consider an average setting
- The noise and smell are hard to control. If someone had a few acres of property they could keep the coupe further from houses but if someone living on under an acre of land has one it can be problematic.
- Unless there are enough bylaw officers to quickly dress noise, odour and other issues immediately (which you don't) then this should not be occurring.
- No livestock should be allowed in the city
- I have a dog. On a hot summer day a week's worth of defecation can be pretty smelly. I can't imagine what a coop would smell like in summer.
- Typical lot sizes do not provide adequate space and buffers for livestock in urban settings
- Seems it would invite a lot of extra noise and smell among closely situated houses.
- Hens carry ghiradia. They would also attract coyotes, bob cats and other wild life further into the suburbs and then they would be destroyed because they are following their natural instincts to hunt food.
- I don't want the noise or possible smell from my neighbor
- Livestock is not necessary in the city
- This system - the reviewed case by case basis - can very easily be subject to abuse by both the applicants and the CBEO. A great deal of properties in the city can't support suitable living conditions and there's an overwhelming amount of NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) in the city, people wouldn't be reasonable even being presented the argument of "chickens would help keep bugs



under control." I recognize the benefits on a personal level, but for all my relentless driving at "let's get a chicken coop," my desire to improve the neighborhood would be bottlenecked at the approval of my neighbors who may not feel the same way I do.

- Many livestock need grazing areas and most people do not have the means to clean and maintain livestock living quarters.
- The stench of livestock in the city should not be introduced. We have a vast majority of land at the edges of the city that are sufficing.
- Having lived with livestock, the potential for negatively impacting neighbours is high. Unless the amendment is written in a way that clearly protects neighbours from negative impacts (noise, odour, roaming critters) I cannot support it.
- How my yard is any neighbours business is beyond me
- Livestock should remain on farms and acreages that have the space to accommodate these animals.
- Noise for one.
- The animals would be too loud and smelly
- If people want to raise farm animals they should take some responsibility and not buy property in a city that doesn't allow it -- why must the majority bend to support a vocal but small minority? In a city we do not have space or infrastructure for manure -- disease would be a constant problem (as with feral and roaming cats). Neighbours would have to deal with smells and noise and probably unsightly runs/henhouses/etc. If rules were to be enforced we would need many more bylaw officers. I invested in an R1 house in a city with bylaws -- if I had wanted to live beside farm animals, I could have saved a lot of money buying a house elsewhere.
- Farm animals belong on the farm, not the city.
- The smell and noise would be a huge issue for neighbours. In addition, they would attract predators like coyotes.
- No livestock in city limits
- Its bad enough having neighbors dogs constantly barking. I just want to be able to sit on my deck in quiet without more animals in the city.
- A city is no place for livestock
- Do we really need chickens in your backyard?
- Live stack are dirty and will attract pests
- I'm concerned that people with livestock may slaughter on their property, in unhygienic and inhumane conditions. There's also an issue with noise and odour if larger livestock such as goats and pigs are kept on city properties.
- Neighbours change and neighbours don't always share the same philosophy. Owning an animal is a privilege, not a right. People should be allowed to possess pets as long as they do not infringe upon the rights of others.
- Too much leeway for animal abuse, neighbor conflicts.
- Allowing hens may have negative impact to neighbours priority
- Noise disturbances.



- Noise disturbance and odour
- Livestock is livestock, not a household pet.
- This will be based on a personal assessment, not a full guideline. The city houses are not meant to be a farm. A clear list of acceptable livestock would need to be provided prior to the bylaw to being approved.
- How will the city have the manpower to supervise urban ranches? What about the human treatment and housing? What would this look like?
- Livestock should be on a farm, if I wanted hens as a neighbour I'd be on an acreage not in the city.
- "If hens are able to roam, cats should be able to roam as well. I thought cats are not able to roam because it brings in predators such as coyotes and bobcats. Would this not be the case for roaming hens?"

- Generally, I like the idea of roaming wildlife."
- It's the owners property, no need for neighborhood approval. Remove that and I'd say yes.
- Yes/no is too broad. Certain livestock (goats/llamas) are cost effective for landscape control. Aviary (chickens) can cause noise disruption. Therefore, my current answer is 50/50 split with your current answer system.
- Livestock are a nuisance to neighbours, whether it be through noise, smell, or otherwise. They should not be allowed in the city.
- No point in this inside the city.
- Livestock can become more of a nuisance than the (wrongly) demonized pit bull
- no farm animals should be allowed in city
- If you want livestock rent some farmland
- Livestock are meant for the country and have the space. This would be animal cruelty. Why would you worry about dogs behaviour that owners are cruel to, and then turn around and bring in more situation were animal cruelty could happen and create an even worse situation. If people want livestock and animals they can move to so land so they get a nice life as we did when we wanted farm life. City life or Country life. People need to start realizing they need to make choices not have the best of both worlds all the time. (bet this pandemic would have turned out different if we all realized not to be so selfish)
- We have enough dogs barking and other noises in our neighborhood today, we don't needs odors as well.
- Livestock carry with them potential for disease and pandemic. I do not believe any animal should be kept as livestock anywhere, but in a densely populated city is asking for another pandemic.
- Calgary is too populous to have livestock properly regulated by citizens and authorities.
- I wouldn't want to live next door to livestock.
- I think that to many people would call in to complain about their neighbours putting extra strain on the bylaw officers.



- My worries is around how the hen owner will keep their hens in out an property. Worried about the mess and appearance of the neighbours yard and how it will impact my property.
- What other livestock? Sheep, goat, cattle? Hens are manageable, but bigger livestock i'm nor so sure
- Such animals belong on a farm or acreage, not within urban setting. Noise and smells are two reasons. If such animals were allowed then City needs a by-law that sellers and real estate Agents must disclose presence of such animals in the neighbourhood that current owner has or or has supported.
- The city is no place for pigs, cows, chickens, etc. They are farm animals & their noise and messiness would not be welcome to other neighbours.
- I don't want farm animals living near me.
- Calgary is not currently providing citizens with proper guidance for dog ownership, it is certainly not prepared to take on other types of livestock.
- Hens will attract more coyotes in urban areas.
- Most people are unprepared or unaware to the normal sights, smells, and sounds that would come along with this. I believe that this would create a number of complaints and charges to bylaw.
- Why the hell are hens and animals alike being treated with more dignity, inclusiveness and respect than dogs? Dogs have special bonds with their owners and become attached. We eat chicken on a daily basis. Wake up.
- There should not be exceptions; we need consistency. As a homeowner I want to be assured that my neighbourhood will maintain a consistent standard
- If you want to live on a farm please move out of the City and enough with folks playing the "comfort animal" card.
- Livestock Can carry disease and need proper vaccines and deworming protocols. Also they can produce smell and need places to roam and keep warm in the winter that requires extensive coupes, pens, and or sheds. They do not belong in the city.
- Housing animals outdoors will cause unnecessary noise and odors which would affect quiet enjoyment of your property. It could also affect property value
- Livestock belongs on acreages not a city.
- Too much work required by the city to ensure the well-being of the animals. Animal cruelty cases are already difficult to address.
- Having farm animals in the city is a ridiculous proposal. They smell, can carry illnesses, can be a nuisance and quite frankly are what I expect to see in a town/city when traveling to a third world country.
- Current building rules have houses FAR too close together to have, even a well maintained number of hens to NOT be a nuisance from time to time
- An urban setting is not the place to raise livestock. The noise, mess, and smell affects neighbours not just the individuals wanting to raise livestock on their property.
- Having farm animals in a city environment doesn't work. Having chickens and other farm animals on the small lots than are generally the norm for city life is not fair on the animals or the neighboring



population. A few may agree to the arrangement but a person has many neighbors who potentially could be affected. e.g. backyard fire pits.

- we don't need a bunch of people with gross chicken coops in their backyard and roosters waking us up at 5 am. Anyone who owns a farm knows chickens are messy nasty creatures
- Question is too vague. If hens, then yes. However, what is the amendment that would permit exploring criteria for potential approval of other livestock?
- They belong on farms only!
- I don't believe farm animals should be raised in the city.
- Livestock can stink way beyond property lines
- What other 'livestock' do people need in the city? Pigs, cows, horses? The yards can not and would not be able to support larger animals
- Livestock do not need to be in urban areas
- I didn't buy a home in an estate area to live next door to a chicken coop!
- "Farm" animals are best left at the farm. People who want these sorts of animals should live in a place where not in close proximity of others. There wants directly impact those around them.
Sound/Smell
- The needs of the many outweighs the needs of the few.
- I don't believe support from neighbours should be required if you don't allow roosters in the city.
- Live on a farm if you want live stock
- The city should stop restricting what private property owners do in their land. Unless the owner is infringing on someone else's rights, person, or property, the city should stay out And stop grossly overstepping as they do not
- Loud, smelly
- I have had friends who decide to raise chickens and are surprised at how difficult and challenging this can be. I worry for the health of the chickens at the hands of the inexperienced.
- Livestock doesn't belong in cities.
- They will be a nuisance.
- it's ridiculous
- [removed]
- Keep farm animals on a farm. The city properties aren't big enough. And the smell.. I would very upset if I couldn't go into my back yard because my neighbour had a stinky chicken coop
- Homes in the inner city area especially typically have very small yards and are not suitable for animals. There are coyotes in my inner city neighbourhood and this would potentially attract them to my yard.
- In the city, there would be more complaints about noise.
- I believe this will encourage people who will not receive any proper education on hens to get them, the hens will be improperly cared for, and likely will be a noise issue.
- Livestock should not be in city limits. Chickens smell really bad and are very noisy.
- They're a mice attractant



- No, no hens in the city. I don't want a neighbour with a chicken coop. They're messy and dirty.
- Urban chicken farming has already caused problems affecting the health of humans in other jurisdictions. Wanna farm? Great, move out of the city and be a farmer.
- Livestock has no place in an urban setting.
- Sounds like it would cause smell and noise. Depends on how big the persons property is.
- It's animal cruelty. The entire world is moving towards veganism.. there is absolutely no need to confine animals in small back yard cages.
- People will abuse the law and will not follow the rules. This will cause animals in shelter and long court cases. One person will interpret different than other. Kind of like apport animal being abused in USA
- Unacceptable for hygiene reasons - especially risk of infectious agents transferring to people. (Avian Flu and salmonella as examples). Also are noisy and smelly. Neighbours can not get away from them. There is no need for this.
- Noise, mess and smell are potentials for community friction with neighbours.
- Noise. If you wish to keep livestock, please relocate to a rural area. Cities are noisy enough already!
- Too noisy/stinky for our urban density
- Personally I don't believe hens should be in the city.
- The big issue would be smell and hygiene issues for neighbours.
- Livestock belongs on a farm.
- Livestock and hens belong on a farm not in the city limits
- Don't believe in urban livestock.
- The cost of bylaw enforcement will outweigh any benefits of urban livestock.
- .no animals in the city!!!
- I do not want to live next to exotic pets, or example a donkey, Turkey or a llama.
- Farm animals do not belong in peoples backyards. Aside from the noise there is also the issue of cleanliness. Farms do not smell nice. I would not want my neighbors yard smelling like a farm.
- Chickens are smelly
- To difficult to enforce
- Many situations where people don't take responsibility for the upkeep of their yards and pets. This would very likely add to the issues. I wouldn't want livestock next door to me.
- Why is the city of Calgary even considering allowing easier access to feeding products for wild animals?
- People living in the city are entitled human beings so save yourself form the unnecessary calls.
- Noise complaints, smell, disease
- Noise
- I currently do not feel typical farm livestock are appropriate for most Calgary neighborhoods. I think there'd be too much noise, too many smells/odours and with most houses too close together, I don't see how this would be a positive experience for most people living next door to this.
- Officials would not have the ability or resources to manage this effectively.



- Lower property value. Do you want here rosters in the morning
- I've lived in places that allow chickens in urban areas, they are noisy and stink I do not want to live next to them or other livestock
- Danger for abuse
- Chickens and other farm animals are just that. They are farm animals. Noisy and smelly. They absolutely do not belong in a city or town. I know, I lived on a farm as a child. I definitely do not want to smell the excrement wafting over from my neighbors yard in the city and I definitely do not want to hear or listen to them.
- A neighbour raised chickens. Turns out he was using the roosters to fight. Having the birds in town will encourage illegal and animal cruelty. I do not want a farm animal next to my home. Chickens are just the start of a slippery slope. City enforcement is lax on so many items please do not add more unenforceable laws.
- Livestock should be in rural municipalities
- Keep farm animals on farms. They are loud and filthy typically.
- I don't think it can be monitored properly. The worst thing I can imagine is neighbours within hearing distance that have a rooster who crows at the break of dawn EVERY DAY! I believe they will bring more predators into the city as well. Wildlife has lost so much habitat from our unending growth (and who is buying these new homes in the economic crisis that Calgary has been in for the last 5 years?), they will start to look for easy prey. I'd say a stinky chicken coop is a great place for them to find easy pickings!
- Urban is urban; keep 'livestock' rural.
- This could lead to additional odors and noise in the neighborhood.
- Too concerned about noise, mess and unsightly hen coops. I think hen ownership would be great but haven't heard or seen anything that convinced me it could be controlled correctly.
- Sorry, I can't see how supporting this slippery slope of allowing farm animals (starting with hens) can have a stop point. Every single animal will have its day in court from here on out. We can't have our cake and eat it. You want farm animals.... go live on an acreage not in a fourplex with a 100sqft backyard.
- Livestock is meant for acreage and or farms on the outskirts of the city or in the country.
- Livestock do not belong in an urban environment. Odor, noise, insects, rodents and predators are always issues when livestock are present.
- It would attract other wildlife into city limits.
- nope grew up with chickens at my neighbors in Penbrooke, they're loud, they smell, and attract all sorts of pests
- Why hens??? Why not goats???
- Urban farming does not encourage best management and animal care practices.
- This could lead to noise complaints
- Not specific enough
- Hens and other livestock are a potential reservoir for zoonotic diseases.
- No other option. Hens are filthy and don't belong in a city



- I worry about the noise of roosters
- It's too much noise and smell, what if new neighbors do not agree etc etc. Too many issues
- They smell, especially during warm days, can be quite strong if housed in a small area. Many diseases are spread through animals as we have seen with covid. Better to be proactive than cause a resident to become ill.
- Livestock belong on a farm and cannot have an adequate life in a back yard. I would be ok with chickens if the owners are held accountable for the smell (ie proper cleaning must be taking place)
- Too smelly for neighbors
- Livestock requires a rural or semi-rural setting, if only for the psychological well-being of the animal.
- Move to a farm if you want a farm animal.
- Neighbour support is too much dependent on someone's preferences and not objective facts or considerations
- Have we learned nothing from recent events and transmission of animal to human diseases.
- Chickens are loud and don't belong in a densely populated area. Not to mention the smell.
- They smell and are noisy.
- The city is not the place for chickens or other livestock.
- No livestock in city (hens and roosters) are very noisy, smelly, and can easily escape. Then like in other areas there has to be a team of enforcement officers placed "the chicken has flown the coop" chase. This gets very bad over time, I have this get out of control fast in many city's
- People live in cities because they aren't farms.
- City is not the place for livestock
- Hens belong at a farm where they can live their best life. Not in an already overly crowded city. Consider their quality of life living in a big city first, that's not fair to the animal.
- The criteria above are too subjective.
- Live on an average or farm if that's what you'd like.
- Noise. More rodents. Odors.
- People do not know how to properly look after livestock including hens. I don't think it would be good for the animals.
- We're opening up potential for more issues that will need to be dealt in a similar manner as this engagement.
- Livestock should only be allowed in the country. It's not fair for neighbors to have to listen, smell or deal with what comes along with having hens close by.
- Obviously if coyotes eat domestic pets, chickens would be tasty viddles.
- The animals are not the problem it is usually the owners. I feel that there may not be enough bylaw officers available to check out complaints if this is allowed.
- "No, I am completely against urban hens and any other urban livestock.
- Noise, smell, disease issues, impact to surrounding property values, etc.



- Actually, no, I would be OK with it, as long as the impact to property values is ameliorated - say a presumed impact of 20% of property value paid out to neighbours immediately (per, say, most recent city property value assessment), and then thereafter the same proportion of property tax be covered. I could put up with the nuisance of neighbouring chickens for that sort of compensation."
- i dont agree with livestock in the city.
- Respect for tax paying neighbours, must be number one priority before allowing farmyard pets.
- People would not look after ensuring the yards were well cared for so the smells were kept under control. These urban farms are fun till they aren't.
- Farm animals or livestock require larger spaces then city properties can accommodate due to mess, odour, and noise.
- We live in a city, not in the country on acreages or ranches.
- Livestock should not be in urban areas as the animals will impact neighbors and the neighbors have no say in this
- I don't believe that cities are appropriate places for laying hens or other livestock. Rural areas can provide more space and appropriate shelter for these animals.
- Why a hen? In the city? Last time I checked hens belonged in the farm.
- I don't have a problem with the idea but can easily imagine a couple people going overboard and bylaw not having the time to deal with it appropriately. It's easier to just stay at no.
- because calgarians are bad people. they would never consider the noise, smell, whatever effects on their neighbors
- I support all of these except for item #1. I don't see why my "community" should benefit from me personally keeping hens. That is nonsense. The other items I agree with.
- "Such animals have no place in the city
- Could cause noise and possible disease"
- Animal welfare is not sufficiently addressed.
- City is not a place for farm animals.
- Impact to neighbors and welfare if livestock
- I would be afraid they would not be properly cared for, or hens would be hoarded and not properly protected.
- Large livestock should not be in the city due to noise, and smell complaints and lack of appropriate living space to accommodate all need for the animals
- Farming should not be allowed in urban areas. It can be noisy and smell bad.
- Livestock should remain on farms
- Dirty and disgusting and could be a noise complaint from people in neighbour hoods
- These animals attract mice and other critters
- It is mind boggling that this is up for debate..... with all the problems in this world and the crisis our city is facing, this is priority.
- The disturbance these can be if escaped or noice for your neighbors. Attracting more prey animals, such as coyotes.



- Please no urban hens in the city.
- Cops are already have “above the law” mentality, this would just aid in that. The city needs to look at other options. Like having a department dedicated to dealing with this issue with proper education.
- I do not believe livestock should be permitted in Calgary. Even if adjacent neighbours agree at the time, if they sell and a new owner comes in, they may not be in agreement. What is to be done then?
- There are to many irresponsible pet owners now. Plus it is almost impossible to get enforcement as it is now with bylaw offences now!
- Opposing allowing hens or other farmed animals in the city, unless they are rescued and not used for food
- Noise and smell
- I am opposed to allowing hens or other farmed animals in the city. They can't be taken care of properly in the city and in allowing this exposes these animals to potential cruelty. It also allows for a lot of disruption to neighbours.
- Livestock belong on farms. I don't support hens either. In my opinion, adjacent neighbours is not expansive enough for consultation.
- Unsure, as I don't know anything about these hens. If they are making constant noise, they absolutely should not be permitted. There would be zero relief from the noise for the neighbours as they are outside 24/7. Regardless of current neighbour agreement, people move often, and not fair to new residents if they have to listen to clicking all day and night.
- A city environment and livestock are incompatible.
- As it is, People can't look after their children and pets. How do you expect them to look after chickens?
- No. I do not support the holding of any farm animals in the city unless they are held for the purpose of providing them sanctuary and safe living space. I do not support the holding of livestock for consumption of their flesh, or production of products with their use, or for experimentation.
- It would depend where they were being kept. For example, I would not want my neighbour keeping hens, as it could be a nuisance during early hours of the morning or late at night.
- Hens have no place in a city
- Neighbours are volatile, and can change in the natural life of an animal. If new neighbours oppose the livestock, then there will be no place for the animals.
- Unless the animal was a rescue and not used for food.
- This would be far to difficult to monitor. Potential for increased noise in communities. Could diminish property values. Could result in unsightly back yards and stench from feces, etc. If people want farm type animals, they should not live in the city. Allowing this will also be difficult to monitor and management. Would need to have more bylaw officers to ensure enforcement, this could be costly to ratepayers. Overall a terrible idea.
- The city could end up sounding and smelling like a barnyard. Also would result in youth temptations to disrupt.



- I have lived in an area that supported hens and they were found roaming the streets and roosters would wake neighbors up.. roosters weren't allowed but showed up..
- Properties are too close together. The additional noise and smell is too much to deal with.
- Noise, smell, and the potential for animal abuse/neglect. They would be an excellent addition to community gardens or centers however
- There is no need for livestock within the city. This would facilitate a lot of animal cruelty issues.
- Trying to manage proper conditions for dogs and cats and other domestic animals is already a struggle with current resources. This will out additional strain on the humane society when they start receiving calls of inadequate food water and shelter
- I am against having chickens or livestock in peoples yards. Who is going to look after the welfare of these animals? The city doesn't have the manpower to go and check up on these animals. I think these animals may be neglected and abused and no one would look after their welfare.
- Against all animal agriculture. Personal and production.
- The noise and the smell would not be worth it
- The smell of chickens makes me sick.
- Against all animal agriculture.
- The city is not built to support livestock.
- As a potential neighbor, i would hate to leave beside someone who has chickens and livestock. These animals shouldn't be in a city setting. Keep them on a large acreage and farm, not cramped in someone's backyard
- Hens require roosters if I'm not mistaken.
- If people live on several acres of land the should be allowed to have live stoke.
- If they want farm animals beside chicken they need to live on a farm
- A city is no place for domestic animals
- Wild animals need to be on a farm. If not looked after and keep clean there could be issues.
- There are unintended consequences of increased livestock in the City, including waste disposal & parasites.
- I do not support any hens in urban neighbourhoods
- Another reason for nuisance
- Livestock smells.
- There are few vets in the city that would be willing to treat these animals, and they would be at high risk for neglect
- I do not agree with urban hens. Sound violations plus my son is allergic. We choose not to frequent farm area due to allergies and would prefer to see farm animals stay in rural areas.
- The city is no place for livestock
- chickens attract mice, coyotes even bears in bordering communités of fish creek
- It would depend on the animal and the environmental footprint it would have in the city.
- Chickens are obnoxious



- "1) I have apprehension for irresponsible livestock owners in ""hoarding"" situations or any situation where the livestock are treated inhumanely, causing transmittable diseases to arise. I would be mostly concerned about viral mutations (that are transmittable to humans) occurring in avian species of livestock (given the most recent viruses).

- 2) I would also be concerned that livestock owners become irresponsible breeders of livestock, or begin to ""sell"" their products (be it eggs, or meat) without proper licenses for this. I am fully supportive of responsible livestock owners, but I would like the City to acknowledge that, should the bylaw be passed, this can be considered either a ""pet"" situation or a ""food"" situation, opening up the potential for irresponsible animal handling practices in both cases.

- 3) The City would have a backup plan for the amount of ""nuisance"" wildlife that may be attracted to city limits (i.e. coyotes). There is already complaints about this in the neighborhood. The potential of more coyotes denning in the City is just something to be aware of.

- 4) (Although this is unlikely given Canadian winters...) In many countries livestock breeding gets out of hand. In Barbados you can see the amount of ""wild"" roosters and hens roaming the streets, which then become nuisance animals."
 - No "other" livestock
 - I am thinking about the noise and smell this may cause for neighbours, how will that be policed if the neighbours do not want livestock nearby? Its going to create issues and then bylaw will have to work to resolve them.
 - No
 - No need for farm animals within city neighborhoods.
 - there are far too many people who can't maintain there property with a basic cat or dog. I dont feel the city should be having to police other livestock, especially, in these tight financial times
 - I don't think that is appropriate for in the city. City yards don't have the space for that, nor do I want to be living beside someone with livestock in their yards.
 - Increased number of hen attacks.
 - there is not usually enough space for other livestock to live a fruitful life. If the owner had over an acre of land, then perhaps. But typically that is not the case.
 - The city is no place for livestock,
 - Spread of disease from animal to human which is contagious.
 - Livestock does not belong in the city. They belong on farms and should not be used for humans comfort, including emotional support animals within the city.



- If it is applied like the basement suite violation then the bylaw would very seldom be used. The officer has latitude and choose not to act.
- This is a persona choice not everything has to be “community benefit” unless it’s like breeding that causes harm to the community.
- These chickens are going to have a greater opportunity to interact with wild fowl than commercial chickens, which can lead to an increase in pathogen mutation and disease transmission.
- Pigeons are not pets they are wild animals and deserve to live that way.
- Livestock need a lot of space not available in urban settings
- smell and noise
- Noise & filth.
- The city isn't a place for hens. I too would love to do that but I see so many magpies and crows where I live - and they are constantly annoying the dogs outside going after them and taunting them...The birds stalk rabbits, cats on the loose too...anything. I think having hens in the backyard will attract more wildlife. I'm in Harvest Hills and coyotes come into the neighborhood all the time - this will just bring more trouble as we try to keep coyotes away from our residences.
- None domesticated animals should not be within city. The purpose of the hens is not the same as a companion pet. They are essentially a working animal and not be within city.
- They are farm animals not city. They also attract mice etc
- The care and feeding of livestock, especially to ensure that livestock ownership is not a nuisance to others, is complex. Vague ideas about "food security" being improved by such behaviours need proof; if the cost of an egg raised in the City exceeds the grocery store, then food security has not improved. Too much regulatory cost is triggered by this topic, to make the gambit worthwhile. And people cannot find themselves arguing about "therapy" animals, if the animals are not allowed in the first place.
- The management of this is not worth the expense
- Farm animals belong on the farm and not in the city
- I'm good with hens but don't feel that other larger livestock need be accommodated in back yards. Too many issues for neighbours.
- Doesn't sound like the proper research has been completed so until this occurs any leaps such as that above should be avoided
- Don't want the noise, smell etc next door to me so.....
- The housing are so close to each other, noises from dogs' barking is already a big issue for me, if there are familys' chicken farm set up in my neighbourhood, the noises and the smell will be another issues, may be those Calgarian with no pets, no chickens have to move to montain to leave to get away from the dogs barking and the animal smells.
- Chickens smell, are loud and would be an aggravating nuisance to live near within the city, if i wanted to live near farm animals, I would move to the country.
- "Livestock belong in the country side, not in The City of Calgary residential back yards, because it
- creates a nuisance and devalues residential monetary property values."



- The city has more than enough problems with dogs and cats, to deal with chickens crossing the road. Urban chickens and livestock has been a total disaster in other cities. Living with animals leads to diseases like bird flu, cat flu, bat flu, swine flu,, MRSA, common cold, SARS, MERS, CoViD-19
- Absolutely not no hens whatsoever
- This is very unnecessary and could get out of control quickly. Having a chicken as a pet I would support, but as livestock I would not.
- We can't control dog behaviour, waste and noise... livestock would be no different. Waking up to goats bleating, chickens crowing or cows mooing from my bedroom window does not sound appealing. The neighbours dogs are a big enough problem.
- The city is not a place for livestock
- Hens do not belong in the city
- Proper handling of livestock needs to be maintained by people with training. The allowance of livestock can cause a local wet market making the community more prone to sicknesses and infections. (Eg. COVID-19)
- not enough information given to support the change. Considering that bylaw has enough to deal with over cat and dog ownership, I don't think we need to add livestock into the mix.
- Noise and smell; we live in a city not a farm district.
- Wild stock should not be in the city
- Mini-livestock of any kind does not need to live in a city. To much risk of an owner not being able to provide sufficient space, and the necessary yard clean-up.
- This sounds like too much bureaucracy. The intent is fine, but I can see this mushrooming into something like the secondary suite debacle. Spell out what is expected of the homeowner, and if he doesn't deliver, then serve notice that the animal must be rehomed.
- I don't want to hear roosters or chickens at 6am on my day off
- I feel this opens up the doors for people to abuse the ability to have livestock in the city. This would result in more animals being abused or neglected by people who don't understand the needs of the animal.
- This is a slippery slope... hens and other livestock are best left outside the city.
- Urban hens can potentially create disputes between neighbors and within the community.
- I do not want the smell or sounds of livestock next door.
- [removed]
- Animals belong in the country please
- Where do you draw the line?
- we have enough wildlife and nucience animals. do not bring in more
- I don't talk to my neighbours nor do I care if they support what I do with my life. Unnecessary restrictions
- I would need to know what other animals are being considered before I could support the concept.
- I believe that it would lead to more probelms, including more negative animal encounters



- Farm animals do not belong in the city. People do not understand how to care for them plus there is not enough space. If you want farm animals, live rurally.
- [removed] Hens belong on farms. You want to ban pitbulls and any animal that scares you by appearance but yay for HENS??!! Taxpayers actually pay for this kind of thing? What a waste of money you are!!
- I believe livestock should Not be in residential or urban areas. Transmission of disease is one area of potential concern. Cleanliness, noise etc
- No urban farming of any kind, impact cannot be limited to neighbours and community.
- Fine for rural but not city.
- Stock living in the city is unfair to the animal and the neighbours. It also makes homes harder to sell.
- To noisy
- Too great of risk that they will be improperly cared for and pose a disease risk to and from wild bird populations and spread to food production poultry.
- Livestock belong on farms, not our very small, close together homes. They won't have the space. Also the smell...
- Absolutely not. Goats, cattle, swine, horses are not allowed in the city properties. Hens are for commercial purposes, they must be restricted from entering the city limits. There is no reason for a person to have a hen as a pet that can not be satisfied by another approved animal. If a person feels they need a hen, then they must move to a location that ownership of hens is approved. City communities must not be burdened with the time, and costs to evaluate each case. Hens are not approved now, they must stay not approved.
- Hens are acceptable with neighbour approval. I don't think other farm animals should be allowed in the City.
- I support sustainable agricultural practices and enabling people to provide for themselves. I believe this can be done hygienically on a small scale in cities.
- The constant noise and smell of farm animal near my house.
- Calgary is supposed to be urban living, not rural.
- i have lived next to urban hens and the smell and noise along with the insects is terrible.
- this bylaw DEFFINATLY needs to be changed. Livestock does not belong in the city limits.
- I am from a farm, roosters crow and should not be allowed. Pigs get big and if not properly confined can rip open fences very easily as they are smart animals. Male goats are very dirty and smelly. It would definitely be on a case to case basis and what animal they would want to keep in their yard. But definitely they would need their neighbors consent.
- I see it getting out of hand very fast and cleanliness of some yards becoming deplorable
- I would not like to see ultimate control being in the hands of just the Chief Bylaw Officer and would want the option of taking an issue to higher authorities including court.
- Stereotyping Pitt bulls is kinda like stereotyping black people. Use your head!!
- The city is no place for livestock.
- Harmless wildlife attracts harmful wildlife.
- "I dont think chicken will be careful by everyone the same.



- Too much noise.
- Too mess of lawns"
- "That's exactly what we need.
- Wet markets in every other back yard"
- Too many potential issues with noises, smells etc for neighbors
- Most yards are small and with 6 people's backyards backing against each other's fences the chickens are noisy and will Disturb others who are near them.
- No livestock should be allowed in city neighbourhoods
- Farm animals belong on farms
- If people want farm animals then move out to the country and buy a farm...this is the city.
- No chickens.
- They are farm animals
- Not sure what other livestock would be but I foresee this as a potential nuisance and problem for many Calgarians.
- Chickens are to noisy, especially for people who work shift work.
- Chickens can be quite loud in an urban environment. Also if not kept up on they do promote mice and rat issues. I found this via neighbours I had back in BC. there was a decent sized mouse population underneath the chicken coop. It's also a reason for smaller wildlife like fox, and even cougars to roam the area in hopes of a quick meal.
- impossible to monitor
- I was raised on a farm and lived on one for years and farm animals belong on a farm. The city can not effectively deal with dogs and cats so how are the going to deal with farm animals. Have you heard the noise a rooster makes at sunrise?
- I do not believe allowing hens in the city would be beneficial as diseases and predators will be more likely to appear.
- Living in an urban area means to give complicit consent to live in close proximity to others. That means sharing limited space. Introducing rural initiatives into urban environments means a virtual guarantee of conflict. Buy your eggs at the store, or move to the country.
- No livestock should be allowed in cities. If you want livestock then you should live in a rural area.
- Livestock (agriculture) should be limited to areas where the landowner has adequate space to reduce smells, noise etc
- we have a coyote problem why increase the problem with hens?
- Farm animals belong on farms!!! Chickens and turkeys are very stinky...
- Chickens are more work than ppl think
- Impossible to control. Too much can go wrong
- I do not agree with urban hens in Calgary
- If you want to have livestock on your property, buy a [removed] farm. It's not right for these animals to live in small confined areas. This whole bylaw needs to address [removed] people, and less about the animals. DO SOME HOMEWORK PEOPLE!!!!



- Livestock should remain only in rural settings.
- No one living inside city limits needs livestock, they aren't pets.
- I think there is enough of an issue with stray cats/dogs do we really need to add livestock to the mix? What happens when a chicken gets eaten by a dog or ages out? Are we going to say its okay to butcher them outside with possibility of blood being found in public areas? This will tie up the court systems. At present, to adopt a cat/dog there is no need to prove a person can care for the animal, nor that it has proper living conditions, etc. We do not presently enforce this with cats/dogs how would we do this with chickens and livestock? With more condominiums and apartments and the increase of immigrants coming to Calgary where do we draw the line between a 'pet' vs food source? What stops a person from processing animals in their home for food consumption? How does living with these animals comply with diseases that humans can contract from animals? Where is the health and safety standards? I mean we are dealing with COVID where animal bodily fluids have interacted with a human and it has caused a pandemic, what measures/controls do we have in place to ensure people are not living in animal feces and are properly cleaning up? I am sorry but not all people are great at being pet owners and adding more types of 'pets' to the mix sounds like a disaster waiting to happen... below you even ask about pigeons and odour management... who is enforcing any of this?
- the last 3 bullet points I agree with. however if I have a hen it should not have to benefit the community. I should not have to share my eggs, or baby chicks with the community. if the neighbours are cool and the animal is taken care of there should not be an obligation to share my animal with any one else. If you own a dog or a cat you are not obligated to share that animal with the community. Imagine, neighbour "hey can I take your dog for a walk?", Me "no, It's my dog", neighbour "well you need to share it or else it will be seized from you"?
- Why add more animals?
- I always thought having laying hens was a great idea. That's was until I was invaded by rats! I live in a lovely community. Never had rodents. Then we got 3 hens. Then the rats came. They got into my home. It was horrible. They did so much damage. It's just not worth the benefit of eggs. I would not want hens allowed in communities where home would be invaded by rats.
- Livestock should not be kept in the city, Most yards are not big enough to hold such animals, but as long as the animals do not become a nuisance and are kept healthy and clean it is not my business
- I totally disagree with having urban hens and any other LIVESTOCK in small city lots.
- Yards are getting smaller with even less privacy, so with that in mind it is not fair to neighbours of the owners of these animals. My daughter's neighbour has a duck living next door right now, which is totally illegal in Walden where 4 houses share one fence!
- This would attract too many coyotes.
- Not all people will keep it clean. Plus roosters wake up real early!
- I believe that there isn't enough power to enforce rules, or enough bylaw presence to ensure rules are being followed.
- farm animals should remain on farms



- Communities are always changing with new people moving in and out. The expectation of having long term support of neighbours is not feasible
 - Knowledge how to dispose of animal waste or the diseases and smells that come with it are limited.
 - I do not want chickens ect. next door and the smell and mess associated with that.
 - Livestock should not be within Calgary city boarders. We are too big of a city.
 - Most Livestock require space to be kept humanely in a way that is not possible in urban backyards.
 - Farm animals belong on the farm - the city is too hectic for them.
 - I don't know what other than hens could be acceptable urban livestock.
 - I do not care for the increased rodent and coyote attraction from housing fowl. Nothing against the critters, just the wants of a few should not outweigh the public good in the neighborhood. Also who wants to hear a rooster at the crack of 3 am announcing it's presence, I've experienced this many times in third world countries where urban chickens are the norm.
 - "Definitely not. People do not have the expertise to care for farmed animals like hens, who have complex needs and space requirements. While this may seem like a more compassionate approach to securing eggs, it is not. Hens are typically purchased from a hatchery where males will be killed or eaten because they do not lay eggs. At the end of their lives, the hens may end up in industrial slaughter operations or killed by someone with no experience.
-
- However, I would support allowing people to care for rescued hens on their property, so long as they are not exploited and slaughtered."
 - I think there is too much potential for things to go wrong
 - It will get out of control, just like off leash area where homes back onto off leash area.
 - Chickens are farm animals and they can carry diseases like pot belly pigs which calgary also allows in homes(yuck)
 - Livestock belong in the rural areas, the smell is not pleasant. It is bad enough that large dogs are kept in tiny apartments. Not fair to the these animals.
 - I have lived next to a rooster before and it is terrible.
 - Livestock does NOT belong in an urban setting. It belongs in clean fresh air with room to roam, such as the case may be.
 - Should not allow any livestock including hens.
 - Not sure I want live stock in my neighborhood. People dont bother to take care of cats and dogs. We dont need livestock running around
 - Enough issues in Calgary with dogs and cats.
 - Livestock need more room then a city/condo can offer. It will become overcrowded, dirty & noisy very fast.
 - People can't even look after dogs and cats properly, and so often, the problems that come up with pets are because of the owners...not the pets themselves. Are we expecting chicken owners to be a more responsible class of citizens than dog and cat owners? What if adjacent neighbours approve,



move and new neighbours do NOT approve? What happens to the poor chickens who don't get a say? Chickens are lovely and sweet creatures, and I've experienced urban homes (Vancouver) that have had them (the chickens were ultimately killed by raccoons). I don't believe this is a Pandora's box that The City of Calgary should open.

- Chickens and other farm animals require care that most urban residents are not likely willing or able to provide. Also, noise and smell levels would be a concern for many.
- I do not want to live down-wind of urban hens. I live in the city so I don't have to be around farming operations.
- Livestock should not be in the city limits unless it's on an acreage.
- Chickens would be quite messy. I wouldn't want feathers all over my yard
- The probably of the mess, smell and owners not taking care of them. The added interest of wildlife roaming to get at them
- The law should be specific enough so that the discretion of Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer is not necessary.
- No urban livestock.
- The future is plant based. Let's not move backwards and increase opportunity for animals to be exploited.
- I don't think Calgary is ready to support more livestock at this time. I worry about bad owners including abusive behaviour and those unable to take care of their livestock properly.
- It opens up too many potential issues.
- We already have a neighbor with hens. Noisy and messy. It also gets neighbouring dogs too excited.
- do not know what other animals you are referring to
- Too much smell and noise
- Why would I want to listen to livestock? Have you heard how noisy they are? This is unacceptable for highly populated areas.
- Livestock is not meant to become urbanized, if people want to have those types of hobbies or lifestyles they need to move to a rural location. The smell and condition of farm animals requires a lot of space to not be an issue.
- Poor use of tax dollars
- I wouldnt want livestock beside me with noise, and smells.
- Livestock has no place in the city. If someone wants to own hens, they can move outside the city limits to a property that is suited for such an activity.
- Barn animals can transmit disease and encourage wild animal prowling. Please do not allow this.
- Too much potential for neighbour conflicts.
- Hens don't belong in the city
- smell and noise would be an issue.
- why the would we need chickens within city limits?
- If people are going to have a pet horse it will not be okay, the animal will suffer because they need space and not all the noise from the city or a cow.



- I am severely allergic to farm animals , hay and all that comes along with the care and maintenance of farm animals. The smell , and gas toxins that come from these animals all effect my breathing. I don't live on a farm for a reason and if my neighbour decided to make their backyard a farm it would have negative impacts to my health on a daily basis .
- Loud
- I don't want domestic fowl in the city AT ALL. Attracts large wildlife to community -> damage to neighbour property. Stinky. Noisy.
- No
- Don't want them around.
- I don't believe that the size of property provided within the city would provide the proper amount of space for livestock, which can't exult in a cruel situation for the animals involved. In addition, it will make reselling of property more difficult as livestock can be harsh on grass (e.g., pigs).
- Livestock should remain on farms, not in the city
- Chickens should not be in a city
- "Want farm animals, buy a farm!"
- Where do you stop, maybe a lion, its not as dangerous as you make pitbulls out to be"
- This should remain outside city
- Do not want the smell of chicken or pigs in the neighborhood
- I have zero faith in humanity actually caring for them properly.
- Absolutely not!!! I think you will have too many people not follow the rules and the smell and noise would be a huge issue for remaining neighbors.
- So you guys are concerned about 45 lbs. 'pitbulls' but are considering bending the rules on 1,500 lbs. cows in a yard?
- Those who want livestock should move to rural areas where the potential to disturb neighbors is reduced.
- Too complicated to regulate. While neighbours may initially agree, once the animals arrive their opinion may change. Bylaw officers have better things to do.
- bylaw officers need to check on the animals weekly to ensure proper care of the animals is being adhered to. I don't think the city will do that.
- High density urban settlements are no place for livestock.
- farm animals belong on a farm or acreage not in the city.
- I don't see why we need farm animals in the city, and I don't want to hear barn yard animals along with having to deal with all my neighbors fire pit smoke, it's too much.
- Cask grab
- Livestock can be loud and interrupt people on a community
- Noise/smell
- They can be noisy and smell. I would be concerned about disease.
- The feces from hens can carry diseases.



- Livestock belong in the country, not in an urban setting. Not only stressful for livestock to be confined in small spaces but also small livestock are attractants for nuisance wildlife like coyotes / cougars, neither of which we need coming into contact with the people / and their pets
- I fear that one day the Avian flu will reappear. The world is crazy enough with Covid. When cages aren't cleaned for long periods of time the feces will dry up and fly away in the wind.
- Although I support it for support animals I feel that it would be easily abused by individuals for other uses.
- It's been proven that it doesn't work in other provinces applied, not only about 1 type of breed is about responsible owners
- However livestock in an urban city opens up the potential for disease
- If you want to maintain livestock, buy/rent an acreage. These should not be allowed in city limits.
- I live in the city not on a farm!
- My experience has been negative. Smelly, flies, feathers everywhere. If you want chickens, move to an acreage.
- Yards are small typically in Calgary. Disease spreads quickly. Huge monitoring cost for the city
- As someone who grew up with chickens, they're gross, loud, and stinky. I would hate to be living next door to that. Animals that produce high odors (farm animals) should be kept on farms out of the city. The city is no place for a barnyard animal. It's cruel and stressful
- If you can have chickens, fine but the neighbor shouldn't have a say.
- There would be a lot of problems for this such as odour and noise
- We already have too many nuisance birds in Calgary that the city will do absolutely nothing about even when they become aggressive towards pets and humans.
- Any livestock should have enough space to roam free on their property. They belong on a farm.
- No live stock in the city
- Too much noise and smell.
- I do not believe that livestock belongs in a city/urban environment.
- Don't feel like there should be livestock in the city. There are plenty of farms on the outskirts that people can go to for fresh animals.
- You are going to end up with dogs living next door to hens and potentially hunting a hen. Should a dog kill a hen does this dog then become a nuisance animal? Keep hens out in the country they do not belong in the city.
- Hens should stay outside the city, they are too noisy and messy.
- Unless there is adequate space between homes I do not feel that it is fair to neighbors. Sometimes there is good intentions in the beginning but over time care of animal could be jeopardized. There is enough abuse of animals already that institutions like (SPCA etc.) cannot cope with. Having to deal with farm animals to find adoptive homes in the event of neglect/abuse is another burden for these systems. Move to a rural community if your desire is to own farm animals.
- Livestock need space and room to run around and be LOUD. And the fact they can smell.. BAD.. I know because we had a hobby farm ON 80 ACERS



- My neighbour should have no say.... they didn't ask me if they could get a barking dog, or a bird-killing cat....
 - An urban environment is not the place for livestock
 - "Let's fix one problem, get real good at accountability for dogs and then add a new problem later.
-
- Also, guaranteed you are going to have a barnyard next to a home with dogs and there will be barnyard vs dogs issues going on. If a dog (historically had to hunt and kill animals to live) kills a hen because it got in their yard, is that dog now a nuisance? If the dog barks nonstop because of the hens, is the dog the problem or the hens that cluck all day?"
 - Livestock belong on farms, outside of the Urban Center.
 - Farm animals belong outside of the city. City lots are not made for farm animals. They also smell, and are noisy and would effect more individuals than simply the owners. If you want to own farm animals, like on an acreage.
 - Increased noise / smell if not properly maintained requiring further resources from city to follow up on complaints
 - Chickens are manageable within a regular yard, however this may not be the case for other livestock. I think that larger animals require larger living space, it's not fair to the animals to confine them to a yard.
 - Not keeping the chicken coop clean and organized
 - Chickens belong on the farm. Assuming that is what a 'hen' refers to.
 - Cats are not allowed to be cats. They have claws, sharp teeth. City won't allow them to roam, bcuz ppl complain about them. But..ppl can have CHICKENS ? WHAT THE HECK !! Crazy. Chickens belong on a FARM !!! What is wrong with the world
 - It oiled be dirty and I would be worried about Neighbour's not properly cleaning after the hens. I am worried about the perennial smell it would chaise.
 - farm animals belong on the farm. Hens smell. People like this idea but many won't take proper care. Imagine living next to a chicken coop on a beezy day in the city. If I wanted to live on a farm I wouldn't live in the city.
 - Live stock do not belong inside the city. They need space and belong on farms or larger acreages and to be owned by someone that can care for them properly.
 - fleas
 - Farm animals should not live in the city
 - Urban 'livestock' attract pests and rodents. I'd guess that 90% of owners don't have a clue what it takes to manage poultry etc properly. Would also lead to an uncontrolled black market for meat and eggs.
 - I find that although there is an openness for neighbour support, that is head to do without creating negative feelings. I feel that it would be easy to get Neighbourhood approval for loud or smelly



livestock while neighbours maybe less onboard but don't want to create a dispute by declining a request.

- I personally would not want to live next door to a bunch of smelly noise chickens etc!if you want to raise livestock go live on a farm.
 - Hens should not be allowed in residential neighborhoods. If someone wants a hen, they should not be living in a house.
 - Only because I am unsure what living conditions need to be met for hens to live indoors
 - "I grew up on a farm
 - Chickens need space to roam and need a lot of care and time and effort
 - Not to mention with coyotes around your just asking for them to come more and more into the city"
 - My concerns would be environmental impact, both for the animal and neighborhood. Smells, noise, proper care.
 - your neighbours should not have a say in what you do with or on your property
 - People struggle to take dogs for walks and have cats only on their property. Why introduce more factors.
 - There is no need for livestock to be in the city and a neighbor who is not adjacent but on the same block could be affected by odor and noise.
 - Livestock cannot have a good quality of life in urban areas.
 - last thing I want is to see people slaughter chickens in their backyard for dinner.
 - City people often dont understand the needs of livestock animals. City homes also don't offer the room necessary for livestock to roam.
 - "Exceptions would be evaluated on a case by case basis and the decision would be at the discretion of the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer.
-
- This seems like it would just add a huge amount of unnecessary work."
 - Our neighbourhood's are not farm land
 - I don't feel that these animals belong within city limits. I wouldn't want to live next to the noise and mess UNLESS maybe a proper enclosure was built, but who could ensure this?
 - You want to take my dog but allow live stock? Thats disgusting. No.
 - I do not feel that the majority of yards in Calgary are large enough to accommodate urban hens.
 - Anyone should be allowed chickens.
 - This opens the opportunity for more livestock to be requested
 - Still shouldn't have a he
 - Bird feces create a smell and attract rodents. There are sufficient sources of eggs available without allowing urban hens. Also concerned about animal welfare. As an adjacent neighbour i wd oppose urban hens and this wd create conflict amongst neighbours.
 - hens and goats are not for a city . I certainly wouldn't want to have a neighbor that has hens or goats. The stink of their poop and they can be very loud.



- Just think you're opening a large can of worms with neighbor complaints and grey areas of what animals would be allowed
- Imagine every house had hens. The care needed is higher the amount of wildlife entering the city looking for food would increase this puts our citizens in danger. Do you want more coyotes? Because that's how you get them.
- You allow farm animals but still target pit bulls?
- We don't live on farms. If you want hens or other livestock, move out of the city
- My neighbours are loud enough without a bunch of chickens making noise and potentially smells and allergens.
- Could be a nuisance for neighbors and chickens are noisy and stinky
- We do not need to allow livestock in the city.
- Would need to see the entire proposal, where the hens will be kept, how many, how far from a residential areas, will there be check ups often to assure animal welfare is being held up, where will the waste they create go?
- Enough by laws
- Noise, smell, allergies- if you want to do this it should be done in a rural area or property large enough that neighbours don't have to listen to chickens or smell them.
- get an acreage or farm. Feel free to rent space somewhere this is no Bakersfield
- We're concerned about people letting these animals loose if they decide that they don't want them. Rabbits are a problem in Canmore already; they could be considered livestock too.
- Chickens have no place in an urban center. Not everyone follows the rules.
- Chickens do not belong in an urban setting. Period
- I think this could contribute to the already large live stock neglect so many animals already face.
- Not sure exactly.
- Livestock doesn't belong in the city
- Are hens or the other animals being considered trainable? What would the noise be like?
- Livestock and other "farm animals require specific environment and care to ensure their health and wellbeing.
- Livestock were originally banned from cities for good reasons, namely noise, health, disease, smell, manure, urine. Terrible idea to allow any back!
- They're annoying
- The density of the city is not ideal for livestock and is likely to result in more neighbour disputes (eg, noise, smell). If allowed, will there be training courses required to ensure livestock are being correctly cared for by people with no experience?
- Farm animals should not be allowed within city limits. No exceptions
- Don't want to hear any early morning cocks crowing
- They are farm animals and do not belong in the city
- Only in rural or farm settings
- Because I feel like this would lead to unrealistic living situations and do more harm than good sadly



- Live stock does not belong in the city. They cannot recorded adequate housing and care in city limits.
- First of all, the term livestock is horrendous. They're not stock - they're animals. And, to only allow certain animals to live within the city based on how they would benefit humans is ridiculous. Backyard hens as a way to get eggs are cruel - those hens come from hatcheries where the male chicks are macerated one the day they're born.
- I do not want to live next to farm animals!
- I am worried of the animals being neglected as well as an increase in coyotes.
- they belong on farms in the country.
- having chickens in city is only anogher reason for predators to remain in the area.
- No one person should be allowed to decide what can be allowed in any area of the city
- Homes are far too close in the city and this would only cause more neighborhood issues
- They belong on farms
- If my neighbours decide to have pigeons in their homes, even if I as their neighbour, don't support that decision, I have no control over it and would be forced to deal with these pigeons without a choice. It's not the same as having a domestic animal, pigeons are wild and cannot be tamed.
- I don't feel livestock have a place within the city limits. They carry diseases and attract other wildlife.
- No one wants to live in the city and have livestock as neighbors
- Livestock of any form should not be allowed in Calgary.
- The noise And smell
- Livestock is meant to be kept on large properties
- "Our neighbors have 3 dogs and their backyard is covered with dogs feces.
- Allowing hens would create early morning noise and hens' shouts and ""songs"" all day long , will create dirt and feces and the smell. Not everyone would treat their livestock responsibly and that would create tensions in the neighborhoods."
- Most yards in the city do not provide enough room for appropriate livestock ownership and those who have yards large enough are *usually* wealthier and if they were allowed livestock it would widen the wealth gap further. Unfair.
- Urban hens are a nuisance to neighbours and I personally would not want to live next to a chicken coop.
- No barnyard animals inside city limits. Not even therapy chickens etc.
- Because I wouldn't want the noise or smell next to my house
- Bring mice rats wildlife to our back yards
- High potential to cause issues with neighbours, for example noise caused by animals, smell, allergies, etc.
- already too many bobcats and coyotes in the city.
- Impacts resale values of property. Just imagine having pig pen in your neighbor's backyard or goat poo everywhere, or just hen's clucking!
- The cost for bylaw and control would not support the change.



- Farm animals belong on a farm. It's a thing
- I have right to enjoy peaceful leaving and these [REMOVED] hens always making noise early in the morning. This should remain illegal go to the store or local farmers to keep economy stimulated. Seriously keep our communities clean! We do not need this looking like a third world country. Major cities in Ontario and B.C. do not allow this so why should we? Go to a rural setting if you want to keep these things.
- no way, too loud, if you have a neighbour with nuisance birds good luck getting rid of them bylaws won't do anything.
- Noisy cockerels can cause a disturbance in an urban environment
- A city environment is unique in having many people in close proximity, which would need to be considered when allowing livestock within. Biosecurity is another important consideration since there are many potentially zoonotic diseases that may be introduced in our backyard herds that could potentially negatively impact our larger production groups, which we must certainly be careful to consider. For example, if someone had a backyard pig they fed scraps to, they could potentially feed it foreign meat containing foot and mouth disease, which could severely affect market access and our national pork industry.
- Noise and odours. Rodents.
- Not needed
- I think it would be difficult to monitor and difficult situations between neighbours would occur.
- I don't think they belong in the city and should not want them in my neighbourhood.
- I think this would require a higher level of oversight.
- I would not want my neighbors having hens in the city!
- City has enough to do to enforce dog/cat control. There is enough surrounding farmland for those interested in livestock.
- I don't believe the city is a place for any type of livestock animal.
- What happens if neighbours move and new neighbours do not agree with the presence of livestock?
- I feel hens will attract more predatory wildlife (Bob cats, coyotes, etc.) therefore bringing more harm to Calgarians and their pets.
- "Support from adjacent neighbors seems like a fluid situation
- If I approve of my neighbor having hens/small livestock - but then subsequently list my property for sale would likely be an obstacle to finalize a sale"
- Loud, smelly, maybe need to have X size yard to be able to have them.
- No hens in the city
- Why does it have to have a community benefit? I would only want to use keep the eggs for myself. Why do we need neighbour support? We don't have to ask them for a fire pit. The smoke from a fire pit is pretty irritating and spreads to more than the adjacent neighbours. Also what if neighbours are renters or a property management company is not available for support?
- If people want livestock they can live in the country. I lived on a farm and the thought of having the sound of chickens (or anything else, yappy dogs included) coming from one of the neighbouring properties is an annoyance



- I understand that people would love to have the “Urban farm” but at what expense? I honestly do not feel the need for any of my neighbors to have them. The smell is disgusting and if not kept up on it can be overpowering.
- Absolutely not. Hens and livestock would be adding to the problem that we already have with pet owners who are not responsible. It would be very difficult to enforce appropriate behaviour.
- Chickens are noisier and more dirty and are more likely to escape people's yards than every dog in this city.
- Too much animal cruelty in Calgary. No proper living conditions would be reinforced as the City finds that as long as an animal has food and shelter, it's all good. Well it's not. Why not, instead, reinforce your laws against PEOPLE who abuse their pets??
- Its a city not the country side.
- Move to the Country if you want livestock.
- No hens in city
- Let's ensure the dogs & cats are taken care of first before offering other animals for stretched bylaw / humane services to look after
- nn
- All farm animals belong on acreages or farms, and not in cities.
- I think that many of the current practices that are in place are harmful and damaging to both owners and their pets especially if they're an at risk animal potentially a nervous dog
- No birds in the city that's what farms are for!
- Having owned chickens, they are noisy and smelly if uncared for properly.
- Livestock do not belong in the city. This could lead to poorly maintained property, smells, nuisance noise and is just another thing to police.
- Not in the city limits
- I don't support keeping animals for agriculture
- If the city cannot manage the ability to control and monitor household pet owners and ensure that there is suitable housing/training/socializing for the animals already residing in the city, it is a waste of time and resources to attempt to bring more animals into the city.
- "disease
- Bacteria"
- Suburbia isn't a farm
- They would likely be mistreated and considering the weather conditions, they could suffer due to wrongful enclosures and care
- We currently have neighbors who can't keep her yard clean from dog feces. Having chickens will compound the unhealthy environment that is only a few feet away from adjacent neighbors.
- Just don't feel there is a need to keep hens in Calgary.
- Livestock belongs on a farm not the city.
- no livestock in the city
- Most of the city does not have space to raise chickens.



- I don't think suitable conditions are possible in the city limits.
- I don't want to live next to a farm
- I strongly do not support urban hens in Calgary. Urban hens can transmit disease to humans, and can also attract rodents and predators. Additionally there are odour, animal waste and noise issues. I grew up on a farm with chickens, and worked as an academic librarian supporting veterinary medicine, so am familiar with some of the professional literature on these problems.
- it depends on the animals. If they are noisy and disturb people sleeping after they work hard I would say no. If they are not causing disturbance to neighbors then why not.
- Hens and livestock cause issues with noise and smell for neighbors.
- Tell the hippie to go live in the country. Hens and chicken coops are disgusting. Do not allow it!
- No livestock in the city limits
- We don't have the climate for (most) people to responsibly have outdoor livestock. I worked in a green house for several years, and it was amazing how many people came back with pond fish because they didn't realize they needed extra equipment to over winter them. Too much room for animal abuse imo
- We are close enough to rural jurisdiction where hens and livestock are permitted. No need to allow them in the city. Too much risk, bacteria and infection may follow, will also increase the coyote problem
- Doesn't make sense
- Too many citizens would interpret the bylaws for or against themselves and others.
- It would just be like the goats. There is a lot more that this money can go to than animals that the city neglects.
- Noise, smell, and damages caused. Adjacent neighbours aren't only ones affected.
- There is insufficient funding available to ensure adequate inspection of livestock facilities. Also concerns about disease spread to wild birds. It only takes a few birds to escape in order for feral chickens to take over.
- I'm very allergic and if my neighbor had hens in their yard I would suffer greatly.
- Definitely don't need the smell/noise/mess in my neighborhood
- I don't feel that property sizes in Calgary are large enough to support livestock of any kind
- Hens are farm animals
- We already have many issues with neighbour relations and lack of respect and consideration for each other. This is a recipe for disaster, particularly in new neighborhoods where houses are VERY close to each other.
- Hygiene issues
- I wouldn't want chickens or livestock living beside or near me (noise, smell etc)
- Hens are not a city pet
- Unnecessary within city limits.
- Noise
- Just no, they don't belong in the city.



- Fine with farms having farm animals.
- Noise, smell and mess that comes with an urban hen.
- If I wanted to be around farm animals I would live on a farm
- Chickens can be noisy, smelly, and offensive to neighbours. They are not pets, urban Calgary is no place for livestock of any variety.
- Hens cause neighbour drama.
- Livestock belong in country.
- .
- livestock can be smelly, noisy, and/or dirty. It is hard to monitor if the animals are a problem, it is very hard to enforce any rules because by-law officers are so busy.
- I live in a CITY not on a FARM
- Growing up on a farm and having first hand experience with hens and other livestock, it is my opinion that b/c of city living space restrictions as well as proximity to neighbors, etc. would create a stressful habitat for the animals - as well as likely create a space that is not "friendly" to neighbors (ie, smell, noise, potential escapes, etc.)
- This is way too vague. Don't really understand what animals and what criteria is involved??
- I believe this can increase yard waste, noise and issues amongst neighbours. This would also draw in more wildlife.
- Inner city housing should not be able to keep hens outdoors because they are noisy, and also require more space to be happy and healthy than most yards can provide.
- I think farm animals should be on a farm, not in a small coop in the city.
- For city lot sizes I think it would be very difficult having adequate space for suitable living conditions for most species (Pidgeon's below probably an exception)
- Livestock carry diseases, are loud and smell bad
- Chickens are loud. What are you going to do when noise complaints come in about the chickens and other animals?
- Would be more open to this on larger lots, but 25ft lots are too small to accommodate.
- Animals are not for food
- Not interested in this idea at all. Horrible idea.
- I would support urban hens, but I would also have concerns. I am on the fence if I would like to participate in having my own hens. I am not against the idea. But, then my number one concern would be if my neighbours had hens and they were noisy.
- The evidence is quite clear that people and livestock living in close quarters leads to zoonotic infections. Chickens carry avian influenza and other diseases. They are not benign pets but rather livestock that should be kept by people with expertise in animal husbandry.
- An urban home setting is not an appropriate place for livestock.
- livestock belongs on a farm
- people can not take care of their CATs when we have hens, how would you enforce rules of this if you can not already enforce rules with cats



- It's already stated in here about dogs having nuisance behaviours, and having a larger fine on that. Now you're wanting to bring in livestock, this will open a whole other can of worms with nuisance. There are not enough bylaw officers to be able to handle all of this.
 - They're loud and can be dirty (mites etc) if not cared for properly
 - I don't support urban hen's
 - If you want hens move to a farm. There's not proper space.
 - Livestock (goats, sheep, pigs, turkeys, or whatever else this might cover) is better suited to rural areas. It's cruel to keep pent up animals in an urban environment. Luckily the city is surrounded by rural land for someone who want to raise livestock to move to.
 - Can people properly care for them?
 - Yards are small and the smell may be an issue. The city is I place for farm animaly
 - Chickens are filthy dirty and the smell can be atrocious. Having lived on a farm, with chickens, I know what is involved.
 - Could be smelly if not cared for properly
 - Livestock does not belong in the city. They smell, carry different types of parasites.
 - People cant even take care of their current pets, dont add more.
 - the risk of rodents/ pests increases substantially with birds, along with the unpleasant smells associated with owning birds.
 - Cities are not the place for farm animals.
 - I don not want to be woken by roosters. Farm yes. City - no..
 - No animals other than cats, dogs, rodents and fish should be allowed within the city limits.
 - Urban and rural are separated for a reason! Also Urban chickens provides 3rd world optics nobody wants that environment.....if you eat it it's not suitable for urban pets!
 - People would be diligent at first but when interest wains troubles could arise
 - These should not be in city limits
 - We have to many rabbits. We don't need chicken as well.
 - Go live on a farm if you want livestock
 - If I wanted to live on a farm I would.
 - Animals other than chickens do not belong in a city. They should only be kept on rural properties.
 - ""No objection" more so...I believe we're doing just fine getting our eggs from the store
-
- Also, for the pigeon thing 1-10 is pretty broad. 5 would be my max."
 - Houses are often very close together in urban Calgary and if a neighbor has a dog or cat, it could lead to disruptive interactions between the pets (dog barking, cat in the yard stalking the birds) and also hens can be noisy in the early morning hours, which disrupts a lot of neighbors in the area. Not to mention the smell of the chicken poop if it's not managed properly. I think it could be an option in areas where house lots are much larger than average where there is more distance between lots, and all adjacent neighbors agree to it, ie. Bowness?



- Neighbours can be difficult with no real reason
- There is no need to have livestock in urban areas.
- Most people have no idea how to properly care for livestock and the shelter will be inundated.
- Back yards in suburban areas are too small (noise, smells) and handling and mishandling of the waste could be a health issue for neighbours.
- "Life stock animals should not be in the city, can be out of towns like in farms or acres.
- I would not like to wake up to hear a cock crowing at 5.00am in the morning."
- Too noisy.
- Can see how this plays out. As communities densify and there is less and less 'yard' and houses are crammed tighter and tighter, it is cruel to animals to put them into something like this, not to mention the good neighbour thing. Regardless of bylaws - unfortunately, there just isn't enough follow-up.
- Livestock belong on farms, not in the city.
- If you want livestock, move out of the city. There is no place for the stink and filth of urban chickens and livestock.
- "I don't want to be waken up at dawn by farm animals from my house neighbour.
- All of you city dwellers spend a night outside with hens/farm animals, and tell me you'd be okay having your neighbour having hens and/or livestock!"
- I support urban hens, but "other livestock" is too broad
- They smell
- Livestock does not belong in the city.
- Farm animals should be on a farm.
- You want farm animals... live on a farm. You want farm fresh eggs laid by well cared for hens..... find a farmer who could use your support and pay them. Consider being the "egg" person and collect weekly for your community and deliver fresh eggs as requested to the households that are interested. Seriously people, we have amazing local farmers who raise and care for their animals they way they deserve. They're called "farm" animals for a reason.
- I think this opens up the door to having these other animals be a problem for neighbors, with noise and smells.
- Not enough room in the city to graze, excessive fecal matter getting in storm system, spreading of disease.
- Barnyard animals do not belong in the City
- Too much room for different approvals for equal proposals. Will become chaotic and who has the greatest moxy and argumentation to get support.
- Farm animals are called that for a reason. Noise, odour and the attraction of vermin are the reasons there should be no farm animals in developed residential areas.
- Livestock that requires farm size land cannot be properly homes within city limits. If there is a farm IN TOWN then yes.



- How is the City planning on the clean up and increased waste created by the animal? Are the owners going to have increased fees associated with the property, waste clean up, etc to help pay for this? Maybe regions in the city would be acceptable but not wholesale across city limits.
- ""Other livestock"" is not defined in this survey. I would not want to live next door to a neighbour who was raising ""other livestock"" without knowing specifically what those livestock were. The word ""livestock"", to me, means ""farm animals"". Aside from the noises and smells, this would not be desirable, for me, to live beside such a household. The place for these animals should be on a farm or acreage. If that acreage is inside city limits, that is fine, as long as it is big enough to contain the activities, smells and noise of such operations.
- It says that it is proposed that support be obtained from adjacent neighbours first. Be very careful with this, as neighbours may initially support, but what happens if they sell and the new neighbour does not support? That would be an administrative nightmare to rectify. What constitutes ""adjacent""? Next door? Two houses away? Three? What if the next door neighbour approves, but the guy two houses over does not?? (Or the guy a block away downwind??) As well, how humane would it be for such ""livestock"" to be raised on a typical city lot? Would they have enough room to roam? How would the owner dispose of animal waste? Would they be butchering out in the back yard? What if someone who keeps hens decides they want a noisy rooster in addition to their hens? How would that be dealt with by the city? What if the rooster owner decides to challenge the 'hens only' rule in court? (Sexual discrimination... ha ha). What would become of the rooster waiting for that to filter through the system, and the neighbours who would be subjected to the noise of a crowing rooster (they crow all day, not just at dawn) while the case winds its way through court? Disaster.... not to mention additional litigation costs thrust on to the City.
- How well would I be able to sell my house next door to an ""other livestock"" operation? Would I suffer a loss in my property value as a result? No thanks - please do not allow this. Nightmare!!
- Noise and hygiene concerns.
- Livestock belong on a farm where they can have adequate space they need
- I don't need to hear or smell livestock of any kind in the city limits. It's a main reason I sold my house in Airdrie
- Livestock does not belong in an urban setting
- If you want to farm move to the country
- Don't like having fowl in city limits - less clean
- Noisy, stinky, diseased animal situations are not for a city.
- Smelling insanitary conditions.
- Farm animals have a lot of odor.
- "(a) Nobody really needs a chicken in their yard. (b) I grew up on a farm. Chickens are really noisy and create a lot of odor.
- If, against all common sense, the city does allow urban chickens it has to require the express written consent of every adjacent property owner."



- They are noisy during quiet times
- We live in the inner city, and the sanitation, noise and health issues that arise with animal husbandry are a concern.
- Would be too hard to police for proper care and non nuisance
- Calgary does not have the resources to ensure bylaws are being followed by home owners.
- I would not want hens living next door. They should be on a farm.
- Noise and smell - also animals need space to roam
- I live very close to my neighbours, and can only imagine how disruptive this might be - I also have 2 dogs that have a prey instinct. I would support as long as there is a minimum distance between backyards, etc.
- I do not want chickens in an urban setting
- No hens in the city! If people want them badly, they can move to an acreage/farm. Hens or other farm animals do not belong in the city.
- "Hens can be noisy and make mess, and in areas in the City that back onto green spaces could attract animal predators.
- Also if it were to go ahead there should be annual licensing and a fee for each hen. Just like there is a fee for a dog licenses. Enforcement and adjudication must be paid by the animal owner, not coming from general revenues."
- Chickens are okay but any other livestock would cause more harm than good. There is also almost no place they can love within city limits that wouldn't be cruel
- All hens or livestock should be held on rural property
- no farm animals in the city .. that's a nuisance having them in the city
- I do not support anybody from the city at their discretion making decisions that is proven idiotic and all it does is make residents angry
- "Today even with dogs there are those who will get them and then not take care of them. What guarantee is there that we aren't adding another type of animal to the already existing neglect and abuse issues that already exist. Do not add another animal to a bylaw when we don't even have enough resources to tend to the dogs and cats that are in this city. I wouldn't want to be subjected to the noise and smell from chickens never mind disease. Does this include butchering?
- If the neighbor puts a chicken coop near the fence line between neighbors, do I know have to smell it and listen to it."
- I believe animals would/could be neglected and couldn't possibly be harassed/injured by neighbours who are upset about them being nearby.
- Livestock seems to vague for me to answer this. I don't know what type of animals are being considered to be able to say yes. I'd need more details.
- Even if all neighbors are ok with a chicken coop what about if one of them moves. They limit the potential buyers or the new owners are afraid to speak out. I'm all for having a bee farm, chickens or goats... that's a benefit of living on a farm or acreage! City is for pets, not livestock. You want chickens, move out to the country!
- health concerns, noise concerns, space restrictions



- Carry disease if not well cared for and monitoring for 5 freedoms would be difficult- how do you ensure suitable living conditions on private property?
- enough of them support chickens and the disease they bring
- This is the City of Calgary and urban environment. If people want to raise farm animals, move to an acreage where it is acceptable or a farm. Think Pandemic and why these things happen.
- The City has no way to control owners of livestock. We do not need to become a 'third world' country...yet.
- "Calgary does NOT require Disease carrying Livestock! Especially dirty disgusting Pigeons! Like in Toronto & NYC.
- The Geese & Seagull Shit everywhere is more than Enough!
- What does this have to do with the Calgary pit bull ban?"
- Farm animals belong on a farm not in my neighbours backyard. I feel like it's ridiculous to be having this discussion. Live on a farm and/or acreage. Not in a city area with livestock.
- Not a big fan of farm type animals living in city
- I THINK IT WOULD DEPEND ON YOUR LOCATION AND THE SIZE OF YOUR YARD, AND RULES AROUND THE KEEPING OF HENS PROPERLY
- Farm animals should not be permitted in the city. It breathes rodents, flies, etc. this is a very unsanitary idea. People also have allergies. No. No. No.
- because it causes disease and more filth and litter
- I am concerned that there is no limit on the amount of livestock. I would be ok with 2 chickens, not 10+. Concerns about cleanliness of yards and pens and enforcement.
- Livestock can be loud, they smell and are always outdoors unlike a traditional pet
- Avian flu. Chickens are vectors.
- Birds are noisy and dirty
- I support hens for eggs, but I cannot see the value of other livestock
- with all due respect to those including myself who would love an urban hobby farm, at inspection time all could look suitable and well, but as I've witnessed with dog owners, clean up in -20 and up does not happen leaving an unacceptable mess in spring or throughout the winter melt and freeze situations we have here in Calgary.
- Undecided.
- People need to still learn how to take care of their domestic animals first. Sadly, I fear this will open up more animal cruelty.
- There is no way chickens should be allowed to be raised in the city, this is a slippery slope that leads to the establishment of unclean and foul smelling urban farms as well as the noise nuisance such animals bring along.
- It can be concerning to hear chickens at the early hours of the day and the odor can be very intrusive. If you want livestock, purchase land in the rural area.
- Having fowl in yards will increase wild animal encounters.
- I oppose allowing urban hens or other livestock



- Chickens stink, are loud and can spread disease. Most people have no clue how to care for nor do they need farm animals with in the city.
- the noise and smell would be too hard to contain
- I don't even agree with hens much less other livestock. These animals belong on a farm.
- I do not feel like suitable living conditions will be upheld within the city and it would be a nuisance to neighbours
- Calgary neighbourhoods are already overcrowded. livestock would only see a rise in noise (and potentially odour) complaints.
- Keep farm animals on the farm
- There are many Restrictive Covenants on inner city properties which do not allow livestock of any kind.
- The city of Calgary is unable to have the resources to support the bylaws they already have in place. Not everyone will take care of hens correctly causing issues in your neighborhoods which the city of Calgary or CPS will not have the resources or the time to support
- Livestock should not be in the city. There isn't enough space on properties to support their spacial needs and not be a nuisance to neighbours.
- Smell.
- People are already bad pet owners
- Keep animals on the farm.
- Odors and insects that I do not want around my property
- It would just open up a huge can of worms so to speak.
- Livestock should be on farm land or larger plots of land that rural communities have.
- [removed]
- I believe living next door to a person who keeps hens, would not only be unpleasant for numerous reasons but would also de-value your property.
- i am against owning hens in calgary as they may be subject to a lot of abuse and i dont trust the SPCA to enforce or fine owners for neglect
- Unless you live outside the city or in a very rural/remote area live stock (including birds) should not be kept in city limits. They are farm animals - they need more space than a city back yard to live!
- Livestock do not belong in people's backyards. By-law enforcement is not enough to ensure these animals are treated fairly. Is this for an emotional welfare animal? If so these are not hens. if it's to have your own eggs, still not good. Livestock carry diseases. CANCEL THIS!!!! Chickens are allowed but dogs are a problem!!!! My mind is blown.
- I think this would be too difficult to manage.....too many rules/exemptions etc. urban homes are already so close together that having to deal with the sounds/smells associated with livestock would ruin my enjoyment of my own property
- To difficult to enforce probable animal abuse
- birds carry diseases and are noisy. Not an urban animal.
- chickens and other livestock belong on a ranch or farm.



- If I want to, I've near a farm and all of the smells that come with it, I will move to the country.
- There are already too many irresponsible animal owners in the city. Having livestock within city limits on a small lot is not fair for the animals and neighbors due to noise and smell
- Do you want to live beside a home that has chickens. The smell.
- It is hard to imagine having space for hens as we are a rather urban city - I have to think there would be almost no areas with large enough yards - attract predators, noise problems?
- Chickens don't belong in cities.
- It is really difficult already for bylaw to force current pet laws. If neighbors had chickens and they became difficult or not following by laws this would mean longer wait times and frustrations.
- I don't feel that urban areas are suitable for the well being of livestock or hens. There is a reason why these animals are kept on large plots of land outside of cities. Having large livestock in city areas will also contribute to air pollution
- I don't want chickens living in the city.
- Living in the city exempts one from smelling manure
- I THINK THE AMENDMENT TO THIS BYLAW NEEDS TO BE THROWN OUT. NOW.
- There is enough farm land for this purpose
- What other livestock?
- I doubt owners could be held accountable for neighbours' concerns about noise or health (i.e. viral spillover events.)
- leave bylaw as is - no livestock
- Slippery slope to allow urban hens. Bylaw will be take advantage of if not enforced.
- People already buy hens and ducks for Easter and give them up when they realize they don't know how to care for them and then overburdened rescue organizations end up taking them.
- We live in a city not In the country. If they want livestock live on an acreage.
- Chickens are disgustingly gross. They are noisy and if people do not clean up or maintain their cages they become stinky disgusting disease infested places that nobody wants to visit or live nearby. It's bad enough that people do not clean up after their cats and a lot of dog owners don't clean up after their dogs but now you're going to try and let people house chickens in their yard or in their house how do you expect to keep the city clean?
- I do not see how the city has the resources (ie. money) to administer this program.
- I do not believe that there is enough room in the city to properly accommodate a farm animal. You're just allowing people to mistreat these animals and shove them into small backyards.
- People already neglect domestic animals. Livestock do not need to be thrown into the mix. Plus there would be a large increase in complaints to the city.
- Few city yards are large enough to properly maintain livestock even if just one animal. I think keeping it to pigeons and chickens and even then controlling numbers, is fine.
- General public cannot be left to their own devices - not everyone has common sense!
- "I like chickens. However, they need to remain on farms. Chicken manure is smelly. Chickens attract predators.



- Feral chickens can be a real neighborhood problem."
- this will not be monitored well by bylaw - there are not enough bylaw officers in the city.
- I do not support livestock being in residential calgary as they are disease vectors, result in increased noise & smell, and can be a source of disease impacting farmers (eg avian flu etc).
- I think it's likely to lead to more neighbourhood disputes.
- livestock should remain where it is most healthy for them and neighbors - the farm or rural communities. There is no need in an urban environment to have livestock.
- Hens are farm animals and as such should not be allowed in a progressive modern city.
- It would not be fair to people living around them.
- livestock belongs out of the city.
- City has proved it is inefficient and unwilling to even enforce the existing by-laws. That would cause more problems to deal with in the future
- Homes are too close together in Calgary. There is no way that animals crammed into small lots will not have impacts on all of their surrounding neighbors. Poultry attracts other wildlife and also creates issues for some people's dogs and cats. Livestock can also attract rodents, flies, fleas, etc. I must say that we have lived in many different settings over the years, both urban and rural where all manner of livestock has been in "backyards". In most cases they create issues for the neighbours and unfortunately in a lot of the cases the animals are not kept as clean and well cared for as they should be.
- It breedism and another money grab and unfair to judge based on breed.
- Farm animals should not be allowed within the city of Calgary boundaries. If you want to raise farm animals go buy a farm outside of Calgary
- Hygiene and noise concerns.
- Yes and no, chickens yes, cows no. They are not pets. How would it be controlled, how do you ensure residents are properly treating, taking care of the animal. Already not enough control on small pets like dogs/cats on animal abusers there is no reason to put more animals in their arms.
- Noise/smell
- People have inconsistent control for their current animals or at the very least many owners lack common courtesy for their neighbours/community members - I see nothing but conflict and issues related to people over romanticizing backyard chickens. I would imagine that few people have any real experience raising livestock and their depth of understanding comes directly from a blog they're read, a reality TV show or a twitter feed.
- Unsanitary in the city and a nuisance to neighbours with constant noise. Not an animal I'd want to live next to
- to much feces involved
- Too many people would think raising chickens would be fun - until it comes time to clean up the mess they make. Neighbours would have to live with their bad choices.
- Hens smell bad and could annoy neighbours
- Legislated responsible livestock ownership within city limits seems feasible. However, the resources necessary to facilitate this should not taken from other areas requiring those resources. Above all



else, our current "system" should be improved before we look to introduce new ways of owning "pets".

- Bad smells, sanitation - let's learn from Covid-19!!
- I feel that hens stink and if not properly taken care could become a problem.
- Already we have a problem where people cannot take ownership of dogs, cats and other animals. There is fecal matter all over the bike/walking paths and sidewalks. Its rare and I mean rare that on a daily walk we don't see anything. Especially during spring melt its disgusting how much fecal matter is seen. Until people can be held responsible for domestic animals how can we allow for farm animals.
- I don't want live stock living beside me. The smell alone will decrease my property value.
- Support from adjacent neighbors!! ☐, what happens when the neighbors move and new neighbors live next door. This will be impossible to monitor and enforce. No hens, no other livestock. This is a city not a ranch. Enforcements officers will never be able to enforce this. People will always find a way to bypass or attempt to bypass the law.
- As someone allergic to bees if my neighbours had them I would not be able to enjoy my own home without fear of getting stung.
- See previous comments
- Farm animals are noisy and stink, keep them in farms
- Chickens belong on the farm not in the city. This is ridiculous.
- Does the Chief Bylaw Officer really have the time or expertise to evaluate on a case by case basis what types of pets people can own? If people want farm animals they should move to a farm, they don't belong in the city.
- They are noisy and smelly you will have alot of complaints, I would be very disappointed to have farm animals living next to me
- Livestock of any kind (including hens) belong on farms or rural property.
- Not every neighbour is going to agree/support.
- Some people are allergic to hens/chickens - if they are allowed there will be a smell and feathers flying around other yards. If you allow hens, you should allow people to have other livestock as well - e.g. miniature ponies, etc. This could get totally out of hand with people not looking after the surroundings and who is going to ensure things are kept clean? We don't have enough by-law officers now.
- If you want livestock then live on a farm or acreage.
- I really don't see how having farm animals in my neighborhood would be beneficial.
- We are not farms and neighbors are already irritated by dogs that bark uncontrollably. To allow fowl that we make noises when the sun rises, will be disturbing to neighbors. Livestock in a city house lot; really??
- I don't believe that any livestock should be allowed in the city. It would be difficult to enforce and the potential for animal abuse it too great.
- For me to support this bylaw amendment, it would need to include public education regarding zoonoses of backyard hens as well as education for the owner of the hens regarding biosecurity



- This would open the doors to bring nuisance critters into the area as well.
- It's stupid. Move to the rural areas if you want livestock.
- Some properties are very close together.
- No farm animal including hens should be allowed in the city limits.
- I feel these are types of animals that would be better suited outside the city to roam larger areas of land, rather than be confined in smaller yards that the cities have.
- Chickens and other livestock need acres of land to be comfortable. They don't belong in a city. Their quality of life would be poor
- Chicken dander flies long distances making it difficult for anyone who has an allergy to feathers and/or dander to avoid if they live in the neighbourhood.
- Seems dirty and could spread illnesses if there is no proper handling. Could be noisy for neighbors. Livestock do not belong in Residential communities.
- Livestock is a broad term. I do not support cows, sheep, etc within city limits.
- hens are for the farm
- It will attract more predators like coyotes. California has this problem
- Depends on the livestock and what is in place to prevent the spread of any disease and smell
- hens and chickens do not belong in urban settings
- The odors from raising livestock in a urban setting could be problematic
- Too many people will abuse it and too few bylaw officers will be able or willing to enforce it.
- Livestock do not belong in the city. Living proximity in a city will cause issues arising from noise and smell. While those who have not lived with them may not recognize this, anyone who has lived on a farm will know the problem this will cause.
- I had neighbors who had chickens for many years (not sure if they were legal) but they annoyed the entire neighborhood. Caused lots of cats to roam the area. And they were not cared for / cleaned properly. The next door neighbors said that it stunk terrible too, they couldn't sit outside due to the smell.
- I feel that this particular option leaves a loop hole for a neighbour to make an issue for reasons other than the hens themselves.
- The term "other" livestock is much too vague.
- There is no acceptable situation to have hens in an urban environment.
- You spoke about nuisance animals above when it comes to dogs, what do you think hens will do all day I don't need hens clucking or roasters crowing all day long.
- I'm not sure city has resources needed to expand its monitoring activities
- Livestock belong on the farm
- "Where does this stop? I would like to have llamas in my back yard in the SW. If you want to have a farm move to a farm or acreage where you can have those animals so they have the space roam.
- if I live in a apartment can I have a chicken or pig, monkey, or pet lion? The city has to be able to say no enough is enough!!"
- Hens are fine, roosters are a problem.



- The city offers no help with things like puppy mills (all of my neighbors can attest to that). There is NO REASON TO ASSUME THE CITY WOULD INTERVENE WITH DIFFERENT ANIMALS.
- Disease can be spread through bird feces.
- Best raised out of city smell noise etc
- I do not support any wildlife including hens within city limits.
- Hens are a farm animal
- Hens are not pets in my opinion
- Because often these animals can be very noisy. Their feces can be very foul and I believe this could make it difficult to enjoy my own back yard.
- "People are pigs in general, you figure they will keep this clean?"
- No way!"
- Hens do not belong in the city. I would NOT want my neighbor having them.
- I think livestock is better suited to rural environments.
- Chickens smell and are a nuisance. I used to work in a chicken farm.
- "We are going to increased densification in Calgary and exploring livestock...really.
- We don't have the number of bylaw officers needed to address roosters in the morning. What about runoff from livestock into the storm system? Who is liable for cleanup? Wild animals will be attracted to the scent and migrate into more urban neighbourhoods...they don't even want fruit trees in Canmore and you are considering allowing a large farm experiment in the city."
- Yards within city limits are relatively small to raise livestock, concern about lack of care/clean up of livestock creating nuisance for neighbours
- Most properties in the city are not large enough, or far enough from neighbours to allow for livestock in a way that won't negatively impact neighbours ability to enjoy their property.
- We already have enough issues with noisy neighbours not taking care of their existing animals, we shouldn't be adding more until they can deal with what is already existing.
- when humans and chicken live in close proximity, it breeds disease and viruses. It is done in China and Africa, let's not import this unsanitary behaviour here
- Think is Ridiculous and a waste of time and money
- Most residential properties are too small to support livestock. Keep them on the farm or a larger plot of land
- The smell of chickens, goats, pigs, and other livestock can and will be offensive to neighbors. Plus you have the added problems associated with fecal matter from livestock.
- Chicken pens can become foul smelling
- "Because of smell and noise.
- Degrading property value"
- The city is not a farm and I do not want a farm adjacent to me. If I did, I would live in the country.
- I don't believe that it is in most cases possible to provide proper care for livestock in an urban environment like Calgary.



- "Concern over close living quarters with neighbouring homes and families and possible poor living conditions of livestock would have a negative impact on others.
- As well, once that livestock is allowed into city limit living, it becomes more difficult to reverse that decision for the owner of it turns into a poor idea."
- No! This will be a disaster. Most houses are too close together.
- Unless zoned for agriculture, I don't want to see urban farming in my neighborhood
- I wouldn't want to live next door to someone with hens.
- We need urban farming
- People can barely look after themselves and their pets dogs cats let alone having Urban hens.
- I dont want chickens and their associated noise and smell being next to my property.
- Far too often, people are given chicks that are male and grow into loud roosters. If people want livestock, they need to live outside residential areas. There are many areas outside Calgary that would allow them to have livestock. With Calgary encouraging increased density of homes, there is already reduced space between neighbours. If there is a problem house, it takes too long for all the reviews, paperwork, enforcement to happen and the neighbours suffer loss of enjoyment of their properties. Chickens smell if their area isn't cleaned daily. Given what I see with people dog waste clean up, I can't see people being better about daily cleaning of their coops.
- I don't think raising livestock is that easy. I'm worried about the nuisance (noise) to neighbors and the cleanliness (smell) issues that could arised.
- Chickens are noisy and stinky
- There is no rational need for anyone to keep chickens in a crowded urban environment where eggs and meat are readily and easily available. There are noise and smell issues with chickens.
- It's unsanitary. People will start raising and selling meat without a license. The smell will be horrible for neighbours. Stop trying to turn the city into a 3rd world county.
- I do not want to see farm livestock encroach into the city
- I do not think these animals should be allowed in urban areas. Our backyards are too small. The noise and smells would be overwhelming
- Livestock belong on farms, not in backyards.
- Concerns regarding noise and smell
- I don't think city folk need chickens in their back yards. I would fear some people would not clean up and care for their pets properly (like people do with dogs and cats etc)
- Biosecurity and disease control among urban hen owners is difficult to control and poses a large burden on food security and public health systems.
- A city is not the place to raise and keep these animals. I would foresee nothing but complaints, etc.
- Livestock belong on a farm, they always have and it needs to stay that way!!! I would not want to smell that or listen to the noise!!
- Their should be no farm pets that produce eatable material in a household yard
- You don't have enough people to deal with current problems . Now livestock? So we can hire more people and pay more taxes? Enough is enough. If someone wants livestock they can move to the acreage.



- Move to an acreage if you want hens
- We live in a city, not farm.
- Chickens excrement is unpleasant in its odour. Being allergic to the dust from this, as well as their feathers are unpleasant experiences.
- Concern about disease
- I think it will just increase conflict between neighbours and I don't see any effective conflict resolution.
- Livestock belongs OUTSIDE the city limits
- This is a slippery slope. For every good livestock owner there will be one that neglects responsibility. We're having enough trouble with traditional pet ownership.
- I don't feel that having livestock in ones yard is appropriate in such a close setting. With homes being so close together, there is more chance of this becoming a nuisance to the neighborhood than it being a benefit.
- These do not belong in the City.
- I don't believe that there is enough room on most city properties to keep the noise and smell away from neighbours.
- If I wanted to live on a farm or acreage, I would have chose that. I did not.
- Come on, seriously? Chickens and pigs in the city? No.
- It's foolishness
- The city is no place for this!
- No place to attract more wildlife into the city
- Livestock belong in the country.
- Livestock should not be in the city
- Smells and noise
- I support suitable living conditions for the animal.
- Noise & smell
- livestock should not be on private property within the city limits.
- Coyotes may become more of an issue
- I would not want a neighbor to have any time of livestock in their yard. Hens are a dirty noisy bird, and if people cannot take care of domestic animals how can we expect them to properly care for livestock
- Livestock need room to roam - room I assume would be limited within city limits.
- If you want to farm, buy a farm. I would not appreciate living next to a chicken coop.
- Noise.
- The city is not a farm. Would proper living conditions be enforced?
- Livestock should not be in urban settings
- I lived in Oregon by some hens and they are smelly. Would need to have a huge backyard, not great for city living.



- Hen is bad idea. They wake you up in the morning and the smell foul. Also they attract wild animals to home!!.
- "Pets to be allowed in the city should be limited to dogs, cats and a small bird. If you start including bigger and bigger animals, where will the limits of breed and size end up? third world country Hygiene, noise and transmittable diseases will become
- rampant. Calgary will become a third world country where everything is acceptable."
- Don't want the smell or the hassle when the novelty wears off.
- It may attract wildlife; then they would be unsafe from human/city activity
- Absolutely no chickens in city this will become a serious issue
- The city isn't the place for livestock.
- I don't think that the city would invest enough in proper enforcement of bylaws.
- If you want chickens live on a farm or acreage.
- Hens are a lot of work and are a big commitment. I worry that people will purchase hens as a fad and quickly get bored.
- Hens are quiet and clean if well cared for. They should be allowed, but a person shouldn't need their neighbor's blessing to own hens.
- If you want livestock. Move to an acreage.
- Hens, livestock etc should be on farms not in urban areas
- No livestock, including hens need to be in the city.
- Too many opportunities to infringe on neighbours enjoyment of their own property
- we have enough going on in calgary we don't need hens running through the city
- Livestock require specific environment for care and an urban backyard is not suited to proper care of the animals.
- I grew up on a farm and I am well aware of what chickens smell like and what they attract.
- I don't agree with it being at the discretion of the chief bylaw enforcement officer 1 person should not have total say. How can you be sure that they are being fair in decision making and not playing favorites based on gender or nationality.
- This is going to open the door to small farm animals in residential areas - noise, smells, getting loose. We are a city and not a place for livestock. Chickens are bad enough
- Absolutely not, it is not the place for livestock in the city and will generate ill will and bad feelings amongst neighbors. Leaving approval to by law will create many inconsistencies with added cost
- Livestock don't belong in the city
- livestock is not ment to be raised in a residential area
- Farm animals are not city pets. They can be a nuisance and should not be allowed in back yards. Live on an acreage if you want farm pets.
- I think enforcement would be difficult, thus increasing likelihood of mistreatment of animals
- It's not necessary and will require lots more enforcement. People are not responsible enough to do it properly. Additional noise and smell complaints will require lots more bylaw officers.



- Livestock should remain outside of a city environment. They are much harder to control for noise and noxious odors
- There is no reason to allow livestock other than "hens" in an urban setting.
- Noise and smell can be overwhelming
- livestock belongs on a farm not on narrow dwelling parcels of land
- Hens do not belong in the city
- Buy a farm..
- Exceptions be allowed by a by-law officer alone. This should be voted upon.
- No urban chickens. Keep those to farmland
- Birds carry bacteria And viruses that can species jump, and their droppings if not cleaned properly are a significant health hazard. Allowing livestock on close proximity and urban areas would increase pandemic potential such as Covid-19.
- chickens are meant to be on a farm with land to exercise. We are already being crammed into condos at 450 square footage. No room for chickens or other livestock in a city full of cement and condos.
- Chickens belong on a farm not in a city
- Calgary already has a coyote problem, and having urban chickens would enhance the problem. Ask any rural chicken farmer.
- I don't understand the ramifications well enough to agree.
- I do not think any alternative animals should be residing on city home properties. There is an option to purchase a farm or part of a farm in the rural.
- Urban neighbours live close together and livestock sounds like unnecessary noise, odour and property damage for non-consenting people to be subject to.
- An acreage is better suited for livestock. Some of the amendments require dedicated city human and financial resources that should be directed to projects that concern the majority of tax payers not some.
- The spreading of food source will increase unwanted rodent population.
- No livestock should be allowed within the city limits
- I'm tired of hearing about chickens. There's a lady in my community obsessed and I think it will lead to too many abusers and the city will end up having to deal with neglected chickens/cleaning up after a terrible chicken keeper.
- Livestock of any kind should not be allowed within the city limits.
- Farm animals belong on a farm, chickens are disgusting and unhealthy
- Live stock stinks. Also would induce more animal attacks.
- Cities are for people. The countryside is for animals
- Livestock belong on farms, not city back yards
- Livestock does not belong in a city and would not be comfortable in a small space.



- Chickens or hens are a tremendous sources of potential disease, odor, and noise pollution. Policing sanitation related to urban livestock would be very difficult, while putting pets, wildlife, and humans at risk.
- "Support from adjacent neighbors is unfair, a lot of Calgarians don't even know their neighbors and a lot of neighbors would say no just because they don't like a neighbor
- Just let people own a set amount of livestock (say 2 hens per household) without needing consent from their neighbors, that idea is ridiculous"
- Diseases, terrible smells, noise....farm animals belong on a farm
- should only be on farms. What about disease of fowls?
- Livestock are not pets and do not belong in homes.
- The conditions in the city are not suitable for livestock. This should be obvious.
- I feel there are few people who would be responsible enough to look after hens. I am not sure of the noise they would cause
- The city is not the place for farm animals. I wouldn't want them next to my home.
- I do not agree with hens and other animals being held in the city. Noise, attract vermin, smell, unsanitary.
- Seems unclear. Is it only direct neighbours you need approval from? If you are 3 doors down you may still hear or smell livestock. Also what is rules around enclosures for these animals. And where does it end? Pigs, goats, hens, etc.
- one person who would be responsible, will open the gate for people wanting any kind of animal, who will then in turn not be responsible. It's a flood gate. Unless of course, rules are put in place prior to.
- Who is going to enforce standards. This could get out of hand fast.
- Too broad in its current form. Which livestock? How much space and how many of each species? Support from the neighbours would need to be ongoing, maybe once a year.
- Livestock, as opposed to pets, don't belong in private homes.
- Bylaw should focus on managing current standards before adding more to the list of items to be upkept.
- Hens are hard to keep up with if in a small living environment, the lots in Calgary are far too small. This would also bring in MORE coyotes, foxes, and bob cats. We have enough just from having wild rabbits/hares!
- I feel this could influence resale and property values to some houses as the noise and smell can be undesirable. Another option may be if a new neighbourhood is deemed "livestock friendly" prior to people purchasing and for those who wish to have that type of lifestyle.
- We have seen a substantial increase in wildlife (bobcats, coyotes, fox) in our neighborhood over the last ten years. We are aware of this issue and are happy to co-exist. Bringing bait in the form of backyard hens into the neighborhoods is just asking for more foot traffic and hunting and leaves the hens as literal sitting ducks waiting to be preyed upon.
- Too much of a nuisance and the smell is terrible, i wouldnt want them next door to me, if i wanted to hear and smell chickens or hens id move to the country.
- You can't control the noise of the animals and could become a nuisance quickly.



- The only livestock I support is the sheep and goats used on city green areas to eat/cut the grass. People are barely responsible enough as it is to pick up feces and respect non-off leash areas. There are WAY too many soccer fields, school fields & greenspaces being treated as such & owners are not picking up feces. Is also disrespectful to those who don't care for or are scared of off leash dogs. They are in an off leash zone so why are owners letting their dogs run off leash? If you say something dog owners become offended and hostile. The city needs to spend more money/resources to this issue than allowing more varieties of animals. Also considering the size of properties is becoming smaller and smaller, where are people going to keep livestock? Opens the door to more resources being spent on complaints. There is no need for livestock in the city. If you want that move out to a rural location.
- I think chickens cause pose a potential for more predators such a coyotes and foxes to become a bigger nuisance with chickens becoming a part of city life.
- smells would be onerous
- I hate birds. If u want to live in the country move. Hens and roosters start at 5am and don't stop. It would drive me crazy! And I would hate my neighbor
- I have chosen to live in an urban setting not a rural setting. Hens and other livestock belong in a rural setting:
- It opens up the door for more neglected and abandoned animals as well as more city complaints. There are also few (if any) vets in the city trained and willing to treat livestock animals
- Animals are not "livestock", they're sentient beings and we have no right to keep exploiting them and forcing them to a miserable life, which is largely the case for animal agriculture operations. Instead of finding new ways to exploit them, we should find ways to reduce substantially the atrocities that go on in already existing operations.
- A dense urban setting is not the place for rural animals. ie - Roosters make a lot of noise and early. Increase of disease / pollution / smells. Plus they will draw in predators like coyotes.
- Noise, smell would bring in dangerous wildlife (cougars, etc). Not in favour.
- We dont need more birds in the city and if they get out thats a problem
- Chickens will suffer due to neglect.
- I don't think the city is a good place to try and raise all sorts of wildlife in a backyard. Some of the older communities have nice large yards but many newer communities are tightly packed with no back lanes and tiny yards. Noise and smells may become more of an issue in these communities.
- Should not need the permission of neighbors.
- I do not support hens or livestock within calgary
- live stock should be on larger areas, so possibly if you have a certain amount of land available?
- Don't believe in musles
- Too many people get pet pigs or chickens but then discard them when they get tired of them. This will only ensure it happens more often.
- Ineffective enforcement of by-law regulations now. Lack of person power to enforce. Unlikely to be a consistent application of the bylaw. A Pandora's Box just waiting to be opened. No confidence in the city administration.

- Very few urban properties have the required space for livestock. And the smell! Chicken poop stinks! No one wants to live next door to a smelly neighbour. If you want livestock, move out of the city and buy an acreage!
- Hens require a lot of work and resources to keep them healthy and laying. They are noisy and get foot disease easily. Unless you are selling eggs you end up with way too many eggs, a waste of food.
- Chickens are a high maintenance animal and most people can't/won't pick up after their dogs let alone having to do something more rigorous like clean out their chicken coop daily. If amount of dog excrement that has been left behind by lazy dog owners over the past many years is any indication of how an average "responsible" dog-owner is in Calgary, they most definitely are not responsible enough to keep chickens. Any bylaw enforcement does nothing except hand out warnings. These people need to receive large fines for not cleaning up after their dog(s)!
- While I understand the idea in high density neighbourhoods there is issues of nuisance, noisex smell
- The City is under-resourced / unable to deal with the problem pets we already have. I would only support this if there was a significant increase in staff and enforcement.
- Livestock belongs on farms. This bylaw is already too easy to abuse. There is not enough open space in most yards for animal husbandry.
- do not want the noise, smell etc.
- Livestock can be noisy and create unpleasant odors which would impact my ability to enjoy my own backyard. These annoyances cannot be controlled. You cannot tell a chicken to be quiet nor a sheep to stop smelling. Yards are too close together in the city.
- Fear of increased predation by coyotes, bobcats and other carnivores. We already have these issues.
- In my experience with some chickens in my neighbourhood they create a nuisance because of massive mouse populations associated with the chicken coop, creating a draw for free roaming cats (and a reason for cats to work hard at escaping from yards with barriers to keep them in), and create a garbage stream in residential areas that can include bacterial pathogens such as Salmonella.
- Farm animals belong on farms. The noise and smell is a concern for condensed neighborhoods
- Farm animals, unless deemed support or therapy animals, should remain on a farm and not in someone's backyard.
- We chose to live in an urban environment and would rather not be awakened at 4am by a rooster.
- I feel these animals belong on a farm and not in the city in a backyard environment. These animals need special care and a certain amount of space to raise. The noise and smell could become problematic. Overall I find it unnecessary.
- Hen's can get very smelly and most people are not responsible enough to clean pens daily.
- There should be no livestock allowed in residential communities.
- Livestock have too many negatives. They are not trainable. Can be a nuisance to neighbors like noise, smell.
- Livestock need room to live. Any urban area home do not have enough room
- I don't believe a city backyard is a suitable place for livestock.



- Smell and noise. Eg Being woken early every morning by a crowing rooster.
- i doubt people would provide good living conditions for animals they cobsider to be live stock versus pets
- There is a public health concern in regards to the spread of infectious disease (especially salmonella). While these risks can be mitigated by following proper safety and cleaning procedures, it's unlikely all these guidelines will be followed by everyone. Monitoring compliance and enforcement of the bylaw would be too complex.
- If you want hens move outside the city.
- Do not support livestock in city neighbourhoods -- too much potential for conflict.
- Most people do not understand what it takes to provide a safe, nurturing home for livestock and all too often when they become hard to handle they end up abandoned or surrendered to rescues and are not able to be rehomed.
- I wouldn't want to move next to a house that already has established chickens. They are gross and smelly. Farm animals belong on farms.
- Unfortunately they attract rats.
- I like the idea of hens, but I'm not sure Bylaw has the capacity to enforce all the things that would be needed. A lot of people already don't follow the rules for their existing pets (i.e. picking up after dog, respecting off leash/ on leash areas). It's a nice idea, but I envision it only leading to difficulties, especially with the potential for avian zoonotic diseases.
- Not acceptable in an urban setting. Smell, noise etc
- I don't want animals slautered next door for food or otherwise. Livestock, including hens will encourage other wildlife and predators to the community. I think this will encourage the death and relocation of wildlife—coyotes, cougars, wolves, bears, large predator birds. Plus the smell!!
- I don't think chickens should be permitted within Calgary. They are messy and noisy and attract wild animals such as coyotes, bobcats, cougars etc who will endanger people and their dogs and cats and cause the coyote etc to be killed.
- Impossible to control
- Most are too smelly and noisy.
- I support indoor support pets but outside hens may get loud and their waste messy
- In most other cities that I have lived in where urban hens are allowed they are an extreme nuisance and lead to attracting predator species - coyotes and rats in my experience.
- This is ridiculous. How can you expect chickens and livestock to NOT DISTURB neighbors? Noise is a real issue. Fecal disease transmission too. Dogs are noisy and a constant source of friction between neighbors right now. You want to expand that to livestock & chickens? WOW. Talk about an administrative nightmare. Property values for neighbors will plummet. If these people want chickens and livestock, they should move to a rural farm.
- Livestock deserve to stay only on farms where they have lots of space. It would be cruel to confine them in a city just so it's convenient for a human.
- The risk of negative impacts on neighbours is too high. I would not want the sounds and smells from urban hens next to my yard. If people want to have farm animals, they should locate in a rural area.



- They often stink, they are often noisy, there is no guarantee that owners will be responsible, neighboring animals (dogs) will be stressed by having "prey" on the other side of the fence.
- Unlike pets, urban livestock are more likely to affect property values and reduce enjoyment especially in areas with smaller lots sizes
- That's what Farmers and Farming is for.
- Livestock belong on a farm or acreage not in a city.
- I have experienced having hens and rooster in close proximity to my home - awful. Adjacent neighbours should not be put in the position of potential negative ongoing relationships if they don't want livestock in an urban setting.
- Current food chain supply is sufficient
- My in-laws (who live out of country) have hens and a rooster, and I find it very unappealing. They smell and make noise, and I don't agree with this becoming accepted in urban communities.
- Livestock Of any kind - hens, honey bees, goats, sheep, ponies, etc... - does not belong in any urban high density area. I'm unable to list all the possible issues and problems, not the least, enforcement resources.
- The question is unclear. What is meant by support from adjacent neighbours? Do the people who want hens have to seek approval or do their neighbours have to find out about the plan and then oppose it. Also, what is the recourse if there is a problem should the hens be allowed. What happens if the neighbours who agreed move and new neighbours who do not approve move in?
- It's a city
- I don't believe that any farm animals should be in the city.
- Cats and dogs are normal. Anything else should be on a farm.
- Mess, smell, disturbances from noise.
- Livestock (including hens) are not bred as "pets" and have much different housing and care needs than can be appropriately provided in the city.
- Hens' feces can lead cancers!
- It will not be possible to enforce regulations on Urban hens. The City's ability to enforce any bylaws is already stretched.
- I feel most people wouldn't properly care for the animals and when the novelty of having them wears off, then what happens to the animals? Shelters and rescues are full because people don't accept animals as a lifelong commitment and they certainly won't with livestock. Kindness to animals builds a better world for everyone unfortunately the animals pay the price when the kindness stops.
- I am having difficulty understanding why we would encourage City dwellers to own / keep farm animals within city limits. Any animal or avian species raised as a food source should not be allowed to dwell inside city limits. To introduce a bylaw that stipulates "neighbors must agree to permit the raising of hens (or other typical farm animals) in a neighborhood will set that community up for neighborhood disagreements, especially if it affects the Requestor's livelihood.
- You are not clear here..livestock bring disease and smells - they do not belong in the small properties, they belong on farms and acreages over 5 acres..
- Chickens /gems do not belong in the city limits due to the odour management.



- The city is not a place for farm animals.
- we have enough problems with accepted pets as it is, asking for trouble having more easy meals for urban predators
- They should not be forced to give away benefits of their livestock that they care for to other people
- There is no place in an urban setting for any domestic poultry. Hens belong on a farm.
- Horrible idea in a crowded urban environment and pandemic times and our socially entitled environment
- The potential for this creating significant friction between neighbors is extremely high. Raising animals is a lot of work and I feel while the hobby farmer may start out with high energy and intention that over time, will wain and animal care or cages will become junky. I believe this view is supported if you simply look at many homes yards or garden boxes. They often start out looking well maintained but people get busy and less interested and yards or garden boxes often start looking overgrown and junky (to put it nicely). A neighbor is put in an awkward position if things do become poorly managed and honestly there is little that a neighbor can do without damaging relationships.
- I don't want the noise or the smell.
- Messy, smelly, lawn destruction, noise. I do like the idea of beneficial short term visits for say slug control.
- The City is not a place for farm animals, otherwise they would be referred to as "City Animals".
- If you need a rooster for hens to lay eggs I am against it.
- It opens too much room for abuse and lack of enforcement.
- Should stay on farms.
- A city environment is not conducive to having "livestock" - ie. Attracts predators potentially harmful to children/adults.
- Too much noise, smell and fecal material
- Livestock are not appropriate in an an urban setting. That is what country living is for.
- Don't feel they belong in urban area
- The yards are not big enough and they are noisy and smell
- noisey, smelly and attract rodents
- The smell and noise
- Livestock don't belong in urban areas.
- If people wish to raise hens they should live in the outskirts or outside the city. Same as pigs etc.
- No chickens in the city
- We have too many animals in the city as it is and too many irresponsible pet owners. I don't see it improving by allowing livestock.
- Hens and other livestock don't belong in the city. Cities are for people and domestic animals like cats and dogs. Hens and other livestock will result in increased conflicts amongst neighbours and there is also the potential for disease. Hard to believe this is even being considered at this time given the pandemic and its suspected origin,



- Chicken manure stinks!! Trust me, I shoveled enough of it growing up.
- Chickens STINK. They belong on a farm, not in the city.
- Chickens and other livestock belong in rural area where there is space for them to live and be cared for while providing distance between neighbours to alleviate tension over noise and any other incidents or issues.
- I believe some animal can live within the city limits but there are one that need large areas to roam and I don't believe there are enough of these. I really won't want a cow living next to me. It's not fair to the animal
- no livestock in the city
- Livestock is a rather broad term and people will be quick to try to expand it to include categories far broader than city council might be considering. The definition of livestock and approved species must be clearly defined and not subject to deviation when someone says that some critter is their 'comfort animal'.
- The city is no place for livestock. Stop listening to a minority of people. The majority of us believe chickens and other such animals should be in the rural area.
- Neighbours approval is not necessary for other types of animal ownership, doesn't make sense to require it for livestock
- Livestock can not be provided a suitable life in the city and their smells can carry for quite a distance. Allowing this could result in manpower issues to handle all the complaints.
- I grew up on a farm where we kept chickens. I do not care how well someone thinks they are looking after their chickens, they will still pose a significant health risk. There was a good reason we always had to wash the eggs and our hands. Also, hens are noise and there is a greater risk at attracting coyotes and other predators.
- Livestock should not be in back yards in urban centers
- Hens are step 1 pigs are step 2 then cows then?
- hens should be in a country environment
- No need for chickens in the city. I see no benefit
- Livestock (chicken, pigs, etc.) should not permitted in backyard of residential areas.
- In older neighbor hoods, this might work as the lots are bigger, but new areas have much smaller lots and the noise and smell would be a nuisance
- Stop being so noise. We don't need to be micro managed as a civilization.
- I grew up on a farm with chickens. Their excrement can be very pungent. They will also attract predators such as Merlins, Hawks Coyotes, Foxes ets. Also, I am sure that night shift workers would have an issue with chickens cockle-doing when they are trying to get some shut eye.
- These animals could be obtained for the wrong reasons and end up not being cared for or housed properly. Also, would they attract unwanted predators?
- There are very few lots in Calgary that are big enough to support chickens or other livestock. Chicken and livestock excrement is very smelly.
- Having been around chickens, they can be smelly and dirtier than most birds. This could lead to abandonment issues as well as bad neighbors.



- I would love to see hens allowed in backyards however, having witnessed the abuse, neglect and cruelty of people towards pets + wildlife, even in my neighbourhood, (drowning and poisoning squirrels, shooting Magpies and rabbits), I fear there would be many birds/animals that would suffer unless proper safeguards, standards and heavy fines for abuse, were in place.
- Livestock in a large city? I do not see much success with this given various lot size limitations. I also have concerns about responsible ownership and the impact on neighbours and neighbourhoods.
- This could transmit diseases or can be a nuisance to neighbours.
- I am not sure what you mean by 'other' livestock but I do not feel that they should be permitted in the city. I can't see this being a good thing!
- Do not support the urban hens plan.
- Livestock and associated noise/smell/potential for disease does not belong inside a city.
- if you want to ban feeding wild birds why would you then okay live stock, you need to re think if food is put out birds will eat it, there is a problem with bobcats now why put captive animals into the mix.
- In my neighborhood, yards are very small and I don't think there would be adequate space for hens or Other livestock.
- I don't want a bunch of chickens in my neighborhood
- I can envision the hen situation getting way out of hand.
- I think that are noise and odor issues that have to be addressed
- This would cause a myriad of problems. Mostly between neighbours.
- Bad idea, the City has enough problems trying to control cats and dogs.
- Chickens are one thing but expanding to a wider range of animals could easily get out of hand with noise and smells.
- "You can't control the environment these animals will be kept in.
- Noise and smell is not fair to the neighborhood. Go live on an acreage if you want these animals."
- I live close to a park where predators such as coyotes and bobcats are often seen and roam the surrounding communities at night. Keeping hens would likely lure more of these predators into the community.
- There is no guarantee that hen owners will be diligent in the cleaning and care of their hens (cleaning fecal matter from coops, cleaning feeding areas, etc.) The smell from chickens can be very overwhelming & can cause problems for people with respiratory conditions. These animals can also be very noisy, & they may attract more predators into the urban areas.
- The fact that houses are so close to each other should have the city seeing this makes no sense. Cackling hens, pigeon poop, pigs grunting we have a zoo. Diseases are also a problem, control will also become a problem, nobody follows the bylaws than are in place already. Why would they after this, waste management of animals that owners should be taking care of is a major problem now. How do the city intend to ensure health and safety when it's now even aware of the nuisance pet owners are currently? Pigeons also destroys properties.
- Will attract predators such as coyotes and bobcats increasing the risk of deleterious encounters for other pets, possibly people.
- This is high maintenance option. City of Calgary should be reducing costs.



- I consider this close to the can of worms opening up analog. Who decides appropriate level of noise, smell and other that neighbors have to endure. This is not fair to neighbors that want nothing to do with any of it and feasible if you only allow it in specific communities where everyone is like minded.
- I am unsure about this. My concern is for the welfare of the animals, the 'use' of the animals by the owner (concern for on site butchering, a health issue and possible distress for neighbours) and the excessive number of animals causing interference with neighbours enjoyment of their property especially odour, noise and witnessing over-crowded conditions resulting in animal distress and neighbour distress.
- There is already too much noise from dogs. I cannot remember sitting on my deck for more than 10 minutes without neighbors dogs barking (Because I am there). I understand why people may want Hens or other livestock, but Hens are not quiet.
- There could be nuisance odours and noise from the livestock.
- The potential for these animals to disturb the neighbours and result in a nuisance (smell) greatly outweighs any potential benefit.
- Potential of diseases
- The cost of the level of enforcement, should a dispute arise, would be prohibitive
- My understanding of "other livestock" is cows or horses. Those animals are very large and are hard to control. They should be given large amounts of space. They should not be allowed in inner city yards. Those animals belong on farms and ranches with acres of real estate.
- Livestock should not be allowed within city limits. If one wants to own livestock, they need to live in a rural area.
- Increased incidence of disease
- "Difficult for oversight
- Urban environment is not suitable for livestock - yards are often small, noise, smell"
- neighbour's should have no say in what animal i'm BBQ'ing that i rised on my land.
- This opens a possibility of all sorts of animals that could be offensive
- The noise and smell of chickens is inappropriate in an urban environment where neighbours are so close together. They would be a constant cause of annoyance and conflict.
- I personally feel that this shouldn't happen because I would be concerned that the livestock would escape they're enclosures and end up roaming the streets which would end up being a danger to them as they could end up being road kill. It could be a danger to humans because if the animal is on the street and the person is driving in order to avoid the animal they would have to move out of the way which could cause an accident. Another way they could be a danger to humans/pets is you just don't know if the livestock have some-type of decease which could mean that if you get bitten you end up in the hospital.
- Can the city ensure/commit to strict enforcement? We can't manage the number of free-running and surrendered cats. We don't need to add hens to that.
- Farmyard animals are smelly and city yards are too close together.
- Where is your list of "other" animals?



- I don't want chickens next door because of the noise and smell.
- With so much irresponsible pet ownership I don't see this as working in an urban setting- smells and well being of animals, possible disease are serious issues
- I feel it brings in an extra cost and more work for the city to manage
- I don't want chickens in the city.
- People are always pushing the envelope on these types of matters - this will just be another area of conflict.
- They don't belong in the city
- Calgary is an urban environment and chicken coops should NOT be allowed in the city.
- The city is not a farm. Noise and smells from farm animals are usually offensive.
- As urban density increases I don't think livestock should be permitted in Calgary
- Yes/no doesn't provide enough nuance. Animals can very easily create noise and smell problems for neighbors, and could potentially escape and become feral. I don't wish to see additional expense for the city to investigate yet more problems beyond the ones that already exist. It's possible that in some instances there would be no problem but I am absolutely sure that there would be plenty of bad cases. Cities are not farms.
- It would be too much to monitor
- Hens (restricted numbers) constitute little problem with the exception of noisy roosters crowing but larger livestock (pigs, sheep, cows should be confined to rural areas and acreages of 6+ acres).
- If people want livestock in their yard maybe they should consider moving to an acreage
- Afraid of diseases that livestock would carry and spread if owners are not responsible.
- Hens are noisy, and eggs collected need to be inspected before selling or eating for health reasons. They could also attract predators.
- Noisy
- Neighbor tensions would only be increased by allowing livestock in a backyard. Properties in the city (yards) are tight enough together that the smell and noise from livestock would impact neighbors.
- Neighbor support should not be required.
- I don't believe in keeping livestock .
- I don't think livestock should be kept in city limits, with the exception of hens for eggs, with a limit of say 2-6
- If you mean cows and pigs, I would say no due to the odour.
- Chickens stink generally the public try to be considerate of their having to
- There are many choices that already exist for people desiring pets, cats/dogs/rabbits/ guinea pigs/hamsters/birds/snakes etc.. Livestock should be in rural settings, where space is more readily available. More allowable species, translates into more work for spca and the city when citizens don't house or treat them properly. Feral cat populations, feral rabbit populations all over the city are examples of this.
- We don't need livestock and hens making messes and noise in our neighborhoods.



- I don't feel that livestock has a place in urban settings. Too much room for owner error.
- The noise complaints would distract bylaw officers from more serious events.
- We have significant wildlife in our community and believe this would lead to increased hunting behaviours in residential neighborhoods
- It is unsanitary and ridiculous to allow livestock in the city
- I do not support needing agreement from an adjacent neighbour
- Live stock belong on a farm not a home
- It shouldn't be up to the neighbour
- I think you need to clarify how many hens, I don't want an entire chicken coop next to me but one or two would be okay.
- Do not feel city is right place/home for livestock. Would it not just invite more problems, such as attracting coyotes?
- Chickens belong in the country, not in the city. Quit with the progressive nonsense and focus on delivering services in a cost effective manner.
- I don't want a chicken coop next to me...
- Hens and other livestock are rural entities.
- Farm animals do not belong in a city.
- I think hens would attract more coyotes into the neighbourhood.
- This would be fine except people would find a way to break the rules and we can't enforce the rules we have now. Accountability is important so if we can't afford to run the system with accountability then we shouldn't do it.
- Animals are not food. So many hens are abused and neglected and then abandoned once they no longer are egg bearing and/or being the wards of all ready over packed sanctuaries. No need to eat animal products or make it easier for people to do so.
- It sounds all lovely in theory, but in actuality, these animals can cause nuisance with smells (if pens not cleaned regularly) and noise. I cannot make comment on item below (pigeons), but I live inner city and two years ago had a horrible time with a neighbour who was attracting pigeons. I had to deal with multiple nests around my property, toxic feces everywhere staining my patio furniture and then their constant cooing. I love birds, but pigeons are rats of the sky and horrible creatures. I would be furious if these were permitted.
- Our climate is too cold to allow people to keep hens etc. as they will keep them for their own use, such as eggs and who is going to make sure the hens have a heated house that is in fact heated all the time in winter and kept clean etc. Farms have inspectors that check that. Some people do not care about the welfare of their animals. Also, it may be another source of an irritant for neighbours with noise. Our houses are very close together (in many new areas) and people have many different world views. We need to have a high standard for caring for animals and also for allowing everyone to live in a peaceful, quiet home without disturbance.
- Majority of people do not understand how much work taking care of hens entails....it's a nice idea ...but then comes the work.



- A benefit to the community will not be perceived the same by everyone and should instead be measured as an animal that does no harm and does not negatively affect other animals or people
- I can see the possibility of a very messy, noisy scenario. Not all owners will keep the area of, for example, chickens, clean.
- Farm animals don't have a place in the City. Livestock need space and owners are not always responsible with waste/food management.
- One person should not decide a pet's outcome !
- I strongly dislike the ability to involve neighbours and bylaw into someone's standard of living and chosen lifestyle. Only animal welfare should have a say.
- Chickens are smelly, noisy and dirty. Housing is too close in proximity to allow for adequate range for these animals.
- The City of Calgary is creating a problem by allowing urban hens. Wildlife and predatory birds which are struggling to survive as wild spaces are developed are moving into cities. Hens will become prey targets and angry citizens will respond by killing wildlife and predatory birds now headed toward extinction. The City of Calgary is missing the "big picture" of mass extinction of wild species , globally.
- If people want to keep hens or livestock they should be living on properties that are larger than what is available within city limits, in other words, acreages outside city limits.
- Properties in the city are too close together for livestock (including hens) not to be bothersome to neighbours. Most of the time such livestock are left outside and can be messy, noisy, smelly. It also makes areas look untidy and can substantially lower property values. I am not saying that one needs a full blown farm to have such animals, but it should be restricted to sizeable acreages outside the city limits. You would be putting more tension into neighbourhoods and between neighbours by allowing such a bylaw. I would be amenable to an exception for non-traditional support animals for those who actually need them.
- I support hens in yards - but I am hesitant to base this on my neighbour's approval. I think it's a case-by-case basis if there's issues - or when permits are issued. But I know certain ppl will just say no bc they're salty and old.
- These kinds of animals are meant to be on a farm.
- "Should not include support from adjacent neighbours. People have other pets without support from neighbours. It's not the neighbour's decision to make.
- I do agree on allowing backyard hens. They provide food, they are not really loud, they help maintain pests in the vegetable garden and they teach children about farm life. Where food comes from etc."
- Back yard livestock brings with it disease and ODORS!! Control of these 2 factors is up to the owner ,which in a lot of case they do not care or see it as a problem. Thus, the main person affected by the animal owners' incivility, is the neighbor. This makes for very awkward relations between neighbors... which in some cases is already tough these days. You are basically FORCING homeowners without pets, to endure the odor, noise, sight, smell of these animals! If i wanted livestock for neighbors I would have bought a house in the country on a farm! When you buy a house in the city, you have an expectation that you will not be woken up by squawking chickens and



the smell of chicken feces or pigs and goats. IF we lived in a world where people generally had care and courtesy for each other, i would support this. But more and more I find neighbors very careless and self-righteous.

- People that are not trained or have experience with agricultural livestock should not be entrusted with their care. Instead encourage people to reach out to local producers that have the knowledge and the means to take care of these animals in the proper environment!
- increases attractiveness for predatory animals
- I don't like it
- Unless they are pets and not livestock! Backyard chickens for food (meat/eggs) is not good I don't want small slaughter houses in homes,
- I currnety live in Brentwood near Nose Hill. We have many more coyotes/hawks/bobcats hovering around already than in other areas of the City I have lived. Hens in a neighbors yard would be a real issue for me - I would likley move if this was ever allowed.
- Having urbwn animals requires larger yards and garden spaces which most people don't have and which the cuty is actively discouraging through densified development. Residential zoning doesn't support urban livestock.
- Animals get free and predators.
- Too many irresponsible owners already
- I'm on the fence for this - I'm sure some people would do great a be responsible, but I'm imagining smells and noise. People are bad enough at owning pets, I think on the average they'd do worse with livestock.
- Farm animals belong on the farm
- Livestock should live on farms, not urban areas.
- This has nothing to do with dogs
- Based on noise alone this is a very bad idea!
- [removed]
- I don't believe chickens or livestock should be housed within the city!
- The COVID pandemic has confirmed that animal husbandry in an urban setting is a danger to health and safety. Allowing livestock at/in individual homes will be impossible to safely manage with limited City budgets. Urban livestock ownership, if allowed at all, should be through a stringently designed, monitored, and enforced communal enterprise - like community gardens but with absolutely complete health controls to ensure that they do not become dangerous like "wet markets." Like keeping horses, this should be in rural areas.
- I can't imagine goats, pigs, sheep, mini horses in a yard. This is ridiculous.
- the city is no place for livestock, there's not enough room in most yards and honestly if you think there's a problem with dog bites just wait until everyone gets a goat because they can. Livestock is not trainable and therefore much harder to control. Small livestock (ie: goats, sheep, etc.) can and will bite, headbutt, climb which causes potential for escape and chew on +eat every thing they can get to including garbage. If you can trust people to properly care for cats and dogs there absolutely no way you could trust them with livestock.



- I don't feel livestock should be allowed in an urban area. People relocate and new neighbours may not be real keen on the smell or the noise generated from a neighbouring house.
- Hens would be too noisy in next door neighbour's back yard. Requires outdoor management of odour, feces clean-up.
- I think it will cause more problems than it's worth and if people want livestock, they should live in the country. I don't want to live next to chickens.
- Farm animals belong on a farm
- If you want livestock, you need to live outside of the city. I don't want animals waking me up early.
- we don't need anymore reason to attract wildlife into the city! It created unnecessary risk.
- Not in urban... acreage or rural yes
- One neighbor's sense of responsibility is not always equal to another. Neighbors change.
- Don't want all kinds of animals in the neighborhood.
- Absolutely do not support this. We already have enough issues with Dogs and Cats and there would be additional administrative costs
- All impacted neighbours should be supportive, not only adjacent neighbours.
- No birds! Dirty, disease carrying, and NOISY. People in the City are not collectively responsible or respectable enough to be awarded this privilege. Education will be lacking and you will have many people not following the rules. Birds will be neglected and there will be many, many issues. This is a terrible idea and I am vehemently against it.
- By law officers cannot keep up with existing complaints. I reported an Ava dined cat, in January, with evidence from the owner, and there was no diligence to support the abandoned car or hold the owner accountable. Adding More animals to protect on an existing overturned system (apparently) not only is illogical but also a financial burden to hire more officers to support. This is ridiculous.
- Difficult to keep clean and prevent odours.
- size of lot, like 5 acres for horse seems to apply to areas outside city limits: smell, extra noise. Arguments could/would occur after approvals - such as when new next door owner arrives. Could drive value down.
- Depends what the definition of "livestock" is
- People can buy an acreage if they want livestock. Livestock in the city carry risk of disease, nuisance to neighbours...and inappropriate living conditions for livestock.
- Based on personal experience of raising and caring for chickens in a rural setting, I am concerned about the noise and odor associated with such activity affecting neighbors.
- It's a matter of trust and the City/Bylaw has broken that trust. If the ring of properties around an urban farm, who have allowed permission for said farm, is later confronted by untenable odour: I have no trust the offender would be forced to stop farm activity. The City/Bylaw administration currently fails to resolve noise/barking dogs if they are not an immediate neighbor. How can they be trusted to protect complainants from the smell of feces along with noise?
- I worry about the cleanliness and noise of such an enterprise.
- So the City has an issue with pitbulls that don't have any higher instances of biting etc, but people don't like them so you feel the need to intervene, but you want to add access to animals that are



equally as annoying and if not cared for bring a variety of different issues? Maybe the lesson here is that you are unable to satisfy everyone so adding more issues to your purview is not the answer.

- Move to the country if you want farm animals.
- Many people in this city do not look after their dogs or cats properly. I have no confidence that people would look after hens, plus roosters are a real problem with the noise they make. I have also seen chickens dumped on Nose Hill. I don't support this in any way.
- City is not the place for farm animals
- Livestock are farm animals not support animals and as such require space not "cooped up" in an urban environment
- It seems to me that this would just have too many shades of grey in its implementation not to be a constant source of contention among neighbours.
- I do not support any urban livestock, including hens, in the City of Calgary. I believe we have enough domestic house animals that can provide emotional needs to people living here. We have enough problems with people not looking after the animal we do allow, let alone adding more species to the list. There would be NO end to what is acceptable and what isn't if this goes through.
- Unless our city lots are made bigger having chickens in the small urban backward we have would be loud and smelly.
- I don't support the keeping of livestock (animals kept for the purpose of providing food) in densely populated urban areas. If someone wants to keep a chicken or a pig as a pet, that's an entirely different matter. I have concerns re: disease, noise, & husbandry particularly by amateurs keeping livestock in close quarters with neighbours.
- Livestock of any kind belongs outside city limits. Hen houses can stink and roosters are noisy. I would not want to live beside someone with any livestock whatsoever. Livestock needs room to roam, and our backyards are not big enough.
- Only if you are on a large acreage and the hens could have a full Co-op and were not close to any other homes
- Wuhan! What about slaughtering of animals for food or religious purposes. Arent abattoirs regulated for a reason?
- It shouldn't have to benefit the community
- The rights of people are clearly more important than those of hens. Hens are noisy and also smell horrible. They should be kept on farms not in residential areas.
- Hens are too noisy for city limits, and they cannot be trained to be quieter. This would disturb all neighbours. Keep hens on a farm - or have a large distance between where the hens are kept and the nearest neighbouring household.
- For the most part I am not in favour of livestock. I think it would be difficult to stop it from getting out of hand. Very limited numbers and enforced site and animal management would have to be enforced.
- There are specific rural farms that facilitate these animals and must not be permitted in an urban environment.



- ABSOLUTELY NOT ... Animals belong on land or farms not in urban city's. Mess, noise escape, luring other wildlife into the city NoNoNo
- A TERRIBLE idea!!! Wherever this has been tried, rescue groups, sanctuaries and shelters are forced to deal with the additional problems created, most notably the massive abandonment of these animals once people are "done" with them, e.g. when chickens stop laying eggs, etc. and these groups are left, unsupported by government funding, to rescue them. Male chicks - after chicks are "ordered" and (horrifically SHIPPED LIVE in boxes; many don't survive; some males used as "packing material"!), males end up being killed off (often gruesomely) since sexing of baby chicks is nigh impossible at the outset, and roosters are not usually allowed to be kept in cities. Most people are NOT responsible or caring enough to commit to "commodified" and exploited animals' needs or lifetimes. MUST READ: 1) <https://www.chowhound.com/food-news/104627/the-dark-side-of-backyard-chickens/#!> 2) <http://gentleworld.org/whats-wrong-with-backyard-eggs/> 3) <https://freefromharm.org/farm-animal-welfare/backyard-chickens-expanding-understanding-harm/>
- These types of animals are extremely noisy! The amount of noise complaints the City will have to deal with will skyrocket which will increase costs to the City and our Property taxes! As well I am concerned with the health implications to the public for these types of animals.
- livestock are usually smelly, sometimes noisy, eg. roosters
- Most city backyards do not have adequate space to provide appropriate care to these animals. Small crowded spaces will lead to smell, fights and disease
- Like cats, dogs and children aren't enough to get neighbours in a twist...now we want to add livestock?
- I don't believe farm animals belong or are necessary in the city
- No thx
- Too noisy, smelly and dirty. Property owners should look at acreages outside of the city, if they are interested in this.
- Concerns over size, cleanliness, and odors of pens.
- If I wanted to live out in the country I would! Having livestock/hens next door to me invites predators & the noise from the hens would be brutal. Strongly against this
- Animals deserve respect and treatment the same way humans do. We can speak/defend ourselves but an animal can not.
- it's awful
- The keeping of livestock should be restricted to rural areas.
- No
- the nuisance factor from hens, sound, smell, predators (coyotes) will outweigh the benefits. If semi-responsible dog owners can't keep their dogs from barking at all hours of the day, how will folks manage hens, who are a farm animal, and not easily managed?
- It's a city with many people. More animals is not the answer in an urban setting. It's not good for anyone or them.
- This is not necessary and would have a stench from lack of cleaning up after pets.
- Why do adjacent neighbors need to support the animal?



- These animals are often noisy and smelly. They don't belong in a city
 - I believe any animal can be a support animal but livestock raised as food or to provide food eg. eggs is for farms/acreages. People will push the limitations of this and set up a chicken coop on a balcony of apartment buildings.
 - I do not believe animals that are not pets belong in an urban environment
 - Don't feel like it's necessary in the city, and not fair to the hens
 - Dogs and cats cause enough problems as many owners are not responsible. All we need now is chickens and livestock. If someone wants to own these, they should buy property out of town.
 - Though I actually do support having hens, I think there are too many people who would abuse the situation and there would be a lot of hens that would be left in terrible situations.
 - Chickens don't belong in urban areas.
 - Livestock are not pets
 - these hens could be a nuisance
 - I would not like to be subjected to farm animals in my neighbourhood.
 - Although I like the idea in principle, the opportunity for abuse and nuisance issues arising from keeping livestock in the city would be overwhelming for The City to monitor and enforce.
 - I don't think we need farm animals living in urban areas. There is enough noise and air pollution without adding livestock to the mix. Farm animals belong in rural areas.
 - we are an urban center. Having livestock in our back yards is a nuance....you have got to be kidding.
 - Are those regulations aiming for the animals to be pets only? Those are animals who sadly are heading to slaughter, way different from what a pet is.
 - Our city is too urban to even consider certain areas that would be acceptable
 - [removed]
 - Because I see problems written all over this. Irresponsible owners. Odors. Cold winters. Not enough bylaw officers to monitor.
 - Livestock in the city would be a nuisance.
 - I don't support chickens in the city
 - Less laws
 - "Calgary is a major metropolitan city, not a farmyard. There are no shortages of organic food at our grocery stores. Why would you consider a bylaw which will only create problems between neighbours and reduce property value? In addition, who is going to police the welfare of these animals? Who is going to annually check on the quality of physical enclosures, food, water, and the feces in the yard? I would LOVE to hear the criteria for ""community benefit"".
-
- It is clear we already have a problem with vicious dogs in our parks, with zero response from police or animal control when called after an attack. As I am writing this, I am watching someone walk their pitbull along the river path, near Eau Claire, unleashed. No bylaw officers or police in sight. Any allowance of people raising animals in their yard will only put further strain on a system that already



cannot do its job. As a taxpayer, there is no room for increased taxes. If someone wants to raise animals, buy a farm and move out of the city. How about creating strict rules to keep vicious animals out of the city and yards clean so neighbours do not lose property value because someone in the area treats their backyard like a henhouse, we stop wasting money on surveys like this and instead give this money to our already underfunded police and animal bylaw officers?"

- My neighbors don't follow by-laws for dogs or cats (barking, running at large), never mind properly raising chickens and pigeons. The lots in my neighborhood are very small and it would be very difficult to comfortably accommodate livestock. If livestock are allowed in Calgary, people will feel entitled to have them regardless of space requirements or the impact on neighbors.
- I am against hens or other livestock in Calgary
- Not appropriate for urban environment
- Hens / chickens belong on farms/ acreage not in the city
- It is hard to be fair and or consistent, for example if everyone on a street wants to keep hens.
- YYC council has elected to squeeze people into narrow lots, not sustainable by any definition because the sustainability model is anti-human. You can't have live stock next to neighbours this close to another's persons home. Bring back a wider lot factor keeping tax's low, then there is "room" for discussion. Not till then, discussion only, many other factors need consideration.
- In practicality, this would be very difficult to accommodate IMO.
- Livestock should not be in urban areas
- It opens up more opportunities for neglected and abandoned animals, and many city vets are not trained to treat livestock
- There is a pigeon breeder near us and cause noise issues, cleanliness issues, and are always in everybody else's yards
- No hens or livestock on residential property.
- Too noisy.
- Too much risk for wildlife to come closer to properties risking the safety of small animals and children
- Noise could be an issue
- If you own your home, your neighbours or the city shouldn't have the right to tell you what you can and can't have in your yard. Yes, suitable conditions should be mandatory as they should be with all animals. If so much trouble is gone through for people to own livestock why can this not be done for all pet owners?
- Livestock do not belong in urban communities.
- They can also do some damage
- The houses are too close together in Calgary for people to own most livestock, especially Chickens with the noise and smell. I'm sure some owners would deal with these issues respectfully but I'm also sure that some people would not and it would cause problems for neighbours and be a headache in getting bylaw officers to attend to deal with the issue.
- Livestock belongs on farms with room to roam
- livestock do not belong in city limits. Nor does manure. What next- ducks, cows, sheep, etc?



- I have lived beside a rooster that crowded at dawn every morning, if not earlier. Enough said.
- I would like to be able to enjoy my yard and not have to listen to hens clucking and smell their feces
- I do not see a need for livestock in an urban environment. Adjacent neighbours may feel pressured to give support, and may regret that decision later, once they realize the impact of their odour and noise.
- We have quite a few neighbours that have had hens and regardless of how they are cared for they make constant noise from sunrise to sunset disrupting the area. It's as disrupting as having a dog sitting outside all day barking
- I grew up on a farm. I don't think chickens or other farm livestock should live in the city.
- no
- Enforcement officer can ignore any and all complaints if they wish to do so. Leaving it up to them is not wise.
- I should not have to get permission from my neighbours to have chickens.
- This would cause problems for neighbours regarding odour and noise.
- Farm animals should not be in the city.
- "Hens in the city will draw other wildlife in ;coyotes, foxes, cougars, etc...)
- This will present a significant danger to the wildlife and (less so but still significant) people. Vehicle bs wildlife incidents would be one example."
- People can't look after their dogs and cats. Chickens are dirty, they shit everywhere. I don't want my neighbour to have chickens. What if a rooster is in the mix by mistake.
- A high density city would not be a suitable place to have livestock.
- You cannot expect dogs to not eat the hens if the come on to you're property.
- Y'all just wanna hate on animals
- Livestock doesn't belong in urban settings, loud, smelly and a healty hazard.
- I do not agree with animal exploitation in any capacity.
- Unsure about livestock and how they could be kept well. I would not like it if a neighbor of mine had livestock - why are they housing livestock?
- Proper cleanliness and storage of chickens isn't common knowledge and keeping them would create a lot of tension between neighbours who don't/do want them.
- I think someone property is someone's property and it seems like you are taking away
- [removed]
- There is no way to insure that people will be responsible and so why start something that can become a real problem in some instances
- No I don't think this would help anything.
- Livestock belong in the country or on acreages NOT IN CITIES. It'll bring down property values, saleability of adjacent homes and is absolutely ridiculous. Lots in the city are too small and will ruin the enjoyment of others in the area to the use of their property. Noise, smell. Could also increase predator species in the city, putting dogs at risk in their own yards.
- I do not want hens living next door tome, they are noisy and make a mess.



- I've said it 5 times already it's unjust
- Because it is cruel to animals who have dine nothing
- Absolutely not. If I wanted hens etc as neighbours I would have moved to the country. Please don't do this to us!!! If someone wants pets/animals then move to the country where you have an opportunity to have some space between you and the neighbour.
- Same as the answer before
- Farm animals don't need to be in the city.
- Livestock are breeding grounds for viruses and illnesses. The pens will stink and not everyone will have the same cleaning standards
- Some home owners will be responsible, but unfortunately many of those who want such things as chickens in their back yard will not adequately maintain the site for cleanliness, smell, poop removal, etc. I've seen it first hand at my relatives place in Nanaimo.
- I feel having chickens and other livestock in an urban setting could have the potential to be extremely loud and unsanitary.
- I don't want to wake up too a hen or roster.
- livestock do not belong in the city.
- livestock and farm animals of all types do not belong in the city
- I am concerned with people possibly not following the rules.
- No additional laws are required specifically for chickens. If the home is not in zoned for such activity then it isn't appropriate. Move to an acreage.
- City living is not small acreage living. Quality of life for the livestock and impact to the neighbours must be considered.
- I do not agree with keeping any animal in a back =yard(including hens).in the city proper i.e. city limits.
- I do not view this as appropriate. Potentially a bylaw to hear special permission for unusual pets would be appropriate where a case by case determination can be evaluated.
- Noise and smell will be an issue. And 'support from adjacent neighbours' makes no sense as neighbours move in/out regularly therefore would impact all neighbourhoods.
- we are living in close quarters in the city with fairly rapid turnover in neighborhoods. I can see this on acreages. This could also present a problem with coyotes; bobcats who generally don't cause trouble...why tempt them?
- Given the parameters stated above I think that the policing of this would become prohibitive financially for the city.
- I do not think an urban setting is suitable for rearing hens
- I don't believe a city is a good living experience for livestock
- I don't want hens in a yardhouse next to me. Perhaps you have a hidden area like you have with the communal gardens. Create a communal hen area.
- Many backyards in Calgary are too small to provide enough physical separation between one neighbour and another neighbour's hens/livestock. Smell and noise will be an issue in small lots.



- It would be nice to have livestock there so cute, they get tired then mistreat, abandon, there would have to be strict rules
- Hens ok. Livestock should be on farms. For their well being.
- I think livestock should remain in the country areas
- No hens or other livestock should be allowed in residential neighbourhoods. But if this bylaw gets passed, the entire neighbourhood needs to vote by secret ballot whether yay or nay.
- I just don't feel the need to have livestock in the city period. If you want livestock, purchase the land for it. There should be a minimum amount of land required within the city. Too many yards are too small and crowded. People aren't taking care of their cats and dogs what's going to be different with people taking care of livestock.
- I don't believe livestock belongs in the city in general, however, if all neighbors are supportive of the livestock being housed nearby and the animals can have appropriate space and care, then I guess it's fine.
- A chicken (hen) is classified as livestock. Livestock does not belong in the City. Also, if one allows hens, why not roosters? Roosters crow at dawn and this will be a big nuisance to people.
- I do not see the need for this
- The impact of these animals would be to more than just adjacent neighbours, Calgarians cannot responsibly provide care for dogs and cats while considering their neighbours this would be worse with livestock.
- Requires increased enforcement
- I don't want to live beside a neighbor who has livestock in his backyard. It is not healthy for my family that have multiple allergy issues that can be fatal to them. If a person wishes to keep livestock, they can move to an acreage.
- This would be difficult to control and may be unfair to neighbors.
- Depending on the yard, hens can be noisy and smelly and some cultures may start raising them for food then the neighbours are dealing with discarded parts etc- I lived in the Middle East and I did not like living next to farm animals in the city.
- This is ridiculous. I grew up on a farm and hens, pigs no matter how much "precautions" and preventative" measures the odour and noise cannot be mitigated. One of the goals of the city is densification, this would be at odds with that. Acreages that happen to be part of the city of Calgary may be the exception
- Clucking is annoying when your sitting in your backyard and no roosters at dawn
- This bylaw amendment is just stupid and you ought to be ashamed
- "These animals would attract the coyotes, bobcats etc to private yards . This is not appropriate to Calgary.
- We are surrounded by natural areas and wildlife"
- They are dirty animals. They are noisy and we have enough problems with magpies.
- Having chickens in the city will be a slippery slope especially if they are looking at other animals (pot bellied pigs, goats) all are noisy & don't belong in a residential area. Dogs you can train to be quiet - not chickens, pigs & goats



- Livestock have no place in an urban/suburban location.
- As stated previously I have 1 nasty neighbor - they would never support anything I would want to try. Should be *majority* of neighbors supporting...
- There is always noise and mess associated with farm animals. This is not appropriate when people are in close proximity.
- I believe allowing people to keep hens and/or livestock in the city would be a nuisance to neighbours.
- Livestock would attract more wild animals and cause more problems for cat and dog owners.
- "No livestock within city limits.
- Maybe special permits could be considered for hens with neighbor approval."
- "They attract vermin.
- They stink.
- They make noise.
- It's unnecessary. Buy eggs at the store or move to the country."
- If you want chickens move out of the city
- Noise and cleanliness. We have enough problems with rodents as it is, we do not need more attractants.
- No live stock in the city! we have farms for that! Too messy and too much trouble and potential diseases.
- Hens and other birds have common disease with humans and can transfer them to humans. It is dangerous and a threat to health.
- Are you kidding? Farm animals belong on farms. They stink, chickens are noisy and I can't imagine what would be in people's yards. Goats, pigs? Don't even think about this one.
- I grew up on a farm. There is no way to contain the noise and smell to the neighbours property.
- No hens should be allowed in the city
- Noise and smell needs to be considered. Smell cannot be managed.....ask a farmer
- It is hard enough getting along with neighbours. I grew up with chickens and would love to see more in the country, but city lots are not big enough. They are noisy and can be smelly. They will attract wildlife (coyotes, bobcats) to spend more time in the denser residential neighbourhoods (vs. occasional visits and remaining on the fringes.) Do you want people armed to protect their wildlife like on farms, too? Not a good fit.
- We bought this house in this area because of the quiet and lack of rental properties - since the city decided to approve rental suites (this property had been illegal suites up until a very short time ago - even then it was EXTREMELY problematic and we were actively pursuing the city to have this resolved.) We have been personally besieged by these BAD renters next door - 2 suites there. The property owner is beyond rude and difficult and has threatened to sue us if we don't stop harassing her. We have had to call the fire department, police and the city repeatedly with different renters to have these people removed. All the time there was LOUD MUSIC, drugs, alcohol, fights -- screaming, yelling, cursing, violence, fires, throwing cig butts ,garbage etc into our yard, smoking soo much marijuana that we couldn't even sit outside to enjoy our own property - Not to mention that



when we step out our back door it looks right into a former laundry room that is now a bathroom only to see naked men & women who have no consideration at all - in fact even with the current upper renter we had the police come out to calm the man down due to a HORRIBLE violent verbal assault on his 16 year old daughter. This has affected us deeply and personally in our emotional and mental wellness. I have suffered with panic attacks and anxiety since this has begun that I am not able to manage. Chickens and other animals besides cats/dogs and small pets will be another nightmare again. A few years ago my son bought a house to remodel and live in - he didn't know there where chickens/rooster there. We helped him to remodel AND clean up the yard and garden - the mess was unbelievable there too. Dead things, mice, chicken residue, all matter of disgusting stuff WE had to clean up - not the neighbor who was breaking the law. So NO we are not open to this at all. I also believe that this change in the law WILL reduce the value of our property.

- We already have a rough time getting rest with neighbors dogs barking through the night, not to mention feces all over our lawn. We live in a city to not be bothered by having to deal with animals. Will all needs of neighbors be considered before hens are brought into neighboring lots? Unlikely. What about containment of scent, feces, mites from these animals and the health impact on my children if cops are just over the fence? Smell from the animals and their feces?
- This will just open the door to ridiculous motions to keep larger livestock. And who wants to hear a rooster crowing in the morning. And even if neighbors approved what happens when they move away and the new neighbors don't approve
- I grew up in a farm. I like chickens, but I would worry about farm odours from chickens or other livestock in an urban setting, particularly in neighbourhoods with smaller lot sizes. What about having a community space for raising chickens, similar to a community garden model, or in partnership with schools?
- No. I don't want the smell of the hen cage feces or the morning sounds from the hens/roosters crowing. I lived in countries where this is common in the city and it was terrible.
- Don't need livestock in the city
- I don't think that's necessary
- While I'm sure that some people would be responsible, many will not. The only way I would support urban livestock is if there was a mandatory course and license requirement.
- I don't think your outlook or attitude to animals is acceptable, way too much bias/exaggeration & therefore not qualified to organise anything for animal welfare fullstop.
- those kinds on animals do not belong in cities ..if I wanted to live on a farm i would live on a farm
- People living across from me in my back lane had chickens. I have trouble sleeping and did not like being woken up at dawn by the chickens.
- I don't believe hens should be permitted within the urban area. Additionally, a pet licence should be for the lifetime of a pet versus annual (or the option of fee increments). LESA pets - I am assuming these let's have been screened. I know of some families cheating and saying their pet is certified in order to bring it to all public venues. All they did was to complete a form but due to confidentiality the dog did not pass any certification process. I believe in service pets but assumed the certification process was more rigorous.



- No livestock in a standard city neighbourhood. However, if there are large, rural-type properties within the city boundaries, perhaps they could fall under an exception given distance from neighbouring properties, size of lot and animal enclosure, noise bylaw and health and sanitation compliance etc.
- Livestock of any kind are not needed in urban settings. Have we learned anything from this pandemic?
- I just don't want chickens in the city
- A large number of people can't even look after allowed animals responsibly - why add more animals to the list. Just look at the number of pets in shelters and rescue agencies already.
- Animals like chickens are great during good weather but suffer considerably if not properly housed and cleaned during the winter. Will their structure require a building permit? Will people use space heaters that have potential of starting a fire? Where will all their excrement go - into compost or garbage bin so increasing costs for all that?
- Livestock should NOT be kept in the city - if people want farm animals they should move to a farm. Most people are uneducated in the proper care of domesticated animals, let alone livestock! However, my biggest concern is over the smell of animal waste and noise (again - too many people can't even be bothered cleaning up after their dogs - let alone chickens, or sheep or pigs)! Also - what makes the Chief Bylaw Officer an expert in making decisions regarding livestock?
- Chickens should not be in the city. It could be a nightmare for a neighbor.
- Chickens are louder than dogs
- I am not sure if I would like my neighbours to have chickens next door to me. Mostly my consideration would be the noise of a cock crowing in the early morning hours! Otherwise, I don't think the hens themselves would be a problem as such.
- Don't want backyard chickens
- I grew up on a farm and if the chicken coop is not well maintained, there is smell and noise that I would not like to live beside.
- the city is no place for livestock - free roaming pets are enough of a problem; clearly too many people do not take responsibility for their animals now and "support from neighbours" can change overnight once a "for sale" sign goes up on a house -
- Hens DO NOT have ANY place in the City. They are farm animals and should remain there.
- Strong no. Smell and noise of urban hens and accompanying roosters is the reason I am not in favour of chickens in Calgary.
- Livestock is for rural properties and should remain that way
- We don't need urban birds. If you are going to discriminate against dog breeds because of poor information and outdated research, birds have contagious diseases (bird flu) and I am also scared of them and find it traumatising
- Livestock has no place within city confines, unless property is registered as an acreage or specified part thereof.



- There are many coyotes and bobcats in my neighborhood. I would be concerned that an adjacent neighbour with urban livestock would attract additional predators to my backyard and endanger my young children and dog.
- I don't want the smell or noise from livestock
- It will get abused by immigrants who think they can live like they did in their home country and turn into a clusterflop. Without mandatory inspections on a quarterly basis, and that gets expensive, people will try to turn it into a business.
- If you want to raise livestock you should be living on a farm, not in the city.
- Farm animals belong on a farm where there is space. Even if you try to make a nice space for a miniature pony in your house, this animal would still be happier in a real pasture. Hens (and other livestock) are noisy and territorial. We should not encourage these animals within city limits.
- You want to exclude wildlife feeding on private property and have stinking hens and barnyard critters actively living in the city instead. How bizarre is that?
- I don't want to live beside someone in the city who had Hens, or pigeons or livestock
- Go buy a place outside the city if you want that, if someone had a rooster next door, or three blocks away, it would be INCREDIBLY infuriating, especially how much it costs to live in Calgary... it's only worth it if there's no roosters, yikes
- Ridiculous if you want to allow people to have live stock in a city but set restrictions for people having loving pitbulls.
- What kinds of animals are we talking about? Other than hens and fowl, I cannot imagine other types of livestock in Calgaryans backyards.
- You are entertaining the idea of banning the feeding of wild birds in Calgary, which gives untold numbers of people great joy, yet you want to allow livestock to be kept on private property where many will ultimately be slaughtered for food. Calgary is an urban centre, not a farm. If people want to raise farm animals they should live in the country. The health implications alone are a great concern.
- People are dumb and will get sick and be gross
- I don't believe that anyone within the city actually has the property or space that would ensure that such animals don't encroach on the quality of life of surrounding neighbours.
- A city is not a place to raise livestock. Period.
- I am concerned about the decision making of the bylaw leadership
- I think it becomes a slippery slope, enforcement would be a nightmare and it would encourage more misconduct between neighbours. I don't want a stinky, noisy chicken coop next to my bedroom window, but one animal might be fine. You would really have to look at parameters and how much time you have to sort out disagreements
- high density neighbourhood and small lots are not ideal for livestock/poultry
- I think they are noisy smelly and wouldn't want them in my neighborhood- I was raised on a farm with hens and can speak from experience
- Risk of disease to other animals and humans is increased.
- Hens belong on a farm
- Livestock belongs on a rural farm to avoid noise and noxious/unpleasant smells.



- Ethnic groups would be killing fowl animals inhumanely. Living conditions will not be monitored by bylaw. Our standards for animal welfare will not be upheld.
- Livestock have specific requirements which are not always suitable for an urban area. Unless certain parts of the city have special zoning to allow this, livestock should remain in rural areas
- I don't think you can get people to look after and clean up after livestock in a city setting. You can't get them to pick up dog poop or keep their dogs from attacking other people or dogs.
- Why on earth do we need hens in a city? They (and their smell) belong on a farm.
- Do not support hens or livestock living in urban areas. People need to choose support animals and pets that can be happy and healthy and monitored properly. We already have a problem finding, caring for abandoned, neglected and abused dogs and cats. We don't have resources to expand that care.
- I don't care about animals other than dogs
- "[removed]"
- Maybe a payment to neighbours within a certain radius for inconvenience/noise/nuisance/property devaluation?"
- I wouldn't like the noise or smell
- Chickens stink. Livestock does not belong in an urban environment.
- This would be highly dependent on the neighborhood and size of lots, etc.
- The city is no place for Livestock/Farm Animals. There are already too many irresponsible domestic house pet owners living in the city, allowing them to have livestock/farm animals in the small city yards will only make the stray/homeless animal population worse.
- "No, hens are noisy, smelly and I would not be happy if my neighbours in these small suburban lots had hens. They carry disease and during a time when a world pandemic is suspected to have been transmitted to humans through animals, this seems a ridiculous allowance.
- The city already can't manage or ensure the safe living conditions of dogs and cats, how are they going to ensure hens are warm, safe and cared for. I suspect many people will just leave them outside or in an unheated garage in the cold weather. That is unacceptable."
- This is how COVID and bird flu are created. City properties are too small and too close together. I don't want to smell horse poop
- It just doesn't seem right
- It's not fair to neighbours to have to put up with the noise, smell etc that comes from having livestock & urban chickens in the city. Not all pet owners are responsible and that's not fair to the animals or neighbours to have to deal with that. Some people just aren't good neighbours and adding urban chickens / livestock to the mix wouldn't be a great combination
- This looks like a very labour intensive process for City staff, with few benefits.
- I honestly struggle with this question - I love small livestock, and would love to have hens etc. and I thought I would answer "Yes" to this kind of question. But as a person who has adopted several pets from the Humane Society over the years - I can only imagine what might happen if people are suddenly allowed more than "traditional pets" in their yards. The city of Calgary doesn't even like people to have clothes lines - what are they going to do when roosters are crowing at the crack of



dawn and goats are climbing on shed roofs!? Most people could probably be trusted to be responsible, but I shudder to think of even a small percentage of possible abuse and/or neglect of livestock because people who have seen it glamorized on the internet think they can have a little "homestead" in the city but it doesn't work out like they hoped. It sure would be a larger range of animalkind for Bylaw Enforcement teams to try and monitor citywide - and I would hate to log onto the Humane Society site in the future to check out animals for adoption and find that not only can people not be responsible enough to take care of a hamster or cat, but now there are abandoned goats and chickens too! Not to mention that with consideration to question 2 - like it or not, (I like it - I want to keep my bird feeder!) wildlife is a reality for the city of Calgary - moose have wandered downtown! Mostly, it is delightful to have so much nature right in our backyard, but "sketchy" encounters will increase between animals which people choose to have in their backyard like livestock and pets - and the wildlife of the Calgary area, and is difficult to control. Basically, put hen houses in the city - coyote, lynx, foxes and the like will be attracted into the city, how will that be mitigated by way of safety for people, pets and livestock? And we are doing those kinds of wildlife no favours by luring them into the city with fresh eggs, juicy chickens and vulnerable livestock in backyards; wildlife might needlessly be destroyed if animal control officers are called on to intervene. Please consider the safety risks from all angles - especially the vulnerability of livestock, and the fact that Calgary is naturally a city filled with delightful wildlife before allowing the amendment, thank you!

- Livestock should be in a Rural setting.
- Hens can contract and spread serious diseases.
- the neighbour cant even mow his lawn or pick his weeds, certainly isn't gonna look after chickens properly, he's lazy. Look how many people in city can not even look after the house or lawn, you cant allow these fools to have chickens. Then these hipsters when the Hen can no longer produce eggs don't have the fortitude to kill and eat the hen so all these chickens end up at the animal shelter.
- I do not want to live next door to chickens!! That's what acreages & farms are for.. I can't stand people who don't look after their yards & the city does nothing about that - I cannot see them bylaw enforcement in this case either!! My property value would soon be zero!!
- Hens do not belong in urban neighbourhoods.
- I don't support raising livestock including hens in the City.
- Farm animals belong in rural areas. Increased risk of noise, odors and disease.
- The city is not a place for any livestock. It is really bad for the neighbors and the neighbors should not be put in the conflict position of having to say no.
- Under no circumstances do I want hens in my neighbors yards. Hens belong in the country or on acreages.
- Not interested in living in a hybrid urban/rural setting. High likelihood that this bylaw would devalue property by limiting buyers with similar views.
- Not enough info. Are these animals going to be predators to the bird life? Ex: South Calgary hospital brought in Per Falcons to kill pigeons but it is my view they also are preying on the smaller colourful birds in our area. BE Careful about species!



- No farm animals should be in an urban environment unless the property is a quarter acre or larger.
- Not everyone will follow the criteria.
- Due to the wild animals in Calgary I do not think this is a good idea
- I don't think most yards are suitable.
- Urban farming is a bad idea.
- It would be too costly and difficult to regulate. Neighbours change. Livestock numbers increase. Such a rule would require us to become monitors of our neighbours' behaviour and to report on them, Stasi style.
- In the country you have to have 3 acres to have one animal. There is NO city lot that would allow sufficient space for these animals to live properly.
- Livestock is meant for farms and acreages.
- No, they shouldn't be allowed within city limits
- this is not a rural town it's a major city
- There is a real coyote problem in Calgary. Having hens in yards would end up a bloodbath and distressing to all neighbours. The noise of hens and roosters would not be pleasant as a neighbour.
- No barnyard animals on my street
- Livestock should be in farms
- Don't want farm animals near my home
- Livestock do not belong in cities
- No roosters re noise issue
- We do not need hens. They are annoying and loud and dirty.
- Sanitation and smell from livestock excrement If numbers of animals are not determined could be a problem.
- "1. Not being an expert in animal husbandry, I question needs of the livestock been met. They tend to be pack animals (ie sheep), the space they require to eat, roam,. Even the numbers. 1 or 2 OK.? Type of safety required. Also how would leaving it outside impact "teasing of other wildlife
- Human impact. Considering neighbours today may work, but if someone moves, is the process reinstated to ensure all concerns are addressed.
- 3.Assume they would be considered similar to pets, so Would they have similar requirements and "nuisance l(i.e. noise or smell Etc. become part of By-law. Would they be allowed in parks, ? Extension of "off leash " include any animal.
- If enclosures are required. Would there be building requirements required and permit system required. With coverage a criteria
- Where and how are feces disposed."
- I am doubtful that people can take care of hens properly. Oftentimes, animals used for food or food production are treated inhumanely. They are not seen as pets but only as inanimate objects that can be treated inhumanely.
- Far too vague as to types of livestock and numbers of same.



- Livestock and poultry belong on farms, not in a city backyard. Chicken meat and eggs are inexpensive, and available at virtually every grocery and most convenience stores in Calgary.
- Livestock belongs on a farm
- Not sure what the benefit would be. Noise, smell etc would be increased.
- Don't agree with the first condition requiring community benefit.
- I don't think mist lot sizes are big enough to consider having other livestock living in our city.
- I personally am not in favour of hens in the backyard, what about winter time and do you know just how dirty they can be?????
- If this is allowed then you have the problem of smell, removal of waste etc. If this is not done then you have to get bylaw involved.
- We have enough problem with pets in the city without adding farm animals.
- Don't want chickens next door.
- Odour. Disease. Poisoning. Animal threats.
- This is a slippery slope and irresponsible owners would mean more problems.
- Current pet owners are irresponsible with there pets as it is. They don't have them on leashes when they are supposed to and a lot of pet owners will not pick up the dog poop and if they do, a lot of owners just drop the bag when no one is looking so they don't have to carry it to a waste bin. Chickens do not smell very nice in confined areas and they are farm animals that should be kept on a farm. If people want chickens that should move to the country were the chickens belong
- If I wanted to live on/near a farm I wouldn't live in a city.
- I see too many loopholes that can infringe on neighbours in their homes/properties as well as health hazards.
- I can't believe that enough space could be provided for a healthy animal except birds that can fly.
- Yards in newer communities are too small to have hens and livestock.
- Too nebulous to support.
- I don't believe there will be follow through from Bylaw
- Livestock care would need to be regulated. The care and feeding of these animals would need to regulated. If the animals are kept in filthy, crowded conditions it can create chaos and a noisy nuisance in a neighborhood. I am not in agreement with having chicken coops in neighbourhoods. There's enough trouble with problem dog and cat owners already.
- Most urban yards are not very big, and I think all livestock should be raised where they have space to move around and have exercise and stimulation in their every-day environment. Therapy animals would be an exception. The other concern to me is that animal feed outside results in staggering increases in the rodent population.
- I do not support hens or other livestock in the city - especially one where the FOCUS is on densification.
- Livestock belong on farms. Who would be paying for the monitoring of this?
- A disturbance to neighbours who may not be in agreement
- Livestock, including chickens, are farm animals and should only be found on farms not in cities.



- I do not support chickens or any other kind of livestock in the city. Move to the country if you want chickens and other livestock. We already have bobcat, cougar and coyote problems, imagine if we start allowing our yards to support farm animals. Some people can't control their cats how are they going to control other animals
- I don't want any "farm" animals in the city or even homing pigeons. They are noisy and smelly and a nuisance.
- I think it leaves the door wide open for abuse and what livestock are allowed. Someone keeping pigs for example - the impact to the neighborhood is greater than just the adjacent neighbors.
- The classification of "livestock" is rather arbitrary, particularly when people are allowed to breed cats, dogs, and other "domestic" animals in urban environments.
- Concerns about attracting rodents.
- You don't have the resources to manage the animal population complaints and violations - as it is.
- I do not support having hens or any other livestock to be permitted in the city. The exception I would consider is if the animal is a rescue and is not being used for food.
- I would be concerned about the cleanliness of keeping hens or other farm animals in a small city lot.
- "This approval may have the support of the present adjacent neighbours but what happens if these neighbours sold their home and the new home owner now finds out that his/her adjacent neighbour keeps livestock. If they make a complaint to the city will the city withdraw the earlier permit issued to the livestock owner or will the city pay for the new home owner who is a neighbor inconvenience fees to relocate from that area?"
- When buying a home it is difficult to know everything about your neighbours until you start living in your new home."
- I choose to live in an urban area where physical distance between adjacent properties is generally restricted. If residents want to own livestock or chickens or bees they should also choose to live on an acreage/rural property where agricultural activities are not just allowed but expected.
- "This is the city. If you want livestock, move to a farm or rural area. Houses are too close, neighbourhoods are too busy and noisy and smelly already.
- This will cause lots of neighbour vs neighbour problems.
- Absolutely not necessary to add hens to our city. Adding urban hens - there is NO need at all and anyone saying they need it, need more help than they can get from a hen."
- No hens or urban livestock should be permitted. Coyotes are too much of a problem as it is.
- I was raised on a farm and fully understand the need for livestock of various types. That is why we have farms. Cities are not farms and as such are not designed or suitable for the raising of livestock. Many people are fearful of non-domestic animals, even including birds such as chickens, etc and no matter what you try you will never be able to sufficiently abate the odours from livestock. Neighbours should not have to tolerate that intrusion on their privacy and enjoyment of their property. If people want livestock, then move to an acreage out of the city.
- Livestock belongs in the country / farm



- The above offers no limitations on number of hens, their humane living conditions, sanitation and odour control of their coops and and no identification of other livestock under consideration. Insufficient information!
- "Waste management ie odour, noice ie crowing and space restrictions in an urban setting would pose problems not only for owners but neighbours .
- Health and animal wellbeing would be the Owners responsibility . However who would monitor this?"
- Concerns around the control of smell.
- If you want to own hens or livestock, move out to the country. I don't want the noise and smell and flies in my neighborhood.
- noise! and smell.
- Terms are too vague. "Community benefit" is an arguable term. What does it mean?
- If we are going to allow hens, why not goats, pigs and cows too and horses on the streets again? This is a slippery slope. If you want farm animals in your backyard , move out of the city to a farm. Farm animals are smelly and noisy.
- Most properties in Calgary are way to small. I can't imagine having a goat or llama in a tiny city back yard.
- Hens pigs and other livestock should NOT be allowed. Dogs and roaming cats are enough problems
- Hens belong on a hobby farm. They would attract mice and rodents to a community.
- I don't support hens either. Inner city is too densely populated and most of the yards in the city in particular the newer areas do not have sufficient space to properly provide for this. I believe it will be a significant nuisance to the neighbours. I think it will also lead to greater presence of predator wildlife in the neighbourhoods - specifically coyotes, coy wolves, and bobcats. I live in a densely populated area near the reservoir and often seen coyotes and other predators running down the streets of my neighbourhood and I think the presence of 'urban livestock' would significantly increase their presence.
- Hens and chickens and other livestock create unpleasant odours which could be objectionable to other residents and impact property values. Perhaps some farms or acreages outside of Calgary would allow the boarding of livestock for a fee.
- This is hard - not enough info to say yes 100%. A hen ok a dozen maybe not, a pig ok a dozen not. What happens when a neighbor who said it's ok, now moves and the new resident doesn't agree. There are a lot of considerations for noise and smell. A hen in a fenced back yard ok but a fenced back yard backing into a green space would likely be noisier due to the echo (we know living on one what the noise is like for a dog bark)
- Those that want livestock in their yard need to move to a farm.
- After visiting a community where chickens are allowed, the constant noise, smell & lack of owner accountability was distressing.
- We don't raise game in the city.
- Leave them on the farms.



- "Care of animals may not be done properly, resulting in problems
- Noise can be a factor as well as wild life coming into area for the hens"
- This is a city, not a farm!
- There is no need for livestock in city yards.
- Too many people in Calgary already cannot be bothered to pick up after their dogs. Are they going to be cleaning up after pigs and goats? I wouldn't want to be living next to someone whose garden stinks of manure.
- hens are noisy and smelly and would decrease the property value and enjoyment by the neighbours.
- Just as in the ownership of pets not everybody is or would be a responsible livestock owner.
- Keep livestock out of the city
- I appreciate that you say the animals need to have suitable living conditions but what are those conditions? They have been deplorable for dogs and cats for years, what will you change for chickens?
- "You would have Roosters that crow and how would you stop them from making their noise.
- This would also bring the coyote closer to your home and any other predator that has made the city their home. If you want to raise chickens move to the country."
- Farm animals do not belong in residential neighbourhoods.
- Why buy a home in the city if you want livestock? No, this will stink if living next door to them, just a like a dog owner who does not clean up after a pet.
- People can justify almost anything today. How long until a cow is in a back yard and the owner indicates it has a positive impact because kids get to learn where there food comes from so they stop eating meat? Cage kept animals are generally smelly by nature. Keep the animals to traditional pets.
- There are not enough bylaw officers to efficiently deal with nuisance complaints re noise, deplorable conditions, and loose animals as it stands now. Adding additional varieties of animals would only make this worse.
- Lack of the city maintain green spaces tells me that they have no time to police this bylaw and all we end up with barnyard smells from unkeptbackyards.
- Unless the city can guarantee that urban livestock being kept in a bakcyard setting will not affect the health (taking into account related allergies, fleas on the birds that can transfer to house pets, etc.) and safety (e.g., cleanliness of the environment), personal use and pleasure of their own spaces for neighbours, clean non-odourous air on the other side of the fence (as relates to the chickens poop/bedding or that of any other urban livestock) ... and those that are negatively affected in any way (e.g., noise, odour, 'escapees') by the urban livestock in a neighbour's yard have a no cost, immediate way of resolving any issues that arise ... I just think that the can of worms being opened will simply cost me, the taxpayer, more for city services. Livestock belongs in a rural area with distances between neighbours, not in a city trying in increase human accommodation density. What rules about space between livestock accommodations and neighbours' fence lines will there be?



- Chickens smell and can attract predators such as coyotes or bobcats. They are also noisy. Most yards are not big enough for other animals. Not all owners are responsible or clean.
- I am concern about the new issues that could arise. Look at some of the chicken and roaster problems in Hawaii. I live in an area where there is a lot of wild life coming through or close by. I do not want to see chickens and the likes in the back yards enticing these animals and then having the wild animal blamed for the harm caused. Some of my neighbours are already over reacting to bobcats. Yards are getting smaller not larger and I think if we are doing a survey for dogs and cats there is issues with some owners not being responsible. Take the issue of domestic rabbits. Check out the C-Train stop at 39th S. I think the city has enough to manage as it is.
- Livestock should have the benefits of being raised in farm environments that better support their specific needs.
- Hens and other livestock should be rural settings not residential neighborhoods.
- having hens in a yard sounds great but most people are not conscientious enough to keep these facilities clean and healthy for the birds.
- There is not enough space in some communities to allow livestock and I do not wish to see what little green space that is available be given up to allow livestock to live within the city proper.
- No livestock in city limits
- I don't want to be living next door to a zoo! Barking dogs is enough where the City does nothing about it anyways!
- Mess and smell...some property owners do not keep a tidy yard now..with roaming hens and chicken coops in their yard this would only worsen!
- People cannot properly take care of their cats and dogs. People have enough trouble with their neighbors without adding more animals to this list.
- If I wanted farm animals in my neighbourhood, I would have moved into a home situated in the country.
- livestock animals belong on farms not in city or towns. The cleanliness, smell, diseases, noise, they can bring to city should be a deterrent not have such animals in the city.
- as a previous owner of hens for the purpose of egg production in a rural setting I know how much of an offensive odor and noise they produce It would be an onerous job to police the owners to maintain a clean environment. A few chickens produce a large amt of amonia smelling waste. Also where is the waste to be disposed of and how will disposal of same be monitored and enforced
- We are not living on a farm.
- Foresee to many issues/problems with this
- Again, for what part of no do you require an explanation?
- Livestock are not appropriate to city living
- Hens are fine; not sure about "other" livestock.
- Smells and sounds from animals are not was Calgarians want in their city.
- The smell of poultry feces has no place in the city.
- There is no place for these animals in a city. They will inevitably often be in crowded conditions, be a nuisance to the neighbours and are disease vectors. We don't need any more Corona viruses.



- If a person wants to raise livestock, they should get a rural property.
- Exploitation of animals is not ethical and has a negative impact on the environment.
- Farm animals do not belong in urban environments .
- There's already too much noise in the city. Working machinery at all times of the day. More peaceful existence in the city is required.
- Not fair to neighbours i.e. buzzing bees and noisy chickens
- Farm animals belong on the farm
- it is a city, not a farm.
- I do not support livestock in the city.
- You'll have horses, cows and pigs in the city. They are not city animals but belong on farms.
- City backyards are not suitable to contain livestock. Too noisy and smelly
- Could encourage bob cats etc. Chickens. pigs can make a lot of noise. Food around could encourage mice. These are farm animals & should be in the country.
- A city back yard should not be able to have farm animals that stink and make noise.
- Agree to all but having support from neighbours, they might not be qualified to participate in this decision and the decision might influenced based on their personal relationship with the neighbours.
- Needs to accompany some kind of noise or smell ordinance.
- Farm animals belong on a farm
- Noise, smell, predators. Bylaw infractions hard to impose when multiple livestock over any set limits.
- This is a city, not a farm.
- "By-law & SPCA are already stretched to the max, they do not need the extra work. Finding homes for neglected/abused domestic animals is already enough let alone having to find suitable homes for farm animals.
- If you want to own farm animals move to rural area."
- A city isn't a farm
- chickens perhaps but not larger animals such as sheep, cows, horses. a city lot is far to small for these.
- I don't believe private properties within the city is appropriate for hens
- Barking dogs are already a nightmare this would be out of control - you want to stop us feeding birds but you would consider adding livestock? what are you thinking
- Noise and odour would be inevitable
- Livestock should not be allowed within the city limits. Backyards are not farms.
- livestock is livestock, can't continue to make exceptions for a very few people. Someone could make the case they need a cow to support their dietary conditions...need to draw the line for the majority of the population vs the implied need of a very few people.
- Calgary is an urban center and not a location for acreage animal raising. Hens are enough, people do not need horses, goats etc. in their backyard.
- The city is no place for livestock. I love animals and would love to own my own little farm but livestock should not be in the city. They need open space and quietness.



- Noise and smell.
- Concern is neglect. We don't need more animals in the city.
- Do not support increase in allowance of urban livestock.
- There will be very few people who keep up with cleaning and maintaining the animals, and hens are very smelly.
- for noise reasons, shift workers will have more noise to contend with, early morning chicken noise. Livestock should be on the farm.
- You cannot guarantee they will not be used for food.
- It will get out of hand
- Hens/other "farmed" animals should not be allowed within city limits unless they are rescues and not being used for any type of food production. "Farmed" animals belong on farms, not in urban centres.
- Farm animals should not be in the city - move out to the country if you want this, dirty, disruptive, no.
- This could cause significant odor issues
- Almost no one knows what they're getting into when either wanting to have hens (or anything else), or potentially agreeing to have hens in the neighbour's back yard. It's a long term commitment, like any pet. Seems likely to be something that causes problems between neighbours, and not just immediate neighbours. Best to just not allow it all and avoid the possible and likely neighbour problems that bylaw and policy would end up having to deal with.
- This is ridiculous for an urban city center.
- There are no farms in the city livestock belongs on farms
- Not sure how this would work or be enforced.
- The potential for inhumane treatment/conditions of these animals is too great; the enforcement needed would be lacking or expensive; and the potential for problems between neighbours would be high.
- No farm animals in city, this out door market is what causes sickness
- I oppose allowing hens or other farmed animals in the city, unless they are rescued and not used for food.
- Too open to individual interpretation; not too sure re "suitable" means
- Due to the noise, lack of cleanliness, and potential of more wildlife incidents (e.g. bobcats, coyotes, etc). There are too many irresponsible pet owners that have dogs and cats, imagine the grief with hens.
- Farm animals do not belong in the city
- Chickens are super loud. Unless you live on an acreage, please don't have chickens in urban areas. Chickens cannot be tamed, yell at all hours, are territorial, and can attack. (Written as a person who has spent time with and been attacked by farm chickens). I support service animals (including ponies), but that's after rigorous training.
- I oppose allowing hens or any other farm animals unless they are rescues and only if they are not used for food.
- They are messy/potentially stinky if owners aren't responsible and many aren't.



- My only concern would be people mistreating or not understanding the full commitment of these animals before getting them and causing animal neglect or too many animal seizures for the city (humane society) to handle
- Livestock do not belong in city conditions.
- houses are too close together and yards are too small
- hens are noisy and messy, and attract predatory wildlife.
- Cleanliness, smell
- i dont need my neighbor support or permission for what i do in my house.. if i want a dog my neighbor has nothing to do.with it.
- If you want to keep livestock, move to the country. This should not be an option for city backyards I have lived in this situation in other jurisdictions, and it was a disaster for everyone except the keepers of livestock, including hens. Noise, smell and disease. NO Thank You
- I am not a fan of urban chickens, especially roosters.
- Too many people don't know what they are doing or how to care for hens. I suspect the result would be many unwanted or higher rates of abuse for these animals.
- Concern for the potential abuse and mistreatment especially if being used as meat or breeding not just eggs. Much like inability of the city to manage other animal abuse / lack of adequate care already.
- Livestock cannot have a sustainable and fulfilling lifestyle in the city. They are agricultural animals for a reason.
- Health issues and predators are drawn to the hens.
- I do not support any livestock, including chickens/urban hens. Goats need to be hired to take care of weeds in more areas of Calgary please! Imperial Oil/Esso is using them too at their plants.
- If people wish to own livestock, they should not live in an urban setting.
- Even with support from neighbour, the rating of livestock in the city will be problematic. Aside from monitoring these activities there will be considerable time and resources needed to police the activities and respond to problems,such as noise and smell.
- Livestock belongs on a farm that offers more space and humane housing.
- Smell, noise, general nuisance and reduced property values. If you want chickens move to a farm.
- Farm animals need proper room and care. A Calgary home/ backyard would not be enough. Exception would be fostering/rescuing an animal and nursing them back to health. Once healthy needs proper farm/sanctuary to live at.
- My neighbors have "urban pigeons" in a coop in their back yard. They are messy, loud, smell awful, and do not taste good. For the sake of the neighbors who can afford their own eggs, please do not move forward with this. Chickens are also loud, smelly, but taste good. That is the only difference.
- I do not want urban hens in my neighborhood due to noise and smell. They belong in a farm or rural area.
- I am concerned about the noise for neighbours and also this attracting wildlife.
- "Livestock come with diseases and smells
- This is a city not a farm / acreage"



- Too much risk.
- "Livestock specifically hens are loud and cannot be controlled under the residential noise bylaws. Livestock is also very odorous and owners most of the time will not put the effort required into cleaning them to keep the smell down.
- Even with the support from adjacent neighbours clause it has the potential to upset neighbour relationships if either a) a neighbour upsets the applicant through saying no or b) the neighbour as they state they are ok with it to not upset the balance even though they don't want the animals around."
- Livestock in urban living setting can draw in wild animals because the livestock such as hens are easy prey. I live in Inglewood and have issues with coyote / skunk and porcupine. Livestock such as chickens will draw these animals in and could create unsafe conditions for pets.
- Given all the viruses, do we risk an increase in transferable diseases by allowing the common individual to keep hens?
- Hens / livestock are a Farm animal and should not be in the city limits.
- City lots are not large enough to distance neighbours from the smell, noise and other impacts of having hens or other livestock within Calgary city limits.
- The effects of the livestock extend beyond the range of the owner's property. Such things as waste management, smell, and noise come to mind. Some livestock also present health hazards, temptation and hazards for other's pets and children, and a source of neighbour conflict.
- No, we have enough issues with domestic animals. We do not need to introduce the same issue with livestock (animal escaping, owner releasing animal when it is more work than expected, the smell, mess, and noise of hens....)
- Hens belong on a farm and/or in the country not next door to my city house. Our yards are too close together.
- A city is not a place for chickens.
- In addition to stray cats or outdoor cats that could be a problem
- "Farm type animals will bring in mice and rodents that will infest and feed on dropped and discarded grain/feed.
- I am not against hens but against irresponsible owners.... no doubt some one will bring a rooster and we know what noise they make."
- I would theoretically support it but NIMBY.
- Hens and roosters are too noisy and messy for urban settings. They should remain on farms away from neighbors. Allowing this would detract from the calm and peaceful nature of urban settings neighborhoods. Roosters (if permitted) can wake an entire neighborhood everyday at dawn! This would wreak havoc in neighborhoods and would create a new chaos/stress to deal with!
- If you want a farm- go buy one. LotS/yards are way too small to support this. Also chain link fence used in community design forces people to have no privacy or peace from those with animals.
- Animals belong on a farm or an acreage, not in a city. The smell & noise is too much.
- This bylaw can't be enforced effectively.
- Farm animals belong on the farm not in the city



- People would abuse this rule. There would be chaos, dogs attacking chickens, people not caring for their hens properly. Can the city keep up with it?
- Urban areas not farm areas, this is how sickness is spread in 3rd world countries
- There are already enough sources of noise and irritation within the city. Farm animals should stay on the farm.
- Permitting livestock in a city setting promotes nuisance noise, pests and diseases
- As we find out with Covid 19, Swine Flue, etc. that essentially living with non standard pets may have potential impacts that we may not be determinable.
- I would worry that people would take advantage of this at the expense of the animals
- At this time, I am unsure if I would support this amendment or not.
- Didn't we learn anything from Covid?
- It's a city not a farm.
- Don't want to hear a farm yard next door if I choose to live in the city
- No livestock of any kind should be allowed in the City . They inevitably brings with them , rodents and other cleanliness problems . Let the Farmers do the farming .
- Maybe you claim Pit bulls to be so bad but will allow farm animals? I grew up on a farm so really I probably wouldn't mind. But why are they allowed and not a dog? Regardless of breed.
- Livestock cannot be given the proper space in a city to thrive
- No place in the City for farm animals
- If people want livestock they should move to a farm. We have enough people that are not responsible for there dogs and cats does the city really have the resources to deal with chickens and goats as well?
- In my opinion, chickens (or pigeons) are dirty and I'd worry about the smell. There are plenty of local farmers growing them that we can support instead.
- Livestock do not belong in the city
- I don't think the city should allow hobby farming animals in city backyards.
- We don't need more animals in close proximity in the City. The City if Calgary does not do a good job now of enforcing bylaws.
- Needs no explanation. We live in a city close in some cases very close to our neighbors. There are enough uncontrolled variants in people's very small yards. Let's see we have trampolines, skateboard ramps, hot tubs (with no restricted times) , swimming pools again with no restrictions effectively imposed by the city (on paper perhaps that's all) what else oh yes rabbits, ducks already kept in a backyard near me and yes they quack very loudly And then let's not forget the numerous dogs which bark and are not controlled. SO NO NO NO no more animals in the city which you people will not hire enough by law officers to police . Stop getting us into more and more situations the city does not have the funds to properly police.
- Hens are not necessary nor is any other livestock
- Hens are noisy and smelly if not kept properly and people will neglect to keep them properly. People can not even keep there dogs quiet. How will they keep hens quiet!
- Livestock does not belong in a city.



- Farm animals belong on a farm not in the city
- suitable conditions is discretionary at the time it is determined, and has no future evaluation. Support from immediate neighbours requires "outing" neighbours who oppose such requests (similar to turning basement suites into rentals - I know of someone who had to file a police report, along with their neighbours, for the retribution they faced for opposing a house rental suite request).
- Livestock including chickens is a very bad idea! It will be impossible for Bylaw officers to handle all the complaints and very unlikely that the hens will have proper living conditions. The smell will be intolerable and how will Calgarians get rid of all the bedding waste? Eggs are cheap, let people get them from the store or local farmers' markets. Absolutely no need for people to have livestock within Calgary!!!!!!!
- There should be no requirement to have neighbours agree. It would be the same as requiring neighbour approval before you could get a dog or cat.
- I grew up on a farm with chickens. They are noisy, stink, and have no place in the city as pets.
- It may cause more conflict among neighbours
- Please maintain a formal differentiation between rural and urban property. Allowing farm animals, no matter what bylaws are in place adds to tensions among neighbors. Having dogs and cats already causes enough tension no matter how well looked after they are.
- Livestock should remain on rural properties.
- I grew up on a farm. Chickens need to be able to be free to forage.
- could negatively affect neighbors and community
- I have lived next to hens and pigeons. The noise is too much and hens cannot be controlled to obey time of day noise restrictions. This isn't a third world country our houses are not farms.
- Adding farm animals to an urban environment creates more waste and nuisance issues that may need to be addressed by taxpayers.
- We dont need more animals roaming the streets and bringing more predators into our communities.
- people can't even take care of their pets. I wouldn't trust that a neighbor would keep up the sanitation.
- owners do not follow the rules ever.
- Don't agree that farm animals should be within the city limits.
- city lots are too small for this. I have a single, detached home and can tell you what they are having for dinner and who's bedtime it is. Please, no.
- I oppose allowing hens or other farmed animals in the city, unless they are rescued and not used for food
- City kids do not grow up with same street farm smart and this can be dangerous. Also I don't want to hear animals around me except a dog that can be brought back in a house.
- Having chickens/hens in a backyard would both create noise that may disturb the enjoyments of others property.
- Hens are fine but what is "other livestock"? Clearly define what you mean when designing the survey. This is so unnecessary and inefficient.
- If you want to own farm animals, move to a farm.



- virus, disease, smell, noise
 - Not a plan that will succeed - houses are too close together, so noise will be a problem. Ensuring poultry is penned appropriately will need to be monitored. Perhaps a licence to own poultry as is required for cats and dogs.
 - "this is a CITY if people want these animals they can move to the COUNTRY and have them
-
- what are you thinking? slippery slope....."
 - Livestock has no place within city limits. This is a city. They are livestock. Ergo, they are meant for rural rearing. Oh, here's another idea though: piss off and leave people alone.
 - The number and type of animals can become out of control.
 - Farm animals do not belong in city
 - Farm animals belong on the farm not in the city
 - No, as it would be too difficult and costly to enforce the nuisance factor to neighbours. Chickens are noisy and smelly and have no place in an urban setting.
 - Most neighbourhoods have houses 8 feet or less apart. Noise, smells, and cleanliness issue are of concern as well as attracting predators into communities and yards (ie. coyotes, skunks).
 - Farm animals should be on a farm. With so many people advocating for animals' rights, what rights do we have to have such animals confined to such small spaces that being in a city would naturally apply. The size and space in a city would not qualify as enough for such animals.
 - Chicken can carry and spread diseases. Increase coyotes and lynks to come hunt.
 - We have enough issues with the animals we already allow in the city why add to the problem. Enforcement officers would be spread too thinly with additional issues to deal with.
 - Chickens and hens are not a CITY animal. They are for rural properties.
 - Hens are best in a farm environment and not in the City limits. If people want hens then they should get an acreage outside the City limits. Having hens would increase the population of foxes, wolf, etc in City limits.
 - Hens = farm = move to country.
 - Hens cause excessive noise and smell, which is already problematic in most neighborhoods.
 - I grew up on a farm and don't want to go jail for choking a loud cock.
 - Chicken make a mess, they stink & can be very territorial. If you're going to ban pit bulls from things, why wouldn't you treat this chicken issue the same way. If you want to treat pit bulls that way (which is fine) you can't just pick & choose the rules if the animals have the same behaviours. For the record chickens are WAY messier than dog
 - I truly don't believe that farm style animals have any place within the city. We have all kinds of access to eggs or milk through thousands of grocery stores. The people raising these animals will feel obliged to continue challenging borders and where will we draw the line? Pigs, lambs, goats, a cow...horse?



- How can the government limit this to chickens? What about other 'pets' that do not living in the home. Within city limits there should be enforceable guidelines to ensure that the animal is cared for as she do not live in that home.
- I don't believe urban settings are the right place for livestock
- We just don't think it is a good idea
- Passing the by law would leave neighbours vulnerable to noise and odour. After all, you cannot toilet train livestock, nor can you train them not to make their instinctive sounds/noises. The crows and magpies in Calgary cause enough disruption, interrupted sleep and annoyance.
- There is no need for urban hens!
- Other livestock attract flies.
- I only worry about the noise of livestock if they were next door to me.
- There would be no limit in what would constitute a service animal and it may be an animal(s) that could spread disease or should not be domesticated (exotic), or what conditions to keep the animal(s) people safe.
- there is already enough animal mistreatment and our winters are severe.
- I believe the feed attracts other pests like rodents which would likely spill into the surrounding area. I don't like the idea of disease/uncleanliness being introduced by fowl in the city.
- Most people live in the city for a reason. Livestock should be outside city limits or on acreage.
- The by-laws as they are now are adequate. If people want to raise hens and other forms of livestock, they can move outside city boundaries.
- We live in a city. Farm animals belong on a farm.
- Too much noise and odour.
- Won't they stink?
- There will be noise and smell issues and neighbors will not be happy.
- Really?! There is no need for hens to be in yards!! What is next, goats? Then cattle? We live in a city, where neighbours will be impacted by hens. If people want to raise livestock, they should move to the country and live on an acreage.
- If you want to be a farmer, go buy a farm
- THERE IS ENOUGH NOISE TO DEAL WITH IN A NEIGHBOURHOOD WITHOUT DEALING WITH THE NOISE THAT ANIMALS BEING KEPT OUTSIDE WOULD ADD TO
- If people wish to own livestock they can move to an acreage. Livestock require certain care and feeding and also their bodily waste needs to be managed, and I have no desire to live next door to anyone who doesn't clean up after their animals.
- I do not support allowing urban hens or other urban livestock.
- THE SMELL.
- Disease risk, for people and other birds
- Don't trust that animals would be keep in a way that wouldn't bother neighbors and create friction between neighbors. We already have a hostile/scary neighbor who thinks it's his right to have 4 large barking dogs.



- Too much potential for abuse. Neighbors should get veto.
- This will become a bylaw enforcement issue at great expense to the city. If people want livestock or hens please move to a farm.
- we do not need livestock in Calgary city limits - it just creates another point of disagreement between neighbours
- [removed]
- We live beside a wildlife corridor with bobcats and coyotes. I am concerned that urban hens would be an additional food source for the wildlife.
- It doesn't just affect adjacent neighborhoods. The noise and smell travels far. And allergies need to be considered.
- This is a city you want livestock move to the country i can thst bylsw being a nightmare
- I choose to live in a city to be AWAY from livestock.
- It's not really fun living next to chickens and hens unless you live on a farm where it's expected
- Hens and other livestock should only be allowed on property if rescued and NOT used for food.
- The city is not a farm
- If I wanted to be surrounded by livestock, I wouldn't live in the city. Current pets are already enough of a nuisance with fouling private property, noise and attacks. This would only worsen the situation.
- I support the amendment, but not the part of support from adjacent neighbours. If all criteria that are put in place so that the livestock is not a nuisance to the neighbours I don't think you need to get neighbour support. I can see neighbours withholding support for non-legitimate reasons.
- Nuisance -noise and smell
- Farm animals should be among other farm animals on a farm
- Go live on a farm or acreage if you want to keep animals. NOT IN MY BACKYARD>
- Some people will not abide by the rules and make the hens et al a nightmare to live beside
- No
- We do not need another city website, permit process, inspectors, and pages of bylaws to manage backyard chickens.
- Noise
- I would only support livestock in the city if there is a minimum distance of 100m from all neighbours dwellings.
- Don't want the noise that is associated with any animals!
- Urban does not mean "farm". If society becomes poor or communist, then yes!
- They stink. And people do not take care of them
- Urban properties are too small and close together for neighbours to have livestock. We do not have the resources to properly monitor the care and management of such animals. Odours and noises would be too disruptive in urban neighbourhoods.
- More noise, bacteria, odors and attraction of predators. While pet owners claim they are responsible or will be, they often let things slide, which penalizes others on adjacent properties.



- We're living in a pandemic world and the suggestion of bringing birds and potential disease into the city is an outrageous idea.
- I am concerned about smell, noise, and unsightly structures/pens.
- Criteria is too subjective and neighbours objections may not be suitably considered.
- it would be impossible to enforce. Owners don't care what the neighbors want.
- Livestock do not belong in the city
- There is no room for livestock of any kind in an urban setting.
- Chickens in the city?? Wake up please!!
- People "glamorize" having livestock, but often underestimate what is involved in their care. Animals that are not cared for properly risk passing disease to other animals or humans. In addition, they can cause noise or odor that disrupt the ability of their neighbors to peacefully enjoy their property. Livestock belong on a farm or acreage, not within the city.
- Hens do not belong in the city.
- Noise and smell issues.
- Absolutely positively not in favour of this. Animals belong on farms. Neighbours may agree that someone may have chickens. However, when those families later move out of the area, the new owners of the house will not be offered to have a say as to whether the neighbours farm animals, since they are already living there.
- I would be concerned about noise.
- chickens belong on a farm
- It is too complicated and there is the risk of a negative impact on the neighbours living beside people with livestock, such as smell and noise.
- Community benefit is too nebulous and a bureaucratic honey pot...Exceptions is a ridiculous, nebulous, bureaucratic money maker again. More civil servants for no taxpayer gain.
- Noise and door bylaws
- They attract predators to residential areas. Crows are a source of noise pollution.
- do not believe that livestock belong in urban environments
- The city cannot afford to take on more by law enforcement. The cost outweighs the very limited individual benefit.
- Want to live on a farm go there.
- it would increase the number of bobcats and coyotes in the city
- Animals like livestock require more space than what is available in Calgary. Smaller livestock is justifiable to keep in the city as they do not require a lot of space however larger livestock (if that is what the statement is referring to in terms of "other livestock") should reside on a larger plot of land outside the city for the benefit of their wellbeing.
- On acreages or other large properties but not sure any houses in city meet this criteria.
- No livestock within city limits
- Urban hens? Really? If you want to begin a farm, go live on a farm. I feel this would be a costly slippery slope to begin allowing "urban livestock" to live in Calgary.



- You are opening up the floodgates to other species, problems that arise from that and an increased burden for bylaw to address complaints. For bylaw to address complaints will put additional burden on tax payers to pay for these enforcement resources through increased fines and penalties to pay for bylaw existence. If a small segment of Calgary population want additional country in their back yard then move to the country... I do not want to head butt with my neighbours over noise, smell that naturally occur with the activities to maintain such.
- This is a make-work project. No livestock or hens should be allowed in the city. If a person wants them they should move to a rural area.
- How be we let the hens and what ever else you rocket scientists are considering stay in the country where they belong.. Even stupider question!!!
- There is enough city noise as it is dint need chickens or any other noisy animal or bad smells. We all know and have neighbours who don't clean up after dogs and let their cats go defecate in other people's property. Rude
- Having animals that must remain outside at all times will bring predators to the area, and increase the risk to all pets in yards and open spaces. Without means to eliminate the threat of a predator, owners of livestock will be putting their animals and everyone else at risk.
- I believe that people will abuse this new law & not follow the instructions. It will cause more issues, than creating a positive impact in the city.
- Livestock, and the associated smells that come with raising them, have no place in a dense urban environment.
- Hens by their nature can carry bad diaseases
- Smell and noise
- Unless there is an education requirement for applicants and a veto vote for immediate neighbours this will cost the city more to enforce than any benefit provided.
- Chickens are noisy and smell..do not belong in an urban setting.
- The city is not a farm.
- Would you want to live next door to the smell, noise and barnyard look of their enclosure? Would you want to sit on your next listening to the various noises created by barnyard critters? Would you want your property values negatively affected over chickens? If people want chickens they need to move to the country or to a smaller rural community. The city shouldn't be implementing or changing bylaws to satisfy the minority...those few people who want chickens.
- Chickens are not city pets.....they are farm animals.
- I do not support every/all species of livestock permitted in Calgary. The question does not include a short list of the animals being considered under the term "livestock". I may require more detail to make an informed choice.
- Hens are a relatively low impact livestock animal. I can't think of another example that is similar impact, and thus given the conditions of support from neighbors etc, I can't imagine this being anything other than a series of drawn out rejections and arguments, creating bad blood between neighbors and wasting city time, for what will ultimately be a very, very small number of approvals. I think time and effort can be spent better elsewhere.



- I think 'backyard' chickens would become an issue with 'trends' supporting this. This can become a 'puppy mill' situation, but with chickens/hens.
- If you want chickens move to a farm
- the early morning noise could and would most likely become an issue
- Benefits don't justify hazards like diseases , noise, etc
- Poultry are not pets. Backyards are not farms.
- I don't understand what would be the advantages for either the livestock or the community.
- Noisy
- u don't need other livestock in the city that may get neglected
- I don't feel they belong in the city and can be a nuisance for close neighbours. I also question whether they can properly be provided for in the size of most city lots.
- Poultry stink, even a limited number. If several neighbours decide to raise them, the quality of our outdoor living will be greatly harmed.
- I cannot see the benefit for both the animal and the people.
- I think it open up a can of worms and will lead to many issues with animal welfare and complaints within the community
- Noise, smell, those animals are not suited for city dwelling
- Livestock doesn't belong in city
- I am concern about people that would not take care of these creatures. Cold/ sanitation as well as some people doing cock fights.
- Chicken etc do not belong in cities. We have neighbors who have many pigeons and they poop on the cars, fences and decks around the neighborhood....a messy, unnecessary nuisance.
- I am quite allergic to birds and bird feces. Having urban hens next door would prevent me from being able to enjoy my own back/front yard and potentially make it a health risk getting from my house to my car.
- livestock do not belong in urban areas
- Hens would be fine but I have trouble imagining the effective keeping of larger livestock in Calgary suburbs
- "This bylaw allowing hens/chickens would be a gateway, as you propose, for all other kinds of farm (or non-domesticated) animals to be housed in people's yards. It's just opening controversy with noises, odors, and creating problems between neighbors. The city is no place for any livestock. Please keep livestock on acreages and farms.
- You say one criteria would be 'support from adjacent neighbours' but what happens when new people move in after a farmyard has been set up? What if adjacent neighbours are a condo complex or a retirement home? And noises and odors from livestock can travel a long ways in a neighborhood so asking for permission from just 'adjacent' neighbors does not adequately cover the people affected by this. I think it is just inviting a ton of problems."
- I would be concerned about diseases spreading, much like bird flu and mad cow disease.
- In rural areas this would be fine, but not in inner city communities where neighbours are close together.



- It would require too much surveillance and inspection if this amendment were to go ahead. This would be costly to enforce and funds could be better used in other areas.
- Hens have no place in the city. They are messy and noisy and will be disturbing to neighbours. I don't want them next door and I doubt nobody does except the person who wants them so why should the rest of us suffer because a few people want them.
- Let's maintain sanity within the city and respect our neighbors. Smell and some early morning noise that comes with this kind of animal is a concern.
- Noise and smell not needed in the city.
- People will not keep feces swept up like they do with dogs and cats. It will be disgusting, especially in NE Calgary. NE has many families living in one house and they will reinterpret the maximum as a minimum. They will abuse the "case by case basis" by overwhelming the one bylaw officer. They will also be selling chicken in unsanitary conditions. NE will be a chicken slaughterhouse on a scale that bylaw officers have never seen!
- Noise, plain and simple. Noise.
- Hens are too noisy and disease prone.
- Viruses such as Covid emerge from close human/animal (often bird) contact. We need less human/livestock interaction, not more.
- Raising and owning livestock requires experience and commitment. It is not a hobby.
- I've been attacked by a chicken as a child -- it was not pleasant.
- It's difficult to regulate and meet the requirements for many types of non-traditional species that haven't been traditionally "domesticated"
- Hens can be stinky!
- An urban setting is no place for "farm animals" and if allowed, there will be abuse. People living within the boundaries of a city like Calgary should not have to be subjected to living next door to someone who thinks it a good idea to own a chicken/rooster or two, a goat or two, cattle and horses. I cannot believe that such a program is even being contemplated but, then again, this is Calgary's council at work!
- I don't think livestock should be permitted in the city.
- This is a city, not a farm.
- They belong on a farm. It would attract wildlife
- If people wish to own chickens or any other livestock they should live on an acreage.
- No one needs to own livestock within the City
- Too much chance for bird flu.
- Livestock belongs on farms and they are dirty and they smell.
- Only domestic animals belong in urban environments
- City is no place for livestock
- Hens don't need to be in the city limits. If people want them, they should move to a farm.
- High risk of noise disturbance and create living condition and neighborhood appearance to be less desirable. Thus affecting property value



- They stink.
- The noise of hens is unbearable. They are a nuisance.
- Too hard to enforce
- We have trouble limiting the number of domestic animals; tackle that before opening it up to other animals.
- Do not support having chickens/hens and other livestock in city limits
- Chicken coups if not cleaned are very smelly. Should be kept on farms and not in the city!!
- No reason to change. Smell & noise for neighbours.
- if not taken care of properly, urban animals will start going into neighbours yards to forage and become a nuisance
- Noise, smell, they attract stray cats
- Maybe Chickens. No roosters. It's bad enough listening to the neighborhood dogs barking all day & all night long. Other livestock? Not sure about smell. Also bad enough smelling the neighbors cigarette smoke and having to keep the windows closed all summer long.
- Most of these would not be domesticated. Livestock should be on a farm.
- Calgary is not a farm. I don't want some mental case raising their emotional support animal as a neighbour. Too many sick folks already in this city. If you want to raise a pig or cow or cheetah because it helps you, move to a farm or zoo.
- because of hygiene issue
- The city is no place for livestock of any kind due to excess smells, noise, attractants to rodents
- My primary concern is the cleanliness of hens. There are a variety of diseases that can be spread by contact with hen droppings.
- Everyone knows the smell of livestock, why would we want that in an urban environment.
- If I want to live near farm animals I would live on a farm.
- Livestock don't belong in city dwellings
- Livestock creates odors and manure which attracts vermin and other pests. It is not healthy to allow livestock in crowded cities.
- If I wanted to live beside chickens I would move to a farm.
- This is a city, not a barnyard. If you want to raise farm animals go live on a [removed] farm.
- There are places close to Calgary where owning livestock is allowed. I feel like this amendment would be abused.
- I think this will bring more wild life in to the city
- Encourage wild life into areas where there could be conflict with humans/pets.
- Chicken feces is too smelly for an urban environment. I would need to be convinced that a neighbour could have a chicken next door without affecting our quiet enjoyment or property value.
- I don't think the city will be able to keep up with enforcing that all requirements are met.
- I don't personally see the benefit of having livestock in urban areas, especially as pets. Would it attract more predators to that area?



- Livestock requires more space than city living provides Feces would be a problem and it's not fair to the animals
- Keeping livestock in the city leads to abuse and disease. Too many examples of violations and taking poultry indoors during inclement weather. Please don't set the stage for creeping inclusion. Next it is goats, then sheep then pigs then miniature horses. Will there be rule enforcement for lot size, available space in the yard, crowded neighbourhoods.
- I feel he s are a farm animal and should be raised on a farm. I feel this could potentially get out of hand.
- The additional noise and smells associated with this in Calgary communities would bring increased neighbour conflict which could lead to violence. Some owners would also build very ugly home made structures in their yards being eye sores and possible fire hazards.
- Livestock should remain on farms or approved spaces not next door.
- This is a city, not a farm. Move out of the city if you want livestock.
- "I'm a farm gal, not every single person in the city understands what it takes to keep a farm animal.
- I studied infection control, avian flu is a concern with chickens in the city. Not a fan of this from an epidemiological perspective. The issue is the lack of genetic variation of the chickens that are available; if one chicken get avian flu, then every chicken will as well within a certain distance if it's virulant. Avian flu is often zoonotic.
- Not roosters, they really do crow at the crack of dawn every.single.day.
- We allow goats to eat weeds, why not allow lawn service companies goat trimming lawn services?"
- Criteria listed above are much to vague and give too much discretionary power to both neighbours and by-law officers.
- I do not support homing livestock within the City of Calgary
- City not congruent for hens
- Property values would decline greatly
- Psychologists/Psychiatrists is/are the most dangerous profession/people and do not/can not understand/see when people are using lies to achieve self centered goals.
- Again you guys are being to extra and extreme
- I don't agree with livestock in an urban environment.
- Some would take advantage of this and turn urban spaces into farms.
- No livestock should be permitted within the city. They belong on large areas of land
- No to pigeons they too easily can escape and become a feral issue in the community taxing resources and tax \$\$\$\$
- No urban livestock
- No.
- No livestock in city.
- This is a city not a barnyard.....these sort of things simply attract vermin and stink. No, no, no, not ever...no
- Sure invite more predators into our yards ... obtuse.



- The noise from these animals, smell from droppings etc, are an unfair imposition on neighbors living across the fence 10 feet away. If you want a farm animal, move to an out-of-city farm. Neighbors giving permission is not relevant; people move. Property values DROP where this is allowed.
- It seems that a bad idea never goes away, it just keeps coming up until people give up and relent. Chickens are noisy and dirty. They belong on a farm, as do other livestock.
- Noise, smell
- Allowing farm animals into an urban space would set a unfair precedent for neighborhood disturbances
- People will take advantage of it. Too much time and cost involved for complaint process to have animal removed.
- Don't want to be awoken by chickens
- Noise and sanitation.
- No hens. This is a city not rural Alberta.
- My Nona (grandmother) owned Hens. They are loud, dirty, and smelly. Hens can carry parasites which could be transferred to house pets. Would make neighborhoods noisy and smelly, especially in high density neighborhoods.
- Live in the country if this is what you want. Publicize this.
- Chickens and other livestock require large areas and the health risks to neighbours, if proper ventilation and cleaning aren't done as well as terrible smell is a problem.
- NEVER
- Chickens would freeze outside in Calgary climate with many not providing adequate conditions for them
- I don't want to live next door to a "farm".
- Noise concern
- Evaluation of all these conditions seems an unnecessary burden on the city for minimal benefit.
- The noise, smell, animals not properly cared for and neighbour complaints would be far greater than any benefit of allowing the above.
- I think many forms of livestock need more space than that supplied in an urban environment. As for chickens, they can. E noisy and disruptive
- I think that it is too cold in Calgary in the winter for a Calgarian to be able to support livestock on their property in a safe manner. A chicken coop shed should be considered part of property with a mandatory inspection(s). I think this goes beyond our city capacity or what I feel comfortable paying in taxes. Eggs are plentiful at supermarkets.
- Should support their own livestock
- We have country farms for livestock. if they feel strongly enough that they want livestock on city property or in their neighborhood, they need to explore rural living.
- My concern would be for the neighbouring community. Noise, smell etc. Also it could affect an individual's home value, both the livestock owner's and neighbouring homes.
- There are a lot of other things to worry/discuss about besides introducing livestock in the city.



- This just seems like a bad idea. If a neighbour moves out or it is a rental property The new owner or tenant would have to power to have the chickens removed.
- I would be pissed if my neighbor had a coop of hens next door to me, noise and smell. Its bad enough she feeds the damn birds and I have to cleanup up bird poop ALL THE TIME
- We do not have control over existing problems with dogs (being a nuisance or involved in an incident) or cats (roaming freely, not being spayed/neutered) and to add yet another potential for problems (smelling up neighbourhoods, animals living in sordid conditions, creating problems between problems) should not be considered
- Where does this end? First hens and then other farm animals. This is a city. If people want these animals on their property, they should move out of the city.
- A lot of "livestock" Especially birds are noisy, messy and I don't believe many urban dwellers understand their needs.
- This is city Living not a farm....
- This doesn't seem like a problem that needs to be solved
- Thry are noisy and smelly
- Since when is it ok to have hens and live stock in a city by doing this the wildlife is now going to more and more in the city this will not be good
- There's farms for that...
- Starts with hens and next we will have cattle in peoples backyard
- Livestock should not be premitted in the City with the exception of any existing agricultural zoned land.
- When will this end. I want a therapy giraffe
- Don't think these animals belong in small city yards
- Not sure what sort of livestock you are talking about. Horses? Goats? Pigs?
- Why have more animals roaming the city when it's not their natural environment
- "I lived next to someone who had peacocks. Never again!!
- Noise, smell, attraction of coyotes, are all issues."
- I love the idea of hens but I think if all adjacent neighbours have to approve there will be many people who don't like the idea and will be able to veto the hens before it is even tried. I think there should be an automatic approval with additional education and enforcement actions taken if problems with neighbours are identified.
- It's a city not a farm leave the farm animals at the farm
- Chicken stink and make too much noise
- I think it could lead to animal husbandry and/or public health concerns.
- Livestock does not belong in the city.
- We don't need livestock in the city.
- I don't live on a farm, if I wanted to live next to chickens, etc, I would have moved to the country.
- There's no need for livestock (other than a few small creatures like chickens and bees) in the city. If people want them, they can move out to the country.



- I feel like allowing livestock would create a large potential for noise, smell and other disturbances.
- Birds are gross, noisy and cause a mess that you know would end up effecting the neighborhood
- ...
- I feel they are farm animals
- I'm worried they would be loud/smelly? If they were intrusive, it may be okay.
- Live stock does not belong in a city setting
- Livestock should not be confined to urban environments
- Hens are incredibly messy and wouldn't want to deal with that if my neighbour had one. It's bad enough that they don't pick up their dog poop.
- Absolutely not. This is a city with a lot of people. If you want a farm move to the country
- No chickens, roosters are very aggressive and very noisy. As a person who has been on many farms, keep chickens on the farm!!!! They are extremely dirty, carry disease and can be very disruptive at early hours.... highly recommend you avoid these things.. keep them on the dinner plate.
- I think if the City of Calgary is having issues with Cats and Dogs, permitting livestock would compound the City of Calgary's present issues.
- Chickens are very dirty animals and can spread disease. they are livestock and should be left on the farm (I know, I grew up around them). Exception being a max of 2 or 3 chickens per household and being penned up!
- Livestock are noisy and also can be have odours
- Hens and other livestock will only attract wild animals. Bobcats, coyotes, raccoons, etc
- I would not want to live beside chickens in an urban environment. They tend to be loud and messy, from my experience of chickens that rural relatives have owned
- With how close homes are I think it could be a nuisance to neighbors.
- The city is not a farmyard, and I can see difficulties escalating between neighbours.
- I'm unsure about this because of the noise - will there be males on site? If so, will there be early morning calls? This would be terrible! However, if not, and the owner keeps the hens away from neighbours windows and keeps the area clean, then this is a possibility. I think there has to be enough space in the backyard so that neighbours aren't affected (ie tiny lots in high density areas may not be feasible).
- I am reluctant to want to see Farm type animals in an urban setting. i don't have confidence in the cleanliness of neighbours.
- Noisy hens are right up there with constantly barking dogs. Irritating. What does support from neighbors mean?
- Turn Calgary into a farm city? What happens when the animals get attached or bums decided they want food?
- Animals such as this increase diseases in the urban community.
- If you want animals, move to the country!!! Some people don't like/want/fear or are allergic. Animals should not be in city.



- Not interested in my neighbours killing for their food in their backyard
- Livestock is for farms, not a city. We pay high enough taxes as it is, we should not have to suffer with the smell and sound of livestock
- I don't see why my quiet animals don't need to be approved by my neighbours, but they can own the yappiest dog and I have to deal no matter what
- Mice, noise, stink, house values.
- Most residential properties do not have the space or equipment/knowledge to support non domestic animals
- Livestock in close quarters with residential properties would likely lead to unnecessary noise, smell, and disease.
- Rooster are too [removed] noisy early in the morning and every morning
- Conflict with coyotes and other urban wildlife attracted to the livestock. Conflict with neighbours. Noise and odours.
- the criteria for "other livestock" is too broad and includes too many animals that might not be suited for urban areas.
- Where would this end!?...cows...pigs!!!
- I am against allowing "farm" animals to live in the city. Only domestic animals should be allowed.
- Anticipated problems would include smell, noise, disposal of manure, disposal of animal remains, attraction of rodents and therefore predators.
- Too congested and noisy already in the city.
- If there are already issues with the animals allowed on private property, why open the door to more issues. If you want farm animals, purchase a lot large enough to provide a good home for them.
- I'm on the fence on this one. While for one we are providing a good place for the hens I'm not sure if some people would want livestock near the neighborhood they live in. As there are such factors as noise, smell and waste at play.
- Animals, such as hens, should have the room to freely roam.
- I do not think hens or other livestock should be allowed in Calgary.
- We are not farms, if you want a farm move out of city limits
- Not interested in introducing hens into the neighborhood
- I'm curious as to why this question emphasizes that the 'needs of the hens' are balanced with the 'needs of humans'. What is the nature of this proposed 'balance'. What is the definition of 'community benefit/positive impact', who gets to decide? Who resolves conflict if adjacent neighbours don't agree? What happens when a new neighbour comes into the environment, do they effectively lose all say? What is the purpose of putting in place a set of rules, but then including a back door for exceptions. What mediation process would be made available if a neighbour disagrees with the judgment of the Bylaw Officer. To my knowledge they aren't an elected official, what oversights would be in place to ensure that these judgments are fair?
- Unless highly regulated and inspected, I don't trust urban dwellers to properly care for livestock that are not pets. I fear that animals would be neglected and mistreated and not have appropriate shelter



especially in winter. Once people realize how much work, expense and responsibility is involved the animals will pay the price. Bad idea.

- They're filthy, noisy, and in no way, shape, or form do I believe you'll enforce any rules around them. You'll cave to political correctness.
- Urban locations are not suitable for all animals.
- Livestock feces, noise and avian flus are not compatible with the small footprint of the average house lot in Calgary. Wildlife entering Calgary is already an issue, additional livestock will make this worse. Furthermore, adjoining lots would suffer all the disadvantages of livestock with no benefit. I have experience with a small scale poultry farming operation and know how bad domestic poultry can smell. Farms keep the chicken operation well away from the household footprint, which cannot be done in a city.
- keep livestock on farms
- You are asking about feeding wildlife in backyards, but want people to be OK with livestock, which could potentially attract wildlife. Most people have no idea what it takes to properly manage livestock, and a bylaw will only be ignored.
- we have a issue with coyotes taking stray cats and small dogs what is going to happen when a coyote gets into a back yard to take the chickens and a child might be in the backyard at the time also the noise level of chickens can be irritating and also the germs that chicken feces bring .
- livestock belongs on farms
- Noise & smell not welcome
- I don't have a problem with chickens because they are small and food producing. However, I have no interest in goats, sheep or pigs in my neighborhood. People already get away with a lot designating an animal as "emotional support". Get a dog or a cat not a farm animal!
- Health concerns regarding cross contamination with poultry related disease and illnesses. And general lack of trust in overall regulatory measures for urban hen ownership to satisfy the hen owners and neighbors.
- Livestock belong on livestock operations or in rural areas. Smell, noise, limited space for animal movement, in limited city lot sizes makes it impossible for this not to impact neighbors.
- I do not think hens belong in the city they are a farm animal
- I think it would require too much work/effort to enforce suitable and clean living conditions and I also think people would take advantage of this and it would become a nuisance to neighbours.
- We have rabbits all over the city that people have let go and are pests , chicken would end up the same.
- There are too many variables which tend to cause abuse of the process and exceptions to be "at the discretion of the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer" is too broad.
- We are not living on a farm. Hens can be kept outside of hearing distance.
- I do not support livestock in the city.
- I grew up on a farm and that is where farm animals belong. I think urban livestock is a ridiculous idea. People can go live on an acreage or farm if that's what they want. If this is passed, would



sellers need to disclose this in the sale of their home? I certainly don't want to buy a home and find out there is a hen house or other livestock or pigeons next door!

- Even if you support your neighbour today having chickens, what happens if it becomes problematic and change your mind. What happens if you want to sell your house and is a deterrent to buying if your neighbour has a chicken farm. What if you buy/rent a house and the previous owners/renters supported it as they were selling the house but the chickens arrived after you took possession of the house. How will disease/illness spread by chickens be managed and who assumes the cost. (A friend owns chickens and it is a problem)
- The problem is that these livestock cause noise for neighbours.
- Inappropriate for such animals to be kept in urban settings. "Adjacent" neighbours aren't the only ones impacted - impact is wider. Damages property values - should not be permitted.
- city houses are too close together. If your neighbour has livestock it will affect your enjoyment of your backyard
- Unnecessary cost to city to control an unnecessary want of a few people
- Having backyard chickens that would likely not be regulated well, is a risk for disease transmission to the public food chain. If this law were to be amended, strict bio security protocols would need to be enforced
- I would prefer my neighbours do not get a say in what I do on my private property.
- To noisy
- Hens are messy, smelly & noisy, personally I wouldn't want to live next door to them.
- I think it would be very difficult to monitor/enforce any infractions including the animals welfare.
- People can't clean up after their dogs in their own yards never mind public lands, do you honestly thing we need the stench of farm animals when we all live in close proximity to one another as well as the health issues.
- Pigs, sheep, cows are not suitable for a city.
- Livestock belong in a rural setting.
- "Who will monitor this? Who will check in to see if animals are being treated well? How often will these farm animals be checked in on? What if a neighborhood moves and the next tenant does not want a chicken coop next door? Will you grandfather the coop in? If so, pretty soon you will have no control over this and all coop will be allowed.
- I am not in favour of livestock in the city!"
- Severe lack of knowledge for proper care, lack of veterinary services for fowl, high risk of abandonment, encourages backyard breeding for sales, and inhumane slaughter of roosters, spread of disease and parasites.
- Chickens would experience stress living in an urban environment and it would be inhumane. We cannot rely on lay-people to understand how to care for livestock and recognize signs of stress.
- Not many animals sre suitable as city animals. It should mit be encouraged
- I think it is going to cause a lot of problems, neighbor fights, stench, noise, etc. More than cats and dogs that overall stay inside.
- Regardless of promises made, they will not be kept and animals will suffer from neglect.



- Livestock that brings bad smells or noise with them and scare off or kill wildlife shouldn't be allowed under this amendment.
- Too much mess noise and quite frankly do not want to witness the murder of any animals
- Hens don't belong in a city unless people have an acreage.
- Do you want to be woken up at the crack of dawn every morning?
- Noise and odors resulting from livestock would interfere with my ability to enjoy my own living accommodations. I would live out in the country if I wanted that experience.
- Go buy a farm! What a stink they create!
- Livestock doesn't belong in the city - they need space.
- Livestock should be kept where there is enough space for them to roam, which I do not think will be possible in the City.
- This could become an issue for neighbours, especially if hens are pre-existing during move in.
- Chickens are loud, messy, and smelly. I do not want them kept in the city especially in the new neighbourhoods where lot sizes are very narrow
- I do not support allowing livestock in the City. There are too many complications that go along with it, and I believe it will be a drag on resources and ultimately be a monetary and well-being net cost to taxpayers and citizens.
- If the City cannot control the noise of dogs in a suitable manner I do not need other farm animals around.
- We are "city" people...if people want animals, move to the country. Chickens may be cute but they smell and carry bacteria dangerous to people.
- Calgary is a major urban center with a dense population. Livestock of any kind is inappropriate.
- "There are enough squawking magpies in Calgary - we don't need chickens too.
- If you want a chicken/pig/cow then live outside the city. If you want to live within the city then don't have a cow! "
- Livestock animals including hens are NOT PETS. You want farm animals, go live on a farm.
- I do not want to live beside a farm, or I would leave Calgary.
- If they are proven to be a support animal and are a house pet then I would agree ..but people that wanna keep a horse or chicken in yard ...no
- We live in a great neighborhood, but already have enough issues with the legalization of pot and now the ensuing and ongoing smell of people smoking. I would prefer not to add hens/chickens or other animals to this mix.
- Have seen firsthand the effects of loosening bylaws regarding other types of 'livestock' in an urban setting: noise, smell, increased fecal material, to name but a few!!!
- Chickens are noisy and smelly
- Dogs and cars are bad enough to deal with, we don't need the noise of other animals all day long.
- If not maintained properly the nuisance to neighboring properties is huge. In my area, pigeon pens often stink. Neighbors helpless.
- I would not want Chickens living next door to me.



- I wouldn't want the loud noises - one of our neighbours down the street had a rooster that constantly crowed; very noisy.
- Noise issues.
- Hens should only be living in large open farms
- Animal agriculture in any sense relies on abusing the life of another being. It is immoral.
- I used to have to clean the chicken coop on our farm. Chickens are noisy and smelly. Even if you enforce all items listed for pigeons, how much time, resources and additional money would it take the city?
- Are people crazy? The amount of dogs per capita in the city is more than a 1/4 of the population not to mention the amount of cats, all the other animals the city is unaware of plus hidden so called "exotic animals". Why is there a need to overrun the city with animals when Calgary is already infested by animal faeces. Taking a walk is no longer a pleasure, disgusting faeces are on our private lawns after spending hundreds/thousands of dollars because we civic pride, sidewalks, grocery stores, malls, liquor stores, bus stops, stop lights etc brimming with animal faeces. Yet people walk around as if nothing this is a huge health hazard. Sea gulls and crows already are too much will this become the "stinking city"? Look at the city already nobody wants to clean up, garbage bins are all over etc. What are you doing at city hall?
- These animals do not belong in the city where they have limited space. Also, the people don't properly care for their current pets, so would not do it for other animals. Also, cleanliness and odour control in the neighbourhood would be a problem.
- They are loud. People will complain
- What happens to the animal in the midst of bylaw infractions.
- Don't feel hens need to be in urban areas.
- Neighbours change over time. Creates unpleasantness between neighbours. Noisy. Smelly.
- Livestock belongs in farms, not in cities. There will potentially be noise, smell and disease. Thanks but no thanks
- "NO. Firstly, the discriminatory ban against roosters is a death sentence for them. For every hen, a rooster is hatched. Where do you think they go? Hatcheries simply kill them as babies or people who hatch eggs at home will dump them in a park somewhere. We just rescued a baby rooster last month from this situations. Are you willing to allocate funds to animal control to address this situation? I assume not. Rooster rescues are already bursting at the seams and these unnecessary bans only add to the tragedy.
- There is no reason to ban roosters if hens are going to be permitted. They are not that loud and hens can make just as much noise. We had a rooster in our house recovering from a health scare. He'd crow in the next room every morning and we slept right through it.
- Aggression is also a myth. Roosters can easily be trained. My four boys are teddy bears! They love to be cuddled and are full of personality. We had to say goodbye to one of our hens after a long health battle. Roo sensed I was sad and spent the whole evening at my side. He's so wonderful! I cannot imagine why anyone should think he not be welcome when hens are. It's ridiculous!



- Regardless, cities are NO place for chickens. Chickens are not egg machines. They are individuals who deserve no less consideration than any other animal family member. We have rescued hens from several godawful backyard coops whose level of neglect was so severe, many hens did not survive it. They often aren't given nearly enough space, their spaces are filthy, medical care is rarely acquired, there's little to no protection from predators, and hens are treated as disposable. There are so many reasons why this is the worst most shite godawful proposal that one can only wonder why anyone would propose it.
- If you want to have chickens, consider moving to the country. Leave it at that."
- My neighbour currently feeds any and all wildlife and has had as many as 4 large dogs in their home, I can only imagine the grief all their neighbours would suffer with this proposal. Property size in Calgary does not allow for livestock to not affect all those in the area. This survey mentions odour management, enough said.
- Most yards within city limits do not provide adequate environments for animals well being.
- Most urban yards/land are not big enough to support a suitable lifestyle for hens. They belong on farms with lots of space for them to roam and large coops.
- NO LIVESTOCK IN CALGARY, EVER EXCEPG PETTING ZOOS
- Why do you need chickens in a city?
- Perhaps in certain neighbourhoods this may be feasible. More details would be required.
- Keep farm animals OUT OF OUR CITY.
- With cuts to this department, there won't be enough infrastructure in place to check on the care of livestock in the city.
- Neighbours would have to contend with noise and odours from these yards. It would take quite an effort to get bylaw to agree with the complaint. Ever try to get a barking dog complaint taken care of? The puppy would die of old age .
- While i would support this amendment if it required the approval of neighbors, I could see this being abused.
- If you want livestock move to the country.
- Having much experience on farms and around hens they are not the type of "animal" that belongs in a small residential yard and it's not fair to neighbours to have to live with the noise and smell that accompanies them. Leave hens on farms and larger rural properties where there is the proper space for them!
- We already have enough issues with certain owners not being responsible stewards of their properties regarding property maintenance and other community standards issues. I don't support this idea for residential neighbourhoods. FYI - we have urban coyotes, bobcats & hawks already. They would probably love to add hens to their prey! This is not a "need" in our current economy.



Taxpayers should not have to fund this!!! People can move to the country if they want to have a farm.

- "The potential for unpleasantness for neighbours is considerable. While many people are thoughtful, many are not. This would be asking for
- trouble."
- Hens and livestock in the city? Noises? Smells? Nowhere near by city lot please.
- Urban areas are built too small and too close together for this type of thing. It will have a negative impact on surrounding neighbors.
- I do not want my neighbours to have hens in their backyard. I'm not interested in any of the smell or noise these hens could produce. I'm not interested in the increase in other animal traffic that having hens would create. I don't need more skunks, squirrels or coyotes coming around during the day or night trying to get at the hens or at the hens food.
- I'd be afraid of noise and smell. Many people would likely be able to manage livestock responsibly, but many would not.
- We already have way too many dogs and cats in houses and parks. Pet owners are not cleaning up after their pets and we are seeing a lot more pet droppings and bad odours on public areas or backyards. More animals will only exacerbate this nuisance.
- Many newer properties have very small yards. Chickens are noisy, can be smelly if not properly cared for and cleaned out. I don't think many neighbours would like this. They would attract coyotes and other predators to an urban area too. There are currently no standards for chicken coops and poorly constructed coops would be a hazard.
- Calgary already has difficulty trying to enforce animal bylaws (shortage of officers?), so to add a whole bunch of other animals to the mix just seems ludicrous. I cannot imagine living next to pens of birds or animals that owners have allowed to exceed limits, neglect to keep clean, neglect to properly keep the animals free of disease etc. Not to mention the possible constant noise. With the tiny yards in much of Calgary, this just seems unreal!
- I do not support urban hens. There are enough issues with cats & dogs, why introduce another area of contention. If people want to own hens, move to a farm. People think it's a great idea until they have to deal with it. They lose interest and neighbours are left dealing with the problem. No urban hens!
- Livestock do not belong in an urban environment and are likely to cause problems for neighbours. Support from current adjacent neighbours does not ensure future neighbour support.
- I don't think we should start introducing livestock into city limits.
- Odours should also be considered. Most urban yards are far too small to prevent odours from livestock from bothering neighbouring properties.
- This seems like a Pandora's box of potential conflicts. There are already issues surrounding the care and maintenance of "normal" household pets, introducing livestock with their noise and smell seems unnecessary and with too much potential for neighborhood conflicts.
- Pigeons, hens, fowl, cattle etc. can be noisy and will be disruptive to an urban setting. There's already plenty of noise generated in the city. There's also the feces smell to consider.



- Hens and other livestock do not belong on private property within the city.
- Livestock should be in the country. There are too many irresponsible and naive people with good intentions for keeping livestock that could create nothing but issues. Lets focus on enforcing responsible and compassionate pet ownership before opening another can of worms with livestock.
- I am concerned that the welfare of such animals would suffer in urban areas
- Would be area dependent - would need to ensure appropriate space exists for the animal and neighbor separation. Also safety to keep in mind - ie. attracting coyotes into the area. Also the cleanliness of the facility - do not need stench in the neighborhood and therefore a way to enforce.
- With the surge in "emotional support animals" we are seeing people who are purchasing livestock and other animals without clear and solid skills, knowledge and infrastructure to proper care for these animals. If people want livestock they should buy a farm.
- Do not support livestock in Calgary residential areas.
- Livestock smells, can be loud and brings with them other critters.
- The City doesn't have enough staff to follow up on hen complaints. If anyone wants to have farm animals they can live outside the city limits...
- Farm animals do not belong in urban settings. Once you allow hens, what about turkeys, then ducks, then goats, etc. ?
- Many people's regular pets are a nuisance to their neighbors and the thought of many of these people and others now owning livestock animals sounds like it will come with even more problems and annoyances. The way I've seen people keep hens does not appeal to me as something I would want in my neighbors yard (mess, smell, runoff from cleaning out the hen house, etc.) Specific to pigeons, these are a pest and should be exterminated as they are already enough of a problem in Calgary (not only downtown but even in suburban neighborhoods). If people want livestock then they should live on a farm or acreage. I live in a newer community and I have enough neighbors that should go live in a townhome/condo because they cannot be bothered with appropriate upkeep of their detached home.
- I do not believe that any hens or other types of livestock should be allowed in the city. They are and always have been farm animals.
- "Humane society already overrun with cats and dogs, how would they be able to handle livestock?"
- Bylaw Enforcement can hardly keep up with cats and dogs, and taxpayers will end up paying for this on top of already very high taxes. It seems from question 7 that the city is already dealing with pigeons on owner's properties, how would the city be able to deal with urban hens? This would just adding to an already existing problem.
- P"
- Will hens bring more predators into the city limits? No.
- Livestock belong in a rural environment not in the city
- Livestock are not pets and do not belong in the City. They belong on farms and acreages. Hens and other livestock create noise, waste, and other nuisances.
- I like the idea of fresh eggs but I don't want my community to have chicken coups in small residential areas.



- Those types of animals do not belong in the confined space of an urban environment.
- There would be increased noise during all hours of the day. In addition, having farm animals in close proximity to other residences could increase the spread of viruses.
- I don't see a community benefit or the positive impact this would have.
- Hens are too noisy to be in the city
- Want a farm? Move.
- Excessive noise would have to be addressed and location and care of the animals. eg. it would be unfair to house some livestock animals in an urban setting. Unfair to the animals and to the neighbours.
- Noise of livestock, chickens, goats ect can be noisy and smelly.
- Caring for livestock is difficult and requires a great deal of space and time, it would likely be noisy and a business.
- We live in a city, not the country.
- This has been attempted elsewhere and has resulted in terrible welfare of hens and overloading of animal control and rescue facilities with unwanted chickens. Terrible idea.
- Certainly not in the form that you're proposing here. again you're giving a law enforcement officer sole discretion whether or not something happens. On top of that you would need the support of your neighbours when it may have nose impact on the neighbours whatsoever and Neighbors come and go. so you could get into a situation where today's neighbour says yes tomorrow's neighbour says no. Obviously Animal Welfare has to be the first consideration and if that is being met Then Calgary has enough laws to cover nuisance animals regardless of species. This whole survey is ill conceived.
- Animals are exploited, owning livestock is a form of exploitation. Resources should not be wasted on livestock.
- I don't think there's enough space between houses in pretty much any city neighbourhood to allow for keeping hens without disturbing neighbours
- hens could be a big headache for a neighbours so I do not think is a good idea to allow them in places that can affect other people in surrounding areas.
- Rural animals should not be in an urban setting, takes down property value and noise, attracts wildlife, people can't follow the bylaws for cats and dogs, not going to follow bylaws with farm animals either
- Hens attract rats.
- there's barely any room for some of these dogs to roam the smell from some of the backyards where people don't pick up is horrible if people what these animals they should move to the country. look at some of our rivers know where people don't clean up.
- Hens are loud and will wake up the neighbours as soon as the sun rises. I do not want to listen to roosters gawking at 7 in the morning we don't live on a farm.
- I just don't believe its necessary and I don't want to be the one to have to approach my neighbors if there is a smell or noise issue. There is enough issues with just the average pet that people to care for.



- Hygiene issues from raising hens, stench, flies, droppings, etc. Operating a day home home for kids and maintaining dogs and hens at the same time do not go together well.
 - In small city lots the last thing we need are chickens. Lots of diseases come from too close contact with poultry
 - I don't think livestock should be permitted within city limits due to noise and smells
 - We don't live on farms and I like a quiet community
 - I'd support it only if neighbours within smelling distance of these allow it. Chickens are very smelly and our urban densification would not mix well with this for some people.
 - "Move to a small town of you want live stock.
-
- The question below asking about lower fees for low income people does not make sense to me as if you can't afford the license I don't see how you can afford to properly care for an animal."
 - Why would we want this? Sounds like a hazard and good way to spread infectious diseases as many birds can carry various diseases. This is what we have farm lands for and we don't need it to become an issue in our city. Given our harsh climates I would think they wouldn't survive well unless given proper living conditions. I'm thinking they would be in the streets? We don't need a problem with them like in Hawaii.
 - I think urban hens and other livestock in my neighbourhood would be a nuisance.
 - Too noisy. Neighbors would get all the noise and smell.
 - Nuisance to surrounding properties
 - Personally I live inner city, but I would support it for people who had more space .
 - We do not need urban farmers. Proper agricultural practices are vital in insuring that the risk of zoological illnesses and their spread remains low
 - Within city limits there are such variation in neighborhoods and some are more conducive to livestock than others. To have a bylaw that allows livestock generally may place them in urban settings that isn't appropriate for the animals as well as attract other wildlife/predators.
 - Let them move to a farm or acreage where they belong!!
 - I could maybe agree with some small livestock (dog sized or smaller). But I doubt that the alot of people would properly take care of their livestock. If for meat, how many would decide to slaughter in their back yard? How many people would decide to start slaughtering/butchering their friends animals in their backyards as a side business? Will they be slaughtered humanley? How many amateurs will be killing their own livestock? I do agree with owning birds though.
 - My only concern is the spread of virus within urban community. I am a pet sitter. Every time I care for any kind of bird, my clothing must be immediately stripped and prepared to be washed before heading into another persons home. Bird viruses can spread incredibly fast.
 - Inadequate space to support livestock within the city.
 - No livestock should be in a person's backyard. Period.
 - Not enough room in the city for livestock



- The noise and smell would not be welcome. There would be an increase in pests (mice, etc) and predators (coyotes, etc) as a result.
- Chickens are noisy & messy - belong on larger properties
- Ridiculous idea. Give your heads a shake . Think of the coyote problem. Would you like to live next to a chicken farm in the city.
- I'm torn by this issue. I would love to have a few chickens but I can see too many opportunities for abuse and misuse. Too many dogs are misused and abused. I can't imagine what they would do to chickens.
- There's enough farms for livestock no need to have in your backyard
- The noise and smell do not belong in an urban area. If I can't keep a dog outside if it barks, why should there be chickens, roosters, etc. outside making noise all day long? We've had neighbours with pigeons. They were noisy and their cages stunk.
- The broad definition of livestock bring in all sorts of complications (noise, fencing, smell).
- City living, size of lots etc...it is unfair for the majority of home owners to be required to accept hens or other livestock living beside or within the vicinity of their home. If you want to own hens or livestock, purchase land that allows this. I.e: acreage
- I'm not against responsible chicken ownership, but am against too many bylaws and bureaucracy to handle.
- It's a struggle to keep up with current complaints, why bring more issues into play.
- You want to ban bird feeders and allow hens? Good grief. You guys really have some stupid questions here.
- Not necessary
- There is a noise impact, cleanliness, also the additional insects flocking to the neighbors and the smell.
- Hens are one thing (our neighbours have some), but goats and pigs are another. Draw the line. And no geese!
- not too crazy about having noisy chickens in my neighbors back yard lol
- There is enough noise issues with people letting their dogs bark and annoy neighbours. I cannot even imagine the noise or smell from hens or other farm animals. This is the city. People wanting farm animals should live on a farm.
- Who really cares about hens
- I would worry about this extending to people slaughtering animals in their yards, which I could very well see happening.
- Lack of resources to adequately and in a timely, investigate community complaints.
- I'm concerned about noise and illnesses that livestock can carry.
- Livestock belong on a farm or acreage, any others should be case by case and not used for food
- "Move to the country
- I live in the City because I do not want the smell and noise of a farm
- It is ridiculous how long it takes for bylaw issues



- le garbage etc"
- Most people will not know how to care for chickens or other livestock.
- I am concerned about owners of livestock not looking after the animals and meeting the requirements to keep their yard clean and mitigate smell going into neighbours yards.
- Livestock does not belong within city limits on small city home lots.
- Hens carry ticks and so do pigeons. Stop all together. None of this is acceptable.
- I do not think it is feasible for bylaw to monitor and enforce bylaws. For the safety and security of these animals I do not support this bylaw amendment.
- "I don't want my neighbour to kill a
- Chicken And pluck it in His back yard. I can tell you everyone would rather kill them outdoors than inside."
- Animals should not live in confined urban spaces.
- They should not be allowed within the city for health reasons
- The city is no place for livestock, too noisy, too messy and not enough room for animal to exercise.
- This is a deep dark rabbit hole to go down. With chicken ownership, there is noise, and alot of manure issues to deal with. How do you police citizens to be keeping their chicken coops cleans and their backyards from smelling up the neighbours property! Do not allow it!!
- "public health
- This idea is so poorly thought through to please the few. I will sue any neighbors with hens and farm animals. I will sue the City of Calgary.
- Damage from pigeon feces and property damage will be sued for also."
- I don't think livestock should be in the city limits, it would be too disruptive to neighbours and the community with regard to noises, odors etc.
- Livestock should not be permitted in residential areas. Noise and odour are problems, as is vermin that are attracted by chicken feed.
- Lots in calgary are not large enough for hens. Will certainly create nuisances for neighbours
- There is a place to keep animals and it is not in the city.... They are noisy, they are smelly I do not want them on the other side of my fence..We are also allowing too many dogs and cat per residence
- Wildlife doesn't belong in the city.
- Hens belong on farms
- Concerned about noise, number of animals getting out of control, cleanliness.
- People don't look after their yards why would I want chickens beside me. Move to a farm
- Absolutely not
- It is a slippery slope for agricultural animal husbandry in urban settings for the level of care. Poor animal husbandry through neglect, ignorance, or even treating them as family pets can lead to disease (zoonotic transfer from close habitation in owner of neighbor), Animal abuse and nuisance neighbour activities leading to unmanageable conflict.
- I'm vegan and do not support this.
- Noise and smell.



- Houses are too close together in the city to allow livestock. It will become a nuisance to all the neighbours. One person wanting livestock will impact many more people's enjoyment of their homes.
- Bringing livestock into close contact with people in cities is one way to spread disease to both people and urban wildlife.
- Encourages unwanted wildlife such as skunks and coyote to come in. Also smells and noise
- Just don't trust people to care for animals in an urban environment. High potential for neglect or unhygienic practices. Urban environments high stress for livestock
- Hens and chickens belong on a farm
- "It puts neighbours in an awkward spot trying to keep good relationships if you disapprove
- There will always be someone resentful and vindictive
- The smell and issuable disease that fowl carry
- The cost of monitoring- if not approved- no cost to tax payers"
- I dont want to smell my morning coffee with chicken poop.
- I would not like to have these anywhere near where I am living
- Livestock does not belong inside a city.
- Bringing hens into the city could further endanger wildlife as they may also wander in search of food also endangering children and adults and other pets. At present wildlife predators feed occasionally on wild rabbits which roam freely as well. I believe farm animals belong on farms.
- People don't know how to look after chickens. What happens in the winter?
- Could become very noisy and stinky
- This sounds like it would be more work, time and money then it would be worth.
- They are too messy and can be smelly.
- These animals draw wildlife.
- Never, allow live stock , hens of any kind in an urban area. There is no benefit for neighbors, that's what farmer's markets are designed to do provide fresh eggs to everyone.
- These are farm animals. Eventually they need to be slaughtered and that is not a suitable activity for the city.
- Unless they meets all criteria, they should not be allowed
- Would have been "yes" before pandemic, but now is not the time to bring a bunch of animal species esp exotics into close living with lots of humans in urban environment. We have farms. I would defer to a veterinary college opinion on this, however.
- Chickens never stop making noise
- Enforcement of rules for this amendment would be difficult.
- Calgary is not a farm. You want to raise livestock, move to a rural property!
- Livestock does not belong in an urban environment with small parcels, tightly packed houses: smell and noise that are common in a rural setting can be extremely aggravating in the urban setting.
- The neighbours who approved it might move. Animals may make noise that affects more than adjacent neighbours.



- We live next to bee keepers. Our life has been impacted considerably by their activities. No one seems to care, there are no by-laws and no recourse. We have been deprived of outdoor time for at least 3 weeks this summer because of this operation and the smoke that it generates. We are avid gardeners who are trying to put together another art show but on this the last warm day of summer I am filling in your form instead of being outside painting. We also have not ventured past the perimeter of our yard because we are high risk seniors so we can't even escape the smoke that burns the eyes and fills one's lungs. If you don't care about seniors, fine. What if there were little children with developing lungs? Asthmatic individuals? What about smoking by-law. This is way worse. Both Toronto and Paris do not allow beekeeping. They have looked at the research and found that beekeeping negatively affects native bee populations
- The city is no place for chickens, pigs and other types of livestock. A pet is a Cat or Dog!
- Unless rescued and not for eating. Otherwise, livestock should not be raised in the city.
- bringing in hens will also attract wild life causing issues in my opinion
- you want farm animals, move to a farm
- I would agree, but I don't think people would stick to the rules
- smell
- No need for more options in a city environment.
- They should not be pets. Plenty of other domestic options with shelters being filled without adding more "exotic" pets to the problems.
- There would need to be strict rules and enforcement. This can very simply get out of hand, and there aren't appropriate supports through local organizations for hens seized or needing rehoming etc
- Issues with excrement disposal, smells, etc.
- I do not feel that individuals living in an urban or suburban environment have the necessary space, time, and resources available to provide adequate care for the majority of livestock species. These animals often do best in the herd environment which requires extensive space and management. Additionally, livestock can carry zoonotic diseases which may not be adequately recognized or treated, as appropriate veterinary care may not be sought out by these pet owners.
- Smell like poop
- Don't want chickens
- "People who want poultry/pigeons/livestock have the option to move to a rural setting. The negative impact of bringing animals farm animals into urban life is so selfish and irresponsible. Disease, insects, neglect, cost of city inspections, odors, noise, feces run off in rains - spring melts, pollution of rivers ...
- Where is the common sense ?"
- I am concerned about noise from having a large number of animals on any property. It would affect more than just the immediate neighbours, also anyone behind, across or nearby. I am not totally against the idea, I would just want to see more information on how it would involve others.
- Even though I support allowing urban hens, I think this will cause a lot of conflicts between neighbors as they will definitely have to agree. My feelings is that many would not be happy about hens close to their backyards.



- No live stock at all should be allowed move out of the city buy a farm
- I understand a couple of hens, but if you want to have livestock don't live in the city limits.
- I'm not confident in The City's ability to ensure animal welfare of livestock, including hens. And I'm not confident that all Calgarians who keep livestock will care for the animals so it will increase animal suffering. People aren't even taking care of dogs and cats properly, why add more animals.
- Farm animals and wildlife do not belong in backyards or confined spaces.
- No if you condemn the breed of pit bulls I do not stand for this.
- Personally , I would not not chickens near me. What would ne next? It there were , a community garden setting , that would be ok.
- Balancing the needs of hens and Calgarians has to be a joke. The needs and wishes of humans have to come before the needs of chickens 110% of the time, every single time.
- In principle but lots in Calgary are generally too small so this is too likely to disturb neighbours
- "If you want to raise animals for food move to the area that supports this.
- If you want to raise pigeons move to an area that is one and the noise/ smell/ and visual appearance goes not affect the neighborhood."
- I believe it would be impossible to regulate to a point where livestock does not negatively impact neighbours and property Values of neighborhoods
- Why don't we try to fix the first problem instead of adding more
- "Common sense. The odours do not remain on hen/livestock owners property. Odours travel several blocks. Fecal matter run off after rains or winter/spring melts. This goes into our drains, pollutes rivers, kills fish. Disease, bugs, bacteria, mice problem, potential salmonella all outweigh one individuals desire for hens/livestock. Calgary is not a 3rd world city.
- I'm from a farming background/history and had to leave because of the toll of prolonged odours put on my body.
- I have COPD and would be forced to move if people in neighborhood started urban hens/livestock.
- There would/will be a law suit if this is started in my neighborhood.
- I will sue the City and I will sue the owner of hens/livestock.
- I have a right to breath."
- Majority of properties would not be able to give a suitable home for the needs of other live stock.
- Adjacent neighbours can change.
- chickens are noisy in the early morning and smell. I would not want that next to my home as I enjoy my outdoor space often.
- "People start off with the best of intentions (cleanliness), however, things can get out of hand easily.
- For example, there are people who do not look after their properties now, (do not cut lawns and back yards are full of unused items - the bylaw officers currently cannot do anything about. So putting livestock into the mix would be a bad idea."
- It is unfair to have to smell animal smells in my backyard. Having to smell the neighbours dog urine and faeces in the spring and on hot days is bad enough I can't even imagine a chicken coop. If it was allowed, they should have to keep it against their own house, not at the property line, which



most of them would like to do. We actually enjoy using all areas of our small yard, this would be very affair to us.

- Keeping livestock close to human housing promotes pathogen jumps from animals to humans.
 - Livestock is not a good idea. Lots of people can't even be bothered to take care of their grass, let alone a coop of chickens.
 - I would support a case by case basis, however, one person's treasure can be another's annoyance. Who wants to listen to and smell animals 25/7. The dogs, cats and skunks are plenty thank you.
 - "No hens or other type backyard farm animals are required in the city. Eggs are pretty affordable as it is. Opens a problem that needn't be
-
- No good can come of this in a busy city"
 - "It will end up with more annoying situations.
 - Move to the country if you want farm animals."
 - Cleanliness and public health. As it stands we have problems with dog owners and cat owners.
 - I think it would be too noisy and potentially stink, especially in the summer.
 - Livestock belong in rural areas.
 - You need to explain exactly what what and all animals that would be considered livestock.
 - This is a slippery slope
 - Nah
 - Although a nice idea it is my impression that many of these animals will not receive appropriate care. Furthermore they will act as a vector for disease and can impact wild bird populations
 - chickens belong on farms not in peoples homes
 - If you want chickens and horses, then move out of the city. Neighbours should not have the peaceful enjoyment of their paid property disrupted by Animal noise and the smell of manure.
 - I am concerned for the well-being of the farm animals
 - Support from adjacent neighbours unnecessary and can lead to prejudice
 - I think hens are messy and would really need to be in a fenced in yard
 - Too much risk for error and irresponsible owners- we have people that cannot care for cats and dogs alone - also acrid with coyotes and bob cats too much attraction for wild life in rural communities
 - Hen's & roosters will lead to many noise complaints
 - Absolutely "would not" support allowing hens or any other livestock in Calgary. Hens and or other livestock belong on farm properties. City properties are too close to one another to allow for hens and or other livestock. Noise alone would be a major concern if a neighbour is allowed to have hens on their property. Offending odours from hens/livestock could also be another concern, if allowed. Why is city even exploring the feasibility of allowing hens or livestock? It just opens up the door for neighbour disputes if livestock of any kind is permitted on city properties. City has enough dog and



cat complaints without adding hens or other livestock to the 311 list. Please reconsider this bylaw amendment.

- It does not feel fair to the livestock to be able to live in city living conditions. Allowing this bylaw would increase the amount of animals living in Calgary, and likely mean that some living situations are overlooked. Although this amendment has criteria, as we increase the limits available, some criteria may be overlooked.
- No livestock in city limits
- Nuisance
- I do not want to have the mess and smell of farm animals in my area. The wind blows garbage everywhere. Lots are too small to keep farm animals.
- Bylaw and the city shouldn't be involved in any way.
- No chickens, pigs etc. in City
- Absolutely not. I enjoy my yard and gardening. I am hyper-sensitive to smells. Dog urine in my Neighbour's yard is already unbearable. I couldn't even imagine a chicken coop against my fence, and near my garden. If you do allow it, they should have to keep it against their house, not my property. This is a big NO!
- They are often let go in rural areas to die after the novelty wears off.
- Not in favour of livestock within city.
- Hens / pigeons or any type of bird or livestock do not belong in the city. Having any type of livestock should not be allowed. The smell noise etc is not fair to any neighbor.
- The noise and smell
- livestock belong on farms
- Only in areas where property is an acreage. City lots are too small to have urban hens or livestock. They belong in the country.
- I feel like this could draw predator animals further into the city looking for animals to hunt.
- I grew up in rural Saskatchewan. Farm animals belong on a farm they are not pets.
- Farm animals have no place in cities if you want farm animals move to a farm
- I live in a lovely community. I do not want to hear chickens.
- There is no need for urban livestock. People interested in raising livestock should live in rural areas.
- Livestock should be only in rural areas.
- Noise and smell
- Chickens and livestock need to live in areas where they have room to wander. In a backyard, etc. in urban centres is cruelty.
- NOISE SMELL
- I absolutely do not support any kind of farmed animals living urban areas. They are not pets and their lives are not to be played with. Is the city going to regularly visit these homes and ensure the animals are being treated responsibly? There is way too much potential for animal cruelty here when it comes to allowing people to raise animals for food or profit. I am 100% against this and will still fight it if it's allowed.



- I have concerns about nuisance (i.e. smell and noise) and safety (like human Salmonella infections from home raised chickens). I am more supportive of non-traditional emotional support animals, but less supportive of animals used as livestock in a residential setting, particularly in narrow R-2 lots that are typically only 25' wide and don't allow for sufficient distancing between neighbours.
- Some animals such as laying hens do not belong in an urban area.
- Noise, smell, cleanliness. Given the close proximity of homes in the city, how would anyone contain hens noise, smell and/or runoff of waste in a house next door without implicating the neighbors?
- Some neighbours prevent this and want to control the decision too much
- Whoever is making these silly foolish questions needs to start realizing that they need to talk to the proper people when it comes to stuff like this. Reaching out to the proper humans like farmers, veterinarians, et... who can give you details on positive and negative outlooks. Realistically asking people who have no idea what goes into owning livestock is silly. You should be asking farmers, veterinarians, and other humans who understands the animals physiology, allowing you to get the proper ruling for what goes. Not simple humans who thinks chickens and pigs are cute.
- They stink and are loud. Unless they would add value to my property, I have no interest in hens or neighbours having hens as they will devalue my home. If you wanted a community coop like the gardens, I'd be open to that.
- I don't think the city needs hens within the city core or boundaries. I did not move into an urban environment to be bothered by a clacking hen.
- I don't believe that livestock belongs in the city, as they will likely end up with unsuitable living conditions.
- Sounds like the bylaw would result in bad neighbors very quickly.
- I've walked by homes in other communities where livestock and/or chickens are kept and they are a mess, as well as emitting feathers, litter, noise and smells onto other properties.
- I do not want hens living beside me. They are noisy.
- Noise
- I've lived next to chickens. Roosters wake up at like 4 am and wake everyone else up to. No thanks.
- Neighbours change. When approved, the adjacent neighbours will be consulted, but what about future neighbours?
- Without proper livestock knowledge chickens won't remain healthy. Without proper health standards it could spread disease. There should be a system to ensure the animals are properly cared for and kept.
- Hens are farm animals and should not be kept in the city.
- I do not support livestock in the city at all. This opens up a whole kettle of fish for disputes between neighbours. Bees as well. People are deathly allergic to some animals. Why make it worse.
- Sooner or later some owners will neglect maintaining cleanliness to prevent bad odour and some livestock will roam around neighbours' yards.
- I see no reason why anyone in a city needs to have a hen.
- Chickens belong on a farm, no exceptions.



- Livestock? Would they be running all over like all the cats? Would a rooster crowing next door wake me up? Seems crazy
- I don't possibly see how an individual household within the city limits would have the appropriate amount of space to house "other livestock". The only exception may be beekeeping (not certain if that exists currently or by exception)
- Livestock should be kept on farmland.
- too much smell and noise.
- livestock of any breed belong on a farm or acreage NOT in the city
- Livestock should remain outside of the city limits. If individuals would like to own livestock or hens, they should have property outside of the city. There is a high potential for odors, disease/illness, noise, and other complications.
- It could lead to other livestock allowed in the city.
- They are for a farm.. you get mites, etc., there has to be regulations for the excess poop, etc. its unhealthy if not controlled
- If I wanted to live near livestock I would move to the country.
- If someone wants these types of livestock animals, then move out of the city to an acreage. Also, exotic animals should be banned from the city. They are not natural to our location and should stay where they came from or isolated outside of the city to an acreage.
- Homes are too closely built to have hens in city.
- I think that this would lead to many issues between neighbours and a challenge to ensure the well-being of the livestock.
- Animals increase the risk of predators which would affect my family and me directly. Also there would be a marked increase in noxious odors.
- Urban livestock sound dangerous for the animals
- Possible noise
- Absolutely not!!! Hens are noisy and smelly. I have lived in the country and we had chickens. There is no way in the world I want hens in my neighbourhood!
- We live in a city which already has wildlife and domestic animal issues. We don't need to further complicate the existing issues with the addition of livestock.
- Noisy, unclean, problem with feces and diseases
- Everything starts out as being responsible, but over time can get out of control. As a person that uses their outdoor space all the time dealing with chickens stmh next door neighbour's would not be too pleasant. If you want chickens move to an acreage, that is what they are for.
- Most owners do not properly care for their pets, I think allowing livestock into the mix would cause further complications / problems.
- I don't need to hear chickens and goats at 5 am. Also this could create more "nuisance" dogs.
- I don't want chickens running around my city
- This encourages the local wildlife going into people's yards, namely coyotes. Also, spilled feed attracts mice, which would be a headache for the owner and the neighbours.



- Livestock belongs on a farm or properties that have sufficient space.
- Most yards in Calgary are too small for livestock.
- Those birds are not pets and don't need to be caged up things like chickens can provide eggs and stuff for family where as pigeons are just load and annoying for others
- Smell from animals may be too much
- Livestock should not be within city limits

Participants who did not indicate whether they would, or would not, support this bylaw amendment however provided comments, are listed here.

- No concern
- not sure how I feel about chickens or other livestock
- unsure, depending on what happens when someone slaughters in their yard
- No opinion
- I'm not sure
- Not sure how I feel on this
- I don't have enough knowledge on this subject to comment
- [removed]
- I have no opinion about urban hens and other livestock.
- As long as noise and smell are a consideration for neighbours and the timeline to deal with complaints is quick.
- I don't understand fully.
- Don't know enough about livestock to comment on it
- I have an issue with any breed specific bylaw. It punishes an entire breed for peoples prejudice
- Neutral
- I am not educated enough on this topic to answer appropriately.
- I have no opinion about this.
- I am neutral on this subject. I can keep a dog quiet at a predawn/dawn time. Can you do the same with a hen?
- I do not know enough to answer this question
- Unsure. Biggest concern is appropriate living conditions for the animal, second concern is that people abandon dogs and cats so what happens if someone abandons a chicken or a goat?
I like the goats eating weeds in parks and I think chickens would be a nice addition to places like Ft Calgary, backyard bees are especially great for community gardens when organized by someone with enough knowledge to handle their care. I don't believe most city dwellers can manage care of livestock animals.
- Hens that lay eggs should be allowed in Calgary. You need to be more specific about what additional livestock is being considered before proper engagement can be requested.
- Need more info
- How do we contend with skunks coyotes bobcats and other wildlife who will pursue them as food



- N/A
- I am in different
- No comment
- No BSL
- No
- I am not informed enough to answer this question
- Chickens yes. What other livestock - pretty open question.
- No opinion
- Unsure. Need more information
- I don't have enough information on "hens" so I cannot provide an adequately informed answer
- I don't really have an opinion on this.
- I don't know enough about this matter to give an opinion.
- Undecided, don't know enough about the possible impact.
- I'm unsure on this as it depends on the livestock and the size of yard, etc.
- It depends what criteria are used to ensure suitable living conditions for the animal
- I have no idea how this would work out. So am not giving answer either way.
- I'm not sure how I feel about livestock being permitted. I'm neutral because I don't know enough about what it's like to own them.
- Unaware of the issues and concerns
- Far more needs to be considered for me to make a yes or no answer. Canada has some of the worst animal transport laws in the world. "Suitable living conditions" is subjective.
- i'm neutral
- Unsure. Would be fine if current neighbours support but what happens if they move and the next one objects?
- No roosters.
- n/a
- I don't understand the question. Please make it easy to understand. We are not all lawyers.
- I need more info on the types of animals allowed and the conditions.
- Livestock carry with them potential for disease and pandemic. I do not believe any animal should be kept as livestock anywhere, but in a densely populated city is asking for another pandemic.
- [DUPLICATE]
- I would need to know more before answering
- I am in different
- I would prefer to have a more clear And specific definition of the term "livestock"
- I don't know enough about this issue to support or deny it
- High potential to cause issues with neighbours, for example noise caused by animals, smell, allergies, etc. [DUPLICATE]
- I don't know enough about the research to answer this
- I do not have enough information on this to base a decision.



- Need more information on the criteria.
- Undecided
- I don't have any opinion on this
- another yes/no question
- No I don't want livestock in the city
- I haven't really researched enough
- No! Bad idea - talk about attracting unwanted predators into the suburbs! And excessive noise and smell!
- I am not sure about the impact of hens in a city yard? Noise, Smell. If those are not a problem I support it if they are I don't.
- I am not sure - the question does not indicate what "other livestock" would consist of.
- Honestly my answer is I don't know.
- I do not have enough information to answer
- Uncertain.
- Let people own hens for their own benefit.
- Livestock belong on farms
- I don't know enough about pros and cons to answer.
- I do not support hens, pigeons, and other livestock in an urban setting.
- There does not seem to be any bylaw at the moment so not sure how one can amend something that does not exist!
- I love any movement that shortens the chain of food production and food consumption.
- Not enough information to offer an opinion.
- Birds should not be covered under this bylaw as far as feeding on a person's property.
- Again, the question includes too many issues. I would support some but not all of the criteria, and the question of hens should be separate from other livestock. Please, come up with better questions, some that are not potentially ambiguous.
- other livestock is too vague to make an informed decision to support this bylaw amendment. Please clearly define "other livestock".
- Hens do not belong in neighborhoods or the city.
- Uncertain
- I would need to know why people are keeping hens. Are they pets? Are they going to be eaten by their owner?
- Is it going to cost me more money?? Is it a new way for city council to fine and tax is?
- No i don't support fowl in urban settings. They are noisy and smelly. People can't even pick up dog feces in their yards without intervention of a bylaw. You would need more staff to deal with the complaints. City says it is looking to cut budget of excess community programs and involvement on a permanent basis, duh!
- You have not listed the amendment. How can I respond. You might as well be Dr. Hinshaw saying choose school or home learning and then oops we are changing the rules after you chose.



- Unsure
- Would need to understand what livestock would be considered and how community benefit is defined.
- Again, you have not provided a clear definition., in this case for livestock. Do you mean cows, horses, etc.?
- unsure of this
- I am undecided as to whether hens are a good idea.
- Whatever. As long as I don't have to smell the coop.
- I don't think Livestock has any place in a city. They need space and most people in a city don't have that.
- I need to read up on this issue before deciding
- I am not educated in this area so I do not have a valid opinion
- While I am not against this for property owners with sufficient space, I'm not in favour of having a rooster wake me up every morning. I think the amount should be limited to a small number

Pet limit

Proposed bylaw change:

A pet limit would be six (6) dogs AND six (6) cats per household. All of the pets need to be licensed. If a household wants more than 6 dogs or 6 cats, a special application will be required.

Potential exceptions to this rule could be:

- Dogs/cats under 6 months of age
- Temporary homes (fosters, breeders, pet sitters, daycares)
- Dogs/cats that are inherited
- Dogs/cats that are grandfathered in if the rules change
- Approved Excess Animal Permit
- Possession of a Dog Fanciers' License
- Service animals

I would support this bylaw change

For participants that responded yes, no explanation was required. Responses from participants that indicated they would not support this bylaw change are listed below.

- Too many - make it max 4 total
- 6 dogs are too much in a household. It should be capped at 4 dogs and 6 cats. The low income license fee waiver should be only for one dog and one cat. This will ensure better animal welfare and medical care and less abandonment of animals.
- are you kidding me?



- animal lovers should be able to care for as many as they choose, as long as they are cared for
- I think it should be 4 dogs and 5 cats maximum. If not less
- It's not fair to have to fill out an application for a pet that you may have owned before the bylaw change
- most owners are good owners, sometimes a household may result in multiple individuals who own pets coming together - you may end up requiring someone to give up a family member in order to live under one roof.
- if there are neighbors who don't take care of the animals they have the smell will bother the neighbors especially in the winter, when freeze and thaw of feces is just terrible...and on hot day the stink does emanate from the garages.....even when they open their windows, there is that stench of indoor animals wafting over the fence....
- Considering LESA only 2 pets should be allowed at max per household.
- Limiting the number of animals does not make someone be a better pet owner. Breeders, dog daycares should be paying business licences and fees
- Only fosters and rescues should have that many dogs.
- That is too many pets in one home to responsibly care for. I feel that a limit of three dogs and three cats makes more sense other than the exceptions
- No one should have the ability to own twelve animals.
- I think 6 dogs is way too many. I believe that we need to decrease the legal number that owners can have.
- I think people should be able to have as many animals as seen fit in the circumstance. If you aren't violating any bylaws, you can have as many animals as you'd like.
- This is how pet hoarding starts and often ends in the animals being poorly taken care of and being apprehended.
- A maximum of 12 pets is ludicrous for any household The number should be capped at a maximum of 2 pets (any combo of dogs and cats) There can be an exception for breeders & service animal trainers providing they get written permission from all immediate neighbours. We have a neighbour with 2 dogs and when they start to bark they feed off of each other. Imagine that with 6 dogs. We also have cats wandering through our yard at night because people let them out. Enough is enough. Put a cap on the number but much lower than what you proposed.
- Unless a hoarding situation. No number limitation
- You shouldn't be limited to the number of pets as long as you are able to care for them properly.
- 6 of each is too high. Should be 6 combined.
- Yes, because again it's about the practicality. We live in a city, few residence can support that many animals to be truly healthy. Go live on a farm. How can one person walk 6 dogs and pick up 6 dog [removed]? And stop it from biting a child, seems way to much to handle. Imagine I have 6 pit bulls because the by law says I can. These disease infected animals are a higher risk than corona.
- No one needs 6 dogs AND 6 cats. That's excessive for a normal residential lot.
- 6 is too many, do you want 6 dogs or cats living next to you?



- I'm not aware of any evidence to suggest there is a problem to be addressed, if there is substantial evidence to say there are a large number of people with too many pets I would consider it, but this extra legislation seems to create more complicated rules without good justification. It's not necessary for anyone to own any pets at all, so claiming it's not necessary to own more than 2 is absurd.
- No more than 2 dogs and 2 cats
- Some people may want 7 dogs. Let them.
- If they're not hurting the animals or anyone who cares how many they have.
- I think 6 cats and 6 dogs is too many already for city limits. I think 4-5 would be more appropriate.
- 12 animals in one house is absurd. Live on a farm if you want that many. If you train service animals get a license to do that and still restrict to 12. That's beyond enough.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and registered and the owner is responsible, I see no issue with pet limits. If anything, limits should be placed on breeders (ie stronger rules, enforcement of proper living conditions, amount of litters per year etc) to help control the pet population and keep pets out of shelters off the streets and prevent unnecessary euthanasia
- I would like more information before supporting a law like this.
- Stop trying to control people.
- there house there rules
- Puts limits on dog boarders that do in home care. Put a limit on breeders
- my answer is no because I don't see pet rescues or places of the sort in there.
- Similarly to what I mentioned above, judge how the animals are affecting others, rather than the number. If there is noise, etc. manage that issue. I know people who have several dogs and great homes. I also know those with 1 and let them howl. Ban roaming for sure, no matter what.
- As long as the owner takes full care of each and every pet, as well as the property, I see no problem in having no limit to the amount of pets you may own.
- It doesn't make sense to have a limit of 6 cats and 6 dogs? That would be 12 animals in a household which is too much, I think it should be a total amount of any animal allowed per household.
- A limit of two pets is appropriate in an urban environment. 6 cats and 6 dogs is way too many and will certainly be a nuisance
- IF the exceptions were in place, I would be supportive, but not as a stand alone change.
- It's no ones business how many animals someone wants to own as long as they are taken care of.
- Retain the bylaw restricting the no of oets
- I agree to everything except the age of the exception. I don't think there should be an age limit, there shouldn't be more than 6 dogs and cats period unless an exception form was filled
- Nope, never support this bylaw. This is wrong. If a person can take care of more than 6 cats and provide a good home then why not!
- Six cats is probably excessive already. Six dogs is even worse. If somebody needs that many animals they should go out of town and live on a farm.
- I don't believe that indoor cats should be licensed but I do support the maximum 6 animal law



- This is a LOT of animals and isn't much different than no limit at all. Most municipalities with limits set it at 3 dogs and 3 cats.
- Just don't think it's necessary to control people like this.
- I don't feel the city should decide how many pets is appropriate for a household, so long as there isn't any issues from the neighbours.
- 6 is too many in town
- Three of any type should be the limit
- Suitability for ownership is recommended on a per case basis
- I think people will abuse this.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs allowed pet household is ridiculous. That is way too many animals for any dwelling in the city
- Too many animals could cause damages to property, people and to other animals.
- Maybe a maximum of four cats or dogs per house is more reasonable unless you are fostering animals. I think that having six dogs or cats in a home is too much and the welfare of the animals would be a concern. Especially six dogs in one home may not sit well with neighbors.
- I still do not believe the number of animals be restricted. Instead, the emphasis should be if a household accumulates enough nuisances or has evidenced they cannot take care of the animals, then they should be removed or fined.
- Government should not be able to dictate responsible pet ownership unless it is a hoarding situation
- If animals are well cared for and licensed I don't see the need for restrictions
- I have never had an issue with my dogs that have been 6 to 9 at any one time
- I think the entire premise of the Responsible Ownership bylaw is exactly that: based on sole responsibility of the individual that is responsible for those animals. If there is a problem with a specific household/owner, then that issue should be addressed on an individual basis.
- na
- There shouldn't be a restriction of how many dogs and cats there should be in a house hold. That's the decision of the house hold and as long as it's not disturbance for others.
- The vast majority of pet owners are responsible. They keep their pet waste cleaned up, don't allow their animals to roam freely etc. I personally have 8 dogs and 4 cats, my yard is clean, my dogs are not allowed to bark when in the yard, my pets are not permitted to roam at large, and my cats are on a leash when they are allowed outside under supervision.
- I do not agree with limiting the number of pets. However, there should be higher licensing fees for exceeding a certain number of pets
- 12 animals in a city dwelling is excessive
- It's nobody's business how many pets an individual has. Often times animals are less disruptive than adults or children.
- They should be able to have as many as they want so long as all the needs (food, shelter, medical, and psychological needs) are all being met as well as cleanliness in and out of home.
- Animal limits are not necessary if there is sufficient care for the animals and no negative impact on neighbours.



- The possibility of having 12 animals in a home is excessive.
- As long as the animals are being taken care of it shouldn't be an issue.
- This limit still allows too many animals
- No
- 6 is far too many. I would support a maximum of 4.
- No one should have 6 cats and dogs. Max should be 4 and 4 and insurance should be made mandatory as well as spaying and neutering. You should have to apply to breed.
- No
- There should be no limit to pets, if they are being kept in a responsible way.
- There are ton of family's who foster animals. And can easily surpass 6 dogs or cats. Not many people have the ability to foster animals. And the ones who do. Tend to foster many. I've personally seen up to 17 dogs at once.
- 6 each, that is crazy! This bylaw should be based on the size pf ypur property. No one household needs 6 dogs, quality of life for the dogs goes down. And 6 cats again, no,quality of life. Maximum of 4 pets per household, a combination of dogs and cata. Do not promote hoarding of animals! Stupis idea.
- That's too many animals.....
- It's difficult to manage 6 dogs or 6 cats at once.
- Some people can responsibly handle more animals. You are going after the good parents.
- Why should the city tell me how many pets I have
- Provided the exceptions above are truly enforced because of breeders, fosters, etc
- I feel it's not necessary to step in and tell people how many animals they may have, unless abuse is suspected. Don't change this just implement more resources to deal with abuse to animals.
- No one needs 6 personal dogs
- Why have a limit
- 6 is too many. ExceptionS cover the key areas.
- it's their own house/property. As long as they clean up after them. I do think you should change calgarys name to fine city. to
- We don't limit the amount of kids a human can have in a household why should an animal be treated any differently
- All some people have are animals. If someone can have more then six kids why couldn't they have more then 6 animals? If well cared for with a adequate space.
- Household should not exceed 4 animals, the infrastructure of the city can hold more then that in new developments.
- No pet limits
- I do not support strict limits. They ignore the fact that it is the responsibility of the owner that matters not the number of pets. Some people are able to have multiple pets with no issues and some can't handle a very low number responsibly.



- Limitations on the number of dogs will only affect the honest owners. If all the animals are well cared for and not a nuisance they should be allowed to own as little or as many pets as they choose.
- Scrap any and all biased/prejudice changes to pet ownership bylaws. Watching Beyond the Myth documentary mandatory for City Council members before voting. This documentary clearly illustrates the failure of similar laws in Denver Colorado.
- Too much government
- the city should not have this power.
- d
- You don't need to make an arbitrary limit. Fine people and confiscate animals if the welfare is in danger and problem solved.
- N/A
- too much noise, faces, in the country yes, not in the city.
- If the animals are well taken care of it is no one else's business.
- Feces/noise/abuse can happen with 1 or 2 dogs. Why count? What makes 6 the magic number?
- 12 animals are too many for the small lots and houses of Calgary
- no
- Some people are able to support more pets
- If they can be responsible than there's no problem
- Because it I believe depends on a person, some people are more responsible about cleaning up after there pet than others. Why do good pet owners have to suffer
- 6 still seems too high.
- Too many animals in one household. It would be extremely difficult to adequately and financially meet the needs of these animals.
- please limit to 3 cats and/or dogs total.
- That is too many animals. Maybe 6 total would be fine, but this allows for up to 12. People can apply for exceptions if they want but the bylaw should be lower for the welfare of the animals.
- I still feel that this is too many pets. I would like restriction to 3 dogs AND 3 cats.
- 12 permanent pets to one household is too many without a full assessment of the situation for an exception to be made. This is likely a stressful situation for the animals involved.
- If someone owns their property, pets are not a nuisance and are all registered it should be their choice
- Thats a lot of animals for inner city living.
- People who have more dogs and cats may not be able to care for these animals, they is costly, this can affect the animal's health. NO Increase for pet ownership.
- How would you ensure that pets are in safe conditions with that many pets in a home.
- That is too many for a reasonable person to own
- I am a pet owner and think that there is no need for one person to have 12 pets in their home to give each animal the proper care. I would support a total of 6 dogs or cats. If a person had 2 dogs they could only have 4 cats, or however it works (limit being 6)



- Considering average house sizes in Calgary. 6 of each animal is excessive and could lead to an overflow of shelter animals.
- I think as long as the animals are well maintained/happy it should not matter how many pets someone has.
- would think 6 total is a good number before a special license is required. 6 pets can end up being a puppy mill
- Deal with problem ones only. No bylaw needed.
- Way too many. People can't take care of them few they're allowed now...
- I feel as though nobody should be restricted as long as these animals are cared for properly. Some people most likely exceed these numbers and would we really make them give up family members if they're willing and capable of properly caring for them? Just get stricter on the cruelty cases
- I think this is bordering on far too much government control. Absolutly none of your business. I do think animal hoarding or mills should be addressed.
- If they are well cared for, spayed/neutered and licensed and indoor cats, no limit.
- More than five pets of any kind seems extremely excessive in the city. Once again, if you want more animals move to a farm
- I think that 6 dogs or cats is a lot for someone to take care of.
- If animals are cared for properly there is no reason they shouldn't.
- Each household is different, some cant take care of even 1 pet, some have 5+ and have zero issue
- A mix of cats and dogs not to exceed 6 total animals
- If they are in a responsible home and supported there should be no limit
- I might support it if it was more clear who would be able to apply for additional animals. Not everyone who has more than 6 dogs/cats is unable to care for them. In general I feel hoarding animals should be dealt with more severely on a case by case basis.
- No comment
- I think this needs to be a case by case basis. While some people may be equipped financially, emotionally, have the space, have the ability to commit the time to care of many pets, others won't.
- Unless a person has a large enough property, there isn't enough room for 6 dogs and/or cats in a household. Perhaps 6 pets total.
- Seems excessive.
- We have friends in Calgary who have a lot of land within city property. They have 7 animals they have rescued that live with them. They are well behaved and well looked after. What would happen to people like this who have rescued these animals and can no longer do so going forward.
- It's too many and would cause noise, damage property and isn't enough space in a city dwelling.
- I've known of people with one animal that couldn't handle the responsibility, and people with more than 6 animals that take good care of all of them, and ensure they are well behaved. If we are concerned about noise, feces/mess, and the welfare of animals, setting standards more directly related to those things makes more sense to me. Noise complaints are already possible regardless of the number of dogs. I would also assume that complaints can be made and addressed with



regards to feces/smell. And the welfare and treatment of animals living in a household should be enforced regardless of 1 or 20 animals.

- Too much government interference. Stop telling people what to do on private property.
- Instead of restricting the animals a person can own, how about enforcing bylaws where people need to actually take care of their animals.
- 6 dog AND 6 cats seems too many. 6 total would be more reasonable
- Setting a maximum number penalizes responsible owners of multiple pets without impacting negligent owners
- The city should have no say, if animals are being cared for properly
- I feel as long as the animals are being cared for correctly, there is no reason to limit the amount or breed type!!
- I feel that this one is a very grey area for exceptions to the proposed bylaw changes and would have to be upheld on a case by case order. I own 3 cats and a dog and am a responsible pet owner. Grandfathered in or not stripping away my ability to have more than 2 of one or the other seems like an infringement on my rights. I'm sure there are many pet owners that would agree with me. However there are absolutely going to be cases where somebody is clearly hoarding animals or not providing for the welfare of the excessive amounts of animals. To some extent I agree with the proposed changes, but I also feel there is too much grey area for this to be an enforceable bylaw that wont result in massive backlash from pet owning community members
- I would like to limit the number of pets per household based on the size of the house. Having six cats or six dogs in a tiny apartment is unacceptable
- The max should be 3 AND 3. Also, the license fee for altered and unaltered dogs and cats should be there same
- Majority of people don't have the capabilities to support this many pets financially physically or emotionally. An increase in bylaw will allow more room for neglect, abuse and rehoming
- There's no guarantee that the exceptions listed above would be upheld in the final bylaw
- 2 pets are enough for any house.
- I know many, many people who have more than 6 dogs and they are better behave and cared for than people with just 1 dog. BTW I am a professional dog trainer.
- I dont think this needs to be a bylaw
- I dont feel anyone needs to have more than 6 pets in a residential home. If they have a business, or need for more than 6 animals, a rural location is better as it provides more distance for noise and smell issues.
- I'm fine with the bylaw change. I want to request the city stop using the term "grandfathered". The word is rooted in racist ideology and history. Please change to 'legacy', 'exempted' or other more respectful term.
- Irresponsible pet owners could take advantage of this and would lead to crowding of animals
- I do not believe a person owning 6 cats/dogs can adequately provide the necessary care, attention and quality of life those animals require and deserve. I believe 3-4 is a reasonable and more realistic limit



- Even 6 dogs and 6 cats may be too many to create noise and disturbance for neighbours
- There are people with one dog that can't pick up the pop and let their dog bark incessantly. They don't train it and let it bite people. Increasing the fines for infractions is better than limiting pet ownership. People that are concerned about number of pets are people that can't understand because they can't handle one. I have many friends with multiple pets that spend all their time with them. The. You see one person at a dog park letting "Fluffy" run around irritating people and dogs while "mom" talks on the phone. Start addressing the problem with the people first.
- 12 animals in one house is too many still.
- Dogs have puppies... cats have kittens. Your bylaw makes that not possible. I am pretty sure cats and dogs do not know about laws regarding these things. Some religions, like Jewish people can NOT castrate or alter a animal. You can't violate religious freedoms.
- As a foster-fail myself, I can say with great confidence that there are numerous highly responsible dog owners with more than six dogs. A limit on the number is not needed. Rather, accessible dog training would aid in reducing negative experiences. Dog training can be prohibitively expensive for some.
- If we are talking about 1 person/1family then depending on the size of the property of where the animals stay is a deciding factor upon how many pets should be allowed. In smaller houses with smaller backyards you shouldn't be having more than at most 2 dogs or 3 cats. Larger houses with more backyard room sure go ahead and have 4-6 dogs and cats. Households that would hold more would already be an exception household technically speaking.
- Not necessary to control this aspect of people's households
- That's not fair to in home daycares and pet sitters at all.
- Interfering with people's happiness and quality of life, the city should mind its own business and find another way of making money.
- The limit should be significantly less! 3 dogs OR 3 cats
- I don't think it's necessary to restrict pet ownership, as long as there are no issues. If there are issues, the owner can be fined/warned under that specific by-law.
- It's not hard to care for multiple animals when done right. If there is obvious neglect, then no. But the average person who has more than 2 animals takes care and cleans up after them. It's ridiculous to try to take away pets when shelters are so full and people are able to give loving homes.
- I agree to the exceptions. But 6 dogs AND 6 cats seems very high, especially if the animals are not neutered or spayed, that could quickly get out of hand. I think it should be 6 dogs and 6 cats IF the animals are fixed, but only 4 dogs and 4 cats if the animals are not fixed.
- If proper care and training can be provided no limit should be in place.
- 6 is already too many.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats in a household is too much and the welfare of the animals would be a huge concern.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats seem too high, it should be reduced.
- As long as there is a special application available for those that have more animals, I would limit this to 6 animals TOTAL.



- Unless you are a breeder or pet sitter etc, there is no need for that many animals in one house hold. Generally, in my experience, the people who have multiple animals like that (other than on farms) can't afford proper vet care or licensing and become back yard breeders at the expense of the animals health to make a few extra bucks
- I think that limit with those other exceptions is good for the city of Calgary. It limits the possibility of hoarding animals.
- If the person is a responsible pet owner, there should be no limit.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats? Give your head a shake people! Far too many animals in one house.
- Responsible pet ownership should not be penalized by having a limit places on how many animals one household can have, as long as there is adequate space and the animals are well cared for.
- 3 dogs/3 cats is enough unless there is an approved permit or a foster
- Fewer would be great
- I think 6 of each dogs and cats under normal circumstances is rather excessive. I would like to see this reduced to 3 each with the potential exceptions to remain as listed above.
- I don't believe the people who take care of their animals properly should have to pay the consequences of this
- I think a max. of 3 dogs and 4 cats and include all the potential exceptions.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is too many. Perhaps 6 pets (dogs and cats) total
- I support having no limit to the number of pets as long as good care standards are maintained
- Two pets are more than enough for any family. This will the owner to properly ensure the the family pet receives the best care, not only physically, but nutritional .
- Only breeders should be allowed to have this many animals for a short period of time.
- Restricting the number of pets is not going to fix the problem as the things listed above (excessive noise, defecation, and the well being of animals) is not determined by how many there are but by the person that owns them. It comes down to responsibility and not neglecting pets. The focus needs to be on addressing people that are irresponsible pet owners. NOT limiting the number of pets people can have as a whole.
- Six is too many for single family dwelling.
- Stop trying to nickle and dime us for you to make more money of us and always cry that's never enough. PUBLIC chools are ridiculously underfunded and it doesn't matter how much money you make, you never do your job. Always cutting public resources, charging more and blowing money in crap we don't need
- That's far too many animals on most city lots. Number should be based on lot or home size.
- 6 Of each is too many maybe 4
- How many animals I care for is none of your business. Your time and money would be better spent making sure people are on leash and picking up their poop
- Nobody needs more than two dogs or cats. Nobody.
- Na
- Unless there are concerns about welfare/fences/noise, I don't think limits of pets are necessary.



- Limits should remain what they are
- The city should only be able to limit pets to people who have recorded bad behaviour as owners.
- Backyard/illegal breeders.
- I think the city only needs to step in when the animals are being mistreated
- That's 12 animals per household? I think this should be based on square footage in order to encourage good animal welfare and healthy living. if you don't have enough room for that many pets you shouldn't be allowed to have that many pets.
- That's too many pets. People don't need more than 1 or 2 pets.
- Stop dictating the amount of pets we can have if they are behaving
- 12 animals on a property!?! in the city?! No. The exceptions I'm ok with but that is really excessive. I also think if you can't afford to licence your pet and care for it, you shouldn't have it and your fees shouldn't be waived.
- Daycares are a business, and should be licenced as such
- Six animals in one home is unreasonable. This is animal collecting or hoarding. There is no way that this is healthy for animals or humans to live like this.
- If pets are taken care of there should be no limit
- Six seems like a high number, especially for dogs. I don't feel as though any house in an urban setting is suitable for that many dogs, except perhaps small dogs. Consider having different categories such as 6 small dogs , or 3 large dogs (and if a mix, 1 large dog would be equivalent to two small dogs). I also think their needs to be some restrictions on number of dogs allowed for breeders.
- 6 dogs & 6 cats.... thats alot of animal crap, vet bills. It should be 3 cats & 3 dogs.
- 6 pets is too much. Limit to 2 or 3 max.
- This is a lot of animals in 1 home and should not be allowed
- This still seems like too many animals
- 6+6 is too many animals per household. Any exceptions should gave to apply for exemption under strict guidelines.
- Who needs that many animals?!
- I believe there should be a limit, there is no need to have more then 3 dogs and a couple cats, anymore and its hoarding and irresponsible.
- Why does it matter what other people do. If the animals are in a safe and healthy environment then it's up to the owner how many they want
- The number of pets I care for is not a city matter - this is my personal choice and very communist of the city to consider.
- Cuz that's stupid
- I know people who are animal lovers that have more than 6 dogs or cats and take great care of them. There are no issues.
- Breeders/ rescue should be allowed to keep more animals



- There is no reason to limit the numbers of pets someone has unless they are reported and proven to not be able to care for them all.
- So many exemptions there wouldn't be a limit in many cases. And 6 dogs is a lot unless they are well trained.
- there are so many loud dogs and zero enforcement in my opinion. It would be so much worse with 6 being allowed.
- 12 animals in a single home is excessive. Even 6 animals in a single home is excessive. Seems like it's borderline hoarding
- The number of dog owned should be irrelevant if they are properly taken care of. Many of the "problem dogs" that are not cared for properly live in single-dog households
- Excessive animals
- I think the current 2 dogs, 2 cats per household is acceptable and that additional animals should be applied for.
- Only exception would be for registered breeders
- No restrictions if the animals are well cared for
- I think the list of exceptions is too long. Daycares and service animal trainers sure. Other, probably not
- Potential of 12 animals in one residence is very concerning. Leads to hoarders, backyard breeders, unlicensed 'daycares'
- That is too many animals. Why would anyone need 6 dogs and 6 cats. Way too many.
- Homes are used for rescues and fostering with fluctuating numbers
- Because if I'm a breeder I can't judge on how many pups my dog will have
- It is none of your business how many animals I have if they are being cared for and cleaned up after.
- the limit is fine.
- I don't think there should be a limit
- no i do not support this if they wish to have more pets and can properly take care of them no bylaw to restrict
- People should have the right to own as many pets as they want as long as they are taking proper care of the animals.
- I believe the exceptions are reasonable to apply to the current limits of animals per household. Six each of both cats and dogs seems like too many animals per home.
- I agree with exceptions listed but those exceptions should be applied to the existing limit of 2 animals per household
- Having that many animals In a city dwelling is not fair to the animals.
- I would increase the amount if animals that can be owned but I would max at 3 or 4 each. But I believe 6 each is too many for any person. I believe the exemptions are okay.
- You did not explain what the current limits are. You mention suggestions. 3 is the right number and after that you have to have a permit for more than 3 animals.



- As is, this doesn't account for household size. A mansion will hold more animals comfortably as compared to a condo.
- No
- 6 is too many. Should allow no more than 2 with the stated exceptions.
- It is impossible to financially take care of that many animals for some people
- If the animals are properly taken care of and have access to food, shelter and proper veterinary care, the amount of animals owned in a home is irrelevant. It is their home, they should have the freedom to own whatever they like.
- 6 dogs and cats is way too many. The limit should be like 2 maybe 3
- Having 6 dogs and 6 cats in one household is too much! It should be 2 dogs and 2 cats seems reasonable.
- Two dogs is enough. I am concerned about their welfare.
- There is no need for a private residence to own 6 cats and or dogs. 3 cats or dogs maximum.
- The bylaw should be based on actions i.e. are the pets cared for & cleaned up after. Otherwise people will do it anyways and just not license the pets so nobody knows unless there is a problem.
- The number of pets doesn't define the responsibility of the owners
- 6 is too much!
- A household with 2 pets can cause noise and dirt issues and I know if multiple pet families that are immaculate. The number of pets isn't the issue - it's the owners
- quit trying to rule every facet of people's lives. If they are responsible pet owners. They can do what they want. If they are not, then laws should pertain to them.
- Keep it the same. No need to change this bylaw.
- 6 is too many.
- Why support a limit on pets that can be trained, but not humans that are disrespectful or grow up with no manners
- I don't know what the current limit is but 6 of each seems like too many.
- That number of combined animals, or any combination thereof remains excessive. 6 combined is pushing the limit in my opinion.
- That is too many animals to take care of their welfare. There is more chance of attacks between animals and people in house hold. Not enough room to keep dogs exercised unless the owners have an acreage, it's not a healthy environment.
- Keep it the same. Too many animals.
- You can be responsible for dogs and cats without a limit
- six cats and 6 dogs are way, way too many for a household!! Too much noise, feces, lack of proper attention to the individual animals I think a maximum of 4 pets in total would be very generous.
- There should be owner accountability on animals in the home. If unable to uphold then that family/person is subject to the 2 pet max. People who care for pets and their homes should not be subject to bylaws that are intended for those who don't take care.
- There should be no limit



- Agree with the 2
- That seems like a lot of animals for an urban area. Is there a way to enforce the amount of space these animals have?
- I think as long as pets are properly taken care of then you should have a limit.
- If the animals are well taken care of I don't believe there should be a limit. If complaints arise they should be investigated and taken seriously.
- I think 3 is a reasonable number of animals per household
- There should be no limit
- You don't limit the number of human children a household can create so why would it be appropriate to regulate the number of four legged family members.
- As long as the animals are cared for, their feces are cleaned up and they are not excessively loud, why should you dictate how many pets someone can own?
- The size of the household affects this
- 6 of each is too many for one household to properly care for, walk safely and clean up after...reduce to limit of 4, even if inherited.
- I have lived in a household with four adult people and between those four people there has been 7 dogs. Because there were four adults in the home the dogs were not only well managed but well taken care of.
- It is for the city to decide who owns what
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is too high without a permit
- If someone is willing and able to care for however many pets they choose to have then they should be allowed.
- 6 is too many for proper care. Maximum of 3 is more reasonable
- As long as the animals are well cared for it's not an issue, if neglected than yes
- I don't think there should be a limit to how many persons can own as long as they are being taken cared of.
- The current bylaws already address appropriate animal care. As long as the owner is caring for the animals according to bylaw, I see no reason to enforce limits on number of animals.
- A responsible pet owner should not have to limit their pets to a set maximum amount
- If the animals are well kept and welfare is not an issue. This should not change.
- It is too many for a residential household. It protects the welfare of the animals by having fewer not more on a property. I feel this proposed change is crazy.
- 6 + 6 is too many animals. Should be less.
- Even six dogs and/or six cats is far too many per household. Certainly would not want to see special applications allowing even more than this. It's the noise factor for me. There's enough noise in the city without incessant barking of dogs left in yards when people go out for a few hours at a time.
- I think a cap of 3 owned of each per house hold.
- I don't think there should be a limit on pets owned in one household as long as they are being properly cared for.



- I would support this change if the exceptions above were implemented. As indicated "potential exceptions" I would want a guarantee that the potential exceptions were absolute exceptions.
- Welfare checks should be done on any person who owns more than 6 of a breed, however if proper care conditions are clearly met (medical needs, etc) then a person who can properly provide for those animals not be penalized
- I do not support restricting numbers of pets.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats sound excessive and highly likely an issue for neighbors. This amount of animals generates very strong odors from relieving themselves.
- Presuming you are responsible and caring for each of your animals it shouldn't matter how many someone has
- I think its ludicrous to have 12 animals in a household who's going to monitor/ensure all household pets are licensed? Also 6 dogs or cats is excessive, most people wouldnt get a license for that many pets. the fecal matter on their property would be disgusting and most cat owners in this city allow their cats to roam at large, huge problem right now look at yyc pet recovery and other lost/found pet facebook groups, its staggering how many cats are let to roam free and the owners admit it.
- Why make more new laws that are useless
- Why 6? That seems ridiculously high. Two cats & two dogs is more than enough, with exceptions made for animals that are being fostered & need the care.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats in a household is too many. There is absolutely no way that someone could take care of that many animals properly.
- As long as they are taking care of the animals properly they are providing a healthy home
- there shouldn't be a limit as long as animals properly cared for
- The only exceptions I support are fosters and daycares (fully licensed).
- Licensed dog breeders that follow a code of ethics should be exempt
- 6 of each is waaaaay too many animals.
- I feel the limit should be lower than 6 dogs and cats. That still seems incredibly high and I am not confident a household could adequately care for 12 animals in a responsible manner - not to mention control them. I would suggest a 2 dogs and 2 cats limit. I would specifically be more concerned with 6 dogs as this evokes an image of a dog pack.
- Noone needs 6 cats / dogs, this is hoarding!
- If the animals don't cause problems, then there should be no limit
- Stay in your lane. This isn't a dictatorship and you have no right to tell someone how many animals they can own especially if they are responsible owners,
- Why do cats need a licence when they can't go outside?
- 6 is way too many
- For residential properties, there is no need for an increased pet limit as it. Space, noise, neglect and dedication issues would all be of my top concerns.
- If someone owning a large number of pets is causing any of the issues stated above then that should be handled on a case by case basis. People who are responsible pet owners and don't allow those issues to occur should not be subject to even more fines and lengthy application processes.



- I think there should be a TOTAL of 6 be it cats or dogs
- Too many
- If there is a bad situation happening with someone owning an excessive amount of animals that's a problem but how the hell is this going to help that? "Hey I'm abusing animals but like... it's legal to have more than 6 so guess I'm doing nothing wrong!!" (????????) you have the right intention but this makes no sense. Also who gives a [removed] that there's a bunch of dog poop in someone's yard? Get a life hahahahaha
- You would be penalizing the responsible dog and cat lovers out there. It's unfair to restrict what people are allowed to have if they are being responsible owners.
- Limiting animals on private property if they are being properly cared for is ridiculous.
- If people are responsible pet owners who pay for their licenses and care for their animals then I don't believe the City has a right to tell people how many pets they can have
- non commercial ownership should be limited to 4 dogs and 4 cats maximum
- 6 is too many
- Not all breeds bark. There's no proof that an increased number of pets will drive accumulation of feces on the property if those are picked up. This is a very discriminating proposal driven by an anti-pets agenda.
- That's too many
- As long as people look after and clean up after their cats and dogs its no ones business
- Governmental over reach
- I think the current bylaw is satisfactory.
- I believe that other issues (waste accumulation, noise, animal welfare) stemming from having a large number of pets would be better dealt with by having specific bylaws and/or laws in place.
- People should be allowed to run their property as they see fit. Though if complaints are made against the owner and the property regarding these issues Then bylaw can step in and make adjustments.
- Na
- Too much government regulation.
- Total of 6 cats OR dogs per property
- To many mixed questions that do not fit or are in conflict with each other. Support Dogs/cats under 6 months of age Temporary homes (fosters, breeders, pet sitters, daycares) Dogs/cats that are inherited Dogs/cats that are grandfathered in if the rules change. Not the rest. Backyard breeders are profiting off the abuse of poor breeding habits. Licenced breeders must be a certified breeder.
- 6 animals is too much within city limits
- Too many animals
- I think it should be based on the square footage and land availability of your current dwelling. For instance, 6 dogs in a 1000sqft house with a small backyard is way too many for that dwelling, but a 4000sqft home could accommodate that. I would keep the exceptions to the rule however.



- People may rent properties together and they may each own their own animals (renting a room in a house and sharing the house with multiple different people). As long as there are not complaints and the animals are well taken care of then it should be okay.
- Maximum should be lower, perhaps 3 dogs and/or 3 cats. With the exceptions listed, and an application/permit would be required for more animals.
- While I think this change sounds generous, I believe it should be decided on a case to case basis. Someone could have more than the allotted number, but are very diligent pet owners, or someone could have 1 or 2 pets, and not take proper care of them.
- I value freedom
- is causing poor conditions for the animal
- 4 is enough. And all pets in the city should be spayed/ neutered. No breeding so no need to allow a higher number of young animals.
- If you own or rent your own home, you should be able to do what the [removed] you like unless you are causing a nuisance or trouble
- People should be able to own as many animals as they want as long as they are properly being taken care of, if they own 6+ animals there should be a way for them to be checked on to reduce back yard breeding
- Too many!! I love animals and would own tons if I could. The problem is people don't know their limits. I say 3 dogs and 3 cats is plenty.
- 6 of each is way to much seems more like a puppy farm
- I think that encourages breeding and poor animal welfare due to the sheer cost.
- Long as people are being responsible why not give the chance for animals to stay out of the crap tasting shelters?
- As long as the person can take care of the sentient beings they have the bylaw shouldn't change
- I like the idea of a limit in the case is that it prevents animals from suffering in situations where the pet owners cannot care for all of them. But for a responsible pet owners I feel this restriction is unfair. More than anything I believe that there should be more authority to be able to remove animals in situations where they are not being cared for.
- A responsible owner is responsible no matter how many animals they have.. irresponsible owners can be a single pet owner. Deal with the problem person on a one to one basis
- It is not fair to judge that a quantity of animals will automatically result in the lack of care, irresponsibility of owner that this implies. Many breeders or enthusiasts can care for quite a few animals better than some individuals who only have one.
- This would add work and take resources to enforce, the calls for people "breaking" these rules would increase. If the rules stay the same the resources designated to implement this can go toward humane calls, the concerns listed this rule would alleviate are responsible pet ownership and an irresponsible owner would still have issues with odour, feces and noise.
- 6 dogs n 6 cats is way too many
- No more than 3 such animals per single detached home. One animal if you live in an attached home. Excess temporary permits can be available for additional \$50/year.



- I think this is too many animals. I would be okay with a total of 6 animals maximum (any combo of cats and dogs).
- I believe a household should be allowed to have any many animals as wanted as long as all are treated properly, fed properly, has the room to do so, and licensed.
- That is too many dogs/cats per household. I would say 4 dogs and cats is enough and if a household wants more they should need to fill out a special application
- No one should have more than 4 dogs per household unless they are operating a rescue organization. Breeding should be illegal until stray and reservation dog numbers decrease
- Less government oversight is what Calgary needs. More by-laws and fines won't do anything to deter irresponsible people.
- I do not think there should be a set limit. If animals are being taken care of then there should be no issue. Perhaps imposed checks to check on animal welfare could happen. Or applying for a special permit to house x number of animals in one residency.
- To many animals
- The bylaw does not account for size of the home- 6 dogs in a small townhouse versus 6 dogs in a large detached home with a spacious yard is very different.
- Let responsible people be responsible
- yes but!!! Breeders should not be allowed to have more than 2 dogs or else someone will breed all 6 and run a puppy mill.
- |
- fostering animals, especially large litters is a good thing, it should be based on size of propertypropertyf properly
- I used to work in the dog industry and know many families with over 6 dogs. All well behaved and well taken care of. The limit won't stop the people that don't take care of their animals.
- I think 6 and 6 is too many. 4 cats and 4 dogs seems very reasonable within the city
- Lots of people are capable of caring for more than the above stayed number of animals, while there are others who struggle with just one. Welfare laws should be enforced rather than a specific number of pets.
- One animal per household is sufficient
- I don't think there should be a limit is the owner is providing a safe home, food, water, shelter, enrichment, and does Not disturb neighbours.
- I don't think there should be limit
- I think that the amount of animals in a home should also be determined by the size of the household. Having 6 dogs and 6 cats in a 600sq foot house would not be ideal. Say 1 dog 1 cat in a home up to 900 square feet. Licensing should be mandatory when you bring an animal home. It should not be able to leave the breeder, pet store, shelter without being registered so there is some sort of tracking for the animal. If someone is attempting to sell dogs for income this might be a red flag that maybe this person or people should be red flagged and dogs removed from premises if they are going against the law. People are sick and there are people that need to be held responsible in a higher



protocol for animal abuse, animal neglect, etc. It's not enforced enough so people don't take it seriously.

- Calgary has done well with no restrictions. If Calgary chose to have a restriction I would like agree with all of the ones listed above. Rescues could even provide an ongoing list (quarterly, twice a year) with foster homes.
- 6 is too many
- The amount of animals does not determine the care they are getting. Some people can't handle even one pet, but many highly competitive dog trainers can handle many dogs and give them the best life.
- I have seen households with 1-2 animals be in terrible condition and filthy living conditions, where other households have plenty more and be in pristine condition. It all depends on the owner and how they care for the animals. As long as the animals have clean living conditions, shelter, food and water, there should be no restrictions to number.
- My moms neighbour has 6 huskies and she doesn't clean up their poop or urine that is on the deck. We can't enjoy the backyard or have windows open because it smells horrible and wafts into the house. in the winter time she leaves them on the deck and they bark and howl a lot. no one needs 12 pets at once unless they have an acreage. I feel like allowing that many pets would create issues especially with those who are not responsible pet owners (previously mentioned neighbour for example) its not fair for the neighbours or for the pets, especially if the living conditions suck. the number of pets should be based on the size of the land/house I think.
- If you can properly care for the animals, I see no need to limit the number.
- I believe the limit should be 4 cats or 4 dogs.
- No matter the amount of animals as long as they are properly cared for. Perhaps owning over 6 pets you are subject to an inspection to ensure their living conditions are adequate.
- You cannot limit the number of pets for great families
- Les animals per household.
- If everything is clean and safe... why bother?
- If animals are well trained, and owners are responsible why limit the number? There is a fine for noise and other complaints.
- I like the bylaw the way it is now. I strongly oppose changing it. As long as the animals are fixed, licensed, properly cared for and not running free there is no need to limit the number. It is not necessary to change this rule.
- people should be allowed as many animals as they are financially and timely able to care for.
- 3 dogs is plenty, not 6. I agree with your exceptions.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is to many
- The amount of animals should be less.
- That is a really high number of pets. I would suggest a combined total of 5 cats and dogs in one home.
- 6 pets is way too many. It should be no more pets than adult residents at most
- I would have concerns about husbandry of that many pets within city limits.



- The limit should be based on the SIZE (square footage) of the home and if there is a backyard. 4 dogs in one apartment/condo is too many. The only exceptions should be fosters.
- Only if God fathered in and doesn't impact rescues
- I don't believe this is a manageable number for a single household. 4 of each would be excessive. 6 would put the animals at risk.
- As long as the pets are properly cared for with ample space without intruding on neighbours quality of life then there's no problem. Location and living conditions / space are what really need to be assessed
- I believe to be allowed to have 12 animals in a household in the city is just asking for trouble, maybe increasing to 3 cats and 3 dogs? Or even have the exception that if you only have dogs you could have 6 and vice versa.
- If someone is a reputable home, it makes no sense as to why they should be restricted
- There seems no need for civil intrusion in this matter
- I think as long as the animals are well taken care of and all laws are followed there should be no limit per household
- 4 pets is too much. A fur family pet is there as a family member not to consume more than two
- Very few homes would have enough space to properly accommodate that many animals.
- I agree with raising the limit but not to 6 of each animal. Dog and cats are expensive to maintain with food, vaccines, supplies etc. I have seen in many cases that the increased amount allowed then lowers the quality of life for the animals due to not enough time, money and resources being available to the animals. I believe that 4 of each should be the accepted number and then if the owner would like more, added licenses need to be obtained.
- I think there should be no limit as long as animals are being cared for properly. I would like to see some limits and rules set for breeders thought I avoid puppy mill or hoarding type situations
- I do not think most people are capable of taking care of 12 pets. Even 6 is more than necessary.
- People can successfully care for large numbers of animals and do so frequently.
- 6 is way to many 2 is plenty
- 6 dogs and 6 cats seems an excessive increase. I would support 3 dogs and 3 cats.
- That is too many animals for one household.
- No limits as long as all licensed
- I have 3 dogs and I do not think this is excessive.
- I find 6 to be excessive 4 maximum seems more manageable.
- 12 animals is too much. I think it depends on the home square footage as well as the land size. 12 animals in a 600sqft condo is much different than 12 animals on an acreage. Also if license fees are reduced for lower income perhaps the limit should be lower so the animals care is managed reasonably.
- I support this law but it MUST MUST include temporary homes. We currently have a rescue that has people fostering way more dogs than they should. We must. Must regulate rescues.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of it shouldnt matter, if you are a responsible pet owner. Those that arent need to be adressed



- 6 is too many
- If the animals are being cared for it isn't any one else's business, and imposing a limit would impact people's ability to foster/ rescue, or cause people to get rid of pets. There's too many animals in needs of home already to limit
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is excessive for a typical home environment. 3 adult cats and or 3 adult dogs is plenty for any single family home.
- 12 animals (maximum) in one residential household is excessive, particularly as there seems no reference to unit size (condo v. single household dwelling v. size of yard)
- 6 Dogs and 6 Cats is excessive
- Max of 3 each
- because what if multiple people live in the house with multiple dogs, or people foster dogs etc
- Other bylaws and fines can address the issues. Cost of implementation for a small problem
- I think it should be the persons choice
- no limit on animals. As long as they are licensed and well cared for, there should be no concern.
- I believe 3 would be an appropriate limit of dogs AND cats per household.
- I'm not sure
- Having worked in partnership with by-law, SPCA, and animal protection officers in my professional life, I appreciate why a by-law of this type would be valuable. That said, strictly speaking, I do not feel that a by-law of this nature would differentiate between animals being abused and not.
- The limit should be kept at two unless owners are successful in applying/justifying a higher number.
- Six dogs AND six cats in a Calgary household? Unless the house is over 5000 square feet, that is too many animals. It does not benefit the animals, owners, or neighbours. I feel five animals per household is more than enough.
- For some people, it's their companionship
- Different sized properties can accommodate more animals. Shelters run out of households would not be able to operate and they save animals lives. There is no need to limit the number of animals a person owns, should we limit the number of children people can have? Talk about a dictatorship.
- This seems unreasonable, and overly controlling.
- As long as all animals have the necessities, there should be no limit or extra tax applied.
- As long as the animals are cared for properly, and not causing problems there should be no interference. Why only limit cats and dogs, why not reptiles or birds?
- 12 animals in 1 house is absurd. Nobody can properly care for than many animals. I think 6 animals (dogs and cats combined) is much more reasonable. I agree with the exceptions listed above.
- What happens if I have 1 dog and meet a girl with 2 dogs and move in together.. would that mean we have to rehome a dog? That would be unfair to owners and pets
- Holy crap, that's a farm! Even rural areas have lower limits on dogs. Add chickens and pigeons to the mix and Calgary would be a very unpleasant place to stay.
- I think the number of pets should depend on a size of the house/condo. If the condo apartment is 1-2 bedroom than no more than 2 pets allowed. And it must be calculated for other types of property.



- . It's about being responsible
- If looked after and healthy and happy what gives this counsel the right to tell people how to live their lives
- I support restricting the number of animals in a household, for all of the reasons stated above. 6 Dogs and cats in a household is a lot of animals to take care of and probably would be quite stressful for the animals (the owners have choices here, the animals don't)
- There should be no limit if the pets are taken proper care of.
- Every circumstance is different. No need to proactively enforce this.
- 6 dogs AND six cats is way too many animals
- I think owners with 1-2 dogs can have excessive barking and feces just as easily as someone with over 6 dogs. It's the knowledge and responsible owners that make a difference on training and cleanliness of their animals
- I have 2 dogs and 2 cats - all well cared for - limits should be. An excessive number
- As long as every animal has access to proper care and being looked after, without harm to the pets, people or property then no limits.
- If people can have an excess amount of kids which are more noisy and destructive than animals, then I should be able to have as many animals as I want. Once again, my house, my rights, I pay taxes. I prefer animals to kids. I hate kids and have to put up with excessive number of kids. I have no recourse when kids run through my front yard and flower beds.
- The restrictions on animal ownership should be based on conditions in the home, not on number of animals. If someone can keep noise, cleanliness, etc. standards then they should be allowed to have whatever they want.
- A change in the bylaw may be more applicable in a rural setting ie. Farms, acreage, however the average urban/suburban household certainly would not have the space for up to 12 animals and I can't imagine all pets would get the attention it deserves. A reasonable limit would be 3 dogs and 3 cats.
- Nightmare to enforce. Kinda like the bs mask bylaw
- I think 6 is too many. If people are already complaining about licensing fees then they shouldn't have more than 4 of each pet. 6 is something to be considered on rural areas.
- I think more than 6 cats & 6 dogs in one urban house is a recipe for escapees and further feral problems
- There are many people who participate in dog sports who responsibly maintain more than 6 dogs. Someone not picking up pet feces has nothing to do with number of animals but entirely with how someone cares for their animals. Limiting numbers will only encourage people not to participate in pet licensing programs
- As an animal welfare advocate, I do not support the idea of a single home having 6 dogs and 6 cats. I believe a more reasonable number would be 3 of each before special permitting be necessary for excess animals.
- 12 cats/dogs on one property is outrageous. There needs to be a limit. We live in a city with small lots.



- People who already have this amount or more will need to rehome
- Tons of breeders in Calgary
- shouldn't be able to limit what someone can own, impeding our rights as human beings, plus way to many variables to apply a standard across the city, property type, owner type, animal type etc
- Yes I would support a limit. Exception people who breed don't have a limit so long as the environment is assessed and said to be safe for the amount of animals that are owned and breed. I think with large numbers the environment should always be assessed.
- Depends on circumstance of household
- Some properties are large enough to accommodate more pets. Animals need a home.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is a lot! That's a lot of feces and a lot of smell and noise. If someone were to be a breeder they should require a special permit to have 6 dogs/cats which should be open to regular inspections
- Enough bylaws! I am not willing to sacrifice any more personal liberties.
- 6 pets total, 6 cats and 6 dogs is too much
- We don't need more government involvement where not needed. If people are following responsible pet ownership, you don't need to control how many pets they have
- I support increasing the limit; however, a maximum of six dogs and six cats (total 12 animals) is unnecessarily high for urban residential areas. Recognize that the City of Calgary is an urban area with generally high density housing. Proximity to that many animals is high. I would expect to see the suggested maximum quantity of animals in a rural setting.
- It is an owners responsibility to ensure their animals have proper care, access to proper vet, fed and waters, cleaned up after. It is up to the city to ensure the owner is following the by laws.
- people can do what they want to do in their own homes
- No one needs or can manAge that many animals
- No one needs that many animals in the city its not fair to said animals and would cause issues with neighbors
- What difference is a limit of 6 dogs going to make than say a home with 8 or more. It only takes one dog to create a nuisance or a mess or to be neglected. Responsible pet ownership has nothing to do with numbers; someone who collects animals with no regard to their care will do so regardless of what bylaw is in place.
- Too many
- If the person is responsible qnd dogs or cats are well taken care of
- Far too high a #. Encourages backyard breeding, esp given you're excluding animals under 6 months. No one needs 6 adult dogs or cats. If they wish to have that many, they should be forced to go the route of business licensing. Currently, how many backyard breeders report their income for tax purposes?
- I agree with all the exceptions, but do not agree with the limit of 12 animals, if none of the exceptions apply
- Too high of a number
- It's fine



- It is not the amount of animals a person owns it is how they care for them.
- maybe for: Temporary homes (fosters, breeders, pet sitters, daycares) everything else is too grey and 12 animals is alot to manage and not fair to neighbors
- The limit shouldn't be a maximum, but there should be a track record of instances where complaints or animals are abused so they can be removed after 3 strikes.
- 12 animals in a household is too many. I would say 6 pets total is more than enough.
- As long as the animals are licensed and cared for, vet care, food/water, shelter. I don't believe making a limit will change anything, people who hoard or have more than 6 animals will just avoid licensing them to avoid being caught
- I think the bigger problem here is irresponsible breeding, not the responsible owners who have enough space and money to have 9 cats and 7 dogs. The responsible breeders who actually keep their animals after retirement manytimes end up with quite a few dogs, but if they are responsible, registered, ethical and reputable then what's the problem.
- I have seen homes with one dog that you cannot see the grass due to all the poop and I've seen homes with multiple dogs where I would be comfortable walking barefoot
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too many - period. Maybe max 4 pets.
- As long as the person is following the noise compliance and odour, while caring for their animals without being a hoarding situation where the animals are not being cared for, a person should have the choice of owning any amount of animal they like.
- As long as people are taking care of their animals, we shouldn't be allowed to tell someone how many pets they can have.
- No. Again, if the owner is responsible and the animals are in good shape, the city has no right to interfere.
- That's too many pets per household. 3 would be a better number.
- Many people are able to properly support and care for more than 6 animal on a property.
- You don't need that many pets in the house permanently
- Number of animals doesn't make you less responsible
- The city should have no say in how many animals I want to own
- If the owner is responsible should be no issue.
- There's different circumstances for each person and this is not a one size fits all situation some people shouldn't even be allowed to own one pet where is others are capable and care well for 8 dogs so I disagree with this
- This will not stop hoarders but could potentially punish responsible owners so it does not solve the issues
- There is no need for 12 animals in the home unless you are part of the exceptions.
- This is a decision that should be made by the individual not bylaw.
- Require owners to specify a reason for owning more than two dogs or cats. Breeders can get a license two on more dogs.
- Unless breeding or fostering dogs and/or cats, there is no reason to have that many animals.



- I cannot support this since the exemptions listed are "POTENTIAL". I know many breeders and people that compete in dog sports. Many of them have several dogs. It's not about HOW MANY, it's about: Are they under control? Are they cared for? I cannot support a limit on pets per household with nebulous terms such as 'potential exemptions'. ONE dog can create excessive noise, and accumulation of faeces, and not be taken care of... .
- The entire reason we have the APA and bylaw enforcement is to ensure people are caring properly for their animals. A person with 1 dog can be just as neglectful as someone with 10, and many people with a larger number of pets are pet professionals, trainers, breeders etc who hold themselves to the highest standards of care. If there is a complaint regarding the care of the animals, it should be treated the same as any other complaint. A hoarder is going to hoard, regardless of the bylaws. As someone who has a dog from a hoarder, the bylaws in that area did nothing to protect her.
- 6 and 6 is still a crazy number. Very few single family houses are large enough for that number of animals
- Lots in Calgary are too small to allow this number of animals, let others enjoy their private yards
- Who in the world needs to own 6 dogs and 6 cats in one house! That's a lot of animals!! If anything the limit should be lowered to a more reasonable number.
- Some households have many people in them and thus they can take care of many dogs if these dogs are personal animals.
- No reason too. Either people are responsible or they're not.
- As somebody that works in Veterinary Medicine, very few people can afford veterinary care for their animals. Very few people would be able to afford licensing, vaccines, food, etc for the allotted amount of animals described above.
- There is no reason to limit how many pets a household can have as long as the environment is appropriate.
- The only ones that need that amount of animals in their home in a city should be someone that's fostering animals
- The number of animals has nothing to do with responsibility of ownership. Bad owners don't follow the rules
- Opportunity for problems
- You can have 1 animal that is a problem or 6 that are not. Numbers are not the problem
- 6 of each seems like a lot of pets
- That is a very high number and I can see more complaints arising around noise, feces, etc
- The limit is too high at 6. I would support up to 3 in the city
- Some people are equipped to handle that many animals
- Calgary does not need a dog or cat limit period. A limit will not stop a hoarding situation, this is a mental disorder. Some people cannot look after one day, others can successfully care for 6 or more. I do not see a reason to fix something that isn't broken. Calgary is an example to the rest of Canada that limits are not necessary. You can have people with 6 or more dogs license them all for income



to the city or they will conveniently not have them all licensed. Slippery slope. At what point does 6 turn into 4 and then 2??? Leave it be!

- This wouldn't be a fair bylaw, if you have the space and it's not crowded, there should not be a limit.
- It's a city, not a country acreage. 2 animals is reasonable, , with exceptions as noted above.
- If animals are not in danger or a danger to anyone else, and are managed in a responsible and respectful manner there should be no limit.
- There is absolutely no way that anyone can properly care for 6 dogs and 6 cats. People should be unable to have any more than 3 dogs and a total of 6 pets.
- There is no reason to have that many animals. They will not get the individual attention they require. This is a hoarding issue.
- There should be NO limit. If the household is providing and being responsible and taking care/following rules then neighbors should mind thier own business and his should not be a concern
- I support the exceptions but 6 dogs AND 6 cats per household I don't limit should be at 4
- People should be able to have as many as they can take care of.
- 6 is way to many. 4 max
- I don't support most of the exemptions that you suggest. They would make the bylaw useless
- If someone had 6 dogs and 6 cats that is too many per house. o support 6 cats or dogs unless one of those exemptions comes in to play
- That's still a lot of animals to a property. Should keep it to a total of 6 dogs and cats.
- 6 is too many I suggest 3
- No reason to change the current bylaw.
- That's too many dogs or cats to care for properly in one house.
- There are already plenty of existing avenues to deal with neglect of care and noise and what not. I don't believe my neighbor with multiple dogs (more than 6) should be punished because folks with mental illness like horders exist. I would rather live next to the 8 dogs, than the 4 kids in the home on the otherside of me. Also, those 8 dogs are better cared for on the whole. I don't think you should have the right to dictate how many pets folks can care for. Lots of animals need homes, including foster homes, and lots of lonely people have no other family. Don't meddle. Deal with issues if/when they arise as is your role. Lots of folks are too irresponsible for one dog, while other people adequately care for a dozen thriving dogs with no need ever for intervention. Don't restrict people's freedoms, because morons exist.
- I have 5 dogs and 1 cat. All are licensed. We do not have feces everywhere, nor do our dogs cause a nuisance. Number limits should only be imposed on problem households.
- That is too many animals for one household
- I own a pitbull and this is absolutely stupid
- Unless the animals are a direct issue and complains have been filed several times, let people own however many animals they want to own. This bylaw can result in an increased number of strays and shelter animals. Shelters are already overcrowded as is.
- Limits should be applied, anything over the limit should be subject to increased charges and require special permitting defining the reason.



- Special circumstances only
- As long as there are no complaints or breeding, I don't see a problem. Shelters/rescues are fine also.
- If the animal welfare is not compromised, then the owner should be able to keep as many as they want in their own property.
- It is not necessary to have hoards of animals when considering the well being of the animals. A 12 animal household within city limits is extreme.
- As long as people are being responsible they should be able to do have as many animals as they can care for.. There are already bylaws for noise as an example that can be applied if a person is being irresponsible.
- 6 is too many. It would be difficult to exercise that many dogs.
- If animals are well cared for there shouldn't be a limit.
- One dog can be more of a nuisance than large number dog homes.. you will find most your larger numbers are owned by responsible owners with no nuisance situations. set guidelines and expectations and fine when that doesn't happen NOT set a limit. I can name about 15 owners you have never had a complaint on that have 10 dogs... their neighbors also love them.
- 12 animals is a huge undertaking and most people cannot afford that many pets/proper healthcare/good food. People will take advantage of that number and we may see an increase in the already too high pet population because of irresponsible pet owners. Neglect may rise as well.
- Current bylaw fine, there is no significant reason to change.
- 6 is too many. probably used for breeding, hard to maintain health for that many pets
- There are very responsible people who have more and the opposite who have less, just enforce the bylaw that's already there
- 3 of each should be sufficient
- As long as they are not breaking any other bylaws and all pets have regular healthcare it should not matter how many pets one owns. Existing bylaws already deal with complaints about noise, welfare of animals, and feces.
- The wording given in this question: "A pet limit would be six (6) dogs AND six (6) cats per household" makes the ownership of other animals for the purpose of companionship banned. Please revise.
- There are a million other issues not regulated that cause significantly bigger issues. This is how you want to use my tax dollars? To police the number of pets people have.
- Specific wording around other animals, birds, exotics should be included with this. And / or a financial means test against income allowing more animals if you have the money / square footage.
- Most properties in town are not large enough for that many animals. I feel the size of home and property should be considered in this
- No limit
- Fewer cats and dogs per household
- They can have whatever they want as long as the noise and smell and such don't affect the community.



- I know of homes where one animal causes more noise and disturbances to neighbours than houses of more than 6 quiet and well cared for animals. Just enforce the noise, leash and defecation bylaws is what is needed,
- If you can care for and have the space, there should not be limits.
- Too many animals unless it is a licensed/approved breeder.
- It could lead to further restrictions against smaller animals such as reptiles, rabbits, and birds
- If a person needs more than 2 or 3 pets in a house they should be bound by a permit that is enforceable. I love dogs, have had dogs most of my life. Even with that I do not support 6 dogs. I have a friend who trains int'l winning dogs in multiple sports. She could provide enough support for being an exception to the rule.
- I think that 6 cats/ dogs is too many. 4 is a better number. I support all other changes stated above
- Responsible owners should be able to have as many animals as they can keep healthy and responsible for. That should only be diminished when they are no longer doing so.
- I believe no more than 2 animals per household whether it be 2 dogs , 2 cats or 1 dog and 1 cat. the exceptions listed above are acceptable. The welfare of the animals is of utmost importance and the attention required that an animal needs most likely cannot be met with more than 2 animals.
- That is too many pets for one household
- no limit to love
- Jjhgyhjk
- Pet owners rarely take pet ownership seriously, they do not understand the real cost of humanely catering for a pet and increasing this limit puts animals at risk of not receiving proper care due to financial restraints, including food, supplements, vet visits, surgeries, training, kennels and appropriate housing and supplies for picking up after pets.
- Everyone is different and should be looked at as such.
- Having many dogs does not mean poor welfare, accumulation of feces or excessive noise. Instead of limiting dogs, increase fines and enforce of those infractions, whether it's 1 or 10 dogs on a property
- There is no need to change the current bylaw. Simply enforcing the current rules would be adequate.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is too many
- I do support this bylaw change, although I think foster homes should follow the same rules. If it's a shelter then can have more but if it's a foster home in a residential house the number should stay at 6 per animal to maintain their health and well-being.
- There is no need for that many animals
- I support this change, but restricted to four of either animal per household, save for the exceptions listed above.
- Bylaw should allow for as many animals as can be properly cared for. Not a specific number.
- Limits should be set on an individual basis based on compliance with existing noise and waste bylaws. Those who receive multiple complaints should be limited. Those with well behaved animals shouldn't be penalized.



- Too many pets people don't take care of and causes problems
- There should be no limit if the owner takes proper care of the animals AND is of sound mind and body. Anyone with a physical, physiological or mental disability that affects their ability to properly care for any animal should NOT be allowed to own any animals.
- 6 dogs is way too many. The limit should be 3, 4 at most.
- I am unaware of enough circumstances where pet ownership of 1-20 animals is an issue. It's the 30-200 animal households that are typically putting animals at risk.
- Too many
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is way too many animals to be able to care for properly. Also, to have control of properly. If dogs from the same pick show up at a dog park this is going to be a disaster.
- Seems micromanagement
- You should be allowed as many pets as you wish
- There is no possible way a person can care for that # of pets in the City. It is cruel and inhumane to have that many animals on a small city property! Ridiculous!
- That'll cause a huge excess in dogs that go up for adoption. If they live on a ranch then sure, however in the city I think 3 is a maximum
- There is absolutely no reason that a normal residential household needs 6 dogs or cats. I agree with stated exceptions, but under no reasonable circumstance can I see the need for 6 dogs in a home. That is excessive and unfair to neighbours.
- Why does one need 6 dogs in the city ?
- Six is to many.
- What constitutes household? Many young folks live with roommates. Say each person has a couple dogs -- two dogs per person that's only three people and limit is met, some of my friends live with over 5 people and all have pets. As long as they're all taken care of it shouldn't matter.
- Doesn't the city have better things to do, than limit personal pet ownership
- I have met plenty of incredible pet owners with 6+ dogs plus other animals and never had a problem. Punish those who create the issues, not those who are responsible pet owners.
- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats are excessive for almost any normal household. I would support at most a combination of 6 cats and dogs. Beyond that and it gets unmanageable for most people and that is where you end up with issues (behaviour, cleanliness, welfare)
- Rescue foundations take larger than 6 dogs. Also it's an arbitrary number. Every situation is different. Just stay out of people's lives.
- as long as the animals are cared for properly and kept under control, no issues.
- I totally disagree with any household having more than 2 pets. It's not necessary and in a majority of the cases where a household has numerous pets the pets are abused and/or malnourished. Plus it's guaranteed recipe for feuding neighbor's..
- That is too many animals per home. I find it hard to believe that homes with this many animals would be able to Cate for them properly and maintain all of their health.
- Foster programs



- The city determining and appropriate, allowable number of animals on a property is ridiculous. The concerns raised during the first phase of engagement were likely from residents that have problem pet owners as neighbours or in their neighbour hood. Enforcing the nuisance, at large and owner infractions is more important than the NIMBY Calgarian's.
- That seems like a ridiculous number of animals for anyone to have at a city property.
- That's a zoo! The noise and smell would likely be high. Again, people wanting this kind of lifestyle should move to a rural area. I would suggest at a maximum 6 pets period.
- That is entirely too many animals in one home in the city. Exceptions for new litters should be made. Exceptions for special circumstances such as flooding or property damage should be made for families forced to temporarily move or stay with other families or friends with pets.
- "It is important to note that while pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds, the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." This is completely false and who'm ever put forth these certifiably false claims on a government website should be let go. All I can say is, this had better be changed because it's 2020 and bigoted government wont be tolerated.
- If they are not causing harm to others it is no ones business how many animals one owns
- I think depending on how many people there are per Household that the current limits are fair for both
- Scale number of animals based on square footage of domicile. One shouldn't have 12 animals in a two room apartment but a 1500 sq ft house would be able to handle the # of animals
- If they're able to care for them fairly, people should be allowed to have as many animals as they want.
- 12 pets per household is too many. sounds reasonable until the apartment dweller or small yard owner is irresponsible owner
- Should be 6 animals total I still think that's high
- I believe this number is too high. Animal hoarding and lack of control are indicated with lack of responsible pet ownership. This number should be lower for normal non-business use urban pet ownership. (3 dogs, 3 cats reasonable or 6 animal total - why decide for people). Also in regards to LESA - one would have to have reasonable confidence that psychologists and psychiatrists act professionally and we are not seeing this. The cost of associated therapies for trauma cost more than a dog licence therefore if this is the prescribed option then the client is obligated to maintain the therapy fully to be compliant. Not having the resources to licence, feed, nuture and control the animal is not a therapy that can be reasonably followed therefore irresponsible of the prescriber. Low income should not be a reason to apply a therapy nor should someone unwilling or unable to maintain the therapy. There are other avenues for resourcing this type of support
- I think when you allow 6 or more per household, you are opening a can of worms. People who want 6 animals are not going to stop at 6! I cannot imagine 6 yapping barking dogs next door it is bad enough that I have to hear my neighbours 2 dogs everyday at 6:00 am and 10:30 pm, could not imagine if they had 6!



- That is far too many animals for a home. I believe a maximum of 2 cats/dogs per household is appropriate. I worry about behaviour issues and medical issues in homes with a greater number of animals.
- .
- Six is a lot of animals- double the dogs allowed in Edmonton for example
- 3 of each per household
- Lots of folks in animal rescue have more than this in their home at a time and lots give homes to animals that nobody else will take. Why should they be limited because of a couple irresponsible people. Again, not the animals that are the problem but rather the people.
- 6 is too many.
- More than 10 animals would be excessive.
- How many animals can one household provide quality care? More animals creates a higher probability of neglect.
- That limit is way too high. 3 dogs max
- Nobody needs six dogs or six cats in one home.
- As long as a person is capable of providing sufficient love, care and nutrition for the number of animals they have, there should be no limit.
- So if the pet owner is responsible and caring for their animals, I am likely not to know how many pets a person owns as long as these animals are on and in their property.
- .
- Who are you to control how many pets I have. I pay a mortgage for the freedom of choices in some areas. As long as my pets are being taken care of and there's no complaints, the decision should rest with me.
- 3 of each max, too many problems with more.
- I can't say I would ever in my life exceed that living in the city. But I feel that if they are responsible pet owners, can clean up after them litters cleaned poop cleaned up and dogs are under control and not disturbing the neighbours. Ie responsible pet owner. I don't see why you can't have more. I would be more interested in seeing something more pet per sqft. Like 12 animals in a 1000 sqft home probably not ideal living space.
- Although i agree 6 dogs and cats should suffice for most anyone, i do not believe there should be a limit on pets, PROVIDING, all the pets are well looked after, with proper housing, feeding and veterinary care. Additionally the pets cannot be a nuisance to neighbours.
- Its not going to fix the problem situations you are trying to fix. This won't help hoarders or make puppy mills more accountable. Government should be imposing limits of animals or children.
- Right now you have everyone imposing restrictions on all of Canada, if you restrict animals people will leave
- If my animals are all healthy, registered and not stinking or making noise, why should it matter. Make a bylaw for those who do violate. Shut down the puppy mills in Forest Lawn.
- I want the current data to show that this is a problem first.
- Too many pets allowed in a single family. Should be limited to two pets.



- No dog limit, some can have many and not cause problems whereas someone who owns 1 is not responsible
- It is unclear how many households are affected and the money spent on this could be better invested in education
- There should not be 6 dogs or cats in a house, too many unless a breeder with a license
- while the bylaw is intending to curb puppy mills and breeders like this.. there is many detrimental controlling aspects.. frankly there shouldn't be any limit.
- I would, in theory, support this bylaw change, but available space should be considered for the health and safety both of the humans in the residence and the animals. A 500sqft condo will not allow the free space for a dozen animals that a 500sqft single family home with yard will.
- How many animals I have in my large home, provided they're all cared for and health and happy, is none of the City's business.
- I think that is still too many animals in one household.
- Why restrict people. As long as the animals are not an issue
- I think this is an owner issue and should be looked at case by case. I know many people that have multiple animals, cats and dogs.....you aren't going to eliminate the issue. People that continue to have issues with the above, should be fined more.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs in one household? No way! That is way too many animals in one building. Our neighbour has 9 untrained dogs that bark incessantly at every dog that passes by and the stench of feces is too much, especially in hot weather. A maximum of 5 animals (mix of cats and dogs) seems more reasonable.
- Consideration for any neighbours
- If the owner is responsible then it shouldn't matter the quantity. I have been to many houses with one barking dog that is more disruptive than another with 10 well behaved dogs.
- There are plenty of people in Calgary who have more pets than this or want more pets than this that care for their animals properly. I feel like this would ruin it for those people even with the grandfathering of the rule.
- I have a hard time believing that most calgarians could afford to properly care for 6 dogs and/or 6 cats. This number is too high.
- Other bylaws should be in place to ensure the safety of people and animals that doesn't restrict the amount of animals on a property.
- As long as the animals are looked after, premises are clean and there is no disturbance of neighbours
- Six and six is unreasonable. Reduce the numbers of both!
- Some people are very responsible pet owners, why punish them?
- I think six dogs and six cats (12 total) is excessive. Properly certified breeders possibly but for individuals 6/6 is way too many to afford proper care.
- 12 animals in 1 house is atrocious. I support the exceptions but 2 and 2 is more responsible.



- Many ppl have 1 pet..or child they don't take care of. Don't penalize the ones who take great care of their pets bc some don't. Will you limit number of children ppl cna have next? Sounds absurd? Maybe..but that thought starts somewhere
- Because some people will take advantage of the change . Who needs that many animals in the city ?
- Just because someone has lots of pets does not mean they are bad pets or getting treated bad.
- 6 is way too many households should be limited to two dogs, two cats
- The limit should be 2 well behaved pets per household.
- Unless a person is a recognized breeder, I don't believe a person can control more than 2 animals. Maintaining control of more than 2 animals is very difficult and I was a licensed dog breeder.
- 12 animals in a household seems like too much based on the average square footage of a Calgary home. Something along the lines of up to six dogs and up to six cats but not totaling more than eight animals per household. My preference is for a lower limit (say 4 animals) and then some simple criteria to progress to a higher limit (say 8 animals) that would be permitted and then increased criteria for animals above that. If a potential owner isn't willing to spend the money or take the time to get a permit for additional animals they probably shouldn't own so many pets anyways. Animal ownership is not a right.
- I believe 6 total pets in house (any combo of cat or dog), not 6 cats and 6 dogs. 12 pets per household is an absurd amount to unless it is to foster or breed. The barking noise of one dog is more than enough. And cats that don't stay indoors ruin my garden.
- We live next to a household that breed Pomeranian dogs. They have 5-6 at a time. They bark non stop when outside. Owners yell at them to be quiet but they only momentarily quiet. There absolutely should not be any more than 2 pets so owners adequately train and care for them.
- as long as the animal's are in good condition then there is no need, many people have 10 healthy and happy cats/dogs
- There should be no limit as long as they are all taken care of. maybe there could be a registry if someone has more than 6 dogs/cats to check on them rather than banning them
- 6 is way too many
- It should be a maximum of two adults cats and/or two adult dogs per household. Six is WAAAY to many!!
- If the owners are able to responsibly care for their animals, they do not deserve to be penalized.
- that's way to many animals a lot of people can't take care of one
- No need to limit
- The bylaw should restrict it to 2 cats and 2 dogs per household.
- 6 dogs and cats seems very high except in the care is foster homes, breeders, and those that raise animals for the betterment of all
- Unless you approved the property and the person before hand, nobody should have 6 dogs on a property unless they are an approved fully certified breeder. The hoarding scenarios could be terrible as we have seen in the past
- I typed this out twice and it kept being deleted.



- People should be able to own as many pets as they want as long as they can care for them and licensed them
- This limits breeders and trainers.
- Some people can manage a larger amount of animals in their home quite well....others cannot. Those who cannot should be penalized not those who can.
- If the owners are being responsible and can afford it then they should have the right.
- Why does The City need to be monitoring this. Handle the welfare calls and deal with poor owners don't make citizens follow new rules bc of a few bad owners.
- 12 animals per household is still too many given the implications of that many pets to neighbours
- 12???! Really?!
- I think the law of 6 feline 6 canine is very good ! i agree with dog licensing how ever to me cat licensing is unnecessary and excessive .
- 6 seems high....maybe 4?
- that is too many in one space. maximum of 6 combined between cat and dog is fine. but 12 would be a smelly noisy gong show
- I don't believe that anyone needs more than 2 pets while residing in a City.
- if people can afford, more than 6 animals and maintain them. Its their choice to own more and should stay that way.
- I don't think anybody has the right to tell people what they can and cannot own. If the animals are being cared for properly there should not be a limit.
- Responsible ownership is not defined by number of animals. Please allow owners who keep clean yards, follow bylaws and provide good care to determine the number of animals for which they can care. Deal with bylaw infractions/ nuisance animals on a case by case basis.
- Can't limit animals if they're being properly taken care of. Not your business
- I think two dogs and cats is sufficient per household. Three animals in total at most. If people want half a dozen animals then they should move to a barn.
- I do not agree with licensing indoor cats that never leave the property.
- What about fosters in rescues? Maybe the rescue should hold the # of licences for their animals but what if the Foster has room for more than the limit in their house? No limits should be applied to houses. Maybe if a specific household is abusing the animals and they should be restricted
- SIX cats or dogs is too many!! I would support up to 4 cats and 4 dogs (not cumulative - so, a limit of 4 total dogs or cats)
- Again every situation is different.
- It doesn't matter how many animals someone has, what matters is how they are taken care of
- 6 is too many for a residential area
- manage the problem areas where and leave limits alone - Calgary is known for its reasonable animal bylaws and they should remain unchanged.
- I agree that there may be a want for more than two animals and I think it's very feasible to have all those animals taken care of but 6 is excessive. There should still be a limit on pets.



- Pets should be limited to no more than two per household.
- I think all dogs should be treated the same
- I just don't see a need for limitations. You can be irresponsible with one dog or six dogs. Usually people with more pets are better, more responsible owners anyway.
- Restrict to no more than two cats and/or two dogs
- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats is a lot, 2 or 3 is plenty
- 3 dogs or cats excepting litters is enough.
- No one needs six dogs or cats in one household. Three pets max per household
- 12 animals is far, far too many due to all the issues listed above.
- Too many animals on property potentially disrupts the community and lowers prop values.
- It's not bylaws job to tell us how many pets we can or cannot have. Stop treating us like preschoolers. Regarding licensing and fines for at large animals - dog owners have been solely carrying this burden for generations. Sure you passed new regulations for cats - I'm curious when these will be enforced?
- I am personally aware of several families with more than two dogs they are all cared for, well trained and do not disturb neighbours (we were a previous neighbour to one family in particular so we know this very well)
- As mentioned above, why would any person need 12 animals in their house?
- Six of each is still too many.
- People should be held accountable to the behaviors of their pets regardless of how many they have or what breed they are.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many to be properly cared for unless on a ranch or farm. I think it would be important that the situation is assessed before approval is given to that many animals.
- How many pets should be an individual decision. As long as animals are properly cared for including exercise, veterinary care, etc. and do not cause issues for neighbors (noise, smell, etc.) then it should be up to the individual. Setting numbers on these types of things is a slippery slope.
- the number of exceptions make it impossible to fine someone who will be over the limit as they can easily use one of the exception
- One nuisance pet can create more issues than 6+ well behaved ones. Mind you own business and don't become a nanny city... Most people will not typically keep more than six pets anyhow.
- Its not necessary
- 6 dogs is too many
- As long as all animals are taken care of properly then it should not be an issue
- 6 pets total. I do not support any more than that. I do support some of the exemptions.
- For the purpose of fosters or responsible ownership this is not necessary. Anyone who owns an excessive number of animals but CAN NOT SUPPLORT THEM should have them removed from their care and placed with a foster agency until such time as they are able to or the animal should be available to adopt.
- No



- If animals are properly cared for and bylaws followed there should not be a limit
- Proposed limits way to high - except maybe for registered foster family
- If you can provide for the animals etc then don't restrict.
- 6 is too many to take care of properly. The animals wouldn't be taken care of the way they should if there were that many in one household. I think 3 or maybe 4 of each is more reasonable.
- There are plenty of dog owners who are more than capable of taking care of 6 or more dogs.
- Agreed, there is no need to own that many pets, it is unfair to the pets and the pet owners.
- I think that if people are taking care of their pets, that there shouldn't be a limit. If they receive more than 2 complaints that are validated, then fines and reduction in pets may be implemented.
- 6 dogs and or 6 cats per household is far too many
- litters are then 6, a restriction on animal such as this do not allow and force the sale of animals. Any amount of dogs is a manageable amount assuming the owner has the appropriate amount of time for them. I strongly disagree with this bylaw going into effect.
- Limit is way too high. The limit should be two dogs / one cat or one dog / two cats
- If you do this you may as well say people can only have X amount of children. That's insane it's none of your business as long as they are cared for!
- As long as animal rescues or fosters are exempt.
- 6 is too many
- The number should be 2 cats and 2 dogs and special license application should apply after that.
- 6 dogs is too much for any one person to handle outside of special circumstances
- Total "weight" of pets could also be a limiting factor ... having 6 chihuahua's is very different from having 6 bull mastiffs. There could be a maximum weight of animals allowed .. i.e. "maximum of 6 animals but not to exceed combined weight of 300 pounds"
- No approved excess animal permit. No dog fanciers' license. No to inherited loopholes.
- Other than the exceptions, there is no reason to have more than two dogs and/or cats
- I think it should be no more than six total, cats and dogs combined
- Does not take into account the size of a person's property. An average within city limits should have different rules than a single family home. I do not support any limits on number of animals
- I am a dog trainer and have witnessed and worked with many families with multiple dogs in the home that do well.
- Potential exceptions are the issue. To support, I would need to know for sure that this would not affect fosters, pet sitters, dog walkers, dog day care etc.
- Too many animals in a house.
- If the pets in the home are not causing nuisance to neighbors, a limit is unnecessary.
- Only an acreage could support this amount of animals.
- There should be no limit, as there is still the possibility that owning less animals does not mean that the animal is being well cared of.
- That is too many animals per household
- I think this number is too high. There is no need to own 6 dogs or cats in the city.



- There is so much 'grey' area to temporary homes. Who would be monitoring this? Little doubt the city would stay on top of it. There are too many loop holes.
- If people are being held to the bylaws there should be no limit
- Houses are too close together, yards are way too small and pet owners are way too irresponsible.
- Seriously? Stop with all this nonsense. Let's encourage responsible ownership and not be bylawed to death. This sitting is being run to the bare ground these days.
- As I mentioned earlier owning pets is a large responsibility and expense to maintain One pet let alone Six. There is no reason that more than One pet should be allowed, it creates additional issues to properly look after multiple pets.
- There is no need for city involvement if there is no issue. And an issue does not mean that a neighbour just doesn't like how many animals a person has.
- The limit should be lower. It should be 1 cat or dog per adult in the household
- Depends on property size and home size. 1000sq foot home vs 5000sq foot home w large backyard should be different
- If the dogs are well cared for and noise and feces are not causing issues then the owner should not be restricted. Noise, poor care and sanitation can be addressed under other bylaws or laws. As a preservation breeder and an avid participant in dog sports I often gave 6 or more fogs when you think about retired ones, young ones and current competitors. If they are not causing problems why can I not continue with my passions and interests?
- I see no reason why anyone needs more than two dogs or cats in one household.
- No limit to numbers. Enforce noise and health regulations that already exist.
- No limit. It not about how many animal it about how there cared for.
- A record should be kept on irresponsible pet owners. The people who had multiple infractions should have restrictions placed on them. 6 dogs seems excessive, but if your a responsible owner why should you be restricted?
- It's not the city's job to tell a person how many pets they can have if they are able to provide a safe and healthy home.
- I don't think there needs to be a limit on pets
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is an excessive amount for a typical household (not temporary, foster, pet sitter, etc). 4 dogs and 4 cats seems more reasonable.
- Some people are more than capable (in terms of space, financials and responsibility) of having more than 6 cats and dogs.
- If people desire excessive amounts of pets, they should consider moving out of the city to an acreage.
- I think it depends on the size of the home. If 6 dogs can be properly cared for then sure.
- Higher fines , no limits on pet ownership
- 12 animals is too much and excessive. Usually not good for the animals. Exceptions could include pet sitters, daycares, and nursing animals (under 6 months) but not breeders.



- A person can own one dog that barks all day and never clean their poop, or own ten dogs that don't bark and they get picked up after. The number has nothing to do with those things, the ownership does.
- Offenders of neglect because they have too many animals won't obey the law even if there was one. All this law does is punish responsible owners.
- Unless the pet owner is a breeder and has pups/kittens until they are weaned and ready to go to a new home, I can see no valid reason for 6 dogs and 6 cats in one home.
- way to high, should be 3 max
- More than two dogs and two cats should require special licensing
- No
- That's too many animals in one home.
- I support the bylaw but the limits are too high. It should be depended on the size of dog (3 for large) (4 for medium to small), 4 for cats.
- Responsible ownership is about education, not bylaws.
- That is way to many cats and dogs for one household in the City
- I don't think there should be any limits on numbers. It should be based on responsible care and following the rules (care, cleaning, barking, etc) not some arbitrary number.
- As long as the pets are licensed and well cared for there should be no limit
- Six dogs and six cats per household is excessive
- Limit should not exist, any issues that could arise due not caring properly for to many animals and issues that may arise are already covered by other bylaws such as feces removal and noise.
- Excessive
- TOO MANY the most should be 2 for this bylaw within city limits There is no need to have more then 2 animals per household
- I don't think it's necessary if the owners are being responsible with their pets, no matter the number.
- 12 animals per household is way too many.
- 6 total is a much higher limit than needed let alone 6 each.
- All the above but with a 3 dog and 3 cat limit.
- There should definitely be no more than 2 animals per house in the city!
- 3 dogs/ cats not 6 way to many
- No way for someone to have that many animals. The smell and trying to keep the area clean would be really hard and then when it isn't done then the neighbors will pay the price.
- People should be allowed to do what they want. You should not go in and limit what people can and cant do without there being an issue. If a problem arises, then do something.
- A person doesn't need that many pets. Maybe 1 or 2 max.
- I disagree that a restriction on the number of pets addresses issues like feces accumulation, excessive barking, or the welfare of the animal. These things are attributed to the ability or inability of the owner to handle on a case by case situation and should not be applied to all owners. There



are plenty of examples where someone owning less than 6 animals is violation of the above conditions, and people with more animals not having any issues.

- on pets is unnecessary
- No exceptions, would you like this next door to your home?
- In smaller homes and higher density communities there just isn't room!
- some people can handle more than 6 pets (dogs or cats) without bothering others, whereas others can't even handle 1 pet. It should be based on a case by case scenario based on the evidence provided.
- I don't think the number of animals indicates an issue. It's the behaviour of the owner.
- You can't tell me what to do.
- 12 animals is a zoo
- 12 dogs & cats in a single home is too many to be properly cared for
- It's none of your business how many pets someone owns
- Too much government interference.
- Just plain no!
- There should not be a limit to the number of pets a person can own.
- It all depends how they behave
- People should be free to have as many animals as they wish, as long as they are responsible pet owners. People that own their own home should not have restrictions, it's their home which they paid for.
- I think 6 dogs in one home is too much but it all depends on how big the house, yard, and dogs are. If they're small then I don't see an issue but 6 big dogs might be an issue.
- Why does that matter- if there's an issue address it then. If not leave people alone to have as many pets as they'd like- as long as they're taken care of
- I think the number of pets per household is too high
- That opens too many doors for people not fixing their pets, not abiding by noise bylaws, and becoming smelly. 6 well behaved dogs are loud, 6 well behaved cats are smelly, that is too many pets and totally unnecessary for people within city limits. It is not a farm.
- It's more a yes but. I believe that there should be additional requirements needed if you want 12 animals on your property. Like not being considered low income.
- No more than 2 dogs or cats due to potential barking issues and irresponsible owners
- too many, should be 2 cat and or dogs, but ok with the listed exceptions
- If all animals in the house are being adequately cared for and loved, then it should not matter how many animals are in the house. The city should not have control over the number of pets in a private home.
- A limit is unnecessary if the animals are being cared for properly.
- No one should be able to tell me how many pets I can have on my property.
- There does not need to be a limit on the number of pets, there needs to be regulation and enforcement of people who are not caring for their animals. Someone with 10 dogs may care for



their pets better than a family with 1 dog. The number doesn't matter, the ability to care for them does.

- As a volunteer at a rescue, there are several people I know with more than six dogs who take amazing care of them. Some are hard to place otherwise. I agree not everyone should own that many dogs. I feel that there can be a compromise. If 6+ dogs, I think it should require larger living arrangements to allow for adequate space, and maybe a yearly check to ensure the animals are not in distress.
- 12 animals in one household in an urban setting is excessive.
- Limiting how many dogs someone can have will only be a detriment to law abiding, responsible citizens. People who are mistreating and hoarding dogs will continue doing so regardless of what laws there are.
- It should not be up to the city to determine how many pets are allowed. Individual HOAs can make rules based on what households in that neighborhood want.
- I do not think any single family dwelling in the city needs 6 dogs and/or cats
- Limiting the number of animals won't fix the issues. I've lived beside people with one dog who never cleaned up after it or stopped the incessant barking. It doesn't matter how many animals a household has, it's being a responsible pet owner.
- Calgary has long been a pet friendly city with no pet limits and certainly no breed specific legislation and I absolutely believe it should stay this way. I would strongly support new/revised bylaws allowing for higher fines and or stronger reprimands for owners who's multiple or nuisance dogs are creating problems for neighbours. We need more enforcement of those bylaws though, otherwise they will never work.
- Too many!!!
- 6 animals is a large number. If someone was to have 6 cats and 6 dogs which is far too many to be able to provide the best care for. Three of each would be more acceptable. The exceptions should remain as above, even for three of each.
- 12 animals in a house is at too many. 6 is too many
- No household needs to have 12 animals while living in the city.
- That is too many animals in a household, six dogs could be noisy with all the barking, and feces pile up in the yard. Cats should be kept inside, we already have too many ferals, i would support 3 dogs max, 3 cats max kept inside and licensed.
- The number of animals housed in a property does not inherently correlate with more feces, animal welfare, or noise. One dog could easily be smellier, louder, and more neglected than 7 or more, and the onus should be put on responsible pet ownership instead. Also? The idea of considering limits because people think that owning more than 2 cats or 2 dogs isnt "necessary" is simply ridiculous. By the same logic, is owning even one animal "necessary?"
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is a lot of animals. 3 should be the maximum. How could anyone need 12 animals unless they are running a circus.
- As long as people are being responsible pet owners, cleaning up after them, etc there should be no limit.



- Too many animals will not get the care and attention they deserve
- 12 animals?! Why bother with a limit of allowing 12 animals?
- Unless the person is found to be a "Hoarder" In my opinion NO ONE has the right to say how many animals a person can have. If they can afford them and are keeping them healthy and happy they have the right to have these animals.
- Don't support
- The no limit has been working just fine and I see no reason to change it. I could possibly be persuaded to purchase a dog fancier's license if it was all encompassing of the foster dogs in addition to my own and I could pay one fee instead of individually license all the dogs.
- There should NOT be a limit. If an Animal Guardian is responsible and properly takes care of animals, they should NOT be limited to just 6. You are punishing the people who take good care of their animals.
- That is far too many animals in one residence. That's fine on an acreage, but not in the city.
- Ban backyard breeders!
- nobody can decide how many animals one is allowed to have
- Because there are multi family homes
- That's still too many pets in one household. Again, we live in the city not in the country or on the farm.
- If the animals are well cared for I don't think limits are needed
- Govt should not dictate how many pets someone should have. We are not a communist country
- Too many
- 6 is too many. I live beside 3 and it's ridiculous
- That seems really high. I'm a pet owner and I'm not sure why someone would need to own that many pets. I think it should be lower in urban areas, with an exception for people with property over a certain size. People who have acreage could keep that many animals without any issue. In the city I feel like 3 of each is more than enough
- This is too many animals for one household. Animal welfare needs to be priority
- 6 is way too many animals in one house. Dogs may start to exhibit pack mentality and become dangerous
- It has been proven that a responsible owner will be that no matter the number of pets they choose to care for. For some individuals that is a single pet, and others it could be many more. Putting harsher restrictions and additional enforcement on those that do not provide adequate care is more productive than limiting number arbitrarily.
- The current limit is adequate
- 6 is too many. I think 4 dogs including temporary homes is enough.
- 6 is way too high! Especially of each. In my experience the types of people who want that many animals are not the types that take care of them and the entire house becomes a huge nuisance. I agree with the statement that nobody needs more than 2 cats or dogs.
- I do not think controlling the number solves the problem. You must clean up after 1 or 12. It doesn't matter. Cat litter from one cat stinks. A single dog poops about 3 times per day, that's 21 in a week



and 85 in a month. That's a terrible mess from one dog. One dog can bark and be a nuisance or be vicious. Deal with the problem behaviour not the number.

- The welfare of the animal should be the priority under all circumstances - the 2 cats and/or dogs limit is a reasonable compromise. The only exception would be temporary foster homes.
- I don't support limits when paired with responsible ownership.
- Ban backyard breeding, ban the sale of live animals in pet stores. I think the limit for pets should be 4 dogs or 4 cats total.
- There shouldn't be a limit. People should be cleaning their yards daily/every few days, animals should be well cared for and attempts to keep noise down should always be used.
- Instead of 6 of each make the total 12 combined.
- Citizens should have the right to decide the number of pets in their household. Having more pets does not equate to irresponsible pet owners. There are many people with several number of pets that they have raised and cared of, and are considered important family members. This includes being responsible for yearly licence fee, vet bills, food and daily needs, training and life long care and love for their pets.
- If I wanted to live next to a "farm" I would move to the country
- 6dogs and 6 cats to me is too much except for the exceptions noted. I think this is already approaching a hoarder type scenario and I think it would put more pets in the position of receiving low quality care
- 6+6is too many.
- No pet owner NEEDS more than 2 animals. SERIOUSLY....FORGET IT. For those who own more than 2 animals, grandfather those in, but do NOT allow for more. I do *NOT* support multiple "exceptions".
- I don't want to
- Why would anyone have 6 dogs in a small home!!
- A total of 2 pets is plenty, 12 is not even managements for most people.
- Your use of "potential". I am a dog breeder/fancier and I from time to time sit dogs. If your Potential exceptions were to change to exceptions to this rule would be, I would support it. I obedience and show train my dogs. But the general public do not necessarily do this. Any involved with breeding/showing/trialing their dogs should be exempt.
- The ability to care for that many dogs or cats is rare. No person should be able to have more than 2 dogs in a residential environment particularly with the compact residential housing currently in many communities.
- There are so many irresponsible owners. The noise and feces in the community. The city won't even clean the pool and can't catch the owners that allow their pets mess the playgrounds.
- Doesn't Works for me
- Some houses are larger and have more responsible adults living in it, with the capacity to handle several pets. Enforcing a limit might motivate people to not register all of their pets.
- 6 is too many
- 12 dogs/cats is too many for a city plot



- If I can't control whether my neighbours play the drums when they are attached to my house who is someone else to control how many animals I can have.
- Different people have different capabilities of handling animals.
- If my dogs are taken care of and behaved it shouldn't matter how many dogs Or animals I have
- No, as long as owners are not suspected or have been charged with abuse I do not think their should be a limit
- no legitimate need for these numbers
- It makes criminals out of citizens. Everyone I know brags about how great our current policy is. We don't want people to hide their animals.
- Some people can handle more dogs than others. Some people should not own any pets
- I support the current bylaw but with proposed potential exceptions: Dogs/cats under 6 months of age Temporary homes (fosters, breeders, pet sitters, daycares) Dogs/cats that are inherited Dogs/cats that are grandfathered in if the rules change Approved Excess Animal Permit Possession of a Dog Fanciers' License Service animals
- People already do not pick up after their pets and control noise so this would significantly add to the existing problem and increased complaints and anger directed at bylaw services. City should consider requiring DNA from all dogs and cats, then using companies like Pooprints that provide feces identification. Fines for owners should cover the cost of the service in order to reduce the amount of animal feces left in our parks, playgrounds and water runoff.
- This seems like it could open up legal animal hoarding and poor welfare of the animals.
- I don't believe feces accumulation, noise, or animal welfare is related to the number of pets in a household. Either people know their own limitations and take good care of their pets or they don't. Hoarders would just ignore the bylaw and carry on.
- 6 dogs=pack; which results in increases in noise. Support exceptions
- 6 of each is too high. Max of 6 of one type with a total max of 8 animals is more appropriate.
- In the city that 12 pets is way to many. 6 Total should be the max if financially able. Proof of financial ability should be proved when more than 3 animals are in a home.
- I truly think that's too many animals in a household to ensure they are treated properly and cleaned up effectively. 6 dogs or 6 cats are just too much and usually the cats are wonderers
- I think me answering no was specific enough
- I think some people can easily manage more animals while others can barely manage 1 animal properly.
- If someone has space, and is fostering animals, then why not let them.
- 6 is too many for someone to control.
- I know many people who own more than 6 pets. Perhaps the limit should be increased a bit.
- 12 pets per household is WAY too many. Ridiculous actually. Move to rural Alberta and have as many animals as you want but not in the City. Unfair for the animals also.
- Many people (like myself) participate in competitive dog sports and are responsible owners and their dogs do not create a nuisance. I have five dogs and my yard is always clean of animal waste, even throughout the winter. However, the suggestion of a dog fancier's license could be a consideration if



the bylaw would allow people like myself who are involved in dog competitions (in addition to breeders and those who show at trials)

- this does not mitigate any of the issue above. The goal should be responsible ownership not limits. If someone is hoarding then the presence of a limit is not going to impact their behavior.
- /
- How would you enforce this - logistically ridiculous - let's hire another 100 city staff to keep up with these ideas. Have you heard there's a pandemic and people are without employment?
- 6 dogs or cats is way too many animals 2 should be the limit
- 6 is still too many
- There are several special cases: Ethical breeders, barn cats, those who are able to properly care for more than 6 animals, people who foster for rescues etc.
- There are plenty of people who can manage more than 6 dogs efficiently.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is too high a number.
- Would only support this with the exceptions listed above.
- its too high, and i have a lot of pets and im a foster house but you cannot own 6 dogs and 6 cats and care for them adequately which includes vet bills, exercise needs, food needs, insurance, change of life circumstance. I would support people being able to apply for a break in the rules if they are one of the above listed but NOBODY needs to own this many animals in city property. no way
- We shouldn't be limiting the numbers of animals someone can have if they are responsible pet owners
- I don't think that this bylaw will stop people who shouldn't own that number of Pete from doing it but punish those who followed the rules and were a good home
- This is a slippery slope that will lead to reductions in future. Issues are often not because of the number of animals it's the ability for the person to care for them. Many people have issues with only 1 pet and many people with multiple pets are responsible pet owners. A restrictive number won't actually fix the problems.
- The number of pets is not the issue. Humans are the issue.
- Totally against limiting the number of pets that a person can own providing that they are responsibly cared for and housed. A limit on animals is very artificial and arbitrary - some people can not realistically care for one animal, others can care for multiple animals. The City should not be involved in such decisions. Although not an accurate analogy, the City would not consider limiting the number of children or properties an individual owns, they should not have the ability or right to limit the number of animals owned if they are well housed and cared for. This limit tries to infer that anyone with more than a prescribed limit would be a hoarder and this is not the case. Hoarding is usually a mental concern that can be handled by current rules for the protection of the animals. The City of Calgary has been an example of how licensing and fair bylaws can lead to responsible pet ownership - imposed limits would seriously interfere with this reputation.
- 6 animals creates excess waste, smell, and generally bad behavior. That is too many. Also, what is the point of lowering license fees - if someone can't afford the pet license, they probably can't afford the poop bags or food for the animal.



- I do not think pet limits are the answer. Higher standards for animal welfare checks would be better
- If the animals are properly taken care of. But ban backyard breeders within city limits. Anyone caught breeding an animal and selling it for profit should face a \$100,000.00 fine and 10 years in jail.
- for the wrong house owner that can get out of control quite easy. I am a responsible pet owner of 2 dogs and let me tell you, I hear my neighbours dogs barking all day and all night. their cats roam all the time, if they are not fixed they can become more than 6 of each.....not at all supported by me.
- There is no need to have that many pets in a home. Many people can hardly afford 2!
- Rule is fine for indoor cats but six dogs in the city can lead to excessive barking. Who needs six dogs in any case.
- Deal with problems case by case.
- Private home ...you don't limit the number of people that can live in one residence; why should you be interfering with the number of animals.
- 2 cats and/or 2 dogs so max of 4 animals of both.
- If the animal is properly taken care of let us have as many as we want .
- The number of animals is not a problem as long as they are adequately cared for. There are already by-laws in place to address issues of noise and neglect use those to address the problem owners instead of punishing the good owners with restrictions on numbers.
- I believe there should be less animals per property allowed.
- I do not believe there should be a cap on the number of dogs or cats.
- 6 animals is too many. That many animals should live in the country where there is property.
- 6 animals on a single property in the city is too high for most homes. Is there a way to restrict the limit based on space? For example, homes with no yard/limited yard space have a limit of 3 or 4 while homes with a larger outdoor space have up to 6.
- That's too many dogs..too much noise..smell etc. I don't want to slice beside someone with a pack of dogs.
- Any arbitrarily set number will negatively affect a responsible person/family who happen to exceed the number for reasons beyond the limited imagination of legislators. Problems should be dealt with case-by-case.
- The limit should be lower than 6 of each
- 12 in total is crazy, should at least be based on size of house and type of property (row housing etc)
- A total of 23 pets is too many for one person. There should have to be a person to pet ratio in addition to number of pets per household.
- I have had as many as 7 dogs in my house and have lived in the same house with no complaints in 54 years
- 6 is WAY too many animals. That's a potential of 12 animals in one residence. Yards aren't big enough to accommodate that many animals. 6 pit bulls in one home is just looking for trouble. I have 2 small dogs, yearly care is running about \$3000 easy a year, that's with no injuries or health emergencies. What happened to 3, 4 and 5 pet maximum? Who pulled 6 out of their hat? Seems like too much of a jump with very little thought or common sense.
- Ok



- No pet limit
- 12 is way too many. 2 total is acceptable. Anything more than that displays mental issues/instability on the owner.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too much for one household. This is a bad situation for both the people and the pets.
- 6 dogs is too many unless temporary for breeding.
- Shouldn't be more pets than people in the house. The exception would be a single person can have a maximum of 2 pets.
- Arbitrary limits do nothing to solve problems.
- There should not be a limit on licensed pets in a home especially if there have been no reports in the home
- People should be free to choose
- We cannot have urban properties being overloaded with pets.
- Regulating how many pets a house hold has doesn't change the problem owners - some people care for 10 dogs better than their neighbours care for 1. I firmly believe animal bylaws need to revolve around RESPONSIBLE HUMANS and keeping people accountable for their choices.
- I don't see what this bylaw would serve. Is there any evidence that Calgary struggles with homes with excess numbers of pets that are causing a nuisance, where other bylaw or legal issues are not at play? (e.g. neglect, noise, nuisance, etc.) I don't understand from the information available here what problem is trying to be solved that is not already covered by other bylaws and legislation.
- Like the rule but how will it be enforced?
- No limit on animals within a home. If someone can provide adequate care for their animals they shouldn't be limited.
- As long as all bylaws for noise are respected and the animals are cared for (mental and physical health) there is no need for restrictions. Obviously all animals should be properly licensed
- if animals are cared for by the owners and are given the attention they require it should be up to the discretion of the owner. Maybe a limit could be explored on an individual basis if complaints have been filed about the animals on the property. Many folks within my circle have opted for dogs instead of children. They would never be instructed to have less children.
- Responsible pet owners won't allow any number of dogs to become a nuisance. Enforcement of this bylaw is likely by complaint only, which would be the same in a nuisance situation so there doesn't seem to be a need to limit the household number.
- it is arbitrary, why is 6 better than 7, it gives no indication of animal care or husbandry
- Again it's not what many of us heard in meetings - we stated that no limit needed - it's making sure dogs are cared for is the problem. Many people have multiple dogs and all are cared for. Some people have 1 dog and it is neglected.. limits do not make animals safe.
- Should not need a license for indoor cat. If someone can care for more than 6 animals, they should be allowed.
- If animals are cared for and not a nuisance then why should there be a limit. I know people with 11 dogs that are all well groomed, cared for, and their property is kept clean and tidy.



- Really, how could having more animals on any premises other than a farm be beneficial? I find this to be insulting and disrespectful to me as a tax paying homeowner who wants a quiet and healthy environment to live. Are you trying to run out respectful homeowners like me?
- Six dogs is a little much in a city of our size. 4 seems more reasonable
- Two is enough. I am sorry but it seems that those that cannot afford pets are the ones that have too many.
- Pet limits are not needed
- A total of 12 animals is too many. If it were up to 6 animals that would still be unreasonable but not ridiculous
- People should be allowed as many pets as they want granted they are responsible.
- No need for extra rules. You have safety enforcement rules.
- 6 is just way too many pets. The max should be 3 to ensure that each animal is being taken care of properly.
- There is no reason to limit the number of dogs people own. Calgary is the most forward thinking with this and if you change your stance, there will be a big pushback. I recall someone bringing this up a few years ago and it was met with huge backlash. Please do not limit the number of dogs people can have.
- I think that number is outrageous. The only exception to should be temporary homes. No individual should have that many animals in a city setting
- I am very happy to hear that the extremely restrictive 2 dogs is not going through and 6 dogs and 6 cats is much more reasonable especially with the exceptions but I 100% stand by that a limit won't have any benefit. I have 4 rescue dogs of my own, I foster dogs and cats and occasionally baby sit dogs for friends. I pick up poop daily, vacuum every 1-2 days and keep the dogs quiet; I know of people with 7 dogs of their own that do similarly; whereas a couple of my neighbours with 2 dogs constantly let them bark through the day and night. It's NOT about the number of animals, it's about the care they receive, a restriction is pointless.
- Haja
- Most pet owners take responsibility for their pets
- Too many pets.
- I have a dog. I love animals. Dogs are a huge responsibility. Should people want more pets they should live on an acreage. A maximum of three dogs OR three cats. We have had a budgie and a hamster as well. Please limit the animals. I don't feel people can take care of them properly.
- 2 dogs AND 2 cats is more than enough per household. The more pets in a house, the more noise and smell there is affecting neighbors.
- I see no reason to change it.
- 6 dogs and/or 6 cats in one household is excessive. Over 6 i.e. Puppies, temporary homes would be fine, but 6 dogs living next door would be too much to live beside in a city with smaller and smaller properties.
- The city cares only about money, how much extra money they can charge for extra pet so let people have as many as they want



- Number of dogs and good ownership are not codependent. If you can properly handle 8 dogs than you should be allowed to have 8 or as many as you want.
- I would be concerned about the reasons stated above (Accumulation of feces on a property, Excessive noise (eg. barking), Protect the welfare of animals) . I would support a slight increase to 3 animals.
- You're judging based on a preconceived notion. Many people with multiple animals do so with no issues. Some people with 1 pet are irresponsible pet owners. I say let people do what they do and judge should issues arise. Conformation breeders, people who compete in dog sports often have multi dog households and are the standard to which we should be holding the general public. People who foster for ethical rescues could be impacted. People who foster for service dog organizations could likewise be impacted.
- In my neighborhood 6 dogs would never work on these smaller lots. Folks would need a direct line to bylaw officers.
- I do not support a limit
- Keep the number of pets to the existing level. No one needs that many pets in one house. It is not healthy for the animals or the owners.
- Keep the limits off, when you tell people there is a max they will do such but if there is no max people tend to be more responsible and hide less
- This is way too many pets per household. 2 cats max and 2 dogs unless you are a trainer or breeder.
- Who is government to propose changes for any of this? Even the bylaw prohibiting licenced cats from being outside is not correct. Why? How much damage can a cat do to a yard? Not much. If anything, cats stop rodents from destroying properties.
- 12 animals is ridiculously high. Breeders should also be limited as animals are poorly treated and there are enough dogs and cats available.
- I do not believe in a pet limit. There are many people who shouldn't even have one pet. It is not the number of pets but the lack of care by the owner. Apply the current bylaws and deal with the issues first.
- if we want responsible breeding programs for both cats and dogs breeds need a viable breeding program and will be over the limit to do so
- a responsible owner can easily manage more pets....while others struggle to manage 1
- Lower amount, 6 animals total not each
- Numbers seem high and too many exceptions.
- I think 6 dogs or 6 cats is way to many for one household.
- I would need to know for sure what the exceptions would be before supporting the bylaw.
- I cannot support this whilst there is an exception for breeders. Breeders within city limits would be covered by the 6 animal limit with the litters covered by the under 6month exemption. Giving an exception to breeders would be only beneficial to puppy mill operations.
- 6 large dogs in a residential home is excessive. 6 small dogs would be acceptable.



- This will only cause people to have "illegal" pets. People would be discouraged from licensing their animals. How many households would this actually affect? We currently have bylaws to deal with hoarding and nuisance situations. Again, another unnecessary bylaw.
- 6 animals is far too many for one household. Taking into consideration, picking up of feces, noise control.
- Six is still too many. A limit of four of each would be more appropriate. Exceptions are valid.
- This should be monitored on a case by case basis. Some people are well equipped to handle multiple animal households, some people can't handle one single animal. We can't control everyone or take away from others. What would happen to households that already exceed the suggested limit? Would there be a grandfather clause. You can't rip people's family (even the furry ones) from them. Many of us need our pets to help us through life. I would not have survived cancer without the constant love and affection of my dogs. They give you strength to go on when no one else can.
- If a person can't take care of 10 dogs they aren't going to be any different than 1. It's about being a responsible pet owner not how many you have.
- I believe that 2-3 dogs per household and 3-5 cats. Concerns re animal welfare and barking happen with just one dog, bad owners not necessarily the number of animals.
- 12 animals is too many. 6 is too many.
- Some people are unable to manage a single dog while others effectively care for more than 6.
- If there are issues with the animals at a particular location, then other bylaws can be used to help solve the issue. An imposed limit will not stop the backyard breeders, or horders nor the irresponsible owners who will just not license their animals.
- A house with 6 cats AND 6 dogs is horrible. Animals are neglected, smell. Noise. I feel 6 animals total is a more appropriate number
- Unless it's an acreage or large space, I feel that's too many animals. (Exception of course for fostering)
- I would support the bylaw if the numbers were 2 dogs and 2 cats maximum
- 6 is too high, 3 max
- The number of animals is not the problem; it's the care given to the animals.
- I'm not sure what the purpose of a limit would be. As long as someone is not disturbing the peace, etc. and complying with other rules/bylaws, it shouldn't matter how many pets they own.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too many for the average house/yard sizes inside the city, unless you have a mansion that is. A limit of 3 or 4 total is more reasonable.
- That could equal 12 per household! That seems excessive. 3 of each max.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is insane for residential areas. If people want to have a mini farm, then go live on an acreage. Our current neighbours have 1 dog and they don't even take care of it, it barks throughout the day and their backyard is a doggy toilet.
- Maximum of 3 dogs and/or 3 cats except at time of litters then they have until weening to reduce the number back.



- There are a lot of inconsistencies and unknowns here. With respect to the fine rates there's no consideration for circumstance, multiple infractions and definitions. Overall fines seem arbitrary especially if you compare to other bylaw fines. The number of total animals allowed seems excessive given the numerous types of 'households' - what if they have their own yard or no yard. Seems there are numerous by-laws without any enforcement applied and layering additional changes without consideration to the larger opportunities.
- Twelve animals? Our homes are too tiny and close together. Imagine being allergic to cats and your neighbour goes out and gets 6 of them and then lets them roam the neighbourhood, defecating and peeing in your yard. Imagine the smell of six dogs pooping twice a day in a back yard in a heatwave, right next to your fence so you can't even go outside and sit in your own backyard.
- I would support this bylaw change if it was 6 total dogs or cats, not 6 of each. 12 animals is just too much. This is a city. Not a farm.
- As long as animals are well cared for the city should not have a say.
- No home in Calgary city limits has room/need for more than 12 animals. Quality of life is not taken into account with those numbers.
- Some pets could be fostered or a large family, if the pet owner is responsible there should not be a limit.
- If the owner can provide adequate living conditions (clean up after animals and has enough room) than the city shouldn't regulate how many pets a person has on their personal property
- We live in a city that yards are getting smaller...we don't need to increase distress for home owners to live beside someone with more pets or animals that is unnecessary
- Lower number of pets.
- Why select 6? You need data to support this number selection. And an option to say more or less. However I think the number should be 7-10. 6 is too low without more info.
- 6 dogs is way too many! Grandfathering the dogs already in the home but limiting the number to 4 dogs and 4 cats.
- I strongly believe our bylaws on responsible pet ownership regarding the number of dogs or cats allowed in a household work and shouldn't be changed if a household isn't complying i.e. not cleaning yard, not getting the animals the vet care needed not feeding properly not grooming anything along those lines then those individuals should be fined and if not in compliance by a set date then the animals should be removed
- A bylaw that addresses neglect is all that is necessary. An owner who is responsible, properly cares for their animals, and ensures they aren't a nuisance should not be limited if they want to have more animals. Limiting the number of animals does not equate responsibility - we have a neighbour who has single dog, the dog is never walked the owners never pick up the feces in their backyard which is very unpleasant for the neighbours, while others in the area who have multiple pets properly care for and clean up after them.
- 6 dogs is an excessive amount of dogs unless someone is a breeder and they should have a special license. If 6 dogs were allowed on a property that doesn't properly train their animals the noise and feces would be unimaginable. I believe a maximum number of dogs should be 3 per household. As



for cats, 6 is a lot of cats, if they are strictly indoor cats, and were spayed/neutered, that is less of a problem than 6 dogs, but the number is still very high.

- I don't think anyone needs 6 animals. Three should be the limit.
- I would support the proposed bylaw amendment for no more than four (4) dogs/cats per household. 6 is too many but cannot understand how having some of the noted exceptions such as grandfathering, excess animal permit, breeders this just complicates the issues.
- Other than fostering an animal, I can see no good reason why anyone needs more than a couple of each.
- The max number is too high. How will you evaluate this with a condo vs a single dwelling - assuming smaller vs large floor space? Many owners seem to have real issues (or do not try) keeping their cats on their own properties. An issue in itself, how could this be enforced with 6 cats?
- 12 animals in a city home (not acreage) is excessive
- That's 12 animals per household. I think max 4 dogs, 5 cats or combination of the 2 not exceeding 5 animals per housee
- That number is too high - becomes unmanageable for most. 3 of each is plenty.
- realistically you should be able to have as many as you want provided you can look after them and they aren't in danger or causing issues with neighbours.
- Still too many pets per household in the city unless the household is a dog breeder or foster home
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is more pets than anyone could ever need. The likelihood of lower quality care and living standards would be great, and it's far more likely for the animals to be poorly behaved.great.
- No one needs 6 dogs/cats.
- If all animals are licensed, spayed/neutered, and properly cared for, I see no reason to restrict the number of pets to a household. I also worry that these restrictions would have an effect on the number of animals adopted from local shelters/rescues.
- My only concern is hoarding situation
- This is ridiculous. 6 cats and 6 dogs?! People with condos will then have 6 of each in the beltline. Many of these condos do not have air conditioning making pets sit in hot condos all day. 1 dog and 1 cat is plenty. And or no animals in condos. Only allowed if you have a backyard. The animals need to have a good life just not a cuddle animal for their owner.
- No family should have more than 2 dogs and 2 cats . One each for seniors
- Other rules deal with feces, noise, and welfare. No need to limit people who can manage their pets themselves.
- Once a bylaw gets into place, it just becomes more and more restrictive over the years.
- if the animals are causing problems then the situation can be addressed through other remedies
- 6 dogs is not equal to 6 cats, should be more cats
- It should stay the same
- In favor of a cap but I think 6 is way too many. Dogs and cats are different
- Maximums should be ONE dog, and TWO cats



- I think that's too many animals per household aside from daycares/kennels and fosters (businesses). However, some citizens claim they are fosters but still "hoard" animals. I also think there should be additional requirements that breeders can only have one litter at a time before breeding another animal on the property. And what about if someone want 6 dogs, 6 cats and then mice, gerbals, birds, etc...how is that being addressed?
- L
- People should be allowed to own as many pet as they want, as long as the pets are well cared for
- 4 is plenty with exception for inherited
- I think six is more than enough
- Yes, 6 of both dogs and cats is a high number and I'm not 100% against the bylaw, if it was to change I would support it however I think that it should also partially be on a case by case basis.
- Hard to enforce, takes time away from more pressing bylaw issues. Problem owners will not comply.
- I feel that 6 cats should be the limit but 6 dogs are too many for proper care. As well, dog breeders shouldn't have more than 4-5 dogs at a time.
- Animal limits should be based on property size and owners ability to provide appropriate care
- As long as the property is maintained whe cares how many pets they have
- People don't train their pets. Two is the right number of dogs. If they breed or there are other special circumstances, they can apply - but those individuals would be better prepared to obey the bylaw requirements.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is a LOT. Can it be lower (with some exceptions).
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is an excessive amount of animals and borders on hoarding. I do not support this many pets per household, and I believe it should be lower. The potential exceptions to the rules are fine, but the limit is too high.
- I don't see this as a problem, I don't see why anyone should be penalized for having multiple pets, especially in a large home.
- You need to regulate breeders, not exempt them from all the rules. If you want to burden people with extra regulations, the complete unlicensed and unregulated breeders should be the first point.
- Keep same.
- The idea that one household could support and care properly for six dogs and six cats is absurd. Six dogs won't be walked twice a day -- they will be let outside to a back yard to bark all day. I experience this with a neighbour already and it is making my life miserable. The dogs are miserable too. Please DO NOT increase the limit to six. Three maximum please!
- I don't feel it's the city's place to dictate how many animals someone can have. Different properties can accomodate different amounts of animals. A bylaw directed at cleanng up after them is sufficient. Whether you have 1 dog or 7 if you're not picking up after them it's an issue. If you are, and the dogs/cats etc are well behaved and cared for the number is irrelevant
- Many dog/pet owners are unable to be responsible with one animal, let alone multiple.
- Not necessary
- Too many animals under one roof
- Keep thw current bylaw , and enforce it !!!!



- Wasting taxpayers money by policing the number of animals in a house. Only go out if there's a concern about animal welfare
- You don't need 6 dogs and cats
- Allowing too many pets in a household seems potentially neglectful.
- 6 and 6, or a total of 12 animals, seems excessive and could encourage backyard breeding situations. Honestly, I don't see the need for more than 4 and 4.
- Unnecessary
- That's garbage
- Not city business what happened to cutting red tape?
- You cannot tell me what I can or cannot own if one is a responsible pet owner
- 6 cats or dogs is too many for an urban household.
- Sometimes we are put in a position to either surrender a dog(s) when a loved one can no longer care for such animal
- We live in the city 6 dogs require a large backyard for the family pack. Walking 6 dogs from one household together can create 'packing' that can mean negative connotations in an off leash area where a pack is free to dominate a single animal or take on another household pack. Packs of dogs can be dangerous on or off leash.
- 6 of each seems excessive in an urban setting
- Again. You people are mental
- The issue of noise, feces and welfare isn't solely based on the number of animals it's the responsibility of the owner. That's why people with one dog still manage to neglect it. Limiting the amount of pets hurts those responsible owners that can handle the amount of animals and are now no longer able to give more animals a home.
- I could see allowing that IF you could confirm that they could afford to not only feed all of these animals but also handle vet bills and that includes fixing them.
- 6 animals max, 12 is way to much.
- Na
- Breeding requires adequate space so a 'home' in the city is not suitable for a dogs and 6 cats
- 6 is too many. I love pets but don't want to have a neighbor with possibly 12 animals. 3 or 4 is a better number. The exemptions seem reasonable
- I do believe in a pet limit to ensure that the pets are taken care of, but I would prefer to see the limit be TEN dogs AND TEN cats.
- That is too many animals
- As long as owners are responsible then no need to make limits
- It should be less than 6, 6 animals is too many.
- I worry that allowing that many pets could negatively affect their living conditions
- I don't think it's fair to ban a breed. My dog is one of the kindest dogs in the world she is full pitbull she has never hurt anyone but if you ban bully breeds I'll move. Hate the owner not the breed.



- I agree with 6 licensed pets but this should be assessed on a case by case basis, depending on how responsible the pet owner is. A blanket statement of 6 animals does not apply to everyone, considering some people can't financially take care of more than one animal.
- 12 animals per household is too high of a limit
- more than 6
- Too many
- Leave things alone and stop interfering where you don't need to
- If owners are being responsible there should be no limit on number of pets.
- I feel like no one can responsibly take care of potentially 12 animals at once. Some can barely properly and safely take care of one 1-5 animals and the animals are suffering because of this. I feel like it'll get out of hand and rescues will be even more full than they already are.
- I feel like people could really bend this rule at will by giving excuses or lying and saying an animal was given to them or they are just baby sitting the animal ect. Unless the exceptions are actually enforced, I think it will pretty much void the original limit.
- It is free country and as long as the owners are caring for the animals, and responsible for them it is not the city's place to dictate anything.
- Number of pets should be no more than 6 combined without special approval
- A special license needs to be obtained for more than 2 dogs and 2 cats
- No one needs 12 animals.
- Fostering ??? House sitting animals ???
- Stay out of my home unless there is a indefensible reason
- Number should be partly based on dwelling size
- 6 dogs/ cats are too many. 4 is a better number.
- I think punishing the whole as a group when there are a few bad owners isn't the correct way to deal with it. Punish the owners that are not following proper responsible pet ownership rules ..
- 6 of either animal is far to many in one residence. Especially depending on size of residence and yard.
- I think the limit should be raised but not more than 4 pets in total with the potential exceptions as mentioned above
- Concerns of overcrowding and the ability to meet animals need fully
- With the exception of a temporary case of a litter, no household should have six dogs or cats. I would support two.
- Let people be.
- I feel if a household wants a larger number of pets they should have to apply for special licenses so there is a forced review and the agency can ensure the living conditions are suitable.
- have that many.
- I am concerned about animal hoarding if the limit is extended.
- Let ppl have the amount of animals they want if they can provide for them properly



- It should be to a maximum of 6 animals based on the square footage of the owner's property. Furthermore, I can't believe you are considering lifting restrictions on vermin, and singling out a single species of animal in pit bulls, this is wrong.
- Backyard breeding would increase.
- Do not agree with the amount of animals
- 6 is too many to have within city limits, 3 should be the maximum
- Some people can have multiple pets and be able to care for them properly while others can have one pet and it receives poor treatment. It is the bad owners ruining it for others. If you put the limit but allow applications for more, how hard will it be for a loving home to have more? How easy would it be for a terrible home to get more? What is the vetting process?
- 6 dogs is far too many and may promote hoarding
- I think restrictions should be based upon situation. If a family is having a hard time caring for multiple dogs that should have a restriction on them. Due to their time or money.
- bsl is so hurtful and totally non effective
- 6 is way too many
- 3 and 3 for an urban area
- I would prefer to see 4 dogs and 4 cats
- I would be concerned about backyard breeding and animal welfare.
- Because I don't
- This seems too restrictive and not able to accommodate many possibilities that aren't problematic. I generally support the notion though.
- If people have the means to take care of more animals they should not be restricted
- In the city it seems excessive with 6 cats and 6 dogs. If people want that many animals in one household, it would be more appropriate for them to be on an acreage where they can roam freely and not be cooped up.
- No
- If the owners are able to support more than 6 they should be able to and placing a limit is government overreaching
- There shouldn't be a pet limit
- 12 pets in one home is way too much. I don't want a zoo next door. They can live in an acreage if they are so fond of pets
- No more than 3 dogs and/or 3 cats per household. Remove inherited and grandfather exceptions and rope those in with Excess animal permit.
- 6 of each is too many. I think if someone wants more than 4 animals, they need to pay for an exception and have a bylaw officer check their home and provide veterinary references.
- Not for government to decide.
- That is way too many animals to be allowed per household within the city. We are too close together, construction is not sufficiently sound proof. People who don't like noise would bear an unfair consequence to 6&6.



- With the exception for the above special circumstances, 12 animals in one single home would/could result in animal neglect. Licensing, vet bills, food, litter, etc. Is expensive. Not to mention space required to let the animals have room to roam and rest. Keep the blow the same.
- As long as they are responsible I am okay.
- The welfare of the animals is the most important thing that we can do for them, keeping them safe and healthy, I think we need to keep it the same.
- People are the cause of animal behaviours. If a dog has become aggressive or fearful it was at the hands of the owner. The owner has taught the dog to have behaviours through abuse, mistreated, neglect, animals are loving loyal creatures who look to us to show them love and their needs. I believe there should be stricter Applications, or laws for people to adopt animals.. to avoid abuse neglect and mistreatments of all animals. I know lots of "bully" breeds whom are amazing, loving, loyal creatures. To deny this animals love, family, and life is disgusting.. IT'S THE PERSON NOT THE BREED!!!!!!
- That is a lot of animals. Would bylaw insure that those animals are being cared for adequately?
- People should have the right to own as many pets as they like as long as they are responsible owners with enough income to care for all the pets.
- too many animals. Maybe 6 total
- If there is multiple compliants then there can be a number imposed on that person.
- 6 pets is too many in one home (except under 6 months of age). 12 pets is ridiculous. There should be no more than a total of 4 pets per household.
- re way too many - I would expect too much noise, disturbance, feces and just general chaos from a neighbour with that many animals. Stick with 2 per species.
- Over reaction How will you control all of this. It will be rules that are never enforced
- No more than 3 cats or 3 dogs in the city
- Responsible owners should be allowed as many animals as they wish
- If properly taken care of you should be able to have as many animals as your heart desires
- Feels like it's just an arbitrary number. Some people shouldn't be allowed any animals, and some could have 50 and take care of them. I don't like imposing a set limit.
- If there is no evidence to support that this change will help the issue.
- I think it is dependent on property size
- I am a responsible breeder and feel the number of animals should not matter if they are well cared for and not a nuisance. No limits for responsible owners
- Who needs 6 dogs and 6 cats the limit should be no more than 3. No house in this city is big enough for dogs to live comfortably
- we NOT a NAZI STATE YET....we are FREE PEOPLE.
- One pet per 1000 sq ft with maximum of 4 pets.
- I'd agree as long as the person can prove that they are able to financially maintain safety in both sections.



- Depending on the square footage of the property, the number could be lowered or increased. Having an excessive amount of animals should be monitored and require a yearly check in to ensure proper care is being given
- An urban home should NOT have 6 dogs OR 6 cats. The max number of dogs in one household should be 2. Cats should be lower than 6 as well.
- Six is unreasonably too much, two is plenty subject to proposed exceptions above.
- It should depend on the size of the property
- too many special circumstances
- Nobody needs 6 cats and 6 dogs in city limits. That's insane! Vet bills, food, basic care, that is so expensive! No way! Reduce it to 4!
- I do not believe there should be a limit to the amount of pets a person of household can have. But it is very important that all animals are properly cared for by the owner's.
- My neighbor has only one dog and they let it bark constantly. Its the owners responsibility to keep their dog quite.
- I feel the number is too high. I think no more than 3 dogs or 3 cats per household unless under special circumstances such as under 6 months or temporary foster homes
- I don't believe anyone has the right to restrict pet ownership as long as the animals are being well cared for, their living conditions are appropriate and and their needs are met.
- As long as all animals are cared for and healthy it shouldn't matter how many pets people have
- I think 6 each is excessive so I certainly would not increase the limit.
- I think this bylaw is too restrictive. And interferes too much with breeders, shelters and rescue organizations. I'm not a person that would desire owning 6 pets but I don't want to be to told or regulated. I also foster for rescue organizations and I don't want to be forced to obtain special permits before I am allowed to commit to taking in animals.
- If the owner have the ability of all the pets than the government should not be making bylaws regrading the number of pets a household should have. While the city of Calgary is working hard to eliminate puppy mills, the city should be working along animal shelters and pets store to reduce the production and the distribution of pets from unqualified breeders.
- It should vary based on the size of the home, the property, the animal care and the attention / exercise they receive.
- Max 4 of each
- No
- 6 and 6 is too many
- The more they have the more the pets would be neglected, and anyone that has that many pets or more can't even keep a clean or tidy home. Some of the mentioned exceptions could be accepted though.
- Too many people font look after their pets. Can't imagine living in between two people who each had six pets
- I feel the limit should be a total of six pets -- any combination of dogs and/or cats up to a total of six.



- I think the number should be lower, but support the listed exceptions. If someone doesn't fall into the exceptions, there's no need to have more than 3 dogs AND 3 cats, especially within some of the relatively small property sizes within the city.
- Six dogs and six cats seems like a high limit.
- It's their home
- I would suggest no more than 6 pets total.
- That is way to many animals to responsibly take care of.
- It's nobody else's business how many pets someone chooses to have. The problems that could arise from more (eg, feces build up) already has existing laws in place. If those are enforced properly then someone having 5 animals vs 2 should make no difference, as long as the owner is properly caring for them.
- In most cases, I don't believe there should be a limit on dogs or cats. If the number of animals in the household impacts the animals' health, then that would be a complaint under animal abuse or neglect. I don't think there should be a limit on the number of pets in a home as long as they are all happy, safe and well cared for. If I were to support this bylaw, I would at the very least require that Approved Excess Animal Permits be free of charge for all additional pets, whether it be one, four, or however many additional animals.
- no more than 4 cats or dogs unless offspring are under the age for safe adoption
- Six dogs AND six cats? Are you not sane? That person? They're a hoarder. Good Idea in principle. Six of any mix is more than ample enough. No exceptions. You want more? Buy a farm.
- no reason on why ppl should have that many animals in the first place.. One maybe two but up to 6 of each not
- This is too many animals to have on one city property
- To reduce household breeding
- if the animal and the property are maintained appropriately why should the number matter.
- A family can have more then 6 kids and to some families that can't have kids have dogs or cats and they are their children.
- Its not anyone else's business how many pets a other person has as long as they are responsible pet owners
- As long as all animals are registered and well taken care of, I don't see a reason for their to be a limit.
- 6 is an arbitrary number. A person could take care of 8 cats much better than another person with only 1 dog in severe circumstances. If the city wants to cut down on animal cruelty, excessive noise or mess/odour, it should target homes where these things have been reported to be a problem. Pulling a number out of thin air and fining people for violating it will capture too many good pet owners and will not capture enough poor pet owners to make the bylaw amendment worth it.
- Would rather reduce the number of pets per household
- Some people can handle many pets while others can't. You can't penalize others for horders.
- 1do not agree with limits



- No house is big enough to handle 6 dogs and 6 cats. Also, the owner should have to be able to walk/exercise the animals. I can not see one person being able to walk 6 dogs on a leash in the city and control them.
- As long as they are able to provide safe environments and proper care it should be fine there should be an inspection process.
- No one needs 6 animals in their household.
- I don't agree with interfering with peoples private lives.
- Too many for one house. Half as much is enough.
- The more pets an owner has, the likelihood of not having a proper behavioural training there is. In addition, the possibilities of affording specific target training decreases when having multiple pets and/or children in the family.
- It is not hard to train your dogs to be quiet. If you can pick up after 12 animals and you STILL want more, great. I feel the ONLY exception at this point would be after 12 animals, if you want more you have to have an inspection done to make sure they're not being badly taken care of and are actually in GOOD LOVING homes
- Pets are my children. Why would I be limited to a certain number of them if I can take good care of them.
- This makes more of a hassle for trainers and others in the animal business
- If the animals are not in duress, are being well kept and in good health, and not causing noise disruptions then it is not an issue.
- Let people love their pets. Sometimes it's all people have to live for in their lives.
- Should be no more than 4 pets total. Service animals should never have to pay anything
- 6 dogs is too many.
- There is no need for this many animals in a single household within city limits
- 6 of each is a wee bit excessive. Maybe 6 dogs and/or cats at the most.
- 6 dogs and 6cats are a lot of work and can be expensive. People should be able to prove quality of care for the animals before having so many. Breeders can be exceptions but I have seen too many animals neglected due to inability to care for them.
- I'm not familiar with the current rule, so I can't say whether I support the proposed change.
- To many animals in 1 place can be hazardous. Unless it is a foster I disagree it should be changed.
- This is not necessary and will only lead to more pets in shelters when they could have stayed in a loving home/or with their siblings. Also there are different house sizes and family sizes, there are some people with senior cats and a young cat with a litter, in that case they would be forced to put down the older cat. 6 is a terrible limit, especially when the average litter is 8. This will only cause more animals to be put down and overflowing shelters.
- I think if the owner is responsible and taking care of all pets there should be no limit
- If you are a breeder of PURE breed dogs and we pay to go by CKC rules pay them to do this
- 6 is excessive. The chance of someone with with that many animals providing quality care and training is low. At that point they are owning for the sake of owning.



- One should not be limited to 6 dogs and 6 animals. Rather I think 12 cats AND/OR dogs works better as it does not limit the number specific to each type of animal.
- As long as it's not a puppy mill and the owner is responsible then there shouldn't be an issue ... This has more to do with the individual and how they are maintaining the health of the animals
- People should be allowed to have as many pets as they can safety and responsibly take care of.
- I just don't see a need for a cap on this, we have for the most part had few issues this
- Nobody needs that many pets in a city. They will not be caring for those animals properly!!
- If the animals are well taken care of what's the problem?
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many unless it's a rescue. It's not pets.. it becomes hoarding. Unless someone has a dog sledding team.
- I don't think there should be restrictions based on numbers but based on issues if the animals are cared for and poop picked up fed proper care then why would the number matter. More about animal husbandry like old school farming its about the care and quality of life for animals and people. Not random numbers
- Instead of focusing on licenses and number of pets, the city should make it illegal to keep a dog chained. Also, should prohibit the sales to benefit puppy mills. Also restrict the number of litters that breeders can produce.
- There shouldn't be a limit as long as they can provide for them
- Getting a license for a cat is asinine. Also, you gonna limit the number of fish people can have in their ponds and aquariums?
- I think 6 is too low of a number for each I would suggest an increase to possibly 10.
- I do agree and appreciate the exceptions. Six of each seems excessive. I think yearly animal welfare checks on households with more than 4 animals and mandatory vet annual checks and approvals of Breeders.
- There needs to be a clause for fosters, etc.
- Because it is a violation of everything our country and city stand for not
- N/a
- Number should be less than 12 combined. How about 6 combined.
- Should be breed dependant, for example there a very big difference between 6 jack russle terriers and 6 newfoundland dogs.
- 6 animals is way too many for one household
- A total of 12 possible animals per house hold is excessive. Care and control of this many animals is difficult for all. This will invite unauthorized breeding.
- It is too many given the typical size of properties.
- No limit on animals as every situation is different
- 2 dogs and 2 cats are more than enough but the size of the home and land should also be a factor. 4 pets in a small house are too much. No exceptions for excess numbers or permits that allow exemptions.



- There should be a animal per square foot rule as 6 cats and dogs would be fine on a large property but not in a studio apartment
- It should be case by case. Individuals have different abilities to care for animals.
- No more than 4 total pets should be allowed in a household.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs in any one household in a city setting is crowded and jeopardizes animal welfare
- breeders should not be in the city.
- I think that 6 of each species is too many. Perhaps 1/2 that amount of each species would be more appropriate for an urban setting. Beyond that should require a special license and setup for breeding.
- You can't silence the masses
- No reason to limit if they are being responsible
- Too many
- Let people have their pets
- Total 4 in any combination
- Exceptions are all good exceptions, but allowing 12 pets in any household is NUTS!
- Unless the owners live on a farm with plenty of land, having 12 pets would cause too many issues for both the owners and adjacent neighbours.
- It depends. I do agree that this could protect the welfare of animals as I believe it would be difficult to give 6 dogs a great life at one time. If you live on an acreage this could be different as there is alot more space for the dogs to be outside.
- This should be dealt with on a case to case basis. Lots of people can take care of a lot of animals in their house. Other people cannot. Those who can't should be dealt with accordingly
- I think that 6 cats and 6 dogs in a household within the urban area are way too many. I do agree with the exemptions
- That's too many dogs/cats in one household in the city. I'd support a maximum of 4.
- Sometimes people can't feed all the animals. As stuff happens 2 pets is enough
- That's too many pets for anyone to care for properly
- more than 6 animals on a city lot is noisy, disruptive.
- I think unless the number of animals is proven to be a problem for neighbors or the animals are in danger, it shouldn't be up to the city to determine how many animals a family can house.
- Six dogs AND six cats is too many for most homes in Calgary. I think if six is the number there needs to be conditions met such as a certain size yard for the number of dogs you own. Six dogs is too many for a condo but may be okay in a house. Not all situations are created equally.
- If the pets are well cared for, people should be allowed to have as many pets as they want. Some people I know have 10 cats and take the best care of them that I have ever seen. As long as the pets are kept clean, and their yard is kept clean, you should be allowed to have as many as you like.
- We should should not change anything because someone else thinks a person doesn't "need" something.



- I think it should be a total number kind of thing. If someone wants to own, say, 12 cats or 12 dogs, that should be allowed (not just 6 and 6). Also, it may be worth it to specify an amount of animals per square footage (i.e. 6 animals total in residences less than 500 ft squared, 8 for 750, 10 for 1000, etc.
- People prove to be careless all the time. The last thing this city needs is irresponsible people getting more animals. Who needs more than two dogs or two cats anyways?
- No human needs to have that many animals
- Having 6 dogs is far different than having 6 cats. I have 7 cats. They are all licensed and vetted every year. They NEVER go outside except in their Catio that we have built for them. We are very responsible cat owners and I know others that are the same. I also have a dog, who is licensed and vetted every year. I walk her twice a day and she does not go to off leash parks. I don't trust a lot of dogs in these parks. I feel my dog is safer not going. I do feel 6 dogs is way too many for a household. If anything that should be reduced.
- People can have as many animals as long as they're responsible
- I think 6 of each per household is too many, it should be based on the size/type of home/property and the owner's ability to care for the animals
- If pets are properly cared for and licensed there is no need to put a limit
- [removed]
- If people are responsible it's not up to the city to restrict. Other bylaws such as licensing already exist.
- There should not be a limit
- How to enforce
- If someone wants 40 cats it's not the city's job to tell them they can't.
- I think it depends on the size of the property that the pets will be living in. Some places inky have enough space to fairly accommodate one animal whereas there are other properties with ample room to accommodate more.
- It's no one's place to pass bylaws in my home
- 6 dogs in a house, that's nuts. The bylaw should be: allow up to 6 dog, but 1 person must be able to manage all 6 dogs at one time. aka, 6 Chiwas pulling on a leash I can handle, 6 German shepherds chasing a deer I'd have to let 3 dogs go to gain control. So perhaps after 3 dogs, owner needs to prove that the 4th, 5th, and 6th dog can all be handled by a singular person.
- It's too many dogs and cats for anyone to properly take care of. Three dogs or cats, with the only exception being when one of the animals gives birth to puppies or kittens, should be the maximum number allowed. Once again, the safety and care of the animals MUST be the top priority, and three is more than enough for any household.
- That seems like too many animals to care for.
- Kick rocks city of Calgary [removed]
- I'm not strongly opinionated on this one but there's not "I'm not sure" option. I'm not aware of other municipalities doing pet limits... everyone's different - as long as they don't cause damage to my property I think people should have strong rights for what they do on their property.



- I agree with all said except the number, I don't believe any general (non of the above listed exceptions) within city limits home needs more than 4 dogs and 4 cats, exempt foster animals and inherited. Anything about the 4 limit should require extra licensing such as a kennel license.
- Not fair to the animals.
- No need for more than 2 pets per house! The noise and smell would be unbearable!
- 2 adult dogs or cats is sufficient. Only more if it involves birth of litter or fostering young animals.
- Except for special circumstances, 12 animals is A LOT. I think 3 dogs and 3 cats, with the opportunity to apply for permission for more would suffice.
- No one in this city should have that many animals unless they are a professional breeder
- Should be a way lower limit. 6 animals? Who in the city has room for that many. I'd support a limit of 2
- If a house fold is responsible with caring for each pet, I believe they should be allowed as many pets as they'd like
- I believe that is unnecessary
- that is a lot of waste and noise. raise a little ok but 12 pets is too many for a city property
- The risk for fights in animals living in close quarters is greater and you would be doing the animals a great disservice. On top of that, with the already small spaces and limited movement in winter, it would be chaos. Having pets is expensive, taking care of them takes time and money. The more animals you have the less attention and care they get
- People should be allow to own as many pets as they want as long as they are responsible and the pets are well taken care of
- What about animals on large properties? such as a farm.
- As long as the pets are well taken care of and the faeces is picked up and removed then who's right is it to say I can't have 8 dogs.....
- Numbers are too high. Waver for puppies and kittens up to 8 weeks old. Then excess permit required.
- Stupid
- 12 animals in one house hold as the pet limit is too many
- Unnecessary
- Why the over policing. If the animals are treated well, what is the issue?
- Personally, I don't believe it is necessary to have more than 2 dogs or cats in a single family dwelling based on the fact that a lot of homes are built quite close to one another, fecal matter and noise would prove to be big factors in not living next to people who have more than the aforementioned amount. I do agree that a special application process should be implemented. Reason being that there could be a special circumstance such as animal fostering, breeding etc. But for the purpose of having in a home, 2+2 is more than enough
- I think a limit of 6 dogs or cats total ensures that each animal can be properly cared for.
- Charge owners and not the breed. Bully breeds are not the issue, owners are. Do not discriminate against bully breeds



- The proposed and increased limit is far too high. There would be no need for an average household to ever own and be expected to properly care for twelve animals. Twelve is far too high.
- Limit of 4 cat/dog per individual living at the residence
- I think If the animals are well looked after and housed properly why should there be a limit? Continue to penalize those people who are irresponsible pet owners.
- This doesn't seem necessary to enforce, if the owner is responsible it should not matter.
- As long as there is responsible ownership, you should not need a limit
- When this limit goes up, some households will have excessive amount of animals and increase the risk of potential animal abuse or neglect.
- It is private property. Use other bylaws to deal with nuisance complaints related to large numbers of pets.
- Efforts should be made towards shutting down back yard breeders instead. People who are unable to care for their pets and everything that goes along with it should not be allowed to have pets, regardless of the number. People who are responsible should not have those restrictions.
- Let people have as many pets as they want as long as they are cared for properly!!
- if a person can care for their animals there is no need for a limit
- I think it should potentially also depend on the size of the property
- A blanket rule of 6 dogs and/or cats should not apply to everyone, but rather should be determined on a case-by-case basis, respective of the owner's income and space available. Thus low-income households and smaller households should be allowed fewer animals while higher income households and larger households should be allowed more animals. If such a system could be implemented it would allow those with the resources to provide good homes to more cats and dogs, while those owners without the resources to properly care for multiple pets cannot accumulate more animals than they can support
- Only allow this for breeders. No one needs 6 animals in there house.
- I don't like how much "pit bulls" are being singled out pit
- I don't believe there should be restrictions on responsible pet owners
- Go from 2 to 6. That's a big increase. No one need that many cats. Buy an acreage.
- multi family households WILL become more common during the economic situation we're heading into. Three households combining into one could cause problems with this.
- The only exception that should exist is the approved excess animal permit otherwise there is literally no point in having a limit, several of the other "exceptions" will be easily abused. The onus should be on the pet owner, not on the neighborhoods to tolerate.
- Depends on the size of the property the animal is being kept on
- Unless you are a breeder, 6 of each is very excessive. 3 of each should be maximum. With regard to previous question for low income, vets charge the same and having an animal is a choice. If you can't afford to care and look after the animal then don't get one.
- I support the proposed bylaw change for most cases although I believe it should make exceptions for households that exceed the proposed limit but have provided a safe and suitable living environment for the animals (especially in regard to households that rescue and adopt animals)



- Limits are redundant; will you take away animals already in homes? Sorry, pick your least favourite dog so we can take it
- Six animals or even up to 12 in one household create a huge amount of feces and huge dedication by the owners to ensure that there isn't nuisance barking and other disturbances to adjacent neighbours. I believe a lower limit with the exceptions listed above would allow dedicated trainers and breeders to have the requested numbers they desire.
- Responsible owners that are capable of providing vetting, care and a stable home that nurtures the animals should be allowed to have as many animals as they would like as long as the above are provided.
- Fines should be used to penalize owners who aren't being responsible for their pets.
- I work as a vets assist. Aggressive dogs are not breed specific. It all depends of how they are trained and their past. It is never the dogs fault. It's the people who raised the dog. I would like to see more enforcement with aggressive animals. I think that known aggressive dogs should not be allowed in public spaces without a muzzle. I believe that you should not be allowed to own more than 4 cats or dogs (both) per house hold. No person should own more than that (not including small animals) as financially it's hard, but there is always neglect with them. I think that if we judge a breed based on it's bite, there is something seriously wrong. I think that a German Shepherd or a husky has a even worse bite than a pit bull. Pit bulls can not lock their jaw and it's bite is just as bad as the next dog. I have been bit by french bulldogs and small dogs and it's huts just as bad. Please for the love of God, if we ban or discriminate against bully breeds, I will be incredibly sad for the state of our city.
- What is the need for 6 animals? Doesn't this seem unsanitary and unhealthy for the animals? Would it depend on the size of property?
- An owner should be allowed to have as many animals as wanted, as long as their living conditions are good.
- There i no reason for that anunt of animals in one household in residential property. If a person is a breeder they should be in a commercial area.
- With exception to fosters, pet sitters etc., 6 dogs AND 6 cats per household seems excessive.
- There should not be more than 6 pets per household
- 6 dogs or cats in a single city home is ridiculously high! Who can properly care for all those animals!
- too many animals in one household to be considered safe for an animal or human
- 3 is alrsssy more then enough . You can't provide quality care unless you are a shelter
- I dont think its needed
- 6 is extremely excessive. I believe 3 of each would be acceptable and I believe it should be dependent on the type of household (ie. Apartment vs house vs acreage etc.)
- This would impact foster pet parents, potentially putting more animals in kill shelters. Allow people to be adults and make a decision on how many animals they can handle.
- There is no need to have six dogs and six cats in a house. This is not fair to the animals who should have room to roam.



- That seems like too many animals to properly care for and manage. Excessive barking and animal waste.
- Low the limit
- Nobody without emotional issues needs more than 2-3 dogs or cats. Nobody! Inherit one? Give it away! I have 2 dogs. That's more than enough. Fostering? Get a farm if you have more than that...
- 3 dogs and 3 cats is more than enough
- As long as the person takes care of their responsibilities then they should be able to have as many animals as they can care for.
- 12 animals (6 cats + 6 dogs) seem too high in the city . On a farm they need lots but not in the city
- I think a good dog or cat owner who is responsible should have as many as they see fit. This will eliminate homeless animals. Also neuter/spading more then 6 on premises should be a requirement. This way we can lower homeless or shelter dogs.
- As long as there aren't problems with any of the animals. Why limit the amount at all
- Let people make choices. This bylaw is unnecessary and fines are irrelevant
- If they look after their pets who cares
- I like it the way it is now. As long as you look after your animals well, then you can have a maximum of 10.
- I don't believe there should be a pet limit as long as the owner is able to take care of the animals they own as well as keep them licensed
- I believe 6 cats AND 6 dogs is too many pets to have in most Calgary properties. I would support a lower limit, and anyone requesting more could apply for it (with things like neighbour consultation, proof that they can support more pets financially, etc)
- It should be no more than four animals in total in the city.
- Too excessive. Three.
- Houses are too small,
- no one requires more than 2 animals
- Seems arbitrary
- There is a house in Sundance that has 14 dogs. FOURTEEN. I need a licence to babysit 5 children but these people don't have to do anything? The stink must be horrible especially if she hoses the poop under the fence onto the alley? 6 animals per household? That's way too much. Even on the farm we never had more than 3.
- Again. If someone wants 10 dogs and takes care of them properly what's the issue? If they don't you guys have plenty of other rules. Like????
- Changing bylaws for owners who are responsibly owning their animals shouldn't be changed if the environment is a healthy environment you should not take people's pets away
- Should be based on size of household land size and distance between neighbors.
- Too many animals.
- you would have to show that you can care for (exercise, mental and physical stimulation, and that you aren't backyard breeding)



- how would this be enforced aside from monetarily penalizing the groups such as fosters and daycares. I would support it if it was free to those groups.
- Another money grab by the city
- Who needs that many animals in the city. Buy a farm.
- I just don't want to see limits. I consider Calgary a pet friendly city. Right now with Covid, I see many people out walking their dogs, enjoying their animals.
- If a person is taking care of their pets and they are not disrupting those around them, they should be allowed to have what makes them happy. Some people get their happiness from taking care of their pets and not interacting with people.
- More info to support change ie: size of dwelling, income suite exceptions, per family or per home (multiple families per household)
- with the exception of hoarding , you should be able to choose for yourself if you want another pet.
- Why worry? Stop taxing people unless they're a problem.
- Different people, different life styles. Regardless of number of pets those that currently don't care for animal needs still won't. This punished those who actually care
- That's a bizarre number of animals for one household. I could see 2 dogs and 2 cats in a household, but 6 of each is ridiculous.
- Should not dictate how many animals if they are paid for and are able to take good care of all the animals.
- Having a neighbor with 3 large dogs and at least 2 cats I find that excessive barking is a concern and lack of control over the animals when they are outside.
- the number or pets isn't the issue. The issue is the pet owners and their irresponsibility. Fines and animal seizure should be strong enforces. 1st time fine. Second time seizure. No exceptions.
- Do not punish responsible owners with greater numbers of pets
- We have 135K licensed dogs in Calgary; if we consider all on small size ~20pounds each this will be equivalent with ~15K human adults using the street as public toilets daily. Think about ! Love pets but owners have no respect for streets or properties or parks
- if a civilian believes they are capable to take care of more than 6 then i dont believe the city should intervene. The city should intervene if they break the existing bylaws.
- I support limiting the number of pets however, 6 cats and 6 dogs still seems like so much. I think 2-4 is reasonable. Maybe 6 in certain circumstances.
- This is government over reach.
- 6+ is excessive in any urban setting
- Nobody needs that many animals no one should have more than 3 animals at there house.
- An individual should be allowed to own however many animals they want as long as they take good care of them and they are not bothering anybody else.
- Pitbulls are not problem animals there are only problem owners. I do not at all support this bylaw change. Pitbulls do not deserve this they are only dogs and should not be held accountable for having bad owners



- If people have the money and time and proper love to provide to these animals, they should be able to express that to as many animals as they want.
- I think that 12 animals in one household is so unnecessary! How can you maintain a good quality of life when you have hypothetically, 12 animals, a lizard, a snake.. as well as maybe children in the house, and your partner?? I think a cap of 5 animals TOTAL per household or even maybe even 6 is appropriate.
- Because there should be a law for mistreatment of animals instead of limiting numbers of animals
- No if a person has the space and means to care for their animal there should be a more flexible number.
- It groups all individuals into a group but doesn't fix symptoms of problems. Worst kind of bureaucracy that only pads pockets to city officials
- I support this change as long as the above potential exceptions are included. It might also be beneficial to animals if breeders are registered, licensed and certified as to prevent Puppy Mills and Catterys that are dangerous to the animals.
- A person could have 20 animals and be the best caretaker in the world and respect the community and neighbours, or a person could have one animal and be disruptive. It is owner dependent, and not animal dependent.
- animals need their space too. The current number of pets allowed is more than enough already. I would support higher numbers outside of city limits on farms and other large properties, but not within Calgary city limits.
- I think a more appropriate pet limit would be 4 cats or dogs. I agree to the excepts above, or the need for a special application to be required. Some people will just have more pets than allowed and not get them licensed anyway.
- Depending on the case. You would know if there is too many. But don't limit how many fur babies someone can have if it's manageable
- Individuals should be allowed as many as they want.
- In my opinion, more than six animals in total is ridiculous. Six should be the max.
- Too many
- If people can support more animals and not cause harm or lower quality of life they should be given that option.
- I don't think 1 limit can apply to all
- There is no way the animals would have a decent quality of life if someone owned 12 pets at one time.
- Depends on the area where the owner lives. If property is large enough and not close to other homes they should be allowed to have more pets.
- No limit especially for rescues or foster homes
- You do not have the authority to control peoples lives, that's not the purpose of the government.
- 6 of each is still a large number and promotes hoarding. Owners should have to apply for a permit for any number over 6.



- We are a free society. Stop interfering. We already know that people who hoard animals are going to do that anyway, and are usually doing that because of a mental or emotional need of some kind.
- .
- Should be a limit of only 2 pets per home. Too many pets infringe on the neighbourhood with noise, feces smell, and increased of black flies. My current neighbour has licenced 15 dogs and 9 cats. Not enjoyable in my own backyard & feel devalues my property.
- NO ONE, NO ONE needs more than two dogs and / or two cats. Please apply some common sense here!
- Leave things the way they are. Fix other issues ..work on more fenced dog parks or bathrooms. Quit be so discrimatative ..this is step backwards
- There is no need for 6 dogs or cats in a single city home.
- Given the seven exceptions listed why bother? Anybody who wants more animals will be able to figure out a way to get around the bylaw.
- Keeping large amounts of animal is cruel and leads to excess noise and fecal matrr
- Too many animals on one property in an urban setting
- N/a
- If the owner(s) of the pets (let's say 6) is taking care of the animals properly and all their needs are met, also if the animals are not causing a nuisance. If owners are found to be irresponsible, then limit it case by case.
- 6 dogs/cats per household seems high. I would set the upper limit at 3 cats/dogs per household.
- No more than 2 pets
- Some people are able to raise and care for more than 6 pets. We aren't limiting people having more children than this.
- No one needs that many animals, plus the care for them would definitely go down.
- 6 dogs or cats (or mix). But it also depends on the size of the house/dwelling. If someone in a 7000sq ft home has 6 dogs there is lots of space for them. But it someone's living in a 700 sq ft home with 6 dogs it would be cramped.
- I'm opposed to the limits period. I have 7 cats. Many people I know have more than 6 cats and they're all cared for responsibly and their environment is clean.
- I feel three dogs in the city. Indoor cats a maximum of 3-4
- Foster families should never have 6 animals (dogs or cats) at one time. A lot of animals in foster care come from traumatic life experiences and need a chance to recover before moving onto a forever family. Recovery is necessary to assist in reducing "nuisance" animals and dog attacks/bites.
- There are always going to be unique situations that fall out of these suggested exceptions. The only priority is making sure the well being and quality of life of these animals are held in high regard. Increasing regulations of how many animals per household doesn't actually protect the welfare, its the conditions that animals are housed in and the treatment from owners whether it be 1 or 10 dogs is the only thing that bylaw should be considered about. If there is a situation where there are too many animals and their not being treated fairly or responsibly then yes action needs to be taken, but the same could be done for a home that only houses a couple animals. The focus of these bylaws



needs to be on the welfare of the animals in the city and holding owners accounting for irresponsible care or mistreatment. With that being said, do your research and just because other municipalities have these regulations in place does not make them effective or accurate.

- People can be responsible pet owners for multiple dogs.
- I don't believe in pet licensing
- This is ridiculous. People will find a way around this and it would be a waste of resources to monitor/enforce.
- Each to their own. If they have the funds to support animals then they should be allowed as many as they want
- Its not up to the city, its up to the owner!
- As a life member of ckc and a breeder for over 40 years I have numbers of dogs which are bred at different times Restricting the numbers could impact my ability to breed quality dogs They are always well cared for and maintained
- I don't see a need to limit so long as animals are well cared for
- Way too many pets for a normal home
- 2 pets are sufficient.
- If they have the space and means to provide then they should be able to have however many they want. People need to stop trying to dictate others lives
- I think this is too many - I believe this would not be good for the health of the animals.
- As long as that person is able to keep more than the suggested amount mentioned above and those animals are thriving I don't think anyone especially the government/ city should be allowed to state how many one household is allotted.
- This is ridiculous , no one needs more than two animals
- 12 animals in a normal home is outrageous. Special circumstances obviously apply and those could be made on a case by case basis.
- Outside of the above exceptions, I do not see a good enough reason why a person requires that many animals
- The number of dogs and cats per household that would be acceptable varies too much based on house sizes, backyard space, behaviour of pets, behaviour of owners, etc. so restrictions would not address the issues stated in any meaningful way
- I would support a Bylaw that would limit the animals to 2 per household. Be it two cats, two dogs or a dog and a cat etc, it is absolutely unnecessary for a household to have more than two pets. It's sometimes bad enough with only one.
- As long as it not a problem who cares
- Some people just want animals
- That is too many pets per Single family household in a city.
- It is cruel to pets to have 12 of them in a house, and likely a nuisance to neighbours (smell, noise). Limit of up to 4-6 cats OR dogs OR combination thereof is fine, with exceptions for in-house adoption services or temporary pet housing (such as an in-house pet daycare)



- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many for any house in the city. I think it should be more limited. More like 2-3 of each max
- No person should ever need either two dogs or two cats. Nobody needs 4 animals in their household.
- .
- 12 animals seems like a lot more than is necessary unless you're running some sort of business. I think 4-6 total animals for cats AND dogs is a bit more reasonable.
- It is against our rights to tell us how many pets we can have
- A pet limit of 12 animals? Nobody but someone training service animals needs anywhere near this many animals. I don't think any animal is in safe hands if they are sharing space with 11 other animals inside the City limits of Calgary.
- doesn't make sense
- Everyone should be the judge of how many animals then can take care of
- If someone can support the animals and is aware of the responsibility they are taking on, there should be no need for a limit.
- Cats and dogs need to be separated you are grouping them and they are not the same kind of animals, you can have a ton of cats and keep up with them keep your place clean and there are no neighbor issues if you don't let them out, dogs need to be let out which can cause all sorts of issues if you have more than 6, this whole survey needs to separate dogs and cats.
- 3 dogs 3-4 cats seems like a manageable number.
- d
- If they can be properly cared for there should be no limit
- if the owner is responsible and takes good care of the animals then I don't see a problem. Only when it becomes a neglect issue and also not cleaning up feces
- If manageable there should be no limit.
- There are several dog owners in Calgary that have more than 6 dogs and take care of them extremely well. There should be no limit on the number of pets someone is allowed to have, but in the event that person isn't able to care for them properly, fines should be implemented.
- Too many animals for one house, I would prefer if that's reduced by half. There is no reason anyone needs to have that many cats and dogs in one home unless they are hoarding, buying and selling or breeding.
- Don't put limits on the amount of pets
- There needs to be some sort of limit. I would say each case needs to be evaluated on a case by case basis. If it's a condo now way! If at an acreage then maybe.
- bylaw remains the same, no limit of animals.
- A large number of pets in 1 house could alter the peace of neighbours due to excessive noise, odours and waste created
- 6 is an excessive amount of animals outside of a professional business (breeder or trainer etc). I fear for the welfare of animals as well as impacts on neighbours and communities.



- In the past I have had seven cats at one time. There were no adverse consequences of having this many and having to give one up would have been traumatic. Three of these cats were strays which were rescued; the restriction would have prevented a rescue.
- I don't think any of this is necessary or worth the tax dollars.
- Our a person is responsible then it's wrong that the city can tell you how many animals you can have in a house. People pay ALOT of money to own their OWN home. Stop trying to control every aspect of a person's life!!!
- Nobody needs more than 2 cats or dogs in an urban environment. It is different if you live on an acreage outside of the City.
- No one should be allowed 12 or more animals per household. This is why homes and yards are destroyed. The limit should be 2 dogs and 2 cats max.
- The limit on number of animals permitted is too high in the proposed change. For residential properties within the city, 12 permitted animals is excessive, when considering noise, waste, and proper maintenance and care. Properties operating as a business (daycares, pet sitters, etc) should have their own restrictions and licensing, of course, but for private family residences, 2 dogs and 2 cats are reasonable.
- 6 dogs or cats is far too many. Should be limited to 2 dogs or cats. Have you ever lived next to a house where people leave dogs home all day barking?? Its no Fun...
- For the average person 6 of anything is a lot of time and money. More noise, mess. I worry with that many animals mental and physical needs of the pets will not be cared for correctly. Anyone needed more is likely a breeder or into dog sport and should need to obtain an extra license. In my opinion 3 dogs and 3 cats as a max per household
- Volume should only be limited on case to case basis
- 6 of each pet sounds excessive, that is a potential 12 dogs and cats living in one home. I see no reason why it should not be limited to 6 total cats and dogs as full time residence with special permit for temporary homes.
- six is too many, unless they are from a litter - timeline to bring number back to a more reasonable number, like 2-3
- If people are adequately taking care of the animals then no problems. There should be an investigation or interview to make sure the pets are taken care of
- it is none of your business if a family wants 3 dogs or cats. Ridiculous.
- Normal house holds can be fine with 2 or 3 max in total. Breeders I understand but they should be apply for extra animals so the city can inspect to make sure they have the correct means to look after that many animals
- Can't stop someone from wanting to adopt animals that have no home. There shouldn't be a limit. "My home, my rules"
- I don't feel anyone, outside of the exceptions, is capable of managing that many pets without causing a nuisance.
- There is no need for that many dogs and cats in the same home. That many poses an issue to the welfare of the animals.



- Bylaws should be changed on a case by case basis (Foster families, ect. Who are funded and trained in handling larger groups of animals). Not granted to the general public.
- There should be no limit as at times there are unforeseeable circumstances that change families and the number of pets that must be accepted to keep family together times there can be unforeseeable circumstances there
- seems clear enough that far too many current owners can't intelligently manage one or two
- Maximum number of pets allowed should be 3 per household.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats in one household is too many, it should be reduced to 3 dogs and 3 cats. I agree with the listed potential exceptions.
- it is common for pets to receive poor care and being ornaments
- Increases risk of hoarding situations and animal neglect.
- Items too vague
- People should be able to own as many pets as they want if they are fit to do so
- Should be able to have as many pets as you can take care of
- This is an absurd proposal. I know many people with over 6 animals and have no issues. To many, animals are family and to restrict how many pets you can have is ridiculous. No one says you can't have more than 6 kids, and kids are often far more problematic than a cat or dog.
- My cats are my children. I can't have children. They are not allowed to roam. They are all licensed. They do not make noise. Limiting certain animals is ridiculous for responsible owners. I would agree with anything more than 5 cats or 3 dogs. There should be no other kind of outdoor animals within city limits.
- Pet amounts should not be restricted
- As long as they take care of the animals, why should it matter ? If someone is having them in unhealthy conditions then that's a different story. I do not support this at all
- Seems like an unnecessary change that hurts pet owners to make non pet owners feel more comfortable
- 6 and 6 is way too many animals per household. 4 and 4 should be maximums.
- people should be able to make their own decisions on how many pets they have. It is their property not the governments!!
- Different properties can accommodate different pet numbers. Not for the city to arbitrarily decide.
- If you are going to set pet limits, you would need to do so for all pets, not just cats and/or dogs. If you will allow people to own as many bunnies, birds, guinea pigs, reptiles snakes, etc as they want, then you cannot mandate limits on only cats and dogs. If we are going to be setting limits on pets, than those limits need to be set on all pets.
- Pitbulls are not aggressive dogs
- Maybe size of household could help determine these numbers, but pets are family ... can't put a number on family.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats? 11 animals in a household seems a bit excessive. I think 6 animals in total, for typical city sized residences is more acceptable. It's healthier for the animals and for the people. If a citizen has a larger property that can safely support more, they can request special permission.

- a random number what if person wanted 7 cat no dogs. what if they want rabbit or hedgehog... what if it is a small condo or a 12,000 square foot home it seems strange to have same limit. Would make more sense to have numbers based on square feet and best interest of animals.
- No one needs to have that many pets. That's definitely overboard and will be nuisance to neighbors for many reasons. I would support a maximum of three adults dogs / cats
- As long as the animals are properly taken care of who cares how many animals a person has.
- no
- should be able to have more pets
- 3 animals of each should be enough per household unless the home is a rescue or foster home for animals. Special exceptions
- 6 of each is way, way too many
- If i can afford more animals i should be allowed. Stop telling me what i can and cant do!
- Why do we need this??? Who is asking for such a thing?? Why does the city want to be involved in these decisions??
- People should have a choice on how many pets they have, as long at the pets are well taken care of
- Let people have however many animals they want SO LONG AS they are being correctly cared for and ensured to be safe and healthy
- I don't think there should be a limit to how many pets are in each household.
- Unless the special circumstances are met, people do not need to own more than two cats or two dogs.
- So long as an animal is cared for its non of your business
- Slippery slope.
- thats a ridiculous amount of animals to have in the city. Should be based off housing type (duplex, 4 level splits etc) neighbour's, and amount of yard.
- I feel like 12 animals on most properties within Calgary city limits would not have sufficient space to have a good lifestyle. I support the proposed exceptions.
- I think the limit needs to be 3 dogs and 3 cats. There is no need for 1 household to have 6 dogs and 6 cats. We shouldn't give them that option either. Lower the better.
- This number should be based on the size of the living space... even 6 small dogs/cats is a lot of animals for a small living space, let alone 6 large dogs in a small living space.
- As long as pets are healthy and happy, you should be able to have as many as you want
- The limit of 6 dogs and/or 6 cats is too high. Who could possibly need that many pets? Dog or cat breeders? And what's with the bias shown towards "pit bulls." There are a lot more other breeds or mixed breeds that bite than "pit bulls." Like they say in court, "i object to counsel leading the witness."
- Some people can handle more dogs with no problems
- No need to have that many pets. Don't think it is a healthy environment for pets or people.
- There is no need for more than 2 dogs in a household.
- STRONGLY DISAGREE. just because one dog bites does NOT mean they are all bad



- Let people do what they want
- this is meddlesome, if an undesirable situation arises it can be dealt with on a case by case basis
- I don't think there should be restriction if they are taking care of the animals properly
- 6 dogs and or cats is far too many in an urban setting
- Some people can have 12 dogs that are well trained and well behaved and some can have one that is poorly trained and aggressive.
- I support parts of this proposal and not others. Putting limits on young dogs (under twelve months) would discourage backyard breeding.
- Too many animals to handle properly. No chance
- You should only own 2 dogs, but at least make it 4 cat limit
- 6 dogs is absolutely insane! This is supporting animal hoarders and back yard breeders
- Nobody needs more than 6 of anything
- As a multi dog owner, the responsibility is with me to adhere to the bylaws irrespective of the number of animals. Given proper space and care is provided.
- I believe it should be upped but not to 12 pets per home there is too many irresponsible pet owners they don't treat them properly and this is a huge factor in that. But then again the city doesn't own everyone's pets
- if the animals are properly cared for and don't cause a disturbance to locals then it should be allowed
- I don't think six (6) dogs or cats is appropriate. Four (4) is a better number, with the potential exceptions staying the same
- Case by case basis only
- I know many of the rescue group volunteers for more than 10 dogs who are responsible..where would these dogs go..back to the shelters?
- I don't know what the current bylaw is. But I don't think we should limit numbers.
- 12 animals in one house is way too high. I do agree with exceptions
- Having 12 pets is ridiculous.
- I might support if there were automatic exceptions based on lot size. Six cats in a downtown 1 bedroom condo is a lot, but 10 cats in a 4 bedroom house on the edge of the city seems fine.
- Because it's no one's business what happens inside my property that I pay for.
- I can't locate what the current bylaw is regarding this, but 12 seems excessive. Unless you are a temporary home or shelter you should not have that many animals. I cannot ascertain how the living conditions would be for that many animals. At most I think 3 of each is more reasonable.
- Pets are better taken care of when there are not so many.
- The potential of 12 animals in a home is alarming to me. Unless in the case of fostering a litter or something, there is no need for a home to have that many animals.
- The exact reasons listed in the question. Why does someone need more than a few pets if they're living in the city? That many pets need space to run around. Even with two pets in the house (dogs) most houses that's more than what is comfortable for the home, especially if there are kids in the household as well. The more busy a household is with kids, the louder it gets, same could be said



for dogs. For cats, yes they often don't make noise if they're house cats, but if outdoor cats are involved...cat fights around a property are louder than dogs barking. Not to mention fecal matter that know for a fact gets spread in flower beds and gardens. I don't own pets and this has happened to me with cats on numerous occasions.

- Noise and smell from urine and feces
- I am not sure anyone need 6 or more service animals What is a Dog Fanciers Licence? and do they need more than 6 of them? I would for animals that may be inherited and pet sitters (certain time frame could be applied for) same for foster homes
- An arbitrary number to limit pet ownership does not make sense. Deal with problem animals and owners under already existing bylaws.
- It is a right to have pets, this should not be determined by the city.
- I support some of the above but do not support other amendments. See above responses.
- You cannot paint everyone with the same brush. This should be assessed on a case by case basis. There are TONS of responsible pet owners. I do feel that 6 of each is plenty - but that would depend on available space and breeder requirements.
- [removed] out of our lives, get your own money, I mean you [removed] just print it any way. [removed]
- I think six dogs in one household is too many.
- I think 6 is still too high... 3 is what I feel is adequate in an urban environment.
- People think they can care properly for more animals but often they can't
- There is no need to have more than 2 dogs or cats per household within city limits. Poor ownership, pet training and animal control will result. There will also be a larger margin for stray/feral cats and dogs resulting in more issues. On rural properties (outside of city limits) that may be an option for criminal deterrent's (more than 2 dogs) and mouse control (More than 2 cats). There is absolutely no reason to own 6 dogs or cats within city limits. Maybe have special licencing for breeders to be able to have an exception for the current bylaw.
- 6 is far too many. 4 should be maximum. If you need more, move to an urban area
- I don't think it's up to anyone else to determine how many animals a household can have. As long as there's not a case of hoarding and the animals are well taken care of by responsible pet owners - it's no one else's business. What right does someone have to limit the number of PETS someone has? What's next? We limit how many kids can be in one household? To some people, their pets ARE their kids.
- Limit should be based on square footage of house/yard.
- That's way too many. I could see maybe a max of 3 cats or dogs - there should also be a COMBINED max of 5 animals
- Cats should be treated differently from dogs. they are less nuisance and don't have excessive noise.
- I don't think any household should be allowed to have more than 2 (two) dogs and 2 (two) cats, except for the conditions listed above.



- it should be 6 TOTAL, not 6 of each. Nobody needs that many animals with the exception being breeders
- 12 animals is unrealistic , animal welfare will suffer, most pet owners do not have the kind of space needed to have that many pets nor do they have enough money to properly care for those same petss
- 6 animals of each breed is too many. 6 animals total is more than enough, unless special circumstances where a request can be made for above purposes.
- These bylaws do not seem to be based on any evidence-based arguments but rather on some arbitrary emotional argument. "Comments say that it is not necessary to own more than 2 cats and dogs"?. What an unprofessional way to present a bylaw. While ownership is not considered necessary, it can be very beneficial, something that was highlighted during the pandemic and stay-at-home orders. Furthermore, may cats and/or dogs will thrive in multi-animal households, while other won't, legislation won't change that. Some families can take care of 6+ without issue while other might struggle with a single animal.
- I think the size of a home and once income should be considere. More importantly home size
- Owning the maximum of 12 animals would cause the animal quality of life to decrease. Most owners are not trained to handle 6 dogs at once, meaning poorly trained, less socialized dogs which is one of the causes to animal aggression
- I believe 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is far too many. The pet limit should be appropriate for the size of household. For instance only 1 dog and 1 cat allowed in apartment/condo buildings. The maximum should be 3 cats and 3 dogs in single-family households.
- there should be no limit on animals. they are the same as children. you don't have a limit on how many kids you can have. Pets should be the same. unless they are in a abusive home and are not properly taken care of
- Stay out of people's living rooms. Problems will rear themselves; then deal with it. Other than that, leave people alone.
- I think there should be a limit of 6, or maybe 8, TOTAL animals in a residence, be they cats, dogs, or a combination. 12 animals is too many for one residence to house safely, and without disturbing neighbours.
- If someone wants to be Dr. Doolittle and just surround themselves with a bajillion animals, let them. Hold them to the same general cleanliness and animal welfare standards as anyone else though.
- We have a lot of dog breeders in town. This restriction could be broken with one litter. Changing the bylaw goes after those that have been breeding within the law.
- I think this limit is too high and would promote hoarding/mistreatment of the animals.
- You should be allowed to have however many dogs you want
- too many animals at 6 each
- I think 6 dogs AND 6 cats is still too many. That is 12 animals. Even 5 of each would be better, with the same exceptions.
- As long as the animals are healthy and there's adequate space it shouldn't matter how many pets a person house



- Your complaint stats regarding multi-animal household issues are not justified. Calgary does not need limits!
- I do not think that anyone needs more than 2 cats and/or dogs per household within the city.
- As long as all requirements are being met, there is no reason to legislate this.
- I think the term household should be more specific. A 1 bedroom apartment would be not appropriate for that kind of number. I think the sizes should also be considered and again how much space this household has.
- Few people have the time or resources to provide proper care, diet and obedience training for more than 2 pets.
- Two is enough. Most people can't look after more animals properly. It is not fair to the pet.
- The city already has mechanisms in place to handle homes with issues. Its called neighbors rapping out neighbors. Through complaints houses are already identified to have issues.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many imo. Would be more comfortable with 4 per.
- That's excessive for urban living.
- 12 animals in most homes is excessive for any animal. The limit should be a combination of 6 cats or dogs.
- Good animal guardians will license and take appropriate care of their animals, bad animal guardians will not, but a bylaw limit will not stop their behaviour. How about you find a way to deal with the problem of hoarders and animal abusers instead?
- Dogs become packs after 2. The behaviour of dogs change when they are packs.
- Excessive noise, feces, We already have too many dogs and dog problems. One is enough, maybe two to serve as a companion animal.
- I don't believe anyone needs that many pets.
- A maximum of 2 cats or dogs per household.
- I agree but also know there are people who's life revolves around their pets and spend great time and money on ensuring they're trained properly and behave in a proper manner. Not to mention they are incredibly responsible human beings. Others, would not be in this position and I do believe they should be assessed and upon investigation, would or wouldn't be granted this.
- I believe that 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive.
- people who breed animals should have exceptions or those who foster large amounts of animals.
- Some people love animals
- 6 dogs and 6 cats in a urban house sound
- Number of pets should be limited
- I believe that there should be no limit of pets owned within a household. As is, should it be found that the owners are not properly caring for their animals, there are fines or even removal of the animal. I think as long as people are taking care of, licensing, and cleaning up after their animals effectively, it makes no difference how many they have.
- If you can take care of your pets there should be no limit!!!
- 6 dogs and/or cats is excessive. Unless you are fostering or animal sitting.



- I think 4 is a fair number
- 6 is too many. 4 or 5 max.
- If you have more than 2 dogs in a household you are creating a pack of dogs. The animals no longer bond with humans as much. Also six dogs or cats creates an crazy amount of noise, feces and more likely that the animals will be neglected.
- As long as the pet owner is responsible, the animals are taken care of and the neighbors have no complaints there should be no limit. Hoarding situations are never okay.
- People should be allowed as many pets as they want proved they a) can provide enough food and water b) provide enough space and enrichment c) financially support themselves and the animals d) license them all with the city
- No one needs more then 2 dogs or cats.
- I think 4 and 4 would be a better base if there is going to be exceptions to allow more. If you're allowed to have 6 dogs but they're all females and end up having litters of puppies that end up being hypothetically 6 puppies EACH. That ends up being over 40 dogs in one home. That to me is not humane at all. If that were to happen to 4 dogs / cats, it's still a lot of animals but substantially more humane and manageable. Additionally, fewer animals as a whole are easier to manage to prevent hoarding and nuisance animals.
- 6 is to many 3 is a more realistic number
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is very excessive. 3 max per household is sufficient. I agree with the above potential exceptions
- I think if you need more than three cats and dogs you should have to apply for a licence
- 6 dogs and 6 cats are too many animals to manage in a city house.
- 6dogs and 6 cats in a single household is far too many, I feel proper care and love would not be able to be give to all
- Unless pets are insured. Financial responsibility for 12 pets is not easy, should be demonstrated.
- If you cannot limit the amount of kids human can have, why do it to animals.
- More help provided for stupid people
- Not necessary
- Enough with all the rules folks!
- I would support a smaller increase, but 6 dogs and 6 cats is too much in an urban setting. exceptions can be made for foster facilities and breeders.
- if a person is able to care for the animals in their care and control and there are no contraventions of legislation, i see no reason to place a restriction on the amount one may own. there are other avenues in place that can deal with this concern should it be required.
- In feudal Europe peasants and serfs we're not allowed to have dogs or weapons as it prevented uprising this tactic has been used multiple times when communism thinks it's disgusting teeth in and make no mistake in the short 38 years I have been on this planet and in Alberta I have seen nothing but my freedoms torn away I don't have six dogs or cats but I do have friends with property who do have a lot of animals they also have a lot of children no you don't have the right to start restricting everything down to number of pets. And leave the pitbulls alone I live with one he is the biggest



whiner I have known many pit bulls even large ones well over a hundred pounds they just want the couch and a blanket an aggressive Pitbull is an abused pitbull in the fault lies with the human not the dog the deal with that on a case-by-case basis don't just assume that most people who have a pit bull are bad people my landlord with the pit bull is a lawyer and the lady he rescued the Pitbull from Ontario where they have a similar ban to what you are trying to implement

- Should be no limit. As long as properly cared for.
- There should be no limit. If they are being taken care of and loved.
- That is too many pets! It should be based on square footage of premise as well.
- Limit is too high. One household cannot take care of that many animals.
- No
- Let people do what they want.
- It is only an issue if all the other requirements are NOT met such as “noise infractions” , animals neglect, smell from unsanitary. If these issues are adheres there is no problem
- 6 of each seems like way too many for one household to care for responsibly. I would lower to 4 of each.
- As long as the pets are being taken care of by the owners, there is no need for a limit.
- How can you ensure all animals have the necessary space
- I live in an attached duplex and the neighbour has 3 dogs that bark constantly and their yard is only 10'x14' and the dog feces smell is unbearable in the heat of summer. Dogs should have a large space.
- Li.it should be 2 cats and 2 dogs per household
- There is no reason to have up to 6 dogs and 6 cats per household. I think most people are not responsible enough to look after that many animals. The smell and noise would definitely be a problem.
- Need more info
- Who are we to decide how many pets one household can have. To some households pets are their children. Until we can decide how many human children one household can have it is No ones business unless the animals are abused or under threat.
- I consider 6 dogs or cats per household as excessive within City limits. I think 3 dogs or cats per household is a more reasonable limit.
- No household should have a pet limit.
- 6 of each seems a lot. However 2 of each seems low.
- So many people want pets but don't provide adequate veterinary care. If they have up to 12 pets, 6 of each I think most will mean well but won't actually be able to afford care.
- Cats and dogs require different levels of attention, setting a limit on them the same as dogs does not make sense.
- The bylaw change will extend the bureaucracy.
- I think 6 is too many unless a fully licensed breeder. The maximum should be 3 . No one can properly look after train, care for 6 animals in one city house on a small lot.



- I think this should be on a case by case basis. If people have the space, are responsible and train their pets then there should not be a limit
- People should be able to have all the pets they can take care of. We don't put restrictions on children.. so why let's?
- That's too many dogs and cats to have in one place
- Agree with personal exceptions, but those must be renewed each year (or applied for when circumstances change.) 6 dogs and 6 cats are too many animals on one property! Limit the number of dogs to the number of adults resident, but not to exceed 4. Perhaps cats could be more than 2 (but NOT as many as 6) as they are likely indoors. I support an exemption process for the number of dogs or cats (for example, when households combine due to relationship changes, emergency or hardship). The exemption must be renewed every year. NEVER as high as allowing 6 dogs. That is too many dogs!
- If People can safely take care of more then 6 animals (ie on a farm or larger property) they should be allowed
- You can't limit this. If the animals are being abused or in bad conditions of course that needs to be examined. But dogs and cats deserve homes. Some people can handle more than 6 and there shouldn't be a reason to limit it if they have lots of experience with animals.
- Other than the potential exceptions I think it's ridiculous for one household to own upwards of a dozen animals in a single household and I don't believe it's possible to own that many and still properly care for them and their individual needs and training. I think limiting total amount of animals in a house to 5 or so is very fair.
- No limit. More enforcement of safe and clean conditions for all animals.
- I support the bylaw change, but I put no because I think the potential exceptions should be actual exceptions.
- Never limit them.
- Six cats and six dogs is disgusting. I can't imagine the state of a person's home/yard and the noise if I was living next to someone with that many animals in their home. Yuck.
- DONT DO IT [removed]
- Six dogs AND six cats is too much. I agree with most of the exceptions, but six dogs in the same house is a lot
- No should have/need 6 cats or 6 dogs, these animals be destined for the shelter, as the family/individual maybe will not have the time, money, or cleanliness for it.
- If an owner is responsible enough, then there should be no issue. If owners who are I responsible are brought forward by their neighbours, then incur fines there. Don't punish the many for the ignorance of the few.
- Should be 6 cats and 4 dogs
- There should be no limit of how many cats/dogs a person can own.
- As long as pets are cared for they shouldn't be restricted to a certain number



- 6 dogs is a lot. Dogs need space and territorial. Most people can't even be responsible with one dog let alone 6. People can't even control Or be responsible for 1 dog so many lose dogs attacking people and pets I can't imagine how a person who can't handle one dog could handle 6
- 12 animals in one house seems excessive. 4 & 4 unless they apply for exception, and if any of the animals are declared nuisance, the cap for the owner reduces to two of each max, once the household naturally reduces (as in once the animals die of natural causes, they cannot be replaced unless it is to maintain the 2/2)
- Six dogs and 6 cats is way too many for city sized homes and yards. No one wants to live next door to people who have that many pets! The exceptions seem reasonable.
- There should be no limit put on how many companions a person wishes to keep. Maybe ensuring that the pets are all taken care of and trained properly, will work better. It's about teaching the owner to maintain and Raise the pet.
- than 6. Possible support if it was longer than 1 year.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of and not causing issues to neighbours, people should be free to own as many as they want.
- 6 is too many. 4 is more than enough
- Honestly, some people's entire lives are about pets. If Somebody wants to adopt 15 dogs/cats rather than have them sit in a shelter, that's fine by me.
- Size of the property should be considered.
- It doesn't matter how many animals reside on a property if they are properly cared for.
- I suppose it would depend on how large the family is.
- I kind of support it, it should just be 12 animals, whether it be cats or dogs.
- 6 dogs is too many
- In cases of hoarding animal rescues need help with fostering no matter what the animals are.
- There is no reason for a household to have more than 2-3 pets. Up to 12 animals in a home is absolutely ridiculous.
- If acceptations are being made, the owner should have to prove they can physically and financially provide for the animals.
- I don't think any household should have the ability to have 12 animals in their house. I think 2 dogs and 2 cats should be the limit.
- It's none of anyone else's business who does what
- Why does anyone need that many animals. It's now a case of collecting/hoarding
- 6 is too many
- This regulation is not necessary.
- Responsible pet owners generally can manage their animals however many they have. This is an other over reach on the part of the city. Deal with animal hoarders who are problematic but leave everyone else alone. This survey is insulting and makes me wonder why I am forced to pay taxes and support silly individuals who think these by-laws will make life better for most Calgarians. Shame on you all!!!!!!



- No one needs more than 3-4 dogs or cats in a house IN THE CITY.. Anymore and your giving backyard breeders too much room to bend/break rules.
- Having more than four animals per household is unwise and leads to illness amongst animals
- I see no logical reason why one household should or could look after 6 dogs and 6 cats. It is too many.
- I should be able to have however many animals I want so long as they're taken care of
- Excludes responsible owners, breeders and multie families in a household.
- It's not necessary and waste of enforcement animals time
- No one household that I've been to could maintain proper living standards with 12 pets in their house. At that point the animals are suffering. If not then a special application can be done to get up to that. I'd suggest no more than 3 AND 3.
- Outside of a rescue, I don't think anyone can take care of 6 dogs let alone 12 entire pets.
- Let people own what they want if they can take care of them
- I see no reason for someone to have 6 or more dog AND cats. Seems excessive within city limits.
- No one except for breeders should have that many animals on the premises!!
- It needs to be a case by case basis, as some people live where more than one dog is not much for them and the well being of the dog where some people can have up to ten dogs with no problems
- seems like overkill if there is already legislation in place to deal with problem issues.
- I feel it's too hard to take proper care of that many animals and properly control the odor that comes with all the feces
- Pet restrictions help to ensure animals are cared for appropriately. Exceptions should be allowed but an application should be required. There are not many residences that allow for 6 cats/6 dogs to live appropriately.
- Should be fewer than 6 and 6
- Get better by laws that focus on back yard breeders as this make exceptions to the problematic over breeding and mistreatment of animals.
- You can own more animals responsibly (maybe up to 4)
- I believe there should be a pet limit based on the SIZE of the household. It is not fair for 6 cats AND 6 dogs to live in a small condo or townhome. On the other hand, if they live in a large detached home, it MAY be suitable. I don't believe anyone needs 6 dogs and 6 cats in one household. The majority of the time it will not be proper living conditions and animals will be neglected.
- There should certainly be a limit for residential pet owners. It is unlikely that someone with six cats and six dogs would be able to care appropriately for each animal.
- I don't believe anyone needs to own 6 dogs and 6 cats at one time. That's just crazy.
- As long as the animals are treated well it's not up to the city to decide, maybe just stop making so many rules
- I do not support this change, however I do support that there are further guidelines for animal welfare when specifically pertaining to households with multiple animals to ensure that no pet is neglected.



- Responsible pet owners with more than 2 pets can be more responsible than people with one!
- Animal hoarders and backyard breeders are the problem and won't care about a bylaw. Responsible owners are not the problem.
- It's such a high number, why bother
- If all dogs & cats are licensed & the city is aware there are more than 6 dogs & 6 cats on a property, I believe an annual check up should be done on the outside of the property for feces, ensuring no animals are being kept/caged outside indefinitely, exposure, etc. A house check in annually could be warranted if the outside of the property gives reason to believe the animals may be in unsafe or uncomfortable conditions as well as the people in the home.
- Multiple family households may exceed these limits. Pets are often incredibly emotional support for family members and as long as they're properly cared for I don't see an issue with owning multiple dogs. Especially if you have the space.
- I believe that the current maximum numbers should be decreased. Under this circumstance, only one exception is needed - "approved excess animal permit" - there can be many specifics under this one by-law.
- I believe if a owner has a dog that's a issue. They should be responsible for the dog and the dogs actions.
- I think it's ridiculous to limit the number for responsible pet owners.
- I believe the exceptions are appropriate
- I dont think there should be a limit.
- No one needs that many pets in a house
- The number of animals is personal choice. I have 17 dogs - and they are cleaned up after daily.
- Anyone wishing to own more than 2 cats/dogs should be required to apply for a special application. They should be able to show the ability to properly care for the animals financially and emotionally.
- Don't see the need for any person or persons to own more than two pets. Lets think about our neighbors, we are all looking for peace and quiet lives. Don't want to be listening to barking dogs all day and night. And looking at an accumulation of dog waste in your neighbors yards. Should be a by-law on noise associated with having animals. Who needs to be listening to that noise all the time. Just want to come home at the end of the day to some peace and quiet. Be able to enjoy one's property, we pay enough taxes. Lets me considerate of all people and remember we have enough issues without extending the amount of pets allowed on one's property.
- i think if the person who has more than the 6/6 and follows all of the other by laws (noise, feces, etc.) there really should be an issue
- people are entitled to owning as many pets as it makes them happy
- Because proper pet owners need to take responsibility with their pets. There's shouldn't be laws forcing them to do what they should already be doing.
- This should also consider the square footage of the property, for many homes, allowing up to 12 pets at any given time could result in an unhealthy environment.
- People should be responsible. If they cannot - then they should have these consequences.
- As long as these animals have a loving home who cares how many is in the home



- 12 pets seems excessive, unless in a foster or rescue situation where it's temporary. 12 feels like it's heading into a hoarding situation.
- People should be severely limited on the number of pets. 6 is too many. Fewer animals.
- This could influence people to simply not register their extra pets, or any of them, in order to have the pets they desire which would outlet be creating/worsening an adjacent issue.
- Responsible pet owners are different than irresponsible pet owners
- Dogs are not to be judged based on breed.
- People can have as many pet they want. Leave them alone
- 12 animals in one house is too many
- I don't think people should be given a limit if they're able to afford to take care of the pet and give it a loving home. There are too many animals on the street and in shelters.
- There would be more strays roaming if people can't own them. Plus doesn't the city make more money with residents paying to licence their pets?
- if a pet owner is responsible for the number of pets they have, there should be no limits on the number
- I would say that owning more than 2 dogs or 2 cats in a City environment constitutes urban farming and I would not agree to this.
- We shouldn't have to limit this.
- I do not believe we need to place a limit on a household with responsible pet owners
- Not many owners or homes can reasonably support that many pets. There is very likely to be negative impacts for neighbours and even the neighbourhood
- The pet limit is too high, if you want to help address accumulation of feces, excessive noise, protect the welfare of animals, the limit of two dogs and two cats is sufficient.
- I think six cats and six dogs are to many for most people to handle, the numbers should be lower
- This is excessive government intervention in the private lives of citizens. People should be free to have as many pets as they like provided they are adequately cared for. Fines should be applied if it is deemed owners are not caring for their animals properly
- So long as the pets are appropriately cared for and trained I see no problem with more than 6 pets.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats permanently at a home is way too many. How can you properly care/train/feed/vet/provide attention to that many pets???
- I think that it's reasonable to have a 6 dog limit /cat limit, Second Other than the exemptions I don't think there should be a reason why one person should have that many dogs or cats
- I prefer a limit of two adult dogs or cats per household with all of the above exceptions other than a "dog fanciers' licence". The limit should be the same for everyone as should the licencing fees.
- It is not appropriate for the government to legislate one the individual actions of pet owners. While I do understand the concern for animal welfare, and for the consideration that must be given to neighbours, the reality is that most people do not have more than that number of animals already. It is unnecessary and heavy handed to create a bylaw targeting a very small demographic while also subjugating the rest of us to its terms, costing the city money in its oversight. The bylaw should stand as it is.



- Less dogs
- Potential exception? If I say yes it leaves room for you to add at delete any of the above so NO! Be more specific!
- If there's a farm or acreage this is a silly rule (like springbank or a farm within city limits). Otherwise I support it.
- Its private property, we have bylaws already for people causing disturbances.
- I support the exceptions, but 12 animals is a lot for one property on a permanent basis. It seems like it would enable animal hoarders.. Maybe 4 of each?
- I don't believe there should be a limit. If it is a large family home with room to have more than I believe they should be allowed to own how many they want. They have to be able to provide for them and give them a good life though.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too much for one household. The more animals people are allowed, the higher likelihood of neglect, abuse, etc. While rules and bylaws can be in place to protect animals, I fear that enforcement of these bylaws might not always happen, thus exposing animals to potentially bad situations.
- I think the limit for cats should be different than that of dogs. Someone could comfortably have more than 6 cats.
- I think more than 3 dogs and/or cats in a household is enough. 6 is excessive, and most people are unable to care for that many properly. If it is a Foster situation, I think a special license needs to be applied for
- I do not believe anyone should need to own 6 dogs and 6 cats. Nobody needs that many animals. I would suggest a total of 6 animals that can be either cats or dogs.
- Laws such as this one is infringing upon people's right of ownership. As long as the animals are being taken care of, there should be no "limit" as to how many animals they are allowed to have. On top of that, the majority of people don't have an insane number of animals to begin with so I don't personally think there is a need for this to turn into a law.
- Individuals can have 6+ pets and properly care and clean up after them
- No one needs more than 2-3 pets n total.
- Let people be
- Too many
- Responsible dog/cat owners do not need a limit on the number of dogs/cats in their home because they are Responsible Owners.
- I don't know what the limit is, but think about this. 6 dogs in a 3600 sqft home with a yard, and 6 dogs in a 1000 sqft home with little or no yard. Maybe apply as per animal over 3 in a household to determine faintness of lifestyle and space for the animals.
- There should be no restriction on how many animals some can own. If you are interested in having more than 6 and can handle it then I think you should be allowed too
- 12 animals seems like an excessive amount.
- People should be able to do what they want



- Its a freedom of right. As long as the animals are well cared for in all ways it is not a govt choice for a household number of pets. Very opposed to this.
- You're limiting responsible pet owners, there are already laws on the books to fight animal abuse, noise, etc.
- Yes I agree with this law... but the early dog warning i do not kids need to learn to ask before not just look at a rag what if the dog doesn't have one... people need to take responsibility for their own actions.
- You can have two cats that have babies at the same time and then boom you have 12 cats until you can find homes for the babies
- That's too many. You want more, open a zoo.
- 6 is far too many.
- Too many animals in one house b annoying to neighbours.lower the limit to3
- Far too many pets for one home
- There should be stricter limits on numbers of animals in a home.
- Being able to own 12 total animals under one roof is bordering on animal cruelty.
- I adopted an overweight cat from a household with too many animals. It is difficult to properly care for that many animals at once.
- I know people with many more dogs and it's their choice how many they have. You wouldnt like someone telling you how many kids you can have. Why tell someone how many pets they can have?
- Limiting in this way is a blanket solution that restricts all pet owners, to penalize some.
- In my humble opinion, People who has more than 6 dogs/cats need to have their head check especially they live in an urban setting. It is not just them, think of what their poor neighbors have to put up with, we can't just cater to a few people with special needs. There are always people with special needs, but the interest of the majorities should be the overriding consideration.
- This is a blanket bylaw that is based on a house, not the type of owner. I live in an apartment style condo and my neighbour has 2 large dogs. She takes these dogs out for 4 walks a day and is a VERY good dog owner. Then there was another owner who had one small dog and let his dog poop on his balcony instead of taking the dog out for walks. I don't think animal limits should be dependent on a household.
- I'm not sure how else to respond other than this; why on earth would someone need Six dogs and Six Cats? It should be 2 and 2.
- To many for someone to look after. More noise, mess etc.
- Silly rule.
- You should be able to have as many animals as you can take care of. If your animals cause a disturbance or you are mistreating them that individual should be barred from owning more pets but don't take away the option for responsible pet owners
- Still too many animals in a house. If the person fosters or has some other reason to have that many pets, then they can apply for an exception



- If one needs a breeding right, they need to move their business to a business not within a city's neighborhood.
- 12 pets per household is nonsense. How about 4.
- The limit should be no more than 2 cats AND 2 dogs, then exceptions could apply.
- If the owner is responsible, let them be. Maybe someone has 7 dogs.
- 12 pets is bound to get smelly, noisy and unless you have a large income the pets' quality of life would suffer.
- If the owners are responsible, let them decide how many pets to have. If intervention is required, then impose limits.
- No, 6 dogs and/or 6 cats is far too many animals in a single household.
- There should be no limit on how many animals a person wants to take off the streets to love and give a safe home. If someone can't be a responsible owner, punish those owners. Not the entire society because a few people don't know how to be a good pet owner. We are all suffering for a few people's mistakes.
- Although I wouldn't ever want this many animals on my property, I do not believe the city should have the right to decide how many pets an individual can own and care for.
- Pet limit should be less than 6, and limit should be nullified if you're planning to have a bully breed.
- be
- Too many pets in the home, at some point it becomes detrimental to the animals.
- Understandably there are people who develop hoarding situations with animals, but there are also animal lovers and people who want to have 6+ cats or dogs. I think that number is too low for some people and I don't think it's fair to them to implement that.
- I do not agree with the amount of approved animals. 6 per household is incredibly high.
- You are wrong about the pitbulls. No reason to think you'd get this one right.
- You should not have a limit on the amount of pets you can have. As long as you have adequate space and they are not bothering anyone.
- 6 Dogs & 6 cats is excessive for any urban home.
- People can do what they want when they own the property.
- 12 animals in a house is far too many.
- That is WAY too many animals for a household. 3 dogs max, same for cats.
- You should be allowed to have as many pets as you want.
- These limits are way too high. Commercial and registered temporary homes/inherited animals or approved permits make sense as exceptions however.
- As long as you can apply for a permit to have more, I agree with the system in place.
- That is too many pets in one house.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is a ridiculous number of pets in a city house and yard. Maximum 2.
- The city shouldn't be making any more rules than it has to. All three of the reasons behind this proposed bylaw change have remedial measures under the existing bylaw. There is no need to restrict someone until something goes wrong.



- RESPONSIBLE pet owners should be permitted to have as many pets as they wish. All animals should be licensed. There should be licenses for the household rather than each individual animal
- Most households are not big enough to adequately care for 6 dogs and 6 cats. There is also a big difference between 6 large dogs in an apartment and a suburban house. Animal restrictions should be based on house / yard size.
- unless you are on an acreage 6 of each is too many 2 & 2 is enough
- That is too many animals to be healthy
- People should be able to own as many pets as they want and can take care of
- Na
- Other people have no business telling others what they can and can't do when it doesn't matter to them.
- I would support A pet limit of three (3) dogs AND three (3) cats per household. Special considerations taken for larger land owners
- I feel most are responsible and those that aren't need education and support.
- There's no need
- There's no need for 6 dogs and cats. I would support a limit of 6 total animals per household
- In a city I don't believe people should have more than three cats and three dogs, plus potential other animals, especially considering that some breeds have high energy and are already living in a restricted atmosphere, having six dogs and six cats and then also potentially having litters it could get out of hand very fast and be a danger to the animals.
- Six dogs and six cats are way too many for a household like come on how bad are we trying to set these people up I get you know two or three dogs maybe one or two cats but 6 + 6
- .
- I would support the by law if the limit was 4 dogs and 4 cats
- That limit is too high within the city limit.
- Having 2 cats and 2 dogs is more than enough, anything more will sacrifice the animal's wellbeing
- # of pets does not dictate level of care
- As long as all of the animals are cared for, I think a decent number would be to keep it under 12 per household
- Maximum two dogs per household.
- 6 is too many animals unless you live in the country.
- May encourage "backyard" breeders who do not have sufficient knowledge of breeding animals.
- If the animals best interest is taken into consideration and they can abide by the issues listed above I don't see why they should be limited?
- There should be no limit to the number of pets as long as they receive equal and adequate care
- Limits should only be in place if the number of animals in a home is causing problems. Many people are able to properly care for 3 + dogs and cats with no incidents.
- As long as the animals are healthy, feces are managed, I don't feel the City should be able to limit the amount of animals in a house.



- Existing bylaws for nuisance and feces should be adequate to curb large numbers. If someone has large numbers and are responsible, there is no issue. If there are issues, then other bylaws would be invoked and enforced.
- Dogs require daily exercise (at least twice a day; Germany has recently implemented a law requiring twice daily walks) and I don't believe a single person can safely walk more than one dog at a time therefore 6 dogs would require 12 walks a day.....plus the noise has the potential to be very disruptive in a neighborhood.
- As long as these issues are not a problem and the animals are well cared for, there should be no limit. For those that are causing a disturbance or not well-cared for fines should be higher.
- I don't believe that people should be allowed to have too many pets. Especially too many cats, and people who allow their homes to smell like cat urine- should be fined and have the pets taken away if they can't keep the kitty litter clean. Toxoplasmosis is real! And some people have half a dozen + pets in some places and all you can smell is animals. Homes like that should have the pets taken away, and owners should be put on a watch list!!
- Many people have more than 2 pets, and take care of them fine. This is an overreach.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of, I don't think it's the government's responsibility to limit the amount of pets in a household.
- My concern is animal cruelty and hoarding I do not believe number of pet restriction solves the problem. Stronger fines and jail time is needed to deal with these offences.
- I believe that a person potentially owning 6 dogs and 6 cats is unreasonable. In most situations owners would be unable to effectively provide for all the animals mental, emotional and physical needs, let alone the financial costs associated with proper pet ownership.
- I believe if the owner is responsible, and has the lifestyle and income to be able to properly provide for all the animals, there should be no limit of animals that are allowed to open their home to and love.
- there have very very little issue with people having multiple pets, regardless of how many. Hoarding is not an issue. Puppy mills need to be shut down. We have multiple dogs, and we foster etc so we help take strain off the shelters and help to rehabilitate the dogs in a safe stress free environment. If you limit the amount we can have, many like us would be unable to foster. We are also quite active in dog sports, so we have retired, competing and future competitors making the limit of 6 not fair to us that can take care of more than 6
- Many have lots of animals but are responsible
- 6 dogs and 6 cats are too many for a basic house in Calgary. This number would only be acceptable on a farm or larger home. Having 12 animals would mean the animals receiving less quality care.
- Who can properly look after than many pets in one location both financial and emotionally. The noise associated for neighbors.
- Pet owners should be allowed to own as many pets as they please
- 2 dogs or cats is plenty, I sure would not want to live next door to 6 dogs and all the associated noise and smell, especially right after the snow melts



- Do better at enforcement and expectations of proper behaviour; this doesn't always mean fines, it can mean seizure of pets or something else. Fines have clearly not been enough of a deterrent or we wouldn't be discussing raising them.
- 6 is a lot of animals. Rockyview county only allows 3 dogs and that's on acreages, not a small city lot. There is no need for more than 4 cats either without approval (with the exceptions above).
- 6 seems excessive. It should be based on a household to household basis. Is: square footage, yard space, income. Case by case basis
- Dogs yes, cats no. There are responsible cat owners out there with more than 6 cats
- For someone who has a large house and yard within the city, having 3 dogs and 3 cats does not have the same effect as someone who has the same number in a small house with no yard. Furthermore, the difference in training, animal temperament and ownership duties such as picking up poop etc. changes with each owner/animal. I think it is unjust to set a low restriction like this just because of a few bad apples.
- I don't think anyone should have a limit on animals just like you wouldn't put a limit on how many kids one has. All that matters is that a person takes care of them.
- I think there are plenty of areas and homes in Calgary and surrounding area (acreages, shops, farms) where more than 6 animals would be considered normal (shop cats) for mousing. Would they need to go into the city to be approved for an Excess Animal Permit? This legislation seems unnecessary in a lot of cases.
- 6 is too many!!!!
- As long as noise and fecal matter are controlled...as per by law....there is zero reason to limit the number of animals. Well, maybe party animals. Breeders should be licensed and monitored. As should in home businesses that involve animals. Dog walkers should be paying a high fee. Other businesses buy/ lease buildings and land...not using what the tax payers pay for..red...lol
- 12 animals in one household is FAR too many for one family, regardless of the number of residents living at the property.
- 12 animals in one house is too many
- That is too many dogs or cats per household. Limit should be 3
- This is wrong
- I think the only time owning many animals could be an issue is with hoarding, which a bylaw isn't going to fix so this would be useless.
- Maximum of 6 total combined cats and dogs within one household, not including lizards, fish, guinea pigs, etc. Exceptions allowed for inherited animals.
- If issues arise, the animals can be removed. You would be limiting responsible pet owners rather than removing the animals from the unsafe ones. Focus on the latter issue.
- As long as there are no complaints, I don't think we need to limit what people can have on the personal property. Thanks
- Limiting the number of pets a household is allowed will only cause shelters to become even more over crowded and cause more animals to be on the streets.



- You're basically saying they can have 12 animals if it is 6 dogs and 6 cats. Just say 12 animals that can be a combination of cats and dogs
- Unnecessary
- There may be cases of abuse, but that is not every case for every household. Creating a limit for those who are caring for their pets and doing what they need to is wrong. Fine the people who are not caring for their animals and then take them away.
- Too many animals! Less than 6/6.... maybe 2/2
- That's too many animals in one household
- 6 and 6!? Not in a city.
- Not necessary.
- Personal opinion, six of each is unnecessary (especially considering the exceptions list appears pretty forgiving). Personally I would prefer that limit down to four of each (two if I'm being honest but I understand some people like having their pack).
- I don't agree because a lot of foster owners for pets have more than 6 animals on their property which include their own pets and the foster animals. And also some breeders could end up have 6+ puppies born per litter.
- I am on board for everything but this would be a slippery slope for puppy mills not breeders... I believe wording should include that the breeder is licensed and can provide proof that they are a reputable breeder with standing.
- 6 animals is way too many in one house.
- No one has any right to dictate what's in a home! We should not have to pay more to license our pets or be told what and how many pets we have! Dogs and cats are family members!!
- It's nobody's business how many pets someone has in their house if they are well cared for and not causing problems. Obviously a hoarder situation would be different.
- Unless you live on a farm, then in the city pets should not exceed 2
- Why are we placing an arbitrary number instead of looking at how the owner is and the welfare of the animals? Useless update.
- 6 dogs in one house is way too many. It should be limited to 3.
- Freedom of choice
- 12 animals (6 dogs AND 6 cats) is excessive for one household within city limits. This number should be lowered to max of 8 (4 cats AND 4 dogs or a mix of whatever but 8 is a big number and should be the max)
- Living in the city, there is no need to keep 12 animals in a house. This may allow hoarding situations to fly under the radar, encourage backyard breeding programs and will likely result in lower quality of life for the animals
- This would mean someone could have 12 animals in their home. Even six owned cats or dogs is verging on animal hoarding and is not good for the animals well being. Especially if the law isn't dependent on the size of the home the animals are living in.
- want as long as they are taking good care of them



- I honestly believe I should be allowed as many pets as I so choose, I bought this house I pay my taxes I'm sick of rules for the sake of rules, be responsible give people education, if someone is hoarding animals in an abusive way then deal with it. If I want 7 cats, you shouldn't be allowed to tell me I can't have them, grow up [removed]
- Unless those are very large houses and yards 6 is too many.
- If a pet owner wants more than 6 pets and they are responsible and caring then they have every right to more pets. Why should they have to get a special application in order to do so?
- 12 animals per house in the city? That's a joke. If you cleaned litter box and yard waste, you'd be nearly 8 pounds of fecal matter stinking up waste bins and neighbourhoods.
- Who needs more than two cats or dogs??
- Too much of a process. Punishing responsible owners.
- I have more than 6 cats and there is no issue.
- If the owner can responsibly care for those animals, just let them have them. If issues arise then action should be taken against that owner but not before.
- This is too many a woman's for someone to take care of. How would that many dogs get out for walks and socializing.
- As long as people are taking care of their pets I don't think there should be a limit
- Not applicable to everyone.
- If the animals are well cared for and not in danger, and the property is kept clean, there is no reason to limit how many pets can be in a household. There are many circumstances that could lead to going over an arbitrary number of animals in a household.
- This would potentially allow people who hoard animals legal rights to possessing more animals, putting this animals at risk of abuse/neglect/health concerns for them and the people.
- I think in very tight knit neighborhoods that 6 as a limit is fine, maybe inner city. But as you move out to more spacious properties, it makes sense that more pets can be on a property at one time. Maybe rings of valence starting at the inner city leading outwards to define how many pets you can have?
- My animals are my children. If my government were to tell me I can only have a certain amount would that be okay? I grew up in a family of 9. Im sure we cause more noise then our 3 dogs and 4 cats at the time
- The number of animals shouldnt matter. The care and treatment of the animals is what matters. Who cares if someone has 10 cats if they are taking care of them?
- As long as the individual is responsible and hygienic they should have as any animals as they'd like.
- i think if people are caring for 50 animals properly and they are all healthy and granted the correct space and atmosphere for what they need to be healthy and happy a person should be able to do so at their own discession. if these animals are being neglected because there are too many than that is an issue.
- 12 animals in a small house?? That's insane.
- Would support a max of 3 dogs AND 3 cats
- Lower the amount of animals
- 6 dogs and cats are too many to properly handle



- Not unless measure to protect the welfare of the animal are put in place.
- 12 animals in a household in the city is way too many - there will naturally be more noise and it's not fair to the animals.
- 6+6 is too high, particularly if you will allow for special applications for certain scenarios. Suggest 8 animals total, no more than 5 or 6 of any one kind.
- Should be based on if issues arise and dealt with on case Eby case basis
- I think 6 animals is too many under most circumstances, I would like to see no more than 3.
- I feel that six dogs AND six cats is excessive. Maybe six animals combined would be sufficient.
- I agree with the current bylaw
- T
- People can have as many or as little pets as they damn well want too.
-
- I think the problems that arise from too many pets (excessive noise, feces, etc) are address with existing bylaws.
- Multiple pet homes can often be mitigated by the use of bylaws that are currently in place, ie, excessive noise, cats at large, dedication. It is not the role of governments to dictate what happens inside my home.
- if a family has the space, ability, and money to manage more animals, I don't see why they can't own as many as they can take GOOD care of.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats. No!!! Are you out of your mind? 6 dogs is a kennel. Go ahead and try living next to this kennel. limit of 2 and 2.
- Too many bylaws and regulations now.
- People should have the opportunity to have this many animals but they should have to show after a certain limit that they have the means to care for them properly(food and vet care). Animals are a luxury not a right to own and need the proper care
- I feel that is too many animals in one household.
- Too many animals. 6 pets in household max
- Private property you can have as many animals you want as long as they do not disturb
- People should be free to own as many pets as they want if they are responsible and do not engage in any type of abuse
- It doesn't matter how many you own. What matters is that your animal is taken care of properly. Does not live in unsanitary conditions and has lots of food/water.
- Dog fighting and puppy mills should be banned - perhaps that's where more effort and funding should be going instead of punishing law abiding citizens who pay for their dog license(s). More restrictive laws and fewer people buy licenses. There are already laws against hoarding animals. Pass this law and the animal haters are one step closer to banning dogs altogether. Most of the multi dog owners I know have rescued dogs at high kill shelters or older dogs that no one wants and take good care of the animals. What gives you the right to tell them they can't have 7 dogs.
- There are many great homes that own multiple pets!



- It depends on the household. A normal sized apartment couldn't possibly have this many, but there are many houses that could. There can't be a blanket number, maybe a certain number per square footage instead.
- It's interesting that you only ask for respondents to justify a "No" answer to this question. So, why do those who answer "Yes" not have to also justify their position? I am firmly in the camp that there is no reason for any normal member of the public to own more than 2 dogs and 2 cats. There are too many examples from around the world and Canada where animal abusers own large numbers of "pets" which simply magnifies the suffering and abuse they inflict to even more animals.
- If people are responsible, having 7 small dogs isn't necessarily inappropriate or worth city resources to inspect. However, there is no doubt more risk. I lived in a city once that had a restriction to 2 dogs. Well I had two and then I met my Husband who had 1. It was very uncomfortable to feel that moving in together means breaking bylaw. We sure weren't giving up a dog. The 3 together were fine and then we moved back to Calgary. Since then I have not appreciated any form of ownership restrictions.
- No one needs 12 animals in their home. This will lead to hoarding and improper care of animals.
- perhaps dog limit but no cat limit
- none of your business how many animals i have
- This is a large number of pets to have in a house hold. I agree with the exceptions to the rules however, the space and time required to probably care for and clean up after and for that many animals is a full time job and requires much more space.
- Too many pets in one house!
- City should just deal with individual problems.
- 6 of each seems high. 6 total would be appropriate.
- I have 6 animals now, it's because I dont have kids. You can tell me how many I am allowed to own when I take cre of them better then myself
- I think the amount of pets you are allowed should be based on how much yard and living space you have
- an average residential home does not provide adequate space for good living conditions for that many pets
- As long as there are no complaints there's no need to restrict the number of pets per household. If a household is repeatedly complained about there could be cause for a restriction but that would likely be difficult to enforce.
- 12 animals is still way too many
- I think we have limits for a reason. People tend to take those limits too far and have more animals then they can support or care for. We have a neighbor who definitely is in that situation and his dogs just sit in the window and bark all day because they are never stimulated or taken for walks. I think if you want more than the limit a permit and permission should be obtained and you should need to prove you can support and take care of more than the limit



- I think there may be some pet owners who can have multiple animals although I dated someone who could not properly care for them and had over 10 cats. There should be a limit only if neglect is not enforced in bylaw.
- I feel 6 is too high. 4 might be acceptable.
- As long as the pets have a good home why limit the owner? The number of dogs doesn't automatically mean the nuisance level; it's the individual pets/owners behaviour. Putting too many restrictions will increase the number of abandoned pets.
- Case by case
- Many people in the dogsport community may have more dogs than the limit but all dogs are well trained, taken care of and owners are responsible.
- some people have the time to take care of more. seems like too much governance here as a negligent owner is a negligent owner.
- I believe that number is too high, and opens the door for puppy mills or poor treatment of animals.
- If the owner is financially able to take care of 6 animals. Who is to say if they can or can't have it? If everything's paid and taken care of I see no issues.
- If all the animals are well cared for and healthy there is no need to limit the number in a home
- 6 seems high, I think 5 is high enough
- The only way I would support this change is if there were guaranteed methods to obtain a kennel license for example, ie for a breeder, without being put through excessive hassle and arbitrary decision making
- Too many, should be lower
- I think that is way too many animals for the average person to adequately care for properly
- There is not enough room in a house or yard for more dogs or cats! A lot of people are not responsible to have 1 cat or dog! People in our neighborhood allow their cats to roam all over and they come and urinate and defecate in my flower beds or urinate on my doors. They are not responsible enough to have more than 1 animal!
- No one needs 6 animals in an urban setting. I do support the exceptions, however.
- This is too many pets to safely keep at one location
- As long as a person is taking good care of the animals, it shouldn't matter. Anyone who would report more than 6 dogs could just as easily report poor conditions of any number of dogs.
- Again, train the dog properly.
- to put 12 pets in a small dwelling. Increased risk for incidents.
- It's not fair to animals
- That's an excessive amount of pets for any home. I believe a maximum of 2-4 is ideal
- If the owners are responsible and the pets are well cared for as well as not causing a disturbance to the community then there should be no limit. The only change that should happen is that if there are a large number of animals on a property and their needs are not being met, those animals should be removed immediately
- 6 is way too high



- 6 seems like a lot for the city with someone whom has limited property size. 3 or 4 would be more reasonable
- I feel like it's too many animals under one roof.
- If someone wants to own more than this limit, I don't think it should be there
- It doesn't matter how many you have. It matters how they are looked after
- I should be able to have as many animals as I want
- If I am taking care of my animals and they are not seriously disrupting the lives of my neighbours, then there is no problem with owning more than 6 dogs and/or cats. This bylaw would only place more restrictions and paperwork for pet owners and supports those individuals who dislike animals.
- 6 animals is WAY too many
- Responsible pet owners can manage the number they choose. Bad pet owners could be fined with only 2 animals. It's about quality of care, not number of animals
- I support a limit but those numbers are too high. I believe a maximum total of 4 animals in any one home is workable: 2 dogs AND 2 cats should be the maximum. Even that number of animals in one home is high density. There are 4plexes in my neighbourhood. What if all 4 homes could have 6 animals? That would be unworkable. The density for people in Calgary is increasing and lots are smaller. The demand on parks right now is the highest we have ever witnessed in this city and we all have to share the space.
- Confirm that this would apply to only cats and dogs not other types of pets
- Is there currently a limit set? If not, then yes, I would support this. Ideally though, 2 is enough per household.
- Imposing a maximum penalizes all owners, not just problem owners
- Very situational
- IF a household is capable of providing a high standard of living for the animals and does not cause problems for the neighborhood let them have their family. If they cannot maintain the home then the current bylaws should be enough.
- Not fair
- Limits to two of each with exceptions for puppies and fosters and special circumstances only.
- You should not limit the animals on the property. You need to do your job and as long as they are being properly cared for, mind your business. 50 dogs receiving great care should not be your concern. One dog in danger and not receiving appropriate care should be your concern. Neglect is the issue not the numbers of animals. Get it right please.
- 6 dogs is excessive, you cannot properly care for them & ensure non nuisance. I think could increase to three but 6 is ridiculous
- Nobody should decide how many pets are "necessary" so long as they are all well cared for and not a nuisance.
- 12 dogs and cats in one household is ridiculous. There is no way that a single family house is sufficiently large for that number of animals and that you are not seriously impacting your neighbours with that number. Should be no higher than 3 of one OR the other



- 6 dogs and 6 cats are WAY MORE than any household should have. If you want to have a farm, go live out in the country! I think a MAX of 4 animals per household.
- 12 animals in one house is too much!
- No limits. Let people live. Responsible people deserve it. The few reckless will pay for their tardiness of care for their animals.
- That's too many animals in the city. City lots are too small.
- The people who own that many animals typically don't take care of them all very well. I think 2 dogs and 2 cats per household would be sufficient for any family.
- I think these proposed limits are way too high. I believe a maximum of 2 cats and dogs would be more appropriate.
- Each dog is different, typically I find single dog households that bark way more than households with multiple dogs.
- I know people with multiple large breed dogs who are quite and clean, and I also know people with two small dogs that are allowed to be yappy, snappy and undisciplined. I have seen a person with one dog, with a feces filled yard. It comes down to conscientious pet owners, not volume of pets
- Move to a farm if you need this many pets
- Are you kidding me? How does this reflect on 'peaceful enjoyment of others homes?' Where does this come from? A home should have a restriction of no more than 2 dogs or cats per household. So are you saying that in an apartment I could have 6 dogs and cats - no the City is nuts.
- no limits
- More than two pets is excessive other than if your pet has just had a litter and you intend to rehome them.
- I believe that as long as the animals are being taken care of as well as the property is kept in good condition that you should be able to have as many animals as you want. As long as they stay on your property and are not causing problems.
- Six dogs - why? That's a lot of animals to care for physically and financially. They can start to act like a pack. Noise would be a concern. Six cats that are indoors only - not so much a concern, however, in an apt that could result in an odour issue.
- I don't think anyone should have a limit on pets
- The limit should be two. Noise. Feces.
- A pet limit is an unnecessary piece of legislation, most residents do not keep more than 6 dogs or cats regardless. This also should reflect the size of the property of the owner.
- Im
- That's excessive - 6 pets!! 2 is enough - for the sake of the pets. 6 dogs will NEVER be walked by the average owner, who will have the will or the inclination or the time?? Would lead to poor quality of life for these dogs
- 12 animals in one home is unreasonable. 6 total even seems a bit much.
- Depending on the home, income, size of property and distance to neighbouring properties these guidelines do not reflect the individualistic nature of the issue being outlined.



- 4 dogs and 4 cats should be the limit. The exception being licensed breeders who have dogs/cats under 6 months only, foster homes
- There should be a limit to how many animals one can have in a home, but saying two maximum is a stretch. One can easily take care of 3 cats.
- A person can have 10 dogs. If they clean up and you can't tell how many dogs they have why punish them ?
- I do support but would like the exceptions to be clearly explained. Foster homes and care are extremely valuable to caring for animals.
- Limit if 6 cats and 6 dogs is ridiculously high and borderline hoarding. I would support a bylaw if half that.
- I think 12 animals in a NORMAL household situation is extreme! Thats a lot of pets and a lot of poop. I dont think any animal can properly get the attn it needs when there are THAT many pets
- How would this be enforced?
- I have had 7 dogs in the past mostly rescues and they were all cared for properly. As long as you can care for and clean up after it should be no ones business how many animals you can love and care for
- It is not healthy to have that many animals in a home.
- It's a case by case basis, you can't make this a hard rule.
- Unless there is enough room for these 6 pets to be comfortable without any kind of restriction to the animals well being, I would have to say no.
- There should be no limit to what someone wants in a house that THEY own. it is THEIR property.
- I think the rules are great, but a lot of the hoarders or people who stole dogs classified themselves as dog sitters. You'd want to be careful on definitions so you don't allow that to happen
- A person should be able to have as many pets as they can provide for properly.
- Why are you looking to restrict people's rights and freedoms. If the owner is responsible and able to properly care for the animals then that's all that should matter.
- 6 in a household is quite a lot
- Breeders should not require city permission or have to sell their animals before 6 months old
- If all the animals are cared for, why does it matter how many animals a person has?
- No one needs that many dogs or cats
- I don't agree with a limit.
- The current rules are appropriate.
- It is not a good bylaw
- If a responsible pet parent wants more animals why restrict that?
- I believe 6 dogs I to many for one household in Calgary I think four is a reasonable number. Cat I would say 5
- A person should have as many pets as they want as long as all animals are being cared for adequately.



- There should not be a limit on the amount of pets but instead increased support in hoarding situations, subsidized spay/neuter surgery and increase in education resources.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats? Who the hell needs that many animals and why? I'd think that a limit of 4 in total animal would be more than sufficient. Of someone needs that many animals then it's time for them to move to an acreage or farm.
- I don't care how many pets my neighbours have. Let people do what they want. The other nuisance rules already cover this if their pets are being a nuisance.
- Some people need more than 2 or 3 support animals and this bylaw may prevent them from getting the help they need
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is ridiculous. Nobody should have that many animals.
- I agree to the list of changes and exceptions, but having 6 of both cats and dogs is excessive for a regular household. I believe the maximum should be 3 each.
- 6 pets is too many
- I don't feel that the people who might need this bylaw would follow this rule.
- You shouldn't be limited on the number of dogs and cats you own IF they are living in good conditions and are being taken care of properly.
- 12 pets is too much. 4 seems reasonable.
- While I agree with the potential exceptions to this rule, I feel that having to go through the process of getting approval for these exceptions etc. would cause challenges for those attempting to help animal welfare. As someone who volunteers with animal shelters, it is already hard enough finding foster homes for pets. Less people willing to foster means less room in the shelters and more animals on the streets. This could create more problems than it solves.
- The city shouldn't have a say on how many animals I should have in MY OWN HOUSE
- No
- No limits
- No limits
- Quality of life should be the key factor in assessing the number of animals in a home. A large, clean, house/yard with a responsible and financially secure pet owner can take care of more than this number of animals, while some people can't even care for a single cat properly.
- It's just not a big enough issue to need to make this change
- As long as they care for and license the animals then no harm done
- The exceptions are wonderful, but the amount of 6 cats and 6 dogs I think is high. Maybe a lower amount such as 3 and 3 would be something better. This way the animals are taken cared of, the property can be cared for and inside their home is kept up for both the humans and pets.
- The limit should be no more than 4 total animals. 6 of each is too great a number.
- As long as a owner can handle and control the companions, they should be able to have as many dogs/cats as they want. How is a breeder supposed to abide by this?
- This is [removed] don't make a by law because of a stereo type that people have created dogs and cats just need to be loved and trained properly but not by abuse
- Way to many, at least half. This will be abused, and to many issues arise with this.



- 6 is too many
- Keep it the same pets are like people id be sad if you ever had ro take a pet away
- the pet limit should be 2, anything larger denotes a breeding operation.
- Yes in special circumstances. Large yard, properly taken care of ect.
- Because I dont support the change
- No one needs this many animals in one home. That seems cruel to the animals.
- Noisy
- that's too many.
- As long as the animals are under controll and being taken care of appropriately then their is no problem. If the animals are out of control or living in sub standsrd conditions then their is a problem.
- I support all but inherited. Anyone can say they inherited an animal then
- I kind of support it.. but the way you have listed a person can have 12 animals.. (6 cats AND 6 dogs). Just make it.. 6 of any kind of companion animal.
- People should be able to own as many animals as they want as long as they take care of them
- 4 dogs and 4 cats per household
- All above however I do not support breeders
- If you have that many pets you require proof the property is large enough to sustain them.
- 12 animals in a home is excessive.
- 6 of both cats and dogs is very high. 6 cats and 4 dogs.
- There is no need to add legeslationwhere none needs to exist. Most poeple don't have more then two cats and two dogs... buyt for those who do and are responsible pet owners, there is no need to make life harder then it already is.
- Number of animals does not mean better care or less nuisance. I have neighbours with dogs that bark all night sometimes. 2 dogs in the household. This doesn't mean that having a limit would change that. It is my experience being in the animal industry that (for the most part) people with multiple animals... 6 or more, take better care of those creatures than others with fewer animals
- This question doesn't explain what the change to the bylaw is as it doesn't state the existing bylaw.
- If the animals are being cared for and are licensed that's all the matters to me.
- Some places are too small for that many and bigger places could hold more. I think it is dependent on space and ability to provide a happy functional home for the animal.
- houses can not safely house 12 pets of varying sizes. This is excessive
- Other: As long as animals are behaved you shouldn't limit how many a person can own.
- Other: As long as people are caring for their animals safely and appropriately the city shouldn't be able to regulate the amount of animals someone has in their home.
- Other: This is just an animal and the people who are taking it should be investigated more if the animal attacks or does something wrong because a dog isn't born mean it's the environment it was raised in.
- Other: I believe three animals would be manageable but more than that is getting to be too much.



- Other: I am not strongly opposed to this but it would be a hellhole owning 12 pets at once. There would potentially be a lot of noise complaints which will be even more work for you guys
- Other: Six dogs is excessive for an urban or suburban residential property, excluding a licensed breeding pair and a single litter of puppies. Six cats is enough for any home,
- Other: I feel the number could be slightly higher
- Other: 12 animals in a household, apartment, small condo, townhouse,,,,,plus the people that live in the house, no..1 cat/1 dog or 2 cats/2 dogs that is enough,
- Other: No limit as long as pets and property are being maintained. Potential for people to not license pets to hide going over limit.
- Other: Dogs company are the best, no need to limit it
- Other: 6 dogs or 6 cats would be excessive
- Other: No one needs to hoard animals
- Other: 12 animal on a single property? That's too many unless you are a responsible breeder or shelter. To many for the average person. 3-4 dogs and 3-4 cats would be he max I puke consider acceptable.
- Other: Enforcement problems
- Other: Some people help to rescue animals in need and may temporarily need to house more animals
- Other: I do not believe any household needs 12 animals. I think a cap of 6 total pets regardless of dog/cat
- Other: No one needs that many animals in one household.
- Other: Too many animals for a home in a large city; 5 total animals seems high, but reasonable.
- Other: People should be allowed whatever pets they want on their property
- Other: 6 is way too many. Even in the country you have a limit, usually four. If you are breeding and have a litter of puppies that should need a different license, otherwise 3 is enough.
- Other: Allowing 12 animals in a household is asking for issues. Many cannot follow the current bylaws so why make it easier to obtain more animals in a home.
- Other: If I own my home, take excellent care of my pets then I should not be punished for those who do not hold the same standard. I licence, have insurance, regular vet visits, ensure a clean home and I will not live in a city that mandates my number of pets. We don't restrict people from having babies - it's the same thing!
- Other: All pitbulls should n9t be put in the same category as a white person should be with to Ted bu dy. Calgary you are a [removed]. I hate you now
- Other: Still too many animals. Unless it falls under the exceptions, the number should be a total of 6 (not 12) animals.
- Other: would not support and shouldn't even be on the table to try and enforce this.
- Other: I think 6 dogs & 6 cats per household is too many.
- Other: If you are not fostering or inherited animals above the current limit of 2, I feel a limit of 6 is excessive and could question the quality of life provided for the animals.



- Other: Dog hoarders such as dog walker [personal information removed] should have their dogs removed. 10 plus dogs in the city is wrong. But someone having more than 2 is not an issue.
- Other: No need for excess pets, 1 or 2 is fine
- Other: A dog is a dog. A pit bull is no more threatening than a German shepherd. I don't see any police force having a pit bull or like breed on their force. Please explain that!
- Other: As long as the animals are cared for in a organized manner I don't see the need to restrict the number of animals per household
- Other: Owners need to be accountable. Educated and fined.
- Other: I think alot of people are adopting older dogs to give them a better life (vs a shelter). And therfor I will support more dogs in these types of cases (older and adopted dogs)
- Other: Before I could support this, I would need to know more about the Approved Excess Animal Permit requirements and the approval process.
- Other: No one needs more than 4 animals
- Other: The maximum number of dogs and cats total per household should be four, and should depend on square footage of the household space.
- Other: Please limit to 3 dogs and 3 cats per household
- Other: Number of animals per household should be based on a number of factors rather than one number across the board. The living conditions (both physical & emotional) for 6 animals in a 2000 sq ft home on an acreage would potentially be completely different than 6 animals in a 1000 sq ft condo with no yard.
- Other: The current by law works if its enforced
- Other: We should not be able to limit the amount of animals within a house-hold (with the understanding that all animals are being treated properly and are well maintained).
- Other: 6 is too many. 2 or 3 is more reasonable.
- Other: The number of dogs per house should be determined by the square footage of where these animals will be living. All pets should always be licensed.
- Other: The yards in Calgary aren't nig enough for 6 dogs.
- Other: Depends on the location - someone who lives on a farm should be able to have more animals than someone who lives in a downtown residential neighbourhood
- Other: Just leave them the way they are.
- Other: People should be free to have as many animals as they want and can afford
- Other: That many animals can lead to animal abuse and not being taken care of
- Other: Because the amount of pets one has should not matter
- Other: As long as the pets are taken care of, leave people alone.
- Other: 6 dogs/cats is too many for majority of people. 4 at most
- Other: 6 dogs does not make sense unless it is a kennel. If you put these changes in people will just say they are inherited or grand fathered in.
- Other: 12 animals on one property is way too many. 2 dogs and 2 cats is a completely acceptable number.



- Other: A limit does not change a persons ability to be a responsible pet owner. I deal with hundreds of people with a single pet, who can't/don't take proper care of that animal. I know many many people with many many animals, and each and every one is impeccably cared for. The focus should not be on numbers, but having more indepth, stricter guidelines and protocols on what is required of a pet owner. If a person can provide proper care for 25 animals, that is their prerogative. Owning an animal needs to stop being a social right, and become a privilege that people need to earn. If you can't prove you have the ability to care for any number of animals, you don't get the privilege of keeping one (or more)
- Other: Maximum 2 pets per household is enough.
- Other: Too many
- Other: 6 dogs or cats would be better. 12 total seems excessive
- Other: Need more checks on people with more animals
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats is too high
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats? Good. Lord. 6 total would be more than enough. If they are acting as a rescue foster home, that is different. Yes, people will try to scam the system but that is legitimate.
- Other: It depends on the houshold
- Other: 6 is too many
- Other: If they are well taken care of, people should be able to have as many as they want.
- [removed]
- [removed]
- Other: I feel that the number of animals allowed in one household should be dependant on the size of the dwelling. What is reasonable for 300 square foot property would not be the same for a 2000 square foot property.
- Other: This is a step on a slippery slope towards not being allowed to have pets at all.
- Other: That's to many animals in one household
- Other: Private property is private. So long as the animals are healthy, no one else's opinion should matter.
- Other: Right now our neighbours have 12 dogs and 6 cats and they don't clean the feces. We can't sit in our backyard anymore due to the smell
- Other: You can't and would not put a limit on the amount of pets a family or owner decides to have, it's like putting a limit of how much children a family can have.
- Other: People are barely taking care of pets now. Why allow them to have more.
- Other: It's too many. Two of each should be the limit.
- Other: There would be too much noise allowing up to 12 animals on a home. That is excessive.
- Other: 6 each is much too high. Perhaps 2 dogs and 3 cats max. I agree with the exemptions listed above.
- Other: The city doesn't need to decide how many pets someone can take care of.
- Other: No one family needs to have more than 2 dogs and cats, the noise levels, chaos, feces, and smells just can not be contained. Please DO NOT increase any limits. Already, people have a hard



time controlling, training, and picking up poo for one animal, let alone 6. So many times on paths and sidewalks, the animals that the lane and humans are, even with stroller, are forced to the road and or grass...this is with only 1, 6 is ridiculous.

- Other: That is way too many pets per one household and I would be worried about the welfare of the animals.
- Other: There is no reason any house needs 12 animals in it. That is absurd
- Other: t nbr of animals
- Other: Treat as a nuisance, disturbance or health issue if it arises
- Other: Na
- Other: I think 4 dogs and 4 cats are more than enough for any household...
- Other: No limit
- Other: Sounds a little excessive. 4 seems more reasonable
- Other: I believe there should be no limit on the amount of cats and dogs one should have. Also this law supports breeder who are contributing to the overpopulation of these species, which defeats the whole purpose of managing the population. If the population was managed more than rescues wouldn't be so overwhelmed which animals. As long as the owners are responsible in having the amount of animals one wishes then there shouldn't be issues
- Other: Most people don't have the means to support that many animals and should not be given the opportunity to potentially neglect animals
- Other: Let people take care of their animals without government intervention. Is this the most important issue in a time such as this?
- Other: WHAT THE FRICK WOULD YOU NEED 12 ANIMALS FOR? No I don't support this. It should be lower. 2 dogs and 2 cats are plenty!
- Other: Some people take on animals that need an emergency home because their living situation is not safe and they need to live with them for awhile.
- Other: I support everything except the limit. Within city limits 6cat and 6 dogs I consider "overcrowding". I'd expect a lower limit 2-3 at most
- Other: I agree, I don't think anyone needs more than 2-3 dogs/cats in total. Having 12 animals is ridiculous in my mind; you can't possibly be taking adequate care of all of them and it requires a lot of money to maintain them.
- Other: We should limit the number of animals in a household to max 2
- Other: If a multiple animals household has never been a problem why should they punished for those that cannot be proper responsible animal owner
- Other: License requirement is not necessary
- Other: Responsible people can handle multiple animals.
- Other: Keep the limit lower
- Other: no one needs that many pets in their home. Considering how many pets get dropped off at the shelter we should not be encouraging higher numbers in households where animals are potentially re-homed or abandoned.



- Other: I am not agreeing to this on the possibility of an exception for puppies/kittens rather than an express certainty. If you want to allow chickens or pigeons you have no grounds for this.
- Other: This allows for 12 animals in an urban setting before a neighbour can even make a complaint. This is a recipe for animal hoarding and a living nightmare for neighbours. If there are some individuals who need to possess more than 2 dogs or cats the bylaw could allow an application process for an exemption. This should require agreement of neighbours as well as proving that the applicant has the financial means to both feed and provide veterinary care for the requested number of animals.
- Other: No
- Other: 4 per household is more reasonable than 6
- Other: 6 pets per house is a ridiculously large number. The number can be amended to 3 per house.
- Other: It should be lower. There is no reason to have 6 of any animal.
- Other: The total amount does not seem reasonable for a household as it's too many
- Other: While I think a limit is necessary, I also think the limit should be based on square footage of the home. A large enough space is healthier for the pet. Having a limit is necessary as someone should not hoard pets since the environment of the household will not be sanitary for both pets and human. Also, if the pet isn't going outside, for example house cats or even tiny dogs, I don't think they need to be licensed as they're remaining on private property and not roaming public grounds.
- Other: Who in their right mind can care for 6 dogs at the same time? Let alone 6 dogs AND 6 cats!
- Other: Why do you need to control this? If the animals are taken care of and there are no issues, I see no reason for a restriction
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats in a residential home is far too many
- Other: I think it is inhumane and irresponsible if people want to have more than 2 dogs or cats in their houses.
- Other: 12 animals in one house!? That seems excessive
- Other: A typical owner does not need 6 cats and 6 dogs and likely cannot properly care for this many animals within city limits. The limit should be lower for typical owners.
- Other: 6 and 6 for a in city setting is astronomical. If you have that many pets move to an acreage for them to enjoy their life. 4/4 would be better
- Other: Who wants to live next to that many animals. It will really impact the neighbours. Way too many animals on one property.
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is insane. 2 dogs and 2 cats, or any combination up to a total of 4 animals should be the maximum acceptable limit. Unless the city is attempting to legalize puppy and kitten mills. Is that the goal?
- Other: Being a veterinary technician, I find majority of homes with average 2 dogs and 1 cat cannot afford appropriate vet care, including dentistry and appropriate food. I personally have 4 cats- all insured, however do not believe the average household can provide financially, or the appropriate mental stimulation for the animals. I would suggest an option of an additional "licenses can be purchased upon approval from bylaw after house evaluation.



- Other: No to an extent. The idea I like however I don't see an issue... let's say someone has 12 dogs and 30 cats and there are no complaints for noise, the owner takes proper care and can maintain the animals, what's the issue?
- Other: No limit
- Other: Doesn't help with keeping nose and feces accumulated on the property in check.
- Other: It seems all concerns would be better taken care of via animal welfare regulations. 6 large dogs + 6 cats in a small apartment would be excessive, while a larger number could be handled in a larger foster home setting. Keep it situational, no need for a numeric limit.
- Other: Pet limit of 6 dog AND 6 cats is quite high
- Other: We don't need more government interference
- Other: That's too many if each animal in a household
- Other: That is excessive unless you are fostering or a whelping home. 2 dogs and 2 cats is plenty. With an exception that babies can stay up to 5 months.
- Other: I think that's way too many animals in a household, there could be special exceptions for breeders
- Other: I believe that if you can honestly provide a safe loving environment for more than 6 then you should be allowed to. But I don't believe trusting someone's word is good enough for that.
- Other: I think the limit is too high for a city. I am ok with a higher limit (but still a limit) to dog/cats under 6 months and fosters. I don't understand why a day care would be included on this list. Or service animals? why would a person need that many service animals?
- Other: Way too many pets to person ratio. All off-leash parks should be a 1/1 ratio or you simply are not able to watch for feces/behaviour safely and appropriately.
- Other: Allowing a maximum of 12 animals (6&6) in one household within city limits is excessive and it then becomes an issue of the animals being properly trained whether this be by the owner or another individual.
- Other: If it is more due to babies and is temporary then fine. However, potentially 12 animals in one house is excessive. That puts a neighbor in a bad situation. People don't need that many animals in a city.
- Other: 6 dogs and six cats in one home is too many. Half that amount would be more reasonable and less likely of animal hoarding or harmful environment for all animals.
- Other: This promotes animal hoarding
- Other: Most people aren't taking care or being responsible when they have 3 or 4 dogs.
- Other: How can you put a limit on the amount of animals a person has, as long as they take care of them
- Other: Unless you're living out on a farm there is no reason that any one household has 6 pets. That's incredibly excessive and there's no way those pets would all be taken care of appropriately.
- Other: No one needs 6 dogs and 6 cats on the property. At most 3 dogs and or 3 cats but 6 is excessive and many people can't afford vet bills for 1 pet alone 12 pets.
- Other: 6 of any animal is WAY TOO Many!! 2 should be the limit for dogs and cats



- Other: A pet limit of 4 would be better (6 is too high)
- Other: There shouldn't be a limit on how many pets can be kept as long as other nuisance bylaws are respected.
- Other: Limit seems too high
- Other: no larger pet limit
- Other: Stop sticking the government nose in people's business. This was supposed to be a free country.
- Other: Some people will take advantage of this
- Other: Far too many.
- Other: No one needs that many animals, which can become a problem for neighbours
- Other: Limit shouldn't be a number but once they reach that number do a house check to see if all pets are being cared for properly
- Other: it's too many pets in one home, I don't support a bylaw potentially allowing 12 animals next to me. I support 2 max.
- Other: 6 is too many. You cannot guarantee there enough space for all animals.
- Other: Limit pets to two of each
- Other: A household should have as many number of dogs or cats in a household as long as they have adequate living standards and the residence is clean and having that many animals is in no way a disturbance to surrounding residences.
- Other: 6 dogs AND 6 cats 12 in total is a lot for a household to manage. Suggestion would be to do six pets in total between both cats and dogs.
- Other: I don't believe it's necessary to have that any pets in a household. After a total of two pets, it becomes an issue of proper care. The only time having more than 2 would be if the person was licensed to breed them .
- Other: 12 animals in an apartment? Seems crazy.
- Other: Ff
- Other: It is not a difference of opinion at all as the question states. People don't want a government imposed limit on pets, they also don't see the purpose in having more then 2 cats/dogs. These aren't mutually exclusive.
- Other: I think that with 6 animals on a property there will be accumulation of feces
- Other: Most people can barely handle the care and maintenance of 2 or more pets. 6 would only exacerbate noise, odour and control issues, as well as condone hoarding situations.
- Other: I would propose an amendment to the bylaw noting that there is a limit of dogs and cats per household as many individual own both types of animals.
- Other: To much control from big brother. If people are crazy enough to live with 20 cats or 10 dogs. Let them get sick. Lol r
- Other: That is 12 pets in one house, that is way to excessive.
- Other: That is too many pets! Maybe three of each or a max of 6 total.



- Other: It can be costly to adequately care for that many animals. Some people want more than necessary and who goes in to check that 12 animals in one household are adequately taken care of?
- Other: I constantly seeing owners who NEVER EVER walk their dogs and open the door for them to relieve themselves and never pick up, the smell is sometimes bad so why give people the added benefit to fertilize their yards even ore if they can't handle what they have. Oh I know you expect the neighbors to police this and contact 311 which just doesn't make sense.e
- Other: I believe that as long as the animals are taken care of properly an individual should be able to have as many pets as choose. It is not fair for individuals who are caring for animals that could potentially be homeless to be told they can only have a certain amount.
- Other: I would support the change if there was an extra fee for breeders.
- Other: I think this is very case dependant and would vary on household situations.
- Other: Bylaw remains the same with no limit of animals in home
- Other: I agree with the exceptions but 6 and 6 is too many. I would say no more than 4 and 4
- Other: 6 dogs or 6 cats is a but excessive in my mind . Let's think of the welfare of the animals first and foremost .
- Other: The current limit is not an issue if the new limit is 6 I donâ€™t see a large difference
- Other: Too much noise and smell
- Other: Too many animals in the city. Feces and/or could not be adequately handled. I am experiencing that problem with only 2 dogs next door.
- Other: Everything comes with cost, you guys have hidden agenda and cant be trusted! majority said no limits so stick with that!
- Other: 2 per house is enough
- Other: No need for this. The reasons you provide are weak and there should already be bylaws in place to deal with welfare/feces/noise. Many people have multiple animals and do not live gross lives in feces neglecting their animals welfare and being obnoxious to neighbors. People can decide for themselves just fine how many animals they can be responsible for.... you can't even figure out what a pit bull is, so maybe just calm down here..
- Other: laws are ineffective
- Other: No breed specific bylaws should EVER be allowed
- Other: No more than two pets unless for fostering purposes
- Other: 12 cats and dogs in total seems a bit excessive; I would be more comfortable with a total of 6- more than that I think you should need a special permit that requires you to verify you can appropriately care for them (pay vet bills, food, exercise, etc)
- Other: 6 dogs/ 6 cats per household is too much. The limit should be 2 and 2 and you have to apply for a special permit. Exemptions for under 6 months old (litters)
- Other: 6 cats and 6 dogs seems excessive for properties within city limits. 3-4 would still allow for people to have multiple pets and ensure their safety/health.
- Other: I feel 6 is too much and should be limited to 3 or 4 per household for cats and dogs



- Other: Needs to be smaller number as there are too many that don't license their animals. Let alone the smell cause people don't clean up after them properly.
- Other: people should not have to limit the amount of animals in a household. It's their choice, not the city's.
- Other: NA
- Other: What about a household who responsibly houses rescue dogs who will be killed?
- Other: The number of pets you should have should be determined by the size of your property
- Other: As long as they clean mess, I don't care how many they have
- Other: 6 dogs and or 6 cats is excessive - in a smaller home or in areas where homes are close together that is ridiculous. Should be dependent on home size, space between homes
- Other: Too many animals to feed, take to the vet, etc
- Other: Problem situations are not related to the number of animals it is a problem of not being a responsible pet owner.
- Other: a total of 12 medium to large sized animals in one house is too many. if you want more than 4 total cats/dogs in a house, you need a permit.
- Other: 6 is far too many
- Other: Increases risk of animals being neglected/abused. Increases risk of breeding and more animals in shelter
- Other: Too many
- Other: This number of pets is grossly excessive and considering the cost of maintaining pets (veterinary fees for example), allowing 12 pets per household would put the animals at risk of neglect. The risk of nuisance to neighbours would also be significant.
- Other: Too many animals in one home
- Other: I agree with the vast majority of this bylaw, excluding banning the "pitbull" breeds. Owners need to be held responsible for their pets.
- Other: It is not necessary to have more than 2 cats and/or dogs per household within city limits. The space for free roaming within private property would potentially contribute to the animals defensive behaviour
- Other: No person needs more than 2 dogs, yards are too small to allow more than 2 dogs, unless you like the smell of shit...
- Other: Not your house not your choice
- Other: 6 is RIDICULOUS - that's way too many. Maybe 3 TOTAL (like 2 dogs and a cat, or 2 cats and a dog). Again, more animals puts more animals at risk of abuse or neglect. (Exemptions aside). Or if you HAVE to expand it, make it based on square footage of house and yard space accessible to the animals.
- Other: Up to 6 cats and 6 dogs is ridiculous. That is too many animals. I say in total up to 5 animals. Even that is too much. The noise, animal feces would be terrible.
- Other: I would make the limits lower. No one needs 6 dogs &/or 6 cats in one household. That's ridiculous.
- Other: It's good as is now



- Other: No
- Other: People don't look after 2 animals let alone 6
- Other: you take away personal choice
- Other: I feel that due to the issues listed above, 6 cats or dogs is still too many. 6 combined is too many.
- Other: To many animals
- Other: stop dictating number of pets and enforce responsible pet ownership.
- Other: X
- Other: No one needs to have that many pets. That is why we have such problems now with neglected, abused animals.
- Other: You have no right to dictate what someone with passion and love for animals can do with them or how many they may have. It's a lifestyle not a crime.
- Other: 6 animals is too high
- Other: This will undo strain on rescues who rely on volunteers.
- Other: 6 dogs and cats is WAY TOO many, no household needs that many. Understand that there is a difference of opinion, but in what situation is more than 4 dogs or four cats needed.
- Other: None of the city's business
- Other: are you fffen crazy ,, thats a kennel ,, next to me ,, constant barking every day ,, cat shit in my yard ,, enough ,, people are unable to look after one pet at best ,, if able to prove ownership of enough land to care for 3 pets total in a residential neighborhood ,, re think the above ,, way -way off ,, s
- Other: Excessive oversight and rules.
- Other: No household should have more than 2 animals. Certainly not 6
- Other: That is too many animals in a city on residential property !
- Other: 6 is way to high
- Other: Potentially 12 animals/house hold? The only time I could see 6 dogs in a house in Calgary is if the pet had a litter of puppies. Perhaps a licence could be offered to people who are fostering, aside from that absolutely not!
- Other: What we oen is no business of the City unless a case of neglect or puppy milling abuse or abandonment can be proven
- Other: That number is far too large, I would support up to three animals per household. Six is too many.
- Other: If the animals are trained, taken care of and cleaned up after there is no issue. There are enough animals in shelters already.
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats are way to many pets for a person to have and own, yards and houses are not big enough for these animals to have a good environment to live in
- Other: People are allowed to have as many animals as they would like no matter the type or breed
- Other: The average Calgary home cannot support such a large amount of animals.
- Other: I don't think there should be a limit on how much pets people have



- Other: To many animals in to small of space. I think the exceptions are very good ones.
- Other: Too many
- Other: Two dogs ,four cats
- Other: You shouldn't be able to tell anyone how many animals they can have.
- Other: If you have someone breeding dogs you could end up with 6+ dogs in a house. My neighbour at one time had 22 dogs/puppies in her house. She was/is a breeder. Breeders should have higher license fees and a more frequent inspection system.
- Other: 6 is too many
- Other: Look at the owner before you look at the animal. Get your head out of your [removed].
- Other: Up to 3 should be the minimum 6 is crazy! And unnessaserry number
- Other: I think surprise home visits would be more beneficial. If a household can care for an "excessive" number of animals in a manner that is humane and loving, we shouldn't be able to dictate what's best for them.
- Other: That is too many animals per household. Every time there is a down turn in the economy, pets are the first thing people give up. The cost to properly care for that many animals (annual vet bills and vaccinations) is more than a second mortgage.
- Other: 6&6 is way too many and should be lowered.
- Other: Way too many animals. Max of 3 animals total.
- Other: Except for the reasons listed above the potential for 12 animals in a family dwelling is too many.
- Other: there should be no limit to how many dogs or cats you can have... there isn't one for people right?
- Other: 2-4 total number of pets per household is enough.
- Other: as long as no complaints shouldnt be an issue
- Other: Our shelters are full and people should be able to take in as many pets and they want
- Other: 6 dogs and/or cats is too many in the city.
- Other: I support a lower number of pets, 6 of each is Way too high!
- Other: No
- Other: It is not the governments role to decide how much property or animals are necessary .
- Other: I believe that 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is much too high (this could be up to twelve animals in total). I would think that a maximum of 5 or 6 animals combined is high enough (I.e. 3 dogs and 2 cats are hard enough to properly care for).
- Other: I think it should be 6 dogs OR 6 cats, 12 is to many animals
- Other: 4 animals with the proposed exceptions would be preferable
- Other: Stop with your busy body work....
- Other: That's too many animals.
- Other: 12 dogs and cats seems excessive unless the owner operates some sort of animal care
- Other: Why should walkers. Daycares and fosters not have limits



- Other: How would you ensure 12 potential animals are being well cared for and not neglected?
- Other: I think the possibility of having 12 animals in one residential property will come an increase in the number of complaints
- Other: 6 is still too many and unacceptable within city limits. 2 should absolutely be the limit
- Other: 6 is too high. I would support this at 4 with the relevant exceptions
- Other: I would Not support bylaw changes targeting nuisance dogs and pit bulls. My pit bull was the most sedate and loving dog and feel it's up to the owner to get proper training for that breed. They are very smart and do well with training
- Other: 6 animals is way too many to safely care for
- Other: If it is my property and I take care of my animals it's not your place to determine how many animals I have. Bylaw or government should have no reign over how many pets I can own period.
- Other: You know why , NOISE, and defecation .
- Other: I would limit to 3 of each
- Other: N/a
- Other: No consideration for neighbors living next to that many pets
- Other: Two is more than enough!
- Other: Nobody needs 6 dogs, limit to 3 adult dogs 3 under 6 months. Unless fostering.
- Other: It's up to the owner how many pets they want. As long as their abiding by the rules then no harm no foul
- Other: I think if a family is willing to take in 12 dogs and love them and look after them properly then it shouldn't matter. I would say that some families could do a better job looking after 12 dogs than some families with 2 dogs. Lots of people have big yards etc. And take in rescue dogs. I don't think it would be fair to tell these people no. With that being said I would approve a home inspection from a rescue foundation if a family was looking to have that many pets to make sure they would do an adequate job and their space is large enough to accommodate that many pets.
- Other: 6 animals is far too many
- Other: The limit should be MUCH lower than this. This is an excessive number of pets and, while there are some responsible pet owners, many are not. This number not only increases the chance that they are not going to get the attention they deserve due to sheer number of pets, but also the associated risk of substantial vet bills discouraging the owners from going to the vet at all. I would think that some exceptions are reasonable, such as having appropriate space for additional pets (living on an acreage, for example), but otherwise 12 pets in total is absolutely excessive.
- Other: 12 total animals is too high. 3 Dogs AND 3 Cats is more than enough unless it is a breeder, shelter or service animal trainer.
- Other: Too many animals
- Other: Unsure what current limits are.
- Other: Why would anyone need 6 cats and 6 dogs. This is far too many! This number should be lower
- Other: I think 3-4 dog should be allowed while 3 cats should be the maxed allowed. If having 3 or more dogs there should be inspections on owner property incase of illegal dog fighting or bait dogs,



if owner has more than 4 dog on farmland near city limit should be inspected due to possibility of a puppy mill operation. Fence height should increase so dogs can't escape.

- Other: 6 is WAY too many. Two of each at the most.
- Other: Households should not be micromanaged.
- Other: Number of animals should not be restricted especially pitbulls.. humans fault not the dog.
- Other: I do not like this bill specifically because of its hate for pit bulls
- Other: All the crazy cat ladies will not like this.
- Other: To each their own. Mind your buisness
- Other: QUIT TELLING PEOPLE WHAT THEY CAN AND CANNOT DO IN THEIR OWN HOMES.
- Other: 6 pets is excessive, for noise, mess clean up and the owners ability to adequately care for that many animals while not having a negative impact on their neighbours.
- Other: I think if someone can pay for as many animals as they want and have lisences, and the animals are all taken care of and loved why can't they have a home
- Other: Limiting pets does not change accumulation of feces on a property, noise, or welfare of animals. If owners don't pick up feces for 1 dog, 2 dogs or 10 dogs, then neighbors should file a complaint. 1 dog can warrant a noise complaint if the owners aren't responsible.
- Other: BSL does not work
- Other: People should be able to own as many pets as they want given they can provide safe, clean and adequate living environments and can fully provide for all animals in the home
- Other: Unless an animal has given birth, there is no reason to have six cats or dogs on a residential property.
- Other: If animals are being cared for properly there is no need to impose a limit.
- Other: No more then 4 animals total.
- Other: I donâ€™t believe we have the right to tell good people how many animals they can or canâ€™t have. If someone has to many and is reported it should be delt with on a case by case bases.
- Other: Age of the cats or dogs nor inherited not really mutter. The number of them in one household should be strictly remain small/limited and if any case the number of animals exceed the limit then the owners have to report/update.
- Other: If someone is apply to responsibly take care of more pets that is their own decision. The city should not be dictating how tax payers live their lives.
- Other: I think 6 is too high. 4 is better.
- Other: 6 is way too many in the city and not necessary. Those numbers are ridiculous.
- Other: The last thing we need in urban areas are more cars, dogs, livestock etc.
- Other: There is no need for anyone to have 6 dogs or cats!
- Other: Unless you are fostering, breeding, or inherit these pets, 6 animals could be a huge nuisance for the neighbours, especially if the pets are trained improperly.
- Other: In many of these cases 6 is too many. One needs to be responsible and recognize their limitations. If you live in an apartment 2 cats at the most and that's if your responsible and dont let



the litter build up and attract bugs to your environment. Just for example. People need to just wake up and take responsibility for the animals they have or don't have them at all. There need to be more regulation around adopting pets. as too many end up going back or on the street. Fix that issue and this one will solve itself. Last Cats that are indoor, fixed and shots up to date with registered tattoos with the vet should not have to buy a license. They can already be traced back to an owner.

- Other: As long as they can care for them they should be allowed as many as they want. Better to save 8 dogs let's say from the shelter and give them love then let them suffer in a shelter. But if there is mistreatment I believe in giving them a fine.
- Other: It's hard for me to understand how someone can live in the city and be able to properly take care of more than 12 cats and dogs.
- Other: Most people disagreeing will be none pet owners which obviously have a bias. If you can properly maintain all animals there should be no limits
- Other: This is not fair to people that have pit bulls that are well behaved.
- Other: It's not the city's business to regulate pets inside the home. If problems arise they can be dealt with as their own violation. (I.e. noise or odour). Pet number should not be cause.
- Other: This is an excessive number of pets for any household.
- Other: Restrict the OWNER!!
- Other: Agree that there should be a limit, but 6 and 6?? Based on what?
- Other: I don't see this as a problem. It is a solution in search of a problem.
- Other: Does this only apply to cats and dogs?
- Other: If a person can manage more than 6 dogs and cats and keep their yard clean and quiet, then they would probably do so with more than that. One dog could be unacceptable if the feces is never picked up and the dog is constantly barking. Enforce the rules you have already, regardless of the number of pets.
- Other: Still too many pets in one house
- Other: I have heard of issues with people walking too many dogs at once (mainly with professional dog walkers) but have never heard of problems with people owning too many animals. If it is a matter of living in an apartment where there is not enough space for the animals, condo boards already have the ability to restrict the number of pets that may reside there.
- Other: I am not an animal lover. There are currently 16 dogs living in my general vicinity. At most times there is some dog barking! Dogs bark when their owners are not home to silence them. And if homes were allowed to have six dogs can you imagine the noise that they can make! Where is the fairness to the people who enjoy the peace and quiet. There are already 135000 dogs in Calgary - we don't need more barking dog!! one or two maybe but not six per household!!!!
- Other: You [removed] are just looking for more money to toss away
- Other: If all animals in the home receive proper food, shelter, and veterinary care and the property is maintained in a hygienic matter and does not cause problems for neighbors, there should not be a limit on the number of pets someone can own
- Other: Totally unacceptable like having a dog kennel or pet rescue in residential



- Other: 6 of both is far too many animals for most residences to contain. 3 of each should be the limit. The other consideration is the size of the animals. 6 large dogs in a small back yard could be very problematic for neighbours.
- Other: I'm sorry but it should be lower. 4 or less - combined
- Other: people should be allowed to have as many animals as they wish. if trailer trash folks can have 12 trashy children then classy pet owners should be able to have as many as they want also.
- Other: This is supposed to be a free country and taking one person right away because the government wants to make more money is not the way to go. If the person can afford to have multiple pets it should be their freedom and right to do so without laws that take this very freedom away from us. Currently there are laws that makes no sense and some are out of fear mongering.
- Other: Taking care of 6 dogs or cats is an enormous responsibility especially, both financially and socially. Very few people would be up to this task without causing either potential neglect to the animals or being a nuisance to neighbours
- Other: Owners should have the right to decide how many dogs &/or cats they are able to maintain & walk - a responsible pet owner would know their limit. This bylaw would encourage people to not register their pets (especially cats), and be onerous on the engagement officers.
- Other: THERE SHOULD BE NO RESTRICTION WHO ARE YOU TELL US
- Other: ...
- Other: No one person needs that many animals - you will increase animal hoarding, back yard breeders, and issues with neglect
- Other: I don't agree with breeding of animals for sale as it is basically puppy mills. All dogs and cats should be spay or neutered.
- Other: I believe if someone wants an Animal and can take care and love them, there shouldn't be a problem here
- Other: no thank you
- Other: Six is too many except in the exceptions listed. I would suggest no more than 3 for the general public.
- Other: Too many.. max 6; exceptions listed make sense
- Other: No one in their right mind needs 6 dogs or cats. ((% of the time when people do have numbers this high....there are severe issues.
- Other: 3 cats, 3 dogs per household aside from the above acceptions. More is a LOT of animals to have in town
- Other: I only have one cat, but love the fact calgary does not currently have a limit on number of pets in household. If the amount of animals becomes a hoard type situation, CHS can follow up with those cases.
- Other: I feel this number is far too high under most circumstances. One possible solution would be a scalable number based on home/yard square footage.
- Other: 6 dogs and 7 cats? Seems excessive
- Other: If it's a responsible owner than the a our shouldn't matter
- Other: We shouldn't change it



- Other: There should not be an arbitrary head count. Noise and nuisance bylaws are sufficient.
- Other: Six of each is excessive. I would say that typically two of each is reasonable, but three of each would be the upper limit.
- Other: Unless it includes all animals not just dogs and cats. (Chickens, pigeons, birds, snakes, etc)
- Other: If you can afford to take care of them and give them a good home that's all that matters
- Other: Less than 6
- Other: If on acreage no limit. In town 6 is good limit.
- Other: I don't believe anyone could properly take care of 12 animals at one time. I agree about the following exceptions: Dogs/cats under 6 months of age Temporary homes (fosters, breeders, pet sitters, daycares) Dogs/cats that are inherited and Service animals.
- Other: Because as long as it's a clean and safe environment for animals then a limit shouldn't be needed
- Other: Do not use terms like "potential exceptions", say what the plan is.
- Other: Singling out one breed is ridiculous there are more bites and injuries from Small dogs and off leash dogs . Then you should go after Rotties Shepherds Doberman's Great Danes the pitbull S that we have in our community are well behaved and the gentle dogs . I will never support this
- Other: Too many - special license should be needed for a smaller number
- Other: No house can safely and comfortably take proper care of that many animals. There should be no more than 3 dogs in a household.
- Other: I think owning more pets should be based on the size of house, yard and income.
- Other: 6 cats AND 6 dogs seems excessive. I would suggest limiting to 3 of each, or perhaps 6 pets total (dogs & cats)
- Other: The city is crazy to have 6 dogs in a household. That's the beginning of hoarding
- Other: 2 dogs 2 cats
- Other: I support the bylaw but I think the # of animals per household (6 cat, 6 dog) should be lower (6 total). Special circumstances/exceptions can always be provided but it is concerning that any one household could have 12 animals under control at one time.
- Other: People will claim all the animals are fosters or temporary and get in way over their heads
- Other: No
- Other: I do not think it is necessary to increase the amount of pets that a household can have.
- Other: I'm so sick of this city dictating every aspect of our lives. Fix the economy instead of worrying how many animals a person has. This is a joke.
- Other: Responsible pet owners should not be penalized. We don't limit children who can be just as disruptive
- Other: Do not believe in Dog Fanciers' license. No one needs 6 service animals. Am in agreement with temporary homes/inherited as long as living conditions are good. Have questions for the excess animal permit.



- Other: 3 seems reasonable. 6 makes one wonder about mental health issues and we have had a number of hoarding animal situations in our province. A large number of animals could result in poor care. Yards offer limited space.
- Other: Drug crime is up, property values or down, the budget is blown up and insane [removed]
- Other: It is not necessary for anyone to own more than 2 cats and/or dogs. As a person who lives beside someone with an excessive number of dogs, the noise and smell are awful.
- Other: limitations should be based on ability of individual to provide adequate environment for the animals
- Other: Too many animals. Lived on acreage and would never have had this many animals.
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats is way too many animals. They won't get the proper care. It should be 4 combined either cats or dogs
- Other: This could easily create hoarding situations and increase seizure of dogs or cause shelters to fill up. Quality of life for animals with more than two in the household is low creating a dangerous situation for the animal.
- Other: the amount of cat/dogs proposed is excessive
- Other: Too many pets - number should be lower
- Other: Your 3 children are 100% louder, and more disruptive than my dogs. Why does it impact you what happens in MY house if my dogs are well cared for, trained and not in your home?
- Other: Are people going to start door to door inspections to verify how many animals people have? How do you plan to enforce this?
- Other: No one needs to have more than 2 cats or dogs in their home. Obviously, if they produced offspring, that would be a temporary situation until homes were found for the puppies or kittens.
- Other: Stop trying to make money off unfortunate situations.
- Other: who needs 6 dogs? Usually people who don't take proper care of their animals and cause noise and feces complaints
- Other: It is not unreasonable for a home to properly care for >6 animals. Focus should be on negligent owners, not responsible owners with many pets.
- Other: I only support the following exceptions: Temporary homes (fosters, breeders, pet sitters, daycares), Approved Excess Animal Permit, Possession of a Dog Fanciers' License, Service animals
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats is way too many to responsibly care for in the city inviting potential conflict with neighbours. The limit should be 2 pets per household.
- Other: That is way too many dogs particularly if they are pitbull types or large breeds such as great daines. Maximum 3 dogs over 50lbs at the very least. 6 dogs is way too many
- Other: I don't see any reason why 6 was chosen. I know several people that have multiple pets and no-one I know has more than 4 so I don't see why the limit isn't 4.
- Other: If the pets are being taken care of I think this is an overreach of government.
- Other: All of this breed specific legislation is absolute nonsense. This kind of ignorance doesn't belong in 2020 - you would think Calgary knows better as a self touting progressive city but here we are. Absolutely disgusting.



- Other: 6 dogs or 6 cats is too many animals.
- Other: Six is too many
- Other: The way it is written someone could have 12 animals in the house. That is crazy in a city environment.
- Other: Some people are responsible pet owners despite having more than six pets
- Other: are you kidding?? If you have that many pets in your home, you shouldn't be living in the city! That's not fair to those animals!
- Other: 6 dogs or cats in a household is beyond reason
- Other: I think 6 cats/dogs per household is too many for most households to manage. Special permits for exceptions to the limit should suffice.
- Other: I think 2-3 pets per household is enough. But exceptions could be made for some situations.(fosters, inherited)
- Other: 6 animals is way too many in my opinion. I would limit at 2-3.
- Other: Responsible pet owners - regardless of quantity on animals - are that...responsible. Hoarding situations are very different in nature - mental health concerns. If a citizen has registered their animals, are cleaning up feces, their animals aren't being a nuisance (that's cause for interpretation) and they are responsible then I see no issue.
- Other: I think 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many animals to be properly looked after at one time, with the exception of dogs/cats under 6 months and temporary homes.
- Other: Let people own as many pets as they would like.
- Other: 1 or 2 pets is LOTS! Exception pups but pops weaned must be sold or given away within a month.
- Other: I feel like 6 cats and dogs is too big a jump from the original bylaw. I would support maybe 3-4 but not 6.
- Other: Would lower the number to total further to a combined total of 3 pets per household.
- Other: There should be a required sq/ft per animal depending on their size. Having 6 dogs in a townhouse for example can be a negative impact in the animals wellbeing.
- Other: I dont think it is your right to say how many pets one household has
- Other: people should be able to have what they want as long as they can provide properly for those animals
- Other: It is not necessary for anyone to own more than 2 cats and/or dogs.
- Other: If foster homes and temporary homes are an exception, then I don't understand how a household would need 12 animals. This number is way too high for a residential property that keeps all the animals (i.e. isn't breeding them to sell). It should be 6 in total (i.e. 3 cats and 3 dogs, or 5 cats and 1 dog).
- Other: That amount of animals within City limits amounts to hoarding.
- Other: No one needs 6 dogs and or cats. That means a neighbor, that is only a few feet from your own house could have 12 animals. How could anyone think that 12 animals is acceptable. No one needs to own more than 2 cats or 2 dogs.
- Other: Too many animals in one space. Lower limits



- Other: People do not need six dogs or six cats.
- Other: 3 is enough unless it is necessary to take in a pet with no other option of a home
- Other: 12 animals per a house is a bit much unless it's a trainer/training facility or fostering
- Other: It doesn't matter how many animals someone has if their house...they are either responsible or they are not...fine and charge and punish the people who do not follow the rules or clean up after their dogs/cats/animals. Change the laws in regards to the people who violate the rules. Don't punish the responsible pet owners because you group them all the same
- Other: No i would not support this bylaw
- Other: Owners and children need to be taught and shown how to work with dogs. We need to stop blaming dogs and hold owners more accountable.
- Other: these numbers are crazy, I have had a neighbor with from 6-3 cats that were on the loose to defecate in their neighbors yard
- Other: Calgary currently has a great system
- Other: Limit of 6 is too high. Two is lots
- Other: If a problem arises, then deal with it, but stop trying to control everything.
- Other: 12 "large" animals is excessive and complaints would draw unnecessary resources from by law enforcement
- Other: where do you get off telling me how many dogs or cats i can have . You are not my Mother or Father. you do not own my property .maybe start with limiting the number of kids people have . Kids are more dangerous that dogs. some kids do become criminals , get your hands and face out of my places.
- Other: 6 is too many. Less is better.
- Other: 6 cats and 6 dogs is too many the size of the yard and house should restrict the amount of pets you can have
- Other: some poeple dont look after the 1 they have so to have 2 or more just adds to the problem
- Other: This is only the business of the pet owners themselves. This will do nothing to stop illegal breeders and it will only harm those wanting to save animals.
- Other: For the livelihood of the animals and people houses would be too crowded with possibly up to 12 pets, it would also be extremely hard to manage cleaning up after the pets.
- Other: If the person is able to take care of said animals without any complaints, then let them. a lot of people look at animals as children, and i don't imagine well get told how many children we are allowed to have.
- Other: 6 is too many 3 is a perfect number
- Other: Deal with individual situations instead of trying to regulate everyone
- Other: You should be allowed to have as many pets as you want as long as you were responsible.
- Other: Its too much in a city - if people want to own that many animals they should live on a farm. When you have neighbors within 50 feet of you - or less - its too much. You have to make concessions on what you perceive as your rights when you have neighbors all around you.
- Other: NO ONE needs 12 [removed] animals in their house



- Other: 12 animals in one home still seems too many.
- Other: Depends on the size of yard/space
- Other: Too many
- Other: There is now way people should be allowed to have that number of pets!
- Other: 6 dogs can be very loud and cause problems with neighbor, maybe it should be reduced to 4 dogs (except exceptions mentioned above) cats on the other hand can stay with 6 cats per household as they are normally quiet, causing less issues with neighbors.
- Other: 12 animals is a farm
- Other: Thatâ€™s a lot. Maybe for exceptions is ok. But really. 2 dog and 2 cats is a lot of pets for the average person to support and take care of responsibly. Who needs 6 dogs or and 6 cats. A bit much and expensive.
- Other: I would support a restriction, but that number is to high
- Other: Not necessary
- Other: Stop trying to control how many animals a person can have. It is really none of your business.
- Other: If a person has the ability to care for more dogs or cats why should they be restricted? I mean to say, that if a person has the income, space, time and fair ability to provide for these animals why should we prohibit them and inevitably allow more dogs to stay stray or sheltered etc. I think there should be rules regulating the number of animals per space of a persons home.
- Other: 6 is far too many pets for one household.
- Other: I think 12 animals in one household is still too many.
- Other: If the animals are provided clean space and good care, who gets to say how many animals a person can have? Thatâ€™s ridiculous
- Other: nobody needs six dogs or cats -- unless they're running a puppy mill, which shouldn't be allowed at all
- Other: pet limit is WAY TOO HIGH for very responsible people (we have 1 pet and the cost of proper nutrition and medical care is way more than we had anticipated). Until breeders are more stringently regulated, breeders should not be allowed in city limits, and this should include accidents breeders.
- Other: unless you live in a mansion thats too many animals
- Other: nobody needs more than 1 dog or cat in household
- Other: Some people only find happiness in their pets, are great owners.. why limit them cause people are stupid.
- [removed]
- Other: That many animals in one home cannot possibly be good for the health and welfare of the humans or animals in that home. I would question the mental competence of anyone who felt it necessary to have more than 2-3 animals in once home.
- Other: There is no real reason to need so many animals. A person could not feasibly address the needs (training included) in that number. More pets in a single location will only serve to exponentially compound the number (and severity) of existing issues. Let's not enable hoarding, please.



- Other: I feel that unless you are a foster for animals having that many animals is quite high. I would go with 4 dogs and 4 cats. Having more dogs/cats is a problem if we have small yards, feces leaking into neighbors yards, clean up. Leads to neglect.
- Other: they are a lot of work and too many are not good as in proper care per animal.
- Other: I don't believe there should be a limit
- Other: That's too many animals in one house and can possibly damage the house for future renters/buyers. Plus the fact with all the feces and noise they would create.
- [removed]
- Other: If it's on their own property you have no right to limit anything or introduce laws unless you are going to start paying my mortgage
- Other: No
- Other: it's not right
- Other: Stop trying to control everyone
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats is too high. A combined total of 4 dogs and cats should suffice with exemptions as listed above.
- Other: 6 dogs or cats in a house hold seems to be a lot
- Other: 6 is too much!
- Other: Similarly to the question regarding hens, I feel people should be entitled to however many animals they can maintain and adequately care for, which is different from person to person.
- Other: I agree with the reasoning to keep numbers restricted.
- Other: The limit should be 3 with the addition of exemptions for fostering and puppies
- Other: Way too many pets that would not receive care, training and companionship
- Other: Agree with the exemptions but 6 dogs and 6 cats is a lot. 6 combined would make more sense. With exemptions if two households came together (marriage, etc)
- Other: Too many.....may lead to neglect, inbreeding, unsanitary conditions, noise. Two cats and/or two dogs - Max. per household.
- Other: People should have as many pets as they like
- Other: Unless there's a huge nuisance of feces; smell; noise or neglect, leave it. Some ppl should limit the amount of ppl living in one dwelling
- Other: It is unacceptable that you would tell me how many animals I can or cannot have on my own private property if I want 10 cats I'll have 10 cats
- Other: None of their business how many I have. Especially if they are being properly cared for
- Other: If the pets are kept in good health and animal waste is dealt with properly the city has no right to tell it's residents how many pets they can have
- Other: TOO MANY. MAX 2-3
- Other: Rule should be no more than 4 dogs/cats per house hold. Total pets no more than 4. Except for new born puppies with their mom for a period of 6 months.
- Other: I think 2 animals at most is reasonable. 6 dogs in one backyard is excessive no matter the breed of dog.



- Other: As long as people are able to take care of their animals they have the RIGHT to own as many as they would like.
- Other: No
- Other: 3 of each animal should be more than sufficient for owners unless the fall under the exceptions rule
- Other: 6 dogs is quite excessive and would require tons of attention and training which would be quite hard for 1 family to do. 3-4 dogs would be a better limit. 6 cats is much easier to maintain as long as they are indoor only cats.
- Other: 6 dogs and cat in one household in the city seems excessive
- Other: It's ridiculous to tell people how many pets they can have. We don't do that with children and they can be way more of a problem/noise factor or not cared for properly!
- Other: 6 is excessive
- Other: Animal hoarding is already a problem.
- Other: The exceptions are agreeable but having 6 dogs AND 6 cats is an excessive amount. 2 dogs AND/or 2 cats is more reasonable; special applications for more than the 4 limit can be addressed for those that are capable and can provide suitable living conditions.
- Other: The limit should be significantly lower. 2 cats or 2 dogs
- Other: A maximum of 2 pets per household.
- Other: Unless this is directly related to the exceptions, why does anyone need six dogs and six cats? I don't think without substantial income these people would be able to afford proper care for these animals. Animals can have health issues and can cost a very large amount to ensure they are getting the proper care. I honestly think beyond two dogs and two cats for normal purposes (not breeding, temporary placement, on an acreage etc.) is very excessive.
- Other: Homes in the City of Calgary do not permit enough space to properly care for that number of animals. Indoor cats is one thing but dogs require ample leash walking and socialization. The common pet owner can not walk 6 dogs at once or provide the ability to control that many dogs alone at the off leash parks. Putting a limit on the number of animals will help ensure owners are responsible and their pets get the care, attention and training they require to prevent bites.
- Other: 6 dogs and cats is ridiculous
- Other: The bylaw is fine. The neighbors are the problem.
- Other: six dogs and cats is ridiculous.
- Other: 6 dogs or cats per household is too many. 3 is a much better number
- Other: I don't think it's necessary for anyone to own 12 pets or take care of that many pets in one home. I don't believe that they would be properly cared for.
- Other: Should be lower than 6 of each (12 animals total!)
- Other: Who in their right mind can take care of 6 dogs and 6 cats.
- Other: 6 dogs/cats is too many. 3 dogs/cats should be limit
- Other: Not necessary
- Other: As long as they are well taken care of there shouldn't be a limit



- Other: Way too many animals in a house. like 2-3 max
- Other: How can a person or family properly take care and maintain the health of more than 2 cats or dogs apart from the above exceptions.
- Other: If people are abiding by rules this seems ridiculous
- Other: The City should not have the power to tell citizens how to live their lives, and who to live their lives with. If people want to live with 10 dogs, they should be allowed to as long as the animals are being taken care of properly and are not creating issues for other neighbors
- Other: I think as long as the animals are well taken care of and the house is well maintained that people should be able to have as many dogs and cats as they like.
- Other: 6 is far too many. 3 - 4 makes more sense.
- Other: Don't think a normal household needs so many pets. It may cause environmental issues for the neighborhoods.
- Other: How many people have more than 6 cats and 6 dogs? I'm guessing it isn't very many, and as long as they are paying the fees and registering the animals and picking up after the animals then they should be free to do so. I would like to breed dogs within Calgary, I don't want someone to complain to the city that I have 3 or 4 dogs and have to deal with the city on top of trying to focus energy on finding a proper home for the dogs.
- Other: How is this enforceable?
- Other: 12 animals in one home is ridiculous and excessive. That's borderline animal hoarding.
- Other: If someone's wants 13 dogs and 11 cats they should be allowed that many pets.
- Other: Limit should be based on welfare - 6 is too many for many properties/owners, while there is not good reason to limit someone who is capable of handling more, other than for the sake of demonstrating the ability to regulate (Napoleon Syndrome/Narcissistic Personality Disorder).
- Other: too many dogs & cats. No one should need 6 dogs OR 6 cats.
- Other: I think the number should be lower, 4 animals total, combination of dogs and cats.
- Other: There is no home big enough in city limits with a big enough yard to accommodate that many animals. I would decrease the limit per household.
- Other: 12 pets in one property is too much
- Other: There's no reason for a family in the city to need 6 animals in their home. MAX 3. No exceptions aside from being legaced in.
- Other: Why should anyone have any right to determine what another person "needs"? This is ludicrous. If the excessive amount of pets is causing issues to their neighbors, THEN enforce the necessary bylaws. Limiting people just because others feel they don't need something is pathetic.
- Other: Out on an acreage (17.5 acres) the maximum amount of dogs allowed is THREE. That is on an acreage with lots of land and space for the animals. Twelve animals total sounds like a horrible idea, I can only imagine that many of those animals would be neglected.
- Other: It still allows for owners to have more than what is necessary. Remove the other clauses that allow people to have more. They can apply for every circumstance where they want more than the 6.
- Other: As long as the animals are being properly cared for and owner can afford them, I don't see a need for a limit



- Other: 6 of each is way too many. 3 max total would be appropriate
- Other: The limit should be lowered from 6 and 6. No one *needs* 6 dogs and 6 cats. Limit should be 3 and 3.
- Other: Six is way too many. Only two (2) animals per household.
- Other: Six is stupid! No more than two and you have to own your property. Zero animals if your in a rental
- Other: 2 cats and/or 2 dogs should be the limit.
- Other: No thank you
- Other: 6 is too many
- Other: I personally think that so long as you can properly care for your animals it shouldn't be an issue with how many you own. I also think its ridiculous to limit and dog shame pitbulls. Its NOT the breed that's bad its sometimes the owners!!!!
- Other: Infringing on the rights for pet ownership
- Other: Whats the point of changing it?
- Other: Too much regulation. Good owners who comply with the existing bylaw are capable of keeping many animals without disturbing neighbours.
- Other: I support tax paying citizens having as many rights as possible.
- Other: No reason for someone to own that many pets. Its absurd. Max 4 in any household.
- Other: You can't responsibly walk 6 or more dogs at an off leash dog park and control them and pickup their poop. I've seen way too many dog walkers not being responsible.
- Other: It's different from case to case. My friend has 3 bigger dogs and none of them bark. Another friend owns 1 that is so anxious that it barks constantly.
- Other: I should be able to have as many pets as I want as long as I have proper space and provide proper care
- Other: Should be no more than 6 animals of any type
- Other: this city doesn't control the number of children a house can have why would we control number of pets?
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is excessive. This rule does not encourage responsible pet ownership and can lead to animal neglect.
- Other: I would not want to live next to this many animals
- Other: It's a very high limit compared to cities of comparable size throughout North America, I don't see a need to have more animals than that in a household unless one is rearing puppies (who will eventually be rehomed) or running a kennel which should require a licence.
- Other: Unless the condition of the home is horrible. I don't see why there needs to be a cap on the amount for animals
- Other: No one needs up to 12 pets. 2 dogs and 2 cats should suffice.
- Other: 2 dogs and 3 cats as a maximum just do to the accumulation of feces. i support the potential exceptions



- Other: Maybe not dog or cats maybe 4. But if the animals are safe and taken care of and off the streets it's better for everyone
- Other: I have seen first hand that having more than 12 animals on one property does not end well.
- Other: Let people do what they want. And if people can't afford to live off what they make they don't need a pet or animal. Do not make special fees for poor people. That's embarrassing
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is still too many
- Other: 6 animals meaning cats and dogs is still too many per household. Should be limited to square footage of yard and/or house based on city taxes. ie. 900 sq.ft. house or single lot should equally 2 outdoor pets. 1600sqft house on double lot equals 4 pets.
- Other: Dogs should be limited to 3 or less
- Other: 6 is too high for dogs should be 3; ok limit for cats.
- Other: My house my pets,
- Other: Honestly I do not agree with hoarding animals as they are not getting the proper care that they deserve. I believe in fostering as this give the animals a quote more normal life and gets them adapted to living with other animals and socializes the animal with different breeds.
- Other: As long as the home is good I don't think there should be any restrictions on how many animals one household can have
- Other: he
- Other: pitbulls are great dogs and shouldn't be punished just because they are stronger than other dogs.
- Other: Why put a limit on it? That's like putting limit on how much food a family can have in their house. If people want more pets then why stop that?
- Other: No evidence that policing the #of pets in a home increases their welfare.
- Other: People shouldn't be told what they can and can't have in their own home. This isn't a communist country
- Other: As long as the owners can properly care and tend to all the animals why should we restrict the amount they choose to care for
- Other: I don't like over-regulation. I owned 3 dogs for a time and was very responsible. I don't want to be told I can't have them.
- Other: I think more work is needed here as this is now currently saying I could own 12 animals that's 12 license, 12 animals to feed and care for and can 12 animals really have enough love and space in the average home especially with most people needing to work most days.
- Other: This is getting very out of hand. I am so disappointed with this city
- Other: 6 is to many, 2 should be the maximum allowed
- Other: If the bylaws are followed and enforced - no barking, no nuisance, the limits should not be necessary
- Other: Because in my opinion, it is wrong. Some people have more than six as they provide homes for unwanted animals. Stop trying to add more control tactics.
- Other: As a pet owner I feel this is extremely judgemental, the amount of animals is not the problem if they are being taken care of. I have many animals all in outstanding health and upkeep and to have



them removed from me or myself fined is extremely rude. There are already so many pet restrictions already set by rentals, condo associations, and homeowners itâ€™s unnecessary to make it a BYLAW

- Other: The limit is too high. Should be 2 pets per household.
- Other: 12 pets is too many pets in one house
- Other: Mind your own damn business.
- Other: You guys shouldnâ€™t make a big deal for dogs and more for pitbulls,
- Other: The limit should be determined by the area the pets will be kept in. Small yard = fewer dogs or smaller home = fewer cats, etc. will
- Other: I support everything with the exception of the pet limit being 6, it needs to be lowered especially for dogs. I would argue a person with 6 dogs not all of them are being properly exercised every single day as someone who had 1-2.
- Other: Too many pets for one household.
- Other: there shouldn't be a limit in my opinion if you have the space and the money then all pets deserve a loving home
- Other: With vet bill having 2 is more than sufficient
- Other: There are many responsible breeders
- Other: Six dogs and six cats in one home is excessive! I would support about half of that as an upper maximum. The potential for inadequate living conditions and disruption to neighbours is too great at a potential twelve pets per property.
- Other: I think 12 animals per household is to many. I would think 3 and 3 would be the max and depending on the size of the home. 12 pets in 700 sqf would be ridiculous
- Other: Those that have that many likely won't disclose how many are at the residence anyways
- Other: The pet limit should be far less per household, e.g., maximum 2 total (dog or cat or both).
- Other: 12 potential animals in a house is too many! are the needs of the animals being looked after? too many issues could arise.
- Other: Too many dogs means more noise. I have neighbours with noisy dogs and also a neighbour who's cats roam free all the time.
- Other: 6 is too many animals in a house
- Other: Professional high end breeders require more dogs
- Other: 12 animals in one residence is far too much even it comes to hygiene and noise.
- Other: this bylaw should be scrapped altogether .
- Other: Again, situational
- Other: None of your business how many pets are "necessary". Will you then want to determine how many children I can have?
- Other: The focus should be on meeting animalsâ€™ needs regardless of numbers
- Other: Dog sitters have more than 6 dogs in a household
- Other: no exceptions maybe except for breeders cuz the dogs are usually gone after 8 weeks. 4 should be the limit for most household, period. Who has more than 4 or 6 service animals??



Inherited?? that's BS too. dog rescue will take the animals. what are the criteria for excess animal permit? If you want more than 4 dogs, buy some fish instead!

- Other: L
- Other: There is no reason to own more than the current by law. 6 dogs is way more noise and feces.
- Other: This is insane. People should be allowed to own as many pets as they want as long as the pets are properly cared for. What is next, restricting the number of children people have? Come on!
- Other: NA
- Other: Have as many animals as you want as long as they are taken care of
- Other: 6 cats AND 6 dogs in one house is ridiculous. Do they all stay inside the house at all times? Of course not. The dogs can be outside barking and the cats use my garden as a litter box. One or two are bad enough. Allowing up to 12 animals next door is asking for trouble.
- Other: 3 dogs and 3 cats should be the limit. Unless approved. No one can handle 6 of each animals in a single family house hold.
- Other: 2 pets is enough in the city. Move to the country if you want more pets.
- Other: Higher chance of negligence and abuse. Obscene amounts of noise. People can hardly manage one dog.
- Other: Noise, feces, irresponsible pet owners, ineffective by law enforcement.
- Other: I'm an adult and I can decide how many pets to own. You can't assume more #s of pets make me irresponsible
- Other: There should be a limit.
- Other: I do support limits and the exceptions for fosters but don't think we need as high as 6 cats and 6 dogs.
- Other: That is a total of 12 animals in a household for an unlimited amount of time. That is too many. If it is for a temporary purpose that is ok
- Other: No more than 6 pets altogether per household. As it is, cat owners in our city are EXTREMELY irresponsible, neglectful, & abusive towards their cats. Roaming cats is a bylaw that is STRONGLY ignored. Too many pets equals less attention & love given out, because there's too many to care for.
- Other: As long as the owner is responsible, and not abusive. They should have any many dogs or cats as they want
- Other: As long as the animals are cared for there is not reason why you should not have any number of animals. I'm just not sure why you would have that many.
- Other: 12 animals total is excessive. Vast majority of people cannot adequately care for that many animals (financially and emotionally).
- Other: 2 is a good number.
- Other: 12 pet total limit is ridiculous!! No one needs more than 3 pets TOTAL!!!
- Other: I have seen people with one animal struggle to take care of them properly, and people with more than 6 do such a great job that you would never know there were more than 6 animals on the property. The issues are related to the people, not the animal(s). How hard would it be to get a



Fanciers' permit? And what if there is a household with less than 6 animals with these ongoing issues?

- Other: The point of responsible pet ownership is to be responsible those that are not should be able to be addressed by the officers in alternate manners in varying bylaws . Property a mess they can issue a fine for that instead of warning after warning - how many homes are actually potential issues in the city that have more than this proposal? I thibk a strategic count of verified complaints need to be looked at to ensure that this is not a rule for a few that affect the large majority of good pet owners
- Other: Within city limits 3 animals is by far enough. If breeding dogs a special license should be required of 3000 or more to prevent abuse
- Other: For the pets' sakes, the number should be reduced to 6 pets IN TOTAL.
- Other: There is nothing wrong with it. Stop singling out breeds, single out bad pet owners
- Other: You have NO right to limit the number of animals. We are "FREE" try to remember that before you keep trying to crush us under a militant police state designed to derive fines out of daily life. This is a pathetic attempt to let us have input on your racketeering, fine for the sheep but not for anyone with a brain which excludes you. (I want to charge you all with Racketeering)
- Other: No one needs 6 damn dogs or cats. Nothing but grief for neighbors to satisfy some pet fetish
- Other: We might need more by-laws to deal with mills and horders not some lonely widow with 7 little dogs. I would support a higher limit than 6.
- Other: 6 is too many!! Max should be 3 of each
- Other: I like the 6 cats and 6 dogs rule but there should be no application to allow more.
- Other: Because it's rediculous
- Other: I am not sure why -unless you were a licensed breaded- you would need 12 animals in your home. Our neighbours have 4 dogs and 3 cats currently. None are spayed/neutered. They can barely afford to feed them and have the bare minimum of care. I do not live in a lower income community in our city. I believe if we increased the amount of pets allowed there will be an increase in abuses and neglect.
- Other: I currently own 7 dogs myself and am a responsible pet owner. I pick up my feces, do not allow my dogs to bark to disturb my neighbours. I don't want to penalized for people who don't do these things as I will not be forced to choose which dog goes and which dog stay. Calgary is one of the only cities that doesn't have this caveat on it and it should remain this way. This could also affect foster based rescues if there are more hoops to jump through in an effort to find foster homes for the animals they rescue.
- Other: Restricting the limit of animals per household is not addressing the cases that really need to be looked at such as hoarders, back yard breeders,etc... These cases will continue to be an issue. These types of households will not care what the bylaws are. Responsible pet owners and reputable breeders are already doing the right thing and following laws such as registrations, CKC membership, registration of dogs bred with the Canadian Kennel Club, proper raising of puppies and adults, etc. Don't hurt the people who are already responsible and following correct practices by



limiting the number of dogs. Implement and enforce stricter bylaws for the hoarders, puppy mills, animal abuse cases instead of the current "slap on the wrist" bylaws.

- Other: the issue shouldn't be how many pets, but rather how well they are cared for. there are plenty of one pet owners who mistreat their animals and plenty of multi pet owners who treat them very well.
- Other: No need to limit if the animals are being properly cared for. If all pets are licensed the city can send inspectors.
- Other: The more pets one has, the more responsibility of not just keeping the home clean, but ensuring proper health care for all the animals. Vets are not cheap.
- Other: Six cats and dogs in one household is ridiculous. Two pet of any species maximum. My experience is that those with large numbers of pets are those who can least afford to keep them.
- Other: multiple pets are not a problem for most people, especially if show animals
- Other: 6 cats and 6 dogs in the city is too much opportunity for a hoarding situation. The majority of large intakes to rescues are from hoarding. Why increase a bylaw allowing this to be more likely?
- Other: if a person is able to provide quality care animals then they should be allowed to have more, within reason
- Other: I'm not sure why it has to go from 2 to 6. I would support a bylaw change from 2 to 4.
- Other: If you have dog(s), clean up after them, keep them in a fenced in yard it should be fine.
- Other: While I can see that someone might want more than 2 dogs/cats I feel that 6 is too high. Dogs can feed of one another's energy and can be quite a disturbance is there are 6 noisy dogs.
- Other: As long as the animals are being taken well care of there should be no limit to the amount of animals a person may own in there own home
- Other: That's too many animals in one residence
- Other: I agree but add in if the owner lives on a property >5 acres and can demonstrate the ability to safely and properly take care of the animals.
- Other: I dont think there should be a limit on the amount of pets you own as long as you can properly care for them.
- Other: 12 animals in a home is too many.
- Other: This should only be for special circumstance like fosters for approves rescue agencies. And these home should be inspected on a regular basis to ensure animal are being cared for. It's a red flag to own that many animals.
- Other: 1 pet per house
- Other: more than 6 animals in the city where we are squished together is too much. One dog barks and they all barks. I lived by a lady with 5 dogs constantly in the yard and constantly barking. It was horrible and I had to move.
- Other: very few homes or yards can properly accommodate needs of 6 dogs. Owners have little control when dogs convert to pack mentality and pursue or act aggressively to people
- Other: 6 is too many
- Other: I agree that a rule limiting the number of dogs and cats on a property would be beneficial, as many people who own a multitude of pets do not take proper care of them and many animals end up



living in hoarding conditions. I do not however feel that "breeders" should be exempt from this rule because the majority of breeders in Calgary could be considered irresponsible in the way that they breed animals. If Calgary could figure out a way to require licensing and inspections for people who call themselves breeders, than maybe they could be exempt from this rule. As of right now, not a single breeder in Calgary is doing it for the love of animals, it is all about the money.

- Other: I think the bylaw should be less than 6 animals! I would say 4 max.
- Other: Are you going to introduce bylaws for misbehaving kids?
- [removed]
- Other: 6 is too many for a city home. Acreage/farm maybe, even then not necessary. Limit to 2-3 per household.
- Other: This number is too many. 3 of each is more reasonable
- Other: I think it should be no more than 3 of each pet....
- Other: I would like it to be lower. No one needs or should have up to 6 dogs and 6 cats. If there were a limit I think it should be closer to 3 or 4 of each with the same exceptions. Anyone that does have valid reasoning or resources to care for that many animals would get approved through special Approved Excess Animal Permit, and it would also help cut down the "side shelters" that mean well, but don't understand what their getting into by trying to start and run a shelter and in turn do not achieve any positive mission statement or add to the problem.
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive. Reduce this to 2/2
- Other: We foster cats for a rescue and occasionally have over 6 in the house.
- Other: No need
- Other: 6 should be the exception not the rule.
- Other: No One needs to have a dozen animals in a city home. If they are breeders, then they need a different license.
- Other: 6 dogs or cats is excessive no more than 4 cats and 4 dogs on premise
- Other: As an experienced handler, the limit of 2 cats or dogs if the maximum amount that one house hold can feasibly handle.
- Other: 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many.
- Other: These exceptions could be the applied to the current bylaw
- Other: 12 pets is a lot of animals
- Other: I would support a bylaw that reduces the number to 4 dogs and 4 cats
- Other: The limit must not simply be per household, though that should occur as well. The limit should be per neighborhood. There are far far too many dogs in the beltliner. Are parks are effectively dog toilets now, with grass damaged. Seen from above you can see how the dog toilets have evolved. The smell in the spring is overwhelming. Memorial park is being used as a dog toilet. It is unsustainable. All parks in the beltliner are now treated as de facto off leash parks as many dog owners simple disregard the bylaws. There should be a long wait list to get a dog in the beltline.
- Other: 6 is ridiculous
- Other: Six is too many. That number should be halved at least. Better yet, two of each.



- Other: That is too many pets in one house. Limit 4 total. Breeders should be required to get a special license and neighbors need to be consulted
- Other: If all the animals in a household are taken care of, properly- who are we to limit how many animals a person has? This bylaw could end up overcrowding our rescues and SPCA's more than they're already overcrowded.
- Other: If someone can properly care for animals and has the finances to do it, who cares how many are there.
- Other: 6 of each is still way too many. The limit should be 6 total animals or up to 4 of each unless there's special circumstances which you would apply for approval for. Or perhaps a ratio of animals allowed per sqft of property? Or number allowed based on building type? Someone on a large property should be able to own more than someone in a small apartment
- Other: Should not have a limit
- Other: Again, don't need that many pets in a household
- Other: The limit should be 4 animals (dogs, cats combined) per household for the well-being of the animals.
- Other: 6 pets is enough
- Other: It's excessive and I worry about the wellbeing of 12 pets in one home.
- Other: No one needs that many animals as pets in their home. This is just the making of neighbours flooding the bylaw system due to excessive barking, roaming cats. The list is endless.
- Other: Move to a rural property if you want a herd
- Other: Rescuers
- Other: The amount of bylaws in this city is beyond ridiculous. I'd love for the city to start minding their business. Maybe take care of the damn roads and alleys? Maybe spend your money on properly taking care of the homeless and people in need. Stop wasting my time and especially my money for your stupid bylaw proposals
- Other: Who needs this many animals?
- Other: 12 animals within city limits on a residential property is too many based on notes above, feces accumulation, noise etc. I feel a lower limit on the number of animals is warranted. For example 4 dogs and 4 cats or even a total of 6 dogs or cats is sufficient for household pets.
- Other: 12 animals plus people in a home is crazy. Max total of 10 so a combination of cats and dog with no more than 6 of either.
- Other: There are already bylaws for feces accumulation, noise, etc. All pets should be licensed. The number of animals doesn't matter. If you are a good and responsible pet owner then the number of animals should not matter.
- Other: 6 dogs or 6 cats is too many for any household in a city. County housing is fine. Cats & dogs should not be a necessity for low income peoples. I've been there & low income money should be focused on getting out of a low income situation but a limited pet per household might be ok.
- Other: If they're meeting all bylaw requirements why limit how many they can have?
- Other: there is no reasonable reason for any household to have this many animals at one time in the limited space a city property has. It would be animal cruelty.



- Other: 6 dogs/cats per household is too many, the maximum should be less 2 maybe 4
- Other: A lot of owners lets their cats run at large. Their arguments are 'cats are outdoor animals'. More pets allowed, especially cats, means more cats at large.
- Other: Our homes are small and how can an animal have any space if there are more than 2.
- Other: Outside fostering there is no reason for someone to own 6 dogs. Limit it to 4
- Other: Let people have as many animals as they want. Itâ€™s not hurting you
- Other: I'm not sure how I feel about this. If the parent of the dogs n cats is responsible why should there be a limit. We gonna start limiting how many kids some people have ?
- Other: 6 is too many
- Other: I would support it so long as the exceptions listed above remain in place. Fosters play an essential role and sometimes need to have many animals to prevent shelter overcrowding. Additionally, if multiple people share a home (eg rental situation) and both are fostering/own animals, this would restrict their housing options in a city where pet friendly housing is challenging to find
- Other: So long as the owner looks after his/her pets it should not matter how many pets they have!
- Other: I believe it would believe it would be too hard to manage the exceptions
- Other: no one needs 6 dogs and 6 cats. You cannot properly care for that many animals.
- Other: I think 6 is a high number, nobody needs that many pets. the only exceptions should be for breeders when there's litters, and rescue foster homes
- Other: it says *potential exceptions* for fosters, rescues, it should say they are exempt
- Other: Some people can not handle more animals, some properties can't. Some people can have 10 dogs and be able to handle it and so does their property. You cannot create one rule for different circumstances. Start having serious consideration towards assessing PEOPLE (such as people who buy pets and expect children to look after them full time). *After every question there should be an ability to comment*! !
- Other: Too many issues at the current number already
- Other: There is no need for that many animals. That's a breeder.
- Other: If someone can help animals like this regardless their number why not? Is it better to leave them in shelters or on the streets?
- Other: I believe 6 total either dogs or cats or a mix. 6 total animals in a home is more than enough for city living.
- Other: Nobody needs 6 dogs and 6 cats for pets for all the reasons stated above. I would support 2 animals with the potential exceptions listed.
- Other: This is encouraging for hoarding
- Other: I dont think there should be a limit as long as the animals are being cared for appropriately, are licensed, are not nuisance animals and are not causing issues for others in the community. If I want to have 7 cats, I keep them in my home, I have them licensed and they are well taken care of, I do not see an issue with having that many.
- Other: For the reasons above. There are people that breed, foster, run daycares, etc.. If someone can responsibly have that many pets on their own property why limit that?



- Other: I think there are responsible pet owners that can have more than 6 pets
- Other: By law enforcement has a job to check on these properties with more than 6 animals. If laws are broken THEN restrict that household. Not the entire population based on a few bad owners. Many owners can look after 6 or more animals.
- Other: I do not believe anyone needs 6 pets, let alone 6 of each. Foolish!
- Other: Unless the number of adults in the household is taken into account, 12 animals is too many for any one person. The max should be 2 dogs and 2 cats unless a permit or exemption is given.
- Other: No one needs six dogs. If you allow it, someone is going to have six large dogs in their backyard howling all night and making a mess. This is a terrible idea.
- Other: Some litters have more than 6 animals. But 6 and 6 is quite high especially for how small homes are becoming in Calgary.
- Other: I am a pet owner, but do not want to live beside someone who has excess number of dogs/cats.
- Other: More than two is too much.
- Other: This will lead to potential hoarding situations and I personally do not feel that the animals would get the vet care that they require because of the cost. There is no need to own that many pets
- Other: 6 is too many. 2 or 3 max.
- Other: the number should be less than 6, 12 potential in one house is way too many
- Other: Not necessary
- Other: 6 of each still seems very high... 4 maybe would be more reasonable. Even still.. who needs 4 dogs and 4 cats?!
- Other: If there is a need for more than 1 cat and 1 dog a special license should be required.
- Other: I can not support something that takes away from my freedoms and also puts me up for potential fines and penalties. It's a dog council.... Open your damn minds and think about things properly before coming up with these ridiculous laws. 100 years ago this wouldn't even be up for debate. Your request to instill a bylaw would be shut down immediately
- Other: Responsible pet ownership should be the main ruler here. If someone can care for the animals and the animal living conditions are appropriate then the person should be able to take care of however many animals they want.
- Other: There is no need other than temporary homes to have that number of pets
- Other: This should be case by case and only imposed if there is an issue with animals not being cared for properly
- Other: City overreach
- Other: there is no reason for an individual to have 12 pets in a household. The max should be a combined limit of 6, not 6 of each.
- Other: There is no need to own this many pets in one home
- Other: Many people foster or rescue dogs or cats for various organizations. Do not limit the number of animals one household may have as the foster care programs will see a drop in public help
- Other: Nobody besides breeders needs that many pets. It's excessive.



- Other: edmonton has a rule of 3 pets. Which I think is a fair number. 6 opens up the possibility to unregistered breeders
- Other: Endangers the welfare of animals to have too many to properly care for, too much feces, too much noise, too much smell!
- Other: It would make the city very dirty
- Other: Let people make their own decisions
- Other: people don't need more then two animals, their big responblity.
- Other: Too many
- Other: I think having 12 pets is too many
- Other: Some people rescue and foster animals out of their homes and they should be able to continue to do so. In lieu of limiting the amount of animals people can have, welfare checks should be done on homes with, say, 8 or more animals.
- Other: If the animals are being properly looked after I don't think the city has the right to limit.
- Other: Way too many and the exceptions will allow noise levels to be high
- Other: I think that is too many animals
- Other: 2 is enough
- Other: Government should not be regulating what is inside my property. There is already nuisance laws on the books to deal with issues.
- Other: I think it should be no more than 6 total combining cats and dogs. 12 animals in one house is to many
- Other: 12 animals per household is alot of pets, especially in the city. Typical yard are not that big.
- Other: The government should have the right to determine the number of pets we have.
- Other: That is too many animals to be properly and safely taken care of in a household. I find it hard to believe that most households could provide enough room and maintain a clean safe environment for humans and pets for an extended period of time. I would like to see a cap of 4 animals except when there is a new litter involved.
- Other: Unnecessary
- Other: There should be no more than two pets per household as there is limited space in the city for so many animals. There are a surplus of animals at the Calgary Humane Society alone due to negligence. People need to have fewer animals and be more educated in obedience training and animal care.
- Other: I like the bylaw that we have right now
- Other: Some people can't look after one dog and some people with 12 have the best dogs ever. There are so many other sections to deal with issues if the number of dogs is higher than the homeowners can handle. Barking? There's a section for that. Too much poo? Section for that. House a mess? Section for that (different bylaw)
- Other: The limit is still too high. Should be lowered
- Other: I think it's fine the way it is.
- Other: 6 and 6. Are you out of your mind. That a kennel. Try living beside one.



- Other: Mo
- Other: the number of pets per household should be determined with consideration for the animal's welfare. it does not make sense to have a predetermined max number.
- Other: 6 is excessive. Can lead to unsanitary conditions, poor life for animals, hoarding along with many other issues. 2 cats and 2 dogs or a total of 4 pets is plenty.
- Other: would actually like to see the lower number of animals per each household in the city. No one needs 6 dogs or cats in the city.
- Other: 6 dogs or cats is outrageous! Way too many. 3 max.
- Other: Why limit animals if they are cared for properly
- Other: I would support 5 pets, but not 5 dogs, or 5 cats. more than 3 of either type can potentially become a nuisance to neighbours. I did not see the option for increased fines for destruction causes by cats. There continues to be discrimination against dog owners, and leniency for cat owners.
- 12 animals in one household is way too many!
- I would support a cap of 10-12 cats and/or dogs total
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many pet household. I support the exceptions.
- That should be our right/choice.
- A maximum of 4 dogs and 4 cats per household is enough. Exceptions to the rule by permit and additional fees for licensing.
- How big of yards do you think there are left in the city?? Six dogs is way too much. I would say 3 or 4 is acceptable. Anything more than that should be by special application.
- Management should be the focus. Many responsible pet owners foster and rescue animals and shouldn't be restricted to a limit. Instead, better manage the poor pet owners.
- That's too many animals !
- Too much interference with peoples property. Enforce noise bylaws instead.
- 6 cats and 7 dogs are way to many for one household. The number should be lower to prevent hoarding and bad pet ownership situations in which pets are at risk.
- There are already laws in place to deal with the problems. noise, feces, neglected animals, etc. Enforce the law. Another bloody tax of a small minority.
- 12 animals in one property is way too many.
- No
- Although 6 dogs and 6 cats may seem like a lot, on an acreage it is much more feasible to have more pets
- As long as they are registered and remain up to standards, it is not necessary to limit the amount of pets.
- Nobody needs 6 dogs or cats
- As long as there's not a crazy amount of pets in a house they should be allowed as long as it's safe and the owners can afford it
- It is your personal property, you should be allowed to own whatever you want.



- As long as other rules are being abused by (feces clean up, no excessive noise etc) there is no reason people should not be allowed to have as many pets as they please!
- Number of dogs does not protect against the issues. The issues themselves need to be addressed instead (eg excessive noise).
- Two is an acceptable number within city limits. If individuals want to own more than two then move out of the city
- You're making people get rid of their pets if they have more than 6
- 6 dogs? Unless you're a breeder there is no reason to own this many.
- bylaw be Grandfathered?
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is way too many. It should be 2-4 of each max.
- As long as animals are not inconveniencing anyone, it is no one's business how many pets you have
- Can own however many animals as you want within reason. As long as you keep a clean house and animals are cared for properly you should be able to have as many as you want.
- You didn't explain how the rule is now for comparison. Or what the cons to this change are.
- No one needs to own that many pets. Pets should be limited to 2 per household.
- Adding more levels of enforcement to an existing issue will not help solve the root problems. If the animals are being properly cared for then the number of animals shouldn't matter as the same conditions can arise regardless of species in question.
- There should be no limits.
- I think 6 of each is way too many for an urban property. Limit should be 6 total regardless of which species.
- I don't like the idea of a limit on animals. Some people can manage multiple animals, others shouldn't be allowed to own any.
- I think it's unnecessary for anyone to have 6 dogs.
- Most people are reasonable. A number law will not prevent someone living with multiple animals. Duh.
- I would say no more than 8 animals, of which no more than 6 may be dogs
- Breeders should be removed from the list
- If a person is a GOOD pet owner, then as long as all pets are well taken care of then there should not be a limit.
- I would say yes but also add exceptions to take into consideration if a potential buyer backs out of a sale
- If its a house they rent sure, put a limit on the amount of animals they have. If they own their home, I don't think you should be able to limit how many pets they have unless of course they aren't being properly taken care of.
- I just don't like arbitrary restrictions. if someone takes issue with something someone else is doing it should be dealt with on a case by case basis that way no one is deemed to be in the wrong simply because they did not follow a rule and it will be easier to see past any stigma having a rule would create. as well, people will be more open with their dialog when issues do arise if they do not feel they must hide as they have broken a rule and we can get to the root cause of any problems easier.



- Excessive
- Six dogs is too many to manage. Four seems reasonable.
- To some pet owners, these animals are like children. If the human is a responsible pet owner, there is no reason to restrict the number of pets they have. We don't restrict the number of children in a family but there is intervention if the children are not properly cared for. Same should apply to pets.
- Multiple pets does not mean irresponsible ownership.
- As long as the owner is taking care and being responsible for their pets, why do they need to be limited in the number. We have bylaw and fines for the issues listed above. That should be the recourse not limiting those who are responsible.
- Most households can't handle one.
- way too many animals. In some circumstance people would be neglectful of fewer animals
- discrimination
- As long as the pets are treated fairly and safely then more pets should be allowed.
- 6 cats AND 6 dogs?! That's way too many to begin with
- Larger families or multiple people living together could easily manage many more animals than a single person
- The amount of animals in a home should be based on the size and type of home as well. This would be too many animals in a townhouse in my opinion.
- 2 dogs or 2cats is plenty. No one should have more!
- People can make their own decisions
- There should be no limit as long as they treat animals well
- city of Calgary needs to keep their nose out of this. As long as the animals are cared for why would the city need to be involved.
- If they're taking care of them all properly let them
- As long as people provide the proper care for their animals there should be no limit on the amount of animals they can own. I'm not sure who could possibly support taking animals from loving homes and putting them in a shelter to suffer or even be murdered because of a bylaw.
- I don't want to. Thanks.
- So but no way does someone need more than 6 dogs and cats. Are you f-big serious
- So long as people are paying their fines and are keeping their animals healthy than it should be of no concern.
- 4
- why add more rules that you can't enforce
- There needs to be a limit on how many cats/dogs people own. Two is reasonable six can be seen as hoarding depending on the size of the living space
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is way too many.
- Only with respect to protecting the animal's welfare would i support this change
- The owner should be held responsible for their actions



- 12 animals to a household is too many unless certain conditions such as space for animals to roam and conditions are checked on a regular basis.
- Maximum 3
- People should be able to have as many animals as they wish as long as conditions are good and pets are happy.
- 6 is too many
- 6 of each is still too many
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is quite excessive. I believe 2 dogs, and 2 cats is reasonable.
- Use common sense. Things are fair now
- If the owner is demonstrated to be unable to care for their animals, then it makes sense to restrict the number. If they are well cared for and not disturbing the neighbours, there is absolutely no reason to place restrictions on responsible pet owners.
- If the animals are taken care of, the number doesn't matter.
- I think the number of animals should be determined by the size of the property, type of animal, etc.
- As long as the animals and property are being taken care of and all needs/ requirements are being met then there should not be a limit however I do not think people should be hoarding animals. If a person is unable to properly take care of or maintain appropriate accommodations for an animal then they should not have one.
- I think it is significantly more difficult to be a responsible pet owner as the number of pets increases. Any combination of two licensed animals should be enough. The only exception should be licensed breeders.
- Six is a lot, a maximum of four each with the above noted exemptions seems more reasonable in the city.
- It's not the governments place to determine the limit of pets a person owns.
- As long as the owners can provide evidence that the needs of the animals are being met and there's no other problems, there shouldn't be a limit on pets
- Not enough households in Calgary that are big enough to support this amount of animals
- As long as the animals are well taken care of, I see no problem with having more than 6 pets
- Such be much lower than six
- There should be no limit
- Pet limit laws are hard to enforce and a waste of tax dollars
- We live in a supposedly "free country" where we should have the freedom to own as many animals as possible, as long as they are cared for and not causing harm to anyone else.
- As long as the dogs/ cats are properly cared for and appropriate husbandry is kept I should not have the power to say how someone chooses to live their life. Exception being if their lifestyle has a direct provable adverse affect on affected said person.
- I agree with an increased limit, but the implementation of a special authorization should begin at a lower threshold. Many people are incapable of properly caring for animals, and this would be exacerbated by incapable owners taking on many animals at once. Prospective owners wishing to keep animals in larger numbers should be able to prove they have the resources to do so.



- Its now how many its how responsible the person is
- There should be restrictions based on space not a blanket number.
- Deal with problems as they arise, not by blanket legislation
- They should have as many animals as they want if they are taking care of them
- I think the limit should be much lower than that. As someone who owns 2 dogs and 2 cats, I understand the huge time commitment just 4 animals makes. I think anymore than 4-6 TOTAL animals should require a specific permit.
- I would not support any limitations on number of pets in a household. Existing laws already address any concerns that limiting the ownership proposes to.
- I do think that it is a very sensitive subject that should be considered on a case by case basis.
- If animals are well cared for & not a nuisance no need to limit #
- As long as pets are well cared for, there should not be a limit.
- People live in houses, not barns
- Keep the limit low for listed issues
- Responsible pet owners should not be restricted
- 6 permanent dogs or cats is way too many . they need to be taken care of . That includes lots of exercise and playtime
- You have no right to tell citizens how many pets they have. If any there should be guidelines on the resources to care for an animal to ensure the animal is in a safe environment
- We have a neighbour with 7-8 dogs and they bark all the time. There should be less dogs per household in city limits. 4 and higher amount of dogs creates a pack and you will have more attacks in the city . Too many to be taken care of properly.
- Perhaps the size of home should be considered. An animal could be at risk in a small home with too many other animals, but a large home (farm etc) could safely house 6+ animals.
- So if a household can have 6 dogs & 6 cats all at the same I would say no to that. What kind of loving conditions world 12 animals have in a city dwelling, an acreage or farm is different. If the bylaw is for a total of 6 dogs & or cats than I would say yes to that. At least the animals have room to grow and be healthy and happy.
- Owning 6 of any animal is hard to do.It could be overwhelming at times for the owner. That's when the pets start to get neglected and that should never happen.
- Could be or will be? Support only if language is definitive
- 12 animals in a house? I have a hard time believing they're getting everything they need. If they want that many pets, they should have to deal with monthly checkins
- No limit is required
- As long as the law is being followed, I don't believe these restrictions should be made.
- Control people. Not animals
- 12 animals in a household is too many.
- That's a lot of animals for someone to control.
- No one needs 6 cats or dogs in one house



- I think there should be a limit of 2 dogs and 2 cats with the exceptions of the above, I think 6 is ridiculously high for the average person.
- This is not clear enough to support
- I think the 'if a household wants more than # of dogs or # of cats, a special application will be required' statement should apply but the number of pets within a household should not rise to 6 per cats and dogs. 12 animals per household is excessive, unsafe, expensive and should only be accepted after assessment of the household owners.
- People can have as many cats and dogs as they want
- So long as the animals are loved and well taken of I believe it is okay.
- If there is more space, you should be allowed to have more animals. To compare cats to dogs like this is just fricken insane. They are completely different in what they require for space. They only poop in your own home, and make no noise AT ALL that your neighbors could here. This is outrageous and these animals should be looked at separately. One human could EASILY own 3 cats and 1 dog. This is impossible to compare/ limit in this way. One could have 2 dogs, 2 cats VERY EASILY. THIS IS A RIDICULOUS BYLAW
- That many pets can lead to hoarding situation
- Seems like more work for bylaw enforcement and completely unnecessary. Just deal with the few households who do want over 12 pets AND are doing a bad job caring for them. Why have more red tape? Dont intentionally prevent good people from caring for as many animals as they can. Also all pets need to be licensed already so why specify all of the pets need to be licensed if you have 6 cats and 6 dogs.
- I think its fine the way it is
- Breeders, pet sitters, day cares all should have business licenses, that's entirely different.
- to many animals period ots not necessary unless its a rescue
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is much too high, this is often not good for animal welfare. Make it 3-3, with special permissions. As a vet it is unlikely an owner could care for the individual needs of 6 of one species of animal in one confined environment
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats per household? With exceptions allowed? Are you crazy?
- The number of pets in a household should be restricted if there are complaints about excessive noise, accumulation of feces, or any other reason that would lead people to believe the animals aren't receiving sufficient and proper care.
- A combined total of 12 seems very high. I would say a combined total of 6 is mire than reasonable
- Unless you pay the rent or mortgage, you have zero say in how many pets are allowed in a home. Get a grip. Stop being a dictator with your hand in everyone's pocket
- There are many responsible owners with more than 6 animals at any given time. Do not punish those owners!!!
- What happens if your pet has a litter, most dogs have a large litter that would put you over the 6.
- That's a lot of animals for one house if you want that many you should have to have a good reason and apply. To protect animal welfare.



- If a responsible pet owner has the space and means to properly take care of multiple animals that should not be governed.
- If the pets are well cared for who are you to judge???
- No. Animals are some people's ENTIRE lives. Some people have whole packs, they take care of these animals, love these animals, these animals are their everything. When animals are not being taken care of is the concern.
- You can't properly care for these animals when there are large numbers in the home
- I support limiting the number of animals a person can own. 6 is way too high!! Even 4 seems excessive.
- That's too many animals for one household
- How big is the home in question. How many people are caring for the animals, I think a rule in regards to square footage would be more fair than setting a specific number as it does not take into account those with very large homes and many family members living inside the home.
- Free country
- Just no
- 6 animals total would be more sensible
- N/a
- As long as pet owners are responsible and can properly care for their animals, there shouldn't be an arbitrary limit. Problem people will always be a problem, no matter the legislation.
- People that are not responsible will go "underground"
- I don't feel that anyone in the City needs that many animals if responsible. 4 of EITHER seems reasonable, or else exceptions should apply.
- 4 animals per house is more than enough.
- The proposed pet limit is large.
- Nothing needs to change
- If someone wants more than 6 dogs and 6 cats that is their choice. As long as they are responsible pet owners, it really shouldn't matter.
- I think it would have to depend on how well taken care of the animals are. Would this include "urban" hens?
- A home with 6 cats and 6 dogs is too many animals. Fear of neglect and ability to control all animals at once.
- This enables poor pet ownership in most circumstances and makes hoarding situations less identifiable and less likely to be remedied.
- If all laws are met there is no reason for a restriction
- 12 animals would be far too many. How will all of them get the adequate care that they need.
- I don't like the government restricting people who have done nothing wrong
- That is an excessive number of animals for a single family dwelling. Also most people can not afford to care for this many animals.
- It should be a max of 3 pets



- that's just too many animals in a residential area.
- No BSL
- shouldn't necessarily be a number. All cases are different
- [removed]
- Too many
- Decrease the amount to 2 dogs and 2 cats
- Unless the outside property area supports multiple pets, this could be considered unhealthy for animals to be cooped indoors, unhealthy for the humans sharing the space, and potential for abuse of these animals.
- The amount should be lowered to 4 dogs and 4 cats, because animals are not only expensive but also dirty.
- Unless they are a licensed rescue or fosters, there is no reason why a person would have 6&6. This would eliminate animal neglect & poor living conditions for the cats/dogs.
- Most Calgary homes do not have the room to have this many animals and this can be hard on the animals' welfare. Animal limits should be subjective to property size.
- Still not pets fault. They are family members
- I think the amount of dogs and cats should be LESS than 6 of each. That is way too many animals per household. Coming from the vet industry not many people could afford that many animals and i think that is half of the problem we see at the vet. Not being able to afford the animals you have! If there are restrictions to LESS than the proposed amount I think that would greatly benefit a lot of people.
- No one needs that many animals. It is unfair to the animal. Hoarding animals is wrong. Unhygienic
- The only exception should be registered breeders. People who hoard animals are often not able to provide for their welfare. Who needs that many animals in a house??
- if the pets are well taken care of there should be no limit
- number of pets should be based on ability of owners to adequately care for them, not an arbitrary number
- Majority of pets want attention from there owners and a 2 dogs/cats per person is manageable. If you have more then that and the animals get in a fight with each other or other animals how is more then two managed. The city is crowded already and lots of pets... the possibility of 6 per household is simply unreasonable.
- There should be no limit to the number of animals
- What if people have pets that give birth and they have a large littler but are responsible pet owners and don't want to sell or give their pets up for adoption out of fear they might be harmed or not taken care of properly.
- As long as the animals are cared for (sufficit funds for regular and unplanned vet visits), and there are no aggression/noise/smell issues them there should be no limit. It should not be the cities job to police this, unless issues/complaints arise.
- Licensing is a cash grab. It is recessive tax against the poor and an insignificant cost/annoyance to more affluent members of the community. There is an abundance of literature on this subject and I,



among others, will be opposing these “revenue tools” in the Calgary herald and other local publications.

- No limit
- The people that ‘need’ this many animals should not live in the city
- I feel this is excessive for urban areas
- There are responsible pet owners capable of multiple pets
- That is way too many pets. Should be per person as well as household. 1 person can’t properly care for 6-12 pets. But maybe 4 could.
- Cap should be higher so that it is only reached when the safety of animals is at risk
- Having 6 dogs in a home is not a good idea. Just having 3 is a huge responsibility, especially if they are all large breeds. That would be 12 animals in a home at one time, then if you make an exception for fosters, that foster animal will not get the attention it needs for rehab and cause even more issues.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of and it is not causing a disturbance to others there should be no limit. If the animals are found to be in a situation that does not permit them a high quality of life the pet owner should have the licenses revoked and permanently ineligible for future pet license.
- The problem isn’t owning too many animals. The problem is when people don’t take care of them. Further/harsher action should be taken against animal neglect and abuse instead of number of pets
- If people provide, care for and license pets and the pets are healthy, the city has no right to tell people how many dogs and cats are allowed. **THIS INCLUDES LEAVING PITBULLS ALONE**
- 6 dogs is way too many for one household.
- 12 animals in one home is excessive
- I don’t think anyone should own 6 pets.
- I am unsure of the current limit. I think if we are to truly consider the environment, pets should not be allowed at all, certainly not 6
- Six pets in a residence is too many. Doggie day cares should be in commercially zoned areas not residential areas. Dog breeders need to be limited as well.
- Dogs bark because it’s their nature, to be upset about this is just purely wrong. The only limit on animals should be for a given space. The amount of animals should not matter, the only thing that matters is the health of the animal.
- N/a
- Should also take into consideration, the size of property to house the animals + the number of caretakers there are.
- I don’t see the purpose of limiting the numbers of pet. The circumstances are greatly differentiated with the knowledge, skill, time, and experience of the owners. One pet might be too many for some but ten pets may not be a problem to some people.
- That’s far too many animals in a home. You are asking for animal hoarding to increase, avpbuse and neglect of the animals, likelihood of animals not being spayed, neutered or obtaining necessary



vaccines. That number of animals would be excessively expensive and few people could afford proper veterinary care, or feeding, or cat litter for that number of animals. Very bad idea.

- That's too many
- No limits
- No limits [DUPLICATE]
- That number is too high in the city
- The care of all pets falls on the owner. You should be focusing on good pet ownership. Its up to the owner to clean up feces and prepare for their pets no matter how many they have. If they can't take care of their pets properly then it falls under animal neglect and is chargeable under the provincial law.
- Responsible animal owners should be able to have as many as they want. Perhaps yearly check ups if there over 6 animals to ensure animals are safe and healthy
- As long as they are responsible and there are no issues of it impacting their neighbors.
- I don't believe this is a good idea. Backyard, mixed breed and small dog breeders will produce more.
- 6 is too many without exceptions. 3-4 would be more appropriate, increase the exception list
- Just have appropriate bylaws and then actually enforce standards for feces clean up, excessive barking, and welfare. I've have known people that take amazing care of 10 animals and I've seen other people neglect 1 dog, never clean up feces and let it bark all day. This limit does nothing to stop irresponsible owners and it may punish responsible owners.
- This is a lot of animals per household in an urban area. I would support a lower number per household with a list of exceptions including temporary homes, breeders, service animals, under 6 months, approved exception permit, grandfathered / inherited animals etc
- Should be max 5 animals either cat OR dog
- 12 animals in 1 household is far too many.
- Just like the government shouldnt interfere with the number of children I have they should not interfere with the number of pets i have. If i cant care for them then bring up issues but if i can reasonably take care of several animals I should be allowed to.
- That's too many animals to reasonably take care of. It should be max of 2 each
- City should not be deciding arbitrarily how many pets a given household should have.
- If there are exceptions and permit available the need to raise to 6 seems excessive. 3 is a more practice number. With 6 you can introduce small breeding operations, excessive feces build up, noise etc. The rural areas don't have a limit that high.
- Shouldn't arbitrarily limit the actions of lawful citizens.
- Six dogs and six cats is a bit excessive. Perhaps limit to 4.
- There should be a lower limit to number of dogs and cats
- I think that regulating the conditions animals are living in is more important than a hard and fast rule of how many cats/dogs can live in each household. The size of homes varies greatly, some homes may be of suitable size for x number of pets while another home is only suitable for y number of pets.



- Number of pets shouldn't matter as long as there are no issues such as excess feces, loud barking etc. 6 or more well behaved dogs is much better than 1 ill behaved dog
- Limits are really not indicative of how well people care for their animals. Some people can't even care for one dog, whereas someone with six or seven can be excellent caregivers. One dog can cause more disturbance than 10. The current bylaws need to be enforced in regards to nuisance or abuse. Ensure bad owners are fined/charged and good homeowners rewarded.
- there should be no limit providing animals are taken care of
- It should be lower than that. If your living in the city you do not need 12 animals in your home!
- More explanation of special circumstances that would qualify, but in general support these changes
- No one in a single family home needs that many animals.
- People should be free to have as many as they want.. yet again you don't own there property
- The pets needs won't be well maintained
- up and should be fined if those standards aren't met
- As long as the animals are cared for properly and well kept there should be no limit. If a pet goes outside why is there a need for a license. Why should I be limited to how many animals I can have on a property I purchased. There should be no limit if the animals are animals well well looked after (happy, healthy, etc)
- The limit should be higher. Some people only have their pets. Or people should be able to go above the limit with an application of sorts and should ONLY be denied if there is good reason to believe they cant care for more.
- what gives someone the right to limit how many pets someone can have
- No one needs 6 dogs as "service animals". This should be removed. If it is a service dog training program, than it would apply under "temporary home".
- mind your business.
- Unfair treatment of citizens
- I think this bylaw ammendment should be more strict than presented. I think 6 pets total (of any combination) is the highest acceptable. This is primarily to ensure that ALL the animals are cared for.
- The current limits are reasonable, for the safety of the animals and reduction of noise and feces.
- Too many animals and jeopardised their health.
- Get real
- So long as the owner is responsible, they have the monetary means to care for them and the property is large enough to accommodate the number, I do not believe the problem is with the number of pets. The problem is with the owner them self, making this quite circumstantial.
- dont limit animals for people
- That's far too many pets for one household. Six total (dogs, cats, other) would be better.
- It seems kind of dumb that you could have 6 dogs and six cats but not 12 cats. I think there should be an overall limit of 8
- 12 adult animals in a home is not necessary.



- 12 pets is enough in 1 house. In the case of fostering an animal 6 may be adjustable but still keeping the number under 12
- Limits are only good if people are being honest about the number of animals. Many are not so honest.
- Worried about the level of care the animals would receive if so many in one home
- I don't think it's fair or supports a free society to put a limit on this for people and families. There are some people that have a lot of pets and take care of them well and it's not an issue. Obviously we are referring to cases where people have numerous pets and are not taking care of them or the area, then I think by law has an obligation to step in for safety and health. But I don't think there should be a black-and-white rule on this. concern should be reported and investigated with integrity and handled on a case-by-case basis.
- Should be 6 animals total not 12.
- I don't think it is right to tell one person the amount of animals they can own. I do believe that their needs to be a standard that needs to be met and a quarterly or bi annual inspection of the property the animals reside, only to make sure animals are being cared for the way they should. I can't tell someone who is going out of their way to adopt an animal in need to give them a better life that they deserve. If the animals are not being taken care of properly then there needs to be a consequence.
- Exemptions would have to be more clear, not a potential for me to support this
- Way to many pets fr one household in my opinion.
- If a person can afford and properly cares for their pets, there doesn't need to be a limit.
- I believe these numbers should be lower. 6 cats and 6 dogs is too many
- No limits. If there are considered to be "too many" it would be an animal abuse issue, would it not? Then that would be a case-by-case basis.
- All of the above issues come around to the owner. One person may have 4 dogs, but keeps their yard immaculate and tends to their needs fine. While the other person down the road with one small dog has a yard full of poop because they are simply too lazy to be a responsible dog owner. The number of animals should not be limited. Only if an intervention is required due to the environment for those animals or the people with in the home / property is considered a hazard for what ever reason.
- There is no real reason why the government should be mandating how many pets a responsible pet owner can have.
- I support a pet limit, but feel that six dogs and cats is still too much within Calgary.
- 6 seems way too high!
- Unless you live out on an acreage , sure have more dogs. But I think it's a bad idea if you let people who love in smaller houses keep more animals where the animal doesn't have space.
- too many animals in one home; 12 altogether, ridiculous
- 12 animals combined is too many in a standard sized home. Instead of placing a limit on each specific animal (6 dogs AND 6 cats) perhaps consider placing a limit of a combined max of 6-8 animals. Any house with limited yard space such as a condo or an apartment should have a lower



limit as well. Whereas someone who perhaps has an acreage or larger yard would be better able to keep proper care of multiple dogs and/or cats.

- I disagree with a limit, i think this should be a case by case basis depending on the household.
- 6 is way to many I think two is plenty
- You don't need that many animals in the city. Rockyview county has a 3 dog max.
- More BS bureaucracy, more taxes. Dog breeders will pay the price and it will do nothing to stop pet hoarders
- If the household is taking care of all animals appropriately I do not see an issue with owning more pets. I'd rather see a home with a lot of animals well taken care off then strays on street or in shelters.
- So long the owner is responsible, the animals are fed and in good care in a clean and healthy environment the limit could be a bit higher.
- Town/city limits should be 3 cats 3 dogs. More than that is excessive and not fair to the animals when living in a city.
- I don't believe there should be a limit on how many pets a person has
- I support the concept but it is unclear how/if this applies to households in rural subsets of Calgary who may have space or need/reason for more pets.
- That is too many animals for residential. People requiring that many animals should live in a space where the animals have sufficient room (acreage type property)
- Nobody needs a maximum of 12 animals in their house. It's not possible to provide optimal care to 12 animals.
- It's each persons right to choose
- 6 animals in one household is too many unless you have a very large house and price of land.
- Not the city's place unless a problem actually exists
- There is no need for anyone to own more than 2 dogs/ 2 cats at any given time aside from fostering dogs, or if you're breeding dogs and that should be done only with a permit.
- Other by-laws cover responsible pet ownership. Who makes the decisions on "Potential Exceptions"
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is too excessive and won't help the problem. Maximum of 3 dogs and 4 cats is more reasonable to deter excess noise and feces on property.
- I would like to see the number of pet limit lower than 6. I feel that this is matter of well being for the animals. In addition I feel this borders on hoarding.
- I believe the limit should be 3 of each
- The need for that many animals in a household is ridiculous
- I think a limit of 3 dogs/cats would be ideal. 6 dogs or cats is a lot of animals. Too many to have in a single family home in a city.
- it is not necessary and should not be acceptable to have that many pets and the limit should be far lower
- As long as you have a home where they are taken care of properly and no one is bothered then there shouldnt be an issue



- No because not everyone can afford that fee
- A pet limit of six (6) dogs OR cats. Not six of each, that is out of control and likely there is not enough land and space for that many animals. It is unrealistic.
- Multiple families living on a large property
- Over-regulation by city is difficult to follow already. Reduce all fines and invest in public education
- That is way too many animals in the city. 6 dogs? Serious noise, feces. No owner can walk them all on leash. At the dog park, too many to keep under control
- I think that is too many pets per house house and 3 cats and or 3 dogs is more than enough
- Animals can be very helpful for mental health and I think it's a person's choice on weather or not that have 10 dogs or 2. There should be more servailence of homes to see if dogs and care are being cared for
- I think the limit should be less, no more than three dogs and three cats, same conditions for any household that would want more than that. Backyard breeding is a real problem and this could help control that.
- Less blanket regulations deal with individuals cases and those neuances
- I think that the number of pets one can own should be determined by the size of their home and property and the distance between surrounded houses
- the pet limit is too high! Reduce limit to 3 and 3 with special application thereafter. Also include a bylaw for exception based on square footage of home and yard so that you cannot have too many animals in a small apartment or home
- A numbered limit is not a good indicator of animal welfare. A bad owner could have 1 dog and be more of a nuisance than a good owner with 10. Also, this question states that there is a large difference of opinion but then only lists the "Pros" to one of the options. It is worded unfairly and is leading.
- 6 of each is too high, that's 12 animals!! 4 (cats/dogs) TOTAL. City lots are small and getting smaller.
- Don't think there should be a limit as a responsible pet owner
- Implementing a limit on cats and dogs will not resolve any of the issues that were listed.
- A pet is a family. You wouldn't charge someone for having a kid.
- Given the exceptions... 6 dogs and 6 cats seems way too high!
- I think cats and dogs should not be treated as the same as dogs have much more requirements than cats do. I would support no more than 2 dogs and no more than 2 cats. Ie one household may have 2 cats and 2 dogs. But i think no more than that. Cats and rabbits could be interchangeable.
- If you can care for it it shouldn't matter.
- If the owner has means to tend to as many pets and provide them with quality life, I don't see why there needs to be a limit.
- Citizens are smart enough to assess their pet needs and the government should not get involved in dictating yet another facet of Calgarians lives.
- don't restrict peoples rights



- There should also be an exception for farms and ranches. Property size, size of animals, and space requirements of dog breeds should also be taken into account
- If the person can safely and properly care for the animals that's fine. Don't punish them cause some people can't, go after those people
- Already have fines for feces and noise, and bad behavior, and there are laws for animal welfare. Those who dislike pets should not dictate who can own what etc.
- It all depends on written contractual agreement that I would like to see put in place to affirm, insure, and also validate by-yearly how this person can support financially, and attend to the physical, emotional, psychological, relational needs of each dog as walking them, for example, does not mean sticking them in their backyard for a day or less. Their lives must matter in all weather conditions. And a plan of action for medical needs, too!
- The city should not have the ability to limit the amount of pets someone may have. It's an infringement of personal freedom, unacceptable.
- 12 pets is a ridiculous amount of animals in a house. Number should be reduced. Maybe 6 maximum total for cats and dogs. I'd support 4 maximum even. Yes I have both cats and dogs.
- There's no reason to own more than 2 dogs and/or 2 cats
- So long as they are not breaking other laws (such a puppy mill prevention laws) responsible pet owners should be free to own however many pets they can handle and give great care to
- 6 is too many dogs/cats in City limits. 3 or 4 would be more reasonable
- 4 cats; 4 dogs in city limits. Increase numbers for rural and farm properties with working dogs, and/or barn cats
- 6 is too many. 3 is a reasonable amount of pets
- A limit of 6 is ineffective and obscene. There is no need to have more than 2 dogs on most properties. There is simply not enough room in most yards in Calgary to take care of that many animals
- Less animals. Max 4 animals
- 6 dogs is to many without a kennel licence. Would for sure lead to neglect
- I think 6 dogs or cats is too many. Perhaps 4 with with the exceptions being OK.
- I think that it should be dependent on the size of house they have. Larger house = more animals. Smaller house = less animals
- I see no reason why anyone needs so many pets. How do they receive adequate care? Vet fees are expensive.
- 6 dogs or cats seems like a lot. With the exception of temporary homes, service animals (but 6+?) I don't see the need.
- Why would you possibly need 6 dogs or cats? Get some friends.
- Current limit is good - how do you care for 12 animals appropriately given the current economic situation
- Wouldn't support a change until the exceptions were more than hypothetical possibilities. Would need to see approved by-law wording before supporting.
- If their needs are met, what is the problem?



- If you take care of them and they are safe it's ok
- Unless they are a breeder, I feel 12 animals in one house is unfair to the animals
- 6 dogs and 6 cats it's too much. I think this number should depend on house and property size. If you can house that many fine, but you can't be cramming 12 animals into a single family home that just doesn't feel right.
- As long as the person has enough room on their property to properly take care of all their animals then it should be ok. They just need to train their animals and clean up after them. If the owner is capable of doing this then there shouldn't be a problem.
- It's none of anyone's business how many pets someone wants to own. As long as they are taken care of properly.
- I just think we will see increased hoarding situations. I'd like to see the stats for other cities on how many they allow (cities we want to emulate - which may mean looking outside of Alberta). It also costs a lot of money to properly care for animals. I work with many people who do it out of love and compassion but then can't feed them or fix them or get medical attention for them and the animals suffer. I also think puppy mill. Bad.
- Farms and acreages should be exempt as felines in a properly controlled environment desiccate rodent populations and ensure farm animals remain healthier.
- I would say 3 or 4 pets. Unless there's more than enough room
- No more than 2
- Excessive paperwork, no need for any of that.
- If I can look after my animals then you shouldn't tell me how many I can have
- How would you guarantee that people won't just call themselves "breeders" to waive this exemption? And letting "breeders" have more dogs and cats could lead to less people responsibly spaying and neutering their pets, backyard breeding (which often results in animals with severe deformities and health conditions). And limiting numbers does not guarantee good welfare. I am a veterinarian and I have had clients with 20+ pets in amazing health and received amazing care, and sadly many people with only 1 or 2 pets kept in horrible conditions and badly treated.
- It should be up to animal owners to make their own decisions on the number of animals that they have.
- Let people do what they want as long as they're looking after their [removed] pets. How about worry about something important - like animals being abused.
- We are a democracy not a police state. Most people are responsible pet owners. For those that aren't, limiting the number isn't going to change them.
- Not mutually exclusive to believe one does not "need" more than 6 pets but also not want government to arbitrarily intervene on peoples lives.
- 2 animals is enough
- I think there is too much potential for accumulation of waste and odour as well as less ability to provide adequate care (who can afford proper veterinary care for potentially 12 animals?). I think there should be the ability to apply for an exception but I think the current number of animals allowed is adequate



- The number of pets in a household has little bearing on those 3 points. A responsible pet owner always cleans up after their pet so feces should not be an issue. The dog should be trained to not bark and separation anxiety issues should be addressed. A dog's wellbeing isn't determined by whether or not it lives with other dogs as long as the owner insures compatibility.
- There should be lower limits. 4 dogs and 4 cats. This would deter backyard breeders.
- The muzzles on dogs is a [removed] move
- I oppose any part of this bylaw that allows people to breed animals.
- 6? More like four is more than plenty. Agree with the exceptions
- 6 dogs and/or cats is a lot! 6 animals total in a single family home is more reasonable.
- I feel like if the animals are well behaved we shouldn't be able to tell a person that they aren't allowed the animals that they want
- Not everyone is a dirty animal hoarder!
- 6 dogs & 6 cats full time in a house is too many unless it is a temporary situation like fostering for a short period
- As long as people are being responsible, there should be no limit on how many pets a person can have, especially if they're a breeder.
- While I don't find it necessary to own an unlimited amount of pets, there may be responsible owners who may not be able to provide healthy and happy lives for pets because the rules don't allow them to.
- There should not be more than 3 of each animal per household. And it needs to be based on size of home and yard to play in
- Should be less than 6
- I personally have two cats and one dog in our family. I don't feel The City should be involved in personal family matters which includes the # of pets. If you were to increase the fees I feel people would reconsider the number of domestic animals they would bring into their family.
- why should there be a limit? if we are going this path then limit the number of kids and family member in a household, kids are a much higher nuisance than dogs any day, so since there are no limits on humans why do we need a limit on dogs/cats, if the owner can feed and care for all of them then by all means
- 6 dogs or cats or both in one household is not responsible pet ownership. other than professionals in the animal industry (foster carers, vets, vet techs, rescue centre owners), the current maximum is appropriate.
- it is important to consider the property you are located on. For larger lots of land it would be more acceptable to have more animals.
- No one can effectively look after that many animals. If they can, they are probably outside the city. A dog sled company, for example.
- 6 of any animal is a lot.
- I would not want to live next door, or even within barking distance, of a house with 6 dogs. Chances of a pack of dogs not barking are extremely high.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is way too many for anyone but a registered breeding kennel



- Depending on the breed of dog. 6 big dogs should not live in one house
- People with a large enough property and tools should be allowed.
- lot of dogs and they are extremely well behaved.
- Perhaps 3-4 animals, 6 is excessive
- Two dogs max and 3 cats
- As described in the previous 3 points above
- Some people's animals are their life
- A total of 12 pets in a household at a time is ridiculous. There is no way any owner would be able to responsibly care for that many animals. Six total(both cat and dogs) while still very high is better.
- its dumb like this survey
- I don't think pet numbers should be limited.
- I don't believe it's responsible to keep 12 animals in one house. It's disgusting for both the animals and the human
- Although I agree with rescuing animals and helping them get into homes, 6 dogs and 6 cats in the same home can lead to unclean environments for the animals. I think 8 animals in total is fair, not 12. To own more I think drop in checks should be made to uphold a healthy environment for the animals.
- 6 cats AND 6 dogs?! That's too many
- Too many dogs
- 12 animals in 1 household is ridiculous. We will inevitably see an increase in mistreatment and malnourishment of animals. It's a city. Not a rural property
- No harm no foul. Punish if they break the rules or if there are complaints. Who cares how many pets someone has, as long as they keep it clean and safe, they should be free to do as they please
- The number shouldn't be that high. 6 animals are way too much on a property in a city
- Nobody needs 6 dogs or 6 cats
- 12 animals in a single home is way too excessive. I believe that 3 is a reasonable number..2 dogs, 1 cat, or 1 dog and 2 cats.
- Stop being nazis.
- there should not be a limit to the amount of pets you can have as long as its not a reasonable disturbance to those around you
- asfd
- The 3 reasons listed are all something a responsible pet owner can address. By laws should be put in place to help enforce the rules not limit the number of animals.
- NA
- If owners are responsible, it should be up to them how many animals they keep.
- no limit on number if no other issues
- As long as the pets are safe and they have ample space, there should not be a limit. Shelters and breeders should be educated on proper living space for animals and should be the ones making the call on if a household has the space for another pet.



- No One needs that many animals in the city. Way too many. Limits should be 3.
- Regardless of the stupidity of owning more than a couple pets, it is programs like these that lead to a bloated city budget and perpetual public debt.
- it shouldn't matter as long as all the animals are being properly cared for
- Too high a limit. Needs to be lower like 3 or 4 total (combined cats and dogs)
- 6 is still too excessive.
- Too many pets allowed per household.
- Foster homes should follow the limit.
- Animal limits can be effective for some people, it does not prevent hoarding, as that is a mental illness. All of my cats (6) and dogs (2) do not roam. I have an enclosed cat run in my back yard. Limiting the # of cats a person has is nonsense if they are not free roaming. They are not impacting anyone else. For dogs, there can be other issues like barking and build up of poop in yards. But that can happen with one dog and may not happen with 10 dogs. There are already bylaws and measures in place to deal with these behaviours. Increase enforcement - don't make new rules.
- I do not understand what the current bylaw is, but 2 dogs and 2 cats is enough. 6 is not manageable, not healthy for anyone.
- Why is it necessary if they follow all other bylaws? If your dog or cat has a litter you will not be in compliance? This makes no sense. The concerns should be about proper ownership not blanket statement of numbers.
- I would like to see the number decrease, 12 pets is a lot in a home. 4 pets total seems much More manageable. I would see this 6 as above on an acreage with a minimum square footage requirement.
- I can't see how having a total of up to 12 animals would make it possible for responsible ownership. Would people with that amount of animals have the means to provide care and food for all of them? Will their income allow it? I think 3 cats and 3 dogs max is a more reasonable number, and exceptions can be made in a case by case basis. I feel like this would protect not only the animals, but also the owners and the community as a whole.
- I feel 6 dogs and/or 6 six cats is too much for any household. I feel 3 and/or 3 is plenty aside for the exceptions mentioned above.
- I think 3 dogs or cats are plenty for a single residence.
- Same rules apply regardless number of pets
- That is an insane amount of animals. Limits should be 3.
- The introduction of this rule has the potential to prevent people from being able to foster/care for additional dogs even with the potential exceptions in place
- it should be lowered to 3 pets per house hold
- It's unnecessary
- Focus on responsible ownership not maximum quantities
- Only if the pitbull related bylaws were changed to all large breeds
- There should only be a limit on households that do not have the proper means to care for multiple animals. ie: money, space, cleanliness.



- There absolutely should be no limit, very few times does the average person have more the 6 dogs. Is it really a problem, do you truly have law enforcement going out to calls where 15 dogs on a property cause a problem? This currently isn't an issue at all. So why label it, why put a restriction down just to make it even harder for places like doggy daycares, breeders, etc. No need to keep taking away freedoms.
- Support everything except the number, six is too many, it should be no more than three
- This does not take into account different sizes in households nor does it take into account individual owners ability to care for their pets.
- Owning and taking care of pets shouldn't require any special licensing or extra fines, if the owner is providing a good safe environment they should be allowed as many pets as he/she sees fit.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of, there should be no limit. It is better to have a household with many dogs than to have them euthanized.
- Unless there is an actual problem, the city shouldn't be dictating how many pets home owners can keep on their property.
- Nobody needs that many animals within city limits. 2 and 2 is more than enough.
- Very few people have the space and ability to care for that many dogs. Of course there are always exceptions...
- Due to many people not being able to spay/neuter their pets for financial reasons they may have a number of pets in their home. If they cannot find suitable homes for these pets they may end up being forced to drop them in the wild
- as long as animals are being cared for and no other bylaws are being broken there should be no limit to number of pets.
- Some people rescue pets and thats their passion is to give many animals a safe home
- Aside from the exceptions you have listed above, I see no reason to allow as many as 6 dogs or cats. I think the maximum should be no more than 4
- If a person can properly care for their animals, then they should be allowed to have as many as they want but spay/neuter should be an expectation
- Anyone can own as many animals as desired. If complaints are issued, action should be taken by the pet owner.
- You would need to remove services animals from the exceptions. No one needs more then one/two service animals. If it were an exception it would just open the door for people to horde animals.
- I think this limit is too low. Some people can't have. 1 dog without excessive feces, barking etc and other people could have 12Dogs or cats and not have any issues. It should be determined case by case if there are complaints.
- We have a neighbor across the street from us that owns 16 dogs (8 of the dogs are very large) and 9 cats. The neighbor's on each side of them and behind them are not able to enjoy their backyard when the 16 dogs are out in the owners backyard. The owner has artificial turf and the dogs do their business back there. It smells, and the bylaws have been called numerous times, and because there is no bylaw there is not much that can be done. I think even 6 dogs and 6 cats in one household is



too much. Every other city in Canada and even Airdrie have bylaws for smaller animals per household. Why not Calgary?

- A total of 12 animals in a household is too much. A total of 4-6 animals per household in a city would be manageable for people/families. Including being fosters.
- To much government
- 4 should be the maximum, not 6.
- As long as proper care is provided no one should be able to mandate what another person has on their own property.
- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats being allowed in every house is too many, perhaps a similar change but of smaller scale? I think it's very case by case
- If all animals are properly cared for and the property is maintained without a disturbance to the neighbours there is no need to limit the number of dogs and/or cats. It's necessary that households with multiple pets maintain a clean, healthy home for the pets and the people who reside there, this is not determined by the number of dogs and/or cats reside in the property.
- It's tough to believe many people with 12 animals would take care and provide to the needs of all these animals. Feel like we would be increasing animal neglect. Just do max 6 cats/dogs can be any number of either.
- As long as all the animals are cared for properly then what is the problem?
- Your dog one on Block head dogs is stupid
- Some people foster pets. Some of these foster pets would be euthanized otherwise. Sometimes it's necessary to have more than two pets.
- Limit to 4 with special arrangements granted to 6
- I think Calgary has managed this without a pet limit. If they are well taken care of, who cares how many. If they are not, one is too many. Backyard breeders should be stopped!
- If a person is a responsible owner of animals then why punish them with limits of ownership? Start cracking down on the PEOPLE that are RESPONSIBLE for NOT taking care of the animals in their homes. This Limiting of good owners is not a good idea! We have 8 dogs and our neighbors have said they wouldn't know we a dog let alone 8. Responsible people are responsible. People with mental issues will hoard animals regardless of laws.
- I don't believe there should be a limit as long as the animals are cared for.
- That's kind of a disgusting amount of animals for one urban residence.
- 12 animals is enough!!!!
- Good owners are pushed because they will be the ones who listen to the law
- 6 dogs in the City is way too many, 4 maxium. 6 cats okay if all indoor cats. Exceptions as listed above are okay
- It is people own property and they should be reasonably allowed to do with it as they please. We should not restrict people but enforce proper management of the animals they do have. Use the noise bylaw amd other bylaws we already have. no need to create new ones and complicated things.
- aaa



- A person should be allowed to have as many pets as they want so long as they raise them responsibly. Don't penalize people for others bad behavior.
- discriminatory
- if people are breeding dogs or cats, they will need to fill out a form every time when it isn't needed because of the licensing for breeding
- I don't think you can tell people how many pets they can have. If you must, 6 or each is low
- There is no reason why 1 house hold would require that many pets. Dogs or cats, would create unmanageable condition, especially in a low income household unit. There should however be more regulations for doggy daycare, or pet care sitters, caring for that .any pets..
- The number is high already. 6 cats or 6 dogs is high! There are a few of the good people that can handle this number and take care of them and then there are those that can't and without the cut off line you will always have problems !
- That is too many animals.
- I don't care for the 'Potential Exceptions COULD be" as it is not clear. If one answers yes, the exceptions may not be part of the decision process.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is far too many! Given the average home size and lot size, I feel 3 pets in combination of both species should be the maximum. Otherwise, the average home owner is not providing the animals with suitable space. Also, the average income would only support upto 3 pets regardless. Any more would potentially stretch feeding expenses beyond a pet owner's means of supply.
- 6 dogs is too much.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is excessive! How would you define household? So in a duplex you could potentially have 12 animals total on the lot? I personally feel that 6 dogs and 6 cats is too much.
- No more regulations....we should have a far more relaxed attitude towards, pets, pet owners. Also should be far more off leash areas in Calgary
- 12 animals total for someone not running a rescue/daycare is overwhelming. I'd lean more towards 4 cats and 4 dogs.
- People can responsibly own multiple pets higher than 2.
- It's none of your business how many animals people own unless they're not being taken care of.
- 6 is too many. Other jurisdictions have 4 (Manitoba) and that is plenty.
- If animals are not a problem people should be free to own however many they choose
- Thats allt of animals in one house
- Animal ownership limitation should be based on space available for the animal. sq ft = # of animals allowed.
- It should be up to the home owner to determine how many pets they have!
- Nobody needs to own 6 dogs in town unless the above conditions and need a permit!
- Someone is going to regulate the exceptions??
- As long as the animals are taken care of, I should be allowed as many as I want and can afford



- Too many resources will be spent updating and tracking the bylaw. Grandfathering in dogs requires compiling a database. STOP WASTING TAX DOLLARS
- The amount of pets should be evaluated on a case by case basis in accordance to property size and environmental safety.
- Would the licensing fee be the same or if someone was at max capacity would they have a reduction on license fees? Why are license fees not implemented with vets more being that is where our money goes to take care of our animals? Why don't license fees come with a microchip? Otherwise I think 6 and 6 with exceptions seems like a fair cap on animals per household.
- The number of animals should be lower. Breeders could get a separate license & require a business license. The stated exceptions are ok.
- This is so dumb
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is TOO many. The exceptions are okay.
- There should not be more than 2 cats/dogs per household and a special permit should be required if there are more. This would be applicable to household pets and not coops.
- The amount of animals on a property should not be restricted unless it involves poor living conditions
- If all animals are licensed and well cared for there should be no limit. If any bylaws are abused or broken then the city can step in.
- No limit please
- this could make it hard for people who rescue cats
- I think that we don't need to dictate to people the number of pets they can own and I feel that a bylaw change like that is an gross infringement on personal freedoms.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats are way too many. The limit should be 2 or 3 of each and an application should be made for more, the potential exceptions are OK.
- Some people adopt multiple dogs that spend a lot of time in shelters otherwise. The quantity of dogs in the house doesn't matter as long as there is quality care for the animals.
- I don't think restriction on number will change irresponsibility pet ownership. The bylaw should deal with the issue that is related to the owner (i.e., feces, noise, welfare) and apply universally to all pet owners regardless of how many animals they chose to have as pet owner. On an unrelated matter - maybe part of Phase 1 - at Nose Hill Park in the off-lease area, the garbage containers should be moved to within 500 m of the entrance of the park on the main trails, that way there would be receptacles for placing feces. The current container is way to far into the park and the ones in the parking lot are not helpful once a pet owner is already 500 m into the walk. Thank you.
- as long as the owners are caring for their animal, they should be allowed to have as many as they can afford.
- that sway too many in the city
- If animals are deemed to be in good health, having access to proper food, water, attention, vet care, and are cared for by responsible people, there should be little control on the number of animals. There are plenty of people who have one animal and can't manage, and plenty who have several and do an amazing job. Assigning a number is a lazy way to manage this. Each situation is unique.



- Today I learned there's an actual bylaw for this, but I think it's more than reasonable as is. Maybe increase the limit to 3 or 4 since couples exist who had their own dogs before they met and once they moved in together now have a house that's technically in violation of this bylaw. 6 dogs and 6 cats in a household seems like it would be quite the mess and noise problem in any case. I don't have really strong feelings one way or the other, but 6 of each sounded a bit excessive to me. I'm no expert though so if you all feel this is a better way forward then that's fine. Putting aside this BSL bs, the dog management program in this city is absolutely top notch and I know it will continue to be this way for future generations.
- This is called responsible pet ownership . Let's let responsible owners decide how many animals share their home . If your not responsible other bylaws should be able to cover any problems that might arise .
- It's none of anyone's business if someone wants 8 cars and can responsibly care for them. Same being said for 8 dogs. Perhaps do an animal or home welfare check though for people who exceed 8 dogs or 8 cats
- I think the total number of animals should be 6, not 6 of each dog and cat for a total of 12. The ability to care properly for that number of animals may be diminished at those numbers which is detrimental and unfair to the animals.
- Having a limit on animals with people who have more space and ability to care for animals is unfair.
- If a household containing a large amount of animals is causing disturbances or where the care of the animal(s) can be questioned then it should be investigated. Implementing a blanket rule like this seems to be a punishment for large families.
- Unfair to police people for the number of pets they wish to own, but it's totally fair to police them for responsible pet ownership, or their inability to care for them properly. Better to administer fines for noise, excessive feces and potentially confiscate animals if the irresponsible owner has repeated violations.
- 12 pets in a single home and average yard is excessive. Should be lowered and allow for puppies or kittens.
- Let lonely people have their pets so I don't need to talk to them
- It isn't the number of pets that is necessarily the issue. It is whether you are a responsible pet owner. We have had people in our area who only have one dog and it is noisier than other dogs who are living as one of multiple dogs in one home. Dogs are social animals and are very often happier, able to socialize better with people and other dogs, if they are not living in a situation where socialization is too restricted. The key is that owner's continue to introduce there dog, to other people and dogs on a continuous basis in a positive way, and interaction. The problem isn't the number of dogs or cats necessarily it's whether the owner is responsible and able to maintain control of the dogs or cats they own. If the dogs or cats are healthy, happy and not allowed to be a nuisance, then six is a pretty low number. For some people one animal might be too much.
- That's a lot of animals, I think the number should be lowered aside from pet boarding and services or rural homes
- If the living space is proper and they are well fed and in good living conditions, LET THEM BE.



- 6 seems too high of a limit to me. 3-4 would be the Max I would support
- 6 animals is excessive number, should be limited to 2
- I do not feel that a household needs more than 3 of each unless out on an acreage
- That's a lot of animals at that point
- As with the tribunal decisions should be made by an expert (s), without this caveat none of this will matter.
- Still too many, should only be 3 of each with special acceptions in fort Mac. They are only allowed 3 animals period
- I feel 6 dogs might be excessive for most home. Especially if they have 6 cats. That would be 12 in one residence. I would say 3-4 dogs and 6 cats. Also allowing special licensing for foster dogs in a home. Making it transferable to a new owner as well would be nice.
- There should be no limit as long as the owner is responsible
- A total of 12 animals doesn't make sense and the bylaw number of animals should be reduced.
- Increasing the limits could potentially lead to poor circumstances for animals and legal hoarding. Maybe the city could consider some sort of reconsideration application for those wanting to appeal the bylaw on a case by case basis. For example: someone with ample space, needing barn/shop cats while still within city limits - they should have the opportunity to explain the situation and request an exception - said individuals should also be responsible for all fees associated with this process and if one cannot afford the fees of a process like this can they afford 6 dogs & 6 cats?
- No one needs that many animals. How can they be properly taken care of? Limit should be three
- No one should be allowed 6 dogs for example. 2 or 3 I understand, but anymore is a nuisance. More noise from dogs barking etc. Same for cats. Max I have had is two cats and that was more than enough.
- Why does the city think they have the right to tell people how many pets they can have? If a person has space and knowledge to reasonably raise pets they should be able to do so.
- Cats live in large clans up to 50. They don't take a lot of room.
- In most cases these animals are being bred. Sometimes not treated right
- Each dog must be regarded as an individual and assessed on its specific behaviors... This comes straight from our own Calgary Humane Society. Please do not use your personal bias to force pit bull owners to mistreat their dogs. By muzzling and treating Pit bulls differently we are doing nothing to help the animals. Please leave your personal bias out of this and instead look at scientific facts/studies which show that Pit bulls are no worse/different from other dogs.
- There should be no limit on the number of pets a person can own on their private property. There are already plenty of bylaws to ensure that pet owners are respectful of those around them. Neighbours should not have a say in what a person does on their privately owned property.
- As long as the pets and homes are cared after, it shouldn't matter. I support penalties if the animals welfare via at risk.
- There are many very responsible pet pet. Again direct your energy to the bad owners do not make all suffer for the few who wreck it. [personal information removed] pitbulls and they are all amazing dogs her home and yard are spotless so why punish individuals like her and her family. [removed].



Perhaps more laws about WHO can own pets. Make it so nuisance owners have their rights taken away. Focus on individuals not the whole

- 6 is too many, make it 3 or less
- 6 dogs and cats is a lot of animals for one household. I feel like a better limit might be 3 or 4 of each.
- 12 animals in a home is way too much for a house in the city. They should have a maximum of 6 animals total or household with no restriction on type.
- Promotes backyard breeding and poor care of animals
- 2 pets is sufficient for anyone to own
- Some owners take great care of their animals and help out rescues
- Cats live in the wild in colonies of up to 50. To give them the best life possible they need a family.
- Sometimes accidents occur and if you have a pet who had puppies or kittens you would most likely have more than 6 at a time. I believe this should be added as an exception.
- I'm not sure what the bylaw currently is in this area. So without comparison, I find it difficult to support or oppose a change.
- Six is far too many for any regular person to be allowed. Permits should be required for anything over 3 or 4 at most with the exception of a litter. 6 cats might be acceptable but 6 dogs is excessive for everyone to be allowed to have. If I have six dogs I should require written consent by neighbors on both sides of my dwelling before being issued a permit.
- 6 is excessive, I would support increasing to 3 not including puppies or kittens until 6 months of age
- I think that if the animals are all very well taken care of then they should be allowed more than 6 dogs or cats.
- 6 is too many. For the welfare of the animals, dogs should be capped at 3, and cats at 4. Exceptions made for breeding and for multi family households. A single family or person can not care for 6 dogs and 6 cats.
- If the pets are being properly cared for and not being a major nuisance to the community then I see absolutely no reason to implement EVEN MORE administration and cost on something which should be determined as reasonable to an owner to have in their care. Hoarding is a separate issue though and if the needs of the animals are not properly met or the owner is not maintaining the feces etc. then it is valid for bylaw to intervene
- too many animals- should be limited to 3
- A residential property cannot support kennels or a multitude of animals without creating a nuisance. Try to find a reasonable number, such as three, and if this is to be exceeded the neighborhood should be consulted.
- That's too many pets for 1 home
- I feel that number is too high. I would suggest the number of pets (dogs or cats) be limited to 2 per adult living in the given household.
- I'm on the fence while I'm okay. With the numbers 6 dogs is a lot there should be something in place to protect animals' rights! It is so easy for people to abuse and neglect animals how many people really have the space AND TIME for 6 dogs I also feel this number encourages small breed owners



who think small breeds dont need As much outdoor access and exercise as large breed dogs which is unfair to the small breed dogs.

- If they're responsible pet owners as covered by other existing bylaws, I don't see a reason to impose an arbitrary limit.
- As long as animals are taken care of who are you to tell someone how many they can love/take care of???
- Who the hell needs 6 dogs or 6 cats within city limits. Way too many animals. Maybe 4 of each but 12 animals is just hoarding.
- I am a pet owner and believe the number of animals per household should be limited.
- Most properties within the city cannot accommodate the size of property requirements for 6 of each. Along with many people would not be able to keep up with the exercise requirements of the animal... if the wish to have more than 2-3 of each then they should require a special liscense as in breeder, boarding facility etc
- I am not sure how much of an issue this actually is and whether it would address potential problems it is trying to solve.
- If all criteria is met with responisble pet ownership, such as , training, vet care, suitable housing and food, noise reduction, cleanliness , cleaning up of feces, then the owners have proven they are capable of looking after their pets
- Multiple animals, no matter the scenario, can lead to the issues listed. The only exception should be under 6 months.
- I like the exceptions to the rule and it would be great but 6 is too high. I am thinking 3 or 4 is a more reasonable number, especially considering the size of most properties in Calgary. Most are not big enough to support that many dogs. I think an Approved Excess Animal Permit which would require a property visit from Animal Control or the Humane Society to ensure that the pets interests are at heart and not a backyard breeder who is looking to make a quick buck.
- Should only allow 1 large dog per household. And up to 5 smaller dogs and up to 3 cats per household
- Backyard breeders are a dangerous group that cause severe harm to animals. 6 animals is too many for one household to adequately provide care for 4 animals total is more resonable
- 6 each is too many. I feel the physical and mental needs of the pet would be compromised in most cases. Perhaps a total of 6 animals would be a compromise.
- Why 6. It's just some [removed] number that has no research behind it.
- If someone is able to care for more than 6 dogs they should be permitted to without application for exception
- I think that 6 dogs or cats per household is too great a number. It should be reduced to half.
- 2 cat and dogs is more than enough. 6 is too many
- I don't think 12 animals in a residential setting is appropriate unless it's an acreage. I would say no more than 8 animals would be more appropriate.
- From 2/2-6/6? Big jump. How about 4/4.
- 6 is a very high number, 3-4 sounds more reasonable



- their pets, cleans up their mess and has them properly trained, I believe they should be able to have as many pets as they want.
- Calgary need their Government to back off as much as possible. If your looking for something to do, solve the spending issues of your department.
- With that many animals in one home, it is hard to train and watch all of them. They are like kids. If they are not disciplined or watched they will get into trouble.
- As long as the pets are healthy and cared for, there should be no limit. Responsible owners maintain their property and safety of the pets in their homes.
- People should not be legally required to have only a specific number of pets, as long as they are properly taken care of, it's nobody elses business how many animals someone chooses to give a loving home to.
- Six dogs AND six cats? I think the number would have to depend on the living space of the owners. Putting that many animals in a 600 sqft space is far different than a 3000 sqft space.
- If the animals are well cared for what gives you the right to limit that family?? Nothing
- Its not about the number of pets, its how they are kept.
- I feel like the appropriate number of animals is best determined on a case-by-case basis.
- I think a general limit should be a total of 4 dogs or cats but allow for permits to increase that number based on good responsible ownership
- Depending on the terms in of the dog fancier permit. In addition backyard breeders are not stopped by animal limitations. Nor will the bylaw stop poor pet owners from obtaining several animals and keeping them in poor conditions.
- There may be extenuating circumstances not considered.
- No one needs 12 pets. I think a general total of 6 dogs/cats should be more then enough, not 6 of each. The exceptions are reasonable.
- You cannot control my house. I may have as many pets and whatever I want ON MY PROPERTY
- As long as the animals are cared for then it's no ones business
- Less. 6 Dogs AND 6 Cats?? 12 Animals??? Might as well live in a barn on a farm. I Believe no more then 2 cats And Dogs, unless the animals have given birth or they are fosters/service Animals
- I would only support a maximum of 3 dogs and 3 cats per household
- 12 animals in a h e is too many. There should be no more than 5 animals of any type
- there should be no limit
- If an owner is responsible, why make them accountable for the ones that are not
- I think this is far too many animals per household. In other municipalities, the limit is far less. RE lower license fee for low-income households: I do support lower fees for low-income households, however, I worry that this would mean they might acquire more pets. I believe animals are soothing and healing and everyone deserves to have one if they choose, so long as they can adequately and responsibly care for it. If the limit is six dogs and cats, plus lower license fees, this could put the household in distress.
- People should be allowed to have as many as they want as long as they are properly cared for



- People can have as many pets as they want or need. The city should have no control on what animals one has on their property
- Enforcement of existing bylaws should be adequate to ensure pet owners are responsible to their pets and their neighbors. Adding a new bylaw doesn't help if the existing bylaws aren't being enforced.
- I think irresponsible pet owners might take advantage of this. I think four dogs and four cats would be realistic.
- I don't believe in limits to pet ownership. I do believe in limits of 5 for any one type of animal
- I think this has to be looked at on a case by case basis. I don't think it's good for even a temp home to have to many animals.
- Putting a limit of the number of pets will ultimately result in people not registering animals to avoid the inconvenience of extra licencing fees and paper work. Making it difficult to know exactly how many pets one owner may have. Emphasis should be on owners cleaning up appropriately and focusing on proper training of pets in their care.
- With more than a couple permanent adult dogs in the home I think it should raise concern over the welfare of the home and humans residing. Is the home clean and safe for all parties living in it? I also think the more let's you have the less likely they are to be well cared for. The cost of quality food and supplements plus veterinary care to one dog is high. I doubt people maintain the same level of care for six dogs as they would for one or two.
- I do not believe that this ammendment helps in many cases, especially those that rescue or take in animals on short notice from bad situations. It hinders them with a lengthy approval process first which could delay necessary rescues
- They shouldn't limit unless it's overabundance of animals that cannot be fully taken care od
- I dont think a mandate on the number of pets allowed should be implemented. Instead perhaps limits should be enforced on problem/ irresponsible pet owners.
- 6 dogs or cats in a house in the city? Come on! That is ridiculous.
- I don't think people should have more the. 6 digs or 6 cats.
- No need for a household to have this many animals. Usually this would be a breeding situation. Breeders should have more restrictions to be authorized to sell animals.
- 6 is too many. 4 maximum
- 6 dogs is too many - three dogs, and 5 cats seems more realistic
- As long as a loving and caring home is provided, no limit should be upheld.
- No is no *shrug shoulders*
- As long as all animals have the care and necessities of life, there should not be a limit.
- I thin it depends on the type of residence and how big or small it is. If it's large enough to have more animals then there is no reason to restrict amount of animals.
- These situations should be looked at on a case by case basis. Animal welfare, property sanitation and noise can be a concern with any number of animals in a home or on a property (ie: I know people with 4+ dogs in the home and their yards and homes are pristine. And I know people with 1 dog with a much lower standard of care overall, which could result in the above noted issues) then



address the particular home in question accordingly no matter the number of animals living there. These standards also allow for those who have an abusive quality of care to keep a certain number of animals even after being fined and with bylaw services involved when they should not be caring for any at all.

- As long as the welfare of the animals is maintained there should no limit.
- Again, I have no right to tell other people how to use their land. [removed]
- Keep the bylaw as it currently is
- having 12 animals in one home that is not a business is still too much. Having that many animals in a small place is not a high quality of life for the animals, and isn't sanitary
- 6 dogs And 6 cats is kennel numbers. If this is the case they should be paying for a kennel license. If this is approved wellness checks of the animals should be completed monthly.
- If the owner is responsible and can take care of the animals it should be their right to choose how many animals they have. Free country remeber.
- In any residential home not supplied with a proper kennel licence, there is no reason for the total number of quadruped pets to exceed 6 in total. That would include lizards, rodents, equids, canids and felids.
- If I read this right you are saying 12 pets is ok, I think it's too high. Maybe six total any combination of cats and dogs or something of that nature
- Think people over 6 dogs and cats should need to get an approval. Not limited to the list. If they have issues with dangerous dogs, or multiple nuisance calls they should be denied, or if not caring properly for animals in their care
- It needs to be a lower limit of total cats & dogs in one the household
- 6 is a lot of animals. I've lived in places where the limit was 4. I personally think that's a better number. With the exceptions included.
- Yes I support this bylaw change, however there should be a special application for breeders i.e: the dogs and cats under 6 months of age.
- The addressed issues are all already covered under bylaws. If someone is able to responsibly attend to 14 cats all the power to them, but this data should be used for enforcement to do wellness checks to make sure the issues are addressed.
- If the rest of the bylaws are properly written and enforced a limit seems unnecessary. I do agree that there are limited situations where one home needs more than six dogs or cats but placing a limit on pet numbers seems like a lazy way to define acceptable responsible pet ownership.
- I think there is an issue with owning up to six dogs and six cats depending on the size of property. I support condos and apartments being able to limit this number based on size of the overall property and units. Having up to 12 animals - plus unlicensed animals such as rabbits or birds - will cause more significant noise disturbances and bylaw issues. I do believe that there should be exceptions in place to any bylaw restricting the number of animals for temporary homes and service animals.
- Noise is my biggest concern.
- As long as the animals are being properly cared for. It should not be anyone's business how many they have



- If a person is able to take care of their animals, they should not have a limit.
- responsible breeders keep their dogs/cats in good living conditions
- So long as the animals are well cared for, licensed and not a nuisance, it's not the city's business how many animals are in a home. Similar to children...so long as the kids are properly cared for, it's not the city's business!
- Yes, but I feel that the amount of pets per household should be based on a variety of factors such as type of animal, for example someone having a pet snake, some fish, a cat and 3 dogs would be way more reasonable than someone having 15 cats and 5 dogs in a single home, or like myself, having more than two dogs, but since none are able to breed, and all are tattooed, keeping a lower level fee for licensing because there's more opportunity for identification, and if a person is not able to maintain their pets needs to be vetted and housed appropriately, there should be a bylaw in place to allow seizure of the animals in the home by a bylaw officer and the ability to offer them to adoption to a better suited home.
- There should definitely be a limit to the number of pets, not good for neighbors regarding noise, nuisances, pet feces on lawn. Plus, anyone owning more than two pets at a time needs to live on acreage or farm. City lots and house sizes doesn't accommodate more than two pets comfortably in average house size in the city. Lets try to make our city more noise free, nuisance free, and promote the getting along with our neighbors, than, adding things that we potentially can cause problems with our neighbors. We all want to come home at the end of the day to a quiet neighborhood. We don't need the added stress of having such neighbors, we need less stress, not more stress in our lives. Lets consider those people that are sensitive to noise, and those that don't want to look out their windows to see a pile of dog feces all over their neighbors yard.
- Would encourage poorly trained animals, and backyard breeding.
- 6 is way too many. Maybe increase to 3 or 4
- Anymore willing to provide an animal safe environment and Home should be able to house as many as they see fit as long as they're giving them a good life
- It's not your decision on what we have for animals in our household
- It depends on the situation. If they have a big enough lot/ space that can keep that many properly, then it shouldn't be an issue.
- 6 and 6 is enough, unless they live on a huge property.
- Depends on the size of the home. If it's a farm, they would likely have more animals, and potentially the animals might not belong to them (ie. barn cats, strays). They are likely to get a greater number of fines for just providing a home for an animal who doesn't have one. How is that fair?
- Too many allowed, should be 2 and 2.
- The exceptions are good but the limit before special permit should be lower at 3-4 cats and 3 dogs
- I don't know how someone is properly caring for 12 animals in one household unless they are breeding them.
- I think the limit should be 4, regardless of the situation. There are rescue groups in Calgary right now that are placing dogs in homes where there are 10-14 dogs already. This can be detrimental to any dog. PLEASE limit the number of dogs to 4 and cats to 6



- I would support a limit of 5 total dogs or cats
- I would support, if there are exceptions, like for farms, and SOME temporary homes, like they need to be screened and scrutinized prior and have several check ups throughout the year to ensure proper care and treatment, and what not. However, a limit cuts down on backyard breeders and pet hoarders, and ensures that they can all be cared for to the highest standard.
- If it's 2 cats AND 2 dogs or four of any combination I think that's plenty for in town. Six of each or any combination is excessive.
- because i disagree with it
- Yes and no. The numbers seem fair at a dozen animals but maybe do not divide it half dogs half cats some people don't like cats or dogs and only want the one type but are restricted due to that. Make it a total living animals allowed situation based on square footage of home. Example. You could have 6 poms in an apartment but 6 Saint Bernards wouldn't be feasible . Just numbering animals isn't specific enough and doesn't ensure the animal is safe it just touched the superficial ideal of hoarding animals or the idea that of you have less animals you'll be more responsible vs identifying bad lazy pet owners regardless of number. Also consider some people have disability's or have other restrictions that could complicate this. This by law cannot be this black and white .
- Unnecessary
- If you're a responsible pet owner And have the space for all of them. There should be no problem.
- Going to extreme. There could be two dogs and two cats but more than that is excessive.
- I would suggest the limit on dogs to be 4. Keeping the exceptions in mind and the ability to apply for an excess animal permit, having to take 6 dogs outside multiple times a day and exercising them sufficiently would be a challenge that most people wouldn't be able to handle long-term. Any exceptions should be evaluated in person by someone who is experienced in dog handling and behavior. In the case of cats, some situations would be fine having 6, but most would become stressful to the cats depending on their temperaments and the size of the house. I would also suggest 4 or 5.
- As long as pets are being taken care of
- Given the average size of property in Calgary owning 6 dogs isn't safe for the dogs. Unless it's a special situation the average household shouldn't have that many pets.
- These things depend. I don't think it's fair to judge what is necessary for pet owners.
- No household, no matter how big, needs 6 dogs and 6 cats. That's way too excessive. I'd lower that limit to 3 dogs and 3 cats.
- Depends on how the owner takes care of their pet. There are people with 10 cats and can responsibly still feed and care for them same as someone with 1 or 2
- 2 dogs/cats is enough per household
- Indoor cats should not need a license. From personal experience, six dogs and six cats in a household is a LOT of animals, the amount should perhaps depend on the square footage of the home, and the number of adults in the home able to care for the animals.
- no one needs 12 animals in their house. 4 dogs and 4 cats sounds more reasonable.



- That is a really high limit. I would definitely support a lower limit. It is hard to provide properly the needs of that many animals in one household. Breeders should also require to be licensed as well as monitored to prevent puppy mills type behavior.
- 6 dogs is too high. there is no way you can possibly train that many dogs
- shouldn't be based on a set number
- That is simply too many pets with homes being so close together and the issues that we already see with public nuisance, feces not being picked up and general lack of care of animals (abuse, running at large, neglect)
- If someone has the means and ability to keep their pets safe and cared for without bothering neighbours, they who is the city to tell them they can't have as many animals as they want?
- You haven't stated the exiting bylaw so I can't judge the necessity for the changes but I think any exceptions should fall under category of Approved Excess Animal Permit and be examined/granted on a case by case basis.
- As long as someone is able to provide a good home and lots of care to the animals, no one should be aloud to tell them how many they can own. If the proper care is not being given to these animals, then they should be seized. But anyone should be able to own as many animals as they want, given they're providing the proper care.
- People have the right to their animals as long as they're cared for.
- That is far too many animals on one property. I would say that a family cannot properly care for more than 4 animals total. 12 is way too high and can easily end up in a hoarding situation where animals are not cared for properly.
- 6 is far too many in one household. 2 is more than enough
- possibility of neglect of animals, and possible presence of mental illness of the owner.
- No limit to responsible dog owners. Some people cannot manage one pet... others can and do manage multiple pets efficiently. Why punish responsible owners that provide a multitude of positive life experiences for a multitude of owned pets because of the inabilities of a few? Do you also limit the number of children people can have? As many are incapable of that yet seem to keep multiplying!
- A normal family household does not even need 6 cats or dogs! I think it should be lowered to 3 pets. I agree with the exceptions except for Dogs/cats under 6 months of age should be licensed.
- I would not want to be a neighbor to a house that has that many pets, for many reasons. Noise, feces in backyards etc...
- Who is the government to tell me how many pets I can have? What's next? Children??
- I would support a bylaw that enforces a limit of pets based on the size of the home and the households ability to financially maintain the health and wellness of all animals on the property.
- Grand total of 6 dogs and cats is plenty for one household. I support registered day cares fosters and breeders (breeders should only be breeding to health standards and testing and should be registered stop back yard breeders who are breeding outside of best interest of pet health and temperament
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per house is too many. Would suggest maximum 4



- I think it should depend on the home. On an average or farm if the conditions are there, great. Within residential areas it should depend on the size of the home and yard and income.
- No one needs six cats or dogs, forget six of each
- Can't restrict what someone owns, one individual who only has one pet may not take care of the animal as well as someone who has more than two.
- Cats are fine at 6 but I wouldn't allow more than 4 dogs except for the circumstances you listed as dogs are louder and require more space than cats. I have two and a larger back yard than most and I wouldn't feel comfortable with more than 3 at my house/ yard let alone trying to walk 6 dogs. Or even have a limit of 3 per adult in a home and 6 maximum. Or two per adult if larger breed.
- I think 6 is pretty high thinking more like 3 or 4 dogs are a lot of work I could not imagine more than two.
- 6 is too high. 4 and 4
- keeping 6 chihuahuas or pomeranians on a property is a lot different than keeping 6 German Shepherds or Newfoundlands!! and why are you combining cats and dogs!! Again 3 cats and 3 little dog a lot different than 4 cats and 3 big dogs!! Should be more relevant to size and situation ie single family home/apartment/ semi detached etc ...all are different
- I agree with potential exceptions. I do not agree with a maximum of 6 dogs and cats to a city household. 4 dogs or cats maximum (besides in the case of litters/young pets) would be more appropriate.
- That is far too many animals for one home. The noise that would be needed to have enough space would have to be quite large. It's also likely they aren't properly being taken care of. I agree with the no more than 2 of each.
- 6 is excessive. 4 is acceptable.
- The limit should be 2 cats and 2 dogs, no matter what size/breed. The reason being is noise, the care of the animals, and if you want more..move to an acreage.
- Will NOT stop hoarding and penalize those that can support multiple animals.
- Should depend on property size. That many pets in a small apartment seems excessive, but on a large lot with no near by neighbours would be less likely to cause concern
- Potential poor breeding, puppy mill initiatives and animal hoarding
- To blanket all people like this does a disservice to responsible pet owners.
- I don't any one needs to have that many
- That would be ridiculous to tell people how many animals we can own.
- Nobody needs more than 2 pets. Anything more leads to problems (noise, cleanup, etc)
- If you limit, then there are no exceptions, many problems stem from those who foster
- as long as they are looked after there should be no limit, just like children
- I believe over 2 animals is crazy and I think the more animals you have, the less care they get. 2 dogs and 2 cats MAX
- 6 and 6 is excessive. More like 2 dogs and 2 cats except in the case of the mentioned exceptions.



- Why should people complain how many pets you have? I'm sure we can't complain how many children they have. Or how many family members live in the same house. Or how many cars they have on their drive way and around the neighbourhood
- 6 is just far too many in an urban setting. 3 would be more reasonable in my opinion, but not 6. I agree with most expectations, exception the excess animal permit and dog fanciers' license. These are appropriate in rural not urban settings.
- 6 animals is excessive. I'd support 4 total
- Not everyone can afford to get their animals licensed.
- 12 animals is a lot of animals. I think there should be a special circumstances bylaw but I would think 6 permanent pets should be enough.
- 6 dogs in a house in the city is NOT a healthy environment for the dogs, and leads to neglect and lack of exercise.
- No limit should be put on pets as long as they are cared for appropriately
- I think a total maximum of pets including dogs and cats should be 4. 6 is way too many unless you are breeding or another reasonable excuse for having that many larger animals in your home.
- just because someone has over 6 dogs doesn't mean they are not providing proper care
- regardless of type of animal, 12 is excessive per household and I highly doubt people are able to properly care for this many animals.
- How the hell can you provide adequate care? Unless your worth millions and have the land for it - no. These animals deserve a standard of life too.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is an excessive number of animals within a home. The noise and smells likely to come of that could be considered a nuisance
- If someone has more than 6 dogs and 6 cats it is going to be an issue with all neighbors
- I feel 6 dogs AND 6 cats are in excess (unless they are the exception, such as fosters and breeders). Many people cannot even responsibly take care of the single animal they have, let alone multiples.
- 12 animals in one house in the city of calgary? I would be supportive if the total amount of animals was to increase to 3 or even 4...but 12 is way too high unless they are fostering/adopting animals on an acreage.
- 6 dogs or 6 cats is way to many...at that point you are creating a pact-and increase chance of attacks. Max 3
- Why limit
- As long as people are following the rules (cleaning up feces, keeping noise under control, etc) who cares how many animals they have? If someone is a responsible pet owner they should be allowed to do what they want. Restricting this to a specific number seems unfair.
- Are you kidding me?? 2 dogs, 2 cats is sufficient!! Or go less!! You are asking for trouble if you increase the number of pets allowed!! Stop creating issues Calgary!
- Potential for hoarding is increased greatly. 12 animals in a home is too many



- It is the responsibility of the owner. I've been in homes that have many pets and never knew how many or types. I've been in others where you can smell a single pet before you walk in the house. Fines for irresponsible owners
- Residential? Rural? Depends on property type, even in residential areas as some have larger property spaces.
- Unless you're a breeder or animal shelter, you DO NOT need this many animals. Then there's no time for proper exercise, attention and training. Limit should be 3 dogs or 3 cats or combination not exceeding 3 animals. This is how problems start when animals learn more from their packs than their humans.
- No need for more than 4 animals without approval/special circumstance.
- The number of animals/household should not allow 12. That is excessive and does not promote responsible ownership
- The limit should be 2 dogs and 2 cats
- Conventionally yes but the max should be 5. It should not be AND. It should be 4 in total. The exception list is good
- That's too much. I could see a minor increase but to 6 is excessive.
- There is already too much unpicked up feces, no one in the city needs this many animals in their home. It impacts neighbours in so many ways.
- I do not think anyone needs to have 6 pets in their home.
- 6 pets in a home will be too many. Regardless of people's wants, there is no way someone can properly care for 6 pets. How could you exercise 6 dogs?
- That's a huge limit I think it should be lower 6 dogs and or 6 cats on a property is a lot I would support 4 .
- If the pets are cared for, I see no reason to limit
- Pet owners need to use common sense and know their limit, with action taken against them in egregious cases. The city should stay out of people's business, unless there is a real problem
- If the dogs are maintained well and the feces picked up I don't see why they can't have more than 6
- This seems excessive. Limit pets to 2 dogs and 2 cats per household with the option to apply for an exception.
- Who needs 6 dogs & 6 cats, unless you are running a kennel/boarding. The average person will not be able to manage this in a responsible manner. A dog trainer, maybe, but even still that is A LOT of animals for one household in the city. Also, people have trouble keeping one cat on their properties, how are they going to keep 6?
- We have a cat and a dog. Our cat is not allowed outside to roam freely. Our dog will soon have another dog companion. I think I'm a small condo or townhouse yes this makes sense but we have a large backyard and decent sized home 2400 sq ft without the basement included.
- Pets are a luxury and a privilege. If the animals are used for breeding then it is a business and needs to fall under business rules. In my experience too many pets leads to poor health outcomes for the pets, poorer living conditions, and can lead to extraneous breeding. Plus there is often more noise and property damage.



- That is way too many animal in one house and most people can not afford the veterinary fees associated with taking care of this many pets.
- If you want responsible pet owners then less dogs means higher chance of them engaging in proper behaviour
- Noise, smell, accommodation for these animals would require a fairly large enough space if twelve animals were housed there
- Dogs specifically require a certain amount of space for the size of the dog. Number of dogs allowed should be determined by the exercise requirement level of the dogs breed in correlation to the applicants lot size.
- People abuse this. Then you have a household with 12 cats and 12 dogs because the 2 people are "roommates". Or they work the system.
- No one needs that many dogs/cats. It's not fair to the animals in a city. It's cruel.
- No
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is just too much for any household.
- 6 cats or 6 dogs, 6 max on a property
- You can't properly care for that many animals at once
- There is no need to have more animals
- This should be dependent on the owner and their circumstances. How they handle the situation may be assessed but to automatically limit the number seems unfair.
- People should have the right to have as many pets in their home as they choose. People should be addressed on a case by case basis
- Too many animals at one location
- Well kinda support, 6 toy poodles are much different than 6 Bernese Mountain Dog's, toy poodles are louder but with smaller poop. 6 cats seem discriminatory for a crazy cat person but for the average cat person enough. Oh and if on low income no fee waved for 6 animals
- That is a rediculus number no more than the cats it dogs
- That is too many animals for one property in my opinion. Worry about welfare of animals.
- Not necessary to explain. Do not support it!
- We have plenty of laws fines and rules.
- If there is a serious issue (such as abuse or neglect) with too many animals in one residence, they residents are unlikely going to abide by a bylaw. If there is a complaint, investigation should go into the welfare of the animals, not the number of them.
- That is enitrely too many animals - the noise of 6 dogs alone would be a nuisance even if the owner tries to stay on top of it. I would support 3 and 3.
- NOBODY needs that many pets in town...move to the country if you want to hoard animals. This is the dumbest thing I have ever heard. Who wants to live next door to 6 barking dogs.
- As long as the peta are being cared for appropriately I think there is no reason to put a limit. Only if neglecting conditions apply
- Let people have as many as they want. It's a freedom thats unnecessary to take away



- it sounds as though the issues are not that there are more animals, rather feces and noise complaints. If these are the problems than enforcement can deal with those issues specifically.
- To hard to police
- It's not necessary to make unnecessary laws. If you can't afford to take care of the animals, then you shouldn't own as many. There are already adequate rules in place for this.
- I think it should be a total number of 6 cats/dogs. If someone had 6 dogs and 6 cats, I believe that is a bit much and can lead to problems. This is how hoarding starts.
- Not necessary
- If people can already get these exceptions, there is no need for the uneducated masses to have so many dogs. I'd say 3 dogs is plenty for the average household.
- You cannot make a one size fits all rule. People can easily look after correctly to small breeds vs large breeds, and numbers of animals should be looked at on a case by case basis.
- I would support an increase, but not that high. 6 pets total cats or dogs. Having 12 animals allowed will lead to more issues such as noise, mess, and more potential back yard breeding operations.
- I believe 6 is too high for the limit. Most households can handle three at max.
- I feel that you can not adequately provide care for 12 pets in one household on a full time basis. Expectation being foster animals as they are short term house guests.
- We should not limit how many animals a person can have. It should be more based off of their home size. If someone is in a small home, there should be limited animals. But if someone has the space for lots of animals, then that should be up to them.
- Should be less than 6 dogs, perhaps max 3 dogs and 6 cats as cats
- Not all pet owners live in small restricted accommodations. If there is an issue address it. Don't paint all pet owners as irresponsible because of numbers.
- NO. Six is TOO MANY. It will create far too many problems.
- is there a distinction between a home or apartment in this? Not all dwellings can adequately have 6 cats and 6 dogs. I would suggest putting a limit on apartments vs single dwelling homes.
- I think 6 of either animal is to many, but I agree with the rest of the changes
- I think owning 6 dogs and/or 6 cats within city limits is excessive. This would be difficult to meet the needs of the animals appropriately. If someone wants this number of dogs/cats they should purchase or rent a larger property such as an acreage or farm.
- There are people who would go out and get 6 dogs and 6 cats, and the household would be very overrun. Also it makes it harder for people the [personal information] ladies to be questioned on the amount of animals they have.
- As long as the animals are being cared for, you shouldn't be allowed to determine how many someone has.
- If pets are being a nuisance or mistreated then a limit should be imposed
- If property is kept clean why again bother the property owners?
- I support everything except the drastic jump from 4 to 12 animals.
- I think a limit of 3-4 TOTAL



- This would affect good, responsible pet owners. Not fair to limit them because of others who don't follow rules or care for their pets properly
- If the owner is responsible and has enough space and income to provide for the animals in a safe, ethical and hygienic way, its not the cities place to determine how many animals can be owned. That is ridiculous.
- I think if a person wants more than the proposed amount 2 dogs and 2 cats then they should apply for a special permit. No need for 6 and 6. That's excessive.
- I think the current limits are reasonable and help ensure the welfare of the animals
- Six of each is far too many animals for one house. I do agree with the exceptions for temporary homes and under six minths
- The one part of this I support is foster homes and daycares. Sometimes fosters take in entire litters which could easily exceed 6. There is no reason the average person needs six animals. At the point the welfare of the animal is at stake.
- Other than a registered breeder, no household needs to have 6 pets. I would suggest having breeders obtain a license and then make the maximum allowed number of pets 3.
- I don't know enough about the downstream effects of this decision to support it.
- I think the number of pets specifically dogs should be determined by square footage of the property
- Again the government should be leaning toward liberty not fascism.
- More animals in a city house will create a nuisance. On an acreage it can be higher.
- 12 pets is too many
- I think 3 should be a max the more dogs the more a pack mentality
- Six seems a bit high. Four seems reasonable.
- Get out of my house. I can't have as many pets as I can properly care for.
- 3 permit pets is plenty in one home, I do support the exceptions being added for a 3 pet home
- I should be allowed to own as many animals as I want as long as I can properly care for them.
- As long as the animals are being properly taken care of, I don't see the problem in having multiple dogs. Especially in a rental situation.
- I would support 6 in total with the exceptions listed but 12 animals in one household causes undo stress
- What happens with responsible owners who currently have more ? Do they get grandfathered in. OR do they have to chose which pets they get rid of..
- We don't need it
- 6 is too many, I think a limit of 4
- Don't tell people how to live
- Unless they can't take care of the animals proly don't tell people how many they can have.
- Owning that many dogs and cats is excessive. Being the neighbor of a person with 6 dogs means you will deal with louder noises. I think 4 is a better number.
- Perhaps we look at the square footage of indoor and outdoor space available to the animal? 6 dogs is alot in a 10x10 yard?



- That's a lot of animals in one location and I would be concerned about hoarding. Some of the exceptions - pet sitters - make sense as it's on a short term basis.
- There should not be a limit on the number of dogs or cats a person can have, if there is an issue then that person needs to be reported and investigated, a responsible owner will not have issues with the number of pets they have and will know what their personal limit is. For me that's 3 dogs and for someone else that could be a team of 10-12 sled dogs. And I'm sure there is someone who can be responsible with a combination of 30 pets in their home.
- I don't think a person needs to own that many animals. Of course if there are exceptions like fostering or something like that. If you have a litter of puppies/kittens. But I don't feel there is a need to own 6 dogs/cats there will most definitely be lack of exercise and potential lack of care
- Increase limit to 8 dogs or cats per household. If pets are well taken care of, not bothering neighbours and abiding bylaws for being a responsible pet owner.
- Limits responsible breeders and forces them underground
- I don't know what the current bylaw is. so don't know if this change is an increase or decrease, but 6 of each is WAY TOO MANY
- Anyone should be allowed to have as many animals as they can take care of
- I am not in support of people being allowed 6 dogs and 6 cats. Nobody needs that many pets to take care of or possibly not take care of. Hoarding could become an issue. Pets livelihood and well being be of utmost importance.
- Breed specific laws are absurd. It's not going to lower bites/fights. It's untrained dogs.
- This hurts rescue organizations? Unless they are an exception.
- I think this is appropriate, but there should be a grandfather clause. If you own more animals at the time of legislation change, you are not forced to get rid of any, but you can not buy more above the 6 restricted.
- only if exceptions were guaranteed, I foster both cats and dogs
- 3 should be the max, 3 of any kind all together
- 12 pets per property is ridiculous, way too high
- Some people do not care well for one animal. Number of animals owned does not reflect on how well they are cared for.
- The number has nothing to do with it as long as the animals are looked after properly.
- Responsible owners should not be held to this. That can but up to 10 pups, a mother and my 2 dogs
- 3 should be the max. After that there should be a permit.
- Nobody needs six cats and/or dogs. 2 of each per household is plenty.
- fosters breeder and daycares are the ones that need more control
- So arbitrary. Case by case preferred. How many pet hoarders do we see? Incredibly rare. Stop being so controlling.
- Some people take in stray or feral cats and dogs to nurse them or care for them permanently
- I think 6 cats is feasible but 6 dogs in a household seems excessive to me. I would recommend 3-4 dogs as the limit.



- 6 is a lot of animals to properly care for in an urban setting.
- That seems like an excessive amount in town. Gives way to animal hoarding.
- Animals in large groups are more likely to have pack hierarchy that supercedes human training. Dogs are more likely to be aggressive to humans.
- A responsible owner who is demonstrating they are capable of providing an appropriate home for multiple animals by not having complaints or concerns and having well cared for animals should not be limited until such time as they fail to demonstrate the ability to care for multiple animals. Responsible animal ownership is the basis for Calgary bylaws so expect people to be responsible.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats limit is too big and could be taken advantage of
- You are missing dog sledding as well, houses with larger farms should be exempt
- That seems like a lot. In a society where so many people are working I think that is unfair to the animals to allow that many in one household.
- If some households have difficulty controlling and providing a safe home for two pets, how will they possibly do better with up to 12 animals on a property?
- I dont agree that anyone should have that many dogs, as its difficult for one or two people to be able to properly handle and train 6 dogs, my feelings are that having more dogs in one home increases the chance that those dogs are not trained properly and/or cause excessive noise. I dont feel any responsible pet owner would ever have that many on a property in the city. I think that many cats is fine though, as cats are low maintenance and generally kept inside.
- 6 of each is too high. 3 of each max.
- I would support THIS AS LONG AS it would not target only one type of dog breed
- 6&6 is too many still. If you're going to limit, again it should be based on square footage to ensure pet is being taken care of responsibly. We will need pet welfare workers soon.
- Number of pets should be determined by square footage of household to ensure safety and comfort for pets
- There is no need to have 6 dogs and cats in your home at one time, no more than 3 and you have to put in a request to have more
- Yes I support under condition: grandfathering current owners
- 6 dogs and cats is too much for the average person. I think the current bylaw is too low but allowing 12 dogs and cats would lead to lower support for these animals.
- Honestly, 12 animals total is too much for one person to fully care for in a humane way.
- If the property is maintained and there are no issues then no problem
- Should include competitive dog handlers to exception as they have multiple dogs at different training stages at once resulting in more than 6 dogs
- If the owner has proper insurance, is responsible and all animals have their welfare taken care of, there is no reason why not. I would say that if the City would invest in education as opposed to enforcement of new laws and upholding them, we would be on the right track as a society.
- A lower limit within city limits is more than feasible, excluding the above exceptions which if proper care is being given should not be an issue so long as the conditions the animals are living in is monitored or regulated.



- This limit is way too high. The logistics of even walking 6 dogs doesn't add up. Dogs are required to have two 15-20 min walks twice daily and I would suspect these minimal needs would not be met. Multi-cat households often pose problems for the cats in the house as there is rarely enough territory or resources to support the number of cats in the home.
- 6 is too large I would support 4
- Should be the same across the board, and some are taking in rescues permanently to provide a home which is nice. Should not have to spend more money.
- Should be fewer animals per household.
- Leave it as it is
- No home requires 12 animals, though I support the exceptions.
- There is no need for anyone to have more than two dogs and two cats.
- We don't need more rules and regulations in our lives, less is better.
- If people are responsible there is reason to limit their number of pets- if people are a problem deal with them one on one rather than punishing all for the actions of a few
- Who needs 6 animals? If people are over visiting it gets loud enough. Not every day all day
- 6 of each is too many. 2 of each per household is far more reasonable. Consideration has to be given to neighbors.
- That's too many animals period
- I would support having people go to classes if they want to have more than 6 dogs and/or cats.
- People can do what they want!
- That's too many pets to properly care for.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too much and sounds like the beginning of animal hoarding. The exceptions above should be if you want more than 2 or 3
- no one needs 6 dogs that's excessive
- That is an insane amount of animals. How would you even control noise with that many
- Unless you are on an acreage or a farm, there is not enough space to for someone to comfortably house 6 cats and/or 6 dogs at one time
- People can have 1 dog/cat and create problems, and others can have 10 and create no problems. The bylaw should focus on responsible pet ownership and not arbitrary limits.
- Only if laws lol licensing were being strictly enforced
- I don't think the government should be collecting money for a dog barking? How come we the people don't collect money when you the government bark [removed] all the time. How come everything is money money money! No one owes you the government money cause an animal decides to bark you're ridiculous
- There are many homeless cats, having over 6 rescue cats keeps them off the street.
- 6 dogs is way too many. 3 dogs and 3 cats per household is a much more manageable number.
- I do not think anyone needs 6 pets in a home.
- 6 of each sounds high, 4 in urban and maybe 6 in suburban with 6 each in rural
- Absolutely no reason to own more than two pets of any species.



- be allowed more.
- 6 is too many
- Enough
- I don't think people need more than 3 animals per household. 6 animals is not only expensive but it can lead to lack of training, and unclean conditions. No one needs 6 dogs living in the city
- Having a neighbour not know how (or be willing to) manage one or two pets is incredibly frustrating. As the number of pets increases, the problems grow exponentially. Everyone deserves a loving pet, but nobody needs six of them.
- 12 animals in the city is a lot for one household
- Who cares. Two seems pretty low. Maybe three or four? Lots of families have two dogs and a cat
- You will need to consider that many people can have more than 6 dogs/cats and responsibility take care of them. If you want to limit, pick a higher number such as 8 or 10.
- Less animals
- I support the bylaw change but there needs to be less potential exceptions.
- 12 pets in 1 home is outrageous
- This isn't China with a 2 child rule, it's Canada.
- As long as the animals are cared for, it is a person's right to have as many animals as they can afford to take care of.
- As long as people are able to provide proper care (housing, feeding, cleaning & vet fees), there should be no restriction on how many dogs they can own.
- It should be based to the size of the property. Larger home can accommodate more or larger animals, smaller properties or condos would not be suitable for such a large number of animals or dogs of a larger size.
- I think the limit needs to be based on the home 12 animals in most city homes is too many. There is not space needed for them.
- N/A
- 6 dogs or cats? How about 2. Anyone I've ever met with 6 dogs or cats is bonkers. Therapy for the socially odd equals a nuisance neighbors
- If people can properly accommodate their animals, they should not be restricted to what they can own and how many.
- Stop focusing on these NON ISSUES. Leave people and their animals alone. Ridiculous and disgusting
- If they have like 25+ animals on the property and it isn't SAFE OR HEALTHY FOR THE ANIMALS then remove them from the home. Otherwise why does it matter?
- I think a limit of 6 is good but only need licensing if you wish to exceed the pet limit or to breed.
- No one needs that many animals. Too hard to keep them well looked after
- I think that when people own more than 3 or 4 dogs, they are not caring for those dogs as well as they could and should be as they have a lot of them to care for. When a dog is one of few or alone, it is better treated and cared for.



- Common sense really. You don't want out bulls but let people have up to 6 dogs
- Are you kidding? City by law enforcement is toothless. And the folks who want to run a small pet farm are the same folks that care not for their neighbors. Yet the city still wants their property taxes. Here's a bylaw change for you. If city allows permissive pet ownership of a dozen or more animals then affected neighbors should unilaterally be able to withhold or cancel their entire property tax bill when this situation inevitably becomes a nuisance. Calling bylaw does nothing to dominate a nuisance once it is established. Having to live near a nuisance such as what's being proposed puts the onus on affected neighbors to repeatedly call the city to deal with it. Which city may or may not even do. And if it does the pace will be glacial because the city doesn't care. Meanwhile months or years go by at a reduced standard of living for neighbors. Put your skin in the game - if you wonks think this is good policy allow affected parties to withhold or cancel their property tax in full when the situation goes to pot and the city does nothing.
- I agree with the limit, however, the exceptions should NOT include breeders. Breeders should be banned from Alberta.
- As long as the animals are being cared for and are safe and healthy people should be allowed as many as they want!
- If a responsible person can support more than 2 animals, providing adequate care and nutrition than why not?
- 12 four legged animals seems excessive, but I don't know what the current limit is... If it is 2, as implied in the question, then it should be higher, maximum 6- 8 total, not 12.
- That's 12 animals, in a large multistory residence that might not be as much, however in an apartment or townhome that's a lot. Restriction should be based on home type, or number of bedrooms. Additionally a total of 12 animals is excessive. 6 total, would be more reasonable.
- If the animals are well taken care of what business is it of anyone how many they have. There's no restrictions on how many children someone can have. Pets should be considered the same.
- 6 of each is way too many for one household
- I do not think the bylaw will address the issue. Many people will not follow it anyway.
- Remove the word potential from the list of exceptions
- I don't think a limit is necessary
- I was recently given a service dog from an agency working with the legion. That dog has severe health conditions due to poor breeding practices. No service dog trainer will be able to train more than 6 dogs at once.
- Four and four
- 12 is too many animals at one residence.
- I highly doubt that anyone can appropriately care for 6 dogs as well as 6 cats. I think if anyone wants to own more than 4 dogs OR 4 cats, they should be required to attend a mandatory dog or cat handling course.
- Four max of cats and four of dogs. It is expensive to feed and take care of animals. They are living beings and must be properly cared for. I do agree with suggested potential exceptions



- I think most people are able to self govern with the number of pets they have, and the people who aren't would not necessarily follow a bylaw limiting how many pets they could have anyhow.
- There should be no animal limit aslong as they are receiving proper care.
- Unless there is an issue with the pet owner not taking care of the animals or not cleaning up feces ect, I don't see why there should be a limit! If there are cases that animals aren't being taken care of, address them on a case by case basis
- I do not believe it is necessary for a person to own more than 6 cats and 6 dogs at a time as this can encourage pet hoarding situations and this number of animals is likely too much for the average person to handle
- I dont think any household needs more than 6 pets total (not including recent litters not old enough to leave mom) Pets need space and attention, 12 is too many for anyone to properly care for full time.
- It's fine
- A normal home should not have to have more then two dogs or and or two cats, except your exclusions listed above. Then I believe that those exceptions should have the max 6 dogs or six cat rules applied to the exceptions unless or course a animal has given birth to more. Then the owner would have a three month grace period to sell or adopt out those puppies or kittens.
- This should be assessed on a case by case basis. If the living conditions for the animals meet or exceed bylaw, any amount of animals should be allowed.
- Number should be smaller. Hard to control that many animals
- I require more details as to the exceptions
- Shouldn't need a license to own a dog/cat. No limit asking as the animals are cared for.
- I think people should have the freedom to however many pets they want
- Stop with the blanket law laziness. Responsible pet owners should not be lumped into this type of "cut and dry" , "let's make it easy for our bylaw officers" type of policing. If an owner has 3 dogs and 4 cats and nobody has ever complained, why do you even care?! On the other hand, deal with jerk humans who have jerk pets and educate them to be better when complaints are received. Regardless of how many are in the household...as long as they are healthy and happy. Geez Louise...5 year olds could take this type of survey. It's called decency.
- 6 total animals would be more then enough. And then have the applications for special situations.
- That's too many animals to properly care for. I would say 4 dogs or 4 cats max.
- I believe that as long as someone properly takes care of X amount of dogs should be allowed to have them
- That's not fair, a person should be allowed to have as many let's as they would like as long as they are responsible!.
- if there is something reported or fishy then go investigate it but sled dog teams have 6+ dogs and some people rescue cats that one else helps
- Dog racism
- Let ppl be. If they want 7 cats. Let them.



- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many. I also think if your a breeder you should she required to hold a breeder business license
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is still too many; I would suggest 2, maybe 3 dogs and 2, maybe 3 cats ... particularly if puppies/kittens under 6 months are exempted.
- Limit should be 4
- I think it is unacceptable for anyone in the city to own six dogs I feel that it is very unlikely that they are able to control all six dogs end it is damn right scary to be at the off leash Park with someone who has six dogs because you know they cannot keep them all in control and I know someone who's dog wasn't victim I'm just such thing! I don't believe there should be allowed to have any more than four dogs maximum cats I'm not so worried about because I'm not worried about them attacking me or my dog or a child 6 Dogs together can act like Pack mentality and attack!
- I'm on the fence with this one
- Too many animals
- I don't support a limit on dogs or cats. If a nuisance arises this should be dealt with.
- Freedom of rugshts if the animals are well behaved!
- If the person has both the space and means to care for multiple animals properly then they should be allowed but in cases of large numbers of animals in possession of one person or family/group possibly checks should be completed by trained and knowledgeable professionals to ensure this.
- Only if that list of exceptions was actually implemented then I would support the change.
- Too large of an increase
- There should be no limit of pets regardless. What if they are all rescued? Why do we need to make it harder for them to rescue all these animals?
- That is an absurd number of animals for anyone living in the city to own.
- Without taking the size of the property or home into account this is arbitrary and an overreach
- Government is too big as it is. Also how often is this a problem?
- These rules exist to protect the animals
- I dont think we need to control number of pets but the noise, disturbance fines should deter any issues from having a large number of pets
- I think the limit should be four: 6 is too many in the city
- We need to also include Registered Non Profit Animal Rescuer
- I support it other than the number - no one needs to have 6 of any pet let alone 12 total.
- There should be no more than 2 dogs or cats per household. We have a woman on our street than currently has 6 dogs and they roam the neighbourhood as she cannot care for them all.
- So long as animals are well cared for and provided for, I don't support a limit. But there should possibly be inspections for those households with more than a dozen animals to ensure they are being well provided for, and is not a hoarding or back yard breeding situation where animals are not safe, healthy or happy.
- I think 6 is too many.
- 12 animals in a residence ..? Really ..? Unnecessary and greedy. No.



- No animals should be kept indoors against their will.
- That is way too many. 3 cats, 3 dogs maybe but even that seems excessive
- Six dogs is too large of a limit. Toronto has a limit of 3 dogs and 6 cats. The impact on the neighborhood is different when it is six cats vs six dogs.
- 6 is too many animals. I think 2 is plenty.
- Please leave it the same.
- If you want any pets move to the country where the animals can run free and bother nobody but their owners.
- 6 dogs, or cats in a city home, especially if owners are working is CRAZY. Way too many, reduce the number to 2, unless it is a short term foster situation.
- 6 is way too many. 2 is more reasonable.
- I am sick and tired of your authoritarian in-your-face domination. Enough!
- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats are excessive
- limit is too high but support exceptions
- Should be no limit
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is way to many. 6 dogs and/or cats in total would be more reasonable.
- As long as the animals are well taken care of, don't infringe on neighbors
- Should be up to the pet owner and the property owner on how many pet they are allowed to have
- This limit is vastly different when applied to someone living in a condo to a large single family home with lots of room for pets. Again I think we should be able to trust people being able to regulate their own lives.
- Go after poor quality owners. If they have a problem and are creating a nuisance deal with them, don't arbitrarily just make a blanket rule to avoid doing your job.
- Cuz no
- Absolutely silly to be able to have 12 animals in a city residence. Perhaps 2 and 2 max.
- Stay at 2 max.
- There is no reason that anyone living in the city needs should have this many animals in their home. If this bylaw change comes into effect it will promote more animal hoarding, poor animal welfare, disturbance to neighbour enjoyment of their own property, even worse littering of feces and bags with feces in parks and more feral cats. I strongly oppose this change. No one in Calgary should have more than 2 dogs or 2 cats per household.
- Numbers are too high, should be 4 not 6
- Limit should be one dog or one cat
- actually should be less animals
- No one should be governing how many animals one individual has, that is absurd. Grabdfathering an animal in.. jeeze.
- Animals need a certain amount of space, and I think that number of dogs and cats is above what those animals need for their health and well-being.
- You can't limit people to owning animals if that's what they want to do



- The proposal is fine but there should be no exception for breeding.
- If they are well cared for no restrictions
- I support this but not for breeders in residential homes within the city limit
- 2 is a pretty small number: Maybe 4-6 would be more reasonable
- I suggest a maximum of 3 dogs and 2 cats.
- Who cares how many pets someone owns as long as it remains to be their own problem
- I feel that in absence of neglect people have the right to have the number of animals they choose to.
- 6 dogs AND cats is far too many animals for one house within city limits to care for. 6 of both (total) is still too much to adequately care for.
- The only concern should be the welfare of the animal
- Should be less than 6 dogs and 6 cats.
- Six is too high. Three is more than enough.
- I think people will keep as many animals as they want regardless of the bylaws. In order to get revenue just sell licenses to people instead of spending money on by-law officers hunting them down. Those people that end up hoarding pets that they are not able to care for will be weeded out eventually because they won't be able to care for them properly.
- A person(s) have the right to have as many pets as they want, provided all the animals are properly cared for
- Far too many animals for one person to own and properly take care of.
- Should be lower than 6, no more than 2 or 3
- Unless living on a larger lot/acreage, that is too many animals in one household
- No one can take care of that many animals. Insane.
- No household should have 6 cats AND 6 dogs. 4 animals per household MAX is reasonable.
- If my animals are well cared for and housed, and I pay for their care, medications and quality of life, who is the city of Calgary to tell me I can only have 6 cats or dogs? I am not in support of this legislation at all.
- This bylaw isn't doing anything to help dog owners. All this by law does is feed into people's fears and lack of knowledge about breeds. I think in order to have a by law that will actually work and help everyone dog owners and non pet owners alike is if laws were made specifically for dogs not breeds. There needs to be more fines and rules for anyone who owns a pet. It's not a big dogs fault that there not actually causes damage when a small dogs (eg: Pomeranians, Chihuahuas, pugs, etc) bite doesn't. I've had more bad situations with little dogs or owners that don't control there dog. I've had to save my big dogs from little dogs or rude dogs so that my dogs don't defend themselves (bite another dog to tell them to leave them alone or protect themselves). It has stopped me from going to most dog parks because it gives people an excuse to not pay attention to there dog. This is not a bully breed/ bad dog issue this is a bad owner/ responsible issue and perhaps having cameras at dog parks or some form of security to in force rules and make sure that people are actually controlling and paying attention to there pets.
- The number isn't as much of an issue, as is the responsibility of the owner.
- pet limit should be 4, this is in the animals best interest



- No need for More than 2 animals.
- Depends on situation, if a large property with no near neighbours then no restrictions should be in place. If downtown area then restrictions could be in place
- 2 pets per household should be the limit.
- A limit is pointless and achieves no purpose. There is no difference in owning 6 dogs or 7. It's an arbitrary number. If you have the space to have 10 dogs and they are quiet, well behaved and owed by responsible owners then it shouldn't matter.
- 6 dogs is too many unless they are on an acreage. Could lead to more puppy mills!!
- We need to Support rescues without being penalized
- if someone wants to own more than 6 animals then I should be allowed as long as they maintain feces and noise
- Shouldn't be a limit. There are massive houses and yards in the city with room for way more than 2 dogs etc
- Not really necessary.
- Love does not have a limit.
- 6 of any is too many!
- These numbers are way too high. No household should be able to have 12 pets! 3 should be the maximum allowed.
- The limit should be 4 animals (dogs and cats combined) with the exception of temporary homes as defined above.
- In a city setting there is no need for anyone to own that many animals. I believe that the limit should be 3 animals per household.
- I do not support this change
- Number is too high per household
- Way too many pets in one household
- Too high a number
- I don't believe that any normal household needs 6 dogs/cats except if they are within the potential exceptions listed above. Both species should be licensed.
- If someone wants to own 7 dog and 10 cats, let them. Who are we to say where the limit should lie if all animals are well cared for?
- Please limit it to 2 cats/ dogs
- Limiting the number of pets does NOT address issues like noise and accumulation of feces. Proper training and cleaning up after your pet does.
- 6 animals person is too many. Amount should be lower. There should also be a limit to how many dogs a 'Dog Walker' can take for a leash walk or to a dog park.
- I think if the person is able to care properly for the animals then have at it, if they can't and have shown multiple times they can't then they should have a lower animal limit. Don't punish everyone just those that disrespect animals.
- No more than one 1 animal per household ... breeders should be in business or industrial area ...



- I think it should be allowed to have any number of animals as long as they are properly cared for.
- Nobody needs that many animals... i agree to the exception for animals under 6 months
- I only support parts of this. Question needs to be broken up more. Otherwise I don't support it at all.
- That is way too many animals. If a person wants to own that many animals they should live in an appropriate location (ie an acreage or farm) outside the city. The animals can have more freedom there.
- Too many animals in one home. Unless this was a registered rescue with licences and accredited persons
- No reason for more than 2 dogs or cats
- I said.
- One female dog can have more than 5 pups which need to stay in the house for approx 6 weeks
- It would depend on the size of the home
- 6 is too high. 4 seems more reasonable.
- People should have the right to have as many pets as they wish
- That is too many animals per household. 6 dogs is a pack, they win how can anyone look after 6 dogs properly. Cats are more self sufficient but they do tend to urinate in a home when they are claiming territory. That just does not work, its not in their nature to live with that many other cats.
- No one needs this many animals in a home within city limits.
- This depends on the owner not the number of dogs
- A regulat pet owner doesn't need to have 6 dogs or cats. What is the purpose of this quantity of pets? That's too much unless the person is a registered breeder and the offspring are eventually sold. Six pets in a household also leads to waste and noise (especially dogs) issues and pets (cats) roaming at large.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is too many die any family in the city limits, even if someone owns only 3 or four of one of those animals they shouldn't have a difficult time applying for a special permit to justify that amount .
- Max 3 animals a household with the exceptions
- This is ridiculous
- Live and let live. This is what the noise bylaw is for.
- 6 is way too many, 12 is just stupid
- Limit of pets in a home should be decided based on size of property instead of a fixed amount. It doesn't make sense if a one bedroom apartment unit is allowed to have 6 dogs and 6 cats.
- Many people can own multiple animals with no concerns or issues over welfare, or disturbances with neighbours. However I would support a limit on unaltered animals in the home which would hopefully encourage spay/neutering and decrease the number of unwanted litters.
- Three total in any combination. Six is way to many I agree with the exceptions
- Responsible breeders sometimes have more than 6 animals at a given time. I stress responsible registered breed etc not back yard breeders
- I think 3-5 animals total is more than enough unless the above criteria are met



- 6 of each in an urban setting is ridiculous. There's no need for that many pets.
- Six dogs is too many. As is six cats.
- 6 dogs and or 6 cats in a household/home is too many for a single household. Exceptions as listed above are reasonable. 3 or 4 pets per household is more reasonable.
- Totally depends on how the number of animals are cared for. If there is great support for food/water/shelter for more than 6 animals then that should be allowed.
- Sometimes people can't have children so their pets are their children's and they take care of them like their children. I have 3 dogs and I couldn't imagine someone telling me I couldn't have one of my baby's . For what reason?
- I find 2 of each seems too low. But 6 of each? That is much too high to allow just any person to have. Most people can barely care properly for 3 of each. 6 is too much.
- Why should a pet limit be in place? If a household has the financial means to own more than 6 dogs/cats and they are able to, then why not?
- Allow people to have as many pets as they want. Restrictions on breeding and treatment.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is a large number of animals that require a great deal of financial support, attention and responsibility. The allowable number of animals in a home should be assessed based upon a person's income, size of dwelling/property, and general ability to care for the animals..
- It's not the number that's important it's the care the animals receive. You cannot legislate common sense
- if they are cared for them properly then let have a zoo
- I think it should be stricter. Less animal max. 3 and 3 instead of 6 and 6. Grandfather existing exemptions so no animals are pulled from their home (if loving and adequate for needs.)
- Having so many animals prevents the ability to properly care for their needs
- I feel having that many animals prevents the ability to properly care for each animal and their need
- excessive restrains
- If the living conditions are monitored and the animals are healthy and well cared for and not breaking any nuisance bylaws it shouldn't be an issue
- Dictating how many animals one can have is like telling someone how many kids they should have. Just doN't go there.
- Animal care (health, food, water, medical treatment, socialization, etc.) and living in an appropriate stress free environment for the animal.
- The current by-laws are not enforced, increasing the number will just make the problem worse.
- If they are being cared for and not causing issue then it is no one else's business but the owner.
- If the animals are being well cared for, are healthy and behaved why does it matter how many animals are in a private residence. Again, this should be reviewed on a case by case basis. The restriction should be placed on people, not households. If a person is convicted of animal abuse or neglect; that individual(s) should be restricted.
- I support alimony for owning animals, and it should be lower -4. They MUST also be a limit on the number of dogs a dositter can have, and they should have to have a license. There must also be a



limit on the number of dogs dog walkers can have in public. They don't pick up after all these dogs and it's gross. They can't control all the dogs either in off-leash areas. No way can you properly control 10 dogs. This is a disappointing oversight in your review.

- If the owners care for the pet and property there should be no problems with several pets
- Next to impossible to enforce
- 6 dogs or 6 cats???? yikes. Most people can't even properly take care for one animal. Vet visits, food, litter all cost lots of money. Having a pet is a huge responsibility both financial and time.
- 3 and 3 should be the limit...with exception for animals under 8 months of age to allow for litters.
- this is too many animals. max 6 of mixed would be more than sufficient
- Do not increase the amount of animals that can be kept in the city.
- I shouldn't have to license my pet.
- Good animal keeping is going to be based on Responsible pet owners, not a limit which would be extremely hard to enforce, regardless of enforcement
- Should be a maximum of 4
- 2 dogs and 2 cats per household is more than enough. Even that is a lot. A special application could be put in place if they want more but then they should have financial backup and training documentation to support these animals. You talk about animal aggression but then you want to allow people to have 6 dogs. I can guarantee a vast majority of these people don't and can't afford to properly train or properly care for that many animals.
- The limit should be lower
- Arbitrary pet counts have no bearing on the responsible behaviour of pet owners. Where owners are failing to provide healthy environments for their animals or are negatively impacting neighbours, the city needs to act on a case by case basis.
- If you want more than 2 animals of the same species, move to an acreage. I'm also against anything that makes it easier for people to breed animals. We still have too many animals ending up unwanted and in bad situations.
- animals are like children for many people. responsible ownership practice should be the goal not bylaw enforcement
- Number is excessive. Total of four animals is plenty for anyone!
- The government should not have any right to decide how many animals a household can take care of. There are other bylaws in place to ensure the animals wellbeing and that of the community around it.
- 6 and 6 is extremely high. It's hard to imagine a city property that could accommodate so many animals. Would limit to 3 and 3.
- There is no need for anyone to have that many pets. If they fall under financial hardship their animals would struggle first.
- 6 dogs is too many for any single family home much less denser housing. How would one walk and exercise that many dogs? There are already problems in off-leash dog parks where dog walkers are walking multiple dogs. I have seen many instances of inappropriate dog behaviours which are ignored due to the # of animals the walker is handling. Also less poop scooping as no one can



possibly observe that many animals. Changing the bylaw to allow more animals leads to only more problems in my opinion and lends itself to animal hoarders and abusive or negligent situations.

- Maximum of two animals per household that is it
- I think that 6 dogs and six cats is completely unreasonable and should be reduced significantly.
- Pets are companions, not a business or a hobby which I think having anymore than 2 becomes.
- I believe it all comes down to how responsible the owner is with the animals. Some might be able to take care of 10 cats and others can't even take care of 1 cat, case by case basis
- People can't take care of 1 or 2 animals why would we then allow up to potentially 12 pets. Are these people running a zoo or a farm that a single home has that much room for that many animals. What about the noise, smell, urine and feces? How horrible would that home be?
- 6 of either is way too many
- [removed]
- 6 animals is too much
- 6 dogs is too many for one household. Maximum should be 4.
- Limit should be a maximum of 3 except as stated in above circumstances.
- If animals are cared for properly, no one has the right to say what is the right amount. If people are not taking care, then they should be punished with far greater fines and imprisonment than we currently have
- I have five dogs, all purebred and four of them bred by me. They seldom if ever bark whereas the two dogs behind me bark constantly day and night. Most people in the neighbourhood who have known me for many years ask me whether I still have a dog; that is how quiet and obedient they are. I would be very surprised to learn if there are many households in Calgary with numbers of dogs sufficient to warrant such a bylaw.
- No limit should be put on animals as long as animals are well taken care of and monitored well by owners
- This seems like legislating for a problem that doesn't exist. By putting limits on something where there wasn't before, it's intrusive. Sure there are some cases of hoarding that pop up once in a while, but 99.9999% of people within the city would have under 12 animals on their property.
- We don't limit children so as long as all animals are taken care of it's fine. 1 animal that is not taken care of is too many so the issue is with the owner not the number
- There is no need for that many animals in one house
- I don't support this 6 animal limit. I think 4 is a more realistic number.
- that's too many dogs. 4 dogs max - or 6 cats.
- The targets above that this is trying to address can happen with one pet and not happen with 6. It's the people who own them who are the problem. Make the targets what is enforceable no matter the number of pets.
- The possibility of 12 pets per property is way too many unless it is a foster program. I live next to 4 dogs and it drives me crazy. Can't imagine what it would be like if someone had 6.
- 12 animals are too many but existing excesses should be grandfathered.



- Allowing a total of 12+ animals on one property seems excessive. Toronto has a pet limit of 3 dogs AND 6 cats per household - given that dogs are larger and often louder than cats, it seems logical to me that there should be fewer of them permitted in one household.
- I don't believe in (a) licensing an animal and (b) imposing unusual/unnecessary limits on things.
- set limit to two, you want more buy a farm, go rural.
- That's way too many animals for one house. I would question the well being of all those animals i
- As long as they're cared for, who are you to say how many pets somebody has?
- Too many. Limit to 4 eAch
- Too many issues when owning many pets, including but not including the costs.
- I will always support safe and supportive animal fostering with competent foster parents! They should have the ability to keep more then 12 animals
- I don't think that many animals in one house is reasonable for the safe my of those animals and the mental health of owners
- Six of each is far too many on a small property.
- People should be allowed to own as many pets as they please.
- I support no more than two cats an/or dogs per household
- Everyone should have the freedom to have any amount of pets they want, as long as they are being well taken care of
- limit should be 2 dogs and 2 cats per household. Exceptions require an approved excess animal permit regardless of the exception.
- Reduce limit to three. Unless you are a breeder why do you need six. If you are a dog breeder move to an acreage.
- Can't see how 1 household could properly care for that many pets. This is a city not a barnyard.
- i dont like idea
- This needs to be seriously looked at and either an application or review needs to be submitted. I lived with 4 dogs at one point because I fostered and adopted the most recent one (who conveniently is the blockheaded' dog) I was able to care for the amount of maintenance and cleanup required but I know with absolute certainty that not everyone can.. this shouldn't be a rule that is blindly allowed. Approval will need to be given. I dont think you realize how much work 6 dogs is. I have 8 currently and that's a handful.
- no need to have the number be so high
- Pets are like children to owners. We don't limit the number of children someone can have. Discrimination. If they are cared for and healthy there should be no limit.
- As long as owners can provide & care for their pets, I do not feel there should be no limit
- This is way! too many animals for anyone to care for no matter the situation. The stress for the animals would be very high living amongst 5 other animals. Please start the maximum at 2 pets so that animals are cared for properly.
- This is too many animals and could result in excessive noise and smells for neighbours
- 6 of each seems very excessive in one household. 2 or 3 of each seems like more than enough.



- if it is not harming the animals or others, there shouldn't be a limit on a person's number of pets.
- Limit of animals seems high. I would bring the number down even lower! 3 dogs and 3 cats per household.
- Limit of two pets per household.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many except if breeding. limit it to 3 and 3
- I think six is reasonable in most circumstances, but I think there should be an application for more, to be granted based on living conditions and quality of care.
- I do not believe anyone needs more than 2 pets.
- I support limiting 1 dog / 1 cat per household.
- 12 pets is absurd. There is no way to attend the needs of each animal. Excessive noise and roaming would be an issue.
- 4 pets in total is surely enough—exceptions as listed except Dog Fanciers (need to cut down on dog breeding), and no Excess Animal Permit, and Service Animals (surely a person doesn't need more than 4 Service Animals).
- I don't think there should be a limit as long as there is proper care and space.
- The need or even desire to have an exemption that allows one to keep more than six each of cats or dogs on a single property (especially a residential one) is based solely around the desire for profit. While foster homes or service animal training centres could benefit from being exempt from the limit, allowing breeders to also operate under this exemption only creates conditions that let puppy mills and backyard breeders proliferate.
- I would be okay with 3 of each animal with the same exceptions applying
- I would say four cats and four dogs per household would be more than adequate.
- If there foster for shelter of some sort or medical shelter dont see why people need that many animals
- Special application is suspicious and poorly explained
- This is a democratic society, we don't live in a dictatorship that government controls how many pets we keep...what's next kids.
- I would support a change to a household Limit of 2 cats and 2 dogs. No one needs More than that.
- Enforcement of bylaw is more necessary. A home can have 1 pet and still have excessive noise, accumulation of feces, and poor welfare of the animal. While those with 6+ pets can still have all those requirements fully addressed. Number of animals owned doesnt ensure proper care.
- Each circumstance is different. I've seen places with 3 dogs that don't make a sound and you have one household with one yappy little toy dog
- 6 dogs or cats per household is way too high. a limit of 2-3 is more than enough.
- The number of pets shouldn't matter here, focus on the living and care conditions instead. If a person can house any number of animals in safe, sanitary and well-managed conditions, then what's the harm? Most households likely wouldn't be able to meet those living standards for huge numbers of animals. Some households can't provide those standards of living for just 1 animal..



- I would support this idea as long as special application is free of charge. As long as animals are cared for well, not mistreated and not bothering anyone, why cause more expense. I think animal hoarding should be examined on case-by-case basis by people qualified to assess the said owner.
- Too many animals reduces ones ability to provide proper care. Limiting the number of pets not only helps address nuisance but also may improve the welfare and conditions for pets.
- Any restrictions on the number of pets should be on the basis of living space/property size, rather than a one size fits all number.
- I think this is based on a case by case basis and should be handled as such.
- I think in most cases aside from those where hoarding etc occurs, most know their limit. Better to fine if day feces etc not picked up versus limiting animals per home.
- No one other than an association accredited fancier in a suitable non residential home should have 6 no one with out income means or location should have more than 1. We had 1 AB licensed service dog who has more? Same for licensed medical dogs only people using fake designations would ever try
- Unfair, likely to reduce Number of licences Purchased
- Less city oversight
- 6 dogs, or 6 cats, is too high of a number for most households. A limit of 2 dogs or 2 cats should be explored. Breeders should not be within city neighbourhoods, and household pets must be 'fixed' to prevent accidental breeding. Permits beyond the limit should not be allowed, whether a 'fancier' or not. Animal daycares need to be in commercial space only, not neighbourhoods.
- Up to 12 animals in one household seems excessive. Maybe only under special circumstances
- Would not stop bad breeders or puppy mills.
- This is too much to have 6 dogs for household.
- Unrealistic & unfair
- Six is too high a number. Smell, noise, safety and welfare of the animal as is difficult to manage. Two is a good limit
- As long as the animals are well taken care of, both inside and outside. It really shouldn't matter how many pets a household has. This includes regular vet appointments and licenses for each animal
- I support the limits, but the exception regarding "dog fanciers licenses" should not be included. It would just be a way for wealthier pet owners to keep more animals. In fact, given that the proposed bylaw contemplates exemptions by application, the categories of automatic exemption should be eliminated altogether.
- 6 of each is far too high
- There should be no limit
- Case by case basis. Some people are fine with having more animals and take great care of them. Others, may not be.
- 6 is too many
- I believe that 6 is too many of any animal in a household, unless it is part of any of these above exceptions. 3 of each (3 cats AND 3 dogs - all licensed) seems more reasonable.
- If there are fines for noise, dedication, etc. It's not fair to punish responsible pet owners



- How about you go after backyard breeders? There are trash people breeding 2 random pitbulls and using them as a paycheck. It's not fair. There are so many pitties already without homes. Go after backyard breeders. There is no such thing as bad dogs, only bad owners. You are not making choose which of my pitties to give up. They are everything to me. Over my dead body will you ever touch my dogs. I am a good responsible owner. I don't even take my dogs for walks anymore because I'm scared of stupid pro BSL people. This is like the holocaust. You are branding pitbulls and trying to take them away and kill them. You will not touch my dogs.BSL
- Not your business
- Needs to be way less. In the City 4 dogs and 4 cats is enough.
- The numbers should not be an issue, so long as the owners adhere to all bylaws and guidelines that coincide with owning pets. Perhaps in-person assessments of animal living conditions should be executed with the purchase of a seventh (or whatever the limit is) pet.
- Pet limit per household is too high. 2 dogs & 2 cats is a much more reasonable#. It would help to prevent people from having puppy mills in private homes & hoarding pets when they cannot afford to ensure the animals care (ie: vaccinations, spaying/neutering & feeding. The potential exceptions listed above are agreeable.
- People that are breathing once they have that letter there over there 6 not fair
- Limit should be lower than six dogs or six cats. No more than 3 dogs - exception when a dog or cat has a litter until animals are placed in other homes.
- 6 is too many
- I don't believe any household should have more than 2 pets total. The only exception being a mom with puppies or service animals.
- Should be the same.
- The limit should be 2 dogs and 2 cats per household. I agree with all the exceptions listed above.
- If a person wants more animals and has the means and space, as well as the accountability, why should they be prevented from having more than six? My issue is with people who don't properly care for their animals. I'd support a limit if it's set based on size of home, for example. But even then, little dogs don't require the same amount of space as big dogs. Putting an arbitrary limit on everyone really isn't fair. Most people are responsible pet guardians and don't require restrictions.
- Excessive number. A property/home could have up to 12 animals.
- max of 2 animals
- 6 cats or 6 dogs is a nuisance in dense neighbourhoods - no household should have more than 3-4 large pets (cats, dogs). They should apply to get more and only be approved if there are no complaints in the past 12 months.
- 6 is too many, especially for dogs.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats seems excessive, perhaps a total of 6 (cats and dogs combined) I would support the change and all the special accommodations
- if you want more animals, move outside the city where the animals have space to have a decent yard and explore.



- Over stepping again. If a person wants 6 cats and 6 dogs that should be their choice. Where you can take a stand to take away animals is if there are children in the home and it is not maintained and becomes a health hazard. Those situations need intervention, not all, so stop taking away people's freedoms.
- So long as the property is large enough for the animals to be happy, and the owners clean and train their animals there is no issue in having more. I believe we should crack down on irresponsible ownership
- If the person is able to properly care for and maintain their animals there should not be a limit on it.
- I have responsible family that has 10 very well behaved dogs who love everyone.
- You can have 12 animals in an apartment!? The limit should be four total; any breeders should apply for a business licence and one time accident per pregnancy should apply for a permit exemption
- I do not agree that someone can not have more than 6 animals
- Too many animals in this city. I've lived in every quadrant and have to deal with dogs barking all night everywhere. My neighbor has at least 4 dogs, they are noisy and their yard smells like shit. I also see people struggle to control even 2 dogs when they are taking them for walks.
- I agree with the 6 dog and 6 cat limit, but the owner should have to prove the living conditions are suitable for the animals after 6 animals total.
- six dogs or cats is an excessive number. No one needs that number of pets. It's just allowing for the potential of abuse of the neighbours.
- People who usually want this many animals fail to clean up after them, or train them properly, which leads to a substantial amount of noise and feces
- Foster and pet sitters should be limited to 6-same as household
- Putting a hard limit wont really help. If the animals are all well cared for, not causing disturbances, etc then the limit isnt necessary. This should be situation dependent. Perhaps have a requirement that anything over 2 and 2 and you have to provide proof of your ability to care for and control them while also and maintaining your yard to prevent odours, etc.
- It makes no sense to limit numbers; the issue is not how many or the size of the animal, but how the owner cares for it. One dog can cause tremendous disturbance and sanitation problems, if the owner fails to act responsibly. Calgary has been a stellar example for decades of responsibility households with multiple dogs; many of which are hobbyists or single people or elderly people who benefit emotionally due to the demands of maintaining a clean, quiet and sanitary animal husbandry hobby. This is not something to arbitrarily limit with any number. Requiring people to apply for fancier licenses has failed in other jurisdictions because of zoning restrictions. It is deceiving to offer such an option, then have applications denied because of zoning issues. Let the hobby breeders continue to function well, as the vast majority are doing; without limit. Put again the onus on ownership to be responsible: clean, quiet and safe - that is a value that all Calgarians can support without restricting the joy that owners of multiple animals have, while living in this city.
- Often pet owners can not afford vet fees for these animals and they end up in the shelter or euthanized so no we should not be increasing the limit to dogs/cats in the city.



- I say it come down to the size of the animal and the size of the property. It makes a difference in the ability to care for the animal. That should be the number one factor no matter what.
- Too many animals in a household
- Once again this only addresses the law-abiding people. This becomes a paper complex situation that cannot be investigated or enforced. Animal hoarders will always be found in any city, and should be dealt with as each requires. Policing this would be exorbitant and could create many more neighbourhood conflicts. Am I required to show by permit to every neighbour? This is intrusive and unnecessary.
- I feel like being able to own up to 6 dogs and cats at one time is a bit excessive. I think 3 of each is a more reasonable number. Any more then that I would be questioning if a person would be able to financially take care of the pets wellbeing, between feeding them, licensing for all of them, keeping up with vaccinations and just regular vet visits. All that can add up pretty quick without adding in if they happen to get sick or injured.
- As long as the animals are being taken care of and there are no complaints it shouldn't matter how many animals they own
- I'm not convinced that anyone needs to have that many pets (dogs and cats) at home given that I don't think that a reasonable amount of care can be given to that many dogs and cats within the same household. The exception of course would be for a litter of puppies or kittens.
- I suggest a lower number (3 dogs and 3 cats) with the above mentioned exceptions or special approvals.
- No one within city should be allowed more than 2 pets, if someone needs or requires more than 2, they can move out of city to an acreage and go nuts.
- There's is no need for more than 4 licensed animals in a home, unless the restrictions are in conjunction with property size.
- 12 animals in one household is way too much. It's too hard to ensure that people are caring for them adequately. I don't believe the city has the resources or the desire to enforce this.
- The limit should be lower by 50% of the proposed bylaw change (3 dogs and 3 cats).
- I think a blanket limit based on household would be unfair to the animals, and should rather be based on environment. The limit should be based on property size, i.e. a single story house should be allowed fewer adult animals than someone who own many acres where the animals have room to live comfortably, and the animals' access to social contact. This could be assessed based on the animal in question (ex: dogs need more space than cats), and could be calculated based on size of dog as well (large dogs need more room than small dogs), and after a certain number of animals has been reached (ex: let's say 6 animals) an assessment of their time spent socializing with humans and other animals should be considered. I have no issues with the proposed exceptions, except for Dog Fanciers as that seems like a way for the wealthy who want ignore the rules by possessing purebreed animals. Given the unlikelihood of my proposal being accepted, I would support the change over no change; however, I do think a small house with 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive and detrimental to the well being of the animals, and it would be better to assess based on space available.



- It's circumstantial.
- 6 is too many, maybe set limit at 3
- Pet owners should be responsible for their pets and the pets actions. If they cannot properly care for the animals then they should not be allowed to have them.
- The number should be max 2 and 2 with the exceptions
- Unless there is evidence of animal hoarding, I think people should be able to have as many pets as they like. Providing they are able to care for them.
- 6 is way too many! We are already getting overrun with pets.
- This is an unreasonable intrusion into people private homes and property. Cats are indoor animals and their numbers should not affect those in adjacent homes
- Just more pointless bylaws we need to follow that only apply to really a select FEW people. Aren't there better things we should be worrying about?
- 12 animals per household is way too much. It is unfair to the animals. I believe 4-5 is more than enough.
- Poses the potential for animals to be neglected. Living in the city would not allow for appropriate room for animals to roam -i.e. backyards
- Too many animals. Not sanitary.
- 6 is still too high. I have two dogs. That is reasonable. I would agree to a max of say 3. (Cat OR Dog - NOT BOTH)
- If owners are responsible and able to care for their pets there should not be a limit
- Unless they live on an acreage or farm, there is no reason that any owner should have more than 2 dogs and/or cats. Any more would become extremely disruptive to neighbours and, especially in the case of dogs, greatly reduce the probability that animals will be properly cared for, exercised, and feces picked up. It's upsetting to hear that so many dogs and cats may be permitted per household, plus pigeons and hens allowed. This is the CITY... not the country, not a farm, not an acreage. Allowing these bylaw changes will reduce property values and increase noise, unsightly premises, irresponsible owners bylaw complaints.
- No one should have 6 pets.
- Don't like this.
- Within a dense urban environment 2-3 dogs/cats should be the max.
- I don't believe it is city councils right to tell someone how many pets they can have
- People love collecting animals. Very few people are able to behave responsible enough to have 6 dogs or cats. Eventually most people who own more than 2-3 pets fall behind in cleaning litter boxes or clear yards of dog excrement. In my experience often people who hoard animals have mental health issues and it's very hard to come to a positive resolution if there are bylaw infractions, because they simply do not understand or choose not to.
- again basic [removed] the city needs to focus on real issues
- 6 is too high 2-4 max. No exceptions.
- Cats are not social creatures (contrary to common opinion). They need to be engaged in life (yes, that is different), whether that be toys, human interaction, or daily exercise. The increase, as



proposed, will increase stray cats, as owners generally watch over their cats less as the numbers in a house increase. This should not be allowed via special application. Dogs vary greatly. 6 dogs is very reasonable in instances of behavioural excellence, and large yard area. 6 dogs should only be allowed via special application. The current limits do well.

- 12 pets in one household is a lot to care for. I agree with the exceptions noted. Suggest lowering pets to 4 in total of any domesticated species (cat, dog, bird, iguana...)
- It is none of anyone's business how many dogs/cats someone has - as long as they are well cared for.
- Limit the number of animals in a household. In most instances numerous animal homes are not responsible for them ie: training, exercise and health care.
- I think that 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive. I support the no more than 2 each group.
- Limiting people's rights is the opposite of what government should do.
- Do not impose limits. If clean, responsible home, and animals are cared for LEAVE IT ALONE
- I typically support this because I believe it would be unreasonable to have more pets than this but also I support letting people do what they want to do. Plus with smaller breeds of dogs, I would feel comfortable having more than 6, depending on the size of my house/yard.
- I would want less dogs and cats per household ie 3 total
- As long as the situation isn't a hoarding situation and the animals are all licensed and properly cared for and not becoming a nuisance to the neighbours, have as many as you want.
- The increase amount is too large a jump (from 2 to 6 of each) to allow for adjustment of bylaw officer enforcement or owners costs and responsibilities. In addition, I believe the by law limit should be totally number of animals in a home, not for each type of animal. I would support a limit increase to 3.
- I don't want to live beside someone with 6 dogs or cats. I would be worried about the excessive feces and noise!!
- Higher fines domcumulation of feces on a property Excessive noise (eg. barking
- You want six dogs get a farm
- I would support an exception for grandfathering in if the rules change, but having an excess. Umber of animals creates unnecessary noise, mess, and unhygienic conditions so should not be allowed in circumstances other then when grandfathered.
- I expect there would be exceptional circumstances and I don't trust the City's responsiveness to deal with exceptions.
- No more than 4 total animals (dogs and cats) is sufficient
- Six is too many as it is.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats in one residence in the city is way too many!
- 6 is too many for a household
- The limit should be 2. Exception for a litter for a period of 12 weeks
- 12 animals in 1 house is too much!!!
- 1pet is enough



- you have no right to dictate the amount of animals someone wants to rescue/foster as long as the animals are all well cared for.
- Case by case basis when problems arise is far better than arbitrary limits.
- No
- Far too many animals for one urban household - too many chances for abuse (of the rules, animals, neighbours, etc.), hoarding, illegal breeding/selling operations.
- Limit is too high. Should be 2 per household
- bad pet owners are bad whether they have 1 or 10 animals
- 3 dog limit and 3 cat limit. 6 of each is WAY too high.
- I'm not sure if I want the city determining my ability to care for my animals and restrict numbers. I wonder if this is being raised because of hoarding situations which is a whole different cause vs. responsible pet ownership issues.
- As long as all other laws are followed and the animals are taken care of there should not be a restriction
- That's way too many dogs/cats!
- As long as there is care for the animals on all levels there should be no restrictions.
- I think 6 dogs and cats are far too many to take care of responsibility
- The numbers of pets does not determine their behavior or their owners behavior
- Maximum number of 6 is too low. Raise to 10
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many for one home, 3 dogs and 3 cats would be a good maximum
- If they can properly take care of said animals, there should be no limit
- Too much under one law change some need to be singled out
- 6 pets per household seems too high of a limit
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is outrageous, unless you have a large property. I think the bylaw should be based on property size.
- A limit of 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many for a person to handle. And the barking!!! and the cats wandering!!! A lot of low income families have animals and can't afford to feed them. I've had clients to know this statement is true.
- 6 is too many
- too many still
- As long as can care adequately for animals and surroundings, should be allowed
- G
- What worked well in our townhouse complex was limiting a household to 2 pets. A pet limit of 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many. I suggest 3 and 3.
- 6 dogs is excessive and unless they are fully trained and managed by a responsible owner, the potential for attack and injury is high. Limit of 4 is reasonable. 6 cats is also excessive but far more manageable if kept clean and healthy.
- That's too many animals for a lot of properties in the city. It would not be good for the animals welfare or the humans if there were that many in, for example, an apartment. Making the limit 6 cats and 3



dogs or around that but having those exceptions listed above seems a better option. Then, for those in situations where they can provide the space and environment for more than that number can apply for a permit. I think this would help limit the situations where people end up with more animals than they can care for

- Pet limit is too high should be a maximum 3 or 4 pets (dogs or cats) per household.
- No more than two dogs or cats per property
- It doesn't seem necessary to limit numbers of animals so long as other bylaws (noise, safety etc) are being followed.
- 6 dogs is FAR too many for a healthy environment for humans. 6 cats is not as dangerous biologically, but there is no reason to have that many. The ONLY exception to this should be made for LICENSED breeders, with NO other exceptions.
- 6 is outrageous. The limit should be lower.
- As long as the pets are cared for the city should not decide what happens in someone's house
- i think only under certain circumstances like a rescue or such should have that many animals. it is not fair to the animals in any way.
- Pet limit should be 2 pets total per household.
- There should be no enforced limit on pets
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is too much. I would support 3 cats and 3 dogs. I agree with the exceptions listed above.
- 6 is enough
- Limit 2 dogs per household
- There is no reason for anyone to have 6 dogs and 6 cats in a household. I think the number should be no more than 2 dogs and 2 cats per household.
- 2 seems much more reasonable
- There is no need for a limit if there is no issues with the well being of the animals. Also licensing is a waste of time and money
- That is alot of animals they require alot of space, only on a larger plot of land would so many be feasible
- 6 is too many in a city. Two maybe 3 tops.
- I'm absolutely certain that most pet owners have no idea of the environmental impact pets have. We are telling humans to eat less red meat, while their six cats and six dogs are chowing down on other animals.
- It can become a hoarder thing and not all pets are emotionally and physically cared for.
- Six dogs is called a pack and can be dangerous on itself unless it's a breeder
- People do not need more pets as they cause excess noise and smell
- Six is too many.
- 6 is still too many pets to care for properly.
- People should be aloud what they want



- I don't believe responsible owners should be punished/limited because of problem owners. Problem owners who own multiple animals that have feces/noise/welfare issues should be dealt with through enforcement of those specific bylaws. A problem owner with one dog could create a higher nuisance than a responsible owner with 10 dogs.
- If they are being taken care of properly, there should be no limit and if the animals aren't bothering anyone there should be no limit. I don't agree with charging an owner if the animal doesn't go outside either.
- The 6 dogs & 6 cats is already too many
- I just don't see why?
- as long as people can afford to keep these animals healthy they should be able to have animals
- Nobody needs to be limited unless they are unable to properly care, excessive noise, unmanageable
- The limit of 6 is too high. To ensure proper care, nutrition, health, and property concerns (barking, feces) this limit should be reduced.
- No
- Animal neglect and lack of training is too common as it is.
- Maybe limit to 10 but 6 seems to low
- I think 2 dogs and 2 cats should be the limit within an urban environment. A house with up to 12 animals in it would be challenging to keep clean, keep quiet, hard to re-sell.
- Under normal circumstances, I believe the limit for animals in a home should be 3 or 4 only. I agree with the exceptions.
- I believe 6 of each is still too high.
- Limit is too high
- 6 dogs in one house in the city is too much. Animals need room to run to thrive and burn off energy. Limiting to 2 dogs in the city
- 6 dogs and/or 6 cats is too large a number to provide adequate home care, attention, and vet care
- I strongly believe a maximum of 2 dogs and 2 cats, with exceptions for foster pets (1 foster animal per household). I have 2 dogs and 1 cat. I would not have the time to optimally provide proper attention to more animals, especially dogs. Daily training, walks, and play are important for dogs. More than two dogs and it becomes increasingly difficult to provide this care and attention. Although cats don't require the same high level of care, they do still require attention and litter boxes are hard enough to keep odour-free with one cat, never mind six!
- Owners can have as many animals as they want as long as they are responsible and take ownership of properly caring for the animals
- Too many animals leads to disputes between neighbours
- I don't support State intervention in a person's right to choose their pets.
- 12 animals simply cannot be controlled by anyone, period. limit 2 animals per property.
- I understand you could have 6 dogs and 6 cats but not 8 cats or 8 dogs. If I understand that correctly then that seems wrong. If it were like max 12 or 10 combination of cats and dogs that would make sense to me more and I would support it.



- I don't think people need to have so many animals.
- j
- No one needs that many dogs or cats. 2 of each is more than enough. Exception is for newly born pups/kittens and the owner should be allowed 2/3 months to find new owners.
- That's too many animals on a city lot. Maybe there should be different rules for the size of the animals and the size of the lot? Like say, 1/2 acre lots can have more, under 1/2 acre are more restricted. Also, 6 Chihuahuas is a lot less poop than 6 Labs (or Danes), however those 6 Chihuahua probably make more noise!
- I know a lot of people who have one animal and can't take care of it and I know people who have six animals and take care of them just fine
- That is way too many animals in one home. Should be based off square footage as well. That law opens up to dangerous situations
- no limit
- I do not support animal limits. Owner responsibility and quality of care are key criteria
- Takin take of a pet is big responsibility, effort and cost. I have no faith that one household can take care of 6 pets. Allowing a home owner the opportunity to have 6 pets shows no regard for neighbours, or neighbourhood.
- I object to this limit as arbitrary.
- This seems like it could unfairly target some responsible pet owners who could be unfairly targeted
- The number is too arbitrary. Limits and restrictions should only be implemented in the case of an established problem. There is no reason to bother anyone who isn't causing trouble or harm
- This is ridiculous. As long as all of the animals are well taken care of, why is it anyone's business how many someone has on their property? Some people throw birthday parties for their animals or have family gatherings where family members bring their pets too, would a fine be given in this situation because there are more than 6 dogs/cats on the property? As long as the yard and the animals are well taken care of, it is no one's business how many animals a home has.
- There should be a land size consideration. For example, acreages, etc.
- I believe there should be no limit
- I do not support animal limites. Owner responsibility and quality of care should be criteria, not the number of animals.
- There should be no limit, by default, with limits only imposed on those who show irresponsibility or continually have problem animals.
- I would support this ammendment if there was an exemption or high voluke per licence for those rare occasions where peolpe hqve many animals AND adequately care for them
- There should be no limit to the amount of pets you can own. You can have 1 dog on your property and create excessive noise. Putting in a limit per household does not solve anything. It's up to the owner to ensure the noise level and cleanliness is under control.
- 6 is very high, not something that would be typical in a normal household, a limit of 3 might make more sense with the exceptions in the bullet points listed.
- 6 dogs or cats per property is too much (unless there are puppies)



- six dogs is an insane number of dogs for one household. the limit should be lower, maybe 4 dogs. six cats is also a lot but more manageable but I would reduce that to four as well.
- A
- There should be no limit
- I agree with everything except in case of new born animals or foster homes with licensing. To license puppies before they are sold seems silly, as is with foster situations where they are fostering for a rescue licensing seems difficult.
- If the home is capable of taking care of the animals, there is no reason to remove them from a loving home and family and force them into a place where they will be desperately sad and alone and dependant on a system.
- 6 is too many max 3 of each
- Nobody needs 6 unless it's a foster home.
- I feel like that's too many. Maybe 4 cats and 4 dogs is more reasonable.
- I don't think the number of dogs equate to quality of life for a dog/neighbours. One dog can be a nuisance and 6 dogs can be well behaved.
- The government should not restrict someones right to own animals it should be dictated by the land lord.
- Infringement on our rights within our own property
- Doing this allows for officers to "bandaid" every situation, sometimes people with only one pet abuse and neglect them. As long as animal needs and happiness are a priority and the living situation is not dangerous, it shouldn't matter.
- I support dealing with any issues that arise from animals at a house instead of trying to prevent them through restrictive laws. If my neighbor has ten silent well behaved, odourless dogs this makes no difference to me
- I think it should be 3 dogs & 3 cats.
- I don't think it's necessary. Based on housing size. And if there are animals being mistreated there will be more than just the AMOUNT of animals that will be an issue.
- It's not up to the government to decide how many animals a person could safely manage
- If you can properly care for your pets you should be able to have as many as you want. Some people cant have kids so they get pets. 6 kids is alot worse than having 6 pets and there's no limit on how many kids you can have.
- If people are responsible it shouldn't require rules
- it is irresponsible and ridiculous in most cases to allow more than 2 pets. You are also encouraging a reduced quality of life for the animals
- Let people live their own life
- I think this goes back to responsible pet owners being allowed to make responsible pet decisions. If a persons dwellings are large enough, clean and safe enough to accommodate a certain number of pets, then they should be allowed to make their own decisions. Calgary needs to step up their animal welfare game. Start going in and checking on the bad seeds more. Responsible pet owners are not on your radar because they are raising their pets well and their neighbours are content. Start



going after the bad seeds. The folks on your radar are the ones that need the restrictions, not everyone across the board. Repeat and or known animal hoarders should be banned from owning pets for life. People that cannot afford their pets and known for having neglected, sick, or starving pets should be checked upon often and they too should be banned from owning pets for life if they cannot get it together, not simply limited in number.

- It would depend on the situation. Ie if u live on an acreage etc
- I do not support more regulation and pet licensing fees should be significantly reduced
- I agree to all of it except for the number of pets in the household. Six cats is too many as cats win and high numbers tend to become more feral. I would suggest no more than four cats. And I see no problem with having multiple dogs of any number on a property if it is multiple units on the property with different owners. But being a multiple dog owner myself three dogs should be the limit for one person.
- Most cities and towns only allow 3 pets per household.
- In general I support the bylaw change just with a different limit of animals. The potential of 12 animal in a house is too many. Unless you are a breeder you should never have that many animals in a house. And a breeder should not be allowed in a regular city property. Animal foster houses shouldn't be allowed to have that many animals either.
- 6 cats or 6 dogs is too many. There are already avenues that allow people to have large numbers of animals and we don't need to make it easier.
- While 6 seems like a reasonable number the broad definition of household is an issue. Some households based on size and number of occupants may be able to care for a greater number of animals. Dogs barking should not be a reason for a fine. It is more important to ensure a standard of well being for animals than enforcing numbers or noise levels.
- some people already have more then 6, and if have to move would be unfair to have to get rid of one or more
- More restrictions like annual household inspections to ensure living standards of the animals are adequate. Grandfathering should not happen, too much leeway. Everyone should be made to follow this and get proper licensing as well.
- I think 6 adult dogs or cats in a home is excessive in the city. Cats aren't allowed to go outside so 6 house cats...?! Quality of life for the animals would not be great. Does the size of dog come into consideration? 6 small dogs vs 6 labs is a big difference as well.
- Extra animals mean more potential conflicts with neighbours
- 6 is too many. Would you want to live next to six pit bulls?
- Numbers should be reduced if complaints are received.
- The number of dogs per household should be less than 6.....maybe 3 dog limit
- 6 cats is excessive. The urine can cause health problems. 6 dogs could also be excessive as well due to pack mentality. If this is approved I would suggest buy early home checks to ensure animal and owner health and safety. For dogs I would also suggest yearly dominance training to maintain order. This must be proven at time of licensing
- I would support it if it was easy for people to get exceptions



- this is a waste of time and paperwork for all of the exceptions that there may be. I do not think this many animals can be properly cared for and would be a unique circumstance anyways.
- A persons property is there's to choose how they want to live. Limiting will only cause grief and mistrust.
- No one needs to have 6 animals within city limits, this should be handled by special exemption
- Not necessary to have 6+ animals in a household
- People can have as many animals as they like.
- So long as pet owners are following the rules and their animals are well cared for then it's their own business. If suspected abuse/neglect/rule breaking is occurring then the individual should be subject to restrictions/bans on pet ownership
- potentially 12+ animals in one home could be unsafe for pets and cause for concern for noise and feces
- Three dogs in a high-density community.
- If the potential exceptions were actual exemptions than maybe
- Breeders have not been considered in this proposed bylaw. Ordinary families should be allowed 6 dogs and 6 cats, which are spayed or neutered.
- There needs to be actual exceptions to the rule not potential.
- Why limit at 12? That's a lot of animals
- Should not be a limit on amount of pets a person can own provided they can provide acceptable living conditions for the animals
- I believe it should be based on property size and ability to care for the animals
- There needs to be an assessment to ensure that animals are being properly cared for not basing solely on number of animals in a home.
- Way too many animals for one house unless it's an average.
- It's to many animals. Concerns for the care of the animals. Is there adequate space for these animals to exist in.
- Allowing 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too many. The bylaw limit should be a maximum of 6 dogs/cats total. The bylaw of 6 dogs AND 6 cats makes it a farm. If you want a farm move out of the city.
- People should be free to have as many dogs as they like
- I support limits based on nuisance, odor, noise, and animal welfare, not by number of animals..
- A 3 dog maximum with exceptions is fair.
- Not necessary
- Absolutely no one, other than rescues/shelters, need that many animals.
- animals don't have to pay these [removed] price tags they have no idea what they're doing half the time. what are u gonna do huh? charge a dog? [removed]
- leave well enough alone
- There should be no limits on responsible owners
- Limit to 4 not 6
- 6 is too many.



- We have 2 dogs and frequently bring in a third as a temporary foster. I like the list of exceptions, but I think setting the limit at six dogs and six cats is excessive.
- I believe it would depend on the size of the property and what the circumstances are it is reasonable for 6 dogs and 6 cat limit or is this one or the other?
- i think its over regulating and government overstep.
- No household needs that many animals
- 6 dogs & 6 cats is excessive in one home, however I do support the extenuating circumstances listed above.
- Government should not control a person's ability to have a pet if the pets are taken care of. People should not require a pet license at all because having one does nothing for anyone other than alienate the poor.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is an awful lot of animals for one home. It would be unlikely that appropriate medical care for 12 animals would be affordable.
- Case by case basis. I am doubtful that just homes with pets have excessive amounts. If there is noise of other bylaw issues or complaints they need to be investigated and Possibly changes be made. A responsible owner is responsible.
- As we live in an urban environment people should not have more than 2-3 dogs or cats. There is not enough space to properly care for or maintain higher amounts safely
- If a family has 6 dogs and 6 cats in the home there are a total of 12 animals. There is no need for that many animals in one home or even more. Having that many animals is almost hoarding and I am very concerned about the care that these animals would get.
- To me six dogs AND six cats, in the city, is getting into a bit of a "pet hoarder" situation. I think it makes sense to increase the limit but to 6?? That is too much. Maybe to like 3-4 of each.
- While some people can take care of this many animals, the average person cannot and that does not give the animals lots of space. This is not fair to the animals.
- I believe we should be stricter on people who break the bylaws for animal noise, welfare and living conditions but if people can meet those requirements, there shouldn't be restrictions.
- Pet limits should be kept within reason ie maximum 6 pets per household wether it be 4 dogs and 2 cats etc, caring for animals shouldn't be limited to how many of each species, but how many in total
- I think 6 is excessive, especially in the city.
- If a person is able to properly care for the animals, and they are not creating issues for neighbors, there should be no limit on how many animals a person can have.
- Less laws, more personal responsibility. If someone is intent on having that many animals, a Bulawayo will not stop them.
- No one needs six cats and six dogs unless you live on a farm. You are asking for trouble allowing an unreasonable amount of animals per property. I am a foster and I agree that you could temporarily have up to 4 full grown dogs and maybe 4 cats but that's a lot of food, faces, and noise.
- If someone had a large property and can accommodate more animals, then they should be allowed to have more.



- 12 animals in a home is WAY TOO MANY!!!there should be 3dogs and 3 cats, any more would require a kennel Licence
- Too many pets for 1 house
- If the owner takes care of their animals and they aren't a nuisance to neighbors then why not
- 4 is plenty, the more animals in a household the less care and attention can be given to the animal.
- As long as animals are behaved, people can have as many as they like
- 6 animals total
- That's too many animals.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too many pets for an average household to provide good care for. Good care includes good training and there are many dogs that are already not well-trained. Increasing the limit of pets per household will undoubtedly contribute to the problem of poorly trained dogs. I support a 6 pet total limit. That is more animals than anyone needs. I support the exceptions provided above. Ownership of pets should be a privilege based on the quality of care than can be provided to the animal, not a right to own just because some think it's a civil freedom.
- We need less government not more
- Instead of (6 dogs, 6 cats), 12 animals total, can be cats or dogs
- 12 animals in a household is excessive. The limit should be smaller with approval required to exceed the limit.
- Nobody needs 6 of each pet unless the pet has babies.
- Calgary is too dense, perhaps 2-3 dogs and cats maximum
- I think the max should be 3.
- No one else's business what I do miles I don't follow the rules
- I believe the number suggested it too high. 2 animals per household is sufficient.
- A person should be able to have as many pets as they want as long as they are taken care of.
- The government should not be involved in personal decisions unless there is proof that violations of common decency, pet health or dangerous situations exist. We have too much govt intervention now.
- Let people have as many pets as they want
- 12 animals in one house, excepting newborn litters, is far too many for it to be a healthy environment for the animals.
- I hate that our freedoms are being taken away. Some pet owners do t give proper care to even 1 pet. Responsible pet owners give proper care and love to several animals. This should be on a case by case
- 6 dogs or 6 cats is too many unless you are a sanctuary a rescue a foster with a large property or a farm.
- allow people to have as many pets as they want.
- Exceptions could be made for temporary homes as it would be for a shorter period of time. Any home with 6 dogs would be very unclean and near impossible to manage. To maintain a healthy



living space for owners and animals I would say a maximum of 4 full time dogs and cats living in one home.

- 2 pets should be the maximum
- That is too many animals
- As these are "potential" and not for sure I'm very leery that these will make it into the bylaw.
- I don't think city should regulate how many pets an owner has. They can regulate conditions but not numbers.
- Again why does someone 'need' 12 pets in their home. 3 is more reasonable. Reduce #s so people can financially take care of them. Special permits required for breeders.
- If the animals are happy, healthy and being cared for I don't see it as a role for the city to limit what can be in a household. There isn't a limit on children one can have for "concern for their welfare"
- Breed specific legislation is ineffective.
- Should be no more than four out of consideration for neighbours
- 6 of each is too many. Edmonton does 3.
- Too many pets
- There should be a limit of cats and dogs, not cats or dogs. The proposed change appears to allow up to 12 animals in one household. I feel that limits should be set up based on property size and access to exercise area. Additional animals would then be approved based on individual cases as listed above.
- Case by case basis not flat rule.
- Do you limit how many kids people have? If they are good pet owners and it's a home that is large enough why would you buy I limit?
- 12 animals within city limits is excessive and does not address the health of the animals in question. Square footage of residence/yard should be considered for more than 2 of each
- Theoretically a person could have 6 dogs and 6 cats per household, that's 12 animals. Someone could have 6 dogs in a small townhouse, this is not appropriate and/or safe.
- That is way too many animals per household. I see a lot of irresponsible People purchasing animals possibly for the sake of fighting and breeding to resell. Terrible idea.
- If some one can support 6 dogs all the power to them. There just need to be bylaws in place to make sure they care for them.
- I feel that the potential to have up to 12 animals in a home is too much for the average home. I believe that this can lead to poor conditions for the animals. I believe the maximum should be lower than 6 and 6. I could understand 8 animals maximum in total (except in special circumstances such as an animal having babies resulting in more in the home temporarily).
- why lump so many options in one question? your survey is poorly written results will not be accurate
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is still too many. I think a maximum of 4 dogs and/or 4 cats to a maximum of 6 animals is reasonable. Exceptions should apply for those on large properties such as farms or acreages.
- A lot of pet owners don't provide the necessary stimulation for them to thrive which leads to problems.



- People can do what they want as long as they aren't disturbing others
- people never need 6 dogs more room for neglect
- As many people foster animals restricting number of animals does not help
- I agree with the exceptions however, 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is too many. I would be in favor of lowering the number of both dogs and cats per household to 4 each.
- 6 or each is excessive
- Unless it harms the quality of life for the animals or residents there should be no limits. Imposing limits should be the exception, not lifting them.
- Every family and household is different. The City should not be dictating the max number of cats or dogs.
- the limit is too high
- Because the number isn't the problem. You can have two animals and them be loud and disturbing and poop everywhere. And alternatively you can have 10 who are all angels and don't make a peep and are completely respectful. I don't think it's a number problem, it's a case by case. So putting a bylaw in enforcing a number just serves to anger people who love animals and want to take care of them.
- More animals means people are more likely to say no and take on too many animals. Their quality of care would go down. The number of animals should depend on housing circumstances ie acres of land, a fence or not, proper housing for all animals
- Leave as is
- That's a lot of animals for one household, 12 animals in a suburban home depending on the size is too many. I think if you can prove you have enough space for that many animals like 1+ acreage then ok, otherwise 3 dogs and or cats would be appropriate
- If animals are cared for properly and comply with existing bylaws then shouldn't be limited
- Responsible pet ownership shouldn't limit how many pets a person can have. Regulate cleanliness and odor and make sure they are being treated by a vet
- I have 4 animals, 1 of which is mine. Lots of roommate situations include 4+ animals at a time, plus if the owners are responsible, they shouldn't be restricted in the number of pets they can take in. I am curious what this would mean for foster homes for animals.
- I believe this same rules with slightly reduced #s would make sense. Perhaps 3 or 4 of both cats and dogs. 6 is too much. (I do not know what the current limit is)
- No one should be limited to how many pets they have on their own private property.
- If the animals are well taken care of, fed, loved and cleaned up after I don't think it's the city's concern how many are in a household
- If the home is large enough For the animals to be cared for properly them there is no concern
- 6 dogs is extreme. 3 dogs is manageable. 6 cats is manageable.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many for a small one bedroom apartment, but you could easily have 6+ cats and dogs on a large property with more space. The restrictions should be done by square footage of a property. Also 6 small dogs and very different to 6 large dogs so that should be considered as well.
- No



- It should be less than 6 and 6. Like 4 of each is alot.
- .
- I don't think you should police what Pets people have in their homes, it's pretty disgusting- also if someone already has this amount what do you plan to do about it? If you make the give up their pets that's awful and will gain a lot of bad media attention
- If someone already has more than 6 of each and this law is imposed, it's highly unethical to remove a pet, but then there's already people breaking the rule.
- Way too many pets for a single household in an urban setting
- It's stupid why do y'all care what people do so much? This is why we dumped all your tea in the river
- You have no right to tell people how to live and some of it your way outside of what you can do and if you try that on me I'm going to sue you for thousands
- I see no reason why the City should be implementing maximum numbers of pets.
- Let people own what they want and do what they want, it's nobody else's business as long as they take care of them all.
- There are so many circumstances that would lead to someone having more than 6 cats or dogs. It would lead to more work for the city if they required special approval for more than 6 animals
- People don't need an excessive amount of dogs and cats. Limiting the number of cats can help prevent hoarders from over accumulating and help prevent puppy mills from developing. No one needs six dogs or six cats and you will find many people with 12 animals in one house or apartment. The smell.
- People should be free to have however many pets they like
- animal hoarding could become an issue
- If someone wants 8 dogs let them have 8 dogs.
- People should have the freedom to decide how many pets to own. Should they fall into neglect then the owner should be challenged.
- No one needs 6 dogs AND 6 cats, especially in city limits.
- I don't think we should have a limit how many animals we have but if animals are mistreated then there should be a big fine
- Start limiting children then
- because it harms rescues -- You need to support those finding homes for unwanted animals and do everything in your power to make life easier -- including tags .
- It is not the cities business what a person has on their property. It is an individuals choice many pets one owns, can afford, and wants to have.
- The limit should be less than 6 each, more like 3 each, with the same exceptions.
- That is way too many animals in a home within city limits.
- Six dogs or cats is excessive for one household in an urban setting.
- The city interferes too much in everyone's lives already. Reasonable people have what they can handle, the thoughtless will be and remain despite rules.
- Licensing fees are silly. You do nothing for cat owners why should we pay the city



- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is too many. i think it should be limited to 2 of each. if you want 6 of anything then move to an acreage. there is not enough room in town for that many per household.
- If they are being looked after and healthy I see no change
- 12 animals in a house is not necessary
- Address the nuisances behaviour instead
- More than needed in an urban area
- Limits on pets is too much restriction
- no limit. Variances in property sizes would allow a responsible handler to continue their life in private.
- 2 is too. Lots of families have 3 or 4 dogs or cats. A limit yes, but at least 4.
- Ordinary people really only need 2 cats or dogs. More cause the animals not to be cared for properly. Exception would be breeders who would need to apply for license and follow regulations. The other exception would be foster homes and carers but that would need to follow regulations as well. Its not just about licensing animals need to be microchipped, vaccinated and wormed. Housed and feed properly. It all very well to love animals and want more but the animals welfare needs to be taken into consideration. There are alot of people out there they claim to love animals but should never be allowed to own them.
- Could result in more backyard breeders. Also more noise complaints, etc.
- Each circumstance is different
- Would create too much of a headache for the responsible people who own many animals and solve nothing of the people who are problematic.
- 6 is too high of a limit
- .
- 12 animals in a home is too many
- 6 is too many pets for anyone, especially in the city.
- 6 are too many
- I support the suggested change but think it could be more general ie: 12 animals total (ex. 4 dogs, 2 cats and 6 hens)
- There's so many other dogs more dangerous than various types of pit bulls/staffys. I've personally been bit by a German Shepard before. So to call out one specific breed of dog does not seem just.
- If you have a farm then you should be able to have as many as you'd like
- To a point but 6 dogs on a small lot size of owner is not cleaning up can be an issue.
- 6 pets is too many for a household.
- Too many pets which lead to excessive noise, fecal matter, and dust/ dander.
- There should be no limit on animals in the house hold as long as they are trained right.
- 12 animals in a household is ridiculous. It should be half this number (or less) with exceptions for the above listed items.
- 2 is more than enough. The noise alone would be awful.



- I feel that this should not be a blanket issue. Different sized living areas should reflect a different amount of animals allowed. Someone in a small apartment with no backyard shouldn't have the same amount as someone with a large backyard and ample area inside the house for the animals to live.
- These numbers are still do high. The maximum number of total pets should be 4. Unless someone has a license to own more (fosters, breeders, daycare,sitter...)
- It's no one's business how many pets they have. don't go around adding more laws for no reason. what if someone had puppies?
- Why does this matter? Let people have pets, we are not to police other people. This is ridiculous.
- the other rules are sufficient to manage pets kept, if they are enforced. Let good responsible pet owners have as many pets as they want. Go after the bad owners with existing bylaws.
- unless the owners are not properly caring for their pets, there should not be a limit
- A middle ground would be more appropriate. No one needs 6/6 - potentially 12 animals. Perhaps 4/4 could be considered as an alternative.
- There are few households that could hold 12 animals and not have issues of territorial behaviour, excess feces and urine, noise and still be safe and comfortable for those animals. 3 dogs and 3 cats is much more reasonable. I would support the potential exceptions for a limit of 3 dogs and 3 cats.
- I do not want a limit for responsible pet owners.
- 12 animals is excessive
- If a person or family is capable of taking care of their animals outside and inside their homes, it shouldn't matter as to how many they own. If both humans and animals are living perfectly healthy and fine lives, that should be it.
- Way too many animals for a single household
- Six dogs and six cats is far too high a number. At the most, it should be 3 animals.
- I would support it if there was rules around noise bylaws for 6 dogs noise and cats must be inside cats and not roamin. Feces need to be monitored to assure folowwing rules for the aftey and conformt of other animals and people enjoying thier dogs.
- People do not need more than 2 pets
- Nobody needs 6 dogs and/or 6 cats in a single house with a few exceptions
- bylaw reasonable but for infractions I would rather see support to re-home/education compassion used
- There is no reason for a common household to have more than 2 cats or 2 dogs
- Too difficult to enforce. Good people could be affected negatively.
- This is ridiculous and has no basis in cat owners being responsible. This is targeting the wrong types of pet owners.
- The number needs to be lower. Perhaps 2
- No one needs 6 animals in the city limits. It gets to noisy and dirty. I feel 3 would be right.
- If animals are taken care of, not your concern
- The existing bylaw regarding the number of pets per household is adequate



- An owner should be able to have as many animals as they want as long as they are taking care of them effectively and providing good living conditions for the pets.
- It's not up to the city to decide how many pet a responsible pet owner should have
- It's a free country, if I want 7 cats then I'll have them.
- From what I researched, I could not find a specific limit on pets per household. I think that should stay and if there is a concern for the pet safety then someone can be tasked with doing wellness checks on pets and making sure their living conditions are proper before deciding on any limit. If anything it should be a case by case basis and based on the owner's ability to take care of them rather than how many animals.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats seems excessive. Ok with exceptions to the rules, but really how many pets does a person need in town, on a town lot.
- Should limit the number of Pets as homes are generally not big enough to accommodate more than a couple
- Contain the animal and noise appropriately and there aren't any issues. Do you limit the amount of kids you can have? They're noisy and messy as we know. Don't be ridiculous.
- Leave pet owners alone
- Too many! No more than 2 dogs or cats are necessary. Seriously, please do not give people such opportunities to harm animals by negligence. Max 3 cats or dogs for average household, exceptions are okay. I would support bylaw change but with fewer animals allowed.
- The way this question is formulated is very deceptive. I support this bylaw change if the pet limit is one (1) dog - not a Pit-bull AND one (1) cat per household. If the owner says his income is enough to support more pets, then Canada revenue will increase that amount on this pet lover person's taxes to support the beaten economy of this country.
- Too many animals together!
- I support a limit, but I think it should be less than 6
- The city should not be enforcing animal restrictions unless someone has a troubled past. Many people like to rescue animals and have the ability, space and funds to do so. They should not be penalized because someone arbitrarily decides on a number that is "ok".
- I think 6 of each is way too high. I think a limit of 2 each except for the above restrictions makes more sense. So many animals in a neighbourhood may cause problems with neighbors due to possible noise or other problems depending on the owner.
- Feel as though 12 animals is excessive and could impede on the animals welfare
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many
- No one needs 6 dogs and 6 cats
- Three pets max
- 6 is far too many.
- Just noted above. Animals can be taken care of with thorough care, and a lot of people have litters of 6 puppies/kittens without making a big deal out of it
- Why does any household need that many animals???



- Breeders should need additional permits to own more than 3 or 4 pets, to reduce instances of pet mills.
- Noise. Feces. Crazy people. Feed your family
- Amount based upon size of the property owned
- That is way too many animals in one spot unless special circumstances. (Ie: RESPONSIBLE breeders or a kennel)
- No.
- This is excessive.
- I would support a maximum of 5 and 5.
- 2 dogs or cats per household should be ample in this city. Anything else is hoarding.
- Why is the number of pets such a concern if they are licensed and properly cared for
- 6 dogs and 6 cats in one house. Come on. That is just wrong on so many levels.
- More than 2 dogs/cats in a household is excessive, except in the exceptions listed above
- You should have to prove that you are financially as well as responsible enough to have that many pets.
- Stay the same.
- People can have as many dogs and cats as they want
- Pet limit should be less. People are not able to care for that many animals properly.
- No more than three dogs and two cats.
- While these things are important to think about, I don't believe numbers themselves are the issue. The issue is welfare and training of animals. Solve this problem by creating bylaws for the welfare and training of animals. You can have 10 well-behaved, taken-care-of dogs. You can also have 1 vicious, mistreated dog.
- 6 seems high (with the exceptions highlighted). 3-4 maximum
- If the pets are safe and in a good environment it shouldn't matter how many animals a home has
- If people can take care of the animals they have then they should be left alone
- Six animal limit is excessive. Two animal limits OK. If more animals are wanted, then special application and excess animal fee to be applied to a max of 3 animals of any type per household.
- This is way too many pets for one household. 2 max
- If it's indoors, it should not impact others. Hoarder situations are different and should be handled separate without good owners being affected.
- Implementing further bureaucracy will cost more than the value it provides. Many people have the ability to care for pets in excess of the proposed number, increase individual license costs if the worry is too many pets.
- I feel like 3 dogs and cats would be acceptable
- Placing limits on animals kept will not address the underlying problems. Well kept animals will not be a nuisance, no matter if there are 2 or 10 in a households. Neglected animals, be there 1 or 100, are the problem I assume this bylaw wishes to address, yet people capable of inflicting cruelty upon



animals in any way are people who also do not abide by bylaws. So, nothing is solved by setting such a limit.

- 12 animals per household is a ridiculously high number! All animals living within the city limits should be neutered. An unneutered animal should require a breeding licence and the cost of said licence should be hefty enough to deter and control the number of kittens and puppies being bred and marketed.
- Keep it low numbers!
- Really? Six dogs on a property!?!? What is this a zoo? Or farm?
- 6 of each animal is too much already.
- 2 pets total maximum for reasons stated above.
- As long as all animals are healthy, licensed and up to date on vaccines, there should be no limit to the number of pets in a household.
- 12 animals per house is ridiculous
- I wouldn't want to be the neighbour to six dogs! Two is good, four is encroaching on too many.
- Maximum of 3 dogs and/or 4 cats
- 6 is excessive. 2 of each is more than enough
- No one should have more than six dogs or cats unless they live on a multi acre land/home. Animals need room and no one can keep tracks of that many animals. It's for the let's welfare and to make sure there isn't hundreds of dogs in a house
- 4 dogs, and 4 cats. 12 animals is too many, there will be neglect.
- Number should be much lower. Anything above 2 should have a special application.
- There should not be a limit if all animals are loved and are in a healthy state, cared for and are not being used to breed.
- 2 and 2 with exceptions for a litter of puppies or kittens, or if someone has to take care of someone else's because they died or are sick.
- It is not reasonable to have 6 dogs and 6 cats. I support a limit of 3 in aggregate.
- 12 animals in a household is too many. I support a lower number and an application for exemptions.
- Numbers if pets are too high.
- Too many pets more concerns. Two per household unless more approved for certain circumstances
- In the city there is no house/yard big enough to accommodate 6 cats and 6 dog. There she limits
- Welfare, feces,
- If pet owners have more than 6, and cannot keep proper standards, follow bylaw rules at that point for infractions.
- That's is too many pets within the city limits
- Deal with problems. Don't create them.
- 6 dogs a pack. A pack can go to wild. 6 cats is too many for one person to clean up after.
- 12 animals in a house is like having a zoo at home. Not good for animals or neighbours.
- Nobody should need 6 animals UNLESS for the specified the above exceptions
- I have the right to own as many as I want as long as I take care of them and they are licensed



- It's not the quantity of animals that matters, it's the quality of care for the animals that matters
- 12 animals in one residential building sounds not only loud but unsanitary and unnecessary.
- 6 and 6 is way too much. I support 2 and 2
- This proposal should be for lower numbers of animals allowed. Perhaps 1 dog & 2 cats. This city is overrun with animals & parks, school yards & sidewalks are littered with feces left behind by irresponsible pet owners.
- I support it if the exceptions for dogs/cats under six month of age, and the exception for temporary homes (as above) are included.
- That number of animals is excessive for any household.
- 12 animals in a home is ridiculous. Two of each would be more than enough. If they want to breed and raise animals let them get a breeders license.
- There should be no limits of cats and dogs on property. It is up to the owner on how many they have
- If space and care is taken a priority I dont see a problem. With the exception of downtown maybe
- There should be no limit if the animals are properly cared for
- no one in the city should have more than one pet! in bearspaw the limit is 3 dogs and the yards are 10 acres on average, the city of Calgary yards are fractions of those in Bears paw and the limit should be ONE
- Too many animals to safely manage
- Would affect breeders and people who own sport dogs that compete.
- If they're properly taken care of and not causing a disturbance to others then it should not matter and the city shouldn't get involved. Also since there's no box for comments on the pit bull section it's absurd that you're attempting to put in restrictions for a specific breed because of the "potential" for stronger bites. It's the exact same as if a muscular person stabs someone and the city decides that anyone that attends a gym isn't allowed to own knives. It's not the breed it's the owners and how they're raised. Don't punish good dogs and owners because of other bad owners!
- The limit per household should be 2 dogs and 2 cats
- There should be no limit.
- Not sure how much of an issue this is
- Too many animals. Too much feces. 6 dogs and cats is an insane number unless in rural areas.
- Anything beyond 4 animals total should be considered a business, and would only be allowed in correctly zoned property.
- The number of 6 plus 6 is excessive. The only fair consideration would be breeding and that should require a permit and/or license. It would be more appropriate to require those to be out of the city (such as a farm).
- I think 6 is too many dogs, 4 is a better number. There should not be breeders in the city limits.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats are too many animals. Should start with 3 dogs and 3 cats
- To many animals in a house a most two dogs or two cats
- No one needs a zoo in their house/yard



- If someone wants 100 dogs and takes care of them well it's none of the cities business, unless you guys wanna pay people's mortgages.
- One animal per household is just right. If every house in Calgary had one animal that would still be way too many animals in the city.
- It should be only two cats and two dogs
- Too many. Should be four max!
- People should be able to have as many pets as they want as long as they take proper care of them
- As long as animals are properly cared for and the owner is being responsible I believe there should be no limit to how many animals they wish to own
- Nobody needs more than 1-2 dogs or cats, more should be exception and not norm
- Inability for owners to have impact on animals behaviour when this many animals in their care.
- 6 is 3 too many
- Living next to a house that has that many animals would be a problem if I was the neighbour, the smells, the noise, the look of the yard etc etc etc. I don't care if there is any fines etc, would you have anyone to check these locations and enforce this on a regular basis. I believe when you allow theses many animals it would be very hard to change it back if this is not working. I am not sure why there would be a need to have that many pets in an urban setting.
- The limit should be lower
- I think 6 dogs/ cats is too high a number per household. I think 3 of each is more manageable with the potential exceptions listed above still in place.
- I feel that 6 dogs/6 cats per household is too high. I think 3 of each is a more responsible number - with the exceptions listed above still being in place.
- 1 pet per household there are already too many pets in Calgary
- Allowing six is excessive. No one needs more than two, just as the pre-ample to this question reads.
- Excessive
- 12 or more animals is obviously excessive. Who wants to live next to a kennel.
- Unless on a large property, 6 cats/6 dogs is too many for a single household. 4 would be a more reasonable number.
- Quality of care is far more important. Some can manage to care for larger number of animals and some fail to care for smaller numbers. This implies care is affected by number of animals in home, which isn't always true. Quality of care should always take priority.
- I do not support animal limit.
- 6 animals is too many. There is no reason to have that many.
- There is no acceptable reason for a home to have that many dogs or cats unless they have an animal that has had a litter.
- 12 animals is a lot for any household I'd like that lowered to 4 then a special permis is required the 4 includes all dogs or cats or any combinations of both up to 4
- That is too many animals in one household. Maybe 3 dogs and 3 cats.



- The pet limit should be two pets except if they fall under the Potential Exceptions Rule.
- Lower the limit. 6 is way too much. If you have low income and have 6 kids they will not be able to manage and take care of the dogs. Limit should be 3 pets period.
- I feel like 4 dogs and cats is a sufficient amount for one household, with the exception of inherited pets and litters from breeders. I also feel the fosters could have litters but not adult pets.
- 6 and 6 is far too many for 1 household
- 3 bedroom space is less for more than 5 humans now that you say they can 6 dogs and 6 cats at a property. Poor animals. Please restrict to a mix of animals like max 1 dog and 1 cat or 2 dogs at a time or 2 cats at the time.
- it is not the city's business to tell people how many pets they can have, what's next birds? fish? if I have too many flowers in my yard will that offend someone?
- I would need more information on the exceptions for breeder before I could decide, I support responsible breeding
- I agree with most of this but breeders need to be watched in how many animals they have. Just wanted to add that in.
- People should be able to have as many animals as they like, provided they can properly take care of them.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive on a city property
- Licensing for indoor animals is a cash grab for the City of Calgary.
- What if they wanted 12 dogs and no cats? Or 11 and 1? Some people spend their lives rescuing shelter animals. If they have the means, and do everything properly, why restrict them?
- My position is in line with the Calgary Humane Society. "Calgary Humane Society does not support a companion animal limit within Calgary city limits. As an enforcement agency, CHS believes the term "responsible pet ownership" incorporates the expectation that pet owners demonstrate the knowledge and training required to ensure the proper welfare and well-being of their companion animals. This also includes adhering to all provisions of the Animal Protection Act. (For complete details on the Animal Protection Act, see <http://www.qp.alberta.ca/documents/acts/a41.pdf>). CHS believes limiting the number of animals in a home does not address the core issues demonstrated in cases of over-crowding and/or hoarding and may result in otherwise responsible pet owners not licensing their pets or seeking veterinary care if the household is in excess of an imposed limit. "
- Pet limitations should be on a case by case basis. As long as the animals are cared for and the owners are responsible, there should be no reason for the city to dictate how many animals someone can own. Use the resources to persecute animal hoarding and abuse cases, instead of people who just want to help animals, there are enough animals in the shelters that need homes, if someone has the means to care for them responsibly, there should be no reason to restrict this resource.
- Noise, lack of adequate hygiene, smell.
- 6 dogs is sensible. People should be allowed up to 12 cats. Also newborn animals should be exempt for 1 year.
- Those numbers are too high. 6 dogs and 6 cats? NO



- I don't believe a city home and yard is of sufficient size to humanely/sanitarily house 12 animals at one time.
- That's too many
- That is way too many pets in one household within City limits. That's ridiculous.
- As a huge animal lover, I still think 12 pets is plenty.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats limitations are still too much. o much
- 12 pets for a non breeder household? Too high
- 6 is too many
- No household should have more than one animal. Houses are too close together. Barking dogs disturb several neighbours. 6 animals is a recipe for neighborhood distress.
- Six of each would be excessive and unnecessary. The welfare of these animals needs to be taken very seriously and not many households can afford the veterinary care annually on two dogs or cats let alone six! Excessive. Barking and feces will be excessive. Roaming cats, excessive.
- I don't feel there needs to be a limit as long as the animals are being care for and there is enough space for the number of animals.
- No one needs to own more than 2 dogs and/or cats, period!
- 6 dogs allow for pack mentality to set in, only experienced owners can handle maintaining control. Exemptions can be made for responsible breeders and temporary homes including rescue organizations. 6 cats require large amounts of space to be happy and healthy, which most Calgary homes cannot accommodate, and 12 animals cannot be adequately cared for.
- 6 is too many! 3-4 should be the absolute max
- Sometimes people can't take care of one pet and you want to give people the right to own up to six pets. Who would be monitoring these people to ensure the animals were being treated properly?
- Address the issues not the number. There is no limit on children which can cause many of the same issues/concerns.
- Some of the most responsible owners have more than 6 dogs.
- Large number of pets is not necessary, and there are too many problems resulting from numerous pets on a property.
- 2 dogs is good any more than that is a pack. And two cats is plenty
- 2 dogs or cats max, oh and nose hill is a dog faces ridden disgusting place. It should not be a dog park.
- No more than 2 dogs or cats per property
- It's companionship that pet owners want not pet shops
- I know lots of older women who have up to nine cards and treat them very well and care for them very cleanly
- No one needs 6 dogs or cats, 2 is enough
- Limit to 3 pets total.
- This is excessive. There is no need to have six cats and six dogs. A total of six pets including both cats and dogs would be better.



- 2 cats and/or 2 dogs are more than sufficient!
- Personal Choice
- As long as animals are being well cared for and not being a nuisance it doesn't matter how many pets are in a household.
- 6 dogs/cats is why to much in my view. Some people can't affor to feed themselves.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive
- 6 animals are 4 too many
- Some people take good care of more
- I used to work for a shelter as well as foster animals, except for the above listed grounds this is very high. A total of 6 sounds much more reasonable to me, for animal care / hygiene and nuisance claims. The only additional exception I would provide for is where the home / shelter is much larger to accommodate more animals. But otherwise an application for more animals seems fair
- who are we to tell someone whats excessive we have the other laws for this
- There needs to be limits. We are not a zoo.Six dogs and six cats is over the top and not necessary. Pets are fine. Huge amounts are not fine.
- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats is completely crazy. Again move to a farm if you want that many animals.
- not necessary for anyone to own more than 2 cats and/or dogs
- Stop being big brother in our lives You'll put in your own rules anyway regardless of how this faux "survey" turns out.
- Too many pets.
- If you require more animals then you need to live in the country!
- Why limit? I have five rescue cats. If I could afford to take care of more I would.
- I think having a lower limit like 2 dogs/cats per household is more than enough
- Too many people just collect animals without the income or ability to provide adequate care and vet services. More than two pets per household should be based on income.
- I agree with everything but the licensing. 0\$ licensing is all I would support
- There are too many "pets" in Calgary that are not looked after properly in addition too many people buy pets then recognize they should not have made that decision for what ever reason.
- The only exception to this should be those that can not care for the pets !!!! Or hoarders who can not clean up after them
- It shouldn't be per household as some households are on acreages And have the space for more animals.
- Limiting number of dogs and cats does not correlate with responsible pet ownership. I work at a vet in Edmonton. Proper education goes a long way. I've had owners with nuisance dog of one and j have owners where they live outside of the area with 5 dogs and are wonderful owners
- 12 animals is way to many. Suggest increase to 4
- 12 animals in one household is too many unless you live out of the city



- 12 animals in a home is a lot for one person to care for- exception breeders, rescues etc. Potential for hoarding situations is possible, along with inability to properly care/feed that many animals. I would think a MAX of 10 animals per household would be fair.
- Unless the bylaw had a specified size of house. 12 animals cannot fit in a 1 bedroom home could easily lead to a less than healthy lifestyle for them and hoarding is always a possibility.
- We don't need these types of limits. Go off the condition of animals, cleanliness, and home safety instead. Allow people to have as many animals as they can as long as they can keep a clean/safe house for them. For some people, it's all they have. Do you limit how many people we can have over? How many people we can have living in our homes? Do you restrict us on children? Some of us treat animals like that and it's clear that council doesn't.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs are way too many in a urban area.
- I think the number should be reduced to a total of 6 pets max.
- If the animals are well cared for, stay out of peoples homes and leave their pets alone.
- Perhaps a limit based on home size. 6 dogs and cats could be allowed in a eg. 3000sq ft home but would not be suitable for a 700sq ft home.
- I think this is ridiculous. There is already a mechanism to handle not cleaning up after one's pets no matter the number and a mechanism to protect the welfare of animals no matter the number. I know many responsible pet owners with more than this. I don't think municipal government has any business restricting how much one can have of any property.
- No-one needs to have more than 2 cats and/or two dogs. The only exception would be a breeder's puppies and kittens awaiting appropriate age for adoption. Temporary circumstance only.
- I believe that is way too many pets for one house and would be a nuisance to neighbours.
- other then the stated exception...one or two dogs per household is more than enough in the city
- While I do agree with the exception for animals under 6 months (as would be the case in breeding) I do not believe there is any situation where someone needs to own 6 adult dogs AND cats at any given time.
- 2 cats or dogs max per household based on the above exceptions
- People should be able to have as many pets as they're able to properly care for
- There is no need to have more than 3-4 animals per household. Any more than that is ridiculous.
- Stop infringing on people's freedom. Use the existing bylaws for enforcement of complaints
- Irresponsible pet owners
- Six animals are too many -should be limited to two.
- No one need to have 6 dogs or 6 cats.. 2 dogs the most & 2 cats no more
- This has been one of the hardest years Alberta has ever seen.I feel like it's very discriminatory against a breed When will Chihuahua Get their day
- People should have the right to have as many animals as they wish as long as they are well taken care off, well trained and obedient, not being used as a pet mill or money making operation.
- no household should house more than ywo animals
- Six dogs Or cats is too many. Thats ridiculous. How would that be clean or sanitary or safe? Dont be silly!



- Maximum of 2 dogs and 2 cats per household is appropriate
- 6 is too many
- Why does anyone need as many animals would be my question. No more than two would make sense. I already have problems with my garden having dogs use the garden as a toilet and owners not clearing feces. Please do not allow so many animals in a household.
- Who needs six dogs/cats except maybe a breeder
- 3 of each is enough.
- A pack of six dogs can be dangerous
- Reduce the number from six to three/four.
- That is far too many dogs and cats per household. The only ones that need that many are animal hoarders and backyard breeders.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is excessive for a household
- 12 animals?!?! That's way too many!
- I don't think the city needs to dictate how many animals people can have.
- Not within city limits.
- You can't lump cats & dogs together. Cats are not allowed outside. Dogs can be dangerous. 6 dogs are too many, 6 cats are not.
- Barn cats, breeders,
- as long as they're cared for it's fine
- I feel that is too many pets for one household. Should be about 3 or 4 of each type.
- If an owner is responsible and spays and neutered their pets and keeps their yards clean and ensures their animals are not a nuisance to neighbours and take good care of their pets, I do not see why they should be limited to the number of pets they have, especially where they are providing a home to rescue animals that would otherwise be strays. Not all multi pet owners are bad owners.
- That is too many animals, potentially 12. Way too many.
- 2 is more than enough
- There is no need for anyone to have 6 pets, recipe for hoarding animals.
- Who needs 6 dogs or 6 cats in the city. People having this many animals is simply asking for trouble.
- 6 is too much.
- You do not need more than 2 registered pets. I do believe most people still do not register their pets so the more they have the less likely they are to have them licensed.
- It is not fair to the animals or neighbors to have That many pets in a home.
- 6 dogs in one home is too many.
- 6 is way too many for one household.
- 6 is too many
- That's too many animals for a household.
- Six is too many - 3 or 4 of each breed with 6 in total is about right
- 6 of each still sounds like a high limit



- If taken care of properly there should be no limit
- No need for change
- by increasing the limit of each pet, I'm concerned with the possibility of pets being utilized in activities such as dog fights etc.
- Six and six seems a bit high. I think the number should be three and three, four and four at the very most.
- Calgary does not need another tax grab. Owners of dogs that bite can be sued by the victim. Why should the city profit???
- Yes to all of the exceptions. No to owning so many pets...that has proven a difficulty in some cases and animals have suffered.
- I don't think there should be more than three cats and or three dogs per household to a maximum of 6 animals. The noise, potential for feces, problem cat wandering behaviour.
- Not possible to properly look after 6 dogs or cats.
- That is a ridiculous number of pets for a single household
- Too many to be necessary.
- We need to lower the number of animals in a home to 2 dogs and 2 cats at a maximum; there is no need to have anymore than that. Ever!
- Its not the number of animals as long as they are taken care of and loved. Numerous people are unable to feed/water/exercise, clean up after and provide affection to only 1 animal.
- 6 is far too many - 12 total ? Not reasonable - I would support 4 animals total
- Having more than 2 dogs or cats in a household should cost more incremental to the number applied for.
- Responsible owners should be allowed to have as many pets as they want
- As long as they are well looked after it doesn't matter to me
- So long as they are cared for appropriately the number of pets you own should be your business
- City has no legal right to limit people's freedom. We do not live in China (as maybe our mayor would wish us to).
- 12 animals is way to many pet one household. Max 4 combine is more than fair.
- People should be free to care for their pets without the government choosing to dictate it.
- If this policy would be to help reduce hoarding of animals, the number of animals in the home does not matter when it comes to a true hoarding situation. Additionally, if all animals are properly cared for and provided with veterinary care when needed, there is no reason to limit the number of animals a person can have in their home.
- The city should not regulate this.
- Only some current owners are doing an adequate job of taking care of their pets. Increasing the number of animals per household would exasperate the existing issues.
- Hoarding and puppy mills could be easier to do
- Let them keep animals.
- 6 dogs is still too much in a single household



- 3 or 4 dogs or cats is what I think is a reasonable limit.
- No one on earth in a city needs more than two animals. This 6 idea is stupid
- 6 dogs is a lot. I'd question how you could properly care for that many animals given their size and needs.
- Too many rules. If a person can afford it and is taking care of the dog properly the city should not be involved. If there is proof that doing this is creating problems such as negative impacts towards the animals welfare then I would support
- If you have exceptions, it should apply to all.
- Reduce the limit to 2 dogs and 2 cats.
- No house needs to have that many animals in the city
- This is still far too many pets.
- 6 pets is more than enough for in the city
- That is far too many. Even in some rural areas they restrict to 3. City lots do NOT support that many animals.
- I think 6 is still too high. 3 is a reasonable number. I dont believe that all the needs or the animals can be taken care of if you have more than 3 animals. Also what do you need all those animals for?
- Way to much flexibility - these limits are much to high
- In the urban environment, with very few exceptions, it is completely unnecessary to have so many animals.
- The limit should be 3 dogs or 3 cats not 6 with the above rules/exceptions.
- The number of dogs and cats per household should not be increased to avoid excessive noise and feces and for pets welfare
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many for a person to properly care for. Should be reduced to 3 of each.
- That is too many for one person to care for. The animals would suffer.
- I, myself think, only my opinion someone would abuse this system. More insurance, that this would not let people who do not give the correct information for their own quote unquote sleezy be checked out with no prejudices. People, always will try to play the system, and for their own reasons, no pun intended..
- So many animals is joke. It is horrible for the animals and for anyone living near by
- 12 animals is a joke. It would be terrible for the animals and all neighbours.
- Good pet parents should be able to care for any amount if animals that they can safely afford and keep the animals safe
- No more than 2. Having 6 is ridiculous and will result in negative effects on others.
- I agree that more than 2 pets per household is not necessary.
- As long as animals are properly cared for & pet excrement is taken care of who are we to place limits
- Needs an exception for dog boarders/day care/dog walkers
- Six dogs or cats on the vast majority of urban properties within Calgary are way too many as the properties are (a) not large enough to support so many animals and (b) too close together for the



peaceful existence and enjoyment of neighbours. No one needs that many animals in a home. A total of four (4) animals/pets (to be clear, that is a TOTAL of four in any combination) would be the maximum appropriate.

- NA
- I would recommend no more than two pets per household. Exception would be pets < 6 months old.
- people don't need more than 2 dogs or cats. its an urban community.
- I believe that absolutely nobody should have more than 2 cats and/or dogs unless they are home and caring for them full time. Anything more than that should be considered animal abuse...
- More pet means more noise. Limit to have pet should be reduced
- I would like to see that number lowered to 3 or 4. Anyone who can have up to 12 animals (max 6 dogs and 6 cats) can be seen as a hoarding situation and not allowing each animal to the five freedoms. Furthermore, few people can appropriately afford more than 2 dogs or cats at once. 6 of each is too excessive.
- 12 animals per household is too many. Reduce the number to 2.
- Still too many. Three is better.
- The more pets a person has the more chances the pets can cause to other people.
- Unless the animals are not well treated, why does it matter?
- Less government
- A restriction such as this does not take into account size of property.not
- No one needs to have 6 dogs and cats in one house, that is excessive. The noise and smell would be awful. The limit should be 3 of each, unless you are a dog/cat sitter, foster care person, or breeder.
- Special exceptions may be needed for volunteers of animal rescues
- limit of 2 dogs and 2 cats all requiring licensing
- If you can afford to look after the pets you should have as many as you can afford.
- Whether its one dog or multiple, it should be the owners responsibility to address behaviour. No matter how many animals they have. The focus should be on behaviour and management.
- more animals involved more chance of neglect
- I believe that 6 animals per household is to many, & that the limit should include both, ie: if you own cats & dogs they should be included in the same category as 3 cats & 3 dogs would be the limit for 6. I do believe that 4 is a more responsible and realistic # for a limit
- No
- I don't think it is the city's place to restrict responsible pet owners from owning animals. Let people have as many animals as they would like in their house. If their are issues such as noise, smell, abuse, neglect, etc.. then maybe the city can impose a restriction.
- It's too vague
- This should be based on ability to care for animals properly and not an arbitrary number. Make it about animals wellbeing



- 6 cats and 6 dogs in one house is very excessive!
- There should be less animals. No more than 3 dogs and 3 cats, so 6 animals total per household.
- 1 should be the limit. Anyone multiple by-law infractions should loose right to have a pet. Consider instituting pet-free neighbourhoods - no pet ownership.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is Way too high of a number. There should be no more than three animals total. No need for that many pets (especially dogs) in the city.
- If the owners are capable of properly caring for these animals and they are not a nuisance to neighbors then I don't see why limiting them would be necessary.
- the threshold is already too high
- That is far too many animals for an urban residential area. I think the most I could support is 3 dogs and 3 cats, which to me seems plenty.
- its not the city place to tell a person what kind or how many pets they can have.. if you have 20 cats there is most likely a mental health issue that is way more serious and needs to be addressed.
- why would anyone need 12 animals 6 is plenty
- No. No one should own that many pets in the city.
- 12 animals in a home is too many
- No one needs that many animals.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats within the city seems like far too much. The animals would not likely have adequate quality of care. The number should be lower ie 4 dogs and 4 cats maximum. Size of dogs could also be considered.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too much. I would support an allowance if 3-4 for cats and 3-4 for dogs.
- 6 is to many
- No one needs 6 dogs in a city.
- Numbers are not needed on limits but ability to provide proper care. 2 dogs in too small of a space is too much but with space 10 could be fine it needs to be based on ability to provide care.
- if those exceptions listed above are included I would support it
- If there is no problem. Butt out!
- That's still too many pets. I think the cap should be 4, not 6.
- Because if the animals are sweet loving animals why can't we have any amount that we would like.
- Six dogs/cats can be too much and can create an insanitary environment. The city cannot monitor every household anymore. This can be a huge problem to lessors.
- If a person is a responsible pet owner, it shouldn't matter how many pets they have.
- 6 seems high, maybe 3 each.
- 6 dogs or cats is still too many- suggest 3 maximum. exceptions are reasonable and i agree w/ them
- Because we need less bylaws
- First I believe this should be based on the number of people in the home. A house with 7 people to care for 7 animals is much different than one with 1 person to care for 7 animals. While I do support a limit, 12 total dogs and cats is excessive. I would be much more supportive of 3 or 4 as a "house"



rule with the restrictions outlined, or a rule that considers people in the home (or a combination - is one per person up to a max of 6)

- too much government interference
- To jump from 2 to 6 is way too much. And realistically it depends on the size of home they are living in. 6 dogs in a 2 bedroom condo, or 6 dogs on a large property in cougar ridge. I think it should be a max of 4 animals (cat and/or dogs any combination just 4)
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many.
- No more than 2 animals per household. Who needs 6 dogs, 6 cats? that 12 animals in a house. Place would be like a barn & barn yard. People cannot look after the animals they have now with dogs barking & dog poop not picked up.
- Six adult animals is still too many. Max 3 dogs.
- I do not know what the current limit on animals is, however I believe that no household needs to have more than 3 pets, except in certain circumstances such as breeding or fostering of animals.
- 6 dogs in a city is too many
- I feel that number of pets shouldn't be dictated.
- Who needs six dogs and six cats in the city?!
- You guys just want to control everything, creating huge, bloated bureaucracy and a feeling of helplessness where everyone comes to the government for things they should work out on their own. No wonder our taxes are so high.
- 6 is too many. I would suggest 3 cats and 3 dogs plus the other exceptions.
- As long as all animals are properly taken care of and property is kept clean, I don't believe a limit is necessary.
- No one should need more than 2 cats and/or 2 dogs. Bring the limit down, not up.
- Not unless the potential exceptions listed above are automatically included and not "potential".
- There are other mechanisms and fines that are in place. If an owner is unable to take care of their pets responsibly then further action should be taken at the and costs should be charged to the delinquent owner.
- I'm quite sympathetic to the reasoning, but I'm increasingly concerned about the government mandating all of these things rather than communities dealing with them internally.
- Owner responsibility and quality of care are key. A person can be a terrible pet owner with 1 pet or a great pet owner with 20. A number restricting bylaw wouldn't change the quality of care for pets.
- I want to say yes for those responsible animal owners but feel that is way too many animals for one house
- I support the proposed exceptions, but I don't support the increased limit.
- Proposing that someone can own 6 cats AND 6 dogs will increase the potential for illegal sale of "rescue" animals or "non-profit" style animal rescues. Increase noise issues and hygienic issues.
- 3 dogs or cats is more than enough for any city dweller. Cats should NOT be allowed to roam free they do major environmental damage and are a public nuisance. The same rules as dogs should apply a leash outside or locked in.



- There should be a pet limit - however SIX IS FAR TOO MANY. this will create huge problems for city. Limit should be NO MORE THAN 3 per household
- 6 of each is to many, there should be a limit of only 2 of each per household, unless your pet just had babies.
- Pet limit does not equate with uncleaned property or more noise. People with one dog or cat could be horrendous owners - focus on having bylaws that tackle poor ownership. More importantly, it is impossible to implement. Better issues to put man power on than going and verifying number of pets in a household.
- I am a dog owner and I cannot see any circumstances (emotional or physical) in which anyone would need to own more than 3 pets in total. If people want more than 3 pets, they should only be permitted to do so if they live on a large acreage (fenced) far enough away from neighbours that the animals' noise, defecation and activities are not noticeable/audible.
- Six is too many for health of animals and safety for animal and humans
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and cleaned up after it's not an issue
- Stop backyard breeding. No one needs more than 6 dogs or cats at a time
- six (6) dogs AND six (6) cats per household is too large of a number of pets. I think 6 pets in total is a more realistic number
- If people want a larger number of pets let them as long as they are responsible about it.
- 12 animals in an household is to much.
- can neglect it as well
- 6 of each is way to high
- No one should own 6 dogs within city limits. cats create little noise and are not a threat when in packs, so cat owners should be able to have up to 6. The dog limit should be 2, tops. Imagine living next to a house with 6 dogs?! No thank you.
- This should be lowered to 3 dogs and 3 cats per household unless the person is a licensed breeder.
- 6 cats or dogs is too many
- As long as the animals are being cared for probably and not a nuisance to anyone it shouldn't matter how many you keep in your house or property
- It should be up to an individual how many animals they can care for. Unless there is an animal care problem or a property care problem or a mental defect on the ownership part.
- Because
- I find it a little hard to understand why people would need up to 12 animals in a regular home. One can be a nuisance if they bark while owners are or in some cases are not home to control. If one barks, it triggers an increase in barking in the house. I have listened to a dog bark all day long for many days while owner is not home. I am concerned for the dog as well as the fact that I have to close my windows and wear ear plugs.
- No one needs that many animals. A limit of 4 dogs/cats per household would be plenty
- cannot say i like this idea as any good pet owner would only own the amount of animals they can properly care for. The problem is those who want a dog or cat or any animal to breed it and just be



making money from it, no good owners just constantly breeding them and selling those should not be allowed.

- Rescues and foster homes for dogs and cats are needed. To limit household amounts would limit space in the SPCA. Property owners should ensure their yards are clean from large amounts of defecation.
- I support the concept of an upper limit on animal ownership and the proposed exemptions, but the number of animals should be lower. I think three dogs and six animals in total would be a more appropriate limit. For example the cities of Edmonton, Medicine Hat and Toronto all have a limit of 3 dogs and 6 cats. In Morinville the limit is 3 dogs and 3 cats. Please look at other examples like this to inform your bylaw development.
- Legally limiting the amount of pets someone has won't eliminate hoarding. Hoarders will still have more animals than they can care for, as this is once again a PEOPLE PROBLEM. Many people who work in rescue find themselves with more animals than the average person, sometimes as long-term fosters. These people (along with people who adopt a large number of animals because they can care for them) shouldn't be punished. Let people keep as many animals as they can responsibly care for and offer assistance to those who need help due to personal issues like hoarding.
- Two is enough, any more than this there should be special applications and fees.
- I think the number of pets allowed is too many. Unless they have a special application to be allowed to have such a large number of pets, people should not have more than 3 dogs and 3 cats in my opinion.
- Having 1-3 dogs is a lot of work. It takes a huge commitment of time. Many people already struggle to financially provide accurate medical care to animals they have. Raising the limit of animals they can have in their home, would raise the amount of animals that don't receive proper medical care. Feeding one big dog is expensive enough, imagine feeding 6. In the past year we have spent over \$1600 in vet bills for regular health issues (one injury, bladder infection, daily medications for thyroid issue, accidental litter of puppies). Now imagine if we had 6 dogs, that all needed medical attention. Majority of people can not afford that, so the animal would end up suffering. We spend about \$200 a month in dog food for one black lab, times that by 6, who can afford to feed that many dogs properly? Then you have to consider space. Would it be in the dogs best interest to shove 6 dogs into a house? No.
- 3 of each is plenty for anyone and probably too much. Too many bad owners, that's how you create hoarders.
- There is no need for anyone to have that many animals in one household, if there are too many animals per household I worry that they wouldn't all be receiving proper care
- Yes to everything except the pit bull part
- The ownership of animals is NOT up to a city, a province or a country. It is up to a person. Limiting the number of animals one can have is an infringement upon a person's rights. If other people have an issue with how many animals one has, that is a personal issue and should not be considered reliable information and should also be seen as bias feedback. If the amount of animals becomes a problem



to the ANIMALS than a limit can be set on the owner, however it should be a case by case ruling ONLY

- owner behavior isn't determined by how many pets a person has. An irresponsible owner will be irresponsible with 1 or 10 pets.
- Too many animals. Move to a farm...
- As long as they are responsible pet owners and keep their property clean, the noise under control and their pets are healthy and well taken care of, there should not be a limit.
- 6 is too high of a number. I'd support 4, tops.
- It may contribute to a higher volume of abandoned animals.
- I think things should be just left alone
- 4 and 4 would be more acceptable
- Some people can take care of more pets than others. There should not be a limit unless the welfare of the pets are at stake or they are a nuisance to those living around. People who work with animals often have more than one dog or cat. Ex dpg groomers may have multiple dogs due to different coat types for showi dogs and or retired oets. Also people who work with animals often take in pets that ththeir owners can not for whatever reason yake care of them. Also people who work with animals, ex at Petstores, Veterinary hospitals, grooming salons etc often get discou ts on service and products making it easier for them to take care of these pets.
- 6 is a very high number of animals. I would suggest 3 of either with an option to apply for more.
- A responsible pet owner is aware if their duties regardless if how many animals you have. Look at how how many hoarding situations there have been when they were supposed to be breeders.
- the numbers should be lower. perhaps a total of 6 dogs and cats (not up to 12 animals, that's still a nutty number). The potential exemptions are good.
- I bought a house so I could have control of what animals I own and how many. This is not something that should be dictated, and if it is then procreation of humans should be dictated as well.
- Having more pets can be beneficial to the owners mental health as well as the animals needs.
- If a person can care for all animals properly there should be no limit.
- 12 pets is to many in one household
- Limit of 4
- I do not believe that there are is adequate space within city limits to house such a large number of animals. Additionally, I do not understand the necessity of owner such large numbers of pets without having them for some industrious purpose (ex. Breeding, dog sledding, etc). My personal opinion would be to restrict animals to a max. of 6. This could be a mix of animals, or all one type of animal (2 cats and 4 dogs, or 6 dogs).
- Bully breeds should not be overpoliced
- I think six each is too much, two each is enough. The exceptions sound reasonable.
- Too restrictive
- I agree with the second part. But the no. Of dogs I disagree with. Especially if there breed is aggressive. 2 dogs per household should be enough
- 6 dogs or 6 cats is plenty in a city property. Most breeders are located outside of the city.



- 6 dogs and/or 6 cats IS excessive! I do agree there could be some exceptions but it should be dealt with in a case by case basis.
- I think having 12 animals in a household is too many. It would be tough to give all these animals proper veterinary care. I think 6 animals total would be the maximum, not 12.
- Multiple pets are not taken care of by owners. More noise, more potential for danger.
- 6 total combined is more than enough
- Given the the close proximity we live in I feel the the number of pets should be regulated by Size of domicile and size of lot.
- 6 should be the max; it will stop the potential for hoarding. 6 is still slightly too much. The more pets you have the less care you can provide for them.
- Why does extra animals hurt everyone else?
- Stop meddling
- There is no need for the city to police how many pets a person owns if the pets are kept responsibly.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive. It should be limited by the space available. Small home and yard, less animals. Removal if not taking care of feces and excessive noise
- A total of 12 dogs/cats in one property is excessive. Maybe a total of six animals would be more reasonable
- If an individual can provide necessary care and maintain more than the allotted amount I see no problem. The issue comes up with those who are irresponsible in which case I support higher fines
- I do not think that there is any reason to have a numbered limit of pets in a residence. However, if a level of sanitation or nuisance behaviours can not be mitigated than there should be the ability to assess and reduce the number of pets that that one household can keep. Broad and wide sweeping bylaws are not the way to go.
- That's way to many animals in one household (just to have as a pet). There is no way 6 dogs and 6 cats in one household can be properly taken care of.
- Should be less, unless fostering.
- If the property and the animals aren't interfering with other people mind your own business.
- There Should be a limit, if they want more they should move it off the city
- There should not be a limit as it is there own property and they should be allowed as many pets as they want. The most that should happen is just behavioural classes for the pet
- would these restrictions REALLY help ensure animal welfare and limits nuisance? It sounds like just another thing to track, and fine.
- You could have 12 animals. Maybe a maximum of 6 would be fine
- There is a wide range of households (condos, houses, etc). Each situation is unique and should be considered.
- It's too many and will no longer address the issues identified above
- Edmonton has these laws, and I know of multiple homes who exceed that. I dont think simple number determines whether or not problems exist, and bylaws should address problems, as well as be clearly enforceable



- As long as the animals are cared for properly there should be no issue on the amount of animals you can own.
- Keeping pets should not have a legal limit unless the numbers put animal and human health at risk. Otherwise stay out of my house and life
- No one needs this many animals and neighborhood disturbances would be significant with anyone having more than 3-4 dogs or cats.
- With all the exceptions it makes no sense
- 6 dogs or cats is too many for a single household
- City vs country is different. Not all kittens get adopted out by 6 months. Same with puppies. I appreciate the 6 animal limit but it would need to be 6 dogs and 6 cats, not either/or. However, permission to own more is not unreasonable. I rescued 2 dogs and a cat, so I'm already halfway there. I would have more but work on the road (they travel with me).
- If a household can responsibly care for all of their animals, regardless of the number, they should be able to do so.
- Quantity doesn't determine quality of care.
- Less than six. I would feel 3 is enough.
- Prefer no limit on number of pets
- The existing limit of 6 dogs and cats per household is way too high in the first place. Having any more than this number, for whatever reason will definitely run into issues around care of the animals, excessive noise, feces. What about the people who live in the neighborhood who are trying to live a pet-free life? Do their voices factor into this discussion?
- Depending on the home/family situation, any arbitrary number may be too high or low. It should be based on the ability to maintain welfare of the animals and avoid nuisance to others which will depend on circumstances.
- There should be no limit, as long as animals are taken care of and not causing damage or threaten others
- I do support the limit in regards to every day homes in order to avoid hoarding situations however would need more information on the special application before I could fully agree. I have fostered and yes, when you receive a litter of kittens or puppies, it's easy to exceed that number for a short period of time.
- No maximum. All that matters is the care an animal receives. I know people with 20 animals which are all well-cared for, and people who cannot care properly for one animal. The measure should be care, not an arbitrary number.
- 6 is too many in my opinion. I would say 4 should be the limit.
- Sounds like government job creation/increased cost to tax payers that will have little impact
- no one in the city needs to own more than 6 dogs at any one time
- As long as the animals are being treated humanely and kept in good order.
- I would support if there were exceptions for dog/cat rescues who meet certain requirements in animal care.



- Bad pet owner are bad pet owners. It doesn't matter if there's one dog or 12 dogs. Fines don't effect [removed] pet owners. This questionnaire was clearly written by someone who has no interest in actually solving problems. This has been a colossal waste of time. Have fun assigning monetary values to arbitrary situations.
- The number seems high. I don't think people will pursue a special application, they'll just do what they want. At 6 dogs and 6 cats, I think it would be difficult for a neighbour to notice/report any infractions.
- Its outrageous that people like to control what everyone else does
- As long as all pets are taken care for then there shouldn't be a limit.
- I don't think any home should have 6 dogs unless you have an acreage, I don't believe it's fair for the animals and I don't think you can give them the level of care needed. The limit should not exceed 3 or four.
- The city should not be in control of people giving loving homes to animals as long as the animals are happy and healthy and the living conditions are clean and suitable.
- Way too many- if you want that many pets go live on a farm
- It really depends on each individual case. Some people are better pet owners then others. Some people can not even clean up after on dog let alone several. But some people are really good at taking care of multiple animals. Also the size of the house/apt/or yard should come into effect. I do think restrictions in apartments should be held as that is quite unfair to the animal to not have enough space. If you need 2 litter boxes per cat and live in a bachelor suite but have 5 cats... Thats not healthy for anyone...but if you have a large house and yard and have the time and money 5 cats are less likely to be an issue...
- I think the number of 6 dogs and 6 cats is significantly too high for permanent pets in the home it should be 3-4 total. And then allow for special circumstances such as fostering rescues, puppies under the age of 6 months. But 12 dogs and cats in a property is unrealistic unless it's a special circumstance.
- Having 12 animals in an urban household seems very excessive. Would the animals have enough space? Food? Training?
- No one needs that many animals near other people's homes
- this should dealt with on a case by case situation
- 3 dogs Max 3 cats max
- If a child acts out in school, is it the child's fault or the inattentive, irresponsible parents, who failed to teach their kids? A chihuahua with 'little dog syndrome' can cause injuries and show aggression towards large breeds. Breeds have NOTHING to do with it!
- I think anyone could home as many dogs as they want, However, they must provide ample space for the dogs to live (not having 8 dogs in your house) buy a farm if you have the desire to have that many dogs. This allows for animal lovers to rescue tons of dogs and home them
- Households should have no more than 2 pets at any given time. The more they have, the increased likelihood that they will be a noise or other nuisance to neighbours.
- That supports animal hoarding



- ^ cats and 6 dogs sounds very much like small puppy/kitty mills. Temp homes okay (with a time limit) and all must have Excess animal permit. We have to stop hoarding of animals
- I am concerned about too many loop holes. An owner has 6 dogs ... demonstrates that they will live with any number of animals. So an easy mark for "inheriting" more dogs. Bylaw needs fewer exemptions to me.
- No, people who want to own a dog should go through a screening process before owning one. Not be reprimanded because their dog decided to do something out of the ordinary, not according to the owner. It doesn't have to do with the dog, it has to do with the owner.
- two dogs or cats is plenty and not added together
- 6 is too high. 4 should be max, with option for exceptions
- That is too many animals for a residential home within City Limits
- The licensing is a cash grab already.
- 6 is wayyyyyyyyyy to many. it is 2 cats 2 dogs where i use to live and you never heard of any attacks or even bad behaviour
- There's no need for fee, Dogs are already chipped or tattooed
- Exceptions for responsible breeders who show their dogs then I would support.
- Pets can help a person keep their mental health in check. Some people need more.
- Two animals per property is plenty. Please note, a lot of people only have limited space today and it is very difficult to keep a dog quiet, let alone more than one.
- No license fees.
- Allow people to be responsible. If they become public nuisance or abuse the animals then step in.
- You don't need a license to love animals.
- no one should be limited on how many animals they can care for humanity is lucky to have someone take care of our animals. Its not fair so many of them already have to spend their life in shelters this rule will only increase the number of those poor animals suffering. Its not right to be taking away our freedoms. Its also not right to discriminate against pitbulls its racist. My two pitbulls are no stronger than any other dog their size and thats been scientifically proven. Anyone who discriminates against pitbulls needs to be better educated and stop the hate. They are literally some of the best dogs. Look at the score they get on their temperament tests compared to other dogs they score better than retrievers. It blows my mind how people can still be so brainwashed when it comes to pitbulls. STOP BSL.
- There are already bylaws in place to deal with such situations should they become problematic.
- That's too many. I would suggest 4 and 4 with special exception for pets under the age of 6 months.
- 6 is too many
- I think as long as the noise levels and smells are kept to a decent level, people should be allowed to keep as many animals as they like provided they are caring for them properly. If the animals are not kept for properly, or begin to be a nuisance to the public, then we can talk about restrictions.
- Not necessary



- individuals should have the right to choose how many pets they have. if it becomes a problem in terms of animal care or a disturbance to neighbors then intervention should happen. most pet owners are responsible and should not be penalized for the negligence of others.
- 6 dogs is way too many depending on the size of dogs and home. 2-3 large dogs is much better. 6 small dogs is okay.
- As seen from past practise, bylaws regarding pet ownership are seldom enforced in Calgary.
- some households have more then one unit it them. Such a upper and Lower suits.
- I would say max 4
- Who and why does somebody get to decide how many animals a person can have?? If they are being looked after, cared for, fed and cleaned up after why does somebody get to say you can only own a certain number?
- i will not explain
- Six seems very generous as a base. I would support more like three.
- I believe this number of animals is too large!! Obviously there should be some exceptions but I believe that within city limits there should be no more than three dogs and four cats within one home
- Dogs licensed - yes. If the cats are indoor cats - they should not have to be licensed
- The pet limits are too high; a maximum of 6 (3 dogs and 3 cats); the only exceptions should be pets under 6 months.
- six animals are too much. Two should be sufficient
- people should be allowed to have as many animals as they are able to care for. Animal services needs better communication. I learned about this survey from a temporary billboard. Why not send it to all registered pet owners? Develop a system that when buying dog/cat food you have to provide your pet license number to ensure the animal is registered. No license, buy one on the spot.
- The number of animals doesn't make a difference in the care. It's the owner that either looks after the animal or doesn't. I've had neighbors with one dog that couldn't be bothered to clean up after their dogs or stop them from incessantly barking.
- A total of 6 animals per households would be better. (Dogs/cats)
- 6 is a lot. 4 maybe
- 6 dogs??? Too many (unless they are fosters for an animal rescue). I would say 2-4 max dogs per household. No more than 4 cats per household (unless it's a foster home).
- Six cats AND dogs is to high of a number especially in a city. Not fair to the animals and realistically that many animals in one household would not receive the care and attention they deserve and require.
- Six is enough for anyone household to manage.Even as a foster,unless it was a mother and baby's it was
- 6 cats or dogs seems excessive for a single household unless they are breeders, fostering or trainers or some special service that requires them to have more dogs or cats. That then should require special licensing.
- I think 3 of each is enough. Unless you are living on a farm or acreage



- 6 is too many animals... Then if someone has 6 cats and 6 dogs in a house.. yuck. it's just too many.
- 12 animals on one property is too many. Perhaps the proposed change should include the size of the property the animals will reside. A condo with no outdoor access is very different for animals to live than a property with 1/2 acre of yard space. The accommodation should also be a factor in determining how many animals can appropriately reside in the space. Service animals should be exempted.
- To many animals for one house hold
- Stop regulating good dog owners. Stop requiring pet licenses. Lower income people do not deserve cheaper fees. Things need to be the same for everyone which should be the city keeping out of people's private business until it becomes a problem to the community, other people or property. Heavily fine the bad and irresponsible owners and stay out of everything else.
- That's too many animals
- Not necessary for more than 2 without special exceptions
- That is waaaaay too many. A total of 6 dogs and cats, whatever the ratio, it's much more reasonable
- Not more than pets = to adults
- 2 pets per household is plenty.
- Should be no more then 2 dogs and 2 cats !! It will be more problems when there is more animals and noise.
- No more than 3 dogs or 3 cats per household with the exception of nursing puppies or kittens.
- I think six pets are too much and should be lowered to 3.
- 2 dogs and 2 cats is more than enough for a household.
- Mind your business. If you're a good care provider shouldn't matter. We don't ban families from how many children they can have
- I know many people who have more than 6 dogs who are given the best care and have no complaints from neighbours. If the animals are licensed and cared for properly then why limit them?
- 12 animals per home is way too high. I think it should be limited to no more than 4 per household, except for the potential exceptions listed above.
- I see it unreasonable to think that a home (with the exception of an animal foster) capable of giving the love and attention that 12 animals would require on a property.
- Probably with working and raising 6 animals in a home. To many to handle. Should stay the same.
- That is far too many animals for a city environment. I would be happier with 4 or less.
- The limit should be lower than 6
- I feel 6 of each is too many. Maybe just 6 animals total.
- The potential of 12 animals (6dogs & 6cats) could increase the likelihood of noise complaints, feces concerns, and animal welfare. Perhaps lowering this limit to 3 each with the ability to apply for additional animals.
- Way too many pets for one household in the City



- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is excessive. I support 3 dogs and 3 cats maximum with the same exceptions listed.
- Not in the city limits.
- The pet limit should be 2 dogs, 2 cats , I agree to the potential exception listed
- That is too many animals
- Still far too high. Limit should be 2.
- 12 animals in a urban setting such as Calgary is too much. It allows more room for people to not be in control of their animals
- I don't think all pets should need a license.
- 6 dogs and and 6 cats is far too many. I think a limit of three total is enough. far too many people cannot take care or control the animals they have. living near bowmont park, I have seen far too many dogs out of control and threatening people walking by, including children. not too mention dogs off leash in soccer fields or playgrounds. perhaps spending more money on animal bylaw officers to actually enforce three laws and keep people safe.
- There should never be more than two pets.
- Leave me alone on my property
- Difficult to ensure 6 animals are being properly cared for - no oversight
- People should be able to do what they want on private property
- I think 6 dogs would be be noisy to live next to when they are barking and the smell of poo when sporting melt comes. And 6 cats is too many if they are allowed outside to wreak gardens and hunt wildlife.
- Six is too many.
- There is no reason to have that many animals in a single home ; move to a rural property if you want that many.
- I think there should be a maximum of four dogs and four cats.
- no one needs 6&6 animals.
- No limits
- Not for dogs/cats that are inherited or grandfathered - could be under special license.
- 6 dogs is a pack - Having encountered them in a family neighbourhood can be terrifying & dangerous - packs including with dog walkers should NOT be permitted
- 12 animals is far too many in a city household. The limit should be six animals.
- Not sure why the limit is the same for cats and dogs. I don't think it would stop hoarders and may just make it more difficult for rescues. If people have the space and time they shouldn't have to jump through additional hoops to take care of their pets.
- It is always the owners responsibilities to tend to their pets. If they can't take care of one why would they get more.
- The whole thing is stupid
- No need for more than two
- A pet limit is not acceptable.



- 6 dogs/cats is excessive, 2/3 is more than enough in the city - go live on a farm if you need more
- No limits.
- People should be allowed to have as many pets as they want as long as they take care of them.
- That's a lot of animals in a household.
- 6 is too many
- The limit should be lower.
- Who needs 6 cats or dogs at once? Rescues, fosters, farms, averages etc., could accommodate this. But a home in the city??? 2 or 3 is reasonable. More than that could become problematic.
- Too much regulation already.
- Should be two dogs and two cats. Your numbers are too high
- I would support a pet limit of 4 dogs or 4 cats. A special application necessary if a household wants more.
- This provides too big of a loophole for animal hoarding.
- Six pets in a household is excessive and is likely to create undue burden on neighbours
- Six dogs per household is just not what I would want to listen to in my town house. Two dogs or cats maximum owner or rescue homes no exceptions.
- The rules as stated above are fine but the limit is too high - maximum 4 of each would be more reasonable for a multitude of reasons.
- Two dogs or cats per house maximum is enough. No one needs more than one actually.
- There is no rule that stop parents from having more kids. Why should this be in place for animals?
- There should be no limit.
- This wouldn't stop people who are irresponsible pet owners. Only inhibit those that are.
- 12 animals? Way too much
- 12 animals in one household! We don't live on farms here in Calgary, three dogs, three cats is plenty to disturb the neighbours! No to temporary homes, they may change over the animals as they are sold but there is still going to be a constant stream of the same number of different animals being in-house. I lived 8 blocks away from a dog daycare and we could hear them barking the whole time they were there, 8am-6pm M-F, I had to make a complaint to get them to muzzle the pooches! Just because they are a breeder or a Fancier's does not mean they care about the people around them. Many are irresponsible pet care givers.
- Absolutely too many pets per household. Noise disturbance, hygiene and animal welfare come into play here.
- no use in a limit if the problems are not caused by the amount of pets but rather inability to provide proper training/cleaning.
- I would not support animal limits. As a foster home, my number of animals varies constantly and I would never go above a number that I am comfortable providing excellent care for. Every animal limit would have to be totally based on the household, are they able to provide a high quality diet, daily enrichment, annual and emergency vet visits, appropriate housing, clean water, etc.
- 6 dogs or 6 cats is way too many. 2, or max 3 animals in total is sufficient.



- To most these animals are family like children. Would you limit the amount of kids someone could have
- We don't limit kids, if the animals are well behaved and cared for who cares how many
- as long as the animals are cared for and aren't an issue its not right to restrict the responsible owners for the actions irresponsible owners.
- It would depend on the size of the house and conditions for animals.
- I would live with as many dogs as I could if I could. If you're a RESPONSIBLE pet owner you should know your limits of how many you can handle.
- I'd say yes but only if managed properly and lets face it when was the last time any government body handled anything properly. If it was ensured that any of the bodies who qualify for the permits were guaranteed to be able to receive said licenses in a guaranteed amount of time I'd say yes. As a guy that subcontracts for an Alberta regulated board and have to work within city board limitations and can see the beaurcrary... No
- 12 animals in a single home is ridiculously high, and the sanitary conditions in regards to the home and neighbourhood must be taken into account. Also noise and nuisance issues...
- No one follows up with people homing many animals
- don't target pit bulls. Aggressive dogs are a result of bad dog owners. Manage owners better!!!rs
- If the animals are well cared for and not disturbing neighbours, there is no need for a limit.
- If they can afford the animals and theyre not neglected or mistreated let them have as many as they want.
- There should be no limit; not all large pet situations are guaranteed to create those issues and should be handled on a case by case basis
- That's just taking away peoples rights , if the animals are not being taken care of properly then the bylaw should be doing something about it anyways
- I don't agree with this bylaw only because we already have bylaws to deal with the problems like excessive noise. And feces is a symptom of a lazy owner, not necessarily quantity of animals
- That's too many pets to one dwelling.
- People should be allowed what they want
- 12 animals seems excessive in one household.
- 12 animals on one property is a lot- I can see 3 and 3 being more reasonable - with the exceptions listed
- No limit
- I would support 4 animals per household. 6 is a lot.
- The problem behaviours are more appropriately dealt with by the fine structure when they arise. If there are no problems we should mind our own business
- 6 is still too many. 3 of each is feasible.
- The number of animals in a household is not the issue. The issue is how responsible the owner is. I do not feel there should be a restriction, but that being said, animal hoarding should not be tolerated. The number of animals in a household should be assessed on how well the owner is taking care of them. I know many responsible cat owners who have more than 6 cats.



- There is excessive noise, digging around fences or jumping against them. The pets need to be in a large open area for their health and safety and not confined to small properties. Pets are often left alone while the owners work and they bark at everyone passing which scares young children.
- I think 6 dogs or cats is sufficient for one house hold (exceptions to be made for circumstances listed above)
- 6 is more than enough
- 6 of each type still seems excessive. Should have even lower limit
- In rural areas surrounding Calgary a special Development Permit is required for a number of dogs / cats / pets / livestock in excess of (x). I would support such a system in the city provided that a person could not be denied having the animals without first having an opportunity to prove, over a trial period, that there would be no harm to affected stakeholders, like neighbours.
- A number of reasons, the city would have to find other ways to make up for lost revenue, no one should be able to decide i cannot have more than 2 pets
- 6 dogs is too many for a household
- 6 is too many.
- The amount of pets allowed in a residence should be based off of occupants and square footage of the home.
- Depends on the situation. If 100 animals are kept neat and are not a nuisance no problem. If one animal is a problem then concerned.
- 6 is too many. 2 of each max is enough.
- No restriction is necessary as this does not seem like an issue that is excessive in the city.
- If owners are responsible it shouldn't matter
- There should be regulations depending on house and property sizes to how many animals can be on the property. Example: small house/apartment=only 5 pets total
- I think 12 animals is too many for 1 house hold. Unless they can prove they're equipped to handle it. At most I would say 6 animals per household.
- if it is a large property with multiple people with dogs should be able to have their pets, people that foster animals from rescues should be able to do so to prevent more animals on the streets, breeders as well
- The last time I checked we live in a free country. If people want to have a million pets then so be it. But they are responsible for those pets.
- Six dogs, in particular, is too many dogs. I can only imagine the noise 6 barking dogs would cause. Three should be a maximum for dogs and cats.
- Should be fewer.
- [personal information removed]
- If the animals do not pose an issue, it is my choice to decide how many animals to share my home with and care for. If my property is large enough to allow, it is my property.
- The only limit should be health related. A response owner with a large property can support more pets than a bachelor apartment dweller could. A simple 6 animal limit is not the answer.
- I would support it, but limited to 4 dogs and/or 4 cats



- Limits imposed on private property are unlawful
- If an owner is taking care of their own pet no matter how many there is then it is fine.
- I don't believe all individuals should be subject to this bylaw. However I feel that in certain cases where problems are arising they can be dealt with on a case to case basis. I know many animal lovers, one in particular who after her husband passed she found companion in her 8 labs. This individual doesn't live within city limits. however I do believe that if someone wants to have a home full of animals they should be able to, as long as the animals needs are being taken care of.
- I think 6 dogs is too many. Max should be 4 with those exceptions
- Excessive animals per property is better addressed through general animal welfare legislation. 6 is too high for some properties, but not inappropriate for others. This proposal is legislation for the sake of writing legislation, which is an abhorrent practice.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is a lot of animals for a home in the city
- I don't think anyone needs 6 cats AND 6 dogs. But I don't think that's anyone's business outside of that household as long as its not a disturbance and the well being of the animals are kept up.
- 4 is a reasonable number for a city property and to ensure proper animal care. Exceptions should be made for legitimate breeding or fosters situations where there may be more puppies or kittens for a period of time.
- The question suggests that the current limit is two cats and two dogs. That is sufficient.
- People should be able to make this decision themselves, if the pets are well cared for and not disrupting the neighbours there should be no limit. Alternatively, if someone can't control 1 dog, they shouldn't be protected by a limit
- There are people who can look after more cats/dogs very well. And are responsible owners.
- I think that if a person wants more then 6 they should be allowed. I think that if the volume of animals a person has is an issue it needs to be addressed with that specific person. Not punishing the general population for a few bad owners.
- Less animals. 6 is basically hoarding unless you're a breeder w pups
- Don't need that many animals. 2 is reasonable.
- i don't think limit should applied to responsible pet owers that have the space for more pets.
- the total should be way lower
- As long as the animals are being cared for properly then I do not care if you want 15 dogs. The city already has many bylaws in place to fine owners for a list of violations. I believe this is further over reach from a city council who has already taxed and regulated its citizens into a near constant state of depression. Enough.
- 6 of each is still too high for certain properties. Definitely the size of yard, house and location if property should influence the amount. Appartement or acreages can't be treated the same, nor infill vs suburban.
- I suggest the number of pets be limited by the owners property size. A 10 foot backyard cannot provide enough space for 6 dogs and 6 cats the same as a 30 foot yard.
- Too many animals to provide adequate care, training and exercise.
- It should be much lower, 4 dogs and cats as a combined number total



- This doesn't work. It is going to force people to go underground.
- I think a pet owner should be able to have as many pets as they want as long as they can provide for them.
- If a person is able to take care of all animals (feed clean and have space) then there shouldn't be restrictions
- Too many!
- E
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive, except in exceptional circumstances
- This is unnecessary and impossible to implement and manage. A huge waste of time and a bylaw.
- Depends on the size of property. A 800foot apartment can handle one cat, 3 is excessive. How much room is there for the animals and people to be living comfortably together?
- Because if you are a responsible pet owner there should be no need to limit the amount if all are taken care of.
- as long as all animals are cared for it isn't anyone's business
- Too many
- There are too many exceptions here. Other than having a litter of puppies or kittens, 6 and 6 is far higher than necessary.
- how have these numbers been determined. should it be the same for someone living on a acreage vs. a condo? the animals well-being should be the determining factor.
- as long as owners are able to care for the animals in all factors, then they should be able to own as many as they please. if the owner is causing issues for the community then i believe the situation should be dealt with.
- if a person has the finances and proper environment to own and care for several dogs and/or cats, they should have every right to do so
- Some animals need the support of another animal in there life so they don't go crazy or lonely
- 6 dogs per household is way too much
- I think less per house hold, or ut should be regulated based on the size of the household.
- calgary is a city with an abundance of animal lovers. Anyone commenting there is no need for more than two liekly does not even own one. As long as each animal is being cared for, the yard is well tended and the noise is only sporadic and not incessant, tehn what is the problem? There are no bylaws about number of screaming childrfen per household, number of children per household blocking the streets by playing in them, number of teenagers throwing parties and talking at loud decibels at three in the morning, so what is this about targeting dogs and their owners? My neighbour has zero pets and makes more noise than the entire block. Live and let live. Again your questions are only about restrictions and punishment for regular per owners. Quite terrible.
- Why should the city dictate how many cats and dogs one has in their home. As long as the animals are properly cared for what does it matter?
- Change the number to 4 I think it's more appropriate and higher than that can apply for special permit



- I know a dog-walker that at any given time has in excess of 20+ dogs (of her own) on her property that she manages impeccably. Very much unlike my neighbor who has only one dog that he has little control over.
- You shouldn't have more than 2 pets
- everyone pays taxes and should be allowed to have as many pets as they want on their property should they not be a nuisance
- I know a person who has 7 cats. Taking one away from her would be very cruel. May inspect he homes that have more than 6 pets, but take them away only if they are suffering from neglect.
- I support the exceptions but being able to have 12 animals in one home is excessive regardless. If people want, say more than three of each, they should apply for an exemption and be able to appeal their case on various grounds.
- There needs to be a clearer definition. 12 animals on a 5,000 SQ. FT. property is too small of a space for them. 10 Acres could be suitable for much more than 12 animals. Can't apply the same law across the board.
- I don't see it indicated what bylaw, if any, is current in place. 6 seems very excessive. I would support limiting to a lower number than 6 of each animal. I don't even think that's healthy or safe for 12 cats and dogs to be roaming a house together!
- How does a person care for 12 animals if they live alone. They can't give hyphen all the attention and love they deserve
- Some people love animals and would like to have more than 6 dogs because they have the means and room to keep them
- Good and responsible owners are good and responsible regardless of the number of pets they have. Punish those who are not responsible, not those with a high number of animals that are well loved and looked after.
- That is too many animals for household. The restrictions should be based on the individuals income , space to care for the animals . There is a difference between holding 6 dogs on an acreage vs a backyard the only exception should be dog rescuers, fosters. Dog breeding should also be banned as there are too many animals in shelters requiring care. Pet stores should also be banned from selling animals. Animals should only be fostered or adopted.
- Six seems like a lot of animals. I think four would be reasonable.
- 12 animals is too many. Maybe consider a limit based on home size (# of bedrooms or something?). For example, having more than a couple animals in a one bedroom apartment would be unnecessary, and could impact the wellbeing of the animals. (Not enough space). However, if someone had a large house or property, then this wouldn't be an issue.
- too cut and dried
- I think there are too many factors for a flat rule to apply. if someone has a large property for example. I think there should more be a bylaw around the conditions animals live in - provided those conditions are met, then the owner is responsible and the number of animals shouldn't matter. I am happy to see that the number is at least quite high. Also - a household may be large and consist of a



number of families. If a house with a basement suite has 2 families - is that 2 households or 1? if 1, then the number of animals is low.

- just no
- None of my business what other people have for animals. As long as there is no neglect.
- No one should own 6 cats or dogs that is ridiculous. I think a person should be limited to three dogs without cats and 3 cats without dogs. Or a combination of 2 dogs and 1 cat or 2 cats and 1 dog
- I support the potential exceptions as listed above, however, I do not support increasing the number of dogs and cats allowed per household. The reason for not supported is based on the potential increase for more noise (barking dogs), increased amount of animal feces. All too often we see and hear of households that have more than already allowed animals live in deplorable conditions. No one needs to own so many animals. If people want that many, they should move out of the city to an acreage or farm.
- If it is someone who owns property, with a certain amount of land, 6 dogs/cats is fine. However, I would not want 6 dogs living in a condo in downtown Calgary, large or small!
- Limit to 3 pets
- Still too many.
- I would support as long as the exceptions were implemented and the additional caveat would be that the number of animals is not limited to a specific number, but is actually based on the sq ft of the property to ensure hoarding and inhumane keeping of pets is mitigated. Pet licence fees should be lowered and multi year or lifetime fees made available. Also fees to licenses could be adjusted if the owner has had multiple legal or bylaw breaches relating to pet ownership to reduce the possibility of them owning too many future animals. .
- You guys do too much where it's not needed and not enough where it is needed. Stick to screwing us over over on taxes and less on how many cats Auntie Therese has.
- People should be able to care for as many animals as they chose.
- It will make it more difficult for caring people to give deserving animals a home. Unfortunately the animals hoarders will always find a way
- People should be able to own as many domestic animals as they like. More community engagement would see people with psychological conditions (e. hoarding) being supported and assisted, not arbitrarily punished.,
- The number of pets in a household does not directly effect the care they are provided. This by-law will still protect the back yard breeders and others that are of more concern. The conditions of the household should be what's taken into account
- It should be 6 animals total, per household not 6 Dogs AND 6 Cats. That's far too many for any responsible pet owner to properly take care of, especially given most of the population in the city don't live in mansions.
- I do not agree with the discrimination to the pitbull and adjacent breeds. As a city we need to be better than that. More regulations to proper dog knowledge and behaviours could be a requirement for bite risk dogs but to just single out a whole breed because they have the potential to bite and cause damage should include all dogs. I am a proud pitbull owner who has spent thousands in



training and an in countable amount of hours training and I guarantee my pitbull is better behaved than most other breeds. I would not live in a place that singled out my family member based on a potential of bite and her appearance.

- Providing the animals are well taken care of, there are no bylaw issues, then people should be able to have as many animals as they want.
- no more than 2 animals should be permitted
- Number should be lower like 3 or 4
- Every home is different. 1 bedroom/2 bedroom -6bedroom. There needs to be more included in the bylaw change. It should be going how large your home is compared to how many animals you should have in your home. I grew up with 9bedroom home vs my 2 bedroom home now. So in order to properly agree with this, I beleive there should be a house sizing that should be included.
- There should not be one rule for all - limits should be placed on a case by case basis
- Leave limit open
- Responsible pet owners don't have issues with their property and shud not b penalized by ridiculous laws like this
- Responsible pet owners should be allowed to have more than 6 dogs or cats. There are thousands of animals that need homes so it seems shortsighted to restrict the number. There are current bylaws in place to protect against excessive noise and poor animal welfare circumstances.
- Because for many pet owners animals are becoming more important than the people living near by
- People shouldn't have to have a limit to how many pets they can have.
- As a responsible pet owner, it is my responsibility to care for my pets. If I choose to have 3 or more, it is equally my responsibility to ensure that the pets are well cared for, cleaned up after, and we'll behaved..if I am unable to provide care or train them properly, then there should be fines.
- If a person is a responsible pet owner I don't think it is anyone's right to limit.
- I live in the Beltline and in spring or any given time there is a lack from dog owner picking up after their dogs. The trees and grass are dying from dogs constantly urinating. It smells walking in the spring!
- 6 dogs is too much given the small lot sizes in calgary. Not fair to the dogs or neighbors.
- It's nonsense to treat cats and dogs the same way here. if cats are confined to the owner's property then they present no nuisance to anyone - two of the three issues you list simply don't apply to cats at all - they're not going to defectate on sidewalks and lawns, and they're not going to create a noise nuisance. And frankly, without doing home inspections how are you even going to know if someone has 10 cats in their house? I had 7 of my own cats at one point, and during a brief period when I was fostering overlapping litters there were 21 cats in my house (mostly the size of guinea pigs....) and I guarantee you none of my neighbours were aware or inconvenienced. Cats and dogs are NOT the same.
- It's not necessary for anyone to own more than 2 cats or dogs.
- This very question raises the issues that would be exacerbated by allowing more pets per household - accumulation of feces, excessive noise, and the very welfare of the animals (and their neighbours). It seems impossible for the pet owner to ensure 6+ dogs and 6+ cats are well-behaved and trained.



This is completely irresponsible, mostly to the pets themselves that will not receive the training and attention they need to maintain good behaviour.

- Limit numbers need to be lowered. 6 cats & 6 dogs= excessive
- The only issue is with hoarders, who are generally already breaking bylaws. This would only serve to punish responsible owners
- I agree with all of the "exceptions" above but do not see a need for more than 2 dogs or 2 cats per household.
- There are exceptions to this such as if a person has 8 puppies and homes that are suitable may take more than 6 months to find
- I dont think people should have this number of pets. I cannot imagine a scenario where that many animals would be treated well and trained properly.
- I dont
- This city has never needed a limit. If all animals are licensed this isnt needed
- If the person is responsible and has room they should be allowed as many pets as they want
- 6 is way too many dogs for one person to control and walk. Options should be explored such as pets per registered residents (ie you can have 3 dogs per adult resident). 6 is a ridiculous amount of dogs and there is no way that the average person would be able to walk, clean up after and keep quiet a pack this size. 6 Cats is fine because they do not interact with the outside world the same way as dogs do.
- Everyone should be able to own as many dogs and/or cats as they please. I feel like 95% of people wouldn't even own 6 pets but if they do then who cares.
- Keep bylaw as is - no limit
- I feel 6 dogs AND 6 cats is reasonable, however I do not feel it is realistic to require all pets to be licensed UNLESS the licensing fees are lowered.
- Too many animals in a location
- if a person can provide for the animals why shouldn't they be allowed to have more than 6 animals on their property. I feel like this should be approved on case by case basis
- What are the instances of people owning more than 12 animals? What is the reasoning for having a restricting bylaw?
- I support fining the behaviours/issues, number of animals is at best an imperfect proxy for problems.
- I think the limit of animals should be less than 12.
- 6 dogs and / or cats is far too many for a residential property in the city limits, the only exception should be for licenced breeders
- 12 animals in a house in Calgary?!? This must be a mansion of a house or else this is not fair to the animals. I think it should be based on the square footage of your home, which would be way too much work. So people don't need more than a total of 5 pets all together (cats or dogs) unless they fall under the "potential Exceptions to the rules."
- If the owner can properly care for the animal (monetary and otherwise) they should be allowed to. Re. Q10
- Sounds like "Red Laws", ie report your neighbor that you don't like laws.



- I think 4 cats and 4 dogs would be a more reasonable number.
- This is more nanny-state garbage.
- It is a health concern, noise concern, and personal safety for children. People cannot responsibly care for 12 animals.
- There should be no limit on private ownership of animals, so long as they are responsibly kept. We already have bylaws for this. Stop infringing on peoples rights because you are lazy
- 6 animals is too much, maybe 3 or 4
- Again, law abiding citizens are most likely following these guidelines. Is there really a problem in Calgary with people owning excessive numbers of animals? In these rare cases, do the owners actually register all their animals? Probably not.
- I support some points of this bylaw change. There are definitely some great pet owners but there are also some lousy ones. The pet limit of 6 dogs AND 6 cats is rather high, BUT, I feel it should be case by case. Each animal MUST be licensed and NOT a nuisance. This is a harder answer to put in print as opposed to a verbal answer.
- Other reasons
- This current bylaw is fine. No need to change. The proposed change is also blunt discrimination against certain breeds.
- So what if someone doesn't want cats, does that mean they can have 12 dogs? Cause why does someone that only likes cats or dogs not both be limited to 6 pets while other people can have 12? I don't know who the hell even needs 6 pets, let alone 12, but you get what I am saying. What about the real crazy pet people that have birds and other animals too? So they can have 6 dogs, 6 cats and who knows how many birds and rodents in their house but someone who only likes dogs are capped at 6.... ? Back to the drawing board
- I do not think up to 12 domestic animals is an appropriate amount. Given the size of most Calgary yards, I think 6 animals total, any combination is sufficient given the attention and care each animal requires.
- This is a city not an urban area. We live here to be with people not animals
- Too many, that's 12 pets
- I need more information. There should be a ban and fine against those who harm animals or hoard animals but ppl like licensed breeders or responsible owners shouldn't have limit.
- Because I dont
- I do not believe one can financially care for that many animals.
- Need an exemption for qualified rescues
- If there are special circumstances/exceptions they can apply for those, but realistically there is no need for more than 3 dogs and 3 cats in a household at one time.
- A person who is keeping animals responsibly should not be limited by numbers. This would make things difficult for reputable breeders as they often have more animals than 6, but maintain them appropriately. More information on a "dog fancier's licence" would need to be provided to change my answer.
- 12 animals per household is a high limit and expensive



- no more than 2
- I think people who wants to own more than 2 cats and 2 dogs they are breeders who want to make more money . They will not concern about the animals ' welfare and they will not care about the noise they will create to their neighbors.
- Numbers are not the issue, the level of responsibility of the owner is where the problem lies. I've lived next to responsible owners who have had well above the proposed limit, and they were never a problem. There were never any behaviour, noise or odor issues. I've also lived near dogs who never shut up. In once instance it was a single dog household and the dog barked almost constantly and the owner showed little to no concern or care for their neighbours and seemed somewhat disinterested/oblivious with regard to the dog and its barking. In the other instance, the owner left the 2 dogs out all the time - even while away at work all day, and the dogs barked constantly.
- The care of the animals should be the main concern rather than the number. I've seen people who take better care of 6 pets than another person takes care of 1.
- I believe people can buy however many pets they want. It is not their fault that dogs and cats express themselves by barking or meowing and they cannot stop them.
- People should be able to have as many pets as they want. There are already fines available if pets become a nuisance
- If the pets owner is responsible and have a good economy, then there should be no limit to the number of pets.
- 3 cats and 3 dogs is a lot and we should protect the wellness of the animals
- One dog could be a complete nuisance and 7 dogs could be very good. Property sizes are also very different. Having 6 pets in a small apartment is unfair to an animal but having 10 dogs on even a small acreage is plausible. It really depends and a better rule would be responding to disturbances and if over a certain number (ie. 6) then some form of action could be taken.
- Only for rescue and foster.
- Feces noise and welfare
- There should be a limit on fosters and breeding, that I would reduce, however 6 dogs/cats to a household works for larger homes and is still maintainable for the above listed reasons of keeping. Additionally - there should be fines given to those who invoke an attack or aggressive behaviour. The problem does not always limit to the animal - we've had personal experience asking people to not touch our animals and have been ignored, dismissed or given the excuse that animals love them. We've also had animals that have been teased and cornered. Anyone doing this to an animal should receive a large fine.
- You're goal should be to educate people on why they should be self limiting themselves. People use pets for compaionship and staples for their life. Some houses and families can care for and have the space for more pets, that should be the limiting factor. I understand the desire to limit others for them looks good on paper however suggestions like this simply leave less to desire in your city. Rules such as this simply label our city as a scared quick to label control freak. I would not move to and would rather move away then live in a city with no direction but to piss away their time with discrimination against breads and the illusion people will respect a pet limitation on just cats of dogs.



Please utilize your time more effectively, like perhaps developing some systems to help educate new owners and low income families so their dogs don't randomly attack (but what do I know I just live here)

- because of the pit bull part
- 6 is a very big responsibility and people might not have adequate space or more to provide for that amount of animals
- Six Dogs and Six Cats seems way too much. Four pets is the most I would be comfortable with.
- I don't think there needs to be a rule around this. Increasing dog and cat license fees should deter most people from having many dogs and cats in their homes.
- Bites from animals are the cause of the owner. Not animals are the same and not animals should be treated the same. Keeping livestock on private property is also wrong because of the cleanliness.
- 6 dogs seems excessive to have in one house. Unless they were living on an acreage I cannot see how 6 dogs will be able to remain quiet and the owners deal with the amount of feces on the property.
- If families join together in one household who have more than 3 animals each this would not be right to have to give up any of their pets
- I think people should have less than 6 of each animal as I have witnessed first hand how terrible life can be for the animals when there's that many in one household-maybe reduce for 3 or 4 of each unless on a farm/acreage or fostering or inheriting.
- IT'S NONE OF YOUR BUSINESS WHAT PEOPLE DO IN THEIR OWN HOMES. I'M REALLY HAPPY TO SEE MY TAX DOLLARS BEING WASTED YET AGAIN. WHAT MAKES YOU SO SPECIAL AS TO DECIDE WHAT BREEDS ARE OKAY AND WHAT AREN'T?
- rescues need exemptions
- This will not matter to the ones that chose to keep more.. no point
- Limit the number to three animals unless they are a licenced breeders
- Two of each is enough unless you live on an acreage
- I feel that 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive for anyone. 6 animals total I feel is more than enough while keeping in mind a typical persons capacity to care for and train the animals properly.
- People should have the right to choose how many pets they have, freedom
- A lot of people already have to many animals, and because they have so many animals they get Licenced because the owners can't afford it.
- Freedom. Stop stepping into our lives. You're the municipal government, act like it.
- It is up to trained professionals to assess whether or not the conditions are suitable for the animals. By law officers are not qualified
- Six animals is excessive for one household to have. Realistically, the animals are not receiving the care they are entitled to: time, training, cleanup etc. Who could possibly afford and care for six dogs and their needs
- Current bylaw adequate
- You don't state what the previous limits are, if no limits then use the other rules to govern if there is a problem, if lower than this proposal then use the proposed amounts



- 12 cats and dogs is too many for a single dwelling. An exception could be temporary or grandfather clause.
- Sounds like hoarding
- Its not up to you to tell people how to live!!! They can have as many of whatever they want!! If a problem shows up....deal with it then!! You shouldnt charge anyone anything for pet licence either BTW, if thats something you want....YOU pay for it.
- That means a potential of 12 animals in one household all of which could conceivably require new homes in short order should a crises arise in the home. Potential for excessive noise, odor and damage to the property is greatly increased making the home an eyesore and source of irritation to the neighborhood.
- Two per household is sufficient. Six is excessive!
- Should be limited to 2 so there is adequate supervision for others and dog care.
- There are many people within Calgary that take on animals that have been mistreated/ are without a home and I would not want to discourage this work.
- 6 of each is excessive. Unless an adult is at home 24/7 those animals are not properly cared for. I would half the amount of pets allowed per residential property
- 6 cats and 6 dogs can not be properly taken care of and loved the way they need to be, no matter who you are.
- No
- 6 animals total. Not six of each.
- A blanket bylaw is not required, rather cases should be evaluated on a case by case basis if complaints arise
- I think this requires more thought, what is the size of home. A farm is large, an apartment is small, etc. Further review is required in this area, it is not one-size fits all. Also what about rescues, I note they are not listed. Fosters are not listed. There may be the odd time where puppies or kittens are present that number is going over 6. Again, more thought is needed on this topic. You can define this better.
- I think the size of house/property needs to be a factor as well.
- Because it's not for the government to dictate how many animals I can have as long as they are taken care of
- The exception would be hoarding.
- all dogs and cats must be spay/neutered unless they are holder of a breeding permit
- There should be no limit. Calgary has great dog bylaws already, and I fear they will become as bad as other cities have become. What a terrible year. If animals are well cared for, not excessively crated, yard cleaned up, vet and grooming care, then there shouldn't be a limit.
- That is still too many animals. I think a total of six animals, dogs, cats or livestock type birds is more than reasonable.
- It is not healthy for a person to own six dogs and cats. Imagine the noise, feces, ripped up yards, noise. It sounds like hoards



- No one requires more than 2 pets period. If you are a licensed breeder and have paid the additional fees to hold this designation then an allowance for the additional animals for a period of 6 months is provided. Any of the animals not sold during this time the breeder will be assessed a fine for each month over the 6 month limit. Euthanization is not an option. For a regular property owner, two pets maximum.
- Should be a limit of three, people will not properly care for 6
- 6 + 6 is extremely high for anyone not requiring a special permit. Most household families can adequately care for only 2-4 animals at a time. Anything more would compromise the well-being of the animal and make it almost impossible to meet other bylaws related to noise.
- The pet limit should be a lot less than 12 animals per household is way too much. You can not take care of that many animals per household. Noise and feces are also a problem.
- That's stupid
- There should be no limit as long as licensing is enforced.
- I might support this change if more information was provided regarding the ability to access the Exceptions. None of these proposed restrictions will stop the hoarders and real problem households.
- 6 is too many
- Why would there be a limit on pets unless something previous has happened to deter
- As long as people are responsible why limit them.
- This is still too many pets for in the city. The number should be lower (3-4)
- Special application for more than 2 dogs/cats. To ensure accurate residential space for care, etc. Avoid hoarding risks.
- You dont limit how many kids bad parents can have. My two dogs are more behaved then some of the neighbourhood kids. So this rule is garbage.
- People foster more than this, I know multiple people who have more than 6 currently. If they're not an issue, why make it one?? You guys are stupid
- People should be required to maintain their property and be aware of noise. This is not going to change how loud 1 dog is compared to 6
- You cannot tell someone that they don't have the right to own and take care of multiple animals
- It could penalize people who have several animals they care for well (people moving to Calgary wouldn't be grandfathered in, I assume). Also, what if someone has 7 cats and 5 dogs? Still 12 animals, so is that allowed? Why does it have to be 6 and 6?
- owners of purebred show animals and competition animals often have far more animals than 6 of one species. There should be an option for a permit for more animals of one species. There are MANY many many purebred breeders in Calgary that this 6 animal per species limmit would negatively effect.
- Unless I read it wrong. I think 6 is way too many pets in one home. Max of 2 is good.
- No person needs to have that many animals in a residential property.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats, unless you have hired help, or lots of help in general, a massive home, and lots of space, is unrealistic. All you are doing is encouraging hoarding and poor animal ownership. People should know their limits on how many animals they can reasonably have.



- The city people don't need to own more than 3 animals
- six dogs and six cats is too excessive per house hold. Max should be 1 dog and 1 cat...or 2 dogs and cats...total max of two pets per household
- Stop controlling people's lives
- A responsible owner should have the right to determine how many cats and dogs he or she is able to responsibly care for.
- 12 is too many. Thus I'd not dogpatch. .
- Maybe focus on enforcement. Not all multi family pet homes are bad. Take care of the burdensome ones. This would prevent responsible breeding, adoption hosts, etc
- Limit is fine as is
- If, there are no other issues or concerns why limit the number. Deal with the problems.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is way too many to have in a household, unless they are on a farm or lots of land for the animals to move around
- Limit the people in houses then too
- As long as pets are licensed and kept in good living environments there should be no maximum number of pets a household is allowed
- If they're picking up their waste and keeping their animals quite. It's non of my business
- I don't think you should try to put a limit on how many pets somebody should own as long as they can support them and give them everything they need I don't see an issue with it
- Unless the person is trained in animal behavior most people have trouble with one dog. All dogs and owners must have to pass a test like the CKC Good Neighbor test within two years of ownership at their cost.
- 6 of each animal is way too much. Often people get these animals and dont consider cost of care. If 1 cat gets fleas you are now paying to treat 6. Problems like this happen often. I think it should be 3 and 3.
- 6 dogs per household in the city is too many
- 12 animals in a family home is excessive
- Our neighbor's on one side owned 10 dogs of 4 breeds (all were licensed), not one issue with smell, noise or activity. The neighbor two doors down the other direction owned just two dogs, however never gave them the attention, care or time they needed and those two were neighborhood problems. If the owners give proper care the dogs are no issue.
- If they are being taken care of then there's no need for a limit.
- As long as animal owners (caregivers) are responsible, there should not be limits on the number allowed per household.
- Like children, people should have the right to choose how many pets they want. They would need to follow the responsible owners bylaws but households should not be limited.
- 3 dogs/3 cats
- It would take an incredibly special circumstance for the average pet owner to be able to give 12 pets the needed attention they would require. That's excessive except in special circumstances.



- That is way too many pets for a single owner to treat them all well. Can 6 dogs actually be walked for the amount they truly require every day? I doubt it.
- How many circumstances does this really happen in in order for it to be a bylaw? If someone has more than 12 animals, either they know what they are doing or they probably require some other sorts of help/services
- No exceptions
- Please keep the limit to the number of pets to no more than 2 cats and/or dogs
- If the animals are cared for, then no limit.
- The number should be based on the welfare of the animals.
- I see no reason to restrict numbers as long as noise clean up etc. Is being observed.
- 2 is already too much. More just means more I re trouble and more mess.
- Animal shelters should be exempt from the limit as well. Also 6 of each is far too many. That means a single family home could be responsible for as many as 12 animals at a given time. It should be 6 animals period (not including caged animals)
- 12 of anything is far to many. If the average household contains 2.5 children then 2 is more than enough. As is right now there are too many animals with too many owners who are not good at taking care of their pets. A household should not be a replacement of a zoo! Your statement above says 12 in total between cats and dogs. How about more than 2 requires you to have an income of X and prove that you have not claimed EI in X number of years. Most people who have numerous pets cannot afford them and end up claiming assistance, or they allow these pets to have offspring who are then abandoned or left at adoption shelters... unless it is medically necessary this has to be controlled somehow. Even when fines are enforced they are not necessarily paid as the owners cannot afford to pay the fine. This proposal is crazy! You are permitting the increase in population of cats/dogs when our shelters are already full!
- As a breeder I am very responsible and due my due diligence in keeping things clean and try to avoid excessive noise My dogs get better care then some children in this world
- I do not believe a bylaw would deter a person from having more than 6 cats or dogs, it's a cash grab. Fines for not cleaning up a property is a better idea.
- I know many trainers within the Calgary city limits who have more dogs and no issue. My suggestion is that over 6 dogs be assessed on a case by case basis.
- I think 6 is too high of a number. 3 seems more reasonable to me for someone within City limits.
- NA
- If someone is a responsible pet owner if they want and can care for more animals we should not restrict that. Someone who is not a responsible pet owner may not provide adequate care for 1 dog.
- If these pets are on private property and the area is kept quiet and clean then why should the law be involved ? How much intrusion should a free country push onto any homeowner
- How many pets a person may have is their business, it is only an issue WHEN THEY DON'T TAKE CARE OF THEM.
- Six is unnecessarily too many! Two must be a maximum per household!



- I feel like that is an excessive number of animals and could be detrimental to the animals health and well being.
- It is just another excessive restriction
- 6 of both is way too many, again houses are getting closer together and you need to consider the neighbours of people who go ahead and get 6 dogs! Would you want to live next door to that? A limit of 2 seems reasonable in order to maintain a clean yard and care for them properly.
- It should be about responsible pet ownership and that has nothing to do with the number of pets
- 6 cats and 6 dogs per household seems to be an excessive amount of animals. That number potentially would require a significant space. I would think a total of 6 combined would be a better number
- I would like to see the number of allowed animals to be lower. No more than 4 animals per household, but that could be made up in any method. 4 dogs or 4 cats, 1 dog and 3 cats for example
- I think 4 should be the limit. Care is not just defined by space, I don't think 1 person can appropriately show the love and attention required to 6 dogs. The caveat to this one, would be temporary homes, a home with partial, yet trained love is better than a shelter.
- should be reduced to 2 dogs and 2 cats
- I think it should go by property size. As I don't think you should have 5 large dogs in a 1000 square foot apartment.
- I believe these changes should be in place but I don't agree with the restricted number (6 or any number) as I have had eight dogs at once and they were well cared for and quality citizens. I also have worked with a number of people how work closely with many animals and they are cared for. Putting a limit only makes people hide or not license their animals. It's cracking down on those who are not caring for their animals wether it be one or 20 who need to be penalized or limited.
- a smaller number.
- Unless there are specific issues with the animals and they are under control, there should not be a limit.
- what there is a family of 8 or more in a home and each of them have pet? what if your pet has a small litter and you would like to keep her babies? I believe as long as you have the space and time for each pet there should be no restrictions.....I would support something like x number of pets per person. I've seen a woman with 8 dogs that she can't care for and they are all cramped in a car when travelling. I believe that's wrong.
- There should be no more than two cats and two dogs per household.
- Putting a limit of allowable pets is the same as putting a limit on allowable children. The concerns of someone having too many pets (mess, noise, well-being) would be the same concerns of somebody with too many children. Child Services are called IF there is an issue, but there are no laws (to my knowledge) limiting the amount of children people may have. Pets should be treated the same.
- Who are you to decide whether someone has the means or space to accommodate more animals.
- 6 per kind and 12 total is too many pets and can lead to dangerous conditions for animals within the city like hoarding. Farms are ok.



- I believe that it is far beyond normal expectation for an individual household to support more than two of the stated animals without creating additional pressures on the neighbor properties with regard to noise, smell etc. How do owners expect to take proper care in exercise and everything else other than a few select owners. Also this is another way to control pet hoarders who unknowingly create hardship to the animals in their care. How many service animals does a person require? The rest is just excess - if you want to run a kennel/breeding operation move out to a rural area. Voila!
- No home should have that many animals in it. I think 4 animals total would be reasonable except under the exceptions 1-5 above (not Dog Fanciers or Service Animals)
- .
- 3 animals per house TOTAL should be the maximum. The exceptions listed make sense and are good.
- As long as the house and property are maintained I don't see an issue with the current limit
- I think we are able to make our own call on what we can handle.
- Seems like it is too many animals to properly take care of them.
- I think all animal fees should be free if you have under 2 animals.
- There should be max 2 cats and / or 2 dogs at the most.
- 4 animals are enough, any more are difficult to keep sanitary and contained
- How can someone possibly manage taking care of 6 cats and or 6 dogs? That's not fair to the animals or the surrounding community who will likely be dealing with the nuisance when the owner can't take care of the animals properly.
- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive and basically animal hoarding.
- Most families likely could not afford appropriate veterinary care for 6 dogs and 6 cats - veterinary standards and costs are steadily rising. As an example, untreated dental disease in companion animals was typically ignored historically, but is now considered a humane issue - it is unlikely that most households with 12 pets could afford even just basic dental care for all of them.
- Hard to say how many 1 home can handle. Maybe this should be based more on land/home size vs steadfast hard number. Too many grey areas. Puppy mills and homes unfit for human or animals to reside in should have higher fines and such. Jail Time
- Don't agree
- Should depend on the size of property. If its a farm with the room and they are taking in rescues, why limit them?
- .
- No one needs 6 dogs and 6 cats in one household
- 6 cats & 6 dogs is way too many. A max of 2 of each will make sure they are properly cared for and a hoarding situation wont occur.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive, under any circumstance. I agree with a special application...but a limit of 3 animals should be imposed (in the interest of animal welfare).
- It is not the city of Calgary's place to tell people what animals they should or should not have, nor dictate the number of them. Your role should solely be enforcement and education.



- Number of animals does not determine their welfare standards or potential level of disturbance to neighbours
- 12 animals is too many
- While I like this proposed change, I would suggest that a restriction be placed based on the square footage of the property. For instance, if a house is on an average, 6 dogs would be reasonable, compared to 6 dogs in a townhouse with no yard. Similarly, there is a difference between owning 6 cats in a 1800sq ft house vs a one bedroom apartment.
- The maximum should be two dogs, three cats.
- Keeping this many animals in a household could impact their welfare poorly
- 6 is too many. Limit 2
- I agree in principle in this but I find it so arbitrary. If someone is a good animal owner, leave them be. If they aren't, let's deal with that specifically.
- Let's put limits on the number of children a household can have (for the same reasons of noise, protection of children, and accumulation of junk on a property).
- Provided all animals are well cared for and behaved, I don't think there should be any restrictions.
- 4 max cat or dog combined (2 cats or 2 dogs)
- There are other ways to address the issues mentioned.
- The limit needs to be lower - maximum two of any combination of dogs and cats.
- If a household can prove that their animals are well cared for and healthy, there shouldn't be a limit.
- It's irresponsible to own more dogs than for in my opinion. It becomes increasingly difficult to manage their behaviour and properly trained them and give them the attention that they require
- No one needs 6 cats and 6 dogs in one household. Limit to 3 dogs and 3 cats
- The amount of animals is fine but I don't support having to pay a license to own an animal
- Not necessary
- I dont think people should be allowed to have that many animals, they need lots os attentiom and raising the limit would mean decrease in care and well fare of the animals.
- 6 animals in an urban setting is intrusive to neighbours who otherwise have nearly no recourse when disputes arise. In my experience pet bylaws are not enforced enough to discourage poor behaviour or resolve problems.
- i should be allowed to have as many pets as i like, asling as they are being taken care of properly
- Who cares as long as they have the space to live happily
- This By-law for pitbull did ridiculous.
- I agree with all potential exceptions but I believe the pet limit is still too high for regular owners, I believe a max of four (4) dogs AND four (4) cats is more reasonable.
- A household should not be limited providing they are responsible owners that take care of the animals properly!
- Welfare of animals would be degraded with 6 dogs and cats. I think this should be lowered to 6 licenced animals total in the household
- If the person can control 6 dogs and 6 cats why put in a limit?



- 3 dogs and 3 cats per household is more than enough to ensure the welfare of the animals is protected
- 2 per household. 6 is ridiculous.
- as long as everyone is taken care of it shouldn't matter how many animals you have
- If someone has the space and financial resources to care for excess animals, then that is their business. As long as they do so properly and without disturbing those around them, who are we to restrict them.
- this is ridiculous. let people get what they want.
- I think that is an excessive amount of pets for one household and could lead to neglect or too much pack mentality amongst pets.
- While I do think that there are special cases where people are loving and giving and generous and amazing and have the best intentions when it comes to having that many animals, I feel as though there's more structure needed to this by law amendment as I would be worried that there are animals being neglected and I would be worried for the safety of some. I am pro people being able to adopt six dogs and cats but I think there should be some sort of special license given out to prove these are good and capable caregivers.
- Other than breeders and foster homes, nobody needs to have 6 pets
- Potential for over a dozen animals in a single home seems untenable
- 2 is a low number, two dogs and a cat would be a normal household count in my opinion.
- Two pets per household is plenty in the city. If you want more move to an average.
- It is not for the city to decide how many animals a person should have, the city should only be involved in the case of neglect, hoarding, or nuisance.
- Should be limited to 2 pets. Not necessary to have 6 pets.
- Limits should remain the same.
- This is unnecessary given that laws/bylaws already exist to mitigate the negative effects of too many animals. It also appears to give permission to have 12 animals in one house, which is also excessive.
- 6 dogs or cats is unreasonable. The noise and feces would be an issue. 2 pets per house in the city is enough.
- Make it fair to all animals
- Some dog breeds are known to have large litters therefore making it a possibility of the owner having more than 6 dogs of over 6-months of age until all puppies have found new homes. What is the breeder to do in this case? Kill the extra puppies? Penalizing these owners by making them pay for an extra permit is not an answer. If the dogs/cats are well-cared for, there should be no reason for artificial limitation placed in numbers.
- Because it will never end here. Soon it will be a one dog max
- Let me have as many pets as they want. This is a bloody shake down.
- I don't think it's enough of an issue to force everyone to comply... only if it would help with animal hoarders, but they are not likely to abide by the law anyway.
- There are people with 1 animal that are terrible owners!



- City cash grab
- Only in cases or animal welfare concerns should a limit of ownership be applied
- I would agree to no more than 3 pets. 6 pets could be unmanageable and too noisy.
- 6 of each is too many. We are not talking about farms or acreages here. Limit should be 3 of each.
- too many
- I think 3 would be a better number
- I'm not supporting any new changes
- I think 6 dogs in an urban setting is excessive. As housing gets closer and closer, noise and disturbances to neighbours is increasing. We have problems now with one or two dogs. If it was increased would there be more By Law individuals hired to react to complaints as now there are not enough.
- Too much bureaucracy...
- People should have the right to make reasonable decisions
- It shouldn't be a limit, each person should be responsible for their own choices, unless those choices affect others then action might be enforced
- N a
- This is too many animals to be located on a city property. Noise and accumulation of feces is a nuisance to neighbors and an unreasonable use of a private property.
- That is an excess of animals and has the potential to increase animal hoarders or unsafe situations for animals.
- That number is too big I would say no more than 3 or 4 for both dogs and cats
- Too many animals under one roof, currently enforcement of clean up is problematic at best.
- We are adults enough to figure this out
- We are adults enough to know what our limit is; if we don't that's what the job of the city is to do is intervene.
- There would be a lack of attention that each animal needs which can cause animals to act out and then you have a whole separate issue on your hands.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many for in the city! Try a lower number
- I think we are able to make our own call on what we can handle.
- I think that for the average person 6 dogs would be too much I think that 3 would be a good amount maybe 4 for a 2 or more adult household and or larger family.
- People who would have a very large number of pets have a disorder and would keep the animals anyway. We need to be realistic about what is enforceable. Blanket statements are not useful or realistic
- 12 Adult pets in one house is not fair to the well-being of each pet
- The number of pets allowed should be reduced further
- This is a free country. As long as the animals are well taken care of and the owner is a responsible owner, I don't believe in limiting the number of family members a family can have.



- Each situation is different, i think it appropriate to have an officer make a judgement call if the conditions arent sufficient for the amount of animals.
- Should be 6 pets total. 12 pets is absurd.
- worry about more important things
- The people who consider a limit necessary are not the same people who are on the ground trying to ensure quality of life to all animals. I am currently in the midst of a home renovation that took in to consideration having 100% vinyl flooring for animals. My goal is to start taking in senior dogs. Having 10 low key senior dogs that get to spend their last days in a home well loved is the goal. Responsible ownership is the key. If I have dogs that are barking, that's a problem that needs to be addressed but the focus should be on **FIXING PROBLEMS WITH BAD OWNERS** regardless of animals. Bad dogs don't exist. Have any of you lived on a farm? Have you seen how scary a mad hen can be? I can assure you that if you get picked by one of those things on the back of the leg, you're gonna know it. I don't want to be hearing about methods to deal with bad hens. I want to hear about what we do to bad owners of hens.
- Too high. I would support no more than 3 with the exceptions above.
- Sometimes its bad pet owners? Tough guys want tough looking pups. I own a 4 yro pit he is too kind even to strangers
- 6+6 is too many! lower threshold required
- Owning 6 cats and 6 dogs is way to excessive. If you have that many animals than chances are you are not taking care of them properly, and they probably don't have enough adequate space inside the home.
- 6 seems too high
- That seems like a lot of animals in one house. A condo verses a house, would you still be allowed the same in each?
- Urban dwellings are rarely large enough to allow for the comfort and cleanliness required for 6 indoor animals, let alone 12! Max of 3 cats and 3 dogs seems more than reasonable with the option for exemptions listed above
- There should be no limits
- 6 of any type if animal in a home is far to many to, dogs being in tight quarters will be more prone to dog fights which in turn may end up hurting a person without knowing
- It is not necessary at any time to have that many animals in one household.
- I'm still a strong believer that if all animals are properly cared for the number shouldn't matter. One or two animals can be neglected and create the same problems if not cared for. It is **NOT** about the number of animals it is about how they are cared for and managed.
- 6 dogs **AND** 6 cats is an unnecessarily high number. I think 6 cats **OR** dogs total is still high but more reasonable.
- Let people own as many pets as they want.
- I do not feel it necessary to have anything close to 6 cats or 6 dogs. The number of people who have one pet and cannot afford to properly care for their vet bills is already high, let alone being able to afford proper care for up to 12 animals.



- We've all seen what happens when too many dogs and cats are kept. Who needs six dogs!? I work with dogs every day, i have two myself. Thats enough. I cNnot under any circumstances imagine why anyone would need more. As a dog lover, i say definitely not.
- if you own your house or even rent, unless your landlord states you cant have them then that should be your decision..
- People should be allowed to have multiple pets if they are being cared for and aren't being a disturbance to neighbours
- Feel it is pointed at only one or 2 breeds unfairly
- City needs to stop telling people how to live their life. If someone wants 8 dogs and can afford to license them and take care of them then that is up to them. We live in a free country lets keep it that way.
- 12 animals in a city lot are too many in my opinion
- 6 cats or dogs in an apartment would be too many. I think case by case review would need to be necessary for me to agree to the proposed bylaw change.
- You can't limit well trained animals, I have 12 just dogs myself all husky's, they are my mushing team. With good behaviour a strong routine these nuisances would not be a thing.
- As long as these animals are being treated well it's none of your business
- It should depend on the size of the house/property
- people should be allowed the freedom to own as many or as few animals as they would like. If someone gets out of hand they will get reported and then they can be dealt with. There is no need for limits from the government.
- six is to many pets in one house. this is not fair to the pets or the neighbors, I believe that a total of three pets is more than enough.
- As long as a person is able to care for the amount of animals they have there shouldn't be a limit on number of pets
- Impacts rescues
- Government interference in how private citizens govern their affairs. More rules do not make a better society. Thin edge of the wedge....only way for the limits to go is down.
- Fines for lack of care would be more effective in reducing the number of pets citizens are keeping.
- if you can financially take care of more animals it is acceptable.
- It's fine how it is.
- If someone can properly take car of more than 6 animals, they should be allowed to
- I think it should stay to 6 total- a city property is not large enough for more than this.
- Everyone should be able to have As many in their household as long as they are not bothering anyone
- 6 of each is too many
- Animals make people happy.
- I support the maximum number of species per household mentioned above and the need for dogs to be licensed but do not understand why cats that are not allowed outdoors would require the same



type of license. Could they be registered and owners pay a lesser fee instead? This would still allow the city to see the number of animals living in each home.

- Let me have as many pets as I want. Yes if there is a welfare concern take the animals away from the people harming them, but there are MANY people with several pets who all get treated like family
- Number of animals in a household does not matter. The only thing that should matter is cleaning up after the animals and ensure good quality of living for said animals.
- 6 dogs in home is way to many
- There are very few owners and properties that appropriately house, exercise and treat their animals well according to the space living in an urban setting if you have an excess of animals. 6 is ridiculous.
- somebody always finds a way to manipulate a law in their favor.
- Keep them limited
- In many cases, this would result in the unnecessary rehoming of existing animals, causing trauma for the animal and owner, and potentially putting the animal in a worse situation. This should be assessed on a case by case basis as concerns arise.
- The number of pets isn't a problem as long as they are following regulations and not causing problems for neighbors. Similar to that we currently don't restrict the number of kids a household can have.
- If looked after properly, no limit needed
- If they comply with all the existing rules I see no reason for a specific limit.
- There should be no limit. Each scenario is situational.
- 12 potential animals seems excessive for a regular household. How about 6 animals in total; any combo of cats and dogs with those 6
- It should depend on the property size and the amount of care provided to the animals
- It's great how it is.
- too many
- I guess if someone has more than 6 and they can afford them, they have space, and the pets are cared for it doesn't matter how many they have
- In order to answer yes, I would need to know just what are "special circumstances", it needs some definition.
- That's too many animals for someone not fostering or in rescue.
- How did you arrive at six? What if the property is quite large or the animals are quite small? It seems completely arbitrary.
- That's too many animals per household
- If the people can afford the animals, and clean up after them and train them properly it shouldn't be an issue.
- As long as all animals are cared for let people have as many as they want.
- I think 4 should be the maximum animals



- No
- if the house is big enough to care for them then there is no need make this a law
- all pets need to be licensed and kept in good health or severe fine/jail.
- I feel 2 cats and 2 dogs is enough in a city home
- Nobody should need that many animals in one house
- NO
- Why license an indoor pet? That is a ridiculous money grab.
- That is still too many. No one needs up to 12 animals in one residence. 3 max is enough to take care of properly.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats! That's too many! 6 animal units is enough. A dog or cat with a litter should count as one unit until the puppies or kittens are 4 months old.
- Provided the animals are cared for properly and follow all guidelines there should be no limit on how many cats or dogs a person has.
- This would depend on the space available for the pets, the larger the property the more pet that can be able to safely inhabit the area.
- no
- It is the right to an individual to decide how ever many animals they can appropriately take care of.
- Some people have 12 well heaved/ care for animals and some people only have 2 nor behaved / poorly cared for animals so numbers do not matter
- Does this include people living in larger properties? Acreages?
- I think limits on pets also depend on the type of dwelling (.I.e condo vs detached home as well as square ft of the property) not just an arbitrary number
- Unless you have the right amount of space for excercise then it should be based on household size. An acreage can have more dogs then an single apartment.
- I love animals, but that many (upto 12) in a residence in city limits is not good for any animal. On an acreage or farm is a different situation
- There should definitely be a restriction to the number of animal someone can have in their home. This is in the best interest of the animal, the neighbors and to ensure people aren't hoarding pets.
- If the animals are well taken care of and the home clean, it seems excessive to not allow someone animals.
- As long as the animals are being treated well, and a healthy environment, if someone wants 30 cats and dogs. Who are we to say no.
- 6 of each is too high.
- A household should not have more than 2 animals
- It's evident that some people can't even take care of 1 never mind 6 and some people are to lazy to keep their yards clean. And with all the wondering cats there will be even more cat crap in the front of my house . That .. I... Have to clean
- I have concerns that 12 animals cannot be properly taken care of. I would support 7 animals total.



- One pet is too many when owned by an irresponsible owner. Responsible pet owners should not be limited. More severe punishments for owners of neglected and abused animals. Penalize the irresponsible pet owners, not the rest of us.
- There is no need other than if they are working dogs (sled dogs) to have more than max three per house. Same with cats, no more than 3
- it is not necessary for anyone to own more than 2 cats and/or dogs. Our neighbors own 3 dogs and their backyard is covered with feces, there is smell, and they don't care about that. Imagine them having 12 animals... I would support an exception for breeders/pet sitters/daycares though.
- Six is too many.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is WAY too many animals under one roof
- 6 cats and dogs is too many for most areas in Calgary. yards are too small and neighbors are too close.
- Temporary would be the only one I support for this.
- If a person can maintain and keep the animals well cared for, there is no need. If they cannot, they should be fined.
- People should be allowed to own however many pets they want
- I mostly agree but if the animals are in good health condition and are being looked after correctly there shouldn't have to be a limit
- 6 dogs and 6 cats/household is TOO Many..potential exceptions seem reasonable.
- People assisting with pet rescue should be exempt
- 6 dogs.
- No - should not be more than 3 cats / 3 dogs.
- Current bylaw is not commented but I assume it is lower than 6. I do not think 6 animals are needed as pets. Exceptions would include breeders with pups which should be under different licensing.
- Not clarified enough. One household could include but not be exclusive to an acreage within the city limits compared to a single bedroom apartment, size and type of animal vs quantity. 6 Chihuahua vs 6 Burmese is a significant difference
- Limiting the number of animals will only increase the number of dogs surrendered and increase the number of dogs needing adopting
- Too many animals to care for. No reason for that many in the city limits.
- Only for cats their numbers should be limited by the size of the residence. Six cats in a very large house is not the same as a small apartment.
- As long as it's a big enough space for the animals have what you want
- I don't need to explain anything! This is bs as well.
- 6 dogs or cats is somewhat excessive when living in the city. Most property sizes do not allow for the proper space needed for them. I do support the exceptions listed, except for the "dog fanciers permit" and the "excess animal permit".
- If they're well taken care of, they shouldn't be restricted
- It doesn't go far enough - I would limit to 4 of each and remove several of the exceptions as people may exploit them.



- You don't specify how many dogs are currently allowed in the bylaw, therefore I won't vote to change it.
- reduction to three
- I believe that is too many animals in one house hold and that it would be difficult to care for that many animals in a normal single family home.
- Not if POTENTIAL is not removed from exception. All listed would be required
- Excessive waste of time and resources to go check up on animals
- Restrictions such as these could lead to an increase in numbers of a) euthanized animals in shelters per year b) an increased number of animals in shelters c) a decrease in the number of adoptions from shelters.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats seems like an unreasonable number of pets. I would support a 6 total and allow the same rules as above. This wouldn't stop anyone from having those pets just having to apply for an overage license
- More than three dogs in a small house is unfair for the animals. If the backyard/living space is not acceptable, a household should be limited to 2 dogs.
- There are many people living in roommate situations, oftentimes each person will have at least one pet. Other situations would include having a senior animal with a younger and getting another animal to help cope with the eventual loss. As long as animals are well taken care of, with regular walks, good food and veterinary care I don't think there should be a limit. I do think it should depend on the size of the household. If you live in a small home and have 3+ dogs obviously that may not be the best decision
- I could easily care for up to 4-5 dogs or 4-5+ cats with ease as a single person, this is all dependent on how responsible the owner is.
- instead of having a set number, create a number per square feet of space. The number of pets allowed in a 1,000sq ft home vs a 2,000 sq ft home should be different
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is completely unreasonable within city limits, move to a farm if you want that many animals. I think max capacity would be reasonable at A total number of 4
- What animals people own in their homes is their own business.
- I believe the household limit should be 4 animals total.
- People can have what they want as long as they can afford them and treat them per current standards.
- Rental housing allowing pets may exceed the listed amount
- I think a household in the city, most with limited space should not consist of more than 6 feline and/or canine pets in total. If you allow 6 dogs and 6 cats, that's 12 animals. In my opinion that's too many for most to be able to care for properly.
- I think the max should be 4 dogs and 4 cats. 6each is too much!
- People should be allowed to have as many pets as they like, and pay fines that they don't take care of.
- This restriction is overbroad. There should be distinctions based on the available space, such as square footage of living space or outdoor space.



- people in the city should not have more than 2 dogs or cats (3 if fostering or one is near end of life). Even rural AB has these limits and bylaws.
- Animals are a choice, and it's nobodies business if the animals aren't causing trouble
- Should have that many animals to be cared for properly. Take good care of the one you got not take ok care of a lot
- [removed]
- I believe that number is still excessive.
- 6 dogs or cats per household are too many. Will increase likelihood of causing problems within neighborhoods.
- Unless there are concerns for the welfare of the animal or neighbors people should be able to do what they want in their own homes
- If my animals are well cared for and safe, no one is going to dictate how many I can have in MY home. Implement welfare checks for animals instead.
- I think this should be done on a case-by-case basis. There's no need to punish the responsible dog/cat owners.
- I feel that's too many animals. I think 3 dogs and 3 cats is plenty.
- 2 animals per house is more then sufficient unless it's hens etc
- This would prohibit a breeders livelihood, or a person who has the time and space to take care of this many animals.
- This should also be handled on a case by case basis depending on the amount of room they have to accommodate each animal.
- I do not support animal limits. Owner responsibility and QUALITY OF CARE are key criteria
- Dont agree
- The bylaw is good as it is on this issue
- A potential total of 12 cats and dogs is far too many animals in a city household.
- You cannot tell someone how many children they are allowed to have. As pong as they are able to take care of the animals, they should be able to. I'd rather see every house full of cats and dogs than the shelters
- Six is more than generous
- 12 is too many animals in one home. I would support up to 6 animals in a household — dogs, cats or a combination.
- I feel the number proposed, 6 dogs and 6 cats is too large.
- In a city 6 animals is too many and it effects an animals quality of life
- 6 dogs and cats is exponentially high.
- I agree with the idea of licensing pets but there should be no fees associated with owning pets aside from the costs required to care for that pet.
- What about animal rescues?
- As long as the pet owner is responsible they can do as they please. Overpaid public servants should not have the power to dictate private life. A-wads.



- If people can finically and properly keep that many animals that's their business.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is enough for any household
- As long as they are taken care of no limit should be placed
- its bot the cities business how many animals a household has.
- People have problems with ONE PET.
- A blanket rule applying to both cats and dogs is unacceptable. Dogs require their owners to walk them and pick up their excrement. Cats do not require to be walked. Dogs bite when provoked or in some cases, just because. Cats do not harbor the same aggression. Cats are primarily kept inside the house where dogs like to be walked, taken to the park etc. As long as the house which houses the animals is large enough to accommodate all the animals an owner chooses to keep, then restrictions are unnecessary.
- I agree with the exceptions but do not feel households need 6 dogs or cats. 4 dogs or cats should be enough.
- You need to look at the square footage of the home. If it is smaller, then the number of pets should also be restricted.
- 2 cats or 2 dogs is plenty. 6 dogs or cats is ridiculous. Those people with more than 2 have psychological issues, or are eating them.
- 12 animals seems too high. I believe 3 & 3 is more realistic.
- If someone is a good pet owner and has enough space they shouldn't be limited to how many animals they can care for.
- I don't see any reason for 6 dogs or cats to be on a single property within the city.
- Puppy mills can still operate under this bylaw
- Residents who want many pets should live in the country on larger properties, for the sake of the animals and other residents
- I don't believe that many animals in one household will be properly taken care of.
- In an urban setting this is far too many animals, resulting in more of the problems mentioned in this survey. A total of 2 cats/dogs would be my recommendation. The rights of Calgarians who do not own animals need to be taken into account.
- i, who have owned pets my whole life, personally feel that that number is still too high. 3 and 3 is more than enough. anymore as individual or team that is not doing it as some form of livelihood cannot be a responsible pet owner with that many animals living within city limits. too much!
- Stop controlling people that are not doing anything wrong. Penalize the people only that are irresponsible/negligent pet owners. . pet owners.
- More than two dogs and two cats is absolutely unnecessary, a complete nuisance to the neighborhood, and ridiculous.
- There should be no limit for how many animals a person is allowed to have in their own household
- If you're gonna put a limit on how many animals can be in a household then put a limit on how many people per household to... oh wait, you won't.
- I feel increasing the amount of pets allowed in a household would just allow irresponsible pet owners to continue being irresponsible without any accountability.



- The bylaw shouldn't determine what a person decides to own
- I'm not sure
- I don't agree with restricting the amount of animals someone can own.
- if someone is happy and can take care of 12 dogs and both the person and animals are living comfortably then i do not see any issues
- 6 dogs is far too excessive. This is not safe for the dogs, the owners, or the neighbourhood. A 2 dog limit should be enforced. 6 cats is a reasonable limit.
- I think we have enough rules regarding behavior of animals.
- I don't think pets should be restricted. It will increase the amount of dogs in shelters.
- People should be able to have as many dogs/cats as they want as long as they are properly taken care of
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats?! No one can adequately care for that many animals. It would encourage breeding and hoarding.
- 6 dogs is too many dogs for an urban household, 6 cats is too many cats for one household. If people want to own that many animals they should live on an acreage or a farm. It's not fair to the animals to have them cooped up in such a confined space.
- If an owner is willing to put in the work to look after multiple pets there's no issue with them having multiple pets.
- Should be based on square footage of home and ability of owner to be a competent caregiver to said animals.
- Who are you to tell me how many animals I can have if I am able to take care of them?
- That's way too many animals in a household at once.
- Let people decide how many pets they Can care for
- Different circumstances
- 12 animals in a single household is too many!!
- There is no reason for people to own any more than 2 animals unless a breeder.
- 12 pets is still too many
- I think that if animals are being properly cared for why are we limiting the amount anyone can have?
- Overall I agree with the number, but could perhaps be raised based on larger property sizes.
- that is too many animals in one location
- That's too many. Too much chance of noise, smell, etc. problems. Again, hard to enforce bylaws.
- Six of anything including children is too many
- This will lead to further un registered breeders
- I would support going up to 3 but anything more should require a special application.
- No one needs 12 pets
- 6 of each are way too many, 4 of each should be the limit
- 6 is too high
- A limit of 2 dogs and 2 cats without special permission and permits

- The system in Calgary has functioned well. Limiting now would stress current pet owners who are over the new limit.
- Especially with cats, six is not necessarily too many for a single-household to manage. It is more about the care that the animals receive from owners than an arbitrary number.
- It should be less per house hold. No one needs that many animals
- That is way too many animals for anyone in the city to own or manage.
- Should be more stricter! Limit pets to 2 per household! Why does any one need 6 dogs or 6 cat? Make special licenses for people who want to breed dogs
- If someone can comfortably and responsibly care for 20 cats or dogs who are you to tell them they can't?
- I think the limit of licenced dogs should be lower. It is in other municipalities. 6 seems too high
- I think having more access to animal welfare check or having applications for more then 6 animals could be beneficial.
- We have an issue with strays, abused animals, inadequately cared for animals, everywhere! If we start creating limitations, the influx of animals being stray or improperly cared for will only increase. However, those obtaining large quantities of animals (Whatever that # is...) should thoroughly screened to ensure they have large enough facilities, adequate cash flow, proper training, ALL other fronts such as love, vet, etc. & perhaps this would call for unannounced visits by authorities to the premises to validate they're adhering to EVERYTHING.... Above it states 'it is not necessary for anyone to own more than 2 cats and/or dogs', I believe in some cases perhaps... BUT that's really a judgmental, uneducated opinion, that is not statically proven from justly sources. To the best of my knowledge anyways. I feel that many cases are not black & white. I have witnessed an became friends with people whom have well beyond 6 cats/dogs & the animals, are very well cared for on ALL fronts. Better than my wife cares for me. Lol. In this case or example, isn't this much better then limiting people & having those poor animals on the street, in facilities such as Humane Society(s), or euthanized...? I'm not saying any random person should have sufficient quantities of animals however, if a person(s) passes or are approved after undergoing thorough regulated screening & training, why not?... In addition, I do feel people with significant animals should undergo unannounced thorough inspections of their animals & facilities.
- This is too many pets per household
- More than two dogs in an urban setting is not appropriate other than the above exceptions. Currently there is almost no time in the summer when I don't have to listen to a dog barking. I see no reason I should have to have this increased.
- Why would you need that many u less you plan on breeding them.
- I'm saying no today because you talk about potential exceptions. What would happen if I agree and then say the law gets changed and no my breeder who is amazing can't breed any more dogs.
- There should be no limits on the number of pets
- The gov/city doesn't need rules for everything. If they're in a good home that's a good choice no matter how many animss as L.A.



- Some people have the means, time, and room for a lot of animals and controlling how many animals someone can have is like controlling how many kids someone can have. I've seen people with 2 dog or a couple cats have worse noise and mess than people with 10 dogs or more cats.
- Two cats and/or dogs is a bit vague but I understand it here to be a total of two pets. I think it should be 4 pets.
- Too intrusive. If an individual or home can manage their pets without the accumulation of feces, excessive noise and protect the welfare of the animal this should not be an issue. Base on results
- You can't limit
- There are many reasons why someone owns multiple dogs. Restrictions would be unfair to those that can properly care for them, like those involved with dog sports.
- No one needs that many pets
- Deal with individual issues. Don't regulate something that doesn't need to be because of a few "comments". Cut the red tape don't drape yourselves in it.
- There are many good pet owners out there that are educated and can take care of more than six of any type of pet, requirements is animals need to be trained
- Who needs 6 dogs or 6 cats?!? Even if you're fostering. Momma and offspring is one thing but as soon as those offspring are ready for rehoming they need to go to new homes. No home needs 6 of an animal.
- If a person wants to own more than 6 cats and 6 dogs they should at their own risk. No one should be limited to how much animals they can have especially if they're helping another animal go to another home.
- A person with 1 dog can be less clean than those that keep multiple. It is up to the owner to be responsible enough to take proper care of the animals in their care. I for one have 3 large dogs and I guarantee I have the cleanest pet yard around.
- I agree with the structure of the proposed change, but think that 6 dogs AND 6 cats are still too many. I would suggest a lower limit -- maybe 6 animals (combined total of dogs and cats).
- 6 per household is a lot. No one needs that many pets. Please save our children from Dog bites by limiting the number of dogs as pet and all dogs should be muzzled except the tiny ones.
- Again, we do not need government intervention in something that is easily handled by responsible pet owners
- I love dogs but no more than two. Some people may think having 6 dogs is okay but your neighbours may not. The city's efforts to control the noise is feeble and toothless. Potentially six or more cats roaming at night, yeah the city can not prevent that either. Easier to prevent the potential problems that you know will come is limit the potential problem.
- I think 6 is still too many. I support a maximum of 2 dogs and 2 cats per household with the potential exceptions to the rule as above.
- people should be allowed to have however many pets they want providing they take care of their pets properly. If someone wants 15 chihuahuas and they take care of them properly then hats off to them. Who are we to tell them they can't have their companions. I only care that the animals are taken care of properly



- Really don't like being told how many I can or cannot have. The bylaw can cover topics on responsible pet ownership. People can have a lot of pets and still be responsible.
- I believe this amount is still too high
- If animals are properly cared for the number of animals shouldn't matter.
- Excessive oversight by government. Better use can be found for limited enforcement resources.
- You shouldn't be allowed to control this.
- No
- Limit is too high. A maximum of 6 animals is enough.
- This is far too many animals to keep in the city. Nobody can properly look after and care for that many physically or financially. Vet bills etc.
- too many
- We currently have no limit to the number of vehicles someone owns (potential neighbourhood parking issues), no limit to stereos (potential neighbourhood noise issues), no limit to number of children/residents per household (host of issues). There's no reason for an upper limit to pet ownership, as our enforcement agencies (Calgary Humane and CPS) are able to use provisions under the Animal Protection Act and the Criminal Code to deal with poor living conditions. The Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw can be amended to address possible nuisance issues from large numbers of pets (feces smell, noise, etc...) but shouldn't be tailored to explicitly ban larger numbers of pets if the owners can show competence and good standards of care for the animals as well as respect for their neighbours. Someone who has 8 indoor cats in their 2500 sq ft house with adequate litter facilities shouldn't be barred from the last two cats arbitrarily because the other [removed] down the street has 16 dogs who live in an unfenced yard and crap on their neighbour's properties.
- Like the idea but 6 still seems like too much. 4 total?
- I do not support a hard limit as a universal rule.
- Way too many animals in one household. Would suggest an accumulated total of 4, regardless of the mix of cats to dogs. .
- If there are issues bylaws can deal with them
- 6 is TOO MANY
- I would only support limitations on pet numbers in relation to lot and house sizes. The size of the pet matters as well.
- 12 animals in a house seems insane - it should be 4 to 6 total and then special application will be required
- As long as the pets are fine, property is clean. Who are we to say how many animals someone can own?
- 6 dogs is way too many animals on a urban property. That's unfair to the animals not having sufficient space.
- I think the limit should be less.
- 12 animals? Are you running a zoo? That's ridiculous. No one needs 12 pets.
- I think people should be able to choose how many pets they have based on the amount of space they have and what they can afford.



- 12 total animals is a lot. I don't know how common this is. I would agree to these limits if there was animal welfare checks in place, with enforcement as needed.
- The pet limit should be 4 dogs and/or cats, meaning a combination of them as long as the maximum is 4. I agree with the "potential exceptions".
- not needed
- I think people should be able to have as many as they want as long as they are clean and not a nuisance to others
- 12 animals plus the exceptions above is a lot. 6 (combination of dogs or cats) seems more reasonable
- Too much noise and stink in yards from lack of picking up feces. People should be content to care for a small number of pets well.
- Too many animals in one household for companion purposes.
- The exceptions suggested here may render this bylaw change impracticable.
- No I do not agree
- 12 animals per household seems like too many.
- That number of animals is not necessary
- I don't support any limitations on any animals. It's a slippery slope for us serious pet owners, breeders etc.
- The limits should be four of each kind per household.
- It is not necessary for anyone to own more than 2 cats and/or dogs. Responsible pet owners recognize that this is reasonable.
- People who have additional animals will not license them making it harder for them to be returned in case of an escape. They may not seek vet care for additional animals in fear of being penalized for having more than the permitted amount of animals
- They should be allowed to own as many animals as they are willing to take care of. Some people only have 1 pet and cannot take care of them whereas some people have 10 and do a great job. It should be specific from person to person
- I disagree with points 3,4 @ 7 -
- There needs to be a cap of 1 or 2 at most. It is cruel to animals to not have anyone there for them.
- No more than 2 animals total. Otherwise it is cruel to the animal.
- I would support a total of 6 animals per household. 12 in house animals plus potential for livestock has a drastic number of potential animals.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats??? Really??? I would support a greater number of cats than I would dogs, as cats should be kept indoors, however dogs require outdoor activities. Again, I would not want to live next door to any household that has 6 barking dogs outside all at the same time!!!! Keep it reasonable, please. How about 2 dogs, and then owners would have to request a special licence for the 3rd (at a higher cost). I see no need for anyone to have more than 2 or 3 dogs, other than if they are a breeder, and even then, that should be a temporary situation. Service dogs should be included in the total.
- 6 animals in a household is too many! Limit to 2 or 3



- deal with problem animals and owners using the already existing bylaws. the tools are there to deal with problems without introducing an arbitrary limit on the number of animals one can own.
- One per person for dog and two per person cat
- My answer is ultimately yes however not sure how this extends to rural areas if at all. Possible properties that are within the City of Calgary limits could have barn cats, and livestock protector dogs that could go over this limit.
- A limit of 1. One. Only one.
- There does not need to be more than 6 dogs or cats in a household. If so, they would need to provide evidence of spaying and neutering, vaccine status, ability to pay for veterinary care etc
- Limit should be way lower, perhaps for Animals per household. This would exclude mother animals with small puppies or kittens.
- It dosent matter
- I do not agree with any household needing 6 dogs and 6 cats. That number should be significantly less. I would support a maximum of 3.
- Six dogs AND six cats is a lot of animals on a city lot. A lower limit of 2+2 or 3+3 is sufficient, subject to the types of exceptions noted.
- 6 dogs is a lot-might as well have no limit.
- Six cats AND six dogs is a huge number of animals per household. Three of each would be more appropriate. Individual exceptions could be made if, for example, one inherited a parent's pets.
- Should be a limit of 3 or fewer animals in total with the exceptions above.
- So longs as people are responsible pet owners they should be allowed to have as many as they want with the exception of obvious hoarding
- There should be no more than two animals in a household, within the city limits.
- Decrease the number of allowed pets. 6 of each is too many, especially dogs.
- I am in agreement with these types of exceptions but I think the regular limit should be 4 or fewer not 6. Unless you are a registered breeder in which case you could be exempt and get a special breeder license.
- 6 cats or dogs per house hold is way to many for the city.
- Six of each car and dog seems extreme. I agree to the exceptions of the rules (like when a litter is born), but 12 medium-large animals on one urban property is far too many.
- If animals are properly cared for, it's no ones business. Until yyc gets a far better spay neuter program in place, we need good homes which may mean multiple pets. If there is an issue, heavy fines and imprisonments for those who abuse animals and hoard. You are not doing your job so don't lay the blame on good people. If there were stronger punitive enforcement then that would be a better deterrent
- Six animals in one household is way too many the neighbours have to put up with it all
- It's resonable
- I don't think it's possible to provide a proper level of care for this many animals. I don't see why this many animals would ever be necessary
- Stop controlling people



- No limits please
- Five is good
- How does the city plan to control the number of pets if owners do not obey the rules.
- Rather than a limit I would suggest a number above which a permit is required (with application and review.process as for a building or development permit and you can out all your rules in that process. license is required
- No limit
- Excessive and unnecessary- most people cannot control that many animals. More dogs loose in nondog parks
- There could be multiple families living in one dwelling and each pet belongs to a different person
- No one should have 6 dogs or cats. 3 MAX How do you walk them?Speical licence for Breeders
- It is never about the amount of animals owned, it is always about how the animals are treated and if they are dangerous or not.
- This is too many and could lead to hardships and cost challenges on the animals
- as long as the owner has the means and space to care for the animals properly I don't think there should be a limit to the number of large pets allowed on one property.
- thats far too many animals for anyone to manage adequately
- Doesn't take into account size of the household
- It is up to the person how many pets they want not up to the nosey neighbor
- that is WAY to many animals. if someone has that many it will 100% be unclean. there is no way those animals are all being properly fed and walked 2 times a day. The TREATMENT of the animals needs to be more of your focus. Also, if low income people have dogs, are they paying a dog walker to walk the dogs while theyre at work? Probably not.
- People should be allowed to own however many animals they want. So long as they can care for them.
- The number could be higher for cats.
- none of the exceptions would justify having more than 12 animals in a home.
- Noboy needs six cats and six dogs in there house. I would say a total of 4 - any combination of the two.
- Government has no place in people's house unless there is a issue.
- As a dog owner and previous cat owner, six (6) of each is too many for a household to properly and safely manage, except under specific circumstances. If the limit increases, it may promote more people purchasing additional pets, which may result in poor animal care (e.g. lack of resources) and increased nuisance and risk to others. If someone feels the need to have more, they should be required to request an exemption. All individuals and addresses with exemptions should be made publicly available.
- Way too high ! No-one should have to live next door to ANYONE with 6 dogs or cats . 2 cats or dogs per household , max .
- Unless potential exceptions were guaranteed



- 6 and 6 is too many. No one needs that many animals in the city, and they will inevitably be a nuisance.
- I believe six dogs and six cats are way too many, owners may enjoy them but neighbours won't, noise and odour will be a problem, the number needs to be lower
- There should not be a difference between cats and dogs. It should be a max of 6 cats and dogs together
- 6 dogs is a lot of dogs is one household.
- It is not the number of animals that is important, rather HOW they are being managed. I know a lady with over 30 dogs and she can manage those better than many people do with a single pet.
- No one needs this inside city limits
- Similar to previous answers. My neighbor can keep as many pets as they want so long as their noise and aroma do not degrade the quality of life for me and my family. Again, very subjective. I may be more tolerant of noise and smell than someone else.
- It matters more that the number is being cared for properly and not a nuisance to anyone else.
- People should be able to have multiple pets as they desire for their own happiness. Should not be dictated by others opinions.
- Personally, six dogs AND six cats are way too many for a household. If people already cant afford the afformentioned licences, how are people suposed to afford that many pets.
- No sane person needs 6 dogs and 6 cats in a household. I would support limiting pets to ONE per household.
- The limit should be 2
- That is way more then should be allowed
- Twelve animals in one home is too many. The health and well being of the animals could be at risk with numbers that high.
- I will have as many as I want. MY HOUSE MY LAW
- If the animals are taken care of it's no one's business
- I would only support a rule such as this if it actually went after owners who neglected their pets. Otherwise this would be just another rule to prosecute good pet owners.
- Personal liberty is valuble
- Do not change the by-law.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats are too many in one house. I feel the max limit should be lower
- A total of 12 animals seems excessive for the average pet owner. I support the exceptions, but would like to see the total number reduces to a total of 6 cats and dogs.
- That is too many animals per property. I dont support that at all
- I think people should have the right to keep their pets.
- No need to have that many pets
- m
- I would like to know what the bylaw limit is now before I support or not support this change.
- Animal Hoarders



- 6 is excessive. 4 would be enough. Maybe 6 IN TOTAL. But, from my understanding, that's 12 pets per household. Also -evaluate the size of the home and size of the animals!
- It seems unnecessary to limit, and an infringement on freedoms— what about those living within city limits on massive properties? Who have the space?
- People are responsible and can have as much pets as they want
- Again, restricting people is not the answer. Maybe there should be a review, does the person have space, can the person financially take care of more than 6. Are the current animals healthy. No additional charges but a review of the home this is how you keep animals safe. I can't think of any scenario where someone living in a city would have more than 2 pets especially 6. If the special application included a review than I would support it.
- I would support a limit of 6 cats but not 6 dogs. I had a neighbour who had 3 dogs, she rarely walked the dogs, and just left the door to her home open so they could come and go as they pleased, they were constantly barking, attacked the landscape crew, she rarely picked up after them. I would support a two dog limit.
- Six each is too many. I would support maximum of 3 each
- Its no ones buisness if they are being taken care of!
- limits on pet ownership should not be mandated but stringent requirements regarding feces removal, animal welfare as noise should be stringently enforced regardless of the number of animals owned.
- Max three dogs per household.
- Limit should be no more than 2 or 3 , unless you are a licensed Breeder. Temporary homes like Fosters/Breeders/DayCare/etc are Businesses and not permanent residence of animals and should be licensed and regulated to ensure proper health and safety of animals in their care. Baby animals should be an exception until they reach the age of being adopted.
- I don't believe we should place restriction on the quantity of residential pets that a person may have. Most people are responsible pet owners and there are generally already rules in place to ensure an animals welfare.
- Should be fewer than 6. Suggest 3 max of both
- There should be a limit to animals due to noise and feces maintenance.
- I think any house owning over 3 dogs should need to apply for a kennel permit so that the house can be assessed so the animals are being cared for properly.
- There should only be bylaws for things like noise and smell and those enforced. It won't matter how many if these bylaws are adhered to.
- There is no reason for anyone to have that many dogs and cats. People should be limited to no more that 4 animals. The way it is written it encourages puppy mills.
- Would you restrict how many children someone can have?
- 6 cats/6 dogs are a large amount of animals. Unless you have so much square footage this shouldnt be allowed for the animals well being.
- People should not be allowed to own more than 2 pets. Those that do are usually hoarders and/or mentally unstable. There was one on our street like that and the stench for her place was revolting.
- There is no need for an individual household to have that many dogs and cats.



- I don't believe it is the number of pets that matters, it's the owner's capability to care and manage their pets. More importance should be placed on the EDUCATION and TRAINING of pet owners, which would reduce the number of problem animals in the first place.
- The number of animals per household should be much lower. 12 animals in a household is opening the door to neglect and abuse of these animals.
- I feel that 6 to 12 animals is still too many. [personal information removed] a woman who owns 12 dogs. She breeds these dogs illegally. We have dealt with excessive barking (over 1000 noise instances inside and outside our home over the course of 6 months in 2019). Also the smell of her 12 animals defecating in her backyard often wafts over to our yard on a daily basis. We have been dealing this noise issue since 2018, filed complaints with bylaw in 2019, and also in 2020. When we moved into this house she had 7 dogs, and then a few years later she inherited 7 more dogs. With this proposed bylaw change, and the proposed exemptions there is nothing that guarantees that I will ever have a quiet existence in my own home. She will continue to be allowed to have her 12 dogs and I will have to file complaints year after year because her 12 dogs continue to bark inside and outside as well as stink up our backyard. Every other city in Alberta and probably across the rest of the country limits the pets to 3/4 per household. Anyone that I speak to about this issue I have been dealing with is flabbergasted that Calgary doesn't have this same bylaw. People that think that pet numbers should not be regulated have never had to live next to someone that allows their animals to bark, howl, squeal or yelp for hours/days/weeks/months at a time. Maybe my experience is not common but because the lack of regulations it has allowed this woman to get away with this for years, wasting valuable bylaw officer time, as well as degrading our neighbourhood relations. [personal information removed]
- bylaw remains same - no limit
- People have their own rights to how many pets they should have. Just impose fines for noises and feces.
- The limit should no greater that 2 dogs Or 2 cats. With the exceptions listed above.
- maximum 2 dogs/cats allowed, for birds could more.
- A household can potentially have 12 pets without special application - I highly doubt noise and feces will be managed properly in this case. I would support a much lower number of 2 dogs and 2 cats.
- No household should have more than a dog or a cat.
- If people can take care of their pets then there should be no limit. Hoarders are already breaking bylaws and this amendment would only serve to punish responsible pet owners
- If you said exceptions to the rule would be: Then I would say yes.
- 6 cats and/or dogs Mac
- To allow 6 dogs and 6 cats in one household is excessive and a person would need a substantial income to support proper treatment of that many animals. I think the exceptions make sense for people running businesses and people that currently have that number of animals.
- I think six each is a lot. How about 3 and 3?
- Six and six is too high. A total of four seems very reasonable.



- I have two dogs and two cats and I run a rescue. The issue isn't in the number of animals someone owns but the level of crate and training those animals receive.
- Don't think so
- Limiting amounts of dogs will not work as people will just not register and bylaw will not go door to door. Make the guideline 1 dog per adult in the household.
- pet limits should be reduced to 4 dogs and 4 cats, with all of the exceptions above.
- Of animals are well cared for. The owner shouldn't have a cap on the amount of animals they have.
- I believe 6 is still too high - there should be no more than 4 animals in any home.
- If owning more than 6 dogs/cats doesn't become a problem (eg barking, pets at large, etc) I don't believe there should be a restriction on the amount of pets owned
- I don't think there should be a limit. But there should be some kind of application to apply for to show that you can maintain the cleanliness and support to own multiple animals.
- If someone is a responsible pet owner and animal lover and would like more than 6 dogs/cats, they should be allowed as long as the animals are well cared for and they are maintaining the property (regular cleaning of feces and no excessive noises). A limit of 12 or so makes more sense as that gets crowded and harder to maintain decent living conditions for all that is involved
- There is NO WAY I would want to live next to 6 dogs. That's insane. (And I'm a dog owner).
- no limits as long as its safe for the animals
- 6 cats or dogs would be too many. two is enough. Kittens/puppies stay for 8 weeks.
- People should be free to have as many animals as they'd like. If it becomes a problem, sure, but there doesn't seem to be evidence presented to show that people having an excess of animals have more problems than those that do not.
- If there are multiple pet owners in one household 6 pets doesn't seem reasonable. If a potential roommate has three cats and I have 4 we would be beyond a 6 pet limit. My cats are over 15 years old and went outside before your bylaws were imposed. How can I tell a cat ...hey you can't go outside anymore?
- It is not the business of others or the city of how many animals one may possess. However it is the city's responsibility to ensure that these pets are not being mistreated
- Should be no limits, but fines and removal of animals for poor care
- 4 dogs 4 cats
- Six animals is very expensive to maintain and a lot of animals for one property. Six is too many.
- This can be compared to limiting the amount of kids people can have. We should encourage responsible pet owners and irresponsible owners should be reprimanded.
- Does not apply to birds or other pet / hens/quail
- No more than 2 (two),
- 6 dogs is fine but the number could be a bit greater for cats. They need less space and aren't as loud as 6 dogs. Maybe a maximum of 8-10 cats
- No.



- The number should be much lower. No one needs have 12 animals, that is ridiculous! I would put a total cap of 6 animals with any mix of dogs and/or cats that the owner wants. No more than 6 total though!
- 6 still seems quite high. I would support a limit of 4.
- I dont think the city should be telling people how many pets they can have.
- 12 animals in a household is too many. It must be reduced
- Unless they are legitimate, humane breeders, there is no reason anyone should have 6 dogs and 6 cats! No more pets per household than there are people!
- I feel 4 animals are enough per household.
- People should be able to have any number of pets, as long as they're cared for.
- i think 6 dogs and 6 cats allowed is way to high for a house in the city
- I am mostly supportive except where the exceptions are considered - especially the fostering and daycares, as well as the fanciers.
- Let people have their animals.
- Far too many animals to be housed in most dwellings within the city.
- The numbers should be lower than that. No one needs to have 12 animals before needing a special application. 4-6 animals combined should be the maximum.
- People may foster which can put them over the limit.
- If a person can take care of more than 6 of each, then let them.
- Why?????????!!!!
- A pet limit seems like an unnecessary thing to monitor and enforce. If all the animals are licensed, vaccinated, and have a good quality of life, then no external intervention should be necessary. We should prioritize enforcing current licensing regulations and laws and not create more "make work" projects.
- if I own my house what gives the city the right to tell me how many pets that I can have in my house if I rent that is a different storyhav
- 6 is a ridiculous number of pets! 2 -3 maximum would be more reasonable there's no way that even a responsible pet owner could take care of 12 animals total! Potentially in a farm setting would be the only way I could see more animals being allowed.
- There should be an exception for the options listed above but otherwise no one needs that many animals in the city.
- I grew up in a farming community NEVER did I know anyone that owned 6 dogs. There is absolutely NO need to be owning that many animals and coop them up in a house. Is that the MOST inhuman thing you have ever heard!
- Why do you need 6 dogs or 6 cats in 1 house hold.
- As long as the welfare of each animal is ensured an owner should be allowed to have as many pets as they want.
- I believe 2 dogs or cat limit is good I also like the exceptions limit so no to more than 2 animals with yes to the exceptions



- Impossible to care for 6 pets in a household!! □ No increase
- I do not think a single family home should own 6 dogs or 6 cats
- I expect bylaw officers to use their brains and common sense when enforcing rules
- Blanket restrictions don't always solve the problem. Address specific issues with specific policy points.
- We think 3 is probably more reasonable in the city.
- It should depend on the size of the house/property the animals are living in
- I do not believe there should be a limit on how many cats and dogs a person has as long as those pets are in a good home.
- I feel putting an exact lower number such as 6 would only end up in people obtaining more pets than 6. Especially if they are more cat people or vice versa and they can only have 6 but if it's mixed they can have up to 12 pets in the house... Doesn't seem fair.
- 6 is already too many unless in a licensed and controlled breeding or shelter facility
- No one should have 12 animals in their house at a time. The most the city should be allowing is 6 animals in total. Three dogs and three cats and that's even a lot of animals.
- No household needs to have six (6) dogs and/or six (6) cats. If they wish to have that many they should perhaps think about moving to an acreage where there is adequate space for these animals. Yards are not big enough, some people do not take care of the feces in the yard for one or two dogs now, what happens with more. The limit should be one (1) dog and one (1) cat.
- People should be able to do what they want on their property so long as no one is harmed.
- 12 is WAY too many animals for them to live comfortable in an average Calgary home. The city needs to ask vet experts what they recommend given the average sq ft of Calgary homes
- Unless they are a kennel, why would anyone need to have that many pets in a city household. There is definitely a higher risk for issues with more dogs in a house, such as barking and disturbing neighbors. As well, 6 dogs in a household will establish a pack mentality and be aggressive in defending the pack and property.
- Too many in one house
- The limit should be 3 dogs or cats. I do however support the exceptions listed.
- I think 12 animals is too much for a household. I would support 3 or 4 cats and 3 or 4 dogs.
- Six dogs and cats is far too many. Three dogs and cats makes more sense.
- Everyone should be able to choose
- 2 cats or 2 dogs seems like a reasonable maximum number of pets.
- six dogs AND six cats is a lot - pet ownership is a luxury that requires time and money and should be done responsibly.
- 12 animals in one household is an incredible amount of responsibility.
- 6 each of cats and dogs may be fine in a large home, but not in a smaller one. I can see an exception for temporary homes
- Pet limit should be 2
- No point as you have so many exceptions to the bylaw, it will be abused. Just leave it alone.



- The only by-law change I would support is banning "backyard breeders". We all know that people do it for quick cash and no other reason.
- Let people make their own decisions
- Six is too many, especially if they have 6 dogs AND 6 cats. Lower the number per household to 3-4 in total. No one needs that many animals at one time except if you foster, breed, pet sitter, or have a pet daycare. IN which case you require a special licence and larger fee.
- Not your business
- 6 dogs and 6 cats are far too many for in town, it's a lot for neighbours to have to deal with and how do you know that all of these animals are being taken care of
- 6 is to many
- If animals are well cared for and cleaned up after. You have no business interfering in how many people have if they are under control
- More than 2 pets is excessive with the exception of them having puppies which must be sold or removed within 3 to 4 months.
- I think having 12 pets in one house is a lot. It should be 6 and then anything above that needs to have special permits.
- The proposed changes, are a infringement on personal rights.
- Restrictions should be related to problems caused to neighbours and environment, not to number
- I think 12 cats & dogs total is too much. Many people also have birds, gerbils, hamsters, etc. I think 3 cats and 3 dogs is a good limit IF the household has additional animals that aren't listed under the cat/dog category.
- This puts a strain on the already taxed animal rescue and humane societies; responsibilities should focus on the person(s) overseeing the care of the animals, regardless of number in a household.
- Less government control. If I can care for numerous animals it should not be governments concern
- I have had up to 6 animals in the past - it is a large responsibility and really a couple of cats and a couple of dogs is plenty.
- Having more than two pets will cause issues caused by the close proximity in which we live.
- To ensure proper care for all the animals and avoid hoarding of animals animals
- If the animals are taken care of and not creating an issue I don't agree that there should be a limit.
- No need for that many animals in one house
- 2 dogs and 2 cats
- The number should be lower. Six animals in TOTAL Would be more appropriate.
- Allowing a total of 12 cats and dogs sounds unreasonable to surrounding neighbours due to noise and feces and also not humane to the animals in an urban setting.
- There is no home in Calgary that should have a need to house 6 dogs and 6 cats, this is excessive.
- You said "and" and then your said "or" in the next sentence. Which is it?
- I fail to see how so many animals can be properly trained, managed and cared for.
- If someone has room to take in multiple dogs(pets), especially senior pets that are abandoned or surrendered, then why not let those people take the animals that otherwise would not make it.



- It's already illegal to damage public property or cause a nuisance, there no reason to arbitrarily limit the number of animals, just enforce existing rules.
- As long as the rules (noise, feces accumulation, animal welfare) are enforced and all animals are licensed, I don't think the number of animals should matter.
- 6 dogs is way too many for any household especially in a city. Too many
- If it is someone's private home, they should be allowed as many as they want
- I cannot think of any good reason why a household should become a zoo. Honestly, the limit should be three (3) each.
- 6 each is too many animals to properly care for. Should stay at two eachre for
- 6 cats or 6 dogs is too excessive unless they are breeders
- No one needs up to 12 animals, this is a major city, not a farm
- No
- Because a pet owner could have 10 dogs or cats and still manage the situation well. I think the city needs to focus on pet owners who aren't ensure their animals are being respectful to the community by ensure the dogs a relatively quiet. They should also ensure that the feces doesn't get to the point where it's out of control. I feel a good dog owner could do this with more than 6 dogs.
- If a pet owner is an irresponsible one then they will be irresponsible with one or with ten pets in their care.
- Owner responsibility and quality of care are key criteria
- Do not agree with limit on number of animals in household.
- I think it is unreasonable to think that people could actually care for that many animals in a way that's fair to those pets.
- Not necessary for more than 2 dogs/cats
- this amount is way too much, I suggest 2 pets max (any combination of cats and/or dogs) or mix
- I support a limit on the number of pets per household, however 6 dogs AND 6 cats it too many. An owner cannot responsibly manage and care for this number of pets.
- Nobody can care for that number of animals properly. Just leads to abuse
- I support limiting the number of pets per household. The limit should be a maximum of 6 pets, cat or dog. There should be no exceptions to this limit.
- I believe that it is very difficult for most people to manage that number of animals. I do agree that there should be an exception if the animals are inherited from family members not able to care for them (ie elderly parents). If people have the need/desire to house more animals there should be special inspections completed by the city to ensure the animals are safe and being cared for properly.
- Why would we limit animals to a household when they are treated good in a loving home instead of making large populations suffer in the humane society?
- If the no. of pets is a nuisance that should be dealt with on a case by case basis not a set no.
- Don't need additional regulations in this regard. Impose the above \$100 fines for noise and \$250 for excess defecation if complaint from a neighbour is lodged.



- 6 of each is too many. I wouldn't want to live near anyone with 6 dogs. Not in a million years.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats seems like an excessive number of pets without special application
- If they want to have that many pets it's time to move to the country.
- I think the numbers should be lower. No one will invest the time and effort to properly maintain that many animals
- I agree that the limit should be 2 cats or 2 dogs, not 2 cats and/or 2 dogs.
- That's way too many animals for one household
- Service animals should qualify for a \$0 license.
- that's way too many
- One only
- Under special circumstances more than 3 of each would be sufficient. But realistically more than 3 of one kind of animal is excessive in the city.
- Should be able to have as many animals as you would like.
- 6 is too many. Reduce to limit of 3. All breeders licensed as this is a business.
- If you are a responsible owner you should be allowed to have as many animals as you want - within reason. I don't think anyone in a city needs 6 dogs and or 6 cats!
- In order to protect the welfare and proper maintenance of these animals, a resident should not possess more than 6 dogs or cats on their property
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats (total of 12 animals) is way more than is necessary or safe for one household. This is not fair for the animal's quality of life. I propose a limit of 6 animals total per household, with a special application/exception for private animal shelters/sanctuaries.
- Pet owners can't care for and control that many animals within a city lot.
- Nobody needs six dogs or six cats, That's ridiculous
- I think that's too many.
- 6 of each pet is FAR too many per household
- Pet limit should be much lower
- Unless it is a rural or acreage property, numbers of animals beyond 2 is dangerous for all of the reasons listed above.
- That is FAR too many animals to be able to control and properly train.
- 6 is too many
- while I can understand why limits could be needed this really isn't up to the city to decide.
- If a homeowner has the space and time to properly train 6+ dogs/cats and they are well taken care of, I don't think it's fair that they should be limited.
- Who are the city to tell people how many pets they'd can and cannot take care of. As long as the animals are healthy and well cared for, it's really none of your business.
- That many animals on one property is excessive
- You should be allowed to have what you want on your own property
- Per household only one pet should be allowed. House hold has to made adjustments and decide the priorities who actually need the pet.



- Temp homes such as fostering should be allowed to increase the limit - but 6 animals in one home is too many animals.
- someone with 6 dogs and 6 cats doesn't sound like a responsible pet owner. I would only support this if the price per animal exponentially increased and covered regular (quarterly?) home inspections that the owner would agree to if they had over the current 2 limit we have today.
- Let people have as many pets as they want
- There should be no limit on the amount of pets one can have
- 6 dogs are too much. They don't permit one dog per two person in household so in absence of one another can take care of animal.
- No one needs up to 12 pets in one house.
- Is there any evidence to support a restriction? Where are the feces and noise and welfare problems arising? Likely within single dog households or ones with a couple of dogs. Unless one is dealing with a hoarding situation, the # of animals is likely not linked to additional problems like noise, feces, or welfare issues.
- six seems excessive... I think you have more of an issue with breeders who hoard and over breed their poor pets- why is that not being addressed here? should you have a check in system to ensure this doesn't become problematic for dogs and cats. - What about changes to the bylaw around people hurting animals- in any way. Why to increase those fees? Or, expedite the court system? It seems there is a lot missing in your review, about the welfare of animals. I get the penalty pieces of a dog that is aggressive- what about its owners?
- No change needed
- 6 dogs and 6 cats way too many. 3 dogs and 3 cats would be more appropriate
- As long as the animals are well kept, and looked after responsibly, it is not the city's concern.
- I feel 6 is to many. People could have 6 of each which means 12 total?
- Unless they have an 2 acre property
- The proposed number of pets is too high. Two cats or dogs per household should be the maximum.
- This is government overreach. Stay in your lane.
- 6 dogs in 1 house could get very messy and loud and create a noise violation for themselves.
- If you're not enforcing how many children someone can have, don't even bother trying to enforce a limit on pets.
- The number of animals allowed should be lower and if you want to be at 6 you must prove you have the means and space for them. 6 dogs and 6 cats are too many unless they are fostering or rescuing strays
- should be fewer than 6
- Its too many. 2 Maximum.
- I would prefer a stricter per limit change - e.g., to no more than 2 per household.
- Current Dog bylaws are some of the best in the world - keep them as is. It's what makes Calgary stand out from other cities in a positive way.



- Again, due diligence is all that is necessary. No limit should be put in place but all animals should be Well cared for. If somebody isn't getting their six dogs they're yearly shots, they probably don't need six dogs. This is situational.
- So long as the pets are being properly taken care of there should be no limit as to how many a home can have.
- That's an insane amount of animals in one home - I don't support the increase but I do support the exceptions
- It should be a tighter cap like three and three.
- A total of 6 animals per household with the potential exceptions Service animals not included in count of animals.
- There is no way to care for this many animals, it lowers property values and is a health risk for people living in the house.
- I think 6 (dogs) or 6 (cats) in ine household is to many. Unless you are fosters, breeders, or a daycare.
- Lower limits should be in place. A 6 dog & cat limit (12 total) is too high unless it is a licensed (& monitored) breeding establishment or a in larger Home located in a rural area with more space for the animals to roam within a properly fenced area.
- This number is too high.
- I don't think they're should be a limit if proper care is given
- 6 cat? Dogs? That's a lot!
- That is too many animals in one home. 2 cats. 2 dogs is a reasonable number.
- Too many animals at the single house
- Just too many in a household at 6. Not necessary as pets and that many almost becomes animal hoarding.
- They are many many people who can adequately take care of multiple animals. A couple bad apples shouldn't ruin it for everyone.
- It should stay as is
- rescues need exceptions
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is excessive and should not be allowed.
- .
- need an exception for rescues ... dogs come and go in that situation some times they could exceed that number easily
- City overreach! Not every aspect of our lives needs dictation from city hall!
- 6 is too many
- I would support this by law only if it could prevent animal hoarding.
- not needed
- Unless it is in some way disturbing others, it's the owners choice.
- N/a



- The limits are set far too high at 6 of each. Crowded animals results in sickness and despite an owners desire to have them most people can hardly care for more than 2. large amounts of animals in small spaces poses a legitimate health risk.
- In my opinion 6 is an excessive number of dogs/cats. I would be concerned for the welfare of the animals. Six dogs in one residential household would pose a significant noise concern.
- This question is poorly worded. There should be limits to the number of pets allowed.
- 6 is too many
- 6 is a lot. I love pets and I think people who are great should be able to apply for free or low cost to have more and with a good plan in place it should be allowed. But a lot of people who shouldn't have 6 pets would do it if the rules permitted. 4 might be more reasonable.
- I don't think it matters how many pets someone has. Fines should be given if the owner does not take care of their animals.
- The number of dogs does not correlate with the wellbeing of the dog or surrounding individuals
- I think 6 is a very large number of pets to have in a city. 3 of each is a good amount when it comes to cleanup etc so just not 6. Do agree with the potential exceptions.
- I think 6 dogs for the majority of urban and suburban residents is way too many. Perhaps a max of 4?
- There is no need to own that many pets.
- 2 large dogs and 2 cats per household unless they are a non profit organization who takes care of rescue dogs.
- It's fine the way it is.
- Except for the exceptions listed above, no household needs to have that many animals in one household.
- Dog breeders should be able to have max 12 animals. Max 3 for the rest of us. Exceptions are all good except dog fanciers. What are dog fanciers?
- If household is in city, then yes. If household is on more land like an acreage, then no
- 6 dogs or 6 cats per household is way too many
- are you kidding me? who the hell wants 6 cats or 6 dogs? That is to much for an apartment. The limit should be 1 dog or 2 cats!
- A large number of pets are a financial stress, and calgarian are already complaining paying property taxes, how can they afford more pets.
- As long as the animals are not a issue the city doesn't need yo be involved.
- 6 dogs it's too much, if they are big they make a mess and smell, and barking distourbing neighbours
- What people do in their own homes is not the City's Business. If the animals are kept outside in kennels or runs, and become a noise problem, then there are other avenues the City can use.
- 6 is too high, 2 is sufficient
- You are taking away a person's freedom to make their own decision.
- 6 dogs or cats is too high. No more than two.



- 6 dogs AND cats is too high, I could get behind 6 cats OR dogs (or a combination) in total but the average pet owner cannot properly care for a total of 12 animals
- 6 is too many in one household, cats will be roaming in neighbours yards, dogs will excessively barking
- It's nobody's business how many pets someone owns as long as they're cared for and aren't a nuisance.
- 6 is too many 3 dogs and 3 cats as long as they do not create noise, smells, feces etc.
- leave it
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is more than the average pet owner could easily care for. Special cases can get special approval but 6 is more than the average can handle
- the amount of 6 seems enhesttt
- 12 animals in one household seems like a lot of animals. However if exceptions could be made when people can prove they are a responsible home (for ex volunteers from animal rescues) I would be more comfortable with conditional exceptions than anyone that wants to being able to have that many pets in one household
- I would support the change if all animals were spay/neutered by 6 months old to prevent pet overpopulation, if breeding of any animals required kennel/breeding licences and registration.
- If this bylaw is trying to stop people from hoarding animals it's not going to stop this. I person that hoards animals is mentally sick and following a bylaw will not stop them
- I have lived, in the past, with 8 cats in our household. Very cleanly. The number should depend on particular circumstances..
- I would support a lesser number like 3 or 4
- If the person has the means to take care of the animal properly and provides a nice home there is no reason to limit.
- Unnecessary to limit if the animals are being cared for and are healthy.
- Six is ridiculous in the city. Three seems a much more reasonable increase from the two suggested. See how that works.
- over the top, animals getting out, faeces buildup, noise levels
- This is an unnecessary regulation. Nuisance animals are dealt with through other regulations - we ought to stay out of mandating what happens inside of people's homes
- Limit should be 3 dogs and 6 cats, with the exceptions listed. But also with some restrictions, less than 3 dogs and 6 cats, based on the square footage of the household and/or the property.
- The number of animals does not dictate standard of care. AllOf these items should be managed on a case by case basis.
- Segregation of animals is unfair to the animal
- Too many animals. Lower amount
- There should not be a limit on the amount of pets provided they are being reasonably cared for.
- No limit!!! Absolutely pointless restriction. Number of animals does not have any correlation with quality of care. I have 7 mid-large sized rescue dogs, they are very well cared for - I pick up poop and vaccum/mop daily, keep them quiet, take them for 1-3 hour walks daily, brush their teeth and



their fur every couple days, trim their nails every week, feed them high quality food and my neighbours adore them! Paying for their care supports the local economy and adopting them has helped with Alberta's stray dog problem (on reserves).

- Not sure what the limit is right now for number of pets. If there is no limit then yes I support this bylaw to limit it. However I personally do not support one household owning 12 animals for reasons stated in the question. It's not necessary, becomes excessive noise & likely increased feces/smell depending on how well the animals are being cared for. Owners should have to pay a special fee if they want so many animals to cover the cost of bylaws to come check at random. This should not be a fee passed onto other taxpayers.
- If someone is a responsible pet owner they would be that for 1 dog or 8 dogs, a bylaw should not decide how many they can have.
- Twelve (12) is too many animals for a city property.
- I feel that this number is too high. I would support 4 animals in total, with exceptions as listed.
- The only way I would support this if it was to stop puppy/kitten mills
- The limits should be more reflective of pet size
- This opens up the possibility for animal hoarding, perhaps alphabet a special permit for those fostering numerous animals, for special circumstances.
- 6 of each is too many, if they have both that's 12 animals...that's too many
- 12 animals on one property is ridiculous. Most people can't afford 1 animal and the vet bills associated with that animal.
- Foster family's should be exempt.
- Animals reproduce just like we do. Gate keeping the amount they do that is outlandish.
- Clean environments and healthy animals are more important than the number of animals.
- If you can financially and physically able to care for and maintain multiple dogs or cats you should be allowed to do so. As long as the animals are healthy and cared for the number owned shouldn't be limited.
- It's not about the number of animals! It's about the way they are kept. How about prohibiting the sale of dogs and cats in petstores like so many other progressive municipalities have implemented. That will help with reducing backyard breeding as well. Also focus on educational and spay neuter initiatives instead of these silly changes that won't address the underlying issues.
- Increased administrative expense
- That's far too many at the the maximum
- No one wants to live next door to a home with 6 dogs and/or 6 cats.
- I don't think anyone needs six dogs and six cats. The limit of pets allowed should be 6 in total.
- Hoarders would still exist, and responsible pet owners would be punished
- It's your personal property you can have however many animals you would like as long as you are responsible.
- 6 dogs OR 6 cats but 12 animals in one house is too many
- Limits are restrictive. Should be a case by case basis.
- 12 animals total is excessive



- If someone has more then what are they supposed to do? Put them down? As long as the animals are taken care of that should be up to the owner of the residence.
- 6 animals per dwelling in the city is cruel to the animals, particularly dogs. Cats, not so much.
- The City should not control private residences except in cases of commercial use (i.e. breeders who are operating for profit)
- people can be responsible regardless of their number of pets.
- Since you have included several exemptions, (I was thinking about breeders), I think that 6 cats AND 6 dogs is too high a number of animals. Perhaps any combination UP TO 6 would be more reasonable, along with the other details you have here.
- That is a lot of animals on one lot or in 1 house. It could get out of hand very quickly.
- That is way too many animals for one household in any circumstance
- We don't need to allow a higher limit - this encourages hoarding and would be to the detriment of the animals' well being.
- Animal welfare is at stake with large numbers of animals in one household
- Give your heads a shake. Too many animals in a city environment. 3 should be a max and for animal welfare that is even high in some circumstances.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is waaaaayyyy too many animals in one household. The exceptions listed above make sense, but for a normal household... no one needs that many animals!
- 6 is way to many
- I believe a limit of 6 dogs and 6 cats is far too high. The limit should be 2 dogs and 2 cats as most of us live in city dwellings where yard space is limited. Dogs and cats are expensive to keep. Noise of six dogs no matter how wonderful they are would be excessive if right next door to me.
- It is not necessary for anyone to own more than two cats and/or dogs. Any more than this should not be permitted.
- Depends on owner, property size. Though by enforcing existing bylaws mitigates the need for this.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is way too many. I support a maximum of 3 pets total per household. I would support exceptions as outlined above if the pet limit was set at 3 or below.
- Animal hoarding is an illness. It leads to disease and property damage. People cannot look after 1 pet let alone a legal herd.
- There is no need for someone to have that many animals in one house regardless of the size of property and amount of people occupying it.
- Have a neighbor with five pets, has not been great experience.
- 12 pets in a household is too many in a city environment. There is not enough room. 6 dogs barking can be very disturbing & feces may be a problem.
- won't
- As long as the animals are properly cared for, The City should not interfere with citizen decisions on # pets
- I think limits won't stop people, more time should be put into welfare of pets that are already in homes.



- 6 dogs & 6 cats is too much for one household. Breeders should be in a different category & should pay higher licensing & have insurance. If a pet has a litter of puppies or kittens, there should be a temporary allowance for the parent to raise the litter & give time to find homes for the young ones.
- Six dogs AND six cats seems excessive.
- 6 dogs is a lot where as 6 cats isnt. Cats are small, quiet and sleep alot, so up to 9 cats is doable, anymore is excessive. More than 6 dogs is excessive for anyone outside of a farm.
- Six dogs or cats is far to many for one household unless the person is a registered breeder.
- 6 of each is excessive I don't know if there is a limit now
- The absolute maximum limit should be 3 dogs and/or cats per household.
- City of Calgary does not need control over how many pets a family in Calgary can own. Instead do this. Increase fines for neglectful owners, poor living conditions, and create fines for puppy mills found in Calgary.
- i think the current #'s are acceptable as a 'standard' but that the special application should be developed further for those expectations that you have listed. As a pet owner of 2 dogs, I would find it a challenge to properly care for an manage any more than that at one time and would worry about the welfare of all if there were too many. However I support a special application for exceptions so that if it is deemed acceptable for more....but this should be an exception, not the rule.
- What if they can't find a home for the animal? What if they live on a large enough property that can take care of more than 6 pets? I would approve if they allow more in those scenarios.
- Unless the animals become a nuisance or cause health/safety issues regulation should not be required.
- Because people will lie and not register their dogs. I rather know theres 10 dogs in a home that the max limit suggested.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats are far too many. I am good with the exception list
- No more dogs or cats per household. It's too much for a lot of people to handle and keep up with all costs especially vet bills. It would increase problems with bad dog owners
- Na
- As a breeder it can be hard to have only 6 dogs in a breeding program. I'm not opposed to a limit, I believe it needs to be 10 dogs or there abouts.
- The average citizen does not have the resources to care for that many animals. The monetary cost of care and time to care for that animal would be extensive and as a result, pets would likely receive insufficient care. Most homes also do not have adequate space to care for these animals. I think this would only result in more complaints from neighbours, as well as more conflicts between animals and people, as pet training is very time consuming.
- We do not live in a dictatorship so the city should mind its own business. It is not up to the city to decide how many pets a person can have.
- Six dogs and six cats per household is too many. As you heard in phase 1, two dogs and/or 2 cats should be adequate.
- Maybe go after the bad animal owners inside of going after the animals



- With six pets, you would be sanctioning commercial/backyard breeding operations and that is not acceptable. NO, NO and NO. Anything over 3 pets of either species should require an application.
- Let people have their pets
- For the most part I do agree but to me there are some errors. I think 12 pets per household is too many and I think that when purchasing or adopting or someone has found a stray or such that their house should be assessed to how many animals they can cater ethically within their household and how much attention can be given to each. So I believe in a reduced number of pets being allowed but being a case to case situation. I think there should be checkups on everyone with a pet to see if they are taking care of their pets. I don't think an exception to the rule should be dogs / cats under 6 months of age because then people will get cats and dogs and after their 6 month stay is up and after their phase of being cute is done they will be throw out on the streets or be hastily given away to people who are not investigated for being a suitable pet owner. I don't think there should really be an approved excess animal permit if my suggestion is taken into consideration, if you do not have the room you simply cannot get excess animals unless it is in the case of an emergency and for example a stray is found and it is being kept temporarily till another home can take it. I don't think that you should be able to get more dogs if you have a license, I think it should be based on the space you have available and the resources you have to take care of it/them.
- No everyone has the right to own as many dogs as they wish
- Six is too many. Three would be more acceptable.
- Keep the bylaw the same why change.
- Up to 12 animals on one property is absolutely ludicrous (even on a large piece of land). I believe this new bylaws will be abused and put animals at risk. I believe more than 2 cats or dogs is low though. I believe the new bylaws should allow for up to 3 cats AND dogs. 6 animals in total on a property is absolutely plenty. I agree with all the above stated exceptions if the new bylaw's allowed animals were cut in half.
- For that many animals in one home could we do welfare checks? I pay high taxes but would support a specific amount increase to monitor the welfare of animals; for safety, abuse, disease. Children get welfare checks why not animals?!
- It would depend on the circumstances
- It would not prevent backyard breeders or hoarding situations from occurring
- Too many
- too high, six dogs and 6 cats in one household is in my opinion far too many. I would support a special license for more than 3
- I think 6 is too many. Within city limits it seems 3 or 4 would be more reasonable. I agree with the proposed exceptions noted above however.
- might be too many factors to be cut and dried and the special applications can be too subjective
- People can be responsible pet owners with over six dogs
- We are living in an increasingly dense urban environment. To increase these limits would place undue stress on non-pet owner neighbors. You cannot regulate and enforce noise and animal excrement issues efficiently.



- 6 dogs+6 cats are too many. I support the change if the number were reduced to 4 dogs+4 cats
- I feel that if a person has 6 dogs and 6 cats, there's no point to a limit. I feel 3 of each is reasonable with the same exceptions listed above.
- Animal limits should be based on safe and healthy living space for each animal.
- We wouldn't restrict how many children one can have...
- No license requirements
- There should be a limit of 2 dogs or cats, with above exceptions by special application.
- Bylaw should be removed
- People are responsible for the welfare of animals, we need to review individual cases.
- I don't know what the limit is right now. Absolutely no more than two.
- I think this would or could put rescues at risk, particularly given the dangerous and misguided BSL legislation that is currently being proposed and the potential number of abandoned terrier breeds that may result
- Too many animals
- The dog and cat limits we have now are good. More per household only increases problems with bad owners. Costs more for vets etc. so owner would not give as good of care to all the animals.
- 6 in a small space doesn't seem fair to the animals
- The cost of care is too great and many of these animals would be not taken care of properly. Also, many people fail in managing their pets. Would this mean a person could now own 6 pit bulls?
- If you are restricting the number, and there are all these exceptions, why allow six of each rather than a lower number, say 3 or 4?
- This is a ridiculously high number for the average house size and family's ability to care for the animals. This would encourage poor animal care in my opinion.
- 6 pets per household seems excessive
- I own two dogs and am aware of the value this brings to the dogs (in having a canine pal). I have owned dogs all my life, but never more than two at a time. Without understanding why a faith would want to own multiples, I cannot support increasing the number of pets per household, e.g. I love dogs, but have zero interest in living next door to a family that had 6 dogs and 6 cats. Animals cost time & money, and the more you gather, the less time you will spend with each pet. I'd like to understand why someone would want more than two dogs or two cats. Running a doggy daycare in a home would introduce multiple dogs into one home, but I would expect City ordinances governing sole proprietor businesses to apply to that situation.
- You are saying increase the limit to 12 pets per home... this is excessive isn't it... is this so the city makes more money? Please keep in mind dogs and cats live in homes unlike wild birds, squirrels and such...
- 6 animals is excessive
- If they can care for all the animals properly then they should be able to choose how many they like
- No need for more laws.
- 12 animals is crazy come on



- I would support a max of 3 Dogs and 3 cats. Anything beyond that is excessive and obnoxious to neighbours.
- I support this except pet sitters or daycares should not be allowed to have more than the limit. I cannot see why having a dog fanciers license should allow more than the number specified, nor why so many service animals would be needed.
- Owning more than 2 of any animal is excessive unless the person is an acknowledged/certified trainer
- Although I feel like that number is fine, there will be no way to enforce this and it will encourage citizens to not license any pets that go over that number. As a homeowner I wouldn't like that the city can tell me how many pets that I can have inside my house. Perhaps if a homeowner has repeatedly violated the responsible pet ownership bylaws then maybe this limit would have merit.
- If they can be properly cared for who are you to tell me when I can and can't have.
- Limit should be 4.
- The time and effort to properly care for that many pets seems non sustainable. The walking, feces pick up, noise control, training, a monumental task and the health issues for residents of a home with that many pets should be considered.
- Limit should be 2 pets per household
- Some people can deal well with lots of animals and some can barely deal with one. It should be case by case if there are complaints
- Two pets is enough.
- If said own can safely care for the animals then there should be no limit. Maintenance of the safety and health of the animals is priority
- This puts a limit on the people who help all the neglected animals. I believe that if there are complaints, then address. But to make this a blanket bylaw, is unfair and judging everyone at one slate.
- It's ignorant beyond comprehension.
- That's too many pets in 1 household
- 6 of each is WAY too many! 3 or 4 at most and that still seems like a lot
- Should also take into consideration the size of the home; 6 dogs and 6 cats is a huge amount for most homes
- number of animals is too high
- Pet limits have not been an issue before. Target people who are an issue
- I support it for new pet owners but not for existing family pets, you should not have to Re-home your pets.
- Freedom and liberty
- Six dogs and six cats is already a large number for a city home. It is a lot of mess that is rarely cleaned up.
- 6 is too many. Limit should be 2. This would provide company for the pets and is a reasonable number per household.



- in the circumstance of excessive pet ownership, anyone who is going to be a problem will not jump through these hoops, so in the end all they do is punish the responsible for being responsible
- One of my neighbours has 3 cats, 1 dog and 1 rabbit. 2 years in a row now I have had to dig up all the fury in my flower beds and haul it to the dump/compost. I then had to purchase more dirt to replace. There is NO reason for more than one pet per household. There are more cats than I can count in my neighbourhood and they are always running free.
- Cats perhaps - but six dogs needing walking outside and pooping outside - increases the interaction of humans with others pets - I think in the case of cats it is contained in the household so would support but not dogs unless the exceptions apply and include CKC registered breeders maybe?
- 6 pets is too many for one household
- It's much harder to take care of 12 pets. The limit should be 4 dogs and 4 cats
- no way people need more than 2 dogs or cats
- That's WAY too many. I love dogs and properly trained mine. It was a TON of work to do properly. Couldn't do it with 6. No way.
- There are too many cats in our area.
- The numbers of allowable animals should be 1/2 of what is proposed with a maximum of 4 in any single household. Twelve animals in a household is unacceptable.
- People's capability to care for animals is drastically different - some could barely care for 1, while others could care for many. What needs to change is the general public's knowledge on what it means to be a responsible pet owner, when something is a problem, how to report problems, who to report problems to, and the assurance that it is truly anonymous. I have worked as a Peace Officer in this city; my training was poor. I learned to not take papers in the house with me after someone grabbed my clipboard from me to see who reported them.
- That is far too many dogs and cats to be in a household. Quality of life of the pets would be of concern, cleanliness of the property and proper health and hygiene of the pets
- There should never be as many 6 dogs and 6 cats allowed on any property. A maximum of 3 or maybe 4 cats and no more than 2 dogs. Most owners cannot take care of any more than that number of either. There is not a reason that I can think of where this many pets should be necessary, especially if one were to have 6 cats and 6 dogs, that would be a dozen pets. Neighbours should not have to deal with the noise, smell and devaluing of their adjacent properties.
- Who needs or can manage 6 of either let alone 12
- Animals need to be looked after probably 3 of each is lots
- again, our lots are too small for this many animals per household, if everyone had the max, this would creat massive issues
- I don't think a person needs 6 dogs and 6 cats. That is difficult to watch after.
- 2 cats & 2 dogs is enough to properly care for the animals
- I know some people like this and their animals and not a bother to the neighborhood
- Again this is infringing on people rights. You have the right to own as many pets as you can care for. If you fail to care for those pets you must face the consequence. By no means should we have any right to tell another person how many pets he/she should have.



- 6 dogs or cats is far too many to have in the city.
- That's too many in one household.
- Who has the time, resources and space to properly care for 6 dogs and 6 cats in a household? The pets' welfare comes before that of the owner's desire to have more pets. This section needed to state what the current bylaw limit is.
- You are making assumptions the anyone not being care for. The wording is too vague
- Except in cases of fostering, 12 animals in a dwelling is a large amount. Animal and human welfare would be a concern
- Not up to government to decide this.
- 12 pets in one household seems excessive. The more animals to care for, the more likely the owner may not have the financial means to be able to provide adequate food and medical care, if needed.
- Unless the animals are neglected i see no reason why there should be limits.
- I object to 6 adult dogs AND 6 adult cats in any one household.
- 2 pets per household is reasonable.
- I would only support in certain cases. For example inherited one animal and a household already has two. Temporary foster homes provided there is no excessive barking and cats are not allowed to roam freely. And how many service animals does one really need certainly not 6!
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats in one household? That is far, far too many! My suggested ABSOLUTE MAX would be 2 of each.
- Take out the inherited. One may claim animal inheritance without legal paperwork. Add a length of time that a household can have more animals, like 10 weeks.
- If owners are responsible and diligent then the city should not have the right to restrict animal numbers within reasonable limits.
- I think the majority of households fall beneath the pet limit so I don't see a need to implement a limit
- 6 is too many
- I am concerned about the ability to adequately care for a large number (greater than two) animals
- As long as the owner takes care of the animals I think they should be allowed however many they want.
- Depends on the situation
- I think 2 animals in a house is enough. Except for breeders. Breeders should be licensed and periodically inspected. As would fostering.
- In my neighbourhood I've observed that most households are challenged to responsibly look after a single dog. This includes walking, barking control and feces pick-up. Permitting more pets per household will worsen this problem.
- I support the concept of this bylaw and exceptions. But I suggest that the number of dogs or cats should be based on the size of the home and/or property. Space is needed to protect the welfare of the animals. Some properties may not even safely accommodate 6 dogs and 6 cats while larger properties may be able to accommodate more without detriment to the animals or equal impact to neighbours.



- The increased amount of animals in a household may cause problems for the animals, owners & for neighbors. It would be difficult to monitor this.
- There is a problem already with amount of pets people have in the city. They are not obeying to the bylaws in place and worst they seem to feel they have the authority above their neighbors and can do anything without consequences because they are pet owners. Homeowners would like their properties back. The city knows that people live in close proximity key word city why are animals being allowed to surpass the human population? When there is little control over what's already there. It stinks, it's gross around the city because people leave feces on people's lawns, sidewalks, outside grocery stores where people stepped in to it and tracked inside the food places. Outside restaurants people are sitting inside while there's load of feces under the window. This doesn't alarm anyone and the city is considering additional animals? The city need laws, strong laws that result in hefty fines because it is getting out of hand.
- We feel that 6 dogs or cats in a household is a bit much. We would suggest a limit of 4.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs per household??? this is excessive!
- That is way too many animals in a community environment, small yards, close quarters, already have trouble with noisy dog and inability to have bylaw interfere.
- Too many exceptions might make the rules difficult to apply. I don't think limiting the number of animals is right. Just need better enforcement of current rules.
- I believe that's still too many animals too be able to give the proper care, I think a limit of 4 dogs and 4 cats
- 6 cats or dogs cannot be properly cared for. This may put a stop to puppy farms. 2 dogs and/or cats is plenty
- There is no need to have 6 dogs or cats per household. There should be a graduated fee - the more animals you have above you should pay a higher licensing fee.
- I believe 6 dogs and 6 cats is way too many pets for one household
- I believe that this is too many pets for one household in an urban setting. Would suggest 2 dogs and 2 cats.
- I don't think that anyone can properly pay for and maintain health for 12 animals in their home. 6 of each is a little excessive.
- to easy to add other pets after bylaw changes. Other bylaws will fine nuance pet owners
- This question is tied to other questions... Low income - what if they have 6 dogs and 6 cats and get a reduced license fee? What if noise and smell accumulates in a yard because of 6 large dogs versus 6 small dogs? The number 6 for any animal poses a question.
- ^ is too many per household
- It's more important to ensure owners are accountable and provide good care than to count the number of pets.
- Others than breeders, why would anyone need to have more than 2 animals in a city home.
- Nobody NEEDS more than 2 animals of ANY kind. 1 pet and a companion for that pet, so that makes 2
- Too many pets- no one needs that many animals within the city of Calgary



- 6 is too much!! how about 4
- I have 5 animals and am responsible
- if a person is irresponsible, it would not matter if they had 1 pet or 20 pets. Same for responsible pet owners. Responsible pet owners could have more than 10 dogs and would ensure feces are picked up, pets are cared for and provided for. Limiting the number will only hurt responsible owners and their pets. Instead of limiting pets, how about look at the possibility of inspections for those with more than a certain number of pets? This would perhaps weed out the [removed] back yard breeders and dog flippers who are only in it for the money.
- I don't believe in limiting people in this manner.
- 12 pets is too many, 6 total
- Many people rescue unwanted and abused animals and give them loving homes. Restrictions on numbers of animals in a home would reduce the amount of rescues getting permanent homes.
- No one needs more than 2 pets : 2 max
- three should be the maximum otherwise you are operating a zoo
- How on earth can anyone properly care for and control so many dogs and cats on a residential property? This is a ridiculous number. 1 or 2, sure but 6 of each? Where is this absurd idea coming from? If people want to have many pets, they can move out of the city and get a large property where their decisions won't affect anyone else.
- I feel like people should have the right to choose how many animals they have as long as the pets needs are taken care of and there are no issues for the community. If this bylaw is passed then people will push to have the number lowered.
- Six dogs and six cats is far too high of a number unless the person is a registered kennel.
- Prefer to have limit as 4 dogs and 4 cats
- A single unit dwelling can be small in size. This does not seem to provide appropriate living conditions for potentially 12 animals (6 dogs + 6 cats).
- I honestly don't see how a person could care for 12 animals adequately. That is excessive.
- I do not think more animals than people should be on a property to give fully appropriate care to an animal.
- 6 dogs AND cats is too many. Seriously doubt a person's ability to care for all these animals properly.
- 12 animals is too many for in the city (the proposed bylaw is not strict enough) and there are too many exemptions.
- do not limit animals
- I do not support this bylaw for people who can afford to take care of the pets. I think low income families should maybe have a limit on pets.
- Because
- I know that it can be difficult for non-pet owners to deal with all that can come with having pet neighbours, and i also know that restricting the number of animals per residence without the pet owners having done nothing to deserve this restrictions seems arbitrary to say the least. I also know that we do not live in an ideal world where all pet owners take exceptional care of their pets and only



have the number of pets that they can properly care for. I would be more supportive of a measure that would require the reduction of the number of allowable pets in a residence if there were incidents where this would be appropriate. Perhaps a partial measure that states that complaints regarding the welfare of these animals and the ability for the pet owners to care for them would mean a reduction in the number allowed. Some type of defined care standard and ability to care for the animals would have to be established. One of the main problems with restricting the number of pets per residence, besides punishing responsible pet owners, is that once a limit is in place, it can be continually argued that this new limit should be reduced, again and again. This has happened in many communities and I know we can find a better solution. It comes down to only restricting those pet owners that actually require it.

- 6 is too many. So many people can't afford vet care already.
- quantity of pets has no bearing on quality of care for the animals or bylaw compliance. Another potential exception, should be for animal shelter workers, that may have more pets than the average household(work in high euthanasia facilities)
- other than fostering, or a pet having a litter, I don't see it as necessary to allow up to 12 animals in a home
- 6 is too many animals.
- I honestly believe that is too many animals for the average person. I think the animals would not be receiving a good quality of life. I think foster homes and different situations like that should be exempt with providing a good reason to having so many dogs and cats.
- Support all, but include exception for those who board animals
- Not the change I want. I want freedom
- No one needs 6 dogs or cats. It's too many in a house
- Should be able to prove income can support animals
- 6 dogs and 6cats/household limit is liable for abuse
- Should be allowed to have as many pets as want
- Too many animals to care for properly.
- There is no need for that many pets. The proper care of an animal decreases as the number of animals in household increases
- It isn't uncommon for pet owners to have 3-4 of a pet - 2 is too low a number - especially if a dog has a litter and the owner can't adopt them all out so the owner keeps the litter of up to 6
- Less dogs in high density housing. Dogs can't sleep outside.
- 6 is already a ridiculous number...7 doesn't matter if you have 6.
- I don't see that this addresses the issues the best way. I believe more stringent rules on the specific issues would be more appropriate.
- I would not want to live next to a house with six dogs and six cats. That is just insane. Why can't people be reasonable and have only one or two dogs?
- No body needs that many pets in a city and I believe it is irresponsible and unrealistic to care for that many.
- I do not want to live next door to 6 dogs.....for any reason!



-
- There is no reason to have that many pets in an urban area. Too many issues with noise, odours and insufficient room to keep or maintain that many pets.
- Existing bylaws are poorly enforced, licencing fees do not help my pets.
- This limit should be lowered to 2 dogs and 2 cats per household.
- All things in moderation
- I support all of the above with a limit of 4 cats and 4 dogs.
- Enforcing a pet limit would punish responsible owners. Focus of this bylaw should be irresponsible owners.
- So long as an owner can maintain proper care and training on their animals why limit the amount.
- I do not think there should be a limit of pets, if the pet owners follow responsible pet ownership that is more important consideration.
- I feel like this is potentially opening the door to animal hoarding. This could be detrimental to the well-being of these animals if so many are allowed in one residence.
- Depends on the size of the house to appropriately house all of those animals. Animals are expensive to care for.
- I think that as long as there are no other issues and the pets are being managed responsibly then it should not be our place to introduce a specific number. If it is not responsible ownership then other parts of the bylaw would then apply to them
- We don't need more regulations, we need less.
- Ownership should be limited to two (2) dogs and two (2) cats.
- I would not support assigning any number of pets to a household even though your exceptions are great. If a large number of pets are within any household and if there is a problem, then a bylaw officer should be on the scene to help and advise the person so that the care of the animals are at the forefront. Many rescue groups assist large animal households.
- I do agree with the change but wanted to be able to state my opinion as well. I currently own 4 dogs. I clean poop up daily(sometimes 2-3 times a day), they get walked daily and if they are barking I stop it. However lots of multiple dog owners do not do the same things and I think consequences should be steeper for not providing a good quality of life for the dog and for your neighbors. I think there should also be stricter application process for multiple dog owners, if they choose to get another dog, when licencing their dogs(ie; house and yard checks, talk to neighbors, require dogs to have proper amount of training, given proper amount of space/ there shouldn't be 6 dogs in a tiny house or apartment). 4 large dogs is a lot and I put lots of time into training and socializing them and again many people do not do this. It's a privilege to own the amount of dogs I do but too many people take that for granted and the dogs end up suffering. I think this also all applies to cat owners. Cars should be inside or outside in a secured place(catio) or leashed. No cat should be wondering outside unsupervised.
- Restricting animal ownership to a set number is overkill and doesn't address the cause of the problem. Some people can't properly take care of more than 1 animal, other people can properly take care of a dozen or more animals. The problem is proper care and control, not the number of



animals in one household. As long as the owner are providing sufficient care of the animals, and have proper control over those animals, they should not be restricted to a set number. While I do not support such a bylaw, should one still be implemented, I STRONGLY support all the expectations listed above being included in such a bylaw - PARTICULARLY the inheritance exception.

- 12 pets in one household (that isn't a business or "professional" foster situation seems like a lot. I know some people who'd look after their pets to a standard that's good, but I think it might encourage hoarding.
- People can have as many animals as they want
- It's not sanitary. Also dogs become a pack mentality which can make them more ferocious. If there are more pers allowed this may make some pet owners less likely to neuter or spay.
- There is no reason for a person to have 6 dogs or cats! This poses serious health issues, and is financial cost to feed and walk all these animals. I would like to limit to be reduced to 3 dogs or cats MAX.
- It depends on the space you have I don't believe animals should be Hoarded, but I don't think it's the city's business really
- 6 of any animal is too many. We watch walkers failing to pick up after a group of dogs (and owner/walker is frequently on phone) and misses some.
- The care the pets received is far more important than the number of pets
- it's nobody's business how many animals you keep, as long as they are humanely treated and not a nuisance to others
- B
- 6 is too many. 3 or 4 at most
- The exceptions appear to prove the rule. Otherwise 6 of each is excessive unless there are several responsible owners in the home. Two or three of each is plenty unless the exceptions apply. 6 i
- Higher risk for neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- It's not good some animals are sweet and good but y'all are judging them just by the way they look and putting them in bars and cages and muzzling them just because of the way they look
- Only 2 cats and dogs per household
- It was not stated above what the current limit is but i'm assuming its unlimited. I think the limits should be much lower than 6 dogs AND 6 cats. If everyone owned that many animals in the city, it would be mayhem. 2 dogs AND 2 cats seems reasonable.
- It's their property
- No one needs more than 6 animals. There should be a maximum of 3.
- If someone lives on a larger property with a larger home? Square footage of indoor and outdoor space should be considered.
- Stupid
- A person should have as many animals as they please AS LONG AS THEY TAKE CARE OF THEM
- No need.
- rescues excluded



- There should not be a licensing fee for animals that won't be going outdoors unless it's an accident. This is unreasonable gouging and the fee funds nothing that is a benefit to society. While we're at it, Calgary, the terms "grandfathered" and "grandfather clause" have racist origins. Stop using them.
- 12 animals seems too high. I would support up to 6 total animals. An exception would be for under 6 months
- I think it should be lower unless the person is a responsible breeder. Like 3 of any combination of cats or dogs. Or maybe 1 per each person old enough to be responsible for a pet. Maybe 12 or older. .
- 6 is too many. It should be fewer.
- As a dog owner I feel that 6 animals is too much to reasonably provide quality care for
- All dogs and cats must be neutered. The number of dogs and cats should be limited to two each, with only an exception for those who temporarily take in kittens or puppies from the SPCA to help nourish and socialize them. Well-behaved excess animals currently owned should be donated to low income households. Animal breeders should relocate to rural areas.
- should be 3 and 3
- I support the exceptions however I do not support the idea of anyone having the ability to potentially own 12 animals(6cats 6dogs) that seems like borderline animal hoarding and creates high chances of poorly cared for animals (basically abuse)
- This would make it tricky for fostering, etc. I don't support it. As long as the animals are exercised daily, in a clean living environment, and behaved, who cares?
- The number of pets should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. There are many situations where one pet is too many (not being appropriately cared for) whereas someone could have 6 or 7 pets that are well-kept and you never hear complaints about them.
- Limits are too high. Perhaps three of either would be appropriate. Preferably fewer.
- There is no reason why someone should have 6 dogs and 6 cats on a single property. The noise and mess would be excessive, not in the animals best interests and not reasonable. If they want that many pets, they should live in the country.
- Higher risk for neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- No need for limit. Use existing bylaws to deal with problems.
- 6 dogs are a lot...4 dogs is plenty in the city. Only One or two pitbulls from Canada.
- Dog daycares are businesses. They should be excluded from this discussion entirely;
- I feel this is excessive and may lead to hoarding , and who can afford that many unless living on an farm or one or more acres of land
- Responsible owners will only have as many animals as they could afford. Animals fill a void for Seniors and lonely people .We don't need more rules , more fees.
- Unfair
- There are already bylaws to be enforced if the number of animals proves to be too much for a property such as noise, feces, etc. Enforce them.
- If you can afford to care for them then there should be no limit.
- I think bylaw should have to have final say on each individual case



- Limit should be 2 dogs or cats
- It would be hard for many to keep up with vet care. So the animals well rung suffers. Also costs of licensing and general care. Plus the ability to keep control of all animals. Makes it hard to walk all of them. Too many irresponsible owners would have more nuisance dogs at one time.
- Unclear what processes and support are in place to protect the well-being of the animals if the limit is exceeded (for example, if a cat has kittens)
- There is no reason whatsoever that anyone within city limits needs more than 2 cats and 2 dogs. There is already more than enough dog defecation in the City. It borders on a public health issue. All owners say they pick it up....so where does it all come from?! When the snow melts the stench is disgusting. We do not need more domestic animals in the City. 12 animals per household is ridiculous. If you run an animal business, you get a business permit AND all the necessary licencing. Calgary does not need to make it easier or cheaper for anyone to pollute the City and/or terrorize citizens with their poorly socialized animals.
- 2 cats AND 2 dogs should be enough. 6 is way too many
- 6 of each is too many on one property due to noise smells etc
- Excluding exceptions, a total of 12 dogs/cats per household is beyond excessive. The neighbourhood suffers from noise and outdoor cats are uncontrolled for neighbours. Calgary already has a zoo.
- Too many animals in one house, difficult to provide adequate care for animals and greater chance of problems for neighbours
- Current limit is sufficient, if you want more animals move out of the city
- a good owner can take care of multiple pets of differing species. exceptions are ok
- I personally know multi pet homes who's animals do not break any of the above mentioned guideline and I know of single pet homes who break all listed. Number is pet does not have a direct correlation with nuisance behaviors
- Because
- I do not support hard limits. Restrictions based on abuse / neglect seem appropriate, but there is no magic to the numbers selected. There are possible unintended consequences. Learn from impaired driving law where people assume being below the .08 "limit" is equated to being safe to drive. This proposal seems to do nothing but add a layer of bureaucracy.
- That's too many pets, gross
- There is no need to have 12 animals. Chances are these people do not train or properly care for these animals. The only people that this may apply to are temporary homes or rescues or farms, but that is already an exclusion. Opening it up to this many animals drastically increases risk.
- Dogs & cats are totally different animals and different bylaws should apply. For eg. you most likely won't have a complaint about cats meowing, like you would dogs barking. Cats are not taken for walks to go to the bathroom. How does limiting the number of cats/dogs protect their welfare, if the own is being responsible?
- Six cats and six dogs is too many, except for puppies or kittens. Please reduce the number.
- This would lead to more animals being left in shelters



- 6 Animals are too much. More than 2 would require excess animal permit. I agree with most exceptions except inherited or grandfathered clause. They should have to comply within a extended definitive time frame
- That is too many animals. I think 3 at most of each animal, or 6 animals total.
- That is way to many animals in a houes
- I think responsible petownership and follow through in enforcing bylaws rather than number enforcements
- If someone can provide a home for more than 6 cats or dogs they should be allowed to do so.
- Two seems to low possible you could set a limit at 5
- I support the proposed change for a maximum amount of pets. I believe the amount of pets should be based on number of adults In the home, square footage of home, square footage of yard space, training; cleanliness, amenities for pets (kennels, walks) as well as financial abilities of the home. 6 cats and 6 dogs permanent in a home is a lot
- 6 doges is too many for one household I would be concerned about neglect. Unless they were used for LESA and were trained as such.
- what are limits now? 2? 12? i have owned pets f0or most of my life but i would never want to live near someone who owns 6 dogs and 6 six cats AND maybe chickens AND maybe pigeons? what are you thinking? please keep in mind that i^m not answering yes OR no because i dont know what the change actually is! i can guess its 2 but its only a guess based on the vagueness of the backgrounder.
- I think this creates more bureaucracy without addressing any problems. What really are the problems and let's deal with those eg. excessive barking.
- I would support a bylaw that limits pet ownership to one cat and one dog
- There are currently many households that have 3+ pets and they are not getting proper care. I do not see a need to increase the limit within the City of Calgary, if the limit were to increase there should be a minimum acreage associated with it.
- Some people want more
- There is no need to have 6 dogs and 6 cats in any household within a city. There is already many problems that the city are not enforcing with current bylaws and this bylaw would promote animal neglect.
- can we remove the term "grandfathered"- it has negative racist origins. Also, does the limit to number of pets only fall to dogs and cats? clarification is that would include all pets in the household
- Licensed breeders only all other maximum of 3
- I think it's fine less would be better but there has to be exceptions as stated by the bylaw
- Fundamentally disagree with tax-grabbing licenses in the first place; does little to nothing to help the animals themselves. Don't believe in placing limits on compassion toward helping/having animals, when so many are killed off in traditional 'shelters.' You will end up with even more abandoned animals than now. And animal BREEDING of any sort should not even be allowed, period, until all homeless animals have homes!



- Some people consider their pets family and that's all they have, as long as there is no danger to the welfare of the animals leave them be to be happy.
- As long as all animals are cared for and healthy, and the property is cared for, and there is little to no excessive noise, pet owners should have as many animals as they want. ALL pets should be registered with the city AND a vet.
- People can have 1 pet and be irresponsible-- letting it be destructive, creating messes, barking. someone else could have 12 and be super responsible. Irresponsible people will break the bylaw irregardless. So this again punishes those super responsible pet owners, and will not stop irresponsible owners or animal hoarders.
- you can't control how people live their lives. stop trying to force people to do what you want
- The current bylaw is sufficient for an urban area. Six is CRAZY. A special permit depending on situation.
- I don't feel anyone needs more than a couple dogs or cats. Six seems too many.
- It wouldn't help
- Should be 6 TOTAL. All cats, all dogs, or any combination thereof.
- Can not believe you are thinking of allowing so many animals in one place !! A hoarders paradise !! Please please keep animals to a maximum 3 dogs/3 cats
- In my Shawnessy area we don't seem to have many problems.
- a person should be able to police their ownership of their animal unless they are being neglected
- Some families simply have the room and resources to have more than six dogs or six cats (foster fails as we call them in particular, folks who foster animals who can't find a home, and inevitably end up keeping them!).
- [personal information removed]
- I would keep the maximum numbers at what they are now.
- Would support WITH the exceptions listed
- I would have concerns about logistics about fitting up to 12 animals in some housing.
- Up to 12 animals in a house seems hugely excessive to me unless there are specific reasons as stated above or the home is a large acreage.
- It is not up to the city how many pets someone can have. If they are properly cared for there is no issue
- Unless it is a situation where a person is hoarding many cats and or dogs, it is no ones business how many animals a person has.
- Pet limit reduction per household.
- There should not be a limit on animals in a household.
- No
- let people have what pets they want if it doesn't bother anyone
- There shouldn't be a limit to the amount of pets
- 6 dogs is still too many, especially if large, barking or outside a lot; 6 cats inside would be fine
- .



- Six dogs AND six cats seems excessive. I support a limit but a lower one.
- I have no opinion on this.
- Limits should be much lower, six of each per household is ridiculous!! Two of three of each is plenty!
- Some people have 1 dog that's excessively noisy and others have several that make no noise, it shouldn't be the number of pets but the impact. Every time my dog barks once, even in mid-afternoon my neighbor shouts at swears at me, but he's making far more noise than my dog ever does and is way more threatening than any bully breed. (No my dog is not any kind of pit bull)
- TOO MANY PETS! Why does someone need 6 cats? Seriously?
- I hate dogs and think their number should be as limited as possible. The amount of urine and feces that are left on grass, away from the owner's home, but on grass which other homeowners are responsible for taking care of is ridiculous.
- There should be no limit to how much cats or dog a person can own as long as they are being responsible for their pets and Caring for them properly.
- 12 animals is WAY too many in a regular sized house.
- I believe that 6 dogs and 6 cats is much too high and unnecessary, unless puppies or kittens under 6 months.
- Way too many!
- The proposed changes allow for far too many animals.
- Unless they have a business license for a business specifically related to animals breeding etc there is no reason anyone should have that many pets
- As long as the household is able to maintain and take care of animals with reasonable living space and the health of the animals there should be no issue.
- There is no direct relation ship between the well being of an animal and the number of animals in a property. A single animal may be a bused, or may cause annoyance if not receivng proper attention and care from the owner. That is why the fines, the fees and the regulations.
- The property along with house size should determine if the people can have 6 animals. If you have a 1-2 bedroom house and it's less than 1200sq feet you should not have 6 dogs or cats. BUT I agree with allowing from the potential list, but again I think having the city going to those places to make sure that there is enough space for the animals.
- A person should have to meet certain standards and it should be up to the city and neighbors whether someone is allowed a large number of pets. I do not think someone should be allowed multiple cat or dog if the ones they currently have are running at large, causing excessive noise, or the yard is a messy state. Perhaps a home in the large city is not the place for a cat breeding or large breed dog breeding operation.
- Stay out of my personal life
- Nobody needs more than two dogs, and/or, two cats. Per comments above, if people want to raise animals such as pigeons and other animals, or have numerous pets, the city is not appropriate. The only way these ideas should be feasible is if the city is responsible for decreased property values for tax payers who have to put up with citizens who decide they need a animal farm in their backyard.



All of this very eye opening what the city is considering. And to think I was considering moving from a downtown condo to a house with a yard, to only one day have to deal with a neighbour who decides they want to raise pigeons and who knows what else in their backyard, and maybe six dangerous dogs in the house.

- Irresponsible pet owners are undaunted by fines apparently; whether it's because fines are rarely handed out, the money doesn't matter or the fine is never collected, I don't know. So instead of two barking dogs, I could now be faced with six barking dogs. Not to mention even more cats running at large, killing birds and defecating in my garden.
- Limit of 6 is much too high
- As long as they are looked after properly there should be no limit.
- I believe there should be no limit if animal welfare is being upheld.
- Why six of each??? Why not four? Three?
- Honestly? Keeping pets is cruel to animals. In future years society will look upon keeping pets the same way it now looks upon keeping humans. I realize this is an extreme opinion but it should be recognized as one of the opinions you receive.
- People can be responsible pet owners with more than 6 pets
- The wording "potential exception" when referring to the list is not enough reassurance. In order for me to agree, the word potential must be removed from the list of exceptions.
- If someone is taking care of them, picking up after them and they are not loud, what is the problem?
- I don't agree
- 6 is to many to start. Animal welfare and waste. Calgary is now famous killing jobs with your globalist mentality. Who's going to do the affording of looking after animals when people loose thier jobs or become under employed even more? Certainly not accepting my taxes support the problems that council self elects into place.
- Pet limits should be based on square footage of the home and backyard. Perhaps tiered systems could ease understanding of how many pets someone can own without knowing exactly how big their property is. Special circumstances could be reviewed and made exempt.
- This would still not stop hoarders, and would punish responsible pet owners who are capable of caring for an increased number of animals
- You can't put a limit on how many animals someone wishes to have.
- People have a right to as many animals as they want.
- It should be based on sizing of home and space for the safety of the owner the pets and the neighbors
- Reduce the number to 2.
- this depends entirely on the ownership being responsible and if they aren't then they should be fined
- If someone needs this many animals, they are bordering on animal hoarding. Having that many animals in a home would be nearly impossible to control (other than a temporary litter of young)
- 6 MAX (dogs AND cats TOTAL)is sufficient, barring the above mentioned circumstances (except breeders/fanciers- should give them a limit too)



- You do not say what the current limit is. I think two of each pet is plenty, with the possibility of an approved permit under special circumstances.
- In Airdrie the limit is 6 why would you want 6 of each. You are creating hoarding situations
- I believe that 6 cats and 6 dogs are too large a number for one ordinary household. A reasonable limit would be 2 cats and 2 dogs in my opinion.
- That is way too many pets per household, no need
- As a professional dog trainer and behaviour therapist, I believe the number of adult dogs in a household should be limited to 5. Puppies need to find new homes during the critical period of socialization between the ages of 8 weeks to 16 weeks.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats seem far too many to me. I prefer a 2 dog/2 cat rule with exceptions above.
- Let people live how they want to but restrict them if they can't control it
- if you tell someone not to do something they're gonna do it
- 6 is too many and the exceptions could still be the way people sneak through the # of dogs they have.
- Lets focus on enforcement of current by laws and education for responsible ownership. No one needs to own a pack of dogs besides if you ban bullies we'll see an increase in popularity of other breeds. You are just growing the dog population outside of manageability.
- I think 12 animals in a single family home in most urban settings is too many for animal welfare, noise and feces.
- not to have, enough of government intervention in our lives. Mind your own business
- Who are we to say how many animals a person can own.
- There are responsible multi-dog households that do take wonderful care of all of their dogs. Perhaps a welfare check on dog homes above 6, to prevent neglect.
- 12 animals on any property is insane. Limit of 6 seems more reasonable and apply the exceptions
- Yes if you invoke the potential exceptions.
- Should have no limits as long as it's safe
- Six is way too many - two would be fine unless licensed as a breeder
- That number of animals would never be looked after properly.
- I would agree to this if the exceptions were more clearly defined and not listed as "potential"
- Banning breeds then increasing numbers per household of all other breeds? Other breeds will emerge to also be discriminated against. Italy ended up adding 92 breeds to its ban under these conditions by 2009 they reduced that to 17 breeds and in 2013 dropped breed specific legislation. Don't allow people to own packs of dogs very few people have the skills to keep that under control.
- I would need clarification of exceptions such as responsible breeders and pet owners who may have more than 6 dogs that are well cared for, healthy, and in a good home. Problem dogs are often in homes with only one or two pets.
- Let people live
- If one can take care of many animals they should be able to have many animals.



- The city does not get to determine how many pets someone can have. An argument based on need is not logical nor can need be accurately determined.
- The other people who say there should only be a total of 2 pets. Need to grow up. [removed]
- Shouldn't be the governments choice
- Too many - lower number - 4
- 6 seems too many. 2 is too low.
- I don't think there should be a limit
- [removed]
- That is too many pets in one household. There would be hygiene and disease transmission risks.
- if all the animals are properly taken care of, the owners should be able to have as many as they want/ can maintain or afford.
- They are very unfair. There are no search that proves that muzzling dogs and stricting them will decrease bites. Instead there are studies shown that they increase!!
- Cause
- People should be able to have as many pets as they want.
- As long as the owner is taking care of them it's ok
- If I want 17 dogs and I treat them all ver well I should be able to have all 17 dogs.
- Unless there is neglect, the animals are safe
- idk really
- Six dogs and six cats allows people to have 12 animals, which is excessive, difficult to manage and take care of, and expensive to feed , licence, train, and maintain health. Six animals total is more realistic. I do however agree with exceptions.
- No one needs 6 dogs or cats, it is unfair to the animals
- If the owners can show responsibly having more than 6 pets then they should be able to
- As long as the animals are treated wqually
- It is unconstitutional to limit someones ability to have a pet it is restricting of their right to the pursuit of happiness
- Because wearing a muzzle and being banned from dog parts is cruel especially to animals that have done nothing wrong
- Keep it the same
- I think the number limit should be set at two or be based on the square footage of the house and greenspace available. Too many neglected animals at the hands of hoarders
- The city should promote animal welfare, not arbitrary max numbers of pets
- Six is a lot of dogs or cats and in the usual pet situation seems almost hoarding. I would think a lower number, with the exceptions listed.
- That's irresponsible, and unethical to allow. It would make it easier for hoarding situations to occur, malnourishment, etc.



- To have animals remain healthy it should be allowed only if they have a oversized back yard/side yard and prove animals have sufficient space to roam per their size - for example 6 dashhounds vs 6 huskies...dashhounds could have a smaller back yard - but huskies would need larger.
- I think the numbers of pets one should have should be based on breeds and square footage of property inside and outside. There is a different amount of space needed for 6 Large Breeds as there would be for 6 small breeds. Also certain large breeds need less room than others.
- Twelve animals in a house is a lot especially if the dogs are big. Also, six dogs is a bigger “load” and more of a potential nuisance than six cats. Cats don’t generally bother neighbours at all.
- I feel responsible pet owners should continue to be allowed to have many pets. If an issue arises when an owner shows they are unable to be a responsible owner then an approach of education and offer of assistance should be the first course of action.
- 2 Cats or 2 Dogs is plenty per household and if not obeying the bylaws no such pets allowed
- 6 is ridiculous. 4 of each
- 6 animals is too much for any home...
- 3 dogs and 3 cats should be the limit. I do support the potential exceptions though.
- six is a lot to care for responsibly; responsible breeders and people training service dogs could have more dogs/household
- Too many animals under one roof. If they abided by the bylaw a household could potentially have 12 animals in one household and they could live in a very small house
- I would support a limit of a total of six (6) dogs OR cats per household, or any combination totalling no more than six.
- max 6 (dogs and/or cats)
- I don't think that there should be a limit on responsible pet owners if they are following the bylaws
- Lower the allowable pet limit to three (3) dogs AND three (3) cats. Exceptions can be applied for through the city
- No one needs 6 cats or dogs
- 2 pets per home should be adaqet.
- People who are not fosters, inheriting animals, or weaning puppies/kittens really don't need more than a couple.
- I think it is unnecessary and a government overreach to limit the number of animals.
- If people take good care of their pets and they aren't bothering the neighbours (noise, smell) then they can have as many animals as they want. I don't see many people having this many animals, and if they do, then problems should be investigated. Hoarders who neglect animals aren't going to follow the law anyway.
- No more than 4 animals in total per house. Period.
- 6 of each pet is too high. That's potentially 12 animals in a house.
- It's too much! And the exception doesnt avoid the abusive breeders!
- Let me make the number of animals does not properly addressed the previously discussed issues. A person May have many animals but as long as they are properly managing in maintaining them those issues won't arise, likewise a person with only one animal can cause more issues if they don't



properly manage and maintain them. Rather than placing a limit we should be addressing the issues at their source, which would be bad ownership, inexperience, incapability, etc. Rather than placing a limit in general and allowing exceptions, you should place a limit on people who have proven they cannot maintain proper standards.

- 6 dogs and 6 cats in one house is unmanageable. 2 is too low. I'd support a 6 pet total of any combination.
- No
- That total number for an urban residential unit is too high. Perhaps a ratio of pets: adults in the home so that there could be more confidence the animals are receiving necessary care?
- That is a completely unreasonable amount of animals in a residential setting. Get a farm if you want that many animals
- Do not support anyone having so many pets in one household unless they are living on an acreage.
- Honestly, if the reasons you suggest as a reason to limit numbers are legitimate then having up to 12 animals in a household is not going to address those. Limits would be broken, you would be better to increase enforcement if the bylaws already in place (just sit in any neighborhood and watch people walk dogs off leash in leash required areas and not pick up their dog poop. Those are much bigger issues you should be focusing on. This City has degraded so much and is full of dog poop everywhere you go now!
- I would support 6 dogs OR 6 cats, or 6 total for private household with 6 & 6 for the above exceptions.
- Ability to care, control and afford an animal depends on the owner regardless of the number of animals. An owner who does not have the resources, knowledge or commitment in maintaining current standards of basic animal care would not be able to care for one animal, let alone multiple. Capacity for multiple animals is case dependent. Comments such as "it is not necessary to own more than 2", is a subjective response. You need to look at ability, not necessity.
- I would support only if litters of babies are excluded.
- I should not be limited to animal ownership if I'm responsible. Make fines steeper for those who don't licence and get caught.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is an insane number of pets.
- Being able to provide quality care for 6 animals is a tremendous responsibility. The limit could be 3 maybe 4 but beyond that the animals well being is put at risk no matter how well intended the owner. If they want more than say 4 then need to get a permit that requires a plan on how they would care for the animals. As for low income it is a harsh reality but in order for them to provide quality care including veterinarian pet ownership is a costly venture to preserve a healthy pet. Community service dogs would be a more viable program.
- I think that is too many. I think 2-4 animals in a house is more than enough, especially considering how close houses are to each other.
- I support the exceptions but feel that 6 cats and 6 dogs per household is too many. I would support a higher household limit if it was tied to the number of adults in the household (eg. two cats/dogs per adult member of the household) to ensure that adequate care can be provided.



- Too many still - 4 per household, pets are a privilege to own and have similar expenses to have children (food, vet, yard mice, proper bed, fencing
- This bylaw change is stupid. Please go back and relearn your facts! It is npt the dog its the human look at that!
- Number of pets does not make someone a better owner
- Again 1 bad neighbor. Has lodged *noise* complaints against me after their children instigate my dogs over the fence!!! I have no recourse with their 3, soon to be 4, children screaming!! Each case is unique and a chance to explain/defend against charges!
- I don't think it's necessary for any household to have up to 6 dogs and 6 cats. If the licensing fee is an issue, then the other costs to having animals should be enough of a deterrent from having more than two pets in a house.
- There is no way that people can successfully manage more than a couple of cats and a couple of dogs. Both from a financial and emotional perspective.
- Freedom.
- A
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many in one household in a city home.
- Too much regulation. Not everything needs to be regulated. If animals end up at risk, deal with that, recognizing that not everyone who has more than 2 or 6 animals neglects them or causes problems in the community. Deal with problems as they arise if they arise
- Some people would be able to properly care for 12 animals, while some are not able to care for 1. The variable is the ability of the owner to provide proper care for them; the number is irrelevant.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too much for a city household, unless it is a breeder or one of the exemptions listed above.
- I think it is still too many. Three dogs or cats is more than enough.
- Stay the same
- I think more thought needs to go into this before restricting pet ownership
- Allowing 6 (or more!) cats or dogs seems excessive, and likely to result in more neighbour complaints and uncared for animals.
- Personal freedom to choose how many pets you can own is key providing you can properly care for all animals in your control. If you can't keep one pet safe and healthy than one is too much
- Six is too high
- .
- I don't support limits to animals, but I do support criteria involving quality of care for the animals and responsibility of the owner.
- Six is too many.
- 6 dogs or cats in a home is way too many. I can't imagine the noise and the smell with that many animals
- More than two significantly increases the problem of noise, smell and other issues related to pet ownership in an urban area.



- total of 2 pets per household is manageable
- Maximum of 4 animals TOTAL, including snakes, birds, etc. (excluding fish tank.) Exception for inherited animals, fosters of senior animals. No exceptions for businesses in non-commercial (residential) areas. No exception for breeders. Pet sitters need to have an overnight average total within this limit. Exception for under 6 months.
- Again we ended up having to involve the city. Next door decided she wanted to have a variety of dogs so from a chihuahua to a great dane. EVERY day there was constant barking, attacking me at me at the fence when gardening or painting the fence. I asked several times for her to please control the animals. Never listened - finally ended up with a mediator who was not impartial at all. She finally moved out several weeks later. We are done!
- We have too much noise from neighbors dogs and too much feces on own lawn from neighborhood dogs that people don't clean up. We have not had the experience of responsible dog owners in our neighborhood. We don't need more stress from more dogs. We deserve to have a decent life in our house too, free of nuisance from animals with irresponsible owners.
- No one needs this many animals on their property under any circumstances. You cannot properly care for this many animals
- 6 dogs & 6 cats! Way to many for city housing!
- That is way too many animals at one residence. I would support 4 each maximum (as long as the cats were indoor only cats).
- Having up to 12 cats/dogs in a house seems excessive. I would cut that number in half, apart from the exceptions listed.
- I think that the limit should be lower. No more than four adult animals. The exceptions are fine.
- Six dogs or cats for most city properties and most city dog owners, is too high, most city dog owners have issues with 1 dog or cat!!!!
- That's too many damn animals on a single property!
- Not if changes are to a breed specific.
- In my opinion if you are not a temporary home then having 6 cats or dogs in one home is to many. In my opinion a typical household shouldn't have more than 3.
- I think a total of 6 pets (cats and dogs combined) would be sufficient.
- There is no reason to have more than 6 dogs or cats. If you leave a loophole, then everyone will start saying that their pets were "inherited"
- a few animals
- PROPER care and love CANNOT be given equally between 6 cats and 6 dogs in 1 house collectively
- I believe the numbers are too high. I agree that 6 cats is realistic, but 6 dogs is outrageous. I would potentially be more inclined to agree with 4 dogs AND 6 cats as the limit. I believe having 6 dogs and up to 6 cats would result in neglect of some of all of the animals, and higher behavioural issues due to lack of attention from the owner(s).
- I think that people should be allowed to have as many pets as they want provided they are properly cared for and they have a high quality of life. However, I ALSO very strongly feel that the laws



around what environment a pet owner is allowed to keep their animals in must become severely stricter. For example, dogs should NEVER be kept in kennels for more than a couple hours per day at maximum, and kennels should not be a long-term solution. Additionally, a good relationship with a vet must be established in order to ensure emergency vet care can be provided in the case that owners don't have immediate funds to cover the costs.

- This is a violation of rights. Each person has the right to have as many children, same goes for pets, they are the children/family of many people. as long as they are well cared for the city nor anyone else has the right to say how many are the right number in a household. There are legal pathways for neglected children and there are legal pathways for neglected pets. There is no need for further recourse or mandating of an "alotment" per household.
- No
- 6 and 6 is too high. 12 animals on a property is too many. 6 of one type would be understandable.
- If care of animals is provided, their shouldn't be a limit
- Surprise pregnancies of animals will easily push people past this number. It should be owning the animal for a period of time. So six animals for over a year. For breeders, yes other application is fine.
- I have seen too many people with 3-4 dogs and if they are not appropriately trained they are a nuisance.
- Leave people alone as long as it isnt effecting the neighbours
- It is not the number of animals that is important, it is the standard if care and housing that is critical.
- I don't think anyone needs to to have a total of 12 dogs and cats. Unless they were very wealthy, it would be difficult to feed and get veterinary care for all those animals. It is better to have fewer animals - say 3 of each- and see them very well cared for. I do agree that there should be room for exceptions for litters, inherited animals or temp homes.
- I think the numbers should be lower. 3 or 4 max.
- It really depends on the dogs. If you have 2 dogs that bark constantly it's 2 dogs too many. If you have 10 dogs that are all well behaved and don't bark and the owner picks up after them no one is the wiser. It's really about the owner of the pet and if they are caring for their animals properly and training them so that they don't bark or get agitated all the time. It's really about owners, not the animals.
- As long as people have the means to care for their animals, they should be allowed to own as many as they wish on their own property. When the needs of the animals are not being met, that is when by-law can come in and issue fines/ charges. Keep it the same as it is now. The city is currently doing a good job.
- 12 animals in a normal city household is ridiculous - the feeding, cleaning and exercise needs alone would not be met
- I feel like 6 is too high - no one can adequately care for this number of dogs. 3-4 would be upper limit in my opinion.
- 6 of either animal in city limits is excessive (even with a special permit)



- I own my own home and I pay taxes. You should only intervene and propose restrictions if there is an incidence or my pets are becoming a nuisance.
- Number of animals is not always an indicator of quality of care. Homes with potential concern should be effectively managed on a case by case basis.
- I think 6 Adult cats or dogs is far too many. How would you enforce licensing? Dogs bark and one is plenty but adding up to five more would create too much noise. How can you guarantee that the animals will be properly cared for? I think you need to look at the income of the person as it costs a lot to feed, house and care for an animal. I think two of each other that the exceptions is more than enough.
- I can see people living in apartment buildings thinking they should have 6 dogs & 6 cats. I do agree with the potential exceptions.
- While working at a vet clinic there are clients who have more than this and they take amazing care of their pets. I do realize that there are others out there that don't, but those people shouldn't ruin it for those who take proper care and love for their pets. Other laws should be in place.
- I would prefer not more than 2 dogs or cats without a special application; and the pet limit should be stated as OR rather than AND ... 12 animals is way too many for any household!!
- I think having up to 12 animals is extreme (unless there are litters). I think 4/4 should be maximum.
- Far too many animals in one location. No one needs 12
- Why? Do not over populate our city with animals
- Beyond 2 or 3 animals is unnecessary. If people want to have large numbers of animals they should live outside of the city.
- I am concerned about the idea of a "Dog Fanciers' License" and the fees associated with that. And what will the criteria be for a DFL?
- rescues excluded
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many. If the current limit is 2+2, that seems reasonable to me.
- I get that someone would have more than 2 cats. Cats are neglected, starved and abandoned so often, that people like myself often rescue them. A limit of 4 owned cats is max in my books. As for dogs, we have enough people breeding and selling dogs that it's time to limit the ownership to a maximum of 4 dogs. The exceptions make good sense to me as well. All animals should all be licensed, provided the money is used for the care of abandoned, sick and ferrel animals like the SPCA, and not to line the city administrators pockets. There also should be a break for the seniors in licensing as well, they get so little breaks from the city as is.
- That's WAAAAYYY too many dogs.....
- In my opinion, up to 12 animals is a large number of animals to be considered for the by law. I would recommend up 4 animals per household. With anything more to be considered under exceptions.
- Six is way too many. 3-4 is appropriate. The exceptions are more than adequate.
- A grand total of 13 animals in one city house hold is not sanitary for one. I would say max 6: 3 dogs AND 3 cats
- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive. Perhaps no more than 6 total of dogs and cats
- Six is too many, a special application should be required for that many pets.



- 6 dogs and 6 cats seems like an unreasonably large number to retain within city limits for a private household. Raising the number would complicate the management of animals and create annoyance to neighbours.
- Fewer pets per household dependent on type/size of dwelling. Larger places could have the proposed limit, but smaller places/apartments/condominiums should have a much lower limit, 2 cats and 2 dogs.
- 2 cats and 2 dogs is more than enough for one city lot.
- Pet limit could exceed 2 only if household is a licensed breeder.
- Make it based on home size and square footage.
- It's your personal property and if you are able to provide to all of the animals and give them proper care, it's nobody's business but your own.
- I think that there needs to be a limit to the animals based upon the size of the house and backyard. If someone wants 10 dogs on a couple of acres, that's fine. But if they want six dogs in a 600 sq ft. townhome, that is excessive and detrimental to the animals and neighbours.
- Only for people fostering etc but not average households. To me that's extreme and
- I feel that the limit should be set lower- 4 large animal per household; this will help ensure that all animals will hopefully receive the care (Vet), food and love they deserve.
- The number of pets does not determine the welfare of that animal or animals. Responsible ownership is based on the individual owner. If there is a problem, it needs to be dealt with. A home with one or two dogs can have an accumulation of feces or excessive noise and the limits in no means protects the welfare of an animal. An owner is responsible or NOT. Numbers have nothing to do with it. I have had neighbors with one dog that is left outside all day and night and it is a source of excessive noise. This is a head in the sand approach.
- Reduce the number of pets
- I agree with the overall limit of six animals, from a combination of dogs and cats
- 6 dogs or 6 cats are too many in city limits unless the person is fostering animals.
- People can do their own thing
- People should be allowed as many pets as they like, as long as they can support proper care, proper vet care, be licensed and properly trained (dogs).
- More regulation
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats !!! 2 dogs or 2 cats or 1 of each maximum makes more sense.
- P"
- Problem owners should be dealt with on a case by case basis, animal safety and quality of life being the larger concern.
- Along with the above rules, I think that the number of animals should also be controlled by the size of the apartment, house, yard that they would be limited to. I.e. I live on a 25 foot lot and there is no way that I should have more than two dogs.
- Regulating pet ownership is already inconsistent and difficult. The increased number is HUGE while also making it far more likely that the quality of life of the pets is lower, and with the difficulty of



enforcing regulation, it's also difficult to make sure that those with that number are in fact taking care of their pets fully.

- There should be no limit
- 6 is ridiculously high limit for many properties/circumstances. In those cases where more than 6 can be kept without undue issue, the limit need not apply at all. Way too situational. It has been observed that desiring control for the sake of control is indicative of several diagnosable and treatable mental disorders - has the proposer of this been seen by a psychologist? I ask out of concern, not insult.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats? Do you live on a farm? I would look at poundage instead. No more than 6 animals combined or 400 pounds total weight.
- Owners should have the ability to have as many pets and options they want for them.
- I think a person can have as many pets as they provided they are cared properly in terms of medically, physically and mentally.
- It's no one's business how many pets a person owns. It should only become a problem if it is a health hazard or impedes the community on some way.
- Maximum 3 dogs and 3 cats. No exception.
- Unless there are other fees like a homeowners association would provide, it truly is no ones business other than the people who are in the home and should be allowed however many they would like.
- As long as the animals are properly cared for and not causing any issues, people should be allowed to have as many pets as they'd like.
- if you have more of these animals, you should be considered a breeder
- I feel like you shouldn't be limited to animals like you can't be limited to friends
- The limit should be less like 3 dogs and 3 cats unless the exceptions.
- If I has 6 cats and a stray showed up at my door and I save it from the elements etc. and to keep it why would that be a problem when just bsaved an animal.
- Two cats and two dogs is more than enough. Six of each is just plain stupid and excessive
- None of your business how many pets a person has if the animals are not a problem stay out of peoples lives nose y Nelly
- One or two pets is plenty. Six is too many.
- I don't believe it is necessary to own more than 2 dogs or 2 cats per household.
- 2 dog 4 cat max
- I feel very strongly about this. There should not be a limit. It should be about care. Anyone who mentions hoarding as a reason to change the bylaw does not understand what hoarding is. The issue is responsible pet ownership. Some owners let feces accumulate with only one dog, while others are out there scooping responsibly. I STRONGLY disagree with the idea that any level of government can dictate what happens in my private home. (Legal and Safety issues excluded - no meth labs, smoke detectors, etc.) If the animals are cared for, and outside bylaws are followed, it is no one else's business how many pets are in a household.
- No limit to number of animals



- 6 dogs in small city lots too many especially big dogs. Its not fair to the dogs. Plus the barking & feces clean-up would be an added issue. 6 cats indoors are fine but how do you keep 6 in your yard. I don't want them pooping in my flowerbeds.
- We can't make bylaws for everything, there are other bylaws on the books to deal with nuisances, noises, garbage whatever related to the by-products of having too many dogs or cats. If someone had 20 cats and they were doing no one any harm - let them.
- Once again, it isn't what people WANT. It is about the welfare of the animals. I have dogs and know what goes into their care, time wise, but more importantly financially. Proper care is expensive. And can be VERY expensive. 2 cats/dogs are plenty.
- The city shouldn't have a say on the number of pets people have
- Limit should be 2 pets total.
- We dont need more bylaws
- Because irresponsible owners will continue doing it
- Responsible pet owners should not be burdened with extra applications and hassles
- I think that people should be able to choose how many animals they own. Yes, those numbers are high but there are certainly people out there that can effectively own many animals. We should crack down on the ones that can't rather than punish the ones that can.
- rescues need exemption should have free six month license to pass on to new owner
- I feel in this economy that having 6 of any animal is to much I would say 3 is plenty
- It should depend on size of house and property
- 3 of each should be the maximum
- As long as animals are cared for people should be able to have as many as they like
- Property sizes and personal responsibility differ so much that this should be a case by case basis and not a bylaw.
- Limit of two is more reasonable.
- I think it's robust enough and fair.
- Too complicated to enforce
- 6 is too many
- I feel that the noise, cleanup, chaos, cost etc. In a household with this many animals would be detrimental to the health of the owner and their neighbours!
- Six is too many.
- Why would anyone need to have 12 pets in a household? This would seem to be abuse of the animals.
- I think the limit should be 3 dogs and 3 cats
- who needs more than two animals of one breed in a household Crazy
- Bylaw restrictions for number of pets for problem owners is a better idea for me
- I support what you are trying to do but I do not like the limit of 6 dogs or 6 cats that is too many, I think 2 or each would be enough as some people can not look after one animal properly.
- No one needs 6 cats and/or dogs



- The limit you suggest is far too many.
- I think 6 dogs OR 6 cats per household, in an urban setting is excessive. Call me animal bigoted(?) but anyone who has that many animals in a city swelling is likely irresponsible. It is also highly likely that the neighbors would bare the brunt of such a menagerie, in both noise and smell & inconvenience to their own enjoyment of their property.
- I don't see this as a major issue. Edge case scenario
- We shouldn't cater to the problem people, we should deal with them on a case by case basis
- None of my business as long as those dogs and cats are being responsible, taking care of all of them and loving them.
- I live next to someone with 3 dogs and 2 are small and noisy. I wouldn't want to live next to someone with 6 dogs.
- I think anyone that has 6 or more pets can't properly look after them
- Two pets per household is sufficient
- 3 cats maximum
- potentially 12 animals is too much. Six animals TOTAL is more than enough.
- The potential exceptions need to be included in the bylaw
- It should be based on level of care / suitable living conditions, not an arbitrary number. Some people cannot properly care for a single animal, some give a great home to many.
- Six is too many pets per any household. The number of pets per household should be restricted to 2.
- Manage the problem owners.
- We can address problem owners without creating more restrictions for everyone.
- I would like to see fewer legal restrictions and more community engagement and supports. Foster positive communities as opposed to adding more rules to follow, that has a negative connotation.
- Limit to 2 dogs or cats, more than that requires special licenses and periodic inspections
- I think 6 is too many. I live next to 6 dogs. Instead of a quiet cul-de-sac, it sometimes sounds as if I live beside a kennels.
- I don't think we should place restrictions to everyone to address some problem people, we should address the problem owners.
- Do not want to increase the limit on pets
- I think a problem owner should be handled on a case by case basis.
- 6 is an arbitrary number. there are too many reasons that people may have/desire more.
- I am a member of a "Dog Rescue Organization" and my personal experience is that 3 dogs (our family dog, plus 2 dogs in care awaiting adoption) is my limit to being able to do a good job of each animals needs - grooming, feeding, walking, training, yard cleaning etc. Six dogs belonging to one family seems too much to handle everything that needs to be done to keep the animals exercised, groomed, stimulated, trained as noted before; not to mention the Vet expenses. Six cats belonging to one household seems too many for the same reasons as mentioned regarding six dogs.



- If the city is not allowed to tell me how many children I can have, then the city should not be allowed to tell people how many animals they can have.
- Six is way too many - ridiculous! Four of anything please.
- As long as the owner is being a responsible owner and is not causing problems with neighbours etc - everything should be fine.
- no limit if the animals are properly cared for
- Max 3 animals of one kind with exceptions for fosters/temp homes. 12 animals is way too many to own.
- No home should have six dogs and six cats in it. The exception would be birth (under 6 months) or pet sitters but only for either dogs or cats.
- There should be a maximum of two dogs or cats in a household.
- Mostly of someone has indoor cats and can provide adequate care why would they need to pay for a licence , sounds like a cash grab
- This introduces more administration and reduces the freedom we all like to enjoy. Rather work on specific cases that create a problem and do not impose restriction for everybody. With this approach you add additional burden to compliant people.
- I think unless the home is very large no one should have more than 6 dogs and 6 cats and be able to care for them properly
- 12 animals sounds like a LOT to me as a base figure with MORE requiring a special permit as there are many situations where such numbers would overwhelm the space.
- I believe 6 is too high. The noise and smell of 6-12 animals is ridiculous.
- In city , why does one household need 6 dogs and 6 cats too many for household
- I think 6 is an excessive number unless you are a licensed breeder. 4 would be a reasonable maximum in my mind. If someone had 6 cats and 6 dogs that is 12 animals in one household. So max per household combined should not be greater than 6.
- I think 6 is too large a number unless they are puppies and kittens that will be adopted out
- A dozen pets in a typical urban home seems excessive. Perhaps a TOTAL of 6 would be more reasonable.
- Twelve (12) Dogs and Cats is preposterous!!!!
- 6 seems like an excessive amount of animals, for the same reasons that the limit is currently 2. Animals could be 2 per person living in a household, or 4 if only 1 person lives in a household. Households consisting of roommates or blended families may have more animals pre-existing than a single person household.
- I agree with the exceptions, but to allow up to twelve animals in one home is not a fair animal to urban home size ratio.
- Responsible pet owners need no limitations
- Six dogs at one residence is too many in an urban area. The total allowed should be no more than 3.
- fewer pets per owner please!!!



- No one needs this many pets. I am an animal lover, and it is not reasonable in the city to have that many cats or dogs. No more than 4 (rescue groups can be exempt). We don't want backyard breeders or hoarders in Calgary.
- I think that 6 cats or dogs on a residential property is too much
- 6 animals per household is excessive. There is no need for that, unless it is a temporary situation of kittens/puppies being born. Excessive animal permits does not solve the social problem of noise, odours, animal hoarding, etc.
- I would support the premise you speak of but what happens when a pet has a litter? Invariably there may be more than 6 dogs or 6 cats and I don't think that someone should have to apply for a special licence in this instance. I think it should be rephrased to 6 adult cats and 6 adult dogs (greater than 1 year old). Most pet owners will home new pups and kittens and they are not the problem.
- What is "approved excess animal permit".
- Yikes – 6 of each??? Who needs more than 1 or 2 – after that a special licence s/b required for circumstances described above
- No one should be allowed to own 6 dogs and 6 cats. A limit of 3 dogs and 3 cats is plenty.
- Be responsible.
- Justification is needed for more than the minimum number of pets first. Why 6? Why not more than 3?
- 12 animals at one urban property is too many. If you want to have this many animals move to a larger property, outside the city where there is room to raise this many animals in an environment that can be healthy for both the owner and the animals. 6 cats are going to overcrowd any typical city residence.
- 6 too many. 2 and apply if more wanted
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive. We used to be a foster home and owned a home in the country with acreage. Even in that case, it was a full time job. I can't imagine what it would be like in the city/suburbs with neighbours so close.
- 6 and 6 seems too many. Would limit to 4 each.
- 6 seems like a reasonable # but don't think the focus should be on a specific # # in a home. This may lead to people not licensing, and trying to hide the # of animals. Focus should be on education, spay and neuter programs and ensuring animals are licensed, cared for and trained. There is no general comments section but: while I'm not supportive of lower licensing for low income - would consider city supported spay and neuter program for low income. I am supportive as well of the multi-year or lifetime licence program
- I do not see why indoor cats require licensing.
- The limit of 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive, and adding more would be wrong. Why not look at limiting the number of dogs and cats first before allowing exceptions.
- quit with the gov. over-reach
- A lesser number would be better. Like you earlier said, 2 dogs and 2 cats.
- Any more than one cat OR one dog is ridiculous.



- there is no need for more than 2 per household unless there is special needs eg, training hunting dogs when one is starting to get old or service dogs for the same reasons
- Size of property should factor. Regular inspections to determine living standards and possible illegal breeding. 6 each seems high for city property
- No way! That would give someone permission to have 12 animals on site?! That's inhumane for the animals, and not respectful of neighbors.
- Reduce pet limit to 2 dogs and/or 2 cats.
- Number of pets should be reduced. Suggest 2 cats and/or dogs to be in alignment with Phase 1 feedback.
- Unless an animal has babies there is no need to have more than 2. Breeders should be restricted to proper zoning (away from residential) as pet sitters and daycares.
- A person should be able to own as many animals (within a certain number) as they want as long as the animals aren't causing problems and they're having their needs met properly including living environment and veterinary costs
- 6 dogs and 6 cats are far too many--I would recommend 2 each unless they are fostering rescue dogs.
- Too many animals in one house. Problems will arise.
- It depends on the household. A larger house might be able to handle six animals where a smaller one can't. The limit of six might be okay, but there should also be a minimum amount of space required per animal.
- I think a limit of 4 cats in a household and 2 dogs is a better number. I don't appreciate seeing someone with 6 large Rottweilers or Huskies walking their dogs in the neighbourhood. It's scary even thinking of the amount of feces that may or may not be being picked up. Also, I don't like the idea of someone with 6 pit bulls!!
- It is not the number of animals it is the engagement and education of animal owners.
- I used to own 5 fully licensed purebred dogs that I took for daily off leash walks. Occasionally, perhaps once a year, we would have a litter of pups, usually ranging from 5-10. Under the bylaw proposal I would require a dog fancier's license, which I am opposed to. I already pay enough for current licensing (I now have 3 dogs - 2 purebreds and a neutered mix-breed)
- i think owning 12 pets is way to many for any household, two and two is plenty.
- I would say it doesn't go far enough. There needs to be massive fees. There can be special rules for breeders or pregnant pets. But if anyone wants any more. They get it on a case by case base only with the full approval once the vet signs of on spay/neuter
- 12 animals on a city property is way too many. Should be capped at 3 total.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats are too many to have in one household. Absolutely no more than 2 of each per household.
- 2 cats and dogs sufficient
- have more animals than currently allowed
- There shouldn't be a limit. How you house, and care for your animals is what is important and you can abuse 1 just as well as 13.



- x
- Six dogs and six cats per household is too many. Should be two max.
- That is too many pets per household. Limit the total dogs and cats to 6.
- Enforcement of existing rules have been spotty and subjective. None of these changes address that problem.
- Limit should be lower
- I think there is a big difference between 6 dogs and 6 cats. I think the number for cats should be higher and the number for dogs should be lower. I do agree that there should be limits on animals in a household.
- Less number of animals in a city house. Rural areas can/need more, but a city home impacts many neighbours around them. No more than 4 of any animal.
- 6 dogs or cats is too many. The limit should be 3 -4. If the limit is allowed to be 6 then I would agree to all of the potential exceptions.
- I think that unless there is a problem, the city should stay out of our houses!
- 6 are too many. Maybe 2, unless a licensed breeder.
- I think that it is dependent on the owner if they can manage the door, faces, noise etc. If they do, I do not see the issue with having multiple pets.
- potential exceptions?
- responsible owners don't need the restriction, non responsible owners should have no animals and this is covered by multiple laws, bylaws provincial, federal and municipale
- A maximum of 3-4 cats and 3-4 dogs is more reasonable unless people are fostering animals. More than this amount is excessive.
- Do people really need to have 6 animals! I would support a maximum of 2, maybe 3 per household.
- for a regular household, there is NO WAY that you can keep your home clean with that many cats and dogs. if you want to be a breeder, that's one thing. but for a regular person to own that many cats and dogs is excessive
- This is an arbitrary number, the definition of enough pets is a personal opinion. As long as the animals are being kept responsibly and safely, no limit is needed.
- I think 3 dogs and 3 cats per house is plenty.
- The number should be smaller than 6, it should be around 3 or 4.
- It should be up to the owner the amount of animals they have. As long as they are in good living conditions it shouldn't matter.
- Don't limit
- That is a whole lot of everything, in the city is it really necessary?
- Keep it at 2 per household
- Too many animals. 3-4 at most.
- How would a household in the city provide a suitable quality of life for that many animals!?
- Investigation of each individual case is required.
- Limit two dogs and two catss



- Max should be 3 dogs and 3 cats
- that is way too many pets and the owner is likely not going to be able to afford proper care. 6 total animals sure, but not 6 of each
- It should be 6 pets total. Not 6 cats and 6 dogs. That could still be 12 animals in a household which is too many. 6 pets total.
- Animal hoarding issues, also cost associated with pet keeping are so high. How can anyone afford 6 animals or even 12 if they have 6 dogs and 6 cats
- I think 6 is to large it should be 3 - 4
- If you are irresponsible with several pets, you will be irresponsible with one.
- I'm concerned 6-12 animals in one home is too many I support the bylaw but feel like that's an unreasonable high number that will likely not impact enough. I would say a limit of 4 is more conservative and then the application process will be better used to stop animal crowding/quality of life.
- All fine except for breeders
- I think the number should be higher
- That's way too many animals in the city for one residence. If you want that many, get a farm
- Two pets are enough
- Lesser ownership responsibility and liability
- Bylaw need to be changed. The limit needs to be lowered to 2 Dogs and 2 cats. Temporary homes should also have a lower limit.
- Too many to handle, afford, clean up after.
- Higher risk for neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- 12 animals in the household is too many. If you're exempting temporary homes, it's not right to animals to have that many in a city home. 6-7 animals (dogs and cats combined) is a generous number to have. All those animals also have potential vet fees, and health matters. 12 animals isn't going to let them get the care, attention, time, space, and focus pets deserve from owners.
- 6 is too many. 4 is plenty within city limits. Move to the country if you need more than 4. 6 is hoarding. Unless puppies ect under certain circumstances.
- 12 pets is far too many for one household. Approvals after 2 of each is sufficient.
- I am unsure if I support this. If the additional permit for animals is inexpensive and simple to access for those who are helping animals then I would support this change
- 12 animals is too many for one household. 4 dogs and 4 cats would be more appropriate
- No one needs more than 6 of anything.... dogs/cats
- Again, this comes down to responsible pet owners. This is where the focus should be, not on volume, breed, or pet type. I can appreciate the need to crack down on animal bylaws, but the focus is going on all the wrong places.
- Too many animals per house, they tend to have a pack mentality



- 6 dogs and 6 cats is way too many animals in one house/apartment. My opinion is that there should be a maximum of 2 dogs and 2 cats. This number is far easier to manage as far as care and attention, excessive feces and noise.
- that is too many animals in a household.
- excessive noise, feces problems
- Number of animals on a property can be dealt with through enforcement if issues such as noise complaints come up. I would be more supportive of limiting the number of dogs than the number of cats.
- 6 dogs is far too many to care for in one household.
- Nobody needs more than 2.
- There are many rescues doing amazing things for animals. If you limit the number of animals in a home, it prevents these organizations from saving these animals lives.
- I think it's individual how many animals someone can be a responsible pet owners of.
- Not sure if you mean that a household could have 12 animals - six dogs and six cats or that there is a limit of six animals (dogs and /or cats). Support a limit of six animal dogs, cats for a mix of both.
- I don't feel anyone needs to own 6 cats or 6 dogs. 4 should be the max.
- B
- 6 of each is too much. No need for this.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per house is a lot.
- 6 animals (dogs and cats combined) total would be a good number with application required for more animals and exceptions for households that are temporary homes
- No house should have more than 4 animals of any kind 2dogs and 2 cats or 3 cats 1 dog. Etc
- I think 6 is too many. Let's face it most properties in Calgary are not that large and 6 is WAY too many for most homes and yards. The noise and feces would be difficult to manage and typically the people with more pets are less likely to keep a clean yard. I think anything of 4 of any 1 species is excessive. 6 pets total per household would be better IMO.
- There should be no limit
- Animal protection laws are already poorly enforced. I do not see why anyone needs 6 dogs or cats.
- I believe a household should be limited to 2 dogs or cats due to excessive noise, accumulation of feces and consideration for nearby neighbors.
- Too many animals in a limited amount of space.
- Can't control or care for that many animals in one house.
- Responsible dog owners who clean up after their dogs with 10 dogs are less of a nuisance than irresponsible owners with 2 dogs. The number of animals is really irrelevant.
- There is no need for anyone to have 6-12 animals per household
- Again the city cannot enforce the current bylaw system.
- I believe a total of 6 animals should be considered, with the exception of foster animals.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats within city limits is still too excessive.
- Two pets only to one household



- No one needs to have that many pets. It is difficult to give that many the care they need.
- Way too many animals. This is animal hoarding and not in the best interest of the animals or the community. Only exception is a breeder- and that should be something you need to apply to do
- The amount of dogs and cats allowed should remain at 2 unless the owner obtains a license for more, this should extend to breeder (to reduce the number of "home breeders or irresponsible breeders) and animal foster homes.
- I support the opinion that it is unnecessary and potentially irresponsible to own 6 dogs or cats.
- Two dogs, and two cats max
- I think no more than 4 dogs and 4 cats is more than reasonable.
- I believe even 6 cats and dogs is an excessive number for most people to handle and train properly. I would support 4 as a maximum.
- Bechase
- As long as dogs are kept clean and are not a nuisance and no laws are constantly being broken, there should be no limit.
- It shouldn't matter. It's your own private property and you should be able to do as your please. If someone wanted 13 children then why not
- No more then 2 cats or 2 dogs should be allowed in any house hold. Unless approved by excess animal permit.
- I am a dog owner (large dog 80+lbs), have engaged in multiple training classes, and understand the diligence it takes to responsibly care for a pet. As the number of pets increases the time available to spend with each pet decreases leading to a higher probability of issues. A maximum of 4 pets (dog or cat) per household should be allowed under the normal pet bylaw and licensing fees. Any household having more than 4 pets would fall under a "kennel" category requiring a more stringent set of rules for noise, cleanliness, health etc.
- Nobody needs to keep more than 2 pets.
- More animals increases the risk of neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- Its would be taken to the max. Already is, capping out at 6 of each animal. Should be lower 4 of each.
- what if dog has litter of puppies and puppies turn into "dogs" while owner is finding homes....
- 6 is too many it should remain at 2 maximum, the noise and feces is too much
- People with a high number of pets are not pet owners, they are hoarders or breeders. No thanks to either.
- Not necessary
- We currently have 10 dogs living beside our home and the noise is extremely excessive; 2 dogs should be the maximum
- 6 is way too many dogs unless it is an outdoor/farm situation.
- It depends on the dog/cat owners. There are people who can take good care of more than 6 animals and others who can't take good care of one
- Citizens should have total autonomy over the amount of pets they choose to have.



- It should be based on criteria as opposed to just being a number. Consider square footage of home/yard, proximity of neighbours, etc. Then include your list of exceptions on top of that. The number "6" just seems arbitrary.
- 6 is way too many. 3 is much more reasonable
- I think that 12 animals in a household is far too many and unfair to the animals
- Unless you were breeding (and then re-homing)" fostering or running a licensed business, 6 cats and 6 dogs is far too many. Especially with how close homes are in new neighborhoods.
- No need for more than 2 total pets
- If your dog give birth to 10 dogs, what is it going to happen with the puppies? They need to stay with the mother for at least 6-7 weeks. What is it going to happen to those puppies?
- 6 or each is too many..
- More than 3 dogs in the city is not appropriate
- Six dogs and six cats is WAY to high , and should be reduced to two .
- I think 12 cats and dogs is too much for one household in the city. I would support 6 animals.
- Cause
- Would support, but with fewer exceptions
- Shouldnt have sny mote than 2
- It should be up to the homeowner.
- That number of pets within city limits is way too large. Our properties do not support that number inside nor out. Costs of keeping that number of pets generally make those numbers unsustainable increasing the likelihood of the pets being neglected.
- Depends on how many people live in the home, as each may own pets; responsible pet ownership should be a consideration
- More dogs and cats brings more dangers and problems to other people and neighbors. The life of the people without dog or cat is also important.
- Six dogs or cats is ridiculous and excessive. The maximum should be two pets per household, i.e. one cat and one dog.
- 2 pets are more than enough.
- Is an urban house a kennel or a cattery? Remember most houses are built very close to each other, consider feces, smells, noise and general hygiene. We have two and sometimes three dogs opposite my house. There are times the barking is very loud. Do you have enough by law officers to deal with households with multiple dogs that bark as soon as someone passes their fence???? No! So dogs and cats is a ludicrous idea!
- The current limit seems sufficient
- might support the exceptions but would limit the number of dogs and cats to 3 of each per household without a special permit.
- Maximum of four of total cats and dogs
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is excessive. I would suggest 3 dog and 3 cat limit
- 6 is too many



- Too many rules
- Larger pet limit increases to risk for neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- Only licensed breeders should be allowed six dogs or cats. Animals in city limits should be limited in the household. Acreages and farms are the exception.
- If you are allowing 6 dogs in one household, why are pitbull-type dog owners only allowed one? This makes no sense as none of your BSL is based off of science and fact.
- There shouldn't be allowed more than 2 pets per household allowed unless they meet the exceptions listed above.
- Too many animals to control or clean up after
- I agree that it is not necessary for anyone to own more than 3 cats or 3 dogs Period! 6 of either is ridiculous and very likely that pet of that number are not being cared for properly i.e. exercise and veterinary care
- For a pet household 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many. This needs to be capped at 4 of each.
- There is so much noise from dogs in my area as it is, there is no reason anyone should need 6 dogs in one house.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is far too many for one household. We have 2 dog and our back yard can be smelly enough at time through the year. Special exceptions for fosters, Fanciers, breeders, sitters and daycares should NOT be allowed.
- If emotional support needed , it could be earned by owning one or two pets (two dogs and two cats the most)owning numerous pets will cause neglected behaviour, lack of space , odour problem and lots more.
- 6 is too many in the city if additive. Limit should be 3-4 dogs or cats or a total of 5 or 6.
- I agree to limiting the number of Dogs/ or cats to 2 is fair.
- If the dogs are trained correctly and don't bother anyone then what right does the city have in telling someone how many dogs or cats they can have?
- 6 of each is excessive for an urban center. 4 would be a more reasonable cap.
- I do support the introduction of a limit, but would like to see a lower limit of 2-3 dogs and/or cats per household. I have seen instances where there are higher numbers and have heard animals crying through the night and barking through day. I do not believe many residential homes are suited to large numbers of dogs/cats and feel it is in best interest of pets to have a limit of 2-3.
- I think that it's not the number but the individual owners that have the problems.
- It should be lower
- I think the limit is too high and should be 3 or 4 not 6 - I agree the exceptions
- Should be case by case and living area should be a factor in determining the number. Also with a clause that could revoke multiple animal numbers if owner is not being responsible and following guidelines
- 6 cats and dogs is too many still. I would prefer no more than 3 of each because how well managed are these animals truly going to be?
- 12 animals? plus pigeons? plus chickens?
- The limit should be much lower for safety of pets and the neighbours



- You have breeders in the list of possible exceptions.
- Don't we already have a pet limit? Isn't less? Don't increase this population while looking to add livestock options too.
- still too many cats and dog for a household. limit to 2 dogs and 2 cats
- You should be limited to the amount of animals you have as long as you can provide safe and clean housing for them
- If a person has adequate space and the means and abilities to care for more pets they should be allowed to without having to jump through hoops.
- 12 animals in one household seems too high. 3 dogs and 3 cats per household is more reasonable.
- I think total of 6 as a maximum for dogs and/or cats is more reasonable
- I support all the potential rules with the exception of the Dog Fanciers License. Another fee.....we are already taxed and fee'd to the max.
- hoarding. look it up-research the topic. along with illegal breeding ie puppy mills-
- Nobody needs that many pets... 3 dogs is plenty.
- Piss off and leave people alone. What is with you people and this nanny-state [removed]?
- The number of pets per household should be reduced.
- More risk for neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- To much risk for neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- 6 of each is too many. 6 total split between the two species is still too many but would be tolerable if the owners are responsible and have the space and resources
- 6 is too many
- six is WAY too many!
- There should not be an arbitrary limit. Some people can take care of more than that, and many struggle to take care of one or two.
- So much talk about animal rights and humane conditions for them. There is nothing humane about 6 to 12 (6 cats + 6 dogs) in one household. Even farmers DO NOT have that many cats and dogs on their farms - they know it is not good for the animals. Also, people cannot take care of that many animals well, either financially or time wise. Ridiculous! Anyone wanting the limit to be this large should be investigated right now because they do not have a clue about looking after animals.
- I think there needs to be a limit. But 12 animals for one person seems too high, and even for six (adult) people seems high
- 2 dogs/ cats to protect their welfare
- No one needs 6 cats or dogs. I would support a 3 cat or dog limit. I agree with the exception above.
- 2 dogs and/or 2 cats should be the maximum
- Six is too many pets in one household. How do you keep 6 dogs in a 1 bedroom apartment? Where do the dogs do their business? On the balcony? What do landlords do when the 6 dogs destroy the property and the tenant does not clean up the feces? Rules are for all pet owners.
- 6 is too high a number.
- 6 is a crazy high number of mammals in a single dwelling, 12 is ridiculous. It needs to be lower.



- A maximum of six COMBINED dog and cat ownership. 12 animals in a single family dwelling in the city isn't reasonable.
- I support unlimited animals of one sex. Animals cannot express gender. This reduces the risk of non consensual intercourse.
- Pet limit should be 2
- If animals are licensed, properly cared for and have enough spaced and behaved there shouldn't have to be a limit.
- Where does the number come from? 6 animals in an apartment or small condo is excessive where as on an acreage 6 can be too few (especially if the animals are working the land)
- So long as people are able to maintain their pets and not create issues for neighbours then they should be able to have as many pets as they want. There should be a strong system in place to investigate and enforce issues that arise from households where a large number of animals is causing distress to neighbors or the animals.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is too many in a city
- In my view, six animals in a household is ridiculous and an intrusion on the lives and comfort of neighbours. With that many animals in a household, the animals are at risk and might not receive the care and attention that they deserve and require.
- 6 animals is too much. Limit to 3. Beterinary care is super expensive. People with many animals will not keep up with vaccinations(rabies) as its too expensive. Animals may be neglected and not receive the care they deserve.
- As long as the animals are safe, fed, have enough room, vet visits. And are not noisy and not at large. I don't see an issue
- I think 3 pets by household is enough to have and be able to take care of them in a responsible maner.
- 6 dogs and cats are 12 total animals that's not acceptable in urban living
- Maintain the current bylaws of no limits
- 1 to 2 pets is enough and prevents neglect
- I would support 3 dogs 3 cats
- No need to limit number of animals. Would support bylaw limiting number of children ... particularly for those of the view that it isn't "necessary" to have more than 2 animals. Ridiculous comment.
- 2 dogs OR cats maximum
- Seems like a lot. Could it be based on size of property
- 6 cats and dogs at one house is WAY TOO MANY!!! Max 2 dogs and 2 cats. Any more than that you better start hiring more bylaw officers now.
- Way too many animals in a neighbourhood with small lot sizes and close neighbours.
- There should be limits on pet ownership and the numbers should be very limited.
- If clean and quiet yards - don't limit. Limit only if complaints or conditions not satisfactory for animals.
- The limit should be lower than six.



- There should be no increase to the number of pet allowed.
- Private property needs to be left alone
- 6 animals within a household is too many.
- Too many animals in one household
- The limit should only be one dog because you get more smell of the urine and feces. Also the feces should be picked up when ever they are let out. Not just once a day.
- .
- 1 or 2 dogs should be the limit due to noise and large amount of defecation. Residential dwelling should not have more than 2 pets. Residential area should not be allowed to have doggy daycare of more than 2 dogs.
- If it is your home and you take care of/clean up after your pets I don't feel that there should be a restriction on the number of pets you can own.
- While there may be irresponsible pet owners that will amass animals, there are those that taken exceptional care of their pets and I don't feel the city has the right to dictate how many pets is reason in someones own home
- This is absolutely unfair to neighbors! We now have 4 large dogs next door in a small space. Why on earth would someone need that many pets in the city? This would also put strain on the parks. We live near the Botanical Gardens of Silver Springs and it is already overrun with dogs since it's an off leach park. The city created an off leach park across the street but dog owners swarm to the gardens instead. This has lead to conflict between walkers and dog walkers. I daily encounter dog feces and out of control dogs. It's hard to even enjoy the Bowmont Park with all the dogs there. When did it happen that the city respects the rights of dog owners over those who aren't dog owners? Many people are afraid of dogs, allergic to dogs and cats or simple want to enjoy our parks with being run over or disturbed by dogs. Dog owners don't get it.
- max should be 3 cats and 3 dogs per house
- 2 is more than enough.
- Limit should be 2 dogs and 2 cats for 4 total (not 6 dogs and 6 cats for up to 12 pets per household), with the potential exceptions you have listed.
- There is no reason to have that many animals!! It is impossible to properly care for that many pets - I've had 4 dogs for a short time and it is not possible to properly train/love/care for that many.
- Nobody needs 6 dogs or cats except for temp homes or businesses
- Too many animals can be causing troubles regardless how trained they are.
- Maximum amount of animals in total should bit exceed 4.
- Two dogs and two cats are enough animals for one house. We have too many running around loose.
- This type of bylaw should take into account the income and the size of the property.
- Too much risk for neglect and unwanted pregnancies. Also do not support backyard breeders
- Do support the bylaw, but should be less than 6. Maximum of 4 dogs and cats.
- Six is way to many! The number should be reduced.
- This is totally unacceptable! No end of diseases and accountability.



- Encouraging puppy mills and nuisance noises and smells
- It's unfair.
- The city does not need to be visiting peoples homes and counting their cats. If the animals cause a problem there are existing bylaws to fine them with.
- 12 pets in one home is too many
- As long as the pets aren't a danger, or a nuisance to others, I don't think such a restriction is necessary.
- The limit should be 1 pet per household. There are too many already!
- A litter of puppies/kittens would contravene this stupid law.
- Nobody needs 6 dogs and 6 cats. I think exceptions should be allowed in some circumstances such as temporary homes or inherited pets only.
- again, the city infringing on civil rights, I don't have a solution
- I would support a limit of 3 pets per household along with the exceptions. 6 dogs and cats are far too many for the average residential household.
- Simply too many animals to support properly...financially, physically, and if one wishes to raise multiple animals they should reside on a private acreage, where adjacent neighbors are not penalized by over population of animals and the additional problems they bring.
- If my animals don't cause any issues and I'm able to properly take care of them, I shouldn't be limited.
- If a pet owner is responsible, the limit makes little sense.
- There should be no limit
- Six dogs or cats are too many.
- 6 dogs and cats is too many in an urban setting where there is not enough space for them.
- No more than one pet per household should be implemented.
- Six dogs and cats in a household is way too many.
- One pet per household.
- Limit is too high. No more than 2 or 3 animals should be allowed.
- That number of animals in a household is ridiculous. It should be much lower with the exceptions listed above included.
- limit is way too high. No one can possibly need or properly take care of 6 dogs and 6 cats in one household.
- There is no reason for anyone to have more than 2 dogs or 2 cats within the city. On a rural property more animals is totally fine. But a home within the city limits should not house more than two dogs or two cats.
- No one house needs 6 cats AND 6 dogs. Also, I am in favour of lowering the price for low income Calgarians, but only for one animal. If they want more than one animal they should pay the full price everyone else pays.
- 2 per household is adequate



- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too many. I would support 3 and 3, but I already live next to a family with 3 barking dogs, and I cannot imagine 6.
- Having 6 dogs in a single family dwelling is not fair to the animals as dogs require sufficient space for exercise and play. Also living in a smaller house is not fair and adequate space for dogs as larger breeds require more space to live comfortably.
- too many!
- 6 seems like too much already
- 6 of anything is 3 to much
- Too high—the max number allowed should be reduced
- No more than 2 pets per house should be allowed. Regardless of the pet type, only two pets should be allowed within city limits. No animal hoarding allowed because animal welfare declines significantly when more than 2 pets exist.
- 6 and 6 is far too many to begin with
- Too many
- Really SIX !!! >>>> THATS JUST RIDICULOUS!!! One barking dog is too much now you want to have 6 JEZUS!
- No person needs more than one pet. Horrible pet owners. Rey irresponsible. They never pick up dog poop let them poop on others property. Rude. Should never be allowed to own pets in a city. Animals are not meant to be locked up in tiny yards and owning more than one pet is irresponsible. Who has time to properly look after more than one pet or clean up after them.
- 6 animals is too many to manage. I would propose that number is lowered to 4.
- 6 is too many in residential neighborhoods
- I think 6 is too many. Dogs exhibit pack behaviour more commonly at 4 and above, and 6 cats just produces exponentially more noisy cat fights.
- The limit should be lower, in my opinion 2. Except for special cases such as temporary homes.
- No one needs to have six dogs or cats - I would suggest two of either would be sufficient
- 6 cats is pushing the limits of reasonable because they can be very self sufficient as long as food, water, and litter are adequately addressed, but 6 dogs is too many for a household that takes proper, responsible care of them. 12 animals in total is just entirely too much as well.
- Should be three dogs or cats Other exceptions are in agreement
- I agree that it is not necessary for one household to have more than 2 pets at a time. For the welfare of both animal and people. The potential exceptions are acceptable. The size of the home and number of occupants should also be taken into consideration when exceptions are being considered.
- I think owning that many animals is close to hoarding. 6 animals per household makes more sense. People could apply for excess animal permit, but have to pay higher licensing fees and bylaw officers should have to visit those households on a yearly basis to ensure all animals are properly cared for, have enough room, food, water to live healthy lives
- 6 is still too many
- Who needs 6 dogs or cats.



- There needs to be a limit of pets in a household.
- Deal with problems on a case by case basis. I find it hard to believe that owning an excessive number of animals is such a problem that we need a new by-law.
- Stop intruding on people's rights and freedoms
- Too high. 6 TOTAL. No need for more in the city
- 12 animals in one city household is too many.....way too many.
- if you limit the amount of dogs a family can have, why don't you limit the amount of children too? to many, a pet is like a child. the fact that the government gotta ask this question is crazy. i feel like the government needs to take a step back from our personal lives
- Having up to 12 pets in one household is over excessive in my view and this is way to much as it could cause too much noise and other issues.
- 6 is too many
- Too
- I feel 6 cats or 6 dogs is far too many to take care of and give the love and attention they deserve.
- Max of 3. Dogs or cats or combination of dog(s) and cat(s) but no more than 3 per household.
- I think the limit should be lower; closer to 4. Any more than that should require a special permit. I am assuming that most working people living in an average sized household cannot give more than 4 dogs, for example, all of the attention and care that they need. Owners need to show that they are able to care for their pets' wellbeing if they have more than this.
- A total of 12 pets is way to many for a household to maintain a healthy environment in a city property.
- No one needs this many animals at one time. Most lots in the city are not large enough to provide a healthy environment for the pets.
- 6 dogs or cats is too many. Two of each is more than enough with exceptions for temporary homes and dogs/cats under 6 months of age.
- Way to many, 4 animals total is more than enough
- Who decides that 2 dogs are enough? Why not 3? 4?
- you do not need more than 3 animals per household
- No house needs 12 pets. 6 cats or 6 dogs or a mix would be sufficient. (like 3 of each)
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is way too many.
- Should be dependent on size of home, size of animals.
- I believe the limit of 6 per household is too many. I believe the limit should be 2. I also would like to point out the fact that I just learnt that Calgary has the highest abandonment rate of animals in all of North America. Pretty disgusting if you ask me.
- I have 4 toy poodles and that's my cap. Six dogs large or small would be to much for me. If a person was fostering dogs perhaps 6 should be the cap.
- There is such thing as too many animals. Noise would be an issue.



- That is still way too many animals and there is a difference between six chihuahua and six Great Danes. Vet bills and food for that many animals to ensure proper care and prevention would be unimaginable. Recommend two dogs and four cats maximum
- As a pet owner, I believe that allowing 6 of each (cats and dogs) is far too many for one household. The time, money, and commitment is enough for one or two animals let alone 12 animals! I fear that the owners would not be able to exercise them appropriately. Also, many owners already have a hard time training and controlling a single pet, so I am not confident they could properly manage 6 dogs! Also, because of the cost of owning pets, I am concerned many would not license their pets if they have that many.
- I'd be fine with not counting under a certain age of animal, completely exempting licensed service animals, and temporarily going over the limit (or a fixed higher limit) for breeders/petsitting/licenced daycares. But for Joe Citizen, 12 total animals is way too high.
- 6 and 6? Should be 3 and 3.
- 12 pets per household seems excessive unless the house is on an acreage or somewhere with lots of space. The maximum should be far, far less than 12. For the good of the animals, surely.
- Responsible pet owners should be allowed to have as many pets as they want!!! Do your jobs and tackle the real issues. Stop wasting everyone's time over this
- no need
- No limit, providing they can provide adequate care
- Dogs and cats should be limited to 2 perhousehold
- people should be allowed to have how many animals as they want as long as they maintain them
- 12 animals in a single home is excessive- caring for 1 properly is difficult enough for most people.
- Too many pets
- 6 dogs and 6 cats sounds excessive within city limits.
- If problems arise then action should be taken if changes are not met.
- No Sane person needs 6 dogs and 6 cats. To even suggest that number as being appropriate is madness.
- 2 dogs are acceptable. No more. Too much excrement in the environment. Service dog trainers should be exempted.
- Get serious. Two dogs and/or cats is absolutely sufficient. My one exception would be for service dogs.
- Less Animal per house
- I feel once a person is over a certain number they should have to apply for a kennel or catery licence. and if someone makes a complaint bylaw needs to enforce the law no warnings.
- It's not about the number of pets it's about responsible ownership
- too many pets
- Too many
- I think there are specula circumstances where responsible people are helping multiple animals or can care for them in large property. I think people should be required to fill out an application to own more pets beyond what's legal today.



- 6 animals total.
- There is no logical reasoning behind potentially owning 12 pets. There is already an overpopulation of pets, and the more you are able to own, more are bred to fill these, only for a lot to end up in shelters and abandoned etc.
- Why so many
- na
- 6 is too many. Fostering situations should be exempt. No one need 6 dogs.
- Maximum of 2 dogs and 2 cats. No one needs 6 of them.
- No one should have 6 dogs or cats. Perhaps 4 maximum
- 6 of cat or dog pee household is excessive
- Six dogs and six cats is too many
- concern would be care of these animals, affect on human living quarters, affect on neighbours whether apartment or house.
- That's too many animals at one home
- No one in the city needs 12 cats & 12 dogs. With the exception of a dog/cat that just gave birth, more than 2 each per household is ridiculous!!
- 6 is too high. 3 or 4 is more reasonable
- People don't need that many pets.
- six animals per household is way too many. I think it should be a maximum of THREE only. Again, I don't want to live by a zoo.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats it's still a very high number and would in many circumstances lead to problems with cleanliness of property/unhappiness from surrounding neighbours
- 6 is too many to have in a home
- Limit of 2
- Six animals in a city household is too many.
- No need to specific change for "pitbull"
- Unless the person is a breeder or animal rescue I think that number is too high. I would say 3 of each is sufficient.
- Too many dogs or cats per house. Won't be properly maintained
- six is too many. no one needs this many animals in a home.
- 1 pet per household no exceptions
- Yes. With exceptions.
- If I am permitted to have 6 cats and 6 dogs, why can't I just have 12 cats. A house can easily accommodate more than 6 cats and as a responsible owner, I don't like this restriction.
- Because this is ridiculous.
- Freedom of choice within existing/amended bylaws.
- Pet limits penalize responsible owners. People who accumulate or hoard animals are typically NOT responsible owners and typically do NOT license their animals. Such a rule would do very little to



stop those types of situations. It doesn't protect the welfare of animals, it just pushes people to be secretive and hide their animals.

- That's too many pets
- According to your proposed By-Law change I could have a total of 12 animals in my house. What difference if they are all dogs or all cats? Many of us are breeders and we do right by the dogs/cats we produce. Often we have more than 6 animals in our homes due to not finding the right owner for the offspring or one(s) we plan on keeping and exhibiting at shows. The City perhaps needs to take into consideration a Kennel License. Why are dogs and cats being targeted? What about birds, rodents, reptiles, etc.
- I don't think there should be a limit.
- That seems like an excessive amount of animals, maybe on a rural farm setting that's fine, but I would not be happy to have a neighbour with up to 6 dogs.
- This needs to be decided on an individual basis. Number of animals, space, care being provided.
- I'm fine with the exceptions. Other than the exceptions, not sure why someone would need a possible 12 animals in their house. Kind of feels like a hoarding situation. 6 dogs can make a lot of noise. Suggest 3 dogs and 3 cats maximum.
- 6 animals are too many for one household the law should be 1 pet per adult in the household Sanitation and animal well being should be a main criteria
- People cannot look after 1 let alone 6. In Europe many jurisdictions are looking at more responsible bylaw changes. Do you restrict LESA owners to less animals? If you can't afford the license fee you sure as heck cannot afford pet care (food and health). Shake your head people. Do you legal want people to live in filth.
- I don't like the term "Potencial" exceptions. Either it is or it isn't
- I support all of the above but would change the limit to 4 as I'm concerned about borderline animal hoarding situations.
- The term household is misleading...6 dogs and 6 cats in a condo scenario is unacceptable but is currently happening. A condo environment needs to be regulated for number and size of dogs and cats.
- A responsible pet owner can determine how many animals they are able to care for. Imposing a limit will not address the issues of people who hoard animals or irresponsible pet owners.
- *
- I think 6 of each is too high. I would support a bylaw that limits owners to 3 of each animal, with those exceptions.
- I do not think there should be exceptions. If you wish to own more than 6 dogs or cats move to the country
- Limit should be 3 unless it's a registered shelter or facility.
- I think this is very difficult to manage and maintain. The city would then require additional resources which would drive additional costs. The city can't manage the current processes so why make it more complicated and convoluted for residents to understand.
- If someone has the room and can afford and care for them they should set the limit.



- A household in a city should not be able to have 12 animals in it.
- To me if you have up to 6 dogs and/or cats in a home are they being treated right? If there is that many animals in a household I'm quite sure not all those animals are given proper exercise regimes to release any daily stress and maintain a good health. Let alone the lack of discipline/obedience for all 6 dogs and/or cat. I know quite a few with more animals then bylaw requests in said household and they just run free with the owners not caring at all. I find the more pets you have, the less control you have over behaviour, cleanliness, proper eating schedules, exercise. So a limit of 2 cats and/or dogs to me is decent. If you want more animals then that, move to an acreage where they can roam and have fun without the city or neighbours getting ticked off.
- The proposed limits are ridiculously high. Housing up to dozen animals on a residential lot (especially the tiny lots that are characteristic of Calgary neighbourhoods) is abusive to both the animals and the neighbours. Limits should be placed at two of each. Exceptions could be made for litters, but there should be a time limit on the length of time that the pups/kittens can remain on the property. Anyone who wants to keep more animals than this is a professional animal breeder/handler, not a pet owner, and should be required to operate in an appropriate commercial or agricultural zone and be subject to appropriate (enhanced) public safety and health standards.
- Dogs aren't harmful if given the proper training. Why can't the city focus more on giving people the right resources and investing in a better dog culture rather than completely shut everything down? Because a person can have 10 dogs and raise them better than 1 dog.
- The limit should not be so high, 6 cats or dogs? There are so many pets in Calgary, we need to decrease these numbers.
- Six of each is to many animals. Two of each is enough
- Nobody needs 6 cats or dogs this number is excessive.
- 6 is too high. 4 cats and 4 dogs would be reasonable or 6 total.
- Who's to say which individual can handle a certain amount of animals.
- That is too many animals to have in the city. Two dogs seems reasonable. Perhaps six cats since they stay on their own property.
- Cost.
- 4 cats, 4 dogs
- Proposal of 6 dogs and 6 cats per Household is ludicrous - WAY TOO MANY!!!
- Why allow more. Let's get our house in order first.
- A normal sized home should not house more than 5 animals (dogs or cats in total) the size and proximity to other homes should be taken into account.
- Current rules are good.
- If some one wants more pets and provide proper care why not
- As long as the animal and feces isn't causing any problems there shouldn't be a limit
- No more than one dog or cat per household
- Should be 4. Six is too many!
- People should be able to own as many pets as they wish so long as they abide by the bylaws.



- Would an apartment be considered a household? I believe that would be a yes. Then I believe this is insane. You don't frame the question for the intent. It's provocative.
- As long as the dogs or cats are safe and being treated good, we should we now have a limit? I own 6 dogs and my house is cleaner than many people who don't have any pets. My dogs are also safer than some kids I know. So we have to be fair. What will happen with people who already own more?
- A more reasonable limit would be two or three animals per house. Six animals is akin to a zoo.
- Please look around the city. There are lots of homeless people here. Do we want homeless pets running astray because the owner wasn't allowed to give them a home?1
- Yard stinks too much.
- Too many. Should be maximum 2 pets per household
- Too expansive. Too high a limit
- Could exempt for foster homes. Maybe.
- City council needs to stop micromanaging every area of our personal lives.
- There should be no limit to how many pets one can own. Don't take away our freedom to decide that.
- Live in the country if you want that many.
- Limit to 3 per household 6 animals in total. 12 animals in a house would be a health hazard.
- That just punishes responsible pet owners
- The # of animals should be based on the living space and property size. An apartment should have less animals than a house on 1 acre
- 6 is too many. Limit to 3 dogs and 3 cats
- 6 is too many. 4 is more reasonable.
- Sounds like a violation of my personal rights
- As long as pets are cared for the city should stay out of it
- 6 is too many. 2-3 is more than enough for one house inside of a city.
- 6 dogs/cats is too many on the city. I suggest 2.
- The number of pets should only depend on responsible pet ownership. Some people can manage multiple pets very well. There used to be one such family on my street, but they seem to be way down now in the number of dogs. For others one dog seems to be too much to manage. All cats should be spayed or neutered unless used for breeding. Unaltered cats should be removed from owner after a warning period. unless they can breed them responsibly.
- Why introduce BSL at the same time increase the number of dogs permitted per household? All dogs are capable of a bite. No to BSL No to increased numbers per home. Please better regulate businesses that pose as rescue centres and bring in animals from out of country with unknown histories.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is simply way too many! I agree with the rest with the rest of the exceptions. Please limit number of dogs to 3 per household. Limit of cats should be 3 per household.
- A limit of 6 dogs AND 6 cats per household is much too high for a regular homeowner.
- Some individuals cope with this number of dogs and cats
- special exceptions list is too onerous. deal with more than issues etc as needed or reported



- Not fair to the animals to be that crowded.
- I would only approve if the 'potential' exceptions are all approved exceptions.
- Some people may have more space and time to look after more animals. I'm concerned a cap would increase the number of animals in shelters and being euthanized.
- Six dogs in a residential property in the city?! Please consider the stress this would download onto neighbours without highly effective, zero-tolerance enforcement. Our last neighbour had just one large Great Pyrenees that woke our children and rattled the windows of our detached home with its barking. One of our current neighbours has two dogs that make your heart stop every time they launch out the door barking hysterically. And the smell in spring when a winter's worth of feces from them begins to thaw is more than enough to tolerate. We like dogs, but positive experiences with dogs as neighbours has been the exception rather than the standard. Please, please do not allow six dogs or cats. Max two, maybe three. And as part of the licensing process, maybe there should be a required online tutorial that reviews key aspects of the Responsible Pet Owners By-Law that every owner must complete. For example, the city requires all residents interested in the Branching Out tree-planting program to complete a tutorial on needs for different tree species, including planting and maintenance.
- Usually I've seen these limits suggested as a solution to address irresponsible pet ownership. However, an irresponsible owner shouldn't have 1 animal, 2 animals, or 10 animals. An owner is responsible or not, regardless of the number of animals. Irresponsible ownership should be addressed directly, rather than via this simplistic "count how many animals" proxy.
- No body (other than a breeder or daycares) should have six dogs or cats - that is a huge burden to support what with costs today. You may be able to afford it today, but if you ever reach a point where you cannot, who then picks up the animals support and welfare?
- I would support 2 of each. then the potential exceptions rules
- Honestly I think that having 6 pets in a house is reasonable, but I can think of many different situations where this is not feasible. There needs to be accommodation for situations where this may occur. I do want to discourage hoarding of pets. However fosters, breeders, sitters are all examples where there will be more pets in a location. I would not want to make it difficult for people to get temporary lodging for animals when required.
- Unnecessary to limit if the animals are being cared for and are healthy.
- 6 of each is too many.
- Incomplete information provided. Changing from what? And great you offer more red tape and more interference.
- 6 is too many. Nobody needs this many animals it is smell costly and noisy the limit should be maximum 4 of each and that's pushing it
- Leaves the window open for hoarding situations to occur more easily. 3 and 3 seems more reasonable.
- 6 is way too many. I would agree with 2-4, but definitely a limit
- Anyone who wants 12 animals in their house should go through and application process. Visit the house. A condo stuffed full of cats and dogs?? That's horrible. People would do it though.



- People should be able to enjoy however cats or dogs they are able to take care of. No one should have the right to tell another person what they can have. What is next, telling people they can't have more than two children? City is turning into a prison with no freedom with far too many bylaws that are out of line
- 2 pets in one house are more than enough.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too many.
- 3 dogs and 3 cats
- No person needs this many animals plain and simple
- That is way too ,any animals. I would support 2 and 2 unless they are nursing babies.
- Restriction to maximum of 2 cats, 2 dogs. Only exception: inheriting a cat or dog. The exception would only pertain to that specific animal. No other animals would be allowed.
- 6 is too many for any animal in one home located in the city
- The proposed bylaws change sounds reasonable but I was not presented with the current bylaw to compare
- This seems like a cookie cutter solution that wouldn't be appropriate for all situations i.e. 400sq ft studio apartment vs a 3,000sq ft house with an enclosed lawn. I'm not so sure it would be fair to allow that many animals in a small space all at once.
- There are lots of responsible pet owners and limiting them would only hurt the animals looking to be adopted.
- If the owners are reasonable they should be able to own as many as they like
- if someone wants more than 6 dogs that's none of my business, plus it can reduce the amount of pets in systems like the humane society. i'm all in favour of allowing more than 6 dogs or cats, as long as the person has no record of animal abuse, no pet related offence and can provide food and care for the animals
- Yes except exceptions for those with Dog Fanciers License not Service Animals - neither warrants an exception allowing the person to have more than six animals.
- If the pet limit increases, so will all associated problems. This will not be healthy for the animals or the community.
- The city should not have input on this matter. I believe incidents involving excessive barking, animal well fare and the accumulation of feces will not change depending on the amount of animals on a persons property. If there is a problematic homeowner (in regard to this question), they will continue to be a irresponsible pet owner even if there is a limit on the amount of animals allowed. Having a limit on the number of pets individuals have will not all of a sudden make people responsible pet owners.
- Some people will abuse the number limit
- The exceptions I am fine with. But 6 cats and 6 dogs = 12 animals in total is too many animals. I would be fine with someone owning 3 cats and 3 dogs for a total of 6 animals in a household. But to me 12 animals in a household is too many and sounds close to hoarding
- if the house is really big, they should be entitle to have more than 6 of the same kind



- I fully believe it depends on the size of your living situation. If you live in a smaller living space, you should have less pets. Otherwise you're mentally and physically harming your animal. If you have a larger space to accommodate more animals, then perfect. I think it's subject to your house size.
- There are better ways to protect animal welfare than arbitrarily limiting the number of pets kept in one home.
- limit should be 2 dogs and 2 cats per household. if someone wants more than that, they should move to acreage. licenced breeders could be exempt
- I do not believe owners would be able to properly care for that amount of animals
- 6 dogs is way too many! Make it 2. Exception for litter of puppies up to 6 months age. No need for exceptions like inheritance, grandfathering, "fancier", etc.
- .
- A good Pet limit would be 3-4 animals for owning with exception to the following above.
- I cannot agree with out the potential exemptions being a gaurantee
- 6 dogs and 6 cats seems like WAY too many animals for one household unless in exceptional circumstances such as dog breeders, dog rescues and dog fosters. I would want to limit it to maybe 4 and 4 at most.
- If I am a responsible pet owner and I follow all rules and bylaws I don't think the city has the right to tell me how many animals I can have
- The limit should be lowerd to 3 dogs and 3 cats
- As long as the animals and property are taken care of, and there is no neglect, there should be no limit.
- I don't approve of limiting how many animals a person has as long as the person is able to provide proper care (medical, nutrition, shelter, exercise, attention).
- If you have the space and money why not more than 2 animals
- I would support this once they have been visited and been deemed a nuisance house. Then they should be restricted for a probationary period of 2 years.
- while I do believe 6 cats and 6 dogs is far more animals than someone would "need," I don't believe it should be a law. I think hoarding situations should be handled accordingly, but I believe that putting a limit on the number of animals a household can have will lead to people not licensing their pets in fear of losing them if they have more than the legal number.
- Six is excessive. My neighbour has 5 and they are unable to control them. Again, this is a city not a farm
- Accumulation of feces, excessive noise, and welfare of pets is not a function of number of animals, it's a function of a responsible adult. Laws of this nature do not properly address the root cause, which is irresponsible behavioiur.
- the amount of cats that can be properly taken care of in a house should be higher than the amount of dogs
- Not everyone can afford these silly fees
- On initial read, this sounds reasonable; however, it doesn't sit well with me. I think efforts should focus on animal welfare, clean and appropriate living conditions and noise..



- Owners are to pick up feces always, no matter how many dogs. Excessive noise can occur with any amount of animals. Welfare of animals is Calgary Humane Society. Leave bylaw as is with no restrictions.
- There is no need to have more than 2 dogs/cats per household. Exceptions as listed above
- I do not support 6 dogs and 6 cats per household, but I do support the potential exceptions.
- Pets are family. There are no limits on how many kids a family can have. I personally would not have more than 2-3 dogs but if the owner is responsible there should be no limits.
- even 6 is to many for one household
- I feel that there should be a lower pet limit than 6, with the exception of puppies and kittens born to the parent animal. Then there should be a time limit for adoption purposes.
- 6 dogs per household within the city is a huge number. It will encourage puppy mills. I am not convinced that anyone need more than 2-3 dogs in house unless they are breeding them
- I do not agree with the exceptions to this rule - there should be no exceptions. I also feel that 6 and 6 is too many for the city. Please do not remove this limit - there are so many animals already that can't be cared for properly. Perhaps when we put better bylaws in place for better education and responsibility and see how this works, then we could revisit the per household limits in the future.
- Too many circumstances that this law would be hindering owners
- Six and six is WAY too many. Besides the feces and cleanliness/hygiene, how could someone afford to license that many animals anyway?
- Some people rescue animals that other don't want.. most cases are in excess of 10 animals.. I respect those people cause the shelters won't step up for certain animals! If you want 15 cats and dogs.. fine.. take care of them, love them and control them! No different to families having more than 6 kids? We going to put a limit on that?
- There should be no limit.
- 6 is far too many for grown animal. Why would any home need more than 2. If you want more animals, MVE to the country!!!!!!
- The other Bylaws provide adequate control for problem animals and owners.
- Too many animals to take care of properly higher risk for neglect higher risk for unwanted pregnancies
- I live next door to very irresponsible pet owners who are at the limit. I don't need more of their animals barking all day long, and more of their cats coming into my yard and destroying my gardens
- That is still TOO MANY ANIMALS in one home!!! No way!!!
- Go further. 3 dogs max and 3 cats max is enough for anyone.
- There should be zero breeders zero pets sold in stores
- Any more than two pets is a business and should follow business regulations.
- Way too many animals on a city lot. That should be maximum 3 dogs as it is in many small towns. And three cats, for maybe a total of six animals on a property and even that can be too much if causes disgusting living conditions in small spaces.
- There are too many homeless and neglected animals and you should be allowed to care for as many as you are able to as long as you don't cause problems for anyone else and the animals are



well cared for. Some people should not be allowed to have any animals while others are capable of caring for many. Also, societal views about animals are changing and my pets are my family. I don't get to dictate how many children others can have (way more annoying than pets in my opinion) so why should an arbitrary number be imposed on me? While 6 dogs and 6 cats seems like it might be at the upper limit of what one household can handle, it depends on the person and the animals. 7 cats or 7 dogs might be easier to take care of, or 8 cats and 2 dogs etc. It depends on the situation.

- Having that many pets in an urban household would likely lead to excessive noise, smell, feces, and disease.
- Let people use their own judgement. If they can support more animals, and want to give animals a loving home, let them
- This is a bad question. Is there a current limit? 6 is way too many. I do agree with exceptions listed but a dog fanciers license is ridiculous idea and totally bypasses the by law limit.
- 6 Dogs and 6 cats are too many for a household, and there are higher chances of increased nuisance with this many animals in a single household.
- Limit of 2 makes sense.
- Twelve dogs/cats total seems like too many animals to be within city limits. I like the exceptions, but I think it should include a clause about dog sledding/mushing as they can have 10+ dogs. I think changing it to a total number vs. having it specific to the type of animal makes more sense. Some people might want 7 dogs or cats, but not 6 of each.
- I support the potential exceptions - But 12 animals in a home? That seems very excessive! 2 dogs and 2 cats seems a little more feasible
- I don't think it's the number of animals that's the problem. I've met people with a lot of animals and yet they take good care of them compared to people with only one. Again I go back to the argument of responsible ownership. We need to educate people better that when they are owning pets that it is a responsibility. Let's use common sense in all of this.
- I think six of each is too many. Six per household of any kind
- I do not think anyone is able to tell someone how many pets they can have, as long as the animals are taken care of who cares. If a hoarding situation is happening and the animals are in danger, a concerned citizen could get the Humane Society involved.
- It should be even less. 6 animals per household?? That's insane. How can they have good lives?
- I agree with a maximum of 2 dogs OR 2 cats in one household.
- Need to control the number again want a farm move outside city limits
- 6 is way to many higher risk for neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- I'll start with a caveat, the following comments are written with the intent of offering constructive criticism. They are not a criticism the individual(s) who wrote this survey form and I hope they can be used to build faith in whatever the final decision becomes. I have many concerns given the implications of some of the ideas presented in this survey. To start, phrasing such as 'we heard many comments' or 'quite a few comments' are misleading to the layperson and several false dichotomies occur among options. If phrasing such as this is carried forward to later stages I worry that proposed changes may reduce the clarity and enforceability of impact bylaws. The fact that the



profile pictures of the project team are all of pets alone makes me question if there is an inherent bias in this consultation process and that voices of non-pet owners are equally present within the team. I hope that is not the case. When it comes to specific points, I am not aware of any evidence that suggests that a total of 12 animals (6 dogs and 6 cats) living in a household is beneficial to animals or humans. Infectious disease epidemiology is clear that indoor crowding increases health risks to both animals and humans. I also worry that as written, the proposed change communicates to pet owners that having this number of animals on a city lot of any size is justifiable regardless of context. The voluntary 'bandana' suggestion also appears to contain several inherent assumptions that I am not sure can be relied upon. First of all, it suggests that the onus should be put on others to complete a risk assessment every time they see a dog and trust that the owner has objectively rated their dog correctly. I also question the benefit of this program for individuals with vision impairments. A dog owner may assume that an individual who cannot identify the color of the bandana has made a decision to interact with the animal even if they are flagged as a risk. Based off my background, I know that there is evidence for the use of LESAs as a mental health treatment support. However, they are only one of several non-pharmaceutical therapies available to patients. The mention of the DSM-V to add a 'scientific/medical' basis for obtaining a LESA is an inappropriate use of that tool and is misleading to any layperson who is not familiar with the DSM-Vs limitations and intended use. Other questions I had when filling out this form were: what bearing does the age of an animal have on animal crowding? What is the rationale for setting up an exemption system on an animal limit when the justification for a '12 animal limit' is not presented? Why not 13 animals, why not 11?

- the pet limit is far too high, 2 at the most. It's impossible for most to properly care for more
- 12 animals in one household is too many as the standard.
- too many animals for city living. 2 is more than sufficient. Should be mechanism for person to apply for exception which involves consult with neighbourhood and ability of person to control large number e.g. animal trainer etc
- I think there should be adequate enforcement if excessive pet ownership is problematic, but if someone wants to own many pets and they look after them and they aren't problematic I see no reason to limit their numbers.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is far too much. Limit it to 3 of one, 4 in total. Exceptions listed are reasonable.
- City lots are too small to accommodate than two animals per household. The concept that up to 12 animals are living in a small city lot makes me question if the proposed changes promote animal neglect.
- The limit would be better if it was 4 dogs and 4 cats, not 6 each. Apart from that, I agree with the rest
- 12 animals total is too many
- mind your bees wax if the animals are well care for then numbers shouldn't be an issue
- 6 each is too high. Should be a combined total of 6.
- Too many animals
- I think 6 pets already sounds like a lot. However, if a household can support and sustain the well being of that many pets without negatively impacting those around them I think it is fine. Perhaps



we need a process where, after there is a complaint, an assessment is completed to review the feasibility of the household to maintain/sustain the wellbeing of the pets. Also, I don't like the idea of voluntary dog early warning system, as soon as, we start 'marking' animals it puts the onus onto the animal. People have tried doing this to people and it is a way to discriminate and make certain behaviours acceptable. I believe that we should focus on increasing awareness that not all small dogs are puppies, that dogs deserve to have their own personal bubble just like humans, that dogs in off leash areas should have been taught to behave respectfully, that dogs in non-offleash areas should remain leashed and respect the people around them, that owners should take responsibility for educating, properly cleaning, and maintaining their dogs well being.

- Case by case you can't lump all people together and rescues are a big factor!
- I do not think a household in the city needs to house more than 2 pets.
- Although it is more work, I think there should be individual evaluation on the situations that require attention.
- Number of animals should be based on size of apartment/home/lot; 3 dogs in a one bedroom apt or bachelor suite is too many. Suggest one animal per 1000 sq ft.
- I believe that 6 dogs and 6 cats is excessive. The limit should be lowered and if the household wants more, then they have to submit a special application for the excess.
- That is too many animals for one home and ignores the needs of this many animals.
- I would suggest 6 is too many, except for your exception list, which is very good. Perhaps 3 instead of 6.
- Six is too many unless it is a licensed business
- 2 pet limit maximum per home.
- This proposed change does not take into account the relative SIZE of the animals in question. Where a property may be able to support six yorkies, it could not support a great dane. May I suggest that a cumulative size limit of all animals as a ratio of available yard space be considered? Eg., one could have (3) 5-pound dogs OR (1) 50-pound dog in a typical residential yard, up to a maximum number of dogs.
- Six of each is WAY too high!
- I think the potential for 12 pets (6 dogs AND 6 cats) is too many for a city property. this number is more appropriate for an acreage
- I think that is too many in one household. I would support 3 cats and 3 dogs per household.
- That is FAR too many dogs and cats in a household. I'd say 6 total, be it all dogs, all cats, or some combination thereof.
- na
- No limit to number of animals
- I don't feel that a single household would give 6 dogs the proper attention and care. ie walks, grooming, etc. 3-4 dogs, max. maybe the same for cats?
- Too much paperwork with exceptions. Hoarders are a different matter and for some unknown reason are never discovered until too late!
- Six dogs and six cats is an outrageous amount of animals. Max 4 dogs and 4 cats



- 6 dogs or cats is excessive. Given the small size of Calgary lots that is not enough space for that many animals.
- Don't tell people what to do in their own home as long as they upkeep it
- 12 animals per household?! There are very few households where these numbers would not be a problem for the neighbors and the animals would be cared for properly.
- Farms and ranches often have many many dogs and cats. As I noted above, so long as animals are being well taken care of, I see no reason to limit a person/family's enjoyment of those animals.
- No need for more rules. Agree with your argument, I just don't see the need for all this costly bureaucracy..
- I agree rescues and foster homes should be allowed more but there is no reason for anyone to have up to 12 pets in a home
- 6 dogs is excessive. 3 or 4 should be the maximum. I also don't believe a home would need 6 service animals. This really confuses me. You would allow 6 Great Danes but as of right now deny a person a handful of chickens. This makes absolutely no sense in my mind.
- Hoise sitters should be held to the same standard in terms of number of permitted animals.
- To many animals for one home to responsibly care for. Higher risk for neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- People should be able to keep as many pets as they are responsibly able to care for... the number would be different for each citizen.
- Six is just too many for most to provide proper care, vet visits (bills), control in public, cleanliness.
- This would be detrimental to those that own animals but also want to help foster them. Limits should not be applies on foster homes.
- Why does my freedom of how many animals I want become monitored
- Increasing numbers of pets per house hold will not help the system manage. Looking for better regulation on "adoption" centres that import dogs of all breeds for adoption. Please stop this practice.
- Reduce the number of pets per household. 4 total.
- As long as the owners are following all the rules it is fine.
- I think it should be reduced to a total number less than 10
- That is way too many animals to reasonably look after in one household. I would only support this if all of the animals had pet insurance.
- I dont think it is simply numbers causing the problem. An equal number of owners of one animal cause nuisance
- 12 animals is too much for any household unless there is a litter to be there until they can be moved to other homes
- I think this will cause severe disturbance for neighbours.
- No one needs to own that many animals more animals leads to higher risk of neglect and unwanted pregnancies
- logically it does not matter if someone has six cats and six dogs, or twelve cats . Human children make more noise , and people can have 8 if they so please. So why limit pets ?



- Too many - make it 4 dogs and 4 cats
- I have more than 1 dog and my dogs make minimal noise while I know of many neighbours with 1 dog that have very noisy dogs disturbing the peace. Luckily it is during the day primarily.
- I don't know how often this comes up but why create a whole new set of rules for something that is probably not a significant problem in the city.
- 2 max per household
- Anytime someone has more than 6 animals, if they are not taking care of their yard, feces, house, etc - that should be reported and fined. If they want to have many animals they need to keep it clean. But as responsible adults we should be able to manage this without a bylaw in place. This is a slippery slope to reduce the numbers down even further.
- As long as the animals are taken care of there should be no limit.
- 2 dogs or cats maximum. I would say 50% of dogs I come across are not trained.
- The limit should be 2 cats and/or dogs with the exceptions listed above.
- 2 is more than enough, noise and smell
- If the dogs and cats are receiving proper care and attention, there is no reason to limit the number of dogs and cats in a household. So many dogs and cats won't get to go to good homes if this bylaw is implemented.
- I don't think many households have more than 6 cats/6 dogs right now so I don't think this change would have any real impact.
- What percentage of pet owners have more than 6 dogs or cats? If the city was being honest and open it would provide a breakdown of how many pets per household there are. The fact that a breakdown these numbers have not been provided is telling. This again seems like a simple way for the city/politicians to claim they are doing something whilst allowing a slow steady ratchet of "no one has more than X dogs so lets reduce the limit to $x - 1$ "
- No more than two pets per household. In the instance of a "fostering" situation, a special license would be required and a limit placed on the total number of pets (perhaps no more than 5 with time restrictions).
- There should be a lower limit on the number of cats and dogs allowable per home. As you have indicated, there is no need to have in excess of 2 animals per household. The increase in quantity directly results in additional noise for neighbours and frequently, additional feces in the surrounding areas.
- This is meant with good intentions but feels like a misguided over reach. It potentially allows one household to have 12 larger pets (6 cats and 6 dogs) yet penalizes others who would perhaps have far less say maybe 7 house cats which could be mostly older rescues etc. that are well looked after and never go outside etc. If there is to be a regulation on the number of licensed pets allowed to have a number of 12 in general or whatever is settled on instead of specific species. I would much more regularly support something of that nature.
- The limit should be less than six. No more than two dogs or two cats.
- Need to engage with citizens PROOF of why limiting number of dogs/cats is beneficial to Calgarians. MUST be proven before implementing this bylaw.



- 2 dogs per household would be better. Yes, get a permit if more than 2.
- Some people can have multiple pets and keep a clean house and yard as well as take good care of the animals. The city of Calgary only has a right to investigate issues both limit what someone's has in their home.
- I think this number should be lower. Maximum 6 cats OR dogs or a combination. The exceptions make sense and should remain in place.
- I don't feel that limiting the number of animals in a household will change people's behaviors, only drive the ownership of animals further underground. This is the opinion of a local small animal veterinarian.
- no need to make this a paperwork exercise
- Good for preventing hoarding, but shouldn't make arbitrary distinction between dogs & cats.
- Unless they're a breeder no one in the city needs 6 dogs or cats. If they're a breeder they need a business license and a higher pet license.
- A maximum number of 2 for dogs or cats seems to be reasonable!! Whereas 6 seems inherently excessive!
- 12 pets in one household is too many
- Unless living conditions are suitable for both animal, human and property. Eg. acreage or large property. This should be a case by case bases.
- Too many
- Really? Do we even have enough by law officers to enforce all this? Enough is enough with noise and nuisance of these animals. We have a couple with 3 little dogs which they pen on their porch daily. They bark at everything and anything.
- That is an excessive amount of animals for one house. Totally ok on a farm but too much for the city.
- Six dogs on a property is too many. Six indoor cats would be okay. Six large dogs, not so okay. The numbers need to be smaller.
- Too many animals in a home is a type of hoarding behaviour, as well the animal likely isn't getting the attention they need. An exception would be if a person had a acreage which then you could apply for more animals.
- Managing that many pets so that the community is not negatively effected is challanging for most people.
- 6 animals is nearing what should be called a kennel. I've owned 3 dogs at a time, that was enough. How is it to be measured that the animals are all cared for properly? 6 animals has significant costs associated with them (food, vet, etc)
- 4 maximum
- Reduce the number of dogs and cats from 6 each to 3 each.
- It is absolutely unconscionable to own 6 dogs + 6 cats in an urban setting! THIS IS RIDICULOUS, DANGEROUS AND POTENTIALLY CRUEL!
- Households should have more than 6 pets. Any more would require prior approval.
- No household needs 6 dogs & cats at any given time, who would be able to live as a human being in such a state. All the pseudo-science using animals as a fix, burdening these poor animals with these



humongous responsibility. They want to be running around chasing cars or rabbits but they are imprisoned 24/7 or 1 hour or less outdoor. People need to check themselves because if we can't function as humans what's the purpose of getting out of bed at all? Human beings need human beings and people are too busy being suspicious of one another instead of forming human relationships.

- People don't take care of or clean up after their pets now. More animals would make this much worse and be a problem in the neighbourhood
- As long as all pets are well cared for no restrictions need be placed
- I feel like that's too many. Granted, if the owners had the square footage (ie: acreage) then there'd be an exception. I just don't know that there's room in home within the city for that many animals in one household. Let alone ensuring they are properly taken care of.
- Current rules are fine. If there are problems there are already bylaws covering those problems.
- Way too many animals in a household! Max 3 total
- Quality of care and health and wellbeing of the animals should be a priority, not the number of animals in a home.
- That is far too many animals on one property. The suggested 2 of EITHER dogs or cats is ample. We have a lot of issues on our street with animals allowed to run free and limiting the number of pets per household will go some way to reduce the problems resulting from irresponsible owners.
- 12 animals in a house is too many
- Do not encourage breeders!! We do not need to be breeding animals when shelters are full. If you must have a limit, the main benefit is to prevent breeding and hoarding. So do not under any circumstances give them an exemption. Six dogs is plenty.
- if the existing bylaws are being enforced it should be able to deal with any issues regardless of the # of animals
- This is far too many pets in a house. Even if well trained, one dog barking starts a howl, and this will greatly affect surrounding neighbours. The City today has very little ability to combat bad owner behaviour, issuing a ticket rarely stops a dog from barking.
- no need to limit
- 6 is still far too many in a household.
- As many as the person wants as long as they can be properly cared for and are cleaned up in a decent amount of time (weekly)
- This sets up hoarding situations. Think of the animals welfare, please do not allow that many animals.
- No more than 3 cats, 3 dogs, unless a licenced foster parent. No one needs 6 cats and 6 dogs . Exception being a *licenced*, vet-approved breeder. Make all breeders have to be licensed and veterinarian approved!!! NO MORE BACKYARD OR ILLEGAL BREEDERS.
- It is different in every situation. If you have a large dog have a litter you already are breaking the bylaw
- Six is still way too many. In my opinion 4 should be the maximum with exceptions for breeders or boarders, service animals, grandfathering, inheriting



- I believe situations must not be reduced to mere numbers, as every situation is different.
- This number of animals in a household is excessive and inevitably leads to nuisance problems with neighbors.
- City houses/lots are not big enough to support a dozen animals.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too many for one household.
- This is still a lot of animals. How did you arrive at 6? What about 3 animals, unless the owner is a breeder, foster, or there is an inheritance issue, etc.
- Six dogs and six cats is far too many. Two of each maximum. No special permits.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats already sounds like too many in the city. I would say 2 of either and 3 total for city living..
- Needs to be case by case. If someone has 7 cats but is fully taking care of them and it's not causing an issue to anyone else there is no problem.
- still too many of the animals,, there is no need for those volumes in a urban environment...
- As long as all animals have a good place to live, and they are receiving everything they need to survive: yard/ food/ fresh water/ shelter then it shouldn't be anyone else's business how many animals someone owns.
- It seems like too many. I would support a lower number. Twelve pets in one household? Yikes. Too much risk that the animals are not being well care for.
- The City should limit the number of pets to 1 or 2 max. If someone feels he/she needs more pets, they should move to a rural area.
- 6 dogs or cats is too many already: 2, maybe 3 are fine.
- I think 6 of each is a lot. Perhaps 4 of each would be a more manageable number.
- I love animals and realize others do also. However I cannot imagine why any household would need more than 3, perhaps 4 dogs or cats. The responsibility of ownership increases with each addition of an animal and unfortunately many whom tend to want more animals are the very people who possibly cannot afford that expense and thus the animals could be at risk or neighboring residents have to put up with the increased noise/smell or danger. Already the playing fields I live adjacent to have everyone walking thier dogs there everyday even 'tho the bylaw says this is not allowed. It is a disgrace! And may do not pick up. And now the city is considering allowing more animals per household? Really. We cannot even mangage what we do have.eer . I n n
- That is still too many animals. Nobody I've ever met can tend to 12 pets properly. That's at least a part time job.
- I agree with 1 dog and 1 cat per household maximum
- Cats I don't care. However dogs much more of a nuisance for those without dogs. Especially untrained dogs.
- 6 of each? ... maybe 3 or 4 of each, with a total of 6 animals allowed.
- I think people should be allowed to do what they want. If an issue arises they can deal with it then
- A limit of 3 dogs AND 3 cats is plenty, not sure why anyone would want more than this.
- Too many exceptions that this bylaw change would be unenforceable. I would remove the inherited and grandfathered exceptions.



- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is definitely too many, how can you properly walk, care and feed for so many pets. Can you truly give 6 animals adequate care and attention? I personally don't think so
- I would support this ONLY if the potential exceptions were put in place for breeders. I would also make it a 6 PET limit meaning only 6 animals no matter the combination of types.
- Six dogs AND six cats per household is too many animals. Limit should be two (2) dogs and two (2) cats, with the potential exceptions you have listed. Too many dogs and cats on one property is opening the door to conflict. Also, licensing should be kept annual, to allow for regular education on bylaws -- (1) dogs must be on-leash at all times, except in designated off-leash areas; (2) dogs are not allowed in school yards, sports fields, playgrounds, golf courses ...; (3) dogs must not bark, howl or disturb others, etc. People need regular reminders of the key bylaws.
- I am not really sure what limits should be imposed or if it is appropriate to do so.
- Nobody that is not a pet breeder should be allowed more than 3 pets per household.
- There is no need to have more than 6 dogs or 6 cats per household unless they have had a litter.
- It takes money/time/commitment to be a pet owner, and I can see how somebody can look after more than 2 dogs at a time. I'm a pet owner of one dog and it is a commitment to properly care for your animals.
- I think owning 6 dogs is too much. No one needs to own 6 dogs. What about a 3 dog limit? Same with cats. A 3 cat limit sounds more reasonable to me.
- Less regulation. Case by case if a problem arises
- I think we are able to make our own call on what we can handle.
- 6 pets is already too many for one household
- Six is way too many in the City. No more than three, maximum.
- So long as it doesn't get to a hoarding point, and the animals have enough room & attention there should not be a limit. Let people have pets
- People, if they can handle their pets should be allowed to have a maximum of 10 of either dogs or cats however they choose.
- All the exceptions I agree with. However I feel I can't fully answer yes or no to this question without knowing what the special application would entail, and how many pets would be allowed within that.
- It isn't 'necessary' to own more than 2 animals but limits shouldn't be imposed as to maximums.
- The number of pets in a household does not determine responsible ownership behaviors.
- We don't need more government involvement here. Address problem pet owners and let responsible people live their own lives
- People can have more than six dogs or cats and be responsible pet owners. This only punishes responsible pet owners.
- Too much risk for unhealthy animals, unwanted pregnancies and more risk for neglect
- Too many animals runs the risk of animals not being cared for, unwanted pregnancies and possible aggression of any animal
- Too many animals per property.



- Again there is enough by laws to support nuisance animals Regardless of the number of them. if a responsible owner wants to have a dozen dogs and they're not barking and the owner is cleaning up then the owner should be allowed to have a dozen dogs. on the flip side one dog can be a nuisance and the owner doesn't look after the animal the knot owners shouldn't have the animal. you can't put a number of animals in a while that's arbitrary that doesn't even consider the responsibilities of the owner. further the owner should be innocent until proven otherwise.
- I would want the law to lower the amount of owning animals under six. Six is still high and I don't think people have enough time to focus and teach each animal individually properly. Also what happens with people who have a cat or dog n move in with someone who also has animals.
- Do you limit how many children someone can have?
- As long as every pet is cared for correctly and has what they need to be happy and healthy, who cares how many people have?
- 6 is too high. 4 at the most is reasonable for cats , 3 for dogs. Potential Exceptions seem reasonable.
- Honestly it has been one of Calgary's highlights is that there are no limits on pets. 12 dogs can be quieter then one, loud, obnoxious dog. It's about the owner and if it's over run, the neighbours call with a complaint and the conditions would be assessed then anyways. I say leave well enough alone.
- I can have as many pets as I damn well please. I own property I own what to do with it.
- People should be allowed to have as many pets as they can reasonably care for.
- Two dogs allowed should be the limit.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs are way to many in a city lot. 3 of each maximum
- I agree with the exceptions. Though, not in an increase in dogs and cats in general. Because it would bring more issues with noise, feces, animal welfare problems and control of the animals. Also, more animals makes it harder for people to afford licensing all of them on top of the other expenses. Animal welfare is more of a problem for the same reason owners will have a harder time providing vet care. Even just teeth cleaning and removal for infections. So many animals can't even get that care right now and suffer malnutrition from the pain of eating and infections that cause other health problems. Just not being able to keep proper mouth care leads to long term suffering and death.
- There are so many animals that need loving homes; as long as food, shelter, water and medical aid as required. Responsible pet owners usually are on top of picking up feces.
- Sounds like too many cats or dog in one dwelling
- If you can afoord to license and care for your pets you should be able to have as many as you want
- Although the above sounds reasonable I would fear that some of these changes might not work. Please explain what a dog fancier's license is? Is that designated to someone who actively enters performance events and is a member of the Canadian Kennel Club? Or would this be available to all people who would claim themselves as a "breeder"? This would be something that would need to be looked into and cross checked. There are some "breeders" in the city who are known to breed for profit, many are of cross-breeds and thus in many cases not eligible by CKC to have a dog fanciers license. Please describe further what that licensing is.



- I agree, only if it doesn't cause disruption, then the fines continuing until the issue is resolved would suffice.
- 6 of any animal is an excessive number; I do not believe anyone needs to own more than 2 of any type of animal.
- All dogs need to be treated equal
- If people need more than 2 cats or 2 dogs than they should have a special application to fill out.
- That many animals need lots of space. I fear the 6 and 6 is even too much
- That allows way too many animals in 1 home. I would suggest a maximum of 6 cats and/or dogs in total. I have been a 2 cat plus 2 dog home/pet owner and there were no problems. However, when one household starts to have 8, 10 or more animals in a single home, that becomes more like a farm, not a home. Perhaps properties over one acre could be allowed more than 6 animals in total.
- Six and six is a very big jump from two pets total- why not increase to two and two?! Instead of being exempt, those who are breeders, fosters, sitters, fanciers, etc should actually be required to have additional licensing to look after more pets. It takes more skill to take care of more dogs. That should be something that is regulated through monitoring.
- 2 is plenty!!! More animals than humans is too much!!
- I agree with all the conditions, but 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many. There was a time where my grandmother (in Calgary) had 13 cats and one dog. That was manageable with their cats, considering the general temperament of the cats, their yard and the 3ft of chicken wire above their fence. Their house was clean (as it could be) and all the litter boxes were downstairs and changed frequently. Dogs are another story. Their loud, needy, and are more violent when they become aggressive. (Everyone in our family has a dog)
- I don't think we should eliminate how many dogs and cats are in a home of a responsible dog owners
- It is none of anyone's business as long as their pets are being appropriately managed
- 2 cats or dogs is enough
- I would rather see the law framed to address hoarding and puppy mill type situations rather than responsible pet owners
- No one needs more than 2 pets per household
- I worry about the welfare of the animals in homes that reach this new proposed maximum (6 cats and 6 dogs). It would be extremely difficult to ensure safe and sanitary living conditions for this many animals in one house.
- There are already too many neighbours that have too many dogs. This week a guy was walking 6 dogs in a park. He could not and did not control them as two chased and barked at me.
- 6 dogs OR 6 cats or combo to make a total of six should be plenty, except for when a breeder has recent litters, or if it is a pet daycare situation.
- I do not think that a prescribed limit is necessary. Responsible pet owners are more than capable of looking after more than 6 animals. Those that aren't responsible will take as many pets as they want without adhering to any limit anyway. By restricting numbers, you are simply preventing an animal



from getting a living home while not targeting the small minority who will do whatever they want irrespective of any rules.

- 6 is too many as a permanent number
- People own their property and they own their animals, if the animals are being treated poorly then the animals should be removed and kept in a safe place until the owner is able to care for themselves, their property and the animals
- I don't believe it is up to the city / bylaw to determine; there are many exceptions and specific circumstances that would not be included.
- Would agree but details should be released regarding special application for more - what does this involve, are there increased fees, what do you look at to provide approval?
- 6 too many ... That is potentially 12 pets. I support 6 total
- No one needs more than two dogs or cats in a household. They are not locked after properly then.
- because if someone owns their home they should be able to adopt the animals they want. There is a problem in this city with stray animals that need to find homes.
- No one should restrict the number of animals that are comfortably kept on a property
- let people have their pets, and address mistreatment as its own issue.
- There is no need for 6 dogs and 6 cats I think 3 should be the limit. Anymore Than that one should have to make application to increase this number. That number is just not sanitary and gives too much opportunity for disturbances and dangerous situations.
- What a person does on their own personal property and does not harm or affect others should not be regulated by the city.
- I think 6 of each dogs and cats is too many. There should be a total of 6 pets.
- The amount of animals could be made dependant on size of residence /yrd. For example on a per square footage basis.. larger spaces can have more animals.
- Limit of 2 cats and 2 dogs per household
- Although I support a change to the bylaw limiting the amount of animals in the home, with the proposed stipulations, I would support lowering the number of animals in the house. 12 animals seems excessive.
- soze of property should also play into this rule, there should not be more animals if there is not enough space.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is too many. Unless there is a special circumstance such as fostering animals there shouldn't be anymore than 5 animals in total (dogs and cats)
- I would reduce the limit to six animals (dog/cats combined) total.
- .
- 6 is to many. More risk for lack of care. More risk for unwanted pregnancies . More risk for aggression.
- Again, the people/family need to be vetted prior to ownership of even one pet. I'm not fussed in the slightest as to how many pets a household may have so long as the owners are a) able to afford to properly care for the pet ie. Food, licensing, etc, b) clean up after their animals and c) are qualified through some sort of process to determine if they should be pet owners in the first place.



- Twelve animals is excessive. Three is each would be a more acceptable number.
- That's too many animals doe the city.
- I assume other rules re animal welfare should apply where needed. Duplicate rules???
- I support the limit but the limit should be 4 for animals deemed as pets for the household.
- Living conditions for large numbers of pets in a household can deteriorate quickly if the financial, physical or mental situation of an owner changes.
- Reduce it to four
- There is no reason, other than hoarding or milling, to have so many pets. A reasonable number of pets would be 3 or less in total.
- This encourages animal hoarding. Who would want to live in a town home next to 6 dogs and 6 cats. It would be hell
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is to many
- Noise
- If the family is able to afford to care for more than 6 dogs and cats, and there is ample space for them, I do not understand why there would be a limit.
- Depends on size of the property and pet, plus level of care by owner
- Noise from the dogs/ cats, feces, cleanup.
- If you can support a higher number of animals, good on you!!
- There are too many people who don't walk their dogs enough, who deprive their animals of fresh air and interesting smells. Allowing a higher number of pets will in too many cases reduce the care for the individual
- as long as licensed and provided for there should be no limit
- Do NOT agree with bylaw change to allow for 6 dogs and 6 cats. Completely unclear why anyone within a city should have up to 12 pets! Agree with limit of 2 dogs and 2 cats. Compromise might be 3 and 3, but not more. Instead I would Agree with all the proposed exceptions. It is by application for exception that large numbers of pets may be justifiable under specific circumstances.
- Some owners can handle more animals.
- 12 animals per house? That's crazy! Too many. Three cats and three dogs should be the MAX
- I don't believe there should be a limit
- As long as the animals are healthy and happy it doesn't matter
- I'm still concerned that 6 dogs and 6 cats would not be in the best interest of the animals and would be very noisy
- i think a maximum of 4 dog and or cats total would be reasonable, unless they are licensed breeders or have a business of boarding animals, or as the exceptions indicate.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too high an amount. I think it should be 4 of each at the most. exceptions would be if it is a foster home, a home with a litter of pups or kittens and finally if approved excess animal permit. Which can only be given to owners that have no previous violations of noise or other.
- 12 animals is a crazy amount if animals in any house within Calgary.



- It would be a case to case basis, size of the property and level of training of the animals should be considered.
- allowing 6 dogs and 6 cats to a household would be too noisy to neighbours and it is unlikely the pet owner could sustain cleaning all of the feces.
- Six dogs and six cats are far too many for one household in my opinion.
- I don't think we should restrict how many dogs or cats people can own.
- The limits of animals maybe considered depending on how much space the owner has. 12 animals in a small house or app art menu would be excessive but permitted under this rule.
- I don't think there should be restrictions on the number of pets in a home. All pets should be licensed and Well cared for and all of the property should be well maintained.
- 6 dogs per household is far too many. 2 maximum should be allowed.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too many in my opinion in the city. Live in the country if you want more.
- Why should the choice of increasing ones family require an application? Pets aren't just animals, they're family.
- ENCOURAGES irresponsible animal owners to own more animals and disobey the law and homes around them. NO MORE RESCUE ANIMALS MUST NOT BE ALLOWED INTO ALBERTA(VERY BAD).
- There's not enough room in the city for so many animals in one house
- 6 seems to high a number of both cats and dogs. I would support a limit of 4 dogs and cats.
- 6 of each is too high. You must take into account the size of property and how well they are looked after and affecting surrounding properties.
- I think that is still top many animals for any random pet owner to possess without some sort of special exception.
- Some households act as rescue organizations for dogs and/or cats. As long as these people would receive an approved excess animal permit, I would support the change.
- 6 animals is to much for most households financially. Higher risk for unwanted pregnancies. Higher risk for neglect
- Limit of 2 animals spayed or neutered
- There is no need for this many pets and they will; not be trained and cared for appropriately above two max.
- I agree with the need to license all animals in your care, and with special applications for situations outside the limits of the bylaw. The number of cats and dogs, seems like it should be dependent on the size of your home (and/or the size of the animal, and/or the activity level of the animal, etc.). It is hard to see how six dogs and six cats would have a high standard of care if they were all living in a bachelor suite, for example?
- I think people shouldn't be allowed to have more than 2 dogs unless they have a huge backyards and appropriate space.
- 6 and 6 is WAY too high. Houses and lots in calgary are not big enough for that number of animals. Number should be restricted but limit should be lower - like 3 max



- I think its ridiculous to license cats . Get them chipped or tattooed so of they get lost . But cats don't take alot of space up..
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is aggressively inappropriate and unhealthy for those animals.
- there should be no more than 2 pets (of any kind) per household
- Households who are able to take care of more than 6 animals should be allowed. There are so many animals out there that need help and support
- Too many pet animals would be allowed.
- 6 of each could be up to 12 animals on one property. I would support 3 of each maximum, with the above exceptions.
- To many animals
- If I want to be a crazy dog owner and have 10 dogs, how is that fair to me to have to put in a special application and pay for that application. If all my 100 dogs are under control, feces is picked up, they dont bark excessively, they are well behaved then why should the city be allowed to put a limit
- Six animals is way to many for one household. I agree with 2 dogs and I suppose + 2 cats but really think having three pets in one house is enough for reasons you listed above. 6 is way to many!
- Again it's about the people not the animals. Animals will do what they do. If an owner wants 4 dogs and is responsible enough to maintain the Oder the health and well being for each of them then so be it. There are irresponsible owners that should be fined, trainees and checked up on and refined with more severe consequences.
- I think 6 + 6 is too many. I would suggest 3 dogs and 3 cats.
- It's too many. Maybe 5 animals in total
- do not pick it up! Cats in gardens too!
- No one needs that many dogs or cats. If they do, they need to see a mental health specialist.
- I fully support this change with a limit of 6 dogs/6 cats, but only if all the potential exceptions are implemented except for the grandfathered clause. If someone has more than 6 when this change comes into effect, then they can get a special application.
- Too much government interference
- not necessary to own more than 2 cat/dog is absurd
- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats is too high for most regular families. I believe 4 and 4 is the maximum unless given permission.
- Under 6 months allows for excessive "basement breeding".
- n/a
- People should be allowed to have as many pets as they can take care of.
- I support if exceptions are included for certain
- Depends on size of house and yard.
- Pet breeding should be banned if you want to actually stop the problem with irresponsible pet ownership, stray or feral animals, or unwanted and under trained pets. BAN BREEDERS!!!!!!!
- There should not be more than a total of 6 animals per household



- 12 animals in a household (excluding puppies or kittens under 10 weeks) is excessive. Dogs have pack mentality and six dogs is definitely a pack. If there is concern around dogs biting and/or attacking people or other dogs, a pack will definitely increase the potential for these to occur. As for cats, if they are strictly indoor, then no issues. If they are allowed outside there will be issues with damage to neighborhood flower and vegetable gardens. Cats are predatory animals and will deplete bird, rodent and insect populations.
- It just ridiculous
- Should not have a limit
- I think this should be entirely the owners' decision.
- Unless you are fostering or breeding - who needs 6 dogs and 6 cats. That's excessive, no more than 3 of each unless you are fostering or breeding. Then you should have to get a special license. My neighbor has two small dogs that literally never stop barking when they are outside. I can't imagine someone who doesn't understand how to train a dog with 6 pets. Set a firm limit.
- I don't think the city of Calgary should mandate how many pets someone should have in their household that should be up to every individual.
- The exceptions would have to be in place. No "potential" about it. As a dog breeder for over 35 yrs there are those times when I have a litter of puppies, as well as one or two really old dogs. As for cats, I have a friend with seven licensed indoor S/N cats. I have a neighbour who can't keep one cat indoors! 35
- If a family has more animals than this but takes care of them well, who are we to judge? If it becomes a problem, address it then
- i dont think within the city having that many animals on one premises is needed. i think it should be reduced to 4 animals total. i agree with the potential exceptions ruling these out.
- Depending on the size of accommodation involved, 6 animals is too crowded. In urban settings 2 should be plenty.
- I do not believe that a person needs to own 6 dogs and 6 cats in one home, this is far too many. The only exception that I would accept would be foster homes.
- I don't think anybody needs 12 animals! The limit should be much lower. Dogs/cats that are inherited should be found another home if limits are exceeded. You only need one service animal and unless there are 6 people each requiring a service animal that exception is not necessary. There should be no exception permits. Grandfathering should only apply until the animals pass away, they should not be permitted to exceed limits by replacing animals as they die.
- It is not the place of government to limit ownership of private property.
- Surely the number should depend on the size of the dwelling. Six cats and six dogs in an apartment would be too much
- 2 is enough.
- Limit the number 2 dogs and 2 cats per household.
- 6 is a very high number 2 or 3 is plenty. Also with that large a number, pack mentality comes into play and the animals can be more aggressive.
- Too many animals



- The bar should be set by standard of care not number of animals per property. ALSO - A COMMENT ON ABOVE QUESTIONS ABOUT FINES - FINES SHOULD ESCALATE SHARPLY WITH REPEAT OFFENSES.
- 1 pet should be adequate!
- 12 animals per household is too many. It should be limited to three total for all, whether cats or dogs.
- 2 pets per household is sufficient more than this amount will become a nuisance to neighbors
- If someone has the capacity to care for the animals in the way they need to be cared for, there should be no limit to the numbers they look after
- Deal with the non-responsible pet owners as needed. We have 6 licensed dogs and there is less mess in our yard than our neighbor with 1.
- Think limits are too high for city living; acreages or space between neighbours support #'s; exceptions ok but slippery slope.
- If properly cared for number should not be a problem. Better to look at regulations around proper care. However, if a limit is put in place all of the potential exceptions should be approved
- There is no reason any person should have 6 dogs or 6 cats in their home. I think 3 maximum would suffice
- unless the animal(s) health is at risk or is being neglected.
- Owner responsibility and quality of care are key criteria
- 2 pets max. My neighbor has set up a puppy mill selling them on kijiji. There was just 16 dogs next door. There are 5 now.
- 6 of each is FAR too many per household within city limits
- I think 12 animals in a household is just too many. I think 3 of each or less would be more appropriate. However, obviously for newborn animals, foster families, breeders etc. that is different as they have facilities and awareness.
- As long as the animals are taken care of (and this could mean random or scheduled checks) and are not a nuisance to neighboring residents, a person should be able to have as many animals as they would like. The person should be responsible for cleaning up after the animals, feeding the animals, ensuring they have enough exercise, and are registered, and just generally kept well.
- An application should be needed for more than 6 total dogs and cats in the house
- 1 dog 1 cat only per household
- There are already provisions in place (noise, nuisance bylaws for example) to address the potential negatives of a large number of pets. If the existing laws are utilized and enforced, there is no need for this excepting people who want a reason to complain about their neighbours. I can't imagine having more than 2 dogs at a time but if someone wants 16 cats, how is that my concern or problem? Seems rather unnecessary.
- 6 dogs is too many dogs. Even if they aren't always noisy, the amount of noise from 6 dogs on a regular basis is a lot. I could support special applications and exceptions but for more than 2 dogs, additional requirements should be in place (training, noise expectations clearly defined, cleaning, etc)



- We live in a free country and a limit on pets shouldn't exist. Trust the person who owns them to make a good choice for themselves about how many animals they own. Even if they own 12 pit bulls, if they can handle it that's their prerogative
- It is problematic for one family to have more than 6 animals per household. It is harmful to pet wellness for owners. And for breeders, it is highly problematic and costly to be reproducing animals at the rate we are and perpetuating the overflow of animal shelters.
- I think animal wellbeing depends more on the owners care and the property's abilities. If a house has multiple floors, if animals get along, if a pet owner is attentive, there is room for more than such a limit to be cared for. Many houses with more animals belong to those who also care emphatically for them and may even be rescue homes or animals found that were unclaimed or strays taken in at cost to the owner as is. Especially cats could be cared for well in higher amounts, and debatable small dogs versus large ones could be easily cared for.
- I think more important than the number of animals in a home is the condition and care given to the animals. There are people with 1 animal that don't provide proper care while others with many do.
- Too many animals can be dangerous. They could injure someone, it's hard to take care of that many animals, they could make noises and disturb others, there could be a lot of feces on a property, it's filthy, other people buying the house won't know how many animals lived there, and those animals could have a disease maybe. It could also be: about a compulsive need to acquire animals that reaches an overwhelming state, resulting in unintentional animal neglect or abuse, could be hoarding.
- I would support this bylaw change with the exceptions that were stated above.
- It doesn't go far enough. 2 animals per house maximum.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is far too many for a single household.
- I believe six is too many and would recommend a limit of 4. I do however support a nuke that limits the number
- Too many
- I believe 6 dogs/cats is too many per household. There are too many small private breeders only trying to sell puppies on kijiji. I know this as a neighbor is selfishly and rudely doing a urban puppy mill.
- People should be able to own as many as they want so long as they have the means to care for all of them and each pet is kept safe, fed and healthy.
- 2 cats or 2 dogs is enough. Let them apply if they need an exception
- No reason to own that many pets. Bigger risk to the animal not being cared for properly. Focus should be on mandatory spay and neuter unless you are a registered breeder. Mandatory spay and neuter may also reduce the bite risk.
- That is too many animals.
- I agree with only 2 or 3. There is no good reason for more. Breeds should be shutdown as well
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is ridiculous. Half of that is much more reasonable without a special quantity permit.
- 12 animals is way too many. That should require a special request.



- [removed]
- Cleanliness and public health. Define household. As it stands now I see people who live in condos with no yard who own two very large dogs. Even for a home owner with a very large yard six dogs (and six cats) is too much. Who needs this many animals? I'm guessing there could be special circumstances, but I think the pet owner should have a valid reason and the city should review each case. Two dogs (and two cats) would probably be a better number if the owner can look after them properly.
- 3 Cats&/or dogs is enough to properly care for the animals
- I think 6 dogs and 6 cats is far too many for a person to reasonably manage. Unless the caregiver is running an adoption or foster service, the limit should be two of each. Fosters and shelters should have a limit considering the means to take care of the animals in the service's care.
- That's way too many animals in a house. Most people don't live in a property large enough to give that amount of animals the space they need. Also, how would these owners have the time to walk and care for each one? They wouldn't.
- Possession of Dog Fanciers license is only going to allow for more breeders. Not all people that fancy dogs (or any other animal), care for them properly
- I don't believe in breed specifics
- Its not your business
- 12 personal seems excessive and likely to have a negative impact on animals welfare
- Unnecessary to limit if the animals are being cared for and are healthy.
- The number of animals does not directly relate to quality or standard of care. Homes causing issues should be dealt with on a case by case basis.
- should be a choice to have as many dogs as manageable. Licencing is a must, for those that are responsible breeders through the Canadian Kennel Club, some of us have more than 3 dogs for our dog showing and breeding programs.
- needs to be case by case some people have many animals and aren't a nuisance
- I think it is unnecessary for households to own more than 4 animals and should have to apply for permits to have more within the city
- Proper care and training should mean you do not have to limit the amount.
- 6 per household limit is still way, way too many. If limit was 2 per household I would support grandfathered if rules change.
- Could result in neglect
- I don't feel this would solve anything so why necessary
- Six is too many.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs is far too many for a single household.
- People should be able to have more than 2 animals if their space is sufficient for them
- Leave as is. Calgary has too many confusing rules already.
- 6 animals of any kind per household is too many!
- 6 dogs and cats is too many for one household.



- I agree with the current number. Anything more seems for a residential property.
- I think the number is too high. 6 cats is ok but 6 dogs might be too high. 4 maybe 5 is reasonable. It all depends on the owner and their responsibility. Some could have 10 dogs and you'd never know. Others could have 1 and this dog becomes a nuisance.
- None of the city's business how many pets a person has.
- Max 3 dogs or cats
- 6 of each seems like a lot, I think 3-4 max and then special permit to ensure they are able to care for all animals adequately
- Should be 1 dog and 1 cat. The more dogs creates for noise etc..
- 12 animals in a house hold is to many
- I don't think it's necessary to own more than 2 pets. I also think it's not good for more than 2 animals to live in the city in one house.
- Should be lower 3 Dogs and 3 cats.
- It seems excessive.
- 2 animals per household max
- This should be based on the private property size not a one size fits all scenario.
- No
- Too many
- Unless there is a terrible reason and the animals are being Injured, no one has the right to tell a person they cannot have pets. It's no one's business. Unless of course, there is an animal abuse situation
- That is way too many animals per household. The limit should be revised to 3 animals TOTAL per household. It can be a nuisance to surrounding neighbours with so many animals (excessive pet waste, possible allergies, noise, etc.)
- If the animals are well taken care of, I don't see a problem with owning more. What I do strongly object to is having to pay the same fee for licensing INDOOR cats as people who allow their cats to roam free. There should be an incentive to keep cats indoors (only outdoors occasionally with human supervision, on your own property). Paying the same rate means responsible pet owners are subsidizing irresponsible pet owners.
- not necessary. very few cases.
- I think there could be a higher chance of a pet being a nuisance animal when care is spread out across multiple pets. Time given to each animal, and space may be too limited unless there was guidelines that determined minimum space required.
- Because
- In my limited experience, the residences that create these problems would either be subject to one of the potential exceptions (particularly breeders, pet sitters), or would be in a situation where mental health / animal welfare is the primary concern, and the City's ability to regulate this behaviour is limited. As such, why have the expense of the regulatory regime to control the actions of population that doesn't exist?



- I agree with the reasons for restricting the number of dogs and cats, as listed above: Accumulations of feces on property, Excessive noise, & Protect the welfare of animals.s
- I am not in a position to judge whether my neighbour owns too many animals. There are already adequate measures for those who do not look after their animals (no matter the number)
- People with large amounts of land have the ability to house more animals than those with a small home.
- Seems like too many animals for 1 household.
- I don't think breeders should be an exception to this rule. Breeders can be part of the problem for not getting animals spayed and benefiting off animals as an income.
- The human should be at fault for feces and excessive noise, otherwise, if a human can control those two issues then there should be no issue to how many animals a human has if they can take care of them.
- So long as the animals are on the property/in the house, cleaned up after, taken care of properly, and not a nuisance, people should be free to have as many as they are comfortable with. Should they have an excess of animals, perhaps spot checks for animal welfare.
- I think 3 or 4 animals is okay. Obviously an excessive amount could be problematic. But, it also depends on the size of the household
- It is private property and you can not tell me how many animals I am able to adopt. You don't do that with children and you shouldn't be allowed to do that with pets when pets are most peoples children.
- Calgary's no limit is a significant selling feature for the city, particularly for responsible purebred breeders. It would also depend on requirements for a Dog Fancier's Permit.
- An owner can be irresponsible with 1 pet or 20 pets. Number is not the solution; education and enforcement are the solution.
- Keep bylaw as is - no limit
- 6 in total seems appropriate. Plus the size of property should determine the number of pets. You can have more animals on an acreage vs an apartment.
- 12 animals in one house is too many for neighbours to tolerate
- the size of residence/lot, etc would have to be considered in the number of animals one could 'house'
- I think six animals is too many.
- As a responsible pet owner, I feel that most ppl know their limitations as to how many pets are manageable for them, not the authorities.
- 12 critters is way too much, but 2 is too restricted. Total of 4 or 5 reasonable.
- Should depend on the size of the property. Total of 6 should be limit.
- People who collect animals do not have the income or the time to support the animal needs. My neighbour has three dogs and a parrot and there is so much dog feces accumulating in the yard. The dogs are also never walked. Unless someone is running a licensed rescue, hoarding should not be legal.
- It should be dependent upon the size of the house. 6 dogs plus 6 cats cannot have the same high welfare in an apartment as compared to a large home with outdoor space.



- Unless someone is a breeder(responsible breeder) doggy day care, watching pets for a friends or family member no one needs 6 dogs and 6 cats. Even in a large home that is a lot of animals for one home. I think the most should be 3 dogs and 3 cats. Also I am considered low income and I register my dog every year. If you are getting dogs and cats that is a cost that you need to be able to pay just like food and vet bills.
- I feel that it should be even lower. I can't imagine many people responsibly caring for that many animals.
- 4 would be my preferred limit
- A limit on house types would be better, for example 1 small to medium sized dog for a n apartment or two house but if someone owns some land inside city limits then they have more space trust allowing more animals
- Limit should be 3 of each. The amount of feces in public spaces is out of control at this point.
- Excessive noise and cleanup. Our parks are already filled with tossed aside bags of animal feces.
- 6 dogs AND 6 cats seems too high. I know many people that don't have the time for just one animal. Could be changed to 6 dogs OR 6 cats
- I think that the limit could be lower than 6 cats and 6 dogs (but could keep the above exceptions in place)
- 6 seems very high. 3 of each seems more reasonable.
- It's a free country. You should not be able to limit pet quantities arbitrarily. Some people thing more than two bathrooms is too many. Or more than three children. Should we limit those as well?
- That number is too high per household
- I think if there is enough living space for all animals to live, defecate, eat, and have daily exercise I have no problem with people having more animals.
- 2 dogs and 2 cats is plenty.
- 6 is far too many
- 10 well-behaved dogs are less of a problem than 2 badly behaved dogs -- number of pets is not an indicator of issues, pet training is.
- What about dog breeders? And a litter of puppies? Would they be limited as well?
- six dogs or six cats are too many - the cats NEVER are confined to the owners house and the more dogs the more barking. I wish my next door people had several less dogs.
- Exemption are fine but 6+6 is way too high. Max 4-6 total animals
- If someone has paid to purchase a home and paying property tax in this city, then noone has the right to tell them how many pets they can have. There needs to be rules on the care of the animals and nuisance to neighbourhood, but if those are met, then a bylaw restricting how many they can have is over stepping our freedoms.
- As long as all the animals are well taken care of, and they aren't bothersome to neighbors, it shouldn't matter how many are in the home.
- Up to 2 dogs and or 2 cats should be the limit.
- Peoples homes should not have more then 2 pets, unless you live on an acreage. Don't treat your home like a pet farm.



- i do not license my cat anyway. make me.....
- pet limit of 6 is to many to start with - all pets need to be licensed
- It will cost too much money to enforce
- That is too many animals for one household unless the conditions above are met. Meaning there should be a lower restriction but still based on same conditions. Or perhaps a look at size of residence.
- There should be no limit to number of pets
- exceptions are good, but how about a special licence fee of multiple animals over 6 total would require additional controls of inspections, could also be used as breeder operations licencing
- Thanks
- I think that is too many animals for any home. I think 2 at most is great. Especially if big animals.
- Six is too many.
- The restriction should be limited to a combined total of 6 dogs or cats. Also, significant changes need to be made to restrict people from starting up their own so called "animal rescue organization" in residential areas. Far too many dogs, cats, rabbits and exotic animals are entering our city from other cities, countries and locations (ie reservations). There should be significant fees/penalties paid by these groups/individuals if they to bring these animals into the city. They are not addressing the core issue with animal over populations. They are just bringing that burden into our city.
- the bylaw needs to enforce owners reparability to protect the welfare of their pets like the same way they need to provide to their children, or we need to put a limit to the number of children we can have?
- Six (6) is too high. I think four (4) is an appropriate number with the exceptions listed above.
- there's no limit to how many children someone can have. why limit what else people can have?
- Breeders, could be a requirement that they have a CKC kennel name.
- I know many people that have more than 6 dogs, they are great responsible owners. They do not deserve to be punished for arbitrary rules.
- I find that people don't take proper care of animals when they have more than 2 due to high cost. Ex vets, grooming, pet food, etc so having that many dogs or cats if they don't have a breeding license it's not ok. Also breeders need to be inspected regularly to eliminate puppy mills. I owned a grooming business in Canada for 14 years so I know what I'm talking about when I said people won't take care of that many animals due to cost. Many dogs already only get groom twice a years and by the time they get groom their fur is Often a solid pellet.
- Megh to controlling on people ... should limit the amount of kids too
- My neighbour has 2 great danes and 2 cats that roam at large. Their backyard is ankle deep in dog poo. It stinks and is terrible. If they were allowed more dogs, this would just be worse.
- too many factors play a part in how many dogs should be in a "household" and household needs to be defined as well
- Limits are a red line that once crossed will continue to be reduced in subsequent reviews.
- I would support the above if all the potential exceptions were actual exceptions
- People have the right to decide how many pets they can own



- i think responsible pet ownership is key to keeping properties clean, protecting the welfare of the animals and not having excessive noise. 1, 6 or more dogs can accumulate feces on property IF owners not being responsible as well as one dog can cause excessive noise IF not properly cared for while 7 or more dogs well trained and cared for can be good 'neighborhood citizens'
- people have the right to own as many animals as they want
- 6 seems very excessive. Maybe 3 dogs and 3 cats
- Animal hoarders would increase
- How can anyone look after more than 12 animals in a city? Kind of a no brainer. Better yet, introduce a requirement for owners to pass background checks before getting an animal. Be forward thinking calgary, not backwards thinking.
- City is no place for a large of amount pets.
- Owner could not possibly take care of all the animals needs, or surrounding area, makes for puppy mills, and animal neglect.
- that's an insane amount of pets in a house, and not realistically manageable.
- I personally think it should be lower. Maybe like 8 animals total. Have 12 animals is a LOT for 1 personal person. After that there should be reviews, breeders need to be looked at WAY harder and have more punishment for backyard breeding vyou guys are going after the wrong problems. Go after irresponsible pet owners, people that can't afford to take care of their pets, animal abusers and backyard breeders. Having 12 animals in a normal house is outrageous.
- No one needs to own any dogs. But they can so they will. I personally think the government shouldn't be meddling.
- I have only ever had 1 animal, however, appreciate that Calgary has no limit. If a concern was raised for hoarding animals, puppy mills, etc., CHS can deal with those concerns.
- I believe a person should be able to have as many pets as they want and are capable of properly caring for. One must be able to maintain the health and safety of all animals and clean up after them. Any and all noise and/or disturbances must be dealt with immediately.
- Freedom
- As long as the welfare of the animals is intact there should be no limit on number of pets you can keep. Many people can house large numbers and frequently use this space for adoption and training and growth of their family. People who own large numbers of pets tend to be more educated on them and more likely to take care of them. Houses with single pets are more likely to rehome dye to destructive behaviour, barkig, ect. It would be more worthwhile to invest in rescues than to restrict private homes pet population.
- The limit of animals should be 2, nobody needs more than that.
- Responsible owners shouldn't have to feel restricted
- Too many animals ... I support 4 of each
- I should be allowed to own as many animals on my private property as I want so long as they aren't being abused and they aren't causing significant noise or odor problems.
- Thwn
- rescues need an exemption



Other

Responses below include comments from participants when asked if had an idea about something that was not covered in phase 1 or phase 2 engagement.

- More enforcement of barking dogs and owners not picking up feces
- More enforcement of people with their dogs (and cats) off leash on sidewalks and in communities (e.g. not off leash areas)
- I really, REALLY, want to see better enforcement of nuisance barking, along with actual fines. There is no excuse for excessive barking.
- More enforcement of licenses for cats - whether they be inside or outside.
- We need far better enforcement of barking, including staged fines. i.e. each additional complaint has higher fines.
- I am against breed specific bylaws and lowering the bar for pet ownership. Can't afford caring for a pet? Don't own one.
- "1. Mobile app to report issues (ranging from not pooh scooping to excessive barking)
- 2. Complaint-based enforcement
- For cost-efficiency"
- An easier process to report excessive barking and have it fined, and the fines must be strong enough to deter further neglect of the dog.
- Pitbulls in Calgary are responsible for nearly all dog attacks on children requiring reconstructive surgery. This is a serious issue.
- More enforcement of barking dogs. There are zero consequences to keeping ones neighbours up all night. Limiting to only two dogs / home too
- The city should limit the number of dogs that dog walkers can have at once. Limit to 3? Hard to control lots of dogs, and remove feces.
- No fines for the first offense, and possibly second occurrence, of canines who are inadvertently at large. Fines could escalate if required.
- More enforcing of all fineable offenses.
- A pit mauled an 8 year old in front of my house 2 years ago. Guy took off with his dog. There needs to be a law that says you have to stay.
- Higher fines for not cleaning up after your pet, but also more availability of free pet waste bags and garbage cans in off-leash parks.
- Limit the number of dogs OR cats to three per household.
- Fines for a second or subsequent offence need to be high enough that people will actually do something to avoid another fine (i.e. training)
- There are areas in the NE where I live that have so many dangerous pits that you can't even walk a normal dog safely.
- Please include foster homes in the limit. Temporary has no bearing on the level of care for that many dogs.



- Banning pet ownership from those who behave irresponsibly. A pet license should be earned through testing or screening rather than sold.
- "Fines increasing with each offence.
- Fines for encroaching in environmentally sensitive areas. (wetlands, streams, native prairie)."
- Many cat owners let their animals out. This is such a threat to our songbirds and also increases the feral cat population. Better education?
- Keep the livestock on the Farms, we don't need chickens and the smell, noise and additional problems with it's natural predators.
- like to see more positive than punitive rules. Reductions for licensing with proof of training. Assistance for lower income training
- I believe that there need to be some restrictions put in place that limits the number of breedings and /or private sales of pets
- If I report a dog barking it is enough to give address but I should not have to give my address and name. Most won't report for this reason
- The number of irresponsible pet owners is countless. There should be a short quiz/test that is required to pass for a pet licence.
- licensing, liability insurance (minimum \$250k) and RF tagging should be mandatory for "large dogs"
- We need to monitor and fine in parks and walkways that do not allow off leash dogs. Cougar Ridge always has a high volume of dogs off leash
- No
- There should be a way to report irresponsible pet owners. I think 311 app would be a great tool for monitoring and reporting from public
- Given the overpopulation of dogs and cats, and numbers in shelters, there should be more measures to restrict breeding and importing them.
- Limiting # of pets doesn't = better pet owners i.e. people with one neglected dog whose feces aren't picked up vs responsible multipet homes
- Instead of breed-specific legislation, there should be mandatory training included with licensing all dog breeds
- N/A
- A problem pet is due to the owner and they should have the ability to either take the pet to a professional trainer or adopt it out
- Increase enforcement and fines for dogs that are off-leash in non-designated areas. Even dogs that are "friendly" are becoming nuisances
- Too many people let their cats roam freely and this needs to STOP! Higher fines and education and ENFORCEMENT!!
- nothing
- Small dog owners need to control their dogs. I have been attacked multiple times by small dogs and nothing happens other than I am injured
- Just because 2 dogs are fighting does not mean both are to blame. Every dog has a right to defend themselves against attacks.



- Breed- specific legislation DOES NOT WORK, it penalizes responsible dog owners without holding owners of actually dangerous dogs accountable
- Breed- specific legislation DOES NOT WORK, it penalizes responsible dog owners without holding owners of actually dangerous dogs accountable
- We require more education and communication on how to be a responsible pet owner, and not just more fines or punitive rules.
- There are a number of irresponsible rescue agencies in Calgary. I would support some sort of city accreditation to hold rescues accountable.
- Please enact a bilaw for leaving 'dogs in hot cars' and include a significant fine for unattended dogs in parking lots!
- City of Calgary should be encouraging people to do more with their dogs. Earn a title and get a reduction on licensing
- How about educating citizens instead of condemning or singling out pitbulls/bully breeds. Punish owners not breeds!
- Stop using pit bulls as the example of bad dogs. There's plenty of dogs who are bad, it's not breed specific. Re home dogs from bad owners
- Don't ban dog breeds. That's idiotic. Ban bad owners, I've never met a mean pit bull in my life
- I would love to see more fenced in dog parks - completely fenced in like the one in Auburn Bay
- Much higher fines for nuisance barking (each complaint) and off leash dogs in residential "on leash” areas.
- increase fines to people who antagonize dogs while the dogs are in their own yards
- Discriminating by breed is tantamount to racism, the fact that this is even being considered makes me ashamed of this city.
- Licensed cats reduce the rodents in yards. REMOVE the bylaw prohibiting cats from wandering.
- Why does bylaw have the right to tell people how many animals they can own? Isn't the bylaw prohibiting fences over 4 feet enough?
- I find that folks do not understand the the off-leash rules and allow their dogs run around the parking lots and on the public pathways.
- .
- Little dogs need to be controlled in off leash parks. A little out of control dog bite causes stress and a long term damage in big dogs.
- Consider a dedicated agricultural district to support landowners that wish to keep livestock. Current S-FUD treats agriculture as temporary.
- This is a meaningless exercise. A single person can click like or dislike hundreds of times.
- Please consider for dog owners who do not wish their dog to be approached by children or strangers - no bandanna whatsoever.
- Breed Specific bylaws are based on unsubstantiated fears. I DO NOT support introducing any breed specific bylaws.
- No



- Mitigation for exploding feral rabbit population. More rabbits means more coyotes, and coyotes also snatch up cats. Rabbit feces everywhere!
- Need to educate: do not pass on sidewalk at high speed in a scooter/bike/skateboard grazing by owner+ dog; tease dog or stare down menacing.
- The pit-bull breed is a dangerously strong animal. They are capable of causing significantly greater bodily damage in less time than others.
- Restrictions on # of pets/household are pointless and unconstitutional. It's not the # of animals that matters, it's the care they receive.
- Increase enforcement, don't make things harder for everyone else who is following the rules because a minority don't.
- I do not support breed specific restrictions.. the breed is not the issue..
- Need increased enforcement of bad behaviour (eg leaving waste). Maybe a system to take a pic and report, since bylaw can't be everywhere?
- No
- No
- I don't see the point of looking at increasing fines when I have very rarely seen them enforced i.e dog waste.
- Why are Rottweilers not included in your "Pitbull" definition? They are even stronger than a pit bull. This is just plain ignorance
- Leashing cats at all times should be mandatory. No roaming cats, period!
- Licensing tags issued immediately once an animal identified as unlicensed and the bill sent in the mail. Problem solved, money later.
- "People should be licensed to own animals.
- Cats that get let out by their owners fines need to be higher"
- I do not agree with breed specific legislation, this is not the direction i would want to see Calgary go in.
- "I just wanted to address animal
- Limits. I would be in favour of limits of 6. But special consideration should be given for vets."
- The city needs more designated off-leash areas. Okder neighbourhood like Varsity and Hawkwood have many off leash areas, the city needs more
- Please use evidence not un-informed opinions when creating by-law regarding "pit-bulls" livestock and other issues discussed above.
- No
- Not once in any of the meetings or in any of the paperwork submitted did I ever see anything regarding pit bulls now I see it. Why???
- Increase fines for repeat animal at large / unlicensed pet offenders
- I do not support breed specific bylaws. I do support license costs and higher fines. If you cannot afford 67 per year then no animal
- Separate areas for large and small dogs. Bylaw officers to visit offleash parks



- no
- Ban Pitbulls
- Need to take all dog bites serious! Small dogs should be treated the same as large breeds. I don't agree with breed specific!
- No breed bans.
- In 61 years, I have never met a mean/aggressive "pit bull" though I have met over 100 "small breed" mean/aggressive biters.
- Pitbulls kill more kids every year in the U.S (where they track fatalities by breed) than all other breeds combined. This is a fact.
- .
- I do not support Breed Specific Rules and Laws as Pitbulls are not recognized by the CKC. Incorrect ownership and not training are the cause
- Not all obedience classes are created equal. Punishment based training is shown to increase aggression in some dogs.
- Unregistered cats need to be picked up by the city so that owners can be fined and animals not returned to owner until registered
- I would like to see areas designated private off leash areas to be rented out by the hour for people who have reactive dogs or for training
- I would love to see some more off leash areas. Maybe for only those pets who are licensed? So getting a license pays for access.
- Cats need to be able to roam. They are not like dogs and you can't put them on a leash. Their quality of life is affected if they can't.
- Wow. Breed Specific Legislation, Calgary? Come on. Not impressed.
- Do not even entertain the thought of breed specific legislation. Its breed discrimination and its disgusting.
- I will never support BSL! Proper education and enforcement of already existing bylaws should suffice for any breed.
- Say NO to breed specific legislation. It's bad owners NOT bad breeds.
- "We need more bylaws and controls for cats at large.
- It is not okay to open the door and let your cat wander.
- Need better enforcement."
- Needs specific exemption for on lease animals to be exempt from liability to injury to off leash animals
- I like the bandana approach and it should be used on dogs who do not want to socialize, not just in dog parks. People could be more consider
- Off leash dogs in on leash areas has become a very dangerous problem and is impacting many dog owners enjoyment of their own dogs
- BSL never works. Read about it



- You need to issue refunds on the unused portion of dog licenses. You have collected twice for the same dogs. Should be transferable.
- I DO NOT support introducing breed specific restrictions or bylaws. The behavior needs to be addressed equitably regardless of the breed.
- Folks need to keep their dogs leashed in all non-off leash parks. You should be fined if you don't
- All owners must acknowledge in writing, current pet ownership by laws, licensing, picking up poo, all fines associated every license renewal
- NO BSL! Small dog attacks to be treated the same as large. Take in consideration what is currently being worked on with a dog ie training
- It's not just Pit Bulls. Responsible ownership is for ALL breeds and ALL owners need to be accountable!
- heavy fines for mistreatment of animals....plus removal of the animal and a ban on having another animal (lifetime)
- Na
- Please create some secure, private, pay per use off-leash dog parks to give people with non social dogs a place to exercise and play.
- Breed-specific legislation is NOT supported by research and is not endorsed by the SPCA or veterinary bodies.
- Enforcement and fines for offleash dogs needs to be increased, particularly in parks with playgrounds and/ or near schools.
- N/a
- I would suggest for a complaint about a dog barking to be investigated rather than taking the word of the complainant for it.
- Animal licensing should be the same price no matter the type of animal.
- "Need more control.
- My dog was attacked by neighbours dog, and that dog also attacked another dog. Was reported to bylaw. Dog is still there"
- Do not mention specific breeds. What if a dog is 1/10 of that breed? What about dobermans, rottis, akitas, chow, corso, husky, malamutes?
- No breed bans. Restrictions requiring ANY dog that has shown aggression towards other dogs or humans to wear a basket muzzle in public.
- Dogs are licensed , so should bikes. Would help pay for their paths, identify unsafe cyclist behavior and help trace stolen bikes
- Go after the individual dog (and/or owner) that is problematic, not the breed!
- I believe putting BSL in place for any breed would be a serious mistake. Keep the responsible pet ownership bylaw
- Why are licensing fees different for cats and dogs? There are way more cats that are reported missing and at large than dogs, yet dog owner
- "Owner rehabilitation for a nuisance dog. Not the dogs fault.



- Many people don't pickup feces.
- Enforcement of these bylaws would be great."
- Breed Bans are Wrong and cruel! Also animal limits punish the good animal guardians who rescue more than 6 and provide a good life for them!
- As with feral cats, and spay and neuter program for feral rabbits.
- Enforcement and fines for offleash dogs needs to be increased, particularly in parks with playgrounds and/ or near schools.
- I have no new ideas but I think enforcement is the most important part. Fines can be raised but if not enforced it does no good regardless.
- Education of the public is the key issue. Mandatory levels of pet (animal, bird etc.) behavior should be demonstrated or attained by owners.
- Science and history show us breed specific legislation doesn't make communities safer. Stick with breed neutral bylaws!
- "Investigate Fully before charging stop destroying innocent animals.
- Fees of licensing should stay the same for either animals."
- Pitbulls should be labeled as a dangerous dog any dog can be dangerous not just that specific breed As a service dog handler with a pitbull
- The fact that the city is targeting pitbulls specifically is unethical and completely misguided. Please don't let BSL happen in this city :(
- Leash requirements need to be more specific for on leash areas. A specific max leash length and owners need to be holding the leash!
- People should be licensing their animals only after they take a test of how to be a Responsible Pet Owner.
- Instead of fine, owners should have to pay for mandatory training sessions. Paying for an injured dog's vet bills is part of the "fine"; too.
- We need large dog and small dog separate dog parks.
- Management of pet sales and higher fines for puppy mills or abuse cases.
- BSL is an unsuccessful approach for preventing dog bites. Stop perpetuating this myth. Continue YYC's leadership in RPO, and scrap any BSL.
- Use of area between neighbouring houses as a "doggy dump zone" should be forbidden if neighbour's furnace air intake is also present there.
- Any type of BSL put in place will be a huge mistake, I will personally move as I will not have my family member discriminated against
- Do not isolate or single out a breed because of the fear the media has installed. We need to educate more people!!!
- i would like to see discounts on licensing fees for dogs that have passed a standard test, like the Canadian Kennel Club's CGN.
- Pitt bulls are good dogs. You guys bending to breed discrimination is really cowardly.
- Maximum number of pets per aware feet of home space in addition to total quantity of pets



- I do not agree with breed bans-an aggressive dog is an aggressive dog period regardless of the breed
- There is more evidence that supports the inefficient nature of breed specific legislation than in support.
- Eliminate or reduce licensing fees for each year a dog takes a training class through a CPDT credentialed trainer.
- I don't have any
- Stop going after certain breed. All breeds can bite. Especially the small breeds, as they are the most common culprits!
- Please add a question that asks about one nuisance dog per home, and have a separate question about one Pitbull per home.
- Puttin measure in place against pit bulls is stupid My neighbor has chihuahua whos ALWAYS off leash and trying to bite my dog but that's ok?
- I feel very strongly that nuisance dogs regardless of breed should have to follow bylaw. Restrict the individual not the breed.
- I'd rather see more preventive education provided. Example people who want to pet a dog they don't know should ask the owner if it's Ok.
- Responsible pet owners will answer this honestly.
- Breed Specific Legislation does NOT work. This has been proven over and over again in other municipalities.
- BSL should not be a thing. Educate owners, don't punish dogs for bad owners.
- None
- Enforcement is key. Increase in fineas but more patrols by by-law oofers in off lease areas. Too many infractions not being addressed.
- A person shouldn't have to pay for a license when the life expectancy of a pet is less than a year.
- I would like to see more enforcement with those providing inadequate care to animals including seizing if they're neglected indoors or out.
- It really bothers me that pit bulls are included as nuisance dogs. They are not nuisance dogs.
- I believe each community should have a fenced in off leash area for small/medium dogs. This would help with small dogs/owners being attacke
- Cat owners need to be held more accountable when a car is picked up. Also up the license fees to match dogs as many cat owners let them out
- Cats and dogs should not be purchased without a license, just like you cannot drive your new car unless you have registered it.
- No breed should be band but owners should be penalized for any aggressive dog . Also there should be a public registry for animal abusers
- Breed specific laws do not work, are not based in fact, fail to address actual problems, and is morally wrong.
- Licensing of pets should help pay for the upkeep of off leash parks and responsible pet ownership courses.



- cats are Outdoors animals and they should not be mandated to be indoors, are way less nuisible than wild rabbits in Calgary.
- Breed specific bylaw is NOT acceptable in the city of Calgary.
- Waive fees for fosters and low income persons, everyone willing to put in the work of being a responsible pet owner deserves an animal.
- I recognize they this will not be popular but I feel that there should be a ban on dangerous dogs.
- All pet stores must state name and location of where they bred the animal
- Luxury dog park: poodles only, no pooping.
- There should be an easier way to report stray animals so that they have a chance to be adopted. Also animal bylaw should be made no kill.
- Education for your bylaw officers. Seeing all the BSL garbage you're asking about solidifies they know nothing about behaviour.
- Don't spend a ton of money on studies and implementation, this city cant afford it
- People may need training "how to approach" CHILDREN taught and the child's parent is responsible. Dog's at large attacking is different
- Bark complaints should not be anonymous. Anonymity encourages over-exaggeration of the complaint.
- Condos shouldn't be allowed to limit the size of a persons dog.
- The breed specific bans are not covering the issues. Any dog, if not given the proper socialization and training can become threatening.
- breed-specific prejudice only harms those with well natured pets, The city would be restricting the freedoms of many innocent dogs and owner
- I support a ban on pitbulls; there are too many aggressive dogs of these breeds and they're the breeds of choice for negligent pet owners.
- Stop targeting a specific breed of dog??? Target the irresponsible owners. I'm so disappointed with how this city has turned out.
- "1) increased education for pet owners regarding dog training
- 2) NOT breed specific, ALL dogs should have this requirement"
- No breed specific legislation should be pursued. When the city's justification for exploring it isn't fact based, it shouldn't be considered
- "More waste receptacles in parks for dog waste.
- Splash fountains for dogs in off leash parks."
- Bandana idea is flawed- will give kids a false sense of security. Green bandana or not, a child should not be approaching strange dogs
- Owners who dont control vicious dogs, who severely abuse or beat dogs or train them to be vicious should be banned from owning any animals
- People should be fined for letting their cats roaming, on a slow day I see 6-12 different cats around my home They drag trash around outback



- How about creating a program to educate people about the proper behaviour around animals and recognizing dog signals and body language.
- I feel that BSL is a mistake. Any dog can bite and cause damage. This is an issue with the owners, not the specific breed of dog.
- Responsible pet ownership key. Shut down unethical pet sources
- Rescue agencies need looking into. Amount animals they bring to Canada as well as medical needs tended to
- Penalizing people for not licensing your dog or cat is counter productive. People will just choose to not register their animal.
- stop euthanasia of animals involved in bites. I think a more intense investigation needs to be done to see if the attack was unwarranted.
- N/a
- Dog /cat breeding should be done by people who complete a licensing program to breed responsibly only. Backyard breeding should be illegal
- Don't penalize "pitbulls". There's so much research that shows how expensive and non-effective BSL is. It costs cities hundreds of thousands
- Make sure all pets are microchipped. Thus if you lose your pet it is easier to find owner.
- Increased licenses only work for people who license their pets. Bylaw needs to be more active at offleash parks etc to enforce the laws.
- No animal should have its life taken from it, full in-depth review on par as if it was a human on human attack, owner accountably.
- I hate that the city is singling out a specific breed. I have no dogs but have met many good natured bull dogs. This is ignorance.
- Whatever you do, do not make any bylaws that are breed specifics. Owners must be held responsible for their animal. Training is key !
- Parents need to educate their children on how to safely interact with dogs they don't know
- Offering free training material for people on how to interact with on leash or off leash dogs (with or without their dog).
- Why was French language option not included in engage.calgary.ca ???
- Open a web portal equipped with photo upload protocol for citizens to report violators . As part of licensing, get a picture of the dog.
- Limit pets wondering around in neighborhoods, I have to collect my neighbours' pet's feces off my grass everyday. 311 contacted, court as op
- Breed specific bans are completely unnecessary. Not all dogs belonging to a certain breed behave in the same way.....
- We have a neighbor that started bee keeping in their backyard and now we have so many bees. We should have been consulted first.
- Allocate funds towards educating parents the correct way to teach their children to approach dogs. This will decrease negative interactions.



- Reduced registration fee for having a) non nuisance animal with no complaints b) spayed/neutered pet
- American Pitbull breed has a average bite force strength of 235 psi beaten by most other common owned dog breeds.
- We educate kids and adults about all kinds of safety issues, so why not animal safety?
- BSL is not effective.. don't waste more of our money
- Pet stores should be banned from selling baby animals, especially cats, dogs, ferrets n rabbits. There are too many pets going to shelters.
- Nothing against cats, but spay, neuter and release of feral cats programs are humane for cats, not necessarily for birds.
- Feedback is completely useless. Literally anyone can reply multiple times. Complete waste of time and resources. Going to get false results
- Base this on behaviour, not on breed. If it's not ok to treat people different based on skin color, it's not ok to treat pitbulls different.
- none
- Why are pit-bull "type" dogs even listed separately? Issues can arise with ANY dog.
- How ignorant was the person that brought BSL forward?
- We need designated off leash or dog parks for small dogs only.
- Starting an awareness campaign about HUMAN behaviour in off leash areas. People often will picnic or play games in these areas creating issu
- Make sure when neighbours or anybody makes a complaint about an animal that it is looked into before you send letters out to pet owners.
- Fines for not cleaning after pets is mostly useless if you Can't monitor the area. Our community is filled with feces.
- Stop demonizing pitbulls. It is unfair and biased.
- Dogs Bark, it is part of life. Most owners with barking dogs are doing training. Waive fine if owner can provide proof of training
- Disgusting that you're targeting a specific breed of dog
- Pet injury and property damage should be their own categories. Pet injury should incur very high fines to help with vet bills. >\$1000
- Calgary needs to put more onus on the owners and actually enforce it. BSL has been proven to not work. Target bad owners!
- How about people being more responsible for their kids behaviour ie: don't hit someone's dog, don't pet or feed w/o asking etc .
- "Owner assessment to license and own animals exceeding 20lb.

- It is proven that breed is not the issue, but training and environment."



- Treat the animals right. Humans are the problem. Every case is subjective. Hold owners responsible. Not the animal. Also no BSL. It's BS
 - The inner city's has a big problem with off leash dogs in locations that are not off leash. -please put an on-leash sign at the Flames arena
 - a
 - Stop putting the blame on a specific breed of dog. It's not just 'bully' breeds that attack people. Other breeds attack if not trained properly
 - Na
 - Every dog that barks should have a shock collar at owners expense.
 - Bias against Pitbulls by this administration, along with mis-information, Dobermans and G.Shepards have higher bite force - just google it.
 - Calgary has the best pet facilities (off-leash parks, etc) of any city I have ever lived in, I hope this is maintained
 - No comment
 - Stop the tattle tailing reporting to bylaw. Noise is noise whether it's dogs or people.
 - Don't ban breeds. Owners and their dogs need to be trained. If the owner doesn't pass basic dog behaviour and body language, no dog allowed
 - See my response to the chickens
 - There's no point in changing any byelaws if you're not going to enforce them, we need more enforcement
 - Stop discrimination on pitbull dogs
 - I think talking to owner
 - Bylaw decisions should use bite statistics to inform decisions around pit bull breeds (not a higher risk), not community misconceptions.
 - Make it easier for violating bylaws to be dealt with . Example , cats in your yard , using your garden as a litter box
 - Limit number of dogs walked by dog walkers . Also monitor number of dogs in off lease park under the supervision of dog walkers
 - "Regulate back yard breeders.
-
- Also don't bully the breed, bully the Irresponsible dog owners and back yard breeders!"
 - People who make false complaints about pet owners or their pets constantly, should be fined for wasting the time of our public workers.
 - Breed-specific legislation is not cost-effective, it leads to higher rates of euthanasia, and it is unethical and unfair.
 - Breed specific legislation must be removed from the list. It's improper training not the breed that creates issues.
 - Reduction in dog licensing fees upon proof of dog obedience class taken and passed.



- No
- Children need to be taught not to approach a dog without asking. I've seen dogs go after a child who was tugging at them without permission
- I do not have further input.
- The city is imposing too many mandatory rules. Time to get out of this city and into the country where we can still have some freedom!
- Please do away with the notion of breed specific bylaws. It's the human who makes or breaks what a dog does, not it's lineage.
- BSL is not the way to go. All dogs can bite, so all dogs need to be trained. People need to step up and take responsibility for their dog.
- So disappointed with the breed specific language without evidence supporting why these breeds are singled out.
- I would like to see a bylaw to limit many dogs a dog walker can have. I believe 6 is a safer and more manageable number than 8-10. Not safe!
- Fine the owners for not responding, and restraining, or training the dog.
- No
- All pet owners must have liability insurance- like cars.
- Make bylaws that fine repeat offenders. Offer city-run dog training classes, just like swim lessons. Hens eat insects, yes.
- I do not understand why this is breed based. Isn't a nuisance dog just a nuisance dog? Naming a breed enforces stereotypes.
- Pet per sqft rule, known aggressive breeds need behavioral certificate / license to own, with yearly or bi yearly re-licensing.
- Something should be done if people go away and leave barking dogs alone in the house for a day or even a couple of hours.
- I think it should be mandatory for owners to attend Dog training. In all honesty, it is the owners that are the issue not the animals.
- Please put something in place to not allow pet stores to sell live animals. Like [personal information removed]. Shut that place down!
- bandanas WONT help at dog parks, if your dog needs to wear a "red” bandana Indicating unapproachable, why would you bring it to a dog park!
- Why No have more officers in neighbours dealing with off leash dogs... people walking their dogs off leash - deal with that! Fine that!
- Please, please do not make ownership breed specific. I have met so many lovely, gentle Pit Bulls. Make them attend force free training
- Pitbulls were responsible for 67% of dog fatalities in the U.S. last year. Most of them children. They make up about 4% of dogs...
- Offer a one time, no-fee reuniting of pet with owner (eg cat or dog gets loose) for pets that are licensed and permanently ID (tattoo/chip)



- I think you're forgetting golden retrievers, labs, etc. can be aggressive. Not just pitbulls. What an awful thing to discriminate against.
- I would like to see more Bylaw officers at the dog parks. In 11 years of regular park attendance, I have never seen Bylaw.
- Low income fees should be similar to a arrange income. If you can afford a let you can afford to support it along as everyone else.
- Keep licensing for cats the same. But impound fees should be \$25-50 more if they are unfixed. May cause owners to be more responsible.
- We need more off leash parks that have water features. There are some parks that need some city maintenance
- Refund money that was spent for the full year if an animal has died!
- Unfortunately the very very small group of pitbull owners will hijack this debate. Pits were responsible for most serious attacks last year
- No further comments
- Nuisance dogs - 3rd offence, the dog would be removed from the owner,evaluated by an animal behaviouralist and owner gets temporary pet ban.
- Public education is key, training for pets/ kids early, often to ensure accountable behaviours for self and pets. Advertise "ok" behaviours.
- No
- Don't target specific breeds. There are no bad dogs-only bad owners. Kids should be taught how to approach dogs. Fines for not picking up waste
- I am actually disgusted that you are targeting certain breeds, when it is the owners that are the issue. It is a form of discrimination !
- I don't support breed specific bands as they have proven not to work. Focus should be on training.
- Grouping "pit bulls" is a very bad idea! SBT, AST, APBT and mixed bull breeds are very different in temperament!! Do your research!!
- cat owners should be allowed to have more than 6 if safe. huge problem w/irresponsible cat owners and resp. Ppl. W/many cats adopt/save them!
- No
- I think it's disgusting to blame the dog for their upbringing and negligence on pet owners that don't know their responsibility.
- There should be rules and limitations for dog walkers and dog daycares in residential areas. Where are these posted?
- all pets should be required to have a chip for identification purposes.
- I'm so tired of seeing all the dead and hurt cats daily due to irresponsible owners. We need to provide cat owners better education/solution
- Stop using breed specific legislation and start offering better resources to educate people are proper training measures. Punish the owner
- Singling out pitbulls because of jaw strength implies that other dogs don't have the jaw strength to do serious harm which simply isn't true



- More off leash parks, especially in the deep south of Calgary! (by the river would be great too - so many dogs love the water!)
- My pit bull is the sweetest little dog and is amazing with kids and people. It's not the breed, it's the owner and how the dog is raised
- Mandatory spay and neuter for people without a breeding license.
- Multi year licenses
- Singling out "pit bull" appearing breeds is wrong. No BSL. Nuisance dogs come in every breed and are the result of bad owners.
- If bully breeds need training so do the small dogs that attack on site.
- More large dog breed friendly off leash areas.
- Unless the current by-laws are enforced, there's little point in giving input. Want to see by-law talking to habitual irresponsible owners.
- Punish bad people not bad pets. Pitbulls are not more aggressive than other breeds and in some cases are less aggressive than other breeds
- There should be large license fees for breeders. Discouraging backyard breeders and breeder must be a member of a reputable dog association.
- Bylaw officers need to be more visible. If people are confident they'll never be given a ticket there's no point changing any of the rules.
- Don't have BSL in Calgary. This is a reason a lot of people live here. Free choice on the dogs they get. If BSL happens we will be moving.
- I think it would be a good idea for Calgary Animal Services to trap cats that are found at large rather than relying on citizens to do so.
- "Fines should be increased exponentially for repeat offenders.
- Bylaw officers need to respond quicker when a complaint is filed."
- Have a bylaw officer visit any park in Calgary, early in the morning and they will encounter off leash dogs. Random visits will solve this.
- Human error resulting in injury to human. Person should be charged. Not animal being euthanized.
- Provide more low income spay/neuter resources for house cats. TNR is great but there are many irresponsible cat owners.
- breed should not be a factor. off leash pets outside of designated off leash areas should be a heavier fine
- N/A
- COVID is encouraging rash decisions to get a pet. There is a potential for a massive population increase at Shelters when regret sets in.
- Barking dogs should be treated the same as the noise bylaw - no noise between 10PM and 7AM M - S on Sun and Hol 10PM and 9AM. Dogs bark!
- The city should take responsibility for our feral rabbit population: implement a neuter/release program. Ban sale of rabbits in pet stores.



- We should not allow "pet rescues" to bring large amounts of dogs from other countries to be adopted out. We have more than enough strays
- "Regulations for inner city cat and dog breeders. Fines for back yard breeders.
- Also the breed is not the issue. Bad owners are the problem"
- I am very disappointed that the City of Calgary is considering BSL and targeting Bully Breeds. Dog Owners need to be equally responsible
- Nothing to say
- Any changes to bylaws and programs need to be 100% user covered. Increase fees for nuisance/aggressive pets to provide more bylaw officers.
- Focus on the behavior before the bite!
- Providing MORE lower income spay/neuter options is a great idea. We need to control the already high pet population.
- YES support your citizens in being grown adults with continue Education programs and continuing to be the best city to live in across Canada
- I'm aghast that Calgary would even consider breed-specific legislation. The absence of BSL is one of the reasons I'm glad to live here.
- More enforcement of barking dogs. My lawn should not be dogs toilet. Follow up with a visit when excessive barking is reported for months.
- Yes. Impose higher fines for people that use leashes in excess of 6ft when walking their dog. Except when in formal training situation
- A licence should be required at the time of a sale/purchase of a pet from a breeder, shelter within Calgary.
- Higher license fees for unaltered pets
- Remember our Animal Control numbers are already infamous with success, by not choking people's freedoms. Don't stray too far from that premis
- Restricting "pit bulls" and "dogs that look like pit bulls" because they're stronger than other breeds is absurd.
- Animal welfare needs to address all needs of an animal. Currently as long as a dog outside has potential access to shelter nothing is done,
- Disturbance of the peace bylaw involving dogs barking should be reassesses. Neighbors complain with no good reason, not fair for dog or us
- I'd like to see rescue organizations required to test for diseases such as brucellosis and heartworm before entering the county.
- Existing bylaws enforced more often - we still see lots of feces, barking dogs, roaming cats, etc. Bylaws should not be breed specific.
- I have none
- If you have a pet that is strictly an indoor animal, there should be no need for a license.
- "No to breed specific legislation!!
- Calgary has always been above this ridiculous bylaw.



- Spay and neuter release program for feral rabbits"
- If proof can be provided fines for failure to clean up after ones pets should extend to private property.
- People need to be educated about dogs, too many people assume they know what the breed is. German Shepards used to get the bad rap
- Breed specific legislation is unacceptable. Provide resources for training for responsible pet ownership.
- The terminology around pet ownership and animal bylaws references animals but not people. This can create a disassociation from human resp
- Increase fees for dogs off leash in on leash areas. Nobody should be punished for an off leash dog approaching theirs and causing a fight
- Don't punish the animals, deal with the owners.
- Bandana idea seems bad. What happens if an owner labels their dog green and then it bites? Increased liability for false labeling?
- No
- None
- It's not uncommon for a cat especially to be excited by the great outdoors. If a cat happens to escape or leave its property, no fine please
- Implementing restrictions on "pit bulls ” and "dogs that look like pit bulls” is ridiculous and absurd. ITS NOT THE BREED, ITS THE TRAINING.
- Licensing should be required immediately at time of purchase/adoption. More needs to be done to ensure spay and neuter.
- No
- All dog owners must attend basic training class covered by Lisence fee
- "It is the owner - NOT the breed!!!
- Unbelievable, that the finger is still pointed at ""the breed"" itself. Sad!!!"
- Breed specific bylaws terrible idea. Behaviour based evaluation of dogs from trusted dog trainers who use positive reinforcement needed.
- More fenced-in dog parks. Enforced fines for people who bring more than 2dogs. Education re: dog behaviour, dog park etiquette
- Regulations for dog rescue organizations. Far too many dogs are coming in from Arizona and Mexico without proper vetting.
- Feral cats should be euthanized. They kill more birds that other direct mortality source by humans. Cats outside need higher consequences.
- Putting restrictions on breed specifics and dogs that look like a "pit bull” does NOTHING to improve responsible dog ownership.
- I have an American Bully and he is the best dog, to have him lumped into a dangerous breed category based on his looks is beyond ridiculous



- it should be mandatory to spay/neuter your dog/cat unless a breeder, and there needs to be special licenses/checks in place to become a breeder
- I don't believe that pitbulls should be singled out. There is no science saying a pitbull is stronger than any other large breed dog.
- There should be bylaws covering stray pet rabbits the same as stray cats. Pet rabbits should require licenses too.
- No by laws
- Any person that has repeated issues with vicious dogs, or found hoarding/abusing animals should be banned from owning animals indefinitely
- The city require a business license and inspections of anyone claiming to be a breeder w/a limit of 4-6 adult dogs exclud puppies on property
- A rebate, or maybe waiving the license fee, for dogs who have been through obedience training.
- No euthanasia of any animal for being a "nuisance"; Only if a case history of repeated biting is established. Appropriate re-homing is prefer
- You should have to take a course to own any animal. Topics covered: animal welfare, obedience, care, vet care, enrichment, etc.
- Lots of comments on cats impacting wildlife. Cats also kill mice and other rodents. Cats should be allowed to roam freely.
- I disagree with the implementation on pitbull dogs it's the owner not the breed.
- If an animal is not being used for the purpose of breeding, they need to be spayed/neutered.
- Any breed can be a problem deal with the individual dog and hold the owners responsible and people keep your cats inside, too many are dying
- No
- No
- All off leash park should be fenced and not within the community.
- Some dogs naturally bark a lot. Maybe instead of a fine, offering education about how to deal/control the barking would be more effective.
- I could not enter a + or - on the question of fines. If a dog bites another dog the fine should be much higher than \$250. Think vet fees.
- Free bands are ridiculous. Owner education and breed education should be the priority
- More accessible training programs - particularly for offending dogs.
- Singling out Pitbulls as a breed is ridiculous and not useful to the conversation. Many other dogs have strong bites, but were not included
- More off leash areas. Why can't a dog be off leash in a provincial park such as Fish Creek? There is way more space in these types of parks.
- No
- If a home owner can prove with photo or video of person not picking up after their dog on a person's private property should be fined.



- For dog noise calls, that the fine should include training sessions as the dog barking is usually due to separation anxiety or poor welfare
- I don't think a single breed should be singled out.
- I think it's a bit prejudiced to have laws against pit-bulls specifically...
- Increased Penalties for owners who consists
- Cats should be able to go outside and be just that, cats. Especially in areas where rodents, mice and voles are fiercely destroying lawns.
- How do you single out specific dog breeds as being dangerous? This is ridiculous. The city's lack of knowledge in this area is a joke
- Service animals should have their fees waived.
- Ban retractable leashes. They do nothing but cause problems, reduce control of the animal and cause injury to person using it.
- If an dog park is listed as off-leash, please add gates at all entry points...even obedient dogs will run through an open entryway
- Please Calgary, let's not start discriminating against pit bulls. Any problem dog, no matter the breed, should be managed promptly.
- It has been shown in many other cities that breed specific legislation does NOT work.
- I would like to see a limit of 8 dogs per dog walker. That's the most you can walk and still have the proper insurance as far as I know
- There needs to be accountability and regulation from authorities on the Animal Rescue Industry.
- Please stop discrimination against bully breeds (pit bulls). Your information about bite severity is incorrect and unfair
- Better off leash areas with full fencing and lights . Can't use them most of the year when it's dark out at 5
- Should be a licensing process to breed; far too many irresponsible individuals doing this for profit.
- Off leash parks need vastly increased controls to ensure nuisance dogs (owners, really) are not jeopardizing safety to begin with.
- I think owning a chicken would be nice, it's helpful to be somewhat self sufficient.
- faster bylaw officer response to calls and more presence of officers at parks (not just sitting in their car in the parking lot)
- Mandatory training classes REGARDLESS of breed. Do some research into bite strength. Pitbulls are not top of the list. And I own Maltese Xs
- Consider a reduction in licencing fees if owners can submit proof of some sort of training or obedience course, or owner education seminar.
- There should be no restrictions on breed as there are no bad breeds or animals and just irresponsible owners. At no fault of the animal
- The pit bull lobby is out in full force. Don't cave in; These are dangerous animals. Just ban them already and save a life.



- Where there are feral rabbits, there are Coyotes. When the rabbits move on, so do coyotes. If hens are allowed in backyards, EXPECT Coyote
- "Bike paths thru offleash parks need rules for bikers vs dogs.
- Sledding at off leash parks should be banned. Unsafe for kids and dogs."
- There should be a one time life time license fee per pet
- PLEASE fence the dog parks all the way around and have bylaw officers do education regularly.
- The pit bull lobby is well orchestrated. You are not going to get a fair view of public opinion by reading comments on this issue.
- Singling out one "breed" is uncalled for. Problem dogs should be addressed when they are just that problem dogs
- Actual enforcement of penalties for aggressive, antagonistic small breed dogs.
- N/a
- Limit the amount of dogs/cats that can be in an apartment/condo or attached house. There's many apartments filled with 5-6 pets. Not kind.
- More off leash areas in the future south area of S.W. Calgary are needed. The farthest south one is in Southwood!
- There is no need to focus on the bully breeds. No the strength of the bite is not a good enough reason, and no I don't own one.
- Killed by a pit bull. <https://globalnews.ca/news/4464233/dog-attack-langdon-alberta-victim-identified/>
- its ridiculous that pitbulls are still being singled out. your misinformation about bully breed bites is irresponsible and disgusting.
- Calgary - please do not go down the road of breed discrimination. It is an uneducated approach.
- No mention of noise-some bark for hours in early am.
- Include expert opinion and research data on making some of these decisions.
- na
- There are other breeds of dogs that are much stronger than 'pitbulls'. Why are you not considering implementing restrictions on them?
- Fines need to increase for Animal Owners receiving the same fines repeatedly fines increase for not removing snow!
- More lower-cost spay/neuter options to reduce the homeless pet populations as well as more funding support for the Rescues trying to help.
- Higher fees for loose cats (considered outdoor) ie brought in multiple times
- Stop isolating pit bull incidents when its propagated by bad pet owners. Enforce mandatory training for all dogs over 40lbs.
- the bandana early warning system is a good idea, but does not currently take into account colourblind individuals
- Please do not include breed specific rules or exceptions.
- This survey should require some sort of verification of People completing it to reduce bias or spamming from various groups/people



- I think the city should consider a ban on apartments and condos enforcing a weight limit on pets. This is ridiculous.
- More accessible reporting and investigating of suspected animal cruelty.
- Increased penalties for neglecting dogs, abusing dogs, etc. Breeds should not be singled out. The owner should be held responsible.
- N/a
- More enforcement against owners who use school yards as off leash areas.
- No ideas
- I agree with more readily available off-leash areas in and around the city.
- Dangerous dog breeds have no place in a modern city.
- "Please consider the racist and classist roots of BSL
- <https://www.nathanwinograd.com/the-ugly-racist-underpinnings-of-pit-bull-laws/>"
- Dog owners (regardless of size) should have mandatory training sessions ensuring they know how to properly handle and train their dogs.
- Excessive noise violations should be met with mandatory training for dogs before a fine is issued. I.e a warning and training must happen.
- Fence all off leash parks.
- BSL doesn't work it has been proven time and time again. I believe we need strong pet regulations that apply to every breed !!!
- A well trained dog is well trained, regardless of breed. No need for discrimination.
- I would appreciate higher fines and more potential enforcement for dogs who are being emotionally/behaviourally neglected.
- Just google "pit bull death alberta". Nuff said.
- No
- Please don't single out Pitbulls and go down the road of breed discrimination. Very disappointed that this is even being discussed.
- I like the idea of having small dog only off leash parks. < 25lbs.
- No idea at this moment
- BSL is not the answer! My "pit bull" is not a threat to a single soul. Some dogs are dangerous, but that has nothing to do with breed.
- None
- Improvements to offleash parks like fencing and lights. Also, better management with shared off leash and bike path areas
- Increase funding for animal rescues to help with spay and neuter programs
- Increase screening process to own an animal and
- Treat dogs as individuals. Just because it's a pitbull doesn't make it more dangerous/ vicious then any other breed
- None



- The complaint process for continuing barking dogs really must be changed the idea of documenting barking dogs is total nonsense
- Mandatory pet owner training for those who obtain pets for the first time and for those who have bylaw infractions. Better enforcement of a
- Legislating pit bulls specifically won't reduce the frequency of bite incidents. Address problems as they arise, don't act on prejudice.
- Target the real problem, Pet owners, not the pets.
- I feel that discriminating against a particular breed is considerably narrow minded - lots of dogs can cause harm. Train the owners!
- Better enforcement of infractions, more neighbourhood patrols...
- Stop condemning "vicious" dog breeds. These are dangerous to animals and specific breeds causing increased panic and unnecessary euthanasia.
- Why should non-pet owners have to subsidize pet owners when considering additional facilities?
- Penalties for people who antagonize animals (approach/touch/hurt without asking) who then get hurt and blame the animal.
- Breed Specific Legislation never works!!! It's 2020 discrimination of any type against people, gender or anything should not be allowed.
- Animal limits should be based on size of house / enclosed yard space.
- Off leash areas w/o a fence should be fenced. It's the most stupid idea I've ever seen. All it takes is a single puppy chase a bunny.
- Breed specific legislation does not work.
- Lower fees for spay and neutering
- I am VERY against any breed specific legislation and I am ashamed that Calgary is even considering it
- Why is there discrimination against pit bulls? There is no scientific proof that a pit bull bite is any different than any other dog.
- If no problems caused, then it shouldn't be illegal.
- A breed ban is not an answer. It does not work. Owner education is the key.
- Pet friendly homeless shelters
- There are not enough off leash areas being included in new developments. Increase the number of off leash. Charging a small amount to use
- Please don't single out pit bulls! I would like to see higher fines for people that mistreat and neglect animals.
- No
- Singling out any breed is awful. I don't own Pitbulls but I know a few and they are wonderful. Why does anyone need 6 dogs? Limit that
- Regulate the pet training industry, promote and enforce the use of positive reinforcement training only
- My idea is to take breed-specific legislation and throw it out the window.



- I disagree with breed specific legislation. Pit bulls are not the problem, aggressive dogs and bad owners are.
- Better training and responsible owners goes along way to
- The best way to reduce outdoor feral cat populations is TNR (trap/neuter/return). Sterilize then return them to live their lives.
- Breed specific biased bylaws are not the answer. Manage incidents based on the animal and its owner, not its appearance.
- Concerned about the limit of dogs one person is allowed to walk at one time. Multiple dogs should be allowed if they are in control.
- Stop being prejudiced against pit bulls. The problem is not a dogs breed but the hand that raises and trains it.
- Bylaw for animal hoarding. Track of pet history and frequency of adoption to prevent abuse (i.e. cats adopted every winter, freed in spring)
- So many off leash parks aren't fenced in and should be. It can prevent so many dogs from chasing a rabbit or other animal
- I think the less the city is involved the better. People should have more freedom on the properties that they own!
- Offer [removed] let owners mandatory classes
- I don't own a bully breeds, but I know first hand that it is not a breed issue it's an owner and training issue. Stop BSL!!!
- Introducing goats/sheep as "pets" in same category as chickens to allow grazing and weed control both in private and public property.
- I do not support breed-specific bans. The issue is poor training and care from negligent dog owners, which can affect dogs of any breed.
- None at this time
- Penalize irresponsible pet owners, not the animal. Hire more bylaw officers to assist with backlog. Have them visit dog parks.
- Concerned about the narrow mindedness of breed specific bylaws.
- I think all of your suggestions regarding Bully breeds is highly discriminatory.
- N/A
- Breed specific bylaws do not work. They are being reversed in major cities. One breed is not the issue - real research needs to be done!
- breed specific rules and regulations is stupid. It has nothing to do with the animal and everything to do with the owner!!
- Breed specific legislation is abhorrent. Education, training, and enforcing rules regardless of breed is what's important.
- Breed discrimination does not work and is not based in fact. Stick to dealing with animals that are proven problems rather than breeds.
- Not to the bandana idea. I feel children should be taught to approach every dog with extreme caution and care. This may cause confusion.



- No
- I whole heartedly disagree with breed specific legislation. It's ridiculous, there is no such thing as a bad breed, only crappy owners.
- A breed of dog does not determine whether it is dangerous to the public - that is a result of training and appropriate management.
- Stop judging "pitbulls" as bad dogs. There is no such thing as bad dogs. Only bad owners who do not properly train there dogs!
- Honestly, you CANNOT go down the road of profiling "nuisance" dogs by breed. Pit bulls are amazing dogs. Bites should be case by case basis
- It's not right to single out Pit bully type breeds. From a Animal foster/vet tech, there are more cases of bites from Labs and small dogs.
- Stop breed specific legislation and maybe make an incentive for proper pet training. Cheaper licensing with proof of training program done?
- Please put "No Dogs Allowed" signs back up in parks/playgrounds. Soccer fields are not toilets. Winter is not an exception. Pickup feces!
- Create standards for what an "aggressive offence" actually is because people who are afraid due to their past make stuff up.
- Amenities and updates to certain off lease parks.
- Higher fines and more severe consequences for animal neglect, abuse and cruelty.
- Breed specific legislation is bad for everyone and doesn't work.
- Owners of dogs who bite should be able to report and start the process of investigation--not just the person bitten
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work. Any dog can become aggressive through trauma or bad owners.
- Pets bylaw shouldnt be breed specific. Fine the owners. Dont punish the animals.
- Breed legislation does not work and shouldn't even be considered!
- Encourage (or even require) pet owners take a course on responsible ownership, training and pet management prior to ownership.
- Renewal of annual licenses should include a mandatory short video on dog care, dog communication and practical dog training.
- It is proven that a German shepherd has a stronger bite than a pitbull. Creating laws based on myths and fear mongering helps no one.
- Nuisance dogs should not ever in any way be breed specific. There should not ever be a bully breed law. Make training a requirement for all
- Pit bull dogs are normally sweet and there are lots of dogs and people who can inflict damage on another. Penalty goes to the person.
- Balh
- Nope



- I really like the idea of animal ownership limits to be determined by the owner's abilities to manage and handle the animals appropriately.
- There is no need to single out any breed (specifically the bully breeds). This legislation would be most fair and effective if it was unbiased.
- Na
- Need to step it up on animal hoarding and unfit pet owners
- Bylaws shouldn't just be based on breed, any dog can bite. More focus on responsible ownership and training for dogs and their owners.
- I would appreciate giving housing and travel rights to those who have been prescribed an Emotional Support Animal.
- no
- I work with dogs, and BSL is bull. It is not a solution; it's a distraction. Provide low-cost, accessible dog training for license discounts
- There are a number of dog breeds that actually have a stronger bite than pitbulls. German shepherds, Dobermans, and Rottweilers. #EndBSL
- I believe that proper animal ownership should be enforced, and training should be mandatory.
- Discrimination against breeds and color coding with bandanas? Seriously Calgary, give your heads a shake.
- Dogs can chade/bite because they are scared. People (and their children) need to be educated about approaching dogs.
- Mandatory training for dogs of all sizes, like Obedience or the CKC Canine Good Neighbour program.
- Before you drive, hunt, or teach you need a license proving you know the risks and how to keep people safe. Do the same for a pet license.
- protection for owners that have nasty neighbors who lie that their neighbor's dogs are a nuisance in order to get them evicted or pets taken
- N/A
- I would like to see dogs over one year need to be spayed or neutered before they can use an off-leash park.
- Designation of some "small dog only" and "large-medium dog only" off-leash parks throughout the city to increase safer options to Calgarians
- I am disheartened by the suggestion of breed specific legislation. Appropriate training of animals should be mandatory no matter the breed.
- Nope
- Leave pit bulls out of the discussion.
- Breed Specific Legislation is NOT THE ANSWER to anything. The responsibility lies with the owner NOT THE BREED.
- Hire people to work the off-leash areas to fine people not picking up their dogs' feces. Would pay for itself.



- Barking dogs are not the problem, bad owners are. Lets focus on ensuring all animals have a safe healthy and appropriate environment to live
- BSL DOES NOT WORK!!
- You can't stereotype a dog due to its breed. I wouldn't muzzle my dog in public. Stick to dogs who have a history of abuse or issues.
- I am honestly disgusted by the fact you guys have the audacity to come after specific breeds. Remove that and you might get more support.
- It's needs to deal with leash length for dogs. Should not be allowed to walk / urinate on private lawns. I am constantly repairing grass.
- This is ridiculous and unfair!
- Microchips mandatory for cats and dogs, then lower the licensing fees as owners will be easier to locate/fine. NO BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS.
- A separate off leash license should be considered with proof of training required before animals can participate at off leash parks.
- Breed specific legislation is absolutely ridiculous. Educating owners and the PUBLIC is most important! And we need to ENFORCE the rules.
- No idea
- Stop singling out pitbull breeds. It is incredibly discriminatory and only contributes to the myth they are dangerous.
- Fines for off leash pets in on leash areas.
- -
- I personally think it is ridiculous to have a cat bylaw that keeps them indoors. Totally ridiculous!
- The dogs aren't the problem the owners are, don't penalize everyone by generalizing "pitbulls" because they "might" hurt someone.
- Suggestions regarding pit bulls are discriminatory. Penalize problem owners, not the breed. Offer nuisance owners mandatory obedience class.
- I think enforcing Breed Specific Legislation is ridiculous. It's not the breed it is the owner. Owners should have to go through training.
- "City of Calgary should take more responsibility in fully fencing designated off-leash areas.
- Remove discrimination of pitbulls."
- I don't agree with the BSL. People with bad ways of raising any animal can cause them to lash out. Not just bully breeds.
- Regulate dog trainers based on modern industry standards and evidence based studies. Ban the use of shock, prong, and choke style collars.
- I feel there needs to be more power for by law officers to intervene when it comes to calls of animals in distress or neglect.
- Education programs for anyone who wants to own any animal. Breed specific legislation is [removed], and doesn't reduce the # of incidents.



- This "proposal" is [removed]!! "Bulls" do NOT have a stronger bite than some other breeds!! Shepards, etc! They are loveable amazing pets!!!
- Breed Specific Legislation is absolutely ridiculous and does not belong in Calgary! We need rules that foster responsible owners, not BSL!
- Keep breed specific language out of this. There are no bad dogs, only bad dog owners!
- super unfair your asking so many negative questions about pitbulls. I've worked in the industry for 20 years, chihuahuas are more dangerous
- Breed specific legislation is wrong! Pitbulls/terriers must NOT be treated differently than any other breed!
- I would like there to be an incentive for dog owners that enrol and successfully complete obedience training with reputable licensed trainer
- Do your actual research city of calgary on pitbulls and pitbull breeds. Stop being discriminatory to a single breed. Get factual evidence.
- Calgary Humane Behaviourists be on the Tribunal and assess animals prior to return to home and recommend training.
- OWNER HISTORY, WHO is taking care of the animal WHO is the animal surrounded by. BAN those who have failed to take care of an animal.
- Yes, dogs biting a person trespassing or committing a crime on a private premises should not be a offense to be fined over.
- In order to renew license owner must do an online course. Giving them all the bylaw information. If they pass the class 100% get a discount
- It is embarrassing that breed specific legislation is even being proposed here. Look at the facts, this is ridiculous.
- The idea that pitbulls bite harder than other breeds of a similar size has no scientific founding.
- I feel we need higher fines for irresponsible cat owners that let their cats roam and not burden the the neighbor that has to deal with poo
- No breed restrictions!!
- Breed Specific Legislation does NOT work! Punish irresponsible owners, not specific breeds or types! #endBSL #dontbullymybreed
- Reduced licensing fees for animals who complete registered training. No matter breed type.
- There are many pit bulls without aggression problems. Decisions should be made on the individual dog's behaviour and not based on breed.
- Breed specification is absolutely discriminatory, against our freedom, and totally absurd !
- The owners should be held responsible for the animals actions. They should be required to do certain things such as obedience classes
- No
- Small dogs are considered more of a nuisance and are more likely to bite humans and other dogs. I don't understand why the focus is on pits.
- Breeds have nothing to do with nuisance dogs. Calgary is better than that. Owner's carry the responsibility of a dog's behavior, not the dog



- I think we need to educate cat owners about allowing cats to roam at large. They defecate in people's vegetable gardens
- No comment
- A breeder should be licensed and held responsible to spayed or neutered animals they sell, to control homeless pet population.
- Bylaws shouldn't just be based on breed, any dog can bite. Focus more on responsible ownership and training for dogs and less on the stigma.
- No one likes yellow grass caused from dog pee. Perhaps people should be encouraged to have dogs pee on mulch or other instead?
- Could bees be part of this?
- There needs to be fines for those who tease/ antagonize pets on walks as well as those who go to dog parks to annoy pets. This is unsafe
- I am absolutely disgusted but the wording in the phase 1 survey. The wording seems completely uneducated. Pit bulls are not a type of dog
- Pitbull rules are discriminatory and not based on sound science. Everything should be discretionary. Nuisance breeds and animals dont exist.
- The city needs to invest in more off leash areas. Possibly making areas designated for large breeds and small breed dogs.
- who came up with the attached breeds to pitbull, who came up with pitbull being problematic, staffordshire bull terriers are not dangerous
- no
- All animals should be treated equal unless they have proven to be a "risk" to public. I do not support segregation of certain species.
- As proven in other large cities, restricting breeds or essentially punishing a specific breed DOES NOT WORK. It is an owner based problem
- Teams of volunteers educating dogs owners in dog parks about basic community rules and commands (recall, behavior, etc)
- [removed]
- How about the welfare of pit bulls? They are dogs, dogs bite when provoked, especially if an owner does not train their animals properly.
- Targeting pitbulls or dogs that have pitbull like traits should not be considered. Owners of nuisance dogs should be trained.
- BSL is developed on the concepts of the misinformed society.It talks about bite force being specifically high in this survey, which is false
- There should be signs at the entrance of each dog park stating and explaining dog behaviour. Along with ok and not ok play etc.
- Breed specific legislation shouldn't effect those with service dogs of these breeds/breed characteristics.
- Don't target dog breeds



- Bylaws should not include breed. Any animal breed/species can bite and inflict injuries on people. Focus on responsible pet ownership.
- Sue Higgins off-leash is phenomenal esp. large, multi-fenced in areas. An equivalent in NW would be great. (Coyote-free)
- Fines for dogs off leash on the bike path.
- Don't single out Pit Bulls by name. People need to be aware that any reasonably sized dog can do a lot of damage. Its not the breed.
- The bylaws in place are already INCREDIBLY poorly upheld. What's the point in doing all of this review without addressing that?
- It's outrageous that there is such a stigma about one specific breeds. Perhaps the city should look into more affordable training for owners
- I believe cats should be allowed to roam free outside. They instinctively return home and are happier they are also great pest control.
- Please don't fall into the breed trap. Owners are responsible for raising dogs. Stereotypes of dogs are just as harmful as they are of humans
- No
- More enforcement of off leash dogs in the city that are not in off leash areas
- That this is Discrimination against pitbulls it's disgusting any dog can be aggressive and this singles out them
- I think that it would be extremely helpful for reduced-fee programs for rescued animals or reactive animals to receive training.
- I just want to add that focusing on particular breeds is counter productive. Don't buy into myths. Focus on humans taking responsibility.
- Become more educated on dog breeds. What you are currently suggesting with "pit bulls" is genocide- this is discrimination/racism
- what a waste of time, really sad that the city has to refer to certain breeds of dogs as a nuisance. Pit bulls aren't inherently bad dogs.
- Stop the breed specific nonsense, ignore the vocal minority who are scared and rarely interact with dogs.
- None
- Stop supporting the current pit bull type hysteria and start focusing on specific problems with individual animals and their owners.
- There should be zero breed specific conditions to a bylaw - any breed of dog can be a risk if they have been mistreated/abused.
- Do not single out Pit Bulls. Issues with dogs is the owner, and how they treat the animal and how they train the animal. Ban the owner.
- See my comment under limiting animals permitted on a property. Breeding licences/approval, mandatory insurance, mandatory puppy/training
- The public should be educated on dogs and their behavior. The bite force of a dog is determined by the size of the mandible not by its breed.

- Roaming outdoor cats. Owner gets a letter from bylaw, Many complaints later nothing changes. City never enforces the bylaw. FIX IT
- Any dog can bite. And most often it's bc of the way they are treated or if someone antagonizes the dog. Don't discriminate based on breed.
- Breeds are not vicious or mean, humans make them mean. To ban pitbulls is the same as banning a race
- Discriminating a dog by a breed is irresponsible and ignorant. Each dog needs individual approach and trained appropriately, but not banned.
- None
- If Licenses are available through vendors - I support this initiative providing the cost of the licenses do not increase.
- Please stop using pit bulls as your example of a nuisance breed. I've been bitten more times but a small dog. Blame the owner, not the breed.
- Pit bulls should have to be neutered/spayed by 6 months old within the city limits.
- Breed discrimination should never be an option for educated and responsible pet ownership.
- Stop going after a "specific" breed of dog due to biased bullshit stereotypes. I'd rather have a pitbull than a chihuahua
- I know its AHS, but allowing well behaved dogs into pubs/restaurants/stores that want to be dog-friendly would be great.
- I think in dog parks there should be certified training signs for owners about dog behaviour and reminders to always remain calm in dog park
- I think this is a discrimination to bully breeds and if you are going to own one u should have to know how to raise one.
- I think this is ridiculous that breed specific policies are even being considered. Lets keep things science-based and not on myths.
- I oppose any and all laws that are breed targeted or breed-specific.
- **STOP SELLING ANIMALS IN STORES. SHUT DOWN [personal information removed]! STOP BLAMING DOGS - BLAME THE OWNERS**
- Increased education and fines for dogs off leash outside of off leash parks including in the owners front yard or in residential neighborhoods
- BSL will not help the fact that people are not responsible for their pets. Nor will fines. We need to support community education.
- dog viciousness is not always due to the animal so look at the human and start there. And do access the dog and see if its still trainable.
- It is incredibly disappointing to see the suggestion of breed specific language being added to a bylaw. Shame on whoever wrote this nonsense
- It is wrong to single out pitbulls specifically. The note that pitbull bites are stronger is false and not based on any scientific fact.
- Actually making cat owners responsible for their wandering cats, implementing huge fines for owners who allow their pets outside.



- Stop picking on pit bulls and bully breeds. They make great pets and companions.
- There are many rules but minimal enforcement. Fines could easily pay for a bylaw officer to ticket dogs off leash, owners leaving waste etc
- "Please do not introduce any BSL guidelines.
- We all know pit bulls are often a product of their environment."
- Look up the history of Pitbull breeds and understand that smaller dogs are more aggressive and have worse temperaments than big dogs. Bi
- Breed Specific Legislation is wrong. It's cruel and it does not work.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Stop doing this.
- Don't restrict Pitbulls. Other "acceptable" bully breed types such as German Shepherds and Dobermans also have exceedingly strong bites.
- Limiting the # of animals someone lives with is wrong. A person can dedicate their life to multiple animals and provide a great home!
- no
- There should be hefty fines and enforcement for dogs off leash on bike paths. Many cyclists are injured. Owners need to teach or leash.
- It's atrocious that you would consider signalling out the pitbull breed. It's an owner and life events that make a dogs behaviours. Not a bree
- .
- Prohibit the sale of dogs in pet stores. Calgary is the last city in western Canada with a store that sells dogs, it's archaic.
- Ban terrible people not pit bulls. People should undergo a screening process before getting a bully breed. Stop dog fighting rings!
- I would like to see a commitment that there be no restrictions of any kind based on breed. Breed based restrictions are fear mongering.
- Pitbulls should not be singled out. I have have many more issues with small breed dogs than I have with pitbulls. Blame the owner.
- Allow dog owners to reduce fines by attending obedience courses. Owners need to be held to a higher standard, not the breed of dog.
- I'm appalled at the singling out of pit bulls. Attention should on owner accountability and responsibility and not breed blaming. Shameful.
- "Bylaw should be put collecting cats the way they do dogs.

- Do you know how many birds/fledglings die because cats roam free? Too many!"
- Definitely higher fines for irresponsible cat owners. Cats do not need to be outside, people only think they do. Too bad we can't trap them.
- Encourage dog owners to take training/socialization classes by providing free classes or incentives to enroll (such as discounted fees)



- I believe dog owners should have to take training., understanding the breed and natural behaviours and potential risks they are assuming.
- Breed specific legislation? If you give a [removed] about animal welfare you'll remove this from your descriptions.
- I really think our city needs to look and what they are going to do to protect animals. In the majority of cases humans are the cause...
- seriously, don't make owners of pit bulls pay for having them. A lot are rescue dogs. Stop targeting certain breeds!
- Stores should not be allowed to sell animals. They are living beings and not products! Take away business permits to places like [personal information removed]
- Stop discriminating against pitbulls
- "pit bulls" are not more powerful then MANY other breeds of dogs that are far more common. It's factually incorrect.
- "Need more access 2 spay and neuter programs
- Stop discriminating against breeds - a dog is a dog."
- Educate people about dog behaviour and stop breed bullying. Bite strength is about jaw size, and pits aren't the strongest either.
- Enforce more: people that walk their dogs off leash in public spaces and when asked to leash up always respond "oh but he/she is friendly"
- Owners can be a bigger problem than the animal, education / medication (sometimes needed) and training can help resolve a lot of issues
- Can't believe this city is dumb enough to think about introducing BSL and punishing responsible pitbull owners. Huge disappointment.
- "More enforcement of off-leash dogs on community sports fields.
- More enforcement of leashed dogs on sports/ school fields."
- More enforcement at city parks AND city waterways where people let their dogs off leash in the Bow to swim near kids. Not off leash areas!
- "Stop singling out one breed. Yes they are strong but so are other breeds.
- I have more fear of the tiny yappy dogs biting me."
- the city needs to address pets in stores. I respect service animals but many stores are allowing more than service animals. I have allergies
- Are you kidding me?! VERY sad to see the city singling out Pit bulls. They make amazing family pets.
- I have always been proud of Calgary for not engaging in BSL. Please don't let us down! Educate and enforce bylaws.
- There is nothing wrong with pitbulls. Doesn't matter if you have a pitty or a chihuahua if you can't raise it that's on you. Blame the owner
- Please don't single out pit bulls! I would like to see higher fines for people that mistreat and neglect animals.



- "Stop the sale of animals in pet stores! Higher fines and jail time for animal abuse.
- Have much stricter breeding bylaws and enforcement."
- Someone said dogs shouldn't be off leash on bike paths. That's already a rule but there should not be bike paths in off leash dog parks.
- Stop stereotyping a breed!! The breed is not the problem it's the crappy owners!
- Non cat owners: Need support to keep cats out of gardens and spraying my house please!
- Pit bulls are not bad breeds
- Rescue, rehoming, breed rescue organizations should be licensed and regulated and annually inspected by SPCA to ensure animal welfare.
- Hens for economic household sustainability
- I'm so disappointed in these potential Pit Bull restrictions. Calgary had one of the best reputations for punishing the deed not the breed.
- Stop singling out pitbulls.
- I don't agree with banning specific breeds, however owner screening and mandatory (affordable and mandated) training must be completed.
- I think singling out pitbulls and all other bully breeds is absolute [removed]!! Very ashamed of you Calgary. Very.
- owners accused of abusing any animals should never legally aloud to own an animal again
- Educating the public (especially children) on how to behave around pets in shared public spaces ie. never approach an animal without asking
- [removed]
- When you purchase your dog license, you should be able to buy a second tag with the same registration number for a small additional fee.
- More enforcement for owners not picking up feces. Many parks have repeat offenders. A system where other park users can report them.
- Punish the owner NOT the breed, heavily fine ALL owners of dogs that bite, are aggressive or nuisance. This will eliminate bad dogs.
- Based on the phase 2 questions, I am guessing phase 1 did not include anyone from the Northern Hills because you missed the issues here.
- Do not allow stores to sell pets [personal information removed]. No reputable breeder would give their puppies to them. It's a disguised puppy mill.
- Pit bulls should not be written in the bylaw specifically. There are lots of dogs that can be aggressive. This needs to be re-assessed!
- There should be no breed bias at all. There are many reasons for dogs being an issue and almost all stem from owners. Need to have education
- Higher fines for outdoor cats and make it more publicly known that there are fines for "Outdoor cats"
- Don't blame the breeds. Owners need to train their pets properly. Big dogs are more gentle than small noisy dogs (like mean chihuahua)



- Start subsidizing humane societies so they can hire trained professionals at an appropriate pay to train the excessive amount of shelter dog
- Nuisance barking is allowed too much leeway. By law officers should be able to ticket after 3 complaints.
- If you researched dog breeds before making this pit bulls would not be singled out. End the stigma behind bully breeds. I'm disgusted.
- Licensing fees should not be reduced for "low income" households. It should be the same for everyone
- No.
- O
- Any dog has the potential to be aggressive in the hands of the wrong owner. The breed bias here must be reassessed.
- What about the small dogs on retractable leashes attacking pitbulls and their owners? Banning a breed isn't a solution.
- Singling out a certain breed due to them being "stronger" in any way is not okay in any circumstance. Any dog can have a strong bite.
- Instead of simply always taking a dog with a problem enforce something like training instead, maybe even require behaviour classes
- Any dog can be aggressive if brought up to be. It is ALWAYS on the owner and how they train their dog. Stop singling out pit bulls.
- So a pit bull is here because they are strong... what about a Great Dane or an Irish wolfhound? Don't see them being discriminated against.
- Pitbulls are the most abused, euthanized, and abandoned breed. They're born with the stacks against them already because of biases like this
- A number of offences in the current pet bylaw are sufficiently broad to allow over-reporting by neighbors angry about something else.
- No breed specific legislation!!! All dogs can be vicious and attack don't single out one certain breed or any dog that has these characteris
- Don't let [removed] neighbors get out of control with their numerous calls.
- I would like to see more enforcement in natural park areas where dogs shouldn't be off leash but are.
- it is very disappointing to see you single out a breed. Do you care about animals or [personal information removed]?
- The city should be embarrassed that BSL is even being considered. Complete ignorance! Punish irresponsible owners, not breeds!
- People need to be educated. Behaviour issues almost always stem from the owner, not the breed. BSL does not work and is ignorant.
- Creating an online resource which is Endorsed by the city to have quick access to information about breeds, breed history and temperament f
- I don't believe that pit bulls should be treated any different then any other breed



- More awareness and fines for dogs off leash - many pet owners of large dogs seem to think it's not a problem even when not in offleash park
- Dogs do not belong in stores, restaurants or shopping centers. People who experience anaphylactic allergic reactions should come first.
- Chs: "deterrents to dog aggression are responsible breeding, responsible homing, responsible and humane training, and responsible ownership"
- Please do not in act BSL. it is completely ridiculous to target out a type of dog .
- NA
- BSL is completely ignorant. I'm embarrassed to be in a city that is even considering this after thinking we were better than that.
- I do not support breed-specific legislation. Stop trying to vilify pit bulls. The scientific data doesn't support these claims.
- Steeper penalties for people who abuse/neglect animals and more support for frontline workers. PTSD. Don't single out pit bulls
- "Breed specific banning or restrictions is barbaric and cruel:
- Focus on irresponsible pet owners and repeat offenders"
- A ban on retractable leashes would be nice. They reduce the ability to affectively control dogs.
- No idea
- Extremely disappointed that Calgary officials still believe in BSL enough that it would even be mentioned.
- Thought this was about responsible pet ownership so why are you punishing a breed and not the irresponsible owners?
- Nope
- Your officers need training on when to take animals from people who are abusing them!
- Absolutely disgusted by the attacks on pitt breeds. Bad dogs are products of bad owners, and no one breed should be demonized.
- Intervention or fines for unwanted behaviours need to be assessed on a case by case basis. There are many factors involved.
- Free roaming and feral cats are a threat to wild birds and their babies. Calgary should set a good example as a progressive city!
- "Please support spay neuter programs! Wait lists are
- months long for low cost and way longer for no cost options. Please support shelters!"
- n/a
- Leashes should NOT be retractable as you don't have even half the control you do as normal 2ft leashes. It's to easy to have a dog take off
- If you actually want input, you should provide a form with a recaptcha that doesn't break every time. Lost an hour to this across 4 attempts
- Judging a dog by breed is like generalizing people by the color of their skin



- Standardized testing and certification for service dogs. Too many untrained dogs running around with "service" vests.
- I don't understand how you can specially separate and segregate a certain breed-pit bull as its own question
- You mentioned 6 dogs and 6 cats but that is ridiculous. I would limit it to 2 dogs OR 2 cats ONLY!
- Totally discussed with this survey, whoever wrote this is uneducated and perhaps should spend a month working at the local SPCA!
- Disgusted that BSL would even be considered. There are plenty of breeds with the potential to cause a lot of harm NOT just Pit breeds.
- This kind of deliberate demonization of a specific breed is despicable. I thought the City of Calgary was better than this. BSL DOESN'T WORK
- no.
- What about the little dogs that run up and "nip" big dogs and then the big dog gets punished for biting back??
- More education put out about why we shouldn't let cats roam free and maybe an easier way to report them? No fine on the 1st offence though.
- Dog breeds should not be singled out in any way. There needs to be harsher penalties for animal cruelty, abandonment, and owner neglect.
- Don't degrade one type of breed, any dog is capable of being aggressive or abused if not trained or taken care of or properly controlled.
- No
- I would like to have high fines for stealing, fighting and using dogs as bait
- No bylaw should be breed specific - pit bull terminology should be dropped in all cases The breed is not the problem the owners are-
- Just keep the same by law.
- Pit bull lives matter
- Absolutely no breed deserves to be singled out due to any reason whatsoever. Get educated and cut the [remove].
- Shock collars should be banned
- na
- A bylaw restricting the amount of dogs that dog walkers are to walk at one time. Also must hold a city business licence and insurance
- Breed should not matter! Pet owners who have multiple violations or history of aggressive animals shouldn't be able to own anymore
- pls don't be mean to pitbulls ;(
- "license with no fees - just mandatory register your pets
- Grace period for nuisance violations for new pet owners allowing time to train"
- Breed specific rules are archaic! Let dogs who are bad be punished, not dogs who have never done anything wrong :(



- No
- No
- No breed specific rules!
- "- I have concerns over breed specific language."
 - more could be done about outdoor cats who leave their property"
- Rules should be based on all breeds and not specific to one... any animal has the potential to harm not just one breed
- No BSL. Period. The end. Those who think it's always "pitbulls" have no idea what they're talking about.
- I would feel so much safer if pitbulls were restricted and used in public.
- Breed specific legislation is horrible, cruel, and an unacceptable means of addressing the issue.
- None
- Just ask the ex mayor of Montreal if breed specific bylaw is a good idea: he lost his job over it.
- Nuisance dogs and pitbulls need to be held accountable and restricted accordingly before they hurt someone.
- Breed specific rules are not a progressive way of thinking. The owner is more responsible for a dog bite than the dog is
- NO BSL! It is completely unfair to single out any one breed over another. It is an absolutely uneducated legislation.
- "All dogs need to be kept on leash everywhere that is not an off-leash park.
- Pit bulls are no different from any other dog breed."
- catalog owners of biting dogs and restrict their ability to own dogs without professional training. Have them face jail for noncompliance
- Used to be okay with pit bulls until we were attacked by 2. There needs to be accountability for people who get aggressive dogs.
- I'm 100% against cat spay/neuter/release programs due to the disastrous effect on wildlife/birds and native species.
- End breed specific legislation, it's not fair. There should be better ways to ensure pet safety than being breed specific
- Stop breed specifying. Dog racists
- For dog and cat per household maximum the square footage of yard and house should be an important factor. 6 cats in a tiny 1 bdrm apartment?
- Raise the yearly fees. Use this extra money pay for enforcement of behaviour training for dogs that bite. No BSL and no euthanasia.
- The problem most generally comes from training-- not from breed. Lets move away from BSL and into a more progressive approach.
- Leave pitfalls and pitbull types alone. I have been bit by small dogs and owners don't care. Maybe along with licensing you have training



- Pitbulls should not be singled out as a dangerous breed. Every dog should be treated the same until there is a legitimate reason otherwise.
- Have you ever been bitten by a Rottweiler? A German Shepard? They are just as strong as pitbulls, and just as likely to bite. BSL is [remove]!
- Pigeon holding bully breeds is unfair to the dogs, and is misguided
- BSL is outdated!! Its the owners responsibility to train their dog. Everything else is case by case, breed legislation should be too.
- Pigeons are nuisance animals. Not pets. Color identifiers on pets are discriminatory, how about just educate your children to not touch?
- I am disgusted that the city is exploring Breed Specific Legislation. Everyone I have ever met that agrees with BSL is extremely uneducated.
- Someone periodically handing out fines to those who refuse to pick up after their dogs at off leash parks.
- If "No problem breeds only problem owners" then owner's of dogs that bite should not be allowed to own again for 10 years and do training
- No
- BSL Is not ok, you can't single out a specific breed.
- I feel cats should be able to roam outside so long as they are licensed. I feel strongly that there would be fewer mice in neighbours' homes
- BSL is ineffective. Restricting a breed does nothing to prevent people from messing up another breed. Education is key.
- I do not agree with breed specific legislation. I do however think there should be lifetime pet bans for irresponsible owners
- More garbages in OL areas, more enforcement in OL areas, more education re off leash parks, easier access to rpt nuisance pets
- Reduced fees for attending training as in most instances, since many of the issues are caused by ill informed pet owners.
- BSL doesn't work!! All dogs need to be leashed and owners need to be responsible for them at all times! It's the owners not the dogs!!!
- None of this works if there isn't bylaw enforcement. Local parks - Bowness, Bowmont for example - should have daily patrols by bylaw officer
- I do not support any form of breed specific legislation.
- Pitbulls are amazing and it is directly related to the owner if an animal is aggressive. Stop blaming the dog and take a look at the owners.
- BLS HAS BEEN SHOWN TIME AND TIME AGAIN THAT IT DOES NOT WORK. IT IS DISHEARTENING THAT THE CITY IS CONTEMPLATING EVEN A WATERED DOWN VERSION
- "Stop stores from selling dogs and cats.
- Make extenda leashes against the law"
- BSL is insane. Especially when backed with false info. GSD's and rotties both have more bite psi but we never hear about wanting to ban them



- Fines for barking
- Train the owners. Provide better help program. Provide the solution when people see the problem. Provide them what they are doing wrong.
- No breed specific anything it is not the breed that is a problem its improper training/care
- Start enforcing the current bylaws! What's the point in changing the bylaws with no enforcement? ie. Off leash areas, picking up feces...etc
- The breed is not the problem. It's the owner
- BSL does not work to reduce dog bites. A 2010 Toronto Humane Society survey found no change in the number of dog bites before and after BSL.
- Please reconsider singling out pitbull types.
- It's not dog breeds that are bad, it's bad owners
- No to bsl
- BSL fails to address the real problem of harmful owners who breed and raise dog to encourage violent qualities. We need education, not a ban
- i think there should be more coverage at local dog parks. Theres alot that happens there without any officials being near by.
- There is only one true American Put Bull terrier. The dogs you are condemning with BSL are overwhelmingly mutts and not actually "pit bulls";
- Breed specific laws are outdated and have proven multiple times that they do not work. It's archaic and completely ignorant.
- There needs to be a time where a dog barks but can be outside. Such as 20min. Right now there is no specified time and it is confusing.
- There needs to be patrolling of on and off leash parks .In 22 years, I have seen one By-Law officer.Need a Bark Watch Program.
- Electronic noise radar available for rent to record and validate noise complaints of nuisance pets and assist in fines and court cases.
- I agree. If it's problem owners not problem dogs then the owners should need to get certified and not be able to own for ten years.
- I think the specific restrictions on pit bulls is disgusting and if that law is passed Calgary should be ashamed.
- No breed specific bans or special treatment! Any breed of dog can be aggressive, owners should be held accountable to do mandatory training
- It's very hard to tell if it's a bad owner until an incident occurs. Then in most cases, it's too late. The penalties are much too lax.
- Pit or bull type dogs should not be part of any bylaw discussion. Somewhat disgusted that my city would consider this. I do not own a pit.
- BSL doesn't work.
- I watch the news everyday... Twice. I saw nothing on this and missed phase 1. I feel that breed specific legislation is abhorrent.



- There should be no BSL. The problem lies with the owners, they should impacted, NOT animals.
- Disappointed the city is considering BSL in the bylaw. The reasoning that pitbulls have a stronger bite is absurd. It's also discriminatory.
- No ideas
- No
- strict rules for private pet sitting businesses. Often causes distress to neighboring pets. Strict rules and regulations
- Breed specific bylaws do not work (as seen in other provinces). It's bad owners that need to be addressed and educated. No to BSL!!!
- "Outdoor cats" should be banned unless harnesses and leashed in a backyard. The fine should be \$1500. A cat unleashed is never going to stay
- Training for humans is important. Children must display appropriate behavior around animals. Small dogs instigate a lot of fights in parks.
- Livestock should be clarified. Hens/ducks/pigs what is and isn't allowed for urban areas.
- More patrolling of parks/off leash areas by By-Law officers, not only to enforce regulations, but to connect with the public.
- There are no problem dog breeds, just problem dog owners. Please stop picking on pitbulls.
- There needs to be a time where a dog barks but can be outside// More garbages in parks for owners to put dog's waste....
- No
- None
- Remove any mention of pit bulls or specific breeds. What an absurd thing to have to suggest in 2020. Targeting a breed does not work.
- Increased rents for those larger dogs that do not have a history of bad behaviour should be looked into
- 2016 calgary choose not to implement BSL and still managed to reduce bites. "Pitbulls" are NOT the problem.
- I think we need to offer more resources to pet owners instead of taking their rights away.
- If the animals are in a persons yard, contained and not causing a disturbance then no fees to the animal owner.
- The pitbulls bylaw idea is crude and disappointing to read, as it all stems from how the owner is NOT the breed.
- Feces cleanup is an issue and I do not see it being enforced. Fines are only relevant if enforced.
- I don't understand why we are still singling out pit bulls and bull breeds as different from any other dog. No bad dogs, just bad owners!
- Some type of financial assistance for lower income pet owners, who wish to get their dog obedience training.
- Mandatory training to obtain dog license (like with driver's license).
- No



- ...
 - Require an obedience refresher and a behaviour analysis in order to keep a pet license valid. Not breed specific.
 - stop villainizing specific breeds and focus on owner responsibility and training
 - More enforcement to deter dog owners that always have off leash dogs in on leash parks or areas . This problem is actually become way worse
 - Please stop discriminating against pit bull type dogs. You have a system in place that has worked wonderfully, there is no need to change it
 - Cats at large are a big problem I would like to see cat fines at \$250
 - Spaying or neutering a dog should not be enforced as it staves off cancer in certain breeds
 - Human brutality to animals is not being covered. Restricting a breed is the wrong move , it owner require training not the breed
 - Rather than focusing on a specific breed for aggression why not crack down on bad owners and breeders?
 - Education is always better. When a pet is registered they should get a voucher to a force free training facility. Or when a fee is issued
 - Remove the *pitbull* wording from this, the dogs are NOT the problem, the owners are , they should NOT be labelled .
 - I don't think cats should be licensed. They are cats..... unless they are outdoor cats. No licensing for indoor cats
 - "Mandatory and free pet training for all first time pet owners.
-
- Fine for humans who touch dogs without owner permission"
 - Do NOT make breed specific laws, it's completely unnecessary. If a dog has a history of aggression then deal with that, not the breed.
 - Before making bylaws regarding animals, City Council should have to consult with wildlife experts, Certified Dog trainers and Veterinarians
 - Look at the bylaws / rules for off-leash parks. "No bicycle riding within the off-leash park" including children "walking" their dog.
 - TNR of the rabbits that roam Repsol Sport Centre. As cute as they are they're becoming invasive to the area.
 - Placing limits on how many dogs per handler while walking. Dog walkers with a pack of 3 or more dogs either on leash or off is unacceptable.
 - Breed specific legislation is not acceptable or necessary. Owner legislation for problem dogs with problem behaviours is!
 - People claim an animal is an ESA and demand the same treatment as a service dog. They are/should not be the same. Clear guidelines are needed!
 - Higher fines and quicker responses for barking dogs



- In addition to a low income pet licensing option, I would like to also see either lower impound fees for low income Calgarians.
- Do not discriminate dog breeds, deal with aggressive/nuisance or not obedient dogs with higher penalties.
- There should be a license implemented to pet owners. Just like we need a license to own guns or fish.
- "At my non-profit dog rescue, we offer free training with every single dog despite their breed.
- Dogs are individuals, BSL does not work."
- Pitbulls should not be singled out!
- Stop singling out pit bulls and instead focus on the people who train them to be mean
- No Breed Specific Legislation! Leave pit bulls alone!
- We need reps at offleash parks to educate and mediate where necessary, and we need a law against "outdoor dogs" - esp in winter. Not okay!
- Please look to progressive practices that respect all dogs as dogs rather than target specific breeds. I am so disappointed Calgary.
- Training, not breed bias. Many small K9s instigate attacks due to poor training/socializing but end up hurt due to responding K9's size.
- Pit bulls make amazing companions and have many myths surrounding them. Do your research!
- Pitbulls are sweet, beautiful animals and it is NOT fair to ban the breed because of bad owners!
- An education program to teach people about the dangers of approaching wildlife and domestic animals alike.
- Breed specific laws have been shown not to work and any dog can be aggressive. Mandate better training and hold negligent owners accountable.
- Do Not agree with Pittbull specific laws. That's terrible and discrimination against the dog and the responsible pet owners!
- Please do NOT implement a breed ban or any special restrictions based on breed. Any dog can bite and poor trained dogs exist in all breeds.
- Cyclists -of any age- should not be allowed in off leash areas
- STOP BREED DISCRIMINATION!
- Breed specific legislation makes no sense.
- Program to teach people to ask owners if ok to pet dog and not get upset when owner tries to show correct way of approaching!
- Focus more on providing resources for owners to train their dogs properly. A dog's behaviour is more due to their owner than themselves.
- Echoing what I already see in the comments. Pit bulls aren't the issue. Speak to animal therapy groups for insight (PALS)
- Why are we still singling out Pitbulls and bully breeds. Focus on responsible owners and training regardless of breed
- Focus on bad ownership and not specific breeds of cats/dogs.



- Please stop punishing animals for stupid people, pit bulls and bigger dogs aren't aggressive or the problem, it's humans doing a BAD JOB
- I would like to see that if a dog owner and cat owner takes a class on pet ownership they get their dog or cat license-free the first year.
- BSL only gives old people and [REMOVE] something to talk about. It would be nice if you could stop other people's cats from craping inmy yard
- na
- Let's get chickens approved.
- "More enforcement
- /reporting for ticketing people not picking up after their dogs. This is becoming more of a problem."
- Ban the sale of puppies/kittens in retail stores - only 1 location exists in Calgary
- place boxes of litter bags on walking paths , like the town of Canmore does.
- You need more bylaw officers enforcing leashing rules on in-city walking trails.
- N/A
- pit bulls or any bully breed dog SHOULD have the right to use off leash parks freely, AND WITHOUT muzzles unless owner seems neceasry
- License fees. Buy only once and its registered for the life of the pet. You get an online registered number on your account plus the tag.
- bylaw officers should be regularly be patrolling off leash dog parks and enforcing the bylaws.
- You are discriminating against dog breeds. That is unlawful. Focus on the real issues. Dogs off leash everywhere, feces everywhere etc.
- Breed specific legislation does NOT work. To introduce it now is taking a major step backwards for society.
- Pet ownership is expensive and a massive responsibility. If you are struggling to pay the standard licensing fee, how are you going to feed.
- Discrimination against specific dog breeds is a terrible idea. If a dog has been declared a nuisance then, yes, apply penalties.
- Liability insurance mandatory for dogs that have bitten. Higher fines. Dogs that have no obedience training banned from off leash parks.
- We should not discriminate against a certain breed, Pitbulls are not inherently dangerous. It all depends on how the dog is raised.
- No breed specific legislation. Deal with irresponsible owners don't punish dog breeds based on misinformation and fear mongering.
- No outdoor dogs. Huge fine
- Where is a review of the face covering bylaw? So much bullying and discrimination thanks to creating so much hysteria.
- I don't think it's fair to single out pitbulls. They are not dangerous unless someone trained them to be dangerous.



- Breed Specific Legislation is not the solution to problem behaviour in ANY dog. Education is the solution. Education keeps everyone safe!
- People with small dogs that are not trained should be looked at just as closely as large dogs.
- Focus on deterring bad owners, and not on punishing breeds due to bad owners. Calgary has been the rolemodel for responsible ownership.
- Stop picking on pitbulls. You literally said they do not have a higher number of bite incidents. Focus on training and resources for owners.
- No
- Discriminating against pit bull breeds won't solve dog bite issues. There are other more aggressive breeds, regardless of "bite strength"
- No
- I don't think it's fair that a licensing fee is charged for indoor cats. I'd support a bylaw that mandates a chip identification program.
- Bylaws should be focused on training and education rather than breed specific restrictions. Rarely is the breed the actual issue.
- Focusing on pit bull specific by-laws is wrong, small Breed dog bite more people than pit bulls combined
- Pit bulls are not the issue the stupid people with dumb dogs that are not trained are . Saying pit bulls are bad is [remove]
- Please no dogs inside shops!
- Anyone proposing a BSL hasn't done any research, it's about the owners. As a pitbull owner I will no longer be able to visit my family
- I am absolutely against any breed specific legislation. Over and over again studies have proved pit bull (and type) are not the issue.
- Education programs through schools in the city would provide a world of good. Children are too apt to run up to animals they don't know.
- "animals left in cars
- animals left outside year round in all kinds of conditions...
- retailers selling animals under the guise of adoption"
- There is an owner who allows his pit bull loose along the green space in Evergreen. Behind Evermeadow Avenue SW. Not acceptable.
- I have none.

- I don't anymore ideas to offer.
- Do not discriminate against certain breeds!!
- The questions were to subjective based on how a stranger perceived the interaction. Colour coded identifiers-awesome but personal accountabi



- Please stop pushing new bylaws we do need more laws and we already hate the by law officers why the heck is this even a debate?
- Mandatory training for all dogs, especially small breeds, that goes beyond ONE class. Training is lifelong. More focus on small breeds
- Livestock emotional support animals should only include certain species.
- There are no dangerous dog breeds there are dangerous dogs with irresponsible owners who have not trained or socialized their dog properly.
- Higher fines for dog bites. No breed specific rules.
- Breed specific by-laws are a huge step backwards!
- "I am 100% against breed specific laws!!
- Any dog can be aggressive, its how they are raised/raised, its not the breed its the owner"
- DO NOT discriminate against dog breeds .It's ALL on the owner to be responsible with there pet.
- No ideas
- Focus more on suppling resources I.e. cheaper/free neutering programs, cheap/free training programs, breed education programs. Educate.
- It is disgusting that you have tried to implement a bylaw targeting the pit bull breed. Police the owners not the breed.
- Stop punishing dog breeds for things that humans do. Bully breeds are some of the sweetest dogs!
- Do something about back yard breeders! Implementing licensing or registration would help ensure they meet standards and protect animals
- No
- Don't single out pitties. Maybe all dogs should have to pass socialization training before being permitted to go to the dog park.
- Breed-specific legislation is discriminatory, and fosters an environment of fear around bully breeds. This is a step backwards, not forwards
- Pit bulls should NOT be discriminated against!! I think it should be based off the animal behaviour not breed!
- No
- Outdoor cats (owned, licenced, not feral) should not be allowed. There's simply no reason for it. It's dangerous for the cat and disruptive
- "After 3 complaints against an animal owner they should have to attend behavior classes for both the animal and owner.
- A parenting class."
- Education for responsible pet ownership instead of creating BSL that are based off of a persons discretion as to what is a pitbull or not.
- Encourage teaching kids not to run in off-leash park dogs have a prey drive and running in a park.
- Provide obedience training as part of the system for addressing nuisance dogs. And offer it free so that low income owners have access.



- I think the city should do research in how to EDUCATE children on how to interact with dogs. A huge push to LEAVE them alone.
- I strongly disagree with the targeting of bully breeds in this survey.
- When multiple complaints have been received for a pet owner the authority should look into it further for the well-being of the animal. Also
- "Allow chickens and bees for residential keepers.
- Nuisance pet owners are worse than any particular breed. Keep an eye on them."
- I would very much support some type of program that makes access to training easier and more affordable. Pitbulls are not the problem.
- "Free dog bags dispenser at parks
- Only 3 cats max.
- barking if it's your own dog: higher fine
- Dog is a fostered rescue: no fine"
- I'm really concerned about the tone around breed specific legislation. This is morally and legally unsound and will undo so much
- Obviously anyone with a pit bull isn't going to be happy about the proposal and I have mixed feeling so would like to see more information
- The concept of "pit bull type" is archaic. Responsible pet ownership and training should be the standard not breed specific
- Responsible pet owner classes and seizures of animals if the owner are unable/willing to care for animals
- Pit bulls are not more dangerous than any other dog breed. Pit bulls have a bite force of 235 pounds, Rotties and German Shepherds have 238+
- Limit the number of dog and cat licenses per neighbor. There should be a long wait list to get a license in the beltline for dogs.
- BSL is a harmful stigma to the "pitbull";, other breeds are far more a risk and nuisance than a pitbull. More bad owners than bad dogs.
- "1. GET [Removed] WITH SINGULARING OUT PITBULL GET RID OF IT.
- 2. What about fining children who don't listen and pet my dog?"
- Mandatory training for fist time pet owners
- A breed ban is an awful idea and it simply doesn't work. Owners a bigger determinant of dog behaviour than the breed of the dog.
- Breed Specific Laws are a good way to show your ignorance.
- What is being done about backyard breeders? Would the maximum 6 dogs allowed partially help with this?
- The license fee for a cat or dog should be either reduced, waived or refunded when a dog is in a temporary foster home for a short period.
- Stop picking on pitbull breeds. First it was Dobermans, then Pinchers, then German Shepards, now Pitbulls. IT. IS. NOT. THE. BREED.



- The city and adoption organizations should prioritize and support dog obedience training more.
- Dogs should have to pass a behaviour test in order to use the dog parks. Stricter enforcement of dog parks.
- There is a need for more offleash parks in central north Calgary - Country, Panorama and Coventry Hills
- When animal licenses are paid, owners must sign an agreement to the bylaws regarding pet ownership and off leash park rules/etiquette
- I find it disgusting that the city would consider discriminating against a dog based on breed or appearance
- Covers a lot
- Targeting pitbulls specifically as a problem breed is the worst thing our city could do
- Bylaws should target the homeowners and pet owners, we need responsible ownership and people need to take accountability for their actions.
- n/A
- The notion of breed specific legislation is prejudice and unethical.
- more education on dog behavior and there body language should be the most important thing we focus on. off leash parks are a mess.
- Bully breeds should not be singled out. Many other breeds are of equal strength and just as likely to bite. No to BSL!
- None
- I do not support breed specific legislation that discriminates against specific breeds
- More education and enforcement is needed in regards to off-leash dogs in non off-leash areas.
- No new ideas
- No
- None
- Responsible pet ownership: mandatory spaying/neutering. Not for profit clinics help First Nations communities with this, City can do this to
- I strongly believe that charging high fines for problem behaviours reduces the ability to afford programs to train and rehabilitate
- Pets offer a lot of comfort and companionship. My dogs have been very important to the family during Covid and keeping our spirits high.
- Stop punishing bully breeds
- it has been proven that breed restrictions do not work, maybe actually consult veterinary professionals before making assumptions
- Focusing on one specific breed of dog is [removed]. It's not the dogs, it's the owners. BSL is horrible and better not pass.
- not too sure
- No
- Breed specific laws are a bad idea. The problem is nuisance animals with bad owners.



- "Breed specific legislation is not the answer.
- Stiffer consequences for repeat offenders. Including removal of animal if habitual offender."
- Breed specific legislation has been proven to not work time and time again.
- Breed specific legislation does not work. Education and access to training support for ALL breeds and dog owners keeps everyone safe.
- There should be more legislation for breeders. Some of them really don't treat the animals well and / or have way too many on a small space.
- Bylaws should be focused on training and education rather than breed specific restrictions. Rarely is the breed the actual issue
- Outdoor cats should not be allowed to just roam and use the world as their litter box. Cap on animals needs to be lowered. With exceptions
- The BSL will not help Calgary. Many breeds have stronger bites than Pit Bulls and you aren't worried about them. Blame the owners instead
- If any of these new by-laws get approved I believe it should be for all dogs no matter size or breed. Breed discrimination is not right
- I strongly believe a bsl will not do anything but cause issue, bylaw should focus on proper education of specific breeds.
- Pit bulls or dogs that look like pit bulls are not the issue. Whoever is supporting these ideas needs more education on the matter.
- Cats should be treated exactly the same as dogs on a leash at all times. Fines should be the same as well
- Responsible pet owners with licensed pets should not be fined if their animal escapes their property. Unless it's repetitive or aggressive.
- No breed specific by laws should ever be passed.
- Mandatory attendance at a behavioral animal session before purchase or adoption of an animal.
- Rules should not be breed specific, it shows a political reaction rather than an animal smart thought out law.
- animals should NOT be euthanized for aggressive behaviors. Instead they and owners be required to complete intensive behaviour retraining
- People living in a condo apartment that have approval for their cat(s) should not have to license the animal in addition to board approval
- Please stop singling out "pitbull" type breeds. More enforcement should be for ALL dog breeds that are aggressive.
- I do not agree with lumping all pit bulls and treating them as nuisance animals. Focus on actual nuisance animals not breeds.
- Bylaws should be focused on specific issues not specific breeds. The fact is ALL dogs can bite. ALL dogs can cause injury.
- "Why don't we focus on increasing fines for animal cruelty/abuse/neglect?"
- Stop stereotyping against certain breeds...humans ruin everything"



- The C of Calgary needs to crackdown HARD on owners who continue to walk dogs off-leash in residential areas.
- Don't discriminate against pit bulls. They aren't involved in more bites than others, and there are PLENTY of dogs that have "great strength";
- Breed-specific bylaws are a terrible idea. Please reconsider this terminology.
- Selling animals in retail stores should be banned.
- Indoor dogs and cats should have a lower licensing fee.
- N/A
- no
- increase in fines for barking dogs, more explicit wording that dogs who are barking need to be brought inside and not left in the yard.
- People need to learn that if a dog bites a human, most of the time it is the humans error. Not watching warning signs from the dog ect
- If people aren't comfortable with "pit bulls"; being in off leash parks - designate a FEW that are pit bull free, while allowing them in some
- Breed specific laws are outdated and show a lack of knowledge on the governments part. Focus on mandating responsible ownership
- For life pet licence
- Dont punish the breed, look at the owner and how they can grow and learn to do a better job
- Limited "farm"; animals on property with a city permit and city approved housing for these animals
- Your focus MUST remain on behaviour of owners, not the breed of dog.
- Bylaw officers need to respond faster and with less red tape paperwork. Owners are the problem - Not the dog. How to ENFORCE laws?
- None
-
- Barking dog complaints need change. Right now if someone complains about barking dog they have to be identified and go to court in order for
- Focus on owner awareness and training, not breeds. If you can't control your dog, don't let it off leash.
- Breed specific legislation has proven not to work in other cities. Consider incentives for training courses/cert (e.g., reduced license \$).
- Stop with the specific breeds laws. Any dog can be aggressive.
- In case you missed it- BSL doesn't work. Claiming it's because the dogs are bigger and can do more damage just shows your lack of education.
- Due proper research before you sounds completely ignorant. Pit bulls and pit bull like breeds.
- Golden retrievers have the most reported bites. should we have special laws for them ?? What about cat scratches ? Leave pitties alone.



- Extremely disappointed in the inclusion of BSL (Breed Specific Leg) in this survey and the absolute lack of evidence based language. DO BETTER
- Don't discriminate against dog breeds. More damage is possible but not a guarantee will happen. Fear mongering isn't helpful.
- Increased bylaw presence to manage off leash dogs in on leash areas.
- It's not the "pit bulls"; fault it's the other end of the leash.
- The discrimination against pit bulls is ridiculous. Shepherds, Rottweilers and Great Danes are all equally strong and don't have a bad rep
- There should be mandatory pet training for new pet owners or repeat "offenders";. It's never the breed.
- STOP FEAR MONGERING! please. Its already impossible to rent a place if you have a pitbull. This could've been a convo on ownership. Ugh,WHY?
- Pit bulls are not the problem. It's the owner. Quit discriminating against the breed
- Absolutely no Breed Specific legislation, it is not the breed that is the issue but the owners of said animal.
- No breed specific legislation!
- No breed specific rules. Animal behaviour is the owners responsibility.
- A bylaw for residents who refuse to control or have removed pigeons that have taken up resident on their rooftops, under solar panels, etc.
- you're doing this against pits for their "strong bite" but there are many breeds with strong bites quit singling out pits.
- review status of Silbmer Springs Botanical garden as being an off leash area when the city built exactly that option just across the street
- Higher restrictions for dogs who have been aggressive, not based on breed. And address backyard breeders/puppy mills more effectively.
- Laws that single out pit bulls specifically is CRUEL and disgusting. Fear mongering. This will only result in more animals in the shelter.
- Bylaws should focus on training and education, not on breed specific legislation. Pitbull breeds deserve to be at dog parks as well.
- Landlords, especially corporate owned condos, should have to allow pets especially if pets have no history of bad behaviour.
- Fines for animals bites should be put into a fund for helping other animals/families with animals(spay neuterprogram/ licensing for LIF
- excessive barking at odd times 4am. Also dogs off leash one of whom jumped on a kid. People not picking up after their dogs ALL THE TIME
- "Pit bull"; breeds are not the issue, it's the lack of education towards reactive dogs and neglectful owners that cause more dog bites.
- Mandatory spay and neuter of pets by 6 months-1 year old besides registered breeders who must be assessed and obtain a license to breed.



- Fines higher for people who have their dogs off leash in an on leash park. These irresponsible dog owners cause incidents between dogs.
- Do not punish owners for having certain breeds, punish neglectful and irresponsible owners of any breed!!
- BSL is not, and is never a good option. Poor dog behaviour should reviewed on a case by case basis - not based on the breed.
- Target good dog ownership, don't punish a dog for being a pit bull.
- The city needs to be involved in the control of the urban feral rabbit population.
- Do not target the bully breeds. Classifying a dog by the shape of his head is wrong. Every dog is different and should be treated as such.
- I'm surprised there is no discussion on number of dogs allowed by dog walkers! In my opinion, no more than 6 is manageable.
- Careful condemning dogs that bite, some bite as a reaction to another dog's aggressive behaviour. This needs more of a holistic approach.
- No
- Please have more visible signage in on leash only areas that dogs that are off leash owner can be fined.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong! It will not stop bites. The owners should be held responsible
- Pitbulls are not the issue it is BAD OWNERS! Shame on the city for trying to implement BSL.
- Licensed breeders only. No retail selling of animals. Limit ownership per household to 2.
- Breed specific legislation is not the way to address nuisance dogs
- No more wandering licenced cats. Leashed in yard kust like a dog. I am sick of finding dead birds and mice on my property from the cat nxtdr
- No
- please put more enforcement/larger fines on animals at large (specifically cats). Huge nuisance having to clean up after other's cats
- Certain breeds or mixes should not have more rules in place than other breeds.
- Install cameras in off-leash parks so a complaint can be properly investigated. Many owners do not call their dogs from jumping on others.
- Behaviour training needs to be more affordable and accessible. Dog racism is not needed and won't solve anything!
- This is terrible. Pitbull breeds are the most loving and affectionate dogs I've ever encountered. It's the owner, not the dog!
- Pls increase fines for people who don't pickup after their pets ..as well as cats at large not everyone likes to clean up after others pets
- Breed specific legislation is a bad idea from the very start. Any breed can harm, any breed can be friendly.
- We're awfully focused on the negative - why can't good dogs have more off-leash privileges?
- Please actually have bylaw show up when there is a complaint.



- Additional bylaw needed for dogs being walked off-leash in on-leash areas.. There are too many owners that think it's okay..
- It is clearly stated that Pitbulls have no more bite offences than other dogs. Stop breed discrimination!
- Definitely against breed specific legislation, this is essentially dog "racism". Its more about owner responsibility than it is about breed.
- actual enforcement from by-law officers would be great. I've only ever seen them sitting in their trucks around the city
- Breed specific laws are not a solution to non responsible pet owners. Having a lifetime license would be very convenient and a great idea.
- Why are pit bulls a focus of this and discriminated against ? The wording should be changed to nuisance dogs nothing to do with breed.
- Bylaws should be focused on training and education rather that breed specific restrictions. Research has shown breed isn't the issue.
- I fail to understand why fines are not substantially higher. It cost more to enforce than fines generate.
- I'm concerned about off leash dogs in on leash areas. As a mom to 2 small kids I don't like strange dogs approaching me and my kids.
- No
- More opportunities for education, both for pet owners and children. An understanding of animal behavior would help everyone, especially pets
- The insurance idea is [stupid], if you worked in insurance you would know it's not that "easy" to get extra liability insurance for a dog
- None at the moment!
- Stop focusing on specific breeds AKA Pitt bulls, any dog is capable of biting. Focus on proper training and resources.
- N/A
- The breed of a particular dog is not the problem, the owner and home environment are. Training is key.
- I am against breed specific legislation. Target the owners who are unable to properly train their pets.
- Changing bylaws based on public consensus is wrong. Get the facts, talk to experts. BSL is not the answer. Educate, don't fear monger.
- The "pit bull" breeds are unfairly targeted in this survey.
- Should not be held liable if you give a fair warning not to come near your animal, and someone gets bit. That's on their own[remove].
- I do NOT support breed specific legislation. The "Pit bull type" definition described in this engagement is worrisome to say the least.
- "Please stop overgeneralizing an entire breed.
- A multi-year licensing program would be very helpful."



- no licensing fees. Get people to licence their animal is more important than fees. free licences and then fees for animals found outside
- There needs to be easier ways to report barking dogs, and quicker/more effective response. Higher fines only work if they're actually issued
- THE PROJECT TEAM- Do any of you own a (Bull Type Dog)?? Seems one sided!
- People leaving when their dog has bitten is high. number of people who don't pick up after their dog is terrible. Don't know what we can do
- Cats at large are a significant issue in this city and need more attention.
- no BSL. DO not punish an imaginary breed idea because of some dogs. Punish owners.
- There are several breeds that include SMALL DOGS that can be aggressive and this should apply to all.
- There are dog breeds with the jaw strength equivalent to a "pit bull", especially when heightened or in a stressful situation. Unfair.
- Pitbulls deserve respect. Harsher punishments for those found abusing their pets including at puppy mills.
- Don't be [Remove] about pit bulls. You are being irresponsible even suggesting it, and this will cause more harm than good.
- NO BSL Breed Specific Legislation Solely on breed. It should be based on owner awareness and ability to train/attend training.
- I would like to see more enforcement and education of pets on leashes in non off-leash areas.
- Would like to see the city enforce the current bylaws instead of spending \$ on this ridiculous survey to micromanage citizens even more!
- If a dog owner has their dog off leash in a 'on leash' park, but the dog is well managed and not bothering anyone, it shouldn't be a fine.
- Animal cruelty and neglect laws. Anyone found guilty -includes hitting an animal, should be heavily fined/jailed, pet removed and counselling
- You should have some kind of protection against puppy mill breeding practices, especially if you are raising the animal limit.
- Make it more accessible and affordable for dog training for all breeds of dogs. Pit bulls and breed specific type dogs are not the problem.
- It would be nice to have small dog off leash areas where big dogs are not allowed to be in. Dogs under 30 lbs
- It is unfair to set standards and laws against one specific breed (pit bulls in this case) when more often than not it is the owners fault.
- There are fines for people not picking up after their animals but no one enforcing these rules so it does not deter people
- Instead of archaic BSL legislation, start reviewing dog trainers and ensuring all dogs have access to positive reward based trainers.
- It is not about the breed it's the owner. Even with private sales of animals there should be a process so people can be screened.



- Any dog can cause a severe bite. There is no reason to single out a "pit bull type" and doesn't benefit anyone to think of dogs in this way.
- Seriously, targeting one breed of dog is shortsighted and disappointing.
- Fine individuals for false reports of nuisance pets, all too often owners receive complaints that based on hatred for an animal, not on facts
- "BSL IS NO BETTER THAN RACISM.

- You said yourself, pitbulls arent more likely to bite. It's not the breed!

- Wake up its 2020"
- I think bringing pitbulls into this is a joke considering i have been bit by dogs in the community before and not one was from a large dog.
- I wish obedience training wasn't so expensive.
- STOP picking on pit bulls! IT IS NOT THE BREED. ridiculous....
- Pit bulls are no more a threat than any other dog. Offer rebates on approved obedience classes to incentivize people to learn and train.
- Why are there considerations being made to specifically target pit bull breeds? This is disgusting and makes me ashamed to be Calgarian.
- It's been proven other dogs are more aggressive than bullies. As stated in THIS agenda ...bullies have less incidents of aggression.
- Bikes in off leash dog parks should not be allowed.
- Leave pit bulls alone. Penalize owners for not taking responsibility with their dogs. Incentivize obedience and training.
- .
- More bylaw officers at off leash parks and more smaller off leash parks that are fenced in
- No
- Breed specific bans are ridiculous - owners are the problem and they should be penalized
- "Unless it is a puppy or if no effort has been made
- To stop the noise, only then should a fine be issued but only after a few warnings."
- I do not support anything that discriminates against any particular dog breed. Owners who are repeat offenders should also be restricted.
- The fact that Calgary is considering breed specific legislation is horrific. It is not the dog, it is how they are raised.
- use fines to start a grant for low-income pet owners to help with obedience costs if required.
- BSL is [remove]!!!
- Calgary has great off leash parks, but their needs to be me off leash access to water in the city
- No breed specific legislation.



- Have you thought of allowing the family horse to come for a birthday party or gathering?
- DO NOT make restrictions based on the dogs breed as it is not the breed. It is the way the owner trains and raises them
- Discrimination towards an specific breed of dogs isn't a good idea. Proper training For the owners is what you guys needs to be enforced.
- A license should be required to own a pit bull. They are not a bad breed, but too often have bad owners. This would address the issue.
- T
- Mandatory obedience training for dogs of all breeds and sizes. Perhaps increase the license fee to include a class provided by the city.
- Laws targeted against specific breeds is NOT the answer. Proper training of the owner is what's needed. We're the problem not the dogs!
- I believe that training should become mandatory.
- There should be no breed-specific policing of dogs. All breeds can be considered "dangerous"; not just "pit bulls";.
- Waive pet licenses and charge to get into off leash dog parks instead - keeping aggressive and irresponsible pet owners out of the dog parks
- no
- No
- Requiring a course before allowing people to own a pet and purchasing a license
- Breed Specific Legislation will negate most animal rescue organizations in Alberta. This is unacceptable.
- Any dog can be good if it has the right house and training. Including Pitbulls. Please dont make me muzzle my 2 babies when i walk them.
- There needs to be more regulation to address backyard breeders. Perhaps requiring a license to breed and sell dogs/cats or any live animals.
- I'm thankful that the City is taking the lead on doing something about vicious dogs. Too many dog owners are not in control of their animals
- Breed specification against pitbulls is ridiculous and wrong!!! If this were between human race it would be considered racism!! Shame on you
- Targeting pitbulls is extremely wrong and misguided. I am extremely angry and will fight this 100%
- I believe that if every dog owner understood dog behaviour/language they would know what is/isn't healthy play and learn to manage it.
- There needs to be more off-leash parks (south). They have a right to exercise and the closest park is a 20 min drive. Ridiculous!
- I would be very disappointed if the city puts in a breed based laws. It has been shown that it does not work
- A reduced licensing fee for low income households is ridiculous. If you cannot afford the licensing fee you cannot afford to be a pet owner.



- No
- Neighbours should be able to use dog silencers to control barking in their neighborhood. As long as it does not harm the animal
- I think that spaying and neutering should be mandatory unless the owner applies for an exemption in order to intentionally breed the animal.
- Licenses for animal breeders and fines for backyard breeders. Help cut down on the amount of animals in shelters and euthanization.
- If an owner receives a disturbance of the peace (aggressive barking) fee multiple times, they have to get obedience training that they attend
- You cannot put all "nuisance" dogs under the same umbrella...noise complaints and biting are very different and need to have different rules
- Make it a city law that condo/multi-residence buildings that allow dogs for any time length supply a area and maintain a marked pet area
- More education for non dog owners about expected dog behaviour and behaviour around dogs (speeding past them on bicycles etc)
- Breed specific laws are ineffective and punish good dog owners.
- It should be considered animal abuse to take pets into stressful situations where there are too many people and too much stimulation.
- I have no dogs but my four adult kids have 5 dogs between them. All large breed dogs: pitbull, bull terrier, shepard. Train the owners!
- Pit bull type dogs should not be unfairly discriminated against.
- I would like to see a discounted licensing fee for multiple dog homes, where both pets are spayed and responsibly cared for.
- I feel that large breeds and bully breeds of dogs are being harassed through misinformation. The dogs are not the problem, the owners are.
- Yes, please raise fines for feeding birds human food in yard that attracts nuisance animals (such as crows, ravens that tease domestic dogs
- How about we stop vilifying certain breeds of dogs (especially pitbulls) and base changes to our laws off accurate information instead of fear
- We should not be allowing any type of farm animals or exotic pets in the city regardless if they are deemed emotional support animals.
- Do not set limits on one breed - it's the owners that need reminders and training and fines. It's their fault, not the dogs.
- N/A
- Pitbulls should not be singled out, there are many larger breed canines that can cause severe damage from a bite or attack.
- A rule requiring an owner to stay at the scene after their dog has bitten would be impossible to enforce...found this out firsthand
- Please do not make separate legislation against pit bulls, it is unfair to the owners and the dogs.



- There must be more proactive visits and inspections to the dog parks and pathways. Why go during the slow periods? Visit in the winter too!
- Dog parks and neglectful owners that don't supervise their dog etc. Letting them run out of sight, hyperactive dogs
- I think you should have to have mandatory obedience training when you get a dog to be able to licence them. And you must licence your pet.
- The breed shouldn't be singled out. I know of a few attacks on other animals that WERE NOT pitties/crosses - all dogs treated equal
- Pit-bulls and other Bully Breeds are not by nature more dangerous than any other dog breeds. Bad owners not bad dogs.
- Mainly stop getting on the bandwagon of breed specific rules. Stop trying to label pit bulls it really is ignorant.
- Needs to be more fenced off-leash parks in the city to reduce over-crowding at current ones. Not all dogs can safely go to unfenced parks.
- No
- The city acknowledges that there are no observable increases in breed-specific bite frequency but continues to support a fear-based approach
- I think overall the laws and fines need to be enforced based on the owners behaviour not the dogs. Dogs learn from humans so why punish them?
- "- look at the owner and how they trained the dog."
 - Look at what the victim did. the victim sometime provoke dogs."
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work and is discrimination. Calgary needs stricter enforcement of responsible pet ownership, not BSL.
- Please do not punish the animals for poor owners. Breed specific legislation does not work and does not hold the proper offenders responsible
- DOGS SHOULD BE ALLOWED ON PATIOS!
- Breed specific legislation has not worked before Singling out pitbulls is not the answer.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong. It's the humans who need to be held accountable. You could offer responsible pet ownership training.
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work, I have had more problems with poorly trained rat dogs acting aggressively towards my dog
- I find it completely ignorant that the city discriminates dogs on their breed and/or appearance. Guess we should discriminate people too!
- If you want less and less people to live in Calgary because you are trying to discriminate against a dog breed, this is the way to go.
- Define how long a dog can bark before it's considered a nuisance. In most cities it's 20 minutes.
- Breed specific bylaws are NOT the answer. These bylaws should look to enforce responsible pet ownership.
- I hate the idea of labeling an entire breed of dogs as unsafe. The attitude of the animal is 100% based on training and treatment of animal



- BSL is NEVER the answer. Absolutely any dog can be dangerous and cause injury. We need heightened accountability/fees/requirements for owners.
- I think your current approach to pit bulls is unfair and uncalled for. Pitbulls aren't a breed, it's a look to a dog.
- Stay out of our lives. Your job is infrastructure. You're over reaching forcing of absolutely everything is tiresome to the silent majority
- Dog parks meant for only small dogs/puppies, and separate for large dogs. Same size and amenities (river, trees, etc)
- Can you look at small aggressive dogs as an issue?
- Proper enforcement for pet owners that have animals off leash in non-off leash areas
- I agree that breed specific legislation is not the way to go, we need higher penalties for irresponsible dog owners.
- The city bylaw group is thinks you can force people to agree. It really is none of your business how many domestic pets I need.
- The fact that your considering breed specific legislation is infuriating.
- Breed specific targets animals not the owner. Nuisance dog owners need to be more accountable.
- Allow home owners to destroy unwanted pigeons on their property!
- Cats who kill another animal aren't mentioned in city fines. I would expect that this should be the same for both/all species.
- I do not agree with a city wide bully ban. Tons of Bully breeds are sweethearts. It sometimes comes down to a non-specific breed that isn't
- One person posting pro pitbull gibberish over and over. Pitbulls killed more kids in the U.S. last year than all other breeds combined.
- Breed specific legis'l'n is ineffective and shouldnt be introduced in Calgary- many municipalities are elimiinating it.Dont single out pitbulls
- ..
- Breed Specific legislation is ignorance in it's truest form
- Off leash dogs parks having a separate fenced in area for smaller dogs; I have seen this in cities in Vancouver/Fraser Valley, BC area.
- Fines - breeding without license, increase with each offence, MUCH bigger fines/jail time for animal abuse and database
- Bylaw officers at high traffic dog parks during popular movies weekend hours would help tremendously. Skip the BSL, we know it doesn't work.
- Do not single out a breed. The dogs actions are a direct result of the owner, no matter what size or breed. It's the owner, not the breed!
- Stop singling out specific breeds. It's not the dogs, it's their owners. Dogs do what their owners train or condition them to do.
- Education is needed for all pet owners. Pets are animals not family members, the cost of management need be less than income of license/fees



- I think we should have a bylaw officer at dog parks to aggressively check how dogs recall to owners when distracted. A fail means you leash.
- The breed isn't the problem! Let's educate owners and enforcement officers instead. NO BSL
- "Pit bulls" do not have the highest bite force. There are MANY breeds with more bite force than "pit bull" breeds. Get educated Calgary.
- I do not support Breed Specific Legislation. The problem is with bad owners!
- STOP singling out certain dog breeds! Treat ALL breeds the same! Singling out Pitbulls is like singling out 'black' people. STOP DOING THAT!
- N/a
- Breed shaming legislation doesn't stop bad owners. We need more legislation to hold owners accountable for their animals.
- Do not introduce breed specific legislation. Perhaps provide more training for authorities to deal with dog issues.
- most of these questions were nothing but self serving to your bureaucracy, add a "none of the above" option and comment section to each
- Breed specific laws are NOT OKAY!
- Problematic dogs are usually a result of owner negligence. Hold the owners more accountable for their animals behaviour.
- "BSL is not the answer. I believe training with certified dog trainers should be utilized wherever possible.
- More support for TNR programs."
- Breeds are not the problem. The problem are irresponsible owners who know nothing about training or treating a dog properly.
- We should be more focused on how the owners raise specific breeds, we shouldn't be blaming breeds for what their owners can provide/prevent.
- Stop focusing on the pitbull. increase fines for bad owners and let the rest of us be.
- An easier way to report roaming cats. Preferably on the Calgary 311 app. There are over 7 in my cul-de-sac alone. Too many in the city.
- Breed specific rules are ridiculous it's nuisance animals that need to be regulated more. It's essentially just a different form of racism.
- Breed-specific should not be the focus of these bylaws. It should include any dog and focus on the responsibility of the owner.
- Many other dogs have stronger bites than Pit Bulls. Singling out one specific breed when you should be paying your attention to the Owners.
- Focus on ownership and proper owner education and not on the breed of dog. Bully breeds are super lovable dogs, any breed is!
- Do NOT identify particular dog breeds (ex. Pit bulls) this will only increase negative stereotypes. Instead, educate breeders and public
- For myself, people letting their cats roam is the biggest issue I have faced in Calgary. It's not ok that they use my garden as a litterbox



- By law needs to follow up on noise complaints- the current methods are a hassle and course of action from by law isn't really enforced.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong. Every dog should be judged on their own behaviour.
- I am ADAMANTLY AGAINST breed specific rules or rulings. "Bullies" can not ALL be treated as the same. This is blatant discrimination
- I do believe in increasing fines and restrictions for dogs that are proven to be a problem. BSL has been shown to not be effective.
- More regulations for roaming and unattended cats.
- N/A
- Stop with the breed specific legislation. It has been proven not to work. Pit bulls and other bully breeds are just like any other dog.
- There is severe erosion on some parks and others (not off leash dog parks) are unused. Suggest rotating parks that are for off leash use.
- Nothing
- I would be horrified to live in a city that supported Breed Specific Legislation. What an archaic and uneducated way of thinking. No!
- Targeting a specific breed is incredibly problematic - the owners are the problem. Leave pitbulls alone!
- To some, animals are our children. Don't be so slack on animals the roam the streets but don't restrict breeds.
- I would be in favor of a fine being canceled when the owner or responsible person then attends a remedial training program-requires proof
- Provide more clarification on the difference between dog bite, dog attack, dog causing injury. As the current fines are all over the place
- It is not the breed but the owner that causes the problem. Also responsible pet owners need access to more pet handling courses.
- I really think education for pet owners in Calgary is key. I see far too many owners who do not understand their animals' needs.
- Incentives for keeping cats indoors. Subsidize the construction of catios (enclosed cat patios)
- Absolutely disgusted that breed specific legislation was brought up. It's sad you'd put this out without any real research on Pit Bulls.
- Perhaps an alternative to City taking fines could be to offer owners the option to take that money and it be used for behaviour training
- Pitbulls should not be singled out. It is not the breed that is the issue, it is bad owners. Please reconsider.
- DO NOT make "breed specific" legislation. All dogs, and cats, and animals deserve equal rights and rules. Owners need more legislation.
- Personal home insurance will not cover a repeated nuisance dog FYI. They will cancel high liability risks or risks with too many claims
- No



- BAN pitbulls in the city limits. I just had a friend save a 2 year old old from the jaws of a pitbull and both suffered life altering injuries
- A dogs breed should NOT be taken into consideration. Irresponsible owners should have to pay an insurance fee regardless of breed.
- Should include other dog breeds that can cause severe damage outside of "pitbulls", ie, German Shepherds tend to latch and shake
- Pets in retail stores should not be allowed. As well as a better monitoring system/registration for rescues. NO BSL in YYC. Ridiculous.
- Instead of looking to increase fees, increase education of what the by-laws are. Better compliance will follow.
- Lowering the cost of licenses for low income families will just increase the amount of families who own pets that can't afford them
- Education for people and children on dog etiquette. Petting a dog you don't know is like a stranger petting you!
- Focus on animal cruelty instead of discriminatory breed legislation. It is on the humans, not the animals.
- I'm shocked to see the breed discrimination against pit bulls. My dog is NOT a pit bull but he is the most aggressive dog I have ever met.
- Stop feeding into the concept that Pitbulls are bad/aggressive dogs. They shouldn't be discriminated against because of preconceived notions
- Do not add Calgary to the list of breed specific law cities, this is grossly unfair to the animals and the people that share in their lives
- There needs to be more enforcement in on leash areas of dogs being off leash!
- People should have to have licences to breed and sell animals such as cats, dogs and large birds.
- No
- No BSL! That is absolutely asinine
- It's absolutely absurd that these questions were even in here. There's so much research easily debunking YYCs bully breed myths. Smh.
- Pets should not be euthanized/ caged away from their owners. If owners are deemed unfit, engage with a rescue to rehome/rehabilitate the dog
- There are no bad dogs. Only bad owners. Please do not make breed specific laws.
- Don't blame the dog's breed. Little dogs are the worst. Fund mandatory dog training and socializing. Let cats roam.
- I think the idea of segregating pitbulls is absolutely disgusting and wrong. Every ten years it's a different breed. Calgary, you're wrong.
- Lower income ppl should not get breaks on licensing etc im sorry but a pet is a privledge not a right. If you cant afford a pet dont get one
- Stop punishing breeds and blanket targeting "pit bulls”. Require owners to take training and background checks to reduce ignorant owners
- City run training programs (at lower then average cost) is more reasonable then BSL.



- Disagree with stereotyping pit bulls, there are several breeds that bite, any dog can be aggressive.
- Indoor cats and dogs should have a much lower licensing fee.
- Sometimes animals accidentally get out or lost, and owners are actively looking for them. In these cases, so long as an animal hasn't harmed
- It is not appropriate to identify a dog as a pit bull at any time. I do not agree with breed specific laws. The owners are at fault
- Breed specific bylaws are not okay. Please reconsider having these as options.
- Put the responsibility on the owners, not the dogs. Stop targeting certain breeds of dogs. It's unscientific and biased.
- Instead of worrying about feral cats, can we do something about the feral rabbit population? Feral domestic rabbits are everywhere.
- Nuisance and dangerous are TWO very different things and there is nowhere to put feedback on that.
- Nothing
- No
- Why not offer affordable or free pet training seminars for new owners with lower income households
- BSL is not a solution.
- Individuals whose dog attacks another dog and refuse to give their information should have their dog taken away.
- Bylaws should focus more on the owner, ensuring there is no cruelty/neglect/abuse. and a bylaw for dogs off-leash in on-leash areas.
- This survey has been tagged on an America pro pitbull website. You will have hundreds of American pitbull fanatics voting on this.
- No I do not
- There should be a license for breeders, and fines for those selling puppies and kittens without said license.
- Online complaint location on website for repeat offenders.
- Licensing fees for neutered or unneutered dogs/cats should be the same
- Owning a pet is a privilege not a right. If a license or basic care is not affordable a pet should not be owned.
- Every single park in Calgary is a dog poo dumping zone. I propose a DNA register and fecal DNA testing. Then put the owners down.
- nothing to add
- There is multiple cats allowed to roam, killing wildlife, and leaving feces. Resume stray cat trapping and increase those fines
- Why start bsl now, when other places are reverting their bsl laws? Bully breeds are amazing dogs when raised correctly. Focus on education.
- No



- A single pitbull owner is posting over and over and over. Pitbulls killed more kids in the U.S. last year than all breeds combined.
- Breed-specific legislation should not be considered. Responsible ownership could include training, etc. for all dogs.
- Fining irresponsible dog owners is a cash grab for the City. Consider mandatory training for both dog and owner following an incident
- Do NOT create a breed ban! There are no bad dogs, only bad humans!
- Fine people who walk their dogs off leash in a non-off leash environment.
- Bylaws should not be breed specific.
- I'm disgusted the CALGARY HUMANE SOCIETY has singled out bully breeds in this survey. I thought we were leaders in fighting this stereotype.
- Nothing
- no
- BSL has been shown to be ineffective. Education regarding pets and harsher consequences for irresponsible owners of any breed is key.
- Do not agree with labelling pit bulls as a nuisance breed. Have seen small dogs that are more aggressive than pit bulls. All about training
- This survey is being posted on American pro pitbull forums. Hundreds of American pitbull fanatics are posting. This is not an accurate view
- No
- None
- No
- Fence all off leash areas!!!!
- Mandatory obedience and behaviour training for all new dog owners (not just first time dog owners). This would greatly reduce attacks.
- Breed-specific bylaws should be banned - they're unreasonable and discriminatory.
- Bylaws should be based on behaviour of the animal rather than specific breeds.
- BSL Does not work! All you are doing is condemning an animal for the actions or negligence of an irresponsible pet owner.
- N/A
- Each issue should be judged on a case by case basis by a panel of educated animal specialists in consultation with local rescues and rehabs.
- Pitbulls and other specific breeds should NOT be singled out. Responsible ownership is key, regardless of the breed of the animal no bias.
- No breed specific legislation!!!
- More education for picking up after your dog
- The focus shall be kept on the OWNER of the pet, not the pet itself.
- If there are issues about dog bites etc it needs to be understood that children under 8 shouldn't be out of arms reach in off leash areas.



- Breed specific legislation is a horrible idea. Why are we even thinking about this outdated approach??
- I just wanted to say that there shouldn't be any bylaws for specific dog breeds. Pit bulls are not bad dogs. They usually have past trauma.
- Pitbulls are responsible for more attacks requiring reconstructive surgery than all other breeds combined. Ban them please.
- All dogs that are licensed should have to do some kind of training that is approved by the city. There shouldn't be a breed ban.
- People with many registered pets should receive periodic wellness checks. We should have no breed specific laws.
- Stop with the communism and leave us alone. This is just a cash grab, and a waste of taxpayer resources.
- DONT bully my breed. BSL just shows how ignorant people are. This is a joke. If anyone supports this, YOU are a bigger danger to society
- This discussion should be on responsible ownership not bully breeds. Calgary this is pathetic!
- No breed specific legislation. It is an uneducated approach.
- The rules/fines for pathway walking should be dismantled inside an off leash park. Dogs should be allowed to be off leash anywhere in park
- "No breed specific legislation!!

- Have "reactive" dog parks with rentable space. Where owners can have the space privately for a fee."
- Breed is not the problem. The owner is. Pit bulls and other bully breeds are just as, if not more, sweet and kind and loyal as any other.
- Excited for backyard chickens!
- Animal welfare is important! Let's focus on that first
- I'm saddened that our city is even considering breed specific regulations. The owner is responsible of ensuring their pet is well behaved.
- Would like to see bylaw officers monitoring communities where owners are not cleaning up dog feces and pathways.
- Judging a dog by its breed is no different then judging a person by there race. It is wrong in both circumstances and needs to stop.
- Don't target pitt bulls, any dog is capable of harm depending on its human. Most Pitts are more docile than chihuahuas.
- Stop discriminating certain breeds of animals.
- No
- Stop with specific breeds. You're just punishing dogs that don't deserve it and the owners who have worked hard to train them properly.



- "END BSL!
- Sincerely, a certified dog trainer who is bit more often by small dogs with major aggression and temperament issues."
- Breed bands do not work! Look to educate and train not focus on type of dog.
- Do NOT penalize 'nuisance' breeds. ie: pitbull 'looking' breeds. My German shepherd has more biting force per pound than mentioned above
- PLEASE DO NOT discriminate on Breed Specific legislation. Mandatory FORALL people who want dogs Professional training by a certified trainer
- No
- Pet owners that rent must present a lease showing permission to have pets on a property before city allows pet license; like temp. park pass
- Funny thing, police will tell you to get a dog to deter criminals. You're looking to take this away because of a complaining neighbour.
- Not on this topic.
- Owners who leave their pets alone all day and they bark constantly, should be fined higher
- Stop the pitbull stigma, any dog breed can be reactive and have bad outcomes
- Owners walking their dogs off-leash on school grounds is way more dangerous than a properly controlled pitbull. Please enforce this.
- "I am disgusted with the inclusion of Breed Specific Legislation.
- Breeds are not the problem. Owners and proper training are."
- Perhaps signage at off leash parks or parks with mixed purposes (such as rotary park) about proper dog etiquette/how kids should approach.
- No.
- Absolutely no breed specific legislation. Pit bulls are not the problem, it is the owner.
- In addition to the 'nuisance dog' designation, I suggest a 'dangerous/aggressive dog' designation for serious offenses with restrictions.
- Remove the specific breed and stop putting down animals as the easy way out. Small dogs can be more dangerous than large. There are variables
- Absolutely no BSL, my girl is 6 years old and has never been a problem to anyone. I've had landlord praise me for turning their outlook over
- "Breed specific laws are awful
- The law should target bad owners, not specific dogs"
- I found the Engagement Questions by accident and as a pet owner I think all pet owners should have a chance to have a say in this matter.
- If owners continuously receive similar fines, start increasing the fines to those liable owners over time.
- None
- Even proposing specific restrictions on Pit Bulls perpetuates fear and a non-evidence-based prejudice. Focus on issues, not breeds.



- I don't think there should be breed restrictions but I do think for all dogs that obedience training should be required to prevent problems
- No breed specific legislation.
- Stop focusing on breed, in particular and focus on the owners. Subsidized training, assessing the owner with the dog .
- The dog should not be punished for being improperly trained. It is the owners responsibility to train and care for the dog properly.
- Ban pit bulls within Calgary City limits immediately.
- Breed specific laws are not founded in evidence and should not be considered. Full stop.
- I have never had a negative experience with a pitbull. I think making breed specific rules is unfair.
- Dog/pet behaviour and body language should be a mandatory unit in schools. It would help reduce bites.
- Breed specific legislation is not science based and leads to unnecessary suffering and suspicion. Many dogs today are a mix of multiple breed
- Stop focusing on the breed(s) of animal and start focusing on who owns the animal!!! No animal should pay for the mistake the human made!!!
- No breed-specific legislation. It isnt the breed, but the owner that's the problem.
- If you own a dog, you should have to do a mandatory obedience/training course.
- Please ban dogs from being close to playgrounds. This is due to anaphylaxis allergies and potential dog bites.
- Pitbulls are not the problem! They where used as "nanny Dogs" because they're patient and gentle. A bad Pitbull is made from a BAD OWNER.
- The breed of the dog should not matter. Its the owner that should be held liable and responsible for anything their pet does
- No breed specific regulations! Pit bulls are not the problem, it's the owner. Stop discriminating the breed!
- SAFE citizen dog designation for dogs who are obedient and community friendly.
- breed specific bans are simply not supported by evidence. the mental/psychological trauma to the animal/owner is the same.
- Definitely no special breed bans! It is not the dogs fault, it is the owners! Please do not make this happen.
- More bylaw officers being a presence at off leash areas. People behave poorly when things don't go perfectly on their walks.
- N/A
- Pit Bulls have KILLED more people than any other breed.Ban them from Canada. This is a fact not discrimination.
- Target owners for bad dog behaviour, not just dogs and certainly not specific breeds.
- Small dogs are a bigger issue than large dogs, they are more often than not the dog to start the fight, or a bite a person.



- I don't believe in the breed specifics. Any dog can be bad. I have met far more chihuahuas that are more aggressive than bully breeds
- Some dog parks (like in NE) don't have an adequate number of garbage bins for pet owners to properly dispose pet waste.
- Breed-specific bylaws are a terrible idea that stigmatizes innocent dogs.
- How shameful to single out pit bulls. The ones I've known are the most passive, sweet dogs. Any breed can be vicious. Disgusting discriminat
- Breed specific legislation should not be implemented. It is up to the owners of both large and small breeds to properly train them.
- Pit bull breeds are strong, no argument there. But many other breeds that are large and strong as well. No breed specific prejudice.
- "apply a requirement for training for all dog owners through vetted trainers.
- Either through existing companies in Calgary or a City program"
- Pitbulls should not be targeted at this. Calgary is better than that.. BSL is ridiculous. How about better charges for animal abuse?
- "No breed specific legislation!!!
- Parents should be teaching their children proper manners for around dogs this will hurt more kids!"
- Pet Training Courses should be mandatory when a household acquires a new pet. No time for training the pet then don't own one.
- Breed specific laws are ineffective. If a dog is aggressive it should be trained there should be no breed specific laws.
- Please reconsider the ban on pit bulls, it's not the dogs themselves but it's how they were raised. Ban people from having pets instead.
- Breed specific legislation is not the answer. Provide education, support and training for ALL dogs who display aggressive behaviours.
- BSL is a wholly negative approach. Limitations should be imposed on owners based only on knowledge and experience, not breed.
- Remove breed specific legislation. How is this still a thing? We know that the problem is the owner, not the animal.
- putting in any breed specific laws is absolutely ridiculous.
- Calgary bylaws should continue to focus on the demonstrated behaviour of individual dogs rather than the breed.
- Breeds aren't the problem its owners.make an owner education class based on breed specifics(prey drive) high power,how to handle in events
- A bylaw or enforcement for small dogs and small dog owners to keep their dogs under control and be mannered and trained
- Cost of licensing pets is very high
- I think the city should stop increasing restrictions on pet owners. The suggested amendments are mostly doubling down on existing bylaws.



- it is usually not the dog that is the problem, its the [removed] owners that don't know what they are doing, which has potential ripple effects
- Increased education/awareness about the dangers of outdoor cats to the cats and to the ecosystem, and how to provide enrichment indoors
- The focus on bully breeds is wrong. The survey itself concedes there's no higher rate of biting, and we have tiered fines for severity.
- I don't support licenses being sold at vets, etc as they'll probably add a service fee and licenses are expensive enough as it is.
- NA
- All dogs need to be trained and loved. However there needs to be consequences for poor behaviour.
- re: low income fees. If someone has a pet and then becomes low income, that is very different from being low income and acquiring new pet.
- Signs explaining why it's harmful to feed wildlife posted in places where people often feed them, instead of just saying not to.
- .
- Pitbulls were responsible for 83% of dog attacks requiring hospitalization last year in Calgary. Labs which are more common were 0%.....
- Smaller breed dogs tend to be more aggressive and more likely to bite people, their should be a training requirement for dogs under 20lbs.
- Breed-specific legislation has been shown NOT to reduce bites/injuries. Don't do it.
- Pitbull owners are the problem and requiring training and liability insurance will make it more difficult for irresponsible owners to have one
- Increased education about animal welfare and responsible and compassionate pet ownership
- N/A
- Judging an animal because of its size and muscle mass does not make it a bad animal. Bad owners do!
- I am against licensing indoor cats! Why should I pay for keeping my cat indoors while others allow theirs to roam the neighborhood?
- If an owner cannot train an animal they should have that animal rehomed.
- No
- Dogs shouldn't need bandanas as an early warning system. Kids should be taught to ask before approaching or petting dogs. See body language
- Please do not imply extra restrictions to pit bull breeds, every dog should be looked at the same and by a case by case basis.
- Nope
- Please refrain from BSL. It's not the dogs' fault, it's the irresponsible owners.
- Much tougher rules for barking dogs and a better or different system for making/proving a complaint of a barking dog.



- ANY nuisance pet should have identical consequences. Negligent owners need consequences. BSL is nonsense.
- Multi-year or lifetime licencing is a great idea! Also, if there's BSL for pitties, there should also be for chihuahuas. They're vicious!
- Anyone who wants to be a breeder has to apply for a breeder license that is renewable every year and have to provide vet records
- None
- There should be a view a complaint, some neighbors call 311 even if my dog barks 1 time. I want to know who is making these accusations.
- Some of the nicest dogs I've met are Pitbulls, and some of the meanest I've met were shitzu's! You shouldn't discriminate against Pitbulls!
- Off Leash license.. Dogs that pass obedience training with a certain grade can walk off-leash on their neighborhoods
- Measures taken against specific breeds is prejudicial and unnecessary - you clearly state that pitbulls are not more likely to bite.
- Regular check up on owners/people who are abusing the system. Stealing/Breeding irresponsibly. Stricter enforcement on bad owners.
- Dogs bite/attack because of bad owners. There needs to be more than just fines for bad dog behaviour to the Owner.
- Breed specific is not the problem! People are the problem and most dog fights I've witnessed have never been a bully breed at the dog park
- BSL (Breed specific legislation) is bullshit.
- Increased fines for dog owners walking dogs off leash in onleash areas. It is dangerous and results in more reactions from onleash dogs.
- I feel like fines and or situations need to be differentiated between circumstances a dog in pain can and will bite as will a fearful dog.
- Training needs to be more accessible and affordable. Low income families should not have to kill their dog when it shows bad behaviour.
- All off leash sites to be managed by private enterprise for a fee. Pet ownership should be considered a privilege, not a right.
- breed specific bylaw = no. Its ignorant to think one breed is more aggressive then another. Its the owners that create bad behavior.
- I believe there needs to be more focus on bad pet owners rather than bad pets. Attacking a specific breed and not the bad owners is foolish
- N/A
- Pitbulls are not inherently vicious. Breed specific legislation is unnecessary. All dogs should have the same regulations.
- No
- On top of fines, how about mandatory dog (owner) training for any repeat offenders? And how about laying off the breed discrimination?



- It's not the breed fault, it's the Owner! Stop being racists..
- Mandatory spay/neuter, or apply for licence to breed. Minimizes back-yard breeding, encourages adoption, better health for animals.
- Nothing
- no Breed Specific legislation
- No
- "A definition of nuisance is required.
- A dog running to get into a car should not be considered as being off leash."
- It is not the dog it's the owner.
- Stop breed shaming. I've been bitten by a golden retriever and a black lab before. People raise bad dogs. Learn how to train and educate.
- I do not
- I don't agree with targeting a specific breed of dog! All dogs can be aggressive and all dogs can bite. Provide accessible pet training!
- Focus less on breed specific restrictions. It basically racism against animals! A dog is only a 'bad dog' due to bad ownership!!!
- Pitbulls are very sweet and loving dogs, people got to get over their inane phobia of them!! Bad owners can own any breeds..
- Stop BSL, this is ridiculous.
- Install cameras in off leash parks to properly investigate all incidents. Stop deeming the larger dog defending themselves as the problem.
- as Cats are one of the leading causes for the decline of bird populations, feral cats should be dealt with.
- I am appalled that specific breeds are even mentioned in your survey! All dogs have the potential to bite! No BSL!!!
- Leave pitbulls alone! Labs and Huskies are more likely to bite people and or in the same tier level for bite strength. Skewed survey thx yyc
- Obedience training and vet visit fees should all be in sliding scale based on income!
- I'm curious if the training that animal catchers receive is public knowledge?
- The idea that a Pitbull has a stronger bite than any other breed is absolutely ridiculous disinformation, and should be removed immediately
- restrictions on one breed open it up for further breed restrictions later.
- Any dog can be raised to be aggressive, not just pitbulls. Make the bylaw more generalized for all aggressive dogs, not a specific breed.
- N/A
- N/A
- If you actually make it so 'bully' breeds of dogs can't go to dog parks then you should make a dog park specifically for them.
- ENFORCE MORE ANIMAL CRUELTY/NEGLECT LAWS. AND ACTUALLY ENFORCE THEM.



- As we see in so many countries, and provinces, BSL does not help. Breeds are not bite specific. They're dog specific.
- Bi laws shouldn't be breed specific. It should be purely based on the behaviour of the animal. I've met more aggressive small dog than pitty
- BSL has no place here! Deal wit the bad pet owners, don't paint us all with the same brush.
- EVERY dog owner should undergo some training/license that shows they know how to properly train their dog. Pitbulls aren't the problem
- BSL has proven ineffective in other communities and is difficult to enforce. Address concerns with owners rather than breed.
- Singling out a specific breed just because of the stereotype that people have put on them is beyod ridiculous. Any dog can bite a person.
- Its people that are the problem. I have had pitbulls around me my whole life. I have never had an issue because I have trained/control them.
- Please don't be like the rest of the world and institute BSL!! Rather focus on OWNER training education.
- Having separate fenced areas for big dogs and small dogs in all off leash dog parks.
- There needs to be bigger fines for people the miss treat animals and more done to protect them.
- I believe Calgary would be taking a step backwards if they were to ban specific breeds.
- No.
- Can we just make it mandatory for people to train their pets? Banning "pitbulls" is ridiculous, I have met many that are super sweet.
- I do not support any policies that are based around specific dog breeds.
- I think it's absolutely disgusting that the city of Calgary is attempting to make a pit bull ban.
- "Dogs should be allowed in more restaurant patios and in small stores.
- The YYC Airport NEEDS MORE PLACES for animals to 'go'."
- I do not want BSL to be a thing in Calgary. Instead we should have training / awareness programs required for problem dog owners.
- There are a lot of laws targeting pit bulls when no evidence exists that they are more likely to attack.
- By generalizing the behaviors of dogs that look a certain way, innocent dogs and pet owners suffer. I do not support BSL.
- Absolutely NO breed legislation, poor training and bad owners are the issue NOT the breed of animal it is!!.
- Any animal that is a nuisance, without targeting certain breeds, should be controlled better and enforced.
- Breed specific bans should never even be mentioned let alone debated about. It's all about the owner and how the dog was raised.
- No
- Breed-specific policies are not based in science and are discriminatory. Also make an easier way to report animal noise disturbances.



- Golden retrievers have the most reported bites, should we have special laws for them? This is an OWNER problem not a breed problem.
- There should be a fine for people who antagonize dogs or approach animals wearing a warning collar or vest.
- N/A
- End breed discrimination. If a MAN is capable of punching harder, should he have his arms tied up etc? Potential does not equal threat!
- Discrimination towards bully breeds is not the answer. Hold bad owners accountable not the breed.
- I don't support BSL. Any breed can be a problem. Focus on punishing problematic owners and push for better access to training courses
- No breed specific legislation.
- Do not ban my sweet baby girl because of people prejudice, I have seem more damage done to people by little dogs than any big dog, ever.
- I don't think pitbulls should be treated differently or have separate rules. It is up to the owners to ensure they are raised properly.
- "All of the comments here speak volumes. Listen.
- Do NOT put restrictions on bully breeds."
- no
- Lower fees for indoor cats. Ban selling of animals in pet stores! Enforcement and penalties for dogs off leash/unsupervised in residential.
- Breed-Specific Legislation is like gun-control - mostly promoted by those with the least knowledge of the subject. Also, no urban chickens.
- No breed specific legislation! It's been proven ineffective many times over. Target irresponsible pet ownership and disregard breed.
- We need more off leash parks. No reason I should have to drive 15-20 min to let my dogs run off leash.
- Do not single out pit bulls. Many dog breeds are strong and can cause serious injury. Individual dogs are problems not whole breeds.
- Do not discriminate against pit bulls or other what you term as attack dogs! Pit bulls are much more docile than believed.
- Lol
- I do not believe it is fair to have the "pitbull breed" treated differently then other dog breeds.i have been bite twice, both by little dog
- Please end this silly idea of BAD BREEDS! Make pet owners be responsible for their pets/ pet behavior regardless of breed.
- Please do not allow people to keep pigeons in coops on the city. If people want animals that live in coops they should not live in the city.
- Pit bulls and bully breeds shouldn't be singled out. Any dog can be aggressive, it's not fair that they are being attacked with these bylaws



- There should absolutely be no bylaws singling out pitbulls. Pitbulls are very loving affectionate dogs.
- Voluntary bandana system is stupid. Children should be taught to never approach animal without asking. Bandanas will invite animal attacks.
- People who want to become dog owners should require proper training.
- We should not be forced to muzzle dogs that have no concerning behaviors. Not fair to the dog, and gives others the wrong impression.
- Breed specific legislation should not be supported. Invest more in education and training opportunities. It is not the dog, it's the owner
- I absolutely disagree with restrictions on breed specific dogs. As a bully breed owner I frequent dog parks and it would be so unfortunate.
- If you increase the fines for bites/attacks, can a portion go to the victim?
- Breed specific legislation isn't the way to handle issues with bad owners. All individuals need to be held equally accountable for their dogs
- Any type of discrimination is not okay. We are above that. Blame the owner, breed has nothing to do with it.
- Only here for the [remove] bully stuff. That is unreal
- Anyone producing puppies (regardless of breed) from unhealth tested dogs (OFA/pennhip, genetic disorders) should be fined. Microchip mandatory
- Stop singling out Pit Bulls. There are many other breeds that are far more aggressive than Pit Bulls. This is archaic and ridiculous.
- Register/license pet breeders and restricts what can be bred to ensure animal welfare and raise awareness on adopt don't shop.
- Licenses for breeders and fines for people mistreating and over breeding their pets.
- Let's start enforcing the existing bylaws before start making up new ones. BSL is WRONG and cops aren't even enforcing picking up feces yet.
- There should be no breed specific bylaws. A bad dog is almost always a result of their environment. Focus on the owner!
- NA
- I think one of the things that are being missed by the city is the sale and resale of dogs or puppies. Licenses should be required to sell p
- I believe more public knowledge in animal behaviour, and proper care is needed. the public should be taught how to greet a strange dog.
- Don't judge a dog breed when any dog can be aggressive.
- Regulations need to be applied equally to all breeds of dogs. A smaller dog is more likely to be aggressive and bite than many larger breeds
- No I do not
- Pit Bulls should not be targeted, It is up to the owners to make sure any breed of dog is trained. targeting them is completely wrong.



- In regards to stop light bandana idea There is a company www.safepettags.com - book for kids available too.
- I am loving the idea of the 6 dogs per household because some people have rescue animals. It would be heartbreaking to have to let them go
- Bylaw should be going around the city and catching cats that are roaming. It shouldn't be a home owner's responsibility.
- Increasing controls around dogs is important. But targeting ONE breed is uncalled for, pit bulls are the same danger as golden retrievers.
- No
- i agree with lifetime fees for licencing. every year is a cash grab.
- A pitbull ban will not change the number or severity of bites. Subsidize and incentivize training for puppies and nuisance animals instead!
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. The breed doesn't matter it's all about the owner.
- Off leash parks should be fenced and clearly marked, to discourage children from playing there making it impossible for my pup to play there
- Singling out pitbull-breeds is ridiculous. They should have the same treatment as other animals until deemed a 'nuisance' as described above
- Golden retrievers are just as dangerous as pit bulls when untrained. Stop trying to blame the breed, blame the owner.
- Na
- It's not the type of breed that can cause violent behaviour it's the owner themselves who create that image of them.
- It would be a start if By-Law showed up when called or actually issued tickets instead of sitting in their trucks in parking lots
- N/a
- PLEASE stop targeting pit bulls and focus more on negligent, ignorant people. THEY are the real problem here.
- Quit dog-shaming the "Bull" breed. The focus needs to be on the owner, not the dog. Educate yourselves before you make any decisions.
- I think owners should have to take obedience tests and attend classes with their so called "nuisance" dogs because it's not always the dog.
- I support urban chickens, ducks, goats and sheep in Calgary. Increase the budget and enforcement for the protection and wellbeing of animals
- No
- Misinformation on pitbulls is whats causing panic. I think singling them out, and dogs that look similar to them, is incredibly wrong.
- Chickens!
- Can we STOP attacking the 'pitbull', there are many other breeds that have strong PSI bite force (equal or higher). Stop the fear mongering!



- You need to get rid of the stigma around pit bulls!!! It's not the dogs fault if they are aggressive it's the owners fault!!!! Not dog fault
- I'm not even a pit bull owner and I'm surprised by how much they're singled out here. Our encountered nuisance dogs have never been pitbulls
- "When you say all of a particular breed are bad dogs, you have now polarized your community" - [Personal information removed]
- No exceptions for breeders of pit bulls.
- A specific license for specific breeds as well as mandatory obedience classes as well as owner education
- Pitbulls and related breeds shouldn't be singled out - owners of ANY breed should be responsible for training and any fines.
- Please do not discriminate against large dogs and bully breeds. This legislation will only hurt public safety.
- NO Breed Specific Laws (BSL) should be considered. Instead of targeting dog breeds there should be more available education/training program
- N/A
- No
- It's not the breeds, it's the owners that need to be restricted. Make owner specific legislation instead of going after/targeting specific breed
- The breed specific legislation is unfair and ineffective. What needs to happen is greater accountability/fines for irresponsible dog owners.
- People should be told to put their animals in puppy training when they get it because a lot of behaviour problems happen because they aren't
- In the use of common spaces where pets are likely to be, cyclists MUST notify of their approach, ringing bell, Help reduce surprise reaction
- Do not single out pit bulls. Punish the owner not the breed
- Love the idea of bandanas to indicate if a dog should be approached. All animals should be registered and owners hold a training cert.
- I would love small off-leash areas where a group of dogs who have grown up together and already play well with each other can be off-leash
- Please do not single out pit bulls breeds/types. I have had more problems at the dog park with huskies and German shepherds than with pitbul
- BSL is being rescinded in US counties/municipalities and internationally because IT DOES NOT WORK. Do your research, Project Team!
- Instead of placing a limit on the number of pets (of any species), I would be in favour of more focus on prevention of neglect and abuse.
- Breed specific bylaws are not acceptable. All dogs of all ages and breeds need to be held to the same manner of restriction and consequence.
- Targeting specific dog breeds resolves nothing. Instead, restrict the breeds that bad owners can own.



- This agenda itself mentions that pitbulls are no more likely to bite than any other dog so why the need for BSL? BS.
- Breed specific laws do not help anyone. With proper training, any dog can be a model citizen, and the reverse of that is true as well.
- Pit bulls do not have stronger bites than other dogs. You have presented a falsehood in this survey. Shame.
- No I do not.
- Instead of blaming animals for the behaviours, the owners should be responsible. It is never the animals fault, look at the owner first.
- There should be additional fines for nuisance outdoor cats that attack other pets, spray homes, and dig up gardens.
- Really appreciate the limit to households. I have 4 dogs and love them with all my life. I would die without them. Theyre all rescues.
- Its not the dog that's the problem, its the owner. All breeds of dogs should be treated equally and not specific to Pit Bulls.
- You all need to better educate yourself when it comes to dogs and bull breads.
- Be fair to all breeds
- No
- Consequences for bad owners! Too often animal abusers are constantly repeat offenders because nothing is done about them and the animals suffer
- Some people have more than 2 dogs or cats. It would be devastating to let them go. 6 is understandable and responsible. Thank you!
- It is ridiculous to even consider a bylaw that is against solely bully breeds. ANY DOG CAN BE DANGEROUS! Why is that so hard to understand?
- Pinpointing on pitbulls as an aggressive breed is really wrong. It isnt only one breed. Every owner is responsible for their pets actions.
- BSL is not the answer. the Emphasis should be on pet ownership reform. It's careless and scared citizens that ruin it for us all.
- When dogs exhibit aggressive behaviour it is almost always the owners fault for not meeting the needs of the dog. Hold owners accountable.
- Do not single out pitbulls as it is wrong. For the owners that have pitbulls, it is really hurtful. They are not all like that.
- Any dog that is triggering can provoke other dogs. The responsibility should not only be on pitbulls
- More dog parks in the NE. The current ones are way too crowded especially with COVID going around, more parks the better.
- A one time fee for animal licenses. Paying yearly is ridiculous.
- BSL is a poor way to treat symptoms, and will never address the actual problem - which is a lack of education and awareness.
- Volunteers that are willing to clean up dog parks. Add water stations for dogs and possibly more trees for shade and protection.



- Install more trash cans in parks with many dogs and offer biodegradable bags for picking up after them. THEN raise fines to compensate.
- Water stations would be absolutely helpful. A lot of owners do not bring water with them, and some dogs overheat or get thirsty.
- BSL is inhumane and will end up in more dogs being in shelters and, eventually, euthanized. Dogs can be dangerous regardless of their breed.
- I will move out of this city so fast ! If you try and take my dogs away from me !!!!! This is absolutely [removed]!!
- Breed-specific legislation is not the answer. There needs to be higher penalties for nuisance dog owners.
- I do not support BSL!
- There should be no ban on any breed of dog. Period. At the end of the day, it's the person that created a monster, not the dog's fault
- "stop blaming specific breeds of dog, when the real problem is poor ownership and training.
- Screen the owners, not the animal"
- I would like an avenue for anonymous complaints for irresponsible dog owners, who do not control their dogs barking.
- Maybe a drop off bin for people to donate waste bags for owners to pick up after their dogs in parks. Some owners do not have waste bags.
- Change the idea of "pit bull" bylaws and instead the human behaviour and how they control their companion. Fine the human, not the dog.
- Should not have any BSL going on. Educate first time dog owners. Educate staff. Educate child. Disgusting to have BSL.
- Would really appreciate water stations at parks for all the animals to enjoy while visiting the parks.
- Please deal with off leash dogs in public parks. We have many off leash areas, but many irresponsible owners who don't follow guidelines.
- You obviously not serious in wanting ideas with the character restriction of this box. Label the owner as a nuisance instead of the pitbulls
- If [remove] can't handle marginalized breeds, implement a breed specific TRAINING program at time of animal registration.
- The approach towards pit bulls is unfair. Calgary should not have BSL.
- No
- The reality of it is - aggressive breeds have that in their nature, and no matter how good an owner you are, one day they will snap.
- If people want to have lower license fees then they should have to prove that their animal is well behaved. Signed off by a behavioralist.
- I would like to see education for off leash dog park owners and their children. I'd also like to see bikes not allowed at off leash parks.
- Use some of the money from licensing and fines and host free obedience classes so it is accessible to all pet owners



- Please have fines for people leaving bagged up dog feces on park trails "to pick up later" and they are litter and rarely collected!!
- I do not support breed specific legislation. The problem is with the owners not the breed.
- The idea of pinpointing pitbulls is so heartbreaking. Stop perceiving them to be vicious. The animals are outcomes of the owners actions.
- Treat all dogs equally. I've been bitten by more small and tiny breeds, been woken by the Yip yap of small and tiny breeds than any other.
- PITBULLS are NOT the issue. The issue is owners that cannot train or properly take care of their dog.
- I am set on the fact that you cannot treat breeds of animals differently. It is all about their environment and how they are raised/trained.
- Breeds are not the problem. Irresponsible owners who do not know how to treat an animal or knowing how to properly train/handle.
- Increase education for children on correct way to approach dogs that do not reside with them. No running up and trying to hug dogs etc.
- Please explain how you'll enforce that a dog owner doesn't leave the scene of a bite 'accident'.
- "For this law [X] is defined as... anything that looks like or has the features of [what we are biased against]" big ethical red flag there.
- I live in Parkland which borders on Fish Creek Park. I would like more signage stating the ridge and Fish Creek is not an off leash area
- I've had big "strong" breeds my whole life and have never seen an issue. I've been attacked by yorkies and poms. STOP breed discrimination
- Separate "large breed" "small breed" and "mix" off leash dog parks. This would reduce incidents and injuries to small breed dogs.
- Dogs barking in a yard is a welfare issue. When my dog barks, I bring him inside. I couldn't imagine leaving him out to bark at people
- I feel that there should be a screening process and a in home visit for anyone who owns a dog or cat not just a specific breed.
- There should be absolutely NO bylaws in place which target specific breeds (ex. Pitbulls).
- Do not implement ANY breed-specific bylaws! Pitbulls have a bite force of 235 psi while German Shepherds have a harder bite force of 238 psi
- It would be cool if by-laws actually enforced things. Then maybe we can talk about these STUPID BSL's some Boomer/Karen group is all about
- Never should any specific breed be legislated and discriminated against. Smaller dogs bite more often and are never called out like bullies
- No
- how important is creating a bloated system for pets - do more with less or significantly reduce this program - euthanize all lost pets
- Banning pit bulls and the other dogs you listed is unnecessary and unacceptable.



- Supporting breed specific legislation is such an uneducated and ignorant way of thinking. Adamantly against this. Pitbulls are not the issue
- All off leash dog parks should be fenced, some of them are right beside roads and I'm scared a drunk driver is gonna hit my dog sometimes
- Animal abuse fines/ offences need to be increased.
- I'd like to see you stop discriminating against bully breed dogs if my dog has to wear a muzzle in public so should every other dog
- I do not agree with singling out pit bulls !! This is not fair !
- Mandatory pet and pet owner training by Licenced Trainers.
- Stop singling out specific breeds. It's the owners, not the dog.
- BSL against pit bulls is just plain wrong. Stop fear mongering against pitties! If your going to make bylaws, make it for all dogs.
- There are many breeds that have a high bite force. We need to evaluate OWNERS, not specific breeds. It's almost always a people problem.
- Bully breeds should not be discriminated against!
- No breed bans - it's bad people, not bad dogs by breeds.
- More dog parks in the NE. Or parks like the placeforpaws to book "appointments" to bring your dog to, for those dogs that like being alone.
- Breed specific bylaws are extremely unfair and instead of focusing on breeds, you should be focused on the owners
- Cat bi law is a waste. Cats roaming keep the mouse population down. I'd rather clean up cat droppings than have a mouse infestation.
- Breed specific by laws are stupid and ineffective as has been proven by other communities that have tried this. The same goes for pet limits
- Educate ppl instead of pointing out specific breeds. Every dog has their own personality it's the owners responsibility to pay attention.
- Temporary homes (doggy daycares, kennels, etc.) should have a limit (for example, 6 dogs at a time in a residential doggy daycare)
- Shared spaces (parks/wetlands). More off-leash near water and in communities (TUC lines). Dogs just want to play fetch without the drive.
- Policies should not include breeds. Aggressive or problem dogs are not always pit bulls, nor is it more common for pit bulls
- "Mandatory license fees that cover costs of Mandatory training for ALL dogs.
- Too many ill behaved animals running around."
- People should have to have a home inspection before being aloud an animal
- Breed specific legislation is disgusting. It doesn't work.
- In minor offences, I believe that requiring mandatory training (instead of fine) would be better for the community as a long term solution.
- I don't agree with a city wide bully ban. Any kind of discrimination is extremely shameful.



- Fully support the spay/neuter program continuing and no kill policy.
- Trying to be breed specific is NOT the answer. Even a small dog can do damage
- What about the large number of domestic bunnies that are in Calgary communities destroying gardens, flowers and killing trees.
- Seize nuisance pets for rehabilitation from convicted criminals. Allow but limit the amount of livestock (chickens) a lot.
- No further comments
- Don't just spay/neuter feral cats, take them off the street into shelters to either be adopted or euthanized. Protect our native wildlife.
- Breed specific discrimination shouldn't be brought in.
- I don't have any right now.
- No
- As a veterinary professional, breed specific legislation is wrong. Every dog should be judged for its own behavior.
- BAN CYCLISTS IN DOG PARKS. I'm tired of almost having my dog run over by some idiot who refuses to use the 2500kms of bike paths in the city
- NO BANS OF ANY SUCH SHOULD BE A CONSIDERATION. All animals have their behaviors based on how they were raised. Punish the owners instead.
- I am completely AGAINST any and all Breed specific bylaws! Don't judge/punish an entire breed for the actions of some irresponsible owners.
- The Pitbull thing is absolutely ridiculous. You should take that out of everything, there are a lot of big dogs with big bites.
- please try to change the attitude of "outdoor" cats as okay... Its not okay for wildlife, cats, or people. Yet cats off the streets
- Breed discrimination is absolutely wrong in any circumstance.
- how are you ensuring that the people responding to this questionnaire actually live in Calgary and are not part of a lobby group?
- Pitbulls are not the only ones that "bite". PLENTY of other breeds do as well. So not single pitbulls out as it is inconsiderate and wrong.
- Pitbulls are a dangerous breed. Breed-specific legislation is way overdue in Calgary.
- bandannas for temperament traffic light system are unsafe a park. Collar is less Likely for another dog to latch onto.
- Animal cruelty should be a main focus. So much goes around that is not being seen. Dont ban pitbulls, focus on all forms of animal cruelty
- Unsupervised feeding in outside spaces should not occur. This would help decrease the skunk issue and deter feral cats.
- Leave pitties alone- they are amazing, smart, sensitive, loving dogs. The people are the problem- not the dogs.



- How is stating that pitbulls are aggressive going to help at all? For those that have them, this is like an insult to them. It is so wrong
- Create a Program to educate kids in schools on how to approach dogs and dog safety. Many families do not do this at home!
- Discriminating the pitbull breed is disappointing. I will move cities if it comes down to this. It is unfair and wrong to look down on them.
- Just leave Pit bull breeds alone, target bad owners not great breeds. This is just another way to cost the tax payer more money.
- I'm hearing lots of, "small dogs can be dangerous too". Key difference: a small dog attack fundamentally less vicious than a pitbull attack
- Pitbulls should not be singled out in bylaws. They are no more of a danger than any other breed. The responsibility should fall on owners.
- No
- Na
- Breed specific regulation should never be a target. As a paramedic I've been to more dog bite calls and be bitten by many more small dogs.
- It's time Calgary catches up to other forward-thinking cities. It's time we bring breed-specific-legislation to Calgary!
- People who do not clean up after their animals should not be allowed to own animals. I am sick and tired of seeing dog feces all over
- I know a caring, responsible owner of a loving, kind pit bull. It's not the breed, it's crappy owners: punish them, not the dogs.
- Fines are not as good a deterrent as good pet education and training that is accessible and affordable. As targeting pit bulls is a new low
- Please remove any reference to single out pitbulls. I've never had an issue with a pit bull in a dog park, but have with golden retrievers.
- Pit bulls were selectively bred for aggression. Stop acting like they weren't and are innocent. They will resort to nature over nature.
- Pit bulls are dangerous and should be banned from city limits. If you want to own one, move to an acreage.
- Stricter punishment for irresponsible breeders
- There is no reason to single out a specific breed. Statistically more dog bites occurs from golden retrievers than pitbulls.
- please don't judge dogs based on their breeds. I have a pitbull mix who is super gentle. We are responsible owners and this feels very unfair
- People who are pro pitbulls are probably the same people who haven't done the proper classes and training. Limit them = Limit the hazard.
- Focus on negligent owners It's not the animals fault for biting someone running loose or barking obsessively it's the owners who are at fault



- I do not support breed-specific bylaws and would focus on encouraging responsible ownership and accountability.
- Stop pinning everything on "pitbulls" when there are more aggressive breeds out there. Some of which are smaller so people brush them off.
- There needs to be more regulation regarding responsible dog ownership. Animals are not the problem, people are the problem.
- No
- More involvement and consequences for roaming, unsupervised cats.
- No comment
- As a certified trainer and employee of humane society it is disappointing and upsetting to see Pitbulls targeted. Education is needed here
- It would be wonderful to add a few enclosures for aggressive dogs in the dog parks so they can run safely, with a private walking path
- Comparing BSL to racism? Come on. We're talking about dogs that are documented killers. Not the same. They are dangerous. Support this.
- We should be focusing more on the owners involved and responsible in these situations over the specific breeds involved.
- Regulate pitbulls like we regulate firearms. Ban them!
- More severe stray and roaming cat control.
- I am AGAINST breed specific rules or rulings. Instead we should offer inexpensive assistance programs to ANY or all animals who may need it
- The city shouldn't lower animal licenses for low income families, if they can't afford the cost they can't afford to take care of the animal
- Higher fines for leaving pets outside in the high heat or freezing snow, or out all night
- Control for nuisance cats in the city.
- Follow high rivers example where pet fees are used to put poo bags and garbages on paths. Calgary fees are just a cash grab
- When a small dog attacks, the result is usually not life-altering. When a pitbull attacks, the result is usually life-altering. Why risk it?
- More accessible reporting for roaming and nuisance cats.
- Targeting Pitbulls (who you state do not have higher rates of aggression) is wrong and overly aggressive. I would protest that bylaw.
- N/A
- BSL is the only answer. It's time Calgary adopts this legislation.
- A dog that is labeled a "nuisance" for barking needs to be treated differently than a dog that bites or escapes - there needs to be nuance.
- DNA sampling of pets to fine irresponsible owners for leftovers on streets.
- More strict guidelines/laws and consequences for cat owners. No free roaming.



- It's time for BSL. Existing pitbulls can be grandfathered, but the city should immediately ban future pitbulls from it's public spaces.
- The approach to pit bulls is short-sighted. It's not a specific breed. And there is no evidence that it will make the city safer.
- Let's make out off leashes safe for our pets and families. No pit bulls allowed.
- No.
- You should have to actually be a Calgarian to fill out this survey, it makes no sense to be getting opinions from all around the world.
- I have no idea how to stop a dog from barking when a owner is not home.
- No
- Stricter bylaws and increase in fine for unsupervised cats.
- Pit bulls should definitely be banned from all public spaces and certainly from off leash dog parks.
- "Breed specific discrimination should not be allowed.
- It's the irresponsible pet owners that cause the trouble for the rest."
- One thing that wasn't covered is educating your staff and the people who wrote the phases they clearly know nothing about actual dog behavior
- Increase in cat traps and fines for roaming cats.
- For all individuals that have domestic abuse or abuse in their criminal history, they should not be able to own any type of animal
- Please don't ban bully breeds ! They're amazing dogs.
- Owners of animals need to be held More responsible for the actions of their animals
- Increased fines for outdoor off leash felines.
- People should not be allowed to vote for ideas here more than once. Same with the survey.
- Water stations within the dog parks would be very helpful for all dogs and owners!
- Easier way to report nuisance felines in the area.
- The need for stronger legislation to help bylaw officers investigate abuse/neglect and ban abusive/neglectful owners from ever owning pets
- Breed specific bylaws deserve no place in the world. Its not the animals fault ever. Its the lack of training. BSL is not needed.
- Do not euthanize stray animals as they could be put into shelters to become adopted. It is wrong to euthanize just to "control" the numbers
- Better way to report and respond to roaming cats that people own. They are out of control.
- Perhaps (some) fine payments could go towards training services that could be provided at a reduced cost .
- Breed specific laws do not work. Many pitties are wonderful, loving dogs. Focus on behaviour!
- I think fines should be smaller in cases where the money could go towards aiding the victim. That should be a requirement - not higher fines
- No
- None



- Waste bags beside every garbage can in public parks and dog parks would be helpful to those that do not bring their own or forget theirs
- If dogs are required to be supervised and on leash outside.. Then why are so many cats running free in the city and less is being done?
- Banning breeds does not work - it is on the owner to train their dog appropriately. Once the dog has public issues then enforce training.
- Why is there any naming of "pit bulls" the blame falls on owners who haven't done their due diligence and trained their pets properly
- How is it 2020 and people are still stating that all pitbull breeds are dangerous? How about we charge those that abuse and neglect them
- breed specific laws are ridiculous. Enforce the laws on the books and things will be fine
- We have cats and have added measures to keep them in our yard. They want to be out front for the chance to catch mice. mice #will go up!!!
- I have 4 amazing dogs. They are mannered and cared for every single day. It would be heartbreaking if they were being looked at as vicious
- I don't agree with having breed specific by-laws or legislation. A dogs bad behavior is reflection of their owner's bad behavior, not breed
- Pit bulls are not the problem it's owners singling out one breed is discrimination just like singling out one race of humans
- Bylaw considering the massive amount of wild rabbits damaging protect and herders in Kensington needs to be addressed.
- Do not discriminate against any particular breed.
- If an animal is exhibiting dangerous/ aggressive behaviour dog and owner should be required to attend a course to improve the training
- All animals have the capability to be mean. But the owners hold the most accountability for their pets actions.
- Breed specific regulations are outrageous, target the owners, not the animals.
- More spay and neuter programs, and then put strays up for adoption and put into shelters!
- It is up to owners to train their pet. Restrictions/fines should only be applied to those who are unfit owners. One breed is not The problem
- The jaws of a pit bull function the exact same way as all other dogs' jaws. Leave Pitties alone!
- DO NOT make "breed specific" legislation. All dogs, and cats, and animals deserve equal rights and rules.
- breed specific discrimination should not be in effect. how horrible would it be to let go of your companion animal due to that?
- Do not descriminate against breeds. Remove from careless owners when necessary.
- Breed specific legislation is such a joke. It's bad owners, not the breed itself. Power tripping council - not a surprise.
- Breed bans are useless and misguided. Focus on animal welfare, including animals in pet stores and private sales, and education for owners.



- I am a rescue Foster. many people do not realize that their cats are not allowed to freely run around the neighborhoods. educate fine
- another animal rescue centre should be in NE calgary. most of them are in the south and not easy to get to or are far for some.
- Pit bull breeds need muzzling in public and a ban from off lease parks, they are inherently dangerous dogs
- No
- Restrictions on Specific breeds (pit bull type) outlined in this survey are ridiculous and unproven. Do not muzzle docile dogs.
- Support mandatory education for all owners with nuisance pets.
- Cats that are let out to wander should be removed from the home of irresponsible pet owners-
- Why not do Breed-Specific Legislation for owners, too? Eg, must be BIPOC to own a pitbull, must be Latinx to own chihuahua.
- For those that are dumping bunnies that they no longer want should be fined for neglect
- Quit discriminating breeds.
- Breed-specific discrimination is wrong. You say it why right here: "pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds"
- Please, please, please, do NOT name specific breeds in any bylaws. Calgary has been a great example of good legislation so far.
- north east calgary needs another humane society or rescue. all of them are too far down south and not easy to get to.
- Breed specific regulations is not the answer. Stricter requirements for pet ownership are required. The owner needs to take responsibility.
- Breed specific regulations are based on bias misinformation, no dog is more dangerous than another.
- Lower licensing fees, to make pet ownership viable for all, but greatly increase fines for violations and infractions.
- Stop discriminating against specific breeds- Pit bull breeds are NOT more prone to aggression over other breeds!
- Breed specific discrimination shouldn't be the backbone of this engagement. Be better.
- love the idea of 6 dogs per household or 6 cats. i have 4 dogs but theyre always taken care of and loved. couldnt imagine life without them.
- Pit bulls aren't dangerous. The owners are the real danger. Don't make dumb rules cause people don't know how to be a pet owner
- Make dog and cat licensing cheaper and available online with e-receipt and tags available through mail delivery.
- Breed specific discrimination is just the same as discrimination with humans. How wrong is that. It is 2020, we should all know better.
- Funding should be discussed for proper rehabilitation programs, training and spaying and neutering programs.



- Bsl does not work. If the dog or owner is being assaulted then the dog should be allowed act in self defense as easily as a human
- Please revisit your definition of nuisance dog and their requirements. Requiring insurance for a dog that barks a lot does nothing.
- Why not just bring in more affordable options for pet owners instead of trying to dictate what animals/number of animals someone owns?
- Fines for people who attack animals or attempt to attack animals
- Breed bans are not helpful at all and all your fines should be based on circumstances for the infraction.
- I think the city should not be promoting or even considering BSL. It's PROVEN in Ontario already that BSL does NOT work.
- license fee per household rather than per pet. Start at your base fee and just add 10\$ for each additional animal. Be affordable, easier
- I think it would be helpful if a set of bylaws was posted.....Ferne has such a set and I applaud them for shedding light on gray areas. EG
- STOP bullying the bully breeds. It is inhumane and so wrong. How could you support that? How as humans we support this nonsense.
- If you allow animal suchs as chickens, there should be a list of 24 hour vet clinics who can help these animals
- BSL does not work. More educations for owners as many do not understand their pets body language and needs.
- More rentable space at parks for certain time slots like placeforpaws in rockyview. Should be placed in the NE calgary area.
- introducing bylaws that are breed specific should NOT be done! I am extremely disappointed in Calgary.
- Another dog park. But with rentable space with a fee. Like placeforpaws in Rockyview County Area.
- breed specific laws are not fair, and are unrealistic. Bylaws should be for ALL dog breeds with teeth.
- BSL is so wrong. It isnt meant for anywhere, especially not Calgary. Why are we discriminating against breeds? That is wrong.
- Specifically discriminating against a breed of any kind should not be permitted and should be the owners responsibility.
- Please do not discriminate against certain breeds. I would suggest comparing the numbers between ownership or pit bulls v.s actual attacks
- I do NOT support Urban Chickens, and am appalled that this is being considered seriously. Livestock belongs in rural areas.
- Scrap any breed specific legislation. They are based on unwarranted fears and not facts. Many jurisdictions are reversing their bylaws too
- I cannot believe the City is still trying to implement this (remove) against pit bulls. Shame on you. Hold responsibility on the owners!



- We shouldn't be punishing dogs just because they are a "pit bull" nor should we be punishing good dog owners for having them!
- I feel that everyone who gets a dog should be required to attend training. There are many many bad dogs out there due to owner negligence.
- EG: Females in heat should not be in off leash park. Children often interpreted as "prey" for many animals so kids must be controlled.
- Pet education as part of elementary school (how to approach/pet; when not to). Onus should be on humans to be responsible (owners/others).
- Breed specific legislation is ineffective and not supported by the evidence. Punish bad owners not the dogs they don't know how to handle.
- I have a friend with a pitbull and it is the kindest dog I've ever met. Please don't punish dogs for bad owners.
- responsible pet ownership, absolutely. Responsible public awareness also. This is a community.
- Punish the deed not the breed. Breed specific legislation is discrimination and fuels the fear and stigma attached to "bully" type dogs.
- People need to be able to afford the pets they take in. That means also attending pet training sessions. Dogs are not magically well behaved
- There is no evidence that pitbulls are a dangerous breed. The ASPCA expressly opposes breed-discriminatory ordinances and legislation.
- Use feral cats for rent in mouse infested areas, or give tax breaks to business that house and maintain feral colonies if the city neuters
- Animal breeds should not be discriminated against. It is how the animal is raised. It is disgusting that you would consider this.
- No breed specific laws
- Not discriminate against pit bulls and bully breeds, as their behavior is a result of their training and life experience, not their breed.
- This breed specific stigma is nauseating. Check the facts, consult with specialists. ANY animal of ANY size can cause harm in the wrong hand
- BSL has been proven to not work. The fact that the City is even considering it is extremely concerning.
- The bylaw focuses on enforcement of poorly correlated metrics. Focus on prevention and the actual issues; improve outcomes and compliance.
- Things should be brought in to support owners with 'unique' dogs that punish those that ignore warnings and engage with the animal.
- BEING RACIST IS NOT SOLVING ANYTHING!! Stop blaming pit bulls and "vicious" big dogs. Blame the owner not the dog! Fix the abuse charges.
- Breeds are not the problem. Pitbulls are not the problem. Owners who do not properly train or care for their animal are the problem.
- "BSL won't solve anything!!
- You can't ban a breed because of human ignorance."



- No pitbull discrimination. More issues with misbehaved labs, retrievers and small snappy dogs.
- Do not discriminate based on breed. You're blaming the wrong end of the leash.
- There needs to be more clear, calculable limits on barking. Like "more than 1 hour with no breaks"; to reduce # of disputes and prioritize neglect
- Breed specific legislation is ineffective and perpetuates a ridiculous stereotype
- I have had a number of altercations with dogs over the years, both off leash parks and on leash. Never once was the issue with a pitbull.
- Bad dog owners are the problem, not a breed. Enforce that and we will see a reduction in indecent
- Calling my dog out because of how she LOOKS is discriminatory! Isn't this what we are trying to eliminate in our society?!!
- The inclusion of breed specific legislation is abhorrent and has no place in this city. Base things off behaviors not physical traits.
- No letting your dog out before 7 in the morning if it barks the whole time
- I believe it's unfair to categorize Pitbulls as a problem dog. My own dog is loving, affectionate and would do no harm to any human or other
- "Trying to be breed specific is NOT the answer. Even a small dog can do damage"
- License fees should be for the lifetime of the animal and owner contact information / pet name should be on the tag.
- I do not believe pit bulls should be singled out as dangerous. It is a misrepresentation of the breed. Any dog can be dangerous
- No dog based on their characteristics should be judged
- BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION WILL SET AN UNFAIR AND DANGEROUS PRECEDENT
- I think all dog and cat owners should take a class on how to properly take care of an animal. For sure large dogs.
- No dog should be muzzled due to appearance! Muzzle the uncontrolled dogs of all breeds and make muzzles more positive light.
- No breed specific discrimination
- DO NOT put restrictions on pitbulls. It's not breed of dog, it's owner. It is ridiculous that Calgary is naive enough to think it's breed
- Pitbulls are no more dangerous than other dogs it's disgusting that Calgary is considering discriminating against them
- More dog parks
- Being breed specific is not the answer. Responsible ownership is the best way to mitigate all of these.
- "Bad owners are often a reflection of a dog's behavior.
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work it's been tried in other provinces."
- can we just end BSL? it is 2020 and it shouldn't be the priority over here. Let's focus on animal cruelty and to put these people in jail



- Breed Specific is discrimination! You can't judge a book by the cover. Small dogs are just as aggressive. Penalize owners not breeds!
- Breed specific discrimination has been proven detrimental across jurisdictions. Do not introduce it in Calgary.
- Breed specific discrimination is unacceptable
- this is all a joke. and even if "pit bulls" get banned from parks ill still be there with mine letting her run and play with all dogs.
- Maybe the City should be concentrating on cleaning up the city, fixing out roads and providing value to our city taxes. Stop wasting my \$\$\$\$
- breed specific discrimination is not the priority over here. it is about all the irresponsible pet owners that neglect their animals.
- I've been severely harmed by a small dog. I had to get a bunch of stitches. breed specific bylaws are not the answer.
- Breeds should not be discriminated. Encourage adoption through shelters versus breeders.
- BSL does not work and is costly to try to enforce. Saying all "pitbulls" will bite is like saying all racial minorities will be criminals. N
- I disagree with breed specific legislation. Dangerous animals should be evaluated case by case and not by breed.
- Biggest challenge I encounter is off-leash dogs in areas that are for on-leash dogs. Suggest higher fines for repeat offenders who do this
- Please remove all breed specific language + consider the harmful impacts of fining for minor infractions could have on lower income people.
- no
- The conditions about dogs that are "pit bulls" are absolutely ridiculous. You are catering to uneducated public instead of educating them.
- For those that dump domestic bunnies anywhere that used to be pets, should be fined for neglect as that is so wrong and not responsible.
- Please do not make any of the bylaws pit bull specific. Calgary has been above this and it needs to be focused on nuisance dogs not breeds
- stop saying pitbulls are bad. talk about the owners and people that neglect them and abuse them. they need to be in jail TODAY.
- I don't believe all pit bulls are bad it's all upon the owner and training. If a dog is vicious it should be at owners fault.
- .
- I think the pitbul restriction is not correct it could be any dog, my dog got attacked by a Rottweiler
- Training/cert. for owners by reputable trainers. I get my pitbull assessed yearly and he's not aggressive but he is still a dog.
- people complain of cats in flower beds. Dogs stop peeing on others property during your walk time!!
- All dogs are capable of damage. Heavier fines for irresponsible owners the right solution.



- Not reallu
- The sub-parks within dog parks where a dog can be off leash without risk to others should be accessible without going into the dog park.
- Make the fine for biting a child LOWER than biting an adult. Also consider finding the parents of children caught teasing dogs.
- we should look more into the owners of the aggravated dogs. dogs end up being a reflection of the owner, the dogs typically dont know better
- There is no good reason to charge for pet license. Registering online should be mandatory but not charge. This is a Cash cow
- Get rid of nuisance dog definitions and specific breed targeting. The definition is too loose and all dogs bite.
- Breed specific polices are not effective or sustainable. They are not supported by logic or evidence based practice.
- Breed specifics was addressed a few years ago there is no need to bring it back to the table. It doesn't work!
- The use of extending leashes should be banned altogether.
- It doesn't matter on the breed of dog you have. They shouldn't be banning pitbulls because of the " name" they are the most loving caring.
- There should be no dog breed discrimination. All and any type of dog can bit and become aggressive.
- It should always be a curdious manner to speak with the neighbours whom they are having issues with prior to involving the city.
- Just as border collies are known to be intelligent and require stimulation, pitbulls are known to be dangerous. Ban bully breeds immediately
- BSL has been proven not effective time and time again. Focus on pet laws that target irresponsible owners, not the pets!!
- ALL animals should be treated the same. Any animal can be dangerous due to their ownership/training. We should never single out one breed.
- Breed specific bylaws are not necessary, nor are they appropriate.
- Breed specific legislation is truly disappointing to see from the City of Calgary. Discipline owners with bad dogs. Not breeds alone
- N/a
- I think introducing the direct relation to pit bull breeds is ridiculous
- Engage in a information based program on how only a small % of Pitbull type dogs are dangerous and owners turn can turn any breed vicious
- Pit bulls should not be discriminated against as a breed and not be banned. All dogs have the capability to learn proper dog behaviour.
- My 6yr old pitbull served as a therapy dog for two low functioning autistic children with 0 incidents. Breeds don't determine aggression
- Fire [remove].



- Discriminating against a dogs breed is the same as discrimination against humans for being of different ethnicity, that is not acceptable.
- "No pitbull bans
- Higher fines and jail time for people who abuse animals including but not limited to dog fighting and aggression training"
- Leave pit bulls alone. It had nothing to do with the breed and everything to do with the owner.
- Not sure but the Bylaw about cats no being allowed outside to roam is ridiculous. It should be removed. It is unenforceable
- I feel that if a dog barks alot there is a solution u can buy collars that make the dog not bark or take the dog in the house
- Breed specific legislation is not supported by evidence and should be rejected.
- There should be NO discrimination towards certain dogs breeds seems like animal racism to me
- Take the idea of euthanasia off the table completely. Support and fund a training program and more appropriate care if necessary
- There should be a by law no long periods of barking between 11pm and 7am
- The owner should be accountable and they should be made to put their dog or cat threw any training. The animal should never be blamed.
- No breed specific legislation! This only hurts the animals and doesn't address the real issue of dangerous dogs in any breed.
- breed specific or similar looks is profiling, what happened to don't judge a book by it's cover. If this happens I will leave Calgary
- N/A
- I feel like there needs to be rules made for people trying to obtain a pet, they should not be classified as 'property' but a family member.
- Specific dog breeds should NOT be targeted. I love my pitbul
- There should be no breed discrimination. It is up to the owner how the dog behaves.
- Off leash should not mean out of control. Dog must have recall, be in sight of the owner, should not be a danger to other pets or people.
- Higher fines for dogs off leash friendly or not in non off leash areas Must be enforced. BSL breeds ignorance and enforces It as factual
- This is step one on the way to a pit bull ban. Breed specific rules are not alright. Stop being discriminatory and change the survey!
- Citizens have a right not to want dangerous animals in their parks, and to have more rules about owning them. This is a good thing.
- n/a
- Breed Specific Legislation should not even be considered
- Don't be like Ontario!! Realise it's the sog owner, not the breed!!!
- BSL is a horrible thing and should not be done. Maybe talk to experts because that obviously didn't happen



- so many variables to consider in regard to the dog related proposal. There are a lot of uninformed dog owners, these rules won't fix
- Breed specific bylaws should be thrown out. Bad dogs are a direct result of bad owners. Plain and simple.
- The bully breed specific items should be dropped. Nuisance/aggressive animals should all be treated the same regardless of breed.
- Do not discriminate against breed types. As you stated Pit Bull Breeds do not bite more often, take away the stereotype.
- If your dog is not ok with other dogs or people, don't bring it to a busy, public offleash. Training/socialization are needed not bandannas
- Specific breed discrimination should not be included in a bylaw. Behaviour is the result of treatment/upbringing not breed.
- I highly disagree with the bully breed ban. Any breed discrimination is disappointing makes me ashamed of this city for debating it
- No breed specific laws! Hold all pet owners responsible, with reminders for small breed owners that they too have to train their dogs
- I take offence at the idea that the city is targeting pit bull breeds. I see more large dogs on leash/ under control than small ones.
- Do not consider breed specific legislation.
- Breed discrimination is ridiculous. Y'all have some bolts loose if you actually do that.
- Offer training
- No breed specific bylaws.
- I'd like to see stiffer fines, jail time or penalties to those who harm animals. These changes may fall under different bylaws etc though.
- The feral bunny problem at Lindsay Park needs to be handled.
- Shame on you. I am furious that you have made this breed specific. It is not the breed but the owner who should be held accountable.
- Dogs should not be seized when waiting for "trial" of an incident. Have a behavioral specialist come and evaluate them in their home setting
- A noise complaint should not be acted upon by the city unless the complainant has tried to engage the owners first. Low level resolution.
- Do not penalize specific breeds. Enforce the bylaws and treat all dogs the same.
- The main issue around bylaws and animals is not the nature of the rules, but whether they are enforced. Please enforce the rules!
- Breed Specific Legislation has been proven ineffective, identifying a dangerous dog based on presumed breed or appearance is primitive.
- Breed specific discrimination shouldn't be brought in. All dogs can bite.
- A requirement for training for larger dogs over a set size or weight since they are capable of causing greater harm if they attack.



- Education to all regarding the number of bites from small dogs, and the frequency of dog bites as result of instigation
- Any erratic animal should be provided with a training class, provided at lower costs
- BSL is horrible. I am a veterinary nurse and I think you should speak with veterinary professionals to get their educated opinions!
- I understand some dogs have issues but this shouldn't be specified to one particular breed
- Seize nuisance pets for rehabilitation and rehoming - not euthanasia
- Better training for by law officers, more ppl skills and less disrespect to the public
- We should not be discriminating against pitbulls. My sister has 3 young children, and her pitbull is the best dog when it comes to the kids.
- Leave people alone to live their lives. We don't need the government involved in what kind of dog we own.
- Lease laws that don't appear to be enforced. We invest public dollars in off lease areas - great but increase enforcement of lease bylaws
- Specific special licensing for aggressive dog breeds. Too many irresponsible owners gravitate towards pit bulls.
- Stop breed discrimination and hold owner's accountable not the dog
- Focus on real issues in the city. This is an absolute waste of tax payer dollars and I am ashamed to call you my city councilors.
- Dog control and temperament classes should be mandatory for any owner fined for having an uncontrolled dog regardless of breed.
- Please remove breed-specific language from your proposed bylaw. This discrimination is wrong and will not make the city safer.
- Discriminating against a breed on "strength" is invalid. If true all large dogs should be under this advisement. Hold owners accountable.
- Fees for indoor cats should be lower than outdoor. Owners should be held more accountable for their pets if they bite.
- Stop criminalizing a breed of dogs. It's the owners not the dogs that are the problem.
- Sometimes a dog is teased or mistreated by children or adults which causes it to be nervous and scared. Authorities do not allow for this
- Pit bulls should not be subjected to unfair treatment by by-law. Any dog breed has the potential to cause harm
- Don't discriminate against certain breeds
- As a responsible dog owner, I strongly oppose any Breed Specific Legislation toward pit bulls.
- Pit bulls should not be singled out or targeted in this specifically. They are not inherently aggressive, this is learned behaviour
- Please focus on funding training, education, and prevention rather than funding people to handle dog attacks, bites, etc. after the fact.
- There should be no breed specific bylaws of any kind, it's just wrong



- The owner should be penalized and the dog should be trained if a dog is aggressive. Aggressive dogs are like that because of the owners
- Breed Specific penalization is [remove]. It is never the dog, or the breed, it is always a crappy owner.
- Mandatory specialized classes for problem dogs. Many owners are ill equipped to deal with problem dogs as they lack experience in training.
- No
- Nothing to add
- No
- Education for parents to discourage children from approaching dogs (whether on or off leash). A constant problem as a dog owner.
- Like many rescues mandate, mandatory obedience training should be part of licensing.
- Pit bulls are not more dangerous than other dogs!! How about we implement stronger penalties for animal abuse!
- Dogs should not be discriminated against, much like how we don't allow human discrimination.
- Off leash areas that are adjacent to residential streets/alleys fenced to avoid harassing animals in yards. eg: West of south end of Blkfoot
- A limit on the number of dogs that dog walkers can supervise at a time. I constantly see one walker with over 10 dogs (on and off leash)
- A fenced-off section in the off leash parks where unpredictable or nervous dogs can take turns running (sniffing) around by themselves.
- People should be charged more for leaving dogs in hot vehicles.
- Fine policy should be 2nd incident, not 1st but should also be accompanied with compulsory training for offence. Also leave pitbulls alone
- Breed specific legislation is not the answer. Target bad owners. Don't punish good owners for bad owners mistakes.
- The humans should be held responsible whenever fit, not the animals. Dog specific by-laws do not decrease the instances of issues.
- It should all be on the owner, breed specific discrimination shouldn't be brought in. Any breed can be dangerous if not trained right.
- If cats "at large" are not causing specific problems or complaints from neighbours, let them be!
- No breed specific bylaw! All animal owners need to be more responsible.
- Making restrictions based off a breed (pitbull) is not fair. You can make fines for biting or threatening higher, but don't restrict breeds.
- Not allowing dogs to socialize with humans or dogs can make them more aggressive. I do support putting a muzzle on specific breeds in public
- Weight and Size limit for pets on retractable leashes, enforce retractable leash length limit to comply with bylaws
- Less restrictions and more education! Stop labeling bully breeds as the villains in this narrative.



- I don't think a breed specific ban of any type should be put in place. Eg my dog got attacked by a shih tzu at a dog park not a 'pitbull'
- Owners should be held responsible for the actions of their dogs. Breed bans have been proven to be ineffective.
- None
- No breed restrictions.
- I feel like with cats that are outdoor cats it should be mandatory to have them fixed
- Reduce licensing fees. They are still too high for the average income earners. Especially if you allow 6 pets per household?
- A breed specific legislation isn't the answer. Promote responsible ownership and responsible breeding. Training mandatory for all dog owners
- I strongly oppose any breed specific bylaws. It takes away from the true problem which is responsible pet ownership in general.
- There should NOT be breed specific legislation and it should be no longer even be discussed. Focus on things that are needed!
- Breed-specific is NOT the answer. Even a small dog can do damage, Owners need to be held accountable, what about domestic bunnies problem.
- It must not be mandatory for certain breeds to wear a muzzle and be banned from dog parks.
- Breed specific discrimination is equivalent to racism. Racism is taught, and bad behaviour in pets is also taught.
- No
- Set up seminars to educate individuals on the different kinds of breeds of dogs, cats and what would be more compatible with the individuals
- Please do not bring in breed specific bylaws, all dogs are capable of biting and injuring. It's the owners, not the dog.
- Breed specific bylaws should not exist under any circumstances. They are based on myths, misinformation, bias, prejudice, and discrimination
- BSL=DEATH SENTENCE. This is shameful that Calgary is considering this. Do more non-biased research on the breeds!
- None
- Some Pit Bulls are actually the nicest and most well behaved at the dog park. It's not fair to their owners to be discriminated against
- Those enforcement officers dealing with dogs and cats, have they taken behavioural courses to understand the animal? this would be a must.
- Stop making breed specific rules. Start punishing people not breeds.
- Breed specific legislation is not the right approach. Requirements should be based on "actual" behaviours/risks not hypothetical ones.
- HOW ABOUT [removed] DONT BAN PITBULLS,,
- no



- There should be some sort of warning/fine for dogs off leashes in leashed areas.
- Maybe try owner specific legislation? If you can't train your dog, you don't deserve one. But the dog shouldn't be punished for human error.
- Stricter enforcement to prevent cats from free roaming, threatening their own safety as well as wildlife.
- Training and rehabilitation should be priority for an pet animal labeled a nuisance. As well as for any dog. No breed discrimination.
- Is there a neighbor that constantly complains just to cause issues they should go to Mediation
- First time owners should have to go to a course to learn how to properly care for a dog. Reckless owners are more dangerous than any breed
- Further leeway re: small livestock such as goats should be considered in the amendment for hens/laying animals (limited #s)
- Encourage responsible cat ownership by promoting harness training, catios, and indoor enrichment as an alternative to outdoor cats.
- Protection training on Opitbulls
- this misinformation about pitbulls shows how [remove]and uneducated calgary by law is, they are such a nice breed, dont discriminate!!
- No BSL in Calgary!
- Breed specific discrimination is wrong.
- N/a
- Breed specific legislation should not be considered.
- What shocked me was the signaling out of dogs based simply on appearance. Calgary has been world renowned for its breed neutral policies.
- Are we going to start limit the # of children a family can have? Little kids are noisy and a nuisance and destructive
- Having animal by law worry more about the animals then writing tickets.
- BSD is [remove].I am a pit bull owner and my dog is loving and caring and a huge part of my household. It is not fair to single out my dogs breed
- I think it is ABSURD that there is even a mention of BSL for pitbulls. Do your research! This has been proven over and over and over again
- Strangers and kids should be fined for harassing and provoking pets
- Breed specific discrimination should not be enforced. When licensing breeder/sellers information should be required to track potential crim
- Need more "wild" areas in the city that are not off-leash. I'd like to walk on an unpaved path without a dog running up to me.
- n/a
- Reduced license fees for spayed/neutered animals, or higher license fees for intact animals to encourage fixing animals/discourage breeding
- Please make bicycles walk through off leash dog areas. Or at the least limit to 5km/hr.



- Breed specific discrimination isn't the answer - encouraging and mandating (when appropriate) responsible dog ownership (eg training) is.
- "There should be no breed discrimination.
- The welfare of all animals should be equality protected."
- Increasing fees is one thing, but I think enforcement is really what can be improved upon.
- Licensing breeders - if no license, spaying/neutering are mandatory
- I really think you should consider the idea of public warnings regarding nuisance and dangerous animals.
- Breed discrimination is outdated and perpetuates the exploitation of pit bulls.
- There needs to be a way for a dog to pass a test to be declassified from 'nuisance' to 'nice pet.'
- Please do not do breed-specific laws/discrimination. Bad owners are bad owners regardless of breed. Keep spay/neuter feral cats.
- There's no reason to specify pit bulls - they can fall under the "any aggressive animal" category ONLY if applicable
- "Support the spay/neuter program, no kill shelters!
- I like the idea of having pet licenses at reduced costs and available in more locations."
- N/A
- No
- Give your head a shake. Breed specific discrimination should not be a thing. Ask yourself, is it okay to discriminate people based on race?
- Breed discrimination should not be implemented but animals who attack should be fined and have to complete training to keep the dog
- Breed specific legislation isn't supported. All animals can bite.
- Provide affordable training classes, so that more people can train their dogs. There are no bad dogs, only people who don't take the time
- It bothers me that this seems to be a bylaw specific to certain breeds of animals. Train the owners not the animals!!!!
- n/a
- We absolutely 100% do NOT need to discriminate breeds in Calgary. It's frustrating reading this section of the changes.
- Separate areas for lg and sm breeds (by weight) at off-leash parks . Sm breeds often charge at my lg breed = faultless retaliatory reaction
- Education for responsible pet ownership is most important. Absurd fines right off the bat help no one except the money-hungry city.
- No
- Pick up your dog's business. Not everyone wants your dog walking all over their front yard.
- don't muzzle the " pit bulls" ; .
- provide spay and netuer programs to everyone. This would prevent males from roaming and siring litters



- There should be a bylaw to limit/restrict dogs in multifamily buildings. The building in which I live even allows large dogs.
- Any breed specific legislation is discriminatory and fails to address the actual issue which is irresponsible owners. I
- Don't bully pits just bc they've got a stronger bite than other dogs, discrimination not needed
- Breed discrimination is absolutely ridiculous. Do better City of Calgary.
- Breed specific discrimination is a big step backwards and completely unfair to the owners it's not the dogs fault it's the owners
- Training for walking cats or other domestic animals that aren't dogs. Parks also designated for leashed cats, etc.
- I think the breed specific legislation regarding Pitbulls should be completely removed from the engagement for phase 2. We are not "racists"
- Bully specific legislation (BSL) is discriminatory and has no place in today's society.
- Proof of vaccinations should be a requirement to get a pet license. To many unvaccinated dogs at the parks.
- Pit bulls should not be lumped together with "nuisance dogs"; "Nuisance dogs" should also be more specific as to the behaviour shown.
- Banning selected breeds doesn't work. I would also like to see higher fines and /or sentencing for people who abuse animals.
- Breed specification should not be brought in. Mandatory education for all dog owners should.
- Any dog, regardless of breed, that has a bite history should be muzzled and leashed in public at all times.
- It has nothing to do with breed it's all to do with the owner and training.
- The fact that pitbulls are being singled out is absolutely bias. The history of these dogs are to be working farm dogs and nanny dogs!
- Targeting specific breeds its absurd. Especially the ones listed above.
- Let's worry about actual issues instead of what people are doing in their homes, thank you.
- More needs to be done about outdoor cats, different licensing and fees should be required as outdoor cats are not monitored and defecate
- Mandatory bite liability insurance for all dogs
- Breed-specific bans and discrimination are NOT acceptable nor rooted in fact.
- No ideas - there should be no breed specific bylaws - the bylaws should apply to all breeds.
- Waiving the period license for in door cats. Why would anyone need a license for a cat that never goes outside or is on a leash
- Na
- Punish owners who have a track record of problem animals and leave the rest of us responsible owners/bully breeds alone
- I don't know
- DO NOT ALLOW BREED SPECIFIC LICENSING.



- I think cats should have a one time registration fee, considering they stay inside for life.
- Why single out a breed and not put ownership on owners. I was shocked to see the bully questions and you are promoting discrimination.
- Pit bull type dogs should not be singled out in the survey. This sounds like it is leading to breed specific legislation which doesn't work
- Stop the attempt on making breed specific rules.
- please don't discriminate against bully breeds. why does no one talk about the little ones? THEY BITE TOO!!
- When pit bulls bite they do a horrifying life changing amount of damage, so much more damage than a retriever or a poodle.
- Dog warnings- when a person has been warned to stay away from dog by owner-person ignores and gets bit. Not the responsibility of dog owner
- No
- I don't believe in breed bias in any shape
- Pit bulls should not be treated differently from other dogs. It is bad owners who raise bad dogs, dogs are not inherently bad.
- Targeting pitbulls is NOT the answer! Rottweiler, German Shepard, Doberman, Husky who's next? Govern the behaviour and owner-not the breed!
- Breed-specific discrimination is not a safe and effective way to deal with nuisance animals.
- breed specific bylaws are insane and so wrong. small breeds can be just as mean.
- Breed specific discrimination is ridiculous. It's not the breed that's the problem, it's the owners. It is NOT the answer.
- I am against breed specific legislation. It is the fault of the owner not the dog.
- This should NEVER be about one specific breed. I've seen Huskies and German Sheppard's be more aggressive than Pit Bulls. Train your pets.
- Breed discrimination is unfair
- Hens should be allowed with a limit of 12. No roosters
- There are no bad animals, only bad owners.
- FACTS about BSL and how IT DOESN'T WORK
<https://www.torontohumanesociety.com/pdfs/Ontario-BSL.pdf>
- Restricting children from entering offleash parks and other parks
- Breed-specific legislation is NEVER the answer Calgary!
- If people of lower income can't afford a pet licence, they likely can't afford proper veterinary care for their pet and shouldn't have it.
- I don't think any type of breed discrimination has anything to do with the "nuisance" of an animal. It has to do with conditioning/training.
- Give some warning before issuing any noise violations. You can't train a dog to stop barking over night.



- Create a new category to distinguish between potentially dangerous and non-dangerous nuisance animals so that laws can be better targeted.
- If you're banning Pit Bulls because of bite strength, you should probably look at all the dogs with greater jaw strength than pitties.....
- Barking is a result of something agitating the dog. Owners with barking dogs should be forced to take training in order to stop the barking.
- There should be pet ownership classes, and they should be mandatory for problematic or first time pet owners.
- Bylaws are useless when not enforced. eg. Dogs in sports fields and playgrounds. Leashes > 6ft. Currently owners can easily ignore the bylaws.
- I love a lifetime licensing fee. Yearly fees are a cash grab for us owners with homebody, nice pets.
- Stop proposing breed specific legislation. The information shared about Pit-Bull type dogs in this survey was false and based on myths.
- I don't think the breed specifics are helpful. There are many small dogs that bite and their owners think they are cute doing it.
- Lay off animal discrimination. All animals are equal regardless of size and color. Start training owners as well.
- There's also needs to be protection against people who antagonize a dog, ie. Blow an airhorn at a dog. There are no rights for the dog owner
- Dogs kill people every year. Ban all dogs.
- Breed bans are inappropriate. Many breeds can cause significant damage or death if not raised/trained properly.
- -
- Would like to see more dog parks open in the Southwest area of Calgary
- I would like to see a reduction in the number of animals being sold online for profit. Higher licensing fees for unfixed animals
- Branding one type of dog dangerous is ridiculous. I have had more issues with small dogs than medium or large dogs.
- I don't think BSL is the way to go - it's an unfair bias against a breed. There's far too many studies done discrediting "facts";.
- Stop targeting Pit Bulls as an aggressive breed. German shepherds used to be used as guard dogs and got a bad reputation too. It's owners!!
- No
- Trap and release programs are a great way to limit feral cats in cities without hurting the cats
- Fees and licensing to city for breeding animals, must be regis. Strict and unforgiving rules for cases of animal cruelty, neglect and abuse.
- None
- No



- This is an absolute joke. The fact that you are being breedist of the specific "bully" breed is disgusting. ALL DOGS CAN DO TERRIBLE DAMAGE!
- Animal behaviour is entirely based off of the owner's training, handling, and bonding with the animal and incidents are as well.
- No breed discrimination in my city
- Please don't punish bully breeds. My dog's sweet spirit will be crushed if he's forced to wear a muzzle and not give kisses to everyone
- Breed specific legislation should NOT be mandated but more education and knowledge for the public would be ideal
- Liability insurance for dogs should be mandatory. To ensure injury to another persons pet is financially covered if the dog does attack.
- Ban people with extensive violent history from owning dangerous breeds.
- Do not breed target animals, a German Shepard can be just as dangerous as a bully breed. Owners need to be held responsible for their animal
- Don't breed or buy while shelter pets die. Adopt don't shop.
- Focus enforcement on owners, not pets. I support an increase to licence fees if the money goes directly to rehabilitating confiscated dogs.
- I don't think responsible cat owners should have to purchase yearly licences. My cats have not left the house in 17 years.
- I think if we focused more on the owner of the dog and less about the breed there would less issues
- On-leash areas need to be enforced, I leash my dogs for a reason and hate when an unleashed dog comes at us in a leashed area.
- STOP signaling out Bully Breeds. Make everyone take a course/classes for ownership. Everyone wins if we are all held to the same standards.
- BSL has not been proven to be effective and it is discriminatory. Training given by the owner is much more important.
- Breed means nothing, it's the owners and how the animal is treated that will reflect how it acts in public places.
- I find it frustrating that they don't have a separation of aggressive vs nuisance dogs. And breed shouldn't be a factor at all in this
- Absolutely NO to Breed Specific Legislation. If anything, enforce adequate training. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- A No kill policy should be in place. Living animals should not be killed because they are homeless.
- Breed Specific Legislation is ignorance and bully breeds do not deserve to be lumped in with nuisance animals. SAY NO TO BSL!
- No idea why pit type dogs are singled out. I have personally been bit by more Chihuahuas and dachshunds then any big dog.
- Pet owners should be licensed similar to how drivers are. Owners caught breaking rules have their license taken away.



- Breed specific legislation is a terrible idea. The onus is on a good owner not a bad dog because of its breed.
- Higher fines up to 1000\$. If no action is taken the landlord be contacted about reducing quality of life of neighbours.
- Breed specific legislation should not be considered. All dog breeds have the potential to cause harm. Punish the crimes, not the breeds.
- Discrimination against a specific breed of dog is retarded. Bad behaviour is taught by bad owners and can be any breed of dog.
- I do not agree that there should be any rules based on dog breeds. The issues are not caused by breeds, they are caused by bad pet owners.
- If you have more than 1 incident of attacks that's on the owner and they shouldn't be allowed to have any more pets
- Bred specific discrimination should NOT be allowed in Calgary! This is beyond degrading for the animal and the owner.
- Pitbull's are not bad breeds we need to start focussing on bad owners who are with these dogs instead of always attacking the dog we should
- No farm animals should be allowed including for emotional support. Those designations are being abused. Farm animals devalue property.
- Separate aggressive dogs from non-aggressive problem dogs. Their circumstances/restrictions shouldn't be the same.
- For minor offences, requiring mandatory training (instead of the fine) could wind up to more beneficial to the community and the animal.
- N/A
- Bully breeds and other dogs considered aggressive and dangerous should be banned
- how animals who are left outside and/or in built habitats outside the main household will be taken care of in cases of negligence.
- Review the off-leash designation for parks that are multi-use. The one out my back gate has a bike path, a playground and over 100 dogs p/d.
- Pit bulls should be banned on calgary
- [removed]
- purchasing a animalnor buying a barn cat should be hard and there should be more requirements to care properly for them and reduce shelter#
- Dealing with problem wildlife in the city that poses a danger to pets.
- Owners of nuisance dogs should be required to complete education classes or lose their dogs. Bad owners = bad dogs
- I don't believe that breeds should be discriminated against. I have met many of the "aggressive” breeds that were sweethearts
- Breed specific descrimination shouldt be brought in. People who raise aggressive pets should have them taken and not be allowed to own pets



- Find the owner if the dog was left abandoned or outside for long periods. Teach the owner how to engage with her pet so they're not bored.
- No
- Limiting the number of dogs allowed by dog walkers to 5 per person. Too often dog walkers will be at dog parks with 10+ dogs with no control
- I do not believe in breed specific bans, i also think mandatory training could be an effective alternative to fines
- House cats should be allowed to roam outside as long as they have a license. Also, certain dog breeds should not be discriminated against.
- It's not about the breed, it's about proper training and responsible owners.
- No
- Breed specific legislation is nonsense. Shouldn't even be asked about on the survey
- The park out my back gate was designated an o/l park with no input from us who literally cannot step off our property sure of our safety.
- Reduce license fees for all, middle class people need help these days too. stop re inventing the wheel as a way to justify over spending.
- discount on license fee if pet has own medical insurance
- Fines for dog owners who let them bark constantly when left outside.
- n/a
- Please make it mandatory if you own a pet to have a home for the pet. Take animals away from homeless people!
- Instead of coming down on specific breeds maybe start putting together teams that check on welfare's of animals. That's not a police visit.
- Don't discriminate against pitbulls.All dogs can be dangerous, it is all based on how the owners train or treat them.
- No
- Discrimination against certain breeds of dogs is unethical. This will be a stain on Calgary's reputation if they go through with this.
- Breed discrimination shouldn't be brought in
- -
- you need to do more to explore the role that the victim played in a dog bite. I.e children running rampant up to an unknown dog
- owners that leaves the scene of an attack against another animal/human should be held to the same level as people who commit hit and runs.
- No
- n/a
- Breed specific discrimination is unacceptable; I'm disgusted its a topic of conversation. Maybe get people who work with dogs on the board?



- Very disappointed the city would even explore breed specific rules. There are no bad dogs, there are bad owners.
- Let pets become dependents for tax purposes
- I cannot express my disappointment and disgust with such a dog friendly city considering Pitbull specific discrimination. SO WRONG!
- Open an off leash park where children under the age of 15 are prohibited
- Targetting specific breeds is unnecessary
- Water stations would be excellent. there isn't enough water in this province and it would encourage people to leave their yards more.
- I think a different dog licencing program should be explored. Promote education on different dog breeds and their traits.
- No idea
- It would be very beneficial if The City had a free online training program for basic cat/dog ownership and training.
- Breed specific discrimination is absurd. Do research!
- Breed-specific bylaws are not the answer here.
- Do not pursue BSL.
- I own English Bull Terriers and I am fed up trying to defend this breed from ignorance and bias. They are no more aggressive than other dogs
- Breed specific discrimination is ignorant and causes fear of otherwise harmless dogs. Owners create "nuisance" dogs no matter the breed.
- Need a more of a clear definition of excess noise. As it stands now, one bark can be considered breaking the bylaw if it disturbs anyone.
- Hold owners accountable for creating a bad dog. Don't take this out on innocent animals when the behaviour is a direct result of bad owners
- The owner is the problem if the dog is aggressive, NOT THE BREED. Also, the Trap/Neuter/Release program is ideal for handling stray cats
- Colored bandanas is a must for me. Kids need to learn they can't approach every dog. Some rescue dogs can be triggered by things like a hat
- Giving dog owners annual fee discount if a proof of obedience training by certified trainers is supplied
- When a pet owner is accused of having an excessively barking dog, the accuser must have and provide proof before any action is taken.
- Colour coded bandanas aren't the answer. If you suspect your dog may create an incident at an offleash park, don't take it to the park.
- Livestock in the city is great but should be restricted to properties of a certain size or type. Chickens do not belong in tiny apartments
- Lower or remove licencing fee for indoor cats.



- A pit-bull should not be listed as a nuisance or have rules similar to a nuisance dog unless proven as one. STOP THE DISCRIMINATION!
- I am against breed specific discrimination. Hold the owners accountable, but don't bully the breeds!
- I don't support breed specific legislation. Increased education on dog and animal safety with youth.
- Stay out of peoples lives
- Colour codes bandanas aren't the answer for on leash areas. Educate people to not approach strange dogs, and to create distance between dogs
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. Fines should depend on situation ex. if dog is being bullied or teased.
- No
- Do not single out "pit bulls" from other dog breeds. All breeds should be equal, breed is not the problem, its the owner.
- This is completely ludicrous if you think banning pit bull "looking” dogs is going to stop dog attacks, ignorant and ill-informed
- Feral cat should be brought to shelters for rehoming or euthanasia. They cause ecological damage and are a nuisance to neighbour's.
- No
- You should not be directing this a bully breeds. It should be generalized for all breeds. I have friends with bull dogs that are friendly
- The questioning/suggestions around pit bulls is breed specific discrimination and disappointing that it's even being considered.
- Judging an animal based on a breed is not right. An animal behaves based on how the owner trains them.
- Feral rabbits should be brought to shelters for rehoming or euthanasia. Life on the streets are short, and painful.
- Breed specific discrimination should not be brought in.
- All dogs should be allowed just because their breed looks aggressive doesn't mean they are naturally like that unless raised like that
- None
- Nothing breed specific should be applied. Providing training courses that animals owners of all ages and incomes could attend for reasonable \$
- There should be a by-law about teasing / harassing dogs in yards. Children down the street tease my dogs and I have to keep them quiet.
- Excessive barking in yards should signal the owner to check on their pet and bring indoors if necessary to calm the dog down
- Breed specific discrimination shouldn't be brought in. The issue is not the breed but the lack of training education of the owner.
- Make dog training for prospective dog owners mandatory.



- Non spayed/neutered pets licenses should cost more. Breeding at home keeps causing the never ending rescue problems. I have two rescues.
- N/a
- Pit bulls should be banned
- No need to ban specific breeds. Provide spay/neuter/housing options for feral cats - as many do not adapt and are euthanized in shelters.
- Public/city funded/vet student practicum animal training/behavioural hotline. Animals act how they are raised and treated by their owners.
- STOP BULLYING PITBULLS
- This is [remove] dogs do their job
- Let's not blame the breed. It's the owners that are to blame for aggression. It's not just pit bulls or the like. A lot of breeds
- Nope
- If barking is causing disturbances for neighbours and can't be resolved, heavier fines should be laid.
- N/A
- Register the person who has history of problems animals and work to restrict their access to animals.
- Do NOT discriminate against specific breeds.
- I think it should be required to bring your dog to a proper obedience program. Too many people don't train their dogs.
- Trying to be breed specific is NOT the answer. Dog owners need to be responsible for the animals they have
- No restrictions on breeds. I.E. pit bulls.
- Dobermans, Rottweilers, and German Shepherds all have a stronger bite than pitbull's. BSL is proven to not be effective effective
- Breed discrimination is ridiculous. I support using a high visibility bandana or leash that indicates on ALL breeds friendly/unfriendly.
- I have an idea about you singling out pit bulls. They are not vicious in any way unless the owner makes them that way. That goes for any dog
- "PIT BULLS DO NOT DESERVE EXTRA PUNISHMENT OR RESTRICTIONS!!!
- pit bull is not a breed
- if anything restrict ownership, not breeds"
- A pitbull ban sounds like a wonderful idea! Much safer for children in Calgary.
- I would like to see more investigations into the owners of aggressive dogs rather than focusing on breeds. Paying more attention to owners
- Stop blaming the animals and start blaming the humans raising them.
- This will make many, including myself, very furious.
- Haven't we agreed as a nation that discriminating against someone because of how they look is bad? No breed discrimination!



- Breed specific legislation is completely unfounded and a deplorable option for the city to consider. Shame on you!
- Blaming one breed of dog is not the issue, it is the owner that is the issue when it comes to singling out pit bulls. This bylaw is TERRIBLE
- Breed Specific Legislation should not even be a consideration. Also the bite force myth you have written has not been scientifically proven
- Breed specific legislation is discriminatory and ineffective. Punish the deed, not the breed.
- None
- There is no reason someone in the city needs a dog bred for fighting.
- The city needs to focus on bad pet owners instead of focusing on pitbulls. They are the problem, NOT the dogs!!
- None
- Na
- Banning a breed (I.E pitbulls) should not be a characteristic of this bill.
- Stop discriminating against pit bulls. This is unfair.
- indoor cats should not require a license
- No breed specific regulations. Have prospective pet owners be required to take a test before getting a pet to show that they are responsible
- Could we consider a chip for dogs that are aggressive to show where they are at all times
- Lets focus on owners and not breed (BOL) Let's look at situations and not base this on breed. BSL includes more breeds than pitbulls, [remove].
- X
- I would support a pitbull bread ban.
- STOP THE HORRIBLE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PIT BULLS AND BULLY BREEDS ITS ABSOLUTE GARBAGE
- Breed specific legislation is equivalent to racism. It should not be present.
- Breed-specific legislation does not work and the thought that our Council would even consider it is appalling. It is equivalent to racism.
- Breed discrimination is wrong . And should never be brought in
- I am not ok with the city trying to ban certain breeds of dogs.
- Fully fund spay and neuter. Make licenses and fines for intact animals significantly higher. Fund rescues. 99% of problems will disappear
- N/A
- [remove] and your hockey team
- I think off leash dog parks needs to be split into sections - a section for large dogs and one for small dogs.
- Backyard chickens help to bridge the disconnect with our food system. They're one part of battling the obesity and other health crises.



- Ban retractable leashes on the pathways. It is impossible to control a dog that is at the end of a 10 - 20 foot leash.
- Breed specific legislation should be banned. I support the spay/neuter program continuing and no kill policy.
- Education works better than fines. How about hosting a series of free webinars and training sessions on common problems like barking?
- breed specific discrimination is a risky step, you should keep it generic and evaluate on a case by case basis..
- [removed]
- I do not support discriminating against pitbull breeds.
- There are no bad breeds, just bad owners. "Pitbulls" are amazing nanny dogs. You're much more likely to be bit by a chihuahua or a poodle.
- Mastiffs, German Shepherds, Rottweilers, and Bulldogs all have stronger bites than Pitbulls- I don't see them on the list. Targeted garbage.
- I'm extremely disappointed in the BSL legislation proposed. This was NOT part of the initial discussion. It is absolutely reprehensible!
- I lived through BSL against Pit Bull dogs in Ontario, and it was a heartbreaking time. These dogs are NO MORE dangerous as pets than others.
- Do not target one breed (pitbull s) they are such sweet dogs they are just stereotyped so badly
- TNR works. Any animal found running at large should be spayed or neutered before it's returned or adopted.
- Education over fines, especially for first time offenders.
- Breed-specific legislation should not be used.
- I love the idea of voluntary bandanas. A lot of incidents could be prevented by having a clear indication of a dog's approachability.
- Breed-specific discrimination causes stigma and leads to a reduction in adoption rates of those breeds. Punish the human, not the animal
- Breed specific legislation is unjust and cruel. Is is a ridiculous reaction to the latest "target breed”. Very disappointed in Calgary.
- Don't bully the breed.
- N
- PITBULLS ARE NOT THE PROBLEM. THE OWNERS ARE. MAYBE A CLASS SHOULD BE HELD FOR PEOPLE WHO WANT TO OWNA PITBULL AND HOW TO CARE FOR THEM
- Where is the protection for dogs and their owners from someone with an ax to grind? Complaints coming from 1 source should be discounted
- Discriminating against pitbulls is bullshit
- Eliminate all licensing for dogs and cats. Do however, require that all animals carry a secure and legible ID tag that includes owner contact.



- Fund mental health services to combat hoarding. A bylaw won't prevent a mental health issue and will make it worse because they have to hide
- Don't discriminate against specific breeds of dog, people are the problem.
- breed specific legislation fails to reduce bites or target poor ownership/abuse.. strengthen Calgary's existing RESPONSIBLE pet legislation
- Human training required and lessons for history of poor behaved pets
- No way I'm muzzling my well behaved PITBULL because some lady didn't know how to train her Yorkie, figure it out
- Breed specific laws should not be allowed.
- Up fines for owners not caring for their animal properly; (If they let the pet howl for hours it's probably the owner being negligent).
- Clean house in Animal Services. A bylaw officer told me "the only good chow is a dead chow" while picking up a stray from a vet clinic.
- Nuisance barking needs to be more clearly defined. What one person deems a nuisance may not be the same as others.
- Many cities and small town through B.C. supply receptacles with poo bags throughout all city parks and green spaces. Use my licence money!
- As someone with a bully breed that was attacked on leash by a GOLDEN RETRIEVER, I refuse to believe in breed specific discrimination.
- Stop blaming specific breeds for incidents. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Bring dogs into schools to teach kids not to fear and to react properly, especially in demographics with cultural fear of dogs.
- The consequence if an animal attack should be on the animal's owner, as it is the owner's responsibility, and not the fault of the animal.
- Please avoid Breed Specific Legislation. The focus should be on the owner to properly train and care for an animal of any breed.
- Using money obtained from fines/fees could go to training programs for new and experienced pet owners.
- Occasional monitoring of pet defecation needs to be addressed. Bylaw officers actually need to walk neighborhoods to find offenders
- There should not be outdoor cats. Cats killed by neglect is out of control. Cat owners should have to keep cats indoor and leashed outdoor
- My biggest concern is around the impound fees for cats and dogs. I wonder how many pets were abandoned due to the owners personal finances.
- If BSL for pitbulls is appropriate, then CPS should arrest white males because they're "more prone to be a serial killer." BSL is racism.
- I do not support breed specific discrimination. I've seen many people and animals attacked and none of them were by a pit bull, still severe
- I believe shelters/rescues need to be more diligent in who they home animals to and what they require from first time dog owners.



- Breed discrimination should be removed. Any breed can show aggression.
- N/A
- More funding for TNR (trap, neuter, return) from the city.
- BSL is NOT the answer. It is being removed from other cities because it doesn't work.
- No
- I think cats should be indoors only. But if cat is allowed outdoors make it a LAW to be fixed. Also judge fitness of owners not breeds
- We need to make Calgary more pet friendly - From rental units to stores and restaurants.
- Use license \$ to subsidize emergency vet care for low income Calgarians.
- Encourage training for both dog and the owner specific to breed. Wrong dog for the wrong family could be a disaster
- Obedience or other types of training should be mandatory on the first offence of the dog. Give dog and owner a chance to fix behavior
- the "look" of a dog should not be a factor. the "pitbull" looking dogs should not be singled out- it needs to be about RESPONSIBLE ownership
- Muzzles and lack of access to parks will reduce socialization and training opportunity, therefore increasing bites and attacks. BOL over BSL
- Make fines based on income. \$100 is nothing to someone with a \$100K/yr income, but could mean food to a single parent working 3 jobs.
- There should be no breed specific bans.
- Hard no on breed-specific legislation.
- This survey made me submit before I finished phase 2. Regardless, threat indicators are not fair. Putting bans on a breed of animal is unfair
- Develop and implement specific criteria and a basis of evidence for dogs that are "disturbing the peace".
- What is proposed to address people that don't like pets and/or chose to provoke reactions and consequences from pets and owners?
- Allow dogs in more public places so they don't need to be left home to cause barking or property damage issues.
- "It's not the dogs it's the owner, you can have two dogs from the same litter turn out differently.
- Pitbulls are not to blame!"
- Support rescues to do their job via funding, bylaw supports for foster homes, etc. so they can deal with the messes the city doesn't want to
- Removal of euthanization for dogs who bite replacing it instead with intense obedience. If owner can not comply not enforce obedience rehome
- Promote shelter adoptions. Licensing fees should be reduced significantly for shelter adoptions and pets that are spayed/neutered.
- Mandatory spay/neuter program for the various pitbull breeds. These dogs are a menace, and should not be sold or bred.



- Instead of making issues breed specific, make them based on the dogs temperament.
- No
- Similar to the wildlife suggestion, implement a bylaw where people aren't allowed to tease dogs. Most barking and bites are because of that
- Making bylaws breed specific is not fair. It should be based on an animal's nature and history
- I believe that breeds of animals shouldn't be discriminated against because the owners are still at fault for not training properly.
- As a former owner of a pitbull and rottweiler, breed specific discrimination is wrong. They were both great dogs and never hurt a fly.
- Backyard chickens can help reduce food insecurity and poverty issues.
- Stereotyping breeds is 90s. Dogs are a product of their environment, just like kids. Its 2020. Lets be accepting. Ownership is the problem.
- Breed specific discrimination is unscientific and unjust, as well as ineffective. I'm horrified it's even tentatively under consideration.
- Please consider banning nuisance breeds.
- There is no reason to single out pit bulls
- I would like to know where abuse to animals falls because those laws or bylaws need some major updating!
- .
- Breed specific legislation is demonstrably counterproductive and should be removed from bylaw language.
- This Is Not An Off Leash Area postings along transport corridor south side of the Stony Trail by Cranston. Peeing on fences and defecating.
- Breed specific bylaw is abhorant
- If there is breed specific laws, they should focus on small breeds that are noisier and more aggressive.
- No
- No BSL. Banning pitbulls based on strength is like limiting the rights of certain men just because they have large muscles - it's not fair.
- Allow 1-10 chickens, but not roosters due to nose pollution.
- Thanks for including calgarians (especially pet owners) the opportunity to share their opinions!
- Breed specific is not the right call, please take this off the table. We don't do that with people anymore, we shouldn't do it with animals
- all ideas of breed specific bylaws should be eliminated
- I do not agree with the breed specific discrimination, and confining a dog to it's home will just exacerbate the behaviour issues
- no
- Licensing for foster pets is a barrier. It takes manpower to administer, and often the animal is adopted before the license even arrives.



- Judging dogs merely on their appearance is completely unfair. A dogs behaviour is direct result of the owner, not the breed.
- N/A
- BSL is not acceptable and will not provide the solution you are looking for. Disgusting proposal Calgary.
- "I have met many pit bulls in my life, and every single one was gentle and sweet.

- They should not be forced to wear a muzzle."
- n.a
- Mandatory training of dogs and people.
- More fines for at large cats
- There should be no breed specific programs. Pets are a product of their environment.
- Breed specific bylaws are [remove]! It's the equivalent of racism in dog form! I refuse to support it.
- NIL
- Need a form of history of aggression/bite check for dogs being brought into Canada from USA kill shelters or not allowed to import.
- Dogs that are off-leash in clearly marked on-leash city wildlife refuge areas should be subject to a higher fine.
- I think that instead of fining pet owners there should be mandatory training for owners with nuisance dogs or dogs with behavioural issues
- be clear for kids (And adults) that they should never approach a dog without consulting owner. Bandana idea is great but please Be careful
- When pets get annual check ups/shots, they also renew their annual license through the vet. All off leash parks should be fenced.
- "Ban anyone convicted of causing animals to be distressed from owning them/require regular vet checkin to deter
- No breed specification laws"
- Breed-specific discrimination will do nothing to solve the problem and will only further the harmful stereotyping. Please reconsider.
- Amend the pitbull distinction to include any aggressive animal. Should be "Nuisance animals" and "Aggressive animals".
- [removed]
- Pi
- "how about no fee's or regulation for responsible pet owners.
- Fees' and regulation for irresponsible pet owners!!
- Seems logical"
- Repeat offenders of any bylaw violation should be followed up with to ensure they actually follow the laws they break.



- pet licensing - a tag is multi year with number officers could look up, and for re-registering an existing dog just make it available online
- Pet re-housing program if pets taken away from no responsible owner. Non kill shelter. Pets lives matter.
- BULLY BREED BANS DONT WORK The city of Calgary should be ashamed for perpetuating it. Encourage responsible ownership/education for all pets
- License fees for cats should be reduced and pet owners should have to vaccinate unless contradicted by a vet. Allow all breeds
- I do not agree with singling out Pit Bulls. Most of the time it is the mistreatment from the owner that is the major problem.
- No longer euthanize wild life who wander into residential neighborhoods, implement better policies for this situation
- TNR programs for feral cats should be implemented. If a cat is deemed friendly, it should be fostered to adopt.
- People need to learn how to properly deal with animals. The answer is not punishing the animals based on breed etc.
- The deadliest dogs by statistics in canada are huskies. Get rid of this pitbull [removed]. Just Calgary trying to stay relevant and newsworthy.
- BSL is [removed]and shouldn't even be a thought. Sounds like a lot of BSL tossed into a bunch of other garbage to keep it hidden from citizens.
- I disagree with implementing BSL. It is not effective, and is discriminatory to our community and their families.
- Legislation against specific dog breeds should not be implemented.
- well behaved street people dogs should be given a special no fee exemption to an animal license.
- Non native species in city parks/green areas are more damaging than any dog or cat. A city initiative against them would gain more support.
- Read my other comment in section 3 please
- Making bully breed specific bylaws has been proven in many other municipalities to be ineffective in reducing dog bites/attacks.
- I hope the city of Calgary is able to see that this prejudice towards pit bulls is absolutely an insult. Unacceptable in today's climate.
- Breed-specific legislation has never been show to be effective in reducing dog bites. It's difficult to enforce and more \$\$ than other options
- Breed specific discrimination should not be brought in.
- Certain dog parks require dogs be vaccinated and pass a behavioral test, and no puppies or children inside. Small membership fee.
- Maybe you should offer classes or incentive to attend classes with your dog (puppy) to learn some skills to make them better citizens
- Discriminating against pit bulls is horrible, and any dog that 'looks like one'? What garbage. Leave them alone.



- Support more accessible dog training courses so that good dogs stop getting blamed for bad owners. BSL is a dangerous joke. Stop it.
 - "Pitbull" breeds should NOT be targeted more than any other breed of dog.
 - Breed discrimination is wrong and unfair. I am actually so ashamed my city is considering this. Disgusting.
 - Fines are a poor solution. If you are rich = don't have to care. Dog bites should result in the owner/dog going through education/training.
 - Treat all breeds equally as they all have equal potential to become dangerous as a result of poor training. Small dogs bite far more often.
 - Do not discriminate based in breed. Make owners more accountable for the training of their pet!
 - Ownership classes for new pet owners, fines for pet abandonment, education for kids on pet care/behavior
 - Everyone knows the animals are never the problem it is the owners. Pet owners need to take responsibility if they want to keep their pets.
 - I am not sure I have an idea, however I do feel that it is unfair and not justified to single out the 'pitbull' breed as 'dangerous'.
 - "Don't single out breeds. Make owners more responsible for their dogs actions.
-
- It's not the breed that is the problem."
 - No.
 - Calgary's ideas for leash laws are working and should be enforced for ALL dogs, not just big dogs.
 - No, but I will be extremely disappointed if BSL is approved, to the point where i would potentially move
 - Breed specific discrimination shouldn't be brought in. It is up to the OWNER. It is NEVER the dogs fault.
 - dogs I have seen 'fight' at offleash parks are not 'bully' breeds but typically other large breeds or small yappy dogs. don't discriminate
 - Not totally related, but I would just like to see more off leash areas in the city and an easier way to find those places.
 - Give more discretion for officers to be REASONABLE, and enforce REASONABLE laws focusing on animal well being. That should come above all!!!
 - I do not agree with BSL. Nuisance dog concerns are fine but pin pointing pit bulls is inappropriate
 - There needs to be an easy way to catch and turn in cats that are at large. Currently we have to buy our own traps.
 - Off leash, aggressive, and poorly trained animals are a problem.
 - Requiring all dog owners to have their dogs trained, offering tax benefits for them being trained.
 - It's never the breed, it's always the owners. First it was Shepard's. Then Doberman's. Then Rottweilers. Now pitbulls.



- Every animal should be treated as an individual, the same way we expect humans to be treated as an individual.
- The government has no place telling people what pets they can or can not have. Singling out pitbulls is shameful.
- Lifetime licensing options would be amazing! Please implement this!!!
- #10. Licenses *should* be renewed annually. It is more likely that people will then remember to keep their contact info up to date.
- n/a
- No
- NO Breed specific legislation
- Please no breed-specific legislation. It has no basis statistically or scientifically. It is a backwards step in a city moving forwards.
- Get rid of all/any ideas related to any breed specific guidelines, breeds are not the issue, owners/background and training are.
- Right now the City of Calgary bureaucrats should be busy looking after a City that is fiscally is tough shape not wasting time like this.
- BSL is not acceptable. This city should be proud that we hold owners accountable for their dogs' behavior, no matter the breed.
- Any dog regardless of breed can be a danger, singling out a breed is not addressing the problem. Deal with the problem not an innocent dog!
- Keep things the way they are now. It has been working. BSL does NOT work.
- Breed Specific Laws should not be made. If you're going to create a law, it should include "ALL" breeds.
- There needs to be more policing of city trails by by-law officers to encourage owners to keep their pets on a leash
- Do not ban any dog breeds, dogs learn from their owners. I have met many well behaved pit bulls, and many more tiny dogs with attitudes.
- We love our Pit Bulls, throw those by-laws out. It's the owner, NOT THE DOG!!!
- Please make this decision based on data and not public outcry/anecdotal stories.
- In order to purchase a pitbull, a background check should be done. Also, the owners should be required to attend training classes with them.
- More focus should be on put on irresponsible pet owners. Eg. Mandatory training for both pet and owner. More strict for multiple offence.
- Not targeting specific breeds with addendums to bylaws as there is plenty of misinformation in the above that is promoted.
- The fact that specific breeds like pitbulls were singled out in this draft is despicable and outrageous. I am not okay with this. Do better!
- Fewer sticks, more carrots. People need help, not punishment, if they're having trouble controlling their pet. Provide affordable training.



- I don't think it's fair to categorize pit bulls as a more dangerous breed for the purposes of bylaws. Subsidize training programs instead.
- Pitbulls should not be singled out in this. The issue is the people who raise them. There is no scientific evidence to support this claim
- "the reason they are listed here is because a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite." this is inaccurate, remove it
- There should never be breed specific legislation, this is discrimination and unjust.
- Pitbulls shouldn't be singled out the issues are with the people who raise them not the breed
- Please remove specific breeds from the bylaws. All animals have the ability to become aggressive so this is unfair for "pit bull" breeds
- Focus on making training for both dogs AND humans more accessible to all. Many don't know how to act around dogs. Also, BSL is awful!
- I don't think the definition of "nuisance dog" is accurate enough. It should be for aggression not barking or getting out of the yard.
- There is no scientific evidence that proves pitbulls are more aggressive than other breeds
- Any type: pitbull/staffordshire etc etc ANY breed should not be subjected to being considered dangerous or an immediate threat. Shame on you.
- Train owners more. Make them take mandatory classes.
- Leave the pitbulls alone, it is not the dogs it is the owners who raise them. There should be NO breed ban on dogs.
- "Bully" breeds were actually raised to be nanny dogs because they are naturally affectionate. Rescues could offer training in adoption fees.
- The definition for animal neglect should be broadened to include inhospitable environments. Trash covered yards and houses for example.
- Any dog breed can be aggressive. It is the owners that are the problem and there should be more regulations for that.
- Do not target specific breeds. Take a moment and think about that.. it is no different then doing that to races of people.
- No
- It is sickening to hear the parts about pitbull breeds. If a human goes to the gym and becomes stronger then the average will we ban them 2?
- No
- I think the bylaw that makes it illegal for cats to leave your property should be removed
- Don't make this all about Pitbulls when there are other dogs with equal aggression. It comes down to proper training. Putting a dog down
- I believe that dogs should have quite free will and freedom has a human but does that are aggressive should be trained and helped instead
- Waste of time and taxpayers money, the city should stop trying to regulate people's lives, and focus on fixing the drug problems in the core



- There needs to be a lot more responsibility put on the owner. Not on the breed of dog.... I know some pit bulls sweeter than the little dogs
- Pit bulls should not be mentioned specifically. It is the owner's, not the dog's, responsibility to ensure a dog is well trained
- Yes education programs not muzzles that doesn't fix the problem long term. You guys are ridiculous with that idea. It's the owners NOT the dog
- Indoor cats that have tattoo's for identification. and are fixed and have their shots should not have to be subject to a license.
- I think specific breeds should be required to complete mandatory obedience classes and be educated on pet etiquette
- There should not be breed specific rules! It is the people who raise and train the animal not the breed!
- I do not support breed specific legislations. Rather than focusing on the breed, turn efforts towards education and accountability.
- Children should be taught in schools how to approach animals. Obedience training should be strongly encouraged for new Pet owners.
- Completely disappointed that Calgary is even considering BSL. Most of these pit bulls that you want to ban are loving family pets.
- I AM AGAINST BREED SPECIFIC RULES AND RULINGS. END BSL. 4 year old boy has his arm ripped off by husky in 2019..ban huskies?? No! END BSL!!
- No
- I do think unfortunately pitbull breeds often attract irresponsible owners and therefore may require specialized bylaws to prevent this.
- Educate yourselves. It is not the breed! It's disgusting that people think this way towards pit bulls!
- Pitbulls are not more aggressive! Its a misconception due to dog fights. They are loving protectors of children. They should not be targeted
- Again, if your going to make more bylaws for dogs dont make it breed specific. All dogs have the ability to bite.
- Judge a dog, and the owner, based on the behaviour of the dog not their breed. Any breed of dog has the capacity to be dangerous to others.
- Please do not target pitbulls. The owners are the problem, not the animal. If they can't train their dog properly, give the dog a new home.
- city of calgary is a joke. you single handedly singled out pit bulls (which isn't even a real breed) and any dog whom looks similar. stupid.
- "If an animal bites a human causing harm.
- That animal should be put down..at the expense of the owner. Plus a fine."
- I think all breeds need stricter guidelines at off leash parks. I have never felt safe at an offleash park thanks to irresponsible owners.
- END BSL



- The selling of animals, stores should not be allowed to sell puppies or dogs, they should facilitate adoptions from shelters. STOP TOP DOG
- stop singling out one dog breed. there are no bad dogs, bad owners yes. some of the most gentle dogs i've met are pittys or pitty crossed.
- No dog should be banned based on breed alone. All dogs (owners) should have a level of obedience training and socialization to go to a park
- Breed specific regulations are 100% unnecessary. Punish bad owners not dogs.
- It is the owner whose responsibility and liability should be increased, not innocent dogs. Any dog can bite. Sad to see such outdated views.
- BSL is not the answer. Banning the ownership of pitbulls would be a death sentence to hundreds of good natured, loving pets. It's not fair.
- NO to breed specific bylaws! Pit bulls have a bad rap already, they are no better or worse than many other dog breeds
- It is a shame the city is targeting a specific breed of canine in an attempt to sway the public towards how specific council members feel.
- BSL doesn't work. There's so many data that show that it doesn't work. I'll move my family if you go ahead.
- Breed discrimination is unacceptable. It is the duty of pet owners to be responsible, and to train themselves and their pets at any cost.
 - Child behavior education for dog parks. 2. It's not the dog (Pitbull) it's the owner, better education less discrimination.
- Coloured bandanas may not be visible due to size of dog, fur length, etc. Coloured leash and collar combo can be seen at distance.
- I'm so over the pit bull thing, it needs to stop. Start educating the people who don't understand them instead of punishing the people who do
- I do not support any Breed Specific Legislation at all.
- All pets should be spayed or neutered unless their owner is a certified breeder. This is the reason we have such a large feral cat population
- This entire thing is completely mishandled! There is no way to verify anyone's address or identity who is completing the survey. Shame CoC!
- Breed specific restrictions are never necessary, stricter rules for problem behavior is. Don't villainize pit bulls and bully breeds!
- Breed specific questions don't reflect the issue of aggression. This happens in all breeds. It is the owner's responsibility for training.
- The rules should not be breed specific. There are other dogs just as large as pit bulls it makes no sense.
- No
- The breed of dog should be completely irrelevant to the investigation following a bite/attack. The focus should be on what led to the attack



- Regarding pigeons, there was no option for limiting pigeon numbers based on location, breeders, racers, other factors. Too narrow on choices.
- Putting in breed specific bylaws should be criminal. You don't know my dog how can you sit there and tell me that because he is X he is bad.
- Breed specific language is inappropriate
- For people with badly behaved animals, I feel that they need mandatory education even more than the animal.
- .
- None
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work. It's the bad owners with no responsibility. Don't punish good pet owners, educate on body language.
- pitbulls should not be discriminated against
- Unfortunate\ disappointing that BSL is being put out there. We have enough division right now we don't need more, we need to stand together
- Breed specific legislation is not appropriate ever. It is more of an owner issue so if anything owner legislation would be more appropriate.
- Breed specific legislation has been proven to be completely unaffactive. Blame poor pet owners, not breeds.
- Pitbulls shouldn't be discriminated against and singled out. As long as pets are being cared for/good quality of life that's all that matter
- I will stand up for pittie breeds until the day I die. It is absolutely ridiculous that anyone is still stuck on the idea that they are bad.
- Problematic animals should be forced to go to training with their owners instead of repetitive fines. Dont ban the breeds.
- Increasing charges and punishment for owners of animals who abuse their animals and no return of abused animal to owner.
- Owner and dog undertake mandatory training at the expense of the owner> Portion of the fee rebated if behaviour changes and is sustained.
- stop targeting specific breeds.
- No
- Do not put bylaws in place that discriminate a specific breed. Breeds are not the issue, animals that are trained to be violent are.
- We shouldn't put bans on any breed. All breeds can be aggressive it is the owner who needs to take responsibility for their dogs action.
- Breed-specific legislation is not the answer. All nuisance pets should be trained, and owners fined.
- A lot of these proposed bylaws directly infringe on a lot of fundamental freedoms, to enforce these would be authoritarian
- the rules on the dogs should not be about breed they should be about behaviour



- The focus should be placed on behaviour and training. Stop putting negative attention and blame on pit bulls just for their breed!
- Please do not target "pit bull" or bully breeds. It is a well known myth that these animals can cause greater harm.
- BSL is not the answer, responsible ownership is.
- If an owner is unable to control their animal then they shouldn't be allowed to own animals
- Do more research as the bias against so called bully breeds is extremely inaccurate and done by unqualified people
- "Options for smaller city tags for harnesses
- Is there any consequence or education for the person or child who got bit?"
- Even the most well-trained animal will bite if it is being harassed. consider lighter sentences for people who brought it on themselves.
- Na
- BSL should never exist, any dog breed can cause problems.
- Breed specific legislation is a waste of time and money. Put the money and effort into enforcing pet bans on bad owners.
- Make sure every breed is well represented and is specifically given credit until proven guilty. We cannot judge a dog by breed.
- Please stop braking judges ruling against the city and bylaw services but u don't care so good luck keeping your jobs
- The ability to enforce existing laws more quickly. I was twice attacked by a cat off its property and it took a month to hear from by-law.
- At the off leash parks I have seen many different types of dogs be aggressive it is not based on breed. Focus on behaviour - not the breed
- BSL has been proven ineffective. Leave it out of our city.
- No
- Stop charging money for everything.
- This is not going to solve anything. BSL will never solve anything. Ban owners, not breeds.
- N/A
- I have a comment, banning a specific breed is no different then banning a specific race!
- Large signs at park entrances outlining proper etiquette.
- The problem is with owners - not breeds. Focus on ensuring good owners have dogs, not limited specific breeds! Not everyone should have pets
- No idea
- Working in a petstore, the pitbulls were lovely. The chihuahua's and german shepherds were nastier. BSL makes no sense.
- Too many animals and different species on properties will cause problems for neighbors.
- I do support stricter rules/fines for pit bulls. I do not think pit bulls should be a breed that exists anymore.



- No
- Less focus on public opinion, and more focus on expert opinion. The experts know more about best practices.
- PITBULLS SHOULD NOT BE MUZZLED CONSTANTLY. THEY SHOULD NOT BE THE ONLY DOGS GOING FOR TRAINING OR BEING BANNED !!! RIDICULOUS !
- In addition to fines given to owners of dogs that injure or kill a person or other animal, vet costs should be covered by those owners.
- Do not prohibit all pit bulls or dogs that resemble a pit bull breed in Calgary. A dog's aggressiveness depends on its training not breed!
- Focus on behaviour rather than the breed. I have never met a Pitt Bull with bad behaviour.
- Going against pit bulls is so stupid. You said yourself they're not the highest in bite incidents, why would they be punished the most...
- Dog training requirements for dog licenses at reduced costs. Even an online course or in person.
- Follow up on cases of animal cruelty where the owner has been fined and prohibited from owning or living in the same household as animals.
- Don't put breed specific bylaws as they do not work and is not fair.
- If a dog is declared a nuisance, the owner should be required to attend a dog training course with the dog.
- The fact that the bylaw for pitbulls is even being reviewed is a waste of money and a total joke.
- If a person dog attacks property, a person, or another animal, the owner of said animal should be fined and pay for the damages caused.
- .
- animal rights need to be raised, as do the fines on owners pertaining to neglect, abuse, and liability of animals actions.
- Breed specific laws are pure discrimination based on something's looks. There is no place for it in our day and age. Focus on bad owners.
- I think having breed specific legislation is ridiculous. Closer look should be taken at owners and their lack of knowledge in animal behavior
- I think that all animals should require copping and licences require an up to date picture of animal and owner
- I don't believe owners with pitbull type breeds should have to do anything different than other dog owners. If a dog is violent then sure
- Pet licenses should have a multi-year option. Reminders can be sent for change of address or phone number.
- I think the city should be in charge of removing skunks from residential areas! It's almost a pandemic with them in the city
- The amount of dogs dog walkers can walk needs to be regulated to no more than 6 at a time. Problem dogs need to be banned from off-leash.
- More should be done about people letting their cats CB off property



- survey will not be accurate.No limit on how many times you can fill this out,there is a guy whos against shepherd pitty taking it overand over
- On breed specific legislation- it is discriminatory and not supported by data. It doesn't save lives, it kills innocent dogs.
- Having the owner's trained on how to have a dog. Encourage those that have a fear of dogs NOT go to a off-leash park.
- "Cleanup municipal spending!
- Stop trying to milk the pet owning TAX PAYERS for your budget shortfall!"
- I would like animals owners to simply take responsibility for their animals especially in the case of aggressive behaviour.
- Engage with academic peer reviewed research to demonstrate need for breed specific legislation. Breed specific legislation is unnecessary.
- No
- ppl should not be allowed to vote for their ideas more than once, not accurate at all
- There is no need to select a single breed to restrict. I have trained absolutely lovely dogs of all breeds and terrible dog of all breeds.
- [removed]
- Breed specific bylaws are based on rumors and false claims. Pitbulls aren't more dangerous than any other dog. These should be removed.
- Education and awareness campaigns for responsible pet ownership.
- Do not I force these laws because YOU feel a pitbull is a threat. It's the owners NOT the dog.
- pitbulls ans dogs like them are not the issue. owners are the issue. more mandatory obedience training, seizure and rehoming of problem dogs
- dog owners that allow there dogs to bark outside all night or all day should be fined the first time and then the second time a huge fine
- No
- Breed specific bylaws take the responsibility of bad behaviour away from owner and should not exist. Implement training for all dogs.
- To ban pit bulls outright is wrong. You're looking at causation vs correlation. Bad pitbull = bad owner, not bad breed.
- Focus on the people owning the animals not the breed. Enforce training on people especially first time owners.
- We do not put restraints on humans for being stronger than others, Pit bulls are no where near the highest bite strength either.
- Off leash parks should not be accessible to dogs that are reactive or untrained to be polite around other dogs.
- Breed specific laws are awful and targeted. The government needs to stop meddling in people's business.



- Breed specific laws are an abomination supported by ignorant people. Creating many problems for countless dogs, owners and shelters.
- I don't think targeting specific breeds is fair. Honestly, some of the nicest dogs I met were pit bulls. It's all about the owner and training
- I think that categorizing dog licenses into size (S,M,L) rather than breed could help more than breed specific laws.
- ambassadors at dog parks able to ticket people for not picking up dog feces.
- Perhaps train the owners as well as the dogs.
- Maybe once a cumulate fine amount has reached \$2000 (or whatever amount is determined) then that owner is not allowed to have pets for 5 yrs
- I think bylaws based on breed specific dogs is irresponsible and perpetuates the stereotypes of these animals
- To encourage more spay/neuted pet. Make the cost for spay/neutering
- Breed specific bans are ridiculous. It's not the dog, it's the way it was raised.
- n/a
- N/a
- Stop targeting pitbull breads. Any dog can bite, any dog can be a danger, so any dog should fall under the same rules as every other dog
- why does everyone have problems with the pit bull breed. The breed has nothing to do with attacks. Any dog that attacks always has a reason.
- Please show links to peer reviewed studies that show BSL works, and that show these dogs bite more then other breeds.
- Education for kids on how to approach or when to not approach animals. Classes on proper dog park etiquette. Online or in person
- Waste bags in dog parks would be helpful
- I do not agree with any type of BSL. Perhaps offering a mandatory course for owners of offenders would make more sense
- I absolutely do not support having breed specific laws or legislation.
- I don't think pets should be licensed.
- euthanizing shouldn't be allowed; i believe "high risk pets" is caused from neglect, abuse, and bad training. Send them to rescue societies!
- Breed specific legislation further victimizes dogs that are more likely to be abused and exploited. Legislation should apply to all or none!
- If a dog has a medical reason for not being spayed/neutered (Eg a heart murmur) Then should pay the reduced fee.
- Mandatory spay and neuter programs. Make backyard breeding illegal.
- I do not support any of the pit bull laws. Most of the people I know with dog are pitbulls and they are not cruel at all.



- There should be no special rules based on breed. It is up to the owner to be responsible for the behaviour of their pet.
- N/A
- Remove all the Breed Specific proposed amendments. If you think larger animals pose greater risk, do it by size, not by breed.
- Breed bans don't work and the evidence is there from other municipalities - suggest mandatory obed training, canine good citizen etc
- The fact that pit bulls are singled out in this survey is terrible. Dogs reflect the competence of the owners nothing to do with the breed
- We're looking at the wrong end of the leash here - we need to target and train the pet owners so they can responsibly train their pets.
- There should never be a breed specific law. It's the owners responsibility for to train the dog. It's not the breed
- From the Oatmeal: Colour coded collars for cats- orange collar = indoor cat. See an orange collar, it's an escape artist and should be caught!
- I am disgusted with the parallel between nuisance pets and pit bulls. There is clearly a discriminatory bias within your organization.
- Stop the breed discrimination! So terrible! we have entered a world where we are supposed to be supportive of everyone so why not dogs!
- Pls do something about the asinine trend of picking up ones dog feces and then leaving it behind for someone else to properly dispose of.
- I do not support breed specific legislation.
- Who needs more than 10 pigeons?
- .
- Focus should be on education and not fines. Training classes should be considered before fees.
- Abolish the breed specific laws. A breed has nothing to do with an animals aggression that is due to the the way the animal was trained
- I think the pit bull breed being targeted as an aggressive breed is ridiculous. The owners are at fault for how their dog behaves.
- No
- I would like to see the allowance of small numbers of domestic ducks being allowed in appropriate urban settings
- Allow for more characters in this space so we can provide a well thought out idea as opposed to a clickbait idea.
- Why do we need to keep bringing up ONE specific breed? It's unnecessary. It is the owner's responsibility for a well behaved animal
- none
- Please don't target specific breeds and only penalize breeds that exhibit problem behaviors
- "Breed bans don't work.



- German Shepherds and mixed breed dogs are high up on the bite breed index and you didn't mention them."
- It's lovely how people find greater importance in keeping a dog created for bloodsport over the safety of other pets and their fellow humans
- Disgusted at the discrimination against pit bulls. This is not okay. Like any other breed, they can be raised aggressive or as sweethearts.
- Small dogs are more frequent biters.
- Please don't discriminate against pitbulls. They are the sweetest dogs given the right owners. I think it's so wrong how much hate they get
- Pit bulls are not threatening! It's the owners responsibility to train them, therefore they are the ones who should see the consequences!
- Singling out a breed (pitbulls) vs stupid owners? Come on Calgary, smarten up.
- Do more to provide public with training and prevention instead of resting to reactionary or blanket breed specific rules.
- stop labeling "pit bulls" as bad, there are other dogs that have worse temperament test scores than "pit bull"; do the research properly.
- ????(
- I have a golden who is reactive to dogs (a rescue). The breed is not the problem ie: Bullies. Early warning Δ is key to coexistence.
- If your dog is aggressive you must obtain training for both the dog AND the horrible owner that raised it to be aggressive
- I am wholeheartedly against breed discrimination. Disappointed that this is even being considered in our city.
- Breed specific laws are unfair. How can a city claim to be a melting pot of races, yet discriminate against certain animals?
- Na
- Reduce licensing fees for pets, and they should be for up to 5 years at owners request. Also make this available for order online/ via mail.
- Ridiculous by the city claiming dogs that bark a nuisance. Aswell as claiming all pit bull dogs are harmful.
- Dogs are a reflection of their owners- Implement a mandatory training/education program for owners of nuisance/aggressive animals.
- Stop discriminating breeds, it's not the animal, it's the owner. The owner needs to take responsibility and train their animal properly.
- STOP bullying the bully breeds. So just b/c my dog looks like one your going to punish her??? So wrong on so many levels
- Nuisance animals are most likely subject to neglect. Problem animals should have owners looked into to see they are being well kept



- Breed specific laws do not achieve anything but causing more animal to die unnecessarily. Any big dog breed can be dangerous if not trained.
- Problem dogs are not usually the problem, it is usually the owner and lack of training. Please stop targeting specific breeds i.e. pit bull
- I do not agree with breed discrimination. Please don't put bylaws in place that encourage this. Stricter laws on owners not dogs.
- Please don't make breed specific legislation, it enforces unwarranted fear of those breeds. Dog behaviour is dependent on training not breed
- There needs to be greater enforcement against pet owners who cannot keep their dogs quiet Perhaps a portal where neighbors can easily report
- No
- How many dogs will become homeless and have to be euthenized due to a short-sighted breed specific policy? Policies like this fail!
- NO urban chickens. NO breed-specific legislation!
- Breed specific rules are unrealistic and make zero sense. Every dog is different, it has nothing to do with breed.
- "All dogs and owners attend training
- Situations evaluated - not always dogs fault"
- I think people that use extend a leash should have train their dogs as many of them with small dogs think that they do not bother other dogs
- "9B. Should fines for bites to children (17 and under) be:
- Should be lower than for adults. Children should be under supervision of adults."
- I don't support the lower license fees for lower income families. If you struggle financially, maybe a pet isn't the best fit.
- "NO BSL!

- It does not work. The issue is with small untrained dogs. Or bad owners"
- Banning repeat offenders from owning pets. offences like neglect, attacks etc. multiple offences, remove pet, fine and monitor, repeat
- Owners are bad not breeds. Any dog no matter the breed can be dangerous if they aren't responsibly trained and cared for.
- NO to breed specific fines and legislation - shame on Calgary
- I don't think any body other than people registered with racing pigeon clubs should be allowed to house or own pigeon as they're pest animal
- I think it would be great if the city could partner with a dog training facility and offer reduced class prices for people on fair entry
- Dogs with previously reported and verified aggressive behavior must not be allowed in off leash areas.



- It is ridiculous that you suggesting certain dog breeds be restricted. Focus on fining or banning irresponsible owners from having pets
- There is way too much room for bias in what dog is considered a "nuisance" or "dangerous".
- I don't agree with breed-specific legislation, I have heard nothing but horror stories from the places that have enacted this.
- No breed specific legislation
- It's not about the number of bites, it's about the severity and fatality. I would rather a chihuahua bite me 1000 times than a pit bull once
- Trying to pass legislation due to breed specific biases is beyond ridiculous. I thought Calgary was better then this.
- To lessen bites of strangers, don't worry about the breed but make sure all dogs are LEASHED in public spaces. EDUCATE about leashing.
- Some off-leash dog parks need better signage. I use a park with a bike path going through it. Many cyclists don't realize there are dogs.
- If a stranger approaches a dog and the dog gets defensive, punish the stranger, not the dog. It is not the dogs fault.
- Some sort of one time test or course for humans to go through, to show if they are responsible dog owners or not.
- Pit bull breeds should not be singled out.
- The city is wasting time with breed specific bylaws. NO dog is born vicious, they become that way from terrible owners and lack of training.
- How dare we use breed focused rules like this. Absolutely not acceptable. This is not fair and needs to be removed from this survey
- Educate owners with training classes especially with large dog breeds. It's not just training the dog but training the human
- Any dog can be dangerous. There should be required education and training to ensure there are responsible dog owners.
- Muzzling a dog anytime it goes in public will only make the dog more aggressive!! This will NOT help anything!!
- I do not think that strictly indoor cats need to be licensed.
- "12 animals per house is lots
- Fines determined by damage done"
- prevent shelters/ animal rescues from not clearly disclosing pet's history and behavior when advertising. No sugar coating or omitting allowed
- I would love to have urban hens. I've always wanted a flock of chooks. Before you judge urban hens, do some research and learn about them.
- The fact that you call out any breed that has the characteristics of a pit bull makes me believe you know nothing about dog breeds.
- Numerous studies show the ineffectiveness of breed specific legislation and the discrimination and divisiveness it causes. - veterinary prof



- "Here's an idea:
- Stop punishing the dogs for the behaviour of had people.
- You guys are following suit of every other [REMOVE] place."
- Singling out a breed that CAN cause damage is not the answer. This is discriminatory. A dogs actions are based on its owner/training,
- Do not implement BSL! Today's "most vicious breed" is just a flavor of the week and not rooted in fact but only conjecture.
- Pitbulls shouldn't be singled out. There are dogs like german Shepard's that have a more severe bite and there are many stronger dogs
- Breed specific legislation is discriminatory. No one breed is more dangerous than another, and this perpetuates stereotypes.
- I really like the idea of waiving low income license fees
- We should focus our efforts on providing more training and education then muzzling our beloved buddies without cause.
- Feral cat colonies is a ridiculous idea. Feral cats will kill at least as many song birds as mice. Feral/off lease cat have no place in city
- Please do not put breed specific legislation in. It did not work in Ontario and won't work here. I am a veterinarian.
- Quit bullying the pit bulls! My girlfriend's pit bull attacked me this morning...with kisses and affection! Penalize bad owners not breeds.
- You know, I used to be proud to say that Calgary was not the kind of city that would consider nonsense like breed-bans or urban chickens...
- Don't discriminate based on dog breeds!
- BSL in any way does not solve any problems. Ban "pitbulls"(not a breed) and people go to breeds like Presa Canario, Dogo and Cane Corsos.
- no breed specific discrimination!
- Cats that are kept indoors should still have to buy a license. There are many dogs that are more house dogs and they need a licence.
- "Pit Bull" mixes are common and dont bite anymore than any other animal. Responsibility to keep control of your animal should be paramount
- Licensing should be a one time fee for the duration of the pets lifetime, and no dog should be judged based off breed.
- Dog and cat licensing should cover a two year period instead of every year.
- If it wasn't already touched on, the issue of it being socially acceptable to allow your cat to wander the neighbourhood.



- Banning "pit bulls" and bully breeds is a HORRIBLE idea and I'm embarrassed that I live in a city where that would even be considered.
- Don't discriminate based on breed, educate those who might need it! Not everyone knows pit bulls have prey drive or can be dog selective.
- Breed specific rules are [REMOVE]. I grew up with a pit bull terrier and have known many. All are the sweetest dogs ever and aren't dangerous.
- Breed specific discrimination is disgusting. Leave pit bulls alone. I am beyond disappointed.
- No bad dogs just bad owners, please if possible deal with that issue
- If this notion that Pit Bull type dogs bite harder has come from animal services I would suggest they all resign as they have no idea.
- Would like to see more emphasis placed on owner's bad behaviours that lead to problem animals regardless of their species.
- License discounts for pet owners that participate in formal pet training programs.
- No dogs should be muzzled for their appearance! Muzzles should be for aggressive dogs with past reported issues only, with any breed!
- No
- My dogs have been attacked by a lab and a sheltie but we have never had issues with any bully type dog. Owners are the issue not the breed.
- Low income obedience training for dogs would be a nice idea for people who own dogs but can't afford training. Also affordable shots program
- Check in's on pet owners after a dog has been charged to ensure the dog is being treated and cared for properly. Bad owners create bad dogs
- Quality pet education program for a decrease on insurance. Why shouldn't the good pet owners be rewarded?
- "1. Pit bulls and their breeders should be banned.
 - There should be 0 tolerance for biting by dogs that have the potential to kill or maim"
- Please reconsider BSL.
- None
- Fenced off leash areas should have 2 gates to enter, with a holding area. Young children should not be allowed in fenced off leashed area
- No
- Offering people with pets a subsidy for support during these tuff times. Pet food is expensive and some people can't afford it right now
- Bites/attacks have NOTHING to do with the breed, and EVERYTHING to do with the owners. Don't discriminate against breeds.
- Fines for people who approach a dog without permission. Dogs are not communal property.
- All breed specific language should be removed. Offenders should be punished by behavior, NOT breed, of dog.



- Owners need to be accountable for behaviour regardless of breed - mandatory behavioural class for any problem dog. BSL is not acceptable.
- The pit bull specification is one born out of ignorance and should be removed from the conversation. Stop furthering the narrative.
- The only idea that I have and that everyone should be open to listening to is to quit stereotyping "bully" breeds. These rules are ridiculous.
- Maybe new owner training being available for people getting their first dog/cat/etc would be useful in getting more responsible owners.
- What about cat-parks with catios for cats?
- I think dogs should be able to pass a test to be offleash at all times. Some dogs are much better behaved than children. A very hard test
- No
- No
- stream line reporting process for barking and loose cats , focus on mandatory schooling and training with followup
- Dogs with barking complaints should not be permitted outdoors without active supervision.
- Do not put restriction a on "pit bull type dogs" they are the sweetest animals I know. It comes down to the owner/training of the animal.
- Educating and training people to be responsible pet owners is key. Specific breeds are not the problem it's the owner that needs disciplining
- Stop singling out a specific breed such as pit bulls. Start addressing poor ownership. A bad dog is not breed he is taught.
- "Cat owners need to be held responsible for their cats roaming at large.
- It's not a neighbours responsibility to catch them"
- It is both absurd and lazy of the city to attempt to impose breed specific legislation. Quite disgusted with our city council.
- Pitbulls are scientifically proven to not be any more aggressive than other dog breeds. Aggressive dogs are usually anxious or badly trained
- Pit bulls should not be discriminated against!
- It's all about ownership. A dog that attacks either has not been trained properly or has been trained a certain way. Owner responsibility.
- There is lack of public education around animal safety. When a person is bit they should be mandated to attend a course on animal approach
- Breed-specific restrictions have proven ineffective around the world, and it is ridiculous to see it brought up here. Do not go backwards.
- I think your question about nuisance dogs was very biased against pitbulls. Pitbulls do not in fact have stronger jaws than other dogs.
- Using " pitbull" is petty and education is better then doing a blanket statement for a breed of dog.



- Apply fines to pet owners who discard plastic bags containing their dog feces in the grass and bushes instead of the garbage.
- .
- Dogs shouldn't be banned by breed, all breeds can be dangerous without proper training and discipline. History of owner should be considered
- Do. Not. Ban. Breeds. A small dog can be just as vicious as a large one, behavior is reinforced from the owner.
- There are other dogs with higher bite forces than bully breeds. Behaviour is based on how they are trained also.
- I would like the rule amended to allow for me to go for a bike ride with my dog while on a leash. It is up to the owner to ensure for safety
- X
- Please don't bring in breed-specific bylaws of any sort. It increases fear around these animals which is unnecessary.
- Breed specific bylaws are discrimination
- Subjective complaints such as noise should not be considered when designating "nuisance" animals.
- Dogs are not the problem, people should control and make their dogs learn. Lower the fees and licenses
- I am offended about the pit bull questions
- Banning specific breeds is a horrible idea and not necessary. Focus on the irresponsible pet owners. Pitbulls are loving and sweet
- "Nuisance dog" should not exist. Not the same as "dangerous" and it's too broad of a definition for this survey.
- The bandana idea is a good one.
- Don't discriminate due to breed. Imagine if you tried to do that to people. Disgusting
- The problem doesn't lie with a specific dog breed. The problem lies with people.
- BSL just breeds segregation and separation. That translates into human interaction too and perpetuates racism, etc.
- Please Calgary no breed specific banning of any kind! We are better than that - all dogs deserve the same chance at life :)
- Please ban pitbulls and pit bull cross bully breeds.
- Set up community times for people and kids to meet friendly dogs and learn dog safety. Most dog bites are provoked by fear responses, etc.
- Would be nice if people face fines for having dogs off leash in on leash only places like parks, off leash should be on off leash area,
- Education is the way to prevent bites in your community. Knowing the dogs in your community will prevent bites and improve community safety.
- "Do not separate Or punish dogs by breeds. Only by behaviours.



- Also, the fines for biting a human, pet, etc need to be on a case by case"
- Male owners of incessantly barking dogs should be neutered. Female owners should be muzzled and made to collect faeces in off leash parks.
- Educate your city of Calgary team members on these subjects. Taking the views of the city is not education.
- Bully breeds are the most loving dogs around and any attack by any breed of dog should only be fined instead of a dog being euthanized.
- breed specific legislation absolutely should not be considered
- Bully breeds should not be singled out. All dogs bite. Also, create questions that include if a dog is provoked, for example.
- Dog breed is not the issue. Irresponsible ownership is.
- None
- Don't make it breed specific. And don't limit amount of pets
- Owners that allow roaming cats should be more heavily penalized. Harmful to ecosystems, pet population, and the cat itself.
- Pitbulls should not be categorized, at all. There are dogs like German Shepards that can be even stronger. It depends on training.
- Nothing to add
- No input
- To lessen bites of strangers, don't worry about the breed but make sure all dogs are LEASHED in public spaces. EDUCATE about leashing.
- Having a BSL puts false facts and fears into people's minds. Each 'attack' or misbehaviour should be specified for that dog not the breed.
- Please, no breed specific bylaws.
- Pit bulls - or any dog breed for the matter should not be discriminated upon.
- Ownership bans for pet owners that repeatedly let their pets roam at large. It's already against bylaw and encourages coyotes.
- My concern is you just specifically picked one breed of dog to Target there are more dog attached with huskies Chihuahuas shepherds ect
- You can not punish pitbull owners biased on prejudice. Rules should be the same for every breed and every owner period!
- Penelziation of owners of nuisance dogs rather than the dogs themselves are more likely to encourage responsible pet ownership
- The designation of a sectioned-off small-dog (
- Banning certain breeds of dogs doesn't make anyone any safer. Banning people that refuse to care for and manage their dogs does.
- Mandatory training classes after violations, and proof submitted that class was completed.
- Breed specific bylaw is not the answer. Owners are responsible for the dogs behaviour. Plain and simple



- BSL will not prevent bad pet ownership. What needs to be heavily reinforced is appropriate/adequate ownership.
- People running through dog parks tend to leave the gates open that opens a can of worms. Those people should be fined.
- Breed specific legislation/bylaw enforcement has historically not reduced attacks or bites.
- No
- No
- Not sure about the warning system, I think it will label dogs.
- Stop consulting the Public and Consult will [remove]. You people don't seem to know enough to leave your Responsible Ownership Bylaw alone.
- Dogs SHOULD NOT be discriminated against. Switch out "pitbull" with any human ethnicity and you'd have massively racist questions here.
- NA
- Fencing around off leash parks near busy roadways. As well as additional waste receptacles in parks.
- "No BSL!!!"
- Declare it a nuisance for behaviour not the breed"
- Im not sure.
- Enforce existing rules.
- Dog walkers allowing their pets to walk in, urinate, and/or defecate in private property. Regardless if they pick it up after?
- Educate Pit Bull owners on the severity of their dog's bite compared to other breeds. The potential new rules are for everyone's safety.
- No
- No
- Breed specific bans or fines is totally unacceptable and unethical.
- I am very disgusted you are considering breed specific legislation. Golden retrievers have the highest bite rate. Do not discriminate.
- NO breed specific bylaws ! The problem is owners not the breed. If you want training for one to be mandatory it should be for all
- circumstances of first-time or repeat offenders need to be considered as well as mental stability of the owner
- NA
- I have nothing more to add
- Breed specific legislation is an absolutely archaic approach to managing aggressive dog behaviour - do your research.
- In 2020 everyone would have thought the year would have expanded minds not shrink them. Don't discriminate a dog based on the owner.



- Please do not punish the dogs. Put more restrictions in place for owners. Follow up more. Make them report more often/educate more.
 - Abolition of breed specificity. Do you treat black and white people differently? No? So stop doing it to dogs
 - All dogs can be a problem should not be deacriminating against pitbulls or other terriers because of past. all dogs can be bad if taught.
 - The fines section should take into consideration circumstances of the incident. Ie a leashed dog injures a nonleashed animal that approaches
 - Breed legislation is not the answer, education is. Please don't move forward with breed banning.
 - More use of warnings for first offences/complaints to allow owners to address the problem (noise, feces, upset neighbors)
 - Punishing dogs for people's bad behavior is ridiculous. Banning a specific breed isn't going to stop people from not training their dogs.
 - Dont ban dog breeds, make stricter rules for all dogs. Plus a pitbull is a single breed, not any dog with a square face
 - The pit bull should not be discriminated against. If any change to bylaws against this breed should apply to all breeds and not zero any out
 - Disappointed to see breed specific language. Don't lower fees if you can't afford them you can't afford the pet.
 - This article states pitbulls do not have a higher bite ratio, therefore no BSL should be instated
 - N/a
 - Breed specific laws are not scientifically sound. They should be thrown out all together.
 - "Allow cats to be outside provided they are spayed or neutered. It is inhumane to force them to be inside creatures.
-
- Allow urban hens."
 - Fine dogs for miss behaving but dogs should be allowed off leash in all city parks otherwise
 - Quick Picking on Pit bulls. Start focusing on their owners/breeders. Pit bulls are truly the sweetest dogs around.
 - No breed specific discrimination. How an animal is raised is the problem. Breeding controls to help control population no puppy mills.
 - Owner education is needed. Poor training and lack of exercise are not the fault of the dog. Indoor cats shouldn't require a licence.
 - No breed specific bylaws!! It has been proven they do not work.
 - The statements made about "Pitbulls” are very wrong, not even top 10 strongest bite, and are nicknamed nanny dogs because their love of kids
 - All dog breeds should require a baseline amount of training (ie. obedience training) to be owned, not just breed specific legislation.



- No
- I challenge anyone afraid of pitbulls to go out and meet one, in a proper home they're loving and gentle, undeserving of this stigma. So sad
- People who have pit bulls shouldn't be punished
- Don't punish the breed. Enforce owners require either further education or not allowed to own a dog.
- Great that we are reviewing this! We should review animal abuse laws as well!
- I've owned hamsters that are more dangerous than many pitbulls I've known. Punishing breeds that look vaguely like pitbulls isn't a solution
- No
- I am extremely disturbed about the discrimination against certain breeds. I will not support the spread of misinformation.
- One time lifetime license for pets.
- Hilariously immature to even propose restrictions on pit bulls. Ashamed of this city.
- Animals should be treated equally. If any breed were to attack/bite, the animal should be assessed and extra training should be required.
- Breed aggression doesn't exist. It's all the owner's training rather than the breed
- NA
- More off leash parks need to be created to allow pets and owners to practice social interaction. This aids in having better adjusted dogs
- Stop debasing the intellect of your enterprise by promoting lore such as the magical strength of pit bulls. How embarrassing. Read a book.
- I think it should be mandatory all animals are chipped.
- Discriminating against dog breeds when there is no data showing more bites/attacks only results in more dogs being euthanized/unwanted.
- Stray cat charges should be higher. You can't control cats, At my house alone I am fighting with 3 outdoor neighbour cats shiting in my yard
- Please make spay/neuter programs actually accessible. Your outreach game is weak and unreachable by the demographic that most needs it.
- do not ban pitbulls. How could you target them? That's racism towards dogs. BSL has been shown to be INEFFECTIVE in other cities.
- It is discrimination to say that "pitbulls" should have restrictions. My certified emotional pitty is better than any chihuahua.
- Be more proactive and less punitive. Want to curb roaming cats have actual accessible outreach tonspay/neuter. And promote ideas like catios
- Breed specific legislation is not a good plan. The dog is not the problem the owner is
- People need to be properly educated to be around dogs, alot of the issues not only surround bad owners, but also very uneducated people



- Targeting one breed of animal is unfair to said breed. If it applies to all animals it'd be different but you are singling out a few breeds
- Bylaws should apply to all breeds, not be breed specific.
- Small dogs can attack big dogs, and the big dogs typically get punished...focus on repeating offenders with higher penalties.
- No chickens, no chickens, people are not educated about their needs or care.
- I believe in keeping aggressive dogs away from public but I am 100% against breed specific legislation. Owners should be held responsible to
- s
- I am very opposed to breed specific bias. And generally speaking, it is not the breed causing the bite, it is the owner and bad training.
- People should be held more accountable for there animals not the animal. They are still wild animals
- Please do not discriminate against dogs based on physical appearance/ breed
- Fines for parents of children that torment/ tease or abuse an animal. Higher fine if the person provoked the dog to bite
- I don't think specific breeds should be singled out in any bylaw. Base things off incidences If they occur
- Pet license fees should be included on the sliding scale with the Fair Entry program. I cannot afford to renew my dogs license at this time
- I would like to see Calgary make it easier to keep chickens and goats as pets
- If a pet owner wants a pet then they should complete a course on responsible ownership not every one deserves a pet let alone six.
- No
- In regards to bites and nuance dogs, all breads should be treated equally. Chihuahuas after responsible for more bites than any other breed.
- Breed specific punitive action is not the way to go. It is irresponsible owners that are the issue Education is key. Do not punish animal!
- A large discount for multi-pet homes. Cheaper licensing fees would make multi animal homes wantand be able to easily register
- There should be NO breed discrimination. BSL is faulty logic and ineffective. Innocent dogs die.
- no dog breed should be discriminated against.
- No to BSL.
- There is no evidence that breed-specific policies are effective by ANY metric.
- You cannot target or punish one specific breed. The issue stems from bad owners.
- More off leash areas - they do not need to be fenced, responsible owners don't need boxes.
- Ban owners not animals
- [removed]
- More trash cans close and in dog parks-not just were it's convenient for city workers to empty them.
- More goats needed. Ravine behind our house (Panorama Hills) is overgrown.



- I do not believe it is right to discriminate against Pit Bulls. Calgary should be aiming to reduce discrimination
- Increased fines for owners who abuse pets and removal of the animal(s) from the home while a complaint is investigated. Also no breed bias.
- Not to discriminate against certain dog breeds because they could potentially cause more harm!
- Please do not implement any kind of breed specific legislation for canines
- More education on where dogs are allowed. many people take their dogs to schools to do their business. School fields are for KIDS NOT DOGS.
- Fines for repeat offenders of continual barking after 11:00 pm.
- "Post behaviors and accompanied fine values at entrance of on leash and off lease parks.
- When licensing a pet a list of bylaws supplied."
- Mandatory training sessions required for nuisance owners and their animal for first offence.
- My pitbull is much gentler than bichon. Pitbulls shouldn't be discriminated against. Irresponsible owners are the problem not a specific dog
- I do not support dog breed specific legislation but I think ALL dog owners should be required to attend some sort of mandatory training clas
- Reduce pet licenses for ALL Calgarians, not just low income
- Banning any one breed of dog because it has the potential to be aggressive is absurd ! So many study's proving this wrong !
- Why punish a dog for having a shitty owner? Make it impossible for shitty people to get dogs. No backyard breeders and more application review
- Enforce a Maximum amount of pets per household.
- Stop branding specific breeds of dogs, it's not helpful and just perpetuate misinformation. Waiver licensing fees with proven obedience class
- Owners are the issue here
- Parents need to be accountable for children when their actions . le a child runs up to a dog in a fenced/enclosed yard
- Thanks
- Please don't single out piltbulls. It should be large breed dogs!
- Apartment buildings/Condos should not have the right to turn away citizens who own pit bull type dogs.
- The fact that you single out pit bulls and pit bull breeds offensive, it either applies to all or none.
- The makers of this survey do not understand Pitbulls and highlighting a Pitbulls bite force is redundant, as a bulldog has a stronger bite.
- Immediately stop attacking bully breeds and mixes thereof. There is no science that proves banning any specific breed has EVER worked , ever
- Focus more enforcement on owners not thepets I do not agree with breed specific bylaws all fines and rules should apply to ALL breeds.



- There shouldn't be breed discrimination. We need to have harsher laws on bad pet owners as they are the ones who create an aggressive dog.
- They shouldn't discriminate against certain breeds of dogs, just because of how a dog looks, such as pit bulls.
- I believe that breed specific legislations are unfair and unnecessary. Pet behavior is affected by owner treatment of animal, not breed.
- I believe that there should be more traps and enforcement on at large cats and dogs! People who like to let their cats roam deserve a ticket
- The breeds aren't bad the training is don't make a law be breed specific
- Licensing fees for dog would be dropped if they have passed a Canine Good Neighbour test.
- "Too many cats roaming freely! Charge owners.
- And please don't pick on the bullies. Focus on owners!"
- [remove] cash grabs, [remove] [personal information removed]
- There needs to be a focus on owners rather than the breed. Bad owners need to be fined and educated.
- The bylaw should be for all breeds of nuisance dogs not specifically pit bulls.
- Do not reverse your current views/laws on "Put Bulls"
- Please don't ban specific breeds! Seems not supported by data.
- Dogs should be given a 2nd chance through professional training after all incidents. Including bites.
- WHERE ARE CHIHUAHUAS ON YOUR [remove] LIST?!? I've been attacked by several, even required stitches a few times. #dontbullmybreed #savepittys
- MUCH more by-law presence and enforcement. In 15 years in my present home I have not seen ONE by-law officer in the neighbourhood to patrol.
- I have nothing meaningful to say.
- If you have a disabled pet (blind, deaf, diabetic, amputee, etc.) there should be a discount on fees for registering/licensing
- Better enforcement for barking dogs, and cleaning up dog waste. No one seems to care about barking, or bagging waste and leaving it in parks
- Make it so that someone with violent/hoarding tendencies has to be approved to have an animal of any kind. Don't breed discrimination.
- There is no need for people living in a city to own a dog bred for fighting. The city should not be licensing these vicious dogs.
- Discrimination against particular breeds of dogs is completely unacceptable.
- The fact that you guys are singling out pitbulls is terrible Its 2020 and racism is already a problem. Pitbulls don't have the strongest bite
- My neighbor owns two German Shepards both are/were aggressive to my dogs and kids. My pitbull is calm/balanced dog. Its not breed! Bad owner
- No



- What about businesses that use dogs but are not considered pets? There should be less restrictions on how many dogs they are allowed
- No
- Non breed specific bylaws
- Breed discrimination is wrong. I like the idea of colors on the dogs when out and about so others can look and see if it is okay to engage.
- Re: max number of pets per home. Hard to impose fines or animal seizures as animal 'hoarders' often do not register animals with the city
- Enough with punishing owners of breed specific dogs. Punish owners that aren't controlling or training their pets correctly.
- .
- It has been proven multiple times BSL is ineffective. Focus on ALL aggressive dogs on a case-by-case basis.
- Leave the sheltering and care of stray and unwanted animals to Humane Society. They are specifically set up to do this work. Stop the waste.
- Do not target pit bulls. They are no more likely or able to cause damage than any other large breed. The problem is irresponsible ownership.
- Do not lower the pet fees for low income, if you can't afford the license fee you can't afford the vet costs. No BSL
- Breed specific legislation is not effective. Dog owners are the problem, not dog breeds. Punish irresponsible owners, not breeds of dogs
- Pitbulls and other "bully breeds" are not inherently bad or evil, just like every other dog out there it comes down to the owner.
- Noise violations are from 11pm-7am (I think) it should be the same for barking dogs
- My dog is trained and responsive, why aren't others? If you can't afford lessons in the first place, you shouldn't have the pet
- Please do not impose breed-specific legislation - this is discrimination. The focus should be the animal, not the breed.
- Breed specific legislation is absurd and only causes more problems. Pit bull type breeds are not the problem. Bad owners are the problem.
- Pitbulls should not be exclusively listed as they are no more dangerous than any other dog
- Do not single out "pit bulls" All breeds should be treated equally.
- Breed-biased discrimination isn't disgusting and the City of Calgary should be ashamed for even bringing it up.
- Including a brief pet ownership guide/course/refresher prior to initial licensing would aid in reducing overall offences.
- Bulldog breeds are not the issue. There are negligent owners for every breed. Penalize the owner, not the breed.
- Should be higher fines for dogs off leash in any non off leash areas.



- Add mandatory and large fines for animals left unattended in vehicles in hot or cold weather or riding in the back of vehicles (trunk)
- All dogs should be properly trained and socialized, I do not support breed specific legislation.
- Breed specific laws are absurd. In your statements you've shown a lack of knowledge on animals, dogs specifically.
- I've seen more aggressive small dog breeds than pitbulls. every pitty i've known is just a big baby who wants love.
- Mandatory spray and neuter, fines if they animals isn't (unless they are a registered breeder). Fine for aggressive dogs in off leash areas
- Why target pitbulls but not mastiffs, or Rottweilers? What about a mop that always bites passer-bys?
- The breed discrimination for pit bulls is not acceptable
- Dog temperaments are majorly based on how they are raised, bad owners typically raise poor acting animals,
- I don't support breed targeting legislation. A lot of these animals act due to improper training. Don't lump them together.
- Please consider a category separate from 'nuisance' for dogs that have harmed people or other dogs and consider muzzle, etc. bylaws for them
- Stop identifying "pit bulls" as problematic . They're not a specific breed of dog, and any animal has the potential to be dangerous.
- A dog that is misbehaving just requires more training. The owners might need some education, and funding for obedience classes.
- I am totally against Breed Specific Legislation. It should be situational, not the condemnation of an entire breed
- Restrictions on "Pit bulls" are not a solution to dog bites it is the owner's responsibility to properly train their dog of any breed
- An untrained chihuahua is more dangerous and more likely to bite than a trained pitbull
- N/A
- Breed specific legislation is an absolutely horrible idea for the city to adopt
- we are blaming the animals/owners whilst nothing is said about those antagonizing an animal ex fence running. That needs addressing
- I just want to reiterate that I will never support any breed specific bylaws.
- Na
- dont be breed specific please, the faults lie with the lack of training, and small dogs are just as much of a problem.
- There should be regulations on pet trainers, daycares, kennels, "rescues" who operate in calgary to uphold animal welfare standards.
- If you single out a specific breed make your data proving that they are the most vicious readily available for viewing. Otherwise, Don't.



- Breed specific bylaws are not the answer and are not going to help or solve any problems because pit bulls are NOT the problem
- Owners should be held accountable for bad dog behavior. It is about how they're raised not the breed of the animal.
- No
- Pitbull apologists/owners are their own worst enemy. If only they would've respected their dog's genetics and tried to mitigate the risk.
- Do not have questions about breed specific by-laws. Be better than the provinces who are discriminating against breeds.
- Those breeding dogs or cats, or selling litters of either, should have to be registered with the city as a licensed business
- Nuisance pets should have mandatory training and higher fines for repeat offenders.
- All dogs at public off leash parks should be neutered/spayed after 12 months of age.
- The BREED of the animal DOES NOT matter it is all in how the OWNER decides to TRAIN the animal. Pit bulls are NOT the problem, the owner is.
- Responsible dog owners should not let their dogs do their business on front lawns. There are plenty walkways/green spaces/lanes available.
- Cat need to be on leashes not allowed to roam free
- Provide public funding for private animal rescues or trap, spay/neuter, release programs.
- Genetics matter-they're why pointers point, collies herd, robins build nests, and why fighting dog breeds fight. We need these law changes.
- Hens are quieter than dogs. Appropriate sized lots should accommodate a small number of hens.
- Breed specific legislation is DISCRIMINATION. That's basically racism, but for dogs. All dogs can pose as a threat if not trained properly.
- I do not stand for breed discrimination. no dog is born vicious. I can't believe we even have to fight about this. DO BETTER, CANADA.
- More enforcement of off-leash is needed. Also dogs should NEVER be allowed on school property. Consent is not given by other parents! Bites!
- We should focus on education of responsible pet ownership and dog behaviors for owners and the public instead of punishing a specific breed.
- Make harsher punishment to animal abuse or animal theft
- I am so disappointed in this city, with all this talk of racism recently and here they are doing the same thing to our dogs.
- Breed specific bylaws are understandable to an extent but also not fair on the other hand. These animals are powerful yes, but not all mean.
- It's not the dog, it's the owners. Short of inbreeding, dogs behave in a manner reflective of their training and treatment by their owners.
- no



- I think that we are doing a good job of honouring pet owners and neighbours. I do like the idea of being able to have a few chickens.
- I support BSL in Calgary to make communities safer. A pitbull mauled a young boy outside Edmonton recently, I don't want it to happen here.
- Revisit restrictions on cats staying on your property. Most people don't follow this and I find it unnecessary, also causes many arguments.
- Nope
- People should have to prove they can own and train a dog before they are granted a license.
- I believe breed discrimination shouldn't be in these phases. It's just as bad as judging someone's skin colour
- No
- It is not the pit bulls that are the problems. It is the owners problem. It's a bad pet owner not a bad pet. Stop the discrimination !
- Do not base any legislation on specific breeds. The science doesn't support it.
- Ridiculous. Majority of it is how they're raised. Some people shouldn't have pets. Any dog can be taught to be aggressive. Not just pits.
- Pit bulls should not be the only dog listed that's not right p
- Breed specific legislation will cause more problems than it will ever try and solve. You are now working against every rescue/shelter.
- I have been attacked/ my dog attacked by more chihuahuas and Yorkies than bully breeds. It's all about the owner and the training.
- Don't agree with Pitbull being the only breed to have more restrictions. German Sheppards can be vicious, they are trained to be police dogs!
- The owners or past owners make the dog. How about we focus on some real issues. IM PISSED.
- I have no ideas
- Animal licensing should be available online for anyone within the regular limit. Tags can be mailed with receipts.
- "I do not agree with breed specific legislation.
- There was no mention of the complaint or fine process for loud or abused animals."
- na
- Na
- Make pet insurance mandatory?
- I do not support BSL. It unfairly targets dogs that look like a certain breed rather than keeping responsible pet ownership
- LOVE the bandana idea! It would be a great education tool and foster better communication and respect between dog owners and dog lovers!
- Given the huge impact that outdoor cats have on birds and other wildlife, I would really like there to be more education and enforcement.



- Tribunal should be made up of experienced pet owners. Pit bulls aren't the problem. The solution is better dog owners and better education
- Breed specific legislation fails to reduce attacks and doesn't support responsible pet ownership. We can do so much better as a city.
- Don't be a breeder! Any dog has the potential to bite and cause harm not just a pitbull.
- Breed specific legislation is unfair to the animal. Responsible owners have responsible pets..of any kind!
- I incur costs to replace grass killed by dog owners whose pets urinate on my property. Recover costs through increased dog licensing fees.
- Breed specific legislation is ridiculous! Humans are to blame and should always be held accountable. Not all people should own pets.
- No
- I've been told when calling 311 that officers won't come out for cats at large if owner unknown - would be great if this could change
- Breed specific laws are inherently flawed. Visible ID of breed is faulty and can result in undue prejudice.
- What is the total Max animals and livestock per household? Limit overall chickens and pigeons and cats and dogs to something more reasonable
- BSL (breed specific legislation) is ineffective and often targets dogs based on their appearance rather than behaviour.
- BSL has been proven not to work. Why, because any breed of dog can bite and cause harm. Therefore all breed owners need to be held responsible
- Put more garbage cans in all parks for dog-feces bags and have machines in parks that offer the bags for free.
- A dog attack can impact your life forever. There shouldn't be second chances for irresponsible pets and owners.
- If an off-leash dog is CLEARLY under control it should not be a fine.
- Increase the fines for dog feces not being picked up to \$1000 per offence or 100 hours of community service picking up dog feces.
- Focus on nuisance animals instead of breed specific legislation! Leave the pit bulls and bully breeds out of it!
- Provide parents with resources to teach their kids how to approach dogs in an on-leash/off-leash areas. Stop criminalizing pitbulls
- "- more enclosed off leash areas
 - No personal cat traps. All traps must be city owned traps with a numbered medallion. Private trap=\$fine\$."
- It is well known that in terms of animals temperament it is a nurture based issue. bad pet owners shouldn't be allowed to own more animals
- Some people have real fears of animals. We should be considerate of them.



- Any dog can have aggression and "a strong bite".it is the neglect of training and care that allow dog(not just pitties)to develop aggression
 - Breed discrimination is ridiculous and uneducated.
 - .
 - Education system about different dog species for a better understanding how to care , restriction for dog breeders .
 - Stop bullying the breed! They are adaptable and smart, and are more caring than most humans!
 - I don't think that cats that are indoor only should have to be licensed.
 - "Making a responsible pet ownership course might avoid help animal abuse.
-
- Having more severe penalties for animal abuse"
 - Breed specific laws are like racism in humans. It shouldn't be acceptable.
 - Ownership to dog/cat owners when issues arise it should not be based on breed.
 - Yea not change anything its discrimination to dog breeds
 - do not ban or discriminate specific breeds. 20 years ago a toy poodle offleash ripped my pit bull puppy's testicle off.
 - Stop looking at breed specific legislation. Instead encourage owners to train (or restrain) their dogs properly. No euthanasiation.
 - Problem dogs are the result of owners, not the dog breed
 - As a RESPONSIBLE pitbull owner.I'm extremely disappointed and upset that pitbulls are begin targeted and generalized based on their breed.
 - Small dogs yap and charge at my bully every day and he ignores them but HE should wear a muzzle? Yeah...how about no
 - Bandanas are a waste of time. Teach children to not run up to a dog whether or not they look friendly instead of all onace on owners
 - Pitbulls are NOT the problem!! Bad owners are. It all comes down to proper training, doesn't matter the breed.
 - DON'T BULLY THE BREED, THE OWNER IS 100% OF THE TIME RESPONSIBLE FOR THE BEHAVIOUR OF THEIR PET. THERE ARE NO BAD DOGS, JUST BAD OWNERS.
 - I do not believe that focusing on pitbulls is necessary for the city. More dog bites are caused by smaller dogs.
 - The city shouldn't ban a dog because of the breed. PITBULLS are the most emotional, smart and strong dogs and lots of people take advantage
 - NA
 - Dissagree strongly with breed specific bylaws and it needs to be taken off the table.
 - I'm DISGUSTED that this city would even be considering bsl
 - Euthanize all pit bull type breeds.



- instead of categorizing dogs based on their breed you should have a screening process for owners. Pitbulls are not bad dogs just bad owners
- N/a
- Could you explain why only pitbulls types are being targeted?
- There needs to be more responsibility of owners for barking dogs. Yes, I understand dogs bark but when owners show no means for stopping it.
- BSL is discrimination... Legislation and restrictions should be based on an individual animals behaviour NOT a based on breed
- Discriminating against a breed of dog is just as bad as racism to humans if it's bad to be racist to people don't be racist two animals
- Rather than putting biased surveys on citizens regarding pit bulls aka nuisance dogs, target the owners of aggressive dogs and not the breed
- Breed discrimination is an insult. I know pit bulls that are more well behaved than most small breed dogs who yap like no tomorrow.
- Do NOT bring in breed specific legislation. Read the pitbull placebo.
- No
- There is way to much bias towards pitbulls in this bylaw and honestly it should be looked at to remove the bias but keep the points
- Quit punishing dogs based on how they look! Pitbull's are some of the kindest most affectionate and loyal dogs, quit discriminating!
- NO BSL
- Don't not make bylaw about pit bulls. Other breeds are just as dangerous
- More enforcement options for nuisance dogs.
- No
- Pit Bulls and others that may resemble Pit Bulls should not be treated any differently than any other breed of dog.
- Do not attempt Breed Specific Legislation further
- How about city administrators making these changes learn more about a breed before discriminating on hearsay and media reports!!!!
- I do not agree with breed specific discrimination. A dogs behaviour is a direct reflection of the owner and the training they have given.
- "BSL is not the answer, education is.
- We will only be going backwards with ideology that targets one specific breed or type of dog."
- Breed specific legislation is not a solution, dont discriminate. Penalties for those who abuse animals, regular vet visits required.
- It's proven that certain breeds attack more then others. The city is responsible to mitigate risk knowing these statistics.
- Breed specific laws punish the dog rather than the responsible party. Punish bad owners and restrict them from owning pets going forward.



- "Don't single out breeds. Make owners more responsible for their dogs actions. It's not the breed that is the problem. ”
- "It's bad owners not bad breeds"
- Banning/punishing a breed of dog does not fix the problem the bad owners will get other breeds"
- I do not support additional budget for these changes. Up the fees to pay for increased enforcement.
- Mandatory training for humans wanting to rescue, own or foster bully-breeds to help ensure the human knows how to properly care for the dog
- Pit Bulls should not be singled out, animals can be labeled as aggressive or nuisance regardless of breed. No breed specific legislation!
- Bully breeds aren't the problem , irresponsible owners are. Breed specific legislation is unfair
- BSL is terrible and proven ineffective. Create a program to license and care for pets of homeless folks. I know vets that would volunteer.
- I would like to see more active involvement from bylaw officers in trapping roaming cats. This is a huge problem in SW calgary
- Training for all dogs should be required
- The early warning collars will be useless unless everyone agrees to use them which they won't. I am absolutely against BSL
- Pit bulls are obviously an enormous problem and it is inherent in the breed, whose genetics incline said dogs to kill/maim other animals.
- Not right now
- It used to be German Shepherds and Rottweilers. Now the Pit Bull is the demon dog of the day. Dog racism is real and has been for decades.
- Dogs are not the problem - their training is. Give new dog owners free or low cost training courses and everyone benefits
- Banning a breed is not going to help at all. It is the person raising the dog, not the breed itself.
- Remove specific breeds from bylaws but be stricter for all signs of aggression in any breed
- BSL has been shown to work. Imagine if 85% of all auto fatalities were due to 1 type of car. At what point do you face the facts?
- No
- Don't discriminate against pit bulls and large dogs. Tiny dogs are some of the worse behaved dogs and vicious but can't do much damage.
- I have no additional feedback
- I think dogs should have to go through an assessment even basic before fines are issued. They are still animals and sometimes unpredictable
- There is a desperate need for a well maintained off leash (with the same quality and path system as Sue Higgins park) in the north west
- I believe that the owner should be investigated before the animal itself. Any breed can be aggressive if treated poorly or trained to be
- All pets, one



- Stop assuming pitbulls are the problem. Smaller dogs are much worse.
- No
- Another way for the city to take money out of my pocket. Small dogs bite way more. But no one cares about that
- Do not do anything that revolves around breed specific legislation!
- BSL not needed. Owner education is by far most important
- How about not calling out pitbulls as being deserving of special fines, conditions, training, etc.
- Breed-specific bylaw does the city a disservice by punishing responsible owners
- I strongly object to Pitbulls being singled out. There are smaller and larger breeds that have worse behaviors and cause more damage.
- Make off leash rules more clear, dogs can not be off leash on any paved paths
- I do not believe in breed specific legislation when it comes to dogs. I do not agree with the pitbull negativity out there.
- Signs in Off-leash areas do not mention owners responsibilities. Or that on a path within the area, a pet must be ON leash.
- Breed specific rules are not the way to deal with problem animals/owners
- Animal Services needs to work on its image to make it more positive. Animal welfare seems secondary to punitive actions.
- Breed specific bylaws should be removed.
- Nope
- I don't believe in breed specific legislation/restrictions for 'resembling a pit bull'. Too open to interpretation + misidentifying breeds
- None
- The breed of should not matter BSL does not work. Currently nothing is done with nuisance dog because there is no one to police it
- Breed specific bans and language is inappropriate and not productive to the conversation.
- More human regulation, rather than animal. All dogs are good dogs, it's a few owners who are bad. Focus on improving ownership of dogs.
- Breed Specific Legislation is useless
- Judging a dog by it's breed and forcing a family to get insurance on that dog is not acceptable. I have never met a pit bull I didn't love
- Pit bulls and pit bull mixes should be banned. No one needs an animal that is bred for and used in the illegal blood sport of dog fighting.
- Ban retractable leashes. They already violate standard leash laws but lead to increased issues with a lack of owner control of their animal.
- Stop blaming the breeds and start blaming the owners. 100% against BSL!!!!
- Stop targeting pit bulls specifically. No animal or person is genetically predisposed to violence. Any insistence otherwise is false.



- I don't agree with the breed specific bylaws. Any dog can be a nuisance dog if not socialized or trained properly.
- Put a stop to targeting specific breeds. Disgusting and unfair.
- After reviewing the current legislation, there is nothing with regards to vicious animals and how to identify them if the owner takes a walk
- Should a person have multiple infractions, they should be ineligible to own an animal for a specified time frame or forever.
- It is disappointing that pit bulls are being targeted by these potential bylaws.
- Punish people who abuse animals, not well-intentioned pet owners who make mistakes.
- The fact that BSL is suggested at all is extremely disappointing... it has been proven that IT DOES NOT WORK!
- The pitbull people need to calm down. It's not a ban. Just measures to mitigate the risk of having fighting breeds around.
- Need to recognize not every animal attack is animal fault, sometimes the person attacked has knowingly ignored owner or been aggressive.
- Not all breeds are bad. Basic training should be required for all dogs.
- Focus on behaviour and how an animal is raised- don't judge and discriminate based on breed alone.
- Breed specific laws are unfair. It's how their owner has trained (or failed to) train them. Anger is not a trait found in puppies.
- Barking excessively and dogs not being on leashes when not in off leash areas
- All dogs should have to register in a mandated obedience training course.
- Pit bulls were bred for fighting. You can't train out that instinct.
- A breed specific ban is ridiculous and breeds are not the issue, people are and their treatment of animals, people need to be held accountable
- a better psychological study and assessment is needed that acknowledges the aggression of substantially smaller dogs.
- Defer to actual animal experts before enacting breed specific legislation, going forward only shows you're unable to follow science
- MORE BYLAWS / LAWS, FINES, RESTRICTIONS, ETC - FOR IRRESPONSIBLE PET OWNERS!! NOT THE ANIMALS! NO LAW SHOULD BE CONSEQUENTLY USED TO PETS.
- Signage in parks about keeping dogs on leash with a bit of explanation (for wildlife, for those afraid of dogs, for those rehabbing rescues)
- Stop targeting specific breeds - small dogs who's owners think it's cute when they snap/bite is far more worrisome!
- Dog breeds have nothing to do with a dogs potential of being vicious; many large dogs have lockjaw, include all or include none.
- None



- Triple the fine for dogs being off leash outside of designated areas, enforce it and MAKE IT KNOWN. There is no reason to let a dog wander
- "Pitbull" type dogs are not the problem, bad owners are the problem.
- Lower licensing and discounted spay/neuter programs. Complaints, multiple offences have enforced obedience classes, training for owners!
- Can't believe the use of breed specific language. All potential dog owners should have to pass mandatory training before they buy/adopt
- Introduce a responsible breeder license. Require all pets to be spay/neutered unless the owner holds a breeding license.
- The bandana system is a decent option but in the past I've seen it as an excuse for poor behaviour in dogs and no responsibility from owners
- I would be very upset whether city puts extra condition to my Staffordshire terrier. Dog racism. NEVER AGREE
- The Pitbull restrictions are AWFUL. Maybe make it mandatory that dog owners need to take training class for themselves and their pet!
- I'm surprised there is still discrimination against pitbulls these days. Responsible owners will raise well-mannered animals, even pitbulls.
- Instead of targeting specific breeds of dogs, there should be more emphasis on how they can be trained to prevent incidents from occurring
- Number of dogs and cats per household should be way lower than 6 of each
- I believe there should be exceptions regarding dog bites. Self defense. Protection . Very disappointed in reading about the breed prejudice.
- none
- No
- I feel that City Pet licensing should actually be free and barrier free. It will increase compliance.
- Breed specific legislation is basically dog racism, dogs will behave how they are trained to behave.
- Pit bulls are not the problem and do not deserve to be punished. People need to be held responsible for their pets behaviour. No BSL!
- Cats should be allowed to roam free with no problems. Specific breeds shouldn't be singled out.
- [removed]
- I do not agree with any breed specific bylaws. I support education for kids and adults on how to interact and approach dogs.
- Banning breeds is just "legal" genocide of another creature, it's wrong! Focus on implementing laws that holds ALL dog owners accountable
- Breed specific legislation is unnecessary esp. re pitbull-these have been proven to be gentle, loving dogs. Its the owners, not the dogs
- No discrimination against breeds. Any breed can be aggressive!
- Breed specific laws are [remove]. It'll only cause problems for shelters and the owners of pit bulls or other dogs.



- There is data to show that the German Shepherd has a more powerful bite force than Pitbull. Thought Calgary was progressive beyond BSL.
- No
- Breed specific bans are ridiculous
- I do not support any bylaws with respect to specific breeds. Pit bull are subject to unnecessary stigma and unjustified fear.
- There would be no special rules for breeds. Though I think attending a training course should be mandatory with all dogs.
- breed specific legislation or bans are not supported by any legitimate statistics, and thus make no sense
- I am strongly opposed to all breed specific bylaws. They have not worked in other municipalities and prevent good dogs from finding homes
- The rules against pitbulls are flat out misinformed and you should be embarrassed to even present these rules as options.
- I would like a bylaw that deals with odor.
- This is ridiculous. I am not worried about the beagle down the street. I can't believe we're still debating this. And +/- votes? Are we 12?
- N/a
- There should be more care put into regulations that ensure the health and safety of an animal instead of just punitive measures.
- Make more puppy areas to play! 1 per neighborhood would be nice. A small, closed off area for 2 months - 9 months pups to play off leash
- Bylaws should apply to all breeds of dogs. A training course for owners and problematic dogs, once identified should be mandatory.
- None. Thankyou
- No
- Laws against "pit bull's" are useless
- Give whoever came up with this title a big high five - that is some excellent punmanship!
- Just please ban pit bulls. Thank you.
- Licensing fees for strictly indoor cats should be a very low amount and good for life.
- The breed has nothing to do with the way the animal behaves. You can have the sweetest pit bull and the most aggressive beagle!
- categories for fines to be too open to interpretation leaving room for the category to be more severe if the victim is overly emotional
- Keep your hands off my well behaved pitbulls! No to BSL! Ban bad owners. Limit numbers for dog walkers. More dog education in schools.
- I think there needs to be more education for owners that have trouble controlling an animal. I also think more needs to be done about cats



- Breed specific restrictions do not work. Education and community support are the best tools we have to help owners and their pets.
- Reduce the licensing costs if people have more than 1 animal.
- I have none
- Small Dog only parks
- memorial options for pets, sponsoring a waste bag dispenser for park garbage, or mailing back licenses to go into a dog park art project
- The city needs better tools to vet pet owners upon their purchase of a license.
- Breed specific legislation is ineffective and only serves to encourage people to use those animals for illegal activity and abuse them
- The survey doesn't ID why pit bulls are held to account for all dog behaviours. Therefore I think this survey is designed to be discriminat
- Pitbull bans are the [remove] thing the city has come up with
- If a dangerous dog is roaming at large the fine should be HUGE. Living next door to a dangerous dog is like being held prisoner.
- No just no this is dumb.
- LEAVE THE BULLY BREED ALONE!
- I do not support any of the pit bulls laws. The owner has to be on control of his dog behavior.
- Na
- Remove the ability for rental properties to refuse you based on you having pets.
- Stop killing animals like pit bulls for owners bad training and aggressive behaviors. Its not the dogs fault, they should be trained
- Can aggressive behaviour be defined in signage in dog parks because some owners think biting, stalking and body slamming are perfectly fine.
- Targeted a specific breed is unfair. I have seen far worse dog fights and attacks on children from husky's, terriers and retrievers.....
- Please do not have special laws for pit bulls. Any pet can be dangerous and aggressive if abused or not trained.
- The city needs to look at adding more off leash areas to newer suburbs on the outskirts of the city.
- I think that targeting certain dog types is unreasonable. Not all pit bulls are mean and not all chihuahua's are nice.
- Can the fines levied for dog bites go to the victim? I was stuck with \$1200 vet bills when a pit bull attacked my dog. Owner declared guilty
- I love the idea of educating kids on dog "green,yellow, red light" bananas. Kids need to be more educated on how to approach dogs.
- Deal with all dogs on equal grounds. BSL has proven nothing in other jurisdictions other than people who don't train dogs pick other breeds
- Breed specific discrimination should not be supported. Owners are almost always the source of the problem (improper care/training/etc).



- I would only recommend to consider an entire situation for a dog bite. Generally speaking, normally they will not attack unless provoked.
- There should absolutely not be any breed specific legislation. Mandatory obedience training before registering a dog would be better.
- Yes. How about stop bullying the bully breeds. When raised properly, they are more likely a lapdog than a dog to be muzzled. Disappointed
- Please do not target specific dog breeds, you are sending a misinformed message to the public.
- Dogs should not be allowed off leash when not in a dog park.
- big thumbs down to all breed specific legislation and shame on you City of Calgary for promoting it
- Anything that promotes spay/neuter programs increased!!!!
- Pit bulls should not be being categorized from other dog breeds. All dogs have potential to be vicious. The owner of the dog is responsible.
- I only said yes to the proposed bylaw regarding the # of cats and dogs, bcuz of the proposed exceptions to the rules. Otherwise no support.
- Focus on regulating pet industry. Ban aversive training that makes dogs aggressive. Ban prong and shock collars to start.
- Stop picking on certain breeds because they "could be a threat";. Punish bad dogs/owners; don't ostracize breeds because you're misinformed.
- Do not punish a breed. Punish the owners who raise their dogs to be aggressive
- N/a
- I do not support breed specific legislation. It's the owner not the breed! This is 100 % prejudice and discriminatory. Disgusting
- If you can't afford a license how can you afford other pet care such as vet visits, food etc. Pets aren't cheap, why decrease fees?
- No
- Ban aversive training methods. Science shows prong, choke and shock collars only increase aggression and fear in dogs.
- Stop scape goating bully breeds as aggressive dogs.
- Please do not blame the dog breed, blame the owners! Make the owners accountable for their pets.
- I do not have any ideas everything I wanted changed was already in the questions but I do hate how you have to have 140 characters to move o
- I believe that Breed specific restrictions are rather insane. I have been attacked by many small dogs in Calgary. Never Large breed. So..??
- My pit bull has been attacked by a Shepard and I know of a chocolate lab who attacked another dog as well. So you gunna ban those breeds too
- breed-specific bylaws do not reduce the incidence or severity of dog bites, penalizes responsible pet owners and kills innocent dogs!!!
- Strict regulations for off-leash/unsupervised outdoor cats please, too many cats injured and lives lost.



- First of all I take great offence at the "Internal expertise" term used to describe your committee because you have shown none here.
- Please stop targeting specific breeds. Irresponsible owners need stricter and higher fines. People are the problem not animals. Please don't
- Dog breed is not the issue. Training should be mandatory for all dogs.
- breed specific legislation does not reduce dog bites/nuisance dogs. please focus on RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP irregardless of breed or type
- Nope
- All aggressive pets required to go through obedience training prior to any euthenization.
- No
- Definitely no breed specific laws. Put more ownership and responsibility on owners
- Any dog will bite; Any breed, any size, any mix. Any dog can become dangerous. Stop punishing dogs, because of bad owners. Know the truth.
- More enforcement and fines for ppl who let there dogs off leash in undesignated areas.
- pitbulls are wonderful dogs. the behavior of the dog does not depend on the breed of the dog, it depends on how the dog is trained.
- Ban extendable leashes. They should not be used ever.
- Enforce the current bylaw more. Calgary has one of the better pet ownership bylaws in canada. Why go backwards, BSL does not work.
- It is not the bread it's the envioument the animal is brought up in!
- The dog is not the issue, the owner is. Please do not pass this as it will punish good owners. Any dog can be aggressive not just pit bull's
- I am VERY opposed to breed specific bans of any type. I own a boxer. All breeds can behave badly if not well trained.
- Responsibility should be put on pet owners rather than breeds. Outdoor cats have negative environmental impact and indoor cats live longer
- No
- Banning a specific breed will not help. Some dogs are nuisances, but that's not about breed. If there's a problem dog, deal with that case.
- Disappointed in discussion of breed specific bylaws/restrictions. Info and obed training for all breeds is better that punishment for some
- Ban the owner not the breed . I will never support banning or treating pit bulls differently . Calgary is better than that .
- its ridiculous and appalling to be breeed specific when looking into any bylaws at all.
- breed specific legislation shows lack of research and use of a scapegoat.. grow up.
- Online page to send in complaints about neighbours dogs.
- Being an owner of a bully breed I am disappointed that this is still a topic.
- You should regulate Animal rescue organizations because a lot of them are corrupt and don't disclose health info to adopters.



- My Pitbull is already always muzzled and leashed under my control and I don't use any public parks why should I pay more fees?
- For point 10 (licensing fees) perhaps waving the fee with proof of spayed/neutered and up to date yearly vaccinations.
- It all come from the owners. Leave dogs out.
- People get reduced license fees for attending and passing basic obedience training with dogs.
- Stop furthering the stigma around specific breeds. The owners should be ensuring their dogs are trained appropriately - no matter what breed
- Breed specific legislation is absolute garbage and I can't believe the city is even humouring such a [remove] baseless plan.
- Treating all dogs the same, punishing the owners and avoiding to surrender the animal.
- Dog breed legislation is antiquated, archaic, and reprehensible. Punish the owner, not the breed
- Make people be able to pass a skill testing set of questions on canine behaviour and body Language to get a dog license
- Na
- Consider pet resort and pet sitting services exempt from special licensing with regards to more than six dogs.
- Implement heavy and severe fines for backyard / hobby breeders who sell dogs to anyone carelessly
- Im curious how much of the pit-bull driven questions are from data driven numbers or public concern. Onus should be on the owner not breed.
- None
- Let residents vote on banning pit bulls completely. My dog almost died after an attack. Since then, another pit bull charged him as well.
- Banning dogs is wrong
- Do not discriminate by breed. I have only even been bit by a little dog. This needs to be an owner problem not a breed problem.
- give your officers more power to deal with things rather than have them tell you to call the police.
- No
- Not in support of breed specific legislation.
- Na
- This isn't right. Many breeds attack, Examples including Rottweilers, Doberman's, Shepherds etc. Please don't single out one breed!
- More dog parks - ie the green areas between roads and houses could be fenced and safely provide better use of these areas, and spread people out
- Targeting Pit Bulls is placating a loud vocal minority at the expense of everyone else. We deserve a better answer, ie, target bad owners!
- No breed specific laws



- Make all dog parks offer free bags if you're going to fine people for not using them. Sometimes my dog goes five times and I run out!
- Feel free to amend the bylaw, but there's no need for it to be breed specific. A dog's obedience depends on its owner's diligence
- Do not put restrictions on pit bull breeds
- Stop targeting large pet breeds. Start looking at the vicious small dog breeds; Chihuahuas and miniature Doberman pinchers.
- There should not be a licensing fee for pets.
- Please share stats on all dog breed bites.
- do not introduce breed specific banning . Any animal can be bad or good. Pit Bulls are not bad dogs. All large breeds have big bites.
- The discrimination against pit bull simply because of the breed is unacceptable. Don't punish the dog; punish the owner if it becomes a problem
- People need to be held responsible for their pets. Show proof of obedience if an issue arises or pay a hefty fine
- Don't label dog breeds, when sometimes it's the owner's problem. and rather than putting a dog down, maybe make behaviour classes a requirement
- No
- There were many questions where I disagreed with all options but couldn't provide a reason. Poorly designed. survey.
- Please don't ban pit bulls. I think stricter rules on how people have to go about getting licensed is a great idea. Vet the OWNER, not pup.
- 6 dogs is still too many for the average person who doesn't fall under the exception list. 4 should be the limit for the average citizen.
- Breed discrimination is uneducated and quotes on the "strength of certain dog-bites"; need to be evidence-based (which it is not).
- BSL is one of the dumbest ideas out there, a dog can not be held responsible for how it is raised, regardless of genetics.
- Calgary needs Small Dog Only Off-Leash Parks or fenced sections in existing parks. This would help reduce aggressive incidences.
- Pitbull attacks account for nearly all dog attacks and I fully support legislating and controlling the ownership of these breeds.
- Please don't single out pit bulls. The owners are the problem, not the breed.
- Owners should be responsible for properly training their dogs. The dog should never be held fully responsible for their actions.
- Disappointed to see BSL language in survey. Responsible ownership shouldn't differ based on breed. Shame on you Calgary. A bite is a bite
- Restrictions on "Pit bulls"; are not a solution to dog bites it is the owner's responsibility to properly train their dog of any breed



- You'll kill a dog for the irresponsible actions of people? Get a grip. I've seen more chihuahua and dachshund bites.
- A flagging system should not be necessary. NO ONE should approach a dog and expect that they are entitled to touch it.
- Ban unneutered male dogs in offleash parks. We are dog owners and have witnessed them cause most altercations in offleash parks.
- I will never support a breed-specific law. Any dog, in the wrong hands, can be aggressive.
- If you bring in bsl you are saying it's ok to be racist. A dog doesn't choose its breed just like humans dont get to choose there color
- Do not discriminate against dog breeds. Putting a target on a dog aka pitbulls allows unfounded fear in people and misunderstanding of a breed
- More off leash dog parks
- I do not support breed specific legislation.
- Tiered licensing fees based on household income. Or raise the low income cut off to a realistic number
- I think that the color system is a great idea. I also believe that dog awareness should be taught by parents and possible in schools as well
- No
- DO NOT JUDGE PITBULLS OR ANY SPECIFIC BREED OF DOG JUDGE THE OWNERS THAT TRAINED THEM JUDGE THE SITUATION NOT THE BREED.
- Ban pit bulls. They are a nuisance. Our children and animals are not safe with them around.
- Pitbulls is a misused term used by many to call their mixed mutts. Disappointing to see the City single out dogs with certain appearances.
- I think each dog attack has to be looked at individually. Why attack?? Why that person??was the dog being teased or attacked first??
- It's much more effective to manage problem pets rather than specific breeds since the issue is about training and owner treatment of the pet
- Dogs of any size are capable of severe injury. Please do not discriminate based on breed or size, the issue is with the owners.
- So disappointed that the city I love is trying to remove pit bulls because of a few bad animals when most pit bulls are great dogs
- Don't believe in breed specific bylaws. Especially to muzzle just because they are a certain breed!
- It has been proven that breed specific laws do not work and cause an uproar in the community by upset people.
- "Stop with this pitbulls are dangerous nonsense. It's just not true.
- Go talk to any local veterinarian they'll probably say the same."
- Why do I have to pay the city to own a pet. This is ridiculous!
- No
- Holding people accountable for harassing animals that are on private property ie through a fence.



- STOP targeting PitBulls!!!
- None
- Trying to place limitations on specific breeds is a suggestion based out of fear and ignorance. Let's be better than that.
- People who scream hysterically and run from a dog who shows no aggressive trades and on leash should also be fined.
- Don't just target pitbulls! Target irresponsible owners and any dogs with a history of aggression
- Targetting breed va behaviour is ineffective and inappropriate. No data supports the need for such biased bylaws.
- No
- Breed specific legislation is discriminatory and defeats the intent of "Responsible Pet Ownership"
- No breed specific legislation.
- Persons convicted of animal abuse are never permitted to ever own another animal in the city.
- stop targeting 'pitbulls'. They have the same chance of attacking as any dog, so stop singling them because of what past OWNERS have done!
- I can't believe that in 2020 people are still so ignorant about the nature of dogs. Pitbulls are amazing, bad owners create bad dogs.
- There should be zero breed specific rules. All responsibility should be on the owner.
- More casual off lease areas required
- not at this time
- I don't understand the obsession with regulating pit bulls. All dogs can be dangerous if their owners are ignorant jerks. FYI, I don't own 1
- Muzzles, b
- The onus should fall on pet owners of any breed or type - not just those who own pitbulls - to ensure their pet is well behaved.
- I support the idea of a lifetime license for cats and dogs with a one time fee non transferable to another pet for \$150
- Nothing really. I did this because I own a pitbull and he's truly sweet and I wouldn't want him muzzled when he isn't dangerous.
- The responsibility should be on the owner and not the animal. It should not be bread specific. Humans are by far the worst animals there are
- If people believe their dogs are reactive or aggressive, and require a leash or muzzle, they maybe shouldn't be allowed at off leash parks
- Removing the specification of pit bulls and involving more consequences focused on the training of owners.
- Love to see heavy fines for cyclists who illegally ride on on sidewalks and go out of their way to scare leashed animals and wildlife.



- Breed discrimination shouldn't be a thing, discriminate against bad owners - no more dogs, high fines
- Use the findings and listen to the people that were involved in phase 1. I've read on social media that you have not been.
- don't agree w/ breed specific bylaws Bully Breeds not only dogs w/strong bites and scary looks. Small dogs bite more. Online license needed
- "I do not believe you can single out or ban a certain breed of dog (Pitbull)
- ""Pitbull lives matter”"
- Breed-specific legislation is a dangerous and unproven slippery slope. The City of Calgary should under no circumstances deem this.
- Licenses should be a one time payment, shared for all pets in house. Charge an additional reasonable fee, per pet added to license instead.
- I disagree with singling out pitbulls. Bylaws should address dangerous or aggressive behavior regardless of a dog's breed
- Don't put restrictions on specific breeds.
- No additional comments
- Do not define a dog by their appearance or physical characteristics. Define them by their behaviour as a result of their owner.
- Provide free pet registration for anyone who takes a pupstart/obedience class. The more we have engage through education the better
- Bylaws discriminating against certain breeds should be terminated.
- Education to adults and children on how to approach pets
- No
- Any breed can be aggressive. My mom was recently bitten by a golden retriever. Breed specific bylaws aren't necessary!
- license fees should be on a sliding scale ie. certified obedience training (would allow a lower \$), frequency of nuisances calls (higher \$)
- No
- Stop the breed discrimination! So terrible! we have entered a world where we are supposed to be supportive of everyone so why not dogs!
- Do some actual research as to the breed of dogs that attack children, not pitbulls!! Then the breed of dog that attack adults, not pitbull!!
- Provide incentives to owners who take their dogs to obedience classes, such as reduced license fees.
- Breeds aren't an issue, the owners are. Breed specific bylaws are obtuse.
- Do not restrict or punish out bulls. That is so ineffective and will make people fearful of these friendly dogs.
- No



- Exceptions to Lsa should be waived in special circumstances but low income may not be the primary driver. Stop thinking breed, think aggress
- Ever heard the phrase "Dont judge a book by its cover"? Breed specific legislation is a perfect example of judging a dog based on a look.
- No support for any version of BSL. To enact bylaw changes does the panel not have to use evidence based practices? BSL contravenes that.
- I do not agree with having specific bylaws for certain breeds of dogs. It is just feeding into the stigma already about pit bull type breeds
- All peace officers and law enforcement should take annual training to improve their encounters with potentially hostile animals.
- More fenced in dog parks. More parks designated for small dogs ONLY (20 pounds or less, for example). Or even fee-based private parks.
- No
- any dog can harm other animals or people. The person taking care of dogs should be taking lesson on the care and expentations
- The bully ban is succumbing to stereotypes. There are other more effective ways to address dangerous dogs (of all breeds). Do better Calgary
- Breed specific legislation should NOT even be considered! Dogs are not born vicious. You CANNOT label a breed as such and make rules for it!
- Non owners should also be accountable for their actions if they provoke or abuse an animal who will naturally try to defend itself.
- It's time to limit the number of dogs a single dog walker walks at one time. Max 4. I often see Some with 12 dogs. Ridiculous.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. BSL has not worked anywhere. Why do it here.
- Anyone breeding should have to be licensed, pay a fee to keep license, and be regulated help stop mill operations.
- Can't say this enough, it's not a breed problem, it's a handler issue. Please get animal behaviouralists to help with some of thesedecisions
- Irresponsible breeding and over breeding is the major issue. Breeders need to be licensed.
- My idea is to not discriminate against breeds. Thanks.
- Please don't single out the pit bull breed. Any dog can be aggressive.
- Leave the pit bull breed alone. Do NOT discriminate against the pit bull bread!
- Offleash areas should be fenced off. This makes the boundary clear to dog owners and keeps dogs separated from other park users.
- Not all nuisance dogs are pitbulls; not all pitbulls are nuisance dogs!
- It is the breed and the owner
- Do not punish a breed. Punish the owners who raise their dogs to be aggressive. Disgusting! Shame on you City of Calgary for promoting this.



- breed specific legislation does not reduce dog bites/nuisance dogs! please focus on RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP irregardless of breed
- Focus on RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP. It is THE OWNER that affects the dog. It does not matter what breed, ANY DOG become aggressive/bite.
- no other ideas
- Breed selective bylaws do nothing but punish and dissolve the animals potential quality of life. It creates an unrealistic phobia and stigma
- No every thing was covered I believe
- BSL is descrimination, punish the bad owner, not the dog. Higher fines to people that don't pick up after their dogs in public, and enforce!
- Animals are not born aggressive, it is all on the owners and how they are trained. Banning curtains breeds isn't going to fix anything!
- Please stop feeding my dog pizza. He doesn't like it. He only eats it to be polite. I taught him very good manners. STOP TAKING ADVANTAG
- Have signs posted at dog parks in regards to Not all dogs play with the same levels of energy some play rougher than others.
- It should not be a requirement for households to license indoor cats.
- I do not understand how someone can claim a support dog and request reduced liscensing but afford care and essentials for pet.
- City-wide review of the location of offleash dog areas with consideration given to environmental impact of roaming dogs and other park users
- The 'pitbull' points addressed in the survey are disturbing. Breed specific legislation is not proven to work - remove those points!
- Singling out pit bull breeds is absolutely ridiculous!!
- Better restrictions on cat owners to spay and neuter.
- I've had bad experiences with German shepherds and huskys, not pitbulls. There should be more responsibility on the owner.
- BSL is not effective,expensive to enforce,and adds extra stress and expense to animal shelters. Liability should be on the owner not the dog
- Breed specific legislation does not work. If you want to improve pet behaviour, then make a specified number of training classes mandatory.
- No
- Signs need to be put up in on-leash parks. Many owners think that any park is the appropriate place to run their dogs offleash. Not true!!!
- Stay out of peoples lives. You are not gods.
- Breedspecific discrimination only escalates things when education/training of PEOPLE is ignored. Say No to pit bull -targeted policies.
- no (:



- aggressive dogs (ones who have shown aggression) would either be put down or muzzled But can do extensive course to be cleared of allegation
- A dogs behaviour is only directly linked to how it is raised. A specific breed has nothing to do with.
- Instead of punishment for letting cats outside, I think there should be some reward/initiative to entice people I.e. lower registration fees
- It's embarrassing that breed-specific legislature is even being considered. It's ineffective at best and punishes the wrong people.
- Punishing an animal based on its breed is equivalent to punishing a person based on their race, which we all know is called racism.
- More enforcement of dogs offleash in parks. Kids should not be afraid to go to the playground or walk to school because of offleash dogs.
- Ostracizing pitbulls just because some people are misinformed and too ignorant to fact check or allow themselves to be educated is appalling
- Cats should be able to roam. Removal of this bylaw.
- Circumstances and canine nature should be considered in bite cases (like if the bitten person was trespassing, threatening the dog, etc)
- I was really shocked to read some folkx have pigeons on purpose. We can't get rid of them.
- No discrimination against "pit bulls.”
- Penalizing '‘pit bull type breeds' for their potential to do harm is dumb. You don't make a strong person wear handcuffs out of fear do you?
- Restricting ownership of a dog breed is a poor way to go about this. Make obedience/socialization classes mandatory or something instead.
- I don't get why pittbulls were singled out. This should apply to all dogs and not be discriminatory. A lot of pit bulls are the nicest dogs.
- Clearer guidelines on what is considered at large or a nuisance. People have their own thresholds and it should not be a matter of opinion
- None
- Charging people with a fine for assaulting a pet. not paying attention, making it fearful, uncomfortable etc that leads the pet biting etc.
- People need to know that not everyone likes dogs While most dogs are good they are animals with instincts and will bite. Cyclists Rock !
- I would like to see the implementation of permits for pet ownership, and especially for breeding. Make mandatory courses.
- By-law officers need to make an effort to look for a dog that they have been told is running loose. Not respond with well its a very big are
- "Bandana idea is terrible. Already hard enough to teach some kids not to approach
- strange dogs. Putting a green/go cue on a dog doesnt help"
- We need more enforcement officers present at the bigger off-leash dog parks.
- Mandatory training programs alongside fines for both animal and owner when offenses occur.



- I think off leash parks are for any dogs. You can not tell people one breed has to be different. That is wrong. The dog can be super Frindl
- Pitbulls should not be banned, that's the most biased and stupid bylaw I have ever heard. Think of how many sweet and innocent dogs will die
- No other ideas
- it's a dog. it's gonna bark. people need to get over it
- If you are going to judge based on of 'strength meaning more possible threat' charge for large vehicles then too. This is silly and a waste
- Teach them not to bark when you say so ... and done
- Stop looking to make breed specific bylaws. Any bylaws proposed for 1 should apply to all breeds. Hold all owners accountable
- No
- Dog breed legislation is antiquated, archaic, and insulting. Punish the owner, not the dog
- All dog owners adopting a pet should require some form of owner and pet together training, subsidized of course.
- Muzzles are safe, humane and the only way to 100% stop a bite. For dogs that are aggressive or reactive i think it's fine, as a big dog Owne
- If training needs to be mandatory for pitbull owners than it should be mandatory for ALL dog owners.
- There should not be breed specific legislation.
- Ability to fine nuisance neighbors that tease pets through a fence or otherwise harass dogs/cats. This is an ignored form of animal abuse.
- No ideas- don't single out specific breeds but addresss the handlers mistakes instead
- Obedience training should be required of all dog owners to obtain a pet license. Onus on owners to train their dogs properly to not be mean
- Increased fine/enforcement/awareness for violating on-leash rules
- Breed specific discrimination should be minimized. I know some pit bulls that are very friendly and well trained.they can be Very lovely dog
- Ruling out only a pitbull when any dog can be aggressive is absolutely absurd. Disgusting to even think of making this into a law.
- .
- "Animal damages another animal or property" property and animal should be separate.
- Ban the deed not the breed!
- Dog owners should not be able to be fined, nor any consequences if an at large cat (or other pet) enters a private property.
- .
- I'm confused about not allowing "outdoor cats"... Shouldn't cats who come back be allowed to live free?
- If the owner/caretaker is able to properly look after (house, feed, clean up after) the animal there's no need to limit types or numbers



- a hotline for insurance companies to access for reports of banned breeds and nuisance animals on a property
- More enforcement for off leash dogs where not allowed.
- "Breed specific legislation will not work.
- Additional training for owners with animal offences should be necessary for additional animals."
- Pitbulls should not be singled out. This shows an ignorant lack of care or understanding of the breed. This may hurt rescue organizations.
- Breed-specific legislation falsely shifts blame to the animal, rather than on irresponsible pet ownership which is the real issue.
- Breed isn't the problem. It's the training. I would love to see opportunities for Calgary to work with trainers to offer affordable programs
- By putting colour coded markers on dogs you are cutting out 1 in 12 men and 1 in 200 women that are colour blind.
- Cost to keep a city record of an animal is ridiculous. Also, fines for spay/neuter cats for roaming and discrimination against bully breeds.
- Dogs must be on leash at all times except in off leash parks, in homes, fenced yards or vehicles
- In a Dog Lover's world it would be considered "RASCIST" to single out "PITBULL" breeds. Section 3 should only pertain to "NUISANCE DOGS".
- There are no bad dogs, only irresponsible pet owners.
- Targeting pit bulls is not ok. I've been bit by a poodle and shih tzu..... but never a pit bull..... it's all about training.
- Do NOT introduce Breed Specific Legislation. Doing so would be a step in the wrong direction.
- Breed specific legislation is a terrible idea. Shame on you for even considering it.
-
- Please ban pitbulls in Calgary.
- Stop allowing petstores to sell intact rabbits! How bad does the problem have to get before it is stopped.
- none
- I do not agree with labelling a breed and putting restrictions on that breed. It's uneducated humans that raise or put dogs in bad situation
- Stop looking to make breed specific bylaws. Any bylaws proposed for 1 should apply to all breeds. Hold all owners accountable
- Increased restrictions for pet owners found to be incapable of proper animal treatment. Increased fines/removal for leaving pets in vehicles
- It is the owner's responsibility to have knowledge of the dogs breed. Dogs are like children they don't know any better unless they're taught
- Creating breed-specific bylaws is ridiculous and not based on evidence. Please read the research on dog bites and do not single-out breeds.



- All dog owners should have to take training classes when they first get a dog and socializing classes when an owner gets a puppy.
- There is no bylaw for leaving a dog outside the house confined in the backyard if they are left without a leash even for hours
- .
- After a certain amount of infractions from a certain owner , they should be banned from owning pets until going through a rehab program.
- Breed-specific bylaws have zero research behind them. Labeling breeds as "harmful" does nothing but encourage bad ownership.
- Please BAN pit bulls. I don't need idiot pit-mommies unleashing their dogs in a park to attack other dogs and then claim the dog is so sweet
- A higher percentages wolfdog allowed in Calgary and less fees for those dogs
- "Program to have Vets lower cost for low income families , persons.
- And for emergency situations."
- "Unfair to label a breed or to ban certain types.
- Responsibility falls upon the owner of any animal to have it properly trained."
- No
- I dont think Breed discrimination should be allowed in this byla. It comes from uneducated people and encourges ignorance. C
- A \$500 fine should be issued to anyone who doesn't license their dog like the Richmond, BC Model and Dangerous dogs owners pay \$300 license.
- there should be any breed specific rules. pets that cause harm should be required to attended behavioral training to correct the behavior
- I don't like the negativity towards pit bulls, any dog can be dangerous if improperly trained. They should be innocent until proven guilty
- Treat each animal as an individual instead of lumping them under umbrella terms. Appearance doesnt increase likelihood of bites.
- Breed specific laws are unjust. The government should not punish, but educate. Problem animals should be trained, not euthenized.
- Spay/ neuter surgery should be more accessible to low income households.
- Problem animals should not be taken away from owners. It traumatizes both animal and owner. Education and training should replace punishment
- Mandatory basic training for all new dog owners including new puppies, rescued dogs, adopted dogs, breeder bought dogs, pet store bought dog
- Realize it is the owner of the animal who is the problem and get your head out your rear.
- Nothing to say
- Toys and other items that could facilitate resource guarding should be prohibited in off-leash and on-leash parks. It leads to fights.



- Make bylaw against touching/handling dog/cat without owner's permission! Exceptions for lost pets of course.
- I know you love your dog but that doesn't mean that your neighbour should have to listen to him bark for 15 years.
- "Make a change to question 1 by offering a choice d.) neither.
- That is my choice."
- Allow reasonable roaming for outdoor cats as long as they are spayed or neutered.
- I don't agree with having just one breed has scare breed. If want to control any thing have spray programs and training programs for breed
- Singling out pit bulls is unacceptable... there are plenty of large dog breeds that could do damage if they were dangerous. Why pitbulls?
- A dog should never be deemed dangerous based on the breed they are or their physical characteristics.
- Poor ownership and a lack of training is what causes dog bites/attacks. One breed or an opinion on appearance do not make a dangerous dog
- Public education on dog behaviour, communication and proper approach is what should be focused on. Not coloured bandanas
- Discrimination against pitbulls is completely ridiculous, inappropriate, unfair and EXTREMELY embarrassing coming from our city. Shame.
- Training classes for owners. Maybe discount fees. That way you promote healthy dog ownership.
- bylaw picking up at large cats. This is a significant issue all over the city and cat owners are held to a lesser standard then dog owners
- I do not agree with singling out pit bulls. It's the owner that is the problem not the breed.
- pet owners need a pet owner certificate as proof they know how to look after a dog. Keep dog leashed in City when not in the off-leash area.
- You should be able to report a cat owner who let's their cat run loose on a daily basis. Bylaw fines should be given out immediately!!!!
- people who let their cats run around outside in other peoples yards do not really care about their cats health and should be fined heavily
- no
- Dog daycares and kennels need way more structure and rules in place. Currently it's a free for all in these environments making it dangerous
- Breed specific restrictions are closed minded and fear based. These do not act in the best interest of the owner or animal.
- Problem animals are the result of problem owners, an uneducated or apathetic owner that fails to provide the proper care/training.
- Special circumstance forgiveness for animals triggered by others ie. Do returning barks from others or defending owners when being attacked
- Very against breed specific bylaws



- no
- N/a
- BSL (breed specific legislation) is NOT EFFECTIVE - overwhelming majority of studies done on BSL concur. Regressive and draconian laws.
- Please stop using stigmatizing pit bulls. Especially since your survey admits that there is no evidential reason to single them out.
- Bad owners not bad dogs
- BSL is uneducated and ineffective. Ontario saw an increase in bites of 57% between 2005-2014. Don't discriminate!
- A prohibition against a breed is silly. It is the owner that should be held accountable.
- None
- Very against lower pricing for low income people. If you are struggling to get by, why would you want another mouth to feed?
- Why focus on pitbulls and not all dangerous breeds? Dogs physically capable of permanently injuring or killing a person need extra rules
- YYC has done such an exceptional job at enforcing responsible pet ownership up until now. Bringing BSL to our city is outdated and uneducated
- "1) Fine for allowing urination on someones lawn.
- Trained dogs allowed off-leash public green space areas when no one else is around"
- Outdoor cats continue to be an issue. Fines should be higher for cats repeatedly found outside.
- Do not impose any breed restrictions. It is cruel and Bree has no bearing on dogs behaviour, it or the owner who determines how the dog is
- Na
- Buying multi-year pet licenses, mandatory dog training for ALL breeds (subsidies available for low income), stricter rules on spay/neutering
- I love the Bandana idea to id your dogs right away. Green = friendly, yellow = Caution, Red, stay away
- Stop discriminating and attempting to implement bylaws that are clearly fueled by feelings of extreme prejudice towards a certain breed.
- Implement mandatory pet ownership training or no animal license will be given. Ignorance shouldn't be allowed as an excuse for bad behaviour
- horrible that the pit bull breed is singled out, when Chow Chow, Doberman Pinscher, Dalmatian, Rottweiler, German Shepard have more incident
- Stop discriminating against a dog before they do anything. Their colors and shape dont mean they're bad.
- Stop signalling out pitbulls. Even with the statement that they don't bite more, specifically naming them increases stigmatization.
- Stop using breed specific language. Pitt bulls are not bad dogs.
- No



- Na
- No
- Education of both pet owners and the general public would be far more effective in improving safety in people/dog interactions. Not BSL.
- Instead of fines for loud or aggressive dogs how about a in-depth wellness check for the dog to ensure it has good living conditions
- How about no fee spay and neutering and stricter rules around breeding
- No
- Speaking as a veterinary professional, pitbulls should not have any additional rules or regulations placed on them.
- Stop using breed specific language. Pitt bulls are not bad dogs.
- Breed-specific legislation not only does not work, it harms dog owners whose pit-bull type dogs are perfectly behaved. It's just wrong.
- "For disturbing the peace (i.e. barking)
- If the complaints come from one sole house or person. No fine should occur. Complainer be warned"
- Bad owners not bad breeds.
- Again, only Pitbulls mentioned when rottis, shephards and dobermans are bigger and stronger? Small aggressive dogs need training too!
- No
- Do not target specific breeds.
- Clamp down - and I mean prevent sale and use of those green "slow down" figures residents place in the roads. Increase fines for those
- V
- Vffffg
- There should be no breed specific legislation
- I do not support any breed specific legislation, owners are the issue not the dog breed.
- do not target specific breeds - adds to stigma. There is nothing wrong with the breed, its all about the owner keep a track record for owner
- "People who abuse or fight-train animals should be jailed.
- No breed-specific legislation. It's on the owner not the breed of dog"
- Breed specific legislation against pitbulls MUST be REMOVED from this engagement. DO BETTER CALGARY! Public education instead.
- Ban vicious breeds
- None at this time.
- Don't be a Montreal. Breed Specific Legislation is disgusting and inaccurate.
- Don't target specific breeds.
- Ban irresponsible people or repeat offenders from owning more animals dont punish a particular breed. Any dog can be bad without training
- Specific breeds should not be targeted. Why is a pitbull's bite dangerous, but larger breeds are fine.



- Dogs have no place in our communities. They pose evident risk to human health and safety, and stunt human development via relationships.
- Please keep the bylaws as is, however enforcement is not present when needed. Having active enforcement will provide effective enforcement.
- The "pit bull" thing is just outrageous. You cannot target one breed backed up with absolutely no evidence. Every bred can bite hard
- Responsible pet ownership education
- No
- No to BSL
- You should not be targeting specific breeds. It especially concerns me when it states "looks like a bit bull."
- BSL is outdated and has been proven not to work because it targets specific breeds instead of irresponsible owners.
- I don't believe that the target should be focused on pit bulls and bully breeds to be banned. It should be covering ALL breeds.
- Pit bulls aren't the issues, the owners are.
- Not sure if this is already available here or not, but offer free socialization classes for young dogs with purchase of a license!
- "Do not target specific breeds."
- Owners should attend mandatory (if possible free) dog owner training."
- Target responsible ownership, regardless of breed or species. Education always works better than legislation.
- Mixed use parks with off-leash areas that are adjacent to children's play areas (eg Rotary Park) should not be permitted.
- Please stop BSL - bad owners not bad breeds.
- Can we really not see how this is just a ridiculous inquiry based on someone's anecdotal experience or preconceived idea of bully breed?
- BSL are the worst, we have bigger problems
- I own a pit bull/black lab mix and she is absolutely lovely. I am worried that these rules would apply to her and are not necessary.
- What does the city feel the need to ban specific breeds? We should be banning repeat offender owners.
- Seriously, pit bulls are not more likely to harm others and it is unfair that they are judged as so.
- Once dogs are allocated "bandannas"; maybe designated areas could be an option as well.
- Breed specific pre- punitive measures do not address the actual issue of anti bite measures. This is antiquated thinking.
- Do not go through with the breed specific legislation!
- I have notice domestic rabbits near LRT stations, parks and communities. We need a way to curb the releasing and spread of domestic rabbits.



- Indoor cats should have no license fee or reduced fee.
- ...
- The fact that Calgary thinks muzzling pitbull breeds is disgusting. It has nothing to do with them. Muzzling a friendly dog is awful.
- Regardless of breed. If an animal is aggressive then owner and animal should be required to attend and pass a behavioural class.
- None
- Do not create breed specific legislation. I've met more aggressive dogs which are nor bully breeds than are.
- Stop taking it out on one breed, it's the owners that make bad dogs. Pit bulls are the happiest nicest dogs.
- Implement, monitor and enforce good living conditions for pets
- If your calling this "Responsible Pet Ownership" then make it about the "ownership" of the pet and not the breed! Same applies for ALL dogs.
- Instead of fining people the amounts listed or even more why not look into helping them find trainers or rehabilitation for their pets.
- Pit bulls were first created to bait bulls. Aka maul bulls to death. That's where the name "pit bull" comes from. They are not nanny dogs.
- Stop trying to increase the amount of government control over our lives. government need to be cut in half at least.
- at large cats of owners who clearly do not follow the law and are repeat offenders of allowing cats outside should have their cats seized.
- Richmond, BC's BSL is a great example of city legislation that keeps everyone safe without restricting ownership.
- Walking dogs off leash on public sidewalks should not be allowed and enforced. This can be dangerous for other animals and people.
- Focusing on pit-bulls is unnecessary and discriminatory. Any focus towards a specific type of animal breed should be categorically removed
- I believe there needs to be more laws and restrictions to the OWNERS of nuisance dogs, and dogs with bite/ attack history.
- It is the owners that are the problem. Have a database that tracts them. I have met more aggressive Chiuwawas than Pit bulls.
- Don't make laws breed specific. I worked in a shelter and was bitten by a chihuahua and a Sheltie..not the big breeds! Small do bite more
- dogs chained outdoors without adequate shelter, food, water or socialization.
- I'm in favour of a pit bull ban, with currently-registered dogs grandfathered but neutered / spayed
- For emotional support animals there should be a clear badge or vest provided by the city if they are expected to pay an additional fee.
- Free Owner Education=bigger impact rather than banning "bully" breeds. Do not allow inexperienced people adopt difficult/abused dogs. :(



- English and French Bulldogs should be exempt given temperament. Owner should produce AKC or CKC purebred paper work to be exempt.
- I disagree with the breed specific bylaws. Pitbulls are not the issue, poor and irresponsible dog ownership is. Training is more important.
- BSL not okay-focus should be on owners and people around them. In the past huskies and german shepards were targeted. Is biased and harmful.
- .
- Rules about children in dog parks. Children have their own parks to play in. My dog gets stressed with children running around and yelling,
- These by-laws are ABSOLUTELY DISGUSTING! I am so disappointed with our city. Stop blaming the dog and start holding the owner accountable!
- Pit bulls deserve no additional attention. Those who raise a dog to be vicious (beyond appropriately protective) deserve major fines.
- law is too lenient on dog owners regarding, attacks. muzzle or one and done law, should be put down
- Dog and cat licenses should be offered as a lifetime license to remove the admin needs
- Lifetime pet licenses for an affordable rate would be a better option than yearly.
- Also, please stop making calgarians register cats and please remove the bylaw that cats have to remain on owners property. It's barbaric!
- Enforcing rules based on BREED in dogs is the same as enforcing rules based on COLOUR in people. Read that again. Now do better.
- What can be done about dog owners allowing dogs to run off leash in areas that are not off leash parks? The owners think it's not a problem.
- I had ranted in my submission about how you guys are singling out bully breeds and how its arrogant. So please read in my submission.
- "Dog behaviour training mandatory.
- A dog in control =called once
- Owners taught to engage with animal prevent incidents
- 4 per dog walker"
- Don't allow retractable long leashes on shared pathways. It is dangerous for people on bikes or skates.
- Pit bulls are not the problem, statistically, smaller dogs tend to bite more frequently. This is too prescriptive.
- I am EXTREMELY disappointed in seeing that pitbulls are being singled out. **NEED MORE SPACE TO WRITE MORE
- "Limit dog walkers - 8 dogs on a foot path, off leash on an onleash area totally unacceptable.
- Occurs in Bowmont Park.
- more space please"
- No I don't



- Pitbulls have more fatal attacks than all breeds combined. Different breeds have different traits. Pointers point, labs retrieve, Pits kill.
- What about people/animals that tease my dogs at the fence....we deter our dogs from barking, a neighbor doesn't and gets our dogs going
- Any dog can become a problem without adequate training from irresponsible dog owners. PEOPLE require the training.
- 311 app needs to have an easy way to report nuisance animals - there is no section under "New Request" to enter this.
- "feces picked up and CARRIED with owner. do not leave on trail
- more wildlife/bylaw officers needed!!"
- BSL is very biased and doesn't target the overall problem....its not usually the dogs, but is the owner
- There should be NO restrictions on breed ..the issue is not the dog it's the owner! Any breed can cause severe damage or infection to humans
- The biggest issue is that an enormous number of people ignore on leash rules!
- Pit bulls are not born being aggressive or dangerous, they are not being properly trained if that is the case. This applies to any breed.
- Bylaws should be placed same for ANY and ALL dogs big and small. As any dog can bite or attack, not just one breed of dog.
- "NO vicious dogs allowed within city limits.
- Creates intimidation for people who fear pets, and will restrict human activity."
- It should be mandatory that people pay other's vet bills if their dog bites. Levy incremental fines for it not being paid.
- The BSL language creates bias and shows the ignorance of the team in charge of this project.
- I am disappointed in your breed specific language. Owner education needs to be mandatory to address dog issues.
- being breed specific (pitbulls and staffys) is straight up discrimination. Imagine if you applied that to people? disgusting.
- STOP BULLYING the bully breeds. They are loyal and the sweetest dogs I've ever met. Its the tiny ten pound dogs that are dangerous.
- Bylaws against certain breeds or dogs that "look like certain breeds" are discriminatory and archaic. Provide education not discrimination.
- I have heard of DNA kits being used in condo complexes for identifying ownership of dog feces and implementing fines for not picking up.
- I am whilst against singling out any breed. It is not the breed that causes these issues it's the owner.
- "Emotional support" animals need to be verified by a professional and strictly regulated.
- Teach your kids to stop petting a strangers dogs. You would teach your kids to not approach strangers, teach them the same for dogs.
- I highly disagree with the breed specific bylaws. You will never know what animal will bite you! It's all about how they are trained!



- Breed specific laws have no place. Focus should be on owners learning and all nuisance dogs in general.
- Breed specific laws are not okay. Dogs act as they are trained. Small dogs are aggressive and bite more, but dont get trouble due to size.
- No
- There should be a more intensive vetting process for potential dog/cats far too often it's the owner that is the problem.
- I just want to stress that condemning certain breeds is ignorant, bias and so harmful. Dogs are not the problem, people are.
- Mandatory micro chipping for pets in the Calgary Area to reunite pets with their owners quicker. Yearly reminder to update contact info
- Do not target specific breeds. Humans should be held responsible for their dogs. Make training mandatory for all dog breeds.
- I think all LARGE breed dogs should be required to have certification of behavioral training. Bully breeds should be banned from Calgary
- No bylaws should ever be breed specific. The hateful rhetoric against bully breeds is getting so old. Responsible pet ownership over BSL.
- Pitbull and bully breeds are not the problem and people need to figure that out!! Its how you train your dog not the breed.
- Idk
- BLS is a joke and the fact that this is suppose to be about pet ownership not pets I'm disappointed in the city bringing this forward
- No
- No
- None
- I find it disgusting that people walk their dogs in other peoples yard and let them use them as toilets, and don't pick up after their dogs.
- no
- Need to keep track of owners. If one owner has had multiple dogs that bite or are at large multiple times, restrictions on ownership needed
- Spreading awareness of dog safety for children (and adults) through a public campaign.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong. Monitor owner issues, not breed specific
- No ideas
- Fine for cats roaming from properties that are not neutered/spayed. Disagree with breed specific bylaws as it is irresponsible pet ownership
- Breed specific bylaws are ridiculous. Focus should be on training and responsible pet ownership.
- I am appalled at the suggestion of breed specific bylaws. There are no bad dogs, just bad dog owners.



- Breed bias is unacceptable. If one breed is to be muzzled in public, all breeds must be muzzled in public. Owners are the real issue.
- NOT ALL pit bulls are bad. It's all in how they are raised and should fall back onto the owner not the dog.
- N/A
- Upgrade off-leash dog park gates - each entrance with two doors instead of one. Change or tighten door latches i've seen dogs open them
- Owners need to take responsibility for their dogs actions. It's not always the dogs fault or it's breed.
- Don't discriminate against pit bulls, if raised by good people they are great dogs! This is so wrong! Like labeling indigenous as drunks
- nothing
- BSL is straight up dog racism. There's no need for the fear / hateful prejudice.. it's 100% on the owner to provide proper training and care
- No making money off of pets!! No license fee no restrictions on amount! Make humans be trained and tested before allowed so they be responsi
- No.
- Singling out breeds does not solve any problems. Hold the owners accountable, not the animal.
- I disagree with breed specific by-laws. The focus should be on the owners and the people around said animal.
- None.
- I unfortunately have to agree with BSL. I've met different yet aggressive pit bulls who actually had decent owners. I didn't feel very safe.
- Nothing. Watch your wording. It should not be responsible for owners but irresponsible as well.
- I think the bylaw related to cats specifically "Remain on the owner's property." is ridiculous - cats are extremely useful in pest control
- Education and communication is key. Hire more officers and volunteers to implement changes and blitzes where problems exist
- BSL IS NOT OKAY!
- Bad pet owners is a problem. There should be no focus on breeds. With a good owner, pit bulls are gentle breeds.
- Mandatory harness on dogs (for their safety) when exercising them via a bike. Fines when only a collar is used.
- .
- You only addressed licensing for special individuals ie low income. How about a reduced cost for people who have multiple pets?
- I 100% disagree with breed specific bylaws. Pet owners should make sure their dogs are trained well. If you can't handle a dog, dont get one
- You shouldn't need a permit to build a catio, cat owners that build catios are being responsible by ensuring their cats are safe



- I would support doggy do-do bags being available at all off leash and walkways. This is the case in Canmore and most BC municipalities.
- PLEASE do not bring in BSL. It is counterproductive and unnecessary. Pitties are the sweetest dogs. I have more park problems w/ retrievers
- You need to focus less on "bully" breeds and more on the ALL breeds. Small dogs are just as at fault for bites/attacks/threats.
- Breeds specific laws don't work. Needs to be all encompassing, or not at all. Its about the owner, not the dog.
- Do not implement breed-specific legislation. If anything, promote free or lower-cost training and education for all dogs.
- Focus on the individual animals that have the issue- don't target a specific breed. That narrow-minded thinking is harmful to everyone.
- No ideas
- Leaving an animal in a hot car is \$100, pee in public is \$300, an animal life is worth a lot more than urine. Add another zero please.
- Don't discriminate against dogs. People are usually the problem. Some rehabilitated dogs can't handle other people or animals approaching them
- The whole thing is being done backwards. The issue is education, and shouldn't be about restriction
- BSL is not the answer. It is the owner's fault.
- I think toys at off-leash parks should be reviewed. An alternative would be allotted parks that allow toys.
- Breed specific bylaws are terrible. Irresponsible dog owners are the problem, not specific breeds.
- Owner training for owning pets. Owners should know the signs a dog is giving off to stop an incident before it ever occurs.
- Having pet owners restricted to a certain quarter of the city, and permits to have them leave that quarter for work, play, or any reason.
- I do not believe the Pitbull breed is an issue. What is the issue is the owner and how they train and treat their animal.
- I disagree with the specific breeds bylaw, certain breeds should not be targeted
- No
- I disagree with the breed specific bylaw! No pitbull is at fault for how their owner trains them.
- I find the pigeon questions to be misleading. Having a coop for let's say 10 birds does not guarantee 10 birds on the property.
- Na
- BSL should not be a focus. Aggression is learned from human induced trauma. Not inherently from one breed. Humans should be held accountable
- A dog attacking or biting someone is not its fault, the fault should be put on the owner.
- Education of pet owners of acceptable behaviours/expectations within city limits is necessary to help coexist with neighbours.



- Off Leash parks are parks for dogs, not small children. Limit access to off leash parks to those 10 years and older.
- no
- I don't agree with breed specific bylaw. No dog breed specifically pit bulls are born bad it's the irresponsible pet owners. Training is key
- TNR programs (trap, neuter, return) are proven to be the most effective method of controlling feral cat populations. Please support TNR!
- Legislation regarding animals should be breed neutral. The issue is not the breed. Do your research YYC.
- how many people and animals have to suffer before we admit that pitbulls are NOT FURRY PETS. get real people! their fighting dogs!!!!
- I disagree with the breed specific bylaw. The breed of animal is not the issue and never has been. It is the care and training of the owner.
- Take into consideration feedback from online comments for #3; The presumed bias on pitbulls is appalling - also im not a PB owner
- Pitbulls should NOT be singled out and forced to wear a muzzle or be subject to higher fees. Training is what matters, not the breed.
- lets be careful people. Racism applies to people NOT animals! There are unfortunately some breeds not compatible to living in cities
- Breed specific laws are the same as racism. Looks do not determine temperament. Training is key
- I think breed specific legislation should not be included in this discussion. It's discriminatory and unfair to responsible pet owners.
- Do not create breed specific bylaws. Chihuahua's are more aggressive and dangerous than any pit bull I've ever met.
- Not allowing animals in parks where there are schools. People are not responsible to pick up their dog waste and control off leach dogs
- I find it ridiculous and insulting to hear this great city go after pit bulls. Instead of going after the breed, go after the owner!
- No breed-specific bylaws. This goes against the most current research around dog behaviour. Trust the experts!
- Breed specific legislations do not solve the problems. Training/ educating owners to encourage and support responsible pet ownership is key.
- Stop blaming pitbull Its not breed specific. Shows how ignorant City of Calgary is to have this in 2020 in a survey Im disgusted in our city
- Please stop allowing people to own too many cats, more than three cats is too many for any household.
- Please never punish the pit bull always punish the OWNER. Yes of course they can do more damage, training is number one!
- I do not support breed specific bylaws. I do not believe fines discourage unwanted behaviours from pet owners.



- Are pigeons tag like any other animal? I have a couple that had made my house a home, but I think they escape from their lofts need by.
- Pitbull specific legislation is ineffective - there should be more focus on training "nuisance" animals
- NO BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS/LIMITATION OF OWNERSHIP. Issue is the owners. STOP BLAMING THE BREED .
- Breed specific regulations are not fair and specific breeds should not have stricter regulations simply because of the breed.
- Breed specific bans have not worked in any jurisdiction that has implemented one. Its insane to think that Calgary would support one.
- One dog should not be treated different than another. Also before handing out fine, look at the why first? Is it vicious or did it protect.
- Pit breeds are not the problem. Dogs make mistakes too. Poor ownership is most often the problem.
- No.
- Not so much of an idea, but pit bulls are not necessarily the most aggressive breed. German shepherds are more aggressive than Pit bulls.
- Do not implement BSL. Our dog has been attacked by multiple little dogs, but never by a pitbull. Implement the bandana system, do not muzzle
- Ban pit bulls.
- "Pitbull" regulations need to be directed to all dog breeds sized medium (25-50 lbs) to large (50-100 lbs) instead.
- Hold people responsible for pet ownership. Stop being selfish, pick up animals waste, don't leave it so others can walk on it or fall on it,
- 7% of all breeds are Pit Bulls.They have KILLED more humans than any breed,most of them children.IT IS THE BREED!
- There is no evidence that Breed Specific Laws have any benefit, prejudice based on appearance is unethical in humans as it is in pets.
- By law officers need to give cat owners warnings or tickets if they allow their cats to run free and bother neighbours.
- These breed specific bylaws are ridiculous. Pitbulls are the nicest dogs you will come across. Any problems with them comes from the owner.
- Any dog can bite/be a nuisance. It's time to end breed specific legislation worldwide. Increase education and owner accountability! #endBSL
- There are too many people ho have large dogs in small apartments. They get bored and bark all day.
- Muzzling friendly dogs and restricting their access to properly socialize with other animals and people will create problematic dogs. NO BSL
- There is absolutely no way that you will ever get ahead by enforcing BSL. Calgary is a success. Don't target innocent families/dogs.
- More education for those with infractions, like cats wandering free



- Provide evidence and rationale for changes to pitbull, because without it seems misleading to the community, Disgusting "leadership"
- Calgary - do not add to the stigma around "pit bull" breeds. This is an outdated and expired view point. Be better, say no to BSL!!!
- n/a
- Pitbulls are not the issue. When trained properly they are the biggest sweetest babies out there. They dont need muzzles.
- No breed specific bylaws! It's the people at fault not the dogs or cats or other animals. Also definitely no endangered or wild animal pets!
- Disagree with the BSL in this. It is very biased, and discriminatory. Mentioned a lot of myths with no evidence backing it up. Ex: Bite Strength
- I used to be a dog groomer, been bit by border collies, huskies, chihuahuas, basically all terrier breeds. But never any "pit bull" breed...
- Enforcement of the current bylaw would be more effective than adding BSL. BSL does not work, its sad to see the city even considering this.
- No breed-specific bylaws! Hold humans accountable for improper training and pet ownership.
- Breed is very rarely the problem. Lack of owner training/education to properly control/train their pets is the main problem.
- Please please please do not introduce breed specific legislation. Bad dogs can be any breed and it's the owners who should face consequences
- We lost a beautiful dog due to his being tormented daily by people walking along the pathway beside his yard, and also workmen nearby.
- BSL legislation is not the answer! More focus should be on training and responsible pet ownership for ALL BREEDS.
- Mandatory training with approved dog trainers at owners expense vs euthanization. (help with cost for low income individuals or families)
- No
- I do not agree with breed specific bylaws. There are good and bad dogs in all breeds
- "High fines for IRRESPONSIBLE owners, disallowed owning pets, jail time if they disobey.
- BULLY breeds are NOT the problem PEOPLE ARE!!!!!"
- BSL is deeply troubling, especially when the breed definition has a vague catch-all for "physical appearance" which is highly subjective.
- BSL is essentially canine bigotry. Not only is BSL unjust, it just doesn't work. Anywhere. And the stats prove it. Look it up.
- NO breed specific by-laws
- Legalized discrimination, much? BSL laws are based on nothing more than misconceptions, misinformation and fear.
- I think there need to be equivalent fines for parents who allow their kids to run up to an unknown dog or chase a dog



- There's No Evidence That Banning Breeds has Any Impact on Dog Bites. Period.
- I think big dogs and small dogs should have the same penalty as I find small dogs bite more than the big dogs
- No pets allowed in school areas, playgrounds, green spaces, soccer fields, or ball diamonds. Dogs roam around while people participate.
- DO NOT discriminate against pit bull breeds. BSL is not okay. Smaller dogs are much more aggressive and bit more often than big dog breeds.
- License fee should be abolished. Registering with the city is completely reasonable, and should happen, paying to own an animal is BS
- Breed specific legislation is not appropriate to add to our bylaw, we need to focus on education and training - owners bystanders and dogs.
- More education about responsible off-leash behaviors for people and dogs.
- Veterinarians and animal professionals MUST be involved. One specific breed is not causing these issues, uneducated/abusive owners are.
- "Pit bulls" rank fourth highest of the 122 breeds tested for temperament. Better than collies, golden retrievers, and beagles.
- Please avoid breed specific legislation.
- I think all your pitbull by laws are completely awful and unfair to all of us and pitbull like dogs.
- Focus on owner behaviours, not the pets. Require education instead of big fines.
- No
- Please do not enforce BSL. Responsible owners and innocent dogs get punished. Please go after irresponsible owners and rid them of owning
- All dogs have the potential to do harm, don't be breed specific.
- Ban All pit bull breeds. This is a city and the needs of the city need to be put ahead of personal wants.
- I like Red Deer's fees. Owning an animal is a financial commitment. Either train your dog well or don't have one.
- Breed specific bylaws are horrible. It is the owner not the dog that causes the problem. Encourage better training!
- The large breed law is complete BS! Husband has been attacked by spaniels and poodles multiple times, never by our friends pitty or mastiffs
- Breed specific laws are why people associate problems with these breeds. It is bad owners taking advantage not the dog
- Na
- I'd much rather the city invested money in behaviour training, and in adoption campaigns rather than to satisfy a bunch of Karen's.
- My husband has been attacked several times by golden/ labs. We have never had an issue with Large head breeds
- It is continued ignorance or stupidity that is pushing the breed specific laws.



- BSL is not okay. Discriminating against breeds of dogs does not make the city safer.
- Magpie control? Collectively, they're nothing but a sqawking garbage-eating nuisance, and this is coming from an orin-thusiast.
- BSL create environments of hate which get taken out on the dog! Stop this now! Areas where these have been implemented has not helped.
- Breed discrimination is wrong. Targeting breeds and banning them will bring shame to this city. We can do better. We know better.
- Why are you trying to make money off people owning pets? They already pay a lot of money early for vet check ups. Hopefully training.
- My dog has been attacked by poodles and Labs at the dog park but never once a pit bull or bull dog breed. Muzzling creates hate
- Let us have chickens!!!!
- Leave the pitbulls alone! No dog is worst then the little ones! Yes it happens. But really we should be looking at the owners. I
- "How many chickens per address??
- Next time describe your idea of nuisance is it case by case or all of one breed"
- Remove the breed specific language. It's unnecessary and it perpetuates a stigma that often ends in harm coming to these dogs!
- Completely disagree with breed specific bylaws (i.e. bully breeds, pit bulls, etc.) The responsibility lies with the owner, not with the dog
- Breed specific laws are unnecessary. It encourages fear and biases towards breeds when the problem is generally the owner not the dog.
- don't believe the fine should be different for children bitten but I do believe the guardian of the child should be fined as well
- There should not be breed specific laws but more accessible and affordable training for all breeds as it is the handlers responsibility
- Plenty of dogs I've encountered that have a vicious temperament that aren't pit bulls. Irresponsible owners are the issue.
- Do not focus on any specific breed. This is not a breed issue.
- Please do not make breed specific bylaws.
- Roaming cats should be handled with neuter and release programs. They don't cause problems as long as they're not breeding.
- Yes please do not force dogs to be muzzled.
- I disagree with breed specific laws. Owners should be held more accountable for their pets behaviour, the breed should not be punished.
- There should be no laws that target certain breeds of animals. It is up to the owner to care for and train their animals.
- OWNERS identified with nuisance dogs should be required to go to therapy and take training courses. Dogs are like children - vulnerable.



- Regulate breeding w/permit! No hobby breeders should be allowed. All dogs/cats should be spayed or neutered unless for breeding
- We live near a park that is used for recreation - soccer, baseball, etc. and includes a playground. No dogs should be allowed.
- I disagree with the breed specific bylaws. Pitbulls are not the issue, poor and irresponsible dog ownership is. Training is more important.
- Breed specific legislation is an archaic level of thinking. More focus need to be on educating pet owners and not prejudice towards a breed.
- Do NOT restrict breeds. Get the pit-bull specific restrictions out of the discussion. It muddies the water. The term nuisance is enough.
- Creating a pitbull specific category of laws further promotes the outdated stigma of the breed, We need to talk training and resp. ownership
- Euthanize stray/at large animals. Penalties need to increase for both animals AND owners. Only increased spending should be enforcement!
- I wish we could enforce obedience training for everyone considering owning a dog, the more powerful dog the more training required.
- Aggression is not breed specific. Bylaws that deal with aggressive dog behaviour should be consistent for all breeds.
- Eliminate BSL. It is discriminatory, antiquated, ineffective and proliferates the inaccurate villainized stigma of bully breeds!
- I have serious reservations on who made this survey and their qualifications. Most of the questions are leading and vague, very poorly done.
- I disagree with the breed specific legislation. The owner is responsible and it's biased to ban an entire breed of dog.
- Post suggestions for how to address complaints peacefully with pet owners before having to involve animal bylaw control officers.
- A city wide ban on Pitbulls. Once they attack, they cause so much damage to others and are incredibly hard to stop compared to other breeds
- how about not banning an entire dog breed due incidents that owners should be blamed for not the dog. city of calgary needs to analyze thing
- Focus on educating owners and less on fines and bylaws. Stop trying to regulate every aspect of pet ownership
- N/a
- no
- It should not be legal to place a bag of feces to pick up later (i.e.: lovely bags dotting the path like ugly flowers!!)
- I think cats should be on leash if they're outside unless being supervised on the owners property.
- Offer more support or links for support to help low income people take care of their animals.
- Do not ban pitbull type dogs you morons
- No



- If dogs were humans, BSL would be a racism issue. Training is important with every breed. Pitbulls are not the issue, owners are.
- There needs to be a place for dogs just dogs. No all off leash but domethrough out the city so dogs can be dogs
- I am actually disappointed that the city has brought up regulations on different breeds such as pit bulls.
- I dont like how you target the bully bread In this survey you make it sound like the bully bread are the only one with the problem
- Breed is not the issue, irresponsible dog ownership is. Owners should be fined and the dogs should be rehomed in a stable home and trained.
- More regulations on breeders.
- No I do not
- BSL IS NOT OKAY. You should be ashamed. As a pitbull owner in Alberta, I will never visit calgary if this happens.
- "Powerful dogs should need paperwork. Like a gun owner.
- Then no crappy people turn sweet dogs to killers."
- Dogs sufferer from mental health problems too.. and I feel that bylaws for barking shouldn't be a thing. As that's how they communicate
- OWNERS ARE TO BLAME FOR THE DOGS BEHAVIOUR!! If you are gonna label pits. Label all dogs the same.
- Mandatory large breed dog classes for first time large breed owners to take to understand large breed dogs. Humans need to be educated.
- DONT BULLY THE BREED
- I wholeheartedly disagree with breed specific legislation. A dog's temperament is dependent on the OWNER. Not the breed. Simple as that.
- People letting their cats roam is an extreme nuisance. Please educate the public. Even a couple billboards.
- I Believe a system should be in place for problem dog owners Who lack the Ability or the wheel to train and care for their dogs in a proper
- Training is the main issue here! Dachshunds and chihuahuas remain as some of the most aggressive breeds but no one talks about BSL for them.
- The issue with increasing fines for bad on her behaviour is that many owners counter won't pay them. The city needs to have more ability to.
- Fine and sentence owners with dogs chained outdoors without proper shelter, food, water and in extreme temperatures. Remove dogs and rehome them.
- First we blamed the Rottweilers, Dobermans and shepherd's and now its the pits. BSL is not okay, ALL dogs should require obedience training
- nuisance dogs should not include running at large, sometimes a dog leaves the property momentarily but is still under control at all times.



- BSL is not effective and is also extremely discriminatory. I would never support such bylaws here in Calgary.
- I think the city should have a dog park specifically for small breeds only. This way small breed dog owners feel more safe.
- Stop being breedist. No breed is more aggressive than the other. If a pet were to become aggressive take a look at their environment
- Pets should either come with a mandatory training or in order to own a pet, you have to pass a pet ownership course. Bad owners not bad pets
- Big fan of the colour indicator for different dogs behaviours. This, along with keeping dogs leashed in on-leash areas would be so helpful!
- How about lifetime licensing? seems like a cash grab to me. Then again it is the CoC. Gotta blow as much on art as possible...
- The enforcement of these new bylaws should not be able to be abused by disgruntled neighbours.
- A lot of aggressive animals in Calgary, very lax bylaws here.
- Pit bulls aren't the issue!!! Owners are! It's so unfair.
- I disagree with BSL. Pitbulls are not the problem. Investing in more affordable training for dog owners would be a better direction.
- Entitlement is what I feel pet owners have. They let their dogs off leash, pretend they don't see them poo and just keep walking.
- If you believe it's all how they are raised/trained, read first hand accounts of victims and their families, who treated the dog as family.
- I do have a dog that is a pit bull and she has been raised properly if she bit or attacked unprovoked, 0 hesitation to be put down
- Just because a dog has the ability to do some thing doesn't mean they will, just like humans. BSL is not the right move.
- Breed-specific laws are abhorrent. They are NOT dangerous animals. Untrained animals are. If they require training EVERY breed should also.
- The focus needs to be on the animal owner having responsibility for the treatment and care of their pets. I am against euthanasia.
- Breed specific is not the answer - the owner should be held responsible regardless of the breed. It is the owners responsibility
- breed-specific restrictions assumes every animal is the same. Don't punish the dog, punish the owner. Get the dog training.
- No
- Make training more financially accessible so all dog owners are able to train their dogs properly (no matter what breed.)
- Not discriminating against specific breeds when the science doesn't support it. Small bites can be just as bad. Pitbulls are good
- I think the city needs to be very careful when make decisions based on emotion. Do your due diligence prior to bylaw changes.



- BSL does not work. Dog behavior is not based on the breed
- There should be no breed specific bylaws. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners.
- BSL does not work, it does not make an area safer. It wastes money and dogs are more often than not mislabeled as a bully breed!
- I've never been so embarrassed to be a Calgarian. BSL is Not a solution it is a problem. There are many powerful large breeds out there.
- Breed-specific legislation is not an acceptable proposal. This will unfairly target many well-behaved dogs. Training is what matters.
- A rule regarding feces on private property .
- I am not in favor of banning pit bulls, focus on training.
- To ban a specific breed is an uneducated proposal. In this day and age are we seriously still discriminating based solely on appearance? Sad
- Treating pitbulls differently doesn't make sense. There are other breeds with similar bite strengths that don't face the same scrutiny.
- Do not implement breed specific regulations. There is NO supporting evidence indicating that they have stronger bites than same sized dogs
- I think that off leash dogs should also be penalized as harrassing wildlife as I have seen them chase deer, squirrels and birds
- NO BSL! Bad owners cause problems, not bad dogs!! Do not penalize 'Pit-Bull' type dogs!!!!
- We don't place restrictions on people based on their genetics and we shouldn't do it to dogs either, it's discriminatory!
- What about the parents who don't teach their kids to ask before petting a dog. These kids need to know not all dogs are friendly!
- No
- I do not agree with the breed specific bylaws. Do not punish the animal for the owners neglect, laziness, and lack of responsibility.
- Visible ID for service dogs and emotional support animals with a description of rights. People seem to think think are the same thing
- No
- BSL shows bias of chief bylaw officer. Calgary animal bylaw used to be progressive but now going backward.Full of misinformation on staffies
- No
- If we can focus on education on other matters, why levy large fines against dog owners whose dog slips up? Less fines, more training!
- All dogs over 1yr dog owners must provide proof from a reputable trainer or training facility to get license. BSL is not the answer!!
- People who have never been around a bully breed have absolutely no right to have input here. If they knew any they'd know better than this.



- Please stop the discrimination against bully breeds. My children have learnt so much on how to care for such breeds. Don't stop the progress
- [Personal information removed] government is supposed to be non discriminatory. These breed specific laws are no good. It's a solid no for my support
- BSL is antiquated, uneducated, and fear based. We are a city that doesn't support discrimination in any form!
- Focusing on a breed is the wrong approach, period! The by-law needs to focus on owner education and enforcement on cat owners.
- Higher fine for animals at large that are not spayed or neutered
- It's about the owners. Also, there is a problem with unjustified complaints from constantly complaining neighbours, no defence from this!!!
- Mandate that dog socialization and obedience training is required from a City accredited/listed training business as part of licensing.
- Fines for adults who bring small children to off leash parks and are allowed to run at any dog they aren't familiar with.
- Not in support of breed specific laws. Pit bull families should not be split up because of a 1 pit bull per household bylaw.
- no i do not
- Pit bulls are not the problem, bad owners are. Offer government funded obedience training or courses for inexperienced dog owners.
- lifetime licensing.
- Don't single out specific dog breeds if there is no quantitative evidence they are more dangerous. Chihuahuas bite more people!
- Dogs bite or attack only when they are threatened. Investigate the actions of the "victim" before taking action against the dog or owner.
- It is the owners that encourage or discourage a dog's behavior, not the breed.
- I would like to see a restriction for cats... who are allowed to roam the neighborhood and poo in food gardens and kill birds!!!!!!
- Pit bulls and other large breeds are not the problem, the owners are. The city should be focused on the owner's abilities and awareness.
- Breed Specific by-laws should not be a thing. Every incident should be dealt with based on each situation. Not based on breed.
- More off leash parks. Something with trails. Nose hill is good but the signage is not clear. All of nose hill should be off leash.
- It is very important to me that owners keep their pet on a leash if it is not an off leash designated area.
- excessive barking from a neighboring property should be more easily dealt with. I should not have to make the same complaint 3 times.
- We don't need dangerous animals to be more heavily fined or monitored. They need to be taken away and euthanized.



- Please alter the term "nuisance dog" and separate it into different questions. I.e would you support muzzling a noisy dog in a dog park.
- Don't [removed] mark breed that "Look” like pitbulls as dangerous. What a load of [removed]
- Some breeds are more dangerous than others. It is not discrimination to take preventative measures against dangerous dog breeds.
- Solutions don't come from creating more problems. BSL is archaic like prejudice. It divides communities, fosters unfounded fear and loathing
- Biases towards Dogs should not exist. Start teaching the little yappers how to be around children/adults AND medium/large dogs.
- Way to much attention to pitbulls! Quit picking on the breed! Any dog can bite and kill!
- Increased number of off leash areas
- I thought Calgary was a more progressive and thoughtful city than one that targets specific breeds. It's disappointing to see.
- I completely disagree with how this bylaw will discriminate towards one breed. I think any specific breeds should be taken out of the bylaw.
- Who started this breed specific talk? Is this 2020 or 1980s? Calgary is better than this.. we have greater issues to worry about in our city
- No
- Breed Specific bylaws and regulations are so misguided. If it's suggested that certain breed owners have training, all owners should!
- Owners should not use extends leashes, they have not control over their pet whether is animal is large or small. They should be banded.
- N/a
- Why won't bylaw follow up if you know who is letting their pet roam at large? Why do we have to trap the animal risking catching skunks etc?
- It is disappointing that Pitbulls/Staffys are singled out. There is no evidence to show they are the dogs that attack/bite more than others.
- Bylaws and increased fines against certain breeds is discriminatory. This shouldn't be a conversation in 2020 anymore.
- The animal at large fee should be different from cat to dog, cats don't pose much of a risk to public. Dog should stay at \$100, cats \$30
- It would be nice to see more educational programs and resources accessible to all public about pet ownership and interaction.
- none
- "End licensing fees.
- End persecution of dogs defending home property: as bounded by nearest street just like grass mowing and weed control"
- Stop Targeting "Pit-Bulls" Put more ownus on the owners.



- I firmly believe that it's about the owner, not the breed. Therefore, the consequences should fall on the human, not the pet.
- Something needs to be re people who do not control their dogs barking.
- Strongly against (and disgusted you'd try) singling out any breed. Licensing should be a pay once thing with yearly confirmation of life
- "Please don't discriminate on breed of dogs. Any breed can bite.
- Also please educate children not to approach strange dogs."
- So called "pit bulls" can be any short haired mutt with a broad snout. Will you be comfortable licensing your dog if targeted by appearance?
- There needs to be more responsibility put on the owners and not breed discrimination as all breeds can be dangerous with wrong owners
- no
- Congratulation on being ignorant lemmings!
- I'm not really sure owners have to be held accountable and mind their animals
- Not really
- None
- Roaming cats need to be addressed. I've scooped too much out of my gardens. They are not litter boxes! My hard work and money is being ruined
- I think animal owner licenses need to be revoked if someone puts an animal up for adoption without a valid reason
- Escalating fines, linked to dog's tattoo id, for barking after 10pm or before 8am, not picking up poop and not having a dog on a leash.
- It's not okay to punish dog breeds for owners IE pit bulls, there need to be better measures in relation to the dog theft in Calgary
- Everything should be based on a case-to-case scenario. I've met some nasty Chihuahuas but they don't get singled out, not should pitbulls!
- Any dog can be vicious it shouldn't be specific breeds not all pit bulls are vicious
- "no BSL
- More laws surrounding puppy mills and home breeding."
- Discriminatory practices based on breed are ignorant. Punish bad owners not breeds! I've seen more bad small dogs than pitbulls.
- No
- To discriminate against a breed and any dog that may resemble a certain breed is ridiculous.
- Do something with owners that do NOT pick up after their dogs, dna testing and a big fine, owners on green belt just use it as their backyard
- Bylaws should not be singling out specific breeds .
- I do not support breed specific legislation. Dog training certification before obtaining a dog licence should be required.
- No BSL, just reasonable, fair, enforceable laws



- Breed specific bylaws are unacceptable. It fails to address irresponsible owners who raise dogs for violent qualities or don't train at all.
 - Don't discriminate against certain dog breeds. Negative consequences should be against an owner, not the dog.
 - Along with a fine for Aggression And/or biting both dog and owner would attend mandatory behavioural classes before being titled Aggressiv
 - Pitbulls are not the issue, bad owners are the issue. You said it yourself "pitbulls don't account for more dog bites than any other breed."
 - Please provide a dog park in the area in the south west quadrant past canyon meadows for the newer and growing communities.
 - na
 - It's not the breed, it's how they are trained. Proper pet ownership is KEY - no mater what kind of pet you have; bird, cat, dog, hen?
 - All pit-bulls should not be discriminated against as a nuisance w/o incident. Shame on the city for perpetuating fear against this breed.
 - Would have to think about it more
 - I do not support BSL at all.
 - BREED SPECIFIC BANNING IS GARBAGE. If anything, dog owners should have to have a license to own a dog. Pitbulls love kids!
 - There needs to be significantly less emphasis on the behaviour of pets and instead a stronger emphasis on pet owners and their responsibilities
 - "Have more off leash parks accessible to water.
-
- Increase number of off-leash parks"
 - Make group dog training at dogs parks accessible and frequent so people learn how to properly handle their animals.
 - Don't solo out pit bulls. Its how the dog is raised and the owner
 - Too focused on BSL. No accountability for people who tease/taunt animals through fences creating issues while they are on their own property
 - Look into options that aren't based in fear and misinformation
 - Please consider lot sizes when enacting these bylaws. Some subdivision lots are too small for 2 animals.
 - I do not agree with breed specific legislation. It is the owners responsibility to train and manage their animal!
 - Remove all "pit bull" specific and targetted policies and language. It is based on false narratives and prejudice.
 - I believe punishing a breed of dog is wrong. The onus is on the pet owner to ensure that his/her pet is well behaved and acts accordingly.



- No ideas
- The city could encourage more areas for training and behaviour guidance options. Basing decisions based on breed alone are discriminating.
- my pitbulls are my children and help me with my PTSD. Do not touch my babies. Ban bad owners not dogs
- How about going after people who take their dogs for a walk on school yards or a skate park located beside a school yard.
- Breed specific bylaws are ridiculous. I have met more aggressive "safe breeds" than pit bulls.
- Dogs should not be allowed in city river systems....our drinking water...
- I highly disagree that "pit bull" breeds should be singled out. The dogs never are the issue - it is the irresponsible owners
- N/A
- Not to make bylaws specified towards Bully breeds!!!!
- There should be a regulation on approaching a dog without permission. Please do not come up to me and my dog screaming "puppy".
- There should be a one time license fee. Yay for color coded engagement bandannas. Educate kids about appropriate animal interaction.
- Do not discriminate against pit bulls I cannot stress this enough!
- Behavioural and training program and test for ownership should be required with licencing a pet
- No
- Breed specific legislation is nonsense. Obedience training should also be mandatory for owners to teach them good habits
- I do NOT agree with breed specific controls
- There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Do not introduce breed specific bylaws.
- It makes zero sense to have breed specific legislations, if its already been statistically proven that they don't work. Use your heads.
- it appears that our bylaws are as good only as the paper they are written on. my area is littered with dog feces, especially in winter.
- I think that the owners are the stem of dogs with behavioural issues and should be required to attend training. Classes with the dog
- RESPONSIBLE breeders should definitely be protected. The public should be taught what "backyard breeders" and good breeders are.
- What happens to the man/lady/child that steals from my property or pulls my dogs tail then gets bit?....
- No specific breeds. It is the owner that creates dogs or cats to be unfriendly. Especially Pitbulls! Stop the stigma!
- Is updating the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw during a pandemic the best use of staff time?
- I believe the privilege of owning a dog should be revoked for anyone with pet behaviour issues until they complete education courses.



- If pets are not allowed around playgrounds and schools then make a law that no kids are allowed in dog parks too. How is that fair???
- I do not think it is fair to single out Pitbulls as a breed, and only single out animals that have proven to be a nuisance or high risk.
- If a dog has not committed any wrong acts, it should say something about the owner. The way a dog is raised says more than about the breed.
- BSL is NEVER a good way of forming bylaws. I have had more issues with small dogs than big ones. Focus on the owners and their behaviours!!!
- I dont see the point in over policing certain breeds. I personally have never seen or been apart of an attack from a pitbull.
- Continued Ignorance and stupidity that is BSL is what makes the city unsafe for dogs. Focus on the owners and their behaviours!!!!
- No
- Targeting one type of dog is absurd and discriminatory. Calgary, you have set the stage for being anti breed specific... keep it that way.
- Why discriminate against bullies? I have heard of more attacks from other breeds and smaller breeds. This is absolutely ridiculous.
- Dont ban or limit a dog based on breed
- No breed specific by laws. My 2 Rottweilers are gentle giants. And I will move before I get rid of one
- I think a publically funded dog behavior class should be made available to anyone who wants to take it and be made mandatory for dog owners.
- I agree that laws etc shouldn't be breed specific! Aggressive and nusnace animals are owner issues not breed issues!!
- Researching your data a little bit more: pitbulls do NOT have the strongest bite. Incorrect data is dangerous
- Allow cats to go outside. Keeping them in is cruel. Cat lovers could get cats again, and there would be a lot fewer dog and dog problems.
- Breed of dog should not be accounted for. BSL does not work. A bully breed dog does not have a stronger bite force.
- Don't segregate one breed of dog make it fair for all and muzzle all dogs that way there is equality seems pretty racist
- Please do not pass a bylaw based on breed. I have been grooming for over 10 years and never had an aggressive "pit bull type".
- Implement a "Good Citizen" program. Pet is assessed on behaviour for Significant discounted/free licenses. Houston Texas has this program
- IT IS THE OWNERS FAULT IF THE DOG MISBEHAVES AND IS UNTRAINED. "There are no untrainable dogs, only untrainable humans.”
- BSL is a big fat no in my opinion. There are way too many factors that play into this- including the dog owners!
- I think any concerns that I would have had are well covered.



- Remove pitbull bias. Hold owners accountable and leave the animals alone. Small dogs are far worse and aggressive.
- It is a myth that pitbulls have a "stronger" bite than other dogs. I expected more research from the city of Calgary.
- "Shame on you for considering restrictions on pitbulls.
- How about enhanced adoption training/screening for PEOPLE?"
- "I oppose breed-specific legislation.
- A nuisance dog due that barks or roams is not necessarily a danger in an off leash park"
- Cats should not be allowed to roam free. They should be confined to the person's house or yard only.
- I think it is ludicrous to single out pit bull type dogs their owners . BSL has NEVER been proven effective in any city .
- No idea.
- A barking dog is the same as loud music at 2am. Nobody wants it and should be treated as such.
- There should be no breed specific legislation. Obedience classes should be made mandatory for every breed before regulating pit bulls.
- Life time ownership ban for people who are proven guilty of animal abuse or cruelty! Also stop being dog racist, stick to facts!!!
- I'd like to see a fence built for the "off-leash dog park" along 26 St SE. It's too close to the road to not have one and is dangerous
- Pit Bulls and other large breeds aren't the problem. It should be on a case-by-case basis and not prejudiced against these large babies
- Less City Hall, cake and more BL officers.
- Make back yard breeding illegal! Provide mandatory educational programs for anyone wanting to own a large or strong dog breed. NO BSL!!!!!!!
- Ban pitbulls
- Dogs should be excluded from fines if defending their property or owners.
- Completely against sticking it to just one breed of dog! It's ridiculous.
- More accountability needs to be put on owners of ANY breed. I.e Bigger fines or restrictions of individual ownership. BSL is not the answer!
- Check out the owners. Dogs do not start out as bad dogs, owners make them that way. Not every human is evolved enough to own a dog.
- From personal experience, family members who own more than 6 animals have mental health issues which resulted in unsafe animal hoarding.
- This is disgusting. Breed specific?? Big, small, lab or bully it does not matter. Very disappointed in our city for targeting one breed.
- There should be a system in place for problem owners. Not just a fine but mandatory training and harsher punishment for repeat offenders.
- The dog has no control how it's raised and trained. Don't punish the dog or breed.



- I believe pitbulls are amazing animals, and if there happens to be one bad pitbull blame should be placed on the owner and not the dog .
- It's more the owner that is the issue. Mandatory training for existing and new dog owners, with biannual refreshers.
- Breed-specific legislation is reprehensible, costly and ineffective - proven time and again in BSL communities, I expect better in Calgary.
- Stop breed specific legislation its embarrassing as a city
- I think anything regarding pit bulls specifically is a stereotype of the breed and not based off any factual reasoning.
- what defines a nuisance dog ??? - if the questions are targeting specific breeds IT IS NOT RIGHT. Lose the BSL attitude.
- Breed-specific legislation has NO place in Calgary. For years, we were world-renowned for successful and effective animal control systems.
- You need to stop with breed specific bylaws. It is a form of prejudice against a breed.
- Bluetooth Microchip all dogs, allow anyone to scan and identify problem dogs, especially dogs at large; just a licence number to report
- Stricter enforcement of roaming cats. The average life span of a cat in the city is 5 years! That's not even reaching full maturity.
- Do not discriminate against breed's because ultimately the owner is responsible for training and handling the animal.
- Pittys and so called "Bully breeds" are not the issue, the issue is irresponsible owners/people that caused bad behavioural traits in dogs
- The idea of classifying dogs based on breed is quite frankly, disgusting. As a city we need to be better than that.
- Focus should be on educating owners - dog training as well as responsible owner education should be mandatory before one can get a dog.
- Breed specific laws don't fix behavior. The focus needs to be on the owners not the animal.
- Please no breed specific legislations.
- Breed-Specific Legislation doesn't punish the irresponsible dog-owners. The dog-owners should be the ones who are fined or punished.
- Please make a bylaw to prevent people from feeding magpies and crows on their property. It is very bad for the neighborhood and the birds.
- get rid of the no-outdoor-cats bylaw, then we may get rid of our mouse, squirrel (rodent) issues; it's just a money grab for the City
- It's not the breed, it's always the owner. Punish the bad owners not a specific breed.
- More emphasis and onus needs to be on owners to be responsible for their pet. Training and obedience should be mandatory for all new Pet owners
- no
- Breed specific bylaws is disgusting. So much animal cruelty is going on, yet the city can't stop obsessing over ONE breed.



- More time needs to be put into preventing animal cruelty and harsher penalties who are found guilty of it.
- BSL is founded on disproven studies and science. I've encountered more aggressive Chihuahuas and Shih Tzus than I have terriers.
- Many municipalities limit the age of children welcome at the dog park(s). The city of calgary should consider a similar restriction.
- ..
- I think it is appalling that pit bulls were targeted in this. No one breed should ever be singled out. Look at the owners not the dogs!
- No
- All breeds are equally susceptible to aggression. It's the owners responsibility to train them. Singling out bully breeds is simply wrong.
- Legislation should not be breed specific. Many small terrier dogs are more aggressive than large breed pit bulls
- the only acceptable change would be to increase fines on irresponsible pet owners. Perhaps even issuing bans on people so that they cannot o
- Pit bulls are excellent family animals when not raised to be aggressive, it's unfair to target them specifically for their build.
- A Staffordshire Bull Terrier is 11 to 17 kg. I doubt that animal has "more potential for damage" than a 36-60 kg Rottweiler.
- The Northern Hills communities have approximately 57,000 people and 0 off-leash parks. There is no equity in how dog parks are distributed.
- I would love more fenced areas in dogs parks where unsocialised dogs can run and exercise without a risk to run into other dogs.
- Punish the owner, not the breed.
- Fines for roaming cats should be different based on the reason, such as escaped/lost cats vs. regularly roaming cats.
- The fines for littering should increase. Walking my dog in neighborhoods all over Calgary has made me very aware of how dirty the city is.
- More warnings/large signs present at off-leash areas like Nose Hill Park warning of coyotes and other wildlife! People just don't get the risk
- No
- Do not ban pit bull breeds, it is all about the owner and the training the dog receives.
- An animal badly injures people then it should be put down so no-one else will suffer the same fate or worse!
- Let's put a minimum age on people who are allowed at dog parks.
- In Canada we expect to be treated as equals. Prejudice and judgemental opinions are not welcome here . BSL is presumptuous and inappropriate
- I am just really concerned about any proposal that is based solely on discrimination and erroneous information. Do better.



- You CANNOT stereotype a dog - no laws regarding certain breeds. Mandate everybody has to take pet safety + body language course
- .
- No
- Breeders should be required to have a special license.
- A Staffordshire Bull Terrier is 11 to 17 kg. I doubt that animal has "more potential for damage" than a 36-60 kg Rottweiler.
- No I don't
- There is no place in modern society for dogs historically selectively bred to fight/kill. If this leads to BSL, I'd support it.
- If targeting dog breeds by "bite strength", be scientific and include German Shepherds and English Bulldog too (see <https://bit.ly/31fK97u>)
- "Bylaws and increased fines against certain breeds is discriminatory. This shouldn't be a conversation in 2020 anymore. ”
- I think there should be more increases fines on people with their pets that are repeat offenders with constantly getting out, biting othes
- Breed specific bylaws and fines should not be in place. Bylaws should be inclusive of every breed as to not discriminate.
- "A system if you wish to make a complaint, but are worried about retaliation?"
- Lower ‘Family' licensing rates multiple pets in one house?"
- ESCALATING fines should be issued to the owner for EACH call the city receives regarding a continuously barking dog of an address
- I am very discouraged to see the attack on the breed of an animal and no repercussions for the owner. Spend money on pet education instead.
- Pitbull/Staffy breeds don't make dogs aggressive, fear and improper training/training to be aggressive make dogs aggressive
- Why do cats get to roam at large when dogs do not, cats should have to remain on the owners property. They dig in flower beds, attack, ect.
- I believe it is up to parents to teach their children how to appropriately treat dogs. We should not rely on bandanas.
- Breed doesn't define a dogs actions
- I don't support a breed ban, but I also live in a Condo that banned pit bulls after one tore a small dog to pieces in an elevator.
- The breed of dog should not have restrictions; poorly behaved or problem dogs is because of bad owners.
- Lower income households should not get a break on any sort of pet fee. They still have to care for the animal as much as the next person
- Na
- DO NOT INTRODUCE BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS



- Pet bylaw infractions should affect the owner not the pet. The Consider a increasing fine on repeat offenders.
- BSL is dog discrimination which is dog racism..why are we reverting backwards [personal information removed]. It's 2020.
- Fines for off leash in non-off leash areas.
- The only thing I would add is, hold the owners responsible for their pet. Quit holding dogs responsible for how they were trained.
- I am very disappointed that breed specific bylaws are still being talked about. It's unneeded and sad
- Extendable leashes leave no control to the owner. They should not be used on sidewalks/busy areas--use in fields, large parks, etc.
- Fire [personal information removed]
- Dogs that bite are a result of their owners, not their breed. Abused/poorly trained dogs are not breed specific, the owner is responsible.
- It's 2020,BSL should not even be addressed anymore. Target backyard breeders. You should be qualified to breed.
- Bad owners create bad pets! Proper training and pet behaviour information for owners is key!
- No to colour-coded bandana! Kids need to learn how to ask before approaching an animal. A colour scheme is coddling and they will not Learn
- Off leash dogs in on leash areas need to be addressed, it's a very common problem in my neighbourhood to be charged by an off leash dog.
- Stop breed discrimination. If there is an issue with a specific dog address it on a case by case basis, breed discrimination is not helpful.
- It is disappointing to actually see the amount focused on bully breeds. I can't believe this is even being discussed. Come on Calgary.
- So disappointing to see the mention of breed specific laws in Calgary! Any breed can be an issue with poor training. DON'T BULLY MY BREED!
- A fully fenced section of off leash areas available on a FCFS basis to a single family/group for more reactive dogs. To avoid nuisance behav
- There should be more enforcement in off-leash parks for people who do not pickup dog feces.
- Do not be bias against certain breeds. It's the owner not the dog and I do not support breed specific bylaws.
- Any dog can be an issue. Blame the owners not the dogs. It's 2020 why are we even bringing up breed specific bylaws?
- It would be nice for obedience training to be necessary for all dogs and for people to stop singling out pit bulls.
- There should be no laws against any specific breed I.e: Pitbull
- Pitbulls should not be singled out! This is discrimination. Maybe make it any dog over a height and weight specification. Same as insuring a
- I am extremely disappointed to see discrimination against pitbulls. There's no evidence showing they are naturally aggressive.



- Free programs for dog education. If its accessible, there would be no excuse of not learning dog manners, we can avoid future problems
- Talk about leading the witness on the "pit bull" bias. All the "pit bulls"/Staffys I know are gentle, non-aggressive family dogs.
- Breed-specific legislation is out-dated and doesn't account for other breeds that have just as much potential to be dangerous.
- Public training/engagement for new pet owners.
- I disagree that pit bulls Are forced to wear muzzles because of bite force!
- Why single out specific breeds? Smaller dogs are generally more aggressive, ban irresponsible owners, which is the root cause of the problem
- When dogs are considered a nuisance or aggressive, they should be required to be given extensive behavioural training instead of euthanasia.
- BSL does not work! We've learned many things this 2020 and one of those things is racism and discrimination will not be tolerated!
- Breed specific legislation has no basis in evidence for reducing the frequency of serious bite injuries. Pet owners need to be responsible.
- I don't believe in breed discrimination. I prefer the terms of 'responsible pet ownership' and 'nuisance pets.'
- Breed-specific legislation is provably ineffective. If ANY dog, regardless of breed, has a history of aggression, focus on educating owners.
- All of these rules should consider the owner. No specific dog or cat should be fined more simply because of other bias opinions.
- Punish the owners of misbehaved animals not the animal itself. Thank you for recognizing the importance of ESAs.
- Get rid of pet licensing fees. Just a money grab, or atleast make it a one time payment.
- No ideas
- If there is a troublesome dog, it is a reflection of the owner. The owner should be required to do some training.
- Cats should be indoor only unless harnessed and on leash.
- Stop telling me what i can do and making a profit off it, your making clowns of yourselves
- What about "outdoor"cats?Why are they allowed to roam free?Bylaw doesn't seem to do anything about cats and they can attack worse than a dog
- Leave things the way they are! No reason to change bylaws. City should be worried about Basic services.
- More policing of school grounds and on leash areas (parks) for pet owners having their pets (dogs) off leash.
- Most problems people see are issues with dogs (dog feces everywhere, nightly barking, attacks). Perhaps require owner training for dogs?
- Breed specific legislation is illogical and discriminatory, and should not even be a consideration.



- Increasing the fines for attacks by certain breeds makes sense. It's not about the animal, it's about the uneducated owner.
- Owners should be accountable for not controlling their dogs, or cleaning up after them. Bigger presence of bylaw enforcing the laws.
- More discrimination should be put towards the dog owner and NOT the specific breed of dog. Dogs learn from their owners.
- Many pit-bull type dogs are wonderful, but as a group they pose a larger threat to the public than others. It's fair to treat them as such.
- Make sure that Calgary has a TNR (Trap Neuter Release) program/po for feral cats as it is the most effective way to control their population
- If citizens are allowed to have 6 or more animals, I think it would be good to have by-law check in on these residences for animal safety.
- Should be all dogs that attack, chase, or bite. How can a low income get the animal fixed when the program is suspended???
- To reduce aggressive canine behaviour, the responsibility needs to be on the other end of the leash with fines to order to prevent a breed ban.
- Pitbulls aren't bad dogs, there is just bad owners
- No
- Certain breeds are more dangerous than others taking preventative measures against these breeds can prevent a breed ban like in Montreal.
- No
- BSL is not the answer. This should not be in the Bylaws.
- Do not implement discriminatory and ineffective breed specific legislation. Bully breeds are not the problem. Irresponsible owners are.
- Any bylaws that discriminate against an animal's breed is cruel. It is the same as judging a person by the color of their skin.
- Animal Services needs to respond to 311 requests to start with. I reported the same aggressive dog at large 5 times with no response.
- The behaviour of the pet owner is far more dangerous than the breed. Don't punish Pit Bulls unfairly but hold their owners more responsible
- Hold owners at fault of any issues with their pets and not the animal. The city should help rehome them if necessary but no suffering to pet
- I'm tired of seeing people let their cats roam neighbourhoods freely while the cats harass other animals in their own yard and harm wildlife
- Dogs must be kept on a leash in ON-LEASH areas, too often people say my dog is fine and then they are not. Bylaw needs to enforce this.
- Instead of targeting specific dog breeds unfairly, why not emphasize training and responsible pet ownership?
- Fines for dog owners that allow their pet to pee on other's lawns/gardens. This kills the grass/plant and costs time and money to repair.



- Training and lack thereof is what causes an aggressive animal, not breed. Please stop villainizing pitbulls and other "bully breeds".
 - Consider offering more workshops teaching people (esp. children) warning signs dogs (give off and tips for appropriately approaching animals)
 - No.
 - As a child i was afraid to go out to play because of a dog owned by neighbour, who would no cooperate to keep him away from we children. IP
 - Strict enforcement of bylaw violations in on leash parks and playgrounds for owners who let their dogs off leash around kids.
 - Children and adults must demonstrate appropriate behaviour when in an off leash dog park and owners must be able to control their dogs.
 - We don't have to take obedience courses to raise children, why single out certain breeds? I know alot more worse behaved children than dogs
 - This idea of banning pit bulls is plain stupid and waste of money. Might as well ban all dogs because of their strength.
 - Animals in abusive homes should automatically be Seized from the owners.
 - N/a
 - I would like to see park n play type set ups in the off leash parks to teach training techniques and socialization for Dogs.
 - There is nothing wrong with pit bulls, horrible to see Calgary law makers are so stupid.
 - Include free or sliding scale mandatory training with each lifetime dog license for all owners. No BSL law. Small dog bites occur more often
 - I do not agree with breed specific legislation. I think All dogs should have the same rules of rules to be a nuisance animal.
 - No
 - Be great if your form had a way to actually submit. Right now it's returning constant errors when trying to submit.
 - "Require obedience training and learning for all dog owners, of all breeds.
-
- Perhaps as part of the licensing process."
 - More dog friendly businesses and off leash parks in general. Not sure if the reason for is difficulty obtaining licenses or owner preference
 - [personal information removed]
 - No
 - A dog bite is serious, whether inflicted by a pit bull or chihuahua. It indicates irresponsible pet ownership, NOT specific breed issues.
 - Do not make special bylaws for pit bulls. They have done nothing wrong and is ridiculous of an idea to do that to the owner as well as dog.



- No
- A low-cost or free training program for low income people should be explored. Stop punishing the breed, help reduce irresponsible ownership
- I moved to Calgary because of your laws on all dogs/owners being accountable. Not having in ridiculous breed bans. Shame on you.
- Did the survey but not receiving message of unexpected error. Will not be completing the survey again.
- No
- We need more areas like the Connaught dog park, divided between small and large breed. I have asked proper channels but fell on deaf ears.
- None
- Long overdue to realize dogs are still animals. OWNERS need to get real and realize they can encourage bad behaviour.
- Not all dogs are dangerous. It's only ones that have not be trained the right way. Don't take everyone's dog away because of one dog
- Please do not enforce anything related to "pit bulls";. This is absolutely horrid. The animal itself is not the problem, the owner is.
- Not really
- I keep trying to submit the form above but get an error (no form element mapping found).
- Government supporting vet bills
- No I do not have anything to add
- ALL dogs are capable of GREAT damage, large or small. Pitbulls should not be singled out. All bylaws should be applicable to all breeds.
- There should be a background check for pitbull owners. Pitbulls learn from their caregivers. It should be sure they are going to safe homes.
- Pet owners should have to undergo mandatory training with each new pet. If they've done training in the past, a shorter course would apply.
- Bylaws and increased fines against certain breeds are discriminatory. This shouldn't be a conversation in 2020 anymore.
- Instead of the bandanas we should be educating children on how to approach all dogs. Approach with caution and get permission from the owner
- I am not surprised by this idea from the City of Calgary. "Progressive" was never a character trait they exuded.
- More off leash areas like Connaught dog park. Ones that provide fenced space between large and small breeds.
- [Personal information removed] was an advocate across Canada for NOT having BSL, disappointing to see this type of questioning on the poll. NO BSL of any type.
- Animal vendors (sellers) should be required to explain the rules of Calgary pet ownership to buyers and allowed do initial registrations



- This is ridiculous. They are not aggressive or dangerous. They are one of the sweetest breeds and are not the only breed that is strong.
- Why do we need to PAY to "register" our pets with the city? And why do I have to do it every yr? Considering my cats are indoor only..
- Would like to see more regulation on "Rescue Agencies" who cross border shop to get low cost shelter dogs and re-sell at high fees in YYC
- Addressing individuals who bring their animals on-leash into a designated off-leash park/area. It creates a defensive and nervous scenario.
- Stop judging dogs based on irrational fear. Huskies, Collies and Rottweilers account for the highest percentage of dog fatalities in Canada
- No
- Targeting larger specific breeds for their potential to cause harm is misguided - more frequently toy and small breeds are antagonistic.
- someone that has trespassed into your own yard, you have posted signs on your gates beware of dog! Your dog shouldn't be at fault!
- Allowing 6 dogs/house for fostering, but only allowing 1 pit/home is ridiculous. Pits are the most abused/abandoned and need fosters more-so
- Taking better steps to protect animals that are being abused.
- I disagree with breed-specific laws. Owners should be held more accountable for their pets behaviour, the breed should not be punished.
- Data from many countries and cities shows that BSL does not work. How is this even a conversation? Shame on you, Calgary.
- I believe that all pet owners who have a violation need to take some sort of training with their pet on top of a fine.
- I am against EVERYTHING breed-specific. It is completely unfounded.
- service animals need visible legal ID. Comfort animal owners need to know their pets legal limits.
- I think this survey is badly done. Eg should feeding and teasing wildlife be banned.. why lump them together; they are different issues.
- How about requiring mandatory training instead of a larger fine for first offenses or smaller incidents before a license can be renewed?
- Breed specific legislation is wrong, and ineffective.
- If a dog attacks me and ruins my clothing I should be able to claim damages from the dogs owner. My sisters coat (2days old) was shredded.
- The survey did not mention feral domestic rabbits. How about banning the sale of rabbits in pet stores to help deal with this problem?
- Focus on responsible ownership - and education for kids (and adults!) about safety and etiquette around dogs!
- Breed specific guidelines are rooted in fear and largely based on misinformation about breeds in question! Archaic and ill advised!



- Pits do not bite most, they don't even crack the top 5 for most powerful bite, and they score higher in temperament than goldens and collies
- Pit bulls are not a bad breed!! Please stop spreading this negative connotation about this breed. Introduce more training guides.
- d
- No
- Pit bulls (and bully breeds) should not be singled out and should not have higher fines/restrictions. There's zero need for this!
- Limits are unfair. Many people in rescue have many animals they take good care of; limits could break up families. Limits don't stop hoarding
- You need to redo this whole survey and do one specifically for dogs and specifically for cats, discussion items around them are different.
- Pitbulls actually don't have the strongest bites. Breed specific bylaws don't work. Look at Ontario. Harsher fines and punishments for owners.
- Bylaws against certain breeds is discriminatory and unfair.
- Targeting pit bulls and rotties? What are we fuking Quebec commies? Wake the fuck up Calgary that's a joke.
- It's unfair to put the weight on certain breeds the fines need to be higher for animal abusers not for people who have a certain breed
- Breed specific legislation is unnecessary and unfairly perpetuates negative stereotypes against large breed and pit bull type dogs.
- There should be a 3 strike system for owners to quiet down their pets after a complaint, failure to do so should result in a monetary fine
- Breed specific bylaws do not address the root problem and should be removed from the conversation.
- have a designated park for bully breeds. Offer rehabilitation courses for problematic pups. perhaps off leash areas for certain sizes of dog
- Canada is already over-regulated. We should consider education over regulation to socialize norms and expectations of pet owners.
- Do not include breed specific laws (BSL)! The way an animal behaves is the responsibility of the owner, not of its genetic makeup.
- Low income households shouldn't be allowed to own animals. If they can't afford basic needs, how could they afford to care for an animal?
- Anyone else think that all the fecal bacteria being found in waterways is related to the number of dogs swimming/playing in/near the water?
- Small dog owners and their ill trained dogs are the problem. They often instigate while the owners call them "cute";
- There needs to be stricter guidelines regarding having appropriate barriers for yards with dogs of any size.



- All dogs should have the same rules and increase fines for the nuisance animals, breed bans and separate rules are ridiculous!
- I'm very disappointed in the breed specific language in this survey
- Make training required for everyone that has a pet. Discriminating against one type of breed is ignorant discrimination.
- Pitbulls are no different than any other large breed of dog
- Education for young kids around pets. Not all all dogs like kids but are good around them
- Bylaw used to offer really great in-school programs. It would be nice to see something similar offered again to help increase awareness.
- Renters need a say when roommates suddenly get dogs when they didn't ask the other people living there if it was okay.
- Online courses about responsible pet ownership in lieu of fines for minor offences. Mandatory courses for major offences.
- Waive the darn pet license fee. That is insane that we have to PAY even more for us to keep our dogs never heard of such a stupid thing
- Breed Specific Legislation has failed time and time again. Waste of resources and terrible look rather than dealing with irresponsible owner
- Fines should be eliminated entirely for dog bites to any child, adult or the death of another animal and dogs that bite should be euthanized
- Don't discriminate against dog species. Punishment should be to the guardians that are negligent
- Introduce lifetime licensing. Instead of muzzling certain breeds, invest in public programs about responsible pet ownership/interaction.
- I do not support BSL and am very disappointed to see this language used here. BSL has been proven to be expensive and ineffective.
- None at this time
- End attempts at breed specific legislation. End annual licensing fees. Our animals are part of the family. We do not license our children.
- Leave our dogs alone. Pitbull breeds are kind animals by nature. All pet owners should be responsible for their pet's behaviour.
- It is not fair or normal for pit bulls to be discriminated against. Give owners better education, they are the problem.
- Don't bully the breed, or the owners of the breed, unless they're bad owners.
- Pitbulls are NOT the issue. To paint all pitbulls with one brush is ridiculous. The issue is NOT the breed, it's most often always the owner
- Bylaws against specific breeds is discriminatory and Calgarians don't need higher fines in the midst of COVID-19 and a struggling economy.
- BSL is NOT the answer!! More education for the public and better formal training for people to understand how to help their individual dog.
- Putting bylaws in place that target specific breeds is not the answer. There needs to be stricter penalties for poor dog ownership.



- Pit bulls aren't the problem, it is always the owner And putting out fake info like their bites are more severe is untrue. Get re- educated
- For multiple year licenses or lifetime licenses, I would recommend it be revoked if some form of address confirmation is not done every year
- Bully breeds are typically less aggressive than many others. All dogs need proper obedience training and socialization to prevent problems.
- Before banning pittys, anyone voting on this should have to foster a pitbull for 1 month before voting. This is an owner issue not a breed.
- I think it's horrible you are singling out pit bulls. There are MANY dog breeds capable of causing harm. This is not justified.
- Having a license that covers multi years is a great idea and having them sold at various locations.
- It's the owner not the breed. Read up on information and facts
- More information for the public about dog behaviour. Too many people treat dogs like live stuffed animals among other issues.
- Disappointing to see an attempt to target a specific dog breed - I don't support this discrimination (it's the bad owner, not the dog)
- Larger fines
- No further ideas, just please do not descriminate dog breeds, especially since it is based on strength and not bite/aggression
- Municipal properties are NOT the place for livestock. The pandemic has opened our eyes to zoonotic infections.
- "Bad behavior is not breed-specific.It's not even species-specific(looking at you, other humans)
- Proper training is a necessity for all dogs"
- The city going after a breed (Pit Bull) but not making changes to how owners are responsible for pets does nothing. Breed bans do not work.
- Please do not go down the road of BSL. It has proven to be ineffective and it discriminates against certain dog breeds and is pointless.
- The target should be responsible ownership, not blanket generalization of an entire breed. Punish the bad owner, not the dog. Training = key
- I do not agree with breed specific bylaws. It is absolutely ridiculous to single out pit bull breeds.
- I disagree with basing decisions on a breed of dog especially. The owner is responsible for ensuring that their pet is well behaved.
- Cats should be allowed outside. Cats allowed outside, should wear a collar like dogs do.
- Stop limiting people's freedoms, we don't live in China no matter how much Trudeau wants us to. Stop the reckless spending.
- No
- Breed specific legislation is complete inappropriate especially when you say that "they don't account for more bites than any other dog."



- Fines against non-pet owners who excessively complain about others pets when no bylaws have been broken.
- If you think breed specific bylaws are acceptable, you need to do more research.
- Please do not punish the dog for bad owners. A dog only knows what the owner's teach.
- I know many people in rescue who have adopted more than 6 cats and provide an amazing home. Limits hurt good families.
- I have never supported and will never support breed-specific legislation (BSL). Owner accountability should be the #1 priority.
- Am am very against excessive ruling g against pit bull type breeds! It is the owners, not the dogs that are the issue.
- It's not the breed. A lot of times it's the owner that should be looked at.
- Tired of residents backing onto greenspaces using it as an off leash park without consequences (chasing kids and/or not picking up feces)
- Medical literature is CONSISTENT in implicating pit bulls in the most severe injuries and deaths. Put public health over "pit bull rights."
- Pit bulls are only dangerous if they have dangerous owners. It is 100% discrimination to restrict people from owning a pit bull
- Do not put restrictions on a dog breed because of ignorant people.
- Emotional support animals that arent livestock? For example, a dog, cat, bird, hamster, etc. As a companion for mentally disabled people.
- I completely understand the the issues regarding bully breeds. Way too many people want them for the status without understand the breed.
- Keep a dangerous dogs map with address and photo of the dog like the City of Minneapolis: MSP's list is mostly pit bulls. Photos don't lie!
- Additional off leash spaces are desperately needed. Consider adding "dogs at large” to the offleash signage so other users are More aware
- Any BSL proposals on behalf of the city is very inappropriate, any animal related issues should be handled case to case, not breed specific.
- If there are multiple complaints of a dog excessively barking or being mistreated there needs to be something done.
- No to BSL!!
- The strength of a pit bull bite is a myth. BSL has been proven ineffective. Calgary actually had lower dog bite rates in comparison to YYZ.
- Pit bulls are not a problem. Breed-specific legislation is wrong.
- Singling out bully breeds is 100% wrong. The dog is not the problem. The irresponsible owner of any dog is the problem.
- If people do not want breed-specific, make Pitbulls take training with the owners.
- Can I pay a higher licence fee for my cat to allow it to be an outdoor cat? Conditions that it is spayed/neutered, licensed, vaccinated, et



- Do not ban "bully" breeds from parks, or make them wear muzzles.
- No comment
- We don't leave our dogs outside alone. They need to be supervised so I can clean fecal right away. If barking, bring inside.
- Targeting pit bulls is so wrong and will not "fix" anything. We need age restrictions in off leash parks and owner education/accountability.
- Alter off leash guidelines for dogs that can pass a competency test. If a dog has a certain level of training. Allow that dog to walk off le
- Hn
- "Mandatory courses for those looking to buy or adopt.
- Instead if adding BSL, proven not to work, get better dog safety education in schools"
- NO SUPPORT FOR BSL
- I firmly do not support the implementation of breed-specific legislation. It has been proven to be ineffective in reducing incidents.
- Excessive barking is not acceptable in any urban situation.
- Do not allow un-neutered male dogs in off leash parks. Un-neutered male dogs can exhibit hormonal behaviour not recognised by human owners.
- .
- Onus is on owners. Train people to control dogs, by a certified trainer. Ensure owners know the fines that can occur and enforce the bylaws.
- Bylaws are great but if no one enforces them or even follows up on complaints, what is the point? Also should not be breed specific evert
- You CANNOT stereotype a dog - no laws regarding certain breeds. Mandate everybody has to take pet safety + body language course
- Please don't ban specific breeds. All breeds with the proper training can be kind and loving.
- Any livestock should be kept outside the city limits.
- Stop the nonsense idea that it's no ones fault when a dog is poorly behaved. The responsibility is on the owner and the dog.
- Do not ban ANY SORT OF DOG! Maybe we should look at the owners before banning a dog! You can train any dog to be bad and not behave.
- Pit bulls ARE NOT an issue. All dogs can and do bite. The media and public only share portions of information.
- Yyc DO NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST BREEDS. Lets look at backyard breeding and shady animal rescues instead.
- "Teaching children NOT to approach/pet a dog without permission from the owner.
- Also, lose the pitbull rule. Any dog can be dangerous!"
- Breed specific bylaws are not the answer.
- There should be exceptions for animals acting in self defense.
- No breed specific legislation. It is unnecessary and costly



- "Bylaw for dog
- noise need to be evaluated"
- I would support licensing being done through other vendors only if they were otherwise exclusive to veterinary clinics and hospitals.
- We must do much more about spaying/neutering more cats/dogs. There is massive pet over-population everywhere.
- No breed restrictions are necessary, it's the owner not the breed.
- Humans not trained properly and not understanding their own dogs signals leads to problems. Train the human, avoid having to punish the pet.
- I feel that areas adjacent to or used as access to off leash areas need signs saying that they are not off leash and that fines can be charged
- Stop being racist towards certain dogs. Buying a dog should require a license, making people competent in training their own pets.
- Breed specific laws are not the answer.
- Dogs should be secured in a vehicle if the owner leaves them with window open, enabling them to jump out and attack dogs walking by.
- Decrease license fee if dogs are trained through approved training facilities. Decrease fees gradually When there's no incident
- All dogs should require obedience training. Consider offering an annual fee reduction for proof of obedience training.
- Dog Groomer here. The muzzle law is insane. There are breeds that bite more often. Training is the key for ANY dog. That's what stops bites.
- QUIT SINGLING OUT PITBULLS AND LOOK AT THE BIGGER PICTURE
- "ALL LAWS FOR ALL DOGS!!!!"
- No such thing as a bad breed, but there is such a thing as bad owners!!"
- Make it illegal to discriminate against how a dog looks. Bully breeds are AVERAGE strength for their size and that's science.
- It would be great if when talking about a dog biting someone you weren't just being breed specific to pitbulls and bully breeds.
- I was unable to complete section 9A all fines need to be increased
- Pit bulls should not be singled out as bad dogs. All dog breeds should be considered as nuisance dogs in a bylaw.
- Do not waive fees. If you can't afford them, you shouldn't have a dog but I do think it's fair to discount proof of obedience trained dogs.
- The breed specific legislation aspect of this bylaw should be eradicated. It is discriminatory and frankly not backed by any actual science.
- I do not support breed specific bylaws
- More fenced off-leash areas and take better care of them. The one by Confluence is entirely dirt! Nicer parks = more use.



- The irresponsible owners, I feel so bad for animals they don't have a voice, or a choice
 - Breed type bylaws are unfair and will not make a difference if the breeds do not account for more instances
 - This is down right ridiculous I have met and been charged by many more small dogs compared to larger "pit bull" type breeds,
 - No breed specific laws! It's not the breed it's the owner! Owners should be at fault and take responsibility
 - N/a
 - Steps before banning bully breeds from a joyful life in public and around other dogs. Training? Owner specific training? Special licensing?
 - Checking up on potential animal hoarders more frequently.
 - Can we get support for organizations doing public education how to engage with different kinds of pets? E.g. educators in schools.
 - Specifically attacking a single breed is disgusting.
 - How about doing something about excessive number of skunks in the city, rather than worrying about domestic animals/pets.
 - Remove breed-specific legislation; it's ineffective and doesn't work. Focus on educating ALL owners how to responsibly train their pets.
 - This should not be breed specific. All dogs, like all owners. I've been bit many times by a dog who is less than 20lbs Which went unreported
 - If you are a registered breeder with the Canadian Kennel Club, then lower the license fee for intact dogs. Not all pit bulls need a muzzle.
 - no to breed specific legislation! Singling out pitbulls/bullies is just wrong especially when the BREED has nothing to do with issues raised
 - No breed specific laws. Can't have laws based on people's race of skin colour so why for breed of dog. That's discrimination and racist
 - I get the Calgary government receives funding from fines and licenses. This website will show pro comments first, what even is freedom?
 - "I still DONOT agree with cat licences (I have no cats).
-
- Chickens, should be allowed in small numbers"
 - I leash walk my dog. There are way more people to walking their dog without a leash. Frustrated. Need more bylaw driving @ and fines
 - LESA should definitely be free to register for low income. Reduced fee for all others. These are support animals come on people!!!
 - Stop trying to put pitbulls under a microscope they are more harmless than the little cute dog that doesn't listen but it's ok it's "cute"



- Don't but any BSL it's literally discriminatory towards specific breeds. The breed of the animal impact the amount of animal bites.
- Providing more off-leash areas and better access to licensing for dog owners
- The human component of animal training, management, and ownership needs to be addressed. No animal behaves independently of its environment.
- No
- The current rules about responsible pet ownership are pathetic. A standard of care for well being of dogs in cold months left outside
- Please reconsider allowing people to have 6 dogs/ cats! How can anyone give them proper care in an urban setting!
- There should be no breed specific bylaws. Period.
- Stop making it about breed that's just absurd.
- Remove the biased breed specific language from your community engagement survey.
- Minimum fees should be imposed for licensing. If you can not afford to license your animal, you probably can't afford proper veterinary care
- Make extended leashes not allowed in on leash areas. Training should be required for all dog owners but, owner should be able pick trainer.
- I feel like all dogs should be considered for proposed changes not just specific breeds. Same rules for all!
- For the love of God, please don't discriminate against breeds. Do not blame a dog, blame the owner.
- Stop targeting specific breeds. It is how the dog is trained that makes it violent. Require obedience with licensing
- I find more small dogs that are more threatening and bite willing than pit bulls, I have been bitten by small dogs twice; never by big dogs
- Separate fenced off leash parks for small dogs and large dogs. (See Cochrane)
- Amount of animals allowed on a property should depend on the size of the property. House vs. acreage is very different.
- Owners need to take responsibility for their pets
- I think Bylaw officers should do patrols in dog parks, especially the busy ones. Officer presence is key in enforcement.
- Discussion would be on pet owner, how they train/what they teaches and how they socialize w/their animals and the environment they were brought.
- I think anyone adopting a dog should be required to do a training course. Most people have no idea about dog psychology or behavior.
- I think it's terrible that the city is differentiating Pitbulls from other dogs. It's important to me that all bylaws affect all dogs equall
- no, but I think cat licenses are too high. Perhaps have one license per household.
- Higher fines for not cleaning up dog waste. People bag and throw on people yards
- The stuff about pit bulls is completely unacceptable. STOP WITH THE BIAS!!!



- Too harsh on pitbulls. I grew up around two at different times of my life and its not the dog who should be punished, its the owners.
- NO breed restrictions. Focus on the the behavior not the breed and irresponsible owners. Educate the public on proper dog interactions.
- DO NOT BREED SHAME DOGS. It's a disgusting tactic, and I would be EMBARRASSED to live in a city where this was enforced.
- 140 characters will not cut it. Sometimes things go bad also irresponsible pet owners. Banning an entire breed just seems wrong.
- Breed specific bylaws are unnecessary and discriminatory. As they say, there are no bad dogs only bad owners.
- There is no reason to single out "pitbulls" in this proposal. Restrictions should be placed on all dogs if any.
- Stop this nonsense and get on with administering the priorities in this City. We are in a global pandemic and many are out of work.
- Na
- Do NOT ban certain breeds.
- The focus should be placed on large/powerful dog breeds rather than focusing on "pit bulls"; in the language.
- Quit discriminating against any breed and do your job! Same rules/fines/etc. For everyone!
- What does end of life look like for backyard chickens? Will they be slaughtered or euthanized or set free? I'd like it to be humane.
- My rescue could bite harder than a pit bull (but she won't because she's well trained). Punish bad owners, not certain breed owners
- I don't think these regulations apply to dogs...it's the humans, the owners that need to be accountable. Humans need the training
- Education programs on responsible pet ownership and the importance of getting animals fixed.
- I have no ideas.
- Has the city considered investing in, or linking their app with pet tracking apps? WhistleFit, Tractive, etc.? Find all them lost pets!
- Charge owners and not the breed. Bully breeds are not the issue, owners are. Do not discriminate against bully breeds
- Provide the public with more education on adopting a dog (puppy mills, responsible and irresponsible breeders)
- Pit bulls (and bully breeds) should not be singled out and should not have higher fines/restrictions. There's no need for this! So wrong!
- Provide free/affordable obedience/reactive rover training for dogs considered a nuisance.
- not at this time
- A license should be required in order to buy an any animal BEFORE the animal is purchased.
- Please lower the limit of cats and dogs to a maximum of two.



- .
- Less breed specific laws (unless it's chihuahua) and more responsible pet ownership. Help low income folks out.
- I'd like laying ducks to be added to the urban hen project. Hardier than chickens, longer laying life, and definitely quieter than most dogs
- Is specific breed selection not the same as racism? The world is trying to erase racism yet we are going to teach it with animals instead?
- This survey is leading and flawed. CANADIAN research does not support bully breed restrictions at all!!
- You really shouldn't be considering breed specific laws at all.
- Suspend the pitbull policies. If your going to apply these to one breed it should be all breeds. Any dog can biter bark or act vicious.
- The targeting of pit bulls is outrageous. Whoever put this together needs more research as a lot of this information is invalid.
- Off leash protocols should depend on how compliant and calm a dog is
- Add dog drinking facilities in the parks.
- Off leash parks are a issue. My on-leash staffie and I have been attacked 3 times by "Friendly" off leash dogs.
- If cats are strictly indoors they should be required to be chipped and tattooed not licenced
- Also leave the fines as is. Increase them on repeat offenders. If your a repeat offender after 3 strikes you lose your animal.
- Do not ban pitbulls or restrict them in any way. They are sweet animals highly desired by terrible people.
- Chihuahua's are more aggressive than Pitbulls. Let's ban Chihuahuas!
- H
- Exceptions for more pets if on a big property .
- Breed specific legislations are uneducated and unnecessary. It's about the owner and training, not the breed.
- Sell the licenses digitally and send documentation digital and in the mail.
- Not everyone can tolerate animals due to allergies, phobias etc. Whatever neighbours do, impacts the people living around them.
- Discrimination against a breed of dog is ridiculous. Punish the bad owners, not the breed of dog! "Pit bull lives matter”
- I echo all the comments on breed-bias. Owners and training is where the focus should be.
- I think rather than obedience training there should be more options for educating the general public on how to properly interact with animal
- Breed specific bylaws are not the answer, it is about being a responsible pet owner. There is no bad breed just bad owners.



- Offer a city subsidy for obedience training, make it accessible and affordable, prevention not reaction!
- Looking into the owner not the breed. My mastiffs are more mild mannered than half the small dogs. This is Rascism, just towards an animal.
- Its ridiculous that one whole breed is being banned when there are plenty of other dogs who are much more aggressive. Don't do this!
- You must not make rules specifically targeting one breed. Dogs are a reflection of their owners. Don't punish all dogs simply by their breed
- Laws against Pitbulls are as stupid as the people who make them. There is no reason for them whatsoever.
- If an animal is a repeat offender for bites, esp serious ones, the owner should have higher fines and possible jail time.
- Small dogs Bite more than the larger breeds, but nothing is done. It is not fair that a "pitbull" type is singled out.
- I have a great idea...DON'T DISCRIMINATE AGAINST CERTAIN BREEDS!!! Discriminate against bad pet owners...case by Case basis!!!
- All breeds should be treated equally, I've had more issues with other breeds than a bully breed. Come on Calgary bylaw!
- Currently pit bulls are being shipped to Calgary and placed up for adoption. This should be prohibited.
- I don't believe in a bylaw or rules for breed the specific animals each case must be dealt with individually
- The pit bull discrimination bothers me. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners!!! Pit bulls get a bad rap.
- I have been bitten or threatened by more small breed dogs than any breed of large dog. Why not focus on bad dog owners rather than the dogs?
- Question #3 is biased against Pitbulls, uneducated, and unscientific. The authors should be ashamed. I am very disappointed in the City.
- Charge owners. Require mandatory obedience training for offenders.
- No breed specific regulations. Dogs should not be penalized for bad owners.
- I think power breed owners must complete a basic obedience class with their puppies. This way both humans and dogs will be more educated.
- Singling out bigger breeds like pit bulls just aids in negative stigma and fear. These animals do not deserve to be punished for existing.
- Make education/training mandatory for individuals licensing any form of "bully breed" dog. It's not the animal, it is the owner.
- "Are fines effective?"
- It's hard to get a sense of the point of this engagement. Has there been an increase in dangerous pet behaviour?"



- More incentives for indoor-only cats - better for animals and local ecosystem. Reduced or no licensing fees for registered indoor cats.
- Any dog owner knows that any breed can bite and it's on the owner to protect dog from situations. Don't discriminate breeds.
- There needs to be more research into breed specific legislation. It is ineffective in other cities and is based on misinformation.
- Singling out breeds such as pitbulls is a disservice to all dog owners, its all dogs or no dogs , the onus is on the owner not the breed
- If an owner makes no attempt to control/contain their animal, it should be removed and rehomed.
- Should be looking into how the owner teaches their animal, not the breed.
- With an Irish Wolfhound, an XXL dog who is a quiet, sweet girl, apartment hunting was hard! Weight restrictions are ridiculous!
- Selecting pit bull type due to bite is not ideal. What about breeds like mastiffs, Cane Corso and Rotweiller?
- Breed specific legislation and agendas need to be absolutely REMOVED from discussion. This is about a responsibility ALL pet owners have.
- Stop trying to implement breed-specific legislation. It is not based on any data or research and is entirely based on ignorance and fear
- I am against BSL. There should be stricter punishment enforced for pet owners based on specific events and not applied to All pet owners who
- direct drive ebikes are excellent dog traning tools and should be allowed on pathways, it is to dangerous train my dog on the roadway.thanks
- What a ridiculous survey! Don't ban dog breeds. It is the HUMAN not the dog. Pls stop wasting my tax money!
- Breed specific legislation is unfair. A bad owner can cause *any* breed to be vicious. Not the breeds fault.
- Strongly disagree to pit bull breeds being treated differently than other breeds.
- Stop grouping pitbulls and terriers into a group that people see as a threat. Educate owners.
- No ideas
- No
- Do NOT ban pitbulls. Do NOT make it mandatory for them to wear muzzles. Agression is not JUST about the species, it's about the owner.
- Small/toy breeds should not be allowed in uncontrolled off-leash areas
- None
- Its not the pit bulls that are aggressive its their owners.
- Dog ownership permit, given to approved people when they complete a course like firearms lisencc. Requirement to have a dog.
- Dog owners in this city are TERRIBLE at taking accountability for their dogs and it is not a matter of one particular breed.



- We shouldn't specifically target breeds like Pit Bulls. We should focus our attention on irresponsible owners.
- Do not make breed specific legislation. Many other breeds bite stronger than pitbulls do. Shame on whoever did the research for this.
- No I do not
- Mandatory basic training and obedience for all dog owner. Completed and registered along with the pet license. No breed specific legislation
- Its the owners who need punishing- jail time if required.
- Lifetime license for indoor only cats. They pose no threat to anyone.
- There shouldn't be any breed specific legislation involved. Bully breeds are not an issue and it is wrong to think they are
- The owners are at fault not the breed. I was raised never to touch a dog without asking it's about respecting animals as sentient beings.
- Quit objectifying pitbulls as "dangerous" dogs. A dangerous dog only becomes dangerous because of a hard life or ignorant owners.
- NO MENTION OF TRAINING FOR THE OWNER OF PROBLEM DOGS!?! BAD OWNER = BAD DOG
- cats are a huge issue. The amount of damage cats cause is horrendous. Cat owners should have high fines if their cat isn't licensed as well
- Please do not label or discriminate against pitbulls. All dogs no matter what breed should be treated equal. We do not need bsl legislation
- N/a
- Breed specific legislations are rooted in/perpetuate fear and ignorance. Any breed has a potential to cause harm if not well trained.
- No
- Not really an idea but I think it's absolute garbage if you place a breed specific bylaw. Every pitbull I have ever met it such a sweetheart
- Do not make it breed specific as one breed shouldn't be singled out
- I think Calgary should remember that we have been the leaders on responsible pet ownership without having to slump to racist laws.
- Actually enforce existing bylaws.
- Absolutely NO Breed Specific Legislation. If it were people we were talking about it would be racism. Hold bad OWNERS responsible not dogs!
- I don't own a pit bull but kind of taken back by some of the information here. There are many dogs (big/small) than can cause severe damage
- A bigger issue is off leash dogs in on leash parks
- "Bad" dogs = terrible owners...
- Be accountable for your pet! No matter what the breed!



- The owner should be charged or punished. Not the animal. It isn't their fault if they were taught that way.
- You can not single out a breed. All breeds bite, all breeds can do damage.
- Strongly oppose breed specific legislation. It carries the assumption that other breeds are not problematic.
- Life time registration, when most people get pets they become part of the family, this yearly give me money is just a money grab
- Breed-discrimination is NOT something that should be enforced. Owners must be educated and all dogs must undergo training.
- Training for owners being mandatory if you have a nuisance pet. Dogs are typically not the issue but lack of owner understanding
- No such thing as a bad/aggressive breed but there are bad/aggressive owners
- Accountability is huge. Pit bull type dogs need to be monitored as they can cause extreme damage and owners need more training
- Make animal training more affordable and more accessible. Breed management isn't the problem, access to appropriate training is.
- NO Breed Specific Legislation.
- You can't single out any specific breed, this thought process needs to be removed, and sole responsibility needs to be on the owner!
- N/A
- The Pet noise complaints in the city can be used and abused as manipulation tactics by neighbours, ESP after these changes.
- If I am restricted to six well cared for dogs, you better start restricting the amount of human children in a household too.
- I completely disagree with the breed specific legislation aspect of this bylaw.
- To say that Pit bull strength will cause a more severe bite is negligent. Don't provide false information that lacks evidence!
- Very upset about the pitbull specific comments, including dogs who resemble pit bulls.
- Sad people are that dumb to single out a specific breed because of an unjustified bias
- Do you blame a child for acting badly? Or do you believe they are a product of their environments? Why is that any different for animals?
- There are NO bad dogs, only bad owners. The focus should NOT be on banning breeds but on the people who mistreat animals. DO NOT BAN BREEDS.
- Stop picking on pitbulls, all dogs can bite. Make it a general rule for all dogs and not breed specific
- Pitbulls or animals that are aggressive and have a history of not been under control should always be muzzled.
- If obedience is mandated, barking shouldn't be a problem.
- start with harsher restrictions on pitbull breeders, many of these breeders are the direct problem, they see the animals as accessories.



- Owners should be accountable, no matter the breed
- For livestock, avoid pigs please. However, multiple homes can house a goat herd for weed management of invasive plant species.
- An online system for reporting ppl who do not pick up dog feces. Incl upload if pictures.
- I filled out the whole survey and then the captcha wouldn't work properly. What a waste of time
- Do NOT make pit bulls an issue. They are some of the best dogs out there. All dogs can be a nuisance regardless of breed.
- There are no bad dogs. Just bad owners. It should be mandatory to attend any type of basic obedience training if you have a dog.
- Don't single out pit bulls.
- This is complete craziness. I work in veterinary medicine and this disgusts me. Educate yourselves and focus on something more important.
- No everything seems good
- No
- I'd put my face next to a pitbull before I'd go anywhere near the uneducated disgusting people trying to pass this law.
- Can [personal information removed] please come back? It appears we need you!
- We need more off-leash park areas for dogs
- Calgary should have a bylaw restricting importing dogs from out of country
- I do not support breed specific bylaws.
- Discount offered for those who rescue senior dogs or special needs dogs from human societies. Get a discounted or waived fee for their help.
- The responsibility needs to be placed on owners for their dogs behaviour and not bringing in blanket rules based on breed/appearance of dog
- I agree with others that dog disobedience has a lot more to do with the owners than the breed. Pitbulls can be sweet and loving dogs.
- It's outrageous to put such harsh regulations on pit bulls. They are wonderful dogs. ANY breed can be vicious, it comes down owners really.
- Please have people who are actual dog owners or trainers to help make decisions, not non animal owners.
- No matter what the breed of the pet, owners should be responsible for training and socializing. Not different rules for specific breeds
- Everyone who wants to adopt/buy an animal should be required to take an educational course on animal welfare and behaviour.
- Against breed specific legislation
- No thank you.
- No
- I do not feel that breeds should be defined in any way as being acceptable or not.



- Approval by vet, trainer or behavioralist required to breed dogs. Fine for unplanned litters or unapproved breeding. Proof of knowledge.
- LESA and low income are should be separate. Pit bulls behaviour is based on the owner. The city should offer free obedience/education classes
- Please do NOT discriminate against pitbulls !!!
- There is no evidence that a specific breed is more aggressive, causes more damage, etc. Do not ban breeds!
- The proposed changes for enhanced measures against Pit Bulls are erroneous and unfair. Smaller dogs are more problematic (noise/aggression)
- I own 2 pitbulls and 2 cats my pitbulls are the friendly gentlest dogs I have ever owned .I do not find it at all fair to target 1 breed
- Instead of banning certain dogs we should be requiring stricter licensing requirements.
- I do not think "pit bull" breeds should be singled out as a "bad breed". This method has been used and it does not work.
- When it comes to certain breeds it is not the animals fault, it's the owners. Humans created breeds and made them pets we are responsible.
- Any dog can be a great companion, no matter what breed. Stems down to the owner. Dog owners should be held accountable.
- No
- I don't support breed specific bylaws. It's the owner, not the breed.
- Problem is not the breed it is the owner. Mandatory training would be beneficial. Also far too many people allow cats to roam free.
- Stop being breed specific, I would be more scared of a little dog than a big dog.
- Singling out breeds is just the same as singling out a race of humans. Has nothing to do with the breed and more a product of environment
- Calgary should invest more money in dog parks. More fully fenced parks With fun features and include waste bags. Ex. Canmore and Whitefish
- Limit the number of dogs a dog walker can walk at one time at off leash parks. This is something that needs a bylaw.
- Why are dogs with stronger bites not included with the pitbulls, such as Rottweilers? This survey seems discriminatory feeding into fear.
- None
- Pitbulls should not be singled out in this. Like any dog if raised properly they are not vicious .
- We shouldn't be singling one breed if many other breeds are doing the same harm to humans
- it is nonsense to think about breed bans or specific rules. Shame on you. It's the owners fault if a dog is aggressive.
- It is the owner's fault for the dogs actions, or often the person bitten for approaching inappropriately
- There should be a mechanism that allows a nuisance designation to expire after a period of time or after appropriate training is taken.



- Issue fines to people teasing or harassing animals, I would bite too if that's all I could do...
- Breed-specific moderation is not required. DOG specific moderation could be a suitable alternative. ie. Dogs previously deemed a nuisance.
- Ban breed specific legislation. Will assist in organizing class action lawsuit and dispute against it
- Help pay for vet bills when they are over a certain amount.
- I hate to say it but outdoor cats should not be allowed unless on a leash because they cause detrimental harm to local wildlife populations.
- a longer term punishment for repeated offenders such as increasing fines, and ultimately losing the privilege of pet ownership
- Try to look at the bigger picture of bad dog owners vs a dog breed/type that gets a bad rap. Punish the owners not the dog
- Restriction on a breed is ridiculous. Why not have the same apply to all dogs. Every dog must wear a muzzle not one type of dog.
- I am vehemently against any sort of Breed-Specific Legislation, pit bulls are no more dangerous than any other dog
- Please do not legislate dog breeds. This arises from misinformation and myths. Many studies have proven these to be erroneous.
- I would like to comment on number 3. Are we also considering enforcing these restrictions on dog breeds with stronger jaws, just as capable
- I will not support breed specific bylaws. Owners are the problem, not dogs or their breeds.
- Educate the general public (especially kids!) about dog behaviour and what it means when a dog does 'x', DO NOT impose bsl, it doesn't work
- No
- Higher penalties should be for dogs who have demonstrated vicious behaviour, not innocent dogs and families. It doesn't make sense otherwise.
- Relaxation of leashing requirements in not busy areas. ie areas one would consider a trail
- The colored bandanas seems like a way for people to provoke and instigate conflict. If people can't control or train their offspring...ugh
- Singling a dog breed out is similar to singling out a race based on stereotypes. With proper training pitbulls are not dangerous.
- Maybe required dog awareness/training classes for the OWNERS, as much of the time, it is the fault/behavior of the owners, not the dogs.
- I do not own a dog. I want to make it known that breed specific legislation is abhorrent as an Albertan and a Calgarian. It isn't who we are
- —
- By-laws and fines must have some nuance. If a dog bites because it is being provoked by an adult or a child this needs to be considered.
- Educating future dog owners.
- "Rescue dogs and dogs



- From a shelter should be required to
- Complete training with the new owner as rescue dogs
- Come with baggage."
- This is a bogus bylaw, any dog can bite and hurt someone. Hold the owner any dog breed more responsible. No breed specific bylaw
- I believe offering sterilization at a cheaper cost and not just low income to reduce the number of animals.
- No
- Breed specification should not be a factor in any bylaw.
- Disgusted to see such unevicenced discrimination against Pit Bulls. You simply feed the cycle of stereotypes. Some good ideas otherwise.
- I think it's wrong to single out and put restrictions on pit bulls. Any breed can be vicious if not raised properly.
- This is wild to even think we are just gonna pass legislation, to segregate certain dog breeds. It's about how they are raised.
- BSL is important, don't walk backwards.
- Breed/Animal racism is not ok. Punishing specific animals for something they did not do isn't solving the problem. Educating would be better
- None
- Ban breed specific legislation. Aggressive dogs are a result of aggressive owners. Behavioural training for dog and owner would help
- Do not make any regulations based on breed
- Animals should be judged on their behavior and that of their owners on an individual basis.
- Owners should be given rules on etiquette in the off-leash areas.
- Na
- Pit bulls themselves are not dangerous. It is how they are treated/raised that sometimes creates an issue.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. My pit bull has been attacked by a lab and the owner just laughed as my dog tried to hide. This is biased.
- Breed specification should not be a factor at all. Any dog can be aggressive and those owners should be fined on a per case/situation basis
- I do not support a lower licensing fee for people with low income. It's only \$40 a year and is an associated cost of owning a pet.
- We should NOT be discriminating against a single dog breed. Equal actions should be taken for all dog breeds. Pitbulls aren't vicious.
- I do not agree with specific breed legislation. It all has to do with the owner and how they train the dog, not the breed specifically
- More fully-fenced areas that are designated as single occupant use would be great for some of the reactive dogs to get exercise.



- If you already know that pit bull breeds don't bite more often make it more about responsible pet ownership rather than breeds in the future
- Mandatory new pet owner course for all breed. The problem is the people not the animal. Licensed dog breeders only, no 'backyard' breeders
- Some dog are aggressive and it's not the owners fault or their breed's fault. Proper handling of aggressive dogs is key = education.
- No
- It's not "all the owners fault";. But knowing how to handle ALL dogs is important. An aggressive dog can lead a happy life if handled well.
- There should be no pitbull related bylaws. Absolutely there should be bylaws for aggressive animals but not all pitbulls are aggressive.
- Banning specific breeds and creating special rules like "must wear a muzzle"; only increase breed stigma. Wrong direction in decision making.
- To encourage dog owners to train their dogs a discount could be offered after completing a basic obedience course
- Reviewing or changing the bylaw regarding animal aggression or bites should not be limited to breed.
- "pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds"; but "strength"; listed as the issue. How do we measure and control?
- Muzzle and no off leash privileges for all nuisance dogs. Muzzle training is not hard, if owners won't train or control pets, keep them home
- Indoor cats should not need a license.
- There should not be breed specific rules and laws.
- Dog bites are not particular to breed. Proper education is key, do not punish dogs for having bad owners.
- Restricting a specific breed, especially one that has a stigma, is just adding to that stigma. Pitbulls are not the issue, it's the owner.
- Stop with the breed specific legislation.
- I would much rather target irresponsible owners rather than specific breeds. The breeds have never been the problem.
- I do not agree with specific breed bylaws.
- Do not stigmatize pit bulls ! This is wrong ! Any breed dog has the potential to bite or be aggressive in the wrong hands !
- I am strongly against breed specific legislation. It is not warranted, this is based on peer reviewed literature and past experience.
- Track animal abusers and give lifetime ban on pet ownership
- Breed specific legislation is not effective. Education and training are.
- Discourage backyard breeders by requiring a business license to sell pets.



- I do not agree with specific breed rules. It all should revert to the owner and responsible pet ownership.
- BSL is nonsense. I have had pitbulls and Staffordshire Bull Terriers with no aggression issues . I support higher fines for nuisance dogs.
- Focus on educating owners. Don't start picking breeds out based on media fear mongering.
- Education is key.
- No BSL. All dogs incidents should be judged the same.
- Pigeons are vermin, and keeping them/breeding them should be against bylaw.
- Feedback: If the concern about dog bites is potential damage, why aren't you targeting all breeds with higher bite strength? NO BSL.
- Fenced areas for single dog or household dogs to get great exercise in would be a great option to allow dogs running room.
- For a city that prides itself on diversity and inclusion, I'm shocked that breed-specific legislation is being entertained.
- N/A
- Create a dog park specifically for small dogs aka the "grandma dogs". Dogs who 99% of the time start it then become the victim when attacked
- Please do not pass bylaws that are breed specific! Working in the rescue industry for years, a breed does not dictate behavior
- BSL is not effective, there is many well documented cities, in Canada, that have already tried implementing this.
- Instead of a by law based on breed specific dogs, cases should be investigated case by case. Owners are responsible for improper training.
- Yellow ribbons on a collar or leash are already very well known to many as a signal to give a dog space. But prohibit from off leash parks.
- Regulations specific to animal rescues
- Not be breed specific. As it's not just pitbulls it can be ANY animal with these problem areas
- pet licenses paid online, you get one tag which stays with your pet for life if you lose it you pay a small fee to replace
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. It is their owner's responsibility to know their dog and put them in situations that are safe for all.
- Stop discriminating against breeds of dogs especially pit bulls or bully breeds. All dogs can be dangerous in different situations.
- No to treating specific breeds differently. All breeds can be vicious if they're treated poorly. Harsher penalties for animal abusers
- Guard dog type working breeds have stronger jaws too. They also need to be included or the BLS is more bias than for proper safety of others
- How many times must it be said? It's lack of training, not the breed itself, that's the problem. Dobermans and Rottweilers are much worse.



- If you have indoor cats that are tattooed and chipped why do you need a license for them.. ours never leave the house.
- "Do NOT breed discriminate.
- Perhaps training for all dogs should be mandatory, especially for 1st time owners."
- Stop discriminating against bully breeds when small dogs are more aggressive.
- more education of responsible pet ownership is required. Its owners responsibility. Add mandatory dog classes with their fines.
- .
- Calgary you lead the way for how a city should handle dangerous dogs. BSL shouldnt be on the table. BSL doesn't work!!
- Pitbulls are no more likely to bite than other breeds. These bylaw changes unfairly target any pitbull-like breed based on their look.
- "No to back yard breeders . They should have a license.
- Also I don't agree with pit bulls having tougher rulings ."
- I have no input but I'm really liking that you're asking the general public about opinions on all of this.
- Keeping out of control dogs at home is not the best solution. Dogs need training, exercise and socialization with other dogs. Some new owners!
- How is this even a proper survey? Breed specific bylaws should not even be a thing - look at the human that raises them.
- "Bite Force PSI: Kangal – 743
- Cane Corso–700
- Akita Inu-350-400
- Rottweiler-328
- Husky-320
- German Shepard-238
- Pitbull-235"
- I disagree with breed specific laws, incidents should be handled on a case by case basis.
- Bsl is a horrible idea. Bylaw should be based on investigating case by case, not based on looks alone.
- Pet licenses should be issued only after the potential owners have take a responsible per ownership course and cleared a test
- I do not support breed specific legislation or bans! I do agree indoor cats should not require licences
- Rather than penalizing pet owners with fines, more should be done to enforce mandatory behaviour training after an offense.
- Do more about repeat wandering cats and dogs, especially cats! Some people think it's their right to let their cats wander.
- I am against any dog type specific bylaws, but I believe any dog infraction should be followed up with some type of mandatory training.



- Roaming outdoor cats that have a home but owners choose to leave their window open to let them be in or out should be perfectly fine.
- It has been scientifically proven that other dogs are higher on the list than bully breeds for aggressive behavior as well as stronger bite.
- Specific dog breeds are not the issue. If there is a problem with a specific dog, the owner as well as the dog should require training.
- Don't just pick on pitbull breed. Most I've met are cuddly friends who are the best
- Thank you for your time
- A license should be required to sell any kind of animal. Requirements for granting the license could help stop the abuse from pet mills.
- Animal license cost need to be the same regardless of income. Proper care requires disposal income. Leave bully breeds alone.
- Breed Specific Legislation is terrible and outdated- I am appalled that the City of Calgary is even considering this.
- Breed specific rules is narrow minded generalization that wouldn't fly if applied to people (ie Charter Grounds). Ascinine idea is DOA.
- Survey questions were leading / yes or no answers when other circumstances weren't considered. Right now - limited space for ideas. :(
- NA-
- Quite questionable that pitbulls are not involved in more bite incidents yet they are the only breed with specific rules/bylaw proposals.
- It's time to move the "ownership" of domestic animals to "guardianship" since they're not objects.
- I don't think we should put dogs down, just train them to be better socialized. Also, additional fees or fines for pit bulls seem crazy.
- Dogs should not be allowed to remain outside to bark while the owners are at work, I.e., continual barking for 7 to 10 hours.
- Implementing BSL is a bad idea. I've been a victim of dog bites from small dogs, never a 'pit bull' breed. It is discriminatory.
- Education for children in schools on how to interact with dogs. Quit blaming the dog!
- Remove breed specific bylaws. Rather - make humans take training and obedience courses for owning a dog (like owning a cars).
- BSL does not work. Education, training and enforcement of our current bylaw (which is one of the best in Canada) would be much more effective!!!
- The idea of breed specific laws is terrifying and sad it has been shown elsewhere that it does nothing to change the number of attacks.
- Stop breed discriminations it's harmful and ridiculous
- Take your attempt at BSL and shove it.
- Please do not walk into the trap of BSL. It was a tragic mistake made in the East and resulted in many "pitbulls" being euthanized. Shameful



- Thank you
- There are no bad dogs only bad owners. BSL is outdated and has shown to make no difference.
- "Pitbull" bites are no more dangerous than any other dog of a comparable size. Research shows this to be true.
- "I do not support any type of legislation that is breed specific!
- It should be case by case. Dogs just like children act how they're taught"
- It would be inhuman to ask dogs to stop barking. People can be sensitive to low barking and call 311. Level of noise needs to be defined
- Pit bulls are not the issue. They should be put in classes if they need help learning. Also we should not restrict the amount of animals all
- The max number of dogs should be 3, except special circumstances. The max cats should be higher: 10 as they are not as noisy, less smell.
- Stop BSL!! I doesn't help anyone. Don't blame the breed..
- -
- Let's continue not singling out any breed, and offer more communication/education to the public about the folly of such.
- stop trying to limit peoples ability to own pitbulls. Higher punishments for bad dog owners by suspending their ability to care for dogs.
- Please don't assume all pit bulls are viscous. That is just not the case. Nor do they have stronger bite strength than other breeds.
- Don't judge a dog based on the way it looks or it's breed. Every single breed of dog can be aggressive or dangerous. Pit Bulls are not bad.
- The BSL is absolute garbage.Has never solved any issues and causes unnecessary stress pain and heartache to many responsible pet owners.
- "Bsl is ineffective and discriminatory.

- Responsible pet ownership should remain the focus."
- The proposed breed specific legislation in section 3 is appalling and will not work; focus on the irresponsible owners not the breed!
- With all these opposed to BSL stating how uneducated everyone else is, can we get programs in place to educate the public on what dogs are?
- I don't have any additional ideas at this time
- No
- There should be more requirements for owners regarding training if their pets are deemed problematic
- What does the city constitute as a "look alike pitbull?????" Also there just shouldn't be a ban
- not at this time
- D



- Breed specific bans are awful it should be based on dogs behaviours
- BSL doesn't make sense and I don't own a dog! This is the same as racism in animals. Bite force only comes into play IF the dog bites!!
- "It would be incredibly disappointing to see Calgary implement BSL.
- A unfair, uneducated punishment for many responsible pet owners"
- landlords should not be able to discriminate against pets of tenants and should have a maximum set for pet deposit or pet rent increase
- stop trying to push breed specific bylaws.
- License fees need to be drastically reduced, if not eliminated. A one time fee is necessary to register your animals. That is all.
- German Shepard's statistically bite the most often. GS can cause a fair amount of damage too. Should they be included in this discussion?
- BSL is discrimination in the same way that racism or sexism is. There are well behaved pitties and there are poorly behaved chihuahuas.
- NO dog should be discriminated by breed all dogs have potential to be loving friendly dogs or controlled by owners if not overly friendly.
- Good
- Pit bulls aren't aggressive by nature, it's highly dependent on the owner and how it's raised/environment, etc.
- Sliding scale for fines for multiple offenders (Animals and/or Owners)
- Stop discriminating against dog breeds...the issue should be about responsible owners.
- DONT. DISCRIMINATE. AGAINST. SPECIFIC. BREEDS.
- No
- No you pretty much covered everything on the agenda
- [personal information removed]
- instead of licensing the animal license the owner in thier ability to own, train and care for specific animals or breeds .. ie: bullybreeds
- No BSL! The local chihuahua has drawn blood but 3 pitbulls on the same street don't even growl. There are no bad dogs only bad owners.
- End BSL!
- I can't believe how discriminatory you are!
- German Shepherds and Rottweilers scientifically have stronger bite forces than "pitbulls". Why must "pitbulls" be singled out yet again?
- Stop discrimination against dog breeds
- I work in veterinarian medicine and the idea of BSL is absolutely archaic. ALL breeds of dogs have the potential to bite. Say no to BSL!!!
- no
- Stop discrimination against dog breeds. I've been attacked by more little dogs than pit bulls. Make the rules equal for all dogs! .



- In the violation portion of the survey you should have specified if it was on the dogs property or running at large
- Quit discriminating against "bully breeds"; case by case situations for dogs should be evaluated. I have been bitten by a chihuahua no pittys
- I suggest that pet owners be held responsible for their pets and not the pets themselves. An animals breed does not define its actions.
- When applying for a pet licence for the first time, not renewals, potential owner must first pass a responsible pet ownership course.
- No
- Stop discriminating against 'bully' breeds. Bad owners are the problem and always have been! I was bit by a Golden Retriever.
- Stop discriminating against bully breeds! What a pathetically archaic mentality. Very sad Calgary.
- It is ridiculous to discriminate against a breed for any reason. Accountability for ALL pet owners is needed
- "I think that if people volunteer to complete a responsible
- Pet ownership course they should receive a discounted licensing fee."
- Don't be breed specific. You look stupid and makes Calgary look awful
- Breed specific legislation is like racism for dogs. Shame on you calgary!
- There should be a streamlined option for neighbour to complain about excessively barking dogs, where system generates a letter to send owner
- Stop discriminating against bully breeds. You should be doing more to hold the owner accountable and stop blaming a breed.
- Someone specialized in bite work should be evaluating the dogs that bite. There are to many variables to generalize a dog bite
- quit trying to make large animals out to be bad animals. its always always smaller dogs that are more violent. the stats say this
- No
- Bsl is stupid. Any dog can be aggressive. Because of their bite force is not a good reason to target certain breeds
- No
- Every dog (well, owner) needs training, regardless of breed. BSL is rubbish.
- This has already been covered but 6! Dogs! and 6! Cats! I know of no one household that could provide excellent care for that many!
- I think the BLS law is [removed] as any dog can bit it is not always the dogs fault I've been bitten more times by Little dog
- "STOP BREED BULLYING!!!!
- This is disgusting that the city of Calgary is actually considering this. Do Better."
- Do not approve breed specific legislation. That's almost synonymous with racism. Do not stereotype them.



- NO TO BREED SPECIFIC BYLAWS
- NA
- Yes the government should be paying the people money for even considering making people pay a fine for a dog barking !This is all about cash
- If a dog shows aggressive behaviors then deal with that specific dog! Don't go after a specific breed!!!
- I am disappointed in Calgary city councils decision to make this city more exclusive yet again.
- All the times my dogs have been attacked, and there's been a few, it's small breed dogs. I've also been attacked by small breed dogs as well
- .
- Agree with some other comments, it's 2020 stop bullying and discriminating on looks of a dog.
- Stop breed bullying and allow people to own whatever type of dog they wish and all be treated fairly.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong. Don't punish breeds. Punish irresponsible owners. Dangerous dogs come in all shapes and sizes.
- If a dog has aggressive behaviours then go after that specific dog - didn't attack a specific breed
- In 2020 Ontario is looking to repeal their pit bull ban, it did not reduce the amount of dog bites, so BSL does not work. Education is key.
- Get off your breed specific high horse. Educate people about owning pets.
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION IN CALGARY!!!!
- No suggestions
- Stop blaming "pitbulls " or trying to make examples out of them. 99.9% of these dogs are very gentle loving big lap dogs.
- Stop singling out one type or breed of dogs!
- Toddlers in off leash parks is poor judgement. Dogs are chasing each other and may run into the kids. Not aggressive just having fun.
- Agression happens in EVERY breed. Stop trying to ban pit bulls! The more you restrict the more you will have people breaking the law.
- Stop demonizing pittbulls and concern yourself with non bias views instead of always saying pitbulls are the issue
- Breed specific legislation is wrong.
- Stop discriminating animals by their looks/breeds/etc . All pet owners should take pet care courses.
- No
- I think it's disgusting that you are choosing to focus on breed specific legislation. Shame on you. It's discriminatory.
- Lose the pit bull legislation. If your reasoning is their strength, then the list of dogs restricted would be MUCH longer.
- I can not believe that the city is thinking about bed specific legislation. Dog and dog owners need proper training and education.



- You should not be targeting pitbulls specifically. That is like saying stronger men should not be allowed to do certain things.
- It is the owners at fault when a dog is vicious not the breed. The city of Calgary calling the terrier breed a nuisance is a disgrace.
- "We cannot discriminate breeds. Period.
- Education on animal care and support to those unable to continue proper care needed"
- It's not a breed issue, it's an owner / training issue. NO to anything breed specific.
- Spay/neuter feral cats but instead of releasing them, have a program for feral cats to be mice catchers on farms. Feral cats kill many birds
- Specific Breeds are the problem, make owners take their nuisance animals to obedience classes as well as a fine.
- This is bullying pit bulls and pit bull owners. I am disgusted by the "breed ism"; in this bill. Shame on you calgary.
- This is no different then saying a certain race of people commit crimes...Just cause it is an animal doesn't mean it isn't discrimination...
- make much larger fines to people that exploit animals or train them to be violent. ban them from ever allowing them to own an animal again.
- No
- No breed discrimination is required. Deal with bites/attacks on a case by case basis.
- Amend reptile bylaws with input and guidance from knowledgeable and responsible groups, such as TARAS
- Any animal can be dangerous, Responsibility falls upon the owner to mitigate the behaviour. Public education is key to preventing bites.
- "Pit bull and pit bull type dogs"; Are NOT the problem. Please stop discriminating against these dogs and look at the other end of the leash!
- Breed specific legislation is ineffective and wrong
- Yes, breed-specific legislation is necessary. People who say otherwise are overlooking the statistics of severe bites.
- No I don't
- No
- Breed specific legislation is unhelpful. Aggressive dogs come in all shapes and sizes and are usually the product of poor training.
- I am completely disappointed and disgusted in Calgary for even thinking of a breed ban! Used to be a proud Calgarian this is just pathetic
- quit blaming certain dog breeds, that's actually being quite racist
- Breed-specific legislation is very wrong, people get bit by little yappy untrained unsocialized dogs than they do by "pit bull"; types
- BSL is NOT the answer. Doesn't matter the breed of the dog. If the owner doesn't train the dog properly, the dog can be dangerous.



- I've encountered more issues with untrained small breed dogs than anything else. The breed is not the issue, it's the owners.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Come on Calgary, we are better than that
- No ideas
- No
- Stop discriminating against breeds! Change the conversation/stigma
- Don't be closed minded!!! It's outrageous you think 'pitbulls and pitbull like dogs are more aggressive than a chihuahua! Muzzle those dogs!
- Need to deal with actual abrasive dogs. Not just dogs that look like they could be aggressive. There aren't bad dogs. Just bad dog owners.
- "All dogs no matter size or breed should be treated the same!
- Just like humans!!"
- Na
- "Breed specific legislation is wrong.
- All dogs should require obedience training. Two per person should be Max. Can we regulate kids too?!"
- "Pit bull and pit bull type dogs" Are NOT the problem. Please stop discriminating against these dogs, HUMANS ARE THE PROBLEM NOT DOGS .
- Breed Specific Laws are unjust and cruel. The breed is not the problem. Mishandling of the animal and humans are the issue
- I 100% DO NOT SUPPORT the City's ideas of breed specific legislation. This is absolutely unnecessary and completely unwarranted.
- There should be higher fees and regulations for backyard breeders. They should have to get inspected for being given a breeding license
- Something needs to change to enforce offleash dogs in public areas. Dogs should always be on a leash.
- Discriminating against certain breeds is wrong. All pets have the potential to cause issues without proper training and care.
- I don't believe in breed specific legislation. It's not the breed of dog it's bad owners and lack of training people.
- Please do not ban bully breeds. Any dog can be dangerous if not properly trained. Chihuahua's are more aggressive than most large dogs!
- Maybe focus on prevention and rehabilitation rather than punishment which we know is ineffective. Wasted tax dollars honestly
- Breed Specific Legislation is definitely not the answer.
- The city assumes citizens understand appropriate behaviour in animals, a large majority do not. Further education would go a long way.
- more education in school about pets and animals will allow other nationalities to appreciate pet ownership



- BSL doesn't work!!!!!! See Ontario for reference. Dog bites and attacks are still high even with BSL. Stricter fines for offenders...
- Dog Breed specific law enforcement is unfair and dated.
- BSL is wrong, not only does it support that certain breeds are more dangerous it plays a huge role in miss information on stereotyped dogs
- From experience my dog (pitbull mix) has been attacked by TWO small dogs just this year. Singling out one breed isn't the answer
- No
- The same person is writing you over and over again, pleading about not banning pit bulls. Ban that person!
- Dog breed specific bylaws create many more problems than they solve. Increase fines for backyard breeders and institute licensing fees
- N/a
- Pit bulls owners should not have to jump through extra hoops based solely on the breed of their dog. It should be based on behavior.
- Discriminating Pitbulls is appalling! Pits are extremely loving dogs! Did you know small dogs bit more often??? Humans are the problem!!
- No
- Breed specific laws are not fair to responsible owners. Put more responsibility on dog owners. It's proven BSL does not work.
- Breed specific legislation simply doesn't work. It doesn't reduce the number of dog bites - education and training does. Do better Calgary!
- All animals musy be spayed or neutered unless you buy a breeders license. There are too many backyard breeders NO BREED SPECIFIC LAWS!!!!!!
- The whole pitbull section is ridiculous. Shame on you. Will definitely and happily move away if this is the case.
- Your downtown core is VIAL!!!!
- Should allow farm duck, pheasants and other egg laying foul in Calgary. Have a limit and ensure they are kept proper.
- "noticed problems with bike users and dogs which always escalate when the biker stops and attacks the dog with bike
- Very bad decisi"
- AGAIN a responsible pet ownership course with a decent monetary amount in order to be able to own a bully breed dogs. owners are the problem
- Bad care = bad animals. There needs to be a program for people to be able to report owners that are causing the issue.
- NEUTER your bully. It causes conflict between dogs. Unfortunately you're dogs a good fighter...
- No breed specific legislation. Training is key.



- I do not support DBS bylaws. Please focus on the specific nuisance animals and irresponsible owners.
- I think it is wrong to have breed-specific legislation. I think your questions regarding pit bulls are uncalled for and continue stigma
- BSL has been shown to have no effect why is Calgary even considering such ridiculous rules?
- I do not support breed specific legislation, it is cruel and unnecessary. The breed is not the problem, people are.
- N/A
- Breed-specific legislation is NOT the answer! Stop discriminating.
- none
- The owners of nuisance dogs should be required to complete extensive dog training. It's the owner's fault, not the dog's.
- I DO NOT Support Breed Specific Legislation!! Completely Unnecessary.
- No BSL please. My dogs face resembles a pitbull and she's not. She's a mixed breed. But she would be condemned by this bylaw
- I think it's sick that you're actively pursuing breed specific legislation. I'm disgusted and embarrassed to be a calgaryian right now. Stop
- No
- You shouldn't make your decision on a specific breed. I own a pitty and she is the most gentle soul I have ever owned. Don't judge a breed.
- N/a
- N/A
- Restricted owners list for those who have multiple infractions and continue to put animals safety at risk
- Punish irresponsible pet owners, not any specific breeds. Pit bulls are wonderful dogs and when raised right no dog or breed is dangerous.
- Discrimination against pitbull's, Rottweilers, Dobermans and any protective breed is based solely on fear! They are most loving of all
- NO to BSL yes to responsible pet ownership. Cannot paint every pit bull type dog with the same brush!
- There is a huge difference between a "nuisance" animal being a barker and a biter. Questions should be much more specific in regards to that
- Breed specific laws are ridiculous, and the city should not support them.
- Nice to see you don't have better things to focus on, say like a pandemic? Instead, you are choosing to look at a by-law that doesn't work
- DO NOT BAN PITBULLS. IT IS BECAUSE OF THE OWNERS, NOT THE DOG BREED. DON'T DO [removed] HERE LIKE ONTARIO.
- Your outright discrimination to pitbulls is disgusting



- More patrolling and fines for people walking their dogs off leash in on leash areas. It poses a huge risk to safety of other dogs and people
- Punish behaviours, not the dog breed. All dogs should be mandated to attend obedience training.
- No BSL
- The pit bull ban is such an unnecessary program to flirt with. If ANY breed shows aggression, make training mandatory with the fine. (1/2)
- No idea
- I'm so disappointed that Calgary is even talking about BSL. SHAME ON YOU. I thought we were a progressive city - guess not.
- I am so disappointed in the extremely ignorant suggestion for BSL. my brother was bit golden retriever proof all dogs can be aggressive
- Do not want to have breed specific legislation in Calgary. Deal with nuisance dogs on a case by case basis
- Breed-specific laws were implemented in the 90s in the US they all have been reversed because they don't work. Do some research!
- Targeting a specific breed is unacceptable! Focus needs to put on bad pet owner's!
- No BSL....only bad owners.
- Additional animal behavioural training for bylaw officers, so they understand reactivity vs. aggression.
- I am glad the Calgary has so few problems we can spend the time and resources to limit dog ownership, or cat ownership, or chicken ownership
- I'm disheartened to hear that the city of Calgary would discriminate against certain dog breeds.
- Please stop focusing on BSL This has been consistently disproven and by highlighting this, you are perpetuating an incorrect stereotype.
- People that want to own any dog breed that is deemed 'dangerous' should have to go thru a rigorous application process to determine suitability
- Focusing on one breed is the problem. The problem is irresponsible owners. Get your acts together. Montreal even ditched this bylaw!!
- Singling out pitbulls is breed discrimination. There are other breeds that are known for attacks. If you're getting a dog, educate yourself!
- Treat all pets equally. German shepherds are actually more unpredictable than a pit bull but you don't seem to have specific laws for them!
- I think it's wrong you guys are trying to target a specific "breed" of dog. Look at the problem dog not a breed. That's as bad as racism.
- I'm extremely concerned about proposed restrictions on "pit bull" type dogs. Data shows BSL does not reduce occurrence of severe dog bites.
- I just really don't support the Pitbull [removed].
- I don't support breed specific legislation in any form. Please don't forget there are no bad dogs, just bad owners. Fine them.



- Instead of punishing the owners and the breed, consider investing in education for pet owners. Breed specific legislation is wrong.
- No
- No BSL. Bad dogs are a reflection of bad ownership, there is no such thing as bad breeds. Muzzles only make people more afraid of bullies.
- Banning or discriminating against a dog because of its breed is ridiculous. Dangerous actions need to be dealt with. BSL does not work.
- discrimination against breeds does not solve the problem of dog aggression and bites. Owner education and responsibility, and dog training do.
- You should be ashamed trying to take away people's beloved fur babies you make me sick and you all should be locked up not the fur babies
- You want to stop racism yet your willing to regulate breeds. Is that not the same just cause they are dogs it's no different
- It's unethical to have breed-specific legislation. Focus on responsible pet ownership, education and training.
- No BSL, a dog's temperament cannot and should not be judged by its breed. Stronger consequences for vicious dogs like mandatory training
- Feces removal programs should be provided by the city at a reduced rate (similar to current trash/composts/recyclables programs)
- No
- Owners are the problem not pit bulls.
- A law prohibiting feed breed to local ducks and geese as it makes them very sick
- Breed Specific Legislation is completely unnecessary and discriminatory. Nuisance dogs should be dealt with on an individual basis.
- Calgary has long been looked at as a positive example of a city who does not use BSL yet has effective dog policies - don't change that.
- No BSL please. Both of my dogs heads resemble a Pitbull, but neither of them are. They are mixed breeds, both rescues, and both so gentle.
- Please don't bring in rules singling out pitbulls or other specific breeds. It's analogous to racism. Instead, focus on individual dogs.
- BSL is heartbreaking to those whose pet is a model citizen, which is most of them. Instead use money to shut down puppy mills, etc.
- More education for people, Usually bad dogs are the result of bad owners. Pitbulls have gotten a bad rap over just this situation
- Nothing at this time
- I do not support breed specific legislation. The breed is not the problem, people are.
- All pet owners should be held responsible for their pets... Dog owners should have obedience training and have each dog they own trained.
- I do not support breed specific bylaws. All breeds and sizes can be aggressive and reactive. Owners fault



- BSL is disgusting, and would cause undue trauma to many innocent animals.
- No
- "Disgusting that you are considering BREED specific legislation!
- Owner legislations and fines ONLY!"
- N/a
- I think it's ridiculous that you're thinking of making specific laws for pitbulls. I own one and he's the sweetest and most gentle dog.
- Do not enact BSL in Calgary.
- .
- If the owner allows the dog to bark excessively they should be given 3 chances to correct the situation. If not, look into the dogs safety
- Breed specific legislation (even using the excuse of bite strength) is not okay. Make it harder for bad owners to own dogs.
- NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION!
- Do not go through with BSL! One specific breed is not the cause - it will always be the owner! Don't hurt the poor dogs due to bad ownership
- Assuming that a dog is dangerous just because of the way it looks is ridiculous. The owner of a dog, regardless of the breed is the Issue.
- Regardless of breed, if a dog injures another dog and/or human, the offending dog's owner should have to pay all expenses faced by victim.
- Need better enforcement on picking up after your pet and disposal, to many pet owner think bagging is enough. Bag it and dispose of it.
- NO BSL!! It has been proven to be COMPLETELY ineffective in dealing with nuisance dogs. It will flood rescues and cause animals to suffer!
- Breed specific Legislation is a step backwards It isn't helpful , putting responsibility back on the owners is.
- BSL has been proven time and time again it does NOT work. Is there not a better use of time and budget to be discussing?
- I think it is unfair to single out certain breeds of dogs. If you are going to muzzle a dog it should be only dogs with a history of biting.
- No breed specific legislation. Terrible that some dog owners might have to chose between keeping only one of their "pitbull” dogs!
- People who don't like animals shouldn't antagonize dogs, for dog to chase or bite them.Owner who train the dog to be mean, need 2 be charged
- PLEASE do not enforce BSL. This punishes all the responsible pet owners.
- Continue to be an example to other jurisdictions with fair, science based bylaws that do NOT target specific breeds, but keeps owners accoun
- The breed specific inclusions to the bylaws ("pit bull specific) is rediculous. Stop vilifying breeds.
- No



- No
- Many breeds have powerful jaws. Many breeds are more likely to bite. After many years as a trainer I am far more cautious around shepherds
- Breed specific laws fail to focus on the core issue of dangerous pets; dangerous owners. Owners need to be held accountable for "bad breeds";
- No more paying to register your dog or cat.
- We should be educating people on dog behaviour and teaching people not to approach strangers' pets without permission.
- I don't support breed specific legislation in any form. Please don't forget there are no bad dogs, just bad owners. Fine and train the owner
- No further comment
- there needs to be more behavior classes available for dogs, young and older!
- Breed specific legislation never worked, it should not still be coming up. Any dog can bite. Pit bull breeds are people pleasers.
- I want 6 mini goats for naked goat yoga.
- Breed-specific legislation is a lazy and inappropriate way to handle nuisance animals. What a waste of time and money to even think about it
- The owners of any animal is responsible for the aggressive behaviour and should not be permitted to keep or have a dog.
- Special classes for owners who have nuisance animals after two or three incidents; mandatory obedience classes and check ups afterwards.
- The breed you lump together as pit bull is not the problem. Any dog can be vicious. The problem is the owners, not the animal.
- Why are we limiting these bylaws to just pit bulls. I had an encounter with Dobermans that was extremely scary. Not pitbulls.
- Breed specific legislation is going to create more issues than solve. ALL dogs have the ability of being aggressive IF NOT TRAINED PROPERLY
- A vicious dog is a vicious dog, small or large. Small purse and lap dogs tend to be more aggressive in public areas
- Do not enact BSL. It's archaic thinking. There are bad owners not breeds.
- You can't judge a person by the color of their skin, don't judge a dog by the shape of its head or body.
- Don't punish bully breeds!
- the focus on pitbulls and those who resemble a pitbull is absolutely absurd. EVERY DOG has the ability to bite/attack.
- BSL is terrible, I do not support it at all.
- BSL is a bad idea. Many pitbulls are peaceful dogs and do no harm to anyone. In dog stress tests they scored second to labrador retrievers.
- Dog walkers should not be allowed to walk more than 3 dogs



- Alienating a specific breed, such as pitbulls, is a form of racism against animal breeds. It should be owner specific.
- BSL is antiquated and should NEVER be considered. Pitbulls are not more dangerous than any other. Proper training is key for all dogs!
- Breed Specific Legislation is NOT THE ANSWER. Deal with nuisance dogs case by case. Do not punish an entire breed! Bully lives matter too.
- Do not put in BSL! It's not fair to punish everyone for the sins of a few! Most pit bulls are lovely dogs!
- no
- Higher Fines for Constant BARKING dogs.
- None
- No
- A dog has the mental capacity of a toddler. Dogs are a product of their environment same as a child. Good home = good dog. Breedism=racism
- Breed specific legislation is archaic. Focus on the owner not the breed!!
- One free "finder's fee" for animals at large (obviously meant for the accidently occurrences) if your animal is licenced.
- Its not usually the "bad dog”, it's more often a "bad dog owner”,. Some people just aren't meant to have dogs or cats.
- BSL is a load of BS. You are punishing a lot of people and dogs that have never ever showed aggressive behavior to anything not even a fly
- The 6 limit is completely erroneous and unnecessary. The Humane Society already employs a team Peace Officers to deal with cases of neglect.
- Bylaw needs more enforcement of not cleaning up after animals and dogs off-leash in areas like Griffith woods.
- Breed specific legislation Makes the city look uneducated. I've been bitten by 2 dogs, a German shepherd and a springer spaniel. Not a pit!
- i do not support breed discrimination. I do support that every dog no matter the breed is trained well.
- Round the world BSL has been shown NOT to work. Why are you resorting to this?
- I am appalled by the breed specific angle - including if a dog "looks like a pit bull”,. Go after the bad owners, not the dogs...
- Bull breeds are no more a danger than other breeds
- Breed Specific legislation is plain wrong. Met way more nice pit bulls working in vet clinics than nice shitzus or chihuahuas.
- Breed Specific Legislation is absolutely absurd. Smaller dogs are more likely to bite someone and the only difference is its not reported.
- I don't support breed restrictions of any kind. They can be required training.
- When you go to license your dog, the person should have to provide a copy of the dogs obedience training certificate. Make it mandatory.



- QUIT BLAMING THE DOG/BREED!!!!!! START BLAMING THE OWNERS FOR NOT PROPERLY TRAINING THEIR ANIMALS!!!!!! I support pit bulls 100%
- Education is key! Funds designated for training people with 'Nuisance' dogs so they can get help. Often not the animal but poor knowledge
- Stop breed specific legislation.
- specific breeds are not the problem, bad (or uneducated) owners are. DO NOT put restrictions on certain breeds, put them on the problem dogs
- I do not support breed specific legislation. Training and education is key, not fear.
- Behavior is learnt it's not a breed of dog it's an owner teaching his dog to be aggressive stop discrimination against dog breeds
- Number of chickens, or any animal, subject to the yard area available. Townhouses are not good place to have multiple animals
- Breed specific legislation is terrible. It's irresponsible owners that make bad dogs. Not breeds.
- Breed specific legislation does not do anything to help prevent dog bite attacks. It is all about responsible training and ownership.
- When you where in class, did you enjoy when the teacher gave EVERY one a punishment because two kids wouldn't shut up? Leave breeds alone.
- No
- Yes to BSL, unless you can enforce mandatory dog and owner training.
- I'm disappointed to see my city talking about pit bulls this way. Pit bulls are sweet and loving and should not be seen as dangerous.
- Being allowed 6 dogs or cats is ridiculous. I
- no
- Why are bully breeds singled out? There are so many other breeds with higher bite problems.
- No
- No ideas
- I don't support breed specific legislation in any form. there are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Don't ban breeds! It's not a breed that causes the problem it's lack of training or teaching on the owners' part.
- It is absolutely disgusting that you have decided to try to discriminate against bully breeds. Shame on you
- Singling out a specific dog breed will not solve anything. Very disappointed that this is something Calgary has even brought to the table
- We need to educate the humans on proper training and care for our dogs. Why are the pit bulls alone getting dragged down for human incompetence
- Focusing on 1 breed is the problem, it's irresponsible owners. Not much different than a vehicle owner, it's fine until the owner drives it.
- I take great offense to breed specific inclusions. Any dog can be an issue and I found this discriminatory ideology in the survey offensive.



- I think you should spent your time in more important matters, like how to give more support to low income families or the homeless.
- Do not make anything breed specific. Small dogs bite more often than large dogs and can cause bad infections. Force owners of badly behaved
- I like to say that I am REALLY against BSL.It states right in this survey that Pit Bulls are not responsible for Increased incidences.
- Education for poor owners and the general public on what is acceptable behavior around dogs, not discriminate against certain breeds
- People need to be educated and informed. Stop stereotyping and labeling pitbulls as an aggressive breed.
- ANY dog with aggression or bite history should be a nuisance dog, bully breeds should NOT be grouped into this category. BSL is [removed].
- Do not discriminate on breed.
- Having more areas where dogs are allowed on leash in public spaces. Having more patios open to allow dogs, and allowing fresh water for them
- More support to train pets. Some people don't have the means and all pets deserve a chance. This will prevent high shelter numbers.
- BSL is a disgusting way to treat pet by-laws. Don't punish the animals. They deserve time at the park, walks without muzzles, and respect.
- Bad owners should not be reflected on animal breeds. Fees and access is high for a city that doesnt maintain off leash parks well.
- I believe in Education. Have programs in schools, teach kids from a young age appropriate animal care and ownership. Then we will see change
- I do not support breed specific legislation; has been shown in other jurisdictions to not be effective and is not fair.
- I do not support breed specific legislation.
- Spend more time on real important issues, there should be a one time license fee for the life of the animal and more fines for abusers.
- No breed legislation
- Stop focusing on the breeds and focus on the owners; you've clearly stated these breeds aren't responsible for more dog bites than others.
- "Please make training mandatory for all dog owners.
- We owe it to all breeds of dogs to give them a fair chance to function in our society"
- Don't have any
- Stop targeting pit bulls and larger breeds. Parents need to educate their children about approaching dogs.
- Fine and train owners!!!
- Breed specific legislation of any form is a thing of the past, this shouldn't even be an area of concern for the city of Calgary



- No
- Pit bulls should not be deemed nuisance dogs because of their breed. I am so disappointed Calgary. BSL is NOT the answer.
- Breed specific legislation is absolutely wrong! I've had worse times with small 'family' dogs than any pitbul or bully breed. Redneck much
- The proposed rules around pit bulls are ridiculous and not science-based.
- People should be educated on not approaching anyone else's pet in a public setting, unless there is expressed permission.
- Require attendance of a class on cat/dog behavior, basic obedience and practical pet ownership within 6-12 months of acquiring pet!
- No
- Why are we singling out pitbulls? There are other dogs who are just as dangerous, if not more. No BSL. Target the [removed] owners, not the dog
- I don't think it's fair to single out pitbulls and Staffys as it's not the dog who is aggressive but the owner who doesn't teach them
- Pit bull breeds don't deserve to be treated differently because they are strong owners should be responsible for training them and withholding.
- "Stop discriminating animals by their looks/breeds/etc . All pet owners should be responsible equally. BSL IS NOT THE ANSWER!!
- The rules should be the same for all dogs regardless of breed. Harsh penalties for nuisance owners should be enforced regardless of dogbreed
- Hello.
- By-Laws targeting Specific Breeds is prejudicial. It's punishing an animal for what the owner has trained it (or not trained it) to do.
- Breed specific legislation does nothing to reduce animal attacks/bites. Studies have been done in various cities across Canada.
- DO NOT put in breed specific laws about pitbulls! They do not work. The dog isn't the problem poor ownership is
- Allow for bee keeping
- Cats should have the same enforcement laws as dogs. These laws should be enforced.
- No
- I do not support any breed specific legislations in any form. Educate and assess the owners, don't just fine them.
- Breed specific legislation is not ok. An entire breed should not be considered a nuisance. I do not support this at all. Bully lives matter!
- I've witnessed 2 severe dog bites, neither was a pitbull. Breed specific bans don't eliminate severe bites. Stop vilifying breeds
- Calgary should not implement a breed specific legislation. Training should be mandatory for dog owners. Poor dog control is the issue.



- License discounts for pets that have Trupanion.
- Save the bully breeds. They don't need to be museled, they're just like any other breed of dogs.
- Breed specific bylaws are not acceptable. Education, obedience classes, and dealing with specific problem dogs are far more effective.
- I don't support Breed Specific Legislation as I don't think it achieves it's intended purpose.
- I do not support BSL as data suggests it does not make a significant difference to protecting society from aggressive dogs.
- There should not be legislation that is Breed Specific. All instances should be dealt with on a case by case scenario.
- Bylaw for cats running a large. Cats must remain on your property at all times unless they are on a harness walking with a person
- Put more emphasis on the owners of the animals that present a danger. Huge fines for those involved with dog fighting and stealing dogs.
- There should not be BSL in this city! Any and all laws should apply to all breeds. All breeds should have proper training!
- Stay away from the pit bulls that are not the only dog in the world that can be bad
- BSL is wrong. Treat things on a case by case. If ANY DOG of ANY breed proves to be untrustworthy, then enforce more restrictions on that dog
- The pit bull thing makes about as much sense as keeping black people in shackles because they are black. Give your heads a shake.
- The idea that any "blockheaded" dog may be punished by looks alone is sheer ignorance. Breed discrimination does not solve problems!
- Pit bulls are one of the nicest dogs. Having that bylaw is frankly stupid. And it's being racist.
- I think it's BS that the city is singling out 'pit bull' type dogs. We have an English staffy and she is the friendliest dog. Ban Chihuahuas
- Owners of any dog deemed a nuisance, regardless of the breed, should be held accountable. I do not support BSL. Shame on you City of Calgary
- Offleash dogs in non offleash areas needs attention. Both my dogs were attacked by off leash dogs. Leash should be required in all public
- Breed Specific Legislation is a very slippery slope, and I'm outraged at the blatant bias City of Calgary has displayed in this survey.
- It is cruel to judge an animal based on breed. No breed is inherently aggressive. Bring attention to rehabilitation training not euthanasia.
- The singling out of pit bulls is breed specific bullying. All dogs can bite. Obedience training should be mandatory for all dog owners.
- Fence and separate all off leash areas. Otherwise it guarantees injuries/user conflicts. NO ONE can 100% guarantee dog behaviour. Lawsuits!
- No
- Keep BSL out of the conversation. Discrimination against a certain breed does nothing to ensure responsible pet ownership.



- BSL is a step backwards in time. It is discriminatory against dogs and owners, and does not address irresponsible pet ownership and abuse.
- Please don't make it harder on the good owners/pittys just because of the breed. And make it more about irresponsible owners/handling.
- Punish the deed, not the breed. Breed Specific Legislation is archaic and ridiculous.
- Many other breeds have higher bite strength than pits. This is breed discrimination. A dog's threat is determined by how/if they're trained.
- BSL is the worst idea! The dog is not the issue, the owner is. If the owner can not control their animal then they shouldn't be able to own.
- No
- veterinarians could handle licensing but pet stores being able to do that would create too much accessibility and not enough accountability.
- The problem with pets is always in the owner. Pet owners should have to pass testing and licensing in order to own pets.
- Waiving of pet license fee for low income is not a good idea, will encourage multiple animals in house, which can't afford medical care.
- Banning breeds won't solve the problem. Rather, require owners of nuisance dogs to take extra training, subsidized if needed.
- The city needs to focus on dogs/cats and owners that cause issues without focusing on one specific breed. #PitBullLivesMatter.
- Remove unfair pit bull rule and start putting stricter rules around breeders and adoption qualification.
- Pit bulls should absolutely, 100%, never be treated differently than any other large breed dog. It is unfair and is discrimination.
- BSL is not the answer!! Holding owners of all breeds and sizes to the same standard of pet ownership is!! A bite is a bite, full stop.
- There needs to be consequences for people who instigate problems with pets. I believe it is most often NOT the animals fault.
- Provide access to affordable dog training. I.e. special dog area in a library with access to YouTube dog training videos.
- I do not support penalizing pit bulls and their owners, or any other specific breed. All pets should be treated equal, just like people.
- Pit bulls/Bully breeds should not be penalized for their size/the way they look. Usually these dogs are gentle and loving, no extra measures
- Require "service dogs" or "emotional support dogs" owners to provide CERTIFICATION from accredited organizations, not a vest from Amazon.
- Attempting to pass Pitbull focused changes is horrendous. Have you SEEN a dogs way home!? It is fiction yes, but with so much truth to it
- breed specific legislation creates false fears in people, and false sense of security around "safe" breeds that cause just as much harm.
- No breed restrictions



- I'm concerned with the idea of lowering licensing fees for low income. If they can't afford the fee how can they afford food or vet bills?
- More education for dog owners and no breed restrictions
- I've seen more attacks from dash hounds and Chihuahuas. This fear of pitbulls and other listed breeds is absurd.
- I do not support breed specific legislation.
- stop focusing on specific breeds, there are no bad dogs, only poor owners. Lifetime license would be great for dogs and cats.
- I think if a pet has been Micro chipped that they don't also need to be licensed. I feel these are the same thing.
- Banning specific breeds will not solve any of the issues addressed in the proposed bylaws. It is the owner who is responsible for their pet.
- Giving bylaw officers the ability to use judgement when handing out fines and requiring a greater burden of proof on complainant.
- I am so disappointed to see YYC even investigating the implementation of BSL. Please, continue to set the example and stay breed neutral!
- You'd think in this day in age we would understand that going after one type of breed is discrimination! Making a bylaw on looks, c'mon now.
- An owner of a dog who is deemed a nuisance, REGARDLESS OF THE BREED, should be held responsible. Do not punish an entire breed. NO TO BSL!
- Breed specific laws are archaic and unfair to the animals. If the dog is well trained and behaved breed is irrelevant.
- Noise, the hours people can visit green belts, school fields, playgrounds restricted to , 9 am to 9 pm. To reduce noises for those near by.
- New owners REQUIRE dog training. Certificate from certified trainer precludes future need for training.
- More about breed specific bans - pit bulls specifically. They weren't addressed in phase 2
- "Train pet/cmpn/lvestck owners (part of licence rqrmt)
- Licence presence in off-leash parks
- Ad-Train public on dog approach etiquette"
- If you need a special colour bandanna to warn others about your dog, it shouldn't be off leash in a public area. Good idea for onleash dogs.
- I am guessing the people making this up do not own or know any of the bully breeds personally. I bet they only know what they see on TV. sad
- Breed specific legislation is not helpful to the community. Stop lumping all pit bull type dogs into nuisance bylaw.
- City should provide free health care to all the pets of low income Calgarians , if they wish to wave the license fee for low income homes
- Pit bulls are not the issue, it's the owners and the way that dogs are raised. All dog breeds can be aggressive if not trained properly!



- Don't agree with Breed Specific legislation. Why does the dog have to pay for the owners lack of education on training.
- Bylaws are in place to protect pets, owners and the community, this isn't offering any reasonable protection for our responsible dog owners.
- Get outta here with the breed specific bylaws. My small dog is more of an [removed] than any pitbull we have encountered at the dog park!
- It is ridiculous that a dog should be judged on appearance or breed. Proven aggressive behavior is the only reason to ban a particular dog.
- This is misinformed, ignorant and bolsters a stereotype that instills misplaced judgement and fear towards bully breeds; educate yourselves.
- Give free training then you can make sure the dogs are trained and the owner is responsible.
- Breed Specific Legislation is wrong and should not be considered here at all
- I'm not on board with the Pitbull Muzzling and banning. Golden Retrievers bite more than Pits, but you don't see anything about that.
- Do not believe in bred discrimination... small dogs bit more often.
- I think all dog bites should be reported no matter how insignificant. Then people will see that small dogs actually bite a lot more often.
- Bylaws protect pets, owners and the community. BSL offers no reasonable protection for responsible pet owners and well-behaved bullies.
- I think it's insane that we're considering an anti-science thing like restricting certain breeds. Dog behavior is moulded by the owner.
- Breed specific muzzling penalizes the good apples!
- No breed specific legislation. Period.
- Irresponsible pet ownership should be addressed, without punishing the "look" of a dog. I do not support breed specific legislation.
- Breed specific legislation is unscientific. Instead, focus energy on increased support for owners, access to training, etc.
- Breed Specific Legislation is unreasonable and not supported by science . Golden retrievers have the most reported incidents of biting.
- There should be NO discrimination against pit bull breeds. Specifically when you note that the research shows they are not dangerous.
- Barking collars
- Do not discriminate Pitbulls!
- "No BSL
- One time license fee for spayed/neutered pets
- educational programs on responsible pet ownership.
- Do not punish responsible owners"
- Barking laws noise bylaws for small dogs ! Fines for them



- Punish the owners and not the animals. Pit bulls are not bad dogs. Muzzles for them is a terrible approach to this issue
- Barking continuously. Needs to be addressed better. If barking more than a half hour or even 15 minutes is unacceptable.
- no comments
- BSL does not create a "safer" community. If dog training is mandatory make it mandatory for all breeds. Owner accountability for all dogs.
- Problem pets are the result of problem owners, not breeds. As traffic violators can go for retraining, so should problem owners!
- Singling out a specific breed of dog is wrong. Not every pit bull is a vicious animal, more concerned about the skittish purse dog
- Fines for roaming cats should be far higher to deter owners from ever setting them out, since so many of them suffer a horrible fate.
- Breed specific legislation is BULL! The same people are going to be making other large breeds into what they've made bully breeds into!
- End BSL all dogs should be treated the same otherwise it's just breedism....and we're better than that!
- I think saying the whole "pit bull" thing is not right. It is all how the dog is trained and treated. I grow up with a rottie.
- BSL unfairly targets a large amount of dogs and leaves many owners of "less intimidating" dogs unaccountable. IT HAS NO PLACE IN YYC.
- I'm ashamed in the city of Calgary for considering BSL. The bias against pitbulls in this survey was sickening
- BSL does not create responsible pet owners... Punish the guilty! If obedience training becomes required for pits, YYC should pay for it.
- The Pitbull issue should not be raised. All dogs can cause damage, some more severe than "pitbulls" All breeds should be treated the same
- Breed Specific legislation has not been successful in decreasing nuisance animals. Education of ownership and training is far more important
- I do not believe that BSL is appropriate or fair. See Temperament tests <https://www.pitbullinfo.org/pit-bulls-temperament.html>
- Don't single out bully breeds. There are more vicious Pomeranians than there are potties. It's disappointing that the city is doing this
- No
- We need more protection of pets from predators because Calgary is overrun by coyotes and they're killing pets in the hundreds per year.
- No
- [removed] Get educated and stop wasting our tax \$! No to BSL!!!!
- Stop the BSL. "Pitbull" type dogs should not be included on this list. Judge an individual dog not an entire breed.



- breed restrictions is not fair. Having responsible owners is far more important.
- Breed Specific Legislation is unreasonable and not supported by science . Golden retrievers have the most reported incidents of biting.
- Breed specific laws are archaic and should not be put into place. Any breed of dog can have a bad owner.
- A bad dog is a bad dog. The breed is irrelevant.
- Breed restrictions are ridiculous and should never be tabled in legislation discussions.
- higher fees/restrictions on dogs just because of breed is wrong on so many levels. Have mandatory behavior training for all pet owners
- Fines should increase each time an incident occurs. Ie if a dog bites someone, then the \$350 fine. But 2nd offence should be much higher
- Breed Specific Legislation is unreasonable and not supported by science . Golden retrievers and labs have the most reported incidents of biting.
- Xx
- 12 barking dogs live at the house by our mailbox - I've heard from neighbours they were reported. How are they still there?
- Please stop with the Breed Specific bias, it's so outdated and so untrue. It makes you look incompetent and uneducated. Focus on bad Owners
- I am extremely concerned about the new view of BLS against Pit bulls that Calgary is adopting what about the responsible pet owners???
- Don't be racist towards pit bulls.
- No idea
- I feel that imposing ownership restrictions makes more sense than BSL. If an owner has one "problem" dog they will likely have more.
- no
- Mandatory Obedience for Nuisance Dogs. Create More opportunity for Training programs for pets. Lower Costs of Training program.
- It makes me upset to see YYC even considering BSL. That is absolute garbage. ANY dog can be a "nuisance dog";. BSL is absolutely archaic.
- Breed restrictions is absolutely ridiculous and appalling.
- No Specific Breed Restrictions!
- "Why aren't we making training and education more accessible
- For pet owners? People are the first issue."
- Instead of bandanas, we should teach kids and adults alike to not approach a animal without the consent of the owner.
- breed-specific laws are backward thinking! All dogs have the ability to be a nuisance and cause issues, educate pet owners of all breeds!!
- Stop going after "pitbulls" this day and age you should be more educated. This shouldnt even be a discussion! I'm disappointed for sure!



- Breed specific legislation is proven to be ineffective, inaccurate and does more harm than good.
- No breed restrictions. Pets, like people, are individuals and should be judged case-by-case, not a blanket law.
- City of Calgary give your head a shake ! You can't be serious with this survey? Do some research first maybe? [removed]
- Mandatory chipping for all pets and animals for sale/sold/given away/inherited. Mandatory spay/neuter for all animals brought in by AC.
- Breed specific legislation is ridiculous. Dogs are NEVER the problem, the people who raise and train them are.
- Pitbulls cannot be treated differently. Any larger dog can be a huge threat when not properly trained.
- Stop targeting pitbull breeds, their bite is not stronger.
- "Breed Specific Legislation is wrong and should not be considered here at all"
- "No BSL
- free education on responsible pet ownership
- Do not punish owners/pets that have not broken any bylaws
- Any breed can misbehave"
- Feral cats should be capture and euthanized to protect wild birds. What is you plan to control rabbits
- Pit bulls don't deserve to be treated differently than any other dog breed. Please don't support discrimination.
- Need more signage to remind people to pick up after their pets. Also more garbage bins in public areas
- Make obedience training mandatory for all dogs. Increase fines for repeat offenders who do not pick up dog waste. Include URINE as waste
- Address owners who allow dogs to Bathroom on lawns!!!! People who have nice, weed free lawns do not deserve to have dogs ruin their lawn
- X
- BSL is not the answer, there are many provinces pulling theirs for this very reason.
- Breeds are not dangerous, owners are. Do not restrict breeds.
- I do not agree that Pit Bulls are a problem. The owners are the problem. I do not agree that singling out one specific breed is the answer
- in homes with multiple dogs, only allow 1 stronger breed. i.e not 3 pits, or rottie or shepards UNLESS the can provide training and exercis
- Would like a bylaw that would have heftier fines or removal of pet(s) after numerous neighbour complaints about noise/nuisance.
- This isn't a breed specific issue. This is an ownership issue. Never see small dogs who are aggressive get this.
- Breed Specific bylaws are just wrong, its not the breed, it is the owner! Do not single out bully breeds!



- While it is good to seek public input and ideas, final legislation should be drafted by experts in the field, (animal behaviourists, vets)
- A specialized crew of employees that can come and address an off leash dog asap, When bylaw is Called currently they take days to do anythin
- Do not create breed specific legislation.
- Before considering BSL, show me evidence that BSL actually works. Plenty of places have implemented it, is there *any* long term benefit?
- Mandating a dog-owner training program for any dog over 50 pounds would be a much more effective way of limiting aggression in larger dogs.
- "Dog training FOR HUMANS.
- more RIGHTS for animals! This seems to be a lot pf bylaws against animals instead of for them."
- Breed specific bylaws won't change 98% of the attacks that happen. Obedience Training should be mandatory for all dogs/owners
- I implore you to remove breed specific legislation from these amendments. It's biased, unfair and ineffective. Handle issues by the case.
- Breed specific (or type specific) laws are bad laws. There are breeds that can do far more damage than any of the breeds/types mentioned.
- I'm absolutely disgusted with [personal invormation removed] for even considering BSL. Imagine if we were this intolerant towards ethnicity
- Breed specific legislation is unfair to well trained animals and responsible dog owners. It is unnecessary.
- Utilize feral cats by renting out to business willing to feed and shelter during winter months, the rent is paid via spay/neutering
- Breed specific legislation is utterly ineffective. People who are bad dog owners are bad owners period.
- I think an obedience training certificate (with a passing grade) should be mandatory for dog owners.
- A survey asking what you "would or would not support" but only provides check boxes on what you would support. Inherent question bias.
- "Judging an entire breed of dogs is equivalent to racism. Stop BSL!
- Blame the owner/upbringing, not the dog!"
- Stop doing breed specific legislation. It doesn't help. Stop being such [removed]. Small dogs bite kids all the time. Absolutely ridiculous.
- There should be no breed restrictions - pit bulls and other pit bull "like” breeds are no greater safety risk than other breeds.
- I think the pit bull bylaw is complete bull. If anything bordie collie dogs and even sometimes chiwuawa dogs should be looked at.
- Not singling out a specific breed due to a bias Many large dogs are capable of inflicting very strong bite such as Shepards but not included
- None



- Should not be based on breed but instead by incident. Instead of fines an option for training would be helpful
- I don't support breed discrimination.
- No
- BSL just reinforces negative stereotypes around bully breeds, more education needs to be provided, and readily available to ALL pet owners
- Please do not implement BSL. The onus should be on the human owner, not on the dog. Survey says 'pit bulls' are not more likely to bite.
- Voluntary 'traffic light' bandannas - the onus should be on parents to TEACH their children how to approach an animal and to ASK the owner!
- Bylaw is about responsible pet ownership? Concentrate on the owners not the animals. Bad owners cause bad animals so fix the owners.
- Not especially, Im not for specifically targeting specific breeds of dogs. I'd rather we target poor behavior.
- Maybe ask the pitbull dog ownership directly instead of asking individuals who have had no to little experience with the dog.
- All dogs need to be considered the same , not one breed more than another. Training is a result of a poorly behaved dog- not their breed .
- Start training people and not just animals!
- I have had many negative experiences all different Breeds. The only commonality was a Bad Human. Not the Breed of the Dog.
- Make the page so it does not kick you out every 30 seconds. If this was not important to me I would have gave up
- anyone with a history of animal abuse should be banned for life from owning animals. These animals have many behavior challenges.
- I think its been shown time and time again that breed specific legislation has had no affect on the number of annual dog bites per year.
- Mandatory training for dogs that have incidents...most dogs behaviors are taught not what they're born with.
- Breed Specific Laws will only further damage the reputation of many many innocent dogs. Many friendly dogs will end up euthanized.
- NO BSL!!! we dont have different laws for different ethnicities stop doing it to dogs !
- Other breeds should be considered vs just bully breeds. Aggressive dogs as a whole
- Breed specific legislation is based on fear not fact. The bad owners are who should be held accountable.
- Don't you dare own a Pitt Bull in my city... But chickens that attract mice and other rodents: have at 'er. -[removed].
- We had humans created breeds and are the ones who train them. We are the problem, not the breed.



- Singling out pit bulls tells me whoever came to that conclusion is woefully misinformed. Probably a Karen who hates dogs.
- Even considering not allowing a certain breed is disturbing to me. I would hate to call myself a Calgarian if it happens.
- .
- It has been proven in many areas that BSL towards "pit bulls" does not work, is not the answer. Please consider each pet case by case.
- BSL is just [removed]. I'm sick of being bit by tiny dogs whose owners laugh it off while a big dog is targeted just due to its breed. Nonsense.
- I don't have an idea
- Puppy mill enforcement. Regulations on breeders
- I believe that if pet training was made mandatory for owners, it would help to avoid or minimize issues occurring, with pet and owner.
- Create a curfew for barking dogs Like not left out alone after 9 p.m.
- Breed restrictions have not done anything to help the owners should be held responsible not the animal. I don't agree with breed restriction
- A survey that asks what you would or wouldn't support but then only provide a list of items of which you would support.... THIS IS PURE BIAS
- More doggie bag distribution posts in public parks to encourage people to pick up after their dogs. Bylaw for aggressive human neighbours.
- DNA tracing of dog feces to owners. Paid for in cost of fines for not cleaning up after your animal.
- I'm highly against any breed specific legislation. A pit bull should be treated no differently than any other breed.
- Am wary of survey that targets specific indiv. I did not get Phase 1 ? I cannot state my full concerns with the min characters allowed here.
- People getting any pet without research is a problem; any dog can be aggressive or a nuisance. BSL targeting pit bull types doesn't stop it.
- Pet owners should be regulated as well, it is not the dogs fault if thier owner does not train them properly.
- You cannot blame a breed, only the owners. Any legislation/bylaws should apply to all breeds, not just one.
- I do not support BSL and am so disappointed at the large step back that Calgary has taken. I am ashamed that my city is even considering this.
- Leave pit bulls be and make people get a licence to have children.
- It is the owners who are negligent the dogs should not be punished for this it is natural for a dog to bark but they can be taught not to.
- No BSL! DO NOT DISCRIMINATE THE BREED. Humans need the training as much as the animals. BSL does nothing. Check out "Justice for Bullies";
- I do not believe it is the breed of dog that is aggressive (been bit by more "purse dogs" than "bully breeds") but the owner. Period.



- Breed specific laws are discriminatory against gentle animals that just so happen to be raised by careless owners.
- This is a massive step backwards. Dogs should not be punished due to its breed. It's the owner. When will we learn this, EDUCATE YOURSELVES!
- No Breed Specific Legislation! Bad dogs are not restricted to a breed.
- Consider bylaws against aversive training techniques which are known to increase aggression in dog. Includes ecollars, alpha rolls...
- I just want to be clear that I don't support any breed specific laws, those don't solve problems, we need to stop bad pet owners
- Excessive barking should be punished. Neighbours of dog owners often are very annoyed with this and cannot do much.
- Don't discriminate against certain breeds. Focus on proper ownership and owner responsibility.
- .
- Bite strength is a poor reason for BSL, many breeds have higher but strength than bullies. It's not the dogs, it's the humans. NO BSL!!!!
- There needs to be more focus placed on educating people about the importance of training animals in a KIND and GENTLE manner rather aggressive
- Possibility of reduced license fees for those who have completed obedience training?
- What about the people who bring multiple 6+ dogs to the off leash and can't control any of them? Who regulates that?
- Target the behavior of owners rather than creating bylaws that are biased against a specific breed.
- BSL is opposed by every legitimate animal welfare/ advocacy group because it has no evidence and is based on bias and racism
- Do not implement a ban on 'bully' breed dogs. This is ignorant and doesn't properly implement any useful safety changes.
- BSL is flawed and unfairly targets breeds. Target the behaviour of a specific dog or its owner not an entire breed.
- Obedience training should be mandatory for all dogs.
- Provide more education on training and understanding dog behaviour...no breed specific bans
- Discrimination on "bully" breeds. Another form of controlling the people. Any breed of dog is considered a "threat";.
- ITS NOT THE DOG. ITS THE OWNER.
- I don't support breed restrictions. But I would support stronger regulations for who can buy them to make sure responsible owners have them.
- Pit bulls may not have a stronger bite but there is an higher intensity behind their bite. Majority safety for all people/dogs. Pro muzzle
- Breed-specific legislation is ridiculous. Responsibility should entirely remain with the owner to properly train and handle their pet.



- BSL is totally ineffective and causes prejudice against breeds similar to human racism. Fines and punishment should be case specific.
- There should be a designation separate from "nuisance", for aggressive dogs, for park bans etc. No BSLs should be considered.
- Dogs making excessive noise should be removed after certain number of complaints filed.
- No pigeons
- No
- N/a
- Anything about restricting, muzzling, or anything to do with Pit bulls is absolute bull. Do not promote this kind of ridiculousness.
- Dogs should be by case by case for dangerous breeds.
- This was already said, but needs to be said again - "Breed Specific Laws will only further damage the reputation of many many innocent dogs.
- N/a
- Why are animals treated differently. We don't cage up and handcuff humans without proper proof to do so.
- Stop singling out bully breeds, it's always a bad owner that leads to a bad dog! I've had more small dogs try to attack me than bully breed
- No breed specific legislation, the only damage I have had from dogs were little dogs.
- The new changes suggested seem to put the onus of innocence on the pets themselves. I'm sure they'll understand. #MunicipalLogic
- NO BLS. Ban backyard breeding incl. kijiji, pet stores etc, obedience training for nuisance dogs, teach kids how to approach a dog in school
- Build more dog parks near bodies of water.
- No new ideas
- Dogs should be allowed to walk in graveyards as long as they remain on the pavement and on a leash.
- Please stop specific breed bans. It is the owner who is responsible not the breed
- Dogs can not be considered more dangerous based on appearance and breed. Aggressive dogs are aggressive dogs.
- The singling out pit bulls and bully breed is reactionary nonsense. All dogs can bite their behaviour is the fault of the owner not the breed
- Do not ban or label an entire breed as a problem! If you haven't noticed during this pandemic, humans are at the root of most issues.
- Children should be taught not to approach an unknown dog without prior permission from the owner rather than an early warning system.
- Breed-Specific Laws are absolutely disgusting. It is not the dog who is at fault, but the owner of said dog.
- Dogs bark when their owners aren't home and people like it quite when they're home from work



- No
- Drop the pit bull bylaw idea....
- Putting restrictions on certain breeds is unfair and harmful. There are many strong dog breeds and putting restrictions on PB's is prejudice
- Public education on how to properly greet and behave around any dog should be posted on signage at dog parks to reduce bites.
- Division isn't accepted in society for People, why create it for Animals? Hate is taught, as is behavior. Education is key!
- None
- Pitbull are also an amazing dog. People need to educate themselves before eliminating them from other dogs activities.
- Dogs under 6 months of age should not be allowed in off-leash parks.
- Any reference to BSL is discriminatory and the City of Calgary should be ashamed for exploring it.
- The fines for behaviour based problems should be mandatory payment and attendance of force-free dog training instead of fines.
- Breed Specific Legislation does more harm than good. There needs to be a greater focus on education and training for pet owners.
- BSL is ridiculous. This is total non sense and completely outdated. Calgary is better than this.
- All animals with any violation should be leg required to do a full round of training with owners. Low income workshops should be considered.
- No
- BSL have been proven to counter productive and prejudicial, they promote negative stereotypes. Any dog can bite, and any dog will bite given
- .
- Stop breed and size discrimination in dogs. Small dogs need to be held accountable for their aggressive behaviours and right now they aren't
- The logic of your pigeon count question is nonsensical, it should be under a certain number, not a lower limit to upper limit.
- None
- I think there should be new laws enforced stopping people out there that are backyard breeding dogs and cats and profiting off of it!
- You can not discriminate against bully breeds. Do not be ignorant. This is so unfair to the dog. Calgary needs to be inclusive!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Any dog breed can be vicious; not just block head dogs. Ridiculous, to single out one breed. No bad dogs just bad owners.
- Why is Calgary thinking so backwards? Other locations that have had these breed biased rules are reversing them.
- I believe all legislation should be enforced in an informative, collaborative way to engage responsibility and accountability with citizens.



- More breeds should be considered as dangerous.
- This survey should be limited to Calgary residents only
- Please waive pet license fees it's ridiculous to have to pay every year and just a money grab for the city. or \$67 lifetime fee.
- It's not the breed that is the problem, it's The owners!!
- Breed specific legislation is ridiculous. I've been attacked or threatened by more small dogs than "pitbull types".
- Owning a dog should include having to pass a test showing you're a competent dog owner. You must have full control of your dog at all times.
- Better training for pet owners. Dogs are not to blame!!!!
- Remove your discrimination of pitbulls. Are we in 2005? You even acknowledge they no more likely to bite you, yet influence people with it
- Limiting text here limits me sharing my idea!!!! Ugh, I give up.
- The criticism toward pitbull type dogs is not with pure motives and intentions. Aggression should be the concern, not a specific breed.
- Let's allow much more off-leash. City parks should allow pets off-leash as long as they are under control. Let's be welcoming to pets!
- Blame the owner, not the breed !!!
- Focus should be on reuniting pets, not on charging owners "at large” fees.
- Breed Specific Legislation is unfair and totally bias. There is a larger problem with people/owners than the dogs..
- none
- Do not be breed selective. Small breeds as well can produce vicious bites. Dogs are only as good as their owners. Bad owner=bad dog.
- Pit bulls are not the problem, owners of all breeds of dogs that are repeat offenders need increasing fines and prevention from owning dogs
- More focus on irresponsible owners! Education is key to improving animals lives and keeping everyone safe.
- As a pit bull owner and lover, I absolutely oppose this breed specific legislation. Let's deal with nuisance dogs on a case-by-case basis.
- Nope
- Do not implement Breed Specific Legislation!! It has been proven time and again that is does not work!!!
- I understand that pit bull breeds can do more damage but they should not be singled out against other large breeds.
- Off leash parks should not be along pathways. Dogs have more rights than humans. That is wrong.
- Don't ban breeds. Maybe require permit system instead. Weed out the bad owners. There will be less bad dogs. Logic please. Logic.



- Requirements for obedience training for all dogs for licensing requirements. Proof of registration and payment in full of training fees.
- There should be an exam to prove that you understand the basic needs (beyond food, water shelter) when you register your pet - both free.
- Distinguish between cats and dogs. There are a lot more cats roaming around than dogs. Increasing fines for repeat offenders
- Muzzles for all nuisance dogs is a good idea, rather than banning from dog parks entirely. This INCLUDES little nippy chihuahuas!
- Dogs that have attacked other dogs should not be permitted in off-leash parks. If caught, owner should be fined
- BSL is discrimination. You cannot judge a living thing by how it looks.
- Going solely based on breed is unjust. You cannot blame the animal for their rash behaviour as it is based off their owner.
- no
- Consider the small vicious dogs more than pit bulls. Majority of the time, they trigger/initiate the attacks
- no comment
- These rules and regulations should be for all dogs, not breed specific. If your pet is aggressive training should be mandatory with the fine
- Stray and feral cat programs require better funding and support from the city.
- Unfortunately some dogs are "anxiety " barkers, not sure how fines deal with this
- There needs to be more support to help with problematic dogs-not fines. We should enforce following through with obedience intervention
- Rental properties and having landlords not say no to emotional support animals.
- If bigger dogs do more damage, you need to decide if bigger vehicles cause more damage so should carry more insurance. This is ridiculous.
- Rules, fines and restrictions for dangerous or nuisance pets are based on infraction and severity on each individual case, not by breed
- As per the tribunal question - do not use a declared list of breeds as an easy check mark to euthanize.
- X
- Makes me sad you call out pit bulls in this. The science shows this is incorrect, yet you still do it? Why?
- BSL should never be considered and the language promotes bias. Who would even decide if a dog is 'bully'? they share features with other dog
- There are no bad dogs, only bad dog owners. Stop punishing dogs, punish bad dog owners. Pit Bulls with good owners are not a problem.
- Please do not use breed discrimination, it kills more dogs for no reason. It's the person not the dog. Please punish owners not dogs



- Should "Indoor only" cats be licensed at reduced cost?
 - I think discrimination against breeds is like discrimination against a certain race or religion. It's wrong and against all ethics.
 - Pit bulls are not the problem, the claim that they have a stronger bite is untrue as dogs like labs, German shepherds etc are just as strong
 - Knowledge of training, caring, responsibilities and other common sense as to owning pets (not specified breeds) be enforced prior!
 - Do not profile dogs based on how they look. If you're afraid, then stay away! Don't let your fear dictate how others lead their lives.
 - Please ban feeding wildlife in backyards.
 - Breed specific legislation is horrific, it punishes good dogs and good owners. There is no need for it, dogs should be examined case by case
 - Animal training (esp. dogs) run by volunteers? Maybe people aren't training their animals because training is too expensive? Or clubs?
 - Leave pit bulls alone!!! It is about how any animal is raised, not the breed!!! Stop animal discrimination!!!
 - Pit bulls are not the problem, owners are. We should not be singling out breeds selectively.
 - An interactive program that goes into schools and teaches young children how to interact with dogs and cats.
 - Pitbull and bully breeds are not to blame for negligent/poor training. It is the people to blame. I oppose this breed specific legislation.
 - I think you shouldn't single out dog breed when small dogs are more likely to attack but cause less damage
 - Fines/Extra Fees/Extra Requirements should be placed equally on all dogs - not specific breeds. It is the owner and training that matters.
 - "The rules need to be applied to ALL dog breeds, not just certain breeds.
-
- There are no bad dogs, just bad owners."
 - BSL doesn't work. in other cities and provinces it's frequently been shown not to reduce number of bites, only the population of the breed.
 - Small dogs are usually much more noisy and aggressive than big ones such add pitbulls. Anyone consider to tax that? Should use the same logic!
 - None
 - Make spaying and neutering a requirement. People who have intact pets should pay higher fees.
 - Cats that are left to wander spraying or defacating on non owners property 1000 fine!
 - Three strike rule. Two warnings to quiet the animal or be fined
 - I think the bully breed owners should be muzzled and banned from public places IF their animal becomes a nuisance. Not the other way around.



- Don't make anything breed specific. That's discrimination and fair to breeds. It's people who turn animals mean.
- Dogs should never be euthanized as a consequence for bad behavior (biting, chasing, property damage). Any dog can be rehabilitated and learn
- Please don't perpetuate dog breed stigma by creating breed specific bylaws. There needs to be access to training and education for owners.
- I strongly oppose BSL. All dogs can be dangerous with improper ownership/training, focus on education, nuisance dogs and repeat offenders
- Perhaps dog licencing should be contingent on owners completing a free (on line?) course on training techniques to avoid problem behaviors.
- Stop wasting tax payers money and government time on ridiculous bylaws like this. Focus on real problems in our city
- I do not support any restrictions against responsible ownership of pit-bull type dogs.
- Research conducted by U.Georgia and nat geo found pit bulls registered the least amount of bite pressure among various dogs tested(GSD, rotti)
- Banning a breed does nothing to prevent dog bites or increase safety. Bad owners will only move onto other breeds!
- Leave good dogs like Pitbull's alone! They are amazing pets when a responsible person owns them. This is discrimination based on looks
- "I'm glad the city is opening discussion on having hens.
- Also dogs are not inherently bad, and BSL does NOT WORK."
- Changing the bylaws referring to pitbull type dogs to all large sport breeds would be very important. Simply put- it's dog racism
- I believe that too often dogs are blamed for being dogs. It is the owners that need to be held responsible for their pets behavior.
- .
- Putting a blanket ban on pibull types dogs is ridiculous and does nothing to address "dangerous dogs' There is a big difference.
- Having private city rentable off-leash areas for reactive or non-social dogs.
- There are No bad pets, just bad owners. It is entirely unfair to single out specific breeds!!! If a dog is declared a nuisance, so be it!!!
- Calgary was recognized nationally as having the most rational approach to dog legislation - why change? breed-specific leg doesn't work
- Enforcement of dogs riding in the back of trucks unsecured needs to be more strictly monitored and fines should be higher.
- Sell license where you register your car
- It is absolutely disgusting and wrong to discriminate against a dog for the way it looks period. This whole survey is bias.
- Rather than banning breeds, let's incentivise training and obedience programs to reduce dangerous and nuisance dog behaviours.



- .
- No
- Fines/punishment for owners that put their cats outdoors in winter - my neighbours' was wandering in -40 last winter and it's beyond cruel.
- Allow a certain number of livestock (hens, ducks, goats, etc.) based on the sq. footage of yard available, to prevent overcrowding/cruelty.
- Make a bylaw that allows officers to seize animals from neglectful homes. Dogs with no attention/training become problems. Fix home, fix dog
- Stop stereotyping breeds would be an idea
- Old arguments, with no proof, based on a bias against certain breeds, that are a violation of our rights to dog ownership. Disgusting
- I am not a pit bull breed owner, but my dog does have "square headed" dog friends that are amazing. proper training/attention = good dogs
- "More places to buy licenses is a great idea!
- I hope it's possible to reduce the price of licenses as well."
- .
- discrimination against a certain breed of dog is the exact same as discriminating against a person of colour. this idea is outdated.
- No
- You seriously should be asking for a postal code to ensure that only calgary residence are submitting responses to this survey.
- The decision about allowing livestock on people's property.should be voted on by the residents of Calgary.
- This survey is insignificant because you have no way of ensuring you are only getting responses from Calgarians. Ask for postal code please
- I'm embarrassed to be a Calgarian if we are legitimately considering breed specific legislation! What a disgrace.
- Bylaw changes should be evidence-based. There is no evidence to support BSL and in fact, there is clear evidence AGAINST BSL. Say no to BSL.
- stop discriminating against one breed! there needs to be more consequences for the owners who arent properly training and caring for their dog
- Being able to get a license at your local vet clinic may be helpful to pet owners
- It is wrong to discriminate against a dog for the way it looks. A person should not be discriminated against for owning the dog either.
- The breed specific bylaws regarding pitbulls or "pitbull like" are to harsh.
- There needs to be a difference in actions taken against dogs who bite ppl vs dogs who bite ppl. Dogs are ANIMALS + scrap w/ea.other at times
- No



- First it was Dobermans to Fear, Then German Shepards, then Rottweilers now it is anything that MIGHT look anything Like a Pit Bull. EDUCATE!
- Letting us speak about phase 3 of engagent since that is the one that will effect the most people. Dogs are NOT bad, people are.
- We need stricter enforcement of animal at large bylaws and more education on how the "my dog will never hurt anyone” approach is harmful.
- Stop targeting specific breeds.
- Owners need to be at fault, not the dog. Proper training for ALL dogs made mandatory!
- Pitbulls are dangerous to all. Hoping this bylaw passes, dog parks and communities will be much safer.
- Stop discriminating against pitbulls! All dog owners need to be held accountable for their pets. SAY NO TO BSL!
- Ban bad dog owners, not Pitbulls.
- No
- Cats at large are less dangerous than dogs - not sure why they're in the same question.
- Dogs can bite for many reasons and making a bylaw that singles out one breed is irresponsible. Support is better than fines.
- To ban pit bulls and to say that they're more likely to cause serious harm is irresponsible and ignorant.
- I do not feel that singling out "pit bulls" or "pit bull like breeds" is fair. A large dog of any kind is just as dangerous.
- Breed specific bylaws do not serve any purpose. Pitbulls are not dangerous dogs and should not be treated any differently than any other
- Noise by-law should be observed
- No
- Punish the owners more severely the animals aren't the problem
- A golden retriever is just as likely to cause serious harm if trained or treated poorly. To say otherwise is bias, ignorant and irresponsible.
- There should be some bylaws regarding people tying up their animals, around length of time, provision of water, shade, and care.
- PLEASE bring back signs for on-leash parks! Too many owners think any green space (incl. schools) is a good place to run dogs off-leash!
- There needs to be more responsibility on the owner not the dog. Also there should me madatory training for all dogs no matter the breed.
- again, I think fining people will only lead to a worse life for the pet there should be city run courses that are mandatory for offenders
- Rules should be setup to target and allow for enforcement against irresponsible pet owners and not specific pets.
- Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw....yet you're blaming breed not "responsible" ownership? Not ok.



- I dislike singling out specific breeds. I would prefer more fines or charges against abusive or neglectful owners.
- Anyone who believes dogs should be discriminated against based on their breed should NOT be allowed to have any input on rules.
- Stop with the pit bull. Classify them as dogs..
- The city needs more fully fenced off leash parks. For puppy and recall training. A well trained dog is best for everyone.
- Higher fines and less leeway for dogs that bark outside and inside.
- This isn't the minority report, you can't punish people or pets for something that might happen.
- BSL will not decrease bad and/or irresponsible owners. All dogs and owners must receive the proper education and training
- DO NOT ADD BREED EXCLUSIONARY BYLAWS. DO NOT BULLY A BREED. BLAME BAD OWNERS NOT DOGS.
- Lower licensing fees for animals from a rescue
- Why do you have 4 separate fines for a dog biting or attacking. Dumb overkill, and too subjective to bylaw opinion. I trust you'd only get 1
- Do not implement breed discrimination.
- Start targeting owners of poorly trained pets. Not the pet or breed of pet. A dog is a dog, a reflection of its owner. You need a muzzle.
- Specific breeds should not have greater restrictions as there is NO evidence to support that any breed is instinctually more dangerous.
- BSL is ineffective. Treat all dogs as dogs regardless of breed.
- Specific breed targeting is both ignorant and asinine, and I am EXTREMELY unimpressed that the city of Calgary is even considering it.
- A bylaw that targets any dog that LOOKS LIKE a pitbull is the dumbest thing I ever heard.
- Stop targeting specific breeds, The owners should be responsible for specific training for their dogs and for THEMSELVES.
- Absolutely oppose the breed specific legislation.
- Cat at large fee should not be the same as dog at large.
- Letting owners tag their dogs "green"; is a bad idea. What happens if that dog attacks a kid???? Red only!!
- Enforce the protection of animals ((Breeders)) need to be constantly monitored as they abuse their cats/dogs and gain profit off of animals
- Stop targeting specific breeds.
- I think we should try to look into having some sort of course or certificate of achievement for being qualified as a dog owner.
- Increase patrols and signage in on-leash areas. Too many people let their run on soccer/baseball fields.



- Consider a licensing fee structure that gives discounts for verification of training completed with a reputable, science-based company
- Pitbull specific bylaws are ignorant. I suggest the people coming up with these ideas go and spend some time with a Pitbull.
- Refusal for pet license for convicted animal abusers and registry to share names of convicted animal abusers that can be accessed publicly
- Increase funding and availability of obedience training. If a dog acts out its usually the fault of a human
- Stop targeting specific breeds. We need education, not division and fear mongering.
- Do not restrict animals or impose regulations on breed specific or "visually" specific animals.
- Owners say to my kid- my dog is friendly or well trained. Kids terrified of dogs are traumatized by people who think leash laws don't apply!
- breed bylaws are as discriminatory as banning people based on their place of origin because of the actions of certain groups
- There needs to be more emphasis on the owner and training rather than the animal, or breed.
- "I think it should be a max total of 6 pets in a household.
- License and registry for a animal should be a one time payment. \$100."
- Statistics do not support singling out pit bulls. Please focus on the problem - nuisance dogs and their owners.
- Muzzling bully breeds in public won't prevent attacks only the responsible dog owners will oblige meaning no change in the number of attacks
- Can we now discuss penalties for owners or others who abuse/neglect animals?! Why are the laws so slack with this? Better owners=better pets
- Owners should have to undergo pet ownership fitness tests, the dogs are NOT the problem. People who dont know what their doing are!
- No I don't
- Pitbulls should not be treated differently compared to other dogs! They are incredible dogs!
- No
- Obedience training should be more accessible if you are planning on implementing a requirement for dogs to receive it.
- BSL has been proven time and time again to not have any positive effect. BSL is based on ignorance and sensationalism, not logic or fact.
- Fines for dogs repeatedly peeing and or pooping on private property.
- Insist that fir problem dogs that owners Out a bark collar on them
- Muzzling any breed of dog in public just creates fear, if you are going to ban a breed from off leash it should be chihuahuas not pit bulls.
- Owners should be held accountable, and need to be educated. It's not the breed, it's the human exploitation that is the issue. Fix the cause



- Regarding all dog aggression laws, fines are not the answer. You're not helping to fix the problem, instead adding insult to injury.
- I don't like the bandana program. Children/people should ALWAYS ask first to touch an animal, regardless of bandana colour.
- There is no reason for breed specific bylaws.
- you need to ban the bad owners not the breeds. it is bad owners not bad dogs. with the early warning system some people dont the meaning
- Dogs off leash in on-leash areas... needs more enforcement. How can owners pick up after their dog if they can't see where the dog is going?
- Any dog can bite. Breed specific law is encouraged by ignorance. Laws should be generalized to include all breeds large or small.
- Stop discriminating dog breeds. They are all dogs. Start teaching people how to respect animals, not always a dogs fault if they bite.
- Do not single out a breed such as pitbulls. They are great dogs, and having a BSL is not ok. Its the owners, not the dogs that cause issues
- How about license the owner to have the specific breeds instead of punishing the breeds? No bad dogs just bad owners.
- This discrimination against pitbulls is despicable. It needs to stop. Make a program where pit bull owners need to meet standards instead.
- Owners should be responsible for all dogs actions
- STOP breed discrimination, an option for a multi-year licence or a lifetime licence for a pet. Make humans responsible for their own pets!!!
- Do not target specific breeds; it's just like targeting someone because of their race! Have your counsel members do their research!!
- give up on the attempts to regulate pit bulls. all breed owners need to train and control their animals
- Provide greater support and training for pet owners to encourage and empower responsible pet ownership.
- I think pit bulls need to be banned altogether , they have a history of attacking and killing. Why wait until it's too late.
- The amount of emphasis that was placed on pit bull type breeds is ridiculous. Any larger dog can cause a severe bite, not just pit bulls.
- There should not be any breed specific legislation, all rules should apply to all animals. It is not the breed, but the owners.
- Having some kind of education on dog and cat training and/or responsible ownership mandatory for new owners
- It isn't the breed of dog, it's the owner. Bad owners = bad dogs
- Breed specific legislation or bylaw amounts to the EXACT same motivation as racism. Owners treatment and training is to blame. Not the dog
- Stop making pit bulls the bad guy. Instead make the owner of aggressive dog breeds take behavior courses or risk getting charged somehow.



- No
- DO YOUR RESEARCH. No breed specific bylaws should EVER be in place. It makes me sick to my stomach that anything breed specific was included
- You should NOT discriminate against an animal based on breed. That is unacceptable in our society today. Give your heads a shake. Disgusting
- Why is there a need for breed specific laws? It should be based on a pet by pet basis
- Pitbulls are NOT the only breed with enough strength to severely injure a person or pet. Consider possibly dogs 50+ pounds. ALL BREEDS.
- How about stop demonizing pit bull type breeds and actually research the breed.
- These breed specific bylaws toward pit bulls is unnecessary. My pitbull has been attacked at off leash by collies and other small dogs.
- More education on dog ownership at the dog parks is necessary. Many people think it's a free for all or don't know dog behavior.
- No animal should be euthenized! It is the owners fault and they can be retrained by someone else.
- We don't need breed specific laws. If you are worried, just make sure all animals go through training.
- breed-specific regulations are pointless - dogs with behavioral issues/bad owners span all breeds.
- There is no reason to target a specific breed of dog with a bylaw.
- The only way to make sure our dogs are looked after and brought up well is by making sure owners are held accountable. Don't bully breeds!
- Biggest thing is, it is not a breeds fault. Owners need to be accountable. Maybe we need to take a course for owning animals.
- Every pit bull I have met is way nicer than most other dogs. Don't ban a dog for its bread but it's behaviour
- Pit bull breeds are not the problem! Implementation of mandatory training should be explored before any restrictions on breeds are placed.
- I think license and registry for an animal should be a one time payment. I would suggest \$100 for a cat and \$200 for a dog.
- DO NOT STEREOTYPE PITBULLS!!!! Any dog can be violent, it depends on the owner. Harsher punishments for the owners or not allowed to own
- When you get/renew your pet license you should have to read and sign the bylaws. Owners shouldn't be able to say they didn't know the rules!
- Dogs should not be targeted for additional by-laws based on breed type. Owners need to be responsible, regardless of breed.
- Calgary has been a world model of how to achieve low bite rates without breed specific legislature. Be a shame to see that change.
- Breed specific legislation(BSL) is horrible. Any breed of dog can be dangerous. Please stop BSL
- No breed specific discrimination!
- Enforce leash laws!!! Just because you think your dog is great doesn't mean other park users want it running around.



- Breed specific bylaw is ridiculous and should not even be discussed. You are punishing all pitbulls and owners for something a few do.
- I think that, in addition to fines, owners of dogs who injure or damage someone/something, should be liable to pay for damages/vet bills.
- It would be good to have a conversation about the number of dogs brought to an off leash area by a professional dog walker.
- Please, do not implement a Breed specific by-law. It is either the owner or bad dog. Not the Breed!!
- Don't support dog specific breed laws at all. Do support severe fines/penalties for owners whose dog (any breed) endangers others/animals.
- No
- I am completely against breed specific bylaws!
- Breed specific bylaws place undue stigma on that breed. Limit dogs only on an individual basis, if that dog has proved to be aggressive.
- There should be mercy for an animal at large. Loving pet owners do everything to bring their missing pet home and shouldn't be punished
- Need more bylaw officers. Should not be up to park users to report infractions (leash laws, etc). Enforce bylaws don't just write them!
- Singling out a specific breed is disgusting, no better than racism. Should we also identify higher risk due to religion as well?
- Stop discrimination based on animal "looks";. Small dogs are far more likely to bite than larger dogs because of insecurity.
- There should be no prejudices against pit bull like dogs. This is simply disgusting. The owner alone determines how any breed is trained.
- Nope
- I do not believe that this bylaw should have any specifications around dog breeds.
- No breed specific legislation!! The 2 times I have been bit while out running, were small dogs and irresponsible owners!!
- Domestic cats should never be allowed to roam out side with out a leash, cat run or an owner present in a backyard.
- Spend time/money on the root problem: people abusing animals and improper care. More fines for abuse and more youth education on animals.
- Public education on approaching dogs. Many assume they can go up and pet any dog. Too many are uneducated and cause incidents of bites etc.
- "Calgary designated as a No Breed Discrimination City!
- Schools teach animal rights/welfare
- Mandatory training 4 all owners and officials"
- I believe that all dogs should be treated equally, there is no ONE breed that is more aggressive than another. Dogs need to be equal



- It is really annoying when you are walking your dog in a leashed area and others think they can walk their dogs without a leash.
 - No to breed specific legislation
 - I believe you should have awards for people who follow the rules
 - Pit bulls are not the problem. Look at Ontario. The pit bull ban has been in place for 15 yrs - bites are still increasing. It's the owners.
 - Bylaws should be based on the behaviour of the dog, not the specific breed. BSL will just cause more problems for responsible owners!
 - The policies of the city toward animal ownership are reactive, not proactive. Bylaw enforcement in general needs a rethink/overhaul.
 - Breed specific legislation is useless.
 - No
 - .
 - "Rights of service dogs as well as expected etiquette when encountering them. A campaign for this!
-
- BSL is difficult to enforce"
 - If you're going to punish breeds, punish makes of cars that have high rates of moving violations
 - Pitbulls are no more dangerous than any other breed of dog. Singling them out, despite your rationale, is ridiculous.
 - When writing your survey questions, please review them for incorrect information and for wording that leads only to your desired response.
 - stop breed specific discrimination!
 - I would like more patrolling of off leash parks. The auburn bay off leash is covered in feces. No enforcement of by laws.
 - Something must be done about people who pick up after their pets and then leave the bags lying around.
 - Looking at the owner of problem dogs! Animals don't just become nuisances on their own, it's because of how they are treated!
 - no
 - "I don't support breed bans because they don't work," said [personal information removed], the former director of animal services for the city of Calgary.
 - This line from your info is incorrect: *a pitbull's strength allows the potential for a more severe bite.* Don't spread false information.
 - In most cases the dogs are not the problem, owners teach the dog behaviors. People need to be held accountable for their dogs actions.
 - "1) Bylaws for exotic animals (snakes, monkeys, large cats) that do not fit current animal bylaws
 - 2) Bylaws against fake service animals"
 - Nope



- No breed specific legislation.
- No
- Ha ha ha
- I've seen many small dogs bite and attack. I've never seen a pitbull that wasn't a ball of love and cuddles. No breed specific laws
- Instead of restricting what type of dogs can be owned, we should restrict who can own them. This can be monitored through pet licenses.
- STOP BSL .. DO NOT DISCRIMATE BY THE TYPE OF DOG
- No breed specific bylaws or bans!!!
- I would just like to say again that making breed bylaws is unreasonable. I think dogs should be treated on a case-by-case basis.
- Na
- .
- There should absolutely not be any breed specific legislation in Calgary.
- If the goal is to reduce the frequency and severity of bites, breed specific legislation is inappropriate. Focus on owner behavior and education
- Implement mandatory obedience training when a dog is involved in any threatening or violent incidences and mandatory education for the owner
- Education and training for pets should a component of ownership.
- Something should be done for those who provoke dogs to bark or tease them, fines for those using playgrounds as off leash areas
- More training enforcement to fix behavior issues (barking, fear of men/other pets/children) if an animal is flagged.
- This is ridiculous!! Its owners not the breed. Small dogs can do damage as well... my big dog has been attacked multiple times.
- Absolutely no laws that place more restrictions on certain breeds over others. It never has and never will have any positive outcomes
- Mandatory training + update visits for owners of certain dog breeds. Rather than a blanket restriction on the breed.
- Breed specific bans are ridiculous. The personality and behaviour of the dog are dependent on their handling by the owners.
- All these bylaws are great in theory but must be actually enforced. Higher fines mean nothing when bylaw is nowhere to be found.
- Any dog can be a problem depending on owner. Focus on the issue, not the breed.
- Take out the option to even vote for breed specific bylaws.
- No to BSL.
- I just think that breed discrimination legislation is a horrible idea. Please do not enact BSL.
- Dog walkers should have a limited number of dogs. Ive seen some with ten or more. It is very intimidating plus they cant control all of the



- Breed specific legislation does not work. There is several countries including United kingdom and it has created much heartache. Suffering
- "I don't believe it should be by specific breeds No livestock.
- No limits.
- More officers ."
- Nothing to add
- Bylaws need to be enforced to be effective.
- No BSL! You even stated that they don't bite more than other breeds and their bite is no more severe than that of any large breed dog.
- No discrimination based on breed. That's irrelevant!
- I do like the idea of the early warning system, but should not allow auto-discrimination and charges on red-bandana dogs.
- Breeds should not be questioned. That's discrimination. Breeds do not become dangerous on their own. Owners make them dangerous.
- Dogs being treated case by case, not breed. Mandatory professional training for any breed dog that has an aggressive attack or bite incident
- No to BSL. The owners that are at fault for bad dog behavior. Any dog can cause harm, please do your research before blaming a breed!
- No
- Don't prejudice certain breeds. Frankly small/medium dogs can cause tons of injuries too.
- DO NOT BLEAND ALL DOGS IN A BREAD THE SAME. THAT IS NOT THE PLACE WE SHOULD BE GOING.
- BSL - is discriminatory towards the Animal when in most cases the owners are at fault. The phrase "Pit bull like" could describe every Dog.
- I disagree with the breed specific bylaw you have in the above survey - it should be based on any animal not a specific breed.
- Please quit fining people for dog bites and dog/cat roaming. For dog bites that are more than a nip, mandatory training for dog and owner.
- Shouldn't be doing that innocent animals pit bulls are loyal loving dogs don't judge a book by its cover
- No
- I would like to know why a specific breed is targeted? Is this truly about reducing problem behaviour if not considering all breeds?
- I completely disagree with BSL!
- n/a
- Discriminating against blockheaded dogs needs to stop. "Bully” breeds need to stop being treated like pariahs. Enough.
- Dogs are like children, they do what they are taught, make education Mandatory for people on how to play with (for children) and approach dogs



- "This is not a progressive idea.
- Questions regarding how people approach a dog needs to be considered."
- "Must differentiate b/t dog bites/ attacks resulting from
- provocation or stupidity of victim vs those initiated by the dog itself"
- Eliminate breed specific restrictions. If there is an insistence on breed discrimination, include other nuisance breeds such as husky etc
- we need much much much higher fines and ramifications for people who deliberately harm animals. we also need to better educate pet owners
- It is absurd to act as though certain breeds are more dangerous. Go case by case not by breed.
- There are many bad dog owners, you see them every day at dog parks. The dogs are sadly the bi product of a bad owners. Do not punish the dog
- Nope
- Its not the dog or breed, most of it is owners doing or people intagganizing animals and then the animal is put at blame.
- No to Breed-specific legislature!!
- Do not make it breed specific! It's the owners and training that impact behaviour
- Offer more resources for cheaper or free obedience training and neuter/spay programs for those who are low income.
- Berkeleys Place in Edmonton has educational programs designed around Bite Prevention. It has even been requested by other communities/cities
- Breed specific should not punishable in Calgary/Anywhere. If a dog is aggressive, its the lack of education and training on the owners part.
- According to the research, all breeds bite at the same rate. "Pitbulls" do more damage but the fines already reflect that. Why BSL also? [removed]
- I really think I would be great that if owners did obedience the following year they would be a discount on there license for the following
- Pit bull owners have a vested interest in ensuring other pit bull owners advise you. Look at the victims instead.
- Nothing other than low income people do NOT need a lower tax fee. if you can't afford the pet don't get the pet
- Not at this time
- Require professional training and potentially muzzles for dogs of any breed with a history of aggression. No BSL.
- No I don't hav anything to raise or question at the moment!
- Raise fines on cats that are caught roaming more than once. Outdoors cats are a threat to wildlife and bites and scratches can cause infection
- Dogs being treaded case by case. Its the owner, not the breed of dog.
- Please don't discriminate against specific breeds. It is not fair to judge simply by a label. A responsible owner manages proper behavior.



- No.
- NO TO BSL! THERE ARE NO BAD DOGS, JUST BAD OWNERS! SHAME ON YOU YYC!
- Remove the fee to register your animal. If the city wants tracking, that's fine, but why do people need to pay?
- Need more education on impacts of cats at large on wild bird populations, and pet/wildlife interactions in general (including releases).
- No BSL! No breed discrimination! There's no bad dog, only irresponsible owners!
- Make it harder to get pets. Stop breeding by just anyone and require fixing- if not give fines. Do not bully the breed- bully the owner
- Mandatory training for all dog owners. The personality of any dog is affected by how they are treated. Responsible owners train their dog.
- all dogs can be vicious if not trained and taken care of properly. To signal out a specific species because of some bad owners is wrong.
- No Breed Specific Legislation. That is wrong.
- I'm a certified trainer with AC experience and I do not support BSL. I specialize in fear and aggression. Please reconsider BSL.
- No
- I think dog walkers who walk groups of more than 4 dogs need to be licensed. 1 person cannot watch 4 or more dogs properly.
- I think it's ridiculous that pit-bulls are being singled out. All dogs react based on how they're trained and the situation they're in.
- Catalog each complaint
- I think breed specific legislation--especially those that are preemptive--is not a viable approach to maintaining public safety.
- You can not discriminate against a dog breed anymore than you can on the color of a persons skin. The owners need the bandannas!!!
- Fines \$100 for dog on school ground, untethered near playground, within specified distance of play equipment. \$100 poop on private property
- "Higher registration fee for pets that are not fixed.
- Flat face dog owners need to pay much higher registration fee due to animal abuse"
- There should be no Breed Specific Rules, Owners are responsible for their dogs and should be held accountable for the actions of their dogs
- No.
- Breed should not matter. Forcing people to muzzle their dog just because of how it looks makes no sense. Any dog can bite.
- Moderating a dog based on its breed alone is like moderating a black neighbourhood more heavily than a white neighbourhood.
- No breed discrimination. A dog that bites is not breed specific. That was already pointed out in phase1/2



- I strongly object to calling out pit bull breeds as dangerous in a general statement. The concern should be over the small aggressive dogs
- We did not cover how money hungry our local government is
- .
- Discriminating against specific breeds is no better than racism against humans. More attention needs to be placed on the education of owners
- You cannot judge a dog based on its breed period! Just like people you have well regulated and unregulated personalities. BSL = BS!
- Evaluate all dogs on a case by case basis and not assume based on looks. Banning a type does not solve irresponsible ownership problems
- Big Heck No!!! Do your research. Each incident should be based case by case. Not by a breed. All this is is discrimination against one kind.
- Increased ability to investigate and (in a timely manner) animal cruelty/welfare issues, more meaningful enforcement, support for low income
- No
- It's by laws is called so many times about a dog barking nonstop said dog should have to go through behavioural training or something like t
- No... to breed specific legislation
- I am absolutely against any kind of breed specific legislation. This is a human issue not a dog breed one. Moving us backwards. Sad.
- nothing to add
- Higher fines after an attack don't prevent the attack...mandatory obedience training to license a PB would be much more effective
- Work with current bylaws. Work with experienced people(trainers,vets, etc). No limits or breed restrictions.
- No
- Semi trucks cause more collision damage than cars. We don't put speed restrictions on Semis; advanced driver training is required...
- When dealing with roaming cats the city should fine the pet owners and not require the person complaining to take the pet owners to court!
- Don't focus on bully breeds. Focus on people who have nuisance dogs.
- No breed-specific fees/regulation. This has no scientific basis in promoting safety. Focus on welfare of animals, education, spay/neuter etc
- Education is crucial, nobody should approach a dog until owner agrees. The owner, not the dog is responsible. End breed specific legislation
- No to BSL. I'm very disappointed that my home town is even considering these horrible bylaws. Time to start calling councilors...
- No to BSL not fair to target a specific breed. You handle dog bites on a case by case basis PERIOD
- Nil



- Do not discriminate against pit bulls or breeds that are similar/ a variation of pit bulls. It is the OWNERS fault and responsibility
- Never blame the breed.
- No
- No to BSL. Do more about owners who let cats wander, tired of dead birds and cat [removed] in my gardens.
- Protect the innocent residents before the people who want to keep dangerous dogs who were bred specifically for animal aggression.
- Fees need to stop being lowered for low income households. If they cant afford the fees they shouldn't own an animal or cant afford the anim
- BSP legislation is wrong, any dog can be a bad dog. It's nurture vs nature. Dogs need to be treated on a case by case basis.
- There was nothing in place to assure that people taking this questionnaire are from Calgary. I am from calgary, but a link is circulating FB
- Dont blame the breed, blame the bad owners
- Your bread suggestions are ridiculous. More small dogs attack people then "bully breeds"
- Bylaws should only fine/punish irresponsible owners. There should be no limitations on dogs by number or type for responsible owners.
- BSL does not work. Period. You really need to focus on regulating breeders.
- Please pass a bylaw that cats must be leashed or contained to their own property by an enclosure when outside. No more roaming cats
- I do not support banning specific breeds
- Breeds of dogs should not be discriminated against any more than people should for being different colours. It is not appropriate...
- dogs are dogs, we as humans train them to be good or bad don't blame a breed on a bad temperament blame the owner. Stop the discrimination!!
- Stricter and more frequent enforcement of free roaming cats and dogs (outside of off-lease) areas to reduce harassment of birds and wildlife
- No BSL!!
- No BSL! Bad owners make bad dogs! The early warning system may be an idea but may still cause discrimination on its own.
- Dog specific legislation will not resolve aggressive dog issues.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2387261/>
- no bully breed legislation is needed at all.
- I do not support breed specific legislation.
- Stop encouraging the breed bias. Other breeds can also cause significant damage, this is an invalid justification for discrimination.
- No breed specific limitations, stiffer penalties for bad owners.



- To curb aggression in dogs and prevent homeless pups spay and neuter programs and incentives are key. Education and more reduced \$ on licences
- No to BSL! There are other breeds of dogs that are aggressive. But its all down to bad ownership, and training of that animal.
- Don't discriminate against the breed hold the owners accountable! Not all dogs are the same and this puts them all into 1 category!!
- Waiving licensing fee for low income is why we see dogs bite. If you cant afford or care to properly train a dog, then you shouldn't own one
- Pit bulls need to be illegal and euthanized out of existence. People are dying from these maulers. Remember Lawn Darts? Illegal after 3 dead
- Licence and regulate breeders so that backyard breeders are illegal. Unregulated cross-breeding causes problems in the dog's health/behaviour
- No
- What the [removed]?! Stop discriminating against certain breeds!
- Non-animal families that use very limited off-leash park space as public park space should not be able to file complaints about dogs.
- No
- Please don't create breed specific by laws against pit bulls! It's is incredibly unfair.
- BSL will not work. Why discriminate. A dog is a predatory canine therefore aggressive by nature, nothing to do with owners. Ban them all!
- Supervised off leash park - Aggressive dogs in there.. owners sit in car while dog is loose in off leash . Also dog walkers have too many
- Don't specify a breed that should be labeled bad. Pit bulls and variants of the breed are not the problem, IRRESPONSIBLE DOG OWNERS ARE
- ANY breed of dog that has issues with aggression should be rehabilitated and potentially rehomed depending on the case. Help, not kill them
- BSL seems like a pretty terrible suggestion. Breed-specific regulation isn't the answer.
- Further enforcement/ penalties for "free-roaming"; cats
- The idea of a BSL (breed specific legislation) in Alberta is utterly ridiculous and lazy law making. Breed is not the problem, its bad owners!
- Someone was walking their dog off leash in a non-off leash area and it ran in front of my bike, causing me to crash. It sucked.
- BSL is not the answer! Bully breeds are not the problem, uneducated owners are. Don't punish the dog, educate the owners!
- There should be no mention of specific breeds. Stop breed discrimination.
- I absolutely do not support Breed-Specific Legislation.
- Any animal can be aggressive. Stop punishing animals based off their breed and start paying more attention to the people raising them.



- I think it's disgusting you are singling out pit bulls, whether they are one or look like one. Do your research. Shame on you
- Strongly disagree with singling out a breed of dog. Animals should be judged on behaviour not breed.
- Do not blame dogs it is so biased and inappropriate it comes down to humans and how we raise and train them.
- Do not make it breed specific! If the animal misbehaved the owners should be reviewed.
- Decrease the amount of regulation and enforcement regarding pets. This city needs to slash its expenditures instead of charging the poor.
- Breed specific laws are not fair
- No to bsl. Predatory canines are aggressive by nature, not due to who owns them. That can't be trained out either. Just ban the species!
- No I don't
- "Please do not target pitbull breeds. We need to address irresponsible pet ownership, not punish the dogs."
- No I think all issues have been addressed.
- Anti-BSL laws and bite risk education for judges. We know a lot about risk factors for bites. Breed isn't one.
- Don't allow discrimination and punishment for innocent dogs. There are no bad dogs just bad people who poorly trained animals.
- Off leash should only be in secure off leash parks not insecure spaces, too vague for all citizens
- BSL is lazy legislation. The right thing to do is increase enforcement and monitoring for "nuisance"; dogs, fines, seizures etc
- I think Landlords should not be allowed to state weight restrictions on dogs.
- I strongly disagree with any form of breed-specific legislation. It is not backed up by science or anecdotal evidence, just fear-mongering.
- There is no good evidence that any dog breed is particularly aggressive. Laws against the way a dog looks ie "pit bull type" are ludicrous
- Stop penalizing owners of pit bulls and the like, all dogs need training and these breeds shouldn't be subjected to harsher punishment
- Breed specific legislation and bylaws are wrong. Pitbulls properly raised are kind and gentle family members
- "Breeding dogs and cats should be regulated and there needs to be clearer legislation on this issue.
- A bylaw regarding the use of dog parks"
- Rationale for specifying bull-type dog breeds for special by-law considerations is flawed. All large breeds can cause damage. Use dog weight
- I think children under 15 should not be allowed in offleash areas.
- BSL is like judging humans on their skin colour. No bad dogs only bad owners and poorly trained pets. Don't lump them together.



- I miss [personal information removed]! He never would have even considered BSL or Animal Limits!
- No
- No
- Focusing on pitbulls just seems unnecessarily polarizing. Just slash all of the language pertaining to those breeds.
- Pitbulls should not be unfairly targeted.
- Cats should not be allowed outdoors. They kill insects, birds, and other small beneficial animals. They also leave feces in other's yards.
- Don't breed discriminate. Identifying breeds distracts from the real 'nuisance dog' problem which is ineffective/Irresponsible pet ownership
- I am a veterinarian. Please consider NOT introducing Breed-Specific Legislation. Nuisance dog legislation would be much more beneficial.
- Pitbulls are like every other dog , their bites are not stronger than a k9 dogs. They should be treated the same!
- BSL is not fair!! Do not do this!!!
- Issue higher, more serious consequences for poor pet ownership in general. No animal is inherently vicious. People make them that way.
- Breed selective legislation is the same as the racial segregation that has happened in the past and still rears its head now.
- No.
- BSL only reinforces stereotypes, nuisance breeds and irresponsible ownership is fair.
- Punish irresponsible owners with outdoor cats pooping and wonder in others yards; allow city to fine in condos instead of solely condo board
- Get on the backyard breeders. I think the main issue is poor pet owners. Bites and attacks ARE PREVENTABLE.
- Na
- Please don't breed discriminate. Identifying breeds distracts from the real 'nuisance dog' problem which is ineffective/Irresponsible pet !!
- N/a
- Don't punish people owning these dogs. Look at ways to better the situation, ie training courses. Not all pit bulls are aggressive.
- High risk breed owners should need to take a course consisting of a certified animal behaviourist and instructions on proper dog care.
- Don't target pit bulls. I don't care what breed your dog is as long as it is well trained.
- No breed should be singled out, every breed treated the same. Yearly fees could be made to be paid in instalments
- BSL is wrong. Don't punish animals for irresponsible owners.
- Children are little [removed], people need to educate their kids. Teach them to not run up on an unsuspected pet. Pulling tail a no no and so



- I think breed specific bylaws are completely unfounded and unfair. Dogs that bite should be punished, not dogs of a certain breed.
- Fine people for not picking up after their dog/s in the off leash parks. Get some by-law officers out there!
- Cats are huge nuisance animals to local wildlife and should not be allowed to be at large!
- All dogs (and owners) need proper training to ensure the animal remains under their control. Mandatory training over breed restrictions
- If given the right training and love I believe every dog regardless of breed has an epic bright future Pitbull we're once used as nannies.
- Enforcement of by laws appears to be none existent in some areas. Prime example is the storm water drain pond area in community of Cranston.
- Breed discrimination will not be as effective as focusing on dogs that have a history of aggression.
- No
- for cats that only reside inside the house and are spayed/neutered should have a lower license fee than outside cats.
- BSL is not OK, PERIOD
- I think only pet friendly salt used for the sidewalks should be allowed. Banning the unfriendly pet salt in Calgary
- I believe breed specific bylaws are ridiculous. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners.
- FENCE/DEFINE/SEPARATE all off leash areas. Open/undefined areas are too much conflict/risk. And the daily "I did not see my dog poo" issue
- N/A
- You know what is a great idea , [removed]. "Pit bulls" are not the problem. It's the owners.
- Punish irresponsible owners who do not take full responsibility for their pets. Don't punish the pets it's not their fault.
- Have strict fines for owners who do not pick up after their dogs or cats in public spaces.
- The fact you lot that sit in your pretend ivory towers think you have the right to say who can own what breed of dog is complete trash. [removed]
- .
- Breed-specific bylaws are unfounded and not effective. Problems start with owners and training.
- Have a very small licensing fee for indoor cats. Most people don't license their house cats, generate some revenue and create data.
- There needs to be accessible spay neutering programs in place
- No sorry
- I believe there should be stricter fines/jail time for animal abuse and neglect. Also, offenders unable to adopt/ own pets ever again.
- No
- Do something to encourage catios so cats don't roam at large. Maybe community workshops to teach how to build them? Save the birds!



- Fine people for not picking up feces anywhere, and not disposing of same appropriately
- Animals, like people, are not perfect. Even well-trained animals have bad days. Don't over penalize pets for being "human". Be understanding
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Proposing adding bsl to the by law is. It will cost more and be less effective.
- Breed restrictions should never be a consideration. Behavior is not based on breed but based on learned behaviour/training and owner control
- Breed specific legislation is not going to solve problem owners. BSL is punishment for an animal that has done nothing wrong except exist
- READ AND LISTEN TO THE IDEAS BELOW OF PET AND NON-PET OWNERS. STOP REINFORCING STEROTYPES, BREED DISRIMINATION AND PUSHING BSL!!
- "at large" cats killing song birds - this is a myth - the population of songbirds is decimated by predatory birds - magpies and crows.
- punish irresponsible and incapable pet owners and stop pushing BSL
- PREVENT the irresponsible people from owning pets do not wait for there to be a need for INTERVENTION when it is too late.
- No breed specific legislation
- Be realistic, dogs do get aggressive. The best way to break up a interaction is to lift the dog with hind legs. This will release the bite.
- Where are all the by-law officers?? I have never seen anyone get a ticket for not picking up poo and people do it all the time
- If BSL is consider than why not request applications for all types of pet ownership prior.
- Don't breed blame. Blame the owner.
- Dog walkers should have limited amounts of dogs at off leash parks. If something happens, it can be hard to control 8-10 dogs
- How is BSL solving any problem? What did my dogs do to you that warrants you to restrict their lives?
- Regulate sales/ breeders/ mills of animals
- Offering behaviour rehabilitation for problem dogs. Assessing the family they are with.
- Breed restrictions should never be a consideration. Behavior is not based on breed but based on what the owner teaches or fails to teach.
- "One time pet registration is a good idea.
- I also don't think pit bulls should be discriminated against."
- No breed specific discrimination and more focus on responsible dog owners. I have always been so proud of Calgary, and disappointed now.
- I strongly disagree with BSL. It's unfair to lump one or a few breeds together as a "nuisance" or "dangerous" breed simply based on looks.
- There should be no breed ban, or exemptions it is not the animals fault for poor training!



- I firmly disagree with these proposed bylaw changes which will only punish responsible pet owners. Breed specific legislation is WRONG.
- Please do not discriminate against pit bull breeds
- Breed specific shouldn't be implemented, many breeds are as aggressive as pitbulls. Low income shouldn't have lower fees. Don't own if you c
- Bully Breed legislation should not be considered.
- I am just sick of people blaming the pets over the irresponsible owners. Pit-Bulls are not evil animals, hate is taught.
- City needs to follow through on its own bylaws
- So Pitbulls are not known to bite more, yet you want to basically surrender their rights. Is this the UCP *cough* Or Communist China?
- Fines for people walking their dog without a leash in areas OTHER than designated off leash parks . It's terrifying to have big dogs run up
- I disagree with breed specific legislation.
- "Please do not discriminate
- Against one certain breed"
- Breed specific bylaws are essentially racism.
- It should be based of the strength of the animal and the competence of the owner
- Yes to BSL! Also look at banning bad breeders as bad breeding is often the result of behavior problems in all breeds that cannot be trained.
- Breed discrimination is not the answer. Responsible ownership and accountability is.
- BSL is a response to fear created by an uneducated public, thus creating an unfortunate stigma.
- Please stop with the "pitbull" category! It's not relavent
- Does the argument that the BSL targets Pitbull's because they have a stronger bite make it OK for Chihuahua's to attack bc they're weaker?
- Complaints should be properly investigated before a fine is issued.
- Don't target Pitbull breeds! Training should be implemented with every dog, no matter the breed, so they can all have manners; owners included.
- Don't penalize the dog by it's appearance - trying to guess whether it is or isn't a bully breed is senseless and these pups are so sweet!
- Larger dogs in general have stronger bites. Can we discuss German Shepards, Rottweilers, Doberman, etc as well?
- You should start a return to field program for community cats. See bestfriends.org
- No
- N/A
- Please review the location of garbage bins at Nose Hill Park. More strategic siting of bins would improve owner removal of waste. Thank you.
- Breed specific legislation is completely unacceptable. There is no such thing as a bad dog breed only bad owners.



- no
- No ideas.
- please do not single out pitbulls, my vet said he has been bitten by more golden retrievers than any of the bully breeds.
- fines for animal bites on humans should have a fee scale determined by severity and negligence to take action on resolution.
- City of Calgary is better than this!!! Discrimination is so unneeded. Don't be dog racist!!!! It's not the dog it's the owner.
- No
- No.
- Breed-specific bylaws are not only unjust they are misguided. Any dog rescued from a Reserve likely has some sort of 'Bully-breed' in them
- If you are worried about pitbulls or nuisance dogs off leash in parks then you can require temperment testing say for dogs over 50lb
- Please say no to BSL in Calgary. Any animal has the ability to be aggressive, training is important for all dogs and owners.
- Incredible we're still having the pitbull debate. Policing according to breed isn't any smarter for dogs than it is for people.
- The city is hemorrhaging money at the hands of our grossly incompetent city council! Leave the pit bulls alone...[personal information removed] is the real menace!
- Breed specific bylaws are discriminatory against responsible owners and their dogs. They fail to address the problem of harmful owners.
- Do not breed specify!
- Do not discriminate against a specific breed.
- I do not agree with any breed specific legislation
- Consider a mandatory training session for people who want to own a cat or dog.
- Please do not discriminate against one breed.
- No
- No
- I understand the fear around pitbull-type dogs due to the injuries they can cause but there are no bad pit bulls...only bad pit bull owners.
- "Bully breeds" and pitbull type dogs should not be considered differently from other dog breeds.
- People are more likely to be bitten by a chihuahua as they are by a "bully" breed. The issue is the owners, not the dog.
- I disagree with breed specific legislation
- I think cat licenses should be lower, especially for indoor cats who are now generally chipped. This is just a money grab by the city.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong, and an absolute disgrace that the city is considering it.
- Dog breeds not be pinpointed you show love and they'll give love!



- No
- Breed specific laws are ignorant of true issues and do more harm than good.
- Breed specific legislation is not only ridiculously biased but it provides FALSE sense of security around other dogs who may also be a risk.
- I disagree with breed specific bylaws. Also if you can't afford a current pet license you likely can't afford to take care of a pet period.
- Please stop discriminating against Pitt Bulls
- stop singling out breeds like pitbulls. Focus on [removed] owners.
- Fines for animal bites to other animals should be required to pay the victims vet bills not city pockets!
- Banning breeds is immoral and should be illegal
- No mention of rotties, German Shepard's, Doberman's, boxers. Just as strong as pits, don't hate on one breed
- BSL IS WRONG! I do support the warning on the leash. Nervous dogs (of any size) need to be walked and many people do not respect their space
- BSL has been proven to be a costly and ineffective protocol to reduce dog bites. Onus should fall on irresponsible dog owners, not one breed
- Breed specific bylaws are wrong.
- Bully breeds are already mislabeled and mistreated among the animal industry - BSL just perpetuates this - w/o DNA tests is nearly impossible
- racism is still racism even with a different species
- Bully Breed legislation - specifically Pitbulls is ridiculous. Discriminating based on breed is out-dated and seriously wrong.
- Fines should be higher for pit bulls if they do attack MUCH HIGHER. deter bad owners, good owners should have nothing to worry about.
- N/A
- Any dogs can have behavior issues depends on the circumstances like human beings. Do not just discriminate them.
- There needs to be more regulation/legislation for the sale, breeding, and discovery of puppy mills.
- All other breeds that can display similar bite force should be included in the by-law, not just pit bulls.
- Whole heartedly disagree with breed specific legislation.
- The idea of singling out pit bull type dogs is very misguided. It is not the dog but the dog owner that is at fault if a bite occurs.
- we need a better solution towards specific breed laws. it is the owner, not the dog.
- Pitbulls are not the problem. Bad owners are.
- Calgary has the highest number of dogs per capita in Canada. Who is the bylaw being changed for? Punish bad owners not specific breeds!
- Breed specific legislation has been proven ineffective in every jurisdiction it is implemented. Calgary is a dog-friendly city. We are better



- permanently muzzling in public and banning "blockhead" looking dogs from dog parks permanently is an absolutely absurd proposition!
- To say that a Pit bull strength will cause a more severe bite is negligent. Don't provide false information that lacks evidence!
- High fines for irresponsible ownership!! Owning a pet is a LUXURY not a right. Put some time/effort into training or you shouldn't have them
- Don't make a decision on an entire breed of dog based on fear and the news you read on Facebook. That's not real news FYI
- BSL has been proven to be ineffective. Focus should instead be placed in education on dog behavior, genetic predispositions, balance training.
- No
- Why should the 99.999 % of responsible dog owners and good dogs suffer for the 0.001% of irresponsible owners!? Absurd breed-specific idea.
- License fee discounts or credits for: dog owners who demonstrate having attended obedience or other responsible dog ownership class
- The answer is not unfair and often apparently arbitrary breed-specific bans and regulations. It's responsible pet ownership.
- No
- No
- Pit bulls are not "inherently dangerous."
- I find it scary that this survey targets Pit Bull's. I don't support any ban or targeted restrictions for any breed of dog.
- Do not implement breed specific laws. It comes down to each individual animal and the responsibility of the owner to train it. Super simple.
- No to nuisance dogs, but breed specific legislation is nonsense.
- Breed specific legislation does not work. It is unfair to target any dog because of their look/shape of their head, etc.
- I thought we live in Canada not US. This is not fair. My Pitt Lili went through a lot before we got her. She doesn't deserve this.
- I believe that only dogs that have a history should have to be muzzled until completing a training course.
- Stop the racism against pit bulls or others. As I stated earlier; would you exclude a human or make them pay extra due to their ethnicity?
- Because
- Instead of being so restrictive with pit bull etc, why not offer a free or low cost training for owners of the breed that they take.
- Breed-specific restrictions punished innocent animals and responsible pet owners.
- I do not agree with restrictions to breed specific dogs or cats however I do agree that animals that are a danger to humans need to be train



- None
- An animals behaviour is directly related to the owners care and training, not necessarily breed. I've met more vicious small dogs than pits.
- Problem dogs and owners are the issue. Not a breed. Would you like it if someone jailed you for the colour of your skin?
- The discrimination against bully breed dogs needs to stop, it is ridiculous. Target irresponsible and poor dog owners.
- Punishing specific breeds is not a constructive solution to problem dogs. Focus should be on problem owners.
- Considering the strength, (comparitive) and ease for a Pit Bull to incur damage/violence, with poor management training should be mandatory.
- Drop any idea of BSL. Pit Bulls are not the problem so stop promoting it. Undereducated and uncaring owners are the issue
- Stop making things cost so much for first offence of some issues. Also do more positive reinforcement to promote good behaviourandcompliance
- Before anyone get any dog , the person must attend some dog training. In another words the person should get a licence to own any dog
- More action for pets that disturb the noise law ie constant barking
- No
- It's nuisance at some point, but at the end of the day, the owners has the responsibility to train their pets.
- "First of all, I love the pun.

- I just think that we target animals rather than increasing safe environments for them."
- Bully breeds aren't the problem here, hold owners accountable for their negligence without punishing the responsible ones and their dogs
- All dogs need training, BSL is not constructive. Disgusting a city which had OG responsible ownership laws is now considering BSL
- Don't blame one breed or what they look like make the owner take responsibility. In my business it is the small mixes that you had to watch
- Pits are not the problem. It is the owners. Many large sized dogs can cause injury if the owners are not caring for them properly
- How bout Chihuahua specific legislation so I can stop getting bit by them? I've been attacked by multiple chihuahua/Yorkies? Why is that ok?
- Breeders should be held more responsible... aka be required to stop breeding dogs known to be aggressive or known pass on aggression.
- Targeting specific breeds is NOT the answer. "Pit bulls” aren't the problem, terrible pet owners are. This is absolutely ridiculous.



- The owner should be given a written notice and after that they should be fined for excessive noise
- BSL distracts from actually "nuisance" dogs and can create a false sense of security around dogs who are actually dangerous and not "pitbull"
- pit bulls aren't the problem and falsely saying they are a threat takes away from the actual issue of incompetent people who buy for looks
- Na
- Please do not discriminate against pit bulls
- I've been bitten three times by a Yorkie! Are you going to make bsl for them and make them wear a muzzle in public?
- Pit bulls are dangerous and I support this bill. Have you ever seen a pit bull attack a person?
- Focus the attention on aggressive and nuisance pet OWNERS, not the pets themselves. The breed is not the problem.
- No i do not.
- Stricter enforcement/fines for owners of dogs with no leash in a leashed area, for example Fish Creek Park and leashed areas of Nose Hill
- No
- Decrease number of animals allowed per house hold to 4 cats 4 dogs.
- Neighbourhood prizes for the most responsible pet owning communities? Something to encourage people to pick up after their dogs?
- When a small dog attacks me or my pet no one bats an eye. This should be no different. Stricter fines for poor pet OWNERS is necessary.
- "Blockhead dogs aren't the issue idiot owners are no bad dogs bad parents.
- Start making it tougher to get the breed and give training"
- I do not appreciate that you are separating "pit bulls" from any other dog! You are being racist towards pit bulls and that breed
- Put a law: if you are getting a pit bull and licensing them, bylaw needs to interview the owners. 99% of the time it's the owner's fault!!
- Ban the sale of non-rescue pets in stores like YYC's [personal information removed]. One of the last pet stores to still support puppy mills.
- Give the land back to indigenous peoples and expand the Inglewood Bird Sanctuary to the size of Calgary.
- -
- any animal can be vicious if the owners are not willing to train them otherwise. punish the bad owners.
- Prioritize mandatory training course for nuisance dogs over fees/fines. Euthanasia should be a last resort not based on the owners income.
- More fenced areas for dogs to be off leash within communities. Designated single use areas to exercise dogs alone for anxiety animals.
- Aaa



- breeding any animals should not be allowed in city condominiums complexes or attached homes. make them get permits first for all breeding.
- Dogs shouldn't be blamed for the failings of the owners. The breed does not matter. Punish owners for negligence, not 'dangerous breeds'.
- Ask rescues like [personal information removed] how to make their lives easier .. Since they are a bridge between you (shelters etc and the public ...
- dogs should not be singled out and forced to wear muzzles because of their breed!
- dogs should not be singled out and forced to wear muzzles because of their breed!
- How about centralizing where people can post photos of lost pets or pets roaming around their neighbourhood?
- If you go after bully breeds, go after German Shepard's, rottis, chihuahuas and other aggressive breeds.
- Educate law makers: BLS punishes the dog, not the owner. The attitude of the owners dictate the behavior of ANY breed.
- Breeders should require a licence to breed and sell animals, and only so many given out per breed.
- No
- Breed-specific legislation is extremely damaging.
- Off leash dogs in on leash areas should be fined
- LEAVE PIT-BULLS ALONE!!!!
- educate the pet wonders about the importance of training the dog, not bash the entire dog breed.
- No law will ever implement a complete safe environment, but it can reduce problems. The people's voice is a great way for a majority vote.
- I think it would be a good idea to have more Bylaw officers visible at dog parks.
- Dogs left out in cold temperatures needs to be addressed more stringently.
- more bylaw officers
- I hope the pigeon restrictions only apply to pets and not the wild flocks that continuously visit my yard!
- Pit bulls should NOT be stopped from going to dog parks or penalised unless they have shown aggressive behaviour in the past
- Education is key. Require pet stores, breeders, and vet offices to give out a pamphlet of the pet bylaw to reduce the 'I didn't know' excuse
- Dogs left outside in cold temperatures or in vehicles with hot temperatures need to be addressed with heavy fines.
- No
- All dogs should be able to enjoy the dog parks without restrictions but also to the dogs should be trained and have good recall
- No
- The pit bull "bite strength" is a myth. Educate yourselves.
- Do not support bsl. Move forwards not back.



- able to buy licences online with annual automatic renewal, discounts for spay/neuter and microchip and additional discounts for proof of Training
- Pit bulls or like dogs have nothing to do with attacks. ALL breed should be considered equal. Owners must be held responsible for All breeds
- There is no evidence that 'pitbulls' are any more dangerous than other breeds. Not to mention that including a generalized type of dog in th
- I completely disagree with breed specific limitations, especially for pit bull type dogs. Many smaller dogs are more vicious.
- nope
- The number of animals in a home should be based on the size of the home. 6 dogs/cats is a lot of animal in a space.
- I completely disagree with pit bulls being singled out. German Shepherds, Dobermans, Chihuahuas all nite. The owners need training.
- I dont like the pitbull specific bylaws
- Blockheaded dogs, or any description that singles out a breed(s) is not acceptable. It has been proven time and again it does not work.
- No
- I have nothing..... except to say it makes me sad to see pit bulls put in their own categorie
- I hate the idea of pit bulls being singled out..... WHY DOES NO ONE SINGLE OUT OTHER BREEDS???
- "do not propose breed specific legislation.
- Ban bad owners from having animals. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners."
- All breeds should be considered equal. Pit bulls are not the issue.
- Children or owners not strong enough to control or restrain large dogs should not be permitted to walk the large dogs in public.
- Blame the owners, not the animals. Animals, like humans, need training. Also, we should consider all breeds equal; stop blaming the Pitbulls
- Enforcement of dog by-laws is woefully lacking in places like Nose Hill Park. Majority of dog owners treat it like one big off-leash area.
- Trouble dogs are always the result of mishandling and poor owners regardless of breed. Singling out pit bulls is unfair to the dogs.
- Dogs at large should be more severely punished than cats at large. Cats and dogs should have individual options shouldn't be lumped together
- I want to echo what most are saying. Breed specific laws are silly. Has anyone ever actually met a pit bull from a good home? Angels.
- N/a
- Cat licenses should be free (or offered at greatly reduced cost), because this would ensure more people license their animals.
- All breeds should be treated equally. Pit bulls are kind gentle dogs that shouldn't be discriminated



- A municipality should have an education officer devoted to the animal control bylaw. The individual should have professional dog experience.
- Remove your breed bias. Dog owners need to be responsible for their animal regardless of their size.
- I disagree with breed specific legislation. The problem is the owner, not the dog. I have met many small dogs more vicious than pit bulls.
- The city needs to enforce off-leash areas, specifically those near bike paths. I have been charged at while biking multiple times.
- The BSL that was mentioned in this proposal is very disappointing. I am all for obedience training for ANY dog. Pitbulls are not a problem.
- The phase 2 survey was very disappointing questions were not open enough, mixing multiple questions with only one Y/N answer is no good
- Please please do NOT pass breed specific legislation!! I came from Ontario where this has already been passed. It's HORRIBLE.
- No additional ideas.
- All breeds should be treated equally.
- There are many dog breeds that are just as strong as the pitbull, I think it needs to be on case by case bases, not on dog breed.
- 00
- I'm a plastic surgeon. I have to save hundreds of people (esp kids) every year after a pit bull attack. The pitbull problem is real. Period.
- No
- Statistics don't lie. 82% of all human fatalities from dog attacks are from pitbulls. If they were a car it would be recalled. Regulate now.
- I do not agree with breed restrictions. Possible mandatory training and education sessions prior to licensing. Certify owners.
- How many more people, kids and animals are going to be attacked and killed by pitbulls before we admit and face the problem?
- When people have too many demerits they have to take classes- why not this as part of the fine system to encourage responsible pet ownership
- Na
- Breed specific is discrimination. The responsibility needs to be on the OWNER, not the dog!
- It's not their fault that pitbulls were bred to rip/tear flesh with enthusiasm and athleticism. Breed traits/instincts require no training.
- I would really like to see if there is a more robust way to manage owners of 'outdoor cats'. I'm frustrated by them coming on my property
- Do Not Pass a Breed specific law .
- Breed specific legislation is an extreme overstep by the city.



- It is disappointing that Calgary is even considering BSL; it's not the breed, it's the owner. Do NOT ban pit bulls; ban bad dog owners.
- I don't agree with penalizing a dog or owner just because of the breed. It should be a case by case basis.
- "The fact is that BSL DOES WORK. EVERY TIME.
- I'm surprised more people don't muzzle their pitbull voluntarily to reduce the risk."
- Any breed becomes dangerous if we as owners set them up for failure. Irresponsible owners are to blame; no breed should ever be singled out.
- Nothing more to add
- Absolutely egregious that the city would even consider the BSL laws. Go after the owners instead of the animals!
- No
- Passing a BSL does NOT fix any problems. Responsible pet owners is what is needed. Any dog regardless of breed can be a threat.
- Meet with some responsible pet owners
 - stiffer penalties for animal neglect, cruelty or abuse
- There should be no breed specific bylaws
- Have neighborhoods form their own responsible animal ownership boards. Whos job it is to educate on by laws and responsible pet ownership.
- To single out pitbulls... disgusting
- Please don't pass BSL! Instead focus on training responsibility of the owner. Pit bulls can be as gentle as any other breed
- Reduced dog licensing fees after 5 years old. As they get older, the fees should reduce (older dogs tend to cost more).
- N/a
- muzzling a breed just because of the strength of their jaws is ridiculous. It would be like saying a very strong man must wear handcuffs.
- Why do we permit so many rescue dogs/cats to enter Canada/Calgary from other countries?? Our own shelters/rescues are full enough.
- I am really disgusted that Pitbulls are being targeted here. Unfair Discrimination for our beautiful breed. Punish bad owners not a breed
- We petitioned counsellors to ban the sale of non rescue animals in pet stores. Almost every counsellor showed support. Where is this option?
- "I'm very against breed specific legislation. It hasn't worked well at all in the UK.
- ANY breed can be dangerous"
- Making laws pertaining to a certain breed of dog is completely wrong, incredibly disappointed in The city of Calgary for even suggesting it.
- No



- You must provide proof that you can provide proper care to more than 4 animals in household, let alone 6
- I am not in favour of BSL. Focus on spaying/neutering and providing resources/training for owners of aggressive animals to prevent attacks.
- BSL is purely discrimination based on a dogs appearance not temperament or history. It does not work!
- Please do not target specific breeds. It is the owner that you have to train properly then the dog will follow correctly.
- BAN SHOCK/PRONG/CHOKE COLLARS. They are proven to cause more aggression and fear based responses.
- No need for BSL just train your dog
- Allowing Calgarians to have chickens will help to increase self-sufficiency in these uncertain times.
- Please look at other municipalities where BSL has been implemented. You ban a breed and a new one will end up taking over.
- No
- Don't judge breeds of dogs, judge owners
- Breed specific legislation does not work! Any breed/type of dog can be aggressive and can do serious damage, it's about owners and training!
- I have NEVER been attacked by a pit bull but have been attacked MANY TIMES by chihuahua's who are MORE THAN HALF THE SIZE..
- I feel it is brutally unfair to have a BSL, owners of all animals need to be responsible
- I am disgusted and disappointed to see breed specific wording in the discussion and legislation information. For shame!
- Don't make silly rules about pit bulls. I don't own or want a pit bull, I just know treating them like ticking time bombs won't help anyone.
- People need to be punished not the dogs. Not every bully breed is aggressive and a lot of the time when they are it is due to bad breed/owner
- Breed specific legislation is not the answer, punish the deed not the breed. Limiting bully types will increase Cane Corso etc
- I am NOT in support of BSL legislation. No no no!!!
- Proper training for pet owners is a must, it will help with incident prevention and ensure animals are receiving the safest care possible
- As many of us are aware, the breed of the animal has very little affect on it's behaviour. Consider human fault for aggression in dogs.
- BSL is extremely unfair, owners of nuisance dogs should be required to take training classes not just fined
- No not at this time
- Please don't make pitbulls wear muzzles, they're good boys.



- I'm only concerned about animal welfare. They are family not property. Are kids considered property?
- "do not pass BSL!
- This survey for phase two was not the greatest in set up or questions...feels like info will be skewed."
- Stop picking on pitbulls! If you're going to make things mandatory, make them mandatory for all!! All dogs have the potential to bite.
- Breed specific laws are horrible and unneeded, we are above that. I came from Ontario and now own two extremely friendly rescued pitbulls!!
- No other ideas at the moment
- The breed specific legislation is unjust. Many of these regulations seem as though they were introduced by people afraid of animals.
- Don't discriminate based on breed. Pit bulls and other bully breeds shouldn't be discriminated against. All dogs can cause harm if untrained
- Dogs are not the problem, people are. Laws should be made to protect all animals not punish them for the idiocy of humans.
- i don't understand why everybody thinks pitbull's are such dangerous animals. you can train a golden retriever to be mean if you wanted to.
- Fine for cat causing death to an animal; cats kill more wildlife than dogs.
- "Targeting bully breeds isn't fair.
- They are capable of vicious attacks, but so are a lot of dogs. Enforce proper training instead!"
- NO breed specific legislation!!!!
- BSL is ineffective. Legislate to protect the public from nuisance/dangerous dogs, not a specific breed (or "look” like a specific breed).
- Breed specific legislation does not solve any problems, it creates new ones. Focus on penalizing behaviours, NOT breeds.
- NO to BSL
- BSL is a rabbit hole I do not think we should go down. I have seen far worse or no training on small nuisance dogs than bully breeds.
- "Please do not pass BSL. It is NOT shown to reduce bites.
- Fine and punish bad DOG owners in general. Not just ones with "'scary looking” dogs"
- Dogs should be considered on a case by case basis. Dogs with a clean past should not have to pay for others' transgressions. NO TO BSL!!
- Owners should be punished not the animal. More options provided for training animals that have behavior issues.
- BSL is wrong and ineffective. For problem or aggressive dogs each situation should be assessed and changes implemented.
- I think we should pay more attention to WHO owns pets not the breed of the pet. Can the dog be removed, rehabilitated and rehomed.



- Breed specific legislation is not the answer, responsible pet ownership and addressing individual cases, NO MATTER THE BREED is the answer.
- I'm a courier and I've been bit by more tiny ankle size dogs than I have by big dogs! It's not the breed, it's the owners!
- Investigate the person making the complaint to see if they are the cause of the barking
- I don't believe breed specific legislation is necessary or beneficial to the City.
- No breed specific legislation
- The dog owner should be held accountable for the pet. There should not be any discriminatory regulation against a category of dogs.
- There are tons of random green spaces in this city. TONS. They're not specifically parks, just undeveloped land. Please add off leash signs
- The notion that a pit bull (or any dog resembling one?!) should be held accountable for something they haven't done is absurd.
- All dog breeds should be treated the same. Blockheaded dogs and pitbulls should not be penalized by their breed.
- I don't have an idea.
- I had to take a mandatory class when I adopted my dog. I think people considering "nuisance" breeds should have to be educated about breeds.
- Would love to see the "Canine Good Citizen" certification encouraged more. Maybe a reduced pet licensing fee could be used as an incentive!
- Please do not introduce breed-specific bylaws. It only makes discrimination against breeds worse. It's all about the owner.
- No, thank you
- NO BSL
- No breed specific bylaws
- Provide proof that bullies render a more severe bite than all others since this is the criteria by which they are being singled out. HOGWASH
- do not have breed-specific rules! Owners and training are the main issue with 'nuisance' dogs
- More water spots in parks, like small ponds for dogs to cool off and play in. More fenced off leash like Auburn Bay. More dog parks in north
- BSL is wrong. There are many well behaved pit bulls. Nuisance dogs come in all breeds. The owners are the problem not the dogs.
- I do not believe the pitbull breed should be discriminated. They are some of the nicest dogs I've met. Instead target any aggressive dogs.
- Breed specific legislation is completely unreasonable. Stop punishing well-behaved dogs and good owners.
- You offer discount licence fees for LESA and people with low income but nothing for me who works full time and will soon be a senior
- Barking is not a crime.



- We have a dog behind us that barks constantly and aggressively at us over our fence but you make it extremely difficult to get help with this
- Target owners not breeds. Habitually Irresponsible owners are disproportionately attracted to bully breeds to look cool.
- No idea
- Teach dog body language to those who are afraid. You're punishing many more good dogs and good people with breed specific laws than you help
- Mandatory participation in training classes to be a dog owner (of any breed) would be far more effective than BSL.
- Dogs can only be trained to be vicious. If there is a dog that has bitten or attacked a person, the owner should be investigated.
- Rescue dogs should be exempt from BSL
- BSL is racist and discriminatory. Create legislation that covers all breeds of dogs. Any breed can inflict damage to a human or animal.
- There should be no bylaws against pit bulls or similar looking dogs. This is an extremely biased law and should be looked into further.
- Most dog vicious incidents are created by the owner. Owner needs to take responsibility of attacks by getting dog training for their self
- Clearer definition of "nuisance" would be appropriate, an aggressive/violent dog is not the same as a dog that barks or has run at large.
- No BSL. Pitbulls are the "bad breed" now, but other dogs had this label in the past and it's been proven it's not the breed, it's the owner.
- Breed specific restrictions are unreasonable. I hope removing breed specific language is done before any proposed changes are put in place.
- If someone or their pet is being taunted the person the animal attacks should get the fine not the owner and the person if not an adult shou
- Make obedience classes for any dog breed mandatory. Make it clear through education that you can't just wing it owning any pet.
- BSL is not appropriate for our city. Animal owners should be held responsible regardless of breed, proper training should be enforced.
- It's not the breed it's the owners.
- Owners of nuisance dogs should be required to undergo training to learn how to deal with their dogs specific Issues
- There needs to be a clear separation of pit bull dogs and nuisance dogs in all questions.
- Please do not allow up to 12 animals per household. That is far too many to be cared for properly and for a house in the city to sustain.
- Please don't judge a dog only by breed, rather by its behaviour. All dog breeds should start with a clean slate, no discrimination
- I believe, that forcing only specific breeds of dogs to wear muzzles is inhumane and cruel. This bylaw would be punishing good, innocent dog



- No to BSL! More education, less regulation.
- There seems to be an issue with pet thieves and pet dumping in Calgary. More police and news attention is needed on these issues!
- Do NOT tell me that 2 pets are "enough"; for a person. Then there should be limits on kids. My pets are my kids, 4 is good (I can \$ care for)
- It is my opinion that singling out any breed is animal racism and should not be tolerated. Uneducated people are the problem not the animals
- I do not believe that breed specific legislation is beneficial
- NA
- We have problems with
- Breedism is reductive, unsupported by evidence, and harmful to the public. It is abhorrent that BSL is even being discussed.
- I don't agree with pit bulls being banned in the city of Calgary. I think ideas listed in the survey can be used with out any breed bans.
- No
- Dog bites against humans should be investigated to determine if the dog is in fact at fault or if it was defending itself from the human.
- N/a bud
- Breed specific legislation is discriminatory. All pet owners should be responsible no matter the breed or size.
- Thanks for this opportunity to advise, the dogs and cats are never the problem. The problem is the owner of a pet! Police the owner not breed
- I don't have any idea.
- Don't blame the dogs, blame the owners and make them be held accountable. Encourage proper training and education.
- NO NO NO TO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION!!!!
- "I do not agree with breed specific by laws.

- I disagree with limiting number of pets.

- Fines should be lower."
- I believe mandatory education for dog owners should be made available.
- Animals should not be considered hostile or risky simply because of breed. Chihuahuas are more violent than any pitbull.
- BSL is ridiculous. I've seen more aggressive small dogs in dog parks than I have large breeds. It's the owner not the dog.



- Chickens could work but I feel like a) not enough owners would be responsible enough, and b) it could cause issues with neighbouring dogs
- Sensible use of outdoor rinks and tennis courts in off season for dogs that aren't ready/ can't be off leash. Use by 1 family group at a time.
- It would be nice to have more designated off leash areas
- Why are you making a joke?
- I believe that the owner of an animal is responsible for the behaviour of a pet. For senior/disabled animals exceptions should be made.
- Larger fines for cats who roam free or that are not in leashes! I've seen many people train them on leashes just like dogs.
- Legislation should be centred around owners of the animals, and not specific to the breed. Responsible ownership should be the priority.
- There are no bad dogs. Just bad owners. Make training cheaper and a requirement. Hold owners accountable to their pet.
- Awareness programs need to be supported. I.e; how to approach a dog, how to recognize aggressive/fearful dogs. Especially with kids involved.
- I thought Calgary did not promote hatred or discrimination, why single out a breed and their owners? Shame on you!
- No law should be breed specific a dogs behaviour is determined by its owner
- Those who don't like BSL - their perspective might be different if they were left with life-altering injuries from a pit bull attack.
- I do not support breed specific regulations and think they could do harm by placing perceived danger on dog breeds rather than dog owners.
- If a yard of a private home is not a completely closed in area, the dog must be on a leash. and unfixed dogs must be leashed at all times.
- Total ban on Pit Bull type dogs in Calgary, Alberta, Saskatchewan and BC. I've been bitten by such a dog whilst protecting my own dog.
- Why has the City of Calgary opened this up to literally anyone on the internet?? Only Calgary taxpayers should participate in the survey.
- Breed specific rules are not fair and haven't worked in other jurisdictions all it does is unfairly vilify a large breed dog.
- Any dog may attack at some point, but chihuahuas don't inflict the damage that a pit bull or rottweiler would.
- Removal of skunks. They are rampant, hurts children and your own pets. Relocation of wild animals in city limits, ie coyote, fox, cougar, et
- Every decade it is a new dog to ban. German shepherds, dobermans, now pitbulls. When will we start putting responsible dog ownership on ppl?
- Responsible owners will abide by regulations. Irresponsible pet owners will not. Serious fines/sanctions for irresponsible owners are needed
- Breed specific rules are silly. It's about responsible owners no matter what the breed.



- Go to DogsBite.org to see the stats. BSL sounds mean, but stick with the facts.
- Breed-specific legislation is not beneficial or effective. Dog owners and their treatment and training of their dog determine these outcomes.
- Breed specific legislation is cruel. Don't be a city that enforces that.
- BSL is such a crock. No bad dogs only bad owners.
- From 2005 - 2019, family dogs inflicted 54% of all fatal attacks. 65% were inflicted by pit bulls. Stick with facts.
- Mandatory training for all OWNERS. Reduction in licence fees if proof of training can be provided. Higher fees may encourage training.
- "Of the 346 fatal pit bull attacks during 2005-2019, over half, 53%, involved killing a family member.
- See stats on DogsBite."
- Increase fines for waking dogs in play/school/athletic parks and walking a dogs dogs without a lead in areas not specifically designated.
- Retractable leads should be prohibited. They pose a danger to the dog, owner, and others.
- Smaller are dogs are proven to be more aggressive, but can be manhandled so they are given a pass, which is not ok
- Offer more free access to low cost dog training so we can reduce the risk to the public.
- I'd like to see a ban on extendable/retractable leashes, as well as any other metal/wire or rope leashes.
- -
- Pitbulls are a wonderful bread. It is the owner who causes issues. I will leave Calgary if pitbull ban occurs.
- None
- It should be mandatory for all dog owners to take training classes.
- How about we find a POSITIVE way to increase awareness and education of pitbulls rather than trying to eliminate them like hitler did the jews
- As someone who was badly attacked by a toy poodle and always around big dogs it disgusts me people are so prejudice of certain breeds
- You keep looking at the DOG or other animal and are not focusing on the problem. OWNERS are responsible and need to be taken to task.
- Legislation shouldn't be breed specific. Owners not breed types are the issue.
- None
- Temporary ban on pet ownership if a person is a repeat offender and shows that they are incapable of providing the animal the proper support
- Provide education to young children about how to approach a strange dog or cat. Some useful do's and don'tS
- Avoiding BSL and language that presents this view is a must. Calgarians do not want breed discrimination! Owners need to be held responsible



- please stop targeting specific breeds, it will not fix your problem. Take more time per case to learn why the dog did what it did instead.
- City Bylaw Enforcement should make some sort of effort to control cats. Currently they make none. It is sad
- I always thought that volunteers in Fish Creek Park could hand a yellow card if they spotted someone not picking up after their animal.....
- Dog breeds developed for fighting have no place in urban settings.
- A big problem is Feral Rabbits. They damage private property due to burrowing. Suggest a trap, spay, neuter, program. If not, then cull.
- if license fees are reduced for low income they should be reduced for everyone
- The banning of animal based on breed is unacceptable and inappropriate.
- In home rentals or ownership there should not be a restriction on having a pet. There are too many NO PET homes. Ontario allows pets.
- Owners with cats that are 100% indoor animals should not be required to license their cat.
- Incentivise good pet ownership habits by perhaps giving them a break on licensing or partnering with local shops for sales opportunities.
- I have a better chance at getting attacked by a human being then a pit ball.
- Dog parks should offer minimum 5 fenced lanes(Bowling alley concept) FCFS, \$5 for 30min, dogs can run without worry, city gets user fees.
- Increased fines for dogs off-leash in on-leash dog parks where other dogs and children are present.
- The idea of identifying one breed over others is discriminating and unfounded
- No pit-bull based by laws. However I am in full support of increasing fines and penalties for bad pet owners.
- Breed specific legislation should not be implemented in Calgary. A dog's behavior is the result of the owners training or lack of training.
- I would like this to be a reconsideration of not targeting one specific breed of dog. All owners have to be held accountable.
- Fines must be accompanied by training and evaluation of the human. This is not enough space to give a complete answer.
- Educate children and people of how to greet a dog/cat they don't know. What to look for? What to pay attention to. Animals have rights too.
- Why just pit bulls? Rotti, doberman, German shepherds etc are all strong, not fair to lil pitties. I love all dogs and will not support BSL.
- "pit-bull type dogs" because of bite strength, "pit-bulls" rank #10 in bite strength @235 PSI with other common breeds ranging from 750-300.
- I do not like the idea of targeting Pit Bulls and associated breeds. Target responsible pet owners!!!
- Euthanizing all stray cats and aggressive dogs that cause attack an injure people.
- Do not implement breed specific legislation, Calgary is a progressive city that knows how archaic that type of thinking is



- I don't believe having a breed specific bi-law will be fair as I have seen more small dogs attack people and other dog than any Pitbull type
- The current by-law for barking dogs places the burden of proof on the person filing a complaint. It needs fixing and enforcement
- I don't think it's fair to isolate a certain breed ie pit bulls. I don't have one, I have a small breed and they can be really bad too.
- I believe the city of calgary should really RE-CONSIDER their possible bylaw regarding "pitbull" dogs and " nuisance" dogs.
- The emphasis on pit bulls is not right. There should be more emphasis on owners being responsible and ensuring dogs are appropriately traine
- I opposed breed specific legislation. I support stronger rules and controls on animals which are demonstrated to be dangerous to the public.
- Bee hives. A resident near has four hives and not looked after. One of the hives typically swarms in the early summer looking for a new home
- Bee hives. A resident near has four hives and not looked after. One of the hives typically swarms in the early summer looking for a new home
- Make the licence fee for a neutered and unneutered dog the same.
- Hey how about we leave breed specific legislation in the past where it belongs and not discriminate against a dog based on the way it looks?
- I didn't see it mentioned anywhere about repeat offenders. Fines should be higher for these people and also a ban on owning pets.
- In the future do not have misleading associations of nuisance and a particular breed. You need to have unbiased questions
- I don't think it should be an offence to have a cat at large. I fail to see the harm a free roaming cat can cause. I also don't support BSL
- Have any revenue gained from animal fines go towards funding rescue shelters and humane training organizations.
- No breed of dog should be singled out. Make first time dog owners take obedience classes to learn how to train and control their dogs.
- .
- Bylaws are useless unless enforced. What do you plan to do to enforce all the bylaws addressed in this survey?
- City-run animal training program; program fee based on income to accommodate low-income pet owners.
- Pit bulls are not dangerous. Most of them are cuddly teddy bears. The Pit bull has a bad name due to bad owners. I will move if this passes
- Owners of dogs, should not let their dogs walk on the lawns , or urinate on vegetation or flowers...
- .
- It's important that pit bulls and bully breeds are not needlessly discriminated against with unduly muzzling, etc. This idea is outdated.



- What about bylaws pertaining to bees. Ensuring rules are followed so it's safe for neighbours.
- Calgary has been a Stand Alone example for the rest of Canada regarding dog issues. The theory Deed not Breed a best practice for all cities
- Calgary was the leader in creating legislation that focused on good pet ownership rather than a particular breed of dog. Shameful to change
- Option for a Licence for the owner, not the pet. Option for licences to go on subscription. Licence for puppies to limit backyard breeders
- Fines should go to the victims of animal violence. Any other animal related fines should be used to fund affordable obedience classes
- Any revenue that is gained from animal fines should go back to animal shelters, spay and neuter programs, and animal rescues.
- Nope
- Limit of 3 animals per house house. Maximum.
- Toss off and focus on real issues like transit or tax burden
- No dog should be discriminated against. Maybe have a test that each dog must pass that determines its behavior.
- Some pet owners obtain a pet and do not know how to responsibly look after it. Education is required for first time pet owners.
- No restrictions for pet ownership in rentals owned by a corporation
- Training in obedience classes cost way too much making it hard for pet owners to get the proper training for their animals, There should be
- One rule for all dog breeds. Stop doggie racism today
- You have been "exploring" the idea of urban chickens for at least a decade now - perhaps just get with the 21st century and make it happen
- no
- all new dog owners must get their new dog temper and aggression tested, and min of 3 dog training classes.
- Nuisance is a broad category. A loose animal is not automatically a dangerous animal. Dog owners need to train their animal not just pits.
- N/A
- As a vet tech, I can honestly say that the worst breeds are the little ones as owners don't believe in training. Don't bully my breed!
- BSL is unnecessary, it's not the breed - all dogs bite if they're not properly trained. It's quite discriminatory...
- Possible mandatory obedience training for owners of Dogs to ensure that everyone is on the same level. Mandatory spaying if no intent breed.
- An action by a pet has been done by the owner. If a dog hurts someone it is assault and battery a criminal offense. It is your pet.



- You really need to stop demonising bully breeds, it's awful and makes you look pathetic. All breeds can cause harm and attack people...
- Dogs aren't bad unless they have been conditioned be that way, be it intentional or not.
- Dogs should not be judged on their breed, they should be judged individually.
- No to single out pit bulls
- Weight limit for animals in rentals should not be a thing. Also, non refundable pet deposits.
- Breed discrimination is not okay, first time dog owners should be required to take training classes with their pets.
- I don't think it's humane to keep a cat indoors all the time.
- The restrictions against pitbull-like breeds is based on misinformed opinions and should have never even reached this stage of consideration
- Why are barking dogs not addressed her we have 2 that bark constantly with no resolve
- Mandatory info and training organized for owners of "trouble breeds" to help understand behaviour of their dog and how to prevent conflict
- Maybe household pet number limits should be in conjunction with property size?
- Ban cropped ears and docked tails, unless medically needed, as it's unnecessary, can hurt the dog, and is often to make those breeds scarier
- Pitbull owners and dogs who have shown a propensity to be dangerous need to have a fence inspection and need to assessed
- I would be like to see strict but proactive ways to prevent dog bites and promote responsible dog ownership
- N/A
- None
- We all know that good people follow societal rules, and scofflaws don't. Making more rules will never change that.
- Require pet owners to complete a mandatory multiple hours course on responsible pet ownership before the person can acquire a pet license
- Licensing dangerous dogs separately, similar with firearms system. The dogs could be more dangerous then weapons because they can act indepe
- There should be minimum weight required for people walking large dogs, so they're able to control the dogs in case of an on-leash attack.
- Have mandatory training for all dog owners. Not all bad behaviours are intentional, some people just dont know any better.
- Would like to see bylaw and fine for nuisance dogs related to constant barking.
- Not all pits are bad there are bad owners so blame the breed blame the deed!!! THERE ARE AN AMAZING BREED.. If taught right!!!
- Very dissappointing by-law regarding "pit bull and pit bull looking” dog! I've never met a bad one yet!!
- Explore urban rabbit farming.



- Pit bulls should not be treated different from other dogs. Nuisance animal labels should only come when an animal is a nuisance not by breed
- .
- I think that dog owners should be required by law to provide at least one hour per day of exercise for the dog.
- Aggressive animals should not incite city fines, that money should go to the victims that are being attacked.
- na
- "Incentivize obedience classes by reducing licensing fees for first 2 - 3 years
- A public register of where pit bulls are located."
- No.
- I really hope you guys aren't dumb enough to put breed specific rules in. Pit bulls are not the problem, bad owners are.
- No
- Roaming cats need to be dealt with better. If dogs can't roam free, neither should cats. For their safety and because they can be a nuisance
- Pit bulls are not the problem , irresponsible owners regardless of breed are. Cats shouldn't be allowed to roam they kill too many birds.
- BSL has my support Calgary. Even if it saves one child from a pitbull attack a ban is worth it. What's truly shameful is pitbull advocacy.
- Bylaws for dog walkers.
- Increasing fines for multiple infractions for nuisance dogs. Mandatory obedience training for large dogs
- I feel bylaws should be set against pet owners not the animals themselves. Tougher penalties for irresponsible owners
- dogs should not be punished because of their breed.
- Policing of pathways and better signage so people are aware of the rules, not many are.
- Pet owners need to be held responsible for their pets and how they act! Pitbulls are one of the nicest breeds I've experienced
- Re-looking at what constitutes an "emotional support" animal
- Breed specific bylaws are not appropriate
- having new dog owners have to take a course in order to licence their pet.
- Breed specific legislation should not be considered.
- punish bad owners, not dogs. Pitbulls are the most beautiful dogs.
- I do not agree with muzzling pit bull breeds. Discrimination against the breed is not right.
- Dogs w/specified height and weight limit should be muzzled in public AT ALL TIMES within City limits. Ends any major injuries to man or animal
- Please remove any BSL language from your bylaws. Responsible pet ownership covers all breeds/species. Do not unjustly punish based On breed



- Breed specific bylaws should not be considered
- Training new Canadians how to behave around pets. They don't need to scream when they see a dog walking or try and hit a sitting dog
- I am firmly against breed specific legislation... it's not the breed that's an issue, it's the owners.
- Chihuahuas bite more than any dog I've encountered
- Bylaws should address nuisance animals not be breed specific.
- Do not promote breed specific laws. Im a retired letter carrier I've been bitten 5× :2cats, 2small dogs 1german shepherd NO pitbulls EVER
- Enforcement of on-leash rules. There are a ton of off-leash dogs in on-leash areas in the beltline.
- an Owner should not be penalized if their dog bites defensively, for example if harassed/taunted by an adult or minor.
- Bylaw policing dog parks on a frequent basis. Irresponsible people ruin it for the nice dogs and pit bulls.
- Quicker response time from authorities for potentially dangerous scenarios - ie someone who refuses to leash his pit bull while walking it -
- I believe that owners should have to take a dog care training program, feeding, vet responsibilities, exercise, waste management, etc
- Encourage training for all dog owners regardless of breed.
- Apply the same rules to all breeds. Singling out certain breeds is super ignorant.
- I take issue with Breed-sp' thinking bc' it's often owner creating danger. Responsible Breeders screen people as much as child adoption!
- No
- There is no conclusive scientific proof to suggest that pit bulls are in anyway more dangerous or aggressive than other dog breeds.
- Make the rules for dogs in general, don't be breed specific. Any well trained pit bull is the friendliness dog you'll ever meet.
- Lower fee for neutered animals. Stricter rules for pop and scoop. Leash free parks by pet size or breed.
- Not really.
- Consider free or very low cost dog training classes for all owners - not attached to income. Violent dogs are because of owners - not dog
- Not at this time
- DO not BSL, it's antiquated. Dogs are like children, if raised poorly will turn out poorly. Blame the owners who failed in raising the dog.
- Update the survey to include accurate information and not target pitbulls w/ inaccurate information just to get a stronger response against
- Proper classes for people who have multiple offenses regarding their pet. Once can be an accident but multiple times is negligence.
- N/A



- Don't demonize a particular breed of dog
- Stop the sale of pets at pet stores. Strict control of pet breeding—could be dependent on how many animals are in local Shelters.
- Any breed is capable of biting, do not single out specific breeds, or dogs who have a certain "look" or body type or markings.
- thank you for exploring hens and other livestock, if instituted responsibly could be a benefit
- More enforcement of leash laws and no warnings. Everyone should know the rules when they choose to they a dog.
- Pet owners should have to complete a free on-line course on Responsible Pet Ownership before purchasing an animal license
- More bylaw officers on duty and longer hours. People run their dogs off leash in on-leash areas before and after bylaw officers are working
- Do not bsl, pitbulls are no more aggressive than other dogs, and are not the dogs with the strongest bite.
- More expensive licenses for pure bred dogs. More expensive license for dogs not spayed or neutered.
- No
- I feel the need to mention that I am inherently against breed specific legislation. There should be larger fines for irresponsible pet owner
- Implement 'corrals' like in Toronto where you can take your pet into a 5 by 5 foot enclosure where your dog can go poo. Controls feces.
- I feel strong that certain breeds of dogs deemed dangerous by a statistical standard should be band from the city
- I disagree with any breed specific by-laws or rules. It's irresponsible owners that are the problem not any particular breed
- What can be done about Calgarians who mistreat or neglect their pets? Is this clearly spelled out by the city?
- No BSL. Every city and province prides itself on changing their own BSL laws to what Calgary has. Don't ruin your reputation!
- Animal cont officers should have training in dog mgmt and behaviour, so they can identify if an "agressive" dog is just fearful or other ...
- Ban pit bulls for the City of Calgary; they ear extremely dangerous and totally unpredictable. Pit bulls kill people.
- Please make Calgary pitbull free. I am a dog owner and lover and have encountered aggressive pitbulls on several occassions.
- If a dog or child is making excessive noise then someone's needs to investigate. Excessive happens for a reason, a need isn't being met
- Ambassadors at off leash parks. Instead of a colour warning system, volunteer ambassador randomly patrol off leash parks,
- Bad pets are because of bad owners. Penalize the owners, not the animals.



- More opportunities to rehabilitate rescues - I mean access to a range of behavioural specialists to assist the owners stop nuisance animals
- No
- Pet bylaws should be linked more with housing. Prejudice against big dogs in apartments is unfair - smaller dogs that tend to bark.
- Make training mandatory when buying or inheriting a pet. For the owner and the pet. Make it easier to enforce rules about cats at large.
- Same law for cats as dogs. Cats are a big nuisance out all the time pooping in gardens that's not theirs. No real repercussions for owners.
- The retraction of off leash dog areas, why does a non dog owner get preference over a dog owner?
- my idea is to stop labeling pitfalls!
- This city shouldn't single out a breed based off of looks and what they think is bad. This city should focus on the owner being responsible
- Dog and cats outdoors should be required to have a collar with there name and owner information
- Owners of dangerous breeds should be required to purchase insurance to cover their dog attacking people, other animals and property.
- .
- Education is always more powerful than black and white abstinence. Don't waste money on a breed specific ban.
- Ensuring barking dogs in yards should also be covered. How often have we walked by barking dog who does not seem secured in their yard.
- Please don't introduce breed specific bylaws. Ban specific people from owning dogs instead, those who would abuse dogs.
- Provided they are 'fixed', microchipped and have not been previously deemed a 'nuisance', I feel the City should permit cats to roam.
- I'm sorry, this was the unrealistic survey and very disrespectful to the bully breeds
- The [personal information removed] causes bigger problems in this city than dogs do. Take care of actual problems before worrying about minimal ones
- Better enforcement when it comes to constantly barking dogs
- Consider linking number of pets allowed to property size and type in consideration of animal welfare.
- The city should address the population of domestic rabbits.
- BSL will not solve any problems. We need lots of education for dog owners, specifically regarding positive reinforcement training techniques
- I would support mandatory dog training sessions for owners that have dogs that are identified as nuisance pets.
- Firearm owners have restrictions on certain capacity firearms due to the potential for significant harm. Pitbull type dogs are the same.
- There's 8 other dog breeds that have a stronger bite force than "Pitbull" type dogs. Why are they not listed if it's about bite force? NO BSL



- Some of these dog bylaws should apply to all dogs, not only pit bulls. We need to keep ALL owners more responsible for their pets.
- BSL has been proven to be discriminatory to certain breeds and targets them unfairly. Any breed of dog can be aggressive. Train the owners!
- Do not introduce breed specific bylaws. Problems are with owners not with breeds.
- Nope
- Introduce fees to offleash areas.
- Dogs should not be allowed in any natural waterway. Their defecation ruins water quality and natural habitat.
- Dogs should not be allowed to pee on private property. My neighbour brings 3 dogs over several times a day to defecate and urine on my lawn
- Just having a survey about banning breeds shows how backward and ridiculous our city is. Ban the deed not the breed.
- 7
- Mandatory DNA testing of dogs so we can catch (and apply absolutely draconian fines) to owners who can't be bothered to clean up.
- Don't discriminate against dog breeds. The evidence does not support breed-specific bylaws and legislation.
- Affordable, accessible dog training and behavioural education for ALL pet owners would greatly reduce the risk of any pet-related injuries
- Pitbull breed dogs should not be discriminated against. Responsible pet ownership should be across the board despite the breed you have.
- enhanced investigation process. There were 5 households with dogs where I lived, one dog would bark non stop(not my dog) all 5 houses got tix
- I am for a full ban of all pit bull breeds. They cannot be trusted with our children and youth. I love dogs but they disgust me.
- NO BSL!!!! All owners should have to take responsible pet ownership courses, not just breed specific ones!!!!!!
- Any dog that bites, should be put down and owners fined or jailed. No excuses.
- BSL are inefficient and antiquated. Every dog is an individual and should be judged on behavior, not appearance.
 - number of dogs per household may need to be linked to the size of the property (6 dogs in a small apartment may be inappropriate)
- Breed specific legislation is inappropriate, for example a Rottweiler could inflict an equally severe bite as a pitbull
- Consider creation of separate optional spaces in off leash dog parks for small dogs only
- Every dog who barks unnecessarily should be destroyed immediately
- Those that use the bylaw to harass pet owners that arent in violation of any bylaw should be fined
- There appears to be absolutely no enforcement of the rules in off leash areas and I would like to see this change



- Pitbulls are dangerous.
- Owners not animal need the rules. Education and awareness work best. Don't create rules to make work make them enforceable
- It is not fair (especially in today's world) that you are singling out one certain type of dog breed (pit bulls), for no specific reason.
- Suggesting that the breed of dog rather than the owner is responsible for their behaviour is beyond ridiculous.
- There is no evidence that breed specific legislation works at all. Proper training, education, and accountability will help much more.
- Do not discriminate against dog breeds.
- Dogs behaviour should be the pet owner's responsibility. No breed is bad. It's owners.
- Don't blame a breed for what WE as humans have put on them (ie forcing them to fight). They are an amazing loving breed. NO BSL!!!
- "I never see bylaw at offleash enforcing ppl to pick up after their dogs.
- Cant owners need to be more responsible, and pick up poo"
- Needs to be a more effective system regarding pets whose owners let them off leash in on leash areas.
- Trapping cats that are licensed and roaming the neighborhood and pooping in my yard should be allowed. The owner should pay a hefty fine.
- Alberta should limit the number of rescue pit bulls allowed into the province.
- Mandatory licensing, tons of people do not have licenses for their pets
- Lower pet costs for licensing would bring more owners to license their pets. Paying these fees do not help in any way to us
- What about exotic pets? Snakes, tarantulas, etc. All dangerous species, can inflict injury and even death and have not been mentioned.
- Deal seriously with barking dogs. A constantly barking dog is sleep-depriving torture to neighbours. The City should deal with the offender.
- All parks with playgrounds where kids play should not allow dogs. There should be a separate fenced area for dogs where possible.
- Discriminating against certain breeds because of social media propaganda and sensationalized news? Seriously? Pit bulls DO NOT deserve that.
- I'm hoping each incident will be dealt case by case. Each situation will be different and I don't believe any dog is at fault, the owner is.
- breed-specific by-laws should NOT be implemented. This will result in a lot of dogs being euthanized and solve nothing. Punish bad owners.
- It is of huge impact to consider the owner of the dog and quality of life and care a dog receives.
- Mandatory training, financial and home security demonstrated by intended per owners and proof of same before pet license issued.
- The breed of dog is not the issue - the owner is. To suggest anything else is ridiculous.



- My chief point is. Don't punish a breed for bad owners. Never bite by pit bull BUT have been by cute, little dogs.
- Breed specific legislation is prejudice and inappropriate. It is disgraceful for a City as advanced as Calgary be so primitive.
- How about a ban on certain dog breeds before any child or adult is hurt!
- Breed specific by-laws are unhelpful each situation should be dealt with on a case by case basis not a breed as a whole.
- An established colour coding system already exists in professional dog circles to ID friendly/non - using a traffic light coding conflicts
- Put [personal information removed] in a rubber dinghy and set it loose on the Bow River
- Potential pet owners should take a course as part of the licensing process. For responsible pet ownership.
- Not at this time
- Our government praises equality, this is contradicting that. Do not judge by breed. It's unfair
- The idea that any single breed of dog being dangerous is ludicrous. Any dog has the potential of being dangerous. Don't target pit bulls.
- People that want to own dogs of any kind should have to undergo training as it's usually the owner not the dog that created the problem.
- breed specific laws are ridiculous.
- Breed-specific legislation should not be pursued because it doesn't address the underlying issue of irresponsible breeding and ownership.
- Breed specific bylaws are disgusting and the product of naive ideals. Proper training for ALL breeds should be the priority.
- "TOO many rules result in people's inability to develop and use common sense.
- BSL= lack of common sense/education.
- TRY EDUCATION!"
- The pets are not the problem.....the owners are! Make it count and hurt the owner financially, they will learn to properly train their pet.
- Breed specific laws are nonsense. There is no "bad" breed of dog.
- Do not judge by breed it is the not a specific breed of dogs that causes issues, majority of the time it is the people stop targeting
- More focus on education programs for all dog owners and less on fines. Stop focusing on specific breeds and more on education for all dogs.
- If someone is unable to afford a pet license, then they shouldn't own a pet, unless it is for a medical reason or an assistance animal.
- I am an animal lover but I admit I am afraid when I see Pitbulls coming near me or my pet. Their behaviour is unpredictable and often severe
- Not at this time.



- We need to be able to sustain ourselves. COVID has shown us that. Urban hens are a start in the right direction.
- Giving incentives to people with well trained, socialized dogs, and penalizing people with ill behaved dogs is a better approach than BSL.
- No for the moment
- Ok
- financial penalty for aggressive dogs should be immediate and severe for owners including removing dog from their care min 1 week 1st offense
- Item #10 has 3 parts, but you're only asking for feedback on 2 of the 3 parts. I would support lifetime or multi year pet licenses.
- "Dog bites a child euthanize.
- Punish the deed , not the breed"
- Breed specific legislation is ridiculous and unnecessary. Pit bulls are not the problem, bad owners are.
- Max 2-3 large breed dogs or 3-4 medium or small breed dogs and maximum 4 cats per household
- Breed Specific is another form of Discrimination... I have been attacked by small breeds of Dogs and Never by Large Breeds.
- "Giving incentives to people with well trained, socialized dogs, and penalizing people with ill behaved dogs is a better approach than BSL
- People have a problem taking care of their own family ... and why should they have animals ...
- Dogs pooping in the river. Barking at the 11 street sw off leash is terrible, and nothing we can do
- Calgary should follow CA's lead and ban pet stores from selling commercially bred dogs, cats and rabbits. Also, I am against a breed ban.
- Stop bullying bully dogs, they are animals, if the OWNERS lose control remove their ability to have them or require obedience training.
- There are some people that just hate animals and try to "hurt" them, if these people are caught then they should be federally charged.
- Have more focus on education programs for ALL dog owners rather than focus on specific breeds (as the breeds are not the problem).
- Just rethink ur bully topic.
- Let the pit bulls be! Don't muzzle them just because they're strong... It's like handcuffing bodybuilders in public.
- I am very AGAINST breed specific legislation. It is proven ineffective as pitbulls are not involved in more incidents then other dogs.
- Enforcement of offleash, onleash areas by bylaw. Too many dustups by having people allow off leash in undesignated areas
- Why would a dog that barks be refused off leash?
- "So what changed in the past few years? Calgary used to have it together!!!
- <https://t.co/4vAySDfb3h?amp=1>



- ?
- I liked the topics covered in this survey.
- NO
- Do not ban pit bulls. Punish a specific dog not a whole breed.
- City of Calgary, pretending to care about your input but will do whatever they want after the survey closes.
- Would love to see bylaw allow for a visiting goat lawn service - following the success of the city's use.
- Larger animals should incur higher licensing fees. Not picking up pet feces should incur higher fines that scale up with repeat offences.
- bite/injury fines be 2 levels for minor or severe + consideration if dog provoked. All/portion of fine to injured/killed if no insurance
- I dont think imposing a muzzle bylaw is fair to people that own a dog of a specific breed or characteristic
- A dogs breed doesn't make a bad dog bad owners do. A dog should not be euthanized for a single offence.
- There should be NO discrimination against PITBULLS. The discrimination and penalties should be against the owners.
- Breed specific legislation is a terrible idea that will not accomplish the outcomes you want. Pandering doesn't work. Do better.
- More off leash areas in the city, specifically nose hill where bicycles are not allowed
- It's awful you're singling out a breed of dog (Pitbulls). Educate yourselves first, and quit punishing an entire breed.
- I think that muzzling breed specific dogs is ridiculous and should be re-evaluated on an as needed basis.
- No one under the age of 25 can adopt, buy a puppy from a breeder, etc., until they have taken a certified training program on handling dogs
- The breed of an animal has absolutely no involvement. Do not put blame on the dog, but on the owner instead. Pitbulls are amazing animals!!!
- Do not ban pitbulls. Breed specific legislation never achieves the intended purpose because it's not a breed specific problem.
- "I am sick of people
- Complaining about dogs barking,"
- Definitely against breed specific rules.
- Wow. Very disappointed in Calgary for literally calling out an entire breed of dogs. How close minded was the person who came up with that
- N/a
- You shouldn't single out pit bulls because of their bite force. Pit bulls are not born to bite, their owners allow that behavior.



- Any dog can be "vicious", it is about education, not discrimination.
- Training of dogs needs to be brought to the forefront. Encourage Canine Good Neighbour Testing. Encourage dog sports and training.
- Dogs are prohibited on school property, but owners (sometimes students' parents) bring them anyway. More education and enforcement, please.
- Do not skew responses by limiting the option for answers. Take in to account what the human did to cause the dog to bite them
- Discrimination of any kind is not okay, even within the realm of pets. Stop the craziness.
- Dogs being left out in yard unattended while owner away and becoming a nuisance
- Need better presence in off-leash parks to distribute fines to unruly or aggressive dogs, remove aggressive dogs, issue fines etc.
- I think more focus on actually enforcing current bylaws is needed. There's no use in creating more hoops when existing laws are ignored.
- Pitbulls shouldn't be targeted!!
- Preadoption training
- more fenced in off leash areas in south east, south west, near 210 Avenue
- I think the focus on certain breeds of dog is not the right approach. Support responsible pet owners no matter the breed.
- I think that muzzling breed specific dogs is ridiculous and should be re-evaluated on an as needed basis
- At the risk of sounding somewhat radical, isn't breed specific legislation simply just descrimination?
- Too vague-would capture dogs that pose no harm based on arbitrary looks/criteria. Lots of breeds can do damage in a bite.
- More enforcement of on-leash parks. There are many 'hot spots' that people continually bring dogs off leash because it is never enforced.
- More feces bag stations around city will mean more feces picked up
- Discriminating against breeds does not prevent biting/aggressive behaviour. More abandon animals could result from increased fees/insurance
- Mandatory rehabilitation for aggressive dogs rather than putting the animal down.
- Pit bulls are loyal, loving animals, people create aggressive animals. Disgusting that we even need to have this discussion!
- N/A
- If a dog commits an offense the owners should be held responsible and should be require to go through some sort of training program.
- Pitbulls are fighting dogs and unpredictably aggressive. We don't want their kind and their apologetic owners around here.
- To create a bylaw specific to pitbull breeds and not behaviours is a completely ignorant response to public safety and pet ownership.
- Dog walkers should have a limit of 4 dogs so that they can be adequately controlled



- Small breeds are much more common biters but only the larger breeds are publicized.
- BSL doesn't solve dog attack problems, it just gives owners with unruly dogs who aren't pit bulls a pass. Enforce training for all dogs.
- None
- Focusing on one breed doesn't change the outcome. This is only caused by people's fear of something they don't understand. Every dog is different
- Do not ban specific breeds, instead ban certain people from owning pets
- Pit bulls should be banned. Doesn't matter who's fault their potential bad behaviour is, they inflict far too much damage.
- Instead of raising fees, make it mandatory for nuisance pet owners to have to attend and then prove attendance at an obedience class ..
- There should be a bylaw against having large dogs in small apartments/condos . More strict penalties should be enforced for bad pet owners.
- More enforcement and fines of dogs being walked off leash in non off leash areas.
- It's definitely not about the breed, it's about Owners who own this breed. Pitbull owners are not responsible enough to maintain this breed.
- Punishment to bad owners NOT the dog/breed!!! NO BSL!!!! Shame on you Calgary!!!
- Addressing aggressive pets in yard with low fences - barking and aggression when the sidewalk is close and the dog can jump
- Just like we need to take a test to get our learners, I think if people want to own pets, they should get a pet owners license.
- Easy access to printable bylaw rules re barking dogs, to drop in neighbors mailbox
- Enforcement of the cat bylaw is a joke. If you have a problem you have to pick up an "acceptable" trap, set it up in acceptable location and
- I think a bylaw to cover neglected or at risk animals should be in place. Current state bylaw passes it off to Calgary Humane.
- You should have to have a business licence to breed animals. If you get caught doing something illegal (selling drugs) animal should be taken
- Breed specific restrictions do not deal with individual dog's behaviour. It would make us move and we don't even have the breed mentioned.
- A golden retriever nearly ripped my face off as a kid and a pitbull reversed the trauma years later. Stop focusing on the breed.
- No
- More off leash paths. Simply put a sign: you are entering an off leash area and then further along "please leash up, entering on-leash area
- Breed-specific legislation is known to be ineffective. The methodology of this survey makes it also ineffective.
- No



- I sometimes see pets in stores. I don't agree with this. They are animals and not everyone likes them.
- Yes, get out of people's lives! Enough of you control, dominate and subdue. Is this Big Brother?
- none
- Any fine should not be set in stone, it should be on a case to case basis . The cat at large fine?
- Pitbulls do not have stronger jaw strength than other large breeds, base legislation on fact, not folklore
- Stop allowing animals to be sold in pet stores and thru other means. If we want to end the abuse against animals, start at the source .
- Responsible owners have nothing to fear from practical pit bull restrictions. The result is the public will be safer from dangerous dogs.
- Obedience training and a behaviourist analysis on animal attacks should be advised in all situations regardless of breed. BSL doesn't work.
- Do not single out Pit bull dogs, vicious dogs come in many breeds and mutts.
- Fines are great and should be higher but we also need enforcement. Currently many irresponsible pet owners are getting off scot free!
- I totally disagree with breed specific bylaws. It encourages fear of that breed. What about licensing discounts for trained pets/owners
- Where is the opportunity to give further feedback regarding roaming cats and irresponsible owners?
- n/a
- "The breed of dog should not effect the fine amount.
- All dogs have teeth."
- All pets should be on a leash everywhere that is not an off leash area.
- Each neighborhood should have off leash areas within walking distance to neighborhoods, dogs can burn excess energy first.
- Enforcement in dog parks. The same person brings a dangerous animal. They say the bite/attack/threat is a one off but it happens weekly
- Consistent enforcement would be a better deterrent than large fines. I have never seen bylaw actually enforcing leashing etc.
- Fines for low impact to citizens (like unlicensed pet, pet at large etc) should start nominal and increase per infraction
- Mandatory Special training /education necessary for having urban livestock. Include topics like parasites, bacteria, viruses.
- I just stand strongly behind keeping pitbulls away from everyone.
- Enable / increase park patrols that can ticket people for off leash dogs; many owners in park near us don't monitor off leash dogs
- no breed specific targeting. I think the chihuahua on my street is more vicious then the pit bull I barely know he is there.
- Ban the sale of dogs in pet stores.



- Do not single out a breed, a dangerous dog is a dangerous dog no matter the breed
- No, I just came here to say how terribly disappointing it is that Calgary is suggesting BSL. Bring back old [personal information removed] and [personal information removed]!
- Ban pit bulls in this city. The breed is not stable mentally.
- huge problem with dog walkers in Calgary being able to walk multiple dogs at the same time - it is so very unsafe to others! We need a law
- Use common sense regarding pets, it's not always black and white.
- Breeders business license. I think anyone who is selling dogs, should carry a business license and be treated as a small business owner.
- "Nuisance" dogs is a broad category that places well trained breeds in the same category as those of which who have incompetent owners...
- N/a
- The "early warning system" is a good idea. It's usually a stranger's fault for aggression, so we should communicate how to approach the dog
- Don't single out a specific breed. There are no dangerous breeds just dangerous owners. Monitoring and enforcement are detrimental!!
- Breed discrimination is ugly and proven not to work in other jurisdictions. Y'all should be ashamed of yourselves.
- The fine question only offering increase or decrease was limiting. Stay as is should have been an option.
- If a dog is aggressive it is not because of the breed. It is because of the owner, and the potential trauma to the dog is receiving
- "Breed specific legislation is racism in the dog world. Many pitbull dogs have not bitten anyone. My 12 yr old one hasn't.
- To many laws now!"
- No
- Responsible pet owners with well behaved dogs should not have to pay extra fees because their dog has bully breed features.
- If kids have support teddy bears as support animals why do adults need more than a cat or dog? No "exotic" animals need to be considered.
- Treat pitbulls the same as other dogs. Get off your high horse
- Limiting the number of dogs with professional dogwalkers in off leash or increasing fines if those limits already exist. I regularly see 12+
- No
- Enforce the bylaws. Breed specific regulations don't work, it targets specific breeds not irresponsible owners that should be held accountable
- I strongly believe that dogs behavior is reflection of the owners. Dogs are kind and human friendly if raised with kindness, love and RULES



- No Breed specific legislation, it doesn't work, this is already known. Target irresponsible owners not the dog breed.
- Stop picking on specific dog breeds.
- Pit bulls raised with love. Trained and socialized at young age with constant reinforcing make a great pet. But all dogs are work. No problem.
- I've never been more ashamed of this city. This kind of ignorance is truly disgusting.
- "BSL questions were a BRILLIANT scheme to arouse the public into engaging the survey.
- Well done Bylaw! You would not dare carry on!"
- How times change. Pits used to be called the nannie dog because kids were so safe with them. The dog has not changed, we have. NANNIE DOG!
- Breeds are not the problem, ignorant and lazy owners are. The owners should be accountable. I've never met a Pitbull that wasn't a softie.
- Off leash areas need more rules, guidelines and expectations for owners who aren't attentive. They are disasters waiting to happen.
- It is the owner and people/the public that create reactions in dogs. More education/awareness is needed. Blaming the breed is wrong.
- No breed specific laws If your dog is aggressive it should wear a muzzle in public no matter the breed If something happens then owner fined
- None
- More fines based on off-leash animal attacks in on-leash areas.
- Interestingly, none of the project team seems to have a pitbull. You can keep redoing the survey, even if you're not from Calgary?
- Fine people for teasing and/ or encouraging dogs to bark. If under 18, fine the parents.
- n/a
- Don't allow pit bull or other dangerous dogs as pet.
- I feel that the animals are getting most of the blame, here, when 90% of "nuisance animals" are due to the owners being lazy/abusive.
- No
- Many of these suggestions rely on case by case basis or law enforcement's judgement which is a recipe for disaster.
- Address people who abuse animals.
- targeting backyards breeders
- just a comment- i believe all children should be educated- NOT to approach a dog without asking the owner if it is ok to pet their dog.
- Obedience training required in order to obtain an animal licence (for all breeds) and the first year license fees will be waived.
- Licensing for owners of aggressive breeds - same standards as gun ownership. Most of these dogs are fantastic pets in ill prepared hands.



- Ensure all legislation is breed neutral. Bite force is determined by size. Many breeds such as German Sheppard have a higher bite force.
- GOOD, responsible pet ownership is not the same standards for everyone. Too often pets are used as "guard” animals or for protection.
- I want to have BSL for pit bulls. They are inherently dangerous and have killed a lot of people/kids/animals.
- Increase fees for purebreds and custom breeds as well as breeders. Decrease fees for rescued animals and shelter adoptions.
- "1.Mandatory training for nuisance animals.
- 3.KEEP PITBULLS IN THE CITY
- 3.Equal treatment for all breeds not size."
- PLEASE do not discriminate against our beaut
- Have more off leash parks in the south east and divide some parks so the large dogs can be separate from the small dogs
- I would like stricter enforcement in off lease areas. Many dog owners do not have control of their dogs and don't pick up feces.
- Do not discriminate against different breeds of dogs. All dogs are beautiful and do not need to be segregated or cost more to have.
- Lower the license fee for cats that remain strictly indoors.
- Higher sentence for those abusing animals
- Responsible neighbours mean having a level of tolerance for pet behaviour. Periodic dog barking has to be accepted - excessive dog barking i
- Responsible pet ownership is a privilege, please respect your community by keeping your pet under control. Parks are for everybody to enjoy.
- Ban all pit bull type dogs.
- We live by the river and at least 20% of dogs being walked aren't on a leash. Stricter enforcement is necessary. More garbage cans availabl
- Pit bulls kill more than any other dog breed in history. They have no place in our parks or on our streets!
- We need to find ways to better deter dog owners who leave their dogs barking outside.
- I would like to see more off leash dog parks designated large dog vs. small dog.
- Breed specific rules are nonsense as it's the owner who is the problem not the breed.
- I do believe certain breeds of large dogs should be prohibited in Calgary e.g. Pit Bulls, Presa Canario, Mastif.
- We should not discriminate certain breeds instead we should implant licensing and training before purchasing a dog that is considered danger
- Dogs off-leash in on-leash areas seems to be getting more and more common. Perhaps warnings, then fines for offending owners.



- Regulate WHO owns a bully breed. If owner is un able to regularly socialize, train spend time with the dog problems arise. Ban some people.
- Breed specific laws should not be contemplated. Fine the owner not the animal!
- Waive or reduce fees for dog owners that demonstrate that they have educated themselves about dog behaviour (obedience classes, etc)
- I'm really concerned about "walking” dogs by dragging them along on a leash while the owner rides a bicycle. Educate more then fine more.
- Make having pets (especially dogs) chipped mandatory. Have it so Vets can report non-compliance and maybe give a reduce licence rate.
- Should have volunteer services for walking and cleanup to help care for pets.
- N/A
- "For number of allowable dogs, having
- a total weight limit (ie no more than 500 lbs total in dogs owned) vs number of dogs"
- N/A
- Use empathy, common-sense and please keep the animals best interests in mind and at heart.
- Breed specific banning of pitbulls is wrong. The city should focus on fines and deterrents for aggressive dog behavior in all dogs.
- Fines for bylaw infractions may impose financially on low income families. Community service could be an alternative.
- Stop looking at the problems as being just one type of dog. I don't go to dog parks anymore due to aggressive dogs of ALL types attending
- We need more off-leash parks, perhaps graded for small dogs to large dogs, and more public spaces where people can enter with their dogs.
- I would 100% support an eventual ban on certain breeds as has been done in other metropolitan areas.
- City is very restrictive on where you can bring dogs, even on leash. So many families have dogs and cant bring them due to not being allowed
- Changes that are overly breed specific are lazy and poorly thought out. All dogs can be bad if not cared/trained. Animal safety =#1
- I think that there should be a higher fine for anyone who has their dog off leash on a path that is not designated as an off leash area.
- Service and LESA animals should be one-time lifetime licenses. Other animal licenses should be 5 year term (reduced administration costs).
- Maximum number of dogs that can be walked by a single adult
- Crack down was harder on bad dogs. A dog should be put down it is bites.
- Do NOT call out a specific breed!! Untrained and owner instructed dogs can be vicious more than a certain breed. Teach owners
- no
- No



- Please please enforce the on-leash rules and fine people. Some on-leash parks have dogs running wild. How can kids play safely there?
- No
- Better monitoring of off leash areas. Stop singling out breed specific. ALL dogs can be aggressive. Consider free education classes.
- No
- The LESA question did not permit an answer that included raise the fee AND permit waiver. I support an increase and waiver potential.
- Pitbulls are proven to be involved in a significant majority of severe incidents. Pet ownership is a luxury, not a right. Higher fines.
- Dog walkers to be limited to number of dogs they walk (suggest 4 as a max)
- BSL is unnecessary, dogs should be dealt with on an individual basis not based on breed.
- 6 dogs or cats in one household is too many. That many animals under one roof in an urban setting will be a nuisance to neighbours.
- Some dog owners do not know to rein in their dog when people are passing them on a path. Pet ownership requires education and responsibility.
- Don't discriminate against dog breeds. It's not the dog, it's the owner. Also, I shouldn't have to register my indoor cats every single year
- Can you explain why the survey is available in 6 languages, but NOT in the other official language of Canada? This is unacceptable.
- I strongly do not support the mandatory muzzling of put bulls. I do not own one, but am concerned it will soon encompass other large breeds.
- Keep dogs that are on a leash off the "out of leash” area.
- Parents need to be responsible of their kids at dog parks. Kids under a certain age must keep their kids working arms reach at dog parks
- BSL is not fair. It is the owners who make the dogs aggressive, not the breed.
- The idea of charging people for simply owning a specific breed with no data presented to back up why that is justified is absolute nonsense.
- No additional ideas
- Honestly just leave the pitbulls alone. it's the owners who bring them up they way that they do. they are not bad they can be super loveable
- Dogs are reflections of their owners. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners.
- Preventative measures and educational programs. NO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION.
- Ridiculous! You wouldn't discriminate a baby because of their race. How is it ok for the city to discriminate a specific breed of dog(s)?
- Why aren't there clearly posted signs or sandwich boards (like the ones in off leash parks), in every city park\playground re animalbylaws
- They should run better background checks on those who want to adopt a dog, any dog because small dogs can be just as vicious as Big dogs.



- No breed specific legislation!
- No Breed Specific Legislation. Just education and preventive measures.
- A dog park is the one place where we as pet owners feel comfortable. Parents of children need to be held responsible not just the dog.
- I do not support breed specific legislation. Dog behaviour stems from their owners, and pit bulls arent the only strong dogs so it's unfair.
- People receiving government subsidies are not allowed to adopt pets.
- STOP BSL. Pitbulls are some of the best dogs they score very high on temperament tests. They are no stronger than any other dog their size.
- Improve engagement with animal welfare organizations when making many of these decisions (e.g. SPCA, wildlife rehabilitators).
- You can remove that pitbull type dogs have a stronger bite. The statements made are not based on fact nor backed by veterinarians.
- Children and their activities should be limited in off-leash parks. Their activity is often seen as play by dogs.
- If dogs are impounded for an incident, have them assessed for potential rehab and re-home them with someone who can improve their behaviour.
- Extremely disappointed Calgary would even present a BSL - NO TO LIMITING, MUZZLING, DISCRIMINATING AGAINST PITBULL TYPE DOGS.
- Are there any measures in place to catch people who may fill out this survey numerous times?
- No fines. Pet owners should pay expenses for any damage caused by their pet. Restrictions for those pets. Program/behavior training for pets.
- Barking dogs are nuisance and pet owners should be made aware of that, along with some suggestions to minimize the problem.
- Nope.
- A dog deemed a "nuisance" for barking should not be served the same penalties as one deemed so for biting or injuring. Should be separated.
- If not already, all off-leash areas should be COMPLETELY enclosed, as dog do not know the boundaries without a barrier/fence being in place.
- All City Rules should be posted at off-leash entrances, and Rules should include "Do Not Feed Pets Other Than Your Own" i.e. ALLERGIES etc.
- A bylaw specifying ANY breed of dog as a 'nuisance' is grossly ignorant. Past breeds thought to be dangerous have now been proven otherwise.
- Breed specific prejudice is misguided and detracts from the responsibility of pet ownership
- Parents of children should be held responsible for minor accidents caused by their kids; No breed specific legislation.
- Pit Bulls should not be targeted here. Owners are the problem, not the dog.
- A reduction in annual animal license fees for owners that complete Good Neighbor training or level 3 and higher obedience standards.



- none
- I completely disagree with any form of BSL , I have seen more aggression in doodles (I'm a dog groomer)
- "Get rid of BSL. I can't believe I need to say this in 2020.

- Bad owners are the nuisance, not pit bull type dogs."
- N/a
- Fines for having dogs off leash in a city park. Hefty fines.
- BSL is absurd and harmful to loved family pets. Pit bulls are strong dogs, yes. But poor behaviour stems from POOR OWNERS! Not the dogs.
- Fully enclosed off leash areas with dedicated areas by activity, etc.
- stop trying to make breed specific legislation. Any breed can be a problem or the sweetest thing
- Put a program in place that sends a " nuisance" dog to mandatory training, other than jumping to euthanization. #rehabilitate
- Small dogs can set off a protection feeling in larger dogs due to the smaller dogs aggression. I do not think you should specify breed.
- Get rid of animal licensing all together.
- Again I will just state again how disgusted I am at the use of pitbulls in this survey. And who ever wrote should be ashamed.
- Specific and increased penalties for people that bag dog feces and then throw it away on paths and other public places. Disgusting !
- It's already been covered in phase 2 conversation but I believe the breed restrictions are absolutely ridiculous.
- Fines are not effective without enforcement. There are MANY violations daily at our multi-use off leash park and there is NO Enforcement.
- Investigate the entire incident. If the incident was provoked or triggered, the 'victim' has a role in accountability too.
- It's ridiculous that pit bulls are specifically listed. Why is one breed being targeted? What about other known breeds that can be aggressive
- Safety and health of the dog is paramount. Re: license fees, # dogs, the owners need to be able to keep their dogs safe and healthy.
- No
- I was intensely disappointed to see the proposed inclusion of breed specific legislation. This is discriminatory and unnecessary.
- Remove the Bylaw complaint category for "excessive dog barking" unless the household in question has more than 10 dogs barking incessantly.
- BSL is the worst idea ever. Making him wear a muzzle on a walk would not only make him look scarier but would also be unhealthy.



- Consider requiring a pet license/liab. insurance prior to acquiring pet. Affords teaching opportunity re: responsibilities/penalties etc.
- No breed specific regulations. Owners with multiple/repeated bite/aggression reports for multiple dogs should face additional consequences.
- the breed restrictions are terrible!
- Leave pitbulls and other bully breeds alone.
- Mobile spay/neuter and microchip truck for low-income areas. City of Toronto runs a spay/neuter truck and a microchip truck.
- BSL is discriminatory and ineffective. "Pitbull" is not a breed and so labeling any given dog a pitbull is problematic. License owners.
- "Pitbulls" do not have an exceptionally strong bite, this is easily researched. There's no reason to arbitrarily target one type of dog.
- PLEASE DESIGNATE PET FREE PARKS FOR THOSE WHO WANT TO COMMUNE WITH NATURE WITHOUT BEING HARRASSED BY DOGS/OWNERS. POLICE UNLEASH AREAS PLEASE
- N/A
- Focus on behaviour, not breed. An animal that causes harm should be rehabilitated wherever possible, with problem owners punished.
- No
- I feel we are only considering the needs of pet owners, non-pet owning citizens need to have their voices heard.
- Attempting to legislate against pit bulls is [removed], please don't do it
- Enforced grooming practices for certain dog breeds
- No
- Provide the city with more affordable pet obedience classes. Irresponsible owners are the cause of "nuisance" pets, not the pets themselves.
- Place an outright ban on pit bulls, Rottweilers and other aggressive breeds.
- Pitbulls are no different than any other breed
- Na
- Absolutely no BSL for Calgary! It doesn't work.
- "- A ban on male intact pit bull type dogs outside of licensed breeders.
 - Additional, mandatory insurance for pit bull type dogs."
- Nothing further at this time
- N/A
- Ban certain large breeds including pit bulls.
- Please ban all dogs. They are nothing but severe health hazards.
- Voluntary dog early warning system is long overdue and needs proper public education to make it a success.
- My idea is the city shuts up about pets, pigeons, chickens and pit bulls.



- DNA testing of all dogs to allow for tracing of ownership of dropped / tossed bags of feces
- Lmnop
- Dogs should only be flagged as a nuisance for aggression. And the bandana system should be enforced at the off-leash areas. not barking.
- We need to get serious about backyard breeders. Theyre flooding the market with animals that can have serious health and behavioral problems
- The nuisance label should apply to the behaviour, not the breed.
- I don't have any ideas at this time.
- I do not support a pit bull ban or higher fees or insurance for pit bulls. This is discriminatory.
- Roaming cats are disease spreaders and kill native birds - this needs more attention. Survey skewed to pet owners and chicken activists.
- Regulation of breeders, especially "backyard breeders", and people selling dogs on Kijiji, etc. They need to be licensed and inspected.
- Quit picking on pit bulls. All dogs have the ability to bite. Sadly it is small % of pet owners that ruin it for the rest of pet owners.
- BSL is biased, discriminatory, and not supported by actual research. Ban the behavior, not the breed.
- No. Just leave Pitbulls alone. It's the owners not the animal!!!
- Fines for owners who specifically breed dogs for aggression and abuse them This includes jail time, bans on owning animals and monetary fines.
- N/A
- Really ashamed to say where I live now, mine as well say Ontario.
- I support nuisance dog legislation but am concerned that pit bull types will be treated unfairly under any such legislation.
- Pit pulls DO NOT have any greater strength than your average medium-sized dog. Focus on rehabilitation and training before punishing owners.
- Ya y'all need to blame people for screwing things up. People screw up animals, they screw up the city and they screw up Surveys
- All owners must take training classes. registry for owners. Tracking of owners who are irresponsible with removal of animals and hefty fines
- Breed specific legislation against 'pitbull' type dogs is unscientific and fear-based legislation that has nothing to do with community safe
- Deeply disappointed the City of Calgary is considering breed specific legislation considering the ample evidence that it is ineffective
- "Off leash dogs running all over the place provincial private properties need to be able
- fine owners of off leash dogs ect dogs at large"
- No
- I would suggest that dog owners get a pet licensing fee waiver from the City if they enroll their pets in animal training classes.



- Don't discriminate against pit bull type dogs. It is the owner, not the dog, who is responsible for a problem dog. Training ALL dogs is key.
- I support nuisance dogs getting training etc., but focusing on pit bulls will cause a larger issue of dog attacks, by ignoring other dogs.
- The common denominator in all this is: owners. The bad ones ruin it for all. None of these measures singles them out. Revisit your approach.
- Please completely ban dogs in city limits that have the capacity to kill a human being. I am an animal lover but animals are unpredictable.
- "Regulating breeders.
- BSL is technically racism. Look/color should not matter."
- Actual proof should be required to report a noisy or barking dog. We've been falsely issued warnings before.
- punish the owner not the dog! Don't discriminate!
- Dog walking business in residential area. The doggy day care must limit animals. walking of animals to walking park
- Don't ban any single breed. If anything obedience school should be mandatory across the board, and not specific to single breed
- Absolutely do not enact BSL. It is backwards and harmful.
- Dog owners should be required to train dogs excrement in their own yard. Not conveniently go for their walk and excrement along their walk.
- I've had a non-owner raise their walking stick as a weapon when my dog was on leash and completely friendly. Dogs aren't the only aggressor
- You can't stop a cat from roaming!
- Educational outreach programs for children and/or when adopting
- None
- I totally support banning pit bulls. Most attacks from dogs are reported to be from these aggressive breeds.
- There should be a limit on the number of dogs a dog walker can take to an offleash park.
- No
- <https://www.fairdog.dk/elements/documents/research/world-wide-failure.pdf>
- The fact you're picking on BSL is revolting. You need to target owners not the breed. More welfare checks and actually do something about it
- Discriminating dog breeds because of the actions a small percentage of poorly trained dogs is no different then racial profiling for humans
- No
- Do not change any laws regarding pitbulls, no specific dog breed is inherently violent, using collective punishment is a bad idea.
- Na



- I love the idea of lowering pet fees for owners who have gone through a training course. But I am completely against BSL. Target bad owners
 - Puppy mill and hoarding cases need to be more severely charged, and jail time issued for those with many sick and emaciated dogs.
 - property damage -beyond owners homes, many now live in apartments / condos that have no requirements for onsite facilities under land use?
 - Multiple fines for a cat roaming should result in increased fines or removal of the cat.
 - "Multiple pet ownership should be permitted or restricted based on the size of a person's home.
-
- Also, don't use BSL."
 - Targeting pitbulls by labeling them a problem breed is scapegoating and doesn't address the real problem, irresponsible owners of ANY breed.
 - No to BSL, pitbulls are no more dangerous than any other dog can be. All dogs need good owners who train them properly.
 - Fix the bylaw so that it includes all dog breeds, not a select few. Chihuahuas are more dangerous than pitbulls. Use reliable information.
 - Nothing at this time.
 - Enforce leash laws!!
 - Instead of singling out a specific breed. Problem isn't the breed it's the people. Make obedience more accessible.
 - Maximum length for leashes!
 - Owners need to HOLD their dogs leash. Many people put their dog on a leash but then drop it once at a park. They argue the dog is on leash
 - Owners need to HOLD their dogs leash. Many people put their dog on a leash but then drop it once at a park. They argue the dog is on leash
 - Don't implement BSL.
 - It's not the dogs fault, some people should not be allowed to own certain breeds.
 - Irresponsible owners / repeat offenders should be banned from animal ownership. I say no to BSL, it's the owners not the dogs.
 - We currently constantly have issues where people walking dogs allow them to put their head/bodies under gate into our yard. Bylaw idea
 - Watch for back yard breeders. They should be target and not allowed.
 - Mandatory follow-up by enforcement officers with nuisance dog owners and an increasing fine structure for second and subsequent offenses.
 - Please ensure you have the officers (and working hours) to support enforcement of these bylaws. No point in having laws without enforcement.
 - Pigeons should not be allowed out of the owners home/cage, they are considered a nuisance and they leave disgusting messes and noisy as well



- Restrictions should be put on people who run or buy from puppy mills, backyard breeders and animal hoarders.
- Stop blaming pit bulls as the cause of all dog aggression. They are no more dangerous than other breeds.
- "There is no bad dog, it's a bad owner!"
- Focus on stopping the dog fights!"
- I don't think it's right to say any dog that looks like a pitbull I have an American bulldog mix he looks similar to a Pitbull. Not the same
- No BSL!
- More training and educational resources for new pet owners and existing pet owners. More fines for puppy mills.
- A
- Animals found to be "nuisances" that are intact should have one of their requirements be sterilization to curb the need to roam et cet
- n/a
- Lower income families typically (not always) cannot afford food for families. Why would we lower the fees for greater accessibility
- Remove any breed specific mention in these bylaws and educate yourselves. BSL is BS.
- No
- I condemn any specific actions taken specifically towards the pit-bull breeds. This is inherent discrimination and lacks statistical basis.
- The sample size/demographic of Ph1 seems skewed. It's rare that responsible dog owners would opt for breed specific rules. Unimpressed
- More training for Bylaw Officers-I should not have to read your bylaws to you to complain. Don't pass on bylaw issues to other organizations
- A training program, brochure or signage showing how to safely approach others peoples dogs. Not all dogs like all humans!
- Don't just ban one type of dog breed. All dogs can be aggressive
- The rules regarding cats have to change. How can you possibly control the population if house cats are allowed to roam free ?
- Dogs need space. People should not be able to get dogs if they don't have the outdoor space for them (based on breed and size).
- It is highly uneducated to condemn specific breeds such as pit bulls. It is often the owners, not the breed, that are the problem.
- Thorough research shows that BSL DOES NOT work! Each dog is an individual and should be treated as such. Ridiculous to suggest discrimination.
- I have not been happy that as a senior on a fixed income with cats that are NEVER ALLOWED OUTSIDE that I have to purchase a license.
- Nothing more to add



- No
- The bully breed question is a straight out bullying of a breed of dog. I was bitten more by a toy poodle, Pomeranian and chihuahua's.
- Calgary, the bylaw did not fail you people did. Proper enforcement and educational campaigns about responsible dog ownership is all you need.
- Having more support for resources to help train new pet owners/ pets vs trying to breed profile a specific breed!!
- a city-wide socialized pet insurance program for all pets would greatly increase the quality of care that animals receive
- Pit bulls should not be singled out. Any dog found to have behaviour concerns should have the tighter regulations. Stop picking on pitties!
- Before getting a pet or adopting a pet, owners should go through basic courses on pet ownership, bylaws, how to identify aggressive behaviOu
- You've already made up your mind, so why bother with these fake engagement sessions? Don't bother next time. Don't waste our money and time.
- I am against the breed specific bylaws. I agree with imposing more restrictions on animals who have been labeled a nuisance.
- Do not ban Pitbulls. Banning Pitbulls will in no way help. This is discriminatory and wrong and if you cant see that there's a larger problem.
- .
- Don't support breed specific regulation, all pet owners should be responsible for costs of injuries caused. Harsher fines for animal abuse.
- Im completely against breed specific bylaws, but I do agree with nuisance animal specific bylaws.
- It's completely unfair to target a specific breed (pit bull type) or the way a dog appears. Don't discriminate against responsible pet owners
- I am severely apposed to the breed specific law. Owners need to be more responsible and understand ownership is a lifelong committment
- Make it mandatory for separate owner training not just the dogs.
- Fully against breed specific bylaws. Make the owners more accountable for the behavior of their pets!
- There should be more effort put into the fair treatment of pit bulls to make people less afraid, aggression is taught and not bred
- having a breed specific law is discrimination. I have been bit or snapped at by more tiny dogs than pitbulls. Punish the deed not the breed!
- when will it finally be accepted that it's not the breed, it's the owners??
- A training program, brochure or signage showing LEASH YOUR DOG. Dogs invade peoples space more than vice-versa. Not everyone likes your dog.
- Please do not pursue breed specific legislation as it obscures other efforts re. around nuisance dogs and shifts focus away from the owners.
- Bark collar



- I support the idea of urban chickens, under the condition that there are reasonable limits on the number of animals per household.
- More needs to be done regarding barking dogs and the ability to report them.
- More accountability from pet owners is a must. Negligence in training puts both public safety and the animals welfare at risk
- .
- The city should look at fining police for all of the traffic laws they break and not try to generate revenue off of responsible pet owners
- Parks need more monitoring for owners with dogs off-leash in on-leash areas for the safety and comfort of all.
- I believe that all dogs that go to parks and go outside on walks should have to wear mandatory "traffic light" flags.
- NO DOG OR CAT IS VIOLENT THE OWNER IS THE PROBLEM DONT BAN BREEDS THAT IS INSANE
- na
- A law that prohibits dog owners to let their dogs pee in other homeowners' lawn. Most people spend a money to make their lawn look nice.
- Steeper consequences for roaming cats.
- Easier to report roaming cats and response from the city that causes change.
- Yah stop making leading questionnaires that are discriminatory and biased in the way they are being asked and presented. Shame on you noBSL
- Roaming cats need to stop it is out of control.
- Owners with cats unattended outside should be fined immediately... Dogs aren't allowed off leash so why does it seem as though cats are?
- Stop targeting specific breeds, More issues with smaller dogs-napoleon syndrome. Myself and my dogs bit, excuses and passes given for size.
- Roaming cat control!They are a danger to themselves,other cats, animals and especially dogs who are leash and don't like cats (many rescues)
- More accessible and responsive way to deal with roaming cats. It is ridiculous.
- Cats should be confined to the property of their owner and this should be held to the same standards as dogs
- Dont ban breeds!!! Ban the owner from owning animals if he/she cant train the animal properly!! This specific breed ban is useless!!!!
- Cats need to be kept inside or on a leash. Steeper fines and consequences for owners.
- You can not target a specific breed. It is based on the owner and training of the animal.
- Catching and trapping licenced roaming cats should be allowed. They are causing damage to many people's property. And a nuisance to dogs.
- Keep cats inside!! Steeper warnings and actions for irresponsible owners.
- I don't believe that any dog should be targeted because of breed



- I do not support any breed specific law. Owners are the ones responsible for their pets big or small.
- Monitoring for roaming cats in problem areas. Bigger fines.
- Bad pet owners are the problem not the breed. We should be focusing on making sure owners properly train and care for their dogs
- We can have many rules but if their not enforced why bother? I have had to call bylaw regarding dog issues and they call back 2 months later
- DNA registry for dogs and testing of feces left on ground and feces bagged and thrown in bushes. Very significant fine for violators.
- I have been to off leash parks and have encountered too many aggressive dogs.
- Here's an idea - don't spend so many taxpayer dollars trying to micromanage pet owners in the city - leave the bylaws alone!
- People jogging or riding their bicycles through off leash dog parks should expect that dogs will approach them. Signs maybe?
- Na
- Responsible pet owners do not have problems with their pets. Increase fines and jail time for pet owners that are irresponsible.
- You should have automatically sent this to all those that presently have licenced animals in the city of Calgary.
- Attempt to return dog before being brought in by bylaw. That is stressful for the animal and helps no one. Return them home if possible.
- Some off leash areas should be for small dogs only. They are often the cause of attacks.
- no.
- Stop the breed specific legislation that you guys are talking about. This survey is terrible and should be used for nothing but garbage.
- "No pet neighbourhoods - no ownership, no walking pets.
- More by-law officers to enforce current on-leash areas. Raise fines."
- BSL is not effective, should hold the owners accountable regardless the breed. Bad owners not bad breeds
- When an animal is treated poorly they should be placed in a better environment. No animals should be neglected or abused.
- Have parents teach kids how to treat animals. Chasing and crowding around them are not ok. No way to address with the parents.
- Let calgary become more dog friendly - more dogs allowed on patios and public spaces. (If well behaved)
- The concept of blaming pitbull and pitbull types is outdated and in general pointless. Small dogs like the most common biters.
- No
- The pet owner is the problem.



- Greater focus on education for humane behaviour change. Or Least Intrusive, Minimally aversive training. NO BSL!!!!
- "Should be something for Lowering the cost fro training for low income, disabled, seniors

- No breeds should be picked on"
- More mandatory training for individuals with problem dogs or high risk animals. Higher fines for anyone circumventing. No outright breed ban
- Would like the pit bulls to be prohibited from the city!!!!
- Pit bull owners are some of the most mentally debilitated individuals I have met, I personally wouldn't blame it entirely on the breed.
- Owner is responsible and should be held liable for their pet.
- I am sure it has been covered but seriously do not punish poor dogs who have the wrong head shape and their responsible owners!
- Dog park for small dogs only.
- n/a
- I do NOT support the categorization of pit bull breeds. This is open and blatant discrimination. I do support increased penalties to owners.
- Low cost or free animal care and training classes available to everyone
- It is not the dog who is the problem, it's the owner, how they train and treat the dog.
- It is people instead of the dogs we need to worry about. Rather than lowering license fees for lower incomes, provide lower cost training.
- Na
- Pitbulls are never the problem. Their owners are.
- A responsible pet owners do not oppose restrictions on their pets that does not materially change their enjoyment yet is good for others.
- Give owners fines of over \$2,500.00 who train animals to be vicious, remove the animal and have a good pet parent to retrain them
- Certain breeds should not be banned. It is generally the owners fault in lack of training or socializing that causes the issue.
- Attacks by animals are not breed specific but rather due to owners not understanding the breed and requirements for the breed.
- Not really. Just breed has nothing to do with responsible ownership. Specific breeds and their owners should not be treated differently.
- We should fight BSL as passionately as we've been fighting racism. This prejudice needs to end, we're better than this.
- N/a



- As another person mentioned, owner MUST be held liable for their pets - no,exception.
- none
- I wish people would start to listen to their pets, outside and barking, there has to be a reason, especially like ten minutes or more.
- Mandatory training that is available for free through the City. Must provide proof of passing the training to allow your dog off leash.
- Breed specific bylaws are disgusting and should be removed immediately.
- Do not Ban pit bull or dogs appearing to be pit bulls! I do not own one, however I have been around many wonderful dogs of those breeds.
- Pit bulls should be banned from Calgary
- Pits definitely need more regulation. Account for most severe attacks. Doesn't matter if "small dogs bite more” they can't rip ur face off.
- Develop a free online course as a prerequisite to adopt animals. Don't make it a barrier, make it a real opportunity to eliminate arrogance.
- In off leash areas there is a lot of violation of the requirement for dogs, to be under the control of the owners. More education needed!
- Breed based discrimination is terrible. The statistics speak for themselves, the city has a responsibility to show people the numbers.
- Any breed big or small, the owner is held accountable for their behavior. More small dog parks with restrictions and fines for noncompliance.
- No ideas
- "it's okay that small dogs bite more as they can't rip off your face””.. my collie is much more likely to rip off your face than my pitty
- We need to start building laws to protect the animals. There is not enough happening to protect animals and punish people miss treating them
- All BSL language should be removed from bylaws
- Making dog training more accessible to everyone. Many people get dogs with the best intentions, but fail miserably at training at home.
- None
- No
- Owner should be held accountable, if you have a breed that is prone to biting people or potential then do your due diligence
- singling out pitbulls is dog racism. I have been bitten by alot of small dogs and never by a large dog.
- No ideas
- Do not penalize pit bulls just because of their breed
- No BSL! disappointed that the city even thought this was okay.
- There should be more emphasis on training dogs and how to locate good dog trainers to help with behaviours not scape goating a breed
- N/A



- no
- I'd like to not have bans or extra restrictions on pit bulls.
- No BSL. Disgraceful that's the city of Calgary even thought this was okay. Shame.
- DONT BAN PITBULLS. BAN BAD OWNERS, DONT BLAME THE BREED FOR DUMB OWNERS
- If you can't afford a pet, then don't get one.
- Stop breed discriminating.
- If you are set on a punishment system for dog owners, you should have a reward system for responsible owners.
- I disagree with breed specific legislation and do not believe it is necessary to pass bylaws about this.
- If I have a pit bull that is certified and trained, why should I be lumped in with bad OWNERS? It is never the dog always the owner
- "keep in mind, small dog owners who feel they don't have to leash their dogs are
- often instigators nipping jowls etc on the larger breeds"
- I am very concerned that the City is motivated to spend money on Tribunals when we have a perfectly functional and effective Court system.
- publish other breeds who also have biting incidents not just bull terriers there are many others,quit using bull terriers as the fall guys!
- No BSL... it is extremely prejudiced and these animals are unfairly judged.
- Authorize neighbourhood volunteers to fine violators as we see them and you don't. Bylaw is never quick enough to enforce anything.
- Any dog has the possibility of biting or attacking. Each scenario is different. Doesnt matter the breed of dog.
- Stop breed discrimination. The temperament of animals is directly related to the humans that train them.
- BSL needs to be removed from the bylaw. It does not reflect scientific fact. What a disgrace to think it is okay to include this!
- Get rid of the idea that it is ok to penalize specific dog breeds when the science/expert opinion does not reflect this! Disgraceful!
- This is it
- "Stop breed discrimination. Pitbulls are some of the nicest dogs I have met. It is ownership issues.
- And if you can't afford a dog, dont"
- Provide affordable access to positive dog training. Do NOT single out certain dog breeds to be more dangerous than others!!!
- No
- stop holding breed stigmas and start realizing no dogs are born aggressive it is taught by owners - plenty of very mean small dogs
- People should go to jail and have much much higher fines if their dog bites or attacks. The dog should be immediately put to sleep.



- stray cats...unadoptable? spay and release= suffering cold/hunger/loneliness. Unhappily I think they should be euthanized not released.
- None
- I do not believe in breed specific legislation. Pit bulls are unfairly targeted. Bad pet ownership leads to incidents. Education is key.
- Ban pitbulla
- Define and educate about nuisance barking. Fines against owners who allow their dogs to bark incessantly.
- Breed restrictions for pit bulls should not happen. Like any other dog, if they are trained well they will not cause problems.
- Chickens, livestock in the city. Ridiculous
- Not at this time
- A bylaw that requires neighbours to clean up defecation in their yard within 24 hours. Doggie doors should be closed between 11 PM and 6 AM
- I don't believe that pit bulls should be put in the same category as nuisance dogs before these negative behaviors present themselves.
- Hold all owners accountable for their dogs behaviour. Stop discriminating against certain breeds! Seriously be better than that people!
- bias against pitbull-type dogs. After being in off-lease parks, the problem is not often them; any owners can be thick. ideas? No room to wr
- Research doesn't support breed specific laws. Pit bull types don't need additional restrictions. There are a lot of myths about pitbulls.
- Do not single out pit bulls. It is not the dog that is the issue, but the owners. Require mandatory training for owners of 'strong' bite dog
- There are no bad dogs..... just bad owners.
- It's truly disturbing to see certain breeds being targeted. It's downright racism against animals. What about all the aggressive small dogs.
- I do not support breed specific legislation. The problem boils down to the owner and if the dog has been trained correctly.
- Stop including only pit bulls as a breed for laws. It's an embarrassment.
- Drop cat licensing. It's equivalent to licensing a goldfish. I am a responsible cat owner and shouldn't have to pay for those that aren't.
- Have animal owners get training regarding their animals. What happens when ,say, a 10yr or 15 yr old intentionally abuse an animal for fun.
- Do not ban pitbulls! Dog aggression is a learned behaviour and not breed specific. Hold irresponsible owners accountable.
- Mandatory microchipping of aggressive dogs
- Leave dogs alone



- pet ownership is a human issue, not a pet issue. A bad pit bull has a bad owner, just like a biting bichon is a bad owner.
- Affordable and easy to access training for dogs.
- Discrimination against certain breeds is outrageous! Education is needed more than restrictions on certain breeds.
- I think more info is needed allot more before you start pointing fingers at one certain breed
- More fenced in small dog designated parks in the city similar to what is in Airdrie. The only one in Calgary is extremely small.
- At the time of license. The owner should sign they have read and acknowledge the city bylaws and fines.
- Breed specific legislation is the Jim Crow law of the dog world.
- I would like to see dog owners be made to take a training course about how to be a responsible owner before they are allowed to own a dog.
- Special licenses for nuisance dogs that can only be obtained if certain criteria are met i.e. obedience training
- Lions and tigers bite people at a much lower rate than pitbulls, so we should allow them, right? Wrong! They kill people, as do pitbulls.
- All dogs and cats should require a minimum liability insurance. Insurance companies are professionals at assessing risk.
- no
- More garbage cans in large off leash areas like nosehill park
- I think cats and dogs should be distinguished more. They shouldn't be lumped in together.
- A lot of times when animals attack it is because they are provoked. Maybe the humans need obedience training rather than the dogs.
- People in residential areas don't always keep there animals on a leash and it's infuriating. Figure out fines for this and how to monitor it
- Ownership licence for the person owning the dog. Like a drivers test
- Please do not implement breed specific legislation. That is unfair, any breed can be aggressive based on how they are raised and treated.
- It is absolutely ridiculous that the city is even considering this!! Focus on the important issues--this is a joke!!!
- "Offer obedience classes through Parks and Recreation so more accessible and affordable.
- Subsidize spay/neuter costs for rescue animals"
- STOP pandering to all those snowflakes who are always wining and complaining about every little thing that annoys them. Stop this Fascism
- I think the price of dog/cat licenses should be lowered the longer they own the pet. This would encourage people to license their pet asap.
- Make humans get training for the larger stronger breeds of dogs. It's not the dogs fault his human is dumb.



- Please do not implement breed specific legislation. That is unfair, any breed can be aggressive based on how they are raised and treated
- Please don't implement breed specific bylaws. I'm afraid of all dogs to start and some of the most lovable pooches I've ever met are pit bulls
- Fines/higher fines for people who don't keep their dogs on leash in non off leash areas and run up to other dogs on leash and cause an incid
- Really discriminating and terrible that it is breed specific.
- No.
- Breed specific legislation and bylaws are ignorant and uneducated. The source of any aggressive dog is poor ownership.
- visible identification for service and emotional support animals. Also an info sheet explaining the difference upon registration.
- This is ridiculous
- against breed specific legislation but you should not be able to own a dog without taking training. Friendly dog workshops 4 fearful ppl
- we need rules for bad pet owners
- Training resources for children on how to properly treat/approach animals. Ask permission first to touch/approach.
- More bylaw officers at busy areas to be visible; educate, educate, educate, much bigger fines for significant bites.
- I think spay/neutering should be more affordable. No breed specific bylaws should be put in place, owners need to be held accountable
- Owners, not animals, should be penalized for poor training. Owners with nuisance dogs need mandatory training or banning. BSL doesn't work.
- Don't mock this section with bad puns, it is a serious issue
- Ban all pit bulls
- All these bylaws and restrictions do is make it more appealing for the wrong people to own these breeds of dogs.
- No
- Irresponsible ownership is the problem, NOT the dog. Size does not equal danger - small dogs are responsible for more bites and injuries.
- If you can't discriminate against people, then you shouldn't be allowed to discriminate dog breeds either. Pit Bulls are the best dogs!
- Please do not punish pit bulls!
- None
- No
- Do not implement breed specific bylaws or regulations. Gear to the behavior and not the breed. Some smaller breeds are just as vicious



- Why don't they have a pit bull only dog parks instead of muzzling them? Muzzling them won't stop the random attacks that occur.
- Breed specific legislation is not the answer! Hold the owners accountable for the actions of their dogs! Don't punish all pitbulls!
- Community Off Leash Park Areas? Would be nice! Rather than some large area ones through out the city. Would reduce parking congestion.
- Poor pet ownership is the issue not dog breeds. Hold people more accountable for poor pet ownership, not the dog.
- I do not support breed specific legislation. Also I shouldn't have to pay a license for my indoor cats.
- Pet training for owners that have violations such as their dog is at large or attacking someone so they do not become repeat offender.
- I didn't see any reference to roaming cats killing wild song birds, which is a very big problem.
- More education for cat owners about the dangers of roaming cats - wildlife suffers tremendously from hunting cats
- I feel the present fine for owners of roaming cats is too low because even after I have turned in a cat, I see it roaming again soon after.
- No comment
- Off-leash dog zones in natural areas should be abolished because I see dog owners ignoring zone signs EVERY time I am in a natural area.
- Why is this field required?
- I believe that its not the breed its the improper training, offer affordable training and some of these problems would be solved! :)
- Post the Bylaw Office phone number on signs in parks so that people can report off-leash dogs.
- All major parks should have signs at entrances stating that the park is on-leash only, because I regularly see dogs running loose in parks.
- Nothing should be made breed specific. Fines should also be assessed on a case basis taking into account circumstances. I.e. Was it provoked
- No. But I think your pitbull specific questions are biased. Dogs who are nuisances have bad owners
- No breed specific bylaws! Spay and neuter to be affordable for all. Back yard breeders should be fined and put out of business. More officer
- Review the owners there is a reason y dogs bite !!!!
- Please don't bring back breed specific legislation. It has been shown not to work. Keep educating!
- Waive dog licencing fees for dogs that have proof of graduation from an approved obedience program.
- Fines, etc. should be more closely tied to situation - ie. bite someone teasing or abusing an animal is different than unprovoked attacks.
- 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many in a household
- illegal to walk your dog in the heat! Over 25 degrees a person should get a ticket of 1000\$ including winter! Ticket if pet left in car.



- The idea of introducing breed specific laws is completely ridiculous with no scientific support to back it up as an effective solution.
- Affordable and accessible training. Can be hard to get into classes and expensive.
- Mandatory muzzling is not a solution. Dogs need to be trained to handle muzzles and may not react well if not introduced properly.
- more attentions to the owners behaviour of a dog that injures or attacks instead of destroying the animal - i believe 80% is due to humans
- Training supports and prevention preferable to fines etc
- Please please please, stop thinking that BSL is okay. It really isn't. Pitbulls are wonderful dogs who are being targeted unjustly
- Leaving pitbulls alone. And register them like any other dog breed.
- more severe punishment for people who torture animals - there are far too many cases of people harming animals
- Education for dog owners about why training is necessary. More accessible and frequent reactive dog training courses. Spots are ofte limited
- How about you leave our dogs alone they aren't the problem it's the people Who raise them, there are MORE bites due to small dogs then big.
- BSL is discriminatory, inhumane, cruel and perpetuates false stigma and myths which will contribute to the increase of euthanasia and loss of life
- Stricter bylaws and fines further harm pet owners with a system that is already built on racism, classism and ableism.
- I think that vet charges should be taken into consideration. Most people who own animals will do anything for them but it can be so costly.
- Humans who have a dog that act out should be penalized and the animal re-homed and not be allowed to own other animals and it be enforced
- Please do not implement breed specific bylaws/legislation. Focus on responsible pet ownership bylaws like we currently have.
- Ban all dogs from the city. They are bad for the environment. They deficate on side walks.
- This comment section should be bigger - I have to shorten my sentences
- BSL is not a good idea
- Pitbulls shouldn't be banned. It's like saying a certain race of person can't live in Calgary. They shouldn't have higher fines/restrictions
- I think chihuahuas are more vicious then pitbulls, but people think they are cuter because they are smaller.
- Dog owners should be required to complete an obedience training course and present a "certificate of completion" to the city.
- Dangerous dogs should be banned. Higher fines for delinquent pet owners, seizure and euthanasia of dangerous breeds that attack other dogs
- I think there should be a more reasonable fee for licensing an animal and it should be a lifetime license. The fees are far too much.



- Photos or videos of owners and pets can be taken or bylaw called (keeping caller as anonymous) to report pet unleashed in children park
- People who buy pitbulls, or other dangerous dogs have serious issues.
- It is absolutely ridiculous that the city is targeting "Pit Bulls." Dog breeds are not the problem, humans are. Target the actual problem
- End this BSL [removed]
- Licensing should be done at vets. Animals get proper treatment, animal abuse goes down, responsibility of owners goes up. Proper care of pet
- No
- Breed specific bylaws should never be allowed. Nuisance dogs begin and end with bad owners.
- Make harmful/forceful tools illegal ie. choke chains, prong collars, shock collars.
- cats should be licensed and there should be more penalties to do with cats being at large
- BANNING PITBULLS IS STUPID . It would destroy many families and would be cruel
- Pitbulls should be banned. The argument that it is not the dog's fault, but the owner does not hold true. Pitbulls will fight till death.
- I think the idea of breed specific laws are stupid. Every dog has the ability to be violent. The owner needs to teach it right.
- Breed specific legislation does not work. It simply creates a void for another breed to fill. Create a framework to penalize owners.
- I think this is ridiculous that any dog that looks "like a pit bull" or "strong and mean" does not mean they are mean dogs. It is not fair
- This is ridiculous. It comes down to responsible ownership. Smaller dogs bite more people than pit bulls....
- I do not have an idea
- No
- Obedience training/classes should be required for all eligible animals/pets. This training should be completed with current owner(s).
- The problem is poor owners not the dogs!
- Dog breed isn't the issue.
- No
- None
- Please do not ban bully breeds or force a nice dog to wear muzzle. Should only happen if the dog (not breed specific has been aggressive.)
- Stop stereotyping dogs by breed. Dog behaviour is the owners responsibility always.
- You should not be putting a bad name to the bully breed. There are other dog breeds that can be unpredictable and have injured others.
- Do not punish a breed punish the owner!
- Thanks



- I am sick and tired of people having their dogs off-leash in parks - whether there are kids present or not.
- I would support Ontario's stance and that is eventually phasing out bitbulls. Owners are the problem but they cant be changed.
- Responsible pet ownership course for all prospective pet owners.
- None of the cities business how many or what kind of animals a person owns on their property so long as the animals are being well cared for
- Humane orgs make \$ on every adopted pit bull. Stop listening to them! Start listening to the M.D.s who treat and study dog bite injuries.
- Civilian oversight of bylaw programs and peace officers .
- Nah
- Any owner whose animal must be euthanized cannot get another animal until they complete force-free training.
- Publish photos of all the dogs deemed nuisance and dangerous to prevent dog laundering.
- Bigger crackdowns on unethical or surplus breeders- dogs, cats, any pet. Adopt, don't shop!!
- Mandatory Behaviour training class for all first time dog owners
- It has been widely studied and found that "pit bull" breeds do not bite more often than others. It is disappointing to see this put forward.
- True pit bulls are not the problem but as too many owners fail to properly train and control them they must be targeted strongly.
- The breed is not a problem. The owner is the problem. If the owner can not demonstrate responsibility, they should not own the pet.
- The law can't control pedophiles nor child abuse. Humans are worse than animals. Animals will fight too. I will fight for pitbull rights.
- Consider humane orgs' major conflict of interest on pit bulls: they make money with every pit bull "adopted" (BOUGHT). Follow the money!
- BSL isn't going to lower the number of attacks, it hasn't in other cities. Calgary should be proud of responsible pet ownership bylaw
- It's the owners that do not train or solicitation the dog that should be gone after. Charged, fined, animal removed and unable to own another
- Breed is not the issue. Pet owners should be educated on how animals interact and how to address behavioural problems
- Consider a credit applied to pet license fees for evidence of successful completion of obedience training (or different tiered pricing).
- I think that children should be held accountable for attacking dogs. They should be fined if the dog retaliates. The parent can pay the fine
- I would like to see more attention to public education about how behave around dogs and service dogs and animal behavior.
- All fines should be increased substantially to fund programs for low income pets.

- Breed-specific fees and bylaws are such blatantly discriminatory pieces of legislation that show how ignorant people can be about pets
- "Train your staff to not blame the victim.
- Diversity training would also be good.
- The survey is poorly worded in places!"
- pit bulls and their cross breeds should be banned completely as they are in many many cities already; one dog per dwelling of other types
- BSL is an embarrassment to the city. Problems for the city will increase tenfold if any of these legislations are put in place.
- Dog breed isn't the issue, give your head a shake.
- The issue isn't with any specific breed or size of dog, irresponsible owners and lack of training is the issue.
- Why is there no options to choose for no Breed Specific laws? What are all the options more towards this happening. You can do better.
- Pitbulls may not bite significantly more than other breeds, but when they do are cause the most damage. Ban pitbulls.
- policing of off-leash dogs outside of off-leash areas
- Dog walkers should be limited to 4 dogs per person.
- None
- I do not support breed specific bylaws. Please focus efforts on positive and responsible pet ownership. Discount license with obedience
- No
- I was attacked by a German shepard in June of 2018 but it was the owners fault not the dogs. I dont believe in BSL at all its the owners.
- Fines for people; chasing or threatening your dog, removing dogs from homes where they are making excessive noise ~ obviously being ignored
- If a dog bites the owner should be mandated to take training with said dog. Proof must be submitted to COC.
- If a citizen witnessed abuse in f an animal the city should respond and remove the animal or animals and investigate
- Mandatory muzzles for dangerous breeds off of their own property.
- There should only be a cap of 2 or 3 pets per low income household to prevent animal hoarding or possible animal neglect.
- Calgary's efforts to micromanage every move someone makes just creates more problems. Stop micromanaging.
- Implementing regulations based on a dogs breed without prior offense is fallacious. Pit bulls consistently score well in temperament testing
- There should be more fines and educAtion for dog owners who insist on letting their dogs off leash in leashed areas.



- I do not support the use of breed specific language. Take examples using "pit bull" out. This is manipulative.
- No thank you
- There needs to be better regulations considering pet adoption and rescues. Rescues should be on the line to spay/neuter all pets adopted.
- Better enforce dogs off leash where they shouldn't be. All fines/fees should be increased- pet ownership is a luxury and the city is broke.
- Do not single out breeds
- No
- If a dog bite occurs, the owner must remain at the scene to speak with an officer and this must be recorded. All pets must be registered.
- Why is there nothing discussing the owners or training? Prejudice against breed is the same as racism. It's the owners, not the dogs.
- I am concerned about pet waste in designated off-leash areas. Some owners do not supervise their dogs, and the volume of waste is disgusting
- Please ban pit bulls.
- I do not support breed specific bylaws. The behavior of a dog reflects on the training and handling of the owner, not of a specific breed
- Off leash areas that are close or adjacent to high traffic roads ie: Crowchild Trail need to be fenced with gate access.
- This is animal racism. And it's awful. Maybe teach people how to properly interact with dogs. And fines for improper care towards dogs.
- Signaling out a specific breed is irritating. Many large dogs become aggressive and bite hard. German shepherd and rottie for example.
- Careful consideration must be given with barking dogs when neighbours complain as some people do not like dogs or animals in general!!
- Breed specific legislation is wrong do not do this!
- Animals who have bitten someone severely should be destroyed.
- Bb
- The TNR program should be changed to Trap-euthanize
- If an outdoor cat has been brought to the city a certain # of times it should be seized because the owners are breaking the bylaw.
- I do not support breed-specific legislation
- More signage for areas where dogs are NOT allowed off leash. Too many off leash dogs ruining everyone else's walks.
- Make humane traps more accessible to trap nuisance cats so they can be taken to animal control.
- Breed specific legislation is not a solution to irresponsible pet ownership. Wow wanted to explain but this post does not permit the space.
- More exclusively small dog parks please.



- Remove all off lease designations in all city parks. All city parks should be on leash parks only. Ban all pit bulls and variants from city.
- TNR keeps cats in the cold and still lets them kill wildlife and terrorize neighbourhoods. Should instead be trap and euthanize feral cats.
- No
- Euthanize dogs that kill other cats/dogs on public property.
- Our neighbourhood has a real big problem with stray cats or people letting their cats run free. The phone should be big enough that people
- The pit bull ban is a horrible idea. It never works and ends up getting reversed. Not to mention the cruelty that ensues through surrender
- Every occurrence should be carefully investigated. Rules should not be applied robotically.
- Off leash parks should be separated from public pathways by a chain link fence. Not everyone is comfortable with dogs approaching them.
- Basing bylaws on breed not offences doesn't address the problem. To base it on the perception the dog could be breed X is ludicrous.
- I do not agree with breed specific bylaws. Pets for the larger part are a product of their upbringing just like children. Think about that
- Do not single out specific breeds!!! It is the owner that creates an aggressive dog, not the breed.
- No
- The definition you have of "nuisance" is way too vague and non-specific to answer questions in #3.
- Cats that people let run free are a big problem in my neighbourhood.
- It is not fair to breed specify. Absolutely ridiculous. This should not even be considered in the legislation.
- For those pet owners that are responsible in licensing their pets annually, offer a multi-animal (ie 3 or more dogs) reduction fee of 20%.
- I do not support breed-specific legislation
- Stricter monitoring and enforcement of pet waste clean up in parks and on pathways. The amount of waste left in public areas is horrific.
- Legislation should be evidence based and breed neutral. No breed specific legislation!
- Pit bulls have larger jaws and are stronger than other breeds. It's not whether they attack MORE, it's the harm they can cause when they do.
- Actual enforcement seems to be the key issue in my opinion.
- Fines for people antagonizing pets. Investigate why they were being chased by the dog. How did the dog get off of the owners property?
- I do not support breed specific legislation.
- Vastly higher fines for owners whose cats/dogs enter private property.
- Breed-specific bylaws are FANTASTIC! Dogs were bred to do certain things; those bred to fight/kill should be banned.



- Owners of dogs that bite someone MUST pay for all medical bills and psychological counseling for the victim. Dog MUST take obedience training
- It's not the animals fault, it's the owner. Put more responsibility on owners and ensure people are responsible, fair and kind pet owners
- Irresponsible cat owners in our city. Higher consequences for roaming cats.
- More accessible cat traps.
- Easier way to report roaming cats.
- Breed specific legislation does not work. Especially when you include "looks" like a pit bull in that description
- No pit bulls allowed in calgary
- Seize roaming cats from owners. Punish repeating offenders..
- There needs to be more leeway given to renters from landlords with regards to owning small/medium sized animals (cats, for instance).
- Seize roaming cats.
- Single out pit bulls is a awful area . Pet ownership education is the key . Problem is seldom from the dogs Often from the owners
- Charge people who let their cats out unattended. Irresponsible owners.
- Do not put extra fees in place for PB owners. PBs already make up a larger number of dogs in shelters and this would increase that problem.
- Cats are a big problem in this city.
- Please ban all pit bulls. These dogs are not meant to be pets and no human life is worth the risk
- Roaming cats need to be controlled.
- Its the owners who create aggression. Same with EVERY other breed. Mistreat a dog and they get scared and act out. People need to stop blami
- Sick of people letting their cats do whatever. It's disrespectful to other cat, dogs, and property owners.
- Damage from roaming cats in the city and people's property. It's out of control.
- Cat control.
- More accessible way to report roaming cats.
- Better way to report roaming cats and action is taken by the city quickly.
- Keep cats indoors.
- Please do not do BSL it is ridiculous
- Too many warnings are given for off-leash dogs in on-leash areas, fines should be given right away.
- Dog training for all breeds and show the certificate when registering the dog, people are to sensitive nowadays, we complain for everything
- If you ever place a ban on certain animals you're just gonna get bashed and fought by the people who own the city. The public.
- No



- More enforcement for animals off leash in on leash areas. More public awareness and enforcement. Dog parks in residential areas aren't ideal
 - I do NOT support breed specific legislation. It's The animal equivalent of racial profiling. Owners should face consequences not the animals
 - Breed bans do not work and should not be used
 - We should not single out specific breed of dogs, for example pit bulls. Any dog can be dangerous if the owner is not willing to train it.
 - What is being addressed for owners who have a neighbor whom despises all Pets and have filed unjust complaints?
 - Why are pit bulls singled out? All dogs can attack and this is like saying black men are more likely to cause a crime shameful
 - Too many roaming cats
 - I think the clean coop bylaw should also include chicken coops. Clean animals are happy animals.
 - Owners are responsible for their dogs behaviour. Enforce current laws and promote behavioural training not breed specific legislation!
 - no barking
 - Breed specific legislation is wrong. Please rethink your stance. Legislation should be event based not breed based.
 - You should fine bad owners not specific breeds!!!
 - I do not support breed specific legislation. I believe in teaching the people how to act responsibly around all dogs and/or pets.
 - Pitbull can be good dogs but it is instinct for them to attack - dog or any random person. all pitts should be muzzled if owner walks them
 - I do not believe it is acceptable to discriminate against a specific dog breed (ie pit bull). Owners should be monitored not the breed.
 - Restrictions should not be put on Pit Bull types most unfair
 - "Stop targeting responsible pet owners of all types.
-
- A breed specific ban or set of bylaws is dumb as [removed] even for our city officials"
 - Too many owners still think "outdoor cats" are okay. Promote trapping roaming cats and turning them in to the city!!
 - Provide a site to post "wall of shame" pictures of dog owners caught not picking up after their dogs (as deterrent).
 - No breed specific legislation, investigate those who tease animals and charge/educate, animals should not pay for the sins of a person.
 - There are hundreds of different dog breeds. There is no legitimate reason why someone needs a pit bull instead of any other dog.



- I think the owner of the dog should face the same punishment had the owner bitten or attacked anyone.
- No
- No
- Animal Cruelty investigation team with SPCA is understaffed and underfunded.
- LOVE the voluntary bandana program!! This could reduce a lot of stress for responsible owners trying to train reactive dogs.
- Free roaming cats are nonsense. You can keep your cat supervised in you yard or in a catio. All this does is keep coyotes and foxes well fed
- Dogs Barking at night there needs to be a fine
- Education for non-pet owners on how to approach animals and what to expect from animals they encounter.
- Blame the owner NOT the breed. Irresponsible owners should get a fine vs a dog who simply doesn't know better.
- Fund an information campaign on the included topics. Encouraging input when people are un or misinformed is counterproductive at best.
- People should have to sign some sort of behavioural contract when they license their pet so there is no way they can plead ignorance later.
- "I do NOT support breed specific legislation. It's The animal equivalent of racial profiling. Owners should face consequences not the dog
- no
- .
- I'd like to see fines for households that store bagged or loose garbage on back decks or in yard which then attracts skunks, birds etc
- Breed doesn't dictate behaviour
- Breed specific legislation is wrong and unfair. It is discrimination based on stereotypes. You care not for dogs if you enforce this bylaw.
- Most people cannot properly identify a dog's breed. Laws shouldn't be made against a breed but to help enforce responsible pet ownership.
- ?
- There are many cat owners who think their cats are allowed to roam free even at night. PLEASE address this issue of roaming cat nuisance.
- the owners should be better educated but do not blame the dogs. would you euthanize a child? no you would educate them.
- When on a sidewalk with a pit bull the pit bull owner should give way to the other pedestrian
- All dogs should be on leash when walked. Fined for off leash.
- ...
- Pet owners of large powerful animals should be required to take a training course to ensure they are properly prepared to handle the animal



- Breed profiling is not right. Every dog, no matter what size, has the ability to bite. Training is key. Responsible ownership is key.
- Breed specific legislation of any kind is unfair and not based on any fact. It does not belong in this municipality.
- "Increase fine for cats roaming from their residence.
- Ways to capture a cat and charge the owner the expenses."
- Offer discounts on pet licensing for completion of obedience training course (proof required)
- Pit bull specific legislation is needlessly discriminatory and unnecessary. I DO NOT support ANY of the proposed targeted regulations
- All dogs need to be trained, non optional. Maybe a test that all dogs need to pass by 1 year old to ensure that dogs are trained + socialize
- I do not agree with breed profiling/ It is up to the pet owner to be a responsible pet owner
- You covered most, if not all.
- The city needs to be transparent about how animals in their care are treated and especially those that are held after attacking a person.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong on all ways. It is the equivalent of having specific laws based on a persons gender, religion or race.
- Leave pitbulls alone. This is the animal equivalent of racism.
- In some scenarios it should be case by case, for example if someone is bitten by a dog, fines should be based off severity of the bite.
- To encourage owners to be more responsible, if a bylaw officer witnesses an example of this like reward them for it with a points program
- ...
- Banning certain breeds has been proven to be ineffective so why even consider this, a color code is a great idea and it was my idea...
- Even suggesting BSL is shameful. No different then racism in people your just doing it to dogs. Blame the owner not the breed
- Breed-based discrimination has no place in our city. It is not supported in fact, and causes more harm than good.
- On leash areas better signage- no off leash animals!!!
- Punish the pets person. DO NOT punish the pet for its irresponsible person.
- We are not allowed to profile and restrict people based on race. Why does anyone think it is appropriate to do it with dogs?
- "Responsible pet owners are a must!!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls""
- #justiceforbullies
- #bslfreeeyc
- #dontbullymybreed"
- Can't vet who owns a dog breed? Ever been attacked by a pit bull? I have. Do it - BSL is needed if you can't vet who owns them



- Unleashed animal fines should increase!!!
- I really think pets should only be euthanized in extreme cases. Exhaust all options, including training. Investigate the family
- Stronger enforcement of fines for off leash pets in on leash areas.
- Question 3 answer 7. Even if someone supports only one nuisance animal per household, does not mean they also support 1 pit bull per house.
- Dogs should be off leash only in their special park, those special parks should be closed to other people, more to say....
- I don't think it's fair to discriminate against pit bulls. This seems to just continue to perpetuate the negative stereotype circulating.
- Save tax payers money by forbidding pit bulls in the city.
- city council to understand that they don't need to make a rule for everything. They need to concentrate more actual issues like roads
- Included should be dog urination. Dogs are peeing everywhere and in winters, it just sits like a frozen smelly yellow pool on the pavement.
- Might we research why some prefer to own breed that engender fear, or are capable of seriously harming others? eg. fearful; trauma history?
- Instead of handing out fines, provide free training courses. Pit bulls should not be the focus, it is the owner that trains them to be bad.
- breed-specific legislation restrict dogs based on appearance do not reduce dog bites in communities. It doesn't belong in our city.
- Less singling out pitbulls. Bad owners cause bad dogs. As well have checks on homes where there is a lot of animals to ensure their wellbeing
- Dog at large fine should stay the same or lower as most dogs at large have gotten out by mistake. Cat should be higher as most are deliberate
- WOW Calgary bylaw, You've sabotaged your credibility, and exposed your true knowledge base to the public with 3 - capital letters! YIKES!
- No
- Educate the community. There is no place for BSL. Pit bulls were originally bred as nanny dogs. Owners need to be responsible, not the breed
- We should consider all citizens to take a course on responsible pet ownership, or how to properly greet pets...especially in off leash areas
- Blame the owners not the dog
- There should be more done about backyard breeders. Poor breeding can be a significant cause of dog behavior problems- go to the source.
- No
- Any dog that isn't socialized has the potential to act out and be aggressive. Singling out bully breeds is absolutely shameful.
- I love the idea of reducing licensing fees if your dog completes obedience training. That would be great for the whole city and is proactive



- Don't need blame
- I'm extremely proud of how many people are against BSL and standing up for bully breeds.. at least SOME of you are educated and have a heart.
- No
- Pet owners with medium to large dogs who are considered aggressive breeds should have to go to obedience classes/courses-show they are educa
- Fines for leaving pet waste in parks and fines for off leash dogs in parks need to reflect the high health hazards they pose.
- Enforce dogs running at large especially in parks and regional pathways.
- Reduced licensing fees training, vaccinations, spay / neutering. These animals are less likely to impact taxpayers and fees should reflect
- BSL unfairly targets dogs and their owner. Punish the deed, not the breed.
- BSL has proven to be inefficient. Please do not turn back the hands of progress and adopt this language. Dangerous dogs come in every breed.
- Should parents be fined for screaming kids? raising evil Children as it is a bother to those of us who do not have them..
- yes. Don't be an embarrassment and put into place breed specific legislation that has a decades long track record of doing nothing positive
- "BSL has been a failure the world over and in [personal information removed] words ""it polarizes communities and makes communities less safe""
- #SayNO2BSL"
- BSL does not work nor does it target the aggressive dogs. I've yet to meet an aggressive Pibbly. It's about education.
- N/A
- BSL is a failure the world over and pit hate fanatics push for flawed legislation that increased number of bites and severity
- Cats that residents allow out at night to roam should be rounded up and put into a retention center or cat pound.
- Bylaws should not be breed specific. They should apply to all dogs. There are no bad dogs just bad or irresponsible dog owners.
- Do not restrict Pit Bulls. This is an extremely outdated idea. Please do non anecdotal research. I'm ashamed this is a city of calgary topic
- Most cities with BSL are going back. This will be costly and cruel and it won't work. We will not let this happen in out dog friendly city.
- Don't ban specific breeds. Ban poor pet owners.
- Dog walker services should have business licences, pay fees, be subject to dog number limits and pay for off leash park use.
- Owners of any dogs should be required to carry additional insurance and remain on scene of any incident; including "pit bulls”



- No additional ideas.
- I think there should be a well subsidized licensing program for seniors, those with disabilities, and low-income Calgarians.
- It appears that the by laws are not being written for property owners, they need more respect from the city.
- No
- laws against pit bulls are extremely outdated and should not be required. No bad dogs, just bad owners.
- N/a
- I don't like the singleing out of pit bulls.
- N/A
- Breed bans are so ignorant, I don't know where to start. People just like banning things that they think look dangerous, facts be damned!
- Why be breed specific? A dog is a dog. If there are nuisance dogs, please look at the owners first. Make them go to training or pay a fine.
- Bully Breeds are not the problem, it is bad owners that are not responsible with their pets. Rules should to apply to all breeds
- No
- No
- Bo
- Leave the bully breeds alone. We are not Ontario. Calgary is welcoming of all breeds, why change this? BSL doesn't work!
- BSL is outrageous. With ALL canines, the issues begin with bad owners not breeds. To be fair, the policy needs to reflect any breed.
- Breed specific legislation is not effective, don't move backwards Calgary, we are better than that.
- There are only bad owners. No bad pets. Energy levels of a dog and laziness of the owner are the critical factors.
- No
- No
- Please do not be breed specific and target 1 group of animals. It is irresponsible pet owners that should be punished.
- Leave the pit bull myth out. You sound dated and uneducated
- This survey is [removed]. You're trying to be subtle about the fact that this is being done to make owning a "Pitbull" breed more difficult.
- barking dogs should be restrained by the owner. if prolonged, the owner should be fined,
- Education for non pet owners. We own 3 dogs and often encounter children running up and greeting our dogs. Ours are friendly but not all are
- no
- "Pit bulls should never be allowed near playgrounds. Read the horror stories of Pit Bulls



- <https://www.reddit.com/r/BanPitBulls/>
- Breeds are not to be singled out. There is mandatory registration, this should include mandatory reading on training, care/socialization.
- Dog walkers. They should not be able to take dogs off leash if they have more than 2 dogs. They can not control them.
- Breed specific rules are wrong. Responsible owners is the way to go
- I think we need to focus more on responsible pet ownership as well as public education on domestic animals people are dumb help them learn
- "Banning dog breeds is discrimination. How would people react if the city created a bylaw preventing
- certain races from entering Calgary?"
- Very little emphasis on people's behavior? What about not adequately training dogs, hoarding, over breeding, leaving dogs outside.
- Current animals should be "grandfathered", esp if no history of issues. Decrease in license fee when proof of training or assessment is done
- Quit targeting specific breeds. I have had issues with all breeds of dogs. Small dogs bite too. DO NOT PENALIZE PITBULLS.
- bigger more obvious signs around playgrounds and parks that say dogs should be on leash
- No
- Not responsible enough to be allowed to own a gun, buy a pitbull instead, added benefits includes legally being allowed to flee the crime.
- There are many misconceptions based in fear and not fact - simply in the name itself of "bully breeds";. I expect policies based on fact only
- Focus should be on responsible pet ownership, not specific breeds.
- Please provide proof that all pitbull-type dogs are inherently more dangerous than other breeds.
- Removing pets from offending owners household
- Unaltered dogs should not be allowed off-leash in public.
- Punishing dogs and reducing their quality of life because of their appearance is trash. Any dog can have an irresponsible owner.
- Increase enforcement of off-leash violations along City pathways, especially in parks.
- None
- Nope
- Stop targeting breeds. Its the bad owners that are the problem!
- Progressive fines and mandatory training for dogs who will be over a certain weight at maturity could be implemented.
- None of this is of any value without enforcement. The City needs to be willing to increase Bylaw monitoring and complaint response.
- Ban dangerous dogs, you need a licence that shows your competence or criminal record for anything else that dangerous.



- No
- Discrimination towards pitbulls reflects poorly on the City of Calgary. This is not inclusive and teaches people fear. Dangerous and ignorant.
- All dogs can be dangerous. I hate how we never hear of any dog attacks except ones that involve a pitbull. some of the nicest dogs are pittys
- Importing dogs from other countries and the risk on new diseases to our city/region. Also, better control of coyotes in off leash areas.
- Education for children on how to safely interact with animals and to be respectful of them always.
- Make obedience training mandatory for all breeds. Provide proof before licensing.
- DO NOT DO BSL. IT IS BULL . IVE HAD PIT BULLS BETTER BEHAVED THEN LITTLE RUNTS.
- Labelling animals as "nuisance" or dangerous because of their breed primes people for fear. Bylaws should not target breed but bad ownership
- People make bad dogs - not just pit bulls! Stop making Pitbulls, terriers and breeds like look like a "Pitbull" the bad guys!
- All aggressive breeds should be identified at registration and require mandatory training for the new owner - no exceptions
- I hear a lot about discrimination against pitbulls as an argument not to ban them, are we allowed tigers and lions? is that discrimination?
- "Ensuring garbage are emptied regularly so people can throw out of dog waste
- Pit bulls should not be penalized for stereotypes"
- How about a support system to reduce cost of spay / neuter. Then life time license if the animal is spayed or neutered?
- You want to ban a breed but allow people to raise chickens? Are you trying to turn Calgary into a 3rd world country?
- nuisance dogs being required to wear a red bandana or red identifier on their collar.
- No
- I feel that enforcement of existing animal by-laws is not properly enforced in this city especially in regards to off leash dogs.
- No
- N/a
- Allow victims of dog bites to have say whether or not to put the animal down.
- Please no chickens, ducks, or other fowl in city limits.
- I have a blond boxer that looks very much like a pit bull. Will I have to carry her DNA test with me every time I walk her. Do not stereotype
- J
- It has been proven that breed specific legislation is not based on the scientific understanding of the animals. This is a foolish concept!
- Shaming or outcasting pet owners based on the "bully breed" should be seen as an act of discrimination.



- Nuisance Dog owners should have to take a mandatory training/management program before they are issued a pet licence.
- Stop targeting pit bulls. It's the owners that are the problem. Target irresponsible owners.
- As someone who was attacked by a dog and had my dog attacked, both times unprovoked, I appreciate the city looking at these bylaws.
- "Large signs at off leash areas

- Restrictions to the number of dogs a dog walker can walk at one time."
- Can't stress enough that socialization of puppies with other puppies combined with ongoing training is key to ownership and safety.
- Education. Genetics play a huge part in canine behaviour. Pit bulls and herding breeds are good examples of genetic bred behaviour.
- This survey is designed to be read that having a pitbull is equivalent to owning a nuisance pet. This is fear mongering.
- Focus should be done on pet care and pet ownership rather than pet specific breed.
- Get rid of cat bylaw where no cats allowed outside = fewer mice/rodent problems (mice carry disease)
- I don't think one specific breed should be attacked as you have in this survey. I think the city needs punish bad owners of dogs who bite
- Signs should be installed along pathways and parks to inform of a fine amount for not picking up feces after your dog
- BSL is an outdated, ineffective way to try to prevent dog attacks. Pitbulls are no more dangerous than any other dog.
- I don't have any other ideas.
- Dog Walkers need to have limits to dog parks! Too many times you see a dog walking company bring 8 dogs, zero control!
- "Cats are the number one cause of wild bird mortality in North America.
- Nothing here that addresses that scourge."
- Increase the fees heavily for owning the pit bulls.
- Do not target specific breeds. When dogs behave poorly step in but don't blame an entire breed for no reason. Pitbull a great dogs.
- Need a bylaw for mandatory obedience training for first-time dog owners/and dog owners who have had problem dogs. or mandatory to adopt a dog
- Why have you not included other dogs? Small breed dogs like chiwawas are also dangerous in the same stroke you are painting large breed dog.
- Barking dogs in city limits should be enforced alot more. And taken as serious as loud music etc
- Bad breeding, bad breeders and bad owners are the issues with all pet problems. Dog bites, barking dogs, cats at large are all owner issues



- See comments inserted above..
- Quit penalizing the dog breed! Penalize irresponsible owners. Little dogs bite just as often and are often more aggressive.
- The traffic light bandana idea should be abandoned. All dogs can be dangerous if approached wrong.
- It used to be Doberman's and Rottweilers and boxers and German Shepard's. stop blaming breeds for human idiots.
- BY LAWS HAVE TO BE ENFORCED Neighbor has 14 dogs. All neighbors have dealt e the city. She's been in court twice NO change in 5 yrs
- Dogs look to their "pack leader” for how to act. It's the owners fault if they are aggressive. Stop targeting breeds!!
- Dog breed restrictions are the animal equivalent of racism!
- "Breed specific language targeting certain dogs is like ethnic specific language targeting humans.
- No two dogs are alike. Disappointed YYC!"
- People are extremely uneducated about pit bulls. Just because you think they look "scary" to you doesn't mean they are more dangerous.
- You license animals themselves when it should be the owner that requires a dog license to own a dog. Much like a drivers license.
- It is more important to focus on responsible ownership and training rather penalizing the animal. Focusing on specific breeds is wrong.
- Breeders of animals should be licensed and subject to annual mandatory inspection. At present, authorities cannot inspect without cause.
- Responsible pet ownership is the issue - not the dogs. Limiting a breed is not going to make irresponsible owners more responsible.
- Tip line for dangerous animals. When a tip is received, by law officers should conduct an evaluation.
- Do not discriminate against any breed. Any dog can be dangerous More education not discrimination!
- More enforcement, higher fines for barking dogs.
- Ban pitbulls, do not allow urban hens, increase fines and lower tolerances for owners keeping pets that have attacked citizens
- no
- I would love to see that training is a requirement to getting a license.
- Stop classifying pit bulls and terriers as dangerous animals. Dobermans, rottweilers and some smller, aggressive breeds are the issue.
- Pitbull are no more dangerous that any other bread. The lack of screening to own a dog and the lack of training of both human/dog are the is
- No
- The focus needs to be done on pet care and pet ownership rather than pet specific breed.



- People who want to make money by breeding animals should have to be licensed and have random checks to their breeding location
- Cats should be kept indoors. It is safer for them so they are not injured in fights, hit by a car, or taken by wildlife.
- Police the persons who frequent the bins in the back alleys behind properties and who provoke well behaved dogs to signal an intruder
- Not in favour of breed-specific legislation. Increased enforcement and fines for irresponsible breeders and owners is more effective.
- No
- One specific breed shouldn't be attacked like this survey. It creates fear mongering. ANY animal can bite. Hold owners responsible, not pets
- "Having to write a letter to to person with a barking dog does not work.
- It only creates issues. Hire more people to deal with complaints."
- Cats should not be allowed outside without a leash. Free-roaming cats have been partly responsible for the decline of many bird species.
- I am disappointed to see that Calgary is considering breed-specific legislation towards pitbull-type dogs. All dogs are born inherently good
- Provide discount on dog licensing if certificate of qualified obedience training is obtained
- "Lower licensing fees for cats than for dogs.
- Don't single out one type of dog breed over another in regard to bites and attacks."
- Stop breed specific legislation. Even suggesting it is causing spread of misinformation and biased opinions.
- I do not support the restriction or banning of specific breeds of animals. That could possibly lead the many acts of cruelty
- This survey reeks of privilege. Pitbulls are not aggressive unless left to their own devices. What about Akitas? German Shep? Rottweilers?
- No
- Stop the differential (discriminatory!) non-spayed/non-neutered registration fees for dogs while increasing the fines for by-law violations.
- Ban all pitbulls! They are dangerous animals
- More enforcement on people who don't pick up after their dogs.
- Target irresponsible breeders and irresponsible owners. Educate people and animals. NO BSL! Target off leash dogs not in off leash zones!
- not one neighbor in our area respects the rules. until thrrre is enforcement not one of these initiatives mean anything.
- Dogs require balanced training, socialization,proper human/dog social behavior,daily commitment and compassion. It's the owners NOT the breed!
- I am not in support of breed-specific legislation.
- "1. Registering rabies vaccinations with pet license.



- 2. Pets who display a serious and or repeat offender, should be national registered."
 - What's next? Are you going to after white, blonde, brown, red, brindle and mixed coloured dogs and only allow black dogs off leash?
 - No
 - "Big ""NO"" to Breed-specific bylaws.
-
- It's bad owners, not bad breeds"
 - Ban pit bulls. I now carry a walking stick after being charged by off lease, friendly pets. Dog owners never see their pets as dangerous.
 - More education for citizens on proper pet etiquette. Not reaching to pet animals without permission etc
 - No
 - More local off leash areas. More fun off leash areas for owners and dogs - not just a block of flat empty land. More trees and off leash paths
 - A special leash for pit bulls and nuisance dogs requiring a secondary tethered to the waist of the dog walker would help prevent dog attack.
 - More information on where off leash are. Not all shoreline of bow river is off leash. Timeline for putting barking dogs out on private land
 - More enforcement on the owners that don't pick up after their dogs , higher fines for dogs that bark all day or night enforced .
 - "<https://globalnews.ca/news/7293560/calgary-woman-pit-bull-attack-pet-survey/>
 - How about some advocacy for victims of pit bull attacks?"
 - Breeders should be licensed and inspected regularly.
 - Once again Breed Specific Legislation rears it ugly head. Pitbulls are not the only dog with a strong bite, let's focus on training not bans
 - Free training workshops to people getting pitbulls because training can be very expensive if the dog is not a puppy.
 - I have no ideas
 - There are people out there whose lives will never be the same due to a vicious dog attack. 70% of these are by pit bulls - see DogsBite.org
 - Stop trying to ban pitbulls.
 - Victims of pitbull attacks need to be heard - children who have died need to have a voice. Do not consider this type of pet for your family
 - .
 - The problem with people owning particularly dogs, and not picking up the feces in their yard often enough and flies are driving us crazy.
 - Do not believe in any breed specific legislation. Should be more about the breeders and owners versus the animal



- No
- I am not a pet owner. However, I am strongly opposed to Breed Specific Legislation (BSL). Many studies have proven it to be in-effective.
- BSL is not the answer. Support responsible pet owners not punish them. Provide incentive to license your animal.
- "Stop targeting pit pulls!! They are not dangerous or aggressive unless they are trained that way, JUST LIKE ANY ANOTHER DOG COULD
- BE."
- Breed Specific Legislation doesn't work. Look at the evidence from other jurisdictions it has failed. Only to punish good owners
- I would like a dog licence you buy once for the life of the dog. It is too expensive in my opinion.
- I do not support Breed Specific legislation of any kind- aggressive or problem dogs can come in any size or breed and shouldnt discriminate.
- BSL is ineffective. Irresponsible owners are to blame. Proof of obedience training should count for something. Urban hens are a great idea!!
- Dog owners and non-dog owners need to be educated about animal behaviours. Any untrained dog can be dangerous, not just pit bulls.
- no its not the dog breed its the owner
- Make stricter laws for animal abuse!!!! Shut down breeders! Breeders need to be shut down! No sale of dogs on marketplace or Kijiji.
- Deal with Bad Owners
- Dog attacks are mainly the owners fault. The dog should be placed on mandatory obedience school and the owner should be heavily penalized.
- Would be nice to see fenced areas for puppies to run around in
- More inforcement and consequences around barking dogs. Require additional training by the owner.
- I DONT think pit bulls/ bully breads should be banned
- Suggestion for people who get warnings or dogs who have issues to get mandated to mandatory training within a 6 month period,
- No.
- Its not the dog that is problem it is the owner Owner should take classes to control their dog or cat
- Put more dog waste bins in parks
- Stop discriminating agasint specific dog breeds.
- Breeders should be inspected regularly, and puppy mills should be banned.
- Breed specific legislation is harmful to many Calgarians who love their Pitty breeds. Please consider the owner not the breed itself
- It isn't the dog it's the owners. Ban bad dog owners not the dogs!
- I don't think "Pit Bull type" dogs should be tagged in this manner. I have more issue with small dogs and German Shepard charging me



- Promote/enable businesses to have appropriate leash-up spaces for dogs (Corner stores etc.) Eg Simple leash hook in a low-traffic area
 - Separate types of offences re: nuisance dog restrictions. Multiple noise complaints vs. bite complaints is very different
 - Hard no to banning pit bulls or dogs that look similar. Bad owners, not bad breed.
 - When a new dog is licensed, there could be a list of places for training. Rescue animals should go through training as well with the owners.
 - More patrolling in parks for off leash dogs and feeding wildlife - I.e Carburn Park
 - Fines and penalties shouldn't be used to discourage and punish specific breed owners. The fault is the owner and not the breed.
 - Put a muzzle on [personal information removed]
 - Hold ALL pet owners accountable. By this survey's "standard", all dogs capable of a severe bite should be policed and deemed a "nuisance".
 - Punishing a breed is absolutely inhumane and cruel. I can't believe that this is a consideration.
 - no
 - Breed specific bylaws are horrific. Dogs are only as good as their owners and how they are raised.
 - No
 - Where are the by-law officers to catch all these owners who don't follow the by-laws regarding keeping them on-leash and feces removal
 - The city needs to stop controlling people.
 - Bully breeds are not more dangerous than other dogs. Every dog owner should be held accountable for more training if dogs become a nuisance.
 - Although this was covered, it is very important that the City is very aware that breed specific legislation is unacceptable!!!
-
- No dog-specific bylaws. Treat every dog the same, until they prove otherwise by being a nuisance. Don't punish innocent dogs and owners.
 - Fines and/or charges for puppy mills and other animal abuse needs to carry harsh consequences.
 - None
 - Nuisance dogs come in all sizes - small dogs are just as bad (or worse). Enforcement should be equal for owners and pets of all sizes.
 - pit bull = strong bite thus we need to restrict them, what about other common breeds with bites as strong or stronger being included
 - IT IS THE OWNER!! NOT THE DOG who should be spotlighted.. (ie. pitbull) these dogs aren't trained properly. That is the issue.
 - Parents are responsible for the well-being of their children at dog parks, no other patrons and their dogs.



- Irresponsible pet owners should be excluded from ever having animals. Harsher punish for animal cruelty and abandonment. #dontbullymybreed
- When I attend Sue Higgins there are dog walkers with multiple dogs. More than 6 at times from multiple households. I feel YYC should backoff
- Anxiety driven dogs need their owners to be given some time to get help to reduce barking.
- no banning bully breeds, period! They are some of the best behaved and well trained dogs. No breed banning at all
- Nothing
- Stop discriminating against certain breeds!! I've been bitten (and bruised) by more small dogs than I have big. And never by a pitbull.
- Violent behaviour stems from no training; dog should not be killed after an attack case. They should be rehomed and retrained first.
- Stop discriminating pit bulls.
- Breed-specific bylaws should not be considered as part of this review. Any fault that exists is that of the owner, the breed is irrelevant.
- Don't punish dog breeds, punish irresponsible owners. In order to licence a pet at home, their should be an online class and quiz.
- No
- BSL's is ineffective and pointless. A bad owner is a bad owner, regardless or breed. Just like children, some people shouldn't have them.
- There are dozens of breeds that have stronger bites than "pit bulls" yet they are not mentioned here. We need to talk about bad owners first
- Biting and attack fines should be paid to victims not used as a money grab for the city. Photo radar does enough of that.
- Some of the new signs in Bowmont park (in Varsity) were installed in the wrong spot, as they straddle a dirt walking path, vs one side
- Most severe bites come from un-neutered male dogs, look at encouraging spay/neuter to mitigate aggression, rather than targeting "pit bulls"
- Breed specific bylaws should not be the mandate for judging incidences. It should be based on objective evidence and testimonials.
- It's ridiculous to assume that we can subjectively ban dogs based on how much damage their bite may cause, where would the line be drawn?
- I don't think fines are the answer but mandatory assessment, rehabilitation if possible and training. Or use the fine money to pay for progr
- No BSL! These legislations have been proven ineffective at preventing incidents and have been successfully repealed in many areas.
- Do not introduce breed specific legislation. Look into issues on a case by case basis regardless of the breed.
- Nuisance dogs of any breed should be removed from the community.



- I think it is unfair to unpunish certain breeds! You should fine dogs and owners that have attacked others not dogs that look a certain way.
- I wish I had a good idea about all of the roaming cats. I am a member of the next-door neighbor app. Full of missing cat ads. Shocking
- More Fenced-in Off-Leash parks. Smaller = Better for owners training recall to avoid chasing their dog for a long time.
- I'd like increased education and enforcement in no dog zones on Nose Hill.
- We need to remember animals are animals and can lash out if threatened, if provoked animals should have the right to defend themselves.
- The focus should be more about eliminating irresponsible dog owners, not pit bulls.
- There shouldn't be a Bylaw based on an animals breed - its absolutely absurd to base something around one single breed. END OF STORY.
- DO NOT DISCRIMINATE.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Owners are.
- Breed-specific bylaws should not be considered as part of the bylaw review.
- Should be mandatory to attend a training and socializing course in order to get a pet licence. Educate owners BEFORE the dog is problem.
- There are way too many off leash areas. Dog owners need to understand the rules and that not everyone loves their dogs as much as them.
- No
- Bad owners are more responsible for issues than bad pets. If someone can't be bothered to properly train and control their pet, no pet.
- Wish i had an idea on how to deal with dog owners who leave their dog feces everywhere. Unless they get caught in the act, nothing happens
- I think this is a horrible idea and that the people against the breed need to be muzzled! I've grown up around bully breedsandtheyarethebest
- I appreciate the survey presented by the city, but breed specific by laws will not help. Responsible owners / citizens first.
- NO to BSL. As a professional dog carer, the majority of issues I see with any dog breed is a result of the owner's inability to train them
- bylaws against breeders, we need to eliminate the backyard breeders. A dog only acts the way it does is because of the owner go after them!
- Stop the rasicism of dog breeds. Every dog deserves a chance.
- Stop targeting pitbulls. Target bad owners its not that difficult.
- Dog(S) who are left outside and unattended to bark all day at everything should not be allowed. The owners should be held responsible.
- Constantly barking dogs should not be allowed to disturb the peace. They should be limited for outdoor time. Also public education is best!



- Owners should provide proof of Enrolment in Obedience training to get a Temporary License for dog and prove completion to get the yearly one
- Dog breeders should have to be licensed if they are making money on the sale of puppy's
- Case by case please! 2 times in my life I have been cornered by aggressive Dogs and neither one were Pitbulls! #dontbullymybreed
- pp
- Issues with dogs often stem from owners NOT the dogs. Stop punishing dogs because of their breed! Small dogs are often worse than large dogs
- To be honest I think it should be mandatory for all dogs to attend obedience training. Because any dog can attack or have bad behavior.
- All Animals Act on instinct. The responsibility of the owner of domesticated animals to ensure the safety of others outside of own property
- I think that anyone who works with or rescues dogs should be required to take a dog psychology/behaviour modification course.
- Put restrictions on owners and owner accountability, not on a breed or dog that has certain physical characteristics
- Nope
- Licensing through vet clinics. Stop targeting pit bulls. BSL is biased and not evidenced based or helpful.
- A cat owner should not keep their cat all the time out of their property. Many times I noticed it bothers other pets such as dogs.
- "There are no bad Pitbulls, only bad owners" is the same logic as "guns don't kill people, people kill people". Further restrictions now pls
- Policies relating to dogs needs to be made by vets and educated dog owners, not a few loud and outraged citizens using poor anecdotal info
- Don't target "bully" breeds. With any breed, small or large, it's their owner's responsibility to take care of and train them properly.
- Still think muzzling ALL dog breeds in public is the best idea stop the BSL [removed]
- BSL does NOT work. This is a proven fact. Making OWNERS more responsible and liable is key. Don't punish the animal, punish the people.
- Shame on you Calgary for even considering BSL.
- A few bad owners should not cause the rest of "pit-bull" type dogs to suffer a lower quality of life, like, not being allowed to a dog park.
- cats at large should not be in the same category as dogs at large - cats do not pose a biting threat like dogs
- It is far to easy for Calgarians to obtain dog licenses for dangerous breeds. No training for either required. This should not be!!
- Stop targeting specific breeds. There is no such thing as a bad dog, just bad owners.
- It would be nice to request a cat trap from the city, and be able to call the city to have the trapped roaming/feral cat taken to the pound



- Educate the owners! Our animals are a products of the environments they are being placed in. More affordable training classes needed.
- More needs to be done about people bringing their pets to playgrounds. There should be signage and enforcement/education
- If Cat traps are unavailable to people, then people should have the option to purchase their own traps.
- I feel that singling out bully breeds is unacceptable and uneducated. They are not nearly the most dangerous, powerful, or aggressive dogs.
- if we ban based on breed we should also do the same for humans??....
- Dogs, chickens, goats...any and all pets/livestock are under control of someone. That someone is responsible for the actions of that animal.
- In no way should pit-bulls be banned from our city or forced to wear muzzles. It is the owner not the breed
- Dogs should not be allowed at all except for elderly and handicapped people help.
- Post large signs warning the general public that they are about to enter a off-lease area -Enter at your own risk -avoid sudden movements
- "More liability on the pet owners to raise their animal responsibly. It's not the breed that is an issue.
- PETS ARE PRODUCTS OF ENVIRONMENT"
- MUCH more signage and fine warnings for on-leash areas, not picking up feces, and areas where dogs are not allowed (playgrounds)
- Too many times dogs are off-leash (in on-leash areas) are or on long leashes and the dogs run at my small kids
- I do not agree with the muzzling of certain breeds because of their looks/false reputations. It is on owners to get proper training
- More repercussions need to fall on bad pet owners. It's not the dog's fault they weren't taught what's right and what's wrong.
- Breed specific legislation is not only logically but biologically defensible.
- There should be clear stipulations to declare a dog a nuisance, but otherwise this tact vs blanket breed based policies makes far more sense
- Seeing dog feces (bagged or not) all over paths and parks where I take my small kids to enjoy themselves is infuriating
- License fees for cats and dogs should be the same fee. Cats at large are just as much of a nuisance as a dog at large.
- Need to have higher penalties for barking dogs, calling 311 doesn't seem to work
- Police the owners! Not the dogs. Stop with the breed specifics. Put measures in place for responsible pet ownership.
- Banning based on breed is unacceptable.
- I think there should be regulations and restrictions on dog and cat breeding to reduce the amount of poor backyard breeders.



- I would Like To See a Segregated, Secure Fenced" OFF_LEASH" area For Problem Owners/with specific breed designation. Strict association .
- mandatory training for dogs who have shown aggressive behaviors, site visits to be sure the pets location is a safe one for it and public
- Time to stop wasting tax payers money
- Banning dogs by breed isn't right, the dogs behaviour is influenced by the human(s) raising the animal
- Tighter restrictions on Pit Bull owners will only heighten the stigma on the breed. Not fair for responsible owners and their dogs.
- Fines for dogs and cats should be looked at separately. I do not open my front door and let my dogs out as the neighbors do with their cats.
- Better access for lower income people to spay and neuter program as well as access to pet training and classes.
- Writing animal bylaws based on the breed of dog is a bad idea.
- For dogs that continuously bark in there yard there should be a bylaw.
- Fines with mandatory training on nuisance Dogs. At owners expense - and reduced for lower income. The animals need a home and training...
- The city should entertain the idea of providing obedience classes and puppy classes to all people who adopt an animal
- No
- no
- Banning based on breed is unscientific and unacceptable. Enforcement should be based on the particular dog exhibiting past issues.
- Don't ban bullybreeds-theyre sweet. More signage/patrol in ON leash areas. proper licensing/close observation/strict rules for dog breeders
- It would be good to know how The City collaborates with other orgs to coordinate on efficient service delivery and reduce duplication
- Continually barking dogs of the neighbors are a big problem with us. Increase the enforcement options for this.
- Parks would benefit from having biodegradable bags and receptacles placed in higher traffic areas, Fish Creek Park .
- Higher fines for people who allow their dogs to roam off leash in non dog parks, ie: walking/bike paths, playgrounds, residential areas, etc
- Barking dogs. This needs to be dealt with. Larger fines.
- Don't condemn a breed worry about back yard breeders and irresponsible pet owners. License needed to breed approved by a veterinarian ect
- Pet Lic.
- Specifically targeting one breed of dog is not the solution. It is the owner that is the issue and how the dog is raised and trained.



- Breed-specific legislation is not scientifically supported and the "facts" presented about bite strength are incorrect
- Economically it is unjust for the city to use financially punitive measures, rather than a rehabilitative approach. Don't slander pitbulls
- Owners are responsible for aggression in their animals. Bully type dogs don't deserve to suffer for an owner's neglect or lack of training.
- Stop using pit bull in the same sentence as vicious. Use irresponsible pet owner with the word vicious. Dogs are not born vicious.
- If it isn't already, banning cosmetic procedures for dogs including ears cropping, tail docking etc. Unless it is medically necessary
- No
- I think it is the owner of the animal of how the animal reacts not the breed.
- Specific breeds are not the problem, negligent owners are.
- Why bother targeting one breed of dog, especially when you don't enforce the bylaws that are already in place. Enforce the current bylaws!
- Animal licenses for cats and dogs should mandatory. As should spray and neutering. If you can't afford your pet, you shouldn't have one.
- Allow for better education to youth and the public about how to approach dogs , how to tell if your dog has aggressive behaviours or stress
- In most cases it is the owners who need training before ever getting there pet and should be required to pass a course
- Stop with BSL. It is cruel and stupid. Who are we as a people? Get the facts out before doing this survey. This is sickening
- I dont agree with livestock in the City (hens, etc) but if allowed, they should have to pay for each animal to be banded and licensed
- Good idea
- Pit bulls are not the problem!
- |
- "DOG BITE STATISTICS BY BREED 1982 –2014
- Rank 1- Pitbull - 3397 attacks
- Rank 2- Rottweiler - 535 attacks"
- Enforcement of a bylaw requiring a license to breed, approved by a veterinarian.
- No Ideas.
- Breed specific legislation is unfair to the animals and perpetuates harmful stereotypes against pit bull owners, especially people of colour
- A pet bylaw needs a commitment from the city to enforce it. Otherwise, it would just be more virtue signalling from the city.
- A breed specific by law condemns many amazing dogs. Poor acting dogs are the result or poor acting humans. Save our breed!



- You do not know, until you know. Don't wait until it is too late, ban pit bulls.
- I do not support any sort of BSL. Responsible pet ownership is key not BSL
- I think a pet limit of 6 total animals is better. 6 dogs and 6 cats is too many
- Maybe do some actual research on what dogs have attacked more people and go after them instead of a pitbull because of how it looks
- H
- Ban all animals that are capable of killing someone. Pitbulls, rottweilers, German Shepherds, crocodiles, scorpions.
- I 100% support banning pit bull type dogs. Any pro-pit commenting needs to stop posing as an advocate, trying to defend their wounded egos.
- No I think most thing was covered
- If you are doing breed specific legislation you better ad all other dog breeds!!! Due to all dogs are capable of being aggressive
- Unleashed dogs in city paths not designated as off leash should be fined and enforced more rigorously.
- There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Do NOT single out breeds - severely restrict bad owners!
- Nil
- Leave it alone!!!
- "Specific breeds are not the problem, negligent owners are," says every pitbull owner before their dog kills someone.
- Pet licenses should include a written exam ensuring owners understand existing bylaws and responsibilities, subsidize obedience training.
- There are no problem breeds, only problem owners.
- No
- Banning/restricting based on "appearance" seems really sketchy, and bans on specific breeds doesn't address the real problem: bad owners!
- enforce the rules about dogs being off-leash out of bounds. My 2yo gets terrified in Bowness Park on the trails when dogs bound toward her.
- Trap-neuter-release programs for feral/stray cats is the best way to control feral cat populations!
- Focus on preventative measures! Qualified must-have training for all pet owners. Education for public not to approach or startle dogs
- **DOG BREEDS ARE NOT THE ISSUE. Instead of blaming specific breeds, focus on the irresponsible dog owners!!! OWNERS ARE THE ISSUE**
- Please make evidence-based policy, recognizing that visual identification of dog breeds is deeply flawed. Do not punish pit bull type dogs.
- no ideas
- Owners are the problem, but since they can't be forced to act responsibly, dangerous breeds need to be targeted instead.
- Increased fully fenced in off leash dog parks. Northwest Calgary has 1... This is ridiculous



- Even if Pit Bulls bite "less" than other breeds there is no denying they have larger jaws and muscles. This is potential for great harm.
- Increased fully fenced in off leash dog parks. Northwest Calgary has 1... This is ridiculous "Specific breeds are not the problem, negligent
- Cat owners should not be allowed to let their cats roam past their property line. If dogs are not allowed to wander neither should cats.
- It is not a child's responsibility to behave well around dogs. It's the owner's responsibility to train their dog.
- Do not be ignorant and underline your lack of education by supporting the ban on certain breeds.
- Pit bulls are dangerous. End of story.
- Targeting "bully breeds" is completely ineffectual for reducing dog attacks. Public/owner education is crucial and scientifically backed up.
- Dog breeds are an issue. Pit bulls are an issue. Public safety is an issue.
- Anyone who would adopt a pit bull needs psychotherapy ASAP.
- who knows what the right answer for this is
- No
- Look to other cities to see their successes with urban chicken programs, with recommendations of coop size, placement, and flock make-up.
- Yes! Freedoms of pet ownership! BUT not Pit Bulls. Sorry. That infringes on my right to safety. I don't want to be attacked please.
- No, keep BSL out of it's the actual statistics and science does not support the media bias and hype.
- I hope they all get euthanized soon.
- I think kids should be taught not to run up to dogs. I think color coding a collar for dogs when in public to let people know if approachabl
- Rehabilitation Program, re-assessments. If convicted criminals are given the chance to change, why not give dogs the same chance?
- Regardless of comparisons to other dogs, pit bulls are bred for fighting prowess, and are capable of killing people. People first.
- It's not the dog, it's the owner. More little dogs attack than large dogs. Fix the problem, not the symptoms
- Ban all dangerous breeds like pitbulls
- Ban pit bulls (grandfathering current ones with microchip requirements). Ban breeding and importation of pit bulls. Euthanize at-large PBs.
- There is no denying the numbers, ban pit bulls! And maybe some therapy programs for people who defend pits, yet have no empathy for humans.
- Stop discriminating against "bully-breeds"
- Too many kids have been killed and maimed by Pitbulls just in 2020. Enough is enough. We have to finally commit to end this savage madness.



- The mentality displayed in anti-BSL comments in this section only further support why a ban on pits is so essential.
- Please have more fenced off-leash parks for well behaved animals.
- Looking through the comments - It's simple, Calgarians DO NOT WANT BSL?
- No
- Be in control of your dog at all times on or off leash, take the time to train them, a dog is a responsibility not a right.
- Do not ban a specific breed of dog, take the dog away from the humans if it is a problem.
- Band all the propaganda emails and the incorrect information being attached! Here's your uneducated people!
- Your focus on bully breed dogs is completely unfair and unwarranted. Do better City if Calgary, you're embarrassing yourselves.
- everyone relax be responsible nothing wrong with pitbulls but idiots teaching them and owning them lack of skills or knowledge
- Less about Cats at large as they help with mice/gophers and more about aggressive dogs, not breed related. Do something about skunks.
- We back onto an off leash area. A dog ran up to a man, barking, man backed up and raised his hands. Dogs feces 2 feet from our chain fence.
- Target bad animal owners NOT the animals!!
- Can't believe we're re-exploring breed specific legislation. ALL dogs should take obedience training and held to higher standard post incident
- I wish there was actual enforcement to fine and discourage people that pick up after their dog but then leaves the bag.
- The definition of a "pit bull" is too broad in this survey. A ban on specific breeds is ineffective in dealing with dog bites.
- Upper limits for pet ownership numbers is NIMBY [removed]. Use existing legislation to target unhealthy/unsafe living conditions (ie-mills) instead
- don't put hate on a breed of animal, put hate on the owners who treat and train the animal wrong. #justiceforthepittys
- No
- If you're going to say all pit bulls are bad and need muzzle, might as well say all black people are bad and should be in jail. Same thing.
- Licensing for cats should be dropped. Most cats are indoor. This is simply a money grab that funds other enforcement programs.
- Poor behaviour is poor training. If we are talking about bite strength, we should include all dogs with strong bites. Don't bully my breed.
- "Pit Bulls DO NOT BITE MORE OFTEN
- Pit Bulls DO NOT HAVE THE STRONGEST BITE!!
- Research and educate"



- Breed specific laws/bans are ignorant. Ignorance is dangerous. End of story
- A breed should not be discriminated against. It should be case by case basis.
- Pet registration for responsible indoor cat owners is nothing more than a cash grab. We don't utilize any of the services that \$\$\$ funds
- it would be nice if some City parks allowed horseback riding.
- Bully breeds should not be targeted, usually it is the people that own the dogs that are the problem, not the dogs.
- Don't blame the breed, blame the person .
- Maybe instead of a limit on the number of pets/household, the licensing fee for each subsequent pet is higher.
- You can't single out a breed .. it's all how you raise a dog .. don't take away the freedom of our companions
- It is the responsibility of parents to ensure their children are taught how to act around dogs and to ask permission before petting
- higher fines for cats purposely let out. Visible Id for service/emotional support pets. Education on the difference between them.
- ID for emotional support animals. Education on their rights
- If a dog is peaceful and docile with everyone except the bitten then then the bitten needs to be investigated.
- Children who are bitten by dogs should have an investigation happen to see whether or not the child provoked the dog. Kids aren't innocent
- How about enforced training for people with dogs that can be aggressive? It's not the breed, it's the owner.
- I do not believe in breed specific legislation. Owners should be licensed by proving they know responsible Pet ownership principles
- Target the owners of all vicious dogs, not just certain breeds that people have vilified
- "Fine adults that come over fences and tease dogs.
- Perhaps people with big breeds should be required to take a small online test."
- The City of Calgary needs to recruit a lot more Peace Officers. The current workload exceeds the existing capacity.
- On/off leash signage is poor, confusing. If dog is not controllable, should be on leash at all times. Enforce pick up excrement bylaw.
- Consider banning owners from keeping aggressive breeds in cases causing severe injury or death.
- I think obedience training required for 'nuisance dogs' is the best compromise. It will disincentivize bad owners without punishing the good
- NA
- Easier portal to request bylaw presence in community parks where there is a lot of offences.
- Make bylaws based on the animals and owners actions. Not based off of its breed. A viscous animal is a viscous animal. Breed doesnt matter



- Don't discriminate against pit bulls. Every single dog out there is capable of biting. Start punishing owners instead of dogs!!!!!!
- The people who are saying to ban pitbulls have NO IDEA about dogs or dog behavior. Blame the owner, not the dog. Period!
- BSL is not a good idea. The animals are not the problem, the owners are. Any dog of any breed can be vicious and not all pittys are.
- "DOG BREEDS ARE NOT THE ISSUE. Instead of blaming specific breeds, focus on the irresponsible dog owners!!! OWNERS ARE THE ISSUE
- City worker to check in with nuisance dogs and owners on how they are doing.
- there are too many uneducated media junkies. Talk to vets and behavior specialists and make a decision based off of facts. Not emotions.
- Please don't introduce BSL. It doesn't work and dogs are family.
- BSL is not supported by science so it has no place in our city. Humans create problem dogs, not the breed.
- I don't like the idea of being able to keep pigeons. My neighbor has pigeons and there is a lot more feces on my vehicle. Need to pay fees t
- Increase fines for violent dogs of any breed, not just focused on the Pitbull family. Owners should be held accountable not the animals.
- why give a break on owning a pet no matter the income. no matter who you are what you have owning a pet has the same responsibilities
- Mandatory annual vet visits, for check ups/vaccines for all dogs and cats.
- Encouragement for training dogs rather than banning breeds, It is irresponsible owners that cause the problems.!
- Mandatory dog obedience training should be a requirement of licensing.
- It's really unfair and unjustified to put restrictions on a breed due to appearance.
- I've never met a violent pitt bull or Stafford terrier and think muscling them could cause psychological issues
- Fines should be absurdly high for all aggressive violations. There meant to passively police rules not just revenue generate.
- Do not ban bully breeds.It's unfair and if you think you need to ban them might as well ban all dogs.All breeds can have uneducated owners
- No
- For those who tell people to get educated, the Pitt bull is a hatebreed dog designed to kill bovine Bulls for sport outlawed Early mid 1600s
- Not sure
- Flailing movements and high pitched squeels are bred triggers for Pitt Bulls. Naturally that's what small kids/animals do and why attacked
- My main concern is the discrimination towards Pitbull's and Staffy's. They are not the problem. Uneducated, mentally unfit, and lazy people are!



- It's not a debate over whether it's Pitt Bulls or the owner's that are the problem... It's BOTH! And two wrongs obviously don't make a right
- More off-leash areas.
- Were not talking about which breeds bite More or less, such a deflection of the issues. I'd personally literally go 20-1 Pomeranian bites
- Pitts are known for their high intelligence + their number one priority is to please their owner, issues are entirely owner related, not pup
- Unfortunately many of the irresponsible pet owners in my area have pit bulls so I support this survey
- Pets (any breed) are a product of their environment. Figure out how to identify and deal with irresponsible owners it's not the pets fault.
- Any dog can bite, not just bully breeds.
- I think there needs to be better circulation of animal bylaws as well as enforcement.
- Pitt Bulls are too much dog for society. There's a reason we're not allowed top fuel dragsters on McLeod trail. It's 4 ur safety 2
- I'd like to see a decrease in licencing fees over lifetime of pet if demonstrated responsible ownership by owner.
- na
- I do not believe in discriminating dogs by breed, and vehemently oppose special bylaws for pitbulls.
- Band pit bulls in Calgary !!!!!
- We need to stop crossing the narrative. Bites and attacks are different. Small breeds fear bite if space invaded, Pitt Bulls attack
- I do not agree with breed specific bans. Any laws should be based on the behavior of the animal
- Treat all breeds of canine the same! Do not single out "bully" breeds as aggressive small breeds are more aggressive than bigger breeds.
- Leave the bully breeds alone and identify the owners who are responsible for the behaviours of their pets.
- no no rules about pitbulls or bulky breeds should be applied i own two dogs neither is a bully breed or pit . I have never ket an aggressive
- Enforce cat bylaws. They are responsible for extinction of birds, ruin gardens, antagonize leashed animals, stuck in trees, eaten by coyote
- None
- No additional ideas.
- There needs to be regulations for back yard breeders. This should not ne allowed.
- Banning pitbulls is not the answer! Small breeds, especially Chihuahuas, actually bite more often due to lack of training!!
- sorry don't have any ideas,
- There should not be any difference in how a dog is treated based on breed. This penalizes good pit bull owners. It is unfair and unjustified



- Fines make no difference if no bylaw officers ever visit the park to write tickets. The ravine in ArbourLk is treated by 75% as off leash
- The focus on Pit-Bulls is completely unfounded and disgusting. There are exponentially more bites by smaller dogs.
- Seems many municipalities have already legislated Restricted Dog by-laws. Is this causing reductions in dog attacks on both people and dogs?
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work. Chihuahuas bite often because of poor handling and they don't get banned. Owner education is key.
- no
- Vets need to be held more accountable. There needs to be something in place for people in low-income.
- Pit bulls are very gently kind dogs when raised right. Restrictions on who can own one may be ok.
- Pin pointing "pit bulls" even though it's a known fact they don't have the highest bite record is absurd!
- cat license's are unnecessary, and onerous on cat owners. repeal the cat license bylaw
- Singling out pitbulls like this is disgusting. We should be encouraged responsible ownership rather than punishing all owners like this
- Stop focusing on specific breeds such as pit bulls. Poor ownership and lack of training are the bigger issues.
- Fines of around \$50 for each excessive barking complaint where excessive is anything over 2 consistent hours.
- It is non-sense wanting to put Restrictions or additional requirements on a specific dog breed / owners based on that dog's bite is strong.
- owners of nuisance dogs should be required to participate in obedience training with their pet AND in a pet management/care course.
- Fines are great 4 generating revenue but do little to solve the original problem Invest in more education and training resources 4 pet owners
- Ban the pit bulls. End of story.
- An addendum for rescued pit bulls. Pit bulls should be illegal to purchase or adopt without proof that they are rescued with culpability.
- Any bylaws or legislation that targets specific breeds needs to be backed by accredited studies published in a respected journals.
- Your pit bull dog should be banned. I'm sorry this bruises your tender ego, but people are getting disfigured and killed. Fully support BSL.
- The more well adjusted and properly trained a dog is, the less likely they will bark.
- People should have to attend force free training for dogs who have had issues to learn to properly train their dogs in effective lasting way
- Please put people first and ban all pit bulls!!
- Owner education is key. Dogs/cats (OF ANY BREED) are not born "bad"; they are raised that way.



- Pro bsl! And please stop hating on fellow humans in favor of vicious dogs. Stop the destruction!
- Need a responsible pet ownership course for owners that explains how to properly take care of and train animals and explains the law.
- I think outdoor cats should be illegal. There are SO many cases of people that kill them for fun or in general them getting hurt.
- I DO NOT support any sort of breed ban. Information offered to support breed bans are after not accurate. All dogs can bite
- There should not support be breed-specific legislation.
- Stop being bias to dog breeds! Work with those owners and figure out a solution. Give them and the dog a chance before you kill the dog.
- I've had lots of problems with loud barking dogs in my neighbors yard as well as dogfights. Nothing has been done after numerous complaints.
- People who own breeds stronger than themselves should have to take mandatory training classes
- Implement more affordable training for dog and owner! Putting legislations on breeds does nothing to reduce attacks. NO BSL! NO BSL!
- TRHRSTHTRHHR
- It is not fair to label all pitbulls as dangerous. It is all about the owner and not the dog! They aren't even the leading dog biting breed.
- Having a dog is a responsibility, not a privilege. All dogs should be given the same chance and all owners make sure they are responsible.
- Pitbulls should not be a targetes species. Chihuahua can be targeted. They bite all the time just to bite
- This needs to be stopped. It's a slippery slope, soon all big breeds could be affected and after that the mid sized dogs are next...
- BSL does nothing but ensure a death sentence to bully breeds and causes more fear of a sweet breed. blame the owner not the dog!
- SAY NO TO BSL! smaller breeds cause more bites and more severe bites than any other breed but because pitbulls look mean they are blamed.
- Bylaw so renters of large breeds are not discriminated against. Muzzling of small, nipping, dogs. Limit dog walkers to 5 dogs per walk!.
- Put fencing on pathways to distinguish between off leash areas and pathways, eg ring road area oakridge west. Seniors cant walk here dange
- Calgary used to be a city that focused on training owners and not blaming the breed, what the heck happened? BLAME THE OWNER, NOT THE BREED!
- Breed specific bylaws do not work. They are targeting the wrong situation and penalize people with gentle and behaved dogs.
- There is no such thing as a bad dog! aka pitbulls...Only bad owners!
- Including a training class with the 1st years license at a higher cost then a reduction in all license fees in subsequent years for graduate
- Fines for dogs off leash in non-designated offleash areas.



- rulings on cases of attacks and bites should not be based on breed, any dog can bite, if the dog and the owner are not trained properly.
- BSL is not a good idea and not scientifically backed up. It is abhorrent that the city is considering this in any form.
- No
- No ideas
- I do not agree with Breed Specific Legislation. The behavior of any dog is ultimately related to how the animal is treated by the owners.
- Please make it legal for any calgarian to shot on sight any pit ball. That is proven to work!
- "Fincial aid for mental health/therapy animals.
- Reduced fines for pet owners who are experiencing financial difficulty.
- Training not fines."
- I don't like fighting breeds-they caused injury to my dog.But I was hurt by a poorly-trained St. Bernard.Target the nuisance, not the breed.
- As a vet for 20+ years, there is no science to back BSL. Owners are the root cause of aggressive dogs.
- Any dog is capable of biting. I do not agree with Breed Specific Legislation. Very backward thinking as far as I'm concerned.
- BSL doesn't prevent attacks or bites. Zero evidence that it does. Don't be like flat-earthers. Educate yourselves.
- Setting up accountability of parents with children who taunt, tease and throw items at yards that have pets.
- Since when does Calgary support BSL?! I've always considered it to be past this! Wasn't Calgary the one that reduced dog bites without BSL?!
- As a part of registering a dog in Calgary, proof of obedience training should be a mandatory requirement.
- Dog owners should have their dogs defacate on their own property! Even if they pick up the business there is remnants and it's disgusting.
- None
- -
- As a pit bull owner, I'm shaking my head. The neighbourhood kids will lay on my dog all the time. He sleeps right through it. So dangerous.
- Rather than increasing licence fees for dog owners with bully breeds....actually reduce the licence fees if the dog reports no incidents.
- City doesn't care about our pets just lookin for source income!
- How can ONLY pitbulls be mentioned?!All large dogs are capable of devastating bites. Stricter enforcement for owners of (ANY) nuisance dog
- You mentioned pigeons being lore limited. I believe that could be more streamlined.



- I do not support any kind of law that targets one breed of animal. Any breed can act out it is up to pet owners to properly train their pets
- "One time license fee for cats and dogs. Higher fee if not spayed and neutered.
- Licenses available through vets and humane society."
- The animals are not the issue here. It's people. Always. Fix your ownership bylaws before you ban dogs.
- I do not support any kind of law that targets one breed of animal. Any breed can act out it is up to pet owners to properly train their pets
- jjm
- Please refrain from singling out specific dog breeds. All of the most credible information has indicated BSL is not effective and wrong.
- Vicious dogs need to include Chihuahuas, etc. Just because they're small doesn't make their aggressive behaviour "Cute".
- nope
- There is absolutely no reason for BSL. I struggle to find a difference between this way of thinking and racism. It is the OWNER.
- NA
- There is a big responsibility in having a pet in ones home. Mandatory training when a new dog comes a home. Every time.
- Put more blame on owners not the animals.
- Fix the stray cat ussue. Im sick of seeing cats hit by cars and cat limbs in edworthy park from owners that dont care enough to keep them in
- "Breed-specific legislation is not beneficial or effective. Dog owners need to be responsible
- I think that each case should be explored based on individuality and severity
- Many green spaces are under utilized and would be better appreciated if made off leash areas.
- I had two savage dog bites as a child from a German shepherd and a yellow lab. Breed specific laws arent the answer
- A one time licence fee for a dog that remains in the house or yard except when it is in the car to go to the vet or get its nails trimmed.
- I would Be in favour of a program to identify potentially dangerous dogs. Education for owners and training for dogs
- No
- Owners are definitely the issue here, not a specific breed of animal. Offering discounted rates for training so, owners properly train pets.
- No
- Have park ambassadors in all parks.
- I do not think that it is wise to focus on breeds but rather behaviors.
- Fix the outdoor cat problem. Increasing fines for each time its captured.
- .



- Singling one dog breed out is outrageous, we should be evaluating if someone is even fit to have a dog- any size
 - The wait time for low-income spay and neuter is too long. Providing more money to this program will limit the feral cat problem
 - Fixing feral cats on farms as lot gets dumped them
 - No
 - Singling out one dog breed is not ok. I will not support a bylaw that discriminates against a specific type of dog.
 - "Don't single out breeds.
-
- Focus on educating and or evaluating owners in all cases of dogs/cats/birds."
 - Please make effort to change behaviour regarding owners that don't pick up their pet waste. This is a nuisance for all citizens.
 - Focus on the owner and give proper training to the owner if there is an issue with the animal. It is not the breed, it is the owner.
 - Singling particular breeds is a waste of time and money. Use that money for education on an early warning system.
 - I would like to see more responsible pet ownership. Dogs, especially large dogs, shouldn't be off leash unless they're in an off leash park.
 - Nope not really
 - I wish the fee for cats wasnt so high. My cats are indoor cats only, making the registration almost useless to me
 - If we believed a race of people had higher potential for violence would we place restrictions on them too. Shame on you calgary
 - BSLaws are not the answer. You should be zoning in on bad owners, the breed is not the problem.
 - "BSL is NOT racism, HELLO - these are DOGS, not HUMAN BEINGS!!
-
- I fully support BSL, those opposed are clearly not of sound mind."
 - I do not support "pitbull " type dogs being singled out. The breed is not the problem. Any dog can be a nuisance with a problem owner.
 - Yes to breed specific legislation - pit bull dogs have no reason to be in our society.
 - none
 - no
 - I am completely opposed to Breed Specific Legislation - it is racial motivated and comes from an uneducated perspective. Review the ON stats
 - The owner does not determine what's already bred into a dogs DNA. And the owner won't be fast enough to stop an attack. Pibbles = dangerous.



- No breed specific legislation
- I would support obedience training for all dogs, but solely focussing just on pitbulls is ridiculous. You even admit they don't bite more.
- Is this about nuisance dogs or vicious dogs? Because to me those are two vastly different things
- I think the idea of breed-specific legislation is antiquated and dangerous. Remove all verbiage pertaining to "bully" or "bullheaded" dogs.
- The current cat bylaw puts the onus on people to pay for a trap and catch a stray cat. The rules for cats and dogs should be the same.
- It's not the breed, it's the owner. Staffies and pit bulls are gentle with the right owner
- I would like to see a relaxation of cat roaming rules.
- I would like the focus for dogs to be education, training and care as well as responsible pet owners.
- Changing perception of dog breeds
- All dogs can be dangerous, no matter the size or breed. Owners need to be held responsible for the actions of their dog(s).
- keep breed specific bylaws OFF the table indefinitely!
- No breed specific legislation is needed. #all[removed]matter
- "An easier method of submitting complaints of excessive barking or other animal noises.
- Some of the current rules seem restrictive."
- "Cats need to be contained like any other pet!
- Pitbulls are the same as Sheperds, Rotties, Mastiffs, Dobermans ect don't be breedist."
- All large dogs regardless of breed, but capable of real damage to an adult or child, should be required to participate in obedience classes.
- Pitbulls were originally bred to be NANNY DOGS. Violence is NOT in their DNA. If raised properly they are very kind and gentle dogs.
- I am completely opposed to breed specific legislation. The breed is not the problem!
- More proactive policing of bylaws at off leash areas and pathways.
- A breed's avg. bite force times 20 yr stats of incidents/fatalities yields a risk factor, higher risk must have \$1mil. liability insurance
- What will the city recommend for the increasing number of feral rabbits. Kingsland community has an issue now due to irresponsible rabbit ow
- No BSL; any dog breed can be a nuisance do not single out Pit bulls
- Better signage and enforcement of where dogs are not permitted
- Don't punish the breed!! Punish bad dog owners!!!
- An off leash park, is not a place to sit on the grass and have a picnic. Screaming when a dog approaches.
- Im absolutely disgusted the City of Calgary is considered judging a dog on its breed. This is so archaic and ignorant. NO to BSL!!
- We already have breed specific laws for pet owners. We can't allow own exotic animals!



- I think it's completely unfair to base any legislation based on a breed. What does a "Pitbull type" even mean? Ridiculous
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work. Any dog can bite. Blame the owner, not the dog.
- Is there any bylaw protecting wildlife such as squirrels or other animals considered as 'pests'? Also increase fines for animal abuse
- No BSL; any dog breed can be a danger do not single out Pit bulls, it's all about how people train their dogs NOT about the breed
- na
- Breed-specific legislation is not supported by evidence. Responsible pet ownership and education need to be the focus, not BSL.
- I wish all cats and dogs would be spayed or neutered. With rare exception.
- None
- Focus on the owner and give proper training to the owner if there is an issue with the animal. It is not the breed, it is the owner.
- #pitbulllivesmatter
- Breed specific regulation is not the answer. Public education on responsible pet ownership and zeroing in on irresponsible owners is better.
- People with pets only, in off leash areas. Not cyclists and family picnics.
- No
- N/A
- Barking dog education and if not taken care of fine. Accepting recordings of dogs sent to by-law via email for neighbourhood disputes.
- Ridiculous to have breed specific legislation. Gives people with other breeds a pass to not train and manage their dogs.
- I have seen more small dogs that are mean ,than the bigger dogs. So sad that a pitbull " pitbull type " has to punished , city gone to [removed]
- Pitbulls are gentle giants. Don't discriminate because of their size. I've seen way more small dogs attack than I have a Pitbull attack.
- Focus on the owners and not the animals.
- All dogs and cat should be need to be spayed or neutered by law with rare exceptions.
- I believe that we should not be targeting one breed of dogs as its cruel and unfair. I have seen more vicious small dogs then I have big dog
- More puns I suppose
- There should be no breed specific legislation. There is no evidence supporting BSL effectiveness. Training is the owners responsibility.
- Eliminate off-leash areas which are also mountain biking areas (eg. nose hill)
- Place a max limit on how many fines/notices are issued before further measures are taken. Should not keep being indefinite warnings/fines.
- No



- Education programs. Hating on 1 breed won't fix the problem, ANY animal can be aggressive and those owners need the tools to train their pet
- I believe it is unfair to single out a certain breed of dog. Many breeds that don't have owners that know how to handle them can be dangerous.
- Breeding of animals should be banned in the city. There are far too many animals already in need of homes. Breeding more is irresponsible.
- BSL does not work. It just punishes dogs for how they look. The problem is the owners, not a "breed".
- Full ban on pit bull and other aggressive dogs
- By "nuisance" I hope you mean nuisance dogs of ALL breeds, not just ones that "look like pitbulls".
- Arguments based on 'stronger bite' are flawed. German Shepherd, English Bulldogs, Boxers etc. are in the top 20 bite strength as well.
- Backyard chickens
- Time has showed us people are too dumb to be responsible for a breed of dog like pitbulls. I love them, but support the ban
- I do not support additional laws targeting "pit bull" breeds.
- No
- A pitbull is not a particular breed it is many breeds. Bad owners will just move to other large breeds (Rottweiler, Cane Corso, etc)
- "Focus on behavioural changes vs the breed"
- Many small dogs can cause damages, be rude, or bite. It isn't specific to bully breeds."
- should be better rules for who can adopt or get a pet, required training or all client who get a new pet has to book an appointment with a vet
- Again; it is not the breed...it is the uneducated/irresponsible owners that are the cause. Stop punishing the breed. Up the fines, BIG TIME.
- To try and single out a breed or type of dog is ludicrous. As a long time owner of bully breeds I am appalled by this notion.
- I, like many others, am completely against breed specific legislation - It reminds me of racism. Please focus on responsible pet ownership.
- Don't be like Ontario, don't ban or muzzle pit bulls. If you do you will be part of the problem
- Most dog bites can be avoided. Training should include recognizing a dog that is stressed and may bite. Even good dogs can bite.
- Do not ban pit bulls. That is an uneducated approach to the real problem which is bad pet owners.
- No
- The antiquated notion of rolling out BSL in Calgary is appalling. The logic is flawed. Terrible.
- Define pitbull not a breed the owner not dog is problem .



- Breed specific bylaws should NOT be implemented. Pitbulls are not bad dogs, there are only bad owners. Any dog can attack. This is unfair.
- breed specific bylaws are proven to not decrease animal incidents! I am appalled by this potential legislation!
- Because people overreact and nowadays use false claims and their emotions to get what they intend to be right when it's not. Abuse the syst.
- Lower fines for not picking up dog poo. Not the end of the world and shouldn't be \$200. Unreasonable. More parks should be off leash.
- I'm appalled YYC is even considering BSL. The data is clear, it doesn't work. Focus on the owners.
- Dog parks are for dogs. Kids need to be controlled Nd educated about their place in an animals environment.
- High fines for animals found in distress. Removal of the animals immediately if found in abuse circumstances.
- Bandannas on dogs won't prevent bad behaviour of owners. If u aren't smart enough to train a dog U aren't smart enough 2 pick the color.
- ?
- Higher fines to owners, more responsibility lays on the owner. It shouldn't be on the breed of the dog. You could lump in Shepard's Doberman
- Breed specific legislation does not reduce bites. Dog breeds do not dictate behaviour. All the pitbulls I have met have been very gentle.
- No
- Instead of placing all the blame on the dog or breed for their behaviour start taking into account the owner and how they handle the dog.
- Make penalties based on individual animal history not by breed
- Provide affordable training center for dog owners. In order to eliminate a problem you must educate the owners not muzzle specific breeds!
- 3 strike rule to warrant a life time ban on owning or selling of animals..
- It's rarely a bad breed ie;pit bull it's bad owners!!
- DO NOT BAN PITBULLS ... JAIL TIME AND FEE DOR ABUSE TO ANIMALS.
- Not at this time
- Penalties and rules shouldn't be based on breed - they should be based on individual animals and owners.
- Do not create any breed specific legislation! It doesn't address any of the actual problems causing dog bites!
- Singling out and vilifying pitbulls reflects poor research on and understanding of the bully breed. I am ashamed to read the proposed laws.
- Creating legislation targeting specific dog breeds will only make people's fears of these breeds worse. Focus on obedience training instead.



- More dog friendly establishments - well socialized dogs are happy dogs! Keeps communities safe and thriving when pets and humans can cohabit
- Breed specific legislation creates more problems than it solves. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners.
- Targeting a specific breed of dog is disgusting. I've been bit by smaller dogs and chased more by 9 pound dogs Then any "high risk breed"
- Put more rules in place for PEOPLE who want to own dogs and mistreat them. Dogs much like humans are a product of their environment.
- The fee structure changes are not useful if there is no enforcement. There needs to be effective enforcement that is proactive
- "Pet licence for rabbits
- Heavy fines for releasing rabbits"
- "BSL has NEVER worked it's legislation implemented to placate the [remove]
- AU, Spain Italy Ontario are just some of the failures"
- I do not agree with identification of breed specific as dangerous. I have seen and been bitten by more small breeds than large breeds.
- Increased dog fees should be used to provide a service to clean up dog feces on public and private property from irresponsible owners
- The amount of things you folks at city hall are trying to control, is getting out control. Keep your hands out of my pocket.
- animals should not be penalized for protecting there home/owner from someone who enter the property unwelcome or uninvited.
- BSL is a form of racism. I am a large breed owner, education is key. Not scare tactics.
- No
- The cat bylaw requires a homeowner to trap the cat. Photos could be used instead along with providing the cat's address to report offences
- I cant say it enough but TRAINING, TRAINING. All dog and owners. Especially new owners need to go through training to understand their dog
- Most animal owners treat them as part of their family. No need to make things more difficult for us.
- Breed-specific legislation is not the answer. We need to enforce dog owner accountability by emphasizing non-breed-specific laws instead.
- targeting a specific dog is beyond disgusting. BSL has been proven not to work, and many cities have dropped it. My dogs are my family.
- No
- Proper training should be done when owning a bigger breed dog no matter the breed.
- Training!!!! Owners and dogs. Bad owners make bad dogs not breed!
- Proactive enforcement or presence in dog parks or high pet traffic areas such as walking paths.
- Pit Bull laws need to be proactive because a first attack is usually severe. Breed specific problems require breed specific solutions.



- No
- Reduced licensing fees for low income pet owners should be restricted to a lower number than the overall pet limits.
- Have neighborhood's that allow cats to roam. My cat meows NON stop to go outside. Vet says my cat has anxiety from wanting outside. RIDICULO
- I'm extremely disappointed to see that our city is even considering bylaws that target a certain breed. These dogs are the sweetest breed.
- Penalties for aggressive dogs. No such thing as bad breed. Every 10 years the "bad breed" changes because people fight train different breed
- There should be more severe punishments for animal abusers and not specific breeds of dogs.
- I would like to see you create a MANDATORY BYLAW that requires the owner to have their animal spay/neuter unless they are a breeder.
- Lower fines and make Force Free (the most modern) pet behavior training mandatory post incident at the owners expense.
- This is ridiculous. The dogs are not born vicious, the stupid owners make them vicious. My pit bull is a protective dog, she's sweet n lovin
- Stop breed discrimination! Pitbulls are some of the kindest dogs out there. All dogs should have to follow the same rules.
- Most breed related issues are due to lack of training and structure from owners. Enforcement on mandatory training would be a better off.
- Enforce leash laws better. I am afraid of dogs and it is very hard to find a somewhere to walk without an off leash dog approaching me.
- A certain breed is no more likely to bite then another. Drop the pitbull [remove]!!
- No discrimination to pit bulls! Focus on EDUCATING OWNERS! Restrict number of dogs a dog walker can bring at one time to off leash parks.
- People should be able to keep up to 6 hens in an appropriate coop and run. There are already avenues for neighbours to complain.
- Allow rate control on animals that are required to take obedience training. A lot of the time owners WANT to take their dog to training
- I am DISGUSTED Calgary is considering BSL. Education and training should be the only solutions we are considering. Pets are family.
- New cat or dog license to require a mandatory 30min-1hr online training session. Renewing or new license of same type has class waived.
- Owners of bully breeds should have to complete recognized animal training program to get licence.
- Calgary is better then this! There is not bad breed, just bad owners. I know meaner wiener dogs than bullies.
- No
- N.A
- Increased enforcement for city parks. People not keeping their dogs on a leash or cleaning up after them. I have witnessed this multiple tim



- Charge owners for crimes committed by their pets.
- Breed specific legislation has NEVER been shown to reduce dog bites. BSL is not the answer.
- Usually it's the "victim" that does something to cause a bite. Dogs don't bite for no reason. It's not always the dog and owners fault.
- Please stop with the BSL legislation. Bully breeds are no more vicious than any other breed. This has been proven time and time again.
- more relaxed for roaming cats, and truly believe that banning pit bulls is outrageous, outdated and the data is NOT affective.
- Questionnaire states that pit bulls do not have a high attack rate. Give discounts/waive license fees for dogs with professional training
- "No separation or discussion of provoked/unprovoked attacks or strangers entering yard.

- Do not penalize breeds, only owners."
- Increased training for pet owners should be mandatory especially for nuisance or pit bulls. It is the owners that need the training
- "Why are pigeons kept as pets? Urban chickens are a bad idea. No roosters should be allowed. Mandatory animal
- Welfare course for owners"
- No
- I don't see anything in the proposed bylaws for action against humans who abuse or mistreat animals. Greater fines for neglect and abuse!
- More enforcement of training for small dogs. Usually bad behaviour that I have seen exhibited the most is from small breeds not large ones.
- Owners of bully breeds should be required to go through training and testing to ensure the dog is not a danger to society.
- Please do not consider implementing BSL. Punish the deed, not the breed. Focus on educating owners to be responsible instead.
- More Enforcement for pet owners who let their dogs off leash in no-off leach parks. Using video evidence to prove this.
- I think that bully breed specific legislation is a very down stream approach. Mandating dog training for every breed would be more effective
- Not a fresh idea, but I'd really like to see more bylaw patrol looking for off leash dogs in on leash areas.
- none
- We should not change bylaws based on one breed of dog. If bylaws are changed ALL breeds should be included.
- When a dog attack or bite, not always is the dog fault, what happens when bites are in self defence or when protecting de owner??



- Dogs learn behaviour based on owners. It is not passed down through breeds. Small dog owners should be held to the same standard
- QUIT DOG DISCRIMINATION
- .
- Send this survey to all who have a pet licence. A mandatory eLearning yearly (2yrs) when renewing licence. (onleash/off leash rules etc)
- If the dog injures a human to protect the owner from a potential threat, there shouldn't be a fine
- "pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other breeds", so why then are you even considering BSL? Be better Calgary.
- BSL is absolutely not the way to go. The idea is asinine and has been proven to be so many times. "Victims" are often at fault.
- Nothing at this time
- no
- Every time a breed is restricted, irresponsible owners just replace it with another. Responsible pet ownership should be the focus.
- "Dogs learn behaviour based on owners. It is not passed down through breeds. Small dog owners should be held to the same standard"
- why were responsible pet owners not provided the survey via email? you send a notice to pay annual fees but not for proposed bylaw changes.
- I own 2 pit bull rescues and have never had issues around babies, children, teens or adults. Punish the owner not the breed!
- There is data to prove that Pitbulls are involved in more number of severe dog attacks than any other breed. Don't ban but revise Breed rule
- No BSL! Responsible owners and higher fines for owners of something happens like a attack
- Pit bulls are not the problem, bad owners is the issue. Don't punish the breed for a incompetent owner.
- Urban hens provide food stability and connection to our food systems. They're so important.
- This survey was flawed. BSL questions need to be decoupled from "nuisance" and should be asked about all breeds if you're truly "curious."
- Nuisance does not equal dangerous. Questions on minor things like barking should be decoupled from serious bite history.
- Mandatory spay and neuter, with a well-supported program accessible to all, is the most important thing you can do.
- If people do not have the strength, knowledge, or time to invest in training their pitbulls, get a different breed!
- Adding your BSL questions is a red herring to distract from other important issues: spay and neuter, food security with urban hens, etc.
- We can not allow breed bans, it's not ethical. There are no bad dogs just bad/irresponsible owners.



- Restricting number of pets doesn't work to prevent hoarding. Invest in mental illness support rather than an arbitrary bylaw.
- Restricting breeds does not work. The "bad guys" don't care about bylaws. BSL only hurts good owners and good dogs.
- dogs do what they have been taught it's not their fault if they were trained to do the wrong thing
- Education, not regulation. We know what works, so let's do it.
- Support rescues so they can actually rehabilitate dogs with adequate resources and properly screen potential owners.
- Pet per household section should also involve property size (e.g., apartment vs a house with a backyard)
- Urban hens help manage public health issues like obesity and lack of access to healthy food.
- Urban hens and other livestock would support Calgary's agricultural history and keep the spirit of the Calgary Stampede alive.
- If there is an incident I think that the fine should be paid to the person that was injured, one time per licences updated by pet death
- Crack down on the real issues: gangs, drugs, trafficking, etc. It's not about the dogs. It's the underlying issue and bad guys don't care
- BSL breeds hate. That is NOT my Calgary. Discrimination is never OK.
- There should be a bylaw that if you are not a licensed breeder, it is absolutely, unequivocally mandatory to spay/neuter your cat or dog.
- I don't feel "pit bull" type dogs should be treated differently than any other large breed dog.
- No everything was included
- Ignore BSL. Increase education for pet owners (require behavior classes for all owners before obtaining a license). Minimize license fee.
- My good friend has two pit bulls mix dogs. And they're are nicest kindest laziest dogs I've ever met.
- BSL is a targeted, prejudice and ignorant motion, with as much factual backing as the boogey man. Your time could be much better spent.
- Ani left outdoors w/o adequate shelter, heat /cold, water will be \$\$\$fined. 2nd offend apprehended and Muzzle barking dog in yard or fines
- No other ideas
- Please do not add BSL. This is unhelpful. Why not add more support and education? Do not punish a breed because people are the problem.
- You should be ashamed of even considering breed specific bylaws.
- STOP DISCRIMINATING. I don't care if it's humans or animals. The owners of the pets are responsible for their actions.
- Ban owners who have committed dangerous crimes or involved in violence from owning pets.
- Increase license costs for owners who have multiple tickets, even jail time.
- For people that had a pet that bite or attack people/ animal to have them to go through a training with professional pet trainers!



- Having a pet is a total responsibility of the owner, no one else. If your pet doesn't know how to behave in public then don't take it out.
- Do your research before coming up with guided bias questions. Why are you allowing anyone to submit answers from anywhere.
- Its the Owners Responsibility to make sure their dog is in control. I take my dog everyday to off leash parks , and its always a great.
- Ban "Backyard Breeders" instead. + Bylaw should be clear on how many animal welfare complaints they receive, but ignore until it's too late.
- BSL causes fear and further perpetuates a problem. An aggressive dog is either afraid or trained to be and it is 100% the fault of the owner
- People who have been convicted of animal cruelty should never be allowed to own another animal and a regular check up should be done
- The idea of BSL anywhere makes me sad. I DO NOT support this for my city.
- Banning people who have multiple animal offences from owning pets, Get rid of the bad owners a dog is only bad of its trained to be.
- Would love to see multi-year licence purchase options (i.e. 2 years, 5 years)
- Other dogs are much more aggressive. I have a aggressive Pomeranian that lives around me. Nothing is being done about that. [remove] By-law
- First-time dog owners should NOT be allowed to own Pitbulls and/or other guard dog breeds WITHOUT professional obedience training.
- Breed specific legislation has no place in a modern and civilized first world developed and progressive country, province or locale.
- I do NOT agree with BSL !!! Its bad owners not bad dogs !!
- Residents with children should have the right to refuse their neighbours owning of guard dog breeds unless they have obedience training.
- Na
- breed specific bands are a horrible way to manage aggressive dogs. I have never been bit by a bully breed but by other breeds
- If you plan to pick on pitbull breeds then ALL aggressive breeds need the same legislation. German shepards, rottweillers, Akedo, Dobermans,
- People should be fined for allowing their dogs on other people's lawns while on walks. It's rude and irresponsible.
- We need to not focus on breed specific dogs, aggression in dogs is not breed specific
- Better licensing enforcement needs to happen. This will ensure responsible ownership and accountability.
- Personally I would ban all ownership of outdoor pets. Pet owners are completely insensitive to people who may not like animals.
- Breed bullying at it's finest! Irresponsible owners should be held accountable regardless of the breed.
- How about some fines for humans baiting animals into biting?



- No ideas at present.
- Increase public awareness of how to approach an animal. Permission from the owner should always be sought first and should not be ignored.
- I think that if dogs bark a lot there should be designated times where that dog can be walked like park closes and there's a membership
- There should be a short course on pet ownership. Responsibilities would include training, exercise, cleaning up etc. You owe them a life!
- no
- N/a
- No
- I would be interested in being part of your tribunal. I am in oil and gas professional in Calgary and a current responsible pet owner. Kathy
- Roaming cats need to be looked at enforced? No one takes the bylaw about cats at loose seriously. Most people "train" their cats to wander
- We need more bylaw officers going into the parks and pathways and giving out tickets to those people that DO NOT follow rules.
- If you dont like dogs, dont go to a dog park and complain that dogs come up to you. Also, more tickets for off leash dogs in on leash areas
- I think that people who continually call to complain about an animal that is not actually in the wrong, should be charged for wasting time.
- educate and enforce cat bylaws. Many owners either dont care about their cats, or dont know they cant wonder. Then cry when they go missing.
- ID for support animals. To separate the real ones from those who bought into the "support animal license" scams online.
- Address the root of a problem. I.e Funding for TNR, subsidized spay/neuter for low income.
- Community gardens. Incentives for eco friendly yards and personal gardens.
- No
- Excessive barking should be followed up for repeat offenders. Likely the animals needs are not being met if it's ongoing
- Make your decision after talking to vets, trainers, and getting facts. Do not make this decision based off of peoples emotions. #nobsl
- There should be no breed based restrictions. Problems are the owners not the breed.
- Punish the deed, not the breed.
- Basic conditioning training. Takes about a 2-3 weeks to help a dog with separation anxiety. For barking you can train them to be quieter.
- Focus on vicious or dangerous dogs, (of any breed). Please don't make a decision to target a whole group of dog types.
- Incentivize food gardens on private and public property. Fencing off more off leash areas would be nice too.



- I sure hope this survey is just to appease the public. But in reality you will make a decision based on facts. Talk to cities that had bsl.
- Treat dogs on their own merits, not as one of a specific breed.
- Animals don't belong in cages. They need room to fly, roam and enjoy life. Ban livestock from the city.
- No bad animals just bad owners. Increase fines for violations e.g. dog not on a lease, not picking up after your dog.
- Work on the stray rabbit and cat issue.
- Focus on owners. Not animals...
- I do not support the bylaw for keeping cats in door, they need to run free! humans are killing more birds than cats do with 5G antennas
- Small off-leash fenced park in EVERY community and a larger area shared by several communities. Social and exercised dogs have less issues!
- Animal Welfare should be an important part of the discussion. Also, more local off-leash areas.
- Small community-monitored off-leash areas. There's so much public space that is under-utilized.
- None
- No to BSL, more education for all also those who don't have a dog or understand the breed,
- A mandatory course for owners on dog behaviour and dog ownership for owners of bully breeds and nuisance dogs.
- none
- Creating bylaws against a specific breed is unfair. All dogs have the potential to be dangerous. Educate not penalize
- The City could make money from an indoor (winter) dog park. Charge a fee. More by law officers in dog parks for feces removal compliance
- N/a
- No more off leash areas where homes back on to them. In our case, there is lots of room, but dogs/ owners come within inches of our fence.
- Cats should have to follow the same rules as any other animal. For natures sake and their own safety.
- Singling out Pit Bulls is wrong. To have breed specific laws is wrong and basically animal racism. Focus on bite prevention and teaching.
- More affordable training. Every owner wants to have their pet professionally trained, but many attempt to do it themselves because it is \$\$\$
- Just as different races of people are not bad or good, you cannot apply good or bad to dog breeds. All lives matter.
- Require all dogs to complete basic training, by a trainer who is accredited through an independent body and uses modern scientific methods
- All dogs (regardless of breed) should undergo an in-home basic obedience test at 1 year of age monitored by Bylaw officers.



- No to breed specific legislation, more education and more enforcement in dog parks. Never seen one bylaw officer enforcing rules in a park.
- Pet wellness program: monthly fee includes spay or neuter, vaccines, annual exam, dewormer, etc. Education opportunities and better health.
- More education of youth, new citizens, etc. on interacting with animals. Most bites are because of inappropriate human behaviour.
- PET CATS ROAMING IN PEOPLES YARDS
- .
- Shut down backyard breeders. Make licenses for unaltered pets substantially more costly (like \$500 more/year than spayed/neutered pets).
- Pit bulls are a misunderstood breed and should not be specifically targeted against.
- Incentivize catios as alternatives to free-roaming cats. Education, no hoops from bylaw to build, demonstration sites, etc.
- Bylaw officers should not show bias. I had to hand over a found chow to officer who said "the only good chow is a dead chow." Disgusting.
- It's naive to think that Pitbulls are an aggressive breed of animals. Happy the City have some common sense in suggesting controlling them
- Quit discriminating against specific breeds. Punish the owners, not the dogs. DOG'S AREN'T BORN BAD. Shame on you for this ridiculousness!
- Strongly penalize owners not dogs. I've seen more vicious small breeds than pitties, any trained, socialized animal can be great!
- BSL is a good thing. <https://www.google.ca/amp/s/time.com/2891180/kfc-and-the-pit-bull-attack-of-a-little-girl/%3famp=true>
- Incentivize food forests and urban agriculture. Improve food security and access to healthy food.
- More emphasis needs to be placed on owners and their behaviours first. An animals behaviour is directly related to that of their owners.
- Dogwalkers should not be allowed to walk any more than 4 dogs at a time
- I am concerned about Pit Bull type dogs. Bites from Pit Bulls can be so much more severe than bites from other breeds.
- City says they're curious about pit bulls but they have no data to show there's an issue. So ask about EVERY breed or don't ask at all.
- Subsidize the cost of spay and neuter for everyone- make it free so it actually gets done. It will fix 99% of Calgary's pet problems.
- Incentivize good behaviour, not just penalize bad. What about some kind of decreasing license fee for every year you have no complaints?
- Ensure pet owners have a right to prove innocence. Especially barking I see dogs falsely accused often because it's hard to tell direction.
- Follow farm guidelines when determining appropriate, housing for small livestock. Liscence each household wishing to raise small livestock.
- I support lifetime licensing options.



- Animal limits ignore differences in property size, physical, psychological, and economic ability to care for animals, etc. Arbitrary.
- No to BSL, animals are the product of our teachings no different than our children are.
- Stop SEGREGATION with dogs and people! Every dog is different. Don't target the bully breed when there are a lot of well trained pit bulls!
- Voluntary bandana idea is good.
- Empower rescues to sell licences but make it easy for them. They are VOLUNTEERS, not paid city staff. Better compliance as part of adoption
- Responsible animal ownership should be praised and encouraged.. reducing fees for owners that have respect laws and are responsible .
- I think there should be a responsible owners course for large dogs. They should not be outlawed and the city should not discriminate breeds.
- To enhance good behavior people pets have to be educated. If an issue occurs fee could be waived for the new pet course or visit a behaviorist
- no
- No one needs 6 pets in one household within the city - it should be lower.
- No
- I disagree with the statements relating to specific dog breeds. Since any breed can be aggressive, the bylaws should focus on nuisance dogs.
- I trust pitbulls more than I trust adults. pitbulls are kind dogs who love everyone. educate the public rather than create fear.
- Stop pushing for breed bans it does not work. Make owners accountable not a breed or breeds. Many people do know what these breeds are
- Do not require a Fanciers license. Membership is already payable through governing body. Have proof of CKC membership only
- No
- All pit bulls should be destroyed
- I believe that anyone that has a dog and applying for a license, should have proof that they have attended obedience classes and passed
- "Singling out Pit Bull breeds is ridiculous. Unfounded fear mongering is irresponsible governing!
- Bad Pitty = BAD OWNER! Every time!"
- There should be an increase in fines for cats at large during the months of June to August to address the increasing loss of song birds.
- I sure wish people would stop letting their cats out to hunt the birds in my yard and use my garden to do their business.
- Public access to obedience training for all dogs. Small dog bites/attacks treated with similar weight to larger dogs. Ending BSL
- My service dog is an American Staffordshire terrier. The proposed BSL would outlaw my lifeline. Training beats BSL ignorance always



- none
- The City should really work to emphasize that we citizens must accept personal responsibility, teach kids about dogs and train dogs!!
- The #1 thing is cracking down on off-leash dogs outside dog parks. And use the many qualified trainers in town to consult on policy.
- No
- No
- Pigeons constantly destroy property and it is very hard in court to prove the pet owners pigeons are the ones that caused the damage. 0 = :D
- BSL has been statistically shown to not be effective (re bites) in many places. Please move forward using facts, not fear mongering.
- Bullies breeds are being exploited here! To name them is being discriminatory!! A dangerous dog comes in all sizes and mixes!
- "Dogs bark to protect property and their owners
- Sometimes if there is a nasty neighbour the dog will let the world know."
- I think all pet owners should have to prove they have space/time/money to take care of any pet!
- I have a dog whose breed is known to be temperamental and she won't even lick me. It's about the training. Punish bad owners not the dog.
- How many animals in a home, consider an area restriction, six big dogs need more room., one dog can make more noise than six !
- A dog is gonna bark that's a dog you need to be specific on "excessive" noise
- Laws based on breeds is a waste of time and resources. Laws should focus on holding owners accountable for their pets.
- I think there should be a limit of dogs in Calgary city. To fix the noise issue and the dogs turning issue.
- It is all about the owners, not the animals
- I think that people who are professional dog walkers should have limits on the number of dogs they have on a walk and have insurance.
- Foster animal off leash area
- It should be a mandatory requirement for people to participate in/complete/pass dog training/obedience classes when they get a dog.
- Dog socialization classes should be mandatory when getting a dog
- "BSL has been statistically shown to not be effective (re bites) in many places. Please move forward using facts, not fear mongering. "
- the dog should wear a bark collar.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. Irresponsible pet owners are the problem! Don't blame the breed!
- Why do people even have pigeons? Seems very unsanitary.
- Get rid of backyard breeders. This industry should be regulated and require proper education about puppy development/needs included. socialization



- Exactly where in "phase 1" engagement was pitbull bsl brought up? Council is just creating stress on those who have "pitbull" type dogs.
- A pit-bulls bite is not the strongest @ 235psi. Quite a few breeds are stronger. Husky @ 320psi. Rottweiler 328psi. English Mastiff 556psi.
- How about dog bite statistics get posted ? I cross the street to get away from Yorkies as I've been bitten by them.
- Exactly what [remove] decided to bring up bsl ? Every other province is looking at reversing bsl as it hasn't made a difference. Why consider it?
- [removed] NO TO BSL!!!
- I don't believe pit bulls should be targeted. I believe bad pet owners should be targeted.
- Animals deserve better care and cruelty bylaws. Focus on that. Humans [remove]
- Potential pet owners should have to prove that they can properly afford, care for, and manage their pet, regardless of size or breed.
- In my opinion, the bird's/pigeons need to be vaccinated, so there r droppings aren't full of bacteria.
- All dog owners must have to take a dog behavior course before getting an animal and their dog pass a test similar to the CKC Good Neighbor.
- We need more animal bylaw officers. Been in city 25 years and yet to see one. Hire more or add this duty to other city staff.
- N-a
- STOP dog racism, a dog is a dog, just like all humans are human and all cats are cats. "Bully" breeds dogs are just dogs. This is stupid.
- No
- In my opinion, it is not fair or necessary to discriminate against "pitbulls" and pass these horrible bylaws.
- Please ensure that higher fines don't lead to people harming animals in order to avoid fines. For example, if noise violations.
- Pit bulls should be targeted, bad pet owners should be targeted.
- Fines for pet owners allowing pets to urinate in public parks where children play...
- -
- I would like to see the 2 meter bylaw enforced and extendable leashes banned.
- Putting severe restrictions in place for "bully" breeds is discrimination. I have more issues with other breeds at parks than with pitbulls.
- Any change should not require an increase in the cost to the taxpayer.
- Leave the bully breeds alone. Start making bylaws for bad humans rather than the dog. Bad people make bad dogs. Get your heads straight!
- More garbage cans along sidewalks could help with feces cleaning.
- There needs to be higher fines for off leash dogs in on leash areas. Your dog may be friendly, mine is reactive, which is why he's on leash.



- The dog bite fines should be clarified to indicate unprovoked. If someone breaks into a house or attacks the owner and the dog bites, no fine
- I think that there should be education for children and their parents to train kids not to approach or touch ANY animal that they don't own!
- I don't understand why the breed of dog is an issue. Huskies are known to bite more than Pit Bulls. Responsible ownership is key.
- False accusations against a Pitbull should result in a fine.
- Never seen an aggressive pitbull in Calgary, proper training of the animal is the difference between the two!
- N/A
- None
- BSL is so far off base as a means to increase public safety. Humans ought to obtain a license in order to own a pet.
- The targeting of pit bulls is not fair. Not all pit bulls are vicious or nuisance dogs and not all vicious or nuisance dogs are pit bulls.
- update the old bylaws as the world changes.
- All dog owners should be required to go through obedience training. If you can't afford the training you can't afford the dog!
- No
- The dog early warning system no good. Visual labels will only increase human fear, which reinforces anxious behavior. Not a resolution.
- There must be a bylaw for clean up of feces on private property for health reasons and door control.
- A bylaw that says you can't feed another persons pet. I have problem with neighbours giving my dog junk though I've asked them to stop.
- Breed specific legislation is not effective, don't move backwards Calgary, we are better than that. ”
- Singling out breeds should not happen
- Shame on you Calgary for even considering BSL. ”
- Shorter leashes for known aggressive dogs. Extendable leashes banned, use of same to carry a fine.
- Responsible pet owners are a must!!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls" #justiceforbullies #bslfreeyc #dontbullymybreed ”
- What a shame for Calgary. There were once the leader for the responsible dog acts.
- "Looking through the comments - It's simple, Calgarians DO NOT WANT
- BSL!"
- Responsible pet owners are a must!!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls" #justiceforbullies #bslfreeyc #dontbullymybreed ”
- What a shame for Calgary! They were once the leader for the responsible dog acts.



- Responsible pet owners are a must!!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls" #justiceforbullies #bslfreeyyc #dontbullymybreed ” [DUPLICATE]
- Responsible pet owners are a must!!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls" #justiceforbullies #bslfreeyyc #dontbullymybreed ” [DUPLICATE]
- Don't target specific breed there are no bad dogs just bad owners
- I don't understand making people pay for liability insurance for owning a certain type of dog, considering most of them are rescues.
- No
- Responsible pet owners are a must!!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls" #justiceforbullies #bslfreeyyc #dontbullymybreed ” [DUPLICATE]
- Breed specific legislation is not effective, don't move backwards Calgary, we are better than that. ”
- Responsible pet owners are a must!!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls" #justiceforbullies #bslfreeyyc #dontbullymybreed ” [DUPLICATE]
- No
- Focusing on pit bull breeds is ridiculous! The problem is the owner, not the breed. Remove the proposals which unfairly target pit bulls!
- No other suggestions.
- Do not implement any Breed Specific Laws. Owner and animal training should be required.
- Responsible pet owners are a must!!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls" #justiceforbullies #bslfreeyyc #dontbullymybreed ” [DUPLICATE]
- NO
- I am not in favour of anyone complaining about barking at a door to be let inside the house if it doesn't continue for more than 1-2 minutes
- Address animal issues on a case by case basis, not breed specific basis. It is frequently the training and handling that leads to issues.
- Stop targeting specific breeds. It's either all dogs or none. Targeting specific breeds cause misinformation and prejudice and harm
- Spraying off leash areas With herbicide should be abolished
- BSL [personal information removed] ? Is this your vision of social equality in calgary
- No dog nor animal is bad. It all depends on the owner with the way it's being treated and/or raised.
- Focus on supporting good training and animal ownership. What about licensing discounts after completing basic obedience? Owner education!
- Blanket bans are ineffective and unfair. Poorly disciplined dogs of all species exist. Legislation should put onus on owners and not breeds
- Breed-specific bans and legislation is not based on scientific evidence and creates an unnecessary stigma towards certain breeds
- I am confused about the fines area. I care less about the fines than I do about compensation for injuries and deaths. What about that?



- We need to encourage people to be better owners not ban breeds
- We're thinking of allowing people to keep pigeons AND talking about BSL? What is wrong with this city and who is on this panel?
- Not sure
- Bad pet owners. Neighbors have 3 German shepherds and are well worst trained than my pitbull. Not the breed it's the owner. Smh city of yyc
- I agree with other criticism that pit bulls should not be explicitly targeted, how the dog is raised and not the breed itself is the issue.
- I am in full support of backyard chickens. Removing the ban would be a win for building a more sustainable, local food system!!
- Put a municipal tax on pet food and pet accessories in order to pay for the off-leash areas and the related municipal by-law services .
- Put away with ANY breed specific legislation and actually follow up on any and all! complaints and reports. Even on dog on dog attacks.
- .
- I am against targeting dog breeds like pit bulls. It's the owners that need training. That is a very gentle breed when treated with love.
- Pit bulls should NOT be targeted.
- Hold everyone accountable for an aggressive dog. Whether it's a 5 pound dog or 150 pound dog. Let's stop being breed specific.
- Pet fines not going to deter people from having a 'violent' animal. Proper training and rehabilitation for violent 'pit bulls' from professi
- stop blaming the dog. it is the owner that is not being responsible. everyone that gets a dog should have to go for dog training.
- the [personal information remove] needs to learn what pet ownership involves before he starts with bsl. dogs are like children, they do what they are taught.
- How about you prevent people from owning certain breeds because its the owner giving a bad reputation. Rotts and GS bite harder than pitties
- Composting bags required and bins for composting in off leash areas
- Enforce leash laws. Too many people think any park or school yard is an appropriate place to run their dog offleash
- Make pet owners review and sign bylaws when renewing their license. No one should be able to say they didn't know the rules. Enforce rules!!
- I'm not sure at this point
- Not at the moment
- Hire more bylaw officers and ensure working hours match when people walk their dogs. Often leash infractions occur on holidays or early/late
- It is really great having all theses bylaws and penalties, but make sure that there is proper enforcement, which seems to be lacking now



- I totally disagree with breed specific regulations. Temperament varies from dog to dog, and from owner to owner, and less by breed.
- Put no dog signs back at playgrounds and schools. People need a reminder...
- Pitbull are not more dangerous then any other breed and shouldn't not be discriminated against.
- I would like dog training to be a requirement for noise complaints. Slapping an owner with a fine won't stop the dog from barking.
- BSL is a proven failure the world over - Toronto 15 yrs later has more bites with greater severity yet pit type dogs R all but GONE
- Responsible pet owners are a must!!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls!! #justiceforbullies #bslfreeeyc #dontbullymybreed [DUPLICATE]
- I don't own a dog, but know that BSL is not the way to go. Deal with dog bites, dog attacks, nuisance behaviour on a case by case basis.
- 6 cats or 6 dogs is too many in the city. And calling out one "breed" (pitbulls ect) is uncalled for!
- BSL does not work. The focus needs to be on education, and responsible ownership of all breeds, not banning pit bulls.
- Please judge dogs based on behaviour not breed. Pit bulls are really wonderful dogs.
- Nothing
- BSL won't work. I think the city needs to look at specific owners and bite history's before breed. I bet small dogs bite far more frequently
- Nothing else right now
- Its not the breed its the human. It should be conveyed to provide dogs with sufficient food, exercise, discipline and affection not neglect.
- All in the survey
- Targeting pit bulls is a waste of time. They are no more dangerous than a large breed and definitely less aggressive than a lot of small ones
- Increase signage and enforcement of dogs off leash in green space areas....ex Strathcona Park Community.
- Lets pick on small dogs!! Leave bully breeds alone!!
- Instead of breed specific laws, the city ought to put actual effort into following up and punishing violent dog owners.
- I do NOT like dog waste bags filling all public trash cans AND unknown dogs approaching me in parks when they are supposed to be on leashes.
- I strongly support passing a bylaw to approve backyard chickens, which I believe will benefit families and communities.
- No
- Punish the people, not the bred. It's their actions and training or lack thereof that caused a bite.
- Ensure a training program is done to handle Large dogs before having one.
- Absolutely NO to requiring muzzles for pit bulls in dog parks/public areas. Ridiculous, I can't believe that was an option on the survey



- Victims of dog attacks should keep the money that the irresponsible dog owner gets fined
 - Please just do not ban pit bulls, yes they are strong, yes they seem more intimidating than other dog breeds but it is not their fault.
 - I totally disagree with muzzles and special conditions for pit bulls!!
 - Fear mongering specific breeds does nothing but create more incidents. Irresponsible owners and bystanders are the culprit.
 - Not at this time
 - Should there be a time limit /day, dog owners are allowed to leave their dogs alone in the back yard and to let them bark /houring
 - I agree with these new bylaws.
 - Pet insurance to be cheaper and maybe have the city provide those services instead of vets.
 - Good idea BSL. You have the support of every sensible citizen in this city. Wise decision :) Thanks for helping keep people safe Calgary!
 - A dog and their behavior is specifically linked to the owner and how he/she raises/trains the dog. It is a complete farce to think otherwise
 - No BSL- and if you surrender a dog there should be at least a 12month minimum wait before licensing a new pet
 - You are asking people who have only the hysteria of the uninformed press to fill out a survey without REAL facts and stats! Irresponsible!
 - Please can pit bulls and similar breeds. We all know a lot of people own them for the wrong reasons or to prove a point.
 - Muzzle small dogs. They are the biters. Leave the lovely pitties alone. Barbaric rules. Change the government.
 - I would like a plan to reduce conflict between pet owners and cyclists on multi-use pathways.
 - There should never be a BSL. If issues arise, the human should be trained with the dog.
 - none
 - BSL is a PROVEN FAILURE it placates the [remove]
 - "Let's put a ban on BSL. Calgary we have been the leaders with our current pet ownership law why change now.
-
- BSLfreeYYC"
 - Fines for people that leave their dogs in their backyard to bark throughout the day.
 - N/A
 - "Stop discriminating against pit type dogs
 - Only 3% of communities around the world have BSL and it's being repealed regularly"
 - "There are ZERO peer review publications that support inherent aggression to any breed
 - SAY NO TO BLS"



- Talk to [personal information remove] a dog behaviour specialist in Calgary. [personal information remove] .He has the facts about specific breed aggression. Dachshunds #1
- [Personal Information Removed] Calgary Model reduced bites 5 fold - It's ranked #1 in North America because he knew it's the owner not the breed
- Harsher punishments for animal abuse and more investigations
- A special licensing program should be adopted to educate ppl prior to owning high needs breeds and used as a vetting process.
- There should be NO BSL in Calgary or any city.
- Ban exotic pets- no usually wild animals should be pets such as snakes, tigers, bears
- Chickens are an obvious go-ahead. The context of having permission from adjacent neighbours is perfect. Roosters are the noise concern.
- A multi-year pet license would be so much easier.
- A bylaw should be passed that prohibits pet owners from letting their pets go own private property. I look after my front lawn and bushes
- No comment.
- Having chickens helps me and others be more sustainable...
- The ideas to muzzle pit bulls in open spaces, limiting one per household or not allow them in dog parks is a dangerous and discriminatory
- BSL is ridiculous and shows the City's ignorance. Require mandatory training for dogs involved in infractions not just fines.
- Leave our pit bulls alone!!! They are the sweetest things! I only grew up with pit bulls and none of them ever bite a living soul!
- No
- I also am disappointed in the City of Calgary's Pit specific questions in their survey. It is not the breed it is the owner.
- Lower pet licensing costs with proof of approved obedience training.
- ""There should be NO BSL in Calgary or any city. ”
- BSL is backwards."
- All Bylaw enforcement personnel should have a certification in animal behaviour and/or training to better understand special situations.
- No but you should use exclusive terms not single out any dogs including bully breed!
- Don't introduce breed specific legislation.
- Pets who must be removed should be rehabilitated and given to new qualified owners and not euthanized
- You need numbers of incidents and not fear. Like if you have a virus that 97% of the population won't get. Should you force citizens masks.
- BREED SPECIFIC BANNING OR BYLAWS ARE RIDICULOUS, USELESS AND HONESTLY, KIND OF RACIST. a bad dog is caused by a bad owner. No bad dogs.



- Legislation that is worded against specific breeds is detrimental to that breed and understanding K9 behavior. No bad dogs only bad owners!
- I think more emphasis needs to be placed on dogs ending up with good owners. Crappy humans are the problem, not bad dogs.
- Not an idea, but wanted to add that FEEDING SQUIRRELS should be outlawed/fineable. Thx
- This is insanely [remove] for a city to try and do this. I would almost pet a "black headed dog" before any other[removed]
- pit bull owners should be required to display their dogs behavior prior to licencing, this could show if the dog has been well trained
- Ban Huskies and Rottweillers which have a higher bite rate in Canada and any breed with a lower temperament test rating than "pittbull breed"
- BSL is prejudicial and has no fact based support. Blame the owner and a lack of training rather than a dog that only knows what it's taught
- Reduce the cost of retrieving a lost or runaway pet. Sometimes bad circumstance happens and I'd hate to see someone separated from their pet
- As pets become more common, there should be free pet training seminars/webinars for how to engage with pets. Train Non- owners.
- Feeding ANY wild animal "people food" should be fully banned. It promotes person-animal interactions and is nutritionally bad for the animal
- There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Bad owners leads to prejudice against a specific dog breed. Learning K9 behavior is key.
- Increase fines for dog breeds that actually do bite more (not bully breeds just bc of the stigma). chihuahuas and cocker spaniels bite more!
- Leave the poor staphs Alone .. So sad
- Responsible pet owners are a must!! Quit discriminating against pitbulls! #justiceforbullies #bslfreeyyc
- I'd really be interested in seeing protection of songbirds become more of a priority ; ie, cats at large as a threat, covering windows, etc
- Treat all dog breeds equally. Any dog (regardless of breed) is deemed a nuisance special limitations (muzzle, park access) should be imposed
- many people have cats, dogs reptiles and birds in house. They should also be limited as they often release reptiles as they get too big .
- No BSL CALGARY! Listen to your sensible people!!!! End of story!
- Have responsible chicken owners use the 311 app to show the location of their chicken coops in Calgary, so that bylaw knows where they are.
- PUNISH THE OWNER, NOT THE "breed"
- Re the bandana idea. 1) Children should not be in dog parks 2) a dog that doesn't classify as green should not be in a dog park.
- Take your dog into the house Pets need human contact and socialization
- BSL is not the answer, let's move towards education not breed bashing



- Was rushed by an aggressive dog off leash while his owner watched, and this morning I was woken up by the neighbours barking dogs. Why?
- Nope
- Enforce responsible ownership, not breed specific licensing. Aggressive dogs should NEVER be allowed in off-parks.
- "Bandana early warning system:
- There should be a resource offered to parents to educate their children specifically pertaining to dogs."
- I have no more comments.
- I do not agree with BSL in any community. Breed neutrality should be the standard. There are only bad owners not bad breeds.
- I am annoyed at owner who cannot control their barking, jumping dogs when I am out walking; allowing them to dedicate any where!
- I'm so happy about the proposed bsl, it's about time Calgary! Proud of my city.
- If you support bylaws against a specific kind of dog (ie; "boxhead" dogs), odds are you'd support the same discrimination against people.
- Responsible pet ownership is the key. Owners should be held accountable for their pets behaviour regardless of breed.
- Uncut dogs should only be allowed for licenced breeders. Uncut dogs should not be allowed in off leash areas.
- YES! BSL 100% - long overdue!
- I love the new bylaw. There's absolutely no logical reason to own a pit bulled dog. You either want violence or need therapy. Or prob both.
- Breed discrimination is not the answer, enforcing responsible ownership is. Heavily fine repeat offenders and develop a clear path to report.
- Pit bulls are not the problem, owners are. Make obedience mandatory, or going through a licensing process you would for a gun.
- Do not blindly ban pitbulls and large dogs based on the breed. Focus on the training and ownership practices that lead to violent dogs
- There is a lot of talk about breed specific laws ... they don't work and I don't want to see such short sighted laws put in place
- owners of pit bulls should be required to undergo obedience training because of the trendiness of with pple projecting a 'tough/edgy' image
- The ideas are good and if implemented should help to reduce the number of incidents. Stop singling out pit bulls, instead of owners.
- No
- Breed specific bans do not work and it would be atrocious for Calgary to implement these.
- Calgary should ban the sale of animals in pet stores, and only allow adoptions of rescued animals



- This is not a breed issue, please do not single out a type of dog. This is a pet owner issue. Let's focus on where the real issues stem from
- No
- n/a
- Placing a breed ban or anything similar is basically racism and not necessary in this day and age.
- Discrimination against a breed is not the answer. Education, not breed fear mongering
- Any new bylaw should apply to all dogs and not specific breeds. Basic obedience and recall training should be reviewed when registering/renewa
- BSL doesnt work!!!!
- Breed discrimination is pointless and unfair. Small dogs bite as well! Pet owners, of any breed, need to be held accountable.
- No thank you
- If a dog bite results from being antagonized/hurt (child/adult) OR due to a conceived threat to dog/owner, there should be no fine.
- evaluations of people to own pets, - this will stop many of the nuisance issues we are facing as most of these cases come from clueless ownr
- Implement for the owner and the pet to be put mandated into training program by a local provider that has been approved if bylaws are broken
- I enthusiastically support education about animal behavior and subsidized positive reinforcement /force-free dog training. BSL is pointless.
- V
- If bylaws about dogs get put in place, this should apply to all dogs.
- Consider putting more onus on owners (not breeds) - ownership bans for people that have demonstrated they cannot care for/control their dog.
- With any of these fines and proposals, you need to see why the dog attacked. Don't blame an animal if people are teasing, throwing rocks etc
- Nothing
- A differential licensing cost, benefiting those who adopt rescues vs. purchase breeds, and/or complete animal training/obedience programs
- Pit bulls are the #1 leading cause of pit bull attacks everywhere. Yes, DO the research. The #s ARE there. The attacks severe. And owner N/A
- For dogs considered "risky", the owner should pay for and prove obedience training for the owner and dog before they are allowed to have one
- Make dog obedience classes a part of the seasonal recreation guide, to make them more accessible!
- Educating dog owners re: off-leash parks (aka, they are *parks/public spaces* where dogs are allowed to be off-leash, not for dogs only).
- Keep legislation breed-neutral, but please increase owner accountability for their dog's behavior.



- There should be a larger fine for letting "wild” cat breeds like bengal and savannah cats roam because they are more likely to hunt wildlife
- You need to remember that dogs are only as good as their owner. Owners need to be held accountable for properly training and raising the dog
- Please do not ban dogs because of their breed. Please increase fines for irresponsible owners.
- Muzzling a dog because it might cause harm is equivalent to arresting someone before they commit a crime.
- BSL doesn't work and unfairly targets dogs based on how they look. Its no different than how black people are being treated. Its racism.
- It's unfair to target these dogs ! It's the owner and not the dog! You are putting everyone of these dogs in danger by doing this!SHAMEONYOU
- n/a
- More enforcement of barking dogs. City intervention that doesn't take months and months to deal with.
- "Ban sale of animals in pet stores - allow only adoptions of rescued animals
- Vet schools to offer medical assistance to low \$ pet owners"
- The idea that "pitbulls" and bully breeds are singled out in this survey is a huge mistake
- Dogs can be triggered by cyclists. Could signs be posted where cyclists and dogs share the area? Nose Hill, for example.
- Change the description of nuisance dog. I dog that barks a lot vs aggressive behaviour. A dog that barks a lot shouldn't need a muzzle on
- Please do not increase fines for these bully breeds. Rich people are not necessarily more responsible pet owners
- Create an all new set of non-leading questions. expand your questions to what positive programs people would like to see.
- Specifically naming "block head dogs" or pitbulls as nuisance animals is discriminatory against responsible owners and animals.
- If all animals are required to go through training, that could be subsidized. I feel like it shows the willingness to make an effort.
- pet owners that unethically treat their pets and do not have the brain capacity to care for their pets should be fined a large sum of money
- MAKE THE PET OWNER MORE RESPONSIBLE TO PROPERLY TRAIN THERE ANIMALS IT IS NOT THE BREED THAT IS THE PROBLEM IT IS THE PEOPLE !!
- lower licensing fees for dogs with good neighbour certification or successful behavior testing by ckc/vet. More small dog only play areas
- I do not.
- adding to the calgary impound pet site any animals that may have been hit by cars and picked up by the city for dead missing pets for people
- There should be protections for owners and pets against the complaints put forward by people who have ill intentions or ulterior motives.



- Every serious attack on a child is from a Pitbull. Dangerous breed.
- There should be nothing against Pitbulls, it's the people who raise them that make them aggressive not the dog.
- The label of "nuisance" dog should be clearly defined (ie. not using "etc" in the definition) so people know what they are asked to evaluate
- the words calgarian and responsible don't even fit together so i don't even know how effective any changes are going to be
- No breed specific target on pets! I've seen many loving pitties at the off leash park and have seen nasty small breed dogs be very aggressive
- The city should adopt a color code system for dogs, "friendly", "don't pet me", "in training". This type of idea.
- Fee reductions or other bonuses for those who have trained their dogs - obedience, CGC, etc. and have certification to prove it.
- No breed specific bylaws. A golden retriever can be just as dangerous as a pitbull. Proper training and conditions apply to all breeds.
- Focus on the owners not the pets
- No
- Use of 'training' leashes and unattended leashes should be prohibited at off leash parks. They are a hazard and recall s/b learned at home.
- I do not
- Dog owners that cannot walk there dogs should not be able to adopt or purchase. Dogs left in backyards day in and day out is cruelty.
- Re: muzzles. Types that don't allow the dog to pant properly should be illegal.
- no other ideas
- I am strongly against singling out any type of dog. Responsible ownership is key!!!
- Put the no dog signs back in the playgrounds as some people don't seem to remember the rules without signage.
- Please refrain from implementing a breed specific law.
- We should make separate off leash areas.Small dogs in one area and large dogs in another.Might save some of the little guys lives.
- No opinion
- DON'T LABEL SPECIFIC BREEDS as dangerous! Many breeds can bite and until a dog has, they shouldn't have different rules put on them.
- I would like to see a nominal fee for off leash access with increased education and enforcement of polite dog behaviour.
- None
- Universal for all dog breed. Not just pitbulls
- Breed Specific Legislation does nothing to reduce the number of severity of incidents. Punish the owners, not the animals.



- Focus on animals by species not breed. Breed profiling is essentially racial profiling. There is no such thing as a bad dog, but a bad owner
- Breed specific legislation is not appropriate. Many dogs are capable of inflicting significant harm regardless of breed.
- Magpie reduction. Reduce the number of magpies in problem areas or provide households with access to tools to do so on their own.
- "Pigeons carry parasites. I don't want in my yard. Address pigeons with no owners.
- Deal with bad dogs/owners not specific breeds."
- Breed specific legislation is utterly ridiculous. It is the owners that should be responsible for their pet
- BSL has been proven in many cases studies to be ineffective. I do not support Calgary incorporating this in any facet
- I strongly support responsible Urban Hen ownership. Used to have three hens which was a huge source of food (eggs) for my family.
- Should not be profiled by breed
- Owners should be responsible for the actions of their dogs. Of their dog does something wrong the owner should be punished, not the animal.
- Remove the ability to ban certain breeds. If you're not responsible enough to train your animals properly, you shouldn't have a pet.
- none
- Targeting a specific type of dog breed isn't the right way to go about this. I've met many nice pit bulls and discrimination is wrong.
- You should not be considering any by-law that is breed specific.
- Fine people who don't respect a dog's space and get themselves or their kids or pets bit. Especially if asked to stay away.
- None
- Breed Specific Legislation is an incredibly prejudiced way of looking at animals. I'm extremely disappointed in Calgary for considering it.
- None
- Love the work done here by both the city and all the volunteers who have taken place. I wish I had known earlier but I deeply appreciate it.
- Allow for reasonable explanation of pet owner before fining or charging them with something.
- We need less municipal government intervention and lower fees and fines except for extreme circumstances like serious bites causing injuries
- Allow pet-sitters to operate without a license if the number of temporary animals is under the maximum number of animals allowed at a home.
- What backwoods [remove] decided to bring up bsl? How about they do something more productive with my ludicrous tax \$? NO TO BSL!
- I feel that pet owners should be held more responsible for there animals, if you have a bad owner you have a bad pet



- Owning a dog is a big responsibility. People should have to apply for a licence to own a dog. Prove you can handle and care for it properly
- **SAY NO TO BREED DISCRIMINATION.** Owners are responsible for knowing their pet and its boundaries to ensure safety of people and pets!
- I am only concerned because our gentle pure breed lab gets confused for a pity cross regularly because she is red in color.
- Cats should not be free to roam, especially when they are bird hunters. We have cats in our neighborhood using flowerbeds as a litterbox.
- Bring back the song birds and stop cats from getting eaten.(they dont get lost) Enforce the cat bylaws.
- Discrimination against pitbulls makes no sense and is completely unfair. Bylaws against them can't be allowed to be put through.
- Looking at data from other municipalities Breed Specific by-laws cost almost \$1 million a year to run. Will our taxes go up?!
- I think people who walk their dogs off-leash in on-leash areas should get fines.
- Please do not discriminate against pitbulls. They are beautiful, loyal and kind breeds. The issues is poor ownership and responsibility.
- No
- No
- My Lab has had nothing but positive Pitty encounters, while sustaining bites from Doodles and Shephards. Breed is irrelevant. Nurture & nature
- Don't ban pits. I went through it in Ontario. They killed more than 2,000 dogs that didn't even have issues. You can't pick apart one breed
- Cats should not be allowed to roam free, regardless if they're licensed. They can cause damage to property and can attack other animals
- From 1986 to 2006 Calgary reduced bite incidents 5 fold with current by-laws. Get back to doing what already works. No to adding BSL.
- "Note: pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents than other dog breeds”... you said it yourselves. **DONT DISCRIMINATE**
- BSL is wrong. **PERIOD.** ANY dog can be vicious if not trained or trained properly. Punish the owner, **NOT** the dog.
- Breed specific legislation is ineffective, unfair, and completely wrong.
- BSL is an ineffective, unfair, totally subjective, and unreliable way to determine the "danger" potential of a dog. Dog racism basically
- Poor pet ownership is a people problem. Nuisance animals aren't breed specific, and animal rehabilitation/relocation supersedes euthanasia.
- Dog training and obedience training should be made more available. So that way people in low income situations can afford the training
- Animals are awesome, keep them out of bad homes.



- Discriminating dogs by breed or 'look' is totally wrong. Fine according to the incident, not the type of dog. Please do better, City of YYC!
- Discriminating dogs by breed or 'look' is totally wrong. Fine according to the incident, not the type of dog. Please do better, City of YYC! [DUPLICATE]
- I'm a firm believer that you need to focus on the household the animal is in before passing judgment onto the animal themselves.
- I would like to see the City actually enforce the rules, which is definitely not done now.
- Making Training classes available at a lower cost and in more locations may aid in problem dogs. Breed Specific Discrimination is NOT OK!
- "The Calgary Model is the number one Animal Control model in North America 5 fold decrease in bites
- BSL has been proven a failure"
- Neighbour's dog alone inside all day, barked constantly. SPCA said dog is not in distress! If it barks all day it is in distress! SPCA wrong
- All ok
- Enforce anti tethering law 25% of all fatalities are from unsocialized tethered canines
- "86% of all fatalities R from unfixed dogs and 92% are male of all breeds
- Push harder to spay and neuter make it easier and cheaper
- NO BSL"
- "25% of all fatalities are from dogs at large - Stiffer fines and force responsible guardianship
- NOT BSL"
- "25% of all fatalities are from unsupervised children left with canines -
- strengthen the lessons to children and adults
- NOT BSL"
- RESCUES should be helped not hindered by Bylaws and charges for tags and capacity
- Discriminating dogs by breed or 'look' is totally wrong. Fine according to the incident, not the type of dog breed
- Spaying and neutering should be mandatory to help control the pet population. Exception would be animals used for breeding.
- I have no problem with spayed cats wandering neighborhoods. It was a real hardship on our outdoor cat when we moved to Calgary.
- Rather than BSL, provide proper training courses for pets/owners as well as spay/neuter programs at a more affordable level.
- Mauling, biting, or killings by dogs should result in the owner getting an equivalent criminal charge and having to defend it in court.
- BSL is not the answer All breeds can be a nuisance . Proper training and spay/ neutering programs should be implemented for pet owners
- Breed specific laws would not just harm responsible owners, but harm dogs that haven't done anything wrong. Don't place BSL in as a law



- No other ideas
- No
- BSL is not the answer. Owners are bad for training, or not training, dogs. Training should be considered and the owners punished not the dog
- People need to lay off Pitbulls,,, Rottweilers and Boxers have the same strengths. PEOPLE and OWNERS need more training.
- BSL is unacceptable. If you want to crack down on vicious and nuisance animals and bad pet owners sure. But don't be breediest!! Unacceptabl
- I do not agree that pit bulls should be singled out as the most dangerous breeds.
- Barking lot for dogs and other animals to run and play is fine as long as the animal owner can handle their pet of leash.
- i believe that the [personal information removed] has to be held accountable for their actions in kidnapping animals from citizens and holding them.
- BSL is wrong. Most of the time it's due to poor ownership that there are issues. Not the breed!
- Instead of punishing one breed of dog purely on the basis of fear mongering and stereotyping, look at more education for owners.
- NO BSL and people need to respect a dogs' space, too. No charges for bites if person was trespassing or threatening the owner.
- pit bulls are not the problem, nor is any specific breed. All dog owners should be held accountable
- No
- It's ridiculous to discriminate against pitbulls when we know they aren't more dangerous than other dogs
- breed specific legislation has not proven to stop vicious and nuisance animals --- manage and fine bad pet owners!
- There is no information on your website on where someone can have their animal registered as an Emotional Support animal. please upload this
- The issue is with humans not a specific breed. Failing to meet the needs of a domestic pet, including a safe environment and training.
- I would like a questionnaire added to the pet license process so that owners demonstrate that they have read and understand city's bylaws.
- An urban environment is not the place for farm animals. Please don't start down the slippery slope of allowing chickens, then sheep, then...
- Terrible to name 'pit bulls'. As a breed are very gentle. Strong but other large breeds r capable of attacking and causing damage.Archaic idea
- no
- Responsible pet ownership includes exercise/socializing. City only proposing punitive measures, no "responsible pet owner" measures. Tsk tsk
- 1 time pet licenses. Removal of the yearly licences.



- BSL is wrong! Owners need more education, not a ban on specific breeds. Judge each dog on its own merits, not its breed.
- Online dog safety course prior to licensing dogs + high fines for unlicensed dogs. Removes owner ignorance for poor dog behavior/training
- Ban bad owners, not breeds.
- Mandatory dog training should be required for pet ownership. Instead of demonizing dogs primarily found in black communities. Shame on you.
- I think that the licensing fee should be the same for dogs and cats.
- I am specifically completing this survey to decrease the input/response that any specific breed should be banned.
- Breed legislation is a terrible idea. The onus needs to be put on responsible pet ownership
- At the end of the day, we, pet owners, are the ultimate responsible for their actions
- Neighbor dogs bark and show vicious aggressiveness when you walk along your own backyard should consider threat to neighbors. Bylaw impose.
- I think, the allowable amount of animals per household should be by sq ft of your indoor residence. Same as for outdoor animals sq of yard.
- You can have an intact dog and still be a responsible pet owner. Enforcing sterilization would be wrong.
- If a person is able to control/contain smells and sounds and the animal as a whole in a humane way this should be more important
- We need bylaw to respond with urgency to reported incidents. Witness won't sit around for hours waiting for bylaw after a bite or attack.
- Muzzles should be mandatory for dogs involved in any attack or bite. Destigmatize muzzles, they save lives.
- Breed specific legislation and bylaws are unfair and prejudiced
- No
- Pit bulls need to stop being targeted and stigmatized. They are no more dangerous than other breeds. It all comes down to the owners
- Color coding may not be visible on a heavy coated dog. Excitable children can startle a dog and cause the dog to react in an adverse manner.
- Don't label Pit bulls as the bad guys, any dog can bite. It is up to the owner to raise a dog right.
- Repeat offenders (owners NOT dogs), should be required to participate and pass some kind of training to ensure education.
- N/a
- A dog that bites, is a dog that bites, damage inflicted and breed are not as relevant as the fact that it bites.
- Increase and enforce not cleaning up after your animals in public spaces, disgusting walking around massive piles left by ignorant owners.



- Mandatory training for NEW dog owners or not had a dog for over ten years mandatory training again
- There should be no ban on pitbulls. There seemed to be a lot of breed blaming in this questionnaire and not on ownership faults.
- Penalty for not having a leash in a non off-leash area should increase.
- na
- N/A
- Can't think of anything.
- Nothing to add.
- Breed specific laws should be banned. A good dog is a tired dog. Taking away potential exercise from a dog doesn't make sense.
- How about an extensive training program for prospective owners as part of the licensing process?
- Stop picking on pit bulls. They are wonderful dogs if treated right. The stigma about them needs to end. It's not the dog it's the owner. Sj
- Instead of banning dogs that did nothing wrong maybe educate yourselves and others about the misconception on "pit bulls"
- Some system to track/ monitor owners that repeatedly have issues.
- Proper training, spay/neutering should be more affordable and mandatory for all pet animals (cats and dogs) but BSL is not the answer
- I think there should be off leash areas for different size dogs. One for small - under 25 pounds, medium 25-50, Large 50-80, and then XI 80.
- Breed specific bans are ridiculous. A poorly trained dog can be dangerous regardless of breed! It's owners responsibility!
- "1. Incessant Barking Dogs can very negatively effect a neighbourhood and need to be taken very seriously by the City.
- 2. Ban Pit Bulls"
- Dog bites to kids are not tracked..it should be LAW that these dogs are tracked and followed up.
- Mandatory obedience classes for pit bull owners.
- Singling out a breed in this engagement is shortsighted, and perpetuates ignorance of the facts (e.g. USPS dog bite data = little dogs bite)
- Breed specific restrictions is unacceptable, don't breed discriminate! The owner should always be held accountable regardless of the breed.
- BSL is inappropriate. Any dog can bite, injure, or cause damage. Rules need to be applied and enforced equally.
- Banning a specific breed is counter productive, Also, 'nuisance ' dogs should be tracked and listed 'on-line' so they be traced.
- Need more plainclothes bylaw officers to monitor and ticket people who do not pick up after their dogs in parks and in offleash areas.
- "I think that it is wonderful to have dogs and a couple of cats. Unconditional love and great exercise.



- Pets are good for us!!"
- I will not ever agree with targeting specific dog breeds. That should not be added in any bylaw.
- STOP PICKING ON PITBULLS AND OTHER BULLY BREEDS. I've been bitten by every chihuahua I've met and given endless kisses by every bulldog.
- Are we going to ban cars because of drunk driving? Is it the drunk driver or the car's fault? Is it the owner or the pit bulls fault?
- No
- This engagement needs to do a little more research and clarify a few things (i.e. Vicious vs nuisance)!!! These are NOT the same thing!
- Breeders should have to be registered and home checks to make sure animals aren't living in deplorable conditions.
- Adults and children should be fined for approaching an animal that is not theirs and getting bite as an outcome.
- DO NOT RESTRICT PIT BULLS THEY ARE FAMILY TOO
- When are we going to stop being prejudice against "Pitbull /type breeds”? It's the owner NOT the type of dog. Many other breeds attack too
- I do not agree with breed specific legislation, I think it in the end owners are responsible for our pets and their behaviour
- I am studying permaculture and would love to have some hens in my garden.
- Going after Pitbulls is absolutely ridiculous. You should be going after any dog owner that neglects or poorly treats their animal.
- No
- Owners need to be responsible for their pets. Punishing a specific look of dog with specific legislation is ludicrous.
- People who leave dogs in cars in the summer months should be fined, DEMERITS off their Driver's License, and increased dog license fees.
- Higher fines and jail time for animal abusers.
- Owner education and training should be the focus here. Breed specific legislation has already proven ineffective in other provinces.
- "Number to dogs per person at off leash
- Many dog walkers have more than 4 cannot keep track, do not pick up after each daog"
- None
- Here we go, another way the city use to create a source of income for [personal information removed] to spend on art work!
- Animals act based on a natural inclination. If they act negatively, this is has to do with the owner, and how the owner raised the animal.
- Pit bulls are quite a calm, loving breed. I understand the concern of the strength of their jaw but I don't think they should be singled out



- A progressive City should know better than to discriminate against dog breeds. Irresponsible and uneducated owners are the issue
- Bylaws should cover animals of all breeds. Bylaws should not discriminate for or against certain breeds.
- Id/legal proof for emotional support animals and service animals. People are claiming them without proof. An ID tag optimally.
- I believe that individuals that commit animal abuse should have to face harsher consequences. There is no excuse for that behavior.
- No
- Offer to decrease city license cost by 25% per year. if the owner shows proof of obedience training.
- crack down on the roaming cats. They should have to abide by the same rules as other pets. There should be more song birds and less dead cat
- Animal abuse - high fine or jail time
- I don't have an idea, give us chickens!!
- I have frustration with my On LEASH park. No one obeys. Large dogs come galloping at my dog who is on leash. They don't care. Fine them.
- Love
- Don't ban pitbulls. Owners require training when owning powerful dog breeds. That is all.
- For all aggressive type dogs not just pit bulls require training which needs to be passed before owning or licensing the dog.
- I don't think it's necessary for owners to have to pay for a cat license for indoor cats.
- More signage for off leash parks and not so close to bike paths and playgrounds that I take my children on.
- More signs reminding ppl to not bring their dogs on playgrounds and larger fees for doing so.
- Ban pitbull breeding
- More fines for dogs off leash outside of off leash area. In particular near the parking lot of 8th avenue NE to access the bike path.
- People who say it is "discrimination" against pit bulls are embarrassing and need to stop comparing dog breeds to actual humans.
- Name a single incident where a chihuahua has seriously maimed or killed a human or another animal.
- "Pit bulls caused 25 percent of the bite injuries." - Dog bite injuries in children: a preliminary survey. (1999)
- Pitfalls aren't the problem. Owners are the problem. Training is required for almost all dogs.
- No chickens or any type of livestock allowed in the City. Dogs must be on-leash at all times, unless posted signs indicate otherwise.
- More signage stating dogs are not allowed on playgrounds. It is unsanitary to have them pooping/peeing where kids play.



- More signage stating dogs are not allowed on playgrounds. It is unsanitary to have them pooping/peeing where kids play.
- More signs stating no dogs around Glenmore Athletic Park. They can hurt athletes and they get in everybody's way.
- It needs to be easier to deal with owners with dogs that bark needlessly, particularly when they leave them outside to bark.
- Stop trying to make money by creating and enforcing rules on what people can own and do.
- I don't think that the breed of dog should be penalized. Just the owners. All dogs can bite. I think 6 dogs and 6 cats are too many animals.
- Fines for off-leash dogs in ON-leash parks need to be way higher! People think their own dog is "good" and so the rules don't apply to them
- Dogs run off-leash in school parks and playground areas should be an automatic double fine.
- Thanks
- More dog off-leash areas are required
- Both victim and owner must take a reactive dog training course. I think in order to get a dog - dog training is mandatory.
- I like the idea of stronger and swifter consequences should a dog bite. I don't believe in punishing all dog owners which this survey suggests
- All dog owners requiring basic obedience training...not just discriminating against pit bulls
- On-line training with breed-group / species specific mental / physical exercise needs that must be completed to purchase initial license.
- Rescues should have a 6 month free license on dogs or till they're adopted/transfer ownership
- Tracking dogs and forcing new owners to license
- Breed bans not required / don't work per recent Calgary research: <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/9/6/324/htm>
- Better enforcement for off-leash dogs in on-leash areas. The sense of entitlement of some dog owners when it comes to this is mind-blowing.
- Stop discriminating against pitbulls
- City to offer basic obedience training to all pet owners with special "lifetime license" purchase (fee to cover costs).
- We need to have an off-leash dog park in the south near Spruce Meadows. There is nothing close by and many neighbourhoods in the area are growing
- "Ban sale of dogs and cats in stores and back yard breeding --
- ADOPT don't SHOP
- Spay and Neuter"
- Anyone looking to get a dog should be doing a training course prior to being approved as a suitable home.
- Pet license fees should be waived for people who have 3+ years of no complaints against their animals



- All dog owners at time of adoption time of taking over from somebody else time of buying the entire household should be mandatory that they
- More off leash areas where owners can actually walk and get exercise too. Convert some of the bike paths to be used only by dogs and owners
- Pets found lost/roaming in city and brought to the vet to secure if no license microchip the owner MUST license their pet to retrieve dog.
- Legislation should not be breed specific but should address all problem dogs the same
- More off leash parks are needed south of Anderson. They should be within walking distance of most neighborhoods, and ridge of fish creek par
- It is important to have a fine for people that provoke a dog bite or a dog chase. People must be responsible for their animals and kids.
- Higher fines and jail time for animal abusers.
- None
- I'm not sure that there is anything that can be done within the cities jurisdiction but I would support any increased penalties or other det
- "Continued due to character limit.
- Deterents for anyone caught harming an animal"
- Stop the sale of animals in pet stores other than rescues
- NA
- No good comes out of breed specific legislation. Makes us look ignorant.
- "!!NO to BSL in YYC!!
- Manage dog bylaw issues on an individual basis and promote responsible pet ownership with education/community support"
- Responsible Owner Legislation not breed specific legislation!
- Something needs to be done about cart owners who purposely let their cats outdoors to roam the neighborhood
- people should be able to fence in their yard, make a dome as long as it's safe without needing a permit from the city.
- Montreal had 480M people petition to remove short lived BSL, as Coderre ignored people, science and fact -- HE WAS REPLACED and so will YOU
- Bee keeping.
- There is a serious lack of meaningful education relating to dog training and owner identification of "red flags” early in a dogs life.
- Responsible owner legislation, not breed discrimination
- -
- I don't not agree with breed specific legislation. Any dog can be a problem with an irresponsible owner and bylaws should be geared to that.
- Large dogs need space to run which is why our dog parks are so perfect for them! The fact that your survey suggested banning them is sad.



- Focus on educating dog and non-dog owners alike how to approach and interact with ALL dogs safely. Don't discriminate against bigger dogs.
 - Money that is fined for dog bite, etc should go to victim
 - This is labeled "Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw". Walk outside any condo or apartment building in Calgary. Feces and urine burnt grass.
 - No
 - This is labeled "Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw". Calgary parks have become an eye sore. Dog feces and urine burnt grass. Kids can't play
 - "Responsible P.O.B." The urine hour. Right after work every "responsible" dog owner lets their dog urinate on their neighbors yards.
 - "Responsible P.O.B." The dump hour. As soon as it gets dark, every "responsible" dog owner lets their dog defecate on their neighbors yard
 - "Responsible P.O.B." The dump hour. As soon as it gets dark, every "responsible" dog owner lets their dog defecate on their neighbors yard [remove]
 - The city should supply a sign that home owners can place on their property to let pet owners know not to use the property as a pet washroom.
 - Any leash over 6 feet (2 meters) should be made illegal. These reel out leashes are dangerous to the public and are a work around for rules.
 - An easier way to identify a dog owner and dog needs to be brought forward. Fines are useless deterrents if the owner can not be identified.
 - On average 108 dogs pass my house each day. Each dogs owner lets them urinate on the property. Responsible? Use your own yard.
 - Could the city on occasion sponsor or host some free dog-training events, something proactively preventing problems?
 - Dogs should not be allowed to swim in waters in Griffiths Woods Park. Increases stream sediment for fish as well upstream Glenmore reservoir
 - Another distraction from the real problems facing Calgarians : high property tax and bad road conditions. time to flush the toilet!
 - Spade cats should be allowed to roam to keep mice and vole populations down.
 - Stop faulting the dog and labeling certain dogs as nuisances- it is the owner not the Dog breed . A chihuahua can be more vicious than a pit
 - There needs to be patrols by bylaw officers through on-leash city parks to address off-leash dogs. I never see any officers
 - "Education is key!!
-
- NO TO BSL."
 - Pitbulls should not limited or banned



- Barking complaint process needs to be easier, particularly at night. Educate owners that all front yard are not dog toilets.
- DNA submission for dog feces not picked up. Apply fines to linked dog for feces not picked up
- "I think having clarity on how much barking is allowed.
- There are alot of owners that walk their dogs off leash in the back alley's"
- Barking dogs are a nuisance when working from home. Homeowners or residents should get \$100 for every dog dropping in their bins or lawn.
- I would just like to say that it is completely unfair to pass a law that pitbulls have to be muzzled and limit it to one per household.
- Higher fines for off leash dogs in on leash areas. I am afraid of dogs and the illegal off leash dogs mean I cannot enjoy my neighbourhood.
- Big fines for letting your cat enter other people's private property without permission. They pee on my house and don't even control mice.
- "No to BSL!!
- Yes to EDUCATION"
- Double fines for dog bylaw infractions in school yards or near playground- just like speeding fines double in construction zones.
- "The city has to get their heads out of their [remove].
- Proposed urban poultry/pigeons/livestock is ridiculous. Where's the common sense ?"
- Concerned about lack of control of some dogs in off leash areas
- Increase dog license fee overall, w/ Reduced fees for owners who do ongoing training (like car insurance, better driver = lower premium)
- If a dog takes a pee on my house, let me go to the owners house and pee on his front door without penalty or punishment.
- Give out fines for people that don't pick up feces of their dog. Too many times people leave dog feces on the sidewalk. Totally not fair.
- limit number of off leash dogs walked. There is no way a person "walking" 8-12 dogs off leash will be able to see and pickup all poops.
- We and our pit bull was once attacked at nose hill park by some unleashed mutt in an on leash area. Higher fines for roaming at large!
- Don't punish the dog breed punish bad owners. Create a mandatory training program and a license in order to own certain breeds of dog.
- Education should include positive education on pitbulls to remedy bias against and express lack of nuisance evidence found above.
- Increased enforcement in on-leash parks, school playgrounds, alleys, etc.
- Off leash dogs in on leash areas of Nose Hill is ruining the ecosystem. Please patrol the area more to keep this park healthy.
- Back-lane/alley off lease areas (i.e. Lakeview) should be abolished as they are unsuitable. They are dangerous for animals and people alike.



- I think all laws regarding pitbulls should be for every dog or not at all.
- Identification of pets/owners. Dog tags useless if owners leave after incident. At registration a photo of the pet and owner should be filed
- Discriminatory policies against pitbulls and rottweilers needs to be changed. The breed of the dog shouldn't influence laws, just training.
- I do not support any form of BSL. All dogs/owners should be required to attend puppy and basic obedience classes with their dogs.
- Still see many cats roaming free. For those that like their cats to be outside, would like to see catios be required in the owners yard.
- Not aware
- Breed-specific bans are nonsense. "Dogs that look like..." Really? We're going to write laws around a dog's appearance? [remove]!
- Focus on responsible pet ownership, versus penalties for lack thereof.
- Banning certain dogs based on breeds is absolutely ridiculous. If anything you should be fining the owners for being irresponsible owners.
- Breed specific legislation is absolutely necessary as these dogs can kill people and other animals. Please do the right thing.
- Breed specific legislation is not the way. Mandatory accessible and affordable dog obedience training for all dog owners is a better way.
- Bringing farm animals to the City and urban areas is absurd. It's a total lack of common sense and responsibility as a good neighbor.
- Free basic dog training classes for low income Calgarians with dogs. Also, kudos to whomever came up with the name Barking Lot.
- No license required for Full time indoor pets.
- na
- Targeting specific breeds is entirely short-sighted, unjust and appeals to those with a lack of understanding or fear of the unknown.
- We have not had a big problem with multiple pet households since it was first allowed, why restrict numbers now. No valid reasons I can find
- It is the owners fault for not training the dog properly. Because of people's ignorance these dogs will suffer. Think about that.
- Six dogs and six cats per household is too high for the bylaw. Would like to see it lowered to ensure less animals are seized.
- :)
- Lower license fees for low income is counter intuitive. If you can't pay the annual fee you can not pay to provide proper support for pets.
- I just wanted to add that if you can't afford a licence fee, how can you afford to provide sufficient animal care, hence I said no on one Q
- Approach to animals within city limits should be more in tune with "permaculture" concepts: exterminate mice with cats etc.



- A focus on dog training would be a solution to the idea of dangerous dogs. A well trained bull breed is safer than an untrained retriever
- People do what they want to do - they know bylaw isn't enforcing responsible pet ownership as it stands today. Invest in education + bylaw.
- all good
- Mandatory use of anti-bark collars - neighbours re left at mercy of barking dogs while their owners are away.
- More than 1 pet should not be allowed!
- People don't need more than 4 pets. 12 animals is too many!
- No
- Fines that escalate sharply for repeat offenses. Lower licensing fees for spayed or neutered pets. Some rules around "therapy" animals.
- Have incentives for all al to all dog and cat owners not just low income . We all have to budget as responsible pet owners.
- Licensing should be only available online. If it's offered through other avenues, I would only support it if it didn't cost the city more \$\$
- BAN BAD OWNERS
- What breeds are considered to be similar in look to pitbulls type dogs? that needs to be more clear
- I really like the idea of adjusted rates for dog registration for low income people.
- Harder enforcement of cats not on-leash in their own property. Catch them and penalize the owners. Cat catching stations in the city limits.
- No
- Increasing fines for reoccurring issues of pets.
- I'd move before I'd stoop to the inhumanity of a muzzle on my dog.
- Anyone entering an off leash dog park should understand they might get bumped by big playing dogs. Put up educational signs.
- Don't focus on the breed, focus on the owner. Any dog can become a nuisance with weak, directionless ownership.
- Breed specific legislation does not work and should not be a part of the system in Calgary. I am appalled that this is being entertained.
- Nobody has pigeons yet there are bylaws allowing to keep them. Let us keep our "pitbull" and chickens.
- Toronto and Montreal did BSL and it hasn't worked for dog bites - why would we even consider it here and punish family dogs in good homes?
- Domesticated dogs are not born vicious. Owners need to understand the breed to not encourage undesirable behaviour (intentionally or not).
- No
- No
- NO TO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION!



- NO TO BREED SPECIFIC LEGISLATION!!!
- No breed specific legislation. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners.
- .
- breed specific legislation does not fix animal aggression, deal with the bad owners and you deal with the "bad" animals.
- I do not
- Breed specific legislation can give other aggressive dogs a legal loophole. Say "all dogs with a personal history of aggression" to be safe.
- Disappointed in Calgary. US with all their problems don't have this type of law discriminating against people's best friend.
- It's Bad pet owners not type of dog. Many dogs bite. License fees are also so high especially puppies that can't be altered yet.
- AU proves that BSL is an utter failure -https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_KFX86ZhoMc
- Rescues need exemptions to animal limits if imposed for many of the animals are transient waiting on a new home they are not personal animal
- Full ban on dogs is required. Bad dog owners have ruined it for everybody. Maybe allow dogs only on private property.
- Why do dog owners think it is ok to let their pet urinate where ever they want? Your choice of owning a pet should not affect the public.
- A crime stopper type line with cash rewards for proof (video) of dog owners not picking up, long leashes, no leashes, aggressive ,etc.
- No
- critical to address the problem of loose dogs on front yards (unfenced). No breed specific legislation. Large dogs with low fences an Issue.
- Before we limit the # of dogs in a home, enforce the laws we have; including increasing fines for ppl who don't pick up after their dog!!!
- N/a
- Increase fines for people that abuse or abandon animals. Dont allow to gave animals again
- "Roaming pet cops visiting all parks occasionally to
- Patrol and fine (with much increased rates) when required, to deter bad pet owners."
- There should not be yearly pet fees. Once per pet lifetime license should be considered. The city can keep track of pets w/o costing owners.
- I don't know
- More education on how to keep cats inside. Many people make excuses as to why they "need” to break the bylaw and let cats roam.
- Fines for people who dump rabbits. I see so many domestic rabbits outside with no owners.
- Collars should be mandatory for cats and dogs. Makes it easier to find their owners if they get lost! We need less lost pets, more found!
- I'm appalled the city has such preconceived notions about bully breeds. [remove] BSL!



- Would like to see more done for the dumped rabbits in the city. Also, education/training of people on proper care and needs of animals.
- Increase fines for roaming cats found off property!! I've seen too many cats hit by cars.
- No ideas.
- More awareness/media/marketing to cat owners that cats can't be "outdoor cats;" ie; they are not allowed to roam free unattended.
- Please have more signs about none off leash areas, dog owners don't know the by laws about having there dogs running free on path ways.
- Fines for owners allowing dogs to walk on our yards. Dogs ruin grass and pee all over it. Lower our property taxes then.
- Law for Owners to train dogs to go in their own yard BEFORE their walk so others don't deal with their feces or damaged lawns. Tx
- All owners should have to sign that they have read and understand the bylaws when getting annual licence. Owners NEED to know rules!
- "Requirements:
- sufficient exercise (which most are not! This is a huge factor avoid problem behaviour)
- thorough behavioural training"
- "Rescue dogs require obedience certification.
- A city license is required to breed and sell animals in the City. Stop the city puppy mills"
- This is not a breed problem this is a people problem
- The citys licensing fees for pets for seniors. The city has many senior discounts for their programs. Should have discount for pet license
- Far SW Calgary needs off leash parks
- #SupportBSL "I didn't believe my pit would ever hurt me. He slept with me." -[personal information removed]
- #SupportBSL "I looked at my child, and the arms were like shredded meat." -[personal information removed]
- #SupportBSL "The pit bulls were not biting me - they were eating me." [personal information removed]
- There should be fines for humans who approach or pet animals that growl and warn you not to touch them. Most bites are the human fault
- #SupportBSL "The pit bull had his mouth around the boy's neck shaking him." -[personal information removed]
- Being discriminatory against certain breeds in unfair and cruel. It is the owners fault, not the dogs.
- Dog DNA database implemented. Match the p**p to the dog. Huge fines could pay for the system.
- Help clean up the city and save a lot of tax dollars. Get rid of dogs.
- The problem is bad pet owners, not the pet or its breed. If you aren't going to properly care for your pet, don't get one.



- Check how many down votes posts about "dog owners being more responsible on where they let them urinate"? See the problem? Entitled?
- A law stating a pet owner must provide either valid name and address or pet tag number when requested by a citizen. No reason required.
- Easier way to identify by-law offenders in public. Visible license?
- I do not support breed specific bylaws. Nation wide data base of animal abusers needed, tougher punishments for those who do not follow bylaw
- It is not right to ban an animal, people will be forced out of their homes, make it harder to find places to rent and create more challenges
- My yard is NOT your dogs toilet, keep off my lawn. "Animal control " is useless. They come out hours after I reported Tuxedo community park.
- PUT ALL "NO DOGS ALLOWED SIGNS BACK UP IN ALL THE PARKS" Dog owners have become inconsiderate and are ignorant about dogs off lease in ALL P
- Na
- Signs are necessary and when ignorant dog owners deface them, use decals to replace the sign but not the pedestal.
- Fire all "Animal Control" and hire new people that will fine dog owners(No second chances, they are ignored as in Tuxedo Park, reported many
- The lady on the internet showed dogs not under owners control in park . She should have said this is illegal. She is biased and must be fired.
- I live in Lakeview (SW Calgary) there's a large population of stray out door cats. Our sandbox is now a litter box. Both dogs and cats need
- None
- Workshop was to be at Lincoln Park but no one showed up. I was there half hour before and after. Identify yourself somehow.
- Stop making larger dog breeds out to be problematic. Bad owner breed bad dogs. Dogs attack if threatened, not for fun.
- I am not in favour of banning any specific breed, the owners are the problem not the dog.
- Ban pit bulls
- N/A
- "Bylaw needs to be present on a regular basis to dog parks etc
- All the time I see dogs in On leash areas that are running loose"
- When renewing or getting a new a pet licence implementation of bylaws review so owners are reminded of them as well as any changes.
- Breed specific legislation is unethical and it makes me extremely disappointed that the city is even debating it
- Ppl freaking out about dog pee. Not cats, deer, bobcats, rabbits, squirrels, skunks etc, and sometimes human urine? It's lawn u don't use.



- More well cared for fences off leash parks (confluence is in bad shape) and there's no other fenced in ones in the NW.
- Many of the questions were confusing. What is the classification of a nuisance dog - barking, viscous, peeing on a post? Survey was flawed.
- What kind of wildlife are you worried about people feeding in their backyard? Harassing wildlife should never be allowed - dumb question.
- I like feeding the wild birds in my yard. Why isn't this an already listed exception? Birdwatching is easily accessible for everybody!
- No mention was made for fines to those charged with animal cruelty. Fines and penalties in this category must be tripled at least.
- All off leash areas should be completely fenced in. Dogs have run in front of my car while driving near offleash parks. Very scary!!!!
- More off leash areas.
- Banning animals by breed goes against what is fair, animals deserve a clean slate without stigma or bias.
- I know of dog owners who's dogs have killed their own other dogs (pit bulls). The veterinarian should be required to report this behavior.
- I think you should completely abolish the idea that a pitbull (of any sort) should be restricted due to breed. It's the owner not the breed.
- So many comment say "it's the owner and not the breed". I'd like one bad pet owner to say, "Yup, I'm the bad apple". No responsibility.
- Many dog owners do not respect on leash areas. Many are aggressive. 311 is always busy. Bylaw officers don't respond. System needs improving
- If it is the owner and not the breed as many think, then we should call the police and not 311 for bylaw officers. Is that an option?
- #SupportBSL "Her child's face was so mauled they had to do closed casket." -[personal information removed]
- #SupportBSL "The emergency care flight alone cost \$18,000." -[personal information removed]
- Do not single out pit bull breeds, it's irresponsible and eluding the fact that any breed of dog could be subject to aggression
- Ban pit bulls
- All dog owners should gave training. Also, The Champions (book or movie) shines a light on how misunderstood pit bulls are. Please watch.
- More enforcement of barking dogs disturbing neighbours. Not just sending one letter of complaint. Follow up on complainant's behalf.
- Owners who repeatedly let their pets roam at large should have to relinquish ownership after 3rd offence. Some have more money than brains.
- Off leash dogs or dogs in areas where they are prohibited should be enforced more stringently. The fines offset costs of more officers



- ownership bans for repeat offenders. pets are never a problem until they have misbehaving management
- Bylaws must not be made specific to dog breeds but to educate dog owners to prevent injuries
- Obedience classes -great! What about the owners of dogs who have been fined? Should be required to get training on how to raise safe pets.
- Increases in fines for repeat dog noise offenders.
- Proof of veterinary visits/shots. Have vets submit records to the city. License number would be the identifier.
- Breed is not the problem. Owners who do not take effort in training their animals is the problem. Please don't punish the breed.
- Red tags for dogs that have been fined for biting or aggressive behaviour. Off leash use requires coloured tags (extra fee) pays for maintenance
- #SupportBSL "She was just so chewed up there was nothing the doctors could do." [personal information removed]
- #SupportBSL [personal information removed]
- Allow 6 chickens per household to improve soil quality, control pests, provide local, sustainable, nutrient dense food to families.
- I agree that owners are the problem but they take no responsibility and would NEVER see themselves as the problem. A police matter then?
- More bylaw officers on bike patrols all summer long. I've never seen a bylaw officer in any of the on-leash areas where offences occur.
- Ban all dogs except pit bulls
- I think that within city limits the number of dogs and cats should be limited to a maximum of 2 dogs and up to 4 cats. or 4 pets total.
- A
- What's the plan to control or charge cat owners when their pets are roaming and using your house as a litter box?
- N/A
- There needs to be a bylaw limiting the amount of dogs a dog walker can walk at the same time in Calgary!! Like other cities!!! 4 max!!!
- "Enforcing rules on dogs based on BREED is equivalent to enforcing rules on people based on COLOUR. now read that again. "
- There needs to be licences and regulations involved with breeding animals. Otherwise, spay and neuter should be a MUST
- More information to show people what responsibilities come with pet ownership
- Having backyard hens has historically been a way for a family to provide food security, a neighbour should not determine if we can have one.
- Approval from neighbours should not be required for owning hens, just as it is not required for owning cats, dogs, or most other pets.



- Legalising urban hens is a no brainer!
- Cat bylaws in regards to free roaming should be like In Walburg. Leashes/various/indoors only, no free roaming.
- People should not be allowed to put their parrot cages outside without supervising their parrots. They get loud and can escape.
- Encourage use of cat leashes and building "catios" for people who insist on having cats outside through education programs and the like.
- "NO TO BSL
- YES TO EDUCATION!!
- THIS IS A PEOPLE PROBLEM NOT A BREED PROBLEM"
- All dogs should undergo obedience training of some sort prior to getting licensed.
- Breed specific legislation does not work. Small dogs bite as often if not more than large breeds
- I would like to see enforcement of current city bylaws regarding off leash dogs and feces pickup. See many violations but no bylaw officers
- Make pet owners responsible of their pets behaviour, not by banning a certain breed but by enforcing a system where the owner is accountable
- Reduce fines for Cats at Large. They provide a service to the neighborhood by keeping down the population of mice and voles in the area.
- In off-leash parking lots it should be mandatory to have you dog(s) on a leash until you enter the designated off-leash area.
- City should stop perpetuating myth of pit bulls and BSL. ALL dogs AND PEOPLE, if not trained, can be dangerous.
- More bylaw offices on the trails to fine bike riders that do not ring their bell or who are travelling too fast. My on leash dog is at risk.
- I support backyard hens without neighbour approval, Hens are less intrusive than dogs and far less understood.
- Cats shouldn't be allowed outside. They chase away and kill the native songbirds. :(
- I saw a coyote eating a cat the other day. Cats should not be allowed outside unsupervised because they attract predators to neighbourhoods.
- Cats are a menace to my neighbourhood. They leave dead mice everywhere, pee on houses, dig up/poo in gardens, and scream at night.
- The city should consider an outright ban on pit bulls (including all pit bull like dogs)
- If households want to raise dogs, cats, hens, etc, there should be an incentive program to learn how to properly care for them.
- I don't want any breed specific legislation. The same rules should apply to ALL dogs!
- I would like pitbulls to be banned, at the very least from off leash areas. Banned would be preferable.
- Please remind people there is a bylaw requiring cats to remain indoors. More and more people seem to be breaking this bylaw.



- The city must realize dog feces and urine is a bio-hazard. If you don't agree, then it sounds like your yard would be a perfect dumping ground.
- A pet owner's choice to own a pet should not affect anyone else in any way. If not able to comply with this. No pet.
- Establishing more fully fenced and secured off-leash parks should be a priority. A lot like Sue-Higgins off-leash park.
- Please have more enforcement in parks. I have often been approached by hostile off-leash dogs in parks where they should be leashed.
- Calgary is lacking access to fully fenced and secure off-leash parks. Most designated off-leash areas are unusable due to proximity to roads.
- Annual licensing fees should be reduced. Yearly fee goes up only when an animal is found lost or receives a complaint.
- Thanks
- Animal cruelty fines should be exponentially increased. Unknown to most, the underground dog fighting ring in Calgary is huge.
- We should never single out a Dog Breed, all dogs should be concerned the same; big or small, black or white.
- We need higher fines for pet bites/attacks and owners should have to stay at the scene otherwise be fined.
- There are circumstances where there should be no fine for dog bites, trespassing onto dog's property for example.
- no
- People should be prohibited from jogging or riding bikes through off-leash areas and dog parks.
- Enforcement for dogs off-leash where they should be leashed. It's not safe for leashed dogs or people when approached by an unfriendly dog.
- Easier ways to report roaming cats.
- Higher fines and response to roaming cats.
- More strict rules for roaming cats.
- Steeper consequences for unattended and roaming cats.
- Dog owners need to be fined for their loud barking dogs! It starts at 5:30 am on Evergreen Heights and Evergreen Point and goes all day!
- Letting your cats roam is a bylaw offence, why is it not being enforced. It is absolutely ridiculous how many roaming cats are in this city.
- Roaming cats are a pest and nuisance to other animals and people in the area.
- Stop roaming cats.
- Strict consequences for roaming cats. People think it's okay to let their animals use other's property as a toilet.
- Dogs on-leash, why are cats not?
- Dumb cat owners being entitled thinking their cats own the whole neighbourhood.



- Actual change and enforcement of roaming cat bylaw.
- Reinforce roaming cat bylaw
- Easier way to report roaming cats
- More accessible way to report roaming cats
- Easier way to report cats unattended
- "Less killing of an animal more training Specialty for the owner
- If you can feed house care for the it you shouldn't have it."
- Get back to basics of apply current animal by-laws. Calgary has been a world leader at reducing bite incidents from all breeds without BSL.
- What are you doing about the threatening, aggressive behavior directed at owners of bulldogs, pitties at off leash parks? Many driven away.
- Areas near off leash parks monitored more for dogs off leash. People walk dogs off leash on the way to the off leash areas.
- No violent animals. Let people feed themselves.
- Education and training help people understand their pets and their pets understand them. Punishment doesn't resolve the issue, it taxes it.
- Why is there no mention of individuals trying to get a reaction out of a dog like throwing a cold bucket of water on the neighbours dog?
- Why waste money enforcing bylaws that no one in real life has a problem with?
- I was severely attacked from behind by a unleashed dog as child walking on side walk. Didn't know it was there. Dogs can bite for no reason!
- Fake people can make multiple comments with no validity on these forms. No to special interest groups.
- People commenting here have no experience in real life and are faking stories.
- Nothing should be breed specific. Any dog (breed) has the capability to be aggressive and have poor behaviour.
- Having real engagements that aren't gerrymandered fake news.
- ONLY BAD DOG OWNERS. NO SUCH THING AS BAD DOGS. when are the bad dog owners going to be held accountable instead of the dogs?
- Let's put this BSL stuff to rest and target only dogs that have an actual aggression history.
- There have been no questions or input provisions for bylaw to enforce any revisions. What will be the City's response for enforcement?
- Nothing to add
- If singling out a specific breed seems right to you should we also single out a race of people. What's good for our dogs is good for us too.
- The city should quit wasting money on things like this and maybe get on with saving some money in these tough Financial Times.
- Drop all the discussion around "pit bull" dogs, all large dogs are capable of causing harm, "pit bulls" are not special in this capacity



- Please don't move forward with BSL... please. I lived in ON and it doesn't work. Pit bulls are AMAZING animals, it's all about the owners!
- I DO NOT SUPPORT BSL. More focus needs to be on the owners not the breed
- This is getting old leave pit bulls alone. When are you going to point out the real reasons behind the problem? THE OWNERS
- Pitbulls were responsible for more serious attacks last year in Calgary than all other breeds combined. It is a breed issue.
- No to BSL.
- Increased fees/enforcement/education surrounding dogs off leash outside of off leash parks. It happens too often and puts everyone at risk.
- Why not focus on preventing dog bites and responsible pet ownership, breed is not a factor in predicting dog bites. NO BSL.
- BSL does not work and isn't fair to responsible dog owners. Target dogs who have caused a problem and their owners, regardless of breed.
- Ban or re-route cyclists to get them off the off-leash areas. Force them to SLOW DOWN at the very least!
- There are so many problems with this, I don't even know where to start. Breed specific legislation is ridiculous.
- Increase fines for those involved in dog fighting and people who steal animals to be used as bait in dog fighting.
- Increase fines and bans for people who engage in animal cruelty.
- Sanctions for animal cruelty and abuse need to be MUCH more severe.
- Ban people from pet ownership if they tie/chain their dogs for more than a couple hours. This is cruel. We need to update bylaws!
- What about fines for irresponsible dog owners? So many dog owners that throw their dogs into the back yard and never walk them!
- I strongly support backyard chickens! They are significantly quieter and less dangerous than dogs plus can be an important source of food
- Not an idea but a comment ...do we really need more pigeons in this city?
- More proactive education to help prevent serious dog injuries and also more education to prevent animal neglect and abuse cases
- N/a
- No breed specific wording... that is not at all helpful for what you are trying to accomplish. Leave breed out of it.
- Barking - Person who owns barking dog gets one warning. When this person gets a second warning, he/she must take dog to a class.
- No breed specific bi-laws. Dogs are not aggressive by breed. Instead enforce mandatory training for all dogs.
- Backyard chickens are integral to a sustainable lifestyle and provide a secure food supply in the face of increasing food insecurity.



- Should be regulations at official off leash dog parks regarding bicycles and small motorized vehicles.
T
- Implement a method of enforcing pet owner removal of feces and applying fines.
- Should be an easy way to report aggressive animals in public places ie - how to report an off leash dog attacking other dogs on a bike path
- provide barking noise levels for different breeds for condos and single family households
- I would like to see a marked increase in bylaw officers issuing fines on site at on-leash parks where many owners disobey the law.
- Signage about on-leash/off-leash areas in parks needs to be larger and more explicit so people cannot continue to pretend they do not know.
- Urban hens will have a massive net benefit for food security, public literacy about our food system and community connectedness in Calgary!
- Citizens should not have to be faced with telling aggressive dog owners that their dogs need to be on a leash when in a public ON-LEASH park
- More enforcement of dog-owners who let their dogs off-leash in on-leash parks and disturb folks who just want to enjoy a park in peace.
- Roaming cats are a HUGE issue. Owners should not be given licenses unless they commit to following the rules and given instant fines if not.
- Why do cat owners feel entitled to let their cats roam free and devour bird populations? Stricter enforcement and stronger penalties needed.
- We need a quicker method of responding to public complaints of dogs off-leash in on-leash parks. Otherwise the law is useless.
- Perhaps an initiative to put many cat traps around the city in order to address the major cat roaming issue? Mass implementation.
- Urban hens are a wonderful initiative that have a very low chance of causing disruption to neighbours- permission should not be required.
- Anyone wanting to own a dog needs to have mandatory training. Dog breeders should have a license to limit the amount of strays in Alberta.
- This idea through the survey that pit bulls are more dangerous and have a stronger bite force is ridiculous and stupid.
- About the pigeons should not be allowed in residential areas to fly because of the pigeons feces are dangerous as you can't control the fly
- No idea
- Focus on education . . . require new dog/puppy owners to complete a canine good neighbor class . . .
- I would love to keep backyard hens, for fun and fresh eggs! As long as they are housed and cared for properly, there should be no issues ^_^
- Widespread education on dog behaviour. Breeds do not indicate aggression of dogs. Low cost/free access to training for dog owners.
- Na



- People against BSL are chirpy. Maybe not so vocal if they were attacked by a pit bull.
- Urban hens are a slippery slope into the urban livestock issue. What is next? Urban pigs, goats, sheep, cows, pony's...
- Strict enforcement and punishment for animal abuse and neglect (wild and domestic animals). 1 strike = not allowed to own/possess animals.
- BSL has proven to be ineffective. Breed does not determine aggression. More responsible pet ownership breed neutral bylaws. No BSL.
- I think all pitbull/"aggressive" breed classification needs to stop. All animals have the ability to be aggressive. Falls back on ownership
- Na
- I served on a drafting committee in California in 1989 and we drafted a generic statute that addressed dog behavior and it worked.
- Stop allowing dog "rescue" missions bringing violent dogs across the border from the US. This is just another form of hoarding.
- "Limit number of cats and dogs per household to 2 or 3.
- Roaming cats should be euthanized if owner continues to allow roaming after dining."
- Heavier fines for animal abuse or neglect. And more programs for low income pet owners to receive discounted food, training or vet bills
- No BSL, more education and awareness for all, both dog owners and non-dog owners
- Lower the prices for training animals, it should accessible to everyone. Put a stop to euthanizing animals, start thinking how you can help
- Lower fees for cats, people dont reclaim cats like dogs. Enforce laws that sell cats on media outlets ie Kijiji. Allow microchips as licence
- I don't think you should need a license for an indoor-only pet.
- You MUST have a bylaw that forces people to register in order to breed animals. It is unethical that anyone can breed animals to sell on kijiji
- I think a few backyard chickens are a great idea and I definitely have more space than industry standards of 6"x9" (battery cages).
- Owners allowing cats to roam are a frustrating nuisance. Higher fees and mandatory education during licensing should be instituted.
- Make ALL pet breeders licensed by City Of Calgary AND APPROVED BY A QUALIFIED VETERINARIAN. NO BACKYARD BREEDERS.
- Heavier fines for animal abuse/neglect
- Calgary is often cited as an example of a city with successful breed-neutral dog laws. We should not change that.
- Increase education for ignorant pet owners. Fines alone don't address the problem and could result in the pet being punished.
- Nothing to add



- Don't punish a breed and their responsible owners for a handful of negligent owners that have created an aggressive dog.
- Our bylaws need to stay breed neutral and focus on incentives to register, spay/neuter and educate children on how to interact with dogs
- Make anyone breeding dogs subject to strict regulation - no backyard breeders or puppy mills
- Thanks
- GIVE US OUR CHICKENS
- Banning pit bulls or any other dog based on breed or appearance is very shortsighted and ineffectual.
- No restrictions against pitfalls. Offer dog training discounts or public dog training sessions.
- off leash should be divided, one side for small dogs and one side for large
- Roaming cat destruction
- Backyard hens provide food security and support anti-fragile systems. They can foster good community relationships.
- My rescued pit bull is now 12, he has never harmed anyone. The city passing any BSL would be revolting, shame on you for labeling.
- A good friend of mine was just attacked and badly injured by a blue heeler. He hasn't suddenly decided to campaign against the breed. No bsl
- Backyard bird feeding is a strongly supported/beneficial practice and should not be lumped into a bylaw that considers "teasing wildlife"
- The cat bylaw for roaming is basically unenforceable unless you know who owns the cat. Even then, it is very difficult to get action.
- None
- Parks and Rec Dept removed "No Dogs" signage on most park and playground areas for what reason?? They're now treated like off leash, FIX THIS!
- Violating invasion and such defacement of property that the law allow pet owners to trespass on private properties to use our lawns as toilets
- Impact of pet ownership on environment and wildlife. Attacks and death of wildlife + sanitation issues + environmental contamination.
- There is no scientific evidence that supports bully breeds have a strong PSI bite than other breeds. Please update.
- Mandatory obedience for all dogs to make them good citizens
- I think owners of any animal should go through some training on how to become fur parents and how to train them this should be mandatory
- A normally friendly dog may react to an aggressive dog, it shouldn't be labeled as a nuisance as a result.
- More signs in on leash areas saying "pets on leash";. Too many people let their dogs run freely in on leash areas.
- Make humane traps more easily accessible so stray/roaming cats can be taken to animal control.



- More bylaw officers patrolling in neighbourhoods adjacent to off leash parks. There are WAY too many off leash dogs in Altadore.
- Fines for roaming cats should be increased to fund TNR programs.
- should not be labeling dogs by behavior. Dogs behavior is dependant on its owner - lowners to be equially responsible for their pers
- All dogs and cats should be equal, no breed discrimination
- Dog owners need more education. Just because it is an off-leash area does not mean they own the location. It is still a SHARED public area.
- The city needs to deal with the large amount of pet waste that is spread through the city each day. It would be nice to enjoy a this city.
- Cats should not be able to roam off-leash outside of their owner's property - same as dogs.
- Breed restrictions are ineffective and do not contribute to responsible pet ownership. The focus needs to be on human behavior.
- More education on dog attacks and how to prevent it. Including (not breed specific) irresponsible breeding, improper living conditions etc.
- More signage in different languages as we've come across a lot of ppl that freak out at our dogs that don't realize they're in off leashpark
- Pet Obedience Classes Subsidy Program for low income earners to help assist their family with education on how to care for a dog properly.
- "More affordable
- options for low income families and newcomers to Canada with pets in terms of obedience class, licensing etc..."
- Dog owners to attend a course on responsible pet ownership would go along way to reduce the animosity between pet-owners and citizens.
- Fines should be scaled for income. Some people are just getting by and a \$200 fine for a pet mistake cuts into groceries, others no big deal
- None
- In addition to the early warning system, dogs that have shown aggression towards other dogs or people should be REQUIRED to be identified
- Let us have chickens!!!
- submitting photos of cats/dogs at large. Pit bulls/pit bull type dogs should not be singled out as a breed. Many aggressive dogs are small
- Create more fenced dog areas in neighbourhoods where there is currently unused grass space (ex. Galbraith Drive in Glamorgan community).
- No more BSL - it doesn't work! Check the stats!! Bring back the nanny dogs
- I'd suggest a mandatory intro dog training course for all licence applicants. Licence issued upon proof of completion.
- No



- BSL doesn't work. "Pit bull bite force" is a myth, "pit bulls" are no more dangerous than any other type of large domesticated wolf.
- City is looking for a new source of income! Bravo [remove]
- I DO NOT SUPPORT any bylaw the city come with, they just care about how to make more \$\$\$\$\$. We will flush them down the toilet next election
- Educating and training people is far better than punishing dogs. Most nuisance and 'aggressive' dog issues can be resolved with education.
- Ban selling small animals at pet stores (hamsters, snakes, geckos, etc). They are often kept in poor conditions and are from mill breeders.
- All dogs should be regulated equally, small dogs have attacked my larger dog on several occasions and should be just as liable for doing so.
- How will it be handled if a smaller dog attacks a larger dog who then defends itself?
- STOP BULLYING PIT BULLS, they don't deserve to be treated this way. I've had several and they've never been aggressive.
- BSL doesn't work. "Pit bull bite force" is a myth, "pit bulls" are no more dangerous than any other type of large domesticated wolf. [DUPLICATE]
- Backyard hens would be a welcome addition to our house and many others' in COVID times and beyond. Small poultry is great in the city!
- There was nothing mentioned in the phase 1 "What We Heard" report about BSL. If it wasn't mentioned in phase 1, it shouldn't be in phase 2.
- I agree fines should be scaled for income. Some people are just getting by and a \$200 fine for a pet mistake cuts into groceries. [DUPLICATE]
- Create more fenced dog areas in local neighbourhoods where there is currently grass space so we don't have to drive a long way to dog parks
- No
- I'm very concerned about the emphasis on Pit Bull type dogs! I find this may be leading to a partial or full ban on this very maligned dog.
- Why is the notion of limiting the number of cats/dogs in a household coming up? I own ONE animal yet would still support citizens with more.
- Nothing comes to mind.
- the city should sell "backyard chickens in a box." A kit that complies with bylaw, provides instructions for raising the animals, etc
- Owning pigeons, chickens or any other livestock within the city limits is completely inappropriate.
- I feel as though fines for biting adults should be the same for if children get bit. it is the parents responsibility as much as the owner
- .
- none
- Breed specific laws are disgusting. Even thinking about this is seriously disappointing for a city I considered to be progressive.



- Fences around all off leash parks. It is safer and makes the border of the park clearer so dogs aren't walked off leash in leashed pet areas
- To put more ownership on the owners that cause bad dog behaviour. Require training for problem dogs
- I think there should be the equivalent of GDL for a dog owner license with restrictions. Mandatory dog training required to get full license
- All dog owners should be required to attend a training course at least once and have this on record.
- Off leash parks should be fenced in for safety of the animals. Animal control laws should not be breed specific.
- I DO NOT agree with discriminating against any breed of dog!
- Disappointed to see a city as progressive as Calgary have BSL language in their bylaw especially when there was no talk of it in stage 1 ??
- Human owners are ultimately responsible for their pets and should be held responsible for their pets actions, not the animal.
- I think we should be allowed chickens
- The city of Calgary should not be involved in the adoption of pets. This is a complete conflict of interest.
- "Remove BSL!!!!
- A nuisance dog is just that!!!"
- Do not go forward with BSL!! Any dog can be/become a nuisance.
- BSL doesn't work. Focus on responsible pet ownership and aggressive dogs, not just a specific breed.
- owners need to be held responsible, if you have a dog that is showing any aggressive traits don't train it at the dog park.
- No, thanks
- I wish my neighborhood pleading hearts would stop feeding the pigeons, squirrels and stray cats. I don't know who is more of a nuisance?
- For dogs (high energy) to not disturb neighbors, more off-leash dog parks within walking distance from each neighborhood would be beneficial
- People should be fined for approaching dogs without permission. Attacks can be instigated by people and dogs always get the blame on reacting
- Pigeon limits should be based on yard size. Acreage vs infill are very different scenarios.
- A bylaw offence summons to be issued at officer discretion. Currently a court appearance by neighbour complainant is required.
- Pitbull lives matter! Don't discriminate based on race.
- nope covered it all
- There should be a dog DNA registry to identify owners not picking up after their animals.
- Bandana system costly to implement, voluntary = inconsistent/unreliable. Animal behaviour is not set in stone leaves owner open to liability



- Keep cats inside. They don't belong outside!
- I think that the registry of all animals should be free!
- Poor training breeds aggressive dogs. Owner education is as important as a dog's education; should be mandatory for owners of nuisance dogs
- Don't discriminate based on breed. Pitbull lives matter
- No BSL. Your excuse about the power and size/bite of a pit bull is feeble. They are no more of a threat than a Doberman, Rottweiler etc.
- Off leash parks should have warning signs to alert families with small children that they will encounter dogs playing and running around.
- I'm for no bylaws-they're removing freedoms. Dogs speak by barking, do not expect them to be silent. Send love instead! Change starts within
- "BSL has not worked. Education for everyone is key. Enforcement of current bylaw.
- NO TO BSL"
- [personal information removed] had a world renown responsible pet ownership bylaw. Calgary lets continue his legacy. NO TO BSL
- Calgary you are blaming the wrong end of the leash. We need to get to the root of the problem. BSL does not work when the owner is at fault
- No to BSL
- If there is an animal bite or attack there should be an investigation as to why not just automatic fines. More training for problem animals.
- Breed is not the problem, ownership and education is the problem. Everyone in the vet industry will tell you what is the real issue.
- There should be pet education classes offered! I personally work in the Pet Industry and would volunteer for this! More education is needed!
- Part of licensing fees should go towards a program to rehabilitate aggressive or vicious dogs that have been seized from owners
- There must be more of an investigation as to why the attack happened. More focus on education and more pressure on the owner.
- Nuisance OWNERS should be identified in this bylaw rather than pinning their actions on their animal!
- Off Leash dog parks at not a place for children to free roam without education from their parents about running up to dogs they do not know
- The main issue is reporting a stray cat doesn't result in any action. This needs to be addressed.
- The City would never implement legislation singling out a specific human race - BSL is the same idea. Shame on you, Calgary!
- Do not ban pit bulls. Ban shitty owners. They are the problem.
- Pets are expensive to care for in their lifetime. Lowering/waiving pet fees for low income earners sounds like an invitation for pet neglect



- Breeds are not the problem. People are. Education is more important. Feeding wildlife eg. Birds is not a problem but therapeutic . Liz
- Need cats to be outside to get rid of mice and control bird population, its nature! my street is mice free thanks to the guy next door cat!
- I do NOT agree with banning/muzzling of pit bulls as a BREED. Any animal can be dangerous, it's an owner problem
- Mandatory training for every pet owner otherwise no licence. Training update every 3 years.
- Roaming cats chased away all the birds at my bird feeder. :(Please keep outdoor cats illegal.
- Outdoor cats do not control mice very well, and can spread diseases from catching/eating mice. Get an exterminator if u have a mouse problem
- Just to reiterate and clarify, I do not support breed-specific legislation. Deal with the issues that arise on a case by case basis.
- When a call is placed on a cat that is continually roaming and you know exactly where it lives, why is the onus on me to trap it. Warn !
- Everyone saying "breeds aren't the problem" are being [remove](and are probably owners of pitbulls).
- Pit bulls are bred to be aggressive, with massive jaw strength + high kill drive. They're gentle until they aren't. Denial is dangerous!
- Better enforcement and higher fines for people engaging in dog fighting and using animals as bait dogs
- I do not agree to breed specific legislation or bylaws. They are unfair and prejudiced against pitbulls. Raised properly pitbulls are gentle
- na
- Before being allowed to adopt a pet there should be a mandatory class, with certification, explaining all the rules and regulations involved
- I believe the city needs to do much more when it comes to dangerous pets and attacks.
- My greatest pet peeve is dog owners leaving bags of dog feces all over the parks and especially around and on top of the garbage bins.
- Ban pitbulls
- Mandatory on-line dog behavior/responsible pet ownership bylaw knowledge when applying for new dog licence.
- Landlords should be held accountable for renting out places where prior renters' animals urinated and caused mold to grow causing illness.
- Encourage all neighborhood stores, vet clinics to adopt and supply pet waste bags (With logos) and bins to be installed on nearby parks
- Make it easier for restaurants to allow dogs on patios, and, allow dogs in more stores. We can't leave them in the car, of course.
- Domestic rabbits are a huge problem in the city especially in the Manchester area, they are pest and destroying landscape and property.



- Mandatory training pre license will prevent people from getting a license. Its odd the license process currently doesn't mention the bylaw.
- Supporting pet friendly businesses and making them easier to be approved! If Cold Garden can do it other places can too!
- What's the current practice w roaming cats? Can I catch it and bring it to the humane society?
- Regarding dogs being left outdoors and constantly barking. Shorten the rules to have the owners put on notice immediately.
- 2018 tickets issued: 256 for animal at large; 1 for failing to pick up feces. The fines are a joke; add a zero to every fine and enforce.
- Please do not punish breeds, educate people
- Training your dog is good practice. But some dogs are reactive and people need to respect their bubble! Non-pet owners also need training!!!
- No I'm good 2ith 2hat was presented
- Fifth estate doc on pitty breeds; banning pitty's makes sense. The anti-BSL mob will be all over this survey to try to influence the outcome
- take the anti-BSL comments/rhetoric in context, they have a well organized lobby to ambush surveys like this; city council will be the vote
- Philosophically I do not support any pet ownership, but I live in the society I do and it's illogical to single out a particular dog breed.
- More bylaw enforcement is needed; I'm tired of my children being scared to go the local field because owner's treat it like off-leash.
- No licenses for cats. They are impossible to contain. (Ever tried herding cats)!
- Fine amounts are good as is, but more enforcement is what is needed.
- Education of the public is MOST important factor in reducing dog bites. NO to BSL
- Escalate fines and compliance measures to any dog breed that has endangered or harmed people or other dogs do not target based on breed
- N/a
- Please don't target specific breeds. Any dog of any breed who has a history of threatening behaviour, needs to be evaluated.
- Target irresponsible dog owners not specific breeds of dogs. For their own safety, cats should not be allowed outdoors.
- No to BSL. shame on the city for even suggesting.
- No to BSL .
- Revisit / Review the number of enforcement officers
- Don't fix what isn't broken. Calgary has been a leader regarding BSL, and nothing has changed to warrant BSL now.
- Need to enforce bylaw on barking! A lot of dog owners are irresponsible and let their dogs bark all the time.
- Treat every dog as an individual. Educate, don't discriminate. #bslfreeyyc



- Ban pit bulls. Period. They are extremely dangerous. They just ripped the intestines out of our friend's dog. I'm not kidding.
- Enforcement is crucial because it's becoming too easy for the public to disregard and flaunt.
- BSL is ridiculous. Training and ownership makes the difference (for all breeds). I have never once seen bylaw at any park (start there).
- Very important to have a method to report too many pets. Requirement for more accountability placed on owners of known dangerous animals.
- .
- Make more visible signage and a speed limit for bikes going along paths. I've had people blow past without bells and almost hit my dog.
- Owners should be charged with neglect for letting pets roam, especially if the pet isn't fixed because more neglected pets result from it
- Outdoor cats live 2-5 yrs vs indoor cats at 15-20 yrs. Letting cats roam should be considered neglect. The current system doesn't work.
- It might be worth considering making spay/neuter mandatory except in special circumstances.
- Cat owners need to be educated about environmental enrichment, nutrition, interactive play, taking their cats for walks and catios.
- A job should be created for TNR and caring for feral cats and educating cat owners. Pay for it by raising some fines.
- Do something for all the abandoned bunnies!
- Educate cat owners and punish bad ones. I don't want any more of the neighborhood cats found in pieces on the road. Cats deserve better!
- Don't punish stray and feral cats for a human-caused problem. Focus on TNR, adoption, and responsible owners. Don't euthanize feral cats!
- "Stop targeting put type dog nothing but sensationalized news driven hysteria
- I left Ontario in 2005 I'm not leaving again We Will Riot"
- N/A
- Work on changing the attitude that cats are disposable. You wouldn't let your dog out to run in traffic or get lost or injured.
- some sort of incentive program for building a catio
- System for surrendering pets at the vet when the owner can't pay for the needed treatment
- Cats should not be roaming on the streets. It's not good for the cat or people who may be afraid or allergic to cats.
- Having dogs off-leash in on-leash areas of parks is horrible for people who may be scared or allergic to dogs, needs to be taken seriously
- Give us chickens!!!
- I believe education is important when it comes to managing dog behaviour. I've met gentle pit bulls and small dogs that bite (less damage).
- Make animal traps and animal at large rules apply year round, and during times of a Pandemic



- Just please do something about the pit bulls
- Pit bulls are dangerous and need to be dealt with.
- Breed specific legislation does not follow the science and has not proven to be effective. Responsible ownership for everyone is key.
- "Owner of recent NW attack is a known abuser dog had 0 chance.
- DO NOT BLAME THE BREED"
- More parks/open spaces where pets NOT permitted. Greater access to dog free areas for all. Higher fines for off leash dogs in on leash parks
- Cats are the highest impact to bird populations. They should not be permitted outside even in people's yards.
- More enforcement when it comes to dogs off leash in on leash areas. It is so scary to have a giant out of control dog run up to me barking.
- Require obedience training for dog licenses, banning breeds isn't a solution. If you can't do training, you shouldn't own a dog.
- "*mandatory jail time for animal abusers *restriction from ever owning another animal.
- PUBLIC REGISTRY for abuser of animals!!!"
- Putting restrictions on Pit Bulls does not make the streets safer. Fine the owners.
- Non
- Enforcement of dogs off leash in on leash areas. This needs to be enforced more
- Limit the amount of dogs one person can have an off-leash dog park at a time or require a special licence.
- "Reclaim natural areas by reducing off leash areas where damage is being done."
- Easier registration for pet owners other than online with alternate options besides credit card. Registration should be one time fee
- BSL has been proven not to work. Isolating dogs from other people and animals creates aggression issues. Dogs need to socialize!
- The less regulation the better in my opinion. Punish problem pets and owners, not general population.
- Mandatory animal behavioural training for councillors and bylaw officers.
- The recent nw attack on the Aussie isn't a pitbull. It's an American bulldog. So ppl that can't identify breeds should just call it a dog.
- Sidewalk paint sanctioned signs that indicate not-ok to urinate or scent on this grass area. "Dog Not-OK" or "Curb Dog." Let them know.
- Off-leash dogs chasing waterfowl in public parks is annoying, illegal, and harmful to the birds. We need more by-law officers giving tickets
- Make the spay/neuter program available to more than just low income Calgarians, more people might get their animals fixed if it was cheaper



- Penalize the guilty, not the innocent. Pitbulls (and others) are beautiful animals if cared for properly. Don't penalize responsible owner
- I'd love to see more public education about why cats should not be free roaming outdoors
- Individuals should be required to take classes prior to buying/adopting a pet. People don't train and are potentially harming animals.
- All fines should be scaled to income - people with a lot of money see them as fees rather than deterrents, and can afford to break rules.
- Don't penalize "nuisance" dogs. Penalize "vicious" dogs and OWNERS. Never single out a breed that IS or LOOKS like a Pitbull period.
- Breed specific legislation is ineffective, discriminatory, and is not backed by behaviour science or animal control best practices.
- No I do not
- If we are trying to move farther away from a world drenched in prejudices, we must include our pets. Pets should have more rights, not less.
- Please actually do some research into breed specific legislation, before continuing to waste everybody's time on an ineffective solution.
- Income dependent fines should be considered
- I propose that the law not classify dog as nuisance dogs. Rather, classify their owner as a nuisance owner. It's a more accurate take.
- Among the questions asked in the survey, you should have asked if the person completing the survey was a pet owner.
- Barking dogs are a real problem in my neighbourhood, you need stricter rules and a less onerous reporting process
- ghh
- More laws/bylaws should be in place for animal breeders. Too many homeless animals already, backyard breeding is unnecessary and ridiculous.
- Don't punish the breed, punish the owners. Bully breeds should not be singled out at all! I have had more issues with small dogs than large.
- N/A
- Pitbulls used to be used as nannies for young children. Its is ridiculous to put rules on a specific breed.
- I say that the fees for pet liscense a should be lower and that cat liscense or small animal(x amount of lbs such as 35) should be lower
- If you have a limited income, it can be said that you can't afford a pet. I do not support a licensing pay scale based on income
- We have a bad problem with 4 or 5 roaming cats in our neighborhood and would like bylaw officers involved
- if a dog is aggressive in anyway. the city should offer training courses to the owner. Courses are expensive, would help a lot of people.
- Specific breeds should not be singled out. Bad owners breed bad dogs



- It is the owners responsibility to properly care for/train bully breeds and therefore, they should have mandatory training before adopting
- I do not support ANY breed based discrimination for dogs. Punish the behaviour, not the breed.
- Nope
- This is covered but I don't think pit bulls should be specifically signaled out. I haven't seen any good data to support this bylaw.
- Dog owners who have a history of owning animals that bite or are aggressive or vicious should be banned from owning dogs
- Many breeds can be dangerous. Pit bulls should not be singled out. Why not rottweilers? Why not mastiffs? Punish behaviour not the breed
- A 2014 literature review by AVMA found that "controlled studies have not identified [pit bull type dogs] as disproportionately dangerous."
- Owners that have dogs who attack other dogs/people should have to complete strict dog training classes or have their animals seized.
- Not all dogs are bad but the fact is that pitbulls are capable of doing more damage than most breeds.
- Re barking- repeat excessive should have a wellness check, requirement of minimum exercise or play time as it's usually a household problem.
- I feel that each issue should be dealt with case by case management. Every issue is individual and should be treated as such.
- I support allowing cats to roam.
- No
- Ban pitbulls
- How can we keep cats out of our yards
- The strength of bite is determined by the degree of bite inhibition the dog develops as a puppy, not by its breed. Puppies need socializing
- No
- Pit bulls are not bad dogs, there's only bad owners!
- No
- Signs and Fines' can only do so much. No point increasing those, if there are no officers nearby to enforce!
- BSL effects more than just dog owner. Small businesses with dog- daycare, walking, grooming, etc. It will effect them too
- I think obedience training should be required for all breeds of dogs regardless of their perception of being a vicious breed
- "Ban the deed not the breed -
- 86% of all falsities are from unfixed canines 92% are male - Spay and neuter"
- STOP SELLING COMPANION ANIMALS IN STORES AND END PUPPY MILLS
- There's no bad dogs, just bad owners



- My Calgary went from hero to zero regarding pet responsibility. Do your research and look at ONT! BSL does NOT work!
- How about showing the fines that were levied against owners of pets. What was the City's total revenue from pet fines? Hmmmm?
- The bylaws as written are great! I would prefer to see bylaw officers stationed at parks and able to educate and enforce daily.
- Bad pets are a result of bad owners, owners need to be held responsible not the animals, it is ignorant to ban a specific species of dog
- No
- If anyone wants to have livestock move to the country. I will never allow anyone to have chickens or goats next to me until I move back to
- Outdoor cats and all dogs need to wear a collar with identification.
- You don't like your neighbors or neighborhood? Why do you let your dog urinate all over other peoples property? Laws to end this required
- "Cigarettes kill millions of people every year. Why do we still allow the sale of them? Oh right \$\$
- NO TO BSL"
- Non-pet owners rights need to be taken into account. Over 1/2 the city do not own a pet according to this site. This survey is pet biased.
- often dogs left alone outside are anxious and the barking incessantly requires a dog sitter therefore open up jobs for dog sitters trainers.
- Allow outdoor cats. They are good at keeping rodent population down. More natural than indoor cats.
- Why is this available to everyone and not just yyc residents? This is amateur hour, stop with your BSL nonsense.
- I find sections of the questionnaire disturbing for possibly targeting pitbull dogs; Do Not Enact BSL
- I think we need more bylaw officers because I've never seen one. Right now the bylaws are based almost exclusively on an honour system.
- This is discrimination and non pet owners will never understand dogs bark if that's the case then every breed gets the same treatment.
- Do not focus on breed focus on conditions and responsible ownership
- We are dog owners, but it is shocking how inconsiderate many dog owners are, in terms of jumping up, etc. Not sure how to educate people...
- I think the focus on pitbull or pitbull type dogs needs to be removed. The focus should be placed on responsible owners above all else
- Any breed of dog can be aggressive and bite. The focus should be on the owners. Obedience training should be recommend for any dog
- Please bring in someone who knows how to write an unbiased survey. The forced-choice questions had glaring holes, no options if I disagree.
- Fines should increase at second and third offense



- Rather than picking up every cat or dog and removing them from neighbourhood that are healthy tag and release to see if go home...
- It is neglectful to allow cats to roam outside to get hit by cars, killed by coyotes, face the elements, and lost. Keep cats inside.
- Cat owners should be fined for neglect/animal abuse for letting their cats wander outside to get hit by cars or otherwise hurt.
- All cats and dogs must be required to wear collars so owners can't be identified if the pet is lost.
- Pigeons are a good idea They make better house pets than parrots. They should not be allowed to fly freely though.
- Dogs should always be walked on leash on sidewalks/neighbourhoods. Almost accidentally hit one with my car the other day. :(
- If a dog bites someone, the owner MUST take responsibility and stay on the scene.
- More enforcement for off leash dogs and free roaming cats. Maybe increased fines for each incident reported.
- Stop people from walking dogs off leash in weaselhead and fish creek. They are hurting the wildlife.
- Keep cats from killing songbirds in the city!
- The city should seize and rehome cats that have been brought in to animal control too many times for roaming at large.
- Dogs should not be allowed to be tied up right at the front door of shops. I am scared of dogs and I don't like walking so close to them.
- Chip and licence must be mandatory for cats and dogs. We need less lost pets in the city.
- Outdoor cats mean less lost cats find their way home, since everyone assumes cats are supposed to be outside. Increase fines for outdoor cat
- "Do not restrict based one breed.
- Punish owners not dogs.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. People are."
- Responsible ownership should be the focus. BSL is ineffective, punishes innocent dogs based on uneducated labeling and costs tax payers \$\$\$!
- I like that people can have their own animals for their own enjoyment. I do not want laws to block responsible owners from having this.
- Escalating fines for repeat off-leash infractions + no warnings. If you own a dog you NEED to know the rules before taking it out in public!
- Everyone should have to sign that they have read and understood the bylaws when getting their annual licence. No excuse for not knowing laws
- I sincerely believe and have for many years, that all dogs should be muzzled in public. I also believe a FREE spay/neuter clinic should be
- No breed specific laws! Owners are responsible not the dog or the breed
- All dogs should be assessed as individuals, not by appearance. Stereotyping by breed is harmful to the whole pet community.



- Off-leash dogs are too common on regular city streets. Leads over 6-feet and non-fixed "extendi-leads" are also common and can't be controlled.
- Please keep control of your dogs and cats and do not allow them to wander freely, or jump on people or other pets. Pick up after your pets.
- Education/enforcement blitz for nuisance behaviours and off-leash infractions. Mandatory behaviour training for repeat offenses.
- I am against BSL. This would just encourage another breed to be exploited.
- Anyone can call themselves a dog trainer in Calgary. The quality and effectiveness is never questioned after an incident. It should be.
- The focus of Mandated training should be the owner!
- Children are often in off leash parks and have had no instruction on how to approach a dog. A shared responsibility for safety would be good
- Dogs should be defined by their behaviour, not their breed. I do not support breed specific legislation. Focus on the owners.
- A breed ban is a contradiction to the idea of Responsible Pet Ownership.
- This survey has been hijacked by a small number of American pitbull fanatics from a rightwing U.S. pitbull forum.
- No
- Pet owners need to learn to become better neighbors. Use your own yard as a toilet if you want to own a pet. Home owners will soon rebel
- Yes the boulevard is public property. That does not mean you should use it as a pet waste dumping ground. Use your boulevard instead.
- Supports for victims of domestic violence. Support for shelters which allow pets. Reduced fees for pet owners who are escaping domestic.
- I am in favour of BANNING bully type breeds all together. They are a public safety hazard!!
- Nearly two-thirds of human pathogens and three-quarters of emerging pathogens are zoonotic in origin. The city needs to study on pet waste.
- Ammend 23M2006 22. to include URINE.
- An easier way for home owners to use 23M2006 25(3) to protect private property and public boulevard from Urine burns. Small claims is slow.
- If the expectations by-laws to allow urban hens is drafted to be comprehensive the added step of neighbour approval can be removed.
- I see a lot of dog feces in my local parks. Some people do not pay attention to what their dog is doing and others just don't pick it up.
- Inner city fenced off leash dog parks suitable for elderly dog owners to access
- I would like to see more buildings allow pets. It is pretty difficult to find a rental property that allows them, especially for seniors.
- Separate dog parks for big and small breeds
- Fines and jail time for dog bites and an animal that killed other animals



- Dog size parks
- Chickens are is important part of a sustainable future
- I think that the idea of dog training should be either replaced or supplemented with dog behaviour education for owners.
- We are expected to treat all others equal regardless of race. Take that same regard when you look at "Pitbulls”
- You can engage all you want about increased penalties, etc. but unless you are prepared to enforce it's all just lip service.
- Immediate fines for leaving dog feces in bags on the sides of trails. Pet licensing should come with a mandatory online course.
- Na
- I would like the over population of skunks in the North East to be considered. It has become out of control, Cities responsibility to clear
- Additional funding for community volunteer stations to feed stray dogs and cats, and much needed neuter programs to reduce populations.
- There should be a course that potential pet owners should have to take. Uninformed owners often cause pets to be ill-behaved or untrained.
- I would like the city to be able to be involved with problem cats who will not be trapped.
- Give a free 6 month free licensing to approved rescues making it easier on rescues then U automatically can track the next owner as adopted
- Make all pets wear a chip of identification of owner and if abandoned put fines of minimum \$1,000. This includes rabbits.
- I don't like how black and white the on-leash vs off-leash restrictions are (except for paved bike paths). NEED SPACE TO EXPLAIN!!!
- Animal attacks on humans should result in euthanasia of the animal. Period.
- Silver Spring Bot. Garden. On leash during peak times (noon to 7 pm) June thru Sept. only.
- Problems with pets are owner related. Breed specific policies and bylaws don't get to the root cause of uneducated, negligent, inattentive o
- "End the sale of dogs at pet stores -- Only rescued adopted animals --
- The World has enough animals --"
- Ban the deed not the breed - 86% of all fatalities are from unfixed canines 92% are male - Spay and neuter” be responsible guardians
- Vets should be required to automatically include license costs to pet owners bill when treating an unlicensed animal/pet.
- I don't find cats at large annoying. I kind of enjoy seeing, possibly petting, a cat when I'm out for a walk.
- Nothing
- Bandanas: add school program to mention this. Increase dog license fee and subsidize training, require dogs to go to lessons.



- No
- this change was thought up by someone who hates dogs and pets in general.
- One problem with high fines is that there is a reluctance to issue tickets when they are viewed as draconian. Lower fines get issued.
- I am at an off leash park daily and can count on 1 finger the number of incidents regarding any dog bites. Don't fix it if it's not broken
- More controls in place to prevent cats from roaming.
- Dogs on the PATHWAY SYSTEM should be on a tightly controlled, right-hand-sided 3-ft leash. NO Retractable Leashes! (protects passers and dog)
- Wouldn't it be wonderful if everyone actually kept their dogs on leash in on leash areas.
- Maybe The City should consider a restriction on leash length. Only one standard length to allow proper 'control' of their animals.
- All dogs and cats should be banned in the city. They are basically just an annoyance and provide zero benefits.
- I believe this bylaw should not be looking at "pitbull dogs" when that isn't even an official breed. If a dog is deemed dangerous yes
- I have tried to talk to my neighbor about his barking french bull dogs that charge my fence. No solution, [remove] owner = [remove] dogs
- If you're going to let your cat outside, like a dog, it should be licensed, like a dog.
- Cats are an invasive species and damaging the city's ecosystem by killing birds. All cats should be kept inside.
- Banning bringing aggressive breeds into the city from animal rescues outside of the country in large numbers
- Natural areas and habitat must be protected. Enforcement not education!
- Other cities tried BSL then scrapped it due costs \$1 million+ a yr tax \$\$,did not solve incidents of dog bites. All breeds can bite.
- Don't punish a breed - punish irresponsible owners. A dog's actions are the result of its present and past training and treatment.
- Many people with poorly behaved dogs won't enroll in training/obedience because it costs too much. Make subsidized/free training available.
- Survey is written with bias and provides untrue statements to elicit fear not accredited to any body or proof. Shamefully executed.
- The idea of banning a breed based on "bite strength" is a horrible one. Ban bad owners, not bad dogs.
- N/a
- N/A
- Don't discriminate based on breed of dog :(Punishment should be based on pet and owner, not because of breed.



- No to BSL. incentivize licensing, spay and neuter programs and training for all breeds. Rewards to be responsible, consequences when not.
- Leash laws need to be enforced and fines given, especially adjacent to off leash areas.
- If this by-law is passed. It should apply to every breed. All breeds should be included in this new by-law.
- "No to BSL. incentivize licensing, spay and neuter programs and training for all breeds.
- Higher fines for dogs in sport fields/playgrounds and dogs off leash in non off leash areas such as the bike path system.
- Maybe there could be a free course to take on dog training which will actually help people and pets be happy instead of putting restrictions
- No ideas
- I think is covered good
- Max dogs/cats per household should be 3 of each (not 6) in my opinion.
- Like most surveys, many of the questions are leading questions and include bias. It's frustrating to see surveys used in this manner.
- If an animal is attacked or killed by another animal the owner should have to pay for the vet bill. Thank you all for your help.
- Do not introduce breed specific legislation!!!
- The idea of specific pets being muzzled is gross injustice to pet owners.
- Having a pet is a responsibility. Owners should have to prove via a strict but fair class that they can care for an animal.
- Do not agree with any form of breed specific legislation.
- The breed of a dog should not matter if they are aggressive they should all be treated the same and the owners fined the same
- I feel that the owner of the animal that caused injury or death to humans or pets should have to pay medical/vet bills. Not a flat rate.
- Was great thanks!
- I have a big issue with cat owners. We have a lot of cats wandering fPeople spend money on their gardens for people's cats to use as a toilet
- There should be a limit to how many cats and dogs owned in high density condo areas such as the Beltline, Mission and Kensington areas.
- I would like to see more officer out in the off leash parks. I would like them to educate and make the pet owner feel safe. Less policing.
- Your animal attacks you pay for medical bills. Person who got attacked should not be the person trying to facilitate this payment
- I also support limiting the # of dogs walked off-leash by professional dog-walkers at dog parks as their ability to control them is impacted
- Education for pet owners and non-pet owners about what responsible pet ownership really means and how to responsibly interact with pets.



- Currently there is little or no enforcement of any pet bylaw. Take a look at Calgary's largest off leash feces park, Nose Hill.
- We require more public education Concerning protecting our urban wildlife they are important to our environment
- No outdoor dogs overnight. Dogs must be allowed in overnight to prevent excessive barking.
- BSL only punishes the responsible pet owners. Negligent owners will continue to raise aggressive animals just a different breed
- "delete the word "" RESPONSIBLE "" our of the
- responsible pet ownership bylaw
- it assumes people are irresponsible"
- N/A
- bsl leads to mass euthanasia of said dogs regardless of behavior and has proven ineffective in stopping problems. Drop the bsl movement
- I think loud dogs should be fined
- All dogs larger than 40 lbs should be required to wear a harness with their lease attached to the harness rather than their collar.
- fines collected for a dog attacking another animal should be used to help the owner of the attacked animal with vet bills
- Not right now
- Higher fine and consequences for roaming cats.
- Easier way to report roaming cats
- Actual follow through of punishment for irresponsible owners who let their cats roam
- Negligent owners need to be held more accountable and not the responsible owners
- .
- All cats should be kept inside as per the bylaw or outside on their property with a leash.
- Roaming cat control
- Instant fine for allowing your cat to roam free.
- Responsible pet owners know where their pets are at all times.. That says alot about roaming cat owners..
- Charging people who let their cats roam unsupervised.
- Fines for people who allow their cats to damage other's property.
- Easier way to report roaming cats. [DUPLICATE]
- Steeper consequences and follow through for people who let their pets roam freely.
- Easier way to report roaming cats [DUPLICATE]
- Better system to prevent roaming cats.
- Easier way to deal with roaming cats
- Easier way to report roaming cats [DUPLICATE]
- More simple way to report roaming cats and officers to deal with owners
- An officer immediately sent out to give cat owners a ticket if their cat is reported roaming



- STOP pandering to [remove]. It just [remove] down the herd. This should be mandatory, especially after this Covid scare. All animals do this.
- Bylaw officers that fine roaming cat owners
- Increase in Roaming cat control
- I believe offenders and the outcome of bylaw investigations should be made public so the victim knows what happened.
- There are no lights in off leash areas and no shelters. When it's dark in the winter you can't visit a park in the evening as you can't see.
- An owner's dog who has attacked or harmed another pet or human should be responsible for the victim's medical bills.
- Ban pit bulls entirely
- Dog and Owner who has attacked another animal/human should be required to display an identifier that their dog has shown aggressive behavior
- No other ideas, just safer communities with big scary dogs. Pet owners need to be more respectful.
- I know it might not be popular but I think people who rent should not be allowed to have more than 1 cat and 1 dog.
- None
- Lighting in parks for night time walks, more garbage bins located in the park, not just at the park entrances. More bylaw for non poo pickup
- Pit bulls are just one potentially aggressive breed - how do you identify a dangerous animal before an incident takes place?
- Urban chickens are a responsible way to ensure food security in Calgary
- No
- Cute! Any new proposed by-law pertaining to pets or animals in general should be drafted in a logical, common sense manner, sans "woke".
- .
- I feel that people need to understand that not all pitbulls are bad animals. I have met and seen smaller dogs that are more aggressive.
- It is irresponsible to let cats damage neighbour's properties. Negligent free roaming cat owners MUST be fined more.
- Roaming cats, cats, cats- enforce this please! Also dogs on the drivers lap in a moving car- irresponsible to the extreme.
- No
- To be fair, Peace Officer should investigate before sending out letter to pet owner. Nuisance neighbor can lie and pick on a can't talk pet!
- Animal enforcement should be fair to both owner and complainer! 311 should not just issue letter very time when receiving a call. Waste \$!
- No
- It is wrong to make rules specific to breed. It's bad owners not breed.



- See Sherwood Park's bylaw for reducing licence fees for people who prove current engagement in dog obedience classes
 - I think that pet owners should be tracked as to how many of their pets have been deemed nuisance. Prohibit repeat offenders from owning pets
 - Let's have training for dogs a positive mission. Affordable and in some cases refunded for the low income owners. We can do this!
 - People should be aware that they are in an off leash dog park. If you don't like dogs, choose a different park! Calgary has lots!
 - I think dogs should be allowed to walk on paved paths in an off leash park, especially if you have a disability or if you have a stroller.
 - After removing the signs for "no dogs in parks"; because of sign pollution. Can you please place a sticker on the garbage cans in parks.
 - enforce the rules we already have. Stop vilifying a breed. Pitbulls are no more dangerous than any other breed but that never makes news
 - Owners of animals should have to be licensed as well as the animals themselves. Most dog owners seem to be ignorant and self-righteous about
 - mandatory training for dogs showing aggressive behaviour should be prioritized over or go along with fines for pet owners
 - No I dont
 - Fines for not picking up your dog feces are not enforce in the west downtown area and I would love to see that improve.
 - No
 - No
 - Dog owners are responsible for their dogs. The punishment for a dog attacking another dog, a child or an adult should be more than a fee.
 - I would like to see 'Pitbull types', described earlier, banned from our city. They have proven over and over to be extremely dangerous!
 - Pit bulls and similar aggressive breeds should be banned. I'd love to say I've met intelligent, responsible pitbull owners, but I have not.
 - ban [remove]not dogs!
 - I think cats at large should receive stiffer penalties
 - no
 - When nuisance animals are reported, the animals should be removed from the home and owners prohibited from owning animals in future.
 - "Owners of pets have to be responsible
-
- If their animal hurts, kills another animal owner of pet responsible for all damages ie vet bills"



- Fines must be a reflection of the actual damage done. If a dog attacks the fines should be greater than the medical bills for the human or p
- Age restrictions, and mental health checks should be enforced for all pitt owners. 25yr+. This is not a breed for an inexperienced handler.
- If your dog attacks someone make it illegal for that person to own another high aggressive dog breed without mental health check
- Nuisance dogs have no place in this city. If a dog cannot behave, it should be removed or euthanized.
- A lifetime animal license is a great idea.
- By-law officers should be patrolling the off leash areas daily, monitoring owners for cleaning after dogs and enforcing the rules.
- I very much favor a pitbull ban. A breed that kills more kids in the U.S. every year than all other breeds combined has no place here.
- Something needs to be done about off leash dogs in non off leash parks. These dogs defecate and owners do not pick up. Also risk for attacks
- I support BSL and would like the process to legally own a pitbull to be so difficult that it deters people from choosing the breed.
- Negligent owners or owners of convicted pets should have to pay medical bills for victims
- I think rules about feeding wildlife should NOT apply to feeding birds on private property; this should be allowed and encouraged!
- There needs to be similar malice toward dangerous dog owners as there is to lawful gun owners.
- As a cat lover and previous cat owner, no more unattended outdoor cats! Indoor cats are healthier and live longer.
- Negligent owners should have to pay medical bills for victims whether they are humans or animals.
- Nothing at the moment.
- Owners should have to attend training with all dogs
- Owners must be fully responsible for their pet behaviour assuming all consequences and damages.
- Have you addressed reptilian pets? Large loud birds? Rabbits?
- Consider the OWNERS and not the pitbull as the problem. An animal, aggressive breed or not behaves in response to how they've been treated.
- Pitbulls should be banned from the city of Calgary period.
- Off leash dog fines should be increased for violations on or near school fields or playgrounds where children are often playing.
- Pet offending owners should be responsible for incurred vet bills for the injured pet.
- There is no way that a special kind of Dog Breed should be picked on. There is just as many small (tiny) Dogs aggressive as big Dogs
- Aggressive breed dogs should have significantly higher licensing fees. Perhaps \$1,000 per annum per animal. ie; Pitbulls



- There's a HUGE difference between nuisance and vicious. For shame whomever drafted this survey and lumped them together. Ur bias is showing
- Off lease parks and bike-running paths problematic. dogs are often not under control. Please change most parks to on leash. Enforcement!!!!
- There should be fines for releasing unwanted reptiles/fish into Calgary. If you don't want a reptile or fish anymore, they should be rehomed
- Children need to be taught not to come up to dogs and assume it is okay. Parents need to take responsibility for their children.
- Pit bulls are not the problem. All dogs require training as do their owners. Focus on prevention and not on breed-specific policies.
- More fenced in Lrg off leash parks. Ppl who don't like dogs have many park options already. Pet owners and their pets need more places to go.
- More transparent communication of the dangers of pit bulls and pit bull like breeds and the added responsibility owners need to assume.
- All dogs should have to go through training. If someone wants to own a pet, they should be required to take puppy/dog training.
- Good neighbour program - too many concerned ab what the other person is doing. Less regulation. We need to learn live beside each other
- N/A
- "Owners need minimum awareness of obligations about being good neighbours.
- Don't let dogs go off leash in the Bow or Elbow River."
- Dogs that bite/injure people and/or pets should be automatically put down. They can't be rehabilitated and their owners don't seem to care.
- ??
- Owners who have multiple violations or an animal abuse conviction should not be allowed to have pets.
- Na
- I think when a dog exits the house he should be on leash to avoid him attacking a person or a vehicle passing by
- Each bite incident needs to be reviewed on a case basis. What caused it? Is the animal abused? Was it protecting? Is the animal in pain?
- Enforcement and fines for dogs off leash in non off leash areas in the city no matter how big or small the dog is.
- Noise nuisance should be easier to report and investigate.
- an endlessly barking dog needs to be dealt with, how? if it's your dog figure it out
- I do not believe licensing should be required for pets that are 100% indoors. I live in a condo and have 2 cats that never leave my unit.
- The pandemic hurt people financially and mentally. Bad year to decide to go after people's dogs as well. Pretty gross city of Calgary.



- Dogs that have a tendency to bark should be muzzled when outdoors. No Exceptions!
- The vet fees in Calgary are ridiculous and it's cheaper to go out of the area or even province to get medical attention.
- Why are we increasing the complexity and scope of pet bylaws when the city and province are in a budget crisis?
- More parks where dogs are not allowed in Calgary. I cannot go for a walk without someone's off leash dog following or barking at me.
- Dogs barking all around my house, seldom any peace, these folks don't care a dam about my quiet enjoyment of my life.
- No evidence to support BSL is effective, very expensive to enforce, better to enforce the bylaw [personal information remove] worked hard for.
- The city needs to get to the root of the problem. BSL is not the answer. Stricter fines that are actually enforced and education!!
- BSL is ineffective and not backed up by behaviour science or animal control
- If a dog kills another dog the owner should be responsible for all vet bills related to the incident
- When [personal information remove] was around bites were down 75% with no BSL. Owners were expected to be in control and responsible of their animals
- Off leash dog owners should be fined immediately. No warnings, they don't listen.
- There should be NO pet stores that sell any size of animal allowed. I only shop at and support pet stores that sell pet food and supplies.
- Make available to pet stores, veterinarians and animal adoption places, a pamphlet of the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaws.
- Prevent unfair judgements based on breed or breed bias. Other breeds have similar bite forces as Pit Bulls have.
- BSL legislation is NOT effective. It's disgusting to have a plebiscite on banning specific breeds. Owners should be held accountable.
- The issue is generally irresponsible pet owners - any changes should focus on penalizing these owners and not just the animal.
- Disappointing seeing that Calgary wrote the book on how to prevent dog bites. This direction towards BSL is regressive.
- If animals are a nuisance of any kind; the pet owner must attend classes to improve animal behaviour with proof of attendance and change inPet
- There is an over abundance of off leash dog parks in Calgary. More park space that does not include off leash use is needed.
- Need to educate people that wandering cats kill birds (our bird populations are in grave danger). Don't make it necessary to give your name
- I would suggest that more reminder signs up in the parks with emphasize on consequences if breaking bylaws. I.e: Fine \$ for breaking bylaws
- Pet ownership is a privilege and not a right. Those who cannot follow the rules should loose that privilege.



- I feel that an owner who continually breaks bylaws should be mandated to take a city pet education course.
- "Make more parks on leash -Especially Botanical Gardens of Silver Springs!!
- People Parks- no dogs allowed
- Higher fines for barking dogs."
- There is a huge problem in Sunnyside with cat owners allowing their animals to roam freely. Traps and greater fines should be implemented.
- Shame on this team for trying to bring in BSL which doesn't work and wasting time and money on this. Is our city not in a budget crisis?
- Too many NIMBY. We share common spaces. Dogs should be on leash (where needed) and off leash (when allowed). Don't want to share, stay home.
- Stop being racist against dog breeds it's not the dog it's the owner the owner has to teach the dog right from wrong. PUNISH THE OWNER
- Nothing
- encourage and reward spay/neuter. abusive pet owners should receive jail time, fines, and NEVER be allowed to own animals again
- Police parks like Bowness Park- people walking their dogs off leash all the time - issue fines even for 1st time offense - no waive fine.
- Feces should be picked up immediately in your yard not just once a day.
- Defund and disband bylaw
- A person needs a licence to catch a fish in this country but anyone can get a dog. It is NEVER the dog's fault, no matter what breed.
- Pet owners need to be aware of severe allergies some people have and ensure their pet does not interact with anyone who has not consented
- Pathetic. Breed specific, really?! You should be ashamed of yourselves; you should be above this by now. Time 2 find a new job? #IThinkSo
- Sorry I missed phase one. Something needs to be done about the system to handle barking dogs.
- Calgary NO BSL. PLEASE do your research first. History shows BSL does not work. Refer to [personal information removed] Bruce!!!
- Dogs assist seniors to stay active. More local off leash areas and dog runs, ability to bring on leash dogs into public buildings.
- I want owners responsible for a victim's vet/medical expenses.
- Get rid of pit bulls within city limits.
- Dog training certificates should be made mandatory, as it relates to responsible dog ownership. My dog received her training at Dogma.
- N/A
- All registered nonprofit rescues should be able to receive a 6-month free license for their rescue dogs, transferable to the new family.



- Funny that ppl want others to prove they can train an animal, but ppl can have as many children as they want w/ no training needed.
- Owners--not specific dogs--need to be tracked for multiple offences. BSL means negligent and abusive owners will just get different dogs.
- These ideas are from people who have never owned a pet and do not like animals they are not constructive in the slightest.
- Why do all these comments sound like someone who hates pets wrote them?
- Pet owners should be allowed to defend/dispute complaints against their pets. Its a bit of a one sided business.
- These ideas sound like they are not well thought out at all. Pet owners responsible for other peoples allergies are you joking?
- Forcing cats to stay indoors is animal abuse, cats are made to roam around. Why rules counter to nature?
- Many proposals specifically mentioned "pit bulls";. Pit bulls are not a problem. The owners that do not train or control vicious animals are.
- Not a fan of breed-specific legislation.
- I encounter too many uncontrolled off-leash dogs, even in on-leash areas. Dogs who can't be controlled shouldn't be let off-leash at all.
- Who will determine if a dog has a "similar appearance or physical characteristics"; to a pit bull? Sounds like [remove] (and BSL).
- We recommend stiffer fines and incarceration for animal abusers. There should also be laws in place for adopting an animal.
- No
- There were no mention of the people who hoard animals. They many only have 1 dog/cat however have a number of other animals.
- A separate set of rules for Pitbulls is ludicrous, all dog breeds should have the same penalties for the same offences.
- "- accountability for drivers who run over dogs. Accident or not.
- -accountability to the owner of out of control dogs."
- A breed specific survey? I suggest [personal information removed] follows [personal information removed]; out the door next October for approving such. Shame on you and your ignorance
- all are here
- If pit bulls weren't a problem, there would be no discussion about them. Anywhere! It's mostly the people. But they were bred for fighting.
- Free spay and neuter program. More support of animals who need to be adopted.
- Rather than fines alone, consider enforcing responsible ownership through education- such as an order to complete an obedience course.
- Very high licensing costs for pitbull type dogs. Grandfather those who currently have but ban for new licensing.



- Have bylaw officers patrol the parks to fine people who do not pick up after their own dogs. Have the bylaw officers hand out tickets!!!
- It should be mandatory for first time dog or cat owners to take a free short 2 or 3 hour course on husbandry and responsible pet ownership.
- Targeting a specific breed of dog is wrong and biased. That is like saying all big dogs are bad. It is better to define what is a nuisance dog
- Offending dog owner should have to pay vet/hospital fees for victimized dog/human
- All bully dog breeds should be muzzled in public, better yet banned totally. Can't love out the inbred meanness.
- Pet's owner should pay vet bill.
- Ppl pushing for higher licensing fees, stop it. Higher fees mean fewer ppl opting to license their pets. Lower fees = higher compliance.
- By law officers frequent public parks to ensure leash compliance. There are so many dogs running free in parks and this is scary for kids.
- If want a license - have to submit plans as to where/how they will shelter animal, how many hours they will be home with it; spot checks
- Owners should have to pay for vet bills incurred when their dog harms another animal.
- Please ban pit bull breeds from dog parks. I have a g retriever and she is the best dog in the world and I'd die if a pit bull killed her
- Free licensing for rescue dogs.
- Once your beloved dog has been mauled by a Pitbull you will change your mind about letting them in our city!!!
- Please do not enact BSL. It does not work. If you're worried about powerful bites in pits you might as well include Rotties, Cane Corsos too
- No
- Pitbulls were bred to fight - pure and simple. You can't love that characteristic of of them.
- Fewer bylaws and more community cooperation is needed, people can live better together and not look to bylaw enforcement.
- Instead of fines the money could be paid towards obedience lessons, this would actually go toward solving the issue.
- Have off leash areas for small and tiny dogs.
- Every 'problem dog' has one thing in common: an owner. Enforce bylaws/fines more often and have repeat offenders take obedience classes.
- What is it with your nanny-state bull-tweet? Leave people alone for Pete's sake. Licensing indoor only cats is invasive enough!!!!
- my ideas are FOR SALE not free.
- Quit bringing in aggressive dogs/pit bulls from other provinces/countries. It's adding to our problem and helping their problem.



- Higher license fee for aggressive dog breeds. Like \$1000 each. Make it harder for people with mean dog mentality to get them.
- There should be a zero tolerance policy for dogs who attack/bite people. Remove these dogs from their homes and have them destroyed.
- "STOP SELLING PETS IN CALGARY
- STOP SUPPORTING PUPPY MILLS
- STOP SUPPORTING ANIMAL ABUSE"
- I am so disappointed in this city for trying to enact BSL, and all of the ignorant people supporting it. Education and compassion is needed.
- Pet owners need to be given a fair opportunity to defend their pets.
- 47 OF 51 VICK DOGS WERE REHABBED 0 INCIDENCE OF AGGRESSION - LIVED W/ CHILDREN and ANIMALS GOOD CANINE AWARD and THERAPY DOGS IT'S NOT THE BREED
- BSL is ignorant and wrong!!
- Insurance? Higher licensing fees? This is just going to ensure LESS people comply.
- Post targeting "PIT BULLS" (not a breed) are from uninformed ignorant pit hating propagandists ignoring science and fact
- Truly disappointing that [[personal information removed] Calgary Model that had a 5 fold reduction in bites is even being considered replaced by ineffective BSL
- BSL is a failure the world over bites and severity are up in Toronto - Yet pit bulls are gone -
- Spain - Journal of Veterinary Behaviour '07 showed the BSL (2000), targeted a number of breeds had no impact on reducing dog related injurie
- Italy '09, abolished its BSL, which applied to 17 breeds down from 92 breeds, in favour of BNL like the Calgary Model
- BSL is a failure the world over - 0.02313 % of communities in America have BSL 21 states have banned it and repeals happen frequently
- BSL leads to higher costs to cities and taxpayers. The list of cities that tried BSL but removed it because it did not work is long.
- More enforcement of people walking dogs off leash in on leash areas! It's a big problem! It means less attacks and threats from loose dogs!
- Disable the like and dislike buttons one person can click them as many times as they want for their side. They are not accurate or fair.
- People with aggressive dogs won't take classes in training. They don't care. They run away with their dog when it attacks someone.
- Don't wat to be responsible for some ones vet/medical bills? Don't let your dog run loose!
- Ban pit bulls, it's the only proactively enforceable thing you can do. Start enforcing defecation bylaws as well, currently it's poor.
- Fines for barking dog owners
- Ban pit bulls and enforce leash bylaws for other dogs.
- Ban negligent owners they are the real root if the problem.



- Start actually enforcing our current bylaw with increased fines and you will see a difference
- Yes to making your own food
- Take the emotion out of it and look at science and FACTS. BSL has been proven to NOT reduce bites and aggression.
- Calgary should ban the sale of animals in pet stores, and only allow adoptions of rescued animals.
- Higher licensing fees will only encourage negligent owners to not license their dogs.
- Mandatory obedience training classes
- Increase licensing fees for dogs that have not taken obedience training
- G
- It seems that plenty of [remove] owns pitbulls. Can we not just ban them from the city?
- Stop trying to punish good owners. Go after bad owners. When someone causes a car accident not all black trucks are banned from the road.
- There are no bad dogs just bad owners. Owners of undisciplined dogs need to be held financially responsible with enforced training.
- We see more roaming cats in the neighbourhood than off-leash dogs. Owners need to keep their cats indoors and not out hunting.
- Xx
- Abolish the idea of BSL it does not work. Check the facts!
- Anti NIMBY community supports / programs, we have a city without a sense of community that want a bylaw officer to tend to every annoyance.
- There should be restrictions on how many pets are licensed in downtown. Our parks are being ruined by dog pee. There are too many dogs
- Why is BSL even still being considered in 2020? It does not work. It is about the dog and their training, not the breed!
- Stop targeting Bully breeds. It's not the breed it's the owner. All owners should be responsible dog owners period.
- This city seems full of hateful awful people. Pretty disgusting stuff. We don't deserve dogs.
- My pitbull has been attacked by several lab types and needed vet attention. This didn't make the news because it doesn't fit a bias narrative
- Most dog owners are responsible. Roaming Cats are a problem in our area. The ones we see are hunting birds and using the gardens for toilets
- Stop targeting the bully breeds . People need to be trained and the dogs need training also . It's the same as driving a powerful vehicle .
- Classifying all bully breeds under the aggressive umbrella is uneducated and based on fear. FACT all dogs have the potential to bite.
- All dogs can be aggressive up to owner to keep dog under control at ALL times. Enforce stronger fines NO TO BSL
- Specific breeds are not the problem, but we DO need more of check on BAD owners of more potentially dangerous dogs- not exclusively pitbulls



- I only support Breed NEUTRAL Legislation
- Refer to [personal information removed] program. Lower bites when he was around and he did not support BSL
- Wild birds should be allowed to be fed on private property.
- Prohibited any pet in the light of under 2 year old baby at home, please.
- Stop targeting Pitbulls. They do not statistically show to bite more. Aggressive dogs is the terminology that should be used. All dogs.
- If everyone just took care of their animals. Kept dogs under control and on leash. Cats inside not roaming. Why is it so hard for so many?
- Please don't increase the number of dogs/cats people can have. It's hard enough for people to take care of and control the ones they have.
- Does a pet licence come with a set of guidelines for responsible pet ownership? A synopsis of the bylaw(s) and penalties for infractions?
- BSL is not backed by science, fact, or any logic whatsoever in keeping citizens of Calgary safe. Very disappointing to see.
- FACT: No supporting evidence that banning breeds has any impact on dog bites.....PERIOD
- Researchers have identified the factors that lead to a dog bite.....BREED IS NOT ONE OF THEM
- BSL wastes money.....with no reduction of bites to show for it.
- Lower the annual pet license fee for owners who put their dog through training and increase the annual pet license 4 cats/dogs found roaming
- Please chickens. We love a da chickens!
- Please limit the number of dogs a dog walker can walk at one time. It is very difficult to watch many dogs at one time in order to pick up.
- Why is the dog barking? Is someone provoking it?
- My arm was destroyed by a lab cross not my American bulldog. BSL's do not work, punish bad owners they are problem not the animal.
- BSL a simplistic answer to a more complex social problem has the potential to divert attention and resources from more effective approaches
- While BSL may look good on the surface it is not a reliable or effective solution in reducing dog bites
- Breed bans do not address the social issue of irresponsible pet ownership
- Banning a specific breed can give the community a false sense of security around other breeds that are not deemed "restricted";
- Calgary should focus on leash laws, licensing, and responding to owners of any dog or breed that posed a risk to the community
- Enforcement of non breed specific bylaws focusing on chronically irresponsible owners
- Spay/neuter of all animals that are not from a registered breeder
- School based and adult education programs that teach pet care responsibility and bite prevention
- Implement bite prevention programs in schools and communities
- Mixing "bike paths" and "off leash".....don't mix. This year has been exceptionally "trying".



- Putting a ban on a specific breed is no different than saying a person of a specific race should not be allowed in a community.
- It is not the dogs that people should fear, it's their owner. Dogs respond the way they are trained and treated.
- Not long ago German shepherds had the same stereotype, and now look at them: The poster dog for police officers. NO TO BSL
- Everyone has an opinion about "pitbulls"; those that are the loudest are usually the least informed.
- "Legislation that is implemented by fear mongering rather than based on sound evidence is unjust.
- NO TO BSL"
- "When fear panic and ignorance trumps logic living creatures suffer. And we should all be concerned.
- NO TO BSL"
- No room for labeling of any kind. Shame on you Calgary
- The root of the problem will never be solved if we just focus on the easy way out....banning breeds. Focus on the owner and the individual c
- Make policy on the best research and data available. Publish info on best practices where policy has had a positive impact on dog incidents.
- It takes weeks for a bylaw officer to visit owners of barking dogs. Speed up that process.
- Do you think by banning a breed you will stop these negligent owners they will find another breed to exploit.
- People are ignoring existing bylaws. Eg dogs within 10m of playground areas. We need bylaw enforcement ie people must have consequences
- Education is HUGE in implementing responsible pet ownership, lack thereof results in irresponsible owners
- Breed bias is wrong. It is owners not pit bulls that are responsible for their behavior
- make owners responsible fully in every aspect of whatever their animal does to someone or something else
- The Botanical Gardens in Silver Springs should not be an off leash area. There are too many dogs and dog owners do not control their dogs.
- All dogs owners say dishonestly this is a friendly dog and selfishly underestimate the inconvenience they make to others.
- Dogs bite for a reason look at the circumstances surrounding the incident
- All dogs bite.....not all are reported
- Only sign needed is a very LARGE one saying DOGS ON PATHS MUSTBE ON A LEASH FINE \$? + NoDOGS ON PLAYGROUNDS SIGNS YOU HAVE NOW CONFUSIN
- Why are we talking about "pitbulls"; when they are not involved in more bite incidents than other breed? Seems odd and unjust



- Lets not try and fix the problem lets just put a bandaid on it. City of Calgary I expected more from you. BSL is not the answer shame on you
- BSL does not improve public safety or prevent dog bites!
- BSL ignores potential attacks/bites of non-targeted breeds
- BSL requires every dog to be identified as a breed something that is impossible to do accurately and objectively
- BSL makes targeted breeds even more desirable to irresponsible and criminal owners
- BSL does nothing to make irresponsible dog owners accountable
- BSL punishes responsible dog owners
- BREED DOES NOT PREDICT BEHAVIOUR
- Many cities and countries all around the world are repealing BSL because it has proven to not work. Why is Calgary talking about it?
- "Owner behaviour has a direct impact on dog aggression and personality" — Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances
- Limit the number of dogs a dog walker can take in the off-leash area to six (6). Bigger groups can be intimidating/threatening to some dogs.
- PROVIDE MORE "NO DOGS" AREAS. THERE DOES NOT SEEM TO BE ANY PLACES TO GO WITHOUT PEOPLE AND THEIR DOGS. ENFORCE BARKING DOG COMPLAINTS.
- There are many responsible, law abiding bully owners in this city! Do not punish them.
- More signs around playgrounds and athletic parks saying "no dogs". It is not clear. People let their dogs run around and pee where kids play
- Less off leash areas. If you can't exercise a dog without taking it for a walk/run/bike ride then get a different breed of dog.
- Enforce leash laws. Too many nuisance dogs off leash who aren't trained in recall.
- I don't trust off leash dogs. Owners shout "he's friendly" as their pet runs up to me and tries to hurt my pet. Enforce leash laws.
- The fines for dog attacks and bites are currently very low and has to be increased.
- License owners and not the pets.
- Need to enforce owners picking up after their dogs great we have the bylaw but I love on a green belt and to many people do not pick up afti
- incentives for pet owners to do obedience training. ie discount on license fees if there the animal /owner successfully completes course
- Dogs off leash has become a frequent issue. We have 3 kids and they have been chased and jumped on. More frequent enforcement required.
- No
- The ability to send in a complaint online and a 3 strike system for fines.
- Off leash areas should be separate (fenced) from other areas of parks to reduce conflict. Many are close to playgrounds, pthwys, bike trails
- Pit dogs should be banned within City limits



- Barking is normal with a young dog and they should be warned to take an obedience class. If no intervention is applied then a fine Issued
- Barking is not controlled strictly enough , five minutes twice per day in backyard is maximum .
- "1. Small dog off leash dog park/area in each quadrant of city.
- 2. Security cameras in off leash dog parks to reduce number of dog attacks"
- BSL is a waste of tax payers money no evidence it actually works. Money will be better spent elsewhere
- Formal Obedience training should be required to license any dog over a specified weight or size. Obedience training is more for the owner!
- I would support narking bylaws for repeat offenders or owners that don't take action for a barking dog immediately.
- Questions asked about lowering fees but did not mention how this drop on revenue would be covered.
- Waive license fee for retired working animals
- No
- The city needs more dog free green areas for people who are allergic or afraid of dogs.
- Need Bylaw officers patrolling on leash parks and areas around off leash parks for dogs off leash. It's constant. Fine owners, no warning.
- It's important to centralize registration for the integrity of the program.
- Na
- Yes, you put in questions in such a way on Phase 1/2 survey that, A. Combines very different questions (i.e. Teasing or Feeding of animals)
- Like zoos which keep animals that are too large for an enclosure, it's no diff than Large Dogs kept in house/condo that should be banned
- "Punishing a breed is blind sided and simple minded . Punish bad owners .
- Make a law that stops landlords from banning pets for no reason"
- Fines should increase every time a cat found free roaming is taken to animal control.
- My pit bull has been attacked more than once. Won't even fight back. If she had, what would the press have said? What people want to here.
- Don't punish the breed punish the bad owners.
- N/a
- I support BREED NEUTRAL BYLAW get to the root of the issue——irresponsible owners who are not in control of their pets.
- I have a pitbull mix and he is the sweetest boy, always smiling, always happy to see people and other dogs. Don't punish a breed please.
- EDUCATION RE: use of neighbour's property as dog potty, use of neighbour's garden as free range for dogs, off leash- not out of control
- Feed wild birds on our property.
- Support BNL. hold negligent and reckless owners accountable for their animals' behavior.



- Calgary has an off leash law. Enforce it! Ppl controlling their dogs = no attacks. Then there is no discussion for BSL.
- Don't make thing breed specific.
- Targeting bully breeds is absolutely ridiculous and short sighted. NO BREED SPECIFIC BY-LAWS.
- I think it is wrong to single out a specific breed or a specific type of breed in any laws. The responsibility should be on the owner!
- Lunging dogs should be fined as well. It is very scary experience for anyone victim of such incidents
- Have enclosed areas in off leash parks for people to work 1:1 with their dogs in a solitary setting if they struggle with socialization.
- Dog feces in public areas are an unsightly public health hazard. Implement a DNA testing system as in other cities. Very effective.
- There is no good scientific evidence that BSL reduces bites. What DOES and needs to be addressed - unneutered dogs, roaming dogs, prev bites
- Require DNA sample upon licensing. Useful for identifying culprits who don't pick up their dog's droppings, currently unenforceable.
- Owners of dogs left alone that bark all day in a house or condo (a dwelling) should receive a fine.
- Steeply increase fines for repeat offenders. Third offence results in revocation of pet license.
- Targeting specific breeds is an oversimplified and pandering solution. Make owners more responsible, don't feed public fear with rhetoric.
- I think the ideas are comprehensive and well-thought out. My only comment is to have more funds directed toward education vs enforcement.
- With respect to pet ownership limits, if the pets behaviors' become disruptive and a complaint is lodged, bylaw should exist to limit the #
- Excessive barking- if repeat offender, owner should have to purchase and use an AboiStop collar (citronella) to stop dog barking
- "Level 4 and 5 bites: Euthanasia after end of rabies hold.
- Level 2 and Level 3: Quarantine at home till decision.
- Level 1- Warning."
- There should be a bylaw re dog size as an example my neighbor has a dog you could put a saddle on and ride it, not fair to a big dog living
- Overregulation of pet ownership!!! Feeding wild birds on private property does not hurt anyone and helps the birds.
- Can't stop wildlife eating fallen fruit or berries on private property. Do not try to regulate this!
- Don't punish the breed , i have yet to meet a bad pit bull yet . The punishment must be higher for the owners of any animal out of control
- Forcing cats to be indoors only is the same as keeping wild animals caged. It is not natural. And they help keep mouse populations down.
- Higher fines and make it easier to fine owners that let their dogs bark outside for extended periods of time.



- I am satisfied with those put forward
- Make the humans responsible, not the dog (in most cases). Blaming a dog is ignoring the actual issue. Learning DOG language is needed!
- I would rather be surrounded by dogs and cats than a lot of the pet hating bitter people commenting.
- Bylaw for putting leashes on children that can't behave in a dog park.
- Your survey clearly shows a negative bias to one specific breed of dog. You should change the wording so that one breed is not discriminated
- I would like more flexibility to take pets (dogs etc) to more public areas, with less restrictions.
- Regardless of the breed, the responsibility falls on the owner. Animal ownership is a privilege and, like others, may be revoked if abused
- Dogs only have so many off leash areas to enjoy, have we considered the risk factors they face? Cyclists? Unsupervised children? Toys?
- I am strongly opposed to breed specific bylaws.
- Come in Calgary. Pit bulls or any muscular dogs called "pit bulls" are not the problem - let's focus on irresponsible owners/nuisance dogs.
- Are there published statistics to support reasons for BSL? We should not suggest subjective by-laws without objective evidence.
- The fee structure seemed overall ok but they should be based on the number of infractions and go up and at some point your animal taken away
- Stop associating specific breeds to aggression. It's not typically the breed that's an issue it's the owner.
- Education & Exclusion
- Dogs who injure another animal should pay for vet bills. Pit bulls should never be off leash and muzzling is a good idea. Then these events
- The growth in the mouse population increases the risk of hantavirus transmission to humans. Cats should be allowed to roam and hunt freely.
- Backwards baseball cap, lifted truck with Pit bull hanging out the window barking at everyone... These are the owners who are the problem!
- Dog off-leash areas (such as the one along Toronto Cr NW) should not be located along streets unless the area is fenced. Dangers for all.
- Dog owners must be made aware that any paved path or street is NOT an off-leash area and it is their responsibility to keep their dog away.
- No
- n/a
- Should you wish to own a "higher risk" animal, you must pass a specific animal training course provided at the owners expense.
- Breed Specific Legislation (BSL) does not work! Please do not go down this path of folly. Just look at other jurisdictions.



- Transporting loose animals in truck beds is a risk for everyone, animals should travel safely in the car or in a secure crate.
- There should be more severe punishment for animal abusers. There should be lifetime sentences for those that torture and murder animals (pet
- No other ideas, but I would like to re-iterate my support for allowing people to have chickens or other livestock where possible.
- It's about time Calgary caught up with many other major cities and made having chickens legal as well as promoting other urban agriculture
- B
- Cats spread toxoplasmosis which can be deadly to the immunocompromised, elderly, or pregnant. Cats shouldnt be allowed to free roam.
- Tired of cats digging up my garden I work so hard on. It's not a toilet!! Keep cats indoors.
- I would like to see owners of aggressive pets who attack be fined and also have to pay the vet bill of the injured pet or person
- Vote for a BSL free Calgary, BSL does nothing but punish good owners and innocent dogs.
- I think that in cases where a dog attacks another animal, the owner of the attacking dog should be required to pay all/some of the vet bill.
- None
- N/A
- No to BSL. More education and investment in preventing dog bites, breed is NOT a predictor in dog bites.
- We should not single out certin breeds of dogs and way stiffer peneties for animal abusers
- I would like to see owners of bad dogs (aggressive, biting etc) forced by law to take their dog to obedience classes such as Clever Canine.
- Dont group pitbulls as separate from other dogs. Separate what livestock is referenced as a chicken is not the same as a cow.
- Make it a requirement that the owner and the dog have to attend formal training to try and prevent any future incidents for nuisance dogs.
- Would love it if leash laws were enforced more. It's incredibly dangerous when uncontrolled dogs run in front of my bike and car.
- Would be great to add additional fines for speeding bikers in off leash dig parks.
- People please take a dog Behavior course to understand how to make sure your dog is mentally healthy and happy not living in fear and servitude
- Fines collected for nuisance animals used as a fund to support victims of animal attacks, and suppliment fees for low income pet licences
- Is there anything that can be done about a vicious dog next door?I have a neighbor with 1 that attacks the fence when I'm in my yard. Horrid
- I think more education into dog behavior is required. The humane society does great work doing this and more people could listen with ears



- I don't support breed specific legislation or pet sales from pet stores vs from adoption services
- Definition of a pit bull should NOT include animals that LOOK like a pit bull. Dogs are very often incorrectly categorized by looks.
- The problem with dogs is dog owners who let animals run free in on leash areas. I can't walk in nose Hill park anymore. The cat bylaw works
- I think you should need to apply to get a license. Not just anyone should just own a dog without training. People need training.
- Stronger penalties for dogs that bark all day!!! I previously was in a townhouse complex where this was a huge problem, and city just shrugged
- As a tax paying citizen I am not ok supporting a bylaw that is very expensive to enforce such as BSL when there is no evidence it works.
- We have the lowest bite rates in North America with our current bylaws. No need for change, except for reviews of fines.
- I oppose any measures or bylaws that single out specific breeds
- Let us feed wild birds in our yard and have chickens.
- There is a leash law to keep dogs from being a nuisance and prevent attacks. Ppl need to abide by it and the city needs to enforce it more!
- I feel as an avid Pet owner and trainer. People need to be more respectful of other owners/pets. Common Respect . I need more room to type
- Owner pays for all medical/vet bills if their dog attacks. Not only small fee. If they leave scene of attack then it's criminal, go to jail.
- It is a interesting time to try and peg public safety on pit bulls. Who put that 12 year old autistic boy in a coma [personal information removed]
- Keeping all dogs on leashes in public spaces keeps everyone (including your dog, other people's dogs, kids, you yourself, etc) safer!
- Allowing ppl to have more dogs and cats is crazy. With just the expense alone. Then trying to control them. Too many irresponsible owners!
- Offleash areas should be only that. Shocked that botanical garden in silver springs is an offleash area. These are not complimentary uses
- Chickens please. But what is meant by other livestock?
- We should not ban any breed of dog!
- My god, please ban, control, restrict the feeding and housing of pigeons. They are a non-migratory nuisance pest!
- I previously filled out this survey listing fines should be alot lower... BUT I intended to say add money for the victims and owner.
- Only 1emotional support animal per household. More control of off leash dog parks. ie control waste pickup control.
- Pit bulls are loyal loving dogs n I believe 6 dogs is a good limit in house hold
- A dog is only as dangerous as its owner allows it to be. Do not restrict the breed, restrict the owner



- Bylaws, and related enforcement, need to be kept to a minimum. The city, and residents, need to look for ways to reduce costs.
- More enforcement for nuisance animals and restrictions on owners not breeds!
- There needs to be legislation at every level of government acknowledging and requiring more careful guardianship of all sentient creatures.
- Disappointing to see a once progressive city take steps backwards with this bylaw. [Personal information removed] worked hard for his program and it worked.
- Decisions should be made based on SCIENTIFIC FACTS not based on emotions, what ifs, and hearsay
- Calgary should ban the sale of animals in pet stores and only allow adoptions of rescued animals.
- No BSL and do not allow "farm” species in the city, unless as companion animals and adopted from shelter.
 - Calgary should ban the sale of animals in pet stores and only allow for adoptions of rescued animals.
- Make dog owners criminally responsible for their dogs action. Dog attack = assault charge. Dog kill = manslaughter charge. to owner.
- Leaving a scene of car accident has criminal/civil charges. Owner of a dog that attacks should too and pay medical/vet bills.
- Fines collected from people breaking the bylaw by letting their cat free roam should be put towards TNR.
- I love the bandana idea for dogs.
- Owners should be held criminally responsible (assault/manslaughter) for at fault dog bites. Fines do not deter irresponsible dog owners.
- Increase fines for pets at large. An unsupervised pet can get into trouble and hurt themselves and others.
- I don't support breed specific legislation! There should be a higher focus on owner responsibility not specific dog breeds.
- More Russian tortoise captive breeds in Canada plz
- No
- It is not the breed of the dog it is the owner and the training.
- Need to control number of rescue pets being brought into the city. Calgary has many adoption pets already, do not import more.
- I don't support restricting backyard wild bird feeding. It's a personal choice that comes with personal responsibility.
- I am afraid of dogs. Owners need to shoulder responsibility for the actions of their dogs. Barking is sorta' like a car alarm, no?
- No extra ideas at the moment.
- Too much regulation is bad. Especially for things like bird feeders on private property and urban agriculture. We are not compliant drones.



- A lot of little dogs are highly aggressive and cause dog fights. Little dogs need more training not large breeds.
- A lot of parents can't control their kids but expect animals to act perfect all the time. Take responsibility for your kids and phobias.
- I don't agree with breed specific. Many, many pit bulls are kind and gentle, loveable, and well trained.
- Retailers and breeders of dogs should be required to keep records and test potential owners. The test should include bite prevention.
- Breed specific legislation does not work and puts animals at risk who pose to threat to the community. Make owners more accountable,
- I think 6 dogs AND 6 cats is too many within city limits.
- Cats should be allowed to be outside . Calgary is one of a very few cities to impose restrictions on cats . Rather ban all off leash dogs .
- A bylaw prohibiting the feeding of wildlife on private property should not prohibit the feeding of birds or use of bird feeders.
- .
- Education and licensing of pet owners, for ownership of exotic or animals / dogs over certain size.
- Enforcement of barking dogs seldom leads to a resolution, how can a chicken coop smell go any better?
- I believe if an animal causes property damage, injury to people or another animal, the owner should be held liable for the damages.
- Breed specific legislation is wrong; it assumes one breed is stronger/more aggressive and others are less. We must educate/train people!
- 6 dogs and 6 cats per household is way too many.
- A definite no to chicken coops and their smell!
- Legislating against backyard of feeding wild birds is ridiculous. Feeding protects rarer species; it's also good for our well-being.
- I really hope you leave the bird feeders alone. Punish the owners of cats who don't wear a collar killing my birds instead
- I would actually love to explain an idea, but this format restricts the number of spaces I can type. This is [removed]!
- We have a lot of dog parks however we need more. It is imperative especially in times of covid and it's fall out that we have pets.
- No we do not
- There should be some education around wild animals and the city should consider partnering with other groups; to reach more people.
- No idea.
- No



- Bird feeders need to be allowed. Livestock belong on larger spaces in the country (chickens included).
- No
- Little dogs jaws may not lock but they can be very vicious. It is up to the owner to know the dogs personality and treat it accordingly.
- All dog owners should be required to take mandatory pet training program before a licence is given. This includes temper, obedience and
- People who own(ed) dangerous animals involved in incidents should be barred from further ownership of large animals for 2 years within city.
- None at the moment.
- Love cats and dogs but do not want them using my property for their toilet.
- City of Calgary should ban firepits. Smoke can be excessive, hard on people with lung issues, danger of fire that can spread to other homes
- None that I can think of at this time
- Wild bird feeders should not be banned. However, feeding squirrels should be.
- Early warning system. Would rather kids ask permission first from parents then owners. Even the best behaved dogs can over react.
- A city supported, spay/neuter program for low income households.
- If you do include something about feeding wildlife, please explicitly ensure that we will still be able to feed wild birds.
- Fines for not picking up after our dogs should be posted in green spaces and parks. Fines should be enforced.
- "6 cats and 6 dogs. It should be a cumulative total significantly less than 6.
- What is the justification for banning bird feeders?"
- Only if declared a nuisance
- Higher level of enforcement of cats running loose and of any animals defecating on other peoples property, if it is not cleaned up.
- I would support a req't for mandatory training/licensing for owners before purchasing dogs (i.e. similar to vehicle license).
- The City should NEVER consider having a breed specific law
- If the City of Calgary wants to imement dog-breed specific bylaws, the City should fund the DNA tests required to prove breed
- No breed specific legislation. You are promoting uneducated ideologies.
- It would make more sense to me if the pet owner were required to pay the fine to the injured party rather than to the city.
- No one within the city limits should have pigeons. They are dirty and there is enough flying around downtown!
- Neighbours should be considered or surveyed before pigeons are allowed in the neighbourhood.
- Encourage people to get their pets from rescue organizations rather than breeders.



- "NO LAWS FOR PITBULLS
- THEIR BEHAVIOUR IS AT THE FAULT OF THEIR OWNERS NOT THE BREED"
- People should be fined for feeding pigeons on grain on open trays or on the ground on their property.
- Enforcement of wandering cats. No different than letting a dog wander -not okay. Much higher fines are needed to get people to learn.
- The idea of banning the feeding of birds on private property shows how foolish Calgary has become. Feeding birds properly is a good thing!!
- No
- Do not ban bird feeders or baths
- Remove licensing requirements altogether. Or at minimum make it lifetime, repeated registration is only a cash grab by governments.
- Regulate children so they don't chase/touch a stranger's dog. My big dog was chased by a small child on a scooter yelling "puppy"!
- I think your fines for dog violations (eg. biting another dog or human etc) are in line. Victims can choose to sue.
- Breed specific bans do not work. There should be more education for responsible pet ownership. Heavier fines for puppy and kitten mills.
- I think the biggest challenge is having rules that aren't enforced. If there is no monitoring, rules aren't followed.
- Can not think of anything else.
- Other strong dogs - Shepherds, Huskies, Dogo Argentino, Rottweiler, Malamute, St Bernard, Bernese, Boxers, Cane Corso. Can't ban them all.
- A 3 digit ph. no. to call to report a nuisance or dangerous dog. Mandatory obedience training before issuing dog license.
- No
- The City of Calgary should immediately adopt breed specific legislation that removes "pit bull"-like breeds from the city.
- Look at all the discussion around problems with dogs and cats. And the city wants to allow 6 dogs and 6 cats per household. I say no.
- Calgary is a great pet friendly city ,let's keep it that way. Responsible ownership is up to my neighbours without new rules or licence's.
- Homing pigeons are OK as long as the owner is responsible. Otherwise the pigeon is a wild bird and can not be caged.
- Chickens are legal in most major world-class cities, surely Calgarians are responsible enough to have a few hens
- Do not ban backyard bird feeders or bird baths. They are part of the urban environment - encourage nature appreciation.
- Bylaws only as good as enforced! Leave neighbours out of each other's business - higher fines for non-compliance will help keep the peace!



- None
- Recommend that people who want to add a pet to their family, try the Humane Society or Pet Rescue Organizations. This saves animals' lives!
- Off leash areas absolutely need more enforcement. Many owners allow their dogs to be out of control on city pathways and on private property
- Backyard hens would be such a great addition to the city, they are not understood today and this is a great way to show people.
- Allow backyard hens, they are not nearly as disruptive as other pets and provide food security and foster good neighbour relations.
- Wish it was easier to complain about barking.
- Register all exotic pets, such as snakes; especially if they could potentially be invasive environmentally or dangerous if released.
- Chickens are awesome pets and provide eggs to share with neighbours! What a great way to support communities.
- Backyard chickens are the best pets, they have shown to encourage good relations with neighbours and who doesn't love eggs.
- We should be able to feed the wild birds and squirrels on our own private property!
- Let us have chickens, they make great pets.
- higher fines for dog owners who take the time to bag their dog's feces, but then drop the bags along their route instead of disposing proper
- Allow ducks in addition to chickens.
- Require neighbor approval for having livestock and hens.
- Dog walkers should not be arbitrarily limited to a given number of dogs.
- more by-laws that protect animals. lots of protection for humans but but what if the dog is being abused/provoked?
- Fines should exist where a person is found to make fraudulent or unnecessary complaints about an animal.
- Higher fines for barking, make it easier to report repeated barking (online) and the option of animals confiscated/ownership ban
- Man kills daughter while driving impaired gets 5.5 yrs only and the city wants to implement BSL, instead of getting to the root of the problem
- Livestock can safely be incorporated into cities and can support health communities. Backyard hens are a great example of this.
- Housing and food costs are high, with an uncertain future we need to support families with livestock, backyard hens are a great for eggs
- Backyard hens make less noise or the same as dogs. Why would I need permission from my neighbour? It's good to be less reliant on stores.
- Chickens are minimally noticeable, they can easily incorporate into an urban setting without neighbour disruption.



- Have no more ideas
- Offer subsidized training for all dogs to ensure early education before becoming a problem.
- Yes to chickens. Limited with proper set up for them. No to livestock like goats, pigs, cows, horses, Lamas, Alpacas, etc.
- Ownership and care of domestic rabbits needs to be addressed. There need to be increased fines for animal abuse, neglect, and abandonment.
- Backyard hens are a great addition to the city.
- Restrictions for problem owners only please, however Pitbull type dogs need more restrictions than they have now
- Urban livestock can be a great addition to a city and done in a responsible manner can help encourage positive community interaction
- Small dog off leash areas. There is one in Airdrie which is awesome, Calgary needs to catch up!
- We need less red tape and fewer new initiatives such as this that increase spending of taxpayer dollars. Pet bylaws are fine as is!
- The fine money from attacks/bites needs to go to the victim !!!
- The City must do a much better job in enforcing the bylaws whose purpose is to ban off-leashed dogs from using on-leash areas.
- No
- Professional dog walkers need to be licensed and no more than 5 dogs at a time ! They can be a real nuisance especially in shared areas.
- Just curious to know what dog breed will be blamed after BSL doesn't work. Asking so I don't have to deal with ignorant people in the future
- breed targeted bylaws do not work!!! responsible pet ownership. responsible pet classes; the same as drinking and driving classes!
- "Like [personal information removed] said ""Punishing responsible owners with discriminating breed laws makes life time
- adversaries I for one will be protesting"
- Not waste money on implementing bylaws for pit bulls. There are no bad dogs, just bad owners. Punish wrongdoers, not breeds!
- I'm ashamed that my city is offering breed specific legislation.
- I've been wishing for so many years for not a municipal not a provincial but a nation wide government funded low spay/neuter program for all
- Do not implement BSL in Calgary. Very disappointing to hear you are even considering it.
- It all depends on the owner and how the animal is cared for. We really need to look at proper ownership not looking at the innocent dogs.
- Restricting how many dogs a dog walker can exercise at a time
- Re: legalizing chickens. Both Edmonton and Vancouver have sucessfully allowed chickens inner city. Of course we can do the same in YYC!



- Chickens allowed in other major cities have proven to be no more noisy or smelly than dogs or cats. If anything they have proven to be less
- I think the idea of chickens inner city seems a bit unorthodox. However if we make it just as regulated as Edmonton did, it can be successful
- Do not apply restrictions and requirements around the type of pet breed (such as a pitbull) All breeds should be treated equally.
- I'm shocked that currently pigeons are allowed but chickens are not? They are both birds... Lets give chickens a chance!
- Owners of Pit bulls and nuisance dogs need to have training as well as the dogs.
- No breed specific bylaws. In order to license a dog, an owner must prove obedience/behavior training has been completed.
- Obedience training should be incentivized for dog owners regardless of breed. Perhaps a system of lower license fees with proof of training?
- Enforce the off leash dog problem in all on leash areas. It keeps other animals and people safer. That's why the law is there.
- We should have zero tolerance for dogs that bite adults or children.
- Shame on City council to think about imposing breed specific legislation or bylaws. It is unfair and prejudiced
- Spaying/neutering should be heavily subsidized - it would likely take down the costs of animal services and break even in the long run.
- I want the City to stop enabling puppy mills. Pets should be either purchased from reputable breeders, or preferably adopted from rescues.
- Have bird feeders and bird baths in our yards. Feed wild birds on our own property.
- I fully support hens and would consider other livestock that support families as well.
- Even with regulations, it won't stop accidents, irresponsible owners will still find other ("illegal") ways to get pitbulls. Sad but true.
- I'm tired of innocent people getting extremely hurt by pitbulls. Yes other dogs bite, even more often. But not as severe as pits. Not fair.
- Recently a dog was killed by another dog. Handler fined \$350 total. Why not the \$1000 fine for dog causing death to an animal?
- Most of these problems could be solved by communicating with your neighbours like respectful adults.
- No tolerance for dogs running loose in on leash areas! More enforcement of offenders! Leashed dogs = no attacks!
- Dogs are being walked daily on the paths around the Glenmore Reservoir even though it is posted 'no dogs'. Increase policing please.
- Do not prohibit feeding birds. Offer advice in this area on your website.
- More policing in Crescent Heights near Rotary Park. People walk dogs off leash daily on the way to the off leash area in the park.



- Strict fines and enforcement for dog fighting and using innocent animals for bait. No breed specific legislation
- Chickens please
- The pleasure people get from watching birds at a backyard feeder is immeasurable. Do not prohibit feeding birds!
- Breed specific legislation and bylaws are wrong and prejudiced
- Strict laws and enforcement against dog fighting and using innocent animals as bait. No breed specific legislation or bylaws
- No breed specific legislation
- Banning a specific breed seems unfair. BUT innocent people getting extremely harmed or KILLED is more unfair. Sorry but Ban pitbulls please
- Bird feeders should be allowed, and there should be higher fines for free roaming cats that eat city songbirds.
- Breed specific legislation is misguided and proven to be inefficient
- It should be a good rule for dogs and cats living together
- Yes to Chickens in YYC. By having inspectors and regulations, it will be a great opportunity to create more jobs for our local economy.
- Home owners should be able to feed wild birds on their own property.
- People shouldn't have to register their pet with the city. The city does not provide any specific service to pet owners.
- Bird feeding and putting up bird houses should be allowed, due to decline in numbers of birds. Also protect wetlands.
- I love that you are trying to help animals and every dog is the best dog! Humans need to be better educated so their dogs don't suffer!
- More consideration should be given to whether an owner is responsible for the type of dog they own. No bad dogs, only bad owners.
- No, I do not.
- There shouldn't be BSL. I have been attacked by a different breed when I was 6 years old and witnessed a child attacked by a German shepherd
- We lost our little 7-lb Tabasco a few times, and the City of Calgary was so helpful in returning him safely home. Thank you for the service!
- Pets are a privilege, not a right. Stronger legislation against backyard breeders is needed, there are already too many homeless animals!
- I really think irresponsible pet owners should be held to account and not punish responsible pet owners or pets because of the breed.
- The most aggressive dogs I've seen have been border collies. Breed isn't the problem, uncontrolled off leash dogs are.
- All dogs off leash should be muzzled with a humane muzzle to prevent bites and other dangerous incidents.



- The process of renting a cat trap from the city should be made easier so Calgarians can more easily catch lost cats.
- It would be nice to have reduced fees for multiple pet homes.
- If you try to ban bird feeders I'll make them a requirement of my mental health.
- More off leash and fenced dog parks are needed. This encourages healthy dogs and healthy calgarians. Invest in health and wellness, it pays
- Hens would be a great way to help communities understand how neighbour friendly they can be.
- I would prefer to see the City have people prove that their dog is receiving appropriate training versus branding breeds as good or bad.
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work, and Calgary has the largest research group and body of work in the country regarding this. Remove.
- Education for dog owners? Most won't pay or go. BSL expensive for city? So is education. Keep dogs in their yard and on leash in public.
- I would like to see more bylaws protecting animals from neglectful and abusive owners . Higher fines, more restrictions.
- DO NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST DOG BREEDS!! Certain dog breeds are more aggressive like chihuahuas, PIT BULLS ARE NOT aggressive by nature
- Rules needed for people with kids in an off leash area, don't let them chase dogs etc. Remove breed specifics as not necessary.
- BSL will NOT change irresponsible owners
- Focus on education, not breed specific legislation.
- Take bike paths out of mixed use Parks and make them off leash parks. Cyclists can take the road rather than cutting through my dog park
- Dog owners need to be more aware of non dog owners and cyclists. The world is not your dog park. On leash areas need better enforcement.
- We need FREE spay and neuter programs. We euthinize far too many animals in this city. Its shameful. We spend money on frivolous art !
- There should be warning people signage for idiots who run/jog through dogs in dog parks. How stupid can you be. Run elsewhere.
- Calgary has been one of the few cities I know without an animal limit or a BSL. Let's stay progressive!
- More bylaw officers are needed to enforce any of these bylaws or else what is the point? Now: very slow process with few resolutions.
- Do not discriminate on the basis of breed.
- Instead of euthanasia or fines, there should be free training courses offered for those with "nuisance" animals.
- I support anything that fosters well being, community and food security, water security, harmony with ecology
- 2 incidents w/small dogs not being controlled and getting away from owners both charged at me. Why is this not an issue?



- Pet licenses need a signed contract of understanding re: humane treatment so bylaw is understood. Animals without licences need HUGE fines
- BSL is damaging and ineffective. Pet owners need to be responsible and accountable for their pet(s).
- Your comments regarding feeding of wildlife were really vague. Birds should be an exception everywhere. Teasing not tolerated but feeding?
- I would like to be allowed to walk my dog through the school yard to pick up my children from school or the park. (on leash under control)
- "Feeding of birds should be limited. Balance is key. Perhaps a limited size and amount could be agreed upon.
- Owners must clean up areas"
- Lower license fees for lower income is a terrible idea .. if you can't afford a license maybe you can't afford a pet
- Mandatory insurance required for all dogs that includes mandatory training, for all areas off leash or on
- Dogs with insurance and yearly training can be off leash anywhere. All dogs off leash must have visible markings to ensure compliance.
- No
- Why do cats have to be licensed if they are fully indoors and do not set foot outside?
- No licensing for indoor only cats. 6 dogs and 6 cats per house is too many. There too many issues with animals now, problems will increase.
- Two suggestions for dog parks. First - prohibit bikes which are a safety concern. Second - enforce fines for not picking up after your dog.
- Six is way too many. This will cause more health issues then should occur. Licensing should be reduced for spayed/neutered animals.
- No
- Info in public venues about how to safeguard the wildlife with whom we share the city. Ex. Dogs can trample nests, ducks can't eat dry bread
- Dogs should be on leash near anywhere there are vehicles like bikes or cars. All dog parks need fences around them to prevent accidents.
- "Don't just ban a breed. Concentrate on the nuisance dogs.
- On bird feeders there is no problem - just keep it clean. They brighten my day."
- Don't want BSL or Pitbull's banned? Get control of them. It wouldn't be a discussion if there wasn't a problem. There's your fact! Yes BSL.
- 6 cats and 6 dogs. Yes way too many. More chance of them not being cared for and not controlling them.
- ...
- Ultrasonic Anti-Bark Device: harmless, silent, cheap, happy neighbours AND a calmer, happier, more confident and less insecure dog I promise



- Why were signs of no dogs in playgrounds taken down? Bring them back Also I think we need signs that this park I leasr green space is NOT off
- Give the seniors a break and allow them to enjoy the love and companionship of a pet without gouging them on licensing.
- Animal noise (barking dogs or otherwise) should not be audible by neighbors. Consistent animal noise constitutes a nuisance animal.
- Without enforcement, a 'rule' is just a 'recommendation'. Current bylaw enforcement rates are very low.
- No extra ideas
- Easier reporting of barking dogs. Enforcement is essential for compliance.
- STOP SELLING ANIMALS AT PET STORES ADOPT DON'T SHOP
- cats or dogs the seller " breeder" need a number permis to certified him and can be inspected for animal welfare and need to put # on adds
- Stop targeting the dog especially based on breed - BSL is a failure the world over
- I don't have an idea
- Start enforcing our current bylaws
- The city needs to stop with this BSL language and start offering bite prevention programs accompanied with enforcement of current bylaws
- BSL really??? Because of what MAY happen! How about using your time to actually investigate real bite reports. This includes ALL breeds
- Pitbulls killed more kids in North America every year for the last 2 decades than all other breeds combined. We need a complete pitbull ban.
- Decisions based on fear, prejudice and discrimination never have good outcomes. The data does not support BSL to solve issue but costs more\$
- Cats shouldn't be off leash and there should be a bigger fine if you see a cat on your backyard (cat using your backyard as toilet)
- Most ppl go about their daily lives with no bad interaction w/ dogs. Stop trying to punish responsible owners. Go after criminals/abusers.
- Most ppl go about their daily lives with no bad interaction w/ dogs. Stop trying to punish responsible owners. Go after criminals/abusers.
- There are too many poo bags being thrown into yards or alleys near off-leash parks. There should be more containers near the perimeters.
- Humans are the dangerous ones. More enforcement needed for IRRESPONSIBLE owners!
- Called city for every day dogs off leash going to off leash area. They said not enough ppl to patrol areas. Need to enforce rules they have
- Living near an off leash park is a problem with dogs off leash outside the park. Can't go outside with out being approach by a loose dog.
- Don't increase number of cats/dogs in a house. Vets are so costly. Healthcare of pet will decline. Especially with age.



- Shame on YYC for even suggesting BSL. Increase fines, hold individual owners accountable and actually enforce current bylaws. No to BSL.
- Leave neighbors out of ppl getting chickens. City limit the amount and check for proper housing. No one asks neighbor if getting more pets
- There should NOT be any breed specific legislation (pitbull targeting) passed in this bylaw reform. It's unproven and ridiculous assumptions
- The bunnies in mission are very therapeutic for many people. Could there be a neuter program for the males? I would hate to see a cull.
- You potentially want to discourage bird feeders in my yard but my neighbours smelly fire pit stinking up my house is ok?
- Breed Specific Legislation is outdated and is not effective- why is this even being considered?!
- Establish minimum training/socialization requirements for every puppy or adopted dog, with obligation to provide evidence within a deadline.
- Calgary, if a person complains about an actual problem. Don't just shrug it off. Check it out and fine if bylaw infraction.
- Breed Specific Legislation is outdated and is not effective. Disappointed in this council for considering this.
- My pitbull is a senior. He has never hurt anything in his life. Pretty dumb he would have to wear a muzzle his last couple years.
- Please do NOT add BSL. [Personal information removed] has a tremendous legacy. Consider breeding standards and positive reinforcement training standards.
- "There should NOT be any breed-specific legislation (pitbull targeting) passed in this bylaw reform. It's unproven and ridiculous.
- I am a responsible pet owner and I don't see what I should be punished for others' mistakes and lack of responsibility.
- BSL is completely ridiculous and misinformed. Shame on our government for considering this...
- More bylaw officers are required no matter what new pet rules are established.
- Inflict stricter laws on irresponsible pet owners... bigger fines, proof of obedience training if they have been identified an issue ,etc.
- How are you going to enforce off-leash dogs in on-leash areas? This by-law is not being enforced and these new rules don't address that.
- All fines should escalate for repeat offenders. People get too many warnings (offleash dogs etc) and have no intention of following rules
- "VERY SIMPLE
- Spay/Neuter pets
- Keep them under control
- Socialize
- Know your breed
- DO NOT PUNISH RESPONSIBLE OWNERS



- NO TO BSL"
- .
- Breed specific legislation will not address the root cause of the problems. Punish the irresponsible pet owners, not a "breed";
- Cats kill wildlife when they are allowed to roam. People aren't being fined for this by-law already. Enforce this by-law!
- Yes to hens!
- Allowing for chickens in backyards really expands food security
- N/A
- The fact that the law was change requiring indoor cats to have licenses is just plain greedy. Stop using everything possible to gain money.
- Please dont put rules for specific breeds. It is the raising not the breed. I fully support nuisance dog classes but NOT based on breed
- With the ability to pay online no need to spend money to expand how people can pay for their licence.
- Chicken
- There should NOT be any breed-specific legislation, to me this is equivalent to racial profiling in humans.
- There NEEDS to be stricter rules on what is considered an acceptable environment for pets and how they are treated (ex. Overuse of kennels)
- N/a
- I want chickens in my back yard!!!!!!!!!!
- How will all these additional bylaws will be enforced when bylaws officers seem unable to deal with the current level of complaints
- I would love to see better control of cats that are not licensed. Also better control of off-leash dogs in leash required areas.
- Feral cats should not be re-released even if spayed or neutered. They kill and injure native wildlife <https://catsandbirds.ca/>
- Kids under 12 should NOT be allowed in dog parks!!! You have parks for kids, let my dog have her dog park!!!
- Cyclists need to be banned from dog parks, it's dangerous to the cyclist and to all dogs the cyclist passes by!!
- No.
- Pitbulls were responsible for every one of the 14 dog on dog fatalities in Calgary last year. Pitbulls are the problem. Ban them please.
- Dogs who consistently bark should have to wear a bark collar.
- It should be illegal to set kill traps outside.
- There is a serious problem with some people not leashing their dogs or leaving full poo bags in the park and not disposing of them properly



- Allow backyard hens! No more or less of a nuisance to the owners or community than cats/dogs, assuming they're taken care of properly.
- in calm traffic area, leave the roaming cats alone, as they control mice population.
- I think that feeding wildlife and teasing wildlife should be separated into two questions. Feeding birds with a birdfeeder is common.
- Chickens are allowed pretty much in every other city... Please can I have some... Please?
- When buying a pet licence, you must provide a DNA sample. If your pet's poo is found, you get fined.
- Q2. Are birds wildlife? I can't answer this question as feeding birds is not the same as feeding squirrels or other animals.
- I would like more fencing around off-leash parks, especially in multi-use spaces where owners often ignore transitions to leashed areas.
- Re-define "nuisance". A dog cited for noise is not the same as a dog cited for dangerous or uncontrolled behaviour.
- if there are no restrictions to breed of animals, there should be no restrictions on back yard hens
- People who bag poo and leave it should be fined double.
- Enforcement at dog parks eves/weekends should generate more than enough tickets to pay their staff salaries and improve overall experience.
- It is illegal to kill a bird with a BB gun in the city, so why is it okay for people to let their cats roam freely and kill birds?
- FULLY fence smaller neighbourhood offleash parks so dogs can be trained in more controlled environment vs. huge parks like Sue Higgins.
- Need more signs for dogs on leash. I've been in on leash areas like weaselhead and people have dogs off leash calling it a dog park.
- Free roaming cats attract coyotes into the city. There should be stricter enforcement and fines for roaming cats.
- Education campaign needed - animal poisons (alcohol, caffeine, tobacco, cannabis, fish hooks) often left in dog parks.
- Education campaign needed for BOTH dog owners AND those sharing parks. Dog behaviour, cyclists, kids and parents' responsibilities, wildlife.
- Muzzling and Lack of socialization DOES lead to aggression issues. This is insane and irresponsible. You are setting the dogs up to fail.
- A dog is a animal—which is exactly why the owner needs to be in complete control and be responsible for their dog. Do not agree w/BSL
- I would honestly love it if the first time an individual applies to license a pet, they have to take a course on responsible pet ownership.
- Nothing to add at this time.
- All off leash dogs should be muzzled.
- How about licensing owners? Can you prove you can be a responsible owner? If so, license granted, if not, no license and no pets.



- .
- Backyard bird feeders help Calgarians learn about wildlife and promote nature conservation. Please exclude bird feeders from the bylaw.
- No further ideas
- ?
- We had 2 pitbull attacks on kids in front of our house last year. The N.E. is so full of them you can barely walk outside. Very unsafe.
- None
- In off leash parks some people do pick up dog feces BUT they leave the bag beside the pathway. Add to signage not to do this. Provide bins
- Instead of tags, have a tattoo or microchip as an identifier. Indoor cats-no lic/Sr no fees, breeders should max litters per yr and licensed
- These changes don't go far enough. A complete ban on pitbulls is the only way to protect kids in our city.
- Do not regulate ability to feed birds. Hens and other animals would allow control over pests (ants and slugs) allowing for natural pest control
- No
- I am against pigeons in residential communities as my mother, suffers from restrictive cement lung from cleaning her Dad's coop as a child
- Outdoor cats cause needless suffering to a lot of small wildlife in Calgary (such as songbirds). No free roaming cats!
- Fines for animal attacks causing injury or death should be much, much higher.
- Breed specific banning is NOT the answer. Responsible pet ownership IS -, no matter what the breed
- Breed banning is NOT the problem. It's the bad owners who raise bad pets!
- Chickens can be healthy and easily contained within the city. Please support food sovereignty so we can thrive in years to come.
- way stiffer penalties for cats at large. They can get hurt (cars, animals) and cause issues for neighbours (spraying, defecating , fighting)
- Targeting specific breeds like pit bulls is not the answer. Improve access to education programs for responsible dog ownership of ALL breeds
- Bird feeders are a wonderful way to experience wildlife within our city and should be allowed on private property.
- Take seriously concerns with coyotes. They leave disgusting droppings in off leash areas. Expensive vet bills and very sick animals result
- NO BSL - more severe consequences for owners with violent dogs (all breeds).
- Still say toss this amendment out
- No free roaming cats. Protect our dwindling wild bird population.
- None



- Pitbull attacks in the N.E. are a weekly occurrence. You can't let your children out to play in some communities it's such an issue.
- Enforcement of leash rules in spaces and pathways adjacent to off-leash parks. Eg. Sandy Beach Park and paths near + across the Glenmore Dam
- No not really!
- Na
- If city is willing to spend the money for BSL enforcement. Why can't they increase officers and enforcement of bylaws they already have?
- I would only support voluntary green bandanas for dog approachability. Red or orange would only work if every owner used them.
- M
- There needs to be more education/penalties for purposefully releasing your pet into the wild (fish, rabbits, birds, rodents, etc)
- Actually enforce bylaws, I'm at the off-leash parks daily and have never seen any enforcement people.
- No license for indoor cats.
- Leave neighbors out of getting chickens. Mine didn't ask me when he got 2 pit bulls that keep breaking the fence trying to get to my Pom.
- Teasing and feeding wild animals should not be in same question. It's not the same thing. Keep us feeding wild birds. It's not teasing them.
- No to dog and cat increase. 6 each is too much! It will increase current problems! Controlling them and their well being!
- Bylaw officers seem to only show up at On and Off leash parks when there is an attack reported. They need regular patrolling.
- Another shooting city should focus on the increased crime and not on BSL
- No BSL, it unnecessarily punished the dog. We need more owner education so that they understand the needs of the breed they are adopting.
- We need more education for cat owners who still think it's okay to let their cats roam free outdoors.
- More enforcement is needed in neighbourhoods and trails adjacent to off leash parks. Too many people claim on leash areas are "dog parks";.
- Please enforce neutral, case-by-case legislation for all animals and dogs. Please not Breed Specific Legislation against pitbull types
- What about [personal information removed] 4 principles? This multi step program, which emphasizes holder the owner accountable. It works! NO to BSL!
- Yes please CRUELTY to animals, people whom are CRUEL to animals should be banned for life from having any kind of animal!!
- License fee waived for neutered animals adopted from shelters and rescues.
- Owners who let their cats roam free should face negligence charges if those pets are injured/killed by cars, wildlife or harmed otherwise.



- "More control for the future owner, their ability to handle animal.
- More fines for abandon and violence against animals."
- Reduce cat licence fee if cat owner buys a harness to walk their cat outside. Promotes responsibility among cat owners. Fewer roaming cats
- Larger dogs should wear muzzles at all times when outside of their property. Even when on a leash in the street they can still bite.
- Please do not punish bully breeds for existing. Any dog can bite in the right circumstances many "family" dogs have a worse history!!
- If pet owners don't want to train the dogs to not bark then the dogs should only be let outside when needing to go to the bathroom.
- I think Calgary needs to become more dog friendly: take them to malls, offices, restaurants. Register the dog with the mall....
- Increased education for families so that there is understanding that children should not approach dogs without permission from the owner.
- I think you should be allowed to run your dog with a bike as long as it is with the proper safe riding equipment.
- Fines for people taking non service dogs into grocery stores and restaurants. It is disgusting and also quite scary as I am afraid of dogs.
- I don't think you need a breed specific by laws. You need owner specific by laws. If a dog, regardless of breed bites, look to the owner.
- Do not implement ANY BSL. BSL is discriminatory, unnecessary and ineffective.
- Request the owner (not the dog) to take training classes to understand the pet's needs to address excessive barking
- I believe all dogs are are good. They learn bad habits from the direction of their owners. Carry a loaded gun and it goes off, it is on you.
- No
- More off leash parks in the downtown area. Many vacant lots/under utilized spaces. High density pop, no yards, gentrify vacant lots for pups
- I believe owner of animals should have them under control at all times, dogs should be on leash unless a off leash area or private property
- I don't like the idea of singling out certain breeds as the owners of any animal need to take responsibility for behaviour of the animal.
- It should be against the law to keep pigeons. I am currently having to pay for a roofer to repair roof issues caused by pigeon droppings.
- I think rental properties should not be able to restrict the ownership of pets and renters should be able to have cats or dogs.
- Breeds should not be singled out
- Use statistics and not feelings to address BSL. Some dogs are more dangerous. Numbers don't lie.
- "For backyard chickens:



- Hefty fines for slaughtering their own chickens and different licence depending on pet/sanctuary or egg laying"
- Mandatory spay and neuter unless a licensed breeder.
- Please no increase on how many dogs and cat in a household.
- Nearly every serious dog attack on a person or animal in the last 5 years in our city was a pitbull. Hence the bylaw change.
- Na
- Mandatory spay and neuter unless a licensed breeder and more serious consequences for animal abusers.
- No pit bull ban — consider education or training courses for people who wish to own that breed of dog. Responsibility should be on the owner
- No
- "Regulate pet noise:
- Barking/whining/calling for >5 minutes straight or > 1hour/day maximum. Repeat offenders must be kept indoors 9pm-9am."
- "How does introducing BSL stop unrestricted breeds from biting?"
- I STRONGLY SUPPORT A BREED NEUTRAL BYLAW"
- This is insane!!! Stop this muzzle bad dogs not happy dogs
- No
- None
- Yall are monsters and should be ashamed for supporting animal abuse.
- Clearly people are making up stories here. Fact Toronto banned pit bulls and the number of dog attacks has gone up not down.
- "Pit Bull" is a description and not a breed. Don't punish a dog for how it looks because it has a bad owner. Punish the bad owner.
- By law officers are not always around to see poor behaviour - any way for a citizen to report an occurrence (picture?)
- An owner should be given a warning to get their dogs behavior changed if they bite a dog.
- No pit bull ban...Owners need to be educated if they want own a pit bull, if the dog is raised to be friendly, there would be no aggression.
- Stop generalizing dogs based on their appearance. Behaviour is learned, not inherited. Blame the owners
- Have higher fines for owners who allow their pets to run in on-leash areas (or areas where dogs aren't even allowed, like athletic parks)
- I think it is shameful that people would judge a specific breed. This bylaw is fuelling a stereotype that simply is not true.
- Pigeons do not belong in Calgary Urban areas, get rid of this backwards bylaw.
- Nothing that comes to mind at the moment.
- There should be fines for owners who let their dogs chase pedestrians and cyclists.



- Increase fines for owners who let their cats wander outside illegally. It can fund more enforcement for these sorts of things.
- Cities that banned breeds did not reduce bite incidents. BSL costs millions per year to fail public safety. Don't waste my tax dollars
- I want to see laws and regulations put in place to reprimand owners who r mistreating animals
- Dogs in public and private property
- At large cat capture information needs to be available. BSL's are a waste of time and money and only cause stress to responsible pet owners.
- NA
- N/A
- Only wildlife allowed on private parties should be song birds.
- For the comment on feeding wildlife.... please exclude birds. A lot of people have bird feeders. The bird need food during the winter.
- info about places/programs for behavior training should be provided and low income households should have it funded if theyre unable to pay
- There should be much harsher penalties for mistreating animals.
- I don't think neighbours should have the right to approve/disapprove of hens. It really does not affect them in any way.
- Training need to be more of a focus! Training for dog owners and education for parents - how to read dog body language, how to treat a dog,
- I do not support breed-specific legislation. It is unsuccessful, costly and dangerous. I support preventative training and education. Deal w
- Letting cats wander outside (to get hit by cars, stolen, and eaten by coyotes) should be treated with the same severity as animal neglect.
- Breed neutral rules will address actual aggressive dogs (they come in a breeds). Animal temperament is far more than a breed issue No to BSL
- Hens please and feeding wild birds.
- Please enforce leash law more. If person tells owner to put their dog on a leash it usually causes problems. Think they are entitled.
- Urban hens would be a great addition to the current pet bylaw.
- no
- Please enforce leash laws better. Entitled dog owners ruin city green spaces for the rest of us.
- more controls for owners that do not train their animals. majority of attacks are at off leash parks because owners can't control their dogs
- Please license the dog walkers so we have responsible individuals doing this job. Also, limit the number of dogs they are allowed to have
- A dog of any breed can inflict severe damage. It is wrong to stigmatize "pitbulls" as dangerous when we know that it is the owner who is res



- Cities that banned pitbulls saw a large decrease in dog bites requiring reconstructive surgery. Dogs bite. Pitbulls maul.
- Nearly all serious attacks that result in severe injury or death are pitbull attacks. Decades of statistical evidence shows this. Ban them.
- Last year in Calgary every single dog killed by another dog was killed by a pitbull or pitbull cross. I support banning them.
- Distinction between legal service dogs and emotional support animals. Im sick of people lying and bringing their pets in restaurants
- A mandatory online course with every license on basic needs and management of animal being licensed. And a basic course on animal behaviour.
- I find that Calgary wanting to change from being the leader in responsible pet ownership to targeting a specific breed absolutely appalling.
- I'm furious Calgary is considering breed specific rules against pitbulls, when will people learn that it is NOT about breed but the OWNER?!
- There should be more understanding about at- large animals. Its not always the owner's fault their animal is running loose.
- stray cats are unsafe for the cat, as well as kill all the birds and ruin peoples gardens. Catch and fine free range cats
- I don't mind giving people who are financially disadvantaged a break on their pet's annual license fee, providing it is only for one pet.
- If someone is forced to turn in a pet due to financial hardship, I believe that they should be able to do that without having to pay a fee.
- stop picking on pit bulls! if you look at the stats, shepherds have the highest stats for biting!
- Much higher fines for repeat offenders. Third offence revoke pet licence. Privilege, not a right to impose your animal on others in public
- We can't judge humans by their appearance so why is it okay to judge dogs? Stop bashing and start teaching!!!
- Pitbulls are not a problem, it's the owners. They are loyal dogs and will follow what their owner is doing, good or bad
- Targeting pit bulls is ridiculous. Go after irresponsible owners. And who would define what looks like a pit bull?
- Please let us have our Hens, this would be a huge step in getting us reconnected with our food.
- Backyard hens should be allowed. Positive impacts would be increased food supply and better understanding of where food comes from.
- It is unnecessary to use pit bulls specifically, it should state ALL large dog breeds that could seriously harm someone or another animal.
- Why is it so hard to understand that BSL will not stop bad owners from owning aggressive dogs. Start cracking down on the owners
- The money it will cost to implement BSL should be used to hire more officers so they can enforce our current bylaws. NO TO BSL



- BSL is not effective in reducing bites and is very expensive to implement. Do not approve of my tax dollars being spent so carelessly
- If colored leashes are used...children still need to be educated on how to approach and behave around dogs.
- We have signs when an area is off leash, why don't we have them when it's on leash. More important! Especially at entrances.
- Backyard hens should be allowed in Calgary. Vancouver has allowed them for approximately the last 10 years. Why is this city so "backwards"
- Bully breeds are actually very gentle. They are no more dangerous than other dogs. They actually do better in temperament test than Labs.
- I do not support BSL. I am very disappointed to see breed specific language in this survey. BSL is not effective at reducing dog bites.
- Re: Fines and increases - increase those related to issues/problems in Calgary not on what other jurisdiction impose.
- Like children, dogs need to be taught how to behave. Many people think dogs learn by osmosis. NOT true! If human doesn't lead, the dog will
- I dont have one
- My wife and I watched a young basset hound decapitated by my neighbors "nice" pitbull Tron two years ago in front of our house in Taradale.
- Most of the people killed in North America last year by dogs were killed by pitbulls. This is an easily verifiable fact.
- I walk by at least three pitbull types everyday. None of them are aggressive. I avoid a street that does have an aggressive lab though.
- Do not place restrictions on pitbull type dogs! All dogs are equal!
- Bully breed or not, there need to be steeper penalties for nuisance and dangerous dogs in the city.
- No
- Just mind your own business.
- Smaller dogs can be just as aggressive as bigger dogs. There are good pet owners and not so good pet owners.
- owners are often the problem too
- No
- Registration fees should be used to support free neuter/spay procedures in large campaigns.
- No pitbull is aggressive until it is, than someone gets reconstructive surgery. This breed of dog needs to be banned to protect kids.
- The adoption procedure should not end delivering the animal to the new home. Doing a follow-up is THE important thing to do.
- Lets stop pretending that a golden retriever is the same as a pitbull. No one uses golden retrievers in dog fights for a reason.
- Increase fees for registrations and use the money to pay for increased enforcement.



- My Calgary went from hero to zero for considering BSL. Do your research first and stop listening to all the Ken and Karen's commenting!
- No animal should be judged by how it looks. That's ridiculous. Also "pit bull" bites are not abnormally strong compared to other dog breeds.
- Who came up with the idea that cats should always remain indoors? My three cats (adopted and inherited) are used to being able to go outside!
- None
- City wants to introduce BSL....yet we allow rapists to walk our streets
- Negligent owners will not abide by any BSL restrictions they have proven that already by not abiding by regular bylaws. NO TO BSL
- Did Mrs.Deagle from gremlins write most of these comments? Dogs are amazing.
- Educate every individual that buys or adopts a dog about the rules in an off-leash area.
- I don't know
- Dog owners are not cleaning up their dog's feces, they are on sidewalks, city parks and when put in a bag the bag is left on city paths.
- Please increase fines (and enforcement) for failing to pick up your pet's feces.
- I live near a natural reserve and see dogs off-leash chase wildlife (deer) . Would like to see more enforcement of existing bylaws.
- Would also like more enforcement of dog owners not cleaning up pet waste.
- The use of breed specific legislation is disappointing. All nuisance dogs (regardless of breed) should be treated equal chihuahua or larger
- Pit bulls are sweet dogs, Stop saying they are aggressive dogs!
- "I support Responsible urban hen ownership.
- #petsthatpoopbreakfast"
- all dogs deserve to be treated equally
- Owners should not be permitted to let their dogs urinate/defecate on the grass between the sidewalk and private property lines.
- blame the dog rings not the dogs for violent dogs. pitbulls are naturally very sweet dogs!
- A quick 5 minute read of the info available at dogsbite.org will tell you everything you need to know about dog attack statistics.
- How about stop saying pit bulls are aggressive dogs when they aren't
- When a breed of dog that makes up less than 4% of city dogs accounts for 80%+ of the serious dog attacks its a breed issue. Ban pitbulls.
- 47 children in Canada in 2018 required reconstructive surgery after pitbull attacks. 0 kids required surgery after chocolate lab attacks.
- In summer hire students to patrol off leash parks with cameras to capture any dog defecating, track to owner's car plate and bill.
- Some areas of the city have a severe problem with cats roaming off of their owner's property. Many cat owners believe it is their right.



- pit bulls are not bad dogs, you're just a [removed] person
- Stop ditching doggy bags in work skips or random green carts. Take your trash home whatever its make up.
- I have yet to see a bylaw officer hand out a fee for a dog off leash or cats roaming freely. What's the point of a revised bylaw?
- Do not haze coyotes at Nose Hill or other such parks. Instead enforce off leash by laws, provide more signage where off leash is prohibited.
- I understand why cats that are allowed to roam should be licensed but I don't see why an inside cat that never goes out needs to be licensed
- Increase incognito patrols to catch those owners who don't pick up after their dogs
- Not all pitbulls are aggressive just like not all owners are responsible. When will we blame the owner?
- You don't need BSL when you have a proper animal program in place that is properly enforced. Ask [personal information removed]
- A good bylaw doesn't care what the dog who bites looks like, it cares only that it bit. Deal with this issue case by case. NO TO BSL
- I have witnessed more small dog behavioural issues and bites than large dog breeds, including bully breeds.
- "In 1 yr in Canada herding dogs such as Shelties and Collies and Australian Shepards were responsible for the most bites.
- NO BSL"
- Negligent owners will continue to be an issue with or without BSL. Blame them not the dogs.
- Increase enforcement against pets (dogs AND cats) that harass wildlife.
- Please ban the sale of exotics in pet stores (like birds and lizards).
- I would like to see the city deal with the opioid crisis and the increased crime rather than go after responsible dog owners
- If you actually fined people the way it's laid out for dogs biting and killing other animals, you wouldn't have so many bites. And no to BSL
- Large dogs can do more damage than small dogs. If there are going to be preventative measures against biting, it should be for all large dog
- Don't just muzzle pits. Make all obedience training mandatory for dogs
- In 1yr in Canada herding dogs were responsible for ZERO bites requiring reconstructive surgery. Pitbulls were responsible for 47.
- Ask any veterinarian, groomer, reputable breeder, dog trainer their opinion of BSL. They will all agree it does NOT work. Focus on owners
- No BSL Calgary! Any dog can attack or bite a person when owners fail to train or control their animal.
- Fining someone after their pitbull mauls a 5 year old does nothing to help the 5 year old. Ban pitbulls before they maul.



- The changes to the bylaws are being proposed because almost all serious dog attacks in Calgary are pitbull attacks.
- Saying any dog can attack is like saying a machine gun and a pencil are equally dangerous because they can both hurt you. Ban pitbulls
- No sane person chooses to own the most potentially dangerous dog you can find. 300+ breeds and pits kill more kids than all of them combined
- I watched a pitbull in my neighborhood Taradale tear a cat in half in the middle of the street while its owner screamed. So dangerous.
- No
- 86.8% of APBT passed temperament test higher than collies golden retriever and beagles
- Thank goodness we have a Mayor that stands up for normal people. [Personal information removed] is doing what's best for Calgary by restricting Pitbulls! Good job.
- I support a total ban on pitbull ownership. Muzzling them isn't enough. How many normal dogs are we going to let die to pitbull attacks?
- More than 30 breeds and mixes are incorrectly identified as pit bulls in bite incidents attributing the pit bull to unfair # of incidents
- The way in which animal noise complaints are dealt with have to change - mediation should be mandatory to avoid unreasonable complaints
- Collies, golden retrievers and beagles killed no one last year in North America. Pitbulls killed 31 people. Mostly kids.
- Every single year the number of people in North America killed by pitbulls is higher than all other breeds combined. Every single year.
- Dogs don't bite unless they are poorly trained or being bothered.
- Painting all pit bulls, or crossed breeds with the same brush is irresponsible and uneducated response. Shame on the city.
- Pitbulls and other similar dogs cause attacks no more than any other dog, so they should not be forced to have additional restrictions.
- Focus on bad owners. Actually enforce the current laws re: vicious dogs. ANY dog can bite and all big dogs are strong. Stop discriminating
- I would like to know what you do with the money you receive from fines. If you want to increase fines, then it should go to victims.
- Pitbulls kill more kids every year in North America than all other breeds combined. Every single year they do that. It's the breed.
- I have had two pitbull attacks on children in front of my house. One of them was a "nice" pitbull that lived next door.
- It's not bad owners. It's the pitbull breed. Pitbull owners are just like other dog owners. The reason pits kill so many kids is the breed.
- In Canada, there have been 46 fatalities due to dog attacks since 1983. Five have been labelled as "pit bull" breeds. Majority were huskies
- "People need to be educated on dog safety. Dog owners need to be in full control of their dog."



- PROBLEM SOLVED"
- Training: for both owner and dog. Train the dog to bark on command and shush on command. Also train the owner to be the alpha dog at home.
- Please fine owners who let their dogs chase people and other pets. I've had to save my (leashed) cat from a dog more than once.
- No
- You said it yourselves -pit bulls are not involved in more bite incidents.. then focus on the VICIOUS dogs that are biting and their bad owner
- none
- Cities w/breed specific legislation don't have lower bite rates. Factors that = safer dog/human relations: EDUCATION + LAW ENFORCEMENT
- Stop picking on bully breeds. [removed]
- If a barking dog is reported as a nuisance, the complaint should not be anonymous to the dog owner.
- I don't think that there should be breed specific laws, but nuisance dog owners should be monitored and only one nuisance dog per household.
- Shame Calgary! BSL is proven to be backwards thinking. Cities that ban "these" breeds did NOT reduce bite incidents and now are removing BSL
- Pit bulls.. how are they more dangerous than a Doberman? Or a German Shepard? What about Rottweilers? Stigmas don't matter, it's the owners.
- Tiny dogs have attacked my pit bull and she growls back and the owner of the tiny dog got mad at me! Control your own dog!
- NO TO BSL. Promoting responsible ownership and targeting behaviour & not breed & is the only proven way to reduce dog bites.
- An OFF LEASH husky came up on my front lawn and attacked my senior cat who was out on his harness and leash. Needs to be a case by case basis
- BSL has not succeeded in reducing dog bite-related injuries wherever it has been enacted. Don't waste my tax money!!
- I had a colleague loss his nose and cheek to a golden lab, 3 wks ago. As a vet, in my 25yrs., I see more attacks from Labs and Huskies.
- I , as a pet owner of all kinds of animals (cats, dogs, horses, cattle ,pigs ,chickens and turkeys) believe any problems are man made.
- BSL has been very effective in reducing serious dog bites everywhere that it has been enacted. Someone needs to stop pitbull maulings.
- As a vet of 26 years O know that pitbulls kill more children in North America every year than all other breeds combined.
- STOP CREATING FEAR ANS START EDUCATING PEOPLE ON BITE PREVENTION
- The definition of "nuisance" in questionnaire includes "dangerous" AND noisy. Separate these. Why disallow noisy dogs from offload parks?



- My neighbor has 2 aggressive dogs he likes it that way. They break the fence to get in my yard. Can't imagine if he and ppl like him had 6??!
- More enforcement of unleashed dogs. Too many ppl think it's ok, they don't take it serious cause nothing happens. It would lesson attacks!
- Some dogs do attack and bite unprovoked. Happens all the time. The latest dog death was unprovoked. Controlled dogs no attacks. Then no BSL.
- Why do we need input from our neighbours for chickens, but not for other animals? This shouldn't be the case.
- Keep wild bird feeders and bird baths. Yes to hens. No to livestock in the city like goats, pigs etc. No to increase of dog/cats per house.
- Do not target breeds. Target irresponsible owners. Control the number of animals per household.
- Yes to Urban Chickens! You can already have many pigeons, parrots, and other pet birds... chickens is a no brainer!
- Can we get a definition of dangerous behavior there was one point I may have supported but the lack of definition made me uncomfortable.
- The City needs to review credible statistics on dog bites etc. The vast majority of studies show that Pit Bulls do not bite/ attack more th
- CLOSE. THE. SCHOOLS. We already have enough COVID cases. Either shut everything down again, and wait for things to settle, or shut down
- 31 serious dog attacks on people and animals last year in Calgary. 29 of them were pitbull attacks. It is a breed issue. I vote ban them.
- Fines for people who steal or report dogs that are out with their owners and tied up outside businesses in reasonable weather.
- Subsidies for trainer assessments to assist with those needing help managing their animals.
- Use 100% successful, science-based, modernized dog training experts for assessments or other issues, as at <https://arfarfbarkbark.com>
- "A sliding scale for fines would allow more flexibility
- Racoons rapidly increasing pop. soon to get out of hand
- Help with skunks"
- Besides fresh eggs, hens are very rewarding backyard pet and they are affectionate. Yes to Backyard Chickens. NOW!!!
- the city of calgary needs to ENFORCE their current bylaws. The amount of complaints we have made and nothing is ever done!
- We need more enforcement of leash laws. There are lots of "no dogs/dogs on leash" signs in weaselhead but no one follows them.
- there shouldn't be a BSL. Licensing included the need for training -proven that it was taken or will be taken? make smarter owners
- Outdoor cats keep trying to fight my indoor cats through the glass and it is stressing us out. Roaming cats need more enforcement.



- I would love it if pet licences were more easily accessible. Not everyone is good with a computer and able to order them online.
- My neighbors dog is often loose coming in my yard. City shrugs. I would have to have her permission for hens? She didn't ask me for her dog.
- they city does NOT adequately address barking complaints and nuisance dogs. Owners should be held more accountable for obedience training.
- Increasing the number of dogs and cats per household is just asking for more problems! Get irresponsible to control what they have.
- Laws against selling puppies, kittens, rabbits and imported animals at pet stores.
- Regardless of the breed, the onus should fall on the dog's owner, and not on a specific breed. Focus should be on responsible ownership.
- No to indoor cat licensing. What's the point?
- Thank you
- Re Q. 9 - I don't understand what fines would accomplish. We need more creative solutions, perhaps direct access to legal aid to handle.
- Please get correct stats from our Vets and credible ppl instead of misinformed sites targeting that breed and very incorrect neg comments.
- Ban fine dog owners letting their dogs defecate and urinate on people's lawn I shouldn't have to chase people down they just ignore and leave [removed]
- Can you get animals and their feces out of our groceries eateries malls the sidewalks parks waterways are already overrun with animal feces
- 31 serious dog attacks on people and animals last year in Calgary. 29 of them were pitbull attacks. It is a breed issue. I vote ban them
- The pitbull issue is mostly in the N.E. parts of the city. We don't need to ban them everywhere but in the NE they make it very dangerous.
- [Personal information removed] promised in the last election to do something about pitbulls. I am very happy to see he's keeping his word. Ban them please!
- Much higher fines for dog attacks and particularly Pitbull dog attacks on kids. We have had to many of them over the least 5 years.
- Cats are a lesson in consent and so many controlling people hate cats because they can't control them! Cats meant to roam and hunt
- Instead of highlighting "pitbulls" I would like dangerous dogs being the focus bc they are the true issue no matter their size or breed.
- Yes to Urban Hens. If there is a bylaw in placed, ONLY RESPONSIBLE OWNERS would be allowed. No need to ask neighbors permission.
- No
- Make it easier to get off-leash areas put into communities. More off-leash parks = less off-leash in undesignated areas = happy, tired dogs
- Support with relearning/training rescue dogs (often are bully breeds that were previously abused)



- Definition “pit bull” is too vague. It sounds like if any dog might appear to be a tiny % pitbull, the owners will be penalized. Not cool.
- Multi-year or lifetime pet licenses would be a great improvement. Yearly renewals are a hassle.
- Thanks for taking the input. I am excited about the possibility of urban hens!
- skunks. We are overwhelmed with in our neighborhood. City does little to help
- I do not support breed specific rules or restrictions - innocent until proven guilty!!! The owner should be responsible for a nuisance DOG!
- Bee keeping within city limits is a direct threat to native bee populations that are already struggling to survive. Please don't allow more.
- I'm super excited about urban hens!
- City should support animal rescue spay and neuter programs. Bylaws unsuccessful because the number of cats being killed keeps increasing.
- Section 9 - fines: keep the fines the lower / same, but the owner is responsible for medical costs resulting from the behaviour of their pet
- Even if pet licensing is not lowered, spay/neuter programs and support should be funded and supported as much as possible for all.
- Should be tightening up on roaming cats!
- No
- Lazy neglectful owners let their cats wander to get hit by cars and eaten by coyotes. City needs to do more about this.
- "More to questions 10a and 10b:
- The license fee is the small cost to affording the well being of a pet.
- Each hen in a coop should be licensed."
- Cats supervised outdoors and encourage outdoor enclosures. NO breeding, only adoption. Abusers/neglecters-harsh punishments, bans on ownership
- TNR funding for cats. Ban exotic animal ownership. No live animal sales in pet stores.
- There needs to be more control of aggressive dogs. Starting with banning pit bulls.
- Not at this time
- Owners need to take their noses out of their phones and start putting the effort into raising well behaved dogs of all sizes
- RE: fines for dog attacks - have the owner responsible for ALL costs associated if injury occurs to either another human or animal.
- A dog bite/attack on a minor should carry a large fine and automatic euthanasia of the animal
- 1 Stop roaming cats 2 Ban urban hens 3 Fine owners who let dogs defecate on lawns. Why can't they use alleys? 4 Fewer off leash areas.
- Any dog regardless of the breed can be dangerous in the wrong hands
- Chicken eggs for all!
- Make new communities include off leash parks. Walden is pathetic and relies on wolf willow without an exact date to open. #shameonyyc



- Condo/townhome developers need to include outdoor space for dogs to do their business, onsite. It's not fair to pets or neighbour properties
- Extremely high fines for owners who refuse to pick up after their dogs. Animal removal after 3 times. People can send in video of offenders
- There are a lot of good pet owners. Need to focus on the bad owners and helping the animals
- Yes to BSL and ban pit bulls.
- German shepherds have a stronger bite than staffers bull terriers. Don't see their breed in here
- When not in a fenced off leash area, there must be consequences for the Dog Owner if their Dog is not on a leash and 100% controlled.
- Get rid of backyard breeders. Mandatory spay and neuter except licensed breeders. Ban and stop breeding pit bulls.
- Yes to hens and pigeons. With limit. No neighbour consent, don't need neighbour consent for dogs or cats.
- I continue to advocate the same rules for cats as for dogs
- Per the comments apparently the NE has many negligent owners. Increase bylaw patrols and seize animals from these monster humans.
- Ban all pitbulls in Calgary. If a dog bites a person the owner should be charged with assault as owners are supposed to be in control.
- would like to see portion of dog license fee designated towards the cost of paying the city to pick up dog waste all over the city.
- I support a harsh penalty for the unauthorized breeding of animals within city limits, and higher penalties for animals not spayed/neutered.
- In addition to fines, add hours of community service of picking up dog waste when caught not picking up after their own dog.
- Let bystanders report bad dog behavior. I witnessed a pitbull attack a small dog but bylaw wouldn't investigate it b/c it wasn't my dog.
- I like the idea of pitbull obedience training. It forces participation by the owner. The responsibility is with the owner.
- Out of 31 serious dog attacks in Calgary last year on people and pets 29 were pitbull attacks. That's why bylaw is proposing the changes.
- Regulate irresponsible backyard breeding
- more needs to be done about bad owners. People are afraid to report incidents for fear of the owners.
- Stop the breed specific bylaws. Deal with problem dogs of all breeds.
- THIS comment, especially for YYC winters "Condo/townhome developers need to include outdoor space for dogs to do their business, onsite"
- More dog parks please. None in Deep SW. Land taken away due to ring road construction. Also dog parks are too crowded so more problems.
- N/a



- STOP discussion of banning pit bulls. Small dogs owners don't always teach their dog to approach large dogs properly. Dogs don't see size
- The importation of pitbulls into our city from the U.S. should be banned. Local "rescue" groups dumping ex fighting dogs into Calgary.
- I do not support my tax payer dollars going to enforcing BSL. There are better methods.
- Dogs barking in homed and yards should be addressed.
- Require dog owners to submit a dog's DNA to the City. Injuries from dog bites and feces not picked up can then be prosecuted efficiently.
- The import, sale, and ownership of all exotic pets in Calgary should be banned.
- All fines should be higher and better enforced.
- Every professional organization associated with animal welfare, animal behaviour, and animal control takes a position against BSL.
- Mayor Denis Coderre pushed through a breed ban and months later was voted out in favour of a candidate who made breed-neutral legislation
- In the last decade in Calgary, an average of 12% reported bites are attributed to "pit bulls"; 88% of all bites are by OTHER breeds.
- Each dog attack/bite incident needs to be assessed on a case by case basis and laws need to be enforced. Breed doesnt matter!!!!!!
- Under the leadership of [personal information removed], our city had some of the lowest bite rates, strongest enforcement, progressive outreach and high licensing
- We need clear bylaws that promote owner responsibility and target known risk factors for dog aggression without discrimination of breed
- T
- dog owners that allow there dog off leash in areas they should be on leash (sidewalks, parks, playgrounds). How to curb irresponsible owners
- Preventative maintenance, training and community support to teach parents how to introduce children to dogs responsibly
- BSL is a knee j3rk reaction by legislators to placate the uneducated and uniformed because it has been proven to be ineffective -
- No sale of dogs and cats at stores only rescues put up for adoption
- There is no such thing as responsible breeding when millions of animals die in shelters in North America - END BREEDING
- BSL is ineffective only 0.002313 % of Communities in America have some form of BSL and it's being banned and repealed often ..
- "[personal information removed] talking in AU about failed BSL -- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_KFX86ZhoMc
- BSL is a proven failure - DON'T IMPLEMENT"
- "Stop calling all dogs with blocky heads pit bulls -- Pit bull is not a breed
- NO TO BSL -- anyone citing stats are a lie"



- Pit hate propaganda from sites like 24/7 who lost in court for falsifying data and pages like DBO are nothing but LIES No To BSL
- How about you spend our tax \$ on something useful like more schools?! It's 2020 and you're bringing up BSL? Enforce and Educate for all breeds!
- How many recent bite incidents involved a true ABPT? My guess is they were mostly mutts labelled as Pit Bulls. Exactly why BSL doesn't work
- BSL ignores the real issue.
- No
- I would fully support more education surrounding bite prevention and more enforcement focused on any breed that has a bite past.
- BSL creates a false sense of security surrounding other breeds in communities
- Mandatory pet ownership/training course for pet owners. Nuisance dogs are a byproduct of ignorant owners, not bad dogs. Education is crucial
- Cats should not be allowed outside without a leash. They can easily jump a fenced in backyard.
- Strong enforcement of current bylaws = responsible owners = reduced bite incidents for all breeds
- make dog training more accessible. dog training required for "nuisance dogs" like taking a driving course to get demerits removed
- I think cat owners who let their cats outside should be held responsible if their cat is attacked by another animal that is on its own prope
- 31 serious dog attacks on people and animals last year in Calgary. 29 of those attacks were pitbull attacks. Ban them please
- If you are a dog owner no matter breed it is your responsibility to keep your dog and community safe. NO TO BSL
- Breed is far less important than the circumstances surrounding the incident. NO BSL
- When one breed is committing almost all the serious attacks it is a breed issue. Thank you [personal information removed] for keeping your promise to ban pits
- Death caused by dogs in CANADA 1983-2017 43 deaths Husky 25% Northern dogs 24% German Shepard 11% Rottweiler 9% "Sled Dog" 7%
- The changes to the bylaw are being proposed because over the last 5 years the vast majority of serious dog attacks in Calgary have been pits
- A secure enclosure for all dogs loose their in yards would have prevented 31 incidents in Canada (74%)
- supervising very young children would have prevented 26 incidents in Canada (63%)
- supervising a known interaction between child and dog would have prevented 10 incidents in Canada (24%)
- any breed can express aggression if it is abused neglected improperly trained/socialized yet we pick on the "pitbulls" shame on you Calgary
- Calgary please continue to take a more progressive stance towards these archaic views of Pit Bull type dogs. Follow [personal information removed] hard work



- Many communities in BC have changed their bylaws regarding BSL because they recognize that they are outdated and prejudice.
- City Hall: The current bylaw is not bringing enough revenue, lets make changes to fix this!
- regardless of the breed when a dog attacks it is due to owner recklessness ignorance and irresponsibility simple as that NO BSL
- the key to reducing bites is not BSL but instead making owners accountable and responsible for their dogs behavior
- A reckless owner of any breed can become an out of control liability that ends up hurting somebody or someone's animal. NO BSL
- Na
- N/A
- no
- Responsible owners will be forced to adhere to these unrealistic regulations while negligent owners will continue to be NEGLIGENT
- Too many people can't control the animals they have. Please do not allow more dogs/cats per household
- Just like us as humans who raised us makes a big difference in how we react to things . Be kind
- Urban hens with proper housing and a limit on how many. No neighbor consent, they are less of a nuisance then a cat or dog.
- Keep breed discrimination out of the equation. It only promotes POOR OWNERS to ruin other breeds of dogs and you will never fix the problem.
- More information should be provided to everybody about how to respond if attacked by a dog or who to phone if your neighbours dog is barking
- Yes to feeding wild birds and squirrels in our yards. No to feeding other wild animals like, skunks, raccoons, fox, coyote, deer etc
- No
- Bylaw have clearly stated that the majority of serious dog attacks they deal with are pitbull attacks in our city. I support a ban.
- Not at this time
- No to urban livestock such as pigs, goats, cows, donkeys, horses, Lama, Alpacas, sheep etc. Yes to urban hens and pigeons.
- I would support a mediation system rather than a tribunal system to shorten resolution wait times for issues with problem animals.
- Investment in education/ training programs to help all owners understand the needs/ challenges of their breed would be beneficial. NO BSL
- Please make survey more streamlined and easier to navigate. Legislate based on behaviour and owners- not the breed. Every dog is different.
- Re-legalizing backyard hens is long-overdue. They were a part of our past and a requirement for our future!



- More urban orchards that are available to anyone in the city to pick!
- No
- YES Urban Hens. NO to neighbors' permission in keeping hens. Next door's barking dogs and pooping cats on others yard is a nuisance.
- Accountability and education. Dealing with problem dogs or owners makes more sense than writing a dog off based on looks or stereotypes.
- LOVE cats - but fed up with owners allowing them to roam freely. My flower and veg gardens are ruined plus bird deaths. Big fines please!
- Determining if a dog is a problem or dangerous should be based on the actions of the dog, not the appearance of the dog.
- As a pet dogs are a strong motivator for elderly people to get out for exercise and to socialize exempt their dog licence fee requirements.
- Focus on dog owner accountability instead of targeting a broad spectrum of canines with legislation.
- Please remove the wording about "pitbull" appearance. It shouldn't be based on what a regular person "thinks"; must be a pitbull
- Hoping this BSL does not happen here!
- "Excellent changes to the bylaw. Please inspect and license breeders. Ban boas and pythons
- Allow rescued cats and dogs to be brought here."
- Rules are pointless without enforcement; been at Edworthy dog park every day for the last 15 years and have never seen a bylaw officer.
- Its kinda wrong to "neuter" animals
- Please stop allowing people to trap cats, rabbits and squirrels in city limits.
- The City of Calgary has signed the Durban Commitment to protect Biodiversity. The City must enforce bylaws for dogs and cats and protect speci
- Make it more accessible for pet owners to have engagement with one another and with the city regarding pet ownership.
- Education options for all cat and dog owners when applying for pet licences.
- City given patches for legal service and support animals. Many lie about their pets. There is no way to prove that it isnt a service animal
- Enforce cat bylaws. Capture cats and Charge free roam cat owners. For both the cats safety and the bird extinctions/ mess they cause.
- The pet owner should have a license to own cats/dogs. Earned by taking an online course. No individual pet licenses.
- Breed restrictions are not necessary, responsible pet ownership is what is important to remember.
- We've had enough pitbull attacks in Calgary. The city is right to restrict them. I can't own a chicken but I can own a 60 pound fighting dog??
- Noise creating nuisance to neighbours. In winter in my neighborhood there is lot of barking and disturbing night sleep and creating nuisance



- Stop the 25 pound rental rule for pets. A lot of people move to this city and can't find homes and have to abandon or surrender their pets.
- Outdoor cats make it difficult for lost cats to be found and find their way homes. Please enforce roaming cat bylaws.
- "Yes to condo/row housing developers creating pee pad parks for dogs to do their business instead of in the common green spaces."
- Breed restrictions are morbidly asinine. There needs to be more accountability for the owners of these pets and less placement on the animal
- Cats should be allowed to roam freely unless they cause a nuisance - it is their natural behaviour. Locking in cats is cruel.
- Please better enforce laws against outdoor cats. It is neglectful to let a pet roam to get hurt or killed when there are better alternatives
- BSL is not an effective way to deal with animals. The science is there to prove that. Why are we going backwards?
- I would like to see higher fines and better enforcement for off-leash dogs in areas which either prohibit dogs, or are on-leash only areas.
- It is appalling that there are breed specific questions. How do YOU determine a breed? Focus on problematic dogs and their owners. NO BS BSL
- All outdoor cats are nuisances who pee on houses, dig up gardens, and kill local songbirds. The city needs to do more about this issue.
- It is terrifying whenever loose cats or dogs run in front of my car or bike. Please enforce leash laws and increase fines for outdoor cats.
- Please limit the # of animals a dog walker may walk at a time. One person cannot adequately manage 6 animals at a time. Also license them.
- Again Breed should have absolutely nothing to do with legislation. Punishment should be directed to irresponsible owner first and foremost.
- Discussions about opening up off-leash parks to other temporary uses. Ie: cyclecross races.
- Accountability! Dogs: don't leave them outside to constantly bark. Cats: (I have 2 indoor cats) - stop making your cat my daily problem.
- Everyone should have to go through a minimal basic training with their animals instead of restricting a breed.
- I find the fact that pits are being pinpointed in this survey deplorable, any dog can bite, some have a stronger bite than pits. Rework req
- Instead of blanket law on a breed it should be case to case. 'Outdoor cats' are the real nuisance, destroy gardens, spraying on chairs etc
- More off-leash areas are needed. Would be nice to be able to use some of the many pathways to be able to walk my dog off-leash on them.
- More bylaw officers giving tickets for bikes going too fast on the trails and failing to ring their bells. They are a risk for on-leash dogs



- Calgary you cannot solve the aggression issues by restricting a specific breed you need to get to the root of the problem...the owners
- Do not implement breed specific legislation for pitbulls! This is proven to do NOTHING to reduce dog bites and they are just like any dog
- All pet owners need to be responsible community members recognizing that their pet may bring joy to them but not to others. Uphold bylaws
- Pets and their owners do not have unlimited rights. NO to Dogs off leash outside their property/off leash parks and NO to at large cats
- Breed should have nothing to do with legislation. BSL has been proven to not work and punishment should be directed to irresponsible owner
- Don't punish the breed punish the behaviour NO TO BSL YES TO BREED NEUTRAL BYLAWS
- Yes to hens! Great idea.
- Off leash areas are a privilege, not a right. If a nuisance dog cannot behave itself off leash, it should not be allowed off leash.
- Shame [personal information removed]! You want to take good dogs from good families to be euthanized or move to another city? BLOOD will be on your hands!
- "Don't punish the breed punish the behaviour NO TO BSL YES TO BREED NEUTRAL BYLAWS"
- "Animals causing damage to others be responsible for all medical costs incurred.
- Owners of nuisance animals MUST be held accountable"
- question three was discriminatory and poorly worded and the person(s) responsible should be removed from their position.
- No
- More patrolling of on leash parks and near off leash parks. It's difficult to walk dogs on leash when loose dogs approach and causes dog fights
- Hen ownership should require neighbour approval as it isn't required for other pets.
- Pitbull attacks make up the vast majority of dog attacks requiring reconstructive surgery. They have no place in a city filled with kids.
- Mandatory owner training for dogs: breed info and learning
- Don't know if this was covered but people letting their dogs out in their backyards and the dogs are constantly barking is a huge annoyance.
- Return to the system where the Bylaw Officers are specialists, rather than generalists, and are actively involved in animal education.
- Higher fine for animal abusers
- Na
- It would be great to include chickens in the bylaw! Food security and education means a lot more in times like these.
- Shame on [personal information removed]! Thinking of taking good dogs from good families to be euthanized or moved out of city. BLOOD will be on your hands.



- "Canadian Veterinary Association has a position statement regarding dangerous dogs, pls consider this
- license dog breeders/ animal importers"
- I like the idea of a lifetime registration fee. Just buy when you get the pet and be done with it!
- City told me not enough funds/officers to patrol for unleashed dogs at parks. How is there going to be enough funds/officers to enforce BSL?
- Hen ownership absolutely should NOT require neighbor approval. It is not required for cats or dogs. Yes hens. pigeons and feeding wild birds.
- N/A
- Canadian Kennel Club DOES NOT SUPPORT BSL. Recommend responsible pet ownership instead.
- City of Dorval REMOVES BSL from bylaw, enacted enforcement and education that is non discriminatory -deemed more effective
- Tougher consequences for those who abuse animals.
- Toronto announces to table the bill to REPEAL BSL... changes bylaw to support enforcement and education no discrimination
- CKC opposes fear based BSL in favour of enforcement and education non discriminatory.. deemed more effective at protecting the public
- Toronto: Bill 147 repeals BSL passed second reading
- Montreal: Mayor Valerie Plante looking at denouncing BSL supports Responsible pet ownership
- Prince George BC updates bylaw - support of responsible pet ownership recognizes BSL is ineffective as dog bites have increased dramatically
- Prince George BC proposed bylaw no mention of breed specific (BSL) favours enforcement and education of all breeds
- Calgary why are we moving backwards when other municipalities are moving forward scrap the idea of breed specific legislation
- City can't find funds for officers to patrol areas.....how will BSL be funded. Expensive to implement with no supporting evidence it works
- I will not support a bylaw that is discriminatory towards specific breeds of dogs especially one that has no supporting evidence
- Politicians seem to be the only ones in support of a breed-specific by law what a waste of taxpayers money better spent in education
- We don't treat criminals this way with a human specific legislation most are allowed to walk away from their crimes only to commit again?
- Removal of neighbour approval for back yard hens. We don't ask for other pets. Back yard hens are a great source of food security.
- Remove the ability to back yard breed mandatory spay and neuter of all pets unless you are a registered breeder or for medical reasons
- Dog bite study by the U of C in 2019 states "that dog bite severity is not dictated by the dog breed". Bull types are in third LOWEST group!



- I do not support any breed-specific legislation.
- No
- Not all pitbulls (breed related) are unsafe. No muzzles or you will have protests!!! Trust me! Harsher punishments for the owners!!!
- BSL is not appropriate and should not be considered, blatant discrimination. Innocent people and animals, should not be treated like criminals.
- I agree with other on the fact that I do not support any breed-specific legislation.”
- Responsible owners = responsible pets. Its not breed, its you the owner.
- "Humans are the real monsters NO TO BSL
- YES TO RESPONSIBLE OWNERSHIP AND EDUCATION"
- Negligent owners do not abide by any bylaw what makes you think they will adhere to these restrictions. NO TO BSL
- Negligent owners will just ruin other breeds if BSL is passed. Focus on enforcing our current bylaw NO BSL
- It's funny how we put a dog down for biting a kid but if a human hurts a kid he lives how about the same for the dog
- BSL HAS PROVEN TO NOT BE EFFECTIVE IN REDUCING BITES EDUCATION IN BITE PREVENTION MORE EFFECTIVE
- I think there needs to be more enforcement of leash laws in areas where leashes are required. People walk dogs without leashes regularly.
- I do not support breed specific legislation
- It's time to get harsh with dog owners who can't / won't control their dogs. Fine them within an inch of their lives and take the dogs away.
- Not an idea, but a fact. There is no proven reduction in bites or attacks under BSL. This is just breed specific bullying and truly ghoulish
- Any breed pose threat without proper behavior management. Lower license fees w proof of obedience class completion. Small breeds attack too.
- "Higher fines for people attacking or threatening dogs on leash.
- Don't highlight pitbulls in bylaws. Agressive or not is important."
- I am completely opposed to Breed Specific Legislation and am deeply disappointed that the City of Calgary are even considering this.
- Uncontrolled off leash dogs are dangerous for people, pets, and local wildlife. Fines for having a dog off leash should be increased.
- I don't like the idea of restricting certain rules to one breed of dog - i think that the restrictions etc. should be linked to behavior.
- We should have and promote possibly monthly cleanup drives to off leash and on leash parks to clean up pet faeces that owners have missed in
- Please no more dogs/cats in a household. It's more to enforce bylaws for problem owners. More chance of neglect/abuse. More expense for all.



- Not only higher fine for off leash dogs. But, no warning, just get a fine. They already know the law. they just do it cause nothing happens.
- Since the city doesn't have enough funds for more patrolling for bylaw offenders. Maybe the public takes pictures and put on a Wall of Shame.
- More penalty to owners for dog attacks. Make it a crime for owner to leave the scene of attack with the dog and it's one of the charges too.
- I live across the street from an off leash dog park. There are dogs barking, fighting and people yelling. Worse when dog walkers are there
- Children should not be responsible for any breed of dog that could be considered dangerous in any public area
- Firepits in the backyards of city homes should be banned. They could be a fire risk, and the resulting smoke certainly are a health hazard
- Chickens please. They make great pets and give us eggs too.
- Don't discriminate Pit Bulls, all dogs can be aggressive. Owners are responsible for their pet. dogs need to be kept on leash by playgrounds
- Amendments to cats at large; homeowners provide a photo of animal at large and send to City for follow-up and enforcement vs trapping.
- Is there any financial aid available to low-income pet owners? I have seen people who cannot afford the vet bills and their animals suffer
- Make pet licencing more affordable and accessible. Also, STOP SENDING BYLAW OFFICERS TO HOMES FOR PEOPLE THAT ARE LATE RENEWING THEIR PETS!
- Yes to chickens! They are lovely and we need increased food security in these insecure times.
- Owners that have dogs that bite other pets, people etc should be made to pay the consequence. Vet, doctor fees, replacement of pet Etc
- Pit bulls should not be discriminated against as a breed. Aggressive dogs happen because the owner and how they train and work with the dog.
- I am very much in favour of limiting the number of cats and dogs and adamant about not taking away the right to feed the birds.
- When a single breed of dog is committing almost all the serious dog attacks it is a breed issue. No more pitbulls please they are dangerous
- "The 66th Avenue powerline area should be an onleash area.
- There should be enforcement of the onleash requirement in North Glenmore Park."
- It seems that pit bull related breeds are being targeted. This is wrong in all instances. It is the owner of bad behavior dogs is at issue
- I live near River Park off leash area and I hear dogs fighting all the time. It is very scary. Nuisance dogs should not be allowed off leash
- The key is responsible per ownership. I've had two dogs and one of the first things I did with each one was to sign up for training.
- A woman took her dog to unload on my lawn told her to pickup she ran off 1/2m dogs in city no waste/owner control now and more? Get a grip YYC



- Pet licensing should be graduated (increased fees) for multiple pets per household and nuisance pets.
- Many dog owners disregard leash bylaws; no you're not a dog whisperer. When you walk your dog, pay attention to your dog, not your phone.
- Responsibility is to the owner if there are any issues.
- Pit bulls are no different than ANY OTHER type of breed. Stop categorizing them as an aggressive breed.
- Animals which are never out of the house should not have a fee
- I don't agree making dog bylaws breed specific. Ie pit bulls. Like other dogs, some are sweet, some are not
- If a dog maims/bites a person it should be treated with the same weight as assault. If they kill a person It should be man slaughter.
- If a person's dog hurts or kills another animal, the owner should pay the vet bills in addition to fines (which should be increased)
- I enjoy feeding the birds in the winter months, I don't feed them in the spring/summer. I hope this option remains.
- feeding wildlife is not specific, would this ban bird feeders, I hope not
- parents of children need to educate their offspring ,not to approach an un-known animal to them and how to act when outside,
- There should not be warnings for people breaking the bylaw, only fines. No one listens to warnings.
- Fine owners not picking up dog feces. I typically see huge poops where my dog chooses to go + pick up his + more before it gets stepped in
- If a pitbull type dog is required to be muzzled how will they be able to protect themselves from another aggressive breed if approached
- The focus on pitbulls is a massive step backwards for a city that was once the world leader for responsible pet ownership. Shameful.
- Is there a way for pet owners across the city to share information, photos, concerns, updates, upcoming events?
- 47 of 51 Micheal Vick pitbulls were rehomed (with other animals in the home) which shows pitbulls R not naturally aggressive! No to BSL!!
- Dog ownership should require license regardless of breed. Dogs are inherently good natured, bad behaviours result from poor training
- Bylaw officers have clearly stated that the reason pitbulls are targeted in the changes is because pits commit almost all serious attacks.
- This whole survey is ridiculous. I've only had negative experiences with little dogs. They're the nuisance.
- [personal information removed] No fighting dogs in YYC please
- I live in the N.E. were most pitbulls live and I have personally watched multiple dogs killed by pits in public. Ban them from the N.E.



- Low \$ pet owner education course to help raise emotionally healthy animals in a safe environment. Obedience and neglect can be ignorance.
- I think I'm regards to a limit on the amount of animals allowed in a single household, an exception should be made for those that are foster
- Fines from dogs attacks should go to victim for hospital/ vet fees
- I think there needs to be a cap on the number of dogs that dog walkers take out at a time as well as more patrol/monitoring in the parks.
- All new dog owners should have to sign up for obedience classes with their animals and the first year should be part of the purchase cost.
- better publication of the on leash laws for dogs is required, as most owners think every open field is off leash, which they are not
- Yyc you are claiming A Ban or BSL is not being discussed but that restrictions need to be in place this IS BSL have you read your own bylaw?
- SPAY/NEUTER INCENTIVE PROGRAMS AND EDUCATION. LAWS AGAINST PUPPY MILLS. IF YOU ARE A BREEDER, YOU MUST REGISTER THE ANIMALS AND MEET A STANDARD
- SPAY/NEUTER INCENTIVE PROGRAMS and EDUCATION
- NO BSL LEGISLATION
- LOWER REGISTRATION FEES FOR SPAY/NEUTERED ANIMALS
- SEEMS AS IF SOME STORIES ARE BEING MADE UP REGARDING "PITBULLS" AND THE NE QUADRANT OF YYC DO NOT FABRICATE STORIES FOR YOUR AGENDA
- Your "definitions" are too vague. The entire survey is easily misunderstood. How do you ever get to specifics in a bylaw?
- No.
- Don't have a breed specific rule. Training for owners and dogs should be required.
- Allow cats to roam outside of owner's property as it is physically not possible to limit a cat from roaming if he is the kind.
- Not applicable
- Everyone adding a new dog to their household and applying for a new dog license must go through a dog training/obedience program
- Prevent sale of animals in pet stores - [personal information removed]. I KNOW (not think) these animals are not ethically-sourced.
- Would really like it if you enforced roaming cats, right now there is vertically no repercussion for this offence as you do not enforce this
- Please publish annual statistics regarding fines and enforcement.
- Cats should be allowed to roam freely!
- Ban pit bulls. Stop breeding them. If there wasn't a problem it wouldn't be brought up. It's not the first time it's been here.
- I think I've provided sufficient information so far.



- No increase for cats and dogs in households. It's enough problems the way it is. Exceptions, to licensed breeders and foster programs.
- Yes to BSL. Yes to ban pit bulls.
- Bylaws should never be breed specific!
- License dog ownership and six months after issue, visible proof of training. My Doby was 100% off-leash trained w/heavy distraction by then
- Educate cat owners that their animals must remain on their own properties. If it isn't in your litter box it's on someone's property.
- Better ban musclebound gym goers too. They are more capable of physical altercation than most. Put this BSL GARBAGE to bed already.
- Some questions are too vague. All dogs should be treated the same no matter the breed. Most dogs will not attack unless provoked. Tell the truth
- Specially mentioning pit bulls is misleading and makes it seem like this engagement already has an agenda.
- If animal services was linked to 311 it would be nice. For reporting areas with lots of dogs off leash for patrol.
- No one's saying ppl against BSL or pit ban are making up stories. But, when ppl say they have been bitten/witnessed it's made up. Ban pits.
- Promote widespread public education campaigns for improved animal welfare E.g. don't leave pets in a car, no leashed dogs while cycling.
- Ban the people that don't train and look after their dogs. A well trained pit bull can be a fine dog
- Pit bulls are a continuous problem and have been since they were created. Because they were made for attacking and fighting. Need to be banned.
- Clearer legislation and management/enforcement of on-leash and no-dog areas is important. People need dog free spaces for lots of reasons.
- The subject of pit bulls is brought up in this survey. So there is a reason for pit bull talk even if pit bulls don't like it. Ban pit bulls.
- None
- Yes to licensing dog walkers but require each individual take a basic animal behaviour course to obtain a license. Limit 6 dogs per walker
- There needs to be "dog on leash" signs in every green space in the city. Too many people see a patch of grass and let their dog run loose.
- City needs better education on their website on how to keep cats indoors. ALL cats can be kept indoors humanely and happily with some effort
- All dogs should be held to the same standard. Period. I agree this engagement seems like it has an agenda with questions like these.
- Off leash areas should not be free parking, why should my tax-dollars when I do not own a pet be paying for the maintenance.
- I'm more likely to be harmed by a male human than male dogs. Nobody is crying to ban men or asking them to be restricted. Why not?



- Election is coming up based on how city council votes in this bylaw will determine how we as Calgarians vote
- When every single serious dog attack on a pet or human last year in the city is a Pitbull attack then it is a pitbull issue. Get rid of em.
- There is a difference between being bitten by a Yorkie and being mauled by a pitbull. It's strange that people seem confused by that.
- Kids need to be taught adults need to be taught dogs need to be taught introducing breed-specific legislation will never change that
- Pit bull ban can mean that owners keep the ones they have, no more are brought into the city and no breeding. Other places have done that
- None
- People should respect the personal space of a pet. Always ask for consent from the owner.
- No
- All dog owners should have their dogs go through basic and obedience training and submit these documents when registering their pets
- There is complete idiocy in the decisions made as to what is on or off leash, What is the difference between one side of a path or the other
- It's not the breed. It's the owners. Owners with nefarious intentions favour certain breeds. Punish the bad owners, not the breed.
- Cats account for an estimated 75% of song bird deaths in Canada. Cats have safer lives indoors. Feral cats should be euthanized.
- Tiered licensing; each pet the cost rises. Barking fees. Every barking complaint costs. Cat penalty. A photo is enough to send a fine.
- Every dog is an individual. Every dog should be judged based on their behaviour, not on their DNA or their appearance.
- I say no to creating breed specific legislation. More enforcement for problem owners.
- Regarding pit bulls, I have seen the same inane discussions about German Shepard's (1970's) and Doberman's as this. If trained they are good
- No
- Be more clear on what affects wild bird feeders in our backyards.
- The bylaw officers are asking for the changes to rules regarding pitbulls for a reason. They deal with serious pitbull attacks regularly.
- "Dog walkers need to be regulated and insured (eg. Max 4 dogs/walker).
- Fee to set up; many do not pay taxes on income I understand."
- Breed specific legislation has never worked. It's time the focus was on the owner and not the dog.
- Bylaw officers should get out of their vehicles and into the parks where bad behaviour happens to educate and fine bad dog owners.
- I live across the street from an off leash dog park. There are dogs barking, fighting and people yelling. Worse when dog walkers are there



- The city has stated that Pit bulls are not involved in the most bite incidents...why are we speaking about them.
- "What about pet rabbits?"
- I think that any animal kept as a pet should not be allowed to roam free and impact neighbors"
- I don't think having regulations around a breed of dog is fair. It is on the owner's to raise a well behaved dog. Bans and fines are stupid
- Have Due Process. If someone claims a dog attacked them do not fine the owner if there is no evidence, ex. Bite/Claw marks. Just Be Fair
- I believe it is unfair to target any specific breed of dog or animal but do support additional training required for any high-risk animals.
- Why are we speaking of restricting pitbulls when they are not involved in the most bites.....seems like an agenda
- How about not restricting pitbulls and start focusing on the dogs that are actually biting
- Don't target specific breeds of dogs target the humans that are making these dogs aggressive by abusing them
- City council please educate yourselves on what BSL truly means and what effect it will have on YYC. For example: lost revenue for buisness.
- Pit bulls aren't a dangerous breed, it's all in the obedience and training a dog gets from its owners. Just. Like. Kids.
- The Canadian Kennel Club opposes breed specific legislation for a reason.
- Prohibit female dogs that are in heat from using an off-leash dog park. A dog walker should only be allowed to walk 5 dogs at one time.
- It's really nice that so many pet owners think playgrounds are a toilet for their animals. DNA testing for feces would be an ok deterrent
- Bsl dog breeds have a bad rap, not all Bsl dogs are bad and having them looped all into one category is wrong.
- All dog owners, at the time of licensing, should be required to attend a training program focused on "How to be a responsible dog owner".
- I see lot of pet-owners walking their dogs Without any leash in downtown / along Riverwalk. City should do a better Job enforcing leash laws
- Attacks by pit bulls are associated with higher morbidity rates, higher hospital charges, higher risk of death than other breeds.
- Clarify what kinds of wildlife you can't feed in your backyard
- Noise by animals (dogs, cats, birds and livestock) should be held to the same standard as human noise (tools, lawn mowers, children...).
- When you register a pet, you must put the pet's DNA/saliva sample on file with the city so that if/when they bite, it's provable.
- Fines for off-leash cats should increase with each occurrence. Some owners habitually let their cats walk themselves (to birds' detriment).
- No



- If anything, pit bulls should not be stigmatized. Owners in this case should undergo an evaluation if needed as owners are typically the iss
- "Serious and unbiased research about the nit bull
- breeds who are inaccurately categorized as aggressive breeds."
- Why is the city so paranoid about families owning a handful of laying chickens. Dogs and cats are glorified
- Pigs allowed in the city, maximum 2 pigs per yard with stringent clean regulations.
- A strained economy/society is the perfect environment in which to consider implementing ridiculous breed specific legislation. Hi five!
- I support BSL and banning pit bulls.
- Pet owners should attend species-specific class(es) to be educated on training, handling, and lovingly disciplining the potential pet.
- Equestrian facilities within city limits.
- City could offer online course for owners of aggressive dog that would be mandatory I order to help owners deal with same
- Please do not single out specific breeds.
- Science -BSL does not work why are we as a city not coming together to find more constructive ways that actually work. EDUCATE!!
- "1st bite incident fine owners
- 2nd bite incident add restrictions to the specific dog not breed
- 3rd incident remove dog ban owner NO BSL"
- Dogs of any size/breed should adhere to the same bylaws restrict only those deemed aggressive on a case by case basis. NO TO BSL
- Media should be restricted against mentioned breed involved in any incident until breed is proved by courts. Media induces fear
- Stop labelling all dogs that are stocky, big head, muscular as “Pitbulls” they are NOT ALL “PITBULLS”
- I highly disagree with breed restrictions. Pitbulls are not the issue. Pitbull owners are. Period.
- A breed ban is ridiculous and has not worked in other places.
- A small child should not be allowed to walk a dog unless supervised by an adult
- On-line registration/applications made available
- Bylaw has clearly stated that nearly all the serious dog attacks on people and animals in our city are pitbull attacks. This is an issue.
- No BSL.
- Again as a new Calgary resident I'm shocked at the disregard for leash bylaws. Pls enforce this better. More officers/big fines.
- What about the rights of non-pet owners? We already have many conflicts. Why consider adding more "pets"? City costs will go up dramatically
- The City needs More fenced off-leash areas where people could train their dogs.



- "I DO NOT SUPPORT BSL
- I SUPPORT BREED NEUTRAL BYLAWS WITH STRICTER FINES AND ENFORCEMENT. EDUCATION AVAILABLE REGARDING BITE PREVENTION"
- BSL expensive to implement and businesses will lose revenue, tax dollars better spent in education surrounding bite prevention
- NO BSL start enforcing current bylaw with increased fines. More officers patrolling off leash areas and parks. 1-2 officer/s per community
- tax dollars better spent elsewhere increase fines and actually enforce them money can go towards educating the public around dog safety
- No BSL. Owners of any unruly dogs sh be held accountable.
- I love off leash areas but some dogs are very aggressive and some people do not seem to keep there dogs in control. (Bowness) enforcement?
- I think generalizing pit bull type dogs in one lump sum is terrible. That is like racism in people. There are no bad dogs just bad owners.
- Threats of fines is not a deterrent if there is little to no enforcement. Zero representation of control seen in parks!!!
- NO
- Yes to BSL. Ban Pit bulls. Stop breeding them. The problem them keeps coming up and has for the last 2 centuries.
- There should be more education and bite prevention about dogs especially aggressive types. But, pit bulls should be banned.
- No
- Let us have chickens and pigeons. Should not have to ask neighbors to have them. No to other livestock. Feed wild birds and squirrels.
- With regard to the fines, I think we should split the 'Animal damages another animal or property' fine into two categories: minor and severe
- Pit bulls were bred to be attack dogs. They are dangerous type dog. Breeding needs to stop and they need to be banned.
- Any Bylaws should be breed-neutral. The most common problem is the owner, not the animal.
- People shouldn't be allowed to have more animals. The aggressive dog is bad enough. Imagine if a bad animal owner had 6 and 6 roaming cats
- Cats and dogs are not the same and should be dealt with separately and not have same bylaw rules and fees. Dogs bite, bark and defecate.
- There should not be more off leash areas until owners learn how to control their dogs off leash. Offleash areas right now are a chaotic mess
- Low income people can't afford to neuter, spay, train pets and are irresponsible pet owners. There is no way their fees should be subsidized
- Hens are a fantastic pet. They are quiet, clean and provide eggs as food. They must be allowed.
- Where I live we have a "dangerous dog bylaw" which works beautifully. It doesn't target specific breeds. Nice to see Calgary do the same.



- Have an off leash area in every community.
- Any dog where the owner knows/suspects their animal will bite (other animals or people) should be required to muzzle their dogs in public
- People treat neighbourhoods with an off leash park as an off leash neighbourhood. I cannot enjoy walking near my home without nuisance dogs.
- Yes. Quit being racist towards certain breeds of dogs. It's the people that are the problem 99% of the time.
- No
- Taking care of the off leash problem would take care of a lot of aggressive dog problems. On leash areas need more enforcement!
- "I believe all off leash parks should be fenced.
- This is for the safety of both the dogs and passerby's."
- Rather than just fines for bad behaviour, also require obedience classes for owners and their dogs. Let's create meaningful behaviour change!
- I have had problems with barking dogs in backyards, and have found that reporting it to the City of Calgary has been ineffective.
- More proper ownership education programs/ information readily available. Educate the public and apparently city officials/staff.
- Of course we need guidelines and bylaws but every situation is unique. The idea that a "bully breed" be targeted is not acceptable.
- Bird feeders on private property allow birds to survive cold winters and allow observation from homes.
- The "bully breed" type dogs being targeted is unacceptable. I also disagree with the amount of pets you can own, as people will just hide.
- BSL is absolutely disgusting and expensive. Only people who have no experience with animals would agree with this nonsense. Shameful.
- Writing legislation for the sake of legislating is a sign of DSM diagnosable Controlling Personality Issues. Have the authors seen a psych?
- Yes to chickens!!! The bylaws can help educate and maintain standards for keeping chickens in the city! Hoorah Calgary for catching up!!!
- Bylaw has clearly stated that nearly all the serious dog attacks on people and animals in our city are pitbull attacks. This is an issue.
- People (especially dog walkers) should be limited on the number of dogs they can walk at one time. I see them with 10-15 all the time.
- should make it mandatory for all breeds to go through training when owners acquire a pet. And no picking on one breed aka pitbull types
- I want Bylaw to have the authority to seize any animal (dog/cat/etc) that is left unattended in a front or back yard and is making noise.
- There should be no pit bull type dogs allowed in children's playgrounds



- By-law officers should be able to trap feral/roaming cats/animals i.e. skunks. People should not be expected to trap and haul animal away.
 - Animal groomers should be licensed and special attention should be paid to the grooming locations. Some should be shut down of lack of care
 - Anyone who wants to own a pet must first take a course on how to be a responsible pet owner which includes everything about ownership. Good
 - Dogs who demonstrate dangerous behaviour should be managed accordingly, not all dogs who are deemed dangerous based simply on appearance.
 - Historically, pitbulls have had a lot of BIPOC owners - and BSL has been used as an “acceptable” way to marginalize or bully on racist lines
 - Historically, pitbulls have had a lot of BIPOC owners - and BSL has been used as an “acceptable” way to marginalize or bully on racist lines
 - My bird feeder has become a cat buffet. Please enforce roaming cat bylaws better, and make people keep cats inside.
 - Breed specific legislation is needed in calgary immediately.
 - Banning breeds doesn’t solve the problem. It’s the owners that need to be fixed
 - More visible bylaw Officers out issuing fine for dog waste, esp those that bag them and leave them on trails or grass.
 - “pitbull” are very loyal and are only as aggressive as they are taught to be. Blame the irresponsible owners not the breed
 - BSL is not the solution education and enforcement is!
 - Dog training classes should be mandatory for anyone looking to acquire a dog. 99% of dog issues are not the dog’s fault, but the owner’s.
 - dog walkers should only be able to walk 4 dogs at a time
 - Ban Pitbulls.
 - No
 - Bull Breeds are NOT more likely to bite than other dog breeds. Where did this notion come from?
 - More enclosed fenced areas would be great, less worry in regards to traffic.
 - Dog walker limit 4-6 dogs. Much more bylaw officer presence in problem on leash park areas to educate/ticket owners with off leash dogs!!!
 - "Report people who make FALSE claims against animals and or their owners as this happens too often.
-
- Be able to report anonymously."
 - Just asking not to be narrow minded please. All dogs deserve a chance!
 - Breed specific legislation doesn’t work people. #justiceforbullies #BSLfreeYYC
 - The off leash issue in on leash areas needs to be enforced. No loose dogs no dog attacks. No need for BSL.



- It would be great to install gates on fenced off sports fields where dogs are allowed, so that they can play off leash and not escape. Thx
- There needs to be more "no dog" signs near athletic parks and playgrounds. Dogs peeing and pooping where kids play is unsanitary.
- Dogs with a bite history should wear a muzzle and not be allowed off leash.
- If a pet is going to be maintained as an indoor pet (eg. Indoor cat), is there really a need for it to be licensed?
- More enforcement of existing by-laws. (dogs off leash in non-offleash areas, failure to dispose of feces). Bag of feces in a tree is not ok.
- Chickens!!!!!!
- Keep wild bird feeders please.
- License dog walkers. They are conducting a business on city property. Too many dogs, too little control. They are not cleaning up.
- no
- Need more Peace Officers 4 animal law enforcement plus powers of arrest and removal. A PACT team for animals (yes im a peace officer 4 AHS
- All off-leash areas should be fenced, for pet and people safety. Commit resources to enforce the bylaws. Improve the cat-trapping program.
- Dogs shouldn't be allowed on kids soccer fields and baseball pitches. Please put up signs saying this. It's unsanitary.
- Clearer designation of on-leash and off-leash areas, especially in larger park areas such as Nose Hill Park. Totally confusing.
- Bylaws for cats at large should be better enforced!
- Licensed cats should be allowed outside. The mice, magpie, squirrel problem in our neighbourhood is ridiculous.
- I agree with changing the bylaw except for the pitbull language mentioned. Restrictions should be applied to dogs on a case basis not breed
- As a mother with kids and pets the colour coding is a false sense of security. Rule: Do not approach or pet any animal unless the owner says
- If an animal attack occurs and the owner has to pay a fine. Let the money of that paid fine go to the victim. Also, educate people on pets!
- Dogs should be aloud to go we're they want it's mean to muzzle any anmail it's cruelty to animals
- Cats spread toxoplasmosis, which can be deadly to those with lower immune systems. Please enforce the cat bylaws.
- I am afraid of dogs, and the amount of people bringing their dogs to dog free areas is so scary. Please enforce no dogs/dogs on leash laws.
- Somehow there are a bunch of outdoor cats in my neighbourhood but we still have a mouse problem. And also a cat problem. No outdoor cats!!
- Please do not hand out warnings, only fines. Someone can be warned 10 times and still break the bylaws.



- no bsl.
- Breed-specific laws are regressive and discriminatory and should not be enforced. All pets should be held to the same standard.
- The park I've lived across from for 22 years... is NON-OffLeash, yet every single day, people exercise their dogs OffLeash, without control.
- There are no bad breeds of pets, only bad owners. Breed-specific rules should not exist.
- No
- N/A
- Support healthy free-range organic eggs from established Canadian farms - don't force hens into a miserable life in the city
- Only "flightless birds" should be kept as pets or LESAs. So yes to chickens and NO to dirty pigeons.
- Na
- Dog parks could use more large fenced areas that are safe for small dogs or small dog areas and large dog areas.
- Breed specific rules are UNNECESSARY. Owners are the problem and should be the ones being making the changes. No euthanasia for "nuisances"
- Please do a business case for sufficient resources to effectively enforce any laws wrt off-leash where not allowed and for not picking up.
- Fines to the parents of children that are caught teasing dogs in owners backyards.
- Dog parks divided for small and large dogs or higher fines for large dogs attacking smaller dogs.
- dangerous dog bylaws should focus on individual behaviour, not solely on looks or breed/mix. Fines/fees should increase w/owner irresponsibi
- Anyone that doesn't follow the rules or has a dangerous pet should be banned from owning animals, and that pet to be rehabilitated/rehomed.
- All parks both off leash and non off leash need to be patrolled more for irresponsible owners with dogs not under control. It's not safe.
- When a dog is continuously barking excessively there is an issue that deserves to be investigated
- Dogs require humans to provide proper care and direction don't blame them when they act out blame the negligent owner DO BSL
- For households getting 1st dog, REQUIRE Responsible Pet owner online course and test their knowledge. Perfect score gets discounted license.
- Dogs are a product of their environment blame their pack leader... the humans NO BSL
- I cannot stand off leash dogs in on leash areas. This should be monitored and fined
- Small dog specific off leash parks
- Dogs barking should be held to the same standard as kids playing, lawn equipment, motorcycles etc.
- Financial repercussions for ppl making false bylaw claims of nuisance behaviour and wasting bylaw officers time



- Dogs require humans to provide proper care and direction don't blame them when they act out blame the negligent owner NO BSL X2
- Put money toward enforcing the current bylaws. Especially on leash parks and areas around off leash parks. Instead of BSL.
- Fenced in off-leash dog parks in all communities. The nice ones are overcrowded because dog owners have limited options.
- Sandstone area 2 off leash is a terrible location next to busy multi lane roads. Add fences. It's a great length to play fetch but unsafe.
- Please don't single out breeds -- No BSL.
- Do not allow off leash dog parks adjacent to playgrounds. Le Rotary park is entirely off leash and is right beside a water park and playground
- Requiring breed specific rules is presumptuous of a dog's personality and discriminatory. The owner is responsible for their pet behavior!
- I think more restaurants should allow dogs on their patios and more stores should allow dogs - so long as the dogs are not vicious breeds.
- Don't ban pit bulls or bull breeds
- BSL does not reduce bites. BSL provides a false sense of security and punishes responsible dog owners.
- Put off leash areas in every community or at least an area where they can get more exercise.
- Anyone that hurts an animal, for any reason, should also be fined at least \$1000.
- More dog friendly restaurants/stores - be more dog friendly, not less
- No
- Reduced licensing if you attend obedience classes
- Making bylaws more publicly known
- Parents who bring kids to off leash parks need to be aware of risks. Same for bikers and runners. It's not your park - it the dogs.
- I do not want dogs defecating on my lawn, even if the owner is picking it up.
- Punish the deed not the breed! Hold the pet owners to a higher standard regardless of breed or size.
- Why is Rotary Park an off leash park? It's next to a playground for kids. Off leash dogs are all over the park not only off leash area.
- Calgary needs to start enforcing leash by laws. The amount of ppl disregarding it is astounding. Leash your dogs!!!!!!
- No BSL. NOT NOW NOT EVER. It is not the animal it is the upbringing.
- I don't have any additional comments
- Required training for all dog owners to take dogs off leash
- Rotary Park as an off leash area is beyond reason. Not all residents can enjoy because of dog defecation, urine and irresponsible owners.
- Please keep legislation breed neutral!



- Large and obvious signs at off-leash parks warning of dogs at large, so non-dog owners using the park are not caught off guard.
 - GIVE PEOPLE PET INSURANCE
 - Breed Specific Legislation has proven to not be effective. I would not want to live in a city that is that narrow-minded and ignorant.
 - BSL is expensive and has not worked in other jurisdictions. Invest in preventative measures: accessible training, bite prevention, etc.
 - "People must be educated that a coloured scarf isn't an invitation to rush up to pet a dog, they must ask first!
 - Free education programs!"
 - Dogs should not be on restaurant patios where ppl are eating or in stores other than pet stores. It's unsanitary.
 - There is a reason for the leash laws. Keeping ppl and other dogs safe from so called "friendly" dogs. Owners need to be fined no warning!
 - Ban the sale of animals (dogs and cats at minimum) in pet stores, they can support pet adoption instead. Regulate breeding of dogs and cats.
 - Targeting a breed is the same as racial profiling. Please don't punish a breed for [removed] dog owners neglecting responsible training.
 - Only place restrictions on dogs that have proven to be aggressive (any breed) don't punish owners who have worked hard to have behaved dogs
 - "No sale of puppies and kittens in pet stores.
-
- License fee for breeders"
 - No
 - There should be fines for people who take their dogs into stores (Walmart, Starbucks, etc). It is unsanitary, annoying, and bad for business.
 - large dogs, when loose, even if they are gentle, can knock down elderly citizens who are also trying to access the walkways.
 - Yyc pls continue to stand by our long held decision to put the responsibility at the other end of the leash NO TO BSL
 - no
 - Human behaviour doesn't change w/out consequences, if you change the human behaviour the animal behaviour will be resolved—[personal information removed] NO BSL
 - Bylaw to manage dogs based on ACTUAL behaviours. NOT apperance/breed. A huge NO to Breed targeted bylaws in Calgary. No BSL.
 - Punish the owner, not the breed! We need to have higher punishments for irresponsible/abusive pet owners. NO BSL! That won't help!



- Rotary Park is not a dog park. It's a multi use park. Dog owners, stop abusing your privilege of use and abide by the city laws.
- Many off leash parks are multi use parks used by runners/bikers and others. They are not the dogs parks. Dogs still need to be controlled.
- Please enforce leash laws better. I am afraid of dogs and it is always terrifying when they run up to me barking.
- I would support a bylaw banning the ownership of known pests such as pigeons, mice etc. If it spreads disease it shouldn't be a pet
- If you only place restrictions on dogs that have proven to be aggressive, it's too little too late. They've already hurt someone.
- Education to the public about fact/fiction regarding pitbull type dogs.
- Yyc is rated one of the most companionable cities in North America for people and pets lets continue our legacy NO BREED SPECIFIC BYLAW
- Targeting pit-bull type breeds is discriminatory, completely ignoring factors such as temperament, training, etc, Same as racial profiling
- Research shows 1 hr of dog safety training in grades 1 and 2 can reduce bites by 80%
- "We don't punish breeds we punish behaviour" — [personal information removed] Director of Animal Services Calgary.....NO BSL
- No bsl
- Pit bulls make up only 6% of the dog population, but they're responsible for 68% of dog attacks and 52% of dog-related deaths since 1982.
- [personal information removed]—"A breed ban on pit bulls would be counterproductive, its up to the owners to make sure their dogs are well trained"
- Breed bans are ineffective— [personal information removed]
- A breed ban would lead owners to replace their pitbulls with other aggressive dogs — [personal information removed]
- "All dogs can and will bite all that happens is your bites shift to other breeds"
- [personal information removed]
- One person is killed by a pit bull every 14 days, two people are injured by a pit bull every day, and young children are especially at risk.
- Breed isn't a factor in dog bites rather people are more likely to report a bite from a powerful breed NO TO BSL
- Ban the thought of Breed Specific Bylaws permanently
- Na
- Please look into rescues in our city so many use the rescue to flip dogs many are being housed in deplorable conditions, not being vetted
- Also look into how these dogs are being transported into the city from across the border through these rescues, unethical transport unsafe
- People that state that pits are not an aggressive breed are 1.out to lunch 2. [personal information removed] supporters 3. Pulled their "facts" out of imagination.



- Not fair to target one breed because some people don't know how to raise a dog properly.
- No to BSL. Do NOT punish bully breeds simply based on the way they look. It's unfair and unfounded.
- All dogs can and will bite, but when that bite is from a pit bull, the damage is devastating and irreparable.
- Dogs are dogs it is 100% up to the owner to keep them under control at all times NO TO BSL
- Your antispaam robot detector didn't allow me to submit my responses to the questionnaire. Thanks for wasting my time.
- High fines and jail time for animal abusers
- Please enforce leash laws. It is unfair to my (on leash) dog to be approached by other dogs, off leash, in public with irresponsible owners.
- Any animal that has been in some sort of "incident" chasing/injury..etc be made to take an obedience course REGARDLESS OF BREED!
- The only thing that is reliable about a pit bull is that once focused on its prey, the dog will be relentless in attack. Bred to kill. Ban!
- Most pit bull attacks are entirely unprovoked and half of the children killed are the victims of pit bulls raised with love in their household
- DNA records kept for pets and testing of illegal dog dirt. If there is a DNA match, impose a significant fine on the dog owner.
- Pits were bred to kill. Creating an unstoppable "fighting machine". Once they attack they don't stop. They need to be banned.
- "BSL does not work.
- Please do not go back to this outdated and ill proven model of animal control."
- No breed specific legislation, and mandatory education/training programs for the OWNERS of pets deemed nuisances
- Owners are the issue, not the breed. Say no to BSL. They are a beautiful, caring, gentle and loving breed. Don't discriminate.
- No ball ! It has been proven ineffective and is being removed in many other regions that have tried it.
- Pit bulls as Nanny Dogs is a myth. Advocacy groups quit supporting as children were in danger. <http://thetruthaboutpitbulls.blogspot.com>.
- It is 100% the owners responsibility to maintain their animal and be in-tuned with them. NO TO BSL. People also need to be trained
- Pit bull issue keeps coming to the table for a reason. If they weren't a problem they wouldn't be. The breeding needs to stop and ban
- no sure what to say.
- Even the suggestion of a breed ban is disgusting of the city. Educate yourselves on breedism. Your ignorance will not go unchallenged.
- All dogs should be treated the same because it is the owner or lack thereof, that causes an animal to be violent, not the breed of the dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Stakeholder Report Back: Verbatim Report

December 14, 2020

- No

Internal

Cats

To deal with the overpopulation of cats, we are considering increasing support for 'trap/neuter/release' programs. This could include:

- increasing fines for roaming cats found off property, and/or
- investing more in spay/neuter programs for feral cats, or
- A combination of A and B

Which option do you think would best serve Calgarians? What additional supports/resources would The City need to make your choice successful?

- Both. Increased fines important for roaming domesticated cats that are owned
- Both, what if we only released cats to their owner once they have been spayed/neutered?
- Like mandatory spay/neuter? Yes, if they are brought into animal services they would need to be spayed to be released.
- If we spay neuter in a catch and release to limit overpopulation. Trap in areas of concern.
- I know that AARCS has a spay/neuter program and we had a discussion on whether City should take over program or just send funding over to groups already doing it. Combination of A and B. Another question is whether we need legislative amendments to the bylaw to be able to trap/neuter. Question for law....do we have legislative authority (municipal and provincial) for these programs? Don't want to run afoul of our own bylaw or provincial legislation.
- In past years CHS took in all cats without ID. Is this something that could be explored in the future?
- Why are we releasing feral cats if cats cannot be AT LARGE?
- We don't.
- If increase fine, is there a risk of people coming in?
- Don't know what mitigation is
- Increase fine in unaltered cats? Does this make sense? Yes it does, stats are unknown at the moment will have to check this
- They don't care if they keep paying or they can't afford, spay or neuter
- Cats are feral, lots of complaints on this – what should we do? – research in TO spay or neuter then let out, invest in spay or neuter and encourage this
- Lowering fines as it might be prohibited – what are the other options? Balancing act, we can see more cats come in
- Increase is this supported? Keep it same for first offence, scaled approach for 2nd, 3rd...



- Education for the public, don't realize cats destroy flower beds – potential Option D for council – this could be part of the solution
- Combining A and B – agree with scaled approach
- I think spaying and neutering is the most effective for overpopulation. With the requirement that there would need to be education on why the City does a TNR program when roaming cats is against the bylaw.
- I think modifying the No Cost Program for ONLY cats, will help citizen's get their pet altered and Microchipped. Also means that we can provide that education while the pet is in our care.
- I support [personal information removed] in her comment on fines being cost prohibitive for owners wanting/being able to retrieve their pet.
- The TNR program from MEOW does neuter all their cats.
- I wouldn't say I support lowering fines but I don't think I support increasing fines. I also think if we offer microchipping, whether at cost or otherwise, would be hugely beneficial with ensuring cat owners are identified and will help with tracking repeat offenders and makes it more difficult for a possible owner match to deny being the owner. Although the microchipping events haven't been as successful as Toronto has seen I think they're still hugely beneficial. But being able to offer microchipping more than a few times a year would be ideal.
- YES [personal information removed]!
- Following [personal information removed] comment then perhaps we need more awareness/availability of the public cat traps.
- No need to discuss, but I want to capture this note (and my apologies if this was already discussed). Don't we already issue one warning ticket per year for cat at large offences (per Section 37(3) of the RPO)? That's essentially a type of scaled fine system.
- Yes
- Guilty in court before escalating, there is a legislated impact – this is not as easy
- Scaled approach but not in bylaw – question for law
- There is a problem with feral cats, neighborhoods people feeding and caring for cats, is there a program/incentive to help them bring these cats to the shelter?
- [additional supports]
- a combination of both would be great.....less of a backlog for the Spay/neuter program.....and for the chronic offenders, higher fines would be nice for us to issue
- What about reduced license fees/fines for cats that are spayed or neutered, to help reduce the population
- higher fines for cats that aren't fixed
- Removal of warning per license period
- get rid of the 1 warning per licence year to give us more discretion
- I agree with [personal information removed] re: no freebie of an at large per licensing year
- need to get rid of the requirement to issue a warning for the first offense in a licensing year too
- they often will be regularly at large, but then new license period = warning



- How about free license for first year if cats are spayed or neutered
- should the shelter be dealing w feral cats? they are busy enough from speaking to them.
- that technically is already in the RPO (double the amount for re-occurrence of offence) it would be nice to see reduced license for ""indoor cats"" however that would likely mean we are accepting outdoor cats
- what about making licensing available at the vets?
- discounted license under the Fair Entry Program has been previously suggested but I'm not sure where this went?
- Increasing a fine is alright, all 3 at once – spaying and neutering, not just feral cats
- We can start with option B
- Do we have stats on feral cats in the city?
- 2% of the cats taken in at the shelter in 2019 were considered feral, 43 cats
- How many cats that end up at AS are still intact?
- That's a great question, I would have to get back to you on that one removing the legislated requirement, warning. Having a policy versus a legislation
- Separate amount for unaltered cats
- Higher subsequent amounts for reoccurring, any thoughts on this?
- I like this, more cats from properties than feral
- Nuisance section – increase fines, helpful for cats and animals
- What additional supports/resources would The City need to make your choice successful?
- Education
- Removing barriers like cost to participate in the program
- I think increase in fines may result in people not licensing cats and also not picking impounded cats up from shelter.
- What about subsequent fines?
- first fine for cats is free already
- More availability for spay / neuter for all cats
- Wait lists should be shorter through city channels
- More partnerships would be helpful as well to help spay / neuter cats
- We have cats coming into the shelter multiple times. And then after a while the owners don't redeem them. Maybe when owners redeem the cat we can do mandatory microchipping. Would make owners more accountable. Sometimes we have cats that come through the no cost spay and neuter program and the owners redeem them the first time they get out but then they don't redeem them after that. First time it gets out, we can give them the benefit of the doubt, but after that make it mandatory microchip and the owner has to pay for it.
- Don't have the exact figures on the number of cats coming in without a microchip – guess would be 50%.
- [How much to charge for that?] Can't make any profits as a City facility, so we could do it at the purchase cost and staff time. Shouldn't be more than \$20.



- I like [personal information removed] idea. But could we also have an offense when they refuse to pick up the animal?
- If we know who the cat owners are and they refuse to pick up the animal because they don't want a ticket, can we not still issue them a ticket? If they say "it's the 4th time my cat's been there, you can keep him"...what can we do? We can invest money into the animal and adopt it out or euthanize it. Can we not still charge?
- If the cat has a form of ID, we can confirm ownership and if the owner doesn't redeem the cat, it becomes a case of abandonment and it becomes a case that we can send to the Calgary Humane Society (CHS). It's an offence under the Animal Protection Act (APA). You can't abandon your animals. At least then these animals would end up at CHS and we would be spared from the medical/spay/neuter costs for these animals.
- Under the APA, if you don't redeem your animal it becomes abandoned. Same thing happens at vet clinics. Those animals end up at CHS. We can offer that as an option, but we still wouldn't get any fines from the owners.
- Are there any other municipalities that have done mandatory microchipping?
- Continue investing in the spay/neuter program and more education.
- [Re: higher fines for unaltered cats. For [personal information removed] - What level of certainty is there that we would be able to say that an animal is unaltered?] That would be easy for us. Females you can see a spay scar and males have an absence of testicles.

Wildlife

It is currently prohibited to feed or tease wildlife in Parks. Would you support a bylaw prohibiting feeding and teasing wildlife on private property? Please explain your response.

If yes, what supports/ resources would be needed to enforce the bylaw?

- Is that not covered in the community standards bylaw (CSB) with the attracting of pests?
- Not sure why people would have wildlife on their private property. We should have something in the bylaw that tells people that they cannot entice wildlife into private property because that will increase the predatory response of other animals which will increase risk to public as a whole.
- Recently dealt with a call with [personal information removed] who is intentionally feeding skunks. I used the accumulation that could attract pests section under community standards.
- in Edmonton, [personal information removed] used to put out meat to entice coyotes. No mechanism to deal with that issue. No real issues in Calgary, but looking for input. Would have to make an exemption for feeding birds. Don't know if there is a problem with people putting out meat or other attractants outside of birds.
- we have had that out in Springbank with people feeding bunnies, which attract bobcats and coyotes.
- Maybe updating CSB would be better as there has been issues with enforcing. You would have to be very specific of feeding of animals – that would have to be proven. You would have to be able to see the food being put out and animals feeding on it for evidence to warrant it going to court. CSB



just talks about attracting – no need to prove animal is feeding. We had a case in the NE with people putting food on a rooftop to feed animals. Complaints in Erlton with people putting out loaves of bread to feed rabbits. Proof has to be there that intent is to feed animals and not just putting out garbage.

- I think it should stay in Comm Standards as this is the Responsible PET Ownership - not wildlife.
- are there prosecutorial challenges with using the CSB to address attractants? Is there an opportunity to strengthen the CSB?
- challenge is word 'accumulation'. One loaf of bread does not constitute an accumulation. Accumulation would be people spreading bird seed on a yard, ground feeders etc.
- There are also squirrels which is common place. And the bird feeders are subject to squirrel checking out. 'Food for thought' Law has defined food as 'not accumulation' as the food is acquired - placed- eaten - then replaced so it's not usually in place too long.
- Comm Standards Bylaw
- S.8. (1) No owner or occupier of a Premises shall allow on the Premises, the accumulation of:
 - any material that creates unpleasant odors;
 - any material likely to attract pests; or
 - animal remains, parts of animal remains, or animal feces.

***I think take accumulation as well and add under (a) pests, wildlife,

- In terms of feeding - untidy property, seeds
- Can cause damage to property
- Fish creek park – food out brings in wildlife and surrounding property
- Yes supports if they are feeding. Is it the avian species or mammals – more mammals
- Squirrel problem, don't know if we can get away from this
- Public and private areas with these problems – Erlton – big problem with rabbits
- If yes, what supports/ resources would be needed to enforce the bylaw?
- One councilor is a bird lover, can't see to put forward not to feed birds
- Put in what is the harm
- Encouraging or luring of wildlife
- would that include bird feeders – answer is no
- Yes, I imagine it would be similar to the ""Attract pests"" under the CSB
- We already have accumulation of material which attracts pests to deal with people feeding wildlife
- I had a complainant in regards to a person feeding rabbits. The offender wanted me to issue a ticket, so he could call the media [removed] to hire an expert to determine if the rabbits caused a problem.
- Two areas most challenging
 - Pigeons, most pigeon coupes from feeding wildlife and accumulates. Prohibiting in private properties will help
 - Hares – challenging to enforce. Dog chasing bunnies at a townhouse complex
- Birdfeeders, where to draw the line. Waste attracting pests like mice and affecting property. Rule of no feeding at all?



- Thought of exemptions of feeding birds, not pigeons this is something to think about
- I think we have something in com bylaw accumulating feeding, are there issues of enforcement?
- We had a similar issue in Bridgeland with a neighbor feeding coyotes. Major safety concern.
- Coyotes found a den, they felt sorry for them and kept feeding them. This was a simple education, don't know if any issues ever since
- How was this resolved?
- More education and talking to them and getting them to realize the impact on rest of neighborhood. We showed them how to board it up and not invite animals. Didn't use CSB more education
- Can we add a definition of ""pest"" to the bylaw? (add to section 8 of comm standards bylaw)
- I'm thinking that an ask to Council for education officers might be required with the RPO review
- Education in schools on dog dangers, co-habitating with wildlife, urban hens, etc
- property owner was feeding ducks and then bob cat was in the area. Incident with officer and home owner, there was confusion.
- Everything other than birds
- it would be tough to enforce on private property
- what wild life would we be speaking about / dealing with?
- ok
- yes there is, not enforced very often
- definition of pests would have to be changed
- that's different yes
- What is considered wildlife? example feral rabbits
- Just wanted to make sure we're not talking about birds. Something that's not fowl-related. The little mammals that sometimes go with it, squirrels and such. I think squirrels should be included as 'no feed' because they can become a pest. They can do damage to people's homes. You do have to put some kind of note in there for people feeding birds, what happens if you're attracting other pests?
- It can create confusion, as people have bird feeders in the back yard and it will attract squirrels. Wildlife is a broad term.
- I think it would be very hard to enforce unless an officer witnesses it. All wildlife on own property.
- Is this really an issue, I have not heard of issues with wildlife in residential areas?

Dogs

The City of Calgary is exploring additional options to deal with problem dog behaviours, such as severe bites. A list of measures that other municipalities have taken to reduce the frequency and severity of dog bites is listed below [Provided in session. See www.calgary.ca/petbylaww for this list.]

What concerns, if any, would you have of any of these measures? What additional resources would you need to implement any of these measures?

- Why pitbulls (which is not a breed)?



- I didn't think we were interested in breed specific legislation.
- I'm not sure that we are, but we have to ask the questions and let Council and strategic decision-makers decide. Need to do our due diligence through this process.
- breed specific would be very difficult to prove - it should go history and behaviour of actual dog involved in each incident.
- The insurance portion is interesting because many of dog owners in district 4 are renters. I think insurance should be mandatory for ALL dogs and can be purchase at ASC.
- I was attacked Lvl 5 on duty by an American Staff. Terrier and I overall think we need to hold ALL dog owner responsible, regardless of breed.
- Comment about not having more dogs if/when a dog is designated as nuisance. Could we add a stipulation that if a dog is declared a nuisance, no additional animals can be brought into the household for the life of that dog. Can't dedicate resources and time to that dog with more animals in the house. Insurance should go into recommendations for sure – benefits dog owners with dogs who bite more than us.
- If an animal has insurance, they get a licence reduction. If they've done obedience training, they get a different licence category. Makes people invest in their own animals more.
- Structured rates based on what actions the owner takes (insurance, obedience) to reduce licence rates.
- Similar to demerit points – dogs get treated differently if they reach a certain threshold. More benefits with further investment into the animal's behaviour (agility training, obedience, insurance, etc). I think it could be a 3-step threshold.
- What is making us target Bully Breeds, why aren't we trying to keep it open when it comes to breeds? We just tie our hands.
- Insurance for ALL dogs would eliminate any discrimination towards any specific breed
- If we over legislate a specific breed the owners of those breeds will not license their dogs and hide from us
- To [personal information removed] this is true.
- There are regions in Europe where all dogs are muzzled if off the property. Possibly a prevention strategy which works.
- People already licence their dogs as something else as they don't want their dog labelled as pitbull
- Having insurance for all dogs would decrease home/illegal breeders due to fine for each dog not insured.
- In social media, emotional response to this.
- Need to do due diligence and bring engagement to council
- No advocacy for this, need answers to these questions
- Is there data that correlates breed with increase bites? Yes, we reviewed our own data, Eg: pit bulls severity of bites are higher dunbar scale .
- Last 4 points – what if that and a loop hole through paid assessments
- Consider not increasing admin work



- Agree with the last 4 points and obedience training. Don't agree with increase fines. Obedience training through license perhaps for these breeds
- Dangerous behaviour - Authority to seize how would this be different from what we are doing today?
No answer
- Agree for these breeds not to go to off leash parks, if owners know they have a history, need education around this.
- Breeders held more accountable, provide training to people they are selling to.
- Big no to BSL because it is hard to visually identify a breed of a dog.
- I do not support BSL.
- How will "nuisance" dog be defined and regulated?
- I would need to understand the definition to answer the question as well.
- I think supporting obedience training is a great idea in general. And then ensuring that a good resource be provided to those seeking training so they access accredited professionals. If a household has more than one nuisance dog then would the owner be forced to surrender one?
- Based on that definition (nuisance), I don't think it's reasonable for a dog that has been involved in multiple barking offences (for example) to be muzzled in off-leash parks or receive higher fines for an aggressive incident. There would need to be more nuance.
- I agree.
- What is an interim order?
- Is there an organization that we could collaborate with to do the assessments?
- Also what is the definition of Dangerous behaviour? and how would that be handled logistically? It seems no different from how a dog is captured today if out rather than 'seized'.
- When someone adopts a dog from AS they have to provide proof of payment of a training class. Can we do something like that for RTOs? In specific circumstances such as with "nuisance" dogs? As I type this I don't even know if I agree with my own comment.
- Have we deemed a dog to be a nuisance since 2015? I used to draft the nuisance letters that were sent out to dog owners.
- [personal information removed] and I discussed previously of taking the issue to the breeders.
- What about higher fines for aggressive incidents that occur in off leash areas?
- Yes to [personal information removed] comment on putting onus on the breeders.
- What additional resources would you need to implement any of these measures?
- Importing and selling – asking law right now, this is in review
- Using a tribunal system provides city with flexibility and expedite the process
- Are they asking for assessments to be available to all dog owners? Or just those that have come to our attention?
- Would not support BSI. It is hard to enforce and I don't believe there is research to support it
- breed specific legislation may be hard to enforce as people just claim it's a different breed or a cross
- In regards to general training - could we offer a license rebate to those that can prove they have done training



- I think increased fines for problem dogs (often at large) is a good idea
- I like the muzzle idea – for pit bull and nuisance
- we technically have it in RPO as is, however an easier way to do this would be great
- what about going by seize vs. breed, pit bull X and nuisance, can we go by weight of dog vs breed
- I'm just thinking more in terms of the size of the dog... (answering [personal information removed] weight question)
- I agree with [personal information removed]
- yup
- ok
- I think we have already established a standard through the courts & in the Canine Behaviour community, the CCPDT is the most accepted standard
- the size of a dog should not matter
- Nuisance would be good
- Setting more specific standards within the bylaw itself clarifying when a dog will be seized may help
- a lot of these need more time, money and officers
- I think it does matter in terms of owners not being able to control the dog
- like 3 at large impounds in 6 months will seize for assess, or something maybe?
- yes.
- Has the topic of allowing nuisance dogs to breed come up?
- Vicious dogs we require to be altered, I am not sure if the same applied to nuisance
- What if the department considered a pilot program to have all dogs in off-leash parks where muzzles for a period of say 2 years so Bylaw can study and determine if a more comprehensive approach needs to take place, or that all dogs be muzzle in the City
- We could see if aggressive incidents fall, and how the owner perceive the new requirement. I think council would go for this on the public safety issue alone
- If we're going to ask for muzzling, it should be for all dogs, not just for pit bulls.
- What additional resources would you need to implement any of these measures?
- requiring training to own a dog would also be difficult as we'd have to establish what standards would be and accredit training
- I think it is hard to ask that all pit bulls be muzzled. However more education on muzzling to the public (so it is not as taboo) is not a terrible idea
- muzzling also involves additional training. I don't think it's fair to have large dogs muzzled and small not. I've dealt with nasty Chihuahuas
- Breed specific legislation – other jurisdictions, not at all helpful, people hide animals
- Minor bites, chase threats – need better education and hope it doesn't get to level 3 – 5 bite. Stopping it here will help
- My concern is if pit bull ban was enacted, what is a pit bull? For us it will be a lengthy list or so generic. Defining what a pit bull is difficult. Officers know their breed and some don't. the range to define pit bull won't work out and will be difficult



- I watched a documentary from the UK, and it was based on size (height in centimeters), ear, head type, muscles etc. – how to identify
- Based on my own experiences while living in the UK the legislation was not very successful. Legislation brought in very quickly, police was brought in, didn't go very far
- Obedience training, reduced license if you have proof of a registered trainer
- Nuisance dogs, Muzzling dogs, higher fines for mid-range bites 3 – up. More education in earlier stages
- Can we set up a system for releasing a dog on conditions after we've seized it?
- Obedience training, any thoughts on this training? What are the standards?
- There is a variance
- Canadian pet trainer
- CPTD-KA certified trainers only?
- CPDT-KA for basic obedience
 - Re: aggression:
- Can we separate the bite with puncture from the bite with no puncture? We can have a level 2 bite, with a bruise, that is the same fine as a level 3 bite (puncture all the way up to tearing of skin). A bite puncture can consist of canines (4 punctures), and the front teeth with significant bruising. This type of aggression is very different from a level 2 bite, which may leave a tooth scrape, and a small bruise.
- This may be more of policy, but when a dog is seized, or when an owner feels that they need further help I think we need to bring back aggression style assessments. I've had a dog that was seized for a level 4 bite on a child at 8 months old, and the assessment was if the dog could sit, and not about its behaviour. The aggressive dog assessment, while not perfect, was a huge help to many owners, and they left with a ton of information on how to avoid further aggression. We did not offer the training, but what was best to help the dog (and there for the public safety as it was less likely to have a further incident). If we are going to add the 'hit and run' section for fines, I think that it will truly help to have benefits for staying around and having an assessment would be part of that.
- What additional resources would you need to implement any of these measures?
- Training is a big deal, better education on the aggression
- More education in earlier stages
- This may result in people not licensing their dogs or lying about the breeds in response to BSL....
- If Pit Bulls are not allowed in off leash parks they may be kept cooped up in a home....these breeds need to run and get exercise
- nuisance control on animals? I feel like it already exists but not using it, think about expanding it?
- I just feel ALL dog owners should be held accountable for their dogs behavior, shepherds / huskies / larger breed dogs can all bite just the same as a bully breed dog.
- How are we defining nuisance dogs behavior?
- Steeper fines is a good option IMO
- What additional resources would you need to implement any of these measures?
- Incentive program for training dogs... ?



- More accessibility for training / maybe discounts for dogs that are professionally trained.
- Breed specific legislation doesn't work from past research. I think the bylaws should include all breeds. Education is key!
- Re insurance: if we put that in the bylaw are we going to define what that looks like? What happens if my broker doesn't provide that? How would I get that?
- Is there an age limit for who can be walking a nuisance dog?
- We should probably have an age limit or the ability to say who can walk the dog. Depends what the nuisance is...is it barking or aggression? Need to be guidelines about who can be considered responsible for that animal.
- Agree, BSL, or mentioning a particular breed will not go well with public, animal welfare groups.
- What about repeat dog owner offenders? (with history of repeat offenses with their dogs) Consider the dog owner the nuisance and that they require higher licence fees, mandatory education etc.
- [Do you mean declare the owner the nuisance and then that would apply to all his/her dogs?] The dog could still be considered the nuisance but if the owner consistently has dogs that are nuisances they are the bigger concern.
- Mandatory payment of fines. Many irresponsible pet owners get away, as they do not redeem their dogs.
- Research has shown that Breed specific legislation doesn't work. I feel that education is key to everything. If more people were educated with behaviour, communication and the responsible pet bylaws prior to owning a pet then this would make a world of difference. I feel that we cannot make training mandatory for a specific breed etc. All dogs should have training and all owners should have some knowledge prior to owning a pet.
- As per nuisance dogs – depends on nuisance – each dog would have to be looked at on an individual basis. Some dogs might not be suited for off-leash parks while others may need this for their mental and physical health.
- As we discussed with higher fines I feel that the fines should go up with each offense or impound. The fines shouldn't be higher just because the dog is a nuisance or a pitbull.
- Pitbulls must be muzzled in public and off leash parks – I think again that you cannot single out a particular breed. Dog and people reactive and high prey drive dogs should be muzzled when walking. Dogs that need to be muzzled at an off-leash park shouldn't be there. There are a number of off-leash parks that people with reactive dogs can rent and use.

Pigeons

Which additional rules would you support for enforcement of properties that own pigeons?

- Locating the pigeon coop within a specified distance of adjacent houses
- Odour management (eg. clean coop, etc.)
- Enforce coop standards
- Removal of some or all birds if problems arise



➤ Cleanup of pigeon feces

Are there other rules you would suggest? What resources would staff need to enforce these rules?

- I think we need to hold the clubs responsible
- Re: odour management, is covered under the CSB.
- Lot of complaints we get in this area is that the owners aren't responsible for their birds. They open the coop, they fly wherever they want and poop, then fly home. Community has to deal with the mess. Owners say it's wild pigeons, not the pigeons they own. We have no mechanisms to deal with that. Should they have to take the pigeons off site to fly them?
- Most of the complaints ref pigeons I have dealt with are from neighbours complaining about the pigeons pooping on their property NOT the pigeon owners. How are we supposed to enforce that? Unable to prove which bird did what.
- Maybe look at having properties install pigeon netting?
- And could be wild birds.
- The Club members fly their birds but I get concerns from neighbours about them pooping on homes and yards etc. There are also no standards for issuing the bands from the club I had to look into this because I had Chickens with bands.
- Pigeon card – possible to get a list of this?
- Don't know what happens if they say I have a racing card. An organization publishes a list
- Standards of where and how to coup, if complaint, can they lose their card?
- What are conditions to lose card?
- Looking for more flexibility in bylaw, hard to remedy and for owners to address issues. Ability for the chief or whomever to understand complaint and then come up with provisions
- What is the remedy of coup? Where to put the birds, contractor comes in? what are the resources, list of resources if enforcement is needed.
- Seize pigeons, contractor needed, location to store, very few go to this extend, use these conditions to get compliance like other investigations.
- If that bad, humane society would be involved
- what about racing pigeons? could we get a list of these
- Out of curiosity, what is the reason that people own pigeons?
- I don't know enough about pigeons to have an opinion or suggestion.
- honestly i feel if these get accepted in the city of Calgary- bylaw, cps, 311, etc will have a lot MORE complaints from citizens
- they are already accepted now?
- at least number allowed for sure
- rules surrounding possible noise complaints
- do pigeons have to be banded? make it easier to distinguish between owned and wild birds
- yes, banded and part of club
- cleanliness - they poop all over neighbouring properties.



- Pigeons: there has been discussion around whether the Pigeons can be let out to fly or be "at large" when banded as part of a Club.....but then they cause damage to feces to neighbouring houses
- we have had damage to property complaints regarding pigeons
- limitations on amount of pets is a concern, for certain animals
- hard to determine/prove that they caused the feces, although that's the biggest part of my pigeon complaints
- there's 2 club in Canada they have to be registered with. Canadian Fanciers and/or Canadian pigeon racing club
- Are there guidelines from those groups where their membership can be taken away if a person is not following set guidelines?
- no. it's either or.
- not both
- It is not both, it's either
- Under the RPO a bird (pigeon) is under the definition of animal so technically they are at large.
- think chickens and pigeons should maybe be permitted similar to emotional support animals
- Then we have a list of locations and can avoid duplicate complaints
- Clubs also don't always respond when you try to confirm their Good Standing
- well my concern with all livestock, animals, birds is transmittable disease control how do we ensure this doesn't increase and cause later concerns
- Banded? Pigeons, yes
- pigeons need to be banded
- What resources would staff need to enforce these rules?
- and a tagging system for chickens, like the pigeon's bands, so we can ID
- What about chicken identification, for when there is 'at larges'
- Maybe they should be required to license - pigeons and chickens?
- Biggest issue is defecation. All over decks and fences. Somehow make sure this is cleaned up. Something to put in the bylaw
- Sense of what the number should be?
- 20 [personal information removed], all fly together and defecation issue
- 10 would still give pigeon racers...
- Similar to bees, owners being serious, have a requirement to be part of club or organization
- Agree with the defecation, in the North, causes havoc, how to control? Impossible. Have a licensing fee to have a coup, yearly license
- Currently, to become a member there is a cost, to be part of the association is in the bylaw. How to clean coup is not in the bylaw. There should be a license and stricter bylaw on this
- I like the idea of the licence for pigeons and with that licence we could include some guidelines from the recognized associations
- What about licensing pigeon coups? Give us flexibility to take license away



- something I would like to see, provide more leverage
- What if people are keeping Pigeons to eat them? I have been to a few calls about this in the past.
- Labelled as nuisance animal, this is a question for law
- If we do have to send it to clean-up, do we need a specified contract with our contractors, so they know how to keep themselves safe from things like bird feces or Hanta Virus? Do they require special things? And then billing back to the property owner for having to do all that work.
- Contractors going in to clean up would not only need to protect themselves but also use chemicals that are safe for the pigeons
- Annual inspection before granting the license on yearly basis.
- Exotic animals, birds, pigeons – should be regulated with an annual check-up to ensure owner is meeting the conditions and animals are being properly cared for.
- Re: urban hens and Avian Influenza. It's a reportable disease for the province – backyard hens would be isolated, and chances are low for disease. Must have a strategy in place though from the Office of the Chief Provincial Veterinarian. Very small risk for backyard poultry but should be considered in a risk assessment.

Dog Early Warning System

To address the needs of pet owners and non-pet owners, and to respond to concerns raised regarding behaviour in on-leash areas and off-leash parks, we are exploring a voluntary dog early warning system.

What concerns or ideas would you have regarding a voluntary dog early warning system?

- Wouldn't need to be under the bylaw because that makes us responsible for saying these colours are reflective of the dog's behaviour. People get to choose which colour they use, then the dog attacks. Dogs have different temperaments which can change with age or illness. Don't think it's for us operationally – can't control what colour the owner chooses and whether they use it. Dogs are unpredictable – dog might have been good for 10 years. Dealt with a dog that was 2-3 years old and had a brain tumor. Was good one minute and nasty the next. Unpredictable when sick – wrong colour collar is asking for trouble.
- This should be something we address in schools with children - our public education team used to go into schools and do dog safety pieces.
- Agree with [personal information removed]. Something not for the bylaw, but maybe for Parks. Don't want people putting a colour on their dog and then holding the City accountable.
- Agree with [personal information removed]. You shouldn't have a reactive dog in an off-leash area.
- Agree with it as a suggestion/education basis, but not in bylaw. Other issue is kids approaching even with a red bandana. Ownership on both parties – dog owner and parents to educate kids on how to act around dogs. Colour also could be used by other to say "why is that dog with that colour bandana here?"
- IF you don't want your dog to interact with people/other dogs - don't go to dog park
- Most dog owners won't put tags on their dogs, I find it hard to think they would comply with this.



- Making the focus on education and schools, bringing back those programs, better to share this information more readily.
- Teach children how to deal with dogs if they're afraid. Was a benefit before rather than asking people to police themselves.
- Agree with education in schools. Did info sessions with my kids' classes in grade 1 on what to do when approached/bit/how to approach. Huge positive from schools – very appreciative. There are so many kids and parents that are scared of dogs. With officers in smaller zones, they could go back into schools to share bite education with kids.
- On the other side, even if you put whatever identification you like on the dog.... once you let the dog run at large with other dogs in the area, you will still run into issues with other dogs or people.
- Is a good system, concern is it is voluntary, if it bites, is there additional hard bec I didn't have this?
- Would this set up an expectation?
- If it stops 20 bites bec bandana on – isn't it worth it?
- Maybe post informational signs with key points about bylaw and expected behaviours
- In terms of liability, beware of dog sign in backyard – related to bandanas? Please clarify what is the correlation
- Reduce culpability
- Work in dogs favour potentially
- Better to have a sign? Reduce some culpability bec they were warned when there is civil lawsuits towards biting dog
- Front counter telling people not to put signs –
- Fear of dogs, pole to tie dogs in front of business, people with fear and people who pet. [removed] not allowed to leave dog unattended. This is a frustration that officers experience.
- definitely need more education on this point. This would be subjective.
- And if my dog is wearing a red bandana and is involved in an incident, does that absolve the owner?
- I don't know what qualifies as colour blindness but this might not be recognized. Also, might get confusing with owners who already have certain colours of dog accessories.
- It could mitigate liability potentially. That would be for the courts to decide based on situational factors.
- I heard the same thing, [removed], when I worked on the front counter.
- I don't think you're allowed to tie dogs up but maybe someone can confirm.
- I feel this would cause issues with others at the dog park. They will probably be giving the DO a dirty look and so forth. It's reminds me of offenders wearing an ankle bracelet and allowing others to see it
- Section 17(1) (tied/tethered and unattended)
- Many owners are in denial about their dog's behaviour and would "mislabel" their animal.
- people would assume aggression on unapproachable animals
- I don't like this idea. Seems like a liability. what happens when a 'nice' dog bites
- I think that's overkill



- up to the owner to control dog and warn people
- That could be taught in the child training about how to behave around dogs - regarding the greeting with permission maybe even for adults too.
- we shouldn't be involved in this...DO need to be responsible
- maybe expanding the tease enclosed animal to enable to charge if someone declares to not approach and someone ignores them
- I think we should be teaching children to never approach a strange dog
- exactly
- I like that idea of the just red bandana, but i think in that case, these dogs should also not be allowed off leash
- red cannot be seen by someone who is color blind,
- Yea "red dogs" should never be off leash,
- DO needs to take responsibility and take proper precautions to avoid a bite,
- people who are bad dog owners that have aggressive dogs - which would be the target area for this warning system - would not comply
- I still think it's a liability, even just the red bandana, if a dog is wearing one and bites someone, then can the DO put the blame on the victim?
- are we not setting these red bandanas as targets by public
- I reinforce the idea of encouraging owners to learn more about dog behaviour and understanding their dogs triggers, through training - and encouraging that training through license rebate program
- I agree with [personal information removed]
- Could red bandanas be used as a defense in court "my dog was wearing an warning and they came too close"
- is this implemented in Edmonton and how did it go? (not implemented in Edm just something worth exploring)
- I like the idea
- Can't mandate the idea to everyone
- What liability is there if green bandana bites someone
- Red bandana and it bites, issue ticket if dog was provoked? Depends on context
- Program online already to get bandanas, research is already out there. Good idea but hard to enforce. Difficult around stampede
- Not a city program, difficult to enforce
- My concern is that we are relying on the owners perception of the dogs behavior
- Good point
- who would provide the bandanas?
- liability, signage would be put up, an education approach
- good point
- If you have a red bandanna on a dog you are not absolved of responsibility.
- Some dogs like to eat bandannas.



- this is good food for thought
- I think it's a good idea. Compliance of the owner – would this be mandatory or voluntary?
- Same comment. I think it's a good idea. Since it's voluntary, I don't think it belongs in the RPO. Maybe education or promotion with City-logoed bandanas to get things started. Not sure it belongs in the bylaw.
- I think it would depend on the owner's opinion on their dogs behaviour. I think that lots of people will buy a red bandana but their dog is really good just to keep people away.
- My concern would be a false sense of the dogs behaviour. If someone has a green bandana, would this give the impression that the dog was completely safe to approach and run up to, pet etc. Also how would a person decide if the dog should be wearing a red or green bandana – would this be what the owner feels their dog should be wearing?

Fine amounts

We are currently exploring fine increases for RPO violations. What situations do you believe could be improved by increasing fines?

- Problem of 'at large'. Small ticket. Not the most serious offence, but the most prevalent. Would help with keeping dogs on leash in more areas.
- 'At large' should be higher. What's the root offence – often 'at large' is the root cause. Needs to be mitigated to prevent more serious offences.
- Not having a warning for Cats at Large - if we are going to keep it as an offence
- 'At large' responsibility is too little
- 'At large' and unlicensed definitely need fine increases. Take away the 1 freebie for at large cats.
- Cats have been in the bylaw for many years now and we can take away the one warning for at large for each license year.
- Discretion is fine.
- Agreed with [personal information removed] that legislating a warning for cats is odd and should be removed.
- but having that in the Bylaw is horrible. I have seen people with many warnings on the same cat.
- Increased specified amounts for repeat offenders, as it is now we have to make tickets mandatory court to increase the specified amount on the ticket
- Should fines be higher for at large cats that aren't spayed/neutered when they pick animal up from shelter?
- Might be hard to enforce (detect spay scars etc.). Don't know if that would cause an issue.
- I think so (re: fines should be higher for intact animals). Fine for at large unaltered animals.
- need to overcome the no ticket if its impounded thru vet clinic....as this is a lot of repeat offenders.
- Agree with [personal information removed] point.
- Agree with [personal information removed] point too. M/C animals. Can we offer it at least at cost? I had [personal information removed] get MC'ed so we can track him - he agreed



- Can we mandate microchips?
- Discussed a couple weeks ago. Should we be spaying/neutering and microchipping all animals at the shelter? Don't know if we can until they become our property.
- Offer m/C as a service when you redeem your animal at the shelter. Offer incentives if they agree. Better for tracking animals.
- Need to add outstanding fees (impound fees) to annual license fees to remove need for debit machines.
- Debit machines don't always work. Tell them it will be added to licence fees.
- Free ride home program being implemented as a value-added for licence fee.
- What about adding the fees into At Large fine cost?
- I don't think you can do that.
- [personal information removed], I meant increase the At Large fine in the RPO so that it covers the impound fee
- We can increase, but the penalty needs to be proportionate to the severity of the offence....you can't increase the penalty to capture additional costs that you currently have trouble collecting.
- Ok I see
- If it's not an effective deterrent or effective consequence then yes we can increase
- did you see the vet clinic comment...above.
- We don't issue VTs for At Large at the Shelter if it came from a Vet
- Why don't we ticket unlicensed pets through vet clinics...is that a policy or bylaw or is it stray animal?
- At large we don't ticket, unlicensed we do.
- Policy or bylaw?
- Policy
- I'll bring it up at the next Chief's meeting.
- It came from law some time ago as they did not want to call vet staff to court if it went to trial.
- It has something to do with if it goes to court and getting the Vets Staff involved in court.
- K, we can review.
- Aggressive should be higher, bites (person to person, animal, death)
- Graduated offences, continue to be unlicensed – higher fines
- Bite to children higher? – What if kid is tormenting the dog?
- Damage to animal is too broad, separate fines for both
- Fines for at large is higher than unlicensed – not equitable
- Aren't fines already higher for vicious animals?
- At vet clinic – no at large fine there. On agenda next chief's meeting
- Section 25(3) (damage to animal) is much too broad - there needs to be a differentiation between minor and severe damage and different fines for both.
- I think too - once a pet has been deemed vicious in the courts then the courts shouldn't be able to waive the keep fees for the shelter.
- Or if there are 2 offenses, such as at large while unlicensed could have a higher fine



- CN (complainant) would be happier with an increase in damages fine
- victim dog owner
- at large should be increased a bit, maybe barking to be more of a deterrent
- damage to animal is same fine as unlicensed. sometimes vet bills for damage are thousands of dollars and they get a 250 ticket
- higher penalties do not prevent anything
- Dividing damage fines - serious vs minor
- I think there should be levels of damage and appropriate fines per level
- because there's a big difference between a victim dog with \$10k in vet bills and a dog that peed on and wrecked someone's coat
- Yes agree with [personal information removed] for a differing fines between a scratch and 10 punctures
- Can we legislate something forcing people to pay those vet fees in regards to damage – no, it will be civil or restitution with victim, conversation with law needed
- I actually like the idea of putting Dunbar scale into the bylaw for both bites to humans and animals. And a fine associated with each level
- i really like this idea [personal information removed]
- it's in POPA [Provincial Offences and Procedures Act] [personal information removed]
- what if you label the bite by the wrong level...would the charge then be thrown out?
- don't like bites to children being higher
- I don't think you can differentiate
- I feel that they should be the same personally
- The Dunbar scale is a widely used scale now that standardizes the injury - I think it creates fairness across municipalities
- children step on dogs and provoke reactions
- I think a bite is a bite. Children often are involved with provoking dogs so wouldn't be fair to charge more.
- I don't think the dogs distinguish between age
- it should be based on severity of bite
- no a bite is a bite no matter who it was.
- I don't think it should be higher - more education to children on dog behaviour, and to new parents.
- just doesn't seem doable...should be across the board...
- I agree with severity
- At large, bad things happen when dogs at large
- Also cats nuisance
- Can we make the at large fine progressive? fines increase as dog continues to be found at large (Yep)
- How many before increased? What would be the deterrent?
- Agreed, but not based on prior guilty convictions



- You would need a paid fine or a guilty conviction to proceed to a higher fine amount though
- Would it be limited to a 12 mon timeframe too
- Higher fines for unlicensed animals - with regard to higher penalties for Bylaw infractions involving unlicensed animals...such as Running at large \$100 for a licensed animal and \$200 for an unlicensed animal.
- I think within a rolling two year time frame as the MGA has a 2 year statute of limitations
- I think that if at large fines increased, that unlicensed could too.
- fines increased when unlicensed running at large. Incentive to license.
- Suggestion – unlicensed and caught infraction to bylaw – increase fee for this
- Higher fine for bites and damages.
- to penalize or gain compliance with increased fines?
- If we increase the fine for 'at large' we might stop people from coming in if their dog is impounded. I think having a higher unlicensed fine might deter some people.
- The unlicensed fine is quite low is it not? [\$250]
- I think increased fines may deter people from redeeming their animals.
- Me too.
- Just the aggression. Fines for animals that are aggressive when they're at large. Should be a higher fine for them being at large and aggressive versus a dog that's friendly when at large. Maybe an additional fine for at large and aggressive. And then if it's bites someone, that's a whole other charge as well. Don't have to be at large and aggressive, you could just be one. The Labrador out playing ball with the kids isn't necessarily a safety hazard, whereas a German Shepherd or Border Collie out chasing kids has a whole different safety component to it.
- What about people not picking up after their dogs, More fines? \$250 is ok.
- I have educated so many people in our quadrant.
- As well - it is a potential health hazard. When you look at why dogs are banned from school yards – feces can cause blindness in children.
- Serious zoonotic disease issues.
- Is that the same fee for folks not picking up feces in their yard?
- the fine is usually for not picking up dog feces outside of their own yard. In their own yard, it becomes untidy and then we can charge back for having it cleaned up.
- Should be \$500 to keep it in line with littering fine, it's \$1000 for burning material.
- If a single dog owner has many violations under the RPO can they not be allowed to obtain a license from us, (thereby hopefully preventing them from having animals legally in the city)?
- I feel that the fines should increase on repeat offences and increase accordingly.

Tribunal

What ideas or concerns would you have regarding a tribunal system?



- I think it's positive. [removed]. Better for all parties, shelter staff, dog owners. Owners have been more present and engaged when they have been allowed to keep their dogs. We have to set a threshold that is consistent. Not all level 4 dogs are seized. If we're going to designate a dog right off the bat, we need clear standards, thresholds for the declarations for consistency.
- The promise to contain order is a great idea. It will ease the process on the dog, dog owner and require less of our resources.
- The way the dogs deteriorate in the shelter. For the wellbeing of dogs if we are seeking to return them to society, they are affected by long-term stays at the shelter.
- The shelter is not equipped for long term care. So I agree with this.
- Promise to contain order in conjunction with tribunal is a good idea. We would still have to hold the dog if the owner wanted to appeal?
- It's also the health and safety of the staff for having multiple repeated interactions.
- 100% support of tribunal system
- 100% support as well, can educate people as well and see the case one by one. More control of the issue and help the owners for future problems
- 100% support a tribunal system!
- Agreed!
- Absolutely there should be a tribunal system. AS is not equipped for long term care and dogs kept longterm at the impound will almost certainly have deteriorated health/behaviour.
- should be an AVBMA member on the panel
- Would an appeal of the tribunal's decision go to the LCSAB? Would it ever enter the court system?
- Two Qs: Is there an estimated time frame for a decision to be made by tribunal? What is the current timeframe? (don't need to discuss this now)
- much faster. Can have a hearing within a month.
- We would hope it would be in a couple weeks, whereas court can require a wait of months in some cases
- I think it is a great idea
- I'd be ok with Tribunal but some concerns with knowledge level of citizen's on a panel
- Can you explain what those timelines would look like
- agreed - tribunal is a good alternative
- if it keeps dog out of shelter longer then great
- why do we need to have non city reps and/or more than one adjudicator?
- agreed- love this idea
- This is a great idea
- yes
- yes
- My understanding is the panel would have a dog Behaviour expert (trainer or vet), with a combo of city and non
- Would a tribunal have the same weight as the courts do? - Yes



- tribunal system through administrative law does not require the appearance of procedural fairness. It just needs to be fair, we have a tribunal system in place that is adjudicated by one person
- What sort of time frame
- I see CDTA, CPTD, and CAPTD on the web
- For tribunal?
- Same force and affect as in court? (yes, still have right to appeal)
- What sort of timeframe for a tribunal?
- Within a month would be our goal
- And we would keep the dog for a month?
- 3 weeks to a month to hold a hearing, 45 days to have judicial review
- Who would make up the members of the tribunal?
- This would be far quicker than the Courts
- I like this process if it expedites the process

Bite and Run

If a dog bites a person or other animal, do you support a rule that requires the dog owner to remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer if necessary? Please explain.

- yes.
- If people don't remain, there should be a fining section for that. There should be a fine. As an owner I'm responsible for my dog's actions, similar to my children. If my animal is involved in an altercation and I'm present, I should be held to share my details to ensure the safety of all, to check vaccines etc.
- Agree, there should be a fine. Owner is responsible.
- Difficult as some people do not realize their dog is injured until they get home - or too embarrassed to admit they have been bitten at the time etc...also not enough officers to commit to attending to the call in timely manner.
- If a person is negligent or is evading, there should be a fine or mandatory court. Would have to consult with law. Not for use with people who are just being belligerent, but for individuals who flee the scene and try to evade.
- They do not have to remain on scene but definitely have to provide information
- You can't expect them to stay for an hour to wait for an officer.
- What if our response time does not allow for a quick attending to the scene? We do not have the ability to respond to the scene immediately.
- I like the idea of providing licence tag # BUT not all dogs are licenced. [Agreed]
- Why don't we make it mandatory for all dogs at off-leash parks to be licensed? Whether that be through a scan card to get into entry points through a swipe/fob system etc.



- For response times - maybe we need a section for dog owners to mandatory self-report or provide contact details to the other owner. Compare it to the vicious section of the bylaw where the onus is on animal owner to report that the dog is at large or has committed an infraction. Self-report might be best with language barriers or if they don't have a pen at the moment to share information.
- Even a sign at the entrance stating all dogs must be licensed to enter the park area.
- All dogs must be licensed in the City regardless anyway.
- To [personal information removed] point above, why not make access to a dog park a membership where all dogs inside the park are expected to be licensed and in good standing with Bylaw Services? Charge a small yearly fee. [Why don't we make it mandatory for all dogs at off-leash parks to be licensed? Whether that be through a scan card to get into entry points through a swipe/fob system etc.]
- Treat like a car accident?
- There should be some sort of waiting at the scene for contact information, but how to enforce. To elaborate, if I'm the bad owner I would take animal away from the scene
- Need to be able to exchange info in some capacity for follow ups
- Question: Do you need the leash with you in off leash park? – yes that is correct
- If you have a dog and it bites another dog, if no leash to put it on, it would be difficult. Having a leash would be easier
- depends on the incident. If the dog cannot be controlled at the location makes more sense to remove the animals and the owner is the usually the best to remove / control the animal
- I think it means that there is far less confusion for the victim too.
- Share Information. Some D/O's would not wait at the scene.
- It should be a requirement of the bylaw that the owner of an offending dog share their information.
- Exchanging information yes because I would anticipate if a dog bites someone then the owner is likely going to be frazzled and won't want to stay put. They'd probably want to leave the situation ASAP because of the dog's state of higher arousal and general stressful situation.
- do we have a bylaw around having a leash with you in an offleash park? IN case the need to leash your dog comes up?
- I think you're supposed to be able to leash your dog if something happens.
- I like the idea of having that charge, don't know if would change behaviour much but gives us more leverage and creates education opportunities to teach people to be responsible
- Yes. But what would the consequence be if they didn't stay?
- Not sure how you can make someone stay on scene - especially a lot of the time we want an animal removed from the situation to avoid further escalation, but a requirement to exchange information and then an extra charge if they are found and failed to do so?
- At least give dog owner info to victim should be required
- Also a fine for providing false information?
- sounds similar to leaving the scene of a motor vehicle accident - I would appreciate to have that penalty as an option
- a VT (violation ticket) for failure to stay on scene would also make te victim happy



- I agree with [personal information removed] on this, would be a nice additional charge if required
- Fine has to be significant enough for them to stay at the scene. I think it should be there
- Significant is 1000. Assessments further help for the aggressive animals, benefits for staying and a fine if not.
- We've had two dogs in our care for the last 10 months and have no ability to release these animals
- As we have a court order to destroy, but have to wait for appeals
- Are we keeping the dog while we wait for a tribunal? Can we establish a release process where the owner is bound by conditions (muzzle/leashed)?
- I agree with, we have hit-and-run rules for Traffic safety act
- More value in tribunal system oppose to the courts
- In order to support if someone were to "bite and run" how we could prove they were the ones who left and if so, what if they fail to provide us with government ID.
- I agree. However I have concerns about seizing a dog and keeping it for weeks/months after a first offence. I think this causes undo stress to both dog and owner. If we can release it, with conditions, we can ease that stress and dog, owner and shelter.
- Is it lawful to keep someone's property without their consent? (the bylaw, the RPO)
- Playing devil's advocate, why bylaw can take my dog away in my home? (MGM provides this authority)
- Anyway we can find a contract keep aggressive animals, any place anyone can think of where they can stay long term (something we can look at under animal shelter review)
- Better enrichment within our shelter, better walks on daily basis
- Section 50's, allows us to write a fine, violation pink ticket – vicious, running at large – under these sections write summons in court, trial sooner than later, this is an option. This is an option for us to use
- Some voluntary compliance with this – a good thing
- Either would be good...might be tricky to get a Peace Officer out to scene right away
- Agreed
- When a bite/attack, occurs; we believed it would be very appropriate for both parties to exchange contact information; whether that is (phone number, driver's license information, or name and number etc) to assist the officer with the investigation; and fail to provide such information to the victim will result in an automatic COURT SUMMONS (PINK COPY) to either person involved (officers' discretion on who) to explain to the courts why it was not necessary to provide information to the victim when many victims on many different occasions have suffered life altering physical damages. The parties involved would not necessarily need to remain on scene until a PEACE OFFICER can attend only providing some sort of information to one another for follow up by a PEACE OFFICER.
- This tool will permit the officer to:
 - Like on many files, the officer has/had spent many working hours and tax payer dollars to try and track down an offending animal owner just to issue an (at large, bite, attack) ticket. And unfortunately sometimes when there is multiple animals involved the officer might not have



sufficient witness information to lay the BITE/ATTACK CHARGE as the witness can be unsure which dog actually did the biting (was it their own dog or the other persons?). Therefore, regardless if that charge can or can't be issued, and one party involved clearly runs away from the location (which can sometimes show guilt) then at least the officer can lay a charge which forces that party to deal with the incident in court and permits the courts to decide the appropriate penalty based on the seriousness of the circumstances.

- Maybe a hotline so that they can phone with their information if it is unsafe to stay.
- [Could 311 act as that hotline?] I think 311 could work unless there is a long hold time
- Maximum time should be specified. If it's not safe for the owner to stay, they should be given 24 hours to call 311 and share the info. After that they should be fined.
- That's a great idea [personal information removed]!
- I agree! Great idea!
- like the idea of a grace period to self-report to the City.
- That is something we could communicate well for public reassurance in these situations - great feedback

Livestock

We are exploring criteria for the potential approval of other livestock, in addition to hens, to be permitted in Calgary. Criteria for other livestock would include:

- Offers community benefit/ will have positive impact
- Support from adjacent neighbours
- Suitable living conditions can be provided for the animal
- Exceptions would be evaluated on a case by case basis and the decision would be at the discretion of the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer

What concerns, if any, would you have if Calgary assessed allowing households to obtain these livestock using the above criteria? Is there other criteria you think should be included?

- Beekeeping is monitored through the province
- Support from adjacent neighbours. You sell your house and someone moves in and doesn't like the livestock. Complaints rise when people move in and don't agree with the existing community standard. There are more concerns with livestock regarding defecation, etc. We as officers aren't training in livestock response. We can't transport. We will have to change our mandate and how we operate/respond.
- We don't have resources or training to deal with livestock. There are people with 20 years' experience in livestock that would be better able to deal with it. We have a checklist for LESA but nothing else to go on. I don't think it belongs in the bylaw because we don't have the expertise, equipment or resources.
- Also Portland is not equipped to store or manage livestock animals.



- And vehicles.
- We have been called for goats, chickens, pigs running loose, and I think there is safety and resource concerns.
- We should reach out to Edmonton for lessons learned.
- Would it be a criteria for the animal to be licensed? Have that approval and I can support this and where does it live?
- Emotional support animals – there is a clause that says not allowed to eat any eggs, will that apply to this as well?
- Will get a Chicken for eggs, under this eggs should be allowed, probably minimum of 3, guidelines to be developed with max as well.
- Required support from adjacent neighbours could be very tricky and lead to serious disputes. And where would the animal reside? Inside? may make a difference to the type of license? Would need a DP as well?
- Would that be after they get the animal? Then if neighbours are not supportive they would have to surrender the animal/give it away?
- I would say no to the DP. Unless it is required somehow.
- would need to align this with the LESA program
- Is there other criteria you think should be included?
- Just like a home business, neighbors should have a say, put restrictions on livestock and how it impacts neighbors. Post for how many days and get support from neighbors. Eg: wolf hybrid, where do they fit? Dog license or wildlife?
- Beekeeping are we going to get any training for dealing with this and or setting up a team of specialists?
- Same question for additional livestock
- The bee king society in Calgary have handled some of my calls well
- I haven't taken Admin Law in a long time, but what is the difference between procedural fairness or a fair hearing [personal information removed]?
- neighbour support may be difficult as people move
- I think half of Calgary will have chickens if we let them, the work load could be beyond our abilities
- need to set limits to numbers for sure or animal hoarding will be an issue
- Beekeeping is governed Provincially, is it not?... – yes
- and would definitely need additional training and gear to deal with any of those animals if they get out at large
- thx
- Good point [personal information removed], there will be people that will hoard
- Agree with [personal information removed] - for sure!
- Hoarding & at large will be a problem for sure
- The Province expects each municipality to govern it though bylaws as there is only like 2 Apiculture experts for the province.



- you've just impounded an ostrich.. where are you taking it?
- we have enough bobcats in the city to deal with at larges...
- What about livestock being at large?
- Most of us have dealt with the cat hoarder, so opening door to other pets will cause a problem in a large city
- Urban Agriculture seems like a bad idea lol
- I think chickens may be ok, but we should stop there!
- Isn't that what Rural Alberta is for?
- I support chickens too
- Is there other criteria you think should be included?
- A lot of people would like pet pigs - a very common question
- a horse?
- Are we getting equipment to impound things like horses?
- emu?
- definitely need clarification in the Bylaw re: criteria for pigeons ie: are they considered at large when left to fly off the property once a day?
- What animals are in addition to hens?
- I think most large livestock will be a concern in Calgary. (Horses, donkeys, etc)
- Does this mean allowing livestock outside the LESA animals? (yes)
- Yes I love animals, however as officers on the ground, we tend to look outside our agency for help. Some officers may not be able to handle nontraditional animals. Will we outsource this to outside agencies?
- Interesting, I like this option quite a bit to offer different animals as pets (as suitable by location size etc.
- I've captured a few goats, sheep and chickens. I love extra training on this too!
- Training for at large livestock
- Would they require to have licensing for these animals? if so what would the cost be
- Letter from neighbours beforehand, neighbourhood survey. Eg: allergy to bees
- We would ask Council for extra money for training if this was something Calgarians wanted as part of the review
- I agree about the bees having more community input
- Would like the ability to solve these problems, have this flexibility in bylaw
- What if a pot belly pig gets loose?
- And we would have to impound the pig...where would we keep it, transport / capture
- Do we have a horse trailer? – no we don't. Who responds to this call? (Calgary Humane, Alberta Farm care. Strathmore...)
- We need to look into internal options. Internal team or partnerships
- My concerns are that if all these bylaw changes happen, we also need to keep in mind that we do not have any facilities to care for livestock, hens, exotic animals if they're abandoned. They need



specific housing requirements, food, care. We need to plan that if we're going in that direction. We will need funding to have those sources in place before this is passed. We need to keep this in the back of our mind. CHS sees this all the time – people abandon their exotic pets and they're found running at large. Maybe develop a relationship with CHS or some other organization who can house these animals, or we have to develop a space within our shelter.

- If citizens are keeping these animals in their backyards, there's a possibility that they might get abandoned, lost, or run at large. They need to be properly cared for until they're reunited or rehoused.
- My concern would be the owners experience with caring for the livestock. I have a mini horse and it's a lot of care.
- I'd also be very concerned with the amount of feces an animal produces.
- Education of animal husbandry of the species citizen are keeping in their back yard.
- [Would livestock produce more feces than multiple dogs?] Depends on the animal. A mini horse for sure.
- Herbivore animals make more feces.
- Smell and attracting wildlife.
- Risk of zoonotic diseases. especially avian influenza from poultry.
- Urban Agriculture – I have concerns with livestock in an urban environment. There is so much to be concerned about. How will we ensure that the owner has knowledge for care of the animal. How can we enforce this? Officers would need to be trained on every species on what is acceptable for housing, feed, basic necessities, etc. I'd also have a huge concern with feces and removal of feces. Like I had mentioned I have a miniature horse – he produces huge amounts of feces a day compared to a dog – with the summer heat and with winter and the feces freezing quickly, I would have concerns with the removal of the feces – green bin or weekly clean up??? (green bin service is only every other week during the winter – the cart would be full at this point) Would these animals be able to leave your property? Most city lots are not large enough to give the livestock ample exercise.

Fees

We are currently exploring changing fees for low-income Calgarians and LESA. Would you support changing these fees? What would that look like?

- No concerns, agree that the whole fee should be charged at first, then reduced if there are no issues at the property. How would we determine who qualifies as low-income? Fair entry type of system? How would a person in the field know that a person is a Fair Entry client. If we can do something to help with people that have to make a choice between food and licences, I would agree. People have to wait until they get their next cheque.
- Don't like creating different categories (low income etc.), like having discretion to grant reductions when appropriate. People having to provide income proof, creates more headaches. Charge additional fee if they want more animals than we allow.



- Charge one fee for visit/inspection rather than for each individual animal.
- Could we cap the license fee? I think as the fees increase less people license their animals
- Support low income and seniors and older dogs – to encourage to license
- Would low-income also be provided lower costs for redemption?
- Higher for LESA, Discount through Fair Entry for licenses (low income)
- I believe if you can't afford the license, you shouldn't have an animal as how can you afford that?
Same or higher
- Agreed with [personal information removed] (see above)
- support for low income would be welcome, especially since they often get tickets on top
- agree with [personal information removed] about LESA due to inspection processes
- I have homeless clients I work with who would welcome the lower fees.
- they maybe had the pet prior to not being able to afford the license fee, not a reason for them to give up the pet if they are able to care for it properly
- seniors are lower income but should be able to have a companion animal
- but still the license fee might hurt
- To be consistent with the rest of the city I would do it through fair entry. They get approved there and then get access to the discounted programs (us, transit, rec...)
- [personal information removed] agree with [personal information removed]
- Need to be based on application fair entry program, proof on this program, help with assessing, a letter supporting low income
- Agree with above, coordinating with fair entry and stream lining and making it easier to apply.
- Not sure what are the fees for LESA. (\$67)
- Low income is very important
- If recommended, certain amount of animals (3 chicken) just one time application
- Chief or director can't waive or reduce fees
- Takes a lot of time and resources through finance
- Look at case by case basis
- I like that
- The 6 month license option was helpful for that previously
- for LESA or all licensing? (not all)
- no opinion on this one
- I'm always happy supporting low income licensing
- I don't think they should have a change in fees. If they are low income how are they going to pay for medical fees that are not subsidized and care costs.
- It will encourage more animals in a low-income household, where there are not enough resources for medical care. Concern for medical neglect, unwanted kittens and puppies.
- No subsidized vets in Alberta.



- To [personal information removed] point (re: LESA fees for multiple hens vs. one miniature pig), could we build something in there that there can be discretion by the CBEO or the Director to waive fees?

Pet limit

What ideas or concerns would you have regarding a larger pet limit? What resources would be needed to implement this change?

- Part of the low income license should include a limit on the pets you have.
- Citizens may call in many complaints about limits and it will take up time.
- Depends on the size of the house.
- Depends on the owners. Comes down to the owner themselves. If owners are involved in certain incidents, then perhaps a cap should come into play. Think it should vary. Know people who have multiples and we never get any complaint.
- Agree. There are some very capable owners who can handle many dogs. Different with small vs. large dogs. Really does depend on the owner. [personal information removed] – had 9 wolf dogs in a very small apartment. Looked after them very well. Couple of incidents here and there. Put their care above [their] own. Depends on the owner and the size of the house.
- All of those animals were licensed.
- Like the limits and I would even argue that it should apply to breeders as well
- Definitely think there needs to be a limit on # of animals per household - I went to property the other day- they had [removed] adult dogs and [removed] cats - the smell was awful but there was no accumulation of feces/urine in the yard as they clean up everyday BUT you could still smell it.
- APA Concern.
- Maybe owners who have been involved in multiple incidents we start looking at capping the number they have. If we are involved in houses with multiples, we reach out to CHS to determine if the health aspect is taken care of.
- We don't get many complaints related to number of animals. Most problems we get is from 1 barking dog, not that there are 4-5 barking dogs. Doesn't come across very often.
- would 4 dogs and 4 cats sound reasonable to you Chief?
- No cats allowed would solve cat at large issue.
- There would be a license and fee for excess animals but it may deter people from having 15 cats.
- The people that would be exempt from the rule (breeders, dog walkers etc.) are the ones that we get complaints about. Better to investigate with CHS for issues related to excessive animals.
- If we come across something regarding health, we can consult with CHS. Agree that the ones we would be exempting are the ones that we have issues with.
- Agree with [personal information removed].
- This shouldn't be a one size fits all. Maybe size of property? Yard?
- Limit of 4 in other muni



- Don't support a limit, when 12 pets what's the difference?
- 6 dogs 6 cats – a large number, why? Do you have space and resources? 4 tops, implement a higher license. Daycares/temp homes – do they need a license for this? Business license for doggy daycare
- Dog walkers? Limit set on walking dogs in public, and all dogs are licensed
- Consideration – worth differentiating why they have a number of pets. Oversight of the reason why.
- Part of application process when exceeded
- Would there be a distinction between owning vs fostering?
- Would that exclude animals under 3 months of age?
- I have a limit where I live (4) and I find it helps prevent pet hoarding or pets not being taken care of properly (I do know there are amazing pet owners with many pets who take great care of them).
- I think people already take issue with licensing their animals and requiring special applications/making it harder will make people disinclined to licensing the extra animals
- I don't support a limit, but once you get to 12 pets, I feel like what's the real difference between that and even more?
- I think that for some citizen's who collect feral cats it would help us to ensure that the pets are well cared for.
- How many incidents have there been related to a large number of pets in the household?
- Quite a few. One officer said she just dealt with a property with 15 dogs.
- I know a lady in [personal information removed] that has 36 dogs.
- What would enforcing the number of animals look like? Will there be a change to the licensing system that prohibits someone from licensing a 7th animal? And then prompts them to complete a special application?
- I love the idea of limits (with those who have more grandfathered in) but i was shocked to see the online survey mentioned the number 6...
- yes, for emotional support...as [personal information removed] mentioned...someone with authority to make decision regarding cost on an individual basis for 'hard luc' cases or whatever you want to call it...but also should be able to justify increasing Emotional Animal fees due to extra admin and physical visits regarding conforming to the required standards, etc...
- Is there any other cities that have pet limits ?
- I live in [personal information removed], in the country, and we are only allowed 3!
- Too high, 6 total cats/dogs/LESA combined
- two is not reasonable - SIX is way too many for most properties in Calgary
- I like [personal information removed] idea
- Most cities do I believe
- and how would rescues fit in...special license?
- Maybe a CHS issue, due to the health and safety of the animal
- Airdrie has a limit of 3
- Most municipalities do - Rockyview, Wheatland, Foothills



- Rockyview is 3
- for pets that are inherited would we have lawful placement to ask and see a death certificates or wills – don't know the answer to this question
- Cochrane-3
- private kennel license for breeders/rescues etc, need to apply
- If your dog just had puppies, I guess that starts a clock for you to sell them before they fall under the bylaw?
- Rockyview requires a "kennel" license for anything over 3
- Apartment or condo verse a house, size of house, would that be a factor of amount of pets allowed?
- good point [personal information removed]
- I don't think we should be asking for death certificates
- Director's authorization on case by case basis for something like that....like any other bylaw...
- Does it just have to be death? I mean what if a parent is being put into assisted living or home that doesn't allow pets? - both
- Could be. This is all hypothetical
- if someone goes over the limit, what would the consequence be? Would we have the pet removed?
- Good to think about
- Can we make a limit on the amount of dogs dog walkers are walking at one time? Esp in off leash park? I've seen many dog walkers that can't keep track of the poop let alone making sure all dogs are behaving and comfortable
- 6 cats is alot unless they are really clean. Are their AHS views on number of cats / sqft?
- How responsible is the owner? If they are going to keep that many pets, they won't go by the bylaw anyway. That many pets don't produce licensing fees.
- Number of pets can be taken care of in other areas
- In Business Licensing they already investigate breeding or selling puppies. – align with BL or overlap, something to consider
- agreed on no limit, if you can care for them and they are not a nuisance
- [personal information removed] agree with [personal information removed]
- I live in [personal information removed], they limit to 3 dogs per household. Same in Foothills county. Yards in Calgary are small and there should be a limit on dogs.
- From an enforcement point of view, how would you be able to determine if there are more than 6 cats or dogs unless they're licensed? Who's issuing the permit and how does that process work?
- Is the City interested in this topic to prevent animal hoarding? It could stop people from licensing their pets too.
- Trying to prove that there's more than 6 might be a problem. We've got 6 black Labs. If I'm going to issue a charge, I would have to prove that these 7 black labs are individually licensed and that they're all over 6 months of age.
- I agree, hard to enforce.



- In my opinion - I don't think the city needs to be involved in the quantity of animals, but more so - should be considered, if I'm complying with the existing pet bylaws - that I am picking up my dog feces, that my dogs aren't barking excessively etc.

Vendors

A suggestion was raised in phase 1 engagement to make pet licences available from more locations.

Would you support the sale of pet licences through local vendors? Vendors could include pet supply stores, veterinarians, etc.

- What might be some anticipated challenges with this approach?
 - What might be some potential successes with this approach?
- Vets 100% should offer this.
 - Absolutely
 - Yes! Vets.
 - Most people think their vets tags ARE licenses
 - 100% [personal information removed]
 - Should have a sign at every vet as well
 - if you can get vets involved and pet food stores, that would be the best place to sell licenses. If you could promote it there. The onus isn't on the vet, but if we can get them to start educating and licensed breeders, partner agencies, to start that initial roll, that would help immensely.
 - I hear it all the time, my dog is Licensed - then show me a M/C Tag etc.
 - They need to check individuals physical ID when issuing new licenses
 - Petshops and rescues etc all need to sell licences to set people up for success as well as vets.
 - People not taking animals to the Vet when its sick because they think they will get a fine.
 - The same if business licencing are going to take on dog walkers companies should make part of the business licence is they have to have a valid tag per dog.
 - Are they selling the physical tag, or do we still mail out the tag? What do they need in the interim?
 - Filling out a form at vets and forwarding to City
 - Confusion over micro chip at vets
 - Enhanced partnership with vets
 - Lots of engagement with vets needed
 - yes, veterinarians for sure.
 - I like [personal information removed] idea.
 - challenge: registering the animal in Chameleon
 - I don't know how payment would be set up for the vet. Maybe the front counter staff would basically run them through ALPO while the person is there? *If the vet takes the payment. *front counter staff at the vet clinic.



- Could we not issue an invoice for all new purchased pets?
- On the topic of strengthening relations with vet clinics I think that AS should do info sessions on the RPO so that they understand the importance of licensing and our processes, etc.
- Filling out a form at vets and forwarding to City
- Confusion over microchip at vets as citizens think this means registered (licensed with the City)
- Enhanced partnership with vets
- Lots of engagement with vets needed
- What might be some anticipated challenges with this approach?
 - Chameleon
 - Where does the payment go if it is at the vet
- YES
- Of course!
- yes.
- a lot of dog owners are already confused between microchips and licenses, not sure this wouldn't make it worse
- rcs, chs, vets, pet store
- More people would be aware of needing to license and knowing the difference between a microchip and a city license
- Yes - we used to have regular programs of free 6 month licenses (to get people in the system) I think it would be easier if vets had the ability to give free 6 month license
- More locations can get it from the better. Just need to make sure we can get the license information and in our system
- any thoughts on a longer license period – multi year and multi pet
- Would an increase in license fee e.g. for having more than 3 dogs or 6 cats be a deteriorate unless animals are foster on compassion concerns
- Any chance Vets or certain places if they sold license, could access our licensing database only...could mean us having a lot less pick ups...
- Vets/Rescues
- I love the multi year idea
- I don't think we should give them access
- or lifelong license
- 5 year license with increased cost of course
- All being considered
- I kind of agree...but at least their own data bases then if they are selling them...could still lead to less pick ups if they can determine ownership info for more animals...
- Licensing 3 dogs or 6 cats is already a bigger expense.
- I think if they offer free six month (like a promo code) and then the person has to register themselves then we can be sure we get the info into our system
- maybe being able to opt to agree to give out their info if animal found when license it?



- sharing between agencies
- Are vets concerned if an animal has a valid city license ? Does it benefit them? Would they want to take on the extra work of selling our licenses?
- Ha probably not
- have to be an incentive
- I was thinking from the standpoint just for getting owners to claim fastermeans less time and money the Vets have to give until we can get them picked up...
- What might be some anticipated challenges with this approach?
 - would be a FOIP issue no? (for sharing database)
 - OR at least their own database...
 - yes it would be
 - for the ones they sell...
 - could fall under hia act
 - giving vets access
 - health information act
- Vet aware of age. Before spay or natured, education with that to understand what is needed.
- Limiting who can sell them as there is a possibility of abusing this
- I have one point I think is important before we leave
- How would fraudulent tags be dealt with?
- Maybe vet offices would be a good option...I would still worry about FOIP
- We should create a pamphlet and provide to all local vets and venders to educate dog owner about pet license.
- What might be some anticipated challenges with this approach?
 - FOIP
 - I feel having outside vendors would cause issues with inputting incorrect information
 - Chameleon / CSR systems not overly compatible or user friendly
 - For folks that don't use all the time
- What might be some potential successes with this approach
 - Registry Offices would be good
- What might be some anticipated challenges with this approach?
 - A great idea. concern would be correct info and information relayed back correctly to animal services from vet clinics etc. Veterinarians time to complete this.
 - Good idea. what about taking a picture of the animal getting a license and attaching that to its file. Vet clinic takes photos and then you can easily ID the animal and narrow down its breed. Many dog owners will describe the breed different than staff would.
 - I agree.
- What might be some potential successes with this approach
 - Fully support it, great idea.
 - From a vet perspective, they will be interested because they may get more potential clients. Come in for a licence and talk about vaccinations or spay/neuter. Not sure if big box stores



are the best location. Will they be making a profit or will it be at cost basis? Based on incentive, I think vets will see a benefit. It will improve animal welfare, more chance of the animal getting home if lost, getting medical care. Also a potential window to talk to clients about medical care and prevention of diseases.

- Re: incentives – most vets would be happy to volunteer for this process. If the City listens to their ideas, most would be appreciative of this. Licence numbers would go up, especially for cats. Most of the time there's no ID or licences on cats that get brought into vets.

Other

- "OFF-LEASH DISCUSSION"
 - How about dealing with dog walkers walking 12+ dogs at parks.
 - I had a dog walker get a court order to limit her number of dogs she could walk
 - I do a recall test at off-leash parks and have had dog walkers remove dogs due to poor recall. Good for business licensing to get involved – not sure that they should have to decide what the reasonable number of dogs is.
- "NUISANCE DISCUSSION"
 - Nuisance dog order – looking to leverage that section to start banning certain individuals from dog parks, barking dogs. Interested in giving more flexibility to deal with problematic situations. My understanding is we used to use it but then got away from it.
 - Stopped 6 years ago.
 - If we go to a dog park and a dog is repeatedly aggressive, or the owner can't control 6 animals, can we leverage the nuisance dog designation to deal with it?
 - The issue with the nuisance was they had to be convicted of the offences previously and we were only going off the Chameleon record.
 - If we move to an administrative tribunal system, we have more flexibility around orders.
- If owners provide proof of training = lower license fee: Strathcona County does this; can look at their model <https://www.strathcona.ca/emergencies-enforcement/pet-ownership/dog-licences/#term>.
- [personal information removed] Q on checking low income status in the field: I think they have a SAMS ID card (or it is just a number assigned to them) that you check on SAMS online <http://sams.coc.ca/Secure/Home.aspx>
- Fair Entry: you apply once (annually?) but for NCSN program you have to be referred through Fair Entry as a separate step to be approved for the program
- Comments on the name of the bylaw from customers– they feel offended on “responsible” part of title of bylaw. This comes up over and over again
- I thought of another section that should be reviewed. this feedback is specifically to when a dog is on leash and has an aggressive act. We have the ability to write the at large ticket, but it is confusing to many offenders, and gets fought in court more often than not. The definition of running at large where an animal has had an aggressive act.



Currently we write the violation ticket under S 12- Animal running at large, and the definition of it is what gives us the ability to write it, however I find it very confusing to explain, and many officers wind up not writing it, or having that particular section fought in court because of how it is written.

I think there should be an animal running at large section, and no control on a leash causing a damage, or bite to other animal or person section. I've thought for years that those definitions need to be separated into different charging sections of the bylaw for clarity for the offender.

- "S. 12 - ANIMAL RUNNING AT LARGE is a current section.

PROBLEM – when officers get a complaint of an animal at large and the animal is in a common area of a condo building, apartment building or at a location where the physical address is the same; I am unable to issue a violation for S.12 of the RPO.

SOLUTION – Is it possible to add in the definition section of 'RUNNING AT LARGE', or add something along the lines of:

'RUNNING at LARGE' means – an ANIMAL is RUNNING at LARGE when the animal is anywhere in the city of Calgary where the public has implied access or not (need to define implied access and add to RPO) whether on private, or public property and not under care and control of the owner via leash when on public and/or under care and control of the owner when on private property; regardless if the owner and/or the complainant reside at the same address or not, and/or regardless whether the animal is in a common area (need to define common area and add to RPO) or not of a (apartment complex, condo, strip mall common spaces, hall ways etc).

Basically as an officer I think it would assist with giving us the ability to write a S.12 when an at large animal running in the hallways of an apartment complex leads to a bite. It would give us another means at dealing with irresponsible pet owners where warranted and of course at the officers' discretion.

- I had another idea which I wanted to discuss in the last meeting but the time of the meeting went by so fast. I also had vet rechecks to do on the animals and was being paged.

I am questioning, if we can brain storm the idea of "MANDATORY MICROCHIPING of Dogs and Cats" and Pros and Cons of it.

Majority of cats which end up at our city shelter, do not have any id.

We get many Injured, HBC (hit by car), trauma cats, chronic and acute disease issues cats. All these cats cost us lots of resources. For the injured cats we have to pay the emergency clinic treatment fee, and then follow up care at our shelter, many injured cat directly end up in our shelter and it is a very intensive process to stabilize them, treat them, daily follow up care, meds and diagnostics. Mostly these costs can never be recovered, as no one comes to it redeem these cats.

We also get many old, geriatric decline cats. Most of them are abandoned by the owners, also some owners think that my old cat has gone out to die and they do not look for them.

We have to invest our resources to hold these senior cats and care for them till the hold period is over. Almost all of these geriatric cats need meds, supportive care, diagnostics and daily checks.

With Mandatory Microchip bylaw, these animals can be reunited faster with the owners, bylaw officers can scan the microchip and drive the animal home right away.



Shelter will save resources as owner will be liable to pay for all the emergency medical bills and treatment costs, decrease in euthanasia and decrease in length of stay in the shelter (less food, meds, care and staff hours).

- Microchip will confirm ownership and not redeeming animals will be considered abandoning, and owner will have the consequences for being irresponsible. Microchipping will also help with stray population control.

City of Montreal have this bylaw since 2019.

For microchipping process - City can discuss with stakeholders. Our City Shelter, CHS, AARCS, Vet clinics can offer microchipping days in a week, where citizens can walk in to get their pets microchipped. Many veterinary clinics will support this idea. Vet clinics will microchip the pet dogs and cats at the time of spay neuter if city has bylaw for it. As it will improve animal welfare as clinics will have the ability to contact the owner in case an injured animal is presented to a veterinary clinic or emergency clinic.

We can give some incentive and perks, say if your pet is microchipped and is spay /neutered , discounted license fee, If just microchipped and not spay/neutered- prorated discount etc. Increase in fine revenues for not microchipping.

Targeted

Cats

To deal with the overpopulation of cats, we are considering increasing support for 'trap/neuter/release' programs. This could include:

- increasing fines for roaming cats found off property, and/or
- investing more in spay/neuter programs for feral cats, or
- A combination of A and B

Do you have any other ideas to address concerns with roaming and feral cats? What might these look like?

- I don't own a cat, my neighbour has a cat that's out all the time. It sits in my backyard and tries to eat the birds. I wish that they would keep their cat home. Increasing fines for roaming cats and TNR are both good ideas.
- In my area, there are many people who let their cats out the door. They sit below my bird feeder and try to get the birds. This goes back to being good neighbours. If I was to rat my neighbour out about her cat, she's going to complain about my dogs one day. City needs to do some mediation – what can we do to complain without them knowing? Don't agree with roaming cats – can't let my dogs out. How has that become a thing that people think it's ok for cats to roam? Another education thing.



- Don't understand why we accommodate feral cats. We have people bringing in rescue dogs from the Dominican Republic because they have feral dogs down there. Don't need feral cats or dogs. If they were dogs they would be picked up and dealt with, but because they're cats they're allowed to roam. I can call in and get support for a skunk but not a cat.
- What happens to a stray dog? [Dog euthanized if not adoptable] Why the inequity?
- Has the City consulted with programs that are already in place for TNR? Have they been involved in feedback for this process?
- I think we can support increased fines for roaming cats that have homes. Would support feral cat programs to reduce numbers.
- Provide incentives for people to spay/neuter feral cats.
- Just watching community pages around animals, there's a lack of education around cats and understanding behaviours around cats. We're catching up, but education is key. People don't understand the licencing program and roaming. There's still this perception that cats should be outside, and they don't understand the impact. We spend a lot of time on dog behaviour and less on cats.
- Not hearing a lot about feral cats in Calgary, maybe need to be more educated on it. Heard about it in Toronto and parts of BC. Does Calgary have a feral cat problem?
- Believe that education also plays a big role in solving these issues.
- People are missing the piece about the reasons behind it – community safety and animal welfare.
- [personal information removed] the Canadian Animal Task Force and AARCS [personal information removed] and have been able to see the impact those programs can have. For those owners who let their cats roam in Calgary that I know... fines aren't going to change their mind...
- People may be thinking that the cat needs to go outside but really enrichment indoors is better than the animal getting ripped to shreds by a wild animal outside. Do believe we can spark some change as a community in terms of thought.
- In Lethbridge, they have a program in the field – all these bins for feral cats. Is the City of Calgary aware of that? Have you talked to the City of Lethbridge? They were trying to catch them but made shelters for them out of Rubbermaid tubs. Have you discussed this with them?
- You could look at what the Cornwall, Ontario is planning to do. They had huge feral cat population that was a very large problem. I don't know the details but I know they have a plan in place at the moment and will start implementing it soon or perhaps already has (perhaps dampened by the pandemic).
- That's really interesting to learn about the population of feral cats in Calgary being quite low. Great to learn something new.
- To your point, it makes me think how effective AARCS program (or MEOW's) program has been in controlling the population
- Yeah, they (and CHS does too) do a ton. It's really surprising the need, and the number of applications they need to turn down due to the volume.



- Unaware of the extent of the problem of feral cats. Do you have estimates on what the population is like? I understand in Vancouver they have massive problems, but I was unaware that we had a problem.
- I support a trap/neuter/release program for feral cats, not for owned cats - how do you know a cat a feral or owned if it does not have it's tag on it's collar?
- Does the City Microchip, or offer micro-chipping?
- 65000! wow
- We do offer micro-chipping
- And low cost micro-chipping events throughout the year where is around \$7 to micro chip your cat
- Super, thanks
- [personal information removed] do you offer microchip clinics to the public?
- they put a small notch in the ear to ID feral cats that have been spayed/neutered
- During our events throughout the year (I think we had 3 last year), we ask the public to bring their cat to our facility to get microchipped
- Another opportunity to partner with industry partners for microchip clinics
- yes there was three cat micro-chipping events held (pre-COVID)

Wildlife

It is currently prohibited to feed or tease wildlife in Parks. Would you support a bylaw prohibiting feeding and teasing wildlife on private property? Please explain your response.

- Would support. Causes more wildlife to come and be around. Like in Banff where they blocked off garbage cans. Don't know if there would be some way of creating something through your website, like an interactive map where people could report sightings, bobcat was sitting on this street. We're being informed in some way.
- Most of us think of skunk, wolf, coyote. I also think of birds. I feed birds on my property all the time. I would hate to have that prohibited. Lots of people enjoy feeding birds and I think it's something we can do to help wildlife. I don't think we should be feeding a coyote but feeding birds should be ok.
- Good point, so perhaps state mammals.
- Have to look at things like squirrels and other things that may be up for debate. Rodents.
- Yes- unless you are asked to step in for wildlife rehabilitation.
- For injured wildlife, various wildlife rehabilitation facilities might ask you to step in and care for an animal on your property (e.g. feeding formula) until they can get to the animal. I do support prohibiting feeding of wildlife with clarification if there is a 3rd party involved asking you to help keep the animal alive by feeding until they can get there.
- Could you define teasing? Would a crow box be teasing? It's a device by which you can train crows to bring you shiny objects or bring you quarters in exchange for treats. It's something where you offer food to an animal in exchange for an interaction.



- In Ottawa we have a large coyote issue (also some new human attacks too) and the city is looking for solution, so if Calgary comes up with a decent plan please send it our way.
- [personal information removed], we have the same issue here in the GTA.
- Private property as in a deer walks onto my property?
- I would prefer wild animals not be fed. I had a neighbour who was feeding rabbits which brought coyotes and bobcats into our yards.
- At no times should a wild animal be teased or fed (birds are the exception) coyotes, deer, moose, linx, etc
- At one of our retail properties, there was a bakery throwing bread out back to feed deer. The whole property ended up with a huge mouse problem. People intend to do good things but there are unintended consequences. There have been a lot of coyotes this year in the Evanston area and we've seen more interactions and a lot of people don't have the tools or understanding of what the consequences of their actions are.
- I fully support such a bylaw, with an exemption for feeding birds. at no time should a wild animal (or any animal) be teased.
- Prohibiting feeding the animals would be hard to implement but awareness campaigns as to the reason why it's not recommended to feed animals might be helpful for public education
- Do wildlife rescues ever use fosters? Would that ever be an exception?
- I agree with [personal information removed] - the enforcement of such a bylaw would be difficult. Again, public education would help. Many people are of the mind, if they are in the city they must be safe (trust me....I have heard this comment)
- This sounds like a 'start' initiative for the city. Are there other jurisdictions (fish and wildlife for example) that may be better suited/poised to oversee these types of issues?
- Lots of invasive squirrels. The ask in the community was to not feed the black and grey squirrels because they chase out the red squirrels. Don't have any hard stats on that, just what I've heard in the community. How do you differentiate between squirrel species?
- Biggest concern is with encountering coyotes and bobcats and how to best manage that. Don't know if that's something that can be tailored with "teasing". If the rabbits bring the coyotes/bobcats, what can I do as a homeowner. I have small dogs. I don't want them to become lunch. What can homeowners do to lessen encounters with coyotes and bobcats?
- Define teasing?
- Including birds?
- No bird feeders?
- Feeding birds?
- My dogs bark at squirrels and rabbits. is that teasing
- Is a squirrel proof feeder teasing ??
- I mean does that include Nana who wants to give the Squirrels nuts?
- Invasive vs. native squirrels?
- Magpies take my dog poop. Am I in violation of feeding wildlife?



- words used along with tease include: "harass", worry, exhaust, fatigue, annoy, plague, pester or torment,
- my dogs do all of those, alas
- pockets of feral rabbits all around the city.
- the only native squirrels are red squirrels. The imported squirrels Black and Grey, which are actually less annoying and they have been here for a really long time
- escapees from the zoo, I think?
- They came from Europe on Boats

Dogs

The City of Calgary is exploring additional options to deal with:

- Vicious dogs - designated by the Courts
- Dangerous dogs - Not currently designated in the bylaw
- Nuisance dogs - Designated in the bylaw and declared by the Director, Calgary Community Standards

What measures do you believe would be the most effective to address concerns with these dogs? Why?

- Just a question, how many vicious dog events are there typically in a year? Vicious is a particular designation, so obviously a formalized event. How many bite/attack events are there in a year typically in Calgary.
- Follow-up question, how many of those would have been bully breeds?
- So 39% of level 5 and above are bully breeds. I'm concerned about the BSL potential, you explained it's not out there yet, but it seems that to use the descriptors that were in the 'What We Heard' reports, I don't like any BSL, some of the breeds like Staffordshire are just not similar enough to Pitbulls to be dumped into the same basket. I just think that vicious dogs and dangerous dogs should be considered on a case by case basis. BSL would be a very unfortunate way to go.
- [Any measures to put in place?] I think that compulsory work with a qualified trainer for those kinds of dogs and careful assessment when a dog is being problematic is very fair. I have a dog that broke a tether several years ago and attacked a Daschund because he viewed him as prey. Would have been considered a class 5 bite. We settled it as neighbours. To do it based on breed....a dog, any dog that demonstrates these behaviours should have some of these measures applied. Training to support more success going forward. But just to categorize a dog as unsuitable to Calgary based on breed is unfair.
- There are many other breeds that cause damage. The dog that killed the infant several years ago was a Husky. Relatively unknown breeds such as Cane Corso and some Mastiffs, because they aren't known aren't a concern. How do you determine which breeds you're going to target?
- Understand what you're saying about being proactive. But it's a balance if I register a Pitbull. Like gun ownership – have to jump through hoops to own one. Regulation becomes cumbersome. Like



the idea of licensing recognition of good dog citizens. That kind of incentivizing is a good idea because it's positive.

- Agree with comment above. Against all BSL. Slippery slope. First of all, Pitbull isn't a breed. If people had to go off of a visual ID, they would fail. Would pick a Boxer or some other breed. See a block head and just assume it's a Pitbull. Start to let the animal activists in. Noticed a lot of chatter on the Global site that wasn't fair. Need to be careful when we talk about BSL. Calgary was looked at worldwide that we didn't have BSL and made it work. Montreal, Ontario have shown it hasn't worked. Bites have increased, not by Pitbulls because they banned them. Have seen very little dogs that should be classified as vicious because they are dangerous, but their bite isn't as severe. You can find many breeds with good bite power. City needs to be that pilot that others look to. Other people in the dog community are envious of what Calgary has. [personal information was removed] was instrumental in making it work without BSL. Dogs got licensed. If BSL is brought in, people will go underground. Need more officers out doing their job. Hang out in dog parks and you'll see lots of issues. My biggest concern is BSL. I don't own a Pitbull but I do own a dog that could be lumped into that slippery slope.
- When you have dogs living in a city environment, I don't know if that's something that will ever stop. Education needs to start in the classroom. Children need to know how to approach dogs. Would be more than happy to see tax dollars go to something in the classroom. Some children have a fear and others have no fear. Some dogs prefer to have their bubble and personal space. Great thing if people would understand that. People always have something to say about powerful breeds or treat you a little bit differently. Everything stems from education. I wouldn't have the dog I have without educating myself. You're going to punish good people with BSL because underground people are going to go further underground.
- I would volunteer to be a school presenter if there was a decent program created to do so. I am a [personal information removed] and would love to do this.
- Just have a lay person comment to make. I'm not for BSL but I do know that some types of dogs are just different than others. A Jack Russell will run up and bite but you can kick it away. There's lots of misinformation out there. Education is needed. The only time I've been terrified for my life, I was walking and something that looked like a Pitbull ran out, owner was there, dog ran out and smashed into my legs trying to knock me down. Don't know what would have happened. Owner screaming her head off. Dog thankfully went back to owner. Grew up on a farm, father raised dogs, had no fear of dogs until that event. When I go walking now, I'm afraid of dogs, not just Pitbulls. Afraid of a lot of different dogs. If we can avoid that type of incident. It has diminished my ability to walk in an off-leash area and not be terrified. Had nothing against any type of dog until this event. Glad the owner was there and able to control the dog. Would have felt better if that dog had a muzzle. Might be way off, maybe need more education, but that's all the education I needed.
- Can you tell me what the situation is with that right now? If someone has a vicious dog, are they required to be muzzled when off their property?



- Are you looking to have a City bylaw that just requires that of certain dogs? I don't think BSL works all that well. I have my own personal opinion about pit bulls but I don't think that's the answer. Any dog can be a vicious dog. We shouldn't single out a specific breed.
- Boils down to the owner and how that person acts with their dog. You get people out there that don't understand what can happen when dogs get into a dog fight. They don't care. "If my dog is loose, oh well." I think it boils down to the people.
- Calgary already has an effective bylaw in dealing with these concerns. We would like to see it stay as-is but more enforcement, more education. Similar to how it was in the early 2000s. Effective legislation in dealing with aggressive dogs. More enforcement, more training for enforcement officers. More education for those who need it, like those who have received a ticket or a citation for a dog that has acted in a dangerous or menacing way.
- Education is a big piece and dog training is a big piece. It's expensive and people don't take the time. Even just for recall and how to read basic dog behaviour signs. If there was something available just for the basics or to get people interested. Saw a program with coloured ribbons on how to approach dogs. Different coloured tags for different things. A dog labeled as a vicious dog could wear a colour so people are aware. Even just a couple colours. These dogs still need to be out and exercised. Education – maybe something offered in a park for basic training or recall. Maybe more people would engage and teach other people.
- Can you explain why you guys feel that there needs to be a bylaw change when we've had so much success with the current bylaw up until 2016. Fairly low bites until then. Why is the change necessary? Is there something else that's driving this?
- Did the breed specific language only come up due to public feedback? There was no indication of this on the questions in the first round of engagement. How did this come up? Is this solely based off of public feedback? Regarding obedience training – it's not regulated in North America. As someone who has done an apprenticeship and is getting certification, what makes someone a certified trainer? Not a lot of options out there for us. What is the City asking for if they're asking for mandatory obedience training? What makes someone a dog trainer?
- Re: referrals for training – Justice for Bullies supports training for all dogs. Encourage people to be proactive and do training. Obedience training for aggressive dogs – concern is that there are a lot of uncertified trainers. We need to come together to source out what the appropriate level of certification should be. Obedience training doesn't deal with aggression. It's only sit, heel etc. Does not deal with aggression. Airdrie is one of only municipalities that I know of that have a definition of who is considered a trainer – Canadian Professional Dog Trainers Association. They say these are the people that we do recommend. These are the only people that can be trainers in our municipality. Concerns about training for aggression with people who are not certified.
- Using a certified trainer is important. Can we look at licensing fees and if you use a trainer on a list provided by the City, you can get a reduced fee? Might encourage people to do training. I walk my dog on a 6-foot leash and there are lots of people who let their dogs off. People let their dogs off and they get aggressive with me and I'm the one following the bylaw. Goes back to educating people



and we need to be more proactive with people rather than reactive. Look at how licensing might be affected by doing training.

- In the last 20 years that I've been working with bite prevention, whenever anybody has asked me what can be done for bylaw to improve results in a city, I have always pointed out Calgary as the answer....always. I literally just said "read Calgary's bylaw" and you have the answer. Not sure you can do anything with the bylaw that's going to improve things. It's always been looked at worldwide as how to properly do an animal control bylaw. It's hard to improve on something that has been working for so many years. So why are bites starting to increase? Not the bylaw. Public perception issues, education issues, other issues are the reason – not the bylaw itself.
- Calgary's MO for the last 25-30 years has been education over everything else. Education of the public, children, rescue groups, dog trainers and animal bylaw enforcement officers. It's always been to lean toward education/compliance rather than fining/discipline. I think that that one thing is the single most important thing to keep in mind. When you educate the public on why it's in their best interest to comply, they will. It could be, it's in your best interest to be a good neighbour, your dog could get returned to you if it gets loose, etc. Social media education campaign would be my first suggestion rather than immediately talking about enforcement.
- Public Education is so important, and I think severely lacking. Higher Fines for 2nd offenders, more severe consequences for 3+ infractions.
- I also believe that rescue animals are not vetted properly, as well. I don't believe that we should be bringing in these animals from out of country. there are enough animals in Canada alone that need to have good homes.
- I believe there needs to be a fine balance of both enforcement and education.
- I've worked with Cities and also refer to the Calgary bylaw as a model. Enforcement, education, outreach. I was lucky enough to listen to a presentation [personal information removed] – said he didn't want animal control to be dog catchers, but peace officers. Wanted them in parks to interact with people, congratulate owners when dogs are licensed, enforce when necessary. Bylaw is only as strong as enforcement. Easy to say, but maybe that means your team goes to council and asks for more funds. There needs to be visibility and constant relationship building.
- Some things that are going well are that Officers are fantastic. They have the support they need in terms of the bylaw and they are collaborative. They make referrals to people when they see people who need assistance. I like the 3rd classification of dogs – maybe nuisance dogs for level 1-2, Dangerous for level 3-4 and Vicious for level 5 and up. I think the bylaw is great. I worry the people are failing a bit. Wonder if there's opportunity to do campaigning and education – what responsible pet ownership means. Making good choices as you rear your dog from puppyhood. Taking the necessary steps if there are issues with aggression even if that means putting some restrictions in place. It means making smart choices in that ownership.
- Social media presence is needed. [personal information removed] used to do town halls with kennel clubs which was really powerful and very regular. For the City of Calgary – we provided a booth free of charge at our dog shows and it was really great. We have a huge gate that comes through – it's a captive audience. What better way to share bylaw news on proper dog ownership. It's 4 days out of



the August long weekend but it works. I remember [personal information removed], it was 1% kill rate. That's something to be really proud of. Our turnaround time with stray dogs, if it's tagged or microchipped, those dogs can be back to their owners in less than an hour. I think a stronger presence in the community, social media, getting out to pet fairs is a powerful way to do it.

- CKC also used to support Responsible Dog Ownership Days with the City of Calgary and the Calgary Associated Dog Fanciers, which I understand were very successful. This can be done virtually also now.
- Education is key to reducing dog bites within a community. By teaching children how to approach and when to approach or not is indisputably effective. The responsibility of the dog lies with the owner. It is our responsibility as dog owners to set our dogs up for success. Responsibility is comprised of many things including, but not limited to, understanding genetics of the breed or (breeds within a mixed dog), knowing what they were bred for (herding/hunting vermin/retrieving/etc) to understand instinct, obedience training, understanding body language, etc on top of providing a safe, stable healthy home.
- In some communities there are three levels:
 - 1 - low level aggression, chasing, nipping, etc. Have restrictions but also have the opportunity to have it reversed if training is done and they can demonstrate the dog is safe.
 - 2 - moderate aggression - handled by the city with fines, restrictions
 - 3 - dangerous dog - conditions imposed through provincial court.The above framework makes it easier for the officers to impose restrictions without labelling it dangerous for life.
- To increase licensing, would it be worth exploring collaborating with pet retailers or other pet related business in the city that would include incentives to pet owners who fill out the licensing? Ex: discounts for services or discounts for products with the purchase of licenses?
- One of my colleagues is a dog walker in New Westminster, which used the Calgary model to remove BSL in 2012. She said she was walking two licensed dogs and an ACO approached her to tell her she was doing a great job and gave her a goodie bag. :)
- Positive reinforcement! Also helps the community see officers positively.
- Related to nuisance dogs. I would suggest if you have some appetite to change definitions, it would be a lot easier to figure out what to do with those dogs. Nuisance dogs is too broad of a term, too generic. Could be a dog that's barking or that has eliminated on your lawn. Could be all kinds of things. Need to have a better definition of what that means.
- Talking about dogs that are a potential safety risk, important to note that dogs that display aggression, it tends to happen contextually. If there's a dog who has challenges with other dogs, that doesn't mean they are problematic with people. You may have dogs who aren't appropriate around other small dogs or cats, doesn't mean they would be an issue around people. Important that we don't lump things too much and that we have the same kinds of options for all types of contexts.
- We have a tendency to split things up too much or lump things too closely – we're on the edge of lumping too much. Putting all of those things in the bucket of nuisance, there's a struggle to come up with effective solutions when they're all in the same category.



- Speaking about dogs at dog parks – important to note that not all dogs are appropriate for dog parks. People have an expectation that their dog should just get along with every dog it meets. That's not valid. Dogs shouldn't have to get along with every dog they meet in the neighbourhood. There is definitely some normalizing that has to happen with the public. If there are non-injurious incidents that happen with dogs at a dog park, people have to understand that that's normal. If there are injuries, that's something that could be addressed. There's a risk when people don't have any idea what to expect when they're at the dog park.
- Re: barking dogs – That's common sense. that's a noise bylaw violation. Definitely something that could be addressed with the noise bylaw.
- Lots of people don't know or don't have information on dog etiquette at the dog park. Lots of education that could be done. Can't just let your dog go in the park – need to understand what is normal and abnormal behaviour. That would have to cautiously approached by bylaw regarding prohibiting a dog from going to a dog park because there are lots of factors that could contribute to an incident.
- Vicious/dangerous dogs – [personal information removed] representing my own views and am also a dog trainer. I own a Staffordshire Terrier. I don't know the difference between a vicious and dangerous dog according to the bylaw. What are the definitions of a vicious dog/dangerous dog. What are your responsibilities if you own one? I don't think that's relatively known in the City. If there are things we can do to address those concerns that would be helpful.
- Lack of education. In all of the definitions, it would be a lack of knowledge, especially with the dog park example. If the dog is becoming an issue, you can't go by a single event, but maybe giving the owner some information on etiquette, reading dog body language. If the issues continue, I agree with banning from dog park.
- Wanted to share the policy statement for the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council of Canada (PIJAC) regarding dangerous dogs. I would be happy to provide the link to the advocacy statement. That's our policy statement and we don't support BSL and we believe that responsible owners are really the key to moving forward.
- [Challenge from enforcement perspective re: reactive/proactive response. Any thoughts on what the City can do to be more proactive and encourage more responsible pet ownership?]
- I'm also from PIJAC. A lot is education with different stakeholders – breeders, pet store owners, rescues – all the avenues where people can acquire pets. Make sure everyone has education about dog behavior. We need to work with all stakeholders to ensure everyone has accountability. Making sure everyone is educated on all elements that need to be assessed around pets, that appropriate pets go to the appropriate owners. Do education at the onset to minimize the need for a bylaw response.
- Proactive – that would mean where are people getting dogs from? Start education process there. Pet store, breeder, rescue facility. Opportunity to introduce education at that point. Give breeders a discount on their licence if they provide education, as well as dog owners if they take training.
- I 100% Agree - very difficult to classify dogs into specific categories as how a dog acts is often very different depending on a specific contextual situation.



- Completely agree as well!
- completely agree as well
- Not all dogs are appropriate for dog parks; totally agree!
- I agree - education of the owners is key.
- Education is key. I never frequent dog parks. My dogs get targeted being intact. When I did go I found them accidents waiting to happen!
- Are there any stats around attacks at dog parks vs anything else? (don't have any specific to dog parks, will look up and add it to the chat)
- The key to determine a pattern of behavior - Once a pattern of behavior has been determined based on a dog by dog basis (and a situation by situation basis), and proven by a certified professional, then strong penalties can be enacted.
- Exactly. Proactive education
- <https://pijaccanada.com/for-businesses/advocacy/an-enlightened-approach-to-companion-animal-control-for-canadian-municipalities/>
- 11.8% of bites reported to Calgary Community Standards occurred in the home.
- A bite is considered "in-house" if the victim is either the dog owner or a member of the dog owner's immediate family who resides in the same household as the animal
- I hear lots on education, but what other actions can the City take to implement more proactive, preventative measures to stop dog bites before they happen
- One of the challenges from an enforcement perspective is that our bylaw is reactive....unfortunately we have to wait until an incident to take action
- So an in-home bite doesn't actually refer to the location where the bite took place?(yes)
- perhaps some free webinars on basic canine communication and behaviour? Something that could be offered regularly, to help people actually understand what their dogs are telling them
- Start education in schools
- Thank you
- Yes, I agree with [personal information removed] regarding education in schools
- PIJAC offers a Best Management Practice Program specific to the last exchange about education to the various pet sourcing
- while this may be controversial, engage with users of aversive tools such as shock, prong based equipment. these are a known risk for aggression
- <https://pijaccanada.com/education/best-management-practices-for-pet-establishments/>
- Those of us who breed purebred dogs have been doing that for years. Prepping our puppy people for what they need to do to keep their dogs safe if really important to me (and other breeders).
- All great comments and things for us to look into. This is helpful. Thank you.
- Disagree. Ecollars and prong collars do not cause aggression

Pigeons

Which additional rules would you support for enforcement of properties that own pigeons?



- Locating the pigeon coop within a specified distance of adjacent houses
- Odour management (eg. clean coop, etc.)
- Enforce coop standards
- Removal of some or all birds if problems arise
- Cleanup of pigeon feces

Are there other rules you would suggest?

- If someone has pigeons and they happen to get sick, is there any concern about them passing it on to wild birds in the city?
- Zoning for pigeons. City zoning for properties – not familiar with pigeon population. Is it a popular thing in the City itself or more on the outskirts?
- Again, zoning for pigeons? Not familiar with the pigeons in our industry, and being from Ottawa, unsure of the popularity
- I am aware that when pigeons are a problem in this city... they are a big problem and that the city may need additional legislation to support them in their roles. I support these changes or other changes to support the by-law officers in their work.
- Are they required to have an ID number? There's provincial legislation of the site and ownership? Is it the same requirements as for urban hens?
- I support this, goes back to responsible pet ownership. also agree with [personal information removed] who says they may have to belong to an organization. A licencing fee would be appropriate as we licence our dogs and cats.
- is there something that covers disease in the birds and potentially spreading to other birds?
- Are they required to be "spayed" or "neutered" (unsure if that's the proper term for pigeons) but that could become an environmental issue if they are capable of reproducing with the "wild" pigeons?
- I like the idea of licensing. [personal information removed], I will share that one of the most impactful challenges we encountered was that birds and reptiles were not licenced/accounted for and they municipality was unaware of the significant number of these animals were being housed. If there are homes with a considerable number of pigeons or have large coops, I would think licensing could just help to create knowledge and awareness for things like disaster response.
- People own a group of pigeons and they race them. They let them out and they fly in patterns. Sometimes they don't always come back. They end up in neighbour's yards and you get into "how do we get these pigeons back?" [How many do you think people should be allowed to keep?] I can't comment on that. My personal answer is zero but that's not fair to the people who own them.
- Seems reasonable to me
- No comment on pigeons. I think people who have vested interest are best to address that.
- I don't know anything about pigeons
- No idea about pigeons.
- My experience with pigeons is that when people have them out to race them or do what they like to do .. that often some will get loose.



Dog Early Warning System

To address the needs of pet owners and non-pet owners, and to respond to concerns raised regarding behaviour in on-leash areas and off-leash parks, we are exploring a voluntary dog early warning system.

What concerns or ideas would you have regarding a voluntary dog early warning system?

- NO FLEXI Leashes on pathways and sidewalks.
- I really like the idea in principle. Would require a huge education piece both to get people to engage but also for people to understand what the colours truly mean. What does a red bandana really mean? I think a bandana program for people walking dogs around the neighbourhood would be good. Think education piece would be steep.
- Love the thought of an early warning system but would require an education push so that people understood the colours - most people go "oh cute bandanna can I pet your dog". So a big city media push for it.
- Agreed [personal information removed] certain bandanna dogs should not be at off leash parks.
- Lots of people with dogs that don't want their dogs pet for whatever reason. I wouldn't see that as "that dog is going to bite", I would just see it as "oh that dog is just skittish". One person I walk with goes up to every dog. Once she stepped on a dog's paw and he jumped back. She intruded on that dog's space. Could have a simple system of two bandanas for pet or don't pet. Too many colours is too complicated. If you choose not to have one, that's ok too. Don't need to put it in the bylaw but could be something to educate people on.
- I love the idea of a bandana that would keep people away from my dogs.
- When we're looking at this it sounds great. We can put a warning system on our dog. But I've learned that most dog owners don't have an understanding of dog behaviour and will mislabel their dogs. Another issue – I teach dog bite prevention to children. Children don't always look at a bandana. Many people don't know or will not look. Lots of room for error. Maybe one day your dog isn't feeling well and is a red bandana. Lots of room for mislabeling and error.
- I train dogs and walk dogs. You can use anything to voice your concerns and people don't want to hear it, they will not use it. We have people who will not call their dogs back or off, even with my voice as loud as it is. We always hear "oh don't worry, my dog is friendly" and that's not always the case.
- I put red on my dog all the time and he's not aggressive, just looks good in red. People need to understand dog body language and need to understand that leash laws apply. Need to have dog bite prevention programs so people understand that they can't just be running up to any dog they want to.
- It's a bit utopian – people aren't always going to learn dog body language. The colour system is a dummy system. There's something to try here, something to think about to make it a little more flexible for people of all ages. Not everyone is going to learn dog body language. Some of us are more interested. Maybe something more grass roots simple. Maybe only label dogs that you don't want people approaching. Have it tied halfway up the leash, not necessarily on dog.



- Can't really see the colour system working. People aren't necessarily paying attention. How do we teach the whole City about the colours when they don't even know about the bylaw? 99% of the time my dog is fine but sometimes not. Do I have to colour code daily? People aren't paying attention. I ask people to call their dogs off and they say "but my dog's friendly". Everyone should be comfortable with the interaction before it happens. Just can't see it working.
- I live in a complex where kids run up to every dog they see with their mother shouting "don't run up to the dog!" Not paying attention. Need to be taught right away how to approach a strange dog as well as their own dog because most bites happen in the home. Need to know how to act with dogs, not with colours.
- Children don't have the cognitive level to understand a colour system. We need to teach children to ask first. Teach them what to do rather than having to look for a certain colour on a dog. What if bandana is covered, has fallen off? Can't rely on children to make that connection. Need to teach them from the beginning how to approach.
- Really do like this idea, would be cool as a community to have a standardized communication piece. Important to discern with pet owners that it does not give permission to victim blame. That does not mean that if someone approaches a dog with a bandana that they (victim) are liable for any bites. That needs to be communicated.
- I used to use this on my own dogs and clients but quickly abandoned it. The type of people that are always going to approach aren't going to see a bandana. Like it as an idea but coming from a city, I should expect space from someone that they aren't going to interact with my dog. People who understand behaviour would like for people to observe space and ask for permission to pet a dog.
- It's an opt-in system, what happens if I forget to put it on or it falls off, child misses that day in school. Message should be education for all to respect people/dogs space.
- Worried about legal issues – if somebody does not have a bandana on their dog. If a child ignored or didn't see a bandana and ran up to it and the dog bit, the legal aspect could be – you as an owner were responsible to put a bandana and you didn't so we're going to sue you. Or the reverse, if your dog is wearing a red bandana and a child who doesn't know the colours runs up and the dog bites, then it's "well you knew your dog was dangerous, why didn't you muzzle it?" Kind of like the "Dangerous dog" sign debate – what do you put on the sign to not be legally responsible.
- We actually wanted to do a pilot project with a local dog park, to provide info posters of common canine behaviour observed in dog parks, and how to read the body language to avoid conflicts or rising aggression situations.
- 100% agree that people need to start respecting the wishes of the owner and ask consent before approaching instead of relying on a bandana.
- Goes back to public education again...
- [personal information removed] could not have said it ANY better! Education about personal space and respect would prevent a significant number of incidences. [personal information removed] hit the nail on the head regarding legalities.
- Yep, I believe awareness, canine behaviour education, in dog park areas is a must



- This latter one is a concern as well. If I just want a peaceful walk and put on a bandana one day, and my neighbour doesn't like my dog, can they use that to argue that I admitted my dog was a problem?
- Not in favor of a bandana initiative, great points [personal information removed]
- Agree with [personal information removed] - I think this will be a slippery slope.
- It is a nice idea but agree that it is messy. For me, I feel like focus on responsible ownership (not choosing to take a dog with a propensity for Level 3 or 4 bite history to off-leash areas, etc), over trying to police everyone around the dog with flag/bandana would be preferable.
- Concern about consistency. We're trying to educate people and they see a dog with a bandana on that says they can't touch them. But then they see a dog without one and they think they can touch it, but really that dog just wasn't part of the voluntary system.
- How do you get compliance on this? Sometimes the ones that need these things aren't the ones using it. What kind of responsibility lays with the owner if they put a 'do not touch' bandana on the dog and an incident occurs? Are they accepting responsibility or does responsibility shift to the victim? Gives a false sense of security.
- Will go back to original statement about context – even a dog with a green bandana could be in a situation where if felt the need to bite. Having a bandana on even the most bomb-proof dog shouldn't be an invitation for people to touch it. Could be a mechanism for people with other dogs though. Yellow Dog Project – people with reactive dogs use it to let other people know to give the dog space. If a dog has to have a red bandana on in on off-leash park – that's just asinine. Red/yellow zone bandanas in an off-leash park is a disaster. Education about your responsibility as a person to not touch dogs is more important. I don't like this idea much.
- I believe the Yellow Dog Project is from a lady in Red Deer. She had a reactive dog, so she put yellow ribbons on her leash to let others know her dog needed space. Dog was not a risk if it had space – just an indicator to stay out of my bubble. Many have tried it to take dogs out into the community. Not sure what the success has been. You're on high alert anyway with a reactive dog. You look around corners and cross the street – use management techniques already if you own a reactive dog. Some don't take their dogs out at all.
- If you're on-leash with your dog, believe yellow ribbons could be useful. Not at a dog park at all.
- The system would be voluntary – so not all owners will have a marked dog, especially not bad owners. Could lead to confusion as some dogs will be aggressive, but not be labeled, whereas others will be. Essentially is a zero sum game where you still can't identify by sight an aggressive dog.
- I would much rather educate people regarding obtaining owner consent before approaching an unknown dog. I think that would be more effective
- Comment about aiding children to identify - this provides a false sense of security
- Does this open the owner up to liability if their dog is wearing a red or yellow bandana and something happens???
- Agree, it may lead to a false sense of security if you see a dog not a warning bandana, and thinking they are safe to approach
- No one needs to be approaching any dog without asking.



- Plus I find some people don't actually grasp the concept their dog doesn't want to be touched green is a false sense of security. Or they don't want the stigma of a red bandana and don't put it on.
- Yes liability would be an issue in my opinion.
- I think we are seeing some overlying themes about the need for education of both pets owners and citizens who could possibly interact with pets.
- Not a fan of bandana idea.
- How many times does an aggressive dog come running up with owner yelling "he's friendly"!!
- Education - people need control of their dogs. No reason dogs come running up to you and your dog. Most people do not have control of their dogs to call them off anyways.

Fine amounts

We are currently exploring fine increases for RPO violations. What situations do you believe could be improved by increasing fines?

- Back to the challenges you have for enforcement. Love the ethic of picking up orphan poops when in an off-leash area but in my 12 years in Deer Ridge, I have never seen an officer in the off-leash area. If a dog goes into the tall grass, people figure they don't have to pick up. Same fight that many civil servant departments are fighting. Cutback curtail how much enforcement you can do. All the things listed do deserve fines, but you have to find the people first.
- We keep coming back to that education point quite regularly.
- Are we finding that people are able to pay the fines that are already in place? What info do we have on the existing fine structure and are people able to pay their fines currently?
- What happens to dog owners who don't have a vehicle? Are they just getting off scot free for bylaw offences if they don't own a vehicle?
- Do fines actually deter anything anyway? I think they're like a speeding ticket. It might change behaviour for a short time, but then you just go back. Or people pay the ticket when they renew their license a year later, but that hasn't changed their behaviour. Are there other ways to change behaviour other than fines?
- For example, looking at excessive noise for \$100. Is it \$100 for every time it happens, or could there be a scale where it goes up for multiple times?
- Like the idea of a scale that increases each time. Sometimes only way to get people is through their pocketbook. What is the difference between a bite, injury or severe injury? How does an officer determine which it was? Do they take photos of the injury?
- Because we're talking about fines and bites/attacks, is there any way to obtain information on which breeds have been involved in each level. Does the city track bite scale per breed? I need to see if that is an influencing factor to this proposed change to the bylaw re: BSL or if there are other breeds involved.



- Can I get the information regarding level 5 bites? We need to look at populations of dogs registered per breed. Need to know if there are more of these breeds than others? For level 5 bites, is it just a visual breed identification or are we asking for papers from breeders?
- When dogs are being visually ID'd, that's a huge red flag. Even experts are often inaccurate in identifying dogs when they follow up with a DNA test. Dogs might not be getting ID'd correctly. I was told when I adopted my dog that she was a pitbull cross, my vet thinks she's a boxer, people on the street says she's a sighthound/greyhound cross. One bylaw officer might identify her as a pitbull and then another officer might identify her as a boxer.
- Other issue is registration – you are not able to pick mixed-breed dog. Reality is that we're dealing with many dogs from unknown origins. Would be good if the City could update their database to allow people to pick 'mixed-breed dog' as a drop down. Reality is that most people have mixed-breed dogs.
- Agree about being able to choose 'Mixed breed". Have no idea what my dog is.
- Looking at dog bites, injuries, attacks – wouldn't those be bundled into one? Do all those get bundled together if the dog bites me and injures me or are they pieced out?
- These do escalate right, second/third time would be more?
- Injuries or attacks to an adult, there's nothing for children. With some of these causing severe injury, is there a rehab program that they have to go through for some of these fines? Is there something that's going to expound a bit on that – if your fine is this, this is what's going to happen.
- I think for first offences these numbers are ok, 2nd and more the fines should be increased. I also think causing death to animal should be 1000 plus any vet bills incurred by the attacked dog's owners. Also it should be across the board, inclusive of children. There should also be a rehab attached to the more serious infractions.
- Is there a rehabilitation program for dangerous dogs?
- What happens if the vicious dog is re-homed?
- I have seen in other bylaws that dog owners can apply to have the dangerous dog label removed after a certain period of time of good behaviour...
- Further to [personal information removed] comment - yes, in some jurisdiction there is a category where you can undergo training and an assessment and have the designation reversed. So for example there would be aggressive, vicious, and dangerous.
- I just want to offer for consideration, that I think changing fee structure would have limited impact. Calgary is a large, and generally prosperous community. I think increasing fines, and the existence of them in general, suggests that your dog can offend in this way (save for euthanasia outcomes) as long as you pay your dues. Where I think we may be able to be more impactful, is to be proactive in communicating the impact to public safety, and the animal's quality of life if it offends and requires court ordered restrictions and tying this into responsible pet ownership.
- Generally, I think that smaller fines (defecation, noise, at large, unlicensed) may help if they're higher. With more aggressive incidents, people don't expect that to happen so higher fines may not be a deterrent to reduce incidents.



- A lot of education needs to be done with owners and families around how to conduct yourself around pets to avoid these situations we're talking about. We need to make sure people don't trigger any type of behaviour as well.
- Bites to children should be higher. Bites can be more psychologically damaging for a kid. Not discounting what an animal or adult might feel but I hear people say they were bit as a kid and are terrified of dogs now.
- I would like to see a higher fine for bites to children. I think it can be more physiologically damaging to a child
- No - biting a person should not be separated by age.
- the fines are fine
- Are more bites reported for kids then adults?
- Fines seem fine
- Kids are more likely to be bitten, for a variety of reasons
- I don't think we have access to those numbers, unfortunately
- Higher fines would support a more robust education program .. but raising the fines would not necessarily decrease the amount of bites / injuries - but I do believe it would help with the removal of defecation / pet liscencing / dog at large / barking dog
- 7 the fine schedule in Calgary is in the middle of Alberta communities....raising fines could be helpful
- I don't have those statistics [personal information removed]. What I would say, anecdotally, the trauma and impact to children is much higher
- I feel fees are fine. If you can't afford the license fee perhaps animal ownership isn't for you.

Tribunal

What ideas or concerns would you have regarding a tribunal system?

- Great positive potential as long as there's an assessment of the knowledge level of the people who are part of it. I was part of conflict resolution regarding barking dogs and I think it helped. I think if a tribunal could offer better solutions for all parties that are appealable. There should be severe consequences if one party breaches conditions set out by the tribunal.
- I like the idea if it does reduce trauma. My concern is with who would be on the tribunal. Need certified trainers, behaviour specialists, veterinarians. Need people who understand animals, not just some random person.
- Love this idea. Wonderful initiative. Is this going to be a panel, small select team, full time or contract role (part time)?
- Love the idea of it being a panel with someone from the City to say "this is what we need to do." My recommendation, there needs to be somebody with CBCC-KA or IAABC equivalent, somebody with a designation and experience with aggression to speak to this.
- Think this is an amazing idea. At a dog show, if there's a dog who bites a judge, its expelled and disqualified from the show. Just wondering if there's a correlation – some are banned for life.



- There are other groups that assess foreign dogs for pedigree. Not really the same but a similar type of collaboration.
- I think that the Tribunal is a brilliant idea, with a panel comprised of perhaps a person who breeds and works with animals consistently but not necessarily with a designation, one with a designation (working with aggression/training) etc. I applaud the city for even looking at investigating this further.
- I think there is a lot of value in this approach, to expedite cases. As long as the members were chosen carefully so they are objective. And, I suppose, there are clear mechanisms for escalation or review.
- Recommendation for requirements for certification. CBCC-KA (from the CCPDT), of the IAABC equivalent AND experience making euthanasia decisions at a high volume.
- Time spent in quarantine is detrimental to a dog's temperament. If we can lessen the amount of time the dog is in quarantine, that would be ideal. My concern is about who would be on the tribunal? What type of education/background would they have? Would they be suited to have these type of decisions?
- Should look for certified canine behaviorists. A well-rounded group of people. Animal control, animal behaviorist, maybe even a human behaviorist because often people are the issue.
- Very stressful for dogs and owners to be taken away for so long, also there is a cost to the city with the current system. Would agree with the tribunal as long as qualified people are on the it. I don't know what the current system is and whether there are experts currently involved. Believe a tribunal would be in the best interest of owners, victims, dogs and the City.
- I would be concerned about how you determine eligibility of individuals to serve on the tribunal. Not all canine behaviorists are created equal
- Agree.
- You need to have people that are well versed in dog behaviour and communication, as well as being able to read people to understand the whole story
- I think that giving the victims some course of action is important. If a tribunal gives this opportunity, I think that it is important
- PIJAC would love to work with the City of Calgary to expand access to its Beat Management Practice program. PIJAC represents several members from the pet community coast to coast. We also have several educational online module.
- If you go with tribunal there's must be an appeals process. You could have an unfortunate panel for your dog. Could be warranted but perhaps not
- Who will the tribunal report to? How will they be governed? What precedent will they use to make decisions?
- Agree with [personal information removed]
- There are other municipalities that use a tribunal system so there is some case law available. Again, Courts can review the fairness of the proceedings and whether the decision was reasonable



Bite and Run

The City is considering a rule around 'bite and run' in the instance that a dog bites a person or other animal.

What ideas, do you have regarding a rule whereby the dog owner must remain at the scene of an incident to share contact information and talk with an enforcement officer if necessary? Please explain.

- I think it would be great if there was someone to enforce that. I feel strongly that if an owner has a dog who commits a crime they need to take responsibility. Public would be more forgiving if they felt someone was going to take responsibility.
- How will you make anybody stay there if they don't want to stay? How many times have you heard they're calling bylaw and trying to make people stay and they won't.
- And that's also trusting that the people are giving the proper name or address because often they don't.
- When I attended the meeting some months ago, in reference to fines, one of the City people who was there said it's often hard to enforce fines that are levied by bylaw offence. You give me a fine, but there's no real ability to enforce that I'll pay that fine, which I was shocked by. It would be nice if the city would help your department get a little more teeth to the fines that are levied.
- In theory this is lovely...it would be amazing if dog owners would take responsibility if something would happen with their dogs. People unfortunately have bite and runs. Rule could be there, but I feel that enforcement would be hard to do. You could get citations for leaving the scene. Feel that this would be hard to enforce because people are already fleeing the scene. Would be better to have a public education campaign encouraging people to report, get all the information they can get at the scene, type of information to collect – description of dog, licence plate etc. Even if it's written in law, people that would break that law are already breaking the law.
- 100% support that [extra tool that City can use]. Love if we could keep people accountable. Entirely support the notion of a citation if people leave the scene. Irresponsible owners are going to be irresponsible anyway. Do support the notion of holding owners accountable. More education. Might be a struggle to gain compliance.
- Agree strongly with this.
- Yes, that makes sense in a safe manner of course.
- Although there are cases where the owner might need to run home to put the dog away, etc, which of course has to be considered, but then the owner should be expected to call their information in later.
- I also agree with this suggestion.
- Absolutely agree with this.
- Risk of reoffence and victim exposure – how can we make the leap from mandatory reporting to mandatory stay on scene. I like the exchanging of information – sounds like insurance in cars.
- 100% agree.
- Does the team have the manpower to respond to these concerns in time?



- Thinking about an hour response time – cortisol levels are going to persist in the dog's system for 72 hours. Would be concerned about the dog being ramped and not being able to recover. Risk of reoffence. Would focus on self-reporting.
- Are police normally dispatched after dog bites with injuries in Calgary? Just curious as I don't know the procedure.
- Yes, I meant when the bite is directed to a human and not another dog.
- Would have to be very clear what constitutes a bite. Jogger passes a dog, maybe there's a nip, a tear of pants. Sometimes people are ok with it, sometimes they have a strong reaction. Sometimes people go home and then aren't ok with it. If the victim seems ok at the time, I wouldn't expect an owner to go home and start a file on the bite.
- Are dog owners informed enough to know what information they need to report during a dog bite situation? Does the city outline this information?
- Yes, good point around dog-to-dog bites. Dog fights happen all the time and there even might be injuries, but both parties accept it as part of life and move on. I wouldn't want every scuffle in the dog park called into the City because people are afraid of being fined for a bite-and-run.
- Would have a concern about a dog-dog case because really you need to get out of there. One of your best courses of action is to get out of dodge because you don't want that to reoccur. If there's some provision where you can provide you name/contact info after the fact within a certain amount of time, to 311 or something, then that could suffice as something close enough to not being in violation. In the event of a dog-human, absolutely you should remain on scene.
- If you run away, obviously there's got to be some kind of punishment. I do agree that there should be some extra fine for not staying and taking responsibility or to show that they're responsible. It's likely the dog was the problem, but the human could have been as well. Same as leaving the scene of a car accident – there should be other charges involved.
- Concern is around containment of the dog and ensuring there's not a secondary issue. If you're standing around waiting the dog might bite again. Maybe a provision to be able to contain the dog and then exchange info. Don't want to make things worse by having the person stay on scene.
- Not sure how you would enforce it, but I like it
- Owners should remain at the scene of an incident, but my concern would be the containment of the dog. It's not a great idea to have the owner and an aggressive dog standing there with a victim of a dog bite – whether human or dog - it is possible the dog may bite again while waiting, and the victim may require medical assistance that would not warrant both parties waiting for bylaw/police.
- Bite and run. I think that's a nice idea. Hard to enforce. Plus often one needs to go to the vet. Everyone needs to be responsible for their dogs actions
- Or remove the dog (put it in the car/house./etc) and return to the scene to exchange information
- Sharing accurate information yes! The only issue with staying on scene is that emotions is high for everyone, including the dogs. A second issue could occur if you stay on scene. Esp. if it was due to faulty equipment (leash, collar, etc)
- Agree with mandating information exchange when dog incident occurs
- People will continue to run to avoid prosecution



- Great questions [personal information removed], we are just exploring this at this point. As it falls under Administrative Law, the Tribunal would have broad authority to place a variety of conditions to mitigate risk when releasing the dog back to the owner. They would also have authority to uphold a dog destruction order. I would envision that creation of over-arching principles to guide decision making, criteria and objective standards for decision making, and parameters on authority of the committee

Livestock

In addition to hens, we are exploring criteria for the potential approval of other livestock to be permitted in Calgary. Criteria for other livestock would include:

- Offers community benefit/ will have positive impact
- Support from adjacent neighbours
- Suitable living conditions can be provided for the animal
- Exceptions would be evaluated on a case by case basis and the decision would be at the discretion of the Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer

Note: The City is looking at creating rules that balance the needs of Calgarians, as well as native and honeybee populations. While beekeeping was out of scope in phase 2 engagement, comments pertaining to beekeeping are still included here.

What concerns, if any, would you have if Calgary assessed allowing households to obtain these livestock using the above criteria? Is there other criteria you think should be included?

- Best management practices for beekeeping. Beekeepers tend, in most cases, if they're going to follow the rules, they do. Our organization's best practices. The City was very very involved in best practices development. We do call them the City of Calgary guidelines because they were ones that we had meetings with the City to come up with some practices.
- Regarding the 'What We Heard' report about beekeeping. Comments were shocking and came from people who didn't know anything about bees and beekeeping.
- When it comes to different interactions and land owners needing to be notified, I often look at when my neighbour got a dog which barks continuously, she didn't consult me first if I wanted a neighbour with a dog. There'll be people who don't get along very well and will say no I don't want a dog just because they don't get along.
- Notification to neighbours not necessary, but should have to register with the City so we can know where they are and do education.
- Proof of education at the same time as registration.
- Had a complaint about flying insects which we were told were honey bees. Turned out to be wasps which you can't do anything about nesting in your property. But if you know where a beekeeper is, you can make sure they're following the guidelines.



- I can guarantee, if you plant flowers you will get bees. Mostly honeybees. 300 different species in Alberta. 20-30 bumblebees. For allergies, [personal information removed], there [personal information removed] who's allergic to wasps and bees. I asked him, [personal information removed], if he had any issues with hives or wanted to know when I'm harvesting honey. He said no. Keeps an epi-pen because [personal information removed] much more likely to get stung by a wild bee. You would have to prove that a person has an allergy through testing because people just say they're allergic. One case in [personal information removed], 6 properties around the house with hives supposedly had people with allergies, where only 4% of the population has allergies. When bees forage they tend not to be aggressive. Only when you're near their hive. A wild bumblebee could have a nest on your property and could be aggressive.
- Beekeeping organization in Calgary are the only ones who go out and rescue native bees. We do between 80-100 native bee complaints/year. When a beekeeping organization goes out to rescue native bees, that says a lot about how much beekeepers care about native bees.
- Excellent idea for registering with the City and I agree no notification is necessary but registration.
- Are they just allowed hens, no rooster? Noise concern. How about ducks? Ducks bring a whole level of odour with them. Ducks are fun to keep but they bring a whole other level of odour than chickens.
- I have spoken with Councillors and they support beekeeping, but one Councillor said never in his life would he support hens. Just some information you should have going forward.
- Accessibility to a veterinarian for livestock. We do need support for care. Those must be available with options for these services to come to your house. Don't have the option to put these animals on Calgary Transit to access vet care.
- Curious as to what people would be doing with urban hens? Are they just for eggs or for meat? Honestly not sure how I feel about that.
- If only for egg laying purposes, what would happen with roosters if people don't know how to sex birds properly? How would we deal with a rooster cull?
- Lived overseas where people do have livestock. Sometimes it smells. That would be my concern. The odour wafts. Other than that, the chickens didn't disturb anyone. People might be bothered by the odour – that would have to be policed in some way.
- I'm sure I would have an opinion if I had chickens living next door - the smell mostly.
- Does the city have enough bodies to enforce something like this?
- Support from adjacent neighbours generated a lot of negative discussion. Applies to any pet ownership that we shouldn't have variable rights depending on who our neighbours are. Bylaw is set up to regulate harms and nuisance – shouldn't be dependent on what our neighbour thinks.
- When we look at ownership of dogs/cats, you're not required to consult your neighbours. Don't love the fact that this is seen as different. They're less common, but when cared for well they're not impactful to neighbours. We have those things in the bylaw. Those can be broadly applied to livestock. Noise/smell guidelines can be generally applied to all animals.
- Partnerships would have to be developed – taking in other animals puts stress on City resources.
- Education again on livestock animals behaviour and living needs, as they are quite different than the "typical pet" that the public is used to.



- Education is needed. I think most neighbours think living next to livestock means a lot of noise and smell. And as long as animals are properly cared for this won't be the case.
- Again size of animal, property size, zoning, might play a role in the decision of who would be allowed to keep livestock. You're allowed to own a cat or dog in an apartment, not sure a goat or hen would be the best fit (having had hens myself :)
- I agree - size of property, size of animal, zoning must be taken into consideration.
- Alberta Native Bee Council – We have a lot of concerns about urban beekeeping. Interesting that they've been separated from livestock because that's what managed bees are. Managed bees can have a lot of impact on native bees. They compete for food sources. Managed bees can spread diseases to native bees. We have a lot of different species in Alberta. 300 native bees species – tremendous wild bee diversity. We have a critically endangered species in Calgary. We have proposed limits on hive densities. Also that beekeepers should have to provide their own food – we have provided estimates on how much land covered in flowering plants is required. Really big issue for us – want to make sure the city is considering these impacts while they're reviewing the bylaw.
- One concern would be the size of the animal. I'm foreseeing someone keeping a cow or a horse in their backyard and let their hooves and shoes scratch up the street. Needs to be consideration for size – should be limited.
- In theory in favour of having ability to have livestock. Would have to have guidelines for square footage or certain number of chickens. I live in the inner city and yards are awfully small. Don't know whether you would have the appropriate welfare for a larger animal. Would like to see a pilot project or a phased approach. Pick a neighbourhood and test it there. Do see this as an additional revenue source for the City. Could see an additional licence – shouldn't be free for people to do. Would also like to see a community chicken coop. Primarily in favour of urban hens, but you could probably make it work for other wildlife. We've had success with the goats cutting the grass in Hillhurst. People love it. You could set aside some land for a community flock/herd. Would be an interesting experiment. Would have to be self-sustaining and licenced.
- Have any pilot projects been run?
- Just talking chickens right ? (they mentioned goats, potbellied pigs and mini horses)
- I'd be worried about smell. If you think dog yards smell bad, poorly maintained livestock are not nice
- The hooves and Shoes are not going to damage the street
- would be interested to hear what other cities are doing and what the outcomes have been
- How much Space is required to have a mini pony?or pig?
- Are there any differences in disposal of livestock waste vs dog/cat waste, from a sanitation standpoint?
- Green bin!
- So many stories of "Micro" pigs that don't end up Micro... or even small.
- You've tested chickens I think
- In favor of chickens/mini horse. But How much space is required to be allowed ?
- It would depend. There are standards that other municipalities have adopted that establish these
- For 3?



- the current requirement for chickens as emotional support animals is .92 sq m (10.2 sq ft.) is required for each bird
- If you allowed hens for egg laying purposes, we would likely allow more than 3
- Up to 8 to 10 likely

Fees

We are currently exploring changing fees for low-income Calgarians and LESA. Would you support changing these fees? What would that look like?

- My thought is that if you can't afford the fee, you probably can't afford the pet.
- With low-income, a licence of probably any monetary amount would likely be over-budget. If one was to do that, you have to give an incentive to want to purchase it. Have to convince them why they must get one. Before it was "a license is your dog's ticket home". Maybe something can be done with respect to low-income Calgarians. Agree with above that if you can't afford the fee you can't afford the pet, but think everyone should be entitled to have a pet regardless of their financial situation. Do agree they should be given some sort of break.
- With LESA, that should only be used for low-income Calgarians. If they have income above a certain amount, they should pay the fee just like I have to.
- If you want to have more than one LESA, then there should be a registration fee for that, just like if you choose to have multiple dogs.
- Low income, if you would like to give them a break, that would be reasonable to encourage responsible pet ownership and get them licensed.
- In the situation that the City is requiring that they have more than one – you pay \$67 for the first one and then a lower fee for the remaining 2. Then the opposite when it's their choice to have more than one when it's not required...you pay more for additional animals when not required.
- Support lower fees for lower income. Read comments from first engagement about people shouldn't have an animal if they can't afford it. I disagree. I think everyone deserves to have an animal if they want one. People will have one whether people agree or not.
- Just to clarify, I do support lowering licensing fees for low income folks.
- For emotional support animals, one of the changes proposed is to only allow 1 pitbull type dog per household. How would that look if the emotional support animal was a pitbull type dog and a 2nd pitbull was required for animal enrichment? If someone wanted a second pitbull would they be able to have one?
- If someone had a pitbull as an emotional support animal, but are only allowed to have one per household, would they be able to have a 2nd pitbull type dog if the bylaw was changed?
- With backyard chickens. We are advocating for a stand alone urban hens bylaw or adding it to this bylaw as most urban hens will be kept as pets. We have a number of members who have gone through the LESA process. It is a high bar – there are many hoops to jump through to have a pet



chicken. Cost is high. You have the cost of getting the letter from the psychologist, then also to add on \$67 per bird. We would like to see that made more accessible.

- Could there be a fee per size of animal (or weight)?
- Such as lower fees for smaller pets, larger fees for larger animals
- I could support lower fees for low income families
- If your dog is at large or you're eligible for any of those fees that you mentioned, I don't think any should be reduced if you're on a low income. If you have a pet, you need to have a certain amount of resources to properly care for that pet. Agree with supporting low income with licencing and spay/neuter, but don't agree with lower consequences.
- For LESA, would it be the same as a low-income bus pass?
- Sounds like a reasonable accommodation to make on a case by case basis. Surely there could be a fund or some ability to help out folks that way.
- For LESA, you keep referring to livestock. How do you differentiate between a dog or cat that is an emotional support animal? What steps can people take to verify that their pet is for emotional support? What kind of verification are you using for livestock as emotional support?
- I would support lower fees for Low income
- Bylaw infractions should not be reduced by low income
- ES animals need what verification?
- I agree
- I agree - fines should not be lower, but perhaps licencing fees could be.
- Support for low income pet owners should be explored
- The applicant would need proof that a registered psychologist or psychiatrist is recommending the livestock as part of their treatment program. They would also need to show that they have adequate space for the animal(s)
- License for your animal is one of the smallest cost an owner will cost, more in favour of low cost spay/neuter
- We have a no cost spay and neuter program already in place through the City's fair entry program for low income residents
- Agree. Vet bills are so expensive. License fee is the least of my bills lol,
- I can't find the thumbs up button for chats, would support for low income pet owners and discuss how PIJAC could support a funding program for such situations.

Pet limit

What ideas or concerns would you have regarding a larger pet limit?

- Huge concerns about this. What proportion of complaints about dogs involve households with multiple dogs?
- If my dogs are too noisy, then I need to be dealt with for noisy dogs. If my house is filthy, then I need to be reprimanded or dealt with for the problem. I can tell you my 4 dogs are quieter than my



neighbours Daschund. Not sure why we aren't enforcing bylaws that are already in place. Not going to help with hoarding situations which is due to mental illness. Often those become SPCA issues because dogs are in such distress.

- Agree with above 100%. I presently have 5 dogs but I compete in performance area with CKC. As a performance person and fancier of my breed, if I was limited to a number of dogs, it would limit me in progressing in the areas that I perform in. If I was capped, that would greatly impact my lifestyle with my dogs. Makes them great ambassadors for their breed. My neighbours can't tell that I have 5 dogs. I keep it spotless. There's a cattle dog 2 houses up that barks non-stop, never shuts up. I have 5 Rottweilers and I don't want them to make a peep because I don't want anyone to complain. Comes down to education and human beings being decent. If smell is an issue, why isn't that being dealt with by bylaw? Definitely not going to stop hoarders. They aren't going to license their dogs. Not going to stop a mental disease. They're lost in the system until their neighbours complain about it. Cap isn't going to stop 3 dogs being worse than 1 dog.
- With excess animal permits, I wouldn't want to have to jump through more hoops than just someone who owns 5 dogs. Would want a process that's fair across the board.
- See a similarity with number of beehives to number of cats/dogs. Bottom line – you make rules and people will always break them. People who aren't educated will break them as well. The more you have, the greater the potential for it to become a problem. That's why setting a number of beehives is likely a good idea, same as with dogs. Someone can have a limit based on yard size of 4 hives. I know people who have 8 and there's never been a problem. They're responsible. I know people who have 5 and it's a problem. By setting a limit, at least the people who follow rules will follow rules and decrease potential for additional problems. Would help bylaw help manage things in the City. Like the idea of the approved excess animal permit. There's lots of cases where people could have 10 dogs and manage them well. And why shouldn't they be allowed if they're a trainer or breeder. Have a limit to help minimize number of complaints that come from multiple dogs.
- What is the purpose of getting a permit? If I'm a rule follower, I'd be concerned about the process. I disagree that the more dogs the more potential problem. I think the less educated the dog owner is, the more likely there will be problems. I've seen very inexperienced people with a German Shepherd puppy and knew they were headed for trouble. I don't think numbers lead to problems, I think the education level of owners leads to problems. What's the purpose of the excess animal permit if my yard doesn't smell and my dogs are quiet and I follow all the rules? If I apply, is someone going to come check my yard? Going to create a whole new level of headaches and enforcement challenges for officers.
- Hear what you're saying [personal information removed] [re: issues with owner with 15 dogs], but those issues are one-offs. For a person with 10 dogs that gets barking complaints, it isn't going to solve the problem. They get grandfathered in and 4 eventually die, there will still be complaints about the 6. And if they're just one-offs, maybe 100 of those types of people in the City, what can we do with the one-offs? What can we do with the one guy with 10 dogs that are constantly barking? Probably nothing. Does it become an education thing or is the person beyond that?



- Mediation between neighbours. I don't love my neighbours but you do have to try to have a civil relationship, whether it's a cat or a pigeon.
- There are some enforcement pieces that must be challenging. I have a friend who is a breeder who has between 6-10 dogs at her property in the City. She does well keeping it clean, but it backs on to a park that is not off-leash. Off-leash dogs come over to her fence that incite her dogs to bark. Her neighbours go crazy because her dogs bark but if those dogs weren't off leash then her dogs wouldn't bark.
- Is there a definition for having the means to take care of them? Is that well-defined?
- Wondering where the number of 6 came from?
- 6 seems like a lot as a person who had 5, 6 seems like a lot so wondering where that came from? How many citizens have 6 or more currently? Some people with 1 dog have a lot of nuisance dogs because they're left out for hours on end, they bark constantly. I can go in and out of my house 20 times a day and 20 times a day those dogs will get set off. Depends on the people who own the dog.
- Other concern is if you put a number on it this go-round, next time will it get cut down to 4 dogs, and time after that 2 dogs? Where is it going to end?
- Again, I think it boils down to the individual situation. Person with 15 dogs, obviously that's a problem that needs to be dealt with. But there are people with 1 dog that are a problem that needs to be dealt with.
- I feel as long as the 5 basic needs are being met pet owners should be given the opportunity to show that they are capable of having multiple pets. This would address hoarding situation, backyard breeding operations etc.
- What are the Five Freedoms?
 - Freedom from hunger and thirst.
 - Freedom from pain, injury and disease.
 - Freedom from distress.
 - Freedom from discomfort.
 - Freedom to express behaviours that promote well-being.
- I have 6+ dogs that are licenced. Sounds like there's only 33 people that have more than 6 dogs. Is this even needed? If we're being responsible owners, you talked about a fancier's licence, I would be interested in that.
- As much as I love the idea of being able to own more pets, I suspect without proper awareness and education towards the public, might increase the amount of "nuisance dogs" or "nuisance animals" within the community. But owners should be able to apply to get "special permits" to own more (ex: rescues, breeders, fosters, etc)
- I struggle with this one. I understand the concerns from the perspective of enforcement with regards to this and at the same time, I (strictly speaking) don't see number of pets being the determining factor in animal welfare. I would be ok with a number but would like to see it higher than 6.
- Going back a few years, but I think it still applies, when I was having a conversation with [personal information removed], his approach was that we already have bylaws to deal with each issue that can show up. If there's animal abuse, we have laws to deal with that, if there's smelly poop, we have



laws to deal with that etc. The person with 15 dogs that couldn't get rid of the smell, I manage a kennel with over 15 dogs and we have no smell. It's possible to keep it clean if you're diligent about it. You have to get into the data – does the data support dog limits? If you were to look at animal services calls related to noise, destruction of property, getting loose and on to neighbours property, how many of those would be going to a house with 1, 2 or 6 dogs? My guess is that the vast majority of calls are for houses with 1 or 2 dogs. Problems would not be solved with pet limits.

- Re pet limits - I would be one of those households, and as a breeder, would most certainly go along with the possession of a Dog Fanciers' License.
- Disagree with a limit. As someone who has dogs and is a breeder we are very aware of the bylaws and ensure that our dogs are not a menace to our neighbors. We also daily pick up after our dogs,
- Volume isn't indicative of irresponsible dog ownership.
- I suspect registered breeders would be exempt of this. I also assume that property and house size could play a factor, or even where the person lives, rural vs city...etc.
- My concern with legislation in general, not just Calgary, is that it ends up affecting a lot of people who aren't doing anything wrong. You end up with the vast majority of people who are doing a good job and doing what they're supposed to be doing and they get negatively affected by the one or two people who are idiots because of the struggle to enforce with those one or two people. We end up with legislation that negatively affects a majority of people. What happens to those 33 people who are more than capable of caring for many dogs? What happens to rescues? I've easily had 4-5 rescues in the house with my own 4 dogs. Noise/poop levels are taken care of, they get good care. I live in a situation where I can do that, but you also want to ensure you don't end up with a hoarder – I understand that.
- If you're be willing to be flexible with permissions for fosters, that would be good.
- I disagree with a limit. There are bylaws already in place for everything noted regarding noise/smell. As [personal information removed] said, volume isn't indicative of responsible/irresponsible pet ownership.
- No opinion on limits. Would be interested to research patterns in communities with low, moderate, or no limits.
- Agree.
- AB kennel club did submit a letter with regard to this – want to make sure you do have that. As breeders, some people do have many dogs. People who hoard, that's never going to be eliminated by a bylaw change. Letter said AB Kennel Club is against BSL and we addressed pet limits.
- Does the City have any partnerships for mental health to address hoarders?
- Agree that such limits end up affecting responsible pet owners.
- Are private homes able to be used for professional pet sitting or daycare? In most municipalities you need to have a zoned building for that.
- No to a limit. I very much agree with [personal information removed]. Limits/bans don't stop the problems, they just punish those that aren't causing problems.
- Disagree with limits based on numbers of animals, due to wide variability in city lot size/capacity to house animals. Manage nuisance (noise & smell) and harm (abuse/neglect/aggression) via bylaws.



- Somebody may terribly manage 1 pet while someone else may excellently manage 10 pets. Depends on the property and owner. Really comes down to how they're managed.
- Agree that it's all about how well they're cared for. If they're cared for and you're following the rules, I don't think the City should intervene. Backyard breeders – would like to see the City be able to act on those. If you're able to show proof of good breeding. Glad to see there are exceptions for fosters but would like to see something done about not very good breeding operations in the City. Would be hard to enforce but would like to see something done about backyard breeders – this (pet limits) may not be a way to do it.
- If you call 311, do we know how many stats we're talking about for odour complaints? What is the scale?
- Trying to define a backyard breeder is a slippery slope. Very hard to determine who's ethical or substandard. We may not agree with someone's breeding practices, but I don't think a pet limit is the way to manage that.
- As far as noise goes, I have 6 dogs. My neighbours are always surprised because I don't let them bark. The dog 2 doors down barks constantly. It's not a dog numbers issue – it's an education issue. I hate the idea of pet limits. There's a reason I moved to Calgary. This is a big thing for me and other breeders and competitors. It's about the quality of care that an owner can provide.
- My concern is that a lot of people might be punished for the irresponsibility of a few.
- If you put in limits, for people who get lots of complaints, that doesn't mean they're going to stop, they're just going to move dogs around or hide dogs. People work around dog limits, not legally. People that you're worried about aren't going to care about a limit and you'll only catch them if someone reports them.
- Not sure if limits are the answer or maybe it's higher fines or other consequences for infractions.
- RE: Limits - I strongly disagree with pet limits
- What is the purpose of a pet limit?
- Pet limits- disagree with any limits. Some people can't look after one! Some competition homes have more than 6. Especially with 2-3 competitors living in one home.
- Strongly disagree with this limit....size of animals may have some influence on the number of dogs in a city lot
- I have had between 6 and 8 dogs (as a breeder) and my dogs are always well cared for. I know of people with one dog that barely manage their dog
- Plus if I don't want cats can I then have 12 dogs? I don't want 6 dogs and 6 cats.
- Hoarders will always hoard. It's a mental disorder
- I agree with [personal information removed]. Pet limits seem pretty ridiculous to a farm girl.
- If a person can successfully manage many animals without issue, then they should be allowed to. If they cannot manage, and there are complaints, then it should be able to be mandated on a case by case basis a limit on ownership – all proven and documented by a certified professional.
- Is there not a city bylaw re smells and garbage already?
- Trust me, pet limits will not affect Backyard Breeders
- Those people will always find a way



- What do you mean "back yard breeder"?
- I agree
- Agree
- A backyard breeder is an amateur animal breeder whose breeding is considered substandard, with little or misguided effort towards ethical, selective breeding.
- How many complaints are there on this, per 311 calls?
- Right now we set an example to other cities regarding no pet limit. I'd hate to see this change. We have shown caps don't need to happen.
- Trying to define backyard breeders is a slippery slope. Who determines what is ethical? Who determines whether somebody is substandard? I strongly disagree with using pet limits to try and control breeding. Until people stop being willing to pay ridiculous amounts of money for crossbreds, backyard breeders won't go out of business
- Even 1 dog could cause smell and noise issues.
- Agree
- Agree
- Agree...limits punish all owners regardless of dog/cat numbers
- Amen!
- Pet limits will not affect unscrupulous breeders - they are unscrupulous, so they will not follow the limit.
- I have 2 dogs. Would not personally have 6 but I'd still never support limits
- Agree with you [personal information removed], and that may allow the city to monitor breeding activity in the city
- Ok but if she gets one complaint ... Then is the license taken away?
- The city likely already has authority under existing bylaws
- Well, there would be an investigation, just like with any other complaint
- If this is a mechanism to work on hoarding cases, has there been engagement with AHS/mental health experts for proactive prevention?
- I would support increased penalties for violation of any part of the pet bylaw to manage people having too many dogs vs a pet limit.
- How many dog owners have more than 6 licensed in Calgary? (a couple hundred)
- So many would just cap at 6 and you lose those license fees. They will hide dogs
- 200 owners with more than 6 dogs in a city of 1.3 million

Vendors

A suggestion was raised in phase 1 engagement to make pet licences available from more locations.

Would you support the sale of pet licences through local vendors? Vendors could include pet supply stores, veterinarians, etc.



- What might be some anticipated challenges with this approach?
- What might be some potential successes with this approach?

- If pet stores are going to be allowed to sell dogs and cats, maybe they have to sell a license before the animal goes out the door. I also think the City has made it very easy with the online process. Maybe if it's more visible, maybe more people would be inclined to engage.
- Think having vets sell them is a great idea. When they come in for vaccines, vet can have a conversation with the owner. Can offer a deal on the license. Most people who bring their dogs in for vet care wouldn't mind purchasing a licence.
- Great idea!
- 100% support access to getting a license at more places. When people see their vet, go to the pet store for supplies for their new puppy – having that reminder that a pet needs to be licensed is a great opportunity. Having multiple places and multiple reminders is a great opportunity.
- I think we have city bus passes as a model – you can get them at multiple vendors. Could be a model for licences.
- Could they issue a temporary license like when you renew your driver's licence? Something temporary while you wait for the official one from the City?
- What might be some anticipated challenges with this approach?
- How do we ensure that pet stores are getting information to the City? Might have lost data.
- A lot to ask of individual business owners. Suggest an incentive program, like for every certain number of licenses sold, there is an incentive. It is more accountability on business owners. Need something put in place for additional work required. Or if they sign up voluntarily, they need to understand what is required. Need to feel like there's something in it for them.
- Agree with having more locations to get licences, also wondering about when you adopt a dog, if you don't go home with a license. You don't have to licence before 6 months, but you can. Don't know why dogs that are being sold within the city aren't being licenced right off the bat.
- Interesting idea, may ensure more people licence their pets, would you have to provide a fee to that organization though? The City already has an amazing online pet licence system.
- 100% agree
- Do you only mean in locations that sell dogs and cats?
- Free 6 month license for adopted dogs is a great initiative!
- Can city licenses be purchased online? It could be to have online hubs available in those other location, removing the responsibility from that location to manage it
- So the actual location wouldn't need to manage it, as long as several online portals for licensing would be provided?
- I was thinking of just providing more visibility of the licensing process, if people see it, they think about it, and are more willing to do right there and then (if the resources are available of course)
- Licensing with the City online is so slick – provide a credit card and they get automatically renewed. They make it too easy to not register your dogs.
- What might be some anticipated challenges with this approach?



- Logistically, I work for a retailer. We have partnered with cities before in providing this service. Technology is kind of advanced with partnering. Getting details back to the City etc. I think where partnership could come from could be from having months or campaigns that could be partnered with retailers.
- Challenges - make sure that staff managing forms and payments are consistent and accurate.
- I guess I am wondering if the investment of time would meet the benefit for the city when the process is already so easy. Would the time and management required to facilitate this, really improve pet licencing in a significant way to justify the change
- What might be some potential successes with this approach?
- Successes - lots of opportunities and reminders to get your license
- Could also be done at pet shows
- Offering this to vendors would be beneficial. It's a very easy process online. It would be good for encouraging the building of community and the opportunity for education. Would a vendor need to meet some sort of expectation? Would they need to meet a standard in order to do this? Not sure how much opportunity there is but driving footsteps into local businesses would be beneficial to help educate the masses on pet behaviour as much as we can.
- Retailers would be happy to support any responsible pet licensing initiatives. Licences are graduated, where they expire at different times. Are we just talking about new licences or expired/renewals as well? Might be a bit tricky but retailers would be happy to provide that. Would also be happy to offer licencing information. The City of Calgary has the highest licencing in North America. Our program is very successful unless it's fallen off a cliff in recent years. If you start spreading it around to retailers, you have another whole set of infrastructure that you have to set up. City could provide education that could be dispersed to vets, trainers, dog walkers etc. That's not as readily available to us (retailers) as I would like it to be.
- Running retail stores, I get first time pet owners or new to the city owners asking all the time, I even took the off-leash ambassador training just to get more information for when I get asked by customers what's expected of them. They just don't know where to go or they come from a City where they did offer licences at a retail location.
- I would support increased vendors - the more locations that licenses are available, the more likely people are going to buy them and renew them.
- It makes sense.
- I like the idea of licenses being more readily available to people. Not sure how it would be tracked by the city, but I think it's a good idea
- What's the cost to have multiple vendors? It's not hard to get one now
- I think that's great suggestion to encourage more education and licensing from vets / stores / etc
- Worked at a clinic. We put license info in new puppy packets. I get my license reminder via email. Pay it on online banking. Click and done.
- Often get asked these exact questions. Info available will be helpful
- My same comment. I think there is an opportunity to leverage pet businesses to promote responsible pet ownership and licensing. Thank you



Other

- We haven't talked about dog walkers. I have strong feelings about dog walkers. They use City facilities for free. They are not licensed. No knowledge of what their experience with dogs is. There should be a licensing process. Demonstrate knowledge of dogs and liability insurance. Fee is reasonable if they're using City facilities.
- Also the number of dogs people can walk should be limited. If I have 6 dogs with me, it doesn't matter how well I control my dogs. If a strange dog comes in, shit is going to hit the fan. No way you can keep up with the poop. Should be some regulation. Not super harsh, but something.
- Dog noise bylaw is far too ambiguous. We used to live next door to a man with a sleep disorder, he would complain if my dogs barked once. The bylaw states any noise that disturbs. He would complain if my dog barked once because he had a sleep disorder. The bylaw leaves owners open to unreasonable neighbours.
- Thanks to the City and particularly Animal Services for being so diligent and receptive in seeking input from stakeholders.
- Thank you for taking the time to listen to us and value our input. Appreciate it very much.
- And I am seriously open and interested in future involvement in some sort of educational program.
- Question regarding the survey itself, is the City going to be looking into restricting multiple submissions and restricting who can participate? Concerned that anyone in the world can respond and can respond multiple times. Would like to see it limited to people who live in Calgary and deal with dogs in Calgary.
- Just want to make sure. We are anti-BSL. I have a following of 100,000 and I can say Calgary doesn't care, go ahead and do it. We know there are large lobby groups who can also direct people there. Just concerned that we may not get an accurate reflection of what Calgarians want. Might just end up being a debate about BSL on both sides. Doesn't take much for one social media influencer to go on and skew results.
- As a responsible dog owner and a tax payer I have concerns that engagement is open to everyone. I have family who live in Italy but I don't care what their opinions are about keeping dogs in Calgary. I'm concerned that either side could come in and provide feedback that isn't reflective of what Calgarians think.
- On the flip side, some of those people might have some great ideas we haven't considered.
- [personal information removed]
- In Canada we really believe in the rule of law and due process. Problem with BSL is that it takes that away from certain breeds. It allows a bylaw officer to make decisions based on visual identification. We really believe in rule of law and due process – BSL will take that away from owners and certain breeds of dogs. Scientific evidence doesn't support BSL as a useful tool in helping with responsible dog ownership.
- I appreciate the role of public consultation and understand that nothing is written in stone, but I would like to address things that are causing people anxiety in the pet owner community. Even framing it as an emotional reaction, they're worried about being treated differently. You go to the science and to the world of animal control and it's mystifying that this [BSL] is even on the table.



Toronto has a bill to repeal, Denver's going through it, Edmonton went through. It's not even just an emotional reaction - people are just honestly confused.

- The questionnaire that went out had very specific wording. It looks like somebody's put a lot of time into creating that questionnaire – looks like some of it was copied from Ontario. My concern is that Calgary has been for the past 15 years a model of animal control. Our concern is that for that amount of work to be put into the questions around pit bulls, that there's some agenda to get this on the table. [personal information removed] specifically said banning is not on the table, [personal information removed] said that banning is not on the table, but there's all sorts of things that can be done prior to banning that target owners of specific breeds, whether that's muzzling, insurance, not going to off-leash parks, extra fencing. All sorts of things that a city can do short of banning that still targets specific breeds. Wording on that questionnaire has me concerned because it seems like somebody put a lot of work into pit bulls.
- I would also like to add that even short of a breed ban, any breed restrictions - especially ones targeting household limits and insurance - are very concerning. Discrimination in any form is a problem!
- How can it not have been taken the wrong way when in the questionnaire it states something along the line of although statistics show that most dog bites are from other breeds, the inquiry is because of the potential damage that can be caused. I think that education both of owners and of the general public is the way to start. BSL legislation has been proven not to work. (I have a registered kennel and am speaking from the perspective of a breeder and dog advocate)
- So many great things have happened fighting this – I hate to see things go south. Facebook is very sensational – all of a sudden there were memes and things going around. If there could be some more positive advertising that Bylaw could do to say, “this is not what we're trying to do guys.” I also did the survey and thought “wow, what is going on here?” They were very poised questions and people just took that and ran with it.
- I'm representing the Canadian Kennel Club. Happy to see our members speaking out and echo sentiment that has been going on. BSL caused a bit of an imbalance in how people have looked at the survey. Language was taken from the Dog Owner's Liability Act. There are other good things about this consultation. I understand trying to get that balance and make sure to take notice of other things – make sure we don't get too caught up on just BSL perspective because we have to make sure that it's not something that's going to happen. The language and comment about the severity of the bite – certain things made one raise their eyebrows. Montreal recently had an incident in the last year or so and the coroner put out a report that disputed that fact. Just wanted to mention – would be good to have a look at that as well.
- I'm a trainer in the community, working in shelters and in private settings. Would echo the City's concerns that there is an increase in vicious dog incidents. Applaud the interest in looking at this. In my experience, vicious dog ownership/infractions are with cross-breeds. If we move to BSL, my concern is we are leaving the community vulnerable to those breeds that would not be included. Transfer of ownership and history of dog – worry about bylaw officers that when they see a first infraction, there could be a history and multiple offences. Re: stats on harder bites for specific



breeds – can that be made available to trainers, so we can understand what some of the challenges are from a professional perspective?

- I have pored over the bylaw on other projects, am I correct in saying that it's not written into the bylaw that reporting bites is mandatory? [yes]. I'm not seeing the community able to make objective decisions about a Golden Retriever who was involved in a level 5 bite. They try to rehome that dog. Is there something we can do to make Level 4, 5, 6 bites mandatory to report?
- [Are you talking about an offence for failing to report?] I'm seeing logs of dogs rehomed that should really have a vicious dog license and don't have one. I'm wondering if we're seeing people who are not willing to report, or is our data skewed because we don't have mandatory reporting?
- As a breeder, I get into the middle of dog fights if I've got females in season. I have been bitten on occasion. I don't want to be governed by law for getting bitten when it's my own fault.
- Through the whole questionnaire, it was directly targeting pit bulls or broad-head breeds which covers a multitude of breed such as Rottweilers etc. Should be on a per-dog basis rather than by breed. Pit bulls were known as the nanny breed – are fabulous around kids. I'm totally for someone getting education when they get a dog.
- But doesn't the viciousness of the dog in question have to be proven...not based on a fear of a what if. I think a per dog bylaw of some sort should be drawn up.
- As a member of The Staffordshire Bull Terrier Club of Canada, we are very concerned that Calgary, a city that has been a worldwide inspiration and champion for breed-neutral animal control and responsible ownership and has been touted as one of the most effective in Canada, has suddenly included breed specific legislation for consideration.
- Another reason people are confused about the inclusion of BSL on the survey - it didn't seem to come up on Phase 1.
- We also stress that breed identification based on phenotype is incredibly inaccurate and is opinion based and not fact based. Studies show that visual breed ID is flawed, especially when it comes to mixed breeds and dogs of unknown parentage – which make up the majority of Calgary's dog population. Can you please explain to me how these dogs the city is deeming 'pit bull type' are identified? Specifically.
- Have heard the stats on level 3 and 4 bites on pit bulls. If you go back to the scientific literature, there's not a good measure of bite strength. There is research on skull anatomy and dogs. Nothing physiologically different between dogs in any literature. Most dogs that fall under pit bull type are not papered – we're talking about visual ID or owner ID. Just wonder if there would be an opportunity to dig into statistics to see what's going on – is it poor rescue practices, poor breeding, larger dogs?
- Very specifically, how is the city deeming to identify what they consider a pitbull type?
- Side comment: This issue can be addressed in two parts, short term or long term, short term being to make sure that the city has the proper tools in order to control dangerous dogs (not breed specific) but also long term more importantly, educating the community to eventually decrease the instances of dog bites at any level. There's a huge gap about canine behaviour and how to properly read dogs and prevent potential conflicts.
- Love that idea and totally agree that awareness and education is key for the long term



- Ok....sorry that I jumped the gun. incentives are good....and no problem.
- Can I make a comment about bite strength?
- Courts aren't recognizing DNA testing yet. Purely visual ID by animal control officers.
- Canadian Veterinary Medical Association in Ontario have also reviewed DNA and visual ID.
- The discrepancies between visual breed identification and DNA analysis is well documented.
- I think she is pointing out that where there is BSL, there are lawsuits, etc on breed ID.
- If we can look at increasing communication between large group stakeholders and the City, we can reduce bites. City had a wonderful program for rescue groups in the city. Were on the right track, content was excellent, and I did see it create change in organizations. Since that's been discontinued, people have reverted back. If you can bring us back together to talk about the flow of animals in the community, rescue groups bringing animals in from out of province, volume of animals, how bites change year over year, that could help. I would also suggest having vets as stakeholders – they are the ones doing the difficult task of euthanasia and behaviour assessments. If City shares their stats, they may be more willing to provide these services. If we share info with stakeholders, what the goals are, we may be able to work together.
- Rescue group practices (and breeders) are a great thing to study - dogs that are responsible for level 3+ bites are likely to have genetic aggression which breeders and rescues should be screening for, and responsible for.
- Thank you and will we get a sneak peek before it goes to council?
- That would be a great idea to know the direction you are going.
- Rescue dog imports – Any dogs brought in from abroad, imports, my concern is with diseases brought into the City (brucellosis, ehrlichia etc.). Is there any thought being given to what requirements might be put in place for imports?
- I groom dogs for a living and anything that comes from Mexico, if they want to come to me they have to show a negative test for brucellosis. Worries me.
- Re: nuisance dogs – pitbull question. My main concern is with the wording of additional insurance. Some homeowner's insurance already won't cover you if you have pitbulls. Also wording about more than one pitbull in a household. Would that be grandfathered in? I have 4 pages of questions but those are the two main ones. Is there anywhere that I can send these 4 pages of questions and concerns?
- Re: dog importation, there's a working group with CBSA, CFIA, Public Health Agency of Canada looking at dog importation specifically. I can certainly follow-up on that with you.
- Can I ask a question re rescue/dog imports and disease prevention
- Wildlife concerns around a lot of bobcats / coyotes.
- There is a working group working with the federal agencies and PIJAC is a member of this committee. Happy to share back.
- Please let me know the outcome and if the City can help
- Against BSL. I don't think the city really needs to move forward with this.
- Could you please reiterate what the next steps will be? Will there be any other opportunities to provide input? Thanks!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Stakeholder Report Back: Verbatim Report

December 14, 2020

- 100% fully against BSL - I am heavily involved with two different predominantly bully breed dog sport clubs which provide a positive outlet for dogs to do what they love. These sports will end if any sort of BSL is enacted in Calgary.
- I am hearing many concerns and fears (and I share them) related to the line of questions on the web survey about BSL. The spectre of this is freaking everyone out. The misinformation and biased language about bite strength is disturbing.
- I second that!
- Ooh. Sorry. Did dog walker concerns get dropped?
- Again this is an information gathering exercise only
- The misinformation and biased language about bite strength is disturbing.
- Well said!
- We need to ask tough questions so we can fully inform Council on public sentiment